Appendix

Herbert Charles Clark, 1877–1960, Isthmian Physician and Scientist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the course of my associations with Isthmian questions, I have become increasingly aware of the contributions made by residents of my State of Pennsylvania in various fields related to the construction, operation, maintenance, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal.

Among such leaders was Herbert Charles Clark (1877–1960), who, in the course of an Isthmian career lasting from 1909 to 1954, saw his original contributions in the field of tropical and preventive medicine receive world acclaim.

In order that a suitable account of his distinguished services may be permanently recorded in the annals of the Congress, I include the following obituary as part of these remarks:

HERBERT CHARLES CLARK, 1877–1960

Herbert Charles Clark, M.D., D. Sc., died at his home in Allentown, Pa., on November 8, 1960, on the eve of his 83d birthday. He was born in Economy, Ind., on November 11, 1877, the son of John Milton Clark, M.D., and Ida M. Conley. He was married to Jessie S. Wilson in 1911. They had one son, John Wilson, who has degrees in both dentistry and medicine and who lives at 1510 Lehigh Parkway South, Allentown, Pa.

After graduation from Economy High High School in 1896, Herbert Clark studied for 3 years at Earlham College in Indiana in preparation for medical school and in 1906 he received his M.D. degree from the University of Pennsylvania. He spent a year as intern at the Children's Seashore Home in Atlantic City, N.J., and 2 years as intern and resident physician at Pennsylvania Hospital in Philadelphia, and in December 1909 he became pathologist at the Board of Health Laboratory in the Panama Canal Zone. He held this position till 1922 with the exception of 2 years spent in the Medical Corps of the U.S. Army during World War I. Upon release from active duty he held the rank of lieutenant colonel and he held this rank in the Reserves till reaching retirement age in 1941.

From 1922 to 1928 he was director of laboratories and preventive medicine for the United Fruit Co., and in 1929 he became Director of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory in Panama. He retired from this position in 1954 and took up residence in Allentown, Pa.

Herbert Clark was well known as an authority on tropical diseases, particularly malaria, and in World War II he was a consultant in tropical diseases to the Secretary of War and lecturer on tropical diseases for the National Research Council.

He served as president of the Medical Association of the Isthmian Canal Zone, the National Malaria Society, the American Society of Tropical Medicine and the American Academy of Tropical Medicine. He was a member of many other medical societies including the American Medical Association, the Southern Medical Association, the American Association of Pathologists and Bacteriologists, the American Society of Parasitologists and the Association of Military Surgeons. He was a Fellow of the College of American Pathologists and a member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. He was made an Honorary Member of the National Academy of Medicine and Surgery of the Republic of Panama and of the American Veterinary Association.

He was also a member of the American and the National Geographical Societies, the National Audubon Society, the New York Academy of Science, the American Museum of Natural History and the American Society of Panama. He was president of this last group in 1935.

He served as a member of the board of directors of Gorgas Memorial Institute and as a member of the executive committee and board of directors of the Grayson Foundation.

The American Society of Tropical Medicine awarded him the Walter Reed Medal in 1940, and in 1959 he received the Richard Pearson Strong Medal from the American Foundation of Tropical Medicine.

The School of Medicine of the University of Panama presented him with the Gold Medal Award in 1954 and in the same year he was presented with the Keys to the City of Panama by the City Council and the Assembly of the Republic of Panama honored him with a resolution in recognition of his service to humanity.

His decorations included the Order Vasco Nunez de Balboa, Grade of Comendador of the Republic of Panama and the Cruz de la Fundacion International Eloy Alfaro, of Ecuador.

He was a diplomate of the American Board of Pathology and of the American Board of Preventive Medicine and Public Health.

In 1946 Earlham College conferred upon him the honorary degree of doctor of science.

He was the author of over 100 papers on subjects relating to pathology and tropical medicine.

The curriculum vitae listed here does little to portray Herbert Clark's warm personality, his friendliness, his enthusiasm and his keen scientific mind. He was a stimulating speaker and could talk well on a great variety of subjects.

He was well known to and well loved and respected by the many physicians who visited or resided in the Canal Zone or in Panama during his directorship of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory. He was outstanding as an individual of character and sincerity and as a physician and scientist.

India's Aggression Against Goa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. SCRANTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial of radio station WEJL, Scranton, Pa., is so timely and indicative of what many Americans are thinking today that I hasten to call it to the attention of my colleagues:

INDIA AND GOA

While many nations, including the United States, have denounced India's aggression against Goa, neither the United Nations nor any country, or group of countries, was able to stop this use of military force by Prime Minister Nehru, the so-called neutralist leader of India. In direct violation of the Charter of the United Nations, and with the approval of the Communists, Nehru made the attack at odds of at least 400 to 1 in his military favor. Many Americans who are traditional lovers of fair play, wonder why India's military might has not been turned on the Chinese Communists who have actually invaded India, rather than on the small Portuguese garrisons—defending land they have occupied for nearly five centuries. Nehru's use of force may well react against India if our Congress refuses to ratify the $1½ billion in cash credits already granted by the administration, but subject to ratification by the American Congress next month. And, the West may suffer, also, should Portugal feel it has been betrayed, and for that reason withdraw from the United Nations and from NATO, as well. Many Americans will be looking for Congress and the administration to review commitments to nations like India, which profess to be peace loving, but who defy the United Nations and engage in armed aggression, as has been the unhappy case with Goa.

A Tribute to Archbishop Francis P. Keough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, last month Baltimore City lost one of its outstanding citizens and a great spiritual leader. It is with a deep and sincere sense of sadness that I note the passing of the Most Reverend Francis P. Keough, archbishop of Baltimore.

Archbishop Keough died at 8:35 Friday morning, December 8, 1961, in the Georgetown University Hospital after having been stricken with a cerebral thrombosis on November 30 past.

Born December 30, 1890, in New Britain, Conn., Francis Patrick Keough was educated at St. Mary's Parochial School in New Britain; St. Thomas Seminary, Hartford; Seminaire de St. Sulpice, Ossy, France; and St. Bernard's Seminary, Rochester, N.Y. He was ordained June 10, 1916. The first and only parish assignment of his career was 3 years as curate of St. Rose's Church in Meriden, Conn. He never became a pastor, an unusual circumstance in a clerical career.

Father Keough was consecrated bishop of Providence, May 22, 1954, a post he served with distinction until being named archbishop on November 29, 1947, by the late Pope Pius XII, following the death of Archbishop Michael J. Curley.

His loss will be felt not only by the members of his own faith but by all who knew him and came in contact with him, for his was a faith which surpassed ecclesiastical bounds, giving comfort to all, regardless of their method of devotion, their ancestral background, or the pigment of their skin. He was truly a religious man in every sense of the word.

Archbishop Keough's death marks the passing of a great spiritual leader from our midst, and he will be sorely missed, especially by the people of Baltimore, whom he served well and faithfully as archbishop for 14 years. I am grateful for the privilege of having known Archbishop Keough, and I mourn his death.

"Floating Merchandise Mart" To Help Seek World Markets for American Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which would provide for the establishment of a floating American Trade Fair in the form of an American ship which would visit the various countries of the world.

The purpose of this floating American Trade Fair is to afford American manufacturers and producers of agricultural products a greater opportunity to display their products to the people of the world and in this way more effectively compete in the stream of international commerce. Provisions would be made to take orders on the spot in the various ports for the products exhibited on the ship.

This legislation is designed to assist the President in his program to increase the flow of American exports and thereby reduce our serious balance-of-payments deficit.

It is my firm conviction that approval of this legislation will contribute substantially to a recognized national goal of increasing employment opportunities for American workers. This, of course is one of the essential features of the President's program for freer world trade.

This floating American Trade Fair will also increase opportunities for the American agricultural community to acquire new markets throughout the world.

I am very happy to announce that this project has been thoroughly discussed with representatives of the American Merchant Marine Institute and the AFL–CIO Maritime Committee. It is most encouraging to see representatives of management and labor in this very important segment of the transportation industry not only help develop this project, but also give it their unqualified support.

I am particularly grateful to Mr. Frank Darling, president of Local 1031, IBEW, Chicago, Ill., and Mr. Harry C. Herman, industrial relations consultant from New York City, who first called my attention to the need for this project. Mr. Darling's membership has suffered considerably because of competition from foreign imports in the electronics industry. I am happy to see that this very responsible labor leader is leading the way to stimulate American exports to help make up the deficiency of jobs in the American electronics industry.

Also, this legislation could not have been prepared without the assistance of Mr. Ralph E. Casey, president of the American Merchant Marine Institute, and Mr. Joseph Curran, chairman of the AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, both of New York City.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to stress that the basic purpose of this legislation is to assist in particular the small manufacturers and their employees and the farmers of America who heretofore have not been afforded an opportunity to compete in foreign commerce.

The urgent need for this legislation can perhaps best be manifested by the fact that only 2 percent of American industry is now selling in foreign markets. It should be of particular concern to those Members of Congress from agricultural areas that only 10 percent of agricultural commodities are exported overseas, despite the tremendous support furnished by existing Government programs of an aid and assistance nature.

It is for these reasons that I today invite my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this legislation.

This bill would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to proceed forthwith with the acquisition of a ship or ships which would be converted into appropriate facilities to exhibit products of individual American manufacturers. Provisions would also be made for the display of products of American agriculture.

The Secretary is authorized to either convert ships now owned by the American Government or, if no such ship is appropriate, he may enter into a charter agreement for the use of an appropriate facility now privately owned.

While I am aware that the Department of Commerce sponsors various trade fairs around the world, a study of exhibitors would show that the small manufacturers all over America are conspicuous by their absence because they cannot afford to participate in this type of venture. They simply cannot afford individual exhibits at each of the trade fairs while, through the use of this display ship, they could demonstrate their products in many countries with only one relatively inexpensive exhibit.

The Secretary is authorized under this bill to charge a nominal fee to help defray the cost of this floating American Trade Fair, but I think it should be perfectly clear to all of us that if we are going to make a concerted effort to put American products into world markets, some financial assistance will have to be forthcoming from the Federal Government.

It is anticipated that several hundred individual American exhibitors could display their wares on one floating American Trade Fair.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of visiting several European countries for the express purpose of ascertaining what problems would be created for the American business community as the Common Market of Europe develops. There should be no question in anyone's mind that when the full industrial potential of the Common Market nations is tied into one cohesive economic unit, the competition for world markets will become more intense.

It is my judgment that any further delay in helping stimulate American exports can well mean tragedy for countless American workers. It is for this reason that I sincerely hope Congress will quickly approve the legislation I have introduced today so that we can at least make a start toward increasing our export position.

On the basis of my observations in Europe, there is not the slightest doubt in my mind that people in foreign markets are willing to buy American products. While I am fully mindful of the complex nature involved in tariff structures and price differentials, these factors notwithstanding, I have heard many Europeans assure me they like the quality and fresh design of American products. It is my thorough conviction that one reason why we have not been able to capture a greater degree of international commerce is because the vast majority of American industry has not had an opportunity to seek these markets either because it does not have the incentive, the facilities, or the knowledge for trading abroad.

I should like to stress that our foreign competitors have already recognized these problems for their own industry, and in at least two instances of which I know, foreign countries are today using floating trade fairs to stimulate sales of their nation's products.

One of our most serious competitors, Japan, has two ships which carry extensive exhibits of Japanese industry touring world ports. It is my understanding that the Soviet Union has similar ships which now operate into ports within Soviet-bloc countries.

It is impossible for me to estimate the cost of putting a floating American trade fair into operation, but the best available estimates indicate that this project would cost approximately $4,000 a day for a Mariner-type ship of the 13,000-ton class. When you consider that anywhere from 800 to 1,200 exhibitors could participate in this venture at one time, the cost of helping create new jobs for Americans per exhibitor becomes relatively nominal.

There is no question that competitive conditions in foreign trade are radically changing in a worldwide upheaval of formal trade relations. It is this revolution in foreign trade relations which has led President Kennedy to give

stronger emphasis and administration support toward the revamping of our foreign-trade policies.

We must not only keep up but increase our favorable balance of exports, and we must do this particularly among the small manufacturers of America who today in virtually every community of our Nation are being most adversely affected by foreign imports.

It would indeed be unfortunate if our country failed to realize the vast opportunities for American exports in the field of consumer goods that are now being created in the newly independent states throughout the world. Unless we make it possible for American industry to go after these markets now, it is my fear that once the consumers of these nations begin dealing with other countries, the force of habit will encourage them to continue dealing with other countries for many years to come.

This specially designed ship which I am urging the Department of Commerce to establish would visit all of the major ports of the world. With the help of the U.S. Information Service and our diplomatic missions in these various countries, buyers from inland markets would be encouraged to visit the American trade exhibit when it reaches the port nearest to them.

This floating merchandise mart, carrying American salesmen and their wares to ports of call in Europe, Africa, Asia, South America, and the Far East, could indeed provide for America a new concept of pioneering in international trade relations.

This floating American Trade Fair could be one of the most important factors in bringing the New Frontier to world markets.

I am particularly impressed with the assurance given by Mr. Joseph Curran, president of the AFL-CIO Maritime Committee, that his union would adopt minimum manning requirements to staff this ship with crew and officers to help keep the cost of operations to a minimum. We know that as new markets are opened up for American products throughout the world, this means greater operating opportunities for our American merchant fleet and the people who man it.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly anxious to have this legislation approved because Chicago, my hometown, is destined to become one of the major ports of the world since the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway. I am confident that Midwest manufacturers would be most anxious to display their products on a ship which could start from Chicago to ports all over the world.

I consider this legislation so vital as an aid toward helping America retain her position in world markets that I intend to ask the appropriate committee for an immediate hearing on this proposal.

No one would contend that this floating American Trade Fair is the answer to all of our problems in the complex structure of international world trade, but I am completely convinced that this one project offers a great deal of hope at least toward a partial solution.

I do hope that other Members of Congress will join in cosponsoring this legislation.

Farm Parity Ratio Hit 22-Year Low During First Year on the New Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture in its monthly publication of December 1961 entitled "Agricultural Prices" reported that during the month ending December 15, 1961, the cost of things farmers must buy edged up to an alltime December high while the prices farmers received did not keep pace with these increased costs. This caused the ratio between costs paid and prices received to drop to 79, or two points below December 1960. As reported by the press, this parity ratio at 79 for the year 1961 was the lowest since 1939, some 22 years ago.

This means of course that farmers as a whole received only 79 percent of parity during 1961, the first year on the New Frontier. On January 8 and 9, Secretary Freeman announced the 1962 price supports on 11 farm commodities at the same levels as he set them in 1961. He set upland cotton at 82 percent of parity, extra long staple cotton at 65 percent of parity, peanuts at 85 percent of parity, dry edible beans at 70 percent of parity, rice at 78 percent of parity, and honey at 74 percent of parity. He also set corn, barley, and oats at 74 percent of parity, rye and grain sorghum at 78 percent of parity. He lowered cottonseed and soybeans to 78 percent of parity and raised flaxseed to 74 percent of parity.

Farmers have a right to wonder what happened to the glowing campaign promises of "90 percent of parity" and "parity of income for the farmer." The American corn farmer would especially like to know because as of December 15, 1961, the price he received for a bushel of corn was 94.7 cents, which is only 58 percent of parity.

Under unanimous consent I include herewith the following news stories of January 8, 1962, from the American Farm Bureau Newsletter and January 2, 1962, from the Wall Street Journal:

[From the Wall Street Journal]

RATIO OF PRICES FARMS RECEIVE TO THOSE PAID HIT 22-YEAR LOW IN 1961—FARMERS RECEIVED HIGHER PRICES IN MONTH TO MID-DECEMBER, BUT THEIR COSTS EQUALED RECORD

WASHINGTON.—The ratio of prices farmers received to prices they paid in 1961 was the lowest in any year since 1939.

The Agriculture Department said this parity ratio was 79 in the month to mid-December, the same as in mid-November. This brought the average for the full year to 79, lowest since the 77 posted in 1939.

Parity is the ratio between prices received and prices paid, based on 1910–14 conditions. Theoretically, if the ratio were 100, farmers would be receiving fair prices.

Average prices received by farmers in the month rose nearly two points from the month earlier level to 240 percent of the 1910–14 average. The Department attributed the increase to higher prices for meat animals, commercial broilers, oranges and tobacco.

But, in the same period, the index of prices paid by farmers for goods and services rose one point to 302 percent of the base period average, a new high for the month and equal to the record level of last spring. The Department said increased prices of used automobiles and trucks, feed and motor supplies more than offset lower prices for building and fencing materials.

The Department of Agriculture reports December 15 parity prices of principal farm crops compare as follows:

	Dec. 15, 1961	Nov. 15, 1961	Dec. 15, 1960
Wheat, per bushel	$2.39	$2.38	$2.36
Cotton, per pound	.3896	.3883	.3850
Rice, per hundredweight	6.04	6.02	5.90
Corn, per bushel	1.62	1.62	1.62
Peanuts, per pound	.130	.130	.128
Tobacco, per pound	.649	.647	.632
Potatoes, per hundredweight	2.46	2.45	2.35
Butterfat, per pound	.752	.749	.736
Milk, per hundredweight	5.13	5.12	4.98
Wool, per pound	.752	.749	.739
Barley, per bushel	1.25	1.25	1.26
Cottonseed, per ton	62.80	62.60	66.80
Flaxseed, per bushel	3.81	3.79	3.81
Oats, per bushel	.843	.840	.837
Rye, per bushel	1.48	1.47	1.48
Soybeans, per bushel	2.90	2.89	2.90
Cattle, per hundredweight	23.80	23.70	23.60
Calves, per hundredweight	26.30	26.20	26.10
Chickens, live, per pound	.252	.251	.256
Eggs, per dozen	.471	.470	.462
Hogs, per hundredweight	21.40	21.30	21.30
Lambs, per hundredweight	25.30	25.20	25.50
Sheep, per hundredweight	9.18	9.15	9.66
Turkeys, per pound	.347	.346	.346

Prices received by farmers for their principal crops compare as follows:

	Dec. 15, 1961	Nov. 15, 1961	Dec. 15, 1960
Wheat, per bushel	$1.89	$1.87	$1.77
Rye, per bushel	1.05	1.05	.827
Rice, rough, per hundredweight	6.23	5.36	4.78
Corn, per bushel	.947	.938	.911
Oats, per bushel	.659	.643	.585
Barley, per bushel	1.01	1.00	.839
Sorghum grain, per hundredweight	1.65	1.63	1.41
Hay, baled, per ton	20.70	20.50	21.00
Cotton, per pound	.3179	.3311	.2873
Cottonseed, per ton	51.50	52.40	45.20
Soybeans, per bushel	2.30	2.27	1.99
Peanuts	.114	.112	.108
Flaxseed, per bushel	3.16	3.12	2.47
Potatoes, per bushel	1.17	1.24	1.96
Tobacco, per pound	.656	.604	.637
Hogs, per hundredweight	16.10	15.70	16.50
Beef cattle, per hundredweight	20.50	19.90	20.20
Calves, per hundredweight	24.10	23.70	22.80
Sheep, per hundredweight	5.37	5.14	5.55
Lambs, per hundredweight	15.50	15.10	16.10
Butterfat, per pound	.611	.607	.609
Milk, wholesale, per hundredweight	4.49	4.56	4.59
Chickens, live, per pound	.143	.116	.150
Turkeys, live, per pound	.186	.184	.266
Eggs, per dozen	.350	.360	.446
Wool, per pound	.408	.405	.393

[From the American Farm Bureau Newsletter, Jan. 8, 1962]

FARM COSTS SET RECORD LAST MONTH

Farm costs reached an alltime high in December 1961, USDA has reported.

Higher prices paid by farmers for used cars and food raised the mid-December family living index to a new record high.

The index of prices paid for commodities and services, including interest, taxes, and farm wage rates, rose one point to a new high for the month on December 15. At 302 percent of the 1910–14 average, the December index equaled the record level prevailing last spring. It was 1 percent higher than a year earlier.

Farm prices also advanced in December, the Department said. But the rise in costs kept the parity ratio at 79—2 points lower than in December 1960, and the second lowest for any December since 1933.

Opinion Poll of Minnesota's Third Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, more than 12,000 residents of Minnesota's Third Congressional District responded to an opinion poll which I prepared last November.

This is an indication of the tremendous interest and concern that our citizens feel today for what we here in the Congress are doing. The results of the poll constitute valuable evidence of the mood of the people regarding some of the vital issues before us. Minnesota's Third District is not only one of the largest in the country, but also is one of the most diverse in terms of population characteristics. The district could well be described as a microcosm of the country in matters of public affairs opinion.

First, a word about the mechanics of the project itself. From beginning to end I had the able assistance of a government student intern who is a candidate for a Ph. D. in American Government at the American University in Washington.

We prepared the questions in the knowledge that their meaning might be open to various interpretations, that they had to be kept relatively short and could not fully describe all aspects of complicated issues, but that the results would be a relatively accurate reflection of the opinions of those who responded.

Volunteers working in my district office hand addressed the many thousands of envelopes, using the names of telephone subscribers in the entire district. There was no attempt to concentrate the poll in any particular area or in any population segment representing special political attitudes. Several newspapers were kind enough to print the questionnaire in full and this produced many additional replies. All returns were tabulated by a group of volunteer students from American University.

A surprisingly high number of persons responding also added their own comments. They gave me the benefit of their expanded views on many important issues, demonstrating a keen sense of awareness of Government matters and of a citizen's participation in representative government. More than three-fourths of all respondents requested to see the final tabulated results.

Many persons mentioned that it was difficult to answer some questions with a simple "yes" or "no." It is interesting that Congressmen often have the same difficulty in the votes they must cast; how easy it would be if every legislative issue were clearcut instead of being complex. Most questions require an evaluation of the favorable and the unfavorable aspects within that issue, and an expression of that evaluation by a simple "yes" or "no" vote when the roll is called in the House of Representatives.

Returns were received in large numbers from Republicans, Democrats, Democrat-Farmer-Laborites, Independents, and others. It is significant to note the great majority favoring a stronger American foreign policy, the public emphasis placed on the need for sounder money policies, and the overwhelming support for an improvement in our nonmilitary ability to prosecute the cold war.

Gratifying response to this experiment in democracy proved that the effort was indeed worthwhile. Thousands of people have been brought into closer contact with their Government, and it is more vital today than ever before that our people recognize the important contribution they can make to our system of self government.

The results of my annual legislative poll are as follows:

ANNUAL LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE OF CONGRESSMAN CLARK MACGREGOR

1. Do you feel that recent events in Cuba, Southeast Asia, and Berlin indicate the desirability and need for a stronger U.S. foreign policy?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	83.8	10.3	5.9

2. Do you favor establishing a new Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	24.4	60.0	15.6

3. Do you favor Federal assistance to education for—
(a) School construction?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	36.7	50.4	12.9

(b) Teachers' salaries?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	18.1	67.0	14.9

ANNUAL LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE OF CONGRESSMAN CLARK MACGREGOR—Continued

(c) Only those school districts without adequate resources?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	44.6	44.0	11.4

(d) Public schools?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	39.0	49.4	11.6

(e) Private schools?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	9.9	76.8	13.3

4. Do you favor medical care for the aged—
(a) With benefits paid for by added social security taxes which are compulsory?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	33.7	50.6	15.7

(b) With benefits to only those who wish to pay added social security taxes (voluntary participation)?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	33.8	43.7	22.5

(c) With increased participation by the Federal and State governments using general tax revenues?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	16.5	58.0	25.5

(d) Through sources outside the Government?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	37.0	34.3	28.7

5. Do you feel that Congress should put a stop to "backdoor spending" which bypasses congressional approval of appropriations and borrows funds from the Treasury with no budgetary control?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	82.5	10.2	7.3

6. Would you favor a peacetime GI bill to grant educational benefits to soldiers who serve during peacetime?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	37.4	58.4	4.2

7. Do you think the postal service should be self-supporting and that postage rates should be raised accordingly?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	76.2	19.0	4.8

ANNUAL LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE OF CONGRESSMAN CLARK MACGREGOR—Continued

8. Would you vote an additional $7 to $9 billion to send a man to the moon and back by 1970?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	34.2	60.7	5.1

9. Do you feel that Congress should continue to investigate activities designed to undermine our Government?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	90.5	6.8	2.7

10. Would you favor National Government control of television programing?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	12.8	83.1	4.1

11. Would you favor a new program designed to systematically reduce the national debt?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	87.8	6.5	5.7

12. In general, do you feel there are enough laws regulating business?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	76.6	18.2	5.2

13. In general, do you feel there are enough laws regulating labor unions?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	25.5	69.6	4.9

14. In your opinion, is the United States engaged in a nonmilitary war with communism which could end in total victory for either side without a major American military effort?

	Yes	No	No response
Percent	70.7	22.2	7.1

(If you answered "Yes," please answer the following:)
(a) Do Americans generally realize we are so engaged?

	Yes	No
Percent	38.1	61.9

(b) Should we train more people to fight it effectively in terms of diplomacy, economics, and public information?

	Yes	No
Percent	95.9	4.1

(c) Are we now putting enough skill and effort into it?

	Yes	No
Percent	7.5	92.5

ANNUAL LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE OF CONGRESSMAN CLARK MACGREGOR—Continued

(d) Are we winning?

	Yes	No
Percent	12.6	87.4

(e) Does winning possibly require higher taxes and postponing some desirable domestic programs?

	Yes	No
Percent	72.1	27.9

15. Of the following general topics, check 3 to which you think Congress should give top priority in the session beginning January 1962.

	Percent
Improve our international situation in diplomacy, economics, and public information	60.4
Seek a peaceful world	44.3
Improve national defense	38.4
Balance the budget	35.5
Check inflation	32.2
Reduce unemployment	17.2
Improve public education	16.9
Improve civil rights	13.4
Solve farm problems	9.8
Win the space race	8.1
Other	14.4

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

BUFFALO, N.Y.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I am writing to tell you I am 100 percent in agreement with your House Resolution 211 (captive nations).

We must act upon this with all our strength. The Congress has voted for foreign aid, disarmament, and other issues. The captive nations may be our one remaining hope.

I am writing to the members of the House Rules Committee to back you up.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. A. REDWING.

PITTSBURGH, PA.,
November 12, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I am writing to let you know that Mrs. Ilgen and I are behind you 100 percent on your Resolution 211 with reference to captive nations. We believe that the activities of the State Department should be investigated and made known to the citizens of this free country—still free.

Sincerely,

LENARD ILGEN.

NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.,
November 10, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I am in favor of your resolution which would provide for a Special House Committee on Captive Nations.

Sincerely yours,

R. L. HANNAH.

TRIADELPHIA, W. VA.,
November 12, 1961.

DEAR SIR: When the 2d session of the 87th Congress convenes, I wish to urge you to give priority to consideration of House Resolution 211, establishment of a Captive Nations Committee.

It is time this country went on the offensive against communism; a committee to study ways of aiding the peoples of captive nations to throw off the yoke of communism could be a positive force against communism. It is also time that Congress takes the initiative in running the affairs of this country; in foreign affairs it is the Executive that should carry out the mandates of Congress, not vice versa, as at present.

There is a swelling chorus of voices in this land that demands an end to appeasement of communism; I am certain that this will lend strength to your stand.

In support of House Resolution 211, I invite your attention to the Manion Forum broadcast of November 12.

Very truly yours,

J. ANDERSON ENGLISH.

NASHVILLE, TENN.,
November 19, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I heartily endorse your House Resolution 211 concerning a Committee on Captive Nations.

I also believe that we should do as much as possible to free these nations as it seems to me a great deal of their plight may be blamed on our actions.

It does not seem as if the United Nations, even with all the diatribes against colonialism spouted on the floor of this body is going to take any action about these Soviet captive nations. Indeed, or any other ac-

tion which will be an affront to the Communist conspiracy.

It is time to lay the cards face up on the table and either abide by the U.N. Charter or withdraw the United States from the U.N.

Our Congress is the last and best hope for our and freedoms survival. So let us get to it.

Respectfully yours,

JOSEPH A. DEAVER.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,
November 17, 1961.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I would like to express my support of the bill introduced by you to form a House Committee on Captive Nations. I am strongly in favor of having Congress make studies and recommend action that would show the captive nations that we are concerned with their plight. Such a committee would give hope to millions of people in Iron Curtain countries that their desires for freedom is recognized and that America is not going to forget them.

Sincerely,

ERWIN BERNHARD.

QUAIN & RAMSTAD CLINIC,
Bismarck, N. Dak., November 18, 1961.

Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I sincerely approve of your resolution to establish a special House Committee on Captive Nations. I hope that this will be approved by the Congress.

Sincerely,

ROBERT B. TUDOR, M.D.

GALVESTON, TEX.,
November 1961.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I am in favor of House Resolution 211 to form a committee on captive nations.

Sincerely,

ELENORA CARSON.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.,
November 15, 1961.

Congressman D. J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It has been brought to my attention that you plan to introduce a bill (House Resolution 211) which would establish a Captive Nations Committee.

That is a most praisworthy idea and I sincerely hope you succeed in your endeavor.

All too long has this country neglected to keep alive the plight of the captive people behind the Iron Curtain. We seem determined, instead, to aid their cruel oppressors.

Such a committee as you propose would show those unfortunate people that there are, indeed, many Americans who are interested in their welfare and eventual release.

Wishing you the very best, I am,

Very truly yours,

MRS. R. A. WRIGHT.

SANTA ROSA, CALIF.,
November 12, 1961.

Congressman D. J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Dean Manion mentioned your bill or resolution on his program this evening. I would very much like to have a copy of the resolution. I think it was House Resolution 211, but couldn't write down all the data fast enough. I will certainly contact our Congressmen on this matter.

It would certainly seem that the administration is not looking for a logical solution to our problems and your resolution sounds like a very good way to a solution.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

MRS. STANLEY CRAWFORD.

Medical Care and Hospitalization Under the Free Enterprise System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I wish to propose a program for medical care and hospitalization for elderly Americans within the framework of the free enterprise system.

The problem of medical costs for elderly people is a problem that demands solution and should not become involved in the old arguments about socialized medicine.

There is no doubt in my mind that Federal sponsorship of a health and hospitalization plan, either directly through a new agency or as a part of social security, and no matter how limited the benefits in the beginning, would lead to the nationalization or socialization of medicine and a decline in the quality of medical care.

In general, I would seek to overcome the dangers and inadequacies of various current proposals by permitting each individual or married couple over age 62 to select his own health care insurance, permitting a choice of plans similar to that now offered Federal Government employees.

Regardless of other medical expenses, I would permit deduction of the total amount spent on such insurance in the income tax returns of individuals whose income exceeded levels I shall set tentatively at $2,500 for the individual or $4,000 for married couples.

I would authorize a tax credit in the amount of the insurance costs for those whose incomes are below these limits.

For individuals having no taxable income or who would pay a tax less than the cost of the insurance plan, I would authorize issuance of a certificate entitling them to purchase an approved health insurance plan. Such a certificate would be in the amount of the difference between the cost of the plan and the amount the individual or couple could pay by reason of a tax credit.

This would mean that a person with no taxable income would pay nothing for the insurance, and others would pay relative to their ability to pay.

The certificates would be accepted by insurance companies in payment of premiums and in turn would be accepted by the Internal Revenue Service as part payment of taxes due from the companies.

As I see it, my proposal has several distinct advantages.

It limits the assistance to those who really need it, and provides assistance in a degree commensurate with need. On the other hand, the social security approach would provide benefits regardless of the wealth of an individual while ignoring millions of needy persons who are not in the social security program.

It provides a variety of insurance programs that may be tailored to the conditions of individuals. The social security proposal restricts everyone to what I consider an entirely inadequate period of hospitalization with no payment of doctor bills.

It preserves both the American's historic right of free choice and the American free enterprise approach to solving individual needs.

My plan would not permit Federal bureaucratic control of the services offered and could not lead to socialized medicine as I am confident most other plans would do.

Finally, it utilizes at a minimum an existing Government agency without creation of a new mammoth bureau, and provides for a yearly review.

The United States has the highest standards of medical care in the world. Other nations have demonstrated what happens to such standards when the cold hand of government imposes itself between doctor and patient.

I think it would be tragic if the real need for medical care for elderly people who cannot afford it were to become the means of restricting them and all other Americans to a lower quality of medical care than we now enjoy, and perhaps to a curtailment of medical care.

The Nation Mourns Passing of a Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial dated November 17, 1961, from the Paterson Evening News which captures the essence and quality of our beloved Mr. SAM.

THE NATION MOURNS PASSING OF A GREAT AMERICAN

If ever a man symbolized America and all its rugged strength, SAM RAYBURN was that man.

More even than Presidents, Mr. RAYBURN was of the America born of Pilgrims' quest for liberty and freedom, of the tribulation of a people striving with might, muscle and heart to create the greatest country in the world.

Lofty of principle, dedicated of heart and mind, implacable foe of sham and corruption, earthy, human and understanding, Mr. SAM embodied all the fundamental ideals which combined to make him truly Mr. United States.

Many called him Mr. Democrat because he was his party's leader in the House of Congress twice as long as the next nearest competitor as Speaker, Henry Clay. But his partisanship was less his source for pride than his unswerving Americanism.

Now Mr. SAM is dead and the Nation sustains a great loss.

Yet even as the country grieves, it is enriched for years and years to come by the

sturdy example of fidelity and fierce dedication he set through the years in which he served in its legislative halls.

Mr. SAM was his party's matchless spokesman in the House, but first, above being a Democrat, he asked whether or not the cause he espoused was for the country's good.

While all about him pomp and ceremony of the Nation's Capital fulminated and he was a prize to be cherished midst formal panoply, Mr. RAYBURN preferred the unostentatious company of his own little group of intimates with whom he delighted to converse on a universal range of topics.

What manner of man he was is best illustrated by his insistence that never was sex to be discussed as is wont among whispering men, nor was there to be shadowy reference to womanhood which he held sacred. From this, it logically followed that Mr. RAYBURN was a deeply religious man, understanding of all faiths, in spite of the fact that he embraced no special religion until 5 years ago when he joined a Baptist church.

Though he battled the Republican side of the House with fervor, his friends in the opposite party were as much his advocates as the Democrats. No less a witness to this universal affection was our own Gordon Canfield who, for the 20 years of his service in the House, found Mr. SAM a loyal and friendly counselor.

Mr. RAYBURN's down-to-earth political philosophy could be summed up this way:

"In politics you have to know how the people feel and what they are thinking. If you don't feel what you can't see, you are dead. You have to be fair. You have to have vision. You have to learn to give and take. You must compromise when necessary. You have to work hard and keep in touch with your people. You have to have faith in the people because they are good and fair. Having good commonsense isn't enough; you have to exercise it."

It was this philosophy which made RAYBURN's name synonymous with American politics and helped him inscribe a lasting page in congressional history.

He left his imprint on far-reaching legislation. The Rural Electrification Administration, the rural highway program, the Securities and Exchange Act, the Federal Communications Act and antitrust laws were among his legislative children.

Sternness of mien was merely a cover for a warm, understanding heart in this great American.

If, from his life and the eulogies which now flow in the midst of grief at his passing, those who follow him will at least attempt to emulate his superb life, SAM RAYBURN will have served his country even beyond his lifetime matchless performance.

Because now more than ever America needs statesmen of great stature which makes his passing so much more tragic for the country.

Farewell, Mr. SAM. Peace to you in God's loving care in the Valhalla of all good people.

MEDICAL CARE FOR AGED—IT'S TOP ISSUE ONCE AGAIN

One of the administration's prime objectives at the coming session of Congress will be to bulldoze into law a medical-care-for-the-aged plan that is tied directly with social security.

The last session of Congress resisted administration pressure to pass such legislation. The measure was killed in the Senate last August by a coalition of southern Democrats and Republicans, 51 to 44.

Approval of the plan would be a major stride toward socialized medicine. Its wide range coverage would include medical care for retired persons under social security; financial help for expanding nursing homes, medical schools, dental colleges, and hospitals.

Social security taxes would be increased to foot the bills, estimated by the administration at $1.1 billion in the first full year of operation, increasing to $2.6 billion by the year 2000.

Ironically, Mr. Kennedy chooses to press a plan that smacks only of socialized medicine at a time when 27 States, including California, have taken advantage directly of the Kerr-Mills law. It provides for Federal-State medical care for the aged.

The Kerr-Mills bill, passed in September 1960, and which went into effect in California this week, has two chief provisions: It extends provisions under which welfare departments may pay certain medical bills for elderly people on welfare rolls; a new program under which aid is granted to those normally able to pay their own expenses but who cannot cope with the additional costs of illness.

It is a Federal-State operation. The Federal Government contributes between 50 and 80 percent of the money, depending upon State wealth as measured by per capita income.

Each State can work out details of its own program, including specific benefits and conditions under which they will be paid. The proposed Kennedy legislation in contrast would strip States of all authority in administering the program.

It still is too early to accurately evaluate the Kerr-Mills plan. But in 15 months its acceptance throughout the Nation as well as in U.S. posessions such as Guam and the Virgin Islands clearly indicates it must have considerable merit.

Few can quarrel with the need for medical assistance for the aged, but why discard a plan before it is tried? It should be remembered that Mr. Kennedy, as a Senator, was among those who voted for the Kerr-Mills compromise plan so that he could go to the voters in the presidential election with a record of support.

It would appear that the President's proposal is aimed directly at the votes of the aged with little real regard for the consequences of such legislation.

Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Union of January 4, 1962:

Letter From a Patriotic American Girl

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to insert in the RECORD a letter which came to me during adjournment from a young student in my congressional district, Monica Ellen Donnelly. To those of us now serving our country in public office, it is reassuring to know that youngsters like Monica are growing and developing into fine American citizens to resume these responsibilities. As she so sincerely reminds us, we should all be aware of our country's greatness and the need for each of us to do his share to keep and protect our freedom and way of life. Her letter is as follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HEALEY: In my history class we have been learning about the beginnings of communism and the tactics the Communists use in their search for world power. We were told that each letter written to the Government represents the feelings of 10,000 Americans in statistics. Even though I am not of voting age, I wanted to let you know that I want you to do all you can to stop the Communists from taking over our country. I don't want to live under those tyrants. I love my country and would sooner die than see it taken over by Communists. America is their No. 1 target. We stand for everything they hate. I try to do my part in bringing up the standards of patriotism here by hanging out the flag on all legal holidays. Could you please see if you could do something to make people hang out the flag and play the national anthem? If we don't show we love our country, how will the rest of the world know we love America? Our country is the greatest on the earth. We should do everything we can to stop communism's spread and display to the rest of the world that Americans love their country and would rather die than live under communism.

I realize that this one letter isn't going to change the world, but at least it's a start. Please do what you can to stop those horrible Communists from getting Red China into the U.N. and stop the United States from giving aid to Communist countries.

Thank you for your kindness and patience. My mother and father and I wish you the best of luck.

Sincerely,

MONICA ELLEN DONNELLY.

Mr. Speaker, with your further permission, I quote the following from the booklet, "How To Respect and Display Our Flag," prepared by the U.S. Marine Corps:

HOW TO DISPLAY THE FLAG

Respect your flag and render it the courtesies to which it is entitled by observing the following rules, which are in accordance with title 36, United States Code, sections 173–178.

The national flag should be raised and lowered by hand. It should be displayed only from sunrise to sunset, or between such hours as may be designated by proper authority. Do not raise the flag while it is furled. Unfurl, then hoist quickly to the top of the staff. Lower it slowly and with dignity. Place no objects on or over the flag. Various articles are sometimes placed on a speaker's table covered with the flag. This practice should be avoided.

When displayed in the chancel or on a platform in a church, the flag should be placed on a staff at the clergyman's right; other flags at his left. If displayed in the body of the church, the flag should be at the congregation's right as they face the clergyman.

Do not use the flag as a portion of a costume or athletic uniform. Do not embroider it upon cushions or handkerchiefs nor print it on paper napkins or boxes.

1. When displayed over the middle of the street, the flag should be suspended vertically with the union to the north in and east and west street, or to the east in a north and south street.

2. When displayed with another flag from crossed staffs, the flag of the United States of America should be on the right, the flag's own right, and its staff should be in front of the staff of the other flag.

3. When it is to be flown at half-mast, the flag should be hoisted to the peak for an instant and then lowered to the half-mast position; but before lowering the flag for the day it should again be raised to the peak. By half-mast is meant hauling down the flag to one-half the distance between the top and the bottom of the staff. On Memorial Day display at half-mast until noon only; then hoist to top of staff.

4. When flags of States or cities or pennants of societies are flown on the same halyard with the flag of the United States of America, the latter should always be at the peak. When flown from adjacent staffs the Stars and Stripes should be hoisted first and lowered last.

5. When the flag is suspended over a sidewalk from a rope, extending from house to pole at the edge of the sidewalk, the flag should be hoisted out from the building, toward the pole, union first.

6. When the flag is displayed from a staff projecting horizontally or at any angle from the window sill, balcony, or front of a building, the union of the flag should go clear to peak of the staff (unless the flag is to be displayed at half-mast).

7. When the flag is used to cover a casket, it should be so placed that the union is at the head and over the left shoulder. The flag should not be lowered into the grave or allowed to touch the ground.

8. When the flag is displayed otherwise than by being flown from a staff, it should be displayed flat, whether indoors or out, or so suspended that its folds fall as free as though the flag were staffed. When displayed either horizontally or vertically, the union should be uppermost and to the flag's own right, that is, to the observer's left. When festoons, rosettes, or drapings are desired, bunting of blue, white, and red should be used, but never the flag.

9. When carried in a procession with another flag or flags, the Stars and Stripes should be either on the marching right, or when there is a line of other flags, our national flag may be in front of the center of that line.

10. When a number of flags of States or cities or pennants of societies are grouped and displayed from staffs with our national flag, the latter should be at the center or at the highest point of the group.

11. When the flags of two or more nations are displayed they should be flown from separate staffs of the same height and the flags should be of approximately equal size. International usage forbids the display of the flag of one nation above that of another nation in time of peace.

The law provides that a trademark cannot be registered which consists of, or comprises among other things, "the flag, coat of arms, or other insignia of the United States, or any simulation thereof."

Take every precaution to prevent the flag from becoming soiled. It should not be allowed to touch the ground or floor, nor to brush against objects.

When the flag is used in unveiling a statue or monument, it should not be used as a covering of the object to be unveiled. If it is displayed on such occasions, do not allow the flag to fall to the ground, but let it be carried aloft to form a feature of the ceremony.

On suitable occasions repeat this pledge to the flag:

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Born amid the strife of battle, the Stars and Stripes became the standard around which a free people struggled to found a great nation. Its spirit is fervently expressed in the words of Thomas Jefferson: "I swear, before the altar of God, eternal hostility to every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

The Sam Rayburn House Office Building Honors One of the Few Really Great Statesmen of This Century

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of our beloved leader, SAM RAYBURN, all Americans in and out of Congress have suffered a great loss.

President Kennedy has said that while Mr. RAYBURN's service extended from the administration of President Woodrow Wilson to nearly the end of the 87th Congress it was the quality of that service more than its length that was distinctive.

He added that Mr. RAYBURN was "a strong defender of constitutional responsibilities of the Congress, he had an instinctive understanding of the American system and was a loyal counselor and friend of Presidents of both parties on the great matters which affected our national interest and security."

The President pointed out that he had singular opportunities as a young Congressman, and as President, to appreciate Mr. RAYBURN's temperament and character. "Both were bedded in rock and remained unchanged by circumstances," said the President.

The President spoke for all of us when he said of Mr. RAYBURN:

This country has lost a devoted servant and the citizens of this country an unflinching friend.

Mr. RAYBURN served with eight Presidents of the United States. His career in the House was longer than that of any previous Member and he was Speaker of the House longer than any of his distinguished predecessors in that post.

His life spanned the years 1882 to 1961, from the period following the Civil War through the two great World Wars to the atom bomb, the nuclear-powered submarine, and the jet airplane.

It covered the times that saw America's passage from the frontier period of the West to that of world leader, and grow from a largely rural nation of 50 million people to a powerful industrial and urban civilization of 180 million people.

His life covered a time of great ordeals and great achievements for our Nation, and during his active terms in the Congress he participated in all or most of them.

Mr. RAYBURN believed in States' duties as well as States' rights. He believed in a strong Federal Government, one that could stand up to the Fascist and Communist powers, one that could unite and lead the free nations of the world in the greatest combined power ever known to history.

But he also believed in a Federal Government that would, in the words of Abraham Lincoln, do for all the people what they could not do by themselves.

SAM RAYBURN in his political faith walked hand in hand with Presidents Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, and John F. Kennedy.

In honor of Mr. RAYBURN I am today introducing a House resolution to provide that the House of Representatives Office Building which is being constructed pursuant to the provisions of the Additional House Office Building Act of 1955 shall be known as the Sam Rayburn House Office Building.

Representative Cleveland M. Bailey Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Clarksburg Exponent, Clarksburg, W. Va., lauding the great work of my colleague, CLEVELAND M. BAILEY. He is one of the hardest working, most dedicated men of the Congress of the United States.

The article follows:

[From the Clarksburg Exponent, Jan. 4, 1962]

AMERICAN VOCATIONAL ASSOCIATION REVEALS AWARD FOR BAILEY

WASHINGTON.—Representative CLEVELAND M. BAILEY has been selected unanimously to receive the highest honor that can be presented by the American Vocational Association, Inc., the national organization of vocational teachers and administrators.

The award is the American Vocational Association citation for 1961. Congressman BAILEY's nomination was sponsored by S. D. McMillen, West Virginia State director of vocational education, State Senator Walter A. Holden, Clarksburg, and W. H. Wayman, Charleston, chairman, awards committee, West Virginia Vocational Association.

The West Virginia nomination cited Representative BAILEY for his lifelong "keen interest in furthering education, particularly vocational education"; for his support of the George-Barden Act and the implementing appropriation; for his long efforts to enact a general Federal aid to education bill; for his cosponsorship in 1958 of the National Defense Education Act, which included an area vocational program; and for his efforts to extend the act in 1961.

The statement accompanying the citation, made by Dr. H. W. Sanders, chairman of AVA's awards committee, follows:

"The Honorable CLEVELAND M. BAILEY has a long and distinguished career in the National Congress. He is now serving his eighth term. As ranking majority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, and chairman of the General Subcommittee on Education, he has been a most effective leader

and supporter of legislative action designed to strengthen all education, and especially vocational education. His wholehearted support was always to be relied upon. Congressman BAILEY rendered valuable service in assisting with the passing of the George-Barden Act; he supported the general Federal aid to education bill; and fought for the inclusion and retention of title VIII in the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

"Other outstanding educational awards which Representative BAILEY has received include his designation as an 'Honorary State Farmer' by the West Virginia Association of Future Farmers of America, and the Parents magazine 'Man of the Year Award for 1961,' an honor previously bestowed upon Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Dr. Jonas Salk, and Walt Disney.

"Formal presentation of the citation will be made at a later date during a function of the West Virginia Vocational Association."

Speaker Rayburn: Mentor and Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, because the Speaker is the elected choice of the House, whoever wields the gavel in this Chamber is insured a high measure of respect and regard. Despite the passage of time, however, it remains difficult to realize that we shall not be called to order again by SAM RAYBURN—that we shall not have his counsel and friendship here to sustain us again as so often in the past.

I undertake no encomium on our late beloved Speaker. His service here will be a panegyric for the ages. My desire is only to record here briefly my deep sense of personal bereavement in the passing of Mr. SAM. It had been my special privilege to enjoy association with this great man in this House for a quarter century. Only a score of my colleagues now serving were favored with longer continuous close availability of his wise, straightforward, kindly guidance.

Speaker RAYBURN extended to me countless courtesies and kindnesses through the years, as majority leader and as Speaker—and, of course, in his uncharacteristic but energetic role as minority leader in the 80th and 83d Congresses. All of us here know, however, that Mr. SAM did not play favorites. While he might admit to a slight preference for Democrats, his appreciation of the high honor of service here under any party banner assured an unhestitant hand of friendship for every Member.

The late Speaker held an unassailable confidence in the judgment of the American people. He was prepared always to abide by their choices. The people, he reasoned, would not be fooled for long, and poor choices would be corrected. He was a superb political strategist and tactician, but he did not countenance sharp practice. He insisted that a conscientious concern for the common good be held aloft as the standard to which all worthy politicians could repair.

SAM RAYBURN never forgot that it was the people who sent him here and kept him here for nearly half a century, through three wars, through years of depression and years of prosperity. He would not let any of us here forget this bedrock truth, and, for the enduring example set by his conception of the public trust, we remain in debt to his memory.

Railroad Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHIL WEAVER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, during the 1950's the American railroad industry came to the Congress to ask for relief and help. The contention of the industry was that laws were archaic and unworkable and had caused near-chaotic conditions within their industry. They complained about having to go to every State through which a passenger train ran to get separate permission from each of the States to change schedules or to abandon trains. This was a costly and time-consuming procedure and harmful to the transportation systems.

In 1958, the Congress took cognizance of this problem and we enacted the 1958 Transportation Act. As is quite frequently the case with legislation, in writing this act I feel that the Congress went too far and we have opened up a Pandora's box. The 1958 act provides for discontinuance of passenger service through application to the Interstate Commerce Commission and without necessarily going to the various States involved. But the act does not set forth adequate criteria outlining and clarifying the responsibilities the railroads have to the public to provide needed passenger transportation.

In many cases railroads have taken arbitrary steps to discontinue passenger trains because individual trains were not showing a profit. These steps have often disregarded completely the convenience and necessity criterion and the public welfare.

In addition, the burden of fighting these cases has fallen upon the public and not upon the railroads.

All of this has led to a great increase in the number of passenger trains abandoned and the curtailment of service to the public.

Mr. Speaker, I am not one who would say that the railroads must continue to serve and provide extra services if they are financially unable to do so. However, in considering the finances of any railroad it is my contention that all aspects of the line's fiscal situation must be considered, not just its passenger service or the financial soundness of a single passenger train. The road's subsidiary operations and its freight operations must also be taken into consideration and used as a criterion for this type of action.

I have many friends on both the management and labor side of the picture in the railroad industry. I do not care to point a finger at either side and say that it is their fault that this situation has arisen.

However, I do maintain strongly that the public must be considered and that the general welfare of the Nation—including the railroads' capacity to provide troop transportation on a mass basis in times of emergency must be maintained.

I have, therefore introduced a bill which would make it harder for the lines just to abandon trains as they see fit. I feel that this legislation would enforce the responsibility which the railroads owe to the public and the Nation.

It is my hope that this type of legislation will help rather than hinder the railroads in performing the duties which they should and must perform to the traveling public and the Government.

Our Democracy in Action in 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, January 5, there appeared in the States-Graphic, published in Brownsville, Tenn., an editorial entitled "Our Democracy in Action in 1962."

The editor of this fine newspaper is Mr. Paul Sims, who I consider one of the finest editorial writers in the Nation. This editorial is so outstanding that I thought I should place it in the RECORD, The editorial follows:

OUR DEMOCRACY IN ACTION IN 1962

We are entering upon a new year.

We are willing to admit that we are living in perplexing times. There are many of our sincere citizens who are aroused to the extent and so emotionally stirred that they fear the democracy upon which our country was founded is about to collapse.

To this we cannot agree.

There are several things to keep in mind before we come to this conclusion.

First: Our democracy evolved over a long period of time, and a lot of blood, sweat, and toil has gone into the process. Of course, in a country such as ours, with its wide and varied interest, of necessity there are some disloyal citizens. However, most every American would die rather than have his way of life taken from him.

Right now, there is a giant struggle going on throughout the world between dictatorship and communism and the democratic way of life.

Ours will win, because it is of government by the majority, while allowing the minority to be heard and to dissent. It is a system whereby one citizen may disagree with another, while at the same time be willing to die for the other's right to disagree.

This system begins at the grassroots level and goes all the way to the top. It's a part of our towns, cities, States, and Nation. Differences of opinion frequently brings out

the best in both sides of a discussion. Many times it is wholesome.

It should be reassuring to all who have faith in our great system, upon which our Government was founded and which is responsible for the wonderful country we have today, to believe there are relatively few disloyal Americans who favor communism or any other form of government which does not promote such freedoms as we enjoy today. The most of us would give up our lives rather than to surrender these principles.

Now that Congress is about to enter upon a new term, of course there will be differences on various legislation, and how much or how little government we should have. Even the President will be both praised and criticized. These should not be confused with a lack of patriotism or unamericanism. It means we are exercising our rights as Americans.

With the voice of the voters being expressed in free elections backed by the resourcefulness of the American people, we have little fear of any collapse of our democratic principles.

Of course it is our hope that all of the conflicting opinions throughout the world can be settled around the conference board, in a way that civilized people should act, and that the so-called cold wars will subside during 1962 and that we may continue to enjoy peace and prosperity.

God's good earth will provide the things we need, and to spare. The new year promises to be a good one financially, for all who make the proper effort. We still have an abiding faith in this great country of ours. We always will.

We face the future unafraid.

Pony Express Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, while it is obvious that the Congress will be asked to consider an increase in postal rates in the near future, it is interesting to note that a community in the Missouri Ozarks has dispaired of ever receiving adequate service and has requested a franchise to again start and again operate a "pony express service." Under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I call your attention to the attached letter:

DECEMBER 19, 1961.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Respectfully, and with complete sincerity, the heart of Table Rock Lake Chamber of Commerce requests of the U.S. Post Office Department the necessary franchise to operate a pony express service for its immediate area.

At first glance this may seem an unusual request. Indeed it may seem to be an unnecessary request. But if this section of the beautiful Ozark hills is to ever have postal service this apparently is the method that will have to be used.

An explanation. Mail is delivered along the highway. The highway is some 6 miles away on the other side of the mountain. So, to receive mail a 12-mile round trip must be made. To go to the post office necessitates a round trip of 28 miles to Reeds Spring, Mo., in southern Stone County.

That there is a need for mail service is evidenced by the fact that there are literally millions of tourists who visit the Table Rock Lake, many of whom want advance reservations for accommodations (they don't all come to this area, of course, but a goodly number do), that hundreds of thousands of dollars of resort facilities are located on the road in question, that the Federal Government alone spent thousands of dollars on a fine recreation area and that there are many families in permanent residence.

Particularly galling is the knowledge that these hills were dotted with post offices as far into antiquity as 81 years ago. In fact radical post office was situated right here within spitting distance.

The local postmaster, Mr. Nelson Holt, has been eager to help and cooperative with aid and information. He has really been the only person in the postal system who has shown concern over the problem. Indeed, Indian Hills road has been surveyed and resurveyed until the surveyors meet each other coming and going. Reams of petitions have been dutifully signed and sent to some never never land to be heard from no more. There have been charts, graphs, forms, requests for more information. Almost everyone here has at one time or another tried to get even the most elementary mail service to come within walking distance. This process has evoked a standard greeting among the residents, "I'll sign your petition if you'll sign mine."

So, on second glance a request for a pony express franchise is not so far afield for there are enough horses and mules and enough serious chamber of commerce members to uphold the familiar Post Office Department slogan, "Through rain and sleet and snow."

With all expediency please forward the necessary documents to complete this application. And please use your most potent influence to allay another round of surveys. The current game has about worn everyone out. All that was ever requested before this was no more than a simple return to the postal service as it was known and appreciated as long ago as 1880.

All that this application asks is that the local people be allowed to perform a service for themselves that apparently is not forthcoming through ordinary sources. They are perfectly willing to do it.

Oh, yes. If it should be necessary to call on the phone for some reason or another, better not do it. There are no telephones here, either.

Yours for progress,

DARREL D. PRESNELL,
Heart of the Lake Chamber of Commerce.
REEDS SPRING, MO.

A National Lottery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, for 10 years I have urged Congress to give serious and favorable consideration to the establishment of a national lottery in the United States as a means of raising $10 billion a year in additional revenue. Such revenue, which could be raised painlessly and voluntarily, would not only lighten the heavy tax burden from the shoulders of our taxpayers, but help reduce our ever-mounting national debt.

The New York Daily News, which has wholeheartedly supported my fight for a national lottery, wrote a very interesting editorial this week. I recommend its reading to each Member of Congress.

NICE WORK, BOBBY, BUT—

Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy is publicly smacking his lips and hammering his chest with exultation over what he has done to organized crime and criminals during his first year as head of the Justice Department.

He's been "hitting the bigtime operators of organized crime in their bankroll," boasted the President's brother in an interview the other day—and by bankroll he means receipts from gambling.

Under a couple of new Federal laws, Mr. Kennedy says, he has forced most of the Nation's leading race wire services out of business, and has greatly curtailed interstate traffic in numbers (policy) slips. Syndicated gambling on football games, too, says the Attorney General, has shrunk markedly in the last year.

This is excellent work—if you grant one big assumption; namely, that gambling is wrong and should be suppressed by law and law-enforcement agencies.

If you don't agree with that proposition, and—certainly we don't—then the logical conclusion is that Bobby Kennedy's anti-gambling work has been and is foolish and futile, to say nothing of its costing the taxpayers a lot of money.

We've just been dipping into a new book (Christmas present from a friend) which promises to become a classic in its field: "Scarne's Complete Guide to Gambling," by John Scarne; Simon & Schuster, New York, 1961; 714 pages, 190 illustrations, $10.

At page 156 in this masterwork by one of the world's foremost authorities in gambling in all its forms, the fascinated reader runs into a chapter entitled, "Why the United States Should Have a National Lottery."

Mr. Scarne points out that more than 50 countries in Asia, Europe, and Latin America now have national lotteries, and that "ticket purchasers are not considered gamblers, but citizens participating in a government fund-raising project.

Because lotteries are illegal in the United States, the unlawful lottery handle here is estimated at the enormous yearly total of $15 billion.

Perhaps the most striking paragraph in the book is this:

"The illegal lottery and numbers industry always opposes the 'friends' of gambling who would legalize it, and blesses its 'enemies,' the clergymen and well-meaning reformers who oppose gambling. The latter, without knowing it, are, paradoxically, in league with the very racketeers and criminals they deplore."

Scarne estimates that a properly set up and supervised U.S. Government lottery would bring in a net revenue of at least $5 billion a year to the Treasury Department. Representative PAUL A. FINO, Republican, of New York, longtime battler for a national lottery, estimates a revenue take of $10 billion annually.

Such revenues would be raised without pain—indeed, with pleasure—to the contributors, meaning the buyers of lottery tickets.

PAINLESS REVENUES

Just as repeal of Federal prohibition (1933) forced a lot of hoodlums and racketeers to get out of the liquor industry or get respectable, so would a lawful lottery chase a horde of similar characters out of the gambling industry.

It follows from all this that brother Bobby Kennedy would be smart to devote some

of his overflowing energies to agitating in congressional and administration circles for a Government lottery, along the lines carefully worked out years ago by Representative FINO and heartily approved by Scarne.

Mr. Kennedy should, of course, try to enforce the antigambling statutes as long as they are on the books, just as various Attorneys General tried to enforce the prohibition laws 1920–33. But they didn't succeed, and Bobby won't succeed.

LEGALIZE GAMBLING

It would be far wiser for this administration to recognize that gambling is a fact of life and human nature, and to serve the people's best interests by trying to legalize gambling—just as the F. D. Roosevelt administration served the people's best interests by forcing repeal of Federal prohibition.

Preservation of Our American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, on December 7 I issued a news release commenting on a court decision in New York to review the constitutionality of reciting an opening prayer in New York public schools. In the same news release, I commented on the banning of religious Christmas carols and nativity scenes from religious observances at eight schools in the Lagunda Salara Elementary School District in California.

In the Washington Evening Star of January 8, Reporter Jim Bishop devoted his column to this subject.

Since such a development is, in my opinion, a matter for concern and of great importance in the preservation of our American way of life, I wish to have the contents of my news release and Mr. Bishop's report printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

NEWS RELEASE OF HON. DON L. SHORT, OF NORTH DAKOTA

Something new has been added seemingly in school policy, with regard to the reciting of a brief opening prayer. Because parents of nine children in four schools in New Hyde Park, N.Y., contended that opening prayer violates the constitutional privilege of separation of church and state, the Supreme Court agreed to consider the constitutionality of reciting a brief daily prayer in New York public schools. The practice of opening prayer is not universal or required in our public schools, but it would seem pretty un-American for an opening prayer to be banned by law. This would definitely appear to be contrary to majority opinion. I am convinced that if a vote were taken, it would fall to the side of those who wish the small prayer to be left in the school curriculum.

Another disturbing development along this line comes in a news story from Redwood City, Calif. Religious carols and nativity scenes were banned from Christmas observations at eight schools in the Lagunda Salara Elementary School District. The reason given by the local superintendent of schools was fear that religious carols at Christmastime would offend non-Christians at the schools. The superintendent also said the order resulted from a ruling by the district attorney that Christmas songs of religious background could violate State laws against the practice of religion in schools. He added, "We depend upon the State for 80 percent of our money" and, "this is a serious and difficult problem." The children will be restricted to such tunes as "Jingle Bells" or "White Christmas." This in the United States of America, where a basic belief in God and simple prayer is assumed even though our Constitution carefully preserves freedom of religion.

What is wrong with silent prayer at the beginning of a school day for those who make prayer a part of their lives at home or in their church? Is this not a part of a truly liberal education, which our public schools strive for? What is wrong with demonstrating how the different religions practice their faith at various times of the year—if such religions are represented in the schools? Who would deny the Protestant, Catholic, Hebrew, or any other faith the right to show what they practice at Eastertime, Christmastime, Hanukkah, or such religious holidays? Is not all this a part of learning what our country—a vast melting pot of different races, languages, songs, religions—is like, just as we teach what other countries are like? We don't prevent the agnostic or atheist from expressing his or her viewpoint. Why should they then prevent those of us who believe and practice some form of religion from expressing ours?

This to me is the real meaning of freedom and liberty in this country.

PRAYER IN THE CLASSROOM?

(By Jim Bishop)

The qestion of prayer in schools is vexing. A solitary plea, muttered in unison by a group of spiritually disparate children, cannot effect the salvation of any of them. Religious life in the home is the important factor, and, if there is none at home, a prayer in class is a message never sent.

Still, the question of prayer in school has been permitted to become a public cause. The overwhelming majority of Christian parents insist that classes were always opened with prayer throughout the history of the republic, and should continue. The minority, atheists and non-Christians, claim that prayer violates the great American code of separation of state and church.

To understand the issue—or rather, to simplify it—one must realize that, when our forefathers decreed a separation of church and state, they were trying to achieve freedom of religion, not to bind it. They came from countries which had state religions—where a man had to belong to a given church or be denied the right of worship.

The Jeffersons, the Washingtons, the Adamses were trying to loose the theological bonds so that the Lutherans of New York could meet the Episcopals of Connecticut and the Catholics of Maryland and the Jews of Philadelphia without spiritual rancor. Each was entitled, without hindrance, to build a temple of his choice and there to address the Deity in the ancient rituals of his fathers.

America has always been a Protestant country. It was then. It is now. It would be a simple example of democracy to permit a Protestant prayer to be recited in all public schools without protest from the others. Separation of state and church does not imply separation of state and God. The writers of our Constitution and our Bill of Rights acknowledged God.

The U.S. Senate opens with prayer every day. Our coins proclaim: "In God we trust." The country officially acknowledges that there is a God and admonishes each man to find his own way to Him.

The current fight in Miami and in New York against prayer in school is a chafing, irritating matter to all. A group of pan-American employees in Miami are so upset that they write a group letter to me asking what they can do to maintain prayer in class.

"We would in no wise advocate the teaching of a particular faith or doctrine," they say, "realizing that this would be contrary to our freedoms. But, as the dominant faiths of our Nation are based upon God as the Supreme Being we feel that scriptures and prayers dedicated toward God should be a part of our school program.

There are 254 religious denominations in the United States. They have a total enrolled membership of 112,226,905—63.4 percent of the population. Of the 36.6 percent remaining, millions believe in God but do not attend any church regularly. The rest are agnostics or atheists.

The largest groups, in order of size, are: Roman Catholics, 40,871,302; Baptists, 20,877,223; Methodists, 12,359,279; Lutherans, 8,082,880; Jews, 5,370,000; Presbyterians, 4,212,554; Episcopalians, 3,359,048. The smallest group is the Old Order or York Brethren, 291.

The motives of those who are trying to extinguish religion in schools cannot be a liberalization of the spirit, but rather a denial of rights to the majority by the minority. Whether they win or lose in the Supreme Court, they will have bred religious distrust and contempt and I am opposed to any measure which sets the true brotherhood of man back.

What would they have us do? Teach the children to say, "Shhh," when the name of God is mentioned, or perhaps cover their ears with their hands? If their real goal is to force the schools to use their particular prayers, then the principals and teachers had better recite the psalms of all 254 sects. This amounts to less than one religion per school day and, in effect, cancels all of them.

It must be discouraging to God to watch puny man fight over the many paths to heaven. It would be better, I think, if the heads of the several sects organized a committee on religion in public schools, and came to an agreement about which prayers, which Bible readings, are least offensive to all.

By killing religion in the schools, we are, in effect, building a religious Tower of Babel in which we Americans speak many tongues, but none of us understand the others.

Missile Gap Fades Away Quietly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, having heard so much about a missile gap, it was refreshing to read the significant analysis by Mr. William H. Stringer, chief of the Washington bureau of the Christian Science Monitor, entitled "Missile Gap Fades Away Quietly." Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include Mr. Stringer's analysis which appeared in the Monitor on December 21, 1961:

MISSILE GAP FADES AWAY QUIETLY

(By William H. Stringer)

WASHINGTON.—Whatever happened to the missile gap?

Now that it's been explained away by the Kennedy administration, there's again the possibility that the Soviets may produce more of the intercontinental missiles than they've had the "capability" of producing.

There's a strong Washington conjecture that Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev may seek to emphasize maximum military power, meaning long-range missiles, since Moscow's previous emphasis on intermediate missiles failed to intimidate Western Europe or the United States.

The recent Soviet nuclear test series perfected nuclear missile warheads that were less cumbersome than the original Soviet brand. The Soviets undoubtedly could transform these prototypes into a less costly, less clumsy ICBM.

CAMPAIGN ISSUE IN 1960

It is, of course, always conjecture, not fact, when intelligence agencies believe that an opponent has certain capabilities or certain quickly available production lines, and then speculate that the opponent will avail himself of these and build missiles fast.

That kind of conjecture spawned the vast array of official pronouncements and news dispatches about a "missile gap"—the gap which became a campaign issue in 1960 and was admittedly nothing but an apparition in 1961.

As for the future, even if Moscow builds more ICBM's, no dangerous kind of gap is likely to appear. This is because the United States has six Polaris submarines cruising the seas, and more quickly abuilding, and because the Minuteman solid-fueled, long-range missile program is speeding ahead, and because several salvos of Atlas ICBM's are on site, and because the big bombers of the Strategic Air Command are on a 15-minute alert.

In other words, the United States now is believed to have sufficient missiles located in hidden or hard sites, and sufficient manned bombers on the alert, so that no nuclear attack could wipe out the United States retaliatory capacity.

Thus there is no "retaliatory gap" likely, and that is what counts—the ability to retaliate, which deters the opponent from launching his missiles in the first place. Only a madman would launch a flight of missiles or bombers if he were certain of being blasted by a nuclear reply of equal or larger weight.

But the missile gap filled reams of newsprint and countless news broadcasts while it lasted. And it began validly enough in 1957 when the Soviets first tested their intercontinental ballastic missile—a cumbersome monster.

Thereafter, as it appeared that Moscow would activate ICBM production lines, projections of likely U.S. and U.S.S.R. missile production indicated that, somewhere between the years 1961 to 1963, the Soviet Union might be outproducing the United States by anywhere from 2 to 1, to 3 to 1.

ATTACK PERSISTED

Columnists such as Joseph Alsop, Senators such as Missouri's STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of the Armed Services Committee, belabored the Eisenhower administration for calmly accepting an inferior missile posture. This outcry was grabbed by the Democrats in the 1960 presidential campaign.

Eisenhower spokesmen replied that the United States had all sorts of nuclear launchers on the ready—from medium-range missiles to fighter-bombers to carrier-based planes—so that an enemy would be overwhelmed if he started something. But the attack persisted.

Actually, before the end of the Eisenhower regime, Defense Secretary Neil H. McElroy told a background session of newsmen that a major ingredient of the supposed missile gap was missing. He said the Soviets did not seem to be utilizing their productive capacity after all. They simply weren't building all those expected 150 ICBM's—indeed they were building many many fewer than that.

EYE TO ACCURACY

Democratic campaigners in 1960 paid no heed to the McElroy cautionings. But it is interesting to note that Presidential candidate John F. Kennedy, with an eye to accuracy, referred very sparingly to the missile gap. What he mainly discussed, in his campaign speech to the American Legion convention at Miami Beach October 18, 1960, and elsewhere, was what might be termed the vulnerability gap.

That is, he spoke mainly of the danger to the U.S. "power to retaliate" and urged steps "to protect our present nuclear striking force from surprise attack." This, he said, demanded crash programs for the Polaris submarine and Minuteman missile, a bigger SAC bomber alert, and more airlift for the conventional Army. Actually, the Polaris and Minuteman programs were doing surprisingly well already.

STORY HELD ON

No Democrat stepped out and admitted that there was probably no missile gap—that the Soviets were not after all outproducing the United States in the crucial long-range ballistic missile category, until the new Defense Secretary, Robert S. McNamara, made some candid observations to Pentagon newsmen on a tour of his quarters in February of 1961.

Reporters interpreted Secretary McNamara as saying that there wasn't any missile gap, period. The White House and Defense Department later attempted to sort out the situation by saying he really meant that there was no "deterrent gap" or vulnerability gap.

Secretary McNamara did mean that—that there was believed to be no chance that a Soviet attack could destroy the U.S. retaliatory power, the U.S. deterrent. But he also meant that Moscow wasn't ahead of the United States in missile production, either.

Nevertheless, the story dies hard. Senator SYMINGTON still said on February 22 that it might not be unreasonable to assume that the Soviets have produced and deployed 150 big missiles over the past 2 years—thereby making a "missile gap."

Before the summer of 1960, the United States could detect whether any big ICBM's were mounted on Soviet launching pads, by means of its high-altitude U-2 airplanes. Now that these are grounded, it must rely on other means of secret surveillance.

STILL CONJECTURE

Certainly Moscow has been producing its less costly medium-range missiles in large quantity. Mr. Khrushchev sought to rely on these to intimidate Western Europe, plus his macabre comments to Western European statesmen concerning exactly how many Soviet bombs would be needed to annihilate each respective country.

But with the U.S. missiles and bombers on guard, Western European nations have been highly resistant to these intimidations.

So now Mr. Khrushchev may try building the bigger missiles—he talks tough about 50- and 100-megaton superbombs. But what he precisely will do is still conjecture.

What is crystal clear is that the old missile gap never existed except in speculation—and in politics.

West Virginia Looking Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, during the fall of 1960 we Democrats in West Virginia were proclaiming to our fellow citizens more or less as follows:

"Send Jack Kennedy to the White House; send Wally Barron to the Governor's mansion; return JENNINGS RANDOLPH to the U.S. Senate; help elect a Democratic House; and the climate will be created so that West Virginia can pull itself out of the economic doldrums."

Our fellow citizens followed our advice. Now, as the new administrations in Washington and Charleston have had a year of performance, it is time to take stock. A review of the situation in West Virginia now, in contrast to a year ago, is extremely gratifying and heartening. True enough we cannot be smug. We have a long way yet to go to eliminate all of the pockets of economic misery. But results have been achieved.

Mr. Speaker, as proof that the Democratic administrations and legislatures in Washington and Charleston are keeping the faith, I invite the attention of my colleagues to an article published by the Wall Street Journal of December 27.

The article begins:

With an assist from old friend John F. Kennedy, this most depressed State in the Union is slowly beginning to emerge from its long dark siege of economic distress.

The report then goes on to review our forward steps, paying full credit to President Kennedy, Governor Barron, as well as the wonderful work being done by so many individual communities.

Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal is a very excellent newspaper. By no stretch of the imagination, however, can it be said to have any bias in favor of the Democratic Party.

The reporter who wrote the story is Paul Duke. Mr. Duke's normal beat is the Capitol here. He spends much time in our offices, in our committee anterooms, and in the Speaker's lobby. He is well known to us all as a reporter of great skill and integrity.

When the Wall Street Journal prints an article by Paul Duke stating that the Democratic campaign pledges in West Virginia are being fulfilled, I believe we can accept the fact as gospel.

Mr. Speaker, I include the article as a part of my remarks:

WEST VIRGINIA'S RISE: INCREASED FEDERAL AID, NATIONAL RECOVERY HELP LIFT STATE'S ECONOMY—ADMINISTRATION FUNNELS MORE DEFENSE WORK INTO AREA; LOCAL DRIVE LURES INDUSTRY—FULFILLING A CAMPAIGN PLEDGE

(By Paul Duke)

CHARLESTON, W. VA.—With an assist from old friend, John F. Kennedy, this most de-

pressed State in the Union is slowly beginning to emerge from its long dark siege of economic distress.

The chronic slump which has afflicted West Virginia since 1958 is easing under the impact of Federal, State, and self-help measures. Unemployment, in many respects worse here than in any other State in the land, is down to around 10 percent of the working force from over 11 percent a year ago and from a high of 15 percent early this year. Stepped-up business expansion has resulted in 5,000 new jobs since July 1; even the downtrodden coal industry is enjoying a mild pickup in employment.

"The sun is rising again over West Virginia," exults one top State official, expressing a widespread revival of confidence.

There's a general recognition, of course, that part of the State's upturn is traceable to a national recovery from recession—a recovery that was bound to affect even the most depressed areas. Steel mills, for example, are demanding more West Virginia coal to stoke fired-up furnaces.

But Uncle Sam's role in the budding renaissance also is large. Federal funds are flowing into the State in record volume; by some estimates an additional $350 million has been allocated under various assistance programs since the Kennedy administration assumed power in January 1960. The Democratic regime in Washington is striving to funnel Government contracts to West Virginia industry and it's helping to lure in new plants as well.

A PENTAGON PROD

Thus, the Pentagon is encouraging defense contractors to consider locating in West Virginia. Implicit is the suggestion they may benefit through increased orders. One result: Lockheed Aircraft Corp., after being prodded by Air Force Secretary Zuckert, decided to open a plant at Clarksburg that will employ 250 to make parts for the C-130 transport plane.

While it's eminently logical that this special trouble spot should qualify for special Federal help, political as well as economic motives underlie Washington's efforts. President Kennedy obviously is following through on his campaign pledge to help West Virginia get back on its feet. Understandably, he has a warm spot in his heart for this State of 1.8 million. For it was, after all, his surprise triumph over Minnesota's Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY in the May 1960 Democratic primary here that put Mr. Kennedy on the road to the Democratic nomination and the Presidency.

State officials report Washington doors are always open to them. "All we have to do is call and they come running to help," declares a State relief aid, finding that Federal agencies are bending over backward to assist the State Democratic administration of Gov. Wallace W. Barron. Governor Barron, who took office last January himself, asserts: "I don't know of any ways the new administration could be more helpful."

Indeed, the President is keeping tabs on much of the rehabilitation effort and has a personal watchdog on the scene in State Democratic Chairman Robert McDonough, a prime backer in last year's primary. Several times Mr. Kennedy has met with State leaders to discuss State economic problems. Once, during a visit of local citizens interested in converting an unused Government ordnance plant at Morgantown to an industrial operation, the President picked up the telephone and requested the Government's General Services Administration to give speedier consideration to the matter.

SOME REPUBLICANS BELITTLE AID

West Virginia's praise for the President's help is not unanimous, to be sure. Some Republicans maintain that the Federal largess is a mere drop in the economic bucket, that the State remains a long way from real recovery. "Kennedy has not by any means fulfilled his campaign promise to lift West Virginia out of the doldrums," contends former GOP Mayor David Francis, of Huntington.

At best, the present rate of improvement in this State may not be maintained indefinitely; at worst, a steel strike next summer could drastically reduce purchases of coal. "A steel strike would knock us flat on our faces again," reasons a Republican leader. "If coal doesn't move, West Virginia doesn't move."

Certainly the recovery period will be prolonged and painful. No overnight booms are in prospect. Unemployment is expected to continue high in the southern tier of coal-producing counties for a long time; nearly one of every four workers still is without a job in Boone and Logan Counties.

While the State is beginning to attract more industry, it desperately needs a few major concerns that would employ thousands and not just hundreds. But rough terrain and inadequate water supplies hinder prospects in many localities. In others, the flight of young people out of the State has reduced the bulk of the remaining labor force to unskilled older men little sought by modern industry.

"We're not so sick as we were, but we still have lots of bedsores," sums up a veteran Charleston newspaperman.

PUSHING ON SEVERAL FRONTS

Whatever the final outcome, the evidence so far suggests Mr. Kennedy is trying hard on several fronts to keep his pledge of help. His first Executive order last winter had the effect of doubling the amount of free Federal surplus food distributed to the State's needy; lesser increases went to other States. This was soon followed by establishment in hard-hit McDowell County of the administration's first pilot project for helping the poor buy their staples directly from groceries with Federal food stamps. More than 250,000 West Virginians are now getting free surplus food, and some 17,000 are getting food stamps.

Under relief measures proposed by the administration and approved by Congress, West Virginia is receiving an extra $30 million this year in extended unemployment benefits and aid to dependent children of jobless parents. Money from the new $394 million program to help depressed areas rebuild their economies is beginning to roll in, with the go-ahead already given for construction of a furniture factory in Mingo County and for job retraining projects in Mingo, Grant, Cabell, and Wayne Counties. Just last week Federal approval was given to a general redevelopment plan drawn up by Jackson County.

By far the biggest bonanza is an "extra" 150-mile interstate highway, 90 percent federally financed, that will cut through rugged mountain country to link the northern area with the somewhat isolated interior. Not only will Route 79 mean an estimated $225 million in Federal road funds, but it also will provide a badly needed artery for trucking West Virginia products to northern commercial centers. The interior finaly will have easy and direct access to the major markets of Pittsburgh and the Lake Erie industrial complex. Within the State, the bonus highway project has been joyously received. "We couldn't build it by ourselves in a thousand years," remarks one State official.

But the award of this plum has also produced a loud cry of "payoff" from Ohio's Representative SCHERER, ranking Republican on the House Roads Subcommittee on Roads. He and other out-of-State critics have strenuously objected to the allocation method; the Bureau of Public Roads simply dipped into a 343-mile reserve set aside for all 50 States and gave West Virginia nearly half the total. Bureau officials take the view that no injustice is being done the other States; they reason that Congress seems certain to increase the reserve later.

In some cases, the Kennedy regime is finding justification for rendering help that the Eisenhower administration couldn't, wouldn't, or didn't furnish. State Republican leaders tried unsucessfully to win approval for the new highway in recent years but couldn't budge the Bureau of Public Roads. Somewhat similarly, a bogged-down move to convert an inactivated naval gun factory in South Carleston into a private chemical plant has been given the green light by the new administration.

The Kennedy camp's endeavor to channel more defense contracts into West Virginia, whose share of the national pie is extremely small, faces a big problem; West Virginia industries for the most part are not equipped to handle major defense orders for such things as airplane frames and missiles. But under Defense Department pressure a number of prime contractors are surveying West Virginia firms with an eye toward giving them more subcontract production of component parts for military equipment.

NEW SHIPYARD CONTRACT

As it is, the State is benefiting more than ever. On December 13, for example, the Marietta Manufacturing Co. received a $5.4 million award to build two Navy oceanographic vessels at its Ohio River Shipyard at Point Pleasant, W. Va. The contract will mean an additional 600 job.

Some West Virginians feel, however, that State and community efforts are helping every bit as much, if not more, than the Washington assistance. The State is currently teaching new skills to 2,000 of its 63,300 unemployed in training units set up in 32 of the 55 counties. Of 100 recent graduates of a training school at Welch, 69 quickly found jobs in their new pursuits of auto and appliance repair and machine work.

Moreover, the new State commerce department, created by the legislature last winter, is making headway in its attempt to snare new industry. New enterprises coming in include a North American Aviation plant at Princeton for making B-70 bomber parts and a Corning Glass Works ovenware plant at Martinsburg. Other newcomers will manufacture electronics equipment, aluminum products, and textiles. Since September 1, 30 outside industries have dispatched representatives into the State to investigate site possibilities.

In addition, expansion is underway at Du Pont's chemical plant at Belle, FMC Corp.'s chemical works at South Charleston, Goodrich-Gulf Chemicals' synthetic rubber plant at Institute and International Nickel Co.'s tubing factory at Huntington.

Governor Barron is pushing hard, too, to develop a flourishing tourist trade. The State already is preparing an ambitious program to lure outsiders to its 100th birthday in 1963. Another project in the works: An $800,000 State-sponsored building at the 1964 New York World's Fair to promote West Virginia's attractions.

RECOVERY AND TAXES

Such recovery efforts are not without their cost to West Virginians, of course. A new State income tax was imposed this year and the State sales tax has been boosted to 3 percent from 2 percent—bringing a deluge of complaints from merchants along the Virginia border who report losing business to that no-sales-tax State. Total State tax collections are expected to climb to $280 million in the fiscal year ending next June, from $243 million in the previous year.

The new mood of hope has spread in various ways. There is even talk about a renaissance in the coal industry through establishment of pipelines into major

eastern markets. Governor Barron plans to ask the legislature at its new session in January to authorize land acquisition for the project. The pipelines would permit transport of a coal-water mixture called slurry at rates making coal more competitive with gas and oil. If successful, it's claimed, the move could mean eventual reopening of hundreds of mines.

Even so, West Virginia is rapidly moving away from its old reliance on coal as its economic backbone. Manufacturing now enjoys a greater role nearly everywhere. Beckley, which almost became a ghost town when coal hit the skids, has staged a major comeback by regearing to factory production of plastics, textiles, and electrical goods; the Beckley Manufacturing Co., largest in the area, employs 500 making electronics parts. Business leaders predict the Ohio Valley area, now the one oasis of prosperity with its gleaming chemical plants, will be in the van of any new nationwide boom.

Inevitably, the new Federal aid programs have been accompanied by snags and complaints. There is local criticism about red-tape in qualifying for industrial development loans under the Depressed Areas Act. While 44 counties are eligible for assistance, money cannot be obtained unless a locality draws up a full-scale economic development plan. After this is approved, it then must submit additional plans to support individual project requests.

Some labor leaders grumble that not enough is being done to clear up severe pockets of unemployment. "We could stand a lot more help," says a top official of the State labor federation. The continued high flow of residual oil and glass imports, with consequent damage to markets for locally produced coal and glass products, still rankles.

But even critics concede the administration is making West Virginia justify its requests and is showing remarkable nonpartianship in parceling out assistance.

The administration refused to okay a $10 million contract to Wheeling's community-sponsored West Virginia Ordnance Co. for production of M-14 Army rifles even though local and State leaders made a strong pitch for the work. Pentagon officials said they felt Thompson Ramo Wooldridge, Inc., Cleveland, which got the contract, was better qualified. The controversial interstate highway required major changes in routing and had to be submitted three times before gaining final clearance from the Bureau of Public Roads.

New Jersey Pharmacist Finds New Natural Biological Which Inhibits Tumor Growth in Laboratory Studio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, there are many unsung heroes in the grim, unremitting battle against the dread disease of cancer. Though little publicized, the painstaking work carried on by the dedicated men and women in laboratories throughout the Nation is literally of life and death importance to each of us. The spirit of these research workers is typified by one I am honored to call a friend, Mr. Samuel Klein, a New Jersey pharmacist who has devoted himself for many years to cancer research. A report on his important project appeared in the July 1961 issue of the New Jersey Journal of Pharmacy and is inserted below together with a biographical sketch:

NEW JERSEY PHARMACIST FINDS NEW NATURAL BIOLOGICAL WHICH INHIBITS TUMOR GROWTH IN LABORATORY STUDIO

(An exclusive report by Samuel Klein)

(The author of this report on important research is a Newark pharmacist who also is licensed to practice in Pennsylvania, Arizona, and California. He was graduated from Rutgers College of Pharmacy in 1923, received certificates in plastics engineering and preflight aeronautics there, later completion certificate in physical medicine subjects at the Army Medical Service School, Fort Sam Houston, Tex. A licensed food and drug inspector with the New Jersey Department of Health, he also is a registered sanitarian in Massachusetts, chief officer of the chemical and biological warfare division of the Newark Defense Council and holder of the gold service ribbon, highest service award of the U.S. Office of Civil Defense. He holds several degrees. In 1946 he was given a citation as pharmacist-civic leader by American Druggist magazine, is listed in the monthly supplement, Who's Who, Leaders in American Science, and on the Board of Editors of Chemical Formulary.)

This preliminary report relates to experimental research with a new complex biological material derived primarily from the blood as a dialysate of the bovine species, Bos taurus.

The blood fraction was originally isolated from animal material which is of human food grade and in addition to the bovine blood also consists of secretions of the synovial membranes of the joints and bursae, salivary glands, etc.

In this study the basic material was obtained immediately at the abattoir floor and collected and stored aseptically at refrigerated temperatures for 24 hours. Then the material was centrifuged and the supernatant fluid was processed with a nontoxic aromatic hydrocarbon which resulted in the formation of a gelatinous precipitate. The precipitate was separated from the solution by colation through a 100-mesh material and dried in vacuum at no higher a temperature than 25° C. The desiccated material then was elutriated with an anhydrous nontoxic aromatic hydrocarbon and the elutriated suspended complex was decanted on to concave glass receptacles and dessicated in vacuum at above-mentioned temperature. The resultant dried material was a yellowish-white to cream colored impalpable power.

This powder was then hydrated with sterile distilled water for 24 hours using about 0.6 percent of the material for each 25 cubic centimeters of diluent, to make a colloidal aqueous suspension; or the equivalent amount of power, 0.6 percent could be suspended suitably in approximately one-fifth of the amount of water diluent using any sterile vegetable oil.

In actual use 160 milligrams of the powder was suspended in 5 cubic centimeters of sterile sesame oil at room temperature. The chemical composition and exact molecular structure of the material is unknown and more research and study is intended to determine the exact chemistry of it. Herewith is what is presently known of the basic material and the material itself.

1. It is insoluble in water, organic solvents, and vegetable and mineral oils.
2. The approximate pH is 7.3.
3. It is composed of proteins (albumins, mucin, globulins).
4. Preliminary studies of the powder suspended in water gave the following findings: it contains nitrogen, phosphorus, peptide linkages, and after acid hydrolysis (boiling H_2SO_4) ultraviolet peaks were observed at 250–270 mu with strong absorption at 204–208 mu.

A number of experiments were performed utilizing C3H mammary tumors inoculated in egg embryos. In 51 injections of 1–2 milligrams of the powder suspended in water and alcohol, definite tumor inhibition growth of considerable degree, 63 percent, was observed in the eggs, with no apparent effects on the growth of the embryonic tissues themselves, i.e., there were no inhibitory or destructive effects to the embryos. Tests were performed on mice, with an average tumor growth of only 16 percent; that is, a tumor inhibition of 84 percent. Human tissue culture tests utilizing J 96 tumor derived from the blood of monocytic leukemia were performed. Concentrations varying from 50 micrograms to 500 micrograms per cubic centimeter were used to determine the degree of inhibition of the tumor. A direct correlation was found between the concentration of the powder and tumor inhibition ranging from 39 percent inhibition at the 50-microgram level to 81 percent inhibition at the 500-microgram level.

To determine any possible allergic or anaphylactic reactions in humans, volunteer human malignancies who were terminal cases received first a 0.1-cubic-centimeter subdermal injection of the powder (160 milligrams suspended in 5-cubic-centimeter sterile sesame oil) and since there were no untoward effects each patient received a daily injection of the full 160-milligram dose, intramuscularly.

With the exception that the patients complained of discomfort and tenderness (which disappeared in a few hours) at the point of injection, there were no apparent allergic or anaphylactic responses.

(Summary: The author suggests that further exploratory studies be performed by independent clinicians using the material in primary, untreated, "young" cases of humans with breast tumors, leukemias, and other types of malignancies.)

Growth or Regression?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, when reading one of the issues of the Wall Street Journal the other day, one of the soundest newspapers in the country, well known for their thoroughness in researching their stories and editorials, I was struck by the pointedness of an editorial entitled "The Engines of Growth."

There is not one of us, I don't believe, who does not want to see our country continue its strides toward greater economic growth, but it seems to me that if we feel this sincerely enough, we would do well to exercise caution and restraint in studying many of the current administration proposals which would place the U.S. Treasury in the role of providing the means for achieving an economic Utopia. We might here speculate on whether or not our Creator ever intended to create a Utopia here on earth, to say nothing of what means should be used.

Our country was made great by self-reliance, independent spirit, religious freedom and individual enterprise. To try and change this self-reliant spirit of

the individual to dependence on the State may be much more dangerous than we think. The road back is difficult and we might lose our capability to continue to grow greater and stronger.

It seems to me that the few words contained in the editorial I am quoting below do more to explode the myth of insuring U.S. economic growth by more and more government spending than many I have seen. Let us take heed now and bear these thoughts in mind.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in my remarks the Wall Street Journal editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE ENGINES OF GROWTH

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 3, 1962]

Much of the argument over future U.S. economic growth is political, generated by those who urge much greater Government spending as the chief propellant of growth. Yet there are real economic and social considerations in this political issue, and they deserve more emphasis than they get.

At a recent meeting of economists, for example, Edward F. Denison, of the Committee for Economic Development, listed 13 steps for raising the growth rate (using the term in the sense of output) by 1 percentage point by 1980. Mr. Denison made clear he was delivering no political polemic; in fact, he said he was not particularly advocating adoption of his list. He was merely saying that if the Nation does want to increase its growth rate, these are some of the ways it can be done.

One of the most interesting things about the list is that Government spending is not given as a step toward growth. Almost equally instructive are some of the items that did make the list.

Increased capital formation, for one, and a particularly important one in view of the new study by Simon Kuznets warning that capital, at the rate it is forming, may not be adequate for future needs. Here are some other growth steps Mr. Denison mentioned:

Working 3 hours a week longer than we otherwise would in 1980. Removing barriers to international trade. Doing away with fair trade price laws. Eliminating union-imposed obstacles to the most efficient use of resources.

Whatever one's politics, it seems to us such requirements are self-evident. It is just commonsense to say that if the U.S. economy is to achieve a higher growth rate, capital must be forthcoming and people must be willing to work and artificial impediments to efficiency and competition must disappear.

Yet what are the attitudes that actually prevail among many people in this country today?

For one, there is the big new union push for shorter hours. This is one of the major current goals of the AFL-CIO, and it is dismally dramatized by the demand of an electricians' local for a 20-hour week. Throughout industry is a seemingly growing desire to avoid work, to be paid more for working less or not at all.

How does that square with the demands for greater economic growth? The answer is painfully simple: It doesn't.

Or consider some of the Government's policies in relation to growth. The present administration is committed, it's true, to the aim of freer international trade, but in innumerable other ways it seeks to protect various segments of the economy from the effort of competition.

And there could hardly be a more powerful deterrent to increased private capital formation than our confiscatory tax system. In addition, we have the persistent inflation of decades, with little indication the Government will finally halt it. If it is not halted, talk of real economic growth is so much wind.

Government politics work damage in more subtle ways. An unhealthy state of mind is emerging from the combination of Government growth and the demands of pressure groups for ever more Government handouts. Whatever may be said of the morality of that collusion between Government and some people, it is plainly economic weakness. A people changing from self-reliance to dependence on the state may be in danger of losing their resources for growth.

In such circumstances, it is a grievous fault for Government officials to propagate, in word and deed, the myth that the Government can spend the Nation into economic growth. The Government can spur an unstable inflationary boom for a time, but only the people, by working hard and saving and investing, can build sound growth.

No politicking can excuse the lie that work and thrift, the very things that made this country, are no longer necessary. They may be more necessary than ever in the decades ahead. The United States is not immune to decline. It cannot afford to trade in the real engines of growth for the delusion of a Government utopia.

Chick Atkinson Leaves Many Sports Records

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH R. HARDING

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, this past week athletic fans in Idaho and Utah lost one of our real leaders and outstanding personalities—Chick Atkinson.

My father has been a high school coach for 35 years in southern Idaho. My earliest memories pertain to gymnasiums, football fields, dressing rooms, and the men that frequent them.

During this time I have developed a friendship with many of our coaches in the West and I am proud of the type of men we have in this profession. I have found them to be men of character and leaders in their communities.

However, of all the coaches I have ever met if I could choose any single one to coach my boy, it would have been Chick Atkinson.

Edwin R. Kimball, the athletic director at Brigham Young University said:

Everyone who knew Chick appreciated him for his wonderful ideas and wonderful ideals. He will live for years to come in the minds and hearts of the boys whom he coached and the people with whom he associated.

Frank S. Dain, superintendent of industrial relations at United States Steel's Geneva operation near Provo, Utah, said:

In the relatively short time that Chick Atkinson has been at Geneva, he has made more friends than many of us do in a complete working career. He had a natural talent for industrial relations work, because he had a genuine liking for people. This genuine liking was returned by those with whom he worked. He was admired and respected by both management and labor.

Mr. Speaker, the two following newspaper tributes illustrate the high esteem in which Chick Atkinson was held by his fellow men.

[From the Deseret News & Telegram, Salt Lake City, Jan. 5, 1962]

CHICK ATKINSON—HE WAS BORN A LEADER—AND DIED A LEADER

(By Hack Miller, Deseret News sports editor)

Chick Atkinson, former Brigham Young University football coach, and one of the best liked gentlemen in sports, died Thursday.

And the sporting scene here and about couldn't have been more stunned if there had been the big blast.

This death came suddenly. He was taken to the hosptial when he became ill while playing handball.

That alone was shock. Here was a guy who had never been off the front team a day in his life.

One could write a book about the likes of Chick Atkinson. He was a rare sort—the kind of a man you'd like your kids to be coached by.

With apologies to no one, he put out Brigham Young University's best football, his coaching was superb. He had more ideas, more spirit, than the Cougars ever had before, or have since. When he moved from Brigham Young University to Geneva Steel, the latter was the gainer.

Yet Chick was always Brigham Young University's biggest booster—the first man up for the quarterback breakfasts—the first man up to pat the player on the back.

LIVED A LEADER, DIED A LEADER

Chick was friend to everyone. He held no quarter. He fought for his men all of the way. He staked his reputation, his career on principle.

Chick Atkinson came up through the ranks as an outstanding athlete, a top-rate student, leader in student and civic affairs.

He died a leader—he was bishop of the Provo 13th Ward at the time of his death—a guy who encouraged every young man to give the world his best.

The least we can note is that our world is better for his having been here.

[From the Idaho State Journal, Pocatello, Idaho, Jan. 5, 1962]

"CHICK" ATKINSON LEAVES RECORD IN MANY SPORTS

(By Ernie Stites)

Chick Atkinson is dead and the intermountain area has lost one of its greater athletes.

A short illness Thursday night claimed a man who seemed to be indestructible.

Many remember him for his top performances on the football field, the basketball court, the baseball diamond, and in track.

All knew him as a model athlete, the ideal type of young man whose conduct on and off the field was an example for the young men with whom he played or coached.

He excelled in every sport in which he participated, was a high-ranking student, and a leader in school activities.

At Pocatello High School he was captain of the 1935–36 basketball team, was voted outstanding athlete of the year after the Indians won the Idaho State championship. In addition he was senior class president.

Giving his athletic ability to Bengal athletic clubs at the then University of Idaho Southern Branch, he was a star on the 1936–37 Bengal basketball team. That club won 25 consecutive games, set a record of 27 victories in 31 contests including participation in the AAU national tournament at Denver.

In the next season he was Bengal basketball captain. The team played in Oklahoma City and Denver AAU tourneys, closing in the quarter finals of the AAU meet as the last college team remaining in action.

In addition to being voted the college's outstanding athlete he was men's representative to student government.

As a football player he was a triple threat in the Bengal backfield, playing defense, offense, and punting, and typical of his performance was the final game in 1937 when he returned to play after an ankle injury. He is credited with standing on his good foot and completing 7 of 10 passes.

He always gave his best, lettering in three sports in each of 2 years with the Bengals and winning a blanket award.

Transferring to University of Idaho, "Chick" played basketball, football, and baseball, was captain of the latter two sports in which he was named to division squads. He was president of the I club, and took part in student government.

His coaching began at Emmett High School and Blackfoot for 1 year each, and in 1943 he came to Pocatello High School as football coach. His composite record at the three schools is 88 won, 10 lost, and 1 game tied.

His football teams at Pocatello won two Big Six conference championships, and in the 2 years his squad lost only one game in each year.

Army service placed him as athletic officer in 1944 at Edgewood Arsenal, Md., and in 1946 he came home to serve as football coach and in addition served as varsity basketball coach and was promoted to director of athletics.

He enjoyed more successes here and in 1949 was invited by Brigham Young University to take over as varsity football coach.

While he did not achieve a record of outstanding achievements there he was an inspiration to players and left the school with the plaudits of the men with whom he worked.

In recent years he has been engaged in industrial relations with United States Steel Co., Geneva plant at Provo, Utah.

Mr. Speaker, I can best conclude my remarks by saying a loud Amen to the fine tributes paid to Chick Atkinson by Eddie Kimball, Frank S. Dain, Ernie Stites, and Hack Miller.

Postal Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, another year has rolled by, but for our Nation's faithful postal clerks and carriers it is hardly 1962. To them, it is more like 1945.

Our Post Office employees are still being treated as Government's poor stepchildren—unfairly, inequitably, and slightingly, in comparison to their brothers.

Little has changed for the postal worker since the end of the war, when he began losing his then prosperous purchasing power. The reason is an outmoded and grossly discriminatory pay adjustment system.

A speedy correction is long overdue.

Last year, it will be recalled, a postal longevity bill—S. 1459—was overwhelmingly passed by both Houses, but President Kennedy felt obliged to veto it. We must try again. Something that is honest, decent and proper, as this readjustment is, should not live or die on the condition of a postal rate increase.

It is silly to reason that the just compensation of an invaluable public service should be absolutely offset by postal revenues. For example, a small post office may have a revenue under $100 a month. No one would suggest that its postmaster's wage be so little. Such a postmaster, in fact, now makes $495 a month. Under the legislation I am introducing, he would get $550.

I hope no one would suggest either that, in order to obtain that modest increase, he would have to sell an extra $55 worth of stamps each month.

What I am proposing amounts to this: An immediate salary adjustment for every postal employee, as of January 1, 1962, with the largest proportional increases going to those with the lowest incomes. The increases would amount to about $1,000 to each postal worker. Starting wages would rise to just over $100 weekly. After 25 years of service, a carrier or clerk would be earning $130 weekly.

I feel that such a gradual raise of 30 percent in the course of a lifetime of service is the least the United States should offer its employees.

These are the mechanics of how the bill would correct the present inequities:

First. It would award longevity increases after 10, 13, and 16 years of service, instead of the current 13, 18, and 25 years. This would put postal employees on equal footing with other Federal workers. And this must be done to make the postal service as attractive a career as other Federal agencies offer.

Second. It would grant most postal employees an increase each year during the first 5 years of service. These increases would amount to nearly $3 weekly. The postal employee would get the $3 weekly increase again after 10, 13, and 16 years of service. As it stands now, postal employees, unlike other Federal employees, are limited to longevity increases amounting to less than $2 a week and have a much longer period to wait for it, as I have pointed out.

Thus I am only advocating an equal footing with other Government workers.

For postal workers such action, I feel, is essential and should be accomplished quickly to bail out, at long last, our dedicated postal employees from their postwar poorhouse.

Hail to Old Glory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am proud to include an American flag dialog by two students of the Exira, Iowa, High School—my hometown—Miss Cynthia Peterson and Miss Carolyn Jessen, who are also members of the 4-H Club.

Mr. Speaker, it was my great pleasure to see and hear these two fine patriotic American lassies put on this very impressive flag demonstration last fall, and because we all know that far too little emphasis is being exerted here in the United States of America to keep the spirit of our blessed heritage alive and burning in the hearts of all Americans today, my secretary, at my request, asked Mrs. Ethel Peterson to send me a copy of that wonderful dialog, to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Her letter and "Hail to Old Glory" follows:

EXIRA, IOWA, *January 2, 1962.*

DEAR MR. WATSON: Just a note, along with evidence that we are trying to start the year out right by keeping promises.

It has been hard to get the girls together to give their demonstration on the use of the flag so that I could type it off, as you requested.

As leader of the club I have been proud of the contribution that the girls have made in giving this demonstration so many times. I'm sure that both you and BEN will agree that it is a needed lesson. Wish that it were possible to have it entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and sent out to schools and organizations.

Hope that your daughter will enjoy the effort of the girls.

Sincere good wishes for the new year.

In haste,

ETHEL PETERSON.

DEMONSTRATION: "HAIL TO OLD GLORY"

(Given by Cynthia Peterson and Carolyn Jessen of the Exira Jolly Juniors 4-H Club at the Iowa State Fair as an activity demonstration, and at many other gatherings)

INTRODUCTION

CYNTHIA. On a visit to a foreign country recently, an American visitor inquired of his host "why their country's flag was in evidence so much, both in town and rural areas." "If ever," he said, "your country should experience an invasion of an enemy, and you were not permitted to fly your flag, you would understand how thankful we are that we regained our freedom and that we can fly our flag as a symbol of it."

In talking about this incident, my teammate and I recalled various Fourth of July observances, Memorial Day programs, and other occasions when our flag was presented, and people did nothing but stand. We decided perhaps they didn't know what to do. Certainly, it was not a matter of disrespect or lack of patriotism. Possibly, it was because we've always known freedom and we've also become indifferent, and taken our freedoms for granted.

As 4-H members and junior citizens we would like to make a contribution to our community by demonstrating the correct private and public use of the American flag.

It was not until June 14, 1777, that the Continental Congress adopted a design for the national flag. [Show the 1777 flag.] It resolved that "the flag of the United States shall be 13 stripes alternately red and white with a union of 13 white stars on a blue field, representing a new constellation." The national flag of the United States today has 13 horizontal stripes, 7 red, and 6 white with a red stripe at the top and bottom, and a union of blue in the upper quarter next to the staff extending down to the bottom of the 4th red stripe. There are five rows of six stars and four rows of five stars. [Show.]

The 77th Congress passed laws regulating the use of the flag and signed them on June

22, 1942. Five Federal laws have since been passed dealing with the display of the flag. President Eisenhower in 1953 signed into law the provision that penalizes the display of flags of international organizations in equal or superior prominence to the flag of the United States at any place within the United States or any of its territories except at the headquarters of the United Nations.

The other laws provide that no trademark may be registered if it contains the flag, the coat of arms, or other insignia of the United States. The display of the flag on Mother's Day was authorized; penalties were fixed for the improper use of the flag in the District of Columbia; and provision for the dismissal of any employee of the Government who, when the country is at war, criticizes the flag.

Carolyn will remind you of the laws governing the use of the flag and will demonstrate its use in the home and in public places."

CAROLYN. Thank you, Cynthia. In thinking about it, I believe that it is important to learn about our flag at home, first. Every home should have a flag and use it on legal holidays. We are familiar with the days that have been designated by acts of Congress, but we have listed them here. [Poster showing all legal holidays.]

This is a simple bracket to hold a wall staff. A flag should never be hoisted to the top of the staff, or placed on its staff in a bracket without first unfurling it. [Demonstrate this.]

Those who are fortunate in having a flagpole could fly it every beautiful, sunshiny day. In removing it for storage, use care so that the flag never touches the ground, roll it neatly and cover with a protective covering. [Demonstrate.]

First of all, in home training, children should learn that a flag is not a toy and should never be carelessly thrown around. If a child receives a small flag, explain that it should be set in a vase or in a container so that it is upright. [Demonstrate.] Teach the child to roll up the flag, cover it and store it in a drawer.

The flag or a replica should never be used as for instance, embroidered on a handkerchief, sofa pillow, or a picture, nor stamped on napkins or in any other form of ornamentation. It may not be used in advertising. The flag should always fly freely.

When your flag, at home or at your business place, becomes soiled, torn or unsightly, destroy it in a respectable manner by burning it. Some flags of good material can be dry cleaned satisfactorily, and a tear may be neatly mended. Do not fly an unsightly flag. With Cynthia's assistance, I will show you how to correctly use the flag in a church or auditorium. As the speaker faces the audience, the American flag, on a staff, will always be placed, at his right and slightly to the front. Just as the honor guest is always seated on the right of the host at a dinner. To the audience, the flag is on the left side of the stage. All other flags are placed to the left of the speaker. Only the American flag holds the position of honor. Off of the stage, in an auditorium, the American flag on a staff would become the flag of the audience and would be placed, floor level, at the right of the gathering.

The flag may be used on the wall in back of the speaker in this manner: Demonstrate, horizontal stripes and vertical stripes with emphasis placed on the blue field always being on the flag's own right. Demonstrate folding the flag, necessitating two people. Demonstrate draping the casket. "The casket is draped with the flag in the burial of any military or naval personnel or high-ranking Government official. The flag must never be permitted to touch the ground or be lowered into the grave. It is removed and folded, as we have just demonstrated, and given to the next of kin. The flag, placed on a casket, isdraped with the union over the left shoulder."

Demonstrate the use of the flag in a procession—the American flag when carried in a line with other flags, is on the right of the marching line. When leading the procession, in front and to the center.

Cynthia will continue with the demonstration.

CYNTHIA. When visiting dignitaries are guests of this country the flags of the countries which they represent are flown in this manner: The flag of the United States is flown in the center, and so forth. [Demonstrate.] If the American flag is cross staffed with another flag, it is at its own right and its staff is in front of the other flag. [Demonstrate.]

When the flags are displayed at the United Nations Building they should be flown from separate staffs of the same height and they should be of approximately equal size. International usage forbids the display of the flag of one nation above that of another in time of peace.

When it is to be flown at half-mast, the flag should be hoisted to the peak for an instant and then lowered to half-mast position; but before lowering the flag for the day, it should again be raised to the peak. By half-mast we mean lowering the flag to one-half the distance between the top and bottom of the halyard. It is done as a symbol of mourning at the time of death of a high-ranking Government or military official. On Memorial Day the flag is displayed at half-mast until noon only, then hoisted to the top of the halyard.

The flag of any State may be flown on the same halyard with the American flag, but it is always below the Stars and Stripes. Only the church flag in the U.S. Navy, a dark blue cross on a white background, may be flown above the flag of the United States. This is done at the time of commencing and kept hoisted during the continuance of divine service on board all vessels of the Navy.

If you are called upon to decorate in a patriotic motif, remember that a flag may not be used as a table cover or in any other way than we have explained. Use red, white, and blue bunting. Be sure to use it with the blue at the top.

When the American flag is presented or passes in parade this is the correct manner in which to accord its respect. [Both demonstrate.] Men in uniform give the military salute; men wearing hats will place their hat on the left shoulder so that the hand holding it will rest on the heart. If a man is not wearing a hat, he will stand at attention. Women and children will place their hands over their hearts. The salute should be given to the flag passing in parade when the flag is approximately six steps away and the salute held until it has passed an equal distance with the eyes following it. The same salute is appropriate when the "Star Spangled Banner" is played. Standing, the salute is rendered at the first note of the anthem, and the position is retained until the last note.

Carolyn will not give the conclusion.

CAROLYN. Cynthia and I have shown you how to correctly display our flag. We have emphasized its use in the home, position in an auditorium, on the wall, in a parade, at half-mast and on a casket. We have made suggestions for patriotic decorations and respectful salutes to our flag and national anthem. We hope that you have learned to care for your flag, and how to properly dispose of it when necessary. Most of all, we hope that each of you will encourage your family to acquire and use a flag if you do not have one.

In closing, we would remind you that in most groups the pledge of allegiance is given incorrectly. I will give the pledge showing that there are three divisions or breaks only. First, I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands; second, One nation, under God, indivisible; third, with liberty and justice for all.

We have secured our information for this demonstration from the following sources: Brittanica Encyclopedia, Source Book, Pictured Knowledge, Boy Scout Manual, the American Patriot's Handbook, the U.S. Marine Corps Manual, Etiquette of the Stars and Stripes, and the flag book of the DAR.

J. Gordon Roberts, Outstanding Citizen of Nebraska, on "Semantics and the Cold War"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, one of the blessings of our system of government and living is the opportunity for the individual to prosper, and when he prospers, to choose his own ways to contribute to his community and nation the fruits of his labor and industry and his experience.

In Nebraska we have a man who has prospered in the dairy industry—Mr. J. Gordon Roberts of the Roberts Dairy Co. Accordingly, in the best American traditions of philanthropy, he has used the fruits of his labor for the benefit of many and varied activities, especially in youth activities.

I would like to name just a few of Mr. Roberts' activities in the youth field: sponsorship of a number of American Legion baseball teams, Big Brothers of Omaha, annual awards for deserving youngsters in dairy husbandry in 4-H programs, first president of the National Boys Football Foundation, sponsorship of midget football teams, active in Boy Scout Covered Wagon Council, donor of athletic awards at two universities, board of directors of Omaha YMCA, contributed land for public parks in three cities, and a member of the President's Citizens Advisory Committee on the Fitness of American Youth.

Last month, the Cornbelt Region of the B'nai B'rith Youth Organization honored Mr. Roberts with a "Citation for Youth Services" during a regional convention attended by 400 youths from Iowa, Nebraska, and South Dakota. The citation was in recognition of business leadership, community work, and a belief in youth and mankind's ability to mold a better man by building a better boy. As an official of the B'nai B'rith organization said, "Mr. Roberts has shared his time with many youth activities in addition to service to the community."

On the occasion of this presentation, Mr. Roberts spoke on a subject in which he has a special interest—semantics. Mr. Roberts suggests a look at semantics as a possible answer to the cold war. His remarks were interesting and stimulating, not only to the young people at-

tending the award presentation, but to all of us in attendance.

I would now like to make these remarks available to the readers of the RECORD, and by reason of the unanimous consent previously granted, I now include Mr. Roberts' speech.

WHAT IS THE ANSWER TO THE COLD WAR?

(Speech given by J. Gordon Roberts to the regional convention of the B'nai B'rith Youth Organization, December 27, 1961, on the occasion of his receiving a citation for service to youth)

The problem of human survival is not a problem out of science fiction. It is a problem faced by all of us. It must be faced by my generation and by your generation.

We see the world divided into two armed camps to defend two very different sets of principles. In both camps, people seem much better prepared to die for their principles than to live by them.

In our own country, the bases of competion are deteriorating in more ways than I have time to describe. Freedom is being lost.

Behind the Iron Curtain, Marxian principles have been sacrificed. Pavlov's conditioned responses represent the principles upon which action is based. As you probably know, Pavlov made some experiments on animals in terms of conditioning. His work has been the basis for assuming that human beings are simply creatures to be conditioned through fear. Intelligence is considered just one manifestation of conditioning, like the exceptional capacity of a bloodhound to smell a trail.

Armament obviously offers no permanent solution to decadence anywhere in the world. On the other hand, with animal behavior as a model for control, disarmament appears to offer no solution either. Under the circumstances, abandoning all means of protection appears to make no sense. We might as well dismiss the police department.

So what is the answer?

In the first place, we must find a better yardstick of measuring human progress or retrogression. As of now, people identify emotionally with capitalism or communism, with very little rhyme or reason to such identification.

Karl Marx said that the human being is an evolving animal. But he also said that the pattern of human evolution may be determined through the study of economics. In my judgment, the study of economics offers too narrow a basis for measurement. I will try to explain why I say this a little later on.

In any case, we certainly need a better basis of measurement than we have now to determine which system is good and which is bad, and to what extent either is good or bad. To find such a system of measurement, progress must be made in the area of pure reason. Progress must be made in the area which lies even beyond pure science.

A small group of men and women are interested in finding the basis for such progress. They call what they are doing the study of general semantics. Semantics has to do with the meaning of words. General semantics covers the effect of symbolism upon our ability to think.

General semantics attempts to show the relationship between the symbols we use to describe our actual environment, and the environment itself. The closer the relationship the better. For words and what they mean are obviously not the same things. Try to eat a meal out of the food section of the newspaper, and you'll find yourself quite hungry.

Behind the approach of general semantics lies even a deeper theory than relationship between symbols and our ability to reason.

The theory is that the human being may best live in harmony with his neighbor if he can live in harmony with himself.

Involved in this harmony is the capacity to measure.

A person must stick his neck out if he is to try to find a way to measure anything and everything which can happen in the physical universe. I stick my neck out a long way when I refer to anything which ever has happened or is likely to happen.

Anyone interested actively in general semantics must be willing to stick his neck out. It's that kind of subject. It is not for the timid. On the other hand, most of us interested in this field take comfort in one rather important fact: Proving that a theory is wrong may be just as important as proving that a theory is right.

For instance, the alchemists tried to make gold out of baser metals. They believed that metal came from a fusion of what they called the stone atom and the fire atom. They were wrong in their assumption, but their activity led to the discovery of elements, nevertheless.

On the basis of the assumption that I may be either right or wrong or both, I am going to throw some rules at you for a new kind of logic. This logic is based upon structure rather than definition. Although I've had help in formulating these principles into words, I hold no one else responsible for them.

I have just two pages of rules. I doubt that you will follow them completely. But to make this talk coherent, I must read them:

"A SYSTEM OF STRUCTURAL LOGIC DESCRIBING OUR ENVIRONMENT

"I. Change, in the form of motion, is the only constant factor in the universe, descernible to the senses.

"II. Balance of forces in motion is implied in a universe of motion.

"III. With regard to motion, infinity, in terms of what may be discernible, must be reached with change in direction. (For instance, let us begin with an assumed point at rest. The point is, of course, an infinitely small amount of space. As the point moves, it develops into an infinity of points in terms of direction and now has dimension as a line. As the line, itself, moves around the original point, a circle develops, which is an infinity of lines, like spokes in a wheel. The infinity of points has not been lost, but it is now controlled by the movement of the line in developing an infinity of lines. As the circle moves around an axis, a sphere develops, with a new order of infinity consisting of circles. Infinity in the sense of the unchanging must be reached with change in direction.)

"IV. A new order is developed when infinity, as described, is reached by changing the direction of motion.

"V. Differing orders of complexity are developed through change in motion.

"VI. The latest order of changing motion describes the controlling order.

"VII. Different orders of complexity may be compared only in terms of common denominators of complexity. (For example, a sphere may not be compared with a circle in terms of cubic measurement, but may be compared with a circle in terms of radius or circumference.)

"VIII. Both progression and regression are possible, with the latest order of changing motion maintaining control in either case.

"IX. Statements about different orders may be described structurally in terms of the general and the specific: (A) True, generally but not specifically; (B) true, specifically but not generally; (C) true both generally and specifically; (D) false both generally and specifically; (E) not proved."

Structural logic should be subject to proof in terms of mathematical reasoning, and observation by the rules of scientific method. Should structural logic prove valid in any appreciable degree, one might well be able to compare like orders of structure even in areas which appear to be completely unrelated. Methods of application would certainly appear subject to improvement.

How might these rules be applied to the question of capitalism and communism, for example? Let's consider the possibility of evolutionary direction. Let's make some more assumptions which may be wrong to see if there is any way to test them.

Let's briefly analyze the basis for evolution.

Apparently Nature abhors pure chance as a basis for solving problems. In any case, our planet is composed of different kinds of material. Without different kinds of material, it is difficult to conceive of life ever developing at all.

In a sense, the development of life represents the exaggeration of differences already present on our planet.

In any case with, the development of life must have come the will to survive, and the necessity of choice.

Examination of lower forms of life indicates that some of these have difficulty in differentiating between what would make them survive and what would not.

In any event, they must have developed some means of differentiating between successful and unsuccessful experience. This must have represented the beginning of what we know as conditioning, a means of avoiding pure chance as the answer to survival.

Conditioning must probably have developed into instinct, as it became more and more deeply entrenched. And instinct must necessarily have been triggered by what developed into emotion. For emotion is a form of psychic comfort or discomfort.

In lower animals we certainly see conduct supporting this theory, in any case.

But with the coming of intelligence must have come also some freedom from the blind rule of conditioned emotion. According to the theory of logic presented here, control of direction must have been transferred away from emotional response to reason.

Suppose this is the case. To return to emotional response as the answer to all problems is to regress and to jeopardize our human values. Despite the glorification of pure emotion as depicted by romantic fiction, our problems may hardly be solved either through emotional comfort or discomfort, but through reason.

Suppose there may be some truth in the assumption that evolution may proceed through direction at higher and higher orders of control. Emotional identification may then hardly be the answer to our problems. Control is being taken from a higher order of evolutionary development in favor of a lower order.

Suppose mob rule were the solution to the problems of humankind. Mob rule would then necessarily signify the domination of what is best and most advanced in human development. But is this true?

All that I have read or observed on this subject would indicate the contrary. Mob rule appears to involve rule at the lowest level of development within any group. If such be the case, then we should turn away from identification through emotion to the use of intelligence, in order to solve the problems of our time.

Whatever may be the answer to our problems, mob rule hardly appears to be one of them. For men may jump, physically, through fear, but can they create through fear?

Some day human society must develop a system which is fitted to human needs. Above all, it must permit the individual to be creative. I hope that some day a system of measuring human progress may be developed which can make this kind of goal a practical reality. I hope that someone in this audience may be helpful in bringing about this kind of progress.

Thank you for listening.

The Congo, Nehru, Sukarno, and the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the Washington (D.C.) Star has performed a notable public service in its excellent editorial coverage of recent events involving the United Nations, particularly with respect to U.N. aggression in Katanga, aided and supported by the United States.

For the benefit of my colleagues who might not have read the Star editorials, I include them for the RECORD:

[From the Washington Star, Dec. 8, 1961]

RUSSIA TO THE RESCUE

Our friends from the Kremlin have rallied to the support of the attack on Britain and other colonial powers for allegedly sabotaging the United Nations Katanga operation. This raises some uncomfortable questions and invites some interesting speculation.

The Russians, of course, offer no proof of their own to support the charge. They are content to cite recent intemperate statements by Dr. Conor Cruise O'Brien and Gen. Sean McKeown who, in turn, offered no proof to sustain their accusations. Thus it goes—Dr. O'Brien, without producing any evidence, blasts away at Prime Minister Macmillan and certain unidentified British "gutter millionaires." General McKeown joins the cry, calling the irresponsible Dr. O'Brien as his witness. And now the Russians gleefully chime in, basing their complaint on the baseless attacks by Dr. O'Brien and General McKeown. And some people, we suppose, will swallow it.

There is one factual point which might be mentioned. Britain, although opposed to the use of force in Katanga, is at least paying her share of the cost of the U.N. operation. The Russians have refused to pay anything. Their first ruble is yet to be forthcoming. If it were not for the fact that our own country has been picking up the lion's share of the check, the U.N.-Congo effort would have collapsed long ago. Who is trying to sabotage what?

It seems to us, however, that there is greater reason to be concerned with the spectacle of the United States making common cause with the Kremlin in trying to subdue Moise Tshombe's Katanga by force of arms. What is the basis for an identity of interest in this highly dubious business? Does anyone believe that the Russians are trying to destroy Mr. Tshombe and discredit the colonial powers for any reason except to further their own interests? The question at the heart of this strange performance is whether our own country really knows where it is going and how it expects to get there. For our part, we doubt it.

[From the Washington Star, Dec. 11, 1961]

THE WORDS AND THE DEEDS

Secretary of State Dean Rusk has said that the "primary mission of the United Nations forces in Katanga is to protect themselves, to maintain their communications and to provide a situation in which the political processes among Congolese leaders can move on to a responsible and peaceful settlement." A joint U.N.-Congo communique issued in Leopoldville last week disclaimed any design of military conquest of Katanga or other warlike aims. The objectives, it said, are to restore law and order, eliminate the dangerous influence of mercenaries, and to seek a political solution.

These are fair words, but they bear little relation to what has been going on in Katanga. The U.N. armed attack, waged in the main by jet aircraft, was launched a week ago after discovery of an alleged Katangan attack plan. This alleged plan has not been made public despite demands by Belgian Foreign Minister Spaak that it be produced. If such a plan exists, and if it justifies the armed assault on Katanga, why has it not been made public?

The assault itself has not been limited to military objectives. On Friday a civilian hospital in Elisabethville was brought under mortar attack for 10 hours, and the building was hit by from 30 to 50 shells. A U.N. spokesman said the shelling was aimed at a Katanga camp half a mile away. This attack on the hospital, which is reported to have killed and wounded a number of civilians, resulted in a vigorous protest to the U.N. from 46 civilian doctors in Elisabethville. In addition to the hospital, they said, churches, houses and missions were hit by the mortar fire. Similar protests, including one to Adlai Stevenson, came from Protestant missionaries in Katanga.

We do not see any basis on which this kind of attack can be justified on grounds of self-defense, maintenance of U.N. communications, or paving the way for a peaceful political settlement. On the contrary, especially without publication of the alleged Katanga attack plan, it looks very much like indiscriminate U.N. aggression, aided and supported by the United States. In short, the deeds make it appear that a U.N. military conquest of Katanga is under way, and fair words cannot put a different face on the matter.

[From the Washington Star, Dec. 14, 1961]

IT DOESN'T MAKE SENSE

In Katanga, actions speak louder and more clearly than words. And, however reluctantly, one is forced to the conclusion that it is what we actually are doing there that is meaningful, not what we say we are doing.

The State Department denies that we are supporting the use of force by the United Nations to crush the Katanga forces militarily or to impose a political solution by force. All that we are doing, the Department insists, is to help the U.N. to protect itself, to maintain its freedom of movement and communications in order to discharge the mission given it by the Security Council and the General Assembly.

So much for the words. What is the U.N. force actually doing?

Clearly, we think, within the means available to it, it is waging full-fledged war against Katanga. Its jets are ranging far and wide, shelling and bombing fixed targets and, apparently, anything that moves on the roads. Its mortars have blasted nonmilitary targets—enough so to evoke protests from doctors and missionaries. Civilians as well as military personnel are being killed and wounded. Reinforcements are being brought up in U.S. planes, and reports from Leopoldville, capital city of the central government, repeatedly claim that Katanga's resistance soon will be overcome.

What is the purpose of all this? One purpose must be to crush Katanga's military forces. At least, that obviously is what is being attempted. If the attempt succeeds, what then? Is no political settlement to be imposed on a defeated Katanga? Will the province, if it wishes, be permitted to continue in a state of secession? Will Moise Tshombe be allowed to remain in control? Will what is left of the Katanga Army be permitted to maintain itself as an independent force? If the answer to such questions as these is yes, then the U.N. operation makes no sense whatever. It will have been an exercise in futility producing nothing but a harvest of ruin and bitterness.

Of course, we do not believe that any of this is contemplated. The intention, we think, is to crush Katanga's resistance and force it to rejoin the Congo. We are opposed to this, because we think it is morally wrong, beyond the scope of U.N. authority and that, in the end, it will be destructive of true Western interests. If the effort is to be pursued, however, if the United States is to break with its Western allies over Katanga and serve as a kind of tail to the Soviet and Afro-Asian bloc kite, we would feel better about it if the facts were to be candidly stated. As things stand, no one is being deceived—except possibly those of our own officials who may be deceiving themselves.

[From the Washington Star, Dec. 18, 1961]

MR. NEHRU STRIKES

In this age of inverted international morality, were it not for one thing, there would be nothing especially surprising about Prime Minister Nehru's aggressive war against Goa and two other tiny Portuguese enclaves. That one thing is Mr. Nehru's record—a record of self-righteous preachments addressed to anyone and everyone whose standards of conduct fall short of what Mr. Nehru thinks, or claims to think, they should be.

The Portuguese have been in Goa since 1510—18 years after Columbus discovered America. Their suggestion that the question of integration with India be submitted to a vote of the Goan people has been ignored. Mr. Nehru, having been assured of Soviet support for his action, has simply brought superior military force to bear in the fashion of all aggressors. The Goans, it is said, are being liberated, and never mind whether they would have preferred to remain as they were.

In unleashing his tanks, troops, and planes, the Indian Prime Minister has ignored appeals from the United Nations and, it is reported from the United States. Why? Because with the Kremlin's backing he can safely proceed to crush tiny Goa in the name of liberation

This confronts the U.N. with a nasty situation. What will it do, or even try to do, about this flagrant act of aggression? Not much, in all probability. For the hands of the U.N. are considerably less than clean at this time.

With Indian troops in the forefront, it has proceeded to smash the Katanga armed forces, while denying that it had any such purpose in mind. With the support of the United States, the U.N. Congo Army has invaded and captured Elisabethville, killing many civilians as well as soldiers in the process. Yet a U.N. spokesman in Leopoldville has the effrontery to say: "Our purpose continues to be to insure our freedom of movements and to protect the civilian residents of Elisabethville from the danger of further Katanga attacks."

With such examples of the new international doubletalk before him, and with Russia at his side, we do not imagine Mr. Nehru is losing sleep over any prospective U.N. action.

[From the Washington Star, Dec. 19, 1961]

WHILE GOA DIED

The Security Council, to paraphrase the familiar line, fumbled in futility while tiny Goa collapsed under the impact of Prime Minister Nehru's unabashed aggression.

This was not the fault of the majority members of the council. Seven of them, led by the United States, called for the immediate withdrawal of the Indian invaders. But Soviet Russia, supported by Ceylon, Liberia, and the United Arab Republic, voted the resolution. This, of course, was all pre-

arranged. When he launched his cynical attack, Mr. Nehru knew he could count upon the backing of the Soviet Union—and this despite the flagrant nature of the violation of the U.N. Charter.

No exercise in semantics, no concoction of disingenuous words, can disguise the meaning of this shameful exhibition. Adlai Stevenson, describing himself as the only man at the council table who was present at the birth of the U.N., said that "tonight we are witnessing the first act of the drama which could end in its death."

We do not think that this is an exaggeration. If anything, the Soviet veto was not the first act leading to the death of the U.N., but the latest in a series of such acts. And the United Nations certainly cannot survive in a climate of moral corruption. The organization was founded on the assumption that the members would respect the provisions of its charter, that wrong would not be treated as right merely because this perversion of fact suits the momentary convenience of one country or another.

The delegates may twist truth into unrecognizable form. They may even persuade themselves that this is their proper function. But the people, especially the Western people, will not be deceived. And when they refuse any longer to support a corrupted organization, the United Nations will be done for. What an irony it will be if Prime Minister Nehru, the "Man of Peace," turns out to have been a principal architect of the U.N.'s destruction.

[From the Washington Star, Dec. 20, 1961]

SUKARNO AND THE U.N.

It seems rather likely at the moment that President Sukarno of neutralist Indonesia will go forward with his threatened invasion of Dutch-administered West New Guinea. After all, he has received much encouragement to do so. The Kremlin, for example, has already bestowed its enthusiastic blessing on the venture. And India's peace-loving Prime Minister Nehru has shown how swiftly aggression can succeed when one launches it with overwhelming military superiority against relatively unarmed places like the ancient Portuguese enclaves of Diu, Damao and Goa.

There is still some hope, however, that Mr. Sukarno will accept the offer of the Netherlands Government to try again to negotiate a peaceful settlement of the issue under the auspices of the United Nations. In any event, in laying claim to West New Guinea, he is on even weaker ground than Mr. Nehru has been as regards the enclaves India's armed forces have just taken over in an altogether ignoble violation of the U.N. Charter and of the Prime Minister's own frequently and piously proclaimed advocacy of morality in international life. Thus, although the Indians at least can argue that the enclaves have been remnants of colonialism within the physical boundaries of their vast subcontinent, the target of the Sukarno regime's projected aggression is far removed from the heart of Indonesia, geographically, socially, culturally and otherwise. The following Dutch view of the matter is well worth quoting:

"New Guinea—is an island—the second largest in the world. It lies across the top of Australia and has an area of 344,330 square miles. The eastern half is under Australian administration. The western half of the island, roughly the size of Norway, is Netherlands New Guinea, a hot and humid land—harsh and unfriendly to man. It is estimated that the whole population number somewhat over 700,000—partly pygmies. Neither from a racial nor from a cultural point of view is there any connection between these primitive people—who are among the most primitive left on this earth—and the highly cultured ethnical groups of Indonesia.

"There is no movement for independence in Netherlands New Guinea; there is no movement for affiliation with Indonesia among the indigenous population. What the Netherlands proposes to do is to continue to develop, through a process of education, a free political consciousness which is a prerequisite for ultimate self-determination. What Indonesia proposes is simply that a territory and a people, which have no ties with Indonesia whatsoever, should be annexed by Indonesia, and once and for all be deprived of self-determination."

All this strikes us as a reasonable summation of the realities. Mr. Sukarno, whose government is in constant difficulty trying to run the affairs of the more than 82 million people living within the vast and far-flung complex of islands that make up the Indonesian Republic, is wrong when he declares that the armed forces under his command must liberate West New Guinea from the colonialism of the Dutch. If the majority of nations, meaning particularly the Soviet bloc and the Afro-Asian neutralists, are determined to support this kind of demagogic nonsense, then the U.N. will hardly be able to survive.

[From the Washington Star, Dec. 27, 1961]

TEMPTING TSHOMBE

There has been some doubt, encouraged by statements from unidentified United Nations spokesmen and by Congolese Premier Adoula, that Moise Tshombe really intends to go through with his agreement to end the secession of Katanga Province. The import of this has been that he signed the agreement in bad faith and that he will find some pretext for wriggling out of it.

Maybe so, although Mr. Tshombe today is scheduled to send a Katanga parliamentary delegation to Leopoldville to participate in the drafting of the new Congo constitution called for in the Adoula-Tshombe agreement. But what is one to think of the U.N. and its intentions?

Last Saturday, at a most critical stage of the supposed U.N. effort to end its war in Katanga and bring that Province back into the Congo, it was announced that 1,000 troops from the Congolese Army will be added to the U.N. military force. What could be better calculated to encourage Mr. Tshombe, if he wants to welsh on his agreement, and to stiffen Katangese resistance to the U.N. effort to end the Province's secession? What earthly sense does it make, especially at this time, for the U.N. to be importing enemy troops into Katanga—troops whose military performance heretofore has been notable for butchery, pillage, and rape?

When the announcement first came it was wrapped in ambiguity. No U.N. spokesman would say why a longstanding policy against using Congolese troops as part of the U.N. force had been changed. No one would say where these troops would be stationed. Our own Government, which has not favored use of Congolese troops on the ground that it would smack too much of intervention in a civil war, remained silent—while presumably our planes were flying in the Adoula soldiers.

Three days later some enlightenment came. A 90-man advance unit of the Congolese troops, it was announced, is joining the U.N. Army at Kamina Base in Katanga, and the others, presumably, will be flown in later. To be sure, it was stated that the Congolese will not be used to attack Katanga. But as the Associated Press reported in a dispatch which certainly is not an exaggeration, "their presence is likely to increase Mr. Tshombe's fear that one day the U.N. may assist the Central Congolese Army to reoccupy Katanga by force."

It may be that the U.N. authorities think they have crushed Mr. Tshombe's ability to resist, and that they can do as they please. If the Katanga leader now tries to back out of his agreement, however, and if the fighting should be resumed, this incredible decision to use Congolese troops may very well be interpreted as evidence that the U.N. planned it that way.

[From the Washington Star, Dec. 29, 1961]

BETTER HIRE HIM

Two State Department big guns have been fired, or perhaps one should say misfired, in reply to criticism of United Nations policy in the Congo and our Government's support of that policy.

One blast came from G. Mennen (Soapy) Williams, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs. It isn't worthy of much attention, since it is a rehash of the familiar State Department-U.N. line, with all of the distortions and omissions, plus a few characteristic Williams-ish embellishments.

The speech by Carl T. Rowan, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, is in a different category. For one thing, it is reported to have been cleared in the State Department all the way to the top. For another, it is filled with fascinating contradictions, McCarthy-like innuendoes, and above all, it introduces most of us for the first time to the man who, according to Mr. Rowan, is the real villain of the piece.

Mr. Rowan starts from the false premise that the United States could not support Katangan secession. It has been our impression that the criticism was directed not to this, but to U.S. support of the U.N. effort—disclaimers to the contrary—to crush Moise Tshombe's meager military power and force Katanga back into the Congo. Mr. Rowan says that Mr. Tshombe, by refusing to return to the Congo fold, has unwittingly been playing the Communist game to the hilt, while the Communists lurk in the shadows waiting to capitalize on the chaos that would result from continued secession. This raises the interesting question of why the Communists, in the Security Council, have fully supported the U.N. effort to end Katanga's secession—a question which Mr. Rowan doesn't bother to answer. Mr. Rowan also pays his respects to those who support Mr. Tshombe and his policy of secession. In the United States, he says, we have a conglomeration of arch-conservatives: people who oppose the income tax; avowed defenders of racial segregation; opponents of fluoridation of water; those who want to destroy the Supreme Court, largely because of its ruling on school segregation, etc. In other words, if one speaks up for Tshombe one must also be against fluoridation of water—which is at least a novel approach to the guilt-by-association school of thought.

Of greatest interest to us, however, are Mr. Rowan's comments on one Michel Struelens, a former Belgian civil servant who operates out of some rather plush quarters in New York, and who heads up a clever, big-money campaign to convince Americans that they ought to support Katanga's secession. Further, as Mr. Rowan tells it, by spreading around at least $140,000 over the last year, Mr. Struelens has gotten some extremely vocal help in dispensing a string of myths and a stream of misinformation about Katanga and the Congo.

The inference, as we get it, is that Mr. Struelens by spending a mere $140,000 in a year has bought up a large segment of the American press, a significant number of Senators and Representatives, such prominent citizens as Herbert Hoover and Richard Nixon, as well as the great majority of people who have written to the newspapers on the question of our policy in the Congo.

We have never met Mr. Struelens, but if Mr. Rowan is right, he must be quite an operator. And we have a suggestion to offer. The State Department, the United Nations, or perhaps both, ought to hire him. As

things stand, they are paying out a lot more than $140,000 a year, and getting a lot less in return, for the efforts of their own press agents and propagandists—under whatever titles they may function.

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 5, 1962]

ANOTHER LOW BLOW

There may be a cease-fire in Elisabethville, but the State Department's private war against Katanga and its American representative, Michael Struelens, goes on unabated. Furthermore, some of the tactics being used are, we think, beneath the dignity of the State Department.

Lincoln White, State Department press officer, has publicly charged that an attempt was made to pay another country to extend diplomatic recognition to Katanga, and that Mr. Struelens was involved. Other sources—sources at higher levels in the State Department—have said privately that the country in question was Costa Rica and that the alleged bribe amounted to $1 million.

Let's step back and take a look at this. In the first place, there is no reason under the sun why Katanga shouldn't try to win recognition from Costa Rica or any other country. But it is hardly any of our State Department's business—especially in view of the fact that the United States has spent and is still spending not millions but billions of dollars in an effort to buy friends and good will in countries scattered around the world. We Americans are hardly in a position to be too self-righteous about spending money to win friends and influence people.

Secondly, this Costa Rica bribe story has been kicking around Washington for several days. It was leaked by a State Department official higher in rank than Mr. White, but since that official would not permit his name to be used most newspapers did not print the story. As a result, we strongly suspect, Mr. White found himself stuck with a smear assignment—one which did receive wide publicity.

Finally, the charge has been flatly denied by Mr. Struelens, and it has also been branded as fantastic by a Foreign Ministry spokesman in Costa Rica. In this situation, it seems to us, one has a right to expect the State Department to put up or shut up. If there is evidence to support the bribe charge, the appropriate officials have both an obligation and a duty to produce it. If they cannot or will not do this, they should put their scalping knives away and start acting like responsible men in responsible positions. Otherwise, these foolish architects of a smear campaign designed to discredit Katanga are going to succeed only in discrediting themselves—and the State Department.

Senator Styles Bridges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York World-Telegram of November 27, 1961, with reference to the late Senator STYLES BRIDGES. The Senate has lost one of its most distinguished members, and I have lost a respected and valued friend. Senator BRIDGES served his country well, and his loss will be keenly felt by the Senate and by the people of New Hampshire.

The above-mentioned article follows:

SENATOR STYLES BRIDGES

Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, dead at the relatively young age of 63, was in his fifth term. Yet some first-termers were more widely known. His seniority, his position as chairman of the GOP bloc and his skill in political maneuvers made him a Senator of exceptional influence. But he seemed to prefer the background.

Throughout his nearly 25 years in the Senate, Mr. BRIDGES was established as a Yankee conservative and often was tagged with sterner catalogings. But he sometimes voted for liberal propositions, often was critical of a Republican administration.

He didn't speak frequently, but he had a talent for remarkably crisp talk, and some of his analyses of current affairs were incisive and bold. He early discerned the danger of a Red China and—even before World War II ended—was identifying Soviet Russia as the great roadblock to world peace. He consistently opposed deficit spending.

In six successive elections (the first as Governor) the people of New Hampshire by wide majorities showed they were well pleased with him. That is one important measure of a Senator, and there are only four now in the Senate who could outmatch him.

We Must Be Informed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to an excellent editorial appearing in the December 5, 1961, edition of the Villanova Prep Times, Ojai, Calif. The author is Robert Andrews, aged 17.

The editorial follows:

Information is a vital thing. A person can, in fact, neither defend nor attack a philosophy or a way of life unless he possesses information about its precepts. This is especially true of the political and ideological philosophy we call communism.

Yet, what is information? It is certainly more than the mere memorization of set phrases, to be parroted whenever the conversation shifts from the latest football scores to politics.

Information is the accumulation of facts—not prejudices—and the intelligent arrangement of these facts in the mind. An informed citizen is not essentially a rightist or a leftist. He is an American.

George Washington, in his last public address, given in 1796, said "Citizens by birth or choice, your country has a right to demand all your loyalties. The name of 'American,' which belongs to you, must always exalt your pride more than any personal or party affiliation."

In other words, those who pledge their fidelity to various organizations and societies, which are in direct conflict with the fundamental truths on which our country is founded, run the risk of allowing hatred of communism to obfuscate their loyalty to their country. Quoting George Washington again, "Guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism."

Patriotism, which has admittedly become too often neglected today, takes the place of information in the minds of some. Just as seniors at Villanova and other Catholic schools take a course in apologetics (which enables them to prove certain aspects of Catholicism through reason, instead of trusting completely in blind faith), likewise Americans should supplement their patriotic feelings with practical knowledge.

Finally, too many people think that either liberal opinions or a conservative point of view will be correct on all issues. Rather than chiming in with the shibboleth-sayers that "I'd rather be Red than dead" or "I'd rather be dead than Red," real seekers of the truth now claim "I'd rather be right than rightist."

Whatever opinions each of us may hold about the situation today, abroad and at home, we all know that communism is a menace which must be met and conquered. And to conquer communism, we must be informed.

Sound Government Financing Essential to a Sound Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I found it somewhat disconcerting to read in yesterday's newspapers that one of the first requirements of this session of Congress, according to President Kennedy, will be to raise the Federal debt limit. The justification advanced is that with heavy defense expenditures, it is impossible to maintain a balanced budget and thus we must continue to add to our unpaid obligations. We now owe more than all other nations in the world combined and since I question whether anyone would advocate a permanent policy of a continually increasing national debt, I am wondering when this obligation of future generations will stop. I know there are some modern economists who argue that a permanent national debt is good. Well, I find this somewhat difficult to accept. In running my own business I have always found that it is best to keep debt at a minimum. Unforeseen emergencies such as drought or sickness often develop and it is comforting to be able to borrow some money to tide over the emergency without crowding your individual debt limit.

It would seem that a more realistic policy on the part of this administration in facing some of the facts of our economic situation are in order. We are experiencing some adverse effects from foreign imports, and we must continue to increase export sales if we are to keep employment up and production at a high level.

The administration seems to have recognized that our past policy of continually raising prices is pricing this country out of the world market in certain instances. The first positive suggestion in this direction has been in connection with agriculture where no fur-

ther increases in commodity prices seems to be the new policy. While this is a realistic recognition of the facts of life, it is unfair if applied only to the farmer. He is now low man on the income totem pole. Why does not the administration suggest that the labor unions use a little restraint in their demands for higher hourly rates and shorter hours?

The ratio of prices farmers receive to those farmers pay hit a 22-year low in December of 1961. This, in spite of farm income having increased slightly during the year. The increased cost of items farmers purchased wiped out any net gain in income. It must be recognized here that labor costs are a large factor in many basic supply items in a farm operation.

Mr. Speaker, David Lawrence in his editorial in the January 8 issue of U.S. News & World Report made some pertinent observations on the factors involved in maintaining a healthy expanding economy. I commend the editorial to the attention of the Members of the House and, under unanimous consent, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD following my remarks:

IF BUSINESS IS GOOD

(By David Lawrence)

We are told that a balanced budget is coming in the next fiscal year—if business is good.

Federal expenditures are not to be cut, and the spending is to be at a record high—with an expected $10 billion more in tax receipts for the Government than last year. This is quite an expectation.

But what is being done to make business better? Are we relying on natural growth? Are we to derive all this extra tax money from the recovery now in progress after the recent recession?

We hear a great deal these days about the rate of growth of the economy. We are told that America must grow at a rate of approximately 5 percent a year, but has been growing at only 3 percent.

Have we truly recovered from the last recession? Let's face the facts. A recession usually means a slowdown for a year or so. Caution in buying results in low inventories. Demand falls off for a while but eventually, in the recovery period, pent-up demand creates the appearance of a boom. Then everybody's happy—at least until the next recession hits us.

Isn't it time to deal with fundamentals and not rely on temporary measures to iron out the so-called cycles? Should we not examine the weaknesses in the American economic system and stop deceiving ourselves by alluring figures of so-called growth? Should we not, indeed, rid ourselves of the cancers that are eating away at the national economic system?

Our railroads are in trouble. Our airlines haven't been doing well. Our heavy-goods industries haven't really grown since 1955. Steel faces an emergency with the threat of another strike 6 months hence.

Meanwhile, Western Europe is reported to be booming, and optimism about the Common Market is filling the air. Some American companies are apprehensive that it means new competition for them, even as we hear plans for removal of tariff walls. Other American companies see it as a huge outlet for exports.

Certainly world conditions today have a greater impact on our economy than ever before. We can no longer depend on the normal growth of population alone to give us a steady upward curve in business.

Perhaps the current crisis is beneficial in the sense that it will make us look facts in the face—facts that we have too long ignored.

For we are confronted with a challenge to our system of free enterprise and free competition. Antiquated laws must be reexamined. The Sherman Antitrust Act was passed in 1890. It has been amended several times since, but the basic principle remains the same—there must not be a monopoly in any industry unless it is a public utility.

Today, however, we have a trade union monopoly in almost every industry. It fixes price indirectly. Virtually uniform labor costs in each industry are the rule rather than the exception. The arm of the law does not reach out to prevent these monopolies from functioning, even when they result in business failures. Indeed, if there are five companies in an industry and one is slowly but surely being forced to the wall by more efficient competitors, the Government steps in and prevents a merger on the theory that this would aid monopoly. Eventually, however, the ill-fated company goes bankrupt, and the other four companies gobble up its sales just the same.

The Government also is no longer content with efforts to prevent conspiracies to fix prices. It has attacked in the courts individual companies which it claims are setting prices at unreasonably low levels.

We cannot expect sound growth through reliance on government spending for public works or welfare programs or defense projects. A temporary stimulus does not bring long-range growth.

We must come to grips with fundamentals. American businessmen must be given the fullest opportunity to compete, not only with each other inside America but against foreign companies by means of plants abroad.

Profit margins must not be constantly narrowed by the extortions of unrestrained monopoly among trade unions. On every side complaints are heard today about the profit squeeze. This is a tragic reality. It is affecting both large and small businesses.

There is a place for statesmanship in labor as well as in business. Self-restraint and a sense of responsibility cannot be imposed by government, but it can certainly be encouraged by government.

The present administration will be headed for trouble on the political front in 1962 and 1964 if it doesn't reduce substantially the number of unemployed. It cannot do so by continuing to play footsie with labor unions in order to insure getting their votes. There are far more voters outside labor unions than inside.

It is time for an agonizing reappraisal of what is happening in business and labor. For America can grow and national budgets can be balanced if business is really good.

A Friend Goes Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to place in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal of December 27, 1961, entitled "A Friend Goes Home."

The editorial expresses some fitting sentiments on the occasion of the departure from our country of Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo of the Philippine Republic. Ambassador Romulo has been an able representative of his country, an understanding friend of the United States, and a stanch champion of freedom and democracy. He has lived in the United States for many years, representing his country in the United Nations and, later, in Washington. He has made many friends, and he will be missed when he returns to the Philippines.

The Milwaukee Journal aptly expressed the sentiments of Ambassador Romulo's friends when it stated that we would like to see him back as frequently as he can come.

The editorial follows:

A FRIEND GOES HOME

In withdrawing Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo as its emissary to the United States, the Government of the Philippines is calling home an able representative of its interests. The American people are losing a loyal friend. Thousands of them have heard him on lecture tours during which he carried on a mission of "not only fighting communism, but also voicing the aspirations of millions of voiceless Asians."

General Romulo's voice has been heard frequently at the United Nations. He had a hand in writing the U.N. Charter in 1945 and was his country's first representative to the U.N. He headed the Assembly in 1949 and the Security Council in 1957. Except for time out for Philippine politics he has been Ambassador to this country since 1952.

General Romulo was not always a friend of this country. His father was a rebel leader who fought for Philippine independence and as a boy Romulo disliked the United States. He changed in his schooldays into an admirer and friend. He fought with General MacArthur's forces during World War II.

It is unthinkable that General Romulo's stirring messages will not be heard again in this country. In the first place, he likes to talk and write too much to stay silent in or out of office. He likes the United States too much not to visit it often. This country wants him back as frequently as he can come.

Tribute to Col. Gaylord B. Kidwell, U.S. Army, Retired

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this point to insert in the RECORD a letter I recently received from Col. Gaylord B. Kidwell, U.S. Army, retired.

Colonel Kidwell, since his retirement from active military service, has devoted his time and energy to the safety of our children. More specifically, he has untiringly worked toward the protection of our children against suffocation in old ice boxes and refrigerators.

I sincerely believe that this devoted individual should be highly complimented and praised for the service he has rendered his country, without pay, and solely to provide a safer place for our children to live in.

I congratulate him and trust that his efforts in this behalf will not go unheeded and unnoticed.

The letter follows:

JANUARY 3, 1962.

Hon. KENNETH A. ROBERTS,
U.S. House of Representatives.
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROBERTS: In view of your many courtesies in the past I am sure you know that for quite some time prior to my appearance before your committee on May 12, 1956, and continuing throughout the intervening years, I have devoted much time and effort to the problem of accidental entrapment and suffocation of children in idle refrigerators and freezers.

This pursuit has been without prospect of financial benefit. It has been mainly concerned with the 90 million national inventory of pre-1958 menufacture which are destined to continue in use for some 15 years hence. These are the types of boxes about which we continue to read in the press as killing one or two children in each incident with discouraging frequency.

My pursuit of this problem has involved contact and discussion with many areas of responsibility and interest in the Government and industry as partially reflected in the list of agencies to whom I beg the privilege of referring a copy of this letter. This to inform them of a new development in my position, and in order that they may consider my future contacts in complete knowledge.

Inspired by my many years devotion to this problem I recently conceived an idea for a safety device for future manufacture of air-tight cabinets. I filed an application for a patent on this device and I have been informed today that the patent has been allowed, and that a Letters Patent will issue in due course. This patent was processed through the General Counsel, Office of the Army Quartermaster General, and includes a "license free" right to the Government.

I do not view this development as interfering in any way with my free offering of devices to be considered for use on existing boxes, such as was done at the committee hearings in May 1956, and more recently to the Federal Safety Council, nor, to my advancing valid objections to some safety precautions now being advocated to the general public—which I have done and will continue to do without financial reward.

As this venture on my part has been entirely as a concerned private citizen, with the time in retirement to devote to this worthy public problem, I would like to take this opportunity to express my sincerre appreciation for the courtesy and assistance that has attended all of my contacts, particularly that extended by yourself and your committee staff.

Sincerely yours,

GAYLORD B. KIDWELL,
Colonel, U.S. Army (Retired).

The Faith To Be Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure recently to attend the award dinner here in Washington at which J. Edgar Hoover was named the recipient of the Mutual of Omaha Criss Award for 1961. This award is given annually to an American who has made an outstanding contribution to public health or public safety.

Certainly we all agree that Mr. Hoover well merits this acclaim and recognition for his leadership and dedication in the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

At the award banquet, Mr. Hoover spoke in his usual straightforward manner and his remarks deserve wide attention. Thus I take great pleasure in introducing these remarks into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time:

THE FAITH TO BE FREE

(Remarks of J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, upon receiving the Criss Award in Washington, D.C., December 7, 1961)

This indeed is a great honor, which has been made possible by the personal sacrifices and devotion to duty of my associates. I accept the Criss Award with deep humility on behalf of the dedicated men and women of the FBI. I shall cherish it always as a symbol of your recognition of their service to the American people. I am most grateful to the awards committee and to Mutual of Omaha.

Ours is the greatest republic in the history of mankind. Our homeland was carved out of a vast wilderness by heroic men and women who were determined at any cost that their children, and their children's children, might live in freedom under God. It is our sacred responsibility to help protect that heritage and to preserve it for future generations.

I would like to be able to report that the internal enemies of our society have virtually disappeared—that they have faded into the dim past like the dangers of the wagon trail and the Northwest frontier. But this is not so.

From the depths of our criminal and subversive underworlds, strong enemies—deadly enemies—continue to challenge the right of decent Americans to live in freedom and dignity under God.

Today, we are facing a crime problem of such magnitude that it represents an acute danger to our national survival. There is a serious weakening of moral and spiritual fibers in our society. We must never forget that a vitiated state of morals, a corrupted public conscience, is incompatible with true freedom.

During the past decade, crime has nearly doubled across the United States, outpacing the growth of our population at the rate of 4 to 1. A murder is committed every 58 minutes. There is a vicious assault every 4 minutes; a forcible rape every 34 minutes; a robbery every 6 minutes; a burglary every 39 seconds.

Crime is no respecter of age, race, or creed. Each year, the cost of crime climbs higher and higher until it now has reached an alarming total of more than $60 million each day.

Year after year, we find that nearly half of the persons arrested for burglaries and larcenies, and almost two-thirds of those arrested for automobile thefts, are less than 18 years of age.

America's juvenile criminality is directly traceable to the failure of adults to meet their moral obligations. In all too many cases, the primary responsibility rests with the parents. If respect for law and order and for the rights of others were instilled in children at an early age and if parents set a proper example for their children, we might keep juvenile delinquency from becoming the door to careers in crime.

I can see no difference between the responsibility of a 17- or 18-year-old who wilfully robs, assaults, or murders and that of an adult who commits the same crime. Each should be held strictly accountable for his act against society. These are not juvenile delinquents. They are vicious young thugs. They should be treated accordingly. I share with Blackstone the premise that the main strength and force of a law consists in the penalty annexed to it.

The most deeply entrenched forces of the underworld in our Nation today are the professionals who comprise the jealously guarded ranks of organized crime. These are the criminal elite, assuming an air of legitimacy, who buy high-priced legal advisers, better termed "lawyers criminal," and "front men" to shield them from proper punishment.

These underworld characters with their criminal scum flout the sacrifices—the blood, the sweat, and the toil of six generations of dedicated Americans—which secured the freedoms they enjoy. These persons wear our constitutional guarantees as a cloak of protective armor. They are unrestrained by those moral considerations which constitute the lifeblood of a democracy. In their eyes, the United States is a haven of rights without responsibilities—of privileges free from obligation to the society which has made them possible. Theirs is a virulent, parasitic existence consuming the lifeblood of the freedom which they would enjoy.

Unfortunately, they are assisted all too often by public lethargy, and by some jurists obsessed with the virtues of legal technicalities, as well as by theoreticians with the soft approach who purport to be experts in the field of law enforcement and penology. Justice is not impartially meted out when the victim and society suffer while the criminal goes free.

We in America emphasize the great value of liberty and the importance of sympathy for the accused. The law-abiding citizen is entitled to more consideration on the part of our courts. The basic purpose of the criminal law is to protect society, not the criminal. As an eminent Justice of our U.S. Supreme Court observed, "The necessity of public protection against crime is being submerged by an overflow of sentimentality."

In this Nation, disrespect for law and order is a tragic moral sickness which attacks and destroys the American traditions of honesty, integrity, and fairplay. Directly or indirectly, its victims include every man, woman, and child in the United States.

It is a national scandal that the streets of many of our cities are as fraught with danger as the jungle trail.

Each of us to his fullest capacity must help shoulder the burden of this growth of lawlessness and strive to end it. Our Nation's moral strength has slipped alarmingly. One cannot preach morality and practice immorality. National corruption is the sum total of individual corruption. We must follow the teachings of God if we hope to heal this moral illness.

The FBI is conducting an all-out war on crime. The entire law enforcement profession has never been more united in the fight against crime than it is today. However, in order to achieve the desired results, law enforcement must have the solid backing of every decent citizen. The striving for law and order, for human decency, for equal opportunity, is a matter of conscience—public and private.

So long as dishonesty and evasion of responsibility are tolerated, it is inevitable that law enforcement will mirror this breakdown in the moral fiber of our society. But, if we continue to progress in the tradition of freemen, with adequate safeguards against any invasion of the rights and dignity of the individual, we will ultimately achieve victory over those who defy law and order throughout our great Nation.

Today marks the 20th anniversary of a tragic event in our history—the attack on Pearl Harbor which triggered America's entry into World War II. That war cost the lives of 400,000 Americans—courageous men

who, at a time of gravest need, sprang forward in the noble tradition of their forefathers to defend the cause of freedom with their lives.

But now, two decades later, in Europe, in Asia, and in neighboring areas of the Western Hemisphere, we find stark evidence of a grim truth—that liberties once won must constantly be defended.

During our generation, a new menace—international communism—has arisen to threaten freemen throughout the world. Actually, there is little basic difference between the fascism of Adolf Hitler and the atheistic tyranny practiced behind the Iron Curtain. The Soviet Union and her satellites are a godless dictatorship ruled by warped and twisted minds.

We are at war with the Communists and the sooner every redblooded American realizes this the safer we will be. Naturally, we want to live in peace, but we do not want peace at any price—we want peace with honor and integrity. And we intend to assure it for the future.

The extent of the menace posed by the philosophy of communism is clear cut and obvious. However, it is absolutely necessary that we attack and oppose it calmly, rationally and objectively.

We must continue to stiffen our national backbone in dealing with the Communists and their dupes, sympathizers, and apologists. If we relax our guard for one moment, we court national disaster.

The atheistic Communist dictatorship now controls one-fourth of the earth's surface and more than one-third of her peoples. The Communist threat from without must not blind us to the Communist threat from within. The latter is reaching into the very heart of America through its espionage agents and a cunning, defiant, and lawless Communist Party, which is fanatically dedicated to the Marxist cause of world enslavement and destruction of the foundations of our Republic.

The Communist Party in this country has attempted to infiltrate and subvert every segment of our society. The party's efforts have been thwarted in this country by the Government's internal security programs, by investigation, arrest and prosecution of party functionaries, and by widespread intelligent public opposition to the Communist philosophy.

Recently, the Communist Party in the United States deliberately and flagrantly refused to comply with the United States Supreme Court decision which requires it to register as an agent of the Soviet Union with the Attorney General. Thereby, it once again has formally declared itself to be a lawless organization. No longer can its members falsely profess that the party is a legitimate political organization. Nor can its sympathizers and fellow travelers feign innocence of the true nature of the un-American conspiracy which they support.

Unfortunately, we are plagued with some Soviet apologists who, time after time, would have us betray the cause of international freedom and justice by yielding to the Red Fascists in the Kremlin on vital moral issues.

We also have in our midst some timid souls who have so little faith in the strength of democracy that they would have our country yield to international threats and intimidation. I include those persons who urge appeasement at any price and those who chant the better Red than dead slogan.

America's emblem is the soaring eagle—not the blind and timid mole. Fear, apologies, defeatism and cowardice are alien to the thinking of true Americans. As for me, I would rather be dead than Red.

America does not have to apologize to anyone. Certainly not to the arrogant, shoe-pounding Khrushchev and his puppets—nor to those neutrals whose neutrality is but an evidence of moral weakness. We should keep our heads up looking for honorable solutions and selling America, rather than keep our heads down looking for shelters and the compromise of human rights.

Those who follow the road of appeasement do not know the true meaning of freedom. They do not comprehend the misery of Communist enslavement. You will not find their cheap slogans on the lips of the Hungarian refugees, the East German patriots nor other freedom-loving peoples who have escaped from behind the Iron Curtain.

Nor do you find their apologies in the writings of great American patriots such as: Patrick Henry, who asked the searching question, "Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?" or Benjamin Franklin, who declared, "They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety"; or Samuel Adams, who reminded us that "The liberties of our country are worth defending at all hazards; and it is our duty to defend them against all attacks. We have received them as a fair inheritance from our worthy ancestors who purchased them for us with toil and danger."

In the fight to preserve our Republic, it is not enough merely to be against crime, against subversion or against any of the other enemies which weaken the Nation's strength from within. To stand for the American ideal, to work for the cause of liberty and justice—these give true meaning to life in this great Republic.

If we are to effectively resist the eroding influence of communism, it is imperative that all citizens of this Nation exhibit in more positive ways the value and superiority of our form of government over any foreign ideology.

Let us also work for a revolution—a revolution by the spirit, not by the sword. Let there be vital forces at work in our society and not merely slogans. Let us be for America all the way; but, at the same time, let us not be taken in by those who promote hysteria by the distortion and misreprehension of the true facts whether they be the proponents of chauvinism of the extreme right or pseudo liberalism of the extreme left.

At another hour of grim challenge a full century ago, Abraham Lincoln urged the American people, "Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it."

We are living in an age of uncertainty—an age of awesome national peril—an age when the struggle between freedom and totalitarian enslavement is drawing toward a climax. We now have need of faith as never before in our Nation's history. We must revive within ourselves the faith of our forefathers, which enabled them to meet and overcome adversity.

Our Nation holds in trust the last hope of a free civilization. Our dedication to truth, justice and individual dignity must not be compromised. If we are strong enough, and care enough, and maintain our national integrity, this Nation will survive the terrible threat that presents itself today. With God's help, we will meet the challenge of survival. This is the heritage of America.

Singing Priest Cuts Second Recording

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the Paterson Morning Call concerning Father Ralph Attenasio. The article was written by Barbara Finkelstein and describes the fine work done by this dedicated curate. The article follows:

SINGING PRIEST CUTS SECOND RECORDING

(By Barbara Finkelstein)

A new 45 r.p.m. record will go on sale this week with some 100 Paterson area boys plugging for it to be a smash hit.

The singer is a well-known figure to them, particularly on occasions when they've found themselves on the wrong side of the law.

Father Ralph, curate of the Blessed Sacrament Church, exhibits his singing talent on the record, the second one he's made, with the hope that it will bring some money into the till of the Dismas Club—his haven for boys in trouble.

On this latest record, which will be distributed nationally, Father Ralph sings "Mama" and "Zim Boom Bah."

During his year-and-a-half in Paterson, the 32-year-old priest has compiled the remarkable record of only one repeater among some 35 boys he's helped out of jams.

The Dismas Club, opened about 6 months ago in an old church building, gives his boys a badly needed place to congregate, where they have supervision, friendship, and understanding.

The club also provides judges with the opportunity to give a boy a break, without letting him go completely unsupervised. An increasing number of youths are being given a second chance, with the stipulation that they avail themselves of Father Ralph's friendship and take an active part in the Dismas Club.

"STRAYED SHEEP"

Father Ralph attributes the successful rehabilitation partially to the fact that boys who have been in trouble are welcomed to the club not as heroes but as "strayed sheep," who will be given a second chance.

The club membership goes far afield of Father Ralph's parish, taking in boys between the ages of 14 and 21, of any race, color, or creed, from any place in the Paterson area. Most of the members have never been in trouble, but they are happy to have a club that provides them with gym activities, dances, relaxation, and friends.

Adults help out at the club, but Father Ralph prefers to leave the boys on their own as much as possible.

"I try to teach them to be gentlemen," he explained, "and I make it a point to be nice to them, but if I have to blast them, I blast them."

To Father Ralph there's only one way to treat a boy. "You have to be fair with him. The biggest thing to me is to make contact with a youngster and keep it. When you start communicating, you establish a relationship. I feel the boys won't take advantage of me, so I don't take advantage of them."

His way of making contact is through dance programs, featuring disk jockies—his modern CYO answer to the original CYO boxing programs—and through social events, such as skating and trips, and above all, an intense interest in their personal problems.

"My door is never closed to them," he said, and everything else takes second place to the kids' problems. Half my working day is devoted to boys in jails and shelters, talks with their parents and probation officers, and to classroom visits.

The popular priest frowns on paternalism toward teenagers. "I speak their language—I learn from them, and if I think I'm wrong I admit it. I never consider them wrong just because they're kids, and I try always to give them a chance to explain their actions."

His theory in running the Dismas Club differs from those at similar clubs, where a great deal of the emphasis is on such activities as boxing.

"My emphasis is on dancing—I think the disk jockey is the modern answer to boxing," he said.

Father Ralph pointed out that many of the boys are available for odd jobs which will keep them off the streets and at the same time put spending money in their pockets.

Father Ralph is hoping the Dismas Club idea will be picked up in other parts of the country where thousands of boys are in need of such a club—and such a priest.

A New Year's Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, James R. Fleming, president and publisher of the Fort Wayne (Ind.) Journal-Gazette should receive outstanding recognition for the excellent New Year's message he released to the readers of his paper on January 1, 1962.

The leaders of all nations and especially the Communist dictators should benefit from the last three paragraphs of this message.

The message follows:

OUR NEW YEAR'S MESSAGE

The Fort Wayne Journal-Gazette and its entire staff again bring greetings to its many thousands of readers for a most happy, prosperous, and peaceful new year.

The old year, 1961, has passed into history, and during that year many things of great importance have occurred which will affect the welfare of America down through the years that are to come.

On January 20, 1961, we inaugurated a new President, John F. Kennedy, who assumed the tremendous burdens which accompany that high office. The cold war was at its height. The Berlin situation looked like it might develop into another world war at almost any moment. The tension in the Far East was mounting daily. Cuba under Castro had developed a problem of major importance. Latin America threatened to provide an expanding territory for Communist infiltration.

Many of these problems seemed almost insurmountable, but President Kennedy, with the same degree of courage which he evidenced during World War II, met these problems as best he could, and finally out of the gloom and shadows, light and sunshine began to emerge, and today we can look forward to the future with a greater degree of optimism than at any time during 1961. All Americans united behind the President. Politics was forgotten and Republicans and Democrats alike marched shoulder to shoulder with only one thing in mind, and that was the welfare of America and her people.

Closer home in this great Hoosier State of ours, Matt Welsh became Governor of Indiana, and in a few weeks the governmental atmosphere changed almost completely, and the people of Indiana quickly placed their faith in our new Governor, and Matt Welsh soon became one of the most popular Governors Indiana has ever had.

This faith was soon justified by the manner in which the various departments of state were quickly placed upon a far more efficient and economical basis. Confidence was again restored in our State government. Gloom was replaced by optimism. Unemployment became less and less. The sunshine of faith, prosperity, and happiness again lighted up our entire countryside.

During the past few years billions of dollars in foreign aid have been lavishly given abroad, much of which has been wasted, while intolerable conditions at home have been permitted to develop in the slum sections of our cities without anything being done.

With children being reared under conditions which exist in so many of the slum sections today, it is almost impossible to bring the influence of religion or education into the lives of those children. America must bestir herself and look after her own people.

Juvenile delinquency is growing, crime is rapidly increasing. It is even penetrating into our own city here in Fort Wayne, and we have so far been unable to check this growing trend.

Many thousands are on public relief and many of those thousands could be taken off relief if employment could be found for them. This is particularly true of those younger people who are just leaving school and have nothing to do except roam the streets of our cities. We must find something for them to do, and these are problems of vital importance to the future welfare of America. The Federal Government is already moving in this direction. The State must assume its responsibility, and here in Fort Wayne we must assume our responsibility.

During 1961, almost daily we were told about the horrors of an atomic war, and our people were led to believe that an atomic war in the near future was almost inevitable.

I earnestly and sincerely believe that the horrors of an atomic war have made this impossible not only in our time but during the lives of those millions of children whose hearts are filled with the joy and happiness of the Christmas spirit during this holiday season.

I believe that our Heavenly Father did not create this world and all of its people and all of its children that they might be destroyed by an atomic blast. I have the greatest faith, and I want to emphasize this, that the future of our children and our children's children will be safe and secure in the hands of and under the watchful guidance of Almighty God, that the tremendous amount of energy to be derived from the splitting of the atom will be developed and utilized not for the destruction of humanity but for the prosperity and happiness and welfare of all mankind.

Thus, living in this great country of ours, surrounded by all of the good things of life and influenced by the spirit of Christmas, the Journal-Gazette and its entire staff again wish our many thousands of readers the best and happiest New Year in 1962 they have ever known.

The Wondrous Workings of the U.S. Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, throughout the fall I have wrestled with the problems of young men whose lives were being disrupted by the Army's mad rush to drag them back into uniform and send them to camp so that they could pull weeds on the post golf course or rake leaves with their hands.

I thought I had hit a high point when I came upon a reservist in my district, a cook, who was rushed back to duty and found himself in the company of several dozen expert computer operators. Apparently there is a one-digit difference in the MOS numbers of cooks and computer operators, and my constituent is still being buffeted about various Army camps, sacrificing his chances for a civilian career, while the Army tries to find a computer that needs a cook.

But this was topped on my return to Washington yesterday to find a disabled, service-connected, veteran recalled to active duty despite the conclusion of several Army doctors that he was unfit for and could not perform military duty. Indeed, he was released from the Army only last year for this reason.

A telegram instructing him to disregard orders to active duty was sent too late to be received before his departure. He was authorized to report by air, but on arrival was told that he could collect only 6 cents per mile for travel.

The finance officer has told him that he cannot collect any pay from the Army unless he forfeits his service-connected disability compensation from the Veterans' Administration. He wonders how his wife and children are going to survive on the compensation, or if he forfeits it and is discharged as he should be, how long it might take to have it reinstated.

The officers at his present duty station recognize that he simply cannot perform military duties, and so he is free to sit in the barracks throughout the day pondering the wondrous workings of the U.S. Army.

Mr. Speaker, these comments are critical of the mobilization, and they are meant to be. I think that a great many unnecessary hardships have been created because of the speed the Army demanded and the inadequacy of its records prior to this recall.

It would not be fair to close, however, without paying a word of tribute to Capt. G. W. Williams, the assistant adjutant general at Second Army Headquarters, who bore the brunt of the countless inquiries and applications for deferment that were made. Without the courtesy, cooperation and assistance of Captain Williams, the work of my office and the situation of my constituents would have been far more difficult than it has been or is today.

Ambassador Biddle: Distinguished Diplomat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, as we meet here in the pleasant renewal of cherished associations, we are struck again by the

sadness of friendships lost in the inexorable harvest since last we assembled in this House.

Of acute poignancy to me was the passing of Ambassador Anthony J. Drexel Biddle. It was my privilege to have his friendship through many years, and his competence, energy, and devotion in the public service had my deepest respect and admiration. When I saw him last in Spain in October, shortly before his return to the United States for further medical treatment, I was heartsick at the seriousness of his illness, but it was my prayer and hope that he would be spared for further distinguished work in his country's interest. Within a month, however, life's burdens had been lifted from him and the Foreign Service lost an outstanding diplomatic talent.

That Mr. Biddle was a member of a moneyed family was well known, but more significant was the character of public service contributed to the United States by that family through several generations. The Ambassador's father was a Marine officer in the best rough-and-ready tradition of that splendid fighting service. In the World War II period, at the age of 67, the elder Biddle was teaching self defense, commando style, to Marine recruits at Quantico, Va.

His son served in the Army in World War I and was released to inactive duty in the grade of captain. In 1944, following a series of diplomatic assignments in Europe, he resumed active duty as a lieutenant colonel and advanced to the grade of brigadier general. His European contacts were of great value to General Eisenhower's headquarters following the Normandy invasion. In 1955, when he ended his active military service, he was a special assistant to Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, then Army Chief of Staff.

It was as a diplomat, however, that Ambassador Biddle's fine combination of commonsense, coolness under stress and natural charm found most effective expression. President Roosevelt appointed him Ambassador to Norway. In 1937, he was assigned to Warsaw and was privy to the negotiations among European powers which sought, unsuccessfully, to stave off World War II. Mr. Biddle manned his post until Nazi tanks advanced on that hapless Polish capital. He nearly fell into hostile hands but reached his new assignment in Paris by way of Bucharest, Rumania. As deputy to Ambassador William C. Bullitt, he followed the withdrawing French Government to Angers, Tours, and Bordeaux, maintaining our lines of diplomatic communication until the French capitulation, when he was ordered back to the United States.

After his military service in World War II and the years subsequent, Mr. Biddle returned to public life in his home Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and became adjutant general. He also served as chairman of the Pennsylvania Aeronautics Commission.

When the final illness struck, Mr. Biddle was performing again the diplomatic tasks to which his talents were ideally suited, as Ambassador to Spain. In this age of continuous international stress, his passing was a tragic loss.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, Mr. Speaker, I include an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on November 16, 1961, as follows:

ANTHONY BIDDLE

As a man who came from impeccable Philadelphia lineage, Anthony J. Drexel Biddle could have spent his life raising Pomeranians or perfecting a talent for polo. Instead, Mr. Biddle saw fit to devote a good deal of his career to public service. His death at 64 diminishes the elegance and tact and gaiety of our diplomatic service. Before his service as Ambassador to Spain, Mr. Biddle performed with aplomb a host of diplomatic duties—including one extraordinary wartime mission in which he was our representative to seven governments-in-exile (Poland, Belgium, Norway, Greece, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and the Netherlands).

Throughout, Mr. Biddle put his grace and polish of manner to statesmanlike use. But whether in the uniform of a brigadier general or in the striped pants of an ambassador, Mr. Biddle also showed a shrewd realism in his estimate of men and events. Perhaps the reason why Mr. Biddle could be called the happiest millionaire is because he refused to conform to the stereotype of the idle rich. His main line did not lead solely to a country club.

Too Much Eyewash on Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, Roscoe Drummond's column for Sunday, January 7, 1962, was such a down-to-earth, fairminded review of some recent contentions and implications of administration spokesmen that it should have wide circulation and be given serious consideration. Mr. Drummond points out that this is not the time to feed the American people any "tranquilizer pills." Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this article which in the Washington Post was entitled "Too Much Eyewash on Cold War."

The article follows:

TOO MUCH EYEWASH ON COLD WAR

(By Roscoe Drummond)

For an administration whose leaders, when out of office, were always berating others for painting the clouds with sunshine, there is just too much hot air coming out of Washington about how well the cold war is going.

This kind of talk is misleading. It doesn't help the Nation. It doesn't help us face what lies ahead. We still remain on the defensive in the cold war. We won't get off the defensive with rosy words.

No sensible person ignores the strength of the free world. No sensible person minimizes the potential of the European Economic Community. There is no reason to fear the future as long as we are willing to face reality.

But in the guise of year-end reviews of 1961, too many spokesmen of and for the Kennedy administration have been perpetrating a veritable "snow job" on the thinking of the Nation. It is clear to me that the purpose of administration spokesmen is to disarm the rightwing critics. Also there is an attempt to persuade the many Americans who feel pretty frustrated because of the adverse trend of the cold war that there is really nothing to be frustrated about—that nearly everything is going along just fine.

It isn't. And when the new administration feeds out such tranquilizer pills, they are doing the American people an injustice.

False argument 1: That erection of the East Berlin wall is really a victory for the West because it shows that the only way the Soviets can hold the East Germans is to imprison them. The flow of East German refugees to Berlin, which often reached as many as 5,000 a week, was a great victory for the West, and now the damming of this flow is also a victory for the West.

Hardly. Yes, the wall is an act of desperation, but it is a decisive and daring act of desperation which has already enabled Khrushchev to win half of his objectives over West Berlin.

False argument 2: The Soviet resumption of nuclear testing in the atmosphere is a victory for the West because it shows that the Soviets realized they were behind us in nuclear weapons and also because the tests annoy the neutrals. In other words, while we were negotiating for a test ban at Geneva the Soviets were preparing massive new tests.

They set off 31 known explosions in the atmosphere in the past 4 months. This is a boon to the West? Nonsense. The more they work at catching up, the better off we are? As to the Soviet actions annoying the neutrals, at this stage neutral influence upon the Kremlin is nil.

False arguments 3, 4, and 5: Laos is a victory for the West because the worst hasn't yet happened. South Vietnam is a victory for the West because there is still a chance of holding off the Communist guerrillas. The recent session of the U.N. was on balance a victory for the West because Red China was kept out and U Thant put in to succeed Dag Hammarskjold.

Black isn't white and tattle-tale gray isn't clean. The tide of events in Laos and South Vietnam continue to be adverse, not favorable. The United Nations doesn't become stronger by preventing it, at one or two points, from becoming weaker.

There are certainly occasions when the Eisenhower administration put much too rosy a glow on the status of the cold war and described minor holding operations as victories. Leading Democrats leaped on them for pettifogging and misleading the public. Now the tables are turned and we have to watch out for this administration's pettifoggers and misleaders.

President Kennedy himself has avoided soft talk and calling bad news good news. His own review of the year avoided wishfulness.

But the President's desire to be realistic is not served by such spokesmen. Of one thing I am sure: we will never get off the defensive by pretending we are on the offensive when we aren't.

All Eyes on Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, the week of January 7–13 has been proclaimed by Gov. Norman Erbe, of Iowa, as All Eyes

on Iowa Week. This week has been set aside in this way to call attention to the excellent opportunities which the State of Iowa affords for new locations for expanding manufacturing and processing plans.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include Governor Erbe's proclamation herewith:

Whereas large segments of the country's industry are constantly in search of new locations for the purpose of expanding manufacturing and processing plants; and

Whereas the location of such plants in the great State of Iowa will assure the continued growth and prosperity of this great State; and

Whereas Iowa has so much to offer these prospective industries in the way of skilled labor, proximity to major markets of the Nation, transportation by barge, air, rails and highways, and by offering a wonderful place to work and live: Now, therefore, I, Norman Erbe, Governor of the State of Iowa, do call upon the people of Iowa to observe the week of January 7 through 13, 1962, as All Eyes on Iowa Week and I further urge that during this week, all citizens make themselves aware of Iowa's need for continued industrial growth and from this date on, do their part to sell industry on Iowa.

Double Standard Intervention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I am inserting herewith an article by George E. Sokolsky that I think it is very pertinent to bring to the attention not only of my colleagues in the House but to the people who do not have an opportunity to read George Sokolsky's column.

The statements in reference to a double standard intervention by Mr. Sokolsky are very clear and concise and I would sincerely hope that our President and State Department take cognizance of the facts pointed out by Mr. Sokolsky. I am sure that if we adopt one policy and follow through on this we will not only be safer and more secure in our own Nation but win peoples all over the world.

The article follows:

DOUBLE STANDARD INTERVENTION

(By George E. Sokolsky)

It seems ridiculous to say that the United States cannot intervene in Cuban affairs when the country has intervened all over the world, beginning with China and continuing in Africa and other places in Asia. We declined to intervene in Hungary but we are violently intervening in the Congo; we refuse to intervene in Cuba but we violently intervene in the Dominican Republic.

This inconsistency of policy, President Kennedy inherited from his predecessors who have pursued a double standard, namely that they know how to support a "good" dictator and that they recognize by odor or something a bad dictator. It has worked out historically that they have consistently intervened from Mao Tse-tung in China to the present situation in Laos, Katanga, the Dominican Republic and almost anywhere one looks.

If intervention is a fixed American policy, let us describe it and be consistent about it. And the description should be made by the President or the Secretary of State and not by novices in the lower ranks of the State Department or by Congressmen and Senators who buzz around the world issuing pronunciamentoes to the press.

This looseness of statement and activity is not beneficial to the United States because there is no consistency of policy.

If we take Cuba as an example, the policy concerning that country was manufactured by two minor officials, Roy Rubottom and William Wieland, during the Eisenhower administration. The errors of these two are so notorious that they are becoming a major political question now under congressional investigation. Every effort that is being made to avoid a public hearing of Wieland only creates more controversy and will undoubtedly lead to a political scandal.

Considering the serious problems that face the President and the Secretary of State, neither should be burdened with the little scandals that arise out of the maneuvers of lower officials to manipulate policy by day-by-day action.

It is natural for insecure men to seek power and to grow upon it, but the country ought not to be burdened by such trivialities which grow into nuisances.

The only way to safeguard the United States from such situations is to form policy at the very top and to insist that all secondary officials conform to major decisions; that those in secondary offices who are by doctrine or emotions incapable of conforming to top decisions be summarily dismissed. After all, the people hold the President responsible and they do not expect him to pass the buck or to be burdened by those who take advantage of the current arrangements under the law.

Authority must be centered in the loftiest positions of Government if there is not to be confusion. So far as foreign policy is concerned, only the President may under the Constitution conduct the foreign policy of the United States, with the Secretary of State as an aid.

The error is in the perpetual shifting of authority lower and lower until responsibility is fixed nowhere. An ambassador is presumed to represent a President, not an underling.

Senator Styles Bridges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under general leave granted to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein the attached statement on the late, beloved Senator STYLES BRIDGES:

SENATOR STYLES BRIDGES

The Nation was shocked and saddened to learn of Senator BRIDGES' untimely passing last November. My own State of New Hampshire and the entire country have suffered a tremendous loss. Senator BRIDGES served in the U.S. Senate continuously from 1937 to his death. During this period of time, he made an imperishable record as a leader and statesman. His career in the Senate of the United States is without parallel. The Nation is proud of his great contribution to our national life during most trying and difficult years in our history. Through the Senator's efforts, our Nation has been greatly strengthened and his leadership had a telling impact in the formulation of national policy.

Senator BRIDGES was a man of great courage and deep understanding with an ability to get things done. His work will stand as a monument to his outstanding contribution to our national welfare.

My friendship with Senator BRIDGES over the years was a most enriching experience. In his passing, I have suffered a deep personal loss. I join with his multitude of friends throughout the Nation in extending to the members of his family deep and heartfelt sympathy. He will always be remembered as a great American, a leader and a statesman of extraordinary ability.

Legislative Program of the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the 1962 legislative program of the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York State as adopted at a statewide executive committee meeting on November 15, 1961. My good friend, the Honorable Harold R. Moskovit, is the State president of the organization. The legislative program is as follows:

THE NEW YORK STATE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM OF THE AFFILIATED YOUNG DEMOCRATS, INC., FOR 1962

The Affiliated Young Democrats of New York at a statewide executive committee meeting held on Wednesday, November 15, 1961, at the Manger DeWitt Clinton Hotel in Albany, N.Y., unanimously endorsed the following legislation which they will recommend to the State legislature when they convene on January 3, 1962:

Primary elections for all State officers; referendum for legalization of offtrack betting; strict vehicle licensing; use seat belts in automobiles; more middle income homes; State bonus for Korea veterans; help forgotten migrant farm workers; vote at 18 years; State conservation camps for youth 15 to 17 years; bias housing legislation; statewide primaries in spring; new science college; more State aid to municipalities; home rule for New York City; reevaluation and toughening of first and second degree rape laws; recodification of the criminal statutes to curb juvenile delinquency; security jail for degeneration by State department of correction; stricter supervision of paroled offenders; establish a maximum security facility for sex offenders; more assistance to the aged; make emergency laws for summer to help young people secure positions, work 2 hours get paid for 2 hours; etc.; committee to study fallout shelters; State to set up network of radiation measuring devices to help escape nuclear fireballs; expansion of benefits under workmen's compensation and study of this law; increase teachers salaries; favor 2 voting days for national elections; urge revision of board of elections of New York City to include all five counties representation; favor enactment of milk dating in New York City; selection of board of regents on nonpartisan basis and with all sections of State; State

aid for child day care in public schools; strengthening rent control laws to closing existing loopholes to prevent windfalls and exploitations of slum properties; build more rehabilitation centers for the mental ill; favor 3-day weekend plan, all holidays celebrated on Monday; devise to be inserted in automobiles to control exhaust gas and curb pollution; more hospitals; more aid to mental ill; repeal the East Hudson Parkway Authority Act; and a printed record be published daily of full proceedings of the State legislature.

Harold R. Moskovit, State president of the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York, presided at this important meeting and stated, "this legislative program adopted will be introduced and advanced in the 1962 State legislature by our own members of which there are 17 State senators under the chairmanship of State Senator Samuel L. Greenberg of Brooklyn; and 31 members in the State assembly with Assemblyman Aileen B. Ryan of the Bronx as chairman.

Gov. Muñoz-Marín, of Puerto Rico, Tells How We Can Save Latin America From Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, a most significant statement by the Honorable Luis Muñoz-Marín, of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, recently appeared in the weekly magazine section of the New York Herald Tribune. It should be required reading for everyone concerned with America's future. I have the privilege of presenting it herewith:

WE CAN SAVE LATIN AMERICA FROM CASTRO

(By Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín)

SAN JUAN, P.R.—Every freedom-loving person in the United States is worried today about how to halt the spread of Cuban-type revolution through Latin America.

Let me make this clear. It's not the fact that there was a revolution in Cuba that has thoughtful people concerned. That revolution was long overdue. Rather it's the way that Fidel Castro has needlessly laid the Cuban revolution at the feet of Soviet totalitarianism. I, for one, was in favor of revolution in Cuba, including social revolution, and I am convinced that even Castro himself could have carried it out in terms of freedom and friendship with the United States and the Western World. It is a tragic and quite unnecessary loss that it did not take that course.

Meanwhile, it is obvious that agents of Havana as well as Moscow are working together for subversive purposes in every other Latin American nation.

How can Latin America cope with this new kind of revolution?

Not with guns and tanks, let me emphasize. It can only be done by wiping out the evils that prevail in varying degrees in all Latin American countries. Just think:

The per capita income in Peru is $119 a year. And $126 in Bolivia. That is less than the average man in the United States earns in 2 weeks.

In Ecuador one-fifth of 1 percent of the people hold over one-third of the land.

Seventy percent of the population of Bolivia is illiterate. And 90 percent in Haiti.

Life expectancy in Guatemala is only 43.8 years. Compare that with the 69 years of the United States.

To sick, hungry people living under conditions of grave injustice, Communist and Fidelista promises of a better life can be tempting. The price is their liberty, of course, but many have never experienced liberty in their own lives.

Fortunately, a determined move is at last underway to improve conditions, to set in movement the peaceful revolution that is the only alternative to a violent one. The alliance for progress that was signed at Punta del Este, Uruguay, last summer commits the United States and Latin America to an intensive effort toward that goal. It combines the work and ideas of Latin America with U.S. financial support and technical cooperation.

The main job will have to be done by the Latin American nations themselves. On the basis of our experience in Puerto Rico, I am convinced that they can do it—and in a democratic way with respect for personal freedom. Not many years ago, Puerto Rico could have been a fertile field for subversive activities. Many of our people were hungry. Most were extremely poor. Disease, ignorance and hopelessness were everywhere. The Poorhouse of the Caribbean, we were called.

Not any more, however. By fresh thinking and hard work, we have raised our standard of living until it is the second highest in all Latin America. We have a fine, flourishing democracy and the 2,300,000 citizens of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico are solidly behind it.

The last Communist who tried for public office here received precisely 235 votes out of half a million.

To one degree or another, the problems we faced are the same that affect Latin America today. As a result, a number of Latin Americans have come to Puerto Rico to learn which of our experiences could be of help to them. There are many, I think—always remembering that adaptations must be made to meet differing situations.

Operation Bootstrap is the name we have given to the economic part of our effort toward a good life. Throughout, careful planning and a set of thorough priorities have been our rule. I heartily urge both. Poor nations, like poor people, cannot afford to be careless. Every dollar or peso must swing its whole weight.

Here are the points that worked well for us:

1. LAND REFORM

The most important thing of all is to give hope to people, especially to hungry farmers who have been forced to till other men's soil for a few cents a day.

We broke up landholdings over 500 acres and paid the owners a fair market price in cash. With the land, we set up a special kind of farm cooperatives in which the workers not only drew regular wages but shared in the profits. In addition, we distributed land directly to people for farms of a size suitable for working by a family.

We could not give land to all the landless at once, but tangible results could be seen. So there was hope.

I remember what a man 60 years old who had never owned land said when he received his plot.

"You mean the land is really mine now?" he asked incredulously.

"Yes, it is now yours," he was told. "Not even you can take it away from yourself."

Tears were in his eyes. "You cannot know what it means," he said, "after all these years of belonging to the land to have the land belong to me."

2. TAX REFORM

One of the reasons the rich get richer and the poor get poorer is low taxation of those abundantly able to pay, and the evasion even of that. It is the curse of a great part of Latin America today.

Very early, we undertook a complete reorganization of our tax structure to make certain that everyone bore a fair share of the taxload.

It gave us the money to tackle our reforms. I doubt if the nations of Latin America can ever wipe out poverty unless they remedy their tax inequities.

3. WATER AND ELECTRIC POWER

There are cities in Latin America where patients have died on the operating table because there was not enough power to keep the light going.

There are cities where water is in such short supply that it has to be rationed. There are countries where once-rich land is so parched for water that it has become desert.

There was a time when much of Puerto Rico's land was parched, too, and we could not build factories for lack of electric current to run them.

It meant straining our resources, but we borrowed every dollar we could for the construction of vast hydroelectric projects. This gave us water to irrigate our land and the electric power we needed so badly to industrialize.

We ran the powerlines into the hills as well as the cities. The bare light bulb in a farmer's hut may not have added to the decor, but as one of our hill people said:

"These wires bring light into our hearts."

I was happy to see the U.S. Government offer to assist Latin America in developing its water resources. I hope very much that the various Latin American countries take advantage of this proposal.

4. HOUSING

Unquestionably, the biggest single social problem in Latin America today, the one that contributes most to a sense of misery and despair, is bad housing. There are slums so dreadful as to be unbelievable. The United Nations made a survey in this connection. It found that Latin America urgently needed a minimum of 25 million decent homes.

The problem can be beaten. It must be beaten.

Governments can do their part by clearing slums and building low-cost housing so far as their budgets allow. In Puerto Rico, we have provided low-rent housing for 133,500 people in the past 10 years.

But the governments do not have to do it all. The people will pitch in. Some years ago, we tried a scheme under which the Government supplied concrete, equipment, and a foreman. Then the people built small houses themselves.

The response was inspiring. In rural community after rural community, neighbors worked together nights and weekends to help each other complete their new homes. That way we were able to put up such houses for just $400 apiece. To date, over 12,600 of these self-help houses have been built. People pay them off at $3 a month.

5. INDUSTRIALIZATION

It is the dream of every underdeveloped nation, I suppose, to industrialize—to establish factories that will furnish new jobs at good wages for its hordes of unemployed, and to manufacture the products required to expand its economy. The trouble is that enormous capital is essential, and underdeveloped nations don't have it.

We Puerto Ricans know how desperate this quandary can be. We have lived through it.

Accordingly, we have developed a plan to attract new industry to our towns, cities, and countryside. We have channeled Government funds as well as private capital toward the establishment of new industries. We have given 10 years' tax exemption to com-

panies starting new industries here—and 13 years' exemption if they establish themselves in the countryside or small towns. We have erected factory buildings ourselves for the companies to move into. We have set up courses to train workers in new skills.

More than 700 new plants have now been opened. During the past decade, unemployment has been reduced substantially in spite of a 7-percent rise in population, and real wages have more than doubled. The Puerto Rican gross national product is currently increasing at the rate of 9.4 percent a year.

Some Latin Americans say, "You Puerto Ricans are doing so well because you have free access to U.S. markets."

It is true. But if the Latin American nations would join together to form a common market, removing tariff barriers, they could do even better. They are rich in natural resources, whereas our only real natural resource is people. True, the economic aid provided Puerto Rico by the United States is larger than that which could be given to any other Latin American country of our size. But, again, the vast abundance of unused land, the rich mineral deposits and the unused tax potential in most Latin American countries make up for this.

6. PUBLIC HEALTH

Tuberculosis is an evil companion. So are malaria and dysentery. Latin Americans can testify to that. They have these killers with them 24 hours a day. Millions of their children die of them.

It will demand a tremendous effort to suppress endemic diseases like these, but I have no doubt that it can be done. The establishment of medical clinics, X-ray programs, sanitary drives, and education in hygienic methods can achieve miracles. A better diet would do a great deal by itself toward controlling many diseases that are caused by extreme poverty.

In 1940, Puerto Rico's death rate from tuberculosis was 260 per 100,000. Now it is down to 29 per 100,000 and still falling. Once malaria was a great scourge. Now we have not had a malaria death in 6 years. It adds up to this: The death rate in Puerto Rico is now lower than in the United States.

7. EDUCATION

"I cannot read or write, but I will not rest until my children learn how."

This is the feeling all over Latin America. There is a deep, unquenchable thirst for education, and the people will make any sacrifice for it.

It is not a matter of erecting elaborate school buildings. Bricks and mortar do not educate children; teachers and books do. Many of our scholastic buildings in Puerto Rico are simple indeed, but the significant fact is that 91 percent of our children go to school.

Education is the largest item in our budget. Almost 30 percent of the government's revenues are devoted to it.

The charter of the alliance for progress calls for at least 6 years of primary schooling for all children. I look forward to the day when it is an actuality.

The charter further calls for a program of adult education, and I subscribe to it. Of all the activities of the Puerto Rican Government, few have given me the satisfaction of our community education work.

We dispatched trained men into the most remote rural neighborhoods, not to do things for people, but to teach them to do things for themselves. The residents of one little place near Rio Grande, for example, applied to the government to build a new road connecting them with a main artery. Under normal circumstances, it would have taken many years for the government to get the job done. Instead, government technician went out and taught the people how they could lay the road themselves.

Every man in the community volunteered to help, and the road was built in a couple of months. The cost was $6,000—one-quarter of what it ordinarily would have been. Best of all, the people feel it is their road. "We have the finest road around here," they are bragging.

It is wonderful for the people and the government when the people show self-reliance. It is the antithesis of totalitarianism.

Let me reemphasize. Latin Americans are at the crossroads. One road can lead them to Castroism—mobs crying, "To the wall," and the end of all their liberties. On the other road, they can lift themselves in a peaceful, democratic way to prosperity, health, and hope.

Upon the outcome of their struggle depends the fate of freedom in this hemisphere for all of us.

An Inbetween Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, from time to time there appear in our newspapers and magazines letters to the editor which merit special consideration and which deserve the attention of Members of the Congress. One of my constituents, Mr. Deane Baker, of Ada, Mich., wrote such a letter to the editor of the Wall Street Journal who published it on Tuesday, September 26, 1961. Captioned "An Inbetween Policy," this letter by Mr. Baker is a notable evaluation of the foreign policy of the present administration.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Baker's letter.

AN INBETWEEN POLICY

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

President Kennedy hs adopted a new foreign policy in the well-publicized words: "We intend to have a wider choice than humiliation or all-out nuclear action."

One cannot help but wonder if more thought was given to the rhetoric of the policy than to its long-term implications. The Eisenhower-Dulles policy of massive retaliation, although terrible to contemplate and exceedingly unpopular with many citizens of the United States and the world, including the Soviet Union, was effective because it was a policy based on courage, morality, and strength. That policy drew a line over which the leaders of oppression would not step because of their mortal fear.

Now comes a new administration stating a need for wider choice, but "wider choice" smacks strangely of equivocation and carries the seeds of eventual appeasement. I do not question the integrity of Kennedy policymakers, but I do wonder at their judgment and wish to present another view which may be useful in the long-term analysis of this new posture.

First, it is important to note that during the Eisenhower years an adequate capability for limited war existed and was occasionally committed to specific situations. But the emphasis was on the use of massive weapons and our stated determination to use the atomic bomb. Now the actions of the Kennedy administration indicate, as a matter of policy, that the United States will negotiate first, next engage in limited action if necessary and finally, if all else fails, commit this country to a loosely defined last resort course of action. So now the emphasis is on limited reaction to limited situations and on conventional arms.

The publicly stated purpose of the new policy is to keep the Russians guessing as to how the United States would react to new thrusts. In actuality it gives the Russians an infinity of new tools to weaken the United States morally, economically, and militarily. The Kremlin can manufacture a crisis or a small war to fit any situation, any place in the world and not necessarily involve its own uniformed troops. The United States will piously and firmly demand and receive a conference to negotiate the matter and thus avoid humiliation. A series of such conferences would eventually bring the United States to a point where it could no longer prostitute its principles and the country would be forced to engage in a limited action under the terms and conditions established by our foe. After one or more such military involvements the alternative of negotiation and/or humiliation again becomes acceptable, except the cycle takes place at a lower level because the principles are less clear.

The long-term effect of multiple consuming thrusts against the United States by the Soviet can be observed if we survey the scene 10 years from now, when we have endured innumerable prolonged conferences and a decade of torture watching America's will to stand for freedom eroded away a soldier's death at a time.

The great weakness of the Kennedy policy is that with each involvement the grim threat of nuclear destruction becomes more real. The appetites of dictators throughout the ages have never been satisfied by easy conquest. Each national rationalization brings the mushroom cloud nearer to American cities, for one day the impasse will be reached. America can then no longer negotiate; it cannot engage in limited actions; it cannot retreat; it must take the stand it should have taken in Laos, in the Bay of Pigs, in Berlin, and in places not yet etched with bitterness in America's heart.

In man's progress over the centuries in his search for freedom it has always been necessary for him to stand unequivocally against tyranny whatever its form. Over countless issues great and small world leaders and lesser men have said: "Here I will stand, I will not yield, I will fight and die because my cause is right." The Eisenhower-Dulles policy strongly and resolutely restated those words. That policy was unafraid to commit the United States to a course of final and dramatic and absolute action. The tyrant saw and believed and hesitated.

Negotiation is a useful tool, but there is a vast difference in its practice between cautious and timid men. I fear the new policy is grounded on equivocation and leaves the advantage with our enemy.

DEANE BAKER.

ADA, MICH.

Civil Defense: A Momentous Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article by Hanson W. Baldwin which apeared in the New York Times on January 8, 1962. This article indicates some of the little-mentioned ramifications of

civil defense. Mr. Baldwin has rendered a great service by pointing out that the question of a civil defense program is a "momentous decision for it will involve not only our concept of national security, but judgment values of all sorts about our future social system, our urban areas, and our economy."

The entire article follows:

CIVIL DEFENSE DEBATE—CONGRESS TO BE CALLED ON FOR DECISION ON MORE THAN FALLOUT SHELTER PLAN

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

Civil defense, and particularly the Government's proposed fallout shelter program, will claim major congressional attention in the session starting this week.

The debate may well be a confusing one, since the problem of the protection of cities and populations against nuclear attack is virtually insoluble. No solution or even near-solution is in sight. There are few agreed-upon facts and any number of assumptions, unknowns and intangibles.

The real issue presented to Congress is not merely approval or disapproval of a proposed $700 million appropriation for civil defense. Nor is it merely whether or not the Government should initiate a national fallout shelter construction program.

Actually, Congress is being asked to approve the beginning of a new and open-end national security program. The meaning of the Government's revised civil defense program is that it has been clearly tied, for the first time, to the concept of national defense, of armed security, of deterrence against nuclear war and of protection if it comes.

The Defense Department has now been assigned the mission of civil defense, and the basic concept is now embedded, in the administration's thinking, as part of our military security concepts.

DOUBTS ARE EXPRESSED

Yet it is precisely in this area that the program is open to most doubt.

As a part of a national security concept, civil defense and a national fallout shelter program must promise to increase significantly the strength of the deterrent against nuclear attack, and to save appreciable numbers of lives if the deterrent fails and nuclear war occurs.

Otherwise, it is not worth the cost or effort. Yet there is considerable doubt in the minds of many experts that the present program, or for that matter any program, can accomplish these objectives.

There is, indeed, a strong possibility, as a number of persons have pointed out, that a fallout shelter program might actually weaken rather than strengthen the deterrent to war.

In a paper, "Résumé of Major Strategic Considerations," prepared in October 1960 by T. E. Phipps of the Naval Warfare Analysis Group, managed by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, had this point to say:

"Ironically, American lethargy toward civil defense—however irrelevantly motivated—is one of the few stabilizing influences in a potentially explosive situation.

"A defense race injudiciously undertaken could be as unstabilizing to deterrence as an arms race, and for much the same reason. Almost any insurance we buy in the way of survival measures increases by some imponderable amount the likelihood of the contingency we are providing against."

MIGHT MISLEAD SOVIET

A national shelter program might increase world tensions and Soviet fears by leading Moscow to believe that the United States was actually shifting to a first-strike strategic concept.

At the same time, a national shelter program could have two other seemingly disparate but concurrent effects of considerable political, psychological, and military importance.

It could induce a mistaken sense of security in the American people, a maginot-line psychology. It would at the same time emphasize in the American mind even more than in the past the dangers of radioactivity with a consequent hobbling and hampering effect upon any resumption of atmospheric nuclear testing by the United States and on our diplomacy in general.

A final danger in the projected program is that it might absorb so much money and so much energy that we would leave undone programs of more vital significance to national security.

D. J. David Singer, in the October 1961 issue of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, says that "it would seem that a civil defense program would enhance neither our deterrent against direct attack nor against nuclear diplomatic blackmail."

In its actual lifesaving value, a nationwide fallout shelter program is also open to major doubts.

ONLY ONE OF HAZARDS

Fallout protection is only one of the enormous number of hazards that must be surmounted if a man or a nation is to survive an all-out nuclear attack.

The problem is far broader; it is survival itself. And yet the fallout shelter program represents only a first step toward a program that, by the terms of the problem, can have no finite goal.

Fallout shelters in a city struck by nuclear weapons would do no good. The occupants would be killed by blast or tumbling buildings, burned to death by heat or asphyxiated by smoke or lack of oxygen in the resulting fire storm.

To those in other areas who lived in shelters for days or weeks and emerged to a scorched earth, the problem would be: where do they go, and who tells them?; how do they get there?; where do they find food?, and so on and so on, endlessly.

Dr. John N. Wolfe, of the Division of Biology and Medicine of the Atomic Energy Commission has pointed out that fallout shelters alone seem only a means of delaying death.

"Thermal and blast effects and concomitant radiation," he said, "would create vast areas that would be useless to the survival of man. Add also fire, insect devastation and disease and the picture in many areas becomes grim indeed."

These are problems that are barely mentioned in the present emphasis upon fallout shelters, yet the shelter program is not worth the cost unless it can be shown unequivocally that it is a necessary part of a tremendous survival program that will, without doubt, save millions of lives.

This, the Government will find hard to do. For we live in an age when the offense has a great, and probably a lasting, advantage over the defense. Additional increments in power to weapons now existing, or the addition of metals such as cobalt to bomb casings, could well nullify all present programs of civil defense.

Thus Congress is faced with a decision on whether the present program is worth starting at all, whether it should be abandoned entirely or whether it should be tremendously expanded and enlarged.

It is a momentous decision, for it will involve not only our concept of national security, but judgment values of all sorts about our future social system, our urban areas, and our economy.

Reason Rather Than Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose herewith an open letter written by Mr. Wade M. Aiken, a fine Democrat from Winnsboro, S.C., to the editor of the State paper, published at Columbia, S.C. I think the letter speaks for itself and points out the hypocrisy of republicanism in my State, and elsewhere. I congratulate Mr. Aiken on his fine expression and I commend it to the Congress and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

To the EDITOR OF THE STATE:

I have read with much interest your editorial in the State of November 8 in which you take Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON to task for campaigning for Democrat HENRY B. GONZALEZ for U.S. Congressman from a district in southern Texas.

You elaborate quite freely about the inconsistencies of Mr. JOHNSON in campaigning for Mr. GONZALEZ, a Democrat.

The caption of your editorial—"Race Rather Than Reason," Mr. Editor, don't you think you could reverse this heading and it would fit the conditions in a more appropriate manner? That is, instead of "Race Rather Than Reason," make your caption to read "Reason Rather Than Race"? For after all is said and done and regardless of what Mr. JOHNSON said about Mr. GONZALEZ' forefathers, it was not because Mr. GONZALEZ had Mexican blood in his veins. It was because he represented the Democratic Party and the majority of the voters of his district preferred to be represented in the U.S. Congress by a Democrat rather than a Republican. That was the real reason why Mr. GONZALEZ was elected over his Republican opponent. Why try to mislead the public?

Then again you closed your editorial by accusing Mr. JOHNSON and the Democratic Party of hauling Mr. GONZALEZ to New York to help elect Mr. Wagner mayor of New York City. Let's look at the facts.

Didn't the Republican Party or some of its followers haul (I use the word "haul" because you used it in your editorial) Mr. GOLDWATER from Arizona to Columbia, S.C., last fall and have him make a speech in one of your hotels, and in the speech didn't he urge the voters of South Carolina to vote for Mr. Nixon?

Didn't the Republican Party or some of its followers haul Mr. Allen Shivers, ex-Governor of Texas, to Columbia and put him on a stand on the statehouse steps where he strongly urged the voters of South Carolina to vote for Mr. Nixon?

Didn't the Republican Party or some of its followers haul Rev. Billy Graham from North Carolina to Columbia, S.C., and put him on this same stand and invite him to make the short introductory prayer when you had probably 30 or 40 preachers in and around Columbia, any one of whom would have been glad to deliver this introductory prayer?

As I recall, Mr. Graham did not mention either candidate by name, but he did ask our Lord and Saviour (in his prayer) to have the best man elected President. I think our Lord and Saviour answered Mr. Graham's prayer. I am not criticizing Mr. Graham. I

am very fond of him, and I think he is doing a wonderful work.

Again, Mr. Editor, hasn't Senator TOWER, another politician from the State of Texas, been hauled around quite a bit for political purposes?

Yes, Mr. Editor, it seems to me that the Republican Party as well as the Democratic Party has been doing quite a bit hauling.

"The pot can't call the kettle black."

WADE M. AIKEN.

Policy Toward Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD today a letter published in the New York Times under date of January 4 written by John Davis Lodge on December 26. John Davis Lodge, as we all know, was our U.S. Ambassador to Spain and a former Governor of Connecticut. I know of no man who has served his country better in a diplomatic capacity than John Davis Lodge. Personally and in his official capacity he is one of the finest men I have ever known. However, it is not my intention to eulogize John Davis Lodge in this RECORD but to have his letter read by all in which he points out an editorial published in the New York Times on December 21 and the unconstructive statements contained in the editorial. This letter of John Davis Lodge is one of the finest pieces of work I have read on the subject in quite some time:

POLICY TOWARD SPAIN—RUSK VISIT BELIEVED RECOGNITION OF NATION'S CONTRIBUTION

PALM BEACH, FLA.,
December 26, 1961.

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

It is unfortunate that a newspaper of the importance of the New York Times should print, a few short days before Christmas (December 21) on the same page as Arthur Krock's wise and statesmanlike column, an editoral as unconstructive as the one entitled "The Telegram That Never Was."

For the influential, the venerable New York Times to oppose Secretary of State Dean Rusk's recent visit to Madrid seems particularly regrettable at this time when the United Nations, where we receive excellent support from Spain, finds itself in such a dangerous situation; when the United States is beset by ever-increasing perils and predicaments; and when the need for unity, both within Western Europe and between the United States and Western Europe, is urgent.

Since 1953, when the current agreements between Spain and the United States were signed, we have received wholehearted cooperation from Spain.

In fact, it is most unlikely that the Government which some day will succeed General Franco's government, although it may meet with more approval from the Times, could be more cooperative with the United States than the Government now in power.

SUPPORT FOR CASTRO

The Times approved—indeed it aided and abetted—the installation of the Castro government in Cuba, at a time when it was clear to some that it was destined to be neither friendly to the United States nor a democracy. Indeed, the Times does not hate all dictatorships. It gave its editorial blessing to the dictatorship of our friend, Ayub Khan, in Pakistan, while expressing the hope that it would some day evolve toward democracy. Quite properly, in my opinion, it raised no outcry against the reception accorded him in the United States.

It understood the appropriateness of the meeting between General Parker, the military dictator of South Korea, and President Kennedy. It does not seem worried by the absence of democracy in Indonesia, in Burma, and in many other countries. Spain appears to be its principal whipping boy.

Carl N. Degler, associate professor of history at Vassar, points out, in a timely and provocative article in the New York Times magazine for June 4, 1961, that "A policy that assumes democracy can be established in countries now ruled by dictators seems to have almost no foundation in reality at all."

CLOSE TIES CITED

We are engaged in a relentless struggle for survival, and as leaders of the non-Communist world we are besieged by many critical problems. It would be irresponsible, indeed it would be downright reckless, gratuitously to adopt an unfriendly attitude toward the third largest nation in Europe, a nation of 30 million people, a nation with close ties of language and tradition and with strong influence with millions of people in our own hemisphere, a nation which, from bitter, bloody, and tragic experience, understands the implacable nature of the Communist threat.

We should not reject the friendship of nations simply because they do not enjoy representative government as we understand it.

On June 3, 1944, Winston Churchill, in a parliamentary debate, referred to the attitude of Spain during the war and to the damage which Spain could have caused the Allies if she had maintained an indecisive position. In the course of his remarks Sir Winston stated:

"I shall always consider a service was rendered at this time by Spain, not only to the United Kingdom and to the British Empire and Commonwealth, but to the cause of the United Nations. I have, therefore, no sympathy with those who think it clever and even funny to insult and abuse the Government of Spain whenever occasion serves."

Secretary of State Rusk, wishing to follow this useful tradition, apparently recognizes that Spain is making a significant contribution to our common cause. Perhaps he feels, as indeed do others, that in a dangerous world we need all the friends we can get.

He should be applauded, not censured, for attempting to continue the fruitful policy of friendly collaboration which characterized our relations with Spain during the Eisenhower administration.

JOHN DAVIS LODGE.

Resolution in New York City Council To Commend President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Joseph T. Sharkey, vice chairman of the New York City Council, recently introduced a resolution in that body to commend President Kennedy for his efforts to further the cause of human rights in this country, including the protection of civil rights and civil liberties of all U.S. citizens. The resolution enumerates many of the actions taken by the Kennedy administration in this field in its first 10 months in office. This is a record of which the present administration can be justly proud.

I am pleased to insert into the RECORD Councilman Sharkey's resolution, which reads as follows:

RESOLUTION 1198

Resolution commending President Kennedy for his actions to promote and further the cause of human rights

Whereas several major steps have been taken by President John F. Kennedy since his inauguration to assure equal rights and equality of opportunity for American Negroes and thereby for all Americans; and

Whereas action in the field of civil rights as well as other areas has been the keynote of his administration; and

Whereas in these days when deeds, not words, matter most, the President has brought to bear the same tough realism with which he approaches all problems; and

Whereas he has made significant advances on the following fronts: The administration has won major victories in the Congress with enactment of legislation affecting low-income groups, minimum wages, depressed areas, housing, etc.—all of which have direct influence on civil rights; and

Whereas the President has moved vigorously in foreign affairs, championing aid and assistance to less-developed countries, condemning Portugal's action in Angola, and censuring the discriminatory treatment of African diplomats in the United States; and

Whereas an examination of what has taken place in these five areas in the past 6 months shows that, indeed, America is once again moving forward to assure equal employment opportunity to all its citizens; and

Whereas the President established the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity; and

Whereas a directive had been issued to all Government department heads to report promptly on plans and recommendations for ending discrimination in Federal jobs and contracts; and

Whereas the Civil Service Commission and a number of departments started extensive programs to recruit qualified Negroes for Federal employment; and

Whereas the Department of Labor is investigating segregation practices involving programs of the U.S. Employment Service and the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training in order to determine what action can be taken to end such practices; and

Whereas Postmaster General J. Edward Day announced that all advertisements for bids to construct postal facilities "must contain a clause barring discrimination on grounds of race, color or religion." All leases must also include a similar clause; and

Whereas Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall issued a special antidiscrimination regulation that would apply to the use of national parks; and

Whereas President Kennedy issued a directive to the Civil War Centennial Commission to avoid use of segregated facilities and accommodations in connection with its activities; and

Whereas the President issued a memorandum directing all executive departments and agencies to cease sponsorship of any discriminatory employee recreational activities; and

Whereas the Department of Justice has filed a number of important new civil injunction suits to protect the right to vote, including two suits in Mississippi—the first

ever filed in that State. Having won the right to inspect voting records in its first lawsuits under the 1960 act, the Justice Department has been able to secure these records without court action in a number of other counties. These records are now being studied for further action, and

Whereas for the first time, the Department of Justice entered a school desegregation case (in Louisiana) not just to assist the court in restoring law and order, but to bring about desegregation; and

Whereas the Justice Department initiated court action to require reopening of public schools in Prince Edward County, Va.; and

Whereas the Justice Department worked successfully in New Orleans to see that teachers in desegregated public schools were paid their salaries; and

Whereas vigilant action by the Justice Department was taken to protect the lives of the freedom riders—sending U.S. marshals to Alabama when the situation there required it—it opposed the injunction imposed on the freedom riders, and thus upheld the right of interstate travelers to test the presence of discrimination; and

Whereas the Justice Department initiated action before the Interstate Commerce Commission and in the courts to assure all interstate travelers equal treatment; and

Whereas it also filed court action in Louisiana to require desegregation of facilities on an airport constructed with Federal money, a followup of the President's policy that "Federal money should not be spent in any installation which encourages discrimination"; and

Whereas the Department of Justice, in adopting a policy of talking directly with southern officials and leaders, has been able to bring settlement of several civil rights problems without legal action. Among these is the desegregation of the airport at Columbus, Ga., and several other situations which had had salutary effect in the reasonable settlement of potentially troublesome incidents; and

Whereas a series of regular White House meetings on civil rights problems has been established for department and agency representatives; and

Whereas the above is an incomplete bill of particulars of his accomplishments in the last 6 months—to enumerate all of the constructive actions taken by him in this field would be too numerous to mention: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of New York commend the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, upon his intense effort to further the cause of human rights as indicated above; and be it further

Resolved, That the President be congratulated on his leadership in the fight against discrimination and for civil rights; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States.

A Gracious Lady Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a most deserving tribute to a Member of the House who has served long and well.

The following column, written by Walter Trohan, the distinguished chief of the Chicago Tribune's Washington bureau, conveys the appreciation which I know the people of her district feel for the many years of service in the Congress given by a grand lady and dedicated legislator, MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH.

Mrs. CHURCH has decided not to run again for the House. We who served with her will be the losers by her decision. I second the remarks of Mr. Trohan and feel that I speak for all Members of the House who know and respect our gracious and effective colleague.

Text of the article is as follows:

REPORT FROM WASHINGTON

(By Walter Trohan, chief of Chicago Tribune's Washington bureau)

WASHINGTON, December 12.—This is something of a columnar love letter to a politician, but let it be noted the object of this verbal display of affection is a lady, and a very lovely lady to be sure, MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH, Representative from the 13th Illinois District, which includes a tier of northern Chicago precincts and the northern suburbs to the Wisconsin line.

Man for man in Congress (to coin an Irish bull) women are less inclined to welter in self-esteem. They can pass mirrors without dreaming of remodeling the White House. They possess many other virtues, including more honesty, but much can be summed up in the simple observation, "They are far prettier."

Male politicians are given to inordinate back scratching. They like to get together and say kind things about each other, even when they are in different parties, but strictly on the understanding that they get the same sort of verbal puffs in return. At one of these cloying love feasts in Washington Mrs. CHURCH jolted her colleagues by declaring: "I think it is all very fine for Members of Congress, Republicans as well as Democrats, to talk of how they are working together to give the people what they want. I wonder if we should devote some time to giving the people what is good for them."

RESPECTED FOR HER COMPETENCE, COURAGE

Mrs. CHURCH has decided not to run for a seventh term. This is a loss to the Nation as well as to the State. She has served in the House with exemplary integrity, capacity, and experience, displaying a passion for holding national safety and individual liberty as her primary consideration in her voting and in the performance of her duties generally.

She has demonstrated herself to be an intelligent conservative, above the demagogs on the right as she is far removed from the vote catching medicine men on the left. Democrats as well as Republicans, respect her for competence, energy, speaking ability, and courage. She has never hesitated to debate for what she believes, even against the most formidable and experienced veterans of parliamentary operations.

Mrs. CHURCH has gone on many congressional junkets, but not for the sake of having a good time so much as to give her background for service to her constituents. In Japan, Korea, and Indonesia, she spent her time talking to women Members of Parliament, when others were sightseeing.

She has ridden 200 miles in 1 day in a jeep in Vietnam to inspect roads, when many of us would hesitate to ride a jeep on a four-lane highway. She has clambered into noisy helicopters to look at fertilizer plants. She has taken taxis to inspect grain elevators. She has gotten close to troops when others were enjoying having their coats held by generals.

Over the years she has talked to kings, presidents, prime ministers, and lesser officials in most of the countries of the world. She wasn't merely making small talk. When she put questions, they were to the point and not for the record. She also spent much of her time in talking to the people, so that she could get at an understanding of the needs, desires, and dreams of the nations she visited.

MEETS CONSTITUENTS TO SERVE THEM BETTER

At home she was not one of those elected Representatives who are content in the belief that their constituents are fortunate to be represented by them. Rather, she was one who sought at all times to meet her constituents so that she might serve them better and more in accord with their views. She undertook to poll thousands of her constituents on their views every year.

There can be no harm now in unlocking a confidence. About 7 years ago when she was being mentioned for the Republican senatorial nomination this writer sought to prevail upon her to make the race. She said she would explain why she would not, if her confidence were respected. She then explained her health was not of the sturdiest and the campaign would be most taxing, but she added the primary consideration was that she had children and grandchildren and wanted to spend as much more time as she could enjoying them.

Most men would have let ambition knock them out. Now, Mrs. CHURCH wants to give all her time to her family and to preparing for the journey all must make. She has earned a high place in Heaven, which Greek philosophers reserved for the best of politicians, but we all hope not today or tomorrow.

Freedom Riders' Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in the fall issue of the Barnard Alumnae magazine, there appeared an article by a young married couple, Francis and Laura Randall. This article, entitled "Freedom Riders' Report," is an account of the Randalls' participation in a freedom ride. The courage of the Randalls in facing personal abuse and possible arrest to further the cause of racial equality should serve as an inspiration to all of us:

FREEDOM RIDERS' REPORT

(By Laura and Francis Randall)

"How did you happen to go on a freedom ride?" people ask us. To go on a freedom ride, a person has to care enough about the struggle to secure civil rights for all American citizens, to be willing to spend some time and some money, to submit to the discipline and the strain of a nonviolent direct action project, and to risk the chance of abuse, mob violence, arrest, fines or imprisonment, and possible damage to one's personal or professional life. We do care about the struggle for civil rights; we believe it is the most important domestic problem facing Americans.

How did we go on this freedom ride? June 1961, was the time when we were needed. Freedom rides were then a going, triumphant enterprise; more men and women were needed to keep up the momentum. We were asked first by a friend who was going himself. Then we were officially invited by the

Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), which was organizing a freedom ride from Washington, D.C., to Florida. We are academic people, and the academic year was just over; we could go. And so, on June 11, 1961—our wedding anniversary—we arranged to have our cats fed and our plants watered while we were gone, and took an evening train to Washington. As it turned out, ours was not a spectacular freedom ride with burning busses, murderous mobs, mass jailings and headlines around the world. Nor was it simply like any normal bus ride, devoid of incident. It was rather a typical freedom ride.

At 9 in the morning on June 12, 32 future freedom riders gathered in the hot meeting room of Fellowship House, a community center in a Negro district of Washington. There we were trained for the whole day and the whole evening by officials of CORE in the aims and techniques of freedom riding. This was none too long a time to accustom a fairly large group, from many occupations and backgrounds, to CORE's difficult ethic and difficult discipline: nonviolent, direct action. Our chief trainer was Miss Genevieve Hughes, a veteran of the world famous group of CORE freedom riders who were beaten and burned in Alabama, and jailed in Mississippi. She is a slim, matter-of-fact young lady, who, although clearly worn by the strain of her experience, conducted our long sessions with great energy and competence. (CORE's leadership is definitely not composed of dour, fanatical John Browns.)

HISTORY OF CORE

Since most of us were not members of CORE, we were first told something of its history and philosophy. The aim of CORE is simple: racial equality. As its initials indicate, CORE is not a mass organization but a core group of activists who seek to push forward the struggle for civil rights and inspire other organizations and individuals to follow. CORE was founded during World War II by an interracial group of graduate students at the University of Chicago, most of whom were members of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, a religious pacifist organization. CORE's special contribution to civil rights was to be—and has been—direct action, such as picketing, sit-ins and freedom rides, which differs, for instance, from the NAACP, whose most stirring victories for civil rights have been in the law courts. At the very beginning in Chicago, CORE was the first to apply the sit-in and stand-in techniques to the struggle for civil rights; the group succeeded in pressing a number of segregated Chicago restaurants and movie houses into opening their doors to Negroes. In 1947 CORE invented the freedom ride. The year before, the Supreme Court, in the case of Irene Morgan, had declared segregated seating in interstate buses illegal. CORE members rode southern buses in a deliberately integrated way, to publicize the Supreme Court's decision, and to demonstrate that Negroes could exercise their legal rights. This battle has now been won; interstate buses in the South—and many intercity buses—are now as integrated as New York subway cars.

But CORE became famous only last year. It was local Negro college students who began the first of the present wave of sit-ins at lunch counters in southern cities. However, CORE soon became one of the major groups to coordinate, train, and help the sit-ins. When the Supreme Court, in December 1960, in the case of Bruce Boynton, categorically declared that interstate bus passengers may not be segregated in any terminal facilities, CORE planned another round of freedom rides to test, enforce and demonstrate the newly secured civil rights.

CORE does not go in for just any direct action; it insists on intelligent, planned, disciplined, nonviolent direct action. A CORE activist on a mission must not strike anyone, not even to save a fellow activist. He must not push anyone, not even someone who is willfully obstructing a public door. He must not, when in action, carry any weapon, even a penknife, even a lighted cigarette. He must keep his hands open and below his waist. He must not get angry, no matter what the provocation. He must not be antagonistic or sarcastic. He must keep up an unfailing good humor and, if possible, smile. He must not willingly submit to any segregation, and if he must retreat, even from a mob, it must be a dignified retreat, not a flight.

CORE's nonviolent convictions come partly from its background, the Protestant pacifist movement in America in the World War I and interwar years, partly from the examples provided by American trade union struggles, American women's rights struggles, and above all Gandhi's nonviolent civil disobedience campaigns in India, and partly from CORE's own experiences. CORE eschews violence, but it sometimes breaks the law. Freedom rides are a rigidly legal operation, but sit-ins, for instance, are often illegal trespass on private property. CORE does not violate laws lightly or irresponsibly, but its members are convinced that there are situations in which a calm, disciplined, nonviolent violation of an unjust law does the world more good than continued submission to injustice.

Most of our 32 freedom riders in training were not pacifists, not enthusiasts for nonviolence, and not members of CORE. But for the trip, we had either to assent to the discipline and nonviolence of a CORE mission, or else to withdraw.

It was all very well to secure our assent to CORE's program; the problem was to train us to live up to it should we be faced with a crisis in a southern town. Most of the training day, therefore, was devoted to sociodramas—acting out likely and unlikely situations at southern bus terminals. CORE's standard method of integrating a hitherto segregated lunch counter or restroom is simple: When the bus stops, an observer, preferably a white person, gets off the bus to spot the police, the crowds and their weapons, location of telephones, etc. Hopefully, the observer will not be recognized as a freedom rider. Unless the observer thinks an uncontrolled mob attack is likely, he signals the testing team. This is usually composed of two persons, one white and one Negro, usually of the same sex. The testing team, at a short bus stop, tries to buy a soft drink at the lunch counter, or to use the restroom. At a long stop, a meal is usually ordered. At a short stop, a testing team who receives service or uses the restroom, returns to the bus, followed by an observer, and that is that. At a long stop, the observer notices when the testing team is served, signals the bus, and other testing teams with other observers come out to test the restrooms, and then to join the first testing team in the lunchroom. The first observer must see that all freedom riders are back on the bus before he boards.

What if things do not go smoothly? If a testing team is refused service at a lunch counter, it must peacefully urge the waiter or waitress to grant interstate passengers their legal rights. Failing in this, the team asks for the manager and urges him to comply with the law. Failing here, the team sits in until the bus is about to go, when the observer calls the team back. In such cases, or in case of simpler dodges such as closing the counter on one pretext or another when freedom riders arrive, we know where abuses of the law exist and what to publicize.

In cases where a testing team is bullied, threatened with—or subjected to—violence, it must maintain its nonviolent demeanor, and persist in seeking access to the facilities. The observer is presumably getting police protection from near or far. Should the police arrest a team anywhere inside or outside the terminal, either on their own or on complaint from a waitress, manager, or private citizen, the team is to submit under protest to arrest. If an arrest takes place, the observer must stay in town to spot the jail to which the arrested men are taken, to call CORE in New York, to call CORE's local contact, to secure a lawyer, or whatever else may be necessary.

During a break in the training, we had a conference with about 10 reporters and cameramen, to whom we tried to give our general route, but not our particular schedule. On the other hand, we had phoned every police department along our route—and the FBI—our exact plans. A local police force might turn the information over to violent segregationists or "go on vacation," but we tried to show the sort of faith in southern law enforcement officers that would bring out the best in them.

On June 13 two groups of freedom riders started South from Washington, D.C. Final destination: Florida. The larger group, 14 ministers and 4 rabbis, marching in spectacular phalanx and clerical garb, was to leave after us and wind its way to Tallahassee. We were not to see them on the trip. Our "union-professional group," 14 strong, was carefully balanced: 7 Negroes, 7 whites; 10 men, 4 women; 4 United Auto Workers officials, 4 clergymen, 6 in secular professions. We were a young group, 25 to 42 years old. We crossed the Potomac River in a Greyhound bus at 8 in the morning—into another State of our own country, but one which we couldn't help but think of as enemy territory. We clutched our interstate bus tickets, our legal privilege and dubious talisman for the coming trials, for which, as it turned out, our training stood us in good stead. None of us, despite several incidents involving surly, abusive and even threatening behavior on the part of waitresses, managers and townsfolk, resorted to—or were the victims of—physical violence.

During our ride, every reporter we met asked us, "Do you consider your trip a success?" The answer now as then is, "Yes. A success in many ways." The members of the group learned an enormous amount. Some of the Negroes had never been in the South before; now they know for themselves. The whites in the group had never before experienced what can only be described as "being treated like Negroes;" it will not be forgotten. Some of us are war veterans, but none of us had ever encountered the peculiarities of a nonviolent direct action struggle; nothing else in the world is quite like it. While none of us was severely tested, not even by the standards of freedom rides, most of us found that we possessed a certain amount of a kind of courage that we had not been certain of before. And lastly, under whatsoever circumstances we may be asked, "What did you do for the liberation of your fellow men?" we can all answer, "In June 1961, we took a bus ride to Florida."

ASSESSING ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The public results of our freedom ride are easier to grasp. We tested the desegregation, if any, of some 20 cities and towns in the southeast seaboard States, at least half for the first time. In some small towns our success was obviously not lasting; in the larger cities, the local Negroes will surely see to it that the bus terminal facilities, now opened, are kept open. We cannot calculate the effect our ride may have on local struggles for objectives more important than integrating lunch counters—schools, trade unions, votes—but it will not be negative. We know now that we are not a pack of northerners coming in and stirring up more

antagonism than anything else. The antagonism can be readily held in check by any police force that desires to uphold law and order. Indeed, our most surprising success was the way in which every southern police force we met—save that of Ocala, Fla. (where three of our group were arrested)—made great efforts to uphold law and order. But the friendship, enthusiasm, hope, and resolve that we seemed to inspire—obviously among many Negroes, less visibly among a few whites—far outweighed any antagonism we stirred up.

We believe that the greatest part of the struggle for civil rights must be fought in Washington. The rest must be fought by southern Negroes, who are now doing more than their share. Southerners must fight school integration suits, southerners must sit in. But sometimes there is a place for others in the struggle. One such place is on freedom rides, although most of the riders have been southerners. To us, as to anyone who has ever gone on a freedom ride, it is clear that the road to full civil rights is fearfully long, but that each freedom rider rides at least some small portion of a mile in the right direction.

Address by Edward M. Kennedy, of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune to attend the 10th anniversary dinner of the American Committee on Italian Migration at the Commodore Hotel in New York on Saturday, December 9, 1961, at which time I was privileged to hear an address by the Honorable Edward M. Kennedy, of Massachusetts, the youngest brother of our beloved President. I was very much impressed by what he had to say and the way in which he expressed his thoughts.

I was particularly impressed by Ted Kennedy's humanitarian outlook and his love for people, especially the little people, the minority groups, the people whose greatest desire is to be treated as equal citizens. He did not hesitate to express his deep interest and strong support for Italian migration to this country, at the same time giving recognition to the contributions made by Italian immigrants to the well-being of the United States. Where others have forgotten their immigrant antecedents or refer to them in a degrading manner, Ted Kennedy speaks of immigrants as "this human treasure."

Listening to him as he delivered his address, I could feel Ted Kennedy's sincerity, his warm personality, his generosity of heart, and his pleasant manners. There is no doubt in my mind that he would make a great and devoted public servant to the people of his State and the Nation as a whole. I hope and trust that the people of Massachusetts will recognize the capabilities of Ted Kennedy.

The text of Mr. Kennedy's address before the American Committee on Italian Migration was as follows:

ITALIAN IMMIGRATION

(Speech of the Honorable Edward M. Kennedy)

We meet tonight at a time when our Nation, and all that our Nation means, is being sorely tried and tested.

The burden of freedom, of progress, of peace throughout the world is to a very great extent the burden of America. To support that burden, all our great wealth, all our natural resources, all the might of our industry would be hopelessly insufficient if we lacked the priceless ingredient of a free civilization: a people strong in purpose, a people possessed of the heart, the soul, and the genius that the times demand.

Material wealth is transitory. But whatever enriches our human resources performs the most lasting service and creates the most durable of treasures. For the quality of people is the true measure of the wealth—or of the bankruptcy—of a nation.

You have devoted your time, effort, and resources to the stimulation of immigration from Italy to the United States. Your goal, as it is fulfilled, contributes immediately to the well-being of the United States.

The contributions of Italians to the culture, the arts, the sciences, the industry and agriculture of every country of the world—the New World and the Old World as well—are immeasurable. Many banquets would come and go before I could hope to list the Italian explorers, the pioneers of industry and business, the painters and sculptors and musicians, the poets and authors, the physicists and chemists and architects, the great philanthropists—no list could tell it all. No list could include the millions of workers, businessmen, craftsmen and just plain, good, hardworking people who have come from Italy to enhance the spiritual and the material wealth of every country of the world, and particularly the countries of North, South, and Central America.

The free flow of this human treasure into the New World continued, practically unhindered, throughout the 19th and up to the end of the 1st quarter of the 20th century.

Between 1870 and 1900 well over 1 million Italians entered the United States.

During the first three decades of this century, more than 3½ million Italian immigrants arrived here.

But in the course of the years from 1931 through 1940, only 68,000 Italian immigrants entered this country, fewer than 7,000 annually.

World War II followed, and in the course of the years 1941–46 practically all immigration from Italy was cut off. When the shipping lanes were opened again, immigration from Italy resumed, but it was a pathetic trickle.

The situation made no sense from any aspect:

Italy, ravaged by the war, impoverished and suffering from staggering unemployment, was looking in vain for an outlet for those who could not find employment among the ruins of Italian economy.

The United States needed the skills and creative talent of the Italian immigrant.

And hundreds of thousands of Italian immigrant families in the United States were longing for their next of kin to come here to join mothers, fathers, children, brothers, and sisters.

And here is where you came in.

Here is where the American Committee of Italian Migration entered the field.

The attention of the Congress at that time was still directed toward the solution of the displaced persons problem. Italians were not included within that definition. No relief was available in that direction.

Someone, I recall, calculated the number of Italian immigrants who could have entered the United States during the 5 war years. The number of those who were prevented by the war from reaching this country was estimated at 35,000. Bills were introduced in the House and Senate providing for the entry of this small number of Italian immigrants—but nothing happened. Even that modest legislative attempt never reached the stage of congressional hearings. It died like so many good intentions, in committee.

At the same time, the immigration quota for Italy was fixed, in 1952, at approximately the same level at which it had remained since 1924: at about 5,666 immigrants per year.

That was the situation when your organization launched its educational campaign. I want to stress that word "education," because it was not a pressure campaign. There was no lobbying in the corridors of the Congress. It was an open, well-planned and vigorously conducted nationwide campaign. Its primary purpose was to open the eyes of the American public. Through it, the Nation saw the wide, national interest involved; our Nation saw the importance of helping Italy with its agonizing problem of surplus population; and, at the same time, you made evident the humanitarian considerations and social advantages involved in reunifying families.

In 1953—barely 18 months after your work began—Congress enacted legislation under which 60,000 Italian relatives of Americans, and of lawfully residing immigrants, found the doors to this country open at last.

It is important to remember that that number of Italian immigrants entered this country over and above the annual immigration quota. Their smooth and rapid resettlement in this country was made possible, again, through the efforts of your organization, through the efforts of your local chapters throughout the Nation.

But you did not stop there. You continued your efforts and you found that there were many who shared your goals. In 1957, further legislation was passed providing for the entry of 25,000 Italian immigrants—again admitted over and above the annual immigration quotas.

I do not want to inject any political note in this talk. And so I will restrain myself from identifying the young man who, before becoming President and while still a Senator from Massachusetts, sponsored that legislation and led the fight to get it out of committee and through the Senate.

Similar legisaltion was passed by the Congress in 1959, thanks to your efforts, and again just a few months ago, in September of this year.

Consider the total results of those efforts:

If Italian immigrants had been entering the United States since the end of World War II solely under existing immigration quotas, the total number of immigrants so admitted would be about 90,000.

But because of your activity, the total number was almost three times that figure.

Instead of 90,000 Italian immigrants during the postwar period, there have been 255,000.

The difference between those two figures—between 90,000 and 255,000—is the gage of your activity and accomplishment. But even that is only a numerical gage—and we are talking about people, not statistics.

How are we to measure the material and spiritual benefits that our country has derived from this influx of Italian immigrants?

How are we to measure the amount of human suffering that this enlarged immigration from Italy has saved?

How are we to measure the importance of your work to the rebuilding of Italy's war-ravaged economy—a reconstruction that has

been amazing, but that necessarily was helped by easing the unemployment burden.

As you complete your 10th year of activity, how proud you must feel to know that you have brought to your country this richest of treasurers. You have made it possible for the United States to be stronger, wealthier, and wiser to the extent of hundreds of thousands of men and women and boys and girls who are the product of one of the world's most magnificent cultures.

It is fitting that one such as I—an American who is not of Italian ancestry—should be here to express the graditude of your fellow citizens for what you have done.

But commendable as your accomplishments have been, they must be regarded merely as steps toward a larger goal: Establishment of a fair and decent immigration policy for the United States.

On Liberty Island, overlooking the ship channel of New York Harbor, stands the Lady of the Torch, the "Mother of Exiles," the Statue of Liberty. This fabulous gift of the people of France, measuring 151 feet from her sandals to the tip of her flame, is the greatest statue in the history of the world—in more respects than one: For she is the symbol of freedom to hundreds of millions who have never seen her. Inscribed in bronze at her feet is the stirring poem, "The New Colossus," by Emma Lazarus, which says, in part:

"Give me your tired, your poor—
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me,
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

Those words, inscribed in 1908, reflected the spirit of an America that did not ask the immigrant, "Where did you come from?" but, rather, 'What did you come for?" All who came to contribute their work or skill or knowledge, all who would help build a better America, were welcome. The emphasis was on contribution—not the accident of origin.

I can assure you that the present administration subscribes to that policy.

I can assure you that the President is dedicated to restoring morality and commonsense to our immigration laws. He has made clear his desire to eliminate the indignity and cruelty and impracticality of immigration quotas based on national origin—and to establishment of a national immigration policy based on contribution.

Accomplishing that goal will not be easy. There will be, as we all know, some bitter resistence.

But I assure you the fight will be fought. And I am confident it will be won.

Several persons in Massachusetts have told me that I intend to run for election to the U.S. Senate in 1962. I do not know about that—but I do know that if I do run, and if the people of Massachusetts elect me, that I will be fighting that fight with you, and with the administration, every inch of the way.

Speaker Sam Rayburn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, upon learning of the passing of former Speaker SAM RAYBURN, my comment was, "I feel that America and the world have lost one of the greatest humans who ever lived. He was one of the most honest, honorable, and patriotic men I ever expect to know."

This feeling was shared by many as evidenced by the editorials which appeared in newspapers all over the country. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the editorials which appeared in the Evening Star, the Washington Post, the Dallas Morning News, and the Fort Worth Star-Telegram:

[From the Washington Star]

SPEAKER RAYBURN

SAM RAYBURN, dead now at 79, was truly a product of the old frontier—a man whose admirably rugged qualities were forged and tempered in the harsh school of privation and grinding poverty. In his last days on the legislative scene, however, he was the advocate, perhaps the indispensable advocate, of the New Frontier—of welfare programs which surely never crossed the mind of young SAM RAYBURN as he began his long, hard climb to the top.

The 8th of 11 children, SAM RAYBURN was born on a rocky East Tennessee farm. While still a child, his father, a Confederate veteran seeking a new start, moved westward and settled in Texas on a 40-acre plot. There young SAM toiled in the fields, dreamed his dreams, and came to know a "loneliness that breaks the heart." When it was time for college the young man had $5 in his pocket. His father handed him $25 more, and SAM RAYBURN in later years often wondered how he had managed to scrape it together, what sacrifices it had meant for his father and mother.

This, then was the background of the Texan who came to Congress in 1912, who was first chosen as Speaker in 1940, and who fought with such tenacity and effectiveness for so many programs of the New Deal, the Fair Deal, and finally the New Frontier. Was this advocacy out of character for SAM RAYBURN, who had known no abundance except that which he had managed to wrest from life for himself? In the case of some people, it might have been. But it was not true of Mr. SAM. Even with his personal struggle behind him, he could not forget what life was like, how hard it was for so many people, and he was ever ready to champion the causes which he believed were needed to improve their lot. This is not to say that he was just another marcher in the Democratic ranks. For he often was at odds with Democratic Presidents. He was a party man, however, not a bolter, and when he believed in a program he was relentless in his support of it.

This led, in the last session, to his break with an old friend—HOWARD SMITH of Virginia. As chairman of the Rules Committee, Judge SMITH was in a position to exercise great control over the New Frontier legislative program, and the Speaker feared that this power would be used to block measures which he thought should be voted upon. Consequently, he joined, even led, the fight to enlarge the committee, and break its power. In the first round, at least, the fight was won, 217 to 212. But deep wounds were left, and it cannot yet be said that Mr. SAM won an enduring victory in this last and regrettable battle before his fatal illness struck him down.

But SAM RAYBURN's political wars are over and done with. He is gone, and there will be no one to replace him in the affection of those who were privileged to know well this unassuming and one might say lonely man. Nor will it be easy to find anyone of comparable stature to take over the speakership. There will be many to feel deeply the loss of SAM RAYBURN, and none more so, we suspect, than the young President who, with his host of other problems, must now await the choice of a replacement for one who certainly comes close to being an irreplaceable man.

[From the Washington Post]

SPEAKER SAM RAYBURN

The greatest tribute that can be paid to Speaker SAM RAYBURN is to be found in the realization all over this land of the large vacuum in the U.S. Government that his passing has created. Mr. SAM, as he was affectionately known in the House of Representatives, never assumed the role of top policymaker for his party or for the country. But he was a key member in many different policymaking teams, and his influence has been felt in Washington for a longer period than has that of any other figure in recent American history.

On the basis of longevity alone Mr. RAYBURN's career commands thoughtful analysis. His 49 years in the House of Representatives spans the vast gulf between the Woodrow Wilson and the John F. Kennedy administrations. His speakership, extending over twice the period any other man has served, covered the war years and most of the turbulent era since. One might reasonably suppose that any one who had so long ridden the tide of power would be either a czar or a worn-out figurehead. SAM RAYBURN was neither when that great enemy of mankind—cancer—forced him to relinquish his gavel two and a half months ago.

What quality in this man enabled him to hold fast to the No. 2 (or perhaps No. 3) role in Washington for so long a period? One factor was his deep understanding of the representative system that has developed in this country. In the Fourth Texas District, which elected him 24 times, he thoroughly identified himself with the interests of the people. In the House he thoroughly identified himself with the interests of his party and those of his country.

Mr. RAYBURN had strong views on many subjects, but he did not permit his personal likes and dislikes to stand in the way of successful party government. His ear was constantly attuned to the grass roots, and he used to say that "if you don't feel what you can't see, you have no business here." With his keen sensitivity to the needs of the occasion, he knew when to compromise and when to stand firm. He knew how to go along with the President, any President, while at the same time using his great power as Speaker of the House to modify extreme demands of the White House and to resist policies which he believed to be dead wrong.

The Speaker could exert great influence without endangering his own position because he usually had his following in the House with him. Over the years he cultivated the confidence and loyalty of Democratic Congressmen by little acts of kindness, by fairness to each and by his good faith in his dealings with them. Mr. SAM was no czar in the sense that Speaker Joseph G. Cannon was. His capacity to mobilize the House behind administration policies lay almost entirely in his personal prestige and in his ability to appeal to reason.

One reason for his special success in commanding loyalty from the unwieldy House was his own intense devotion to his task. Unlike some of his predecessors, he did not live for a day when he could step from the speakership to the Presidency. His great love for the House and respect for its traditions and functions made him an ideal spokesman for that body and an effective bridge between the legislative and executive branches.

Mr. RAYBURN is entitled to a large measure of credit also for bridging the gulf between the northern and southern wings of the Democratic Party. Though a loyal Texan, he never succumbed to the blindness that afflicts the professional sectionalists. Some of his views were very conservative by com-

parison with those of liberal Democrats, but the net effect of his influence was moderation. It cannot be said of him that he was always right; nevertheless, he had a statesman's toleration for the public will running somewhat at variance to his own.

His great capacity for adaptation of his thinking and leadership to the needs of the times appears to have won for Mr. RAYBURN a secure niche in the history of American Government. Though he could be fierce in a political fight, he was magnanimous in victory, and he never lost sight of the fact that the welfare of the Nation was more important than his own. The country will be fortunate indeed if Speakers of comparable stature can be found in the troubesome years ahead.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Nov. 17, 1961]

SAM RAYBURN

The end came for SAM RAYBURN in the community he loved, in the midst of friends in the district that first sent him to Austin 54 years ago and chose him 25 times to represent it in Washington. The record he wrote is not likely to be surpassed. His achievement is among the amazing superlatives of American political history.

Mr. RAYBURN'S career was the epitome of the practical functioning of democracy where such intangibles as loyalty, friendship, and individual persuasion shape events more surely than the oratory of a Roosevelt or a Kennedy.

Above all else, Mr. RAYBURN was human. Four of the eight Presidents of the United States who knew him live today to mourn the loss of a personal friend. So do two young Dallas boys whom he greeted with "Glad to see young folks my age," when he interrupted a busy conference schedule not long ago. For millions of other Americans, too—who knew him only as the unsmiling, gavel-pounding arbitrator of Democratic National Conventions and sessions of the House of Representatives—a friend is gone.

Of all the lessons learned in mankind's chronicle, the most certain is that only history can weigh fairly the real worth of men. Many opposed with deep conviction the issues for which Mr. RAYBURN strove. In the struggle, he was a relentless fighter but usually a warm friend when the tumult died.

So be it today, for in death there are no foes. There is only the lasting memory of the love of the many Mr. RAYBURN befriended, and of the unique service he rendered longer than any other American.

[From the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, Nov. 17, 1961]

MR. SAM'S DEATH

The death of House Speaker SAM RAYBURN Thursday in his hometown of Bonham evokes now only sadness and a sense of political and personal loss. The lethal character of his ailment was thoroughly understood and many of his longtime friends and associates had paid him their respects while he was yet able to receive them.

Mr. SAM was a great Texan, a great American, and an outstanding public servant. He had served in the National House of Representatives for almost 49 years and as its Speaker for 17 years. He was honored and trusted by the leaders of both major political parties and revered in his own Democratic organization, for he possessed both the talent for powerful and persuasive leadership and great integrity.

It is no wonder that the Nation mourns his death and that congressional leaders recognize the difficulty of his replacement in a post that had become almost a traditional and personal thing.

If the warning of Mr. SAM'S passing has blunted the shock of its occurrence, the grief is fresh and poignant. Few men have had the character to muster such understanding and courtesy in a role that required purpose and firmness.

It is indicative of Mr. SAM'S stature that the President traveled to Texas to visit him in his last illness, as did former President Truman. The late Speaker was a confidant and adviser of Presidents. His friends outside the party included former President Eisenhower, whom he knew as "Captain Ike" even in the latter's early Army days. In point of continuous service, he was dean of the House, although in the longevity record for the entire Congress he was outranked.

Mr. SAM was denied one of his wishes, that he might die "with my gavel in my hand," but he virtually did so. His fellow Texans will remember him as a plain man and a loyal friend, who placed duty above self. All Americans will remember him as a patriot and a stateman, who contributed enormously to this Nation's welfare and moral strength.

Homecoming for a Poet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lawrence (Mass.) Eagle Tribune of January 6, 1962, concerning an illustrious son of my home city of Lawrence, Mass.:

HOMECOMING FOR A POET

Robert Lee Frost comes home to Lawrence tomorrow to attend the dedication of the new schoolhouse that bears his name.

His return tomorrow will be the first since he was graduated, valedictorian of his class, from Lawrence High School in 1892, but it will be, we think, the most important.

The dedication of a schoolhouse to a man of letters by the city in which he received his early education is most fitting recognition of the man and his achievements. Frost's first poem was printed in the Lawrence High School bulletin. He wrote the class hymn for the 1892 graduation program. A Lawrence teacher awakened in him the latent poet. Lawrence, the community, touched the poet's personality during its most impressionable period.

The influence of the teacher, Katherine A. O'Keefe, especially interests us. She was one of nine teachers on the faculty of that time. The salary she received, $900 a year, probably was adequate for 1892, but it was trifling compared with today's salaries. The schooolhouse in which she taught was long ago abandoned as obsolete. By today's standards it would be considered scandalously inadequate and, we do not doubt, rightly so. But it produced Robert Frost.

No other American poet has attained greater fame in his lifetime. No other has won higher praise from contemporaries for distinguished contributions to American literature. No other has longer held a large popular audience. Whether these achievements mean literary immortality for Frost, the future will decide. The simplicity of his language and the vividness of his imagery speak persuasively for the endurance of his fame. His work from its earliest days to the latest is in refreshing contrast with the surrealist obscurities that clutter printed pages today with affronts to the muse of poetry.

We like to think that the Frost rhythm is clear and spare because of his New England heritage. The poet once told an interviewer for the Miami Herald, who asked him why he wrote no poems about Florida:

"But I lived in New England during the formative years when impressions go deepest. From 10 to 35 are the sensitive years, when ideas and images, like footprints on wet cement, remain forever.

"In youth you see things that you do not realize you see. Passing moments are not really transitory. They sink deep into the memory to come out years afterward when you have found the power of expression."

Lawrence, in view of these words, can believe it supplied some of those memorable impressions, for 7 of those sensitive years were spent by the poet in this city. And Lawrence too reasonably can believe that a vital impression was that made by Katherine O'Keefe on the young student.

That impression testifies eloquently to the power of the teacher. Better buildings and elaborate facilities, despite their importance, are not the principal ingredients of education. The inspiring teacher is of first importance. A superior environment for education should mean superior teaching. Thus, we can hope that the new schoolhouse to be dedicated to America's great poet will foster more inspiring teachers to awaken latent talents in more young people. The law of averages warns us not to expect another Robert Frost but we can expect the budding of spiritual and civic and political leaders and scientists and educators and members of learned professions.

Working in and attending a school dedicated to Frost should be a stimulating, challenging experience.

Tomorrow's dedication is to us more than a fitting gesture by which the city honors the poet and the poet honors the city. It is an event potentially as significant as that on a summer day in 1892 when the Lawrence High School graduating class sang the class hymn composed by Robert L. Frost:

"There is a nook among the alders
Still sleeping to the cat bird's 'Hush';
Below, a lone stone-bridge is bending
Above a runnel's silent rush.

"A dreamer hither often wanders
And gathers many a snow-white stone;
He weighs them, poised upon his fingers
Divining each one's silvery tone.

"He drops them! When the stream makes music,
Fair visions with its vault-voice swell;
And so, for us, the future rises,
As thought-stones stir our heart's 'Farewell!' "

More than 60 years later, for the poet who wrote the class hymn, the future was still rising. In an 80th birthday interview with Ray Josephs in This Week he said that in three words he could sum up everything he had learned in life—"Life goes on."

As he comes home to Lawrence tomorrow the poet is 86 years old. His 87th birthday is only a few weeks away. Although he has facetiously said that in Vermont the natives refer to him as "perma Frost," he is not immortal, no matter how enduring his verse. The school that bears his name will long survive him. So will the city in which he studied and wrote his first poem. What school and city do to deserve the honor which the poet's fame bestows on them depends on how firmly they cling to the truths inherent in the words of the man of 80 and of the boy of 17—"The future rises—life goes on"—to men and to institutions of vision and vigor and nobility of purpose.

Let's Stop Poisoning Our Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article appearing in This Week magazine of December 3, 1961, entitled "Let's Stop Poisoning Our Water." Having long been concerned with the problem of polluted waters I am delighted to see the vigor with which our new Surgeon General, the Honorable Luther L. Terry, M.D., warns of the hazards of water pollution.

As many of the Members of the House will no doubt recall, I have been extremely critical of the manner in which the Public Health Service has approached the problem of water pollution, and the lack of vigor shown by that Agency in the past. This is indeed a hopeful sign and one which is appreciated by those who want vigor in cleaning up the sick, deadly, and dangerous waters of this beloved land of ours. I join other conservationists, the housewives of this Nation, the hunters and fishermen, the swimmers and recreationists in hoping that this editorial presages vigorous action under the Blatnik-Smith-Dingell bill enacted during the past session of Congress.

The article follows:

LET'S STOP POISONING OUR WATER

(By Luther L. Terry, M.D., Surgeon General, Public Health Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare)

(There's danger ahead if we continue to take the purity of our greatest natural resource for granted. The Surgeon General tells what can be done about three alarming new hazards.)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—When I entered the Public Health Service some 20 years ago, I was taught by the senior physicians of our corps that whatever else in our environment was dangerous to health, our water supplies were safe. One could go anywhere in our country, turn on the tap, and drink a glass of water without worry. Some of the water might taste like medicine and some of it might be strangely colored, but it couldn't harm you.

Medical evidence, in those days, seemed to bear us out. Typhoid fever, cholera, and the waterborne dysenteries were diseases one read about in medical books or encountered on trips abroad; they were not diseases one expected to treat in private practice. This is still true, incidentally. There probably is not 1 practicing physician in 50 who has ever treated typhoid or cholera within the continental United States.

But three dangers—one potential and two actual—are causing us to reexamine our water's spotless reputation.

The potential danger is radiation. So far, we know of no water in the United States which approaches a level of radiation immediately dangerous to health. We are keeping very close watch, and must continue to do so as the uses of nuclear energy increase in the years ahead.

A second danger has to do with the viral diseases. We are by no means sure that at least some viruses are not slipping through our present water purification and disinfection processes and entering our water mains. Hepatitis may be an example. A count of 59,573 cases of hepatitis in the United States through October 14 this year—the highest in history and 4 times the usual average—is extremely disturbing.

The third danger is something else—something new.

Modern man is living in a new kind of environment which has been largely created in the incredibly short time of 20 years. In this brief period at least a half million new chemical compounds have come into existence. We manufacture these substances, we use them, and when we are done with them, in a good many cases, we discharge them into our rivers and streams or dump them on the ground and let them seep into our underground water supplies. And then, days or months or years later (in minute quantities, it is true), we drink them.

Some of these substances come from your home. In 1947, the housewives of the Nation used 275 million pounds of detergents. Last year they used more than 3.2 billion pounds. They also used more bleaches, powders, and other household cleansers, much of which went down the drain and into the nearest waterway.

Others of the new substances come from farmlands. Every rainfall washes fertilizers, herbicides, and pesticides off the crops and fields and into the streams and rivers. Unlike most other forms of pollution, these cannot be traced to a single source.

Still others come from factories. All industrial production has increased 65 percent since 1947, and the chemical industry's production has increased 176 percent. Use of plastics, one of the major types of chemical product, has increased from 277 million pounds in 1940 to over 6 billion pounds last year.

The most disturbing thing about these new substances is that nature cannot handle them as efficiently as she handles human waste and other impurities of natural origin. Fish, plants, molds, bacteria, and other living organisms in water can, in time, break down any natural impurity and use it as food. But for many of the manmade compounds, there seems to be no organism that can give us a helping hand. Once these substances get into the water, they are diluted, but they persist for long periods of time.

DETECTING POISON

The Public Health Service maintains a constant watch on the interstate rivers and streams in our country. Health workers row out in boats, go to the end of city piers, or walk along beaches and shores and collect water samples; the water is then tested for different impurities and poisons and for radiation. The individual States supplement these tests in their own waters and a number of city health departments and other agencies also test water.

The durability of some of today's new substances was dramatically demonstrated by one incident not long ago. Headquarters for our national water quality network is at the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center in Cincinnati. One day a water sample from St. Louis produced a peculiar mark in a routine infrared test procedure. A week later the same mark appeared in a test made from water sent in from New Orleans.

This put our Taft Laboratory water detectives into action. They tracked the substance to a factory in St. Louis—it existed in no other place. The chemical had traveled hundreds of miles in the Mississippi River without undergoing any change, and showed up in one liter of water taken from the billions of gallons of water which pass New Orleans every day.

The equipment that has worked efficiently to purify drinking water does not always remove today's new contaminants. You yourself may have noticed that sometimes the water you draw from the tap foams in your drinking glass, almost like beer. The foam sometimes results from detergents that have passed through upstream sewage treatment plants and your city's water purification equipment. No one knows how many other chemicals pass through, since most of them are not obliging enough to foam, taste, smell, or add color.

We have also found that when different substances are poured into the same stream they sometimes get together and form wierd new compounds which defy analysis. Chemists refer to them by the unappetizing term, "'gunk."

A town in Alabama a few years ago had an especially bad problem with "gunk." A textile mill had been operating there for years and, although it discharged some waste into the river, the town's water supply had not been affected. Later, a plant that manufactured pesticides opened. It too used the river, also in a way that did not affect the water quality. Still later, a bleachery was established. This industry was equally careful about disposing of waste.

SOLVING THE MYSTERY

As far as any scientists could tell, the waste disposal practices of all three industries were entirely safe. But soon after the bleachery opened, people began to complain about taste and odor in their water. Moreover, the physicians of the town noted an increase in patients suffering from nausea and digestive disorders.

When water samples were studied more intensively, it was found that discharges from the three industries had combined to form a new, and harmful, chemical. Once the cause was found, the industries changed their disposal practices and the water in this town is now apparently safe and palatable.

Any program which provides adequate protection for our water supply must be based on three things.

First, we must put to greater use what we already know about water pollution control. How can we hope to control new impurities unless we first do a better job of treating city sewage and controlling those kinds of industrial pollution which we already know how to handle? We have a vast amount of practical knowledge about pollution control. Yet 5,100 U.S. towns and cities and an estimated 6,000 industries today lack adequate sewage and waste treatment facilities. Many have none at all.

During the past summer, the Congress enacted new legislation which will strengthen our hand in pollution-control enforcement and also provides individual cities more financial aid in building sewage treatment plants. This is the Federal program; it can work well only if the States, local communities and industries fulfill their responsibilities.

Second, we must continue and increase our surveillance of water. Unless we know what is going into our rivers, streams, and lakes, we cannot do an adequate job of keeping them clean. This means establishing water-quality criteria and measuring the usability of water against them.

Third, we must increase our research activities. The new Federal Water Pollution Control Act provides more funds for research, and every cent of these new funds is needed. We must be able to identify the wastes going into our streams. We must know what they are doing to public health, to the country's industrial growth, to agriculture, and to our precious fish and wildlife environment.

Some of this research will take strange forms. Already our scientists are working on new and strikingly different ways of cleansing waste waters. Under trial are some methods such as distilling and freezing, similar to those being used for taking the

salt out of sea water. Other experiments are quite different. One fascinating possibility—under serious study and working very effectively in the laboratory—is electrolyzing of sewage. It breaks water into hydrogen and oxygen, leaving everything else behind, and then puts these two elements together again as new, and clean, water.

I see no reason, scientific or economic, why we cannot protect our water supplies and our air, as we now protect our food. I cannot believe, as a physician and as a Government administrator, that the water supplies of this country cannot be kept safe, and clean, and suitable—not only for health and economic growth but for important recreation and conservation values as well.

It will cost money, it will require a great deal of research, it will call for the support of every citizen and every local and State government. But it is a job which can be done and I am sure it will be done. Our civilization, which has worked so many miracles, can surely protect itself against its own poisons.

Premier Ben-Gurion's Statement on the Arab Refugee Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, the Israel Digest, a leading periodical on events in the Middle East, in its October 27, 1961, issue contained a most significant statement by Premier Ben-Gurion, of Israel, on his proposed solution of the distressing Arab refugee problem.

The article follows:

There is only one practical and fair solution for the problem of the Arab refugees: to settle them among their own people, in countries having plenty of good land and water and which are in need of additional manpower, the Prime Minister, Mr. David Ben-Gurion, said in the Knesset on October 11. If the Arab rulers entered into direct talks with Israel for a peace settlement, Israel would give all possible aid toward the settlement of the refugees among their own people, Mr. Ben-Gurion added. He was replying to a motion by Mr. Hayim Landau, of the Herut Movement, for a debate on the subject. The following is the text of the Prime Minister's statement:

1. The Second World War resulted in a tremendous movement of refugees from one country to another, totaling almost 20 million souls: from India to Pakistan and from Pakistan to India; from East European countries to Germany and from Eastern Germany to Western Germany; from one East European country to another; and it would not occur to anyone to put back the clock and repatriate all the refugees to their prewar homes.

2. Almost all the Arab refugees from Israel left the country before the establishment of the state, immediately after the publication of the U.N. resolution. After the establishment of the state, the number of refugees was very small.

3. Almost all the Arabs who lived in Israel on the day the state was established are here today, and they have been joined by some 30,000 refugees whose return was permitted by the Government of Israel for family or other reasons, and the inhabitants of the "Triangle" area added as a result of the armistice agreement.

4. The departure from the country of the Arabs referred to as refugees began immediately after the U.N. resolution from the areas allocated to the Jewish state. We have clear documentary evidence of the fact that they left the country at the orders of the Arab leaders, headed by the Mufti, on the assumption that the invasion of the Arab armies after the departure of the mandatory government's forces would destroy the Jewish state, and throw all the Jews, alive or dead, into the sea.

5. Immediately after the establishment of the state, while the invasion of the Arab armies was still in progress, large-scale Jewish imigration began—from the DP camps in Germany, from Cyprus and, especially, from the Arab countries: Iraq, Yemen, Egypt, Libya, Tunisia, Morocco, Syria, and Lebanon.

6. The number of the Arabs who before the U.N. resolution lived in the area allocated to the Jewish state by the U.N., and who left it voluntarily or at the orders of their leaders, is not larger than the number of the Jewish refugees from the Arab countries, so that what has taken place is an unplanned, but de facto exchange of populations, and there is no practical possibility or moral justification for putting the clock back.

7. There are also Jewish refugees in the State of Israel from areas of Palestine which were settled by Jews before and during the mandatory period: the old city of Jerusalem, the Etzion bloc of settlements, Neveh Yaakov, Atarot, and so forth.

8. In assessing the property of the Arabs who left Israel, it would be inconceivable not to take into account the property of the Jewish refugees from the Arab countries, and from Palestine itself.

9. If compensation is to be paid—and we are not opposed to compensation if the question as a whole is solved—the Jewish refugees are just as entitled to compensation as the Arab refugees.

10. If an Arab refugee problem still exists, this is entirely a result of the violation of the U.N. Charter by the Arab rulers and their callous treatment of members of their own people. Israel did not wait until the Arab rulers should return the property of the Jewish refugees, but, regarding them as human beings and brothers, saw to their absorption, housing, employment, health, and the education of their children. The Arab rulers treated the Arab refugees not as human beings and members of their own people, but as a weapon with which to strike at Israel. Some of the neighboring Arab countries are underpopulated, and they have plentiful resources of fertile soil and water, as well as a shortage of manpower, but for the purpose of destroying Israel—with the aid of the refugees as well—they are behaving callously to their own people and treating them as nothing more than a political and military weapon with which to undermine and destroy Israel.

11. Israel categorically rejects the insidious proposal for freedom of choice for the refugees, for she is convinced that this proposal is designed and calculated only to destroy Israel. There is only one practical and fair solution for the problem of the refugees: to settle them among their own people in countries having plenty of good land and water and which are in need of additional manpower.

12. If the Arab rulers comply with the Assembly decision and the principles of the U.N. Charter and enter into direct talks with Israel for a peace settlement, Israel will give all possible assistance toward the settlement of the refugees among their own people, utilizing her own great experience in the settlement of refugees under conditions much more difficult than those prevalent in neighboring countries.

I have not been able to submit this reply to the Cabinet, but I know that it reflects the attitude of the entire Government, although there are various nuances in regard to unimportant details.

Benefits Authorized for Individuals Recalled to Active Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to outline in the paragraphs below the benefits which are presently in force and are available to recalled reservists and National Guardsmen.

Particularly, I have been asked about whether or not wives and families of the men who lost their lives in the tragic plane crash recently are covered. The answer is in the affirmative. They are covered by dependency and indemnity compensation as outlined later in this statement.

Among the benefits available to individuals in the Armed Forces today, and I emphasize particularly those who are being recalled as reservists and members of the National Guard, are the following benefits which are indicated below:

Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act: Default judgment protection, court proceedings postponement, statute of limitation extension, rate of interest limitation, lease termination authorization, dependents eviction prohibition, contract cancellation preclusion, mortgage foreclosure and repossession stay, tax deferment, homesteading rights preservations, guarantee of insurance premium payments.

Aside from the guarantee of $10,000 commercial insurance, this act is administered locally by the courts and a serviceman is well advised to consult an attorney or legal officer of his unit before proceeding under this law.

Reemployment rights: Government and private.

These rights are guaranteed basically under appropriate sections of the Selective Service Act.

Unemployment compensation: Compliance with State laws required.

The rates payable here vary with the States and the various requirements of the individual States must be met.

Federal civil service preference: Appointment and retention.

Peacetime service must have been in campaign or expedition, for which a badge was awarded, or veteran must have service-connected disability.

Social security: Active duty—covered employment.

The basic military pay is the wage base on which the social security taxes are collected.

Disability compensation: Payable to veterans for service-connected disability.

Rates 80 percent of war rates, from $15 to $480 monthly. Full wartime rates, $19 to $600, payable if incurred in extrahazardous service.

Peacetime compensation rates are as indicated below, plus additional amount for dependents if 50 percent or more disabled.

(a) Ten percent disability, $15.
(b) Twenty percent disability, $29.
(c) Thirty percent disability, $44.
(d) Forty percent disability, $58.
(e) Fifty percent disability, $80.
(f) Sixty percent disability, $96.
(g) Seventy percent disability, $112.
(h) Eighty percent disability, $128.
(i) Ninety percent disability, $143.
(j) Total disability, $180.

(k) Anatomical loss, or loss of use of a creative organ, or one foot, or one hand, or both buttocks, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, rates (a) to (j) increased monthly by $38.

Anatomical loss, or loss of use of a creative organ, or one foot, or one hand, or both buttocks, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, in addition to requirement for any of rates in (l) to (n), rate increased monthly for each loss or loss of use by $38. But in no event shall the total payable under subsection (k) exceed $360.

(l) Anatomical loss, or loss of use of both hands, or both feet, or one hand and one foot, or blind both eyes with 5/200 visual acuity or less, or is permanently bedridden or so helpless as to be in need of regular aid and attendance, monthly compensation, $247.

(m) Anatomical loss, or loss of use of two extremities at a level, or with complications, preventing natural elbow or knee action with prosthesis in place or has suffered blindness in both eyes having only light perception, or has suffered blindness in both eyes, rendering him so helpless as to be in need of regular aid and attendance, monthly compensation, $287.

(n) Anatomical loss of two extremities so near shoulder or hip as to prevent use of prosthetic appliance, or suffered anatomical loss of both eyes, monthly compensation, $321.

(o) Suffered disability under conditions which would entitle him to two or more rates in (l) to (n), no condition being considered twice, or suffered total deafness in combination with total blindness with 5/200 visual acuity or less, monthly compensation, $360.

(p) In event disabled person's service-incurred disabilities exceed requirements for any of rates prescribed, Administrator, in his discretion, may allow next higher rate, or intermediate rate, but in no event in excess of $360.

(q) Minimum rate for arrested tuberculosis, $54.

(r) If entitled to compensation under (o), or the maximum rate under (p), and in need of regular aid and attendance, while not hospitalized at Government expense, additional monthly aid and attendance allowance, $120.

(s) If totally disabled and (1) has additional disability independently rated at 60 percent or more, or (2) is permanently housebound, $212.

Dependency and indemnity compensation: Payable to widow, children and parents for service-connected death of veteran. Widow's rate, $112 plus 12 percent of service basic pay—minimum $122 monthly. Other rates vary according to number of children and income of parents.

Medical care: Treatment for service-connected disabilities in any 1 of 171 VA hospitals located in 48 States, and in private hospitals under certain conditions, if serviceman is separated for a service-connected disability or qualifies for compensation. A veteran meeting one of these requirements may also be furnished VA outpatient treatment for a service-connected disability and hospital care for a nonservice-connected condition if a Government bed is available.

Insurance: $10,000 nonparticipating policy available to a service-connected disabled veteran if he applies within 1 year from the date of his service connection.

War orphans' education: Children allowed up to $110 monthly while pursuing higher education—but not to exceed 36 months—if death of the serviceman is direct result of performance of duty, or received while engaged in extrahazardous service during the induction period. The induction period ends when individuals are no longer liable for induction into the Armed Forces under the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

Six-month death gratuity: Paid by service department for any death in service or a service-connected death within 120 days after service. Payable to spouse, children, or, if designated, to parents, brothers or sisters. Amount is six times monthly service pay, but not less than $800 or more than $3,000.

Third Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interesting editorial concerning the third most important job in the Government to be held by Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, which appeared in the Boston Sunday Herald on January 7, 1962:

THIRD MAN

Massachusetts may be losing two seats in the House of Representatives, but it is gaining a Speaker. Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, the present majority leader, is considered a shoo-in for the top House post and the third most important job in the Government when Congress reassembles next week.

The Bay State is proud to have another distinguished son take over the House leadership. This has become a Massachusetts tradition. Our State has already produced more Speakers than any other. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., who served in the Republican 80th and 83d Congresses, was the sixth Bay Stater so honored. Representative MCCORMACK will be the first Democratic Speaker from Massachusetts.

The Herald salutes the speaker-to-be and wishes him well in his new assignment. We have not always agreed with his point of view. His line in the House has tended to be rather New Dealish. But our differences have been friendly, and when the majority leader has rapped our knuckles for such solecisms as calling the House the lower Chamber we have hastened to mend our ways. On measures affecting Massachusetts and New England we have almost always been able to work together.

With a Massachusetts man in the White House and another in the Speaker's chair the country can't go far wrong, particularly since the Speaker is now the third man in the line of succession to the presidency. The soft-spoken, hard-working gentleman from Dorchester has earned the confidence which the House and the country are about to place in him.

The Case for a Tax Deduction for the Disabled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague from New York, the Honorable EUGENE J. KEOGH, is the author of a resolution which would provide a tax deduction for transportation expenses to and from work incurred by disabled and physically handicapped persons. This is a meritorious proposal which I endorse wholeheartedly.

Some months ago, Dr. Howard M. Rusk wrote a very interesting article in the New York Times in which he discussed the Keogh bill and presented a very strong case for the adoption of this measure. I am pleased to insert this article into the RECORD and call it to the attention of all my colleagues, urging their support.

The article reads as follows:

DISABLED AND TAXES—FEDERAL LAWS ARE SAID TO DISCRIMINATE AGAINST EXPENSES OF THE HANDICAPPED

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

As the income tax deadline approaches—this year on April 17—millions of Americans once again grumble as they prepare and file their returns.

This is a normal and understandable human reaction to taxpaying. The 364 other days of the year, most Americans believe the graduated income tax to be the fairest of all tax systems.

There is a group of physically handicapped citizens, however, which has a legitimate complaint that the current Federal tax system discriminates against them. These are the persons with orthopedic disabilities who must incur unusual expenses because of their condition.

Legislation to remedy these inequities has been introduced by Representative EUGENE J. KEOGH, Democrat, of New York, in each Congress since 1956. Unfortunately, like many other measures that seem to have the support of the majority of Americans, the Keogh bill always gets lost in the mass of legislative proposals and ends up in committee.

DEDUCTION ON EXPENSES

The Keogh bill (H. Res. 424) would provide a deduction for transportation expenses

to and from work by disabled persons as business expenses and an exemption of $600 more for a taxpayer or spouse who is physically handicapped.

Disabled taxpayers unable to use public transportation because of their disabilities have consistently been denied deductions for expenses such as cars with special controls or taxis.

The most recent case is that of *James Donnelly v. Commissioner*, 28 TC, No. 150, filed September 30, 1957. The petitioner, who had poliomyelitis in 1916, cannot use public transportation and had claimed that his car, which is equipped with hand controls, should be tax deductible.

In denying the petition, the court said: "* * * We are fully aware of the hardship that may well result from our approval, from the Commissioner's determination, in view of the petitioner's earning power; and substantial medical expenses, both of which are attributable to his poor physical condition. The law does not allow us to make exceptions, even in the most appealing cases."

To permit deductions of extraordinary transportation expenses by the physically handicapped in connection with employment would be consistent with basic income tax principles. These permit other categories of wage earners or the self-employed to deduct certain expenses they incur as essential to their income-producing activities.

There is no doubt that in many instances current tax laws act as a deterrent to employment of the handicapped.

Often the net income after transportation costs to a rehabilitated disabled person who has been placed in employment is actually less than he had been receiving on public assistance.

This writer, for example, knows of an instance in which a disabled worker earns $60 a week but must spend as much as $30 a week in transportation to and from employment.

The second provisions of the Keogh bill would give to the orthopedically disabled individual or spouse the same additional $600 exemption now given the blind. Its purpose would aid those with extraordinary expenses caused by disability that are not related to the production of income.

There is no doubt that severe disability creates extraordinary expenses over and above those that are now deductible as medical expenses.

Some disabled persons, of necessity, must live in ground-floor apartments, which command higher rents. Finding housing without steps and with elevators frequently puts the disabled person in a higher rent bracket. Extra costs are involved in ramps and special household equipment.

Clothing of the disabled is subjected to unusual wear and stress. Many disabled persons require custom-made clothing or alterations on ready-to-wear clothes.

The disabled frequently must employ someone to do household cleaning and minor household repairs.

In many instances, rates for the disabled on all types of insurance are higher.

Because he cannot climb the steps to the balcony, the disabled person must buy the more expensive orchestra seats at theaters and concert halls.

These costs mount up.

Many medical, health, welfare, labor, veteran, and other groups are on record as favoring Mr. KEOGH's proposed legislation.

The disabled are not seeking favoritism or special treatment. All they ask is parity and equity.

Should this bill be enacted, those who would benefit would exercise the same prerogative as all other Americans to grumble on income tax day. It would be a healthy, normal grumble, however, rather than the current justified feeling of discrimination they have under our present tax laws.

The New Frontier and the New Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Michigan Chronicle of Saturday, December 30, 1961.

This is a distinguished weekly newspaper of general circulation within the State of Michigan, and its voice on questions of equality and protection of the basic rights and dignity of American people has always been clear and forthright.

The evaluation of this fine newspaper is a matter of great concern to all Americans, and it is deserving of careful consideration by all.

The article follows:

THE NEW FRONTIER HAS SET THE COURSE FOR THE NEW YEAR

The close of 1961 and the advent of 1962 provide an excellent opportunity for comment on the first year of the New Frontier administration of President John F. Kennedy.

To attempt to describe in detail the areas in which the Kennedy administration has made itself felt would take too much space for an editorial of this kind. We believe an objective appraisal of the first year could well concern itself with the ways in which the influence and prestige of the White House have been used in the creating of a democratic atmosphere in our Nation.

When the Kennedy administration took office at the beginning of the year, the Nation was struggling with massive problems ranging from the cold war and the nuclear threat to the difficulties involved in African nationalism, Castro, and the fight against racial discrimination in the United States. It was widely recognized at the time that one of the major things needed was a positive attitude and philosophy in leadership for dealing with them.

The Presidents' inaugural address made it clear he fully appreciated the magnitude of the problem facing the Nation. His words were designed to awaken all Americans and the world to the seriousness of the challenges which lay before it.

And now almost 12 months later it can be seen that a strong sense of direction has come from the White House. And while many of the problems of a year ago are still very much with us, the President has left no doubt of his intentions to meet them all head on with the full intention of hastening their solution.

It is significant that the administration has recognized the important relationship between our domestic problems and the world problems. The impossibility of developing a sound international policy without at the same time making democracy a reality in our own Nation has been fully realized by the administration.

The first year in the main has been given over to bringing this realization to the American people. The unmistakable positions on civil rights, unemployment, education, and other purely domestic problems have erased all doubts of the determination of the Kennedy administration to work positively for the fulfillment of those facets of the American heritage which will give to all the opportunity to fully contribute to and share in the great bounties of our Nation.

It is further significant that although there have been rough spots in some of these areas, and some have shown more progress than others, none of it has been due to the absence of direction and leadership from the White House and the administration.

The first year in our opinion has laid the ground work for the great tasks which still remain ahead. No easy course or panacea for the problems facing the Nation have been advanced. What has been advanced is a positive attitude with regard to the goals sought, and the sacrifices and hard work which we all can expect in reaching them.

We believe the groundwork has been laid by the administration for a new year which should produce historymaking advances as the result of the groundwork which has been laid.

Democracy and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am indebted to Mr. Arthur De Vincentis, secretary, New Jersey State Bar Association, section on immigration and nationality, for informing me of the activities of his organization in connection with the observance of Citizenship Day on September 17, 1961 and Constitution Week, September 17 through September 24, 1961. Mr. De Vincentis' account follows together with the thoughtful address entitled "Democracy and Freedom" delivered by Mr. Amerigo D'Agostino at the ceremonies on September 25.

Mr. E. P. Bouchard, district director of immigration and nationalization for the State of New Jersey, initially aroused the interest of the New Jersey State Bar Association in the observation of Citizenship Day and Constitution Week when he invited Dougls M. Hicks, Esq., its president, to participate in the appropriate ceremonies throughout the State of New Jersey. Mr. Hicks assigned the responsibility to our section, and with the enthusiastic cooperation from Mr. Bouchard and a goodly number of the county bar association presidents, appropriate ceremonies were arranged in most of the county courthouses at Newark, N.J.

On Monday, September 18, 1961, at 10 a.m. our section conducted a Citizenship Day ceremony in the Essex County Courthouse, Superior Court Judge Alexander P. Waugh presiding. Our section chairman, I. Arthur Levy, Esq., and Mr. E. P. Bouchard made appropriate remarks.

On September 25, 1961, at 10 a.m. a Citizenship Day ceremony was conducted in the U.S. District Court, Federal Building, Newark, N.J., U.S. Circuit Court Judge William A. Smith presiding, accompanied by Federal Judges Reynier J. Wortendyke, Jr., and Richard Hartshorne. U.S. District Attorney David M. Satz, Jr., and Mr. Bouchard made a few remarks and the principal Citizenship Day address was delivered by our section

first vice chairman, Amerigo D'Agostino. A copy of his address is attached.

I think the person who should be commended is Mr. E. P. Bouchard, district director of immigration and nationalization for the State of New Jersey for his efforts in arousing the interest of the civic, educational, and legal organizations in the State of New Jersey in the observation of Citizenship Day and Constitution Week in 1961. I am sure you are pleased to learn that Citizenship Day and Constitution Week was appropriately observed in your congressional district and we are very glad to have been of some assistance to Mr. Bouchard in the accomplishment of his worthy effort.

The aforementioned address follows:

DEMOCRACY AND FREEDOM

(Address by Amerigo D'Agostino, Esq.)

I am called upon to speak with you today on the celebration of Constitution Week, as proclaimed by the Governor of this State.

It is not difficult for troubled people to speak. The history of yesterday gives me courage to learn today; but today, I wonder upon the future of tomorrow. I am troubled because I think our country may be in danger.

Celebrations like this, should no longer serve to bring our citizens together to indulge in pleasant dreams of things past, or sing platitudes that cushion and dull the mind.

As these chambers are a forum of justice under law, so should meetings such as this be centers for conversations upon our freedom, upon our constitutional democracy.

By justice under law; we mean the recognition of equal claims of all people. By freedom; we mean the right to define the word according to our conception without infringing justice.

Our Constitution has given us the ideal compromise between justice and freedom; justice to secure opportunities and freedom, for the use made of opportunity.

As justice guards the external conditions of a good life, freedom guarantees the personal pursuit of happiness.

The definition of freedom in the conversation of free men is the right to make one's own definition. To say that freedom is what we say it is, is freedom itself, unencumbered by party line or dictated by the monolog of the tyrant.

It is a historical fact that the gifts of freedom come only to those who join in controlling the restless forces of decay and decline.

Our Constitution is a statement of the law of reason that must govern the conversation of freemen. Have we not as freemen conversed and lived; alone and among nations, in deeds, in ideas and events to establish the rule of democracy and the sovereignty of truth?

This conversation of freemen never ends; in deeds, in ideas and events, in the language of a heritage that proclaims to us our debt to the past and our obligation to the future.

This heritage endows as well as demands. It has endowed us with a civilization with roots from all of the Western World. It demands that we now learn its final teaching; that the ordeal of freedom shall not find defeat in our weaknesses at home, abroad, or in outer space.

The weaknesses of caution, convention, and predictability lie sprawled fat and flabby—asleep—at the crossroads of the space age. The decline and fall of a civilization has never been an act of destiny.

Are we where we are because the problems we face today are more difficult than we thought and our resources more modest than we assumed?

Yes, America is on trial in your heart and in your mind; everywhere. We are undergoing new trials for truth, patience, and intelligence. No power of wealth or weapon can long fill the need and want of freedom.

We must conquer our weaknesses by understanding the dialogue of democracy—spoken between the state and the people. We must also understand the monologue of tyranny; the state speaking alone, that also needs and covets the allegiance of the people, no less.

We spoke of the conversation of men and the dialogue of democracy and we ponder upon some probable failings.

Have we reveled in oversimplification and placed too great a reliance on things economic?

Have we lost our true sense of history or our poise in national conduct?

Do we fret and vacillate before each difficult decision?

To speak of the glories of our immediate past would be like tucking you in, in a bed of quilts floating down to a dangerous waterfall.

To speak in comfortable terms, with easy-going words full of accepted meanings would be like offering pies-in-the-sky.

I cannot; because our country, our freedom, our democracy, may be in danger. I cannot; because we need to mobilize our minds and spirits to reevaluate our present needs and plot our future hopes. Time is running out.

We must seek within and among ourselves new meanings, new values, and new courage, with which to arm and fortify new decisions and see to it that freedom shall not perish from this planet.

Among ourselves the age of enlightened self-interest is dead. It was a selfish era. It dulled our senses, disturbed our moralities, tarnished our dignity.

This new age demands that we enter into a new dialogue of democracy and speak and listen and act—not falteringly at the polls—not hesitantly in public life—not hermetically sealed in an illusory vacuum of material success and immaterial security. It demands that our voices ring out loud and clear above the indecisions of partisan and bipartisan complacency. It demands new convictions based upon the ideas of our fathers and the hopes of our children.

Our Constitution is the testament of our ancestors as well as the prophecy of things to come. We, the heirs, have accepted the gifts it has given us but with it we have pledged the most solemn responsibility to make the prophecy come true—the prophecy of peace and freedom for all mankind.

Hon. John W. McCormack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, it was with great pleasure that I cast my vote for the gentleman from Massachusetts to serve as Speaker of the House of Representatives.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK has come to the Speaker's chair after 21 years of outstanding service as majority leader and a 33-year progressive record as a legislator. This is an impressive record of devotion to his country.

There is no one more qualified than he to hold the high position of Speaker; his character, intellect, legislative experience, his proven ability as a strong and helpful leader, admirably fit him for the arduous duties ahead. The office of Speaker is one of great power and responsibilities. We have complete confidence that JOHN MCCORMACK will discharge his duties as Speaker with the wisdom, integrity, impartiality, and true statesmanship which have endeared him to us in the past. His serious devotion to duty in behalf of his Nation and his community has long been heralded.

Ever since coming to Congress, I have found JOHN MCCORMACK to be a true friend; I shall always be grateful for his many courtesies and his assistance.

I consider it an honor to join with my colleagues in extending to our distinguished Speaker heartfelt congratulations and best wishes for many years of success and happiness in the high office he now holds. In these days of crises, the people of our Nation, and we, as Members of the House of Representatives, are fortunate to have him guide and help us preserve our freedom and meet our responsibilities to our country.

Rayburn, of Texas: A Big Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during Speaker SAM RAYBURN's political career, many of our great political writers and analysts wrote articles on this great man—some complimentary and some critical. But there was always one count on which they agreed, and that was that he was a great man and a big man.

During the critical illness of Mr. RAYBURN, Mr. William S. White wrote an article for the November 3 issue of the Evening Star, which I commend to the Members of this body:

RAYBURN, OF TEXAS: A BIG MAN

(By William S. White)

In his own full knowledge and by his own unterrified command, Speaker SAM RAYBURN has gone home, gone home for the last time.

From the big, glittering hospital in big Dallas they have taken him back to die of ravaging cancer in the quiet, wind-blown town of Bonham in the autumn of the 80th year of a life lived in memorably able and grumpily gallant service to the United States of America.

Because I have had the unforgettable honor to be his intimate friend for nearly 30 years, and because I have never found it possible to speak publicly of any still living man as though he lay already dead, I have not before this wished to write of the imminent departure forever of RAYBURN, of Texas.

RECOGNIZES END IS NEAR

But RAYBURN, of Texas, himself, has ended any possible need for such a reticence. He has calmly recognized that the dark wings are hovering very close over him. And, hav-

ing recognized as much, he has plainly said as much; or rather he has caused it to be said for him.

This he has done, I am entirely sure, because all his life he has loved candor, even hard candor, and because all his life he has not liked those soft, careful evasions so common to many of our public men. He has recognized that even in the last moments of life he has the harsh obligation which lies upon all highly placed and amply honored men not to be behindhand in surrendering the power and the glory when the time for that surrender has come.

He is making it decently possible for all those who must now bear the responsibility of choosing his successor as Speaker—the leaders in his House of Representatives, the President, and all manner of party captains and kings—to get about the somber but necessary task of preparing the succession.

For—and let no one suppose otherwise—the coming death of RAYBURN, of Texas, carries within it a national political crisis. It is said that no man is indispensable; but this man is, and long has been, or very nearly so. In the true sense, he has for nearly three decades been "Mr. Democrat." But he has also been the irreplaceable bridge, the vital cement, between all the contending wings of that Democratic Party which now bears all ultimate responsibility for the Government of the United States.

It is not simply that the whole complex of national legislation for these 30 years bears more of his imprint than that of any other man, living or dead. For this man has literally embodied much of all that is best in our national politics: An invariable public and private sense of honor and of deep responsibility; a wry, rough, generosity always carefully hidden; a compassion for all mankind never candied over with dripping sugar.

I do not suggest that RAYBURN, of Texas, was always "right" politically; for only little men must always and eternally be "right." He never wanted, nor respected, such uncritical, such jumping-up-and-down, admiration.

NO PETTY ATTACKS

He was a stout, partisan Democrat; but he never learned to hate in a partisan way. The best measure of him as a politician that I know is this: He never could stomach petty atacks on any President of the United States, in whatever party. And inconceivable always to him was the littleness of many in attacking any President—Wilson, Hoover, Truman, Eisenhower, or Kennedy—in matters beyond the borders of the United States.

He was a great politician, yes. But, far better, he was a great man. In 30 years I never saw in him the smallest trace of smallness. So he was also more than a great man. He was a big man. And that is the best and truest of all possible epitaphs, of all possible farewells, to RAYBURN, of Texas.

A Guideline in Prayer by Rev. Peter Marshall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent granted me heretofore so to do, I respectfully set forth the text of a prayer given in the U.S. Senate when he was Chaplain of that body by Rev. Peter Marshall, a short time before his untimely decease.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the basic thinking of this humble utterance by Rev. Peter Marshall would not be found amiss as we begin this 2d session of this great 87th Congress:

O God, our Father, let us not be content to wait and see what will happen, but give us the determination to make the right things happen. While time is running out, save us from patience which is akin to cowardice. Give us the courage to be either hot or cold, to stand for something, lest we fall for anything. In Jesus' name. Amen.

AFL-CIO Resolution on Equal Representation in Our Legislatures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, at the AFL-CIO convention in Miami Beach in December the prominent labor leader, Mr. Jacob Potofsky, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, introduced a resolution which deserves the attention of all Members of Congress. Mr. Potofsky submitted this resolution as chairman of a special subcommittee at the convention which looked into the problem of unequal representation in Congress and in the State legislatures. The resolution was approved by the AFL-CIO convention.

The resolution points out that the United States is today primarily an urban nation, where 7 out of 10 Americans live in urban areas, but our State legislatures are still rurally dominated and many discrepancies exist in our congressional representation. In fact, after noting some of the discrepancies, such as differences in population size of congressional districts, their grotesque geographic makeup, and redistricting which discriminates against urban population, the Potofsky resolution states:

Thus, the House of Representatives as it is constituted today, fails to be truly representative of the people, in violation of the clear intent of the Constitution.

The resolution maintains that this problem must be dealt with on a national scale through the enactment of legislation. It urges early action on a bill by our distinguished colleague, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, whose bill H.R. 4068 requires the establishment of Congressional districts which are composed of contiguous and compact territory.

Mr. Potofsky and the AFL-CIO deserve to be commended for this resolution and its objectives. He is rendering a real service to the Nation in fighting for more democratic representation for the people. In this way Mr. Potofsky shows that he is not only a distinguished labor leader, but also an alert citizen and a leading American who places the interests of the people uppermost in his mind and heart. I want to take this opportunity to extend to him my sincerest congratulations and best wishes.

Mr. Speaker, the full text of the resolution follows:

UNEQUAL REPRESENTATION IN STATE LEGISLATURES AND IN THE U.S. CONGRESS

Today, millions of Americans are being deprived of their proper voice in government. Every year that Congress and the State legislatures fail to act, fewer and fewer citizens exert more and more weight at the polls. Conversely, more and more citizens exert less and less weight in the selection of those who govern them. This is true in both the State legislatures and in the U.S. House of Representatives.

The United States has become an urban nation. Seven out of ten Americans now live in metropolitan areas. Yet the residents of the cities and their suburban communities are grossly underrepresented in their State legislatures and, all too often, in the House of Representatives.

The problem of congressional apportionment and districting is one that has been with Congress for many years, actually since the formation of the Union.

Prior to 1929 almost all earlier acts, starting from 1842, required congressional districts to conform to certain standards, particularly compactness and reasonable equality of population. Under the terms of the Automatic Apportionment Act of 1929, however, those standards are no longer required.

As a result, congressional districts range in population from 226,000 in Alaska's single district to over 2½ million in Connecticut's Sixth at-Large District. Looking at some individual States, Texas' smallest district has 216,000 residents, while its largest has over 950,000; Michigan's smallest district has less than 180,000—its largest over 800,000.

Furthermore, the rurally dominated State legislatures that are responsible for congressional redistricting consistently discriminate against the increasing urban population. Moreover, in order to favor one political party or the other, districts are created that are geographically grotesque. Their gerrymandered boundaries follow no reasonable course, but are designed to encompass the party faithful, carefuly avoiding the opposition and the independents.

Thus, the House of Representatives as it is constituted today, fails to be truly representative of the people, in violation of the clear intent of the Constitution.

Of even greater detriment to the American public is the disgraceful malapportionment of our State legislatures, as a consequence of which the urban population is being cheated out of proper representation in our State governments.

In virtually every State, districts representing a decided minority of the population control a majority of the seats in the legislature. Thus the concept of one man, one vote—a concept inherent in the Constitution—is being flagrantly violated. One of the faults lies in the refusal of State legislatures to periodically redistrict even though most State constitutions specifically mandate it. As a consequence, some legislatures actually are controlled by representatives elected by as little as 15 percent of the population.

Representative government requires the election of lawmakers who are responsive to the will of the majority. Minority rule not only vitiates the democratic processes, it frustrates the moral obligation to legislate in the interest of all of the people.

In almost all States the long effort to correct the glaring inequities in representation has met with little success. It is now evident that, unless the problem is recognized as one that is national in scope, rural mi-

norities will continue their stranglehold over the legislatures of the States. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That, if there is to be an effective remedy for the disease of malapportionment of congressional and State legislative districts, it must be a national remedy.

Clearly, the excesses of State legislatures in gerrymandering congressional districts and in failing to redistrict their own is a violation of the Constitution, and the people have the right to expect recourse from the Federal courts.

What is more, the Congress itself can and must act to insure proper representation in that body. For years it has had before it a bill by Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, to require geographically compact congressional districts of reasonably equal population, enforcible by the Federal courts. It is high time this bill be passed.

With leadership from the President, support by the Congress and in the courts, and with the insistent demand of the people, the ancient disease of unrepresentative government which mars our Federal and State lawmaking bodies can be ended.

The AFL-CIO will utilize all its resources in the effort to achieve this proper purpose.

A Banker Looks at Foregn Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, our foreign aid program is a new horizon in the search for security in our time. Freedom is threatened around the globe and this is one of the ways that the peril which we see looming may be averted. After our own defense structure, our second most powerful weapon in this struggle is our program of foreign assistance. Few individuals are better qualified to explain the importance of a sound foreign aid program than Eugene R. Black, President of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. He stressed the importance of the quality rather than the quantity of our aid program in a speech made before the New York group of the Investment Bankers Association of America at its annual dinner meeting at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York on October 4, 1961, and titled, "A Banker Looks at Foreign Aid." As individuals and as groups we must realize the stake that we have in this effort. I therefore include Mr. Black's speech in the Appendix of the RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

A BANKER LOOKS AT FOREIGN AID

(Address by Eugene R. Black)

I am delighted to be here with you tonight. In a very real sense I feel that I have come home. When I left here almost 15 years ago for Washington, it was your support which was my greatest ally in helping to mold the World Bank into what it is today. And though I have had to travel much and have come to know well many parts of the world, it is always Wall Street to which I am drawn again by will and inclination.

Yet I would certainly not have wanted to miss the privilege that has been mine during these past 15 years of participating in the exciting, frustrating, perplexing—and yet infinitely hopeful—business of helping to build up the economies of less developed countries around the world. And it is about this experience, and about some of the lessons concerning foreign aid that I have drawn from it, that I want to speak with you tonight.

For I am convinced that foreign aid is the concern of Wall Street as much as it is the concern of Washington and that there is a great deal that you, as financial and business leaders of America, can and should do about it.

I suspect that I have not selected a very popular subject for my talk. The United States' effort in the underdeveloped countries has left all of us, in greater or less degree, uncomfortable about this foreign aid business—and for good reasons. The foreign aid program has been muddled and confused in its objectives, often mediocre in its administration. Much of the resistance and outright hostility which the executive presentation of the foreign aid budget has encountered year after year, whatever the political persuasion of the congressional majority, is attributable to impatience with the operational weaknesses and administrative failures which have characterized the program in the past. We have been sold foreign aid as an emergency measure to stop communism, as a necessary tool to make friends and influence people in the underdeveloped world, as a must to expand our export trade. Yet none of these so-called objectives has been achieved. Soviet influence remains at high tide; our dispensations of money have won us neither gratitude nor affection, but more often grumbling dissatisfaction; and our balance of payments position has worsened, not improved.

Yet despite what may seem a pretty disheartening record, I want to advance to you, and with conviction, the following propositions:

First, that foreign aid, properly conceived, is a vitally essential element of our national policy—not for the shrill, short-term reasons usually advanced, but for the longer-range objective of building the kind of sound world economy and society which alone will let us fulfill our own national aspirations.

Second, that we can only achieve the real objective of our foreign aid program if emphasis is put, not on the quantity of money provided, but on the quality of the investment made with that money—on the amount of effective development which foreign aid funds buy or induce.

And finally, I want to suggest that the financial and business leaders of this country have a much greater role to play in making our foreign aid program effective than has ever been appreciated in Washington or has yet been generally recognized by you.

Let me start with the basic question of why foreign aid at all—why you and I should support and not oppose it. Foreign aid has been sold—oversold, I believe—largely as a necessary weapon of the cold war.

Indeed, there seems an almost direct relationship between the congressional fortunes of the various aid proposals over recent years and the violence of Soviet threats at the time. That there is a connection between the need for economic growth and the cold war is, of course, true: to the extent that the peoples of the less developed areas are better housed, better fed, better clothed—to the extent that they can see some prospect of improving their low standards of living—their loyalty to their own institutions will be strengthened and they will be less susceptible to the insidious sales pitch of communism. But we mustn't make the mistake of thinking that by helping to finance their economic growth we can buy the loyalty or friendship of the less developed countries—or their vote in the United Nations. They are too independent and too proud for that.

Nor must we make the mistake of thinking that foreign aid will buy us popularity. If we are out to be popular—if we aren't thick-skinned enough to hear, without rancor, criticism from those to whom we have extended aid—we had better get out of this business. And we had better get out of it, too, if we are going to consider every temporary advance of communism a defeat for our program.

But if we ever did cut out or cut down on our foreign aid for any such reason, it would be more than the loss of a battle in our struggle with Russia—it would be a defeat for the affirmative objectives of our national policy quite apart from the cold war. Indeed, if the Communist conspiracy should be totally defeated tomorrow, foreign aid to the underdeveloped world would remain, I suggest, an imperative of our time.

There are a number of reasons why this is so. For one thing, there are humanitarian and moral considerations behind our aid. We are moved by a concern for the welfare of others, by an impulse to help those who are engaged in a struggle against poverty, disease and ignorance. We need not and should not be ashamed to recognize and indeed to proclaim this reason for our foreign aid; generosity to less fortunate peoples is an aspect of our national tradition of which we can justifiably be proud.

There are economic considerations behind the program of considerable importance to our own welfare. The only effective way to assure sources of supply for the basic raw materials we need, the only effective way to assure expanding markets for the products of our industries, is to help other countries to achieve and maintain self-sustaining economic growth.

But important and valid as these humanitarian and economic considerations are, I suggest that there are reasons for foreign aid far more compelling, far more basic, than these. We discovered many years ago in our own society that growth based on a prosperous few and an impoverished many was neither healthy nor enduring, that our Nation's system of free enterprise could expand and grow strong over the long pull only by opening opportunities to the people at large and thereby releasing their energies and initiative. This has been reflected in many different ways—in our public education and public health systems, in our fiscal regime, in our slum clearance and urban renewal programs, in our encouragement of agriculture, and so on.

Every consideration of policy which dictated our national program is reproduced on the world scene, and the world today is smaller in many ways than was the United States when these national programs were first started. The industrial countries cannot count on remaining, for long, isolated islands of prosperity. Certainly, as I have already commented, their industries cannot achieve their long-range potentialities except as they build up the markets waiting to be developed in the economically backward countries. And, even more certainly, they cannot count on the political stability they need so long as great parts of the world are smoldering with the discontent born of poverty unrelieved by hope.

The only answer I know to all this is somehow to give the peoples of the underdeveloped world the opportunity, the means, and the incentive, to produce more. That is the simple meaning of all the high-flown talk about economic development. This is the essential objective of foreign aid, to enable the impoverished peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America to improve their own lot by growing more crops, extracting more minerals, manufacturing more industrial products, so that they can enjoy a better standard of living and higher standards of edu-

cation, thus giving their children greater opportunities than they themselves have known.

I have stated the objective in simple terms, but achieving the vast increases in production that are necessary is an infinitely complicated task. It is not just a matter of building factories, it is first a matter of educating and training people equipped to manage and operate such factories.

It is not just a matter of providing better seed and more fertilizer for the farmers; one must first give the farmers incentive, and put them in a position to use modern tools effectively. This means, among other things, providing adequate agricultural credit and extension services, and reforming antiquated systems of land tenure.

It is not just a matter of building new roads—it is equally a matter of organizing an efficient highway department to maintain the roads once they are built. It is not just a matter of constructing new powerplants—it is equally a matter of assuring that the power industry will be strong and solvent.

To achieve the necessary production increases, in short, requires changes, and sometimes revolutionary changes, not only across the whole broad front of economic life, but also in many aspects of the social structure.

This is all familiar to us in the United States. Our production has been our strength. The broad diffusion of its rewards among all our people has been the main source of both our economic growth and our political stability. The challenge to us now is to help get the same process going in the backward areas of the world. And foreign aid—financial and technical—is our means for doing this.

That brings me right to my second proposition—that the proper measure of our foreign aid is not the amount of money we make available, but the amount of effective development which our foreign aid funds buy or induce. We should be concerned more with quality than with quantity. Money provided to the underdeveloped countries buys nothing lasting except as it is productively invested either in additional physical facilities or, even more important, in the improvement of human resources. That's why I get so impatient with theoretical global estimates of the amount of external capital needed to bring about development at some given rates. What X millions of dollars will accomplish in countries like India, for example, with well prepared projects, a good level of administrative capacity both in government and in the private sector, and with political and monetary stability, is one thing. What the same amount of money will acomplish in another type of country—of which there are many—with no program, few projects, and a very thin layer of administrative competence, is quite a different thing. Both types of country need help—but help differently fashioned to meet their different needs and in amounts which differ in accordance with their capacity to undertake effective investment.

On this aspect of foreign aid, action is called for by both the recipient and aid-giving countries. The recipient countries need to work out national development programs which reflect a rational determination of investment priorities and, even more important, to translate those programs into specific projects ready for execution. In this task, foreign technical advice can be extremely useful, and is often absolutely necessary.

Equally, the aid-giving countries need to confine their help to sound projects which meet a real developmental need—and not to waste it, either to meet political pressures within the underdeveloped country (as in the case of the Soviet rubles used to pave the streets of Kabul) or else to promote the short-term trade interests of their own exporters. When loans are made for projects that are ill conceived or of low priority simply in order to facilitate the sale of equipment for those projects, the cause of development is retarded, not advanced.

Again, when in response to political pressures, foreign aid is made available to countries which are not effectively mobilizing their own resources—countries, for example, which fail to bring inflationary pressures under control or which fail to tax their citizens effectively—the result is often to enable the recipient government to put off the day for taking the necessary domestic action—again retarding, not advancing, the cause of development.

It isn't foreign aid itself, therefore, that is important—it's only the extent to which that foreign aid brings about sound investment. That's why I say to you that we must stress the quality, not just the quantity, of our foreign aid.

And that's where you come in. What I have described as essential in the administration of foreign aid is, after all, nothing more than the standards which you, as investment bankers, are accustomed to apply in the practice of your profession. You know the value of productive investment; you know the importance of assuring the best use of available resources; you know the dangers of lending without considering the technical merits of the project and whether it will result in a marketable product; you know that each client has his own peculiarities and capabilities and that the amount and terms of the financing you provide must take appropriate account of the borrower as well as of the project.

As Americans, you have, I believe, an obligation to support the general concept of foreign aid. But as bankers, you have a special and affirmative obligation to see to it that that concept is translated into a program so framed and so administered that it produces results. It's easy to sit on the sidelines and carp about waste, mismanagement, money down the drain, and the like, but that doesn't help. What the program needs is not more derogatory cliches, but the very kind of informed criticism and discriminating support which you of all groups in the country are in the best position to provide.

There is still a reasonable chance of getting a sound foreign-aid program underway. The concepts and principles underlying the new foreign-aid legislation are a big step in the right direction; financing in the context of carefully considered development programs, rather than for a series of isolated, unrelated projects; long-term planning and commitment of funds; special concern for countries prepared to mobilize their own resources effectively and to carry out necessary internal reforms; and administrative responsibility entrusted to a single aid agency established at an appropriately high level and as an integral part of Government. The targets of the program will not be easy to achieve and, in actual administration, realistic compromises will sometimes have to be made. But given the understanding support, the friendly but firm criticism of groups such as this, I feel confident that the program can be kept headed in the right direction.

But let me say again in conclusion, as I said at the start, that your support will be effective only if and to the extent that you emphasize the right issues.

We must stop asking whether foreign aid is really winning us popularity and ask whether it's really buying us development.

We must stop worrying every time the Soviets extend development assistance to one of the underdeveloped countries and concentrate instead on whether our own programs are being effectively carried out. For this development business is our game and our heritage, and not Khrushchev's or that of the Soviets.

It is our heritage which has demonstrated to the peoples of the underdeveloped world that there is an alternative to abject poverty.

It is our heritage which introduced the radical idea of self-determination and national independence.

It is our heritage which has shown the way to mass consumption and to the widest participation in the fruits of economic progress.

It is our heritage which, by giving impetus to this whole revolutionary business of development, has carried a message of hope to human beings the world over.

So let's play the game with good heart and cool head. Let's play it with vigor but without panic. Surely, we need not fear to lose if we only play it well.

Twenty Years Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial commemorating the 20th anniversary of Pearl Harbor, which appeared in the National Tribune on December 7, 1961:

TWENTY YEARS AGO

It was 20 years ago today that the bombs fell on Pearl Harbor and an astounded American populace was driven into the realization that we were at war with the Japanese Empire.

In the sneak attack which occurred in the morning hours of December 7, 1941, the Japanese were successful beyond their highest dreams in smashing a great percentage of the firstline naval might of the United States in the Pacific. When the smoke of battle had cleared and the Japanese bombers had taken off for their bases in the Marshall Islands, a checkup showed that 18 Navy ships had been sunk during the attack. Eight were battleships, all that were in the Pacific. Some 2,400 Americans were killed.

Fortunately the airplane carriers based at Pearl Harbor were that day out on maneuvers and thus were spared to head up the mighty flotilla that within 12 months' time this country was able to send to the Pacific and begin the hard, tortuous road toward final victory.

It is difficult to realize that today, after a lapse of 20 years, Japan is one of our stanchest allies in the Far East and serves as a stalwart barrier to the inroads of Communist activity in that section of the world. Nor could few comprehend that in Europe the German people would be alined on the side of the United States in its effort to beat back the Soviet menace on that continent.

Historians are agreed that much of the damage and loss of life could have been averted in Hawaii had there been some method of communication between the commander of the naval forces and the commanding general of the Army in that area.

Ample warning had been given that the Japs were massing for an attack of some description but unfortunately, again through lack of cooperation and communication there was no coordinated plan of action.

Some experts in this country are fearful that the disaster at Pearl Harbor might again be repeated. They claim that at the present time there is a distinct lack of cohesion and cooperation between the var-

ious branches of the armed services. If such is the case remedial steps should be taken immediately. If the Secretary of Defense finds that it is necessary to knock some heads together in order to safeguard the security of this Nation, the American people will applaud such action.

President Franklin Delano Roosevelt termed December 7 "a day that will live in infamy." We can make certain that no such similar incident ever again takes place.

Observance of the Republic of Latvia Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement issued by the Latvian-Americans of Metropolitan Detroit, assembled at the Detroit Institute of Arts on the 19th day of November 1961, to commemorate the 43d anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Latvia.

It is fitting, indeed, that the United States should remember with sadness and renewed dedication, the lost liberty of the people of Latvia and of other captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

I hope all will read this moving statement and will rededicate themselves to restoring liberty, not only throughout this land, but throughout the world.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF LATVIAN-AMERICANS OF METROPOLITAN DETROIT

1. As we pause today to observe the 43d anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Latvia, we again thank the U.S. Government for refusing to recognize the forcible seizure by the Soviet Union of the Baltic States of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania. We urge that this policy be continued.

2. At this time when many peoples in Africa and Asia are receiving their freedom, it would be well to remember that the Soviet Union has enslaved whole nations and peoples but at the same time attacks the free world as colonial powers.

As Latvians who witnessed Soviet occupation of our country we know the true meaning of Communist greed and hatred of freedom in any form.

3. The naked face of Communist brutality and terror has been exposed for the whole world to see in the recent H-bomb tests the Soviet Union has been carrying out. Their sole motive is to blackmail and terrorize the world into surrendering.

After all these years, and repeated examples of Soviet viciousness, the world is only now coming to realize the true motives of the Communists—world domination and oppression.

4. History has shown that large countries gain only perhaps a brief respite in a struggle by bartering small nations as if they were a commodity to be sold, but in the long run the big powers lose morally and then physically. Nations are people and can't be sold in the international marketplace. To this respect the West's record is not clean. The history of World War II with its Yaltas, Teherans, and Potsdams prove this. The damage has been done in most areas of Eastern Europe and in major portions of Asia. However, it is not too late for the West to once again assert its moral leadership, to its own people, as well as the captive nations, by reaffirming its will to resist communism and to repair the damage done to the helpless people by Western inaction and acquiescence in Communist plans that aim at international slavery.

5. If there are to be any negotiations with the Soviet Union, the free world should constantly remind the Communists and neutral States of their opposition to the subjugation of the Baltic States and press for their liberation. There can be no peace in the world unless the principle of self-determination is applied universally for the small states as well as the large.

6. In this connection the world should be reminded that failure to apply the principle of self-determination has put in power Red party functionairies such as Khrushchev who represent only themselves and not the people they rule with an iron fist.

7. Despite 21 years of Communist persecution, the continued deportations, attempted extinction of the church and peoples national heritage, the Latvians still proudly hold their head high and look to the day when they will be free again. They see the United States their only hope. This country must not fail them.

8. This statement is the expression of the entire Latvian-American community of Metropolitan Detroit and this assemblage directs that copies of this statement to be sent to the President of the United States, Secretary of State, the U.S. delegation to the United Nations, Senators and Congressmen from Michigan, Governor of the State of Michigan, and mayor of the city of Detroit.

Walter Hornaday on Sam Rayburn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for many years a figure almost as familiar on Capitol Hill as Speaker RAYBURN was Mr. Walter Hornaday, Washington correspondent for the Dallas Morning News. Following Mr. RAYBURN's death, Mr. Hornaday, now retired, was asked by the News to write an article on his association with the Speaker.

Mr. Hornaday's frank portrayal of Speaker RAYBURN shows him as a man of strong convictions and deep integrity.

The article follows:

[From the Dallas Morning News, Nov. 18, 1961]

CORRESPONDENT RECALLS RAYBURN PRESS SESSIONS

(By Walter C. Hornaday)

AUSTIN, TEX.—For more than 15 years, it was my good fortune to have almost daily contact with SAM RAYBURN while Congress was in session.

During that time I was the Washington correspondent of the Dallas Morning News and the Speaker was an important news source.

On the days that the House met, the Speaker would receive the press in his office just off the House floor. The press sessions were supposed to start 15 minutes before the House convened, but the newsmen considered themselves lucky if they had 5 minutes with Mr. RAYBURN. More often the time left for questioning would be 2, 3, even 1 minute.

It was remarkable the amount of information the Speaker could impart in these brief press conferences.

When Mr. RAYBURN had no news, the meetings with the reporters might become a pleasant discussion of the crop and weather situation in Fannin County or some reminiscing on his part.

Everything was off the record unless indicated otherwise. "In the room" was the way the Speaker expressed it. And woe to anyone who violated this rule.

There were times when Mr. RAYBURN would be so tied up he would cancel his meeting with the press. More than once it was because some folk from back home had called. His constituents had the right of way into his office. Even important Congressmen were kept cooling their heels while the Speaker chatted with hometown friends.

Mr. RAYBURN heartily disliked the Dallas News because of its editorial policy and its sometimes critical comments about his own views and acts. He was always pleased when nice things were said about him but couldn't forget the unfavorable editorials. He didn't extend to me personally his attitude toward the newspaper I represented and went out of his way to so inform me.

His comments about the News and me would be made when I would drop by for a chat. Saturday morning, after he had finished his mail, was the best time for an uninterrupted visit during the cold months. During good weather of spring and fall he would most likely be fishing on Saturday.

The Speaker was a kind man, but he had his hearty hates that persisted underneath even when political circumstances forced him to deal with those he considered his enemies. To close friends, he didn't hesitate to voice his feelings about persons on his blacklist in positive and colorful terms.

In spite of long years of political life, Mr. RAYBURN retained some of the countryman's suspicions of new faces. He was friendly enough to all he met for the first time, but newcomers had to undergo a testing period before being accepted even to the outmost approaches of the inner circle.

He was a reserved person. He had strict ideas about what was personal and private business and didn't want anyone encroaching on that area.

For some reason, Mr. RAYBURN and I hit it off almost from the start. We had only one serious personal disagreement that I can recall and that difference caused no rift in our relations.

Some years ago while the News' Washington correspondent, I learned that the Speaker had personally appeared before the Democratic Committee on Committees, composed of Democrats in the House, to oppose a Texan for a committee vacancy. The Member had the necessary seniority but Mr. RAYBURN thought his views were too far out of line from the party's and his own.

After I had verified the report, I asked the Speaker about the matter. Our conversation occurred in the Speaker's lobby of the House, where accredited newspaper reporters are privileged to enter and call Members from the floor.

My questions immediately aroused his ire. He informed me in a firm rather loud voice, for him, that I should not write that story. He said that if I did I would never receive another piece of information from him.

While other passing Congressmen and newsmen turned to watch curiously, I reminded the Speaker that he had told me that if I ever wanted correct information on matters involving him, to come to him for it. This I was doing, I explained.

My job, I continued, was to find and write the news. I was trying to get through to him that my integrity as a newspaperman was involved, hoping he would understand

my viewpoint. I believe he caught the point, although he never did come out and say so.

Anyway, I wrote about the Texas Congressman being blocked and RAYBURN's part in it. I sent a copy to Mr. RAYBURN. When I next saw him he told me the story was all right, that he could not object to the way I had handled it.

This incident, I believed, helped me earn Mr. RAYBURN's respect and contributed to our friendship.

I have known many men in public life during my long years as a newspaper reporter, particularly as a writer of politics. Of them all, none has had the respect and admiration that I hold for SAM RAYBURN.

Foreign Trade Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I enclose herewith a letter to the President of the United States which was written by Mr. E. B. Shaw, president of the American Thread Co., pertaining to the foreign trade issue.

The letter follows:

THE AMERICAN THREAD CO.,
New York, N.Y., December 11, 1961.

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR PRESIDENT KENNEDY: Your addresses before the National Association of Manufacturers and AFL–CIO conventions last week offered concepts of foreign trade that I am certain are heartening to our friends overseas. Certainly they are challenging to us here at home.

If your discussion was general and tended to emphasize the more attractive features of your forthcoming proposal, this undoubtedly can be attributed to the demands of present international conditions.

Nonetheless, it is fair, I think, to say that both of these presentations (as well as others being made by your aids) leave several aspects of your program still largely undefined. These apsects, as I am sure you recognize, while less appealing than others, do nonetheless form essential elements to your proposal.

Perhaps I don't have to explain that we in American Thread are interested parties in any discussion of foreign trade. Obviously, much is at stake for us, as for all industry in this country whose future is threatened by foreign competition. On behalf of our 4,500 employees and others with whom we are closely associated, customers, vendors, and neighbors, I respectfully suggest that these other less appealing considerations receive an early and thorough public review. I make this suggestion in order that Congress and the people of our country may be enabled to reach an intelligent decision on this formidable foreign trade issue.

Understandably, the most pressing of the concerns still to be enlarged upon is the cost of your program to American citizens. Certainly, few will dispute the desirability of strengthening free world economic and political ties. And, in my opinion, Americans generally are prepared to make sacrifices if such sacrifices will materially contribute to this effort. It is no longer a question today of which way do we go, toward more—or toward less—international trade. Clearly, we must move in the direction you suggest: toward more international trade. The only question is: How far do we go? Surely there are limits, and it is here that differences may arise.

Your references to retraining and relocating workers suggests, for example, that the program you propose would anticipate some job displacement. One point Americans weighing your program should know then is: How many jobs do you estimate would be displaced? Over what period? In what industries?

These questions lead inevitably to others, perhaps equally important. Who will perform this retraining? Will people receive income during the retraining period? Will they receive benefits? What will these cost? Who will pay for them?

And what fields will they be trained for? With an estimated 25,000 new jobs needed each week within the next few years just to accommodate new workers entering the labor market, and with technology displacing more and more of the jobs that presently exist, where are the jobs replacing those lost to imports going to be found?

I believe our citizens also require a better understanding of your parallel plans for Government assistance to business, tax incentives to encourage plant modernization and expansion, and public works programs. They should be told, for example, how the funds drained for these plants will be replaced.

They should be told what the net impact of your proposal would be on personal and business taxes. They should be told just how much sacrificing your program will entail and for whom.

It is urgent, I think, that all of these areas be clearly defined, so that congressional leaders and the citizenry at large can intelligently weigh the pros and cons of this proposal, and of others to be advanced, as an aid to selecting the course that they believe will best fulfill our long-term national interests.

I would also ask that this review not be confined exclusively to our relations with the European business community, but that it be extended to our relations with all nations to whom the principles you propose might be applied. Specifically, what would happen to trade with Asiatic, Middle Eastern, and South American nations under your plan? And what would be the impact of this trade on us?

In matters of such far-reaching significance, surely full understanding is imperative.

I would submit one further suggestion. In order to minimize the possibility of the public's being misled in its deliberations on this issue, I would ask endorsement by your administration of two well established truths concerning the textile industry. I believe you are aware of both.

First, when you advance as justification for freer trade the need for greater efficiency in American industry, I would call your attention to the fact that this need is in no way unqualified. I cannot comment with authority on other industries, but I can say that among the country's leading textile concerns you will find high efficiency already an accomplished fact. This is not to imply that further gains cannot and will not be made. They are already on their way. I seek simply to point out that in relation to industry as a whole the leading textile companies of this country can probably be ranked among the most efficient operations in the world. Indeed, I believe they could fairly be cited as prime examples of that dedication to improvement which you yourself have now indicated you would have others embrace.

I might add, too, that with all this and in spite of wage scales, pricing policies, and profit taking, each of a minimum order, it is a proven fact that members of our industry cannot compete with foreign producers in U.S. markets today and, for the most part, wouldn't be able to do so with the offsetting equalization fee for cotton now under consideration. They are at a much further disadvantage, of course, in markets overseas. I offer this thought simply to suggest there may be wishful thinking in too great a reliance on the merits of higher efficiency and greater technological progress as a cure-all for oversea competition.

Secondly, I would ask that the textile industry be classed not as isolationist or even protectionist in its thinking, but that it be grouped in company with those who favor expansion of international trade. The leaders of our industry have expressed this expansionist view repeatedly in recent months. We are not against—we are for—steps that will foster international trade. We believe simply that our country's part in this expansion should be kept consistent with this Nation's long-term best interests.

Closer examination would show, I expect, that this same view is shared by the great majority of our citizens. Assuredly it is your view as well. And this lends support, I believe, to my principal contention that all of the advantages, all of the consequences, and all of the alternatives, to your proposal should receive careful consideration by the widest possible audience at the earliest opportunity. If the public is given the facts, I have every confidence the Nation's long-term best interests will be served.

Respectfully,

E. B. SHAW,
President.

Better Ships for Coast Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article from the Boston Globe for January 4, 1962:

BETTER SHIPS FOR COAST GUARD

Are there enough heavy Coast Guard boats available for search and rescue work in winter seas off Massachusetts? This question, long discussed privately among coast guardsmen, became a matter of public concern last year when a light patrol craft broke up off Nantucket, luckily without loss of life.

The same issue has been raised again at the board of inquiry hearing on the loss of the scalloper *Barbara and Gail*, 5 of whose 10-man crew were drowned. The commander and engineer of the 95-foot Coast Guard boat involved, have asserted that it "seems a light craft for such heavy seas." Its draft is too shallow. It does not easily carry a gyrocompass.

Considered fully capable of operating in all kinds of weather, and of carrying the best type of equipment, are the 125-footers of the *Frederick Lee* class, which, among other things, dropped depth charges in World War II. There are three of these in the 1st Coast Guard District, two at New Bedford, and one at Gloucester.

But are there enough? That is an important question for the U.S. Government and Congress, and for the American people, apart from any finding the board of inquiry may make on the strength of the evidence in the case of the lost scalloper. The Coast Guard saved an estimated 3,500 lives last year

and untold millions in property. In wartime, it proved an invaluable part of the Navy.

The Coast Guard should have ships and equipment which would assist its officers and men to do the best job possible, and would minimize the inevitable risks of their calling.

Probe of "Katanga Lobby" Will Redden Faces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion in reference to our participation in the Congo and particularly insofar as our actions in respect to Katanga are concerned.

I am inserting herewith an article published in the Long Island Press on Friday, January 5, 1962, which is self-explanatory. If the information that is coming out now is true, certainly the statement and white book published by the State Department over the name of George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State, entitled "The Elements in Our Congo Policy," seem to prove that there is a great deal wrong with our State Department in the handling of this situation. I, like many other Americans, would like to feel that we are following a policy that is consistent, not only in the best interests of the United States but to bring about peace and freedom throughout the world. It seems ridiculous to me that we try to blame the situation in Katanga on a so-called lobby in the United States, or anywhere else for that matter. I hope that all the facts will be brought to light and that our policy will be so adjusted as to present a proper picture to all peoples everywhere:

PROBE OF KATANGA LOBBY WILL REDDEN FACES

(By Robert Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—The State Department's face is going to be a bright red before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee finishes its investigation of the Katanga lobby.

The embarrassment is going to start next week when the subcommittee hears testimony that the State Department once thought so highly of Michel Struelens, the lobby's chief spokesman in the United States, that it sent him on a secret mission to the Congo.

The 33-year-old former Belgian civil servant, whose visa to the United States has been invalidated, is now the main target of the State Department's biggest guns for his pro-Katanga activities here.

Struelens, who will make public his amazing story when he testifies on January 10, already has briefed the subcommittee in private on the role he undertook for the State Department.

He told the Senators that one of Secretary of State Rusk's top aids visited him last August and solicited his services to mediate the differences between President Moise Tshombe, of Katanga, and Congo's Premier Cyrille Adoula.

Under secret instructions to arrange for a Tshombe-Adoula meeting, Struelens left New York on August 2 to fly to the Congo. The State Department furnished Struelens his transportation and made the arrangements for him to enter the Congo under the guise of a U.S. immigration official.

On arriving in Leopoldville, Struelens went immediately to the U.N. headquarters there where he briefed Dr. Sture C. Linner, the United Nations chief officer in the Congo, on his U.S. mission.

Struelens then called President Tshombe, who said he was agreeable to meet with Premier Adoula at any location other than Leopoldville. Tshombe said a conference in the Congo capital was out of the question because the last time he had showed up there Foreign Minister Justin Bomboko had arrested him and had him thrown into jail and neither the United Nations nor the United States had protested his seizure.

When this message was relayed to Dr. Linner, the chief U.N. officer took the uncompromising stand that if Tshombe wouldn't meet with Adoula in Leopoldville there would be no conference. Tshombe balked at this mandate.

Unable to break the deadlock, Struelens then flew back to the United States on August 5, reporting to the State Department that his mission had not been successful.

"All my efforts were for conciliation, not for division," Struelens told the Senators in his private meeting with them. "I'm completely surprised and dumfounded at the way the State Department has tried to discredit me."

In carrying out his secret mission for the United States, Struelens even spent some of the $140,000 that Carl T. Brown, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, accused him of "spreading around * * * to help in dispensing a string of myths and a stream of misinformation about Katanga and the Congo."

They Don't Make Them Like That Anymore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, when the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, left the bedside of former Speaker RAYBURN, he said "They don't make them like that anymore."

Using this statement as their lead, Life magazine ran an editorial entitled "SAM RAYBURN's Frontier" in their issue of October 20, 1961. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I commend the following article to the Members of this body:

SAM RAYBURN'S FRONTIER

"They don't make them like that anymore," said the President of the United States of the Speaker of the House, as he left the stricken Texan's hospital bedside. With SAM RAYBURN a breed is passing whose like the American Nation will not see again. He is one of the last, living links with its frontier. In his boyhood in the Tennessee mountains women still carded and spun their own wool and the men drove wagon teams to the nearest railhead to trade corn grist for salt, nails and calico. Men still living then remembered when Andy Jackson, Davy Crockett and Sam Houston were fellow frontiersmen. RAYBURN's own father, Will, a Confederate cavalryman, could tell with remembered tears of standing at Appomattox when Lee surrendered. SAM, the 8th of 11 children, was 5 when Will and Martha Rayburn picked up stakes and went down the wagon road to Texas to seek a new and better life. When SAM went off at 17 to get "book larnin'" at East Texas Normal—where he swept floors and milked cows to work his way—the $25 he took with him was about all the family had. "Character is all I have to give you," his father told him. "Be a man."

And character has distinguished SAM RAYBURN all the rest of his life. Lee, the hero he worshiped, said, "Duty then is the sublimest word in our language," and that was good enough for SAM. So was the frontier acceptance of a man's word as his bond. In the 48 years RAYBURN has served in Congress—more than a quarter of its history—no other man was more respected, loved or admired.

He was respected because he never went back on his word. He was loved because he never resented defeat or held a grudge ("I haven't time to hate anybody"), and was the soul of kindness, tolerance, and unassuming simplicity. He was admired because in the 17 years he has been Speaker—longer than any other man in history—he has managed through persuasion, tactful force and the dignity of his person to get effective legislation out of the warring factions of the Democratic Party. And by so doing he made his office the most powerful next to the Presidency itself. When his party was in the minority—as his good friend Dwight Eisenhower found—SAM RAYBURN kept it a loyal, and often indispensably helpful, opposition.

If his father fought to dissolve the Union, SAM RAYBURN has risked his own political life to preserve and strengthen it. In 1941, when Congress was ready to kill the draft only 4 months before Pearl Harbor, RAYBURN pulled it through by courage and tenacity. "I know you're on the spot but so is this country," he told the wavering. "I want you to vote for this bill even if it means your defeat. You've got to if this country is to live." The vote was 203 to 202.

As he grew old (he is 79), Mr. SAM had none of an old man's jealousy of youth. Instead, to each new generation of Congressmen, including Jack Kennedy, he imparted his wisdom: "Don't try to go too fast. Learn your job. Don't ever talk until you know what you're talking about." He was not ashamed to weep openly when he was deeply moved, as when he said farewell to Alben Barkley: "God comfort his loved ones. God comfort me."

Mr. SAM was more at home with older fashioned Democrats like Truman and Johnson than with Kennedy's manicured New Frontiersmen from eastern cities. But he accepted this change, like all others, with face turned uncomplainingly forward. The man who appropriated funds for the first U.S. tank did likewise for the race to the moon. The man who heard firsthand stories of Indian raids did not lose the frontier's caution ("We must look the world in the face; it is a dangerous world") even as he preserved its neighborliness ("I look forward to peace and friendliness for all good peoples of the world").

We shall not see his like again. No other Speaker can possess his personal link to Appomattox or the wagon trail West. But the American character that forged SAM RAYBURN's own, need not change, if we can teach ourselves and our sons to pursue as diligently his concepts of duty, integrity, loyalty, fairness, forgiveness, and humility which made this simple man a great man. In his words, we've got to, if this country is to live.

An Open Letter to the U.S. Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the January 9, 1962 issue of Boston University News, the largest college weekly in America, and published in Boston, Mass, by the Boston University:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE U.S. CONGRESS

(This editorial has been sent to the 100 Senators and 437 Representatives in the Congress of the United States)

Tomorrow you will meet for the 2d session of the 87th Congress. Your decisions during the months that follow will shape the future of the more than 180 million Americans you represent.

More than 38 million of your constituents are students in elementary and secondary schools, colleges, and universities. They face a dim future of crowded classrooms, a shortage of qualified teachers and rising college costs that will mean abbreviated college careers for many of them unless you respond to their urgent needs.

During this session of Congress you must pass a realistic aid to education bill.

The conflicts of today are struggles of ideas. The outcome will be determined not in the battlefield but in the classroom. The quality of education offered in our schools and colleges is the key to the preservation of our heritage and the fulfillment of our destiny.

While quality education is dependent on more than money, without it, without a great deal more money than is now spent on education, standards in our schools will crumble with the upsurge in enrollment ahead.

You know that State, community, and private resources cannot sustain the cost of education, which will more than double to $35 billion by 1970. The Federal Government can painlessly alleviate the burden but is now paying only 5 percent of the cost.

A climate for quality education in the United States can only be maintained by the fiscal powers of the Federal Government. During this session you must bring these powers to the aid of schools and colleges.

Federal aid to education need not mean Federal control of schools, as some of you have suggested. The billions of dollars in aid to foreign countries have hardly resulted in U.S. control of these countries.

There was, for instance, nothing in the several bills of the unsuccessful aid to education program last year that would have infringed on the power of States, communities, or college administrations to control schools, determine what would be taught in them, or select those who would do the teaching.

Last year's bills, which over a 3-year period would have provided $2.3 billion for aid to public schools, $577 million in scholarship aid to college students and $2.8 billion in loans for physical expansion by colleges and universities, would have been a good beginning toward alleviating many of the financial problems facing education. These bills, however, failed to become law.

Those of you who were instrumental in their defeat subverted the good of the Nation for reasons that are religious, racial, and political. Some of you supported the bills but failed to exert the influence to see them passed.

The responsibility for the failure of these bills, however, is not all yours. College students were content to remain voiceless while their future was being drawn and quartered in the House of Representatives. Teachers made a few idealistic whimpers, but only in the safety of the classroom. Administrators would not condescend to "get involved in politics" to pressure adoption of the program.

But the failure of these bills has stunned us to awareness. Students, wondering how they're going to pay next year's tuition; teachers, watching the number in their classrooms mushroom, and administrators facing shortages of classrooms, libraries, and laboratories are realizing that Federal aid to education is an acute necessity.

Our plea is a reflection of this concern. You must answer it. Early in this session you must adopt an adequate Federal aid to education program.

Hon. John W. McCormack: A New and Great Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, this is truly a memorable day in the history of the House of Representatives, this Nation, and, indeed, the world.

It is an extreme personal privilege and pleasure for me to join with my colleagues in congratulating our distinguished son of Massachusetts, Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, upon his selection for the speakership of this House.

By our action here we have conferred upon him one of the highest honors that can be granted to any man and we have called upon him to fulfill one of the greatest responsibilities on this earth.

As we all realize, he richly deserves the honor and we are equally aware that he will discharge his responsibilities in the fullest measure of his acclaimed integrity and acknowledged ability.

If any man has ever earned such national and world distinction it is JOHN W. MCCORMACK. For practically his entire mature life, he has dedicated his spirit, his talents, and his energies in patriotic public service to his Nation.

He has served continuously in this body for nearly 35 years and throughout 21 of these years he has superbly fulfilled the most exacting duties of the office of majority leader. Because of his remarkable and outstanding performance in this office, he was repeatedly elected majority leader and has occupied that office longer than any man in either party in the history of the Congress. It is this unique background of knowledge and experience, possessed by no other living man, that the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOHN MCCORMACK, brings to his new and higher office.

Beyond and above knowledge and experience, the office of Speaker requires character. Character in a man is measured, in summary, by his devotion to principle, his industry in his work, his integrity of action, his compassion toward his fellow man, and histolerance of the beliefs and causes of others who may differ with him.

For more than 30 years, Members of this body have had the opportunity to observe the character of JOHN MCCORMACK. Out of this observance, we have seen his demonstrated and unswerving devotion to principle founded upon his fervent faith in God, his fellow man, and his country.

We have watched his intensive and exclusive application of mind and energy, from dawn untill well into darkness, to his work, not only as the national Representative of his district here, but also as our majority leader for over 20 years.

His integrity of action throughout his extraordinary career here is a byword in the annals of both parties. The testimony on this point comes from the distinguished minority whip himself, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], when he stated in this House on last September 26—"The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] was always a man of his word. If he had made a promise of a commitment, he would keep it come what may. His word is his bond. We all know that and we respect him for it."

There is hardly an individual who has served in this body over the past 30 years, who has not been the recipient of wise counsel, friendly encouragement and practical assistance from JOHN MCCORMACK.

Throughout his long service here, and especially in his position as majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOHN MCCORMACK, has become universally recognized for not only his tolerance of the beliefs of others but his gentlemanly graciousness to others with whom he differs. He has presented his own beliefs with all the vigor and persuasion within his command, but he has been equally vigorous in proclaiming the right of others to friendly and fully speak their own beliefs, and in the rare instance where his own causes could not prevail he has reserved no rancor. With his devout faith in God and his sympathetic understanding of his fellow men the spiritual nature of the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOHN MCCORMACK, could not permit him to act otherwise.

In brief this is then the experience, knowledge and character of the colleague whom we have selected to lead and guide us in our national legislative responsibilities through the gravest period and most challenging time of our history. We are supremely confident that with his unique capabilities and unmatched experience he will provide the inspirational and effective legislative leadership for this country to enter a new era of ever greater progress and strength at home with increasing sucess and prestige abroad.

We congratulate you, JOHN, Mr. Speaker, and join in our prayers that God's help will be granted you in the discharge of your tremendous responsibilities and that the Almighty will preserve both you, and your devoted and gracious wife, among us in good health for many years to come.

The High Price of Indifference to Water Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a thoughtful monograph appearing in the January 1, 1962, edition of Conservation News, an educational service of the National Wildlife Federation, on water pollution. This sets forth some of the problems, causes and effects of America's frightful pollution of its priceless water:

THE HIGH PRICE OF INDIFFERENCE TO WATER POLLUTION

(By Ernest Swift)

The most vital of public issues will eventually die on the vine unless the principles involved are not repeated constantly and kept before the public eye. And even the justification for reforms does not strike home unless people as individuals experience some personal impact. Reforms are a two-way street, and human nature is such that those who are for something are more prone to throw in the towel than those against; and it is so easy to procrastinate and hope that matters will take care of themselves, or at least delay the day of reckoning.

Pollution abatement falls into this category. That water is a basic resource upon which all life depends is an academic statement to which all will agree. But after it has been said and repeated, everyone turns back to his own engrossing interests. It takes more than academic statements to stir people out of this lethargy. Each individual has to be personally affected; wherein pollution strikes at his health, robs his pocketbook, or ruins his vacation—or all three. Then his emotions, or his indignation, or possibly his fear, will prompt some action.

It seems strange that the benefits of pollution abatement have met with such indifference—are even being fought against consistently. This indifference can be attributed in part to the last of the old wives' tale that America's resources are limitless and indestructible, and in part to the fact that some people care nothing of what happens tomorrow so long as they can gratify their wishes today. And if one cannot smell this issue, it is felt it can be ignored; but a clothespin on the nose, though it may temporarily stop the smell, does not solve the problem. Like death and taxes, pollution is always with us; and taxes get higher all the time.

The ruthless fight against pollution abatement is in part the fight of rapidly expanding industries, which wish to use public waters as sewers; and in part is due to sprawling urban developments where people are willing to let other communities downstream worry about the sewage problem; and both are unwilling to pay for their share of a clean-up program. In some rural sections, the butter-and-cheese factories, those sturdy monuments to agricultural prosperity, dump their waste into nearby streams, to run white with sour curds instead of pure backcountry water. The seasonal vegetable canneries also take their toll of aquatic life. But agricultural progress should not be denied—so they say.

Collective indifference and greed are now imposing a heavy financial load on the public, and some public officials attempt to rationalize this by saying that individuals are blameless. Lack of any feeling of individual responsibility is the cause of this high cost. Too many wait for laws which they hope will not be passed, and in the meantime, keep on polluting.

The U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates a cost of $600 million per year for the next decade to abate municipal sewage. This does not take care of all industrial wastes, nor the cheese factory and hog wallows along streams and lakes.

The history of pollution abatement has been one of frustrating sufferance, stifled efforts, and fierce opposition externally; and in the Health Department, wheel-spinning timidity, feuding over objectives and prestige, plus penurious appropriations. There has been too much research both State and Federal on how much of a filth load a stream can carry and still be called a stream; and not enough research for a high quotient of elimination.

With no immediate promise in the use of sea water, the problem now facing the Nation centers around the known water supplies and their reuse. Neither is salt-free sea water going to eventually solve all the water problems of the Nation.

However, to forecast future needs because of population expansion by using present consumption as an index, is not drawing a true picture. These forecasts are premised on the assumption that all the present water consumption is vital and necessary. Nothing is further from the truth. The time may come when some of the domestic and industrial water-using gadgets will have to be abandoned because there is not sufficient water to go around.

The time may come when we will have to made a choice between bathing and drinking water, as against lawn sprinkling, automatic dishwashers, and fancy washing machines. Will sportsmen deny themselves swimming pools and cooling systems to guarantee the future of a trout stream? Focusing attention on such elemental questions, makes some people shudder, especially manufacturers. We are now faced with the problem of making water stretch for many new uses. Pollution abatement is one way to make it stretch.

In addition to industrial, municipal and agricultural needs, the Nation is now dedicated to a prodigious program of recreational expansion, which some sources estimate at this time reaches the $40 billion mark. The National Wildlife Federation, not unmindful of other needs, is in the fight to see that fish and game resources get their fair share. Wild creatures need clear water as well as do humans.

Dams and pollution have also jeopardized the commerical fishing industry, both oceanic and inland. Already these items of progress have practically eliminated some of the Nation's greatest fisheries resources. Such destruction can easily be documented. If the coastal fisheries are to be maintained, and any semblance of recreation in relation to water perpetuated, then far different standards must be prescribed. The old moth-eaten rule-of-thumb of how big a pollution load a stream can carry before everyone is killed off will have to be radically changed.

The first change will have to come in the minds of those in responsible positions who in the past have defended this formula. There should be a better balance in numbers between engineers and aquatic biologists working in public pollution agencies.

A criteria will have to be established which will protect aquatic life. Without this criteria, too much is left undefined and to prejudice. There should be a quality of water requirement for each of the desired uses. These should be established and applied on a national basis, so that the standards of one State cannot be played against the standards of another. What these tolerance levels should be is not known over any wide range at the present time, and there is far too much effort being made to discourage this approach.

These tolerance levels and criteria to insure a high degree of purity in reused water should be promulgated as rapidly as possible. Establishing these standards is, however, a mighty big order. At best it will take time, research, and the most expert manpower and facilities in the business. For the sin of indifference we must pay a high price.

There will need to be unqualified cooperation between all Federal and State agencies involved in managing fisheries resources. They do, however, have a wealth of knowledge to draw from. Full cooperation will be necessary from State organizations responsible for pollution control. Frankly, this could develop into a foot-dragging problem, but an exchange of information should lead to confidence and progress if all parties are sincere. Most important, the objective benefits to aquatic life should be nailed down so there is no backpeddling or artful dodging within health departments.

When these standards and criteria have been established, the next step is to apply them universally throughout the Nation; and in the application should be provisions for their enforcement. This is where the backlash will come. Reasons ad infinitum will bring forth legal briefs for special consideration and delay. All enforcement should be intelligent and tempered with justice, but it should always advance toward the objectives for its creation.

Recently, pollution control was given increased status by the naming of an Assistant Secretary in the Health Department who will direct the pollution abatement program. It took a great deal of stench to accomplish this much.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has been urged to make a clean break even though it is recognized that there are advantages through being associated with the Public Health Service. Advocates of a separate administration contend that the justification for clean water goes far beyond health considerations to include such uses as recreation, industry and agriculture. At present there are too many levels of medically oriented administration and, like the waste it is attempting to handle, the water pollution program becomes choked with red tape. Medical administrators are inclined to look upon pollution control only as another waste disposal problem—in the same light as air pollution or garbage collection. As has been stated before, research emphasis has been on how much waste a stream can carry without killing everyone off, and not on how to keep the waste out of the water courses. It is also an old Spanish custom to pressure State health agencies to make ineffective enforcement of pollution laws. If this were not the case, Federal laws would not be necessary.

After many years of trials and tribulations in getting this far with an action program, there will be many battle-weary people who will now look for real accomplishments. Among them will be the true lovers of the out-of-doors. If the Health Department does not live up to its promises, it will again hear from this very vocal group. That is also a promise.

An Old Friend Writes of Sam Rayburn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. W. B. Ragsdale of the national staff

of U.S. News & World Report, a longstanding friend of former Speaker SAM RAYBURN, has sketched a word portrait of the Speaker which appeared in the October 23, 1961, issue of the U.S. News & World Report. I believe the impression Mr. Ragsdale conveys of this great man is a clear and vivid one.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include Mr. Ragsdale's article:

AN OLD FRIEND WRITES OF SAM RAYBURN

(The career in Congress of Speaker SAM RAYBURN spans a political era now closing. Mr. RAYBURN was at the center of things from the time of Woodrow Wilson on—into the time of John F. Kennedy. W. B. Ragsdale, of the national staff of U.S. News & World Report, first met Mr. RAYBURN in Washington in 1928. Their latest visit—the last of many—was in Bonham, Tex., a few days before Mr. RAYBURN's doctors announced that the Speaker was incurably ill. This is Mr. Ragsdale's word portrait of an old friend—Speaker of the House for more years than any other man in history.)

SAM RAYBURN would not have used any of the adjectives that other people are using about him now.

The Speaker talked plainly and lived simply. He liked honey for breakfast. He liked cornbread and sweet milk for dinner. Many a time, at Bonham, he would have just a dish of cornmeal mush for dinner.

Mr. RAYBURN lived by a simple code: Be kind. Tell the truth. Be fair. Do what you think is best for the country. Be a man.

To SAM RAYBURN, these were not just words. They were a way of life throughout his career.

This was clearly apparent in the last visit that I had with the Speaker at his home in Bonham in September.

I arrived on September 16. The Speaker was lying, fully dressed but shirtsleeved, on a soft in the back sitting room. A wood fire crackled on the hearth. His sister, Mrs. Robert Bartley, went in with me. His greeting was familiar and cordial.

Mr. RAYBURN had just returned from what had been—although no one knew it then—his last visit to his farm to look over his crops and cattle before going to a hospital in Dallas. He was cheerful. Except for the pain in his back, Mr. RAYBURN said he was feeling fine.

"It's just lumbago," he said. "But the doctors found some poison in my system that they are trying to get rid of. They say for me to take it easy—and I am. I just lie here and do nothing."

At home in Bonham, Mr. RAYBURN's day was filled with callers—in person and by telephone. The Speaker answered the telephone himself, and turned no one away. In the intervals that I was with him, these things happened:

A neighbor dropped in. He had remodeled a building to house a post office and wanted assurance that the Government would pay enough rent for him to get his money back.

"That seems fair," said Mr. RAYBURN, "I'll see what I can do about it."

A House committee chairman called from Washington with a legislative problem. Mr. RAYBURN took care of it.

A reporter telephoned to check a rumor that the Speaker planned to retire. He said: "No."

CHARLES A. HALLECK, House Republican leader, called to tell the Speaker he was being missed in the Capitol.

A grandmother rang up to ask what she could do about her grandson who was not interested in school. The Speaker listened patiently, then told her he was not an expert on raising children.

A man wanted help to get his son out of the Texas National Guard, which had been called to active duty. Seems that the boy joined the Guard to keep from being inducted into the Army.

A telegram came in from Bernard M. Baruch, saying: "I'm sure that you are only suffering from growing pains. To me, you are just a teenager." Mr. Baruch, 91; Mr. RAYBURN, 79.

Through more than 30 years, I had many hours of personal, informal talks with Mr. RAYBURN. Some impressions—

ON THE RACE ISSUE

The Speaker, a Texan, dealt with people as individuals. He felt that there were good people and bad people in every race. Every man had a right to live his own life and be treated fairly. But every man had to earn respect for himself, in his own way. He had little patience with extremists on either side of the race issue.

ON POLITICIANS

Throughout his public life Mr. RAYBURN disagreed with all his heart with those who ridicule and distrust politicians. To him, politics was the profession of Jefferson and Washington, an honorable one that should draw into it men of high caliber. He disliked demagogues and demagoguery, believed in fighting out issues on their merits. The smooth, smart television politicians of today disturbed him a little, but he respected them, nevertheless.

ON PARTIES

Mr. RAYBURN early won a reputation as a fighting Democrat. During the years, from 1940 on, when his party was engaged in factional rows in Texas, he was always a loyalist. He often said that he thought that the Democratic Party came closer to reflecting the views of the people—but he held in high esteem most of the Republicans with whom he worked.

On the American people: At no time during his years in Washington did Mr. RAYBURN ever doubt that the American people would fail to meet any emergency that might develop, if they knew the problem and understood what was expected of them.

ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The Speaker's philosophy—people of all nations must learn to live together in peace; but the people of each nation should be allowed to live their own lives as they see fit, and without outside interference.

Far back in the Truman administration, I caught Mr. RAYBURN in a reminiscent mood in a hotel room at Miami Beach. It was during a meeting of the Democratic National Committee. Nothing was happening except speechmaking, and Mr. RAYBURN had heard his quota of speeches.

Of his own inheritance, he said: My father was a poor man and a farmer. He told me that he did not have much money to leave his children. All he could give us was character. When I was elected to the Texas Legislature, he rode to the train with me. I was 24. All the advice he gave me was: "Sam, be a man."

About how he went to college: "There were 11 of us children. My father had a 40-acre cotton farm. It was the first year that cotton prices had been as high as 9 cents a pound. My father, mother, 11 children, and an uncle were living together. We did not have much money.

"I asked my father's permission to go to college. I did not ask for money. I thought I could make out. He agreed. When he took me to the train, he gave me $25. That was all the money I had.

"I went to East Texas Normal College and got a job ringing the college bells and sweeping the floors in a public school. Somehow, I made it. I went to college, dropped out and taught school, went back to college. When I was in the legislature, I went to law school at the University of Texas in my spare time."

In a New Orleans hotel, I found the Speaker relaxing between sessions of another party meeting. He told how he had been inspired to go into politics.

"I was just 12 years old," he said. "Joseph W. Bailey, then a Congressman from Texas, came to Bonham to speak. Our farm was several miles from Bonham. I walked through the rain to hear him.

"I was just a timid country boy. When I got there, the townfolks had crowded in and gotten all the seats. I stood for 2 hours and listened while the rain dripped down the back of my neck from the edge of the roof.

"I was so carried away with what I heard that I vowed that one day I would be Speaker of the House."

Again, during a visit I made to Bonham in 1958, the Speaker relaxed and talked about many things. This was at his office in the Sam Rayburn Memorial Library. The library was his pride and joy during the latter years of his life, and the office is an exact duplicate of the Speaker's office in the U.S. Capitol.

On books: "I hope that this can be made into the best library of American history there is in the United States. I always liked to read. In Washington, when I was lonely, I liked to browse through the secondhand-book stores. There you find books on American history. But I always felt guilty when I had a book in my library that I had not read. I got into the habit of writing 'SR' on the bottom of page 99 in every book that I read."

On the Senate and the Presidency: "I'd rather be Speaker of the House than 10 Senators. I never had the slightest desire to be a Senator or Governor. I love the House. So far as the Presidency is concerned, I was born in the wrong part of the country and at the wrong time to ever become President. I have achieved everything I wanted."

In quiet moments in his apartment, just north of Dupont Circle on Connecticut Avenue in Washington, the Speaker often dropped into a reflective mood in his conversation. For example—

On the seniority system in Congress: "I don't see any substitute for it. I have studied the question a great deal over the years. On the committees, there always is somebody who has served many years who is capable of being chairman. Not too many mediocre men stay in Congress long enough to get to the top of an important committee. The voters see to that. Those who are members of a committee for a long time learn the problems before the committee and become good leaders."

Of his advice to Harry S. Truman when his old friend suddenly became President: "I told him this: 'I have been watching the White House for many years. I know some of its hazards. Your biggest danger is in the White House, itself. Some of the people around you are going to try to do to you what they have tried to do to every President—they are going to try to build a fence around you, and in building that fence they will be keeping out the very people you should see. Don't let that happen.' I gave the same advice to Dwight D. Eisenhower and to John F. Kennedy.'

Although a strong party man, Mr. RAYBURN did not believe in ironbound party discipline. At various times through the years, he gave these views—

On the Republican-Democratic coalition in Congress: "I never was for blocs—never joined one. I wanted to be a free, independent legislator; to vote my own sentiments. Of course, my sentiments are usually on the side of the Democrats, because I have had a part in making up their program."

On applying pressure to Members of Congress: "I do not believe in asking a man to vote against his own interests. A long time ago, I was running for the Texas legislature. A friend came to me, and said: 'SAM, I'd

like to vote for you, but this man you are running against is a power in my section. I'm going to run for prosecuting attorney and I need his support. What would you advise me to do?'

"I told my friend to go ahead and vote for the other fellow, that I was going to beat him anyway.

"Things even out in the long run; if you lose a vote one time, you will get it back again when you need it more."

The Speaker seldom discussed his role in Congress. When he did, it was in a wholly impersonal manner.

Few people know of the part that Mr. RAYBURN played in initiating the atomic-bomb program during World War II. Long after the event, the Speaker told me this story in this way:

"Gen. George Marshall and Secretary of War Henry Stimson came quietly to my office one day during the war. They brought a scientist with them and explained what they had in mind. They wanted to make an atomic bomb and said the Germans already were working on such a project. But they could not go before a congressional committee and explain the project. It had to be kept secret. They needed $800 million to start the work.

"I called in some of the committeemen and told them that $800 million was needed for the war. That was all the members of the committee knew about it, and it was all that the House knew. They did not ask any questions. That was all the information the House had on which to appropriate $800 million. The work was started."

It was not just Congressmen who took Speaker RAYBURN at his word. In 1952, an issue of U.S. News & World Report went to press on his word.

Adlai E. Stevenson had just been nominated for President by the Democratic National Convention. It was late Friday night. The convention adjourned until Saturday, when it would choose a vice-presidential candidate.

Publication of the magazine was being held up to include the vice-presidential nomination.

At 1 a.m. on Saturday, President Truman, Mr. Stevenson, Mr. RAYBURN, and other party leaders went into a meeting to decide upon a candidate for Vice President. They met in a little room set aside for Mr. RAYBURN, as presiding officer of the convention.

When the meeting ended, none of the participants would talk publicly. I caught Mr. RAYBURN by telephone just as he entered his hotel suite, about 2 a.m.

"It's going to be JOHN SPARKMAN of Alabama," he said. "That is the decision."

On that word, the magazine's final story had already been written when, about 12 hours later, the convention nominated Mr. SPARKMAN.

There were quiet times with the Speaker. Indeed, he liked quiet. He was not gabby, and he was not a backslapper.

In 1960, at the Los Angeles convention, I talked with the Speaker after the nomination of John F. Kennedy for President. Mr. RAYBURN was alone. He had fought for the nomination of his protégé, LYNDON JOHNSON, and had lost.

"Kennedy is in there now trying to persuade LYNDON to be Vice President," he said. "I hope LYNDON doesn't take it."

Then he went home to fight for the election of the Democratic ticket.

Less than a year later, I talked with Mr. RAYBURN in his office at the Capitol.

Of President Kennedy, he said: "He is a fine man, sharp as a tack. He is the best listener I have ever seen. You don't have to draw a map for him. He understands a situation when you tell him about it, and does something. He will make us a fine President."

On a quiet Saturday, the Speaker talked of many things.

About private political understandings: "You'll never get mixed up if you simply tell the truth. Then you don't have to remember what you have said, and you never forget what you have said."

On handling Congress: "Jack Garner used to say, 'You can't run the House without getting your knuckles bloody.' I don't see it that way. Most men are reasonable. I think 95 percent of them mean to do right. You can persuade men and lead them easier than you can drive them."

On home: "When I get away from Washington, I don't want to go anywhere in the world except home, and to see my lovely country, to see what little possessions I have, and to associate with my brothers and sisters and old friends. Home looks better to me than any place in the world."

Development Fund Drive of the Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, in the district which I have the honor to represent is located one of the world's great healing institutions. In order to better fulfill its humane goals, it has been found necessary at this time to appeal publicly for assistance. Many distinguished citizens and humanitarians have interested themselves in this project. It is my opinion that their efforts in this direction are worthy of being recorded in these archives.

The Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center in New York City, the largest voluntary hospital in the world and the first medical center established in the United States, is now conducting a development fund drive for $50 million. The objective is the increased relief of human ailments through the advancement of medical science and the improved dissemination of medical knowledge.

The affiliation between Presbyterian Hospital and Columbia University's College of Physicians and Surgeons was formalized 50 years ago and in 1928 gave birth to the complex of buildings known as the Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center. This institution has benefited the entire world through contributions to better health.

Grayson Kirk, president of Columbia University and Augustus C. Long, president of the Presbyterian Hospital in the city of New York, announced that $35 million of the campaign goal will be used for new construction, already underway, to include the $13 million William Black Medical Research Building.

Gen. Lucius D. Clay, retired, is general chairman of the Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center Development Committee. General Clay, chairman of the board of the Continental Can Co. and vice president of Presbyterian Hospital's board of trustees has guided the fund close to the halfway mark. He has interrupted this stewardship to serve the President of the United States as his personal representative in Berlin with the rank of ambassador.

In discussing Columbia-Presbyterian's combination of patient care, medical education, and research during the last 30 years, General Clay said:

> I believe that it is not an unrelated coincidence that these same past 30 years have seen more forward surge in medical science than in all the previous years of human history. This is by no means a claim that all such progress occurred in the center, but simply that the impetus in research, teaching, and treatment which found expression in the center idea has had extremely wide and useful results.

More than 3 million patients of all races, creeds, and circumstances have been treated at the medical center since it was opened in 1928.

The high quality of medical education and research at the Medical Center has drawn a steady stream of visiting scholars from all points of the globe, many of whom are leaders in medicine in their own institutions both in this country and abroad.

A most important accomplishment of the center has been the training of thousands of doctors, nurses, and other members of the health professions. Approximately 4,000 medical students, 5,000 interns, and residents, and hundreds of research scientists have gone out from the medical center during the last three decades.

This country leads the world in both the qualitative and quantitative scope of its medical education. Yet, it suffers from a shortage of doctors that threatens to grow more serious in the face of a burgeoning population and increased commitments for world leadership in all fields.

This merely adds to the urgency of supporting the expansion of our great teaching institutions like the Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center.

In this era of growing requests by Government and private philanthropic organizations for research projects into various aspects of diseases the enormous demands for maintaining and extending research activities require more and better facilities—facilities unthought of when the Columbia-Presbyterian buildings were on the planning boards in the 1920's.

The trustees of Presbyterian Hospital and Columbia University deserve the grateful commendation of Americans everywhere for their determination to extend the contribution of Columbia-Presbyterian toward better health by a major expansion of facilities for patient care, research and medical education.

I cannot too strongly urge Americans to support our free institutions like Columbia-Presbyterian in their dedication to nurturing a better way of life for all men.

Presbyterian Hospital, like all voluntary hospitals, is critically dependent upon funds from philanthropic giving, fund-raising campaigns, bequests and endowments to enable it to serve the community.

Yet this institution stands ready to serve regardless of the patient's ability to pay. Medical care is provided in the wards and outpatient departments, without charge, by attending staff doctors. Community volunteers serve, without pay, in virtually all parts of the hospital.

A gift to the medical center's development program is an investment in the health of our Nation. Furthermore, it is a promise to the free world that we shall not shirk our responsibilities for the well-being of peoples everywhere.

R. M. Pully Issues Statement on 1962 Textile Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Clover Herald, Clover, S.C., of January 4, 1962:

R. M. PULLY ISSUES STATEMENT ON 1962 TEXTILE CONDITIONS

The American Thread Co. plants of Clover have been going through a trying period in the history of textile industry along with other similar firms throughout the textile belt.

These trying times have been accounted to a large degree to the unfavorable and unfair trade policies with foreign countries.

Robert M. Pully, manager of the Clover plants, this week sent out letters to business and civic leaders in this area explaining plans for the local plant, perils of the industry, and things that local people can do to help the industry.

His letter is as follows:

"To combat this situation, we are spending great sums of money to modernize our mills so that we may operate more efficiently than ever. Here in Clover we made extra expenditures of one-half million dollars in 1961. During 1962 we have plans again for extra expenditures of one-half million dollars for modernization. All of this, we hope, will give us a better product made at a more competitive cost. As our president, E. B. Shaw, has previously said, only the well run, well equipped, efficiently operated textile companies will survive.

"We believe that today, in our textile industry, we have the most efficiently operated industries in America. Yet, this is not enough under the present market conditions. The foreign-made textile products that are being permitted to flood our own market today are made by wage earners that are paid only a fraction of the wages paid in the United States. The cotton used in these products is also purchased by the foreign manufacturer at lower prices than we must pay in our country—where most of it is grown. For these reasons, these products can be offered for sale at prices we can not possibly meet, even under the most efficient operating conditions.

"We further believe that until world economic conditions are in a better balance, legislative action is necessary to protect our own industry and the employment it provides for millions of our citizens.

"You may wonder why I am giving you this information. The reason is twofold: First, as a community leader, you are interested in what is taking place because this affects you and the community economically in some way. Second, you are a citizen, taxpayer, and voter. The people running our Government and making our policies will listen to you. They are your representatives in such matters. You can help them by letting them know your opinion on such vital issues.

"May our joint efforts make 1962 and years to come prosperous."

Better Brave Than Slave

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, a few days less than a year ago, in front of this building where we are now assembled, our President delivered to the Nation—and to the world—one of the great addresses of modern history.

His courageous words resounded throughout the world, filling the hearts of freemen with hope. And in the months that followed, his action from the White House and ours from this Hill have transformed these hopes into beliefs.

The cause of freedom is advancing everywhere—freedom from "tyranny, poverty, disease and war itself." Yet, in recognizing the fight for and the advance of freedom, there has too often been such a negative acknowledgement of the need for freedom as to approach defeatism. The battle cry in the fight, for want of another, has become "Better Dead Than Red."

On the eve of the new year, a new and far more stirring expression was born that I hope will become the new battle cry in the fight for freedom: "Better Brave Than Slave."

Who first said this or where in the course of history, I do not know. But it first came to my attention in the December 31 edition of This Week magazine, distributed throughout America as a supplement to Sunday newspapers. The entire edition of the magazine is worthwhile, and I am happy to commend it to the attention of those of my colleagues who may not have seen it. But the most important item in the magazine is the editorial that stems from the four words I quoted above. Written by William I. Nichols, editor and publisher, this is one piece that belongs in the minds and hearts of all men everywhere today and in the books of all tongues for the minds and hearts of tomorrow. It is a privilege to make it a part of the record of this Congress.

The article follows:

BETTER BRAVE THAN SLAVE

(By William I. Nichols)

For many years, each issue of This Week magazine has opened on this page with "Words To Live By"—that is to say, a quotation, or saying, which seems to have special qualities of meaning and inspiration for our time.

Normally these words are presented by some notable contributor who discusses them in terms of his own experience. But today, instead of turning to outside sources, we venture to print some words of our own—the ones at the top of this page. These words, we believe, express the unique historic opportunities which confront us, as Americans, at the beginning of this new year.

"Better brave than slave." This is freedom's true answer to all those who have been chanting "Better Red than dead"—or vice versa.

It gives the lie to the notion that free men have no other choice than to be Red or dead.

"Better brave than slave" are words to keep us from growing paralyzed by talk about the H-bomb. They remind us that life has always been a struggle, that the race is won by the strong and bold and that life on this earth is not meant to be easy or effortless or everlasting.

Perhaps one of the basic troubles today is that many of us have come to believe too literally in our own slogans about "inevitable progress." We think miracle drugs will bring us eternal youth. Similarly, we hope that social and political miracles can make our rivals or enemies go away, and bring us perpetual—and painless—peace and prosperity. We forget that through the ages, such ends have been won by brave men, acting with faith, energy and imagination. Often just by standing firm they have prevented war.

"Better brave than slave." These words, I believe, speak to us with the firm voice of history and hope. They speak, too, with the voice of morality, for they affirm the everlasting fact that for free men there are things in life worth fighting for, even dying for. They give us the courage, the manly gift, to stand up and be counted on the side of right, as God gives us to see the right. And in so doing, they unlock for us the greatest of life's secrets, which is this: The minute you know that you are not afraid to die, that is the minute you begin to know how to live.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

"The Role of the Government in Education"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, a national conference on curriculum experimentation was held at the University of Minnesota, Center for Continuation Study, at the end of September. Among the speakers was a former member of the faculty at Davis and Elkins College, and now the senior Senator from West Virginia, JENNINGS RANDOLPH. In a searching and thoughtful address on "The Role of Government in Education," he spoke of the need and function of Federal support for the national educational effort, and of the need for review of educational methods. I ask unanimous consent that the speech given by Senator RANDOLPH be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent to include a letter commenting on Senator RANDOLPH's address, which was written by five Minnesota educators, and was printed in the Sunday Gazette-Mail, of Charleston, W. Va., on November 5, 1961.

If the Senator from West Virginia were not now on the floor, I would read aloud the letter of commendation which has been signed by a number of educators in my State. But I know that because of his modesty he would attempt to qualify the statements; so I merely submit the letter for printing in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech and the letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT IN EDUCATION

(An address by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, at the National Conference on Curriculum Experimentation Center for Continuation Study, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn., September 28, 1961)

It is doubtful that anyone in this room is unfamiliar with the famous declaration of the Ordinance of 1787 in which the Congress of the Confederation stated that:

"Religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

Since that time there has been a steadily increasing involvement of the Federal Government in education, a participation which now embraces every major department of the executive branch and every level of education from elementary school to postdoctoral research. Since 1777, when the National Government initiated instruction of military personnel, there have been some 45 major programs enacted in aid to specialized and general education as well as research.

In the 87th Congress alone, 16 different measures involving substantial Federal assistance to educational, scientific and cultural affairs were either acted upon by one of the bodies of Congress or reported by a congressional committee. These ranged in scope from the School Assistance Act of 1961, offering aid to school construction and teachers' salaries, which was passed by the Senate with a vote of 49 to 34, to the very constructive measures introduced in the House by Representative FRANK THOMPSON, which would establish a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts and a system of State grants for the establishment of development programs in the arts.

There is no question, therefore, that the Federal role in education, and in related scientific and cultural activities, is a massive and diverse one. Nor is there any question in my mind but that this role is amply justified by the "general welfare" clause of the Constitution, the intent of the Founders, and the needs of modern society.

There will doubtless continue to emerge from some quarters—at the occasion of every Federal advance in this area—the claim that education is solely a State and local responsibility and that Federal aid inevitably leads to "Federal control." This cliche and the regrettable religious controversy were, of course, the chief obstacles to enactment of general aid-to-education legislation in the House this session. Regardless of how outworn the argument and how completely the history of such legislation fails to substantiate the fears of Federal control, it still carries a strong appeal to many. Apparently, however, the opponents of general aid to education are able to quell their anxieties concerning Federal control when the issue is one of aid to so-called federally "impacted" areas—many of which are communities that have lobbied intensively in Washington to acquire the Federal installations that are now presumed to be such a burden.

However, this is secondary to the issue on curriculum experimentation—a topic that is central not only to this conference, but also to the future of the American educational system. As Prof. Robert Ulich of Harvard stated a decade ago:

Prolongation of school age is in itself not a blessing, but may even be a curse to civilization unless there goes together with the prolongation a revolutionary rethinking of the total program and a restructuring of the total educational system from the secondary school upwards."

I would concur with Professor Ulich's statement, as far as it goes, but I would extend this injunction to the elementary school as well.

The need for such "rethinking and restructuring" was recently dramatized for me by encountering reference to a study of elementary school geography conducted by John D. McAulay of Pennsylvania State University. Professor McAulay discovered that over the 20-year period covered by his inquiry, there was a lag of 10 years between formulation of new generalizations by professional geographers and the acceptance of such principles in the textbooks; and there was an additional lag of a decade before these materials were introduced in the public school curriculum.

If this condition still prevails—as it doubtless does in many if not most school systems, despite the greater articulation between university scholars and public school teachers—it would point toward very serious limitations in our traditional methods of local and State determinations of curriculum. And it becomes a "clear and present danger" to the function of public education when viewed in the light of such a comment as that of Dr. Bentley Glass regarding the doubling time of scientific knowledge as approximately 10 years.

It would be a reasonable conjecture also that in such fields as physics and the life sciences, where I believe the growth of knowledge has been particularly rapid in recent decades, this lag between the discovery and the diffusion of new principles is even greater than in geography.

Even such presumably reliable absolutes—in the minds of some—as the teaching of English and the classical languages seem to be not immune to the impact of new knowledge and new insights regarding the process of learning. But I am informed, that the significant developments of descriptive grammar and scientific linguistics of the past few decades have as yet impinged but little upon elementary and secondary teaching of English.

And consider this statement regarding the teaching of classical languages, from the Committee on Secondary Schools of the American Council of Learned Societies:

"With respect to the classics, the panel agrees with the steering committee of the foreign language program of the Modern Language Association than 'an ancient language can be learned most efficiently if a modern foreign language has first been approached as speech' and therefore recommends that, contrary to practice, a modern language be studied before Greek or Latin." This view would probably be considered rank heresy by most teachers of Greek and Latin today, and most assuredly by my own Latin teacher of 40 years ago.

I regret that I was not able to attend your earlier sessions and listen to the reports on some of the curriculum experiments that are in progress throughout the country. This is a seminal and immensely exciting field and one which holds much of the future of American education in its hands.

And it is a field to which the Congress is not insensitive in its own deliberations on aid to education. Though, in view of the deletion by the House Education and Labor Committee of the provisions of S. 1021 for curriculum experimentation, perhaps I had best qualify that statement. My very able congressional colleague, Representative THOMPSON, has the burden of explaining the House actions and I shall therefore restrict my comments to the functioning of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee and its Subcommittee on Education.

In passing, it may be of interest to you to learn that among the nine members of our Subcommittee on Education, there are three of us who have had experience in teaching: Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, the chairman, who has a very distinguished background as a professor of law, and was a former law student and professor here at the University of Minnesota; Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH of Texas, who was an instructor for several years in the public schools of that State, and I, who taught public speaking and journalism for a number of years at Davis and Elkins College, West Virginia, and Southeastern University in Washington. It may fairly be stated therefore that in addition to the other able and highly educated members

of that subcommittee, it has a substantial proportion of professional background for receptivity to the problems of our educational system, the community of scholars, and the teaching profession.

Regarding the more specific question of curriculum experimentation, we of course incorporated in the School Assistance Act of 1961 provisions prescribing that each State set aside 10 percent of its allotment for this purpose and other special projects.

However, more directly related and heavily oriented toward curriculum questions is the National Defense Education Act which was extended by the Congress for 2 years. The principal function of this program was and is to strengthen the curriculum, particularly in the areas of science, mathematics, and foreign languages. During the Senate committee hearings on this measure in May of this year, much of the testimony was devoted to curriculum problems, with considerable emphasis upon the need to broaden the curriculum support to include American history, government, economics, and sociology.

It is unfortunate that Federal assistance has not been extended to these areas, but that is largely the result in this instance, I believe, of the initial justification of the measure in terms of the limited conception of national defense. Though Federal support for a strengthened curriculum in many other areas is just as essential to the long-term security and development of America as the development of physics or foreign languages it is more difficult to justify such action in terms of immediate national defense needs.

This brings me to the larger question of Federal support throughout the structure of knowledge and through all the modern branches of inquiry. Though not immediately bearing upon curriculum problems, this question most assuredly has long-range implications for such a conference as this.

Perhaps the best index of Federal activity in this field is given in the Federal Funds for Science bulletin published by the National Science Foundation. In the most recent edition, No. IX, total funds for research in all sciences—and this refers to research only not research and development—in fiscal 1959 are recorded as $1.39 billion. The physical sciences, as would be expected, are the largest recipients, to the amount of $765 million; the life sciences follow with $420 million; the social sciences with $31 million, and the psychological sciences with $24 million. Other sciences, a category including space sciences, operations research, etc., received $150 million.

For fiscal 1961, there is an estimated $2.3 billion—the figures not yet having been completely tabulated—for an increase of approximately 65 percent, the physical sciences receiving the bulk of the increase, with a total amount of approximately $1.5 billion; the life sciences, $.68 billion; the psychological sciences, $.4 billion; the social sciences, $.4 billion; and other sciences, $.3 billion. Presumably, the category of space sciences, in view of the increased activity in this area, is no longer tabulated in other sciences.

If you will bear with me in relating a few more figures I would like to extend the implications of these remarks as they apply to universities and the academic community.

In the total Federal funds obligated for research in fiscal 1960, approximately 39 percent was devoted to basic research, that is, the type of research directed toward the increase of knowledge within a particular field without reference to practical application of such knowledge. Within the aforementioned categories, the physical sciences, averaged 31 percent basic research funds; the life sciences, 34 percent; the psychological sciences, 41 percent; and the social sciences, 24 percent. In comparison to the investment of private industry in basic research (perhaps 5 to 8 percent of its total research and development expenditures), this represents, of course, an extremely high ratio, and is probably sufficient to maintain an adequate "capital reserve" in scientific knowledge.

Of the total Federal funds obligated for basic research in fiscal 1960, 44 percent was distributed to educational institutions, 30 percent to Federal agencies, 14 percent to profit organizations, and 12 percent to foundations and other groups. Many university administrators are, of course, delighted by this distribution. Yet I suggest that the very fact of this Federal cornucopia holds threatening implications for the balanced development of knowledge within our academic community and ultimately for the intellectual and cultural life of America.

You ladies and gentlemen who live more intimately with the problem than I doubtless know that no Federal grant covers the full cost of research, and even less so when it is distributed on some sort of matching basis. The difference between the Federal grant and the actual cost of research must, therefore, be drawn from other sources of university revenue. With the heavy preponderance of Federal funds going to the physical and life sciences, this consequently means an inevitable weakening of support by the universities themselves of the social sciences, the psychological sciences and the humanities—those stepchildren of a modern industrial society which have traditionally carried a major share of the burden of transmitting our cultural heritage from one generation to the next.

Acknowledging that the bare figures are not an adequate index of the proportion of research activity among the various fields, because of the inordinate expense of so much of the research in the physical and biological sciences as compared to the psychological and social sciences, there still exists a disproportionate emphasis on the former. This imbalance is, of course, accentuated by the exigencies of national security, but it is not created by them. It stems primarily from a short-sighted utilitarian cast of our society. And with regard to congressional resistance toward Federal support of the social sciences, it emerges partly from the uninformed suspicion on the part of some Members of Congress that the social scientists "want to tell us how to live."

Both of these problems must be addressed by the academic community, for the universe of knowledge is one; and we cannot long skimp on behavioral studies and the humanities without soon feeling the effects in the tone and quality of life in America.

The correction of such imbalances cannot be initiated by the Congress. For we do not possess the expert, the professional and detailed knowledge of where the inadequacies exist. The initiative for action of the sort implied here must come from the academic, scientific and school spokesmen.

I have seen some of the reports of the work conducted under grants from the National Science Foundation by the Biological Sciences Curriculum Study at Boulder, Colo. This valuable work fully justifies the statement by your chairman, Dr. Paul Rosenbloom, that "a modest program, conceived with imagination, may be more valuable than a much more costly program of a routine nature." Such studies, conducted by the other major scientific and academic societies as well should lead to the sort of rethinking and restructuring of which Professor Ulich spoke.

But it would seem to me that we would still need some agency in the nature of a National Advisory Council on Education to bring these findings in relation to one another, and through advice and persuasion, give more rigorous attention to a coherent curriculum that meets certain national minimal standards. Of course, I am aware of the vigilance with which State and local authorities guard their rights in the field of curriculum planning. And I do not suggest that these rights be overridden by any national authority. However, it does seem to me that the national scientific and academic societies and the Federal Government have a responsibility to bring the local agencies—through every voluntary means possible—up to national standards consistent with the needs of a rapidly changing technology and the increase in scientific knowledge. I would hope that the relevant congressional committees might receive the benefit of your counsel and that of your respective professional societies in the continuing future. For although the record of Congress on educational legislation this past session was hardly encouraging, the issue is not closed, and I can assure you that many of us are determined to achieve affirmative action in the future.

In closing, I would refer to a general curriculum problem and one which embraces many of the more detailed issues of your conference—that is, the need for the attainment of a point of view which can encompass the new and altered scope of change in life. This, I believe, is the central task of the schools today. One aspect of this problem was discussed by the eminent Austrian theoretical physicist Hans Thirring, in his article "Education for the Age of Science" (Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, v. XV, No. 7, Sept. 1959). Dr. Thirring expressed the hope that there might be included in our primary and secondary school curriculum an "ABC of elementary wisdom."

We have conventionally assumed that wisdom is the peculiar attribute of age. In this respect we have shown little advance over the doctrine of the Athenian philosopher, Solon, who taught that wisdom is to be achieved only through suffering—possibly because our traditional education has forced men to suffer before achieving wisdom. Dr. Thirring believes that this need not be.

"According to the definition of wisdom which I am proposing," he writes "even a young person, driven by all the passions and impulses of his age, and without being a marvel of virtue or self-sacrifice, might be called wise, if he fulfills these conditions:

"First, to possess the knowledge and good will for a better understanding of, and insight into, himself and his fellow men.

"Second, to be able to assign the proper values to the various human issues, duties, and responsibilities.

"Third, to be trained to understand man's natural inclination to overestimate the issues lying within the range of his limited mental perspective."

These may seem ambitious aims to establish for primary and secondary schools, but I would venture to say that if the foundation for such a perspective is not laid during the relatively flexible and plastic condition of youth it is seldom achieved thereafter. For there are few of us who radically alter our intellectual and spiritual garments after passing into adulthood.

Now, this is not to suggest that the schools should merely attempt to inculcate a set of socially acceptable and humanitarian attitudes. Far be it from that. The kind of wisdom, the kind of excellence, which our society calls for today is not to be achieved by shortcuts or "life-adjustment" course.

On the contrary, the quality of mind most in need today is that which is fostered by discipline in the basic methods of inquiry and techniques of problem solving. Only when a student feels at home with the basic structure of investigative methods and problem solving will he welcome the challenge of novel conditions and achieve competency in

meeting them. I would suggest, therefore, that we attempt to break through the ancient argument of "student centered" versus "subject matter centered" teaching and consider the value of "problem centered" teaching, with the problem embracing student, subject matter, and—I might add—teacher, as well.

In its practical applications this should mean that we would teach science as a process of inquiry rather than the products of inquiry; we would teach art as the creation and appreciation of objects rather than their identification and labeling; and we would teach history as a pattern of inquiry and a process in time rather than as an aggregate of facts.

Many people of late—laymen as well as scholars and teachers—have posed the problem in terms of a choice between quantity and quality, a choice between equality and excellence.

We have no choice. We must—if our civilization is to survive and persevere—have both.

We must have a generally informed citizenry capable of making intelligent decisions on matters of the public good. And we must have the highly trained specialists as well as the men and women of broad-gage learning that our modern complex society demands.

In this regard, we may bear in mind the remarks of Epictetus when commenting upon the fall of Athenian democracy as caused by education of the few: "The State says that only free men will be educated; God says only educated men will be free."

[From the Sunday Gazette-Mail, Charleston, W. Va., Nov. 5, 1961]

MINNESOTA EDUCATORS LAUD SENATOR RANDOLPH'S WISDOM

EDITOR:

Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, gave on September 28 at the University of Minnesota a brilliant speech on the role of the Federal Government in education. His address was one of the outstanding events of a national conference on curriculum experimentation, attended by about 75 leaders from all over the country, and from every segment of the educational community.

We were all impressed by Senator RANDOLPH'S sincerity and deep understanding. He got down to the heart of the matter—how the general welfare depends on what our children are taught in our schools * * *. He stressed the importance of our young people learning to assign the proper values to the various human issues, duties, and responsibilities.

Your Senator also pointed out several ways in which the Federal Government could act in the national interest in these matters without interfering with local control. He made a forceful plea that both professionals and laymen discuss their interests in educational legislation with their Congressmen at the time when the congressional committees are working on these problems, and not to depend solely on the large lobbies in Washington.

He discussed many complex issues * * * without a single platitude or cliche. We also appreciated his frank and courageous answers from the floor.

Senator RANDOLPH came to our conference at considerable cost to his personal comfort as well as at a financial sacrifice. He left Washington immediately after the Senate adjourned with little time for rest.

We congratulate the people of West Virginia on being represented by such a wise and well-informed man. We hope the whole country will continue to benefit for a long time from the dedicated services of Senator RANDOLPH.

R. H. BECK,
Professor of Education.
F. E. BERGER,
Director, Center of Continuation Study.
N. DEWITT,
Chairman, Professor of Classics.
L. HURWICZ,
Professor of Economics.
P. C. ROSENBLOOM,
Professor of Mathematics, State Department of Education, Institute of Technology.
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA.

Is the State Department Delinquent?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ELMER J. HOFFMAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written in these times about the management of foreign governments. We, as the leader of nations in the world today, must be prepared on all sides to demonstrate not only with words but action that our Republic is the best form of government in the world today.

It might serve us well to look into certain branches of our own executive departments. In this connection I call attention to an article which appeared in the January issue of Reader's Digest written by an able and knowledgeable writer and author, Frank L. Kluckhohn and the commentary thereon by one of the Washington columnists versed in international affairs, George E. Sokolsky.

The article and editorial follows:

[From Reader's Digest, January 1962]

IS THE STATE DEPARTMENT FAILING US IN THE COLD WAR?

(By Frank L. Kluckhohn)

While Americans watch, the driving engine of Communist aggression rolls relentlessly on, dealing us psychological and political defeats in every corner of the world from Laos to Cuba to Berlin. And as our record of cold-war losses mounts, people ask: What's wrong? What has happened to the experts who shape and carry out our foreign policy? Why aren't we fighting back effectively?

I believe I know the answer. As one who has spent many years amid State Department activities, I am convinced that our diplomatic bureaucracy is itself in large measure responsible for the setbacks this Nation has suffered. Time and again State has demonstrated (1) unwillingness to face the reality of an enemy bent on our destruction, (2) inability to compete.

Our Foreign Service officers are essentially gracious, well-intentioned men, but too many are professional pussyfooters who, in the tradition of watchful waiting, let matters slide while hoping for Khrushchev to begin observing the golden rule. They dilute and defeat our power and prestige across the world. Their presence does a disservice to the many others at State who have served their country valiantly and who are eager to prosecute the cold war effectively. Scores of these latter men are frustrated, often sick at heart, because they are unable to make any headway under our Foreign Service system.

There is perhaps no more devastating illustration of the State Department's inability to cope with Communist intrusions than Cuba. Consider some of the events that set the stage for the final tragedy, the abortive invasion of last spring.

By April 1959, 3 months after Fidel Castro took power, intelligence reports from the CIA, Pentagon representatives and the FBI all pointed to a Communist takeover in Cuba. Robert C. Hill, then our Ambassador to Mexico, knew that Moscow agents were already shuttling back and forth between the Soviet embassies of Mexico City and Havana. He tried to warn Washington, he told the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee later, that failure to take action would mean "a solid Communist bastion on the doorstep of the United States." But his reports—as well as those of the CIA, FBI and the Pentagon—failed to break through the bureaucracy and reach the decisionmakers. Department analysts downgraded the Red threat and took a go-easy view.

Hill knew that firsthand reports on Cuba often were not carefully read by higher-ups at State or the White House; instead, these men perused intelligence summaries prepared by faceless State analysts—summaries which, Hill says, were often "prejudiced." One of these State briefs, No. 179 dated July 24, 1959, as circulated to our embassies around the world, was so transparently sympathetic to Castro that Hill complained bitterly to Washington. Only 3 months later did he receive a bland letter admitting that the report had been prepared by a junior officer and "perhaps should have been more carefully scrutinized."

Desperate to get word through to the top about danger in Cuba, Hill jumped at an opportunity to brief Dr. Milton Eisenhower, the President's brother, who was on a goodwill visit to Mexico in August 1959. The encounter took place in an Air Force C-47 flying Dr. Eisenhower to Mazatlán. Seated on a curved divan in the middle of the plane were Dr. Eisenhower, Hill, and Raymond Leddy—our Embassy's secretary for political affairs in Mexico City, graduate of the FBI and a seasoned Cuban and intelligence expert. Also present was the State Department officer in charge of Caribbean-Mexican affairs.

From the start, this latter official opposed the briefing. "Each time that communism was mentioned, and its control of the situation in Cuba, it was discounted by this man," Hill testified before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

As Leddy tried to make his presentation, the State man kept breaking in to insist that Castro was an idealist whom he knew personally, and that there was no evidence in the State Department's files to confirm Leddy's point of view. Annoyed at the interruptions, Hill turned to the man and said, "I do not recall asking you to be in on this conversation. Dr. Eisenhower has agreed to listen to a man of integrity and experience in Latin America. What Mr. Leddy is discussing comes from the joint intelligence report of June regarding Communist infiltration in Cuba."

The man persisted: "There is no evidence of Communist infiltration in Cuba." At this point, an air attaché who had joined the conversation became so incensed that he accused the man of being "either a damn fool or a Communist."

By then tempers were so short that Dr. Eisenhower refused to hear more. He never saw the report: And thus, high in the air

over Mexico, Hill's last effort to reach the White House with a warning about Cuba came to a dismal end.

In Costa Rica, U.S. Ambassador Whiting Willauer from January 1959 through July 1960 wrote 11 letters to the State Department sounding the alarm about communism entrenching itself in Cuba. The FBI also funneled information to State concerning the Communist connections and associations of Fidel and Raul Castro. These reports, too, failed to get through the lower levels of the bureaucracy. When the subject arose in conversation one day between J. Edgar Hoover and the then Secretary of State, Christian Herter, the latter said he had never seen any such material. The next day Hoover received a phone call from Herter. "I have now read some of those reports," said Herter. "I did not realize that the situation was so serious."

In December 1960, Herter called Willauer back from Costa Rica to become a special assistant. His assignment: to take a hard look at tentative invasion plans of the Cuban refugees, then undergoing consideration at CIA. Willauer relates that he made an intensive study and finally concluded that, to insure success, we would have to back up the invasion with U.S. power.

The Kennedy administration, when it came into office in January 1961, asked Willauer to continue in his assignment. Now, however, he found himself strangely cut off from his CIA contact. For 30 days Willauer tried to tell Under Secretary of State Chester Bowles that he was being removed from the picture. "I'm awfully busy. I will see you later," said Bowles—but he never did. Willauer says he was never able to pass along his conclusions. Thus his painstaking effort went for nothing, while less knowledgeable practitioners at State and the White House scuttled the plan to use effective U.S. force if needed. And so the Cuban invasion was doomed in advance.

Why does the State Department operate in this manner? How does our Foreign Service mold men who so mishandle the cold war?

There are now 23,000 persons on State's payroll, the controlling group being the 3,628 Foreign Service officers. Typically, a young FSO steps into the department direct from college. For 6 to 8 years he stamps visas or does routine Embassy chores while being shifted around the world. Even as he accumulates seniority and begins to assume responsibilities, he rarely has to make an individual decision. Whatever reports he turns out are initialed and OK'd by so many persons that he doesn't have to worry about being blamed personally if things fail to go right. In fact, his basic technique for advancement in the bureaucratic morass comes to consist of avoiding the displeasure of his immediate superior, or identification with any controversial action—even when the avoidance may mean ignoring a problem that could build up to a disaster.

After 20 years he has learned the fine art of diplomacy, but he may have scant ability to make fundamental judgments and the necessary fast, hard decisions. Yet he's now considered an expert in foreign affairs, and is likely to be praised when in time of crisis he pontificates about the great shifts and the aspirations of masses that made these problems so inevitable. Such mere observers of the sweep of history, who seldom act but only react, have no place on the political firing line; they are, in fact, the cause of many of our cold-war woes.

Whether or not the diplomat becomes skilled at anticipating Communist moves or combating Red riots, he does become expert at self-advancement in the bureaucracy. Here are some points in the unwritten code for getting along in the service which have contributed to so many of our present difficulties:

Rule 1: Don't rock the boat.

In December 1960 the Soviet Union brazenly sent cargo planes to deliver military supplies to Communist forces in Laos. Head-on action to counter the Soviets was called for. But, fearful of upsetting India and other nations regarded as neutrals, our diplomats bucked plans to give the pro-Western Lao forces any means to stop the airlift—even so little as an antiaircraft bazooka. And so the chance to keep Laos from becoming riddled with Red guerrillas faded away, and Soviet intrusion continues.

Caution dominates in the arena of words, as well as of action. In 1953, a specialist on Red brainwashing of American prisoners of war in Korea was brought to the White House to help prepare a speech for Dr. Charles Mayo, then one of our representatives at the United Nations. When the address was ready, a high-ranking Foreign Service officer showed up with a policy paper in hand and said to forget the project because it was "too strident—foreign countries wouldn't be interested." In answer, the Presidential adviser threw the State policy paper in the wastebasket.

"You can't do that," the man from State exclaimed. "You've got to go through channels."

Fortunately, the White House man was not inclined to be pushed around, and so in November 1953 a rapt U.N. audience heard Dr. Mayo deliver the speech. It was one of our few outstanding propaganda successes. The Russians were forced to stop their false accusations that the United States had resorted to germ warfare in Korea, for every time they mentioned the subject, listeners were reminded of how the evidence was obtained: through the chilling process of brainwashing captured U.S. soldiers.

President Eisenhower was never able to carry out some of his plans because they were bucked at the State Department. "We're out to fight communism," one White House official said to me, "but what stops us cold is the marshmallow curtain that falls down at State whenever you try to carry out a determined, aggressive program against the Communists."

Rule 2: Avoid making any decision for which you may be held personally accountable.

A week before Vice President Nixon arrived in Venezuela during his 1958 Latin American trip, our Embassy there cabled that the Vice President might not get essential protection unless we complied with a Venezuelan demand to return two political exiles. Precious days went by as, up and down the line, our officials dodged making the hard decision of what to do about the exiles.

They were still dodging when Nixon arrived in Caracas—and came within a hairbreadth of being torn apart by a mob. Only then was an official of the Venezuelan Embassy in Washington bluntly told that U.S. paratroopers at that time in flight from Fort Benning would go right on into Caracas at once unless his government rallied to Nixon's aid. A phone was put in his hands, and within 20 minutes protective tanks pulled up around our Embassy in the Venezuelan capital, where Nixon had found momentary shelter. The whole affair was a serious psychological defeat for the United States, as well as a narrow escape for our Vice President—and it need never have happened. But it's easy for State to dodge decisions, or even to buck White House orders, so long as action, or inaction, cannot be traced to one person.

"No one ever puts his name on a document," says William Pawley, who during his 5½ years with the Department served first as an ambassador and later as special assistant to the Secretary of State. "I made a point of trying to find out who makes policy, and it's a very difficult thing."

The new African nation of Guinea, after it broke away from France in 1958, turned to our State Department for support. Months passed while the experts hesitated, each one seeking a plan that everybody could OK. Meanwhile, a handful of our own desperate officials stood by in Conakry, helplessly watching Iron Curtain technicians walk in and take over. (See "How the Soviets Stole a March on Us in Africa," the Reader's Digest, November 1960.)

Rule 3: Cover up your colleagues' mistakes or incompetence.

A key diplomat at our Embassy in Mexico was carrying on an open affair with the wife of a European ambassador. It became such a scandal that our national reputation was dragged through the mud. The culprit was not dismissed, however; he was merely given a 2-week suspension and then promoted to a higher post at another embassy in Latin America.

One of our officials in Washington was carrying secret papers in his car when he collided, while drunk, with a telephone pole. The Department admitted to the press that he had violated security regulations by failing to safeguard this classified material. But was his career set back as a result of such negligence? No. Since the incident, he has rapidly moved up to become one of the most important men at State and today is an influential shaper of our Berlin policies.

A specialist in Soviet affairs with a self-confessed weakness for talking about his work admitted that he had been giving out secret information. Yet, at the very time he was under investigation, his protective superiors gave him an outstanding efficiency rating, and today he still holds his sensitive job.

One reason such action continues is that the deliberations of those panels that screen Foreign Service officers for promotion are zealously kept secret. Several years ago when a new Assistant Secretary of State charged with personnel supervision tried to obtain information about the proceedings of these panels, he was curtly informed that "nobody can see these files, not even the Secretary of State."

It is clear that one root of our cold-war failures is the timidity and evasiveness characteristic of our State Department bureaucracy. There are other causes, specific philosophies that have come to infect the shapers of policy at State.

Among some of our foremost diplomats, for instance, concession has been elevated to the rank of policy. Instead of carefully, accurately calculating the risks of nuclear war, they yield to the nuclear shakes and use it as an excuse for avoiding anti-Communist action. They fall back from plans for assisting rebellion behind the Iron Curtain, even while Soviet agents coolly plot outbreaks inside free nations. Thus we pass up countless chances to call Kremlin bluffs.

Most recent evidence: the Berlin wall. At first only a few strands of barbed wire, it could easily have been pushed down by our tanks, which had every legal right to roll in and protect points of access along the Berlin border. But over the course of days the wire became a wall, and our best chance to show the world that we could not be pushed around vanished.

Other ideas are seized upon by State policyshapers as an excuse to sidestep or put off anti-Communist action:

1. The "evolutionary" theory—State's hope that satellite nations will, in time, map their own non-Communist courses, independent of Moscow. This concept even holds that Russia herself will change course. State became so enchanted with this latter corollary that in 1956, just before the Hungarian revolt, when Gen. Maxwell Taylor (then U.S. Army Chief of Staff) tried to write an article saying that "there is no reason to believe

that communism will change its habits and permanently renounce aggression as an instrument of policy," it was blocked by State. Our Foreign Service didn't want these words stressed, because "it is generally recognized that the Communists for the present have renounced aggression as an instrument of policy" and therefore Taylor's claim was "not only undesirable but inaccurate."

2. The "accommodation" theory—the notion that by some magic we can reach a safe agreement with the Communists, despite their record of treachery and torn-up treaties. Listen to Robert D. Murphy, former Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, a veteran of 43 years in diplomacy and one of the most respected men ever to serve at State: "For some strange reason there are those in places of influence who seem to convince themselves that a deal is possible; that an understanding could be reached if we just find the right formula. The thought that a massive package deal is possible is a fake, a delusion, and a snare."

3. The "reduce tensions" theory—the idea that we can get along with the Reds by suppressing information that would be "provocative." Last winter State was alerted that one member of a Polish exchange mission about to visit the United States was a known espionage agent. Career men dealing with European affairs talked the Secretary of State into letting him enter, on the ground that to do otherwise would disturb our relations with Poland. This in the face of strong opposition from the Justice Department.

These fuzzy ideas show up in, among other places, the activity of State's censors. Lt. Gen. Arthur Trudeau, the Army's Chief of Research and Development, who is also an intelligence expert, wanted to say in a speech that nothing less than "sacrifice, understanding, and change" will permit us to "emerge victorious." The State Department, which reads every proposed Pentagon speech touching on foreign policy, struck out "emerge victorious" and substituted "achieve our goal." The censor crossed out another Trudeau passage which said that "coexistence is not a choice, it is a fatal disease."

In another speech General Trudeau warned that we could "go down in the ignominy of defeat" or "remain the champions in this vicious race." The censors wrote on the margin of the draft: "This might well be tempered, since it largely rules out any chance of an evolution of the Soviet system."

How, then, does State think it best to pursue the cold war? Our diplomats' favorite weapon against communism is the idea that we can, indiscriminately, sway nations away from communism with foreign aid; that we must continue dishing out billions to so-called neutrals who consistently support Moscow; that we must even assist Iron Curtain countries such as Poland, which reciprocates by partially mobilizing its armed forces to bolster the Soviets in Berlin.

Yet perhaps the greatest error of our strategists at State lies in letting ourselves be pushed around at the United Nations. We are blackmailed into allowing a Kremlin puppet, Outer Mongolia, to become a member of the U.N. Worse, our State Department gave its blessing last September to an attempt by U.N. troops to take over Katanga, the anti-Communist province of the Congo—in an effort to set up a central coalition government strongly influenced by Antoine Gizenga, a Communist trained in Czechoslovakia. This despite the fact that the Soviet publication New Times proclaimed the coalition a complete triumph for the pro-Soviet side.

Declared Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut: "This is still another in a long list of instances where our policy has been misguided by the nameless subordinates at desk positions who prepare analyses and position papers. I believe that the time has come for a critical review of this entire situation. Those responsible for briefing us into disaster after disaster should be dismissed or transferred to non-policy-making posts where their penchant for wrongheadedness can do no harm."

Add to this the recently released report from Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, of Washington, chairman of a special subcommittee set up by the Senate 2 years ago to assess our cold war machinery. Said Senator JACKSON, "No task is more urgent than improving the effectiveness of the Department of State."

If we are to meet and repel the forces of communism, if we are to start winning the cold war instead of just watching it, we must shake up the system at the State Department and bring about some real reforms. Now.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 3, 1962]

THE STATE DEPARTMENT

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Frank L. Kluckhohn has had a wide experience as a newspaperman and Government official and knows the State Department well. He does not heap the blame for State Department failures on the Secretaries of State, but describes the mechanism of the Department in an article in the January Reader's Digest, which makes it clear beyond doubt that something drastic must be done to revise, reorganize, redirect the staff of the State Department.

Citing chapter and verse, Kluckhohn shows how men in lower positions prevented Secretaries of State from becoming aware of the data that were essential to them. This does not apply only to the Kennedy administration, but has been continuous for years.

Kluckhohn describes the situation as follows:

"There are now 23,000 persons on State's payroll, the controlling group being the 3,628 Foreign Service officers. Typically, a young FSO steps into the Department direct from college. For 6 to 8 years he stamps visas or does routine embassy chores while being shifted around the world.

Even as he accumulates seniority and begins to assume responsibilities, he rarely has to make an individual decision. Whatever reports he turns out are initialed and okayed by so many persons that he doesn't have to worry about being blamed personally if things fail to go right.

"In fact, his basic technique for advancement in the bureaucratic morass comes to consist of avoiding the displeasure of his immediate superior, or identification with any controversial action—even when the avoidance may mean ignoring a problem that could build up to a disaster."

Kluckhohn indicates how the young official is trained to avoid getting into trouble. His first lesson is: "Don't rock the boat."

It is so easy to be squeezed on the escalator of achievement. The man above can kick the rising personality off the ladder; the man below can trip him as he moves upward. The rising personality cleverly avoids interference or sudden emergencies. He takes his strides slowly, even if it damages the country. The man who moves out of step can do infinite damage to himself.

Kluckhohn gives as his No. 2 rule: "Avoid making any decision for which you may be held personally responsible."

This requires the responsible personality always to mark time so that if anything goes wrong he can blame someone else. The easiest one to blame is the Secretary of State; the public will believe that he took the wrong steps because he is the big man in the picture. How could a little gnat cause so much trouble? But the little ones do cause trouble. They get in the way of things. They talk too much.

The President protects himself by having a staff in the White House to screen what comes from State and the CIA, but the Secretary of State is a daily workhorse on the job who has day-by-day responsibilities and who cannot duck issues. All sorts of dispatches are signed in his name and decisions are taken for which he is directly and personally responsible. As few as a half dozen boneheads can trip him up.

Secretary of State Hull, for instance, specialized in tariff questions and too often overlooked broader problems, so that the President or the Under Secretary was handling matters that rightly should have been the Secretary's.

This explains why the London Economic Conference at the beginning of the Roosevelt regime was such a failure. Secretary Hull was left out altogether. Raymond Moley, President Roosevelt, and Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau were reaching decisions about which the Secretary of State knew nothing. In fact, Hull never knew anything about this most significant meeting out of which, in a large measure, grew World War II.

Similarly, President Eisenhower was never adequately informed about the Castro situation. Kluckhohn describes how efforts were made to inform General Eisenhower through his brother, Milton, and how these efforts failed. Little men stood in the way.

Visao's Man of the Year 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by His Excellency Mr. Roberto de Oliveira Campos, the Ambassador of Brazil, on his selection as "Visao's Man of the Year 1961" in Rio de Janeiro.

The lucid concepts expressed by Ambassador Campos have a permanent value which transcend the Brazilian local scene to apply to most underdeveloped countries in the world and thus become of interest to all of us here who are entrusted with the task of advising and consenting on the American foreign policy toward those areas.

Ambassador Campos, through his long relationship with this country—as a junior economic officer at the Brazilian Embassy in Washington and at the United Nations; as a member of the Joint U.S.-Brazil Economic Development Commission, one of the most interesting and rewarding experiences in United States-Brazilian relations; as the managing director and president of the Brazilian National Bank for Economic Development; and now as Brazilian Ambassador in Washington, has gained the respect of Americans and Brazilians alike for his high degree of competence, straightforwardness, courage, and devotion to the public cause. I therefore ask that his remarks be printed in the RECORD so that they may be made known to my fellow

Senators and to all who are interested in U.S.-Latin American relations.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY AMBASSADOR ROBERTO DE OLIVEIRA CAMPOS ON HIS SELECTION AS "VISAO'S MAN OF THE YEAR 1961" IN RIO DE JANEIRO

Like the Romans, I shall mark this day with a white stone. Because it represents a deep moment for one who comes from the marshland to the cloister after a rugged journey; and from the latter, timid and unexperienced to the world of diplomacy and the economic battles. Not without moments of great solitude during which the search for truth appeared as a lack of patriotism, and coherence was tantamount to vice in which the ship of destiny seemed to throw me overboard still far away from the beach on the other side, desperately struggling for islands where truth might not be useless and reason irrelevant.

I can find no merits to justify the mobilization of such good people and so large group, select, lucid, and able to evaluate and to discern. But I enjoy the homage just the same. Unless one can consider merit that which my friend Luiz Bahia calls "vocation to swim upstream"; the habit of the marshland man to walk bent against the wind, following the trail that will take him to cattle strayed away; the constant preoccupation to anticipate in the midst of the present the contour of the future; and the patient acceptance of the loneliness of unpopularity. In the course of the years, in my preoccupation of being coherent with myself, I managed only to be different; not to the pleasant point of originality, but unfortunately to the acid limit of controversy.

At this "Jantar de Visao" what is my outlook of the domestic landscape? I shall speak about the spurious options, the illusions of development, and the great conflict.

THE SPURIOUS OPTIONS

I can perceive two spurious options in the present hour. Alternatives which in fact do not exist but nevertheless spread poison and instill passion. The first one is the injurious and fictitious distinction between "Nationalists" and "Entreguistas" or "cosmopolitans." It is about time to end this sham of abusive personalism, to use Jeremy Bentham's expression in his "Treaty of Political Sophisms." Brazil has nothing to hand over and much to discover.

In fact, many of those criticized in the past for being "sellouters" always practiced a vigorous nationalism. Not even the President of the Republic during his campaign escaped from this slanderous personalism—a man in whom the Nation today unanimously sees an uncompromising affirmer of the national will, anointed with courageous independence and capable of leading the Nation to the fulfillment of its destiny with the tranquillity of the strong. In this group of defendants one may find scientists and geologists who enlarged the mineral wealth of the country and made it less dependent of the external world. Also included in this group are economists, designers, and administrators who discovered processes, formulated theories, and created efficient institutions of development.

If the world is freed from its totalitarian and demagogic distortions, we must all be nationalists. The option is spurious. Aside from the Communist minority which is denationalizing by doctrine, the valid distinction I see on the basis of my analysis of men and things is between pragmatic or functional nationalists and romantic or temperamental nationalists. The latter confuse intentions with results. They start with enthusiasm and end in fanaticism, this being, according to Santayana, "the art of redoubling efforts after losing sight of objectives." Often they espouse an inconsistent theory of development, wishing at the same time more consumption, more investment, and less of capital inflow. They want more investment from the Government, and, at the same time, less taxes and more social benefits. They want the national entrepreneur strengthened but mutilate him with disturbing interventions by the state and incompetent manipulation of the price system. They want the results of development, but not the means to achieve it. Many of them, though they do not confess it, favor the dangerous surgery of revolution, while the pragmatic nationalist seeks to operate within the frame of democratic institutions and prefers reform to revolution.

As to myself, I shall continue considering myself a pragmatic nationalist. I renounce the temptation of mobilizing resentment in order to gain authority to plan development. I would rather strengthen the national entrepreneur than merely antagonize the foreigner. I would want the State not to do what it cannot do, in order to do what it should do. I prefer to love my own country than to hate the others.

The second spurious option is between stabilization and development. Inflation, like all fevers, has a stimulating phase; but like all fevers, it corrodes the organism. The answer to the spurious option is no option. We should pursue development in a context of stability, because only in this way shall we transform a passing excitement into a safe journey.

THE ILLUSIONS OF DEVELOPMENT

A realistic approach to the problem of economic development presupposes the capacity to overcome illusions.

One of the most prevalent ones at the moment is the "transpositional illusion." This is the idea that resources are magically multiplied and reduced costs by the mere change of the economic agent—namely from private enterprise to the State. The reluctance to accept the direct cost of operation of services, and the endless patience to bear the indirect and cruel taxation brought about by State deficits, exemplify this illusion.

The second is the "distributive illusion." It is believed that the raising of the standard of living of the population can be accomplished directly through regulation of capitalist "selfishness," instead of being, as it indeed is, a byproduct of economic development. A delicate balance must be maintained between fiscal measures for income distribution and social benefits indispensable for the creation of an internal market large enough to justify a speedy economic growth, on the one hand, and, on the other, the need of accumulating public resources and private funds for investment.

The third illusion is the "mechanistic illusion." This consists of an overemphasis on physical investments in machines and buildings as compared with investment in education and technology. "But everything is of no value, as Sophocles said, "neither the tower nor the ships without man." And all recent research on economic growth in the Western World indicates that at least half of it was due not to equipment and quantity of manpower but to the improvement of productivity derived from education and technology. Another mechanistic exaggeration from the emphasis given to industry to the neglect of agriculture, thus threatening the industrialization surge itself through inflated costs of foodstuffs and the scarcity of foreign exchange derived from a paucity of exports.

THE GREAT CONFLICT

But the key problem of present-day Brazil lies, perhaps, neither in the spurious options nor in the illusions of development. It hinges rather on a sound solution of some contradictions in our development process. Among these the most important is perhaps the hidden controversy on the role of the state and the limits for its intervention. In this matter, there is no point in being dogmatic, since both extreme positions—that of the Socialists and that of the liberal—are naive.

As Boulding in a picturesque way stated "the Socialist is likely to be too optimistic about the power of the government to do good and the liberal is too optimistic about the power of the market to prevent evil."

The preoccupation with State intervention—so strong among us today—has valid roots and perverse roots. The important thing is to separate the wheat from the chaff, so that we may arrive at a social and Christian capitalism and not at a hybrid and inefficient system, which only externally keeps the appearance of a capitalistic system but is devoid of vitality and motivation.

Few would question today the need, in under-developed countries like Brazil, of a greater degree of state intervention than that which guided the development of the United States, Canada, and the majority of countries in Western Europe. Among the valid reasons appear, first, the nature of the developmental process, originating less from the vigor of the private entrepreneur than from the claims of the masses for a better living; second, the flaws of the price system and the market mechanism, which create the need for regulatory government intervention to refrain monopolies, to preserve competition and to attenuate excessive imbalances between people and regions in the distribution of national income; third, technologic factors demanding massive investments in large production units above the resource—mobilizing the capacity of private enterprise; fourth, the existence of critical areas of investment, of interest to national security.

But along with these valid reasons, there are spurious motives which sap the vitality of the system and transform such intervention into a factor disheartening to private enterprise, which causes capitalism's vigor to be lost without the discipline of socialism being gained. These motivations are (1) the "subsidy mentality" which consists in disguising the real cost of the goods or service, making impossible the direct coverage of costs and replacing it by taxes and subsidies; (2) the "paternalist tradition," which enlarges the area of State intervention merely for the purpose of providing more jobs; (3) "the ideological bias," which leads many to support the widening of State action as a means for the surreptitious establishment of socialism.

Our society will lose its operational efficiency if a clear and stable delimitation of areas is not arrived at as early as possible, withholding for the State those areas where there exist technical reasons to believe that the State activity will be more efficient and taking advantage elsewhere of the vigor of private enterprise, which permitted the capitalism of the Western vanguard to accomplish an increase in the standard of living which in socialism is still a promise.

THE TASK OF DEVELOPMENT

What is my vision as to the crucial direction that our effort should take in the coming years, filled with danger and promise?

The first task is to mobilize the hidden sources of savings for investment. This would either make the contribution of foreign capital less necessary or permit an equal volume of external help to be turned into a higher rate of development. There are unexplored sources of savings to be tapped by curbing sumptuary consumption; by utilizing the idle capacity of industry, a move facilitated by the recent exchange reform; by abandoning the excessive subsidization of public services, thus avoiding the frittering

away of resources for coverage of operational deficits when they could be used for investment; by concentrating on priority investments instead of scattering resources; by reducing military expenditures; by restoring monetary stability, which will make individual saving an advantage and not an expoliation.

The next task is the solution of problems arising from our insufficient capacity to export, which threatens to strangle our development. The third task is the betterment of the governmental machinery achieved by the training of planners and administrators.

The fourth task calls for a massive effort designed to raise the general level of education and technology, as the fruits resulting from gains in productivity will be a generous multiplier of investments.

CLOSING WORDS

This discourse has lasted too long and to carry it further would abate the warmth of the wine and the pleasure of the food. It remains for me to thank the "man of vision selecting committee" for having turned their eyes to a controversial man. I want to thank my dear friend João Leão Teixeira for the care in the preparation of this fete. But it is to my dear guide and mentor, Minister Mariani, that I address my final thanks. His generous words were rather an extension of his personality than an evaluation of my merits. I worked with him in several phases of our administrative life and I don't know what should have more of my admiration—the percutient and objective reasoning, the political prudence, the calm courage to take silently dramatic decisions or still the unflinching devotion to public service. Thank you.

Here I am at the pleasant moment of raising my cup. Whom shall I salute?

I shall not drink, gentlemen, to those of us who achieved success and power and have on the lips the rich flavor of victory. But to the farmer, who bedews the earth with his tired sweat, often on others' fields; to the worker, whose reward is meager after a long and noisy day; to the small functionary immersed in the routine without promise.

I shall not drink to the elites, who inherited the benefit of culture and enjoy the privilege of technology; who often consume too much and invest too little, who have the obligation to become austere investors, so that it will not be unfair to demand patience from the consumer and diligence from the wage-earner.

I shall not drink to those who have already climbed the slope of the mountain and can see the first glow on the horizon; but to those still dwelling in the dark valley of poverty without respite and work without hope.

I drink to the great and suffering Brazilian people. I started my life devoting myself to the service of government. I hope to end it at the service of man by working with rationality and obstinacy so that in the course of this generation, the social and economic development becomes a living reality and not only a great and useless desire.

A Christmas Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, we all received and appreciated many Christmas cards and messages. One of those which most impressed me was that which came from our colleague, the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON, of Ohio, and with her permission I am glad to place it in the RECORD today. It is brief but it is thoughtful and timely.

I hope it will be widely read and I am sure that all who read it will feel well repaid. It is as follows:

1961.

GREETINGS: I write that you may know I think of you in these days when men and nations are confused and fearful. Let me remind you that in 1781 George Washington wrote: "We must not despair the game is yet in our hands; to play it well is all we have to do." Surely we can do this.

For our strengthening I give you words that St. Teresa of Avila wrote in the 16th century:

"Let nothing disturb thee; let nothing dismay thee:
All things pass; God never changes.
Patience attains all its strives for.
He who has God finds he lacks nothing:
God alone suffices."

May His blessing be upon you.
Sincerely yours,
FRANCES P. BOLTON.

Alabama Writers' Conclave First in Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, Alabama "firsts" run the gamut of human activity. One of Alabama's contributions to the Nation, as a first, is the Alabama Writers' Conclave, the original conference of professional writers in the United States, which was organized in 1923 at Alabama College, Montevallo, Ala.

The annual assembly of this group is still held at Alabama College and if one judges only by the literary contributions of individual members of the Alabama Writers' Conclave, it must be agreed that no organizational activity is more worthwhile. Among the more familiar names of members of the Alabama Writers' Conclave, one finds names of the distinguished authors Harper Lee, Hudson Strode, James Saxon Childers, and Maud Lindsay.

The current president of the Alabama Writers' Conclave is Mrs. James M. Sizemore, who is also dean of women at Howard College, an outstanding institution in my district. I have asked Mrs. Sizemore to prepare a brief history of the Conclave and am pleased to insert same in the RECORD in order to call to the attention of my colleagues in Congress, and to all those around the globe who read the RECORD, the splendid history of this important literary organization.

The article follows:

The Alabama Writers' Conclave was organized in 1923 and held its first meeting at Alabama College in Montevallo. Dr. Thomas Waverly Palmer, president of the college, and Mary Staten Gilmore of Birmingham, writer and civic leader, were the cofounders. Dr. O. C. Carmichael was dean of the college and his wife was the official hostess for the social events. Mrs. Charles Sharp (Laura Jacks) was the first president (1923–24).

The annual conference is still held at Alabama College and its minutes and scrapbooks are on file both in the library of the college and in the department of archives and history in Montgomery. The conclave which is a conference of active writers in the State of Alabama, has had such recognized writers as members as Miss Maud Lindsay (who, incidentally, was the second president) who set up the pattern, recognized everywhere, for juvenile stories. Mrs. Thomas Owen (Marie Bankhead), well-known historian, was the fourth president. Others are:

Mrs. Mary Staten Gilmore, Birmingham, cofounder and first chairman, 1923–24.

Mrs. Laura Jacks Sharpe, Birmingham, 1923–24.

Miss Maud Lindsay, Sheffield, 1924–25.

Mrs. Katherine Hopkins Chapman, Selma, 1925–26.

Mrs. Marie Bankhead Owen, Montgomery, 1926–27.

Mrs. Frances Ruffin Durham, Mobile, 1927–28.

Mrs. Martha Lyman Shillito, Birmingham, 1928–29.

Mrs. Mildred Reynolds Saffaold, Montgomery, 1929–30.

Mrs. Alice Alison Lide, Minter, 1930–31.

Miss Frances Youngblood, Birmingham, 1931–32.

Mrs. Leila Fearne Lusk, Guntersville, 1932–33.

Mrs. Mittie Owen McDavid, Birmingham, 1933–34.

Mrs. Jean Cameron Agnew, LaFayette, 1934–35.

Dr. George Lang, University of Alabama, 1935–36.

Dr. George Lang, University of Alabama, 1936–37.

Mrs. Mary B. Ward, Birmingham, 1937–38.

Dr. Emmette Kilpatrick, Troy Teachers College, 1938–39.

Dr. Emmette Kilpatrick, Troy Teachers College, 1939–40.

Mrs. Willie Hughes Tarpley, Birmingam, 1941–46. No annual sessions held during World War II.

Mrs. Elizabeth W. Sheeham, Montgomery, 1946–47.

Mrs. Gertrude W. Jeffries, Birmingham, 1947–48.

Mrs. Linnie Mae Brobston, Bessemer, 1948–49.

Douglas Bailey (no annual session held), 1949–50.

James F. Sulzby, Birmingham, 1950–51.

Mrs. Evelyn P. Dahl, Mobile, 1951–52.

Mrs. Mollie Hollifield Jones, Auburn, 1952–53.

Mrs. Mildred Elberti, Birmingham, 1953–54.

Mrs. Madera Adams Spencer, Montgomery, 1954–55.

Mrs. Corinne Demetrepolis, Mobile, 1955–56.

Bert Henderson, Montgomery, 1956–57.

Miss Sallie Hill, Birmingham, 1957–58.

Mrs. Nellie Bigbee, Sheffield, 1958–59.

Dr. W. S. Thompson, Vernon, 1959–60.

Mrs. Celia Prince (Mrs. John D.), Birmingham, 1960–61.

Mrs. James M. Sizemore (Margaret Davidson), Birmingham, 1961–62.

Television: Dividend to a Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, last year we witnessed some rather strong criti-

cism of our Nation's television industry. Fortunately, the situation is not as black as some officials would have us believe.

On October 16, 1961, Mr. Brent O. Gunts addressed the Maryland Association of Insurance Agents on the subject, "Television: Dividend to a Way of Life." Mr. Gunts is vice president and manager of television of WBAL-TV in Baltimore, Md. His long years of experience in the TV industry qualify him to speak with authority on the subject.

I commend this speech to the reading of all my colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Gunt's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TELEVISION: DIVIDEND TO A WAY OF LIFE

Last spring, Mr. Newton Minow, new Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, quite sweepingly attacked all television programing as a "vast wasteland." Not unexpectedly, Mr. Minow's attack made newspaper headlines on front pages across the country—and column after column of news magazine space. Not unexpectedly, because it is a fact many newspapers and magazines are in a battle for survival against inroads made by TV into advertising revenue, circulation and reading time. Almost any critic of TV is certain of front page newspaper space with matching large, black headlines.

Since last spring, Mr. Minow has continued to hammer away with criticism of various aspects of TV programing—and the newspapers have continued to keep his attacks on the front pages.

Frankly, I am deeply concerned about the situation—and I think you should be—concerned because I can't help but gather that Mr. Minow is leading the FCC intentionally or unintentionally toward Government censorship of TV programs, direct or indirect censorship. And the Communications Act under which the Commission functions, in section 326, clearly states—"Nothing in this Act shall be understood or construed to give the Commission the power of censorship over the radio communications or signals transmitted by any radio station—that includes TV"—and the act further forbids interference with the right of free speech by means of radio communication.

The Supreme Court ruled in 1940 that the Commission is given no supervisory control of the programs, of business management or of policy of licensees. And further—I am concerned because TV is in fact—not a vast wasteland—not by a long shot it's not—and having worked in radio and TV for more than 20 years, I resent it being labeled as such on the front page of practically every newspaper in the country—not once—but over and over again.

In just about 13 years television has accomplished a communications miracle—unmatched in the history of the world.

Today—89 percent of the wired homes in this country own and operate a TV set—54½ million sets, that is—more TV than telephones, than bathtubs. It is a mass medium of communication as no other medium has ever been. Why—WBAL-TV—has a circulation nearly three times that of the largest newspaper circulation in the State.

Conservatively the American public has invested more than $11 billion in TV sets—and it happened primarily because people—all kinds of people—wanted to see Milton Berle, Lucy and Desi, pro wrestling, Jackie Gleason, Perry Como, football, baseball, Howdy Doody, and the like.

You and I know that had Bach, Shakespeare, education and information been the principal attractions offered—the nearly saturation installation would never have taken place.

Don't misunderstand—don't think I believe all to be peaches and cream with TV programing—I don't—neither do most of my fellow station operators.

But—I do think—that in the main—TV is providing a remarkably fine service—and it is anything but a vast wasteland.

Whatever kind of service it is—it causes 54½ million American homes to use their sets an average of over 5 hours a day—about 38½ hours per week.

Certainly it can be better—it will be—but its first 13 years have brought it a long way.

Let's look at the facts—how vast is the wasteland?

Remember please that TV is a mass medium—looked at in varying degrees by almost everyone in every walk of life. And each watcher has made fundamentally the same investment in his set.

Actually, it occurs to me—that TV's program planning would be far simpler today—if we had patterned the medium's growth along lines similar to those employed by insurance companies. When a person applied to buy a TV set—the dealer could have questioned him about occupation—education—put him through a physical examination—determined his likes and dislikes—his emotional stability, etc. And if he didn't appear to be a good calculated risk, not sold him a set. Maybe TV should have determined in advance what each person wanted to watch—or should be allowed to watch—and built the sets so they could only be turned on at the times when such programs were on. Believe me—our job would be easier under such a plan. But it didn't happen that way—instead—anyone was permitted to buy—and anyone is permitted to watch as much or as little as he wants.

Our station programs 133 hours per week—7,000 hours per year—the three stations in Baltimore, therefore, offer about 20,000 hours of service annually.

And what can you see—in this vast TV wasteland?

Let's examine last week of TV (using TV 11 as example):

6 a.m. (Monday through Friday) in color, "Continental Classroom" (now in its fourth year on network; can earn credits, if desire from College of Notre Dame).

6–6:30 a.m., "Contemporary Mathematics."

6–7 a.m., "American Government" (taught by Dr. Peter Odegard, noted political scientist, from University of California). (When did the quick-to-criticize press last offer a course in mathematics and government?)

7 a.m. (Monday through Friday), "Today Show" (2 hours of information, current topics and a new point of view in the world around us).

9 a.m. (Monday through Friday), "The Jack La Lanne Show" (a qualified physical culturist attempts to help Americans, principally women, to look better and feel better through scientific diet and exercise). Tie-in with President's Physical Fitness Commission.

9:30 a.m. (Monday through Friday), "The Looking Glass" (appealing principally to pre-school tots, Miss Rhea, a charming and appealing young teacher from Department of Education, teaches good health habits, presents stories designed to educate, presents interesting guests and, generally, prepares the young child for the world around him).

10 a.m., in-school viewing programs.

(A) This is 13th season * * * since 1948.

(B) In-school viewing programs: (10–10:30 a.m.) (Programs presented by the Department of Education in cooperation with WBAL—and viewed in all secondary schools as integral part of curriculum.)

Mondays: "Science Everywhere."

Tuesdays: "For Better Speech" (with Rhea Felkin): "This Week's News" (current events).

Wednesdays: "Accent on Music" (with Emile Serposs, director of music education). "It's an Original" (with Miss Pauline Smith, supervisor of art education).

Fridays: "For Better Speech." "Steps to College" (deals with problem of preparing children for college and what parents must do for this important step).

4:30 p.m. (Monday through Saturday): "Pete the Pirate."

While realizing that this program is designed primarily to entertain, via cartoons, it does, nevertheless, present certain rules about good living to youngsters and educates in a way which no classroom situation can imitate, using an appealing and very popular character.

6:20 p.m. (Monday through Friday), "Hertsgaard and the News" (the latest in local and regional news.)

6:30 p.m. (Monday through Friday), "Special Report" (current news stories and topics are selected and carefully probed and examined from an unusual point of view, that is, "Playboy Clubs," "Santa Maria Story," and so forth.)

6:40 p.m. (Monday through Friday), "Youth in the News" (still to come, this program will provide news stories by young people, for and about young people.)

6:45 p.m. (Monday through Friday), "Huntley-Brinkley Report" (Nation's top award-winning news team; features latest national news.)

11 p.m. (Monday through Sunday), news program.

8 a.m. (Saturday and Sunday), "Learning To Read" (a unique program, prepared in cooperation with the department of education, to assist persons with reading problems and those who cannot read. Mention Social Security Manual revision as result of show.)

12 noon (Saturday), "Update" (young people's program on current topics.)

12:30 p.m. (Saturday), "Mr. Wizard" (helps teach scientific subjects to youngsters.)

1 p.m. (Saturday), "Fair Exchange" (in cooperation with homemakers' clubs, assists with such subjects as foods, clothing, home accessories, furniture arrangements.)

1:30 p.m. (Saturday), "Garden Living" (produced in cooperation with Agriculture Department, imparts information on subjects such as pest control, lawn and garden care, and so forth.)

9 a.m. (Sunday), "Sunday Sermon" (features various area ministers and church choirs—provides a church service for the many people in area who cannot get to church of their choice.)

5 p.m. (Sunday) "Spotlight On * * *" (a panel of outstanding local newsmen interview a prominent figure in the news.)

5:30 p.m. (Sunday), "Chet Huntley Reporting" (current topic in depth.)

6 p.m. (Sunday), "Meet the Press" (a prominent figure in news-making is interviewed by panel of newsmen.)

6:30 p.m. (Sunday), "To Promote Good Will" (now in its seventh season on TV 11, program brings together panel of all faiths—Protestant, Jewish and Catholic—to answer questions of a group of four college students.)

For excellent entertainment, with rarely a gun or a fight may we call you attention to:

1. Monday nights, can see "The Price Is Right," 8:30 p.m.

2. Tuesday night, can see Dick Powell Show," 9 p.m.

3. Wednesday nights, can see "Joey Bishop," 8:30 p.m.; "Perry Como Music Hall," 9 p.m.; "Bob Newhart Show," 10 p.m.; "David Brinkley's Journal," 10:30 p.m.

4. Thursday nights, can see "Strikes 'n Spares," 8 p.m.; "Dr. Kildare," 8:30 p.m.; "Hazel," with Shirley Booth, 9:30 p.m.; "Sing Along With Mitch," 10 p.m.

5. Friday nights, can see "Bell Telephone Hour" or "Dinah Shore," 9:30 p.m.; "Frank McGee's Here and Now," 10:30 p.m.

6. Saturday nights, can see "Pinsubsters," youngsters in healthy, wholesome competition, 6:30 p.m.; "Saturday Night Show," two features, 9 p.m.–1 a.m.

7. Sunday nights, can see "Bullwinkle Show," delightful cartoon, 7 p.m.; "Walt Disney's Wonderful World of Color," exciting tales, many are classics among well-known books for all ages, in full color, 7:30 p.m.; "Car 54," comedy, 8:30 p.m.; "Show of the Week," featuring variety of subjects from music and dancing to Ernest Hemingway, 10 p.m.

This means, then, that in an average week of TV viewing, you can watch approximately 52 hours of service which I sincerely doubt that even Mr. Minow would call a wasteland.

But that's only the beginning—what about TV "specials"?—programs not regularly scheduled.

1. Yesterday, TV 11 presented "The Nation's Future"—1 hour of probing two of the Nation's prominent figures—Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN and Secretary Ribicoff—enlightening, eye-opening viewing.

2. This Friday night, TV 11 will feature a return of the Hallmark special, "Macbeth," featuring Maurice Evans and Judith Anderson.

3. This season, WBAL–TV 11 is carrying "Baltimore Colts." (Is this a community service? Judge for yourself by number of people who view. We believe the people want to see sports—good, professional sports.)

4. What about "Political Scene"?

(a) Last Wednesday, TV 11 presented President Kennedy's news conference.

(b) Last season, as in this one, TV 11 will provide viewers with complete insight into Presidential news conferences, and series of J.F.K. reports. (In few newspapers or magazines around country can you find the complete text of the President's speeches.)

5. TV is there in such cases as:

(a) United Nations sessions.

(b) Moon shoots (Comdr. Alan Sheppard).

(c) Presidential inaugurations.

(d) State weddings and ceremonies.

6. Scholastic sports, i.e., Maryland scholastic wrestling finals, poly-city classic football clash.

7. Perspective of our times series:

(a) Last month's "Minus One Million"—the story of high school drop-outs—(quote from YMCA letter: "* * * This program will add a great deal to the understanding of teen-age problem in our community. * * * Programs like these perform a great public service to our communities and help agencies like ours to better work at our tasks as they are related to the problems.") ("Mention," will repeat again at time when more teenagers can see program.)

(b) Next week, "The Years After," dealing with problems of widows left alone, and helpless, in the world.

(c) Other subjects to be featured and explored include: "The Dark Corner," mental retardation, a little discussed, greatly misunderstood problem faced by a great many families; "Let There Be Sound," the story of progress and research in the field of hearing restoration; "2,000 A.D.," an exploration of the fantastic phenomenal population explosion in our area.

8. "The Play of the Week," featuring such widely acclaimed stars and some of the best plays ever penned, "Rashomon," "Therese Raquin," "The Power and the Glory," "Emmanuel," Carol Lawrence, Eva LeGallienne, Burgess Meredith, and many, many others.

9. "Purex Specials" (network), series of eight programs presenting dramatizations of thoroughly researched problems of our society, specifically designed for women. This Thursday, first program, "What's Wrong With Men?"

10. Holiday viewing:

(a) TV 11's Madrigal Singers at Christmas.

(b) TV 11's Voices of Christmas.

(c) Special Christmas Eve programs.

TV 11 specials from last season:

1. "DeGaulle and 6-Year War"—the civil strife, insurrection, and open rebellion in France and Algeria (March 1961).

2. "Portrait of a Problem," Hagerstown situation (March 1961).

3. "Patuxent," searching look at a unique component in Maryland's penal system (July 1960).

4. "Christ and the Steel Strike."

5. "Castro, Cuba, and Communism."

6. "Voices of Christmas."

One of Mr. Minow's complaints has been that most education and informational programs are not presented in so-called prime viewing times when most people can see them—we've been accused of relegating the quality programs to Sunday afternoon, for instance.

Well, I question what is prime time, and my answer is that prime time is any time when what is scheduled has wide appeal, and a lot of people want to see it.

It is true than an opera, an intellectual discussion on Sunday afternoon is not seen by many comparatively. But suddenly, miraculously, let WBAL–TV schedule a World Series game or a Colt game on a Sunday afternoon, and suddenly it is prime time, with as large or larger an audience than many a night-time show.

Saturday night is prime time in Mr. Minow's book, but look, last year on Saturday night the three Baltimore stations scheduled at the same time, a cowboy show, a boxing match, and a debate on some subject of national or international importance.

The most accurate available research shows 64 percent of the people had their sets on, 50 percent watched the cowboy show, 10 percent watched the fight, 4 percent watched the debate.

This year, on Saturday night, same cowboy show, the boxing match, but on WBAL–TV instead of the debate, a full-length movie. The result: about 70 percent watching: 10 percent, the fight; 30 percent, the cowboy show; 30 percent, the movie.

The debate has been moved to Sunday afternoon, and I wouldn't be at all surprised if more people don't see it then, than did on Saturday. Apparently, the people who bought and operate TV sets in the main want entertainment on Saturday night. I believe TV serves the public interest in a very real sense when it provides that entertainment.

Six a.m. is hardly prime time, but miraculously, it became that when Alan Sheppard was scheduled for his space shoot at that early hour—millions upon millions turned on their sets and watched.

A Monday afternoon is not normally prime time—what man can watch? he's working—but somehow when a world series game is scheduled on Monday afternoon, the sets go on, and millions do watch * * * and it is primetime.

Unfortunately, the same urgency to watch doesn't seem to occur even when the President conducts a televised news conference at a similar time.

But is that television's fault or is it simply that in this land of freedom, we resolutely reserve the right to read, hear and see what we the people want and not what somebody thinks we should read or hear or see.

No, TV is not a vast wasteland, it is anything but. We in the business have a long way to go, a lot to accomplish—but we've come a long way.

We've put sight, sound and motion communication into 89 percent of the wired homes of the Nation, we've provided round-the-clock, 7-day-a-week service that people use more than 38 hours a week, 52 weeks a year, and it's all been accomplished under a system of free choice, free enterprise, bought and paid for voluntarily by the people and their businesses, without Government taxation or Government control of programing.

To Mr. Minow's vast wasteland charge, I say, "God bless American television—and you ain't seen nothin' yet."

Edward Hellman Heller—University of California Regent and Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, when Edward Hellman Heller died last month the Nation lost a great American. California lost a fine and distinguished citizen and the Democratic Party lost a prominent and dedicated member. Ed Heller moved in three worlds and he excelled in all of them—the world of educaton, the world of business, and the world of politics.

An article on Ed Heller appeared in the December 19 issue of the San Francisco Examiner. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the San Francisco Examiner, Dec. 19, 1961]

E. H. HELLER HAD MAJOR CIVIC ROLES

Edward Hellman Heller, who had a long and distinguished career in California financial, civic, and political affairs, died yesterday at his home in Atherton.

The 61year-old financier was a senior partner of Schwabacher & Co., San Francisco investment brokerage firm.

He joined the firm many years ago after serving as a director of the Wells Fargo Bank, an institution of which his late grandfather, I. W. Hellman, was president.

Mr. Heller was serving his second 16-year term as a member of the University of California board of regents, having been appointed by Gov. Edmund G. Brown in March 1960.

He was appointed to his first term as a regent by Gov. Culbert Olson, but failed to win reappointment from Gov. Goodwin J. Knight when the term expired in 1958.

An ardent Democrat, he was California finance chairman of President Kennedy's 1960 campaign.

His wife, Elinor, joined him in his political activities and served recently as Democratic national committeewoman for California.

In addition to his partnership in Schwabacher & Co., he was a limited partner in Draper, Gaither & Anderson, a Palo Alto investment firm.

A native of San Francisco, Mr. Heller was the son of Emanuel S. and Clara Hellman Heller.

After his graduation from the University of California, he studied law at Harvard for 2 years, but then decided on a business career.

He returned to San Francisco, joined the Wells Fargo Bank and went to Schwabacher & Co. in 1925.

He saw service in both World Wars. In World War II, he left the Army with rank of lieutenant colonel in the Finance Department.

In 1939–40, he was vice chairman of the California Commission for the Golden Gate International Exposition.

In 1961, he was a member of the California Olympics Commission.

He held directorships in more than a dozen corporations, including Pacific Intermountain Express, Permanente Cement, Siegler Corp., Pacific Industries, Allied Properties, U.S. Leasing Corp., International Rectifier, and Raychem Corp.

He was an organizer of Pacific Cement and Aggregates.

In addition to his wife, the former Elinor Raas, Mr. Heller is survived by a daughter, Miss Elizabeth Heller of San Francisco, and two sons, Clarence E. Heller of Atherton, and Alfred E. Heller of Grass Valley.

The family announced that funeral services will be private. Contributions to the University of California were requested.

Former President Eisenhower Discusses Our System of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the Congress will consider many proposals this year designed to increase the authority and jurisdiction of the Federal Government in a great many areas of responsibility. The rapid and constant growth of the role of the Federal Government in our country is threatening to change the traditional concepts of our American system of government. As a result, these developments should be thoroughly weighed by Congress during the deliberations of the many proposals under consideration during this session.

Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower has recently discussed the far-reaching significance of these principles and he noted "tendencies developing that affect adversely our cherished ideas of government and tend to revise the structure built by those who preceded us." General Eisenhower's remarks were made before the constitutional convention of the State of Michigan; however the significance of these principles has great meaning for those who cherish our American system.

In the desire to bring the impressive address of the former President to the attention of all my colleagues, I wish to include it with my remarks:

ADDRESS BEFORE THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION, LANSING, MICH., DECEMBER 13, 1961, BY GEN. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

By the terms of the invitation that I received from this convention by the hand of Mr. Romney, I have the honor of speaking to you briefly as you meet in the bipartisan purpose of rewriting the constitution of the great State of Michigan.

Such a purpose, pursued in such a setting cannot fail to bring to me, as an out-of-stater, renewed respect for my late friend, Senator Arthur Vandenberg. As the first individual of our Nation to give true significance and real depth to the concept of bipartisanship in our country's international affairs, it would be strange indeed if any of you engaged in this worthy effort should fail to feel a sense of guidance from his spirit and his mature wisdom. I am certain that all of you here are convinced—as I am—that his passing was a grievous loss to his State, his Nation, and the world.

Because in political work at the State level, I have had no experience whatsoever, it would be far from fitting for me to urge upon you any notion of mine respecting either the form or content of the document you are engaged in preparing. But since I did have the privilege of serving for 8 exciting years as head of the Federal Government, it might be appropriate for me first to express to you some personal thoughts as to the desirable relationships between State and Federal levels of government in this Nation.

The several States—at least the first 13 of them—are the collective parents of the Federal Government; our Constitution recognizes that each of them possesses a sovereignty limited only by the specific grants of authority given by them to the Central Government.

If it were possible for us to have here, at this moment a temporary reincarnation of any one of the framers of our Constitution, telling us with what care those men defined this relationship and how they believed it would develop, I am quite sure that we would be astonished by the differences in his vision of 1787 and the reality of 1961. By the same token our spiritual visitor would be bewildered if not dismayed by the result he would see around him.

For example, some years ago, a court decision extended the meaning of that section of the Constitution which accords to Congress the power to regulate commerce among the several States—so as to include in the term "interstate commerce" also those things that "affect such commerce." The changes that have grown out of that decision are indeed great—for the better or for the worse is here beside the point. But because we today are bound by the judicial interpretations made of any part of the Constitution the effect have been to place in the hands of the Central Government more power over the Nation's internal commerce than was previously and popularly supposed to be intended.

So as you set about the rewriting of your constitution it seems to me you must take account of other governmental changes in our Nation. Such an examination is timely and I have felt—and surely you have felt—that there are tendencies developing that affect adversely our cherished ideas of government and tend to revise the structure built by those who preceded us. Of those principles I refer specifically to one drawn from the colonists' bitter struggle against tyranny and from man's progress from serfdom to liberty and self-government. That principle is this: Those who would be and would stay free must stand eternal watch against undue centralization of power in government. Faithful to that principle, our founders saw to it that governmental authority would be diffused—counterbalanced—checked, hedged about, and restrained so as to minimize the possibility of its abuse. In that principle and in those precautions, we have believed was established the true anchor of our freedom.

Due to our decentralized system, most political-economic questions can be approached in many reasonable ways. Without constitutional checks and balances, with our State and territorial governments, our multiplicity of county and municipal governing bodies, our emphasis upon individual initiative and community responsibility, there is encouraged unlimited experimentation in the solving of America's problems. Through this diversified approach the effect of error is restrained, calamitous mistakes are avoided, and the self-governing genius of our people is perpetually renewed.

In this vast system of self-government, the State echelon is of vital importance, and was so recognized by our forefathers.

Being accustomed to decentralized authority, we are too often inclined to accept it as an ordinary fact of life, to expect it as our right, and to assume that it will always endure. But in other lands millions, helpless before concentrated power, have been born and lived and have died in slavery, or have lost their liberties to despots.

Today, in those areas, any one who speaks does so as the government directs, or he speaks no more. A meeting such as this one would be unthinkable.

Contemplating these things, we in America gain renewed determination to hew to the principle of diffusion of power, knowing that only thus can we be sure to avoid drifting irretrievably—even though so slowly as to be almost imperceptible—into the grasp of some form of centralized government.

Our governmental system, with its checks and balances, with power filtered and the people free, has survived longer than any other attempt to conduct a nation's affairs by the authority of the people themselves. Yet we have often been cautioned by responsible observers that in the measurable future, if present trends continue, the States will finally degenerate into powerless satellites of the National Government in Washington.

The tendency of bureaucracy to grow in size and power does not bear the whole of the blame for the march of political power toward Washington. Never under our constitutional system could the National Government have syphoned away so much State responsibility and authority without the neglect, acquiescence, or unthinking cooperation of the States themselves. Every State failure to meet a pressing public need has created the opportunity, developed the excuse and fed the temptation for the National Government to poach on the State's preserve. Year by year, responding to transient popular demands and localities seeking special advantage, the Congress has increased Federal functions. The pendulum of power has swung far from our States toward the Federal Government.

Eight years ago, I publicly expressed the conviction that unless we preserve the traditional power and responsibilities of State government, with revenues necessary to assure exercise of that power and discharge those responsibilities, there will not forever be preserved the kind of America we have known. Eventually, we shall have, instead, another form of government, and therefore quite another kind of America. That conviction I hold just as firmly today.

In that same year I obtained congressional authority to establish a commission to study and report on intergovernmental relations. The study brought long needed perspective and pointed the way to improvement in areas of mutual concern to the States and the Federal Government. Unfortunately sound recommendation and resultant action are not always the same.

Opposed though I am to needless Federal expense and centralization of power, I found

it necessary at times, during my terms in the Presidency, to urge Federal action in some areas traditionally reserved to the States. In each instance, State inaction or inadequate action, coupled with undeniable national need forced emergency Federal intervention. But I tried to keep the word "emergency" of real significance in such legislation so that the invasion which I felt forced to accept, would not be of long duration. These recommendations applied to such problems as classroom shortages, slum clearance, urban renewal, relief in the case of natural disasters and matters of traffic safety.

In varying degrees and varying circumstances, both Federal and State responsibility in some types of activity has been, is now, and will continue to be indispensable. But I would urge that the States insistently contend for the fullest possible responsibility, well knowing that with responsibilities there goes, in the long run, authority.

Take the matter of traffic safety. This happily is still a State and local responsibility, but day by day the American people are paying a fearful price for the failure of the States to agree on such safety essentials as standards for licensing of drivers and vehicles and basic rules of the road. Each year, from 35,000 to 40,000 persons are killed on our highways, a million and a half citizens injured, of whom many are disabled for life. The estimated cost to the country, in the year 1956, was almost $5 billion. We simply cannot let this go on. The human and material costs of inaction are prohibitive. Who is going to fill the vacuum? Someone must and someone will. I believe that the Federal Government has a function, but only as a leader and coordinator. The basic responsibility and authority should be with the States among which there should be effective coordination.

I believe that the preservation of our States as vigorous, powerful governmental entities is essential to permanent individual freedom and to national growth. But it is idle to champion States rights without upholding States responsibilities as well. So I hope that the rewritten draft of Michigan's constitution will define carefully the responsibilities that its people believe should belong to Michigan, and that they will forthrightly assume and exercise the authority essential to the carrying out of those responsibilities.

So acting, they will do something, positive and effective, about problems that directly concern their fortunes, their welfare, their lives—the spending of their tax money wisely and efficiently; the development of programs and institutions best fitted to fill the present needs and to promote the future well-being of Michigan; the creation of long-term policies that will foster in the State a climate of opportunity for every citizen and his family, a reasonable assurance that opportunity can be used for his and his family's good.

Of and by and for themselves, they will be using their money; improving their present; exploring their future—as these things can never be done by a distant and centralized bureaucracy, preoccupied with its own amplification and the manufacture of inflexible master plans for the infinitely varied circumstances of 50 sovereign States and many thousand communities.

The responsibilities, best exercised by the people of a State, can be returned to them in all 50 States. And Michigan can lead the way.

The only limit placed by the Constitution on the kind of State government established by its people is that it must be republican in form. I believe therefore that this body, awakened to the trends of our time, has an opportunity to establish greater respect for the vital place that State government has filled in our national development. Michigan's example of self-examination and its assertion of responsibility and authority could lead to like action in other States of the Union.

Let us not forget that the American people are not completely dependent upon congressional action to accomplish any amendment in the National Constitution if they should believe such action desirable. On the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, the Congress is compelled to call a convention for proposed amendments. It is quite clear that if two-thirds of the States wanted our Constitution so amended as to define more exactly proper relations between the Federal and State Governments, they could accomplish this by gaining the approval of three-fourths of the States.

Now a final word which may be shooting far wide of the target at which you are aiming. It is my hope that in its preamble or in accompanying documents of your new constitution, there will be greater emphasis placed, particularly before our young people, on the opportunities rather than merely upon the problems and fears of our age. The hope of lifelong individual security is a natural one; but it is not an inspirational impulse. It does not encourage exploration, venturesomeness, ambition. Unless the individual is inspired to dream, work, and accomplish according to his own needs and desires, he will be courting a dreary, dull, and eventually an insecure life indeed. I pray that the language of your new constitution will bring to its people a message of hope, a feeling of greater courage and confidence, a pioneering urge to sustain and enjoy freedom to the full, so that your State government and other State governments will cheerfully assume their own responsibilities, assert their proper authority over them, and repel any temptation of whatsoever kind to surrender these to the Government in Washington.

Put it this way—if our people are to be tireless two-fisted champions and workers for America's great goals, they should have two-fisted, sturdy, alert and tireless State governments to preserve their opportunities and give them example.

Trade Policy and the Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, few people are as sufficiently qualified to speak on behalf of the American cotton textile industry as my distinguished constituent, Mr. J. Craig Smith, president of Avondale Mills, and chairman of the board of the National Cotton Council. On November 27, 1961, Mr. Smith addressed the Farm-City Week Observance in Huntsville, Ala., and his remarks are of such importance that I wanted to give my colleagues in Congress the opportunity to ponder them. Under unanimous consent, I insert Mr. Smith's address into the RECORD at this point:

TRADE POLICY AND THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

(Remarks of J. Craig Smith, president of Avondale Mills and chairman of the board of the National Cotton Council at Farm-City Week Observance in Huntsville, Ala., November 27)

Under the current trade policies of the United States, a whole host of foreign-manufactured goods is flooding into this country. The flow is ever upward, and poses a very grave threat to many American industries and millions of American workers. Nowhere is this more true than in the case of the U.S. cotton industry. In the early 1950's, imports of manufactured cotton goods were small, even negligible. Then, in the middle fifties, they began skyrocketing. They now have reached a level where they are taking about 500,000 to 600,000 bales a year of our domestic market—which is not too much less than the total production of all the cotton farmers of Alabama. And unless our Government takes some sensible action, they will continue to go up—ruining the domestic textile industry, robbing farmers of their biggest and most dependable markets, and putting hundreds of thousands of textile workers out of jobs.

What is the basic cause of the import problem? Is it because the domestic textile industry is flabby? Or noncompetitive? Or suffering from obsolescent machinery and techniques? Or victimized by inefficient management? Absolutely not. Even those who oppose governmental relief for us will usually recognize the phenomenal progress that's been taking place in the American textile industry. For example, at a recent gathering of the National Foreign Trade Council, Carl Gilbert (chairman of the Gillette Co.), the keynote speaker, singled out the American textile industry as among the world's most efficient producing industries. To quote Mr. Gilbert: "This (textile) industry has been faced with decline in the price of its products during the last 10 years. At the same time, wage costs have gone up substantially. * * * Despite this, due to increased productivity, unit costs have declined. This is a remarkable record and demonstrates the skills in organization and management in the American textile industry." These complimentary words, mind you, are from a man who is not in sympathy with the American cotton industry's position on the import problem. And he makes it abundantly clear that our textile industry has not been derelict in measuring up to the stiffest standards of competitive enterprise. The stark fact is that our Government itself has made it utterly impossible for us to cope with foreign-produced cotton textiles. Under our Government's minimum wage laws, we have no alternative but to pay domestic textile workers many times the wages that their foreign counterparts earn. What's more, under our Government's export subsidy program for raw cotton, the foreign mills pay something like $42.50 a bale less for their raw fiber than we are forced to pay in this country. That's the story, in a nutshell, of how our Government has imposed impossible ground rules on the domestic industry.

What is the answer? This depends primarily on whether you believe that the domestic textile mills—and other basic industries as well—are expendable. Those who believe like Mr. Gilbert—and their ranks extend into high places in our Government—leave no doubt as to their view. This same Mr. Gilbert—who was so highly complimentary of the organization and management skills of the American textile industry—thinks that our industry should look overseas for greater opportunities. Again I quote from his address before the National Foreign Trade Council: "Who knows," he asks, "what such management (textile management) could do in places with different cost factors? How many companies in the textile industry or other beleaguered industries have taken a world view of their opportunities?" Mr. Gilbert obviously feels that American capital and management should take their factories overseas where they can hire low-cost foreign labor, enjoy lower raw material costs, and have other advantages.

Mr. Gilbert's view was reinforced by some statements of Under Secretary of State

George Ball, at the same convention. Mr. Ball issued a sweeping call for our free trade policies to become much freer. His remedy for the troubles of domestic industries included faster tax write offs—which are something we do need—and loans for modernization—which are something the textile industry doesn't need. Mr. Ball also indicated that when a factory goes broke, the Government would be glad to offer assistance in relocating and retraining labor, although he didn't explain where labor's new jobs would come from.

The American textile industry takes a different view. We don't want to close down our plants here and move them to Hong Kong or the Congo or somewhere else where we can get cheap labor and cheap cotton. We are proud of the good jobs we provide for hundreds of thousands of Americans. We are proud of the good wages we pay. We would hope that if our markets can expand—as they would in the absence of unfair import competition—we could provide more jobs and still better pay.

So far as competition is concerned, we welcome it on any kind of fair basis. We are accustomed to fierce competition in the American textile industry. It is an everyday fact of life for us. We don't shrink from it. But we do insist that we must not have our Government setting up one set of ground rules for foreign mills and an entirely different and completely impossible set for us.

I am not proposing that we abolish the minimum wage. Nor am I proposing that the export subsidy on raw cotton be abolished—for I believe the Government, whose programs did so much to ruin the farmers' export market, has a duty at this time to help farmers rebuild this market. I am not even suggesting that Congress needs to pass any new legislation for the cotton textile import problem to be resolved on a sensible basis. The fact is that the Congress has already provided, under existing law, ample authority for the administration to work out this problem on a satisfactory basis.

Solution of this problem has been left in the air by both a Republican and a Democratic administration. President Kennedy has indicated his intention of doing something about our problem. He has announced a seven-point program of help, one point of which has been implemented. So far, however, the most tangible actions have been: to raise the Japanese "voluntary" quota of our market; to increase the foreign mills' raw cotton cost advantage from $30 to $42.50 a bale; to raise the domestice support price of cotton by about $20 a bale—an action which not only has increased mill costs but which has cost cotton farmers about 200,000 bales of consumption, lost to rayon, in the first 8 months of this year; and the administration has given mills a more liberal depreciation allowance, which will help us some if we can stay in business and make a profit.

With respect to the two basic causes of our problem, the administration has recognized the unfairness of the raw cotton cost differential favoring foreign mills—but has worsened the situation instead of helping it; and no real recognition at all has been given to the foreigners' low wages—wages which we are prohibited by law from matching, even if we wanted to.

The stakes involved in the textile import problem should be of deep concern to everyone. What we face here is the basic question of whether American business and industry are going to be given a reasonable chance to survive and go forward—to create new jobs and new prosperity in our own home country—or whether our Government is going to foster the kind of climate in which American capital and management and job opportunities are progressively transferred overseas to the less developed countries.

Certainly we must have—and we can continue to have—a high, expanding volume of international trade. But our Government must give American industry—and American workers—a set of ground rules which gives them a reasonable and fair opportunity to meet the challenge of foreign competition.

ADA: An Evaluation—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, during the month of September of last year, the Los Angeles Times ran a series of articles explaining and evaluating the purposes of the organization named the Americans for Democratic Action, its means of working for these purposes and the individuals who are connected with it. Robert T. Hartmann, chief of the Los Angeles Times Washington Bureau, prepared this study of the ADA neither as an apology nor as an exposé. I believe that his treatment of the subject reflects the care with which he researched and the diligence with which he pursued information of importance to an understanding of this influential group. I share with the Los Angeles Times its belief that "any national organization with a political purpose is of paramount interest" and for this reason I am placing this series of articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There are seven articles and the series is capped by an editorial which makes value judgments by the Times in regard to the reported facts in the articles. The first of these articles, "The ADA: Its Impact on the New Frontier," points out the influence which the Americans for Democratic Action has in the official Kennedy family:

THE ADA: ITS IMPACT ON THE NEW FRONTIER—ONCE ALOOF FROM KENNEDY, IT STAFFS HIS ADMINISTRATION

(Because it believes that any national organization with a political purpose is of paramount interest, the Times assigned Robert T. Hartmann, its Washington bureau chief, to make a thorough study of Americans for Democratic Action. The following is the first of seven articles on this organization, written after months of careful research and interviews.)

(By Robert T. Hartmann)

WASHINGTON.—"I'm not a liberal at all," protested John F. Kennedy soon after becoming a Senator in 1953. "I never joined the Americans for Democratic Action. I'm not comfortable with those people."

Eight years ago, American liberals were not very comfortable with the young Senator, either. Taking their cues from Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, honorary national chairman of ADA, most of their hearts belonged to Adlai in that bitter winter of Republican restoration. They also deeply distrusted the open association of Senator Kennedy's rich father and that other Joe, ADA's particular pet hate, Senator McCarthy, Republican, of Wisconsin.

Last May, as the 14th national convention of Americans for Democratic Action met in the Mayflower Hotel to celebrate the recapture of Washington by the Democrats, National ADA Chairman Samuel H. Beer reported that "ADA can be proud of the role it played in the election of John F. Kennedy."

LETTER OF WELCOME

And for the first time in 8 years there was a letter of welcome to Washington on White House stationery hailing "liberals as today's minutemen leading the way" in the "democratic social revolution as against the revolutions of nihilism and totalitarianism."

Professor Beer, of Harvard's department of government, credited a 21-percent upsurge in ADA membership (to about 50,000) to "our new respectability, with so many of our leaders prominent in the New Frontier."

The roster of past and present members of ADA who occupy key appointive posts in the Kennedy administration is even more impressive because so few of them boarded the Kennedy bandwagon before Los Angeles, coming (as New York Post Editor and ADA Founder James Wechsler told the 400 delegates) "reluctantly and perhaps grudgingly to Mr. Kennedy's side."

Let us start with the White House, the pivot of power.

SPECIAL COURSE

Theodore C. Sorensen, 33, special counsel to the President and his closest confidant outside the family circle, was active in ADA's campus auxiliary, Students for Democratic Action, at the University of Nebraska, where he topped his class.

He later joined ADA, but told the Times he dropped all such affiliations, for Kennedy's sake, 5 or so years ago. When Mr. Kennedy came fresh to the Senate he hired Sorensen on the recommendation of Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, and DOUGLAS' top aid, Frank W. McCulloch, both ADA founders. Since then Sorensen (who researched Mr. Kennedy's Pulitzer Prize book, "Profiles in Courage," and masterminded his presidential strategy) has been the President's alter ego.

Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., 43, administrative assistant to the President, is a former national ADA chairman, a current vice chairman, a founder of the organization and one of its most active and articulate prophets.

STEVENSON ADVISER

Also a Pulitzer winner, described by fellow ADA'ers as "the egghead's egghead," Harvard historian Schlesinger was a chief Stevenson adviser and speechwriter in 1952 and 1956. He joined the Kennedy braintrust in 1960 and wrote a cutting campaign tract against Vice President Nixon.

Harrison L. Wooford, special assistant to the President on civil rights, is a former ADA member. Operating in this area at the White House prior to his recent resignation was Frank D. Reeves, another ADAer, whose nomination by President Kennedy to be the first Negro Commissioner of the District of Columbia was withdrawn when it was disclosed his own District of Columbia taxes were in default.

At the State Department, ADA friends in and out of Government recently rallied around to save the key assignment of Under Secretary of State Chester Bowles, former Price Administrator, Connecticut Governor, Congressman, advertising executive, chairman of the 1960 Democratic platform committee, and one of ADA's founding fathers.

Bowles' special assistant, Mrs. Katie Louchheim, formerly vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee, is a former ADA member, as are two Assitant Secretaries of State, ex-Michigan Gov. G. Mennen (Soapy) Williams (for African Affairs) and Philip H. Coombs (for Educational and Cultural Affairs). The U.S. representative on the United Nations Trusteeship Council,

Jonathan B. Bingham, also is an ADA alumnus.

Two of President Kennedy's toughest ambassadorial assignments to crucial cold war battlegrounds went to longtime ADA policymakers. Harvard Economics Professor J. Kenneth Galbraith, who captained the intellectual backfield in the Kennedy campaign, went to India as the U.S. contact with Prime Minister Nehru, a fellow disciple of Keynesian economic theory. Galbraith was an ADA founder and former deputy of Bowles in OPA.

James Loeb, Jr., Ambassador to Peru, was also a founder and from 1947 to 1951 the full-time paid executive secretary of ADA. Before that Loeb held the same position with a parent liberal group, Union for Democratic Action (UDA), set up in New York City before World War II to fight nazism and U.S. isolationism.

RECORD NOT CLEAR

Adlai Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, has a relationship with ADA that is tender and enduring but something less than formal marriage. The record is unclear. ADA World, the official house organ, identified Stevenson as "one of the original founders of ADA" when he won the Illinois governorship in 1948, and as a Presidential prospect 4 years later called him "a charter member of ADA." Stevenson's name does not appear on the list of founders submitted by ADA during a 1950 congressional lobbying probe; which I have taken as authoritative. And Stevenson himself wrote conservative Senator McCarran, Democrat, of Nevada, in 1952: "As for ADA, I have never been a member of it."

In an effort to resolve this contradiction, The Times asked both ADA headquarters and Ambassador Stevenson for clarification. His U.N. assistant, Clayton Fritchie, replied by wire: "Stevenson out of country. My personal recollection is that he was not a member of either" (ADA or IVI, its Illinois affiliate which drafted him into politics.)

National ADA Director Violet M. Gunther stated: "Adlai Stevenson has never been a member of ADA. He did attend one convention as a nonvoting guest and has, of course, spoken to ADA meetings." He has had ADA's warm support in both his presidential campaigns.

A FORMER MEMBER

In the realm of labor policy, ADA holds some strategic command posts. Secretary of Labor Goldberg is a former member, and President Kennedy named the chairman of ADA's national executive committee, McCulloch as the new Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board.

Assistant Secretary of Labor (for International Labor Affairs) is George L.-P. Weaver, another ADA founder and former head of the CIO committee to abolish discrimination. Though President Kennedy did not appoint Weaver until July to succeed George Cabot Lodge, the son of his oldtime Massachusetts rival and 1960 campaign foe, his choice was frontpaged in the January issue of ADA World—a 6-month scoop.

WOMEN'S BUREAU DIRECTOR

Assistant Secretary of Labor and Director of the Women's Bureau is Mrs. Esther Peterson, an ADA member. So is the Labor Department Solicitor, Charles Donahue.

In the key New Frontier Department of Health, Education, and Welfare ADA is represented by Secretary Ribicoff, Assistant Secretary (for Legislative Affairs) Wilbur J. Cohen and Mrs. Jim G. Aken, congressional liaison officer—all former members.

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, former Minnesota Governor and protege of ADA founder and vice chairman, Senator HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, is an active ADA'er. Under Secretary Charles Murphy, an old New Dealer and Truman aid; the Deputy Administrator of Price Supports, Robert G. Lewis; and Director John A. Baker, of Agricultural Credit Services, are all ADA alumni.

Under Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler and Assistant Postmaster General Frederic C. Belen (in charge of postal operations) are both former ADA members. So is Director Charles H. Stoddard of the Interior Department's technical review staff. The solicitor general of the United States, Archibald Cox, is a current ADA member. So is the special assistant to the director of the Civil Rights Commission, William Taylor, since 1959 ADA's paid lobbyist on Capitol Hill.

No top appointments in the Commerce and Defense Departments are held by ADA'ers, according to ADA headquarters, but the U.S. Ambassador to NATO, Thomas K. Finletter, is a former Air Force Secretary and former member of ADA's national executive board.

President Kennedy's top-ranking Negro appointee, Housing and Home Finance Administrator, Robert C. Weaver; his deputy administrator, Jack T. Conway, and the HHFA commissioner of community facilities, Sidney H. Woolner, are all ADA alumni.

FPC CHIEF, TOO

Other ADA'ers named to powerful independent regulatory agencies are Federal Power Commissioner Howard Morgan, Federal Trade Commissioner Philip Elman and former Kansas Gov. George Docking, Director of the Export-Import Bank.

This Who's Who of New Frontier figures, which has been carefully checked with Mrs. Gunther, ADA's national director, and in doubtful cases with the individual concerned, is not exhaustive.

Nor is it cited to prove or disprove that Americans for Democratic Action is (1) a conspiracy to take over the U.S. Government or (2) an extraordinary magnet for administrative talent.

It can be taken as reasonable proof, however, that Preseident Kennedy has clearly overcome the discomfort he expressed about liberals and the ADA 8 years ago.

But when any 14-year-old organization numbering no more than 50,000 citizens, with a budget of less than $200,000 a year, regarded as an albatross by many Democrats and as anathema by most Republicans, holding no I.O.U. from the Presidential winner for his nomination—when any such organization can staff a new administration with 3 White House aides, 3 Cabinet officers and 31 key administrators in vital areas of finance, labor, civil rights, public works, power, housing, and foreign policy, it is worth looking into.

And thereby hangs a tale—one which tries hard to wag the Democratic donkey—which after 3 months of study I shall try to tell fully and factually in this series.

We Can Be Proud of Our Merchant Seamen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, while returning from a European trip last fall on the SS *Independence* of the American Export Lines, our ship was delayed by a rescue operation at sea. This incident confirmed my faith in the ability, alertness and efficiency of our merchant seamen, of whom we can justly be proud.

In addition to the captain of the vessel, Hugh L. Switzer, the other members of the rescue party who deserve mention are: Staff Captain John Korista, Chief Radio Officer Charles C. Berger, First Assistant Engineer William W. Hurd, Machinist Joseph Hoerger, Deck Maintenance men John W. Grace, James H. Kohn, Sirrel Khatin, Michael N. Stamou and Carmen Soler, Carpenter Abdul Amed and Bosun Mate Nicola A. Giammorino.

The rescue is described by G. Paul Butler, book editor of the Mirror and author of the Butler Travel Guides, as passenger on the ship, who was invited by the captain to accompany the crew on its rescue mission. His story follows:

On the night of November 4, 1961, the American Export Lines ship *Independence* made a dramatic rescue at sea. After leaving Madeira, where the passengers had enjoyed a pleasant stopover and the slide down the mountain in the basket sleds, shopping and rides in bullock carts, the passengers and crew were all set for home, when Capt. Hugh L. Switzer (who is known as the Samaritan of the Sea for his two previous rescues several years ago) notified the ship that he was turning around to steam back 6 hours to rendezvous with the French ship *Ile D'Arz*, reported at the time to be either an oil or coal carrier, with a seaman aboard suffering from a ruptured hernia and in danger of his life. Captain Switzer, with the cooperation of staff Capt. John Korista and volunteers from the crew, got everything in readiness for the rescue. Lifeboat No. 3, equipped with motor, two-way radio equipment, searchlights, lifejackets was made ready. About 9 p.m. the *Ile D'Arz* was sighted about 15 miles ahead. At 10:15 the lifeboat No. 3 was swung out in the davits and about 10:30 was lowered into the sea and Captain Korista swung her bow toward the *Ile D'Arz*. As the sea was too rough to approach on the windward side, Captain Korista circled to the lee side where safe contact was made with the ship, she was made fast and the injured seaman was lowered on ropes in a ship stretcher to our lifeboat, where he was made comfortable.

The return trip to the *Independence* was made with skill. All the way through I was proud of our American seamanship and the way the officers and crew cooperated. You could feel the good will between Mr. Korista and the members of the crew, a mutual respect and confidence. Mr. Korista gave his orders quietly, easily, and the crew responded willingly, happily. It was fun, a great experience to go with the rescue boat for it gave me a stronger faith in our American merchant marine and its efficiency.

I would praise the crew for their willingness to go with the rescue boat—more men volunteered than could be used—for their ability, cheerfulness. One of them made motions to the rescued seaman, as no one spoke French well enough to talk with him, to find out if there was anything he wanted or that they could do for him. One of the crew lighted a cigarette for him and helped him to smoke it, a comfort, as you could see by the expression on his face.

On arrival at the ship, boat No. 3 was taken on board with skill, it rolled a bit in the 8- or 10-foot waves, but was brought under control with ropes as it was attached to the block and tackle. When it was stopped at deck level the injured man was taken off easily, carefully, and taken through the hallways to the hospital where the doctor was waiting for him.

There was no uncertainty, no fumbling—all was done well. Let's praise our merchant marine and help shipowners, officers, and men to have new pride in the work of our

ships and seamen. Congressman GARMATZ—who was on board—took the occasion to offer his congratulations to the ship, officers and men, for the rescue. Most important, the sailor's life was saved and he was brought home to get well.

Paul Brown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL VINSON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein a eulogy delivered by the Reverend Edgar A. Padgett, minister of the First Methodist Church, of Elberton, Ga., at the funeral of our former colleague, the Honorable Paul Brown, on September 26, 1961.

The eulogy is as follows:

PAUL BROWN

We have gathered here to pay love's last tribute of respect to Paul Brown, who has passed from among us into the great unseen world beyond. His manner of life, his accomplishments—numerous and impressive—how he lived and how he died, are known and appreciated by us all.

At ease with the great, at home with the humble poor, his was a life of such quiet dignity and uncommon grace that men were strengthened and inspired by his presence.

Early in life he gave his mind and soul to some lofty moral principles and spiritual ideals, found in the Bible and taught by his church. These Christian principles gave direction and depth to his long and brilliant career in the public service:

Reverence for God and holy things; honor and integrity, in all good conscience more highly esteemed than silver and gold; a high sense of personal duty and accountability; a sincere compassion for his fellow men; love for his country and appreciation for its greatness; a constant passion for the public welfare; loyalty to those who honored him with their trust; unselfish service for others and the common good; tolerance for those with whom he differed; unshaken confidence in the goodness of God, and the surpassing splendor of the kingdom of God.

With these ideals steadfastly before him, he was able to withstand all the dangers and difficulties of public responsibility amid human frailty without losing confidence in either God or man—without losing hope in the future of free society and democratic institutions.

With these principles to guide him, he was able to decide in matters large and small where his duty lay. His life was framed and fashioned by these great beliefs, and he ever sought to make government the servant and man the sovereign. Because of these convictions, he was able to serve his country without neglecting his district, and to serve his district without harming his country.

We mourn today the passing of an American patriot, a wise statesman, a Christian gentleman, a friend to humanity.

We will walk with steadier step whenever we recall his moral courage, his selfless devotion to the peoples' business, his childlike trust in the help of God.

More than that, we dare to believe and confidently declare, for faith has taught us, that in Christ Jesus, who is the resurrection and the life, the souls of the faithful after death are in strength and gladness, clothed with honor, and crowned with righteousness—forever with the Lord.

WHEN ON MY DAY OF LIFE THE NIGHT IS FALLING

When on my day of life the night is falling,
And, in the wind from unsunned spaces blown,
I hear far voices out of darkness calling
My feet to paths unknown;
Thou, who hast made my home of life so pleasant,
Leave not its tenant when its walls decay;
O Love Divine, O Helper ever present,
Be Thou my strength and stay.

I have but Thee, my Father! let Thy Spirit
Be with me then to comfort and uphold;
No gate of pearl, no branch of palm I merit,
Nor street of shining gold.
Suffice it if—my good and ill unreckoned,
And both forgiven through Thine abounding grace—
I find myself by hands familiar beckoned
Unto my fitting place.

Some humble door among Thy many mansions,
Some sheltering shade where sin and striving cease,
And flows forever through heaven's green expansions
The river of Thy peace.
There, from the music round about me stealing,
I fain would learn the new and holy song,
And find at last, beneath Thy trees of healing,
The life for which I long. Amen.

Address by Mr. Stanley W. Burke to the South Carolina Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I insert herewith the text of a statement made by Mr. Stanley W. Burke, president of Project Alert of Kershaw County, Inc., Kershaw, S.C., to the South Carolina legislative delegation at the statehouse in Columbia on November 10, 1961:

TEXT OF MR. BURKE'S SPEECH BEFORE STATE'S DELEGATION

I am appearing here today in behalf of Project Alert of Kershaw County. As far as I know, this is the first group of this type incorporated in our State.

Project Alert is a local organization. It is not affiliated with any national organization. Its only relationship with other local movements or any national anti-Communist organizations is willing cooperation in order to facilitate the exchange of ideas that may be mutually helpful. It must of necessity depend upon outside sources for much of its research material, educational literature, films, and so forth.

It is not an investigative organization and does not propose to engage in name calling. It is nonpartisan and nonsectarian. It welcomes in its work any sincere anti-Socialist, anti-Communist patriotic American.

Stated very briefly, our objective is twofold. First, we are attempting to alert our fellow citizens in our county to the danger our country faces from communism and secondly, to rekindle in our fellow citizens a deep sense of patriotism and a knowledge of and respect for our priceless American heritage.

Our group is composed of an executive committee and a committee of 100. A list of the members who are active in this group is included in the material I will leave with you.

The Committee of One Hundred is just being formed. It will comprise a cross section of the leading individuals in our community. This committee will serve in an advisory capacity to the executive committee and will lend support to our various projects.

To date we have put on the following programs:

1. Community programs consisting first of a showing of the film "Operation Abolition" and later, an address by Dr. Frank R. Barnett. In both cases our audience was in excess of 400 adults.

2. Our speakers' bureau consisting of 14 local men who have prepared speeches on various aspects of communism and presented them to the several religious and civic groups in our country. These talks have all been taped and have been presented over our local radio station. The taped talks are now being loaned to Winnsboro and Cheraw stations for similar presentation.

3. Our cold war seminar for the college students of our country was presented on August 31, 1961, at Fort Jackson. It was attended by more than 200 students and was proclaimed a success by all of the students and adults who attended. We are maintaining contact with these students while at their several colleges and attempting to keep them informed. We were particularly gratified by the many students who persistently asked "What can I do to combat communism?"

4. The "Americanist" bookshelf we have established in the city and county high school libraries has been well received. The high school librarian reports that several of the volumes from the "Americanist Shelf" in that library are always out. We shortly will begin publishing authoritative reviews of the books in our local newspaper to awaken even further interest in reading these books.

This fall and winter we have scheduled several additional programs. Some of these are:

1. Additional community programs to further alert our fellow citizens to the danger we face. In addition to continuing our local speakers' bureau programs, we hope to be able to obtain several nationally known speakers for this season.

2. We are cooperating with the PTA to finance the purchase of flags for all classrooms in our city school. We hope in this way to bring an additional sense of patriotism to our schoolchildren.

3. We are providing assistance to a group of men in Hartsville who are interested in forming a group similar to ours.

Naturally, we are hopeful that all of you will see fit to assist us in this program in any way that you can. Specifically, we ask you to:

1. Send any literature on the Communist menace with which you come in contact to Project Alert of Kershaw County. We assure you that it will be adequately distributed. We hope this will include copies of your own speeches in this field.

2. We hope that by being aware of the existence of our group you can supply copies of speeches, names of speakers, or similar information that might be used in meeting our objectives.

Based on revealed historical facts and the pronouncements and writings of Socialist Communist leaders, from Rousseau to Marx to Stalin to Khrushchev, it is our firm conviction that communism is a philosophy of

atheistic materialism in action and must therefore persevere to a consistent end by conflict and deceit. It is logically self-evident that coexistence with this diabolical conspiracy is inconsistent, impossible and fatal. We oppose any and all attempts at appeasement or coexistence with any nation in the orbit of world communism.

It is our further conviction that the Communist parties in all countries are not political parties per se, but are extensions of, and utterly subservient to the world Communist Party. We know that the Communist Party of the United States is a traitorous organization and that logically every individual Communist is a traitor, we oppose any approach politically or by civilian organization to justify the Communist Party or its members.

We are for any and all political entities and investigative committees such as the Senate Internal Security Committee and the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and we will support those in politics, whether elected officers or appointed, who support these committees. We will oppose all those who endeavor to help in any way the anti-anti-Communist movement which seeks to destroy these investigative groups or interfere with the orderly pursuit of their duties.

The sentiments and convictions of our group were well expressed by General Walker in his recent statement to the members of the Senate Armed Services Committee. We believe that we express the sentiment and thinking of a very large segment of the citizens of Kershaw County, and of the entire country, when we commend General Walker and our own Senator STROM THURMOND for their fearless and conscience-dictated actions.

While not discounting the grave possibility of external armed conflict, it is our conviction that Communist conquest of the United States is planned by internal subversion and revolution from within, and that armed conflict is contemplated only as a last resort. It is our conviction that the forces of the World Communist Party will employ every device and means to destroy America by economic bankruptcy through debt, depreciation of the currency, confiscation of gold, confiscatory taxations, and Federal acquisition of private property and enterprise; therefore we oppose all legislation that gives aid and comfort to the enemy in pursuit of that end.

We are not interested in survival without victory. We are interested in survival only through victory. We would "rather be dead than Red."

The Missile Gap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in the event that some of my colleagues, because of the holiday season, may have missed the statement made by the Chief of the Air Force Weapons System Command, I wish to invite attention to a news clipping dated December 20, 1961; which contains a comment or two by Gen. Bernard Schriever.

The news item is from the Associated Press and was contained in the Washington Evening Star newspaper. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AF MISSILE CHIEF SEES GAP CLOSED

SAN BERNARDINO, CALIF., December 20.—"I have never felt we were behind Russia in missile development," says Gen. Bernard Schriever, Chief of the Air Force Weapons Systems Command.

General Schriever, who heads the Air Force's missile development, told a news conference yesterday that most officials believe the United States has closed the so-called missile gap with Russia. He added:

"The gap has been applied to numbers, and I don't think it exists anymore. The Russians have nothing like our Polaris submarine missile and our Minuteman solid-fuel ICBM."

New Era in Public Administration Advanced With Inauguration of National Computer Center of Internal Revenue Service at Martinsburg, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on November 6, 1961, the city of Martinsburg, W. Va., was the scene of another advancement in the technological revolution of our age. On that date the National Computer Center of the Internal Revenue Service was dedicated, thus initiating a nationwide data processing system which by 1980 will handle some 135 million tax returns and 450 million other documents.

Though the popular imagination is perhaps captured more by the dramatic advances of missile and satellite programs, the electronic computer is the more fundamental symbol of our times. For it is only through the achievements of electronic data processing that the exploration of space has been made possible, and it is the application of electronic computers to other areas of science, industry, business, and government that makes it possible for us to encompass the bewildering array of data provided in a modern industrial civilization.

Significant observations were made on this theme by Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon and by Commissioner of Internal Revenue Mortimer M. Caplin at the dedication of the National Computer Center. I therefore ask unanimous consent that my remarks delivered at that time and those of Secretary Dillon and Commissioner Caplin be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR J. RANDOLPH

Mr. Secretary, Governor Barron, Commissioner Caplin, distinguished guests, and ladies and gentlemen, we are today dedicating another step in a technological and scientific revolution the end of which is not in sight.

It has become almost axiomatic to refer to our time as the Atomic Age or the Space Age. More accurately, we might refer to it as the Computer Age—for it is the modern and fantastically ingenious electronic computer which more than any other instrument makes possible the spectacular advances of the natural sciences and modern technology in this era.

When the present computer system of the Internal Revenue Service is completed, with its nerve center here at Martinsburg, I am informed that some 100 million returns will be compared to 450 million documents pertaining to personal finances. I have no accurate measure of the amount of taxes which will thus be recovered, but I should judge that it would be in the order of several billion dollars annually. One might observe in passing that this fact would seem to refute the notion of science as being ethically neutral—in this instance, science and technology are very much on the side of a higher and more rigorous morality regarding the payment of taxes.

Presently, there are some 9,000 persons employed by the Federal Government in the operation of computers. Their activities range from performing mock weapons tests at Los Alamos and operating the Ballistic Missile Early Warning System to ordering supplies and planning highway interchanges. And before many years the computer may well have invaded every segment of our economic, industrial and political life.

In all truth we are presently embarking upon a second industrial revolution even before we have fully accommodated ourselves politically and economically to the first industrial revolution of coal and iron. The dangers implicit therein were noted more than a decade ago by one of the pioneers in this field in a work entitled "The Human Use of Human Beings." In that book Professor Norbert Wiener pointed out that the electronic computer and its progeny may be our servants or our masters, depending upon how we order our society.

I sincerely hope, therefore, as we dedicate this National Computer Center, that we dedicate these instruments and ourselves to the continued progress of a humane civilization and that we think always of our wondrous technology, not as an end in itself, but in terms of its contribution to greater freedom and prosperity in a democratic society.

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS DILLON, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE, NATIONAL COMPUTER CENTER, MARTINSBURG, W. VA., MONDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 1961

We are here today, not merely to dedicate one more Government building, but to launch a new era in public tax administration.

By employing electronic equipment to process an enormous mass of data far more rapidly and far more accurately than can be done by manual methods, we are taking a giant stride toward improving the operation of our tax system. We are also demonstrating that Government is a dynamic organism, capable of self-improvement through the adoption of modern tools and techniques. The British statesman, Edmund Burke, once said: "Government is a contrivance of human wisdom to provide for human wants. Men have a right that these wants should be provided for by this wisdom."

One of the continuing wants of the American people is ever more efficient and more effective public administration. By meshing an automatic data processing system into the operations of the Internal Revenue Service, we are moving closer to fulfilling that want.

The ADP system we are initiating here today is a major advance that brings an entirely new dimension to tax administration.

A very important element in this advance is the fact that adoption of automatic data processing equipment will increase our total revenues by helping to insure that all of our citizens are bearing their full and fair share of the national tax burden. It should also give comforting reassurance to our honest, taxpaying citizens—and they are in the vast majority—that life will be made far more difficult for the foolish few who are tempted to cheat or to evade. And, by enhancing the certainty and fairness of our tax administration, it will strengthen the Nation to face the tasks that lie ahead.

We are locked in a struggle with a powerful and resourceful adversary. There is no end in sight to that contest. We are confident that we shall emerge victorious—no matter what form the contest may take. But, to prevail, we must have an economy that flourishes and grows stronger every year.

Our economy must support heavy expenditures to meet our urgent national needs—both at home and abroad—and to sustain the defensive forces that guard our own security and that of the entire free world. These necessary expenditures are reflected in our present tax burden. More than half of our tax dollar is devoted to defense alone, and substantial additional portions go to other programs of vital importance to our national security. Therefore, every additional dollar of revenue derived from the improved collection techniques made possible by electronic equipment is a direct contribution to the advancement of our national interest.

The facility we dedicate today is the heart of the total ADP system. Within this building, magnetic tapes will eventually store the entire record of every taxpayer in the United States. These master tapes will transcribe information electronically from data supplied by nine regional service centers to be established throughout the country. Five or six years from now, when the system is fully developed, some 78 million accounts—72 million individual and 6 million business—will be maintained here on some 400 miles of tape. From this data, the Internal Revenue Service will be able to determine the tax status of any taxpayer, at any time.

With automatic data processing equipment, the Service will be able to keep a systematic check on failure of taxpayers to file returns, to determine quickly whether taxes are owed for previous years, and to instantly detect such things as duplicate claims for refunds. It will also enable the Service to do a better job of determining which returns should be selected for audit purposes.

But the advantages of ADP will not be limited to improve tax collection. The Internal Revenue Service is also charged with paying out refunds under our system of withholding. Last year, some 36 million refund checks were mailed. Every year, some 500,000 of these checks fail to reach their destination, usually because the taxpayer has moved without leaving any forwarding address. With the help of ADP, the Internal Revenue Service will be able to cure this situation and refunds will be faster and more certain.

The new technique will not dehumanize our tax administration. It will not be man against machine—the individual taxpayer versus a giant, impersonal monster that thrives only on numbers. The Internal Revenue Service will continue to offer all the assistance and other services now provided to taxpayers with questions or problems. In fact, the new system should permit the Service to devote more time to direct, personal contacts. The overall effect will be improved and more rapid service to taxpayers in all their dealings with the Government.

I am pleased that you could join us on this important occasion. As the ADP system becomes fully operative in the years ahead, I am confident that we will look back on this occasion as a major tunring point in public tax administration.

DRAFT OF REMARKS BY COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE MORTIMER M. CAPLIN AT THE DEDICATION OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE NATIONAL COMPUTER CENTER, MARTINSBURG, W. VA., NOVEMBER 6, 1961

History has long been known to repeat itself, but these repetitions often produce some unpredictable patterns. A century ago, this city was the scene of bitter fighting between North and South—a symbol of the most divisive struggle in our Nation's life. Today, Martinsburg moves into a new role—the symbol of a cohesive revenue system through which Americans in all sections of our country contribute to the attainment of our national goals.

The adoption of electronic equipment as a tool in our individual, self-assessment tax system marks a major stride in revenue administration. In the next few years, the tax accounts of every taxpayer in the United States will be assembled under this roof, permitting us to collect internal revenues more efficiently and effectively than ever before and to provide better and more rapid service to taxpayers.

The Internal Revenue Service has made swift progress in converting its operations to an automatic data processing system. The construction of this national computer center is a good example of that progress. If we had met here 5 short months ago, we would have been standing in a field of grass. We owe a deep debt of gratitude to the General Services Administration; to the architect, John Hans Graham, and his Mr. David Bernstein; to the builder, Scott S. Bair; to the contractor, W. Harley Miller; and to the project engineer, Marshall Elam; and to many, many others for their splendid cooperation in expediting this center.

We also have been able to accelerate other parts of our conversion to automatic data processing. Our plans for new regional service centers are substantially ahead of our original timetable. Our Atlanta service center goes into operation in a little more than 1 month from now. Philadelphia will be operational a year later. Just last week, we announced the selection of Austin, Tex., as the location of our third regional service center. We expect to announce at an early date the site of the Cincinnati region's service center. This center will process tax returns, reports, and other documents for Ohio, Indiana, Kentucky, Virginia, and this very fine State of West Virginia.

In addition, we are moving up our timetable to convert existing service centers in Lawrence, Mass., and Kansas City, Mo., to automatic data processing in 1963. This means that these two service centers will then handle not only their regular processing work with present techniques, but will begin to process certain business tax returns with ADP methods. In 1964 we will convert the existing service center in Ogden, Utah, and activate the two remaining service centers in the New York and Chicago regions.

At the rate we are now proceeding, every taxpayer in the United States will have his returns processed under this new system by 1966.

It is with much pleasure and pride that I make these announcements and welcome you to our ceremonies today. We in the Internal Revenue Service believe that this new direction in tax processing dedicated here will have a profound effect on the future health of our American system of government.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, as a matter of further interest and information, regarding the role of the Federal Government in pioneering computer applications, the Honorable John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, recently delivered a most enlightening address on this subject before a national symposium of the Federal Government Accountants Association. I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of Chairman Macy's remarks printed in the Appendix to the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY JOHN W. MACY, JR., CHAIRMAN, U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION, BEFORE THE 10TH ANNUAL NATIONAL SYMPOSIUM, FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTANTS ASSOCIATION, SHOREHAM HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 18, 1961

Government was far ahead of business in the use of EDP back in 1951, and it is still in the lead. Government has pioneered computer application and continues to pioneer it. Federal officials you will hear in this symposium are the leaders, not the followers, in the development of complex, large-scale applications of technology to assist management in reaching critical public decisions.

A brief review of the historical growth in automatic data processing gives us proper perspective on Government leadership.

The Univac which General Electric put into operation at Louisville, Ky., in the summer of 1954 was the first of these systems in business, but the first large-scale fully automatic business data processing system was delivered to a U.S. Government agency, the Bureau of the Census, in 1951.

By the end of 1957, 121 electronic systems for data processing had been installed in Government agencies. By 1957 almost every major activity in Government having large-scale paperwork and recordkeeping functions had been affected in some degree by the introduction of electronic systems.

Today there are over 700 computer systems operating in 30 Government agencies.

John Pfeiffer, in his book titled "The Human Brain," states that we need computers because we have developed ways of living too complicated for our brains to cope with. The needs, tasks, and responsibilities of big management have become so large and complex that they are no longer understandable or manageable without the aid of the modern computer. The conclusion is that the complex circuity and design of the computer are necessary to simplify life in management. Just as thousands of years ago man learned to use simple handtools and mechanical devices to help him better cope with his environment, we have had to develop new methods to cope with the complexity of the mid-20th-century environment.

EDP is only one example of the new methods and concepts crowding in upon us.

The scope of Government operations demands leadership in developing these new ways. It demands that we understand and make use of each new concept and practice that will help us do a better job.

The rapidity of change is best illustrated by the fact that in less than half a century we can see three tides in the development of management, each one overtaking its predecessors and leaving its mark.

First of these was the era of scientific management, which placed a premium upon functional specialization according to a careful analysis of the one best way to do

a job. A hallmark of scientific management was the fractionating of superivsion and the separation of planning and control from the actual conduct of operations. It was an era of emphasis on devices to assure compliance. The ascendancy of machine-model scientific management over individual artisanship was expressed in industry in the formation of the great Detroit assembly lines. In government this thinking could be seen in emphasis on centralization and uniform practices—in the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, which led to the important establishment of the Bureau of the Budget.

The 1921 act represented a major revision in the whole budgetary procedure. It disposed of the practice whereby each agency came to Congress on its own and it focused upon an increase in Presidential control over financial planning. For the first time we had a national budgetary system. On the audit side we also saw the requirement of centrally prescribed and relatively uniform accounting and review systems. The General Accounting Office actually kept the books of the Post Office Department until 1950.

Another administrative revolution was being generated even before the techniques of scientific management were in full flower. The work of Elton Mayo and his followers gave impetus to the participative management philosophy. It was realized that the release of productivity and the success of programs were dependent upon the involvement of people in goals and methods. Management's interest again turned to decentralization and the placing of responsibility for results at the locus of operations.

The 1940's witnessed the development of concepts underlying the Budget and Accounting Act of 1950, which decentralized responsibility for financial management to agenices under general guidelines prescribed by the central agencies. These general guidelines permitted variation in practice to meet the needs of management in each agency, while they retained the element of consistency with central review. Although the term "financial management" did not come into general use until 1953 or 1954, I was exposed to some of the earliest uses of the new concept during my own experience at the Atomic Energy Commission in the late 1940's.

Now we are on the threshold of a new wave of managerial advance in which we will draw heavily upon a new concept of science in management. Contributions by mathematicians, statisticians, industrial engineers, and such social scientists as psychologists and economists are converging to provide new approaches to solving intricate management problems. We are finding new ways of thinking about the handling of information. We employ the capabilities of electronics both in the rapid communication of data and its manipulation.

We are thus in a position to bring more testable data to bear upon problems and to simulate solutions. While historical data will continue to be important for knowing what has happened, so that adjustments in direction can be made, managers are increasingly in need of predictive information. The concepts of operations research and the other "optimization" techniques have enhanced management's judgment by sharpening various alternative courses of action available to them, including the interrelated "penalties" and benefits accruing to each course.

The ability to obtain current, accurate, and meaningful information of the most comprehensive sort is yesterday's dream come true for those who carry the day-to-day administrative responsibility.

ADA: An Evaluation—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times series on the Americans for Democratic Action discusses, in its second article, the question of the goals of the organization, its origins and its operations. This article is entitled "Views Far Apart on Aims of ADA":

VIEWS FAR APART ON AIMS OF ADA

(By Robert T. Hartmann)

WASHINGTON.—What is ADA—Americans for Democratic Action?

It is easiest to tell briefly what it is not. It is not the American Dental Association, a common error which annoys both groups.

It is not a secret society nor a subversive organization, by law or traditional American ground rules. It is not a political party and not, as commonly believed, an appendage of the Democratic Party.

By its own letterhead definition ADA is "a national, independent liberal organization" and by its constitution ADA proclaims itself "an organization for progressives, dedicated to the achievement of freedom and economic security for all people everywhere, through education and democratic political action."

OPEN TO ANY CREED

It bars Communists, Fascists and all totalitarians from membership, but is otherwise open to "any person of any race, religion, color or national origin" with $5 annual dues and the approval of ADA's national board.

According to a 1958 Senate Republican policy committee staff study ADA is "a group of leftwing Democrats who hope, as either the senior or junior partner of a labor alliance, to capture the Democratic Party and bring about a system which would amount to national socialism in America."

In the sympathetic but sardonic view of a liberal Democrat of impeccable credentials, who never has joined ADA, it is "an organization whose whole is less than the sum of its parts—very dominated by Fabian ideas—the 'thunder on the left' which has become a squeak, leaving an alumni association of old New Dealers who hold annual reunions to reminisce—without any political influence except in Pennsylvania."

To the Communist Daily Worker (1948) the fledging ADA was "the imperialists' fifth column inside the liberal and labor movement" and in 1949 "the confused liberalism that makes up the mish-mash called ADA."

To the 1961 California senate subcommittee on un-American activities ADA "is in no sense a Communist front, or in any way subversive (but) some of the techniques employed by ADA leaders, and the fact that it has opposed with considerable vigor almost the entire loyalty-security program of the Government—have made it the target of considerable criticism."

Clearly, no consensus here. So let us begin at the beginning.

DREARY WINTER

April 1947, was coming in with dogwood blossoms to brighten what had been for New Deal Democrats a dreary winter of discontent when ADA was born in the old Willard Hotel in Washington.

Republicans and Communists were giving them double trouble. Franklin D. Roosevelt only 2 years in his Hyde Park grave had left them orphans in the postwar storm. They were unsure of Mr. Truman, whose liberalism extended mainly to old cronies who were no more egghead than he.

Sound of lung and full of fight, ADA was born with four voices at a press conference March 30, 1947. The chairman was Wilson Wyatt, ex-housing expediter later to be Adlai Stevenson's campaign manager; another old New Dealer was Leon Henderson, chairman of President Truman's council of economic advisers; the younger spokesmen were FDR's namesake son and the new mayor of Minneapolis, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

HUMPHREY, bursting full blown on the national scene, did most of the talking. He described ADA's aims as "militant political action, from the grassroots right through to the national level, without turning into a third party movement." He stressed ADA's domestic program.

"There seems to be a phobia (sic) in progressive organizations to wrap themselves up in pretzel knots on foreign policy only," HUMPHREY told the reporters.

At the outset ADA stressed its "independent" (not nonpartisan) character, but Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., prophetically observed "from the way the Republicans are legislating in Congress, we will be supporting, many, many more Democrats than Republicans."

Later ADA testimony suggests that it was formed to purge Moscow-line Communists from the ranks of patriotic liberals. Contemporary news accounts indicate that the election in November 1946 of a Republican 80th Congress triggered the reaction. Certainly Congress became ADA's first concern when it cast off wartime economic controls (run by some ADA founders) and sought to curb labor unions (run by others).

RED CONCERN REAL

The anti-Communist concern was certainly real in ADA's formative years, though taking second rank in the 250 organizers resolution "barring Fascists and Communists from membership." In retrospect, Harvard Historian Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., now a Presidential assistant, termed 1947 "the watershed at which American liberalism began to base itself once again on a solid conception of man and history."

Among the American liberals who stood at the Great Divide that year, 144 had met in January, led by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt and two of her children, "to map a campaign for restoring the influence of liberalism in the national and international policies of the United States." Others, including the U.S. Communist Party, formed up around the tattered banner of ex-Vice President Henry Wallace who—had F.D.R. not dumped him in 1944—would have become President of the United States.

Sunday we listed the ADA founding fathers who now surround President Kennedy in the White House, three Cabinet posts and more than 30 strategic administration appointments. Other well-remembered ADA founders include the first woman U.S. Ambassador, Eugenie Anderson; War Labor Board Chairman William H. Davis; Mrs. Roosevelt's protege, Joseph P. Lash; Will Rogers, Jr., son of the humorist, and Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., Washington lawyer who has always been ADA's lodestar.

LABOR FOUNDERS LISTED

Among the labor union founders were ADA Vice Chairman Walter Reuther of the UAW, CIO; A. J. Hayes of the independent Machinists; CIO Secretary-Treasury James B. Carey; David Dubinsky of the ILGWU, AFL, and many more. Over the years unions have contributed one-third of ADA's funds.

As champions of civil rights there were the late Walter White of the NAACP, Morris Ernst of the ACLU, and George L. P. Weaver (now HHFA chief) of the CIO anti-discrimination committee. The liberal clergy was represented by Theologian Reinhold Niebuhr, Methodist Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, Rabbi Milton Steinberg, the Reverend George Higgins of the National Catholic Welfare Council; and Unitarian Dr. A. Powell Davies.

COLLEGE CONTINGENT

From Congress came Senators Lehman, Democrat, of New York, and Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois, and Representative Andrew Biemiller, Democrat, of Wisconsin, later to be ADA's lobbyist and now the AFL–CIO representative on Capitol Hill. Another founder was ex-Representative H. Jerry Voorhis, Democrat of California, just unseated by an unknown Republican, Richard Nixon. (Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat of California, is listed as an ADA founder but told the Times he was not.)

The college contingent was less conspicuous at ADA's birth than now, but Schlesinger and his Harvard colleague, J. Kenneth Galbraith (now Ambassador to India), were present.

Also on hand were many officers of organizations that preceded ADA—the Friends of Democracy, American Veterans Committee, U.S. Students Assembly, Union for Democratic Action, Independent Voters of Illinois, and like outfits in New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Michigan (where ADA strength is still concentrated).

Most significant in view of ADA's avowed political aims was the considerable number of influential editors, columnists, and Washington correspondents who attended its birth.

Listed among ADA founders are Joseph and Stewart Alsop, Marquis Childs, Kenneth Crawford, Robert Bendiner, Barry Bingham, the late Elmer Davis, Edgar Ansel Mowrer, Nelson Poynter, the late Tom Stokes, Palmer Hoyt, Hodding Carter, John and Anna Eleanor Boettiger, Aubrey Williams, Monroe Sweetland, and James Wechsler.

This seemingly heterogeneous assembly was drawn together by alarm at the offyear Republic success in Congress, fear that the fruits of the New Deal were withering amidst the embarrassing exposures of Communist agents masquerading as liberals in high Federal jobs, and the all but universal expectation of a Republican President in 1948.

WARTIME COLLABORATION

The wartime collaboration with Communist Russia and its United States branch was definitely over—by the Communists' choice—and the ADA was first blooded in savage battle with the Wallacites, whom they denounced as a Moscow-inspired lot. ADA backed the Truman doctrine for Greece and Turkey (somewhat dubiously at first, preferring United Nation action and economic over military aid, as ADA still does).

But ADA'ers as liberals were unhappy with Mr. Truman, despite Mrs. Roosevelt's early counsel not to work outside the Democratic fold.

On April 10, 1948, ADA's national board urged the Democrats to nominate either General Eisenhower or Supreme Court Justice Douglas for President. But as neither proved willing, ADA endorsed the Truman-Barkley ticket rather unenthusiastically.

GOING CONCERN

By 1950 ADA was a going concern with 32,000 members in 123 chapters located in 30 States, plus some 5,000 "Students for Democratic Action" members on over 100 campuses. According to ADA officials, its total membership has grown some, to 45,000 in 1955 and an estimated 50,000 today—but the latest sworn post office circulation statement of the monthly ADA World, which goes to every dues-paying member, was only 18,600.

ADA chapters have consolidated and closed down to about 100 in 16 States.

After a spurt during the postwar GI bill period, student groups, now called ADA's campus division, have dwindled to 22 chapters with some 2,000 members, largely in the East.

The formal organization and key policymaking officials of ADA have remained remarkably the same throughout its 14-year history. Its national officers are virtually all founders or early members and alternate in musical chairmanship and vicechairmanships, though so many have been drafted by the New Frontier some new blood may be needed.

The paid staff of 15 that operates national ADA headquarters in a converted town house at 1341 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, has more turnover. Mrs. Violet M. Gunther, national ADA director, has worked her way up from the outset of ADA's activities, and appears to run an extremely efficient though underpaid and unpretentious office.

TOP SALARY $175

(The top ADA salary reported to Congress as required by the corrupt practices and lobbying laws was $175 a week, and the total payroll for 1960 was $61,990, roughly one-third of ADA's expenditures. The rest goes mainly for routine office expenses, printing, mailing, telephone, telegraph and travel costs.)

Only contributions of $10 or more are required by law, so ADA's financial filings do not include the $5 annual membership dues ($7.50 for couples to preserve domestic tranquility) and do not give a complete picture of its fiscal situation. Rarely in recent years have contributions from individuals or labor unions (the UAW and ILGWU are the most regular) exceeded $10,000 and $1,000 to $2,000 gifts are more frequent. The only political expenditures exceeding $100 reported for 1960 were $1,000 to the New York ADA chapter in September and $150 to Representative Charles Porter, Democrat, of Oregon. Porter lost.

Union subsidies to ADA have dried up some since National Chairman Biddle testified in a 1950 probe that labor support, essential to any liberal group's success, made up one-third of ADA's revenue. Last year ADA reported union contributions of $33,833 out of a total (extra large because of the campaign year) of $179,683 excluding dues.

Labor's decreasing interest is partly due to concentration on its own political action committees, partly to some unionists' disenchantment with ultraliberal ADA policies such as caused David McDonald's steelworkers to drop their cash support and President Sal B. Hoffman of the Upholsterers International Union, one of ADA's founders, to resign in 1951 over the Red China issue.

ADA performs a meticulous but confusing job of double bookkeeping to steer clear of the Taft-Hartley law's prohibition of political contributions by labor unions. This was explored by the 1950 House lobbying hearings, still a useful source on ADA's birth and behavior, and sharply criticized by the GOP minority including Representative CHARLES HALLECK, Republican, of Indiana, now minority leader.

NONPOLITICAL FUND

Union donations go into a "nonpolitical fund" and all others into a "regular" fund used for purposes ADA considers to be political. The 1960 Congressional files show contributions to ADA totalling $179,683 including $33,833 from unions. From these "nonpolitical" funds $14,232 helped make up a total staff payroll of $61,991 and $18,912 was spent for educational and housekeeping purposes. "Regular" expenditures ran to $147,607 and ADA's total spending reported was $180,751.

The bonanza year for ADA contributions reported to Congress was 1954, when $205,273 came in. The peak period for union gifts was $66,824 in 1952.

What Our Port Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the January 2, 1962, issue of the Chicago Daily Tribune:

WHAT OUR PORT NEEDS

Oversea commerce handled by the port of Chicago showed a gain in 1961 and a further improvement is expected in the coming year. But it is no secret that the port's development has failed to match the high hopes expressed when the St. Lawrence Seaway was opened with much fanfare in 1959.

In the first year of the seaway's operations Chicago's port handled 802,854 tons of export-import general merchandise cargo. In 1960 the total tonnage dropped to 765,248 because of the business slump and a 3-week strike of longshoremen. Complete figures for 1961 are not yet available but the total is expected to be 800,000 tons or more. With general business improvement and with several port installations completed, more than a million tons of general cargo are expected to move in and out of Chicago in 1962.

In addition to general merchandise, the principal commodity moving out of the port is grain. Oversea shipments in 1961 were 233,000 tons, a decline of 88,000 tons from the previous year. Grain shipments to Canadian and domestic ports increased, however, and the total movement of grain was 1,290,000 tons, a piddling gain of about 22,000 tons over the total for 1960.

Chicago cannot be satisfied with this record. A study made several years ago by the Chicago Association of Commerce showed that the area tributary to Chicago originates at least 13½ million tons of export cargo, most of which moves overseas by way of Atlantic and gulf ports. One reason why the port of Chicago fails to get more of this business is that the port has no expert traffic men to encourage shippers to use the seaway or the Illinois waterway. At the same time at least 10 other major American ports have traffic representatives in Chicago to help funnel freight through their facilities.

Another reason for Chicago's poor showing is the favorable railroad freight rates enjoyed by export-import cargo moving to and from coast ports. The railroads naturally will try to keep all the business they have. They are unlikely to lower rates to and from the port of Chicago unless they get some benefits, or unless shippers persuade them to do so.

We favor the establishment of a Chicago port traffic bureau which could promote our harbors and instigate pressure on the railroads to revise their rates. The cost of such a bureau properly might be borne jointly by the Chicago regional port district, the city of Chicago, and the Chicago Association of Commerce.

Another immediate need is for deepening of the Calumet River and Calumet Harbor, along with removal of bridge obstructions in the river. Congress has approved an appropriation to begin the river channel improvement. Funds for removing three bridges are expected to be granted this year. The Il-

linois delegation in Congress should pursue these projects. Until they are completed, our most important harbor at Lake Calumet will be severely handicapped.

Several long-term projects deserve attention this year. One is a single port authority to control and develop shipping facilities. It makes no sense to have rival authorities—the city, which operates Navy pier, and the port district, which runs Lake Calumet Harbor. Creation of a single authority would be a step toward another desirable long-term goal, the creation of an Illinois-Indiana agency in charge of ports.

During the last year Congress moved to complete the widening of the Calumet Sag Channel, which extends from Lake Calumet to the main sanitary and ship canal. Cal-Sag is the link between the Great Lakes and the Illinois-Mississippi river system. During the first 10 months of 1961 barges carried more than 16 million tons of cargo on the Illinois waterway. Traffic undoubtedly will grow when the Cal-Sag bottleneck is removed, and twin locks will be needed at Lockport.

Development of inland waterway traffic is as important to the future of Chicago as seaway traffic, if the port is to become a great cargo interchange point like Rotterdam.

So far Chicago has been coasting on the natural advantages which it enjoys. It is now time to wake up and really compete with the Atlantic and gulf ports.

What Do You Know About the World of Communism?—Part 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times on Sunday, December 10, 1961, carried a review of a new book titled "The World of Communism" by Dr. Rodger Swearingen, associate professor of international relations and history at the University of Southern California in Los Angeles which is located in my congressional district. Dr. Swearingen is director of the University of Southern California's Soviet-Asian Studies Center and its new Research Institute on Communist Strategy and Propaganda, and has been a consultant to the State Department and Rand Corp.

This new book should be required reading for all students of history in the United States and for all citizens of the United States interested in a more thorough knowledge of what communism is and how to recognize its insidious influence and combat and defeat its avowed plans and purposes which are bent upon overthrowing the Government of the United States by force and violence if necessary.

I have consistently and vigorously fought and opposed communism, and have on every occasion tried to impress upon the people of my district the urgent need to be alert to its bad influences upon all segments of our American way of life.

I have introduced a resolution to define communism in which I stated: "Americanism and communism cannot mix. Democracy and communism are incompatible. Freedom and liberty as we know them cannot tolerate communism. We must be vigilant and alert to the wiles and insidious influences it is attempting to inflict upon us. In our schools, in the press, through the radio, and our motion pictures, its agents, and in many cases its unsuspecting adherents, are expounding the theories of communism. It should be defined so that all will be aware of its dangers to our way of life in the United States."

I have introduced in this session of Congress H.R. 8043 which, if passed, would outlaw the Communist Party in the United States.

I was so impressed with the review of Dr. Swearingen's book, "The World of Communism," that I felt it should be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD together with the above remarks of my own because Dr. Swearingen has used language which reveals in a very understandable manner the insidious influence that communism can have upon our American way of life.

I think the Los Angeles Times should be complimented for this excellent public service by publicizing the following review of Dr. Swearingen's book, "The World of Communism."

WHAT IS THE WORLD OF COMMUNISM?

(By Rodger Swearingen)

The world of communism is a strange world only vaguely familiar to the majority of Americans.

By the world of communism we do not mean merely those lands and captive peoples behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. We also mean the realm of the mind, that Marxist-Leninist never-never land of backward logic and doubletalk.

Included, as well, is the region of the domestic Communist, particularly Communist activity here in America. These areas are all tied in together by the Communist theory, Moscow-Peiping foreign policies, and an interlocking network of international Communist organizations. This is the world of communism. How much do you know about it?

WHY BOTHER STUDYING IT?

Why bother studying it? It's not our world. True, but it is increasingly our problem and the problem of free peoples everywhere.

J. Edgar Hoover, director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in his thoughtful book, "Masters of Deceit," puts it this way:

"Every citizen has a duty to learn more about the menace that threatens his future, his home, his children, the peace of the world."

One of the cardinal rules of military strategy taught at West Point and at military academies throughout the world is, "know your enemy."

The Bolsheviks declared war on the capitalist world in 1917. Communists everywhere today make no secret of the fact that they regard the United States as their principal enemy. Khrushchev said recently that he intends to "bury us". Our grandchildren, he assured us, "will live under communism."

The record is, thus, rather clear on one point: The Communists have declared war on us. To be sure, it is not a hot war fought with guns, tanks, aircraft or nuclear weapons, but it is a war all right—a war waged with ideas, propoganda, economic aid, trade, culture, and espionage.

A more polite and palatable term for this gigantic world conflict is competitive coexistence. But perhaps the time has come to call a spade a spade. We are presently engaged in a life-or-death struggle for which we are ill prepared—historically, psychologically, or politically.

But when the stakes are for the survival of our way of life, we would do well to find out something about the rules of the game. It would be helpful also to know as much as possible about the number, strengths, and weaknesses of the players on the opposing team.

And finally, we had better learn all we can about the system, formations and specific plays employed by the coach on the other side—lest we be taken by surprise, overwhelmed and defeated.

HOW MUCH DO WE KNOW ABOUT THE SUBJECT?

Winston Churchill described Russia as a "riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma."

But that was years ago. Intensive research and experience during the past decade have taught us much about the subject. The stranger will still become hopelessly lost in the world of communism without some kind of guide or road map.

The essential point is, however, that we now know quite enough to define and sketch accurately the theories or ideology, the political and economic system, and the daily life of the world of communism. The problem is no longer diagnosis. It is communication.

Once we come to understand the Communists, what they believe, how they think, the basis of their system, the record of their rule, and the realities of life behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, much of the mystery disappears. And when the clouds have lifted and the mist has cleared away, what do we find?

We see two massive power centers and an international Communist movement operating with goals and rules quite different from ours. But they are goals and rules which can be identified and studied. Once understood, these goals and rules help explain much of the mystery of the theory and practice of the system.

A look at the life in Russia and China today further serves to demonstrate the difference between reality and propaganda. It also supplies a vivid contrast between the open societies and the captive peoples, between freedom and slavery.

Here a word of caution may be in order. Communism is a subject on which many hundreds of scholars have spent their lives. It is complicated, and significant. It is difficult though intriguing.

Do not be discouraged if some of the ideas are so strange as to be literally unthinkable at first. Do not expect more than some hints of a new horizon of understanding from this brief introduction to the vast world of communism.

One final suggestion. Don't be satisfied with a brief or incomplete answer. Don't take the Communists' word for it. In fact, don't take any one individual's or organization's word for it.

Dig out the facts. Ask more questions. Read more about Marxist-Leninist theory and practice. Become familiar with some of the brilliant critics of communism. Challenge Communist doubletalk. Above all, learn more about your own country. Remember, there are two tests that communism cannot pass. The first is the test of truth; the second is the test of comparison.

In this way you will be able to confront Communist lies and distortion with organized truth. In this way you will be able to demonstrate to others—and to yourself—the superiority of our American system and our democratic way of life.

WHAT IS COMMUNISM?

Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary defines communism in this way:

"1. Any system of social organization in which goods are held in common; as, Brook Farm was an experiment in communism.

"2. A doctrine and program based upon revolutionary Marxian socialism as developed by N. Lenin and the Bolshevik party, which interprets history as a relentless class war eventually to result everywhere in the victory of the proletariat and establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and which calls for regulation of all social, economic, and cultural activities through the agency of a single authoritarian party as the leader of the proletariat in all countries so as to achieve its ultimate objectives, a classless society and establishment of a world union of Socialist Soviet Republics."

But the complex, controversial term "communism" cannot easily be reduced to a dictionary definition or a simple explanation. Certainly, today, when we use the term, we do not ordinarily refer to any of those early Christian or utopian experiments in sharing, such as the Brook Farm.

Modern communism is many things:

Communism is a philosophy of history, a view of society and the world. A century ago, Karl Marx, the father of modern communism, taught materialism, atheism, and the evils of private property, that is, of owning things. He believed that the class struggle—of the haves against the have-nots—explained all of human history.

As the oppressed workers (proletariat) became more and more numerous and miserable, they would eventually rise up as a class against the capitalists who exploited them. This proletarian revolution, Marx was convinced, was bound to take place in one after another of the advanced, industrialized capitalist countries of Europe and in the United States as the middle class became poorer, and finally this desperate, swollen working class sought to liberate itself.

But Marx was wrong. The middle class has not disappeared; it has grown in size, wealth, and importance everywhere. The worker, as a class, has not become more miserable; his lot has improved markedly, especially in the democratic countries. Communism came to relatively nonindustrialized Russia and agrarian China, not to industrialized Europe or America. Revolution did not occur automatically. It was manufactured.

Communism is a political strategy and a social system. Lenin overhauled Marxism at the turn of the century and forged it into a political weapon for reshaping society.

Lenin was the master of organization and of the strategy and tactics for revolution. He saw the need for a corps of revolution-makers, a vanguard called the Communist Party.

A revolution, like war, Lenin said, has to be planned, organized, and skillfully executed. It doesn't just happen. And when the revolution is over and the Communists are victorious, this vanguard will eliminate the opposition and organize every facet of the political, social, and economic life of the nation.

This dictatorship of the proletariat would prepare the road to pure communism and hasten the day when the state will wither away, to use Marx's term. But state or government power in all the nations under communism has not shown the slightest tendency of withering away. Quite the opposite. The Communist socio-political system has become, in practice, a one-party, ruthless totalitarian machine run absolutely by a few men at the top.

Communism is an economic system: Communism is an economic system of total planning, collectivization of agriculture, and regimentation of workers and peasants.

The state owns virtually everything. The state operates all sectors of the nation's economy. There are no private businesses, no effective labor unions, and, of course, no strikes. The government runs all enterprises from the railroads to shoestores and lunch stands. The government determines both salaries and prices.

In order to assure maximum resources for development—to build new factories, bridges, or apartment buildings—instead of taxing the people heavily, the government simply pays extremely low salaries while keeping consumer prices high.

Virtually every phase and aspect of life is thus planned and controlled—from the cradle to the grave. The individual becomes a quiet, small cog in a big, inflexible machine.

Communism is a worldwide conspiracy. Nor does communism confine its goals to domestic issues or its activities to the home front. Its stated aims are the destruction of capitalism, the subversion of the free societies, and world domination. Its revolutionary activities, which radiate from both Moscow and Peiping, are extensive and worldwide.

Communist Parties in the nations of the free world are part of this worldwide system. Lenin suggested in 1923 that the road to Paris is by the way of Peiping. Khrushchev said in 1959 referring to the United States, "We will bury you." Communists believe that their system will eventually triumph throughout the world, and they are working 24 hours a day to that end.

The Communist ideal—what communism is supposed to be—was put this way by Stalin:

"The anatomy of the Communist society may be described as follows: it is a society in which

"(a) there will be no private ownership of the means of production, but social collective ownership;

"(b) there will be no classes or state but workers in industry and agriculture managing their economic affairs as a free association of toilers;

"(c) national economy organized according to plan will be based on the highest technique in both industry and agriculture.

"(d) there is no antagonism between city and country, between industrial and agricultural economy;

"(e) * * * 'from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs';

"(f) science and art will enjoy conditions conducive to their highest development;

"(g) the individual freed from bread and butter cares and of the necessity of cringing to the 'powers that be' will become really free."

In practice, communism in this sense does not exist anywhere in the world today, and it seems unlikely that it ever will. The Soviet Union today is a far cry from the model described by Stalin. The commune system in China, designed as part of the "great leap forward in communism," has proved neither successful nor popular.

The other so-called Communist countries behind the iron and bamboo curtains, the "people's democracies" in Eastern Europe, North Vietnam, and North Korea have economic systems and social conditions crudely patterned after the Soviet model. These bear little or no resemblance to either the Marxist-Leninist ideal or to current Communist propaganda claims.

But Communists continue to push the same tired propaganda line. Khrushchev said recently:

"The paid agents of capitalism * * * attempt to scare people who know little about politics with the bogey of communism. What is socialism, and what is communism? It is a social system under which there is no exploitation of one man by another. All means of production belong to society and are used in the interests and for the good of that society. To put it more simply, socialism and communism mean a better life for working people than they have under capitalist conditions."

As we shall see, the facts do not support Khrushchev's words. The reality is quite different from the ideal.

What Do You Know About the World of Communism?—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, this is a continuation of the original article, "What Do You Know About the World of Communism?":

WHAT ARE THE APPEALS OF COMMUNISM?

Why would anyone want to be one? To whom does communism appeal and why?

In his book "The Naked Communist," Cleon Skousen, who served for 16 years with the FBI, says:

"The influence of Marx and Engels has continued on the earth, not simply because they were against so many things, but primarily because they stood for something. In a word, they promised to satisfy humanity's two greatest needs: the need for universal peace and the need for universal prosperity.

"The very fact that communism offered a millennium for all the distracted, dissatisfied and unhappy people in the world assured it a hearing, not merely by underprivileged workers, but by many of the aristocracy, many of the wealthy, and many of the political and economic theorists."

Specifically, we may identify at least 11 groups or kinds of people to whom communism appeals. They are:

(a) The desperate. Communism has an understandable appeal to the pitiful and the poor, especially the masses of uneducated and underprivileged of Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America. They think they have nothing to lose.

(b) The misguided and the uninformed. There are lots of such people throughout the world. They are easy targets for clever Communist propagandists. Who is not for peace? Who does not desire a better life for his fellow man?

(c) The lazy. The something-for-nothing crowd finds communism's promises attractive: "Divide up the riches; to each according to his need; a chicken in every pot. A week on a collective farm or a day in a Chinese commune quickly sobers up an individual of this type.

(d) The naive do-gooder. Sometimes people with the very best intentions wind up serving Communist interests. Occasionally, even a few church members are found in the Communist ranks. But how can you both believe and not believe in God at the same time? Such an individual is naive and confused. He is an example of kindly ignorance in action.

(e) Bitter members of minority races. The Communists work very hard to capture for their cause members of the minority races in any country. When they are successful, it is usually among those few bitter members of the minority races where minorities are ill treated, whose lives have been marred once too often by tragic experience with prejudice or poverty. Such people usually become quickly disillusioned with the false claims of communism.

(f) The opportunist. A few individuals join the Communist Party to "get ahead in politics," to feel the personal thrill of power and leadership, to be able to give orders to party flunkies. Quickly after joining the party, they lose whatever faith they may have had in Marxism. Their life becomes involved with the game of politics for the game's sake.

(g) The frustrated intellectual. Communism also has appeal for the confused educator or writer, or artist who is really a frustrated man of action—a crusader of sorts. He yearns for faith and for action. In the Communist Party he can find both.

(h) The beatnik adventurist. A few younger people of the beatnik or bohemian type join the party out of curiosity, for a thrill. After all, with passwords, codes, meetings at night and couriers from Hong Kong, it's better than TV. Of course, as it turns out, there are also endless, dull lectures on doctrine and duties. But it is very late when such irresponsible youths learn that they have been contributing to the destruction of their country.

(i) The guilty rich. How do you explain a millionaire who joins the party or contributes to Communist causes? He may be at the same time a member of one or several of the above groups. Psychologists tell us that, in addition, he may have certain guilt feelings about having so much money. By helping a group that claims to be for the poor working class and for peace, he feels better about it all.

(j) The disillusioned. Sometimes an individual beset with problems and having lost faith in his religion or his political system will turn to communism. In the party, for a time, he may find a new faith and a new purpose. But it usually does not last. Human history is strewn with tragic wreckage of the twice disillusioned, those children of the God that failed.

(k) The frustrated leader and fanatic follower. Certain people feel the need of discipline, leadership, and regimentation. You all know the kind of person who isn't happy unless he takes or gives orders, who wants to belong to a crowd and hates to think for himself. Psychologists say he wants a father image to lead him. These are the same kind that followed Hitler. Communism attracts them, too.

HOW DOES ONE-PARTY SYSTEM OPERATE?

In theory, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is a federally organized constitutional democracy. In practice, the constitution is relatively unimportant. Decisions are made by the Presidium of the Community Party in Moscow and implemented by a hierarchy of governmental organizations backed by the authority of the Communist Party.

The system of checks and balances and the concept of separation of powers, so important to the functioning of any genuine constitutional democracy, are absent in the Soviet Union.

What gives the Communist Party this privileged all-powerful position? Authority derives from the presumed superior understanding of the science of Marxism-Leninism enjoyed by the Communists. The Communist Party is viewed as having a monopoly on wisdom. No other political parties are deemed necessary—and none is allowed.

FIFTEEN SOVIET REPUBLICS OPERATE—IN THEORY—AS INDEPENDENT UNITS

The Soviet Union is a federation of 15 theoretically independent Republics, the largest of these being Russia proper, which is called the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR). This hub Republic alone occupies a land area almost twice the size of the continental United States (not including Alaska).

The other 14 Republics grouped around the RSFSR are formed primarily on the basis of nationality.

Each of the 15 republics like our American States has its own constitution, government, plus, of course, the party hierarchy. Each is allowed to run its own affairs as long as it does not run counter to national policy. The catch is that all important decisions on all sigificant matters are made in Moscow. To be sure, those powers not delegated to the central government are reserved for the republics—but these are precious few and relatively unimportant.

The 15 republics (states) are divided into 116 oblasts or regions (countries). Oblasts are divided into rayons, or districts, and these, in turn, are divided into the smallest territorial-administrative unit—the rural soviet. This pattern varies slightly in the seven smaller Soviet republics.

COUNCIL OF MINISTERS SOMETHING LIKE U.S. PRESIDENT'S CABINET

The top command, the executive branch of the Soviet Government, is the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers. It is something like the President's Cabinet in the United States. Each Soviet republic also has its own Council of Ministers—a carbon copy of the central organization in Moscow, and to which occasionally a local matter may be referred.

These legislative bodies have little actual power. Their main function appears to be to rubberstamp decisions, laws, and appointments made by the party. Known as the Supreme Soviet at the U.S.S.R. and republic level and as soviets of working people's deputies at the oblast and below, these legislatures are theoretically elected by direct, universal, and secret sufferage.

In practice, candidates are actually chosen carefully and in advance by the party. That is why when questioned as to why only one candidate appears for each office in any election in the Soviet Union, the official Communist guide in Moscow can reply to an American tourist: "Why put up the second best man?" A few party big shots decide for the people who is best for the job—he is rarely the people's choice. Here again the system differs fundamentally from democracy.

SEVEN PERCENT OF THE ADULTS BELONG TO COMMUNIST PARTY IN RUSSIA

Membership in the Soviet Communist Party (8,239,131) is 7 percent of the adult population of the country. Consider what this means. This small but tightly organized and highly disciplined group controls the destiny of 210 million Russians.

At the top of the party structure is the presidium, the secretariat, the central committee and the various staff departments of the central apparatus in Moscow. These are all duplicated on the region level, and lower echelon levels.

The two central points, the keys to the system are (1) supreme authority in both party and government is vested in the same man—currently Nikita Khrushchev, Chairman of the Government's Council of Ministers and first secretary of the Communist Party, and (2) the party organizational structure, authority and activity reaches into every corner and nook of the Soviet nation—no one can escape its influence nor question its authority.

HOW IS THE SOVIET ECONOMY ORGANIZED?

The economy of the Soviet Union may be characterized as totally planned and completely Government controlled and operated. Emphasis is placed on heavy industry and military production rather than on consumer goods. The basic units of the Soviet economic organization are the factory, the state farm, the collective farm.

The profit motive, free choice of one's career, job opportunities, going into the business for one's self, taking over dad's store, a wonderful little farm in the country, a used carlot, the corner drugstore, a gas station, the stock market, a drive-in—all of these items and many more which are commonplace in America are meaningless in terms of the Soviet economy. They are either unacceptable ideologically or simply nonexistent.

SOVIET ECONOMY RUNS UNDER BLUEPRINT KNOWN AS THE PLAN

How is the economy organized? What makes it tick? The Soviet economy is run according to a master blueprint called the plan. The current version is a 20-year plan announced in 1961.

Up to 1957 operational control of the Soviet economy was in Moscow with responsibility divided among some 40 economic ministries. This highly centralized economic structure was largely dismantled in 1957. The Soviet economy was decentralized and reorganized into 105 economic regions. With some minor changes, this is essentially the situation today. In each region, a regional economic council, or sovnarkhoz, operates as the planning and operational authority for virtually all industrial and construction enterprises within its borders.

The Gosplan, or supercentralized planning agency, is still responsible for the long-range planning and for supervision to assure that the plan is fulfilled.

What are the purposes, advantages, and disadvantages of the planned, decentralized system? How has it been working?

DECENTRALIZATION SOLVES SOME PROBLEMS, CREATES SOME OTHERS

While it has been suggested that a political power struggle behind the scenes may have prompted Khrushchev's decision to make such a drastic reform in 1957, some very real economic considerations also appear to have been involved. The problems were essentially:

1. How to reconcile the aim of maximum growth with the desire for consumer goods.

2. How to assure both efficient planning and central direction and local or individual initiative.

3. How to eliminate the top-heavy bureaucracy with the duplication and competition between ministries on the regional level that this inspired.

The decentralized pattern may have solved certain problems. It is said to have produced more efficient use and organization of local resources. Some of the redtape of having to go through Moscow to obtain even a box of pencils has been eliminated. Local arrangements can probably solve more quickly certain supply and transportation questions.

At the same time, a whole new set of problems has been created. One of the most acute is the problem of regionalism. Where previously the overcentralized planning caused bureaucracy, inefficiency, and disregard of local needs, now the regional administrators are accused of a different kind of inefficiency—fending for their own region at the expense of shipments required in other regions.

Extremist Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it is fashionable nowadays to point the finger of

shame at extremists of the right, and many, including President Kennedy, have impugned the motives of many conservative patriotic citizens. Also, occasionally, criticism is directed at leftists, although strangely enough, many political leaders are inconsistently silent when it comes to condemning extreme liberals.

As for me, I am not joining any chorus of intolerance. Rather, I would proclaim with pride that this is a land where freedom of belief is not condemned. Indeed, in America, our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution were born out of such travail of dispute and clash of view. Freedom of thought and expression is what has made America great. So, rather than scorn American citizens for their convictions, I prefer to welcome all extremists, providing only, of course, they do not violate or advocate measures in nonconformity with law and order.

Let all liberals and conservatives express their honest convictions, and as George Washington said, when the people have the facts they will do the right thing.

Who's To Blame for the Rising Wave of Crime?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, in the January 1, 1962, issue of U.S. News & World Report there is a most interesting and informative interview with J. Edgar Hoover concerning the rising crime wave and who is to blame for it. I feel sure my colleagues will want to be apprised of this if they have not already had an opportunity to read it.

It is reprinted, as follows:

Question. Mr. Hoover, is the problem of crime in this country getting more and more serious?

Answer. It certainly is. During the 10 years between 1950 and 1960, serious crimes in this country increased 98 percent. Population rose 18 percent. So you see, crime grew five times faster than population.

Question. But what does this mean in terms of crime itself?

Answer. It means that, in 1960, the more than 7,700 police departments of this country reported 1,861,300 murders, forcible rapes, robberies, aggravated assaults, burglaries, automobile thefts and larcencies of $50 or more.

Question. Can that figure be simplified still further, so that the public gets an even better understanding of it?

Answer. Yes, it can. In analyzing the 1960 statistics, we have found that, on an average, there was a willful homicide committed every 58 minutes; a burglary every 39 seconds; a robbery each 6 minutes; a major larceny every minute; a forcible rape every 34 minutes; an aggravated assault every 4 minutes; a car theft each 2 minutes during the year.

Compare 1960 figures with an average of 3 preceding years, 1957–59, and you find that murders were up 10 percent; forcible rapes up 9 percent; aggravated assaults rose 12 percent; robberies up 23 percent; burglaries up 24 percent; major larcenies up 22 percent; and automobile thefts rose 13 percent.

Or, look at the cost side of crime. Our estimate of this cost is $22 billion a year—an average of $128 for every man, woman and child in the United States. For each $1 spent on education, crime costs $1.11; and for every dollar donated to religious organizations, crime costs $9.

Question. Where does the Federal Bureau of Investigation fit into this crime picture?

Answer. The Bureau functions merely as the depository for the previously cited statistics, which are supplied to us on a voluntary basis by local and State police departments.

It is in the field of crimes in violation of Federal law that the FBI finds its responsibility. A total of 12,390 convictions in cases investigated by the FBI were recorded in the 1961 fiscal year [the year ending June 30, 1961]. That was the highest number in a peacetime year. Fines, savings and recoveries resulting from FBI investigations during that same year were $167,654,622—or $1.34 for every $1 appropriated for the FBI during that year.

Question. Mr. Hoover, it has been 37 years since you became the directing head of the FBI. Has this whole crime picture changed over the years since?

Answer. Oh, yes. Back in 1924, when I became Director of the FBI, the country was in the prohibition era. It was considered fashionable in those days to wink at violations of the law. Public regard for the Government had been weakened by the Teapot Dome scandal, and people seemed to have little faith in anything.

With the repeal of prohibition in 1933, bootleg gangs moved into other fields of crime. They were highly organized. They robbed, plundered, kidnaped, and killed.

It was at this point that Congress empowered the FBI to move into some areas against organized gangs. Our jurisdiction was increased with passage of the Federal Kidnaping Act, the Federal Extortion Act, the Federal Bank Robbery Act, the National Stolen Property Act, and the Fugitive Felon Act.

We played a major role in destroying the gangs of the 1930s and in bringing some of the leading criminals to justice. The situation today is certainly different.

Question. In what way has organized crime changed?

Answer. We find that the overlords of crime have moved out of gang hideouts into the mainstream of American life. These criminals have great wealth, taken in from organized gambling, prostitution, the sale of narcotics, the sale of obscene material, and other vices. With that money, they have bought into legitimate businesses or set up their own. They have even infiltrated some labor unions.

Using this new "respectability" and their wealth, hoodlums and racketeers have been able to exert real pressure on government, businesses, and unions to make possible a further spread of graft and corruption.

The fountainheads of this organized crime, of course, are the vices that support it. These vices and their byproducts, such as thievery, assaults, rapes, and murders, are basically local crimes and do not violate Federal laws within the FBI's jurisdiction. While the FBI does not have direct responsibility, we do render every possible assistance to State, county, and city police in their fight against crime.

Question. The country hears, though, that much crime today is committed by youths—

Answer. Unfortunately, that is correct. Arrests of juveniles have more than doubled since 1950, while the population increase of youths aged 10 through 17 was less than one-half.

Of all arrests reported in 1960 to the FBI, 14 percent in cities and 15 percent in rural areas were youths.

Young people in cities accounted for 62 percent of all arrests for automobile theft, 51 percent for burglary, 49 percent for larceny, 28 percent for robbery, 20 percent for forcible rape, 12 percent for aggravated assault, and 8 percent for murder.

In rural communities, youths represented 52 percent of all arrests for automobile theft, 41 percent for burglary, 33 percent for larceny, 13 percent for robbery, 10 percent for forcible rape, 8 percent for aggravated assault, and 5.5 percent for murder.

Question. What, as you see it, has caused this rise in the crime rate among youths?

Answer. For one thing, there is a steady decline of parental authority. Moral standards, too, have declined in the home and the community. Because of adult delinquency, young people are not being given the proper guidance.

Public indifference to organized vice has made it easy for the salesmen of the criminal empire to reach young people with obscene material, narcotics, and other evils which weaken their character.

Television and movies, I think, must also share part of the blame. The highly suggestive and, at times, offensive scenes, as well as the frequent portrayal of violence and brutality on television screens and in motion pictures, are bound to have an adverse effect on young people.

Question. Do you have any suggestions concerning how this youth-crime problem can best be dealt with?

Answer. I have been called an advocate of a get tough policy with respect to young criminals. I do not deny the charge.

Of course, I do not propose harsh treatment for perpetrators of minor offenses. The treatment of young criminals, like those who have passed their 18th birthday, should be fair, reasonable, and realistic. However, I can see no difference between a 17-year-old who willfully robs, rapes, or kills and a person of greater age who commits the same acts.

Frankly, I am disgusted by the misguided sentimentalists who want to pamper and excuse teen-age thugs. This leads only to disrespect and contempt for law and order.

As long as we have people who insist that tender age is an excuse for any and all misdeeds, we will have young hoodlums who will think they can get away with anything. When they realize, however, that they will be held strictly accountable for their crimes, many of them will be deterred from committing crimes.

Question. There is another crime problem, too. Streets have become unsafe in many large cities. What, in your opinion, is it going to take to make it safe once again to walk on streets or use parks at night?

Answer. Much of the blame for the dangers which lurk in the shadows along streets and in parks can be placed right at the feet of the citizens of the community. The disheartening truth is that too many of our citizens have become totally unconcerned about the safety and welfare of their fellow man. Many of the vicious assaults which occur take place within sight or sound of individuals who lack the courage to aid the victim personally, or the interest to summon help.

There simply are not enough law-enforcement officers to constantly patrol all the streets and parks of America; hence, law enforcement must rely on citizens to report potential troublemakers and danger areas.

Question. In another phase of the crime problem, gang wars have broken out again on a rather big scale in Chicago and some other cities. What lies back of these wars? What is it going to take to bring them under control?

Answer. Gang wars today, as they always have been, are spawned by greed and a

struggle for power. When one gang attempts to encroach on the realm of another, violence is inevitable.

The surest way to bring gang wars under control is to remove the profit from gang activities. In other words, control illegal gambling and other forms of vice and racketeering, and the gangs will have nothing to fight over.

Question. Is it going to be necessary, then, for the public attitude toward criminals to change? Has the time come when police authority needs to be strengthened?

Answer. There is a large segment of the public which seems bent on protecting a criminal regardless of what crime he has committed. I firmly believe that the lawless must be convinced that they will be held strictly accountable for their willful acts.

Unmerited sympathy only encourages disdain for law and further depredations. Certainly this is no time for weakening the authority of law-enforcement agencies, but the matter of strengthening authority must be decided by the people according to their needs.

Question. Is there something that the private citizen can do to help decrease crime?

Answer. As long as the private citizen trades with the gambler, the prostitute, the drug pusher, or any other agent of the racketeer, there will be more vice and more and more murderers, rapists, robbers, and thieves. But, if citizens will stop dealing with criminals and start reporting what they know about illegal activities, we can clean out the top hoodlums and racketeers and their underlings.

Question. In view of various police scandals we keep hearing about, can the American people really trust their law-enforcement agencies?

Answer. Yes, of course they can. Now, I know that there are dishonest members of the law-enforcement profession—just as in every other profession. But I am glad to say that such low characters are very few, and the vigor with which honest officers ferret them out is a credit to the profession.

When I took office in 1924, public respect for law enforcement had reached a low ebb. Great strides have been made through the years, however. Inadequate pay in many areas still is a bar to recruitment of the best qualified personnel, but, in spite of this and other hardships, law-enforcement agencies have progressed to the point where the American people can and should take great pride in them and provide the support they need and deserve.

There have been some isolated areas where dishonest policemen have made a mockery of the profession. The cause of this can be traced to lack of interest by the good citizens of the community, who have allowed corrupt individuals to gain control.

When this happens, the honest policeman will either knuckle under to the "boss" or he will be replaced by someone who will follow orders.

Honest citizens who take an alert interest in local affairs can prevent hoodlums and their political stooges from gaining control.

Question. In your opinion, are most criminals mentally ill people who should be treated in a hospital, not punished?

Answer. The trend toward labeling all criminals as "mentally ill" is gaining popularity among some people. I view this as just another attempt to shower sympathy on those who mock law and order.

Hardened criminals definitely are "morally ill." Their "sickness," in my opinion, is more dangerous to society than the most dread communicable disease, and society can be protected from them only by their isolation.

Question. Should rights of a community be superior to those of the asserted rights of criminals?

Answer. Of course not. No person or group of persons should have rights which are superior to those of another. Such a situation would violate all principles of our form of government.

The rights of the community and those of the criminal must receive equal consideration, so that the scales of justice will be balanced. In many areas today, however, the scales are being tilted in favor of the criminal through the efforts of misguided sentimentalists. We must constantly strive to maintain the necessary balance.

Question. What is your position on capital punishment?

Answer. I believe that despicable crimes must be dealt with realistically. Experience has shown that the best deterrents to crime are sure detection, swift apprehension and proper punishment. Each is a necessary ingredient.

It is my opinion that, when no shadow of a doubt remains relative to guilt, the public interest demands that capital punishment be invoked where the law so provides. I cannot see where the complete abolition of capital punishment would benefit this country.

No one, unless he can probe the mind of every potential killer, can say with any authority whatsoever that capital punishment is not a deterrent.

A judge once said: "The death penalty is a warning, just like a lighthouse throwing its beams out to sea. We hear about shipwrecks, but we do not hear about the ships the lighthouse guides safely on their way. We do not have proof of the number of ships it saves, but we do not tear the lighthouse down."

Question. What are your feelings about parole, probation and other forms of leniency for convicted criminals?

Answer. I realize the necessity of rehabilitation efforts. I stand behind the principles of parole, probation and other forms of clemency. But nothing can discourage a law-enforcement officer more than to see some criminal he has risked his life to capture set free through unwarranted leniency.

I have seen too much abuse and maladministration of the systems of parole and probation, and too many instances where little or no consideration was given to the need of protecting society by isolating depraved criminals. It is imperative that the rights of law-abiding citizens receive at least the same respect and consideration as the rights of the lawless.

The demands on law-enforcement agencies are heavy enough without the added burden of tracking down hardened criminals who are turned loose prematurely, to again prey on the public.

To give you an idea of how often ill-advised trust has been placed in convicted criminals: More than 20,000 of the persons listed as fugitives in our Identification Division are wanted as parole or probation violators. Of the 160 criminals who have appeared since March 1950, on the FBI's "Ten Most Wanted Fugitives" list, 135 have previously received some sort of leniency.

We cannot expect crime to abate until criminals learn the full meaning of the old adage, "Crime doesn't pay."

Question. To turn to another field in which the FBI operates—that of Communist activity: Some people keep saying that because the Communist Party in this country has decreased to a relatively small organization, it is no longer a danger to the United States. Do you agree with this?

Answer. Emphatically "No." Members of the Communist Party, U.S.A., are active participants in an international criminal conspiracy which is totally alien to our way of life, and completely dedicated to enslaving the world.

Question. What should Americans do to fight communism?

Answer. The most effective way to fight communism is to gain an understanding of its meaning and what its end result would be. Such information is presented through our newspapers, magazines and other news media. Americans should also understand and appreciate our own form of government.

It is not enough merely to oppose communism. Americans must take a positive approach to rid this and other nations of the social, political and economic frictions which the Communists exploit.

I want to say also that I feel it would be far better for Americans to remain silent rather than to make unfounded charges that various individuals are Communists. It is not unusual for Communists to mouth opinions which coincide with those of many loyal citizens. There is a growing tendency today for people to label anything or anyone with whom they do not agree as Communist. Such rash accusations only divide and weaken us and give aid, comfort and assistance to our enemy.

Question. Mr. Hoover, both you and the FBI are held in high esteem by most Americans. What are the organizational principles which you have followed, to earn this respect?

Answer. The FBI is organized under three basic principles. Recruit the best-qualified men and women of integrity possible, thoroughly train them, and hold them strictly accountable for the work they are assigned to perform. Each applicant for work in the FBI is thoroughly investigated and carefully judged to determine if he meets the high standards we have for employees. We strive to weed out the weak and the untrustworthy before they join us.

Training, of course, is a basic element. Not only are FBI employees thoroughly schooled in the duties to which they are assigned, but they are carefully instructed with respect to the various procedures, rules and regulations which are uniform throughout the organization.

Accountability for work performed is essential in the FBI. A single mistake could result in a tremendous wrong being committed against some innocent citizen. All employees know they will be held accountable for any errors they make, just as they are aware that outstanding accomplishments will be recognized.

We realize we hold a great trust, and all our principles of operation are aimed at insuring that we do not violate or misuse this trust in any way.

Led by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, some of the best minds in our Nation—not only people associated with law enforcement, but persons from all walks of life—are studying the crime problem, searching for new methods to fight the lawless. New laws have been enacted and old ones strengthened, to close the loopholes which have enabled some criminals to operate without fear of prosecution.

The Attorney General has been particularly successful in developing closer teamwork between all branches of the Department of Justice and other governmental agencies, so that there is truly cooperation both in word and spirit.

ADA: Evaluation—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the internal organization of the

Americans for Democratic Action and some of the propositions for which it stands are the subject of "Loyalty Oath Is Required in ADA," the third in the Los Angeles Times' series devoted to studying the ADA:

LOYALTY OATH IS REQUIRED IN ADA

(By Robert T. Hartmann)

WASHINGTON.—"Americans for Democratic Action is not a mass organization," the liberal magazine New Leader observed 4 years ago. "It counts because of its quality. The common quality shared by all the group is the eagerness to do their share in seeing that the world is run right."

How does ADA propose to run the world, given the chance?

Every applicant for membership must subscribe without reservation to ADA's creed taken from its 1950 constitution, which affirms:

"We believe that rising living standards and lasting peace can be attained by democratic planning, enlargement of fundamental liberties and international cooperation. We believe that all forms of totalitarianism, including communism, are incompatible with these objectives. In our crusade for an expanding democracy and against fascism and reaction we welcome as members of ADA only those whose devotion to freedom is unqualified."

NEW MEMBERS

ADA prefers that new members be sponsored by a going ADA chapter or another ADA'er, refers unknown applicants to known ADA contacts for investigation, and finally to its national executive board for approval.

Its bylaws provide for expulsion of those who dishonor their vows, but the national ADA has never used this power and neither National Chairman Samuel H. Beer nor National Director Mrs. Violet Gunther recalls any ideological purges "except in a few instances at the chapter level," the details of which they did not supply.

In this study, I found none in the public record, nor any proven Communists (except self-confessed disillusioned former fellow-travelers) in ADA's ranks.

The keynote of ADA's loyalty oath cited above, however, is not so much its negative disavowal of totalitarianism as the positive goals set forth in its first sentence especially "democratic planning."

Planning is the panacea that runs through all ADA literature and what is meant by democratic planning is not individual or family or corporate planning but government planning.

ADA policy is theoretically made by chapter delegates and members-at-large who attend the annual spring conventions in Washington. They debate and adopt resolutions on a wide variety of foreign and domestic topics very much the way political parties approve a platform. And the result is equally dull, though not as thoroughly disregarded.

CALLS FOR DISARMING

The 1961 ADA policy statement calls for total disarmament under U.N. controls, inclusion of Peiping and Paris in nuclear talks, a U.N. Army to keep the peace, immediate initiation of negotiations for U.S. recognition of Red China and its admission to the United Nations as China—i.e., with a Security Council veto—and a plebiscite on Formosan independence or reunion with the Communist mainland.

ADA also seeks removal of all U.S. trade and passport barriers with Red China and food surplus shipments to the Communist Chinese, less stress on military aid for free Asia, a neutral Laos as part of a neutral buffer zone, long-term assistance to India's economic planning, support for NATO—except for Portuguese colonialism—but no atomic arms to U.S. allies, continuing integration of the Atlantic Community, support for Latin American social and economic reforms, and a hands-off policy toward Cuba.

ADA's current platform opposes U.S. resumption of nuclear tests on the one hand and the Soviet plan for three-headed troika control of all international agencies on the other. It condemns the "U.S. fiasco in Cuba" as morally wrong and self-defeating.

Among its domestic planks ADA stresses fulfillment of the civil rights pledges of the 1960 Democratic platform—largely shaped by ADA founders Chester Bowles and Joseph L. Rauh, Jr.—which include a Federal FEPC, full voting rights and integration of both public and private housing and all federally assisted schools.

PUBLIC SCHOOL AID

It advocates Federal aid to public schools at all levels, but none to private schools at any level except scholarships for needy students and research grants to colleges and universities.

ADA calls for the removal of Gen. Joseph Swing as Chief of the Immigration Service, drastic overhaul of the McCarran-Walter Act, no Justice Department or local wiretapping in any form, home rule for the District of Columbia, more urban renewal and planning in all cities, freedom of governmental information, liberalization of the Hatch Act which forbids politicking by lower echelon Federal employees, and direct popular elections for President and Vice President.

For all the ADA's fetish about "flexibility" and changing with the times, its latest policy platform is strikingly like the first. With a few explosive exceptions, the resolutions were approved by voice vote of the convention exactly as they came from drafting committees of top ADA founders and perennial officers, also little altered over the years.

NOTHING FURTIVE

It is within this group, ADA's executive committee of 19 and 79-member national board, that policies are really formed. There is nothing furtive about this—the ADA bylaws plainly provide that these officials, collectively or if need be individually, may speak for ADA between conventions. This they often do.

Their policy declarations are issued by national headquarters in the form of press releases, letters to chapters, testimony before Congress, publication in pamphlets or in the monthly ADA World, a tabloid-sized 4- or 8-page newspaper with a paid circulation of 18,600.

Edited by David C. Williams, ADA's education and research director, the ADA World accepts no advertising.

The ADA World regularly runs the Washington Post's talented Herblock's cartoons which his syndicate supplies "for a nominal fee"—he has never been a member of ADA, according to Mrs. Gunther, but is considered a friend.

Thumbing through old files of ADA World, one notes an early inspection of Senator Kennedy in January 1959, by the Philadelphia chapter, and a cable from ADA congratulating provisional President Urrutia on Castro's overthrow of Batista, but urging orderly trials.

An April editorial called for Red China's admission to the United Nations despite its "brutal repression of the people of Tibet." The first 1960 issue exults over ADA Mayor Richardson Dilworth's trouncing of Harold Stassen in Philadelphia and complains of "the low-blow campaign waged by 'Childe Harolde.' "

PARALLEL CAREERS

As the campaign year progressed, ADA deplored Governor Rockefeller's withdrawal, toed a tight line between Kennedy and Humphrey in the primaries but offered both, plus Adlai Stevenson, the use of ADA's master mailing list. No less than 130 ADA members were delegates to the Democratic National Convention, holding key platform drafting and rules committee jobs, the paper boasted. A headline of the October issue, quoting ADA vice chairman and Kennedy adviser Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., confidently proclaimed: "War and Religion Last Nixon Hopes."

PARALLEL CAREERS

Richard M. Nixon and ADA have had curiously parallel careers, mutually hating but nevertheless helping each other since their simultaneous appearance on the political stage. Nixon's first election opponent was an ADA founder, Representative H. Jerry Voorhis; for the Senate, he defeated Congresswoman Helen Gahagan Douglas, then a member of ADA's national board; he campaigned against ADA and/or Adlai Stevenson in four national elections, finally losing to a nonmember surrounded by ADA tutors.

Since Senator McCarthy's decline and death, anti-Nixonism has been as much an article of ADA faith as anti-McCarthyism and anti-Wallaceism were in previous periods.

Schlesinger's 1960 tract, "Kennedy or Nixon?" was mainly an elegant elongation of an anonymous ADA pamphlet, "The Second Man," which appeared during their savage encounter in 1956 when ADA enthusiastically boarded Stassen's dump-Nixon monocycle. The idea, which liberals deplored in others, was to concentrate on the enemy's character (or lack of any) rather than his record or his views.

EMPHASIS SHIFTS

Currently, ADA is without an arch-adversary, so its emphasis has shifted back to civil rights and civil liberties. Curiously, the guilty party here is none other than the President's brother, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, his closest non-ADA adviser, who favors wiretapping and is moving too slowly against segregation to suit ADA.

In 1958, Republican supporters of Nixon replied to ADA's "The Second Man" salvo with an equally anonymous staff study by the Senate Republican policy committee, headed by Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Republican, of New Hampshire. This well-documented but partisan 109-page document found no cardholding Communists in ADA, and the worst charge it could make was that early membership was a purification rite for liberals who had long and knowingly collaborated with the Moscow-disciplined comrades.

Ban on Red Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Board of Aldermen of Derby, Conn., a forward-looking community in Connecticut's Fifth Congressional District, recently adopted a resolution opposing the sale of products made in communistic countries within the United States and specifically in Derby establishments. The resolution was approved by the mayor of Derby, the Honorable John L. Bartimole, and forwarded to me.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I have called this resolution to the attention of my colleagues because it is in keeping with the action of the Congress in the adoption of the Mutual Assistance Act of 1961 to preclude

from its benefits any nation under the domination of international communism.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OPPOSING THE SALE OF PRODUCTS MADE IN COMMUNISTIC COUNTRIES WITHIN THE UNITED STATES AND SPECIFICALLY IN DERBY ESTABLISHMENTS BY DERBY MERCHANTS

Be it resolved by the mayor and the board of aldermen:

Whereas the United States is engaged in a cold war with the communistic countries of the world; and

Whereas the United States has taken from home hundreds of thousands of American servicemen and sent them to every corner of the world in order to keep this country free; and

Whereas these communistic countries are endeavoring to overrun the world and make all people their slaves; and

Whereas goods manufactured in communistic countries have found their way and are being sold in the United States thereby causing loss of jobs here and causing a buildup of their economy with our money; and

Whereas if this is allowed to continue the United States will find itself in economic disaster because of the heavy burden due to loss of jobs and higher taxes needed for our national defense: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by this board of aldermen, That it go on record as being opposed to the sale of these products by Derby merchants; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Senators and Congressmen of this State in Washington with the recommendation that legislation be enacted prohibiting the importing of such products.

Adopted by the board of aldermen December 14, 1961.

Approved by the mayor December 14, 1961.

State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Frank Kluckhohn appeared in the current January issue of Reader's Digest. The overwhelming majority of the American people are asking these same questions about the State Department's role in our foreign policy. These questions can best be resolved by a thorough investigation by the people's representatives, our Congress, of our whole foreign policy—past, present, and future.

The article follows:

IS THE STATE DEPARTMENT FAILING US IN THE COLD WAR?

(By Frank L. Kluckhohn)

While Americans watch, the driving engine of Communist aggression rolls relentlessly on, dealing us psychological and political defeats in every corner of the world from Laos to Cuba to Berlin. And, as our record of cold-war losses mounts, people ask: What's wrong? What has happened to the experts who shape and carry out our foreign policy? Why aren't we fighting back effectively?

I believe I know the answer. As one who has spent many years amid State Department activities, I am convinced that our diplomatic bureaucracy is itself in large measure responsible for the setbacks this Nation has suffered. Time and again State has demonstrated (1) unwillingness to face the reality of an enemy bent on our destruction, (2) inability to compete.

Our Foreign Service officers are essentially gracious, well-intentioned men, but too many are professional pussyfooters who, in the tradition of watchful waiting, let matters slide while hoping for Khrushchev to begin observing the Golden Rule. They dilute and defeat our power and prestige across the world. Their presence does a disservice to the many others at State who have served their country valiantly and who are eager to prosecute the cold war effectively. Scores of these latter men are frustrated, often sick at heart, because they are unable to make any headway under our Foreign Service system.

There is perhaps no more devastating illustration of the State Department's inability to cope with Communist intrusions than Cuba. Consider some of the events that set the stage for the final tragedy, the abortive invasion of last spring.

By April 1959, 3 months after Fidel Castro took power, intelligence reports from the CIA, Pentagon representatives and the FBI all pointed to a Communist take-over in Cuba. Robert C. Hill, then our Ambassador to Mexico, knew that Moscow agents were already shuttling back and forth between the Soviet embassies of Mexico City and Havana. He tried to warn Washington, he told the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee later, that failure to take action would mean "a solid Communist bastion on the doorstep of the United States." But his reports—as well as those of the CIA, FBI, and the Pentagon—failed to break through the bureaucracy and reach the decision-makers. Department analysts downgraded the Red threat and took a go-easy view.

Hill knew that firsthand reports on Cuba often were not carefully read by higher ups at State or the White House; instead, these men perused intelligence summaries prepared by faceless State analysts—summaries which, Hill says, were often "prejudiced." One of these State briefs, No. 179 dated July 24, 1959, as circulated to our embassies around the world, was so transparently sympathetic to Castro that Hill complained bitterly to Washington. Only 3 months later did he receive a bland letter admitting that the report had been prepared by a junior officer and "perhaps should have been more carefully scrutinized."

Desperate to get word through to the top about danger in Cuba, Hill jumped at an opportunity to brief Dr. Milton Eisenhower, the President's brother, who was on a goodwill visit to Mexico in August 1959. The encounter took place in an Air Force C-47 flying Dr. Eisenhower to Mazatlán. Seated on a curved divan in the middle of the plane were Dr. Eisenhower, Hill and Raymond Leddy—our embassy's secretary for political affairs in Mexico City, graduate of the FBI and a seasoned Cuban and intelligence expert. Also present was the State Department officer in charge of Caribbean-Mexican affairs.

From the start, this latter official opposed the briefing. "Each time that communism was mentioned, and its control of the situation in Cuba, it was discounted by this man," Hill testified before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

As Leddy tried to make his presentation, the State man kept breaking in to insist that Castro was an idealist whom he knew personally, and that there was no evidence in the State Department's files to confirm Leddy's point of view. Annoyed at the interruptions, Hill turned to the man and said, "I do not recall asking you to be in on this conversation. Dr. Eisenhower has agreed to listen to man of integrity and experience in Latin America. What Mr. Leddy is discussing comes from the joint intelligence report of June regarding Communist infiltration in Cuba."

The man persisted: "There is no evidence of communist infiltration in Cuba." At this point, an air attaché who had joined the conversation became so incensed that he accused the man of being "either a damn fool or a Communist."

By then tempers were so short that Dr. Eisenhower refused to hear more. He never saw the report. And thus, high in the air over Mexico, Hill's last effort to reach the White House with a warning about Cuba came to a dismal end.

In Costa Rica, U.S. Ambassador Whiting Willauer from January 1959 through July 1960 wrote 11 letters to the State Department sounding the alarm about communism entrenching itself in Cuba. The FBI also funneled information to State concerning the Communist connections and associations of Fidel and Raul Castro. These reports, too, failed to get through the lower levels of the bureaucracy. When the subject arose in conversation one day between J. Edgar Hoover and the then Secretary of State, Christian Herter, the latter said he had never seen any such material. The next day Hoover received a phone call from Herter. "I have now read some of those reports," said Herter. "I did not realize that the situation was so serious."

In December 1960, Herter called Willauer back from Costa Rica to become a special assistant. His assignment: to take a hard look at tentative invasion plans of the Cuban refugees, then undergoing consideration at CIA. Willauer relates that he made an intensive study and finally concluded that, to ensure success, we would have to back up the invasion with U.S. power.

The Kennedy administration, when it came into office in January 1961, asked Willauer to continue in his assignment. Now, however, he found himself strangely cut off from his CIA contact. For 30 days Willauer tried to tell Under Secretary of State Chester Bowles that he was being removed from the picture. "I'm awfully busy. I will see you later," said Bowles, but he never did. Willauer says he was never able to pass along his conclusions. Thus his painstaking effort went for nothing, while less knowledgeable practitioners at State and the White House scuttled the plan to use effective U.S. force if needed. And so the Cuban invasion was doomed in advance.

Why does the State Department operate in this manner? How does our Foreign Service mold men who so mishandle the cold war?

There are now 23,000 persons on State's payroll, the controlling group being the 3,628 Foreign Service officers. Typically, a young Foreign Service officer steps into the Department direct from college. For 6 to 8 years he stamps visas or does routine embassy chores while being shifted around the world. Even as he accumulates seniority and begins to assume responsibilities, he rarely has to make an individual decision. Whatever reports he turns out are initialed and OK'd by so many persons that he doesn't have to worry about being blamed personally if things fail to go right. In fact, his basic technique for advancement in the bureaucratic morass comes to consist of avoiding the displeasure of his immediate superior, or identification with any controversial action, even when the avoidance may mean ignoring a problem that could build up to a disaster.

After 20 years he has learned the fine art of diplomacy, but he may have scant ability to make fundamental judgments and the necessary fast, hard decisions. Yet he's now considered an expert in foreign affairs, and is likely to be praised when, in time of crisis, he pontificates about the great shifts and the aspirations of masses that made these

problems so inevitable. Such mere observers of the sweep of history, who seldom act but only react, have no place on the political firing line; they are, in fact, the cause of many of our cold war woes.

Whether or not the diplomat becomes skilled at anticipating Communist moves or combating Red riots, he does become expert at self-advancement in the bureaucracy. Here are some points in the unwritten code for "getting along in the service" which have contributed to so many of our present difficulties:

Rule 1: Don't rock the boat.

In December 1960 the Soviet Union brazenly sent cargo planes to deliver military supplies to Communist forces in Laos. Head-on action to counter the Soviets was called for. But, fearful of upsetting India and other nations regarded as neutrals, our diplomats bucked plans to give the pro-Western Laos forces any means to stop the airlift—even so little as an antiaircraft bazooka. And so the chance to keep Laos from becoming riddled with Red guerrillas faded away, and Soviet intrusion continues.

Caution dominates in the arena of words, as well as of action. In 1953, a specialist on Red brainwashing of American prisoners of war in Korea was brought to the White House to help prepare a speech for Dr. Charles Mayo, then one of our representatives at the United Nations. When the address was ready, a high-ranking Foreign Service officer showed up with a policy paper in hand and said to forget the project because it was "too strident—foreign countries wouldn't be interested." In answer, the Presidential adviser threw the State policy paper in the wastebasket.

"You can't do that!" the man from State exclaimed, "You've got to go through channels."

Fortunately, the White House man was not inclined to be pushed around, and so in November 1953 a rapt U.N. audience heard Dr. Mayo deliver the speech. It was one of our few outstanding propaganda successes. The Russians were forced to stop their false accusations that the United States had resorted to germ warfare in Korea, for every time they mentioned the subject, listeners were reminded of how the "evidence" was obtained; through the chilling process of brainwashing captured U.S. soldiers.

President Eisenhower was never able to carry out some of his plans because they were bucked at the State Department. "We're out to fight communism," one White House official said to me, "but what stops us cold is the marshmallow curtain that falls down at State whenever you try to carry out a determined, aggressive program against the Communists."

Rule 2: Avoid making any decision for which you may be held personally accountable.

A week before Vice President Nixon arrived in Venezuela during his 1958 Latin American trip, our Embassy there cabled that the Vice President might not get essential protection unless we complied with a Venezuelan demand to return two political exiles. Precious days went by as, up and down the line, our officials dodged making the hard decision of what to do about the exiles.

They were still dodging when Nixon arrived in Caracas—and came within a hairbreadth of being torn apart by a mob. Only then was an official of the Venezuelan Embassy in Washington bluntly told that U.S. paratroopers at that time in flight from Fort Benning would go right on into Caracas at once unless his government rallied to Nixon's aid. A phone was put in his hands, and within 20 minutes protective tanks pulled up around our Embassy in the Venezuelan capital, where Nixon had found momentary shelter. The whole affair was a serious psychological defeat for the United States, as well as a narrow escape for our Vice President—and it need never have happened. But it's easy for State to dodge decisions, or even to buck White House orders, so long as action, or inaction, cannot be traced to one person.

"No one ever puts his name on a document," says William Pawley, who during his 5½ years with the Department served first as an ambassador and later as special assistant to the Secretary of State. "I made a point of trying to find out who makes policy, and it's a very difficult thing."

The new African nation of Guinea, after it broke away from France in 1958, turned to our State Department for support. Months passed while the experts hesitated, each one seeking a plan that everybody could OK. Meanwhile, a handful of our own desperate officials stood by in Conakry, helplessly watching Iron Curtain technicians walk in and take over.[1]

Rule 3: Cover up your colleagues' mistakes or incompetence.

A key diplomat at our embassy in Mexico was carrying on an open affair with the wife of a European Ambassador. It became such a scandal that our national reputation was dragged through the mud. The culprit was not dismissed, however; he was merely given a 2-week suspension and then promoted to a higher post at another embassy in Latin America.

One of our officials in Washington was carrying secret papers in his car when he collided, while drunk, with a telephone pole. The Department admitted to the press that he had violated security regulations by failing to safeguard this classified material. But was his career set back as a result of such negligence? No. Since the incident, he has rapidly moved up to become one of the most important men at State and today is an influential shaper of our Berlin policies.

A specialist in Soviet affairs with a self-confessed weakness for talking about his work admitted that he had been giving out secret information. Yet, at the very time he was under investigation, his protective superiors gave him an outstanding efficiency rating, and today he still holds his sensitive job.

One reason such action continues is that the deliberations of those panels that screen Foreign Service officers for promotion are zealously kept secret. Several years ago when a new Assistant Secretary of State charged with personnel supervision tried to obtain information about the proceedings of these panels, he was curtly informed that "nobody can see these files—not even the Secretary of State."

It is clear that one root of our cold war failures is the timidity and evasiveness characteristic of our State Department bureaucracy. There are other causes—specific philosophies that have come to infect the shapers of policy at State.

Among some of our foremost diplomats, for instance, concession has been elevated to the rank of policy. Instead of carefully, accurately calculating the risks of nuclear war, they yield to the nuclear shakes and use it as an excuse for avoiding anti-Communist action. They fall back from plans for assisting rebellion behind the Iron Curtain, even while Soviet agents coolly plot outbreaks inside free nations. Thus we pass up countless chances to call Kremlin bluffs.

Most recent evidence: the Berlin wall. At first only a few strands of barbed wire, it could easily have been pushed down by our tanks, which have every legal right to roll in and protect points of access along the Berlin border. But over the course of days the wire became a wall, and our best chance to show the world that we could not be pushed around vanished.

[1] See "How the Soviets Stole a March on Us in Africa," the Reader's Digest, November 1960.

Other ideas are seized upon by State policyshapers as an excuse to sidestep or put off anti-Communist action:

1. The evolutionary theory—State's hope that satellite nations will, in time, map their own non-Communist courses, independent of Moscow. This concept even holds that Russia herself will change course. State became so enchanted with this latter corollary that in 1956, just before the Hungarian revolt, when Gen. Maxwell Taylor (then U.S. Army Chief of Staff) tried to write an article saying that "there is no reason to believe that communism will change its habits and permanently renounce aggression as an instrument of policy," it was blocked by State. Our Foreign Service didn't want these words stressed because "it is generally recognized that the Communists for the present have renounced aggression as an instrument of policy" and therefore Taylor's claim was "not only undesirable but inaccurate."

2. The accommodation theory—the notion that by some magic we can reach a safe agreement with the Communists, despite their record of treachery and torn-up treaties. Listen to Robert D. Murphy, former Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, a veteran of 43 years in diplomacy and one of the most respected men ever to serve at State: "For some strange reason there are those in places of influence who seem to convince themselves that a deal is possible; that an understanding could be reached if we just find the right formula. The thought that a massive package deal is possible is a fake, a delusion, and a snare."

3. The "reduce tensions" theory—the idea that we can get along with the Reds by suppressing information that would be provocative. Last winter State was alerted that one member of a Polish exchange mission about to visit the United States was a known espionage agent. Career men dealing with European affairs talked the Secretary of State into letting him enter, on the ground that to do otherwise would disturb our relations with Poland. This in the face of strong opposition from the Justice Department.

These fuzzy ideas show up in, among other places, the activity of State's censors. Lt. Gen. Arthur Trudeau, the Army's Chief of Research and Development, who is also an intelligence expert, wanted to say in a speech that nothing less than "sacrifice, understanding, and change" will permit us to "emerge victorious." The State Department, which reads every proposed Pentagon speech touching on foreign policy, struck out "emerge victorious" and substituted "achieve our goal." The censor crossed out another Trudeau passage which said that "coexistence is not a choice, it is a fatal disease."

In another speech General Trudeau warned that we could "go down in the ignominy of defeat" or "remain the champions in this vicious race." The censors wrote on the margin of the draft: "This might well be tempered, since it largely rules out any chance of an evolution of the Soviet system."

How, then, does State think it best to pursue the cold war? Our diplomats' favorite weapon against communism is the idea that we can, indiscriminately, sway nations away from communism with foreign aid; that we must continue dishing out billions to so-called neutrals who consistently support Moscow; that we must even assist Iron Curtain countries such as Poland, which reciprocates by partially mobilizing its armed forces to bolster the Soviets in Berlin.

Yet perhaps the greatest error of our strategists at State lies in letting ourselves be pushed around at the United Nations. We are blackmailed into allowing a Kremlin puppet, Outer Mongolia, to become a member of the U.N. Worse, our State Department gave its blessing last September to an attempt by U.N. troops to take over Katanga,

the anti-Communist province of the Congo—in an effort to set up a central coalition government strongly influenced by Antoine Gizenga, a Communist trained in Czechoslovakia. This despite the fact that the Soviet publication New Times proclaimed the coalition a complete triumph for the pro-Soviet side.

Declared Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut: "This is still another in a long list of instances where our policy has been misguided by the nameless subordinates at desk positions who prepare analyses and position papers. I believe that the time has come for a critical review of this entire situation. Those responsible for briefing us into disaster after disaster should be dismissed or transferred to nonpolicymaking posts where their penchant for wrongheadedness can do no harm."

Add to this the recently released report from Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, of Washington, chairman of a special subcommittee set up by the Senate 2 years ago to assess our cold war machinery. Said Senator JACKSON, "No task is more urgent than improving the effectiveness of the Department of State."

If we are to meet and repel the forces of communism, if we are to start winning the cold war instead of just watching it, we must shake up the system at the State Department and bring about some real reforms. Now.

Mr. Sam's View of Things

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, our Mr. SAM is gone; we will never again hear him call, "The House will be in order." His point of view, his philosophy if you will, is still with us and will continue to have its effect on our proceedings here in this Chamber. One of the last interviews Mr. SAM granted took place after he went home to Bonham. It appeared in the magazine U.S. News & World Report for October 9, 1961, and is called "SAM RAYBURN Takes a Look at the World." As we start this 2d session of the 87th Congress, under a new Speaker, ready to move forward under his leadership, let us stop long enough to read the inspiring and wise words of our late friend and mentor:

SAM RAYBURN TAKES A LOOK AT THE WORLD

(With the first congressional session of the Kennedy administration now history, how does the record look to one of the most powerful men in Congress—the 79-year-old Speaker of the House, SAM RAYBURN? And how does Mr. SAM measure the pulse of the country, and the world? Drawing on his years of experience, what does he feel about the critical present, the uncertain future? To find out, W. B. Ragsdale of the National Staff of U.S. News & World Report went to Bonham, TEX., to get this exclusive interview with the dean of the House of Representatives, a personal acquaintance since the 1920's.)

(It was nearly half a century ago that SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, entered Congress—and he has been there ever since. Mr. RAYBURN has worked with eight U.S. Presidents, has been Speaker of the House more years than any other man in history.)

Question. Mr. Speaker, these are dangerous times. Do you think that enough of the national effort is being turned toward strengthening this Nation? In other words, could people do more?

Answer. It is just a question of how much the people know, how much they are called upon to do. And that is what I have been trying to do—to bring them face to face with their responsibilities as citizens, or as a part of a group of citizens, or as a party, and let them know that their responsibility right now is teriffic.

Question. Do you think most Americans are aware of that responsibility and realize what it means?

Answer. If this generation doesn't live up to its responsibilities, then what of the next generation, or the next?

I try to say to people that we are all in this thing together, we all go up and stay up, or we all go down together. There is no room now for selfishness. There is no place for hate and distrust. We must set out on the broad highway together and keep going.

Question. Most of the world's troubles seem to stem from Nikita Khrushchev. Have you formed any personal impression of him as a man or as a leader?

Answer. I met him once at a dinner at the White House. I sat some distance away from him. After dinner, President Eisenhower said, "Come in here, Sam, and talk to this man." So I got up close to him so I could look at him.

I wouldn't say that he had a face I liked, at all. My impression was that he had a cruel face, and I still think that. I wasn't in his presence long enough to form much of an opinion of him, except that I have looked in the faces of a lot of men and I have judged them by their looks. And that is how I judged him.

Question. Did he impress you as a man who would dare drop a nuclear bomb on this country?

Answer. Well, if we were in that business—big war—yes. Now, whether he is reckless enough to drop the first hydrogen bomb, I don't know. He would have to be a pretty reckless man, because he knows other people have agencies of destruction just like he has. And I imagine he wants to live.

I would think that his scientists have acquainted him with all the destructive elements in these things—how far reaching would be the effects. I think he hesitates to drop the first one.

Question. Let's look at it from the U.S. standpoint. Do you feel that this still is a great and powerful Nation?

Answer. Yes, the greatest and most powerful. And when called upon to exert its strength, it will do it now as it always has. I do not lose confidence in the fortitude and valor, patriotism and bravery of the average American. I think they are as high now as they have always been.

A great many people are standing on the corner criticizing this, that and the other, but when the supreme test comes, they usually come through, too.

Question. Are you saying that the people are just as self-reliant as ever? Is that what you think?

Answer. I do. I would hate to live in a country if I didn't have faith and confidence in the people. I think the American people are the best jury I ever saw an accused tried before, when they know all the facts.

Question. One hears a great deal of talk that people are getting more selfish than they used to be. What about that?

Answer. Well, a great many of them have more to be selfish about. They own more property, they have more income, and they want to keep it.

But selfishness has always been and always will be. Nearly everybody is going to be a little selfish about what they have to provide for their family. But when it comes down to the point of my saying that anything like the majority of the American people are selfish to the extent that they wouldn't support their Government in a crisis, I just don't believe it.

Question. Coming down to specifics, Mr. Speaker, does the level of Federal spending disturb you?

Answer. Well, of course, any spending disturbs people. Any payment of taxes disturbs people. But we must look the world in the face, and this is not a very happy world we are living in. It is a dangerous world, more dangerous to the civilization we know and love than people ever sought to exist in.

But, as long as the world is in an arms race, and as long as reckless people have hold of weapons that are totally destructive, we must spend.

We must keep ahead in that race so that we can defend ourselves. This takes a lot of money. We are spending $40 billion a year for defense. Now, that is one thing that we can't cut down on if we have any judgment. We just have to have the money to produce the things that are necessary to defend ourselves.

The national debt is big and is going to remain big.

Taxes are high, and they are going to remain high until the world settles down.

Unless we can have what President Kennedy spoke about in his speech at the United Nations—disarmament, real disarmament—we must go on spending. This arms race is what is costing the money, and we have to stay in it as long as it lasts.

I admired the President very much for the bold, frank statement he made to the people at the Assembly, and to the whole world.

Question. There are some people who say we are spending too much on social welfare and things of that kind—

Answer. And they don't know what they're talking about, a great many of them. A lot of people talk about social welfare and this, that, and the other, and don't know much about it.

Every time you say something about social welfare, people go to yelling "socialism" and "welfare state" and all this. We don't have any welfare state. We haven't lost our grip on our domestic problems, and we aren't going to.

But there are just so many people who are going to jump up and accuse the other fellow of spending, spending, spending. And when those people are in power, they keep right on spending, spending, spending.

It is kind of ridiculous at times.

GOVERNMENT HAD TO GROW

Question. Are you disturbed by the growth of Government?

Answer. If I answered that question flatly, I would have to say that I am not. Government had to grow.

Talk about the simple Government of Jefferson—of course, it was simple. There were just a few more than 3 million people, and there were no communications. There was not a hard-surfaced road in the United States, and there was no such thing as a monopoly at that time, because the Nation just wasn't big enough.

As these things grew and developed, the Government had to grow. At that time there weren't any railroads to regulate, no rates to fix, no bonds to be issued. But, as business grew, then trust laws had to be enacted and enforced, and it took a lot of people to do that. The same thing about the railroads—they started little, but they became big, and it went on and on.

Rural electrification came. That was the greatest boon to the farmer that I have ever seen.

And then, take Federal aid to highways. In 1944 I had them put into the bill for aid to highways a provision that 30 percent of every dollar that was spent by the Federal Government for highways must be spent on farm-to-market roads.

As we grow, the Government must grow. It is one thing to pass the law, and it is another thing to enforce it. I don't shrink from the proposition that the Government has grown, because where the Government has grown, it has been adding something that was in the interest of the public.

Question. You said earlier that defense and these other things cost a lot of money. Do you think that taxes are now about as high as people can stand?

Answer. You never know what people can stand. They are carrying a great burden now, of course. And we are hoping that we don't have to increase that burden, but, if the time should come when we needed more money—if we just had to have more money—I don't think there would be anything that would prevent Congress from raising taxes in certain places.

I think the people would go along if they had the information and knew the taxes were needed.

Question. Mr. Speaker, let's talk about you, personally, for a moment. How long have you been in public life?

Answer. I first ran for the Texas legislature in 1906, and went into the legislative session of 1907. I went to Congress in 1913.

Question. You must have seen amazing changes in all those years—

Answer. Well, you would need to write a book, and even then that wouldn't be able to tell all of them.

Question. By and large, do you feel the changes have been for the better?

Answer. I think Government—both State and Federal—is more responsive now to the wishes and the needs of the people than it has been at any time during my legislative experience.

I know the changes have been for the better. We couldn't have gone on like we have if they were not.

Question. Have you noticed many changes in the role of Congress in that period?

Answer. Not too many—we have the same number of men and women in the House as they had then.

As far as I am individually concerned, I think that the character and ability of the men and women who are in Congress have not deteriorated, and I think that the caliber in education, experience, and so forth, for the Members of the House of Representatives today is probably higher than it was when I went there.

I am not one of those who say that we don't have as big men in Congress as we used to have. I think that is nonsense. I think we have more men and women of real ability in the Congress of the United States than I have ever known, and I think they have demonstrated it on many occasions.

When something that has affected the national interest has come up, a big majority of them—not all, but a big majority—has laid partisanship aside and moved ahead in the right direction.

HOW STRONG A PRESIDENT

Question. What about the White House? Do you think the Presidency has gained in power over the years?

Answer. The President, of course, has always had vast powers. He executes the law as Commander in Chief of our armed forces, and in those fields, of course, the President has maintained power.

The question is always: Who is the strong man? During my time we have had eight Presidents. Most of them have been strong men, some stronger than others.

The Congress of the United States wants the President to exercise his powers, and it wants to exercise its own powers—and it does. It does this every time a bill advocated by the Administration comes up in the House. It exercises its power. It follows the President's recommendations, or it goes along its own line, takes another approach.

Sometimes this is better than the original approach made by the President, and the Presidents are always willing to agree that, if the Congress passes a better bill than they advocated, they are happy about it if they are the right kind of President—and most of them are.

Question. What about the present administration? How did Mr. Kennedy make out in the session of Congress just closed?

Answer. I think President Kennedy had one of the most successful sessions of Congress that I have ever served in. In his state of the Union message he laid down quite a program. Much of it was controversial.

The Congress passed on every one of his proposals in some way, and the vast majority of them have been enacted into law.

Therefore, I think that this first term of the 87th Congress, working with Mr. Kennedy, has done a real job. It has responded to his suggestions, and has enacted a very fine program.

Question. The President didn't get everything he wanted, though, did he?

Answer. No, not everything. But he got most of what he had asked for except the school business, and we did continue two very essential parts of that program.

Question. Would you say the record of the session is as good as you had expected?

Answer. It certainly is. I thought there would be more controversy about a great many legislative proposals.

And I will say this, also: There has been very little backbiting in the House of Representatives. Very few Republicans have been against something simply because a Democratic President wanted it.

There has been such a small amount of partisanship that it has been very pleasing to me.

Question. How would you list the credit side—the principal accomplishments—of the session just ended?

Answer. This divides into several parts. First—to fight the depression and start the country to moving again—there were, among the most important things, measures for area redevelopment, for housing—the most comprehensive program in history—an increase in minimum wages, a new farm bill, a strengthening of the whole fabric of defense, several important foreign-affairs measures. This Congress was one of the most productive in our history.

WHEN CONGRESS MEETS NEXT

Question. Now that this session is over, what are some of the problems that will have to be dealt with next session?

Answer. There are always new ones.

Of course, this school thing will have to be faced again, and I would imagine there will be some kind of solution, or compromise.

Foreign aid will be up again. There will be a row over that again. Some people don't believe there should be any aid.

And reciprocal trade will be up again. There are some people who would like to do away with reciprocal-trade agreements and go back to setting up tariff walls. But I think our American industry has got to adjust itself to a great many things.

Question. In what way?

Answer. There is a complaint about Japanese textile. Now, we are a nation with many surpluses. We have a surplus in cotton. How much of a squeeze can we put on Japanese goods and still sell Japan several million bales of cotton? There are a lot of places where you can buy cotton, you know. And those new factories in Japan are up to date. A great deal of our American machinery is not up to date, and our industry is going to have to adjust itself.

We cannot afford—this greatest surplus-producing country in the world cannot afford to settle down behind a tariff wall. If we enact tariff laws against other nations, they will enact tariff laws against us.

Money doesn't cross the ocean to balance trade. It's surplus goods for surplus goods. We must stay with some kind of arrangement whereby we can take their surplus goods and they can take ours, or our trade is bogged down. That's all there is to it.

Question. Speaking of industry, there are reports that the administration is opposed to business. Will you comment on this?

Answer. That is utter nonsense. No administration that had any sense would be against business. We want business to be prosperous. In order to carry on, we have to have people prosper and make profits whereby they pay taxes.

Question. Does business continue to have a fair hearing in Congress?

Answer. Yes, it certainly does, and always has had.

Question. What about the strength of union labor in Congress? Is that growing?

Answer. Union labor has a lot of strength, of course, because it has these millions of people. How much power labor has in Congress, I don't know.

TAKING THE PUBLIC'S PULSE

Question. There sometimes have been complaints that Congress is slow to respond to public wishes. Do you think that perhaps too much power may have been concentrated in the hands of minorities in some of the key committees?

Answer. No, I do not.

Now, this thing of responding to public wishes—well—sometimes it takes a long time to find out what the public wishes are.

The big storm for or against measures comes from a small minority, and Congress wants to wait around and see not only whether these changes are necessary, but whether they are wise, whether they would be in the public interest. Congress must determine by legislative procedure what it thinks is in the public interest, after hearings in committees, debates on the floor, and so forth.

But on this thing of responding to public wishes—sometimes we find out that what seems to be a public wish really is only that of a small minority. We determine that it is not in the public interest, so we don't enact it.

Question. Do you mean that first you have to find out what the public wish really is?

Answer. And on top of that, what is the wise thing to do? Sometimes the public might wish a thing this year and find out next year, that if it had been enacted it would have been a mistake.

Congress just doesn't like to be rushed. And it shouldn't be on these vast questions. Great deliberation should be had, and many times it takes time.

Taking time sometimes is not really a loss of time.

Question. In the end, would you say that the will of Congress generally is the will of the people?

Answer. Generally, yes. It might not be the apparent will of the people at that moment, but wise people—and the people of the United States are wise when they know the facts—finally determine what is the right thing to do.

Question. There are those who say that Members of Congress think first of their home district, then of the national interest. How do you feel about that?

Answer. The man who comes to Congress has received the endorsement of his people. He thinks he is sent there to represent them, to get justice and fair play for them.

The people at home have shown faith and confidence in him that he will do the right thing in representing them: the projects in their district, how friendly they are to agriculture, if there is a lot of labor in the district, how friendly they are to labor and how fair they are to enterprise, too.

Then, if he or she has energy along with ability—and ability isn't much unless it has energy with it, because it doesn't go into operation—then I think they will say, "This is my country; this whole country is mine."

I think the average Member of the House of Representatives is a patriotic person who really, in the last analysis, wants to do the best, for the whole country, that he is capable of doing.

Question. When it comes to expressing the will of the people, do you feel it would be better if the Members of the House were elected every 4 years, rather than 2.

Answer. There are some people who say House Members ought to be able to serve during the whole term of the President.

Well, suppose at the middle of the term the people back home became dissatisfied with what was going on, and justifiably so? I think the people should be allowed to change. And, therefore, I am for continuing 2-year elections of Members of the House of Representatives.

Question. Looking closely at Congress, geographically, would you say that the South is losing power?

Answer. I would not. They have the chairmanships of a great many of the committees, and I think inside those committees nearly everybody is pretty reasonable.

When it comes to the floor of the House, some people have always wanted to build up this Republican-Southern bloc. Well, if they tried to organize this bloc against the Kennedy program, they didn't get very far this past session. I think that thing has been blown up, and blown up beyond what its influence really is.

I think a great many of the men from the South are getting tired of being put into that lineup. And probably, too, some from the North are hearing their people say, "Well, this fellow has joined up with the Dixiecrats."

I never was for blocs—never joined one. I wanted to be a free, independent legislator; to vote my sentiment. And, of course, my sentiments are usually on the side the Democrats take, because I have had a part in making up that program.

ABSOLUTE FAITH IN THE UNITED STATES

Question. Mr. Rayburn, almost all the pressures building in the country are exerted upon you in the Speaker's office. As you watch these pressures, and feel them, what crosses your mind about the American people—their present and their future; the future of the world?

Answer. I have absolute faith in the American people. I believe that more than 95 percent of the American people have more good in them than bad. And, when properly appealed to, they will respond—now as they have in the past.

The American people have never failed to respond to the best interests of the country when this country was in danger and in a crisis. I just know that they will do it again if they are called upon.

The great body of the American people is sound, patriotic and willing to sacrifice to the limit to preserve, protect and to perpetuate the great future of this great country.

I have never doubted the patriotism or the willingness of the American people to sacrifice and do the right thing. I think we will come through in a fashion that will make us all proud.

So I look forward to living in this country at peace, I hope, and in friendliness for all good peoples of the world. We want other people to have their real life, and we want ours.

We do not want to interfere with the affairs of other governments.

And we want to stay at home and attend to our own business, and to build our own structure without interference from anybody else.

ADA: An Evaluation—IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Robert Hartmann, chief of the Los Angeles Times' Washington bureau, quotes Presidential Aid Arthur Schlesinger, ADA vice chairman and leading advocate of the group's positions, to help clarify the role and the viewpoint of the Americans for Democratic Action. This is in Mr. Hartmann's fourth article, "ADA Liberalism Is Plan of Action":

ADA LIBERALISM IS PLAN OF ACTION—MORE MEANINGFUL ALINEMENT OF PARTY'S MAJOR CURRENT GOAL

(By Robert T. Hartmann)

WASHINGTON.—"A program of laundered communism with the Bill of Rights tacked on" is the way a 1958 GOP staff study described the aims of Americans for Democratic Action.

"Keynes, not Marx, is the prophet of the new radicalism," is the answer of ADA's articulate apostle, White House Adviser Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr.

Neither precisely pegs ADA. But the Republican oversimplification does highlight the central contradiction of liberal dogma in the United States and England, where the Fabian socialism of the Webbs and the economics of Lord Keynes were the intellectual fountainhead of ADA.

The goal of greater governmental direction and planning is hard even for ADA'ers to square with maximum individual freedom, so both are embraced simply as an act of faith.

DECISIONMAKERS

The key point is that ADA liberalism is not a coherent system of philoscphy or ideology but a plan of action which will, if it works, eventually place its adherents in decisionmaking seats of power, as many already are.

"Above all—and this is the important and distinctive thing about ADA—it acts to carry out its program," says an anonymous ADA pamphlet of 1955 vintage.

ADA's major short-run aim is to achieve "a more meaningful party alinement"—an all-liberal Democratic Party and an all-conservative Republican Party.

Its major long-range goal for America is summed up in the ADA password—"planning"—a term more palatable than "government control" which is implicit in any plan's execution. A continuous concern of ADA is civil rights, especially in support of racial equality and the defense of accused security risks.

In a remarkable book written when he was only 31, Harvard Historian and ADA Vice Chairman Schlesinger tried to reduce his ideas of liberalism to a system rejecting both Soviet communism and U.S. capitalism and, with a benevolent big government run by selfless intellectuals, insuring traditional American liberties through a continuing but controlled class struggle.

"The problem of reconciling majority rule with minority rights is, in terms of strict logic, insoluble," Schlesinger admits in his 1949 book, "The Vital Center," but he argues that it has been solved pragmatically, case by case, ever since the Constitutional Convention of 1787.

His book, hailed on publication as "a brilliant statement of the principles ADA stands for," is regarded as rather conservative by some ADA leaders today. To them it is too tolerant of private enterprise. ("Private ownership will have an indispensable role; we talk at present about setting up public plants to provide yardsticks for the efficiency of private management, but in the future we may wish to use the private plants as the yardstick.")

WITCH HUNT DREAD

Schlesinger echoed the liberal dread of witch hunts and red herrings but he rebuked liberals for using a double standard in security risk cases defending suspected Communists as loudly as they once demanded the scalps of Nazi sympathizers. He expressed doubt in 1949 that any Communist has a right to employment by the State Department, even though he may advocate communism freely. As cochairman of ADA in 1953, however, Schlesinger formally protested Attorney General Brownell's charge that Harry Dexter White was a Soviet agent secretely shaping U.S. policy in a key Treasury post.

"The Vital Center," cannot be condensed here, but it is required reading for anyone trying to understand the ADA point of view. It eloquently explains (though in terms of Stalin's regime) ADA's consistent opposition to Russian communism and its U.S. party-line comrades.

To say that Lord Keynes, not Karl Marx, is the ADA prophet is to say, as Schlesinger does, that liberals do not hate the Soviet system because it is Socialist but because it is a cruel perversion of socialism.

Keynes and his followers—Harry Dexter White was accepted as one—brought Marx up to date, not as Lenin, Stalin, and Khrushchev have done, but with a cultured Oxford—or Harvard—accent. Taking a realistic view of 20th century capitalism, much different from Marx's, Keynes saw that it is not necessary for the state to physically confiscate all property as long as it can control productive property and its fruits.

Furthermore, with Moscow's mistakes to guide them, Keynesians shudder at the useless waste of hard-to-find managerial talent crudely carried out by lining all capitalists up before firing squads. They prefer putting them to work for the state, like it or not, even letting them think they keep title to their enterprises, if not control.

POPULAR WILL

State control, rather than state ownership of the basic productive facilities in a highly industrialized society, is recognized as more efficient than vast central bureaucracies trying to make every minor decision from afar—as Khrushchev has also discovered. Control, in the Keynesian scheme, is achieved through manipulation of money and credit and the expenditure of a decisive share of the national wealth by government.

As seen by the Senate Republican policy committee staff, the substance of ADA belief is "that it is possible for a police state to be obedient to the popular will; that the apparatus of such a state can be so affected by benevolence that it can produce—through such coercive measures as compulsory union membership, enforced fraternization, a confiscatory share-the-wealth tax system, and a strong centralized bureaucracy—a guaranteed annual wage for everybody, complete freedom from fear, want and anxiety for all, and total economic welfare from the cradle to the grave for the entire

populace. Yet in some way not made clear by ADA, it simultaneously remains marvelously flexible so that the individual has complete freedom of action at all times."

ADA's defenders retort that something like this has been done by Fabian Socialist-Labor governments in Great Britain (and is now carried forward by British Conservatives) in Scandinavia and Western Europe. They see the hope of the future in the new Socialist regimes in India, Asia, and Africa and are eager to implant them in Latin America as a barrier to Soviet and/or Chinese imperialism.

ADA agrees in its own language with Khrushchev that the tide of history is moving steadily toward socialism.

But ADA believes Russia is on the wrong or roundabout track.

LIBERAL SPLIT

Really the ADA was largely founded to split from the liberal movement in America those elements of communism and fellow travelers, which in my opinion—certainly up until 1945—did great harm to the liberal movement by permitting, with some justice, the accusation of fellow travelers to be pinned on persons before the sheep and the goats had been counted." F.D.R.'s Attorney General, Francis Biddle, told the 1950 House investigation when he was ADA national chairman.

"To my knowledge no ADA member has ever been charged with subversive activity by any governmental authority," National ADA Director Violet M. Gunther told the Times. In response to a question, Mrs. Gunther stated that "neither Dr. Robert Oppenheimer nor Prof. Owen Lattimore was ever a member of ADA."

NOT SO CREDITABLE

(Dr. Oppenheimer, touring South America as a lecturer in physics under the auspices of the Organization of American States, was an A-bomb pioneer whose security clearance was revoked in 1954 after lengthy hearings by a 4-to-1 vote of the Atomic Energy Commission. Lattimore, a former State Department adviser recently in Outer Mongolia (whose recognition both he and an ADA-sponsored study advocate) was a controversial figure in the early 1950's when a Senate probe charged him with furthering Communist causes.)

While this reporter's inquiries have failed to turn up any known Communists associated with ADA, the record of ADA on anti-anticommunism is not quite so creditable. This tends to blur the verdict of less careful observers. Chiefly responsible for this are two perennial ADA stalwarts, Vice Chairman Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., a Washington lawyer, and Editor James Wechsler, of the New York Post who, as Washington correspondent for his paper, helped set up ADA in 1947. Both are militant anti-anti-Communists.

Wechsler keynoted this year's ADA convention with a stinging speech about "the gap between the great expectations of November 1960 and the rough reality of May 1961." He accused President Kennedy of unholy compromise on civil rights and "selling thousands of exploited laundry workers down the Potomac" after "running for President on a platform that bore suspicious resemblance to the program, and perhaps more important, the attitudes of the movement assembled here."

ADA Founder Schlesinger rushed over from his new White House office to rebuke Wechsler's berating of his boss, which proves that ADA figures do not always agree. ADA financial angel, Dorothy Schiff, publisher of the New York Post, once blasted ADA Senators HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, and MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, as "the demagogic twins" for proposing to outlaw the U.S. Communist Party.

SECURITY CHECKS

But Rauh, foremost of ADA spokesmen throughout its 14 years, can fairly be called chief of the inner circle of ADA aristocracy. In its infancy ADA's national office was literally in Rauh's hat. He has, except for 2 years, always been a national vice chairman, and was ADA national chairman from 1955 to 1957. He still issues many of ADA's official statements.

So far in 1961 Rauh has urged President Kennedy to eliminate FBI security checks of Federal appointees ("some of the debris of McCarthyism still clutters our national life") and restore Dr. Oppenheimer to Government service ("A review of the record would lead any responsible group of men, freed of the hysteria of the past, to find him fully qualified for any post").

He also publicly advised the freedom riders to ignore Attorney General Robert Kennedy's appeal for moderation ("if 600 marshals are not enough, 60,000 will be"), demanded the Pentagon stop showing the anti-Communist film "Operation Abolition," hailed Postmaster General Day's lifting of bans on Iron Curtain mail and opposed any congressional probe of the rightwing John Birch Society ("a clear and present danger only to themselves").

Rauh was born in Cincinnati 50 years ago, attended Harvard (B.S. 1932; L.L. B. 1935) during the depression, served as legal secretary to Supreme Court Justices Benjamin Cardozo and Felix Frankfurter for 3 years, after some New Deal legal jobs was commissioned in the Army in 1942 and emerged a lieutenant colonel with a Legion of Merit, was a District of Columbia delegate to the last three Democratic national conventions and has been a partner in the law firm of Rauh and Levy since 1947, when he helped found ADA.

COMIC-MELODRAMA

In 1956, while ADA's national chairman, Rauh played a leading role in the curious comic-melodrama involving one Paul H. Hughes, which was later revealed at Hughes' trial in New York Federal court. Hughes, a 35-year-old dischargee from the Air Force, posed as a secret investigator for the late Senator McCarthy (Republican, of Wisconsin) who was and is Rauh's pet hate. Hughes propositioned Clayton Fritchie, then deputy chairman of the Democratic National Committee and now Ambassador Stevenson's U.N. aid, to turn over inside reports on McCarthy's investigations of suspected security risks in return for expenses which he never accounted for in detail.

Actually, as it turned out at Hughes' trial (the jury disagreed on perjury charges) he had never laid eyes on McCarthy, had no connection with his Senate staff, and made his voluminous and detailed reports out of his own vivid imagination. After paying for 2 months to the tune of $2,300, Fritchie balked and Hughes peddled his phony revelations to Rauh who scraped up some $8,500 more at the peak of the Army-McCarthy dispute. (Rauh testified he got the money from liberal friends, some of them also ADA contributors, but there is no evidence he tapped ADA funds.)

WECHSLER DECLINES

Wechsler declined a bid to help finance Hughes despite Rauh's tip that the New York Post's cooking editor was a secret McCarthy spy, but Rauh had more luck with the Washington Post. The Post prepared (but later destroyed) a long exposé of McCarthy skulduggery based on Hughes' fabrications.

But a young reporter assigned to verify the series discovered it was a complete hoax. Neither Rauh nor anyone else ever filed any complaint against Hughes, however, nor did the Post expose the fraud. Tried on a wholly different charge arising out of his testimony in the Matusow case, Hughes swore that Rauh knew his witness was false all along; Rauh testified under oath he was as fooled as Fritchie. He denied ADA's involvement, though Wechsler had suggested it might be "an ADA project."

After denouncing the use of informants by the FBI, McCarthy and other anti-Communist investigators as much as he and ADA have, it hardly matters whether Rauh was knave or fool to employ one. As the Saturday Evening Post observed editorially "the evidence in the Hughes trial seems to indicate that in ADA circles 'McCarthyism' is not considered reprehensible when practiced by dedicated liberals against reactionaries and their ilk * * *. If Mr. Rauh does not get a grant from the Fund for the Republic, invitations to give the Thomas Jefferson lectures at four Ivy League universities, and the applause of all right-thinking liberals, he has a right to be a disappointed man."

WHITE HOUSE CALLER

Rauh shows no signs of disappointment. ADA did not consider him expendable but repeatedly reelected him vice chairman, and among President Kennedy's early White House callers this year were present and past ADA Chairmen Samuel H. Beers, Robert R. Nathan, and Joseph L. Rauh, Jr.

Save for this episode, this study has not found ADA using any but normal and legitimate methods of democratic action appropriate to the organization's name. ADA's political and economic aims are plainly stated—though ADA economics get less attention than they deserve, and foreign policy sensations such as recognition for Red China overshadow the more significant domestic plans ADA actually is accomplishing.

Needs of the Elderly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the most expert and compassionate studies of the needs of the elderly was made recently by a nun in La Crosse, Wis. Sister Alora, of Aquinas Convent, wrote me about this survey in which she took a leading part.

I ask unanimous consent to have appropriate passages from her letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AQUINAS CONVENT,
LaCrosse, Wis., January 2, 1962.

DEAR SENATOR: * * * As you perhaps know, a citizens' group here sponsored a questionnaire survey of all senior citizens of the city. It asked about age, amount and sources of income, monthly rent or home ownership costs, state of health, medical costs, health insurance, adequacy of nursing care, adequacy of meals, suitability of dwelling place for a person of their age and health, social contacts, recreation needs and facilities, etc. Although I was not on the committee which summarized results and made recommendations, my colleague, Sister Mary Roderic, of Viterbo, was, and I helped her do some statistical summaries on the survey.

We decided to concentrate on the parts of the questionnaire answers which shocked us most and, to our view, needed remedy most

urgently. We drew up a statistical study on the relation of monthly income to monthly rent. It is shocking how many of these elderly people are living on social security alone or pension alone. How can they do it? I have an M.A. in sociology from St. Louis University and surely studied slum conditions, but this reading of first-hand questionnaires showed me that you don't have to traverse south side Chicago to find poverty. The situation, as you know, is aggravated in LaCrosse by our past chronic unemployment—and the present collapse of practically all factories except the healthy Trane Co. People now in their late sixties, seventies, eighties probably didn't expect the extension of lifespan back when they had work. Surely they didn't plan on the increased cost of living and heavy medical costs when and if they put away savings. And people laid off at 65 find reemployment almost impossible in a city like this. Many have used up their savings and probably cashed in life insurance. In many cases their rent is too high for their income—many were actually paying one-half or two-thirds of their monthly income out for rent. (We worked out a chart on that.) Add poor health to this and you have an impossible situation.

Two things, of course, are needed: (a) A low-rent housing project for the aged; (b) extension of social security to cover medical costs. Simple, isn't it.

Sister ALORA.

Excise Tax on Telephone Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD some information and views given to us by Mr. Frank Barnes, Jr., former president of the South Carolina Independent Telephone Association, and presently a director of that association. Mr. Barnes had been long concerned with the excise tax on telephone service, both local and long distance service, and has been quick to advise our congressional delegation, accurately, of facts concerning this tax and the injustice of it. Recently he appeared before the South Carolina congressional delegation at the annual delegation open forum in Columbia, S.C., and made a significant statement. I think it is of value to those of us who have to vote on the extension or deletion of the tax. I favor doing away with the tax and I include his summary at this point in the RECORD:

INFORMATION AND FACTS FOR APPEARANCE BEFORE SOUTH CAROLINA CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION NOVEMBER 10, 1961

INTRODUCTION

My name is Frank Barnes, Jr. I live in Rock Hill, S.C., and am vice president of the Rock Hill Telephone Co., a past president of the South Carolina Independent Telephone Association, and now a director. I am representing today the South Carolina Independent Telephone Association composed of 44 independent telephone companies serving over 140,000 telephones with telephone exchange in 125 communities in South Carolina. I am appearing specifically in the interest of the telephone users served by these companies, and generally for telephone users throughout South Carolina.

PURPOSE OF APPEARANCE

We would like to take this opportunity to express appreciation and thanks for the effort of this congressional delegation in past sessions of Congress towards the elimination of a tax which is unfair and should have been removed promptly after World War II. We are grateful for the legislation which has been introduced by this group and for your individual support of other legislation dealing with this subject. Your action and support have contributed greatly to the progress that has been made towards the elimination of the tax. We would also like to review with you the Federal excise tax on communications and discuss the reasons why this unfair tax should now be dropped as a means of raising Federal revenue.

HISTORY

The present communications tax was levied over 19 years ago. It was enacted at a time of national emergency during World War II for the purposes of raising emergency revenues, discouraging the use of telephone service, and conserving scarce telephone supplies and materials which were needed in the war effort. In 1954, the tax was reduced from 25 percent on long distance service and 15 percent on local service to 10 percent on both local and long distance service. In 1959, the Senate acted to eliminate the tax altogether; however, the final action of Congress was to eliminate the tax on local service only, but not until July 1, 1960. At the last two sessions of Congress, because of urgent requests from the executive department the tax was retained for an additional year.

PRESENT SITUATION

As it stands today the excise tax on communications is the only tax on a household utility, there being no excise tax on electricity, gas, or water. The South Carolina Legislature in its 1959 session passed a resolution asking Congress to remove this tax burden from telephone users. The South Carolina Public Service Commission which regulates the firms and corporations rendering telephone service in South Carolina has urged that this tax be removed. The National Association of Railroad and Utility Commissioners which is made up from representatives of public service commissions all over the Nation has gone on record by resolution urgently requesting Congress to terminate this wartime tax. There are now approximately 600,000 telephones in South Carolina. The Federal excise tax on this telephone service amounts to $6 million annually on telephone users in South Carolina.

REASONS WHY THE TAX SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO TERMINATE JUNE 30, 1962

There have been no changes in the objectionable features of the tax since 1959 when Congress took action to terminate the levy on local service. There is no need now to restrict material or curb the service but to the contrary as emphasized by the present administration there is a need to expand. In addition to the adverse effect on the telephone subscribers directly this tax is now beginning to place the telephone companies at a serious disadvantage in meeting the competition which is fast developing in the communications field. This is being made possible by recent decisions of the Federal Communications Commission opening up to the public directly the use of radio frequencies. If our companies are to successfully compete for the communications dollar our customers must be freed from the additional 10 percent tax burden placed on our service.

WHO WILL BENEFIT

Aside from the small benefits in reduction of tax collecting expense, the entire immediate dollar benefit of the removal of this tax would accrue directly to the user of the telephone service. If the tax is permitted to expire this coming July 1, it will mean over $3 million annually will be retained by telephone subscribers in South Carolina, and if the tax on long distance service is also terminated it will mean about $6 million will be retained by telephone users in South Carolina.

Again, let us express to you our grateful appreciation of the efforts you have made in the past to bring about the termination of this unjust tax on telephone subscribers and to urgently request you, in this coming session of Congress, to support and advocate the termination of this tax or shifting the tax burden where it will not be discriminatory upon one particular industry or group of our citizens.

An Important Contribution to Culture by Ukrainian-Americans in Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, a unique redevelopment project will get underway in Philadelphia this year. The Ukrainian-American community in Philadelphia will begin a 5-year project to develop a city block for cultural purposes at a cost of about $1 million.

I understand that this is the only redevelopment project in America being conducted by an ethnic group. It is further tribute to the dynamic Ukrainian-American community which has made many other contributions to the cultural strength of Pennsylvania.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a story about this project which appeared in the Philadelphia Bulletin on December 10, 1961.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN OUR TOWN

(By James Smart)

The Ukrainian-American community in Philadelphia will begin developing a full city block in north Philadelphia into a cultural center early in 1962.

Philadelphia's Ukrainian colony is old, proud and active. It has a soccer team and a string band, a couple of newspapers, and many civic, social and business organizations. The heart of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in America is located here.

Now the Ukrainian-American Citizens' Association, which was founded in 1909, is planning to expand into a new, modern focal point for the estimated 150,000 Philadelphians of Ukrainian descent.

A member of the association's redevelopment committee showed me the plans the other day.

The entire block bounded by Seventh Street, Poplar Street, Franklin Street and Parrish Street is involved.

The association's headquarters are located at 847–851 North Franklin, in the center of the block.

Blighted housing on the rest of the block is now awaiting demolition. The association has a contract with the redevelopment authority to buy the block and redevelop it.

The building at 847 Franklin will also be torn down. The existing building at 849–851 will have a new wing added, which will house social headquarters with old-country atmosphere.

The association's library, hall, theater, and choral group facilities and immigrant education facilities will also be housed in the rejuvenated building.

The first phase of the project, to begin early in 1962, includes development of a parking area at Franklin and Poplar Streets and an athletic field along Parrish from Seventh to Franklin.

Phase two, also expected to begin next year, calls for development of courts, for tennis, basketball, and volleyball, a large patio and a children's play area extending along Seventh Street.

The new wing of the building will be the third step. Construction of an olympic-size swimming pool on Poplar Street will complete the overall project, which is scheduled to take 5 years.

The entire block will be walled and landscaped. Eventually, Popular Street will be made into a sheltered walkway and closed to automobiles.

Just south on Franklin Street is the cathedral of the Ukrainian Catholic diocese. The church also plans to buy 2 acres from the redevelopment authority for $46,500 and improve the site. Tentative plans include erection of a new cathedral.

The citizens' association will pay $40,000 for the less-than-2-acre site of its project.

The entire project will cost $1 million, the leaders estimate.

Walter T. Darmopray, an attorney, is chairman of the association's redevelopment committee. There are four subcommittees. Dietric Slobogin heads finance, Leon Sywulak, building, and William Nezowy, Jr., public relations. Chairman of the arts committee, to determine the esthetics and decor of the center, has not been selected.

The committee members say this is the only redevelopment project in the Nation being conducted by an ethnic group.

Depreciation and Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the problems of depreciation and depreciation allowances are complex and require the most serious consideration of all of us here in the Congress who are responsible for writing the laws governing this subject.

Accordingly, I felt it would be of value to our colleagues to consider the content of a talk given before the 30th annual conference of Comptrollers Institute of America recently by Mr. Clarence W. Teal, of Omaha, Nebr.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of Mr. Teal's speech:

CAN DEPRECIATION BE THE GUARDIAN OF CAPITAL DURING INFLATION

Accountants and businessmen have been struggling with the problems of depreciation since long before we were born, but a good deal of the impetus for the evolution of present day depreciation theory came from the need to measure taxable income which began in earnest with the income tax law of 1913. A major depreciation problem today results from the fact that tax law and regulations have not changed with our economy. Depreciation can be the guardian of capital during inflation only if depreciation allowances for income tax purposes can reflect the recovery of the purchasing power of the original investment in plant and equipment so as to prevent a levy on capital in the guise of an income tax.

The basic assumption underlying historical cost depreciation is that the dollar constitutes a stable measuring unit, and this assumption was substantially true over the years when the major body of accounting principles and income tax regulations relating to depreciation were developed. The purchasing power of the dollar had remained remarkably constant for many years prior to 1913. Price levels in 1913 were practically the same as those in 1865 and during the years between, price level fluctuations, up or down, did not exceed 28 percent. This is an entirely different matter from the drastic change that has occurred in the value of the dollar during the past 50 years, and particularly so in the last 20 years. The price level increase between 1913 and 1940 was 42 percent, and since 1940 we have experienced an additional 112-percent increase.

However, if we are to have a fruitful discussion of the manner in which depreciation should be adjusted to reflect the effects of inflation, we must first be in agreement as to what the function of depreciation really is.

From an accounting point of view, there seems to be general agreement that each year's costs should include a charge representing that portion of the investment in depreciable plant and equipment that is properly allocable to the production of goods or services during the year. Accountants and engineers have established various methods to measure the amount of investment so allocable such as straight line, double declining balance, sum-of-the-years digits, and units of production. Under the varying circumstances peculiar to particular industries one of these conventions may produce a more reasonable and accurate measure than the others but the point I am making is that they all seek the same end result: to determine and to charge off currently as expense that part of the investment in physical facilities allocable as a cost to the period under report. This concept of depreciation does not attempt to take into consideration in any way the cost of replacing the physical plant being used nor is there any need for such a measurement. The cost of the investment in physical facilities used exists whether the related plant facilities are to be replaced or not.

This can be illustrated simply by taking two enterprises, A and B, with the same investment in productive facilities having the same service lives. In the case of company A the intention is to continue the business indefinitely, whereas in the case of company B the intent is to continue in business only during the service life of the plant and equipment involved. In other words, company A will replace its plant and equipment as it wears out whereas company B will not. It appears obvious that the depreciation cost of the two enterprises should be the same whether the depreciation accruals are reinvested in the same plant or in something else.

Assuming that we accept the concept of accruing depreciation to represent the cost of plant used and are not concerned with replacement cost, we are still faced with a serious problem of measurement. The Internal Revenue Code has consistently required us to use as the measuring unit the number of dollars originally invested in the facilities, regardless of what has happened to the purchasing power of those dollars. In other words, under these rules a relatively strong and virile dollar invested in facilities some time ago may in time of inflation be recovered by what General Eisenhower has termed a "dollarette," having a purchasing power of less than half of the older dollar. But there is a growing sentiment to adjust our measuring unit to recognize this change in the purchasing power of the dollar as a step necessary to prevent the erosion of the capital investment.

As long as depreciation allowances for tax purposes are less than what is actually happening to the plant involved taxable income is overstated, taxes paid are too high and the result is a tax on capital. Depreciation allowances must be equivalent to the purchasing power of the original investment in the assets being consumed in production or the capital invested in the business will be taxed away in the guise of income. In this era of high corporate tax rates it is vital that depreciation allowances reflect as accurately as possible the depreciation taking place—no less and no more. Otherwise taxes will consume capital.

No doubt some successful unregulated companies have been able to obtain protection against the capital erosion of inflation through another source, that is, through earnings. Those companies which have been in the fortunate position of being able to obtain higher than normal earnings have been able to retain from such additional earnings amounts equivalent to the deficiency in depreciation allowances resulting from inflation. This source of protection has been open to only the most successful and is a costly process from the viewpoint of the consumer because for every dollar that is brought through to earnings for this purpose, the consumer must pay over $2 under present Federal income tax rates.

Let me illustrate—suppose a business is seeking to supplement its depreciation accruals to offset the effect of inflation by increasing its retained earnings in the amount of $150,000 in a particular year. With a 50-percent tax rate it would have to obtain $300,000 additional from its customers to end up with $150,000 of additional retained earnings after taxes. Accordingly, with the Government as an equal partner, customers must pay $300,000 in order for the businessman to offset a $150,000 effect of inflation. This is why I believe that to some extent the present tax depreciation restrictions have an inflationary impact that would not be present under price level depreciation.

Assuming that we agree on the necessity of considering price level adjustments in tax depreciation allowances, how can we best measure such adjustments?

In my opinion a general price index rather than specific indexes should be used in adjusting depreciation allowances based on historical cost, since the purpose of price level depreciation should be to recognize as a cost spread over the useful life of facilities the general purchasing power of the investment in those facilities. I believe this is sounder than basing the adjustment on the cost of replacing specific assets. For example, when there is no change in the general price level there is no need to adjust historical cost depreciation even though the prices of specific items of plant and equipment may have doubled or have been reduced by half through technology. The funds originally invested constituted purchasing power of the most general kind and the same purchasing power should be recognized in calculating tax depreciation allowances even though such recognition results in allowing a larger or smaller number of dollars than originally invested.

The best measures of the general price level in my opinion are the CPI and the implicit deflator of the GNP. Neither one can be considered as a precise measure of changes in the value of the dollar and both have drawbacks. The CPI is a fixed base index and, therefore, increases or decreases only if the included prices rise or fall. The GNP deflator has the problem of a continuously changing weighting system resulting from shifts in the relative amounts of the components of the GNP. As a result it would be theoretically possible for the overall GNP deflator to rise or fall in a given year when no change occurred in the price of any individual item.

The CPI fluctuates less and shows a smaller rise since 1940 than the price deflator of the GNP or almost any of the other available indexes. In other words it is a conservative expression of the existing degree of inflation. In addition, it is the best known and accepted price index and has been used widely by Government, management, and labor as a measure of the changes in the general value of the dollar. Accordingly, it would appear that the CPI is the most suitable index to use in adjusting depreciation.

Taxing authorities may be loath to recognize price level changes in the tax law if taxpayers plan to use this as a means of tax reduction while following historical cost accounting on their own books. It seems to me that this situation can be remedied if any new legislation contains a provision that a taxpayer cannot use more liberal depreciation methods for tax purposes than he uses on his books of account. Such provision would offer protection of the Government's tax revenues in those cases where a taxpayer uses depreciation methods which, although proper for the plant of another business, are more liberal than can be justified by the actual depreciation of the taxpayer's own plant. Also, I believe firmly that this requirement would be a proper limitation because depreciation methods which are not sound for accounting purposes should not be permitted for tax purposes. Incidentally, according to the Treasury Department's preliminary report on its depreciation survey, 86 percent of large corporations and 97 percent of smaller ones would be willing to conform their book and tax depreciation methods if the tax law were amended to provide the depreciation relief which they feel is necessary.

To summarize, I submit that a major step in dealing with the depreciation problem as well as with the stimulation of the productiveness of our economy would be the recognition for tax purposes of the true cost of capital consumed. I feel that sooner or later the Government must recognize that the preesent tax depreciation policies are hurting the economy at a time when it can least afford it.

ADA: Evaluation—V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the congressional activity, including the lobbying effort of the Americans for Democratic Action, are the subject of the fifth article in the Series of the Los Angeles Times: "ADA Impatient With Congress":

ADA IMPATIENT WITH CONGRESS

(By Robert T. Hartmann)

WASHINGTON.—"Light a Fire Under Congress" is a current nationwide campaign of Americans for Democratic Action, with some 200,000 pamphlets being distributed nationally to stimulate liberals in support of New Frontier programs.

ADA World, the organization's house organ, has become increasingly impatient with the wall of apathy in the 87th Congress, with Vice President JOHNSON's continuing influence * * * and an utter lack of commitment by Democratic leaders to the promises made in their platform.

(William Taylor, ADA's paid lobbyist who wrote this, shortly thereafter was plucked from his critical perch on Capitol Hill by the Kennedy administration and named special assistant to the Director of the Civil Rights Commission. A Yale attorney, Taylor formerly was with NAACP in New York.)

PART OF LIBERAL LOBBY

ADA regards itself as part of the liberal lobby in the Capital and like many special interest groups headquartered here it regularly concerns itself with legislation. ADA registers its lobbyist according to law. It claims to spend no money directly to influence Congress except his modest salary of about $125 a week.

The extent of ADA's influence on Congress cannot be measured by enumerating its legislator members, who probably total no more than 25 in the House and a half dozen Senators. Nor is the success or failure of ADA's public policy stands—backing Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT's drive to abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee, for instance, or opposing any congressional probe of the John Birch Society—a meaningful index.

Most Congressmen questioned by the Times said ADA had very little influence with them. No legislator likes to admit he is swayed by anything but his own civic conscience, but in the "don't quote me" whisper that passes for candor in politics one California Democrat had this to say:

"As far as ADA's ability to influence Congress goes, I'd say it is very limited. But I feel ADA performs a very important function. It takes the unpopular view that needs expressing and sticks with it until it becomes the popular view. Its views are refreshing and certainly a useful foil for the conservative view. It's a wonderful gadfly for Congress."

Representative ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of Los Angeles, a longtime ADA'er and member of its national board, dressed this description up by saying ADA serves as "the good conscience" of congressional liberals.

NO TIME WASTED

Whether gadfly or good conscience, ADA wastes little time lobbying Republicans and conservative Democrats ("I never hear from them—I'm on their list," a GOP stalwart reported.) Instead it keeps liberals in line and exerts a steady leftward pressure on the legislative process, using the standard methods of Washington lobby groups.

In the Senate, where nonconformity is more acceptable than in the House and sometimes a means to power, ADA'ers are more conspicuous. They include, according to National ADA Director Violet Gunther, two national vice chairmen of ADA: Senate Democratic Whip HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, and Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon; Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, like HUMPHREY, was a founding father of ADA.

Among the relative newcomers, Senator CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY, Democrat, of Minnesota, and Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon, are active ADA liberals, and Senators HARRISON WILLIAMS, Democrat, of New Jersey, and JACOB JAVITS, Republican, of New York, are former members. (JAVITS, in earlier House contests, had ADA support rarely given Republicans.)

AHEAD OF PARTY

The ADA phalanx in the Senate reflects the nature of ADA'ers everywhere. It is overwhelmingly Democratic, away out ahead of the party on many issues—especially civil rights—and militantly on the side of enlarged Federal powers in general. Its publicity noise is out of all proportion to its actual strength, as showed up annually in futile January revolts against LYNDON JOHNSON's discipline and compromise. Some of its members already are snapping peevishly at President Kennedy's measured liberal pace.

The liberal viewpoint has many more sympathizers in Congress who might be embarrassed in their home districts by ADA membership. ADA prudently does not press unwanted favors on its pet politicians. For this reason it is virtually invisible in the South. In California, ADA's current revival includes a pledge not to endorse or campaign for specific candidates in competition with regular Democratic organizations.

CALIFORNIA MEMBERS

ADA'ers in the 30-man California delegation include ROOSEVELT, JEFFERY COHELAN, Democrat, of Berkeley, and CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat, of Montebello, who disputes ADA's listing of him as a 1947 founder and says he isn't an active member.

No less than 9 of the 16 California Democrats in the House, however, have voted 100 percent in accord with the ADA position on 39 ADA-chosen rollcalls over the past 4 sessions—though Members ROOSEVELT and HOLIFIELD strayed once or twice. The ideal Congressmen, by ADA's yardstick, are C. MILLER (Corte Madera), JOHNSON (Roseville), Moss (Sacramento), SHELLEY (San Francisco), G. P. MILLER (Alameda), MCFALL (Manteca), KING (Inglewood) and COHELAN.

Departing most often from the ADA line among the Democrats were the delegation chairman and California's senior Congressman, Representative HARRY SHEPPARD, Democrat, of Yucaipa, and Representative HAGEN, Democrat, of Hanford, with seven ADA demerits each.

VOTING RECORDS

Inclusion of Hawaiian statehood among ADA's key votes prevented any California Republicans from batting zero, but Representative JAMES UTT, Republican, of Santa Ana, opposed the ADA position on all 38 other issues. Also far down on ADA's totem pole are GOP Representatives HIESTAND, of Altadena, SMITH, of Glendale, and LIPSCOMB, of Los Angeles. The "best" of the Republican lot by ADA's standards are Representatives BALDWIN, of Martinez, who voted with ADA on 29 rollcalls, and MAILLIARD, of San Francisco, 22 times. In the south, Representatives HOSMER, of Long Beach, WILSON, of San Diego, and TEAGUE, of Ojai, were high ADA scorers with 14, 11, and 10 "right" votes, respectively.

A similar ADA rating of California Senators (using different votes) shows senior Senator KUCHEL, Republican, voting 24 times for and 23 times against the ADA viewpoint. Senator ENGLE, Democrat, a House Member in 1957–58, cast 41 votes with ADA and 5 against, 1 as a Senator.

RATINGS PUBLISHED

ADA World publishes these ratings of every Congressman at the end of each session but warns readers of their limitations as "a guide for liberals."

During the 1950 House lobbying investigation, ADA officials frankly testified they aim

to turn the heat on individual Congressmen by stirring up their big backers and constituents back home. When the tally sheet used by ADA to record each Congressman's votes was introduced in evidence, ADA's executive secretary, James Loeb, Jr. (now Ambassador to Peru), was asked:

"What does the column captioned 'Contacts' mean?"

"We indicate, if we can, in the last column our best contact," Loeb replied. "We might indicate our own chapter, or a particular individual we know in that community. We might indicate a labor organization, if they were particularly powerful * * * somebody in that community that we can go to and say: 'Look, Senator, So-and-So is dubious on this issue—we would like you to talk to him.' "

ADA also keeps up a steady bombardment of letters and telegrams to key Members of Congress on major policy matters and provides witnesses to testify on pending bills either for ADA or as expert individuals. ADA'ers often reinforce and corroborate one another as in this example:

NEWSLETTER DISTRIBUTION

At hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on President Kennedy's $4.8 billion foreign aid request, ADA's research and education director, David C. Williams, urged more money for Latin American social reforms. He was followed by an ADA founder, former Representative H. Jerry Voorhis, Democrat, of California, speaking for the U.S. Cooperative League. Voorhis urged more emphasis on consumer coops in the "Alianza para Progreso." New York Attorney Morris Ernst of the ACLU, another ADA founder, also appeared in support of foreign aid and all three were helpfully questioned by ADA Vice Chairman Senator HUMPHREY, a committee member. But only Williams was openly flying ADA's colors.

(One witness against foreign aid was heard that day.)

For months before and after, ADA's fortnightly Legislative Newsletter went to some 1,100 subscribers at $3 a year advocating more Latin American aid and deploring "the application of banking standards to human needs" by the conservative coalition in Congress.

"ACTION: Write your Congressman, urging him to help restore an appropriation vital in itself and necessary also to give early assurance of U.S. good faith in its professed dedication to Latin American progress," ADA'ers were urged.

The ADA newsletter also was plugging hard for foreign aid with its 5-year financing feature, the Peace Corps, Senator HUMPHREY'S U.S. Disarmament Agency adopted by the administration, Federal school aid and defeat of Attorney General Kennedy's wiretapping bill.

Representative COHELAN, Democrat, of Berkeley—an ADAer—told the Times he first learns of ADA policy stands in letters from his California constituents, while another nonmember Democrat in the California delegation complained, "You can put all my liberal mail in a thimble."

The time may come, however, when an ambitious congressional politician is sharply reminded that ADA has been watching him and keeping cumulative score on his off-year devotion to liberalism.

On April 6, 1960, for instance, a memo marked "Confidential, Nonpublic Documents" went out from ADA national headquarters to all ADA chapters and national board members, beginning:

"A review of Senator LYNDON JOHNSON'S voting record in Congress over the past two decades stamps him as the most conservative of the candidates for the Democratic nomination."

JOHNSON ASSAILED

It then assailed Johnson's "failing to use his influence to curb Senator McCarthy" and his "faithful service to the cause of the oil and gas interests." Enclosed were copies of two private letters signed by the Texas Senator assuring constituents of his opposition to socialized medicine and recalling his votes to override President Truman's veto of the Smith-Connally Act and the Taft-Hartley Act.

(Earlier that election year, ADA World called JOHNSON "a symbol of compromise and political opportunism (who) has no fair claim to be the standard bearer of a liberal Democratic Party. ADA was rougher on JOHNSON than on Nixon, never did endorse him, and continues to attack his influence as Vice President. JOHNSON'S private opinion of ADA cannot be quoted in a family newspaper.)

KENNEDY VOTE RECORD

After the Los Angeles convention, ADA widely distributed Senator Kennedy's 14-year voting record on 146 rollcalls in both House and Senate. The Democratic nominee's liberalism was attested by voting with ADA 80 percent of the time and against ADA's position 10 percent of the time. He was absent for 10 percent of the votes, among them the acid test of ADA liberalism, censure of Senator McCarthy. (Mr. Kennedy was near death in a New York hospital after spinal surgery.)

ADA recorded 14 wrong decisions by Mr. Kennedy during his 14-year career in Congress, favoring restrictions on U.S. aid to nations trading with Red China, civil rights compromises, stronger antisubversive measures and reduced farm subsidies. In the domestic areas of labor and education, immigration, welfare, housing, urban renewal, and the like, ADA found no spot or blemish in the future President, who was with ADA on 118 of the 146 showdowns.

Yet when ADA endorsed Mr. Kennedy for President over Mr. Nixon, it curiously ignored his domestic fidelity and cited his foreign policy views as the primary reason he should be elected.

Kennedy Farm Audit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the new year brings the reconvening of Congress and the judgment that we must pass as a legislative body as we represent the American taxpayer. The new year also brings the second year of the New Frontier with its wonderful cures for all the ailments of our Nation and the world.

One of the cures the New Frontier was to produce was in the field of an agricultural program. Since we have had an agricultural problem since the early days of the New Deal regimentation of agriculture, I place into the RECORD an editorial which accurately describes current conditions. I submit for the RECORD the editorial entitled "Kennedy Farm Audit" which appeared in the Chicago Sunday Tribune, January 7:

KENNEDY FARM AUDIT

"Our agricultural program," said Candidate John F. Kennedy during the 1960 election campaign, "will cost $1.5 billion, possibly $2 billion, less than the present agricultural program."

In the first full fiscal year of President Kennedy's administration, which ends June 30, the budget for the Department of Agriculture has risen to a near record $6,271 million, an increase of $1,131 million over that of the preceding fiscal year.

This is an item not included in a summary of the administration's agricultural achievements issued a few days ago by Secretary Freeman. The summary characterized 1961 as a "year of enlarging opportunity for American agriculture—which brought a reversal in the buildup of surplus stocks and a substantial turn upward in income." It said net farm income went up $1 billion, or 9 percent, in 1961 over the preceding year, and listed as one of the "major accomplishments" a cut in the annual surplus buildup of corn and other feed grains for the first time since 1952.

Other major accomplishments included an increase in price supports on important crops and the export of a record $5.1 billion worth of farm commodities, of which about 70 percent was commercial dollar sales. Unfortunately, the report gave few details.

It did not mention, for example, the half billion dollars the Government spent last year to acquire surplus dairy stocks, which was double the cost of the preceding year.

Nor did it mention the new surplus of soybeans that may result from the record 693 million bushel crop, an increase of 25 percent over 1960 output, stimulated by higher price supports and the administration's feed grain program. Some economists estimate this may have generated a soybean surplus of 65 million to 110 million bushels by next fall, compared with a carryover of only 5 million bushels in the fall of 1961, which could cost taxpayers up to a quarter of a billion dollars if the Government has to take it over.

As to the feed grain surplus, the administration's program cut the acreage of corn, the major feed, by 18 percent but achieved an actual reduction in the crop (for grain) of only 7 percent because of record yields per acre. Total supplies of feed grains and concentrates were cut only a meager 3 percent for the current market year. The program cost taxpayers an estimated $1 billion, nearly three-fourths of which went to pay farmers for idling acreage, with the remainder expected to be accounted for in higher price supports and administrative costs.

Drouth in the Northern Plains was largely responsible for a 10 percent reduction in the 1961 wheat crop, which was still under the program that was in effect in the Eisenhower administration. Total wheat stocks owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation or held under price supporting loans were down 5.8 percent last October 31.

The quantity of surplus cotton held by the CCC under loans or in inventory on October 31 was only about half of the 5.5 million bale stockpile a year ago. This substantial reduction was brought about by a change in the law, enacted under the Eisenhower administration, which made it profitable for textile manufacturers to buy it from the Government. The total cotton carryover in Government and private hands at the end of the 1961 marketing year was about 7 million bales, only a trifle below that of a year ago, although only half of the record surplus that existed in 1956.

Reduction of total surplus farm commodities in the last year has been small, although a change in CCC accounting procedures makes a comparison difficult. As of last October 31 (the latest estimate available), stocks owned by the CCC and held under loans totaled $7.3 billion. This was the actual acquisition cost, and did not include an estimated loss from storage, handling, and transportation costs of $1.6 billion which will be realized when stocks in inventory are disposed of.

On the same date in 1960, CCC stocks in inventory and under loan totaled $9.1 billion which included all costs.

The record $5.1 billion worth of exports undoubtedly kept the surplus stockpile from growing larger in 1961. Although 70 percent of the total moved for dollars, roughly half of the dollar sales were subsidized, with the remaining 30 percent of the total bartered, donated, or sold for foreign currencies, which is virtually giving them away.

Thus the administration's achievement of raising net farm income a billion dollars was accomplished at taxpayers' expense through huge outlays of funds to fix domestic prices at artificially high levels, to pay farmers for not growing crops, and to subsidize exports. When Mr. Freeman claims major accomplishments and enlarging opportunities for agriculture, he is not only blowing his own horn. He is talking through his hat.

Civil Defense Shelters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the most thoughtful and touching observations I have read on civil defense shelters has come from a Milwaukee first grade teacher.

Miss Joan Caton has written me to propose that the Congress carefully consider the good sense in locating civil defense shelters in schools.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
November 12, 1961.

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: I write to you because those for whom I am writing are still in the process of learning, with labor, enthusiasm, and sometimes with discouragement, that the letters of the alphabet make words, and words, in turn, make sentences. It is for my 32 first-grade pupils that I write. For while they are busy assimilating their cultural heritage, they are wondering about the future.

I teach in a public school in an area of Milwaukee which some people classify as "underprivileged." A pair of shoes, a good meal, a warm coat—these things are considered luxuries by many of the children in my room.

Many of the parents in this neighborhood are on relief. Often the children are neglected, unwashed, uncared for. But because a higher justice prevails, these children are not unblessed. Among the 32 pupils in my room are children of inspiring and challenging abilities. All of them have the potential to become substantial citizens.

Last week, I took my first-graders down to a small room in the basement of our very old school. They stood in three lines and faced the wall. The principal explained to them that this room was to be their shelter in case of an atomic attack. He explained why they were there and for what reasons they would again return to that room. He was honest with them and spared no details.

There were no hysterics. There was no panic. For these are brave children. Most of them, during their young lives, have lived too close to reality to become afraid of it now. As we left the basement and filed up the two flights of creaking, wooden stairs and back to our classroom, a small voice in the back of the line was heard to say, "A big bomb might fall and kill us all deaded."

Back in our room, I explained to the hushed children that ours is a strong and powerful country and that we have many brave and wise men to protect us. Children, too, must be brave, I told them, and do all that they can to help their country.

I couldn't tell them that the basement room we had just visited was an inadequate shelter for the nearly 100 children and 3 teachers who would be forced to remain there in the event of an atomic attack. The children didn't notice that the room contained no water, no food supplies, no sanitary facilities.

I couldn't tell them that their own homes, in the crowded and congested heart of the city, would provide even less protection. Private fallout shelters are out of the question for families whose main concerns are enough food on the table and meeting next month's rent.

Furthermore, I couldn't tell them that apparently only the children of parents affluent enough to build shelters in their homes would be privileged to survive an atomic disaster. I would have to tell them, if they were old enough to ask, that the phrase in the Constitution which promises "to provide for the common defense," as of now, excludes the children of an underprivileged and crowded city neighborhood.

Each morning they stand, straight, still, and serious and salute their flag. "One Nation, under God, with liberty and justice for all," they say. At age 6, most of them aren't old enough to know such abstractions as liberty and justice. But this I do know: like the children of Troy, Athens, or Auschwitz, they believe that their elders can and will save them from destruction. Because they are children, they have limitless faith in our limited abilities.

Because they are only little children and believe so comprehensively in the existence and protection of brave and wise men, they would find it difficult to understand that their childish interests are so often overlooked in the important business of foreign policy, highway planning, and election campaigns. For you see, children are egocentric and think that they are the most important things in the whole world.

They couldn't understand how we could have local, State, and National provisions to protect our forests, our minerals and elements, our wildlife, our salmon—and yet no provisions at all to protect our most cherished and important resource: our children. Their innocence makes it impossible for them to understand such logic.

Is it too much to ask that our National, State, and local governments cooperate immediately to provide adequate blast and fallout protection for all of our American children—"privileged" and "underprivileged" alike? It seems dishonest, hypocritical, even cruel to make children aware of the danger under which they must live and sacrifice and then not to provide them with the means for their survival. Since most children spend a great deal of time in school, it seems logical to provide our big city schools with adequate blast shelters.

And if such shelters are not used, which we pray will be the case, would it then be a foolish waste of money to provide them for our children? I think not. Generations to come would look at them, I think, as loving monuments, more important than thousands of miles of highway, hundreds of parks, statues of war heroes, or art centers, erected by a people with a firm enough grasp of reality to realize that the education and protection of the young was the most important factor in assuring an enduring democracy.

Life is the most important thing in the world to our children. There is no "Red or dead" dilemma for them. They are the children of democracy and see no reason why they can't live in freedom and peace. If they must live underground while their more mature elders hurl death at one another, they will do so. For as I have said, they are brave and courageous children. But they are children—small and meek—asking for only what is theirs: the right to inherit the earth.

Any interest and action that you take in this matter will be appreciated for all time.

Respectfully,

JOAN CATON.

ADA: Evaluation—VI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, "ADA Lists State as 1961 Target" is the sixth in the series of articles on the Americans for Democratic Action by Robert Hartmann. This article tells of the activities of the organization in California and gives an insight into the concept of operations which the ADA has:

ADA LISTS STATE AS 1961 TARGET

(By Robert T. Hartmann)

SAN FRANCISCO.—Americans for Democratic Action have made California their priority target for 1961. The bay area comes first, Los Angeles later.

ADA, the national liberal organization heretofore concentrated in the northeastern industrial States, has heard the message of the future. Taking Horace Greeley's advice whole, a young man did go west.

Just over a year ago national ADA headquarters in Washington sent Sheldon Pollack, their top organizer, here to revive ADA as an effective political force in California. Half his salary of $300 a week—the highest ADA pays anyone—comes from the group's national treasury, half from the newly formed northern California chapter.

CAREER IN ADA

Pollack is a 35-year-old bachelor from New Jersey who has spent most of his time in ADA work since 1950 when he got a master's degree from the University of Chicago in foreign affairs.

His volunteer partner in the bay area beachhead is 31-year-old Edward P. Eichler, executive vice president and son of the founder of Eichler Homes, Inc., of Palo Alto. The senior Eichler, 1956 San Mateo County chairman for Stevenson, is an ADA member but his son was unaware of it until he joined 4 years ago at the suggestion of a Philadelphia friend. A 1951 Dartmouth graduate, father of two sons, "Ned" Eichler is chairman of the northern California ADA chapter.

Both these young men are intense, articulate, and enthusiastic liberals of the new generation which puts the New Deal and the Emancipation Proclamation in the perspective of ancient history. Pollack was chairman of the Students for Democratic Action group at Chicago, but Eichler's political stirrings came later.

DISPUTE OVER FILM

Neither their youth nor their crowded one-room office at 41 Sutter Street in San Francisco's financial district nor their miniscule budget of $15,000 a year should mislead anyone about the seriousness of this pair's plans for the conquest of California.

The northern California ADA chapter now has about 800 dues-paying members ($6 a year; $10 for couples) and is recruiting more. Its first sortie into the political arena was a successful campaign, backed by the national ADA, to stop Defense Department showings of the film "Operation Abolition" about the San Francisco student riots during House Un-American Activities Committee hearings here in May 1960.

The riots took place before the local ADA group got organized, but ADA nationally called for abolition of the Un-American Activities Committee and charged distortion of fact and sequence in the privately produced motion picture which purports to document the committee's charge that the riots were Communist-inspired and directed.

Mrs. Carolyn L. Weiner, a San Francisco housewife and ADA member, was commissioned by the new chapter to write a 12-page pamphlet (with the aid of an ADA editorial board), which has been printed and distributed in large quantities by national ADA. It is done in a more scholarly style than the protest letter which ADA also sponsored and sent to the eight Democrats and five Republicans representing northern California in Congress, decrying the harm done San Francisco by a film depicting it as a "hotbed of subversion."

Subsequently the new Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, Arthur Sylvester, ordered the Army, Navy, and Air Force to discontinue purchasing the film or screening it for civilian audiences.

Two new "Elmer Davis Memorial Pamphlets" published this year under national ADA auspices were written by northern California chapter members. One is "New Perspectives on Northeast Asia" by Prof. Robert A. Scalopino of the University of California (Berkeley), which set forth arguments for U.S. recognition of Communist Outer Mongolia only slightly paraphrased in a later New York Times editorial. The other, "New Perspectives on Sub-Saharan Africa," is by Prof. James S. Coleman, of UCLA, and Asst. Prof. Carl Rosberg, Jr., of the Berkeley faculty.

URBAN PROBLEMS

In January the ADA chapter staged two conferences of local and visiting experts on metropolitan area problems and housing and in April held a symposium on the recession featuring Dr. James Tobin of President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers.

At the crowded San Francisco office, Mrs. Frances Strauss donates half her time as the only paid staff member supervising a score of ADA clerical volunteers. Among other things ADA's Legislative Newsletter is telefaxed fortnightly from Washington, mimeographed and mailed to all California ADAers.

Pollack has registered as a lobbyist at Sacramento and has testified for ADA, along with Eichler and Oakland attorney Harold A. Galloway, before legislative committees in both State and National capitals considering housing, farm labor and narcotics legislation.

In the legislature, State Senator George Miller, Jr. (Democrat, Contra Costa) and Assemblymen John O'Connell (Democrat, San Francisco) and Nicholas C. Petris (Democrat, Oakland) are active on the ADA chapter board.

NOT SUBVERSIVE

National ADA Chairman Samuel H. Beer told the 1961 ADA convention in Washington he is "particularly proud" of the fledgling northern California chapter and Pollack hopes to double his budget for 1962. Already ADA activity here has been sufficient to arouse the State senate subcommittee on un-American activities to devote two pages of its June 13 report to answering "many inquiries" about ADA's status with the assertion that it "is in no sense a Communist front, or in any way subversive."

The Burns committee report relates that ADA was launched in California in 1947 by Actor Melvyn Douglas and his wife, former Congresswoman Helen Gahagan Douglas, as a liberal group forthrightly proclaiming its antipathy to communism. But ADA was concerned by and formally protested the inclusion in the California report of the name of Carey McWilliams, Sr., editor of the Nation, as one of ADA's early members along with Harry Girvetz, Santa Barbara State College professor, and Attorney General Mosk.

CASE OF M'WILLIAMS

Girvetz, former research secretary to Governor Brown, is a stalwart of the loyalist pocket of ADA'ers in Santa Barbara who survived the general hiatus of ADA in California during the past decade, and regularly sent $500 contributions to Washington headquarters. He offered a like amount to Senator Burns' favorite charity if shown proof that McWilliams, cited by Burns' committee for "participation in the Communist Party itself," was ever a member of ADA. Burns replied on July 28 that "we stand on the evidence concerning the assertions made in the report, which we believe are true until we receive convincing evidence to the contrary" and there the matter rests at this writing. My own study has not identified McWilliams as an ADA member from any other source.

ADA in California foundered in factional feuding over the 1952 campaign and was quickly superseded by the Democratic club movement here, which now takes a quizzical view of ADA's return.

HOLIFIELD COMMENTS

"The organization never amounted to anything in California and is not needed there," Representative Holifield, Democrat of Montebello, a liberal and early ADA member, told the Times.

The open and generally undisciplined character of California parties gave ADA scant excuse for existence in the fifties. Liberals were not frozen out of Democratic leadership as in the eastern boss-controlled cities, but rather rose to prominence in California, while conservative Democrats gravitated toward the GOP on election days. So ADA stayed out, until 1960 changed the picture.

The cold statistics of the U.S. Census showed where the center of political gravity in the nation is inexorably moving. The shilly-shallying of California's Democratic leadership at the July convention appalled the 130 ADA'ers who were delegates and convinced them the No. 2 State was by no means in the liberal bag. Finally, in November, it went Republican and appeared to be the pad from which Richard Nixon might launch his political comeback.

RICH, GROWING AREA

All this is not part of ADA's announced purpose in renewing interest in California. (Elsewhere in the West, there is a new ADA chapter at Anchorage, Alaska, and groups in Seattle and Tacoma.) It is frankly to use this growing area as a laboratory for "planning."

"Everything moves faster than the art of government," explained ADA Chapter Chairman Eichler. "And California has all the problems. It's going to be our job to come up with new proposals, primarily for this State, on urban and suburban planning, chronic unemployment, automation, and that sort of thing."

Eichler contends that a political party cannot criticize itself or the performance of its candidates, and has too little time for creative thinking. He says ADA has a place here and is winning acceptance by regular Democrats.

MOVE INTO SOUTHLAND

Pollack has a real chamber of commerce enthusiasm for his new State, and outlines ADA's expansion program as follows:

"California really is more progressive—that's why we have a better chance to solve problems here. Our intention is to start moving into southern California as soon as we have the people and the finances. (ADA has several hundred unorganized national members in the Southland.)

"First we'll add some people from the South to our executive board, then next year we'll schedule some area meetings down there and also in Stockton, Monterey, Carmel, Sacramento, and maybe set up some small ADA committees for a start. But most of our activity will be statewide."

Eichler again: "It's really largely accidental we started here—we've already set up a State policy planning committee to look 20 years ahead at California problems."

The youthful chairman said he meant the State legislature when he wrote California ADA'ers that "the necessary changes which involve a break with our past will not come from the organized political powers * * * too encrusted with inertia, provincialism and concern for the status quo."

VOTES SCRUTINIZED

The ADA chapter here is assembling a voting record on Sacramento legislators similar to its national scoreboard on Congress.

Though not a member, Governor Brown "has been very friendly" and his new executive secretary, Charles A. O'Brien, is "on the ADA chapter's executive committee." Pollack said.

No less than 13 members of this policy-making board are professors, 9 of them from the Berkeley faculty of the University of California, which probably explains ADA's choice of the bay area as a starting place. Dr. Paul Seabury, a political scientist, left the chapter chairmanship to be chairman of the national ADA executive committee in Washington this year while on a Guggenheim fellowship. Dr. Eugene Burdick, coauthor of "The Ugly American," is active in ADA affairs.

The northern California chapter was auspiciously launched July 9, 1960, at the Fairmont Hotel, with some 400 guests paying $7.50 to lunch and listen to an array of ADA big guns: National Chairman Samuel H. Beer, Vice Chairmen Walter Reuther, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., Robert R. Nathan, and Joseph L. Rauh, Jr.

According to ADA's own account, "the northern California chapter will pioneer a new organization format for ADA. Taking cognizance of the growth of the Democratic clubs in California and their role in involving liberals in election campaigns and grassroots organizations, the new chapter will not engage in direct political action (nor) hold regular membership meetings.

"Instead it will function as an idea and issue organization acting on behalf of the National ADA on national political strategies," the ADA World reassured regular California Democrats.

During 3 months of investigations which took me from Washington to Boston, San Francisco, and Los Angeles, I have found ADA officials and members unfailingly friendly and helpful in supplying information. I am grateful and hope I have stated ADA's case correctly and fairly, so that Times readers may judge for themselves: What is ADA?

Lippmann on the Frustration of Our Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Congress and the Nation today embark on a new era: of promise, of progress, of threats, of opportunity, and of challenge.

The success of our endeavors—within the environment of these times—depends not only upon our physical-material, but also the intellectual-psychological-spiritual strength of our people.

Without calm, wise heads in these nerve-straining days, it would not be possible to make the difficult decisions—often determining by a hair's breadth the difference between war and peace.

Yesterday, a distinguished, renowned commentator of our times, Walter Lippmann—speaking before the Women's National Press Club—reflected thoughtfully on the frustrations of our times and upon the kind of national—yes, world—attitude necessary to avoid war and accommodate, if not resolve, the differences that threaten peace.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the speech by Mr. Lippmann printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIPPMANN ON THE FRUSTRATION OF OUR TIME

(Address delivered by Walter Lippmann, distinguished author and columnist, before the Women's National Press Club)

It is an honor, which I greatly appreciate, to be asked to speak on this occasion; it is also a personal kindness. For Congress is about to convene, and that means that there will be many speeches in the months to come. Experience has taught me that it is always a good idea to be able to speak early in the program. By the time Congress has adjourned next summer, adjourned in order to go out and make more speeches in the constituencies, your bright and eager faces may not be so bright and eager at the prospect of hearing yet another speech. I am happy to catch you while you are still in such robust good health.

When I sat down to prepare this talk, I considered and rejected the idea of delivering a kind of preliminary message on the state of the Union. I remembered that this will soon be done with much more authority by the husband of a former newspaperwoman. So I decided to talk to you tonight about the state of our minds, the state of our nerves, and perhaps even about the state of our souls.

I am moved to do this by a letter I received just before Christmas. It was from a friend of mine who was a great hero in the First World War. He has been an extraordinarily successful man since then, and his letter began in this cheerful fashion. "My dear Walter: Another year of frustration, confusion, and compromise is about over."

I know that my friend is not alone in feeling this way and that during the coming session of Congress there will be many who will say what he says and feel as he does. At different times I suppose all of us share his feelings. There is indeed much frustration, much confusion, and—because we live on earth and not in Heaven—there is, of course, much compromise.

FRUSTRATIONS NOTHING NEW

I could have written back to my friend, reminding him that in every year of which there is any historical record, there has been much frustration and confusion and compromise. Anyone who thinks he can get away from frustration, confusion, and compromise in politics and diplomacy should make arrangements to get himself reborn into a different world than this one. Or if that is beyond his powers, he should move to some country where there are no newspapers to read.

However, it is certainly true that in our own time we are experiencing a very special frustration and confusion. There is, I believe, a reason for this. Certainly, if we knew the cause, we might feel better, even if we cannot do quickly something drastic to end the difficulty.

The age we are living in is radically new in human experience. During the past 15 years or so there has occurred a profound revolution in human affairs, and we are the first generation that has lived under these revolutionary new conditions. There has taken place a radical development in the art of war, and this is causing a revolutionary change in the foreign relations of all the nations of the world. The radical development is, of course, the production of nuclear weapons.

As a scientific phenomenon the nuclear age began with the explosion at Los Alamos in 1945. But in world relations the nuclear age really began about 10 years later. For during the 1940's the United States was the only nuclear power in the world. But by the middle fifties and in the years following, the Soviet Union has created an armory of nuclear weapons and has built rockets which have made it, for all practical purposes of diplomacy, a nuclear power equal with the United States.

The essential fact about the appearance of two opposed great powers armed with nuclear weapons is that war, which is an ancient habit of mankind, has become mutually destructive. Nuclear war is a way of mutual suicide. The modern weapons are not merely much bigger and more dangerous than any which existed before. They have introduced into the art of warfare a wholly new kind of violence.

Always in the past, war and the threat of war, whether it was aggressive or defensive, were usable instruments. They were usable instruments in the sense that nations could go to war for their national purposes. They could threaten war for diplomatic reasons. Nations could transform themselves from petty states to great powers by means of war. They could enlarge their territory, acquire profitable colonies, change the religion of a vanquished population, all by means of war. War was the instrument with which the social, political and legal systems of large areas were changed. Thus, in the old days before the nuclear age began, war was a usable—however horrible and expensive—instrument of national purpose. The reason for that was that the old wars could be won.

In the prenuclear age, right down through the Second World War, the victorious power was an organized state which could impose its will on the vanquished. We did that with Germany and with Japan. The damage they had suffered, although it was great, was not irreparable, as we know from the recovery after World War II of West Germany and Japan and the Soviet Union.

But from a full nuclear war, which might well mean 100 million dead, after the devastation of the great urban centers of the Northern Hemisphere and the contamination of the earth, the water, and the air, there would be no such recovery as we have seen after the two World Wars of this century.

The damage done would be mutual. There would be no victor. As far in the future as we can see, the ruin would be irreparable. The United States has the nuclear power to reduce Soviet society to a smoldering ruin, leaving the wretched survivors shocked and starving and diseased. In an interchange of nuclear weapons, it is estimated coolly by experts who have studied it, the Soviet Union would kill between 30 and 70 million Americans.

A war of that kind would not be followed by reconstruction, it would not be followed by a Marshall plan, and by all the constructive things that were done after World War II. A nuclear war would be followed by a savage struggle for existence, as the survivors crawled out of their shelters, and the American Republic would have to be replaced by a stringent military dictatorship, trying to keep some kind of order among the desperate survivors.

To his great credit, President Eisenhower was quick to realize what nuclear war would be. After he and Prime Minister Churchill had studied some of the results of the nuclear tests, President Eisenhower made the historic declaration that there is no longer any alternative to peace.

AN IMPOSSIBLE INSTRUMENT

When President Eisenhower made that statement, no one of us, I think, understood its full significance and consequences. We are now beginning to understand them, and here I venture to say is the root of the frustration and the confusion which torment us. For while nuclear weapons have made war, the old arbiter of human affairs, an impossible action for a rational statesman to contemplate, we do not have any other reliable way of dealing with issues that used to be resolved by war.

It is enormously difficult to make peace. It is intolerably dangerous and useless to make war about the fundamental issues.

That is where our contemporary frustration and confusion originate.

We are confronted with an extraordinarily tantalizing and nerve-wracking dilemma.

For as long a time as we can see into the future, we shall be living between war and peace, between a war that cannot be fought, and a peace that cannot be achieved. The great issues which divide the world cannot be decided by a war that could be won, and they cannot be settled by a treaty that can be negotiated. There, I repeat, is the root of the frustration which our people feel. Our world is divided as it has not been since the religious wars of the 17th century and a large part of the globe is in a great upheaval, the like of which has not been known since the end of the Middle Ages. But the power which used to deal with the divisions and conflicts of the past, namely organized war, has become an impossible instrument to use.

President Eisenhower and President Kennedy are the only two American Presidents who ever lived in a world like this one. It is a great puzzle to know how to defend the Nation's rights, and how to promote its interests in the nuclear age. There are no clear guidelines of action because there are no precedents for the situation in which we find ourselves. And as statesmen grope their way from one improvisation and accommodation to another, there are masses of people who are frightened, irritated, impatient, frustrated and in search of quick and easy solutions.

The nuclear age is only a few years old. But we have already learned one or two things about how to conduct policy in this age. It was once said of a British admiral in the First World War that if he made a mistake, he could lose the British fleet and with it the whole war in an afternoon. Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Kennedy are in a similar position today. In a few days or so Mr. Khrushchev can lose the Soviet state and the promise of a Communist economy. He can lose all the work of all his 5-year plans, his 7-year plans, and his 20-year plans. In that same time, Mr. Kennedy can lose the Constitution of the

United States, the free enterprise system, and the American way of life and, along with them, all the frontiers, old and new. I don't think I am exaggerating. A full nuclear war would produce by far the biggest convulsion which has ever occurred in recorded history. We cannot understand the realities of the Khrushchev-Kennedy encounter, which has been going on since they met at Vienna last June, unless we remind ourselves again and again of what war has become in the nuclear age.

The poor dears among us who say that they have had enough of all this talking and negotiating and now let us drop the bomb, have no idea of what they are talking about. They do not know what has happened in the past 20 years. They belong to the past, and they have not been able to realize what the present is.

In this present, only a moral idiot with a suicidal mania would press the button for a nuclear war. Yet we have learned that while a nuclear war would be lunacy, it is nevertheless an ever-present possibility. Why? Because, however lunatic it might be to commit suicide, a nation can be provoked and exasperated to the point of lunacy where its nervous system cannot endure inaction, where only violence can relieve its feelings. This is one of the facts of life in the middle of the 20th century. The nerves of a nation can stand only so much provocation and humiliation, and beyond the tolerable limits, it will plunge into lunacy. This is as much a real fact as is the megaton bomb, and it is a fact which must be given great weight in the calculation of national policy. It is the central fact in the whole diplomatic problem of dealing with the cold war. There is a line of intolerable provocation beyond which reactions become uncontrollable. It is the business of the governments to find out where that line is, and to stay well back of it.

Those who do not understand the nature of war in the nuclear age, those who think that war today is what it was against Mexico or Spain or in the two World Wars, regard the careful attempts of statesmen not to carry the provocation past the tolerable limit as weakness and softness and appeasement. It is not any of these things. It is not softness. It is sanity.

But it leaves us with a task: because we cannot make war, because we cannot achieve peace, we must find some other way of meeting the great issues which confront us. For life will go on, and if the answers of the past do not work, other answers must exist and must be found.

The answer lies, I believe, in the nature of the struggle between our Western society and the Communist society.

It is often said that the struggle which divides the world is for the minds and the souls of men. That is true. As long as there exists a balance of power and of terror, neither side can impose its doctrine and its ideology upon the other. The struggle for the minds of men, moreover, is not, I believe, going to be decided by propaganda. We are not going to convert our adversaries, and they are not going to convert us.

The struggle, furthermore, is not going to be ended in any foreseeable time. At bottom it is a competition between two societies and it resembles more than any other thing in our historical experience the long centuries of conflict between Christendom and Islam. The modern competition between the two societies turns on their respective capacity to become powerful and rich, to become the leaders in science and technology, to see that their people are properly educated and able to operate such a society, to keep their people healthy, and to give them the happiness of knowing that they are able and free to work for their best hopes.

The historic rivalry of the two societies and of the two civilizations which they contain is not going to be decided by what happens on the periphery and in the outposts. It is going to be decided by what goes on in the heart of each of the two societies. The heart of Western civilization lies on the shores of the Atlantic Ocean, and our future depends on what goes on in the Atlantic Community. Will this Community advance? Can the nations which compose it work together? Can it become a great and secure center of power and of wealth, of light and of leading? To work for these ends is to be engaged truly in the great conflict of our age, and to be doing the real work that we are challenged to do. I speak with some hope and confidence tonight. For I believe that in the months to come we shall engage ourselves in the long and complicated, but splendidly constructive, task of bringing together in one liberal and progressive economic community all the trading nations which do not belong to the Communist society.

MAGNETIC ATTRACTION

I dare to believe that this powerful Western economic community will be able to live safely and without fear in the same world as the Soviet Union, and that the rising power and influence of the Western society will exert a beneficent magnetic attraction upon Eastern Europe. This will happen if we approach it in the right way. Jean Monnet, who is the original founder of this movement, has put it the right way. "We cannot build our future," he has said, "if we are obsessed with fear of Russia. Let us build our own strength and health not against anyone, but for ourselves so that we will become so strong that no one will dare attack us, and so progressive and prosperous that we set a model for all other peoples, indeed for the Russians themselves."

At the same time the wealth and confidence of the new community will enable the Western society to assist and draw to it the societies of the southern hemisphere, where social and economic change is proceeding rapidly.

You will have seen that I do not agree with those who think that in order to defend ourselves and to survive we must put a stop to the progressive movement which has gone on throughout this century. This movement began in the administration of Theodore Roosevelt. Its purpose was to reform and advance our own social order, and at the same time to recognize that we must live in the world beyond our frontiers. We shall lose all our power to cope with our problems if we allow ourselves to become a stagnant, neurotic, frightened and suspicious people. Let us not punish ourselves by denying ourselves the hope, by depriving ourselves of the oldest American dream, which is that we are making a better society on this earth than has ever been made before.

Is all this conservative? Is all this liberal? Is it all progressive? It is, I say, all of these. There is no irreconcilable contradiction among these noble words. Do not Republicans believe in democracy, and do not Democrats believe in a republic? Such labels may describe political parties in England; they do not describe political attitudes in the United States.

Every truly civilized and enlightened American is conservative and liberal and progressive. A civilized American is conservative in that his deepest loyalty is to the Western heritage of ideas which originated on the shores of the Mediterranean Sea. Because of that loyalty he is the indefatigable defender of our own constitutional doctrine, which is that all power, that all government, that all officials, that all parties, and all majorities are under the law—and that none of them is sovereign and omnipotent.

The civilized American is a liberal because the writing and the administration of the laws should be done with enlightenment and compassion, with tolerance and charity, and with affection.

And the civilized man is progressive because the times change and the social order evolves and new things are invented and changes occur. This conservative who is a liberal is a progressive because he must work and live, he must govern and debate in the world as it is in his own time and as it is going to become.

Hon. John J. Riley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Frank Van Der Linden, a distinguished Washington correspondent, is an eloquent and fitting tribute to our late, beloved colleague and friend, John J. Riley:

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN RILEY'S DEATH IS LOSS TO NATION AS WELL AS TO STATE

(By Frank Van Der Linden)

WASHINGTON.—The American people will never know how much they owe to a small group of dedicated Congressmen, one of whom was John J. Riley, of South Carolina, who died January 1.

Riley had served for 11 years on the House Appropriations Committee. As a member of its Defense Subcommittee, he spent many months out of every year at closed hearings, studying the budget requests for billions of dollars in expenditures for national security. He heard the Nation's foremost military men tell their highly classified plans for defense against a possible attack by the Soviets; their projects for highly secret weapons; their proposals for strengthening national security against the Communist threat.

Five days a week, starting in January, Riley and the other subcommittee members would leave their offices, walk over to their hearing room in the Capitol and conduct the budget sessions, often staying there until dark. They would take breaks for important votes on the House floor, then resume their work, and return to their offices late in the day to perform their other chores as Representatives of their districts.

FILLED TWO JOBS

So, Riley filled two jobs, as a Congressman from the Second South Carolina District, and an Appropriations Committee member charged with the duty of providing funds for an adequate defense. It is no wonder his health finally gave way and he died of a heart attack, at his beach cottage at age 66.

Riley also insisted that the military men must spend the money wisely, with the least possible waste. On one occasion, he successfully demanded that they use standardized plans for Army barracks, rather than paying costly fees for custom-designed buildings. He brought to Congress the commonsense of a businessman from a small town, Sumter, S.C., who knew that tax dollars come not from trees, but from the pockets of hard working Americans.

John Riley never claimed to be a professional politician. He had successfullly managed a real estate and insurance business for 25 years before he was sent to Congress in 1944. He lost his seat in 1948 to a young liberal Hugo S. Sims, Jr., of Orangeburg who was the "baby" of the 81st Congress at age 27. Two years later, however, Riley beat Sims and won the seat back permanently. Thereafter, the Congressman, a conservative, States' rights Democrat, was rarely even challenged for reelection, and in his few contests, he won without a hard struggle.

"INDEFATIGABLE WORKER"

As he built up seniority, Riley moved up the ladder of the Appropriations Committee until he became one of its senior members, and an expert on the huge Federal budget which will reach a peacetime peak of $93 billion in fiscal 1963.

Chairman Clarence Cannon, of Missouri, lamenting Riley's death, said of him: "He was one of the older and most valuable men on the Appropriations Committee and occupied positions of most importance on subcommittees for many years. He was an indefatigable worker and was depended on for much of the detail and processing of appropriations bills. He rendered special service for provisions of national defense, which for particular reasons could not be publicly discussed."

Riley never revealed any of the secrets entrusted to him in the appropriations hearings, not even to close friends off the record. He never sought publicity, seldom made a speech, and therefore did not become famous. Only his colleagues in Congress realized how conscientiously he worked for the benefit of the American people. He was truly one of the unsung heroes of Congress, to whom the Nation owes a debt it can never repay.

ADA: An Evaluation—VII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the final article in the Los Angeles Times' series on the ADA is an interview by Robert Hartmann with the national chairman of the Americans for Democratic Action, Prof. Samuel H. Beer. Using the words of the organization's leader, Hartmann clarifies the points which the study has brought forth. This article, "What and Why is ADA?—Its Top Man Gives the Answers," concludes the factual presentation of the study which appeared in the Los Angeles Times during the period September 3–10, 1961:

WHAT AND WHY IS ADA?—ITS TOP MAN GIVES THE ANSWERS

(By Robert Hartmann)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—In the basement of the Littauer Center, Harvard's School of Public Administration which is something of a farm for the major leagues in Washington, you may find a professor with a shock of sandy red hair brighter than John F. Kennedy's and a guard's moustache.

He chews a small cigar and pecks on a portable typewriter which undoubtedly accompanied him to Oxford 30 years ago as a Rhodes scholar. Dr. Samuel Hutchinson Beer, 50, professor of government and former head of the department, is the current national chairman of Americans for Democratic Action.

Dr. Beer, like the engineering professor who has built his dam, believes in practicing his pedagogical specialty. Besides the expected shelves of books and wall maps, his hide-away office is decorated with unacademic political posters and convention badges, a menu emblazoned "The Ike Age Is Over—Let's Celebrate" and an invitation to the 1961 inaugural ceremonies in Washington.

He is the first ADA figurehead who was not one of the original founders of the 14-year-old liberal organization, and was reelected for a second term at this May's convention. Here is the informal interview I had with him at Harvard, regrettably condensed from 2 hours of pleasant talk to fit the available space.

"Question. First, Dr. Beer, how did you get interested in ADA?

"Answer. I can't remember the exact year I joined, around 1949 or 1950. I'd been a strong supporter of President Truman—a strong liberal Democrat a long time. I come from Ohio, not the best place to produce liberal Democrats though the last three ADA chairmen have come from there. I'd always been a strong New Dealer and I was interested in local politics here in Massachusetts. The ADA gives you a chance to go into politics for a purpose—it has a policy stand rather more clearly defined than that of the Democratic Party.

"Question. What function has ADA that cannot be done as well or better by individuals within the Democratic Party? Are you dissipating your energy in ADA?

"Answer. I don't think so. I think you're concentrating it. You'll find most active ADA members, 90 percent or more, are also acting in the Democratic Party. Now we want to see the party rather more committed to a liberal program nationally and in the States, and we work in it with this idea in mind. But if you only work in the party, you become isolated. There are times and places where being a party adjunct won't work.

"Question. For instance, what did ADA do in the recent senatorial race in Texas? Wasn't the Republican [TOWER] really more liberal than the Democrat?

"Answer. A good many liberal Democrats down there voted for TOWER in an attempt to get the conservatives all over on one side. They thought there wasn't much hope for liberalizing the Democratic Party until you got the conservatives out of it. I'm not sure what our ADA people did.

"Question. Why has ADA done so little in California as compared with New York, Pennsylvania, and other big States?

"Answer. We were very active there in the early days and then a lot of people were drawn off into the club movement. Also, there were quarrels. The anti-Communist line within ADA was very strong [and] some thought we were being too anti-Communist. I suppose some thought we weren't being anti-Communist enough. When we reconstituted our northern California chapter about a year ago we designed it rather differently. We're not going to do much direct political action out there—we do publications, forums, State lobbying very much so.

"Question. How would you describe ADA to a man from Mars?

"Answer. Well, we are a liberal, independent political organization concerned both with political education and political action. We are very much interested in this egghead activity on questions of interest, disarmament, foreign policy, economic planning. We also try to combine this with political action at every level, trying to influence decisions, backing candidates, taking part in conventions—we had a big group at Los Angeles. No, we didn't have a caucus—we knew who our people were.

"Question. Do you operate through fronts or act openly as ADA?

"Answer. Normally in the name of ADA. Of course we often join with other organizations, like other civil rights groups or 'Citizens for Dilworth' in Philadelphia, and issue joint statements.

"Question. There isn't any secret character to ADA?

"Answer. No. Even if we tried to be secret we couldn't. I don't see any advantage in it for us.

"Question. There might be in Alabama. Are you cooperating with the Freedom Riders?

"Answer. No, no. I suppose you'll find some members in it but we cooperate more with NAACP, I would say. At times you have to make compromises, you have to work with politicians that may not agree 100 percent with what you want done, but that's the way democratic politics are. I like this combination between idealism and realism. I think as American parties become more distinguished in terms of their principles, liberal and conservative, it will be much easier for us to work with the Democratic Party. This has happened more and more and, I think, nationally.

"(Mrs. Violet Gunther, national director of ADA's Washington office, pointed out that ADA editorially supported the Freedom Riders and set up the publicity apparatus for the Freedom Riders when they left Washington. ADA's perennial policymaker, Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., Beer's predecessor, publicly advised the Freedom Riders to ignore U.S. Attorney General Kennedy's request they refrain from further provocations.)

"Question. Do you feel our two parties should be diametrically right versus left rather than representing a consensus in each party?

"Answer. Well, you want a little bit of both. While labor is much more on the Democratic side there'll be plenty of union members who will vote Republican and rich people who'll be voting Democratic and supporting it and, indeed, the ADA. So interests will be mixed but opinions will tend to separate more and more.

"To get back to ADA's objectives, we use the word "liberal" and it is not an ideological party; it's very important to see that ADA does not have a lot of rigid, inflexible principles about how the economy must be run or how society has to be organized or how foreign policy should be conducted. I think one of the great strengths of the liberal point of view is its flexibility, its willingness to recognize facts and to see that the world changes.

"This is our objection to the overly ideological conservatism of many Republicans. They have an idea of a laissez faire economy where the Government has no part, where a great number of small producers compete in a free market. That was a fine idea in its day, a great progressive move, but it just doesn't exist any more.

"I think the ability to recognize facts is one of the strengths of the liberal mind.

"Question. How do you define a liberal?

"Answer. A liberal is a man who recognizes not only what the Founding Fathers called man's natural rights but also his natural duties. The individual not only has a claim to be free against interference from the community but also positive duties to discharge toward the community and the well-being of his fellow men. I would stress this dual aspect, rights and obligations, and ultimately the principle of liberty and belief in the creative intelligence of the individual. We like variety. We like pluralism. We like differences. We like individuality.

"Question. Do you think that is true of ADA members generally?

"Answer. I hope it's true. When they get too intolerant and prejudiced they're not being liberals.

"Question. In your opinion is ADA, like most institutions, becoming more conservative as it gets older?

"Answer. Our basic answer is 'No.' Arthur Schlesinger wrote a book which was actually to the right of center 'The Vital Center' in some respects. But I do think the American progressive movement is much, much more sophisticated today. We found out that the world is a much tougher place than many of the old progressives thought.

"In foreign affairs we learned a great deal from F.D.R.—and liberals helped teach him a lot too—that power politics is not easily eradicated, that a nation must have a great military power, that soldiers will not spring up from the ground ready armed. I think you'll find this realism in ADA policy statements on disarmament and the Marshall plan.

"Question. What is the most effective way in which ADA helps to shape our national policy?

"Answer. That depends, I would imagine, quite frankly, the most effective way we are shaping policy right now is by the large number of ADA people—present or former members—who are in the Kennedy administration. To tell the truth the Kennedy administration is full of ADA members or people who were in ADA—of course that wouldn't be true when it's a Republican administration.

"Question. What about your ADA index of congressional voting records? Does that carry as much weight, say as the AFL-CIO tally sheet?

"Answer. I don't know. It's mostly for the benefit of our members and the liberal community in general to get a rough line. Another way it's effective is a direct appeal to conscience. There are many people in Congress who would like to vote our way, but may be worried or deflected by some local consideration or group—I could go into examples but I won't.

"The measure of this is when they genuinely apologize for their vote, a kind of backhanded measure of ADA influence which I've see operate very often. Then of course there's the straight lobbying on Capitol Hill and here we simply join with other people. We do the same thing in State legislatures.

"Here in Massachusetts one of our members wrote a pamphlet and we distributed 2,000 copies for newspapers and people who have influence and it turned the tide. It beat the sales tax. It wasn't ADA votes that did it. This kind of thing is hard to measure but it makes you feel effective.

"Question. As a teacher, do you find today's youth are becoming campus conservatives rather than campus radicals?

"Answer. I think there's more organized conservatism today. Before the war there was a great deal of unconscious conservatism among undergraduates, most students during the New Deal were anti-Roosevelt. But conservation has been under attack so long and has lost battle after battle and now—as groups do when they're no longer dominant—it's organizing. I think many of these conservatives will end up as liberals in not too many years. They are thinking, and when a man begins to take an interest in politics, he becomes a liberal. Now maybe not as liberal as ADA—maybe more, I don't know.

"Question. Has your family always been Democratic?

"Answer. No, my father was a Republican. And my mother. My grandfather was a Democrat, but not particularly liberal.

"Question. What about the New Frontier? Is it liberal enough for you?

"Answer. It's a brilliant and progressive administration. I have great confidence in the President. Kennedy is a man of great capacity—I've known him for many years and I'm delighted he's President. There is very little he has said or done I disagree with. I think and, of course, ADA thinks and I know perfectly well Kennedy thinks there's a great deal more to be done.

"I don't think we've done enough so far to stimulate the economy to get out of it the growth we need to meet challenges at home and compete with the Soviet Union abroad. Their economy is growing by leaps and bounds—ours is in some ways stagnant—the things some of my sober and pragmatic economist friends tell me are very alarming.

"Question. Can this stimulation be done without more taxes?

"Answer. I don't think it's so much taxes. It needs more planning.

"Question. Will people get sufficiently alarmed unless the President tells them 'you are going to have to pay,' do you think?

"Answer. Actually we need a tax cut. I agree the things President Kennedy has asked are not enough to send anybody, but that's his political calculation. The same with civil rights, where he doesn't want to alienate too many southern Democrats. But our position, I think, is to be the liberal conscience constantly pressing and telling him to do the things that we believe he wants to do, and at the same time give him strong and ardent support. Our function is not just to be critical, though that's useful, but to give positive support and remember that our political foes are the conservatives—not Kennedy.

"Question. At your ADA convention you seemed to scold him a bit.

"Answer. There was some criticism on wire-tapping, on freedom of information, on civil rights; yes.

"Question. How do you make sure Communists don't infiltrate ADA as they have tried with other organizations?

"Answer. When you sign the card you declare you're against all forms of totalitarianism. I don't know of any case where we've had a Communist—the question came up here in Massachusetts 6 or 7 years ago and we dropped somebody, as I remember. The point is, you don't get obsessed with it or you start purging everybody. I've never seen any evidence of Communist or fellow traveler influence. Our people from way back have been battling these guys and we know them so well, and their tactics so well, they wouldn't have a chance.

"This goes back much further than when ADA exposed the Progressive Party's infiltration by Communists in 1948. I can remember my own experience in trade unions. I worked for the Government awhile (writer, Resettlement Administration and Democratic National Committee 1935–36) then a newspaper (New York Post, 1936–37; research Fortune magazine, 1937–38) and I was in the Newspaper Guild, then I was here (Harvard, instructor to chairman of government department, 1938–58) and we had a teachers union.

"We had our experience just like Walter Reuther did. They're not that hard to spot, frankly, I know what they're like. And they will wreck any organization, they don't care about its purposes as long as they get what they want out of it.

"Question. What do you see ahead for ADA? Would you want it to grow or is it more effective as a closely knit group? Is it going to become another political party—a labor party?

"Answer. No, no. ADA people aren't Socialists. They're flexible. Socialism as a form of ideology. In some cases public ownership might be good and if it's proved we're ready to accept it.

"But I think the future of ADA is extremely important, the international picture is dark and in recent months has grown darker. We may meet more defeats. The balance of power has swung against us. Eight or nine years ago, who was preaching against neutrals?

"Who said if you're not for us you're against us? It was John Foster Dulles. Who's saying that today? Khrushchev. He says there are no neutrals. He's feeling his oats, and he is stronger. There's no denying that. Now this means the United States is going to have to put its back into this struggle. We're going to have to act soberly.

"I fear some sectors of American opinion will become so frightened they'll demand panicky and hysterical action, throw in the marines, start throwing atomic bombs around, or institute some great domestic witch hunt. The ADA must press for vigorous, prolonged action which is level headed and sober and prudent. See what I mean?

"Question. Is it possible, if the tide has turned against us, if we are really in peril, to make the advances on the home front that would otherwise be desirable, and at the same time catch up with the Russians? They had to set priorities and let human welfare suffer. F.D.R. came to a point where he had to let the social gains stand still while he built airplanes and ships. If we try to have both, aren't we liable to come out second best in both?

"Answer. Well, that's complicated. We can get so much more out of our resources than we are getting now. Those pictures from Alabama did us as much damage as an aerial bombardment. Education is absolutely critical in the longrun, this is why our economy has grown. Conceivably at some point we might have to make a choice between a reduction in our own standard of living and carrying out our foreign policy objectives. But we aren't there by any means. We might be there much sooner if we fail to grow.

"Question. Are we going to have that much time—30 or 40 years?

"Answer. No, it doesn't take that long to produce engineers. Kids in high school right now are going to benefit from Federal aid to education. In 10 years."

Is There a Fire in Egypt?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by A. N. Spanel, chairman, International Latex Corp., appeared in the New York Times of January 5, 1962, and questions whether the dictator of the Nile is not getting ready to lease a naval base to the dictator of the Volga. Hopefully we have learned that when smoke appears over the pyramids there is going to be a fire in Cairo.

The article follows:

THIS SMOKE MASKS WHAT?

(By A. N. Spanel, chairman, International Latex Corp.)

The conservative London Daily Telegraph on December 27 front paged a report by a diplomatic correspondent that "President Nasser has agreed to the establishment of a Russian naval base on the Egyptian coast."

Cairo hastened to deny the report. But that does not dispose of the matter. The head of the Soviet Navy, Admiral Gorshkov, arrived in Cairo on December 12, on invitation of his Egyptian opposite number, as part of a Soviet military mission. Alarmed Western governments, we may be sure, are exploring how much fire there may be behind the smoke. Nothing is beyond the self-willed Egyptian dictator, his recklessness and

arrogance long fed by free-world appeasement.

As recent as January 3, 1962, Mr. C. L. Sulzberger, the gifted journalist of the New York Times wrote: "Egypt, which is all that remains of the United Arab Republic, has made a new arms deal with Russia, primarily involving ships * * * Nasser needs some coup for prestige reasons and presumably Soviet weapons serve that purpose. His renown has faded; he is at odds with most Arab States since the Syrian break; and Egypt's economy is bad. There has been practically no cotton crop * * * Nasser is importing cotton from the United States. Property expropriations cannot hold things together for long."

THE THREAT

Even the chance of Soviet nuclear-missiled submarines nested in the eastern Mediterranean is enough to jolt the West. The possibility will shock the American people especially, in view of the enormous aid the United States has given Egypt in dollar grants, foodstuffs, loans and gifts, to say nothing of moral and political support.

The man whom we have seen fit to trust and strengthen is the same Nasser to whose relief we rushed blindly in 1956, hand in hand with jubilant Soviet Russia, at the moment when France, Britain, and Israel were in the process of guaranteeing the Suez Canal as a free artery of navigation for the world.

As long ago as August 3, 1956—months, that is, before the disastrous Soviet-American intervention—this column warned: "In grabbing control of the Suez Canal, President Nasser of Egypt has placed a life-crushing tourniquet around the jugular vein of world commerce. He has put himself in a position to extort endless surrenders of their basic interests from the democratic great powers." We have repeated that warning through the ensuing years.

Unhappily these fears have been all too amply justified. The surrenders extorted by the pocket-edition Hitler on the Nile have made Russia, for the first time in modern history, a Middle Eastern power and have opened lines of Communist influence to Mediterranean Africa.

Nasser, despite occasional spats with his Kremlin mentors, has been following the Moscow lead in world affairs. He votes with the Communist bloc in the United Nations, steals Western property, indulges in wild anti-Western propaganda, treats the Suez Canal as if it were a stream on his private estate.

OUR INTERESTS AT STAKE

How long before the Suez, the free world's lifeline in Africa, will become a pawn in the Kremlin's hands? What will then be the counterbalancing bastions of the free world in north Africa? Will we then wish that the French African naval base at Bizerte had remained where it is now—in French possession—instead of in Tunisia's grasp. And what about the enormously strategic bases—naval, air and missile—in the Algeria which Washington has for 8 years insisted was purely a colonial area without strategic meaning for the United States or for the NATO nations dependent on American nuclear military strength?

Has public opinion in our country fully grasped the significance of Nasser's arbitrary refusal to permit passage through the Canal to Portuguese gunboats rushing to defend Goa and other Portuguese enclaves against coldblooded aggression by India? Was this Nasser's way of repaying Mr. Nehru, the apostle of peace and nonviolence, who so nobly raved his objections in 1956 on behalf of Egypt against the efforts of France, England and Israel in their Suez Canal campaign?

It was a Soviet veto that prevented the U.N. Security Council attempt to halt the Goa outrage. Clearly Nasser, athwart the Suez, also acted in close concert with Khrushchev.

Have we Americans fully grasped the significance of Nasser's recent arrest of four members of a French diplomatic mission, in defiance of diplomatic immunities and civilized international conduct? Understandably, the French people are bewildered and incensed by apparent American apathy on this Egyptian insult to a traditional friend and ally. Our State Department appears to remain inert, paralyzed, while the French diplomats are languishing in prison, being brainwashed in the familiar Communist style in preparation for "demonstration trials" featuring "confessions." Not alone France but the free world will sit in the Egyptian dock.

COURAGEOUSLY MEETING THE ISSUES NOW

Our failure to halt Nasser early in his career of larceny and depredation has facilitated the Kremlin's undisguised purpose of extending its power into the Mediterranean. It has compounded the larger political error of our dismissal of the French struggle in north Africa as a mere colonial matter, leaving France to fight a lone and desperate battle for the maintenance of free-world bastions in that critical area.

The dangerous confusion of our country in the face of the Soviet challenge in the Mediterranean continues. At this very moment there are reports that the United States is discussing seriously an Egyptian request for 400,000 bales of American cotton—the very product Nasser is exporting to the U.S.S.R. in return for military equipment. If made available to Cairo, these bales would help extricate Nasser from the cotton crisis caused by his loss of Syria and, incidentally, bolster Egyptian competition with American cotton even in Europe and other markets.

Is there truly no limit to the compulsive, illogical, self-defeating policy of appeasement of the Egyptian dictator? How long shall we remain blind to the piled-up mischief worked by the Nasser-Khrushchev axis with what amounts to blind American cooperation? How long must the American taxpayers continue to save the dictator on the Nile from the consequences of his own arrogance, inflated ambition, and cupidity?

Surely the time is overripe for a searching reappraisal of American policy in north Africa and the Mediterranean. We must immediately reconsider, before time runs out (1) our role in relation to French control of Bizerte and the Algerian bastions of free-world power, and (2) our bewildering political and economic support of the Nasser dictatorship.

Late as the hour may be, we must restore close cooperation with France, our traditional ally and the one dependable member of the Western coalition in the Mediterranean, if we are to bar communism from that all-important theater of conflict, both through Egypt and through north Africa. To do less is to guarantee the total success of a Soviet-Egyptian conspiracy against the West that is already far too advanced for comfort or complacency.

U.S. Goals for 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the reconvening of Congress presents us—and the Nation—with complex, broad-scope problems, opportunities, and challenges.

With the beginning of a new year, we traditionally take a backward look and attempt to evaluate our progress. Following such a review, then, we shoot for new goals for the future.

These goals, however, will not be accomplished automatically, magically, or by wishful thinking. We, as a people, rather, must rededicate ourselves to creating—and putting into action—the workable programs that will better serve humanity and promote peace and progress.

Recently, I was privileged to review broad-scope objectives which, if attained, would, in my judgment, help us to better meet the challenges of 1962. I ask unanimous consent to have a summary of these propositions printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS FOR 1962

We, the people—to promote a world of peace and progress—rededicate ourselves to the following objectives:

I. Crystallize—and spread the principles and ideals of freedom around the world. In the past, we as a nation have not engaged in broad-scale efforts to export our political concepts. Why? Because we respected for all nations what we will fight to preserve for ourselves: That is, the right of self-determination. In a world—threatened by communism (expansionism and aggression)—we must, however, not only improve the U.S. system of freedom, but also expand efforts to establish a global climate in which all nations may enjoy the right of self-determination.

II. Create a more dynamic economic system to—

Enable all citizens to live on still better standards—now the highest in world history;

Assure that our agricultural-industrial-technological system meets the needs of a fast-growing 185 million population and the revolutionary fast-changing times;

Maintain the United States out-front economic position—with a gross national product estimated at a current output rate of $540 billion annually. By comparison this far exceeds in value the combined output, valued at $350 billion, of the Soviet bloc (including Albania, Bulgaria, Communist China, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, North Korea, North Vietnam, Outer Mongolia, Poland, Rumania, and the U.S.S.R.);

Strengthen our faith in the ability of the United States and the free world to continue to outproduce and outprogress (if not outbrag) the Communist world.

III. Be better stewards of our manpower, brainpower, monetary, agricultural, technical, scientific, and other human and natural resources to (a) assure best utilization—not wasteful dissipation—of these God-given and man-created resources, for the American people; and (b) demonstrate a willingness to earmark the necessary human and natural resources and productivity to promote peace and freedom in the world.

IV. Strengthen the free world defenses: A mighty jet-missile-space-nuclear U.S. force serving as the backbone of free world alliances provides a shield (a) against Communist military aggression and (b) holds the Communists at bay while undertaking counteroffensives on nonmilitary fronts to regain lost territory and attain the triumph of freedom—not communism—in the world.

V. To better understand—and more effectively combat—the threat of communism on military, economic, political, cultural, ideological fronts.

VI. Better educate the world on how free economic, social, cultural, political systems of, by, and for the people—not Red dictatorship—can best serve a people; better than totalitarian communism.

VII. Expand economic, political, social, cultural cooperation among nations of the free world alliances for peaceful progress.

VIII. Renew efforts to better understand, and improve, man's relationship to man. Despite thousands of years of existence and experience, mankind is still adolescently groping for a mature fundamental understanding of human relationships that will—if ultimately attained—enable people to work and live peaceably together on earth.

J. Edgar Hoover Offers His Creed of Freedom as Recipient of Mutual of Omaha Criss Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on December 7, 1961, many of the Nation's leaders in the fields of government, business, industry, communication media, and military affairs attended a banquet in honor of Director J. Edgar Hoover, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, on the occasion of his receiving the Mutual of Omaha Criss Award.

This award, established by Mutual of Omaha in honor of the founder of the company, the late Dr. C. C. Criss, is given by a distinguished board of judges to the person who, in their opinion, has made an outstanding contribution to public health and/or safety.

The award for 1961 was given to Mr. Hoover for his selfless devotion and contributions to the safety and security of the American people over a period of more than four decades. During this time, and especially as Director of the FBI since 1924, he has built an organization which has become a national and international byword for intelligence, effectiveness, and integrity. Indeed, the reputation of the FBI has become such an accepted fact in American life that few of us give conscious reflection to the marvel of achievement which is almost solely attributable to the character and dedication of one man.

The responsibility which J. Edgar Hoover holds as head of a Federal police system he has kept in trust for the American people, and always with a high consciousness of the proper use of police authority in a democracy. Never during the entire history of his directorship, though he has served under 6 Presidents and 13 Attorneys General has J. Edgar Hoover allowed politics to intrude upon the work of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. On the contrary, the FBI has served as a model of integrity in the civil service. In his eloquent address on "The Faith To Be Free," Director Hoover expressed the creed which has guided his service to the Nation for more than four decades. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hoover's remarks on this occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, following the list of invited guests at the award dinner.

There being no objection, the list and speech were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

E. S. Adams, Hon. George E. Allen, Inspector George H. Ashley, His Excellency Augusto Guillermo Arango.

Robert Baker, James E. Barrett, Morgan M. Beatty, Alan H. Belmont, Hon. Richard E. Berlin, Dr. Walter A. Bloedorn, Herbert C. Blunck, William A. Boleyn, E. R. Brady, Hon. Sam R. Broadbent, Hon. Wiley T. Buchanan, Jr., John S. Bugas, Hon. Warren E. Burger, Hon. Harold H. Burton, B. G. Byars.

Frank Carbo, Lt. Gen. Joseph F. Carroll, E. Taylor Chewning, Sr., Dr. Robert V. Choisser, Hon. Tom C. Clark, Rex Collier, R. B. Condon, Hon. John B. Connally, Bob Considine, J. Patrick Coyne, Dr. N. L. Criss, Hon. Glenn Cunningham, Hon. Edward M. Curran, His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing.

Blaise de Sibour, Sr., Cartha D. DeLoach, George Dixon, Thomas J. Donegan, Lt. Gen. (Ret.) James H. Doolittle, Spencer J. Drayton, Dr. James Spencer Dryden, Harry F. Duncan.

Joseph J. Eigenman, Dr. Edward L. R. Elson, Hon. Paul B. Fay, Maj. Gen. H. Feldman U.S.A. (Ret.), Irving Ferman, George H. Fishman, Edward Fox, Julius Frandsen, Jr.

Hon. Arthur Gardner, Dr. Fred A. J. Geier, Hon. Whitney Gillilland, Brig. Gen. W. D. Graham, Hon. Frank C. Grismer, John H. Grosvenor, Jr., Esq., Homer H. Gruenther, Edwin O. Guthman.

Andrew G. Haley, W. Earl Hall, William Hetzler, Robert H. Hinckley, Hon. Alexander Holtzoff, Hon. Roman L. Hruska, Chet Huntley, Robert Hurleigh, Joseph E. Jones.

Henry C. Karpf, Samuel H. Kauffmann, Hon. Irving R. Kaufman, Dr. Richard C. Kendall, Harold L. Kennedy, Dr. Joseph V. Kennedy, Hon. Robert F. Kennedy, Michael F. Keogh, Philip M. Klutznick.

William D. Lane, William L. Laurence, David Lawrence, Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Mervyn LeRoy, Fulton Lewis, Jr.; Boris Litwin, John F. Loome.

Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, USMCR (retired), Dr. Shane MacCarthy, Corneal J. Mack, Donald M. Madgett, W. J. Maginn, George Preston Marshall, Dr. Charles W. Mayo, Emmett C. McGaughey, Hon. James P. McGranery, Hon. Matthew F. McGuire, Benjamin M. McKelway, Don McNeill, Dr. Earl S. McRoberts, E. T. Meredith, Matt Meyer, Dr. Merle M. Miller, John P. Mohr, Lee Mortimer, G. Robert Muchemore, Robert Neale, Louis B. Nichols, Dr. Walter E. Omundson.

Dr. Thomas Parran, Donald J. Parsons, Horace E. Pascal, William D. Pawley, Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, Hugh V. Plunkett, Jr., Dr. Daniel A. Poling, Howard Pyle, Hon. Thomas D. Quinn.

Hon. Jennings Randolph, Hon. J. Lee Rankin, Dr. F. Turner Reuter, Dr. Frederick A. Reuter, George Richardson, Capt. E. V. Rickenbacker, William E. Robinson, Clair M. Roddewig, Hon. William P. Rogers, James J. Rowley, Dr. Howard A. Rusk.

G. David Schine, Robert J. Schissell, David P. Sentner, Thomas J. Skutt, V. J. Skutt, George E. Sokolsky, A. E. Stoddard, Bernard R. Stone, Henry C. M. Stone, Walker Stone, Carlton P. Swiler.

Ansel E. Talbert, Hon. Edward A. Tamm, Oscar M. Taylor, Clyde Tolson, Walter Trohan, Leonard R. Viner.

DeWitt Wallace, Hon. Lawrence E. Walsh, Jack L. Warner, J. Leroy Welsh, Maj. Gen. Floyd L. Wergeland, Dr. Charles S. White, Jr., Dr. Charles S. White, Sr., Lyle C. Wilson, Carroll Zimmerman.

(Remarks of J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Upon Receiving the Criss Award in Washington, D.C., December 7, 1961)

THE FAITH TO BE FREE

This indeed is a great honor, which has been made possible by the personal sacrifices and devotion to duty of my associates. I accept the Criss Award with deep humility on behalf of the dedicated men and women of the FBI. I shall cherish it always as a symbol of your recognition of their service to the American people. I am most grateful to the awards committee and to Mutual of Omaha.

Ours is the greatest Republic in the history of mankind. Our homeland was carved out of a cast wilderness by heroic men and women who were determined at any cost that their children, and their children's children, might live in freedom under God. It is our sacred responsibility to help protect that heritage and to preserve it for future generations.

I would like to be able to report that the internal enemies of our society have virtually disappeared—that they have faded into the dim past like the dangers of the wagon trail and the Northwest frontier. But this is not so.

From the depths of our criminal and subversive underworlds, strong enemies—deadly enemies—continue to challenge the right of decent Americans to live in freedom and dignity under God.

Today, we are facing a crime problem of such magnitude that it represents an acute danger to our national survival. There is a serious weakening of moral and spiritual fibers in our society. We must never forget that a vitiated state of morals, a corrupted public conscience, is incompatible with true freedom.

During the past decade, crime has nearly doubled across the United States, outpacing the growth of our population at the rate of four to one. A murder is committed every 58 minutes. There is a vicious assault every 4 minutes; a forcible rape every 34 minutes; a robbery every 6 minutes; a burglary every 39 seconds.

Crime is no respecter of age, race, or creed. Each year, the cost of crime climbs higher and higher until it now has reached an alarming total of more than $60 million each day.

Year after year, we find that nearly half of the persons arrested for burglaries and larcenies, and almost two thirds of those arrested for automobile thefts, are less than 18 years of age.

America's juvenile criminality is directly traceable to the failure of adults to meet their moral obligations. In all too many cases, the primary responsibility rests with the parents. If respect for law and order and for the rights of others were instilled in children at an early age and if parents set a proper example for their children, we might keep juvenile delinquency from becoming the door to careers in crime.

I can see no difference between the responsibility of a 17- or 18-year-old who willfully robs, assaults, or murders and that of an adult who commits the same crime. Each should be held strictly accountable for his act against society. These are not juvenile delinquents. They are vicious young thugs. They should be treated accordingly. I share with Blackstone the premise that the main strength and force of a law consists in the penalty annexed to it.

The most deeply entrenched forces of the underworld in our Nation today are the professionals who comprise the jealously guarded ranks of organized crime. These are the criminal elite, assuming an air of legitimacy, who buy high-priced legal advisers, better

termed "lawyers criminal," and "front men" to shield them from proper punishment.

These underworld characters with their criminal scum flout the sacrifices—the blood, the sweat, and the toil of six generations of dedicated Americans—which secured the freedoms they enjoy. These persons wear our constitutional guarantees as a cloak for protective armor. They are unrestrained by those moral considerations which constitute the lifeblood of a democracy. In their eyes, the United States is a haven of rights without responsibilities—of privileges free from obligation to the society which has made them possible. Theirs is a virulent, parasitic existence consuming the lifeblood of the freedom which they would enjoy.

Unfortunately, they are assisted all too often by public lethargy, and by some jurists obsessed with the virtues of legal technicalities, as well as by theoreticians with the soft approach who purport to be experts in the field of law enforcement and penology. Justice is not impartially meted out when the victim and society suffer while the criminal goes free.

We in America emphasize the great value of liberty and the importance of sympathy for the accused. The law-abiding citizen is entitled to more consideration on the part of our courts. The basic purpose of the criminal law is to protect society, not the criminal. As an eminent Justice of our U.S. Supreme Court observed, "The necessity of public protection against crime is being submerged by an overflow of sentimentality."

In this Nation, disrespect for law and order is a tragic moral sickness which attacks and destroys the American traditions of honesty, integrity and fairplay. Directly or indirectly, its victims include every man, woman and child in the United States.

It is a national scandal that the streets of many of our cities are as fraught with danger as the jungle trail.

Each of us to his fullest capacity must help shoulder the burden of this growth of lawlessness and strive to end it. Our Nation's moral strength has slipped alarmingly. One cannot preach morality and practice immorality. National corruption is the sum total of individual corruption. We must follow the teachings of God if we hope to heal this moral illness.

The FBI is conducting an all-out war on crime. The entire law enforcement profession has never been more united in the fight against crime than it is today. However, in order to achieve the desired results, law enforcement must have the solid backing of every decent citizen. The striving for law and order, for human decency, for equal opportunity, is a matter of conscience—public and private.

So long as dishonesty and evasion of responsibility are tolerated, it is inevitable that law enforcement will mirror this breakdown in the moral fiber of our society. But, if we continue to progress in the tradition of freemen, with adequate safeguards against any invasion of the rights and dignity of the individual, we will ultimately achieve victory over those who defy law and order throughout our great Nation.

Today marks the 20th anniversary of a tragic event in our history—the attack on Pearl Harbor which triggered America's entry into World War II. That war cost the lives of 400,000 Americans—courageous men who, at a time of gravest need, sprang forward in the noble tradition of their forefathers to defend the cause of freedom with their lives.

But now, two decades later, in Europe, in Asia, and in neighboring areas of the Western Hemisphere, we find stark evidence of a grim truth—that liberties once won must constantly be defended.

During our generation, a new menace—international communism—has arisen to threaten freemen throughout the world. Actually, there is little basic difference between the fascism of Adolf Hitler and the atheistic tyranny practiced behind the Iron Curtain. The Soviet Union and her satellites are a godless dictatorship ruled by warped and twisted minds.

We are at war with the Communists and the sooner every red-blooded American realizes this the safer we will be. Naturally, we want to live in peace, but we do not want peace at any price—we want peace with honor and integrity. And we intend to assure it for the future.

The extent of the menace posed by the philosophy of communism is clear-cut and obvious. However, it is absolutely necessary that we attack and oppose it calmly, rationally, and objectively.

We must continue to stiffen our national backbone in dealing with the Communists and their dupes, sympathizers, and apologists. If we relax our guard for one moment, we court national disaster.

The atheistic Communist dictatorship now controls one-fourth of the earth's surface and more than one-third of her peoples. The Communist threat from without must not blind us to the Communist threat from within. The latter is reaching into the very heart of America through its espionage agents and a cunning, defiant, and lawless Communist Party, which is fanatically dedicated to the Marxist cause of world enslavement and destruction of the foundations of our Republic.

The Communist Party in this country has attempted to infiltrate and subvert every segment of our society. The party's efforts have been thwarted in this country by the Government's internal security programs, by investigation, arrest, and prosecution of party functionaries, and by widespread intelligent public opposition to the Communist philosophy.

Recently, the Communist Party in the United States deliberately and flagrantly refused to comply with the U.S. Supreme Court decision which requires it to register as an agent of the Soviet Union with the Attorney General. Thereby, it once again has formally declared itself to be a lawless organization. No longer can its members falsely profess that the party is a legitimate political organization. Nor can its sympathizers and fellow travelers feign innocence of the true nature of the un-American conspiracy which they support.

Unfortunately, we are plagued with some Soviet apologists who, time after time, would have us betray the cause of international freedom and justice by yielding to the Red Fascists in the Kremlin on vital moral issues.

We also have in our midst some timid souls who have so little faith in the strength of democracy that they would have our country yield to international threats and intimidation. I include those persons who urge appeasement at any price and those who chant the "better Red than dead" slogan.

America's emblem is the soaring eagle—not the blind and timid mole. Fear, apologies, defeatism, and cowardice are alien to the thinking of true Americans. As for me, I would rather be dead than Red.

America does not have to apologize to anyone. Certainly not to the arrogant, shoe-pounding Khrushchev and his puppets—nor to those neutrals whose neutrality is but an evidence of moral weakness. We should keep our heads up looking for honorable solutions and selling America, rather than keep our heads down looking for shelters and the compromise of human rights.

Those who follow the road of appeasement do not know the true meaning of freedom. They do not comprehend the misery of Communist enslavement. You will not find their cheap slogans on the lips of the Hungarian refugees, the East German patriots, nor other freedom-loving peoples who have escaped from behind the Iron Curtain.

Nor do you find their apologies in the writings of great American patriots such as: Patrick Henry, who asked the searching question, "Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?"; or Benjamin Franklin, who declared, "They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety"; or Samuel Adams, who reminded us that "The liberties of our country * * * are worth defending at all hazards; and it is our duty to defend them against all attacks. We have received them as a fair inheritance from our worthy ancestors * * * who purchased them for us with toil and danger."

In the fight to preserve our Republic, it is not enough merely to be against crime, against subversion, or against any of the other enemies which weaken the Nation's strength from within. To stand for the American ideal, to work for the cause of liberty and justice—these give true meaning to life in this great Republic.

If we are to effectively resist the eroding influence of communism, it is imperative that all citizens of this Nation exhibit in more positive ways the value and superiority of our form of government over any foreign ideology.

Let us also work for a revolution—a revolution by the spirit, not by the sword. Let there be vital forces at work in our society and not merely slogans. Let us be for America all the way; but, at the same time, let us not be taken in by those who promote hysteria by the distortion and misrepresentation of the true facts whether they be the proponents of chauvinism of the extreme right or pseudoliberalism of the extreme left.

At another hour of grim challenge a full century ago, Abraham Lincoln urged the American people, "Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it."

We are living in an age of uncertainty—an age of awesome national peril—an age when the struggle between freedom and totalitarian enslavement is drawing toward a climax. We now have need of faith as never before in our Nation's history. We must revive within ourselves the faith of our forefathers, which enabled them to meet and overcome adversity.

Our Nation holds in trust the last hope of a free civilization. Our dedication to truth, justice, and individual dignity must not be compromised. If we are strong enough, and care enough, and maintain our national integrity, this Nation will survive the terrible threat that presents itself today. With God's help, we will meet the challenge of survival. This is the heritage of America.

Where To, U.N.?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, few issues that will come before the Congress this session will arouse as much controversy as a discussion on the future of the United Nations. I ask leave to place into the RECORD a penetrating editorial from the Thursday, January 4 issue of

the Lansing (Ill.) Journal entitled "Where To, U.N.?":

WHERE TO, U.N.?

Something has got to give at the U.N. It is broke, yet spreads its military wings (on credit) beyond the confines of its charter. Its forces—with the assistance of that onetime champion of freedom, the United States—marched against Katanga in violation of the U.N. commitment against intervention in any nation's domestic affairs and for the purpose of preventing the self-determination of its people for freedom.

As of now, this shameful action appears to have delivered Tschombe, his people, and his once orderly, industrious, and prosperous land over to Gizenga and his Communist-oriented Central Congolese government. And, at the same time, the U.N. took no action against India's armed invasion and seizure of the four-and-a-half-century-old Portuguese State of India (otherwise known as Goa).

Katanga, in the eyes of the U.N., is guilty of seceding from a state it never joined; and Goa—whose elected representatives have sat in the Portuguese National Parliament since 1822—is convicted of the covetous aggressor's charge of being a colony.

And meanwhile talk that the U.N. might move out of the United States—which many Americans feared was only rumor—is being revived, along with discussion of its insolvency. The most likely destinations are Berlin and hell. If it should be the former, the world's fractured hope of decency and dignity and peace with honor may—even more appropriately than in New York—be quartered on the East Side.

On the basis of its record, the free world could breathe easier if the U.N. were consigned to Gehenna.

ADA: An Evaluation—VIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the articles on the Americans for Democratic Action which appeared in the Los Angeles Times were followed by an editorial in which the Times attempted to bring together the factual material of this series and comment upon its meaning to this country. We are indebted to the newspaper and to its writer, Robert Hartmann, for undertaking this significant presentation of the facts of the ADA. I also feel that its editorial is worthy of the close attention of the American people for, from the facts presented, some important conclusions have been drawn:

ADA IN THE ADMINISTRATION

About a week ago Robert Hartmann's articles on Americans for Democratic Action—ADA—concluded in the Times. The dispassionate, almost definitive, report on this loose but influential organization of politicians and liberal ideologies could not have been better timed (although timing, except in the loose sense of topical journalism, had nothing to do with the serial publication from September 3 through September 10).

OMINOUS THREATS

It happened, although Mr. Hartmann could not foresee the event, that President Kennedy, whose official family is loaded with members present and past of ADA, told the steel industry while the articles were being published that it could raise wages again without raising the price of steel. Mr. Kennedy made vague but ominous threats against the steel companies. We have pointed out before that the President seems to be operating under a double standard: David McDonald of the Steelworkers Union can force a contract of stepped-up wages and an outrageous kind of featherbedding on the companies, but the companies are immoral or unpatriotic if they raise their prices relative to the cost of producing steel, although labor charges one way or another are 75 percent or more of prices. This is an expression of the notion that profits are bad and that if something must give way, profits ought to go first.

When Mr. Kennedy threatened the companies, he presumably had his Secretary of Labor, Arthur J. Goldberg, sitting at his right hand. Mr. Goldberg is a former member of ADA, and he is not the only member, recent or present, employed in the Labor Department.

BRITISH SOCIALIST

To point the way that Mr. Kennedy is being driven—or perhaps willingly led—we can take Mr. Hartmann as guide. He described the ADA economic line as follows:

"Taking a realistic view of 20th century capitalism, much different from Marx's, Keynes [the British Socialist] saw that it is not necessary for the state to physically confiscate all property as long as it can control productive property and its fruits.

"Furthermore, with Moscow's mistakes to guide them, Keynesians shudder at the useless waste of hard-to-find managerial talent crudely carried out by lining all capitalists up before firing squads. They prefer putting them to work for the state, like it or not, even letting them keep title to their enterprises, if not control."

State control, according to Lord Keynes (who, by the way, is harder to read than Marx), is more efficient than forthright operation of industry by bureaucrats, when it can be achieved by manipulation of money and credit (which is probably what Mr. Kennedy and his advisers meant in the threat against steel) and by "the expenditure of a decisive share of the national wealth by Government."

DIFFERENCE IN TIMING

The ADA members, a very small but very dedicated and articulate minority, are as an organization strikingly like the British Fabian Socialists, of whom Keynes was a late ornament and George Bernard Shaw the most famous member. They derive their name from a Roman, Quintus Fabius Maximus, who beat Hannibal, not by fighting him but by wearing him down with slow unrelenting pressure. The Fabians stood for non-Marxian evolutionary socialism, to be achieved not by class war but by ballot. They helped to found the British Labor Party 60 years ago and since then have had a relation with that party roughly comparable to that of ADA with the liberal wing of the Democratic Party for the last dozen years. The difference is in timing: under the tutelage of the Fabians the British Labor Party created the bony structure of a Socialist state in 45 years; the ADA may better that record in the United States.

Americans who favor free enterprise—to whom "profits" is not a dirty word, like "slavery"—must remember that ADA is not an organization for subversive violence like Marxist-Lenin communism. ADA'ers do not seek to overthrow the U.S. Government to establish their Socialist state; they have no underground, no espionage system, no loyalty to another power. The socialism they want to bring about would be quite as total, industrially, as that in Russia, but they would accomplish it by legislation, not by shooting, and, of course, by infiltrating the executive branch of the Government, as in the example of steel, where they found a spokesman in the President of the United States.

The attack on private ownership and control is being carried out skillfully, screened by the diversionary skirmish for civil rights, of which ADA is a most active and vehement proponent. But civil rights somehow seem a little empty when they are not related to property rights, as many emancipated slaves discovered in the classical cities of Greece. To fight for civil rights while seeking to destroy the others is like dueling for the honor of a lady one intends to seduce.

Welfare State Is the Objective?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, much has been heard concerning the domestic policies that the New Frontier will attempt to drive through the Congress in 1962. There is considerable doubt as to the wisdom of expanding domestic spending at the same time our defense costs continue to rise.

One of the issues which is receiving the President's major attention, presumably at the request of the ADA, is accurately described in the January 4 issue of the La Grange, Ill., Citizen in an editorial entitled "Welfare State Is the Objective," which I submit for the RECORD:

THE PUBLISHER SAYS: WELFARE STATE IS THE OBJECTIVE

President Kennedy has announced that he has four major objectives for Congress to tackle and to recognize as musts in his New Frontier program for 1962.

One of these objectives offsets another. The President's insistence that medical care for the aged should be financed by social security taxation is vulnerable from many angles, and one of these is its increase in tax burdens instead of easing them, which is another of the President's four objectives.

The Kerr-Mills law, which Congress enacted last year and which has not had time to be proven adequate, indicated the attitude of the legislators who were not willing to accept the socialized medicine aspect of the King-Anderson bill which President Kennedy and Secretary Ribbicoff urge for adoption. The continued effort to have the King-Anderson bill passed indicates that its proponents fear the Kerr-Mills bill would prove adequate if given a chance.

The almost frenzied efforts to have medical care for the aged financed by social security leads to the conclusion that the supporters are more interested in changing political philosophy than aiding the aged.

The social security program is not all-inclusive, and its sponsors ignore that fact. It would benefit only those included under social security, many of them having large incomes, and leaving out the group most in need of medical care support. The Kerr-Mills bill provides for assistance to all persons in need of that assistance.

Statistics released in support of the King-Anderson bill emphasize generalizations about the number of persons who are age 65 and could be benefited by medical care.

I have not found figures or facts to indicate how many persons are now in distress because of illness and who cannot be aided by existing programs. This is a fact which would help decide whether or not we have the neglected old people the welfare state planners talk about.

Not many Americans would deny old persons, or any other category of citizens, medical aid. At issue is how such aid can be supplied most efficiently, under the best conditions, without destroying the basic freedoms and concepts of American institutions, and under financing that does not overburden the taxpayer.

"If medical care were financed under the social security system, half of the cost would rest on those with incomes under $4,800, many who would be forced to pay for another's medical care. The social security method would apply only to those under the program and would be paid to many wealthy persons who need no such aid to pay medical expenses," is the statement of Congressman HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI, of Pennsylvania.

"Thus far we have won our fight against the King-Anderson bill, but I want to tell you that the fight goes on and that the real critical days are ahead," are the words of ROBERT S. KERR, Senator from Oklahoma, and elected as a Democrat.

Many more persons have phrased their opposition to the King-Anderson social security legislation, and in much of this opposition the fear is expressed that it is an attempt to introduce socialized medicine in a manner that is acceptable to many, but which would open the door to all the evils as well as the few attractive appearing but dubious benefits.

Key West Citizen Carries on Tradition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, 140 years ago, in 1822, Key West, Fla., was first settled by John Simonton, who purchased it from a Spaniard, Juan P. Salas, to whom it had been granted by the Spanish monarchy.

Seven years later, on January 8, 1829, a four-page, hand-set, weekly newspaper called the Register and Commercial Advertiser gave Key Westers their first newspaper.

In the ensuing 133 years, the residents of the westernmost of the islands composing the Florida Keys have had 23 newspapers—culminating in the outstanding daily, the Key West Citizen, which is under the able direction of Norman P. Artman.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my fellow Members to an article from the Key West Citizen of January 8, 1962, which traces newspaper history in this most tradition-bound city of the State of Florida. The article follows:

[From the Key West Citizen, Jan. 8, 1962]

KEY WEST NEWSPAPER HISTORY BEGAN 133 YEARS AGO TODAY

(By Earl R. Adams)

A four-page handset weekly newspaper carrying local, State, and national news on a small scale made its appearance in Key West on January 8, 1829.

This four-column-wide periodical named the Register and Commercial Advertiser gave Key Westers their first newspaper.

Up to the time of the appearance of this weekly, Key Westers depended on newspapers arriving here on sailing boats to keep up with national and world events.

On June 5, 1828, Thomas Eastin, a printer with a long record of newspaper work in Tennessee, Mississippi, and Alabama started the Florida Argus in St. Augustine. Business was poor.

None too well pleased with the response by the residents of St. Augustine to the Argus, Eastin announced through the columns of that paper in November of the same year that he was moving his plant to Key West.

The printing equipment was loaded aboard the brig *Enterprise* which brought it to this island city.

The Register and Commercial Advertiser lived until 1830, when Eastin was compelled to close shop because of the lack of advertisements.

In 1834, Eastin became U.S. marshal in Key West and held that position until 1836. He later became naval agent at Pensacola and died in Mount Vernon, Ala., in 1865, at the age of 77.

On March 21, 1831, Benjamin B. Strobel and L. M. Stone published a sample issue of the Key West Gazette, the island's second newspaper. The response was good and on April 20, the first regular edition of that weekly paper made its appearance.

In October of the same year, Thomas N. Jeffry became publisher with Strobel and Stone as the editors.

Strobel, who was a native of South Carolina, was acting surgeon at Key West and a member of the town council and port physician.

The Gazette went the way of the Register and Commercial Advertiser on September 5, 1832.

Key West was without a newspaper until October 15, 1834, when the Enquirer went to press. The name of this paper was later to be changed to Inquirer.

Jesse Atkinson was the editor and William A. Whitehead, of New Jersey, was the publisher.

The chief contributor to the newspaper was Whitehead, who wrote most of the editorials.

Stephen R. Mallory, who was later to become U.S. Senator from Florida and then secretary of the navy for the Confederacy, was also a contributor to the Inquirer.

This paper was four columns wide and included eight pages. It was published once a week.

Whitehead proved to be the only person in those early days of Key West history who was sufficiently interested to preserve the newspapers of that day.

Two bound volumes of the copies of the Gazette and Inquirer were presented by him to Monroe County.

These volumes found their way from the Monroe County Courthouse to the P. K. Yonge Library of Florida History in Gainesville.

The Old Island Restoration Foundation is now having these early papers microfilmed. The Monroe County Library Board is endeavoring to obtain a viewer so that these old volumes, telling of bygone days in Key West, can be read by those interested in this island's history.

Since the days of the Gazette, Key West has had 21 newspapers. Many were short-lived.

The Key West Citizen, which started as a weekly newspaper in 1904, has had a longer existence than any other newspaper. A few months after it made its first appearance, Marcy B. Darnall and Thomas Treason Thompson purchased the plant and consolidated it with the Inter-Ocean, the town's daily newspaper, and the Inter-Ocean's name was changed to The Citizen.

Later L. P. Artman, Sr., bought a one-third interest in The Citizen and eventually obtained control of the paper. Since his death, his son, Norman, has been its editor and publisher.

Lynn's Lifeblood: The GE Plant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following most interesting newspaper article on the GE plant in Lynn, Mass., which appeared in the Boston Sunday Advertiser on November 19, 1961:

LYNN'S LIFEBLOOD: THE GE PLANT

(By Harold Banks)

The quickest way to cast a pall of gloom over Lynn is to start a rumor that there's trouble at the River Works or at the other one a half mile down the road in Federal Street.

The river is the Saugus. The works there and down the road are General Electric plants.

The company has 149 others in 122 cities in 29 States. The one on the river is the second largest. Only the mother of them all in Schenectady, N.Y., is bigger.

In Lynn, 11 miles north of Boston, nothing is bigger than GE. It pays more taxes, more men and more attention to the welfare of the community than any other enterprise in Lynn.

It's the key to the city.

If it ever moves out of its two-part, 147-acre estate and goes elsewhere, nobody knows exactly how many other businesses in Lynn would have to lock their doors and throw their keys away.

But, unless the fourth biggest company in the country suddenly goes bankrupt which is about as likely as central heating in the Congo, no one need worry about GE staying in Lynn for at least another decade.

This year, it began a 10-year, $50 million program for research and development of commercial jet engines.

The first such engine in the Nation was secretly designed in the Lynn plant during World War II and went through its trial runs in October 1942. The man who sent the whole Lynn GE corps a Thanksgiving Day telegram from overseas 5 or 6 weeks later probably knew about the engine.

"Let us thank God," he wired, "for American industry, labor and management, which have given us the weapons and the equipment with which to conduct our north African campaign. More power to you."

He signed it, "Eisenhower, lieutenant-general, commanding, European Theater of War."

There were more people working in Lynn GE during the war than were living in Monaco.

Now there are 14,080 men and women on the rolls of Lynn GE employees. They come from 148 Massachusetts communities and from 12 in other States.

But 52 percent of them live in Greater Lynn, which encompasses Saugus, Nahant, Lynnfield, and Swampscott.

And they represent 28 percent of the Greater Lynn work force.

That's why any time Lynn GE shows the least sign of distress, the rest of the city

prays fervently that it's not caused by labor pains—a strike or a shutdown.

Either one costs $2,265,000 a week and the bill is paid by the workers. That's the current size of the weekly GE payroll.

Over the year, it amounts to $117,780,000, and though not all of it is spent in Lynn, it's what the total volume of retail sales in the city came to in 1958, the last year for which the figures are complete.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce reckons the weekly payroll of the Lynn GE complex is enough to keep 238 grocers, 216 restaurants, 152 filling stations, 60 apparel shops and 30 home furnishers going.

Total sales of the whole GE company, which makes work for 250,621 citizens from coast to coast and is second in that rsepect only to General Motors, was reckoned at $4,200 million in 1960.

How much of that was credited to Lynn is one of the few statistics the company prefers to withhold.

But out of its 259 buildings last year came 225 different products from a 5-cent glass jewel for instruments to a titanic steam turbine costing more than $1 million—and out of its four awesome laboratories come periodic feats of wizardry that constantly change the course of the world and consistently for the better. Progress, GE insists, is its most important product.

It started with Charlie Coffin. This may be the first time he has been called Charlie in print. In the annals of GE the first president of the company is called Charles A. Coffin. He was a Maine boy who came down to Lynn out of the wilderness of Somerset County, Maine, where he was born in 1844, and laced himself into the shoe industry.

Those were the days when last made Lynn first. She was the top shoe producer in the world. The whole thing was an accident that happened this way.

One of the first settlers in Lynn, which began sprouting in 1629, was a tanner. In 1635, a couple of British cobblers named Philip Kirtland and Edmund Bridges moved close to the tannery and began to make shoes by hand. They taught others who came to live in Lynn, which, incidentally, was first known as Saugus, and by the turn of the century, there was hardly a house in the town without a kitchen or backyard shoe shop. A hundred years later, 1810 it was, an army of household shoemakers began producing 1 million pairs a year.

Charlie Coffin didn't get to Lynn until long after the first shoe sewing machine was set up there in 1848. That took the army out of their homes and put them in factories.

By 1883, Coffin was in full command of a brigade of his own. He headed a profitable shoe firm and was looking around for some other business he could polish off.

Coffin was farsighted. From Lynn he looked down to New Britain, Conn., and spied the American Electric Co., which an obscure genius named Prof. Elihu Thomson was sparking.

First, Coffin persuaded a group of other Lynn manufacturers to join him in buying the Connecticut company. Then, he talked the professor into coming to Lynn and setting up shop there. The site chosen for the new factory was in West Lynn, where the smaller of the two GE plants is now. They called it the Thomson-Houston Electric Co. Houston was another professor, Edwin J., his given name was, and he was as bright a light in his own right as Thomson.

The move that lifted Thomson out of relative obscurity spared Lynn from dropping into it.

Six years later, the great Lynn fire of 1889 transformed 31 acres of the business section to ashes and, thereafter, the shoe industry began to decline. But there was a new venture—electricity—to keep the city on the beam.

In 1892, Coffin, a galvanic financier whose mind was always generating, quietly arranged for the merger of Thomson-Houston with a company in Schenectady, N.Y., established in 1878 by the man who thought of pouring electricity into a glass bulb and thereby light up the world. His name was Edison. His surnames—Thomas Alva—aren't important. He was one of a kind. Folks used to like to call him "The Wizard of Menlo Park" after he set up his workshop in that New Jersey town.

The wizard had called his Schenectady company the Edison General Electric. The merger required him merely to drop his own name out of the title. A year thereafter, President Coffin of General Electric saved Lynn, Schenectady and the company. His financial agility kept GE from being crushed to death in the panic of '93.

And his confidence in himself and GE was sure enough for him to start building the Lynn River Works when the financial structure of the country was tumbling down.

GE has been delayed on the road to progress from time to time since then, but has never been stopped. Four years before Coffin died in 1926, he predicted the late, late show.

"Moving pictures will be broadcast," he said. "This is dreaming, of course, but of one thing I am certain. We are just at the beginning of the electric age. Electricity is international. It's social and democratic—and the greatest force in the world because it's everybody's servant."

The River Works that Coffin started 68 years ago isn't finished yet. It never will be as long as GE keeps on making its most important product—progress. Something new is always being added.

The rate of reinvestment for new tools, other equipment and more facilities for the River Works and its smaller sidekick a half-mile away in West Lynn is $10 million a year. That's $1,045,000 more than the city's indebtedness was January 1, 1960, and only $2,160,130 less than the real estate taxes she collected last year.

Lynn GE's contribution to the tax levy was $696,000. It paid another $250,000 for water. At the rate of $84 per $1,000 of evaluation, the GE complex was assessed at $8,285,714.

It would take vastly more to buy its 147 acres, put up its 259 buildings, lay its 6 miles of roads and 7 miles of railroad track, string its 10 miles of telephone cables and electric conduits, and install its 4½ miles of steam tunnels, 3 miles of fuel lines and 6 miles of surface drains.

It takes a crew of more than 700 to keep the complex shipshape. It takes more than 38,000,000 gallons of oil a year to heat the two plants and more than 15,500,000 kilowatt hours of electricity to power and light them.

The complex itself generates 50,000 kilowatts, which is sufficient for the needs of a city of 110,000. The population of Lynn is 94,478.

The Lynn Fire Department doesn't have to worry about a blaze in either of the plants unless it's a big one. GE maintains its own firefighting crew.

A huge cafeteria provides sustenance for the body.

Six years ago, GE officials began providing food for the soul, too. During Lent, Catholic services are held in the big GE auditorium on Wednesdays, Protestant worship on Thursdays.

In sum, Lynn GE is virtually a city within a city. Labor union stewards represent the people and take their grievances, ultimately, to the GE city council. The councilors are the heads of the four departments in the complex—aircraft accessory turbine, instrument, small aircraft engine, and medium steam turbine, generator and gear.

One of the councilors is the mayor. Mayor Armand T. Chandonnet heads the medium steam turbine, generator and gear departments. In the GE echelon of command, Chandonnet isn't the general manager of the complex. He's the senior management official.

Nobody is more sensitive to the damage Lynn GE could do to the city with a single careless decision.

"We have deep roots in Lynn that go back nearly 75 years," he said. During that time the company and the community have experienced all of the stresses and strains—the growing pains—that have characterized industry.

As the major and dominating employer in Lynn, our position is often a lonely one. A business decision by a small concern, for example, might not ripple the surface of the work force. A similar decision by GE could become an economic tidal wave in Lynn.

One of Lynn's major needs is to diversify its economic base. We think Lynn is a good place to operate a business and we think that other employers looking for business sites should carefully consider the many resources of the city and its people."

The shoe industry still thrives in Lynn and there's many another enterprise within its 10.48 square miles. The chamber of commerce lists 156 of them from aircraft equipment to wire soap dishes and, together with GE, they absorb Lynn's labor force of 33,000 men and women. Some of those who don't work at GE benefit from it indirectly, anyhow.

In the course of a year, GE pays $8 million to 250 Lynn concerns for goods and services. In 1960, it contributed $72,000 to local charities. Its employees added $215,000 to that.

All this is Lynn GE in facts and figures and their impact on the city.

But worth isn't always measurable in cash or credit.

No price, for instance, can be placed on the value of the 350 scientists who think and toil in Lynn GE's laboratories.

They are tinkering now, among other things, with refinements of a fuel cell that converts chemical energy directly into electricity and with the problems of a gear transmission system and a powerplant for a transport that doesn't really fly and doesn't really sail—the hydrofoil ship designed by Grumman Aircraft and expected to skim over the water at more than 70 miles an hour, to begin with.

They're making adjustments in certain mechanisms of the Polaris missile, puzzling over various matters related to the Atlas-Centaur space probe, developing accessory power units that may help put a man on the moon.

The 14,080 workers in the Lynn complex are as much a part of the Nation's defense forces as any of its uniformed divisions.

They're the ones who make the turbines and propulsion gear for nuclear-powered submarines.

They're the ones who made the machinery to drive the Navy's first nuclear-powered surface ship, the cruiser *Long Beach*, at a speed which the Pentagon decided ought to be kept secret.

From their hands and heft come—

The J-85 engines for the Navy's Freedom Fighter, the Air Force's Talon trainer, one of its target drones, and the Quail decoy missile, which can be released in coveys by B-52's to penetrate and confuse enemy air defenses.

The hydraulic constant-speed drives for the Convair 880 jetliner and the Convair 600.

The fuel-air starters for the Air Force's F-101-B jet interceptor and its KC-135 jet tanker, for the Navy's A-2D attack jet and its F-4H all-weather fighter.

The meter that precisely measures the rate of flow of liquid and gas in pounds regardless of volume, density, pressure, temperature, or other variables.

In a word, the 225 items that Lynn GE produces, from that 5-cent glass jewel to that 50,000-kilowatt turbine generator.

The significance of the situation isn't lost on management or labor.

Each knows it wouldn't amount to much without the other.

Officer, Arrest That Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Gerald W. Johnson appeared in the November 20, 1961, issue of the New Republic. It speaks for itself and I trust that such calm appraisal will result in the continued diminution of our fear of each other. Fear can only lead to a paralysis of the national will: this America can do without.

The article follows:

OFFICER, ARREST THAT MAN

(By Gerald W. Johnson)

Junius Scales, the North Carolina Communist, is now doing 6 years in a Federal prison for violating the new alien and sedition law, and one of his friends sends a letter asking support of a plea for executive clemency. Since I don't believe anybody should ever have gone to jail under that law, I am of course in favor of letting Scales out, but I doubt that he has a Chinaman's chance.

If the man had murdered somebody, there would always be the chance of convincing the public that the deceased ought to have been murdered, which would set up a strong demand for Scales' release. But he, like Thoreau, is in jail not for what he did, but for what he didn't do. He was convicted of not thinking the right thoughts back in 1954, and I, for one, am persuaded that he was guilty. Furthermore, I can imagine no way of proving that he is thinking the right thoughts now, so if it is lawful to send a man to jail for wrong thinking. Scales' friends have no case at all.

What happened was that Junius Scales, a sixth-generation native, white Protestant, of Anglo-Saxon ancestry—therefore a man with no organized friends at all—shortly after he came of voting age swallowed the Communist rumble-bumble and held it down until 1956, when Khrushchev's famous speech formally admitted that Stalin had been what sensible people had all along believed he was. This was too much for Scales and he renounced the doctrine, thereby incurring the venomous hatred of the Communist Party.

But at first he had been its fair-haired darling. For generations his family had been wealthy and socially prominent—a great-uncle had been Governor of the State and there was some connection with a Revolutionary partiot who became an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. Such a convert was a prize indeed for the Communists, and they promptly made him State chairman. So in 1954 he was indicated under the Smith Act and in 1958 was convicted, although he had then been out of the party for 2 years.

The Government offered no evidence that he had advocated overthrowing the Government by force and violence, and certainly he must have made no effort to do so. But it was charged that he knew the Communist Party was dedicated to violence against the Government, therefore, he must have approved that policy—he thought well of it, even though he did nothing about it. That was thinking the wrong thoughts, so he got 6 years—a heavier penalty than was imposed on any other violator of the Smith Act, even those who stayed in the party after Khrushchev's revelations.

It wasn't even hinted at in the trial, but current belief is that Scales might have saved himself, or certainly drawn a lighter sentenc, if he had been willing to save the Government gumshoe boys a lot of work by ratting on all other members of the party. That he refused to do. He answered truthfully, as far as is known, all questions about his own acts, but named no names, thereby attaining, in the estimation of this superficial observer, the rating of a damn fool and a gentleman. In Valhalla, or wherever good Governors go, Junius Scales' great-uncle may be snorting in disgust. But he isn't blushing.

Yet what can President Kennedy do about it? In the old days President Jefferson pardoned everybody convicted under the first alien and sedition law on the ground that thinking the wrong thoughts, even thinking that elected persons are swine and saying so out loud, is not a crime, and a so-called law making it a crime is no more real law than if Congress had ordered everybody to bow down and worship the image of Baal.

But John Marshall put the kibosh on that. He established the Supreme Court as the sole arbiter of what is and what is not real law and President Kennedy's opinion on the subject is just about as authoritative as yours and mine.

I wish that Scales were out of jail, not on his account, for I never laid eyes on the man, but because it seems to me that every day he stays there is a new proclamation that it is criminal to think that "whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends (life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness), it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it." Those words are in the document that created the United States of America.

But modern times are different, better illustrated by a cartoon that, in the unhappy days of prohibition, was published by Life—not the picture magazine, but the earlier one that was intentionally humorous. It portrayed a character coming down the street, head up, and grinning from ear to ear, while behind him a harridan screeched at a cop, "Officer, arrest that man. He seems to be thinking of beer."

Chelsea Naval Hospital Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chelsea Record, Chelsea, Mass., of October 19, 1961, with reference to the 125th anniversary of the Chelsea Naval Hospital:

NAVAL HOSPITAL BIRTHDAY

The naval hospital this week celebrates the 125th anniversary of is founding, an event which has had a great bearing on the life of our city, served an invaluable role for America's Armed Forces in the six wars in which the United States has participated since the institution came into being, and has been the scene of many lifesaving and outstanding developments in the medical and surgical fields.

Since its founding it has proven to be a powerful force in the battle against the great influenza epidemic of 1918, has played a brilliant role in modern medicine's successful search for the development of the frozen blood program, and has saved the lives and made possible the mental and physical rehabilitation of hundreds of servicemen who were injured during both World Wars and the Korean conflict.

The hospital has also been a tremendous influence on the daily life of our city. During its existence dozens of Chelsea people have been employed there, hundreds of families were treated there, its officials have always been most cooperative with the local city government, and the civilian and service personnel have spent thousands of dollars in local stores and business places.

It is our sincere hope that the naval hospital will remain in Chelsea for the next 125 years, that it will continue to be successful and rewarding, and that it will continue to play an outstanding role in civilan and service medical progress and advances.

The Wall: An Epitaph

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most heartbreaking developments of the year was the construction of the wall in Berlin. An outstanding community newspaper in my district, the Park Forest Reporter, has vividly described the crisis surrounding this wall in an editorial on January 3, 1962 entitled "The Wall: An Epitaph," which I submit for the RECORD:

THE WALL: AN EPITAPH

When happenings of 1961 are evaluated, most newsmen pick the Berlin crisis as the top story. The wall comes in for a good bit of speculation with some pundits blaming our Government for not blasting it to bits as it was being built by the East Germans.

As we mentioned in an editorial some months ago, had our Government acted without restraint and rumbled our tanks into the brick and barbed wire enclosure, the unilateral act, without the blessing of our allies, England and France, might have provoked a greater storm than we could conceivably contend with at that time of tension.

We concur along with some beliefs, that this provocation might not have triggered a war, but the risk was not worth the taking at that time.

This has been borne out, particularly in the past week when East German Red Leader Ulbricht admitted that without Soviet Russia's help, he could not hold the reins of government. The reliance on aid from Nikita and company is paramount for the East Germans to survive under their present form of oppression.

The wall, although an ugly sight, is proof to the free and uncommitted world that communism can thrive only with restraints on personal liberty and that it survives only "under the gun."

This new year of 1962 will see some realinement in the opposing camps of the world. From our vantage point it appears that the West has the better opportunity of

survival, providing we remain strong and relentless in our efforts to stifle the advance of communism, by whatever means we can employ, short of provoking a war.

Fallout Shelters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call attention to a column which appeared in the Montclair (N.J.) Times, one of the Nation's outstanding weekly newspapers, on December 7, 1961.

In this column, the author, Mr. Don McKee, presents a series of questions and answers on the subject of fallout shelters in an interesting and informative manner.

The column follows:

Now that the initial emotional surge over fallout shelters is ebbing it might be wise to take a layman's look at some of the ridiculous and near-ridiculous remarks we've been hearing and repeating:

"If a bomb falls on my house what good will a fallout shelter do?

Fallout shelters are meant to protect against fallout, not bombs. If a bomb falls on your house, sell it fast, even at a bargain price.

"I can't hold with this theory of shooting my neighbor if he tries to get into my shelter."

This was an opinion expressed by one man and a few people who plan to shoot their neighbors anyway. It is not a recommended national policy.

"If they bomb New York——"

This is similar, but not identical to remarks made all over the country. In Berkeley, Calif., it begins: "If they bomb San Francisco——" In Evanston, Ill., it's: "If they bomb Chicago——" We all think "our" city is the important one.

'I know New York isn't a top military target, but think of the psychological effect."

With hydrogen bombs, psychological effects?

"I refuse to let fear drive me into the ground to live like an animal."

Fox holes were pretty popular during World War II and some of the animals who lived in them are still around and doing well.

"I don't want to come out of a shelter 2 weeks later and live in a completely devastated country."

If a single bomb could devastate a 300-square-mile area, it would take 10,000 of them, all perfectly aimed, to devastate the entire country, and still leave Alaska and Hawaii untouched.

"Some madman may push a button and start the whole thing by mistake."

Has the instigator of this remark never watched on TV the hours-long, highly technical count down that precedes a missile launching?

"The next war may be over in a matter of minutes."

The number of H-bomb targets is extremely limited—population, transportation, and industrial centers. But spread a million guerrillas over a half-dozen large western States and the enemy would go broke trying to beat them with costly H-bombs. A war might drag on for years at the rifle and bayonet level.

The foregoing is no pitchman's plug for fallout shelters. Even experts disagree on their merits. But it does lead up to the last oft-repeated statement:

"People in other countries aren't excited so why should we be?"

Well, maybe it's because those Soviet missiles are aimed at the United States. Then, too, the French and the Danes and Norwegians weren't excited in 1939, but they were occupied in 1940—for 5 years. Twenty years ago this morning we weren't excited, either. Twenty years ago this afternoon we had no Pacific Fleet.

As the man said, "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." Vigilance is that state halfway between lassitude and panic.

The Late Very Reverend James T. O'Reilly, O.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks by the Very Reverend Vincent A. McQuade, O.S.A., president of Merrimack College, North Andover, Mass., before the Reverend James T. O'Reilly Hibernian Division No. 8, of Lawrence, Mass.:

ADDRESS BY REVEREND MCQUADE

I am honored and pleased to have this opportunity to speak to you. On this day when you remember the 35th anniversary of the death of the late Father James Thomas O'Reilly of the Order of St. Augustine, I wish to offer a word of commendation for your thoughtful kindness. Without doubt, Father O'Reilly was one of the great men of this city. May his memory endure amongst us forever.

I believe that most of you are acquainted with the facts of Father O'Reily's life. He was born in Lansingburg, N.Y., on May 1, 1851. His grandfather emigrated to this country in 1847 from Athboy, County Meath, Ireland and died in 1886 at the age of 96; his father Edward O'Reilly served in the Civil War and died from natural causes in the field. Father O'Reilly attended Villanova University, entered the Augustinian Order and was ordained a priest on March 15, 1874. During the next 12 years he fulfilled a few assignments with distinction and was assigned as Pastor of St. Mary's Church in Lawrence in 1886, a position he held until his death on November 12, 1925. A zealous priest, friend of the poor, community leader, renowned orator, Father O'Reilly left an indelible impression on the city of Lawrence: his name will always be held in benediction.

Throughout his life, Father O'Reilly displayed a remarkable gift for administration and organization. Assigned to St. Mary's when it was perhaps the most undesirable and difficult assignment a priest could receive, he brought order out of chaos and restored confidence and trust in the hearts of his parishioners. The conditions which prevailed in 1886 may require a brief description.

For some years the parishioners had placed their savings on deposit with the priests on the assumption that their savings would be safer than in the regular banks. This was not an uncommon practice during the 19th century. The moneys accumulated had been used in building a magnificent stone church. Much as a bank today will take deposits and place them in certain classes of investments, during this period some churches were built with these savings accounts, and the savings accounts replenished as yearly collections helped to defray the costs of construction. As long as deposits exceeded withdrawals this practice proceeded smoothly, but when conditions were reversed and withdrawals exceeded deposits, difficulties were encountered by some in obtaining their savings, confidence was lost, failure and disgrace ensued. This problem had developed in 1881 and when Father O'Reilly assumed charge in 1886, the shortages amounted to a princely sum.

Father O'Reilly had the difficult task of healing the distrust of both parishioners and church authorities, of uniting the dissident and scattered groups of the parish and reorganizing the entire parish into a harmonious group of active religious men and women. At the same time he had a most difficult and involved financial problem to solve. Father O'Reilly's success in achieving all of these objectives is well known. Under his leadership, St. Mary's Parish became an outstanding parish in the Archdiocese of Boston.

A zealous priest, he wrought many improvements beneficial to the entire city. He founded further parishes to provide adequate care for the spiritual requirements of his people; St. Monica's Church in Methuen, St. Anthony's, St. Francis, SS. Peter and Paul, St. Augustine's, all were due to his efforts and priestly zeal. The parish schools were expanded and education was always an important part of parish activities. Advocate of total abstinence and lover of Irish patriots, Father O'Reilly had a warm feeling for every beneficial activity. An extraordinary priest and a rare leader, Father O'Reilly was loved and revered by all.

Contributions to the civic life of the Lawrence community were many and varied. An active member of many civic groups, his contributions to the industrial life of the community were noteworthy and of national interest. On at least six different occasions he was called upon to help solve industrial disputes and restore peace and harmony in the community. Honored and respected by the workers and mill owners, Father O'Reilly knew and applied the principles of Pope Leo XIII's encyclical on labor, at a time when few recognized or understood the import of the social revolution taking place in the western world. Father O'Reilly had a warm understanding and sympathy for those who labor and are heavy burdened. He also demanded strict adherence to justice and right.

In the late 19th century (1894) as a member of the board of trade, just 3 years after the publication of "Rerum Novarum," Father O'Reilly was endeavoring to put into practice the principles of this social encyclical. On one occasion a leading mill manager of the city objected to having him serve as a member of an arbitration committee because Father O'Reilly had already declared himself against management. In replying, Father O'Reilly expressed a principle which has since been widely acknowledged, "If any man cannot manufacture by paying reasonable wages, he has no moral right to manufacture."

The strike in the Washington Mills concerned wages. The mill was undercutting competitors and by their competition forcing wages down in other localities.

Ever alert to changing conditions, Father O'Reilly warned employer and employees of the dangers ahead. Some 10 years before the great strike of 1912, he had directed attention to the imminent trouble: "I feel it a duty to call your attention to a condition of affairs in our city," said Father O'Reilly, "that threatens disastrous consequences to the common interests of all our citizens. You hear now the rumble of a socialistic battle between labor and capital" (Life, p. 55).

When the storm finally descended on the city in 1912, Father O'Reilly was away recuperating from a severe illness. Lawrence was soon known throughout the country, indeed throughout the world, as the city of anarchy and rebellion. Lawrence was believed to be in the grip of radical socialism. The organizers of the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW) frequently called "the Wobblies" (a wobbly was a slang name for speakers favoring the IWW), were successful in spreading their nefarious doctrines and engendered hate, discontent and discord among the workers, especially the foreign-speaking workers in the city. Exaggerating and distorting conditions, they led many to believe that unless the workers dealt a death blow to capitalism, the workers themselves faced starvation and death.

The strike of the textile workers which began innocently enough soon became a rebellion of major proportions. The National Guard were called to the city and the mill districts were circled by a band of steel. The strike resulted when the 54-hour law for women and children became effective in the mills and wages were cut accordingly. Soon the agitators and organizers of the IWW seized control, the strike lost the identity as an industrial dispute and became a battle between law and order on one side and rebellion and chaos on the other. As the months passed, the conflict seemed to wane but quickly came to a climax one Sunday in September when a gathering of I.W.W. supporters marched down Essex Street bearing the red flag of revolution and with the sign "No God, No Master." A battle ensued before the marchers passed Lawrence Street and some were injured.

One of the victims of the riots was a Catholic who was buried from the Immaculate Conception Church. On the day of the funeral, the body was escorted through the principal streets of the city, in an endeavor to arouse the strikers to a higher degree of rebellion. The banners of anarchy and revolution were flaunted in the faces of the bystanders who lined the streets. Revolution seemed to be on the march in Lawrence. This strange funeral cortege proceeded unmolested in triumph through the city, to the gates of the cemetery. At the gates of the cemetery, awaiting the marchers, was the pastor of Saint Mary's.

With courage, filled with a holy indignation, Father O'Reilly commanded the agitators, the troublemakers to disperse, not to enter the cemetery for "unhallowed footsteps such as theirs should never press the soil of consecrated ground." The tumultuous crowd stopped: for a long moment it halted, held at bay by the dauntless courage of the priest, the crowd wavered, then slowly turned away and scattered in all directions, as the piercing gaze of Father O'Reilly brought home to the throng the enormity of their transgression.

A meeting of civic leaders soon followed and under the leadership of Father O'Reilly a tremendous demonstration was planned for the following Columbus Day, October 12. Quickly organizing all resources and with Father O'Reilly leading, inspiring and encouraging, a patriotic parade was held on Columbus Day with over 40,000 marching "for God and country." The crisis was over. Soon the city returned to normalcy.

Time will not permit us to dwell on his mediation in the strike of 1922. The magnificent tribute paid to Father O'Reilly in May 1924, when he celebrated his golden jubilee as a priest, is well remembered by some of those present. Father O'Reilly was a giant amongst the great men of this Commonwealth and on that occasion the entire city joined in honoring him. The years, however, were taking their unrelentless toll and in the fall of 1925, he celebrated his last Mass in the shrine he loved so well on October 4. Toward the final stages of his illness the subject of his grave was discussed with his priests of the parish. Some suggested that a suitable and appropriate place would be alongside St. Mary's Church on Haverhill Street.

With simplicity and true humility, Father O'Reilly protested: "Make no distinction for me. Bury me in line along with the others who have labored before and with me. Although I have been pastor here for almost 40 years, I am not a bit better than they. There are some mighty fine men resting on that hill. My people will know where to find my grave and say a prayer for me."

Father O'Reilly answered the summons of the angel of death on Thursday, November 12, 1925, at the age of 74, exactly 35 years ago this day. His solemn funeral took place on Monday, November 16. He sleeps the eternal sleep of the just in the priests' lot in St. Mary's Cemetery. His people know where his grave is: seldom will you visit that grave without finding flowers there. I am sure that there are many, like yourselves, who say a prayer for him.

Division 8 of the Ancient Order of Hiberians on the occasion of his death passed resolutions memorializing Father O'Reilly. Today you have remembered his anniversary. Father O'Reilly was a zealous, spiritual father, a faithful and honored son of Augustine, a militant soldier of Christ, revered, honored and beloved for his simplicity, kindness, and charity. His memory will be remembered always by those who love this city of Lawrence.

Father O'Reilly taught us many things. Love of God, love of country, love of truth, justice and right, the importance of civic responsibility. His life shows us the meaning of true Christian charity: his charity would bend to every man, reproving the weak when necessary, goading the strong to greater achievement, stimulating all to have a deep loyalty to God, high fidelity to country and a boundless love for fellowmen.

May his memory ever remain enshrined in the hearts of the citizens of Lawrence. May he rest in eternal peace.

Berlin: The Symbol of Unification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, today one of the great trouble spots in the world is the city of Berlin. One can understand the problem by reading the newspapers, but a better appreciation and understanding can be had by visiting this famous city which is located physically within the heart of the Soviet zone of occupation. I was fortunate in the course of my legislative duties to visit Berlin, to talk to many people, to observe conditions, and to draw some personal conclusions. While my visit was of brief duration, I had the privilege and opportunity to speak with officials in authority, to inspect places barred to nongovernmental persons, and to receive briefings by military and civilian officials. Upon my return I was invited to speak before the International Relations Club of St. John's University and the Columbian Lawyers Association. After my talks, there was a question-and-answer period. I believe that my talk before the Columbia Lawyers Association on December 13, 1961, in the Bronx might prove interesting and informative to the readers. My speech follows:

Mr. President Nicholas Iannuzzi, Surrogate Samuel Di Falco, Judge Louis Pagnucco, who trained me in the district attorney's office of New York County in 1945, Sylvester Cosentino, president of my political club, distinguished guests and members of the association, at the outset let me thank you for the invitation offered through your secretary, Jerry Crispino, to address you. I am pleased to meet many of my old friends, some of whom I had the honor of sponsoring for admission to practice before the Supreme Court of the United States.

On December 6, 1961, I returned from a trip to Rome, Berlin, and Paris. I would like to talk about the city of Berlin.

1. What the issue is and what the problems are.
2. What is happening there.
3. What the recent events signify, such as: (a) The building of the wall in the middle of the city of Berlin from north to south separating West and East Berlin; (b) the interference with the free movement of our Government and our garrison soldiers; (c) the interference with our access routes.
4. What a free city of Berlin means to the free world.

Germany, as you know, after World War II was divided into four zones of occupation or sectors and Greater Berlin being a fifth zone of occupation. These zones were known as the United States, British, French, and U.S.S.R. The city of Berlin which is geographically located within the Soviet sector, 110 miles distant from the western allied frontier, was physically divided into four sectors, Britain, United States, French in the western part of the city and the Soviet in the eastern part of the city.

A 10-day visit normally could hardly qualify one as an expert but permit me to detial some of my activity in the political military economic spheres.

I had a very interesting talk with Gen. Lucius Clay, the special consultant and representative of President John F. Kennedy in Berlin, who was the former military governor in Germany and closely associated with Gen. Dwight Eisenhower in World War II. Those who wish to get more detailed information may read General Clay's book "Decision in Germany." After my talk with General Clay I concluded that if he were present on August 13 when the East German authorities started to put up the barbed wire and the wall that we would have taken quick action to preserve our access and rights by taking it down.

I and my colleagues were briefed as to recent events by Brig. Gen. F. O. Hartel of the Berlin Command, Lt. Col. Emanuel Tineri, staff secretary of office U.S. commander, Col. T. C. Foote and Maj. F. E. Karhohs. They discussed also our military posture in Berlin, the organizational setup of the Allied control council which governed and has jurisdiction over Germany, and the Allied Kommandature which governed Greater Berlin. They discussed the background of Germany, Berlin, and the recent events in Berlin beginning August 13, 1961, when the East German authorities with the urging and the consent of the Soviet Government commenced to build the wall through the city.

We interviewed the assistant chief of the U.S. Mission Berlin, E. A. Lightner. Later I had a short talk with Maj. Gen. A. Watson, the U.S. commander in Berlin, after his emergency talk with the Soviet commander. We were then briefed by the political analyst, Mr. G. F. Muller, and the economics expert, Mr. Frank Taylor.

We visited the trouble spot, "check point Charlie," on the Friedrick strasse which is

set aside as the entry point for our military forces and Government personnel and which was the scene of the confrontation of American and Soviet tanks. We visited the American, British, and French zones, and inspected the 28 mile wall which meanders through the heart of the city of Berlin from north to south dividing the Western sector of Berlin from East Berlin.

This wall must be seen to be appreciated. This wall of concrete, barbed wire, twists and turns for 28 miles from the north part of the city to the southern part of Berlin. Imagine if you will a concrete wall dividing 5th Avenue from 14th Street up to Central Park across 57th Street over to Columbus Avenue, up Broadway to 207th Street, across Fordham Road to the grand concourse down to 161st Street over to 3d Avenue and down to 125th Street over to the East River down to South Ferry, with a wall blocking intersections, and the buildings bricked up forming part of the wall for a distance of 28 miles. This is what the wall would mean in New York City. The houses are evacuated and land cleared behind it for a distance of 200 feet with tank traps and concrete poles imbedded into the ground. Near this wall stand soldiers on guard, the East German police or "Vopos." Where the wall crosses the cemetery, the entrances are bricked up and the grief-stricken families are forced to place their wreaths at the base of the wall. They are denied the opportunity to bring their dead for burial or the opportunity to show their respect to their deceased loved ones. In the French sector, on Bernauer Straus, East Berliners jumped to their death in seeking to escape. One can see crosses on the sidewalk with mourners placing their wreaths daily to show their sorrow.

It was on a Sunday, August 13, 1961, that West Berliners were surprised by the East Berliners putting up barbed wire fences. This precipitated a last minute exodus of East Berliners who sought to escape; young people, old people; secret police and others made their escape to West Berlin. During the month of August more than 40,000 refugees fled and took refuge at the Marienfelde refugee camp, where they were housed. Approximately 200,000 escaped during 1961 from Soviet sector and from East Berlin. I had the good fortune to see how they processed their refugees. One person in particular on November 4, escaped with a friend, avoiding the shots of East Berlin police, the vopos and the East German police. He swam across the Spray River and escaped. After a month's convalescence in the hospital, he was processed, given a job and permitted to make a new life. He was a former postal clerk who refused to join the secret police. He refused because he did not want to shoot down West Berliners and his friends. Many of the refugees who are processed through the camp are directed to that part of West Germany where they desire to go or where their talents or background fit them.

We visited McNairs training field barracks where we reviewed the training of our U.S. 2d and 3d battle groups of the 6th Infantry Division. We observed signal corps and artillery practice and riot control squad practice.

All this took place in drizzling rain. We interviewed Col. J. Deane and Lt. Col. D. Hickman, the battle commander. We inspected our military equipment and the Signal Corps equipments and the new Army rifles, submachine and machineguns, and antitank bazookas. Our equipment is modern; our boys well trained, poised, on edge, and ready. Colonel Deane told us the story of one of the boys by the name of "Mexico."

When East Berliners saw too many people escaping, they cleared the area near the wall and warned that any person who approached within 100 yards, would be shot or handled. Our troops refused to be restricted in their actions on our side of the wall and our boys moved forward, including this soldier Private Mexico. The East German soldiers threatened to spray a hose on this young soldier.

As they brought the hose spray toward him, Mexico stood his ground, took off a hand grenade from his person and indicated by his gestures that if he were molested with the water hose that he would hurl the hand grenade. When the East Germans saw this they lowered the hose and spray and backed away. Trouble was averted. Colonel Deane said he felt like hugging the boy, because of the poise, courage, and restraint he displayed under pressure. Our boys are unafraid. They have been instructed not to start a fight but have been told not to back away from their position. Our boys are ready and equipped for any eventuality.

We visited the refugee camp of Marienfelde where we observed the process by which the West Berlin authorities handled and handles the hundred of thousands of refugees from East Berlin and the Soviet sector of Berlin. More than 3 million people have fled the Soviet Zone since the war. Over 200,000 have left since the beginning of the year, and despite the wall and tyrannical conditions, many people escape East Berlin to freedom in West Berlin.

We also visited East Berlin as tourists through the S. Bahn which is the elevated train system. To obtain entry to East Berlin, and to return, it was necessary to show identification which I did with my social security card inasmuch as I refused to show my passport or congressional documents so that my official status would not be disclosed. We were stopped by three guards. It is easier to get into East Berlin than out of East Berlin. When I started to get out of East Berlin the guard demanded a photograph. While I had my passport which contains my photograph in my inner pocket, I refused to show it and insisted that I was an American and that my social security card sufficed. The guard let me pass.

In Paris we interviewed Gen. James Gavin, Ambassador to France, with whom I discussed the Berlin situation, the position and attitude of Gen. Charles de Gaulle, the French attitude toward West Germany and Berlin, and the reasons General de Gaulle insists on developing his own atomic weapons.

We visited NATO headquarters where we conferred with Ambassador Tom Finletter on the role of West Germany in NATO. We were then briefed by top American officers of NATO on the overall NATO military posture, and the mutual weapon development program in its various phases. We had various conferences with businessmen on the economic situation, and the effect of the Common Market. There is no doubt that economic unity will conduce to political and military unity and that the Common Market is eliminating any tensions which might exist between France and West Germany.

What is the issue in Berlin and what are the problems? The important issue in Berlin is that the Western Allies are trying to maintain their position in Berlin and to keep West Berlin from being taken over by the Communists. Russia is trying to push the Western Allies out of Berlin and eventually to take over West Berlin. An ancillary issue and pertinent to the major issue is: Will East Berlin be recognized as a sovereign unit?

There are four major problems involved:

(1) Air and ground access to the city of Berlin from the West and freedom of movement within the city of Berlin.

(2) Our so-called propaganda activities.

(3) Refugee flow.

(4) Strength of allied garrison.

These issues and problems are related to the overall issue of: Shall there be a united Germany with Berlin as its capital and one treaty or shall there be a divided Germany with two treaties?

* We must never forget that the Soviet fears the German people, its intelligence and its ability to make war. It has reason to respect Germany and its prowess. Germany, with its 72 million people, almost defeated Russia and laid waste its lands. The Soviet breakthrough in space and its development of missiles and nuclear weapons have been stimulated by captive German scientists. The Soviet is furious because West Germany joined the NATO forces in the NATO Pact. The U.S.S.R. intends to divide Germany as best it can even if it means separating 17 million Germans from West Germany and imprisoning 1.1 million East Berliners behind the wall.

Contrast France, which suffered from the devastation of war begun by Germany. France believes it can live in peace with Germany. France has joined with West Germany in the Common Market and De Gaulle believes that economic unity with Germany will relieve the tensions behind the countries and bring permanent peace. Trade between West Germany and U.S.S.R. in a common market program and an exchange of peoples might help in eliminating tensions.

The East German authorities claim that the Western Allies' activities in sending our troops through East Berlin are violating a sovereign state's rights and are provocative.

The Western Allies, that is, United States, United Kingdom, and France, do not recognize East Germany as a sovereign state or the German Democratic Republic as a legal government. Our position is that East Germany and East Berlin are parts of occupied territory under the jurisdiction of the Soviet subject to veto by the Allied Control Council and the four commanders in Berlin, the Komandatura, and that by agreement we have a right to come and go as we please.

The Soviet threatens to sign a separate peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic representing East Germany. The Western allies claim that the Soviet has no right to sign unilaterally a peace treaty with an illegal government and that we recognize only the Soviet authorty in East Germany and in East Berlin. The Western allies further claim that putting up a wall, stopping our personnel from free travel and requiring indentification and harassing our troops are designed to demonstrate the legality of the German Democratic Republic and the sovereignty of East Germany.

To better understand the present-day situation and to determine whether the allies are right or wrong, it is necessary to look backward and to at least reexamine some of the highlights in the long series of events which led to the situation today.

In 1943 the Western allies met with Soviet officials and agreed on zones of occupation for Germany and Berlin. Our soldiers did better than our statesmen anticipated and by the time Germany surrendered, our troops had gone far beyond the lines that the statesmen had set up. We were therefore required to pull back our forces from Saxony and Thuringia and on July 4, 1945, our forces entered into West Berlin which the Soviet vacated. England had suggested that we not pull back our troops but the U.S. keeping to its agreement and understanding withdrew U.S. forces from Thuringia and Saxony which its armies had overrun and conquered.

Each of the allies, France, United States, and United Kingdom, controlled a zone in West Germany and the Soviets controlled a zone in East Germany; and the authority was subject to veto only by unanimous agreement of the four commanders acting as the Allied Control Council.

Greater Berlin was divided into four zones. Each of Western Allies garrisoned the Western zones allotted it and the Soviet garrisoned East Berlin. The city of Berlin was

to be administered by a four-power Allied Kommandatura composed of four Allied city commandants, with a rotating chairmanship.

The Soviet commandant walked out of the Allied Kommandatura at the time of the Berlin blockade in 1948. Concurrently the freely elected citywide government was forced out of the city hall or Rathouse located in the Soviet sector of Berlin, moved to Schoeneberg and the city was divided into East and West Berlin.

Analyzing what the Soviet Union has done since it withdrew from the Allied control council in 1948, and from the Allied Kommandatura, one can see a common thread in the Soviet actions, leading to one conclusion; that is that the Soviets decided to unilaterally terminate our agreements of occupation, and decided by itself that the Western Allies could have Western Germany and the Soviet would take Eastern Germany, including all of Berlin either under a puppet regime or under its own control. Here is what has happened which leads a person to such a conclusion:

1. East Germany set up a separate currency in 1948.

2. Soviet blockaded the ground access to Western Berlin in 1948.

3. East Germany imposed an authobahn toll on Western Germans, West Berliners, and foreigners on highways leading to Berlin.

4. East Germany curbed telephone service between East and West Berlin in 1952.

5. The German Democratic Republic passed a passport law on December 11, 1957 requiring East Berliners and East Germans to get passports if they desired to go to West Germany under the Federal Republic of Germany.

6. German Democratic Republic passed a law requiring West Berliners desiring to go to the Soviet Zone to get a special permit which is seldom granted.

7. The Soviets proposed that West Berlin be declared a free city with the United Nations protecting the free city November 27, 1958.

8. West German visitors were refused free access to the Soviet sector and East Germany.

9. August 13, 1961, East Germany constructed a wall 28 miles long, dividing East Berlin from West Berlin, barring East Berliners from going to West Berlin and West Germany, and imprisoning 1,100,000 East Berliners.

10. East Germany required identification by all people at crossing except at check point Charlie at the Friedrichstrasse where military forces and Government personnel commands cross to East Berlin; narrowed the opening at check point Charlie, and erected red and white striped customs barrier gate at the seven crossing points.

This is the history of events so far seeking to destroy the quadripartite agreement. It is a salami tactic, cutting off a piece at a time until there is no salami left.

While we Americans have a sound legal position in Germany and Berlin, the Soviet and East German authorities are acting and because of lack of immediate Allied action the Soviet is cutting off the access routes. Allied forces and Government personnel have five agreed routes left for access to Berlin, three air corridors, the autobahn from Helmstedt to Berlin and the rail line through Marienborn. There are seven crossing points between East and West Berlin. How long these access routes will remain open is a matter of conjecture. The East German authorities claim that the Western Allied activities in sending our troops through East Berlin are violating a sovereign state's rights and are provocative.

The Western Allies, that is United States, United Kingdom, and France do not recognize East Germany as a sovereign state and do not recognize the German Democratic Republic as a legal government. Our legal position is that East Germany and East Berlin are parts of occupied territory under the jurisdiction of the Soviet, subject to veto by the Allied Control Council and the four commanders in Berlin, the Komandatura, and air access to Berlin along the three corridors from West Germany is and has been unrestricted since the end of World War II in 1945.

We claim the rights with respect to air access to Berlin derive from precisely the same source as do the rights of the U.S.S.R. in East Germany, and in East Berlin, namely the joint military defeat of the German Reich and the joint assumption of supreme authority over Germany. These rights are confirmed by the circumstances under which the Four Powers entered Germany, by their subsequent discussions and agreements, and by open and established practice over a period of 15 years.

Right of access to Berlin was spelled out by the following events:

1. November 14, 1944, European Advisory Commission agreement.

2. Talks of Gen. Lucius Clay with General Zhukov June 29, 1945, regarding the withdrawal of troops and entry of American forces into Berlin.

3. Correspondence between President Truman and Marshal Stalin at end of Berlin blockade, 1949.

4. Orders by Gen. Vassily Chiukov in ordering end of blockade in May 1949.

5. An agreement between Allied Powers in 1949 guaranteeing right of access.

What do these recent events in Berlin signify? The 28 mile wall in the heart of the city is more than a physical division of a city. To Americans it is a symbol of a division between freedom and tyranny, freedom in the West and imprisonment in the East. To Germans in the West it is a barrier to the unification of Germany, and a goad to their nationalistic aspirations. This wall is ghoulish. Walls in the past such as the Chinese wall were designed to keep people out, this wall is designed to keep people in. It separates families and relatives. It seals the fate of 1.1 million Germans.

It is a prelude to a separate unliteral peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic with U.S.S.R.

It is an affirmative action reaffirming the Soviet declaration that it no longer recognizes quadripartite control of East Berlin and Berlin..

It is an attack on the Potsdam agreement which promised unity of Germany.

It is a forerunner of blockade to West Berliners.

It is a forerunner of a customs toll on the autobahn which would hinder transportation of trade goods.

The wall blocking the crossing at the Brandenburg gate has a special and significant meaning. The Germans have always been neurotically attracted by symbols and the Brandenburg gate has been a symbol of the glorious past, a dreary present and an uncertain future. At the Bradenburg gate Germany was once united and here it was later divided. It was here that Napoleon celebrated his capture of Berlin, removed the Guadriga, a bronze statue of the goddess Victoria drawn by four horses, it was here that when Berlin split during the revolution of 1948, the Brandenburg gate became the symbol of reunification and freedom. Within its sight the Reichstag went up in flames. During the battle of Berlin, the U.S. Embassy which stood next to the Brandenburg gate was bombed and destroyed with other buildings in the vicinity. It is within its shadow that Hitler was entombed in his impenetrable bunker. It was here that the students of workers of East Germany on June 17, 1953, with sticks and stones stormed the barricades put up by the Red army until their bones were broken by Red enemy tanks.

What does Berlin mean to the world and to Germany. Without a unified Berlin there can never be a united Germany. West Berlin is a lighthouse of freedom in a dark totalitarian sea. It demonstrates the economic superiority of a free society which allows and encourages individual initiative. More important it is a shining model of political intellectual and spiritual freedom with which individual liberties are assured and the people chose those who govern them.

For the Western allies, free Berlin is their symbol, the evidence and the acid test of their unity, strength, and determination.

Berlin is a battleground of wills. The allies have a responsibility not to cause a nuclear war but they have a responsibility not to permit the freedom there to be whittled away by actions which in their small measurements, mean very little but when added up are substantial. France will not yield, Germany does not wish to yield, England seeks compromise, and the United States does not want to chance war. The U.S.S.R. wants to maintain what is theirs and to negotiate what belongs to the allies.

As General De Gaulle says, he is not concerned with the opinion of Nkrumah or world opinion. He will not negotiate to give away under threats, any of rights which belong to the Allied Powers. He demands that the Soviet come forward with plans to negotiate the overall problems, not Berlin alone.

The task is difficult and the decision is weighty. With faith and the courage of freemen our leaders will decide. Whatever the decision is, we can be certain that our strength is superior, our equipment is of the best, and our boys in Berlin are ready for any eventuality. What shall we do?

We must encourage our leaders to stand firm; to let our President know that we support a firm position and that any further yielding on our part must be accompanied not only by a written agreement but also by physical changes which will permit the carrying out of the Soviet written promise and will not prevent performance of the promise.

That in view of the past broken promises by the U.S.S.R. of free access to Berlin, West Germany must be given that portion of the Soviet sector between the East frontier of the allied sector and the west frontier of Berlin, an area of 110 miles, so that the air corridors and access routes cannot be interfered with. This should be in my opinion one of the areas of negotiation in regard to Berlin.

Once our leaders make a decision we cannot submit any further arguments or reasons for any proposed settlement. We must make our wishes known now. After the decision is made and agreement is reached, we must maintain our word and we must be as soldiers in the ranks, and understand that thereafter it is not for us to reason why but it is for us to do or cry.

What Do You Know About the World of Communism?—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, this is a continuation of the original article, "What Do You Know About the World of Communism?"

MORE HESITATION, EXPERIENCE AND PERHAPS CONFLICT POSSIBLE

British economist Alec Nove sums up the situation this way: "The imperfections and stresses inherent in the Soviet system of central planning are still there. Many Soviet economists are urging a major recasting of the system, to permit wider scope for free contract based on rational prices, to reduce the area of administrative decision and increase the importance of automatic forces in economic life * * * voices are advocating the use of linear programing methods, which would necessitate theoretical and practical changes of the first magnitude.

"None of this the actual reforms so far adopted have realized. The party leadership is, by tradition and self-interest, averse to automatic economic forces and will probably resist reforms on these lines. Yet this same party leadership is actively searching for new ways of achieving efficiency in its self-imposed task of overtaking America. Thus, there will be more hesitation, more experiments, and perhaps conflict as the search for a more rational basis of economic organization continues."

IS THE UNITED STATES AHEAD OF THE SOVIET UNION ECONOMICALLY?

Any attempt to compare the economies of the United States and the U.S.S.R. is a difficult, dangerous business. This is especially true if a short, concise treatment is desired. We must pay attention to at least three points:

1. Present levels of economic development (steel production, oil, hydroelectric power, etc.).

2. Differences in systems, purposes and emphasis of the two economies (to what use is a given ton of steel put? Why are there relatively fewer TV sets and bicycles in the Soviet Union than in the United States?).

3. Pace of development, rate of growth (Is the Soviet economy gaining on us?).

Levels of the two economies: In terms of a comparison of the two economies, across the board the United States is clearly ahead in almost all areas. Here are the comparative production statistics for a few representative industrial and consumer areas for the first 6 months of 1961:

		U.S.S.R.	United States
Iron	tons	25,000,000	28,500,000
Steel	do	34,900,000	44,859,000
Oil	do	79,700,000	188,700,000
Electric power	kilowatt-hours	157,000,000,000	422,706,000,000
Motor vehicles (buses, trucks, cars)		275,000	3,331,332
Television sets		934,000	2,801,000
Washers (washing machines)		583,000	15,237,000
Leather footwear (shoes)	pairs	220,000,000	304,304,000

Two critical points must always be kept in mind when comparing these statistics and before drawing any conclusions:

Point 1. The Soviet Union is operating at full capacity, with the throttle wide open. The United States is not operating at full capacity. (In steel production, for example, the United States regularly operates at something like 70–80 percent of capacity. United States 1961 steel capacity: 149 million tons.) This means that the Soviet Union is relatively weaker and the United States relatively stronger than present level statistics when compared, would suggest.

Point 2. The Soviet Union emphasizes heavy industry and military production—coal, steel, aircraft industries, etc. This is done deliberately at the expense of the hapless Soviet consumer who is asked to wait indefinitely for most luxuries and many items that we would regard as daily necessities.

Automobiles, stoves, refrigerators, color film, or mechanical toys are as scarce in the Soviet Union as they are expensive. This means that when the economic development and production are compared, across the board, the United States shows up substantially stronger, more fully developed and prosperous than the U.S.S.R.

DIFFERENCE IN PURPOSE TENDS TO EQUALIZE PRODUCTION LEVELS

The difference in the approach and emphasis of the two systems thus makes it necessary to evaluate these comparative statistics very cautiously. For two reasons, it would be wrong to jump to the conclusion that the United States is so far ahead of the Soviet Union economically, that the Kremlin will never catch up. Here are the two reasons:

1. The difference in systems or emphasis means that a ton of Soviet steel produces for the Soviet planners as much heavy industry or war material as a ton and a half or two tons of steel in America. The Soviets do not bother with a great many motorcycles or steel chairs for fancy high school auditoriums. Soviet steel is used primarily for heavy industry, not for luxury, consumer goods. In terms of national economic or military strength, this difference in purpose and system has the effect of equalizing the differences in present production levels of the two economies.

2. We dare not worry only about today. This has been one of our unfortunate American habits. As important as current comparisons are trends, what the picture is likely to look like 10 to 20 years from now. This is where the matter of pace of development or rate of growth comes in.

SOVIET GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT EXPANDING 6 TO 7 PERCENT ANNUALLY

At the time of World War I, the Russian economy was sixth or seventh among countries of the world. The Soviet economy is today second only to the United States.

In terms of the economic yardstick which economists call the gross national product (the national total output—industry, agriculture, services, etc.) the Soviet Union trails far behind the United States. The Soviet GNP has been expanding at a rate of 6 percent or 7 percent as compared with 3.5 percent for the United States.

This means that the Soviets can maintain or increase this rate of growth (and assuming that the U.S. rate remains constant) the Russians could eventually catch us. However, as the size of an economy goes up, the rate of growth usually goes down.

Speaking before the St. Louis Junior Chamber of Commerce in June of 1960, Vice President Nixon suggested that the problem had been exaggerated: "Mr. Khrushchev boasts," Nixon said, "that he will catch and pass us in 7 years. By any projection that can be applied, there is no possibility that the Soviet economy will overtake our own at any time in this century."

SOVIETS MAKING EVERY EFFORT TO CATCH UP TO U.S. ECONOMY

At the same time a report issued by our Central Intelligence Agency in May of 1960 estimated the Soviet GNP at $120 billion in 1950, $225 billion in 1960 and projected a figure of $420 billion in 1970. (U.S. GNP in 1958 was $440 billion.)

On one hand we should avoid the mistake of overestimating what the Soviets can do. At the same time, we dare not underestimate Soviet industrial and military power.

The simple conclusion is unavoidable that the Soviets have closed the military gap and are now making every effort to catch up with the United States economically.

HOW DO SALARIES AND PRICES COMPARE WITH THOSE IN THE UNITED STATES?

Prices, of course, only have meaning in terms of wages. Twenty-five years ago right here in America you could get a hamburger or a malt for 10 cents, a shoeshine for a nickel, a gallon of gasoline for 15 cents, and a haircut for a quarter.

But, the monthly salaries or weekly wages of the schoolteacher, the painter, the officeworker and the mechanic during those good old days were roughly one-third what they are today.

In other words, if a worker makes $100 a month, today he could not possibly afford to pay $2 or $3 for a pound of butter or a dozen eggs or $150 for an overcoat. This is, however, precisely the position in which the average Soviet citizen presently finds himself. And the fact that he pays comparatively small rent and little license tax does not make up the difference.

Study this representative list of average monthly salaries in the Soviet Union. Figures are based on information from the Monthly Labor Review of April 1960, as modified by more recent information out of the Soviet Union. (At the current official exchange rate one ruble is worth $1.10 United States).

Position or job:	*Monthly salary range (in rubles)*
Scientist	800–1,500
Professor	500–1,000
Docent (assistant professor)	300– 500
Plant manager	100– 300
Engineer	100– 200
Physician	100– 200
High school teacher	85– 150
Primary school teacher	60– 100
Skilled worker (toolmaker, lathe operator, accountant, etc.)	100– 250
Semiskilled worker (busdriver, storekeeper, etc.)	60– 90
Unskilled worker (street repair, janitor, maid, etc.)	40– 60

Here is a price list showing the cost in the Soviet Union today of some typical items. (A kopek roughly equals a penny.)

Food

Small loaf of bread, 12 kopeks.
Pound of butter, 3 rubles.
Medium size chicken, 3–4 rubles.
Dozen eggs, 2½ rubles.
Pound of sugar, 1 ruble.
Pound of apples, 2 rubles.

Clothing

Man's suit, 110 rubles and above.
Man's overcoat, 150 rubles and above.
Leica camera, 160 rubles.
Fountain pen, 2 rubles.
Television set, 250 rubles.
Automobile, 2,500–4,000 rubles.

Try this experiment. Make your own comparison. Take this price list to a supermarket and a department store. Put down after each item the price for which it is being sold here in America. Then, find out what is the current average salary of a teacher, a painter, an office worker, a mechanic in the United States. You will be surprised at the results.

HOW DOES THE COMMUNIST SYSTEM IN CHINA DIFFER FROM THE SOVIET SYSTEM IN RUSSIA?

Both Russia and China are Communist. The Soviet and the Chinese Communist Party subscribe to the same basic tenets of Marxism-Leninism. Moscow and Peiping each regard the United States as its principal enemy.

Khrushchev and Mao would equally like to bury us in order to make it easier to impose totalitarian communism on the remaining free nations of the world. On the

questions of ruthlessness or hypocrisy it's clearly a tossup. These are the unpleasant facts of life which we dare not ignore.

At the same time, in our own interest, we would do well to remind ourselves occasionally that Russia is Russia and China is China. This obvious (if sometimes neglected) fact has conditioned or created certain differences in communism as a system and a way of life in China as compared with Russia. There are at least three important areas of difference: cultural tradition, political organization, and stage of economic development.

Cultural tradition: The Chinese cultural tradition, the environment in which the Chinese Communists operate, is primarily Asian in its roots. The Soviet system is primarily European. Mao Tse-tung may have had a point when he said: "Russian history produced the Russian system * * * Chinese history will produce the Chinese system."

Marxian concepts in the Chinese language have a different image, a somewhat different meaning from the same concept when expressed in Russian. Further, despite the Communist attempts to stamp out Confucianism and China's traditional ways, the evidence suggests that most Chinese—even party members—remain surprisingly Chinese.

The Chinese Communists have consistently attempted to adjust their approaches to the Chinese environment and traditions.

Political organization: The Chinese Peoples Republic versus the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—the very titles suggest basic differences in terms of the organization of the state. There are, for example, autonomous regions in Communist China but no separate republics—even for largely non-Chinese areas such as Sinkiang and Tibet (Inner Mongolia is now predominately Chinese in composition anyway).

Chinese Communist Party leadership has been welded together, steeled, and forged into a well-coordinated team. Despite Mao Tse-tung's very real importance as the great leader, it would appear that there is a bit more of the true committee rule in the Chinese than in the Soviet system.

Certainly, the decisionmaking process in Communist China, as in the Soviet Union, takes place strictly at the top. The Chinese Communist Party is largely modeled after the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R. But the Chinese Communists have consistently made a greater effort to convey the image of "popular participation in government" than has been the case in the Soviet Union.

Stage of economic development: China is a have-not nation. The Soviet Union is (relatively) a have nation. To put it another way, the Soviet Union, in theoretical terms, now qualifies as a metropolitan area, while China remains an agricultural countryside.

If there is still imbalance between Soviet industry and agriculture, there is far less than in China—and the imbalance is somewhat corrected by the extensive foreign trade of the U.S.S.R. Further, while the economic picture in the Soviet Union appears to be improving, recent evidence suggests that the situation in China is becoming worse.

The imbalance between China's vast, growing population and China's relatively decreasing amount of arable land (which means between population and food supply) is a source of much greater difficulty in the case of China—and that difficulty is increasing with every passing day.

These "stage of development" differences (and growing difficulties) led the Chinese Communists, in desperation, to introduce the communes in 1957. Accordingly, Communist China has developed economic (agricultural and industrial) and political (administrative, military and party) functions and practices which are very different from organizations found in the U.S.S.R. for performance of the same functions.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Address by Senator Kuchel Relating to Air Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last December 7, I made a speech at the University of Southern California in connection with the California State Department of Health weeklong seminar of air pollution.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the comments I made at that time be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNITY ACTION FOR CLEAN AIR

(Speech of THOMAS H. KUCHEL, U.S. Senator, before closing session of Fifth Annual Medical Conference on Air Pollution sponsored by the California State Department of Public Health, Thursday, December 7, 1961, at 1:15 p.m. in the Hancock Auditorium, University of Southern California, Los Angeles)

The obnoxious effects of the 20th century phenomenon known as smog have been realized for more than a decade and a half. The possibly dire consequences have been a subject of concern nearly that long.

As we take cognizance of those facts, we should recall that the first murky occurrences reported from Los Angeles in the hectic years of World War II were regarded for quite some time more as a topic for banter by comedians than as an ominous warning that the American people might have to pay a high price for the benefits of what we call technological advances in our mode of living and our economy.

During the subsequent period, the seriousness of air pollution has become more fully appreciated. The holding of a meeting such as this is a testimonial to an awareness in at least certain quarters that we cannot tolerate continued befouling of the atmosphere which is essential to human existence, let alone more contamination.

I can tell you—as one who has been in the forefront of efforts to obtain congressional appreciation for the importance of this curse—that it has not been easy to awaken persons not exposed to smog-caused misery and discomfort to the necessity of attacking it on varied and numerous fronts. Still, it is gratifying that since enactment of the Air Pollution Research Act, which I had the honor of introducing in Congress back in 1955, the scientific onslaught has been greatly stepped up and broadened. I am pleased that over the past 7 years, total appropriations by Congress to Federal agencies for research and investigation have risen from a pitiful level of under $1 million to the figure of $8,800,000 for the fiscal year in which we now are operating.

Ordinarily, I am loath to have Congress take on costly new programs especially when Government is urged to foot the bill for activities which basically are a major concern of private citizens and industries. But when the fundamental health and safety of millions of people is jeopardized by a monster with ever-expanding grasp, I certainly feel that expenditures—and substantial sums, not mere token outlays—by the Federal Government are fully warranted. Hence, I am glad to have this opportunity of pointing out that during the time since Congress agreed with me on the urgent need for Federal leadership and participation altogether more than $30 million has been voted to finance research, investigation, measurement, observation, training, and other effort under the direction of the U.S. Public Health Service.

Now the question arises, What has been accomplished? Along with asking that, many want to know: Is it enough?

I must leave it to the technical and scientific people to report on their achievements and progress but I can tell you that there seems to be sound reason for feeling our efforts to put an end to further pollution and then to reduce the discharge of contaminants are far less than the public welfare requires.

This is the judgment of, among others, the two most recent occupants of the White House. Both President Kennedy and President Eisenhower have told Congress specifically that it is imperative to broaden our programs and to intensify our labors in the air pollution field. In my own capacity as a legislator, I say it is foolhardy to believe that we are doing everything which might be undertaken to protect ourselves against this insidious danger giving mounting concern in more and more places across our Nation.

Lately there has been widespread alarm, bordering on impatience in some neighborhoods and certain strata of the population, about the danger of radioactive fallout. Such apprehension is directed at a event which—God willing—may never happen. Yet, over the course of a year, sometimes for prolonged periods of day after day, often recurring with exasperating frequency, millions and millions of Americans are exposed repeatedly to a danger not only with us but growing in fierceness and extent, one which may be far more serious than even the gloomiest among us suspect.

On that point, let me observe that since American eyes were opened to the repetitious nature of Los Angeles smog there has been a spreading national consciousness that pollution in various forms is already causing heavy damage, both physical and monetary in widely separated areas. This condition cannot be ignored.

Here in California alone, we have observed the symptoms of an undeniably menacing situation in such physically unlike communities as San Diego, the bay area, the farming sections of San Joaquin Valley, and the vicinity of our own State capital of Sacramento. On the opposite side of the continent, measurements this year in the National Capital and its environs in Virginia and Maryland brought frightening disclosure that concentrations of certain contaminants—fortunately for only brief periods and at rather wide intervals—sometimes have exceeded what is tolerable under the regulations and standards devised for the safety of people in Los Angeles.

As a legislator whose voluminous correspondence opens the eyes to multitudinous concerns and problems of American citizens, I can tell you that in a good many parts of our land there is a rising demand for drastic and sweeping action and for speed in taking it.

I am gratified that a wide spectrum of research projects has been financed by the Federal Government under authority of the law which bears my name. But it is obvious that we cannot protect the people's health by confining our efforts to the laboratory or making experiments in private. I agree it is essential to investigate the physiological consequences of exposure to smog, in order to know what elements must be removed from the atmosphere soonest and to determine to what degree we can tolerate certain emissions. I favor the establishment of atmosphere-measuring stations and scientific analysis of specimens collected.

At the same time, I fear that preoccupation with purely scientific studies may lead to an undesirable and avoidable invocation of needlessly stringent regulation. I am disturbed about the possibility that delay in encouraging other action may result in Federal invasion of what I characteristically have deemed the jurisdiction of municipal, county, regional, and State authorities. I would very much dislike to see the person of Uncle Sam clothed in a policeman's uniform, using the authority and power of a central government to act as a cop on the beat ordering incinerators or furnaces out of use or ruling automobiles off the road. Pressure for stern and far-reaching governmental action exists and is mounting, however.

As a sample of what may be in store, observe the quite momentous step taken in this very State. California at the moment is on the verge of specifying the particular types of devices or gadgets which must be attached to automotive vehicles in order to prevent the discharge of toxic elements injurious to humans, livestock, growing things, and even inanimate objects.

Back in the Nation's Capital, one of my Senate colleagues is sponsoring a bill—one which I am not yet convinced must be enacted to safeguard our people, but nevertheless, a proposal with plausible appeal to many—which would go a long way in the exercise of Federal police power. Among other things that bill would authorize abatement procedures similar to those provided in the Water Pollution Control Act, with Federal cease-and-desist orders and judicial enforcement as the climax. Unless results are achieved by voluntary measures, including perfection and use of devices to lower contamination, or effective controls at the community or area level, the time may very well come when Congress concludes that such far-reaching action is warranted.

There is a crying need for more interest, greater expression of responsibility, and larger investments of ingenuity in this situation. I am disturbed by many complaints about foot-dragging. I had hoped that industry would display more concern about its part in checking the growth of this monster. I likewise hoped I could play a role in staving off precipitate legislation which might do

violence to our concept of private enterprise and initiative by working to have Congress put up money for research that might pave the way for voluntary measures and realistic local controls.

Rightly or wrongly, the finger of suspicion about the primary source of the most objectionable air contamination is directed at motor vehicles. If that is so, it would seem to behoove the automotive industry to expend more energy and to clamor persistently for guidance, for data and facts, and for ideas. One would think that a segment of the American economy so imaginative as to conceive and foster design and production of conveniences and comforts such as automobile radios and air conditioners would have been equally eager to do everything possible toward reducing the amount of aerial garbage overhanging crowded city streets on too many days.

Here in southern California we do have an encouraging example of what can be done by public-spirited industries. I am heartened that our petroleum refiners, the big steel plant in a neighboring county, and assorted other manufacturing establishments recognized their obligations to install apparatus or alter operating methods so that contaminating discharges into the atmosphere might be curtailed. In different areas of the Nation such as Pittsburgh, Pa., it has been demonstrated that similar steps were possible to promote the public welfare.

Likewise, California has pointed the way toward sound and fair control procedures at the metropolitan area level. This use of governmental power is in accordance with American traditions and ideals. By creating air pollution control districts for Los Angeles County and the San Francisco Bay region, the State legislature has afforded a means of formulating programs tailored to fit peculiar local conditions and to attack particular local problems.

Because of the complexity and spreading blight of this problem, there appears to be both room and need for greater consultation and collaboration in efforts at its solution.

Many agencies of government at different levels, along with industries and businesses whose products and operations may be factors in or affected by air pollution and scientific and civic associations, undoubtedly could benefit themselves and advance the cause of cleaner air by swapping knowledge, evaluating ideas, and charting remedial courses along which all might travel.

A real desire to give practical application to findings of researchers and investigators could open the way to concrete achievements and thus be a boon to mankind.

Progress along these lines should be stepped up. In the hope of accelerating it, I twice have introduced in Congress legislation which I feel would be helpful to all with a stake and duty in remedying this condition existing so widely today. I am committed to strengthening the leadership role of the National Government, as Presidents Kennedy and Eisenhower recommended. To my regret, while the Senate twice has approved this legislation, there has been no committee consideration, and consequently no floor action, in the House of Representatives. I deplore such delay and trust that the next session in 1962 will find our colleagues in the other Chamber more disposed to give added impetus to Federal activities and efforts.

My proposal is no panacea. Its enactment would not result in overnight elimination of the chemical fumes and other contaminants which are suspected of making bronchial diseases more acute, of causing fruits and vegetables to shrivel, of bringing on tears and coughing, of lowering downtown visibility. But I do consider it imperative and highly desirable. Therefore I solicit your help in overcoming the apathy which has stalled it in the other branch of Congress.

Briefly, this bill would broaden our knowledge of the scope and nature of air pollution problems and give impetus to my thought that there is a great potential in voluntary action by informed people. It would not put Uncle Sam in the role of a cop on the beat but it would have him pointing the way as a guide and focusing attention on the need for practical measures.

The legislation which I say has Senate approval and is pending in the House would empower the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and, under him, the Surgeon General to call conferences, hold hearings, and make investigations whenever requested by State or local officials or whenever he believes such moves appropriate for the purpose of ascertaining all relevant facts about major pollution problems which may affect or be of concern to American communities or which are interstate in extent or character. The contemplated hearing boards would make reports with recommendations but, in respect for the concept of limiting the exercise of what are considered police powers, their conclusions, findings, and suggestions would not be binding or imposed upon any person, agency, or organization.

This is a minimum next step forward, in my estimation. It is a reasonable one and it has been advocated by two different administrations in Washington.

In the meantime, the Congress is awaiting reports on a so-called crash investigation into the part motor vehicles play in air pollution. Within the next year a comprehensive report is due from the U.S. Public Health Service, resulting from studies carried on with funds which I was privileged first to induce Congress to appropriate in order that the Schenck Act would not be a meaningless collection of words on the statute books. This report may have far-reaching significance and implications. It may result in greater public demand that Uncle Sam do something in the role of policeman. It may give rise to proposals that the Congress lay down standards of air purity under the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution or public welfare concepts of using Federal authority as it has done in the field involving foods and drugs.

We have come a good distance since the first feeble moves, back in 1954, to have the Federal Government take part in the war on smog. I regret that progress has not been greater, that action has been slow. At the same time I feel we have reason to be somewhat encouraged by developments since President Eisenhower set up at my urging 7 years ago the Ad Hoc Interdepartmental Committee on Community Air Pollution Problems. There is no denying the inescapable necessity of seeing that our vaunted industrialization and mechanization and technical progress do not choke off the supply of air we once thought limitless and inexhaustible.

A conference such as this is evidence of a spreading awareness of the need and wide responsibility for grappling with a menace of grave proportions. I trust that among its results will be constructive indications to the Congress of additional legislative steps to improve the protection of our people against polluted air. I trust that it will intensify the determination of all attending to fight as vigorously as they are capable to awaken all elements of our people about the importance of overcoming the problem.

Our Disappearing Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in my remarks an address delivered by Merrill E. Shoup, of Colorado Springs, Colo., on our gold situation. Mr. Shoup is a business leader, lawyer, and economist. He has long been a champion of sound money and integrity in our Federal fiscal policies. He is president of the Golden Cycle Corp., producers of gold at Cripple Creek, Colo., the Holly Sugar Corp., and a number of other enterprises. I am sure his comments on our gold reserves, and the necessity for increasing our supply of gold, will be read with great interest and profit.

The address follows:

OUR DISAPPEARING DOLLAR

One of the gravest perils confronting this Nation today—hundred-megaton bombs, intercontinental ballistic missiles, the cold war, and the Berlin crisis notwithstanding—is our disappearing dollar and its effect upon 185 million Americans. Undoubtedly it is natural to become more thoroughly exercised over the prospects of mass incineration in a nuclear war than over the threat of collapse of the national economy via the "funny money" road down which we are traveling during these days of money managers. But we must keep up our defenses against both of these disasters, if we hope to survive as the greatest nation on earth.

KEEP ECONOMY STRONG

Defense of our Nation against armed attack of any kind demands that we be strong economically, that we look to our financial system with an eye to keeping our business and industry and all the rest supporting our Military Establishment just as alert and robust as are our Armed Forces.

It, therefore, behooves us to examine what has been happening to our dollar, why it is literally disappearing in value, and what may be expected as the result of a continuation of present policies, or of certain suggested changes in existing policies.

There lately has been a drive on, supported by a curious combination of New York bankers and liberal congressional groups, among others, to seek repeal of provisions under the Federal Reserve Act which require the Federal Reserve System to maintain a gold reserve equal to 25 percent of the Federal Reserve's notes outstanding, plus 25 percent of the deposit liabilities of the Federal Reserve banks.

This comes at a time when our gold reserves have dwindled to a point at which they are now insufficient to meet even the legitimate foreign claims upon our gold.

Prior to 1934, any citizen of the United States could own gold and at any time convert paper dollars into gold or gold into paper dollars at any bank he chose. This fact was the basis for great confidence in the American dollar, since every American, and every foreigner, knew that American money was backed with gold.

On March 9, 1933, and thereafter, the Federal Government, through Presidential or-

ders, acts of Congress, and other devices, forced all citizens to deliver their gold to the U.S. Treasury and to accept therefor paper money. By May of 1933, not only had orders been issued forbidding the possession of gold coins by our citizens, but provisions had been made for flat money, the devaluation of the dollar and other forms of currency depreciation. From that time down to the present our Nation has been on a managed currency basis built upon flat money which, in simple terms, means that the value of our dollar is secured only by the Government's say-so as to what is legal tender.

HOW I O U'S BECOME MONEY

Managed currency is based upon monetizing the public debt, which briefly can be described as a procedure something like this:

(a) The Federal Government spends or gives away dollars;

(b) Then it prints I O U's to itself in the form of bonds or notes;

(c) It next turns these notes over to the banks who list them as assets; that is, dollar credits to the Government;

(d) And, finally, the bank then uses these Government I O U's as security for making outside loans—thus creating money out of public debts!

It is easy to see why I have used the expression "funny money," for indeed this is what we are talking about.

Now, the question may be asked, what has been the result of our having managed currency? And the answer has several parts, including these:

1. We now have a dollar worth about 40 cents as compared to the 1939 dollar, and the value of our dollar continues to depreciate at the rate of at least 3 percent per year in its purchasing value.

2. Labor has been robbed by taking away a fixed standard of buying power through increasing inflation.

3. The incentive for people to save has been blunted and the security inherent in life insurance, pensions and fixed return investments undermined.

4. We are losing out in our world trade position by being undersold in our own markets, because we cannot produce as cheaply or as efficiently as foreign nations such as West Germany, Japan, Belgium, Canada, and others.

5. We have been saddled with an all-time peak in taxation which continues to grow. Today, taxes take at least 35 percent of our national income.

6. Many of the States in our Union have been brought into deep financial difficulties.

7. Our real money—gold—is taking leave of the United States. Foreign nations are building up their gold reserves at our expense.

History shows us the folly of our ways. Nation after nation—at least 20 major ones in the period since 1790—have tried the managed currency route and have brought to themselves only inflation and financial disaster.

INTERNATIONAL DILEMMA

Must we continue to go down the same road, and can we afford to make the situation even worse by wiping out convertibility entirely through elimination of the 25 percent gold backing of our Federal Reserve notes? I think the answer is quite obvious.

Internationally, we have created for ourselves a very real dilemma. Now we have a dollar of two standards: On the one hand the American citizen does not have the right to demand gold for his paper dollars; while, on the other hand, any foreigner can demand gold for his paper dollars and settlement of other obligations. Thus we have an outrageous situation in which the foreigner receives a protection and a privilege which does not exist for our own citizens, the latter having been deprived not only of such protection, but also his constitutional rights.

Those New York City bankers, and others, whom I have mentioned as being the protagonists in the scheme for eliminating the 25 percent gold backing of Federal Reserve notes and thereby abolishing entirely convertibility of the U.S. dollar, should be advocating, for the good of the country's economy, plans to build back the gold reserves behind our paper money to a full 100 percent. Accomplishment of this goal would halt further inflation and bring our dollar back to a point at which it would once again be worth a full 100 cents.

Perhaps I am old fashioned, but I still believe what I was taught to the effect that a banker is a trustee for his depositors and customers and certainly has a moral obligation, if not a legal one, to do everything in his power to preserve the integrity and purchasing power of the dollar. We seem to be lacking in leadership along these lines among the eminent financiers of today. When one compares the theories advanced by such leading figures as H. C. Alexander, chairman of the board of the Morgan Guaranty Trust Co., New York City; Per Jacobson, Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund, and others, with the great financial leadership of the elder J. P. Morgan, head of the House of Morgan, and an outstanding patriot whose first concern always was the maintenance of the status of the American dollar throughout the world, when one makes such comparison, the latter-day financiers simply are not even in the running. Indeed, how much the Nation needs a man like J. P. Morgan today to straighten out the mess into which we have drifted.

DOLLAR IS AT LOW EBB

There are thoughtful people around the country who are as much exercised as I about the state of the U.S. fiscal policy and the low ebb to which the dollar has dropped. Let me quote to you a statement published by the Mining Record, whose editor is a knowledgeable and respected author:

"Sometimes we are appalled at the lack of knowledge of monetary history of even some of our great financial leaders. If we removed all of the gold backing from our Federal Reserve notes, regardless of how theoretical it now is, those Federal Reserve notes would then have no security behind them except the faith and credit of the United States, which is at a new low. These Federal Reserve notes would then be in the same class as the paper money issued by the Continental Congress and which was not backed by any gold or silver reserve. That currency soon became worthless, as we mentioned in a previous editorial. Remember the phrase, 'not worth a Continental.'

"History teaches that any nation which has resorted to paper money not backed by a gold or silver reserve, or convertible into gold or silver, cannot long escape inflation. That is happening to us right now. How often must we learn this lesson?

"We need a gold reserve for the same reason that we need a bill of rights in our State and Federal Constitutions. If these theorists who preach that we need nothing behind our money except the faith and credit of the United States are right, then we should by the same argument do away with the Bill of Rights and rely solely upon the promises of our public officials and legislators to guarantee our fundamental personal and property rights. Since legislative bodies repeatedly pass laws which violate these fundamental rights despite these bills of rights, a fact proven by the number of cases each year declaring such laws unconstitutional, how can we expect Congress, in the absence of some check, such as the gold standard, to protect the credit and solvency of this Nation and the integrity of its money. The present gold crisis best proves that Congress itself must be subject to restraints. As a matter of fact, our Federal Constitution nowhere gives Congress the power to print money. It specifically authorizes Congress to 'coin money and regulate the value thereof.' And we repeat what we said in a former editorial, those who drafted the Federal Constitution and who used the word 'coin' instead of 'print' had already experienced the worthlessness of the Continental currency.

"A gold reserve for our paper money is as necessary to the value of our money and to the financial stability of our Nation as the Bill of Rights in our Federal and State Constitutions are to the safety of our lives, our property, and our freedom.

"Again, a gold reserve puts a limit upon the amount of printing-press money that can be issued. Our laws now require a 25-percent gold reserve. That means that before the Federal Reserve bank can issue a $5 bill, it must have $1.25 in gold as a reserve for that $5 bill. The amount of money that the Federal Reserve bank can issue is limited by the amount of gold it has. It can only issue four times as much Federal Reserve notes as it has gold. Take away that limitation, take away that gold reserve, and there is no brake, no restraint upon the right of the Federal Reserve bank to issue paper money except commonsense and good judgment. And as history has proved, it is a fatal mistake for any government to rest fundamental rights solely upon that basis. That's why we have a Bill of Rights in our Federal and State Constitutions.

"Frankly, we see no solution to the dilemma that we are now in with our hundreds of billions, even a trillion dollars or more, of public and private debt. Must it end in a wild inflation, wherein the value of all bonds, all promissory notes, life insurance policies, pensions, social security reserves, and the like, will be wiped out?

"This country is like a man who mortgages his house and whoops it up with the mortgage money. There comes a time when the mortgage must be paid. That time may be approaching for the United States. No restraints are practiced either by government or economic groups. All want more. Each one is trying to outdo the other. We have floors under many basic commodities. We have minimum hours and minimum wages. The only commodity of any consequence which has a limitation or ceiling on its price is gold. Gold is the only stabilizing influence, and yet there are those in this country who would throw away this stabilizer."

Not only are we damaging ourselves, but we are helping our enemies with our prodigal monetary policies. One of the greatest weapons in Russia's arsenal for carrying on the cold war is the mounting pile of gold bricks stacked in the vaults of Moscow's state bank. While the United States has been allowing her gold reserves to slip through her fingers, Russia has been building hers, and there remains little question that the Soviet Government is dedicated to the accumulation and hoarding of a large stock of gold for the sake of the economic and political power possession of such reserves provides. It is a distinct possibility that, when our U.S. gold reserve is gone and the run on our American dollar continues, other nations will take note of this run, realize that the American dollar is in bad shape, start liquidating their American holdings and demand gold from the United States. This could become a stampede, result of which would be that much of the remaining gold in our stockpile would end up in Russia and, when our gold reserve is exhausted, our dollar would be worthless.

RUSSIA STOCKPILING GOLD

This may seem to be an exaggeration, but let me tell you that it is not. I was a delegate to the International Sugar Confer-

ence at Geneva, Switzerland, in the fall of 1958. For 30 days I sat next to the No. 1 Russian delegate. Three or four days after the Conference began, this Russian official discovered that I was interested in gold and said to me substantially this:

"Your country is so stupid (he may not have used exactly those words, but his meaning would have been unmistakable even for a 3-year-old child). You are treating your gold as a cancer or a plague which has to be removed before the patient can be cured of whatever it is you are attempting to cure. Russia is accumulating gold. One day we will back our trade ruble 100 percent with gold and make it completely convertible. Then your Nation, so far as world trade is concerned, will become secondary, and you will be of no further bother to us."

Plain talk. The Russians have a habit of telling all the world what they intend to do in such seemingly fantastic terms that no one pays much attention to them. But, ultimately, they seem to do exactly what they have forewarned. I think perhaps they enjoy chuckling to themselves about how they can delude us in this manner by telling us the truth in such terms that we disbelieve, to our own later discomfort.

Elimination of the 25-percent gold reserve, which is the last vestige of protection for the American dollar, would place in the money managers' hands decisions as to what financial policies should be adopted for the welfare of more than 185 million Americans. Mr. Alexander, whom I mentioned earlier, insists that sound money can be achieved only by sound, honest, wise fiscal and economic management, but men being men and human, what assurance is there that a man or group of men exist in the United States or in all the world who, in his or their judgment, know what is best for the American citizen? What this Nation needs is sound money and not money managers. Paper money managers are, after all, mere men, not supermen, and because our record of the last 30 years has been a failure, spokesmen and sponsors of continued paper money management are on the defensive. America's own rainmakers and paper money managers are now far from receiving worship by their fellow man. Theoretically, paper money management, like socialism or communism, holds out the always unfulfilled promise of utopia. There may be one man in these United States with capabilities to manage our money, our pocketbooks, and our lives wisely, prudently, and successfully. If such man does live, he has to date failed to offer his services to our political administration in Washington. The paper money managers, who have enjoyed with the spenders in our Washington administration a blank check arrangement on John Doe Public's bank account, have accomplished some rather questionable results. Under irredeemable paper currency, John Doe Public is helpless to put an end to Government financial rampages; but, under a gold coin standard and redeemable paper money, he could demand gold for his paper money at any time he felt his Government was handling its finances unwisely. This enabled John Doe Public to put a brake on the spenders.

PUBLIC CAN'T HALT SPENDING

During World War II we spent $350 billion and suffered 1 million casualties, all to save the rest of the world. Since World War II we have spent or committed ourselves to spend additional billions of dollars to save the world and have suffered many additional thousands of casualties in police action, so-called. John Doe Public might well question where we are heading with these outlays of money and lives; and he might also look askance at some of our other actions, such as our coziness with Russia, the sellout of Nationalist China, the Korean affair, and the continued spending policies originated by men tried and found wanting. But Mr. Public cannot call a halt to our spending because he has been stripped of his right to demand gold for his paper money. Since 1940, he might have at times been worried by the increase in paper money in circulation and by the increase in bank deposits, but could do nothing about it. Maybe John Doe Public is the loser under any money standard and maybe he will lose under the gold standard, but one thing is certain, proven by past history, recent history, and events reported daily in our newspapers: his losses under the gold standard have been negligible compared to his losses under irredeemable paper money management. Mr. Public enjoyed peace, prosperity, progress and individual dignity from 1814 to 1914, when the then world leader, England, adhered to a gold standard.

DOUBLE STANDARD IS EVIL

Speaking further of paper money managers, it is interesting to note that they apparently do not trust each other or subscribe to a super, super money manager who would control the paper money issue for the entire world. Paper money managers in the world today settle balances between themselves in gold. Out of one side of the paper money manager's mouth comes all the glittering promises of security, benefits, high standard of living, as sales talk to American citizens. And it has been a good sales talk; it had to be, to talk Americans into giving up their gold in exchange for paper. From the other side of the paper money manager's mouth comes the idea that trade balances must be settled in gold—paper money is not acceptable. There is something evil about any double currency standard, when that standard makes available American citizens' gold to foreigners and denies that same redeemable dollar and hard money to the citizens of this country.

The only alternative to chaotic conditions (wars, currency deterioration, dictators, and all the rest) is peaceful trade between individuals, communities, states, and nations. There can be no real trade under irredeemable paper currency in which John Doe Public has no confidence. The hope of a safe future, not only in the United States but the entire world, lies in a prompt return to the gold standard and not its complete elimination.

In summary, let me emphasize these points:

1. Exchange of the world's goods is a continuous thing. It is either accomplished peacefully or by force. In order to accomplish the peaceful exchange of goods, it is necessary that there be a currency available as a medium of exchange in which all individual people have confidence. People have had confidence in gold for several thousand years, in spite of the suggested substitutes and efforts to discredit gold made throughout history by the tyrants, dictators, and would-be world managers.

2. Trustees of our Treasury's gold have, since 1949, sold our gold to foreigners at the bargain price of $35 an ounce with the result that our remaining gold reserves are now insufficient even to meet the remaining foreign claims on our gold. Solution to our having insufficient assets to meet our liabilities is to be found in building up our assets and reducing our liabilities, not in giving away our remaining insufficient assets.

GOLD STANDARD IS NEEDED

3. For some 30 years American citizens have agreed to and lived with the mandate of the money and economic managers of our Government in Washington who have denied individual American citizens and taxpayers the right to buy gold from their own Treasury at $35 an ounce, while foreigners have had these rights and benefits. Meantime, and during this interval, wars, tensions, and inflation have proved that the hopes and dreams of successfully substituting money management by fallible human beings for the money management of the gold standard is tantamount to pursuing a will-o'-the-wisp.

4. We must go back to the gold standard and stop the further watering of dollars as we would stop the watering of stocks. Gold has been the measure of value for more than 28 centuries, gold is power, and nations with gold have always led the world. Gold is the one medium of exchange understood by everyone in the world.

5. We must never consider for a moment eliminating the 25-percent gold backing now behind our paper money, but instead must start rebuilding the 25-percent reserve to 100 percent to stop the further spread of inflation and bring our dollar back to respectability and a worth of 100 cents.

6. We must return to the citizens of the United States their constitutional right to own gold and must make paper and gold completely and freely convertible.

7. We must make an immediate reappraisal of our oversea military and foreign aid commitments to cut down our expenditures.

8. The Federal Government must balance its budget, retire debt, and reduce the banking system holdings of Government bonds.

9. We must use every effort to increase our exports and decrease our imports. To increase our exports, American business will have to become more efficient and American labor will have to stop its yearly demands for automatic pay raises unless it can increase its productivity proportionately.

10. The campaign to induce investment abroad should be terminated and an investment abroad must not be favored by preferential tax treatment or other subsidies.

ELIMINATE FIAT MONEY

11. There must be a gradual but progressive rise in the reserve ratio, until currency and deposit liabilities are fully covered by gold. This may require revaluation of the price of gold, but any revaluation of the price of gold should occur only in connection with a return to full reserve currency .

12. Only by the elimination of fiat money, the return to a complete gold standard, and the rejection of money managers can the American people regain control of their finances, stop the ever-increasing inflation, and enjoy the economic future to which this Nation is entitled.

13. The gold standard automatically enforces restrictions on inflationary schemes of the politicians. We must not let the all too small remaining 25 percent gold backing of our paper money be removed. If it is, the last vestige of protection for our present 40-cent dollar will be removed, and then we can be as sure as we are that the sun will rise in the morning that our dollar can sink to a value of 5 cents to 10 cents. I need not tell you what this will do to life-insurance proceeds, retirement funds, fixed investments, and pensions. Those of us who have worked to pay life-insurance premiums with dollars of value ranging from 100 cents to 40 cents do not want our wives, children, or other beneficiaries to receive 5-cent dollars for their support. The American people, if they have any interest in their future, must arouse themselves and make known to their Congressmen, Senators, and other public officials their determination to halt any further tinkering with the gold reserve behind our paper money.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION NEEDED

The Government recently stopped U.S. Treasury sales of silver in commercial markets at a pegged price of about 91 cents, which is less than the cost of production. This action would seem to indicate a realization of the folly of a silver policy which has resulted in a steady drain on our Nation's silver reserves while depressing the entire

silver mining industry. It is a step in the right direction.

Now, if the Congress will take similar action in regard to gold, moving toward a free market in which the price of gold can rise to levels at which resumption of production will be economically feasible, and the drain on our reserves stopped, then the trends toward more inflation and complete devaluation of our currency may at least be reversed.

The tragedy of our disappearing dollar and its terrible effects on every man, woman, and child in this country, our total economy and our future as a nation, cannot be overemphasized, nor can the urgent need for corrective action. May God give us the wisdom and foresight to do what must be done before it is too late.

Bank Mergers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include testimony presented by me on December 4, 1961, before the Comptroller of the Currency in re the application of First National City Bank of New York and National Bank of Westchester to merge under the Bank Merger Act of 1960. My statement follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

I am particularly pleased to participate in the first open merger hearing held by the Comptroller of the Currency, because in a way we are at the crossroads.

Either we maintain our traditional way of competition or we change our direction and travel the way of cartelization. Industrial and business mergers never were more expansive than today. Concentration of economic power has become inordinate. Leading the field are financial entities.

I shall review the debilitating effect of the merger history of banks in this country at some length when I discuss the relevant factors which require denial of this application. But at the outset I think it imperative to call certain facts to your attention.

The number of banks have shrunk from 28,921 in 1929 to 13,971 in 1960.

Monolithic banks like First National City have emerged as a result of merger after merger and, as this application illustrates, continue to seek ever greater power through mergers.

The viselike grip of an oligopoly of banks dominates the banking interests in all large cities. The five largest commercial banks in every large metropolitan area save two held more than 50 percent of the commercial bank deposits in 1960. In the majority of such areas they held over 75 percent of such deposits. In 26 of such areas the 5 largest commercial banks held over 90 percent of all commercial deposits. In most of the metropolitan areas three commercial banks held from 65 to 96.9 percent[1] of all commercial deposits. Thus, a few banking leaders in almost all significant economic centers hold the power of life and death over industry and trade.

Lord Acton said: "Power corrupts. Absolute power corrupts absolutely."

Those banks already have absolute power, and they thus have the power to corrupt absolutely. Their officers hold in their hands the destinies of many enterprises. Thus, I am informed, when a large motion picture company—defendant in an antitrust suit—engaged in consent-decree negotiations with the Department of Justice, it thought it necessary to bring an officer of a bank with which it had a revolving loan. An antitrust violator thought the voice of its financier as to the scope of an antitrust judgment should be heeded.

I have referred to the corruptability of great power. This applicant and its fellow bank merger applicants, such as the Morgan Guaranty Trust Co., furnish proof of such corruptability. Instead of expressing concern over the degree of banking concentration in all financial centers, they advance such concentration elsewhere as a justification for further augmentation of banking concentration in their own local areas. This is an immoral argument. This is an immoral application.

Should we promote the creation of a huge banking cartel through mergers?

This application would scotch competition in a substantial way. It would strike a blow at what is precious to us. You, Mr. Comptroller, must forfend that blow.

You, Mr. Comptroller, have a great responsibility. In my opinion the public interest requires denial of this application.

While this hearing represents an earnest indication of your appreciation of the necessity of giving careful and impartial consideration to an application for bank merger approval, I note that it was quite otherwise under your predecessor. Under him, I regret to say, approval automatically followed the filing of an application. Upon him rests an appreciable measure of responsibility for the present degree of concentration in the banking industry. In the period 1950 through 1960, the Comptroller of the Currency approved the merging of 904 banks.[2] Many of them were approved by Mr. Gidney despite the contrary recommendations of the Department of Justice and of the Federal Reserve Board.

If you grant this application you will set up a chain reaction. Banks of a size comparable to that of First National City will seek to do likewise. They, too, will go into suburbia—Westchester, Nassau, and Suffolk Counties—to grab up all local banks, arguing that only other giants can furnish competition to an existing giant. They will supplement this argument with the further argument that they cannot compete with First National City unless they, too, are permitted to absorb the smaller independent banks in these counties. Thus, a few blocks away, before your sister agency, the Federal Reserve Board, there is pending an application by another Brobdingnagian New York bank for approval of the creation of the Nation's largest bank holding company. And there, prophetically, the argument is being made that the existence of another large bank holding company in New York State justifies the one sought by Morgan.

As I shall point out more fully later, in the application before you we find a bold attempt to have you in effect overrule an earlier decision by the Federal Reserve Board against this applicant when it sought approval for a similar merger, First National City-County Trust, and to take a position directly contrary to that taken recently by the New York State Banking Board in denying a similar application by the Bankers Trust Co.

Where is this trend to end, Mr. Comptroller? It is a calamitous trend. You and the Federal Reserve Board have it within your power to prevent a few New York City clearinghouse banks from laying hands on practically all the banks and banking deposits in New York State. Unless you stop this gigantic reaching out for more and more moneyed power, every bank—every small independent bank in New York State—will be in jeopardy.

Such banking power bodes ill for all of us. What is then to prevent these giants from merging with each other, so that eventually only one or two huge banks remain. No combination is more potent than a moneyed combine. As Ben Franklin said: "If you would know the value of money try to borrow some." I do not want the borrowing business community to be at the mercy of a First National City-National Bank of Westchester combine.

Remember, too, New York City is also the financial capital of the Nation. Thus the proposed merger is not a matter of local but of national importance. It concerns not only the people in my Brooklyn district. It concerns as well the people in Kalamazoo, Mich., in Fort Smith, Ark., in Phoenix, Ariz.

Why do I speak so vehemently? So emphatically? I do so in order to impress you with the gravity and danger of banking concentration threatening our Nation. That gravity and danger is inherent in this application.

I turn now to this particular application.

II. THE APPLICANT

The applicant is the First National City Bank of New York City. It has 96 domestic offices including 9 branches approved but not yet established.[3] It has branches in each of the five counties of New York City and two in Nassau County. It has approval to establish two branches in Westchester County.

First National proposes to merge the National Bank of Westchester. The latter has 22 existing offices and 4 branches approved but not yet established.

III. THE BANK MERGER ACT OF 1960 IMPOSES A HEAVY BURDEN OF PROOF UPON THE APPLICANT

Before discussing the facts which require denial of this proposed merger, I shall advert to the statutory standards against which such facts must be tested. These statutory standards, I find, are ignored by the applicant, perhaps because of the illumination they would cast upon the weakness of its application.

The Bank Merger Act of 1960 (12 U.S.C. 1828) provides that: "* * * In granting or withholding consent under this subsection, the Comptroller, the Board, or the Corporation, as the case may be, shall consider the financial history and condition of each of the banks involved, the adequacy of its capital structure, its future earnings prospects, the general character of its management, the convenience and needs of the community to be served, and whether or not its corporate powers are consistent with the purposes of this act. In the case of a merger, consolidation, acquisition of assets, or assumption of liabilities, the appropriate agency shall also take into consideration the effect of the transaction on competition (including any tendency toward monopoly), and shall not approve the transaction unless, after considering all of such factors, it finds the transaction to be in the public interest."

The originating bill (S. 1062), as originally adopted by the Senate, had phrased the seventh factor differently; namely, whether the transaction would "unduly lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly."

As noted in your annual report for 1960,[4] in the Congress I expressed my concern and testified at length before the Senate and House Banking and Currency Committees, that this language in the bill might lead to the application of a test quite inconsistent with the competitive standards of the Sherman, Clayton, and Celler-Kefauver Antitrust Acts. I testified that such test might open

Footnotes at end of speech.

the door to mergers rather than to make that door more difficult to open.

The Committee on Banking and Currency of the House was of the same opinion. It proposed the language now embodied in the act. The adoption by Congress of the seventh factor in its present form is a definite indication of its intent to impose a strict test rather than a lenient one with respect to the anticompetitive effect of bank mergers.

The background of this legislation furnishes further ground for the importance with which the seventh factor was regarded by Congress, in fact, that this factor was the primary motivation for the Bank Merger Act, which, today, you are called upon to enforce.[5] The Comptroller has recognized this legislative intent by incorporating part of the legislative history of the act in his annual report for 1960.

Congress was both aware of and concerned with the fact that prior to the 1960 act, controls over bank mergers were, I quote, "incomplete and confusing, particularly with respect to the competitive factors involved."[6] The House report stated:[7] "* * * Competition for deposits increases the amounts available for loans for the development and growth of the Nation's industry and commerce. Competition for loans gives the borrowers better terms and better service and furthers the development of industry and commerce. Vigorous competition in banking stimulates competition in the entire economy, in industry, commerce, and trade. There is no question that competition is desirable in banking, and that competitive factors should be considered in all aspects of the supervision and regulation of banks."

Congress also was greatly concerned over the consistent and substantial decline in the number of banks in this country. Year after year, as the House and Senate reports noted, the number of merged banks exceeded the number of new banks.[8]

I think it highly significant that although Congress did not adopt the Celler-Kefauver Act or the Sherman Act as the sole standards for evaluation by the bank supervisory agencies of proposed bank mergers, the enumeration in these reports of permissible mergers is very similar to those recognized under the antitrust laws.[9]

It is clear that a heavy burden rests upon the applicant. The House report asserted unequivocally:[10]

"We are convinced, also, that approval of a merger should depend on a positive showing of some benefit to be derived from it. As previously indicated, your committee is not prepared to say that the cases enumerated in the hearings are the only instances in which a merger is in the public interest, nor are we prepared to devise a specific and exclusive list of situations in which a merger should be approved. We do, however, reject the philosophy that doubts are to be resolved in favor of bank mergers. At the risk of saying the same thing another way, we feel the burden should be on the proponents of a merger to show that it is in the public interest, if it is to be approved. After all the factors have been weighed, the transaction should be approved only if the supervisory agency is satisfied that, on balance, its effect will be beneficial."

The statute in express terms admonishes you to consider whether this application is in the public interest. If this means anything it means that antitrust principles and antitrust philosophy must be given great weight because of their preeminently high place in the rubric of public interest. Since public interest is also a criterion under section 3(c) of the Bank Holding Company Act, I commend to your careful consideration the case of the *First New York Corp.*, 44 Fed. Res. Bulletin 912 (1958), a case in which this very applicant was involved.

And in this connection I bring to your attention the following statement from the decision of the New York Superintendent of Banking (adopted by the New York Banking Board), disapproving an application of Bankers Trust to acquire the County Trust Bank in Westchester County:

"In passing upon two important New York City bank merger applications in 1959, the superintendent applied to them, under the 'public interest' factor of section 10, certain tests deriving essentially from antitrust law."

IV. THE FACTS COMPEL DENIAL OF THIS APPLICATION UNDER THE RELEVANT STATUTORY STANDARDS

I turn to the facts which compel denial of this application under the applicable statutory standards. First, I shall outline the more relevant facts which pertain to this particular application. Secondly, I shall review the merger trend in the banking field which was the primary reason for the Bank Merger Act of 1960. That history furnishes a highly relevant background against which this application must be considered.

Facts directly related to this application

1. First National City Bank, with resources of almost $9 billion and deposits of $7,771 million[11] was, as of December 31, 1960, the third largest bank in the United States and the second largest in New York City. This merger would give it more banking offices and more IPC deposits than Chase Manhattan Bank.[12]

I may well be underestimating the position of First National since, as of December 31, 1960, its capital exceeded that of any other bank in the Nation. And as noted by the Federal Reserve Board in the First New York Corp. case, First National City has on occasion been the largest bank in terms of deposits in New York State.

First National admits that it is in the lead among banks in the United States in breadth of services offered.[13] It makes loans in virtually every State in the Nation. All of the Nation's 100 largest industrial corporations are its customers.

2. The applicant has achieved its mammoth size in substantial part from mergers:

Merger history, First National City

Name of institution	Year absorbed	Resources
		Millions
International Banking Corp	1915	$41
National City Co. (City Co. of New York)	1916	----------
Commercial Exchange National Bank, New York	1921	11
Second National Bank, New York	1921	30
Peoples Trust Co., Brooklyn	1926	76
Farmers Loan & Trust Co., New York	1929	205
Long Island National Bank, Long Island City	1931	4
Bank of America N.A.	1931	500
First National Bank, New York	1955	713
Total	----------	1,580

Sources: (1) Rand McNally, (2) Polk's "Bankers Encyclopedia," (3) Moody's "Bank and Finance Manual."

3. The National Bank of Westchester, with resources of $237 million and deposits of $216 million is the second largest bank in Westchester County. As of December 31, 1960, it held 23.4 percent of commercial IPC deposits; 19.6 percent of commercial bank loans; and 21.4 percent of the total commercial banking offices in the county. It was more than twice as large as the third leading bank in the county.[14]

Its home office is in White Plains which serves a trade area containing more than one-third of the population of Westchester County.

4. The National Bank of Westchester has achieved its position largely through the process of merger:

Merger history of National Bank of Westchester [1]

Bank	Year	Deposits
Huguenot Trust Co	1952	$7,040,500
Peoples National Bank & Trust Co. of White Plains	1953	27,060,000
First National Bank & Trust Co. of Tuckahoe	1954	13,590,643
Tarrytown National Bank & Trust Co	1954	7,207,074
Crestwood National Bank & Trust Co	1955	3,236,724
Westchester County National Bank of Peekskill	1955	12,752,482
Rye National Bank	1960	24,718,000
Mount Kisco National Bank & Trust Co	1960	24,066,000

[1] Does not include a proposed merger with the Gramatan National Bank & Trust Co. which may have already taken place.

Thus, a total of over $119 million in deposits is directly attributable to acquisitions during the past 10 years.

In 1955, the county of Westchester, with a population of 709,000 and an area of over 400 miles had 12 commercial banks. Now, with a population of over 800,000, as brought to your attention in July of this year by the Federal Reserve Board, the number of Westchester banks has declined to 9. Mergers have taken their toll.

I feel certain that the threat of huge New York City banks acquiring the largest Westchester County banks has been a major inducing cause for the merger of some smaller Westchester banks in recent years, and thus a further cause for the declining number of banks in that county. Moreover, a number of witnesses in the earlier First National City proceeding before the Federal Reserve Board, testified that there was a reasonable likelihood that such merger would cause independent banks in Westchester County to seek association with other New York banks.

It is inevitable, if this application is granted, that a chain reaction of mergers will be induced thereby.

Appropriate at this juncture of my discussion is the following language from the Board's decision on the application of First New York Corp.:

"Moreover if the increased power of County Trust would impel independent banks in the county to seek affiliation with New York City banks, it is likely that it would also lead them in some cases to seek mergers with other banks in the county. The record indicates that both County Trust and its largest local competitor, National Bank of Westchester, have been active in this respect in recent years. Bank mergers within the county could, of course, be accomplished without prior approval by the Board under the Bank Holding Company Act."

5. First National City has increased its dominance in New York City. Prior to October 1954, it had 16.5 percent of the banking resources then. In 1956, it had 19 percent. In June of 1960 it had 20 percent of the IPC demand deposits, 24.3 percent of IPC time deposits and 20 percent of the loans of commercial banks in New York City.

In the still larger New York banking district, as of December 31, 1960, First National City had 18.36 percent of the total commercial bank IPC deposits, 18.15 percent of the demand deposits, 19.22 percent of the time deposits and 17.42 percent of the loans. It had a larger percentage of the time deposits than any other bank, and only slightly less than the Chase Manhattan Bank in the other categories.

In the New York City-Westchester area, as of December 31, 1959, National City had

Footnotes at end of speech.

19.09 percent of the commercial bank assets and 18.6 percent of the deposits.

In June 1960 total bank deposits in Westchester County were less than $1½ billion.[15] This is to be compared with $8 billion in deposits of the merging companies.

Size, because of the power of control it embodies, and because of the deterrence by its existence to an incentive to enter the field or to compete on the part of smaller banks, is a most relevant consideration. In the First New York Corp. case, the Federal Reserve Board stressed that, "before considering the probable effect of the size or extent of the holding company system here proposed upon adequate and sound banking, the public interest and preservation of competition, it is necessary to determine what would be the actual size and extent of the proposed holding-company system. In making this determination, consideration must be given to the size of the proposed subsidiary banks and the extent of their operations."

This statement is peculiarly applicable to this application.

6. There is already a dangerous degree of commercial banking concentration in Westchester County. Two banks, one of them National Bank of Westchester, as of December, 31, 1960, had over 71 percent of the IPC deposits, over 75 percent of the loans, and over 62 percent of the banking offices.

7. There has been a marked and unhealthy increase in banking concentration in New York City because of mergers. Before the wave of mergers was initiated by the Chemical-Corn merger of October 15, 1954, the concentration ratio in terms of resources of the five largest banks was 57.7 percent. By September 1956 it was 66.9 percent. At the end of December 1958, in terms of deposits, it was 65.8 percent.

According to the complaint filed recently by the Department of Justice to try to prevent the merger of the Manufacturers Trust Co. with the Hanover Bank, the five largest banks in New York City hold 75.2 percent of total commercial bank deposits in New York City and 77.2 percent of total commercial loans. First National City, of course, is one of the five. It is significant that since December 31, 1956, whether we use assets, deposits, or loans as the criterion, there has been an increase of from 9 to 10 percent concentration in New York City.[16]

This is not an academic matter in relation to this application. In the Bankers Trust case the New York banks superintendent acutely said, "Moreover, this department may not ignore the influence which its decision on the present application may exert upon the future course of asset and market concentration in the banking industry."

8. The rule of stare decisis should bar this application. A scant 5 years ago this applicant, using the name of First New York Corp., applied to the Federal Reserve Board for permission to acquire the largest independent bank in Westchester County. Turned down in 1958, it appears now before you to seek permission to acquire the second largest independent bank in that same county.

It was my privilege to present testimony at that earlier hearing in opposition to that application. I testified and the hearing examiner and, ultimately, the Federal Reserve Board, found that the application should be denied because the adverse anticompetitive consequences of the plan, relevant under the fifth factor of section 3(c) of the act, outweighed any conceivable advantages from its consummation under the other factors.

In reaching this conclusion, the hearing examiner found in summary that "the program, by combining the dominant banking system in Westchester County with one of the largest banking systems in the Nation, establishes in Westchester County a financial organization of such relative size as perhaps to give it decisive advantage over competitors; may result in an undue concentration of banking assets and control; may induce unnecessary dislocation in the existing banking structure of the county—and thus unsound banking; may unduly and substantially lessen competition between city and county banks; and may result in undue reduction of the number of independent banks in the county with consequent reduction in the number of competing banking organizations.

* * * * *

"On balance, the prospective and possible benefits of the program do not outweigh its prospective and possible disadvantages. It is concluded that the program is not required for the needs and welfare of the community and area, and further, that the effect of the proposed acquisition may be to expand the size or extent of the holding company system involved beyond limits consistent with adequate and sound banking, the public interest, and, the preservation of competition in the field of banking. Under these circumstances the applicants have not sustained the burden of establishing that the public interest will be furthered by granting approval of the applications."

The Federal Reserve Board, in turn, elaborated its conclusion by pointing out among other things:

1. That a certain amount of competition existed between the Westchester Bank and First National City Bank there involved which, though small percentagewise, was substantial in amount and illustrated the existence of a convenient source of banking facilities as between Westchester County and New York City.

2. That the trend, asserted by the applicant, toward integration of the two areas gave rise to the inference that such existing competition between the two banks would become more intensive in the future.

3. That such potential competition would be lessened by the effectuation of the plan.

4. That the plan would give First National City considerably greater access to County Trust correspondent business than at present, and greater access than would be enjoyed by other New York City banks, and would have an adverse effect on such banks and on competition in New York City for correspondent banking business (viewing the New York bank as a supplier of services to County Trust and citing *United States* v. *Dupont & Company*, 353 U.S. 586 (1957).

5. That the plan would substantially strengthen the already strong position of County Trust in Westchester County, giving it additional competitive advantages over independent county banks.

It is particularly significant in the present proceeding that the decision of the Board in the First New York case took into consideration the predicted rapid growth of Westchester County and the asserted integration of that area into the New York City metropolitan region. Thus, the Board rested its denial in part upon the inference that the integration of the County Trust Co. with the large New York City bank there involved would eliminate not only the substantial existing competition between these institutions, but also the potentially more intense competition that would, predictedly, be created by the development of Westchester.

I refer to this last mentioned aspect of the Board's decision because the same applicant, in this proceeding, also stresses the potential development of Westchester.

If the name "National Bank of Westchester" is substituted for that of "County Trust Co.," you will find the First New York Corp. case on all fours with this application.

The decision of the New York State Banking Board disapproving the bank-holding application of the Bankers Trust-County Trust application is unusually pertinent to this application. That decision was rendered as recently as April of this year. There, Bankers Trust Co. sought permission to acquire the County Trust Co. The latter was the largest bank in Westchester County; Bankers Trust Co. was the sixth largest commercial bank in New York City. It was less than one-half the size of First National City Bank.

That application was turned down because, in the words of New York State banks superintendent:

"The competitive factors of section 142(1) are inconsistent with approval.

"(a) The formation of the proposed bank holding company would result in 'a concentration of assets beyond limits consistent with effective competition' [in Westchester County].

"(b) Such formation may result in such a lessening of competition [in Westchester County] 'as to be injurious to the interests of the public.'

"(c) Such action may result in a tendency toward monopoly [in Westchester County].

"3. Finally, the primary statutory factor for the Board's consideration, 'the public interest and the needs and convenience thereof' is, on balance, inconsistent with approval. While some added convenience to the public might result, in the event of approval, the anticompetitive implications of the proposed actions and the consequent adverse impact thereof on the public interest, weigh heavily toward disapproval."

I submit that the First New York Corp. and the Bankers Trust decisions are precedents of the most compelling nature for denial of this application.

Banking merger history

While I think it clear that this application, when considered by itself should be denied, there is an historical as well as a current background which furnishes compelling support for denial. That background supplies a basis upon which the current and future consequences of approval of this application may be presaged.

There can be no doubt of the relevance of this merger history. Said the Senate report:[17]

"The large numbers of mergers in recent years, the vast resources involved in these mergers, and the increases in the size of the largest banks, particularly those which have grown through mergers, all give rise to concern for the maintenance of vigorous competition in the banking system. The reduction in the number of banks and the loss of competition between merged banks also give rise to concern."

I may say at this point that the courts,[18] and the Federal Trade Commission[19] have recognized the relevance of such factors in determining the validity of a merger.

So acute has been the problem of mergers in the banking field that within the past 5 years Congress, with the active support of the executive branch of the Government, has considered it necessary to enact two statutes to slow down the merger parade. One was the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, and the other is the Bank Merger Act of 1960, with which this proceeding is directly concerned.

My own concern with the merger situation in the banking field led me to take an active part in the enactment of such legislation. The current situation, I regret to say, still leaves me with that concern.

There has been a very sharp decline in the number of banking institutions in this country. While it is said that a large number vanished during the major depression of the early thirties, it is a fact that there has been no upsurge in the number of banks since

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

that time despite a burgeoning population and economy.

Thus, at the end of 1941, there were almost 15,000 banks in the United States. By the end of 1960, there were less than 14,000.[20] Even more pertinent, in 1940 there were 14,385 commercial banks; in 1950, 14,054; in 1955, 13,656; in 1960, 13,472.[21] It is apparent that the rate of disappearance has been greater in the last decade than in the prior decade.

Testifying in support of the Bank Merger Act of 1960, I pointed out, in 1959, that in 10 of the Nation's 16 leading financial centers, 4 banks owned more than 80 percent of all commercial assets. I added that in nine of these financial centers, two banks owned more than 60 percent of all commercial assets. Furthermore, I testified, in each of 16 financial centers, the first 4 banks owned 60 percent of all the commercial assets; and the first 2 banks, more than 40 percent. The cause of such concentration, I made clear, was that in the period 1950 through 1958, some 1,330 of the Nation's commercial banks disappeared by way of mergers and consolidations.

In the banking field, the trend is for the big to grow bigger, the small- and the medium-sized banks to become fewer, and for both of the latter to become part of the former.

In 1958 the 10 largest commercial banks had 19.9 percent of the deposits of all the commercial banks in this country.[22] In 1959 they had 20.2 percent.[23] As of December 31, 1960, the 10 largest commercial banks held 20.3 percent of all commercial bank deposits. In 1960, 23 commercial banks, each having more than $1 billion in deposits, had 29.8 percent of the deposits of all commercial banks in the United States. When it is realized that commercial banks were some 13,000 in number and had over $230 billion in deposits,[24] this is a dangerous picture of concentration.

In New York State, at the end of 1958, five commercial banks or groups held 52.1 percent of the deposits of all the commercial banks in the State.[25]

This concentration has come about, in large part, by mergers. In fact, in my home State, I regret to say, 40 percent of the banks in the State have been absorbed in mergers since 1945.[26]

In 1959, the honorary president of the Independent Bankers' Association of the 12th Federal Reserve District testified before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency that in California there were only 69 unit banks; in Oregon, 2 branch organizations held over 81 percent of the State's banking assets; in Washington State, 5 banking systems held about 90 percent of the banking assets; in Arizona, only 2 small banks were outside the orbit of the 2 bank holding companies which controlled almost all the banking assets; in Nevada, 1 bank holding company controlled 76 percent of the banking assets.

I would remind the Comptroller that he has a grave responsibility to prevent this unhealthy situation from becoming universal.

As one of the members of the Federal Reserve Board said: "Whenever you get a banking system where, as in this country, less than 3 percent of the banks have more than 63 percent of the deposits of commercial banks, I think you are getting into a dangerous area." [27]

What has been the enervating process by which the diminution in the number of competitive banks has occurred? From 1950 to the end of 1960, over 1,600 banks were absorbed by other banks. These absorbed banks had resources of almost $33 billion. Bank mergers, moreover, continue to be troublesome phenomena by their number and size. Thus, between May 13 to December 21, 1960, 191 banks, with resources in excess of $18 billion, were involved in mergers.[28] The ink had hardly dried on the President's signature approving the amendment of May 13, 1960, to the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, before merger approval was sought and obtained—by December 31, 1960—in 21 instances.

New York State has been one of the leaders in this merger parade. As a result, at the end of 1960, it had 402 commercial banks. One hundred fifty-eight of these banks had one thousand three hundred and sixty-eight branches.[29] Between 1934 and 1958, the number of banks in New York declined from 934 to 561, a decline of almost 40 percent.[30]

Between December 31, 1960, and June 30, 1961, the number of banks merged in this country exceeded the number of new banks, while the number of branches increased by about 400.[31]

Applications for approval of bank mergers still continue to flow in considerable numbers. Each approval seems to encourage another. During the past 5 years, over 60 applications have been filed with the Federal Reserve Board under section 3 of the Bank Holding Company Act—16 of them within the period of November 1, 1960, to November 15, 1961. The Comptroller of the Currency has had 539 applications for mergers in the past 5 years—114 of which were presented during the past year. And in the period November 1, 1960, to October 1, 1961, the above number of applications was augmented by 33 filed with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The annual reports of the Federal Reserve Board, I might add, show some 700 bank mergers in the 1956–60 period.

I would sincerely hope that you will help effect a deceleration of this trend.

V. OTHER FACTORS AND THE ARGUMENTS OF APPLICANT

There are a number of additional factors which require denial of this application. The applicants' arguments, moreover, are not persuasive to the contrary. I repeat again, because of its importance: It is a fact that these very arguments were raised and rejected in both the First New York Corp. and Bankers Trust Co. matters, decided, respectively, by the Federal Reserve Board and the New York Banking Board.

A. Factor No. 1: This case has a factor which gives added support to denial of this application. First National admits that it has received permission to open two banking offices in Westchester County. It is obvious that this imminent potential competition with National Bank of Westchester will be eliminated by the proposed merger.

It is equally obvious from First National's experience in Nassau County that through these offices its alleged benefits to Westchester residents by coming into the county could be accorded. It admits that its experience in Nassau County has been that its banking offices there have drawn business from distances of 10 miles and more. Moreover, within the past year a substantial New York bank, the Chemical New York Trust Co., has opened a banking office in Westchester County.

B. Factor No. 2: This merger will have an effect far beyond Westchester County. The applicant, with its vast resources, will have two banks in Peekskill which is close to the borderline of Putnam County, and Peekskill is the largest city northward to Poughkeepsie in Dutchess County in New York State. The applicant has admitted that the estimated population service area is almost twice that of the population of Peekskill.

Additionally, I point out, National Bank has approval to open a bank at Jefferson Valley which is right at the Putnam County border.

In view of the applicant's argument of the county's need for its services, it is pertinent to note that, in 1957, the National Bank of Westchester, through its president, appeared as a witness before the Federal Reserve Board in a proceeding instituted by First National City to acquire the largest bank in the county. National Bank, at that hearing, testified that the development of Westchester County had not created a demand for banking services not adequately met by the banking facilities of the county alone or in conjunction with correspondent banks. It further testified that it had not experienced any difficulty in utilizing correspondents to meet the requirements of Westchester applicants for loans. Nothing in the instant application before you today contradicts such testimony. In fact, First National City, in its application, presents a striking exposition of the services of a correspondent bank.[32]

C. Factor No. 3: That National Bank of Westchester is likely to cease using other New York City banks as correspondent banks seems obvious. The application shows that banks other than First National City were its correspondents.

In the Bankers Trust case the New York bank superintendent took cognizance of the likelihood that affiliation of County Trust with Bankers Trust would tend, to a substantial degree, if not completely, to cut off other banks in New York City and elsewhere with correspondent relations with County Trust, and this, he said, "would result in at least a tendency toward monopoly in Westchester over 'wholesale' banking services, foreign banking services, and the numerous other specialized banking skills of Bankers Trust which are described in the application."

A fortiori, I say, would this be true, in the case of the instant application.

First National's argument as to limited future deposit growth because of an expected decline in New York City population and the expected further growth in the suburbs, cannot be reconciled with its admission that it is primarily a national and international bank. Furthermore, as I have already mentioned, First National City already is in Nassau County—a faster growing county than Westchester—and has approval to open several branches in Westchester.

Neither bank is in a poor or failing position. There has been a substantial increase in the operating income and in the earnings of both banks during the past 5 years.[33]

Since 1950 First National City has more than doubled its capital funds, and the dollar amount of its loans is up 156 percent. Since 1950 it has opened 52 banking offices here and abroad.[34]

In the case of National Bank of Westchester we have it from the lips of the applicant that it "has increased in size dramatically in recent years in about equal measure from mergers and from operational results." [35]

In 1960, First National City had its highest total earnings and highest earnings per share since at least 1953.

As of December 1960 the book value of that bank's stock was $64.55 while the price range was 71¼ to 90¾. And last week its price range was 107 to 110½. The book value of the stock of National Bank of Westchester as of December 31, 1960, was $13.39 while its price range was 27 to 41. Last week its price range was 43¼ to 46⅛.

The applicant's generalized argument that other smaller banks in Westchester County would not be adversely affected does not hold water. The present degree of banking concentration in Westchester County held by National Bank of Westchester and County Trust is such that there is considerable doubt as to whether smaller competing banks in the county will have long-range opportunity to do business profitably; whether they will have unfettered opportunity for growth and expansion; whether new banks will be able

Footnotes at end of speech.

to enter into business without severe handicap; and whether new capital will find such new banks an attractive investment.

The short of the matter is that present concentration in Westchester County is serious enough; to combine the resources of the second largest banking institution in Westchester County with the gigantic resources of the First National City Bank of New York, may well compound that situation to an enormous extent. If smaller banks in Westchester now labor under a competitive disadvantage with the National Bank of Westchester, that disadvantage would pale into insignificance by adoption of the pending proposal. It now takes considerable courage for small businessmen to pool their resources and charter a new commercial bank in Westchester County. The obstacles to new charters, now especially serious because of concentration of banking assets, could well become infinitely greater once National Bank of Westchester had behind it the weight of the First National City Bank resources.

It follows that the acquisition would introduce in Westchester County an institution of such power that the banking community would be transformed into one overwhelmingly dominated by a single company, with a reasonable probability of price leadership and a general absence of price rivalry. Smaller banks in Westchester County could not be expected to be unaware of the financial power with which they would be confronted by virtue of this consolidation. In these circumstances their means of competition would be hardly comparable to those available to the First National City-National Bank of Westchester combination. It is nonsense to suppose that entry by First National City Bank in Westchester County might have no adverse competitive effect on the other eight banks in that area.

The applicant refers to mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations. Even if they be considered, First National City's position would be only slightly altered. As of December 31, 1960, no savings bank in the New York-Westchester-Nassau area had $2 billion in deposits. In Westchester County, the largest had $103,900,000 in deposits.[36]

The largest savings and loan association listed by the applicant had deposits of less than $210 million. The largest in Westchester County had less than $40 million in deposits.[37]

Moreover, commercial banks represent a clearly identifiable and distinct line of commerce. No other financial institution, either in the scope of its activities or in the size of many of such activities, compares with the commercial banks which have been described as the "department stores of finance." Commercial banks have the unique power to accept and create demand deposits. Surely a monopoly of commercial banks could not be justified because of the existence of mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations.

Finally, the applicant argues that there is a negligible overlap and negligible competition between the merging banks. In reality, however, the overlap and the competition are far from negligible.

First National City's service area, of course, includes Westchester County. In the local area, First National City has loans of $760 million and deposits of $1.7 billion. Both banks furnish an appreciable number of similar services.

They have almost 3,000 common depositors. Each bank had commercial loans outstanding for customers in the other's service area. First National City had 660 regular checking accounts for customers who had accounts in National Bank of Westchester. It also had 620 savings accounts for customers who had accounts in the other bank.

First National City has over 4,800 deposit accounts and over 4,500 loan accounts, involving very substantial sums, in the service area of National Bank of Westchester. The latter has 2,593 deposit accounts, 642 loan accounts, 1,073 checking accounts, and 1,193 savings accounts with customers in New York City and Nassau. It has over $25 million in outside-of-the-State mortgages.[38] First National City has over $1 million in deposits in other banks in Metropolitan New York City.

In the First New York Corp. case, the Federal Reserve Board had this to say:

"That a certain amount of competition presently exists between City Bank and County Trust is apparent. Applicants stated that deposits of City Bank originating in Westchester County were less than 1 percent of City Bank's domestic deposits, and that the deposits of County Trust originating in New York City were less than 3 percent of its deposits (exh. F, pp. 5, 6). One percent of City Bank's deposits, excluding deposits of national concerns and deposits at foreign branches, would be over $20 million. If only deposits of foreign branches are excluded, 1 percent of City Bank's deposits would be approximately $55 million. Three percent of County Trust's deposits would be about $10 million. Accordingly, despite the small percentages involved, it appears that the actual amounts involved are substantial."

Certainly, as large an amount is involved in this proceeding.

Applicant asserts that its monopolistic entry would be good for Westchester County. It proffers the benevolence of lower interest rates. But, I think there is an eloquent rebuttal to this argument in the words of that great spellbinder, William Jennings Bryan. Said he:

"I do not divide monopolies in private hands into good monopolies and bad monopolies. There is no good monopoly in private hands until the Almighty sends us angels to preside over the monopoly. There may be a despot who is better than another despot but there is no good despots."

In conclusion, I say that you will never have so strong a case as this to stop the trend toward monopolization of banking. You will never have such opportunity to prevent banking in one of the world's most important financial areas from falling into the hands of a few giants—the classic case of oligopoly. You will never have so just a cause to curb one of the most persistent leaders of such oligopolistic movement—First National City Bank.

I call upon you to deny this application.

---

[1] Annual Report of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (1960), pp. 102–103.

[2] Annual Report of Comptroller of the Currency (1960), p. 16.

[3] Including military facilities, etc., it has 99 branches. See appendix B–3, p. 1. The applicant does not state where such offices are located.

[4] Annual Report of Comptroller of the Currency (1960), p. 38.

[5] In the 1960 Annual Report of the Comptroller (p. 33), it is stated that "the basic purposes of the enactment of this legislation were (1) to make all bank mergers involving insured banks subject to Federal approval, and (2) to establish standards by which bank mergers were to be considered by respective banking agencies and to insure that adequate consideration would be given in each case to the effect upon competition."

[6] H. Rept. No. 1416, 86th Cong., 2d sess., p. 5. The S. Rept. No. 196, 86th Cong., 1st. sess., revealed a similar concern on the part of the Senate. It was noted that "in short, at the present time many, perhaps most, bank mergers can proceed with little or no consideration of competitive factors," p. 2.

[7] H. Rept. No. 1416, p. 3.

[8] See H. Rept. No. 1416, 86th Cong., 2d sess., p. 10; S. Rept. No. 196, pp. 8–9.

[9] See S. Rept. No. 196, pp. 19–20; H. Rept. No. 1416, p. 10.

[10] H. Rept., pp. 11–12.

[11] Application, p. 67.

[12] App. B–3, p. 1 to application.

[13] Application, p. 63.

[14] See application, p. 119.

[15] Distribution of Bank Deposits, by Counties and Standard Metropolitan Areas, June 15, 1960, p. 57.

[16] See supplemental report of hearing examiner in the matter of application of First New York Corp.

[17] S. Rept. No. 196, p. 8.

[18] E.g., *United States* v. *Brown Shoe Company*, 179 F. Supp. 721 (E.D. Mo., 1959)—now on appeal to the Supreme Court; *United States* v. *Bethlehem Steel Corporation*, 168 F. Supp. 576, 586–87 (S.D.N.Y., 1958); *United States* v. *National Steel Corp.*, 26 F.R.D., 599 (S.D. Texas, 1960).

[19] E.g., In the matter of Scott Paper Co., FTC Doc. No. 6559, decisions of Jan. 5, 1959, and Dec. 16, 1960.

[20] Federal Reserve Bulletin, February 1961, p. 230.

[21] Polk's Bank Directory, March 1961, p. VII; 47 Fed. Res. Bull. 486 (1961).

[22] Annual Report of Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (1960), pp. 41, 44.

[23] Staff report to House Committee on Small Business on Banking Concentration and Small Business, 86th Cong., 2d sess., p. 3.

[24] Polk, Bank Directory, March 1961, p. VIII. In 1959 commercial banks with $1 billion in deposits had over 25 percent of the total assets of insured commercial banks. Staff report, p. 3.

[25] Annual Report of Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (1960), p. 54.

[26] Staff report, p. 47.

[27] Hearings before Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, 86th Cong., 1st sess. (1959), p. 63.

[28] 1960 Annual Report of Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, p. 10.

[29] 47 Fed. Res. Bull. 486–487 (1961).

[30] Report of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (1960).

[31] 47 Fed. Res. Bull. 1002 (1961).

[32] See app. C–7, pp. 3–4 to application.

[33] See application, pp. 17, 66, 68.

[34] See application, p. 63.

[35] Id., p. 64.

[36] Application, pp. 126–127.

[37] App. B–4, pp. 77 et seq.

[38] See application, p. 136 et seq.

Powers of the Comptroller of the Currency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter which I addressed to the Honorable James J. Saxon, Comptroller of the Currency, on January 9, 1962. The text of the letter follows:

JANUARY 9, 1962.

Hon. JAMES J. SAXON,
Comptroller of the Currency,
Treasury Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SAXON: After reading your opinion in the First National City Bank of New York case with great care, I believe it advisable to make the following comments:

At the hearing, after you had referred to Westchester County branches of New York City banks, I had the following colloquy with you:

"Mr. CELLER. Your statement only emphasizes the fact that New York City banks have the opportunity to enter Westchester County by application for branches and approval thereof and that they can and should do it in this manner and not do it in a wholesale manner by grabbing up the second largest bank in Westchester. * * *

"The COMPTROLLER. Well, Mr. Chairman, this is a pertinent question. Where should the line be drawn?

"Mr. CELLER. Some agency has the power to control the number of those branches. Here you go in and allow willy-nilly a bank to secure control of 22 branches at one fell swoop. I think that is wrong. Let them grow gradually and let there be supervision over the number of branches that they shall have."

I am pleased that your decision is in accord with that position.

I am, however, disturbed by certain obiter statements in your opinion—noted in the press—which I find inconsistent with the intent and understanding of the Congress.

Thus, while your decision acknowledges your responsibility to act "within the statutory policies prescribed by the Congress," nevertheless in referring to the antitrust laws you state that the nature of commercial banking is such as to render "highly questionable for judging bank mergers the concepts developed in the application of those laws to industrial corporations." This would seem to question the judgment of Congress in not exempting banks from the Sherman Act and other antitrust laws. It would seem to question the wisdom of Congress in requiring the bank regulatory agencies to consider competition and tendency to monopoly factors in considering applications for approval of mergers. And it would seem to question the propriety of applying antitrust law precedents to bank mergers.

In your opinion you state that "we have considerable doubt that there can exist effective monopoly power in commercial banking as it operates in this country today." You also assert in your opinion, "that there has been a considerable overemphasis upon an alleged lack of competition in banking, and an alleged concentration in banking. To the contrary, banking is highly competitive. It is diffuse rather than concentrated."

I find these remarks utterly inconsistent with the position and understanding of Congress as expressed in the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, the Bank Merger Act of 1960, and the extensive supporting legislative history. Congress was well aware at the time it enacted these laws that it was dealing with a regulated industry. On the basis of uncontradicted facts adduced before both House and Senate committees, however, it considered that banking concentration was so acute a problem as to require corrective legislation.

I am sure you recognize that regulation of some aspects of an industry cannot, in itself, insure that unhealthy monopoly and detrimental absence of competition may not arise in such industries. It may be, therefore, that what you may have had in mind in the above utterances was that the Federal agencies, properly enforcing the applicable Federal statutes, would prevent any substantial lessening of competition or tendency to monopoly in the banking field.

In your opinion you take the position that only the banking agencies have the competency and equipment to determine competitive standards for banks. According to the press, you have more recently asserted that your office should have the sole or primary responsibility regarding the fixing of service charges by banks in restraint of trade.

I remind you, therefore, that Congress did not regard either your agency or the other Federal bank supervisory agencies to have such competence in evaluating competitive factors in the banking field as to entrust consideration of such factors solely to them. Thus your predecessor testified: "I have no competency in that (the antitrust) field. I do not know what the courts have done." (Hearings before Antitrust Subcommittee, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, on S. 3341, 84th Cong., p. 80.)

You, of course, are well aware that the statutes expressly envisage that these agencies will avail themselves of the special competence of the Department of Justice on such matters to receive its advice thereon. The courts also, undoubtedly, will have occasion to consider such factors in pending litigation before them.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman.

The Economic Outlook for 1962

REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Nation, going ahead at a moderate rate of progress, can look ahead to 1962, according to predictions, as a year of opportunity and advancement—and, yes, of challenge.

In a weekend broadcast over Wisconsin radio stations, I was privileged to reflect upon some of the major features of the economic picture.

I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

The Nation—with the dawn of 1962—can look ahead optimistically to a fairly good year of economic progress.

As of now, the economy is turning out: A record volume of goods and services, estimated at a rate of $540 billion annually; peak income of $429 billion, with about 67 million workers employed; and a generally brightening outlook in many fields.

Despite the fact that the Nation is rolling along at a moderately good pace, however, a microsopic analysis still reveals dark spots in the economic picture.

In agriculture, for example, the American farmers—including Wisconsin dairymen—are still experiencing prices of farm products too low in relation to the price of equipment, labor, taxes, and other farm expenses; deplorably low income of 85 cents per hour—compared with $2.29 per hour for workers in manufacturing industries; and surpluses that still weigh as a liability—not an asset—on the economy.

The labor picture, also is clouded. Despite upsurges in the general economy, there are still about 4 million unemployed (including about 70,000 in Wisconsin). The major categories include manufacturing, agriculture, construction, and other fields.

Unless this situation is corrected rapidly, the high rate of unemployment will not only have tragic effects for the jobless workers and their families, but will also be a dragging millstone on the overall economy.

What is needed? A microscopic analysis of the causes of unemployment, such as: Reduced output of an industry; displacement because of automation; slowdowns because of imports taking over markets from U.S. producers; and changing trends in the economy. Following such an analysis, the job will be to evolve specific plans, industry by industry, for improving the economic outlook.

The Government, too, must play a responsible roll in promoting economic progress by (a) Reform of the tax laws to spur—not stunt—growth and progress; (b) restricting Federal expenditures to absolute essentials, and (c) encouraging expansion of job-creating enterprises to assure not only adequate revenue and a balanced budget, but also provide a real stimulus to an overall economy.

The ogre of inflation, however, remains a threat and danger to the economy. In free enterprising Government cooperative efforts to promote a faster rate of progress, then, we must guard against ballooning inflation—an economic evil that hits hardest the folks in the moderate-to-low income brackets.

OPTIMISM—KEY TO ECONOMIC OUTLOOK

Progress in our economy, also, depends to a tremendous degree upon optimism and confidence in our economy by you, Mr. and Mrs. America.

Now, is there a justification for such confidence and optimism? In my judgment—yes, absolutely yes.

In the past, unfortunately, there have been mistaken—and sometimes ridiculous and irresponsible—efforts (both at home and abroad) to categorize our economy as second rate.

The economic facts of world life, however, demonstrate that this is far from the truth.

Let's cite some examples: First, comparison with Communist progress. Today, the United States—as mentioned—has a GNP rate of about $540 billion annually. According to best estimates available, this is way ahead of the combined output of all the Communist countries—valued at $350 billion annually. The Red bloc includes Albania, Bulgaria, Communist China, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, North Korea, North Vietnam, Outer Mongolia, Poland, Rumania, and the U.S.S.R.

Second, what about competition with free-world nations? Again, the United States is way out front. Annually, our production far exceeds—in fact, about doubles—the combined output of the United Kingdom, Germany, France, Canada, and Italy.

For these reasons, then, the American people should, in my judgment, be absolutely out of patience—in fact, irritated with—the economic pessimists who, for whatever motives, downgrade our economic progress and accomplishment. There is absolutely no justification either for political or economic shortsightedness in underselling our country.

From these comparisons, then, it is obvious that we are not in danger of being immediately overtaken either by the Communists or non-Communist nations—although we cannot disregard such competition. The long-range efforts of the economy, then, should be zeroed in on such targets as (1) providing the goods and services to meet the needs of a growing 185 million population—expanding at the rate of 3 million a year; (2) creating the jobs necessary for our labor force, growing at 25,000 a week; (3) strengthening the economy to enable it to bear the burden of an ever-growing Federal budget—including skyrocketing costs for defense amounting to about $50 billion annually; and (4) promoting economic progress—not just in response to competition from abroad, but, rather, to live up to the great traditions and particularly the potential of our free economy—the mightiest production system in the history of the world.

Challenges for 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last week President Kennedy presented the State of the Union message to the Congress.

The Congress now in accordance with its constitutional responsibilities must examine the problems and proposals in these and other fields; accept, or reject the proposals—as best serves the public interest; consider alternative methods of dealing with national problems; and then, as needed, enact new laws—or revise old ones—to better meet the needs of the Nation for progress and security.

We recognize, of course, that the problems confronting us cover a worldwide spectrum. We will need, then, to adopt a realistic priority system—"putting first things first." Prior to the President's message, I was privileged to review some of the major issues which—in my judgment—should be of high priority. I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of this statement printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. DEFENSE

Putting more muscle and striking power into U.S. jet, missile, nuclear deterrent-to-aggression forces; expanding psychological-ideological offensives of the free world; strengthening the military, economic, political alliances of free nations, now serving as a bulwark against Red expansionism; develop a realistic civil defense program for maximum protection of the civilian population in event of war.

2. TAXES

Consideration of the President's special "Tax package"; efforts to wipe out inequities; avoid overlapping or pre-empting of State-local sources of revenue; establish a more equitable tax system.

3. ECONOMY

Handling a skyrocketing Federal budget, accompanied by deficits; coping with an ever-growing national dept; promote a favorable "balance of payments" for exports-imports; lowering too-high level of unemployment, still totaling over 6 percent of the labor force; expanded private and governmental efforts to promote a good rate of domestic progress.

4. HUMAN NEEDS

Medical care for the aging; aid to dependent children; efforts to establish realistic criteria for eligibility for public welfare programs.

5. AGRICULTURE

Review level of price supports; take a new look at supply-demand situation; more effectively utilize surpluses for: Food-for-peace program; special school milk and school lunch programs; food for the needy; etc. Carry forward improved conservation, management, and utilization practices for soil, water, and forest resources.

6. FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Resolving the question of scope of possible additional Federal aid; aid to private schools.

7. RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

Review of national and international trade policies; efforts to eliminate discriminatory tariffs, quotas, etc., against U.S. products; possibility of providing assistance to U.S. industries damaged by, or suffering from, inflow of commodities under trade agreements; attempt to improve market opportunities for U.S. firms.

8. SPACE EXPLORATION

Putting more boost in our big booster rocket program; stepping up our man-in-space program; research for possible use—and defense against use—of space vehicles for military purposes; expand Government-private cooperation in utilization of satellites and other space vehicles for communications, weather reporting, and other purposes.

9. DOMESTIC PROGRESS

Strengthening free enterprise system; promote labor management cooperation—and curb abuse of economic or political power—to: (a) Better fulfill needs of people and nations; (b) hold down inflation; and (c) meet the crises of the times; carrying forward projects needed for port and harbor development, flood control, watersheds, conservation, highway, airports, housing and home building, antipollution of water and other programs.

10. FOREIGN POLICY

A comprehensive review—and recommendations for improving—U.S. foreign policy and needs to more effectively deal with the global threat of communism, including: the Communist bloc; the Congo; Cuba; Southeast Asia; and elsewhere in the world. The Congress also should consider enacting emergency legislation to deal with unforeseen contingencies—including war. Overall, U.S. foreign policy, of course, should not just be against communism; but—positively—should be designed to advance peace and progress in the world.

CONCLUSION

Admittedly, these are only highlights of a very long, complex legislative program ahead in Congress.

In these critical times, we need: High statesmanship and an ever-greater sense of responsibility; and a rededication of—and renewed effort by—our citizens and leaders to meet the complex challenges of these high tension times.

I am confident, however, that by: A greater awakening to the challenges ahead of us—domestic and foreign; and more effective utilization of our available and potential human, natural, and man-created resources, we can stop the Communists' progress toward world conquest; and strengthen a world climate of security in which people can dedicate more of their efforts toward peaceful purposes.

Let Private Enterprise Do the Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the States-Graphic of Brownsville, Tenn., on December 29 a fine editorial by the editor, Mr. Paul Sims, entitled, "Let Private Enterprise Do the Job."

I heartily agree with the editorial in that private enterprise should be given a chance to do the job. The editorial follows:

LET PRIVATE ENTERPRISE DO THE JOB

The Federal Communications Commission is in the process of determining who should control our space communication. There are those who advocate the Government controlling such a system, while others are equally adamant that private enterprise is better equipped to handle it.

Backers of the Government plan say that the private enterprise operated system would be a monopoly. Possibly this is so, but for many years, our country has had private enterprise to thank for its growth and expansion.

It was private enterprise that caused our country to be settled, pioneered the West, laid railroad track, telegraph systems, telephone and radio communication. Even now our DEW line system is operated by private enterprise and just about all the research in satellite communication has been done by private enterprise.

We say let the Government keep out of private business. Let us never kill the initiative of free enterprise.

Charity Begins at Home—In the United States—Not the U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, evidence accumulates each day that the citizens of this country are becoming aware of the phony character of the proposed loan of $100 million to the United Nations.

An editorial by Mr. Charles Mooshian, editor of the Carroll County Times, Westminster, Md., is typical of the growing resentment to the "squandermania" of the Federal Government. The editorial follows:

To see it through its current financial crisis, the United Nations needs some $200 million. The U.N. got into this financial predicament because of its involvement in the Congo mess and went to war with Katanga.

Another reason for its financial troubles is that Russia, France, Belgium, and Portugal are not paying their share of expenses for special assignments such as the Congo.

The United States already is paying almost one-half (47 percent) of the total costs of the operation of the U.N. and now is considering buying $100 million worth of bonds that the U.N. is trying to sell.

A full-scale discussion will take place in Congress (which opened yesterday) to find out why the United States should finance half of the Congo operation.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD of Virginia, and Representative H. R. GROSS of Iowa—both longtime foes of what they regard as excessive Federal spending—issued statements saying they would oppose administration efforts to have Congress approve U.S. purchase of $100 million in U.N. bonds.

Representative GROSS said he would attempt to block any U.S. participation in the

bond transaction by offering a joint resolution of disapproval in the new Congress.

"It is incredible that American taxpayers should be required to pay for the dereliction of such (U.N.) members as the Soviet Union," Representative GROSS said.

Financial experts have said the sale of the bonds is actually a farce since the U.N. has no way to earn interest or to collect long overdue payments. Actually, the experts say, the United States and other nations who buy the bonds will be really making an outright contribution to the U.N.

With our excessive high national debt we are not in a financial position to give the U.N. $100 million. That amount of money should be used to pay off some of the interest on our own debt.

Everything is pointing toward the buildup of NATO as a substitute for the ailing and failing U.N. If we must throw in $100 million of the taxpayers' hard earned dollars, we think a strong Western alliance will give us more for our money.

If the Congress will study carefully the complete U.N. picture and program at the present time, we wager that it will not vote to buy a single U.N. bond.

We further suggest that Congress, before it gives another penny to the support of the U.N. give the individual and group supporters of the U.N. an opportunity to come to its defense financially.

If there ever was a time for U.N. supporters to come to the aid of their 'beloved organization" it is now. We believe they should finance the full amount of the $200 million or keep quiet about the "wonders of the U.N."

It is a case of put up—financially—or shut up—verbally.

The Railroad Industry Needs Help From Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, last fall the Railroad Transportation Institute held its annual meeting at Pittsburgh, Pa., on October 24 and 25. The institute, organized 7 years ago, is educational in purpose and provides a forum for the discussion of mutual problems and trends in transportation and for consideration of new techniques and developments in regulatory law and practice.

It was a pleasure to accept an invitation to attend the first day's session of the institute on October 24, at which time I delivered the following address:

THE RAILROAD INDUSTRY NEEDS HELP FROM CONGRESS

(Address by the Honorable JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania, before the Railroad Transportation Institute, Pittsburgh, Pa., October 24, 1961, 10 a.m.)

I appreciate the honor of the invitation to address this gathering of experts in railroad transportation.

As you all know, I am an old railroader. Although no longer actively engaged in railroading, I have retained my interest in the industry.

As a Member of Congress I am intensely concerned with whatever affects the welfare of this Nation.

Transportation not only affects the welfare of everyone in the United States—it is the foundation on which an industrial civilization such as our is built—and without which it could not continue.

During the years when this Nation was expanding from the east coast to develop the vast areas to the Pacific, railroads were the prime movers of goods and people.

For many years railroads and common carriers were synonymous.

Now there are other common carriers—and much of the Nation's transportation is by private means as well.

The motor vehicle and modern highways have increased the mobility of an already mobile people.

The jet age—with its ultramodern aircraft and service facilities—has reduced travel almost to the status of commuting.

But despite these new modes and methods of transportation the railroads remain the backbone of the system—basic to the American economy—and not only to the economy but to our very survival and that of the free world.

We all know that the railroad industry is the second largest in the United States—that it represents an investment of nearly $35 billion—and is one of the Nation's largest employers and taxpayers—as well as one of the largest buyers and users of goods and services produced by others.

Yet we also know that this great industry is today in grave economic trouble.

Partly—railroads are victims of their own history and of the chaotic conditions that marked our growth and development as a nation.

But in larger part they are victims of the excesses of Government control and of the failure of Government to gear its policies toward transportation to the changed conditions of today.

Although railroads have lost their position as the only common carriers of consequence, they continue to be regulated much as when they were the only practical means for transporting large volumes of goods.

Railroads are still the best means of moving the vast volume of traffic.

But under present conditions they may not compete with other common carriers on an equal footing and both the railroads and other common carriers are unfairly handicapped in competing with private and other unregulated carriers.

Railroads must work under limiting restrictions which are not applicable to other forms of transportation.

If railroads were permitted to compete on equal terms with other forms they would be able—as true common carriers—to provide better public service.

You are all as well or better aware than I of the many problems the railroad industry now faces.

But let me mention a few which are—in some measure at least—related to Government regulation.

Railroads have been trying to operate a 1961 business under 1920 regulations.

As a result technological development has been retarded and many new and proved techniques have not been widely applied.

Restrictions have made it impossible for railroads to use their capabilities as mass producers of transportation to enlarge their markets and earning power.

Railroads need a large volume of business to realize the full capabilities of the plant.

Continuing low earnings necessitate a tight rein on maintenance and capital expenditures.

If prolonged—as earnings have been since World War II—the inevitable result is a shrinkage of railroad capacity.

Reserve railroad capacity is now less than at the beginning of World War II and would be dangerously inadequate in the event of a national emergency.

No transportation form has a vested right to handle certain traffic or to be protected against fair competition.

On the other hand, no form of transportation should be arbitrarily or unfairly precluded from competing with others.

Railroads should not be barred from charging rates for their services which exceed the cost of performing the service.

Consumer prices should not be inflated by unnecessarily high transportation costs.

Each transportation agency should be free to tailor services to fit the needs of customers.

But under Government regulation today, these basic principles of sound regulatory policy are completely ignored.

The result has been to encourage the inefficient in transportation at the expense of the efficient.

Total freight volume has increased rapidly, but the railroad share and that of common carriers as a whole have steadily declined.

The greatest increase by far has been in unregulated transportation, especially private.

Unless this trend is quickly reversed, there is danger that the Nation will soon find itself without an adequate common carrier system.

Despite the mushrooming growth of unregulated carriage, few changes have been made in the basic pattern of transport regulation and even these have been made on a sort of patchwork, emergency, or crises basis, without attention to basic problems or long-range goals.

The Transportation Act of 1958 was a step in the right direction but the railroads need more freedom to make competitive rates.

Provision should be made to allow the railroads to offer any rate so long as it is compensatory and is not unduly discriminatory between shippers or regions.

Rates must not be denied in order to protect other forms of transport.

Ratemaking freedom should be extended and not curtailed.

Consideration of the revenue effect of a proposed rate should be limited to the carrier proposing the rate.

The same ratemaking rule should apply to all carriers subject to the Transportation Act and should not be used by the ICC as an instrument to manipulate the normal competitive balance.

In this connection it would seem that the ICC should not set specific rates but only reasonable minimum and maximum rates.

If ever an industry needed the attention of Congress to correct grave inequities, it was railroads in 1961.

But, ironically, the measure that received priority attention almost to the exclusion of all others was one that would have repealed even the limited ratemaking freedom won for railroads in the Transportation Act of 1958.

Although the measure did not get out of the Senate Commerce Committee the danger is not yet past.

For its supporters, led by James Hoffa and the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, have promised an even more determined effort next year.

Both shippers and railroads gained in the defeat of recent proposals to suspend the power of the ICC to approve mergers.

While the exact number of railroad systems needed to serve the Nation cannot be stated exactly—it is clear that the Nation cannot afford the luxury of existing duplication.

To compel certain railroads to merge with others according to some plan worked out by a Government body would be tantamount to nationalization.

Mergers must be worked out by railroads themselves on the basis of practical and realistic interests in each case.

However Government can and should make certain of reasonable safeguards to protect weaker railroads in the way of maintenance of routes and services—and the power to do this already has been vested in the ICC.

Few markets grow faster than transportation—which is predicted to double in 1980.

With present restrictions on railroad operations—it is impossible for railroads to develop as they should and as the national interest requires.

One of the major limiting factors is the insufficiency of funds generated through depreciation.

The low average rate for depreciation of road and structures and equipment makes the railroad especially vulnerable to inflationary influences.

For example—a car which cost $2,500 in 1929 can only be replaced today at a cost of $10,500 or more.

The difference has to be made up largely from borrowed funds—but the low level of railroad earnings has little appeal either to investors or lenders.

Congress should take note of these factors and allow a more realistic depreciation program.

Railroads should be allowed to recover their investment in plant and equipment within a shorter tax writeoff period than the present average of 40 years and should be permitted to earmark more funds out of income for replacement of property worn out in operations.

Rolling stock should be allowed a writeoff period of 15 years and other equipment 20 years.

One area in which Congress has acted to remove inequities between railroads and other transportation is in tightening the agricultural commodities exemption.

The 1958 act returned several formerly exempt products to regulation.

But again it did not go far enough.

The agricultural commodities exemption should either be repealed or extended to railroad operations.

Present regulation places railroads at a severe disadvantage in competing for hauling these commodities.

Their rates must always be published and cannot be changed on less than 30 days' notice to the public.

Other carriers may quote any rate necessary to obtain the traffic.

The opportunity to handle agricultural commodities traffic must be made available to all carriers on equal terms.

Congress should also repeal the bulk commodities exemption applicable to barge transportation or extend it to include the same commodities when carried by railroads.

Also, the commodities clause should be repealed.

This, as you know, is a restriction on the right of railroads to transport commodities which they own, or in which they have an interest.

It applies only to railroads, and other transport forms are not so restricted.

The passenger problems of railroads particularly need attention.

The provision for discontinuing certain passenger service contained in the 1958 act made it less cumbersome and burdensome to discontinue unprofitable trains and services.

But what is needed most are measures to help preserve railroad passenger service by making it possible to operate passenger trains at a profit.

Repeal of the 10-percent passenger fare tax would help and would also remove the discrimination against the people who must use public transportation.

Most of the critical passenger service problems involve the commuter lines.

Modernization to permit profitable operation of commuter service is not possible unless traffic volume is high—and unless railroad property used in this service is relieved of the heavy and inequitable taxloads it now carries.

Many cities that have allowed their raillines to disappear are belatedly finding out that they will have to be rebuilt—and at far higher cost.

Only a few short months after allowing its privately owned taxpaying commuter railroad to close up shop—the city of Los Angeles is reported to be seriously considering the construction of a costly new rapid transit system—employing conventional tracks and trains.

San Francisco is in the process of readying final plans for a similar system of rapid transit.

A fully automated rail rapid transit system costing $200 million has been proposed for Atlanta.

Right here in Pittsburgh—an exhaustive transport study is being made at a time when the Pennsylvania Railroad has about concluded that its commuter service to the city cannot be made to pay.

In short—the preoccupation over the past decade with multilane freeways and expressways as a solution to metropolitan transportation problems is now revealed as the wrong approach.

Valuable tax-ratable property is replaced by nontaxable concrete and asphalt—and no matter how fast approach highways are built—they do not solve the problems of parking and street congestion within the cities themselves.

One of my colleagues in Congress estimates that if railroad commuter service were discontinued in just five cities—the cost of additional highways to take up the slack would be $31 billion.

While the commuter problems are basically local or area problems—insofar as they affect the capability of the railroad system to serve the Nation they are national problems.

During the session of Congress just ended legislation was enacted which provides funds for assisting local government agencies with commuter service.

This is a step in the right direction.

Measures to provide more adequate funds for procuring commuter equipment should follow.

An ICC proposal to help preserve essential passenger service by subsidy to individual railroads will probably come before the next session of Congress.

I have mentioned only a few of the more serious inequities that handicap railroads as a result of the failure to modernize our national transportation policy and laws; there are many more.

Despite these handicaps—railroads since World War II have somehow managed to invest over a billion dollars a year on the average to provide new plants and equipment.

They have also developed ingenious new methods and concepts such as piggybacking and containerization.

Considering the low level of railroad earnings in the same period—their record in this area of self-help is outstanding.

Yet there are those who say that railroads have not done enough.

Curiously some who say this are Members of Congress who have voted to approve expenditures totaling $1,364 million in foreign aid to railroad projects outside the United States.

Surely it is reasonable to expect our Government to give as much attention to insuring adequate railroad service at home—as it has to providing for railroad needs in other countries.

In saying this—I do not mean to imply that the remedy for railroad ills lies in a massive infusion of tax dollars.

Nor does it involve the enactment of measures that would place undue burden on railroad competitors.

Above all—the remedy does not lie in hamstringing private transportation.

The motor vehicle is here to stay—and an American citizen still has the right to choose whether he will drive his own automobile or operate his own trucks—or engage the services of carriers for hire.

Freedom of choice for the individual is one of the freedoms which are the very foundation of our national life.

But the general welfare and defense of the entire Nation is endangered when the common carrier system of transportation is not kept strong.

The only sound remedy lies in relaxing government regulations which prevent common carriers from competing on equal terms—both servicewise and costwise—with private transportation.

There are obvious advantages in common carrier service for a large part of the traffic now carried by private vehicles—and given the freedom to tailor charges and services to fit the customers' needs—common carrier service could be made much more attractive than private carriage.

The Federal Government is engaged in a variety of programs designed to regulate and promote various forms of transportation—with little or no coordination among the programs.

Better coordination is necessary in the public interest and many Members of the Congress, including myself, are working to that end.

Through legislation—some of which I have briefly indicated today—the Congress can contribute substantially to solving the problems facing the railroads and to maintaining the strong and adequate common carrier system which is vital to our national existence.

You may rest assured that I shall continue to support measures which will strengthen our rail transportation system and provide a regulatory climate within which a well coordinated—truly national system of transportation may evolve.

It has been a great pleasure to be here today and I thank you for affording me the opportunity.

Petitions Call for Congress To Stop the Red Mail Subsidy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have today submitted to the Speaker a number of petitions calling for an end to the subsidy of Communist propaganda.

These petitions, signed by 353 persons in several States, were forwarded to me by various persons with the request that they be submitted to the Congress. I am more than happy to oblige these persons who share the disgust felt by many Americans of the fact that this Nation

delivers free all the tons of Communist propaganda sent to this country.

I would call attention to the several bills before the House which would ban this material from the U.S. mail. Early action on this legislation is needed to stop this subsidy given the Kremlin in its efforts to poison our minds and confuse and trick refugees from Iron Curtain countries.

I now include the text of the petitions:

"A petition calling upon Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM to present to the Congress of the United States of America to stop the Red mail subsidy.

"We, the undersigned citizens of the United States, pledged to support the Constitution, do hereby urge the Congress of the United States to immediately stop the incoming Communist propaganda mail. On March 17, 1961, President Kennedy ordered a halt to the Government's practice of intercepting Communist propaganda mailed to this country from abroad. Not only do we now allow the incoming Communist literature to be distributed to our schools, churches, and individuals but Uncle Sam obligingly delivers free of charge. Congress should act now on this suicidal foolishness. Representative FRANK T. BOW, of Ohio, said:

" 'No other country in the free world permits Moscow's propaganda to be delivered at the expense of its own taxpayers. Many countries refuse to let such subversive material in under any circumstances.'

"Stop the flood of Communist mail into our country."

A Bill To Close the Loophole in Coastwise Shipping Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to eliminate a loophole in maritime law. Under the present act, U.S. vessels only are permitted to carry freight between two points in the United States.

The act which my bill would amend is the Merchant Marine Act of 1920, commonly referred to as the Jones Act, which in section 27 thereof provides that no merchandise shall be transported by water or by land and water between points in the United States, either directly or via foreign port, in any vessel other than one built in and documented under the laws of the United States and owned by U.S. citizens. There is a clause in section 27, however, which I propose to repeal, containing an exception or waiver in favor of routes which are in part over Canadian rail lines and their own and connecting water facilities. This exception opens the door to an operation such as was recently announced by the Canadian rail lines under which they would move merchandise in bonded railroad cars from Midwestern points in the United States to Prince Rupert, thence transshipped via their Canadian-owned railroad car carriers for discharge in Whittier, Alaska, a terminal of the U.S. Government-owned Alaska Railroad.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my bill is to remove the discrimination of this loophole and assure equal treatment of all coastwise cargo transportation. In this connection, the bill seeks to protect U.S. privately owned carriers from unfair Government-subsidized foreign-owned railroad and barge service.

If some of the existing volume of traffic to and from Alaska is diverted through new routes via Canada, the U.S. carriers presently struggling under great financial difficulty to maintain service will be forced to curtail or completely abandon their operations.

If Alaska trade is open to foreign-flag subsidized service, Mr. Speaker, temporarily the U.S. Government-owned Alaska Railroad might benefit, but Seward, Anchorage, Valdez, and all southeastern Alaska ports would suffer substantially. I believe some of these communities would disappear entirely in the wake of no regular transportation at all.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, American-owned barge lines and steamship companies have operated under great difficulty. A Canadian Government subsidized railroad barge line from Prince Rupert would threaten continued operation of U.S. privately owned unsubsidized carriers and thereby in the long run Alaska's overall economy would lose heavily. American railroad lines and west coast suppliers would be hard hit.

It is no secret, Mr. Speaker, that the Alaska Steamship Co. has recently been advised that its contract to carry the U.S. mails will be further drastically cut. Also it is known that this company has been transferring its capital into other areas and business activities. Just such a syphoning off of traffic to a Canadian-subsidized carrier could result in abandonment of the old long-established privately owned service.

The Congress should see to it that the laws governing coastwise trade of the United States do not discriminate against U.S. carriers.

It is to the long-range overall economic advantage of Alaska to see that the loophole in the law is removed, such as my bill contemplates.

Otherwise, Alaska may wake up and find that outside of a U.S. Government-owned railroad from Whittier to Fairbanks and a Canadian rail car service from Prince Rupert to Whittier, she will have no other regular freight service by water.

This Canadian railroad development could be a brainchild of some bureaucrat in the Alaska Railroad. I know some advocates of big government that will never rest until the Alaska Railroad is extended over land to connect with Canada's railroads, regardless of the cost to the American taxpayers. The report of the Battelle Institute, which conducted independent research for the Alaska Rail and Highway Commission, clearly showed that Alaska could best be developed and obtain the lowest freight costs by the building of highways to tidewater.

In the past there was a program to have tolls imposed on the highway to put private truckers out of business and force shippers to use the railroad.

Mr. Speaker, I warn that if U.S. water carriers serving Alaska are forced to curtail or terminate completely their existing service, as well may be the case, it would be a serious economic blow to Alaska. It would hurt all west coast ports. But the precedent of allowing foreign-flag operations could do harm in many areas.

This is an emergency situation, Mr. Speaker, and therefore I am asking for expeditious action on my bill by all agencies and the House Committee on Merchant Marine.

Saturday Evening Post Calls for an End of the Subsidy for Communist Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the respected voice of the Saturday Evening Post has joined many others in speaking out editorially on the shameful subsidy being given Communist propaganda by our postal laws.

The Post editorial asks the question, "Why do we assist the Soviet Union and other Iron Curtain countries in distributing tons of propaganda material in this country among refugees, minority groups, student, and youth organizations?"

I commend to all my colleagues this forceful editorial from one of America's oldest and most respected periodicals, which appeared under the title "Let's Stop Giving Red Propaganda a Free Ride."

There are now some 13 bills before the Congress to end this subsidy. One of them, H.R. 9004, which I introduced late in the last session, has been the subject of conferences with postal and customs officials. It is my hope that—unless the pending postal rate bill is amended to ban this Communist propaganda—hearings will be scheduled early in this session on H.R. 9004 and all similar bills.

It is time to call a halt to the subsidized distribution of this Red propaganda.

I now include the Saturday Evening Post editorial of December 16, 1961:

LET'S STOP GIVING RED PROPAGANDA A FREE RIDE

The United States is supposed to be fighting Communist propaganda. Why then do we assist the Soviet Union and other Iron Curtain countries in distributing tons of propaganda material in this country among refugees, minority groups, student and youth organizations? This is just what we have been doing.

Previous to a Presidential order of last March, second- and third-class mail—including some gaudy propaganda magazines—was rejected by the customs authorities at the ports of entry. Recipients in the United States of such material from Iron Curtain countries were asked if they wished to accept it. If not accepted, the letters were returned

to the sender. Thus a harassed Czechoslovak or Ukrainian need not reveal his whereabouts for possible threats or blackmail.

Today there is no means of holding up the truckloads of propaganda material sent to Communist agents in the United States for distribution where it will do the most harm. Irving Fishman, deputy collector of customs in New York, told the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security that "the effect of the Soviet material can best be evaluated by the reaction of the people of foreign origin who have been in almost daily communication with us from all over the country, asking us to withhold delivery of this material and explaining that it is dangerous to circulate it among the people of the United States, especially those who have their heritage in these foreign countries."

Besides the millions of packages of tracts and magazines, there is a persistent campaign by letter, directed to exiles in this country. A Ukrainian or a Hungarian who receives a letter by registered mail from his homeland realizes that, despite the fact that he has moved or changed his first name, the authorities in the Communist country have a line on him. Dr. Bela Fabian, chairman of the Federation of Hungarian Former Political Prisoners, states that "these exiles are constantly harassed by Government-inspired letters from relatives in the Ukraine and not infrequently accosted or approached by alleged agents of the Soviet Government. They are alternately implored, threatened, or blackmailed into returning to their homeland, to work for their homeland in the country of their adoption or even solicited to act as spies."

Apparently in the hope of creating good will, the United States finds itself acting as finger man on behalf of the Communists, at the same time facilitating the distribution of enticing pictures of life in the slave countries. Could we not at least demand equal treatment for our own publications?

How We Got This Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, between October 8 and December 24, 1961, the New York Daily News published a series of 12 thoughtful editorials entitled "How We Got This Way." Each editorial stands on its own feet in that it is a treatment of a separate phase of our history. At the same time, each contributes to the overall topic "How the United States came to be the kind of Nation it is instead of some other kind." I believe they deserve to be widely read and discussed. The series will be presented as separate insertions in the RECORD for the next 3 days. The first of the series appears below:

HOW WE GOT THIS WAY

The News begins today a series of Sunday editorials on how the United States came to be the kind of Nation it is, instead of some other kind.

There will be 12 editorials in the series, unless our enthusiasm for the subject carries us beyond that number.

The United States of America grew, by way of armed revolt, out of Thirteen Colonies planted mainly by British pioneers, adventurers and businessmen along the middle Atlantic edge of the North American Continent in the 17th century—except for Georgia, which wasn't founded until 1733.

These Colonies were Virginia, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connnecticut, Maryland, New York (snatched by the British from the Dutch), New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, New Hampshire, North and South Carolina, and Georgia.

The two most famous names in our early colonial history were those of Capt. John Smith, boss of Jamestown Colony (1607) in Virginia, and William Bradford, second Governor of the Pilgrim vanguard that arrived in Massachusetts aboard the ship *Mayflower* in 1620.

TOUGH BREED OF SETTLERS

The British in those days were, by and large, a tough, bold, optimistic, ambitious, and grabby breed of cats. Some of the toughest and boldest among them took off for North America.

These people, besides being extremely hard cooked, had a fierce dislike for various things at home—notably the Church of England's 17th century intolerance toward dissenters, and the nobility's habit of fencing off large tracts of land so that an estimated one-third of the British population was hopelessly pauperized.

Accordingly, many of the colonists started out with convictions that everybody should be free to worship as he pleased, and that any man willing and able to farm should not find it too hard to get himself a piece of what land was available.

Almost from the beginning, there was friction here and there between the Colonies and the so-called mother country.

The monarchs of Great Britain, busily building an empire ever since the wrecking of the Spanish Armada in 1588 by Sir Francis Drake, swiftly came to regard the North American Colonies as their personal property, to do with as they pleased.

They granted huge domains in the Colonies to court favorites; sent over crown governors who robbed and oppressed the people; levied heavy and often unfair taxes; and consistently pursued a policy that went by the name of mercantilism.

This policy boiled down to the proposition that the Colonies were to be milked by the Crown and should relax and enjoy it.

"FARMS" OF GEORGE III

The colonials didn't relax, didn't enjoy it, and gradually developed sly and highly effective ways of cheating on the system which London strove to keep riveted on them.

Matters began to come to a head shortly after King George III (1738–1820) took the throne in 1760. George III customarily called the Colonies his "farms," which gives you an idea of his government's policies toward them.

Tax laws were piled on tax laws. More and more British troops were sent here to be fed and housed by the Americans. Trade with countries other than Britain was severely curtailed. Manufacturing was virtually forbidden.

Of all these oppressive laws, the Stamp Act (1765) and the monopolistic Tea Act (1767) were the most detested. On December 16, 1773, a mob of citizens disguised as Indians boarded British ships in Boston's harbor and heaved their tea cargoes overboard.

The Boston Tea Party should have taught George III a lesson; but George was not one who learned easily.

By this time, colonial fire-eaters were talking revolution—among them Patrick Henry in Virginia and Samuel Adams in Massachusetts. Time was running out on a king who didn't know it.

The first Continental Congress convened September 5, 1774, in Philadelphia. The first shots of the American Revolution were fired in the battles of Lexington and Concord (Mass.) April 19, 1775; and the second Continental Congress met at Philadelphia May 10, 1775. Of that, more in the next editorial in this series.

Extremists on the Left

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD C. BRUCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, the January 8, 1962, issue of Babson's Washington Forecast contains an interesting item focusing attention on one outstanding example of the extremist language often used by those who like to parade as "liberals." The item most lucidly speaks for itself and should be heeded carefully by our extremists on the left.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the item, as follows:

STRAWMAN

The State Department is firing potshots at a "strawman" in response to the nationwide tide of criticism against this country's Congo policy.

Charges by Mennen Williams and Carl Rowan that the "Katanga lobby" has brought American support for its causes are ridiculously incredible.

Michael Struelens, the Katanga public-relations man, was given a 1½-year budget of $140,000. With this, he rents and operates a fairly expensive office, pays the salaries of two assistants as well as his own; publishes a Katanga publicity bulletin, and pays for extensive travel and other expenses.

The State Department implication is that—with what money is left—Struelens has "bought up" such prominent Americans as Herbert Hoover, Richard Nixon, a large number of U.S. Senators and Representatives, a host of American newspaper editors, reporters, and columnists, and millions of "seemingly indignant" citizens.

Williams accuses this "propaganda machine" of spreading "horrendous tales of indiscriminate mayhem by the United Nations troops." Actually, the mayhem tales were wired by AP and UP newsmen in Elisabethville who were almost annihilated in the promiscuous UN bombardment of that city and random bombing of civilian targets.

Rowan used catch phrases in referring to Struelens' operation as a "clever big-money campaign" representing "special economic interests * * *." By American money standards, Struelens is a piker.

Rowan charges that Katanga Chief Tshombe, by his unreasonable plea for self-determination for his people, has been playing directly into Communist hands * * * as the Reds await the opportunity to make hay from the resulting chaos. The truth: The Soviet Union is actively supporting the U.S. and U.N. objective of forcing anti-Communist Tshombe to submit to and join the Communist-riddled government now ruling the rest of the Congo.

In his speech, Rowan associated the Katanga supporters in the United States with the archconservatives, enemies of the income tax, defenders of segregation, oppo-

nents of water fluoridation, and assailants of the Supreme Court. This sort of guilt-by-association technique would, by comparison, make the late Senator Joe McCarthy look like the epitome of restraint.

Our advice to Mr. Rowan: The tide of criticism would quickly change to a wave of applause if, at long last, American foreign policy would start operating in the interest of America.

The U.N. Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Wall Street Journal of January 11. This editorial expresses the thoughts and anxieties of many of our people and many of our constituents concerning the future usefulness of the United Nations.

The United Nations has proved incapable of either promoting or keeping the peace. Since it has broken with the original charter and started interfering in the internal affairs of its members and many of the small and weaker states, it has become a positive menace.

The United Nations now acts on a double standard, one for the weak, on whom it can work its will with mercenary troops, and a very different one for the strong, before whom it bows in deep humility.

The editorial follows:

THE U.N. QUESTION

It's just about impossible these days to avoid running into "the U.N. question." In conversations and in periodicals of all political hues the same questions are being raised: Is the United Nations worth keeping? More particularly, can the United States continue to support the U.N. as an instrument of policy?

This widespread concern, although belated, is healthy. For the questions are the right ones, and they are important ones for the United States.

From the beginning, or so it has seemed to us from the beginning, the U.N. had to be regarded with skepticism for the plain and simple reason that it was founded on a fallacious premise: The assumption that the Soviet Union would cooperate with the United States in building a peaceful world.

In view of this fundamental fallacy, it has been a disquieting thing all these years to see American children taught to revere the U.N., and sometimes taught more about it than about their own Government. Even more disquieting has been the incessant reference to it by Government officials as the cornerstone of American foreign policy. As recently as last year the U.N. was called the only alternative to war—an absurdity if there ever was one.

Still, for years no irretrievable harm was done to U.S. interests in the world as a result of the U.N.'s false premise. For this we can thank the Soviets, who quickly made their implacable hostility unmistakably clear, and thus drove us to other alliances and arrangements more suited to our interests. We found we could live with the U.N., in effect using it when usable and ignoring it when not.

Today, however, we confront a new situation. Due to the unseemly swelling of the U.N. membership, the United States now has 1 vote out of 104 in the General Assembly; it is overwhelmed by many new "nations" that are but fictitious fragments. What this means in practice was well illustrated in the wake of India's aggression against Goa and the other Portugese enclaves.

The United States wanted a Security Council condemnation of India; the Soviets vetoed that. The next step would have been for the United States to take the matter to the General Assembly, where a two-thirds majority can override a Security Council veto. In the old days the United States would have got it handily; this time it didn't even try because it knew it couldn't get anything like the required number of votes. Even though the Indians had conquired the enclaves by force, the Afro-Asian bloc was on India's side; to them this was a case of an ex-colony, India, proceeding against a colonial power, Portugal.

Now the United States obviously doesn't have to apologize to anyone for its own anticolonial origins and traditions. But the thinking in the U.N.'s dominant factions on this issue is upside down. Russia, the only significant colonial power today, is not regarded by the Afro-Asians as a colonial power. As for the rest, anything goes in the name of anticolonialism. And this includes the use of force by the U.N. itself in the name of anticolonialism.

That is the case of the Congo, in which the United States is so deeply involved through the U.N. The U.N. force was used not as a buffer, not to prevent civil war and keep peace, but as an active antagonist to drive out the presumed vestiges of colonialism. In the expert opinion of Harvard Professor of Government Stanley Hoffmann, writing in the New Republic, this was a reversal of the peaceful policies the late Dag Hammarskjold tried to apply.

Unquestionably it is a precedent, and an awesome one for the United States to contemplate. If the United States goes along with this anticolonialism theory, as it has in the Congo, into what more morasses may not the United States be dragged? As Mr. Hoffmann puts it, "The U.N. is simply not equipped to cope with a world in which too many hunting grounds are left open; another aggression justified by anticolonialism might, this time, provoke extensive bloodshed."

And that, we think, suggests the nub of the U.N. question. The United States is thoroughly enmeshed in an institution it cannot control and which is a potential danger both to peace and to American interests. Professor Hoffmann states it even more strongly: "There is a serious risk involved in entrusting the pursuit of important national interests to a mechanism the next twists and turns of which one cannot predict."

At least this much ought to be clear: The United States had best be extremely wary of the U.N. And the Congress and the people had best face the questions honestly, and at last without sentimentality. Our security may depend on realistic answers.

A Parallel in Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, on last Wednesday, the House installed a new Speaker and Majority Leader. Both JOHN W. MCCORMACK and CARL ALBERT are capable and experienced legislators—dedicated to our form of government and the welfare of the people. The Democratic majority did well in its choice of these two Members.

A parallel exists in my State of New Jersey where on last Tuesday, the State senate installed a new president of the senate and majority leader, except both are Republicans, but apart from party affiliations, the similarity remains. Frank S. Farley, the new president of the senate, and Charles W. Sandman, the majority leader, are capable and experienced legislators. Senator Farley of Atlantic County has served as State senator for over 20 years, and has been a dedicated public servant all of his adult life. He is an acknowledged Republican leader in South Jersey, and has received many honors for a host of accomplishments. His political motif has always been good government and the welfare of the people. He has never forgotten the training of his youth as a member of one of the fine old families of Atlantic City, and is always kind, considerate, and fair in his associations with his colleagues and constituents.

Senator Sandman, the new majority leader, is a man of great fortitude borne of good training and experience in government. As the senator representing a small county, he has had to battle with the political leaders from the large counties, and has always faired well in the result and gained stature at the same time. He, too, is a patient, kindly man with a convincing manner that pleases and placates all who come in touch with him.

The State of New Jersey is, indeed, fortunate in having these fine officials directing the senate during the forthcoming year, and as the senators representing two of my three counties of the Second Congressional District, Atlantic and Cape May Counties, I am looking forward to our cooperation, which has been so steadfast and helpful to me in my 4 years in Congress.

Views of H. L. Yochum, President of Capital University, Columbus, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks of H. L. Yochum, president of Capital University, Columbus, Ohio, which appeared in the December 1961 issue of the Capital University Bulletin.

President Yochum is a highly respected educator and administrator on a college level and his views are most refreshing in these times when so many people seem to be demanding so much more from the Federal Government.

VIEWS OF H. L. YOCHUM, PRESIDENT OF CAPITAL UNIVERSITY, COLUMBUS, OHIO

WHAT ABOUT FEDERAL AID?

A few months ago when we were about to start construction of a new residence hall for men students, estimated to cost over $400,000, we decided that we should arrange a loan of $300,000 from a local savings and loan association rather than from the Federal Government. Instead of a 40-year loan, this is a 20-year loan. Instead of around 3 percent interest we are paying 5½ percent interest. Was this right or wrong, wise or foolish? You be the judge; let us tell you why our board of regents took this action.

At the very outset we may as well admit that most of our colleges and universities are gladly applying for Federal loans on construction of buildings. Some of my colleagues tell me that we are foolish to hold out on this issue and some impressive reasons are given in educational journals why we should quit debating and gratefully accept all the Federal aid we can get. Frankly, most of the argument in support of accepting Federal aid seems to be rationalization (which I would define as giving impressive reasons for what you have already decided to do for less impressive reasons). I cannot help thinking of the alleged reply of a politician when he was asked where he stood on a certain issue "as a matter of principle"; said he, "wait until I have figured out where the advantages are, and then I'll tell you where I stand as a matter of principle.

OUT OF BOTH SIDES OF OUR MOUTHS?

During November the college presidents and some of their colleagues have been visiting business and industrial firms throughout the State to present the needs and merits of the independent college and invite support through the Ohio Foundation of Independent Colleges. For 10 years we have told these business and industrial leaders that we feel there is a place for the independent colleges and universities alongside the tax-supported institutions of our State and several of our cities. We have declared that we think independent colleges and independent business firms have a common stake in preserving private initiative and enterprise, that we should help one another and not run to the Government to get the help we need. Now, can we have it both ways? Can we talk out of both sides of our mouths? Can we solicit gifts as voluntary support and then turn around and ask for aid from tax-derived funds? During the 10 years we have worked together in the Ohio Foundation of Independent Colleges we have received significant amounts; the total for capital is nearly $300,000. We have said this was the alternative to losing our independence by taking Federal aid. I want to be honest when I present our case to the public.

WHAT ABOUT CONTROL?

But do we risk our independence by accepting Federal aid? Will Government control result? To some degree it is inevitable. Those who are in charge of disbursing funds collected from the public by taxation have an implicit right—and duty—to see that these funds are used as intended, that the recipients follow the directions which are part of the deal. While I suspect no sinister plot on the part of anyone to set the stage for taking over control of education, the more we become dependent on anyone for the financial aid we must have the more we subject ourselves to the possibility of such control. This is clearly involved in church support for church colleges: when we accept support from our church body we accept also a degree of control, and rightly so. Should independent colleges, particularly church colleges, place themselves in the same position with our civil government? I want to be sure we do not jeopardize our independence.

THE DRIFT TOWARD SOCIALISM

Entirely aside from political partisanship, all of us must recognize the trend toward more and more government participation in social and economic affairs since 1930. More and more the State and National Governments have taken over responsibilities from the local community, the church groups, and the individual. Construction of roads or highways, expansion of hospitals and welfare services, now education—matching grants or other subsidies are provided from Federal tax sources. Why? Chiefly because no other agency has such breadth and depth of taxing power as the Federal Government. But, just as truly, because we think we get by cheaper that way. We regard such grants as given to us free of charge, though we know the ultimate source of all taxes must be ourselves. Money does not increase in value by being sent to the State or National Capital and then back again to the local point of origin. The only ones who can gain by this procedure are those who have little, contribute little in taxes, but receive more because it was taken away from others. This taking from all to give to some at the discretion of individuals or bureaus is socialistic. What's so wrong about that? It erodes our spirit of enterprise and individual responsibility, substituting a paternalistic state. What we should reject and resist if it were attempted by force we are supinely accepting because it is done by handouts. I want no part of that trend, a poor substitute for the spirit of independence and responsibility which built America's greatness.

REBUTTALS

Two rebuttals are frequently offered to our stated position. "You cannot resist the historic process—you cannot fight the current trend." Why not? If we feel that the current trend is wrong we can and we should fight it. If we are convinced the historic process is in the wrong direction, we are morally obligated to resist it. Where are our principles, where is our concern for values, where is our fidelity to the best interests of our institution or church or nation, if we go along with policies we consider wrong? "Well, even so, since this money is available you are foolish if you do not get your share of it." Such opportunistic motivation represents a dismal surrender of ethical principles, it seems to me. Can we stoop so low and maintain our integrity, our self-respect?

WHICH PRICE DO WE PAY?

It will cost us something to decline cheap and easy money, so freely given. Our church, our alumni, our friends who believe in private enterprise and in the independence of our church colleges will have to provide the money that we need for our survival in the years ahead. I believe that is the better way and I have enough faith and hope to take this calculated risk. Much is at stake; the future of Capital University and even more than that. Tell me, am I right or wrong? Tell me, where do you stand on this issue?

Minneapolis' Outstanding Financial Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the city of Minneapolis recently received the distinction of maintaining one of the Nation's best managed city financial programs. The gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. WALTER JUDD, and I jointly represent the residents of Minneapolis and hence take great pride in this accomplishment of the past and present city councils who have so skillfully managed the finance program for the city. In recognition of this fine record the Hennepin County Young Republican League Resolutions Assembly recently adopted the following resolution which, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD:

Whereas the city of Minneapolis has received a triple A credit rating from Standard and Poor's and Moody's; and

Whereas only six major cities in the country have received such a high credit rating; and

Whereas this credit rating will enable the city to obtain finances at lower interest rates: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Hennepin County Young Republican League Resolutions Assembly commend the members of the past and present city council and board of estimate and taxation, especially Alderman Frank Moulton, for securing for Minneapolis this outstanding financial achievement.

Labor Unions Versus Public Interest in Defense Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House to bills which I introduced on the opening day of Congress, which I sincerely believe to be in the best interests of our defense effort.

One of the bills, H.R. 9555, would prohibit strikes by employees employed in certain strategic defense facilities, such as missile sites, and so forth. The second, H.R. 9554, would amend the antitrust laws to prohibit certain activities of labor organizations in restraint of trade.

These bills are identical to the two introduced last September by Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, chairman of the Permanent Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Government Operations Committee. Hearings held by this committee last April and May showed that a series of strikes, work stoppages, featherbedding and other inefficient and uneconomical practices and abuses at Cape Canaveral, Vanderberg and other missile bases and defense establishments, had most certainly harmed our defense efforts. The revelations brought out during the course of these investigations were truly shocking and astounding.

In a speech given last September by Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell L. Gilpatric, before the National Security Industrial Association—which is made up of defense contractors—I note that he stated "the country has a right to demand of both defense industry and defense establishments a higher level of efficiency." I agree with this statement. I feel the country has a right, and I feel the Congress has a duty, to follow up

this demand by considering and passing legislation which will put the necessary teeth into the laws which will help provide this high level of efficiency. While the Missile Sites Labor Commission, set up by President Kennedy on May 26, 1961—after the revealing story of missile site abuses by some labor groups had become public—admittedly has done a fine and effective job, and has succeeded in reducing the abuse of our defense program to a great extent, this, in my opinion, is merely a stopgap measure, depending to a great extent upon the promises of some labor leaders, or voluntary compliance, to lessen and prevent such abuses. Promises, as we all know, are like piecrust—easily broken. A few hotheads in labor, just as a few hotheads in management, can too easily and quickly undo all the good which men of integrity and honor have brought about.

I noted further, in an article published in the Washington Star last October 10, that Secretary Goldberg, commenting upon the progress made by the Commission, pointed out that while strikes idled workers at missile and space sites for 1,136 man-days in September, 1961, this strike record was better than the 4,979 man-days lost in September, 1960—before establishment of the Missile Sites Labor Commission—and said "it is too high in view of the critical importance to the Nation of our missile and space programs."

While I full well realize Secretary Goldberg was not suggesting that the Missile Sites Labor Commission be dissolved, I believe and feel certain many other Members of Congress will agree with me, that we should exercise our responsibilities, as representatives of our people, to pass legislation which can insure the highest level of efficiency needed in our defense effort. The public deserves, and has a right to this insurance, and we would be remiss if we did not bend every effort to provide it.

I, of course, have been queried as to the likelihood or possibility that such legislation would be given consideration by the present administration. Let me say that I feel President Kennedy should be more than willing to give his political blessing to such proposals, in view of several statements he made while running for the office of President, regarding our "missile lag." Let me give you two examples from the printed "Speeches of Senator John F. Kennedy, Presidential Campaign of 1960." Here is a quote from a speech made before the VFW Convention at Detroit, Mich., where he said:

> The facts of the matter are that we are falling behind—behind in our schedules, behind in our needs, behind the Russians in our rate of progress. The missile lag looms larger and larger ahead * * * we need to put our Strategic Air Command on an air alert and under wide dispersal, improve our systems of continental defense, step up our antisubmarine warfare effort, increase the thrust of our rocket engines, harden our missile bases * * *

In a speech made at Kittanning, Pa., on October 15, 1961, Candidate Kennedy said:

> I believe that the present rate of growth of the Soviet Union in military strength, particularly in long-range missiles, is greater than ours, and while I believe that today the United States is secure, I believe there is a danger in 1962, 1963, and 1964, that unless we move ahead at a greater rate, we won't meet it * * *.

In adding up these statements, and the facts as developed during the investigations by Senator McCLELLAN, it becomes painfully apparent that we cannot afford to pamper one segment of our population at the expense of the security of our Nation. These legislative proposals should not be construed as a criticism of labor as a whole, any more than antitrust legislation of the past should be considered as criticism of business or management as a whole.

I believe it is important for the Congress to consider and pass this legislation, and for the President to join in this effort. We must remember that whether we like it or not, we are in a race for survival as a free nation. This situation is not one of our choosing and we have to bear in mind that neither is our defense effort. The work on missile sites and defense installations is critical in the final determination of whether or not the United States maintains its present military superiority.

I sincerely hope the Members of Congress will see their way clear to join in consideration and passage of this, or similar legislation.

Public Costs of Urban Renewal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on December 29, last, Dr. Robert Moore Fisher, chief economist of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, delivered a thoughtful address before a meeting of the American Finance Association in New York City entitled "Public Costs of Urban Renewal." I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC COSTS OF URBAN RENEWAL

(By Robert Moore Fisher)

The text for this paper is taken from the 14th chapter of the Gospel according to St. Luke. Verse 28 reads as follows:

"For which of you, intending to build a tower, sitteth not down first, and counteth the cost, whether he have sufficient to finish it?"

To sit down and count the cost or to weigh the benefits of urban renewal—whether in terms of office towers, replatted streets, or rearranged establishments—requires more than saintly exhortation. Some burdens and rewards, such as cash outlays for capital expenditures or cash receipts from property taxes, may be measured readily. Others, such as involuntary mobility or reshaped townscapes, may only be estimated at best.

Nor is that all. Public aid for urban renewal takes specific form under legislation. But urban renewal goals are broadly, if not vaguely, defined. Trying to match dollars and projects against purposes and objectives may only complicate the picture. That, in turn, may leave all too little room for considering alternatives.[1] Toward resolving all these matters, this paper is intended to represent only an essay, not a verdict.

SOME FEDERAL COSTS AND BENEFITS

Substantial Federal resources and technical aids have been reserved for the urban renewal program. Under Title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, Federal grant authorizations for urban renewal total $4 billion. This contract authorization may be used chiefly to help write-down development costs of projects. Besides the sum of $4 billion, $75 million has been set aside for urban planning grants under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended.

Over and above these amounts, certain features of programs within the Federal Housing Administration, the Public Housing Administration, the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Small Business Administration, and the Area Redevelopment Administration have been especially designed to support urban renewal. To cite two cases: For low-rent public housing, the provisions of the Housing Act of 1961 made available some 100,000 additional units at estimated average development costs of $14,000 each. A substantial number of these dwellings, it was said, would be needed to accommodate urban renewal requirements. The 1961 act also permitted the Small Business Administration to make loans under its disaster loan program for the first time to small businesses displaced from urban renewal sites or by other construction conducted by or with Federal funds. Thus to express the maximum potential Federal commitment toward urban renewal solely in terms of the $4 billion title I grant authorization would understate the case.

Federal aid affecting patterns of urban land use, of course, goes beyond title I and its supporting programs. Within various cities, dominant Federal facilities like courthouses, office buildings, military installations, or defense highways may be erected, remodeled, or closed. Substantial increases or reductions in Federal employment may take place. The size and location of such actions have impacts upon community land uses that politicians, at least, have come to understand forcefully.[2]

Economic benefits to the Federal Government from urban renewal seem more difficult to trace. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator has stated that $4 billion in Federal grants might stimulate as much as $2 billion in community cash-or-kind contributions plus $20 billion in supplementary private investment associated with urban renewal projects. From this activity will come Federal income tax revenues of undetermined amounts.

The question remains open however, whether the marginal increase in revenue may justify the marginal cost to the Federal Government. The answer may depend in part upon how much urban renewal aid may merely shift the location and timing of changes in urban land use. May it, say, only redirect some capital formation from the suburbs to central cities? Or may it generate additional spending, investment, and employment that would not otherwise occur?

The issue of substitution of public for private credit versus stimulation of autonomous capital formation, I believe, deserves greater consideration than it has so far received.[3]

The more the Federal Government becomes involved in our economy, the greater becomes its potential impact upon the costs and

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

benefits arising from changes in urban land use. Examples of this involvement may range from a Supreme Court decision on school segregation to legislation concerning the treatment of capital gains on real estate transactions. They may include administrative actions such as the designation of areas or neighborhoods eligible or ineligible for federally underwritten mortgages. These and other fields of Federal activity, in one sense, represent alternative approaches to the present urban renewal program which may also influence the timing, location, scale, nature, and cost of changes in city land use patterns.

SOME LOCAL COSTS AND BENEFITS

To communities, expenses of the urban renewal program have been conventionally expressed in terms of local grants-in-aid toward net project costs. Under present law, these contributions must supplement the $4 billion Federal grant authorization by at least $1.3 to $2 billion, depending upon the aid ratio involved.

As in the case of public housing, local contribution requirements toward urban renewal have eased over time. The one-third local, two-thirds Federal, formula under which the program began in 1949 has gradually been liberalized. Various amendments have allowed local contributions of one-fourth in certain cases. No local outlays at all are required for eligible displacement costs, for which Federal grants may be made on a 100-percent basis. Still other amendments have broadened the types of local contributions acceptable as noncash grants-in-aid to urban renewal projects. They have also extended the retroactive deadline applicable to local noncash contributions. Reflecting such changes, the required local contribution was largely or exclusively in noncash form for more than two-fifths (236) of 518 reporting urban renewal projects with loan-grant contracts authorized as of June 30, 1961.[4]

In 1959, amendments first permitted community renewal programs to be developed. Their emergence may allow further easing in the ability of localities to meet their share of project net costs on a noncash basis. In some cases, this might impose minimum burdens upon local budget expenditures over and above what would be required in the absence of Federal aid.

If such developments occur, they would make it financially easier for localities to undertake urban renewal projects. The demand for more Federal funds would widen accordingly. This, in turn, would tend to increase local dependence upon Federal aid and could open the program to charges of being a political giveaway.

To spread Federal urban renewal aid as far as possible by assuring some tangible community contribution, proposals to require a local cash grant at a fixed ratio of the Federal outlay deserve serious consideration, in my opinion. A single local cash contribution would serve as a readily understandable index of the Federal-local financial partnership. It would simplify administrative procedures. It should also help to minimize local feelings of urgency in asking for Federal aid that might otherwise be available to others at minimum cost. Even now, one observer has suggested that "Federal grants and loans for urban renewal have been allowed to divert the energy of local governments from local action to efforts to obtain their share of Federal assistance."[5]

So far, local grants-in-aid made in the form of cash have totaled about $244 million toward the net project cost of 518 reporting projects with authorized loan-grant contracts as of mid-1961. Federal grants toward net project costs came to $1,195 million, and an additional $48 million went for 100 percent Federal relocation grants. Thus local cash grants-in-aid represented about one-fifth of Federal cash grants.

Community economic benefits from urban renewal are often phrased in terms of increased revenues from property taxes. Numerous cases have been reported of greater assessments and property taxes derived from completed projects. For example, the September–October (1960) issue of "Urban Renewal Notes," published by the Urban Renewal Administration, stated:

"A URA study, covering projects in the United States and Puerto Rico, indicates that assessments will be 3½ times and revenues more than 4 times as much after redevelopment as they were before in these particular areas."

Again, however, it does not appear clear how much urban renewal efforts may only result in shifting the location of high-tax properties within one jurisdiction or among tax districts. Nor is it certain how much they may generate some new tax revenue that would not otherwise be forthcoming.

Upon occasion, urban renewal expenditures have been justified as a means of restoring local tax bases. As a primary objective rather than as a possible byproduct of the program, this justification seems questionable. Tax bases might be broadened less expensively by extending local tax jurisdictions to include outlying suburban areas.

Community economic costs and benefits may also be measured by the net impact of urban renewal upon local budgets. Here burdens and rewards include more than local grants-in-aid and changes in tax revenues. They comprise the effects of large-scale rearrangements in land use that may (or may not) make for more efficiency in urban activities. They also range from before-and-after municipal services for project areas, to the enforcement of workable programs for community development, and to the market effects of uncertainty about future public action. Not all such forces can be tabulated.

A line from Shakespeare's "Coriolanus" asks: "What is the city but the people?" Upon the people finally rest the burdens and rewards of urban renewal, not upon physical structures and improvements. It is the people who occupy redeveloped space in completed projects. They are involved also in displacement from renewal sites and relocation or loss of households and businesses that form a locality's social and economic base. Some 85,154 families and 14,579 nonresidential establishments, for instance, were reported as relocated from urban renewal properties acquired within the United States through mid-1960.[6]

The social costs and benefits connected with involuntary mobility on this scale will not be discussed here. Part of the picture appears in "The Death and Life of Great American Cities." Another side is given in "The Seven Myths of Housing" and similar literature.[7] Did Edwin Markham, the American poet, perhaps have such considerations in mind when he wrote in his poem, "Man-Making":

"Why build these cities glorious
If man unbuilded goes?
In vain we build the world, unless
The builder also grows."

SHARING PUBLIC COSTS

Public aid under the urban renewal program is directed, among other things, toward one or both of two major financial objectives. First, it is designed to shift part of total capital costs to the public. Second, it is intended to hold within competitive limits periodical outlays for residential or nonresidential space in urban renewal projects.

Some shifting in total capital outlays has taken place in terms of gross and net project costs. Through mid-1961, gross project cost came to $2.6 billion for 518 reporting projects with authorized loan-grant contracts. Of this total, net project cost or public writedown comprised $1.8 billion. Disposition proceeds from resale accounted for $789 million. In terms of cash outlays only, Federal and local grants were nearly double the amount paid by redevelopers as disposition proceeds. (All figures exclude outlays made after site disposal.)

Sharing of total costs depends in part upon the aid ratio. It also depends upon the provisions of other supporting programs. Liberal FHA–insured urban renewal mortgage terms, for instance, can affect the incidence of total capital costs upon various kinds of legal interests involved. A recent report of the American Institute of Real Estate Appraisers cites one case as follows:

"One of the general urban renewal factors * * * is worthy of special mention. * * * This is the factor of special financing which is available under FHA–220 and 221 in urban renewal areas for certain types of reuse.

"When financing is available for 90 percent of cost and where cost is permitted to include a 10 percent builder's profit, it is obvious that a builder who is also a developer can for all practical purposes obtain approximately 100 percent financing for a new apartment house in an urban renewal area. Individual residences under FHA–221 can be provided under certain price limitations with homeowner financing at 100 percent of cost with a 40-year amortization period.

"Tremendous leverage exists in this unusually favorable financing. But it requires a redeveloper with a large project and long patience to wade through and wait out Government processing of loan applications. It can affect price to a rather startling degree. In the course of our committee conferences, one instance was cited where two reuse appraisals were made on an apartment house site in a major city at $130,000 and $160,000. The property was offered in disposition at an upset price of $160,000. Some 28 prospective developers registered interest at this figure. The list was reduced on an architectural and financial responsibility basis to three finalists who were told that they were of equal acceptability and that sealed bids would be the determining factor. The winning bid was in excess of $400,000. The bidder admitted quite frankly that since FHA treated the 220 financing on a cost basis, it was more important for him to get the site than it was to pay a proper price for it."[8]

In this case, a smaller share of the total capital cost was absorbed by the public than might have otherwise occurred. Also, a larger share of Federal aid went toward loans and less toward grants. The amount of Federal grant aid was reduced as a result of the higher final bid price. But the amount of Federal lending was increased to the extent that the Federal National Mortgage Association may have bought larger FHA-220 mortgages based on a higher cost.

PUBLIC COSTS FOR WHAT?

Public aid for urban renewal projects is applied against net project cost. This cost figure acts as a measure of (and serves as a limit upon) the Federal and local shares. Assistance goes immediately toward redistributing capital outlays made for land acquisition and (often) clearance. Eventually, it goes toward reducing total development costs. Of these costs, only a portion represents capital sunk in the site.

Once improvements have been erected or rehabilitated, the total project capital outlay includes expenditures for land as well as for improvements. From this viewpoint, it makes no difference whether aid may be directed toward reducing the acquisition cost of land, the demolition cost of old structures, or the construction cost of new or refurbished facilities.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Thus public aid requirements vary with the choice of site and also with the reuse made of it. Each affects the amount of the so-called land writedown. Neither site selection nor site reuse, however, finds guidance under the law from economic criteria.[8]

According to urban renewal legislation, the location of projects is not based principally upon economic considerations of minimum cost and maximum benefit. Rather it depends chiefly upon physical considerations such as lack of existing facilities or activities judged to be adequate. Thus in designating criteria of eligibility for Federal aid, the law refers solely to "slums and blighted or deteriorated or deteriorating areas."

As for site reuse, the act merely provides for aid to be extended with "maximum opportunity for the redevelopment, rehabilitation, and conservation of [urban renewal] areas by private enterprise. * * *" Both physical and economic guidelines are lacking.

In determining site selection as well as reuse designation, physical standards of adequacy play a large part. The higher the standards followed, the greater the number of eligible project areas and the larger the dosage of public aid required to renew them. For urban renewal, as for public housing, "selection criteria of housing standards affects both the size of the problem and the cost of solving it."[10]

A prerequisite to Federal urban renewal aid is the existence of workable programs for community improvement. In drawing up and implementing them, it is to be hoped that attention will be given to economic as well as to physical criteria. "Costly thy habit as thy purse can buy" is a useful admonition not only for Danes in travel but also for cities in transition.

In this respect, the problem of renewing our cities becomes first a quesion of finding out how much the public and private parties are willing and can afford to devote toward that purpose, in view of all other demands upon their resources. Once these limits may be set, standards of adequacy may then be adopted with more reasonable assurance of being attained.[11]

And to what end? Should urban renewal be a program primarily for redrawing legal boundaries in order to facilitate large-scale land use changes? Or should its main function be to eradicate structures and neighborhoods deemed inadequate? Or should it be a means of redistributing certain business and residential populations more democratically? Or should it provide the means of changing undesirable housekeeping habits and values of community living?

For whom are our cities to be saved? Should all of them be saved, even at considerable public and private outlays? The resolution of such questions may help to show whether a land writedown device is the most appropriate way of dealing with the problem.

In his "Prayer for Generosity," the 16th century saint, Ignatius of Loyola, asked for guidance in teaching us "to give and not to count the cost. * * *" It is not the intent of this paper to reverse that supplication by persuading the reader to count the cost of urban renewal and then not to give the subject another thought. Rather let us consider the alternatives so as to make the most of what is available. Only then may we "have sufficient to finish" the unending job of shaping the changing environment within which most of us live.

---

[1] Cf. Alain Enthoven and Henry Rowen, "Defense Planning and Organization," in Public Finances; Needs, Sources and Utilization (Princeton: Princeton University Press, for the National Bureau of Economic Research, 1961).

[2] For a recent case in the Senate, see the floor debate over Senator LONG of Louisiana's proposed amendments to the Area Redevelopment Act then under consideration, beginning in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 14, 1961.

[3] One recent source is Louis Winnick, "Economic Questions in Urban Redevelopment," The American Economic Review, May 1961, pp. 290–298. See also Winnick's unpublished paper, "Facts and Fictions in Urban Renewal," presented before the Philadelphia Housing Association, Jan. 28, 1960. A recent review by Richard H. Leach, "The Federal Urban Renewal Program: A Ten-Year Critique" appears in Law and Contemporary Problems, pt. I, autumn 1960.

[4] Urban Renewal Administration, "Urban Renewal Project Characteristics, June 30, 1961." Some data cited later are also from this source. The Housing Act of 1961, for example, incorporated certain liberalizing amendments. It made any community with a population of 50,000 or less (150,000 or less for a community in a depressed area) eligible for three-fourths Federal grants. Previously, only municipalities doing their own initial planning expenses were eligible for three-fourths grants. The act also extended to 7 years from 5 years the retroactive limit on expenditures by educational institutions or hospitals that might be eligible as local grants-in-aid.

[5] Leo Grebler, "Criteria for Appraising Governmental Housing Programs," The American Economic Review, May 1960, p. 327.

[6] Urban Renewal Administration, "Relocation From Urban Renewal Project Areas Through June 1960." The Urban Renewal Administrator estimated in 1961 that about 1,000,000 families may be displaced from urban renewal sites over the next 10 years. Large as these figures seem, they are relatively small when related to national mobility patterns. Over 34 million members of our civilian population changed residence at least once in the 1-year period March 1959 to March 1960. The small relative size of the Federal program would seem to reemphasize the need for aid to be used to supplement, not supplant, other public and private renewal outlays.

[7] Jane Jacobs, The Death and Life of Great American Cities (New York: Random House, 1961), and Nathan Straus, The Seven Myths of Housing (New York: Knopf, 1944).

[8] American Institute of Real Estate Appraisers, "Report on Unique Features of Urban Renewal Appraisal Assignments" (1961), pp. 24–25.

[9] Cf. Ernest M. Fisher, "Economic Aspects of Urban Land Use Patterns," The Journal of Industrial Economics, June 1958.

[10] Robert Moore Fisher, 20 Years of Public Housing (New York: Harper, 1959), p. 55.

[11] Ibid., p. 61.

Spain as a Market for U.S. Cotton and Competitor With U.S. Cotton Textiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, while in Madrid, Spain, this past December during a 2-week tour of active duty as a Reserve officer in the U.S. Air Force, I had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Robert H. McBride, Chargé d'Affaires in the American Embassy.

He very graciously consented to furnish me with a written report on Spain as a market for American cotton and as a competitor with our domestic textile industry. Mr. McBride's report has been received, and I have found it to be very interesting and informative. In view of the fact that we will be called upon at this session to take up legislation with respect to our international trade policy I believe my colleagues in the House will be interested in learning of the cotton producing and textile manufacturing industry in Spain.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include Mr. McBride's report in the Appendix of the RECORD:

SPAIN AS A MARKET FOR U.S. COTTON AND COMPETITOR WITH U.S. COTTON TEXTILES

During the past 10 years, Spain has purchased an average of over $27 million worth of U.S. cotton and exported to the United States an average of almost $2 million worth of manufactured cotton goods per year. Annual fluctuations and trends in production, cotton imports and textiles exports are shown in the accompanying table.

Spain began about 10 years ago to increase her cotton production through increased irrigation, improved dryland cropping practices and seed improvement. The increase in production from 73,586 to 450,000 bales is evidence of the success of this effort. In order to achieve this production, nonirrigated acreage was increased from about 34,000 acres in 1952 to 425,000 acres in 1961 and irrigated acreage was increased from zero in 1952 to 45,000 acres in 1961.

During the same 10-year Spain's cotton consumption requirements increased from around 400,000 bales per year to around 600,000 bales. For this reason, import requirements have not declined in proportion to the increase in domestic production. It should also be pointed out that Spain normally produces a sizable amount of low-grade, short-staple cotton and, even if domestic production continues to increase, import requirements of high quality cotton are likely to continue at a rather high level.

Spain is a traditional exporter of cotton textiles. Such exports have fluctuated greatly during the past 10 years. Between 1952 and 1958, Spain's cotton manufactured goods exports declined from $16 to $5 million, then again reached the $16 million mark in 1959 and moved up to $44 million in 1960.

The decrease in exports between 1952 and 1958 was the result of the generally depressed world textiles market on the one hand and inflationary developments in Spain on the other. This latter development caused both increased domestic demand and increased prices and costs resulting in a continued decline in exports. Beginning in 1958 and continuing to the present time, the Spanish domestic textiles market has also been in a depressed condition. This has caused textile mills to look for foreign markets for their surplus textiles.

In July 1959 the official exchange rate was devalued from 42 to 60 pesetas to the dollar. This, in effect, reduced the export price of all Spanish goods. At the same time, Spanish exporters were permitted to import the equivalent amount of cotton exported as textiles without payment of import tax on other penalties. The effect of these developments is reflected in Spain's exports during 1959 and 1960. Exports for the first half of 1961 were slightly less than for the first half of 1960, and total exports of manufactured cotton goods during 1961 are estimated at around $40 million compared with $44 million in 1960.

Spain's traditional exports are fabrics of various types. However, during 1960 she

exported over $8 million worth of cotton yarn. The export of thread is a relatively new undertaking which amounted to around one-half million dollars in 1960 and averaged around $22,000 per month during the first half of 1961.

Exports of cotton manufactured goods to the United States over the past 10 years have fluctuated from only token exports during the 1953–57 period to $7.7 million in 1960. Such exports to the United States during 1961 are estimated at $7 million. Spanish statistics on textiles exports to individual countries are shown only in groups, which makes it impossible to provide exact statistics on individual items.

Spain's ability to continue her cotton textiles exports at the present level will depend on future domestic demand, the success of efforts to modernize the industry and developments in future wage rates.

Domestic demand for cotton textiles is now in its third year of a rather substantial depression. There are economic indicators of increased business activity in Spain. Industry officials are hopeful that the domestic market will show some revival in 1962. If this should happen, the pressure to export would be reduced.

In 1959, a committee was established to make a study of Spain's cotton textiles industry and submit a plan for modernization. This committee reported that a majority of the manufacturing units were small with antiquated machinery. In spinning, they reported 249 factories with 2.4 million spindles. Factories with less than 5,000 spindles constitutes 32 percent of the total number of factories. In weaving, there were 855 factories and 72,275 looms. Factories with less than 100 looms constituted 90 percent of the total number of factories.

As to the age of the equipment, it was reported that 18 percent of the spinning machinery was installed in the 19th century and that another 23 percent was installed between 1900 and 1920. In the weaving group, 52 percent of all installed looms were more than 40 years old.

As the above indicates, the output per worker in Spain is very low. At the same time, wage rates in the cotton textiles industry in Spain are very low. Unskilled and semiskilled man wages range from $1 to $1.25 per 8-hour day. Most of the producer type labor in the mills consists of women with wages of $0.90 to $1.10 per day.

Wages in the textiles industry have not increased since 1956, even though wage increases have been granted in other industries. Recent wage increases in the iron and steel and automobile industries have ranged from 20 to 100 percent. One reason for maintaining low wages in the textiles industry is that this is a depressed industry and wage increases would only cause further unemployment. There is, however, much agitation for wage increases, not only in the textiles industry, but in other industries as well.

As to future developments, it is expected that any gain in efficiency from modernizing the industry will go toward wage increases, at least for the next few years. Spain's comparative advantage in the world textiles market is not likely to improve, and may possibly be worsened as the demand for wage increases move ahead of increased plant efficiency. At any rate Spain's contribution to world exports of textiles will continue to be small in relation to total exports and the value of sales of U.S. cotton to Spain will continue for the foreseeable future to be many times larger than the value of Spain's exports of manufactured goods to the United States.

Spain: Domestic production and imports of raw cotton and exports of cotton manufactured goods

Year	Production	Imports of raw cotton		Exports of manufactured goods	
		Total	From United States	Total	To United States
	Bales	*Bales*	*Thousands*	*Thousands*	*Thousands*
1952	73,586	373,568	$8,852	$16,223	$1,180
1953	84,141	310,972	20,093	12,897	22
1954	97,160	266,127	21,065	10,956	112
1955	159,327	338,718	41,023	8,099	93
1956	229,698	206,827	39,300	7,857	307
1957	162,493	202,213	14,731	9,105	316
1958	189,211	435,627	53,013	5,429	1,279
1959	291,832	270,927	21,813	16,364	1,623
1960	325,200	248,359	28,045	44,257	7,734
1961 [1]	450,000	290,000	25,010	40,000	7,000

[1] Preliminary estimates.

The Debate About Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, a thoughtful and amusing column on the debate about civil defense appeared in the December 7 issue of the Montclair Times. While this session of Congress is faced with some deadly serious questions about civil defense which demand the most careful consideration we can give them, I am sure that in connection with this, as in other vital issues, our ability to look at ourselves critically and in good humor remains a priceless national asset.

I ask unanimous consent to have this column printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Now that the initial emotional surge over fallout shelters is ebbing it might be wise to take a layman's look at some of the ridiculous and near-ridiculous remarks we've been hearing and repeating:

"If a bomb falls on my house what good will a fallout shelter do?"

Fallout shelters are meant to protect against fallout, not bombs. If a bomb falls on your house, sell it fast, even at a bargain price.

"I can't hold with this theory of shooting my neighbor if he tries to get into my shelter."

This was an opinion expressed by one man and a few people who plan to shoot their neighbors anyway. It is not a recommended national policy.

"If they bomb New York * * *"

This is similar, but not identical, to remarks made all over the country. In Berkeley, Calif., it begins: "If they bomb San Francisco * * *" In Evanston, Ill., it's: "If they bomb Chicago * * *." We all think "our" city is the important one.

"I know New York isn't a top military target, but think of the psychological effect."

With hydrogen bombs, psychological effects?

"I refuse to let fear drive me into the ground to live like an animal."

Fox holes were pretty popular during World War II and some of the "animals" who lived in them are still around and doing well.

"I don't want to come out of a shelter 2 weeks later and live in a completely devastated country."

If a single bomb could devastate a 300-square-mile area, it would take 10,000 of them, all perfectly aimed, to devastate the entire country, and still leave Alaska and Hawaii untouched.

"Some madman may push a button and start the whole thing by mistake."

Has the instigator of this remark never watched on TV the hours-long, highly technical countdown that precedes a missile-launching?

"The next war may be over in a matter of minutes."

The number of H-bomb targets is extremely limited—population, transportation, and industrial centers. But spread a million guerrillas over a half-dozen large Western States and the enemy would go broke trying to beat them with costly H-bombs. A war might drag on for years at the rifle and bayonet level.

The foregoing is no pitchman's plug for fallout shelters. Even experts disagree on their merits. But it does lead up to the last oft-repeated statement:

"People in other countries aren't excited so why should we be?"

Well, maybe it's because those Soviet missiles are aimed at the United States. Then, too, the French and the Danes and Norwegians weren't excited in 1939, but they were occupied in 1940—for 5 years. Twenty years ago this morning we weren't excited, either. Twenty years ago this afternoon we had no Pacific Fleet.

As the man said, "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." Vigilance is that state halfway between lassitude and panic.

U.S. Customs: Big Business Well Run

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of Customs is one of the most efficient agencies within our Treasury Department. Thousands of Americans returning to the United States from abroad have the opportunity each year to meet representatives of the Bureau at our various ports of entry. Our customs inspectors perform their duties in a quiet, efficient, and pleasant manner.

I was very pleased, therefore, to note in the January edition of Forbes magazine an editorial commending our customs inspectors for the very fine manner in which they perform their duties. With the belief that the editorial will be of interest to my colleagues in the House, under unanimous consent, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

U.S. CUSTOMS: BIG BUSINESS WELL RUN

(By Malcolm S. Forbes)

As an oft-traveling American businessman I'd like to abandon the usual role of critical commentator and turn to enthusiastic backslapping. The back: U.S. customs. They do an exceptionally difficult job extraordinarily well.

As one who comes into Idlewild—and occasionally Honolulu—several times a year, I developed a very high opinion of the efficient and courteous manner that the customs inspectors display in handling multitudinous travelers. To find facts to fit the opinion, I spent several hours the other day at Idlewild with the collector of New York port, Joseph P. Kelly, and his administrative officer, Frank R. Creed.

Into New York port from foreign points come 1½ million people a year, 75 percent of them returning Americans. The port customs collects over $550 million a year, only a small fraction of it from dutiable things brought in by individual passengers. Today, with fewer employees, customs is handling in less time a far greater volume. Idlewild itself has a force of 120 inspectors working in five overlapping 8-hour-a-day shifts round the clock 7 days a week. Doing the normal clerical work there are an additional 49 men who are trained so they can function as inspectors to expedite the job at peak periods. The goal sought—and maintained—for each inspector is to take no more than an average of 4 minutes per passenger.

Complaints about U.S. customs for the most part fall into three categories.

First, there are those who complain because they feel others are being given preferential treatment—and those who complain because they think they should have had preferential treatment and didn't get it. The first part of the complaint usually stems from the fact that diplomats have immunity from customs and, therefore, are waved through. With the U.N. located in New York this happens often. Other times, when the arrival terminal is choked by the simultaneous arrival of many giant jets, the customs will, for a period of 15 minutes or a half hour, authorize spot checks, where perhaps alternate passengers open one or more of their bags while the others are passed through.

VERY IMPORTANT PERSONS: REAL AND PHONY

Usually the genuine very important persons are quickest and most pleasant in complying with the inspection procedures. But the would-be big shots, when they are made to open their bags like everyone else, even after they have dropped names all over the inspector, resent it.

The second category of complaints aimed at the inspector is simply a matter of the law. Plants, meats, some fruits, etc., are not permitted to be brought in under any circumstances. But the fellow bringing back a baseball-bat-sized piece of his favorite bologna sometimes feels it's taken away from him just to improve the inspector's own menu.

Often delays in getting through the line to an inspector arise because some travelers have the devil's own time getting their luggage open. They've reinforced the bulging bags with wrappings and rope and straps to keep them from bursting before arrival.

Customs also has the difficult task of enforcing the Copyright Act under which manufacturers can set quotas on imports of their own products, such as Jensen silver, assorted perfumes, musical instruments, etc. There are several hundred such articles and, unless the tourist has written permission from the manufacturer in this country, he cannot bring in the trademarked item from abroad. Again, some people tend to blame the inspector when he won't pass through their treasured, bargain-bought Steinway grand piano.

Every complaint that comes to customs is investigated. When somebody beefs about having had to wait an hour in line it is promptly and easily checked by checking his customs declaration, which is stamped with the time of its completon. By reviewing the time stamped on the declaration of the man in front of the complainant and the person behind, the officers can swiftly find out exactly how long it took the inspector to do his job. By this method, the order in which everyone went through every customs line can be completely reconstructed and the time involved exactly computed even weeks later.

Top boss of the New York Port, Collector Kelly, often personally checks out letters of complaint that come to his attention and very frequently he can be found on line observing how the job is being handled. He has a cheerful determination to see that U.S. Customs' reputation under his tenure is further enhanced.

CUSTOMS' VIEW OF THE PUBLIC

As for the other side of the coin—the customs men's opinion of the traveling public: Procedure is based on the premise that 99 percent of the travelers are basically honest, and 85 to 90 percent of returning travelers go through the line with no complications. The others usually hit some complications by virtue of bringing improperly filled-in declarations, bringing in copyrighted goods or forbidden fruits of one sort or another.

One veteran inspector, Joseph Burton, 40 years in the U.S. customs service and now deputy collector and head man on the scene at Idlewild, estimates that no more than 1 out of 500 travelers is suspicious, and he is spotted with startling consistency. Many a tourist trying to sneak in an undeclared jewel or expensive Paris gown must be ruefully bewildered at how the inspector seemed to know it. The answer has nothing to do with a secret divining rod. Over half of the time it is simply a matter of advance information. Informers receive 25 percent of whatever penalty is imposed for attempted smuggling.

UNCLE SAM'S HELPER

The suave, persuasive jeweler who sold Mr. and Mrs. Gotrocks that lovely bracelet isn't content with his profits at the scene. As soon as the couple has departed his store he rushes to the phone and tips the nearest Treasury agent in the American consulate about the sale. If the store proprietor doesn't happen to think this is a nice thing to do to his foreign customers, some underpaid clerk can frequently be depended upon to supplement his income by helping Uncle Sam keep American tourists honest.

The most pleasant American tourists so far as customs is concerned? Those coming in by ship. They are rested, relaxed, in no hurry. They can take all the time they want in departing from the comforts of their liner.

Air travelers, on the contrary, are usually in a hurry, and before they have been 15 minutes in the terminal are pointing out to everybody who looks official that in the same amount of time they could have gone several hundred miles on the plane they just left. In addition to which, of course, the delightful effects of the huge meal, and spirit-elevating refreshments have worn off. They view the customs man through eyes red and weary.

Surprisingly, the inspectors and their bosses still seem to have a pretty good opinion of their fellow citizens.

It certainly ought to be reciprocated.

Dedication of Engineering Sciences Building of West Virginia University—Address by Ira H. Abbott, Director of Advanced Research Programs of National Aeronautics and Space Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on October 6 of last year the dedication of the new Engineering Sciences Building of West Virginia University located on the new Evansville campus of the Colleges of Engineering and Agriculture, was a notable event.

This modern 14-story building, the space requirements of which were designed by the faculty of the College of Engineering, has been built to accommodate the expanding program in advanced research until 1975 or 1980. The structure houses the various departmental offices, classrooms, and lighter research facilities such as the electronics laboratory—in addition to which there are separate buildings housing the aerodynamics laboratory with its subsonic and supersonic wind tunnels and the propulsion laboratory where jet and rocket research is conducted.

This is all part of the ambitious program in advanced engineering research which is being conducted under the highly able administration and leadership of Dean C. A. Arents of the College of Engineering, a program which realized one of its goals in 1960 by instituting doctoral studies in each of the departments of the college. Enrollment in the College of Engineering now numbers some 1,300 undergraduate and preengineering students and approximately 150 graduate students, with the ultimate goal being an enrollment of approximately 500 in advanced research in the engineering sciences.

The modern and progressive Medical Center of the University of West Virginia has already established an honored reputation in the research and practice of the medical sciences. There is every reason to believe that the advanced research program of the College of Engineering will achieve equal eminence for our university in the physical and engineering sciences.

The vital interdependence of democracy and scientific inquiry has been acknowledged by leading American thinkers since the time of the Founders of this Nation. The challenge of securing the continued advancement of democracy and free scientific inquiry was addressed at this dedication by Ira H. Abbot, Director of Advanced Research Programs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. I ask unan-

imous consent that his eloquent remarks "Engineering Sciences and the Challenge to Freedom" be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENGINEERING SCIENCES AND THE CHALLENGE TO FREEDOM

(Presented by Ira H. Abbott at the dedication of the Engineering Sciences Building, College of Engineering, West Virginia University, October 6, 1961)

Almost 2 centuries ago fateful words thundered from Philadelphia to provide a soaring vision of a new society. The free peoples of the world, as well as the oppressed and hungry, are still moved by these words:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Thus brave men established the concept that governments are created for men and not men for the state. This concept together with the rising industrial revolution created the Western civilization in which we live and believe.

Today we live in a period when these principles and ideals are being challenged as Greek civilization was challenged by the Persians; as Rome was challenged by Carthage. Not since the time of the Reformation has there existed such a period of turmoil to resolve itself finally into a new civilization characterized by a new moral, intellectual, and material life. We are privileged to live in such a period; to strive for that in which we believe; and to work to continue the feet of man on the path of freedom that permits his moral and intellectual growth as well as his material well-being.

Our crisis differs from the the previous ones in that the challenge includes but extends beyond the conventional areas of ideology, religion, and philosophy. In searching for a chink in our armor, the forces which oppose our civilization have also attacked where we were seemingly the strongest, but, perhaps, actually weakest. Thus we find our intellectual forces under strongest attack in the areas of science and engineering.

The importance of this attack arises from two facts. The first, and most apparent one, is that, to a degree never before experienced, preeminence in science and engineering carries with it the brute force capability to conquer, to maintain the conquest, and to impose the will and ideology of the conqueror on all mankind. This fact is so apparent to any thinking person that it needs no elaboration, but the situation is complicated by the fact that our beliefs and ideals forbid us from using this force aggressively to conquer and impose our will.

The second fact is that success in science and engineering, including the material benefits arising from that success and the stimulus resulting from dramatic new achievements, has become a symbol of success in all things and, to many minds, a proof of the superiority of the type of society that best produces such results. It is beside the point that we may reject such reasoning. It exists, and is a force that we must recognize.

It is not surprising that such beliefs exist. Multitudes have experienced within their own lifetimes a transformation from an agrarian life of scarcity to an industrial life of relative plenty. Even larger numbers have watched from the sidelines while this transformation happened to others but left them in almost their original primitive condition of near starvation. Literally hundreds of millions have watched the development of new weapons in the hands of others of such power as to leave those without them as helpless, individually and as nations, to resist aggression as the wild beasts are to resist civilized man.

Only 4 years ago, man's first space vehicle was sent beyond the confines of the earth to report back new information about the cosmos in which we live. Since then man's instruments have been sent to the moon; to orbit about the sun; and man himself has ventured into space. We look forward with confidence to further space explorations by instruments and to journeys by man to the moon and the nearer planets. It would be strange indeed if such achievements did not affect man's outlook and views of the society in which he lives.

Today, the powerful Government in Moscow is attempting to marshal the talents of its people in science and engineering with the avowed purpose of surpassing our achievements. Its boys and girls are carefully selected according to their talents and trained in science, engineering, and related fields. The intent is that no talent considered worthy of training and useful to the state be wasted and that no one be deprived of opportunity to study by lack of economic means. Powerful economic and prestige incentives are used to focus the purpose and industry of the student. Those with exceptional talents are encouraged to advance their studies to the full extent of their capabilities. The result is a flow of productive scientists and engineers that already considerably exceeds the number graduating in this country.

This, then, is the challenge we face. We must provide better education for our youth, and, without detracting from other fields, turn more of them to science and engineering. I am confident we will meet this challenge.

This will require the provision of additional incentives to the young people themselves. Additional economic incentives will, no doubt, be essential, but other incentives will be at least as important. To an even greater degree than now, science and engineering must establish itself as a field of high professional quality and prestige, and one which produces satisfactions of a spiritual as well as a material nature to compensate for the discipline and labor involved.

Our success will require dedicated and skillful teachers and research workers to train the students. If we are to obtain such men, they must be made to realize more than today that our country values their dedication and talents.

While human dedication and talent is the first essential, people cannot work together effectively without the classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and living quarters that make up the physical body of a modern university. We stand here today in the presence of a magnificent new building dedicated to the advancement of education in the engineering sciences, and, through this function, to an important contribution to the preservation and improvement of the ideals and philosophy of our Western civilization.

The President's Commission on National Goals stated in its report, "Goals for Americans":

"The development of the individual and the Nation demand that education at every level and in every discipline be strengthened and its effectiveness enhanced. New teaching techniques must continue to be developed. The increase in population and the growing complexity of the world add urgency.

"Greater resources—private, corporate, municipal, State, and Federal—must be mobilized. A higher proportion of the gross national product must be devoted to educational purposes. This is at once an investment in the individual, in the democratic process, in the growth of the economy, and in the stature of the United States."

The determined reaction of our free society to this challenge will require vigorous acceptance and deliberate participation by our citizens, educators, the scientific community and the executive and legislative powers at all levels of government. One university, State, or any other single group cannot do it alone. West Virginia deserves congratulations for what is being done here, but our pace must be stepped up everywhere.

Improved and expanded plants, higher quality of teaching staffs, and proper recognition and rewards for teacher and student are the pacing items which must be accelerated in our acceptance of the challenge with honest expectation of success. This building stands as a symbol erected by West Virginia in evidence of our determination to do the job necessary to assure the rights of men everywhere and for all time to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The Home Is the Heart of the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, in its 1961 essay contest, the California Real Estate Association awarded honorable mention to Donald Goldstein, Venice High School, Venice, Calif., for his essay entitled "The Home Is the Heart of the Nation." Winner over 284 entrants from Venice High School, where he was 1961 class valedictorian with a 3.96 average, Donald read his prize-winning effort at a recent banquet of the Venice Board of Realtors. I know my colleagues will find his words most heart warming:

THE HOME IS THE HEART OF THE NATION

(By Donald Goldstein)

It is evident that in the United States, as in no other country in the world, the rights of the individual are dearly cherished and carefully protected possessions. The people are guaranteed the freedom to live how and where they desire, and it is significant that the majority of them choose to gather their loved ones around them in private dwellings which each identifies as his home. Because in a democracy the future of the country is in the hands of the people and the people are a product of their environment, the home occupies an important role in the destiny of our great Nation.

A home is recognized as more than just a testimony to our freedom; it is primarily a symbol of security, a place where we find release from tension, and a place of warmth, shelter, and love. Because of its great value, people will work hard to acquire and keep a home of their own; consequently, it becomes a steadying influence on its owner by giving him a goal to work for.

It is around the home that the family unit revolves; for it is here that the family shares many of its common experiences and spends most of its time together. To the parents, it is a haven in which they can relax and forget the troubles of the day, and a place where they find the happiness of being near those whom they love and those who love them. To the children a home represents

food, warmth, security, and love. It is their whole world when they are young—a palace full of strange adventures and experiences. As they grow older, it becomes the hub from which they extend themselves when venturing out into the strange, new world. Moreover, it is a classroom where they are taught many of the important lessons of growing up.

Most important of all, a home is a reflection of the personality and the way of life of its inhabitant. Its appearance varies according to its occupants, who also impart to it a distinct atmosphere. In many cases it is a means of identification for the owner, as it is a product of his endeavors.

A home is much more than a place to hang your hat. To the individual, it is a symbol of status, security, and happiness. In general, it represents one of the fundamental principles of our democracy—the right of the people to live as private citizens. As long as people are free to choose their own distinct modes of living, it is certain that the ideals of the United States are still in existence.

Hot Foreign Aid Battle Looms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Hot Foreign Aid Battle Looms" which appeared in the January 11, 1962 edition of the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOT FOREIGN AID BATTLE LOOMS

When the new session of the 87th Congress settles down to thrashing out specific major individual issues a bitter "no holds barred" battle on foreign aid promises to essay a headline role. And uniquely, it isn't going to be sharply defined as just a Republicans versus Democrats fight.

The majority of the Republicans of course will be arrayed on the side of moderation in foreign aid, though not all of them by any means. However, there isn't going to be anything like the internecine battle that promises to rack the Democratic ranks. For one thing, the most potent foe of foreign aid in Congress today is a Democrat, Congressman OTTO PASSMAN, of Louisiana. Some idea of how irreconcilibly he is opposed to the lavish foreign aid handouts that were favored by former President Eisenhower just as they now are by President Kennedy, was the tribute PASSMAN paid to foreign-aiders the other day when he declared:

"When you really pin these people down, from top to bottom, they say we have only one think to offer—that's our dollars. I could sob like a woman when I hear them say that. We're enticing foreigners with our dollars. We'll lose them all as friends if we're not careful."

How formidably and effectively antiforeign aid PASSMAN is, may be gleaned from the fact that last year he was largely responsible for a House vote of $1,118 million less than the President had requested, and $596 million less than Congress itself had authorized. And actually, the PASSMAN subcommittee had recommended a still further cut of $300 million.

This self-styled country boy is chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, which, of course, includes most importantly, foreign aid. Thanks to Senate pressure, the bill finally signed by the President provided a little more than $3.9 billion, only about $861 million less than requested by the Kennedy administration. However, it took real bipartisan efforts and much obeisance by the President to liberalistic Republicans to get the spending authority up to that level.

Incidentally, President Kennedy, on September 2, issued a statement earnestly urging Congress to appropriate funds as close as possible to the amounts he requested. And significant of the bipartisan liaisons on the question of foreign aid, a day earlier former President Eisenhower had called the PASSMAN clashes incomprehensible to me, especially in light of present world tensions.

The widespread distrust of foreign aid acquired by conservative House Members—Democrats and Republicans alike—is attributed in large part to PASSMAN's impressive knowledge of all aspects of the foreign aid program, his boundless energy and his articulateness. And this year, obviously, India's devouring of Goa and two other Portuguese enclaves appears to have been made to order for PASSMAN.

For instance, a report to be made to Congress before the new session gets very far along, will show that foreign aid to India in various forms over the past 10 years came to about $3.3 billion and just in the year ended June 30, U.S. aid of all sorts to India totaled $712.9 million. How this vast sum, like many others extracted from the American taxpayers for foreign aid has failed to promote democratic processes in the world, is particularly dramatized by the experience with Nehru's India.

The antiforeign aid Democrats, of course, are to be commended for their economic sanity in opposing wild, reckless foreign aid of which that long surfeited on India is only one of many examples. Incidentally, it adds color to the pungent comment of the London Economist that—

"The Democratic Party is a coalition of ill-assorted elements that usually manages to achieve a semblance of unity during presidential election campaigns, but begins to disintegrate soon afterwards."

Wildernesses From Lands of Milk and Honey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, there is growing concern over the wilderness bill which is being considered by this Congress. This concern was expressed to me in conversations when I was in my district and is being expressed in letters and editorials since my return to Washington, D.C.

I believe that careful consideration should be given to this legislation. Also, I believe that the report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission which is due at the end of this month should receive careful study before action is taken on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, an editorial which appeared in the January 2, 1962, issue of the Everett, Wash., Daily Herald presents many thoughts of value in regard to wildernesses. Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, I include this editorial in the RECORD:

CREATING WILDERNESSES OUT OF LANDS OF MILK AND HONEY

Grass is wonderful stuff for a lawn, and cows turn it into butter. Grass also becomes lamb chops and hamburgers through a wonderful process of nature, aided by skilled ranchers.

There is some question, though, as to why 60,000 acres of grass should be turned into a national park in Pottawatomie County, Kans., over the objections of many of the residents. Will people really flock from all over the United States just to look at grass? The backers of the Prairie National Park seem to think so.

Yet, as residents of the area have pointed out, nobody much stops to look at the grass now, and it's already there. Motorists speed through the prairies at 70 miles an hour because they consider the landscape monotonous, and under the park proposal it will merely stay that way.

The matter is more serious than it first appears. All over the Nation, the Government is moving to take lands out of private hands and place them in Federal hands for the sole purpose of creating recreational areas.

On Cape Cod, the Government has condemned residential and business areas which give the Cape much of its color and charm. The residents of a large Michigan area, the Sleeping Bear Dunes, are threatened with grave losses as the Government acts to create another recreational area.

And the wilderness bill idea, pending in Congress, would virtually bar any future development of any area not already developed no matter how badly we may come to need the land or the minerals there.

All this is happening at a time when the Forest Service is opening more of the national forests to recreational use, and when many private lands are being opened to the public. Many of the recreational areas the Government already operates draw sparse attendance.

Our population is growing, and our people need room to live and for gainful employment. Our natural resources are needed for defense and for improvement of living standards. Our Federal budget is in enough trouble without committing new millions to create wildernesses out of our lands of milk and honey.

Dedication of U.S. Courthouse and Federal Building in Charleston, W. Va., Attended by State Notables

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is my belief that in the tomorrows we will regard 1961 as the year that America turned the corner on the road to a new era of greatness. The signs are already evident in many areas of the land, and in our own State of West Virginia there is a growing sense of hope in the future.

A significant factor in this new vibrancy in America is the heightened awareness of the partnership between the Federal Government and the individual States. In West Virginia this relationship was strengthened by the dedication in Charleston of a new U.S. courthouse and Federal building. Among the many governmental leaders speaking at the dedication were Gov. W. W. Barron, Representative JOHN M. SLACK, the Honorable John A. Shanklin, mayor of the city of Charleston, and the Honorable Chapman A. Revercomb, former U.S. Senator. The Honorable Robert T. Griffin, special assistant to the Administrator of the General Services Administration, represented the Federal Government on this occasion. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks and those of the other speakers at the dedication be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY HON. ROBERT T. GRIFFIN, DEDICATION CEREMONY, CHARLESTON, W. VA., OCTOBER 12, 1961

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests and friends, it is a privilege to be here today. I am flattered to appear on a program and a platform with so many speakers of renown. In deference to them and this fine audience, I will be brief.

The General Services Administration, as you may know, is frequently identified as Uncle Sam's landlord. In that capacity, it manages a giant network of buildings—federally owned and leased—from Maine to Hawaii. One of the many responsibilities of GSA is to provide suitable working space for the thousands of Federal employees who discharge the highly diversified duties of modern government.

Here in Charleston, as in many another city, GSA first determined the need and feasibility of a building through a process of community surveys. It then worked with your community leaders and elected officials to obtain a site, and after that it contracted for architects, engineers, and builders. In supervising the progress of the project from conception to completion, it sought to serve your interests by localizing as much as possible the planning, the labor, and the skill that have transformed a dream into a reality.

I am happy to say, too, that for us in GSA this marks a second recent occasion to work closely with your officials and to share with your officials—local, State, and National—a sense of achievement. Our agency was charged with the disposal of the Government's surplus ordnance plant in neighboring south Charleston. Its sale to a firm prepared to reopen the facility and promote employment in this area gratified many people, including the President of the United States.

With propriety, I feel sure, time might now be taken to recount the history of the building we are dedicating today. And with such a recital would go sincere thanks to all those who labored long for the goal attained. On both scores, however, it may be reasonably assumed that the people of this community are well informed and gratefully aware.

Two features of your impressive courthouse and Federal office building deserve mention. On a wall inside will be found a permanent exhibit panel. Displayed there are authentic facsimiles of our Nation's most precious documents—the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights. For young and old, in years to come, your freedom shrine will stir anew pride and appreciation of the enduring democratic precepts which are the bedrock of American freedom.

Flanking the main entrance of the building are large reproductions of the great seal of the United States, front and back, in calling attention to them, I should like to ask Mayor Shanklin to come to the rostrum.

Here, your honor, as a memento of this auspicious event, is a bronze medallion. It is a faithful miniature of the great seal. With the best wishes of Administrator John L. Moore, of General Services, it is presented to you and the people of Charleston as a keepsake symbol of the unity, integrity, and idealism which mean so much to all Americans.

REMARKS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, DEMOCRAT OF WEST VIRGINIA, IN DEDICATION OF THE U.S. COURTHOUSE AND FEDERAL OFFICE BUILDING, CHARLESTON, W. VA., OCTOBER 12, 1961

Mayor Shanklin, distinguished guests, and ladies and gentlemen, we are gathered today to dedicate another step in the steady progress of Charleston. This building, which will house two U.S. courts and some 18 Federal agencies is witness to the growing economic and commercial significance of this city and our State.

But it is also testimony of a larger process at work in our society—the growing responsibilities of the Federal Government and the extension of the physical presence of the Government into such regional and local field offices as this.

In dedicating such a structure, it is appropriate for us to give thought to the question of the broader purposes to which we commit not only this building but our Government and our society as well.

Contrary to the presumptions of some critics, the increased scope of governmental responsibilities and action is not due to an insatiable thirst for power by so-called bureaucrats. It has been due to the inevitable growth in complexity of modern industrial pattern and to the greater number and variety of problems which transcend State boundaries.

It is our eternal debt to the wisdom of the founders of the Constitution that they established a framework within which the Federal Government might function to meet these problems without diminishing the personal and civil liberties which animate the spirit of democracy.

We hear much today from some quarters about the encroachment of the Government upon these liberties. Yet a dispassionate reading of American history would reveal, with occasional temporary lapses, that progress in the essential civil liberties—freedom of religion and of speech, freedom of the press and assembly, and extension of the right to vote—has been augmented by the Federal Government, rather than lessened.

True, the scope of the Government has grown, especially within recent decades, and with it governmental authority. But the principal change has been in control of the external conditions of our society which render more secure the internal life and liberty of the human spirit.

This then is the proper division of authority between the individual and the Government, between liberty and control. In those areas where spontaneity, creativity and the free interchange of ideas are involved, liberty must reign supreme. In those areas where men must be restrained from doing injury to their fellows and where we are moving toward an increasing awareness of our collective responsibilities, the Government rightfully exercises its authority for the benefit of all.

Thus, such Federal actions as maintenance of certain mutual restraints in trade and economic competition, enforcement of minimum wage and working conditions, and provision for the years of retirement—among many others—have not encroached upon, but rather, they have enhanced the development of individual freedom and the life and liberty of the mind. It is to these values that this building, our Government, and a free society are dedicated.

REMARKS BY GOVERNOR BARRON, DEDICATION OF NEW FEDERAL BUILDING, CHARLESTON, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1961

Dedications are special kinds of ceremonies. They are special because they represent milestones—measures of human accomplishment. Buildings grow out of needs, and when they are erected and ready for dedication they represent a victory, a fulfillment, an evidence of progress. Moreover, they are tangible victories, readily observable and reasonably permanent.

Monuments of the type represented by this new Federal building commemorate the vision of the past, but they also signify the prospects for the future.

The State and Federal levels of government are full-fledged partners in virtually every aspect of public life ranging from soil conservation to employment security. Increased Federal services to States have, over the years, brought more and more Federal employees to live in our midst. Rather than forcing us to go to Washington for every need, they have brought their services to our doorsteps. This makes sense both in terms of economy and convenience—to the Federal Government and to West Virginia. It was a simple yet far-reaching idea that these services could be more effective in a new house. We now have that new house, and a beautiful one it is.

The building we are dedicating today was erected to meet a real need: to serve an immediate practical purpose. The design was for utility, but much more was achieved. It has been said that beauty is its own excuse for being. Certainly the planning and building of a beautiful city and an attractive State is a worthy end in itself.

Never before has there been so much interest in lifting the face of West Virginia. All around us the new is replacing the old. Our new Federal building is a pace setter—an example of the kind of architecture that should grace all of our metropolitan centers. Through urban renewal projects and private enterprise we should see increasing numbers of truly modern structures of the type we now dedicate. And when they exist in abundance, our State will have a different appearance—a 20th-century look and a 20th-century attitude to go with it. We will be proud because the new look will be tangible evidence that West Virginia has come of age in the generation that accepts progress as our direction and as our goal.

Nearly 100 years ago the people of western Virginia identified their own interests as parallel with those of union. The State of West Virginia was thus conceived in the crucible of a war destined to weld our growing America into one of service to all. It is this concept of service to all Americans that has now brought to Charleston this impressive new building. So, here today we can be proud that the Union western Virginians fought to preserve has built this great structure to serve the needs of both a great Nation and a proud and progressive State.

CHARLESTON FEDERAL BUILDING DEDICATION, OCTOBER 12, 1961

(Acknowledgments to those present.)

This ceremony today—the dedications of a new Federal building to serve Charleston and surrounding communities—provides a

significant event for all of us and a particularly happy occasion for me personally. A new Federal building is opened in a community only once in a lifetime; it is a permanent addition to the economic and political life of the city.

As a lifelong resident of Charleston, I have had an opportunity to watch the growth of this city and its increasing importance in the scheme of regional and national developments.

This ceremony today serves as an assurance of even more important stature yet to come, and of the confidence of the Federal Government in the stronger role yet to be played by this metropolitan area in the advancement of Federal programs. Today's ceremony is also significant because we are dedicating a landmark in steel and stone, permanent reminder of the durability of our Federal Union.

In these days of unrest and uncertainty, there is much cause to doubt the strength of organizations developed by mankind. Those who advance their causes through the destruction of organizations are active everywhere—in Berlin, in Cuba, in Africa, and southeast Asia. We are seeing a concerted attack upon the United Nations, a body which was created in an effort to guarantee justice for all peoples and governments. It is easy to become discouraged about the association of men for noble purposes, and to develop strong doubts about the permanence of governments and their functions.

Against this pattern of doubt and unrest, however, there stands the American Union of States, bound together by a written Constitution and the laws passed by the Congress—a Government by the consent of the governed.

In many countries, the buildings which house representatives of the national government are symbols of fear and oppression. The people of these countries avoid these buildings, and often cross the street rather than pass directly in front of their doors. The connotations of federal government in such countries are invariably evil, the federal building houses the secret political police and party officials who can take away the citizen's right to a job or credentials permitting him to buy food and necessities. A single command coming from one of these federal buildings can uproot whole communities and send them away into a wilderness for the rest of their lives without right of appeal.

We must not forget that these circumstances exist elsewhere even though we live in a different world and are blessed by constitutional guarantees supported by the active will of the majority. Thousands of citizens in Poland, Hungary, and East Germany have entered federal buildings and have never been seen again.

In contrast, we are proud of this new structure, it will house representatives of a Government chosen by all of us, and those representatives will administer the services of that Government impartially and without regard to race, creed, or political belief. When we consider this building and this ceremony, I believe we should bear in mind the comparison between the meaning of Federal authority in our country and elsewhere in the world. Every time we pass this way, that comparison should be refreshed, and memory should make us more alert then ever to the challenge required to keep strong our own Federal Union and its institutions.

Today's dedication, then, is much more than just the opening of a new Government building. It is another sign that we, as a people, governing ourselves, can create the services we need without the dictatorship of a one-party state.

The struggle which rages today in the international arena is basically a struggle between those who insist upon the right to plan for themselves and their future by means of elected representatives of their own choosing, and on the other hand, these who maintain that a minority in a police state can arbitrarily plan the use of national resources for the benefit of the majority.

Bearing this in mind, it seems to me that every dedication of this kind in an American city is another bit of proof that ours is the best way of life. It is another endorsement of the conviction of our Founding Fathers that we could stand firm on a strong Constitution and improve our national stature a little more each year.

Today, at this dedication, we are adding one more piece of evidence to our belief in ourselves and our future, and we are offering another piece of evidence to confound those who maintain that the democratic way cannot survive. We have just cause to be proud and pleased with the work of those who made this new facility possible.

The problems of a growing nation and a restless world will always be with us, and we must expect to face repeated challenges as the years of our history advance. But, we do move ahead, as we have here in the Kanawha Valley, from the log house which first flew the American flag to this magnificent new building.

Much has changed, but not the principles on which our Federal Union was founded or our devotion to those principles. As a symbol of that Union and that devotion to it, I am proud to commend this building to your attention and to assure you that those who work here will be committed to the public betterment.

REMARKS BY HON. JOHN A. SHANKLIN, MAYOR OF THE CITY OF CHARLESTON, DEDICATION CEREMONY, CHARLESTON, W. VA.

It is indeed a pleasure as well as an honor for me as mayor of Charleston to welcome all present to this dedicatory service for this beautiful Federal building.

On November 23, 1959, a small group of citizens with top officials of General Services Administration, together with the former Governor of West Virginia, Hon. Cecil H. Underwood, the architects and contractors, met here to participate in the ground breaking ceremony.

Now, just some 23 months later we see this magnificent building, designed by Greife & Daley and C. E. Silling & Associates, all local architects, not only from the artistic point of view—but from the utilitarian standpoint.

This building will provide a much needed facility in Charleston, and will be a great benefit to all the communities in this part of West Virginia.

REMARKS AT DEDICATION OF THE NEW FEDERAL BUILDING AT CHARLESTON, W. VA., OCTOBER 12, 1961, BY HON. CHAPMAN REVERCOMB

I am sure that the citizens of this community, and the State, dedicate this modern, fine building with a just feeling of pride and appreciation—pride in the structure itself and the purposes to which it is to be devoted. It is a mark of progress in a progressive city and country. It will be a monument to those who planned and built it—and a monument to those who use it well.

From these quarters the national laws will be applied and administered.

Here will convene the Federal court, presided over by an able judge, to apply the country's laws to the problems and issues that arise for people, involving their rights, their liberty, and their property. Here will be upheld the rights of the people under the laws of this Nation.

Here, also, will be located the various administrative offices of the executive branch of the Federal Government, touching the lives of all who dwell in this area, administering the laws that have been enacted for the security and orderly life of those who dwell in America.

The application and administration of law will in large measure determine the verity of the freedom which has long been the claim of our people and which is their most valuable temporal possession.

As has been so truly said: "The reason of the law is the life thereof." Unless it be administered in the light of reason, government can be oppressive and the very purpose of law for a free people can be destroyed.

Never before has there been a time when it was so important that the law be enacted and administered with consideration of the people, than now. This is necessary if we are to save internally that which we prepare to defend against outside aggression.

In an existing basic division in the whole world, involving those, on one hand, like ourselves, who maintain that the freedom of the citizens in living his life is paramount to the desires of those who operate government; and, on the other hand, the view of those in power in other lands that it is their right to direct the lives of the citizen without limit on oppression and abuse, presents the gravest of issues for us.

It is, indeed, a very old issue. Freedom against tyranny. Our forefathers met that problem for us when they chose the way of freedom of the individuals as the highest purpose of government. This issue has confronted men ever since they were organized, or organized themselves, into groups called nations. However, today it confronts us as a flaming threat. We must meet it with all the power and the wisdom which we possess. It is a time for steadfastness—a time for good sense and judgment—not for emotions and feelings.

We are firmly anchored to the position that we must not, and will not, give up the liberty of the people living here. If that be taken from us, or surrendered by us, all else is worthless. Americans cannot live that way.

Therefore, it is a time for new dedication to the security and united strength of our people, and to the well-being of all who stand with us in this hour.

So as we dedicate this structure, let us rededicate our own lives, all of us, both those who administer law and all those who live under it, to the freedom we have inherited within our land, and to the preservation and defense of it.

A Tribute to Grandfather

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, recently I was privileged to attend a dinner at which a granddaughter paid tribute to her grandfather. The young lady read her tribute beautifully. But more important, she expressed so well a life lived in the true tradition of America, and I believe many of my colleagues will enjoy reading the following:

A TRIBUTE TO MY GRANDFATHER

(By Suzanne Ellen Silverstein)

(Presented at Congregation K.I.N.S. of West Rogers Park, Chicago, Ill., on the occasion of his being honored in behalf of State of Israel bonds, November 19, 1961.)

Who is this man we have come to honor?
This is a big man.

This is a strong man.

Shrewd in business, quick in controversy, and stern in principle.

Yet, inside his powerful framework, is a most gentle man.

Have you ever looked into his soft blue eyes, or encountered his beaming smile?

Within them lies the story of this man.

Fifty-one years ago, he set his feet on the shores of America. There he stood, with no formal education, unable to speak English, and absolutely penniless. But he had in his favor a gift from God—he had a heart containing perseverance, ambition, and most important of all—love.

His two strong hands, his good mind, and his undying will to go on, built up a successful business.

He loved well and wisely when he chose the lovely and gentle Esther for his wife. And together they created a wonderful family and a warm Jewish home.

Oh, such a father, such a good devoted father. When material luxuries were rare, he sufficed with other things. He taught his children everything from horseback riding to Torah. He taught them family togetherness, compassion and responsibility to fellow man. He inspired them to pursue knowledge, and he taught them the Jewish way of life. To his children, Hebrew school and devotion to the synagogue became a joy; and they acquired a profound attachment to Israel.

Not only was the Schaffner Pesach Sedar open to all, but so was the everyday dinner table. To him, his employees have always been his fellow men—regardless of creed or color. Their problems are his problems.

At least 12 hours a day he worked. He came home tired and aggravated; but always with enough spirit to play with his grandchildren. To cuddle a baby in his arms, never was he too tired. Or, to tease them when they grew older. Is it a wonder that his picture occupies a place of prominence on the bulletin board of a certain college girl?

So, we, his family, thank you and admire you for your wise choice in choosing this man to honor.

Who is this man—this gentle man—to whom we all pay tribute? He is our beloved father, grandpa and friend Abraham Schaffner.

The Profit Motive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Profit Motive" which appeared in the January 11, 1962, edition of the Shelbyville, Ind., News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PROFIT MOTIVE

Americans believe in the profit motive because they know that it has made possible in our Nation the highest wages and the greatest opportunity ever enjoyed by any country in the history of the world.

Believing in the profit motive, what would your answer be if your son or grandson asked you to explain how there can be a profit which is not taken from the work of someone else?

A prominent educator was asked that question by his grandson. His reply, as reproduced some time ago in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, was as simple and convincing an explanation of the profit system as we have seen. Here it is:

"Profit is the result of enterprise which builds for others as well as for the enterpriser. Let us consider the operation of this fact in a primitive community of, say, 100 persons, who obtain only the mere necessities of living by working hard all day long.

"Our primitive community at the foot of a mountain must have water. There is no water except at a spring near the top of the mountain; therefore, every day all of the 100 persons climb to the top of the mountain. It takes them 1 hour to go up and back. They do this day in and day out, until at last one of them notices that the water from the spring runs down inside the mountain in the same direction that he goes when he comes down. He conceives the idea of digging a trough in the mountainside all the way down to the place where he has his habitation.

"He goes to work to build a trough. The other 99 people are not even curious about what he is doing. Then one day this 100th man turns a small part of the water from the spring into his trough and it runs down the mountain into a basin he has fashioned at the bottom. Whereupon he says to the 99 others, who each spend an hour a day fetching their water, that if they will each give him the daily production of 10 minutes of their time, he will give them water from his basin. He will then receive 990 minutes of the time of the other men each day; this arrangement will make it unnecessary for him to work 16 hours a day in order to provide for his necessities. He is making a tremendous profit, but his enterprise has given each of the 99 other people 50 additional minutes each day.

"The enterpriser, now having 16 hours a day at his disposal and being naturally curious, spends part of his time watching the water run down the mountain. He sees that it pushes along stones and pieces of wood. So he develops a water wheel; then he notices that it has power and finally, after many hours of contemplation and work, he makes the water wheel run a mill to grind his corn.

"This 100th man then realizes that he has sufficient power to grind corn for the other 99. He says to them, 'I will allow you to grind your corn in my mill if you will give me one-tenth the time you save.' They agree, and so the enterpriser now makes an additional profit.

"He uses the time paid him by the 99 others to build a better house for himself, to increase his conveniences of living through new benches, openings in his house for light, better protection from the cold. So it goes on, as this 100th man finds new ways to save the 99 the total expenditure of their time, one-tenth of which he asks of them in payment for his enterprising.

"This 100th man's time finally becomes all his own to use as he sees fit. He does not have to work unless he chooses to. His food, shelter, and clothing are provided by others. His mind, however, is ever working, and the other 99 are having more and more time to themselves because of his thinking and planning.

"For instance, he notices that 1 of the 99 makes better shoes than the others. He arranges for this man to spend all his time making shoes, because he can be fed and clothed and sheltered from profits. The other 98 do not have to make their own shoes. The are charged one-tenth the time they save. The 99th man is also able to work shorter hours because some of the time that is paid by each of the 98 is allowed to him by the 100th man."

And so it goes.

"As these developments continued," the explanation goes on, "each member of the community, while giving something from his own accomplishments, became more and more dependent upon the efforts of others. And, unless envy and jealousy and unfair laws intervened to restrict honest enterprises who benefit all, progress promised to be constant.

"Need we say more to prove that there can be profit from enterprise without taking anything from others, that such enterprise adds to the ease of living for everyone? These principles are as active in a great nation such as the United States as in our own imaginary community. Laws that kill incentive and cripple the honest enterpriser hold back progress. True profit is not something to be feared, because it works to the benefit of all.

"We must endeavor to build, instead of tearing down what others have built. We must be fair to other men, or the world cannot be fair to us."

We think explanation of the "profit motive" is excellent. In the United States the people, acting through their elected representatives, have passed laws which insure that our personal enterprise system shall not be abused by those who become greedy and who wish to make dishonest profits. These safeguards find expression in our antitrust and antimonopoly laws. Yet, there is still one law which is higher and even more effective than all of these. It is the power of free choice, exercised by the individual consumers of America. Perhaps it finds its best expression in the words of a Man who lived long ago. Modern man was paraphrased His words but they mean the same thing: "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." So long as our profit motive system is operated with honesty and a genuine desire to serve, there is no system ever devised by man which can produce a more equitable distribution of good for all.

Council Opposes Wilderness Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have received two resolutions approved by the Washington Resources Council, December 7, 1961, at its 22d annual meeting. I believe these resolutions are a matter of interest to the Congress because they concern legislation under consideration.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include each in the RECORD. The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTION 1—WILDERNESS AREA

(Approved at the 22d annual meeting of the Washington Resources Council held at Olympia, Wash., December 7, 1961)

Whereas there is now being considered by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States Senate a bill entitled "The National Wilderness Preservation Act" which gives legal existence to the additions to the national system of wilderness and wild areas and creates a council with extensive powers over such creation and existence; and

Whereas passage of such legislation would violate the principle of flexibility in the wisest use of our Nation's resources as dictated by the necessity of proper growth and development; and

Whereas both the utilization of such resources and their use in recreational activity can best be served by a flexible multiple policy rather than a rigid restriction on the use of these resources; and

Whereas wilderness areas are continuing to be established in our State of Washington: we, therefore, continue to

Resolve, That the Washington Resources Council oppose enactment of the National Wilderness Preservation Act in its present form and urge continuance of the present policy of administration of such areas: be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the U.S. legislators from the State of Washington, the Washington State Reclamation Association, and the Department of Natural Resources.

M. C. KNOX,
Secretary-Treasurer.

RESOLUTION 2—WATER RESOURCES PLANNING ACT OF 1961

(Approved at the 22d annual meeting of the Washington Resources Council held at Olympia, Wash., December 7, 1961)

Be it resolved that the Washington Resources Council oppose enactment of H.R. 8177, the Water Resources Planning Act of 1961, which would establish a Water Resources Council as an administrative agency of the executive department of the Federal Government.

The council recognizes the need for interstate and interagency cooperation in the matter of wise use of the Nation's water resources. However, in fact, proposed legislation must recognize and preserve the individual State's rights and authority in the administration of its water resources.

The council recommends the continued financial support of the Federal Government, but respectfully requests that the individual States and interstate commissions involved be included in all administrative judgments, as regarding conservation of the Nation's water resources.

Copies are to be mailed to Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and Washington delegation.

M. C. KNOX,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Virginia Invites New Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New York Times of December 31, 1961, outlining the outstanding progress that is being made throughout Virginia.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIRGINIA INVITES NEW INDUSTRIES—IN ONE PROJECT, UTILITY IS HELPING COMMUNITIES

(By Gene Smith)

Industrial development is the key word at opposite sides of the State of Virginia.

The goals are the same—a steady, growing economy. Only the means are different.

On the East Coast, the Greater Norfolk area is in the midst of a $332,000,000 development program. It encompasses an area that covers Norfolk, Hampton, Newport News, Portsmouth, Virginia Beach, and the counties of Princess Anne, York and Norfolk. This is a region whose population amounts to some 860,000 persons.

Across the State to the west, Appalachian Power Company has selected the town of Abingdon as the trial horse in what has been described as "a bold, new approach to industrial development." Basically, the plan works this way: Apalachian has invested $200,000 to put up a shell building in Abingdon. The utility's area development department will help find an industrial occupant that is both suitable to the building and acceptable to the community, which agrees to accept financial responsibility once the tenant is found.

IMPACT SIGHTED

Although Norfolk's program is by far the more spectacular of the two, the one at Abingdon may eventually have the greatest impact on regional developments across the country. Norfolk's project is closely tied to the opening of a new Chesapeake Bay crossing, a once-in-a-lifetime event.

Abingdon, if successful, could show the way to utilities across the Nation. Appalachian Power, an operating company of the American Electric Power System, has set up a revolving credit system that could be adopted in thousands of areas in this country.

Under the label "Project Decision," the utility has developed a basic questionnaire that sets the entire program in motion. As used in its Virginia-West Virginia service area, the first step was to send to 73 communities a one-page survey with 10 questions. Its purpose was to determine how many communities had suitable sites and whether rail, utility, zoning, and other necessities were available.

The 35 that passed this initial test were then sent an exhaustive inquiry that covered all aspects of community and business life. At no time was the exact nature of the project disclosed to anyone. This second questionnaire contained 33 detailed parts.

SITES VISITED

These were scored and an impartial jury of three visited sites that ranked high. (Nine received excellent ratings.) Abingdon won out and Appalachian then contacted the local development organization. Under the agreement with the town, Appalachian Power bought the land, is putting up the building, landscaping the site and helping to find the industry. Once the tenant is found, the local group assumes the responsibility for completing the building to the tenant's specifications and provides for the return of the utility's $200,000.

That sum will then be used in another community for the same purpose. Company officials note that the other communities have become improvement conscious as a direct result of Abingdon's success and have started local programs so that they may qualify for the second or third award of the $200,000. Community ratings are not final. Periodic examinations will be conducted to see if local improvements can cause an upgrading for eventual qualification for Appalachian Power support.

Across the State at Norfolk, the entire community has pitched in on that area's development. Typical of the spirit of local businessmen is that voiced by Thomas P. Chisman, president and operator of WVEC-TV, Hampton, Va. He is one of a group of 60 businessmen in the area who are working on a voluntary program to promote the overall growth of the region.

"Few people realize what is happening in this area," Mr. Chisman said in an interview here last week. "The Virginia Peninsula is the fastest growing part of the State. Since 1951, the population in Hampton alone has grown from 7,500 to 95,000, an increase of 1,396 percent. The population in Newport News has increased 168.3 percent and in York County 83.7 percent through both consolidation and natural growth."

INDUSTRIAL GIANTS

Mr. Chisman noted that such industrial giants as Dow Chemical, American Oil, Union Carbide and Plymouth Cordage had moved into the area.

"We are the space headquarters for the United States," he went on, "and Hampton is the home of the astronauts. This has brought a flood of subsidiary space-age industries into the area to supplement the other major industries."

Clarence Osthagan, vice president and executive director of the Tidewater Virginia Development Council, credits the new Chesapeake Bay crossing with generating the spirit needed to make the regional development program successful. He predicted that by the end of the 1960's the Greater Norfolk area would have a population of more than a million.

Mr. Osthagan is credited with bringing into the area 10 major new industries since 1958. Among these are Newark Packing Co., Tidewater Oil Co., St. Joe Paper Co., and Atlas Portland Co.

John S. Alfriend, treasurer of the development council and chairman of the National Bank of Commerce in Norfolk, firmly believes that the region's future is assured with the completion of the bay bridge-tunnel in 1963.

"The water around Norfolk has always been one of its greatest assets, but, at the same time, has presented a liability in transportation. The bridge-tunnel will remove the water barrier as a liability and make distribution to and from the city infinitely more flexible."

Typical of the commercial ventures in the Norfolk program is the $6 million Golden Triangle Hotel, which opened in mid-June. It is in an entirely reconstructed area of downtown Norfolk. Some 70 regional and national conventions were booked into the hotel prior to its opening, thus assuring the area of a great new source of income.

How We Got This Way—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, the second—October 15—in the New York Daily News series of editorials "How We Got This Way" appears below:

HOW WE GOT THIS WAY—II

The first editorial in this series on the evolution of the United States wound up with the governing of the Second Continental Congress in Philadelphia, May 10, 1775.

Revolution against the British Crown was already underway, though not officially.

George Washington was named Commander-in-Chief of the Continental Army June 15, 1775, more than a year before the Declaration of Independence.

The Americans took Ticonderoga and Crown Point (May 10–12, 1775), fought the Battle of Bunker Hill opposite Boston (June 17), and drove the British out of Boston after a long siege (March 17, 1776), before concluding that the break with Britain must be declared permanent.

In June of 1776, the Continental Congress appointed a committee of five, including John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, and

Thomas Jefferson, to draw up a formal statement that the 13 North American Colonies were cutting loose for good and all from the Old World.

Jefferson wrote the bulk of the document; Adams and Franklin acted as editors. The result was one of the most moving and beautifully written official papers ever produced in this country. It was adopted by the Continental Congress July 4, 1776, though some of its 56 signers put their names to it later.

The Declaration of Independence was not and is not a law. It was only an official statement of the Americans' grievances against King George III, and of the broad political and philosophical principles on which they proposed to found a new nation.

Jefferson and his editors led off with this paragraph:

"When in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bonds which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation."

"NATURE—AND NATURE'S GOD"

Most noteworthy in this preamble is the mention of God.

Religion was a powerful force in the Thirteen Original States, and had been ever since the beginning of the colonies in the 17th century.

It is evident that the writers and signers of the Declaration wished it understood from the start that this was to be a nation in which the existence of a Supreme Being (who has the whole world in His hand, as a latter-day song puts it) was to be acknowledged.

Thus, the American Revolution differed basically from the atheistic French Revolution of 1789 and the equally atheistic upheaval in Russia in 1917.

The Declaration's second paragraph sums up the political philosophy of the founders of the United States. In this philosophy there were three cardinal principles:

1. All men are created equal, with certain unalienable rights granted them by their Creator—among these being life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

2. Governments' prime job is to guarantee and safeguard these rights, and governments get their powers from the consent of the governed. (In short, government should be the servant of the people, not their master.)

PRINCIPLES OF THE DAY

3. When any government neglects its duties, the people have a right and an obligation to revamp or abolish it, as they see fit, and to set up another government "in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

There followed a long, itemized list of the crimes and oppressions visited on the American colonies by King George III.

The Declaration ended with a paragraph "appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world" to witness the rightness of the revolutionary cause, and declaring "that these United Colonies are, and of Right ought to be, Free and Independent States * * * absolved from all Allegiance to the British Crown * * *"

It was a long and bloody road from July 4, 1776, to the end of the Revolution. But a treaty signed in Paris September 3, 1783, made the U.S. victory official.

In the next three or four editorials in this series, we'll describe how the self-liberated colonials struggled to put the principles of the Declaration of Independence into practice in their laws and institutions.

Conservatism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in a recent and excellent editorial, the Milwaukee Sentinel has commended three conservative Members of Congress for their appeals to conservatives to avoid indiscriminate name calling and demagoguery and to make their case on the record.

Particularly praised is the statement of Senator JOHN TOWER, of Texas, at a recent meeting of conservatives in Washington when he said:

We can't get our message across by shouting slogans and calling everyone who disagrees with us Communists.

Mr. President, I recall reading this thoughtful and practical contribution to a responsible dialog by the junior Senator from Texas. I congratulate him upon it. And I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Milwaukee Sentinel be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSERVATISM

The razzle-dazzle misuse of labels by extremists in the political debate of this era took a shellacking last weekend from three Republican Members of Congress. JOHN G. TOWER, the first GOP Senator from Texas since Reconstruction days, and Representatives JOHN J. RHODES, of Arizonia, and BOB WILSON, of California, made important contributions to keeping the Nation's sights straight.

The three were among leading speakers to a Washington gathering sponsored by Human Events, a newsletter of impeccably conservative views. The point stressed by them was that conservatives can be effective politically only by appealing to Americans' commonsense and shunning demagoguery and namecalling.

Senator TOWER drew an ovation from the conservative audience when he said: "We can't get our message across by shouting slogans and calling everyone who disagrees with us communists."

Hailing the resurgence of conservatism in the United States, TOWER ascribed the trend to increasing political maturity of voters. Like Representatives RHODES and WILSON, he called for conservatives to devote their energies to electing legislators who represent their views, rather than to indiscriminate accusations such as those made by right-wing extremist groups.

It is time that true conservatives speak up for what they represent, and halt the misuse of their name. Radical extremists of the right have been borrowing the label "conservative," to which they have no legitimate claim. At the same time, leftist groups who misscall themselves "liberals" have been contributing to the confusion.

A conservative is by dictionary definition a moderate. Therefore no extremist of the right is a conservative, but is instead a radical just as the extremist of the left is.

No good to the Nation can come from false identification of political groups, intentional or otherwise.

The President's Vista

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER A. GARLAND

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Speaker, we have already read and will be reading many more interpretations both pro and con of President Kennedy's state of the Union message to the Congress last Thursday. The point of view as expressed in the following editorial, which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on Friday, January 12, 1962, unfortunately will not be as widely echoed across the country as it should be. I take this opportunity, under unanimous consent, to call it to the attention of my colleagues:

THE PRESIDENT'S VISTA

The President's message yesterday does indeed add up to a comment on the state of the Union—or at least on the state of the national mind. And it is not, we think, a very happy comment.

For a key to this address is that it is almost impossible to wax angry or even indignant about it, despite its proposals for still further Government expansion and intervention. Most of these ideas have been kicking around for so long that people are used to them and regard them apathetically. Those who question the trend they reflect can but shrug wearily—what else can be expected in the United States in the 20th century's middle age?

That, we suggest, is the depressing part, despite the President's observations on such appropriate Federal concerns as defense and international trade policy. For the fact remains that this message as a whole promises a significant forward thrust in the momentum of Federal aggrandizement. Look in it where you will, and you will look in vain for any problem, large or small, truly national or obviously local, for which the President does not propose a Federal solution.

Do our cities have troubles? No mention is made that their troubles stem in large measure from the corruption of big-city political machines and existing Federal intrusions. No, the Federal Government will attack all their problems—literally everything, from juvenile delinquency to air pollution to mass transportation. To undertake this glorious enterprise we are to be given a new Federal Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

Could our children be better educated? Don't even think of what the localities are doing and could do; the Federal Government will see to it. All through the educational process, Federal money is to be the solution.

Do some young men quit school in the confident expectation the welfare state will support their loafing? Very well, the Federal welfare state will do just that, making sure they never learn the meaning of the word "incentive."

Are some "small" business buffeted by the winds of competition? Never fear; the Federal father will protect them. Is the economy as a whole a weak, unstable thing? That's all right; Washington will stand by, ready to rush in with vast public-works spending at the first hint of economic adjustment.

And so on—and one certainly could go on with this list. The Federal Government is to create that "instant utopia" which Senator MANSFIELD has just said it could not conceivably do. As we say, it is mostly

familiar stuff, but maybe it's worth asking what it suggests for the future.

Once the principle of a Federal solution for everything is accepted, it's extremely hard to see where the process stops, or indeed why it should stop at all. Perhaps the good sense of the American people, and their instinct for political compromise, will keep the process within the broad bounds of freedom, though that will be difficult to do.

But even if the federalization of our life can be kept gradual, it offers an inexpressibly dreary prospect. At best it offers a widening pall of bureaucracy to smother all the powerful energies of our individual and national life. No one who has seen that kind of life in action—as in Britain under the Labor government, not to mention more extreme examples—could seriously regard it as desirable.

The President talks of vigor, stimulation, creativity, fulfilling the world's hope by fulfilling our own faith in freedom. It is a pity that the vista his program, taken as a whole and seen clearly, would actually open is of another sort entirely.

The saddest part about the state of our Union is that few indeed seem to see, or to care.

A Farmer Speaks on the Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

ROCHEPORT, MO., *January 8, 1962.*

Congressman MORGAN M. MOULDER,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MOULDER: I am writing you in regard to the 1962 farm bill, which in its real form has been kept secret so far. But if it is more rigid and more discriminating than last year's program (God help us small farmers); we family-sized farmers cannot stay in the business.

I own a 198-acre farm. Last year they gave me a 19-acre corn allotment and one 8-10 wheat allotment. They measured the corn ground and I agreed to put 5 acres in the soil bank. Then the 5 acres grew up in a fine crop of hay. Then after the weeds grew up in it, I mowed it down and left it to rot. In the fall after the corn was mature and part of it harvested, I received a letter from the ASC office stating that I had overcropped 2 3/10 acres and would have to destroy that amount. I gave them their money back and kept the corn. If I had gone ahead and planted that 5 acres, I could easily have fed out $500 worth more hogs and calves which were badly needed to meet the rising cost of living and farm operation.

I see in the paper that Secretary Orville L. Freeman and Fred Heinkel say the 1961 program was a big success. If it was then its only purpose was to put small farmers out of business and big farmers in b'gger business. In my opinion, 90 percent of the small farmers do not grow enough corn or other feed grain to feed out the amount of stock it takes to pay their living and operation costs. Therefore, they have to buy some feed produced by the big farmer who is overflowing the surplus grain bins. I have a friend in the adjoining county that harvested near 3,000 acres of corn and stored 50,000 bushels in one large quonset building and took a Government loan. Would it not be better to cut this man down to 1,000 acres and let 200 small farmers grow 10 acres more each and try to hold on to our farms? It was out West in 1960 and saw six big 16-foot combines running in one field that had no buildings or fences. I talked to one of the machine operators who said they had been cutting on this one man's crop for 2 days and had another day to go. Would it not be better to cut him down to one-half of his crop and let several hundred of the family-sized farmers plant a few more acres each?

Last fall I was told I could not plant barley because I had not planted any the last 2 years. Does it mean that a man should be barred from planting a certain crop the rest of his life because he did not plant it on a certain year? Oh, yes, I meant to say that those 6 combines could cut my wheat allotment in 30 seconds—one-half of a minute.

Today there are thousands of farmers living in town in poverty who were making a good and independent living on the farm 10 years ago. Today there are thousands of farm houses falling apart and vacant which were well kept and occupied a few years ago. There are about 1 million fewer farmers today than there were 10 years ago.

And, if I do not miss my guess, there will be double that number within the next 3 or 4 years. And I am a purebred Democrat.

Now, Mr. Moulder, we farmers have needed you badly in the last 9 years and we need you more than ever in the next few years, and if your health permits, we beg of you to stay with us and keep pitching. We will pitch with you.

Maybe you can keep some of us old farmers down on that farm even though we have seen poverty.

Our country is spending billions of dollars fighting communism and letting it breed right here among us. The farmers that have left the farm in recent years did not leave because they wanted to but because they had to. No country in the world could lick this country if we stay united but letting the big eat the little is not unification.

I hope, Mr. Moulder, you will excuse the poor manner in which I have addressed you. I have spent my life working hard on the farm with little time for school. But I do know we are fighting surplus in the wrong place and communism in the wrong way.

It looks like my typewriter needs repair as bad as my tractors and other machinery. I hope my tractor does not skip as many acres next spring as this typewriter has spaces; if so, I am ruined.

I have tried to point out, Mr. Moulder, that we cannot make a go of it unless we are allowed enough acreage to pay our expenses. And that we cannot cut down the surplus by cutting where the surplus does not grow.

Another thing, we have too many farm owners who never scooped a load of grain in their lives but use their farms as a means of income tax deductions.

I hope you will read this letter before the House and Mr. Freeman as we do not like to be told how to not make a living farming.

Very truly yours,

C. A. FREESE.

President Kennedy's State of the Union Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the highly regarded and usually objective and dispassionate Washington Sunday Star yesterday carried a lead editorial commenting on President Kennedy's state of the Union message in a manner which should cause every liberty loving and peace desiring American to read and carefully ponder it. It is most certainly an editorial of exceptional importance.

Consequently, so that it may be brought to the attention of the Congress and the country generaly, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in full in the Appendix of the RECORD. It will undoubtedly be reprinted by many of the more important newspapers of America.

This editorial suggests steps by which the United Nations can be saved and by which it can be made to serve the cause of peace and justice. It also points out the very real perils and spells out the challenges which must be met through appropriate American leadership in the United Nations if that great hope for a better world is not to become instead a vehicle for advancing the cause and strengthening the position of godless, aggressive, imperialistic communism. It is clearly time to provide effective and sound American Leadership in the United Nations rather than to continue to permit ourselves to become a pawn to be pushed around by self-serving so-called neutrals, or by geographic blocs of delegates whose countries are just emerging on the world scene but which are entirely lacking in significant military strength, or by members of the Communist bloc itself.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPERFECT IS RIGHT

The President, in the course of his report on the state of the Union, said that the United Nations is "our instrument and our hope" in keeping the peace. And then he added: "I see little merit in the impatience of those who would abandon this imperfect world instrument because they dislike our imperfect world."

This strikes us as an imperfect analysis of the reasons why many people are losing confidence in the United Nations.

It is true, we suppose, that most of us dislike this imperfect world. Only the village idiot could think it is the best of all possible worlds. But this has very little to do with the public's disenchantment with the U.N. If the President really believes that the disaffection can be attributed merely to dislike of an imperfect world he is deluding himself—and helping to dig the U.N.'s grave.

The reasons, we think, go deeper. The United Nations will not retain respect and support in this country if it is to be influenced by considerations of expediency as opposed to principle. The distinction between that which is right and that which is wrong must be made. The clamorous and often irrational demands of the so-called newly emerged countries cannot be satisfied at the expense of justice to other countries. The U.N. must not become a sounding board and a vehicle for Communist propaganda—aided and abetted by delegates from the nonalined countries who ought to know better, but who apparently do not.

Above all else, as we see it, the United States must not let itself be caught up and swept along in the treacherous currents that are running through the U.N. It was wrong for us to support the resolution on Angola—a resolution which we knew to be inequitable but which we voted for in the hope of

harvesting some good will in the Afro-Asian bloc. We were wrong in voting for the unjust resolution of November 24 on Katanga because we did not want the Congolese representative in the U.N. to go home empty handed.

Our guess would be that not too many Americans, as of this time, want to abandon the U.N. But the number will increase, and increase rapidly, unless there is a change for the better in the U.N. itself. Mr. Kennedy, instead of blaming it all on dislike of an imperfect world, should be insisting upon and leading the demand for such a change—especially as far as the role of the United States in the U.N. is concerned.

Commission on Campaign Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. ASHMORE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, on October 4, 1961, President Kennedy appointed a nine-member Commission on Campaign Costs. This Commission is a temporary, nonpartisan, study group. The work of the Commission will be to consider the cost of campaigning in Presidential elections and to recommend to the President not later than April 30, 1962, improved methods and means of financing future campaigns for President and Vice President of the United States. I think it appropriate at this time for Members of both the Senate and House of Representatives to know what is being done in this field. Therefore, I wish to call my colleagues attention to the statement of the President in announcing the appointment of the Commission, and also the Commission's statement subsequent to its first meeting with President Kennedy on November 9, 1961.

Senator CANNON has introduced S. 2426 in the Senate and I have introduced H.R. 9255. These bills provide for numerous changes in the Federal election laws:

The President today named a nine-member Commission on Campaign Costs to consider the costs of campaigning in presidential elections and to recommend improved ways of financing essential expenditures required of the major party nominees for President and Vice President.

Alexander Heard, dean of the Graduate School at the University of North Carolina, will serve as Chairman of the President's Commission on Campaign Costs. Dean Heard, a leading authority on the problems of campaign financing, is author of the definitive study "The Cost of Democracy," published last year by the University of North Carolina Press.

The Commission is a temporary, nonpartisan, study group. It will do its work during the fall and will make its recommendations to the President in the spring in time for its recommendations to be considered by the next session of Congress.

In announcing the appointment of the Commission, the President said:

"Election of the President of the United States is the supreme test of the democratic process in this country. Because the duly nominated candidates of both our national parties must campaign throughout the country, carrying their views to all the Nation's voters, there are great financial burdens in conducting presidential campaigns. To have Presidential candidates dependent on large financial contributions of those with special interests is highly undesirable, especially in these days when the public interest requires basic decisions so essential to our national security and survival. The financial base of our presidential campaigns must be broadened.

"Among the services which must be paid for are staff assistance, transportation and communication facilities, radio and television time. Under present circumstances these items are enormously expensive, and thus the ability of candidates to carry on campaigns is, in large measure, governed by their success as fund raisers.

"Traditionally, the funds for national campaigns have been supplied entirely by private contributions, with the candidates forced to depend in the main on large sums from a relatively small number of contributors. It is not healthy for the democratic process—or for ethical standards in our Government—to keep our national candidates in this condition of dependence. I have long thought that we must either provide a Federal share in campaign costs, or reduce the cost of campaign services, or both.

"My Commission on Campaign Costs will take a fresh look at this problem, and will make such recommendations as it deems appropriate, looking toward proposals for the next session of Congress.

"A Federal share in presidential campaign costs has been under public discussion for a great many years. President Theodore Roosevelt was among the first to propose that presidential campaigns be assisted by the Government. Comparable proposals have been advocated subsequently by private citizens and by Members of the Congress, notably by the late Senator Neuberger of Oregon. Several such proposals are contained in bills pending in the current Congress. I am asking the Commission to inform itself on all of these as it conducts its study. In addition, I am asking the Commission to examine programs actually employed by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and by several democratic countries overseas in which governments participate in financing political campaigns. Finally, I expect that the Commission will consider a variety of other measures used in this country and elsewhere for facilitating campaigns, among them the permissive legislation which made possible last year's television debates without cost to the candidates.

"As I made plain in a press conference last May, I regard the inquiry to be undertaken by this Commission as a matter of great importance. I am grateful to the distinguished members of the Commission for their willingness to serve. I look forward to the results of their inquiry."

In addition to the Chairman, the other members of the President's Commission on Campaign Costs are:

V. O. Key, Cambridge, Mass., professor of government, Harvard College.

Dan Kimball, Los Angeles, Calif., president, Aerojet-General Corp., former Secretary of the Navy.

Malcolm Moos, New York City, adviser to the Rockefeller brothers on public affairs, professor of political science, Johns Hopkins University, former administrative assistant to President Eisenhower.

Paul Porter, Washington, D.C., member of law firm of Arnold, Porter & Fortas, former Chairman, Federal Communications Commission.

Neil Staebler, Ann Arbor, Mich., small businessman, Democratic national committeeman from Michigan, former chairman, Michigan Democratic State Central Committee.

Walter Thayer, New York City, president, New York Herald-Tribune, former chairman, United Republican Finance Committee of New York, national finance chairman of Volunteers for Nixon-Lodge.

John Vorys, Columbus, Ohio, member of law firm of Vorys, Sater, Seymour & Pease, former Member of the U.S. House of Representatives.

James Worthy, Chicago, Ill., president, Republican Citizens of Illinois, former president, United Republican Fund of Illinois, former Assistant Secretary of Commerce in the Eisenhower administration, former vice president, Sears Roebuck & Co.

Members of the President's Commission on Campaign Costs met with the President at noon today to launch its task of considering the costs of campaigning and recommending improved ways of financing expenditures required by nominees for President.

President Kennedy asked the Commission to make a report to him as early next spring as possible, but not later than April 30th.

Following the 3-hour organization meeting the Commission announced the appointment of Dr. Herbert E. Alexander as Executive Director to head the staff of the Commission. Dr. Alexander is presently director of the Citizen's Research Foundation, Princeton, N.J., from which position he will take a leave of absence.

The Commission will seek and welcome the views of interested parties, however it has tentatively decided not to hold formal hearings.

Toward Equitable Treatment of Americans Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Congress last year included as a part of the foreign aid appropriations bill a provision that—

> It is the sense of the Congress that any attempt by foreign nations to create distinctions because of their race or religion among American citizens in the granting of personal or communication access or any other rights otherwise available to U.S. citizens generally is repugnant to our principles.

This provision was consistent with the so-called Lehman resolution adopted by this body in 1956, of which the then Senator Kennedy was a cosponsor, and the provisions of law enacted by previous Congresses. Such a provision is also consistent with long-established American traditions.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the other body, and a colleague from Pennsylvania, Hon. THOMAS E. MORGAN, recently had published an article on this subject in the November 1961 issue of the Committee Reporter, organ of the American Jewish Committee. Dr. MORGAN points out the difficulties encountered by individual U.S. citizens of the Jewish faith and by American firms seeking to pursue their affairs in Arab lands. It is a sad fact that Americans of the Jewish faith, for example, are barred from visiting Jordan even though U.S. tax dollars underwrite approximately half of the budget of that nation

and Jordan can ill afford to turn away potential earnings from tourism.

The 1960 Democratic platform, "The Rights of Man," contained as a pledge:

Protection of rights of American citizens to travel, to pursue lawful trade and to engage in other lawful activities abroad without distinction as to race or religion is a cardinal function of the national sovereignty.

Full force and effect should be given to this pledge. We must neither at home nor abroad let any of our citizens be relegated to a second-class status. For the U.S. Government to be a party to such distinctions by not effectively opposing them is not only contrary to some of the oldest traditions of this Nation but in effect serves to negate the efforts to strengthen the concepts of freedom and democracy throughout the world on which we are now expending so much of our national effort and treasure.

I ask unanimous consent that the article which was prepared by my colleague from Pennsylvania, Representative THOMAS E. MORGAN, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, entitled "Toward Equitable Treatment of Americans Abroad," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOWARD EQUITABLE TREATMENT OF AMERICANS ABROAD

(By Representative THOMAS E. MORGAN, of Pennsylvania) [1]

When the foreign-aid bill was under consideration before my committee this summer, we inserted in the statement of policy an expression to the effect that "any attempt by foreign countries to create distinctions because of their race or religions among American citizens in the granting of personal or commercial access or any other rights available to U.S. citizens generally is repugnant of our principles." It added that "in all negotiations between the United States arising as a result of funds appropriated" under the Foreign Assistance Act or arising from the sale of surplus agricultural commodities, "these principles shall be applied as the President may determine * * *."

The principles enunciated in the statement of policy are in accord with a view long held by our Government. One need only recall the well-known protests by the United States against the mistreatment of American citizens of the Jewish faith by czarist Russia. These protests culminated in 1911 in the abrogation of our trade treaty with the Russians, a treaty that had been in effect since 1832. During the 1930's our Government was forceful in its protests to Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy concerning their maltreatment of Americans of the Jewish faith.

When the Arab League initiated its economic boycott against Israel in 1951, the boycott was initially applied only to companies with Israeli branches or otherwise doing business in Israel. But during the past decade the boycott has been extended to American firms that have American citizens of the Jewish faith among their owners, officers, directors and personnel. A recent issue of Fortune magazine indicates that about 80 American companies are on the boycott list. The effect of such a boycott can be far-reaching for it touches not only hundreds of thousands of employees and stockholders of all faiths and their families but also suppliers and transporters of goods as well as the communities in which these companies are located.

Travel of American citizens of the Jewish faith has been restricted. American Jews are barred from using the U.S. built air terminal facilities at Dhahran, Saudi Arabia. These discriminatory practices have been applied to Members of Congress traveling on official U.S. business.

I noted with particular interest a recent announcement by the Government of Morocco, an Arab League member, that a prominent Jewish Moroccan, R. Benarroch, had been appointed to a high post in that country's defense ministry. He is only one of several Jews holding responsible positions in the Sherifien Government. I can only express the hope that other governments in the Near East will soon avail themselves of the talents of all their citizens without regard to race or creed to participate in advancing their national welfare.

When the foreign-aid bill went to conference to iron out differences between the House and Senate versions, the House conference in the interest of a more concise statement of policy accepted a more general statement similar to that adopted by the Senate. Included in the final act is a reaffirmation of "freedom of the press, information, and religion, freedom of navigation in international waterways, and recognition of the right of all persons to travel and pursue their lawful activities without discrimination as to race or religion. In the administration of all parts of this act these principles shall be supported in such a way in our relations with countries friendly to the United States which are in controversy with each other as to promote an adjudication of the issues involved by means of international law procedures available to the parties."

Language similar to that deleted by the conference committee was inserted by amendment on the House floor in the foreign aid appropriation bill. The Senate Appropriations Committee, in its report on the foreign assistance appropriation bill, urged "the executive departments concerned to give force to the sense of the Congress as expressed in this section in the administration of the foreign assistance program, to the extent feasible, and by other appropriate means."

The House adopted an amendment to the bill establishing the Peace Corps that barred the use of the Corps in countries where discrimination would be practiced against members of the Corps. In the final version the language did not appear. The conferees were convinced that in the less developed countries government policy frequently may not be well coordinated and public opinion not fully matured. Hence individual incidents of discrimination might occur which did not reflect either the policy of the government or the attitude of the public generally. Further, the committee was assured that the Peace Corps would not maintain a program in any other country in which volunteers were repeatedly subject to discrimination.

In the statement of the House managers accompanying the conference committee report on the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act, the managers on the part of the House expressed the desire that "in the administration of the various programs authorized by this bill, no discrimination as to race, creed, or color be practiced in the selection of individuals to perform functions under this bill or to benefit from the provisions of the programs authorized in the bill. Similarly they desire that countries that practice such discrimination shall not be the beneficiaries of any of the programs authorized in this bill."

It must be apparent from the instances cited above that the House has been unusually diligent in expressing itself on the matter of discrimination. This involves much more than the relatively few Jewish and non-Jewish Americans who are directly affected; it involves a matter of national pride and respect. It is our expectation that the executive branch, in administering the various programs that we have authorized, will be equally diligent in carrying out these principles.

[1] Representative THOMAS E. MORGAN, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, is chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. A Member of Congress since 1944. Dr. MORGAN is a graduate of the Detroit College of Medicine and Surgery.

Managed Agriculture and Proposals for a Broadened Domestic Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the present administration is advancing plans for a managed agriculture and proposals for broadened domestic programs. In the light of this, I think it is highly appropriate to direct my colleagues' attention to pertinent extracts from the December 15, 1961, issue of the Financial Times and the December 14, 1961, issue of the Evening News and Star, both of these being English newspapers:

MEAT PRICES AND THE BUDGET

In the 8 months since April the Government has increased its spending program by £162m.—twice the cost, to put the figure in perspective, of Mr. Lloyd's surtax concessions. It is true that this increase has been partly offset by savings of £18m. It is possible that the sharp rise in the farming estimates announced yesterday is unnecessarily pessimistic. But the Government has made so much of its determination to bring its spending under control that it must be left to find its own excuses.

The cost of the agricultural guarantees is difficult to predict because it depends on the course of market prices during the year. It has been plain for some time past that this year's bill would be much larger than suggested in the budget, and the increase now turns out to be one of £78m., over 28 percent. Of this £78m., no less than £67m. is the result of higher payments to farmers for beef, lamb, and pigmeat. The markets in all three have collapsed in turn this year, and the Exchequer has had to make up to farmers the difference between the market and the guaranteed price. It is bad luck, of course. It would have been very much worse luck if there had been a sharp increase in meat imports as well.

MARKETING

Something can probably be done to improve methods of forecasting the level of demand. It is foolish to continue encouraging beef production on the grounds that consumption is still not back to the prewar level if consumers prefer to eat something else. Something can almost certainly be done to encourage a more efficient form of marketing. The calculations with the help of which the Minister yesterday distributed the benefit of the increased subsidy between farmers, consumers, and distributors are too shaky to carry much conviction, and there is little point in trying to make the butcher into a bogyman. But the present marketing system can certainly be improved, and the Government has now admitted it. Since

its calculations seem to have been chiefly upset by the fact that a relatively small increase in beef supplies caused a sharp drop in market prices, it may be worth considering the pros and cons of intervening in the market when prices seem unduly high or low.

LIMITED SCOPE

Everything possible will be done, of course, to impress on the farmers at the next Price Review the embarrassment they have caused. But the Government's scope for action is strictly circumscribed. For the life of the present Parliament, at least, it is committed not to reduce any individual guarantee by more than 4 percent, or the value of the total guarantees (after allowing for increased costs) by more than 2½ percent in a single year. On beef, moreover, it may well feel bound by the plain statement in the Review White Paper earlier this year that beef production is a relatively long-term business, and that the existing price should be maintained if at all possible.

The fact remains that grants and subsidies to agriculture now account for some 10 percent of all civil supply expenditure in the budget. This is a good deal more than by industry can expect to go on receiving indefinitely. Whether or not Britain eventually joins the Common Market, the present system will have to be radically revised. The farmers have been given plain warning of this, and they seem ready to accept it in their own long-term interest. When the time for the revision comes, it will be up to the Government to insure that the consumer does not lose more than the taxpayer saves.

EXCEPTIONAL?

For the moment, however, the rising cost of the farming subsidies must serve as another reminder of the Government's undertaking to get its own finances under control. There is no absolute merit in a balanced budget, particularly while the budget accounts continue to be presented in their present form, but there is no doubt that the tendency of British Goevrnments is to spend too much rather than too little. The reasons for this tendency—obvious political reasons apart—are not difficult to find: many departments with divided responsibility, defense projects which are difficult to cost in the normal way, a large labor force with little opportunity of making up for higher wages with increased efficiency, subsidies provided for social reasons which are essentially a blank check. The Government has not undertaken to peg, still less to reduce its spending, but merely to keep the inevitable rise within limits; and it will take all the work of Mr. Lloyd and Mr. Brooke to see that even this undertaking is honored. The £78m. increase in the agricultural estimates, we were assured yesterday, is the result of "very exceptional" circumstances. And so, of course, is every other increase.

£78M. MORE FOR AGRICULTURE: THE REASONS WHY

Farmers will be as alarmed as everybody else by the big jump in the cost of agricultural support in the current financial year. To the original United Kingdom estimate (made last December) of £274m. is now added a further £78m., giving an expected total of over £350m.—the highest figure since decontrol. But before casting around for someone to blame, it may be useful to understand why in this year of the pay pause, such an unhappy state of affairs has arisen at all.

ERRORS: INHERENT IN THE SYSTEM

The first point to realize is that this sort of margin of error is inherent in the way we do our sums. It has never occurred before, but there is always the odd chance that it may happen again.

First agricultural estimates are put together in December, 2 months before the price review starts; and because of decisions taken at the price review last March—widely held at the time to be reasonable and just—the first estimates were even then out of date. Ten shillings a hundredweight, costing £10m., had been written into beef prices, to give confidence to a side of the business that in the course of nature takes a couple of years to tool up for expansion. It seemed sensible at the time; and in the light of existing undertakings to farmers, reinforced by the white papers of December 1960, it was the best way of proving to skeptics that Government policy was not wholly restrictionist. Apart from this, an extra 3d a score was added to bacon pig prices, because the pig herd was static, and on the cards only a small sum of money was involved.

TWO DIFFICULT ASSUMPTIONS

But the main reason why first estimates of the cost of farm support can be shaken is that, with the best will in the world, they are based on two unpredictable assumptions. The first of these is what the free market price will be over a 12-month period for any commodity in receipt of a deficiency payment; the second is the portion of home production that will be marketed. This in turn influences prices and depends, as will be seen, upon other things than the predictable shrewdness of farmers.

In normal circumstances, the law of chance decides the game, and an underestimate here is concealed by an overestimate there. This year, however, chance has abdicated. Three bad numbers have come up in a row.

NATURE'S HAND REFLECTED

In the first place, as the Minister explained to the House yesterday, nature took a hand in the lamb crop. Under the rules of the game, we market about 12m. lambs. This year, we shall market 13m. At its lowest, the price of fresh home-killed lamb touched 1 shilling 6 pence a pound: even now, it is only 2 shillings. The official estimate was that over the year the average would be 2 shillings 5 pence. The difference between what is happening and what was expected to happen is likely to cost an extra £13.6m. in deficiency payments by March next year.

THE PIGS AND FAT CATTLE

Secondly, pigs: at the outset, all went well. The quality premium had the effect intended, and slaughterings reached a desirable level. Then Danish imports in early autumn brought a slump in price. It touched bottom at 205s. Today, it is 245s. In the marginally overloaded meat market—probably no more than 2 percent oversupplied—the assumed price of 265s on which first estimates rested will not be reached. On present showing, £17.9m. extra will be needed in deficiency payments.

And thirdly, fat cattle—a margin of error of £35.3m. larger than the other two put together. How has this happened? It was easy, what with the December White Paper and predictions about the Price Review, for farmers to put two and two together, and hold off the market for an increase in the beef price. They were not disappointed. Speculation, coupled with a warm early spring, accounted at least in part for a 30-percent increase in cattle—two-thirds and more from the dairy herds—coming forward for certification. The surge coincided before long with the flood of lambs.

Another element in the situation was a more than plentiful supply of broiler chickens, already selling at cut prices in butchers' shops. The outcome has been a postwar low in beef—98s a cwt. Now that the spate has subsided, the price is still only 133s. The Ministry of Agriculture had reckoned on an average price of 142s for the year.

THE OTHER ITEMS IN THE LIST

These are the main facts. But for these miscalculations, nothing might have been heard of the supplementary estimates for votes 2 and 11 this year. The remaining items in the list, including several savings, the chief of which is eggs (£5m.), add up to a difference of less than £12m., after charging the Exchequer the cost of support-buying potatoes of the peak 1960 crop. The questions therefore that need to be asked are, first, who, if anyone, has benefited; and secondly what can be done in the future to strengthen the market, and thereby the estimates?

Witchhunting the butchers is probably a waste of spirit. It is hard to pin down exactly what has happened, but the best available figures are those already quoted by Mr. Soames. On a rough analysis, checked from two angles, it looks as though farmers will secure about £31 million out of £76 million difference in meat subsidy between this year and last—£13 million from the increase in the guaranteed prices, and £18 million because of the greater number of units marketed.

If this is so, some of these gains will come home to roost in the net income calculation of the industry which will loom large in next year's review. As for the housewife, on a retail index that includes poultry meat, it looks as though she may reap the benefit of a 5½-percent drop in retail price, worth £35 million off the nation's meat bill in a full year. If this too is about right, it leaves £10 million or so to cover the cut of the distributive trade.

NOTICE SERVED ON THE FARMER

Finally, what can be done? Notice has already been served on farmers that they must expect a tough review next year, and, within the limits of the long-term assurances, this could mean a cut of £15–£20 million in the value of guarantees, after allowing for increased costs—chiefly labor. Lamb will be a certain victim. Beef and pigs are covered by a 2-year pledge on price, but something can be done and should be done to reinforce the discipline of payment on deadweight and grade. This in turn leads to an expedient that would not have been seriously entertained 3 months ago—the possibility of support buying to maintain free market prices at a sensible level. The operation has already proved successful with potatoes. Though the circumstances are vastly different, with the help of the trade and the Fatstock Marketing Corp., it might be made to work with meat.

DRIFT INTO SERIOUS SITUATION

But, when all is said and done, it is no use disguising the serious situation into which farmers and nation are drifting with an agricultural policy now in urgent need of overhaul. Estimates may go awry—we employ human beings to make them. But the trend of farm output, both here and in Europe, is inexorably upward, and this particular shock will not be money wasted if it prepares farmers as well as policymakers for radical changes in our present system of farm support.

£96 MILLION SHOCK FOR TAXPAYERS

(By John Egan)

A shock demand for an extra £96,830,500 is made to the taxpayer by the Government today.

It is a demand while will stir up fresh anger among Tory MP's who have pledged themselves to hold back Government spending.

And it appears to jeopardize the Chancellor of the Exchequer's bid to restrict public expenditure in the current year and to allow a rise of only 2½ percent in the coming year.

The demands for the extra cash were laid before Parliament in a supplementary estimate.

PRODUCTION OF BEEF

Biggest item is £65,209,000 to cover agricultural and food grants and subsidies.

Most of this money is needed for farmers to cover the costs of beef production. Market prices fell this year but, as every housewife knows, the butchers failed to reduce the price in the shops.

The original net estimate for agriculture was £234,753,230.

Fat stock price guarantees also account for more than £9 million of the extra £12,953,500 required by the Scottish Agriculture and Fisheries Department.

PAY RISES BEFORE PAUSE

Another big supplementary estimate is £16,546,000 from the Ministry of Health, in addition to the original estimate of £534 million.

Most of the extra money is needed for regional hospital boards.

The Scottish Health Department also needs an extra £2,122,000.

The bulk of the extra cash for hospitals is needed to pay wage increases agreed before the pause began.

Because of the success of the polio vaccine campaign the Government needs an addition £1,160,000—well over double the original estimate.

Will Common Market Help U.S. Shoe Industry?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a statement by Herbert Lape, Jr., president, Julian & Kokenge Co., Columbus, Ohio, relative to the effect of the Common Market on the U.S. shoe industry. Mr. Lape is a highly respected businessman in Columbus, Ohio, and his views should be of benefit to the Members of Congress:

WILL COMMON MARKET HELP U.S. SHOE INDUSTRY?

(By Herbert Lape, Jr.)

The present administration is pulling out all the stops in an effort to sell American industry on the reduction of tariffs and a trade agreement, which in effect would permit European goods made by cheap foreign labor to literally flood the United States.

Wages have increased to a point in the shoe industry where they are now at least five to six times that of the European shoe worker. With such a low labor scale the European tanner can buy hides and skins in the American market, take them back to Europe, process the leather at an extremely low cost, and make it into shoes produced by shoe workers whose wage scale is exceedingly low.

If the United States should become an associate of the Common Market, what are we to do? Does the administration recommend that we reduce all labor rates to the level of those in Europe, or by some fantastic miracle will they bring European rates up to the levels of the American shoe workers?

It has been said that imports affect only about 1 percent of our total production. The imports of leather footwear for the first 9 months of 1961 already amount to 6 percent of our domestic production, an increase of 39 percent over the same period a year ago.

The administration has stated that labor forced out of jobs because of any dislocations, should we become associated with the Common Market, would be in some manner subsidized. This is putting in the hands of the Government the welfare of people who want to work for a living and it is denying them the fruits of free enterprise, which is the very foundation of our economy and our way of life. We should resist such activity by the Government with every means at our command.

The shoe industry is certainly a basic industry—it must be preserved.

American Foreign Policy in the Midst of the World Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following address was delivered by Dr. Robert T. Oliver, professor and head, department of speech, the Pennsylvania State University, Pennsylvania, at the annual convention of the Pennsylvania Nurses Association, Pittsburgh, Pa., October 24, 1961. It also appeared in the December 1961 issue of the magazine, Vital Speeches of the Day.

Dr. Oliver, who is a constituent of mine, was formerly a consultant on International Affairs to the Republic of Korea. He is the author of "Syngman Rhee," "Verdict in Korea," "Man Behind the Myth," et cetera.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY IN THE MIDST OF THE WORLD REVOLUTION

(By Robert T. Oliver)

Two different ways occurred to me of adapting my remarks for this evening particularly to this audience. One way was to discuss the sick world—and no one can doubt it is highly feverish—in terms of diagnosis and treatment. This was tempting, because as nurses you know that laymen commonly are concerned with symptoms rather than with causes of disease, which often gives a ludicrously false notion of what is wrong and what needs to be done about it. I think it would not be difficult to demonstrate that laymen also make the same error in thinking about international relations.

The second method of adaptation that also seemed appealing for a time was to select those particular aspects of the world situation that might be of special interest to your profession—the growth of population, the prevalence of hunger, the lengthening of the lifespan through public health measures, the problems of the rapidly developing underdeveloped nations. This method also had some appeal, for what we all are primarily concerned about is the welfare of individuals, regardless of national boundary lines and ideologies.

What I have decided to do, however, is to talk to you simply and straightforwardly about how we ordinary American citizens can set about analyzing the world situation in an effort to make sense of it—to see where we are going, and why, and what our future is likely to be. This is the kind of problem that concerns all of us, not as nurses or as professors, but as men and women with our own lives to live and with the future of our children to think about.

I

In the first place, when we read the newspapers and when we get together to talk about American foreign policy, it seems to me there are five simple but valuable guidelines by which we should try to govern our thinking.

First, we should try to think in terms of practicalities, not of impossible ideals. It does no good, and it simply confuses the issues, for us to retreat from reality into the never-never land of dreams and fantasies. What good does it do to indulge in such wishful evasions as: "Why can't we human beings act like rational creatures?" "Why don't the Russians and the Allies just get together and talk things over like sensible people?" Or "If everyone would be truly Christian, or intelligent, or pure of heart, we could settle all these problems in a hurry." People are people, and governments are governments. We must deal with problems and possibilities as they are, not as we wish they were.

Second, we have to deal with the situation as it exists today. We cannot turn back the clock and eliminate errors that have been made. Germany and Korea and Vietnam ought not to have been divided. Castro should not have been allowed to seize power in Cuba. The African colonies should have been much better prepared for self-government during the past several decades. We should have insisted on some fundamental settlements while the United States had a monopoly on the atomic bomb and while we were the only nation in the world with a sound economy. All these things are true, but we can't wipe the slate clean and start all over again. Every decision we now can make is already largely predetermined by past events—just as every action we now may take will shape and determine our possibilities in the future.

Third, when we criticize what our Government is now doing, it should be done in terms of constructive suggestions for better policies or wiser methods. Partisan sniping seems peculiarly unproductive in the realm of international affairs. Many of us criticized Truman and Acheson; then we found the same kinds of fault with Eisenhower and Dulles; and now it appears that Kennedy and Rusk are not doing any better. Criticizing our leadership has very little value except as a release for our emotional frustration. A good test for each of us to keep in mind is this question: "What would I do if I were the Secretary of State?" This is the best prescription I know of for encouraging a realistic approach to American foreign policy.

Fourth, we cannot evade our responsibility as citizens on the assumption that we do not have available the facts on which decisions should be based. Of course President Kennedy gets some detailed information on Berlin, and Cuba, and Vietnam that we ordinary citizens do not have. The precise timing of actions and the determination of some of the tactics to pursue do surely depend on secret data known only to the Executive. On the whole, however, the significant facts concerning all the major international issues are completely available to anyone who takes the trouble to keep up with the news. For more than 12 years I served in a very intimate capacity in the inner councils of the Korean Government, dealing with foreign policy matters; and from this experience I am convinced that we should not shrug off our own responsibility on the theory that our leaders somehow have insights and knowledge that we are unable to share. The very theory of democracy rests on the dominance of public opinion—and we have a duty to help form it.

The fifth of these suggested guidelines for thinking about international problems is that we learn to look beneath the surface

of contemporary crises, to try to fix our attention on the basic trends that persist over a long period of time. Events flow rapidly, but the basic factors that affect human affairs remain relatively stable. We can avoid a lot of fuzzy thinking and emotional turmoil by developing the habit of historical thinking. This does not mean that we should wave aside concern about urgent problems with the airy assurance that "it will be all the same a thousand years from now." It does mean that nations, like individuals, should learn from experience. In other words, if we refuse to profit from mistakes of the past, we shall be condemned to repeat them.

II

As we try to look through the booming, buzzing, confused mass of world problems to the solid realities that underlie them, I think the major fact that emerges is that changes occur with dizzying speed, but that on the whole the changes are in a predictable direction. The huge and overriding fact that needs to dominate our thinking is that we are living in an Age of Obsolescence.

Mankind has always lived in the midst of change—but never before in such a tornado of rearrangements and development as that which besets our own generation. We human beings are creatures of habit. Our minds get set into patterns. We long to be left alone, to do as we have done, to think as we have thought, to live as we are used to living. But this hope is vain. We live in a period of tremendously rapid transition. The values we have clung to have to be reassessed. Old methods no longer work. New ones must be tried. The way of life into which we were born is not yet obsolete—but it definitely is obsolescent.

As we try to peer into the whirlwind to see where it is heading, it seems to me there are four major types of change to which we need to be alert.

The first of these is that the cultural context for each one of us has become worldwide. The comfortable isolationism of the past is gone forever. The United States is no longer a psychological island in the midst of the Atlantic community. Whether we like it or not, we have to try to understand Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America. Global news is fed into our homes several times a day. Military rockets with a range of 6,000 miles are forcing us to plan and build bomb shelters in our own homes. Our own sons are liable for military service—and many of us are right now getting letters from them addressed from Germany or Okinawa.

The world, every part of it, affects us, every day of our lives. Similarly, what we do, day by day, is no longer our own business but is a matter of global interest. What we teach in our schools is determined in part by Moscow and Peiping. How we treat our American Negroes is front-page news around the world. The rise and fall of our stock market and what we do about our 5 million unemployed are fever charts that help determine the policies of nations we never even have heard of. The view that every religion except our own is paganism or idolatry is a luxury we no longer can afford. The world may not yet be one family, but it certainly is one community. In much that matters, Asia and Africa are just as much a part of our environment today as are Mississippi and Massachusetts.

The second basic factor that underlies the whirl of rapid change grows directly out of the first—the comfortable compartmentalization of nations is rapidly ending. We do not have, and may not soon get, world government, but nevertheless the old privileges and special benefits of independent sovereignty are visibly vanishing. We have realized for a generation that peace is indivisible—that war anywhere threatens war everywhere. Now we are gradually learning that human welfare is also indivisible—that poverty anywhere threatens our own welfare, even in the midst of our wealth. Every day we are suffering consequences because two-thirds of humanity are undernourished, undereducated, and underprivileged. The old safeguards of tariff walls, immigration quotas, and exclusive national currencies are already outmoded—not yet, of course, discarded, but obsolescent crudities that are manifestly unsuited to deal with the needs of our age.

Let us glance at just one illustration of the intimacy with which all peoples are now bound together, for better or for worse. Many Americans are puzzled because the peoples and governments of the Afro-Asian bloc, the so-called neutralists, insist still on condemning us for colonialism, even after we (meaning the Western democratic powers) have actually set free more than 600 million people since 1945, with the result that the United Nations has grown from 50 members to 100. How in the world, we wonder, can they still think of us as colonial? The answer, I think, lies not in policies, but in attitudes. We are the white minority in a colored world. Our racist attitudes, our feeling that there inevitably is a line of distinction that separates the white people from those who are black, or yellow, or brown, brands us around the world as being still colonial minded. This world is not going to persist as one-fifth white and four-fifths colored. We can't afford to consider it an achievement because 13 Negro children were admitted to white schools in Memphis, Tenn., without a riot. So long as we remain colonial minded—so long, that is, as we are racist in our thinking—we shall continue to be denounced as a colonial power. This is one of the facts of the 20th century which we shall be forced to accept.

The third fact of consequence is that conditions will continue to get worse before there is any hope of their being better. The complexities are going to become greater, the problems even more urgent than they now are. The trend into increasing difficulty is easily discernible.

The population of the world, for one thing, is multiplying with amazing speed. One-tenth of the whole human race that has ever lived is alive today. The United States will have a population of 400 million within another 40 years. Red China's population is already close to 700 million and is increasing at the rate of 45 to 50 million a year. The lebensraum which Hitler made a slogan for Nazi expansion has ceased to be an excuse for imperialism by nations and has become a genuine need for the human race.

Natural resources—coal, iron, timber, the topsoil of our farmlands—are being used up and wasted so rapidly that an observer in space might be pardoned if he mistook humanity for a kind of cancer eating away the earth's surface. Of course human ingenuity is hard at work developing synthetic substitutes—plastics for wood and steel, atomic energy for coal and oil, fresh water from the oceans for use in irrigation, vitamin pills to supplement our foods. One result is that a higher and higher premium is being placed on ability and on education. An economist whom I respect forecasts that by 1970 the United States will be in a major depression—but that there will be an urgent demand for scientists and workers with technical skills. What this means is that life is going to become very much harder for the uneducated masses of the world—and they are and will remain the great majority of mankind.

Moreover, despite everything we can do, individualism, individuality, and civil liberties are going to become increasingly harder to defend. The sheer size and complexity of the modern world demand ever-increasing numbers of rules and regulations. Critical international issues demand centralized power to make decisions and to enforce them. Already Thomas Jefferson-style democracy has been largely swallowed up by the welfare state. And regardless of which party is in power, the movement toward bureaucracy and control is growing and expanding.

Democratic and totalitarian governments are becoming more and more alike in their methods of governing—through the manipulation of public opinion by control of secrecy and publicity. On the one hand, high government officials create news and focus public attention where they wish by means of their public statements—as witness the dominance of the front pages of our newspapers by stories flowing out of presidential and cabinet-level news conferences. On the other hand, every 2 weeks, in the Pentagon alone, the stamp of secrecy is placed on a stack of documents higher than the Empire State Building. The situation is not one we like. But in a world of tensions, dangers, and complexity of relationships, it is one we cannot avoid.

The growing complexity and urgency of problems is still further illustrated as we look at a map of the world and read recent history. Nine hundred million people have been gathered under Communist dominance since 1945, and the menace is increasingly sharp right now in southeast Asia, in Africa, and in Latin America. Many of the democratic governments established in new nations after World War II have been replaced by military dictatorships. Government controls are expanding, everywhere, over production, distribution, and income. Much of this is bad; some of it is good; but all of it emphasizes the tremendously growing need for more and more education for the whole mass of the world's population.

And this brings me directly to the fourth basic factor in the world situation—which is that in many parts of the world education is already and inevitably outrunning economic and social developments. To put the matter simply, people are getting educated faster than jobs are being created in which they can utilize their new skills and knowledge. This is happening especially in the rapidly developing underdeveloped nations, and it is creating an explosive sense of mass frustration.

I can discuss this with real feeling in connection with the Republic of Korea. For 18 years, ever since 1942, I have maintained a close friendship with Dr. Syngman Rhee, the first President of Korea—and it was naturally a sad disappointment when his government was overturned. It is also a satisfaction that history has hastened to justify Dr. Rhee's record in Korea. He was accused of dominating the Government too thoroughly, but Dr. Chang Myun, who succeeded him, failed utterly because he was not strong enough. Dr. Rhee was also accused in some quarters of being dictatorial—but now, under the present military dictatorship in Korea, we are seeing by contrast how free and liberal Dr. Rhee's government actually was. The reason why it was overthrown is, I think, rather simple. In a real sense, it was a victim of its own success—or perhaps I should say, of its partial success.

To realize what happened in Korea—and what is happening in many parts of the world—we need to look at two sets of facts and to understand their very close relationship. In the first place, when Korea was freed from Japan, 78 percent of the population was illiterate. Dr. Rhee's government, with American help, did a magnificent job of correcting this sad deficiency. Within a dozen years, illiteracy was reduced to 5 percent; more than half a million young people were enrolled in senior high schools; and there were 80,000 students enrolled in more than

70 colleges. This was achievement of a high order. However, the second fact is that the Korean standard of living was and still is among the lowest in the world, with a per capita income of about $105—in contrast to the $2,500 per capita income in the United States. The Korean Government could educate its people, but it had no magic with which to create wealth or to multiply high level jobs.

The dilemma lies in the fact that you can't educate the sons and daughters of rice paddy farmers, and then send them back to the rice paddy farms. Yet this is what happened in Korea. It is virtually what happened in Cuba, and what is now happening in Africa and in many other underdeveloped parts of the world. The problem is that progress cannot be achieved uniformly in education, in social conditions, and in economics. People can and do develop knowledge and aspirations for self-improvement. They do attain to equality and a new sense of personal dignity. After that, they can't be restrained in unemployment, underemployment, and in the lower echelons of labor. Yet this is precisely the situation that confronts us in many parts of the world, and it is rapidly becoming a serious threat to stability in many areas.

III

As we view the various factors I have briefly discussed, the question of principal import is: What shall we do about them? How and in what ways should American foreign policy be reoriented to deal with these fundamental facts in our age of obsolescence?

First and perhaps most important, I think we should emphasize, far more than we commonly do, our feeling of unity with the other peoples of the world. Our Declaration of Independence stated very well the faith upon which our democracy rests, that "all men are created free and equal." Talk of our national rights, or slogans such as America First hurt us a great deal in the world community. The principal appeal of communism, I believe, is that it at least pretends to be worldwide in its sympathies and in its concern. For selfish reasons, Soviet Russia refuses to recognize the sanctity of national boundary lines. For unselfish reasons, we Americans should always stress that the brotherhood of man is of more consequence to us than purely national goals.

Secondly, and closely connected with this first principle, in my opinion, we should devote not less but more of our resources to foreign aid. The time is past when we can build a wall around our prosperity. We cannot live in either physical or spiritual comfort in a hungry world. The best protection we can possibly devise for the American standard of living is to do everything in our power to make it universal. This sounds as though I am advising that Americans should be taxed for the benefit of African natives and South American peons, and this is exactly right. I know the point of view is not popular; but there never was a time in all history when there was more force behind the saying of Jesus that whosoever would save his life must lose it. We can serve ourselves best by serving others better. We cannot expect the understanding and support of the rest of the world while their problem is how to survive, and our problem is how to reduce. Our program of foreign aid rests solidly upon two foundations, one of which is humanitarian service and the other self-interest. Those of us who believe in this principle can do our bit by helping to elect politicians who will vote for more, not less, foreign aid.

Thirdly, I wish that somehow we could become as evangelistic for democracy as the Communists are for communism. Personally, I don't believe in ethical neutralism. I don't believe our foreign aid should be given without any strings. I do believe we should help the people who are doing their level best to develop democracy and to maintain the decencies of international relations. In my view we should do everything in our power to keep Red China out of the United Nations. I can see very little reason for giving 2 billions of dollars to Yugoslavia, as we have done since 1948. My own preference is for channeling our aid largely to people who are doing their best to live in freedom and who cherish the ideal of international cooperation.

Finally, under existing conditions it is my conviction that we should maintain the strongest miliary force in the world—while, at the same time, we continue to do everything we can to establish a workable system of disarmament with a dependable system of inspection. I can never forget what Lenin is reported to have said in 1922, and which has been operative ever since as the guiding principle of communism: "First we shall take Eastern Europe, then the masses of Asia. After that we shall surround and undermine the United States, which will fall into our laps like overripe fruit, without a struggle." This is the measure of the danger that confronts us—and we must do everything we can, including the building of bomb shelters and facing the threat of war, to defend not only ourselves but the future of freedom and democracy everywhere.

IV

In conclusion, it seems to me that a gigantic world revolution is now in process which parallels, but is different from, the French Revolution that occurred between 1791 and 1840. You will recall that John Locke developed the theory that all men are created equal—and that the first benefits of political freedom, based on his theory, came to England and the United States. Then the masses of France arose to claim that same freedom for themselves. The tragedy is that Napoleon Bonaparte intervened to try to funnel that perfectly legitimate yearning into the form of French imperialism. Because of this misuse of the political aspirations of the French, Napoleon had to be defeated by a European alliance led by England. He was defeated—and French imperialism was quelled. After that, the normal and proper yearning for political equality was brought to fruition not only in France but also throughout most of western Europe.

Then, a hundred years after Locke, Adams Smith in one way and Karl Marx in another confronted the exploitative evils of the industrial revolution and developed a theory that there can and should be a degree of economic equality. The tragedy is that first Lenin, then Stalin, and now Krushchev and Mao Tse-tung have tried and are trying to convert this reasonable hope into Russian and Chinese imperialism. Because of their misuse of the ideal of economic fairness, the United States is destined to lead a worldwide federation to defeat their goal of nationalistic conquest. I am confident that this can and will be accomplished.

But our goal will not be to defend a system in which a few benefit at the cost of the many. Just as we have proved that free enterprise can help elevate living conditions for everyone in the United States, so must we cooperate to bring this same result for the masses of the world. The revolution that is sweeping the world in our time will not end until there is both bread and freedom—democracy and opportunity—for all men, everywhere.

This is the size of the challenge that confronts our foreign policy. The task is appalling. But failure would be so utterly disastrous that we have no choice except to do whatever is demanded to make sure that it succeeds.

What Do You Know About the World of Communism?—Part 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, this is a continuation of the original article "What Do You Know About the World of Communism":

IT'S MISTAKE TO SEE SOVIET UNION AND RED CHINA AS THE SAME

What may we conclude? Certainly not that Communist China is any less of a threat to the free world than the Soviet Union. Certainly, not that China is any less Communist or more democratic than the Soviet Union. The point is quite another one. In evaluating the nature of the Chinese Communist enemy, unless we are aware of his Chinese (Asian) as well as his Communist (Western) aspect, we shall never be able to satisfactorily explain his motivations, his reasoning, or his actions. As a consequence, we may well wind up expending valuable energy searching in vain for an effective cure for pneumonia only to discover, suddenly, that the patient, in fact, has tuberculosis—as well as pneumonia.

In a word, the Peiping leaders are both Communist and Chinese, and it is this explosive blend of traditional arrogance, sensitivity, antiforeignism, dialectical materialism, urgency, Leninism, and zeal that is the cause for concern.

HOW DOES THE SOVIET APPROACH TO FOREIGN RELATIONS DIFFER FROM THE TRADITIONAL AMERICAN APPROACH?

First, we had better clarify the question: What exactly is foreign policy?

Foreign policy is the sum total of a nation's official attitude and actions toward other nations and other areas of the globe. It is a government's aims and needs as applied and reflected in its external relations.

What is our attitude toward each of the different countries of Latin America? Would we sign a trade agreement with Turkey? over Berlin? Is a mutual defense pact with Japan in our best interests? Is NATO a useful instrument? Should we support the United Nations?

These and a thousand other urgent questions must be answered by those responsible for foreign policy. The precise nature of a given country's foreign policy may be judged by the speeches of its leaders, by treaties and agreements, and, most of all, from that nation's behavior pattern over the years.

SOVIET AXIOM: DIPLOMACY IS "WAR BY OTHER MEANS"

The famous German student of power politics, Von Clausewitz, termed war diplomacy by other means. The Soviets have turned this notion around. To the Communists—in Moscow or in Peiping—diplomacy is war by other means.

The issue is clear. The enemies of the Communists include all nations of the Free World, but particularly the power centers of the United States and Western Europe. The means employed by Communists: anything short of total war—propaganda, atomic blackmail, subversion, espionage, economic entanglement, conference diplomacy, pressure, intimidation, limited war.

Two fundamental approaches set Soviet or Communist foreign affairs off from the traditional foreign relations of the United States and the other nations of the Free World.

First, the Communists believe in the nonpermanence of the non-Communist world,

that is they believe that all the governments of the nations outside the Moscow-Peiping orbit will eventually and inevitably, collapse or be overthrown. When this happens, the Communists assert, these bourgeois regimes will be replaced by Communist governments. Therefore coexistence with such capitalist governments is thought of as strictly temporary.

COMMUNISTS APPEAL DIRECTLY TO PEOPLE OF OTHER COUNTRIES

Secondly, the Communists pursue a policy which they term "people's diplomacy." This means that rather than deal strictly on a legal, government-to-government basis in the tradition of Western diplomacy, the Communists appeal directly to the people of another country. To influence or subvert the foreign nation, the Communists use every means and weapon available. Such a policy is designed to sell communism, to discredit the United States and to promote Soviet aims among the peoples of the world.

This is an entirely new kind of foreign policy based on the ideology of Marxism-Leninism, but utilizing all the methods, power and resources of the modern totalitarian state.

The differences between the American and Soviet approaches to foreign relations can be summed up in three phrases: (1) self-determination, (2) limited goals, and (3) means.

1. Self-determination: The fundamental attitude of the United States toward other peoples is that they should have the right to determine their fate themselves, without any other nation telling them what they can or can't do. An important aspect of this principle is the closely related one of democracy, especially the right of the peoples themselves to determine their policies through democratically elected representatives. In other words, our policy generally has been "hands off"—unless other nations have threatened us, or unless they have asked us to intervene in some way.

The Soviet policy has been the opposite. While paying lip service to the principle of self-determination, they have repeatedly, and as a matter of policy, interfered with the affairs of other states whenever they thought it to their advantage, and whenever they thought they could get away with it. They have imposed oppressive governments on other peoples against their will, and have denied them the right of choosing their representatives democratically.

2. Limited goals: You might argue that there really is no difference between Soviet and American foreign policies—that the Russians want all the world to be Communist, while we want all to be democratic. But there is a difference.

While it is true that we would like for the whole world to be democratic, we have not adopted a policy of wholesale intervention in all countries of the world for the purpose of imposing America-style regimes on people everywhere. Our goals are limited. We are content to live peacefully with dictatorships and monarchies, as well as with democracies so long as they do not threaten us.

Soviet goals by contrast, are unlimited. Communist leaders have stated openly and repeatedly that their goal is world communism, and that they will not be satisfied until every country in the world has a Communist regime modeled after that of the Soviet Union. Since World War II they have helped to impose such regimes in 16 countries, and they are actively working every day to achieve their unlimited goal.

3. Means: The Soviet objective to enhance Soviet power and prestige and to establish communism throughout the world would not be such a threat to us if it were not for the fact that they are willing to use any means for achieving this goal. Lenin preached and Stalin and his successors followed the idea that any means including lies, deceit, theft, subversion, sabotage, and murder are acceptable for furthering the cause of world communism.

The United States finds it difficult to combat such a ruthless foe by traditional, peaceful means. The Communists have no reluctance about using force. The United States does not use force to impose upon other people a type of government which they do not want. At times we have found it necessary to engage in what might be considered "dirty work."

For example, the United States, like all great powers, engages in espionage. We sometimes find it necessary to interfere in the affairs of other nations. But this does not mean that our hands are just as dirty as the hands of the Communists. We try to use honorable means wherever possible and to avoid dirty means. If the Soviet threat were removed, we could, no doubt, abolish such means altogether.

DO THE RUSSIANS REALLY BELIEVE IN DISARMAMENT OR THE UNITED NATIONS?

In answering the question—"Do the Russians really believe in disarmament or the United Nations?"—we must record a qualified "No" on both scores. Qualified, because the disappointing record of Soviet words and deeds adds up to the unpleasant fact that the Kremlin honors its agreements only when it serves Soviet interests. This means that we can never trust the Communists.

But this also means that we should not discount entirely all Soviet statements on disarmament or the U.N. If approached realistically, it is entirely possible that we may find in the future as we have in the past certain limited areas of mutual agreement and advantage between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

All of this does not, of course, change the basic facts of life—namely, that the Kremlin considers both the disarmament and the U.N. issue relatively unimportant. The idea of a sincere agreement or compromise with the capitalist world—as has been suggested—is simply not part of Soviet mentality.

The Soviet Union and Disarmament: A 641-page Brookings Institutions study (published in August 1961) of the Soviet record in disarmament negotiations over the past 15 years is hardly reassuring. The conclusion of the study is that in the past decade and a half the Soviet Union has not yet shown a desire to sacrifice its system of Iron Curtain secrecy in order to obtain real disarmament. As we know, the Kremlin broke a nuclear test-ban tacit agreement and despite the protests of the people of the world went ahead in the fall of 1961 with dangerous nuclear tests which have polluted the atmosphere with radioactive fallout.

The Soviet Union and the U.N. It is obvious from the record that the Soviet Union does not really believe in the U.N. They have repeatedly thwarted the will of the majority of the Security Council by imposing their veto. They have consistently refused to let the U.N. have jurisdiction over matters which the Soviets considered vital to their interests. They look upon the U.N. primarily as a sounding board for their propaganda, rather than as a world organization for the preservation of peace.

It seems clear that the Soviets would have preferred that the U.N. had never come into existence, and never really took it seriously. During the early negotiations for the creation of the U.N., Stalin showed that he had paid the question little attention. He seems to have agreed to the creation of the U.N. reluctantly, and as a concession to Western pleadings during the era of good feelings that existed at the end of World War II.

At one time, Stalin refused to send Molotov to the founding conference of the U.N. at San Francisco, and it was only after a personal plea from President Truman that he finally agreed to let his Foreign Minister attend. The Stalin record within the U.N. was correspondingly bad.

The Khrushchev record is even worse. It includes the astonishing spectacle of the Soviet leader noisily pounding his shoe on the rostrum of the U.N. General Assembly before the distinguished representatives of the nations of the world. This rude act is symbolic of the disdain and distrust with which the Kremlin looks upon the U.N.

WHAT DOES THE KREMLIN MEAN BY PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE?

Stripped of its propaganda content, peaceful co-existence may be defined briefly and precisely: By peaceful co-existence the Soviets mean simply the absence of nuclear war. Thus seen in the cold light of reality, Communist pronouncements on the desire for peaceful co-existence are both true and meaningless or misleading.

True, in the sense that Khrushchev is certainly for co-existence. Given the U.S. nuclear retaliatory striking power, the alternative to co-existence, that is nuclear war, is nonexistence—national suicide.

Such statements are meaningless and misleading because they are too often equated or confused with the concepts cooperation, agreement on principles, mutual trust, conciliation or friendship.

To the Kremlin, peaceful co-existence is no more than a necessary strategy and a clever slogan dictated by the relative power positions of the two great superstates and useful in convincing the naive and the uninformed that the Soviet Union stands for peace.

Foreign Trade Knottiest Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the question of tariffs and their effect on our trade relations will be uppermost in the minds of many Members of Congress after hearing the President's state of the Union message.

There is one rather simple fact that seems to be completely overlooked both in the message and by the exponents of free trade in our midst—how can a man being paid $2 an hour compete with one who is equally skilled and has equally efficient tools but is paid 83 cents an hour? Of course he cannot, and any child could answer this simple question; that of course never gets asked.

Would it not be well to suggest to our foreign friends and competitors that any nation who raises their wage scale to meet ours will automatically enjoy free access to our markets? This would be workable and beneficial for all concerned.

The following article by Mr. Gould Lincoln, which appeared in the Washington Star of January 11, has prompted these thoughts:

FOREIGN TRADE KNOTTIEST PROBLEM

(By Gould Lincoln)

Of all the proposals which President Kennedy will urge upon Congress in his state of the Union message today, none will receive closer scrutiny than the recommendation that the Chief Executive be granted power to extend more freely international trade agreements—resulting in lower tariff duties—than the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act permits. For, bound up in the proposal may be life or death for some American industries. One of these is the textile industry which has been called second only to steel in essentiality for defense. There are many others that can be hard hit, too.

The President's recommendations relating to freer trade have not been spelled out in detail. Until they have them, Chairman WILBUR D. MILLS of the House Ways and Means Committee and Chairman HARRY FLOOD BYRD of the Senate Finance Committee are unlikely to commit themselves, beyond promising the President to give their close attention.

It is no secret that Senator BYRD regards the administration's proposals—which may look to direct U.S. dealing with the European Common Market—as the most momentous question which has come before his committee. Senator BYRD always has been sympathetic to the principle of reciprocal trade agreements and to freer trade thereby. He was able to put through the Senate the most recent extension of the Trade Agreements Act—for a 4-year period which ends June 30.

Although the approaching end of the 4-year period does not mean that the trade agreements already made will die (on the contrary, they will not), it does focus strongly on the need of some new trade legislation.

SOMETHING MUST BE DONE

The administration has become convinced that something must be done quickly to make the United States able to compete for international trade, particularly to compete with a growing European Common Market, which Britain appears to be on the verge of joining. But how far it should go is the question that is stirring not only Members of Congress but also the industries themselves, including workers who might find themselves legislated out of jobs. A spokesman for the administration. Under Secretary of State George W. Ball has put it this way: "The problem is to find a way to shift American manpower as swiftly and painlessly as possible out of the industries which cannot stand up to foreign competition into those which have stood the test."

This statement has made some leaders of American industry see red. Floyd W. Jefferson of New York, chairman of the board of the Iselin-Jefferson Co., Inc., and chairman of the Executive Committee of Dan River Mills, Inc., has commented: "When did it become the function of our Government to destroy a segment of American industry to please and appease foreign nations? When did it become the function of our Government to shift manpower from one great industry to another, uproot families from their ancestral homes and move them to labor far from their communities of which they have become a part?"

Mr. Jefferson said the textile industry has been told it must do everything possible to make itself competitive and to increase its exports. To make itself more competitive would require it to run three shifts, spend money on rehabilitation and new equipment, take full advantage of automation, and cut wages. At present, textiles suffer from overproduction, and the flood of cheap imports accentuates this problem. Profits have dwindled to an extent that funds for improvements and additions are not available. Labor reacts unfavorably to automation. To cut wages would bring on a general strike. "To make matters infinitely worse," Mr. Jefferson continued, "our Government sells cotton to foreign manufacturers at 8½ cents a pound less than they will sell the same cotton to our mills. This cheap cotton is processed in countries where labor costs are one-tenth to one-fourth our standards."

FEARS FOR WAGES, JOBS

This is the kind of argument which will be presented to the congressional committees and to Members generally. It is the kind of argument which is giving some of them pause, even those who favor reciprocal trade agreements. Through the system of agreements, the tariff duties contained in the last general tariff act—the Smoot-Hawley Act in 1934—have been reduced 75 percent. Foreign-made steel, as well as textiles, are flowing into this country. If this kind of thing is increased, it is feared that great unemployment will prevail. Labor wages and standards of living in this country have risen greatly. Any effort to cut wages would be followed by a general strike, even though the cuts were necessary.

One Member of Congress commented: "If we had control of labor instead of labor having control of us, something might be done." Yet this country must be able to compete in the markets of the world.

Congress probably will have to deal with this problem at the present session. But it may be slow getting to it. The House Ways and Means Committee is to take up first the Mills bill to plug loopholes in the tax laws, then medical care for the aged, and an increase in the national debt ceiling. After all these—the trade agreements legislation.

Address by Justice Michael A. Musmanno

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, from time to time someone speaks out on love of flag and this brings a real joy to my heart because, unfortunately, sentiment for the symbol of our country is not often publicly declared. This reticence to display a deep feeling for love of our country and our flag has, I fear, brought about a certain indifference and often at times a disrespect for the flag. I had occasion recently to address this House twice on episodes which involved disrespect for the flag.

I respectfully ask you, Mr. Speaker, to authorize the publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of a brilliant address made by Pennsylvania Supreme Court Justice Michael A. Musmanno on this subject. Justice Musmanno is certainly ideally qualified to speak on patriotism. He served his country in both World Wars. He was twice wounded in action. He is now a rear admiral—retired—in the U.S. Naval Reserves. Justice Musmanno's address follows:

SPEECH OF JUSTICE MICHAEL A. MUSMANNO AT BELLEVUE-STRATFORD HOTEL, PHILADELPHIA, NOVEMBER 11, 1961, 7 P.M., AT BANQUET OF 21 VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS CELEBRATING VETERANS DAY

I rise tonight to speak of patriotism, of the flag, and of the faith of the Founders of our Republic. I realize that if I were to make this utterance in certain circles of supposedly higher intellectualism, it would be met with lifted eyebrows, cynic murmurs, and restrained sardonic sneers. To speak of love of country among certain classes of this high class snobbery is to be called old fashioned and even antiquated.

When I was a boy we could hardly wait until Flag Day, Memorial Day, the Fourth of July and other patriotic holidays to unfurl the flag, salute it, caress it, and with hearts beating, faces glowing, and eyes sparkling, recall proudly and joyously its glorious history. Every public building and private home was bright with Old Glory glistening in grandeur and beautifying the very air in which it waved.

But today these patriotic holidays are days of frenzied hurrying off to the beach, to the mountains, to the lakes or other places no matter where, and the flag is forgotten in the rush. If a flag appears at random here and there, it seems as lonely as a forsaken housemaid, and I feel I want to approach the flag, to take it by the hand and say: "Don't worry, there are those who still love you."

So unimportant has the flag become in the frenetic, distracting life of today that there are communities where impediments have actually been placed in the way of exhibiting the flag. Some of you may remember that in the town of Fairless Hills only several miles from the sacred shrine of Valley Forge, a building restriction prohibited the erection of flag poles and, of course, without flag poles there are difficulties in displaying the flag. This prohibition was so drastic that there was not even a flag flying above the U.S. post office.

I shall never forget the morning of August 11, 1959, when I visited Fairless Hills, a town of pretty homes and splendid streets, but without a flag. It had a magnificent supermarket, a park, impressive landscaping, but not a flag. Not a bit of color broke the skyline which was as bleak, gray, and empty of Old Glory as a Siberian village. The roof of the U.S. post office could have been the roof of a neglected warehouse in Cuba.

I called on the postmaster, I telephoned higher postal authorities, I visited the offices of the corporation administering the affairs of Fairless Hills, to protest this flagless spectacle. I ran into obstacles, evasions, subterfuge everywhere. One of the excuses advanced for the strange state of affairs was that the roof of the post office building could not sustain the weight of a flagpole with a flag.

I had brought with me a flag which had been given to me by my good friend and distinguished statesman, Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD. This flag had been flown over the U.S. Capitol. Commanders Boehmer, Bosch, and Holzer of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and I climbed to the roof of the post office and planted the flag there to show that this could be done.

How was this official act of the Veterans of Foreign Wars received? The editor of the local newspaper of the community sneered that what we had done was a circus antic. Another editor in Easton wrote a scurrilous piece attacking me, seeming to find fault, I don't know why, because I wore my VFW uniform, even though I was a department official of the VFW and certainly I don't need to apologize to anyone for wearing the honor-blessed uniform of the VFW, made up of Americans who have carried the U.S. flag into every corner of the globe and over every ocean. Still another newspaper in Monessen viciously attacked me as if I had committed a crime. And what had I done? I had raised the flag of the United States over a U.S. post office because those who were charged with that basic, fundamental duty refused to do so. I had placed where it belonged the flag which is and should be the inspiration of all Americans, the flag for which my three brothers and I

fought in three wars, the flag which covered the grave of one of those brothers on a battlefield in France, the flag which symbolizes the sacrifice of all the patriot-martyrs who gave their all for America.

Following the flag raising I communicated with Congressman FLOOD who made a powerful speech on the subject in the House of Representatives. He communicated with the Postmaster General demanding that the disgraceful situation in the Fairless Hills post office, with regard to the flag, be corrected. I called on Benjamin Fairless in whose honor the town was named. I conferred with officers of United States Steel Corp., and eventually the flag appeared over the post office and the town, and, eventually the building restriction was removed.

I am happy to say that during this VFW fight for the flag, the Philadelphia Inquirer and the Philadelphia Bulletin gave excellent and absolutely fair coverage to the entire controversy, thus helping to bring about the excellent results I have indicated.

Even before this Fairless Hills episode, there was another incident involving the flag. This one will sound almost fantastic to you. In Pittsburgh, my hometown, arrangements had been made to publicly burn the flag of the United States on the steps of the city-county building which houses the supreme court, the courts of the county, the mayor's office, city council chamber, and other government offices. Those in charge of the project intended the flag burning as a demonstration of how an old 48-star flag could be destroyed. The whole enterprise was appalling to contemplate. The mayor, councilmen, judges, and other officials were to participate, a detachment of U.S. Marines was to conduct the actual burning. Cameramen, TV crews, newspaper photographers were all ready to record the sensational and disgraceful event. I visualized Communist newspapers throughout the world reproducing the pictures and proclaiming in headlines: American Flag Burned by Rioters in Front of Government Building While U.S. Soldiers Look on Helplessly.

Of course, this would not be true, but who ever commended the Soviet press for telling the truth? And what would the American people think? Would they not be horrified to see an American flag being burned in what might seem to be a gala and festive spectacle?

I tried to persuade the persons in charge of the event to call it off. They refused. I ordered them not to burn the flag and served notice that if they dared to touch the tiniest flame or spark to the flag I would hold them in contempt of court. I then proceeded to the front of the building and stood there with a bench warrant prepared to jail the first man who put a violent hand on the flag. The flag was not touched.

Congressman FLOOD, ever vigilant, ever alert, spoke in Congress describing this near outrage to the flag of our country and demanded that the Department of Defense absolutely forbid any such future attempted desecration of the flag. It was not long until the Department of Defense did issue such a directive.

How could such desecration of the flag ever have been thought of? The answer is that the spirit of old-fashioned, heart-thrilling patriotism is lagging; it is because many persons who should be inculcating respect and reverence for the symbols of Americanism and the expression of patriotism are exhorting American youth to do just the reverse. In point, let me tell you of Dr. Edward D. Eddy, Jr., president of the Chatham College in Pittsburgh.

On September 19, 1961, Dr. Eddy at the opening convocation of the college, made this astounding declaration to the student body:

"Please don't inherit either your religion or your nationality. Subject them to your own intelligence test. I plead with you, while you are a student, to question and to doubt the Judeo-Christian tradition and to doubt democracy. You will not become truly convinced of either until you have wrestled with both. Only then will the idealism of both be rekindled truly for you and your generation.

"The great majority of us find meaning in the Judeo-Christian tradition and in the democratic form of government—but we cannot pass on to you the will to make it work. You must find this for yourself. It would be senseless for us merely to wave a flag in your face, for you would be smothered by its folds."

What kind of language is this for a college president? "You would be smothered by its folds." He is speaking of the American flag, each fold of which is rich with the patriotic deeds of Paul Revere, Molly Pitcher, John Paul Jones, Captain Lawrence, Admiral Farragut, Commando Kelly, and the countless others who faced death to save the liberties which Dr. Eddy and all other Americans enjoy.

But Dr. Eddy didn't stop there. He said further: "It would be senseless for us to bellow 'God bless America,' for you would turn away from its abundance of cliches." Please note the verb Dr. Eddy employs: "bellow." He is, of course, being cynical and sarcastic, for only such a person or an outright boor would bellow "God bless America." And then he says that "God bless America" is abundant with cliches. What is a cliche? It is something stale and commonplace. Do you find anything stale and commonplace in any or all of the three words: God bless America? Has Dr. Eddy never thrilled to hear the dulcet voices of schoolchildren singing with all their hearts and souls "God Bless America"? Did he turn away from that sweet music, finding it stale and commonplace?

But Dr. Eddy didn't even stop with that witless statement in his speech to the students of his college. He went on to say: "As Samuel Johnson said so wisely, 'Patriotism is the last refuge of scoundrels.'" Note he says that Johnson spoke wisely in declaring that patriotism is the last refuge of scoundrels. Was Nathan Hale, who said "I regret I have but one life to give for my country" a scoundrel? Was George Washington, who was first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen, a scoundrel? Were the signers of the Declaration of Independence who offered their lives, their honors, and their fortunes for the independence and defense of their country, scoundrels? He said further: "We do not want you to grow up as breast-beating scoundrels but as students committed to a faith and a nation you have found for yourself. This is what we should mean by "rediscovery."

I do not share Dr. Eddy's idolization of Samuel Johnson. In my estimation, Johnson was a bloated, slovenly hypochondriac so muddled in his egotistic British self-exaltation that he defended taxation without representation. He called the American Continental Congress a "congress of anarchy." It was he, Samuel Johnson, whom Dr. Eddy praises, who said contemptuously that Americans multiplied "with the fecundity of their own rattlesnakes." It was he who said that Americans "are a race of convicts and ought to be thankful for anything we allow them short of hanging."

This is the man Dr. Eddy apostrophizes as a man of wisdom.

I do not mention Dr. Eddy because I consider him particularly influential, and I certainly wish to emphasize that he in no way represents the teaching profession of America. I refer to him only because his words typify a kind of thinking which is doing considerable harm to America in degrading patriotism and smothering love for the flag.

Only 2 days ago the second secretary of the U.S. Embassy in Warsaw, Irvin C. Scarbeck, was convicted of passing U.S. secrets to Polish Communist agents. He certainly did not love the flag. We all remember the infamous and malodorous Alger Hiss who also sneered at patriotism while giving state secrets to Russian agents. He held no small position in our Government. He was executive assistant to the President of the United States. A report made by a committee of the U.S. Senate revealed the revolting evidence that among those who lurked and worked at betraying our Government were such high-ranking officials as:

An Assistant Secretary of the Treasury of the United States.

Director of the Office of Special Political Affairs for the State Department.

Head of the Latin-American Division of the Office of Strategic Services.

Member of the U.S. National Labor Relations Board.

U.S. Treasurey attaché in China.

Secretary of the U.S. National Labor Relations Board.

They were all men who looked upon the flag as a painted rag and derided patriotic ceremonies.

Not long ago a young American aviator, Francis Gary Powers, went on trial in Moscow for flying over Russia, taking pictures. I don't know whether in school he listened to someone telling him that patriotism is the refuge of a scoundrel but certain it is he was never impressed enough by Nathan Hale to defy his accusers and say: "I flew over Russia because we did not want a repetition of Pearl Harbor." Instead he cringed and whined: "I didn't know what I was doing. I know now I was risking world peace. My superiors were responsible."

Dr. Max Rafferty in the current issue of Reader's Digest properly and indignantly comments on Powers as follows:

"Thank heaven, they're not all like that. But this one was. So were a sickening number of our young men just 10 years ago who sold out their fellow American soldiers, and licked the boots of the brutal Chinese and North Korean invaders, and made tape recordings praising communism. So are all the phony sophisticates who clutter up our colleges and agitate against ROTC and parade in support of Fidel Castro."

I would like to call to your attention a recently published books which shocked me more than if I had touched a highly charged electric wire. It is called: "Why They Collaborated," and was written by Eugene Kinkead, a highly competent writer, from personal investigation and from a study conducted by the U.S. Army into the conduct of American prisoners who during the Korean war collaborated with the Communist enemy.

I hold the book in my hand and turn to page 34 where Mr. Kinkead asks Hugh M. Milton, Assistant Secretary of the Army, the percentage of American prisoners who collaborated with the enemy. Milton replies: "One man in every seven, or more than 13 percent were guilty of serious collaboration—writing disloyal tracts, say, or agreeing to spy or organize for the Communists after the war."

Never had there been any such traitorous conduct in previous wars. And the reason is that up until this present cynical attitude toward patriotism and the flag among certain people in America, American youth was not embarrassed to speak of loving the flag and to tell about feeling the corpuscles dancing in their veins as they listened to the stirring strains of the Star-Spangled Banner.

Why did so many of our young men wearing the uniform of the United States betray the United States as soon as they got away from the American forces? The answer, of course, is that they didn't love America. America meant no more to them than a

piece of real estate on which they were born. They saw in "God Bless America" something stale and commonplace. They saw what Dr. Eddy called cliches.

Why did these American soldiers inform on their comrades, make broadcasts for the enemy and even falsely declare that America was using bacteriological warfare? What was their reward? I turn to page 129:

"They yielded for strictly personal and selfish reasons. They were the sort who would inform, sign petitions, and make broadcasts because for this they would receive tangible benefits—freedom to walk outside the camp compound, an egg or two, cigarettes."

Another group of the defectors actually accepted communism. In explanation as to why they did this, the author says that they were youths "who for various reasons had been unable to form any strong attachments or loyalties in their past lives." Maj. Harry A. Segal of the Army Medical Corps said that "they were the kind of men who say to themselves, 'I'm just a kid. I don't know where I'm going. I don't know whether people actually like me. Will I ever really be a success?' "

I want to make clear that I in no way suggest that Dr. Eddy is in any way responsible for the reprehensible actions of these young traitors. His speech was made 10 years after the Korean War, but I do say that his speech in no way helped to break down the cynical attitude toward American institutions and the American flag unhealthily prevalent among a certain class of young people.

In his speech on September 19, 1961 Dr. Eddy quoted the archtraitor Whittaker Chambers. He called him a "far less worthy apostle of liberty" than Judge Learned Hand, but beyond this he did not criticize him. He quoted Chambers who said:

"The dying world of 1925 was without faith, hope, character. Only in communism had I found any practical answer at all to the crisis, and the will to make that answer work. If it was the outrage, it was also the hope of the world."

And there, Dr. Eddy let the matter rest, stating only that the students had to decide for themselves what is fiction and what is reality in communism and capitalism. Is there even a stone in the street that does not know that communism is the diametrical negative of belief in God, faith in democracy, and adherence to the Golden Rule?

Dr. Eddy left the situation as if the students could find something to admire and follow in communism.

On November 20th, the Communists in the United States will be required by Federal law to register. Will Dr. Eddy or anyone else who thinks like him urge students to doubt whether Communists should register on the ground that there could be the possibility of fiction in the congressional finding and in the pronouncement of the Supreme Court of the United States that the Communist Party is an agency of the Soviet Union determined to achieve world domination, even at the cost of oceans of blood?

As I already stated, Dr. Eddy exhorted his students not to inherit their religion or nationality. In other words he asked his students to doubt their own parents and the religion of their parents. As if there were not already today too much lack of appreciation on the part of children toward their parents who make tremendous sacrifices in order to give them the best living in the world.

Dr. Eddy called upon his students to "doubt democracy." The defecting Korean soldiers certainly doubted democracy. When they were asked to choose between communism with an egg, plus cigarettes, and America without an immediate egg and cigarettes, they gave up love of home, of parents, of friends, and the boundless golden opportunities of America. They exchanged this priceless treasure for the rotten egg, the moldy cigarettes, the atheism, the blood-soaked ideology, the children-murdering, torture-inflicting, barbaric program of Bolshevism.

Mr. Kinkead, the author of this book, asks how this incredible thing could happen and he replies on page 18:

"The roots of the explanation go deep into diverse aspects of our culture—home training of children, education, physical fitness, religious adherence, and the privilege of existing under the highest standard of living in the world."

How can we avoid that such a disgrace should occur again. Mr. Milton says, page 211:

"The Army would like to see every American parent, every American teacher, and every American clergyman work to instill in every one of our children a specific understanding of the differences between our way of life and the Communist way of life, and, even more important, work to give every child, in the blunt, old-fashioned spirit, a firm regard for right and an abiding distaste for wrong."

Let us look at another educator, but first let me repeat that the overwhelming majority of American educators are patriotic, God-fearing citizens who have probably accomplished more than any other class or profession to make America great and strong because they have properly taught the dreamers and the builders of America. But we must look at the few who, wilfully or undesignedly are giving aid and comfort to the enemy that would destroy everything we hold dear.

On April 6, 1960, there appeared in the New York Times a full-page ad, of which I have a photostatic copy here, sponsored by 31 persons, one of them being Prof. Robert G. Colodny, professor of history at the University of Pittsburgh, an institution which receives appropriations from the Pennsylvania Legislature, that is to say receives money from the Pennsylvania taxpayers. What does Professor Colodny say in this advertisement? The ad is entitled:

"What Is Really Happening in Cuba?" In it Professor Colodny says:

"Cuba and visitors to the island remain freer in many respects than do U.S. citizens. For example, no police permit is required for a public meeting or demonstration, as in New York City. There is no censorship."

This is, and was at the time the ad was published, an unmitigated falsehood. Yet Colodny teaches the youth of western Pennsylvania.

Here is another statement sponsored by Professor Colodny:

"Although the word 'confiscation' has often been used by the press [he refers here to the U.S. press] in a context which would suggest illegal seizure, nothing has stolen from any American—or any Cuban."

This, of course, is and was at the time the ad was published, an unmitigated falsehood. Castro has stolen a billion dollars worth of property from Americans. He has killed Americans without trial. Yet Colodny teaches the youth of western Pennsylvania at the University of Pittsburgh.

Colodny approved of the statement that:

"Cuba's recent trade pact with the Soviet Union represents an effort to find new markets for Cuban sugar, and to obtain, not arms, but agricultural implements and industrial machinery for which credit has been denied in the United States."

This was a falsehood at the time the ad was published and more so now. Cuba has received arms, tanks, ammunition, and untold other weapons from the Soviet Union, all aimed at establishing a Communist beachhead on the Western Continent, in spite of the Monroe Doctrine. And yet Colodny teaches the youth of western Pennsylvania and receives money taken from the pockets of Pennsylvania's taxpayers.

Here in Philadelphia the taxpayers were required by court order to pay unearned wages to a teacher who for 6 years was a dues-paying member of the Communist Party. The taxpayers were required further to pay unearned salaries to other school teachers who, accused of belonging to the Communist Party, while teaching school, refused to answer questions put by a congressional committee as to whether they were members of this criminal organization committed to the overthrow of our Government by force and violence.

Another Philadelphia school teacher, a Mrs. Goldie Watson, was asked by a congressional committee whether she adhered to the precepts of the Communist Party and if she had ever participated in a movement to destroy the American school system. She declined to answer. There was sworn testimony that she had been a member of the Communist Party. She put herself above Congress, the sovereign body of the United States, and declared that "no power on God's earth" could compel her to cooperate with the congressional committee. Mrs. Watson's behavior was the worst possible exeample to schoolchildren on how to behave. How can children learn to love their country and respect its flag and be inspired by the examples of patriotism of its heroic defenders if their school teachers defy Congress, insult the school authorities, and ridicule loyalty to the ideals of America as exemplified by the deeds of the Founding Fathers of our Republic?

The time has come to return to the faith of the Founding Fathers. America faces the most perilous period in her whole history. We stand at Armageddon and we battle for the Lord. Those who are not for us are against us. Our schools are to be training grounds for the responsibilities of citizenship, not for cynicism, not for mockery and derision of those principles which have given us liberty and opportunity unsurpassed in any other country in the whole world. The disgrace of those young American defectors in Korea must never be repeated.

Khrushchev and his criminal conspirators are determined to destroy America. He should not be encouraged in his criminal enterprise by allowing him to interpret from irresponsible utterances in this country that we are divided in our resistance to Communist tyranny.

I oppose preachments of fear and foreboding. I dislike what was said by the noted columnist Sydney Harris several months ago. He said he had a dream that in a nuclear war against Russia we won but that 60 millions of our people had been killed and other millions were dying. He then said:

"A 'free society,' as we now understand it, was no longer possible. In order to survive its dreadful wounds, the nation would have to forego the luxuries of competition and concentrate on collective welfare rather than on individual effort.

"The men who had pulled us into war crying, 'Life wouldn't be worth living under communism,' found that, having won the war, we were now living under something very much like communism. We had defeated the enemy abroad only to find it among us at home."

This is defeatism at its very worst. America will never live under communism. America will never live as slaves. Moreover, what Mr. Harris doesn't realize is that it isn't a question of someone pulling us into war. It is a matter of Russia forcing war upon us, and the way to avoid that war is to keep ourselves strong. We must never appease because appeasement is what precipitated World War II. There is no doubt in

my mind whatsover that Hitler and the rulers of Japan would never have attacked America had they known that we would retaliate as we did. Khrushchev must know, as he is now being informed, that we will never tolerate abridgements of our freedom. This does not mean that we will be provocative or belligerent. It was stated beautifully by our wise and courageous President John F. Kennedy:

"Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate."

God through the instrumentality of our scientists and the determination of the American people has provided us with the means to protect this blessed land from barbaric invasion. President Kennedy has said:

"In terms of total military strength the United States would not trade places with any nation on earth. We have taken major steps in the past year to maintain our lead—and we do not propose to lose it."

We are invincibly armed with a protective sword of fire which we hold aloft not in aggressive attack but in warning.

We say to Khruschev: "Come, join with us in the ways of peace, the good Lord has provided enough for all, the land is fruitful and the sea is rich; science has removed the burden from the back of man and put it into machines. The laboratory has not been confined to the discovery of engines of death, it has revealed new vistas for the conquering of disease, it has expanded the average span of life from 45 to 68 years, and we are gaining 6 months each year.

"Come, let us listen to the song of happy children, let us revel in the concert of understanding hearts. Let us work for the true world parliament of man.

"There is nothing which you possess that we covet: Keep your lands, your forests, your mines, your factories, your rivers, and your skies, but do not try to take ours. Do not seek to throw chains around the globe, do not aim to strip away from mankind its faith in the everlasting goodness of the Prince of Peace. We ask all this in the name of the Lord.

"We hold this sword of fire not for aggression but as a torch of freedom, a beacon of justice between man and man, but if you take one step of attack against this fair land, then that invincible sword will strike."

We are prepared for every sacrifice but that of relinquishing our freedom. Americans will never be slaves. We must and will be worthy of our Founding Fathers and bold for the right. With such a new Declaration of Independence, we will not; we can never, under God's guidance, fail.

The Uses of Wood—Speech by Miss Donna Axum, Arkansas Forest Queen for 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, in 1960 Congress passed a joint resolution setting aside the week beginning with the third Sunday of October as National Forest Products Week. The President promptly approved, thus extending proper recognition to an industry that has long merited such a signal honor.

This past October I had the privilege of participating in the observance of National Forest Products Week in my home State, and I was greatly pleased to witness as a part of the ceremonies marking that event, the crowning of Miss Donna Axum as Arkansas Forest Queen for 1961. At that time Miss Axum made a most instructive speech on "The Uses of Wood." I believe her comments will be of great interest to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This young lady is extremely well versed in the subject of forestry, as her remarks so clearly demonstrate, and I ask unanimous consent that her speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE USES OF WOOD

(By Miss Donna Axum)

I hold in my right hand a piece of wood. Man has always depended on wood. Our Pilgrim fathers established the first colony in Jamestown, Va., 352 years ago. Since that time man has developed over 6,000 uses of wood. I would like to invite you now to travel with me as we turn the pages in history, and review the uses of wood, past, present, and future.

Let's begin our journey with the colonization of the first settlers in Jamestown in the year 1609. There is John Smith, a perfect example of the first settler. His prime ambition in this country is to provide a comfortable home for his family, and it is here that he first turns to wood. With his home completed, John Smith realizes that wood is his best friend; for from it he carves tools for farming and weapons for hunting. The Smith family always rides in style on land or sea in their wooden boat and wagon. And Mrs. Smith's pride and joy is her wooden spinning wheel on which she creates the latest fashions of the day. After a good day's hunt, the delicious evening meal is prepared over a blazing fireplace. And when the wooden dishes have been cleared away, we see the Smith family enjoys sitting around the dimming fire and singing the current folk songs of the day. They are, of course, accompanied by the old wooden banjo. This family, as well as all pioneer families, are solely dependent upon wood for their existence. Construction, tools and weapons, transportation, fuel, machinery, and entertainment all show us the important uses of wood to the early settlers.

Let's continue our journey now as we move up to the present decade in our review of the uses of wood. Many years have passed, and many pages in history have been turned, and we see that man has developed over 6,000 uses of wood.

Progress has combined chemicals and other substances with wood to create thousands of products for our everyday living. We have just arrived in New York City, one of the focal points of the Nation in 1961. And as fashion takes the spotlight, we see that there is magic in wood. Famous designers create the most beautiful fashions from wood. Yes, many of today's synthetic fibers such as rayon are wood products. The homes of today have changed quite a bit since the time of John Smith. We have found that there is beauty as well as versatility in wood as an interior decorative material. Wood is the unsurpassed material from which the finest furniture can be made. And since it is flexible, it enables the craftsman to mold it into the most beautiful furniture imaginable. Something very popular in today's homes is wood paneling. By matching and combining the grains of wood, beautiful designs can be made to enhance the beauty of any wall. A telephone is an essential item in every home and office today. But you may ask this question—what does a telephone have to do with wood? The case is made of plastic, which is a wood product. Plastics do play a large part in our everyday lives, for how could we ever do without our clocks, radios, and one very essential item that we use three times a day—our toothbrush. Here is one of the newest wood products on the market today. From the Forest Products Laboratory in Madison, Wis., comes Papreg. It is made of paper which has been soaked in resin and pressed. The result is a material half the weight of aluminum, yet, strong as steel. When this material is used in the construction of airplanes, it needs no finish, is not harmed by salt water, and will not tear or shread. It still will, no doubt, be a valuable material in the peacetime construction of refrigerators, radios, and many other similar items.

The last leg of our journey will be a fantastic one as we jump to the year 2000. It's a pushbutton world where automobiles have become museum pieces. And jetstream transportation will take you from New York to Dallas in only 30 minutes. Remember back in 1961, when the women thought the knee-tickling skirts were too short? Well, today's fashion designers have made them thigh-ticklers, and in every fabric imaginable—all made of wood. That TV and telephone will bring your friends and neighbors right into your own home every morning for that regular chat over coffee. It is impossible for us to know everything about the future, but there is one thing that we can be sure of—that is that wood will continue to be one of the key materials in the production and development of thousands of useful products for our everyday living.

We must end our journey now and return to the present, but you and I have covered a period of over 491 years in only 5 minutes. We have visited the past, the present, and the future, and at each stop we have seen the important uses of wood to man. I think our journey can best be summarized in the poem by Henry Abby entitled "What Do We Plant?"

"What do we plant when we plant the tree?
We plant the ship which will cross the sea.
We plant the mast to carry the sails,
We plant the planks to withstand the gales;
The keel, the keelson, the beam and knee,
We plant the ship when we plant the tree.

"What do we plant when we plant the tree?
A thousand things that we daily see,
We plant the spire that out-towers the crag.
We plant the staff for our country's flag,
We plant the shade, from the hot sun free,
We plant all these, when we plant the tree."

How We Got This Way—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, part 3—October 22—of the New York Daily News series of editorials, "How We Got This Way," is as follows:

HOW WE GOT THIS WAY—III

The American Revolution (1776–83) ended British rule over what had become the 13 Original States of the Union, but it also bred a legion of troubles for the new Nation and most of its citizens.

For one thing, Britain sought revenge for the Revolution by barring U.S. trade with the British West Indies. This brought on the bad depression of 1784–85.

But as most historians view the matter, the basic reason for the infant Nation's woes was the form of government under which it

struggled for some years to live, prosper, and progress.

Back in 1777 (November 15), with the Revolution officially only about 16 months old, the Continental Congress had approved a set of laws known as the Articles of Confederation. Ratification by the States was completed March 1, 1781.

The Articles of Confederation viewed the States as so many independent little nations, in most respects. These little nations agreed in this document to form "a firm league of friendship," to see to their common defense, and to advance their "mutual and general welfare."

Having so agreed, they proceeded proudly to disagree, on virtually every subject of importance to them, and to act like independent nations in almost all respects.

Each State, for example, was at liberty to issue its own money. They all did so. In seven of them, the farmers' fondness for paper money brought about the printing of ruge wads of the stuff, which rapidly became almost worthless.

Again each State was free to levy tariffs on goods coming into it from anywhere outside its borders. New York was especially fond of collecting such duties on imports from New Jersey and Connecticut.

There was border fighting here and there between the armed forces of various States.

MISERIES OF CONFEDERATION

The State legislatures, all 13 of them, were the most powerful lawmaking bodies in the land. They could and did thumb their noses at Congress whenever they pleased.

Congress itself had no powers that amounted to anything, and lacked the ability to use what powers it had.

It couldn't collect the taxes it imposed, from anybody or any State that didn't want to pay them; couldn't raise and maintain a respectable Army and Navy; couldn't regulate interstate commerce; couldn't use troops to put down uprisings; couldn't compel States to live up to any treaties Congress might negotiate with other countries.

Consequently, a large number of intelligent Americans came to realize soon after the Revolution that something drastic had to be done if the new Nation wasn't to blow itself apart or be taken over by the first strong and determined country that might attack it.

The big question was what to do; and innumerable answers were offered from time to time.

A considerable number of people, including many veterans of the Revolution, wanted to set up a military dictatorship.

Numerous others thought for a while that it would be a good idea to crown some American as king of the new Nation. Gen. George Washington would have been the logical choice for this honor—which he did not want.

DICTATORSHIP—KING—OR WHAT?

It was Washington himself who set the machinery in motion for the solution that was finally worked out. In 1783, he sent a letter around to the Governors of all the States, pointing out the dangers of the 13-independent-nation setup and calling for the creation of a more powerful Central Government.

Alexander Hamilton, another veteran of the Revolution, began soon afterward to attack the Articles of Confederation in speeches and print, and to demand some sort of convention to draw up a new and much stronger set of ground rules for the united-in-name-only States.

Washington, Hamilton, and their less well-known colleagues in this movement had a very rough time selling their ideas to most of their fellow Americans. The States did not want to give up any powers for the Nation's benefit; many a citizen dreaded a return to the sort of tyranny he had endured under King George III.

At last, though, in May of 1787, the Constitutional Convention assembled in Philadelphia; and the next editorial in this series will describe what happened there.

The Migrant Farm Labor Story—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dale Wright of the New York World-Telegram and Sun who experienced at first-hand the shocking conditions confronting migrant farmworkers. I hope to continue to bring to the attention of my colleagues this excellent series of articles:

THE FORGOTTEN PEOPLE—MIGRANT PAY $4.32 A DAY IN FLORIDA TOMATO FIELD

(By Dale Wright)

(Four migrant farmworkers burned to death last Sunday in their squalid shack in a Suffolk County labor farm. The tragedy typifies the shocking abuse of "The Forgotten People" which, according to an on-the-spot survey of the World-Telegram, still persists today despite some protective laws. This survey started last April, when staff writer, Dale Wright, was assigned to work in Florida as a migrant laborer, and continued until last month. Today his article tells of his first day of overwork, underpayment and exploitation.)

On a warm, humid morning last April, a rickety old bus jolted along at its top speed between rows of carefully manicured estates along Route 1 from Miami south to Homestead, Fla. Although the vehicle had seats for 35 persons, it was crammed with 64 passengers.

I was one of them.

I was on my way to my first day of work as a migrant farm laborer in the lush tomato fields of southern Dade County. I had shaped up (reported for assignment) earlier that morning on a Miami street corner and was hired—with no questions asked—by a fat character known as a labor contractor.

In the South, labor contractors round up crews of workers for transport and assignment to farms where crops are to be harvested.

SALES PITCH SOUNDS GOOD

"Everybody that gets on this bus," he promised reassuringly, "makes $10, $12, $15 today if you want to work. There's plenty of tomatoes to pick and there will be no cheating, nothin' taken out of your pay. And it will be clean work."

His pitch sounded good but I wanted to see for myself. The smirks on the faces of the seasoned migrant workers around me raised by doubts.

In a vast patch of ground outside Homestead our crew joined about 150 other farmworkers. They were busy when we arrived gathering a crop of "red ripes," tomatoes ready that day for shipment to the markets and canneries. It was just after daybreak and a bright sun already had begun to broil the pickers as they stooped in the long rows.

The job was to pick and pack the tomatoes into baskets that contained five-eighths of a bushel. Each loaded basket weighed 60 pounds. When we had them filled we lugged them to the end of the row where they were loaded onto trucks. Pay promised was 12 cents a basket.

KIDS GOTTA EAT

In the row next to mine, an emaciated man of about 40 coughed and spat incessantly as he bent to his task. When I noticed the blood and spoke to him about it, he muttered:

"Yeah, they say it's consumption. It don't make no difference. I gotta keep working. The doctor, he can't do nothing for me. I got no money for medicine. I got a woman and a lotta kids. I gotta keep pickin' tomatoes."

Obviously, the man was seriously ill and belonged in a hospital. But he was trapped by the need to work for his family in the only job he knew how to do. Later, when we stood up to smoke a cigarette, he said to me:

"Been doin' farm work all my life. Don't know nothin' else. I can't go to a hospital. Kids gotta eat."

CHILDREN SICK, TOO

He said his name was Alonzo and that he lived in a tin and tarpaper shack near Goulds, Fla., for which he paid $10 a week rent. He added that three of his children—the small ones—had dry, hacking coughs and probably had caught the misery he had in his chest.

Medical treatment? No. None of the youngsters had ever seen a doctor.

Despite his illness, Alonzo was a hard worker. As we worked along the endless rows of tomato plants, he loaded basket after basket of tomatoes and was soon far down the field from me.

Later that day Alonzo told me he soon would be moving north from Homestead because the harvest was "going down." To keep living, he explained, he'd have to load his family and his belongings onto a truck or bus going north, where other crops were ripening.

"It's the same," he said. "This job is just like the last one. Next be just like this one. Never no different. Never will be."

TYPICAL CASE

This sick, frustrated laborer, doomed long before his time, was summing up the lot of today's migrant farmworker.

The back-breaking labor of stooping close to the orange-tinted Florida earth begins as soon as a picker can distinguish red tomatoes from green ones in the gray dawn of an endless day.

His work ends when he no longer can see the tomatoes to pick them. At the promised rate of 12 cents a basket, a good picker can fill 70 to 80 baskets a day and earn—it says there—from $8.40 to $9.60 a day.

As bad as that kind of pay is, it generally worked out that the man in the fields received considerably less than the promised rate. Often the rate dropped on payday to 8 cents a basket and the field hand who actually "took home" $7 a day for his work considered himself lucky.

On my first day in the fields, I worked 10 hours with only a 15-minute break for what they called lunch. It was the hardest, most punishing work I had ever done.

NO TOILET FACILITIES

In the first hours of that miserable day, my hands became grimy and encrusted with the green insecticide they spray on tomatoes. It covered my khaki pants and ate its way into my legs. It collected under my fingernails, covered my shoes and socks and festered in the scratches I received from the tomato vines.

But picking the tomatoes was the easy part of the job. The hard part was lugging the heavy baskets to the end of the rows—often

as far as 150 feet—to be loaded onto the trucks.

All around me were men and women—all ages—dragging themselves along the rows on their hands and knees in the near-90-degree heat.

Toilet facilities? There were none. The pickers, male and female, used the field whenever they found it necessary. It was more than a mile to the nearest clump of trees.

DAY'S PAY: $4.32

That lunch I spoke of? A little before noon a battered pickup truck drove into the fields. The meal consisted of greasy sausage sandwiches and warm soft drinks. The sandwiches cost 35 cents and the drinks 20 cents.

Drinking water was dispensed from a wooden barrel. We dipped our water with a sawed-off tomato can shared by some 200 other migrant laborers toiling in the field. Because the barrel was in the middle of the field, thirsty workers had to walk as much as a half mile for a drink of water.

As I figured it that first day, we picked more than 5,000 baskets of tomatoes. After 10 hours of stooping, squatting, crawling, picking and loading, I had earned just $4.32.

Many of the men and women working with me had earned less.

Federal Control Under Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in the Appendix of the RECORD printed on October 13, 1961, my colleague from Pennsylvania, Representative SAYLOR, inserted an article from the then current issue of Nation's Business magazine by Dr. Anthony Marinaccio, superintendent of public schools in Davenport, Iowa.

I sent the article for comment to the Office of Education, because it was the first indictment of the impacted areas education legislation that I had seen, which raised the charge of Federal control against the Federal Government administration of the program. The author did not confine himself to this program alone, however, and he raised all of the old familiar charges about the inevitability of control in any Federal aid to education program.

Commissioner of Education McMurrin's reply is an effective answer to Dr. Marinaccio's misleading and confusing complaints, and I ask unanimous consent that his reply be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, OFFICE OF EDUCATION,

Washington, D.C. November 30, 1961.

Hon. JOSEPH S. CLARK,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CLARK: This is in reply to your request for comment on the article "We Reject Federal Aid," by Dr. Anthony Marinaccio.

Dr. Marinaccio makes the common mistake of not distinguishing between types of Federal-aid programs. Categorical aid programs such as those provided under the vocational education acts and the National Defense Education Act are designed to achieve certain purposes as defined by Congress. They must, of necessity, involve standards since they are trying to establish improved conditions in particular subject areas. Actually, the standards are largely set by the States themselves as the wide variation in approved National Defense Education Act programs will attest. Federal administration is confined to fiscal accountability and approval of State plans to see that they meet congressionally defined purpose. State employees involved in the supervision and administration of State plans in the various categorical areas do not become Federal employees because their salaries, in part or in whole, are paid by Federal funds granted to the State.

Any school district which has the resources and the initiative to establish its own programs in these areas is free to reject Federal categorical aid, as Dr. Marinaccio did, if the community feels that the standards are objectionable or inadequate. This can hardly be described as control when it is on a voluntary basis. Even if called control Dr. Marinaccio has largely confused State control with Federal ocntrol. There are certainly no constitutional prohibitions against State control and the responsibility for education generally rests with the State even though much authority in this area has been delegated to the local level.

Another type of Federal aid is general in nature. Aid to federally affected areas, Public Law 874, would be illustrative of this type even though it is restricted to certain geographical areas which meet the qualifying conditions for participation. The aid, as such, is given to the schools for general use in supporting the community's educational program. A Columbia University doctoral study based on a nationwide sample found that no "control" existed in the administration of Public Law 874.

The assumption that most communities have the potential resources to provide an adequate educational program fails to meet the arguments for Federal aid on several grounds:

1. Many communities do not have adequate resources and these areas cannot in the national interest be ignored.

2. Many more communities even with adequate potential resources are unable to tap this wealth because of competitive situations or inadequate authority.

3. Relatively few communities are providing on their own the level of training, particularly in the sciences, so necessary to our national survival. Technological achievement is today a national concern rather than a community concern due to our high mobility and international competition.

The individual's definition of "control" may determine the type of Federal aid program which will be supported but any reasonable definition of "control" will not preclude the establishment of all such programs and should allow very substantial Federal aid.

Sincerely yours,

STERLING M. MCMURRIN,
U.S. Commissioner of Education.

We Should Know When To Retire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article by Norman Ross which appeared in the Chicago Daily News, October 14, 1961, on behalf of my friend Dr. Norman Hilberry, who recently retired as head of Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Ill.

WE SHOULD KNOW WHEN TO RETIRE

(By Norman Ross)

Years ago, at the end of a town hall recital, Lotte Lehmann suddenly said to the audience:

"Like the Marschallin in 'Der Rosenkavalier,' I look into the mirror and realize: it is time." Eyes brimming with tears, she left the stage. Though still at the height of her career, she never sang again in New York.

I count it among the privileges of a lifetime to have heard her final concerts, a few days later, in Chicago and Madison.

So few of us will admit even to ourselves that the time has come to retire. Even fewer are emotionally secure enough and selfless enough to do so 2 years ahead of time so that our successor can step in smoothly.

Such a man is Dr. Norman Hilberry, who has just retired as head of Argonne National Laboratory, one of the Nation's primary and premier facilities for research into the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

A brilliant 34-year-young British-born high-energy physicist, Dr. Albert V. Crewe is the wise and—typical of Dr. Hilberry—daring choice as his successor to ride herd on a $300 million complex, divided between Chicago and Idaho, and staffed by 4,000 workers, 1,100 of whom are scientists from a considerable variety of disciplines.

Dr. Hilberry is a remarkable spirit, as warm as he is wise, as articulate as he is down to earth.

He feels very strongly the increasing difficulty but increasing need for scientists to communicate with each other and with an informed public. The extraordinary skill with which he is able to do this should not obscure his genuine contributions to science.

He took part in bringing off the first nuclear chain reaction that historic December 2 in 1942, at Stagg Field, University of Chicago.

After President Eisenhower's bold atoms-for-peace speech, he spearheaded the organization of the institute to train scientists for the atomic energy installations of the free world. He was the institute's first director, and it remains unique.

At the end of World War II, the scientists who had worked so brilliantly for the Manhatten project, were about to break up and return to universities and private industry. Dr. Hilberry was one of the prime architects to set up the chain of national laboratories like Argonne so that their skills would not be lost to the Nation.

Like Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, he is a man who will still be embarking on new adventures of the intellect at the age of 90. For deep within him is what he has called the almost insatiable and almost infinitely patient curiosity that drives people to be scientists.

Looking back over his 63 years, what have been the chief rewards of a career in science?

"An internal satisfaction that nothing else can bring, save maybe music or writing—inner satisfaction with a job that you know you've done well. There is only one person with whom you are sure you will always have to live, whom you must always satisfy—yourself.

If you have this inner satisfaction, the buffetings you will sustain from outside will be much less meaningful. You will have your own frame of reference to judge your actions and evaluate your performance."

Looking forward, does he see anything that might make us fail in our destiny as a nation?

"Fat bellies—fat heads."

If your country continues to churn up men like Norman Hilberry, we needn't worry.

Tom Storke of Santa Barbara News-Press Peels Bark Off the Birches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, Tom Storke, Publisher of the Santa Barbara News-Press, is a newspaperman in the highest tradition of journalism. In all the years that I have known him he has never fallen short of the outspoken and courageous qualities that are his trademark. It is heartwarming to know that many years in the sunny and relaxed atmosphere of Santa Barbara have not mellowed Tom Storke's fighting spirit. Last November he took both gloves off in an explosive series of articles exposing the John Birch Society. This country needs more men like Tom Storke.

Two months ago Tom Storke received the Richard E. Lauterbach Award from the Nieman Foundation for Journalism for his "defense of civil liberties," and for being the first to raise an editorial fist against the Birchers. For that story I commend to the attention of my colleagues an article in the November 17 issue of Time magazine. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KING STORKE

Tucked snugly between Southern California's Santa Ynez Mountains and the Pacific coast, the expensively attractive city of Santa Barbara (pop. 60,000) is a natural harbor for old bones. There, under a gentle sun, the retired well-to-do live out their twilight years, nourishing a vehement conservative concern for the State of the Nation. It was a natural place to organize an active cell of the radical right-wing John Birch Society. But less inevitable was the fact that it was the leading citizen of Santa Barbara who first peeled the bark off the Birchers. The man who did it was Thomas More Storke, 84, crusty editor and publisher of the city's only daily, the News-Press (cir. 31,466).

When word of the Birchers' fulminations first reached Tom Storke's ears last year, he was more bemused than angry. Their secret meetings, their talk of using Communist cellular methods to fight Communists, their indiscriminate character assassination he did not take seriously until, centering their attack on U.S. Chief Justice Earl Warren, the Birchers offered $2,300 for the best college essays on why Warren should be impeached. This attack on a man who happened to be a lifelong friend of Storke's touched a nerve.

THE WHOLE TOWN LISTENED

The News-Press ran a two-part series exposing the Birchers and burst into editorial flame: "How can anyone follow a leader absurd enough to call former President Eisenhower 'a dedicated, conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy?'" To counter the society's "impeach Warren" contest, Storke offered $1,500 to the students of law or psychiatry who could best explain the behavior of the society's founder, Retired Candyman Robert Welch. As the News-Press pressed its anti-Birch crusade, the whole town listened. For Tom Storke is more than publisher of Santa Barbara's only daily. He is the ruddy, irascible, benevolent tyrant who has played king of Santa Barbara for 61 years.

PICKING FIGHTS

Even Mayor Edward Abbott consults Storke daily. The telephone company is shamefacedly rushing a corrected directory into print because Storke found a few errors in a new edition. After a devastating 1925 earthquake, Storke and his paper ordered the city rebuilt in Spanish style, and it was. Having assisted Franklin D. Roosevelt into the White House in 1932—by helping California's William G. McAdoo (later U.S. Senator) deliver the California delegation at convention time—Democrat Storke got his expected reward: $22 million in Federal public works, including an armory, a reservoir, nine tennis courts, and a public bathhouse.

Son of an easterner who migrated to Santa Barbara to teach college Latin, young Tom Storke went to work as a $6-a-week cub reporter. After 3 years, with $2,000 borrowed from a retired druggist, he bought the Santa Barbara Daily Independent, a listless newspaper only 300 subscribers from extinction. Steadily, Storke not only stifled—by sale or merger—all the local newspaper competition but picked editorial fights up and down the California coast. He took on the Southern Pacific Railroad, which then ruled the State as Storke now rules Santa Barbara; he beat down enemies of his plan to dam the Santa Ynez River to provide Santa Barbara with water.

GOD AND CONSTITUTION

Today Tom Storke has things so much his way in Santa Barbara that he has little left to fight. Few men dare oppose him: "If I was ever quoted as saying something against T.M.," said an understandably anonymous Santa Barbara businessman, "I'd lose my job the next day."

One night last week, Tom Storke's subjects crowded into the ballroom of the neo-Spanish Santa Barbara Biltmore for a testimonial dinner for their cantankerous king. For his defense of civil liberties, for being the first to raise an editorial fist against the Birchers, Editor Storke received the Richard E. Lauterbach Award from the Nieman Foundation for Journalism. He heard congratulatory messages from all over the United States, among them one from an admirer named John Kennedy (who praised Storke's sturdy conviction and judgment). "For 61 years I've been dodging brickbats," said Tom Storke. "Tonight it is a little difficult to accept these orchids. What I did was not a courageous gesture. It should not be considered courageous to stand up and defend what God and the Constitution have given us."

Medical Assistance Plan Starts Slowly in Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the January 5, 1962, edition of the Oregon Labor Press.

The article relates to the inadequacy of the medical-care-for-the-aged program, the so-called MAA program, as it has been applied in my home State of Oregon.

The MAA program is shamefully inadequate response to the desperate need for adequate comprehensive medical care for the elderly with small incomes. We all know of the skyrocketing costs incurred by those with major illnesses that require lengthy surgical and hospital treatment.

The burden of the article illuminatingly illustrates the inadequacy of halfway measures in this area.

The article's study of the Oregon experience provides convincing evidence of the need for the Kennedy administration's legislation for medical care for the elderly financed through the social security tax.

We speak easily of investment in factories and armament; in other words, in things. These, of course, have their place. But I suggest it is at least equally important to invest in our greatest resource—the American people whose efforts have made the United States the wonderful country it is today.

The article follows:

MEDICAL ASSISTANCE PLAN STARTS SLOWLY IN OREGON

The medical care for the aged (MAA) program, launched in Oregon November 1, appears to be a dud.

Only a small percentage of those eligible under the program have applied for benefits.

MAA was the Eisenhower administration's answer to the need of retired persons with small incomes for medical and hospital care. The program was implemented—after a fashion—by the 1961 Oregon Legislature.

The American Medical Association, which is fighting the social security approach to the problem, gave its blessing to MAA. But apparently the program has little appeal to Oregon's older citizens—even those who need it most.

Take a look at Multnomah County where about 40 percent—or 22,000—of the State's estimated 55,000 eligible older persons live.

The Multnomah County Welfare Commission began accepting applications from these individuals the middle of October.

By the middle of December the Commission had received about 2,500 inquiries, in person or by telephone.

Of these 2,500—a little over 10 percent of the estimated number eligible—the Commission processed 1,500 applications.

Of these 1,500 applications, just over 700 persons proved to be eligible for the aid.

This means that out of 22,000 eligible persons—a rough estimate—only about 700 individuals are benefitting from the program.

Why?

To get the answer, the Labor Press has done some sleuthing. Here is what we found:

First of all, MAA is administered by the welfare commission in each county. Many persons, even those in desperate need, refuse to apply to the welfare commission for help.

Assistance from the welfare commission is a lien against the estate of the person who accepts it. Many retired persons will endure—and are enduring—severe hardship in order to be able to pass along to their children the house or small capital which is theirs, without having the welfare commission take a large bite out of it first.

And the commission would take its bite to recover medical benefits furnished under the MAA program.

One retired worker, whose only income comes from social security benefits, told us he could imagine no circumstance that would force him to apply to the welfare commission for MAA "or any other assistance."

"I worked hard all my life," he said. "The small acreage I own near Gresham could mean the education of my two grandsons. I am 79 years old and the education of those two kids is a great deal more important than my health."

The income and property restrictions for MAA probably have resulted in sharply reducing the number of persons eligible.

Income limits are $1,500 annually for a single person, or $2,000 for a couple. Social security benefits usually amount to a little more than these figures. Even so, MAA will not pay the first $75 of hospital bills or $50 of doctors' bills for any individual during a benefit year.

The Multnomah County Welfare Commission frankly admitted that it was prepared for a far greater number of MAA applicants than those received so far. But Administrator Gus Lange said the experience of other States where the program was launched earlier has shown that it usually gets off to a slow beginning and gradually builds momentum.

He urged those retired persons who are in need of medical assistance to apply, and if they are eligible, to accept the aid.

Those who are deterred by pride, or consideration for their heirs, can act in their own behalf. They can flood their Congressmen and Senators with letters urging all-out support for the King-Anderson bill—backed by the Kennedy administration and by the AFL-CIO.

Under this bill, medical and hospital assistance would be the right of all retired persons. The benefits would be paid under the social security program. The cost would be covered by increasing both employer and employee contributions to social security.

The King-Anderson bill, deliberately misrepresented by the AMA as socialized medicine, would in no way affect each person's free choice of doctor or hospital.

Tax Revision for Sound Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Tax Revision for Sound Economy," which was published in the Philadelphia Inquirer, issue of January 2, 1962.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAX REVISION FOR SOUND ECONOMY

As the people of the Delaware Valley and throughout the country return to work this morning after New Year's Day there is a great deal of optimism about the economic outlook for 1962. Everyone—labor, management, government—should bear in mind that predictions don't make prosperity. It takes hard work, efficient operation and sound fiscal policy.

The Secretaries of Labor and Commerce—Arthur Goldberg and Luther Hodges, respectively—have very wisely cautioned the Nation to avoid setting in motion an inflationary wage-price spiral that would nullify the benefits of a business upturn. Labor and management will need to exercise restraint and hold a reasonable line on wages and prices commensurate with increased productivity and improved quality.

For Mr. and Mrs. Average American Taxpayer—and the business community, too—the present focal point of interest is on proposed changes in the Federal tax structure. This is an important but unknown factor in the country's economic future. What Congress does or does not do in the field of tax revision will have profound effect on down-to-earth aspects of the economy such as job opportunities and unemployment.

We believe that careful, well-considered changes in the Federal tax system are needed to make taxes more equitable and to eliminate existing injustices. Tax revision should be approached on a broad, comprehensive scale—not haphazardly on a piecemeal, hit-or-miss basis that would merely make inequities worse.

Priority consideration in any tax-change suggestions must be given to the Nation's requirements for defense and security. Foreign policy and tax policy are closely interrelated. Prospects for a tax reduction certainly could be enhanced by successful solution to international problems, particularly in the field of disarmament, and by agreement on satisfactory methods to ease tensions at cold-war points such as Berlin.

Specifics of the administration's proposals on tax revision will be made known soon in President Kennedy's messages to Congress but it already has been disclosed that a two-stage program is in the works. The first stage, for launching in 1962, would provide new incentives—in the form of investment credits and depreciation allowances—to spur expansion of facilities and modernization of equipment by business and industry. The basic goal, it should be noted, is to provide more jobs—thus labor would share directly in the benefits of these tax adjustments even though the inevitable trend toward automation will continue to result in serious unemployment problems.

The second stage, for 1963, would include lowering of the Federal tax rate for persons in all income brackets, to be accompanied by a tightening of exemption features to reduce or eliminate some deductions.

Administration bills of the past year calling for a withholding system to collect income taxes on dividends and interest also are expected to be revived.

Judgment on details of the administration's tax proposals must await their full disclosure by the President but it is our opinion that revising tax rates downward—while encouraging business expansion, closing deduction loopholes and improving tax-collection methods—is in principle a sound approach to tax revision. In the long run it would provide more income for individuals and corporations, more revenue for the Government, and a healthier national economy for everybody.

How We Got This Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, the fourth—October 29—in the New York Daily News series of editorials "How We Got This Way" is presented below:

HOW WE GOT THIS WAY—IV

Continuing this series of editorials on how the United States became a republic: The Constitutional Convention met in Philadelphia May 5, 1787, with the initial purpose of amending the old Articles of Confederation so as to strengthen the U.S. Government.

The Convention was called at the instance of Congress, and all the States except Rhode Island sent delegates.

There were 55 of these, and they included some of the best brains this country ever has produced—George Washington, Alexander Hamilton, Benjamin Franklin, James Madison, Gouverneur Morris, Roger Sherman, Charles Pinckney, to mention only a few.

The Convention worked from early May of 1787 until September 17. There were numerous arguments and differences of opinion, and various compromises were made.

But by and large, the carpenters of the Constitution were agreed on the fundamentals of what they wanted to put together—a set of broad, general principles having the force of law and designed to set up a strong (but not too strong) central government which could ride herd on the States without depriving them of such powers as they ought to have.

It was soon agreed that amending the Articles of Confederation would not be enough; that a new body of laws was essential.

FRAMEWORK FOR THE NEW NATION

The framework of the Government ordained by this new body of laws was to have three main branches: the executive, legislative, and judicial.

Heading up the executive branch was to be the President. Congress was to be the legislative branch, with a Senate elected by the State legislatures and a House of Representatives by the people of the several States. (Senators have been elected directly since 1913—amendment 17.) The Supreme Court, with a lot of lesser Federal courts, was to constitute the judicial branch.

These three branches were to be pretty much coequal in power, so as to insure a system of checks and balances which, it was hoped, would keep any one element in the Government from ever becoming supreme.

For example, the President was to be given power to veto acts of Congress; but Congress was to have power to override vetoes by two-thirds majorities in both Houses.

Congress was to be given a fistful of other powers, too. Among the more important of these were: to levy and collect taxes, to borrow money on the Governments' credit, to regulate trade, both foreign and interstate, to coin money and regulate its value, to establish post offices and post roads, to grant patents and copyrights, to declare war, and to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

Various limitations were to be imposed on the States, so that they could no longer act like little independent nations as they were doing under the Articles of Confederation.

FEDERALIST'S SALESMANSHIP

Ample provisions were put into the Constitution for amending it—a tough job, and intentionally made so in order to prevent innumerable frivolous or ill-considered changes.

No sooner was the proposed Constitution unveiled to the American people (Sept. 17, 1787) than demands for amendments began to be heard, along with furious outbursts of oratory against ratifying the thing at all.

The most effective salesmen of the Constitution were Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay, with their 85 long newspaper articles published in two volumes in 1788 under the title "The Federalist."

These brilliant essays dissected, analyzed, and surveyed the proposed new laws from every conceivable angle. They are still regarded as masterpieces of political thinking and expression—and they got results.

Ratification by 9 of the 13 States was sufficient to make the Constitution effective. New Hampshire became the ninth State to okay it, in June of 1788. It took effect March 4, 1789.

There were all sorts of misgivings and reservations here and there, though—particularly about the Constitution's lack of a Bill of Rights.

Accordingly, the first 10 amendments were adopted soon after the original Constitution became effective. We'll discuss the Bill of Rights in the next editorial in this series.

Climate for Surrender

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, one of our colleagues, GORDON H. SCHERER, of Ohio, made an outstanding speech before the annual meeting of the Cincinnati Club on Tuesday, November 28, 1961, entitled "Climate for Surrender." This is a factual description of the problems which face our country in combating the inroads of communism based on Mr. SCHERER's experence as a member of the Un-American Activities Committee of the House.

Every Member of Congress is aware of the threat of communism and I am convinced is determined to do everything possible to prevent it overthrowing our priceless liberties and freedoms. I am sure that reading this outstanding address we will all renew our fight against the spread of this godless ideology and do whatever is possible for our country's protection. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the address, as follows:

CLIMATE FOR SURRENDER

(Address by GORDON H. SCHERER, Member of Congress, Ohio, at the annual meeting of the Cincinnati Club, November 28, 1961)

Not many people longer deny that we are engaged in a life or death struggle for survival with the international Communist apparatus. We cannot hope to prevail in this struggle unless all Americans in every field of endeavor are absolutely convinced beyond any peradventure of a doubt that we are not engaged in a popularity contest with a competing economic system; that we are not faced merely with certain annoying adjustments which should be made so that we may coexist with a different system of government; but that we are now in a death grip with an enemy the like of which for debasement and inhumanity the world has never before experienced—an enemy we can ignore, appease, negotiate with, only at the expense of our survival.

This is the challenge of our day to all patriots of this Republic. We must accept this challenge. We shall either dedicate ourselves to it or, like the countries already behind the Iron Curtain, face slavery and eventual destruction.

I mention patriots with some misgivings since today there is a fast-growing, cynical segment of the populace which scoffs at and scorns any mention of patriotism. To them patriotism is old fashioned. To them any show of reverence or respect for the flag is a display of childish emotionalism unless it happens to be the banner of the United Nations. To them Americanism is not even secondary to "one-worldism." To them the American heritage and basic constitutional rights should be chipped away when welfare statism or political expediency demands.

In a recent issue of Reader's Digest, Dr. Max Rafferty, a school superintendent, asked what has happened to patriotism. Let me plagiarize just a few paragraphs from Dr. Rafferty to illustrate the change that has taken place. He reminds us that over 100 years ago our country was engaged in a strange sort of undeclared war against the forces of despotism, as it is now. A young man only 21 years old volunteered to go behind enemy lines to collect information. He was captured and tried as a spy. Surrounded by the jeering foe, cut off beyond all hope of rescue, the rope already knotted around his bare throat, he broke his steadfast silence. His words echo down the corridors of time to us today, ringing and magnificent. He said: "I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country."

A little over a year ago another young American went on trial for his life in Soviet Russia. The country for which Nathan Hale died had grown now to glorious life and wonderful reality—the last best hope for man on earth. What do we hear this young man say: "I didn't know what I was doing. I know now I was risking world peace. My superiors were responsible."

Some will say that Gary Powers was the victim of new Communist brainwashing techniques, but what about Irvin C. Scarbeck, a trusted employee of the U.S. Embassy in Warsaw, recently convicted, who gave his country's secrets to the enemy because he was afraid some harm might come to his mistress?

What about Bernon Mitchell and William Martin, two brilliant young mathematicians in our top security agency, from fine American homes, educated in our best universities? They defected to the Soviet Union last year and disclosed to the enemy that the United States had broken the Kremlin's secret code. On television and radio in the Soviet Union they bitterly condemned the United States, thus giving the Communists a tremendous propaganda victory in the cold war.

What about the men in the National Security Agency who approved these men for employment and top security clearance when they knew that at least one of them had been the worst type of sex deviate, thus making him easily subject to blackmail by the agents of the Kremlin?

You can understand such approval when it is determined, as it was just last week by the Committee on Un-American Activities, that Maurice H. Klein, who was personnel officer and later Assistant Director of the National Security Agency, in violation of the law, changed the information in his own personnel file. On one form he said his mother was born in Russia; on another, that she was born in the United States. Klein claimed to be a graduate of Harvard Law School when actually he attended Harvard only 1 year. When called before our committee, he denied he substituted records in his file. Such substitution has now been proved, and his testimony just the other day was referred by our committee to the Justice Department for possible perjury prosecution.

Let's consider another so-called brilliant young American, one Edward Yellin, who graduated from one of our leading universities. He went to work as a colonizer for the Communist Party. Now what's a Communist colonizer? It is a person who misrepresents his educational attainments by downgrading them in order that he may obtain a menial job in an industrial plant. As an example a person with a master's degree claims only 2 years of high school on his job application. He hides his Communist connections from both his employer and his fellow employees on the assembly line. He then surreptitiously attempts to indoctrinate his fellow workers and, following Communist directives, stirs up strife and dissension in the plant.

Yellin was before the Committee on Un-American Activities in Gary, Ind., in 1958. He defied the committee and refused to answer questions about his activities as a colonizer for the Communist apparatus. He was tried and convicted in the Federal court for contempt of Congress.

Now the National Science Foundation has been set up by your Government primarily in the interests of national defense—and note I say in the interests of national defense—to advance scientific study and research in this country. After his conviction, while his case was on appeal and while a graduate student at the University of Illinois, Yellin made application for a National Science Foundation fellowship to continue his studies at the University of Illinois. Believe it or not, he was given one from taxpayers' money.

Professors at the University of Illinois who knew about his conviction and activities in behalf of the Communist Party and who recommended Yellin for the fellowship were strangely silent in their recommendations about Yellin's Communist background and his conviction. On the other hand, this Government foundation—again, believe it or not—made no inquiry concerning Yellin's character and background except as to his proficiency as a scientist.

You would have been nauseated as I was to listen to those in the National Science Foundation who approved the award. They said in substance that they were interested only in Yellin's ability and suitability as a scientist; that some scientists were a different breed of cats than the rest of us and that they would not give the Government the benefit of their scientific knowledge and research if we inquired too closely into their backgrounds and political beliefs.

If you think this is an isolated case, let us take a look at one or two others. Lee Lorch started off at the University of Cincinnati some years ago. True, Lorch was a brilliant mathematician—but also an identified, hard-core Communist. He was fired from three universities. He also subsequently received a grant from the National Science Foundation.

One of the great universities in this country—some people refer to it as one of the more liberal—received from the Federal Treasury over a 3-year period $277,000 for scientific research projects. These projects were requested by and were under the supervision and direction of a professor who, when before our committee just a few weeks ago, invoked the fifth amendment in refusing to answer questions concerning his membership in the Communist Party.

I don't want what I have said to be considered an indictment of our colleges or the young people of this country because I am talking about a small minority. Yet just 10 years ago there were way too many young men who sold out their fellow American soldiers and licked the boots of the brutal Chinese and North Korean invaders and made tape recordings praising communism. Although a minority, there are still too many phony sophisticates who, as Dr. Rafferty says, clutter up our colleges and agitate against our ROTC, parade in support of Fidel Castro, and riot against congressional investigating committees. Whether we like it or not, it is our fault. We have been so busy educating for what we call life adjustment that we have forgotten to educate for survival. We have in effect taught by precept and example that it is better to be Red than dead.

Too many of our leaders in education, in the clergy, and in government, who are the vocal proponents of appeasement, not only themselves ignore but hide from our youth that eternal challenge proposed by Patrick

Henry to his fellow Virginians when he said: "Is life so dear and peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?"

What can we expect when some of these leaders, including the President of the United States, oppose, as insulting, loyalty oaths for students who want money from their Government to further their education? Why do they oppose loyalty oaths in this specific instance when they so readily sanction every public official from dogcatcher to President taking an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States? The antiloyalty oath crowd does not consider it insulting to compel a boy who is drafted into the armed services to swear allegiance to the United States and to swear to defend it against all enemies, foreign and domestic, with his life if need be.

Somehow we hear no complaint from these so-called liberals when a person joining the church of his choice is required to most solemnly swear adherence to the tenets of that particular religious faith. They still feel that it is perfectly proper when two persons are united in wedlock, in a most sacred ceremony to take vows of dedication and loyalty to each other.

Does it not seem passing strange that this great furor has arisen over the swearing of loyalty to this great country of ours and disclaiming Communist Party membership when a student is asking for something from his Government and not inquiring as to what he can do for it?

Today we are rapidly losing this struggle with international communism simply because our spiritual and moral fiber has been eroding. Our love for, our dedicated service to, and our fervent faith in, the power, goodness, and destiny of this great constitutional republic—in other words, our patriotism—is slowly dying.

We have been gradually softened and brainwashed into believing that the faith of our fathers in the strength, in the principles, in the purpose, and in the destiny of this Nation and its Constitution, which have brought us through crisis after crisis in our long history and which have made us the light and hope of a chaotic world, are no longer adequate weapons in our present struggle for survival.

I am going to recount a few of the things we have done recently during this struggle which are difficult to believe and then be a little presumptuous and tell you why, in my opinion, we have followed such a course.

One of the most effective weapons used against us in this cold war has been the intensive, massive, and vicious Communist propaganda assault on the free world, including the United States. Our Committee on Un-American Activities, after exhaustive hearings, established that some 13 million pieces of Communist propaganda were coming into this country each year through the U.S. mails alone. I wish I had time to tell you about it and its effect, but that is a subject for another speech.

Most of this material is delivered to the addressees but, under an Attorney General's ruling during the Roosevelt administration, the Post Office was able to hold up a part of this poison which arrived at our shores in bulk, unsolicited, and unlabeled as political propaganda as intended by the 1938 Foreign Agents Registration Act. Of course, the Communist news media complained bitterly and the leftwing in this country cried censorship.

Lo and behold, on April 25, we were shocked beyond belief when the President reversed the Attorney General's opinion and allowed this unsolicited, unlabeled Communist propaganda to flood this country. Since this Presidential order, do you know that the volume of this stuff has increased 130 percent?

Next let us look at the Communist agricultural system which has failed miserably. This is where the Soviets and Red Chinese are hurting most. So what do we do? We permit the shipment of taxpayer-subsidized agricultural products to the Soviet Union. Thus we allow more Russian farmers to go to work in their missile plants. Whether some people admit it or not, we are at war with international communism. In a war you even sink the ships of neutrals that are trying to deliver essential commodities to the enemy.

But it is not only agricultural products that we are now sending to the Soviet Union. Believe it or not, strategic materials are now finding their way into Communist ports at an appalling rate. Don't we ever learn? American scrap iron went to the Japanese for dollars and was returned to us in the bodies of American boys. We have been sending planes and other war materiel to Tito for years. Now we are sending jets and training Communist pilots at Air Force fields in Texas. The excuse is that Tito is feuding with Khrushchev. Look at what Tito and Nehru did to us in the U.N. and at the recent conference of the so-called neutrals at Belgrade. We have our differences fairly regularly with McMillan and De Gaulle, but, if the shooting starts—when the chips are down—England and France will be in our corner and Tito's United States-made jets will be flying side by side with Khrushchev's MIGs.

The 81 Communist Parties of the world, meeting in Moscow, who are always leading peace offensives and supporting so-called sane nuclear policies, cheered when Russia rocked the world with its 50-megaton nuclear bomb. Among them was Comrade Harry Winston the U.S. Communist Party organizational secretary, who was recently released from prison. Winston was one of the 11 Communists convicted for advocating the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence. Yes, Winston was released, given a U.S. passport, went to Moscow and began to plot against us again.

About the same time, as a friendly gesture to the peace-loving Khrushchev, Bobby Kennedy ordered the release of two Russian spies. More recently he ordered the dismissal of spy charges against Igor Y. Melekh, a Soviet staff member of the United Nations. He was allowed to return to the U.S.S.R. It is a wonder we did not give him a medal before shipping out.

Is there any reason why, when our relations with the Soviet Union have reached such a low point that we have had to call up thousands of American boys, we should relax security checks on appointees to high Government positions? Derogatory information in FBI and other intelligence reports have been ignored. More than 200 persons have been cleared through Executive waivers.

We even granted a passport to Owen Lattimore for a so-called study trip to Outer Mongolia. Lattimore, as you know, has been named by the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security as a conscious, articulate instrument of the Soviet conspiracy. Since Lattimore's visit, Outer Mongolia, a stooge of the Soviet Union if there ever was one—in fact, a part of the Soviet Union—has been admitted to the United Nations. Not counting the Iron Curtain satellites, the Soviet Union already has three votes in the United Nations to our one. Outer Mongolia will give it four.

We, of course, will be paying Mongolia's dues to the U.N., the same as we are doing today for dozens of other tincup countries who have defaulted in the amount of $44,777,541. Included in this list of delinquents is the Soviet Union which owes the kitty more than $30 million. Although there are 101 nations and tribes now U.N. members, the United States with one vote pays 38 percent of the total freight. Since we are also carrying the load for those who won't cough up, we are over the 50 percent mark.

Now all of us have heard of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, who some years ago was in charge of the development of the atomic and hydrogen bombs. The Atomic Energy Commission, after exhaustive hearings, threw him out and denied him security clearance. The hearings established beyond any peradventure of a doubt that he had been identified as a Communist; that both his wife and his mistress were Communists as well as his brother; that he was a regular contributor to Communist causes; and that he lied to security officers when questioned about his activities in connection therewith. Oppenheimer even admitted at his hearing that he had lied in this respect.

Oppenheimer just reecently was appointed as a representative of the Organization of American States as a roving professor in Latin America. It is no secret that all of Latin America is the object of Communist infiltration and subversion. Since we pay 66 percent of the operating costs of OAS, Oppenheimer had to have the nod of our State Department for this highly sensitive job.

And speaking of the State Department, the Lord knows that if there ever was a spot where the most capable and experienced man available is needed, it is at the head of the State Department's Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs. Now who is appointed? None other than one Anthony Bontempo. Now, Bontempo is a loyal American. However, he has absolutely no background or experience whatsoever in security matters.

Even the New York Times, in reporting his appointment, said:

"As commissioner of conservation for the State of New Jersey, Bontempo put some 80,000 miles on the speedometer of his State car in pursuit of proper utilization of the State's natural resources. He has led the drive to reclaim and develop the Jersey meadowlands. He has initiated plans for a wholesale food market and spearheaded a drive for regional planning."

These might be excellent qualifications for a director of parks and playgrounds but, when we are engaged in a cold war in which our security is the focal point of attack, such an appointment is a farce. The St. Louis Globe-Democrat calls the appointment preposterous.

FRANCIS E. WALTER, one of the top Democrats of the House, complained not only of Bontempo but also of his assistant appointed at the same time, one Michael Cieplinski, who, if my information is correct, has been a citizen only 12 years.

WALTER said they were "totally unqualified political appointeees." He felt so strongly that he introduced legislation to try to stop the appointments.

Henry J. Taylor, the well-known columnist for the Scripps-Howard newspapers, in his column entitled "Letdown in Security," said that, as a result of the appointments, "the State Department is being rocked by a disgraceful and alarming blow to our Nation's security." Taylor continued:

"Incredible as it may seem in the face of Soviet espionage, the word has gone out—as it did in the days of Alger Hiss—that internal security problems are 'tut-tut, never mind.' To confirm that 'tut-tut' signal the dismissal of the 25 experts * * * was accompanied by placing in charge a pair of political hacks."

Taylor concluded:

"But these political hacks have the backing of Chester Bowles in a scandalous, self-serving move to butter up the leftwing of his party. Bowles is leading their organized playing-down of the Communist problem here at home. In its innocence our public may not believe such a liquidating movement is afoot under the banner of liberalism.

But it is, and Bowles is doing his part in the place he can do it as Undersecretary of State."

I don't have time, but I could take you down a long list of almost equally bad appointments.

I have referred to the meeting of the Communist Parties in Moscow a few weeks ago. The same 81 Communist Parties from throughout the world met there in December of last year. They decided it was necessary to make an all-out attack on anti-Communist organizations and persons, particularly in the United States, if the Communist program of infiltration and subversion was to continue to go forward.

It was almost uncanny but within a few weeks there began in the liberal press and magazines here in the United States a simultaneous, sinister, and often vicious attack on practically all the well-known anti-Communist movements in this country. A recent report of the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security entitled "The New Drive Against the Anti-Communist Program" is alarming. It deals in great detail with this assault. I only wish there were time to talk about it.

At the height of this anti-Communist campaign there appeared a new book entitled "The Un-Americans," by Frank Donner. This is a vitriolic, libelous, and vicious attack on the Committee on Un-American Activities. Of course, this committee has always been under attack. But the campaign of vilification and for abolition of this committee has been stepped up as part of the all-out anti-Communist drive in the United States.

Leftwing writers like Gore Vidal, who by the way was a guest at a gay White House party a few days ago, have been praising this book. They call its author, Frank Donner, a brilliant constitutional lawyer, in an attempt to give the book prestige. It is significant that Vidal and his other leftwing cronies conceal the fact that Frank Donner has been an identified Communist; that he has a long, well-documented record of service to Communist causes; that as a top employee of the U.S. Government in the early days of the National Labor Relations Board, he was a member of a Communist cell comprised solely of Government officials in the NLRB. They met regularly to discuss National Labor Relations Board policy in the light of Communist Party directives.

Do I hear someone ask: "How is it possible, SCHERER, for these things to happen?"

I have a theory about this. Let's see whether you agree with me.

At the outset, let me state as plainly and as forcibly as I can that, in expounding this theory, I am not accusing anyone of being disloyal or even having sinister motives.

Today we have in the top echelons of this Government, the likes of Stevenson, Bowles, Jimmy Roosevelt, Schlesinger, Fulbright, and Galbraith. Their whole record over the years indicates that they are soft on communism; that they believe there is no substantial threat to our security from internal subversion; that the anti-Communists and congressional investigating committees exaggerate the menace; that they do more harm than good.

The ego of these liberals and leftists is such that they look down on the rest of us; they feel that, because of their superior intellect—FULBRIGHT is an example—they and perhaps they alone have the key to the solution of the world's tensions. In fact, they have a phobia that they can reform and make good little boys out of the murderer of the Ukraine, the butcher of Hungary, the enslavers of Tibet and the masters of 800 million captive people now behind the Iron Curtain. They indicate that, if left alone by the super-patriots, the military, and the rightwing rabble in the Congress, they can, through the application of their special and superior talents, negotiate a settlement of the cold war tensions with the despots of the Kremlin.

Ever since January 20 these boys have been running the ship of state. We had many just like them in Foggy Bottom during the Eisenhower administration. Most of them are still there.

They have decided that, in order to negotiate a settlement with the international Communist apparatus, it is necessary to create a favorable climate or atmosphere in which to move and operate. They feel that such a climate cannot be obtained unless certain irritants emanating from this country which are plaguing the Communists are removed.

The London Times of a few months ago put its finger on this approach. It said: "President Kennedy was told by his advisers even before taking office that it was felt the Soviet Union was in an accommodating mood. The record shows that this conclusion was accepted and was a belief that the cold war could be terminated within the lifetime of the Kennedy administration," the London Times concluded.

If this analysis of the administration strategy is correct, then you have a charitable answer to the almost unbelievable and heretofore unexplainable actions which I have been discussing. There is another example which I think proves this theory to be true.

In 1958 the National Security Council, after long and careful deliberation, decided that, while our men in the Armed Forces were trained and familiar with military weapons, they, like the general public, were unaware of the new, sinister, and diabolical weapon of modern psychological warfare, namely, subversion and infiltration; that they were not fully aware that it was largely by the use of this new weapon that international communism in the short space of a few years had been able to successfully dominate and control one-third of the land mass of the world and one-third of its people.

The military was, therefore, directed to acquaint our men and the civilian population through anti-Communist seminars with the various facets of this new, dangerous, and effective weapon which is being so successfully used against us at this very moment. Since the President is the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, and since the military is more directly under the control of the top leadership of this country than any other agency of Government, it can be readily seen that, if there is to be created a favorable climate, free of irritants to the Soviets, it is necessary first to put a stop to these anti-Communist speeches and seminars by the military.

In these seminars all of the ugly and heinous tactics and objectives of the amoral, atheistic, Communist apparatus were being exposed to the cold light of common day. These, like the revelations of congressional investigating committees, were truly irritants to the boys of the Kremlin and certainly not conducive to the favorable climate or atmosphere which the appeasers were trying to create.

It is obvious therefore that General Walker who was doing the most effective job right under the noses of the Communists had to be silenced. It should be obvious now that the reasons given by the top echelon for the Walker reprimand and transfer were not the real reasons.

While we reprimand and remove from his command a great patriot like General Walker, the Air Force provides a plane to enable Dr. Vera Micheles Dean, a controversial leftwinger, to lecture at the Air Force School in Montgomery, Ala. She came to this country from her native Russia in 1919. Her activities are described in the publication "Plan Talk" as follows:

"Behind the perfect front afforded by the esteemed Foreign Policy Association, Mrs. Dean has been sending forth an unending stream of propaganda, intermingled with genuine information, that is calculated to strengthen the position of the Soviet Union in pursuing all its aims, regardless of their nature and their effect upon the interests of world peace and the United States."

We have been looking at some of the seemingly unbelievable things that have been happening inside this country. Let's take a squint at some of the thinking that prevails in the conduct of our foreign policy. I will give you a typical example. It just happened a few days ago.

Katanga Province is the most prosperous, orderly, and economically stable government in the otherwise incredibly uneducated and turbulent Congo. Above all, Katanga is the only pro-Western and anti-Communist province of this tormented former Belgian colony.

The Katanganese want no part of the pro-Communist, central Congo government and its shocking, mutiny-prone, atrocity-guilty, riffraff army.

Yet last week Adlai Stevenson deserted Britain and France and voted with the Kremlin in demanding that the Kantanganese cease forthwith in trying to set up their own government, apart from the pro-Communist Congo central government; that the United Nations use armed force if necessary to make the Katanganese deport all foreign mercenaries, Belgians—military, paramilitary, technical, political, and economic advisers.

Why do we do this, especially when we have supported independence and a seat in the United Nations for every other aggregation of tribes unprepared for self-government? How far will we go to appease Khrushchev in order to get him to negotiate in Berlin? Keep this up and the administration is going to force more people into the right-wing camp which it detests.

How often do we have to be tricked and deceived before we are willing to recognize the true nature and objectives of world communism? Like Hitler, the Communists have given us a blueprint of their strategy and objectives. They have said and they have written that there can no more be sincere diplomacy than there can be dry water. It is also written so that all who read may know that, to accomplish Communist objectives, any and every conceivable type of promise, treachery, deceit, espionage, sabotage, abduction, and murder is to be used. Even if it were not so written, the Bible says, "By their acts, ye shall know them."

The Soviets in their drive for world domination have entered into more than 1,000 treaties, agreements, and nonaggression pacts with other countries of the world. They have flagrantly broken and violated all of these except a handful which it has suited their purpose to keep.

The spirit of Camp David which the world hailed has become the ghost of calumny. At Paris Eisenhower and the United States were insulted, humiliated and vilified as never before. In Vienna Kennedy was ignominiously spanked and given his orders. In the United Nations Khrushchev threw his weight around like a bully and got away with it. The Kremlin's pipsqueak stooge, Fidel Castro, has kicked us around and humiliated us as never before in our long history. The so-called neutral nations a few weeks ago at Belgrade, nations to whom we have poured out billions in aid to buy their friendship, licked Khrushchev's boots and gave the United States an insulting cold shoulder.

For 2 years at the disarmament and nuclear test ban talks at Geneva, we negotiated like suckers while the Soviets never had any intention of arriving at agreements. They

continued these fraudulent negotiations solely for the purpose of enabling them to obtain a nuclear advantage.

I won't even talk about Berlin.

Haven't we had enough? Haven't we learned that you cannot appease or negotiate with the Communists? Don't we know that the Soviets practice the salami-type of aggression? They take slice after slice, but each one so thin that it is not worth fighting for and then all that is left is the string and, of course, who would fight for a string?

I can hear the leftwing scream: "SCHERER is a warmonger." No, but the only way to prevent war and to avoid eventual domination by international communism is to call the Soviets' bluff—to draw the line and say: "This far and no farther," and mean it and by our actions and deeds let the Soviets know we mean it. They will not start an all-out nuclear war. They will not risk the almost total destruction of their cities when they have come so far in the short space of 40 years by internal subversion or indirect aggression.

If they had not learned the lesson of success by subversion or indirect aggression before, they certainly learned it in Cuba. If the Soviets had sought to take Cuba by outward aggression, by force of arms, in the air, on land, or by sea, they would have failed miserably because we would have moved in with everything we had. Yet today Havana—90 miles from our shore—is as Communist-dominated and controlled as are Moscow and Peiping. The Soviets did it without the loss of a man. They took Cuba intact. They did not need to destroy physically the Cubans or their possessions. They have taken their people and their possessions and have put them to use.

The weapon we must fear most and learn to combat is indirect aggression or internal subversion and infiltration. This is really what the General Walkers are trying to do. This is what we all must do if we are to survive.

What Do You Know About the World of Communism—Part 5

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, this is a continuation of the original article "What Do You Know About the World of Communism":

KHRUSHCHEV GIVES HIS DEFINITION OF CO-EXISTENCE

Keeping this definition in mind and remembering the astounding record of Soviet aggression, hypocrisy and intimidation, Kremlin talk of "coexistence" may be evaluated for what it is, pure propaganda. Here is a typical Khrushchev statement on "peaceful coexistence":

"What, then, is the policy of peaceful coexistence? In its simplest expression it signifies the repudiation of war as a means of solving controversial issues. However, this does not cover the entire concept of peaceful coexistence. Apart from the commitment to nonaggression, it also presupposes an obligation on the part of all states to desist from violating each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty in any form and under any pretext whatsoever.

"The principle of peaceful coexistence signifies a renunciation of interference in the internal affairs of other countries with the object of altering their system of government or mode of life or for any other motives. The doctrine of peaceful coexistence also presupposes that political and economic relations between countries are to be based upon complete equality of the parties concerned, and on mutual benefit."

How does the Communist Party differ from the traditional American political party?

The Communist Party (CPUSA) differs from, let us say, the Democratic Party or the Republican Party in the United States in at least five fundamental ways:

1. Ideologically: All party members are required to subscribe to a specific ideology called Marxism-Leninism. Deviation, however slight, from the official party line is not tolerated. Total dedication and absolute obedience is demanded of each and every member. While we may say that both the Republican and Democratic Parties have "philosophies of Government," neither has an absolute ideology to which all members must subscribe without question.

2. Organizationally: As we have seen, the Communist Party is a tightly organized structure like a pyramid with every subordinate organization directly responsible to the next higher echelon. In this sense, it resembles an army: The party secretary-general is the commanding general, regional district chairmen are like colonels in charge of regiments, state chairmen are company commanders, the Communist Party cells are the platoons which fight the party's battles on the ground, in factories, schools, government offices, and in our Armed Forces.

No such formal, strict organization is maintained by our traditional political parties.

3. In terms of responsibilities of members: To be a member of the Republican or the Democratic Party is one thing, to be a member of the Communist Party is quite another. Most Republicans and Democrats have never in their whole life attended a meeting of their party and most have not contributed a cent to the party campaign. Members of the CPUSA are required to attend party meetings regularly, are required to pay monthly dues to support the party, are, like doctors, on duty 24 hours a day.

4. With respect to goals and methods: The Communist Party does not respect God, private property, liberty, law, our Constitution, or any of the other great traditions of America. With the Communist Party any strategy—legal or illegal, fair or foul—if it serves the ends of world communism is perfectly all right. In a very real sense, the Communist Party is un-American.

5. On the matter of location of final authority: Final authority or control in the traditional American political parties rests with the great American political leaders and with the parties' national committee and in the last resort, with Congress and the American people themselves. Final authority and control in the case of the CPUSA comes from outside of America.

It is in the hands of individuals who are not even Americans—final authority rests with the Kremlin. This is why the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that members of the Communist Party of the United States must register with the Department of Justice as agents of a foreign power.

What has our Government done to check communism in America?

The U.S. Government has sought to deal with the Communist threat within America in four ways: (1) investigation, (2) exposure and public enlightenment, (3) control legislation, (4) prosecution.

Investigation: By far the most extensive and efficient agency of investigation is the Federal Bureau of Investigation. One of its several responsibilities is to discover and keep track of subversives, including Communists. Its record in the field is unexcelled. Its agents are trained professionals, responsible Americans who know their business.

J. Edgar Hoover underlines the point when he says to Americans:

"Don't try to do any investigating yourself. The innocent must be protected as well as the guilty identified. That is the job for the professional investigator. Hysteria, witch hunts, and vigilantes weaken our internal security."

Exposure and public enlightenment: The record of the House of Representatives Un-American Activities Committee has been attacked by a number of thoughtful, patriotic Americans who charge that in its zeal to alert the American public to the very real Communist danger, the committee sometimes has damaged the reputation of innocent Americans.

At the same time, it should be stressed that certain of that committee's staff studies on the Communist threat to America are excellent and helpful in revealing the Communist's tactics of infiltration, deception, and subversion. Responsible investigation is essential, but it alone will not do the job. Responsible public education is also essential.

WHITEHEAD IN "FBI STORY"—BOOK URGES INTELLECTUALS INTO STRUGGLE

Don Whitehead in his book, "The FBI Story," put the issue very well when he said:

"The top command of the FBI have no illusions that communism can be destroyed in the United States by the investigation, prosecution, and conviction of Communist Party leaders who conspire to overthrow the Government by force and violence. That is merely one phase of the job to be done in a worldwide struggle.

"The FBI knows that the bigger job lies with the free world's intellectuals—the philosophers, the thinkers wherever they may be, the professors and scientists and scholars and students. These people who think, the intellectuals if you please, are the ones who can and must convince men that communism is evil.

"The world's intellectuals themselves must see that communism is the deadliest enemy that intellectualism and liberalism ever had. They must be as willing to dedicate themselves to this cause as the Communists have been to dedicate themselves to their cause."

Control legislation: Legislation on the books under which Communist members of the Communist Party may be prosecuted is as follows:

Smith Act of 1940: The Smith Act appears to be aimed primarily at the individual (Communist). The act prohibits anyone from willfully advocating the overthrow of the Government by force and violence, or from publishing any literature advocating such overthrow. The act also prohibits anyone from organizing a group which advocates the overthrow of the Government by force and violence, or from being a member of such group with knowledge of the group's intent.

Internal Security Act of 1950: This act appears to be aimed at the Communist organization itself. The act establishes the Subversive Activities Control Board and empowers it to hold hearings to determine whether an organization is a "Communist action" organization.

If a group is determined to be a "Communist action" organization, that is, an organization which has been determined to be under the control of the world Communist movement, it must register with the Attorney General within 30 days after it becomes such an organization or is declared such an organization. Under the 1961 Supreme Court decision, the Communist Party had until November 11, 1961, to register as an organization. If the organization failed to register it became the duty of its

executive officers to register for it. This was to have been done within 10 days after failure of the party to register.

MEMBERS OF PARTY MUST REGISTER EVEN IF LEADERS DON'T

If neither the party nor its officers registered then it was incumbent upon each individual member of the party to register. Under the recent court decision, this must have been done by December 20, 1961. Failure of the party to register subjects it to a fine of $10,000 per day for each day of failure to register. Failure of the officers or members to register subjects them to a fine of $10,000 per day or 5 years in jail per day.

The Communist Party must also file with the Attorney General an annual report setting forth complete membership, financial records, source of funds and expenditures. The party must label all its publications and must acknowledge sponsorship of all radio and TV time.

The act also prohibits party members from applying for or using a passport or from working in a defense industry.

The last also provides for the registration of Communist "front" groups and provides similar requirements. Further it contains provisions for prosecution of individuals guilty of espionage, sabotage or obstruction of justice. It also contains provisions by which the Immigration Service can exclude or deport certain aliens, such as those who advocate the overthrow of the Government by force and violence.

CONTROL MEASURE REAFFIRMS INTERNAL SECURITY ACT OF 1950

Communist Control Act of 1954. This act is primarily a reaffirmation of the Internal Security Act of 1950. It does not however, take away certain privileges and immunities which the Communist Party formerly enjoyed, such as the right to hold office, receive various permits and licenses, and to receive tax exemptions.

This act, as it amends the Internal Security Act of 1950, also gives the National Labor Relations Board the right to deny representation to a Communist infiltrated labor union.

Prosecution: In July of 1948, 12 top, first-string leaders of the Communist Party of the United States were indicted in New York on violation of the Smith Act. The trial began in January 1949 and with the exception of the chairman of the organization, William Z. Foster, 11 of those Communist Party leaders were found guilty.

The sentence of one was reduced in view of his World War II record. The others were each fined $5,000 and sentenced to 5 years in a Federal penitentiary. Their conviction was subsequently upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court. Four of them went into hiding. Two were later caught and given additional years in prison for contempt of court. The other two later surrendered.

In June of 1951, 17 "second string" leaders of the American Communist Party were indicted in New York and arrested.

Again four of them went into hiding to avoid arrest. With the exception of two, all were convicted and given varying sentences.

PATTERN OF RED PROSECUTION REPEATED AT THE STATE LEVEL

This pattern was repeated at the State level. For example, in July of 1951, 12 leaders of the Communist Party in California were arrested. Also in 1951, the Communist leaders in Baltimore, Pittsburgh and Honolulu were indicted and arrested. In 1953, the same for St. Louis, Detroit, and Seattle, and in 1954, in Philadelphia, Illinois, and Connecticut. The effect was, as intended, to weaken seriously the Communist conspiracy in America.

The Supreme Court decision of 1961 places an additional weapon in the hand of our law enforcement agencies.

The issue is before us. The danger is clear and present. We see that the problem is international, national and local. The solution, likewise, must be projected at all levels. The question remains: What can we do individually—right now?

Here is a positive program for suggested steps toward combating communism while improving America:

1. Take your work more seriously: Whatever you do, do it the very best you know how. Don't be satisfied with less than the best from yourself. A lazy, what-does-it-matter attitude is the sure path to defeat. A dedicated Communist can always whip a lazy or careless American. A Communist, however dedicated, is no match for an American ready and willing to do his best.

2. Rededicate your life to positive values: The world is divided into those who build and those who destroy. If you attend a church or synagogue, try to get there more often than just at Christmas, Easter or Yom Kippur. If you don't attend church, then live by the values in which you really believe, by what you know is right. These are the things that have made America strong, and they are what will keep us free.

3. Learn all you can about communism: Know your enemy. Learn to recognize Communist lies for what they are. Be able to defend your own country and the free world against the false charges made by the right or left extremists. Don't let yourself become a victim of either clever Communists or misinformed ultrapatriots. Become, rather, an informed, dedicated, responsible patriot. Read more. Think more. Act more—intelligently.

4. Take a new look at your own country: Stop taking freedom and plenty for granted. Count your many blessings. Remember, literally millions of people throughout the world are suffering starvation or slavery—or both. We are the lucky ones. But our freedom and plenty are no accidents. They have been forged out of faith, wisdom, vision and hard work.

Our fortunate present is the product of the blood, sweat, and tears of the millions of Americans of the recent past.

5. Work for a better America: Don't let prejudice, cheating, petty crime, and discrimination grow around while you sit silently by. It is our business. It's every American's business. Stand up for what our Constitution guarantees. Stand up for what you believe. Speak up for our American way of life. Above all, be sure your own hands are clean.

7. Organize for America: In your clubs, unions or other groups, don't permit Communists, pro-Communists or other undemocratic elements of the left or right to take over. Organize for America. Vote. Make your voice heard. Participate.

Ice Age National Scientific Preserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of January 14, 1962, on the proposed Ice Age National Scientific Preserve. The proposed ice age preserve will be made up of segments of the 500-mile-long record of glaciation located within the State of Wisconsin, and will provide recreation for thousands of visitors from other States:

ICE AGE PRESERVE

There are, of course, grander vistas of scenery and more dramatic arenas of wildlife ecology, but in few places did the great glaciers that landscaped so much of North America leave more interesting and legible tracks than in Wisconsin. There the remaining unspoiled areas—with their kames and eskers and kettles and drumlins and lakes—are relatively small, noncontiguous, dispersed and generally ringed or flanked by towns, farms, roads, and other developments. It is impossible to visualize them as a national park in the classic pattern of a Yellowstone, Yosemite, Great Smokies, or Everglades. Still, they ought to be preserved, as Representative HENRY S. REUSS has pointed out.

Not all the places of high scientific or scenic value that deserve national recognition can be fitted into the classic park pattern. Some new formulas will have to be found. Perhaps the proposed Ice Age National Scientific Preserve, which Mr. REUSS is sponsoring, is one of them. It would not be a national park, with all the restrictions (such as prohibition against hunting) that apply to national parks. While there would be Federal-State sharing of acquisition costs because the area is of national interest, the land, in noncontiguous sections, would be held and largely administered by the State and local governments. This is a new formula and an ingenious one.

New Way To Expand a Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, one of my distinguished constituents, Lawrence M. C. Smith, Esq., a man of many interests and chairman of the Board of Trade and Conventions of the city of Philadelphia, has developed a new way to expand a farm. He rented a farm from an old-time farmer; then he hired his landlord to work for him. This has resulted in a profitable arrangement for both parties.

The article is so interesting that I submit it for examination by my colleagues:

NEW WAY TO EXPAND A FARM

Suppose you need both help and land, and are hemmed in by older neighbors on social security who don't want to move off the home place. How do you expand into an economical unit?

L. M. C. Smith, Cumberland County, Maine, is solving the dilemma by offering his neighbors a chance to lease their small farms to him, then operate as part of his beef breeding and feeding setup.

"We need to raise and sell 80 beef animals every year to make our home place pay out," says Smith, who is expanding both his Angus cow-calf herd and his feeding operation. "But to do this, we need more feed than we can grow on our 250 acres of cropland."

Smith has 45 cows and figures he needs 90. He'll keep the cows and the 80 feeders at home, but he needs extra help and feed to over-winter the weaned calves. That's how he hit on the idea of teaming up with his older neighbors. He's currently trying out the idea with Horace Mann, age 71.

Mann works on Smith's farm summer months and collects wages up to the allowable limit for persons drawing full social security benefits. Since there's no limit on

income from rents under social security, Mann also rents his 60-acre farm to Smith, and during the winter, keeps 30 or more of Smith's calves on his place.

"It's working out well for me," says Mann, whose summer hours are 7:30 to 4. "I wouldn't be happy if I weren't working and I make out better than if I were going it alone."

Besides the rent and summer wages, Smith offers anyone who feeds his calves a bonus based on half the gain the calves make.

Here's how the bonus idea works: Suppose the calves gain 10,000 pounds during the winter, and the market price on May 1 when the calves are weighed is 30 cents. Half the gain would be worth $1,500, and if the rent came to less than that, the farmer-landowner who overwinters the calves gets paid the difference. If the value of half the gains falls below the rent figure, the farmer still collects the basic rent agreed on.

The calves at Mann's haven't yielded a bonus the last two winters so the two men plan to add oats to their all-forage ration. If it works, they'll probably grow oats for grain next year.

Smith and Mann have a 10-year contract, currently in its third year. Both like the arrangement.

"I don't have as many worries and I live better," says Mann.

Smith looks at it this way: "We hire younger men for the heavy work, but it's hard to find young men with the special interest, experience and sense of responsibility that it takes to raise and feed cattle," he says. "If the wage-rent-bonus idea continues to work out well, we're hoping to interest more neighbors in our feeding and breeding operation. These older farmers know the land, the climate and the cattle. It's in the contract that I'll supply the management, but Mann's judgment is often better than mine."

Smith retails a lot of his beef as cutup frozen halves and quarters right at the farm. He and his wife use the name of their place, Wolf's Neck Farm, as a brand name for their home-grown, grass-finished beef.

"Maine consumes about $140 million worth of beef, but it produces only about $8 million worth," says Smith. "That's why we think there's a real opportunity to expand."

To make more money and to make his setup attractive to older men, Smith has completely mechanized both his feeding and harvesting operations.

He cuts hay, silage and green chop with a flail harvester. Conveyor wagons dump the silage and green chop into fence-line bunks, and the chopped hay is self-fed through built-in stanchion feeders in the barn. He zero-pastures—has only three 5-acre exercise pastures—and green-chops up until November 1.

"We harvest up to 60 percent more feed than we could by grazing," says Smith. "We don't have to fence fields and we're more flexible—can change crops or feeding rations any time we need to."

To fix up Mann's barn for self-feeding, Smith rebuilt the sides of the haymow with feeders. He also put in drying ducts and a portable 48-inch fan.

Before he blows in the chopped hay, Smith drapes the feeding stanchions with old plastic silo covers so the forced air can't escape out the sides. He also spreads several hundred square feet of discarded black plastic on the ground near the big fan's intake to "let the sun help heat the air going in."

A dial thermometer on a long pointed rod keeps tab on hay temperatures. "We worry about feed loss whenever the needle goes over 85 degrees," says Smith. "Some day, we hope to work out a heat exchanger to dry hay with the heat that builds up inside."

Besides getting in 300 tons of chopped hay, Smith puts up 150 to 200 tons of silage in a season. This year, he's storing the silage in stacks under nylon-reinforced plastic.

Smith doesn't drive over the silage to pack it. Instead, he lets it settle, covers it with the plastic and seals the edges by filling a shallow trench around the outside. Then he inserts a regular household vacuum cleaner hose under the seal and draws out air and gases for several days.

"With the air pulled out, the silage really packs down under its own weight," says Smith. "I got the idea from an English farmer. The first year, we ran the vacuum cleaner continually for 2 days, but we found that it needs fewer repairs if we run it 2 or 3 hours at a stretch, then let it cool. The silage keeps just as well, too."

A scientist friend of Smith figured out that his vacuum packing is equal to standing a 144-pound man on each square foot of stack surface.

Smith finishes out his own cattle, mostly on homegrown hay and silage. He cooperates with the Maine Experiment Station in a production testing program. They weigh his young stuff twice a year and he weighs cows and feeders three times annually.

"We started out with some beef animals that did well on grain, but they didn't measure up when we went almost entirely to our homegrown hay and silage," says Smith. "Now, we think we're building a herd that gains and finishes especially well on roughage."

"We take a dim view of anything that doesn't weigh 450 pounds at 8 months," adds James Mann, who is Horace Mann's son and works full-time as Smith's farm manager. "Any 3-year-old heifer that doesn't reach 1,000 pounds on our hay and silage doesn't stay in the cow herd. Some of the culls do real well on grain, but that's not what we're production-testing for."

Smith believes that up-to-date farming methods can make Maine a topnotch beef State, since land is fairly cheap and grows good hay crops. "New ways to harvest, store, and feed roughage roll back the climate limitations we used to have," he says. "And farming with the neighbors looks like a good way to make use of our own talent and resources without a big outlay of capital."

Proposed New Executive Power Over Tariffs, and Barriers to Greater Free World Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, in his State of the Union message, the President requested broad new Executive power over tariffs.

The Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress, held hearings December 4–14 on the world trade policy of the United States and on the need for forging closer ties among the industrialized nations of the free world.

Following the conclusion of the hearings, a joint statement was issued by the gentleman from Missouri [THOMAS B. CURTIS], and myself; and in it we expressed some preliminary views and discussed some of the major barriers to greater free world unity.

We concluded that the area of public discussion of these matters must be broadened, and that the administration's program, as outlined to date, tends to focus attention on only one problem among the many related problems which confront the United States in the task of forging greater unity among the industrialized free nations.

Among problems which we believe deserve more urgent and higher priorities are these:

First. The need for vigorous action by the United States toward formation of a new alliance of free nations outside the framework of the United Nations.

Second. The need for a more equitable sharing of the burdens of the common defense against Communist imperialism.

Third. The present lack of a unified free nations policy respecting trade with the Soviet Union, Communist China, and the Communist satellite nations.

Fourth. The persistent and dangerous deficit in the U.S. balance of payments.

Fifth. Rigid protectionism by the United States and Western Europe in agriculture and energy resources.

Sixth. The need for Western Europe to accept a greater share of the increasing industrial output of Japan and other lowest-wage countries.

Seventh. The need for the United States and Western Europe to agree on the provision of adequate markets for the products of the developing nations of Latin America and Africa.

Eighth. The need for improvement in the competitive position of American industry in world markets.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the statement to which I have referred be printed following these remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with four editorials commenting on the statement, which have appeared in the Connecticut press.

There being no objection, the statement and the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S REQUEST FOR BROADER EXECUTIVE POWER OVER TARIFFS: ISSUES AND VIEWS

(By U.S. Senator PRESCOTT BUSH, Republican, of Connecticut, ranking minority member of the Joint Economic Committee and Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri, ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy)

The President's announced determination to forge closer links between the United States and the nations of Western Europe merits the approval of all Americans. Certainly, we of the Republican Party are fully aware of the importance of a greater degree of unity and agreement upon common purposes in the free world. We are pleased therefore that the present administration is continuing the efforts made by the previous administration to achieve these ends.

Indeed, we believe the present administration may have set its sights too low. Has not the time now come to work vigorously to form a "Concert of Free Nations" within which all other freedom-loving friendly countries and the United States may work in harmony to counter the challenge of the

Soviet Union, Communist China and the Communist bloc satellites? Now is the time, we believe, to press for the formation of such an alliance. Freed of the frustrations which beset the free world in the United Nations, it could accomplish much toward winning the cold war.

We do not recommend abandonment of the United Nations, but it is painfully evident that it is an ineffective instrument for achieving the objectives America shares with Western Europe. As a forum in which tensions between the East and West may be relieved, or in which the newly developing nations may voice their aspirations, the U.N. may continue to serve a useful purpose. We share, however, the views expressed by John J. McCloy (the President's disarmament adviser), Senator FULBRIGHT, and others that a new alliance of free nations is needed to meet the challenge of world communism which the U.N. Assembly majority has evaded.

As a start toward formation of such an alliance, we urge the administration to seek to expand the framework of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization so as to provide for closer ties between them and free nations outside the Atlantic Community.

The NATO Treaty provides, in article 2, that members "will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any and all of them." Here without further ado or legislation, we already have the authority and foundation for wide economic negotiation and collaboration. The administration should press for full implementation of this provision.

The issues involved in the administration's vaguely outlined proposals that Congress give to the President new broad and sweeping power to negotiate tariff reductions are of such gravity that partisanship centered on domestic political considerations must be rigidly excluded. These issues must be fully explored. It would be extremely unfortunate if the debate on extension or revision of the Trade Agreements Act were to be conducted in the black-and-white terms of "free trade versus protectionism." We deplore the tendency, already evident in some quarters, to picture those who refuse to accept blindly proposals which the administration itself has yet to specify as advocates of retreating to a "Fortress America," allegedly cowering behind exclusionary tariff walls.

Major questions raised by the subcommittee's hearings include:

1. Is it necessary at this time to give the President broad new powers to negotiate tariff reductions with the European Economic Community (Common Market)?

2. Can increased exports solve the U.S. balance of payments problem?

3. Will American industry's ability to compete really be increased by mutual across-the-board tariff reductions by the United States and the Common Market?

4. Will Western Europe accept increased imports from Japan and other low-wage countries?

5. Can the United States and Western Europe agree on a mutual program to provide adequate markets for the products of the developing tropical countries—in Latin America and Africa?

6. Are the United States and Western Europe presently prepared to press for free trade in agriculture and in energy resources?

7. Can and will Western Europe and the United States agree on a joint policy respecting trade with Communist bloc nations?

8. Will a "trade and life adjustment" program, as hinted in vague terms by the administration, be effective in relieving the admitted hardships forced by tariff cuts?

These questions need to be fully answered. Certainly they cannot be swept under the rug in the "great debate" which will inevitably result from the administration's request.

ONE-SIDED HEARINGS PROTESTED

The procedures followed by the majority of the Joint Economic Committee in conducting the recent study are scarcely suited to a great debate or great issues. We have no criticism of the papers which were commissioned by the subcommittee's chairman and published as Joint Committee prints. On the contrary, they contain much valuable material and constitute for the most part scholarly contributions to the discussion of the matters under consideration.

Of great and fundamental concern, however, was the one-sided nature of the hearings which were conducted by the subcommittee over a period of 9 days, December 4 to 14. There is substantial circumstantial evidence that the hearings were deliberately and hastily staged as a propaganda springboard for the administration's program. With one exception, all of the witnesses who testified represented a single point of view in support of the administration's request for broadened executive power under the Trade Agreements Act.

We object moreover to the failure of Under Secretary of State George W. Ball and a parade of other administration spokesmen to disclose to the subcommittee details of the legislative proposals under consideration, and to have ready the type of information which the subcommittee and the public must have before sound judgments can be made. A colloquy between Senator PELL, a member of the majority of this subcommittee, and the Under Secretary of Labor, W. Willard Wirtz, on the vitally important subjects of potential unemployment effects of lowering tariffs and so-called trade adjustment proposals illustrates the present lack of information. A brief quotation from the record suffices to reveal the inability of Mr. Wirtz to produce basic information to which the subcommittee is clearly entitled.

"Senator PELL. Another question is in connection with trade adjustment, on page 11 of your testimony. I was wondering if you would give us some thought, some idea as to your views as to what specifics—I note you say that we shall discuss it at a more appropriate moment.

"What more proper moment could there be than this?

"Mr. WIRTZ. After there has been an indication of the position of the administration through a source which I am not in a position to command * * *. The President has not spelled out his position in any detail. * * *

"Senator PELL. To us—at least to me—it makes it much more difficult discussing the whole program when we really do not know what the whole program is we are discussing.

"Mr. WIRTZ. That is correct."

The ranking minority member of the full committee, Senator BUSH, recognized this problem at the outset of the hearings, and requested that the subcommittee delay the writing of a report until the complete details of the administration's proposals were known and were considered by the subcommittee. This request was ignored, and the chairman announced to the press at the close of the hearings that he intended to submit a report early in January. This announced decision to proceed with a report and, presumably, recommendations, before the evidence is all in, is the basic reason for this statement of views and issues.

We now proceed to discuss questions which must be answered before the Congress can legislate intelligently in response to the administration's request.

IS IT NECESSARY AT THIS TIME TO GIVE THE PRESIDENT BROAD POWERS TO NEGOTIATE TARIFF REDUCTIONS WITH THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY?

Much of the testimony centered upon the alleged "necessity" of giving to the President broad new powers (although not specifically defined) to negotiate tariff reductions on or before the expiration of the present legislation next June. It was argued that this new authority is urgently needed because of the emerging of the European Economic Community (Common Market) and of its possible expansion at some later date to include the United Kingdom and perhaps other members of the European Free Trade Association (Outer Seven).

No clear or convincing case was made for urgency.

There is first of all considerable uncertainty about the timetable by which the Common Market countries will progress toward an agreement on a common external tariff for manufactured goods, and even greater uncertainty about their progress in arriving at a common agricultural policy. This uncertainty is compounded by the United Kingdom's recent application to join, which raises a whole set of new, difficult, and complicated problems.

As was observed in one of the study papers submitted to the subcommittee ("The European Economic Community and the United States" by Robert R. Bowie and Theodore Geiger):

"Just how far and how fast the integration of the Six would proceed without the addition of the United Kingdom and other members of EFTA is today extremely difficult to predict, and their addition makes prediction the more hazardous."

It should be noted further, as was disclosed in the hearings, that under existing authority, representatives of the President already have been negotiating with the Common Market. The last day of scheduled hearings by this subcommitte was indeed suddenly canceled because the President had dispatched to Brussels the Under Secretary of Agriculture, Charles S. Murphy, in an effort to resolve difficulties flowing from a reported Common Market decision to exclude trade in agricultural commodities from the U.S.-Common Market negotiations which have been underway for many months.

Moreover, the President's existing power for bargaining with the nations of Western Europe is not limited to bargaining on tariffs. Rather than be confined to the narrow scope of tariff discussions, the President can invoke, as we have recommended, article 2 of the NATO Treaty and call upon our fellow members of NATO (which includes all the Common Market countries and the UK) to join the United States in discussions aimed at elimination of "conflict in their international economic policies." In such a forum, tariff matters could be placed in proper focus alongside the enormous contributions America has made and is making to the peace and security of the world, and to Western Europe in particular.

Would it not be appropriate for the United States to call attention to the great progress already made in lowering our tariffs, and that these reductions have in many cases been made without our receiving an adequate quid pro quo?

In this connection, consider the testimony of Theodore V. Houser, Chairman of the Research and Policy Committee of the Committee for Economic Development:

"Most other developed countries have more numerous and discriminatory quotas and other trade restrictions than has the United States, and the new regional arrangements in Europe are introducing futher discrimination against the United States.

"For these reasons, as well as because of the balance-of-payments situation, it is appropriate that other countries should move faster and further in trade liberalization."

Would it not be reasonable to say to the nations of Western Europe, and particularly to those to whom we have given billions in Marshall plan aid for the rebuilding of their industrial plants: Give us a breathing spell until you lower your tariffs to the level of ours?

Tariffs and other trade restrictions could be considered in such a forum as one of the many interrelated problems which must be solved before closer unity in the Atlantic community can be achieved.

The Bowie-Geiger study paper to which we have previously referred suggests the complexity and urgency of these issues by listing five basic tasks which face the Atlantic nations as follows:

"First, they must assure the security of the non-Communist world through military strength and deterrence.

"Second, they must foster economic growth, independence, and viable societies in the less developed regions.

"Third, they must work out a common approach for their political and economic relations with the Communist bloc.

"Fourth, they must enhace the vitality of their own societies and economies in order to provide the resources for carrying on these tasks.

"Above all, in order to perform them, the Atlantic nations must develop political ties and institutions adequate to insure unity of purpose and effort."

To these should be added the task of finding a satisfactory relationship between the Atlantic nations and industrialized Japan which will ensure the achievement of a maximum common contribution in the struggle against Communist imperialism in the Orient as well as in other world regions.

Considering the wide range of problems to be solved in the successful accomplishment of these tasks, and in reaching agreement on a fair distribution among free nations of the burdens which necessarily will be involved, the tariff problem does not appear to have the overriding importance which the administration places upon it. The tariff question might well yield first priority and be deferred until substantially greater progress has been made toward solutions of these related basic problems.

WILL INCREASED U.S. EXPORTS SOLVE THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS PROBLEM?

An underlying assumption of the administration's determination to request new tariff-cutting authority for the President appears to be a belief that an expansion of U.S. exports will solve this country's balance-of-payments difficulties.

The validity of such an assumption is open to serious question.

The United States has for many years enjoyed a favorable balance of trade on merchandise exports and imports. In the latest year for which full figures are available, 1960, merchandise exports totaled $19.4 billion, and merchandise imports $14.7 billion, resulting in a favorable balance of $4.7 billion. We also enjoyed a favorable balance on nonmilitary services, receipts from these items totaling $7.6 billion against payments for similar items of $5.6 billion (including U.S. tourism, $1.7 billion), a gain of $2 billion.

These plus items, totaling $6.7 billion in the aggregate, were more than offset, however, by deficit items of which those of major importance were U.S. military expenditures abroad, $3 billion; U.S. Government grants and credits (foreign aid), $3.4 billion; U.S. (private) direct and portfolio investment abroad, $2.5 billion, and an increase of $1.3 billion in U.S. private short-term assets abroad.

The net result in 1960 was a deficit in our balance of payments of $3.8 billion. In 1958 and 1959, the United States incurred deficits of $3.5 billion and $3.9 billion, respectively, and the December 1961, issue of "Economic Indicators" reports that the deficit is running at a seasonally adjusted annual rate of $3.4 billion.

Is there any reasonable prospect that any reductions that could be expected or hoped for in the external tariffs of the Common Market will result in an expansion of U.S. exports sufficiently large to close a "deficit gap" which in recent years has ranged between $3.5 and $4 billion?

Consider in this connection the testimony of Dr. Henry C. Wallich, former member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers and a member of the economics faculty of Yale University, who has specialized in balance-of-payments problems.

Dr. Wallich advised the subcommittee that as the U.S. gross national product expands, imports increase at a faster rate than exports.

He testified as follows:

"I would guess that if this economy were run at its full potential—if one can put it that way—by 1963 we might get well over $600 billion GNP—maybe $620 billion. That means $100 billion GNP above now. For each billion GNP typically in a cyclical advance, we add some $40 million of imports. That means for $100 billion, we will add something like $4 billion of imports. Now, this will be offset by some rise in exports—if we buy more others will buy more from us—and typically our exports have gone up by something like $1 billion a year. So, over 2 years, to 1963, maybe we would gain $2 billion in exports. That still would leave an increase in the balance-of-payments deficit, if nothing were done about it, of $2 billion."

We share the administration's desire that the economy achieve its full potential as quickly as possible, although we may disagree over methods to achieve that goal. We question, however, whether the President's advisers have fully comprehended the balance-of-payments effects of an increase in the GNP, as outlined by Dr. Wallich, in advocating a sweeping reduction in tariffs by this country. For tariff reductions, obviously, would increase imports even more rapidly than the normal expansion of imports to be anticipated from a rise in GNP.

Accordingly, we believe there are ample grounds for skepticism concerning the administration's apparent assumption that a mutual reduction of tariffs with the Common Market will result in a sufficient expansion of U.S. exports to make a significant contribution to closing the deficit gap in our balance of payments. We believe that more fundamental solutions are needed, including a more equitable sharing of the costs of the common defense among the United States, the nations of Western Europe, Japan, and other free nations.

We suggest that prudence dictates that the administration make more strenuous efforts along such lines to close the balance-of-payments gap before it embarks upon a tariff-cutting course which would widen it.

WILL MUTUAL TARIFF REDUCTIONS BY THE UNITED STATES AND THE COMMON MARKET INCREASE AMERICAN INDUSTRY'S ABILITY TO COMPETE IN WESTERN EUROPE?

Another assumption evident during the hearings was that tariff reductions by the United States, in exchange for comparable reductions by the Common Market, would increase American industry's ability to compete in Western Europe. This requires searching examination.

There are grounds for believing that American industries have established branch plants in Western Europe for other reasons than to get behind the Common Market external tariff wall before it is erected. These include a desire to get close to a booming market, to achieve greater efficiency in sales and service, to eliminate some costs such as ocean freight, and to reduce other costs, notably labor.

In connection with the latter point, a comparison between average wage rates in manufacturing industries in the United States and those paid by competitive industrialized nations provides food for reflection. In 1960, our manufacturing industries paid on the average, $2.29 an hour, in comparison with $1.02 in Sweden, $0.90 in the United Kingdom (adult males only), $0.70 in Switzerland, $0.63 in West Germany, $0.44 in Austria, $0.43 in France, $0.37 in Italy, and $0.29 in Japan (including salaried employees and family allowances).

We are familiar with the argument of economists that wage differentials are in themselves unimportant and that what counts is the difference between unit labor costs. We agree that in the United States there are some industries that turn out goods which can compete in any and all markets to which they are permitted access and that among these are industries which pay wages above the U.S. average.

We question, however, whether economic theory has kept pace with the reality of the rapid modernization of plant and equipment in Western Europe and Japan which enables certain industries in these nations, paying far lower wages than are prevalent here, to mass produce goods as efficiently as can their American competitors.

Additionally, we question the fond hope expressed by some of the witnesses that wage rates in the nations of our industrial competitors will rise sufficiently rapidly and sufficiently high to eliminate the disparity before it can seriously harm American industries and the workers they employ. U.S. wage rates will be rising also.

The validity of the academic theory is made suspect by the fact that the nations of Western Europe do not accept it for themselves. Faced with competition from lower-wage Japan, they impose outright quantitative restrictions—quotas, to use a blunt, unpopular word—against Japanese goods.

This was brought out in a colloquy between Senator BUSH and Jerome B. Cohen, dean of graduate studies, the Bernard Baruch School of Public Administration, New York City, which appears in the record as follows:

"Senator BUSH. Mr. Chairman, I want to go back to * * * the question of * * * discrimination is because the Japanese, be- European Common Market people.

"Now isn't it true that the basis of their discriminatios is because the Japanese, because the low-wage costs, and the big wage differential between Japan and these countries—they compete very severely with this particular Common Market that is trying to build itself up? Isn't that the basic reason there for the exclusion of Japanese goods?

"Mr. COHEN. We had a session in New York a week ago—the Committee for Economic Development is making a study of Japan and U.S. economic relations * * * there were about 15 European businessmen and European officials participating in this session. This was one of the questions that came up: Why is it that there is this discrimination in Europe? And one of the man points that each one in turn as we went around the table—Sweden, Italy, Germany, and so on—was the wage question—the fact that they felt that Japan was a lower-wage country, and therefore that they could not effectively compete. This undoubtedly is one of the largest factors in the European attitude toward Japanese goods."

It should be noted that the disparity between Japanese industrial wages and those prevailing in the countries of Western Europe is in many cases less than that be-

tween U.S. wage rates and the wage rates of the Common Market countries and the United Kingdom.

This fact raises the unpleasant and difficult question: If restrictive measures are necessary to protect labor in Western Europe against the lower wage rates in Japan, may they not also be necessary to protect American labor against the lower wage rates of Western Europe as well as of Japan?

We conclude that tariff reductions by the United States, in exchange for comparable reductions in the external tariff of the Common Market, will have little significant effect in increasing the ability of American industry to compete in Western European market. We believe, for reasons more fully discussed in the next section of this report, that such reductions, if not carefully controlled, may have a seriously damaging effect upon American industry's ability to compete in domestic markets.

More fundamental solutions to the competitive problem must be sought.

In this connection, we have noted President Kennedy's admonitions to management and labor to hold prices and costs in restraint, in his speeches before the National Association of Manufacturers and the AFL–CIO convention.

We wish the President had laid even greater stress upon the necessity of achieving a more equitable distribution of productivity gains—in lower prices to consumers, in wage increases attributable to increased labor productivity, and in profits for industry which may be used to improve the competitive position of plant and equipment.

In view of the AFL–CIO's curt rejection of the President's appeal for voluntary restraint in collective bargaining, and its adoption of a resolution calling for still higher wages and shorter hours, we believe the administration faces a major task in creating here at home better public understanding of America's competitive position in the world and of the necessity of improving it.

We believe further that the administration must advance beyond the limited tax incentives to new investment in plant and equipment which it has proposed, and move boldly toward a major reform in tax policy to enable American manufacturing industry, with its higher wage scales, to compete more effectively in world markets. The evidence seems clear that the rapid economic growth of Western Germany and other Common Market countries is attributable in large measure to liberal depreciation and other tax policies which encourage free enterprise to invest heavily in plant modernization.

WILL WESTERN EUROPE ACCEPT A GREATER SHARE OF EXPORTS FROM JAPAN AND OTHER LOW-WAGE COUNTRIES?

In the preceding section, we have recorded the wage differentials which exist between Japan, the nations of Western Europe, and the United States, and have referred to the discriminatory restrictions against Japanese products which have been imposed by the Common Market countries and other Western European nations.

These facts raise a fundamental problem.

The United States follows the most-favored-nation doctrine in its international trade relations. This means that the lowest tariff we grant to any one country is automatically extended to all countries with which we have trade relations.

Thus, if the United States reduces tariffs to the Common Market by as much as 50 percent, as the administration reportedly intends to propose, then we will automatically reduce our tariffs by 50 percent to Japan, Hong Kong, India, Pakistan, and other low-wage countries which are intent upon increasing industrial production.

During the hearings, testimony was received that Japan hopes to almost treble her exports to the United States in the present decade, increasing shipments from their 1960 total of $1.1 billion to $2.8 billion a year by 1970.

Whether the United States can absorb such an increased volume of Japanese imports without serious dislocations in the domestic economy is open to question, but more fundamentally important is whether Western Europe can and will agree to open its markets to Japan and the other low-wage countries.

In this connection we call attention to one of the recommendations of Prof. Warren S. Hunsberger, of the Johns Hopkins University, an expert on United States-Japanese relations, who testified before the subcommittee as follows:

"The U.S. Government should support Japan's reasonable demands for acceptance and status among the leading powers, where Japan belongs and can contribute a great deal. The United States should continue to support Japan's efforts to remove the discrimination against Japan which 15 countries now engage in by invoking Article 35 of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The United States should also support Japan's request for admittance to full membership in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development."

While the industrial output of other oriental low-wage countries has not yet reached the volume of Japan's, it is growing. The nations of the West should begin to consider how markets can be found for the goods produced by these countries, and how their output can be used to strengthen rather than weaken the free world.

We believe the United States should vigorously exercise leadership in this area, and that a solution to the problem of markets for the products of low-wage countries might well take precedence over negotiations for mutual tariff reductions by the United States and the Common Market.

Unless a sound solution is found before such negotiations are concluded, the U.S. most-favored-nations policy of extending tariff reductions to all countries with whom we have trade relations, including the low-wage nations of the Orient, might create serious dislocations in domestic markets.

CAN THE UNITED STATES AND WESTERN EUROPE AGREE ON A PROGRAM TO PROVIDE ADEQUATE MARKETS FOR THE PRODUCTS OF DEVELOPING TROPICAL COUNTRIES—IN LATIN AMERICA AND AFRICA?

Comparable to the problem facing the Atlantic community in dealing with the expanding industrial output of Japan and other oriental low-wage countries is that of providing adequate markets for the expanding output of the developing countries of Latin America and Africa.

In the development of the Common Market, special and substantial preferences were made for tropical products exported from the former French and Belgian possessions in Africa and a few other former colonies of member nations.

The application to join the Common Market by Great Britain raises many complications in this connection. New Zealand, Australia, and Canada now enjoy free entry into the British market for their important agricultural products—butter, lamb, and cheese in the case of New Zealand; wheat, meat and butter in the case of Australia, and wheat in the case of Canada.

The difficulties arising were succinctly summarized in the Bowie-Geiger study paper to which we have previously referred:

"If the British were simply to join the Community, leaving the Commonwealth and the remaining oversea possessions outside, a serious problem would be created for the countries which are heavily dependent upon exporting tropical products to the British market. For the British would have not only to deny these imports of tropical products the preferences they now enjoy in the British market; they would also have to subject the tropical exports of the colonies and Commonwealth members to the common external tariff, which gives a substantial preference to competing products from French Africa. (For example, the common external tariff for coffee is now 16 percent, for cocoa 9 percent, and for bananas 20 percent.) This is recognized on all sides as an unreasonable and unacceptable result."

After discussing ways in which the United Kingdom and the Common Market might seek a solution, the Bowie-Geiger paper goes on to underscore the interest of Latin America and other areas in this problem in these words:

"Countries outside the Commonwealth and the Community are vitally interested in the way this problem is worked out. The Latin American countries, and with them the United States, have an obvious concern about the extension of preferences in the continental European market to their competitors in Africa and the Caribbean for such products as coffee, sugar and bananas. Southeast Asia is also concerned. The dependence of these countries on exports of tropical products is no less than that of the British colonies and the Commonwealth members. Thus we see again the interest of the rest of the free world in a liberal solution."

Here again, we believe the administration should press vigorously for a sound solution of this problem before it proceeds to enter discussions with the Common Market which are narrowly confined to tariff reductions on industrial goods.

ARE THE UNITED STATES AND WESTERN EUROPE PREPARED TO PRESS FOR FREER TRADE IN AGRICULTURE AND IN ENERGY RESOURCES?

It is a curious anomaly that the most ardent advocates of free or freer trade in industrial goods turn a blind eye toward the rigid protectionism that the United States and virtually all other nations practice in the field of agriculture. If pressed, they concede that it is discriminatory against industry and industrial workers to move toward freer trade in this field without moving in the same direction in agriculture. But, it is argued, the agricultural problem is so difficult, so complicated—and so political—that it must be brushed aside.

We refuse to accept such a defeatist argument, and insist that simple justice to American manufacturing industry and to its working men and women demands that progress toward solving the agricultural problem go hand-in-hand with any further steps toward tariff reductions on industrial goods.

The U.S. Government heavily subsidizes agricultural production. We heavily subsidize agricultural exports, by direct cash payments as well as by the foreign aid shipments involved in the Public Law 480 program. And to protect artificially high domestic farm prices, we impose rigid prohibitions against the importation of agricultural products from abroad.

How heavily American agriculture is dependent upon export subsidies is revealed in figures supplied by the Department of Agriculture. For the period July, 1954, through June, 1961, Government-financed programs supported $9.5 billion out of a total of $28.5 billion in agricultural exports. In that period the total agricultural exports "outside specified Government-financed programs" of $19 billion include many products subsidized domestically. Additionally, many transactions not directly financed by Government receive governmental assistance in the form of (1) extension of credit for relatively short periods, (2) sales of Government-owned commodities at less than domestic prices, or (3) export payments in cash or kind.

It is clear that American industry and American industrial workers contribute a

substantial portion of the taxes they pay to subsidize agricultural exports, in addition to subsidizing domestic farm prices at artificially high levels.

A striking example of how American agricultural policy increases the competitive disadvantage of American industry lies in our treatment of cotton exports. Because of high domestic price supports, the United States sells cotton to foreign textile manufacturers for 8½ cents a pound less than domestic manufacturers must pay.

We note that a tentative step by the administration toward elimination of this inequity by imposing an import tax sufficient to wipe out the competitive advantage thus gained by foreign manufacturers has encountered strong protests in Japan.

Like the United States, the nations of Western Europe practice a high degree of protectionism in agriculture. The Common Market is encountering difficulties in working out a common agricultural policy, and these difficulties will be increased as negotiations for the entry of the United Kingdom are undertaken.

But, if this were a perfect world in which free trade were permitted to have full rein, it would appear that the mutual agricultural problems of the United States and Western Europe could be rationally solved.

U.S. agriculture is highly efficient, the most efficient in the world. In contrast, the main problem of European agriculture is not so much chronic overproduction as in the United States, but poverty and inefficiency.

If free trade theory were followed to its logical conclusion, the United States should cease to provide subsidies to its highly efficient agricultural economy, and let American farm products compete in world markets without Government support. Our rigid prohibitions against imports of such products as Argentine beef or Australian mutton which can be produced more efficiently and at lower prices elsewhere, should be removed, with resultant benefit to the American consumer. Europe should open her markets to the farm surpluses of the United States and other efficient agricultural producers.

We recognize that such a shift to free trade in agriculture by the United States and Europe would require radical readjustments and a drastic alteration of past Government policies. We are fully aware that it would take many years to accomplish.

We believe, however, that at least a modest start in that direction must be made if a move toward freer trade in industrial goods is to be made palatable to American industry and the workers it employs.

At a minimum, we believe the administration must reverse its policy of higher and higher domestic farm price supports, which have already added $1.2 billion a year to the agricultural subsidy program, now over $6 billion annually.

Additionally, an attempt to work out a rational free world agricultural policy should be placed high on the list of priorities for discussion at a conference of Atlantic Community nations, such as we have suggested take place under article 2 of the NATO Treaty.

Similarly, we believe the United States and Western Europe must reexamine the rigid protectionism which is practiced in the field of energy resources.

The United States is the world's most efficient, highly automated producer of coal. American coal can be landed on the shores of Europe at prices lower than it can be produced by European mines. Yet European countries impose quantitative restrictions and other discriminations against American coal.

This country has imposed quotas on imports of petroleum products, especially residual fuel oils. These have adversely affected our relations with other nations, particularly in Latin America, and have had an adverse effect upon competitive costs of industry on the eastern seaboard.

Should not the United States and Western Europe move toward freer trade in such areas before rushing into a program of tariff reductions confined largely to industrial goods?

CAN AND WILL THE UNITED STATES AND WESTERN EUROPE AGREE ON A JOINT POLICY RESPECTING TRADE WITH COMMUNIST BLOC NATIONS?

A major source of friction between the United States and our Western European allies arises from the lack of a joint policy respecting trade with the Soviet Union, Communist China, and the Communist satellite nations.

The Soviet Union has undertaken—and with considerable success—an aggressive economic offensive which is designed to divide the industrial countries and to win the developing countries.

A major objective is to strengthen and accelerate the Soviet economy. From the West, the Russians import strategic equipment, entire plants, and technological competence which they find difficult to provide from their domestic resources.

In payment, the Communists supply mostly raw materials and commodities, frequently at prices well below world markets. In so doing, they achieve a second objective—the disruption of the normal flow of raw materials within the free world and the creation of maladjustments in price structures.

Additionally, much of Soviet trade has a political rather than an economic motive, and this is especially noticeable in its dealings with the developing nations whom they hope to convert to the Communist system. Communist goods and equipment shipped to the newly emerging nations are accompanied by "technicians" whose function, we suspect, is as much political as it is technical.

Drift and indecision have characterized the Western response to this Soviet offensive. The nations of Western Europe in some cases have looked upon trade with the Communist bloc as an extension of the normal commercial trading relations they enjoy among themselves, whereas in reality they are dealing with monopolistic state trading organizations which are ready at any time to subordinate economic to political considerations.

There has been a progressive erosion of allied controls over the shipment of strategic materials to the Communist bloc nations. The United States has a much stricter definition of what materials are "strategic" than have our allies, a fact which gives rise to divisive disputes.

We believe there is urgent need for the United States to make a determined effort to obtain a coordinated economic policy toward the Communist bloc nations. Such a joint policy should include: (1) effective multilateral controls on the shipment of strategic goods and the extension of export credits which tend to strengthen the bloc's military and industrial power base; (2) agreement on the method by which the West should control the flow of technological advances and knowledge to the bloc, and the amount of such information which should be passed on; (3) provisions to control the disruptions and dislocations caused by the "dumping" of Russian commodity and raw material supplies upon world markets; and (4) protection of the economies of the developing nations from the danger of Communist bloc trade and aid penetration designed to create politically motivated dependence on bloc markets and supplies.

Again, we believe that broadly based discussions under the aegis of article 2 of the NATO Treaty which encourages member nations to "seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies" and to "encourage economic collaboration" among them provide a better method of approaching this problem than do discussions between the United States and the Common Market which are limited to the narrow field of tariff reductions on commercial goods.

If coordinated, the economic power of the United States and her allies of the West and Japan is so great as to play a decisive part in the cold war. We urge the administration to spare no effort in achieving the required coordination.

WILL A "TRADE AND LIFE ADJUSTMENT" PROGRAM BE EFFECTIVE IN RELIEVING THE ADMITTED HARDSHIPS FORCED BY TARIFF CUTS?

Advocates of across-the-board tariff reductions by the United States in order to persuade the Common Market to make comparable reductions concede that hardships would inevitably result. Industries vulnerable to import competition would suffer financially; for some, bankruptcy would be the consequence. Thousands upon thousands of men and women employed in such industries would lose their jobs. Entire communities which are dependent upon a single industry which cannot meet import competition would face the prospect of becoming ghost towns. All these disasters would result, the freer trade advocates concede, and accordingly they recommend government intervention with a "trade and life adjustment" program of which the details have yet to be specified.

Internal domestic competition within the United States, the exhaustion of resources, changing consumer tastes, technological advances—all these and other factors have resulted in hardships, both corporate and individual. For example, New England experienced an extremely difficult transition period following the migration of its textile industry to the South because of lower cost factors, notably the lower wage rates prevailing in Southern States. Over a 20–30 year period, New England replaced the vanished textile industry with electronics and other new technologies, but in the meantime the cost in human suffering was great and there was little Government could do to relieve the hardships.

Other examples which come readily to mind are the demise of the buggy whip industry with the advent of the automobile; the ghost mining towns of the Western States, West Virginia and Pennsylvania; the displacement of the steam locomotive by the diesel engine, and of harvested natural ice by mechanical refrigeration, etc.

There is a key difference, however, between these adjustment problems and those proposed to be created by a new program of tariff reductions on commercial goods. In the latter case, the hardships will be inflicted by direct and deliberate discriminatory action of the Government. This indeed seems cruel and callous.

It should be noted that what is proposed is the reversal of a traditional governmental policy. As the author of one of the papers submitted to the subcommittee ("U.S. Commercial Policy: A Program for the 1960's" by Peter B. Kenen, associate professor of economics, Columbia University) has written:

"From the birth of the present program, the State Department and White House have been obliged to promise that the United States would never knowingly cause injury to any American enterprise by granting tariff concessions to other countries, and that, in the event of inadvertent injury, would take remedial action. This pledge was prominent even in President Roosevelt's 1934 message to Congress proposing the trade agreements program; it was repeated again and again * * *"

Now it is proposed that tariff reductions be made regardless of the injury to industries and the workers for whom they provide jobs. It is said, as Kenen puts it, that the United States must recognize "the need to do injury."

To salve the wounds caused by reckless tariff cutting, it is proposed to enact a new Federal aid program of trade and life adjustment. While details of such a program are thus far shrouded in obscurity, the broad outlines appear to encompass Federal loans or tax advantages to enable factories to convert to lines of production not immediately affected by imports, a Federal dole to the workers made jobless by import competition, plus allowances for retraining them for some other form of economic activity and, possibly, moving expenses to enable jobless workers to move their families to other, more favorable economic areas.

A similar program was proposed by David J. McDonald, president of the United Steel Workers, in 1953–54, when President Eisenhower's Commission on Foreign Economic Policy (the Randall Commission) and the Congress had a prior revision of the Trade Agreements Act under consideration. It was rejected, both by the Commission and by the Congress. The policy then adopted, and followed since, was one of gradual, selective, and reciprocal tariff reductions, within limits set by the Congress, and retention of the "peril point" and "escape" clauses as safeguards. The "peril point" was intended to provide a method by which the Tariff Commission could set floors beneath which tariff concessions could not safely be made, and the "escape clause" a way in which the Commission and the President could rectify serious injury.

Whether these safeguards have worked as effectively as intended has been questioned by some. Others have contended they are too restrictive upon State Department negotiators when tariff discussions are undertaken under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

While this is a matter of controversy, what seems indisputable is that our present policy, embodying both safeguards, has permitted a substantial expansion in both U.S. exports and imports.

In 1953, our merchandise exports (excluding mutual security program shipments) totaled $12.4 billion; by 1960 they had grown to $19.6 billion, and in 1961 are expected to exceed $20 billion. Merchandise imports in 1953 were $11 billion, by 1960 they had risen to $14.6 billion and in 1961 are expected to reach approximately the same level as last year.

Surely, a trade policy which has permitted such a significant expansion of both exports and imports and has resulted in such a favorable balance on the merchandise account should not be lightly discarded. The burden of proof rests heavily on those who advocate an untested, unproven "trade and life adjustment" program as a substitute.

During the hearings, several witnesses testified that the problem of adjustments to tariff reductions might not be as great as might be supposed. In support of this view, they pointed to the experience of the Common Market countries. Although dislocations had been anticipated, it was said, little use had been made of special funds created to deal with unemployment, to retrain laid-off workers and to help finance industry conversion programs.

This may be true, but it should be noted that internal tariff reductions in the Common Market were made at a time of booming prosperity in which conditions of full employment generally prevailed. Indeed, in some of the member nations there was overemployment, evidenced by large scale importations of laborers. Can the Common Market experience, therefore, be accepted as a guide for policy in the United States where serious unemployment exists at a level exceeding 6 percent of the labor force?

An additional ground for skepticism is the statement in one of the study papers submitted to the subcommittee ("Trade Adjustment in Theory and Practice" by Otto R. Reischer) that "application of readaptation measures in some instances have been less than effective because some of the national governments as well as industrial interests involved in the European Coal and Steel Community, for example, have, in effect, sabotaged directives of the high authority. The European experience, at least up to now, would not seem to be a good basis for judging the efficacy of a trade adjustment program in the United States."

There have been suggestions that a trade and life adjustment program could be undertaken through expansion of the Area Redevelopment Act which was enacted in 1961 to aid the so-called depressed areas of chronic and persistent unemployment in this country.

We observe that the Area Redevelopment Administration has scarcely had time to do more than designate a total of 826 labor market areas and 1,035 counties in the United States as areas eligible for assistance under sections 5(a) (industrial areas) and 5(b) (rural counties) of the act. We have been informed that the ARA has encountered serious administrative problems which are yet unsolved.

We note that the first widely publicized undertaking of the ARA was a $160,000 Federal water system donated to Gassville, Ark., to help induce a nonunion shirt factory to locate in the community.

As stated in the Washington Post of December 8 and 9, 1961, this project raises "disturbing questions of public policy and economic development."

Should Federal aid be given to projects which, in the words of the Post article, "are built on shaky foundations of low wages, antiunion commitments on the part of a community, and heavy public subsidies to unstable industries seeking out low-wage and even subservient areas"?

We believe the Congress will want to examine carefully the operations of the ARA, and determine whether it is fulfilling expectations, before entrusting to this agency the rehabilitation of additional depressed areas which would be created if the administration's tariff-cutting powers were enlarged and injudiciously used on an across-the-board basis.

CONCLUSION

The administration's trade program thus far has been outlined only in general terms in recent addresses by President Kennedy and Under Secretary of State George W. Ball, coupled with statements before the subcommittee by Mr. Ball and other administration witnesses in the recent hearings.

Our final judgments must await specification of the program in more comprehensive detail and its examination in such detail by the legislative committee with jurisdiction. Nevertheless, we have felt compelled to raise the questions we have considered and to express some preliminary views in order to broaden the area of public discussion.

Our major objection to the program as discussed to date is that it tends to focus public attention on only one problem among the many related problems which confront the United States in the task of forging closer unity among the industrialized nations of the free world.

The questions we have raised outline some of these problems, among which we would underscore the following for which solutions deserve higher and more urgent priorities:

1. The need for vigorous action by the United States toward formation of a new alliance of free nations outside the framework of the United Nations.

2. The need for a more equitable sharing of the burdens of the common defense against Communist imperialism.

3. The present lack of a unified free nations policy respecting trade with the Soviet Union, Communist China, and the Communist satellite nations.

4. The persistent and dangerous deficit in the U.S. balance of payments.

5. Rigid protectionism by the United States and Western Europe in agriculture and energy resources.

6. The need for Western Europe to accept a greater share of the increasing industrial output of Japan and other lowest-wage countries.

7. The need for the United States and Western Europe to agree on the provision of adequate markets for the products of the developing nations of Latin America and Africa.

8. The need for improvement in the competitive position of American industry in world markets.

There are other problems, notably that of preserving industries and industrial skills which are essential to the national defense and whether, and to what extent, subsidies are necessary for this purpose, as in the case of the merchant marine. This vital question received little attention in the subcommittee's hearings.

We believe that instead of myopic concentration on the limited field of traiffs on industrial goods, the administration should broaden its vision to encompass the whole wide range of problems which must be resolved before the industrialized free nations can more effectively pool their resources to insure victory in the cold war.

Again, we urge the administration to take dynamic and vigorous action toward the formation of a new alliance of free nations in which these problems can be considered in proper perspective and steps taken toward a more equitable and widespread sharing of the burdens of the common defense against Communist imperialism. In such action, we believe, lies the ultimate triumph of freedom in the cold war.

MORE URGENT NEEDS

We have heard and we shall continue to hear about the urgency of getting in step with the European Common Market if we are not to face a severe economic challenge. We believe this to be so. We are a great nation capable of producing more than all of the members of the Common Market lumped together. We are in a position to expand our foreign trade in spite of the fact that we pay the highest wages in the world because our methods are up to date and our workmen are craftsmen in many fields.

We certainly do not suggest that crutches be given to obsolete industries which are simply clinging on until time takes its inevitable toll. By the same token, there are valuable industries employing many thousands of Americans which are as deserving of assistance through tariff restrictions as the farmers are deserving of price supports.

This is where we agree with two ranking members of the Joint Economic Committee and the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy. These two Members of Congress, respectively our own Senator PRESCOTT BUSH and Congressman THOMAS E. CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri, have drafted a joint request to the two committees to forward to them a draft of the report which will be offered to the coming session.

Both men believe that in spite of the course we must follow, there is no great urgency in simply slashing tariff barriers across the board.

They outline eight other specific problems for which solutions deserve higher and more urgent priorities.

For the sake of argument as to what is more urgent, we herewith present those problems which Senator BUSH and Congressman CURTIS, of Missouri, consider as top priority.

1. The need for vigorous action by the United States toward formation of a new alliance of free nations outside the framework of the United Nations.

2. The need for a more equitable sharing of the burdens of the common defense against Communist imperialism.

3. The present lack of a unified free nations policy respecting trade with the Soviet Union, Communist China, and the Communist satellite nations.

4. The persistent and dangerous deficit in the U.S. balance of payments.

5. Rigid protectionism by the United States and Western Europe in agriculture and energy resources.

6. The need for Western Europe to accept a greater share of the increasing industrial output of Japan and other lowest-wage countries.

7. The need for the United States and Western Europe to agree on the provision of adequate markets for the products of the developing nations of Latin America and Africa.

8. The need for improvement in the competitive position of American industry in world markets.

THE TARIFF FIGHT

Of all the issues to face the new Congress, that of liberalizing trade policies is likely to prove the most explosive, most time consuming, most significant of the session.

The necessity of making America more competitive in the world is upon us. We have watched European postwar recovery reach a point where now, through the instrument of the Common Market, it threatens to become the principal trading bloc in the world—at the expense of our own economy. Thus, the creature of our own assistance has reached the stage where it rivals, and in some cases, already exceeds our own activities.

Senator PRESCOTT BUSH this weekend added some significant thoughts to the coming debate. In a lengthy statement, he developed a strong case that the way to meet this growing economic challenge is not through tariff reductions alone, but through a massive attack on barriers to free world unity.

In effect, Senator BUSH is serving notice that he does not fully support President Kennedy's appeal for stronger Presidential powers to cut tariffs, so as to better compete with European industry.

Senator BUSH, while urging development of stronger economic ties with Europe, as well as numerous other ways of strengthening our position, does not deny the significance of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement as a major instrument in shaping that relationship. Its continuance—or more fundamentally, its modification—is at the root of the administration's program.

Perhaps broader Executive power over tariffs is not the whole answer to meeting the challenge of the Common Market. But it is obviously one major phase of it, and as such, deserves the attention it is receiving. Perhaps Senator BUSH is correct in approaching the problem on a wider basis, but meanwhile, the Trade Act does expire this June, and some action on it is a must for Congress.

SENATOR BUSH WEIGHS THE TARIFF ISSUE

As the Kennedy administration continues to build up pressure for a broader executive control over tariffs, Connecticut's Senator PRESCOTT BUSH and Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS of Missouri—both members of the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress—have raised some questions of high import in the mounting debate.

Their questions are particularly important in industrial Connecticut, because in our opinion, nothing could be potentially more damaging to this State's prosperity than a Federal tariff policy based entirely on partisan political theories.

And the Bush-Curtis statement implies that just such partisanship may be shaping a narrow approach to serious domestic and international problems of the broadest scope.

The Republican leaders see the tariff-cutting issue not as a black-and-white struggle between free trade and protectionism but as a genuine American need—which should however, be related to other problems for which solutions deserve higher and more urgent priorities.

The problems which they would relate to, but raise above, the tariff issue are:

1. The need for vigorous action by the United States toward formation of a new alliance of free nations outside the framework of the United Nations.

2. The need for a more equitable sharing of the burdens of the common defense against Communist imperialism.

3. The present lack of a unified free nations policy respecting trade with the Soviet Union, Communist China and the Communist satellite nations.

4. The persistent and dangerous deficit in the U.S. balance of payments.

5. Rigid protectionism by the United States and Western Europe in agriculture and energy resources.

6. The need for Western Europe to accept a greater share of the increasing industrial output of Japan and other lowest-wage countries.

7. The need for the United States and Western Europe to agree on the provision of adequate markets for the products of the developing nations of Latin America and Africa.

8. The need for improvement in the competitive position of American industry in world markets.

The wholly natural Democratic reply to this claim will be a challenge to the nonpartisanship of Republicans BUSH and CURTIS. But as an early minority report in the hearings and the directions of the Joint Economic Committee this is both stimulating and productive commentary. Tariff concepts have such deep roots and such emotional undertones in both parties that it will be very easy for Congress to tie itself in knots on this question. A look at the larger problems related to tariffs helps to restore some focus.

TARIFF QUESTIONS

President Kennedy's request for broader executive power over tariffs, an issue destined to become one of the hottest in Congress this session, has already polarized Senators and Representatives.

U.S. Senator PRESCOTT BUSH, ranking minority member of the Joint Economic Committee, has teamed with U.S. Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Missouri Republican and ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy, to issue a position paper on the proposed tariff measures.

Part of their 21-page statement is devoted to the question, "Will mutual tariff reductions by the United States and the Common Market increase American industry's ability to compete in Western Europe?" Liberal trade proponents say unquestionably that they will, but the Bush-Curtis statement indicates that this contention bears much closer examination.

The establishment of branch plants of American industries in European countries is not solely to get within the tariff barriers of the Common Market, as some would lead us to believe. Several factors, principally propinquity to foreign markets, availability of lower wage labor and administrative efficiency, are involved.

Some American industries produce certain products at a unit cost that enables them to sell anywhere in the world; but many, including a large portion of those who have already opened oversea branches, cannot compete with foreign products produced at a fraction of the cost involved in U.S. manufacturing.

The Bush-Curtis statement includes a listing of the hourly wage scales paid by the industrialized nations which speak meaningfully for themselves. In 1960 U.S. manufacturing industries paid an average of $2.29 an hour in contrast with 90 cents an hour in England, 60 cents an hour in West Germany, 43 cents an hour in France, 37 cents an hour in Italy, and 29 cents an hour in Japan.

There is a limit to the degree of efficiency American industries can reach. And with a $2-an-hour differential with a nation like Japan, reaching comparable costs through efficiency is improbable.

Particularly inasmuch as industries in Japan and Western Europe enjoy tax policies and depreciation allowances that enable them to approach an efficiency sufficient to compete with American production.

It has been argued that foreign wages are due to rise and that production costs will be somewhat leveled. But it must not be forgotten that U.S. labor costs are rising and in spite of President Kennedy's call for wage and price restraint, U.S. labor, as pledged by the recent AFL–CIO convention, is going to fight for higher pay and shorter hours. A lowering of the protective tariff barriers in order to gain a better competitive position may prove illusory.

The Honorable Luther Johnson, Sr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, when I came to Congress to fill the unexpired term created by the Honorable Luther Johnson, Sr.'s resignation to accept a judgeship on the U.S. Tax Court, I had some big shoes to fill.

I have kept in close touch with Mr. Johnson since his retirement, and have found him to be a close friend and advisor. The Dallas Times Herald of November 5, 1961, carried an article on this exceptional gentleman, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include this article:

LUTHER JOHNSON, SR.—HE QUIT POLITICAL WARS WITHOUT ELECTION LOSS

(By Dotty Allen)

CORSICANA—A young Texas lawyer stood on a dusty platform at a political rally in the early 1900's and told voters, "I'm going to win this race, but I want to win it in July. It's too hot to run in August."

"That's just like Luther Johnson," one of his opponents shouted. "He doesn't want to work like you farmers do."

"Now, just a minute," the speaker fired back, "I do want to work like the farmers. They lay their crops by and I want to lay mine by."

Voters in the area must have responded to his logic, for when former Congressman Luther Johnson Sr. retired from a 60-year career of public service five years ago, he had never lost an election nor competed in a runoff.

Dubbed as the "Kid Candidate," he was admitted to the Texas Bar Association before he was 21, having had his disabilities of minority removed. Two years later, he was elected county attorney.

"They use to laugh at me, and my opponents would point out my blushes as the 'blush of infancy,' but I'd just tell the voters I had the flush of victory."

He was district attorney 6 years for a tri-county district (Limestone-Freestone-Navarro), and has a vivid recollection of the days when every term of court had several murder trials. During that period, he estimates he tried over a hundred such cases. He was prosecutor at the trial of the last man sentenced to be hanged in Navarro County.

The young district attorney had his taste of lynch mobs, too. A man was burned to death by lynchers on the courthouse lawn in Corsicana when he was in office.

Once he was teamed with another young court-appointed lawyer, also practicing in Corsicana, to prepare the defense in a murder trial. To their surprise, the defendant was acquitted, and paid them with an old surrey with fringe on the top.

The other lawyer became well known later as Senator Tom Gore, of Oklahoma.

Unopposed in 1922, Johnson was elected representative from his district to the 68th Congress. He was a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee during World War II. He left the House of Representatives in 1946 to accept a judgeship in a U.S. Tax Court, where he served 10 years prior to his retirement.

During his years in Washington, he collected great stores of Capitol stories, which, with characteristic humor, he now relates to friends. One favorite is about a transplanted southerner, who complained about Washington weather during a hot spell.

"It's not the heat in Washington, ah cain't stand. It's the stupidity," he said.

The 86-year-old Johnson now lives at the Navarro Hotel in Corsicana, a structure which stands on the block where the home he was born in once stood.

Still alert, he retains much of the ready wit of his younger days. He visited in Washington last year, and still corresponds with his old friends of Congress days.

Saddened by the illness of his longtime friend, Speaker Sam Rayburn, he offers no panacea for the ills of the world today, but does term the world situation as "very" critical.

In reference to his retirement he says, with a twinkle in his eye, "I made a fairly wide circle, but now I'm right back in the same block, on the same street, where I started."

Man of the Year Believes World and Civic Duties Are Basic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to call to the attention of the U.S. Congress and the American people the outstanding work of Adolph W. Schmidt, of Pittsburgh, who is the chairman of the U.S. delegation to the present Atlantic Conference of NATO—North Atlantic Treaty Organization—in Paris, France. We people of Pittsburgh and western Pennsylvania are proud of the constructive work which Adolph Schmidt has accomplished in public and civic service in our area, and agree thoroughly with the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh in choosing Adolph Schmidt as 1961 Man of the Year.

As a longtime personal friend of Adolph Schmidt and his good wife, Helen—Patsy—Mellon Schmidt, and as one of the people who recommended and sponsored the appointment of Adolph Schmidt to membership on the U.S. delegation to the Atlantic Conference of NATO, it is a double pleasure to find his talents used so well for the development and progress of the people of the Atlantic Basin. The selection of Adolph Schmidt as the chairman of the delegation is an excellent one, as he has been giving his full time and talents for the success of our U.S. mission and the success of the Atlantic Conference.

An excellent article by Pittsburgh Post-Gazette Staff Writer Alvin Rosensweet has appeared in the edition of the Post-Gazette Daily magazine of January 11, 1962, entitled "Man of the Year Believes World and Civic Duties Are Basic," and I am inserting this article as part of my remarks. I am also inserting the article, "Local Executive Urges Union of NATO States," from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of January 10, 1962:

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Jan. 10, 1962]

ADOLPH SCHMIDT, OF T. MELLON & SONS, SPEAKS IN PARIS—LOCAL EXECUTIVE URGES UNION OF NATO STATES

PARIS, January 9.—Two American speakers today advised NATO nations to adopt a unified top level political mechanism, and to face up to the world's overpopulation and underdevelopment problems.

They spoke to about 80 prominent citizens of the 15 North Atlantic Treaty Organization nations in the second day of a 2-week Atlantic convention of NATO nations, a newly organized discussion group with no power of decision.

Adolph Schmidt of Pittsburgh, vice president and governor of T. Mellon & Sons, proposed the adoption of a union of sovereign NATO states which would tie the collective defense responsibilities of all the NATO countries into one political organization along the lines of either a federation or confederation.

Hugh Moore of Easton, Pa., retired manufacturer who founded the Dixie Cup Co., said that while the death rate has been cut in recent years, the birth rate has increased, leading to a serious overpopulation problem. He also pointed out the dangers of increased revolutions is underdeveloped countries because of their poverty and ignorance.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Jan. 11, 1962]

MAN OF THE YEAR BELIEVES WORLD AND CIVIC DUTIES ARE BASIC

(By Alvin Rosensweet)

When Adolph W. (for William) Schmidt was named yesterday by the junior chamber of commerce as Pittsburgh's 1961 Man of the Year he was roughly 3,939 air miles away in Paris taking part in the Atlantic Convention of NATO.

This activity is typical of this businessman-banker who believes that all the problems in the world today can be summarized in one basic issue; tyranny versus freedom.

"That's the only issue in the world today," he said before leaving for Paris as 1 of 20 leading U.S. citizens who are striving to effect greater cooperation and unity among the countries that form NATO—North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Schmidt, 57, a native of McKeesport, occupies a foremost position in Pittsburgh as vice president and governor of T. Mellon & Sons and as president since 1954 of the A. W. Mellon Educational and Charitable Trust. As head of the Mellon Trust he is charged with distribution of funds which, through 1960, totaled $157,800,251.

Schmidt is engaged in a wide range of civic activities, among the most important being the Allegheny Conference on Community Development, of which he was chairman and which he served as president from 1956 to 1959. International affairs as well as community progress occupy most of his waking moments.

Attorney David Glick, former president of the Allegheny County Bar Association, has likened Schmidt to the citizen of ancient Greece best described in Pericles' Funeral Oration as recorded by Thucydides, the Athenian historian.

"These citizens attend both to public and private duties and do not allow absorption in their private affairs to interfere with their knowledge of the city," Glick observed at the bar association's annual meeting in December.

"It's a good thing for Pittsburgh that its Man of the Year is a classic scholar with more than a bowing acquaintance with Plato, Emerson, Lincoln, and Justice Holmes," Glick said yesterday. "Adolph Schmidt is a dreamer whose dreams become realities."

As a measure of the man, philosopher Mortimer Adler's second volume on "The Idea of Freedom" is dedicated to Schmidt.

A Pittsburgher who has worked with top Government people in Washington and who knows Schmidt well described him as "a man with critical and philosophical depth who would be tops in any league." In addition to Schmidt's intense preoccupation with international affairs, this man summarized Schmidt's principal interests as:

1. His belief that a liberal education as a basic cultural necessity is essential.

2. His sense of responsibility in urban planning.

2. His interest in the whole field of health, which helped lead to formation of the Allegheny County Health Department.

Schmidt's office on the 39th floor of the United States Steel-Mellon Building at 525 William Penn Place reflects his manifold interests. Unlike the offices of most executives, it is faced on three sides with bookcases from floor to ceiling. (A fireplace is at the other end of the handsomely paneled, carpeted quarters.)

Schmidt's office library runs the gamut from foreign affairs to conservatism. Roman religion, Chinese painting, ancient Greece and Rome, and the classics. It includes magazines on foreign affairs; "Political Handbook of the World," published by the Council on Foreign Affairs; and studies on "The United Nations and Promotion of the General Welfare."

Books range from "The Flood Control Controversy" and "The Conservation of Ground Water" to Shakespeare, Thomas Aquinas, Virgil, Plutarch, Hegel, Goethe, and Melville.

Schmidt's presence in Paris at the NATO Citizens Convention reflects his greatest immediate interest, one that has concerned him since the end of World War II. This interest led him to attend as a U.S. delegate the Princeton University Conference on NATO and the Conference on the North Atlantic Community at Bruges, Belgium, in 1957, and the Atlantic Conference in London in 1959.

Appointed to the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO by the late Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House, Schmidt was chosen chairman of the U.S. delegation to the preparatory committee of the Commission. In that role

he went to London last March to help make plans for the Paris sessions.

At Paris, Schmidt is one of 98 delegates from the 15 NATO countries who, as private citizens uninstructed by their Governments, will try to come up with some recommendations to present to their Governments in an effort to promote Western solidarity against the Communist bloc.

Schmidt says that his overwhelming interest in international affairs stems from his World War II experience. Schmidt was a lieutenant colonel stationed in Africa with the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), at Cairo, and at Accra on the West Coast.

After that he moved with Gen. George Patton's 3d Army across France to the Elbe, to make a junction with the Russians. He was awarded the Bronze Star and two battle stars.

"We had a reception in Lepzig with the Russians at what was left of the town hall," Schmidt recalled. "It was a terrific reception. They were great. The Russian officers had a great sense of humor and they were quite free except when they saw a commissar standing in the wings. But I got a strong impression of the stupidity and futility of war."

To examine what Schmidt describes as "my main hobby"—the field of international affairs—it may be well to quote him at length on his attitudes in this respect. In an interview before he left for the Atlantic Convention, he said:

"I feel a terrible frustration that man over his entire history has been able to make no progress in the relationship of man-to-man, tribe-to-tribe, nation-to-nation. We are doing things today exactly as did the caveman and the men of all previous civilizations.

"Our technological advances are not progress in this sense. They're only change. Man goes 600 miles an hour but he still goes from point A to point B.

"If we do nothing different we will suffer the same fate as Roman civilization. Unless we do something different there is no question that we'll destroy ourselves, not by war so much as by losing the leadership group that suffers the heaviest attrition at a time of war.

"Have we by sheer horror of present-day weapons arrived at a point where Western man can put a taboo on war? Can't we make a small leap forward where men can say 'We'll try to arrange our political affairs to do just a little better?'

"The peace will only be kept by power. We must strive for an overwhelming balance of power on the side of freedom. Under a united Atlantic community a political instrumentality would be devised to provide an economic, political, and military policy.

"But everything within the United States, Great Britain, and the other NATO countries would be the same. Without this, the Soviet strategy to divide and conquer would be a success and before long the United States would be isolated.

"Progress since formation of NATO is not visible."

Schmidt conceded that a major obstacle in forming a united Atlantic community is the unwillingness of the countries to surrender even a fragment of their sovereignty. But in his talk before the bar association in December, Schmidt pointed out that the meaning of sovereignty is misunderstood.

He observed that insistence on complete individual sovereignty in international affairs creates anarchy. He took the position that it is entirely possible, even proper, to transfer a portion of our sovereignty if it will provide greater security or prosperity.

"The important distinction we must make for the future is not the surrender of sovereignty by the individual government, but the further extension of sovereignty by the sovereign private citizens," he said.

"The difficulty in part lies in confusing patriotism with sovereignty * * * but patriotism and love of country can remain undiminished even after a transfer of political sovereignty."

In our interviews, Schmidt emphasized that the United States and Canada must enter the European Common Market, and that eventually there will be complete elimination of tariff walls. Industries that could prove severe damage by an end to tariffs would receive subsidies and other protections, in Schmidt's view.

"The tariff issue will be a big fight in Congress," he forecast. "But I hope wiser heads will prevail and show that the United States would be better off by taking this route. But men must educate themselves on these issues, form a proper opinion, and get them to their Congressmen and Senators. They will do nothing until they hear from their constituents."

Schmidt said in his bar association talk that he believes the Atlantic democracies must be brought together in order to cure "the anarchy which exists in the Atlantic area."

Such an organization, he believes, would prevent future wars among the Atlantic nations and stop disruptive economic competition. He believes also that the West must as soon as possible "present a fully united front in the struggle with the Soviet Union and Communist China." Only an unbalance of power in our favor, democratically controlled, will keep the peace, he believes.

Schmidt's route, which leads now to Paris, began 57 years ago. He was born in McKeesport September 13, 1904, the son of Adolph and Louise Schmidt. His father, a druggist who became interested in real estate and banking, died in 1937. His mother, now 85 still lives in McKeesport. His sister Louise is Mrs. Charles Heinz whose husband is a vice president of H. J. Heinz Co.

Schmidt, who remembers McKeesport of his youth as a grimy milltown, attended McKeesport High School before transferring to Mercersburg Academy, where he graduated. He took his bachelor of arts degree in 1926 at Princeton, where he rowed on the 150-pound crew, worked on the editorial board of the Tiger, and took part in the chorus of Triangle Club productions.

He spent the year after Princetown touring Europe, visiting museums, living with families in France and Germany, and acquiring the beginnings of his interest in world affairs. He studied at the University of Berlin and at the Sorbonne, then came home to Harvard University Business School for a master's degree in 1929.

On June 27, 1936, Schmidt married Helen (Patsy) Mellon, daughter of Thomas A. Mellon, a nephew of Andrew W. Mellon, late grant financier and Secretary of Treasury. Mrs. Schmidt is a grandniece of Andrew Mellon.

Mrs. Schmidt, who is in Europe with her husband, is an accomplished ornithologist and has recorded a number of bird discoveries that have won her the commendation of professionals. Occasionally, Schmidt accompanies his wife on bird-watching trips in the Ligonier Valley, where they have a weekend home.

The Schmidts have two children, Thomas, a senior at Princeton, and Helen, who graduated from Sarah Lawrence last June and is now doing graduate work in fine arts at New York University. The Schmidt's home for many years has been at 1060 Highmont Road, East End, a white brick, once a gardener's cottage, to which several wings have been added.

Schmidt went straight from Harvard Business School to the Mellon National Bank and he was later with Forbes National Bank & Union Trust Co. Associated with the A. W. Mellon interests since 1938, he was named vice president and governor of T. Mellon & Sons in 1946 and became president of the Mellon Trust in 1954, after serving as trustee and treasurer since 1949.

Possibly, Schmidt's most positive contribution to the Pittsburgh community has been in his role as president from 1956 to 1959 of the Allegheny Conference on Community Development, of which he is now chairman.

He was an effective force, as a representative of the Mellon interests, in the Pittsburgh renaissance. Schmidt has urged that open spaces in the area be reserved for future use, and that such land be held for recreational sites, rights-of-way for a regional transportation system, and for the development of carefully chosen industrial sites.

Redevelopment, rehabilitation and housing have been a cornerstone of his approach to urban renewal. He has pointed up the necessity for conservation of water resources.

As first chairman of the Board of Health of Allegheny County, he guided the county health department through the stages leading to its formation and has fought for Government funds for preventive health programs.

This interest in the renewal of a city has led also to his membership on the Urban Redevelopment Authority, Pittsburgh Regional Planning Association, National Planning Association and the Pennsylvania State Planning Board.

Schmidt today feels that he did not get the education at Princeton that he should have. He became aware in later life of the importance of a liberal arts education and believes that 17-year-old college freshmen should not be choosing their own subjects.

Schmidt's interest in the need for a people better schooled in the liberal arts is of a piece with his interest in international affairs and urban redevelopment.

"I would hope," he said, "that a faculty would say to its students 'this is what you should know. If you don't want to take these courses go somewhere else.' Today, most colleges have a pick-and-choose method of selecting courses."

Schmidt's interest in this field led to his appointment from 1954 to 1956 to the board of visitors and governors of St. John's College, Annapolis, Md., which has created what Schmidt terms "the essence of a good education."

At St. John's 40 percent of the entire curriculum is in science and math, and there are no electives and no textbooks. Seminars and daily tutorials—meetings between students and teachers—are the rule.

"This is what Jefferson meant when he said 'A democracy can only be continued by an educated citizenry,'" Schmidt believes. "My interest in education is that we continue our democracy. We are a terribly informed people.

"There is a basic intelligence in the United States but basic education is lacking. In the past 15 years it has become superficial. Perhaps sitting in front of a television set is too overwhelming an influence on the American people."

Schmidt feels deeply enough on this subject that in a speech in 1956 at Colorado Springs before the Association of American Medical Colleges he advocated a greater emphasis on the liberal arts for premedical and medical students.

Schmidt has engaged in innumerable other projects. He is a former president of Presbyterian Hospital and has been active in campaigns for the Pittsburgh Symphony Orchestra, the Pittsburgh Playhouse, which he helped found, United Negro College Fund, Children's Hospital, and others.

He has, as it has been said of him, met the standards set by Pericles and by Justice Holmes. "The man who holds himself aloof

from public life is not quiet, but useless," Pericles said. To which Holmes, much later, added that "It is required of a man that he share the action of his day or risk being judged not to have lived at all."

In these respects Schmidt has met the test defining the true citizen. He sees in his present role, as a citizen-delegate to the NATO Convention in Paris, the answer to a citizen's troublesome question:

"What can I do about the state of the world?"

He is seeking, as one man among many, to do something about it.

Larger Federal Share in Medical Care a Necessity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on Thursday last the Senate and House of Representatives heard the President of the United States deliver an urgent and eloquent call for the extension of medical services and care to the Nation's elderly citizens under the social security system.

The immediacy and high priority which the Kennedy administration gives to this issue is substantiated by the unhappy experience in our State of West Virginia, where a genuine effort was made to implement a program of medical care for the aged under the provisions of existing legislation.

The program, launched shortly after Congress enacted legislation setting up a system of Federal-State cost sharing in 1960, already has literally "gone on the rocks." Payments have been cut back, remedial care payments outlawed, and many doctors and hospitals have withdrawn from participation in the program—despite the fact that this formula was one which the medical profession, in general, supported and recommended.

Many of us saw the coming crisis in the West Virginia medical program as early as last summer. On August 2, 1961, I appeared before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives to say:

> The failure of Congress to move ahead with and provide social security coverage for the medical care program has already necessitated in West Virginia the development of plans for a cutback. And if the proposals for social security expansion are delayed beyond this year, it is estimated that West Virginia's share of the cost of the limited need aged care plan will advance to beyond $10 and $12 million a year.

For our State of less than 2 million citizens, Mr. President, this financial load—which has now materialized—is an intolerable burden.

Our hope that Congress would pass—as I said last August—"a substantial and more meaningful measure under social security tax financing" has not materialized, and the senior citizens of West Virginia, despite the State's efforts to provide care under Public Law 86-778, are suffering accordingly.

One of the best commentaries on this inequitable and unfortunate situation is presented in cogent and pertinent editorials recently in the Charleston Gazette.

I ask unanimous consent to include these editorials, at this point, and I commend them to the attention of Members of the Congress and other interested persons.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE AGED CARE WOES SORRY LESSON FOR UNITED STATES

This week in West Virginia the Medical Assistance for the Aged program—which has the AMA's certified seal of approval—received a number of stiff jolts from W. Bernard Smith, State welfare commissioner.

The MAA schedule fee underwent drastic revision. The highest charge formerly allowed for a doctor's fee was $187.50. Now the maximum is $40.

Hospital costs used to run as high as $35 daily. In the future only 90 percent of daily costs will be paid, limited to a $20 maximum.

Remedial care payments have been outlawed.

Druggists, who had been charging whatever the traffic would bear for prescriptions for MAA clients, will be restricted to "the manufacturer's wholesale price plus a service charge of 75 cents per prescription."

Eligibility requirements have been increased, meaning that fewer aged citizens will be qualified for the program.

All of these changes were made necessary by the skyrocketing costs of the current program. The State simply doesn't have the funds to continue the program in its present form.

"Two million dollars in doctor bills," said Smith in explaining why his department was forced to order the cutbacks, "remain to be paid, and it is estimated there is another million dollars to be paid doctors who are behind in billing."

At the forthcoming budget session legislators will be confronted with a crisis. They can scrap the whole program. They can find the necessary funds—an impossible assignment—to return the program to its former high standards. They can scratch around and come up with sufficient moneys to continue the program on a relatively inadequate basis, thus assuring that thousands of West Virginia's aged who desperately require medical assistance aren't going to receive it.

The results in this State of the MAA program prove conclusively why the Kennedy program is mandatory. We commend to West Virginia Congressmen the failures experienced here, and we believe it is important they document to the whole Congress this sorry, miserable record.

The West Virginia story speaks volumes in support of the social security approach. The aged will be protected by broad, comprehensive coverage. The State's economy will be relieved of an intolerable, insupportable burden. And surprisingly the medical profession will benefit by receiving adequate compensation for services rendered.

AGED MEDICAL CARE BILL MAKES AMA APOPLECTIC

One of the prime domestic issues to face the Congress in the new session is the President's proposal to finance medical care for the aged through a prepaid insurance program within the social security structure.

The American Medical Association, which sees socialized medicine behind every bush in exactly the same frequency that the Birchers see a Communist at every street corner, has not been exactly reticent in expressing its opposition to the idea.

So distraught, in fact, is the AMA that last year—when the bill never even reached the stage of serious consideration in the Congress—the lobbying group spent a sum that went well into six figures. The AMA topped all other lobbying groups in its reported lobbying expenditures, surpassing the efforts of even such free-spending veterans as the letter carriers, the unions and the Association of American Railroads.

The American people well might ask where this money comes from. The answer, of course, is that it derives—directly or indirectly—from them in the form of money they pay their doctors or their private insurance companies for medical care.

The AMA is so exercised about the bugaboo of socialized medicine that it is incapable of making a great deal of sense on the subject of the proposed program. It insists that the prepayment plan would take away the patient's traditional freedom of choice in selecting a doctor, although it neglects to say where it obtained this information.

The association has an answer all its own to the problem of medical care for the indigent aged. It would, on proof of need, apply the Kerr-Mills formula—but only, naturally, in those States which have implemented the Kerr-Mills Act. The indigent aged in other States get short shrift from the AMA. And even in some of the States which have acted, the formula would allow something in the neighborhood of 3 days hospitalization according to the generous, warm-hearted AMA plan.

Aged and indigent doctors (if there are any) have nothing to worry about, of course, because professional courtesy takes care of them.

Aside from the natural repugnance many Americans feel toward the means test as a measure of eligibility, there is just no rational argument against the use of the social security framework as a vehicle for providing medical care. There is nothing socialistic in prepaid medical insurance—and if there is, why are the doctors themselves in many areas cooperating in similar insurance programs?

The absence of a rational argument has forced the AMA to fall back on its traditional rallying cry: If they can't think of a good reason to oppose something, they just call it socialized medicine and let it go at that.

As for us, well, if the President's proposal is socialized medicine, then we guess we're for socialized medicine.

EDITORIALS—STATE MAA DIFFICULTIES REFLECT GENERAL CHAOS

West Virginians need look no further than their own pitiful experiment with medical assistance for the aged, conservative-style, to glimpse the chaos which dominates the economics of American medicine.

The MAA program was conceived by self-styled fiscal conservatives, with the support of the American Medical Association, as an alternative to placing medical care for the aged under the social security system. It is perhaps the most fiscally irresponsible program ever adopted in West Virginia, threatening an endless drain on the State treasury.

Adoption of the program smacked of bipartisan political expediency. Republican Governor Underwood sprang it on a Democratic Legislature only a month before the 1960 general election. U.S. Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat of West Virginia, warned of the enormous financial burden the State might be assuming.

But Underwood hooted him down and Democratic legislators, fearful of antagoniz-

ing aged voters, embraced the program with little meaningful debate. The State is now paying the price for such political togetherness on an election eve.

The very physicians who championed the MAA program are now refusing to participate in it because their fees for doctoring the aged were reduced to avoid a possible State deficit. They apparently favor medical care for the aged—but only on their own prosperous terms. And that means fat fees to be paid them from the State and Federal treasuries while they continue to denounce any alternative proposals as socialism.

It's time for hospitals and doctors to stop talking out of both sides of their mouths. Both are partially subsidized by taxpayers—through Federal aid which has stimulated the construction of new hospitals, through the State pop tax which provides future physicians with an education at the West Virginia University Medical Center, and through property tax exemptions for hospitals that call themselves nonprofit.

Their refusal to cooperate with the State Department of Welfare during the current financial crisis—created by the very MAA program championed by the doctors—clearly brands them as deficient in a sense of responsibility to their fellow citizens and State.

For poorer States such as West Virginia, the MAA program is a bottomless well in which scarce State tax dollars will be dropped from now until the AMA announces it favors socialized medicine.

West Virginia lacks the resources to finance an adequate program of medical care for its aged citizens, even with generous matching funds from the Federal Government. Our other welfare programs were in a sad state of neglect before MAA was adopted, as were many other State services.

Such a gigantic task can only be carried out by the Federal Government—which can assure that the aged of both New York and West Virginia get the medical care they need without selling their homes and spending their last years on earth hopelessly mired in debt.

There is no rational reason why a man's life or health should depend on his ability to pay for medical services. Permitting physicians to preserve their laissez-faire kingdom will continue to spawn such economic quackery as the MAA program, which has proved a cruel deception to West Virginia's aged.

Our sad experience with MAA is only symptomatic of the desperate need for reforming American medical economics. A good place to begin is for Congress to adopt President Kennedy's proposal to put medical care for the aged under the social security system.

Free Enterprise, Free Markets, and Free Hearts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., before the Rotary Club of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., on January 2, 1962, together with an editorial from the New York Daily News of January 6, 1962:

FREE ENTERPRISE, FREE MARKETS, AND FREE HEARTS

There are prophets of doom among us who dolefully report that these are times of greatest challenge. In grave notes they intone that not only our political institutions but our very way of life must be validated before the world.

I certainly agree with them on the facts, but I cannot agree with their mournful conclusion.

The reason is that I believe in our way of life. More than that, I believe that our country and our way of life were built by enthusiastic response to challenges just as great as those confronting us now. For example, I cannot bring myself to believe that this generation faces greater challenge than the Continental Army at Valley Forge—freezing in the snow and with three major cities, Boston, New York, and Philadelphia in the hands of an invading army. I cannot believe that this generation, or the ones succeeding, are likely to encounter heavier test than our country invaded, the White House in flames and an American President driven from Washington. Consider the Americans who crossed the plains in Conestoga wagons: remember the American families who rounded stormy Cape Horn in sailing ships, or walked across the infested jungle paths of the Isthmus to settle our own Far West. I say that if we are not made of such stuff then we have failed our heritage. Certainly, this is a time of challenge; and, for myself, I welcome it.

I think we need apologize to no man and to no nation for our success as a people. Furthermore, I am prepared to defend the American way not only as a purely American pattern but as a demonstrated experiment by which all mankind may profit.

It is assailed now and in quarters other than Communist—because too much attention is bestowed upon the family.

But, has any government at any time created an institution which is better equipped to raise children. It is true that the largest civic investment in any American community is usually its school systems.

But what better economic venture is there for a democracy than in its future citizens? Even so great a conservative as Sir Winston Churchill remarked that there is no safer investment for a nation than a bottle of milk in a baby. I will go one step further; there is no more profitable one than a textbook in the hands of a child.

With finality, therefore, I say that our Nation is built on its families and their devotion to our educational systems. And from some experience with Government, I have no hesitancy in saying that family love and care are beyond the powers of legislation of any government, including our own.

I do not deny to governments, other than our own, their right of experiment. But I do state that the life of our Nation depends upon raising children to be people, not robots; and that even in this age of science the slide rule does not exist which can yet measure the values of the human heart. Whether or not all of our children should be fully educated as responsible citizens of a democracy is not a matter of national politics; it is a matter of national conscience and it is a matter of national defense. And its essence is in what is taught the child, not who pays for the books.

The second great phase in which we are assailed is in our system of free enterprise. I note with particular satisfaction that on this score we are attacked from both the extreme right and the extreme left. I note this with extreme satisfaction because it exactly demonstrates my point; that wherever free enterprise ceases to exist personal and political freedom ceases to exist with it. Obviously, the enemies of personal freedom are also the enemies of free enterprise and private property. Of course, it can full well be seen why the totalitarian states so vigorously assault private enterprise; it is in truth the bulwark of freedom.

More particularly, the Communists predicated their whole postwar policy on the theory that our economy would collapse without war to sustain it. And what happened? The standard of living of the free world soared—not out of competition with the Communists but out of the competition inherent within our own democratic way. That which the Communists most feared was stated by a distinguished American labor leader; namely, that the greatest example of working democracy was the counters of a supermarket. Why? Because a wide choice of the same products is put there by free enterprise, and the American housewife casts a free vote for which product she thinks best every time she makes a purchase. In short, it refutes Karl Marx at every point—that a nation can multiply its wealth by simply not interfering with free men and free capital functioning together to give free people a free choice of their products.

The Iron Curtain was built to keep this knowledge from the peoples behind it. It is one of the great paradoxes of history that the very states which declare free enterprise as obsolete refuse to meet it in fair competition, in the open market of goods or of ideas. It is not because free enterprise has failed to meet the needs of this 20th century that they fear it; it is because it has succeeded only too well.

It is for that reason that President Kennedy wishes, and wisely, that American business and capital function abroad. It is because American business, over and above its economic usefulness, is a demonstration that the free way is the right way; that the rights of men and the rights of property are one and the same; for in the final analysis the right of property is only one of the many rights of a freeman.

Now, one of the reasons for the effectiveness of free enterprise is that it is mobile and adaptable; it is directed and guarded by those most at interest, exercising instant and untrammelled judgment.

It would seem, therefore, that in countermeasure for the attacks made upon free enterprise that enlightened self-interest of the free nations would indicate that they unite to protect it. And, to my way of thinking, the best way to protect foreign investment, as was stated by William S. Youngman, chairman of the board, American International Underwriters Corp., before the Far East-America Council of Commerce and Industry, is to permit free enterprise to defend itself. More particularly, when an American plant or business is seized by a foreign dictator, as in the case of Cuba, the Cuban Communists ought not be allowed to sell its products in the free markets of the world. No American State would permit a gang of automobile thieves to open a taxi service with the stolen vehicles; no civilized country would permit wholesale diamond thieves to open a jewelry store for the disposal of stolen gems. Could it be argued that such practices would be legal if the gangsters succeeded in seizing the State capitols and passed laws validating title to the thefts? Of course not. To do so would be depriving honest citizens of their honest savings without due process of law.

Still less would it be justice, as we understand it, to deprive the rightful owner of his rights in court. The fact that a district attorney acts for all of the people in the prosecution for the crime of theft does not deprive the actual victim from recovering his own property by civil process in the civil courts.

That is good law domestically and it is good law internationally. Yet that is not the state of international law today. To-

day, a private citizen cannot sue for the recovery of his identifiable property from his confiscated factory, in an American court, even though he is an American citizen and the identifiable property is here in the United States. Under an age-old and now obsolete concept, in practical effect, a diplomatic immunity attaches to products of confiscated property, provided such confiscation is by order of the nation wherein the property is located. Against an opponent like communism this is practically a standing offer of the use of the worldwide free markets for any set of desperadoes capable of capturing and looting a country.

Indeed, it is one of the prime economic weapons of the Communists to seize factories and institutions of a free people and then use the sale of the products in the free market to purchase the means to overthrow the free markets themselves. This is being carried out, right this minute, on a scale so monstrous as to be unmatched in history.

Yet the remedy is immediately available. Free enterprise needs no help; it need only not to be hindered by the free governments. If the civil courts of the free world were opened to free enterprise to recover its merchandise as it appears there such markets would be denied to the Communist dictatorship. This is a simple matter of passing a statute by the Congress permitting private enterprise to sue in the courts for its private property.

This simple recognition of simple morality would endanger no nation, create no crisis. Indeed, it would ease the diplomatic tension in our own time honored fashion: that is, by permitting those most at interest to take care of themselves—and by simple recognition of their American rights in an American open court. I do not hesitate to recommend to other free nations, our allies, that they take similar action.

Thus, my answer to the challenge to our freedoms and our ways of life is to reassert them as strongly and as proudly as I can. To do less is to deny that which has taken us so far. It is only a century and a half since Americans blazed a trail through the wilderness, but four-lane highways pass millions of people through their mountain gaps today. Almost within the memory of living men Americans on the great plains slept in stockade by night—and today the spires of great cities, as towering now as their faith and hope then, grace these selfsame prairies. Where their wagon trains crept across the great uplands jet planes now dart at 660 miles an hour; but the airplane directional beams gleaming from the distant peaks are but the reflection of the beacons which glowed in the indomitable hearts of the pioneers.

Certainly this is a time of challenge but it is no greater now than it was then; and now, as then, this is not time for faint hearts or unsure faith. Speaking only for myself, there is no challenge I would not face rather than turn my back on my heritage as an American citizen. And the first of our traditions is that we head into a gale and not run before it.

Finally, I state my own articles of faith. I say our country is free because it was not developed by State-owned men, running State-owned factories. I say we believe in and we shall continue to believe in free enterprise, because it is the response to a free man's first challenge—to earn his bread by the sweat of his brow and not by the blood on his brother's back drawn by the whips of the State.

GUEST EDITORIAL

By James A. Farley, in a speech in Chicago, January 2:

"There are prophets of doom among us who dolefully report that these are times of greatest challenge * * *.

"I cannot bring myself to believe that this generation faces greater challenge than the Continental Army at Valley Forge—freezing in the snow and with three major cities, Boston, New York, and Philadelphia, in the hands of an invading army. I cannot believe that this generation, or the ones succeeding, are likely to encounter heavier tests than our country invaded, the White House in flames, and an American President driven from Washington [in the War of 1812]. Consider the Americans who crossed the plains in Conestoga wagons, or walked across the infested jungle paths of the Isthmus to settle our own Far West. I say that if we are not made of such stuff then we have failed our heritage. Certainly, this is a time of challenge; and, for myself, I welcome it."

"The Proposal for Authority To Issue Temporary Cease and Desist Orders"—Address of FTC Commissioner Everette MacIntyre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 10, 1962

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 1961, I introduced H.R. 1233, a bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide for the issuance of temporary cease and desist orders to prevent certain acts and practices pending completion of that agency's proceedings. Later during the 2d session of the 87th Congress I introduced a somewhat modified similar measure—H.R. 8830. The distinguished and able chairman of the House Small Business Committee, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, also introduced an identical measure—H.R. 8831, and prior thereto several Members likewise sponsored similar legislative proposals.

It will, no doubt, be of interest to my colleagues in the House, that Commissioner Everette MacIntyre of the Federal Trade Commission, delivered a most illuminating address before the Federal Bar Association in Washington, D.C., on January 4, 1962, regarding these bills. This able and learned speaker, prior to being appointed by President Kennedy to the Federal Trade Commission, was the general counsel to the House Small Business Committee. Inasmuch as these measures are still pending, I feel that Commissioner MacIntyre's address merits your fullest consideration. It is as follows:

"THE PROPOSAL FOR AUTHORITY TO ISSUE TEMPORARY CEASE AND DESIST ORDERS"

(Remarks by Everette MacIntyre, Commissioner, Federal Trade Commission)

BACKGROUND OF PENDING PROPOSALAS

In the 86th Congress, the Honorable TOM STEED, Democrat, of Oklahoma, a member of the House Small Business Committee, and the Honorable, WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, chairman of that committee, introduced identical bills to authorize and empower the Federal Trade Commission to enter temporary cease and desist orders to provide for temporary relief, pending the issuance of final orders in long, drawn-out litigated cases.[1]

For a period of time prior to the introduction of his bill to empower the Federal Trade Commission to issue temporary cease and desist orders, Representative STEED, as chairman of a special subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee, had heard testimony and received considerable evidence from small business firms about trade practices in the dairy industry. He had listened to numerous complaints that price discriminations involving sales at prices below cost and other related practices, were destroying small business firms and tending to create monopolistic conditions in the sale and distribution of dairy products.

In the course of testimony before Representative STEED's subcommittee in April 1958, it was pointed out that complaints about these alleged destructive trade practices had been made to the Federal Trade Commission. In that connection, it was further alleged that due to provisions of existing law and procedures, long drawn out litigation would ensue before the issues could be resolved. In the meantime, victimized small business concerns would be forced out of business as a result of these practices.[2]

At that point, a representative of dairy industry-small business firms suggested that one way to overcome this difficulty would be for the Federal Trade Commission to issue temporary cease-and-desist orders, pending resolution of the long-drawn-out and protracted litigation.[3]

Similar proposals for legislation of this kind were made by others. At that time, the House Small Business Committee recommended favorable consideration of these proposals. In the 86th Congress, the House Small Business Committee in its final report[4] submitted a strong recommendation for amendment of the Federal Trade Commission Act to authorize and empower the Federal Trade Commission to enter temporary cease-and-desist orders. In referring to the testimony which had been taken about this problem during 1958 and 1960, it was stated:

"Currently pending at the Federal Trade Commission are 24 cases involving price discrimination and other trade practices utilized by the large processors and distributors of dairy products. These cases have been pending for periods up to 12 years—nine of them have been pending for a period of more than 6 years, and others for varying periods of time. Representatives of the Federal Trade Commission who have testified during the course of hearings about this situation have failed to indicate that under existing law better results can be obtained. On the contrary, they have made it clear that they believe that under existing law they are doing all that is possible to expedite the litigation of these cases."

Much more has been said and written about the backlogs and delays in the handling of important cases at the Federal Trade Commission. President-elect Kennedy on December 15, 1960, received a report in which it was stated:

"Inordinate delay characterizes the disposition of adjudicatory proceedings before substantially all of our regulatory agencies."[5]

The Federal Trade Commission was singled out as an agency where the problem was particularly acute and reference was made to frustration of its efforts to expeditiously dispose of its work.

On March 21, 1961, a report was made by the Federal Trade Commission to the chairman of the House Small Business Committee which set forth a number of the facts involved in this problem. That report was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.[6] That report showed that a large number of

Footnotes at end of speech.

cases in which small business was vitally interested had been pending at the Federal Trade Commission from periods ranging from 6 to 10 years unresolved. Many of these cases were directed against practices which were alleged to be destroying small business firms and otherwise substantially lessening competition and tending to create monopolies. Of course, it appears that while these cases drag on, the practices which are allegedly destructive continue. The statement has been made that the Federal Trade Commission is not at fault. It has been said that it has done as well as it could with the tools Congress gave it.

HOW WILL THE PROBLEM BE RESOLVED?

This problem is proving troublesome to many. Members of the Federal Trade Commission, Members of Congress, and others are worried about it. They are asking themselves what can we do about this problem? How shall we resolve it? Few are those who answer with the words "do nothing."

In the meantime, additional bills have been introduced in Congress by Representative STEED[7] and by the chairman of the House Small Business Committee,[8] and the chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee.[9] Identical bills have been introduced by other Members of Congress.

On June 15, 1961, the Executive Office of the President, in a report to the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, stated:

"The Departments of Justice and Commerce, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Small Business Administration have all submitted reports favoring the objectives of these bills. The Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission have pointed up a number of technical difficulties which they feel need clarification before enactment. The Bureau of the Budget concurs with the reports of these agencies."

On August 28, 1961, the President of the United States, in a letter directed to the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, strongly supported legislative proposals authorizing the Federal Trade Commission to issue temporary cease-and-desist orders.

PENDING PROPOSALS: H.R. 8830, H.R. 8831, AND S. 2552

These bills, while authorizing the Federal Trade Commission to issue temporary cease and desist orders, would not empower the Commission to use that authority routinely or as a matter of course. The bills have included safeguards and limitations which were suggested in the President's letter of August 28, 1961, to the Honorable OREN HARRIS. It is noted that in his letter, the President, in reference to the proposed cease and desist order, stated that "Such order should, of course, be subject to the protection of appropriate due process, including the safeguards of judicial review." It is reiterated that the pending bills—H.R. 8830, H.R. 8831, and S. 2552 provide these safeguards. In that connection, it is explained that they contain safeguards such as those which surround the traditional temporary injunctive orders entered by courts. Among those requirements are: (1) a prima facie showing of illegality of the acts sought to be enjoined; (2) a showing that irreparable injury would result if the alleged illegal action should be permitted to continue; and (3) provision for proper judicial review of questions challenging the validity of the restraining order.

It is emphasized that these pending legislative proposals provide for the issuance of temporary cease and desist orders only in those cases where the Federal Trade Commission has made an investigation and has reason to believe that the practices which would be made subject to the temporary cease and desist order are illegal under the terms of one or more of the statutes administered by the Commission. In other words, the Commission would not be authorized under these pending bills to issue any temporary order to cease and desist prior to its issuance of a complaint in which it is stated that there is reason to believe that the acts and practices in question are illegal. The Commission recognizes the inappropriateness of entering a temporary injunctive order in any case where there is lacking substantial "probable cause" for believing that the challenged acts or practices are in violation of law.

In a Commission proceeding an essential element for a cause of action is the protection of the public interest. Therefore, the Commission would, under the authority provided by the pending legislative proposals, enter a temporary order only where the failure to do so would substantially diminish or impair the effectiveness of any relief ultimately directed by the Commission for the protection of the public. In this respect, the issue of irreparable injury comes into focus under the proposed temporary cease-and-desist order provisions. Upon this issue the ultimate burden of proof would rest upon the Commission, not the respondent. In that connection, any showing made by the respondent concerning hardship or other effects which the proposed order would have upon it would be considered by the Commission in determining whether such order would be in the public interest.

Under these legislative proposals, judicial review of a temporary cease-and-desist order issued by the Commission would be available, either upon appeal by the respondent, or by application of the Commission for an order of enforcement. In either event, the order of the Commission should be enforced by the court of appeals unless it is shown that such order does not satisfy the provisions of the statute, or if it is shown that the Commission acted arbitrarily or capriciously. The court should not substitute its judgment for that of the Commission regarding the necessity for a temporary injunctive order.

In order to prevent unnecessary hardship, the Commission, in any case in which it issues a temporary cease and desist order, would thereupon place the case on a special calendar or docket for expeditious determination. Such proceedings would be given precedence over other pending cases and be expedited in every way to the maximum extent, consistent with fairness and justice.

As has been pointed out, law enforcement by the Federal Trade Commission on many occasions has been frustrated by delays and an increasing backlog of cases. The present Commission is attempting to eradicate this evil; it seeks to speed up the procedures before the Commission so as to cut down on delays and the backlog of cases.

Among the steps recently taken by the Commission to cut down on delays and backlogs of its cases are changes recently made in its organization, policies, procedures, and rules of practice. In spite of these efforts, in contested cases before the Commission, various procedural steps are required in order to comply with the Administrative Procedure Act and other statutes assuring due process. This will, of necessity, consume considerable time, especially in an involved case, before the Commission can render its final decision in the matter. Even then, if the Commission's decision contains an order to cease and desist, the respondent may in due course appeal to the courts.

All of these various steps inevitably are time consuming. Therefore, a considerable period of time may elapse between the issuance of a complaint and final judicial approval of an order to cease and desist.

During all of this period, a respondent is free under existing law to continue the practices charged in a complaint.

During this interval, small businessmen frequently suffer serious injury, including severe loss of business or even failure due to the allegedly illegal practices of their larger competitors against whom the Commission has issued the complaint.

It appears that in some instances of this kind, the ultimate result is damage to the vigor of competition in the marketplace. Long ago we discovered that you cannot have competition without competitors. It is obvious that competitive harm of this kind could be avoided in many instances if the Commission should be given the authority sought in the pending legislative proposals for temporary cease and desist orders.

Delay works greatly to the advantage of respondents in these monopolistic or restraint of trade cases in the same way it does for respondents in cases involving deceptive acts and practices, such as, false advertising.

Some have alluded to the fact that the issuance of temporary cease and desist orders pendente lite would be drastic action. Such action would be significant. However, it would be far less drastic than actions which have been and now are being taken by Federal regulatory commissions. The Federal Trade Commission and other such commissions long ago were authorized and empowered to enter permanent injunctions in the form of final cease and desist orders. If it should be concluded that these commissions are not sufficiently competent to enter temporary cease and desist orders, then it would seem that it would follow logically that they are incompetent to enter the more drastic permanent and final cease and desist orders, such as they have been entering for many years.

In discussing the significance of temporary cease and desist orders, we should not overlook or ignore the significance of the acts or practices they would be expected to stop. Which is more drastic—a temporary cease and desist order directed to a party to stop temporarily the use of a practice, or the continuation of a practice which would result in destruction of business firms and impairment of the public interest?

Upon lifting of a temporary cease and desist order, a practice could be resumed. However, business firms and competition destroyed as a result of the use of the practice, cannot be revived as could business practices upon the lifting of a temporary cease and desist order. In other words, a corpse may be lifted from the grave, but we have not yet found the magic by which we can restore life to the corpose.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] Representative STEED's bill was H.R. 8841. The bills introduced by Representative PATMAN and other members of the House Small Business Committee on that occasion were H.R. 8842, H.R. 8843, H.R. 8844, and H.R. 8869, all of the 86th Cong.

[2] P. 42, H. Rept. 2713, 85th Cong.

[3] Ibid., pp. 42, 43. In that connection, the witness testified as follows:

"Due to the slowness of our enforcement divisions, and I say this with no bitterness on the subject because I believe that our enforcement divisions of the U.S. Government are terribly overloaded at the present time because we have so many sinners in the camp, I offer the following suggestion as an amendment to the Robinson-Patman Act.

"When a formal complaint is entered with Federal Trade Commission, by one or more of a group of small concerns operating either in a limited area and/or on a few items of an industry against a large and formidable company operating in all lines of an industry and often with diversified interests this formal complaint should go before a committee of 3 members of the Federal Trade

Commission, who shall make a prompt preliminary investigation of the formal complaint, not taking more than 30 days. If they have reasonable belief that the complaint justified a complete detailed investigation then they should order the company, against whom the formal complaint is lodged, to discontinue the practice pending further investigation, final hearings, and conclusion.

* * * * *

"Now, gentlemen, you have got to get this thing down so the action is prompt. A fire chief does not go and look at a fire and then afterward call out his engines. He brings his engines with him and that is what must be done.

"Large companies know the laws as they have large expensive legal organizations. Sometimes one wonders whether these legal organizations are employed to keep the company operating within the laws and whether they are engaged in finding ways to evade the laws."

[4] H. Rept. 2235, 86th Cong., p. 167.

[5] Report from Hon. James M. Landis to President-Elect Kennedy on regulatory agencies and commissions, Dec. 15, 1960.

[6] The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (daily copy, Mar. 22, 1961, pp. 4338–4339).

[7] H.R. 1233, introduced Jan. 3, 1961, and H.R. 8830 introduced Aug. 21, 1961.

[8] H.R. 1817 and H.R. 8831.

[9] S. 2552.

Editorial Writer for Dallas Morning News Has Some Pertinent Thoughts on Communism's Gains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, before we swallow too completely the administration claims that the past year has slowed Communist advances, I would like to call your attention to the following editorial written by Dick West of the Dallas Morning News. As Mr. West points out, let's not become victims of our own optimism:

PEACE AT ANY PRICE

(By Dick West)

The President, in his Columbus speech last Saturday night, indicated that the Communist world was beginning to crack up. Maybe he knows something the rest of us don't know. He did not document his optimism—maybe he couldn't, for fear of revealing secrets.

On the other hand, this is election year. Occasions for the speech was Mike DiSalle's birthday blowout at $100 a plate, the proceeds to be used down the line when Democrats start running against Republicans.

As titular head of the Democratic Party, Mr. Kennedy naturally would make it appear that his administration the past year has been so strong that Communists everywhere are running for cover—just as he made it appear, when he was Candidate Kennedy, that Republicans under Dwight Eisenhower had been so weak that Communists everywhere were gaining ground.

Just what is the truth—political labels aside?

Mr. Kennedy has no reason for optimism. Since 1946, international communism has expanded its power and control faster than any other movement of aggrandizement in human history.

Half a billion people have come under domination of the Soviet brand of communism since the end of World War II.

The Communists run an area outside the Soviet Union of 4 million square miles. If you count Russia's 8,700,000 square miles, the Kremlin directly controls nearly 20 percent of the earth's land mass.

The Red march continues, and the Communists do not fire a shot in their triumphs. Usually their stooges (Sukarno, Castro, Cheddi Jagan) take over under another label.

But there is no doubt who calls the shots, who furnishes the infiltrators, who supplies the money and guns if a revolution is necessary.

The Communists are marching for one reason: U.S. foreign policy since the end of World War II can be summed up in one phrase—peace at any price.

Before World War II our national objective was to preserve our system of freedom. Everything else was secondary.

Under Truman, Eisenhower and now Kennedy we have set peace as our goal—and everything else is secondary.

Russia knows this.

So Russia takes risks, knowing we are likely to sit down and negotiate for peace when a crisis like Berlin arises. When we sit down with the Communists around the table, the Communists usually walk out with the table.

The initiative is theirs, because of our announced and proved policy of avoiding war at all costs.

Idealists like Adlai Stevenson have moved into high positions of power. The President must depend upon their judgments. Idealism is wonderful, except there is doubt whether a Communist knows the meaning of the word.

What Really Matters Is That Men and Women Are Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, we have all been saddened by the recent illness of the President's father, the Hon. Joseph P. Kennedy. George Sokolsky wrote the following tribute to the senior member of this remarkable family which appeared in the New York Journal American on December 26, 1961.

I know that I share with our colleagues the grateful feelings his family must feel now that Ambassador Kennedy has left the hospital. The article follows:

THESE DAYS: A WONDERFUL DAD LIVES IN HIS CLAN

(By George E. Sokolsky)

In these days, it is so unusual for a father to live to see an entire family grow up who all achieve notable position. Such a blessing came to Joe Kennedy. Although his eldest son died before the father, the second son, Jack, became President of the United States; Bobby became Attorney General; Ted will probably become Governor of Massachusetts. The daughters have not married for wealth or position but have established socially purposeful lives.

This is indicative of a disciplined and well-bred family that found within family life a completion and joy that is not usual in this era. To know a Kennedy is to know a clan, headed by Joe and Rose. The devotion of one for the other is beautiful.

Bobby, Jack's campaign manager, has been devoted to his brother, giving his time and his ability to aid his brother to succeed. The sisters and the brothers-in-law joined the campaign and went before the public to serve their brother. Even Rose, the mother, now 72, campaigned along with the Kennedy girls. This was a family in action.

Joe has had the gratification of seeing his boys and girls grow into positions of prime significance. I remember, years ago, seeing the proud father walk down Fifth Avenue on Easter Sunday with his boys and girls—then a young patriarch of a growing clan. And he brought to them the ideal of patriotism and religious fealty.

Few men could say that they had so completely succeeded in building a family that based its relationship on mutuality and love. To have achieved this is enough for any man.

I have known Joe Kennedy many years and in all this time I knew the depth of this man's love of country. A friend said to me the night before Joe suffered a stroke: "I do not fear that the Kennedy boys will ever disgrace this country. Joe would shoot them if they did a dishonest act." That man was Bernard Baruch who is a good judge of men.

Herbert Hoover worked closely with Joe Kennedy in organizing the executive branch of Government and always spoke in the highest terms of respect and affection of the father of this clan which was trained to public service and who knew no other life.

When Joe Kennedy was the American Ambassador to the Court of St. James's he was sometimes berated as pro-German or anti-British. Joe was neither. He was pro-American. He objected to any country taking advantage of the United States. He always thought in terms of what was beneficial to the United States and if he and Franklin D. Roosevelt quarreled, it was over each man's judgment as to what was then best for the United States. This singleness of purpose, Joe passed on to his children.

He fashioned them for public life. He established them in economic independence, so that each could serve his country without succumbing to temptations or compromising to earn provender. Under his tutelage, they grew up solely for public service. He has had no cause to be ashamed of them.

One year, I had delivered a lecture in Palm Beach and, as is the custom, some came up to speak kindly to me and to shake my hand. And along came a modest little lady who said:

"I'm Rose Kennedy, the mother of the Senator."

There was pride in her voice and I realized for the first time that this is not a congeries of individuals but a family, bound by love and proud of each other's accomplishments. These young people were not competing against each other but were united in the strong personality of Joe who bred them to be effective and virtuous.

It is not important that one became President of the United States. This is one of the accidents of life, an accident that might have gone one way or the other. What matters is that they have all grown up with elegance of manners, with a strong sense of moral responsibility, with a consciousness of civic duty.

To me, it seems that Joe Kennedy had more to be proud of that he reared such children than that he achieved wealth and position and that his son is President. For what really matters is that men and women are good, not that they are successful. And Joe's progeny is good.

Remarks of Congressman Edwin B. Dooley at Assembly of Rye, N.Y., Junior and Senior High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on December 14, 1961, I had the pleasant opportunity of addressing more than 1,000 students at the Rye Junior and Senior High School in my district of Westchester County, N.Y.

The attitude, responsiveness, and conduct of the students of that institution was most impressive and admirably reflected the fine leadership of the principal, Miss Elizabeth Brown, and the teachers there.

The text of my remarks follows:

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN EDWIN B. DOOLEY, RYE JUNIOR AND SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL, RYE, N.Y., DECEMBER 14, 1961

I am honored to have been invited to participate in your assembly program this morning. I am especially indebted to your principal for affording me this opportunity.

I stand before you with mixed emotions. On the one hand, I am grateful for the opportunity to exchange greetings with my younger constituents, for to do so is always an enriching experience. Too frequently, students are limited to visualizing their Federal Government and Representatives in Washington through the pages of their social studies books. If time permitted, I would like to vist every high school in this area, for it is young men and women like yourselves whose future destinies are most affected by the legislative decisions made in Washington.

On the other hand, because of the nature of the subject, this is perhaps the most difficult speech I have ever been called upon to deliver.

About 3 weeks ago a petition which originated here at Rye High School was brought to my attention. It was addressed to President Kennedy, your United Nations Delegate Adlai Stevenson, your two New York Senators, and myself. Although some of you in this auditorium did not sign it, I am sure at least some portions of it expressed the sentiments of all.

After citing your apprehension over the possible effects here in Rye of a nuclear attack on New York City you said, and I quote, "We want to live. We want a peaceful world, where we can learn, and play and work, and enjoy the good things in the world as we know it now. We think young people everywhere want these things too. And we believe that it is your wish, too."

Although those words originated with you, the sentiments are indeed universal.

I have not come here to say you have nothing to fear. To do so would be an insult to your knowledge of current events. The fears of all of us are perhaps one of the stabilizing forces in the world today. It was a benevolent Almighty who instilled fear in the heart of man and beast alike, for this was to be the primary force in their survival. But unlike the beast, man was endowed with more noble emotions to the end that he has had to learn to understand his fears.

With much justification, you and I may feel we are living in the darkest and most perilous days of history, when too few of our scientific achievements are harnessed for peaceful purposes. Nevertheless, I sometimes wonder if the dangers of our times, magnified by more rapid communications, have not blurred our vision of the past. Man has always lived with fear.

From the Egyptian enslavement of the children of Israel to the slaughter of Christians in the Coliseum at Rome, fear for survival did not deter the growth of the great western religions. From the outnumbered ranks of Lexington to the battle of sticks and stones against tanks in Budapest, fear did not dampen man's yearning desire for dignity and independence.

Fear of a mysterious continent, savage Indians, and cold winter winds did not discourage those brave men, women, and children from settling in America. Fear is in the mind of Astronaut Commander Glenn, but it will not alter his desire for accomplishing a higher ideal, that of challenging the mysteries of space.

But some of you may be saying to yourselves, these people are all nobler than I. Perhaps, but I wonder how many of you in your younger years sustained a bloody nose against uneven odds when you felt you were in the right? How many will risk the temporary disgrace of failure rather than cheat on an exam?

So it is in the world today. We must never betray our moral principles strictly in the name of survival.

Your petition concludes with the appeal, and I quote, "We urge you to listen to us, and to start to take the steps necessary for world disarmament and permanent peace." I wonder if those of you who signed the petition appreciate the significance of those words.

When you asked your President to "start" to take the steps necessary for peace, you were asserting that the United States had not yet done so.

I disagree. Although you were too young to remember, there was a time when your Government enjoyed a monopoly of atomic weapons. During that period—in 1946 to be specific—former President Truman endorsed a plan that was submitted to the United Nations by one of our greatest living Americans, Bernard Baruch. This would have turned over all phases of atomic development to an agency of the United Nations. Russia rejected the offer. Eight years later former President Eisenhower submitted his open skies proposal to the United Nations, which would have laid open to the penetrating aerial camera lens any possible military buildup, either nuclear or conventional. This, too, was rejected. These and many other offers for effective arms control were made by the United States from a position of strength, not weakness.

While I disagree with this part of your petition, I think it is very significant that here in Rye, N.Y., there are at least 280 high school students who freely express dissatisfaction with their Government's efforts for world disarmament.

In Russia, your contemporaries of high school age would never do likewise. Because there is virtually no public discussion of governmental policy either on the radio, in the newspapers, or among adults in the home, these young people have been convinced their Government seeks peace, that it has been forced into warlike preparations only by hostile and aggressive acts of the Western Powers. For this reason above all others, Soviet young people will blindly exert any effort their leaders require of them.

We have in the world today two opposing systems, each capable of destroying the other, where the people of one are satisfied their Government can do no wrong, and where the people of the other are traditionally skeptical of the performance of their leaders.

In Communist countries, only a chosen few can depose a leader either by a bullet or other brutal means; in the United States your parents can eliminate those of us in public office through their ballots. In Russia, through ignorance, the people are satisfied with the efforts of their leaders for world peace; in the United States, through spirited discussion, our people feel too much effort cannot be exerted.

Yet, freedom of discussion and action is a trust. Our criticism should always meet the test of being constructive. On grave issues such as nuclear testing and disarmament we should always strive for unity of action and purpose, while reserving the right as freemen to criticize. To do otherwise would be to weaken the cause of freedom.

The strength of a country rests with the strength of the individual. Just as light dispels darkness, understanding dispels panic. As panic destroys the person, so also can it destroy government.

President Kennedy recognized this when, in the spirit of Lincoln at Gettysburg, he warned the Nation that "we shall have to test anew whether a Nation organized and governed such as ours can endure."

It is a test we have met many times before. With your support, I am confident we will meet that test again.

May you all have a very happy holiday.

The Ivory Tower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I think most Members of Congress will agree that our former Ambassador to Spain, John Lodge did an excellent job. It is therefore with pleasure that I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD his reply to a recent editorial in the New York Times, attacking Secretary Rusk's visit to Madrid, as it appeared in the Brooklyn Tablet on January 13.

It is well even for the New York Times to come out occasionally from its ivory tower attitude and face reality. It is also time for the United States to find out who its friends are and whom to list as enemies, and then to act accordingly in all phases of our foreign policy.

The article follows:

EX-AMBASSADOR ANSWERS TIMES ATTACK ON SPAIN—JOHN LODGE DISCUSSES TELEGRAM ATTRIBUTED TO MRS. ROOSEVELT

(Recently Secretary of State Dean Rusk while on a visit to Madrid praised the Spanish Government and people for their friendly relations with the United States. Several days later the New York Times printed a telegram, purportedly from Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, addressed to Dean Rusk, denouncing his visit and remarks in Madrid. Two days later Mrs. Roosevelt denied she ever sent any such telegram. The Times, in an editorial headed "The Telegram That Never Was," mentioned the hoax but said such a telegram might have been sent, and then vented its usual hatred of the Spanish Government. On Thursday of last week the following letter from John Davis Lodge, U.S. Ambassador to Spain from March 1955 to April 1961 was printed:)

It is unfortunate that a newspaper of the importance of the New York Times should print, a few short days before Christmas, December 21, on the same page as Arthur Krock's wise and statesmanlike column, an editorial as unconstructive as the one entitled "The Telegram That Never Was."

For the influential, the venerable New York Times to oppose Secretary of State Dean Rusk's recent visit to Madrid seems particularly regrettable at this time when the United Nations, where we receive excellent support from Spain, finds itself in such a dangerous situation; when the United States is beset by ever-increasing perils and predicaments; and when the need for unity, both within Western Europe and between the United States and Western Europe, is urgent.

Since 1953, when the current agreements between Spain and the United States were signed, we have received wholehearted cooperation from Spain.

In fact, it is most unlikely that the government which someday will succeed General Franco's government, although it may meet with more approval from the Times, could be more cooperative with the United States than the Government now in power.

SUPPORT FOR CASTRO

The Times approved—indeed it aided and abetted—the installation of the Castro government in Cuba, at a time when it was clear to some that it was destined to be neither friendly to the United States nor a democracy. Indeed the Times does not hate all dictatorships. It gave its editorial blessing to the dictatorship of our friend, Ayub Khan, in Pakistan, while expressing the hope that it would some day evolve toward democracy. Quite properly, in my opinion, it raised no outcry against the reception accorded him in the United States.

It understood the appropriateness of the meeting between General Park, the military dictator of South Korea, and President Kennedy. It does not seem worried by the absence of democracy in Indonesia, in Burma, and in many other countries. Spain appears to be its principal whipping boy.

Carl N. Degler (associate professor of history at Vassar) points out, in a timely and provocative article in the New York Times Magazine for June 4, 1961, that "* * * a policy that assumes democracy can be established in countries now ruled by dictators seems to have almost no foundation in reality at all."

CLOSE TIES CITED

We are engaged in a relentless struggle for survival, and as leaders of the non-Communist world we are beseiged by many critical problems. It would be irresponsible, indeed it would be downright reckless, gratuitously to adopt an unfriendly attitude toward the third largest nation in Europe, a nation of 30 million people, a nation with close ties of language and tradition and with strong influence with millions of people in our hemisphere, a nation which, from bitter, bloody and tragic experience, understands the implacable nature of the Communist threat.

We should not reject the friendships of nations simply because they do not enjoy representative government as we understand it.

On June 3, 1944, Winston Churchill, in a Parliamentary debate, referred to the attitude of Spain during the war and to the damage which Spain could have caused the Allies if she had maintained an indecisive position. In the course of his remarks Sir Winston stated:

"I shall always consider a service was rendered at this time by Spain, not only to the United Kingdom and to the British Empire and Commonwealth, but to the cause of the United Nations. I have, therefore, no sympathy with those who think it clever and even funny to insult and abuse the Government of Spain whenever occasion serves."

Secretary of State Rusk, wishing to follow this useful tradition, apparently recognizes that Spain is making a significant contribution to our common cause. Perhaps he feels, as indeed do others.

The Federation of American Scientists Speaks Out on Civil Defense Shelters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, December 4, 1961, I caused to be distributed to the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives copies of a statement issued by the Federation of American Scientists on the subject of civil defense shelters.

It is a thoughtful statement on a question which needs thorough discussion. Unfortunately, there has been much confusion and too little scientific information made available to the American people. In this session I believe Congress will want to examine the many ramifications of civil defense. This statement is of great assistance in suggesting the inherent policy questions. The Federation of American Scientists have made a real contribution by this presentation.

Mr. Speaker, I am sponsoring House Concurrent Resolution 391 to set up a select committee of Congress to examine the political, economic, psychological implications of civil defense. I outlined some of the questions such a committee might consider on September 19, 1961, in my speech "Civil Defense: Dangerous False Security or Indispensable Protection?" See the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 19, 1961, pages 19139–19142.

I believe the statement by the federation on this same subject is important enough to be read by every Member of this body. For that reason, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am inserting herewith the statement:

STATEMENT BY THE FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS ON CIVIL DEFENSE SHELTERS

Oversimplifications in the public press recently have tended to produce the misleading impression that the individual can by his own efforts insure his survival in the event of any nuclear war. This impression is as wrong as the perhaps equally widespread view that there is nothing that anyone can do to improve his chances of survival if war comes.

The Federation of American Scientists considers the shelter issue unusually difficult as it involves measures and estimates that are without precedent, making predictions highly uncertain. Shelter planning involves many technical considerations not easily conveyed to the public, many of which depend in some degree on information that is unavailable—either because the information has not been released, or because it is not known in the United States, or because it depends on decisions not yet made, or because the effects involved are in fact imponderable. The fact that civil defense planning bears intimately on the individual citizen's everyday life, to a degree not true of other security measures, has engendered higher emotional content in the discussion.

The truth about fallout shelter programs is both simple and complex. It is clear that a properly designed fallout shelter program can save at least some people and, in some situations, most people. It is also clear that few, if any, people can become safe by building a fallout shelter.

Beyond these simple truths, both of which must be recognized in any responsible discussion of a fallout shelter program, the truth becomes more complex and more difficult to determine.

For example, claims of over 90-percent survival would be reasonable for one particular kind of possible enemy attack; namely, an attack at present Soviet force levels which concentrated only on our counterattack bases. In this event, there would be little direct threat to most of our population, and fallout shelters could be effective in those downwind population centers where lethal concentrations of radioactive fallout would occur. On the other hand, an attack pattern which included the bombing of our centers of industrial strength and of population might well take the lives of half our total population. Fallout shelters would provide little or no protection to those in the area of blast and firestorm damage—an area of hundreds of square miles in the case of a 20-megaton bomb. In this case, fallout shelters might still save the lives of some tens of millions of people in the surrounding areas of heavy fallout. However, the problems of survival of these people after they emerged from their shelters and of reconstructing a social order would be enormous. It is not possible to predict what attack pattern would be selected initially by the Soviet Union in the event of nuclear war nor what pattern might develop as the war progressed.

Furthermore, it is particularly complex and difficult to determine the truth about what might be called the political impact of a fallout shelter program—upon ourselves and our Government, upon Russia, upon our allies, and upon neutrals. These political effects can be of critical importance because they may change the chances that there will be a nuclear war; and it is clear that a substantial reduction in the likelihood of nuclear war would increase the Nation's safety far more than would a fallout shelter program.

While well-reasoned statements on civil defense possibilities have been made by the President and by some other high administration officials, we believe that our national leadership should now assume a special responsibility for making detailed information readily available to the public so that people will know the chances for and against survival if we get into a nuclear war and how much a fallout shelter program might realistically contribute to improving the likelihood of survival.

It is evident that the destruction of life and of the mechanisms for maintaining our society in its familiar pattern would be vast in any kind of major nuclear war. Consequently, it is recognized by our Government that its efforts toward security must be directed at the prevention of such a war. A large part of the effort must be devoted to our military strength so that it will be apparent to a possible enemy that his security also depends on the avoidance of war. Another part of the effort must lie in the area of negotiation and mutual conciliation to keep tensions from growing out of control. We call attention to the danger that a shelter program that is oversold may develop public attitudes which would hamper our Government in this latter important function, and might generate a public conviction that nuclear war is just another one of the ordinary risks of life in the 1960's. This may, in turn, encourage an attitude of undue inflexibility in foreign policy.

In addition to our interest in identifying and clarifying the facts and policy considerations germane to a shelter program, the Federation of American Scientists believes that the administration should direct the present concern over the possibility of nu-

clear war, as manifested in the public's interest in shelters, toward developing support for political measures designed to lead toward a more basic solution of the problem of security. Indeed, it is our belief that a frank appraisal of what shelters will and will not do in the event they might have to be used, will provide the Government with a reservoir of public support for more positive approaches to reducing world tensions. Such positive approaches which merit high-level consideration might include, for example, agreement to submit all international disputes to binding arbitration, the beginning of political integration among at least those western countries of common values, renunciation of first use of nuclear weapons, establishment of a United Nations peacekeeping force on a permanent basis, additional efforts to curb any further spread of nuclear weapons, and greatly enhanced operations of the new Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, among many other policy initiatives, either as alternatives or in combination.

EXPLANATORY TEXT

Shelter policy involves a number of components that interact with, and frequently counteract, one another and that require a political judgment in deciding which considerations should be governing. Thus, a judgment on a national shelter program cannot be made on purely scientific grounds. Yet we believe that a conscientious review of the major considerations involved in such planning, and their principal technical components, is of considerable potential usefulness, and is one which the Federation of American Scientists is appropriately qualified to undertake.

The memorandum that follows is intended to provide such a review, directed primarily toward fallout shelter programs of relatively modest scope. A modest shelter program is one which will not prevent the Soviets from inflicting very large scale civilian fatalities if they choose an attack pattern designed to achieve that objective. On the other hand, a modest shelter program is one which will provide some protection against fallout for those who are outside of the area of immediate destruction. The memorandum deals with the considerations that have to do with three main aspects of security planning: protection of the population against attack at current Soviet force levels, and possibilities of reducing potential civilian casualties; the effects of possible changes in the strategic force levels of the Soviets and others; and the effects of the program on the likelihood of war. Each aspect will be considered in turn.

1. Protection of population against attack at current Soviet force levels: The degree of protection which a modest fallout shelter program would provide depends importantly on the scale of the enemy's attack, and on the tactics he employs. At any given time, the Soviet Union has a virtually fixed maximum number of bombs it could realistically hope to deliver on the United States in the event of war. This number can change with time, but cannot change drastically overnight. Whether or not the administration has precise estimates of current Soviet capabilities is not publicly clear, but several public sources indicate that present Soviet delivery capabilities are probably in the range of a few thousand megatons of yield, with roughly half the total yield derived from fission energy, which would produce the bulk of the fallout. Just how much these maximum capabilities might be reduced through the action of our air defense forces, and by U.S. attacks on Soviet strategic forces in the opening phase of the war, is highly uncertain; the reduction could range from slight to substantial, depending on how the war started.

Even a modest national fallout shelter program would be likely to result in some reduction in U.S. casualties from an attack of this approximate scale. The extent of reduction, however, depends considerably on the tactics used by the enemy. Simple fallout shelters would be of maximum utility if most or all of the enemy weapons were directed at our own strategic forces such as bomber and missile bases, rather than at cities or industrial centers. In this case, modest shelters could save many tens of millions of lives, and total casualties might be held to approximately ten million persons.

Even so, this would constitute an unprecedented catastrophe for the United States. However, if the enemy attack were directed chiefly or entirely at population or industrial centers, fallout shelters would provide little protection against blast and firestorm effects, and the casualties could approximate half the populace. Fallout shelters could still save a few tens of millions of people who might otherwise be killed, but these survivors would face many more difficulties in the recuperation than in the former case.

Many strategists maintain that it would be foolish in circumstances of relatively limited stocks of weapons and delivery systems for an enemy to expend weapons on population or industrial centers simply for the sake of killing people, because he might better expend the weapons attacking our strategic forces, and thereby reduce his own destruction. Others argue that an enemy will sacrifice at least some strategic gain to attack at least some population or industrial centers, either for blackmail purposes, for influencing resolve to continue the war, out of sheer tradition, or for some other reason. It is clear that reliable information concerning present Soviet war plans—whether they would chiefly attack cities or strategic forces—probably does not exist in the administration, and certainly has not been made public. Moreover, what—if any—change in those plans would occur once a war had started is difficult or impossible to predict. Even more uncertain is the question of whether such Soviet war plans would themselves be influenced by a U.S. shelter program; it is sometimes argued that such a program would cause the Soviets to increase the scale of attack on population and industrial centers, and thus draw more of their weapons away from our own strategic forces. In view of the fact that the strategic forces could then retaliate more effectively, this argument does not seem forceful.

2. Possible changes in strategic forces: The foregoing discussion concerned possible wars involving Soviet forces at more or less their present levels. It is possible that Soviet forces may increase, or strategic nuclear forces of other nations may develop, to levels that could nullify the protection afforded by a modest fallout shelter program. Such an increase may not occur; it is worth pointing out that the first-strike delivery capability of United States forces has probably been declining slightly in the recent past, and many military strategists believe that a deterrent force of a few hundred reliably deliverable weapons of a few megatons each constitutes an adequate deterrent force, whether or not the potential enemy has civil defense. But the possibility should be considered.

The radiation protection provided by a modest program of fallout shelters ranges from factors of 5 or 10 or 20, in largely unmodified basements of existing buildings, to factors of 100 or 1,000 or more for specially constructed basement or backyard shelters. Therefore, the increase in enemy strategic forces required to nullify the shelter program would be something like a factor of 10, so far as fallout effects alone are concerned. However, other effects could be more important, and the increase required could be as little as a factor of 2 or as much as a factor of 10 or more, depending upon enemy tactics both before and after the increase.

Changes of this scale could not be effected overnight. However, it seems possible that the Soviets could, with a sufficiently intense effort, double their existing forces in something like 1 year, or multiply them by 10 in 2 or 3 years. Such an effort would require a very large diversion of resources, comparable to mobilization on the scale of World War II. Without such diversion, a more reasonable time scale for a 10-fold increase would be 5 to 10 years.

It is possible that the shelter program itself might be partly or wholly responsible for such an increase in opposing strategic forces, if the opponent were interested in causing a large number of fatalities. If so, the shelters could still have had a temporary value, in terms of a possible contribution toward deterring nuclear war and in terms of technical effectiveness in case nuclear war occurred. On the other hand, if shelters contribute to an accelerated build-up of strategic forces, their possible temporary value must be balanced against the increased destructiveness if war should occur.

To summarize the considerations under items 1 and 2, we can say the following: In the near future, a modest fallout shelter system offers substantial reduction of civilian damage in an attack against our strategic forces only. It offers appreciably less reduction in an attack pattern that includes bombing of our population and industrial centers. In the longer range, a modest shelter system offers even less assurance of a major reduction in casualties and damage, if opposing strategic forces increase deliverable yield substantially.

3. Effects on likelihood of war: It is possible, at least as a matter of principle, that the existence of a shelter program might itself influence the likelihood of general war. This question has been the subject of intense discussion, and is one of the major imponderables. Nonetheless, we should discuss the main considerations of this problem, which are quasitechnical in a broad sense of the term.

(a) It is perfectly clear that the political leaders of the United States would never initiate a general nuclear war except under extreme provocation or by mistake. However, the question of what constitutes sufficiently extreme provocation is likely to depend on just how catastrophic the war might be. Therefore, any shelter program that could substantially mitigate the consequences of a war is likely to lower the provocation threshold, which might of itself make war more likely. To be set against this, however, are two other factors: first, no foreseeable shelter program will make nuclear war appear as something to be undertaken lightly, so the threshold would not be lowered very much; second, potential enemies would be aware that the threshold had been lowered and would presumably tend to be more careful not to engage in actions that could seem extremely provocative (such as, e.g., attacking Berlin or West Germany).

(b) In the event that we received equivocal evidence that an attack on the United States was underway or about to get underway, our own military officials would be strongly motivated to attack the strategic forces of the opponent immediately, in order to blunt the attack as much as possible. One of the possible sources of accidental war is that such evidence might be incorrect. To the extent that the populace is protected against an enemy attack, one of the motives for initiating a blunting attack on the basis of equivocal evidence would be reduced; it would then be potentially less catastrophic to wait and make sure. Therefore, this aspect of population shelters might tend to make certain types of accidental war less

likely. However, shelter programs are probably much less important in diminishing the likelihood of accidental war than is the protection of our strategic forces.

(c) An effect that is less certain than the preceding, but possibly no less important, is the psychological effect on the populace resulting from an organized program of fallout shelters. It is possible that such a program might develop public attitudes and pressures that would narrow the range of policy alternatives available to the Government, in ways that could make the ultimate occurrence of war more likely. The possible extent and character of this effect is a subject of controversy among students of these matters. However, the possibility is a source of concern to many.

(d) There is another psychological effect which must be mentioned, and which has generated perhaps the greatest amount of emotion: that is the effect of a shelter program on the personal behavior and attitudes of people, even in the absence of nuclear war. A well organized fallout shelter program, coupled with a balanced flow of information about the efficacy of shelters, may strengthen the ability of the public to recognize realistically the dangers of nuclear war, which may occur despite all we can do to prevent it. Such realistic facing of the danger could have the effect of strengthening public support for drastic political action aimed at preventing nuclear war. Against this possible beneficial effect must be weighed the deleterious effects which could occur. Although difficult to measure or predict, these include the possibilities of weakening of the society by preparations for personal survival with little regard for others, and of the diversion of effort from long-range concerns in an atmosphere of fear and fatalism.

(e) A final possible effect on the likelihood of war is the provocative effect of a shelter program as it may be interpreted by the Soviets. Although President Kennedy has stated that the major purpose of a shelter program would be an insurance in case of "an irrational attack, a miscalculation, an accidental war which cannot be either foreseen or deterred," it has been argued that the Soviet Union might consider that a major purpose was to strengthen our own position in case we decided to initiate nuclear war. Such a conclusion by the Soviet Union, the argument goes, could increase the overall degree of tension and make more likely both a major war and an initial attack by Russia.

We believe in fact that the provocative effect of a modest fallout shelter program will not be appreciable, for the reason that clearly such shelters would not prevent very large-scale fatalities in case of a deliberate attack on population and industrial centers; certainly such a program should be far less provocative than a massive civil defense program designed to protect the populace even against deliberate retaliatory attacks.

4. Conclusions: The Federation of American Scientists does not now recommend the adoption or rejection of a specific shelter program; we believe it more appropriate simply to set forth the above summary of major quasi-technical considerations that relate to civil defense programs, primarily to modest fallout shelters. A very expensive program of blast shelters and other measures would pose a new range of problems that we have not discussed. Still less do we presume to advise individuals on the personal preparations they should make.

However, we do wish to emphasize again two major points: First: Although a modest fallout shelter program offers substantial protection for the near future and for some kinds of attack, it offers appreciably less protection under other kinds of attack that might occur in the immediate future, and still less protection against possible strategic forces that might evolve later. Second: The present time seems especially opportune for furthering political measures that would tend to improve security. This point is separate from the question of any decision concerning shelters. Though such political measures do not involve engineering or science, we wish to state that as individuals most of us believe that the best hope of long-term world security resides in basic political rearrangements, rather than in continually increasing military expenditures. The administration should use the present period of national concern to consider further such political measures as agreement to submit all international disputes to binding arbitration, the beginning of political integration among at least those Western countries of common values, renunciation of first use of nuclear weapons, establishment of a United Nations peace-keeping force on a permanent basis, additional efforts to curb any further spread of nuclear weapons, and greatly enhanced operations of the new Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, among many other policy initiatives, either as alternatives or in combination. It might also be possible, and would seem highly worthwhile, to agree with the Soviet Union to refrain from pursuing intensive and expensive civil defense programs, and inspection of such an agreement would be relatively simple.

Freedom in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Luis Muñoz-Marín, Governor of Puerto Rico, has done much for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Its progress has been noteworthy under his wise and dynamic leadership.

The following article by Columnist Arthur McClure of the Hearst newspapers suitably commends the contribution which Governor Muñoz has made to the economy and culture of Puerto Rico:

[From the New York Journal American, Jan. 9, 1962]

FREEDOM IN ACTION

(By Arthur McClure)

Luis Muñoz-Marín, the wise and dynamic Governor of Puerto Rico, has an answer for the Jeremiahs who belittle the image that American democracy presents to the world.

The answer is the fact that the leaders of the undeveloped nations are beating a path to this once poverty-stricken island to see how our democratic methods have helped to bring about one of the most dramatic transformations of modern times.

In 10 years, 15,000 political leaders, teachers and social scientists have come from Africa and Asia to see for themselves how this miracle was accomplished and to adapt these methods for their own countries.

Walk the streets of bustling, metropolitan San Juan, or drive out into the lush, tropic back reaches, and you will see these people everywhere in turbans and saris. They are getting the facts and in the process developing a new respect for democracy, U.S. style.

In partnership with the United States as a self-governing commonwealth, Puerto Rico has shown the way to how a once backward land can prosper in freedom. And Governor Muñoz says this is what President Kennedy's alliance for progress can accomplish on the larger stage of all Latin America.

This pragmatic politician who also is poet and philosopher says the first lesson Puerto Rico learned was that "hope is the spiritual fuel that moves people who live in misery." The hope was provided by programs that could be put into action swiftly.

SEEING IS BELIEVING

Thousands of low-cost homes were provided for the rural poor with noninterest, long-term loans. New schools blossomed. The problem of a shortage of teachers was met by broadcasting instruction to outlying schools by television. A ribbon of roads tied the most remote pueblos to main arteries.

With this start, Puerto Rico was ready for industrialization. The government embarked on a massive selling campaign to lure industry from the mainland. The ranks of those who had worked for 12 cents a day on the great plantations dwindled fast. Today this island has the highest economic growth rate in the world.

This is what Governor Muñoz calls "Operation Seeing Is Believing." "I would like to see this phrase on every truck carrying food and materials, every bridge, every new house or hospital or school, and on the armbands of every medical team reaching into the depth of despair," he says.

But Governor Muñoz, who knows the Latin world so well, has two warnings for us:

"The United States should not support a tyrannical government merely because it denounces Castro. And the United States must not shrink from governments that are not exact models of U.S. democracy. You cannot, as President Kennedy has said, 'expect all nations to adopt like systems'."

Fiscal Expert Analyzes Danger in Back-Door Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following article from this morning's Washington Post, written by former director of the Budget, Maurice Stans, is a clear and unexcelled explanation of back-door spending and a keen analysis of the danger such fiscal policy presents. We had better go slow on giving up to the executive branch any more of our legislative responsibility if we are to maintain a government made strong by the separation of powers. For this reason, I include as part of my remarks this article by Maurice Stans:

OUR CHANGING ECONOMY—BACK-DOOR SPENDING TO RESUME

(By Maurice Stans)

Surprisingly, the last loud gun fired in the 1961 session of the Congress was not a political shot by one party at the other. It was a bipartisan cannon roar in the House aimed at the Senate over the issue of back-door spending. It will be reverberating in the Capitol through much of this 1962 session.

Few people outside Washington know what the fuss was about or why this is a continuing vital issue that effects the pocketbook of every taxpayer. In involves not only the Constitution but also the question of orderly discipline over the financial affairs of the Government.

Section 9 of article I of the Constitution demands that "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law." The objective of this is to provide a double control over the spending actions of the executive branch of the Government. First, no activity may be carried on by any agency unless that activity is specifically authorized in a substantive law spelling out its scope. Next, no money is to be spent on the activity without an appropriation for the purpose for each year.

ESTIMATE OF PRIORITIES

Under the annual budget process, each department and agency of Government submits its requests for money to spend to the President through the Bureau of the Budget. After the painstaking and detailed procedure of budget review is completed, the President presents his recommendations to the Congress early in January in the annual budget for the forthcoming fiscal year.

The Congress has the right to approve, reject, or modify his proposals, and this determination centers in the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate. They hold hearings, first in the House and then in the Senate, on the President's budget for each part of Government, and the agency officials give evidence in support of their items.

After the Appropriations Committees make their respective findings, they are approved on the floor of the Congress and enacted into a series of appropriations laws. These establish ceiling amounts. The Appropriations Committees, like the President, are expected to view spending plans in relation to each other and to the total so that the Government's programs will be carefully balanced to the Nation's needs and resources.

COMMITTEES LOSE CONTROL

Back-door spending is a simple process of bypassing this careful constitutional procedure. To avoid having a matter brought before the Appropriations Committees, congressional proponents of a program may be able to include, in the substantive law authorizing the program, permission for an agency to borrow funds directly from the Treasury to carry it on. The money is then spent without an appropriation. Or the substantive law may contain authority to make contracts in advance of appropriations, in which case the later appropriations are only a formality. Either way, back-door spending provides a much easier way for an agency to obtain funds, because it need ask for them only once in each House instead of twice. The end result is that the Appropriations Committees lose their control over the budget and the Constitution is violated.

Back-door spending has been a growing phenomenon of the last 30 years. After observing the way in which it impaired fiscal control, President Eisenhower directed the Bureau of the Budget in 1959 to approve no new requests of Government agencies for back-door spending, and he included none in the subsequent budgets which he submitted to the Congress.

This position was reversed by the present administration in 1961, and many proposals for back-door spending were included in its messages to Congress. Quite a few were approved in legislation. The Appropriations Committees, properly jealous of their prerogative, fought back hard, but their objections were ineffective in most cases, principally because the back-door spending items appeared in legislation which contained other provisions desired by congressional majorities.

A typical back-door spending proposal was the one by President Kennedy for a 5-year $9 billion authorization for foreign aid. On this he was defeated. After a long fight the long-term idea was approved, but with a provision requiring a separate appropriation action in each year. He also lost on a proposal for back-door spending of $375 million in aid to airports over 5 years, which was instead passed with a requirement for annual appropriations. The 1961 housing bill, however, enacted several provisions for back-door spending, as did the Agricultural Act. In all, according to a table entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by House Appropriations Committee Chairman CLARENCE CANNON, $29 billion was asked by President Kenedy via the back-door route and $20 billion was enacted.

SENATE FUMED AND FUSSED

This explains the closing day's explosion. In protest against the whole business, the House worked into a final piece of legislation, a provision insisting that several programs already enacted on a back-door basis be amended to require appropriations instead. Then it adjourned for the year. The Senate, still in session, fumed and fussed but had no alternative. The action stuck.

The battle is sure to be resumed. The aim of those who seek back-door spending is clearly to make money easier to get. Not all such efforts originate with the White House. Many are inserted by the legislative committees of the Congress. Either way the taxpayer loses. If Government finances are to be subjected to a sound control that assures that spending programs take their right place in line, it is elementary that back-door raids on the Treasury must be ended.

Bond Issue Risks Integrity of U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an excellent editorial from the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., on the subject of the proposed United Nations bond issue:

BOND ISSUE RISKS INTEGRITY OF U.N.

President Kennedy's recommendation to Congress that the United States make a supplementary contribution to the United Nations to pay half the Congo-based U.N. deficit is certain to meet with responsible opposition in both parties. What is asked is just that—a contribution—despite the euphemism of bonds. For the only way the U.N. can retire such obligations is through assessments on its members, and the United States has, from the beginning, carried a sugar daddy's share of U.N. assessments.

This year's U.N. budget is $73 million, excluding emergency assessments, the greatest of which is the Congo operation. Subtracting certain self-generating sources of income, the net appropriation amounted to about $63.5 million, almost exactly half of the anticipated annual cost of the U.N. operation in the Congo, which is running at a rate of $12 million per month.

To meet the regular 1961 budget, the United States was assessed 32.51 percent, or roughly one-third; the U.S.S.R. was assessed 13.62 percent; and the next highest contributor, Great Britain, 7.78 percent. Other assessments were as low as $2,287, or a small fraction of 1 percent, for the newest and smallest members. The United States has been footing an even bigger proportion of the bill in the Congo, about 47.5 percent (almost half), largely because the Communist bloc, France, Belgium, and some smaller nations have petulantly refused payment of their duly assigned assessments because they disagreed with U.N. action in the Congo.

The emergency fund for the Congo is not the only one on which Soviet Russia and other nations have reneged. As of June 30 of this year, 44 nations, almost half of the total U.N. roll, were behind in payment of special assessments, excluding that for the Congo, a total of more than $5 million. More than half this total was that of the U.S.S.R., which owes $2.7 million, more than $2 million of which has been on the books since 1957. Members are generally in better standing in the matter of payment of regular assessments. But 14 are, in fact, in arrears even in payment of the regular assessment, with a total of $3.3 million.

It is because of these records of delinquency, plus the much greater drain of the Congo, that the United States is being asked, in effect, to take the U.N.'s I O U for up to $100 million, or half the $200 million in U.N. bonds authorized by the 1961 General Assembly.

What is one to think of the financial integrity and prospects of an organization so lax in the administration of its revenues? Even the humblest social organization requires its members to keep dues paid up to date or face suspension or expulsion. Now it appears that the loftiest of human organizations has chosen another course, to ask the paid-up members to pick up the bad debts of the deadbeats.

Article 19 of the U.N. Charter reads: "A member which is in arrears in the payments of its financial contributions to the organization shall have no vote if the amount of its arrears equals or exceeds the amount of the contributions due from it for the preceding 2 full years. The General Assembly may, nevertheless, permit such member to vote if it is satisfied that the failure to pay is due to conditions beyond the control of the member."

But even this lenient rule, which permits 2 full years of nonpayment of assessments, has never been invoked. No distinction is made between regular and emergency assessments. Failure to pay Congo assessments would, in a few months, put some nations, including those of the Soviet bloc, in arrears equal to assessments for 2 preceding years. The Communist nations and others have made a practice of withholding payments of assessments for those U.N. projects they disapprove.

Is the General Assembly prepared to enforce article 19? Apparently not. The approval of the $200 million bond issue implies another course and avoidance of the hard decision to require members to pay up or lose their vote in the Assembly.

We would go even further, and, for flagrant offenders, invoke article 6 of the charter, which reads: "A member of the United Nations which has persistently violated the principles contained in the present charter may be expelled from the organization by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council."

Of course, any such resolution would be vetoed by Soviet Russia. But the principle is clear: The United Nations must require its members to meet their financial obligations as well as their moral and political obligations if the Uinted Nations is to retain the respect of the world and the power to exercise even its limited authority. No country would risk even the loss of its vote in the General Assembly on an issue of money. And, on the other hand many countries will not pay if they find that the United States and the few others will foot the bills.

We are strong in our support of the United Nations and of its role in the Congo, but we are dead opposed to the United States buying $100 million worth of U.N. bonds to pay the debts of others. We think that many others, too, will, in the best interests of the United Nations, object to this

easy way out, this admission of financial weakness, this confession, in effect, that the United Nations, as an organization, lacks the courage to insist on financial integrity both in itself and in its members.

Benefit to United States Only a Myth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Nation's Business of January 1962:

BENEFIT TO UNITED STATES ONLY A MYTH

(By U.S. Representative NOAH M. MASON)

When the first extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act came to a vote in February 1937 I was 1 of 13 Members of the House who voted "No." It was my first important vote in Congress. I have never regretted that "no" vote.

In fact, I have voted "No" every time the act has been extended since then. Those first 13 "no" votes have gradually increased until today there are more than 200 votes in the House against further extension of the act.

The word "reciprocal" is a misnomer. It is anything but reciprocal. Our trade program has developed into a one-way street with the benefits all flowing one way—away from the United States. What has it accomplished?

The four reasons given for its enactment in the first place were that it would:

Advance world peace;

Make for world prosperity;

Bring about amity among the nations;

Remove world trade barriers.

Has it accomplished any one of these four objectives?

Has world peace been advanced? During the 27 years the act has been on the books we have had World War II. We have had the Korean war. We have had the so-called Spanish Civil War. We have had 14 years of war in Indochina. We have trouble between England and Egypt, between India and Pakistan. We have had Communist Russia extending her Iron Curtain until she now has control and domination over 900 million people instead of the 300 million people of the Soviet Union before the close of World War II. Can anyone truthfully say world peace has been advanced?

What about world prosperity, the second objective? Are we any nearer world prosperity today than we were in 1934 when the program was instituted?

To try to bring about world prosperity we have given away more than $140 billion in the past 20 years—$60 billion lend-lease during the war and $80 billion since—to say nothing of the $350 billion we have spent for national defense in the cold war.

Certainly our prosperity has not been advanced. We are more than $285 billion in debt today, which is more than all the other nations of the world put together owe—and more than twice as much as all the nations of Europe put together owe.

What about the third objective? Is good will or amity among the nations any nearer today than it was before 1934?

Let us be specific: Has the relationship between India and Pakistan improved since 1934? Between Palestine and Arabia? Between Italy and Yugoslavia? Between Communist China and Nationalist China? Between the United States and Cuba? What about our relations with Russia? Are they improved?

What about internal dissensions and strife? Italy with her 36 percent Communist vote in the last election; France with a national legislature that is 25 percent Communist? What about England torn between her socialist Labor Party and her Conservative Party?

Have good will and amity among men been advanced by the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act? My answer is: Not so anybody can notice it.

Finally, have world trade barriers been reduced or removed? Do we have a freer flow of goods today across national borders than we had in 1934?

While world tariff walls have been lowered, other obstacles or barriers more effective than tariffs have been erected in their place—among them import and export licenses, trade preferences, currency manipulations, multiple currencies, quotas, subsidies, state trading, and the European Common Market freezeout.

It is a fact, and we must face it, that, under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, practically every foreign country that has lowered its tariff walls has erected other barriers against U.S. imports, thereby nullifying the effect of their tariff concessions or reductions.

In the face of these facts—can anyone say our 27 years of experience under our so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act has been a success from the standpoint of its effect upon our American economy? Has it been a benefit to American workmen? The answer to both questions is "No."

In addition to the advantages we have given foreign nations under our Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, during the past 15 years we have poured out to war-torn foreign nations some $75 billion to rebuild their factories; to replace their wornout or war-destroyed machinery with our modern machinery—thus creating competitors for us in both foreign markets and in our own American market.

So, today we face the question: Is the United States being priced out of the world markets? It certainly begins to look that way. One thing is absolutely certain: The United States is facing increased competition in world markets.

Today, for the first time in our history, we have an unfavorable international payments balance. In 1958, our unfavorable world payments balance was $3.4 billion. In 1959, it was $3.7 billion. In 1960, it was $3.9 billion. What it was in 1961 we do not know exactly yet. But we do know that no nation on earth can run a deficit in its international balance of payments of this magnitude very long without going on the rocks.

Our Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act gave the President the power to regulate foreign trade. In effect, this put the State Department—an arm of the Executive—in control of American industry.

Under the guise of seeking allies and friends in an unfriendly world, the State Department has issued what may be termed death sentences to hundreds of American industries and destroyed millions of American jobs.

Consider these effects on American industries already dealt body blows by the tremendous imports flooding our markets today:

1. The American jeweled watch industry has been practically closed out as a result of our tariff reductions since 1934. We formerly had 20 jeweled watch companies in the United States; now we have only a handful. More than 80 percent of the American market for jeweled watches has been taken over by Swiss watch manufacturers.

2. Lowered tariffs in the fresh and frozen fish industry have resulted in such large fish imports at such cheap rates that American fishermen are unable to compete. Some of our largest fish processing plants have moved to other countries where wage rates are lower.

3. Widespread unemployment is now prevalent in our industries that make chinaware, pottery, glassware, and kitchen articles. All industries classified as handcrafts are affected, industries that depend largely upon hand skills. This is the direct result of tariff reductions and the greatly increased imports of those articles.

4. Thousands of lead and zinc miners are today out of work and on relief because of greatly increased imports of both lead and zinc. Recently our zinc factories have been reducing their working forces or going on a part-time basis because of the importation of processed zinc.

5. An excellent example of the way import licenses work is the American motorcycle. American producers formerly enjoyed a substantial market for motorcycles in Great Britain, in Australia, and in other British areas. The British duty on motorcycles was reduced under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, but the British import license system has absolutely shut American motorcycles out of British markets.

These are just a few samples of the direct results of our reciprocal trade agreements program, and the results are only beginning to become evident. In the face of these facts, can anyone say that our trade program has been a success? Should the program be continued? Should the President be given the power to lower our tariffs still further?

How can we maintain high wages for American workmen and high living standards for American people when we permit goods manufactured by foreign workmen working for low wages and farm products raised by farmers who for centuries have been living like serfs, to flood our markets and destroy the jobs upon which our workers depend? There is such a disparity in labor costs between European and American labor that three workers can be employed is Europe for what it costs to employ one in America.

The Constitution gives Congress, and not the Executive, the authority to set tariffs. Congress should no longer shirk its responsibility. Congress should assume that responsibility and through its arm—the U.S. Tariff Commission—repair the damage done by the misguided policies of the past 27 years.

I feel sure this will be done within a year or so. The exportation of American jobs and industry and the ever increasing importation of foreign-made goods to be sold on the American market will be one of the campaign issues next fall.

If we continue any longer on the path to economic destruction, more American capital will go overseas, more and more American businessmen will transfer their plants abroad, more and more American factories will close, and more and more American workers will be out of work. It is past time to act. We must repeal the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and do it now.

Sam Rayburn: Friend and Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, Sam Rayburn was a man whose qualities

radiated in spite of his quiet nature. He is greatly missed by all who knew him, and throughout the country, even by those who did not have the privilege of knowing him personally. I consider it a high honor to have served in the House with Mr. Sam as Speaker. He was a good friend as well as a great statesman.

His friendship can be truly appreciated only by those who knew him. His statesmanship, however, is evident to anyone who has lived through the Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower administrations and this first year of the Kennedy administration, or to anyone in future times who studies those significant years. Few men will leave an imprint as large as Mr. Sam's.

All of Us Should Be Free To Choose Our Own Company

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in our zeal to promote and protect the civil rights of minority groups it may be that we are endangering the freedom of every person to choose his own company and associates. It is the right of every individual to seek membership in any organization he chooses and it is the right of members of any private organization to determine the qualifications of such applicants. We will take a dangerous step toward the loss of freedom of all the people of this Nation if public officials, either through legislation or by exerting undue influence by virtue of the office they hold can dictate to any private organization as to who or who may not become members. In protecting the freedoms of our citizens let us not forget the freedom to pick our own social associates. The following editorial from the Wall Street Journal and another from the Dallas Times Herald should be carefully read by all those concerned with civil rights and individual liberty:

[From the Wall Street Journal]

THE PLEASURE OF OUR COMPANY

Some years ago, in our Washington reporting days, a friend proposed us for membership in the Cosmos Club. For reasons which we never heard, we were not elected.

We don't bring up this obviously personal matter in order to appear in sackcloth and ashes, but because another applicant for membership in that club has been turned down, and the event has erupted into a national hubbub. Perhaps our own experience makes us feel a little freer to make some observations on the right of people to associate with whom they please.

The reason for the fanfare in the case of a State Department official is that he is a Negro. It is quite likely, although we do not know, that his application was turned down because he is a Negro. And the objective of all this publicity is to challenge the right of this club to reject anyone, as a Negro.

This is not, of course, an isolated affair. There have been other occasions when the failures of applicants to be accepted into private clubs or social organizations have made national publicity. In at least one instance the Attorney General of the United States publicly interested himself in the election rules of a club, and there have been some hints from political figures, not exactly veiled, that perhaps this sort of "discrimination" ought to be a matter for legislative action.

Nor are private clubs the only target. The right of people privately to choose their associates in other ways, as for example in living as neighbors, has also been challenged, both with the weight of the law and the weapon of public castigation.

All this is done in the name of civil rights. The right of a person to be welcomed by others—his right to "join"—is equated with every citizen's unquestioned right to vote, to receive justice in the courts and to share in all of the public facilities on an equal basis with every other citizen. The blanket of public policy would be spread over the one as over the other.

At the very least this is misguided, for the forced association is the breeder of resentment and there is no such thing as friendship not freely given. If the object is, as we think it should be, to end unreasoned prejudice in men's hearts, its cause is not forwarded by mistakenly invoking the name of one right to trample upon another one.

For what is overlooked here is that one of the most fundamental of all rights is the freedom to choose one's friends and social associates; this above all is no affair of the state or of society.

In exercising that right people may be blindly prejudiced, snobbish, arrogant or just plain muddleheaded. Still it is their own affair if they prefer not to associate with Protestants, Catholics, Jews, Gentiles, white people, dark people, or undistinguished journalists; or if they prefer, as some in all these groups do, to have societies exclusively limited to their fellows with whom they feel a common bond. Any injury they do, in a free country of infinite variety, is only to themselves.

But when we, as the whole society, undertake to say they cannot do so, and that every member of society must conform to one rule of conduct, then our own prejudices have become blind and the injury we do is to the whole of our society.

Any freedom, if it is to mean anything, must oftentimes embrace the right to do things most people don't approve of. Freedom of speech includes the right to say silly things; freedom of worship includes the right to bow down to idols. And so freedom must include the right of some very nice people, for possibly quite foolish reasons, to decide that they do not want to share the pleasure of our company.

[From the Dallas Times Herald]

CLUB INTEGRATION

J. Kenneth Galbraith, Ambassador to India, resigned from the Cosmos Club in Washington because a Negro applicant was refused membership. President Kennedy, an applicant sponsored by Galbraith, now lacks a sponsor and does not intend to become a member.

Integration of public institutions and public facilities is one thing. Use of pressure by officeholders to force integration of private organizations is entirely another.

The Cosmos Club is a private organization. Its membership is its own business. Undoubtedly it has rejected other applicants, white as well as Negro.

Mr. Galbraith is a private individual as well as an ambassador. His decision to leave the club—for any reason—is his own business. So is that of Mr. Kennedy.

But neither has any right to use the prestige of the office he holds to dictate the membership policies of a private organization.

Youth of All Nations Encourages International Friendships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a story by David F. Behrendt of the Milwaukee Journal on the fine work that is being done by Youth of All Nations, Inc., in encouraging an international exchange of ideas. I am indebted to Mrs. W. J. Walters of Mequon, Wis., for telling me of Youth of All Nations, an organization founded by a former Milwaukeean, Miss Clara Leisen:

Two or three times yearly, about 20 boys and girls in 14 widely separated countries carefully write letters in English and mail them to 3335 North Bartlett Street, Milwaukee, Wis., U.S.A.

The letters are sent either to Catherine or Peter Schellin. They are read carefully and replies are sent back—sometimes in English, sometimes in French, Spanish, or Portuguese.

LETTER TAKES 3 MONTHS

The frequency of the letter exchange depends on where the pen pals live. A letter from her friend in Hong Kong takes 3 months to reach Cathie, but she exchanges letters five or six times a year with two Cuban girls.

"Our main problem is settling wrong ideas about America," Cathie said. She and Peter said that their pen pals had asked in letters about the two or three cars they are sure each American family owns, or the large homes and staffs of servants imported from Europe or Africa.

Among Peter's pen pals are boys and girls from England, France, Scotland, New Zealand, Japan, Sweden, Turkey, the Union of South Africa, the Netherlands, and the Congo.

Cathie's write from England, Hong Kong, Cuba, Union of South Africa, Nigeria, North Wales, Northern Ireland, and the Netherlands.

Peter writes in French to those in France, the Congo, New Zealand, Sweden, and the Netherlands. Often, however, the letters are written half in French and half in English because his foreign friends also are studying those languages.

Sometimes he writes in Spanish to his French friends because they are studying that language. Occasionally he takes a stab at Portuguese, a language which he began teaching himself after he ran across some Portuguese books in the library.

Cathie and Peter find that their foreign friends are extremely interested in politics—their own and America's.

During the presidential campaign, Peter said, "I got letters from all of them. I wrote pretty much the same things to them the first time, but then they all wrote again asking questions."

"A lot of the girls are interested in politics," Cathie explained. "They're also interested in fashions. I often send them different patterns printed each month in the magazines. And they want to know about schools and our grading system."

They also ask embarrassing questions. Racial segregation in American schools is a frequent subject.

WANT MORE MEMBERS

Both Schellins are members of Youth of All Nations, Inc. (YOAN), a nonprofit, non-

sectarian organization which puts youths 14 to 25 years old who have like interests in touch with each other throughout the world.

They both are strong backers of YOAN and would like to see more American members. The organization, founded and operated by Miss Clara Leiser, a Milwaukee native, from its New York headquarters also publishes a quarterly newspaper composed of writings from YOAN members throughout the world.

(Information on the YOAN program can be obtained by sending 10c in coin and a stamped, self-addressed envelope to Youth of All Nations, 16 St. Luke's Place, New York 14, N.Y.)

INVOLVED WITH WORLD

Cathie, a junior at Riverside High School, and Peter, a University of Wisconsin (Milwaukee) freshman majoring in art, give similar reasons for maintaining their foreign contacts.

"It's like being emotionally involved with people all over the world," Peter explained. "If we can contact these kids, then when all the cold, indifferent leaders of the world die, maybe we can get through to the next generation."

Cathie said: "I like to think that my correspondence has something to do with a worldwide peace we someday may achieve.

"Maybe that's too idealistic, but I feel if we can understand kids our own age, when we become leaders of the world, we will have a foundation. If we can at all avert any type of war, I think this is a good way to start."

Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, following is the text of my remarks on the subject of Red China, delivered in a speech before an adult church group at St. Augustine's Auditorium in Larchmont, N.Y., on November 28, 1961:

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN EDWIN B. DOOLEY, BEFORE COMBINED CHURCH GROUPS OF ST. JOHN'S, ST PAUL'S, AND ST. AUGUSTINE'S, AT ST. AUGUSTINE'S AUDITORIUM, LARCHMONT, N.Y., NOVEMBER 28, 1961

I am honored by your invitation to address this gathering tonight on what I consider to be one of the most important moral issues of our time.

After viewing the motion picture "Red China—Outlaw," I am not going to try to deliver the words of good cheer and optimism often associated with a Congressman. I don't think that is what you came here for.

I am proud to be one of those who has joined with over 1 million fellow Americans in signing a petition against the admission of Red China to the United Nations. Perhaps it would be well to read the entire petition, for its brief message pretty well sums up what I have to say this evening. The petition reads as follows:

"We continue to oppose the seating of Communist China in the United Nations, thus upholding international morality and keeping faith with the thousands of American youths who gave their lives fighting Communist aggression in Korea. To seat a Communist China which defies, by word and deed, the principles of the U.N. Charter would be to betray the letter, violate the spirit and subvert the purpose of that charter. We further continue to oppose U.S. diplomatic recognition or any other steps which would build the power and prestige of the Chinese Communist regime to the detriment of our friends and allies in Asia and of our national security. Any such action would break faith with our dead and the unfortunate Americans still wrongfully imprisoned by Communist China and would dishearten our friends and allies in Asia whose continued will to resist Communist China's pressures and blandishments is so vital to our own security interests in that part of the world."

Today, the United States is faced with a dangerous contradiction on the issue of its relations with the Chinese Communist regime and, in particular, on the question of seating Peiping in the United Nations.

What is this contradiction? On the one hand, the United States has declared itself utterly opposed to the admission of Red China to the U.N. It has done this through the articulation of the American people's sentiments through the Congress, and through the strong public statements of Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy. There should be no doubt where the United States stands on this issue. Yet—and herein lies the contradiction—the governments of the world are still not convinced. In the U.N., the member delegations are confused. It has been a thinly disguised secret that the Communist bloc delegations believe that the U.S. policy is moving toward accommodation of Red China. Our allies now believe that our policy will soon change. Even those nations in Asia who are most intimately concerned with Red Chinese aggression are fearful that the United States will permit Red China to be seated in the U.N. In the face of strong statements from the White House to the contrary, why has this happened? The answer probably lies with the fact that many of those who have been entrusted by the President to implement our policy toward Communist China have indicated, time and again, that they are personally opposed to the present position of their Chief Executive and the announced policy of the U.S. Government. Their public statements have given the nations of the world good reason to doubt that the United States means what it says.

Let us examine just a few. The U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., Adlai E. Stevenson, said that it was "inevitable" that Red China be admitted to the U.N. and added: "Moreover, as a member of the U.N., Communist China would be more accountable to world opinion than as an outcast." Under Secretary of State, Chester Bowles, is considered one of the creators of the "Two China" policy and publicly calls for a "fresh perspective" on Communist China to meet "the crucial issue of disarmament." Harland Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organizational Affairs, has long been a proponent of the admission of Communist China to the U.N. In addition, the U.S. Ambassadors to India and Japan have both openly advocated admission of Red China to the U.N.

I do not want this to be interpreted as meaning that I am in any way attempting to cast a cloud of suspicion over these individual's loyalty, for each and every one has devoted most of his life to the service of his country. I do, however, think they are all in tragic error and should at all times be required to echo the sentiments of their Chief Executive on this grave issue.

Moreover, those who would admit Red China to the U.N. are not all to be found in one of our two major political parties, for many were in high places of responsibility in previous administrations. These people can be easily identified because they are prone to calling themselves pragmatists, or in other words they believe in being what they call practical and realistic. Unfortunately, however, they forget that those who created the U.N. were neither pragmatic nor practical, but rather were idealistic in that they had faith enough to believe that the nations of the world would someday pay the price of individual sovereignty in order to live and prosper together in mutual peace.

No, advocates of Red Chinese admission to the U.N. cannot in any way be identified by party affiliation. As a matter of fact, among the charter members of the Committee of 1 Million, producers of the fine movie we have just seen, were former President Hoover, Congressmen Walter Judd and John McCormack, Senator John Sparkman, and George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO. On the subject of party politics, you couldn't safely put these gentlemen together in the same room for 5 minutes. Yet on this issue, they are as one.

Moreover, protagonists in this debate cannot even be sorted by the line dividing conservatism from liberalism. Both Senators DODD and DOUGLAS, whom we had the pleasure of listening to during the movie, would hardly appreciate being called conservatives on most issues. As a matter of fact, my good friend and colleague from Illinois, Senator DOUGLAS, is often referred to as "the darling of the liberals." No, this is neither a party nor a philosophical question, but rather it is exactly what I called it at the outset of my remarks tonight—a moral issue.

It seems to me this whole thing is answered by the Charter of the U.N. itself, where membership is, and I quote, "open to all peace-loving states which accept and, in the judgment of the Organization, are able and willing to carry out the obligations of the charter."

How could Red China possibly portray itself as a peace-loving state, when its leaders continually preach that war between capitalism and communism is inevitable? Just last month at the Communist Party Congress in Moscow, there was an open clash between Russia and Red China on party ideology in that Red China subbornly held to the theory that war is not only inevitable, but in fact desirable as a means for advancing communism's goal of world conquest. Further than this, Red Chinese leaders have been quoted as saying that nuclear war between East and West would be to their ultimate advantage because such a holacaust would leave Red China as the dominant survivor, due to her vast and widely dispersed population and industrial plant.

If Red China gained membership, how, I ask you, could she live up to the obligations of the charter, where member states are required to (1) settle their international disputes by peaceful means; (2) refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the U.N.; (3) give the U.N. every assistance in any action it takes in accordance with the charter, and to refrain from giving assistance to any state against which the Organization is taking preventive or enforcement action. On this third point, while we are gathered here, she is doing all in her power to subvert the efforts of the U.N. forces in bringing peace to the Congo.

This very evening, Laotian and South Vietnamese peasants are being roused from their uneasy sleep to be murdered and butchered by guerrilla forces trained and equipped by the Red Chinese.

No my friends, there can be no question about the nature of Red China in the eyes of any who seek the truth. It is a government which, by its words and deeds, openly and constantly violates every basic principle for which the United Nations stands.

As the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles said in 1958, "The United Nations is not a reformatory for bad governments. It

is supposedly an association of those who are already peace loving and who are able and willing to carry out the charter obligations."

But there are those who say that admission of Red China is inevitable in the long run, so why not now? Well, my answer to them is that it is about time we and our friends stopped crying that this and that is inevitable and started saying instead that the free world can fashion its own destiny.

Another argument often raised in support of Red Chinese membership is that Russia and her satellites gained membership, so why not Red China? This is a specious argument to say the least, for the situation in 1945 when Russia became an original member and the circumstances today are in no way analogous. In 1945, Russia had been allied with the Western Powers in the war against Nazi Germany. After assisting in drafting the charter, it of course became a member. At that time, we, along with the other original members, had to assume that Russia was a peace-loving nation, willing to live by the charter. We correctly chose not to prejudge Russia's qualifications. That this trust was soon to be violated makes the case against committing a similar mistake even more convincing, especially since this time we don't have to rely on blind judgment in the case of Red China. As Senator DODD said last month, "having been wrong a dozen times, we do not propose to be wrong a thirteenth."

Which leads me to yet another argument used by those who would reward this bandit regime with the cloak of respectability; namely, that membership would subject Red China to the good influence of international society. My answer to this is simply, what has this good influence done for Russia?

But all these reasons for keeping Red China out of the U.N. pale when compared to the disgrace that would attend admittance of a godless state.

While religious worship has been discouraged by the Soviet Government through insidious attacks and carefully planned ridicule, nevertheless, millions still openly defy their leaders by continuing to worship in their churches. As destestable as this is, never in the history of mankind has religious worship been systematically erased and smothered as it has been in Red China. There, the people are not even permitted to be atheistic, for they all must worship at the altar of the state and its dictators. The state has become the diety.

In none of the religious or ethical gospels from which came the concepts and precepts which have prevailed in Chinese thinking and teaching is there glorification of "the state." In Buddhism, in Taoism, and in Confucianism the emphasis is on man, the individual, on conduct, on rights and duties, on relations between and among human beings. In the thought both of the sages and of the people, the state was the family enlarged and the ruler was a "father." Since 1949, countless thousands of leaders of these ancient religions of the Orient, together with tens of millions of their followers, have been executed. The moral fabric of the nation has been torn to shreds.

Martyred at the same time were millions of Chinese Christians, both Protestant and Catholic. I was advised by the Department of State just yesterday that 140 American priests, ministers, and nuns were thrown into jail. The Coliseum at Rome in its darkest days never exceeded the tortures committed in Red China in the 5 bloody years of 1949 through 1954. The full story will probably never be told because so few survived.

Father Thomas J. Bauer of nearby Maryknoll Mission has listed the barbaric means of execution employed by the Red leaders as including stoning and burying and burning alive. Over half of the American Catholic priests imprisoned were of the proud and courageous Maryknoll Mission, which graces the banks of the Hudson at Ossining.

As an example of this brutality, although it is unpleasant, let me read to you from the pages of the New York Times for September 3, 1952, the events leading up to the death in a Red Chinese prison of Bishop Francis X. Ford, also of the Maryknoll Mission. I quote:

"Before he died he was questioned interminably, kept on a meager prison diet and humiliated before the people he had served more than half his lifetime.

"He was accused of espionage, the possession of weapons and various other illegal acts, but was never brought to public trial. While he and Sister Joan Marie were being escorted by bus from Mesan to Canton the nun said they were removed from the bus in several villages and paraded before the villagers as students beat the bishop with ropes, sticks, and stones. The nun said the bishop's hands were tied during these exhibitions and added that the students heaped refuse on him as he fell. When they got to Canton jail, she stataed, the bishop was forced to undress in her presence before they were separated. Later the Sister was shown a grave, and forced to sign a document stating that the Bishop had died of old age, illness, and natural causes."

All this to one who had served the Chinese people since 1917, one who is remembered by his associates as a polite, cheerful man who founded a number of schools, spurred the building of roads and drew up plans for many river bridges in his area of the country. This was his earthly tribute for having remained in China all during the Second World War in order to be by his people in their hour of great need, and for tirelessly lecturing on behalf of relief for China after he returned to the United States for an intended rest.

And yet another example of Christian martydom languishes in a Red Chinese prison today, in the person of Bishop James E. Walsh, also of the Maryknoll Mission, the first American Catholic to be consecrated as a bishop in China.

He was the only American Catholic priest in Shanghai who was not arrested in the infamous roundup of June 15, 1953. For a little while after that he was permitted considerable freedom within the city limits. This personal freedom gradually disappeared with increasing Communist restrictions on his movements, activities, and contacts with the Chinese people. The bishop chose to remain in Shanghai even after September 1955, when the Chinese Communist representatives to the ambassadorial talks at Geneva assured Ambassador U. Alexis Johnson that Bishop Walsh was free to leave. He felt that his continued presence lent moral support to Chinese Catholics in the face of increasing pressure on them. Bishop Walsh's desire to remain until ordered out by the Communists was with the approval of the Vatican. After this, Bishop Walsh was arbitrarily denied permission to administer the sacraments.

On October 18, 1958, he was arrested, and on March 18, 1960, after holding him incommunicado for 17 months, the Chinese Communists tried and sentenced Bishop Walsh to 20 years in prison for espionage. Today, at the age of 70, this courageous bishop faces nearly 19 years more of prison.

Need I say more. I have no doubt as to the judgment of the Almighty against those who perpetrated these crimes against not only the brave people of China, but against all mankind. But it is also the responsibility of mortal man to prevent this from recurring elsewhere.

To the shame of the entire free world, these very same Chinese Communists were permitted to transform the peaceful palaces of Tibet into public torture chambers for its monks. Today the lovely land of Tibet is godless and devoid of any national character. Half of the territories of Korea, Laos, and Vietnam have withered the same way.

Hundreds of millions of these Orientals chose neither to be Red nor dead—they were merely victims of a struggle they had no part in creating. It is not our moral right to make this choice for them by sealing their fate through the respectability of United Nations membership.

On this issue we must all stand up and be counted.

Need for New National Parks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two editorials which were published in the January 2 and 3 issues of the New York Times, entitled "Needed: New National Parks," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Although there may be disagreement over the conclusion reached in the editorials, I believe they are very thought-provoking and thoroughly cover an area of national interest.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEEDED: NEW NATIONAL PARKS—I

The national park system of the United States is an example for the world of how a great nation can set aside outstanding areas of its land, not for commercial, or industrial exploitation but for the inspiration, esthetic enjoyments and physical refreshment of its people. It is an example that gives the lie to the accusation, frequently leveled by its critics and enemies, that this Nation is governed by gross materialism and devotion to the dollar.

But our existing national parks, besieged by the recreational hungers of an exploding population, are proving inadequate to the purpose. In this, the first of two editorials on the parks, we call attention to the major park proposals which should be enacted in the near future; tomorrow we will discuss briefly some of the principal problems involved in carrying out such a program.

Congress made a start toward expanding the system last year when it added the Cape Cod National Seashore, but this is only a start. In the 1962 session Congress should move promptly to complete action on the pending bills to establish national seashores at Point Reyes in California and Padre Island in Texas. Also needed, to insure the preservation of the best of our fast-dwindling, unspoiled shorelines, is passage of pending legislation affecting the outstanding Oregon Dunes area on the Pacific Coast and both the Indiana Dunes and the Sleeping Bear Dunes on Lake Michigan.

Fortunately there still remain a few inland scenic and relatively unspoiled areas in the East and Midwest that would be worthwhile additions to the system. The historic and unique C. & O. Canal area along the Potomac River, now partially protected as a national monument, deserves to be enlarged into a national park. Other interesting proposals, in various stages of advancement, are for an Allagash National Recreation Area in the unspoiled forest and river country of Maine, a Robert Frost National Park in the

Green Mountains of Vermont, an Ozark Rivers National Monument along the famous Current and Elevenpoint Rivers in Missouri, and a Prairie National Park to save the last of the virgin grasslands of the Great Plains.

Western areas of special scenic and wilderness values include the North Cascade Mountains of Washington, the Oregon Cascades, the Wheeler Peak region in Nevada, and a wild, sweeping expanse of canyon and desert in southeastern Utah where Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall has proposed the creation of a Canyon Lands National Park.

NEEDED: NEW NATIONAL PARKS—II

It isn't as easy now to create a national park as it was when large areas could be carved from the undeveloped public domain.

Most of the Eastern and Midwest proposals, discussed in the preceding editorial on this subject yesterday, involve costly acquisition of private holdings. Some of the plans may never be realized unless private philanthropy or the States help with financing, as occurred in the establishment of the Grand Teton and Virgin Islands National Parks (both due primarily to Rockefeller money) and some others. In considering all the factors, however, Congress should keep in mind that acquisition costs will never be less than now. The choicest of the areas should be set aside as soon as possible, with or without private philanthropy, before commercial development and rising costs put them forever beyond reach.

Some of the western proposals face a different obstacle. The Washington and Oregon Cascades and the Wheeler Peak area of Nevada, all mentioned yesterday, are largely within national forests; and the Forest Service has shown no inclination to relinquish jurisdiction without a struggle. The Forest Service, which has done fine work in the fields of timber and watershed conservation, permits and encourages activities (such as logging and hunting) that are entirely foreign to the purposes of the National Park Service.

All of the areas mentioned in today's and yesterday's editorials ought to be contained within the national park system which, thus rounded out, would give the growing population of our country assurance that it will always have, permanently preserved in unspoiled state, superb examples of the extraordinary natural, scenic, and historic heritage of America.

"Hot Item" on the New Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly evident that despite the almost complete failure of the administration's foreign policy, its main activities in 1962 will be centered upon domestic issues with an eye to their political repercussions. The Chicago Sun-Times on Sunday, January 7, discussed this aspect of the Washington scene in a thorough and fascinating manner. Under unanimous consent, I insert this penetrating editorial into the RECORD at this point:

"HOT ITEM" ON THE NEW FRONTIER

Now comes John M. Bailey, national chairman of the Democratic Party, with as crude an appraisal of the instincts of the American voter as we have seen in some time. Bailey has selected medical care for the aged—medicare—as his party's most attractive issue in this year's election. He believes it will not only attract support for the administration from the 17 million Americans over 65 but also from sons and daughters responsible for the care of their aging parents.

At least the chairman is frank about it. He is saying the administration expects to buy the support at the polls of the Nation's elder citizens by offering them tax-supported medical care, regardless of need, and that the younger generation can be won over by giving it the opportunity to shift its responsibilities to the back of the Government.

We don't buy that kind of thinking and we believe the majority of Americans don't buy it either.

The administration's attitude on medicare, where Bailey sees political gains, stands in striking contrast to its plans on two other burning issues.

On civil rights, the White House plans to propose no legislation.

On aid to education, the administration will be satisfied if Congress votes some assistance for higher education. There is no plan to drive for passage of a general aid bill for school construction and payment of teachers' salaries such as was urged in the last session. Taking Bailey at his word, it must be concluded that these matters lack the voter appeal he foresees in the medicare issue.

The party chairman is not the only Democratic leader with rosy dreams of ballot dividends from administration support of compulsory sick benefits for the aged. Health Secretary Abraham A. Ribicoff reported to President Kennedy on December 7 that the administration's medicare program is "the hottest item in the Democrats' political storehouse." He also termed it "the greatest sleeper in the 1962 political situation."

The unbiased Congressional Quarterly reporting service suggested in a December 29 review of the issues facing the upcoming session that the legislation "may still be sleeping" in committee when the session is over. Nevertheless, CQ forecasts "a vigorous forensic fight" for the administration's bill.

In other words, the administration orators will thump the tubs, win or lose; they will speak long and loud as they impress the young and old that they, and only they, fought for this measure.

Under the program, limited hospital, home nursing, and nursing home service would be extended to approximately 17 million, aged 65 and over, who are on social security retirement. The benefits would be financed through a two-way boost in present social security taxes: First, the wage base on which the tax is now paid would be raised from $4,800 to $5,200. Second, the tax rate paid by employees and employers would be increased by one-quarter of 1 percent to start.

This would be a jolt for wage earners in addition to increases in the social security tax written into the law last year for the years immediately ahead. Last Monday, the tax went up one-eighth of 1 percent for employees and employers, making the present rate for each 3⅛ percent on the first $4,800 of earnings. By 1968, the rate will have gone up to 4⅝ percent.

When and if medicare passes, there would be an immediate increase in the schedule. By 1968, the bite for those making $5,200 a year or more would average $21.12 a month compared with the present average of $12.50 on $4,800 or more annual earnings.

When similar legislation was before Congress in 1960, it was rejected on the grounds that it would put social security into an area where it does not properly belong, and it would discriminate against millions of older people not covered by social security.

Further it would impose on younger people the double burden of financing through taxes the care of those now over 65 while paying for their own present medical expenses.

This is a socialistic concept. It compels participation of millions who are already amply protected by, and who prefer, private health plans.

Instead of the revolutionary compulsory Kennedy proposal, the Kerr-Mills bill was passed to supply medical aid to the needy aged through matching State and Federal funds. Thirty-eight States, including Illinois, now have programs under this legislation. Other States have their own types of medical assistance for their elder citizens who need and want such help.

Eventually, Kerr-Mills, admittedly a compromise, will be replaced by a broader program. But before Congress can act intelligently it requires information on actual needs and long-range costs. No such information existed in 1960. It does not exist today.

There is only the feeling expressed by administration leaders that there is political gold to be mined in medicare in this election year. This is indeed a shabby and cynical approach to a matter involving principles of human dignity and the fortunes of the helpless in times of personal emergency.

Communist Strategy in Legislative Assemblies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Petr Zenkl was Vice Premier of Czechoslovakia before the Communist domination of that country and is presently Chairman of the Executive Council of Free Czechoslovakia. Mr. Zenkl has written an open letter to United Nations delegates warning of Communist plans to subvert that organization. His letter appeared in This Week magazine on October 29, 1961, and I commend it to the interest of our colleagues.

The article follows:

HOW THE REDS PLAN TO SMASH THE U.N.

(By Petr Zenkl)

NEW YORK.—My native country was lost to the Communists in 1948 without civil war. I bear partial responsibility, for I was there and, as a Vice Premier and Member of Parliament, in a position of some authority. If I, a few of my colleagues, and the free world had known then what we know now, it might not have happened. Czechoslovakia might still be free.

I do not know when I shall see my country free again, or even what I can do to hasten that day. But there's one thing I can do to help keep the same thing from happening to other free nations.

I can warn you—with all the urgency at my command—of an amazing new publication in which the Communists reveal a new strategy of conquest. Step by step they have developed exact techniques to undermine free governments without the use of military force. The dress rehearsal was in my country. Now the Communists have produced a how-to-do-it handbook showing Communist conspirators in Latin America, Africa, and Asia how to proceed in captur-

ing, from within, any country anywhere. It is a systematic program aimed at the undermining of every free parliamentary assembly, local legislature, national Congress, and even the world parliament of the United Nations.

The author, Jan Kozak, knows what he is talking about, for he is a Communist and a Czech. Thirteen years ago, representatives of the democratic parties and the Communists were members of the last free Czech Parliament. While debating and sometimes voting with us on economic and social issues, the Communists were then plotting to capture the Parliament and the Cabinet.

A GUIDE FOR RED PLOTTERS

Now, as a guide to plotters in other countries, Kozak has written it all down. Like most Communist theoretical literature, his book has a long and clumsy title: "How Parliament Can Play A Revolutionary Part in the Transition to Socialism and the Role of the Popular Masses." But its message and its intent are short and clear. So much so that, after his guidebook was published, the Communists did everything they could to restrict its general circulation outside the Communist movement. But it was too late. Two key chapters had been taken out of the country, translated into English, prefaced by a British Laborite, and published this year as a small 45-page book by the Independent Information Centre, 4 Holland Road, London, W. 14, England.

Members of the United Nations, each of you can buy this book—for 6 shillings (85 cents). I beg you to do so. For this is a book of warning and in it, just as clearly as in Lenin's "State and Revolution," in Hitler's "Mein Kampf," or Mao Tse-tung's treatises on guerrilla warfare, is a frightening blueprint of things the Communists hope to accomplish.

WHAT THE BOOK TEACHES

You know as well as I that the fate of freedom depends on the orderly working of representative government both in local parliaments and in the United Nations—in which you serve. The quickest way to destroy freedom, short of armed intervention or civil war, is to undermine the prestige and efficiency of these legitimate representative assemblies.

And that, gentlemen, is what this book is all about—the destruction of all free parliaments, including ultimately your own United Nations which last Tuesday reached its 16th anniversary.

Kozak is a true Marxist and constructs his thesis in a solemn, workmanlike and conscientious way. It is a precise and orderly arrangement of points and rules and procedures, setting forth specific directions for what must be done both from without and from within a parliament to destroy its effectiveness.

For example, the first direction prescribes a systematic weakening of the adversaries of the Communist Party. For this purpose the Communists must either effectively weaken or control at least some departments of the executive branch of the government. In the case of Czechoslovakia, one primary target was the Ministry of Interior, which in turn controlled the national police.

The international counterpart of Kozak's first direction is apparent in the Soviet efforts to paralyze U.N. executive functions (since they cannot yet be brought under Communist control) by various Soviet vetoes barring any U.N. action; Soviet agitation to transfer U.N. headquarters from New York to a city where Communist-led demonstrations could be more easily organized; Soviet refusal to contribute financially to U.N. undertakings in the Middle East and the Congo; and—above all—Soviet attempts to replace the late Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold with a three-man executive in which a Communist representative would have the destructive power of veto.

And so, point by point, Kozak's formula unfolds. It includes:

Canceling the treaties with Western Powers.

Undermining the old ideas (e.g. faith in political freedom) and conservative institutions like the church.

Participating in national fronts but capturing them from over the heads of the leaders.

Calling protest meetings, organizing mass demonstrations and political strikes with the purpose of making up for Communist numerical weakness. Finally, arming the Communist workers.

Yes, tested stratagems and many of them familiar. But they become deadly when applied, as Kozak instructs, systematically, according to timetable and plan. A free society, he points out, has never yielded its power by a simple act of parliament. But with the correct strategy of subversion, he insists, "it may be deprived of its power at an opportune moment without an armed uprising and civil war."

Throughout the book, Kozak illustrates his points by referring to events which took place in Czechoslovakia between 1945 and 1948. But any informed reader will inevitably find fresh insights to events elsewhere in the light of this new understanding of Communist strategy. And this applies equally to recent events at the United Nations.

NOTHING IS LEFT TO CHANCE

You will see instantly how many seemingly unrelated Communist maneuvers follow the pattern laid down in Kozak's book—such events, for example, as Khrushchev's outrageous shoe pounding with the cynical aim of degrading the parliamentary respectability of the U.N. General Assembly * * * the street demonstration in front of the U.N. * * * mob riots in Tokyo, Leopoldville, Ankara, Caracas * * * worldwide meetings protesting Lumumba's death * * * the U.N. balcony demonstration timed to interrupt the speech by Adlai Stevenson, etc.

Gentlemen of the U.N., let me end, as I have begun, on a personal note. As one who comes from a country which has lost its freedom, I can only express my regret that Kozak's somber warning was not available to me while I was still serving as a Member of Parliament in Prague (1945–48). Reading Kozak's thesis now brings back not only some bitter memories of political battles lost but also of my own—and my democratic colleagues'—lack of thorough knowledge of Communist duplicity and conspiratorial tactics.

While democratic Czechoslovakia's defeat was composed of many factors, one important element facilitating the Communist march to power certainly was our wishful thinking. We believe that Communists could be transformed into partners in the parliamentary sense. The contrary happened. While taking part in Czechoslovakia's Parliament, they sucessfully followed Kozak's commandment: "not to lose sight for a single moment of the aim of a complete socialist overthrow."

But now the secret is out—in Kozak's book of revelation. Read it and heed it, gentlemen of the free world, while you are free. For those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it.

Dr. Jose Rizal, Filipino Hero, Patriot, and Martyr

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, following is a radio address delivered by the Honorable Mauro Baradi, of the Philippine delegation to the United Nations, on December 30, 1961, which I think deserves being published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The speech was made in commemoration of the centennial birth date and 65th anniversary of the martyrdom of Dr. Jose Rizal, a patriot of the now independent Republic of the Philippines:

DR. JOSE RIZAL, FILIPINO HERO, PATRIOT, AND MARTYR

(Speech by Dr. Mauro Baradi, delivered on the radio station WNYC "Hands Across the Sea" program, New York City, December 30, 1961, in celebration of Jose Rizal's centennial birthday, and the 65th anniversary of his martyrdom)

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, people the world over generally celebrate their heroes' birthdays. The Filipinos, however, not only celebrate the natal day of their greatest hero and patriot, Dr. Jose Rizal, but also commemorate the anniversary of his martyrdom.

A GENIUS IS BORN

One hundred years ago on June 19, 1861, Rizal was born in the town of Calamba, province of Laguna, Philippines. The town then belonged to the Dominicans—an order of preachers especially stressing poverty—which helped Spain in colonizing the country. His father, Francisco Mercado Rizal, was industrious, thrifty, and well respected in the community; his mother, Teodora Alonso, a religious and devout housewife, was greatly interested in the education of her children. In these circumstances, it is understandable why Rizal's passion for education which began at a very early age never diminished. In spite of many difficulties and serious obstacles, his scholastic record whether in his own country or abroad is something worth aiming at.

RIZAL ON EDUCATION

Rizal believed that through education, the lot of his countrymen could be raised to a high level; that it would enable a person to understand better the causes of the misfortunes of others and to suggest or find remedies therefor.

Rizal himself set the example. He was proficient in so many fields. He was an agriculturist, author, economist, educator, engineer, historian and reformer, linguist, novelist, oculist, painter, philosopher, physician, poet, scholar, scientist, sculptor, and world traveler. Prof. Ferdinand Blumentritt, a famous philologist, opined that Rizal was the greatest son of the Malay race.

FIRST ASIAN NATIONALIST

Still there is a singular honor to which Rizal was entitled, that of being the first Asian nationalist. Both time and circumstance fomented his nationalism which was inborn. When only 8 years old, he had already composed a poem in Tagalog—one of

the Philippine languages—on the subject of "Our Mother Tongue," in which he referred to liberty of a country, and of other living beings born in liberty.

In his day, the Spanish colonial system in the Philippines had turned from bad to worse. There was union of church and state; the government was by a privileged few for the benefit of a favored class and to the detriment of the neglected many; the administration of justice was corrupt. And to add insult to injury, the brown-complexioned Filipinos were regarded as indios with limited intellectual qualities and restricted moral faculties and "it seemed then an impossible task to remove them from the category of an inferior race in which divine providence had placed them."

Rizal was fully aware of the deplorable condition obtaining in his fatherland. There was no task so heavy nor sacrifice so great that he would not undertake if only to lighten the burdens of his oppressed countrymen, bring to an end an alien rule, and hasten the political redemption of the Filipino people.

THE "NOLI" AND "FILI"

As a novelist, he wrote "Noli Me Tangere" ("The Social Cancer" or "The Lost Eden") wherein he endeavored to depict his country's condition faithfully and ruthlessly * * * for as a Filipino, its defects and weaknesses were also those of Rizal's; thus, may the cure therefor be found.

He also wrote another novel, "El Filibusterismo" ("The Right of Greed") which "endowed the Philippines with the decalog of her political redemption and human dignification."

He foresaw things to come. His nationalism would make of him a filibuster and a marked man, and an arch enemy of the men in authority in his native land. Regardless of the consequences, he trusted in the God of truth. He was fearless in the performance of his duty as he saw fit; this he reiterated in his "Last Will and Testament" (1892) to the Filipinos which came to light a few years after his demise, as follows:

"I desire, furthermore, to let those who deny our patriotism see that we know how to die for our duty and for our convictions. What matters death if one dies for what is loved, for the country, and for the beings that are adored? * * *"

He wrote the bylaws of Liga Filipina, among the purposes of which were "to unite the whole archipelago into a compact body, vigorous and homogeneous; to provide mutual protection in every difficulty and necessity; and to provide mutual protection in every difficulty and necessity; and to provide defense against all violence and injustice."

WHAT PRICE LIBERTY

Rizal's activities especially in the Philippines culminated in his arrest followed by his deportation to Dapitan. After 4 years in exile, he thought he was a freeman, but not for long because on his way to Spain as volunteer army surgeon in Cuba, he was again arrested; and upon his arrival in Barcelona on October 3, 1896, he was sent to jail, then returned to Manila where he was informed of the accusation against him; the procedure being inquisitorial, Rizal was not permitted to defend himself. Among the documents in the case against him were a poem he wrote in 1891 concerning country, despot, and liberty; and a Masonic document he received in 1892 from his Masonic brethren commending him for his relevant services to his country and extending to him "the greeting of peace" from the members of the lodge.

Summarizing the charges before the court martial, the prosecution pointed out Rizal's ceaseless efforts "to demolish the sovereignty of Spain in the Philippines"; his publication of "Noli Me Tangere" and "El Filibusterismo"; his promotion of the interests of the Liga, and his alleged participation in the armed rebellion against Spain.

The defense was handled by an army lieutenant and Rizal himself who steadfastly maintained his innocence. Rizal had nothing to do with the rebellion.

It is common knowledge that the case was prejudged, the trial a farce, and the so-called justice done to Rizal, a mockery. Result: the death penalty was imposed.

THE FAITH THAT DOES NOT KILL

On the eve of his execution, Rizal wrote a poem, "Mi Ultimo Adios" ("My Last Farewell"). This immortal poem has since been translated from Spanish into many languages. Through this medium, he left for the living an indelible lesson in patriotism and an undying faith in God. Said Rizal:

"My idolized motherland, whose grieving makes me grieve,
Dearest Filipinas, hear my last farewell again!
I now leave all to thee, my parents, my loved ones I leave,
I go where there are no slaves, a brute's lash to receive;
Where faith does not kill, and where it is God who doth reign."

EXECUTION AT BAGUMBAYAN

Rizal was executed by shooting on the 30th of December 1896 at 7 o'clock in the morning in the field of Bagumbayan, city of Manila. "Long live Spain. Down with the traitors," the Spaniards exclaimed, but only momentarily. How tersely did the poet Cecilio Apostol interpret the significance of Rizal's death in these lines:

"Your brain was stilled by a bullet's thrust,
But your spirit soars o'er an empire's dust."

What was considered a defeat and humiliation for the martyr and his people, turned out to be blessings in disguise—the triumph of good over evil, truth over falsehood, and the eventual freedom of the Philippines.

Rizal whom an empire could not silence was indeed no ordinary man. Of him, a noted American author, Charles Edward Russel, wrote: "The most versatile, the most powerful, the most notably and diversely gifted mind of which we have record, was possessed by a man whose character was singularly pure and noble, and whose career was nearly blameless as any man can hope to achieve in this tangled and troubled world."

WE SHALL NOT FORGET

Rizal chartered the course to be followed by those who would come after him. By his upright conduct and lofty example, we are inspired; by his herculean task and great sacrifice, we are challenged.

And on this, his centennial birthday, and the 65th anniversary of his death, we, the Filipino people pay him solemn tribute.

Today, as always, we pledge anew our determination to uphold the ideas and ideals which he espoused.

As Rizal lived so did he die—for the vindication of his people and the honor of his race. This, we shall not forget.

A Lesson in Human Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, about 30 years ago, a group of Gary, Ind., citizens under the leadership of Reuben Olson, 4456 Jackson Street in Gary, organized the Anselm Forum, Inc. The purpose of the organization was to bring together mutual understanding, friendliness, good fellowship, and better human relations between the numerous nationalities and religious groups in the Calumet region of Indiana.

During this period of time, hundreds of successful meetings and programs have been consummated which places the city of Gary, Ind., as outstanding throughout the Nation in successfully banishing prejudice, bigotry, and suspicion among individuals and groups in pioneering the promotion of human relations and brotherly love throughout the community.

The following story from the Gary (Ind.) Post Tribune of January 1, 1962, illustrates but one of the many accomplishments in human relations which can be credited to the Gary, Ind., Anselm Forum:

HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO GARY FROM GARY

(By Phil Cullimore)

Happy birthday greetings go out today from the proud, young city of Gary to an all-American boy named Gary Reuben Kitahara, who lives in Parlier, Calif.

Although Gary, who is 10 years old today, has never seen the city of Gary, he knows a lot about it and he's proud of the name.

To him, the name Gary is synonymous with brotherhood, understanding and kindness shown by the people of Gary to his parents back in the early 1940's when brotherhood, understanding and kindness were rather hard to find elsewhere.

The story of young Gary's name is a heart-warming one. It's also a genuine tribute to the cosmopolitan people of Gary who probably wouldn't think the story unusual unless someone else pointed it out.

It's the kind of story that has happened thousands of times in the friendly, melting-pot atmosphere of Gary, but it's still an unusual story.

This story goes back to the dark, early days of World War II when, after Pearl Harbor, some people became suspicious of all Japanese—even those whom they had known for years as good neighbors. The Government quickly uprooted these people from their homes and businesses and sent them to relocation camps.

Such was the plight of George Kitahara, young Gary Reuben's father.

George was born on his father's 200-acre fruit ranch at Reedley, Calif. His father had moved to the United States in 1898. George was a graduate of Reedley High School and the University of California where he studied agriculture and majored in chemistry.

So George found himself—along with thousands of other nisei—in a relocation camp in Arizona.

After about a year, having been checked out and found to be a good security risk, George was released from the camp and came to Gary to work at the Reynolds Metals plant which was then located in Glen Park.

In Gary, George was befriended by Reuben Olson and became an enthusiastic member of Anselm Forum, a group which Olson founded for the purpose of breaking down barriers between various nationality, religious, and racial groups.

Also in Gary, George met another nisei, a young woman named Viola Takeda who had been a student at San Diego State College when the war came. Viola also had been "relocated," first at a camp at the Santa Anita Race track in California, then at Post-

on, Ariz. She, too, had passed the security check and had worked in Chicago as a dental X-ray technician before coming to Gary to work as a typist for the Lake County Department of Public Welfare.

George and Viola fell in love and were married in 1943 in Grace Lutheran Church here, where George taught a Sunday school class and Viola sang in the choir.

After the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the law under which the nisei were interned was unconstitutional, George and his bride returned to California where they bought a farm at Parlier, near Fresno.

But before they left Gary, the Kitaharas were feted at a dinner by George's coworkers at the Reynolds Metals plant. They were deeply touched by this show of friendship, and they have never forgotten it.

Another event that helped restore Kitahara's faith in American democracy, he said at the time, was his contact with Anselm Forum in Gary.

So, 10 years ago today, when the Kitaharas' first son was born, it seemed entirely natural to them that he should be named Gary Reuben—Gary for the city that befriended them when they needed friends, and Reuben for Reuben Olson, a very special friend.

While in Gary, George Kitahara made quite a name for himself. He was one of the big-volume purchasers of war bonds, was active in church work and other community activities.

In Parlier, Kitahara has also been a spirited and public-minded citizen. He has been an officer of the Parlier Community Church, chairman of the Farm Bureau, County Fair chairman of the booth committee, an officer of the Parlier Lions Club, a member of the school board and various other activities besides running a big farm.

The Kitaharas also have two daughters, Delight and Ellen.

Young Gary, as you can see in the snapshots on these pages [not printed in the RECORD], is a typical youngster, full of mischief and interested in the things that all boys his age like such as football, golf, playing with his dog, Mickey, and (see his handwritten letter) admitting that what he likes most about school is vacation.

Gary also mentions in his letter that he took part in Christmas programs at church and school, and that the programs were about "Peace on earth, good will to all men," which seems to sum up what this story is really all about.

Gary the city and Gary the boy both seem to practice that theme, for Gary says in his letter that there "are all kinds of people living here too. We all get along fine."

Young Gary and his parents often express their feeling of kinship with Gary in frequent letters to the Olsons. They say they'll never forget the friendship shown them by the people of Gary when there was so much distrust elsewhere.

Gary is grateful for the honor bestowed upon it by George and Viola Kitahara, and through it chamber of commerce and Arnold Coons, president, sends to young Gary Reuben Kitahara best wishes (see letter) today on his 10th birthday.

DEAR GARY: This is a letter from Gary to Gary—a letter in which all the people of the Nation's largest 20th century city join in wishing a happy birthday for a little boy in Parlier, Calif., on New Year's Eve.

Ten years have gone by, Gary, since you came into this world to add to the happiness of your mom and dad. Soon you will be old enough to understand why, out of the gratitude in their hearts for the nice people with whom they once lived in Gary, Ind., they named you Gary Kithara. You see, mom and dad likes this cosmopolitan city. (That means a city in which people try to understand one another and don't form bad opinions about their good neighbors.) They liked Gary so well they wanted to bestow the gift of a famous name on you, their first son.

I want you to know the city of Gary is proud of both you and your parents. They are real nice people and we were sorry when they moved back to California after the war. We want you always to be proud of the name Gary; and you can be.

You see, the city of Gary also is a youngster, as cities go. It is only 55 years old and the biggest city in the United States born in this century. In that time it has become famous the world over as the Magic City of Steel, with some of the world's largest steel plants. One of these days, when we get our new ocean harbor in the nearby town of Portage, we will be known as one of the world's great seaports as well and there will be more than a million people about us.

But industry is not all that Gary has. It has miles of the finest bathing beaches in the world on the shores of Lake Michigan. It has hundreds of acres of beautiful parks. It has world famous public schools and I know you will be interested in that because Uncle Reuben Olson says you are a good student. It has hundreds of churches, including Grace Lutheran where your dad once taught a Sunday school class and your mom sang in the choir. And it has over 180,000 of the finest people in the world.

We will be growing so fast that I'll bet even mom and dad will hardly recognize our city in 10 years, but then we hope they won't stay away that long because we want to see them and meet you for the first time.

You just tell them that you want to go back east to Gary to see all the fine friends they left there and all the good people who want to see how big you have grown.

So a happy birthday greeting to you, Gary, on your 10th anniversary. Maybe you can talk mom and dad into bringing you to Gary, Ind., to celebrate your 11th birthday New Year's Eve.

Sincerely,

ARNOLD A. COONS,
President, Gary Chamber of Commerce.

PARLIER, CALIF.

DEAR MR. COONS AND THE GARY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE: I was so glad to get your nice letter on my 10th birthday. It was real nice of you to tell me how the city that I was named after is today.

My mommy and daddy said they named me after Gary, because they liked the city so well. They lived there during the war. You people were very kind to them and I want to thank you also. They have told me that people from all over the world have come to work in the steel factories and it is a nice place to live and work. I have heard them tell of the fire and smoke that come out of your big smokestacks.

We now live in a small town in central California. There are all kinds of people living here too. We all get along fine.

My father is a farmer. On our farm we raise grapes, peaches, nectarines, and plums. We have a cat, dog, and 20 white mice to take care of also.

I am in the fourth grade and my favorite subjects are reading, writing, and arithmetic. I usually get good grades except when I don't study enough. Daddy and mommy are proud of my grades. Now it is Christmas vacation from school and it is the best time of the year. I had to take part in the Christmas programs at church and school. The programs were about, "Peace on Earth, Good Will to All Men."

I wish all of you good people of Gary a very happy New Year.

GARY REUBEN KITAHARA.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

The Citizen and International Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it was my privilege last October 30 to address the students of Salem College, my alma mater in Salem, W. Va.

The occasion was a regular assembly at chapel, as part of a political science program which was designed to bring the young men and young women of that campus in touch with persons engaged in practical legislative and decision-making matters. I spoke on the theme of "The Citizen and International Affairs," indicating the role that the enlightened citizen might perform in an area which is generally assumed to be far removed from the influence of the average voter.

Events of the past 3 months have not greatly altered the context of international relations to which I addressed my remarks, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that my speech be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CITIZEN AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(An address by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, at Salem College, Salem, W. Va., October 30, 1961)

The theme for the development of Salem College this year is, I understand, "the importance of academic integrity." I commend you on this selection, and I hope that each of you is able to give new and functional meanings to the term in the coming year.

For the question of the integrity of the individual, in the fundamental sense of that word, although at least as old as the Book of Job, is also an ever new and evolving one. As the world changes, it presents new demands, new challenges, and new threats to the achievement and maintenance of our integrity. And we must constantly replenish our moral and intellectual resources with new insights and new perceptions of our relationship to a changing world.

This morning I would speak of the problem of attaining and securing one's integrity as a citizen, particularly in relation to foreign affairs. This difficult area—far removed from the personal experience and knowledge of most of us—today poses the greatest test of our maturity as citizens and as a nation.

The problem was well defined in a recent article in Foreign Affairs by Henry M. Wriston, president emeritus of Brown University, when he wrote:

"There has been a growing feeling that the problems of foreign affairs have become so complicated that the private citizen cannot be expected to understand them, much less make a positive contribution to their resolution. Concurrently there has been a surfeit of demands that Washington officials should develop bold, new, imaginative policies and plans. This is tantamount to asking that those eminently desirable ends should be achieved in a vacuum. That is not only undesirable, it is impossible. We do not have a Government of experts, and if we were to try to form one it would be utterly disastrous to the whole concept of democracy to which we are deeply committed. The expert has an essential but nonetheless a subordinate role to play; he can advise, but he cannot take the place of political leadership. By its very nature political leadership loses its effectiveness unless there is a significant degree of public consensus behind proposals for action. Many a novel and constructive idea, possibly conceived by experts but responsibility for which was accepted by a political leader, has come to nought for lack of intelligent popular support."

We may not, therefore, and we must not delegate our responsibilities as citizens, for our own actions and expressions are part of the "public consensus"—or lack of it—on which the ultimate political decisions are grounded. Thus, integrity of citizenship in this respect means the fulfillment of our responsibility to achieve through knowledge and imagination and understanding of America's role in the currents and cross currents of action in the world today.

Now let me give some content to this rather abstract statement and indicate some of the hazards to its attainment. Perhaps the greatest obstacle to the achievement of a positive role for the citizen in the field of international relations is the brooding omnipresence of the threat of nuclear war.

The mind balks and the imagination stumbles in the attempt to envisage the effects of a 20-megaton nuclear bomb—a weapon equal to the explosive power of 20 million tons of TNT—or the equivalent of 8 million bombloads of the World War II Flying Fortress. Yet this kind of arithmetic does not bring us much closer to an imaginative perception of the dreadful consequences of nuclear war.

Some people, in a sense of despair and fatalism, have attempted to fill the void with the slogan, "I would rather be Red than dead." A more ethically developed, but closely related view was recently advanced by the eminent Protestant theologian, Dr. Paul Tillich, in his assertion that "a war fought with atomic weapons can ethically not be justified, for it produces destruction without the possibility of a creative new beginning: it annihilates what it is supposed to defend."

Though Dr. Tillich's position is unassailable from a purely ethical point of view, such ethical absolutism, abstracted from the total political matrix in which it functions, tends to disarm one from considering an alternative to the "Red or dead" polarity.

At the other extreme from the pacifism of Lord Bertrand Russell and the ethical position of Dr. Tillich is the shrill and meaningless cry for total victory against the Soviet Union and the occasional irresponsible talk of preventive war. Both extremes are determined by the overriding horror of nuclear conflict, and both reactions short circuit the process of reflection in their attempt to provide some substitute for the patient and persistent efforts to achieve a viable political solution to the antagonisms between the Soviet bloc and the free world. But there is no substitute for responsibility in our personal and political behavior, and we may not delegate it to chance or luck or a benificent cosmos.

In his eloquent address to the General Assembly of the United Nations, President Kennedy expressed his recognition of the long and difficult road ahead, for us and for the world, before peace and freedom can be achieved. Looking "across the world of threats to the world of peace" he acknowledged that "* * * we cannot expect any final triumph—for new problems will arise. We cannot expect that all nations will adopt like systems—for conformity is the jailer of freedom, and the enemy of growth. Nor can we expect to reach our goal by contrivance, by fiat or even by the wishes of all."

This, my young friends, is an honest statement of the reality of our time. It means that your generation as well as mine must learn to contend with the problems of achieving peace and freedom. And it means, in all likelihood, that we must continue to live with uncertainty; we must continue to live under the shadow of a potential nuclear war, and yet actively plan and work to realize the hope of a future world without war.

I would ask you to follow me now, in looking beyond our own shores and ambitions toward one of the prominent problem areas in our relation with other countries. I do not presume to be an expert in foreign affairs; nor do I pose any final solutions. Rather, I suggest a point of view which might be adopted by the interested and responsible citizen in his contribution to the public consensus which must underlie the successful execution of American foreign policy.

It was first suggested when I was invited to speak this time at Salem that I address the topic of "Berlin and Its Implications." Though one must naturally approach this subject with some trepidation, I shall attempt to indicate some of the principal considerations that must be kept in mind not only by our policymakers but by the thoughtful citizens who support American policy.

First, regardless of party affiliation, we must put aside the tendency to cry "Munich" every time the administration gives indication of the possibility of negotiations on Berlin. It is not only irrelevant to the present crisis, but it tends to place a dangerous limitation upon the President's freedom of action.

Second, we must recognize that the conflict over Berlin—which is only part of the larger "German problem"—is not solely, or perhaps even primarily, an ideological conflict between communism and democracy. It is in large measure a conflict not of ideas about society or the future, but of the way we see the facts of national life in central Europe.

The Soviet rulers and the Soviet people apparently believe quite literally that West Germany is controlled by unrepentant Nazis and militarists, a view which is shared by many Poles and Czechs as well. Before we dismiss such a belief as complete fantasy, let us recall that Germany overran Eastern Europe twice in 30 years, with a dreadful toll of life taken among the peoples of Poland, Czechoslovakia and Russia.

On the other hand, we cannot ignore the history of the cruelty and treachery of the Russian policy in Europe during Stalin's last years from 1945 to 1952. It is across this gulf in our perceptions of the facts that we must somehow make contact and reach a modus vivendi regarding Berlin and Germany.

In so doing, we must not only maintain the Western rights of access to Berlin, but we must also be assured that the city will remain a viable part of the political and economic life of Western Germany. West Berlin has achieved a miracle of political and economic reconstruction since World War II. But if allowed to be isolated from Western Germany, it will soon wither away; its young people will leave; its industries will dwindle, and eventually it will be immersed in the gray tide of communism of East Germany.

A third factor in our consideration is the acknowledgment that Western Germany is not necessarily irrevocably and eternally married to the Western allies. And the rupture of this marriage would be the highest pinnacle of achievement for Soviet policy in Europe. This is what the noted correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, Joseph C. Harsch, refers to as the "Rapallo factor." Writing from London earlier this month, he commented that "As Moscow and the West edge their cautious way toward negotiation over Berlin the word most heard in private conversation among diplomats is Rapallo."

He refers, of course, to the treaty negotiated in 1922 by a defeated Germany and the newly established Soviet Union, a treaty characterized by Ambassador George Kennan as a "triumph of Soviet diplomacy," which "detached Germany decisively and finally from the ranks of those pressing the Soviet Government for payment of the debts of previous Russian governments and for compensation for the foreign property nationalized in the Russian revolution."

This rapprochement between Germany and the Soviet Union reached its culmination, of course, in the nonaggression pact negotiated by Molotov and Von Ribbontrop in 1939 at the very time that the Soviets were also conducting negotiations with Britain and France against Germany.

To refer once again to Joseph Harsch, "Opinions differ as to whether a second Rapallo is possible. A Western pessimist is one who believes the Germans could again be tempted. A Western optimist is one who believes that whatever the provocation, West Germans are now so firmly oriented toward the West, and bear such deep scars from Soviet behavior during and after the last great war, that Germans will never again be tempted to betray the West for a deal with Moscow."

Though normally an optimist about most affairs of life, I do not believe our foreign policy can safely be predicated on one's temperamental disposition toward German political maturity. A factor which colors my normal optimism with a bit of scepticism in this regard is a letter I received earlier this month from the publisher of Der Spiegel, the largest weekly in Western Germany, accompanying a reprint of an article by the German-born British journalist, Sebastian Haffner. Mr. Haffner's article was entitled "Giving the Germans a sense of betrayal and mortal insult," and its general thesis was that if the Western allies recognize East Germany, it will give a sense of betrayal to the West Germans and turn "the most loyal, if also most exposed and endangered, member of the Western alliance and community into its bitter and vindictive enemy."

I would not hazard such a categorical prophecy; but I would suggest that the possibility of such an outcome should be kept foremost in our minds as we view future negotiations, especially in view of the obvious effort of one of Germany's leading publishers—and one who believes in democracy—to influence the opinion of American legislators.

All of these factors must be considered, and many more, in a resolution of the Berlin problem. We must maintain the political and economic viability of Berlin; we must not give occasion to the West Germans for a sense of betrayal and insult; and yet we must also establish conditions which will remove the Soviet fear—partly pathological and partly justified—of German militarism.

I have touched upon only a few of the relevant considerations of this problem, and not in order to indicate a solution, but to point to the avenues of understanding open to the individual student and citizen in regard to foreign affairs. And with the exception of the article by Sebastian Haffner, I have drawn upon no materials or sources of knowledge not open to any intelligent and interested person of an inquiring mind.

The citizen is not expected to be an expert in these matters. Indeed, Aristotle long ago, and Jefferson more recently, argued that the citizen need not be an expert in order to exercise sound judgment in public affairs. But that is not to state that it does not require effort and study and disciplined use of one's intellect and imagination.

But no one maintains that democracy offers an easy way. On the contrary, it still remains the most difficult and demanding form of government that man has created. And in the history of man's affairs, the failures of democracy far outnumber its successes. It is not a form of society decreed by a beneficient universe—but a way of life which men have won at great cost, and which will be maintained only by men and women who have the mind and will to commit themselves to something greater than their own private and personal affairs. In the final analysis, it is to this sense of commitment that we look for the meaning of the word integrity among students and citizens in a democracy.

In Support of the President in His Wise and Great Endeavors—Resolution of Young Democratic Clubs of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the Young Democratic Clubs of America recently held their 12th biennial convention at Miami Beach, and a constituent of mine, the Honorable William Nicholls, a magistrate in the magistrate court of the city of St. Louis, was accorded the honor and recognition of being named chairman of the Committee on Platform and Resolutions.

I take personal pride in the fact that one of the resolutions adopted by the convention called for the extension of the food stamp plan idea.

However, my purpose in calling the convention of the Young Democrats to the attention of the Congress is to cite the resolution adopted by the organization expressing support of the Democratic platform of 1960 and expressing the pride of the Young Democrats in the manner in which President Kennedy worked last year to turn the campaign pledges of 1960 into realities of 1961.

The resolution referred to, drawn up under the direction of Judge Nicholls of St. Louis, is as follows:

RESOLUTION OF YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CLUBS OF AMERICA

Whereas this is the first national assembly of the Young Democratic Clubs of America since the Democratic National Convention of 1960, which adopted a platform that was a historic achievement in the clarity of its language; the scope of the specific programs it advanced to strengthen the free world and safeguard the American way of life, and to better the life of all of our citizens: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Young Democratic Clubs of America assembled in its 12th biennial convention at Miami Beach, Fla., affirm by this resolution its full accord with, and support of the Democratic platform of 1960; and be it further

And be it further resolved that this convention express its pride in the manner in which a Democratic President, aided by a vigorous Cabinet, has worked in cooperation with a Democratic Congress to turn the campaign pledges of 1960 into realities of 1961; and be it further

Resolved, That this convention adopt as its major national program of urgent priority, the task of enlightening the young voters of America of the domestic progress which has taken place under President Kennedy and a Democratic Congress and on the new military muscle which backs up our President's firm stand against Communist aggression, of turning the spotlight of truth on the selfish Republican obstructionists who have fought to prevent these achievements, and of enlisting the understanding and support among young voters which will help the President and the Congress continue his program which is to restore American prestige among our friends and the uncommitted and to restore the respect of our adversaries, has put America on the move again and has opened new frontiers for the American people; and finally, be it

Resolved, That this resolution be suitably engrossed and presented to the President as evidence that the young Democrats of America recognize clearly that the vigorous and progressive programs of President Kennedy offer to our generation and the ones which will follow us the best chance for a life of opportunity and fruitful service to our society and that we are going to offer all of our skills and strength to support the President in his wise and great endeavors.

Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, those of us who are supporting the proposal to provide health care for the aged through social security were extremely pleased the other day when the President declared in his state of the Union message that the matter continues to have top priority in his domestic program. It has been almost a year since 16 Senators joined me in introducing the health security measure. Since then the debate on this proposal has become as intense

as any in recent legislative history. It will continue to be until a vote has been taken in this Chamber and in the House of Representatives.

As an indication of the unfortunate manner in which many of the opponents are fighting this measure, I ask unanimous consent that an article by Rowland Evans, Jr., which appeared in today's Washington Post and Times Herald, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PINK POLITICAL PILLS NO ONE WILL BUY

(By Rowland Evans, Jr.)

Political propaganda is an art, requiring a special skill, a careful subtlety, a precise knowledge of how much the market will take. The oil and gas people, who should have known better, learned this vital little fact the hard way several years ago, when, so to speak, they got their hand caught in the cookie jar.

Now it is the doctors, or some of the eager-beavers among them, who show unmistakable signs of having to learn the hard way. It is really quite surprising how devoted these medical fellows are to the task of defeating the administration's proposal of medical care for the aged and protecting the country.

"Remember, we can buy everything but time," a solid AMA-type wrote his fellow doctors not so long ago in an appeal for campaign funds to fight the great battle against the administration.

"The mournful bell is tolling out the final hours of freedom of medical practice in America * * *" and who is pulling the bell cord? Powerful forces, including the combined muscle of organized labor, "political opportunism and economic nihilism."

And what do the good doctors have to defend themselves (and the Nation, with its millions of aging citizens) in the final hour of freedom? Why, the chamber of commerce, of course. As the letterwriting doctor says:

"Their forces are mighty * * * when their voice is raised in Washington, legislators listen * * * membership in the U.S. Chamber of Commerce is ridiculously cheap insurance against a political ideology that is anathema to us all, and it is deductible at that."

Deductible, it would appear, means that the cost of a membership in the chamber of commerce is a tax-deductible item. And so it is, if membership is necessary for the conduct of business.

"A minimum membership in the chamber," the letter continues, "is $50. Fill out the application (which was included in the letter), attach a check and return it to me. I will gladly forward it to the national chamber for processing."

The last paragraph is also straightforward:

"And remember one thing if you will—we can buy everything but time." These words, without elaboration, leave themselves open to various interpretations, one of which is distinctly nasty.

The men who fought the New Deal's Social Security bill, the Utility Holding Company Act and some of the other landmarks of progressive legislation always went one or two steps too far, and the record of what they were saying 30 years ago makes spicy reading today. The head of the Georgia Power Co., for example, was asked what would happen if the Holding Company bill passed.

"Well, you would paralyze the Nation," he replied.

The great Democrat and famous lawyer, the late John W. Davis, described the bill as "the gravest threat to the liberties of the American citizen that has emanated from the Halls of Congress in my time." And so forth.

Here we still are, not yet paralyzed. We survived the grave threat, somehow. Grass still does not grow in the streets of our cities so as you would notice it.

It is far too early to make a hard prediction on President Kennedy's proposal to raise the social security tax by one-half of 1 percent to finance hospital care for citizens over 65. But it is not too early for a soft prediction—that if the bill can be brought to a vote, it will pass, because the people want it.

The AMA will be on mucky ground if it claims that the bill will lead to "socialized medicine;" that the bill will bring the Federa Government into the doctor's examination room, between the patient and his doctor; that the bill will destroy the historic relationship of doctor to patient. Because these arguments are Halloween ghosts, and skinny ones at that.

There may be arguments, and good ones, against the proposal, but emotional drivel is not one of them. The letter which came into a reporter's hand is an unfortunate example of how far some doctors seem prepared to go. It is hard to believe that a majority of the 165,000 practicing doctors in this country would agree with the doctor from New York that those who are against the medical care bill "can buy everything but time."

Senator FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota, through a third party, was offered a $2,500 campaign contribution in 1956, no strings attached, but with an implication that a vote for the gas bill would be appreciated.

He didn't like it at all.

The Migrant Farm Labor Story—Part IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the excellent series by Dale Wright which appeared in the New York World Telegram and Sun on October 12, 1961:

MIGRANT WORKERS LIVE A HORROR STORY TRAVELING TO JOBS

(By Dale Wright)

(Last April the World-Telegram assigned staff writer Dale Wright to see if the desperate plight of the migrant laborer had been eased by recent protective laws. After working and living as one of them in dozens of locations from Florida to Long Island, he found these forgotten people still overworked, underpaid, cheated on every hand and forced to live in filthy conditions degrading to human dignity. His report continues today.)

The transportation of migrant workers within a State such as Florida is a horror story.

I was in Florida last spring riding with and working with the thousands of migrant laborers who follow the harvest of crops for their miserable livelihood. Travel, for a migrant and his family, is a nightmare anywhere. In Florida, and other States which don't regulate migrant transportation, it's worse.

Item: The Federal statutes decree that drivers of interstate migrant carriers must pass physical fitness tests.

I rode in a bus with a labor crew of 17, including a young couple with a 4-month-old infant. The trip from Homestead to Ruskin, Fla., covered 325 miles. The driver, in a moment of sleepy candor, told me he was subject to violent epileptic seizures.

Item: Federal laws say that rest and meal stops must be made at least every 6 hours.

Our crew traveled 13 hours before the first stop was made. The driver stopped for gas but not for people. The infant had to use for toilet purposes a filthy rag salvaged from the bus floor. As for the men and women, their experiences must go undescribed.

Item: Every State requires that bus and truck drivers be properly licensed.

The driver of the ark-like vehicle I rode in admitted that his license had been lifted because of a conviction for drunken driving.

Item—Most State laws require that migrant carriers be maintained in reasonably safe and operable condition.

But on our antique bus, windows were cracked or broken. Seats had collapsed. Floorboards had long since broken away from mountings and been removed. Both rear wheels, with their smooth, whirring tires, were visible from inside the bus. The owner admitted to me later that the bus had not been inspected in the 5 years he had owned it.

Baggage and trash barred access to the rear emergency exit door. And, because the door catch was broken, it had been bound firmly shut with baling wire.

NEVER STOPPED BY COPS

And thus we migrants—I was one of them by now—rolled along Florida's roads. We passed—and were passed by—several State troopers and local police patrol cars. Not once were we stopped.

Our destination was Ruskin, next stop on our journey to the never-never land of plenty. We'd all been promised top wages, good food, a real nice place to live.

The crew boss' name was David Tuten, Jr., of St. Petersburg, Fla. He made it sound real good.

"Every man and woman of you will make $15 a day. And nobody takes nothin' out of your pay."

An old man sitting next to me muttered "Amen," which gave me a pretty fair idea what was coming.

EIGHTEEN HOURS—THEN BAD NEWS

When we arrived at the camp outside a big farm about 3 miles from Ruskin, we had been traveling—with just one stop—for 18 hours. Everybody was tired, dirty, hungry. And then we got the bad news.

The tomatoes were still green and not anywhere near being ready for harvest.

"Sorry to tell you this," said the grower, "but there'll be no work for at least 10 days."

This, I learned from friends I had made on the bus, often happens when that "land of plenty" is just around the corner of the winding road. It meant just one thing, that the workers were there on their own to wait until green tomatoes turned red.

It also meant that, at the mercy of the tomato farmer and the crew contractor they would run up big debts for food and lodging to be paid for later when they trudged out into the fields.

FEW SHOUTS OF PROTEST

There were a few shouts of protest but not many. This had happened too often before, just as it will happen too often again.

I looked around the camp. There were no toilet facilities whatsoever. There was no kitchen equipment in the barracklike living quarters. There was no food that I could see.

The only available water came from an irrigation pump. Adequate provision had been made to water the tomatoes—but not the people. Some of the migrants washed themselves and their clothes in a muddy irrigation ditch.

The crew boss explained, without apology, that he hadn't known the crop was late or that the grower hadn't installed facilities for his workers. Nobody said anything. We were all too tired.

A man who had brought his wife and child along finally broke the silence.

"WE'RE EVEN WORSE OFF"

"We got here broke," he said mournfully. "Everything we got is tied up in this bundle." He pointed to a tattered bedspread tied up by its four corners. "And now we're even worse off than before 'cause we got to start borrowing money to live on."

The man then walked away with his family and slowly dug a hole in the ground. Then he set up a makeshift stove by placing a piece of sheet metal on four empty cans and built a fire under it.

I watched as he tramped off into the fields. In a few minutes he was back with a small cabbage and a can of water—from the irrigation ditch.

He and his wife boiled the cabbage over the can stove. It was the first meal that they and their child had eaten since leaving Homestead 18 hours before.

Expanding U.S. Exports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, economically, the Nation, despite its record levels of productivity, still faces serious problems, both at home and abroad.

Our participation in the world market, for example, remains, in my judgment, far less than its potential.

With the greatest, most efficient production plants in the world, we find that only about 4 percent of our manufacturers are exporting their goods.

The expanding of the export trade would result in: More jobs; greater utilization of our plant capacity (now running at reduced levels in many industries); greater demand for services; more favorable balance of payments in the import-export trade; and general improvement in our economic health.

For these reasons, I believe it is especially important that we undertake new creative efforts to expand U.S. exports.

Having commented on this subject recently, I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of a statement printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEEDED: MORE DYNAMIC, CREATIVE EFFORT TO EXPAND U.S. EXPORT TRADE

Currently, the U.S. economy turns out goods at a GNP rate of about $540 billion per year.

U.S. consumers—with a personal income of about $429 billion—serve as the major customer of this great agricultural-industrial production plant.

In a shrinking, increasingly integrated world, however, we, as a nation, can—in my judgment—benefit also from a more enterprising effort to find and serve more markets elsewhere in the world.

Around the globe there are about 2 billion people outside the Communist orbit. Of these nations, only the industrialized countries of Western Europe exist on comparable—but still somewhat lower—economic levels. The lesser developed nations need literally everything for development and progress.

If the United States, then, could successfully serve more of these potential markets, the result would be more jobs; greater utilization of our plant capacity (now running at reduced levels in many industries); greater demand for services; more favorable balance of payments in the import-export trade; and general improvement in our economic health.

What steps, then, need to be taken? Certainly any program should include the following:

1. Better education of business leaders on the potentials of expanding export trade;

2. Greater governmental-free enterprise cooperation in market research and development;

3. More effective dissemination of information to U.S. firms on how to expand foreign trade;

4. Expansion of research to determine how U.S. products (often too complex for utilization in less developed economies) can be modified, and then mass produced, for export to less developed economies;

5. Greater availability of information on how to finance foreign trade ventures; and

6. Greater efforts by the Government—through bilateral negotiations as well as through the U.N.—to obtain protection against expropriation, without compensation, of foreign investments.

Over the years, however, the Department of Commerce—as well as U.S. firms individually and through their associations—have made constructive efforts toward expanding foreign trade.

As a nation, we have—in my judgment—fallen far short of our potential. Only about 4 percent of U.S. manufacturers, for example, participate in, and benefit from, the export business. For that reason I believe that:

1. Congress must take a new look at our overall trade policies and programs—including a close look at reciprocal trade agreements to see what can be done to eliminate discrimination against U.S. products and thus encourage more exports;

2. The Department of Commerce—now administering a comprehensive but too-largely unutilized trade-development program—must step up its efforts to stimulate U.S. interest in expanding international trade;

3. Leaders in business and industry, themselves, must demonstrate more dynamic, farsighted tradesmanship in broadening commercial horizons; and

4. There must be greater international cooperation among nations to remove obstructions and encourage—on a mutually beneficial basis—a greater to-and-fro flow of commodities.

If this can be accomplished successfully: we as a nation will benefit economically; other nations—particularly the lesser developed—will find themselves able to progress more rapidly; and there will be a brightening of the economic outlook of all people—particularly the "navenots," which will help create stability and peace in the world.

Orchids for the Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, wherever is found civic programs of foresight and progress, you find a member of the press—a newspaperman in the forefront.

It must be a source of great pride to Charles M. Young, Sr., publisher of Helena-West Helena World to view the results of his 51 years of labor in the twin cities of Helena and West Helena in Phillips County on the Arkansas side of the broad Mississippi River. These two communities have grown industrially and populationwise extensively in the past few decades. The files of the World relate the stirring and vivid news articles of the local citizens and their efforts to build better and to do more. Today the result of those efforts can be seen in the fine citizens, the beautiful churches, the splendid schools, the modern business enterprises, and the comfortable homes of Helena and West Helena.

On all of these things Charles M. Young, from his vantage point of 80 years—his birthday was on the third of this month—has played a full part in making these things a reality.

And, another source of the keenest joy must be the distinguished careers that his seven children have achieved in their chosen fields. Charles Jr., is a general in the U.S. Air Force with a gallant record still being made; Jack is the editor of the Helena-West Helena World and the East Arkansas Record, and his other son, Porter, is the advertising manager of these publications. The daughters have inherited the devotion to charitable and civic endeavors and have blended such humanitarian attentions to the advantage of their families and these?

How much of himself Charles M. Young has given to his community and to his Nation is incalculable, but can anyone seek for greater rewards than these?

On the occasion of his 80th birthday last January 3 the following editorial appeared in the Helena-West Helena World, written by his son Jack entitled "Orchids for the Living." The article is thought provoking and appealing.

The article follows:

ORCHIDS FOR THE LIVING

More than a half century ago a young Pine Bluff newspaperman came to Helena to take over the old Helena News but was persuaded over a cup of coffee to buy into the Helena Daily World instead. A group of businessmen, headed by the late Philips Solomon, prevailed on the visitor to take this second step.

Today Charles M. Young celebrates his 80th birthday, still on the job in the new Helena-West Helena World office pushing the staff toward the proper deadlines, worrying about proper deliveries and the countless other problems that have multiplied over the past 51 years.

It was on August 2, 1910, that Mr. Young became manager and publisher of the Helena Daily World, the oldest paper then being published here. His problems were legion, only weeks before the editor of the paper had been shot to death on Cherry Street by unknown assassins.

He first worried about getting his plant into shape and adding new equipment. Even today he still worries about new equipment that must be added in order to continue to publish the best paper possible.

That newcomer back in 1910 not only launched a campaign for a better plant, but also joined in a fight for a better city. Cherry Street in those days was a sea of

mud; West Helena was an area west of Columbia Street; 20 saloons dotted downtown Helena.

The World joined with the old 20th Century Club to have the city council pass the first ordinance here requiring that bread be wrapped before sale. It fostered city beautiful and cleanup campaigns.

More than 35 years ago, Mr. Young launched the Goodfellows Club which has become an institution at Christmas time and is still one of his pet organizations.

For many years Mr. Young was active in Boy Scout work and saw his three sons become Eagle Scouts.

Back during the drought of the 1930's, he launched a one-man campaign to secure food and money to inaugurate hot-lunch programs in the schools of the county. To our knowledge, that was the first lunch program in Arkansas, although today it is commonplace.

In 1927, when he wasn't carrying coffee to workers on the levee, he was in charge of a commissary at a refugee camp at Barton.

During World War II, he served as chairman of the local draft board, for which he received a Presidential citation. Back in the early 1930's he also found time to serve on the State NRA board for the printing trade before the Blue Eagle was thrown out by the U.S. Supreme Court.

In addition he has served as president of the Helena Rotary Club, president of the Arkansas Press Association, and has found time to serve on the official board of the First Methodist Church.

Not the least of his activities has been his long service on the board of directors of the Phillips National Bank, a post he has held since the bank was started.

Beside this, he and his wife managed to rear seven children and see to it that all of them attended college. He has also found time for lots of fishing and worldwide travel.

Politically, our publisher has backed many lost causes but that hasn't deterred him. He still believes in going along with the best man, even if others feel different. However, he can boast of his share of victories and as a result has served on various State boards during the past.

Today marks another milestone for the boss but he'll be back here tomorrow still telling everyone what to do and fighting to get the paper out on time.

Bellamy Award Presentation Address by Peter Cote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, a young leader of Maine spoke briefly but eloquently at the 20th annual Bellamy Award presentation on October 13, 1961, in Topeka, Kans., during the congressional recess.

I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with an article on the same subject, published in the Kennebec Journal, of Augusta, Maine, of September 20, 1961.

There being no objection, the address and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PETER COTE, CONY HIGH SCHOOL, AUGUSTA, MAINE, STUDENT COUNCIL PRESIDENT

(State of Maine representative to the 20th annual Bellamy Award presentation to the State of Kansas, October 13, 1961)

Miss Miller, Mr. Weaver, Senator Schoeppel, honored guests, distinguished alumni, faculty, and students, I am very proud to have been selected to represent Cony High School and the State of Maine in the 1961 presentation of the Francis Bellamy Award.

My school is located in the city of Augusta, capital of the State of Maine on the eastern bank of the Kennebec River. History has left its touch on our city. In Augusta stands Fort Western, the only fort now existing in Maine that predates the American Revolution. Benedict Arnold and his troops stopped there on that famous tragic march to Quebec. Paul Revere, the clever silversmith and great patriot of Revolutionary times, visited the fort.

We of Cony High School are humbly proud of our achievements. Among the more notable awards that students at Cony received during the past year were a place as a semifinalist in the national merit scholarship contest, as representation to the 1960 World Youth Conference, and a first place in the U.S. National Junior Nordic Cross Country Ski Race. Above all, how proud we are as a school to have received the Bellamy Award last year.

Our graduates include Congressmen, Governors, an admiral of the U.S. Navy, and a chief justice of the Supreme Court of Maine. In the list are lawyers, doctors, artists, professors, professional athletes, writers, and actors.

As for our State, Maine is one of the most healthful, most beautiful, and most interesting States in the Union. The lavishness with which nature has bestowed her gifts on Maine and man's creation of well-built highways to travel over and up-to-date hotels to stop at are the reasons why Maine is known as the "Playground of the Nation." It is a place of work and accomplishment too.

The laconic observation of one of our rural citizens who said "We ain't better than other folks; we're just different" best characterizes Maine people. The cooperative, friendly attitude of Maine people is more than conversation; it is a fact, and the phrase "Yankee ingenuity" is in reality a tribute to their intelligent resourcefulness.

Now, to further commemorate this great occasion, I should like to present to Topeka High School a plaque with a special inscription and a copy of the 1961 Cony High School yearbook, the Coniad.

I wish to thank publicly Miss Miller for the invitation to take part in this program and to acknowledge again the gratefulness of the people of Maine to Francis Bellamy for the wisdom and strength he expressed in the beautiful pledge to our flag.

Please accept my sincere thanks for all that has been done for me during my stay in your wonderful city. Cony High School congratulates you and hopes that you will continue in the excellent traditions that enabled you to receive the award today. Thank you.

TO REPRESENT CONY HIGH AT BELLAMY AWARD

The recently elected president of the Cony High School student council will be Cony's official representative at the presentation of the Bellamy Award in Topeka, Kan., October 11–14.

Peter A. Cote, senior, was elected to head the council for the school year and will attend the Topeka ceremonies. Cony, 1960 winner of the national award, is underwriting the trip by a $100 donation from the PTA, $40 donated by the class of 1936 and funds from Chizzle Wizzle and other activities.

Cote was vice president of his class his sophomore year and president during his junior year. A member of the French Club, Varsity Club and Hi-Y, he attended Boys State last year and was assistant treasurer of Chizzle Wizzle.

A cocaptain of the Cony football team, he also plays hockey and basketball. He has also been elected captain of this year's baseball team.

Cote plans to attend the University of Maine following Cony graduation where he will major in physical education. He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Romeo J. Cote, 2 Swan Street.

Elected vice president of the council was Stephen Ellis, son of Mr. and Mrs. Kervin Ellis, Riverside Drive, and Miss Christina Esser, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Harrison Esser, 10 Viles Street, was elected secretary.

Noted West Virginia Author and Historian, Phil Conley, Offers New Insights on American Origins in Most Recent Work, "America's Debt to Greece"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, West Virginia is fortunate in counting among her citizens the noted author and historian—and valued counselor and friend—Phil Conley. Mr. Conley has not only specialized in the chronicles of the coal industry of West Virginia, in which subject he is an acknowledged authority, but he has ranged in broader fields in such works as "Beacon Lights of West Virginia History," "The Greatest Century in History," and "Everyday Philosophy."

Phil Conley's most recent publication, "America's Debt to Greece," is an expression of his study of the relations between classical Greek civilization and the foundations of American government. It is also a product of his insights into contemporary Greek culture which he achieved as a member of the American Mission for Aid to Greece in 1947 and 1948.

This book is rich with the author's perceptions of the contributions of Greek thought to the philosophies of the Founders of our Constitution. And it offers an eloquent presentation of those values of Greek antiquity which are viable in the American present.

Perhaps the most penetrating appraisal of "America's Debt to Greece" is that offered by His Excellency Alexis S. Liatis, Ambassador of Greece, delivered at a meeting of the Education Foundation, Inc., in Charleston, W. Va., when the book was published last November. I ask unanimous consent that the address by Ambassador Liatis be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD, followed

by the review published in the National Herald, an English language newspaper devoted to Hellenic culture in North America.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY HIS EXCELLENCY ALEXIS S. LIATIS, AMBASSADOR OF GREECE, AT THE MEETING OF THE EDUCATION FOUNDATION INC., OF WEST VIRGINIA, NOVEMBER 17, 1961

It is indeed a flattering occasion for me to take part in today's meeting of the Education Foundation of West Virginia and be associated in the formal announcement of the publication of a new book by your president and my friend, Mr. Phil Conley: "America's Debt to Greece."

I am among the privileged few who have received an advance copy of this interesting and instructive book. I read it in two installments the day it reached me, and I did so attracted by the easy, simple, and suggestive way in which the author expounds his thesis, namely the innumerable instances in which the writers of the American Constitution were inspired and guided in their discussions, in their arguments, their deliberations, and their resolutions by the Greek historic precedents dating more than 20 centuries back.

Never do I recall perusing at greater speed and with greater ease, almost in one and the same breath, I may say, both text and quotations. And there are many quotations in Mr. Conley's book, so well selected, though, and so fittingly and suitably inserted that they constitute like part and parcel with the author's writing.

The reader is duly reminded of the successive failures of the ancient Greeks in their efforts to expand the basic tenets of democracy beyond the confines of their small city-states into wider pan-Hellenic political structures. One is given the principal reasons for such failures and is clearly shown the lessons statesmen like George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, Edmund Randolph, and others were able to draw from the vicissitudes of classical Greece.

I do not intend to review Mr. Conley's work before this select gathering which includes learned men and women much better qualified to do so more aptly and more authoritatively than I could possibly endeavor.

I should like, however, to call your attention to two principal considerations or conclusions I have been led to by Phil Conley's concise but at the same time lively, engaging and stimulating presentation of his subject.

One is the eternal and imperishable value of that branch of studies we usually call the humanities, which include Greek and Latin classics, as well as the masterpieces of our modern Western literature, history, and philosophy.

I am stressing the value of classical studies before this group of distinguished men and women, all with a keen interest in education, as the general trend during the past 50 years and nowadays has been and still is toward curtailing more and more and even abandoning altogether the teaching of classical Greek as well as the Greek masterpieces in the original.

It was not so in the 18th century, both in Europe and on this side of the North Atlantic. As a matter of fact, one is really astounded at the fact that most of the framers of the American Constitution knew so much of, and were so familiar with, the writings of the ancient Greek historians, orators, philosophers, geographers, and mathematicians. You see them referring in Philadelphia to the Delian, the Achaean, or Aetolian federation, or the Amphictionic League, with greater ease than our contemporaries, even amongst the most educated, would be able to talk today either of the European Holy Alliance of the last century or even of the defunct League of Nations of a generation ago.

One might well wonder what course the American Nation would have followed in its political development had the Founders of this Nation not been in a position to foresee and preclude errors and fallacies that had caused the ultimate downfall of ancient Greece; had they not established the sound and solid foundations upon which this great country was erected and has since evolved into the greatest and most powerful and progressive democracy of the free world.

Their foresightedness actually exceeded anything one might have expected or dreamed of. It is indeed a different thing to create and apply free democratic institutions within the narrow limits of a small city-state—of which there were several scores in ancient Greece—and a different thing altogether to expand the same principles and ideals over almost an entire continent, from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific, and from the 49th parallel down to the Rio Grande.

The primary credit for such a wonderful achievement is due, above all, to the Founding Fathers of this great Nation, to their wisdom and forbearance, their love of God and farsighted patriotism. Some of the credit may and should actually be assigned, through them, as Mr. Conley explains, to some of the wisest men among the political leaders and thinkers of ancient Greece.

One other point I wish to make is Mr. Conley's personal experience during his term of service with the American mission in Greece and the common traits he discovered between ancient and modern Greece.

The reader is taken on several guided tours in my country the author knows so well. He is not only shown the physical environment in which the human mind attained the higher strata of human values and first conceived the higher forms of organized society; he is not only led to admire the standing relics of that amazing Greek golden age in Athens and elsewhere.

He is also taken to a modern Greek agora, not very unlike its ancient prototype, to see the people leading those interminable and lively discussions, often underscored by the lifting of voices and by vivid expressions and gesticulations. In one of those agoras, none else than the central piazza of Constitution Square in the Greek capital, the reader may enjoy the rules and the spirit of such open debates in which no one can be denied the right to talk; even a shoeshine boy passing by can join and speak up his mind if the topic under discussion is of interest to him.

Two other special characteristics of Greek life, which have hardly changed through the ages, namely the love of freedom of the Greeks and their "rugged individualism," are given due credit and emphasis in the everyday attitude of the people, as well as in their national reactions and behavior.

More than a century ago, a German historian aroused furor in Greece and caused heated debate among intellectuals in Europe by claiming that modern Greeks had almost no relation to their glorious ancestors. His thesis, founded on certain misconstrued passages of Byzantine chroniclers, was soon disproved and the general opinion among scholars has settled to the view that despite admixture of a substantial proportion of alien blood as a result of foreign incursions and invasions, modern Greeks still are racially preponderantly Greek.

But is it not really of secondary importance whether the Greeks of today are only by 90 or 80 or only 70 percent purely Greek? What matters more is that they themselves feel Greek and that their general attitude and philosophy of life is deeply influenced and shaped by their Hellenic heritage.

It is in this broader light that Mr. Conley has seen my countrymen. An entire chapter in his book is devoted to the heroic Greek struggle against the axis in the Second World War, what 21 years ago was called the "Greek miracle" or "the glory that is Greece." This phase of modern Greek history would remain indeed incomprehensible without recourse to the history of the ancient Greeks, in particular to such well known historical facts as Marathon, Thermopylae, and Salamis, of which the 1940–41 Greek military victories against overwhelming odds seem to be a repetition.

May I thank the author for this valuable contribution of his toward a better understanding of modern Greece and her role in our world today.

I am sure that "America's Debt to Greece" will find its place in the hands, on the desks, and in the libraries of all those who are interested in a more enlightened view of the background of American history and of our Western civilization as a whole. I am expressing this belief and cordial wish not only as an educated man but also as a citizen and official of one of the most devoted member-countries of the free world.

AMERICA'S DEBT TO GREEK CIVILIZATION AS SEEN BY DR. PHIL CONLEY

An American's personal view of ancient Greek civilization and the debt his country owes to the glorious past of that nation is contained in a book just published by the Education Foundation, Inc., of Charleston, W. Va. The author is Dr. Phil Conley and the volume is titled "America's Debt to Greece."

In easy-to-read narrative style, Dr. Conley tells of his journey to Greece by plane and the stops he made at various places in that fabled land. But this is not a travelog, nor a description of places visited. In each locale Dr. Conley delves deeply into the ideas and thoughts that were born on the site he was visiting, or were expressed for the first time publicly. Then Dr. Conley goes even one step further.

He not only describes the ideas and theories of ancient Hellas' great thinkers but relates them to modern American history. He does this by showing how the men who built the American Nation—the framers of the Constitution—derived idea and inspiration from these ancient sources. As the distinguished American historian, Dr. Allan Nevins, puts it:

"Dr. Philip Conley, out of many years of devoted interest in ancient Greece, its ideas and achievements, and almost as many years of understanding acquaintance with the people and institutions of modern Greece, has performed in this volume a double service. In its earlier chapters he eloquently sketches the immeasurable heritage that ancient Greece left to the modern world, in laws and constitutions, in poetry and art, in philosophy and political thought, and in examples of unselfish devotion to the common good. In his later chapters he describes the work of the authors of the American Constitution; men who stood sturdily upon their own feet, but who numbered well-read leaders deeply imbued with Greek thought, and keenly aware of the value of ancient ideas in their application to modern needs."

Dr. Conley points out in this book that many of the early American leaders were so familiar with the traditions of ancient Hellas it was, to them, a living heritage. Without downgrading the Founding Fathers of our Republic he points out that "many of the provisions of our Constitution were not original, that they were not 'a novelty in the political world.' The intrepid Madison was not content with giving a few arguments for ratifying the Constitution; he hammered away with many and varied illustrations from ancient Greece."

Yet, this book, America's Debt to Greece, is not a dry, historical tome. It is lively history the way Dr. Conley tells it. In it are mingled not only the thoughts of ancient Greeks and early Americans; part of its vitality derives from the fact that Dr. Conley includes in his work discussions with modern Greeks with whom he has spoken. As the Honorable Alexis S. Liatis, Ambassador of Greece to the United States, said of the book, "America's Debt to Greece is not a pedant philosophical discourse on the evolution of doctrine and practice in political science."

Ambassador Liatis goes on to state:

"Though based on scholarly study and research, the book is a concise, lively, and stimulating presentation of the subject, guiding the reader to a comprehensive grasp of the infinite connections between Greek and experience and the constitutional edifice erected by the Founding Fathers of the American Republic.

"It is more than lively, I should say, as the reader is taken on a guided tour in Greece to see the environment in which the human mind developed and concived of the higher form of society, admire the remaining relics of the astounding Greek golden age, and also witness that rugged individualism so characteristic of the Greek people in their thinking and behavior through ages—parallels such as that drawn between Marathon and Salamis, on the one hand, and the heroic resistance of little Greece to the Axis in 1940–41, on the other, are indeed illuminating."

Dr. Conley was a member of the American Mission for Aid to Greece in 1947–48. Upon his return home, his friend, Dr. Allan Nevins of Columbia University, suggested that he write a book and bring out the influence of ancient Greek culture and history on the men who drafted the U.S. Constitution in 1787. In the book he quotes from references to the leagues and confederacies of ancient Greece and also from the essays in the Federalist.

Dr. Nevins was one of three distinguished people to contribute to the foreword of America's debt to Greece. Mr. Constantine Tsatsos, Minister to the Prime Minister of Greece, and Judge Michael A. Musmanno of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, also contributed to the foreword.

The sale price of the book is $4 and may be ordered from Education Foundation, Inc., Charleston, W. Va.

AMERICA'S DEBT TO GREECE

(By Alexis S. Icates, Ambassador of Greece)

Every high school student knows that democracy is a Greek word and that the system of government and related institutions it denotes have their origin in ancient Greece.

Few, however, have any notion of the many and close relationships between the original Greek models and present day forms of free government.

Dr. Phil Conley has just filled this hiatus for the benefit of the average college graduate as well as for the layman, in an effort to help increase the ranks of better enlightened citizens.

His book, "America's Debt to Greece" is not a pedant philosophical discourse on the evolution of doctrine and practice in political science.

Though based on scholarly study and research, the book is a concise, lively and stimulating presentation of the subject, guiding the reader to a comprehensive grasp of the infinite connections between Greek and experience and the constitutional edifice erected by the Founding Fathers of the American Republic.

It is more than lively, I should say, as the reader is taken on a guided tour in Greece to see the environment in which the human mind developed and conceived of the higher form of society, admire the remaining relics of the astounding Greek Golden Age, and also witness that rugged individualism so characteristic of the Greek people in their thinking and behavior through ages—parallels such as that drawn between Marathon and Salamis, on the one hand, and the heroic resistance of little Greece to the Axis in 1940–41, on the other, are indeed illuminating.

If "America's Debt to Greece" would possibly be reviewed by the 16th century French philosopher Montaigne, it would certainly be found most instructive and commendable. That's the highest praise I think I can offer for Mr. Conley's work.

AMERICA'S DEBT TO GREECE

(By Stewart H. Smith, president, Marshall College, Huntington, W. Va.)

"America's Debt to Greece" is a delightful and readable book written in a charming, intimate style yet giving evidence of considerable scholarship with many apt quotations. Living up to the title, the book reviews the many contributions of Grecian civilization to our American institutions, government, and culture. I commend it for wide reading by all people who seek inspiration, knowledge and relaxation. It should be most helpful to high school and college students. Mr. Conley deserves much credit for this extraordinarily fine contribution to international understanding, appreciation, and scholarship.

AMERICA'S DEBT TO GREECE

(By Joseph F. Marsh, president, Concord College, Athens, W. Va.)

Most of us have some acquaintance with Greek civilization through our (alas) casual study of history, politics, and philosophy. In a vague way we acknowledge the contributions of the ancient Greeks to our own modern America. But Dr. Phil Conley, a distinguished American devoted to the noble ideas and high ideals that gave birth to our Nation, expressed in full what a grateful United States owes to Greece in his admirable book, "America's Debt to Greece."

A book so personal as Dr. Conley's causes the reader to span the centuries as if by magic—first to the golden age of Greece, and then to the days of our Founding Fathers. This reader recalls being similarly taken through time for a close contact with the literature of the ancient Greeks by many personal conversations with the late Gilbert Murray, O.M., regius professor of Greek at Oxford University. It is fortunate that our modern civilization has such men as Professor Murray and Dr. Conley to make us aware of our ancient heritage.

In these days of crisis for America and for the world, "America's Debt to Greece" is especially appropriate reading. Knowledge of our heritage can give us added strength today as it gave strength to those who established our great Republic.

This reader, in a modern Athens in the hills of West Virginia, is pleased to join Dr. Conley in his salute to the Greece that gave us the first seat of learning.

AMERICA'S DEBT TO GREECE

(By Robert C. Bowles, professor of history, West Virginia Wesleyan College, Buckhannon, W. Va.)

Dr. Phil Conley's new book, "America's Debt to Greece," should be of genuine delight to lay readers and professional teachers alike, for it presents the results of a businessman's ardent labor of love with a youthful enthusiasm akin to that of the people he describes. It is a timely book. Now that our way of life is challenged, it seems important that Americans understand the institutions and concepts which they resolve to defend and the rich cultural heritage which molded them. Dr. Conley presents here a vivid review of the dynamic Greek quest for order in life. These ancients provided all subsequent civilizations with a laboratory of governmental experimentation. Their law evolved through an almost boundless series of trials of the various forms of governments and constitutions in a quest for the golden mean of democracy. They addressed to the task the simple honesty which eschewed hypocrisy, verbosity, and ornamentation. Theirs was always a quest for the essentials, and the result was a harmony and simplicity which appear to have been instinctive with them.

The author here traces the evolution of the Greek historical experience and the constitutional law which resulted. The latter part of the book shows how this Greek thought was reflected in the minds of the framers of our own constitution. Our forefathers were well aware of the Hellenic message to the world. Many of them were profound scholars of the classics, and they saw in their task an affinity with that of the ancients. Both faces a new world far from the beaten track of the older civilizations and found the field of constitution-making open to experiment. Both had a profound seriousness of purpose and a youthful confidence in their destiny. Both recognized the significance of their efforts to the world. The present book is a testimony to that significance.

AMERICA'S DEBT TO GREECE

(By Charles C. Wise, Jr., Charleston, W. Va., member, board of governors, West Virginia University)

"America's Debt to Greece" is a scholarly account of the Hellenic threads so creatively woven by the Founding Fathers into the American pattern of government. But it is far more than that. This book is neither dull nor pedantic. The author has recounted vividly and with compelling interest his travels to the Shrines of Liberty. The personal and intimate pilgrimage of one man to the golden age of Greece and its peoples will guide the way for all men to share in the unique contributions to civilisation made by them. The reader will not only enjoy the feast of ideas so temptingly spread by Phil Conley but will also find sustenance for the soul.

AMERICA'S DEBT TO GREECE

(By Frank R. Shea, assistant to publisher, Time magazine, New York, N.Y.)

It is fitting that Phil Conley, who was a member of the American Mission for Aid to Greece at a tortuous moment in Greek history, 1947–48, should give us "America's Debt to Greece." He is putting first things first and he does it admirably.

AMA Labors Mightily for Its Own Benefit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call to the attention of the Members an article which appeared in the Pittsburgh Post Gazette by Sydney Harris, under date of January 8, 1962, concerning the biggest lobbyist in Washington—the American Medical Association.

I believe this article most timely, especially in view of the President's message calling for legislation which would provide medical care for the aged.

AMA LABORS MIGHTILY FOR ITS OWN BENEFIT

(By Sydney Harris)

Which group do you imagine was the biggest lobbyist in Washington during the first half of 1961? Which group spent the most money as a means of influencing legislation in the Congress of the United States?

It was none other than our old friend, the American Medical Association. For the first 6 months of 1961, a Congressional Quarterly study of spending reports shows the AMA topped the 274 lobby organizations with half-year expenditures of $146,894.

This was nearly $80,000 more than the second-running group in the listings, the AFL-CIO. Most of the AMA money was spent in opposing the administration's proposals for medical care for the aged through social security.

Now there is no doubt that the AMA has a right to do this—indeed, has a duty to do this if it believes such a program is against the best national interest. But what are some of the other bills that the AMA lobbies against—and effectively—during the year?

It opposed social security benefits for physicians, liberalized social security disability benefits, creation of a U.S. Commission on Aging, and several proposals for expanding medical treatment under the Veterans' Administration.

And what did the AMA lend its support to? Bills to provide construction grants to medical schools, to give doctors and other professional people a tax break on income set aside for retirement, and to grant deductions for lobbying expenses.

In addition, the AMA said it was submitting this lobbying information under protest, because it did not consider itself subject to the Federal law regulating lobbies.

The bills the AMA supported would take money away from the U.S. Treasury, but the doctors are most zealous that no money be taken away by other segments of the population, where medical care is concerned.

Now, the AMA has a legal right to do this—to ask as much for itself as it can get, and to oppose the milking of the Treasury by other groups. But then the AMA has no right to put itself on a pedestal and to resent criticism of itself as a trade association.

For this is what the record shows it to be—a group no better and no worse than the labor unions, the farm interests, the truckers, the steamship companies or the post office clerks. Devotion to the public, and the sacred duty of medicine, have little to do with the case. It is time the AMA stopped posing as a friend to anyone except itself.

Nehru's Actions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Members, I include as part of my remarks an editorial that appeared in the December 22, 1961, edition of the Grand Junction Daily Sentinel. Whether the actions of the Government of India were right or wrong in its occupation of the territory of Goa, the editorial pinpoints a most important aspect of the matter—what is the resulting image that now lingers in the minds of the general public.

It goes without saying that it is in the interest of each Member to mark well the writings of those who not only help to mold public opinion, but very often reflect that opinion. The editorial follows:

NEHRU'S ACTIONS

Movement of Indian troops into Goa has provided the final disillusionment of those who had faith in the sincerity of Nehru. Following hard on the heels of his recent visit to the United States the move takes on the aura of a betrayal of this Nation's confidence in the Indian Government.

Whatever were the Indian reasons for the invasion the act itself cannot be explained away. India has too often and too long preached nonaggression and the rights of nations.

When the U.N. question came up it was the Soviet bloc and the Soviet bloc alone which prevented the Goa question being discussed within that body. This, too, stamps Nehru's decision as a betrayal. It is possible, but hardly probable, that it was made without at least a strong conviction that the Soviets would sanction India and refuse to let the U.N. take action.

Whatever influence Nehru had for peace and reason in the East or in the world has been destroyed by this one move. The blocking of U.N. action has made it even worse. Now the little nations have seen what can happen, and how helpless the U.N. is, when two large powers combine their efforts to nullify the purpose of the world organization. Nehru has not only lost face and friends. He may well have laid down the final straw which breaks the U.N. back.

The Internal Threat of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. PAUL KITCHIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial recently used on WRAL-TV, Raleigh, N.C.:

The Washington correspondent of the Chicago Tribune, a veteran reporter named Willard Edwards, recently wrote a story about the career of J. Edgar Hoover, who has served since 1924 as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The story, while it is a tribute to the dedication and loyalty of Mr. Hoover, also is an alarming commentary on this Nation's failure to recognize the internal threat of communism.

Even today, in the face of Mr. Hoover's repeated warnings to the contrary, governmental leaders—including, unfortunately, the President—contend that the danger of communism lies totally from without, not within.

Mr. Edwards reports that FBI files contain evidence reflecting on the loyalty of between 2,000 and 3,000 Federal employees. Most of them, Edwards wrote, "are locked safely in their (Government jobs) under the Civil Service System, carefully hiding their sympathies."

FBI Director Hoover is probably this Nation's most respected public servant. Members of Congress are particularly aware of Mr. Hoover's meaningful service to his country. Not once in the history of the FBI—Mr. Hoover is its first and only Director—has the Congress cut down on an appropriation requested by Mr. Hoover. In fact, the Congress has often urged more money upon him.

But the Presidents under whom Mr. Hoover has served have not been so kind to him. Mr. Edwards cites a number of examples when various Presidents have ignored information provided by the FBI. In each case, they lived to regret it.

President Truman, for example, refused to consider the FBI report on an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. The FBI had assembled conclusive evidence that the official in question—a man named Harry Dexter White—was a Communist espionage agent. In the face of the FBI report, President Truman announced that he was nominating White to a $17,000-a-year job as American Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund. White's nomination was confirmed by the Senate, which had no knowledge of the FBI report. Several years later, when another Government official—Alger Hiss—was tried and convicted, the FBI evidence against Harry Dexter White was confirmed.

There was a note of irony in one portion of the Hoover story. During the period in which the atom bomb was being developed at Oak Ridge, Los Alamos, New York and Chicago and other places, FBI agents were aware of the fact that Russian agents were swarming to those points. The FBI first learned that the United States was developing this bomb not from official channels in Washington, but from information gathered by FBI agents in their surveillance of Russian agents. The greatest secret of the war was known to Soviet spies before any official got around to informing the FBI about it.

There is a tragic aspect to the disaster at Pearl Harbor. Many an American boy died because of the surprise attack. Again, J. Edgar Hoover had unsuccessfully tried to warn of an impending danger. He got no cooperation from anyone else in Government, but the record shows that he had the FBI on a "war alert" 10 days before Pearl Harbor.

The FBI, as long ago as 1957, tried to warn the State Department that Fidel Castro was a Communist. Our former Ambassador to Mexico, Robert C. Hill, testified last June that FBI reports to this effect were sidetracked in the State Department by a man named William Wieland, who, incidentally, is still with the Department.

There are some, of course, who classify FBI Director Hoover as a rightwing extremist. But for others, he is a man whose courage and patriotism are in too short a supply. On December 7, in a speech in Washington, Mr. Hoover warned again about the dangers of Communist infiltration. He added, in these words: "Fear apologies, defeatism, and cowardice are alien to the thinking of true Americans. As for me," J. Edgar Hoover said on that occasion, "I would rather be dead than Red."

No loyal American who has observed the career of Mr. Hoover since 1924 has the slightest doubt about his sincerity. And this country will be safer if his warnings and his advice are treated with more respect in the future than in the past.

United States-Japan Atomic Industrial Forums Joint Conference on Nuclear Power, Tokyo, Japan, December 3–8, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, representing the congressional Joint Com-

mittee on Atomic Energy, I was honored to have the privilege of delivering the following address to the United States-Japan Atomic Industrial Forum, Joint Conference on Nuclear Power, in Tokyo, Japan, December 6, 1961:

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY, CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, AT THE UNITED STATES-JAPAN ATOMIC INDUSTRIAL FORUM, JOINT CONFERENCE ON NUCLEAR POWER, DECEMBER 7, 1961

Let me say at the outset that I am deeply pleased to be in your beautiful country and equally honored to address this distinguished group today.

Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, the Chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, conveys his regrets that he can't be here with us today. Congressman HOLIFIELD has been confronted with an urgent workload of congressional business during the first 2 weeks of December. Reluctantly, therefore, he had to cancel his plans to meet with you.

In just the few short days that we have been here, we have become aware of the beauty and the culture of Japan. We have also been impressed by the industry and energy that we see about us everywhere. Your achievements have been legion and you may well be proud of them.

It has been most stimulating to learn of your efforts and plans here in Japan to harness the energy of the atom for peaceful purposes. We were very much impressed with the comprehensive nature of your program.

You appear to have both a very strong theoretical and experimental program directed toward the solution of the problems connected with the use of atomic energy. Your approach to the problem reflects very favorably on the vision and technical competence of your scientists and engineers.

The degree to which Japanese industrial firms are being brought into the atomic development program is especially indicative of the soundness of your program. In this way, as we have found out, you will bring to bear a myriad of talents and resources on the tasks before you.

You have already attained an important landmark in your efforts as evidenced by the design and construction of the JRR-3 research reactor—the first reactor designed and built entirely by your own efforts. This project provides proof of the soundness of your efforts in the atomic field.

The step you have already taken in the nuclear power field is also impressive. Here I refer to the two power reactors you now have under construction. I understand your first power reactor, the 12,000-kilowatt boiling reactor, is scheduled to be completed next year and the 150,000-kilowatt gas-cooled reactor will follow shortly.

This show of energy, initiative and inventiveness in atomic energy could not be equaled by many other nations in the world today. To the extent that international cooperation has made this success possible and specifically to the extent of America's contribution, we are pleased to have played a role in your vigorous atomic energy program.

I cannot help but compliment you on the soundness of your approach in the atomic energy field. Your emphasis on developing the basic skills and performing the basic research needed in atomic energy reflects the obvious sober thought and consideration which has been given to this program. The combination of this experimental work and the effort which we see going into the development of commercial fabrication techniques creates a firm groundwork for progress.

In your country, as in mine, there have been outstanding achievements in nuclear research. For you, as for us, another equally important task remains ahead—making atomic power a commercially competitive source of energy.

I understand you too are finding the solution to the attainment of economically competitive power a difficult job. Although nuclear power costs continue to decrease so have the costs of power from the new conventional plants. I understand you here have recently experienced a reduction in fuel oil costs and additional reductions are expected in the future.

These developments make the solution of the economic problem more difficult but I'm sure you agree with me that it can be solved. I'm sure we all also agree that nuclear power must be developed to meet the world's ever-increasing demands for energy.

I have been interested to learn about the outlook for nuclear power in Japan. The great economic strides realized by Japan in just the last several years indicate an enormous need for increased electrical power. I have been informed that you expect a fivefold increase in your power demand by 1980 and that to meet part of this accelerated demand for electrical power, you plan to bring in about 1 million kilowatts of nuclear power in the 10-year period ahead and approximately 6 million to 8,500,000 kilowatts in the next period, 1970–80.

These are admirable, ambitious goals, and we wish you success in achieving your nuclear objectives. We hope that American atomic equipment companies will be able to obtain a fair share of this business, along with our British and European friends, and of course your own industry.

In this regard, our interest is not limited to that of a sportsmanlike competitor—we shall always stand ready to discuss with candor any proposal for international cooperation.

Specifically, I am aware of your concern with respect to long-range assurances of the availability of enriched uranium. I am sure that the joint committee will sympathetically receive any suggestions in this regard. Moreover, we shall listen with interest to discussions on this subject in the course of this conference.

You know, of course, of President Kennedy's interest in this subject. In announcing the increased availability of enriched uranium, the President on September 26, 1961, stated:

"The purpose of this announcement is to provide assurance of the availability of enriched uranium for peaceful programs contemplated at home and abroad. As those programs develop in the future, it will undoubtedly be necessary to make further determinations to meet their requirements."

It is my hope that suitable arrangements can be worked out so that your atomic power program will not be impeded.

Let me say also that we appreciate fully your concern over the U.S. nuclear fuel pricing policy. But again, this is an area where I believe that forthright discussions of the many problems involved can lead to mutually satisfactory solutions.

I would also like to see more nation-to-nation discussions of the reactor siting problem. Recently the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission published its reactor site criteria. Necessarily, these criteria can only be guidelines and not firm requirements at this early stage in the deevlopment of nuclear technology. If this is true within the United States, it is even more true when the criteria are aplied to other nations with different geographical and other considerations. Perhaps a nation-to-nation exchange of ideas on this problem would be a helpful device leading to the establishment of sensible site criteria on an individual basis.

I might add that the Joint Committee stands ready to consider other constructive measures for cooperation in the field of atomic energy. It has been American policy, since the dawn of the atomic age, to share with the world community the atom's manifold benefits. I believe that our good faith in this regard has been amply demonstrated in the support which we have given to Euratom and to the International Atomic Energy Agency, not to mention the many cooperative programs undertaken with individual nations, including Japan.

We invite Japan then to move forward with us as partners toward the achievement of a common goal: the betterment of mankind's condition through the use of man's most awesome servant—atomic energy. Let us learn from each other; let us profit from each other's experience; let us proceed in a spirit of mutual trust.

It has been said that "man is neither the child of fortune nor the slave of fate." Our achievements will thus depend on the vigor with which we pursue our goals—in short, on how well we do our job. The atom can be the leading citizen of the world. It is our task to make it so.

Fund Cuts Close USIA Unit in Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, as one who has been greatly interested in the activities of our Information Agency throughout the world, I was distressed to learn that the Kennedy administration has closed an important information center in Spain as indicated by the attached item from the Washington Post.

If we are to win the battle for the minds of men, we must be expanding rather than curtailing our information activities. This is one activity for which the Federal Government has the sole responsibility to do an outstanding job. The budget should be increased, and propaganda activities of the type mentioned should be expanded rather than cut back.

FUND CUTS CLOSE USIA UNIT IN SPAIN

(By Richard Scott Mowrer)

MADRID.—What looks to many like a miscalculated risk on the part of the U.S. Government is scheduled to take place in Spain December 31: the closing of the U.S. Information Center in Bilbao.

Bilbao (population 230,000) is one of northern Spain's big ports, an industrial city with a large middle-class and working-class population. It is the capital of the Basque country, a region where separatist sentiments are deeply rooted, where political turbulence is a latent force beneath the surface calm.

It is a part of Spain where Spanish-language propaganda broadcasts from behind the Iron Curtain come in most clearly, seeking to exploit a void caused by the fact that the Spanish press and radio are heavily censored. Radio Espana Independiente, the Czechoslovak station that beams its programs to Spain, lately has stepped up its attacks against the American military presence here.

WITHDRAWN FROM BATTLE

Yet at a time when the anti-American emphasis of the Communist broadcasts is being increased, the Casa Americana (American

House) of the U.S. Information Service in Bilbao is to withdraw from the battle being waged to win, and keep, the friendship of the Spanish Basques.

The close-down is motivated by budgetary considerations related to the U.S. Information Agency's expansion plans for Africa where the number of centers is to be increased from 43 to 58. The Casa Americana in Bilbao is not the only casualty. Throughout Western Europe the USIA setup is being trimmed as part of the shift of emphasis to Africa.

[A USIA spokesman said that a library staffed by Spaniards will remain in Bilbao although the American-manned branch will be closed. A branch in Barcelona will shut down but a binational center with Spanish employees will remain there, he said. These are USIA's only Spanish operations due for a cutback, he said.

[The spokesman said USIA has been unable to use counterpart funds to support its activities in Spain, apparently because the Spanish Government has not given the necessary concurrence for their use.

[He said that USIA's Western Europeon operations were curtailed at the specific direction of Congress. Most of the cuts affect France, Italy, and West Germany, which has offered to underwrite the 9 of its 18 information centers scheduled to go. Some 32 USIA jobs for Americans and 240 for local employees in Western Europe are marked for loss.]

NO TRADITIONAL TIES

Unlike the democracies of Western Europe, Spain does not have the political traditions, nor the ideological ties with America that endure regardless of the presence or absence of U.S. information centers.

The Casa Americana in Bilbao has been in operation 14 years. It is a popular landmark in the city, appreciated and well attended. Every week between 7,500 and 8,000 persons use its library. Films about America made available by the USIA are seen by some 150,000 persons in and around Bilbao every month.

Young people, some of whom may be destined to wield decisive influence in Spain a few years from now attend the Casa Americana's English classes or study in the library.

Abraham N. Hopman, the Bilbao center's director, has received many letters from Basque friends of the Casa Americana expressing their bewilderment and dismay.

The U.N. Question—The President's Vista

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I am glad to place in the RECORD two editorials clipped from the Wall Street Journal. One, entitled "The U.N. Question" appeared in the issue of January 11, 1962. The other, under the heading "The President's Vista" comes from the issue of January 12, 1962:

THE U.N. QUESTION

It's just about impossible these days to avoid running into "the U.N. question." In conversations and in periodicals of all political hues the same questions are being raised: Is the United Nations worth keeping? More particularly, can the United States continue to support the U.N. as an instrument of policy?

This widespread concern, although belated, is healthy. For the questions are the right ones, and they are important ones for the United States.

From the beginning, or so it has seemed to us from the beginning, the U.N. had to be regarded with skepticism for the plain and simple reason that it was founded on a fallacious premise: The assumption that the Soviet Union would cooperate with the United States in building a peaceful world.

In view of this fundamental fallacy, it has been a disquieting thing all these years to see American children taught to revere the U.N., and sometimes taught more about it than about their own Government. Even more disquieting has been the incessant reference to it by Government officials as the cornerstone of American foreign policy. As recently as last year the U.N. was called the only alternative to war—an absurdity if there ever was one.

Still, for years no irretrievable harm was done to U.S. interests in the world as a result of the U.N.'s false premise. For this we can thank the Soviets, who quickly made their implacable hostility unmistakably clear, and thus drove us to other alliances and arrangements more suited to our interests. We found we could live with the U.N., in effect using it when usable and ignoring it when not.

Today, however, we confront a new situation. Due to the unseemly swelling of the U.N. membership, the United States now has 1 vote out of 104 in the General Assembly; it is overwhelmed by many new nations that are but fictitious fragments. What this means in practice was well illustrated in the wake of India's aggression against Goa and the other Portuguese enclaves.

The United States wanted a Security Council condemnation of India; the Soviets vetoed that. The next step would have been for the United States to take the matter to the General Assembly, where a two-thirds majority can override a Security Council veto. In the old days the United States would have got it handily; this time it didn't even try because it knew it couldn't get anything like the required number of votes. Even though the Indians had conquered the enclaves by force, the Afro-Asian bloc was on India's side; to them this was a case of an ex-colony, India, proceeding against a colonial power, Portugal.

Now the United States obviously doesn't have to apologize to anyone for its own anticolonial origins and traditions. But the thinking in the U.N.'s dominant factions on this issue is upside down. Russia, the only significant colonial power today, is not regarded by the Afro-Asians as a colonial power. As for the rest, anything goes in the name of anticolonialism. And this includes the use of force by the U.N. itself in the name of anticolonialism.

That is the case of the Congo, in which the United States is so deeply involved through the U.N. The U.N. force was used not as a buffer, not to prevent civil war and keep peace, but as an active antagonist to drive out the presumed vestiges of colonialism. In the expert opinion of Harvard Professor of Government Stanley Hoffmann, writing in the New Republic, this was a reversal of the peaceful policies the late Dag Hammarskjold tried to apply.

Unquestionably it is a precedent, and an awesome one for the United States to contemplate. If the United States goes along with this anticolonial theory, as it has in the Congo, into what more morasses may not the United States be dragged? As Mr. Hoffmann puts it, "The U.N. is simply not equipped to cope with a world in which too many hunting grounds are left open; another aggression justified by anticolonialism might, this time, provoke extensive bloodshed."

And that, we think, suggests the nub of the U.N. question. The United States is thoroughly enmeshed in an institution it cannot control and which is a potential danger both to peace and to American interests. Professor Hoffmann states it even more strongly: "There is a serious risk involved in entrusting the pursuit of important national interests to a mechanism the next twists and turns of which one cannot predict."

At least this much ought to be clear: The United States had best be extremely wary of the U.N. And the Congress and the people had best face the questions honestly, and at last without sentimentality. Our security may depend on realistic answers.

THE PRESIDENT'S VISTA

The President's message yesterday does indeed add up to a comment on the state of the Union—or at least on the state of the national mind. And it is not, we think, a very happy comment.

For a key to this address is that it is almost impossible to wax angry or even indignant about it, despite its proposals for still further Government expansion and intervention. Most of these ideas have been kicking around for so long that people are used to them and regard them apathetically. Those who question the trend they reflect can but shrug wearily—what else can be expected in the United States in the 20th Century's middle age?

That, we suggest, is the depressing part, despite the President's observations on such appropriate Federal concerns as defense and international trade policy. For the fact remains that this message as a whole promises a significant forward thrust in the momentum of Federal aggrandizement. Look in it where you will, and you will look in vain for any problem, large or small, truly national or obviously local, for which the President does not propose a Federal solution.

Do our cities have troubles? No mention is made that their troubles stem in large measure from the corruption of big-city political machines and existing Federal instrusions. No, the Federal Government will "attack" all their problems—literally everything, from juvenile delinquency to air pollution to mass transportation. To undertake this glorious enterprise we are to be given a new Federal Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

Could our children be better educated? Don't even think of what the localities are doing and could do; the Federal Government will see to it. All through the educational process, Federal money is to be the solution.

Do some young men quit school in the confident expectation the welfare state will support their loafing? Very well, the Federal welfare state will do just that, making sure they never learn the meaning of the word "incentive."

Are some "small" businesses buffeted by the winds of competition? Never fear; the Federal father will protect them. Is the economy as a whole a weak, unstable thing? That's all right; Washington will stand by, ready to rush in with vast public-works spending at the first hint of economic adjustment.

And so on—and one certainly could go on with this list. The Federal Government is to create that "instant utopia" which Senator Mansfield has just said it could not conceivably do. As we say, it is mostly familiar stuff, but maybe it's worth asking what it suggests for the future.

Once the principle of a Federal solution for everything is accepted, it's extremely hard to see where the process stops, or indeed why it should stop at all. Perhaps the good sense

of the American people, and their instinct for political compromise, will keep the process within the broad bounds of freedom, though that will be difficult to do.

But even if the federalization of our life can be kept gradual, it offers an inexpressibly dreary prospect. At best it offers a widening pall of bureaucracy to smother all the powerful energies of our individual and national life. No one who has seen that kind of life in action—as in Britain under the Labor government, not to mention more extreme examples—could seriously regard it as desirable.

The President talks of vigor, stimulation, creativity, fulfilling the world's hope by fulfilling our own faith in freedom. It is a pity that the vista his program, taken as a whole and seen clearly, would actually open is of another sort entirely.

The saddest part about the state of our Union is that few indeed seem to see, or to care.

One With Nine Zeroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, some of us who continue to become alarmed over the massive Federal Government spending programs are encouraged when someone comes along and tells the public just how much is being spent.

There is a fundamental difficulty: trying to impress on the public mind that a billion dollars is a huge amount of money and, importantly, it is all the public's. The Federal Government does not have a dime of its own; it is all the taxpayers.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I should like to submit an editorial from the Los Angeles Times of January 12, 1962. We in the Congress are soon to work on another budget, the highest in peacetime records. The Times is performing a public service in pointing up its astronomical size:

A ONE WITH NINE ZEROES

When he concluded his State of the Union message, the President had spent 4,000 words and more than $92 billion. Mr. Kennedy left little doubt that the Federal budget will be that much or more even thought he predicted a surplus for fiscal 1963.

According to administration budget experts, there will be a couple hundred million more dollars coming in than going out—if the economy continues strong, if Congress approves all revenue proposals and if no new spending ideas come from the White House. Only seven U.S. budgets since the end of World War II, however, have been able to triumph over these ifs and emerge in the black.

Apparently the least disturbing thing in the Thursday speech was the size of the new budget in absolute terms: the spending of at least $92 billion in 12 short months. In 1940 the Federal Government needed only one-tenth that amount; in 1930 the budget was only $3.33 billion.

We have spent billions in such numbers and with such abandon in recent years that this vast figure no longer inspires awe in anyone. Economists, in fact, have begun using its 12-ought cousin, trillion, more and more in discussing national fiscal policy.

A billion dollars is nevertheless more than a one and nine zeroes. It is a stack of $10 bills 5.7 miles high. It is a sum that would still be substantial if given away $1,000 an hour for 12 hours every day beginning in 321 B.C.

But these comparisons simply make the mind boggle. The far more soothing approach of the public spenders is to point out that a billion dollars amounts to a mere $5.41 for every person in the country.

Ninety-two of these billions, however, adds up to nearly $500 for every American man, woman, and child. And next April 15 the meaning of a billion will for the moment become considerably clearer.

Legislation To Promote Greater Safety in River Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill (H.R. 9700) for appropriate reference which would require the inspection and certification by the Coast Guard of certain motor vessels known as towboats. This proposed legislation is an outgrowth of a long series of exchanges of correspondence which I have had with members of the legislative committee of Local 28, International Organization of Masters, Mates, and Pilots, AFL–CIO, of St. Louis, both in my capacity as a Representative of St. Louis in the Congress and also as a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House.

The bill, which I am introducing by request as a means of bringing a long-standing problem before the committee in a manner which will assure thorough hearings and consideration of the underlying issue, would extend to diesel-powered towboats the same requirements for inspection and certification now required in the case of steam-propelled towboats. Insofar as the inland waterways are concerned, I am informed that steam-powered towboats have virtually disappeared.

I am not personally conversant with the technical details of inspection and certification proceedings, but as one who was born and reared in one of America's great inland ports located on our greatest river, I am certainly aware of the importance of taking whatever steps are necessary to assure the safe use of our rivers by the mammoth trains of barges which carry tremendous amounts of industrial cargo.

In previous discussions of this problem which the Coast Guard, I was informed that accident statistics have not disclosed so far any emergency situation as regards the operation of uninspected and uncertified towboats on the rivers. Nevertheless, as long as the danger of serious accidents exist, I believe we should take appropriate steps to extend the Coast Guard's inspection requirements if that course of action is feasible and practicable. The purpose of my bill is to provide the vehicle by which the whole problem can be brought up for hearings in committee, with the expectation that if the supporters of this bill can establish the soundness of their position, we can then correct any deficiencies in present law.

Other provisions of the legislation would require licensing of pilothouse employees on diesel-driven towboats just as they are now required to be licensed in steam-driven vessels of the same type.

How We Got This Way—VI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, the sixth—published November 12, 1961—in the New York Daily News series of editorials "How We Got This Way" appears below:

HOW WE GOT THIS WAY—VI

As noted in a previous editorial in this series on the political evolution of the United States, the Constitution's framers intentionally made it hard to amend that body of basic law.

You have to get a two-thirds vote in each House of Congress to offer an amendment to the State legislatures. Or two-thirds of the legislatures have to agree on a national convention to amend the Constitution before such a convention can be called.

By whichever method a proposed amendment gets to the State legislatures for ratification, three-fourths of them (or of State conventions) have to vote Yes before the change takes effect.

The first 10 amendments were adopted soon after the original Constitution, and are known as the Bill of Rights. They were discussed in No. 5 of this series.

Since then, only 13 amendments have been added.

TWELVE LATER AMENDMENTS

In the 11th amendment (declared effective by Secretary of State Timothy Pickering Jan. 5, 1798), the Federal courts are barred from entertaining lawsuits by citizens of one State against another State, or by foreigners against States.

The 12th amendment (effective Sept. 25, 1804) repealed a part of article 2, section 2 of the original Constitution, by setting up—for better or, as many think, for worse—the present electoral college method of making the election of each President and Vice President official.

It was 61 years before the Constitution was again amended. The 13th, 14th and 15th amendments came about as a result of the Civil War (1861–65).

One big issue in that war had been Negro slavery. President Abraham Lincoln, in his Emancipation Proclamation effective Jan. 1, 1863, had declared all slaves in areas in rebellion against the Union free as of that date.

After the war, there were efforts in parts of the South to keep slavery alive under various disguises and legal fictions, some of them rather clever.

The Republicans in Congress set to work to nail down the abolition of slavery once and for all. They rammed the so-called Re-

construction amendments through enough legislatures to make the last of them effective March 30, 1870.

These three amendments add up to provisions flatly abolishing slavery throughout the United States, guaranteeing equal rights and immunities to all citizens, opening the way to pardons for former Confederates, and granting the right to vote to U.S. citizens regardless of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

FISTFUL OF AMENDMENTS

Another 43 years passed before the Constitution was amended again. Then, in 1913, just before President Woodrow Wilson took over the White House from William Howard Taft, the 16th amendment (effective February 25, 1913) empowered Congress to levy and collect income taxes.

Three months later (May 31, 1913), Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan declared amendment No. 17 in effect. This one took the election of U.S. Senators away from the State legislatures and gave it to the people of the several States.

On January 16, 1920, the Constitution was festooned with one of the biggest mistakes ever made by U.S. lawmakers and majority public opinion; namely, the 18th amendment, forbidding manufacture, sale, or transportation of intoxicating liquors. This error—at once tragic and farcical—was rectified by amendment 21 (December 5, 1933), which repealed the 18th.

The fight for woman suffrage had been a long and bitter one. It came to a victorious end on August 26, 1920, when amendment 19 took effect. This enactment gave the vote to citizens of the United States and of the States regardless of sex.

Amendment 20 (February 6, 1933) changed the old dates for the President's inauguration and the convening of Congress to January 20 and January 3, respectively. Amendment 20 also tried to arrange for successors to dead or disabled Presidents and Vice Presidents, but didn't do a complete job.

On February 26, 1951, the 22d constitutional amendment went into effect. It is the one which limits Presidents to two terms, thereby seeking to guarantee the Nation against another four-term power-grabber like Franklin D. Roosevelt.

And, as recently as last March, the necessary 38 State legislatures ratified amendment 23, giving citizens of the District of Columbia the vote in presidential elections.

Harnessing the Atom for Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following progress report by Frank Carey, of the Associated Press, on harnessing the atom for power, taken from the Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot, January 13, 1962, reveals that more than 380,000 Americans already are lighting their homes with "juice" from atomic energy and another 640,000 will do so by the end of 1962 as technologists continue studies expected to bring down the cost.

HARNESSING THE ATOM FOR POWER

(By Frank Carey)

Economical electric power from the atom still eludes the Nation. But more than 380,000 Americans already are lighting their homes with "juice" from atomic energy and another 640,000 will do so by the end of 1962 as technologists continue studies expected to bring costs down.

Thus, while the toughest hurdle remains to be passed, the American atomic energy industry has come a long way since its nativity in an athletic setting two decades ago.

It was on December 2, 1942, that history's first self-maintaining nuclear chain reaction was produced in a relatively crude device set up on the floor of a squash court beneath the west stands of the University of Chicago's football field.

This historic event opened the way for man to tap electrical power from the atom.

Now, nearly 20 years later, the foreseeable goal of making atomic power economically competitive with power produced from conventional fuels is still some 6 years away—even for limited applications.

The Atomic Energy Commission says it expects that by 1968, the atom can be made competitive with coal and oil in parts of the country where conventional fuels already are high in cost. But it won't be until the early 1980's that it can be expected to be competitive in low-cost fuel areas, says the AEC.

Meanwhile, a widespread and diversified American atomic industry has long since been growing.

Beginning to develop shortly after the close of World War II, it reaches into industrial, military and scientific life in the United States. It plays a role in relations with friendly nations. It almost literally extends from the Arctic to the Antarctic.

Approximately $4½ billion has been invested so far in reactors of various types, of which $4 billion has been supplied by the Federal Government, the rest by industry and other private groups, including colleges and universities.

American-produced atomic energy is lighting homes; propelling submarines and larger ships; powering medical and other research reactors at home and abroad; furnishing heat and light for soldiers in Greenland; and during 1962 will make its bow on the ice capped continent of Antarctica.

The United States now has more than 300 nuclear reactors of various types in operation, under construction, or planned in this country and abroad.

Private industry and Government are spending about $200 million annually on civilian reactor development alone.

There are 90 civilian reactors in operation, ranging from big prototypes of central-station electrical powerplants to relatively small-sized research and testing reactors. There are 55 military reactors in operation, ranging from powerplants for more than 20 nuclear-powered submarines to an experimental reactor which may lead the way to America's first nuclear-powered rocket.

And, some 30 American-built reactors are in operation in foreign countries, including a central-station electric power producer at Kahl-am-Main, Germany. The other reactors in foreign countries are research and training devices.

In the United States domestic program for producing industrial electricity from the atom, only three reactors are presently producing such juice on a full-time basis. All of them are feeding into existing power systems, and none of them are producing power at costs competitive with conventional sources.

These plants and others under construction or planned are all designed to give scientists and engineers the knowledge which eventually is expected to make nuclear power economically competitive. Meanwhile, as industrial firms and Uncle Sam underwrite the excess costs, customers suffer no increase in their electric bills for the privilege of using the new force.

The three existing full-time plants are the Shippingsport (Pa.) station jointly operated by the AEC and the Duquesne Light Co.; the Commonwealth Edison Co.'s Dresden Station, Morris, Ill.; and the Yankee Atomic Electric Co.'s station, Rowe, Mass.

Together, the three plants generate 383,000 kilowatts of electricity—enough to meet the electrical needs of that many people.

In addition, two relatively small experimental reactors are also furnishing electricity to civilian consumers on a part-time basis. These are the 5,000 kilowatt Vallecitos reactor, operated by General Electric Co. and the Pacific Gas and Electric Co. at Pleasanton, Calif.; and the 6,000 kilowatt "sodium reactor experiment," operated by the AEC and the Southern California Edison Co. at Santa Susana, Calif.

During 1962, 10 other nuclear powerplants now under construction will start feeding juice into commercial, public, or cooperative power systems. Their combined output—642,150 kilowatts—will feed the needs of that many people.

These plants are: Consolidated Edison, Indian Point, N.Y.; Power Reactor Development Co., Lagoona Beach, Mich.; Hallam Nuclear Power Facility, operated by AEC and Consumers Public Power District, Hallam, Nebr.; Pathfinder Atomic Plant of Northern States Power Co., Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; Consumers Power Co., Big Rock Point, Mich.; Pacific Gas & Electric Co., Humboldt Bay, Calif.; Elk River, Minn., reactor, operated by AEC and Rural Cooperative Power Association; Piqua, Ohio, Facility, operated by AEC and the city of Piqua; the Carolinas-Virginia Associates, Inc., reactor, Parr, S.C., and a reactor operated by AEC and the Puerto Rico Water Sources Authority, Punta Higuera, P.R.

The first six of these are large-plant prototypes the latter four are small-plant types.

Five additional large-plant types are in the planning stage. Four of them will be located, respectively, at Peach Bottom, Pa.; Genoa, Wis.; Bodega Bay, Calif.; and at an undetermined spot in southern California. No location has yet been selected for the fifth.

Together, these five plants will have an output of 820,000 kilowatts, or enough for 820,000 people.

Anniversary of Flight: December 15, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, Dayton, Ohio, and the Great Miami Valley have long been known as the birthplace and cradle of aviation. It was here that Wilbur and Orville Wright developed their ideas, performed their experiments, and constructed their airplane which was to make the first powered flight in the history of the world. This first powered flight was made only 58 years ago last December 17 and this great achievement has completely changed the course of history throughout the entire world in very many ways.

In this relatively short time, tremendous advances in the science and technology of air transportation have been made. Many of these discoveries and much of this progress has occurred in the Dayton area through the work of the scientists, engineers, and technicians in

the research and development programs at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. Our Nation and the entire world have benefited by the dedicated work and service of the highly skilled and trained men and women in the WPAFB complex.

Each year the Dayton Area Chamber of Commerce sponsors a luncheon in honor of the anniversary of powered flight. It has been my privilege, Mr. Speaker, to attend many of them. Each year a speaker of outstanding ability and accomplishment in the science of air transportation is secured and 1961 was no exception. Gen. William F. McKee, commander of the U.S. Air Force Logistics Command, was the speaker on December 15, 1961, and gave an outstanding address.

Mr. Speaker, I feel the address of General McKee was so appropriate that, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include it in the RECORD at this point:

ANNIVERSARY OF FLIGHT: DECEMBER 15, 1961

(Address by Gen. William F. McKee, commander, Air Force Logistics Command)

Mr. Wozar, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I think it is especially appropriate for our friends from Montgomery, Ala., to be with us today for an occasion such as this. For many years, Maxwell Air Force Base in Montgomery has been known as the cradle of Air Force education.

I am deeply honored to take part in this observance of the 58th anniversary of powered flight. The years since the historic first flight at Kitty Hawk have witnessed tremendous advances in aviation. The extent of those advances could not have been foreseen completely even by those men of faith and vision—Orville and Wilbur Wright.

Typical of the growth and progress that have marked the age of flight are the Air Force installations in this area—Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, the Dayton Air Force Depot and the Clinton County Air Force Base. I believe I can speak for all of us in expressing pride in the excellent relations that exist between these Air Force complexes and Dayton and the other communities in the area. A notable spirit of good will and cooperation has grown with the years.

There are, of course, many yardsticks by which progress can be measured. In transportation, speed is one of the most important measures. It is interesting to realize that in the centuries preceding the invention of the steam engine and the internal combustion engine, the top speed at which man could travel remained relatively the same. It was the speed of the fastest horse.

The first powered flight—on December 17, 1903—covered a distance of 120 feet in 12 seconds—a speed of 10 feet per second. The first U.S. military airplane, constructed by the Wright Brothers, was accepted in 1909 after being flight tested at a speed of 42½ miles an hour—or 62 feet per second.

Last month, on November 9, the X-15 research rocketcraft set a speed record for controlled flight of 4,093 miles an hour. That is 68 miles a minute or more than a mile and a tenth per second.

The X-15 also has reached a record altitude of 217,000 feet—about 41 miles above the earth.

Between the Wright Brothers' first airplane and the X-15 there have been innumerable milestones of aviation progress. Many obstacles—some regarded as insurmountable—had to be overcome; many barriers— thought to be invincible—had to be broken. But once those obstacles were overcome, once those barriers were broken, it was only natural that man should continue his quest to fly faster, farther and higher.

However, there was more behind these accomplishments than man's natural desire for excellence and improvement. There was also the insistent prodding of necessity. Aircraft, through the years, became increasingly important as a military weapon. The security of the United States demanded that our Nation achieve and maintain supremacy in airpower.

The need for such supremacy is greater now than it has ever been. But this supremacy is in terms of a new environment—"aerospace."

As most of you know, "aerospace" describes the continuous and indivisible operational medium which extends outward from the surface of the globe. The weapons which comprise our principal strategic war deterrent are "aerospace weapons"; the principal power which we maintain to preserve the peace is "aerospace power."

As we move along, projects that once seemed to belong to science fiction no longer appear fantastic.

There are few today who doubt that maintaining the military security of our Nation in the years ahead will require operations in deep space—voyages to the moon and to the planets. Bases and orbital stations will have to be set up in space. These operations will have to be supported, resupplied, and maintained.

The Air Force Logistics Command has nine air materiel areas—better known as AMA's. There are those in the command who are looking ahead to a new base that literally will be out of this world—we might call it "Lunar Ama."

I will have more to say about space logistics. But for the moment, let us return to the present.

It isn't necessary for me to dwell upon the world situation. We all know that the growing power of the Communist bloc represents a threat to our security and the survival of freedom throughout the world. I would like to discuss some aspects of the defense structure we have built and are maintaining to counter that threat. Our mission is to deter war—or to win, should war be forced upon us.

As an essential element of our national defense posture, we maintain powerful long-range strategic forces. The Strategic Air Command—a bulwark of peace for years—wields much of this power. Its mighty B-52 bombers are the heavyweights of the Air Force, while its B-58 bombers can fly at twice the speed of sound—and the power of SAC is being increased.

The Skybolt program, a good example of SAC progress, is being pushed with vigor. This nuclear-tipped ballistic missile—fired from an airborne B-52—has a range of more than 1,000 miles.

The Skybolt program is directed by the Aeronautical Systems Division at Wright-Patterson. Its importance recently was emphasized by the appointment of Brig. Gen. David M. Jones, former vice commander of ASD, to head the program. Since the Skybolt can be carried by the B-52 in addition to the normal complement of bombs, it makes the B-52 a more versatile weapon—in effect, a mobile launching platform.

Acceleration of the Minuteman program promises another important boost in the power of the Strategic Air Command.

Not only has the program been stepped up, but the production base for this solid fueled ICBM has been expanded so that we can rapidly increase production if it becomes necessary.

In order to increase the ability of our missiles to survive an attack, we are emplacing them in hardened sites. We are improving the airborne alert capability of the bomber force with the same objective in mind. The ground alert status of the bombers is being improved so that half of the force can be airborne in 15 minutes after an alert signal.

It is possible to keep a portion of the B-52 fleet in the air at all times.

And a flying command post—staffed by an Air Force general officer in a specially equipped jet transport—is now in the air 24 hours every day.

These are just a few of the highlights of our aerospace power. There are many more. What they all add up to is a proper blend of manned and unmanned weapon systems. Such a blend is essential to our national defense posture.

There are many who wonder what the percentage of manned to unmanned systems is going to be in the future. Some have gone so far as to express the belief that the missile will make the manned systems obsolete.

I believe it is possible to say with confidence that the missile will never completely replace the man. We are building good missiles and each generation of them promises greater reliability. They will perform some missions more efficiently than a manned system. But missiles will always have certain limitations.

For one thing, a missile can be used only in conflict. When you are authorized to push the button, you know you are at war. With a manned system the situation is different. You can launch a manned system if you only suspect an enemy attack is near, knowing you can recall it if the alarm proves to be false.

Another advantage is that if something malfunctions in a manned system during flight the crew can make corrections or return and repair it on the ground. Then the mission can still be carried out. However, if something goes wrong with a missile in flight you have not only lost a costly piece of hardware but the mission has failed.

Also, there is the possibility of the development of countermeasures which would be effective against missiles on their predetermined courses—but not against flexible manned aircraft.

Warfare is the most uncertain of all activities; events can never be expected to unfold exactly as planned. That is why there is such a premium on trained human judgment and on manned weapon systems that can look, and find, and report, and attack; and return, and attack again.

The important point is that manned and unmanned weapon systems complement each other; they are not competitive. Together, they give us a balanced and well-rounded capability. Obviously, it would not be wise to concentrate on one to the exclusion of the other.

A moment ago I spoke of human judgment. In the last analysis, people will always be the key to successful defense. The computers and other electronic marvels coming off the production lines are not—in my opinion—going to change that.

Original and creative thinking are essential—and electronic devices cannot provide that. Courage and patriotism are essential—and they cannot be supplied by automation. Man has a brain, a will and a soul—mechanical miracles do not.

Earlier, I referred to the fact that operations in space will be necessary in order to maintain the military security of our Nation. To clarify this point, it may be helpful to recall how airpower developed.

In World War I, the first use of the airplane was for reconnaissance. Early operations were conducted with a degree of politeness. Both sides had equal access to the sky. This did not last long. Air reconnaissance began to have a decisive effect on battles and commanders realized the importance of depriving the enemy of this capability.

Inevitably, opposing airmen began to engage in combat, first with small arms and then with machineguns. Then came more

sophisticated weapon systems. Aerospace appears to be the next arena for a new type of conflict.

There is a striking similarity between the state of airpower at the beginning of World War I and the state of operations in space today. It is only logical to expect that the development of space power will follow the trends that airpower did.

Today the military capabilities we are developing in space are defensive—warning of attack through the use of satellites. But consider the natural consequence once such devices are effective in reducing the advantage of surprise attack. It is only sensible to expect that an aggressor will look for means to eliminate our defensive space systems.

This is just one reason why—from a military standpoint—it is imperative for us to develop space capabilities at the most rapid rate feasible.

It is entirely possible that advanced space technology may some day bring about the disarmament of nuclear weapons, rendering obsolete present concepts of warfare and defense.

Possession of such a technology by an aggressor—while we still lacked it—would make the world vulnerable to complete tyranny.

What are the steps that are necessary if we are to acquire the space capabilities that will be essential for our survival? Let me mention a few of the most important ones.

The ability of man to work and survive for extended periods in space must be insured. We must be able to place large payloads in space. Economically and reliably. This means either a cheap booster or one we can recover.

We must develop the capability to rendezvous with, support, and recover space payloads. And we must develop the means to maneuver and to communicate in space.

The answers to many of the problems involved in taking these steps may be found in such programs as the X-15, the Discoverer, the Mercury, and the Dyna-Soar. These projects can lead to the development of a manned space vehicle with complete mission flexibility. It would be able to take off from existing runways, go into orbit maneuver into a parking orbit, deorbit, maneuver reentering the atmosphere, and land conventionally at an airbase.

Other programs envision orbital bases and command posts involving missions of 12 months duration. Obviously, this will entail substantial logistics support. We are already preparing for such tasks in the Air Force logistics command.

It will be necessary to resupply the orbiting bases and command posts and to rotate crews at isolated temporary duty stations in space. A basic problem will be the subsistence factor. This is not a major matter with aircraft programs. But provisions of such items as food, fluids, and oxygen becomes a key problem in manned space vehicle projects.

Problems of logistics support undoubtedly will multiply—at an ever-increasing rate—as operations in space become more ambitious. Let us assume, for example, that you embark on a trip to the moon and back.

According to one concept of such an expedition, your space vehicle would be boosted into earth orbit and be resupplied from stock that had been prepositioned there.

Next, your spaceship would proceed into orbit of the moon, where it would drop off a fuel supply on a space platform and then descend to the moon. When it was boosted back into lunar orbit, it would pick up the fuel previously stored and proceed to earth orbit. There it would be refueled for a retrorocket landing on earth.

Suppose, in the course of its journey, your spaceship required maintenance attention. A space repair vehicle—it might be called an astrotug—would be boosted to a manned orbital base, from which it would move to your craft, perform its maintenance mission and return to earth under its own power.

The space capabilities I have described and the logistics processes involved may seem fantastic. Let me assure you, however, that they are within the scope of our knowledge and our rapidly advancing technology.

It would tax the most lively imagination to try to visualize the great accomplishments that will be described 10 years from now when the 68th anniversary of powered flight is observed. One invention that no one has come up with yet is a perfectly clear crystal ball. And we haven't developed radar to the point where it will penetrate the future.

Even the Wright brothers—with their tremendous vision—could not foresee the full scope of the age of flight which they ushered in 58 years ago.

During those 58 years the rate of our scientific progress consistently has been underestimated. Those of you who attend the observance of the 68th anniversary of flight 10 years from now—and I hope you all do—may well look back on the words spoken here today and marvel at how far they undershot the mark.

Thank you.

Nineteen Hundred and Sixty-one Marked the 100th Anniversary of St. James Evangelical Lutheran Church, Altoona, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, during the month of October 1961, the 100th anniversary of St. James Evangelical Lutheran Church, of Altoona, Pa., was observed in a solemn and impressive manner. As a fitting climax to 100 years' service in the religious life of Altoona, Pa., the church was renovated and presented a pleasing appearance to all worshipers and especially those of German descent, since St. James congregation was originally comprised of German immigrants and has had a number of German pastors.

It was a great pleasure to me and my wife and our son, Jamie, to be able to accept the invitation to attend the homecoming service on Sunday, October 8, 1961. Mrs. Van Zandt being of German descent has always felt at home when attending St. James Church and therefore, we welcomed the special invitation extended by Pastor Paul E. Jaunzemis to worship there during one of the centennial services.

The sermon for the homecoming service was delivered by the Reverend Dwight F. Putnam, D.D., president of the Central Pennsylvania Synod of the Lutheran Church.

At this point, I wish to include in my remarks the following news article concerning the centennial of St. James Church which appeared in the September 27, 1961, edition of the Altoona Mirror, followed by an editorial in the issue of October 7, 1961:

LUTHERAN CHURCH WILL OBSERVE ANNIVERSARY

St. James Lutheran Church, corner 8th Avenue and 14th Street, is celebrating the 100th anniversary of its founding during the month of October.

For over a century this congregation, first founded to conduct Lutheran services in the German tongue for those just migrating to America, has served its community well. Over the years, St. James Lutheran, first called "St. Jacobus Evangelische Gemeinde" was a meeting place and a religious home for many a homesick German coming to America in the heavy waves of immigration during the 1880's and 1890's. However, the need for the service in the German language has disappeared until now all church business and religious meetings are conducted in English.

It was in 1861 that the minutes of the Allegheny Synod first record a request from the German Evangelical churches of Altoona and Hollidaysburg for a charter to form a new church. It was just a few months later that this young congregation purchased the present church site and began the erection of a building thereon. Pastors John H. Schmidt, Michael Wolf, Carl Jaeckel, and H. J. H. Lemcke served this thriving new congregation with daily church school and religious services held in two languages. In 1889 the need for a new church building was deemed urgent and it was in that year that the cornerstone for the present church edifice was laid.

The St. James Church follows a style of true Gothic architecture with wood carvings on altar, lectern and pulpit executed by foreign masters. The years have mellowed this art work until at present, St. James is regarded as one of the most beautiful churches of the area.

With the new church building the congregation continued to thrive under Pastors John Mueller, Charles L. Boecele, Reinhold Schmidt, J. F. Flegler, Ernest Boening, Russel J. Crouse and the present pastor, the Reverend Paul E. Jaunzemis.

In 1903, a parsonage was built which is now used as a parish house for office and Sunday School work, and in 1950 a new parsonage was purchased at 428 Pleasant Valley Boulevard, which adequately serves as a home for the minister's family at the present time.

For the present anniversary celebration the entire exterior of the building has been cleaned and sandblasted. New walks, railings, steps and blacktopping add to its exterior appearance. Inside, the whole church auditorium has been renovated. New pews, floor tile, and lighting add to the beauty of its architecture. Special services will be held all during October to commemorate this 100th anniversary. All friends of St. James are urged to join with members in this joyous occasion.

The celebration begins October 1 with Holy Communion administered by Reverend Jaunzemis to all the congregation and their worshipping friends. This joyous redication of St. James members in their Lutheran vows will institute a month of special services of interest to St. James members and the community as a whole. On October 8, at 10:45 a.m., Dr. Dwight Putman, president of the Central Pennsylvania Synod, will bring the synod's greetings, while that evening at 7:30 p.m., at a community service, the Reverend Waldem M. Holl, D.D., pastor of the First Lutheran Church, Johnstown, will conduct a service for all neighborhood churches and friends.

On Thursday, October 12, a fellowship dinner, with the Reverend E. H. Boenig as

guest speaker, will be held for all church friends at the Juniata Pavilion. On October 15, the Reverend Robert T. Dell, a former son of St. James who is at present on the faculty of Wartburg College, Waverly, Iowa, will bring the message. Oscar L. Lingle, president of the United Lutheran Church Men of the Synod will conduct the service October 22, while on October 29 the Reverend Russell J. Crouse, a recent pastor of St. James, will meet old friends and preach at a special service in charge of the United Lutheran Church Women.

St. James invites all friends to these services. Throughout the past 100 years the language, the church building, the customs, have changed but the spirit of loyal service and dedication continues. It is the hope of the present generation that this spirit continues for the glory of the Church and in Jesus Christ to all generations for ever and ever.

MARKS 100 YEARS

A century of operation and 100 years of existence in the field of religion is being marked in Altoona during the month of October, members of the St. James Evangelical Lutheran Church celebrating through special services and programs with a homecoming, community night, fellowship night and a return of former pastors.

The St. James Church, long established on the east side, has had a most interesting history. In honor of the 100 years of service a special anniversary book, one of historical facts, has been compiled by the present pastor, the Reverend Paul E. Jaunzemis.

Inaugurating the month-long observance, the Reverend Dwight F. Putman, D.D., president of the Central Pennsylvania Synod, has been selected for the morning homecoming service Sunday, October 8. The Reverend Walden Holl, D.D., pastor of the First Lutheran Church, Johnstown, will direct the community night service Sunday.

Among the former pastors, the Reverend Ernest H. Boenig, who served from 1949 to 1955, will be the speaker October 12. He is presently pastor of the Teutsch Lutheran Church in Cleveland, Ohio. The Reverend Russell J. Crouse, S.J.D., pastor from 1956 to 1960, now at the Windsor Park parish in York, will be the October 29 speaker.

The St. James Church was the outgrowth of the influx of German immigrants to this area and the first documentary record is contained in the Allegheny Synod minutes of 1861, although records show a small mission formed prior to that date as German pastors of Newry, Frankstown, and Martinsburg made horseback journeys to Altoona to assist the group.

The present edifice was dedicated in 1890 and for many years a parochial school for youths was operated. Pastors have been most successful in building up the congregation, Pastor John H. Schmidt being the first minister. Pastor Charles C. Boecele had an incumbency of 22 years and Pastor J. F. Flegler a period of 25 years.

In commemorating the anniversary, Pastor Jaunzemis, in his dedicatory message to the congregation, announced: "A 100th anniversary is God's special blessing to a congregation. It demonstrates in a rare way the fact that a Christian congregation is God's handiwork and His instrument. God not only initiates a congregation, but He also enables it to function. A congregation which served Him through a number of generations is found to be useful. St. James looks forward to its centennial with deep gratitude and humble joy that God has used it in His service for 100 years."

The community is indebted to St. James Church for its fine contributions to the city's advancement and most hearty congratulations are bestowed by all citizens during its centennial. May its influence continue to be manifest in an even greater degree in the years ahead.

Is Americanism Only for the Little Fellow?—VIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished editor and publisher of the Dallas (Tex.) White Rocker, Mr. Elton Miller, has for some months been carrying on an editorial campaign in the interest of his fellow Americans. In a remarkable series of editorials he has asked the question: "Is Americanism Only for the Little Fellow?"

The series deals in part with the availability of corporate information to individual stockholders. I am including herewith under leave to extend my remarks the eighth editorial of the series:

IS AMERICANISM ONLY FOR THE LITTLE FELLOW?—VIII

No officer can fool his enlisted men for long; their aggregate intelligence is greater than his.

When I was a boy in the second grade, I was told a story about a poor village. Whenever anyone had a grievance, he would pull the rope of the village bell and assemble the villagers, who would then dispense justice. One day the rope of the bell wore out, and the villagers, being poor, replaced the rope with a grapevine.

There was a miser in the town who starved his horse. One day the horse broke away, ran into the village square, and, seeing the grapevine attached to the bell, ate the vine, and thus rang the bell. This caused the villagers to assemble, and they dealt out justice to the miser although the complainant was nothing but a poor defenseless animal.

The White Rocker believes that in this American democracy every determined aggrieved person can ultimately ring a bell, state his grievance to the Nation, and obtain justice.

Speaking specifically, we proclaim, we ring the village bell to clearly shout that a shareholder in a public corporation can require even J. R. Dilworth, the president of Rockefeller Bros., Inc., to answer questions concerning his personal actions concerning dilutions, self-dealing transactions and dispositions which he planned or from which he personally benefited.

In like manner, we ring the village bell to unequivocally state that Henry H. Patton, the president of American Overseas Investing Co. (owned by the Rockefellers, Kuhn, Loeb & Co., and the First Boston Corp.), can be brought to a similar accountability.

Thirdly, the White Rocker rings the bell to state, as a matter of fundamental Americanism, that if the Rockefellers permit, tolerate, sanction, or encourage a continuance of this policy of personal protracted silence by their top men, that Nelson Rockefeller should not be President of the United States, and, moreover, will never be President of the United States.

What have Dilworth and/or Patton personally got to gain by refusing to answer questions of shareholders of a public corporation?

What have the Rockefellers got to gain by permitting this protracted and inexplicable silence? Could the Rockefellers believe that this embarrassing silence by top Rockefeller men concerning their personal actions is conducive to public confidence?

If the Rockefellers do not require their top men to answer questions of shareholders in order to maintain public confidence in these men, do the Rockefellers actually respect the public's fundamental right to accountability?

These top (repeat, top) Rockefeller men may be as pure as the driven snow. If so, they should answer out of respect to the American public, and should have done so without editorials being written about their silence. In any event, the Rockefellers should require their top men to answer out of respect to the American public. Jesus said that a soft answer turneth away wrath. But here, no answers have been provided. Is it too much to ask the top Rockefeller men to follow Christian principles requiring a proper reply?

And if these answers be not provided, and provided in factual, respectful detail, without hauteur, evasion, further hesitation, or equivocation, then Nelson Rockefeller should never (repeat, never) be nominated as the Republican nominee in 1964; and if he cannot perceive, comprehend, or realize the ethical, moral, and political importance of requiring this accounting by his top subordinates, then should he be so nominated, he should not be elected President of the United States. * * * nor even mayor of Podunk.

Lewis L. Strauss (one of the top Rockefeller advisers) suffered an historical defeat in 1959 for confirmation as Eisenhower's Secretary of Commerce because he would not answer questions concerning this same public corporation. The White Rocker predicts that this same blind spot concerning this corporation's activities will have the same impact in 1964 unless accountability be substituted for silence by Messrs. Patton and Dilworth. After all, all that is sought from them is the simple unvarnished truth.

In evaluating what type of man Nelson Rockefeller really is, it is extremely important for the people of the United States to know whether Nelson Rockefeller desires Patton and Dilworth to reveal or conceal the truth. If Nelson Rockefeller desires the requested facts to be revealed, then why haven't Patton and Dilworth provided the facts? A suggestion from Nelson Rockefeller should be sufficient to require personal and proper answers by both Patton and Dilworth.

The public is like a group of enlisted men; it will appear lethargic and stupid to the secretive, but ultimately, it will demand the truth. * * * and what's more, it will find the truth.

THE WHITE ROCKER.

How We Got This Way—V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, on November 5, 1961, the New York Daily News published the fifth in its series of editorials "How We Got This Way." It appears below:

HOW WE GOT THIS WAY—V

When our ancestors adopted the U.S. Constitution (which became effective March 4, 1789), they had some lively and disagreeable memories of the assorted tyrannies imposed on them as colonials under England's King George III.

Further, most of them had a morose distrust of all kinds of government, and a strong desire to keep their own government from ever getting too much power over them.

(If you ask us, a lot of Americans could use a strong dash of that distrust today, no

matter what party controls the White House and/or Congress.)

So, as stated in the previous Sunday News editorial in this series on the Nation's political growth, our forebears made haste to attach a Bill of Rights to the Constitution.

A total of 145 amendments was offered to the first Congress convened under the new body of laws. Eventually, Congress submitted 12 to the States for ratification. Two of these were turned down.

The 10 that were ratified—the Bill of Rights—took effect December 15, 1791. They are so intimately bound up with the rights, problems, and risks of ordinary citizens in a republic that it seems worthwhile to print them here in full:

"1. Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

"2. A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

"3. No soldier shall, in time of peace, be quartered in any house without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

"4. The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

"5. No person shall be held to answer for a capital or other infamous crime unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service, in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.

"6. In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which districts shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

"7. In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed $20, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury shall be otherwise reexamined in any court of the United States than according to the rules of the common law.

"8. Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

"9. The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

"10. The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

AN AMERICAN MAGNA CARTA

Each of the above amendments is well worth considerable study by anyone who wants to understand the spirit of the U.S. Government and the aims and purposes of the men who built the Republic.

Some of these amendments have been abused from time to time—notably No. 5, by persons afraid to admit being connected with the criminal Communist conspiracy.

Some of them have been violated—for example, No. 2, by New York's Sullivan Act against unrestricted possession of firearms—and some of such violations have stood up in the courts.

By and large, though, the Bill of Rights remains a sort of American Magna Carta—the basic charter of the rights and immunities of the people of the United States.

It is a magnificent document, which has been reproduced in State constitutions and copied in various other countries. If it ever goes down the drain, our fundamental liberties will go with it, and we'll get a country that few of us will recognize and fewer will like.

Coast Guard 1961 Accomplishments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, my good friend Adm. Alfred Carroll Richmond, Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, has today sent me a copy of the "Coast Guard Reviews 1961 Accomplishments."

I think so much of this report I would like to include it, and a biographical sketch of Admiral Richmond, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I think all Americans should know of the accomplishments of this great service headed by that great American, Alfred C. Richmond.

I therefore Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, include the following:

COAST GUARD REVIEWS 1961 ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The year 1961 was a busy one for the U.S. Coast Guard as it strove toward its traditional objective of maintaining safety and order on the high seas and navigable waters of the United States, Adm. Alfred C. Richmond, Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard, announced today.

In reviewing service accomplishments for 1961, Admiral Richmond pointed out that the Coast Guard had answered 32,335 assistance calls and had rescued 3,499 persons from peril. In the same period, the total value of property saved, including cargo, was $1.735 billion—approximately five times the amount appropriated for the entire service during 1961.

Nineteen hundred and sixty-one was also notable for several outstanding advances toward modernization of the service, Admiral Richmond said. They included the launching of an atomic-powered buoy, utilizing strontium 90; pioneering in the application of the gas-turbine principle to helicopters, 82- and 210-foot vessels; and the building of a new type offshore light structure at Buzzards Bay, Mass. Loran C, the Coast Guard's latest refinement of its long-range aid to navigation program, was evpanded to many additional areas of the world.

For the seventh consecutive time, the Coast Guard assisted the Navy in Operation Deep Freeze in the Antarctic. In 1961 this assignment was carried out by the Coast Guard cutter *Eastwind*. As in previous years, the Coast Guard continued its research and exploration in the Arctic.

The Coast Guard's longstanding program for oceanographic research was given further impetus during 1961 when President Kennedy on October 5 signed legislation officially confirming the Coast Guard's work in this vital field. Currently, the 21 vessels on ocean stations in the Atlantic are receiving new electronic equipment for oceanographic study. Eventually, similar equipment will be installed on Pacific as well as on Atlantic ocean station vessels.

Admiral Richmond noted that, during the year, further progress was made in replacing remaining 83-foot wooden patrol boats with 82-foot steel boats of a new design. Military personnel totaled 31,520 in 1961 as compared with 30,616 in 1960, while authorized civilian personnel totaled 4,914 in 1961.

In the field of merchant marine safety, the Coast Guard completed 5,433 inspections of merchant vessels with a gross tonnage of 11,301,814 tons; made drydock examinations of 5,180 vessels with a total tonnage of 13,654,872 tons; conducted 6,204 miscellaneous inspections and reviewed plans for 32,300 vessels.

In the year 1961, there were 40,853 aids to navigation maintained by the Coast Guard in the United States and other areas. They included 68 loran stations; 194 radiobeacons; 6,023 day beacons; 10,513 lights (including lightships); 575 fog signals (except sound buoys); and a total of 23,460 lighted and unlighted buoys. Four ocean stations were maintained by the Coast Guard in the North Atlantic and two in the Pacific throughout the year. They provided search and rescue, communications and air navigation facilities and meteorological services along heavily traveled ocean routes.

Ice conditions in 1961 were of less than average severity. The Coast Guard continued its oceanographic work and aerial reconnaissance as part of its international ice patrol function.

The Coast Guard's larger ships included 184 cutters and buoy tenders of various types. The number of fixed- and rotary-wing aircraft in operation totaled 133. Coast Guard reserve strength was 4,351 officers and 32,329 enlisted personnel.

The Coast Guard Auxiliary, a nonmilitary organization of volunteers, was active in approximately 700 communities in the promotion of safety and efficiency in the operation of small boats. Its 20,975 members gave instruction courses to 114,000 persons, examined 130,000 motorboats, patrolled 900 regattas, responded to 3,700 calls for assistance, and saved 153 lives.

During 1961, the Atlantic merchant vessel reporting system (Amvers), initiated in 1958, assisted materially in expediting the Coast Guard's search and rescue work.

ADM. ALFRED C. RICHMOND, U.S. COAST GUARD, COMMANDANT OF THE U.S. COAST GUARD

Alfred Carroll Richmond was born at Waterloo, Iowa, on January 18, 1902, and at the age of 10 moved with his family to Cherrydale, Va. After receiving a certificate from the Massanutten Academy of Woodstock, Va. he entered the George Washington University College of Engineering of Washington, D.C., at the age of 16. At the same time he was employed at the U.S. Naval Observatory.

Appointed a cadet at the U.S. Coast Guard Academy, New London, Conn., in July 1922, he was graduated senior man in his class and commissioned an ensign on October 1, 1924.

Subsequently he advanced in rank to lieutenant (junior grade), October 1, 1926; lieutenant, October 1, 1928; lieutenant commander, October 16, 1932; commander, July 17, 1942; captain, June 1, 1943; rear admiral (when he took oath of office as Assistant Commandant) March 10, 1950; vice admiral and Commandant, June 1, 1954; admiral, June 1, 1960.

From November 1924 to September 1926, he served as aide to the Commandant of the Coast Guard at headquarters in Washington, D.C. During this time he also performed temporary duty from May to July of 1925 as an aide to the commanding officer of the Special Patrol Force operating against "rum runners" off the coast of New York State, and of the Special Service Squadron off the coast of Massachusetts. He was commended for efficient work in this connection.

Beginning in September 1926 he was assigned for 2 years as a member of the Coast Guard Academy staff. During this period he served temporarily with the cutter *Mojave* from June to September of 1927, and took part in the cadet practice cruise aboard the destroyer *Shaw* during the summer of 1928. In October 1928 he was assigned a course of instructions at the Sperry Gyro Compass School at Brooklyn, N.Y., after which he became navigator aboard the cutter *Pontchartrain* stationed at Quincy, Mass. From July to November of 1930, he served as executive officer of the destroyer *Wainwright* in the Gulf division.

He then reported to the Coast Guard representative at the Philadelphia Navy Yard, and was assigned as executive officer of the destroyer *Herndon*, Flagship of Division III, Destroyer Force, when the ship was commissioned and assigned to Boston for permanent station.

In May 1932 he transferred to Coast Guard Headquarters to undertake duties in connection with the small arms training of a Coast Guard detachment which he helped assemble at Camp Curtis Guild, Wakefield, Mass., then later accompanied to such places as Cascade, Md., and Quantico, Va., for the National Rifle Association regional shooting matches and the national matches held at Fort Sheridan, Ill. Completing this tour in August he returned to headquarters and 2 months later became executive officer of the cutter *Haida* stationed at Cordova, Alaska, in which he performed patrol duty in the Bering Sea and Arctic waters.

In September 1935 he again was assigned to Coast Guard Headquarters at which time he began taking a resident law course at the George Washington University. He was graduated on June 8, 1938, and awarded a degree of juris doctor "with distinction." Thereupon he was assigned duties in Headquarters' Office of Operations, with collateral duties of assisting in the preparation of certain law enforcement education material, and of assisting the Engineer in Chief in the preparation of permanent land records for property held by the Government for Coast Guard use. He served also as a representative of the Treasury Department and as a delegate of the United States at the International Whaling Conference convened at London, England, on July 17, 1939.

A transfer in May 1941 sent him to the Bethlehem Steel Co. at Baltimore, Md., for duties in connection with the outfitting of the new Coast Guard vessel *American Sailor* which was destined to be used for training maritime personnel, which was the responsibility of the Coast Guard at that time. After placing the ship into commission, he commanded it from her assigned station at Port Hueneme, Calif., where, in addition, he commanded the Maritime Service Training Station (assuming charge in February 1942).

From September 1942 (when the *American Sailor* with the Maritime Service was transferred to the War Shipping Administration) until February 1943 during World War II, he served as commanding officer of the cutter *Haida*, stationed at Juneau, Alaska, for convoy escort duty. He was then assigned to the Merchant Marine Inspection Office of the 3d Coast Guard District in New York City. His duties there included those of examining officer and hearing officer.

Transferred overseas in July 1943, he became senior Coast Guard officer in charge of the U.S. Coast Guard Merchant Marine Hearing Unit in London, England. His duties there included that of administering and enforcing laws and regulations relating to the functions of Coast Guard vessels and personnel, and as examining and hearing officer administering laws and regulations governing investigations of accidents and casualties involving U.S. vessels and personnel with the U.S. Naval Forces in Europe.

Later he received the Bronze Star Medal "for meritorious service as Senior Coast Guard Officer on the Staff of the Commander, U.S. Naval Forces in Europe" during and after the Normandy invasion, when he assisted in organizing Coast Guard forces preparing for the invasion and contributed to the efficiency of the merchant marine ships sailing invasion routes.

Meanwhile the French Government awarded him the Croix de Guerre for exceptional services rendered in the liberation of France.

In May 1945, he was assigned to duty at headquarters as Chief, Supply Division. The following month he was designated Chief, Program Planning Division, while in August he became Chief, Budgets and Requirements and Assistant Chief, Planning and Control.

On March 9, 1950, with the advice of the President and consent of the Senate he was appointed Assistant Commandant of the Coast Guard with the rank of rear admiral for a 4-year term. Effective May 1, 1951, with a reorganization of the Coast Guard, he assumed the additional duties of Chief of Staff.

He was appointed Commandant of the Coast Guard with the rank of vice admiral on May 13, 1954, to succeed Vice Adm. Merlin O'Neill upon his retirement. He took his oath of office on June 1, 1954.

On April 22, 1958, the Senate confirmed a second 4-year term for Admiral Richmond as Commandant, effective on June 1, 1958.

Effective as of June 1, 1960, he was appointed to the rank of full admiral by the President with the confirmation from the Senate under authority provided by act of May 14, 1960, Public Law 86-474, which pertains to a reorganization of top commands, amending title 14, United States Code, section 41 and 44. (Whereas previously only two Commandants had ever attained the rank of full admiral while in office, the new act provides that all Commandants shall hereon serve in the rank of full admiral.)

Admiral and Mrs. Richmond, the former Gretchen C. Campbell, live at 2365 North Edgewood, Arlington, Va. They have two sons, John Mason, 24, and Alfred Carroll, Jr., 22. John Richmond was graduated from the Coast Guard Reserve Officer's Candidate School in 1958 and commissioned an ensign in the Reserve.

Admiral Richmond was installed in the GW Letterman Hall of Fame which was inaugurated at George Washington University in November 1959. He won his letter in football.

The Truth About the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the United Nations is under attack I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a brilliant article by United Nations Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, which appeared in the New York Times magazine section on January 14. Ambassador Stevenson's report on the achievements of the world organization provides an eloquent rebuttal to those who wish to destroy the "dwelling house for the family of man."

The article follows:

PAST, PRESENT, FUTURE OF THE U.N.

(By Adlai E. Stevenson)

In April 1945, near the end of humanity's most terrible war—but before any man had seen the atomic age—the architects of peace met in San Francisco to complete the design of a new dwelling house for the family of man, to be called the United Nations.

I was there during those golden weeks. And no one who was will ever forget them. It was a beginning—fresh with the hope of a new day.

Now, more than 16 years later, what is the report? The house is crowded; 104 members, every room is full, and more are coming.

The house is battered. It resounds endlessly with family quarrels. Outside, the cold winds of war and danger, of hatred and fear from every quarter of the globe, rattle the doors and windows.

And, as is not uncommon in such cases, quite a few of the tenants are behind in the rent.

But the house is still standing. Through the cold war it has stood, and the Korean war; through the communizing of mainland China; through the revolutionary surges of colonial peoples toward national independence; through the terror of Hungary, the shock of Suez, and the worse shock of the Congo; and through the perilous, infinitely frustrating tangle of the race in nuclear arms.

Tomorrow the General Assembly will meet once again in the great hall by the East River. The Security Council, as always, is ready to meet on a few hours' call. Other U.N. bodies go about their constructive tasks without benefit of headlines. It is a good moment to look back, across these nearly 17 turbulent years, to seek the perspective we shall need to face the new turbulence which most certainly lies ahead.

Troubles are a test of man's spirit—and none of us foresaw how the men who held the fate of the United Nations in their hands would respond in their time of testing. What could be done was done: The United Nations was built to last, and to withstand unknowable storms.

Then the record began to be written:

Soviet troops withdraw from Iran; and French and British from Syria and Lebanon; the Palestine armistice agreements; U.N. support to repel aggression in Korea.

Vexing colonial conflicts which disappeared from the U.N. agenda as new nations were born and became members: Indonesia, Libya, Morocco, Tunisia, Cyprus.

Other nations, once outside the U.N. world, restored to full standing in the community: Austria, Italy, Japan.

Territorial and minority disputes brought under some degree of restraint: Kashmir, Alto Adige, and West New Guinea.

And a measure of security, at great cost and effort to the U.N., for areas under outside attack: Greece, Suez, Lebanon, Laos.

Such are some of the nations which, since 1946, have owed at least a part of their independence, or even their security against direct or indirect aggression, to the United Nations. As this is written our hopes are rising that another name may take its place on this list: the Congo. Here, in spite of errors and omissions going back many years, a new nation of immense possibilities is in

the process of being rescued by the United Nations, without military involvement of any great power, from a multitude of mortal dangers: internal chaos, Balkanization, and a new imperial yoke far worse than the old. Because of the United Nations it is possible to do this without a direct military clash of the great powers. The price has been great, but so is the achievement—possibly one of the greatest and most decisive in all United Nations history. Indeed, one early measure of its greatness was Mr. Khrushchev's towering rage.

All these political actions, let us remember, are supported by U.N. economic and technical programs of great and growing value, and all aimed at the same major purpose: To enable the weaker and less developed nations to stand on their own feet in the modern world.

There are failures, too—or, at best, hopes deferred. A dozen U.N. resolutions made the cause of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters world famous, but they have not freed Hungary. A thicket of mistrust still chokes the hope for Arab-Israeli peace. A decade of U.N. protest has failed to mitigate apartheid in South Africa, or to free North Korea. Fifteen years have not been enough to dissipate the Soviet suspicions which have made the disarmament debates so sterile

And the recent unhappy case of Goa showed that the writ of the United Nations does not always run even in the country whose heroic Gandhi taught nonviolence to the world.

It is painfully evident that pious platitudes do not keep the peace—nor does verbal respect for great principles nor does sterile debate. It is painfully evident that the rule of law and order requires the means for enforcing the law—that peaceful change and the settlement of disputes require machinery for effecting change and containing dispute.

And it is painfully evident that we have neither used as well as we might the existing procedures for peaceful settlements and the peace-keeping machinery of the United Nations, nor have we used them frequently enough; nor have we paid sufficient attention to the improvement and expansion of the machinery at hand—not just in connection with colonial questions but in connection with others as well.

But today the greatest drama of the United Nations—full of both promise and danger—lies not in one dispute or another but in the sudden, almost explosive growth of the membership.

In the United Nations of 1945, out of 51 members only 11 were from Africa or Asia. Today, of 104 members, 50 are from Africa or Asia. Of the 22 members today from sub-Sahara Africa, only 2—Ethiopia and Liberia—were original members.

The authors of the charter could hardly have anticipated the speed of this vast independence movement, or the turbulence and tragedy that would sometimes attend it. During the war President Roosevelt, whose views were decidedly anticolonial, urged the example of the Philippines (then on the verge of independence) as "a pattern for the future of other small nations and peoples of the world."

But the Philippines had had over 40 years of peaceful tutelage aimed at eventual independent—far more than any of the new nations of Africa. Nor did the Philippines have to cope with a large minority of colonists, such as has bedeviled the independence movement in so many countries since the war.

It is idle to ask whether this flood of colonial emancipation was wise or not. It is almost complete, and whatever the weaknesses and dangers it has this to commend it: it is overwhelmingly the will of the people concerned. Thus the agents of Moscow in most of Africa have lost their best grievance against the West, and the new United Nations members have entered in an atmosphere of comparative friendliness which cuts across racial lines.

When you think how eager the Soviets have been to act as grand marshal in the African freedom parade, it is no small thing that they have been denied such an opportunity in most of Africa. The British Government, and President de Gaulle's government in France, deserve enormous credit for the statesmanship that made this possible.

Would that this were also true in the Portuguese colonies, and some other areas of Africa.

But the question persists—I hear it or read it every day: Aren't these new members irresponsible? Won't they side with the Russians and turn the United Nations against us? Hasn't the United States lost control of the United Nations, and hadn't we better reduce our emphasis on it and rely on alliances like NATO instead?

I think the record of the General Assembly in 1961 gives us a fair test of these questions.

Irresponsible? In some situations I think the word is justified—but let him who is without sin cast the first stone.

The fever of all-out, ultra-anticolonialism, fed always by Soviet encouragement, produced some hot speeches and a few rash resolutions which were not entirely sound or in accord with the Charter and parliamentary due process. Such moves not only put a strain on the United Nations; they also put a strain on mutual confidence between the Afro-Asian nations and the industrial Western powers who are their natural friends and collaborators in the generation of development that lies ahead. And that, quite certainly, is why the Soviet Union always encourages such extremes.

There is no need to deny these difficulties; but neither is there any excuse for building them up into artificial monsters to frighten ourselves out of a true estimate of the United Nations. If the record of last fall's General Assembly is studied, it will be found that this allegedly feeble, irresponsible, Soviet-influenced body of 104 members did these things:

Put U Thant in office, and thereby assured that an independent and active Secretariat so vital to the U.N.'s life—had not died with Dag Hammarskjold.

Met the issue of China head on, and solidly defeated the attempt to replace the delegates of Taipei with the delegates of Peiping.

Provided for the financing of the Congo operation by an unprecedented $200 billion bond issue.

Endorsed three major U.S. proposals—the U.N. Decade of Development, a new start in U.N. cooperation on outer space, and a new $100 million world food program.

Resolutely faced, once again, the issues of Communist injustice in Korea, Hungary and Tibet.

Endorsed our plea for the renewal of talks in Geneva for a controlled nuclear-test ban.

On this last point, however, the record should be kept straight by frankly acknowledging that there were also some rash votes on resolutions dealing with nuclear testing, which, in the opinion of the United States, ill advisedly omitted any reference to inspection and control—and these at the very moment the Soviets were testing nuclear weapons.

The above is only a partial list, but the significance of it is that every decision listed was supported by—or even proposed by—the United States, and most of them were strongly resisted by the Soviet Union. They could not have been adopted without the backing of most of the new Afro-Asian nations.

Cries that the United States has "lost control of the U.N." do not alarm me. I am reminded of the man who said: "Things are not like they used to be in the good old days—in fact, they never were." The United States never controlled the U.N. and never sought to. What is the use of holding debates with yourself?

I was a delegate to the first two sessions in 1946 and 1947, and I know how much persuasion, and how much careful listening, went into our job of leadership. It was a tough job then, and now in the doubled U.N. it is at least twice as tough—but qualitatively it is the same thing.

Must we, just because the going is hard, turn away from the United Nations to some supposed alternative? Are we now to drop the U.N. in favor of NATO, or a concert of free nations, or a better foreign-information program to win the war for the minds of men, or the Peace Corps and people-to-people exchanges, or the opening of Soviet society to outside influences, or religious faith, or higher ethical behavior here at home—or our military strength?

The fallacy is that these things are not alternatives at all. Every one of them has its essential place in our strategy of peace and freedom. And at the heart of that strategy is, and must remain the United Nations.

The United Nations was built for trouble and thrives on it. It has gained its strength and authority not from the drafting of blueprints but from the hot breath of emergency: Korea, Suez, the Congo. The General Assembly has demonstrated its ability to act—with or without Soviet consent. The authority of the office of the Secretary General, steadily built up by Trygve Lie and Dag Hammarskjold and by the felt necessities of the time, has been preserved—and is now being fully exercised by U Thant.

We hear the United Nations called weak and timid.

An organization which fully debates and judges injustice from Hungary to South Africa, despite loud cries of intervention from the accused powers, is not a timid organizaiton—unless timidity consists in unwillingness to resort to war to correct what war cannot correct.

An organization which can put 20,000 troops into the field to prevent communism, or any other force, from reconquering or partitioning the Congo, is not a weak organization.

Indeed, I think those who call today's United Natinos weak must have forgotten their history. The United Nations at its birth was hedged about with restrictions: there was the veto in the Security Council; the General Assembly was conceived as a body that would only debate and recommend; intervention in internal affairs of sovereign states was sternly forbidden; and the Secretary General was conceived as scarcely more than the chief clerk of the organization.

Circumscribed as it was, the United Nations of those early days seemed to hold out only limited promise. But now, apparently, all that is forgotten by those who dwell on the impotence of the U.N. of today—and who compare it unfavorably with an ideal institution of absolute powers which in fact never existed.

The failures and mistakes have been many, and there will be more. Only one way exists to avoid them—and that is for the U.N. to stand aside from all the really tough and tangled problems of the world. Then it would look good, like a well-pressed parade-ground soldier, undefeated in battle because he has never been in battle. Compared to him, Bill Mauldin's exhausted Willie and Joe make a sorry sight—but it is Willie and Joe who win the wars. And it is the weary but durable diplomats of the marathon conference who win the victories for peace.

What a lot of criticism (not to say calumny) the U.N. could have avoided by staying out of the Congo. But history would not have been kind to a U.N. which turned its back on a situation so fraught with danger to the peace of Africa and the world.

Fortunately, the U.N. has not stood aside.

For years it has been struggling in the arena of history, and by those struggles it has grown steadily in strength and authority. Every one of the main charter restrictions has been loosened: the veto circumvented by the General Assembly; the right of free debate and recommendation used again and again despite loud cries of intervention; the executive capacity of the Secretary General strengthened beyond all early expectations.

I suspect that, if in 1945 there had been proposed such a world organization, endowed with all the actual authority, and energy which the U.N. is showing today, the nations would never have agreed to it.

Yet today this vigorous U.N.—this Western device—has become indispensable not only to the West but to most of the nations of the world. It is our common ground. It is the center where the peoples of the Atlantic and of the Afro-Asian worlds, with so much of conflict and mutual hostility in their past relations can build the harmony of interest and action so vital to them all.

Certainly it is hard work. Its hardness is one proof that we are dealing with real problems. And in this generation, as never before, our Nation in its foreign affairs, and notably in its conduct as a leader at the United Nations, has the chance to develop qualities of maturity and endurance.

As long as there is trouble in the world, there will be people selling get-peace-quick plans. Some consist of wishful utopianism; others suggest that we fight fire with fire and let the world burn up if it must. Both are the escapist fantasies of the impatient and the immature. The U.N.—the real U.N.—has no place for either one.

The real U.N. is an organization in which nations can—and, however imperfectly, do—combine their power and influence, and place it at the service of the charter's aims; peaceful settlement of disputes; the independence and security of nations, including the small and weak; cooperation for economic and social progress and for the advancement of human rights; self-government and self-determination for dependent peoples; justice and respect for international law.

On these great premises, validated by particular U.N. actions through more than 16 years, the great majority of members have striven across barriers of culture and race and tradition to achieve that golden mean, that midpoint between world anarchy and world conformity, a community of nations.

That word "community"—how little it is understood, even by us of the West among whom the idea arose. Yet this is the broad, inclusive, tolerant principle that can one day truly unite the nations, if anything can. This is the unity in diversity by which nations of all regions and cultures can outgrow old hatreds and old injuries and live in peace.

Community is not ideology. It is more flexible and more durable. When communism says to us: "Our ideology will bury yours," America, or any true member of the United Nations, could well make some such reply as this:

"Ideology? We have none, and we don't want one, for no imposed ideology can comprehend the human spirit. But we are members of a worldwide community, its members diverse, tolerant, and free. And one day, when your ideology has been eroded by experience, and you, too, have learned tolerance, the community will welcome you, too."

The United Nations is not dead. It is alive with the spirit of the age to come.

America Listen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, there is a new book recently published which is authored by Frank L. Kluckhohn, former ranking officer of the Departments of State and Defense and also a former writer for the New York Times which is entitled "America Listen."

In the foreword to this book Mr. Kluckhohn has done an excellent job in putting in a few succinct words the crux of our position in world affairs today. He has developed most thoroughly the position in which the United States finds itself vis-a-vis the Soviet Union in our foreign relations. I commend it as "must" reading for all in these troubled times.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from this foreword be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREWORD

The threat to our survival is greater than most Americans have been permitted to realize. The danger to us is immediate, both as a nation and as individuals.

Nikita Khrushchev is driving all out to force U.S. compliance with Communist aims. He employs the threat of fallout from nuclear explosions and "rocket rattling" in an attempt to frighten us into a frame of mind for surrender. His many agents are now spreading the despicable phrase, "It is better to be Red than dead."

Ninety miles from U.S. shores, in Cuba, the Red leader has established a Communist base, with his puppet, Fidel Castro, in complete control. This was Khrushchev's first major step toward abrogating the Monroe Doctrine, an important move in his drive to dominate all nations in the Western Hemisphere.

Already, Khrushchev is passing word around the globe that the United States will not fight under any conditions. As a result, nation after nation embraces neutralism, that halfway point to surrender.

In his campaign to isolate the United States, Khrushchev is pushing toward absolute control of the United Nations, not only by the troika plan but by inducing individual U.N. members, including the new countries of Africa, to vote against us.

Thus, at a point in history when man finally has acquired the ability either to reach other planets or to blow up his own, a struggle between two opposing philosophies and forces to control this earth and all mankind reaches a climax.

The outcome of this struggle will determine how we humans will live—if we live at all—for a long time to come. Every person, everywhere, has a stake and a part in it. Not only military, economic and political forces confront each other. Because of the peculiar nature of this conflict, the social fabrics of nations, and even of tribes, are a key factor in the struggle. Vital are the will power, the strengths and weaknesses, of peoples and of individuals.

The United States of America, heading one side in this gigantic test, proclaims the importance of the individual and his rights under the law. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, leading the mighty attack, asserts that the individual is merely an expendable tool of the state in a drive for the eventual material betterment of mankind. It is free enterprise versus production planned by a self-selected few.

One side stands for the theory that man is more than just an animal; that he has the right to think for himself and to select the kind of government he wants. The other side has rejected the idea of human dignity and denied the existence of spiritual values. The fruits of Judaism, Christianity, and Mohammedanism are discarded and the idea that religion is the opiate of the people becomes the new philosophy.

This is also a struggle between Western democratic thinking, which created the science of today, and an ancient oriental concept of despotism, queerly blended with a belief in an exclusively scientific universe.

Karl Marx preached that only by doing away with capitalism could every man's lot be improved, and no doubt he was genuinely sincere in his views. But the present Communist hierarchy has failed to take into consideration that today's free enterprise systems—especially in the United States and Europe—are vastly different from the predatory capitalism that existed in the Europe of Marx's day. Indeed, the common man has never lived as well as he does under the new benevolent capitalism. Communism, on the other hand, still seems incapable of providing for its citizens a life of comfort, dignity and freedom. And the state, far from withering away, becomes more despotic and absolute.

Disregarding its propaganda and its spurious claims to high ideals, we see the Soviet Union as it really is—a police state with a rigid class system—as opposed to a nation, the United States, which is rapidly attaining a much more classless society, with opportunity for all, instead of the few.

The true issue today is whether man is to go, at least for a time, back to the days of slavery or is to continue to improve his mastery of himself and his environment by his own free will.

The weapons in this basic struggle are many and varied. The Communists mobilize resentments, hates, hopes, and ambitions. Nationalism, and even intertribal jealousies, are exploited. So are the individual's fears, and his sexual and other personal weaknesses. It is doubtful whether economic need is even the 10th best Soviet weapon.

The West's weapons are many, but they are only partially exploited. Superior economic know-how and strength, and a superior moral position, are among our advantages. Despite the fact that no man, or woman, likes to believe that everything begins for him on birth in this world and ends when he dies here, almost nothing has been done to exploit our advantage in holding a spiritual belief in immortality. Neither, despite Russia's extremely low birth rate, has the superior status of women in our society been exploited. We Americans still have, moreover, considerable military weapon superiority to fall back on in case of military attack, yet the world at large does not believe this.

The United States itself is the most expert nation in the world in the use of domestic advertising and publicity; and yet we are not even effectively challenging Communist propaganda, when, in the final anlaysis, willpower and conviction may decide this great conflict.

We do very little toward destroying the many myths created by the Soviet Union, heartland of communism. Despite its claims, Russian is not a mighty monolith. The truth is that only about 40 percent of the people of the U.S.S.R. are Russian. Some 60

percent are of varied races, many of them, like the Ukrainians, deeply resentful of Russian domination.

Moreover, among the conquered peoples of Eastern Europe and elsewhere, now controlled by this multiracial state with so many chinks in its own walls, are once-proud and independent people. Many of them are Christians. They are bitterly unhappy under the slave colonialism they are presently forced to endure. And then there is Red China, with its own ambitions.

Five million Communists, a relatively small group, control the 300 million people in the U.S.S.R. and its East European slave states. This handful of party members not only rules autocratically, but they are the new royalty, the party-designated elite, who are entitled to special privileges and special considerations. These are the chosen few who select for themselves the best and largest apartments in crowded Moscow, located in a choice district from which all others are excluded by armed guards. These are the people, too, who have houses and estates in the country, chauffeur-driven cars—in a land where few automobiles exist—servants, state-provided mistresses and other luxuries.

For the multitudes, including women, in sharp contrast, are left only unrestricted hours of toil for at least 6 days a week, crowded and inferior living quarters, scanty provisions. Today only children of the Communist elite can attend the best schools, thus permitting the ruling caste to perpetuate itself. Even feudal England did not see such a rigid class system.

The leaders of communism have elbowed, and often murdered, in Byzantine fashion, their way to the top. The dark struggles for power in Russia are fought out in secret behind closed doors.

History, however, teaches that no tyrant is ever safe. Nikita Khrushchev himself gave us our best glimpse of this nightmare process in his speech before the 20th Communist Congress, when he disgorged the secrets about Stalin and the horrors of his regime. One by one Soviet leaders are killed or driven from power. None have the solid backing on an elected president or prime minister. A. Molotov, one of the last survivors of the original founders of the U.S.S.R. sleeps with a revolver under his pillow wherever he is sent.

The free interplay of forces in a country like the United States makes for right answers to problems and the correction of wrong ones. This is not true in any totalitarian society where rigid, planned decisions are made by one man or a mere handful.

Communists like to claim that they do not make mistakes, and the rest of the world for some self-deprecatory reason, swallows this fable. In reality, Soviet mistakes are plentiful if we but open our eyes to them. As an example, it is probable that communism would have easily dominated all of Europe had not the Red Army frightened it by its insistence on remaining as far west as Germany instead of withdrawing to its own borders. Were the advantages of taking Czechoslovakia in 1948 by murder, trickery, and the threat to use the Red Army for a takeover worth the subsequent effective rearming of the free world? Austria was able to move out from behind the Iron Curtain because the Red leaders completely miscalculated on how the Austria people, who had seen communism in action, would vote in free elections. The Communists obtained less than 4 percent of the vote.

There are cracks and crevices all over the Soviet system. Bluff—clever bluff, but still bluff—has had to take the place of strength on many occasions. It is disconcerting to note how many of these bluffs have worked in the past and how many continue to work in the present. Subversion and perversion have often had to take the place of economic power, and propaganda has to take the place of accomplishment.

But what of our side? What of our leadership?

Obviously, it should be tough, experienced and convinced of the strength of our system. It should be strong but flexible, and readily able to deal with Red aggressions, machinations, and sudden shifts in strategy. It should not be a leadership that is easily frightened into hysterically—and usually disastrously—jumping at every twist and turn of the Russian maneuvers. It should be a leadership that does not delude itself into thinking that Russia can be charmed or swayed from its purpose: the eventual domination of the world.

At this time of great crisis in our history, we cannot afford to settle for less than a dedicated leadership. This is no time for leaders without convictions, men who, for the sake of ambition, are ready to accept the convictions of nonelected advisers who have for years sat patiently on the sidelines waiting for the opportunity to promote the unorthodox and the bizarre; men who are anxious to change our form of government—without the consent of the governed.

This is no time for leaders who, bored with themselves and with the orthodox and the proven, use the Government for wild experiments, ego inflation, and self-aggrandizement. This is no time for the creation of our own wealthy elite, a group which, because of vast sums of money, can afford to play at politics.

What, then, of our present leadership? What of the man now in power? How does he stack up against the requirements and the lacks?

There is an old saying that every nation gets the leadership it deserves. Certainly in a democracy the leaders are, to a considerable extent, the product of their society and their age.

In our time, in this United States of America, the leader of the free world, people tend, perhaps more than ever before, to live by self-set standards. It has been widely said, and with a high degree of accuracy, that we have become a nation of conformists. What has not been as adequately emphasized is that these standards of deportment, conduct, and living are arbitrary, and perhaps largely false.

One of the undeniable factors in our American civilization of the mid-1900's is our insistence that our children do well competitively, whatever their qualifications or whatever their own desires. High marks, higher education—the highest possible—are hallmarks for success in this generation. Ambitious parents all over the United States push and prod their children, sometimes beyond their capacities, allegedly for their own good. Too often the parents are obviously trying to express themselves, their ambitions, fears, and hopes, through their children. The children are thus forced into a highly competitive life where, it is made clear to them, they cannot fail if they are to amount to anything.

Pennsylvania Postal Clerks Oppose Free Distribution of Communist Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the action taken by the United Federation of Postal Clerks, eastern branch of the Philadelphia region, in opposing the free delivery by this country of Communist propaganda.

I now include the text of a letter from Mr. Herman A. Dyke, chairman of the publicity committee, eastern branch, UFPC:

We, the members of the Eastern Branch, United Federation of Postal Clerks, in meeting assembled, November 13, 1961, by unanimous vote, wish to express our strong disapproval of the distribution of Communist literature through the mails by the Post Office Department.

This practice has contributed to the postal deficit and more important than that, we fear, to a deficit of American patriotism and the will to resist Communist infiltration, which, in turn, threatens the destruction of our republican form of government.

We urge every Member of Congress to give this matter careful study and to take appropriate action toward the discontinuance of this policy by our Government.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of bills before the House which could accomplish the objective desired by these postal clerks and millions of other Americans who are concerned about this propaganda service and the proposed increase in American postal rates. My bill, H.R. 9004, would simply declare that no postal rate is available to material determined by the Attorney General to be Communist propaganda.

Another approach is also available to counter this flow of Communist propaganda—an amendment to the postal rate bill which will apparently come before us in the very near future. I intend to offer an amendment to the postage bill on the floor of the House if the bill has not been amended by the Post Office Committee to block the free distribution of this propaganda.

I would welcome the support of all Members who are concerned about this serious situation which confronts us.

Exchange of Allotments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to permit the exchange between farmers of cotton acreage allotments for rice acreage allotments. The full text of the bill is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding after section 378 the following new section:

"Exchange of allotments

"SEC. 379. The Secretary shall by regulations authorize the exchange between farms in the same county, or between farms in adjoining counties within a State, of cotton acreage allotment for rice acreage allotment. Any such exchange shall be made on the basis of application filed with the county

committee by the owners and operators of the farms, and the transfer of allotment between the farms shall include transfer of the related acreage history for the commodity. The exchange shall be acre for acre or on such other basis as the county committee determines is fair and reasonable, taking into consideration the comparative productivity of the soil for the farms involved and other relevant factors. No farm from which the entire cotton or rice allotment has been transferred shall be eligible for an allotment of cotton or rice as a new farm within a period of 5 crop years after the date of such exchange."

For several years farmers who produce both cotton and rice have been asking authority to swap acreage allotments with each other within the county or an adjoining county. There were many reasons that the authority was asked by the holders of the rice and cotton allotments. In many areas where these commodities are produced small farms have been removed from production, which has hurt the general business activity in the communities. Also, in so many instances holders of small allotments do not have enough acreage to make an economic unit. A cotton farmer has equipment which is adaptable to the planting, cultivation, and harvesting of that crop. This same equipment cannot be used in the operation of a rice farm. The cotton farmer who is fortunate enough to have land which is suitable for cotton production and having the equipment being used in such an operation may have both cotton and rice allotments upon his land. He may want to dispose of his rice allotment and obtain in its stead a comparable amount of cotton allotment from his neighbor, or from a farmer within the county or an adjoining county. On the other hand, a rice farmer may have, let us say, a 40-acre rice allotment, and ordinarily a 60 to 70 allotment in a much more economic operation since one pump properly placed on his farm should service at least 60 or 70 acres of rice plantings. He would cherish the idea, probably, of going out of the cotton business and concentrating his efforts in the production of rice by arriving at an understanding and an agreement with a nearby farmer who desired to have additional cotton acreage and was not wanting to use his rice allotment. Both farmers are benefited by such an arrangement, as well as the community itself in which they live. The result would be approximately the same production of both crops in the affected areas where such transfers are made. The swapping of the acreage would be on the basis of comparable values.

The cotton and rice farmer differs from the corn farmer and many wheat farmers in that they are under strict controls, in which each must adhere to acreage allotments and marketing quotas. Since that situation prevails the programs for both crops should be made more palatable. Also, more flexibility in the operation of the programs is obviously most desirable.

In 1959 quite a number of bills were introduced on this subject. Hearings were held before the House Committee on Agriculture, but the legislation was not approved. Since 1959 there have been growing demands for action for legislation of this kind. Many letters have been written to Members of both Houses of Congress and to the Department urging that something be done to permit the transfer of cotton acreage allotments to rice acreage allotments and rice acreage allotments for cotton acreage allotments. This legislation can do no harm, but would be most beneficial to a major segment of farmers, who are asking that they be given this privilege of making for a more economic and logical farming operation.

Address of Mr. Edward J. Gorman, Veterans' Administration Staff, Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Veterans' Day address delivered before the Rotary Club of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., by Mr. Edward J. Gorman, of the Washington staff of the Veterans' Administration, on November 7, 1961.

Mr. Gorman's fine address follows:

VETERANS' DAY SPEECH, DEILVERED BEFORE ROTARY CLUB, WILKES-BARRE, PA., BY EDWARD J. GORMAN, WASHINGTON VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION STAFF, NOVEMBER 7, 1961

Rotarians, when our Administrator asked me to represent the Veterans' Administration, at your meeting today, I felt both proud and humble. Proud of the honor, humble before the responsibility of speaking to such a concerned group of citizens about a day of basic and symbolic importance to all Americans.

We have all heard many speakers describing the profound meanings of Veterans Day; how it is a day of national stocktaking; a day of reconsidering the causes for which we fought in war; a day of rededicating ourselves to the cause of peace. Veterans Day is all of these things—and more.

And I would like to tell you what Veterans Day means to me.

I want to start my story where stories should start, at the beginning. This beginning took place right here in our Wilkes-Barre General Hospital at 2 a.m. this morning when a sharp wail pierced the quiet hospital halls to signify the birth of a new baby boy—and thus reflect the final curtain on the miracle of birth—and the first-act curtain on the miracle of life.

Let's look at that new baby boy. A healthy, little profound bundle of potentialities. What will he be when he grows up? Will he be a fine upstanding citizen, or a juvenile, or adult, deliquent? The answer, of course, lies in many hands. It depends on him. It depends on his parents. And—to a far greater degree than we usually think—it depends on us—on society.

On thing is certain. If he were to be given the best of food, and clothing, and shelter, and nothing else, he would grow up to be ignorant.

Regardless of his potential—without the training of his teachers and parents and friends—without the stimulation and example of our complex environment—he would not become very much, he would be quite useless.

We are what we are—largely because of the society we live in. That society gives us all that makes a civilized man. No matter what our monetary wealth, when we are born, we inherit all the best that man has thought and done. Millions of our ancestors went through endless "schools of hard knocks" so that their hard-won knowledge might become our commonsense.

Our new baby is heir to all the ages. He inherits the greatest civilization the world has even seen. Man lived for hundreds of thousands of years before the thought of the wheel, fire, the bow, the compass, gunpowder, flying machines, and cracking the atom.

Our little boy rides his tricycle, shoots his cap pistol, and chases the neighbor's cat. When he gets old enough to join the Boy Scouts, he will use the compass. In school he learns all about gunpowder and airplanes and a thousand other things undreamed of by his ancestors. Already, the young boy with a slight interest in science knows more about the structure and potential of the atom—and of space than did the greatest mathematicians, physicists, and astronomers, of only yesterday.

He inherits all this knowledge. And when our youngster is old, and ready to leave this world, any of his contributions to our great store of knowledge will be passed on—to be added to the heritage of another little baby being born in some other hospital.

If our little lad is an American, he will inherit more than the fruits of science and technology. He will inherit far greater things, among which are a democratic system of government; separation of church and state; freedom of religion, of speech, of the press. He will inherit the Constitution and its Bill of Rights, the Declaration of Independence, and a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

That he inherits these riches at all, he owes to a very special group of ancestors, some 30 million of them.

These 30 million ancestors were the men and women of America's Armed Forces who answered the call of duty in 9 major wars.

That he can freely chose his own destiny, as well as have a voice in his own Government, he owes to the men who fought—and suffered at Bunker Hill, at Lexington, Concord, and at Saratoga.

If we are to continue strong in unity, we must recognize the dignity and equality of all men—and remember always the thousands who shed their blood in the great trial of a civil war.

That freedom-smothering waves of tyranny and hate never reached our shores, we owe to millions of young men who left home, some never to return, and who fought and died in places like Argonne Forest, Chateau-Thierry, Guadalcanal, the Coral Sea, Hill 409, the Bulge, Iwo Jima, and Chongsan.

Thus—from Valley Forge to the valleys of Korea—and a thousand valleys, peaks, and fields known and unknown in every corner of the world, Americans have fought to protect their country and the things for which their country stands.

And they have fought successfully. They have won victory after victory. Always waging war in order to make the world more secure, more peaceful.

That we today live in a free land; that we can choose our place of worship, speak our minds, send our children to schools which reflect our thinking, elect our Government, all this we owe to those men in homespun, or khaki, or olive drab, or blue, who make Veterans Day what it is, who indeed make it possible to have a Veterans Day at all.

This, then, is what Veterans Day means to me: a day of salute to the spirit of those

brave men, living and dead, who struggled in a thousand battles, in a hundred lands, so that 170 million Americans—and uncounted others overseas—could maintain their dignity as children of God. Their deeds have consecrated Veterans Day far above our poor power to add or detract. To finish, in the words of Lincoln:

"The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did. It is for us the living rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought, have thus far so nobly advanced."

Prospect: The Servile State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following speech by a constituent of mine, Mr. Joseph J. Eley, appeared recently in "Vital Speeches of the Day."

Mr. Eley feels, as many of us do, that the next generation must be aroused to the dangers brought on them by the strange machinations and political demagogery of the present generation.

The day for soothing syrup is over, and facts, even bitter ones, must be faced.

The speech follows:

PROSPECT: THE SERVILE STATE

(By Joseph J. Eley)

It is a privilege to have an opportunity to address a youthful audience. The circumstances present here provide that we look toward the future somewhat. The very name of the Future Farmers of America, of which you are part, helps emphasize the future. This looking to the future seems to me much more desirable than the foot-pawing, teeth-gnashing that we indulge in so often as we review the past or examine the present.

Yet, the future rests on a foundation established in the past and present. Thus to find a starting point, we must deal, however, briefly, with these.

In considering what I might say to you on this occasion—and I gave it serious thought—there came to me, with crashing impact, this fact. I owe you an apology. I owe you this apology on behalf of my generation and those which have immediately preceded mine. You deserve an apology because we have mortgaged the future fruits of your labors; we have permitted liens against your freedom.

In the past three decades, your predecessors have acquired a monstrous indebtedness beyond our capacity to pay off. We have borrowed from Peter to pay Paul. You are Peter. As you approach the years in which you should have the opportunity to work out your economic destinies in freedom, you will discover that we have placed economic hobbles on you and that we have narrowed the corridor of freedom to a marked degree.

How have we created these cruel conditions? By indulging in economic practices which shake the foundations of mathematical good sense. What is the extent of the burden that is being constructed for you? Maurice Stans, former Budget Director, estimates that the mortgage on your work and freedom amounts to $750 billion at the Federal level alone. Other estimates make the burden even more staggering. Further, it has been estimated that programs enacted by past Congresses require Federal spending amounting to approximately $80 billion per year.

These figures are so awesome as to lose meaning—yet they represent a burden which you must share. Contrary to some popular thought, the only resources which government has to pay its indebtedness is the work which each of us does. What we as individuals produce is the only wealth we have to meet our obligations. What you produce has already been committed. These are the economic hobbles placed upon you.

Now, what about the liens on your freedom?

These have evolved because we have injected a variety of Socialist ideas into our way of life. Recognizing that the word "Socialist" has become blurred by indiscriminate and partisan use, let me define it as I use it. Socialism is hinged to the Leninist concept of "from each according to his ability, to each according to his need." It is a political economy which subjects the individual and his density to the state.

A century ago, Alexis de Tocqueville, French philosopher, who observed at first hand the American experiment, predicted that we might be victimized by a self-indulgent welfare program; by a surrender of responsibility to the superstate. He wrote: "The will of man is not shattered, but softened, bent, and guided; men are seldom forced by it (the state) to act, but they are constantly restrained from acting. Such a power does not destroy, but it prevents existence; it does not tyrannize, but it compresses, enervates, extinguishes, and stupefies a people, till each nation is reduced to nothing better than a flock of timid and industrious animals, of which the government is the shepherd."

Hillaire Belloc, British writer-philosopher, added a decisive note. In 1913 he wrote: "The effect of Socialist doctrine on a capitalist society is to produce a third thing, different from either of its begettors—to wit, the servile state."

What a dreadful prospect. Yet, how prophetic were these words.

Thomas Jefferson warned on many occasions against the course we have taken. He said, "I place economy among the first and most important virtues and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared—to preserve our independence we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt—we must make our choice between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude."

Lest you think the ideas of Jefferson are old-fashioned, let me quote to you someone of contemporary importance. This man, while serving in Congress, stated:

"The scarlet thread running through the thoughts and actions of people is the delegation of great principles to the all-absorbing leviathan, the State. Every time that we try to lift a problem to the Government, to the same extent we are sacrificing the liberties of the people." The author of those profound words is the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy.

Finally, I cite the words of a hero of the welfare state. George Bernard Shaw—who exerted massive efforts to bring welfare state socialism to England and indirectly to the United States—wrote a book entitled "The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism." In summing up his ideas, in his conclusions, he wrote: "I also make it quite clear that socialism means equality of income or nothing, and that under socialism you would not be allowed to be poor. You would be forcibly fed, clothed, lodged, taught and employed whether you like it or not. If it were discovered that you had not character and industry to be worth all this trouble, you might possibly be executed in a kindly manner, but whilst you were permitted to live, you would have to live well."

This then is your prospect, the servile state: a society in which your value as an individual has little meaning, a social order in which you shall be penalized for succeeding—and rewarded for mediocrity—wherein the fruits of your labor will be divided by Government fiat on the basis of "from each according to his ability to each according to his need." And wherein there shall be further erosion of the vitality of America so that Mr. Khrushchev's prediction looks increasingly like a good bet.

This is your prospect unless there is change in the attitude of the American people.

What alternative is there to the servile state? The answer is the responsible state. Perhaps, more properly, it should be the state of responsible people.

For years, so-called conservatives have champed and complained about the excesses of welfare statism. They have criticized and properly, the economic foolhardiness of legislation forged out of Socialist thought. But their cries have been often fruitless because they had no positive ideas to suggest. Unemployment compensation may be economically and morally improper, but we must face up to the fact that in a society such as ours, no one should be without adequate food, shelter, and clothing. In a word, there are social problems—there are among us the poor, the underprivileged, the jobless, the indigent. The solution to these social problems cannot go unfound. Wherein lies the answer?

It begins in the recognition of this fact; that we do have social problems—and that we are our brother's keeper. This is a moral fact. It is a practical matter also, for we are going to accept our social responsibilities either voluntarily or government will impress them upon us so that we pay involuntarily through the tax structure. The latter course is destructive of our liberty.

The blame for the circumstances which we are in; the fault which leads to the prospect of the servile state lies not with government. It is not the fault of Mr. Roosevelt or Mr. Truman; not that of Mr. Eisenhower or Mr. Kennedy. The blame lies with those of us who forget that liberty and responsibility are inseparable. The fault lies in our repudiation of the duties which correspond to our rights.

What kind of a society should we construct in order to remain free men? Having recognized our responsibility for social problems and determined to move positively to eliminate those problems, we should reconstruct our social order thus; first, we must impose on the individual the responsibility to sustain himself to the best of his ability. We cannot continue circumstances in which we reward the incompetent, the lazy, or the shirker. The premimum must be on willingness to work and produce. Second, conceding that some individuals are not capable of self-sustenance, we should insist that the family resume its traditional role of sustaining its members to the utmost. Third, recognizing that some problems are beyond the capabilities of self and family, should not the churches of America again accept a responsibility for welfare?

Fourth, local government must accept the next priority of responsibility. Once in America we tried this and failed. We failed because we created the symbol of the county poor farm and the county orphanage. We literally threw human beings on a scrap heap, divesting them of every shred of human dignity. If we are to utilize our local governmental mechanism for the welfare of the people, it must be with such a spirit that we do not subject the unfortunate to such indignities.

Only after the resources of individual, family, church, and local government have failed should we turn to State government

and beyond that as the last possible resource to Federal Government.

This manifest of responsibilities is more simply stated than achieved, of course. In fact, it is patently difficult.

The mere fact that you are here, to me, indicates your interest in personal economic development. The spirit of your organization is one of dynamic progress. I deduce from this that you then are interested in a society which will allow for personal growth, spiritually and economically.

The order outlined, I am convinced, is the right path. How to achieve this society is another matter.

The lures of the welfare state are not easily exposed. Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, in his book entitled "How To Go Into Politics" had something to say about this. Dealing with stolen elections, Senator SCOTT made the point that votes can be bought through processes other than the exchange of dollar bills at the polling place. He wrote:

"There were caesars before Caesar, and after him, who dealt in bread and circuses. Caesar was high priest not only of the corrupted religion of the day but of a debauched electorate as well. He poured out the public moneys from the treasury for their amusement; he manipulated the price of their bread; he told them always that these blessings came from Caesar. And it was quite a while before the Roman people tumbled to the fact that the big party was on them, after all.

"Overinflated payrolls, printing press money, and government largess for political purposes may corrupt the electorate as surely as vote stealing at the polls, and much more successfully.

"Those who seek power beyond the will and intent of the people gain their foothold by winning over the voters with appealing promises; something for nothing, security without work, entertainment without price. After all Mussolini and Hitler were elected at perfectly legal elections, so far as the electoral forms were concerned. So was Huey Long, the first time."

To achieve the state of responsible people we must first square our own thinking, resisting those tempting lures of bread and circuses; something for nothing.

Then we must apply our efforts to our churches and our political parties. It is not our minister, priest, or rabbi that we must convince; it is we ourselves and our fellow church members who must assume the responsibility.

We will need to give better support to the welfare agencies of our communities. More than just money is required; personal attention and participation are vital.

In our political parties, we must search for candidates who provide more than glib answers to massive problems. We need real leadership; leadership of integrity. I am reminded here of a saying that has great meaning to me. It is: "When little men begin to cast long shadows, the sun is setting on a civilization."

Our emphasis cannot be on Federal Government alone. We need to find good candidates for offices ranging from purely local responsibility to the Presidency.

You, as you cross the bar to adulthood, must prepare. In sum, you need to exercise your energies, your abilities, your integrity across the board in your communities—in every phase of life and living. In the meantime, you have the right to demand that those presently making decisions exercise care. After all, we are dealing with your destiny, your future, your heritage. These precious matters should not be pawns in a political football game.

The how to do it offered here in general terms emphasizes again that the task of maintaining liberty is a difficult one indeed. That thought is neither new nor unique.

There is a story from American history—it has almost become a legend—from the Constitutional Convention. Perhaps you recall that the writers of the Constitution were not altogether sure of themselves. How competent man is to govern himself was a large question. But, these men decided that self-government—a society of freemen—needed to be tried. Benjamin Franklin shared the trepidation of others, but he signed the document. Having signed he moved out to the street. As he emerged, he was accosted by a woman who demanded: "Mr. Franklin, what kind of government have you given us?"

Franklin responded with one of the profundities of American history. He answered, "A republic, Madam, if you can keep it."

Whether legend or not, the anecdote puts the entire problem in focus. What the eminent Dr. Franklin said in these brusque terms is fundamental and obvious. Freedom is the problem of each individual; it must be won and rewon in every day of every freeman's life.

These thoughts may be viewed by some as old fashioned; the word "reactionary" has been applied by the contentious and cynical advocate of welfare state socialism. The truth is that he is the reactionary because he is taking us back to the servile state. Under the guise of something called liberalism he is destroying the root of true liberalism, human liberty. The fact is that despite his protests, he does not believe man capable of living in freedom and accepting his responsibilities.

You, as representatives of the youth of America, I think will make the final decision. My generation and those living of prior generations can at best do little more than engage in a holding action. By girding yourselves to full acceptance of your political and economic responsibilities you can lead not simply the American people, but the people of the entire world to soaring heights of spiritual, cultural, and economic achievements.

How We Got This Way—VIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, the eighth in the New York Daily News series of editorials "How We Got This Way"—published November 26—is presented below:

HOW WE GOT THIS WAY—VIII

The opening paragraph (preamble) of the U.S. Constitution (effective March 4, 1789) states ungrammatically that the American people are adopting the document "in order to form a more perfect union" and for other purposes.

Within 5 years (1794), the power of the Government of the "more perfect union" to collect taxes was challenged, in the Whiskey Rebellion in western Pennsylvania against excises (sales taxes) on American liquor.

Militia from several States put down the Whiskey Rebellion. But the idea was already batting around that any State had the right to declare null and void (nullify) any act of Congress which it didn't like.

This proposition was solemnly set forth in resolutions which passed the Kentucky and Virginia Legislatures (1798–99) and were written by two undoubted patriots—Thomas Jefferson and James Madison.

The Hartford, Conn., convention in 1814 (of delegates from the New England States) felt the same way, because of a pre-War of 1812 Federal embargo on trade with England and France. It remained for John C. Calhoun to build nullification into a powerful political doctrine.

Senator Calhoun, Democrat, of South Carolina, who had been Secretary of War and twice Vice President, went into battle in 1832 against the high tariffs which were making northern manufacturers prosperous and doing little to help southern cotton and tobacco growers.

A South Carolina State convention in 1832 passed a Nullification Act declaring the 1828 and 1832 U.S. tariff laws null and void inside South Carolina. President Andrew Jackson came within an ace of invading the State with Federal troops and starting the Civil War then and there.

The crisis was settled in a compromise engineered by Henry Clay, the great compromiser, and the doctrine of nullification went into a decline.

Another and far more explosive idea had been kicking around for many years; namely, the notion of secession—outright withdrawal of States from the Federal Union.

The nullificationists believed that a State could snoot an act of Congress and go on obeying all other U.S. laws as a full and legal member of the United States. This was a pick-and-choose principle which didn't contemplate any breakup of the Union.

Secessionists—many of whom were only nullificationists to begin with—believed a State had a perfect right to check out of the Union bag and baggage and set up in business as an independent nation.

They based their argument largely on amendment 10 of the Constitution, the last article in the Bill of Rights.

This amendment says that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." And the original Constitution doesn't say in so many words that no State may quit the Union.

As the northern enemies of Negro slavery grew stronger and louder in the 1840's and 1850's, the idea of simply quitting the Union became more and more attractive to more and more southerners.

Further, slavery was as inefficient and uneconomical as it was morally wrong. Hence, the South's prosperity increased far more slowly than the North's—a fact which galled many a southerner and increased southern dislike of the Union.

Things began coming to a head soon after Abraham Lincoln was elected President in November 1860. On December 20 of that year, South Carolina adopted its ordinance of secession. Frantic efforts were made in Washington to reach yet another compromise in the pattern set by the now dead Henry Clay.

But between January and May of 1861, 10 more Southern States seceded; and on February 4, 1861, the Confederate States of America was established, with Montgomery, Ala., as first capital and Jefferson Davis as President. The Confederates attacked Fort Sumter, S.C., April 12–13, 1861.

The showdown had come between the secessionists and the Union Firsters. This showdown lasted 4 years almost to a day, took the lives of about 1 million men, has been known ever since as the Civil War or War Between the States, and buried the idea of secession apparently beyond possibility of resurrection.

State Man in Vietnam Helps Farmers at Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, our technical assistance program in other areas of the world is one of the long range contributions that the United States is making to halt communism and make possible world peace.

The Jackson (Miss.) Clarion Ledger recently had an article about the work of one of the devoted technicians in this field, Mr. J. K. Garner, of Greenwood, Miss. Mr. Garner is now working in one of the most important areas of the world, South Vietnam.

Under unanimous consent I would like to insert the article about Mr. Garner and his work:

STATE MAN IN VIETNAM HELPS FARMERS AT WORK

(By Daniel Dorsdoff)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM.—"One great impact of our aid program in South Vietnam is that we're showing the Vietnamese that they can carry out their own projects for progress," according to J. K. Garner, a U.S. technical assistant from Greenwood, Miss.

A farm machinery expert, Garner is now advising the Vietnamese on the purchase, operation and repair of farm equipment, from bulldozers used to clear jungles to small hand plows and water buffalo harnesses.

"It gives a great deal of satisfaction to see the Vietnamese apply our suggestions with their own initiative. They are among the most enthusiastic and aggressive people that I've worked with," he said.

The biggest project which Garner has aided is the reclamation and preparation of approximately 250,000 acres of idle land in order to relieve population pressure and help resettle hundreds of thousands of refugees from Communist North Vietnam.

CONTINUAL TASK

"In land development we have had a continual task of operation and maintenance of machines for opening up and developing new lands since 1957," Garner said.

Garner helped the Vietnamese set up a central shop in Saigon that can repair any piece of farm vehicles or farm machinery. According to American foreign service officials, it is the only shop of its kind in the Far East.

Once, when a fire in Saigon threatened the shop, Garner rushed to the scene and took personal charge of firefighting operations until firemen arrived, and he was credited with saving over $1 million worth of machinery given by American aid to South Vietnam. He received the International Cooperation Administration Meritorious Service Citation, "For heroism beyond the call of duty and without regard for personal safety."

Though tractors and other large machinery are starting to be introduced in South Vietnam, Garner said that small hand tools will continue to be most important for the majority of Vietnamese farmers for several decades.

"One of our programs is to increase and improve the supply of water buffalo, which the tractor might never replace in importance in Vietnam. He's a heavy worker and can thrive on only a grazing diet in tropical conditions. He can also be used for meat and milk."

Raised on his father's farms in Marvell, Ark., where he was born, Garner has had continual experience with farm machinery.

KNOWS HAND TOOLS

"The South did not extensively mechanize its agriculture until 1940, so I'm well acquainted with hand tools. I had been working on our farm long before we got our first tractor."

After attending the University of Arkansas in Fayetteville, he managed plantations for his father and for Wilson's Bank in Greenwood, and he was a factory representative for Minneapolis Moline Implement & Co. In 1940 he entered a partnership in Greenwood in an implement and machine repair business.

In 1950 he was elected president of National Retail Farm Equipment Association, after serving as president and vice president of its Mid-South branch, which he had helped organize.

During World War II, Garner served on the implement dealers price control committee.

One problem in foreign aid is getting people to realize that it takes time to implement programs abroad, just as they do in the United States, according to Garner.

"For instance, we've brought in a hand machine with which a group of farmers can make bricks for their homes, using a mixture of 6 percent cement and 94 percent soil. But it's hard to make people realize that it will take years to experiment with different types of soil and construct trial homes, train farmers and villagers to use the machine, and provide for repair," Garner said.

GUERRILLAS A PROBLEM

Another problem has been the Communist Viet Cong guerrillas.

"The Viet Cong have continually hindered our work since 1958. They've dynamited machinery and have killed several of our tractor drivers in their efforts to undermine the effectiveness of the Vietnamese Government in reaching the people," Garner said.

Working with the United Nations and U.S. technical assistance missions almost continually since 1952, Garner has been a machine adviser to Pakistan, Indonesia, and Thailand, before his assignment to Vietnam in 1957.

His wife is now staying with their daughter, Mrs. Hal D. Coppock in Jackson. His son, J. K. Garner, Jr., is a broker with Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith.

More Petitions Calling for an End to the Red Mail Subsidy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have today presented to the Speaker's desk 43 additional petitions, calling for an end to the subsidy given Communist propanganda by this Nation.

These petitions, signed by 462 persons in 13 States, call for action by the Congress to stop the free distribution of Red poison in our mails.

Since March of last year, the Post Office has been forced to deliver—without 1 cent of payment—tons of Communist propaganda all over the country, most of it to persons or groups that do not want the material and are especially incensed to learn that it is delivered free.

These people cannot understand why the Congress is called upon to raise postage rates for Americans while the Post Office delivers Communist propaganda free and adds to the postal deficit. It is time for action by the Congress on this matter.

ADA Leans Toward Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

ADA LEANS TOWARD SOCIALISM

The Americans for Democratic Action (ADA) supports diplomatic recognition of Red China. It also advocates compulsory health insurance, compulsory union membership along with Federal price, rent, and wage controls.

This unique group also would grant President Kennedy the authority to modify rates of taxes and expenditures to meet changing conditions.

By its proposals the ADA cannot be considered anything but an organization that has strayed far to the left.

Unfortunately the ADA is not a tiny, fringe organization. Its roster includes many in high office. There are at least 36 members of the Kennedy administration who belong to the ADA.

Among them are Abraham Ribicoff, a Cabinet member; Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., special adviser on economics to the President; Adlai Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations; J. Kenneth Galbraith, Ambassador to India; and Harrison L. Wooford, Special Assistant to the President on civil rights.

The ADA, not satisfied with liberal trends of the administration, now is demanding that the Government swiftly liberalize just about everything immediately, particularly in the field of segregation. There certainly are reforms to be made in this field but they can't be achieved with a stroke of the scythe. They must be brought about in a gradual, orderly manner.

The organization also has urged Secretary of Defense McNamara to continue his unyielding opposition to military men who attempt to tell their troops the facts about communism.

The ADA may have its principles, conceived in an aura of unreality and continually shrouded in a cloak of "happiness for all" because Uncle Sam will pick up the check.

But if the Nation heeded the advice of the ADA we all would plunge merrily along the highway to socialism.

Sadly, many of those to whom President Kennedy listens most avidly have alined themselves with this organization. It seems primarily concerned with promoting unrealistic ideologies rather than the best interests of the United States.

It indeed is unfortunate that many of those on whom Mr. Kennedy leans for advice

are prophets for the ADA. If he heeds their mouthings the Nation could be engulfed in socialism so quickly that no one would have time to say "Just a minute."

Man on the Moon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR A. KNOX

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an editorial from the October 30, 1961, issue of the Detroit Medical News, which Dr. E. S. Parmenter, director of District Four Health Department, Alpena, Mich., has requested of me.

I believe Mr. Slevin's statements to be timely, and it is my opinion that the enormous cost of placing a man on the moon could be put to a better use. If and when such an accomplishment comes into being it will not be possible for just any citizen to make the same trip, and even if this were possible how would one exist and make a living on the moon?

The editorial follows:

MAN ON THE MOON

(By John G. Slevin)

Driving home the other night, the harvest moon was so beautiful and big it looked like it was only a few miles up there in the firmament. This writer got to thinking about our space project to put a man on the moon and how we are in a race to beat the Russians to reach our most famous satellite. How much will it cost us? About $10 billion of taxpayers' money.

For America to get a man on the moon first has become an obsession with some people. Why land a man on the moon? This is one orbit in the solar system which has been thoroughly explored by astronomers. We know it won't support life. Why spend $10 billion to get there, just to beat the Russians? If the same amount of money was spent on a crash program to answer the riddle of cancer or the common cold, it would be of immense benefit to the human race. Landing a man on the moon will not solve our problem of population explosion. We could not send our surplus people to colonize the moon, or any other planet in the solar system.

That there may be some military value in the project to place a man on the moon cannot be denied. But is it worth $10 billion? No doubt Khrushchev, as a good atheist, would like his astronaut to get there so that he can say he did not find God up there either. (Poor Mr. K. probably thinks of God as an old man with long white whiskers.) Whatever military value such a space project may have, should be weighed carefully, and compared with the value of scientific research for the benefit of the human race.

It is our money, as taxpayers, that is being spent. We ought to have some say as to how and for what the Congress spends it. Let us not go hog-wild in our space race with the Russians. Let us spend billions for defense if we must. But let us stop this silly business of racing the Russians in space. Let us remember that there is a limit to the amount of taxpayers' money available and that other matters of greater value to humanity can be achieved in the field of scientific research than putting a man on the moon. Let us put first things first.

Farewell to the Romulos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Washington Post of Monday, January 15, 1962, about the distinguished Ambassador of the Republic of the Philippines, Carlos P. Romulo.

General Romulo is a renowned diplomat and a public servant of long experience going back before the days when he served as delegate of the Philippines to the Congress of the United States.

His good works rank high in history. He has served with distinction as President of the General Assembly of the United Nations and as delegate of his country to that august body. He has been an outstanding spokesman and fighter for freedom since the dark days of Bataan and Corrigedor. His championship of American-Filipino friendship and his splendid record as spokesman for the free world to the peoples of Africa and Asia have won him the well-deserved affection and gratitude of the American people and the admiration of the world at large.

The United States regrets to see this eminent champion of liberty and friend of the United States leave our land. We know, however, that he goes to continue his fine record of service to his country and to the world. We are confident that the voice of Gen. Carlos P. Romulo will continue to be heard in the same clear, well-reasoned way which has always distinguished his thoughts and words in so many important and difficult assignments and at such crucial junctures in history.

The Post editorial follows:

FAREWELL TO THE ROMULOS

Nostalgia will run deep today as Washington bids goodby to an old friend—Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo, of the Philippines. Mr. Romulo has represented his country here for an entire decade, and the friendship between this jovial soldier, writer, diplomat, and a vast number of Americans began at a much earlier date. His books dealing with United States-Philippine relations and other subjects brought a favorable impression of his abilities, and his close identification with the historic events at Bataan and Corregidor, and later his return with General MacArthur to Leyte, gave his name a place in a significant chapter of history. Since then he has won distinction as the most lucid spokesman for the Philippines abroad.

General Romulo's standing among the diplomats at the United Nations was illustrated by his election a few years ago as President of the General Assembly. He has not, of course, always seen eye to eye with the molders of American foreign policy, but he has retained their respect and confidence. And he has become perhaps the foremost symbol of the friendship between the American and Filipino peoples.

We join in a warm salute to Ambassador Romulo and his charming wife and wish them many happy years in Manila, where he is scheduled to become president of the University of the Philippines.

A Department of Consumers to Protect the Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I introduced a bill, H.R. 9619, which provides for the establishment of a Department of Consumers in the executive branch, for the creation of a Committee on Consumers in the House of Representatives, and for various other purposes. It is an omnibus bill which calls for a broad program of protection for the American consumer and I am, therefore, entitling it "Consumers Act of 1962."

In his state of the Union address on January 11, President Kennedy made this statement:

> To protect our consumers from the careless and the unscrupulous, I shall recommend improvements in the food and drug laws—strengthening inspection and standards, halting unsafe and worthless products, preventing misleading labels, and cracking down on the illicit sale of habit-forming drugs.

I am very pleased to know that the President is taking steps to afford the American public this protection. In fact, he recognized this need during the 1960 presidential election campaign and stated on several occasions at that time his deep interest in consumer problems.

My bill, however, goes much further than improving the food and drug laws. It seeks to provide protection to the consumer not only in food and drugs, but also in safeguarding the economic interests of consumers in such areas as financial charges on installment loans, in representing consumer interests before the courts and regulatory agencies, in giving consumers greater representation and a voice in government, and in other ways.

I regard the American consumer as the biggest factor in the U.S. economy today on whom the continued growth of our economic structure depends to a very considerable extent. He is the supporter and the mainstay of our industry, commerce, agriculture, all types of services, and every other phase of our national activity. Under the circumstances, it is imperative that the consumer have a voice in government and that his interests be properly protected.

Several years ago, when I served as a member of the House Agriculture Committee, I was instrumental in the creation of a Consumers Study Subcommittee, of which I was the chairman. This subcommittee conducted studies on food prices, marketing costs, agricultural sur-

pluses, the food stamp program, food stockpiling, and so forth. Our subcommittee served as the voice of the consumer and was effective in bringing about better understanding between farmers and consumers as to their specific problems. After I left the House Agriculture Committee, the subcommittee was discontinued, and as far as I know there is no other committee in Congress and no agency in the executive branch of the Government which is devoted primarily to the study of consumer problems and the protection of consumer interests.

I have always held a deep interest in consumer problems and still retain this interest to this very day. It is my view that Congress has a direct responsibility for safeguarding consumer interests since it not only involves the general economic situation and growth of the country, but also matters of consumer interest which come before our regulatory agencies and such Departments as Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and others.

Just as the Congress and the Government provide a voice to farmers, labor, business and industry, the armed services, the war veterans, education, science, and other segments of our national activity, so it must give a voice to the consumer, the housewife, the wage earner, the elderly and retired, and all others who struggle with the problem of how to cope with the high cost of living, with the safety of foods and drugs, with protection of health and economic security.

Think of all the instances that have come to light in recent years involving price rigging, fraudulent advertising, low standards of purity and lack of wholesomeness of foods and other articles, misleading labeling, deceptive packaging, misrepresentation in manufacturing, questionable techniques of merchandising, usurious charges of interest rates on installment purchases, and other ways to deceive the American consumer. The consumer is being completely ignored, disregarded, stepped upon, and abused.

My bill is comprised of three major sections or titles. Title I provides for the establishment of a Department of Consumers as a new department in the executive branch, headed by a Secretary of Consumers who would be a member of the President's Cabinet. The new department would assume the functions and duties of the following agencies: Food and Drug Administration of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department; the Federal Trade Commission; those areas in the Department of Agriculture which are engaged in the enforcement of the meat and poultry inspection acts; the Division of Prices and Cost of Living of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor; the Home Economics Research Branch and the Human Nutrition Research Branch of the Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture; and those areas of the National Bureau of Standards which are engaged primarily in the research and testing of articles intended for consumer use.

The Department of Consumers would be provided with wide powers in the field of consumer protection. Specifically, its functions would be: to present the consumer viewpoint in the formulation of government policies; to represent the economic interests of consumers in proceedings before courts and regulatory agencies; to conduct annually a national consumers' conference, to be attended by experts on consumer education and representatives of organizations engaged in protecting consumer interests, for the purpose of advising the Department and offering suggestions for its effective performance; to assemble, evaluate and disseminate information helpful to consumers, including information on commercial and trade practices adversely affecting consumer interests, and other functions.

Furthermore, the Department shall conduct economic surveys and investigations of the productive capacity for goods affecting consumers, of the distribution systems for consumer goods, the levels of prices and the factors entering into the establishment of such prices, the quality and suitability of consumer goods, and similar other surveys.

Title II of the bill contains the "truth in lending" proposal which requires a full disclosure of financial charges on installment loans, the purpose here being to protect the consumer and small borrower in their own interests and in the interests of the national economy. The consumer receiving such credit or loans is to be provided with clear information in writing on the cost of the property or service, the amount to be financed, the financial charges, and other details.

Title III provides for the creation of a Committee on Consumers in the House of Representatives to deal with measures relating to the protection of consumer interests. This committee shall conduct studies and investigations of consumer problems, with particular emphasis on legislation needed to provide adequate protection for consumers against overpricing of medicines and drugs, misleading advertising, deceptive merchandise practices, impure foods, and related matters. It shall consist of nine Members of the House and is to submit to the House the results of its investigations, together with recommendations for legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to stop making an easy victim of the consumer and to see to it that he obtains his dollar's worth in the market-places of our country. The American consumer taken as a totality is too big and too vital a part of our economy. He deserves greater recognition. The establishment of a Department of Consumers in the executive branch and a Committee on Consumers in the legislative branch would provide such recognition. I hope that the House Committee on Government Operations, to whom my bill has been referred, will give early consideration to the measure.

The Present Maritime Situation—An Unfortunate Administrative Hiatus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks there has been much talk about what will or will not happen to merchant ship construction subsidies. The maritime industry on the one hand believes that steps are being taken by the Government to slow down or stretch out the Maritime Administration vessel replacement program, started less than 5 years ago.

On the other hand, with unconvincing denials, Government officials have raised more questions than they have answered. One fact now seems evident—whatever the reasons might be, there has been some foot dragging in the past several months where this shipbuilding program is concerned.

One financial writer, Allen M. Smythe, quoted a high administration official who characterized this situation as an unfortunate administrative hiatus in an article appearing in the New York Herald Tribune on December 24, 1961, which under unanimous consent I include in the Appendix of the RECORD:

SHIPBUILDERS JITTERY OVER BUDGET CUTS—FEAR SLOWDOWN IN SHIP REPLACEMENTS

(By Allen M. Smythe)

The Nation's shipbuilding industry is suffering a severe case of jitters and it is not from too much Christmas cheer.

They are afraid that the Department of Commerce's Maritime Administration is about to slow down or stretch out the $4 billion program to replace the Nation's subsidized cargo and passenger fleet in an effort to help President Kennedy balance his budget.

Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges has attempted to convey some assurance by denying that he has ordered a freeze on shipbuilding subsidies. At the same time he admitted last week that some ship operators have asked for a moratorium on the replacement program which would make the request for new shipbuilding subsidies unnecessary.

UNFORTUNATE HIATUS

One high administration official, who cannot be named, has admitted that there might be an unfortunate administrative hiatus in ship subsidy schedules. Such a hiatus might be caused by the following facts:

During fiscal 1961, contracts for 31 vessels were awarded for a total value of $302 million. Of this $156.2 million was committed by Federal subsidies. This left a good-sized carry over of $54,882,000 in uncommitted subsidies for fiscal 1962. In addition Congress appropriated $98 million for merchant ship construction aid.

In the first 5 months of this fiscal year, ending November 30, only $24 million of the $152.8 million subsidy total has been committed. This went for contracts for four Lykes Bros. cargo ships and two cargo ships for Gulf and South American Lines. In the last 7 months of fiscal 1962, which ends June

30, only one vessel, a combination passenger and cargo ship for Grace Lines, is scheduled for contract award. This will call for an $11 million subsidy commitment.

Thus the end of the fiscal year will see a $117.8 million carryover available.

Congress kept its ship construction appropriation at $98 million for this fiscal year because of the carryover of $54 million existing at the end of fiscal 1961. The total available for 1962 was expected to cover most of another 22 cargo ships. Six of these will be built for Moore-McCormack Lines, four for Grace, five for United States Lines, and seven for Lykes Bros. But under present plans, it appears that contracts for these cannot be awarded until fiscal 1963. Of course, there is no guarantee that some ship operators will not ask for further delay.

FOR A BALANCED BUDGET

Mr. Hodges, former Governor of North Carolina, said he is a strong supporter of a vibrant merchant marine. But he also is an avid advocate of a balanced national budget.

Few observers expect the next session of Congress to appropriate additional new money for shipbuilding subsidies if Mr. Hodges reports a $117 million carryover in unused funds.

Many observers believe that President Kennedy has already decided not to recommend any additional funds for shipbuilding in his budget message to Congress in January. Mr. Hodges, as a high administration official in a position to know what the White House is considering, cannot properly comment on anything in the budget until the President delivers his message.

The shipbuilding industry's jitters have been increased by reports that two study groups will recommend decreases in all transportation subsidies—air lines as well as maritime. It is known that advance copies of these groups' reports have been sent to White House budgeters who are drafting the President's message on fiscal requests.

Paul Taubman's Big Brass Band

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, many of us, I am sure, will recall from our youth the village bandstand, the big brass bands which were so much a part of the American scene a generation or two ago. Today they are all but gone from the American scene, except for films or television programs depicting that era.

A noted American musician, Paul Taubman, who is a composer, pianist and conductor, has recently made an attempt to revive the old-fashioned brass band. He assembled a group of first-class wind players and percussionists in New York, now known as Paul Taubman's Big Brass Band, and an album of some of America's most famous marches has just been released. It is produced by Ernie Altschuler.

The album opens with "Stars and Stripes Forever," John Philip Sousa's best known march, and it concludes with a rich, sonorous version of "The Star-Spangled Banner." Among the more famous marches presented in this album are: Franz Schubert's "Marche Militaire," W. C. Handey's classic "St. Louis Blues" set in a rousing march tune, Sousa's famous "Washington Post March," the "Colonel Bogey March" from the film "Bridge on the River Kwai," and a half dozen others.

Let me add a word about Paul Taubman. In addition to conducting music for as many as 20 television and radio programs a week, he serves on the board of governors of the Academy of Television Arts and Sciences and has helped organize concerts by high school students in cooperation with the New York City Board of Education. He has conducted band concerts in New York Central Park and Washington Square and has appeared with symphony orchestras in various parts of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to commend his album to all my colleagues and to the public at large. I think it should be in every American home and in every school.

Knorr Soups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today the Honorable EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, the junior Senator from Illinois and the distinguished minority leader of the Senate, was host to all Senators in the Senate dining room for a serving of Knorr soup. This soup is a new hydrated product, produced by the Best Foods Division of Corn Products Co., whose headquarters plant—the world's largest food processing complex—is located in the northwestern section of my district in Argo, Ill.

Other than the fact that the quality of Knorr soup is of the highest, Mr. Speaker, I think it will be interesting to the Members to learn of the origin of this soup. It was originated in Heilbronn, Germany, in 1838 and in the ensuing years became popular not only in Germany but also in all other countries of Europe. Later on, Knorr soups were brought to the United States by importers and were sold, primarily in gourmet and specialty stores under the brand name Knorr Suisse. Recently, the Corn Products Co. brought this soup to the United States for manufacturing.

Mr. Speaker, this action represents an international business action worthy of note. Bringing in this product from abroad has meant not only a new product for the American public, but it has meant new investment and new jobs here in the United States—and at a time when we hear so much discussion of foreign-made products being sold in the U.S. market. In other words, the Knorr example shows us one way that the gold outflow problem can be ameliorated.

Not only was a brand new plant constructed at Argo, Ill., but additionally these soups have already created more than 1,130 new jobs for U.S. citizens in manufacturing, selling, and marketing—and that is just the beginning.

Raphael Semmes: Distinguished Son of Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, among the constructive results of the Civil War Centennial commemoration is a revival of the study of basic American history.

An excellent illustration of this trend is a biographical sketch of Raphael Semmes, famed naval hero of the war, by Ruby R. DuVal, in the September-October 1961 issue of Shipmate, the well-known magazine of the U.S. Naval Academy Alumni Association.

In order that this article may be given wider circulation and be permanently recorded in the annals of the Congress, I include it as a part of these remarks:

RAPHAEL SEMMES, DISTINGUISHED SON OF MARYLAND, HONORED BY U.S. NAVY

(By Ruby R. DuVal)

The State of Maryland is proud to claim as a native son the daring Raphael Semmes—sailor, lawyer, and advocate of the Doctrine of States Rights—so often referred to as the South's most intrepid mariner. And it is of nationwide interest to learn that when a new guided missile destroyer slid down the ways at Avondale Marine Ways, New Orleans, on May 20, 1961, it was given the name of Raphael Semmes who won fame as skipper of the Confederate sea raider *Alabama*. The U.S. Navy thus honored the fearless seadog whose successful maneuvers toward commerce destruction paralyzed the ocean-carrying trade of the United States during the War of 1861–65.

Raphael Semmes, elder son of Richard Thompson and Catherine (Middleton) Semmes, born September 27, 1809, at Piscataway, Charles County, was destined for a varied and colorful career—first in the U.S. Navy, later a student of law, and still later service in the navy of the Confederate States of America. He was orphaned in childhood and was reared in the home of an uncle in Georgetown, D.C.

When Semmes, at the age of 17, received a warrant as midshipman in the U.S. Navy from President John Quincy Adams, he little dreamed of what the future held in store for him. At the age of 26, in 1835, he was named acting master of the famous U.S. frigate *Constellation;* and, less than 30 years later, he was destined to skipper two of the most elusive and feared raiders in the history of maritime warfare—the *Sumter* and eventually the *Alabama*.

With his midshipman's warrant, Semmes reported for duty aboard a sloop-of-war of the Mediterranean Squadron on September 8, 1826. Later he completed a short course at the naval school at the Norfolk Navy Yard and had duty afloat in the *Lexington*, the *Erie*, the *Brandywine*, and the schooner *Porpoise*. In 1832 he qualified for promotion, but there was no vacancy in the rank of lieutenant. Discouraged, he thought of studying law so he requested leave of absence and went to Cumberland, Md., where

he read law in the office of his brother Samuel for 2 years. He was admitted to the bar but soon realized his first and foremost interest was the Navy and decided not to resign.

Raphael Semmes received the rank of Lieutenant in February 1837, nearly 2 years after he had received an appointment as acting master of the frigate *Constellation*. He was interested in oceanography and was a faithful follower of Matthew Fontaine Muary, the "Pathfinder of the Seas." He always found duty challenging and profitable when given assignment with hydrographic surveys.

During long leaves of absence, as was customary in his day, Semmes from time to time studied and practiced law in Maryland and in Ohio. It was in Cincinnati, Ohio, that he met and married Anne Elizabeth Spencer in May 1837. They had six children—three sons and three daughters.

When war came with Mexico, Raphael Semmes was in command of the U.S. brig *Somers* and his ship was one of the blockading squadron off Veracruz in 1846. He lost the *Somers* in a gale and a court of inquiry exonerated him of blame while praising his seamanship unstintingly. He was soon detailed as flag lieutenant to Commodore David Conner and sent ashore with the naval artillery at the bombardment of Veracruz. He accompanied Gen. Winfield Scott's troops to Mexico City on special duty as volunteer aide to Maj. Gen. W. J. Worth, who cited him for his intelligence and gallantry. Thus, unforeseen circumstances had permitted him to obtain dual experience in the profession of arms.

In November 1847 Semmes returned to Prospect Hill, Ala., where he had established a home for his wife and family in 1841. He was given command of the *Electra* in 1848 and 1 year later was detached and placed on waiting orders. In fact, until 1861, he was in the waiting orders status more than half the time. He had moved his family to Mobile, Ala., in 1849 and it was there that he maintained his legal residence the remainder of his life. Promoted to the rank of commander in 1855, he was detailed to the Lighthouse Service and served as inspector of stations on the Gulf of Mexico. Next came duty in Washington, D.C., as secretary to the Lighthouse Board and he was named a member of the Board in 1861. In the interim he wrote and published his memoirs and practiced law.

On February 14, 1861, the Committee on Naval Affairs of the provisional Confederate government then meeting in Montgomery, Ala., requested Raphael Semmes' presence for a conference. His views on the Doctrine of States' Rights were known and his ability as a naval officer had been proven. He knew that the invitation to a conference meant a summons to active duty which he had been anticipating. The following day he resigned his commission in the U.S. Navy and started for Montgomery where he gave the Confederate Congress his views on national defense.

Semmes was sent north to purchase munitions, ordnance machinery, and ships; and in April 1861 he was given command of the C.S.S. *Sumter*, the first national warship of the Confederacy. Formerly a packet steamer, the *Havana* at New Orleans, her new commander had to rebuild and equip her for war; and with all in readiness on June 30, 1861, Raphael Semmes put to sea with a crew of 114 officers and men. Thus began the epochmaking raids against enemy commerce.

Cruising to the Caribbean and the South Atlantic—and taking prizes for the Confederacy hither and yon—Semmes hoped to find a legal way for the South to profit by his activities. Finally he crossed to Gibraltar, taking six prizes along the way, but there he was blockaded by Federal vessels and there his ship, the *Sumter*, had to remain. Meanwhile his accomplishments on the high seas were being weighed by Capt. James D. Bulloch who had been sent to England by President Jefferson Davis as a secret agent; and at length he was notified by Stephen R. Mallory, Secretary of the Confederate States Navy, that he was promoted to the rank of captain for gallant and meritorious conduct.

Captain Semmes' new command was the raider *Enrica*, commissioned as the C.S.S. *Alabama* and receiving her first salute on August 24, 1862. The Azores had been chosen as the rendezvous for this occasion.

The fame of Raphael Semmes and the *Alabama*—almost legendary during the war years—are important factors in the naval history of that period. His cruise to the American coast in 1863, his following the lanes of the Atlantic up and down the coast, his recrossing to the coast of Africa in August of that year, his rounding the southern tip of Africa and following the coast up to the Indian Ocean and on through the straits of Singapore were history-making voyages of commerce destruction. His confident return voyages via the Arabian Sea, the Indian Ocean, and up the Atlantic to Cherbourg, France, where the *Alabama* found anchorage on June 11, 1864, are indications of his determination and resourcefulness.

Another ship-of-war steamed into the harbor of Cherbourg on June 14, 1863. Now the die was cast—here was the U.S.S. *Kearsarge*—and 5 days later the two engaged in battle. The gallant *Alabama* foundered, surrendered, and finally sank. Semmes and many others of his crew were picked up by the English yacht *Deerhound* and were taken to England, where the English people were determined to make a hero of him.

Wounded and with his health shattered by stress and strain, Raphael Semmes journeyed to Switzerland for a rest before returning to Richmond, Va., in January 1865. The following month he was appointed rear admiral and given command of the Confederate vessels on the James River, consisting of three ironclad rams and seven wooden steamers. When Richmond was evacuated, however, he was obliged to burn his ship rather than have it fall into Federal hands. He landed his men as a naval brigade and eventually surrendered as a part of Joseph E. Johnston's army at Greensboro, N.C., 17 days after the surrender at Appomattox.

Following his parole on May 1, 1865, Semmes returned to his home in Mobile where his whole family had assembled to greet him. Much to his chagrin, politicians of the Federal Government were preparing a bitter blow, and he was arrested and taken prisoner to Washington. When he finally returned to Mobile in April of the next year he was elected probate judge of Mobile County and took up the practice of law. He devoted his spare time to writing his "Memoirs of Service Afloat During the War Between the States"—a valuable contribution to naval history—published in 1869.

Raphael Semmes died August 30, 1877, and the citizens of Mobile who regarded him with admiration and deference took steps to express their high esteem. His funeral was military, with an admiral's salute befitting his colorful service afloat; and, as he was a devoted Catholic, his funeral oration was given by Father Abram J. Ryan, the poet-priest of the Confederacy, another native son of Maryland long identified with the city of Mobile.

Advertising, the Multiplier of Our Economy—Address by Roy E. Larsen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON ALLOTT

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, we as Americans are finding it increasingly necessary to examine the nature of our economy, the direction of its movement, and the importance of its growth in relation to our domestic goals and international commitments. The role of advertising and marketing as a part of our economic growth is an extremely important one.

Attacks on the economic validity of advertising have been made by, among others, no less important personages than The Honorable Kenneth Galbraith, now our Ambassador to India, in his book "The Affluent Society," and Dr. Arnold J. Toynbee, the British historian. I believe it is equally important that we know the viewpoints of business leaders who have, to a large degree, the responsibility for achieving the economic goals desired by government.

At the annual meeting of the Association of National Advertisers, Inc., this winter, Mr. Roy E. Larsen, chairman of the executive committee of Time, Inc., examined the role of advertising in our economic life. Mr. Larsen is a director of the Ford Foundation, a director of the Committee on Economic Development, and has been a director of the Advertising Council since its formation 20 years ago.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address by Mr. Larsen to the Association of National Advertisers at Hot Springs, Va., on November 2, 1961, be inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADVERTISING, THE MULTIPLIER OF OUR ECONOMY

(Address by Roy E. Larsen to the Association of National Advertisers, Hot Springs, Va., Nov. 2, 1961)

Mr. Chairman, members of the Association of National Advertisers, I was delighted to be asked to join the distinguished businessmen on your program this morning and to be asked to speak about some aspects of the role of advertising in our society.

Sometimes people get asked to speak because they have just recently written a book. But my presence here, I'm afraid, is based on a flimsier pretext. I am guilty of having written no more than a single chapter for a recent book.

The book was called "The Promise of Advertising." It was published in honor of James Webb Young for the University of Illinois Department of Advertising. My own chapter was entitled "Advertising and the Affluent Society." In it I attempted to answer some of the recent criticism we have been hearing about the basic role of advertising in our economy.

There have been a great many attacks on advertising in recent years. They fall into two categories. Some critics merely single out advertisements—advertisements that are dull, misleading, offensive, or in bad taste. Such attacks can best be met by making our advertisements better, and that is something we should all be doing. Sometimes this criticism is unassailable and should be heard thoughtfully, rather than argued with. But the great danger is that bad advertising provides a favorable climate for a broader kind of attack—an attack on the economic validity of advertising. But such criticism is eminently assailable, and it is to combat such critics that I am speaking to you today.

The chapter I wrote for "The Promise of Advertising" was in answer to the attacks on the validity of advertising that appeared in "The Affluent Society," by Kenneth Galbraith. At the time he wrote he was a Harvard professor, and now, naturally, he is an important member of the new national administration. His book had an important impact on thinking people. And the latest reverberation from it is a new attack on the basic role of advertising—this time from an even more eminent authority, Dr. Arnold J. Toynbee, the British historian.

Each of these men premised his criticism on his own specialty—Ambassador Galbraith on economics and Dr. Toynbee on history. But they both came out at about the same place. In any event, I am about to put myself in the unenviable position of arguing economics with Galbraith and history with Toynbee, or maybe history with Galbraith and economics with Toynbee.

I am sure that most of you are familiar with Galbraith's book. But because many of you may not have read what Toynbee said last spring before a distinguished audience at historic Williamsburg, Va., I would like to quote some of the major—and to me shocking—points that he made. Toynbee's speech has been widely distributed and widely quoted.

"In the Western World of our day," he said, "the tempter's role * * * is being played * * * by everything we sum up under the name of Madison Avenue and all that this label stands for. A considerable part of our ability, energy, time, and material resources is being spent today on inducing us to do hard labor in order to find the money for buying material goods that we should never have dreamed of wanting if we had been left to ourselves * * *." And now mark this. Toynbee says: "I would suggest that the destiny of our Western civilization turns on the issue of our struggle with all that Madison Avenue stands for more than it turns on the issue of our struggle with communism."

Much of this is a leaf direct from Galbraith's book. But then Toynbee goes off on his own. Galbraith had seemed to suggest that the answer lay in abandoning the satisfaction of material wants met by private enterprise, in order to concentrate on needs he thought should be met by Government. Toynbee went further. He asked that we continue to produce material goods, but that we spread them evenly, with the impartiality of a cement trowel, among all the people of the world.

"Fortunately for the economy of the affluent Western World," said Toynbee, "there is no scarcity of genuine needs in the present-day world as a whole * * *. Let us suppose that the affluent Western minority were to reorient the aim of its economy to the new objective of meeting the elementary needs of the indigent majority. This would insure our economy's health and survival."

I was genuinely startled to see that the man who has taken such giant steps in history would venture this unsophisticated step into the field of international economics, for what he proposes is nothing less than government planning and socialism on a world scale.

Thus, the two most recent and important of the long series of attacks on both our free enterprise system and advertising's role in that system.

In he trials of the depression of the 1930's, particularly the burdens of widespread and crippling unemployment, a great deal of attention was directed to a school of thought known as the new economics, and especially to its brightest star, Lord John Maynard Keynes, a Cambridge, England, professor economist. Keynes urged that government take on the job of controlling the economy and employing the unemployed through public works, thus bringing into play a magic multiplier for the economy.

In fairness to Keynes, his acute analysis of factors at work set into motion much positive and penetrating thought: public works, as they came into being, helped to ameliorate human suffering. And countercyclical fiscal policy is still generally accepted today as a valuable tool of government.

But his multiplier never seemed to multiply very much where it should have worked best. Unemployment, which was 16 percent of the total work force in 1931, never dropped to less than 14 percent during the whole decade of the thirties.

Eventually, with the defense and war periods, full employment was achieved. Beyond a doubt, it was achieved by public works, because production for defense and war is nothing if it is not public work. But as we are all well aware, when there was an overwhelming need for the highest possible production, these public works were conducted under private auspices.

Nevertheless, the disciples of the new economics viewed America's World War II production record as crushing proof of how much America could produce if its economy were centrally directed. What is more, they were almost unanimous in anticipating another great depression after the war unless the Government continued to play a very large role in the economy.

But the failure of a great postwar slump to materialize was a considerable jolt to many of the new economists. They were likewise taken aback when the recessions of 1949 and of 1953-54 failed to deepen into depression—and thereby failed to fulfill their predictions.

By 1955 their charge that the private system simply could not deliver the goods—or enough purchasing power to enable the American people to buy the goods—began to seem like an unpromising line of attack on the free economy and an unconvincing reason for advocating a more statist economy. The free economy was delivering the goods—and the purchasing power, too—in embarrassing profusion.

It was at about this point that Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., now also an important member of the new administration, wrote a New Republic article advising liberals to find something new to be liberal about. And it was at about this point that Harvard Professor Galbraith sat down to write his book.

In bright, readable prose, Galbraith pointed out the glaring deficiencies in our society in the midst of affluence—as had many a writer, educator, and businessman before him. What militates against the timely correction of these deficiencies, he said, is the "conventional wisdom * * * ideas which are esteemed at any time for their acceptability," and which resist change long after events have made them obsolescent.

Galbraith was already intellectually bored with the truly fantastic production and consumption that a predominantly private economy had wrought in America. He now said, in effect: the important thing is not the quantity of production and consumption. It is the quality of consumption that merits concern. American consumers cannot be trusted in free choice to buy what is best for them, and American businessmen certainly cannot be trusted to give them what is best for them.

By and large, his catalog of needs was very much the same as that which has been set forth—and acted upon—by many a public-spirited American businessman in this room. Galbraith said he was concerned about American education, American taste, about slums, unsafe parks, tangled traffic, shortage of hospital beds, shoddy or silly products, juvenile delinquency, etc. In all this he was saying that the quality of American life is more important than, but presently deemed inferior to, America's productive power.

To this, surely, the right reply is simply: welcome. Welcome for adopting as his own one of the oldest and most conventional of all the pieces of conventional wisdom; namely, "man does not live by bread alone."

But Galbraith's new wisdom then took a new plunge. It is not the consumer who is to be charged with poor judgment in making his choices, said Galbraith. Not at all. It is the producer who has taken over the prerogatives of choice. Having produced the goods, he must somehow get them distributed and sold. So, through advertising and salesmanship, he lulls the consumers into believing that they want what he has made. Said Galbraith—in words that Toynbee has now echoed: "The link between production and wants is provided by the institutions of modern advertising and salesmanship. These cannot be reconciled with the notion of independently determined desires, for their central function is to create desires—to bring into being wants that previously did not exist."

I am afraid that many of Galbraith's readers were completely taken in by the conclusions he based on this oversimplified premise. Certainly advertising has played a large and significant role in the achievement here of great and widespread affluence. But it has not and could not create wants that did not exist, nor bring forth needs from the infertile soil of public apathy. The role of advertising is to connect human desires with production and so create mass markets, and to make the satisfaction of those desires an economic function. Advertising does for distribution what the assembly line does for production. The net result of both is not uniformity and sameness, but rather a tremendous variety of mass-produced and mass-marketed products, continuing competition to make those products better and, above all, the widening of human options and choice.

At this point, I would like to make a concession to Professor Galbraith. Much legitimate criticism can be directed against large areas of American taste. So there is nothing amiss in Galbraith's presuming to criticize Americans' choice as to how they use their money.

But Galbraith did not stop with mere criticism of the choices that Americans make. Because the choices are bad, he said in effect, the matter of choice should be taken from the consumer—and out of the marketplace altogether. Clearly, in his book, he advocates a greater role for government—using its taxing power to make good the deficiencies in American life that private persons and groups would never have the sense and will to correct voluntarily. In place of private taste, we must assume then, would be the imposed taste of government, perhaps an office of good taste.

Of course, he's wrong in principle, and he's wrong as a matter of practical economics.

The matter of principle, of course, is that Galbraith would narrow the area of voluntary choice—the area of freedom—in American life, and thus enlarge the area of coercion. What he overlooks is the cost—the

cost in freedom, in innovation, in vitality—of interfering with human options.

And surely the enlargement of the government sector of our economy, especially under auspices of a philosophy as hostile to private production as Galbraith's book is, would damage incentives, the investment process, and productivity. We might well end up destroying our affluence. Then, the era when we were worrying about the uses of affluence would seem like the good old days indeed.

Public taste, furthermore, is self-correcting—far more so, I suspect, than government taste. The tailfin, for instance, not so long ago often excoriated as an example of inferior public taste, has disappeared from most American cars. The compact car within 1 year became a major part of automobile production—not because the producers wanted it so, but because the public demanded it. Last year a charting of spending of discretionary income by Americans, in a period of growing affluence showed larger percentages were being spent for theaters, operas, concerts, education, active recreation, and medical care. Public education, in particular, has almost tripled its spending in the past decade. And note that this tripling came not from Washington but from our States and communities.

It is abundantly clear that a revolution in tastes and standards is actively underway. Ours is a society of motion and growth. Just this month, Fortune is reporting that Americans spent or donated $3 billion for culture last year, 70 percent more than the estimate for 10 years ago—including a billion dollars' worth of books, $300 million to run public libraries, and $300 million to operate their 620 art museums. I wish that Historian Toynbee would take social critic Galbraith by the hand and remind him that what he observes today is not nearly so significant as the direction in which a society is moving. It is this direction and momentum of change, more than present affluence, or present power, or present standards, that best define a civilization.

What is it that changes public taste for the better, and that elevates public standards? It is a great many things. One of the most important is affluence itself, which gives us time for more education and leisure pursuits, and whets our demands, not just for more goods, but for better ones. But there have been other important catalysts for our developing taste. And one of them has been advertising. Galbraith charges that the voice of advertising has been heard on behalf of more beer, but not on behalf of better schools.

True, the advocacy of better schools, better health, better communities has not been a primary use of advertising. Nevertheless, as you know, the engines of mass communications, whose own efficacy was made possible by advertising, have stimulated communities into action on behalf of better schools for a great many years. Through the dedicated efforts of the Advertising Council, millions of people have been exposed, insistently and repeatedly, to the needs that Galbraith himself professes to be concerned about—better schools, better cities, better health, better government.

Businessmen today are keenly aware of all these objectives of a healthy society, and what's more are in the forefront of the efforts being made to achieve those objectives. In the past 12 years, corporate aid for higher education has risen from less than $25 million a year to more than $150 million. No wonder that American Socialist Norman Thomas confessed not so long ago that practically everything he stood for when he entered politics has been accomplished.

Thus, when Britain's Toynbee lectures us at Williamsburg by saying that "Producing and disposing of the maximum quantity of consumer goods was not the purpose of the American Revolution," we can only reply, "Who ever said it was?" I fear that Dr. Toynbee has fallen into the error, so grevious for any historian, of confusing means with ends.

The purpose of the American Revolution was, and the ongoing purpose of the continuing American revolution still is, "To secure the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity." Several years ago Fortune magazine in a special issue on distribution pointed out that "The Declaration of Independence, intended for the American Revolution, had a surprising philosophical relevance to the industrial revolution, hence to the American market. The Declaration's basic principles are the sine qua non of mass production and mass distribution in the 20th century."

In that same issue Fortune faced up to the old question of whether distribution costs too much, and Fortune made what was to me a very startling disclosure: The higher the ratio of distribution costs to total costs, the higher our general level of prosperity will be.

The place to really see the importance of distribution is in an underdeveloped economy. I thought of that recently when I saw in Life some pictures of Ambassador Galbraith in his new assignment in nonaffluent India. I have myself visited those isolated Indian villages, where distribution costs are virtually zero, because there is no distribution. The standard of living is not much higher than zero. When the village is opened to a main highway and a cooperative marketing center is set up nearby, distribution costs begin. And living standards go up.

If Galbraith is perceiving some of these truths, then I wish he this time would take Dr. Toynbee by the hand and guide him patiently through the perplexities of world economics. For Toynbee shows very little understanding of those perplexities when he suggested "that the destiny of our Western civilization turns on the issue of our struggle with all that Madison Avenue stands for," and "that the affluent Western minority reorient the aim of its economy to the new objective of meeting the elementary needs of the indigent minority."

Reorient our aims, indeed. What nation in the history of the world has ever given so much of its bounty, or so large a fraction of its treasure, to other nations in need? The hungry we have fed by the millions. Others we have helped to help themselves. The striking testament to this purpose is today's thriving mass-consumption market in Western Europe. There is no way to raise the standards of other nations except through helping them put to work the natural forces of growth in their own economies. This requires, not perpetual reliance on the benevolence of others, but the creation of some kind of governmental order where individuals can buy, sell, invest, and freely exchange goods, labor, knowledge, and education.

And this surely was once the philosophy—and should be today—of the bona fide liberal, the man who stood for personal liberty. We need such liberals today to push for higher standards everywhere, to work for the force of law in the world to advance the cause of legitimacy and responsibility and limits in government, to spread the understanding of the deepest meanings of individual freedom.

In that very fundamental sense, much of American business has made itself a part of the liberal tradition. But those of us in advertising, as the communicators for American business, must do still more.

Under the onslaught of a mounting wave of criticism, misunderstanding and misrepresentation, two things need to be very clear to us. First, we must understand that an attack on advertisements is very different from an attack on the economic validity of advertising; and second, that an attack on the validity of advertising is equally an attack on our free enterprise system.

It is not our function to debate criticism of advertisements. We should rather correct deficiencies by improving their quality, and by making effective legitimate suggestions for self-policing. But it is our function to debate criticism of advertising as an economic force, and we need to do this better than we have—better than I have this morning.

The talents and the brilliance of people in advertising have helped move mountains of goods, and have had a major role in creating our mass-consumption economy. But those same talents and that brilliance have not yet succeeded in effectively communicating these truths about our business system to enough of the educated and intelligent citizens of our modern industrial democracies; I mean in Western Europe, in Australia, in Canada, and right here at home. If truth is on our side, the task should not be too formidable. If truth is not on our side, then our critics are right and we are wrong, advertising is wrong, business is wrong, and America is wrong. I, for one, am convinced that America is right. Thank you.

How We Got This Way—VII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, part VII—published November 19, 1961—of the New York Daily News series of editorials, "How We Got This Way," is as follows:

HOW WE GOT THIS WAY—VII

For most practical purposes, the history of political parties in the United States didn't begin until 1792, toward the end of George Washington's first term as President.

President Washington himself disliked the idea of political parties; thought they would divide the Nation dangerously and unnecessarily.

He was elected and reelected by unanimous vote of the presidential electors—an experience which no doubt strengthened his conviction that the country could do very well without political parties.

In Washington's own first administration, though, and in parts of his second, were two brilliant and strong-minded men whose views continually clashed. These men were Secretary of State Thomas Jefferson and Secretary of the Treasury Alexander Hamilton.

Jefferson believed in the wisdom of the people—particularly of the farmers. Hamilton believed in the wisdom and orderliness of businessmen, bankers, and property owners. Jefferson, in short, was a radical, though not an extreme one; Hamilton a conservative, though not a reactionary.

There are those who say that everybody is born either a conservative or a radical, and that nothing can be done about it. At any rate, the Federalist and Republican Parties were in active operation by 1792.

Hamilton and John Adams were the Federalists' first leaders. Jefferson headed the Republican Party—which after a few years changed its name to Democratic, and has survived under that name to this day.

Hamilton's men fought to keep the Nation a republic, as created by the Constitution. Jefferson's party strove to turn it into a democracy. (A republic is governed by

officials whom the people elect; a democracy is run directly by the people.) Neither man succeeded 100 percent.

RADICALS VERSUS CONSERVATIVES

Washington and his one-term Federalist successor, John Adams, held office long enough for Hamilton to shore up the U.S. Treasury, establish the Government's credit and stabilize the money system.

But President Adams' party grew tyrannical during the unofficial war with France (1797–1800), and when that excitement died down there was a terrific reaction against the Federalists.

In the Presidential election of 1800, Jefferson defeated Adams by act of the House of Representatives, since Jefferson and Aaron Burr were tied as to electoral votes.

Jefferson brought in a number of reforms, some needed and some not. So popular was his Democratic Party that it stayed in power until 1841 (Presidents Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, John Quincy Adams, Jackson, Van Buren)—though Adams, while technically a Democrat, actually was a conservative who had once been a Federalist.

The Federalist Party dried up and blew away.

This early U.S. political history was a sort of preview of all that has happened politically in the Nation since 1840.

The pendulum swung back toward the conservatives in that year, when the Whigs—a sort of resurrected Federalist group—elected William Henry Harrison President.

About that time the Democrats, because so many of them were Southerners, grew conservative on the issue of Negro slavery. The Republican Party (founded 1854; elected its first President, Abraham Lincoln, 1860) became the new radical group because it opposed slavery, and led the Nation in the Civil War which abolished that "peculiar institution."

CEASELESS PENDULUM

After the war, the Republican went conservative, and the Democrats returned to radicalism—which flowered fantastically in William Jennings Bryan, who ran three times for President but never made it.

The two parties today have their radical and conservative wings—or, as they prefer to call them, liberal and conservative. The liberals pretty much run both parties, and have done so for years.

But it may be that the pendulum is again swinging toward the conservatives—either a Republican Party grabbed by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, or a coalition of Northern Republicans and conservative Southern Democrats.

All politics aside, it looks as if the United States is the great Nation that it is today largely because conservatives and radicals are continually at fierce odds with one another, but neither group—thanks to the Constitution's built-in safeguards—has ever yet been able to get a permament grip on the Government.

United Nations Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, many, many persons from my district have been particularly concerned over the issuance of $200 million worth of bonds by the United Nations. Many of them have pointed out that the United States is already paying 47 percent of the total cost of the United Nations and is now considering buying $100 million worth of these bonds that the United Nations is trying to sell. One constituent puts it rather succinctly when he writes me to the effect that each time the U.S.S.R. buys $1 million worth of bonds, we, or the United States, buy $2 million worth. I think that most of my colleagues in Congress would agree, that if we use this type of a purchase plan, the U.S. Treasury would be called upon to pay out very little money.

In view of the concern within my district, that I have mentioned, I am pleased to support my colleague, the Honorable H. R. GROSS, Representative from Iowa, in his introduction of House Joint Resolution 595. This resolution provides that the United States shall make no loans or grants to the United Nations until all members of the United Nations have paid in full their assessed share of the costs of the operations of the United Nations, including the expenses of operations in the Congo and Gaza strip.

State of the Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing we have learned since coming to Congress it is to be able to separate a man from his words, to evaluate him by the standards of character, personality, and forthrightness, while at the same time reviewing his proposals on the basis of their practicality. This seems to be the attitude in which the American people are today placing their estimates on President Kennedy—they like him immensely—but haven't gotten around to associating his legislative recommendations with the man.

As we review the recent state of the Union message we are immediately struck with its departure from the inaugural address of a year ago when the people were reminded that their first obligation is to serve their country, whereas last week's speech before the joint session puts the emphasis the other way round. Emphasis, too, that as Congressmen we are henceforth to consider ourselves as partners of progress seemed to ignore the fact that such a partnership must be a balanced one, not only as to responsibility but also as to authority.

The one area where the President should have enthusiastic support is in the field of the mutual responsibility of both management and labor to hold the line on inflation. Heretofore, it has appeared that all of the appeal has been directed toward management to keep down prices with precious little said to labor to forgo another undeserved and unjustified round of wage increases. Everyone understands that this administration owes its very existence to the unions—and indeed in many States the Democratic Party has been taken over by labor—but there is a prior responsibility to protect the welfare of all of the people, regardless of their economic or political character.

Of keen disappointment to most of those with whom I have talked was the President's apparent conviction that our people can have both guns and butter, that we can increase our defense expenditures and at the same time expand the welfare state. In my opinion—and I find that most of my constituents agree with me in this—the economic stability of the Nation is the key to its longevity, that we can meet Mr. Khrushchev successfully on all fronts and then by falling on our faces financially, we make it possible for him to take us over without firing a shot. To my way of thinking, President Kennedy would have been a bigger man, albeit less popular with the liberal contingent, if he had served notice that until the threat of communism is fully met we of necessity will have to hold the line on this welfare hodgepodge. Instead, he seems to subscribe to the idea that we can have our cake and eat it, too and we all know that will not work.

It comes right down to this, that Congress has its work cut out for it, and it must be our responsibility to call a halt on any new programs, or the expansion of old ones, that have been recommended for no other purpose than to keep the current administration in power. As for me, I shall continue to do my best to represent the conservative philosophy of those whom I have been elected to serve, a philosophy which is admirably set forth in the following editorial taken from the January 12, 1962, issue of the Daily Local News, of West Chester, Pa., and commended to your careful perusal:

THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH

The President who addressed the Congress yesterday was a different President from the one of a year ago. And his state of the Union message was in decided contrast to the one he delivered last January. So was the underlying philosophy.

The "ask not what your country can do for you" idea was missing yesterday, and in its place was a host of things which Mr. Kennedy has proposed that the Federal Government will do for the people. In fact, if everything that the President mentioned were to become a part of our daily lives it would not be necessary for anybody to ask anything of their country. Everything would be done.

The President reminded Congress that "the Constitution makes us not rivals for power but partners for progress. We are all trustees for the American people, custodians of the American heritage." That implies a grave responsibility on the part of the President and Congress. It was never the intent of our Founding Fathers that the Federal Government should do for the people what the people are able and ready to do for themselves.

When Mr. Kennedy was a growing boy another member of the Democratic Party, the late Woodrow Wilson, made an observation which is worthy of repeating. "The history of liberty," said the late President, "is the history of the limitation of governmental, not the increase of it."

But history shows that the Federal Government has steadily encroached upon the duties, the rights, and the powers of the various States. The concentration of power in the Nation's Capital in recent years has been brought about at the expense of every taxpayer in the country, and the end apparently is not in sight.

What has become of the sacrifices of which Mr. Kennedy spoke so easily and so frequently during the past year? Surely there are no sacrifices, at least not at the moment, for a people whose government would do everything for them. The old frontiers were far more rugged than the new.

President Kennedy has called for record expenditures at a time when there should be a curb in spending, at least on those programs which are not essential to our national security. He intends to battle for those programs which were fought over and lost in the last Congress. He doubtless will encounter rough going in a congressional election year but he has served notice that he will pursue the course he has laid out.

No need to refrain from asking what your country can do for you if the President succeeds in having his way, it will be done without the asking. If, as Mr. Kennedy stated in his message, he and Congress are "partners in progress," then Congress will also have something to say. It said it positively and conclusively last year. There is little doubt but that it will repeat that performance this time around.

Resolutions of the United-Italian American Labor Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the texts of three resolutions adopted by the United-Italian American Labor Council at its 20th annual conference held on December 21, 1961, at the Hotel Commodore in New York. The prominent labor leader Luigi Antonini is the president of the council and my good friend Howard Molisani is the secretary.

The three resolutions deal with the massacre of the 13 Italian airmen in the Congo recently, the reallotment of the unused quota numbers to countries which are members of the Atlantic Alliance and whose quotas are oversubscribed, and enactment of legislation to provide medical aid to the aged under social security.

The three resolutions have my heartiest endorsement. They read as follows:

RESOLUTION ON THE MASSACRE OF 13 ITALIAN AIRMEN IN THE CONGO

Whereas the entire civilized world was shocked and horrified by the massacre of 13 unarmed members of the Italian Air Force who were in the Congo to serve the United Nations on a mission of mercy and humanity; and

Whereas all reliable information and factual evidence have confirmed that the savage massacre was perpetrated by riotous Congolese troops who were incited by totalitarian stooges like Gizenga to mutiny against the legally constituted central government of the Congo and to fanatical hatred of the western peoples; and

Whereas efforts by the recognized Premier of the Congo, Adoula, to bring to justice the barbarian perpetrators of the massacre are still being sabotaged by the followers of Gizenga, a self-admitted enemy of Western democracy and a promoter of anti-Western and anti-democratic intrigues in that tormented country: Be it

Resolved by the 20th annual conference of the United-Italian American Labor Council, held on December 21, 1961, Hotel Commodore, New York City, That we—

(a) Extend our heartfelt condolences to the Government and to the freedom-loving people of the Republic of Italy and to the families of the martyred thirteen airmen;

(b) Urge the U.S. delegation to the United Nations to make unceasing efforts to make sure that the perpetrators of the horrible crime and their political mentors and instigators be brought to justice;

(c) Call on the Department of State to order a study by experts in the field, of the political intrigues by the totalitarian Communist elements in the Congo and in other newly independent countries of Africa and Asia, so that a more effective policy may be formulated to isolate and defeat these brutal enemies of human dignity and freedom; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the President of the Italian Republic, to the Secretary of the Department of State, to our Ambassador to the United Nations, to the AFL-CIO and to the press.

RESOLUTION ON IMMIGRATION

Whereas about 140,000 Italian citizens, members and close relatives of families of American citizens in the United States, have applied for admission to our country and their applications have been processed and approved; and

Whereas they have been put in the fourth preferential quota, for which no visas are available, with the result that these applicants have been vainly waiting for the last 7 or 8 years to be permitted to join their dear ones in the United States; and

Whereas about 50,000 quota numbers are left unused annually by the northern countries of Europe; and

Whereas the President of the United States had recognized that the most urgent task of our immigration laws is to help the reunion of families that are still divided: Be it

Resolved by the 20th annual conference of the United-Italian American Labor Council held on December 21, 1961, Hotel Commodore, New York City, That we call upon the administration and Congress to have its next session enact a measure providing for the reallotment of the aforementioned unused quota numbers to those countries which are members of the Atlantic Alliance and which, like Italy, have an overwhelming number of already approved applications in the fourth preferential quota, but are still vainly waiting for their United States visas; and be it further

Resolved, That this resoltuion be sent to the President of the United States, to the leaders of the U.S. Congress, to the AFL-CIO and to the press.

The United-Italian American Labor Council, at its 20th anniversary conference held on December 21, 1961, Hotel Commodore, New York City, calls on the President of the United States to renew his efforts and recommendations to the coming session of the Congress to speed up the procedure for the enactment of pending legislation to extend to our senior citizens full medical assistance through social security; and urges the Members of Congress to cooperate for the early enactment of the bills providing for this necessity and highly humane reform.

Marine Corps League and American Legion Post Declare War on International Communist-Socialist Conspiracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying indeed, to note the awareness on the part of so many thousands of small patriotic organizations, of the existence of the threat posed by the international Communist conspiracy. The realization by the people that this struggle is actually a war for our very survival, and not merely another international political chess game, manifests itself in a multitude of resolutions calling for a recognition of the existence of that war.

The southern Kansas detachment Marine Corps League, and the Patrick Henry Post No. 144, American Legion, recently adopted "a declaration of war" on the international Communist-Socialist conspiracy. The declaration reads as follows:

A DECLARATION OF WAR

We hereby declare war on the international Communist-Socialist conspiracy, and its army of fellow travelers, dupes and red liberals who serve Communist purposes and objectives. We have neither willed nor chosen this war. The Communists have willed it, and they have been fighting it with success for over 40 years. This Declaration is not presumptive; it is years tardy.

American appeasement, sellout and betrayal in Eastern Europe, in China, in Korea and now in Cuba has so strengthened the enemy forces that today our own lives, and those of our loved ones are threatened. Under the deceiving label of "fighting communism" we as taxpayers have been made, by pro-red influences deep within our Government, to contribute billions of our savings to strengthen Communist and pro-Communist governments—our self-admitted life-and-death enemies. Our first great task is to win the battle of America—to achieve a foreign and domestic policy which in truth is pro-American and effectively anti-collectivist. Collectivism always becomes totalitarian.

THE MEASURE OF COMMUNIST INFLUENCE

In making this commitment, we are aware that the lives we save may be our own. Since we and our comrades in arms made our sacrifices in World War II, the Communists have enslaved 800 million more people. And these conquests of atheistic Communism have been won following the inception of the United Nations with its pretense of serving the freedom and dignity of man!

We refuse to be side-tracked by any controversies over mere name-calling. We have but to look at the appalling record of Communist conquests and gains during the past three national administrations, and then consider what that record could and should have been. Good intentions and mere anti-Communist word attacks are not enough. Our total enemy must be fought as a total enemy. Since 1917 the absolute cost to non-Communists who try to do gentlemanly business with the Communists is subversion, enslavement and death.

The Communists and their stooges, Red and otherwise, are not our brothers in God or in Christ. They deny or pervert all religion and all morality. They are the de-

ceivers, the atheistic children of the Devil to whom we owe not appeasement, aid, or surrender, but our undying resistance.

OUR INSPIRING EXAMPLE

In this struggle we have the inspiring example of Jesus Christ who stood firm before Pontius Pilate and the mob of lying, covetous deceivers who screamed for His blood. Americanism was born in controversy; it has always been controversial because evil men always seek to destroy human liberty. To be noncontroversial is to be nothing. Jesus Christ was and still is controversial.

To engage the vast Communist-Socialist smear apparatus head on does require moral, emotional, and intellectual courage. But we have never claimed nor aspired to be gutless wonders. Indeed, we and millions of our former comrades in arms, who we pray will be inspired to join our effort, were blooded in the mortal controversy of combat. We challenge patriotic organizations and individuals across America to adopt this or similar declaration of war, and thus also become "controversial" by speaking up for God, freedom, and country.

FOUNDATION PRINCIPLES

In this war, ideas and truth are more potent than nuclear weapons. We deny that man is merely an accidental arrangement of atoms; we assert that the personal freedom, dignity, and responsibility of man are the gift of God, and that this gift is eternal.

We concur with Woodrow Wilson that: "The history of liberty is the history of limitations upon the power of government." It is manifest that the overexpanded power of government is the curtain which has again and again blacked out the lights of human liberty. Man cannot eat the fruit of the tree of supergovernment and preserve the fruit of the tree of liberty.

We declare that the principles upon which our Constitutional Republic was founded are ever valid; that these principles, inspired by the Holy Scriptures, are the true foundation for building a better world. Against Socialist enslavement we proclaim these truths which we hold to be manifest in the history of civilization:

1. Justice is always personal and individual. Social justice is only individual justice to the many. Only individual man has moral and spiritual capability.

2. Justice is to reap that which one has sown. To sow badly or not at all and to take much from others is injustice. To reward the mere material need of man or nation, regardless of moral standards and self-help ability, is to encourage convetousness, dependence, and moral bankruptcy. We displease God and demoralize men when we do for them that which they should and could do for themselves.

3. Never to unnecessarily burden others is a primary basis of good neighborliness. Each has the just obligation to earn his bread by the sweat of his own brow, and to care for his dependents unless prevented from doing so by circumstances beyond his remedy or control.

4. The good society is the product of good citizens. Individual man must be reformed and redeemed with God's truth and grace before the nation can be reformed.

5. All men are created unequal in their talents and abilities. Social and economic equality deny the natural differences among men, and can be imposed only by force and fraud. Liberty is the natural right to be unequal in all things except in the equality of freedom. Liberty cannot endure apart from real moral and religious standards.

6. To be free is to accept the risk and responsibility of personal failure; to be enslaved is to surrender the major control and use of one's life to State political authority.

7. A moderately regulated, private, competitive economic system serves the people best because it provides the fairest, the most bountiful, and the most efficient method of producing and distributing goods and services.

8. To love our enemies does not mean that the forces of virtue, truth, and humanity should aid or compromise with the forces of atheism, untruth, brutality, and fraud. To compromise with evil strengthens evil and weakens virtue. True love is always constructive. To do good is to strengthen the personal virtue, competence, and responsibility of men.

9. Nations of freemen can excell totalitarian states only so long as the incentives to personal responsibility and high moral standards are not dissipated through materialism, covetousness, and irreligion.

10. To encourage the best in men we must reward not irresponsibility, but responsibility; not imprudence, but prudence; not dependence, but self-reliance; not incompetence, but competence; not evil but virtue.

TO FIGHT THIS WAR

In cold war, as in hot, it is essential to identify and expose the forces which serve the enemy, and to establish the tactics, strategy, and purposes of the enemy. This we shall do to the limit of our ability—without fear or favor to individuals or organizations. We shall expose and oppose the Communists and those who serve their evil and deceiving purposes. We shall work so that those who are now duped may see the truth, repent and join our cause. We shall employ, not rumor or hearsay, but documented evidence.

As veterans we have on past occasions been the spearhead force for our wonderful country in mortal combat against its enemies. On the occasion of this declaration of war against the most murderous and diabolical enemy our civilization has ever faced, we act, not under orders, but as free men who, as did our forefathers, voluntarily pledge our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

Msgr. W. A. Losieniecki, J.U.L., of Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of Saturday, January 13, 1962, on the death of Rt. Rev. Msgr. Wenceslaus Losieniecki, J.U.L., pastor of St. Mary's Church of the Maternity, Wilkes-Barre:

MSGR. W. A. LOSIENIECKI, J.U.L.

The death of the Right Reverend Monsignor Wenceslaus Losieniecki, J.U.L., pastor of St. Mary's Church of the Maternity, Wilkes-Barre, writes finis to a notable career, dedicated to the service of God and shared by his country, his community, and the cause of freedom. While his health had been failing and his earthly mission accomplished, his passing, nevertheless, will be a severe blow to his parish, his colleagues in the priesthood, and to a legion of friends and associates here and elsewhere.

Although he was as American as Plymouth Rock, he was steeped in the tradition of Poland, and understandably so. In the first place, he was a native of Blossburg in Tioga County, the first Polish settlement in northeastern Pennsylvania, and a town that has furnished the Roman Catholic diocese of Scranton with a score of priests.

From boyhood, his ties reflected his Polish background. He was educated at Orchard Lake and the Catholic University in Washington. His assignments, with one brief exception were at Polish parishes in the diocese. He was active in the Polish American Congress, Friends of Poland, the Polish Union, the Polish-American Historical Association, the General Pulaski Memorial Committee, the Polish Veterans, to mention just a few. He was an authority on the role of Poles and Americans of Polish extraction in the history of the United States.

That is not to imply he had no other interests. He was affiliated with a score of organizations, nationally and locally, that had no connection with Poland. In the community, for instance, he was a prominent figure in the Red Cross, Playground and Recreation Association, the Pennsylvania Heart Association, and the Catholic Youth Center. In the diocese, he held such offices as consultor, prosynodal judge, and examiner of junior clergy. His activities covered a wide range, proof of his industry, versatility, and dedication to the affairs of God and man. An idealist, he never spared himself in meeting his obligations in life.

But the foundation of his career was the priesthood. First and foremost, he was a pastor, although he had been elevated to the rank of domestic prelate by a grateful church in recognition of his outstanding service and attainments. And, of course, in recent years St. Mary's on Park Avenue was his major preoccupation. Thanks to his vision, initiative, and piety, a beautiful edifice, one of the finest in the area, was erected, and today this magnificent doorway to heaven stands as a monument to his zeal, one of a number he leaves as a spiritual leader, humanitarian, and administrator. His impressive record needs no encomiums here, speaking eloquently for itself.

The Role of Research in Managed Abundance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the question is frequently raised, among farmers as well as our Nation's food buyers, as to why we continue research to find better ways of producing and marketing better foods and at the same time carry on programs designed to cut back production of some commodities so supplies will more nearly match needs.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman came into my State recently to dedicate a new national animal disease laboratory in the city of Ames, and realistically faced up to this question. I might add, in that connection, that Secretary Freeman's ability to discuss every facet of foods and farming, knowledgeably and candidly, has encouraged Americans generally to take a fresh look at where we are and where we are going in agriculture.

Secretary Freeman explored "The Role of Research in Managed Abun-

dance" during the laboratory dedication program and I believe Members of Congress and both producers and consumers of foods will find his comments, which follow, interesting and informative:

THE ROLE OF RESEARCH IN MANAGED ABUNDANCE

(Address by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman at the dedication of the National Animal Disease Laboratory, Ames, Iowa, December 14, 1961)

Since becoming Secretary of Agriculture, I have been telling the people of the United States of the significant contribution to their welfare and to their standard of living which agriculture is making. Today, at the dedication of the National Animal Disease Laboratory, I believe we have a fitting occasion to show how research in agriculture benefits every person in every walk of life.

It is true that the American farmer is better off and has a better standard of living than farmers in most other countries, and production research has played a part in this. But, it is fair to say that the public has received a far greater proportion of benefits in terms of having available a plentiful supply of food at lower real cost than anywhere else in the world.

Let me illustrate this more specifically. In the past 50 years, our population has nearly doubled, while the number of farmworkers has been cut in half. Yet our people are better fed and better clothed today than ever before.

One farmer today can feed 26 people, but if we farmed with the same techniques and the same seeds, fertilizers, and chemicals used in 1940, we would need almost 6 million more workers on the farm.

But those 8 million workers can produce nearly half of all our manufactured goods. They can build all our new roads, new factories, and new homes; then can mine all our coal and iron, and leave more than enough manpower besides to drive our trucks and buses, run our railroads and airlines, supply our gas and electricity, and keep our telephones working.

And all the while, the productive success of those remaining on the farm has lowered food costs to the consumer from 25 percent of the average income in 1940 to 20 percent in 1960. By comparison, food costs in Western Europe take 30 to 45 percent of the average family income and in Russia food costs amount to well over 50 percent.

In this context, it would be fair to assume that the cost of this production research should be charged to the general public. Certainly, the benefits of continued research in developing more efficient and economical methods of producing food and fiber will be needed in the years ahead as our population increases and our standard of living continues to rise.

Yet, there are many people today who are puzzled by the fact that we are continuing this research in agricultural productivity.

They ask: "Why do we, on the one hand, continue research in agriculture to find better ways of producing farm commodities while on the other hand we are seeking to cut back production, to adjust farm output more nearly to the level of current need?"

Or they may phrase the question this way: "Why do we continue such practices as land drainage when we are paying farmers to take land out of production and put it to conserving uses?"

Now these are legitimate questions. At first glance there is a real and significant contradiction. And it is a contradiction which those of us in agriculture must understand more fully if we are first to show that it is a false analysis and, second, if we are to deal successfully with the problems of overproduction and low farm income.

I propose here to open a discussion which those in production research should pursue further and to attempt to clarify the role of research in a program of managed abundance in agriculture.

Let us look a little further below the surface of these contradictions. If we follow the analysis of those who raise this contradiction to its logical conclusion, they are saying, in effect, that we can better meet the challenge of agricultural abundance by making agriculture inefficient and less productive.

Without production research to make the agricultural economy more productive, the whole economy of a nation suffers. Without adequate food to feed its people, a nation cannot hope to begin raising the standard of living of its people.

I raise this point to emphasize this one fact: The primary goal of research in agriculture has been to raise the standard of living of all people by providing food and clothing at relatively lower cost, while making possible the development of other productive resources. It is the public policy in a democratic society such as ours to encourage activities which will provide the maximum benefit to the greatest number of people.

And agricultural research to increase productivity has contributed materially to the economic progress of the United States. I think it would be criminal to stop this research today because we would be stopping progress which benefits the economy as a whole.

Actually, success in terms of longrun production research is not something to be turned off and on. The present level of farm technology is the result of research which began decades ago, and in order to have adequate food supplies in the decades ahead, we will have to continue production research today—we must keep the production research pipelines full.

It is generally true that production research will not provide the answer to the problems of low farm income and overproduction, and we should be under no illusion that it will. The farm income problem is a special problem of economics which grows out of the lack of bargaining power the individual farmer has in terms of his influence in the market and on the problem of overproduction.

Thus we are dealing with two separate areas and two separate goals of agricultural research. Production research is designed to gain the maximum production in the most efficient and economical manner to provide for the future food and fiber needs of a whole nation.

Since it is difficult to obtain the precise amount of food and fiber needed at a particular time, it then becomes the task of economic research to develop methods which will lead to effective resource adjustment and supply management to insure that those who produce are not penalized for their efficiency.

When efforts are made to strengthen farm income by reducing the amount of land under cultivation, this should not lead to the conclusion that research, soil improvement and other conserving practices to make agriculture more efficient should be abandoned.

If we were to cease all efforts to make agriculture more efficient, we would interrupt the longrun progress which is necessary to insure that the general public will continue to eat better and more cheaply and from which the Nation as a whole will benefit.

We must continue to seek ways which will increase the share of the Nation's wealth which goes to the farmer, and this is an area where economic research in agriculture can play an important role. But we cannot expect a slackening in production research to help solve this problem any more than we can expect continued production research to have any appreciable benefit to the farmers as a group.

New and efficient practices will benefit, for a time, the farmer who is an innovator. By putting the product of research to work first, he gains a temporary economic advantage over his neighbor who does not act as quickly to put new technology into practice.

But eventually his neighbors adopt the same practices, and climbing production is soon followed by lower prices. The result is that the benefits of technology flow through the farmer to the consumer. This pattern is often missed by those who advocate research as the answer to the problem of low farm income, and their efforts serve only to confuse two different problems.

Research has a definite role in the agricultural program of the 1960's, both in its historic function to maximize the general standard of living and in the growing task to enable the farmer to share in the results of his productivity.

It is fitting, I believe, to turn our attention at the dedication of this animal disease research facility to this role of research in a policy of managed abundance in agriculture both now and for the future.

This group of buildings and the equipment they house represents the finest and most modern facility anywhere in the world for the study of animal diseases. From the scientists who are working here will come, we hope, some of the answers to animal diseases which today rob the farmer and the Nation of 11 out of every 100 hogs farrowed and take a heavy toll of cattle and poultry.

Thus this lab can contribute great value to the efficiency and productivity of the farmer if it can identify and cure the diseases as it has been designed to do.

But this is only one aspect of overall agricultural research for the 1960's. Today, in terms of the overall goal of Managed Abundance agricultural research should serve five ends:

It should help farmers prosper in a period of abundance.

It should help provide more and better food at reasonable cost for all Americans.

It should help protect our production potential.

It should help adjust land, water, and human resources to meet growing needs for recreation, forests, and open space.

It should strengthen our ability to use food as a major instrument of foreign aid.

Obviously, economic research, utilization research, marketing research, production research, and basic research all overlap in their contribution to these five ends. We cannot depend solely on utilization or marketing research to lift farm people to a level of prosperity in periods of abundance.

The search for new and expanded markets for farm commodities must be accompanied by production research which lowers costs and improves quality—and by economic research to mark the path of agricultural adjustment to economic growth.

It means that where we have in the past placed a major emphasis on production research, we now will be calling equally on all disciplines. Each area of research, and each research facility and each person engaged in research needs to view their role not as an end in itself, but as one part of the great single force of overall agricultural research.

It is this broad view—the new perspective of overall agricultural research—which will be most meaningful to the farmers and nonfarmers of the Nation in programs of Managed Abundance.

We should consider the overall impact of the research carried out here on animal disease as it relates to research carried out elsewhere on forages and mechanization, and further relate these programs to the eco-

nomic research or agricultural adjustment such as that being done at the Center for Agricultural Adjustment here on the campus at Ames.

We will continue expanding industrial and food uses for farm commodities through utilization research. It already has brought such well established innovations as frozen foods, concentrated fruit juices, potato flakes, and other dehydrated foods.

Scientists will continue the search to improve packaging, transportation, wholesaling, retailing, and other functions of the distributing process. Research in this area can produce savings—some of which may be passed on to the farmer but most of which will go to the consumer in lower prices—and it will result in better quality products.

The basic research in dietary problems will continue because there are many questions still be to answered that could lead to healthier lives for all the people of the Nation. We need to know more about the exact role played by fats in the diet and their effect on health. We need to know more about what nutrients are actually contained in the 1,000 most commonly used foods.

It also is vitally important that we continue production research to further improve farm production practices and the use of agricultural resources. In doing this, we protect the gains in farming efficiency which already have been made while maintaining the momentum of progress in creating further efficiency and economy.

No one here today can predict with precise accuracy what our population will be in the next 15 or 20 years, or what food and clothing needs of those people will be. We do know that the demand placed on our agricultural resources will be greater than they are today.

It then follows that if we are to maintain the high standard of living which we now have—and which the citizens of this country will expect to be continually improved—we will need to continue basic and applied research in agricultural production.

We not only must continue production research for this reason, but also for the simple fact that agriculture, as a science dealing with living things, is constantly changing.

In the past 10 years, for example, we have had to completely replace our durum wheat varieties, grown in the northern Great Plains, because of a new and more virulent race of stem rust disease. Oat producers in many areas have had to switch varieties completely three different times in the last 20 years to stay ahead of fungus diseases that otherwise would have made oat production completely unprofitable. It is the same story with livestock and other crops across the entire range of farm production.

In conjunction with production research, the continual improvement of conservation and resource management practices are equally as vital to meeting the Nation's needs in the years ahead. In many ways, they may become more important than production research since the pressure on land and forest is likely to increase even more rapidly than population will.

We should insure, within the context of conservation and land use management, that the best croplands are maintained—and improved—so that the food and fiber we will need can be produced when it is needed.

We should also be prepared to accommodate the rapidly increasing demand for recreation and leisure time activities. These pursuits which a high standard of living makes possible will require substantial amounts of land and forest areas.

I think it is apparent that overall agricultural research will occupy an important position in the agricultural programs of the 1960's. Research, in one sense, has become the power source to drive the massive agricultural machine which has developed around the democratic concept of family owned and operated farms.

It is, I believe, the public consensus that we should maintain the astounding productive vitality of this system, and I want to discuss the branch of research which will contribute most heavily to securing this goal.

There is an example of this branch of economic research at work on this campus—as I mentioned a moment ago—in the Center for Agricultural Adjustment. This unit was created several years ago to determine if a more coordinated approach to research would help bring the Nation closer to solving the basic farm problem of overproduction and low farm income.

The studies underway in the center, we hope, will shed new light on the means of developing the procedures which will be most useful in adjusting agricultural resources to produce the kind of food and fiber we want when we need it.

Economic research can address itself most directly to this task which, in itself, may provide the answer to the problems which the individual farmer faces today.

We know that, for the foreseeable future, the farmer can produce more food and fiber with presently known techniques than can be used commercially and concessionally at home and abroad. If we are going to correct this situation before it destroys those who have made our agricultural abundance possible, then we must accept the fact that we will need to develop the tools which can be applied to manage this abundance. In this effort, we will look to the scientist for help.

Scientific research is, in essence, the search for truth. Whether it is carried out in agriculture, or in nuclear energy or in the way man reacts to his environment, it is the means by which man seeks to expand the limits of his knowledge.

We often are troubled today because we don't know how to utilize the power which scientific research has given us—particularly in harnessing the atom for peaceful purposes rather than in experimenting with its destructive potential. But the progress which this research represents also gives us hope that the answer may be found tomorrow as we seek more knowledge.

We know that the search for knowledge in agriculture has produced the answer for many of our problems. Research has brought within reach the power to banish forever man's age-old fear of hunger and starvation. It has shown us how to take strontium 90 out of milk, and it has shown us how one farmer can be four times as efficient today as 50 years ago.

And so I believe that the stimulus of success in production research which has given us the power of an abundantly productive agriculture will lead, through research in economics, to an expansion in our knowledge which will enable the farmer to live with abundance as profitably as do all other people.

Tom Curtis Subject of Los Angeles Times Feature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, during a recent visit to California, our colleague Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS, of St. Louis, Mo., was the subject of a lengthy feature interview in the Los Angeles Times of October 25, 1961. The noted political analyst, James Bassett, talked to Mr. CURTIS at length and afterward wrote an editorial page feature, "A Conservative From Missouri Shows Them."

I have heard many favorable comments about this enlightening article about our constructive colleague, and with unanimous consent, I include the item in the Appendix as a portion of my remarks:

A CONSERVATIVE FROM MISSOURI SHOWS THEM

(By James Bassett)

Political neophytes in both major parties—aspiring to legislative careers—could learn a lot from Missouri's Representative TOM CURTIS, a Republican who has survived 11 rugged years in solidly Democratic St. Louis.

Surprisingly youthful at 50, with a graying crewcut and a pair of boyish dimples, CURTIS is the sort of man you'd always call "TOM"—not THOMAS BRADFORD, which is how he was christened.

He stopped briefly in Los Angeles en route to San Diego, where he conferred with another crewcut lawmaker, BOB WILSON, chairman of the GOP's congressional campaign committee.

As one of his party's top-ranking members, CURTIS will assist his good friend WILSON elect more GOP Congressmen. Their aim: 44 additional House seats.

But his own career, and the way he views a Federal legislator's duties, makes CURTIS a model for any political hopeful.

We asked him what sort of magic keeps him in office year after year in Missouri's bedrock Democratic stronghold, how he drew a 35,000-vote margin last November out of 220,000 ballots cast, and impelled the arch-liberal St. Louis Post-Dispatch to endorse him for the job.

Especially, we added, since he himself is an outspoken economic conservative.

"There's no magic about it," CURTIS grinned. "Just two things to remember—that you've got to take a stand, and you've got to know why you've taken it."

Naturally it's not that simple.

"A lot of people vote for me," CURTIS explains, "even when they don't agree with me." Why? "Because I do my homework, seek to know the issues, and don't straddle a fence."

His original election to Congress came when the new Taft-Hartley Act was under heavy fire from union labor. TOM CURTIS said he thought it was a good law. And he kept on defending it even during speeches in St. Louis' labor heartland.

"Some conservatives," CURTIS avers, "take a stand, but when they're pressed on their views, they don't know why they feel as they do. They operate from instinct rather than from their brain. That's a weakness."

The key to winning elections, CURTIS believes, is (a) finding good potential candidates, (b) providing an organization that will work loyally for them, and (c) seeing that they get their ideas before the voters.

Shown a political map of Los Angeles County, where Democrats seem to have a dominant edge in 11 of the 15 revamped congressional districts, CURTIS shrugged. It's rough on the GOP, he said, but "not too discouraging."

"You can always knock off the hacks with strong candidates," he declared. "Fellows who know the issues and can discuss them will surmount unfavorable registration and the so-called party label handicap."

First time CURTIS stood for office, he offered to debate with the labor-backed Democratic incumbent. His opponent refused. So CURTIS debated anyhow—against an

empty chair on which sat a big placard depicting a rubber stamp.

He regards himself as a constructive conservative—a battler for reform rather than merely rejection of programs involving welfare, civil rights, education, and Federal spending.

"My aim," CURTIS says, "is to make Government economy believable. That's better than the 'meat-ax approach.'"

Asked about the apparent conservative resurgence, he replied: "Conservatives are better organized. They're being heard. They're also more articulate in getting their message across."

But he added: "Where conservatives tend to become simply dogmatic, they hurt themselves and their cause."

Nevertheless, the ardent rightwing may cancel out the extreme left, CURTIS figures, and thus leave the middle ground as the proper area for both parties to "consider rational issues."

"BARRY GOLDWATER," he thinks, "has taken the 'curse' off being an honest, dedicated conservative in politics."

St. Louis-born, Dartmouth-educated TOM CURTIS is the senior Republican member of the joint Senate-House Economic Committee. As such, he's been able to make known his bold, unswerving ideas on how the U.S. budget ought to be handled.

The key is "fiscal responsibility," as he sees it.

For example, whereas CURTIS urges strict economy on a "need" basis, he leads a movement to expand Federal retraining programs for workers displaced by automation. He wants Congress to maintain its position as controller of the country's finances.

CURTIS contends that the Federal tax structure inhibits national growth—particularly in the field of small business.

We suspect you'll be hearing a great deal more about TOM CURTIS and his "constructive conservatism" as the 1962 midterm campaign progresses.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

NOVEMBER 12, 1961.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I am in hopes that you will be successful in attaining the passage of House Resolution No. 211. I understand that it will establish a Captive Nations Committee.

This committee should be formed to keep the issue of Moscow's colonialism constantly in the world spotlight.

The best of luck to you, sir.

Sincerely,

JACK B. SHARER.

DALLAS, TEX.

OLYMPIA, WASH.,
November 12, 1961.

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: My husband and I want you to know we are in complete agreement with House Resolution 211 pertaining to captive nations.

Sincerely,

Maj. and Mrs. J. W. SHOTT,
(Retired).

NOVEMBER 14, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Please accept this as our support of your "Captive Nations Resolution," that is House Resolution 211. We would sincerely appreciate receiving a copy from you, of this resolution.

Our Government seems to have mania for joining in with the Kremlin to blacklist our friends for colonialism, such as Portugal and Belgium. Meanwhile we ignore the biggest imperialists of all, the Soviet Union. Bearing in mind our failures to act in Hungary and Cuba, it is about time that we recognize this powerful weapon, the captive nations behind the Iron Curtain, and use it to further the cause of world freedom.

Continue your fine efforts, and thank you for your attention to our request.

Very truly yours,

Mr. and Mrs. JAMES F. MCAULIFFE.

SEATTLE, WASH.

HERRICK, S. DAK., *November 18, 1961.*

Congressman FLOOD,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We heartily support your bill No. 211 and wish to add our names to your list of supporters.

Tell the world what Russia does and stop helping them get the upper hand, in so many places, even making headway in our own country.

Send them all home and don't bother to talk. They have proven, no one can trust anything they say.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. HENRY CRUME.

TUCSON, ARIZ., *November 16, 1961.*

DEAR SIR: My sincere appreciation to you in your efforts to combat the Communist conspiracy by introducing House Resolution 211, to furnish material to the opposition to communism in the captive countries. Could you send me a few copies of House Resolution 211 so that I may enlist the support of other Americans in this most worthy proposal?

Sincerely,

CLARENCE F. KERNKAMP.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am very happy to learn that you plan to introduce a bill to Congress whereby a Committee for the Captive Nations would be considered.

This makes me very happy as I have relatives who are behind the Iron Curtain and it grieves me to think there is so little done by this free Nation to give them hope for future release.

A bill such as you propose would do much to encourage them and to let them know they are not forgotten.

Very truly yours,

N. S. PLODINEC, Sr.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.

TUTWILER, MISS.,
November 18, 1961.

DEAR SIR: As chairman of the House Rules Committee, I want to urge you to do your utmost to pass Congressman FLOOD's House Resolution 211 to establish a Special House Committee on Captive Nations.

I want to commend you on your vigorous work in behalf of our country. May God give you the strength to continue your courageous work. The "grassroots" people here are stirring. If we can do anything to help the cause, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Mrs. THOS. J. BRUISTER.

NOVEMBER 21, 1961.

The following is a copy of a letter to Members of the House and Rules Committee:

(Attention of Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania.)

"*Members of the House and Rules Committee,*
Washington, D.C.

"GENTLEMEN: DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, is the sponsor of the resolution to establish a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. I understand the Republican Congressional Policy Committee is on record favoring such a committee.

"I, too, am heartily in favor of such a committee. This is something the public needs to be informed on. It is a subject Khrushchev fears and therefore is invaluable as an aid to the United States in the cold war. Lets keep it that way by using the assets we do have.

"I urge you to pass this measure.

"Sincerely,

"BLANCHE BUSH.

"SANTA BARBARA, CALIF."

NOVEMBER 27, 1961.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I am 100 percent behind your House Resolution 211. I also feel this the greatest weapon we have and that we should start with first things first. Good luck and hoping this goes through. Voter.

LOUISE WILBER HADLEY.

NOVEMBER 27, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I am glad that you have introduced a House Resolution No. 211 to establish a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. I am writing to my own Congressman to support your bill and I trust that it will pass in the next session.

Yours very truly,

SHELDON HANEMANN.

NEW ORLEANS, LA.

Christian Education: The Leaven of Leadership in a Free Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, on December 10, 1961, at Shawnee, Okla., Dr. James Ralph Scales was inaugurated as the ninth president of Oklahoma Baptist University.

A native Oklahoman and a graduate of OBU, Dr. Scales has received advanced degrees from the University of Oklahoma and the University of Chicago. In his doctoral dissertation he made a distinguished contribution to the history of Oklahoma politics.

In his years of productive work at the university he has proven himself to be the kind of educator Thomas Jefferson had in mind when he wrote in 1822:

> I look to the diffusion of light and education as the resource most to be relied on for ameliorating the condition, promoting the virtue and advancing the happiness of man.

His inaugural address, which points to the central problem of our times, follows:

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION: THE LEAVEN OF LEADERSHIP IN A FREE SOCIETY

(By Dr. James Ralph Scales, president, Oklahoma Baptist University)

I here publicly accept, in the presence of this great company of scholars, the office of president of the university. Eight great and good men have wrought well here; one of them remains to serve with me.

I assume these responsibilities with certain convictions: that education is life's greatest investment; that the higher learning is essential to the survival of civilization; and that this kind of school is indispensable in the total pattern of public and private education in this country. The leaven of spiritual leadership in Christian lands comes from places like this. I announce no new discovery but, as William Blake said, "When I tell the truth, it is not for the sake of convincing those who do not know, but for the sake of defending those who do."

In reviewing the life of an institution, as in language study or in philosophy, it is good practice to go back to the roots. On the medallion I wear is the motto of the university, "veritas eruditione religioneque" (truth through learning and religion). Baptists have always been in the mainstream of our society, and their concern for education indicates they intend to stay there. They believe with William Penn, "religion ought not take men out of the world; it ought to put them back into the world to better it and purify it." Like the great Quaker, our people have been activists; they have not been afraid to put their faith or their learning to the test of human experience.

We despise not the day of small things when we say that our beginnings were humble, that the educational fare was often limited, and the social program the classic one of the hilltop denominational college: high thinking and plain living. If we may believe the reminiscences of early alumni, the climate had something of the sourness of puritanism without the discipline and beauty of that great movement. The founders committed us in the charter to "instruction in all branches of knowledge," a ruinously ambitious program. Even today it is beyond the scope of any single institution.

But there was here 50 years ago the nucleus of a good college. Fortunate were the first students in the quality of their seven-man faculty. The curriculum was not much more than the medieval trivium and quadrivium, but these dedicated men, who endured privations to found this school, did the main thing well. Knowledge grows exponentially with every passing decade, so that the 1961 curriculum is more nearly a centrivium of subjects, many of them unknown in 1910, but our purpose holds: to do the main thing well.

Those halcyon days of peace before 1914, when most of our colleges were established, seemed to be a solid, ordered world of certainties. To those who come into places of leadership in these parlous times, few things are certain: Every morning's surprises rob last night's certainties of their meaning. The atmosphere of our time is contaminated with the fallout of rampant evil. Our country, our planet, our universe, are theaters of strife. We are in danger of tearing ourselves apart—youth against elder, rural interest against urban, class against class, race against race, the radical left and the radical right.

There is another danger, imposed on us by the struggle for continents and space. General Eisenhower, in his farewell address as President, voiced the curious warning—curious, that is, from a man of his background—that our way of life may be threatened by a military-industrial complex, ready to regiment our lives in the name of military necessity. It is a warning that the custodians of free institutions must heed.

For submerging everything else is the cold war, waged with every weapon short of Armageddon. And we must not complacently suppose that the ultimate cannot happen to us. In Robert Levitt's warning, "If Khrushchev's public statement 'we will bury you' does not have a message for us, then words have lost their meaning."

What kind of response do we, the bountifully endowed 6 percent of the world's people, have in this crisis? What appeal have we against the battle song of the Communist International?

> Arise, ye workers of the world;
> Arise, ye wretched of the earth;
> For justice thunders condemnation,
> A new world's in birth.

Do freemen have the spiritual resilience for the sacrifices ahead? We need not go beyond the best-seller list to form a disquieting picture of the average American college graduate: The Organization Man, The Waste Makers, The Image Merchants, The Operators, The Status Seekers, The Ugly American, and other recent sociological works and contemporary novels. These are hollow men who have lost their way—cynical, grasping, lacking in abiding values. Their society is adrift, meretricious in its standards. If these are accurate judgments,

> We are here as on a darkling plain
> Swept with confused alarms of struggle and light
> Where ignorant armies clash by night.

And thus paralyzed, we shall be one with Nineveh and Tyre.

Education must do better than this. If, by applying the motto on this emblem, we can achieve a new integrity in our individual lives, and a new unity in our corporate life, we may yet witness not the sunset of civilization, but the explosive dawn of a new age of genius. There have been two such creative periods in the history of the West: one, in the city states of Greece in the fourth and fifth centuries before Christ, and the other, throughout Western Europe in the age we call the Renaissance. The third great age of human creativity can be now. If this vital link is to be strengthened, we must address ourselves to two groups—the learned who are indifferent to religion; the religious who are afraid of learning.

We of the scholarly professions have often failed in the painful process of interpreting the real issues of life—in history, and science, and philosophy. We wait for the Gallup Poll to tell us what to think. We seek the ivory tower, escaping into a world of detachment and frivolity. Our scholarship is too often irrelevant to the world's sore need. True understanding cannot be forced, but our students are justified in the impatient question, made famous by Marshal Foch, "Do quoi s'agit-il?" (what's the point?). In the phrase of our own "Uncle Jimmy" Owens, we must "teach as for eternity."

The laudable ideal of learning for its own sake becomes, on too many a campus, a precious intellectualism, shared by an ever more restricted circle, a private dialog ending in a private joke. It is right that we guard against the tendency to become wise in our own conceits and to remember the obligations of sharing in a democratic society. The gifted do their best work, I think, where they must observe a decent respect for the opinion of mankind.

In the house of intellect, we are needlessly divided, even men of good will. Pettishly, we refuse to recognize other scholars and their work. C. P. Snow's concept of the Two Cultures, the sciences and the humanities, each indifferent to the other, is well known. Communication between the two, he says, is all but stopped. One of the advantages of a small campus is that men of many disciplines can still talk to one another in an easy fellowship.

No one who cares about the future direction of our society can afford to ignore science—at least since August 6, 1945; and I am glad that the young Dean, a scientist who took office with me, is dedicated to bridging the gap in our understanding. Under his leadership, strong programs will be advanced. Yet it is not too much to ask that the scientific subjects be taught in the humane tradition. If science and technology are to gain a monopoly of the curriculum or to be taught in a mechanical way, we are already brutalized. Rockets and missiles are no more urgent than Plato or Paul, Isaiah or Santayana.

All of us recall Job's catalog of woe, and his final humiliation, when God revealed himself to Job and to us:

> "For I will demand of thee and declare thou unto Me
> "Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth?
> "Declare if thou hast understanding.
> "Whereupon were the foundations of the earth fastened?
> "Or who laid the cornerstone thereof,
> "When the morning stars sang together,
> "And all the sons of God shouted for joy?"

We, like Job, sometimes fail to see the unending miracles passing before our eyes every day. You recall, further along in that 38th chapter:

> "Hast thou entered into the springs of the sea?
> "Have the gates of death been revealed unto thee?
> "Declare, if thou knowest at all.
> "Hast thou entered the treasures of the snow,
> "Or hast thou seen the treasures of the hail?
> "Hast the rain a father? Or who hast begotten the drops of dew?
> "Canst thou bind the cluster of the Pleiades, or loose the bands of Orion?"

And on and on—God's great satiricial questions to Job, each of which admits of but one humbling answer.

And the scholar is humble before the questions he cannot answer. We must remember that truth enters lowly doors sometimes, as it did enter this world in the person of Him whom we serve, and whom to know aright is life eternal.

We of the intellectual community must do a better job of understanding the business community; the special needs of the churches; the achievements of men who toil in hard places to lift mankind a little above the bestial level of existence.

We of the spiritual community must defend the scholar. From primitive times, people have feared the scholar and his magic. Even sophisticated Athens, at long last, took its vengeance on the superior Socrates. There are still those who fear the implications of free inquiry.

Church-related colleges have known the caution of expediency. After Darwin, there was the flight from higher critisicm; after Scopes, the flight from anthropology. After three centuries of geographical isolation, the flight from foreign languages as unnecessary and possibly un-American. Let us absorb the lessons of the census figures. A once great rural denomination has become, like the society of which it is part, a greater urban denomination with a better educated constituency. Shall we retreat into idle hopes and empty dreams about a world which is past? Shall we temporize with the forces that would curb the free growth of the human spirit? Can we compel the heart to retain what the head has rejected?

For my own part, let me say that my beloved denomination has never imposed restraints on me in two decades in these classrooms. In times of bitter conflict, and teaching in a controversial field, I have been restricted only by my own ignorance. And I have been constrained by a sense of responsibility.

But there are those who look on the role of the college as a mirror—only reflecting the society that created it, and the most timid, common denominator of the constituency it serves. Let it be said in billboard language: A university does not follow, it leads. If it retreats, it retreats into disaster. We drive out the good minds of our fellowship at our own peril.

An unexamined faith will not sustain us long. As President Boone commented in the 1930 inaugural, "Ignorance may be bliss, but it is never piety." No Christian can mark off any area of his life as out of bounds to the intellect. No citizen can quarantine his life or his nation's life as out of bounds to the theological and the ethical. If the education of the individual is viewed in its entirety, disciplined hearts must dwell in the same body as disciplined minds.

This, then, is our mission: nothing less than providing Christian leadership for a free society. The role of reconciliation is better taken by those who have an enlightenment from within. We must not fail to speak freely and responsibly. To perpetuate freedom we have to practice it. In the spirit of reconciliation, divergent views are blended. Warring men identify in their foes the spark of divinity that reposes in us all. Old enmities give way; intellect stoops to candor; and reason to faith.

Any discourse on education in a free society must advert to Thomas Jefferson, to whose sublime spirit we credit the most significant American contributions to the rights of men: freedom of the person, freedom of religion, freedom of the mind. With sure instinct, he saw these three achievements when he wrote his own epitaph. Ignoring the great offices he had held, he chose for his monument the Declaration of Independence, the Virginia Statute on Religious Liberty, the University of Virginia. In an age when Burke was extolling the wisdom of prejudice, Jefferson bestowed on his fellow countrymen a passion for a divine sanity—which has not faded under the pressures of war or revolution or reaction. This versatile mortal, who in his letter to the Danbury Baptists, acknowledged his debt to our own fellowship, set us on the right course. "And today the yeast of his revolutionary thought still moves upon the waters and in the spirit of man in Africa, Asia, and Latin America." His vow of eternal hostility to every form of tyranny over the mind of man remains a beacon to scholars everywhere. This founder of the public university system, himself a product of the liberal arts college, never believed that all wisdom had been crystallized in his generation, and must be handed down intact, for "the earth belongs to the living." Julian Boyd, the distinguished editor of Jefferson's papers, said of the intellectual preparation Jefferson had at William and Mary College, "One thing we can be sure of is that his teachers did not try to instill in him the idea that this was the best of all possible worlds or that colonial Virginia was a stable orderly society incapable of improvement. William and Mary prepared him for a world of change."

And he helped change it.

What Jefferson had to say about freedom was not just for colonial rural society. His principles have served well this empire of cities; and today, where cross the crowded ways of life, men of intellect no less than untutored men of the soil, bless his memory. Soul freedom, intellectual freedom go together.

Jefferson was the living embodiment of the spirit of reconciliation in his own spacious life. There was no more bitter rivalry in American history than that which pitted him against John Adams. Yet in their retirement, as passions cooled, the two became great friends; and American letters have been enriched by the volumes of correspondence that passed between them. It is a feast of reason. Every subject was examined by these elder statesmen, so different in backgrounds and attitudes. Adams, with his unbending New England sense of duty, mellowed under the gentle urging of Jefferson's mind. Jefferson, confessing that music was his great passion, science his delight, agriculture his cherished occupation, and his beloved Monticello the end of all his private dreams, subordinated all these pursuits to the higher duty that society imposes on the citizen. Each man, in the spirit of reconciliation, helped the other, and together they have enlightened all posterity.

It is a coincidence of American history that on the 50th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1826, both lay dying. The old man in Massachusetts, in his last words saluted the old man in Virginia, his erstwhile enemy but eternal friend: "Thomas Jefferson still lives"—and he does, he does, so long as men love freedom and cherish truth.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of January 13, 1962:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, Jan. 13, 1962)

The opening of the 2d session of the 87th Congress went according to expectation. The usual opening formalities were followed by the unusual election, in the off year, of a new Speaker and reorganization of the House made necessary by the death of Sam Rayburn. The Democrats, in caucus, nominated as their candidate for Speaker of the House, JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts. We Republicans nominated CHARLES HALLECK, of Indiana. On the rollcall vote every Democrat voted for Mr. MCCORMACK and the Republicans, without exception, cast their votes for Mr. HALLECK. This points up, once again, the importance of the first vote and illustrates the argument I have been making for 7 years, the fallacy in the thinking that a conservative Democrat can be effective in Congress as an advocate of conservatism. With that first vote every single Democrat supported the liberal JOHN MCCORMACK, who is listed in the ACA index with a 0 rating, and thus insured the continuation of the most liberal Members of the House as chairmen of key committees such as Education and Labor, Judiciary, Government Operations, and Public Works, all headed by men with 100-percent ADA voting records.

My reaction to the President's state of the Union message was simply stated to the press as "God help us for the President's total lack of understanding of sound economics, and the role of freemen in a free society." I consider it fortunate for the Nation that the most vital of his proposals regarding trade and tariffs, socialized medicine, and taxes will have to be threshed out in the Ways and Means Committee, of which I am a member, and where we do have some solid thinkers who firmly believe in constitutional government.

As this historic session of Congress begins, it seems to me important that I restate the basic beliefs I hold, all constructive, all positive, and which I have repeated to the people of Dallas County many times. The Americans for Constitutional Action have stated these principles in such clear language that I am borrowing their seven points to restate my own thinking. (1) I am for safeguarding the God-given dignity of the individual and promoting sound economic growth by strengthening constitutional government. Which means I must be against "group morality" and a socialized economy through centralization of power. (2) I am for sound money and against inflation. (3) I am for the private, competitive market and against Government interference. This means I am for protecting the individual's freedom of choice and a competitive market and against price-fixing, wage-fixing, and Federal controls. (4) I am for local self-government and against central government intervention. Simply put this means I am for the citizen's right to be let alone and opposed to Federal Government intervention in local government and private affairs. (5) I am for private ownership and against Government ownership. I believe strongly in the free enterprise system of private ownership and control of the means of production and distribution as opposed to the Socialist-Communist doctrine of government ownership of the means of production and in this connection I strongly oppose the unfair competition of Government with private, competitive enterprise. (6) I am for individual liberty and against coercion. I believe in protecting individual rights and responsibilities and will fight against the coercion of indivduals through Government sanctions. (7) And finally, I am for national sovereignty of the United States and will do all in my power to strengthen and preserve it.

It is my sincere hope that every citizen of the Fifth District of Texas will consider carefully these concepts of Government and the destined role of the United States in world history, so that in assessing my stewardship as your Representative in Congress

for the past 7 years, you will know for certain whether or not you are in agreement or disagreement with these principles. It is a mystery to me, and I wish someone could explain the paradox which permits honest men to publicy advocate States rights, the free enterprise system, elimination of Federal controls, adherence to the above-stated seven basic principles of a free society, and then turn right around and urge support of candidates who are part of an administration and a party leadership dedicated to insuring the passage of programs directly opposed to these fundamental principles.

So once again I have stated my beliefs. But it is our Government. That means you. If you share these beliefs you have the opportunity (and your country needs you) to join with me in preserving a free society for free people.

Another's view of our President's state of the Union message might well be: "We cannot expect the Americans to jump from capitalism to communism, but we can assist their elected leaders in giving Americans small doses of socialism, until they suddenly awake to find they have communism" (Nikita Khrushchev).

Dartmouth's President Dickey Dwells on Cold War and Liberal Learning at Convocation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, John Sloan Dickey, president of Dartmouth College, in opening the 1961–62 year of Dartmouth addressed the attention of the college's convocation audience to the problem of the cold war and liberal learning. President Dickey, as the president of one of the country's leading colleges and as an observer with a distinguished record of public service, eloquently sets forth some vital considerations in preserving the greatness of this country in the struggle of the cold war. I believe President Dickey's observations are well worth the attention and consideration of my colleagues and of the country and for this reason I am making them available below in the RECORD:

THE COLD WAR AND LIBERAL LEARNING

(Convocation address by John Sloan Dickey, president, Dartmouth College, September 25, 1961)

Colleagues and gentlemen of the college, we are privileged this morning to gather for the purposes of peace, but it has been a close thing. Indeed, it has been a closer thing this summer than men should pretend to calculate. Once great nations publicly assume the posture of war toward each other, like schoolboys squared off with precariously balanced chips on their shoulders, no one can be sure what comes next. Let us hope that at least this common truth is never lost to sight in either Moscow or Washington.

Just 7 days ago this morning the inscrutable hand of tragedy took the life of a valiant man. Death is always an awful teacher, but the death of a great man at the height of his effort makes his life a lesson for all mankind. If the lesson of Dag Hammarskjold's life and death escapes us, there is surely no learning here or elsewhere in the world that can save us from becoming a footnote on the pages of history's unlearned lessons. Let us pay this man's work the only tribute he coveted—our commitment to it.

At such a parlous time one wonders what can usefully be said in public by private persons. The temptation is strong either to stay silent or to indulge oneself by castigating the foe. Manifestly, a fresh measure of such castigation is merited, but it is also evident that there is no shortage of tongues eager to perform this service. Understandably, there are fewer of us standing in line to speak of those things which as a nation we ought to have done but have left undone, let alone those things which we have done and ought not to have done.

One good but terrifying reason why such reticence in self-examination grows among us is the spreading conviction on the part of Americans that short of "rolling over and playing dead" there is nothing we could do that would make any real difference in Kremlin policies, that is, nothing except being just as ruthless and rough, just as conspiratorial and unreliable, in fine, just as fundamentally unapproachable as the Soviet leaders themselves.

Silence, at such a time, is human in another respect. Whether out of a sense of fellow feeling or some personal experience with these things, most of us strongly prefer not to make the road any rougher than it is for the hard-pressed, able men who manage the foreign affairs of our Nation and who but for the grace of God—and a few thousand votes—would still be as omniscient as the rest of us. Moreover, I am sure that in world affairs, as the marriage experts tell us is true in marital affairs, leaving a few things unsaid each day is the most potent secret weapon of all.

I cannot put such considerations wholly aside and I should not myself today venture public utterances about the cold war for the purpose of offering gratuitous advice either to Mr. Khrushchev or to those whose business it is to represent us in these matters. I have decided to say what I do because what we are as a nation is the business of education and as far as you and I are concerned the time to decide what that is to be is now.

Silence ceases to be golden when it masks from ourselves as well as others our most fundamental character and our deepest concerns. A progressively stifled democratic process does just that. My concern today is to suggest that we have reached a point in the cold war where along with the risk of war we must reckon with the fact that it will not profit America to win any struggle if thereby as a nation we lost our character, or as the Bible would put it, our soul.

We now know for a certainty that, at best, the twilight of the cold war will be indefinitely prolonged. From here on for a long time nothing is going to be "normal," not even the emergencies. In the course of our growing up as a nation we have learned to live with the kind of wartime emergency in which by common consent, for the self-limiting period of a shooting war, we suspended democratic prerogatives and practices, as we said, "for the duration." We met the "clear and present danger" of these emergencies confident that in relatively short order we could and would return to our normal ways by simply throwing off the limitations on liberty we had ourselves invoked.

Civilians—and junior military officers—have long taunted generals with the charge that they always prepare to win the last war, not the next one. And yet our civilian leaders in public and private life will, I think, be committing the same folly if they attempt to lead America through the endemic and endless "crisis" of the cold war on an emergency basis.

Consider but these two difficulties. In the first place, taking human nature for what it has been up to now, is there good reason to believe that we—not to speak of our varied allies—could sustain a sense of emergency for a generation or so? And one only needs to recall the fable about the danger in the repeated shouting of "wolf" to be aware of the cumulative peril to the Nation of any attempt, however sincere and justified by circumstances, to sustain an alert and resolute national mood by repeated invocations of an emergency spirit.

And even if we should somehow be successful in sustaining a mood of wartime emergency for another generation what would we have? My fear is that we would have a nation that had lost its appetite for freedom and forgotten how ever again to make the democratic process work. Let us never underestimate what even one generation of such indoctrination can do to a people. The Soviet itself provides the most instructive example we could have.

No, if we are to win, or even to coexist as a free society, we must continue to exist as a free society. Over the long pull we now face we must preserve the democratic process, not by leaving it behind us piece by piece as the going gets steeper, but by taking it with us to new levels of maturity and effectiveness. Even if the going is never easier in our time and if, as often in the past, an unforeseen future needs to rescue our beleaguered present, a better future will know where to look for us and our rescue will be worth the effort because we stayed on the course freemen have always set for themselves.

On this course we need to talk with each other, even on occasion to argue out which way is up. Certainly silence about such things is not good for America and conversely neither will self-criticism on such terms give comfort to a foe whose ways we wish to follow no more by mistake than by design.

In point of time we are today able to examine our position at a moment when the Soviet by flaunting its perfidy in negotiations that concerned all mankind has made us, as the phrase goes, "look good." And there is surely no more propitious place for checking the course of a free society than in a historic college whose commitment to man's fulfillment in freedom antedates even our Nation's birth.

Beyond these considerations of time and place that bid us be bold in self-examination, there is the great, overriding fundamental that we cannot hope to win for our purposes and our ways by beating the Soviet Union at its own game of secrecy, duplicity, and self-deception. Champions in all fields know many good reasons for not playing the other fellow's game, but in this great contention which we call the cold war, I suggest that there is one imperative reason for not doing it: there are simply too many decent people everywhere who don't care who wins that sort of a game, who won't play the part of pawns in it and who ultimately will be content to see the participants in such a struggle fall of their own futility. This, I assume all would agree, is not the way we want anyone to feel about America or any cause to which she commits her might. We neither want it nor can we afford it.

And yet do we even now recognize how close we came last April to putting our cause in this light? Confronted as we are with Castro's pathologies and provocations, can we yet see the extent to which the Cuban affair revealed American foreign policies and our democratic process were being compromised by the cold war? I put it this way because I think we reckon only with the superstructure of what we hit if we dispose of this fiasco as simply a tragic miscalculation in an intelligence operation or as merely a bad round in a wholly honorable opposition to the perversions of Fidelismo.

Test the matter by trying on yourself the view of some that the only thing wrong with our part in this whole business was that it failed. Assume, if you will, that it had succeeded and that an American sponsored regime governed in Cuba today: what would be the outlook for mutual respect and trust between us and the 19 other independent nations of Latin America in the decisive decade ahead; where would the promise of our alliance for progress with those nations be today? If it had succeeded would there be any stopping those among us who would commit this Nation to the dead end hope that we really can beat international communism at its own game of conspiratorial imperialism? If it had succeeded would future public assurances by our highest officials concerning our noninvolvement in such things elsewhere be likely to pass current within our own democratic process, let alone in the marketplaces of public opinion throughout the world? Could a great nation committed to such policies ever hope to lead the United Nations into a new era of greater effectiveness?

Can there long be any great doubt about the answer America must give to such questions? If after the hurt to pride is gone we still are in doubt about such questions I fear we must face the possibility that schizophrenia in American foreign policy could be as dangerous to us as the paranoia of the Kremlin.

It has been said that "America is promises" and surely no nation has surpassed us for nearly two centuries as a proclaimer of the ideals of freedom and of honorable international behavior. At this point in history a terrible burden of proof rests on anyone who proposes to seek a worthy future for such a nation outside those promises and those ideals. In the large view it is not a nation's mistakes that are at issue but her character.

We are led by a President who went far in personally assuming officialdom's amply shared responsibility for the aberrations of policy and process that culminated in the sad but salutary fiasco of April 1961. Now, it is for all of us to assume the larger responsibility of demonstrating afresh to ourselves and to others that we are worthy to lead in the ways of freedom and honor because we follow in those ways.

No men ought to welcome such a challenge more gladly and more confidently than those who are committed to the work of liberal learning. Gladly, because unless America is willing to seek her destiny in this direction, liberal learning will soon be asking the dinosaur to move over in the bed of things past; confidently, because this is what liberal learning at its best is all about.

Whether one looks to the classical origin of the liberal arts as studies befitting free men or, as I prefer, we approach such learning more dynamically as a personal introduction to man's ongoing need to liberate himself from the meanness and meagerness of mere existence, liberal learning has always spoken to those things in man's experience that enlarge both his enjoyment of his knowledge and the management of his ignorance. Any learning that is relevant to contemporary life must be concerned with the kind of knowledge that can be measured and put to proof of demonstration but if that learning is also to instruct man in the enjoyment of his lot and the management of his imperfections, it must not shy from embracing those intangible elements in human experience that are as inescapable as they are immeasurable. It is to such learning, in class and out, that Dartmouth stands committed.

The relevance of this kind of learning to the contemporary condition of man needs no laboring here, but I will close with the avowed conviction that nothing is more important to the vigor and responsiveness of liberal learning in America today than that the undergraduate college with its unique institutional concern for the total fulfillment of both the individual and his society should remain at the heart of things because it is concerned with the heart of things.

May it be so with us here in the year ahead, and being so, may the privilege of this day prosper in our learning and in our lives.

And now, men of Dartmouth, as I have said on this occasion before, as members of the college you have three different but closely intertwined roles to play:

First, you are citizens of a community and are expected to act as such. Second, you are the stuff of an institution and what you are it will be. Thirdly, your business here is learning and that is up to you. We'll be with you all the way, and good luck.

The Common Market: An Entree to the New Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the prospects of a prospering and enlarged European Common Market, to which the United States and other members of the free world have direct access through a mutual reduction in trade barriers, is one of the most challenging and potentially rewarding developments in recent years.

Much has been written on this subject already, and much more will be forthcoming during the next months as this vital subject is debated. I would like, however, Mr. Speaker, to call my colleagues' attention to the penetrating comments of two distinguished columnists, Walter Lippmann and Roscoe Drummond, which appeared in the Washington Post last month.

I would also like to call my colleagues' attention to the editorial which appeared in yesterday's New York Times citing the significant advance made by the Common Market's Council of Ministers in agreeing to a common farm policy. As the Times so correctly stated:

In our own interests the Common Market's advance needs to be followed quickly by congressional approval of the President's program.

In addition to the important points made by Mr. Lippmann and Mr. Drummond in their articles, I would also like to stress the point made by the distinguished Under Secretary of State, George Ball, in his speech before the National Trade Convention in New York in November. Mr. Ball explained that we dare not turn our backs on the logic of our own economic position; a position which for the last 30 years has led the world toward freer trade. To do so would set off a chain reaction of retaliation and counterretaliation that would do irreparable harm to the free world—our own economy included. We would give up any claim to a role of leadership in the free world and we would deny the very strength and vitality of the economic system for which we stand.

These are telling arguments, Mr. Speaker, and I urge my colleagues to give them their thoughtful study and consideration:

[From the New York Times]

THE COMMON MARKET ADVANCES

When their complex and long-drawn-out negotiations finally ended in the early hours of yesterday morning, the members of the European Common Market's Council of Ministers were exhausted, but understandably jubilant. By finally agreeing to a common farm policy they had broken a major roadblock and had made it possible to go on to the next stage of Western Europe's economic integration. It was a historic achievement. The magnitude of this success can be understood only if it is remembered that farm politics are at least as important and sensitive in Western Europe as they are here. Agreement required compromise between France—whose farmers are relatively efficient and are clamoring for wider markets—and West Germany, whose farmers are relatively inefficient, high-cost producers concerned about the dangers of increased competition from imported food.

This new success will presumably set free still more additional creative and productive forces in the nations affected, thus permitting still more rapid economic growth in this area. But there will be repercussions abroad as well. For Britain, clearly, the advance in Brussels will increase the pressures which had earlier induced the British Government to apply for Common Market membership. It is virtually certain that the tempo will be quickened in Britain's negotiations for entry, and a similar stepped-up pace is likely also for the efforts to gain Common Market admission for other nations associated with Britain in the European Free Trade Association. Now the prospect looks brighter than ever that the 1960's will witness the economic—and perhaps also the political—unification of almost all Western Europe.

It would be perilous to ignore the implications of the Brussels success for our own economy. Western Europe is a major export market for the products of our farms and factories. Without adequate action on our part, the future growth of the Common Market could damage our interests by reducing our sales in that area. That growth could also stimulate the export of long-term capital from our Nation to Western Europe. The action needed to cope with the new problems posed by the Common Market is the adoption of the new trade policy President Kennedy outlined last week. In our own interest the Common Market's advance needs to be followed quickly by congressional approval of the President's program.

ACROSS THE OLD FRONTIER

(By Walter Lippmann)

There is an important connection between the talks now going on in Paris about the Western position on Berlin and the speech which the President made last week in New York to the National Association of Manufacturers. The speech in New York prepares the way for the great and historic business of uniting the non-Communist world in one free or low tariff trading area. As this is achieved, problems like that of Berlin will become more manageable because the overall political and ecoonmic power of the West will be more than a match for the Communist world.

If this sounds like a big claim, imagine what the situation would become in Berlin if the non-Communist world split up into quarreling trading blocs—Common Market, the other Europeans, the British, the Africans, the Latin Americans and the United States. No amount of beating our breasts about defeating communism will be worth

a tinker's dam if the West refuses to unite.

It goes without saying that there are enormously complicated and difficult problems that will have to be solved before a sufficient degree of unity is achieved. Never before in history has a situation existed like that which we now face. Until very recently the U.S. economy was unique. It was based on a rich continent in which trade was free, and on this continent the American people, who were drawn in the main from the highly civilized nations of Europe, produced for themselves a standard of life which is preeminent. Only in the past few years, only since the foundation of the Common Market in Western Europe, has there begun to exist in the Western World an economy capable of being compared with that of the United States.

Today, when it has become probable that Great Britain will join the Common Market, drawing with her in some form of association the rest of Western Europe, the United States must make itself ready to live and to trade with a free economy which will soon be larger than our own, which is growing much faster than our own. This confronts us and all the rest of the Western World with an overriding question: Do we come together in one great trading community which includes not only Western Europe and North America but also Japan, Australasia, Latin America, and Africa—or do we go our separate ways, fragmenting the non-Communist world?

This was the underlying theme of the President's speech to the manufacturers. It is of historic importance. Tariff debates are mighty dull reading and they are dull to write about. But the tariff debate which will begin in the next session of Congress will have incalculable significance.

There is reason to think that while the problem of our relations with the enlarged Common Market is a new one, there is already a remarkable awareness in this country that the problem must be met. Thus when the magazine Business Week questioned 150 key executives, more than a quarter of them were found to be strongly in favor of the President's thesis. It is even more interesting that only a scant 25 percent voiced outright opposition. The other half were on the fence.

This does not mean, of course, that the President's program will have an easy time in Congress. For on the tariff, as we all know, individual Congressmen listen very carefully to those weaker local industries which believe they will be unable to compete successfully with imported goods. This array of local interests will have to be dealt with by negotiation. The administration will have to be prepared and able to do enough for them to enable them to make the adjustment without tragic consequences.

The argument against the new trade policy is likely to revolve around the claim that American costs, owing to our high wages, are so high that we cannot compete successfully in a wider free market. In the course of the debate during the next months we shall have to take a careful look at this thesis, which sounds so plausible, and may, nevertheless, not be true.

One positive indication that higher costs have not priced the United States out of the world market is that as a matter of fact our exports of merchandise are larger by about $3 billion a year than our imports of merchandise. Moreover, there is the fact that American wages tend to be highest in those very industries that export most successfully. They tend to be lower in those industries that rely on tariffs to protect them against imports.

According to the high protectionists, this ought not to be true. Why, then, is it true? By and large it is true because in the high-wage industries labor is highly productive. It is highly productive because there is a greater investment of capital and there is more working and technical and managerial skill. As compared with the averages for the Common Market countries, American wages are between two and three times higher. But the productivity of American labor per hour is between two and three times greater. There is no reason to think that at this time the American economy as a whole cannot stand up competitively to the Common Market as a whole.

What, then, about the future? Europe with its enlarged market will surely become even more productive than it is today. Not all of this increased productivity will go into lowering prices. A considerable part of it undoubtedly will go into increasing European wages which as a matter of fact, are rising faster than our own. Nevertheless, the increased productivity of Europe will compel us to make ourselves more competitive. No attempt at price fixing by the tariff mechanism could shield us from the increased efficiency of Europe. The increased competition will be good for the economy as a whole. It will be hard on the weaker elements in the economy, and they will have to be given some special treatment.

But the reward of all this will be greater than the pain. For the reward will be a much richer American economy in a much richer Western World.

CONSERVATIVE SUPPORT ENLISTED

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Respected and influential conservative opinion is rallying behind a more liberalized U.S. trade policy.

The objective is to strengthen the economic ties and widen the channels of trade among the countries of the free world.

The U.S. Reciprocal Trade Act comes up for renewal at the most opportune moment, at the very time when the American Government must determine its relation with the expanding and prospering European Economic Community.

The decision which Congress will make in the next few months is whether both sides—the United States and Europe—will reduce tariffs to promote mutual competition or raise tariffs to fend off competition. The choice is whether to embark upon a healthy rivalry to take advantage of tremendous trading opportunities or to launch a trade war in an effort to wall off these trading opportunities.

It seems logical that conservative leadership in the United States should begin to align itself behind the goal of constructive competition between the common market of the United States and the Common Market of Western Europe.

Conservative leaders who have already taken their stand in recent days include former President Eisenhower, Alf Landon, the 1936 Republican presidential nominee, Christian Herter, a former Republican Governor of Massachusetts who succeeded John Foster Dulles as Secretary of State, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, whose spokesmen have been testifying before the Boggs committee in favor of amending the Reciprocal Trade Act to give the President adequate powers to negotiate with the Common Market.

It is noteworthy that these conservative leaders support the competitive trade policy not only in the national interest but in the conviction that it is an essential and very possibly a decisive initiative in organizing the free world to win the cold war.

Former Governor Landon puts the issue precisely and in its largest terms when he says:

"The tremendous release of energy—raising wages, improving working conditions—generated by the European Common Market is a more explosive shock to the economic and political policies of the world than the Russian thermonuclear bomb testing.

"Legislation of sufficient scope must be enacted to give the President authority to construct a bridge to working relationships between America, the European Common Market, and other great nations where we have highly important trade and political relationships."

The question Mr. Landon raises is whether we are going to seize—or throw away—the opportunity which the European Common Market puts into our hands to create "a more powerful bloc for peace than the Communist bloc which intend to bury us." His own answer is:

"Let me say to the leaders of American labor, agriculture, and industry that it would be the height of folly to be more concerned about attempting to maintain the American wage scale or American profit scale than girding our loins to meet a more dangerous foreign foe than Hitler and the Nazis. Yet by pursuing Common Market policies we can have our cake and eat it too. The history of the Common Market of Europe gives evidence that the removal of barriers to trade, commerce, and industry all over the world will open a greater market for U.S. products than we have ever known."

What impresses me about General Eisenhower, Mr. Landon, Mr. Herter, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce spokesmen and others likeminded, is that here are conservatives who are not content merely to complain about the West's being on the defensive in the cold war. When they see a momentous opportunity to take the initiative, they seize it rather than run away from it as too adventurous.

The reason that associating the Common Market of the United States with the Common Market of Western Europe is conservative is that it rests on the principles of competitive enterprise. It is, at the same time, a bold and progressive initiative capable of reversing the adverse trend of the cold war, an initiative which ought to galvanize the support of Americans who have so loudly been saying that we have too long been on the defensive.

Appeal to All Governments and People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following appeal which I have received from Dr. Malvin H. Lundeen, president, Augustana Lutheran Church. I believe that in these times of conflict and compromise it is well for us to note this appeal:

REQUESTS THAT PEACE APPEAL BE BROADCAST

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.—Dr. Malvin H. Lundeen, president of the Augustana Lutheran Church, who recently returned from the Third Assembly of the World Council of Churches held in New Delhi, India, has received a request from Dr. W. A. Vesser 't Hooft, general secretary of the world council, seeking his aid in broadcasting the appeal for peace made by the New Delhi assembly.

"The central committee," Dr. Vesser 't Hooft wrote to the Augustana executive, "has instructed me to recommend that in every country the member churches, individually or jointly with other member churches,

make the appeal known to governments and people by whatever means seem to them most appropriate and effective."

The appeal, which is addressed "to all governments and peoples," reads as follows:

"1. The Third Assembly of the World Council of Churches, at which are gathered Christians from all parts of the world, addresses this appeal to the government and people of every nation.

"2. Today, war itself is a common enemy. War is an offense to the nature of man. The future of many generations and the heritage of ages past hang in the balance. They are now easy to destroy, since the actions or miscalculations of a few can bring about a holocaust. They are harder to safeguard and advance, for that requires the dedicated action of all. Let there be restraint and self-denial in the things which make for war, patience, and persistence in seeking to resolve the things which divide, and boldness and courage in grasping the things which make for peace.

"3. To turn back from the road toward war into the paths of peace, all must renounce the threat of force. This calls for an end to the war of nerves, to pressures on small countries, to the rattling of bombs. It is not possible to follow at the same time policies of menace and of mutual disarmament.

"4. To halt the race in arms is imperative. Complete and general disarmament is the accepted goal, and concrete steps must be taken to reach it. Meanwhile, the search for a decisive first step, such as the verified cessation of nuclear tests, should be pressed forward despite all obstacles and setbacks.

"5. To substitute reason for force, and undergird the will to disarm, institutions of peace and orderly methods to effect change and to settle disputes are essential. This imposes a duty to strengthen the United Nations within the framework and spirit of the charter. All countries share this duty, whether alined with the major power blocs or independent of them. The nonalined can contribute through their impartiality; with others they can be champions of the principles of the charter.

"6. To build peace with justice, barriers of mutual distrust must be attacked at every level. Mutual confidence is the most precious resource in the world today: none should be wasted, more must be found. The fundamentals of an open society are essential that contacts may freely develop, person ot person and people to people. Barriers to communication must go, not least where they divide peoples, churches, even families. Freedom of human contact, information, and cultural exchange is essential for the building of peace.

"7. To enhance mutual trust, nations should be willing to run reasonable risks for peace. For example, an equitable basis for disarmament involves, on the one hand, an acceptance of risks in an inspection and control which cannot be foolproof, and, on the other, the danger that inspection may exceed its stated duties. Those who would break through the vicious circle of suspicion must dare to pioneer.

"8. There is a great opportunity for constructive action in the struggle for world development. To share the benefits of civilization with the whole of humanity is a noble and attainable objective. To press the war against poverty, disease, exploitation, and ignorance calls for greater sacrifice and for a far greater commitment of scientific, educational, and material resources than hitherto. In this common task, let the peoples find a positive program for peace, a moral equivalent for war.

"9. A creative strategy for peace with justice requires universal recognition of the claims of humanity—of all people, whatever their status, race, sex, or creed. Lest man's new powers be used to degrade his human freedom and dignity, governments must remember that they are the servants of their citizens and respect the worth of each individual human being. The supreme achievement for a government is to enhance the dignity of man, and free him for the creative exercise of his higher powers.

"10. In making this appeal to all governments and peoples, we are constrained by obedience to the Lord of History, who demands righteousness and mercy and is a light unto the nations and the hearts of men. For the achievement of peace with justice, we pledge our unremitting efforts and call upon the churches for their support in action and in prayer."

Timely Article Against Back-Door Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of the President's budget message which is being sent up to Congress on Thursday next, an article appearing in the January 15 issue of the Washington Post is especially timely and illuminating. It has to do with the bypassing of congressional appropriations procedures and instead, authorizing Treasury borrowings which are not scrutinized by Congress each year.

Under unanimous consent, this article follows:

BACK-DOOR SPENDING BATTLE TO RESUME

(By Maurice Stans)

Surprisingly, the last loud gun fired in the 1961 session of the Congress was not a political shot by one party at the other. It was a bipartisan cannon roar in the House aimed at the Senate over the issue of "backdoor spending." It will be reverberating in the Capitol through much of this 1962 session.

Few people outside Washington know what the fuss was about or why this is a continuing vital issue that effects the pocketbook of every taxpayer. It involves not only the Constitution but also the question of orderly discipline over the financial affairs of the Government.

Section 9 of Article I of the Constitution demands that "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law." The objective of this is to provide a double control over the spending actions of the executive branch of the Government. First, no activity may be carried on by any agency unless that activity is specifically authorized in a substantive law spelling out its scope. Next, no money is to be spent on the activity without an appropriation for the purpose for each year.

ESTIMATE OF PRIORITIES

Under the annual budget process, each department and agency of Government submits its requests for money to spend to the President through the Bureau of the Budget. After the painstaking and detailed procedure of budget review is completed, the President presents his recommendations to the Congress early in January in the annual budget for the forthcoming fiscal year.

The Congress has the right to approve, reject, or modify his proposals, and this determination centers in the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate. They hold hearings, first in the House and later in the Senate, on the President's budget for each unit of Government, and the agency officials give evidence in support of their items.

After the Appropriations Committees make their respective findings, they are approved on the floor of the Congress and enacted into a series of appropriations laws. These establish ceiling amounts. The Appropriations Committees, like the President, are expected to view spending plans in relation to each other and to the total so that the Government's programs will be carefully balanced to the Nation's needs and resources.

COMMITTEES LOSE CONTROL

Back-door spending is a simple process of bypassing this careful constitutional procedure. To avoid having a matter brought before the Appropriations Committees, congressional proponents of a program may be able to include, in the substantive law authorizing the program, permission for an agency to borrow funds directly from the Treasury to carry it on. The money is then spent without an appropriation. Or the substantive law may contain authority to make contracts in advance of appropriations, in which case the later appropriations are only a formality. Either way, back-door spending provides a much easier way for an agency to obtain funds, because it need ask for them only once in each House instead of twice. The end result is that the Appropriations Committees lose their control over the budget and the Constitution is violated.

Back-door spending has been a growing phenomenon of the last 30 years. After observing the way in which it impaired fiscal control, President Eisenhower directed the Bureau of the Budget in 1959 to approve no new requests of Government agencies for back-door spending, and he included none in the subsequent budgets which he submitted to the Congress.

This position was reversed by the present administration in 1961, and many proposals for back-door spending were included in its messages to Congress. Quite a few were approved in legislation. The Appropriations Committees, properly jealous of their prerogative, fought back hard, but their objections were ineffective in most cases, principally because the back-door spending items appeared in legislation which contained other provisions desired by congressional majorities.

A typical back-door spending proposal was the one by President Kennedy for a 5-year $9 billion authorization for foreign aid. On this he was defeated. After a long fight the long-term idea was approved, but with a provision requiring a separate appropriation action in each year. He also lost on a proposal for back-door spending of $375 million in aid to airports over 5 years, which was instead passed with a requirement for annual appropriations. The 1961 housing bill, however, enacted several provisions for back-door spending, as did the Agricultural Act. In all, according to a table entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by House Appropriations Committee Chairman CLARENCE CANNON, $29 billion was asked by President Kennedy via the back-door route and $20 billion was enacted.

SENATE FUMED AND FUSSED

This explains the closing day's explosion. In protest against the whole business, the House worked into a final piece of legislation a provision insisting that several programs already enacted on a back-door basis amended to require appropriations instead. Then it adjourned for the year. The Senate, still in session, fumed and fussed but had no alternative. The action stuck.

The battle is sure to be resumed. The aim of those who seek back-door spending is clearly to make money easier to get. Not

all such efforts originate with the White House. Many are inserted by the legislative committees of the Congress. Either way the taxpayer loses. If Government finances are to be subjected to a sound control that assures that spending programs take their right place in line, it is elementary that back-door raids on the Treasury must be ended.

Workreation: A Program Which Has Proved Its Value

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1952, "workreation" was a new word in the teenager's vocabulary in Berkeley, Calif.

What does workreation mean? It means just what it says—work and recreation.

Workreation provides a work and recreation program for 14- to 17-year-old boys and girls who, because of their youth and inexperience, would not be able to procure summer jobs. These boys and girls work 4 hours, for which they are paid $1 per hour, and also benefit from 2 hours of supervised recreation for 5 days a week during their 3 months of summer vacation.

Designed to give youngsters work experience as well as an opportunity to earn their own money, workreation is Berkeley's answer to all play and no work can make Jack—and Jill—a problem to himself, his family, and his community. Providing gainful occupation during the summer has proved a very positive means of curbing juvenile delinquency, though the program stands on its own feet and does not attempt to do good in this respect.

HOW WORKREATION BEGAN

How did workreation start? The background, or reason for, fits most communities' economic picture. Hundreds of boys and girls besiege employers for summer work which does not exist. Knowing that teenagers' interests and needs require physical work and fair wages for work done, Berkeley employers could not realistically absorb the youth of the community every year between June and September.

Prompted by concern for these teenage children, a group of Berkeley citizens faced up to the problem in 1952. They asked the president of one of the heavy industries, characteristic of the city and typical of the plants unsafe and unsuitable for teenage labor, to serve as chairman of a citywide committee to work on the problem. The manager of the California Department of Employment, a member of Alameda County Board of Supervisors, an executive of the YMCA, members of the city council and the board of education, and representatives of the city playgrounds, the park department, and PTA met to do something about a work experience for teenagers. Thus, the Workreation Committee was formed.

A budget was drawn up and work projects were set up and submitted to the city council. Details of workmen's compensation, public liability, social security, income tax deduction, work permits, payment at end of program, clearance with labor commission were all worked out. When the summer of 1952 arrived, for the first time there was a program waiting for teenagers, financed by the city and the board of education. Since then the Berkeley city library has also participated. The program is administered by the Berkeley Workreation Committee.

PARENTS' COMMENTS

Characteristic of the parents' comments about the program are:

Bob wasn't too interested when he first started, but his attitude certainly changed after he had worked a few days. He liked the work very much. He's rather hard to get up in the mornings but got up readily each morning while working for Workreation. I feel he really gained so much in the weeks that he worked.

I think the Workreation program is a wonderful thing. It keeps the youngsters out of trouble, and also keeps them out of the streets. It is a means of keeping their minds occupied, because they have to think to master their jobs.

We couldn't afford to send him to camp, and the work he did was almost like a vacation to him. It's hard for a boy 14 years old to stay home and not have anything to do, and he was so proud to have the chance to earn his own money.

This unique program embodies aspects of President Kennedy's important program for youth. It includes a work experience, it includes physical fitness, and it helps to curb juvenile delinquency.

As a Berkeleyan I am justly proud of what my constituents back home have done, and in honor of the 10th anniversary, which Berkeley Workreation is celebrating this year, I am pleased to bring this program to my colleagues attention.

Memorial to Alexander Hamilton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity of placing into the RECORD the following statement which I made before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs this morning in support of House Joint Resolution 449, which is a bill to establish the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton as a national memorial:

STATEMENT OF HON. HERBERT ZELENKO BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is a privilege for me to appear before you. My purpose here today is to support House Joint Resolution 449, which I introduced on June 13, 1961. This legislation provides for the establishing of the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton as a national memorial.

House Joint Resolution 449 is an amended version of House Joint Resolution 85 previously introduced by me on January 3, 1961. The amendments have been incorporated into House Joint Resolution 449 in accordance with the suggestions of the Department of the Interior contained in a letter to the Honorable WAYNE ASPINALL, chairman of this committee, dated May 9, 1961.

House Joint Resolution 85 was a reintroduction of House Joint Resolution 717, which I introduced in the 86th Congress, but which had not been acted upon.

House Joint Resolution 449 directs the Secretary of the Interior to take such action as may be necessary to establish the Grange, the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton situated in New York, N.Y., as a national memorial and designate it as the Hamilton Grange National Memorial.

The Grange, built in 1801, was the only home ever owned by Alexander Hamilton, who was a major draftsman and proponent of the Federal Constitution and the foremost architect of American financial policy in the first critical years of the Federal Union. The design of the structure is simple but dignified and is one of the few houses of the Federal period still standing in New York City.

Hamilton occupied the Grange for several years prior to his death. His home today is the most tangible link with his career and his times. The night before his fatal duel with Aaron Burr in 1804 was spent in this structure. There is no national memorial to Alexander Hamilton. The preservation of the Grange will fill this void.

The American Scenic and Historic Preservation Society, which owns the property, has agreed to transfer the title of the Grange to the United States without cost. In the house at the present time are many objects which relate to Hamilton, such as paintings, furniture, and personal mementos, also to be donated. There is now under consideration by the present owners the legal status of a certain endowment fund approximating $50,000 which may be made available to the United States if there are no legal difficulties encountered, and this sum will further the purposes of this legislative proposal.

Among the plans involved in the preservation of this historic property is one to move the structure a short distance from its present location where, because of newer surrounding buildings, it does not lend itself properly to the preservation contemplated.

The new proposed site is on the campus of the College of the City of New York, a short distance away. This will bring the structure into an appropriate situs, that is, within the grounds of an institution of learning. At the new site it will also overlook a fine public park. The city of New York has indicated that it will make the necessary land available.

At this time I wish to read the following letter from the president of Columbia University and to make it part of my presentation:

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY,
New York, N.Y., April 21, 1961.

Hon. HERBERT ZELENKO,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HERBERT: My attention has been called to a resolution, House Joint Resolution 85, introduced by you in the House, and also currently before the Senate as Senate Joint Resolution 29, for the establishment of the home of Alexander Hamilton, the Grange, as a national monument. This, to my mind, is an extremely worthy project. Hamilton served his country well as an officer in the Revolution, as a member of the Continental Congress, and as Secretary of the Treasury.

Of more particular interest to your alma mater were Hamilton's student days here and, subsequently, his important services as a trustee, for which the college granted him

an honorary master of arts degree. Also, as you know, the alumni association of Columbia College annually awards its Alexander Hamilton Medal to a distinguished graduate.

For these and many other services to the country and to the State of New York, it is only fitting that his home should become a national monument—that the students and citizens of our country may be reminded of the principles for which he stood and the services he performed.

On behalf of Columbia, may I, therefore, congratulate you for introducing this bill and support wholeheartedly its passage.

Sincerely,

GRAYSON KIRK,
President.

I would appreciate the favorable and early consideration of this legislation.

Congress Faces Many Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the election of Speaker definitely took the spotlight, especially for Massachusetts, as this session of Congress commences its work.

While the election of Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK was already assured, it is noteworthy, indeed, that for the third time since 1947, a distinguished son of the Bay State has taken over the third highest office in the land—an office second in succession to the Presidency. Congressman MARTIN held the position for two prior periods and now Congressman MCCORMACK is being elevated to this very high post to succeed the great, beloved "Mr. Sam."

For our State, there is great significance in having another famous son of Massachusetts in this office because the Speaker of the House is the foremost parliamentary, political leader of the Nation and the world, whose influence over the course of history, at home and abroad, is truly immeasurable.

We of the Massachusetts congressional delegation are especially proud and gratified by the richly merited promotion of our distinguished and beloved colleague and friend, Congressman MCCORMACK, who brings to his most arduous and vital tasks a ripe experience in the affairs of the Federal Government, seldom, if ever, excelled by any of his predecessors.

His election is another great day for Massachusetts, and it holds a promise of effective, united leadership on Capitol Hill and in the Government that will contribute greatly to the solution of many extremely grave and difficult problems.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND WORLD COMMUNISM

Fortunately, our defense machinery is in very good shape and our defense potential is incredibly powerful and well coordinated, and together with that of our allies continues to exert tremendous, deterrent effects upon possible aggression.

Our House Armed Services Committee of which I am a member, will continue its work in rounding out and, where necessary, buttressing the many components and systems which are required to defend us, to prevent all-out war and promote peace.

We have made very impressive gains in many vital fields of defense and our defensive and striking position is continuously being strengthened.

It is likely that our committee will be faced with many pressing demands from the American public to take a sharp look at the entire reserve setup, particularly the plight of those reservists recently called to active duty.

A most important corollary to the defense of the Nation and the free world must be our unceasing, determined campaign for peace with all its connotations and that means, of course, proposals for universal disarmament and control of nuclear energy based on carefully devised and special safeguards that will not only put an end to aggressive designs and actions, but prompt the organization of the world under a rule of law and a human brotherhood that will promote peace and betterment for all peoples. I expect that the Congress will make considerable progress along these lines this session, and it goes without saying that the President will find ready and overwhelming support in the Congress for any efforts he makes to check the forces of communism, dispel the fears of nuclear destruction and establish enduring peace. But we must recognize that it takes two to make a bargain and sincere Soviet cooperation is required to secure this end.

On the domestic front, there are numerous challenging, and especially complex, questions that Congress must tackle this year.

Recognizing the more or less urgent needs of the people, the national well-being, problems dealing with the growth and strength of our great, productive economy and compelling social problems that lay claim to our interest and attention, Congress will be called upon to consider: First, medical care and the public health; second, support and aid to education; third, streamlining and improving the tax sytsem; fourth, reciprocal trade; fifth, the continuing gap in international payments; sixth, accommodation to the problems and intricacies presented by the so-called Common Markets; seventh, broader planning and implementation of urban and community rehabilitation, renewal, and improvement; eighth, thorny agricultural problems requiring production for actual use rather than warehouse waste, reducing the staggering burdens on the public treasury, establishing more equitable balance between farm income and consumer prices; and, ninth, a host of problems having to do with better utilization, control and use of water, including development of new sources, elimination of pollution, conservation of precious natural resources.

These are but a handful of the many legislative proposals which will undoubtedly be presented for the consideration of the Congress.

There are numerous very controversial questions, like medical care, which the Congress will explore with regard to need, its cost, its adequacy to suit public need, adaptability to free enterprise and other pertinent factors.

In the field of education, another controversial area, consideration will be given to aid to construction, higher standards, support of State efforts for adequate pay for teachers, assistance to federally impacted areas, and other proposals relating to Federal encouragement and support of higher education through various grants, loans, scholarships, research projects, and other aids calculated to beef up our education system to cope with competitive standards in other countries and make higher education more generally available to qualified young Americans.

The revision of trade and tariff laws is bound to produce more controversy. Whether the Congress will go along with proposals to open still wider the markets of this country to cheaply produced foreign goods from overseas is at the moment obscure, but it is certain that any measure along these lines will be met with strong determined opposition.

Tax laws need general overhauling, but it is probably too much to hope for that this job can or will be completed this session. Amendments to plug current loopholes and exemptions would be vexatious and costly to many but quite superficial, indeed, in probing the real areas for drastic tax reforms which lie, most likely, in those revisions, designed to spur incentives, fortify free enterprise institutions, plow profits back into expansion, and reduce onerous exactions on many individuals of the rank and file, hard-working people so to speak, upon whom current taxes, coupled with the high cost of living, are working a genuine hardship, as well as reducing their social standards.

I hardly think that such a task can be adequately tackled in an election year but perhaps some start may be made.

There is a prospect and a hope that Congress may increase the membership of the House, taking into account the Members gained by the admission of Alaska and Hawaii.

Historically, whenever new States have been admitted to the Union, the membership of the House has been increased. It is, however, about 50 years since this has been done.

It is hoped that partisan politics will not enter into this question which is essentially an issue of basic government. If a bill can be passed authorizing four additional Members, this would greatly facilitate and simplify the problem of redistricting Massachusetts. We face the redistricting problem this year because the State was lacking only about 15,000 additional population in the census of 1960. Under the situation now obtaining, Massachusetts would secure the first seat made available in any bill increasing the size of the House.

A Doctor Diagnoses the Broiler Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, just prior to my return to Washington it was my good fortune to meet and talk with Dr. John C. Huttar, the director of poultry industry relations for the Cooperative Grange League Federation Exchange, Inc., of Ithaca, N.Y.

Dr. Huttar is to be highly congratulated for the effort he is making to diagnose the ills that are besetting our Nation's poultry industry. All of us have seen what "integration"—meaning a combination of nonfarm capital and the use of the farmer's equipment and labor—has done to the broiler portion of that industry, and there is now a clear and present danger of the same process being introduced into the production of market eggs. The end result would almost surely be the financial ruin of the remaining independent farmer-producers or, when that became imminent, more of those stifling and seemingly futile Federal controls that most of us would like to avoid.

John Huttar's diagnosis of what happened to our broiler people is that the removal of all financial risk from the grower has eliminated the automatic governors which, as an inherent part of our free-enterprise system, have heretofore controlled production. The result has been wild overproduction, declining prices, and a not-unexpected readjustment of those original no-risk integrated contracts which has meant, in recent years, virtual serfdom for most of our broiler growers, with little or no return for their labors not to mention a return on their own capital investments.

What to do about all this is still far from clear, but Dr. Huttar makes some suggestions worth thinking about in the following article of his as published in the December 1961 issue of Poultry Processing and Marketing. The article follows:

DON'T PANIC—COUNT 10

(By Dr. John Huttar)

Our poultry industry has passed through many rough periods and a few crises. I expect this can be truly said of every important industry in our American economy. As we all know, the poultry business is in one of these periods right now. In the broiler end of the business it has reached crisis proportions. As I get around and listen and read, I sense a hint of panic in a few spots.

Now, mind you, I'm not critical of anyone directly affected by the terrific squeeze which the last 6 month's markets have put on those who finance production. I'm quite sure I would panic if I were going through what some of my friends are. All I'm trying to do is look at the picture and see if a viewpoint from a safe and secure position can add something which might keep our industry from jumping from the frying pan into the fire. It may be easier to do this if you're not yet in the frying pan.

DIAGNOSIS

If my doctor's degree were an M.D. instead of a Ph. D., and the poultry industry were my patient, I'd start off by asking questions concerning things in the background which could lead up to the sickness. I'd also take a few measurements—like temperature and blood pressure. It would be my hope that I could then make a correct diagnosis of the trouble.

Let's see if we can get anywhere along this line. Now remember, I'm the doctor and the patient is Mr. Poultry Industry. Here's the way I would picture an interview:

"Dr. J. Where do you feel bad?

"Mr. P. Well, Doc, I feel worst in my broiler region, but my turkey section is beginning to kick up, too.

"Dr. J. Everything OK in the egg portion of your anatomy, is it?

"Mr. P. M-m-m—yes, I guess, at least so far, but I have a hunch it might not stay that way.

"Dr. J. I see. Well, let's take these one at a time. How long have you noticed these attacks in your broiler region?

"Mr. P. I guess the very first symptoms came a few years after the end of the last World War—maybe about 1948.

"Dr. J. Tell me what they were like.

"Mr. P. After 8 or 10 years of profitable production we ran into an occasional dip in broiler prices which wouldn't cover all our costs.

"Dr. J. I see, and what did the growers do about it?

"Mr. P. They left the houses empty until consumption caught up with production.

"Dr. J. The right medicine. If taken in time, it should keep the broiler region in reasonably good health. What happened to change things on these nasty attacks.

"Mr. P. Well, you see, Doc, empty broiler houses mean less business for feed men, hatcherymen, and processing plants. Each of these had put up large and expensive plants to service my fast growing broiler business. They didn't figure they could afford to let these run at half speed or stand idle. Their plants weren't paid for yet.

"Dr. J. So, what did they do about it?

"Mr. P. They talked many growers into filling up their houses on a 'no-risk' basis at the expense of these service industries.

"Dr. J. And I suppose this stopped the use of the 'cut-back medicine.'

"Mr. P. Right.

"Dr. J. Too bad—too bad. I suppose broiler prices continued to drop.

"Mr. P. They sure did.

"Dr. J. But, why didn't producers become more efficient and cut their production costs? Breeders kept giving them a faster and faster growing bird; feed men were making more and more efficient feeds, and even the processors were cutting costs fast. All this should have added up to declining production costs to match the sliding price level.

"Mr. P. For a while it did just that, but this only seemed to spur the people putting up the money. They figured that increased production would also cut costs. As fast as efficiency increased, they put out more birds.

"Dr. J. I see. I'm beginning to suspect what the trouble is in your broiler region, Mr. Poultry Industry. But, let me have a look at your chart.

Year	Average cost per pound	Average price of broilers	U.S. broiler production
	Cents	*Cents*	*Millions*
1948	27.0	36.0	313
1950	25.5	27.5	650
1952	25.0	29.0	900
1954	22.0	24.0	1,100
1956	19.0	18.8	1,300
1958	18.5	18.5	1,500
1959	17.5	15.5	1,700
1960	17.0	17.0	1,950
1961	16.5	[1] 14.5	[1] 2,200

[1] Estimated forecast.

"Just look at that chart; the more efficient producers got, the worse off they were. I've suspected for a long time that there was a hole in this much-publicized "get-more-efficient" theory.

"Mr. P. Yeah. The way it's worked in my broiler region is that the more efficient growers weren't satisfied with moderate profits. They boosted their production faster than the less efficient dropped out.

"Dr. J. So it would seem. But what about per capita consumption?

"Mr. P. People ate all we produced. They always do. It makes the consumption chart look wonderful.

"Dr. J. But to get people to keep eating up this mushrooming production, you had to lower your price faster and faster.

"Mr. P. Right.

"Dr. J. So that this has also turned out to be a mirage. Well, Mr. Poultry Industry, it's easy to make a surface diagnosis of the disease in your broiler section—it is more or less constant and continuing overproduction. But we have to dig deeper to get the real answer. We'll have to see what causes the overproduction. But, let's hold up on this a while until we have a look at your turkey section.

"Mr. P. Like I said, Doc, it's not so good either. As near as I can remember, it feels like the broiler region did about 5 years ago.

"Dr. J. And are the aches and pains progressing in about the same way?

"Mr. P. I would say so, except faster.

"Dr. J. And are the feedmen, hatcheries, and processing going through the same contract and financing motions as with broilers?

"Mr. P. Looks like the same thing all over again. So far I may still have somewhere between 20 and 30 percent independent growers left. The rest are all on no-loss deals.

"Dr. J. Too bad, too bad. How will the deal work out this year? Will there still be a plus margin between prices and costs?

"Mr. P. I'm afraid not, Doc. You see, most growers made a little money last year so we're boosting production more than 25 percent this year. My turkey section feels like it's got to eat this surplus itself. It's like an acute indigestion.

"Dr. J. OK. I've got your production pulse. It's running too fast. And your sales pressure—it's critical in your broiler region and sending out storm signals from your turkey section. Everything here points to the basic cause of overproduction. And it's clearly overproduction that's causing your pains.

"Mr. P. What's the basic cause, Doc? Is it malignant? Will I live, Doc? Huh—will I?

"Dr. J. Now, calm down, Mr. Poultry Industry. Don't panic. Count 10 before you grasp at the first straw that's offered you.

Be sure any medicine you take gets at the basic cause, not just the symptoms.

"Mr. P. OK, OK, Doc. B-but, you haven't told me—What's the basic cause?

"Dr. J. Removing the financial risk from the grower. Some say it's easy money. Easy money is the means used to remove the risk, I'll admit. And you can tell your industry people that it doesn't all come from the Government. They've been pretty free with their money—especially in the broiler and turkey sections of your anatomy.

"Mr. P. But, if it's overproduction we're trying to cure—you said this was the disease——

"Dr. J. This is true.

"Mr. P. Then why can't we cure it with Government production controls?

"Dr. J. Now, that's what I mean by grasping at straws. Government controls might hold the disease in check for a while, but has the Government ever come out with a control program which isn't sweetened up with easy money? And isn't the avowed purpose of all such Government programs to remove risk at the grower level—or at least reduce it to a minimum?

"Mr. P. Well, yes, I guess they say it's the way to save the family farm.

"Dr. J. Don't you see, Mr. Poultry Industry, that your whole record shows the more growers you relieved of loss, the faster your production boomed? And even your magnificent record of cutting costs and improving efficiency didn't help in the long run? To me it seems a little sad that such a splendid record should fail to reap rewards. Let's look at it this way.

"When the grower got the profit and took the losses which came from the production and sale of his products—be they broilers or eggs or peas or potatoes—there was an automatic governor in the business. Production didn't get badly out of line with demand at a livable price for long. Growers don't have the kind of money to stand a long, dragged out period of losses. Remember what your growers did in your broiler region back in 1948?

"Mr. P. Yes, I do. And I think I see what you mean.

"When growing a product or a crop gets unprofitable, they cut back. The size of the cutback is usually in proportion to the size of the loss. They did it quick. And when they had a good year—bingo—they expanded. Boom and bust we call it.

"Dr. J. That's one of those catch phrases some propagandist tacked onto the situation in order to sell his pet cure. It's a gross exaggeration—'good, so-so, and bad' would be much more accurate. And the average of the three built a healthy, growing poultry industry.

"Mr. P. I think you're right.

"Dr. J. But even accepting the 'boom and bust' labeling, what did the removal of the 'bust-bogey' from the grower do for your broiler region? It went from 'boom and bust' to 'bust and buster,' didn't it?

"Mr. P. All right, Doctor. I'll accept your argument that removing the risk of loss and opportunity for profit from the grower leads, inevitably, to overproduction.

"Dr. J. Maybe not inevitably, but as yet we haven't been able to equip it with a governor that works. Until we do, the only prescription I can write out for you is to put the risk back on the farm and the individual farmer.

"Mr. P. And just how am I going to get this prescription filled?

"Dr. J. Now I might as well admit I have no simple answer for that, but as long as we're in the mood to try something, I have a suggestion.

"Mr. P. I'm all ears.

"Dr. J. You may have suspected by now that I haven't much faith in the changing moods of politics. So, I feel that too much government isn't good. But I don't say that government must be kept entirely out. As a matter of fact, some wise Federal legislation might be needed to make my suggestion work.

"Mr. P. How's that?

"Dr. J. I suggest that the use of off-farm money shall be prohibited in the production of poultry products.

"This doesn't mean that such money—from banks, feed companies, hatcheries or whatever—must be withdrawn from legitimate uses.

"Here's where my proposal takes me over my head, but I've visited with some professional credit people. They tell me that fair and proper rules can be written and enforced to prevent 'shenanigans.' That is, credit extended means that the grower is obligated to pay back and has security to back this up.

"Now, let's have a look at this other sore spot—eggs.

"Mr. P. Not really sore at the moment, but I think it could be in another 6 or 12 months.

"Dr. J. Why do you think so?

"Mr. P. For three reasons and here they are:

"1. Because egg-feed price ratios have been favorable for 15 months.

"2. Because people in my broiler region are converting to egg production, and

"3. Because integration is gaining in my egg portion.

"Dr. J. Three mighty potent reasons.

"Mr. P. Would you say that your suggestion of restoring the 'automatic governor,' as you call it—I mean putting the risk back to the production level—applies to eggs, too?

"Dr. J. Yes; I do. And in this portion of your anatomy you may still have time to head off serious illness.

"Mr. P. Well, thanks Doc, I'm not sure I feel better, but at least I'm going to count 10 before I panic."

Skilled Workers in Demand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, one of the findings of the House Republican Policy Committee's study "Employment in the Dynamic American Economy" was that there exists side by side with a high percentage of unemployment among American workers a great need for skilled workers in almost every phase of the economy. The dynamism, and not the sluggishness, of the American economy has caused unemployment by raising a need for workers with higher skills while making certain skills obsolete and rendering the market for unskilled workers nil.

The need for skilled workers was discussed in an article by Robert Dietl, financial writer of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, which appeared in that paper on January 3 of this year. I should like to place this article in the RECORD at this time:

VOCATIONAL SPECIALIST SAYS: 500,000 SKILLED WORKERS NEEDED

(By Robert Dietl)

The U.S. employment outlook for skilled workers in 1962 and during the rest of the 1960's is excellent, according to vocational training specialist John C. Villaume, president of International Correspondence Schools.

Mr. Villaume said that the latest analysis of employment trends shows that an average of 500,000 skilled jobs should be available each year between now and the end of the decade.

However, Mr. Villaume warns that "unless much greater emphasis is placed on industrial training programs, there is ample evidence that by 1970 our demand for skilled craftsmen may exceed the supply by some 1 million qualified workers. Such a shortage would pose a grave threat to the whole U.S. economy."

At the same time, worrisome unemployment rates among the semiskilled and unskilled are likely to persist in Mr. Villaume's opinion until these workers have the training to qualify for the "in demand" occupations. According to ICS, many States with above-normal unemployment still report numerous openings for electronic technicians and maintenance mechanics. Qualified tool and die makers, molders, machinists, carpenters, plumbers, and electricians are also in demand in many areas.

"If we are to narrow the serious 'training gap' in our Nation's economy, job-related correspondence study must play a still larger role," Mr. Villaume says. "Only a small percentage of our work force can afford to quit their jobs to undergo full-time classroom training, and few companies can afford to supply similar facilities. As a result, industrial training programs employing the correspondence method are now the most popular and the fastest growing. By 1965, we estimate that 200,000 workers will be enrolled in them—a 400 percent increase in 10 years."

The central divisional office of Kerr-McGee Oil Industries, Inc., has been opened in Hazelwood, Mo., at 47 Village Square. The establishment of the office is a part of the company's recent realinement in branded marketing operations to provide better and faster service to customers.

Back-Door Spending Battle To Resume

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Government economist, Mr. Maurice Stans, who was director of the Bureau of the Budget for 3 years, has ably and clearly outlined the issue of back-door spending in an article in the Washington Post of January 15.

I am sure many of us regard the issue to be of vital importance to our Government today, from the double standpoint of fiscal responsibility and the proper balance of powers needed to assure the fundamentals of a working democracy:

BACK-DOOR SPENDING BATTLE TO RESUME

(By Maurice Stans)

Surprisingly, the last loud gun fired in the 1961 session of the Congress was not a political shot by one party at the other. It was a bipartisan cannon roar in the House aimed at the Senate over the issue of back-door spending. It will be reverberating in the Capitol through much of this 1962 session.

Few people outside Washington know what the fuss was about or why this is a continuing vital issue that affects the pocketbook of every taxpayer. It involves

not only the Constitution but also the question of orderly discipline over the financial affairs of the Government.

Section 9 of article I of the Constitution demands that "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law." The objective of this is to provide a double control over the spending actions of the executive branch of the Government. First, no activity may be carried on by any agency unless that activity is specifically authorized in a substantive law spelling out its scope. Next, no money is to be spent on the activity without an appropriation for the purpose for each year.

ESTIMATE OF PRIORITIES

Under the annual budget process, each department and agency of Government submits its requests for money to spend to the President through the Bureau of the Budget. After the painstaking and detailed procedure of budget review is completed, the President presents his recommendations to the Congress early in January in the annual budget for the forthcoming fiscal year.

The Congress has the right to approve, reject, or modify his proposals, and this determination centers in the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate. They hold hearings, first in the House and then in the Senate, on the President's budget for each unit of Government, and the agency officials give evidence in support of their items.

After the Appropriations Committees make their respective findings, they are approved on the floor of the Congress and enacted into a series of appropriations laws. These establish ceiling amounts. The Appropriations Committees, like the President, are expected to view spending plans in relation to each other and to the total so that the Government's programs will be carefully balanced to the Nation's needs and resources.

COMMITTEES LOSE CONTROL

Back-door spending is a simple process of of bypassing this careful constitutional procedures. To avoid having a matter brought before the Appropriations Committees, congressional proponents of a program may be able to include, in the substantive law authorizing the program, permission for an agency to borrow funds directly from the Treasury to carry it on. The money is then spent without an appropriation. Or the substantive law may contain authority to make contracts in advance of appropriations, in which case the later appropriations are only a formality. Either way, back-door spending provides a much easier way for an agency to obtain funds, because it need ask for them only once in each House instead of twice. The end result is that the Appropriations Committees lose their control over the budget and the Constitution is violated.

Back-door spending has been a growing phenomenon of the last 30 years. After observing the way in which it impaired fiscal control, President Eisenhower directed the Bureau of the Budget in 1959 to approve no new requests of Government agencies for back-door spending, and he included none in the subsequent budgets which he submitted to the Congress.

This position was reversed by the present administration in 1961, and many proposals for back-door spending were included in its messages to Congress. Quite a few were approved in legislation. The Appropriations Committees, properly jealous of their prerogative, fought back hard, but their objections were ineffective in most cases, principally because the back-door spending items appeared in legislation which contained other provisions desired by congressional majorities.

A typical back-door spending proposal was the one by President Kennedy for a 5-year $9 billion authorization for foreign aid. On this he was defeated. After a long fight the long-term idea was approved, but with a provision requiring a separate appropriation action in each year. He also lost on a proposal for back-door spending of $375 million in aid to airports over 5 years, which was instead passed with a requirement for annual appropriations. The 1961 housing bill, however, enacted several provisions for back-door spending, as did the Agricultural Act. In all, according to a table entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by House Appropriations Committee Chairman Clarence Cannon, $29 billion was asked by President Kennedy via the back-door route and $20 billion was enacted.

SENATE FUMED AND FUSSED

This explains the closing day's explosion. In protest against the whole business, the House worked into a final piece of legislation a provision insisting that several programs already enacted on a back-door basis be amended to require appropriations instead. Then it adjourned for the year. The Senate, still in session, fumed and fussed but had no alternative. The action stuck.

The battle is sure to be resumed. The aim of those who seek back-door spending is clearly to make money easier to get. Not all such efforts originate with the White House. Many are inserted by the legislative committees of the Congress. Either way the taxpayer loses. If Government finances are to be subjected to a sound control that assures that spending programs take their right place in line, it is elementary that back-door raids on the Treasury must be ended.

Answer to a Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR A. KNOX

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boyne Citizen of September 28, 1961. The editorial refers to my legislative proposal, H.R. 9388, which would provide tax incentives as the basis of encouraging the advancement of education and provide progress in education through the individual and not through a Federal bureaucracy far removed from the problems facing local communities.

The editorial follows:

ANSWER TO A PRAYER

Representative VICTOR A. KNOX, Republican, 11th District of Michigan, has introduced a form of aid to education that in our estimation is infinitely better than the brand that has been recently espoused in Congress—and which has been temporarily shelved because of religious and political complications.

The provisions of the Knox bill make tax incentives the basis of encouraging the advancement of education and place the emphasis on educational progress where it should be—with the individual. Furthermore, it can be administered without the creation of an expensive new Federal bureau.

Its provisions are briefly this:

1. It would allow a tax credit equal to 30 percent of expenditures for tuition or other fees expended for full time training at institutions of higher learning or occupational training.

2. It would provide tax credit to individual taxpayers for amounts paid on real estate taxes imposed for support of public schools up to a maximum of $150 on such real estate taxes.

3. It would clarify the tax-exempt status of scholarships, fellowships, and students assistantships whereby up to $300 a month could be earned by students through such grants without incurring tax liability even though such awards are more in the nature of compensation than grants. Persons who are candidates for degrees would receive such awards without a maximum limit.

When we look over the news release announcing Congressman KNOX's bill, to us, it seemed like the answer to a prayer. For years we've railed against the inequities of parents sacrificing to make better citizens of their children—and receiving less recognition and financial consideration for their contribution to the Nation—than the farmer did for not raising a hog.

Politics and "Mr. Sam"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, comment and praise on the life and work of the late Speaker of the House of Representatives, Sam Rayburn, have come from sources around the world since his death following the close of this Congress first session. One of these, appearing in the St. Louis Review, the newspaper of the Archdiocese of St. Louis, comments on Speaker Rayburn's profession, politics, calling it "a noble and high vocation." In honor of the late Speaker and the profession he followed, I should like to place the editorial "The Politician" from the November 24, 1961, issue of the St. Louis Review in the RECORD at this point:

THE POLITICIAN

The death of "Mr. Sam" Rayburn will have, we hope, a broader effect than merely calling to the minds of men his long and valued service to the country. Mr. Rayburn had many qualities that deserved recognition and attention. The radio and TV coverage of his life helped put them in their proper perspective.

The broader effect of which we speak is not meant in any way to derogate from the honors given to the late Speaker of the House. He considered his vocation as a politician a very high and noble one. To our knowledge he conducted himself in accordance with the ideal. These are the fringe benefits to the American community which Mr. Sam's death provides.

So often one hears the term, "politician" used in a demeaning sense. One who considers politics as his profession is frequently looked upon as a man who thinks whom you know to be much more important than what you know. If the consensus in this country is along these lines the profession is apt to take that shape.

Politics is a noble and high vocation, as Mr. Rayburn held it to be. Aristotle gave it its name because he considered it the science which embraced the whole of human affairs. No small task, therefore, confronts the politician who seriously observes his state in life.

St. Thomas called politics the first of the practical sciences. It does not excel theology, of course, as a science. They are in different orders. But in that class of science which are considered practical and are concerned with human affairs, it comes first. One who chooses this field as his life work and seeks to translate the principles of the science into the art of working effectively for the common good has selected a highly respectable, though difficult, way of life.

All of us are, by nature, social and political animals. The common good must be continuously sought or the individual, together with his rights and liberties, will not long survive. In this country it is the politician whose duty it is, in behalf of all of us, to pursue and attain this goal. Men may at times derogate themselves by not living up to the ideals of this calling, but the calling itself is one that demands men of dedication, ability, and character. It can never be demeaned.

The Arabs of Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most human and most disturbing problems in the world today is that of the Palestine refugees. These people have been used by the Arab countries—particularly Egypt—as political pawns for years. Martha Gellhorn, a distinguished lady journalist, has written a compassionate and realistic appraisal of the situation of these people today. Her article appeared in the Atlantic Monthly magazine in October 1961, and I commend it to the interest of our colleagues:

THE ARABS OF PALESTINE

(By Martha Gellhorn)

(Martha Gellhorn, novelist, journalist, and former war correspondent, has recently returned from a journey to the Middle East, where she went to see the "Palestinian refugee problem" in terms of real life, real people. Here she reports how the Arab refugees and the Arab Israelis live, and what they say about themselves, their past and their future).

According to Arab politicians and apologists, this is what happened, this the authentic view, these are the facts. Doubt is treasonous. There can be only one truth, according to Arab politicians and apologists, and it belongs to them:

In 1948 war took place between five Arab nations of the Middle East and the Jews in Palestine. This war was caused by the United Nations, whose General Assembly resolved, to partition Palestine into two states, one for the Palestinian Arabs, the other for the Jews. The Arab nations and the Palestinian Arabs would not accept this monstrous decision. They were obliged to protect themselves against it, with force. The United Nations operated as the tool of the Western imperialists, notably Great Britain and the United States. The United Nation swanted the Jews to proclaim the upstart State of Israel. Because of the Western imperialists, who favored Israel, the Arabs lost the war. By massacre, threatening broadcasts, pointed bayonets, and the murderous seige of cities, the Jews drove hundreds of thousands of Arabs out of their homeland. For 13 years, these Arab refugees have languished in misery around the borders of Israel. The United Nations (Western branch) bears the blame for these events and must repair the damage. The condition of the refugees is a sore on the conscience of honorable men. The Israeli Government refuses to welcome back to their homeland the refugees, now swollen to more than a million in number. This refusal demonstrates the brutality and dishonesty of Israel, an abnormal nation of aliens who not only forced innocent people into exile but also stole their property. There is no solution to this injustice, the greatest the world has ever seen, except to repatriate all Palestinian refugees in Palestine. Palestine is an Arab country, now infamously called Israel. Israel has no right to exist, and the Arab nations will not sign peace treaties with it but will, by every means possible, maintain the state of war.

The details of the Arab case vary, depending on the political climate of the moment and the audience. However, the Palestinian refugees always remain the invaluable, central theme. The case is painted the color of blood in the Arab countries: revenge and return. For the Western public, tears replace blood; the Arab case rests on the plight of the refugees and is a call to conscience rather than to arms. But no Arab statesman has ever promised final peace with Israel if only the million Palestinian refugees may return to their former homes.

The best way to consider this case is close up, by looking at the Palestinian refugees themselves, not as a problem, not as statistics, but as people. The Palestinian refugees, battered by 13 years in the arena of international politics, have lost their shape; they appear as a lump and are spoken of as one object. They are individuals, like everyone else.

Despite the unique care and concern they have received, despite the unique publicity which ranges around them, the Arab refugees, alas, are not unique. Although no one knows exactly how many refugees are scattered everywhere over the globe, it is estimated that since World War II, and only since then, at least 39 million non-Arab men, women, and children have become homeless refugees, through no choice of their own. Their numbers grow every years; Angolans are the latest addition to the long list. The causes for this uprooting are always different, but the result is the same; the uprooted have lost what they had and where they came from and must start life again as handicapped strangers wherever they are allowed to live.

The world could be far more generous to these unwilling wanderers, but at least the world has never thought of exploiting them. They are recognized as people, not pawns. By their own efforts, and with help from those devoted to their service, all but some 6 million of the 39 million have made a place for themselves, found work and another chance for the future. To be a refugee is not necessarily a life sentence.

The unique misfortune of the Palestinian refugees is that they are a weapon in what seems to be a permanent war. Alarming signs, from Egypt, warn us that the Palestinian refugees may develop into more than a justification for cold war against Israel. We ignored "Mein Kampf" in its day, as the ravings of a lunatic, written for limited home consumption. We ought to have learned never to ignore dictators or their books. "Egypt's Liberation," by Gamal Abdel Nasser, deserves careful notice. It is short, low keyed, and tells us once again that a nation has been ordained by fate to lead—this time, to lead the Arab nations, all Africa, all Islam. The Palestinian refugees are not mentioned, and today, in the Middle East, you get a repeated sinking sensation about the Palestinian refugees: They are only a beginning, not an end. Their function is to hang around and be constantly useful as a goad. The ultimate aim is not such humane small potatoes as repatriating refugees.

The word "refugee" is drenched in memories which stretch back over too many years and too many landscapes: Spain, Czechoslovakia, China, Finland, England, Italy, Holland, Germany. In Madrid, between artillery bombardments, children were stuffed into trucks to be taken somewhere, out of that roulette death, while their mothers clung to the tailboards of the trucks and were dragged weeping after the bewildered, weeping children. In Germany, at war's end, the whole country seemed alive with the roaming mad—slave laborers, concentration camp survivors—who spoke the many tongues of Babel, dressed in whatever scraps they had looted, and searched for food in stalled freight cars though the very railyards were being bombed. From China to Finland, people like these defined the meaning of "refugee."

No one could wish to see even a pale imitation of such anguish again. In the Middle East, there would be no high explosive, no concentration camps, but the imagined, expected scene was bad enough; lice and rickets and tuberculosis, bodies rotting in the heat, the apathy of despair. Why, in 1961, did I have such a picture of the Palestinian refugees? Obviously from what I had read, as one of the average absorbent reading public; notions float in the air exactly as dust does. Nothing that I had read or heard prepared me for what I found.

What do they look like, the undifferentiated mass known as the Palestinian refugee problem? What do they think, feel, say? What do they want? How do they live, where do they live, what do they do? Who takes care of them? What future can they hope for, in terms of reality, not in terms of slogans, which are meaningless if not actually fatal, as we know.

The children are as fast as birds, irreverent as monkeys, large-eyed, ready to laugh. The young girls, trained by carrying water jars or other heavy household bundles on their heads, move like ballerinas and are shrouded in modesty and silence as if in cocoons. The young men, crudely or finely formed, have in common the hopefulness and swagger of their new manhood. The middle years seem nondescript, in both sexes. After this the women, who age quickly but not as quickly as the men, wear unpainted experience on their faces; they look patient, humorous, and strong. When the men have grown visibly old, they turn into a race of grandees. Their color, infant to patriarch, ranges from golden fair to mahogany dark, all warmed by the glaze of sun. The instinct for hospitality, the elegance of manner have not been exaggerated.

UNRWA (the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East), inheriting its role from previous caretakers, has been the splendid mother and father of these people for 11 years. In the course of its parenthood UNRWA has spent about $360 million on the Arab refugees, this money having been contributed by members of the United Nations, with smaller but loving donations from private, charitable organizations as well. Of the total the United States provided more than $238 million, Great Britain over $65 million—but spread across the years and in varying amounts, 61 states, including Israel and the Holy See, have helped with cash. The Soviet Union has never paid 1 cent. This is a tiny note of malice: Arab refugees often express tender emotions for the Soviet Union, whereas most of the village orators blame the United States and England, or that bogey, Western imperialism, for their exile.

In the so-called host countries, Lebanon, Jordan, Syria, and Egypt, UNRWA runs 58 refugee camps. The camps in Egypt are not

in Egypt but in the Gaza strip, which is Palestine; Egypt is the de facto mandatory power, the land and the government of the Gaza strip are Palestinian. The majority of camps in Jordan are also on what was the territory of Palestine, now annexed to Jordan.

UNRWA has never yet been allowed to make a total proper census of its refugee population, so statistics about the number of ex-Palestinians are nothing except the best estimate possible; UNRWA itself says this. Over half of the registered Palestinian refugees do not live in camps, but have made more or less comfortable private arrangements varying from first-class houses, at the top, to hand-built Hooverville shacks, at the bottom. UNRWA calculates that, at the end of June 1960, 421,500 refugees were living in their camps, almost double their camp population 10 years ago. The advantage of living in a camp is that life there is rent free; and for the poor, the standard of housing and sanitation in an UNRWA camp is better than that of the native population.

The international personnel of UNRWA, Americans and Western Europeans, is small; 128 men and women work in four countries. The mass of those who serve the Palestinian refugees are Palestinian refugees themselves, something over 10,000 of them. UNRWA is running a world, simply, a little welfare state. It makes villages, called camps, and keeps them clean and free of disease, feeds, educates, trains teachers and technicians, and craftsmen, operates clinics and maternity centers, sends out visiting nurses, encourages small private enterprises with small loans, distributes clothing, soap, kerosene, blankets, provides hospitalization, footballs, youth clubs, mosques.

UNRWA is a kind, impartial parent; it has no favorites. However, people are all different, luckily; and though one man will arrive in exile as a destitute refugee and in time own a whopping Chevrolet and be a self-employed taxi driver, with a cozy home and a smiling wife in a flowered print dress and a gleaming refrigerator in the dining room, another will remain in whatever shelter UNRWA gave him, sitting either on his own floor or at a cafe table, waiting for nothing, or for divine intervention, or for the mailed, promised, delivering fist of Nasser. UNRWA did not invent the human condition.

Of UNRWA's 58 camps, I visited 8—in Lebanon, the Gaza strip, and Jordan. The plan and facilities of every UNRWA camp are alike; they differ only in size and are better or worse depending on whether they are newer or older and on the character of the people who live in them. Each camp has its clinic and school—or schools—warehouse center for distributing rations, "supplementary feeding station," where hot meals are served to those who need them, village bazaar street with small shops, market booths, cafes. The bigger the camp, the bigger the bazaar. I also went round two hosptials, two vocational training schools, and was received in two private homes, having been invited by refugees.

My guide and chaperone was an UNRWA employee, a Palestinian Arab, who served as translator when needed. My system was to say: please show me your best and your worst camp, and if time permits, let us also look at the inbetween. In the camps, I knocked on any door and many. Nothing was planned. We chatted at random and went wherever I liked. In the Gaza Strip, I was accompanied for a day by a young Palestinian in a pinstriped suit; he or someone like him is a cross every foreigner has to bear. He is local secret service, and the refugees know this; he is an ardent Nasserite, as apparently all Palestinian Government officials in Gaza are, or must appear to be; and he is by avocation a propagandist and demagog. At one Gaza camp, besides this young gent, I had an escort of three Palentinian cops who lent an even heavier note to the proceedings. Otherwise, my visits were uncensored. I may have seen a true cross section of the Palestinian refugee population, and I may not have. I only know that I saw real people in the flesh, and a large number of them, and I know what they said. When the word "they" appears on these pages, it means those Arabs whom I saw; it means nothing more.

Beirut is a lovely boomtown, an entrancing mixture of Asia Minor and France, with scenery to lift the heart and glamour hotels all over the lot and more abuilding. We set off, my Palestinian guide and I, in a shiny car for a UNRWA camp in the Lebanese hills. My guide, like his colleagues who accompanied me elsewhere, was an executive, responsible for an UNRWA department, dressed in a Western business suit, a self-asured, middle-class organization man. The refugees are not only individuals, but they come from widely different social backgrounds. Men of the class of my guides would not be living in refugee camps; they might work in them as doctors or teachers.

This camp was inhabited exclusively by Christian Arabs. I wondered aloud at a separation by creed. My guide was a Muslim and said that Christian camps were always cleaner and superior to Muslim ones, and besides, very few Christians lived in camps; they arranged their lives better on their own.

The camp consisted of little cement or framehouses rambling over the hillside, a village of poor people, disorderly and beflowered and cheerful. School was letting out for lunch; troops of children, dressed in the pinafore uniform that small boys and girls wear in Italian schools, meandered home, shouting bye-bye at friendly, giggling length. They are Roman Catholics here, but the young teachers are refugees, not priests. They have to teach the children about Palestine, since most of them have never seen the country and even the oldest cannot remember it. The children are taught hate, the Garden of Eden stolen from them by murderers; their duty is to live for return and revenge.

The miniature white clinic had only one customer, a nice-looking girl of 21 who had brought her fourth baby for a checkup. Her husband works in Libya; she too lived there for a few years but returned. Libya is very expensive; she can live here with his parents and thus save money for the future. The resident nurse, a buxom elderly woman, said they had no real sickness; in summer, the children got a bit of conjunctivitis and diarrhea; oh, no, trachoma is very rare, and besides, we cure it; there's some chickenpox now. My guide announced that if any refugee needed an operation he was taken in an ambulance to a hospital in Beirut where UNRWA reserved beds and paid for everything; you would have to be a rich man in Lebanon to get such good and speedy treatment. Her fourth baby, I mused, and she only 21. Yes, yes, said my guide, the refugees have a higher birth rate than any other Arabs, and healthier children.

Refugees receive a monthly basic food ration of flour, pulse (dried peas, beans, lentils), sugar, rice, oils, and fats; this amounts to 1,500 calories a day per person, increased in winter to 1,600 calories a day, and it is not enough. The refugee must find some way to earn money to increase his diet, or keep poultry or rabbits, or grow vegetables. Many had planted tiny gardens here, but charmingly and with more enthusiasm, they also grow flowers for the joy of the thing. There is a daily milk ration for children and pregnant and nursing mothers; and hot meals are served in the supplementary feeding station, to those who need them, on the doctor's order. In this camp, said my guide, 85 percent of the people have work. If there are hardship cases, when no one can bring money to the family, UNRWA's welfare section steps in. This pattern is universal.

If you think it your duty, I said, to make everything seem better than it is, don't. I'm not on an inspection tour, I only want to get some idea of what life is really like. He stopped, offended, in the middle of the stony path and explained: Here, in Lebanon, 80 percent of the refugees are better off than they were in Palestine. Twenty percent are not. The 20 percent were small capitalists, and there is much rivalry with the Lebanese in business, they make obstacles. Also it is political; they do not give the refugees citizenship, you understand, because the main part of the refugees are Muslims and that would upset the balance here, where the Christians rule. I do not speak to you of the rich Palestinian refugees; they are richer than before, they are very happy.

We went to pay the required visite de politesse to the camp leader. Every camp leader acts as an apopinted village mayor; he has to keep the place running, serve as liaison officer with UNRWA local headquarters, and handle the complaints of his own people. Sitting in his neat office, with my guide, the principal of the school (a former member of the Palestinian police), and the camp leader, I listened to the first of what became an almost daily Mad Hatter conversation. It went like this:

"The Arab countries invaded Israel in 1948 to save the Palestine Arabs from being massacred by the Jews."

"Were there massacres? Where?"

"Oh, yes, everywhere. Terrible, terrible."

"Then you must have lost many relatives and friends."

This, being a tiresome deduction from a previous statement, is brushed aside without comment.

"Israel overran the truce lines and stole our country. We left from fear. We have a right to our property, which brings in 47 million pounds a year in income. If we had our own money, we would need nothing from UNRWA. Our own money is much more. We do not have to be grateful for the little money spent on us. We should have our own."

"Then, of course, you want to return to your property and to Israel?"

"Not to Israel. Never to Israel. To our own country, to our own part."

"But didn't the Jews accept Partition, while the Palestine Arabs and the Arab governments refused?"

"Yes, yes. And England protected the Jews. An Arab was arrested if he carried a pistol only to defend himself, but Jews could go through the streets in tanks and nothing happened to them. Also, England told the Arab states to attack Israel."

The principal of the school then spoke up. "In our school, we teach the children from their first year about their country and how it was stolen from them. I tell my son of seven. You will see: one day a man of 80 and a child so high, all, all will go home with arms in their hands and take back their country by force."

On this warlike note, we left. My guide had seemed a sober contented fellow until our little meeting, whereupon he sounded like a politician running recklessly for office. He then astonished me again.

"It can all be solved with money," he said. "Now the people have nothing in their mouths but words, so they talk. Money fills the mouth too. If every man got a thousand dollars for each member of his family, for compensation to have lost his country, and he could be a citizen in any Arab country he likes, he would not think of Palestine any more. Then he could start a new life and be rich and happy. And those who really do own something in Palestine must be paid for what they had there. But

those are not many. Most had nothing, only work."

High on a mountaintop, with a downsweeping view of orange groves and the satin blue of the Mediterranean, is a small Muslim camp named Mia Mia. Here one whole Palestinian village, amongst others, had landed; they came from a mountaintop in Galilee, a place called Meron. Their headman, or village leader, the muktar, plied us with Coca-Cola and Turkish coffee in his exile's parlor. He is a beautiful man, perhaps 65-years old, lean, with exquisite manners. He wore the handsome white Arab headdress, held in place by the usual black double-corded crown; he was dressed in a well preserved cream silk jacket, a white silk shirt, pressed gray flannel trousers, polished Italianate black shoes.

Whilst we sucked Coca-Cola through straws and studied his son's pitifully bad but lovingly executed paintings—a portrait of Nasser; Christ and the Virgin—the muktar talked. Seventeen people of his village were massacred, which was why they fled, but an old blind woman of 104 was left behind and the Jews poured kerosene over her and burned her alive. How did they know, if they had all fled? Well, then the Jews went away and some villagers crept back and found her, and besides, the United Nations Truce Commission also found her.

My guide looked embarrassed. The Truce Commission was a shaky point. It was a strain to believe that the U.N. military observers, occupied with armies and frontiers, would have had time to investigate each atrocity story in the country. I wondered where the families of the massacred and the cremated were; everyone knows everyone else in a village, surely the surviving relatives were the best witnesses.

"I could tell you many such stories," said the muktar.

"I am sure of it," said I. "But please tell me about Meron."

So I heard of Meron, their beautiful stone houses, their lovely groves, their spacious and happy life in Eden; all lost now. I could readily imagine this aristocrat living in a palace on a mountaintop and decided that I would later go and see his home; but for the moment I accepted a rose from him, and we set off to pay calls in the camp.

A woman of 40 or so, with a face like the best and juiciest apple, and lively eyes, seized me and hauled me into her house. She began, with gestures, to deliver an oration. She touched the ceiling with contempt, pulling bits away; she called upon heaven to witness her misery. Her voice soared and fell in glorious rhythms. She loved doing it and I loved watching it. In mutual delight, we smiled more and more as the tale of woe unfolded, until she could keep it up no longer, burst into roars of laughter, and kissed me copiously. My guide seemed unduly glum about all this, perhaps because this day we were three; a European UNRWA official had joined us.

'She is a big liar," said my guide, when we had left her house. "She lies as she breathes. We gave her all the material for a new roof. She sold it. She is so poor that she is going to make a pilgrimage to Mecca this year. She does not have to make a pilgrimage. Do you know what that costs? One thousand pounds."

In Lebanese money, this amounts to about $350—a fortune.

"Oh, she is a terrible bad one."

"I loved her," I said. "She's one of my favorite types of people in the world. A really jolly open crook. I hope she has a wonderful time at Mecca."

"But we have to fix her roof anyhow," said the UNRWA official.

In our suite of followers, I had noticed a tall boy of 16 or 17, with fine intelligent eyes, a happy face, and a fresh white shirt. I spoke to him in English, and he understood; I asked whether we could visit his family. His house was no larger than any other, but clean, peaceful, and touching, with orderly furniture and picture post cards tacked to the walls. His mother was blind from cataract, and his grandmother seemed older than time, of a generation so old that she had tattoo marks on her cheeks.

The boy had graduated from high school and now worked as manager of the food distribution center in the big camp (14,000 inhabitants) on the plain below. He must have been very competent and very reliable to merit this job. He hoped to become a TV-radio engineer. He did not speak of Palestine. There was work he wanted to do, wherever a man could do such work. UNRWA is now building a vocational training school in Lebanon; it should be open in the autumn. With any luck, this boy will learn the technical skill he so desires and make his own life independent of anyone's charity.

We heard shrill painful child's crying and went toward the sound. A child of about 2 was tied by the ankle to a chair, howling the same word over and over. A younger child was silently trying to hold its body up, clinging to the arm of another chair. On a clean mat, on a clean little sheet, a baby twisted its body restlessly, but its legs lay still. All three were remarkably good looking, all seemingly husky and well formed.

The camp leader carried on a short barking exchange with their young mother and reported: "She is 25. None of the children can move their legs; the legs will not hold them. The child is tied because he can pull himself out of the house and get hurt. She says: 'please, will you help her?' "

Speaking French to the UNRWA official, because no one else there knew the language, I said, "She can easily have five or six more children like this. It is terrible for her. The visiting nurse ought to explain about birth control."

"You don't know what you're saying. UNRWA could not touch such a thing, not even mention it. Here are these people, and the name of their country does not exist on the map any more. If we start teaching them birth control, we will be accused of trying to wipe out the people too. Besides, the men would never allow it. They want to have a lot of sons; it is a matter of pride with them. And politics enters too, as into everything; I've heard them say it. "We need to have many children and grow and increase so that the world will never forget us."

"They're doing well, from what I've seen. "About 30,000 babies a year."

The camp leader, escorting us to our car, remarked that no one here had any work. He delivered a short speech in English; he was a very nice, gentle man. "All the men do is sit in cafe and suffer, suffer. A young man sees time running, running, and he gets old with no years. If I did not got my land to hope for, I lose my brains."

On our way to Beirut, the UNRWA official said, "Eighty percent of the men in that camp work. It's quite a prosperious little camp."

"Do they lie just for the fun of it?" It had been a long day.

"Well, it's natural in front of us. If they earn too much, they are taken off the ration lists. If they earn above a certain amount, they aren't eligible for the services. Free medicine and doctoring and schooling. So, obviously, they don't want us to know."

"Like nonrefugees with the income tax collectors?"

"That's it."

"Do you know what they are earning?"

"Not really. How could we? Of course, if anyone has regular employment, we eventually learn of it and cut down the rolls."

The refugees, in camps as well as outside of camps, do fine work of some sort; otherwise, on 1,500 calories a day, they would soon become and look like a severely undernourished, sickly group. UNRWA's health statistics can be relied on; they know how many refugees use their medical services and for what reason and with what results. The standard of health is unusually high and is one of UNRWA's finest achievements.

On the plain below Mia Mia, the land is green with citrus groves, banana plantations, where nothing grew before. This is the work of refugees; someone should be very grateful to them. Refugees who were city dwellers in Palestine gravitate to city work: taxi-drivers, employees, merchants. No matter what official attitudes are, all of these people tend to seek their own previous level, under the universal refugee handicap of starting from scratch, of being exploitable, and in competition with established locals. Besides, they are living in a part of the world where poverty is an endemic disease and it is hard for anyone to make a good living, unless you are born into a silver-spoon family.

Out of the blue, my guide announced: "There is no crime in the camps. No thefts, no fires, no blood feuds. It is much better than it was in Palestine. They know they are all brothers in refuge. There were a few murders sometime ago; someone raping, something like that. It is natural. But no crime."

And this is true. In all the camps. Exile has taught one valuable lesson: how to live peacefully and lawfully together.

To enter the Gaza strip you require a military visa from the Egyptian Government in Cairo. I had arrived in Cairo expecting to proceed like the wind directly from there to Gaza but was informed, by the local UNRWA press officer, that this permit took 2 or 3 weeks to get, and that sometimes you never got it. Besides, there was only one UNEF army plane to Gaza each Saturday, and they didn't like carrying anyone except their own personnel; besides, it was now Thursday, and tomorrow was the Muslem Sunday, and indeed all looked hopeless. I foresaw buming a jeep ride over the sandstorming desert and infiltrating into the strip somehow; but meantime I called on the Egyptian authorities.

Because of the Moslem holy day, and the number of passport photos I needed and the number of offices I had to run between, it took about 4 days to get the visa, and every minute was enjoyable. The Egyptian officials could not have been kinder, and I loved seeing them, the new ruling class, who remind me, in their cheerful, inchoate, important busyness, of many new ruling classes I have observed round and about, over the years. It is difficult to believe that these pleasant young men, in shirt sleeves or uniforms, with their numerous callers, their telephones, their mounds of mimeographed forms, their empty Turkish coffee cups, have any connection with the vainglory, the xenophobia, the anti-Semitic hatred that smear the press and pour over the air of their fascinating city.

The Gaza strip, from all accounts, would be a real hell hole. It is a roughly rectangular slice of land, on the southernmost Mediterranean frontier of Israel, some 40 kilometers long by 5 to 10 kilometers wide, and 365,000 people, refugees and residents, live on it. I imagined it as a sand dune, packed solid with human flesh, blazing hot, hideous, and filthy. It is none of these. The weather was so idyllic—a china-blue sky and a constant cool breeze—that I assumed this was special luck and at once asked my charming landlady about it. No, the weather in Gaza was always delightful. She had lived here for 30 years; there were 2 sticky weeks in the summer, otherwise you could not find a more benign climate. Flying over the strip, I had noted plenty of sand, but also plenty of green. There were always citrus groves in

Gaza, my landlady reported, Gaza was famous for them, but since the refugees came these had greatly increased, as had the general cultivation. Anything grows here, she said, exhibiting her blossoming garden.

Then I remarked that Gaza town was a beehive of activity, with all the UNEF soldiers, Danes, Norwegians, Indians, Canadians, Yugoslavs, who patrol the Israeli-Gaza border and spend money in the town in their free time, and the Egyptian upper crust which oversees the Palestinian officials, and UNRWA and visitors and the local residents and, indeed, the refugees. The refugees seemed to bring prosperity with them; it was most mysterious.

Not at all, said my landlady, we do not know why we are not completely bankrupt; but she was adding a third floor to her already roomy house, so great is the demand for lodgings. Sizable villas are being built in what must be the fashionable section of Gaza. The main square boasts an array of parked Mercedes, finned pastel American cars, and humbler Volkswagens. The taxis in Gaza are new. There is an imposing movie theater, in the ugly worldwide chromium-and-junk style; there are abundant cafes and numerous ill-lit dingy shops, typical of the region. An economist could surely answer this riddle: if no one has any money, what are these eccentric merchants and purveyors of services doing?

The refugee camps are much larger than those in Lebanon, small towns by Middle Eastern standards. They are by no means luxury establishments, but many people live in a nastier state in American anti European slums. The poor villagers of Gaza are not as well housed or cared for as the refugees. The Gaza strip is not a hellhole, not a visible disaster. It is worse; it is a jail—with a magical long white sand beach, and a breeze, and devoted welfare workers (UNRWA) to look after the prisoners.

The Egyptian Government is the jailer. For reasons of its own, it does not allow the refugees to move from this narrow strip of land. The refugees might not want to leave at all, or they might not want to leave for good, but anyone would become claustrophobic if penned, for 13 years, inside 248 square kilometers. A trickle of refugees, who can prove they have jobs elsewhere, are granted exit visas. The only official number of the departed is less than 300, out of 255,000 registered refugees. It seems incredible. Rumor says that more refugees do manage to go away illegally, by unknown methods.

These locked-in people—far too many in far too little space—cannot find adequate work. Naturally, there is less chance of employment than in the other host countries. Meantime, they are exposed to the full and constant blast of Egyptian propaganda. No wonder that Gaza was the home base of the trained paramilitary bands called commandos by the Egyptians and Palestinians, and gangsters by the Israelis—the fedayin, whose job was to cross unnoticed into Israel and commit acts of patriotic sabotage and murder. And having been so devastatingly beaten by Israel again, in 1956, has not improved the trapped, bitter Gaza mentality; it only makes the orators more bloodthirsty.

Another Mad Hatter conversation practically a public meeting, took place in the office of the leader of two adjacent camps, a man in charge of some 29,000 people. The camp leader, the self-appointed orator, sat behind his desk. The secret service youth, mentioned earlier, the quiet UNRWA Palestinian, my regular chaperone, and the three uniformed cops of highish rank completed the company.

First the camp leader told me how rich they had all been in Palestine and how miserable they were now and how much land they had all owned. I do not doubt for 1 minute how much land some of them owned, nor how rich some of them were, and I did not point out this subtle distinction: If everyone owned the land claimed, Palestine would be the size of Texas; if everyone had been so rich, it would have been largely populated by millionaires. To gild the past is only human, we all do it; and to gild it with solid gold is even more human if you are a refugee. This part of his address was already so familiar that I could have recited it for him.

Then he spoke of Jaffa, his native town. The Jews surrounded the city, firing on all sides; they left one little way out, by the sea, so the Arabs would go away. Only the very old and the very poor stayed, and they were killed. Arab refugees tell many dissimilar versions of the Jaffa story, but the puzzler is: Where are the relatives of those who must have perished in the fury of high explosive—the infallible witnesses? No one says he was loaded on a truck (or a boat) at gun point; no one describes being forced from his home by armed Jews; no one recalls the extra menace of enemy attacks, while in flight. The sight of the dead, the horrors of escape are exact, detailed memories never forgotten by those who had them. Surely Arabs would not forget or suppress such memories if they, too, had them.

As for those Arabs who remained behind, they are still in Jaffa—3,000 of them—living in peace, prosperity, and discontent, with their heirs and descendants.

"The Jews are criminals," the camp leader continued in a rising voice. "Murderers. They are the worst criminals in the whole world."

Had he ever heard of Hitler?

He banged his table and said, "Hitler was far better than the Jews."

"Far better murderer? He killed 6 million Jews as a start," I observed.

"Oh, that is all exaggerated. He did not. Besides, the Jews bluffed Hitler. They arranged in secret that he should kill a few of them—old ones, weak ones—to make the others emigrate to Palestine."

"Thirty-six thousand of them," said the secret service man, proving the point, "came here, before the war, from Central Europe."

"It's amazing," I said. "I have never before heard anywhere that the Jews arranged with Hitler for him to kill them."

"It was a secret," the camp leader shouted. "The documents have been found. Everyone knows. It was published. The Jews arranged it all with Hitler."

There is a limit to the amount of "mad hattery" one can endure, so I suggested that we visit the camp. I knocked on a door at random, before the camp leader had a chance to steer me anywhere. Two young married couples lived here. In a corner by the courtyard wall stood a group of visitors, silent Arab women, in their graceful long blue dresses, slightly hiding their faces behind their white head veils. The older women wore silver coins on chains across their foreheads; this is very pretty and is also guaranteed to prevent sickness of the eyes. It was useless to try to lure the women into talk, but one of the husbands talked freely. The Secret Service youth translated.

"It is the blame of America that this happened, because they help the Jews. We only want America to help us to get back to our land."

"How?" I asked. "By war?"

"When the Arabs are united, we will make the war."

"What do you want from us then? Arms to make this war with?"

"No, we want you to stop giving arms and money to Israel. Just now Kennedy has given Israel $25 million for arms."

"I do not believe that the U.S. Government has ever given or sold arms to Israel. What about the arms Nasser gets from Russia and Czechoslovakia?"

"That is all right. That is different. They are peace-loving nations. They only want to help the undeveloped countries."

The Secret Service man put in: "America offered us arms, but with conditions. We will not accept conditions. So we take from the Eastern countries, who give without conditions."

"What do you do?" I asked the fat young husband.

"Nothing."

"What would you like to do?"

"Be a soldier and fight Jews."

This oratory pleased the public very much.

"Do you all like Nasser?" I asked, politely.

Wide smiles. General joy.

"We do. Certainly. Oh, of course. He will unite us and make us strong. He is our leader."

For rest and relaxation, together with thousands of locals, I went to the School Sports Day. Fifty thousand refugee children attend school on the Gaza strip, 98 percent of the possible school population. In Gaza's spacious stadium, 2,000 schoolchildren were gathered. They ranged from tiny tots, the Brownies, in berets and ballet-skirted orange uniforms, to boys in running shorts and muscles. They paraded past the governor of the Gaza Strip in the viewing stand, led by girls in colored outfits who formed the Palestine flag. The human flag was followed by the Brownie babies, Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, girl gymnasts, and boy gymnasts. "We dressed every one of them," an English UNRWA official said. "This show costs us about $2,000, but it's worth it. It gives them something to look forward to. They all love it." They loved it and their admiring families loved it and the public loved it.

The children had marched in earnest stiff-legged style. ("Like the British Army," I said. "Like the Egyptian Army," he said.) They then lined up in formation, and a loudspeaker blared out Arabic. Three times the children shouted a unanimous, squeakly but enthusiastic reply to the loudspeaker's commanding male voice.

"What are the cheers for?"

"The first is: 'Long live a free Palestine.' The second is: 'Long live the United Arab Republic.' The third is: 'Long live Gamal Abdel Nasser.'"

I stayed to see the white-clad girl gymnasts, as graceful as a field of Isadora Duncans, doing lovely swaying motions with blue gauze handkerchiefs.

The vocational training school at Gaza is a freshly painted group of buildings, with well-kept lawns, flower borders, scrubbed Spartan self-respecting dormitories, and impressive workshops equipped with the complex machinery that modern life seems to depend on. The boys were on their playing field that afternoon, a holiday, marking white lines for various sporting events to come. A few of them drifted back and wanted to show off every inch of their school. Did they like it here, did they enjoy their work, were they happy? Needless to ask; the answer glowed and shone on them. The graduates of this school find good jobs for which they are trained; amongst its many other parental functions UNRWA operates a placement bureau throughout the Middle East. This is the new generation, the UNRWA graduates, and you find them everywhere in the Arab refugee world. They have not yet been crippled by exile, regret, or hate, and they may well be the brightest citizens of the Arab future. They are the source of all hope.

Two accidental conversations stick in my memory. Once, lost in the UNRWA compound of offices, I chanced on a pretty, dark secretary, who told me the kind of inside human angle of history which is more interesting than any other. In 1956, when the Israelis took the Gaza strip, during what they call the Sinai campaign and we call Suez, for short, telephone communication

was restored between the strip and Israel, which is, after all, just across the fields. In the midst of enemy occupation, the secretary's sister-in-law rang up from the small town where she lived in Israel, to have a chat. How was everyone? The sister-in-law reported that they were fine, her husband was doing very well, they had a nice house and no trouble of any kind. The secretary, recalling this family news, said, "I think if we had all stayed where we were, nothing would have happened to us. All this would not have come about. And what is it for? My children have never seen Palestine. I tell them; and in every school, every minute, they are always told. But when they are grown? The people who knew Palestine will die, and the young ones—will they be interested?"

The second memorable talk took place at the Sewing Center. The Sewing Center is another of UNRWA's camp inventions, and it is self-supporting. UNRWA Sewing Centers teach dressmaking and new uses for traditional Palestinian embroidery—vast tablecloths and sets of napkins, blouses, skirts, which sell at good prices to local customers and to city specialty shops. Hundreds of refugee girls earn small wages and stave off boredom, while learning a trade. The Gaza center was managed by a bustling, cheerful, plump Palestinian refugee, who would be taken for a bustling, cheerful, plump young Jewess in any Western country; but, of course, Arabs and Jews are the same race, Semites. The young manageress showed me massive tablecloths (which none of us would be grand enough to own or get washed), and she praised her girls, who sat on a long porch, embroidering, flattered, giggling.

It was as clear as if she wore a sign, but I asked anyhow: "You're happy, aren't you?"

"I have a nice husband, and two children, and a comfortable house. I like my work very much; it is very interesting. Yes. We are happy." And she smiled. Such a smile. The world isn't lost, not even on the Gaza strip.

Most of the Christian Arab refugees live scattered around Gaza in rented private houses. A few Christian families asked for free government land at the edge of a Muslim camp, the usual free allotment of building materials from UNRWA, borrowed extra money, and built their own houses with small, well-tended gardens. My UNRWA guide, himself a Greek Orthodox Arab, took me to visit one of these trim, respectable, self-made homes, belonging to a family he had known before in Jaffa.

The old mother was half blind; the recurrence of eye disease is a Middle Eastern, not a refugee affliction. My guide and this family had not seen each other for some time, and immediately after their first geeting, the old woman wept with incurable grief and was consoled, gently, but as if he had done so often before, by my guide. He explained: this family had suffered a great tragedy. One of the sons was killed by shellfire, in Jaffa.

I report this because it was the only family I met where an actual human being was known to be dead. Here, at last, the infallible witness testified; and here this death, 13 years old, was mourned as if it had come upon them yesterday. My UNRWA guide behaved as if this case were unique and deserved the aching pity which everyone feels for those who have lost a loved member of the family in war.

I left Gaza, wishing that I could take all the young people with me, and not to Palestine, but out into a wider world. Their destiny should not be to go back, but to go forth. They need exactly the opposite of what the Jews need. There is plenty of room for both needs.

Officially, over 600,000 Palestinian refugees live in Jordan, more than in the other three host countries put together. But legally there is no such thing as a refugee in Jordan. The refugees are full citizens of Jordan; they have every right and privilege and opportunity that a born Jordanian has. Many of the Palestine Jordanians are contented and have made good lives, despite the limitations that a hot, barren, undeveloped country places on all its inhabitants.

Much of the barrenness and poverty could have been corrected by a scheme for the use of the waters of the Jordan River, to irrigate land now wasted. Eric Johnston, who was President Eisenhower's special representative to implement this lifegiving plan, finally reported: "After 2 years of discussion, technical experts of Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, and Syria agreed upon every important detail of a unified Jordan plan. But in October 1955 it was rejected for political reasons at a meeting of the Arab League."

Judging by the refugees I saw in Jericho, in camps outside Jerusalem, in Jerusalem itself, the boon of citizenship fosters sanity. The emotional climate in Jordan is noticeably different from that of the Gaza Strip. A school principal stated that children are taught the history of Palestine, without politics. Exactly what this means, I cannot say. In Jordan, a refugee's education and self-reliance showed at once in his politics. The better educated, the more able do not waste their time on thoughts of violent revenge, and give their loyalty to King Hussein. The more ignorant and less competent nourish themselves with a passion for Nasser, war, and return.

Two men, living next door to each other in a camp outside Jerusalem, aptly illustrate this difference in personality and politics. The camp watchman, who lived in a new little UNRWA house which was already a pigsty, with empty sardine tins on the floor, a filthy yard, rags for bedding, announced, "We were evicted by force, and so we will return. Led by Nasser and Hussein and all the Arab leaders." His neighbor, an old man, had cleared the stony ground around his house and made a flourishing vegetable garden. Inside his courtyard you could hardly move for the rows of drying laundry. He did not have a word to say about war or force or Arab leaders. He said that he would rather starve to death than not give his grandchildren education. "As long as I live and can work, my grandson will go to the university."

The largest Jericho camp is run by an objectionable tyrant, yet its cleanliness was nearly Swiss. "I gave them 6,000 trees," said the refugee-tyrant, speaking in his capacity of God. "Five years ago, the Muktars (the village leaders) would not let me give the people trees; they said if they plant trees, the people will never want to go home." Now trees rise over the walls that separate the little houses, and more trees are to be distributed. An inexhaustible supply of clean water flows from 21 water points. Forty thousand people live here in solid dwellings, under the stern eye of their tyrant; bird-fast children play in the streets.

"How is your name? Are you well? Goodby. Good night. Hello, leddy." The children chirped and circled; the tyrant tried roughly to shout them off. One boy, determined to have his say, presented me with a whole English sentence.

He took me to his home, four airy rooms (one lined with chairs for visiting), a neat yard, presided over by a smiling serene-faced mother, very proud of her son who could speak alone in a foreign language to a foreign guest. He told me, slowly, of his life, his family, and his ambitions. He was 13 and had studied English here for 2 years, in school. He had never talked English with anyone before, except his teacher. After this encounter, I visited some English classes in another camp, to watch the miracle in the making. The boy wants to become a teacher.

"In this country?" I asked, waiting for the expected cry, "No. In my country. Palestine."

"No, not in this country, in Jerusalem or Amman."

So finally I realized, as I should have all along, that "country" means town or village; when the Arab peasant refugees talk of their country—even if they happen to be in it, as they are here—they are talking about their own village, their birthplace. The boy's mind had gone no farther than the big cities of the only country he knows; his mind may travel much farther than that. The highest ambition of all the best students is to become a teacher or a doctor. Teachers and doctors are needed throughout the world, and the Arab world needs them intensely.

Jordan has a vocational training school also, as happy and hopeful as the school in Gaza. Here I forgathered with a class of budding plumbers, another set of citizens the world can well use. They were very merry in their blue work clothes and greasy hands, and full of plans for the future. One wished to go to Kuwait, one to America. One boy said he wanted to plumb in Palestine. The youngest and smallest of them, in a curiously wise voice—both bored and dismissive—said, "Oh, all that will take a long time." None of them was interested enough to go on with it.

The only place that looked as I originally expected refugee life to look was in the Jordanian part of divided Jerusalem, in the old ghetto. Jews had festered in those lightless ratholes, jammed among the ancient stones, for longer than one can imagine; for 13 years, Arab refugees have endured the same hideous life. This is medieval misery and squalor; nothing like it exists in the modern world.

From a fetid passageway, a straight-backed, cleanly dressed, handsome boy bounded into the cobbled alley street. He took the arm of his teacher, who happened to be my guide that day; they were good friends. He was the star pupil of his class. Where could he possibly study? In the street, the boy said, anywhere outside. He has known no other home than a single damp room, a dungeon, where he lives with his bedridden grandfather, his parents, and a brother.

"All the boys from here are good boys," the teacher said, and his amazement showed in his voice. "And very witty." He meant "intelligent," I later discovered.

Did the UNRWA Director know of this vile slum? No, said the camp leader. I hurried off to ask why UNRWA allowed human beings to live in such revolting squalor. Whereupon I was informed that the Director had visited the Jerusalem ghetto within 2 weeks of taking on his job. UNRWA had tried, at various times, to move these refugees, who refused to go because they preferred living inside the city. But now, since their birth rate had risen at such lightning speed, they were more than ready to leave, and within the year they would be settled in a new camp outside Jerusalem. There were two more dreadful refugee slums in the host countries—I did not see either; these were the only subhuman living conditions, and it was not UNRWA's fault they continued. They would, in time, be eradicated.

Despite all difficulties, UNRWA runs a welfare state; no other exists in the Arab Middle East. "The refugee has a net under him; the local population has none." Quote from an UNRWA official. It should be stated that the UNRWA personnel loves its Arab charges, which is not only right but essential. You cannot help those you do not cherish.

With my suitcases packed, and my mind overpacked with treasonous doubts, I set off for Israel across the street. I had not dared

tell anyone, including the Western UNRWA officials, of this intention; to have been in Israel, to go to Israel, is enough to brand you as an enemy and, more possibly, a spy. The Arab psychosis (an ornate word but not too strong) about Israel is official, and infectious. There may be many reasonable people in the Arab countries who are able to think calmly about Israel and about Arab-Israel relations; if so, they choose safety and keep their mouths shut.

When it comes to moving from one side of Jerusalem, which is Jordan, to the other side of Jerusalem, which is Israel, the world of dreams sets in. You take a taxi, through normal streets, and suddenly you arrive at a small Jordanian frontier post, also in a city street. You wait, in this little shack, while your passport is checked against the exit list. After this formality, a charming courteous young porter carries your suitcases half a block. You tip him, and he deposits them on the porch of a house which is no longer there. Artillery fire removed it, years ago. Around you are shelled houses; one side of the street is Jordan, with laughing soldiers in the shelled houses; one side of the street is Israel, with washing hung out on lines. You walk a half block farther, leaving your bags behind. You are now at the Israel frontier post, another shack. Like crossing the River Styx, this is a one-way journey. When you have left Jordan for Israel, you cannot return by this road. The Arab blockade of Israel thus extends to foreign visitors. You would have to fly from Israel to neutral territory and start all over, provided the Arabs still like you, after a visit to Israel.

Since you will not be admitted to any Arab country if you have an Israeli visa on your passport, you carry your Israeli visa on a separate sheet of paper. Other nations than ours present their traveling citizens with two passports. After the Israeli border police have checked your visa, an equally charming courteous young porter, an Israeli, collects your bags from the porch of the nonexistent house in no man's land. You tip him and put the luggage in a taxi and drive a few blocks to your hotel. From your hotel in Israel you have a fine view of the beautiful wall and the Old City of Jerusalem, where you were residing three quarters of an hour ago.

There is not a war on, not by any terms we know. The object of this nonpeace-nonwar exercise is to destroy Israel, which remains undestroyed. I cannot see how it helps the Arab countries, but perhaps it does. Perhaps they need one enemy they can agree on, as a unifying force, as cement for their nationalism.

I wanted to visit Palestinian Arabs in Israel, the ones who stayed behind, the nonrefugees. Seeing them at home, I thought I might better understand the mentality of their brothers in exile. Some important clue was lacking, but I could not name it or define it.

The driver of my car, on the journey in Israel, was an Israeli Jew, born there, who speaks Arabic as his second mother tongue and looks so like Nasser that it is a joke. I said I wanted to visit the village of Meron, on a mountaintop in Galilee. He said that at Meron there was an ancient temple of the Jews, the grave of a famous rabbi, a synagogue, a Yeshiva (the Orthodox Jewish equivalent of a Catholic seminary), but nothing else to his knowledge. Let us go and find out, I said. So we drove north through this country, which is a monument to the obstinate, tireless will of man. In 1949, the new immigrants, like ants on the hillsides, were planting trees: their first job. It looked as if they were planting blades of grass and seemed a pitiful act of faith. Now the trees have grown.

There are countless changes in Israel, but the Arab villages along the road to Nazareth have not changed. The old adobe or fieldstone houses cling to and grow from each other. They are charming, picturesque, primitive, and wretched; but not to Arab peasants. This is the way it always was; this is the way they like it and want to keep it.

We drove up the mountain. Between the synagogue and the heroic ruins of the 2,000-year-old temple, we did indeed find Meron, the home of the aristocrat who had offered me a rose on a mountaintop in Lebanon. There were not more than 12 houses in the village. The Muktar's palace is a long narrow stone shed, with an ugly narrow porch along the front. Instead of beams, bits of rusted railway track hold up the porch. The other small houses were built of the honey-colored, rough field stone, with traditional graceful doors and windows. Inside, the houses were like stables unfit for decent animals. The rich fields and groves the Meron refugees had described were the steep slopes of the mountain behind, where the villagers cultivated tobacco and some fruit and fig trees. In their day, the village had no electric light or water; the women carried water on their heads from the wadi at the foot of the mountain. The view is a dream of beauty. Hardship for hardship, Meron is no better than their refugee camp, Mia Mia, perhaps not as good; but memory is magical, and Meron was home.

Beside these pretty stone hovels tower the remains of a great temple. The blocks of granite in the fragmented wall are as massive as those in the wall of Solomon's temple in Jerusalem. The broken pillars are enormous, unadorned, and suddenly Samson is real and pulled down real pillars as heavy as these. Here, 2,000 years ago, the Jews were praying in a new temple, for 2,000 years is not all that much in the history of the Jews or of this land. And here, with weeds around their low walls, stand the abandoned houses of the descendants of warrior strangers, the Arabs who came to this country and conquered it when the temple was some 600 years old, doubtless already a ruin. Were the villagers of Meron happy when they lived on this mountain; did they think it Eden then? And why did they run away? The war never touched this place.

On January 1, 1960, according to Israeli statistics, 159,236 Moslems, 48,277 Christian Arabs, and 22,351 Druses lived in Israel. These people will have increased, but that is a good enough basis to work on; roughly a quarter of a million Arabs by now. The Jewish population, coming together here from the 4 corners of the earth, was 1,858,841. These dissimilar people live on 8,000 square miles of quite beautiful, laboriously and lovingly reclaimed rock heap and sand dune—of which one-third is irreducible desert. The Druses, a separate and secret sect, are a phenomenon; they are content. They trust and approve of the Jews; they are loyal citizens of Israel. The remaining Arabs are something else again.

On this tour, I visited a Christian Arab village near the Lebanese frontier; a Moslem Arab village on the coastal plain near Acre; two Moslem villages near the Jordanian frontier; a new Moslem settlement near Tel Aviv—the exact copy of a new Jewish settlement, built by the Government; and a Roman Catholic priest, in the beautiful Crusader city of Acre.

My idea was to search out Arab schoolteachers, on the grounds that they would probably speak English, were educated men, would know the feelings of their communities, and would have thought about Arab problems. Arabs, living in their own communities, have their own schools, by their own wish, where the children are taught in Arabic, according to Arab principles. Nissim, my driver, was to serve as translator until I had found someone I could talk to; he was then to disappear. I did not want anyone to feel hampered by his alien presence. I might have spared myself anxiety. The candor of the Arabs is proof of their freedom inside the State of Israel; they are not in the least cowed.

In the Christian Arab village, the schoolteacher was an attractive lean young man, with prematurely gray hair, working in his garden in the cool of the evening. He had a good modern house, a young modern wife, and after 6 years of marriage, a first baby, a 6-month-old girl named Mary, whom he and his wife so adored that neither of them took their eyes off the child at the same moment. He was healthy, prosperous, respected, freely doing his chosen work, loved and loving; by any standards, a fortunate man. After hours of listening to him, I had grasped the lacking clue, and felt hopeless.

"Great Britain helped the Jews," he said. "The English gave weapons to the Arab countries, and they gave weapons to us. In this village we were all armed; we all fired at the Jews, every one of us. But our bullets were no good; the English gave bad bullets to the Arabs. Four out of five of the bullets were no good. When we saw this, we ran away to Lebanon for 2 weeks and then we came back."

"Were any of you killed in these battles?"

"No, no one. Yes, we refused partition. We did not want the Jews here; we wanted the whole country for ourselves, as is right. We only lost because of the United Nations and the Western Powers.

"The Ottoman Empire crushed the pride of the Arabs. The Western Powers divided the Arabs into many nations, after the First World War, to keep them weak. In the 1948 war, the next village was bombed by the Jews; when we saw that, we knew we had no hope."

(Pause for breath: The Jewish Air Force at the time consisted of 19 Piper Cubs, a nice little plane, not a bomber; the next village was a good 7 or 8 miles away.)

"Now we have military zones, all along the frontiers. We must ask for permission to travel or work in different places. They have taken our land which is in the military zones. Yes, they pay for it, but very cheaply."

"At the price it used to be worth in the mandate? Before it was improved by the Jews?"

"Something like that. No, even cheaper. Just now two boys from this village were caught on the Lebanese frontier; the Lebanese police sent them back. The Israelis are holding them for interrogation. How could such boys be spies?"

"I don't know. But you do remember that the Arab countries are at war with Israel? I should think it might be hard for the Jews to know what Arabs they could trust."

"They are right not to trust 50 percent of the Arabs in this country."

"How can they know which 50 percent?"

"Oh, they know everything. They have a CID agent in every Arab village. He is a Jew, and everyone knows him."

"What's the use of having a secret policeman if everyone knows he's a secret policeman?"

"There are plenty of informers. I don't know what it is that has taught all Arabs to be spies." He said this with real despair.

"There is compulsory education in this country up to the age of 14. That is a very good thing. We did not have such a thing before. But the Moslems do not send their girls to school half the time and do not send the boys if they can earn. Then what? The fine for the father is only 5 pounds. What is 5 pounds to the father?"

"Do you really mean that you want the Jews to supply the schools and the law which makes education compulsory, and also to force the Arabs and Druses to send their children to school and take advantage of

this education? Wouldn't that make the Jews even more unpopular?"

He admitted, with a smile, that this might be the case and went on: "Nasser buys arms from Russia because he could not get them from the West. Egypt has 22 million people, so it needs many more arms than the Israelis, who are only 2 million. But Nasser is not crazy; he will not make war. He spends as much on social reform as on arms. All children now go to school in the Arab countries."

"Have you ever visited the Arab countries? Have you been to Egypt?"

"No."

We drank more coffee; we lit more cigarettes. I braced myself for further enlightenment.

"The Arab kings were not the true representatives of the Arab peoples when they made war against Israel. Now all the refugees should come back and we should have partition."

At this point, I decided to make one long, determined stand to see whether there was any meeting ground of minds on a basis of mutually accepted facts and reasoning.

"Please bear with me and help me," said I. "I am a simple American, and I am trying to understand how the Arab mind works, and I am finding it very difficult. I want to put some things in order; if I have everything wrong, you will correct me. In 1947, the United Nations recommended the partition of Palestine. I have seen the partition map and studied it. I cannot tell, but it does not look to me as if the Arabs were being cheated of their share of good land. The idea was that this division would work, if both Jews and Arabs accepted it and lived under an economic union. And, of course, the Arab countries around the borders would have to be peaceful and cooperative or else nothing would work at all. The Jews accepted this partition plan; I suppose because they felt they had to. They were outnumbered about 2 to 1 inside the country, and there were the neighboring Arab states with five regular armies and 40 million or more citizens, not feeling friendly. Are we agreed so far?"

"It is right."

"The Arab Governments and the Palestinian Arabs rejected partition absolutely. You wanted the whole country. There is no secret about this. The statements of the Arab representatives in the U.N. are on record. The Arab Governments never hid the fact that they started the war against Israel. But you, the Palestinian Arabs, agreed to this, you wanted it. And you thought, it seems to me very reasonably, that you would win and win quickly. It hardly seemed a gamble; it seemed a sure bet. You took the gamble and you lost. I can understand why you have all been searching for explanations of that defeat ever since, because it does seem incredible. I don't happen to accept your explanations, but that is beside the point. The point is that you lost."

"Yes." It was too astonishing; at long last, East and West were in accord on the meaning of words.

"Now you say that you want to return to the past; you want partition. So, in fact you say: 'Let us forget that war we started, and the defeat, and, after all, we think partition is a good sensible idea.' Please answer me this, which is what I must know. If the position were reversed, if the Jews had started the war and lost it, if you had won the war, would you now accept partition? Would you give up part of the country and allow the 650,000 Jewish residents of Palestine—who had fled from the war—to come back?"

"Certainly not," he said, without an instant's hesitation. "But there would have been no Jewish refugees. They had no place to go. They would all be dead or in the sea."

He had given me the missing clue. The fancy word we use nowadays is "empathy"—entering into the emotions of others. I had appreciated and admired individual refugees but realized I had felt no blanket empathy for the Palestinian refugees, and finally I knew why—owing to this nice, gray-haired schoolteacher. It is hard to sorrow for those who only sorrow over themselves. It is difficult to pity the pitiless. To wring the heart past all doubt, those who cry aloud for justice must be innocent. They cannot have wished for a victorious rewarding war, blame everyone else for their defeat, and remain guiltless. Some of them may be unfortunate human beings, and civilization would collapse (as it notoriously did in Nazi Germany) if most people did not naturally move to help their hurt fellow men. But a profound difference exists between victims of misfortune (there, but for the grace of God, go I) and victims of injustice. My empathy knew where it stood, thanks to the schoolteacher.

"Do you follow the Eichmann trial?" I asked. An Arabic daily paper, weeklies, and radio station thrive in Israel.

"Yes. Every day." He wrinkled his nose with disgust.

"Do you not imagine that all the Jews in Israel believe this massacre of their people could have been prevented if the Jews had had a homeland to escape to? Don't you think that they knew, also, what you just said: there would have been no Jewish refugees from here—they would be dead or in the sea? Doesn't that perhaps explain them to you a little?"

He shrugged, he smiled; with these gestures he tacitly admitted the point, but it was of minor importance. "In 1948, the Arabs were not united; that is why we lost. In 1956 the Jews beat Nasser. He will never make war. But when there are 5 million Jews here in Israel, the Jews will make war, because they will need more land."

"Israel is about the size of New Jersey, a State in America. Some 6 million people live quite comfortably in New Jersey. Israel could become an industrial state, a very useful one."

"No, it cannot. The Arab nations will not allow it. They will not trade with Israel. They will not let Israeli ships go through the canal. They do not wish Israel to do these things. They will not accept Israel."

"It is hopeless," I said. "In my lifetime, those who threatened war sooner or later produced it. If Arab-Israel politics keep up like this, my friend, perhaps all of us, everywhere—you and your wife and Mary, and my child and my husband and I—will have the privilege of dying in the same stupid final war."

He thought I was making a rich foreign joke. He has never seen even a corner of a real big war; he cannot imagine it. He thinks war is something that lasts a few weeks, during which you shoot off bad bullets at a remote enemy, no one is killed, you run away for a bit and then come home to your undamaged houses and lead a good life, indeed a better material life than before. None of these Arabs has suffered anything comparable to what survivors of modern war know; none can imagine such catastrophe.

The Christian schoolteacher sent me on to a friend of his, a Moslem schoolteacher, in a village called Masra on the plain near Acre. The Moslem schoolteacher was a young black-eyed beauty, who received me in a bleak cement-walled room, scantily furnished with an ugly desk, wardrobe, straight chairs, and day bed. He wore striped pajamas, traces of shaving cream, and a princely ease of manner. We got right down to business.

Before 1948, the population of Masra was 350; now it is 200. They owned little land, they had worked on neighboring kibbutzim and in Acre factories. They always had good relations with the Jews. "No one here shot at Jews; and no Jews shot at us." (Note the order of the sentence.) But now Masra had grown and swollen; 900 refugees lived here.

"Refugees?"

"Yes, people from those villages."

He gestured out the door, across the fields.

"What? From villages nearby?"

"Yes, yes. Those villages. They are maybe 7 kilometers away."

"And you consider them refugees?"

"Of course. There was no fighting near here, but the people are frightened, so they fled to the Druse villages, where they know they will be safe, because the Druses were always friendly with the Jews, and after, they came here. The Israeli Government will not let them go back to their villages. The Government offered them other land, but they will not take it. Before the war, only my father sent his sons to school from this village. Now we have a school and 240 children in it, 100 girls and 140 boys. We have a water tap at every house and electric light; never such things before. No one owned a radio; now there are 100 radios and frigidaires, too. The people earn good wages."

"Then everyone must be happy."

"No. The people are not glad. They want to go back to their old houses, even if there is no light or water or money."

They knew the refugees were living under good conditions; he had brothers in Lebanon and Syria who were doing well. How did he know? They wrote messages to the Israel radio, which broadcast them, and the Lebanon radio sent messages back; that way they heard news of their families.

But all the refugees should return and Israel should be partitioned. I put the same proposition to him as to his Christian colleague; if the Arabs had won the war, would they accept partition?

"No, never, of course not. We would let some few Jews live here as immigrants but not be masters, not in any part of Palestine."

"Why do you think the refugees left in the first place?"

Well, there was much fear. Then, they all knew about Dir Yassin and expected the same to happen to them. Inside Israel, the Arabs do not need or use the refugees' stories of massacres; they do not have to account for flight, since they are still at home. They know what happened around them, and their neighbors know, and such stories would be pointless. But they do speak of Dir Yassin, which was a genuine massacre and took place in the village of that name, near Jerusalem, on April 9, 1948.

Before the official Arab-Israel war started (on May 15, 1948) there had been months and months of incidents. ("From the first week of December 1947, disorder in Palestine had begun to mount. The Arabs repeatedly asserted that they would resist partition by force. They seemed to be determined to drive that point home by assaults upon the Jewish community in Palestine" (Trygve Lie, "In the Cause of Peace," Macmillan, 1954).) By February 1948, aside from scattered Arab attacks on scattered Jews, and reprisals for same, the Arab liberation army had moved into Palestine from the north, and Jerusalem was bombarded, besieged, and cut off. The Jews were trying to run food to the beleaguered Jewish population of Jerusalem. A lot of Jews were getting killed in that effort, in Jerusalem and elsewhere, and in the eyes of some Jews not enough was being done to prevent or avenge this. The state of Israel did not exist; no functioning Jewish government could control this anarchic, deadly phase of undeclared war.

Two famous illegal groups of militant Jews, the Stern Gang and the Irgun Zvai Leumi, had their own ideas on how to fight fire with fire. The British regarded them both as terrorists. The Jewish Agency and their underground army, the Haganah, which were the official Jewish authorities in Palestine, also rejected the Stern Gang and the Irgun Zvai Leumi, because of their ruthlessness. Under the circumstances that cre-

ated them, these two outlawed bands do not seem very different from resistance groups, partisans, or commandos, all of whom were admired as patriots, and none of whom obeyed the Queensberry rules.

The Irgun Zvai Leumi, in any case, behaved like desperate men at war, not like the millennial inheritors of a high moral code. The village of Dir Yassin lay close to besieged Jerusalem and its lifeline road. According to the Irgun, Dir Yassin was a nest of snipers and armed Arabs; an effective enemy concentration. On their own, the Irgun decided to attack Dir Yassin. Their leader was killed by Arab fire from the village; the Irgun fighters then went brutally mad and shot everyone in sight. Two hundred and fifty Arabs were killed.

To this day, Israelis cannot get over their shame for Dir Yassin, while failing to remind themselves, the Arabs, and the world that murder, horribly begets murder; and they could present a longer casualty list of Jews killed by Arabs, before and after Dir Yassin, during the twilight period of terror that preceded open war.

The news of Dir Yassin spread like the tolling of a funeral bell throughout Arab Palestine. According to their own ethical code and practice of war, Dir Yassin must have seemed a natural portent of the future to the Arabs. They intended to massacre the Jews; if the Jews were victorious, obviously they would massacre the Arabs. As the beautiful schoolteacher pointed out, Dir Yassin threw the fear of death into vast numbers of the Arab population. In panic, they fled from Palestine.

Since we were talking about war, we came easily to the subject of Nasser.

"Here they love Nasser. All love him. He is Arab person. They do not believe what he says on the radio—kill the Jews, kick them into the sea. So long he says it, and nothing happens. It will not be war. Something else will arrange, but not soon."

The Christian Arab schoolteacher had told me of a priest in Acre whom I should see, but I could not find him. Instead, I directed myself toward the nearest church steeple, rang a doorbell beneath, and was admitted by an enormous, rotund priest in a brown cassock. He looked like an Arab but was an Italian. He had lived in this country for nearly 30 years and had learned how to survive: by laughter. He laughed at everything, and it was an awesome sight.

We settled on his stiff upholstered visitors' chairs, and he ruminated on the problem of the refugees. If there was the choice between a big financial compensation or return, only 50 percent of the refugees would wish to return, and most of those who came back would not stay. "They could not endure how this country is run. The discipline. The work." The refugees are kept thinking of Palestine by the Arab leaders, by propaganda. Why not build factories and arrange land resettlement in the Arab countries? (The Arab governments do not wish this, Father.) Give the money to the Arab governments and tell them to get on with the job and control it. (How?) By force. (But what force, Father?)

He often told Arab priests about the 13 million refugees who came from East Germany to West Germany; they were all absorbed into West Germany and enriched the country. Why would not 800,000 Arab refugees enrich the Arab countries, which were big and underpopulated? But it is no use; Arabs have never heard of any other refugees or any other problem than their own, and they cannot think about that, in a practical way.

The whole problem is between the East and the West; the Arabs are very happy in the middle, using blackmail. This would stop if the East and the West came to terms, or if the West was united and strong and could impose its will. (But how, Father?)

Ah well, the Jews might as well let the refugees come back; the Arabs here are loyal to the state. ("The ones I've seen detest the Jews and the state, Father, and you know it." I expected his laughter to make a sound, it was so violent.) Yes, yes, that is true, but they do nothing. There is no resistance, no underground. Think what they could do if they really wanted to, with the Arab countries all around as a base. (Some Arabs did for a long time, Father—until 1956, in fact; look at the countless incidents with the U.N. police force called out to investigate murders, thefts, sabotage.) Oh, that was nothing, nothing to what they could do if they really wanted to.

With another mute roar, he told me that the Arabs said, "First we will finish with the Shabbaths, and then with the Sundays." They never changed their ideas. They went around looking at the women and the houses they would take when they managed to get rid of the Jews and the Christians. He laughed himself into a good shake over this one.

I asked about the Eichmann trial and the reaction of his Roman Catholic parishioners. Well, his Christian Arabs thought Eichmann was right, because the Jews were the enemy of the German state. They were always the enemy of the state; the Pharaohs had to drive them out of Egypt, the Persian King tried to clear them out, Ferdinand and Isabella kicked them out of Spain. No one could live on good terms with them, so Eichmann was right. (Horrified, really horrified, I said: "Surely that is not a Christian attitude to the most appalling murders we know about?" He found it terribly funny that I should expect a Christian attitude from Arabs.)

"I do not like either Arabs or Jews," the priest announced with great good humor, "but I serve them with my whole heart, as I must."

He asked me at the door whether there are any Christian Arabs in refugee camps. Yes, I had seen a camp of Christians in Lebanon.

"I am surprised. There must be very few. I would have expected them to manage better. They do not dream all the time. They have more contact with reality than the Moslems."

By now I could foretell one local Arab account of reality. First they explain that they did not lose the war against the Jews; various others are responsible for the defeat. Then they boast cheerfully of their present material well-being, as if they had invented prosperity. At this stage, the Israeli Jews might be wisps of smoke; they had nothing to do with building the country. However, Arabs are miserable; although they never had it so good, it is not good enough, owing, of course, to the Jews. Usually these Arabs say how much they love Nasser and in their devotion are curiously remindful of Nazi Austrians, 25 years ago, when they praised the handsome distant leader, Adolf, from whose hand all blessings would flow. What they believe they now want is to bring the refugees home and partition the state. They have not considered this as a practical matter, nor imagined its effects on their new-found prosperity.

I visited a school in a village where prosperity had broken out like a rash—new houses, shops, hospitals, high school, bigger elementary schools—and the teachers harangued me as foreseen. After telling me how well off everyone was, and bragging of their growth, they told me they were all unhappy and poor because they had owned 40,000 dunams of land (10,000 acres) and now only owned 10,000 dunams. But another Arab, who had not overheard this conversation and was employed as an agricultural inspector, explained that the 10,000 dunams were irrigated, which was new, and also they were scientifically farmed, and therefore produced far more than the 40,000 dunams had. To listen to these conversations is work for a psychiatrist, not a journalist.

I yearned for my silent hotel room in Jerusalem, but Nissim had two heart's desires, and Nissim was such a nice man that I could not refuse him. There was a great lady he wanted me to meet, a Muslim. "She began a Muslim women's club all alone, she," Nissim said. "Such a thing has never been. What a brave woman. The Muslims go to a place and learn together, and hear lectures, the women. Is it not wonderful?" I could see that Nissim was by nature a suffragette. He also wanted me to visit a new village of government-built houses, which the Arab citizens buy on the installment plan by paying a low rent. Not everyone has a chance to own such fine, inexpensive houses, and Nissim—like all Jewish Israelis—is ardently proud of every improvement in his country.

First we called on the lady, who lived in a modern villa, luxurious by middle-class standards anywhere and palatial by Middle Eastern standards, very shiny and tasteless. Nissim thought it wonderful; so did she, with well-bred restraint. She was young, charming, just returned from her schoolteacher's job, bathed and dressed for the afternoon in a sleeveless red dress. She spoke of her Muslim women's club, whose members ranged in age from 15 to 60, and learned sewing, cooking, child care, listened to lectures, and were enthusiastic over their new venture. I am a suffragette like Nissim and was delighted. Then the predictable complaints began. The peasants, she said, have work and money and don't care about anything else. But the educated people suffer; they have all this education, and after they finish their studies, what can they do? Only the professions, and business, and a few are elected to Parliament; but they cannot get positions in the army. Her husband, a pharmacist, has to take four buses to reach his place of work, but here is this village of 8,000 people without a pharmacy; why don't the Jews open a pharmacy?

"If there is such a crying need for a pharmacy here, why doesn't your husband start one himself? This is not a Communist state; there are no laws against private enterprise. You are well-known people, full and free citizens. You could certainly raise a loan, if you need it."

You are not supposed to argue about complaints; it is abominable manners. Her face closed like a lovely olive-colored trap.

"The Israelis say that they do not conscript Arabs—except the Druses, who insisted on it themselves—because the only people the Israel Army would ever have to fight are Arabs. It seems decent to me, and it seems like reasonable military security. How would your men feel if called upon to fight fellow Arabs, who might be their blood relatives and intended to be their liberators? Do you think it is a good job for a man to join an army he cannot serve with his heart, and would sell out if the time came? That may be excellent work for spies, but not for soldiers."

She opened her closed face to say, "Yes, I see. But it is our country."

It was too hot, and too futile. Besides, I was tired of the convention which apparently requires non-Arabs to treat Arabs as if they were neurotic children, subject either to tantrums or to internal bleeding from spiritual wounds. This girl did not strike me as a pathetic weakling.

"Only by right of conquest," I said. "In the seventh century. The Jews got here first, about 2,000 years ahead of you. You haven't lived as masters in your own house

for a long time. Aside from the Crusaders, the Ottoman Turks bossed you for a steady 400 years, before the British took over. Now the Jews have won back their land by right of conquest. Turn and turn about," I said, feeling as beastly minded as an Arab myself. "Fair's fair."

"How was it?" asked Nissim, who had been waiting in the car. "She is fine, isn't she? Think that she starts to teach the Muslim women. No other one did."

Israelis are the first to explain (and who can know better?) that it is painful to be a minority: the Arabs in Palestine became a minority suddenly. It is grievous (as who knows better than Israelis?) to be separated from the numerous, needed members of your family. Israelis will also explain that the Arabs in Israel are torn in two: their racial loyalty belongs to the enemies of Israel, and they are afraid; if the Arab nations make war against Israel, as is regularly promised on the radio from Cairo, Damascus, Beirut, what will be their fate? Would the outside Arabs regard them, the Arabs inside Israel, as collaborators, traitors?

The emotional position of the Israeli Arabs is tormenting (and is held in that torment by the Arab radio stations), though they are materially secure, protected by equal justice under law, and by an almost exaggerated respect for their feelings. If the Arab nations made peace with Israel, it is possible that all Israeli Arabs would relax, be happy, and wholehearted supporters of Israel. If not, not. No one, after listening to Israeli Arabs, could believe that Palestinian refugees would be either contented or loyal citizens of Israel.

The new village, that so pleased Nissim, was rows of small plastered houses painted in pastel shades, or white with pastel-colored woodwork. They have a porch-veranda, two fairly large rooms, a kitchen, a shower-washroom, and small gardens. No working-class Arabs I saw anywhere in the Middle East possess houses like these, but the owners were not satisfied, as I knew they would not be. One boy of about 14 could speak English; boys of this age are valuable informants—they parrot their elders without reflection.

"We are very poor," he said.

"How can you be very poor and live in these houses? You have to pay for them."

"We must to work very hard. More harder than before. Terrible work. We have no land."

"Wasn't farming hard work?"

"No. That was easy. Not like now."

"How does your family manage?"

"My brother works. In Tel Aviv. In a gasoline station. That is terrible hard work."

When we left, the pretty, healthy children ran beside the car, shouting. I waved. Nissim looked queer, something was wrong; that chronic optimist seemed sad.

"What's the matter, Nissim?"

"Nothing. What the children say."

"You mean just now, shouting?"

"Yes. They say: 'Where you going, bastard? I spit on you.'"

What for, I thought, what for, and will it never stop?

"Do you hate the Arabs, Nissim?"

"No. Of course not."

"Why not?"

"What is the good of hate?"

What indeed? Arabs gorge on hate, they roll in it, they breathe it. Jews top the hate list, but any foreigners are hateful enough. Arabs also hate each other, separately and en masse. Their politicians change the direction of their hate as they would change their shirts. Their press is vulgarly base with hate-filled cartoons; their reporting describes whatever hate is now uppermost and convenient. Their radio is a long scream of hate, a call to hate. They teach their children hate in school. They must love the taste of hate; it is their daily bread. And what good has it done them?

There is no future in spending U.N. money to breed hate. There is no future in nagging or bullying Israel to commit suicide by the admission of a fatal locust swarm of enemies. There is no future in Nasser's solution, the holy war against Israel; and we had better make this very clear, very quickly. Long bleak memories will recall the Sudetendeutsch and Czechoslovakia. In a new setting, Palestinian refugees assume the role of the Sudetendeutsch. Israel becomes Czechoslovakia. Propaganda prepares the war for liberation of our brothers. Victory over a minor near enemy is planned as the essential first step on a long triumphant road of conquest. A thousand-year Moslem reich, the African Continent ruled by Egypt, may be a mad dream, but we have experience of mad dreams and mad dreamers. We cannot be too careful. The echo of Hitler's voice is heard again in the land, now speaking Arabic.

Unfortunately for us all, including the Arabs, the Middle Eastern Arab nations have been hit by independence and the 20th century at the same time. It is a lot to handle, and they are not handling it safely or sanely. The cold war does not help them; it encourages folly. East and West both treat the Arabs with nervous anxiety; placatory and bribing, East and West keep their eyes fixed on the geographical location of the Arab states and the immense amount of oil under their deserts. No one does or can talk practical facts about Israel to the Arabs; it would be useless. Even the soundest Arab leaders have tied their own hands tight in an official hate policy. At present, any Arab government which urged a quick, peaceful, advantageous settlement of the Palestine refugee problem would be mobbed. The mobs have been indoctrinated for 13 years, as have the Arab refugees.

The Palestinian refugees could have been absorbed into the economic life of the Arab countries long ago, despite the remark of UNRWA's Director—in his 1960 report—that jobs do not exist for the refugees in the Arab countries. Of course they do not exist; if they did, the Arab standard of life would be a finer and a better thing than it is now. The jobs must be made; but the Arab countries need to have the jobs done as much as the refugees need to do them. The Director of UNRWA states, in the same report, that the majority of Palestinian refugees are unskilled peasants and there are enough or too many of those in the Arab countries already. No doubt. But unskilled peasants, all over the world, have learned to become skilled factory workers or scientific farmers, at very short notice; that ability to learn is what makes our modern industrial civilization tick. The Yemenite Jews who moved in a week from the Middle Ages to Israel, the unskilled Polish peasants operating the Nova Huta steel mills are obvious examples of this transformation. Neighboring Arabs regard the Palestinian Arabs as outstandingly intelligent. I would think this reputation deserved. There is no reason to believe that they cannot learn as others have.

Where there's a will—and as much unused land and wasted water, mineral and oil resources, underpopulation and undeveloped industries as in the vast Arab territories—there's a way. Western imperialists would have to contribute most of the cash for the way, and it would be cheap at the price. It is more expensive to maintain paupers forever than to establish free, self-supporting citizens. One outlay of capital is futile and never ends; the other is a capital investment, humane and profitable, and pays for itself. It pays in buying peace, and we don't have to argue which is the better bargain, peace or war. Western imperialists should provide the way; the Arab governments would have to provide the will.

Economics are not all, and the tragedy of most refugees is not that they starve in their countries of adoption, but that their hearts and minds and souls starve. They are lonely strangers who do not speak the language of the new land, or know its customs; they are aliens. But the Palestinian refugees look, think, feel, and organize themselves socially as the Arabs of the host countries do. They speak the same language, they practice the same religion. The Christian minority would find fellow minority Christians in every Arab country except Lebanon, where they are on top. The Palestinian Arabs are not foreigners in the Arab world; they are members of their own family.

According to Arab politicians and apologists, the Palestinian refugees refuse to become integrated in the Arab world; it is Palestine or nothing for them. Everyone shouts for the Palestinian refugees, and at them, and about them, but no one has ever asked the refugees what they themselves want: where do you want to live; what do you want to do? My tiny personal Gallup poll unearthed plenty of refugees who were happy where they were and had no desire to return to Palestine, no matter what; and plenty of refugees who longed to emigrate to the richer Arab countries, where the future looks brighter, or out into the great non-Arab world. Except for one Christian Arab from Jaffa, who thinks Jews more honest than Arab Muslims and better people to do business with, none of them wanted to return to Israel, as Israeli citizens, and dwell in peace with their Jewish neighbors. We need a secret poll of both sexes, from the age of 12 onward, to discover the refugees' own wishes for their own lives. The poll would have to be secret because it is impossible, even perilous, for an Arab refugee openly to disclaim interest in Palestine. Such a freethinker would be marked as a traitor to the Arab cause. Man is a political animal, but he also wants to live. Politics have offered a very dry crust to these refugees for a very long time.

Yet the Arab governments insist that the Palestinian refugees are a political problem. Once a year, formally, they brandish these waiting lives at the U.N. Assembly. The rest of the year, with different degrees of intensity, depending on their domestic politics, they wield these waiting lives to stir up Arab hate at home. The Arab governments say they will not accept the existence of the State of Israel, now or ever. The logical conclusion is that, when ready, they intend to burst from their cold belligerent status into hot armed conflict and terminate Israel's existence. We cannot force the Arab nations to make peace with Israel, but we have to prevent them from making actual war—for the sake of all human life, their own included. A vital preventive act would be to remove Paletinian refugees as a justification of war.

Is it fruitless to offer terms to the Arab governments? We cannot hurry them, or threaten them. Their pride has been scarred; they are uncertain noisy adolescents in a tricky clever adult world; their nationalism is new, and they suspect insults or attacks on it, from every side; they do not live easily with themselves or with each other; and they have not yet understood that a nation is only as strong as its people—arms laid on top of disease, illiteracy, and poverty are a useless burden. But if we know our own minds, are patient, firm, and generous, in time the Arab governments might allow us to enrich their countries.

Our Western offer should be clear: UNRWA is to continue as a bridge to the future; we will pay for the bridge and the future—Palestinian refugees are gradually to become Arab citizens, earning their own livelihood on land, in industries, which our money and technical help will make available. All of this, but not another penny for a political

problem. The Palestinian refugees must be taken out of politics forever and given the same chance that millions of refugees have had before them: a chance for work, private peace, and private life.

Would the Arab Governments reject such an offer flatly, in pique, and turn UNRWA over to the Russians? The Arab leaders do not care for communism at home. Russia, as parent and teacher of hundreds of thousands of young Arab refugees, would not charm them. In the ugly East-West rivalry for Arab affection (and oil and geography), we might for once risk taking a reasonable, compassionate line. We are not likely to be outbid in this field. The Arab Governments do not love us, but they fear the proselytizing Communists more.

UNRWA has been a splendid mother-and-father and can serve the refugees as a guide to the future. UNRWA's greatest gift to the refugees, to the Arab world, and, indirectly, to us all is the education and health of its charges. UNRWA should receive more money and be considered primarily an educational institution. In my opinion, UNRWA will be with us for some time, an admirable training school for young Palestinians and a kindly old folks' home for aged Palestinians. But UNRWA too must be taken out of politics. Its work should not be subject to Arab political supervision; none of its activities should be used for Arab propaganda purposes; and its Western personnel must keep themselves rigorously detached from the Arab-Israel controversy.

The Palestinian refugees are a chain reaction. Arab politicians and apologists would have us believe that the explosion began with the Balfour declaration to view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a home for the Jewish people. More likely, the explosion started in the depths of time when the Romans drove the Jews from their one and only homeland, the soil that grew their history, the Bible. Nearly 2,000 years later, Hitler and his followers committed such barbarous crimes against the Jews as all Christendom and all Islam, barbarous too, had never inflicted in the centuries of the Jewish dispersion. The Nazis and the gas chambers made the state of Israel inevitable: The Palestinian Arabs and the five invading Arab armies determined the boundaries of Israel.

The Palestinian refugees are unfortunate victims of a brief moment in history. It is forgotten that Jews are also victims in the same manner, of the same moment. The Arab-Israel war and its continuous aftermath produced a two-way flight of peoples. Nearly half a million Jews, leaving behind everything they owned, escaped from the Arab countries where they lived to start life again as refugees in Israel. Within one generation, if civilization lasts, Palestinian refugees will merge into the Arab nations, because the young will insist on real lives instead of endless waiting. If we can keep the peace, however troubled, the children of Palestinian refugees will make themselves at home among their own kind, in their ancestral lands. For the Jews there is no other ancestral land than Israel.

Missiles, Politics and Honest Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the foundation of a representative democracy such as ours is the power of an informed public to choose between advocates of competing public policies. This choice, to give the best in government, should be made rationally and on the best of available facts. It is the duty of candidates and the parties which support them to assure that every fact comes before the electorate to aid the voters in their decision. A part of this duty is to conduct fair and honest debates; a failure in this duty may well lead to demagoguery and dictatorship.

No one can be said to be blameless when matched against this criterion of honesty, but it is important that instances of dishonesty be exposed to discourage it for the future and help educate our citizenry against the techniques of campaign falsehood, so they may be better able to withstand its influence in other campaigns.

Mr. David Lawrence dealt with one instance of campaign dishonesty that arose during the last presidential election in his column in the New York Herald Tribune. I am placing this column in the RECORD both to commend its appearance and to help bring its message to America:

"MISSILE GAP" ISSUE RAPPED AS POLITICAL PROPAGANDA

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—How honest is American politics, and how honest-minded are many of those political speakers who confuse, if not mislead, the voters in order to win an election?

The subject becomes pertinent now in view of a frank and candid comment just presented to the public by the New York Times—a supporter of Mr. Kennedy in the election campaign last year. The editorial says in part:

"The 'missile gap,' like the 'bomber gap' before it, is now being consigned to the limbo of synthetic issues, where it always belonged. The 'missile gap'—the prediction of an overwhelming Soviet superiority in intercontinental ballistic missiles in the early 1960's—was the product of partisan politics and service—primarily Air Force—pressures. The same forces and the same congressional and journalistic mouthpieces who manufactured an alleged bomber gap in the 1950's sponsored, and indeed invented, the alleged missile gap in the 1960's. Today, judged by the hard-bitten estimates of actual Soviet strength, to which all the services apparently subscribe, the 'missile gap' has vanished; the quantitative advantage, if any, is on the side of the United States.

BASED ON AIR FORCE INTELLIGENCE

"The issue became one in part because Air Force intelligence estimates of Soviet missile capabilities, which were always far higher than other estimates, were used as political and propaganda footballs. The Air Force thought it had a good lever with which to pry more money out of the administration and Congress. The Republicans, needlessly on the defensive, got a bad case of foot-in-mouth disease. The Democrats, then on the political out, used the alleged 'missile gap' as a club with which to belabor the administration. The result was that a ghost, a shadow, became a synthetic issue, which obscured real national defense problems and confused the voter."

But the people of this country were not the only ones confused. Abroad, the so-called prestige of the United States supposedly went down on the barometer of the hour, and the Democrats began to demand that all the prestige polls obtained by governmental agencies abroad be published at once. Nobody took the trouble to analyze how much of the decline of American prestige overseas was due to the faultfinding and despair crying groups of politicians making speeches inside the United States.

Some of the harm done was partly offset later by President Kennedy, who, shortly after he took office, repudiated, in effect, some of the things he himself had said on the stump indicating that American defenses had been neglected. There is no telling how many people who listened to the great debates on television between Messrs Nixon and Kennedy came to the conclusion that, if things were as bad as they seemed in comparison with Russian military power—as described by the politicians in their speeches—then maybe a change of administration was really necessary.

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM

The Democratic platform had conveyed the impression of American military weakness. It said: "As a result, our military position today is measured in terms of gaps—missile gaps, space gap, limited-war gap."

Mr. Kennedy himself in a campaign speech in New York stated: "The missile lag looms larger and larger ahead." This was repeatedly emphasized by other Democratic speakers throughout the campaign.

Yet, shortly after Mr. Kennedy took office, he endeavored to change national psychology on this point and also impress the world with America's military strength—certainly something that had not been built overnight and surely couldn't have been achieved in the few months after the 1961 Presidential inauguration. ROBERT MCNAMARA, the new Secretary of Defense, was among the first to reveal that the "missile gap" did not exist.

ANYTHING GOES

Unfortunately, too many politicians in both political parties nowadays seem to think that "anything goes in politics" and that anything said to the voter is all right—even if, after the campaign is over, it proves to have been misleading. One cannot help but wonder if there shouldn't be a supplement to a recent speech by the Attorney General with reference to enforcement of the antitrust laws. He said:

"We are talking about clear-cut questions of right and wrong. I view the businessman who engages in such conspiracies in the same light as I regard the racketeer who siphons off money from the public in crooked gambling or the union official who betrays his union members."

Maybe there should be added now: "or the politician—in or out of public office—who betrays the citizens generally, misleads the voters, and by misstatements of fact damages the prestige of his own country throughout the world."

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Testimonial by Senator Dodd to the Very Reverend Vincent C. Dore, O.P.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 17, 1962

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on October 22, 1961, the Providence College Alumni Association conducted a testimonial dinner in Providence, R.I., in honor of the Very Reverend Vincent C. Dore, O.P., the seventh president of Providence College.

The principal speaker at this testimonial dinner was the junior Senator from Connecticut, the Honorable THOMAS J. DODD, a graduate of Providence College in the class of 1930.

Senator DODD's address was truly magnificent and I ask unanimous consent to have a copy of his remarks printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. It was truly a most deserving tribute to one of the country's outstanding educators.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD AT THE TESTIMONIAL DINNER IN HONOR OF THE VERY REVEREND VINCENT C. DORE, SHERATON BILTMORE HOTEL, PROVIDENCE, R.I., SUNDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1961

There is something about the inauguration of a new college president that makes it a significant event in the lives of many thousands of people and of society itself. For it marks the commencement of a new leadership that will influence, for good or for ill, the mental growth and the approach toward life of thousands of young students. And it means a new impact, for better or worse, upon the intellectual and academic life of our Nation.

Happily those of us who know of Father Vincent Dore are confident that his influence will be for the good and his impact for the better.

Father Dore is in himself an embodiment of the ideal of the "whole man" which true education seeks to develop. As an athlete, as a student, as a man, as a teacher, as an administrator, as a civic figure and above all, as a spiritual leader, he has left upon all things he has touched the mark of his zeal, his character and his great ability.

Those of us who love Providence College and who are concerned with its welfare were cheered and heartened to hear of Father Dore's appointment as the new president. We confidently look forward to his administration as a period of unparalleled growth and achievement.

Father Dore follows in the footsteps of some remarkable men. It was my privilege to know and to regard as friends two presidents of Providence College. I well remember Father Lorenzo McCarthy, who built a tradition of intellectual excellence here and left a heritage in the hearts and minds of the students of that time which continues to bear fruit. And all of us revere the memory of Father Robert Slavin. He maintained and improved academic standards here. He led the way to a great physical growth so that an improved curriculum could be made available to more and more students. Through his writings and his lectures, he made an ever broadening range of people aware of and interested in Providence College.

For those who are returning to Providence College after some absence, this event evokes the deepest sentiment. Certainly it has greatly affected me. For it was here that I came into contact with philosophy, with theology, with the great minds of the past.

I have always felt a debt of gratitude to the Dominicans who taught here and who by their example and by their precept opened to me and to so many others a vision of what life ought to be and what it can be.

One cannot be among the Dominicans without feeling again the influence of the two greatest figures of the Dominican Order. And in reflecting upon them, it seems to me that they, and the order they served, offer the answer to the terrible challenge that faces 20th century man.

St. Thomas Aquinas showed us the philosophy and the system of logic by which we can seek and find the truth. His teachings remain the basic guides not only in theology and philosophy but in economic, social and political questions.

St Dominic demonstrated for us the zeal for conversion which the Western World must find again if it is to overcome the new barbarism that threatens to engulf it.

And the Dominican Order itself offers to the free world the tools which it desperately needs: the true intellectual and moral life and the passion for propagating it.

A vast and crucial struggle is raging across the earth between freedom and communism. At bottom, this is a continuation of the ancient conflict between civilization and barbarism and between good and evil.

Some people find it naive and unsophisticated to describe this world struggle in terms of good and evil but the more I see of it the more I am convinced that at bottom this is a moral struggle.

The conflict is more critical today than ever before. For in the new barbarism of the Communists, the force of evil has at its disposal enormous resources that it has not had before; a fantastic capacity for organization, a gigantic apparatus of terror and propaganda, a perverted zeal, a false but self-sufficient system of logic which is its own judge and which admits of no higher tribunal, the incredible tools of modern technology, the inestimable resources of whole continents and the forced labor of 1 billion slaves.

All of this has been harnessed and is now turned against Western civilization which, whatever its grave and tragic faults, represents and defends the force of good in the world.

And while the enemy is at its strongest, Western civilization is at its weakest state, for it is infected with an internal disease which threatens to destroy its roots and thus pull it down.

As those of us who were schooled in the teachings of Thomas Aquinas look out upon Western society, we see a strange paradox. Its people are enjoying the fruits of the most successful of all civilizations, fruits which have their origin in certain fundamental spiritual and intellectual beliefs. Yet in large measure Western man either ignores or actually rejects those truths that form the basis of our civilization.

Western man once believed in the existence of objective truth and in the capacity to discover truth through the use of his reason, and so he embarked upon those intellectual adventures which revolutionized human existence, through the study of the nature of man, through the development of rules of reason, through the mastery of the arts and sciences.

Western man once believed that he had a free will and was a responsible being, endowed by his Creator with freedom to choose, and thus a network of political freedoms and civil rights was woven to protect and encourage this free choice, thereby liberating an incalculable amount of creative energy and incentive.

Western man once believed that every human being possessed an inherent dignity, not the shallow thing that passes for dignity today, prestige, status, social grace, but an intrinsic worth arising from his nature as one created and redeemed by God and destined for eternal life in accordance with His plan; therefore, a humanitarianism evolved which spread its beneficent effects throughout the structure of society, largely eliminating the ancient cruelties and degradations.

At critical hours in the struggle against barbarism some Western men believed that some things were more important than life itself, and they gave their lives to throw back successive waves of invaders, preserving our chance to receive from our fathers and to pass on to our children the blessings of more than 2,000 years of endeavor and growth.

The civilization which was based upon these fundamental beliefs is now under a double onslaught, beset from without by the mobilized forces of communism, which already control one-third of the earth, and undermined from within by ignorance of its origins, doubt of its essential truths, and rejection of its root ideas.

Against the Communists we must develop superior organization of our men and resources, superior technology, stronger armies, more effective propaganda. This is a matter of political leadership, of military budgets, of industrial production, of foreign aid, of alliances, of diplomacy. It is a tremendous task, and our immediate survival hinges upon it.

But in the end, how successful Western man will be in defending what he has will depend upon what it is that he is defending, or what he thinks it is.

Those who are struggling to preserve only their conveniences and pleasure will cease struggling when the battle causes inconvenience and pain.

Those who are defending only our superior material abundance will prove to be summer soldiers when faced with the threat of unparalleled material destruction.

Even for those who are defending their lives, their homes, and their families, the struggle may lose meaning when it threatens mass destruction on so vast a scale that individual survival appears hopeless.

And so we see growing up all around us groups who fear the bomb more than the loss of Western values, and who march under the miserable slogan, "Better Red Than Dead."

If we try to combat the Soviets on the ground that they offer the world a brutal and tyrannical form of materialism, whereas we offer mankind a humane materialism softened by democracy, then our stand is futile and ultimately self-defeating.

It is only when Western man realizes that he must struggle, not for the material fruits or the scientific achievements or the political refinements of Western society, but for its spiritual origins, its eternal truths, that he will be prepared to make the heroic, sustained endeavor that must be made.

If Western man believes in a Supreme Being, whose will he serves, then he is clothed in a certain armor of courage and confidence which is essential to victory.

If he believes in the immortality of his soul, then he is no fearful weakling whose goal is mere survival under any circumstances; he is a man who will lay down his life for those values which we are trying to preserve.

If he believes that there is such a thing as objective truth and that he is endowed with the capacity to know it and the duty to seek it, then he will be a purposeful citizen and a resolute defender, for he has the strength that goes with knowing his side is the right side.

If he believes in the dignity of man, properly conceived, then the thought of 1 billion slaves behind the Iron Curtain, deprived of their basic human rights, will be a constant thorn in his side and a spur to action.

So long as he grieves over their enslavement, he will never be fooled about the nature of communism, he will never acquiesce in any agreement which consigns others to perpetual slavery, he will never invite the enslavers to his shores to be received as honored guests, he will never join in the diplomatic recognition of gangster regimes as legitimate governments. And for the same reason, he will strive constantly toward the elimination of those forms of discrimination and injustice and degradation here at home which deny men the rights and opportunities and patterns of growth which are their just inheritance.

If Western man believes in inalienable rights and in the inalienable responsibilities that go hand in hand with those rights, then he will be a bulwark of our system of free government and he will accept the painful obligations which must be accepted if any free society is to survive, the duty to sacrifice, to take risks, to bear arms, to pay taxes, to forgo individual interest in behalf of the common good.

The question before us then is, can we in the Western World develop even a significant minority of men and women who are mentally and morally equipped to do battle with both the frontal attack of Communist barbarism and the internal corruptions of Western materialism, atheism, and agnosticism.

The leaders in this effort must be men like yourselves, products of our finest traditions, students of Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas, followers of St. Dominic. But if these traditions are to be preserved only as academic curiosities in ivory towers and cloistered halls, we are done for, we have already lost.

The task of our time is to restate these truths, to apply them to current events, to imbue a large part of our intellectual community with them and make them intelligible and acceptable to the people.

The role of an institution like Providence College in a task of this kind is central.

If each day, its faculty and graduates can make a contribution to the mainstream of American thought; if each year we can send out into the world from Providence College and those many other institutions dedicated to our common ideals, new legions of young people grounded in religious beliefs, equipped with the tools of logic, and infected with a zeal for converts, then there is a chance that Thomistic philosophy may be for our age what it has been in the past: a leaven spreading its elevating influence throughout the social structure and cleansing society of internal weaknesses. This is a goal grand enough to fire the imagination and enlist the efforts of each of us.

If the fate of the West hung upon what men alone will do, then the outlook would indeed be dismal. Left entirely to our own resources, we should surely fail. But we are sustained by the faith that God still rules the world.

We stand in much the same position as did Charles Martel before the battle of Tours, or Don Juan of Austria on the eve of Lepanto, or Jan Sobieski before the gates of Vienna, or indeed Winston Churchill in the summer of 1940.

At these climactic periods of history when the West seemed destined to be engulfed by barbarism, pitifully inadequate forces led by resolute men with spiritual faith and moral courage turned the tide and saved civilization. We cannot therefore know the mighty result that can come from the dedicated efforts of a few men acting in harmony with the laws of God.

If we of the West can stand up to the Communists now, if we can hold the line in Berlin, in Vietnam, in Quemoy, and all around the perimeter of freedom, if we can gain the time for that intellectual and moral resurgence in the West of which we now see many signs, then we will win the struggle.

We will win because man's higher needs are the very things that western civilization answers and which the cold dogma of communism cannot supply. Man has needs and appetites that no material order or philosophy can satisfy. Whatever may be our weaknesses, we have one great strength. Our universities are free, and our churches are free. The people of the West remain free to seek the truth and to worship God. I believe that in the end the church and the university will save us.

Both of these great institutions are represented here by Providence College.

It has been my privilege and great fortune to attend Providence College during its early years, to watch it grow into a great institution of learning, to see it make a contribution to the life of our time and now to see it embark upon a new period of growth and of service.

Most of us have our own ideas about the future course Providence College should take. I have one ambition, one hope which I would like to see realized and that is the establishment of a great library of Thomistic literature and a great institute of Thomistic studies at Providence College.

To those of us who believe with Pope Leo XIII that the teaching of the scholastics is a necessary basis for the future restoration of the social order, such a center for Thomistic learning is essential.

Others have already begun the work. At the University of Toronto, the Order of St. Basil has established the Pontifical Institute as a center of medieval culture, scholarship and research. And here in our own country at the University of Notre Dame, the Medieval Institute has been established and has already become a center for students of the Middle Ages. Even in lay circles there is a resurgence of interest in the scholastic heritage.

And where can this task better be done than here at Providence College? This is the one Dominican institution of higher learning on the North American Continent and it is here that the traditions of the Dominican schoolmen should be preserved, reinterpreted and restated for the people of our generation.

I hope that the establishment of such a library and center will become the objective of Providence College and of its alumni, for I think it is a cause to which we shall all be willing to give our best effort and support.

As those of us who have returned to Providence College for this occasion look at what has been wrought here, as we meet again these great and good Dominicans who work and teach here, as we reflect that other institutions and other men across this country and throughout the world are laboring in the same vineyard, then we can leave with renewed confidence that there are forces working for the triumph of good which shall not be denied the victory.

The Late Honorable Styles Bridges

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to add my tribute to the late Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire. It was my privilege to know him long before I became a Member of this body. I would like to place in the RECORD the fact that in the 79th Congress Senator BRIDGES was the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services and also of the Committee on Appropriations and the second ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. When the 80th Congress convened, a Republican-controlled Congress, it was necessary for him to drop one of these committees. He dropped the committee on which he was second in rank, the Committee on Foreign Relations. Soon thereafter the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the great Senator from Michigan, Arthur Vandenberg, died. His death was followed by a deterioration in the bipartisan foreign policy which he had done so much to create. Then-President Harry Truman called in the senior ranking Republican of the U.S. Senate with the request that he do everything in his power to recreate a bipartisan foreign policy approach. Having resigned prior to that time from the Committee on Foreign Relations he was not in a position to do then what he so wanted to do and what the President of the United States thought was in the best interests of the Nation. Nevertheless, he did me the honor of asking me to come down to the Senate and act as liaison with the White House in recreating bipartisan foreign policy. In the meeting with John Foster Dulles, who was then serving Dean Acheson, and as a result of meetings in the Senate, it was finally determined that the job or recreating bipartisan foreign policy could not rest on the shoulders of a man who was not a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I say this with a degree of sadness because, in looking back, it seems to me that this was the one thing he most wished to do. Nonetheless, he went on to contribute as much as he could toward building bipartisan foreign policy. Often he would say to those of us who knew

him that he was the first "Republican internationalist Senator."

Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in the well-chosen words spoken here today paying high tribute to a valiant servant of the Nation, Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire.

Alaska's Power Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST GRUENING

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 17, 1962

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, Alaska is heading toward a critical and crippling scarcity of electric power. The city of Anchorage is already in short supply, and by 1963 or 1964 Fairbanks may expect dismal "brownouts." Similar situations exist in southeastern Alaska communities in Juneau, the capital, Wrangell, Petersburg and Ketchikan, and elsewhere.

The need for plentiful low-cost power if an economy is to expand is axiomatic. A region which can hardly meet its current power demands will not lure new power-consuming industries; rather the incumbents, unless some remedy is offered, may find continued operation difficult. In the fiscal sense Alaska had been the economic stepchild of the Federal Government for so long that its spindly economic condition in the midst of national plenty grew to be a national disgrace. While it was under the national aegis the territory was "shorted" on highways and electric power, the arteries and blood of any viable regional economy and neglected and discriminated against in other fields. Other adverse effects of a near century of colonialism persist and remain to be liquidated.

As a State we are trying to correct the deficiencies, but it is not done in a twinkling.

Rampart Dam on the Yukon, when constructed, will give Alaska 2-mill power at the busbar, a fantastically cheap rate in a land of exorbitant prices and what will doubtless be the lowest cost power under the flag. Hence my colleagues and I are working with all our energy for the realization of Rampart, which will be the free world's largest hydroelectric installation, a needed galvanizing element in Alaska's economy, and a distinct boon to this Nation. If construction on this mighty project were to commence as early as tomorrow morning, however, it would be 7 years or more before the current was electrifying the lines. Considering that studies will require at least 2 years for completion, and a year or more to design the dam, Rampart at best is a decade away.

Alaska, then, particularly Fairbanks and Anchorage, and the area in between and in the Kenai Peninsula, must take immediate, interim steps; a stopgap must be provided which will meet the day-to-day needs of the next few years and allow both needed power service and expansion. An illuminating series of articles by Paul Lien on the power needs of the rail belt area of Alaska have recently appeared in the Fairbanks News Miner.

Alaska's economy needs expanding; its requirements for power grow more urgent every day. Electric energy must be provided at once, even though it will be relatively high cost, and we must press with all strength and speed for the earliest possible completion of Rampart which will do more than any other single factor to activate the sleeping giant of northwest America.

The series of articles which I propose to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD deals only with the needs of the so-called rail belt area. That is now the most populous part of Alaska, extending from the lower end of the Kenai Peninsula with its communities of Seldovia and Homer, its railway entry and port of Seward northward through Anchorage, the Matanuska Valley, Talkeetna, Nenana to the great Tanana Valley in which Fairbanks is situated and beyond to the Yukon where the Rampart Canyon, site of the proposed dam, is located.

This series does not include the power needs of southeastern Alaska. There the Long and Crater Lakes project also known as the Snettisham project, for the Juneau-Douglas area has been readied for congressional presentation by the Bureau of Reclamation. Studies of the Swan Lake project for power for the communities of Petersburg and Wrangell are under way, with the possibility that its power might be transmitted to Ketchikan, although nearer sources of power to Alaska's "First City" are available.

I ask unanimous consent to have the first of the series of articles on the power needs of Alaska's railbelt printed at this point in my remarks, in the appendix of the RECORD, and the remainder to follow one by one in successive issues. Subsequently the power needs of other areas in Alaska will be discussed.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROBLEMS, SOLUTIONS OF AREA POWER LISTED

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—News-Miner staff writer Paul Lien has made an exhaustive study of power potential of the Fairbanks area in particular and the Railbelt area in general. The study has resulted in the disclosure, long known by power experts, that this area faces a power shortage in 2 years. In a series of 12 articles Lien tells of the problems facing this area in the near future and the plans of the consultants to solve these problems before they become more critical than they already are.)

(By Paul Lien)

Fairbanks will face a power shortage in the winter of 1963. Managers and personnel of both the Municipal Utilities System and Golden Valley Electric Association are busy day and night trying to find the best possible solution to the problem of bringing additional power into the area at the least cost to the consumer.

Everyone is agreed that cost in Fairbanks and the Tanana Valley is entirely too high.

Operation of small power units is given as the main reason for the high cost of electricity; second, the long haul transportation costs of fuel to the plants, and third, high cost of living and labor in this area.

What is being done about this matter?

In Anchorage, where the power shortage is even more critical, an organization was formed called the Central Alaska Power Pool (CAPP). Comprising this power pool is Chugach Electric Association, Inc., the city of Anchorage, the city of Seward, Homer Electric Association, Inc., and the Matanuska Electrict Association, Inc. In addition, the city of Fairbanks, the Copper Valley Electric Association, Inc., and Golden Valley Electric Association, Inc., were invited to join the group. MUS and GVEA have joined for the purpose of pursuing further study of the proposed power projects.

Authorization to make a survey of power needs and potential sources of power was given to the Ralph M. Parsons Co. of Los Angeles in August of this year at an Alaska REA Co-op meeting in Homer.

This survey was finished late in October.

After exploring all possible sources of power in the time given, the Parson's report recommended the use of mine-mouth steam plants at Healy and Sutton on the Alaska Railroad belt and a gas turbine plant near Anchorage.

The steam plants would have a 44,000-kilowatt capacity while the gas turbine plant would have 16,500 kilowatts.

Cost of building the plants and transmission lines was estimated to be between $35 and $40 million. Target date for completion of the new plants was set for December 1, 1964.

An expenditure of an additional $10,000 was authorized to have Parsons make an economic feasibility study. This study will give a firmer report on costs and time, concentrating only on the plants to be built at Anchorage, Healy and Sutton, and will be completed by January 1, 1962.

PEAK DEMANDS

According to the Parsons report the projected peak demands for the railbelt area show a need for about 368,000 kilowatts by the year 1980, an increase of more than 300,000 kilowatts over today's load.

As a step in meeting this demand, a comprehensive evaluation of present and prospective power resources was made and summarized as follows:

1. The present diesel and steam generating plants should be retired to reserve status as soon as possible to allow the utilization of larger and more economical units.

2. The present hydroelectric stations at Eklutna and Cooper Lake should be "base-loaded" until such time as economic considerations require a conversion to peaking status.

3. Neither nuclear power nor any of the proposed hydroelectric projects, except Rampart Dam, should be considered for present development.

4. For the conditions outlined in the study it was determined fossil fueled coal power plants offer the most economical source of energy.

The Late Honorable Louis C. Rabaut

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in paying a final tribute to our distinguished friend, the late LOUIS C. RABAUT.

When I first came to the House of Representatives, LOUIS became one of my first personal friends, and over the years we developed a warm and cordial friendship.

For 25 years, LOUIS served his constituents well. He was truly a representative of people everywhere who cherish the goals of progressive and humanitarian legislation. The Nation is indebted to him for the very important part he played in the progress that has been made in our country.

To his beloved wife and other members of his family, I express profound sympathy.

Criteria for Free Speech for Military Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 17, 1962

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in the January 14, 1962, issue of the New York Times magazine section is an article authored by our colleague, the Senator from South Carolina, STROM THURMOND, in which he sets forth his position on the subject of troop education in preparation for fighting the Communists in the cold war. In this article Senator THURMOND has set forth the criteria which he feels should be used. His criteria do not infringe on the right of the President to determine foreign policy or any other policy of any administration. He sets forth only criteria which all good Americans should know so that they can recognize the techniques and methods of our common enemy in the cold war which is costing the American taxpayer untold billions of dollars.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no obection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRITERIA FOR FREE SPEECH FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL

(By Senator STROM THURMOND)

WASHINGTON.—Perhaps the most jealously regarded right of Americans is that of free speech. Not only has our freedom of speech been buttressed with legal safeguards but, as a review of the periodicals of any era will show, it has been extensively exercised. Efforts to impose censorship, originating either within or without the Government, have traditionally met with vigorous opposition from practically all segments of our society.

In recent months, a pattern of censorship of the statements of military personnel has been revealed, which, although usually subtle, can only be characterized as infringement of free speech. In this instance, however, there has been lacking the usual unanimity of protest. Indeed, some of those who have on previous occasions taken the lead as champions of free speech are to be found among the defenders of this censorship.

What underlies the acceptance, and even defense, of censorship in these cases? Overtly, this acceptance of censorship is based on the military status of those censored. This leads, of course, to the question of whether a distinction hinged on military status is valid at all; and if so, to what degree?

The constitutional prohibitions against the suppression of free speech make no distinction between citizens in and out of uniform. The protection of free speech is extended equally to all citizens. Military personnel, insofar as the Constitution is concerned, are subjected to no limitations other than those imposed on all citizens.

Statutory provisions dealing with free speech are equally nondiscriminatory toward military personnel. Under provisions of the Hatch Act and related statutes, persons employed by the Federal Government are generally prohibited from using their official positions to engage in political activity, and this prohibition is, of course, applicable to military personnel. In the Hatch Act, however, there is a specific disclaimer from any prohibition of free speech in "private" statements. This disclaimer reads: "All such persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose and to express their opinions on all political subjects and candidates."

There can be little question that from a constitutional and statutory standpoint there is no valid distinction between the rights of free speech enjoyed by civilian and military citizens.

Regardless of the constitutional and statutory provisions, it must be recognized that from a practical viewpoint there does exist a distinction. Some of the limitations on the free speech of military personnel are necessitated by the need for disciplined organization, essential to an efficient military force. These limitations are effectuated primarily through a self-imposed sense of responsibility and the sparingly used—until recently—power of control over an individuals' military career residing in his superiors, military and civilian.

The limitations on the exercise of free speech by military personnel which have arisen from practical, rather than legal, considerations are shaped largely by custom and practice, and are, therefore, difficult of precise definition. Obviously, the limitations fall primarily in the area of official, rather than private, statements.

Not all military personnel are subject to the same limitations. For instance, a chaplain must have the greatest latitude in order to perform his mission, while a public information officer, who by the nature of his job speaks officially for his service, would probably have the least latitude. The limitations vary similarly with subject matter, for while almost any official expression on a partisan political subject might be within the limitation, almost any nonclassified expression on a scientific subject might be untouched by the limitation.

While it is difficult, if not impossible, to define the extent of this practical and justifiable limitation of the right of free speech of military personnel, it is possible to define specific areas where such a limitation does not and cannot justifiably apply. By the application of such a process, it is clear that the current widespread censorship of the statements of military personnel goes far beyond justifiable limitations and, indeed, poses a serious threat to freedom as Americans have enjoyed it.

Currently, military personnel are being subjected to prior restraints on their remarks dealing with the nature, methods and tactics of our enemy in the protracted conflict—Sino-Soviet imperialism and the worldwide Communist conspiracy. A few specific examples show the complete lack of justification of such censorship. Censored and deleted from the proposed speech of one person within the Department of Defense was the following statement: "There is no reason to believe that the Communist conspiracy will abandon its goal of world domination or alter the basic strategy contrived to obtain that goal."

Another statement prohibited: "It [communism] represents a combination of the worst aspects of atheism. Hitlerism and godless materialism." And still another statement deleted from a proposed speech was: "In fact the big question of our day is just simply this: Will the future world, that is, the emerging world order, be in our image, the image of the Western world, or will it be in the image of world communism?"

These three examples are illustrative of the degress of censorship which is applied to personnel within the Department of Defense on the subject of communism. The existing pattern of censorship should and must be judged on the basis of such statements as these, rather than on sloganized characterization of the statements.

Such statements about communism are not "forays into the field of partisan politics." Surely at this late date there is none among us so naive as to consider communism a matter of political partisanship within the United States. Even the Supreme Court has held that the Communist Party, U.S.A., is not a political party, but rather an agent of a foreign power. Communism is a false ideology, contrived to mask the terroristic power lust of its leaders and their efforts to enslave humanity.

It is generally conceded to be inappropriate for military personnel to make statements which are inconsistent with the foreign policy of the United States. Were statements such as the three I have listed above inconsistent with or contradictory to the foreign policy of the United States, then it is possible that censorship of such statements would be justifiable. According to the Secretary of Defense, the foreign policy of the United States can be determined from the statements of the President and of the Secretary of State and from policy papers prepared by the National Security Council.

My research has failed to reveal any statement by the President, or his predecessor, or the Secretary of State, or his predecessors, which contradict the foregoing censored statements. Policy papers of the National Security Council are, of course, classified and unavailable to most military personnel. Are military personnel to assume that the classified policy papers of the United States conclude that there is reason to believe that the Communist conspiracy will abandon its goal? Such would have to be the case if censorship of remarks such as those aforementioned is to be justified on the ground that such remarks contradict our national foreign policy.

It should also be apparent that the threat of communism is a matter within the cognizance of the military. The threat which communism poses is total in nature and cannot be characterized as either exclusively military or exclusively nonmilitary. Today's military personnel are never confronted by an exclusively military onslaught, for Communist thrusts are invariably a mixture of closely interwoven and interdependent moves utilizing military, economic, political, subversive and psychological methods.

For this reason the military cannot prepare exclusively to defend against military attack and be successful in performing the mission with which it is charged. To be adequately prepared, our military organization must prepare to defend itself and our country in terms of the total threat and in full awareness of the nature of the enemy and all of his devious tactics.

Only the most naive could believe that one could consider the military potential of Sino-Soviet imperialism in the abstract without taking into consideration the nature of

the insidious ideology which spawns the inhuman and barbaric tactics through which its military potential is utilized.

Even by the standards promulgated by the Department of Defense, statements on communism by military personnel are not legimately censorable. Directives of the Department of Defense prescribe that statements by military persons should not touch the field of partisan politics, should not conflict with national or foreign policy, and should be confined to matters within the cognizance of the Department of Defense.

From the occurrences which have taken place in recent months, it is obvious that the Department of Defense and the administration have so interpreted these criteria as to suppress to the maximum extent possible any statements of military personnel on the subject of communism. No matter how broadly interpreted, however, these criteria cannot legitimatize the censorship of such remarks as those cited.

Unfortunately, not all Americans have had the opportunity to judge impartially this outbreak of censorship since news media covering the subject have only infrequently carried the actual text of the censored remarks, although numerous examples have been made public. All too often the news media have merely given a characterization of the remarks of military personnel as political remarks or the remarks of right wing officers or as speeches of right wing extremists in the military.

If such statements as one which asserts that the goal of communism is to dominate the world constitute extremism or rightwing radicalism, then the time has come to examine the standard by which such remarks are judged. If such a remark should be classified as extreme, what then is the moderate position on the Communist goal? Is it that the Communists do not intend and strive to dominate the world?

Let us examine the statement: "In fact, the big question of our day is simply this: will the future world, that is, the emerging world order, be in our image, the image of the Western World, or will it be in the image of world communism?"

This phrasing of the issue states the conflict that confronts us in an either/or concept. The word "extremist" is a superlative and indicates a position oriented far from an objective view of the issue. What would be the middle-of-the-road view of the challenge facing us compared with the above-quoted "extremist" position? Could the moderate view be that there is a third alternative for the image of the world—perhaps in the form of an international government which presides over a socialistic system which is conceived to lie midway between communism and freedom? Or is the moderate position one that holds that, in fact, communism and freedom can peacefully coexist?

If one of these, or some similar position, is the moderate or middle-of-the-road course, then surely either the majority of Americans or the Government policy must embrace such an outlook, for otherwise it could not be characterized as "moderate" or "middle-of-the-road" in comparison with which the either/or concept would be extreme.

It is hard to believe that a substantial portion of the American public would disagree with the statement that the issue facing us is whether the future will be in the image of the Western World or in the image of world communism. It is even harder to believe that any sizable segment of the American public would characterize this statement of the challenge facing us as extremist or right-wing. It seems much more likely that the third force proponent or the peaceful coexistence advocate is the one who characterizes such censored statements as extremist or rightwing radicalism.

Many reports have even gone so far as to cite the desire to make such statements as those above mentioned as evidence that military personnel are attempting to usurp civilian control of policy in our Nation.

Nothing could be more patently absurd. Civilian control over policy in our country is firmly established and has never been challenged in the slightest by the military. Indeed, the military traditionally has strongly supported civilian control over policy. At no time in our history has civilian control been more firmly entrenched than it is today. In postwar years, new levels of civilian administration have been superimposed over military personnel. Today in the Pentagon and related buildings in Washington, there are almost 33,000 civilians, compared with slightly more than 12,000 officers and enlisted men.

Only recently it was reported that a statement of the U.S. military position prepared by a civilian in the Department of Defense and transmitted through the State Department to all of our NATO allies was never even transmitted down the line far enough to be known to the Joint Chiefs of Staff; and, according to the report, it came to the official attention of military personnel only when inquiries were made by the governments of our allies to the general in command of NATO.

Additionally, State Department political advisers—or should they be called political commissars?—are now being assigned to senior military commanders. Not only do civilians have absolute and complete control over policy in our Government, but it is beginning to appear that a case could be made that civilian personnel are now, or shortly will be implementing policy within the Department of Defense.

While public discussion of the threat posed by communism can never be a substitute for purposeful national policies in defeating communism, general knowledge and accurate information concerning its nature, its purpose and its tactics can serve to build our national strength by reducing our vulnerability to Communist assaults. Suppression of discussion about communism, whether by censorship or by smearing those who discuss this subject as rightwing radicals or extremists, will contribute nothing to the solution of our problems. We cannot sweep the Communist menace under the rug, pretend it does not exist and expect it to go away.

Censorship and suppression of anti-Communist discussion may well be politically expedient, but it is expediency which free people should never tolerate. Suppression of free speech is a characteristic of dictatorship, and suppression of discussion of the Communist menace multiplies our vulnerability to that menace.

The Late Honorable Louis C. Rabaut

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as the years go by Members of the House of Representatives form many friendships. Most of these might be called casual. We each have a warm regard for the other. If our paths cross in matters of legislation we may become more or less intimate with each other. As I look back on my own service I can think of many who would exchange with me the title of "friend." However, there are in my mind always a few who are outstanding and who have from time to time demonstrated for me a warmth and an affection and a helpfulness that sets them apart and in my mind and heart, places them on a pedestal. Such a one was LOUIS RABAUT. I cannot remember just when it was that he took me under his wing and began to give me his help in many things, particularly those which I presented to the Appropriations Committee. I can think of many times when his words of wisdom probably meant the difference between success and failure of some project of mine. His death grieves me sorely. I shall miss him, and I shall miss his good counsel. I hope that the things he has taught me will guide me in the years to come.

Tribute to Senator Bridges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 17, 1962

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a tribute to the late Senator BRIDGES entitled "America Mourns Death of GOP Leader Senator BRIDGES," written by Robert Pfeifle, Washington Correspondent for Overseas Report, which is circulated in many parts of the world.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA MOURNS DEATH OF GOP LEADER SENATOR BRIDGES

(By Robert Pfeifle)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—From the President of the United States to the elevator operator in the new Senate Office Building, the news of the death of revered Republican Senator STYLES BRIDGES saddened the Nation's Capital, as eulogies echoed from every corner of the land.

President Kennedy made a personal telephone call to the Senator's widow and said later in a statement as he arrived in Washington from Hyannisport:

"The Nation will mourn the loss of Senator STYLES BRIDGES, a great patriot who devoted his life to the continuing strength of our country. He was a distinguished advocate of his State, his region, and his Nation. Mrs. Kennedy and I extend deepest sympathy to his widow."

General Eisenhower said he was 'deeply distressed' to learn of Senator BRIDGES' death. "During my years of close association with him in Government," the former President said, "I came to learn how deeply he was dedicated to the good of our Nation."

From Missouri came this message from former President Harry Truman of the opposition party who served in the Senate with him: "I was very fond of Senator BRIDGES. He was a good man."

In California, former Vice President Richard M. Nixon declared: "He was one of the most effective political leaders ever produced by the Republican Party."

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER stated in Arizona: "His death was a great personal loss. Senator BRIDGES was one of my best friends and most trusted advisers."

From Connecticut came these words from Senator PRESCOTT BUSH: "Senator BRIDGES served with only 16 Republicans when he was elected in 1936. His determined efforts for the next 10 years brought his party to an effective national position."

Newspapers around the world headlined the news of the staunch fighter against communism's death while the Voice of America beamed the story behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

The newspaper columns recalled Senator BRIDGES' creed on communism, "I would not appease communism by an action which sacrifices one inch of free land, one human life, or one American principle."

Last June, Senator BRIDGES demanded President Kennedy reaffirm the U.S. policy of defending West Berlin, stating "the urgency of the moment is survival itself."

Just before he was hospitalized for a lung congestion in August, he demanded a Senate investigation of a Defense Department directive which he claimed prevented military officers from speaking out on Communist infiltration and foreign policy matters.

Typical of the editorial comments are these from the Washington newspaper, the Evening Star:

"With the death, at 63, of Senator STYLES BRIDGES, the Nation has lost an influential political leader and legislator whose statesmanlike qualities had won him the respect not only of politicians of both parties but of the public generally. President Kennedy, who learned firsthand of these qualities during his service in the Senate, aptly described the New Hampshire Republican as a "great patriot who devoted his life to the continuing strength of our country.

"The loss will be felt with special keenness by the Republican Party, which Senator BRIDGES had served so long and so well in several capacities. At the time of his death he was chairman of the Republican Policy Committee, in which post his conservative views on domestic issues had an appreciable effect.

"The conservative wing of the Republican Party will surely miss the counsel and leadership of STYLES BRIDGES in its continuing struggle with the liberals for legislative dominance. It was a struggle which undoubtedly played a part in sapping his energies, although he never shied from active participation in any fight which he considered to be in the best interests of his State and country. No more could be expected of any man."

Washington Daily News:

"He didn't speak frequently in the Senate, but he had a talent for remarkably crisp speeches, and some of his analyses of current affairs were incisive and bold. He early discerned the danger of a Red China and even before World War II ended was identifying Soviet Russia as the great roadblock to world peace. He consistently opposed deficit spending.

"The Senator was mixed up in some peculiar situations, and sometimes shot from the hip. But he often was a peacemaker and a conciliator.

"In six successive elections, the people of New Hampshire by wide majorities showed they were well pleased with him. This is one important measure of a Senator, and there are only four now in the Senate who could out-match him."

The Overseas Report also carried the following article:

"STYLES BRIDGES—PATRIOT—STATESMAN

"The untimely passing of Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Republican of New Hampshire, was seen as a serious loss in the battle against communism.

"Prominently identified as the inheritor of the mantle of the late Senator Robert S. Taft, Senator Bridges was an articulat voice of conservatism and enjoyed equal respect among those who shared his political philosophy and those who held to the 'New Deal' ideology of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Unlike others in the Senate who held conservative views, Senator Bridges was a redoubtable opponent of isolationism. He was among the first to urge and support the rebuilding of post-war Germany and its integration into the Western community.

"An unwavering foe of communism, the New Hampshire Senator fought against postwar continuance of Lend-Lease aid to the Soviets and assailed the Yalta agreement. Later, he opposed the extension of U.S. aid to Soviet satellites in eastern Europe and Yugoslavia. He warned the leader of his own party, President Eisenhower, against entering into negotiations with either Soviet Russia or Communist China.

"Senator Bridges was born on a farm in West Pembroke, Maine, September 9, 1898. He worked his way through school and earned degres from the University of Maine and Dartmouth College.

"He entered politics in 1930 and four years later was elected Governor of his state, one of the youngest men ever to hold that office. As Chief Executive of New Hampshire, he is still remembered for the enlightened social legislation he sponsored and achieved.

"He ran for the Senate of the United States in 1936 and very soon teamed up with Senator Taft, the leader of political conservatism in the United States for many years and to this day regarded by both Democrats and Republicans as one of the true immortals of American government.

"By common consent, the leadership exercised among Senate Republicans passed to Senator BRIDGES at the death of Senator Taft, who had himself indicated this wish.

"The New Hampshire legislator became the Republican floor leader in 1952 and soon afterward was elected President pro tempore of the Senate, its Presiding Officer in the absence of the Vice President. He was the head of the powerful policy committee of the Republican Party and, as such, was recognized as the single most influential architect of his party's positions on vital matters of foreign and domestic policy. During the Eisenhower administration, he headed the Senate Appropriations Committee and also served on the Senate Military Affairs Committee, positions in which he was able to exercise his enormous influence on both fiscal and defense policies of the country.

"His friendship for the Federal Republic of Germany, from the day of its birth, was repeatedly manifested in speeches on the Senate floor backing up legislative viewpoints he had taken in using his great influence in the Senate to strengthen the bonds of mutual defense and security between the United States and the Federal Republic. He lent his great prestige repeatedly to the organization of official Senate receptions to Chancellor Adenauer, former Foreign Minister Heinrich von Brentano, and other high Federal Republic officials when they visited Washington.

"The identification of Senator BRIDGES as a conservative was not a matter of self-designation. He observed one time that in his home State of New Hampshire 'they always spoke of me as a radical or a liberal. In the Senate of the United States, I am classed as a rightwing conservative. I guess,' he said wryly, 'I am really a middle-of-the-roader.'

"But whatever the political category others assigned to him, his principles were never in doubt."

The Scripps-Howard newspapers, in an editorial tribute, noted:

"Senator STYLES BRIDGES was in his fifth term. Yet some first termers were more widely known. His seniority, his position as chairman of the GOP bloc, and his skill made him a Senator of exceptional influence. But he seemed to prefer the background. He didn't speak frequently, but he had a talent for remarkably crisp talk, and some of his analyses of current affairs were incisive and bold. The measure of his worth was that the people of New Hampshire elected him by wide majorities in six elections."

Dedication of the U.S. Post Office and Federal Building, Martinsburg, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 17, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on October 18 last year in the city of Martinsburg, W. Va., Postmaster General J. Edward Day presented the principal address at the dedication of the new post office and Federal building.

This event was the source of a sense of deep personal gratification for me in that it represented the fulfillment of efforts which I initiated more than 20 years ago when serving as Representative from the Second Congressional District of West Virginia. The construction of this building, which was interrupted by World War II, has now been completed, and the modern facilities serve a vastly altered postal system and the greatly expanded business and commercial interests of the Martinsburg area. It was a happy event for Marlin Eckerd, the efficient postmaster, the postal and Federal employees, and the citizens of this splendid city.

Postmaster General Day delivered on this occasion a most interesting and enlightening address on the historical highlights of the postal system. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks and the speech by Postmaster General Day be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks and speech were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, DEMOCRAT, OF WEST VIRGINIA, IN DEDICATION OF THE U.S. POST OFFICE AND FEDERAL BUILDING, MARTINSBURG, W. VA., OCTOBER 18, 1961

Postmaster General Day, Representative Staggers, Mayor Golliday, Postmaster Eckerd, and ladies and gentlemen, my pleasure in participating in this dedication is a particularly keen one and more than merely ceremonial. For this building represents the final fruition of efforts which I initiated more than 20 years ago as Representative of the Second District.

I do not now recall whether the site accepted in 1940 is the present one, but I do vividly recall the pleasure which attended my receipt of the knowledge that it had been approved by the General Services Administration. Unfortunately, the creation of the War Production Board in January 1942, and the subsequent termination of all nondefense Government construction postponed the fulfillment of the original contract for construction.

But now, 20 years and the accompanying growth in economic and commercial significance of Martinsburg have made this build-

ing a reality. It is a testimonial not only of the progress of Martinsburg and this section of West Virginia, but also a sign of a larger process at work in our society—the growing responsibilities of the Federal Government and the extension of the physical presence of the Government into such regional and local offices as this.

In dedicating such a structure, therefore, it is appropriate for us to give thought to the question of the broader purposes to which we commit not only this building but our Government and our society as well.

Contrary to the presumptions of some critics, the increased scope of governmental responsibilities and action is not due to an insatiable thirst for power by so-called bureaucrats. It has been due to the inevitable growth in complexity of modern industrial society and to the greater number and variety of problems which transcend State boundaries.

It is our eternal debt to the wisdom of the founders of the Constitution that they established a framework within which the Federal Government might grow to meet these problems without diminishing the personal and civil liberties which animate the spirit of democracy.

We hear much today from some quarters about the encroachment of the Government upon these liberties. Yet a dispassionate reading of American history would reveal, with occasional temporary lapses, that progress in the essential civil liberties—freedom of religion and of speech, freedom of the press and assembly, and extension of the right to vote—has been augmented by the Federal Government, rather than lessened.

True, the power of the Government has grown, especially within recent decades, and with it governmental authority. But the principal growth has been in control of the external conditions of our society which render more secure the internal life and liberty of the human spirit.

This then is the proper division of authority between the individual and the state, between liberty and control. In those areas where spontaneity, creativity, and the free interchange of ideas are involved, liberty must reign supreme. In those areas where men must be restrained from doing injury to their fellows and where we are moving toward an increasing awareness of our collective responsibilities, the state rightfully exercises its authority for the benefit of all.

Thus, such Federal actions as maintenance of certain mutual restraints in trade and economic competition, enforcement of minimum wage and working conditions, and provision for the years of retirement—among many others—have not encroached upon, but rather, they have enhanced the development of individual freedom and the life and liberty of the mind. It is to these values that this building, our Government, and a free society are dedicated.

REMARKS OF POSTMASTER GENERAL J. EDWARD DAY AT THE DEDICATION OF THE U.S. POST OFFICE AND FEDERAL BUILDING, MARTINSBURG, W. VA., OCTOBER 18, 1961

In its leading editorial of May 16, 1896, the New York Times said of a distinguished public servant: "There is not at this moment a single man in public life in the United States who has rendered more practical, difficult, and enduring service."

The object of this editorial accolade was William Lyne Wilson of West Virginia—Postmaster General of the United States.

As we meet here today to dedicate a new link in the vital communications chain of America, it occurs to me that your State has had a unique role in the development of the U.S. postal system.

Not only did you produce one of our great Postmasters General, but it was in this State that rural mail delivery service was born.

It was John Wanamaker who, as Postmaster General in 1891, first officially proposed the establishment of a national rural delivery system.

But not until your own W. L. Wilson was appointed by President Cleveland to head the postal system were the first rural routes actually put into operation.

Rural mail delivery service was first established in the United States from Charles Town, Uvilla, and Halltown, W. Va., effective October 1, 1896.

The annual salary of each carrier on these routes was a meager $200.

From this humble beginning in West Virginia, the rural delivery system has progressed to the point where it now boasts 31,341 routes, stretching for nearly 2 million miles across these United States, serving more than 9 million rural families.

In West Virginia alone, your mailmen daily cover 15,740 miles in making their rounds over 400 rural routes.

And from this beautiful new building, the Martinsburg Post Office and Federal Building, these carriers will go forth each day to serve the needs of nearly 2,000 families who reside outside the city.

Free city mail delivery had its start July 1, 1863, when Congress authorized the establishment of carrier service at offices where the income from local postage was more than sufficient to pay all expenses of such service.

Only 49 cities met the requirements of the act, when free city mail delivery service went into effect. No West Virginia communities were among them. Wheeling became the first city in this State to get free city mail delivery service, and it began there August 1, 1873.

Today the Post Office Department handles some 65 billion pieces of mail a year, an increase of 13 times the volume handled in 1890. Yet, today, we have less than 6 times as many employees as the postal service had in 1890.

We in the Post Office Department are proud of the fact that the massive increase in mail volume that has occurred since those early days has been accompanied by a corresponding increase in operational efficiency.

The design and engineering of the building which we are dedicating today is indicative of the progress that has marked the postal system since the days of its inception, when Benjamin Franklin was tapped by the Continental Congress to be the first Postmaster General.

When rural free delivery was established, horses and mules were the main conveyance for these routes. Today most of our rural carriers are motorized. However, horseback riders still carry the mails on 68 routes in the United States, including three in your own State—Stouts Mills, Harmony, and Wilsondale. In Alaska we even have a dogsled route. Elsewhere our carriers utilize motorboats, helicopters, jeeps, and mailsters in covering their appointed rounds.

Your State may lay partial claim to another important forward step in the postal system's march of progress.

For it was also Postmaster General Wilson who first instituted a policy of basing promotions upon merit in the Post Office Department and in the railway mail service. Unfortunately, this policy was often forgotten in the decades that followed his administration. But we who now operate the postal system have borrowed this page from Mr. Wilson's book of achievements. One of our first major policy statements was that under this administration all promotions to and within the supervisory ranks of the postal service will be founded strictly on merit, without regard to race, creed, color, or political intervention. Through policies such as this, we hope to instill in our 580,000 postal employees an esprit de corps unmatched in Government service anywhere in the world. And through improved morale and better working conditions our goal is to provide the American public with the finest service of which any postal system anywhere is capable.

We do not plan to do it with gadgets and gimmicks, with rockets or coaxial cables or other departures from our basic mission. Our aim is steady progress rather than ballyhoo or talk about "bouncing mail off the moon."

Your city has played a historical role in West Virginia's postal progress.

It was here in Martinsburg that the first post office for what is now West Virginia was established on June 30, 1792.

On that date, David Hunter was appointed postmaster for this community, or deputy postmaster, as they were then called.

In these early days the cost of mailing a letter from Martinsburg to Charleston—a distance of 276 miles—would have been 20 cents. By 1834, the rate had decreased to 18¾ cents. However, in that same year a full course dinner at New York's fashionable Delmonico's restaurant could be purchased for only 12 cents. Of course, this was before the advent of the postage stamp. The system then in practice was that all letter mail was handled c.o.d., with the addressee footing the bill if he desired receipt of the letter.

The first post road established over West Virginia's hills was one from Alexandria, Va., by Salisbury and Leesburg, in that State, to Shepherdstown and Martinsburg. This route was put into effect on June 1, 1792, by an act of Congress. On June 1, 1794, Congress authorized another post road here, between Martinsburg and Liberty.

Both nationally and in your own State, the postal service has come a long way since W. L. Wilson was Postmaster General.

The Post Office Department's Annual Report for the year 1896 indicates that in that year your post office took in gross receipts amounting to only $8,878. Last year your gross annual receipts totaled $342,018.

For the entire State of West Virginia, gross receipts in 1896 amounted to $1,457,407. Last year the State's postal receipts came to $12,472,302—an increase of about 750 per cent.

Sixty-five years ago, all postal workers in this State were paid a grand total salary of only $77,500 a year. Your postal establishment in this State now employs 4,658 persons, who are paid an annual aggregate salary exceeding $22 million. This represents an increase of more than 28,000 percent.

They work out of 1,330 post offices, including this fine new Federal building which we are dedicating today. Annually your West Virginia post offices hire about 460 new employees. We utilize a fleet of some 254 vehicles in this State to serve your postal needs. From these statistics it is easy to see that an important portion of your State's economy depends upon the Post Office Department and its operations here.

The $22 million which we pay out in postal salaries in West Virginia is but a fraction of the huge sum of money the Federal Government puts in circulation in your State. Through its post office lease program the Department provides local communities with much needed economic booster shots by putting local and Federal money into construction and operation of postal facilities.

It provides thousands of jobs for local workers, building, and maintaining postal establishments.

This is particularly true since last spring when President Kennedy ordered a speedup in post office construction, and in the letting of postal procurement contracts in States hard hit by economic depression.

Through your local post office you can purchase stamps, mail letters and packages, buy money orders, and salt away money for a rainy day through the postal savings system.

The Post Office Department insures your packages against breakage, guarantees—by its registered and certified mail program—protected transportation of valuable documents and articles, offers a cash-on-delivery service, sells duck hunting stamps and internal revenue stamps for Federal taxpayments on property transfers and stocks.

Its Postal Inspection Service provides you with a nationwide network of the world's finest law enforcement officers whose lives are dedicated to protecting you from schemes to defraud and other violations of postal laws.

In short, the Post Office serves more people in more ways in more communities than does any other branch of the Federal Government.

This splendid new building which we are dedicating here today—and others like it throughout the Nation—will better enable us to provide you with this kind of service.

It stands as a million-dollar monument to American postal progress.

We are proud of it. We know that you are too.

Invocation for the 77th Annual Meeting of the Family Service Society of Yonkers, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, the invocation at the 77th annual meeting and dinner at the Yonkers Family Service Society was pronounced by the Reverend Robert Smudski, minister of the First Unitarian Church and president of the Yonkers Social Planning Council. I feel certain that his insights into the state of our society and the spirit of Christian concern which ought to motivate us all will be of particular interest to those in the Congress. I would therefore like to insert at this point in the RECORD the invocation given by Reverend Smudski:

INVOCATION FOR THE 77TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE FAMILY SERVICE SOCIETY OF YONKERS, N.Y.

As we gather for this annual meeting of the Family Service Society, may the shared sacrament of the concerned community and the urgency of human need stiffen our spiritual backbones and stimulate our creative imaginations. We know that those who hunger for food no longer press for our attention, but we also know that their place has been taken by those who hunger for guidance and counsel in their anxiety. We know that the naked no longer walk our streets, but we also know that those who feel naked to the icy blasts of despair jostle in every throng. We know that our prisons do not overflow with the innocent victims of tyranny, but we also know that the prison of hopelessness is filled to capacity. Let the needs of this hour stir in our hearts the resolve that what we know, others shall know also, for we shall tell them at every opportunity.

But lest we are tempted to compare our own virtue, because we work for a worthy cause, with the indifference of the many who seemingly do not care, let us not forget the comfort from which we care. It is good to work for such a noble cause. It is better to do it for the right reasons. May the spirit of sincere concern for human beings infuse this gathering, lest we anesthetize ourselves with abstractions. May a genuine devotion to individual well being lead us to see that cases have no fear, statistics never become desperate, and waiting lists do not walk the streets ridden with guilt. In this Christmas season may we affirm again that mankind is our business, but may this affirmation come as an awareness of people so that mankind does not become a blurred generality.

May what you do here bring you the quiet satisfaction of a worthy work in a many-troubled age, and may the quality of Family Service, and the scope of its outreach, be enriched and enlarged under your guidance. In the spirit of all that is holy, we make this invocation.

The Dangers of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial which appeared in the St. James (Minn.) Courier calls to our attention the need for awakening the American people to a sense of responsibility for the growth of Federal Government spending and controls. Mr. Speaker, following is the text of this fine editorial which I ask be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

NEED MODERN REVERE TO ALERT U.S. CONSCIENCE

What, or who, is our worst enemy?

Is it really Communist Russia and Khrushchev?

Or is there a much closer, more sinister, more deadly enemy, in our own midst?

We have many enemies at home. Recognized enemies are disease, unemployment, racial discrimination, production surpluses, accidents, certain types of criminals, and known members of the Communist Party.

How about the undefined enemies: inflation and mass confusion allowing change in our basic political-economic philosophy?

We accept inflation as we have accepted other undesirable fixtures that have been installed in the drift deeper into socialism * * * bureaucracy, withholding taxes, the welfare state, compulsory military training, deficit, greed, waste, increasing Federal Government controls and power to restrict individual liberties.

Inflation and confusion are allied, and may hasten the realization of Soviet Premier Khrushchev's prediction that America's grandchildren will live under socialism.

Khrushchev also had predicted that his society will ultimately abolish the necessity for money.

In a sense, this is being accomplished in America. Inflation, continually accelerated by Government and union demands, is wrecking the value of the dollar, and in so doing is wrecking the American economy.

As if these two forces alone are not enough to drive us into national bankruptcy, the New Frontier has dynamited the tariff dikes and exposed the United States to exploitation by other nations, hastening the draining of our purchasing power.

Every basic law of economics is being violated. American industry, despite its supply of natural resources and superior type of workers, cannot produce and sell merchandise in competition with imported duplicates.

Importing is now a major business in the United States. Few firms still express pride in handling "strictly American made" merchandise. Imported copies can be sold cheaper, and more profitably. Practically everything made in America is duplicated in imports—cars, jewelry, light bulbs, ballpoint pens, clothing, etc.

This transfer of American dollars to other nations of the world is sapping the strength of the United States. It is creating serious economic problems.

Import sales have placed many American manufacturers in a four-way squeeze: Loss of business, if not complete shutdown of production lines; inflation in cost of operating because of lowered production—geared to decline in sales; and the certainty that organized labor will continue to make annual demands for increased benefits and wages, regardless of the company's ecenomic stability; also that Government controls and taxes will maintain pressure right down until the completion of bankruptcy proceedings.

Loss of business and loss of jobs also means an increase in the employer's contribution (tax) for unemployment compensation. This again pyramids his cost of operation and either trims profit or prices his product even higher than the competitive import.

Whether or not the destruction of trade restrictions is part of a diabolical and deliberate plot, it is un-American; it is increasing the stranglehold of a form of Federal Government far removed from that founded by pioneers of great stature and personal sacrifice; and it is expediting the forced dependency of greater numbers of spineless, selfish, or helpless individuals upon the Federal Government.

It is hastening the arrival of out-in-the-open total socialism.

What can we do about it? Possibly it is too late to do anything. Boycotting of buying imports would now mean loss of billions of dollars to American merchants on every main street. Also, it is questionable how much patriotism we really have left, how much true honesty remains in our society, after too many years of horrible example, by public officials, by labor bosses, by industrialists, and business leaders, right down to the individual who cheats on his income tax.

Yet, there is something that can be done. This is a congressional election year. You have the power to destroy the trend toward socialism, if you have the conscience to place your X behind the names of those candidates who pledge to restore American Government to its original concept.

American Government is not supposed to be an international relief agency. That is the job the Red Cross and the many church organizations have been doing on a voluntary basis.

American Government is not supposed to be Santa Claus to those at home who refuse to carry their share of the load.

American Government is not supposed to solve the unemployment problem with jobs for life, or other forms of sugar teat.

American Government was never intended to destroy individual initiative to toil, to succeed, and to provide for one's own retirement.

American Government was never intended to run any less efficiently than private business.

American Government was never intended to maintain, in peacetime, a system of compulsory military training—the list could go on.

These things have happened and are continuing to happen, because conscience has failed to alert enough patriots, to activate an effective counterorganization to that advancing the transition into socialism.

This Nation needs a modern Paul Revere, to issue a clarion call to the conscience of every American, warning of the nearness of the enemy, and the necessity of using the ballot as an effective weapon in the general election this fall.

Washington Reaches for Your City Hall—Proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 17, 1962

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the November 1961 issue of Nation's Business contained an article dealing with the proposal to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

In view of the fact that the President in his state of the Union message has again urged the establishment of this Department, and that the above-mentioned article appeared in Nation's Business at a time when most Members of the Congress where in their home States, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

My views of this proposal are contained in the minority report of the Senate Government Operations Committee which considered this measure in the past session of Congress, portions of which are quoted in the article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON REACHES FOR YOUR CITY HALL

Control of city governments could move to Washington if Congress votes next year to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

It's likely your city would then be less responsive to your individual needs. You would lose personal contact with the level of government which affects you most.

The new Cabinet-level agency is recommended by the Kennedy administration, strongly backed by city officials and, among others, the AFL–CIO.

By establishing a direct line of communication from the mayor's office to the center of the Federal Government, it would soon become the most powerful and expensive Cabinet post. The authority of Governors, State legislatures, and other local levels of government would be demolished.

Although the backers of the proposed Department put most of their stress publicly on the need for Federal coordination, planning, and research, they have in recent years been in the forefront of every fight to enlarge present Federal welfare programs—housing, urban renewal, community facilities, water treatment plants, airports, schools.

They've battled vigorously to get Uncle Sam deeply involved in dozens of new areas: helping depressed communities, combating juvenile delinquency, expanding public health facilities, modernizing and renovating hospitals, subsidizing commuter facilities, acquiring park lands. They've suggested the Federal Government take on such other chores as helping cities to relocate industry, planning public works, fire prevention, even snow removal.

Opponents of the new Department put its real purpose bluntly: to pressure within the administration, with Congress, and with the public for big new spending programs the cities have long wanted.

MOST EXPENSIVE DEPARTMENT

"To say that the bill merely conveys status to the present housing agency without transferring any functions in or out of the agency," say five Republican members of the House Government Operations Committee, "only describes the first step of the long-range strategy—a strategy apparently designed to bring the solution of the day-to-day problems of community life under the direction of centralized government."

Declares a minority report by two southern Democrats and two Republicans on the Senate Government Operations Committee: "A department of Government which will carry out the functions envisioned by the supporters of (this) plan will be the most powerful Cabinet post—and it will be the most expensive."

The fight for the Department of Urban Affairs has been gathering momentum in recent years. President Eisenhower resisted it, warning that "nothing is really solved, and ruinous tendencies are set in motion, by yielding to the deceptive bait of the easy Federal tax dollar."

But the 1960 Democratic platform and Democratic presidential candidate, John F. Kennedy, made the Department of Urban Affairs a key campaign promise.

Shortly after Mr. Kennedy's election, some of his advisers started having second thoughts on the idea, and wished the administration weren't committed quite so firmly, but it was too late—particularly in view of the way the big-city leaders had delivered votes. The administration last spring recommended the plan, the two Government Operations Committees held hearings, and both approved the measure. It is ready for floor action early next year in both Senate and House.

The proposed bill would set up a new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. It would immediately absorb the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency, including the Public Housing Administration, Federal Housing Administration, Urban Renewal Administration, Community Facilities Administration, and Federal National Mortgage Association.

In addition to administering these existing housing programs, the new department would be directed to study and advise the President on new problems in housing and urban development, provide technical assistance to States and cities, encourage comprehensive State and local planning on community development, and coordinate Federal, State, and local programs for urban aid.

The bill has been caught in a slight crossfire because all indications are that President Kennedy intends to appoint as Secretary of the new Department his present Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, Robert Weaver. Mr. Weaver would thus become the first Negro Cabinet member, and this prospect has obliged some southerners who might ordinarily have supported the new department to oppose it. At the same time this prospect has brought support for the bill from some Republicans who might otherwise have opposed the Department but now fear being placed in an anti-civil-rights position. Unless its opponents rally between now and the time the bill will be voted on in early 1962, the odds strongly favor its enactment.

Establishment of the new Department would climax a trend that has been growing steadily in recent years—a trend of cities turning to Washington for financial help.

City officials claim this is the natural result of the Nation's increasing urbanization. Today, they point out, some 70 percent of all Americans live in about 200 metropolitan areas, and practically all future U.S. population growth is expected to be in urban areas. These new metropolitan areas, they continue, expand rapidly across city, county and State lines. Their needs for new and enlarged local services outstrip the availability of local taxes, the argument goes.

So they turn to the States, and what do they find? According to city officials, they find a legislature whose membership was set back in the days when the States were predominantly rural rather than urban areas.

Even where the States are sympathetic, the cities say, they have run out of resources or lack the power to do anything for metropolitan areas that cut across State boundaries.

So the answer is to turn to the Federal Government.

Sponsors of the bill suggest that all they want for the cities is the same sort of representation other groups already get. They say the Agriculture Department represents the farmers, the Commerce Department represents business, the Labor Department represents workers, but no one represents the city dwellers.

Over and over they promise that the only purpose is to coordinate and help plan. "No new programs would be established by the bill, nor would existing provisions of substantive law be altered," the official Senate report on the bill goes out of its way to proclaim.

"There is considerable research being carried on today," asserts Mayor Richard Daley of Chicago, "but such studies are made in bits and pieces. The results are often not widely publicized, and a Federal Department could not only develop its own program of essential information but would have channels available to distribute basic research studies to city, county, and State officials."

Declares Senator JOSEPH CLARK, Pennsylvania Democrat and Senate sponsor of the new Department: "State or city officials with complaints will have someone to whom to turn. A local official with an inquiry will be able to get one-stop service instead of being bucked around from one Federal agency to another."

Not only do the bill's sponsors protest their innocence of new spending aims; they assert it will make things more efficient and even more economical.

Senator KENNETH KEATING, New York Republican, another sponsor, argues: "The creation of a new department to deal with urban problems does not necessarily mean the Federal Government is going to spend more money. By bringing together under one Department a number of separate agencies that now, in many cases, overlap, we may actually be able to realize considerable savings."

But opponents remain skeptical. They point to the past history of new departments, which rapidly become advocates and lobbyists within the Government for the groups they represent—the Agriculture Department fighting for bigger farm spending; the Labor Department pushing for more spending for workers; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare constantly supporting enlarged outlays in its areas. Appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the newest Cabinet post, lion in the year ended June 30, 1953, to more than $3.8 billion in the year ended June 30, 1961, while civilian employment in the agency has climbed from some 36,600 workers to almost 63,200.

It's far more than history and normal bureaucratic trends that worry the opponents of the Department of Urban Affairs.

They're more concerned over the records of the chief backers of the new Department.

The two main sponsors—the American Municipal Association and the U.S. Conference of Mayors—last year asked the Democratic and Republican nominating conventions to adopt urban affairs planks endorsing the principle of Federal grants-in-aid as an appropriate method through which the National Government with its broadly based tax resources can fulfill its duties and obligations in helping local governments.

Specifically, the proposed plank called for Federal-city cooperation on urban renewal, highways, mass transit, airports, water supply, air pollution, juvenile delinquency, hospital construction, atomic energy, civil defense, area redevelopment, payments in lieu of taxes, and public works.

In almost every bill considered by Congress this year in the welfare field, these groups fought for enlarged programs. For example, they called for a 5-year program of $100 million a year for airport help, with the administrator having far more leeway in the type of projects to be helped. The previous program was $63 million a year. Congress authorized a new program of $75 million a year for 3 years.

The National Housing Conference urged that $1 billion a year be voted indefinitely for urban renewal; Congress actually voted $2 billion for a 3- to 5-year period.

Congress authorized $75 million of aid for commuter facilities and $50 million of Federal help for cities to acquire open spaces for parks, recreation, conservation and scenic areas; the urban groups suggested a $500 million, 10-year program of transportation help and a $500 million, 5-year program of open space support.

City officials urged not only continued and enlarged aid for new hospital construction but a $150 million annual program to modernize and renovate older hospitals. The municipal groups led a successful fight for more than double past Federal spending for community health services and facilities.

Advocates of the Urban Affairs Department have supported new programs of Federal spending—some large, some small—to combat air pollution, provide special housing for minority group members, build arterial streets, construct libraries and cultural facilities, subsidize public works planning, and help in locating and relocating industry.

The International Association of Fire Fighters even argued that fire prevention in this day and age is no longer solely a matter of local concern, but is a serious national problem, and urged the Federal Government to provide technical assistance and planning aid to local communities in this field, help standardize equipment and appliances, and promote regional and interstate cooperation among fire departments.

NEED TO CUT DEFICIT

"There is a steady stream of pious protestations in Government," says the Senate minority report, "that we need to cut down the deficit and the public debt, but we will, in one sweeping gesture, create a Goliath which will drain our Treasury and which will keep a watchful police eye on every urban community and its citizens, planning, spending, directing, until citizens will not call city hall when streets need repair or a water main needs replacing, but will notify their Congressman to contact the Cabinet member handling such problems, seeking repairs and services."

Establishment of Urban Affairs Department, opponents predict, will encourage groups pushing other new departments to lobby for their interests within the Government. Bills already are pending to set up a dozen other new Cabinet posts, ranging from a Department of Transportation and a Department of Science to a Department of Peace and even a Department of Public Relations.

Opponents use other powerful arguments, too. To the contention of the bill's backers that they want coordination, the opponents point out that two Federal agencies contributing from half to two-thirds of all residential mortgage financing are omitted from the new Department—the Home Loan Bank Board and the Veterans' Administration. The bill's critics suggest these have been deliberately omitted for the time being to avoid stirring up opposition from veterans and housing groups, but that once the bill is passed, the new agency will grab for them. The same argument is made about many other programs which logically could be expected to go into the new Department but which are being left for the present in other agencies.

Thus, while the sponsors proclaim they want to give city officials "one-stop service" in Washington, they've carefully left in existing Departments a long list of urban programs ranging from roads and airports to schools and water pollution treatment facilities.

The bill's backers have for the most part been carefully guarded in public about programs that might later be transferred to the new Department, but every once in a while some clues are dropped. Thus Representative J. ARTHUR YOUNGER, the California Republican who was one of the Department's first proponents, told the House Government Operations Committee that he thought such programs as helping cities to fight smog and polluted water "would be included, normally" in an Urban Affairs Department, and that aid for education "could well be transferred to this new Department."

When the bill's adherents argue that cities deserve Cabinet representation, opponents counter that other Cabinet members such as the Attorney General, Secretary of Labor, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and others already serve urban interests, and that this new Department would be the first set up on geographic rather than functional lines.

They suggest that cities should use the facilities of existing Departments and, if something more is needed, it could be provided by a coordinating official in the Budget Bureau or White House—without any huge new bureaucracy set up to lobby for new spending. Cities can do far more to help themselves solve what are and must remain primarily local problems.

Finally, opponents make a major stand on the argument that the new Department would undermine the traditional American Federal system. Cities, they say, would turn more and more to the Central Government, bypassing State and other local units. These would atrophy, and ultimately the cities themselves would be swallowed up by the Central Government.

"A powerful Cabinet Department of this type would tend to weaken existing relationships between the States and their political subdivisions and would materially accelerate the dependency of local government upon the National Government," the executive committee of the Governors' conference declared in opposing the proposed new Department.

CITIES MIGHT DOMINATE

Said the National Association of County Officials: "We feel establishment of such a Department may well empower large metropolitan cities to deal directly with the Federal Government, bypassing not only the States but local communities as well * * *. Those of us at the local government level have grave concern that the proposed Department, once set up, might strengthen the hand of the metropolitan core city to the extent it would be in a position, because of its close association with the Federal Government, to dominate other local municipalities which operate contiguously to or within the periphery of the core city's metropolitan area."

The Senate minority report warns that "a line of communications will be set up directly from the city mayor's office to the center of the Federal Government. County commissioners, State legislatures, Governors will be ignored." And as for the cities themselves, "If Washington pays the bill, Washington will direct the action * * *. More than hopscotching over State and county government, this new Department can eventually nullify local city government."

Back-Door Spending Battle To Resume

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the former Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Hon. Maurice Stans, has explained with remarkable clarity and insight the issue of back-door spending in an article in the Washington Post of Sunday, January 14. I ask leave to include it with my remarks:

BACK-DOOR SPENDING BATTLE TO RESUME

(By Maurice Stans)

Surprisingly, the last loud gun fired in the 1961 session of the Congress was not a political shot by one party at the other. It was a bipartisan cannon roar in the House aimed at the Senate over the issue of back-door spending. It will be reverberating in the Capitol through much of this 1962 session.

Few people outside Washington know what the fuss was about or why this is a continuing vital issue that affects the pocketbook of every taxpayer. It involves not only the Constitution but also the question of orderly discipline over the financial affairs of the Government.

Section 9 of article I of the Constitution demands that "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law." The objective of this is to provide a double control over the spending actions of the executive branch of the Government. First, no activity may be carried on by any agency unless that activity is specifically authorized in a substantive law spelling out its scope. Next, no money is to be spent on the activity without an appropriation for the purpose for each year.

ESTIMATE OF PRIORITIES

Under the annual budget process, each department and agency of Government submits its requests for money to spend to the President through the Bureau of the Budget. After the painstaking and detailed procedure of budget review is completed, the President presents his recommendations to the Congress early in January in the annual budget for the forthcoming fiscal year.

The Congress has the right to approve, reject or modify his proposals, and this determination centers in the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate. They hold hearings, first in the House and later in the Senate, on the President's budget for each unit of Government, and the agency officials give evidence in support of their items.

After the Appropriations Committees make their respective findings, they are approved on the floor of the Congress and enacted

into a series of appropriations laws. These establish ceiling amounts. The Appropriations Committees, like the President, are expected to view spending plans in relation to each other and to the total so that the Government's programs will be carefully balanced to the Nation's needs and resources.

COMMITTEES LOSE CONTROL

Back-door spending is a simple process of bypassing this careful constitutional procedure. To avoid having a matter brought before the Appropriations Committees, congressional proponents of a program may be able to include, in the substantive law authorizing the program, permission for an agency to borrow funds directly from the Treasury to carry it on. The money is then spent without an appropriation. Or the substantive law may contain authority to make contracts in advance of appropriations, in which case the later appropriations are only a formality. Either way, back-door spending provides a much easier way for an agency to obtain funds, because it need ask for them only once in each House instead of twice. The end result is that the Appropriations Committees lose their control over the budget and the Constitution is violated.

Back-door spending has been a growing phenomenon of the last 30 years. After observing the way in which it impaired fiscal control, President Eisenhower directed the Bureau of the Budget in 1959 to approve no new requests of Government agencies for back-door spending, and he included none in the subsequent budgets which he submitted to the Congress.

This position was reversed by the present administration in 1961, and many proposals for back-door spending were included in its messages to Congress. Quite a few were approved in legislation. The Appropriations Committees, properly jealous of their prerogative, fought back hard, but their objections were ineffective in most cases, principally because the back-door spending items appeared in legislation which contained other provisions desired by congressional majorities.

A typical back-door spending proposal was the one by President Kennedy for a 5-year $9 billion authorization for foreign aid. On this he was defeated. After a long fight the long-term idea was approved, but with a provision requiring a separate appropriation action in each year. He also lost on a proposal for back-door spending of $375 million in aid to airports over 5 years, which was instead passed with a requirement for annual appropriations. The 1961 housing bill, however, enacted several provisions for back-door spending, as did the Agricultural Act. In all, according to a table entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by House Appropriations Committee Chairman CLARENCE CANNON, $29 billion was asked by President Kennedy via the back-door route and $20 billion was enacted.

SENATE FUMED AND FUSSED

This explains the closing day's explosion. In protest against the whole business, the House worked into a final piece of legislation a provision insisting that several programs already enacted on a back-door basis amended to require appropriations instead. Then it adjourned for the year. The Senate, still in session, fumed and fussed but had no alternative. The action stuck.

The battle is sure to be resumed. The aim of those who seek back-door spending is clearly to make money easier to get. Not all such efforts originate with the White House. Many are inserted by the legislative committees of the Congress. Either way the taxpayer loses. If Government finances are to be subjected to a sound control that assures that spending programs take their right place in line, it is elementary that back-door raids on the Treasury must be ended.

Dollars for Defeat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 17, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Dollars for Defeat" which appeared in the January 10, 1962, edition of the Indianapolis News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOLLARS FOR DEFEAT

At this session of Congress, the topic of foreign aid will once more be the subject of hot debate.

As a first step toward injecting sanity into this program, the United States should put an immediate end to all grants made to the pro-Communist bloc of nations which call themselves neutrals. By aiding these nations, we are merely subsidizing our own defeat at the hands of communism.

In a forthright proposal made at the opening of the new session of Congress, Senator HUGH SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, urges that our Government quit trying to woo national leaders who play both ends against the middle in the cold war and whose failure "to distinguish between the principles of freedom and the principles of Lenin seriously undermines the strength of the free world."

Tito of Yugoslavia, Nehru of India, and Nasser of Egypt are three the Senator names who have been the beneficiaries of vast U.S. aid, but who have nevertheless hewed to Moscow's line.

From the end of World War II until March 31, 1961, the United States gave and loaned more than $6 billion to the 24 neutralist countries. The following table gives the totals of loans and grants:

Yugoslavia	$2,081,000,000
India	1,906,000,000
Indonesia	479,000,000
United Arab Republic	346,000,000
Cambodia	257,000,000
Morocco	168,000,000
Tunisia	142,000,000
Afghanistan	116,000,000
Lebanon	83,000,000
Ethiopia	79,000,000
Burma	73,000,000
Iraq	69,000,000
Ceylon	63,000,000
Cuba	54,000,000
Sudan	31,000,000
Nepal	27,000,000
Saudi Arabia	27,000,000
Congo Republic	19,000,000
Yemen	10,000,000
Cyprus	7,000,000
Somali Republic	7,000,000
Ghana	5,000,000
Guinea	2,000,000
Mali (figures not available)	
Total	6,051,000,000

President Kennedy has said our treatment of nations sharing our views in times of crisis should vary considerably from our dealings with those who are indifferent. Congress should force him to demonstrate he means what he says. It should demand that all who seek our favor stand up and be counted squarely on our side.

There is real merit in Senator SCOTT's proposal that the United States offer the world an "Alliance for Liberty, whose members would pledge allegiance in joint convenant to the ultimate freedom of mankind." Such an alliance also could and should replace American collaboration with the Soviet Union and other of our Communist enemies in the United Nations.

It is time we moved out of the twilight zone of confusion and declared our intention of defeating communism. Our first step should be to end the incredible spectacle of American aid to our pro-Communist enemies.

If you agree, why not let your two Senators and your Congressman know your opinion?

Dedication of New Facilities of Fairmont Aluminum Co. Offers Additional Evidence of Industrial Development in West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 17, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, we are all heartened by reports in the press and by our own observations of the economic recovery of America during recent months. And, though much remains to be done to achieve full employment and assure all Americans of a decent standard of living, I rejoice at the progress that has been made during the past year.

I am particularly encouraged by the signs of economic resurgence in West Virginia. Among those events which offer hope for a strengthened economy of our State was the dedication last September of the expanded and modernized facilities of the Fairmont Aluminum Co., a subsidiary of the Cerro Corp.

Fairmont Aluminum Co., one of the oldest rolling mills in the country, joined the Cerro Corp. 5 years ago. With the new facilities provided by the greater financial resources of Cerro, Fairmont Aluminum will be able to equal the production rate of the most modern plants in the industry.

It was my privilege to speak at the dedicatory ceremonies, which were also addressed extemporaneously by Representatives CLEVELAND M. BAILEY and ARCH A. MOORE. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks and the principal speech by Robert P. Koenig, president of the Cerro Corp., be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks and speech were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH AT THE DEDICATION OF THE MODERNIZED AND EXPANDED SHEET MILL OF THE FAIRMONT ALUMINUM CO., FAIRMONT, W. VA., SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1961

This is an auspicious moment in the economic and industrial life of Fairmont and West Virginia.

This dedication is the culmination of a modernization and expansion program of the Fairmont Aluminum Co.'s sheet mill which represents a new capital investment of well over $8 million.

I am privileged to share your pride in this complete and modern facility, and in the impressive array of production equipment which has been brought to this community.

A pledge has here been fulfilled to make this establishment thoroughly competitive in the aluminum industry. And, in so doing, Fairmont Aluminum Co. and its parent organization have also registered their faith in the people of this section and in the future economic and industrial development of our State.

Not only has this reliable firm been revitalized, but, also, it has been placed in a stronger position to supply an even larger portion of West Virginia's and the Nation's needs in the future.

The importance of these facilities extends well beyond this community and beyond the families supported by them. It is important, also, in offering another sign of the vigor and foresight of American enterprise. And for those of us—and there are many—who have worked to attract new capital to West Virginia, it is a vindication of our faith in the industrial potential of our State.

The initiative and leadership exhibited by the management and personnel of Fairmont Aluminum Co. are the sort that once served to place West Virginia in the vanguard of the fuels and minerals industries. I have no doubt that the same kind of leadership will bring our State to the fore once again in the future with a more diversified and firmly grounded economy.

It is worth noting, in this respect, that no matter how dynamic and forward looking our leadership at the national level, no program of national goals will be achieved if these aims are not embraced and carried forth by the actions of individual men and women at the community and local level. One of the main sources of strength of the American system of enterprise is that it offers the flexibility and freedom for such initiative to operate.

We have good reason to be delighted by the considerable investment in modernizing Fairmont Aluminum's facilities here in order to provide it with a healthy and promising future—for itself, for the industry it serves and, most important, for the community of which it is such an important part. And it is my further hope that this may be seen as part of a trend of other industries to expand their facilities.

It is almost axiomatic these days to think of our industrial development in relation to the unremitting contest between international communism and a democratic way of life. I believe we will all agree that our Nation is more secure every time a basic industry invests in new, modern plants and equipment. for, although hotspots will continue to flare up in the cold war, the fundamental and underlying struggle with the Soviet Union will, we pray, remain largely political, ideological, and economic.

If this be so, a central factor in our eventual success in the conflict will be our capacity to maintain the industrial and economic development necessary to supply the increasing needs of our own people and also help bring the emergent nations into freedom and independence.

Though it is only one aluminum plant of the substantial number in the United States, this expanded Fairmont facility has its part, and an important one, to contribute in this great power struggle. And we know that, through modernization, the Fairmont Aluminum Co. is assured more years of prosperous and productive life. This is our wish—and with it we extend our congratulations.

FAIRMONT DEDICATION ADDRESS BY ROBERT P. KOENIG, SEPTEMBER 30, 1961

During the years I have been coming to Fairmont, I have been struck by the new attitude that has taken over among these rolling hills. Where once there seemed to be an air of inertia and resignation to economic fate, there now has entered a restless spirit. The people of Fairmont and its neighboring communities have taken on a determination to lift themselves up from the doldrums brought about by shifts in the coal industry.

Some months ago I had the pleasure of speaking before a meeting of the Fairmont Regional Development Committee. At that time I noted the need for improved roads and other transportation facilities in the area, that, along with other steps, would serve to stimulate industrial development and help fill the gap left by the passing of coal as king. Now I see that in the ensuing time new locks are under construction on the Monongahela River, deeper oil wells are being drilled, new civic parking facilities and even golf courses are being planned. And the new wide roads have been pushed ahead and some of the hairpin curves have even been taken out.

I don't wish to imply that my words have brought any of these changes about. I am simply reporting to you my observations that your community and your State have not stood still.

Nor have we at Cerro been standing still. When the Fairmont Aluminum Co. saw fit to join with us in the new and growing major industry that is aluminum, Cerro was a company with only 2 plants and 750 employees in the United States. Only a third of our total sales volume was derived from U.S. operations. The remainder came from our mines and affiliated companies in Latin America.

In the intervening 5 years, Cerro has sought to employ its increasing economic and management resources not only in Peru and Chile. It has also added, in the United States, 7 plants and some 3,400 employees, exclusive of Fairmont Aluminum. More important, we have undertaken to bolster the strength and insure the survival of these plants and the welfare of their people by expanding facilities and installing modern equipment. This has been done so these operations may move forward in a metal-fabricating industry that is each year becoming increasingly more competitive.

Here at Fairmont, your citizens and your resources have joined with us in undertaking a program of modernization and expansion that we trust may permit the Fairmont Aluminum Co. to stand up against its large, integrated competitors.

The new facilities that you see before you will be able to produce aluminum sheet at a production rate equal to the best in the industry. The quality of product should set new standards. The location of West Virginia in the aluminum sheet market, the skills and training of the Fairmont area, and our own resources, have all combined to strengthen this organization and give it new vigor.

However, the changes made here and the objective that we envision in the aluminum industry must be seen in their proper perspective. Since Fairmont originally entered the industry, and even after Cerro joined Fairmont Aluminum, there have been a succession of changes in the industry which today still confront us with big problems and leave us with questions that must be answered before we can consider this expansion successful.

Let me take a few moments of your time to review a bit of the history and comment on a few of the problems that have developed in this industry and that must be solved in one way or another.

THE CHANGING ALUMINUM INDUSTRY

In 1920, the city of Fairmont saw its first nonferrous metal venture, a brass mill that never operated and was converted 6 years later into aluminum rolling to become the Fairmont Aluminum Co. Over the ensuing 35 years which encompass Fairmont's participation in aluminum—for this is Fairmont's 35th anniversary—the industry has gone through a series of rather distinct phases.

For the first 13 years, there was a period of gradual growth. The number of companies in the industry was limited to a handful, all dominated by one large concern that was largely responsible for pioneering the industry. These companies developed new markets and gradually extended the use of the light, bright, formable metal into all sorts of new uses.

This first period was terminated in 1939, with the outbreak of war in Europe and its gradual spread to our own shores. The half-decade of World War II saw a period of emergency growth in aluminum, as both primary refining facilities and fabricating plants were expanded to meet the extraordinary needs of the defense effort.

Then, with the relatively abrupt cessation of arms production, the demand for aluminum sank to a mere fraction of its wartime output and only a very farsighted few predicted anything but glut and vast unneeded capacity for the wonder metal from which our giant airfleets had been formed.

However, by the Korean war in 1950, pessimism in the aluminum industry had rapidly disappeared, and the original primary U.S. producer had been joined by two others that were growing with dazzling speed. The new period of post-World War II growth was off to a phenomenal start, sparked by the sudden defense needs of the Korean conflict.

Action by the Government in the early 1950's in the form of accelerated tax write-offs, favorable power contracts, guaranteed loans, and so-called put contracts brought in new producers of primary metal and expanded fabricating facilities. By the end of the first postwar decade in 1956, there were five primary aluminum companies in this country alone—Alcoa, Reynolds, Kaiser, Anaconda, and Ormet (a combining of Revere and Olin). These five were joined by Harvey later in the decade. All of these are integrated, in that they fabricate a major portion of their primary metal output.

The breathtaking, if at times erratic, advance of aluminum in all its many forms began to falter, and with it quickly faded the impressive profit margins and phenomenal growth rates of a decade. The trend of ever-increasing production figures broke at a time when the new facilities and the new producers were just starting production and concentrating their efforts on building sales to turn to account the staggering capital costs of their new refineries and mills.

Clearly, the industry was in a fourth and new phase. This phase has lasted for the past 5 years—we are in it today.

It has been a time of intense competition; it has also been a time of continuing growth for the industry. But this growth has been in sales volume and not in profits; and even volume has advanced at a greatly reduced rate.

The many new sheet producers—there are now 29 fabricators, excluding a number of captive sheet mills, compared with 6 in 1946—have not been the sole factors in changing the conditions of the industry. Not only has the tremendous demand for goods and services brought on by war and the postwar boom been partially satisfied, but the capacity of competing materials to produce has also grown to a point where it has far surpassed demand. No longer do steel, glass, copper, and zinc remain inert to the penetrations of aluminum into their own bailiwicks—they have learned to fight back. And on top of this reaction by competing materials has come the rising import

of aluminum products from other industrialized countries of the world.

This combination of circumstances by itself does not fully explain the condition of the aluminum industry of today. Automation of facilities, about which all of us hear so much, has also come to aluminum and brought with it the desirability of maintaining high production rates at almost any price in order to try and make the new equipment pay off. This factor has been one of the major causes of the profitless prosperity that has descended on the aluminum fabricating industry.

PROFITLESS PROSPERITY

The principal problem of all aluminum manufacturers is the relentless deterioration of profit margins for fabricated products. Prices have been cut again and again both officially and unofficially by big producers and small, with the result that few of the companies are earning an adequate return for their stockholders. Some are finding it difficult if not impossible to meet their interest and amortization on borrowed funds. For example, one of the large primary producers in 1955 returned in operating profits before taxes 20 percent on its net assets; in 1960, the return was only about 4½ percent. For the small nonintegrated producer, the situation is far more serious, to the point where many have been caught on the hip and have had either to sell out or to close their doors.

Among the principal controllable causes of the situation has been the compulsive expansion from which, particularly major aluminum companies, seem to suffer. Their eyes are bigger than their stomachs, and their insatiable appetites for markets beyond their economic reach carries suicidal implications.

Examples of this phenomenon of expansion simply for the sake of expansion are found in the manufacturing of building siding and sheet for the can industry. In both of these we hear strident publicity from all sides about the rapid future growth of aluminum. Yet, the price of this growth can be absurd. Let me illustrate.

For those of you unfamiliar with the industry, refining of primary aluminum into ingot is the first stage in which the metal becomes recognizable. The ingots are the raw material from which the independent fabricators—sheet rerollers, extruders, casting shops and so on—generally obtain their raw material.

Aluminum ingot until last week sold for 26 cents per pound: yet certain primary companies who are integrated in the fabricating field are selling at 28 cents per pound metal that has been cast from pig into rolling ingots, then rolled down in a series of complex operations into coiled sheet. That this sheet can be processed and carry its share of operating, overhead and sales costs, let alone depreciation, for 2 cents per pound is fantastic; but this is the price at which primary producers are offering rolled aluminum stock to the large container manufacturers.

From our experience at Fairmont, we know that it is impossible to roll and ship any type of aluminum sheet to a customer for 2 cents per pound over the metal cost and still pay overhead, much less earn a profit. What justification do primary producers find for invading the can field on this basis?

The argument is advanced that this is being done to promote the market for aluminum. However, in the long run such practices can only have detrimental effects, since they destroy the logical pricing basis for all the products of the aluminum sheet industry. The fabricating end of the business should show a profit based on the margin between the selling price of the sheet and the buying price of raw metal. The recent reduction in the price of primary metal is a trend in the right direction, but the spread is still insufficient to cover the costs of rolling.

Other such commodity pricing schemes are rife in the sheet fabricating industry until it has become an economic "Alice in Wonderland."

Coiled siding sheet, which is the aluminum strip material used to fabricate the siding that we are beginning to see on many new homes, has been handled similarly. Its price has been cut to the point where profit margins on the production of the sheet are nonexistent. Without dwelling on technical details, siding stock is a product that requires special manufacturing care to insure that it is straight and that its width is held within very close margins. It is also specially packed. Notwithstanding the extra attention that must be taken in its manufacture, it has been priced far below the reasonable economic level that allows the fabricator to obtain a proper profit. And the burden of this special price has fallen on the smaller nonintegrated producer, because he must obtain all of his profit from transforming the purchased ingot or reroll stock into the end sheet product.

I could cite other examples of such price cutting, but there are other devices used by the major aluminum producers which also threaten the survival of the nonintegrated producer and therefore deserve mention.

One such device is the use of special credit terms to certain customers. Payment for most aluminum products is required 1 month after material is shipped. However, for certain products like furniture tubing, large producers have instituted 3-month payment terms. This is clearly an enticement to buy—most buyers are interested in operating with their suppliers' money. However, most smaller companies that sell in these fields do not have the financial resources to offer similar terms. If they try, they place themselves in financial jeopardy.

In certain of the areas mentioned above, minor corrective action has been started by one or more of the major producers. The chaotic schedule of prices for special sheet products has in recent weeks been modified to some minor extent. A tiny step in the right direction has been taken, but it is only a start.

THE INGOT VICE

The companies that produce aluminum in its various stages, starting with bauxite and running through primary ingot to the highly fabricated items, hold the whip hand over their smaller and less powerful brethren. The latter are forced to buy from these producers the ingot from which they must fabricate their products—at the same time, they must compete in the marketplace for business for their finished products. Thus, the destinies of the small companies are closely controlled by the integrated producers, who have it in their power to set the prices at which the small companies must buy as well as the maximum price at which they can sell. In this light, it is noteworthy that the price of aluminum ingot is today the same as it was 5 years ago. For sheet aluminum, however, the selling prices are by no means as high as they were 5 years, or even 4 years ago, since the horde of special price arrangements on one commodity or another has reduced the average price sharply. At the same time, the special cut prices on such items as can stock have caused buyers to demand similar prices for material, modified only slightly, further eroding the average selling price.

Parenthetically, the big companies are the ones that, at the bargaining table, set the pattern for basic labor rate increases for the whole industry. In this manner, they influence another important aspect of the welfare of the smaller nonintegrated producer.

In short, the large producers can take their profit on the pig and let the little guy worry about trying to make a profit on the fabricated products. Fairmont has been one of these little guys, and that is the reason it has been essential that we improve our position. It has depended too much on a high degree of responsibility and economic maturity on the part of the integrated aluminum producers—responsibility and maturity that, unfortunately at present, appear to be lacking.

One move that Cerro, and consequently Fairmont, has taken toward greater independence was participation in Alroll, the aluminum hot rolling mill venture at Oswego, N.Y., in conjunction with three other major North American metal companies. This undertaking is designed to supply reroll stock—like the heavy gage coils you see over there—to our new tandem cold mill here at Fairmont. The joint mill will, of course, similarly supply mills of other participants.

We are also studying, together with another important nonferrous metal fabricator, the feasibility of building our own primary aluminum reduction plant in the State of Oregon. Access to its own primary ingot supply clearly would put Fairmont in a more favorable position, by freeing it from one end of the economic vise in which independent fabricators find themselves.

Barring such moves which Cerro's access to long-term capital may make possible, Fairmont will continue to fight an uphill battle against the pricing policies that have been foisted upon the industry. It would remain outside the umbrella of the fixed ingot price, which the primary companies maintain; at the same time it would have to thrust its way through the economic jungle of end product pricing created by these same companies.

Perhaps it is time for the integrated aluminum producers to examine their present pricing policies in view of the narrow profit margins from which most aluminum producers, large and small alike, are suffering. It is time that action be taken to return an adequate reward to stockholders. Accordingly, I suggest that the primary aluminum producers return to a sound and just pricing schedule for semifabricated products.

I have dwelt long enough on the problems that confront the aluminum industry and, therefore, affect the citizens of Fairmont. We of Cerro are proud to be part of converting one of the Nation's original aluminum fabricators into one of its most modern. For myself and my associates, let me extend a note of sincere thanks to all of you that have helped make this project possible. We are also grateful to those of you who have taken the time to come here today to participate in an occasion that, to us, is very significant. As you can see, we are trying to do our part to strengthen the industrial foundations of Fairmont and of West Virginia in keeping with the new spirit that we find here.

Nip 'Em in the Corn Flakes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to offer an editorial from the Canton Repository that expresses exactly my thoughts concerning the increasing frequency of invitations to rise at dawn and breakfast in

a hotel on cold ham and eggs and congressional business.

The editorial follows:

NIP 'EM IN THE CORN FLAKES

What is this creeping nonsense about breakfast conferences?

They now have crept into the White House. They were there even before Dwight Eisenhower left and are finding sanctuary under John Kennedy.

They should be nipped in the cornflakes before they go any further. If there is one institution that should be kept personal and private, it's breakfast. It is no fit time to confer about anything, as all seasoned husbands and wives must have known for a long time, else they would have broken up their marriages with early-morning spats before they learned to forgive each other's foibles.

It was bad enough when the busy bees who are forever buzzing with important matters desecrated lunch with their intrusions. Before that, they had staked out late-afternoon and evening for their conferences, indoctrinations, armtwisting and elbow bendings. Nothing is sacred to these operators and manipulators. Once they have become accustomed to sitting down at table three times a day with the victims of their blandishments, you can bet on it they will be sitting on the edge of the bed next, or taking a tip from the Romans, who found that taking baths together created a clubby atmosphere for a business deal.

Breakfast belongs to the individual; it is properly an interval of meditation. There is no place at the breakfast table for a pest who leans forward, chin on hand and says, "Let's get down to business."

Conferences at breakfast? Spare the thought.

"What To Look for in the New Session": An Interview With Hon. John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives, U.S. News & World Report, January 22, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am confident that Members of the House of Representatives and citizens generally will read with great interest an interview published in the January 22, 1962, issue of U.S. News & World Report in which the distinguished new Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, expresses his views on the forthcoming session of Congress.

The text of this significant interview follows:

WHAT TO LOOK FORWARD TO IN THE NEW SESSION

(An interview with Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK)

Question. Mr. Speaker, do you think there will be a close working relationship this year between the House of Representatives and the White House?

Answer. Oh, yes. Of course, no President gets 100 percent of his program. President Kennedy was very successful last session in getting legislation that he recommended—and I have every confidence that there will be the same cooperation in this session, and it will be a very successful session.

Question. Do you expect any real trouble from the so-called coalition of southern Democrats and Republicans?

Answer. Well, the coalition works both ways. Our task is to get enough Republican votes for progressive legislation that will enable us to get such legislation approved. That is no new task. We've had that for a long while.

Question. Do you sense any more conservative attitude in Congress now than there was a year ago, or a few years ago?

Answer. No. I think the state of mind is pretty much the same.

Question. I wonder if you'd be willing to tell us, against the background of all these stories of differences between you and President Kennedy, what, if any, are your political differences with the President?

Answer. There's no justification to what I've read. The President and I are very friendly—always have been. I don't have to agree with you 1,000 percent or you with me. I've been a progressive for 33 years—for all my life.

Joe Kennedy, the President's father, and I have been close friends as far back as I can remember. The grandfather, John F. Fitzgerald, until his death, was a very, very close friend of mine.

The talk of political differences with the President is absolutely unfounded. I read about a feud and all this and that and everything else. There's nothing to that at all.

Question. Is it true that you and the President have had your political difficulties back in Massachusetts as distinct from here in Washington?

Answer. What have you got in mind?

Question. A fight over the party machinery.

Answer. The party machinery in Massachusetts doesn't mean a thing so far as control is concerned. The State [Democratic] Committee doesn't mean a thing to me as such. Individual members who are friends do. The State Committee as such never meant anything to me because I never had any statewide ambitions.

Question. Do you have any doubt that you and President Kennedy will be able to get along well?

Answer. I certainly have no doubt. There is absolutely no justification for creating the image that there's a feud between President Kennedy and myself.

The fight [in 1956] for chairman of the Democratic State Committee in Massachusetts—about which much is made—was purely impersonal. Control of the party was not involved. Furthermore, if anyone would undertake to make a fight for control of the Democratic Party, no matter who he is, the Democratic voters of Massachusetts would defeat a man on that issue because they don't stand for control—they're independent and individualistic, and I'm glad they are.

Some men may have more influence with the Democrats of my State than others. For example, I probably would have more influence today than I had 30 years ago—or 40 years ago, when I started in the legislature. But, on the question of control, the Democrats of Massachusetts are very individualistic. So there was never any fight for control of the party. I supported the man who had supported me in the past, and who was always loyal to me.

Did I answer your question on my relations with the President?

Question. Yes, you answered it—

Answer. Furthermore, I have profound respect for the office of President. I have profound respect for the occupant of the office—without regard to his party.

I could never conceive of any man who is President of the United States not doing what he thinks is for the best interest of our country. I might disagree with him, but I would never impugn his motives.

If that's so with reference to a President who's not of my own party, what is it with reference to President Kennedy, who is the leader of my party. I might say that nobody was closer to F.D.R. than I was on the legislative level—or to Harry S. Truman. And that relationship exists and will continue to with President Kennedy.

I believe in the separation of powers, but that doesn't mean the divisibility of branches of Government. I don't believe there should be a wall between.

Question. Can you say what will be the major issues in this session of Congress?

Answer. Well, you're going to have the issue of reciprocal trade—and new trade recommendations made by the President. There will be the question of a new Department of Urban Affairs. There will be the postal increase bill. There's the manpower development and training bill. There's the medical assistance bill—for the senior citizens—and the school legislation as well as the college bill. There is to be other progressive legislation, too.

Question. You didn't mention taxes. Do you feel there will be a tax bill passed by the House that will carry out the recommendations the President made this past year?

Answer. I would think that any bill reported out by the Ways and Means Committee would pass the House, and I would expect that the Ways and Means Committee, before any bill was reported out, would harmonize any differences with the executive department—or vice versa.

Question. Do you think a bill will be reported out by the Ways and Means Committee?

Answer. If legislation is necessary to carry out the purposes sought, I would say that a bill will be reported out, and at that time the views of the executive and the legislative, in committee, would be very well harmonized.

Question. On this question of tax legislation, would you be willing to predict whether the House would agree to the 8-percent investment credit on business spending for plant and equipment?

Answer. No, I'm not. To answer on any of the details of the parts of the bill now would be beyond my power. I doubt if any member of the Ways and Means Committee could give you a specific answer. I would say that, if legislation is necessary, I expect that legislation will be reported out of the committee.

Of course, involved in this is also withholding of taxes on dividends and interest and foreign profits—earnings abroad—as well as expense-account deductions, which, of course, is a very important subject in itself, particularly among businessmen.

Nobody wants to disturb reasonable and proper expenses. It's the abuse that some have made of expense-account deductions that is the problem. Where abuses develop, then they very easily become contagious.

Question. Do you think foreign aid will be looked at with a more critical eye by Congress this year?

Answer. I think the emphasis would be put more on self-help on the part of countries getting aid. That's been the evident trend for the past several years. Of course, there's military assistance in certain areas that you've got to give, but I think the emphasis in the economic field will be more on long-term loans to help those countries that are willing to help themselves.

Question. Do you feel that Congress will give the President more power to reduce tariffs than he has had?

Answer. I'm in favor of something being done in this field because, in my opinion, it's vitally important in our national interest. In my opinion, Congress will give the President broader authority in this field.

Now, again, people may agree that something needs to be done, but they might have an honest disagreement about some of the details of what should be done. That isn't fatal to a bill.

Question. On the question of medical care for the aged, do you favor placing it under social security?

Answer. Yes, I've always been in favor of it.

Question. What's your judgment about the chances——

Answer. If the bill is reported out of committee, I feel that we will get it through the House. The difficult task will be in having a bill reported out of committee.

WAYS TO HELP SCHOOLS

Question. How about your view on aid to schools, including parochial schools and private schools?

Answer. Parochial schools are private schools. I always refer to private schools, because there are private schools that are not church-related—though it is true that most of them are church-related, I will agree. Do you want my position on school legislation?

Question. Yes——

Answer. I've always supported school-construction legislation.

My position on school legislation is very simple. I respect the fact that people may not agree with me and I respect their right to their views and their right to disagree. But I expect others to respect the fact that I have the right to my views.

To begin with, I've always supported school legislation, and you'll find that, whenever the vote came, I voted for it. And you'll find that I spoke for aid to schools in the past years. I believe that we should strengthen our whole educational system.

I'm talking now about elementary and secondary schools. I realize we can't legislate for private schools on the same basis that we can for public schools. But I do believe that we can strengthen our overall school system, including private schools.

I support the general bill for school aid. But I also believe that, in the best interests of our country—certainly in strengthening the overall elementary- and secondary-school system—there should be provisions for long-term loans at reasonable rates of interest to private schools for the building of classroom facilities: (1) to teach science, (2) to teach mathematics, and (3) to teach languages.

I don't know how anybody can say that that's inconsistent with the Constitution, and I don't see how anybody can, in this day and age, disagree. But people do. They have a right to their views.

I also believe in the 50 percent forgiveness for those who have received Government loans to finish their college education and to enter the career of teaching. When they teach in public schools, they are given, as you know, 50 percent forgiveness of the loan over a 5-year period. This should be extended to private schools.

Private schools have a demand for teachers. This is an unintentional discrimination against the private schools, when graduates of colleges who wish to make teaching a career in private schools are denied the same privilege of loan forgiveness given to teachers in public schools. I imagine it makes it more difficult for the private-school system to get the young-men and young-women teachers.

That's been my position. However, suppose a bill were reported out of committee without any provision for private schools—what would I do? I would vote for it. I am quoted as saying I'd vote against such a bill. All anyone had to do was to ask me. My views are entirely different than they have been portrayed.

Question. Are you and the President in disagreement on some phases of aid to education?

Answer. I couldn't answer that question. I don't know definitely what are the President's views with reference to my views relating to private schools. I'm for the general education bill—have always been, through the years—every rollcall will find me voting for it.

However, I believe that long-term loans to private schools for the purposes I have stated would be for the best interest of our country. I think it would be unfortunate not to encourage the almost 6 million young Americans attending private schools to study to be scientists, physicists, mathematicians, learned in the languages.

Question. Do you think that aid to education is going to be approved in this session?

Answer. Of course, without the question of private schools involved, such legislation has been defeated in the past. And, without the question of teachers' salaries involved, legislation has been defeated in the past. It's only a few years ago that, on the final passage in the House, a bill confined, as I remember, to school construction was defeated by five votes. It was almost the same bill that former President Eisenhower had recommended a year or so before. But there was a change in the climate of the administration between the recommendation and the time the bill came up for vote. The result was that it was defeated by five votes, and we didn't get many Republican votes for it.

Question. And was that limited to public schools?

Answer. That was confined to public schools, yes. So if we have a straight school-construction bill, it's going to have a hard job getting approval. We brought up an abbreviated bill the last session, and it was defeated by a very substantial margin. I voted for it.

Question. Would you care to predict what will happen this time?

Answer. No, I couldn't. I would say this: that I favor a bill with provisions for loans to private schools. If we get a bill up for vote and the provisions for aid to private schools are not in it, or if they are in and the House votes to strike them out, I'd vote for the bill just the same.

THE CHURCH AND EDUCATION

Question. It sometimes is said that, as a Roman Catholic, your attitude toward aid to education has been influenced by the church. Could you discuss that?

Answer. There has never been any member of the hierarchy of the Catholic Church that has ever discussed the subject with me.

You know, the strange thing to me is to read in the paper about so-and-so as a Member of Congress and a Catholic. You never hear anybody mentioned as a Presbyterian or an Episcopalian, or a Baptist, or any other religion, and that is correct. My views are my own independent views. Nobody has ever even spoken to me.

I have felt for many years that long-term loans for certain purposes, for private schools, were proper. As a matter of fact, you could go much further. You could have specific grants.

Nobody talks about the constitutionality of long-term loans for college dormitory purposes, or about aiding private colleges, yet the same basic constitutional questions are involved.

We have long-term loans now for equipment—purchase of equipment—in private schools for those purposes, already in the law. Mine is just a step further through the building of classroom facilities for the purposes I have heretofore stated. There are many aspects of this question. As a matter of fact, one of the greatest educational bills we have is the one I introduced—the Donable Property Act. Schools, colleges, as well as hospitals, are the beneficiary of all this surplus property that the Government has.

Last year there was an acquisition value in this property of about $400 million—just last year, alone. Since the bill became law, the hospitals and schools of the country have got probably $4 to $5 billion acquisition value in usable items. And I am the author of the bill. They all benefit.

So—from the angle of effect on education and hospitals, the Donable Property Act is a matter of great significance and importance. And, since it's been mentioned, I will just tell you that I resent with all the vigor at my command these references to my religion influencing my attitude on public questions.

Question. Some people say that your party tends to be one of big spenders. Is an effort to be made to curtail spending in this session?

Answer. Of course, the accusation is not supported by the facts. The Democratic Party is one of great builders. I could make a campaign speech in response to that question, but it would be inappropriate on this occasion.

Of course, the cost of Government is increasing and in all governments—Federal, State, and local—there are factors that we're all acquainted with. But I know what you mean—you mean unnecessary expenditures.

The increased expenditures last year—a little over $6 billion, as you will remember—were for national defense. I think the American people will support any recommendation that the President felt was necessary for the defense of our country. I'd even go further: I think they would be willing to make sacrifices by accepting additional taxes if necessary for greater national defense.

COALITIONS IN HOUSE

Question. Coming back to the House of Representatives: Is there such a thing as a real working coalition in the House—a conservative coalition?

Answer. I cannot answer that question, because that presupposes a definite organization. I've heard it charged, but I couldn't say, on the evidence I've had, that it is so.

Question. Well, would you say that, to the same extent there might be a conservative coalition, there is also a liberal coalition?

Answer. On all important legislation of a progressive nature—recognizing that there might be honest differences of opinion—every effort is made to try to attract the progressive-minded Members in both parties to support progressive legislation that is before the House.

Question. Conservative grouping is a little bit more formal than the liberal grouping, is it not?

Answer. You're the one who made that statement, and you'd have to give me evidence. I see no evidence upon which I could make a finding that there is a formal organization.

Question. Do you favor an increase in the size of the House?

Answer. I favor an increase.

Question. How many members would you favor adding?

Answer. The House membership in this Congress will be 435. The increase suggested is either to 451 or 438 or 439. The 438 is by reason of the admission of Hawaii and Alaska.

Three States lost Congressmen because of admission to the Union of Alaska and Hawaii, and I strongly favored the admission of Hawaii and Alaska. Massachusetts is one of those suffering loss of a seat in the House as a result. And so it seems to me there's a clear case for increasing House membership to this extent.

There's some logic to the argument that, to keep the House odd-numbered, membership should be 439 rather than 438. You can't ignore the logic of that argument. So any reasonable bill that the committee reported out is one that I would support, even if more than three or four.

Question. Isn't it going to be a little hard to hold the House, though, on any fixed number of new Members, once you open up the subject?

Answer. That's one of the imponderables that confronted us last year, and you can't really answer that until the matter comes before the House. No one could give a definite answer before action by the House.

Question. Complaints are heard that the House membership is out of balance; that is to say, it gives too much weight to the viewpoints of the rural areas and the small towns and small cities and not enough to the viewpoints of the big cities. Would you agree with that?

Answer. No; not today—not for some past years. There might have been something to that when I first came to Congress, but, no; I could not agree to that now—otherwise, you wouldn't have had housing legislation, minimum wage, so many progressive bills that are of primary interest to the urban districts, particularly cities. You wouldn't have them enacted into law if that was so. I think that's the answer.

REFLECTING PUBLIC WISHES

Question. Would you say that a Member of the House tends to be closer to the people than either a Senator or the President, inasmuch as House Members stand for reelection every 2 years?

Answer. I don't think either branch is closer to the people than the President. The President is a symbol of all the hopes and aspirations of our people.

As between the two branches, the Senate now, of course—as a result of direct election and, in most States, direct nomination—is certainly close to the people. But, having that in mind, I don't think the Senators, as close to the people as they are, are as close as the Members of the House, because they cover a State and we represent a congressional district. And, by reason of that service to a district, we can keep closer—and the people know their Congressman pretty well, where they might not know the Senator.

Question. A Member of the House, because he's elected every 2 years, has a chance to get close more often than a Member of the Senate—

Answer. I think the House Member would be closer even if there were 4-year terms.

Question. You've been in Congress a long time. Has it been your observation over the years that Members, by and large, tend to reflect what they conceive to be the majority view of the people of their own district?

Answer. I would think most Members view things from a national angle. My experience teaches me that. Take my own case: I've always supported farm legislation. I come from Boston, where there isn't a farm in my district. But there's a problem in agriculture. I've always supported farm legislation, because I realize the great importance of agriculture to our national economy.

I've always voted, also, for projects to develop our natural resources and to protect against floods, etc.

Just because these projects are not located in New England is no reason why I should vote against them. I don't know why I should vote against a great project out West or down South or anywhere else if it benefits our country.

Making Sure About the CIA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the Senate will shortly be asked to consider the nomination of John A. McCone to be the new head of the Central Intelligence Agency. A hearing on the nomination is scheduled for January 18.

Because I believe this post is one of the most important in our Government, concerned as it is with the information on which our policy decisions may be based, I have taken a great deal of interest in this nomination. The Senator from Minnesota, EUGENE MCCARTHY, has also been deeply interested in the qualifications and background of the nominee and plans to testify.

I feel that Senator MCCARTHY is doing a most useful and necessary job in studying the circumstances surrounding this nomination and in bringing the facts into full consideration. It is one of the problems uniquely arising here that the qualifications and attitudes of the Director of Central Intelligence may be examined only the one time—at a hearing upon his qualifications—and the work his Agency does, is subjected thereafter to no regular congressional surveillance.

Tribute has been paid to the work which Senator MCCARTHY has done in an editorial which appeared on January 14 in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. I offer this editorial for the RECORD as I believe it underlines the importance of this hearing.

I would make one statement, however, regarding a conclusion drawn in the editorial. It states that Mr. McCone should be questioned whether he believes he has a mandate to use force anywhere in the world, even in violation of U.S. treaty obligations. Congress has already entrusted authority to the Director of Central Intelligence to carry out any assignments given him by the National Security Council. He is precluded from taking any steps not authorized by the President of the United States. Yet there remains excellent reason why Congress should exercise surveillance over the policies and organization of the Agency it established in 1947 and gave such tremendous power.

The article follows:

MAKING SURE ABOUT THE CIA

Extraordinary is the only word for the Powers of the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. Conceivably, he might involve the United States in war. Short of that extreme, the Agency is engaged not only in the search for information by espionage and any other means it deems suitable, but possibly also in political intrigues in many parts of the world. All this without the clear knowledge of Congress. Even the CIA budget, obviously big, is a guarded secret.

Especially since the tragic fiasco of the Cuban invasion, the risks involved in its activities have engendered a desire for greater assurance about the work of the CIA. Since the Government may make perilous decisions on the Agency's say-so, its head—at the least—should be one of the most mature, objective, and responsible men in Washington.

John A. McCone, former head of the Atomic Energy Commission, was named to the post by President Kennedy after Congress adjourned. Now that it is again in session, Senator EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, of Minnesota, says that he will oppose confirmation. This may not please the White House and it may offend some men on Capitol Hill, but the quietly competent Senator from Minnesota is conscientiously doing his duty.

Objections to Mr. McCone have been raised on his record. It is a question whether these are disqualifying. Yet it would be a dereliction of congressional responsibility if such matters were not looked into. As Senator MCCARTHY has indicated, the investigation also should go into policies established by Mr. McCone for the CIA—especially whether he believes he has a mandate to use force anywhere in the world, even in violation of U.S. treaty obligations. In insisting on a review of Mr. McCone's qualifications, Senator MCCARTHY serves his country well.

Opposition by Delaware Farm Bureau, Inc,. to Controls on Turkeys and Broilers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 17, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Mr. James H. Baxter, Jr., president of the Delaware Farm Bureau, Inc.

In this letter Mr. Baxter calls attention to the fact that the Delaware Farm Bureau has unanimously passed a resolution opposing any type of controls on turkeys and broilers.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DELAWARE FARM BUREAU, INC.,
Dover, Del., January 5, 1962.

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: At our board meeting on Tuesday, January 2, we discussed our position on production controls, and we thought it best that we bring you up to date with our policy on volume controls on turkeys and poultry.

At the annual meeting of the Sussex County Farm Bureau membership it was unanimously passed that they go on record opposing any type of controls on turkeys and broilers.

This same resolution was placed before the voting delegates at our State convention and was also unanimously approved.

Our State policy was then sent to the American Farm Bureau Convention in Chicago and the following policy was approved:

Volume controls: "We oppose the use of any legislation on administrative controls to restrict the total volume of production on marketing of livestock, turkeys, poultry, or any other agricultural commodity not now under control."

We feel that this information is very significant at this time because of the fact of the proposed turkey referendum and the proposed legislation in the Senate to place poultry in line for Government controls.

So, therefore, we hope that you will vote against any such proposal and that you will use your influence on others to do likewise.

With the best wishes for a happy new year for 1962.

Very truly,

JAMES H. BAXTER, Jr.,
President.

Tariff and Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the Ohio Chamber of Commerce for several years refused to take a position on either side of the foreign trade policy issue. This long-standing position has been changed, following a discussion of the issues by Dr. Jack Behrman, of the Commerce Department, and myself, before a chamber meeting at Columbus a week ago. I offer as part of my remarks the resolution stating the new position of the Ohio Chamber of Commerce:

TARIFF AND TRADE AGREEMENTS

(Resolution unanimously approved January 8, 1962, by board of directors, Ohio Chamber of Commerce)

In view of the Federal Government's recognition of and its expressions of concern over stiffening world competition with American-produced goods, it is the judgment of the board of directors of the Ohio Chamber of Commerce that the Government has an obligation to pursue policies which will assist American enterprise to lower its production costs and thus broaden world market potentials.

Under present world economic conditions, opportunities for freer competition and freer trade should be goals for our Nation; but this board feels impelled to observe that the concept of freer trade, without opportunity for more equal competitive status, is fraught with the danger of grave economic dislocations and the creation of much new unemployment.

It is a part of this board's judgment that the Federal Government, along with consideration of tariff and international trade relations, has the responsibility to reexamine policies which increase legislated costs of production—growing tax-financed subsidies in multiple economic fields, promotion of vastly enlarged relief, welfare and unemployment benefit payments, and steadily enlarging aid to governments of other nations.

The Ohio Chamber counsels painstaking examination of the remedies being proposed as an accompaniment to new tariff and trade agreements—loans to injured companies and communities, retraining and moving allowances for displaced workers, more generous unemployment insurance payments, and earlier retirement under social security.

To us, these proposals constitute additional tax-cost and payroll assessment burdens to be legislated onto American industry, business and labor, when the demonstrated need is to reduce, not to increase, such costs—costs which must be met, in turn, by increasing the price of goods marketed here or abroad.

Policies which, in the opinion of this Board, require reexamination, are illustrated by the following:

Corporate income tax rates higher than those of any other country except Great Britain; negligible tax credits to stockholders, as compared with those allowed by other countries; lower depreciation writoff than in any competing nation; competitively adverse treatment of capital gains; excessive income and excise taxes, a part of which are devoted to financing competing enterprise both within and without the United States; and excessive payroll charges for Government benefits under social security.

These Government-controlled economic factors are imposed upon American enterprise, which also pays wage rates more than twice as high as those in any competing country; more than three times as high as those prevailing in Europe.

In our judgment, these combined factors have made the problem of replacing and modernizing the American industrial machine exceedingly difficult; have made the creation of new plants and the expansion of plants an unnecessarily high-cost program; have forced mergers and other protective policies which tend to lessen creative initiative in new enterprise and new products, and in creation of new employment; and have restricted the ability of American manufacturers to hold and to further extend their equitable share of the world's markets, domestic and foreign.

Since it is the judgment of this Board that these governmental policies, among others, have produced, in total, the overall national problems now brought into sharp focus by the debate over tariff and trade policies, it is our conclusion that—concurrently with reconsideration by the Government of its tariff and reciprocal trade policies, and the proposed broadening of Presidential powers in this area—the Congress of the United States of America should revise other policies, such as those itemized above, which have brought about this present national concern.

HARRY W. ARNOLD,
Chairman of the Board.
HUGO H. YOUNG,
President.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Let's Stand Up on Our Hindlegs and Be Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the Philippic denunciations of Communist sympathizers by many loyal Americans has been termed as the irresponsible actions of "superpatriots." So much so that one might think a unique inspiration like that of Francis Scott Key in writing "The Star-Spangled Banner" might today be labeled the act of a "superpatriot."

The inference we obtain from the word "superpatriot" when used in the press is that it is a dirty word—the individuals are evil, and could be considered dangerous. If our children were to read some newspapers, they might get the idea that the likes of Paul Revere and Patrick Henry were faithless.

Mr. Speaker, just what is a "superpatriot"? I feel that many of those so stereotyped speak with earnestness and force on subjects that are close to the hearts of the American people. Ben Hibbs in the December 23, 1961, issue of the Saturday Evening Post writes with the zeal of James Russell Lowell in the following editorial which I feel is one of the finest articles I have read on this subject:

LET'S STAND UP ON OUR HINDLEGS AND BE AMERICANS

This is our last issue before Christmas, and traditionally this should be a Christmas editorial. It will not be. It also happens that this is the last issue of the Saturday Evening Post in which my name will appear as editor, and there are some things I want to say. I came to the editorship of the Post in a time of national crisis—in the black early months of World War II—and now, 20 years later, I am leaving the editorship in another era of crisis and doubt. I suppose you might call this editorial, if indeed it is an editorial, a declaration of my faith in a country that I love deeply.

There was a time when our way of life in America was simpler and easier, when human values seemed to be more nearly black and white, when the currents of national pride ran more strongly than they do now. The younger generation cannot remember those times. I do, and while I am not ancient enough or foolish enough to wish vainly for the return of an era that is past, I think it is urgent that we recapture some of the national fortitude, the ebullience of spirit, that were so evident in the time of our fathers and our grandfathers.

As a kid growing up on the Kansas prairies of 50 years ago, I often listened to the yarns of the old sodbusters as they sat around the stove in my father's hardware store of a winter evening. These were the leathery old pioneers who had lived through drought and blizzards and the devastation of the grasshopper years; who had subsisted on very little, and who in the end had taken this raw plains country by the scruff of its neck and turned it into a gracious and smiling land. Among them were men of foreign extraction. Some were veterans of the Civil War, which was still recent enough to be green in the memories of our elders, and some had fought, even later, in the final Indian wars of the western prairies. Doubtless there was an element of fiction in the tales they told, but there was also a deep and justifiable pride in what they had accomplished. And above all, they possessed an abiding faith in the future of America and a profound gratitude to the country that had given them their chance.

In those days the Fourth of July orators called America the land of opportunity and the greatest country on earth, and we believed them. In our schools and churches and our homes we were taught pride in country, and on holidays the bands played and the flags waved. It never occurred to anyone that all this was unsophisticated or corny. Although the prairie country of my youth was closer to the pioneer days than most of America, the same spirit of pride and belief in our destiny pervaded the Nation as a whole during the early years of this century. This was the atmosphere in which I and millions of other young Americans, who are now past middle age, grew up. It was an atmosphere, a state of mind, which gave meaning to life, put some purpose into toil and struggle, fired the soul of many a young man with a consuming desire to be somebody.

Now America is no longer an insular country. In a brief half century we have had to grow up and take our place among the nations of the world, and it has been a painful, and often confusing, experience. We have made some mistakes and have learned that we have some national faults. We have become indisputably the leaders of the Western World, and we have found that such leadership involves some awesome responsibilities. We also have learned that a leader is always the target for criticism of all kinds, much of it captious and unreasonable.

The heads of neutralist nations come to this country and lecture us on our faults, at the same time asking for financial assistance. The press of many so-called friendly countries carries on a constant drumfire of criticism of America and its actions—and even sometimes of its motives. We are told by people wo don't really know us, who don't know what America is like, that we are all materialists, with but little desire or capacity for the finer things of life; that we are brash and cocksure; that we are psychopathic about the threat of world communism; and so on and on down the list of our sins—personal, national, and international.

We, of course, can live through this senseless sort of carping. It is also true that in some cases we deserve the censure that is leveled at us. The bungled Cuban invasion of last spring is a sad example. What worries me, however, is that this barrage of niggling criticism from abroad, this posture of superiority on the part of our friends, is having its effect on our own national attitude of mind. The seeds of doubt—doubt of ourselves—are becoming too strong within us. It is right, of course, that we should examine our faults, and I honor our American writers who do this chore fairly and honestly. I have published much of their work in the Post. It was in the Post, for example, that the provocative book, "The Ugly American," was first given to the public. For it is only by a free discussion of our errors that we can correct those errors.

But throughout all this, in the name of Heaven let us remember that we still have a great deal to be proud of. We Americans have become so sensitive about what the rest of the world thinks of us that we are now inclined to lie down and roll over whenever the finger of criticism is pointed our way. Yet there is no reason to be apologetic about America. Other nations have also made their mistakes, and it would be hard for any one of them to match the decent idealism which we have brought to our role in world affairs.

In World War II we did more than any other nation to destroy the evil forces which were determined to dominate the earth. After the war it was our Marshall plan which helped restore Western Europe and kept communism at bay in that vital part of the world. We have continued to pour out our wealth and our manpower in an attempt to shore up freedom and human decency in other parts of the earth—sometimes without success, but we keep trying. We are now attempting, insofar as our resources permit, to assist the undeveloped countries and the emerging nations, and we know that the end is not in sight. We do these things because we believe they are right, not for territory or trade or the love of power. We have demonstrated that on the international scene we are an unselfish people, and we all know, even if it doesn't occur to our foreign critics, that the wherewithal for all this comes right out of our burdensome income-tax remittances, and that in many families there is hardship because of our national generosity. Foreign legend to the contrary, we are not a nation of millionaires.

Back in 1948 that wise old statesman, Bernard Baruch, wrote an article for the Saturday Evening Post which he titled "A Few Kind Words for Uncle Sam." It was a resounding pronouncement of his pride in his country. I think it is high time that we all start saying a few kind words for Uncle Sam whenever the occasion arises, and perhaps even when there is no obvious occasion. Somehow we must revive in the hearts of our young people the deep pride that all Americans must have in their heritage.

Elsewhere in this issue of the Post there is a fascinating survey of the attitudes of some 3,000 typical young Americans, boys and girls of high school and college age, on a variety of matters. It is a survey that was made with scrupulous care by the Gallup organization, and it was done on such a broad and scientifically balanced base that its results can hardly be challenged. The thing that emerges most clearly from this study is that far too many of our boys and girls these days have a curiously flabby and uninformed attitude of mind about our country, its history and its future, and about their own lives and their own futures. Too many are interested chiefly in security, an 8-hour day, and a relatively easy way of life. If the spark of ambition is there, it is buried pretty deep in some of them.

Now, this may be nothing more serious than evidence that the first stirrings of maturity are slower in coming these days. But I am afraid it is a bit more than that. I am afraid that somehow we have lost the ability, or perhaps the will, to fire our boys and girls with the human spark of pride in self and country, with the urge to accomplish something and to be somebody in this land of opportunity. And if this is true, we must not make the mistake of laying the blame entirely on the schools. The place where these things are best taught is right in the home—by example as well as by word.

These are bewildering times, fearful times. The shadow of atomic destruction hangs constantly over us. I am not one of those who believe the shadow will become reality, but I cannot deny the possibility. In any event, our only safeguard is to remain strong, strong in heart and fiber as well as in arms. This I believe we shall find a way to do. This is the basic faith I have in America. Perhaps it is too simple, but there it is.

Last June my old friend, MacKinlay Kantor, famed novelist who writes of the Civil War era and pioneer days in the West, was given an honorary degree by Iowa Wesleyan College, and I have before me a copy of his address. He discussed, in far more eloquent language than I can command, some of the same things I have dealt with in this editorial. His tone was one of firmness and hope. At the end of his speech he addressed his remarks to the spirit of old Abe Lincoln, and his final paragraph was this: "The dreams are ever around us, Mr. Lincoln. There is medicine in the breeze and an enzyme beneath the sod; and we still have a yearning and a gallantry, sir."

I like that high trumpet note from Mac Kantor. I echo it. I think we still have it in us to dream and to achieve, to be gallant and proud, to stand up on our hind legs and be Americans.

A Good Thing Gets a Crowd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a very interesting editorial entitled, "A Good Thing Gets a Crowd," published in the Chicago Daily News on Thursday, January 11, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GOOD THING GETS A CROWD

Rush-hour traffic congestion on Chicago's expressways will increase to the exact point that these highways offer no timesaving over the older, ordinary routes. This theory was advanced by Anthony Downs, analyst of the Real Estate Research Corp. It has the ring of a profound, cosmic truth, like Parkinson's law that expenses always rise to equal income.

The assumption is that every motorist will use the expressways as long as—and only as long as—they offer an advantage. Only if expressway capacity is enlarged to accommodate all possible users can we avoid a state of equilibrium in which travel time is equal on all routes.

This, as we said, sounds like an axiom applicable to all public facilities. Open a new golf course and players will flock to it until the waiting time becomes the same as that on the old one.

Downs' law seems even to have application to medical care, as West Virginia is discovering. The State plunged heavily into the Federal money-matching plan for aiding the aged. The appropriation of $1,325,000 is exhausted, and the States owes another $2 million to $3 million in unpaid medical bills.

One reason for the high cost was the steady rise in hospital admissions, which gained by 1,000 a month as the word got around that the State would pay the bill. By December 1 the State was obliged to cut the fees allowed under the medical-care-for-the-aged plan back to those previously established for persons on relief. This meant a maximum of $20 a day for hospitalization instead of $35. Physicians now get a maximum fee of $40, instead of the previous $187.50.

Consequently, only 132 of West Virginia's 1,800 physicians, and only 23 hospitals out of 108 previously participating are going along with the new program. In other words, the traffic exceeded the capacity of the freeway, and brought about an equilibrium in which the quality and cost of medical care is level between the new program and what previously existed.

The Government can, of course, pour more money into expressways and more money into a medical care plan. The proponents of medical care for the aged under the social security administration contend that with everybody under a health insurance plan there would be no question of adequate financing to keep facilities ahead of demand.

The very phrase "health insurance" is a fraud in that context. Insurance is a voluntary sharing of a risk, at stated cost, actuarially computed, and with the benefits stated in a firm contract. Social security is merely another tax to finance whatever Congress may see fit to prescribe in the way of medical care or any other benefits.

Socialized medicine is an accurate name for it. It is not new. It started in Prussia in 1845. Bismarck enlarged it into a plan covering all German workers. It is significant that absenteeism ascribed to illness thereupon trebled.

When the British started it in 1948 the estimate of the first year's cost was some $300 million. It proved to be twice that, and in 10 years was $2 billion. Charges for things formerly free have brought the system into equilibrium with what the taxpayers are willing to shell out.

What it all seems to show is that any new government service, be it medical care or rapid expressways, is quickly saturated by demand. It should be noted, however, that in the case of expressways there was a net addition to the existing facilities. In medical care, what is proposed is new demand on existing means of serving the ill.

Jim Piersall, Connecticut's New Senator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I predict a successful and colorful season for the Washington Senators in 1962. A genius for baseball and business, the personable Jim Piersall, who comes to Washington from my native Waterbury, Conn., by way of Boston and Cleveland, will provide the spirit and the spark at center field and at the plate to help swell the attendance at Washington Stadium, and improve the club's league standings.

Jim Piersall has won many major battles in the approach to the successes he has attained. He is now about to become the highest paid player on the payrolls of the Washington Senators. This is an achievement in itself; his record of other achievements has captured the admiration of the world of baseball.

I have followed Jim Piersall's career in baseball from the time he showed great promise as an athlete in Leavenworth High School, Waterbury, Conn. I have witnessed his ups and downs, sharing with his loyal fans and friends his triumphs and frustrations. I look forward to welcoming him and his lovely wife and their eight children, and his mother, to Washington when he joins the Senators for the 1962 season. I am confident that my colleagues share my feelings, and I know that all Connecticut natives in Washington will be members of the Jim Piersall Admiration Society.

I include at this point a column written by Francis Stann for the January 16, 1962, edition of the Washington Star, which is a commentary on the Jim Piersall who is going to take Washington by storm:

TOMBSTONE SALESMAN FROM WATERBURY

(By Francis Stann)

A distinguished visitor in our town is a wealthy tombstone salesman from Waterbury, Conn., named James Anthony Piersall. When and if he signs a contract he also will become the highest paid athlete ever to work for the Washington Senators.

It cost Gen. Pate Quesada a hefty press luncheon tab at the Statler for the privilege, but the Senators' boss guy got his first closeup look (and listen) to the colorful, controversial centerfielder yesterday. And Piersall, unawed, unafraid, and unashamed, was in top, if restrained, form.

"The two questions I hear most?" Jimmy mused. "Yeah, first the one about my fight in Yankee Stadium last summer. The other is, 'How do you like playing for a last-place club?' "

The general's ears pricked up at the second question, which Piersall answered first. "I say to people, 'What difference does it make what club you play for if you don't go to the Yankees?' Anyway, there aren't any last-place clubs in the winter."

About the so-called fight: Two young fans who were vocally belaboring Piersall in New York accepted his dare and jumped out of the bleachers on the attack. The tombstone seller, who also is a magazine publisher and sells some kind of batting gimmick, smiled in reminiscence.

"Mickey," he said to Manager Mickey Vernon, another interested guest, "I really kicked that first one. My foot was black and blue from toe to heel. I put everything I'd been saving up for all qualified knockers over the years." ("Qualified" takes the place of a row of asterisks.)

"I don't win many fights but I won this one. I turn to the other guy and now I see Mickey Mantle charging. Man, that was a good feeling. Mantle was the answer to those qualified sports writers in Cleveland who always said, "Nobody cares anything about that qualified goofball." Well, Mickey did, and I saw a couple more Yankees starting out, too.

"So I turned back to this second qualified bum and when I took a good look at him I knew I was well."

Piersall, who is sometimes given to giggling instead of laughing, demonstrated. "They put those two in the jug and the father of one told the judge he wasn't worth bailing out. The other father gave me hell, but I read in the rule book where you can't go up in the stands after a foul-mouthed fan. But if he comes on the field, he's your pigeon."

It is possible the Senators wistfully hoped to sign Piersall as soon as he hit town. However, General Manager Ed Doherty was detained by weather in Chicago and wasn't on hand yesterday to perform the ceremony. Today Jim was balking.

"I got a contract," Piersall testified, "but I figure it was just the kind a club has got to send a player by January 15 in order not to lose him."

Vernon gazed noncommitally at his empty parfait cup. General Quesada studied the ceiling.

"Was it for more or less money than you got in Cleveland last year?" somebody asked.

"Oh, it was for more money," Jimmy said, breezily. "But like I said, I figure it was just a number Doherty wrote down. At least, I hope so."

"Let me ask you something personal," another interposed. "Do you make as much money on the side as you do for playing ball?"

"This year, twice as much," Jimmy replied. Then perhaps a bit defensively, he added: "I've got 11 dependents—a wife, 8 kids, a mother and me."

Small arithmetical wheels turned and silently spelled out an income that might go as high as $120,000. However, only Piersall's manager spoke.

"Do you suppose," Mickey Vernon wryly inquired, "you'd be interested in opening a branch office in Marcus Hook?" Mickey is one of that Pennsylvania metropolis' most illustrious sons.

Piersall is properly proud of his '61 feats, which included batting .300 or better for the first time. To be exact, he hit .322 and stood third in the American League. "It was my best season in every way," he declared. "I made more big plays in the field than I ever did. One reason was that our pitching in Cleveland fell apart and there were always a lot of runners on base."

There was a defiance, too, as he played last season. He was constantly feuding with the sports writers. "How about those guys?" he asked, "They called me a clubhouse lawyer. I don't think I am. But they also said, 'You won't be here next year.' I guess they called that shot right."

The meeting might have lasted indefinitely except that Piersall, stuffed with prime ribs, had to race to Baltimore to attend a banquet. Was it mentioned earlier that our new boy also is in wide demand as an after-dinner speaker? He thinks last night's banquet was his 31st of the off-season—so far.

Irregularities by the New Jersey State Police in Handling Traffic Tickets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. The Newark (N.J.) Star-Ledger is performing a useful service in bringing to public attention reports of irregularities in the method of handling traffic tickets by the New Jersey State Police and the general administration of tnas important law-enforcement agency.

Congress, too, is vitally concerned with highway safety and law enforcement. Irregularities of the nature reported in these articles, if true, undermine public confidence and respect for law enforcement. I ask unanimous consent that several articles from the Newark Star-Ledger on this subject be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Newark Star-Ledger, Jan. 10, 1962]

STATE POLICE: POLITICS AND TICKET FIXING

The New Jersey State Police, long the symbol of incorruptible law enforcement, has been fixing tickets for the politically favored and disciplining troopers who balk at the practice.

The charge is being made with increasing frequency by veteran troopers, disturbed over the state of affairs in the organization in which they have staked their careers.

Fixes and other political meddling, they assert, is at the root of an attempt by some troopers to form a "fraternal organization" to protect them against politically motivated superiors.

But the complaints are not confined to those backing the organizational movement, a survey by the Star-Ledger shows.

The political meddling, charge the troopers, operates in three areas: Ticket fixing, assignments, promotions.

The ticket fixing was described as widespread, but political interference in assignments and promotions was pictured as even more demoralizing.

The tickets, in a State which boasts a supposedly fix-proof traffic ticket system, are being fixed in several different ways. Here are some fo the cases cited by the troopers:

One involved downgrading a ticket from speeding over 65 in a 50-mile zone to speeding at 59 miles per hour. The difference seems small but the effect is large.

New Jersey has an over-60 policy, under which a driver's license is automatically suspended if he is convicted of going that fast on a State highway. The revocable speed for the turnpikes is 70.

Another case involved a speeding offense in which all four copies of a ticket were conveniently lost.

But still another case involved altering a record to show that the ticket in question had been issued in another court's jurisdiction. The case in question never did reach a court.

Troopers assert that this type of activity, which an audit could uncover, doesn't span the entire area of political interference. There are certain "untouchables" who just do not get tickets when they are caught in an offenes.

One trooper related that men on radar duty are instructed not to issue tickets to cars with special license plate numbers.

Another trooper told of ticketing a State judge for speeding. The ticket "disappeared."

A trooper told of stopping the same State official three times for breaking 70 on a superhighway. Each time he was instructed not to issue a ticket.

The pressure to go along with this system, the troopers say is "terrific."

If a man is uncooperative, say the troopers, the weapon of transfer is brought into play. Here is one of the cases they cite:

Trooper A decided that a highly placed speeder was no better than anyone else, and he issued a ticket. Subsequently he was asked to go along with a downgrading and he wouldn't.

The trooper was transferred to a barracks 50 miles from a home he had bought only a short while before.

The threat of transfer is a tangible lever. An intangible pressure, say the troopers, is the certain knowledge that any chance of promotion is throttled by "non-cooperation."

Assignments and promotions are also subject to politics in their own right.

The man with "the in" is more likely to get the comfortable post near home and the promotion.

The man with no political sponsor is at the mercy of this system.

There is no civil service road up the ladder of rank in the State police.

One trooper in Monmouth County got so tired of waiting for his service record to be recognized he filed suit in Superior Court for a promotion.

Other cases in point say the troopers are those of two men in the middle ranks who jumped over several waiting in line for appointment to high-ranking posts "because they knew State officials."

"After you have a lot of time in the service and see this happen, you feel like quitting."

[From the Newark Star-Ledger, Jan. 11, 1962]

TROOPERS QUIT IN DISGUST; BLAME POLITICS, LOW MORALE

Many men joined the New Jersey State Police because they saw in the golden triangle of the blue uniform a symbol of an elite law enforcement outfit.

But 64 troopers quit during the past 4 years disillusioned and disenchanted. They blamed politics, poor morale, low pay, long work hours, and trying "to fill a ticket quota."

Some troopers said they resigned because they felt there wasn't any chance for promotion due to politics.

State Police Commander, Col. Joseph Rutter, defends his promotional system, claiming promotions were made on "merit and seniority."

"If things are so bad why do so few men quit?" Rutter asks.

Yet are they so few? The official record indicates trooper resignations have been on the upgrade since 1957, when 9 of the 833-man force turned in their badges. Four resigned the following year, 12 the next, 17 in 1960, and 22 last year.

Veteran troopers were among those who resigned. Some turned to other police careers in municipalities and others took jobs as private investigators.

One former trooper, now a Newark police officer, told why he left the State organization.

'When I first joined the State police I had high ideals," he said. "I was impressed by the training program. But I made one mistake. It convinced me I would never be promoted."

The trooper stopped a man for speeding and handed him a ticket. He learned the man was a high-ranking politician.

"Instead of being commended, my superiors chewed me out and told me never to do it again. After a series of disillusionments, I decided to resign and joined the Newark police force.

"The promotions are made on a competitive basis there and I would have time to further my education in police work.

"When I was a trooper, we worked 90 hours a week and didn't have time off for anything. * * *"

A veteran trooper, attached to the radar unit, said he was reprimanded and transferred when he ticketed a car with a special license plate number.

He said his superior told him:

"There is plenty of trash on the highways that you can give tickets to."

Another ex-trooper with 4 years of service said he thought it was a topnotch outfit when he joined. But after 6 months, he said:

"I found it to be a feudal system where no trooper had any constitutional rights and

you had to belong to the West Trenton clique to get a promotion.

"I got out before I got so much time in that it would be unwise to quit and lose the pension."

Many State cops complain about the ticket quota, although the existence of quotas has officially been denied.

Said one trooper:

"We were reprimanded unless we ticketed at least 20 motorists a month. Failure to give out enough tickets meant a transfer to a far-off post."

Another 5-year man complained about the nonexistent quota system setup. "It forces troopers to give out tickets unfairly * * *."

A 10-year careerman stationed in North Jersey said he once arrested a politician for speeding and while writing the ticket, the politician slugged him. He arrested the politician for assault. Later he said, he was reprimanded by a superior who told him: "What are you trying to do? Get us in trouble?"

A youthful ex-cop with 5 years' service quit because "I became disillusioned."

"I had no political pull and looking into the future I realized things would not get any better, so I quit," he said. "What's the use of wasting time?"

But the father of four added: "I would go back into the State police if there were such things as promotional examinations and a nonpolitical administration."

[From the Newark Star-Ledger, Jan. 14, 1962]

TROOPERS TELL OF ORDERS TO TAKE IT EASY ON VIP'S

The bulletin board read "use good judgment in dealing with influential people * * *."

A superior officer tells a trooper he'll be transferred if he tickets any more VIP's.

A high-ranking officer sends a trooper to pick up his laundry.

A trooper is commanded to take home a "very important drunk."

A trooper tells how a State police relay squad was used to take a personal package from North Jersey to Trenton for an official.

These reports came in a sweeping tide last week from troopers stationed throughout New Jersey. The notice on the bulletin board was posted as "the minutes of a noncommissioned officers meeting of troop D in New Brunswick." Troop D patrols the New Jersey Turnpike from Bergen County to Salem County.

It said in part:

"Troopers to use good judgment in any dealing with influential people (politicians) who can influence this extra money for us. Use diplomacy and tact."

A trooper explained that the brass "felt if too many VIP's got tickets they would knock down our pay raises when we asked for them * * *."

The veteran trooper said superiors constantly warn them not to ticket important figures.

"That's what is meant by the use of diplomacy and tact * * *."

"They threaten you with transfer if you don't obey orders * * *."

The trooper then explained that it has taken years for some troopers to get stationed near their homes and they just follow orders to stay there.

Another trooper explained: "If you ticket a VIP that's it * * *. You'll be brought in, reprimanded. They'll (superiors) tell you that you have embarrassed them * * *."

The trooper, who has more than 5 years in the military-type police force, cited a case of a classmate who bucked the brass and gave a VIP a ticket for speeding.

"He was doing way more than 70 miles per hour," said the trooper. "You know where the trooper is today?

"He's down somewhere near Cape May. They brought him in, reprimanded him and told him he was embarrassing them.

"This just shows how a trooper can get hurt for doing his duty."

"And don't think it hasn't hurt that trooper," he said. "His family still lives up in the north Jersey area and he has to drive about 50 to 60 miles to work every day."

The trooper said he can't use the relay system under orders from the brass.

Under the relay system, a trooper is carried from one station to the boundary line of the next, from there until the next and so on until he reaches his destination.

Another veteran trooper gave further details about the relay system.

"I guess the brass thinks it's all right when we act as taxi drivers, chauffeurs and errand boys," he said.

The trooper told about picking up VIPs and chauffeuring them around. Sometimes troopers have to take these men to their destinations, wait for them, and then make sure they get back home.

Some of them, report the troopers, aren't too steady on their feet for the return trip.

Troopers also say they have been errand boys on several occasions to deliver packages. One trooper told of picking up a package and it was relayed for miles to Trenton.

A report came back later that it was a State officeholder's pajamas.

"I don't doubt it one bit," said the trooper. "We are called on to deliver so many things."

Then there's the laundry story told by another trooper.

A superior ordered the trooper to fetch his laundry. When the trooper returned, the superior chewed him out for not getting the discount. The laundry gives a discount for cash-and-carry customers.

Last week charges of political interference were made by the troopers, who also charged that they have been forced by their superiors to downgrade and fix tickets issued to influential persons.

Attorney General David D. Furman and Supreme Court Administrator Edward B. McConnell have begun investigations.

[From the Newark Star-Ledger, Jan. 15, 1962]

THE CASE OF TROOPER X

If there's any doubt about what a trooper has to face when he tickets a VIP, consider the case of trooper X. Trooper X was working on radar patrol when a car had barreled through at 75 miles an hour. He flagged it down and discovered it was former State Conservation Commissioner Salvatore Bontempo's auto. The trooper said he was sorry, but had to give the chauffeur a ticket.

Trooper X continued patrol as the chauffeur-driven limousine drove away. A short time later trooper X was ordered to report for questioning.

The captain reportedly dressed him down during a half-hour lecture, telling trooper X that he had used poor discretion and judgment. The trooper, it was suggested, should quit because he had disgraced the State police for issuing a ticket.

He warned trooper X to "shape up" or he would be transferred.

A few days later trooper X was called to Trenton. A major told him that he was a good man and could probably get ahead if he used discretion.

TROOPER TRANSFERRED

At the same time, the major inferred the trooper needed psychiatric help.

Trooper X returned to his post, but after a few more tickets given to other important figures he was on his way—to a State police station more than 100 miles from his home. It takes him 2½ hours to get to work and he's away from his family for almost a week at a time.

Contacted yesterday about the incident, Bontempo denied being in the car when it was stopped. He said an aid was in the car at the time. But he remembered the incident.

"Even if I had been in the car I would not have interceded for the chauffeur. He was going over the limit and should pay the consequences.

"That included a 30-day suspension of his license," Bontempo declared. "In fact, I told an assistant at the time it was too bad, but he had it coming to him.

"I still believe anyone who gets a ticket is guilty of speeding and should take the consequences," added Bontempo.

TROOPERS CITE MINUTES

Troopers charge that they have instructions to "take it easy" on VIP's. They cite the minutes of a September 27 meeting of noncommissioned officers in State police troop D with instructions "to use good judgment in any dealing with influential people (politicians)."

This, they charge, was nothing less than a thinly veiled order not to ticket VIP's. A photostat of the minutes was printed in yesterday's Star-Ledger.

Troopers also charge that they have been forced to "kill" or downgrade tickets issued to drivers with the "right influence."

An investigation of these charges has been undertaken by Col. Joseph Rutter, State police superintendent, and Edward B. McConnell, supreme court administrator.

[From the Newark Star-Ledger, Jan. 16, 1962]

BECOMING "TAX COLLECTORS," STATE TROOPERS CHARGE

State troopers complain they are becoming "tax collectors" instead of law enforcement men.

As one trooper put it: "We now spend most of our time on traffic patrol and almost no time on criminal investigations."

Officially, the high command denies troopers have ticket quotas, but unofficially troopers claim they are ordered by superiors to surpass the total number of tickets given out for the same period last year.

Giving substance to the troopers' complaint about spending more and more time on road patrol is a directive made last February by Attorney General David D. Furman.

At that time, Furman ordered all State motor vehicle inspectors off the road, leaving troopers the only statewide agency patrolling the roads.

Furman explained at the time that the move was made to eliminate duplication of services by the two agencies, both of which operate under the attorney general's office.

The Furman order halted a much publicized program of selective enforcement started by the motor vehicle division.

The program had been concentrated in areas with high accident rates and particularly where fatalities were on the rise.

The move meant that the workload on troopers would increase * * * or there would be less patrolling of the roadways.

The "efficiency" of the road patrol, the troopers point out, is measured by issuance of tickets.

"All they want us to do is give out tickets," said a trooper. "We call ourselves tax collectors now."

Asked if he had a quota, the trooper replied:

"Yes. But it's not called that. It's known as activities."

The trooper then explained that sergeants constantly hound them to improve their activities.

He said where warnings were given to motorists previously, tickets are issued now.

"The quality of violations for which we issue a summons has reached a new low," said another trooper. "But the sergeant wants to make sure he has more tickets issued this year than he did this time last year."

The trooper told about a fellow officer who had come back from patrol and fell short on his "activities."

"The sergeant sent him right back and told him not to return until he had caught up on his 'activities' " said the trooper.

A third trooper told about another trooper who had broken up nearly 20 burglaries in a month and "then was rapped for not giving out enough summonses for the same period."

A fourth trooper said "courtesy is a thing of the past on the highways.

"We used to tell motorists that a light was out, get it fixed at the next service area. But now this is discouraged.

"The sergeant won't stand for any 'goose eggs' on 'activities' ", he added.

[From the Newark Star-Ledger]

THE CASE OF TICKET X

This is the case of traffic summons X.

The case opened at 8:03 p.m. on a Friday night in 1959 when the State police radar patrol stopped a driver for speeding at 69 miles per hour in a 50-mile zone on Route 22.

A traffic summons was issued.

If found guilty, the driver of the car could have automatically lost his license for 30 days under a State motor vehicle law.

But strange things happened.

At first, traffic summons X mysteriously disappeared from a file.

A superior then ordered a facsimile made of the radar-supported ticket. But it had one significant change. The speed of the vehicle was reduced on the facsimile of traffic summons X from 69 to 59 miles per hour.

The rating is 1 mile below revocation speed for a highway with a 50-mile-per-hour limit. The driver, however, would receive four points for speeding under the State motor vehicle law.

Apparently the driver never did. For traffic summons X never made it to court.

A check of court records disclosed that the ticket number for traffic summons X bears no disposition.

The case of traffic summons X is the latest in a series of articles in the Star-Ledger on State police tickets.

Troopers charge that superiors have forced them to "kill" or downgrade tickets issued to drivers with the right influence.

Troopers also tell how they have been ordered to take it easy on VIP's and, instead, to get the "trash" using the highways.

An investigation of the charges has been undertaken by Col. Joseph Rutter, State police superintendent, and Edward B. McConnell, supreme court administrator.

United Nations Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday President Kennedy delivered his state of the Union message to Congress. One of the recommendations made by the President was that Congress should pass legislation authorizing the United States to purchase $100 million of a pending United Nations bond issue. This is a highly controversial proposal. I have devoted considerable study to this proposal, and I cannot convince myself to vote for the purchase of these United Nations bonds. I might say that I speak not as someone who has opposed the United Nations, but as a House Member who has voted for every appropriation for the United Nations that has come before the House of Representatives in the 8 years I have been here.

Let us analyze why this United Nations bond issue has become necessary. It has arisen out of the operation of the United Nations military police force in the Congo. This U.N. police force was authorized by vote of the membership of the United Nations. It was determined that assessments should be levied against all U.N members to pay the cost of this military police force. Assessments totaling $48,500,000 were levied in 1960 and assessments totaling $100 million were levied in 1961 up to October 31. However, the United Nations has no means of enforcing the payment of such assessments. If a U.N. member fails to pay its basic dues, it loses its right to vote. However, this is not true with special assessments of this type. Therefore, there is no penalty whatsoever for failure to pay.

Now let us see what has happened. Of the $48,500,000 assessment levied for 1960, only $25,651,017.75 had been paid as of December 31, 1961. Of this sum, the United States had paid its full assessment of $15,745,211.00, or three-fifths of the total paid by all nations. Sixty-four nations never paid a dime. The situation with the 1961 assessment of $100 million is even worse. Of this amount, only $49,275,727.60 had been paid as of December 31, 1961. Of this sum, the United States had paid its full assessment of $32,204,061, or two-thirds of the total paid by all nations. Seventy-eight nations never paid a cent.

The United Nations deficit on this Congo operation was increasing so rapidly last year—1961—that President Kennedy submitted a recommendation to Congress last summer that we appropriate an additional voluntary sum of $15,305,596, above our assessment of $32,204,061, to keep the United Nations solvent. Your Representative reluctantly voted for it, because I felt that we should not let the United Nations go into insolvency.

However, this deficit on the Congo operation has continued to mount. The United Nations has now voted to launch a $200 million bond issue to offset this deficit. The bonds would bear 2-percent interest and would be repaid in 20 years. President Kennedy has recommended that Congress authorize the United States to purchase one-half or $100 million of these bonds. This means that the United States is being asked to pay, for the United Nations Congo operation, not only our original 32-percent assessment plus our voluntary additional contribution of $15,305,596, but an additional sum of $100 million to buy U.N. bonds made necessary by the Congo deficit. And who were the majority of nations that voted in the United Nations to issue these bonds, hoping that the United States would buy them? They are the nations who themselves have not contributed a dime toward the Congo operation.

It seems to me that Congress should not allow this course of action to continue any further. If we always step forward to pay all United Nations deficits, no other nation will feel any necessity of paying any special assessment. It seems to me the United States should meet this situation head on, and insist that the United Nations Charter be changed so that if a nation does not pay a special assessment, that nation will lose its right to vote. We will never solve this problem by "picking up the check" every time there is a deficit.

You might be interested in the major nations that have refused to pay their assessments for the Congo operation. Soviet Russia is the biggest offender. Its unpaid assessments for 1960 and through October 31, 1961, amount to $20,088,253, upon which it has not paid a nickel. This unpaid assessment is twice as large as that of any other nation. None of the other Communist bloc nations have made any payments on these Congo assessments. In addition, Belgium, France, Italy, Nationalist China, and other nations also have not paid their assessments because they did not approve of the actions of the United Nations police force in the Congo.

It seems to me that if the United States were to buy $100 million of U.N. bonds to make up this Congo deficit, we would indirectly be making a loan of $20,088,253 to Soviet Russia at a subsidized interest rate. This is because we would be making up a deficit caused in part by the failure of Soviet Russia to pay its $20,088,253 assessment. In addition, we would be buying U.N. bonds paying only 2 percent interest, but to raise the funds to buy these bonds the United States would have to increase our national debt as we are currently operating at a deficit. The United States has to pay over 3 percent in interest on our national debt. Therefore, we would be indirectly subsidizing Soviet Russia by indirectly loaning her money at 2 percent interest which our country has to itself obtain by borrowing at more than 3 percent interest. I do not see any valid reason why we should be such a Santa Claus.

For the above reasons, I plan to vote against the proposal that the United States buy $100 million in United Nations bonds.

A Trail To Blaze—The Wilderness Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, last September the Senate passed the wilderness bill by a 78-to-8 vote. This legislation is now in the House Subcommittee on Public Lands, whose chairman is the very able Congresswoman from Idaho, GRACIE PFOST. The Washington Post and Times Herald on January 17 carried an editorial on the wilderness bill. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TRAIL TO BLAZE

One of the important bits of unfinished business before the House is a measure that would assure that future generations can have at least a sample of the old frontier. This is the wilderness bill, passed by the Senate last September in a one-sided 78-to-8 vote. Put simply, the purpose of the bill is to set aside in perpetuity a portion of the untracked wilderness. No new bureau would be set up and the cost would be negligible, yet by passing the bill Congress would present the future with a gift beyond price.

The wilderness bill is now before the Subcommittee on Public Lands headed by Representative GRACIE PFOST, of Idaho. Field hearings have already been held in Idaho, Colorado, and California, and final committee hearings ought to be held soon. Despite the overwhelming support of conservation organizations, diehard opposition is still expressed by some mining, livestock, and lumber interests. After thorough debate, the Senate decided that there were adequate safeguards for legitimate commercial interest in the public lands. President Kennedy has given his explicit support to the measure; we hope the House follows suit.

Federal Highway Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the apportionment of Federal-aid grants from the highway trust fund for improvements to the Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban systems for fiscal years 1964 and 1965.

The highway systems referred to are those commonly known as the A–B–C highways, including approximately 230,000 miles of rural primary routes, 575,000 miles of rural secondary routes, and 35,000 miles of urban roads and streets. These roads extend into every county of the United States and affect the life of every citizen to a significant extent.

As is customary, this biennial A–B–C bill also authorizes the appropriation of funds from the general fund of the Treasury for forest highways, forest development roads and trails, national parks roads and trails, national parkways, Indian reservation roads, and public lands highways.

Last year, when the Highway Act of 1961 was under consideration, thought was given to a proposal that a schedule of authorizations for the A–B–C highways be enacted as a part of that legislation, to provide for annual authorizations through fiscal year 1971. The Subcommittee on Roads was unanimous in the opinion that the custom of reviewing the A–B–C program biennially should continue to be a part of the authorization process. Accordingly, the consideration of A–B–C authorizations was deferred until 1962.

It is important that this review and consideration by the Subcommittee on Roads be undertaken early in the session because, in order to maintain the continuity of the program and to provide ample opportunity for orderly planning, the apportionment for fiscal year 1964 should be made this summer.

As introduced, my bill provides for an authorization of $950 million for fiscal year 1964 and $975 million for fiscal 1965, to be allocated among the primary, secondary, and urban systems and apportioned to the States in accordance with the statutory formulas. The policy for increasing the A–B–C authorizations by annual increments of $25 million was first recommended by the House Public Works Committee in 1956. The practice has been followed since, with one exception.

On the basis of information presently available, I hold the opinion that the proposed increases are feasible within the framework of present highway trust fund revenue law, and are needed to maintain an adequate level of construction on the A–B–C systems. The Subcommittee on Roads will schedule early hearings on the bill to bring together current information on the basis of which the necessary judgments can be made.

The last quarterly report of the Bureau of Public Roads shows that 11,252 miles of the Interstate System were open to traffic on September 30, with work underway on an additional 15,000 miles. As completed segments of the system are linked up, the Nation is beginning to collect significant economic dividends from the system, and these dividends will multiply as a truly connected system of high-standard freeways emerges.

The continuing program of improvements to the A–B–C roads is dovetailed with the Interstate program. The A–B–C roads must serve as connectors and feeders to the Interstate System, serving farms, homes, offices, and factories. Since the start of the accelerated highway program on July 1, 1956, construction projects costing approximately $8 billion involving more than $4 billion in Federal funds, have been completed on more than 125,000 project-miles of the A–B–C systems.

Substantial progress is being made toward meeting the requirements of our growing human and automobile populations. Many lives have been saved because of the engineered safety built into modern roads. Travel has been made more convenient and speedier. Nevertheless, our national highway system has serious deficiencies which must be corrected.

The purpose of the bill, simply stated, is to insure that the A–B–C program will go forward.

Back-Door Spending Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, with the presentation of the Presidential budget—a record proposal for Government spending in peacetime—it is timely to call attention to a recent article by the Honorable Maurice Stans, former Director of the Budget during the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. Stans devotes his column of Monday, January 15, distributed by the Times-Mirror Syndicate of Los Angeles, to the problems of back-door spending, the method used to circumvent the constitutional procedure of submitting expenditures to the scrutiny of the congressional Appropriations Committees.

While we have been successful in the past in defeating some of the plans for the back-door spending approach, there is no doubt in my mind that attempts will again be made to take from the Congress its authority over spending.

Mr. Stans' views on this subject are deserving of particular attention by the Members of the Congress at a time when we are confronted with one of the most massive budgets of all time.

I request permission to include the article at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACK-DOOR SPENDING BATTLE TO RESUME

(By Maurice Stans)

Surprisingly, the last loud gun fired in the 1961 session of the Congress was not a political shot by one party at the other. It was a bipartisan cannon roar in the House aimed at the Senate over the issue of back-door spending. It will be reverberating in the Capitol through much of this 1962 session.

Few people outside Washington know what the fuss was about or why this is a continuing vital issue that effects the pocketbook of every taxpayer. It involves not only the Constitution but also the question of orderly discipline over the financial affairs of the Government.

Section 9 of article I of the Constitution demands that "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law." The objective of this is to provide a double control over the spending actions of the executive branch of the Government. First, no activity may be carried on by any agency unless that activity is specifically authorized in a substantive law spelling out its scope. Next, no money is to be spent on the activity without an appropriation for the purpose for each year.

ESTIMATE OF PRIORITIES

Under the annual budget process, each department and aegncy of Government submits its requests for money to spend to the President through the Bureau of the Budget. After the painstaking and detailed procedure of budget review is completed, the President presents his recommendations to the Congress early in January in the annual budget for the forthcoming fiscal year.

The Congress has the right to approve, reject, or modify his proposals, and this determination centers in the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate. They hold hearings, first in the House and later in the Senate, on the President's budget for each unit of Government, and the agency officials give evidence in support of their items.

After the Appropriations Committees make their respective findings, they are approved on the floor of the Congress and enacted into a series of appropriations laws. These establish ceiling amounts. The Appropriations Committees, like the President are expected

to view spending plans in relation to each other and to the total so that the Government's programs will be carefully balanced to the Nation's needs and resources.

COMMITTEES LOSE CONTROL

Back-door spending is a simple process of bypassing this careful constitutional procedure. To avoid having a matter brought before the Appropriations Committees, congressional proponents of a program may be able to include in the substantive law authorizing the program permission for an agency to borrow funds directly from the Treasury to carry it on. The money is then spent without an appropriation. Or the substantive law may contain authority to make contracts in advance of appropriations, in which case the later appropriations are only a formality. Either way, back-door spending provides a much easier way for an agency to obtain funds, because it need ask for them only once in each House instead of twice. The end result is that the Appropriations Committees lose their control over the budget and the Constitution is violated.

Back-door spending has been a growing phenomenon of the last 30 years. After observing the way in which it impaired fiscal control. President Eisenhower directed the Bureau of the Budget in 1959 to approve no new requests of Government agencies for back-door spending, and he included none in the subsequent budgets which he submitted to the Congress.

This position was reversed by the present administration in 1961, and many proposals for back-door spending were included in its messages to Congress. Quite a few were approved in legislation. The Appropriations Committees, properly jealous of their prerogative, fought back hard, but their objections were ineffective in most cases, principally because the back-door spending items appeared in legislation which contained other provisions desired by congressional majorities.

A typical back-door spending proposal was the one by President Kennedy for a 5-year $9 billion authorization for foreign aid. On this he was defeated. After a long fight the long-term idea was approved, but with a provision requiring a separate appropriation action in each year. He also lost on a proposal for back-door spending of $375 million in aid to airports over 5 years, which was instead passed with a requirement for annual appropriations. The 1961 housing bill, however, enacted several provisions for back-door spending, as did the Agricultural Act. In all, according to a table entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by House Appropriations Committee Chairman CLARENCE CANNON, $29 billion was asked by President Kennedy via the back-door route and the $20 billion was enacted.

SENATE FUMED AND FUSSED

This explains the closing day's explosion. In protest against the whole business, the House worked into a final piece of legislation a provision insisting that several programs already enacted on a back-door basis amend to require appropriations instead. Then it adjourned for the year. The Senate, still in session, fumed and fussed but had no alternative. The action stuck.

The battle is sure to be resumed. The aim of those who seek back-door spending is clearly to make money easier to get. Not all such efforts originate with the White House. Many are inserted by the legislative committees of the Congress. Either way the taxpayer loses. If Government finances are to be subjected to a sound control that assures that spending programs take their right place in line, it is elementary that back-door raids on the Treasury must be ended.

Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most controversial issues to come up in this 2nd session of the 87th Congress will be the administration's proposal to integrate a so-called medical care program for the aged through the social security program.

While the propagandists for the administration would like the people to believe that practically every senior citizen is agreeable to this proposal, I should like to have reprinted in the RECORD at this point a letter just received from Mrs. Martha Goodell, aged 68, 1711 Prospect, Kansas City, Mo. Her story is, I am sure, typical of many which could be cited from around the country.

The letter follows:

KANSAS CITY, MO., *October 31, 1961.*

Representative ROBERT H. MICHEL,
Washington, D.C.

President Kennedy's plan for medical care for the aged in connection with social security is not as practical as people who have had no experience with social security might think. I have had experience.

Social security, while not adequate to meet the needs of elderly persons who have no families or other income, serves the purpose for which it was intended. It is not practical for short term needs, which medical care would be. Communities should and do have facilities for the care of indigent patients.

I am entitled to social security benefits for the months in which I do not earn $100 if my yearly income is less than $2,000. In 1960 there were two months in which I did not earn $100. After considerable delay and much red tape, I was paid what was due me. Without my asking for it, I was sent checks for January and February. I notified the Social Security that I thought I was not entitled to them as business was good in those months, and asked what I should do. After a reasonable time in which they did not answer my letter, I used the money.

Early in June they asked me to return the checks. I wrote them that since I had earned less than $100 in March and May, I though that made us even. In June I made only $13.97. Social security recommended that I arrange with my employers to work for $100 a month so that I could get regular social security payments. I took their advice and am now working for $80 a month—take home pay $72.15. I occasionally have a little income from the other company. They paid me the above mentioned $13.97, which was my entire income for June.

My first check came in October which was for September. They said they did not pay me for June, July, and August because I was paid $13.97 in June by the other company and they were afraid I would make more than $100 a month. Now they say they will not pay me for those 3 months until January, although I have made arrangements with the company to limit my pay to a maximum of $15 in any month that I produce business. (Total so far this year $30.)

In the meantime, I do not have money for necessities. My landlord is unhappy about the past due rent. I have always paid it when due in the past. I cannot pay for groceries c.o.d. as heretofore; my apartment is dirty; nearly everything I have to wear is dirty; I have no money to pay for these items and I am physically unable to do it myself since I had a stroke in April 1958, so I will have to be dirty until January as I have no money to pay the bills.

It is easy for me to arrive at the exact figure of the money I will have earned by the end of the year (if I had an adding machine), $1,258.50.

This is what I call antisocial insecurity. I certainly do not want my medical care messed up like this.

MARTHA GOODELL.

P.S.—Since writing the above they have sent me more than I asked for. They don't know what they are doing. In the final windup, I think I should have had $98 more. I will not ask for it, as I am sick and it is too hard to fight.

Burley Acreage Tobacco Allotments for 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, it was again my privilege to join with my colleagues from the great tobacco State of Kentucky and other tobacco-producing areas this morning in submitting to the Department of Agriculture our recommendations concerning burley tobacco acreage allotments for 1962.

I ask unanimous consent that my prepared statement, which was presented at the annual quotas meeting, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR THRUSTON B. MORTON ON 1962 NATIONAL MARKETING QUOTAS FOR BURLEY TOBACCO, JANUARY 18, 1962

I appreciate having the opportunity of meeting here today with my colleagues from burley-producing States to submit my recommendation for the 1962 national marketing quota for burley tobacco.

The essence of my recommendation is that acreage allotments be increased from 5 to 7 percent for 1962. The results of the current marketing season vindicate the decision to increase allotments by 6 percent for the 1961 crop. Farmers have received top prices for their burley, and most of the crop has gone into normal trade channels, with only about 1 percent going to the associations under the loan program. This exceptionally strong demand clearly indicates that the tobacco farmers' customers want burley and will pay premium prices to get it.

The 1961 production was based on a national marketing quota of 536 million pounds, which made approximately 329,000 acres available for allotment. Of this total acreage, it is estimated that only 318,000 acres were harvested, but an unusually heavy crop now makes it likely that net production will be in the area of 570 million pounds.

However, authorities in the industry estimate that the total volume of useful tobacco, that is, the net yield for manufacturing

purposes, will run about 550 million pounds because of the above-average moisture content of the tobacco. These moisture estimates, I am advised, will run from 4 to 5 percent higher than usual.

It is important that the customers of burley tobacco, both at home and abroad, continue to be provided with adequate leaf supplies from the standpoint of volume and selectivity if the industry is to remain healthy and prosperous. At the same time, adequate care must be exercised to protect the producers' interests from the dangers of excessive production of the magnitude which existed for several years after the 1954 crop. It is also imperative that we avoid incurring a repetition of the increase-decrease cycle.

There are several factors which I feel strongly support another acreage increase in 1962:

1. Cigarette production in 1961 rose to an alltime high of 537 billion units, a 4-percent increase over 1960.

2. Gains in domestic disappearance of leaf tobacco indicate that manufacturing technology has about reached maximum utilization of the leaf. Thus, we may expect further anticipated increases in cigarette production to demand the use of more leaf tobacco in the future.

3. The carryover on October 1, 1961, was the lowest since the 1952–53 marketing year. It has dropped each year since the high point reached in 1955–56.

4. The total supply of burley tobacco has dropped for the seventh consecutive year.

5. Total disappearance increased for the third consecutive year.

6. Manufacturing companies still are unable to purchase full requirements, even on a replacement basis, when the 2-year lead-time basis of usage is considered. Since manufacturers will not use burley at a rate they can't replace, they must necessarily spread their available burley a little thinner and make up the difference from other types. Substitution for burley represents a market loss which could be difficult to recapture.

The industry has indicated that its manufacturing requirements in 1964 will approximate 587 million pounds, which will come largely from the 1962 crop. I believe that the statutory formula, allowing for the trend for greater consumption of burley, will support a 1962 marketing quota of from 575 to 585 million pounds.

In converting to acres, I have applied a per-acre yield of 1,670 pounds, which is 32 pounds greater than the most recent 5-year average and higher than any single year on record with the exception of the 1961 crop, whose yield is estimated at 1,725 pounds per acre. This would give a 1962 allotted acreage of between 344,000 and 351,000 acres, an increase of between 5 to 7 percent above 1961.

I would also like to reaffirm my full support of legislation which would require all growers participating in acreage increases to share equally in future reductions, using 1960 allotments as a point of departure. This, in my opinion, would be a most constructive modification of the burley program, and I hope that something can be accomplished this year.

Our Policy Toward Yugoslavia Is in Need of Reevaluation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, should Yugoslavia be treated as a "different" kind of Communist country and thus be considered eligible for vast amounts of U.S. aid to purchase at giveaway prices U.S. military equipment, to be accorded a preferential status in the formulation of U.S. export trade control policies, and so on?

There is ample evidence to show that our present policy toward Yugoslavia is open to very serious question.

Certainly there is no doubt that Yugoslavia is a Communist country. For all practical purposes and in terms of its significance to the security of the United States, I believe that it is an integral part of the Soviet bloc.

I firmly believe it was a tragic error for the United States some months ago to sell 130 Sabre jets and 70 jet trainer aircraft to Yugoslavia and to train Yugoslav pilots in the United States.

This appraisal appears to be underscored in a recent report which appeared in the January 16, 1962, Los Angeles Times.

In the item it is reported that one of two Yugoslav freighters which picked up a portion of these U.S. planes made a secretive 5-day stop in Cuba en route to Yugoslavia.

Furthermore, it is reported that at Castro's celebration of the third anniversary of the revolution some 30 Yugoslav officers, about one-third of them airmen, were on Castro's reviewing stand.

According to the article, U.S. military attaché in Belgrade at the request of the Joint Chiefs of Staff made a detailed inspection of the delivery of the Sabre jets and jet trainers shipped on the two Yugoslav freighters but the findings have not been made known.

I have this date addressed a letter to the Joint Chiefs of Staff and to Secretary of State Rusk requesting to be advised of the contents of that report.

Because I know many will be interested in reading in its entirety this item from the Los Angeles Times, which contains additional information and comments concerning our policy toward Yugoslavia, under leave to extend my remarks I submit the article for inclusion in the RECORD at this point:

YUGOSLAV AIRMEN SPOTTED IN CUBA

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

The most startling exhibit in Cuban dictator Castro's ostentatious celebration of his revolution's third anniversary was not the Russian Mig's flying overhead or the Red tanks and other weapons in the military parade.

The real jolter was in the reviewing stand—in the form of some 30 Yugoslav officers, about one-third of them airmen.

Sharply intensifying the significance of this surprise are these factors:

The presence of these Yugoslavs has been cloaked in drum-tight official secrecy. Neither Havana nor Belgrade has said anything about them either before or since the celebration.

Their dramatic appearance on the reviewing stand adds powerful confirmation to intelligence and refugee reports that a group of Yugoslav military officers had arrived in Cuba for training purposes.

According to these sources, this unit has been in Cuba since early December, engaged primarily in training jet pilots and antiaircraft forces for Castro.

But beyond confirming their awareness of this extraordinary situation, State Department and Pentagon officials are declining to comment. They explain the matter has many ramifications, and nothing can be said until a thorough study now underway has been completed.

There is no doubt as to the existence of a number of jarring ramifications.

Foremost among them is the fact that Yugoslavia is one of the largest beneficiaries of this country's economic and military aid programs.

But for this massive U.S. succor, Marshal Tito could not have stood up against the late tyrant Stalin.

Since 1946, the United States has given Yugoslavia a total of $2,132 billion in aid; $1,438 billion economic, $694 million military. Another $1.8 billion was granted Tito in loans and credits—for an overall total of around $4 billion.

That still isn't the whole story. Other intriguing facets are:

A number of Yugoslav airmen are now undergoing training as jet pilots in the United States.

Several months ago the United States sold 130 F-86D Sabre jets and 24 jet trainers to Yugoslavia at giveaway prices. Approximately half of these planes have been delivered. A number of them were shipped from west coast ports on two Yugoslav freighters, and one of those freighters, en route to Yugoslavia, made a 5-day stop in Havana under a complete blackout.

In late December it was announced the United States had decided to sell $40 million of wheat to Communist-ruled Yugoslavia—to be paid for in its currency. The United States already has more than $100 million in such counterpart funds in Yugoslavia.

At the express request of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the U.S. military attaché in Belgrade made a detailed inspection of the delivery of the F-86s and jet trainers shipped on the two Yugoslav freighters. His report is still classified and not available for publication.

However, Members of Congress are intently interested in these findings, and Secretary of State Rusk will be questioned about them.

A Navy report on Yugoslav relations with Castro is also arousing keen congressional interest. This study discloses that the number of Yugoslav ships arriving in Cuban ports more than doubled in 1961. These vessels carried cargoes both to and from Cuba.

Russia is preparing to train more trouble-breeders in Latin America. The Soviet Union has established a school especially for this purpose. Headed by S. S. Mikhailov, a veteran Communist organizer, the school will train cadres of experts to go to Latin America to contribute to the development and strengthening of relations between those countries and the Soviet Union—and to stir up as much opposition as possible to the United States.

There have been other reports in the press which would certainly tend to indicate the existence of close ties between Yugoslavia and the U.S.S.R.

One of these is to the effect that the Kremlin has given its approval to a plan by Communist Tito to take over Albania under the guise that it needs to be liberated. Albania, of course, has been reported to be feuding with the U.S.S.R.

Another recent report was that a Soviet trade delegation was in Belgrade to negotiate a new trade agreement.

In spite of the repeated reports along these lines and indications of close cooperation and togetherness between Tito and the Kremlin as of this time there appears to have been no indication that U.S. policy toward Yugoslavia has undergone or is about to undergo significant revision.

Sales by the United States of large quantities of wheat to Yugoslavia have been announced.

In the trade field, a large portion of licenses continue to be authorized for shipment of goods to Yugoslavia.

The following list includes basically the items licensed for shipment to Yugoslavia over recent weeks. Included also are their value and the date licenses were approved by the Department of Commerce.

January 16, 1962: Borates, $2,680; special purposes vehicle parts, $114,113; iron and steel scrap, $314,000.

January 15: Borates, $10,073; borates, $11,192; borates, $11,194; electronic computer parts, $10,872.

January 12: Borates, $11,194; borates, $11,192; borates, $4,289; physical properties testing equipment, $290; borates, $1,051.

January 9: Electron tubes, $211; construction machinery, $1,191; electron tubes, $171; processing vessels and parts, $38,940; electron tubes, $1,628; copper alloy tubing, $625; electron tubes, $19,792; electron tubes, $557.

January 8: Electron tubes, $135; electrolytic copper, $260,146; electrical testing instruments, $440.

January 5: Electrolytic copper, $129,851; electrolytic copper, $130,071; electrolytic copper $130,073; electrolytic copper, $264,552; gas compressors, $300,000; electrical testing instrument parts, $105.

January 4: Electric motors, $321; electron tubes, $734; electrolytic copper, $291,175; copper scrap, $59,524; physical properties testing equipment, $1,173; waveform measuring instrument, $800; electrolytic copper, $325,179.

January 3: Electrolytic copper, $390,216; copper cathodes, $130,072; copper scrap, $595,247; silicon crystal, $485; synthetic rubber, $26,510.

January 2: Copper scrap, $47,620; electrolytic copper, $165,345; electron tubes, $1,412; signal generator, $1,175; electronic characteristic testing instrument, $405; electrolytic copper, $97,633; electrolytic copper, $129,851.

December 29, 1961: Copper scrap, $297,624; copper scrap, $47,443; copper scrap, $88,460; electron tubes, $100; electrolytic copper, $251,765.

December 28: Copper scrap, $53,076; copper scrap, $117,946; copper scrap, $240,300; electrolytic copper, $191,800; steel scrap, $377,625.

December 27: Iron and steel scrap, $725,000.

It is clear from the export license lists that the amount of licenses approved for shipment of goods to Yugoslavia is far heavier than to any other Communist country. Since we have no real way of knowing just what happens to these shipments after their arrival in Yugoslavia, could it be that Yugoslavia is acting as a funnel for the shipment of goods and materials to other Soviet bloc countries to whom various of these items would be denied under the export control program?

I have long felt that our policy toward Yugoslavia is in need of reevaluation and recent developments certainly indicate that this reevaluation must take place without delay.

Precious Islands of Wilderness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, happy memories of a four-horse stage drive in 1902 to visit Lake Tahoe have stirred one of my well-informed and widely traveled constituents to compose a very interesting and compelling argument on the subject of conservation.

Miss Myra H. Hopson of Pond Mountain Farm House, Kent, Conn., writes with feeling and conviction that "as for all our wilderness areas, if they are not saved now, we will never have them."

Miss Hopson has favored all Connecticut Members of the Congress with copies of her letter. Believing that it will offer a message of interest to all of our colleagues I include Miss Hopson's letter in the RECORD:

Hon. JOHN S. MONAGAN,
1528 House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MONAGAN: I understand that a wilderness bill with provisions for keeping our wilderness areas free from further encroachments is to come up for discussion in Congress during the near future, and that it may be hotly contested. I think this is a serious matter.

For one thing among others, the Congressmen from Connecticut and other States should bring pressure to bear upon the conscience of those who come from the States where grazing is permitted on public lands, showing that we pay taxes which go to the owning and keeping of those lands. Our taxes should not be allowed to be channeled into the profits of the cattlemen and sheepherders. Those lands are national public lands. They never should be operated to the extent that the pockets of private people in the States where grazing is permitted are lined from all citizens' taxes. If they must be grazed at all, the limitations must be enforced, which I understand is not the case now. Charges should be made to those who graze sufficient to allow restoration of damage and for oversight. I think it only right that Congressmen from other States should insist upon this as a protection to their constituents.

As for all our wilderness areas, if they are not saved now, we will never have them. They are our responsibility which we owe to the coming generations. They will be needed increasingly for scientific, geographical and historical studies so that our children may know what this country was once like, and also places where beauty and tranquility may be experienced by them. They will never know unless these lands are saved now while there is yet time. With the exploding population, and more and more machines, bulldozers, cars, planes, motorboats and roads, I can see danger indeed. These areas must be carefully guarded against these encroachments, or they will not be "wilderness." I feel it would be a national crime to spoil them.

May I speak of an experience of my own? In 1902, I traveled "out West" and visited Lake Tahoe. We approached it in a four-horse stage, driving at first through desert and sagebrush, then we began to climb the mountains which became wooded. The arrival at Lake Tahoe was breathtaking: a large crystal-clear blue expanse of water, the shores of red stone and evergreen, and all surrounded by mountains with white caps. There was a tavern for accommodation of travelers, suitable in architecture to the surroundings, a pier and a boat. Nothing else of man's work from this place, just extensive beauty. The other day I read in Harper's magazine, with utmost horror, of what it has become today: a center for gambling houses, wide hard roads, constant travel of buses and cars day and night. The States of California and Nevada, and all of us as a Nation, deserve condemnation that this wonderful place was not preserved.

Could I recommend to you the wilderness books of Mr. William O. Douglas? You may know them, or may not. Anyway, surely you know this man—a great and fine person who is an authority on the wilderness areas, for he has traveled them extensively on foot and on horseback, the only way they should be. His words should have true weight. May I ask you to read the following brief quotations from the book, [illegible] Wilderness East to Kathadin"?

On page 32: "We have reached the point where only a few precious islands of wilderness are left. If we behave in the future as we have in the past, they will be depleted or nibbled at until they too are gone. The demands for more sheep and cattle, for more mass recreation (now treated as an industry) will cause even higher basins to be badly hurt. More and more roads, more and more hostels, more and more resorts will be built deeper and deeper in sacred precincts of the mountains. Under those influences we will end up like Europe with hardly any wilderness left."

On page 235: "But roads and autos are the antithesis of wilderness. There is none where roads and autos penetrate. There is no wilderness where the roar of motors is heard."

And he issues this warning on page 237: "The oncoming generation will inherit either wilderness or mountains chewed up by machines, depending on the social philosophy and outlook of a few men in the Forest Service. This is not right."

I think a clause should be added to this bill to establish some sort of guardianship for these areas manned by people dedicated to conservation and responsible to all citizens of this country.

Sincerely yours,

MYRA H. HOPSON.

KENT, R.F.D., CONN.

Death of William W. Howes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, friends of William W. Howes in South Dakota and throughout the country were saddened to learn of the passing of this distinguished South Dakotan who for many years was an active participant in the political affairs of our State.

Having served as First Assistant Postmaster General under Franklin D. Roosevelt, "Bill" Howes, as he was known back home, attained the highest rank in Cabinet circles of any South Dakotan ever to serve in Washington by political appointment. Bill Howes was a devoted Democrat, a determined political advocate, and a warmhearted, generous friend to all who knew him.

Mrs. Mundt joins me in extending our sincerest sympathy to his widow, Mrs. Howes, who lives in Washington, and to the descendants and relatives of Mr. Howes.

I ask unanimous consent that there appear in the Appendix of the RECORD the obituary notice as it appeared in the Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILLIAM HOWES DIES—SERVED UNDER FARLEY

William W. Howes, First Assistant Postmaster General during President Franklin D. Roosevelt's administration, died last night at the Washington Hospital Center after a brief illness. He was 74.

Mr. Howes was credited by his boss, Postmaster General James Farley, with having paved the way for Roosevelt's Democratic convention avalanche in 1932.

Known across his home State, South Dakota, as "Big Bill," Mr. Howes helped swing the State's delegation to Mr. Roosevelt and was a contact man in negotiations for support from neighboring States. After the nomination, he spent most of the campaign in the national headquarters as one of Roosevelt's chief advisers.

Born at Tomah, Wis., in 1887, Mr. Howes was educated at the University of Minnesota and the University of South Dakota.

He began his career with a law practice in Huron, S. Dak. His entrance into politics was as a State senator in 1916. He ran for Governor in 1920, became State Democratic chairman in 1922 and was elected State's attorney in 1926 and 1928.

After Roosevelt was elected to the Presidency, he entered the Post Office Department as Second Assistant Postmaster General. But he soon stepped up to first assistant—the office which deals with the appointment and supervision of postmasters.

He resigned his job in 1940 after 7 years to go back to South Dakota to organize support for that year's presidential campaign.

After the election, Mr. Howes entered private business and served as vice president for Mid-Continent Airlines until 1944. He served on its board of directors until his retirement in 1955.

He leaves his wife, Hazel, of the home address, 1635 Myrtle Street NW.; a daughter, Mrs. Whiting Wicker of Herndon, Va.; a sister, Mrs. Katherine Schultz of La Crosse, Wis.; a granddaughter and a grandson.

Services will be at 2 p.m. Thursday at Gawler's funeral home, 1756 Pennsylvania Avenue NW. Burial will be in South Dakota.

Situation Must Be Right for Fruitful Negotiation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a very important article entitled, "Situation Must Be Right for Fruitful Negotiation," written by a distinguished political scientist, Dr. Kirk H. Porter.

Dr. Porter is truly one of the great men in the field of education. For more than 40 years he has been a leading professor and author in the field of political science; for some 19 years he served as chairman of the department of political science at the State University of Iowa.

He has taught, counseled, and inspired young people to seek more than that which is merely patently obvious. He has taught them to look beyond the political bickerings and seeming absurdities of our Government institutions to the true and meaningful goals of our way of life and to analyze critically the means we adopt to attain those goals. He taught them, by example, to ignore the obvious and the trivia, and to look deeper. In a word, he has inspired them to always seek truth.

The article which I call to your attention is an example of the perceptive mind that Dr. Porter possesses. It demonstrates a kind of thinking which we need more of.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that every American ought to have an opportunity to read this article for it deals with a subject which is very current—negotiation with the Soviet Union on Berlin. There is nothing immoral or even wrong with negotiating provided that conditions are right. However, Dr. Porter states:

Negotiation, arbitration, and compromise are often the recourse of those who have the weakest cause.

He further cautions:

It makes a great difference who proposes to negotiate and who indicates a willingness to do so. As long as it is only we who do that it is clear that we would go as suppliants tacitly agreeing to give up something. This we must not do.

Dr. Porter's timely article deserves much more than fleeting attention; I urge its carefuly study and consideration:

SITUATION MUST BE RIGHT FOR FRUITFUL NEGOTIATION

(By Kirk H. Porter)

The situation in Berlin is thought to be the most dangerous problem facing us today. Failure to deal with it properly could result in all-out war. In these circumstances there is urgent pressure for negotiation, preferably at the summit, in the hope that a solution can be found.

Nearly everyone favors negotiation. The word has a good sound. One who is willing to negotiate is broadminded and reasonable. Presumably he is willing to yield something in return for something that will be yielded by the opposition. Both sides give in a little. There is no victory or defeat but a reasonable compromise by sensible leaders on both sides. The same idea is conveyed by the words "conciliation" and "arbitration."

All of these terms imply goodness and virtue, self-restraint, and willingness to consider the other fellow's side of the case, and above all to avoid fighting, even though to do so involves some appeasement.

It is no wonder that good people everywhere rally to these terms and cry shame upon those who do not respond. For many years our own responsible officials have been under pressure from good and virtuous people who demand that they negotiate, conciliate, appease, compromise and arbitrate away our difficulties in international relations.

And all of these terms do suggest a civilized and sensible way to settle disputes. We have resorted to every one of them time and time again and thus have settled many difficulties. We have patiently conciliated, sometimes appeased, always stood ready to negotiate and to compromise, and we have been an outstanding advocate of arbitration.

Indeed I think our record has been magnificent. To be sure we did once fire upon an open city of a Latin American country. We have landed the Marines now and then, and have let them keep the situation well in hand for a long time. We loudly shouted, "54–40 or fight," chiefly I think because it sounded good, and then compromised our dispute with Canada. Theodore Roosevelt threatened to exterminate the fur seals. And we sent a battleship to the coast of South America to break a Pacific blockade. But the cases in which we have yielded by conciliation and compromise very greatly outnumber the others. We took Panama, but later we appeased Colombia quite generously.

Thus it is true that today the urgency with which it is argued that we seek negotiation with Russia concerning our differences is quite in harmony with our traditions and our behavior in the past. As a matter of fact there is scarcely any protest against it except from the extreme right. The force of public opinion is so strong in favor of it that our officials could hardly resist it even if they desired to do so. It is all the stronger because the finest people among us are in favor of it. They believe that to negotiate stalls off war and is sure to open up paths to a peaceful solution. It is always better to talk than to fight. All of these alternative peaceful methods are advocated in terms that bespeak good will and reasonableness.

This has been true in our country to such an extent that few of our people are aware of the dangers that lie in every one of them. We have been so big and strong and prosperous that we have not been concerned about these dangers. If we lost a little we could shrug it off and incidentally increase our stature as a good humored benevolent giant. But today we face an adversary who is just as big as we are. It is not a question of generously giving in to a weak state which cries to the world for sympathy in its conflict with a big bully. But there is no trace of this in our present controversy. The situation is altogether different and infinitely more dangerous.

One time when President Coolidge was being pressed to submit a dispute to arbitration he refused, saying that some things were too important to submit to arbitration. He did not elaborate and the blunt statement brought down upon him a torrent of abuse from nice people. They do not realize that negotiation, arbitration, and compromise are often the recourse of those who have the weakest cause. One who has done you wrong, stolen something which belongs to you or violated your property will resort to any of these devices in the confident hope of getting something out of it. He usually does. You, who are right, take a beating. The very fact that you agree to compromise or to negotiate or to arbitrate is to concede in advance that you are willing to give up something. However, negotiation can serve a good purpose before an issue has been clearly stated, and before the adversaries have been publicly committed.

President Kennedy has again and again committed himself to the proposition that we will not surrender our rights in Berlin. We are very happy about that and that is one reason why he keeps saying it. He has not clearly defined those rights, and that is fortunate for there lies an area for negotiation. But Russia no doubt will take a very narrow view of these rights even if she recognizes them at all after East Germany is recognized. The Russians found that the wall in Berlin did not lead to violence. They may wonder if anything would. Whether or not we consider the wall a negotiable item I do not know. Adenauer certainly does. But I would think it has become less so

every day since it was erected. As in the Cuban situation we submitted and did nothing. Those two episodes involved dreadful loss of face, stature and prestige in international relations.

Khrushchev committed himself to recognition of East Germany and then backed off. Perhaps that proposal is negotiable. The issue would lie in whether or not East Germany would respect our rights as they now exist. We can hardly hope to prevent recognition but we could stand firm on the rights we now possess.

And let me emphasize the fact that change in sovereignty over a piece of territory does not automatically involve loss of all rights in connection with it. That idea has been given great publicity. It is mistaken. The point should be more clearly stated in the press stories.

Russia has not seriously interfered with our rights of access for a long time. Apparently she is not eager to do so through a puppet regime in East Germany. Let us make it clear that is what she would have to do. For unless Russia acknowledges in advance that our rights would persist as against East Germany it would be we who would be offering to yield everything even to propose negotiation. Apparently this is the attitude of De Gaulle. He seems to think we would be acknowledging a fatal weakness in our position even before we reached the point of negotiation. I believe he is right.

It is said we should always be willing to negotiate. That is our way and we should be proud of it. But it makes a very great difference who proposes to negotiate and who indicates a willingness to do so. As long as it is only we who do that it is clear that we would go as suppliants tacitly agreeing to give up something. This we must not do.

Khrushchev has said several times that our rights in Berlin are not in question. Let him be more specific about it, and then negotiate on ways of preserving them. But to rush off eagerly to negotiate publicly in the expectation of winning peace in our time, without an acknowledgment from the other side that the issues are indeed negotiable is to invite disaster. It could well be that our foreign office people are striving to win such acknowledgment. Let us not press unduly for negotiation until the situation is right for it.

What Is Excellence in a Weekly Newspaper?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, the State of New Jersey is proud of the traditions of excellence and integrity in reporting that have been developed in her press. Though it is largely through her 27 dailies that she receives national attention, I wish to call attention to the record of her 241 weekly publications. As journals of community news and opinion they serve a valuable function in encouraging good government and individual interest on the community level and develop that concept of local pride which is a backbone of national strength.

It came as no surprise to me, then, that such a New Jersey weekly, the Montclair Times, recently was a first prize winner in the National Editorial Association's 1961 contest. Having served its community for more than 80 years, the Times was asked to define for the Editorial Association's fall meeting what constitutes excellence in a newspaper. The clarity and purposefulness of its response commends itself to the widest audience, and I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the Montclair Times be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Reprinted from the Montclair (N.J.) Times]

WHAT IS EXCELLENCE IN A WEEKLY NEWSPAPER?

With the Nation celebrating National Newspaper Week October 15–21, we feel there is no more appropriate time to set down the principles that have guided the Times through its more than 80 years of service to the citizens of Montclair.

Our most important principle is that our columns must be devoted to live, local news, written by our own staff or by local contributors. Our aim is to give our readers the most thorough coverage possible of what Montclair is doing—its government, its organizations, and its people—sparkled with interesting features dealing with the local scene and its personalities. Every story, no matter how worthwhile, must meet the local angle test. We're proud that our advertisers, too, have respected this policy as being, in the long run, in their best interests.

In order to do a thorough job of coverage, we have maintained one of the largest editorial staffs of any weekly in the country, and our percentage of news to advertising has been consistently far higher than the average weekly. We think the people of Montclair deserve this type of complete, though costly, coverage. It gives us deep satisfaction to realize, moreover, that putting out the highest quality newspaper possible has been good business.

No legitimate item of news, no matter who might be involved, has ever been omitted from the Times. We are, however, a family newspaper and we insist on publishing the kind of paper that can sit proudly throughout the week in the living room of any Montclair home. With this in mind, we do not dwell on the lurid details of scandals or accidents that might occur in the community. We'd rather have the year-round confidence of our readers than to sell a few extra papers on some passing story of a sensational nature.

Our columns are open to all political parties and all sides of controversial issues. We consider it a solemn obligation to present this type of news in as fair and balanced a manner as is humanly possible. No letter to the editor, unless considered libelous, has ever been suppressed. We reserve the right in our editorial columns—and there only—to express what we consider to be in the best interests of the community, but at the same time we feel that a full presentation of the facts from all sides to our intelligent readership is a far greater factor in arriving at the best answer than any editorial guidance we could give.

Lastly, we are proud to be a part of the great American tradition of the free press, which we consider one of the greatest weapons of democracy in a world where democracy is on trial. In asking that our readers support us in maintaining this freedom, we pledge them a complete, responsible and impartial presentation of the news of the community, and an unremitting effort to join with them in making Montclair a good place for good people to live.

Saving Old Germantown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, an article in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of January 16, 1962, relating to old Germantown, which is now part of Philadelphia and in my district, will be of interest to Members and to students of early American history. In 1954, Mr. Speaker, you delivered a speech in that area, and I had the good fortune of being in the audience.

The Battle of Germantown on October 4, 1777, although lost, was a great factor in renewing the courage of General Washington's army and getting new allies, which led to eventual victory.

The area is the subject of restoration and could be developed as a colonnial compound.

The article follows:

SAVING OLD GERMANTOWN

(By Paul Jones)

The old twin house at 6505–6507 Germantown Avenue is now safely in the hands of the Germantown Historical Society. Last year Judge Saylor made a generous gift of the southern half (bordering on Upsal Street), and now the society itself has acquired the other part.

Looking ahead a bit, loyal Germantowners hope the area may be developed as a battlefield park or a colonial compound. The neighborhood of the 6500 block, just short of the Chew House, was a key point in the Battle of Germantown, on October 4, 1777.

Washington lost that fight, but after the defeat at Brandywine and the loss of Philadelphia, made a great impression here and abroad. In the Colonies it put new courage in the fainthearted, and in Europe it led eventually to the French alliance of the following spring, by convincing doubters that the Continentals meant business.

Yet it was a lost battle. The staff timetable, which called for parallel columns of attack on Germantown Road and the Limekiln Pike, did not work out, partly because of fog and partly because of the hedgehog resistance at the Chew House (Cliveden, 6401 Germantown Avenue).

A FIERCE FIGHT

That morning, about 9 a.m., you must imagine George Washington and his staff reining their horses on the road, opposite 6505–6507. The fighting had been fiercely contested, with Sullivan and Wayne driving in the redcoat light infantry on their side of the Germantown Road.

Just north of the spot where Washington consulted with his staff, at Sharpnack Street, a single cannon ball had killed General Nash and his aide, Major Witherspoon, of the North Carolina Brigade.

The tactical problem at the moment was caused by the 120 British soldiers who had made an improvised fortress out of the Chew House. What to do? Should an attempt be made to carry it by assault, before pressing on, or could it safely be bypassed, leaving a small force to amuse the defenders and keep them from breaking out?

Consulting with the Commander in Chief were Maj. Gen. Henry Knox, of Boston, chief of artillery, Maj. Gen. Lord Stirling, Adj. Gen. Timothy Pickering, one of his deputies, William Smith, and a number of aides.

The decision of the staff conference was to pause long enough to reduce the British strongpoint in the Chew House. Henry Knox, an able soldier and a military scholar, seems to have given the weightiest opinion. It was against all the rules of war, he said, to leave a castle in your rear.

DECISION IN FOG

With the fog and the drifting clouds of black powder smoke, it was almost impossible to get a true estimate of the situation. The Chew House was invisible, except for the flash of musket fire from its windows. Knox was probably right. The position was too uncertain to take any needless risks.

Smith, the Deputy Adjutant General, went forward with a white cloth in his hand and called for the surrender of the Chew House garrison. He was shot and killed.

Then the American troops who had gone down the Germantown Road reappeared, on the run. They held up their empty cartridge boxes to show they were out of ammunition and had to retire.

That was virtually the end of the battle. The Americans on either flank had also run into trouble. Sullivan was finally hit by three fresh, tough regiments of British regulars, and the left wing, on Limeklin Pike, was almost an hour late, because their route was 4 miles longer than anybody realized.

Washington got his army out safely, under cover of Knox's excellent artillery. Germantown was a disappointment but by no means a disgrace.

The twin houses at 6505–07, now known as the Michael Billmeyer House, were built shortly after the land was acquired in 1727 by Hans George Bensell. Billmeyer, a printer and the successor to the more celebrated Christopher Sower, bought them in 1789 and lived there until 1831. It was also his place of business and there he published an almanac and a newspaper, besides attending to his duties as German printer for the Pennsylvania Assembly, which then had to cope with a large non-English-speaking constituency.

Tribute to Jake Gaither, Football Coach at Florida A. & M. University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, our Florida institution of higher learning for Negroes is the Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University, at Tallahassee. This school has done a wonderful job throughout the years for our State as a whole, for the colored citizens of our State, in particular, and for many, many others. For instance, Althea Gibson, who has distinguished herself as a tennis player, is an alumna of this fine institution.

In this connection, I should like to call attention to an excellent column on the sports page of the Tallahassee Democrat of Tuesday, January 16. This is a typically conservative paper, published with a southern viewpoint in racial matters, though by no means a radical or race-baiting approach to such matters. This coulmn is "From the Sidelines," by Bill McGrotha, the capable sports editor of the Tallahassee Democrat, and is entitled "Respect and Gaither." Jake Gaither has been for many years the football coach at Florida A. & M., and he has turned out winning teams so often that such has become a custom.

The article points out that perhaps the biggest honor that has come to Gaither is that last week he was named "small college coach of the year," indicating the professional respect in which he is held as a person and as a coach by other coaches throughout the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that this fine column reporting the attainments of Coach Gaither and reflecting the esteem and general respect in which he is held not only by other coaches throughout the Nation, but also by local citizens of Tallahassee whose thinking this newspaper certainly represents well, may be made available to all Members of the Senate, as well as all other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I call particular attention to the last sentence of Mr. McGrotha's article, which reads as follows:

And it has been the simple virtues rather than frills—plus an always ready sense of humor—that has earned Gaither a big spot in college football.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESPECT AND GAITHER

(By Bill McGrotha)

There are many reasons Florida A. & M. has good football teams every season, is always in the running for the national Negro collegiate championship.

The school, the team has a prideful tradition. And the intangible asset of tradition is something you can hardly overestimate in the appraisal of athletic success at any school. This intangible is perhaps the biggest factor in the A. & M. football story.

A. & M. has goodly amount of wherewithal for successful football. It's annual share of the dividend from the State's racetrack which goes primarily for athletic scholarships, isn't as big as Florida's or FSU's. But, dollar for dollar, it goes further. Tuition isn't as high at A. & M. as it is at Florida State University and Florida.

The A. & M. coaches will tell you, however, that some other Negro college football powers have more money with which to operate. They say that A. & M., in the athletic financial aid picture, rates better than most but not as good as the best.

Of course, an indisputable factor in A. & M. success is Jake Gaither, who on Saturday was named national "small college coach of the year."

A WHIP, PLUS PRAYER

It is the biggest of a number of honors to come to Gaither. Among other things, it is indicative of professional respect of Gaither by other coaches all over the country.

A. & M. each year in June has been able to attract to a grid clinic here some of the Nation's very finest coaches * * * Frank Broyles has come many times, so have Woody Hayes and Bear Bryant—and other comparable names. They have come not so much to help A. & M., not so much because of the money they received but more to "help Jake."

Gaither is not a man without faults. He has his share. But he is a good man, and he has been able to accomplish so much primarily because he works hard and because he is respected so much.

With his players, Gaither is a tough disciplinarian, though he's been a soft enough touch in certain situations.

In the most recent Orange Blossom classic, before more than 47,000 fans at Miami, a talking-to Gaither gave his team before the game was tuned in by Richard Llewellyn, author of "How Green Was My Valley." He was doing a story on A. & M. for the London Times.

Here's an excerpt from that talk, as written by Llewellyn: "I don't want to see a Tiger leave that field unless he's wishing he never even heard of a football * * * All I want you to do is what I'm telling you to do * * * All of you stand up, in turn, and promise me out loud that's the way it's going to be."

A whisper was heard in the squad's rear ranks, something about a phone call. "I'm talking," Gaither's voice lashed out, "Shut your big mouth."

Prayer is a part of A. & M. football. There are pregame prayers, dressing room prayers, postgame prayers.

J. R. E. Lee, Jr., the A. & M. vice president, tells an interesting story on Gaither, of way back 30 years ago when the coach was a student at Knoxville College.

SLICKNESS PLUS SIMPLICITY

Lee, business manager of the school then as he was for many years following, went to Knoxville with the A. & M. baseball team. Knoxville was a strict Methodist school that tolerated no foolishness.

But after the game, says Lee, "somebody found a piano in the gym and soon the place was jumping with students doing the charleston."

Lee says one Knoxville student was called on the carpet and expulsion from school looked likely. Gaither, just a student himself, spoke up big for the boy, declared that others were equally to blame. ("Jake was always a persuasive orator," says Lee.) The boy came out of it OK.

Lee implies that Gaither was one of those doing yesteryear's equivalent of the twist. "They just didn't catch him," Lee says, "he was slicker than the rest."

In football, you outslick more opponents off the football field than on. You outslick them with organization, discipline, hard practice more than anything else.

And it has been the simple virtues rather than frills—plus an always ready sense of humor—that has earned Gaither a big spot in college football.

A Quick Easy Way To Save $150 Million

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, this date I have written to the President of the United States urging him to take direct action to prevent needless waste of $150 million on "phantom acres" in the administration of the 1962 feed grains program.

"Phantom acres" caused approximately $150 million waste in the program last year, and a similar waste will occur this year if nothing is done.

I invite your attention to this correspondence which explains the nature of "phantom acres," shows how they

were permitted and the quick and easy remedy to prevent this unfortunate waste in 1962.

In view of the President's budget message this date, action to avoid a repetition of this glaring waste seems especially desirable.

The correspondence follows:

NOVEMBER 1, 1961.

The Honorable John F. Kennedy
President of the United States, the White House, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. PRESIDENT: I read with interest the Associated Press news report of October 29, indicating you are disappointed that the feed grains program has not materially reduced surpluses and alarmed at the continued high cost of farm programs.

The failure of the feed grains program is no surprise to me. Since it was first introduced, I have predicted it would not materially reduce surpluses nor improve farm income, and it would hike USDA costs. USDA reports already bear out the accuracy of these predictions.

More important, I predicted it would give Government absolute power to manipulate feed grains prices, and thus weaken what is left of the marketplace economy which, historically, has served American agriculture so well.

The accuracy of this prediction was borne out be excessive dumping of Government-owned corn on this year's market—more than twice last year's volume—which effectively drove down the price of corn. I wholeheartedly concur with Secretary Freeman that cheap corn means cheap livestock. In fact, as a result of this dumping, most livestock items are today selling below last year, and next year's prices are expected to be even worse.

Now comes the USDA news release of October 27, giving the philosophy behind plans for funding certificates acquired under the "money in the springtime" feature of the feed grains program.

The first-listed objective is "to honor the Department's general understanding with cooperators that they can expect to benefit by diverting their feed grain acreage to conservation uses." In other words, certificate sales will be paced to keep market prices low, as a reward to those who signed up and punishment to those who did not.

Congress intended the certificate arrangement to be simply a means of financing part of the feed grains program cost. Curiously, in announcing the new sales policy, USDA does not even list this among the stated objectives.

Three out of five corn producers did not sign up under the program. With farmers' costs continuing to rise, it is shocking to me that the Department would continue deliberately to punish the majority of corn growers.

From the tone of the October 29 news report, you seem to be puzzled as to what to do in farm legislation.

I respectfully urge that you:

1. Order Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman to handle the funding of certificates in a manner that will provide the least adverse influence on market prices, and to desist from these callous market-breaking sales of Government-owned grain.

2. Order Secretary Freeman to keep "phantom acres" out of the 1962 feed grains program. Sloppy administration of the 1961 program resulted in $150 million waste. Farmers were paid to retire 20 million corn acres, but the reduction in corn acreage only amounted to 15 million. In other words, taxpayers shelled out $150 million for about 5 million acres that were not actually corn acres. My bill, H.R. 9329, to prohibit paid retirement of such "phantom acres," would stop this sloppy administration in 1962, but you could accomplish this by direct order to your Secretary.

3. Enact a program to get Government out of the grain business, so farmers can once more produce for the marketplace, instead of Government bins. I invite your attention to my proposal, H.R. 8306, which would end the surplus grain headache by selling stocks back to farmers at attractive prices in exchange for short-term land retirement.

As a member of the Committee on Agriculture, I am deeply interested in the welfare of the American farmer and would welcome the opportunity to discuss these ideas with you personally.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL FINDLEY,
Representative in Congress,
20th District, Illinois.

DECEMBER 19, 1961.

The Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States, The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On November 1, I wrote to you in regard to the feed grains program which I suspect is a disappointment to both of us. Certainly it is to me.

In my letter, I suggested three courses of action which could improve the feed grains situation next year. So far, I have not had acknowledgement of my letter, and I want to repeat my desire to work with you for the improvement of American agriculture.

I look forward to your reply and to the opportunity to consult with you personally about this grave problem.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL FINDLEY,
Representative in Congress,
20th District, Illinois.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 21, 1961.*

Hon. PAUL FINDLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The Pesident has asked me to thank you for your letter of December 19 in further reference to the feed grains situation for next year.

Upon receipt of your previous letter, the President requested that it be brought to the attention of Secretary Freeman for direct reply to you. I am sorry that you have not received an acknowledgement.

However, we will again take the matter up with the Department of Agriculture and again request that the matter be checked into immediately and a further reply be sent to you. I am sure you will be hearing from his office in the very near future.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN,
Special Assistant to the President.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., December 28, 1961.

Hon. PAUL FINDLEY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. FINDLEY: The White House has requested that we reply to your letter of December 19 concerning the feed grain program. On checking into the matter we have found that your letter of December 19 to the President was a followup of an earlier letter of November 1. It is our understanding that the letter of November 1 was also referred to this Department by the White House. However, we have been unable to locate this letter in the Department or to determine why it was not answered promptly. In order to prepare a comprehensive reply to your letter of December 19 we requested your Washington office to supply us with a copy of the earlier communication. We obtained the copy on December 27 and are now in a position to reply to both letters.

Your earlier letter was written at a time when much misinformation and distortion of facts concerning the 1961 feed grain program had been appearing in the press. Your letter to the President was evidently prompted by some of the same press reports which caused us to issue on November 9 a statement to correct some of the then current misinformation. A copy of this press release is attached. Fortunately, stories which have appeared in the newspapers in the past 45 days have corrected some of the original misinformation. However, as is usually the case in such situations the correction is never brought to the attention of all of the people who received the original erroneous information.

It is evident from your letters that you are under the impression that actions of this Department have been designed to or have had the effect of punishing corngrowers who did not participate in the 1961 feed grain program. This is not correct.

In order to determine just how the farmer who elected not to participate in the feed grain program has made out it is appropriate to attempt to determine what would have happened if the 1961 feed grain program had not been enacted. Secretary Benson had reduced the corn price support level for 1960 six cents below the 1959 level. Accordingly, with no program we would have expected the market price for the 1960 corn to average about six cents per bushel below 1959 for the first part of the marketing year and for this spread to widen as it became apparent that weather conditions for 1961 would be ideal and that record yields per acre would be produced. The market price data indicate, however, that the prices at which farmers sold their 1960 crop corn have been fully as high and perhaps a little higher than could have been expected without the 1961 feed grain program. Preliminary data indicate that farmers have received an average of $1.00 per bushel of 1960 corn sold as compared with an average of $1.04 per bushel for 1959. Any objective analysis with complete statistical information available will indicate that farmers have received more not less for 1960 corn than would have been the case if no new legislation had been enacted.

There is one other erroneous assumption indicated in your letter which I should correct. You indicate that "phantom acres" could be kept out of the 1962 feed grain program by good administration and that your bill H.R. 9329 would prohibit payment for "phantom acres." In any voluntary program some of the participation will be offset by persons who remain outside of the program and increase their corn plantings. This was true with respect to the 1961 feed grain program. It will be true to some extent with respect to the 1962 feed grain program, and would be equally true with respect to the program you proposed.

I hope you will read the complete press release of November 9 which corrects some of the misstatements made by enemies of the farm program and shows that the 1961 feed grain program has not been a failure but has achieved its purposes. One of the most gratifying aspects of our efforts to date is the fact that the decline in farm income has been arrested and a substantial increase will take place this year. It is also gratifying that for the first time in many years there will be a reduction in the CCC feed grain inventory and a start has been made in eliminating the storage costs which were brought about by the buildup of commodity surpluses in the period from 1952 to 1960.

If you have any additional questions I will be pleased to answer them. I again wish to express my regret over the delay in replying to your letters.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

JANUARY 18, 1962.

The Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have received a letter dated December 28, 1961, from Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, in response to my letters to you of November 1 and December 19, 1961.

Secretary Freeman has failed to understand my concern over the so-called "phantom acres." In his letter, Mr. Freeman stated:

"You indicate that 'phantom acres' could be kept out of the 1962 feed-grain program by good administration and that your bill, H.R. 9329, would prohibit payment for 'phantom acres.' In any voluntary program some of the participation will be offset by persons who remain outside of the program and increase their corn plantings. This was true with respect to the 1961 feed-grain program. It will be true to some extent with respect to the 1962 feed-grain program, and would be equally true with respect to the program you proposed."

Mr. Freeman misses the point completely. Payment for "phantom acres" has nothing whatever to do with increased planting by those who remained outside the 1961 program.

The simple fact is that the 1959–60 average corn acreage planted, according to official U.S. Department of Agriculture statistics, equaled 82.2 million acres, but the base acreage assigned to corn producers last year, according to an official report to the President of the Senate dated June 21, 1961, equaled 87,047,000 acres. Both figures related solely to average annual planting history for the 2-year period, 1959 and 1960. The figures should be the same, not 5 million acres apart.

In administering the 1961 program, the Department apparently made no serious attempt to distinguish between actual history and what the history was claimed to have been.

Just how did the 5-million-acre difference, real "phantom acres," come about?

When I first wrote to you on November 1, I was inclined to think the $150 million waste on "phantom acres" was due to a combination of loose administration and overzealous efforts by the army of USDA field men conducting the signup.

Since then, I have discovered an item in Department of Agriculture regulations which makes this waste appear to be invited.

On page 5358 of the Federal Register dated June 15, 1961, you will find this item among regulations covering administration of the 1961 feed-grains program:

"In those counties where the Department of Agriculture has established the average adjusted corn and grain sorghum acreage produced in the county in 1959 and 1960 for use as a guide in determining the feed grain base for farms in the county, the total feed grain bases for all farms in the county, excluding any increase in farm feed grain base resulting from corrections, requests for reconsideration or appeals, pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 495.13 to the extent practicable, shall not exceed 105 percent of such average adjusted corn and grain sorghum acreage."

This is a clear invitation to 5 percent exaggeration in crop histories. Here is the clue to "phantom acres," because 5 percent of 82.2 million acres is 4.1 million acres. That represents over 80 percent of the 5 million elusive acres.

Please advise me under what authority the Secretary authorized the county committees to exceed official county acreage base by 5 percent plus the amounts needed for corrections and appeals.

In both the 1961 and 1962 programs, the law clearly requires adherence to the official 1959–60 planting histories.

When cotton was once more placed under controls in 1954, the USDA spent considerable time "squeezing the water out" of individual farmers' recollection of their historical acreage data.

Similar care has been exercised in administering tobacco, peanuts, rice and wheat programs, in order to avoid exaggerated histories.

Indeed, the invitation to "phantom acres" under the feed grains program seems to be a first. I can find no record where any previous Secretary of Agriculture allowed a 5 percent overstatement of planting history.

This regulatory invitation accounts for most of the $150 million waste last year on "phantom acres."

A similar waste will occur in the 1962 feed grains program unless my bill H.R. 9329, prohibiting payment for phantom acres, is enacted—or, unless you direct your Secretary of Agriculture to stop this waste himself by striking from 1962 regulations the authority for 5 percent overstatement of planting history.

The country faces serious budgetary problems, and I am sure you will welcome this quick and easy way to prevent needless waste of the $150 million this year.

It's not too late, and I hope you will find it possible to give this your personal attention.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL FINDLEY,
Representative in Congress.

George W. Pfeiffenberger: Cotton's Man of the Year for 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a distinguished Texan, Mr. George W. Pfeiffenberger of Lubbock, has been honored in the January 13, 1962, edition of the Cotton Digest as Cotton's Man of the Year for 1961. Cotton Digest is an informed and informative journal of the cotton trade.

This tribute and recognition is most proper for Mr. Pfeiffenberger, a man of great international stature in the cotton trade, and the exceedingly able executive vice president of the Plains Cotton Growers, Inc. The work of the cotton growers' organization, directed by Mr. Pfeiffenberger, is of tremendous value to the State of Texas and the Nation. The quality of leadership demonstrated by Mr. Pfeiffenberger is a credit to the State and Nation. Mr. Pfeiffenberger's experiences included residence in Ohio and Massachusetts as well as in Texas, and also include extensive travel and work in Europe on behalf of American cotton sales abroad.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Cotton Digest, setting forth a brief digest of the work and achievements of Mr. Pfeiffenberger.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEORGE W. PFEIFFENBERGER

Riding high on the current cotton scene, firmly entrenched in the saddle that sits astride the stallion of American agriculture, King Cotton, is a man from the Western Plains, George William Pfeiffenberger, of Lubbock, Tex.

Lubbock means cotton. Cotton means Lubbock. And the city is capital of the Texas High Plains, a kingdom or entity of its own where cotton reigns. As mid-January is reached, the area or "state unto itself," is presently winding up the harvesting and ginning of a 1961 crop of cotton without parallel.

The High Plains, comprised of only 23 counties, is producing a crop of 2,300,000 bales, more than any other State in the United States, besides its own State of Texas. This is half of Texas 1961–62 crop.

This alltime record cotton crop represents almost $400 million in new area wealth this season alone.

George William Pfeiffenberger, a Runyonesque character with the build and wit of a present-day George Gobel, is cotton's "Man of the Year for 1961." He is Mr. High Plains to the cotton trade around the world. Due to the well-advertised prominence of this area's cotton, and due to his leadership in promoting this area's staple, he now rides high as cotton's No. 1 salesman from any area.

And his organization, the Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., of which he is executive vice president, is known from Hong Kong to Le Havre.

George Pfeiffenberger, born in the unlikely midwestern spot known as the city of Dayton, Ohio, in 1908, is the 14th "Man of the Year" the cotton trade has recognized. He follows Will Clayton, of Houston, the first man so honored, for 1948; Everett R. Cook, of Memphis, named for 1949; then R. O. Beach, of Houston for 1950; E. F. Creekmore, of New Orleans for 1951; William D. Felder, Jr., of Dallas for 1952.

Lamar Fleming, Jr., of Houston for 1953; the late A. Elkan Hohenberg, of Memphis for 1954; Roger L. Dixon, of Dallas for 1955; Eric D. Hirsch, of Memphis for 1956; Hugo N. Dixon, of Memphis for 1957; Frank P. Biggs, of New Orleans for 1958; Burris C. Jackson, of Hillsboro, Tex., for 1959; and A. G. Paxton, of Greenville, Miss., for 1960.

Mr. Pfeiffenberger is the first producer association executive named "Man of the Year"—for it is a fact that many people of the industry harbor the prejudiced idea that producers and shippers are diametrically opposed, all of which is an old canard that has been proved untrue time and again in the past few years.

George was educated at the University of Dayton Prep School, graduating in the top quarter of his class. Then followed 2 years at the University of Dayton, Chemical Engineering Department, in the years of 1928 to 1930. He emigrated to Texas in 1932, working part time and going to Texas A. & M. College from 1932 through 1934, in the textile engineering department, where he was again in the top quarter of his class.

Along the way during schooldays and in vacation periods, he served as a minor weather observer with the U.S. Weather Bureau from 1924 to 1926; worked as a clerk from 1926 to 1928 for F. L. Walker, a patent attorney; then stepped into the industry that later brought him fame, when he joined the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Cotton Division, in September of 1930. He worked here as a fiber, ginning and spinning research specialist until 1945.

From 1945 to 1953 he worked with the Chicopee Manufacturing Corp. in Lubbock and Chicopee Falls, Mass., as cotton research director. While with the USDA and Chicopee Manufacturing, he wrote a number of articles for technical journals.

The Lubbock dynamo traveled Europe and spoke before many cotton and mill groups in 1954, as a representative of the Otto Goedecke, Inc., Hallettsville, Tex., cotton merchandising firm. He wrote more articles

and did many lectures for the National Cotton Council, when employed as a cotton technologist in 1955 and 1956.

Then, in 1956, he set up the new cotton producer organization, the Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., with headquarters at Lubbock, becoming its first and only executive vice president.

As the working head of this grower organization, Mr. Pfeiffenberger directs a broad program of research, education, promotion, and legislative representation for the Texas High Plains cotton industry. The organization means much to the area's bankers, its merchants and its citizens, as well as to the other members of the cotton trade and allied industries, such as the Lubbock Cotton Exchange, the Texas Cotton Ginners Association and the National Cotton Council.

Mr. Pfeiffenberger married Charlotte Will, of Dayton, in 1934, and they have two children, Ann, a commercial artist in Lubbock, and Will, a senior physics student at Notre Dame University.

The growers executive secretary is a member of the ASTM, the Fiber Society, on the advisory board of Texas Cotton Research Committee and is a board member of the National Cotton Advisory Committee of the USDA, appointed by President Kennedy, and a member of the American Society of Association Executives.

In 1958 the Plains Growers organization won a national award from the ASAE for "accomplishments made by a local association."

The Plains Cotton Growers, supported by voluntary per bale fees from the producers who grow 15 percent of the U.S. cotton crop, further conducts research through grants to public and private experiment stations and to the Texas Tech Fiber and Pilot Plant Spinning Laboratory, and does it own research on production, breeding, fertilization, insect control, harvesting, and ginning.

Although the Plains Cotton Growers has no cotton production of its own to sell, it analyzes market situations here and abroad and conducts educational work with farmers on marketing problems. It also carries on extensive and very successful advertising campaigns in cotton publications.

George Pfeiffenberger strongly believes in the power of research and promotion as a leading tool in solving the many problems that face the king of all staples. He particularly believes in local associations where the program can be pinpointed for greater effectiveness. He points out that not only can results of cotton research be used in application by the farmers, ginners and spinners, but research also furnishes the most effective field for legislation, for promoting and for advertising.

As an example, fiber and spinning research proved the true value and desirability of light spotted cottons, whether from the high plains, or from other sections. Results from these research tests were used to correct loan inequities and to advertise light spots and their desirability throughout the world. Shorter staples and lower micronnaire cotton, due to effective research and effective promotion and advertising, is now found to be more than suitable for many uses not formerly believed possible.

The diversified cotton industry of the high plains understands the value of an organization devoted to its chief money crop. They support the Plains Cotton Growers, with its outstanding leaders from the industry such as W. O. Fortenberry, president; Wilmer Smith, vice president; and Roy Forkner, secretary-treasurer, who themselves have done so much for the high plains economy.

The high plains has a great future allied with King Cotton. There is room for advancement and there is room for big men like the above with big ideas. Pessimism is truly scarce in this area—and it is unknown to its chief exponent of optimism, George W. Pfeiffenberger, the plains leading salesman—and cotton's leading salesman for the past few years—and now Cotton's Man of the Year.

Threat From Colored Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRIS FAIRCLOTH BLITCH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, as we resume our legislative duties, as Americans, and as Members of Congress, we are very concerned about the constant threat of communism to the United States and to our allies. This is a headache and no one will deny it. Russia's aggressiveness is hard to live with or even understand. But I have long believed that this is probably not the greatest danger to be faced during 1962 by the Western World.

News Columnist Constantine Brown has backed up my beliefs in an article which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on January 9, 1962. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article for the information of my colleagues and the general public at large:

THREAT FROM COLORED NATIONS—DRIVE AGAINST COLONIALISM DURING 1962 FORECAST AS DARKER CLOUD THAN SOVIET

(By Constantine Brown)

ROME.—That the clouds over the Western World in 1962 will come more from the colored nations than from Russia is the considered opinion of responsible West European observers, including British.

The crusade against the West will start in earnest under the pretext that colonialism must be liquidated everywhere. It was begun near the end of 1961 when the Indians, encouraged by international communism, swooped over the Portuguese enclaves and took them by force in defiance of India's pledges to live by the United Nations Charter.

Western Europe was indignant. But it could do nothing to deter the New Delhi government short of using force. And this was unthinkable from the logistic point of view alone. Britain, which shared the anger of the allies across the channel, also was paralyzed. India is nominally, at least, a member of the British Commonwealth. Britain could afford, at Mr. Nehru's prodding, to expel South Africa from the fraternal body, but not India, the darling of the United States and the U.S.S.R.

All eyes were fixed on Washington—the stanchest supporter of nonviolence in international relations and the strongest supporter of the United Nations. The U.S. Government could have cooled off the militaristic ardor of Mr. Nehru and Mr. Krishna Menon who hates the West.

India depends even more than our Western allies did then on American assistance which, according to present plans, will reach more than $2 billion in the next 5 years. India has nowhere to go to avoid complete economic disaster. Russia and China can, and have in the past, promised much but delivered little.

Surely, it was thought by astute political observers in Europe, America would use the same weapon to prevent not only the aggression against Goa but also to deter the carefully planned crusade against the West.

But nothing happened because Portugal is very low on the Washington totem pole. Portugal, despite the assistance given us during the war, and its unflinching loyalty later, is regarded as stubborn; it refuses to hand over Angola to the dark forces of Africa, and so far the Portuguese have refused to overthrow their strongman, Salazar.

What so many European statesmen don't understand is that the cornerstone of our foreign policy is the destruction of colonialism and dictatorships. We are willing to go along with Communist dictatorships such as Khrushchev's and Tito's. We have assisted the latter militarily and economically to the tune of $2 billion and more is to come. But we don't want dictatorships among our allies.

Hence there were, even before the Angola crisis started, many furrowed brows in the State Department at the mere mention of Salazar.

Our theorists in policymaking positions never stop to think that the English and American type of democracy is not exportable. And even with us there are indications of deterioration. They also overlook the fact that when Salazar came to power Portugal was in chaos. Between 1910 when the monarchy fell and 1926 when the present dictator became minister of finance, Portugal set a record which even the Third French Republic could not match—it had 8 presidents and 44 cabinets in 16 years. Portugal was corrupt, corroded, and bankrupt.

Then Salazar came and gave the people a government. It was and is at times relatively harsh, particularly since the end of the war when Communist infiltration began to seep in. But there is no evidence even from careful American observers who have visited Portugal repeatedly that the harshness of Salazar can come anywhere near matching that of Tito on whom we lavish gifts.

Hence our failure to take a firm position against India's aggression is regarded by the Portuguese and their European friends as another sign of hostility toward an ally who if toppled, which seems likely in the near future, will add more troubled waters in which the Soviets can fish.

Qualified European observers ask the question: When will Washington realize it must support its smaller allies, even if it doesn't like their governments, lest the West face what General de Gaulle reportedly describes as "the tidal wave of color" which is supported by internal communism?

Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on December 15 last year, at the naturalization ceremonies in the U.S. District Courthouse in Memphis, Hon. George W. Grider, a member of the bar, and himself a distinguished Naval officer during World War II, delivered one of the finest and certainly one of the most moving addresses I have heard on the subject of Americanism and what it means to be a part of this great country as a citizen.

Senior Judge, Marion Boyd, and his colleague, Judge Bailey Brown, presided.

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER and I were accorded the privilege of speaking brief-

ly. At the time I asked Mr. Grider for a copy of his speech to these new citizens because I wanted to have it made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so my colleagues in the Congress, and many others to whom are made available the RECORD, may have the opportunity to read an address so brief but so filled with the deep philosophy of our Government.

So, Mr. Speaker, having been granted the privilege to extend my remarks, I include the address, which follows:

SPEECH BY GEORGE W. GRIDER AT NATURALIZATION CEREMONIES, U.S. DISTRICT COURTHOUSE, FEDERAL BUILDING, MEMPHIS, TENN., DECEMBER 15, 1961

May it please the court, Judge Boyd, Judge Brown, distinguished guests, my fellow citizens, I say that to you with pride—for I am proud to be one of you. There are no second-class citizens in America, and so you now bear fully the privileges, the blessings, and the awesome responsibilities of American citizenship.

But you have worked very hard for this distinction which came to me by birth without my willing it and without effort. You know so well its meaning—because you have worked so hard in overcoming the obstacles of language, in learning the facts necessary to pass the examinations and tests, and in crossing oceans to come here.

That is how we all came to this great land in the beginning. As did some of you, we often came in suffering and always in the search of freedom. You who have just come have a fresher taste and keener appreciation of the sweetness of liberty and I am proud of this privilege to say a few words to you.

You have come from many lands: Italy, England, Germany, Greece, Jerusalem, Jordan, the Philippines, Japan, China, Costa Rica, British Honduras, Canada, Morocco, Latvia, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Russia, Poland, Cuba, and other lands. Some have come as refugees from tyranny, some as the wives of men who serve our country overseas, some as men who already themselves serve in our Armed Forces. Some of you are heavy with years, others are only children.

Just now, as you took this solemn and glorious oath, did you notice its revolutionary meaning?

You swore to bear true faith and allegiance to something. You vowed to support and defend something against all enemies. What was it that you have committed yourself to? Is it a man? Is it a political party? Is it a regime, a territorial state? No; it is none of these. You and I have pledged our lives to support an ideal. An ideal that we call the Constitution and laws of the United States of America.

Notice too, where we have assembled for this ceremony. Are we in the halls of the rulers of our country? No, this is not the Governor's chamber. This is not the anteroom of a king or of a sovereign. This is not the headquarters of a political clique. No, this is quite simply a hall of justice and the power that rules here is the law. And this is the American dream. This notion—once thought fantastic—that a land could be governed—not by people, but by law—and that all who submit to that law have a voice in its making.

And so you see, you have already become a part of the American dream. This is a relatively new and fantastic dream. Less than 200 years ago the very statement of this dream started a revolution. This was the first revolution of men seeking to be free and it still continues and we still fight it. We have fought for freedom abroad and we have let our own blood in the struggle for freedom.

On two occasions, after the cause of freedom seemed almost lost, we have bestirred ourselves and gone forth to win freedom anew. We are a tough people, we Americans, you and I, when our freedom is challenged. Even here among the comfortable, well dressed and alas, middle aged, there is many a man who has fought on the battlefields of freedom, many a mother or widow who gave their man to that fight.

The cause of freedom is being challenged again and again America is bestirring herself. This time the threat comes from the nations committed to the concept of communism. This is perhaps the gravest threat of all. Perhaps this threat can only be met if all the people everywhere adopt the notion that the world can be ruled by law; that all the problems between nations as well as people can be solved by the rule of law and that war, as a solution, is a third or fourth rate solution.

We Americans are committed to that rule of law. To assert it to the world will be a challenge, a danger and an opportunity. You have joined our ranks just in time—for America needs you today. She needs the committed. She needs people with knowledge of the evils of tyranny. She needs people who have worked and labored for freedom. These are dangerous times and promising times, but this Nation was founded by the bold and cannot be maintained by the timid. America has known her greatest moments in her periods of greatest trial. We face that future with confidence, with anticipation and with the resolve to continue the fight for freedom.

The Kennedy Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, one of the more inaccurate things we do in this country is classify or categorize the writers of syndicated columns in terms of permanence as too far right, too far left or even in degrees to either side. Not only the width of range of viewpoint but also their susceptibility to change makes the professionals of the opinionated press area unique proponents of freedom in world journalism. Today it is a pleasure to call to the attention of my colleagues the evaluation of the administration by a journalist of stature who is neither right nor left but down the line and on the objective:

THE KENNEDY STORY

(By George E. Sokolsky)

One of the exciting evidences of public response to events these days is the reaction to President John F. Kennedy. Many conservatives are annoyed over the fact that they have to recognize that he will be in that position for at least 3 more years and possibly 7; that the Constitution gives him certain powers and that others come to him by virtue of his office and by the fact that he grows increasingly popular and influential.

What they can do about it, they do not know, but they do get excited over Cuba and Katanga and say of those who favor Mr. Kennedy that they have sold out. I was so bold as to ask one such person where and what is Katanga and apparently upset the applecart because the place is only a name and it is difficult to explain what the excitement is about.

No man, not Khrushchev or De Gaulle or Kennedy, is a free master in our very complex world. The course of events moves more swiftly than anyone can estimate in advance. According to Lenin's estimate, the capitalist system should by now be collapsing. As a matter of fact, it is gaining strength, particularly in Europe and Japan, where the production of new goods has altered the economy of nations. According to Communist calculations, the United States and Great Britain should have destroyed each other in an economic competition; instead, the United States poured billions of dollars into the British, French, West German, and Italian economies, making those countries stronger than they were prior to World War II and saving them from collapse at the risk of collapsing itself.

In fact, most calculations were incorrect because it was difficult for small minds to foresee the capacity of the American mind to respond generously to historic misfortunes. It is the same lack of prescience which makes it difficult for us to grasp what we are liable to do that is broad and generous in critical periods.

For instance, President Kennedy was elected by a small majority after a fairly popular Presidency of President Eisenhower, who had no particular program but who moved along as events would permit. Mr. Kennedy's program was not particularly clear. In fact, it seems that his proposals were stronger than his actions. Nevertheless, a year of activity indicates that he has maintained peace without compromise, that he has strengthened the economy of the United States without conceding to foreign powers, that he has safeguarded the dollar without imperiling its value.

President Kennedy tripped over Cuba, but it is becoming clear that Castro has failed to achieve anything beneficial to Cuba by his cupidity. It was believed that Mr. Kennedy's Dominican program was incorrect, but it is working out. The Russians attempted to bog us down in Cuba, Laos, Vietnam, the Congo, and other places, but failed. We have prepared to meet the future, but we have not been tricked into being required to accept their battlefield.

There are those who violently oppose the President's domestic policy, suggesting that he is throwing our wealth down the drain. They despair of the future. They are frightened by his enormous proposed expenditures. But his basic task is to provide jobs for our workers.

President Kennedy is meeting the problems which face the American people soberly and with an understanding of the current problems. He is not living in 1930 but in 1962 and the world has changed sharply during the past 30 years. He recognizes that it has changed sharply. Those who want him to live way back in the days when he was elected to the Senate are not looking at the calendar. He is.

How We Got This Way—X

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, part 10 of the New York Daily News series of editorials—December 10—entitled "How We Got This Way" is presented below:

HOW WE GOT THIS WAY—X

A previous editorial in this series on the political history of the United States men-

tioned Alexander Hamilton's deep concern for the stability and soundness of the Nation's money.

Hamilton, as first Secretary of the Treasury, attended to this matter conscientiously and effectively.

He got Congress to order the Federal Government to take over the debts of the States, run up during the Revolution and under the Articles of Confederation.

The new Constitution stopped the State's happy-go-lucky issuing of their own 13 different kinds of money, and a single decimal-system currency replaced these weird and wonderful shinplasters.

To get enough money into circulation for the needs of an expanding Nation, Hamilton established the first U.S. bank, in 1791. In this institution, the Federal Government owned some shares, but private investors bought and held most of the stock.

The bank branched out as time went on, and became a highly satisfactory agency for keeping U.S. money solid, and for seeing to it that all paper currency emitted by the Government was backed by sufficient reserves of gold and silver.

FIRST BANK, SECOND BANK

The first U.S. bank's charter expired in 1811, and the Nation's monetary system floundered along for the next 5 years, which witnessed the War of 1812 and a bad postwar depression.

In 1816, the second U.S. bank was set up, along the lines of the first one; and it was with this bank that President Andrew Jackson (served 1929–37) staged his historic fight.

Jackson was elected mainly by the votes of southerners and of the new States which now make up our Middle West. The people in those areas were pioneers or planters who wanted cheap land, low tariffs, and soft money.

To these people, and to Jackson, the U.S. bank typified vested interests, northeastern moneygrabbers and grubbers, and a Federal Government which had grown too powerful for the safety of the Nation.

In his first state of the Union message to Congress, Jackson expressed strong doubts as to the wisdom of keeping the U.S. bank in business. To him, the bank smelled of monopoly and special privilege, even if it did keep the currency on an even keel.

In 1832, Henry Clay introduced a bill in Congress to extend the bank's charter. Jackson vetoed the bill. When he and Clay ran against each other for President in the fall of 1832, the bank's continued existence was the principal issue between them.

Jackson was reelected overwhelmingly, and decided that he now had a mandate from the people to wreck the U.S. bank.

JACKSON VICTORY; NATIONAL DEFEAT

He got busy with the deadly earnestness and thoroughness to be expected of an old soldier.

Two of his Secretaries of the Treasury flatly refused to remove the Government's deposits from the bank on orders from Jackson. In Roger B. Taney (later Chief Justice and author of the Dred Scott decision), he found a Secretary who would obey orders. The Senate refused to confirm Taney; but that didn't halt President Jackson.

Government money was transferred in large amounts to various State banks (known to Jackson's enemies as "pet banks"), and the big central bank withered away.

This triumph of Jackson's did his heart more good than, possibly, any other official act of his White House career. But it also threw the Nation's monetary system into near chaos once more, and brought on a wildfire of land speculation which climaxed in the terrible panic of 1837—with President Martin Van Buren doing his best to clean up the financial mess he had inherited from Jackson.

It wasn't until shortly after the Civil War that Congress dragged the country back to a national banking system founded on fairly sound principles.

From Jackson's day to this, we've had a continuing conflict between sound money and funny money people—or, you might say, between people who know you can't get something for nothing and those who believe you can.

On the final outcome of this struggle depends the Nation's continued solvency or eventual bankruptcy.

Hungarian Freedom Fight Rally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the heroic struggle of the Hungarian people in 1956 to throw off the yoke of international communism captured the sympathy and admiration of free people throughout the world.

The Philadelphia Chapter of the American Hungarian Federation, desiring to commemorate the bravery and spirit of independence of these unforgettable people, held a Freedom Memorial Rally on the fifth anniversary of the historical event. The rally took place in Flanagan Auditorium of St. Joseph's College in Philadelphia on Saturday evening, October 21, 1961.

Bela H. Backskai was the master of ceremonies, and Dr. Leslie E. Konkoly, president of the chapter, welcomed the audience. The Honorable Joseph Kovago, mayor of the city of Budapest during those glorious days of freedom in 1956, was the speaker in the Hungarian language. It was also my privilege to speak at this memorable occasion, and I am including my remarks below.

FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

I find myself this evening deeply honored to be able to share so glorious a moment as a memorial tribute to the Hungarian people who fought so heroically 5 years ago.

When the free world first heard the news that the Hungarian people were in revolt against their Communist oppressors, it experienced an overwhelming feeling of joy and optimism. The Iron Curtain was being torn asunder at last. Once more we felt that the people of the Russian satellite countries could enjoy the freedoms which we here so cherish. October 23, 1956, the day when the Hungarian revolt began, was the day we heard that fateful news. It will be remembered by our generation. This day must also be instilled into the minds of succeeding generations, never to be forgotten. This day must be preserved even after the Hungarian people have won their freedom to worship, their freedom to speak, their freedom to vote. October 23 should pass into history as Freedom Day, a day when all free persons should give thanks for being allowed to share in the special privileges permitted by freedom.

The Hungarian people have always fought valiantly and courageously for their homeland. It was they who were able to stem the tide of the Tartar hoard from overrunning Western Europe. With their aid, although Hungary had become a part of the Ottoman Empire, the combined Western European forces were able to stop the westward Moslem expansion. The Hungarian people fought to free themselevs from Ottoman rule only to find themselves under Austrian domination.

Therefore, the revolution of March 1848 which attempted to throw off the yoke of Austrian Hapsburg tyranny was a natural expression of the wishes of the people. But the Free Hungarian State which emerged was short lived. Caught in a visor-like grip by advancing Russian and Austrian armies, Hungary was again subjected to rule by great powers. Twenty years later she won nationalistic status by proclaiming a kingdom, still under the Austrian Empire, but at least having partial autonomy.

The spirit of the 1848 revolution was never crushed. The initial movement 5 years ago began at the foot of the poet-hero of 1848, Sandor Petofi. His words had inspired a surge for freedom in 1848; his statue in 1956 was to do the same thing, to act as a catalyst to the Hungarian Freedom Fighters. There were many heroes, too, in this struggle. Pal Maleter, a commanding officer and inspiration to the Freedom Fighters, a member of the Imre Nagy cabinet, fought so bravely only to be treacherously abducted by the Russians during truce talks with the Russians. Cardinal Mindszenty, the prelate of the church, who had defied from the beginning the Communist leaders. Although kept in prison until he was released during the revolt, his presence was continually felt in Hungary. His freedom was short lived. Suspecting treachery he fled to the American Embassy in Budapest for refuge. And he is still there, unable to leave, at least savoring some freedom, the little left to him by the Communists who patrol the Embassy waiting to take him into custody should he ever step foot from his American sanctuary.

The free world rejoiced to hear the news which flowed from strife-torn Hungary on the 23d of October, and for the next 8 days, when the revolution appeared to have succeeded. The treachery of the Soviet Government on November 1 stunned once more the hopeful well-wishers. Four days later, Soviet tanks and guns had won the battle for Budapest. The city lay broken on the bank of the Danube, a reminder to the world that Russian superior force shows no mercy. Over 120,000 refugees managed to escape to Austria, afraid to stay and live under anarchy. Behind them, lay 25,000 dead, with countless thousands of their young comrades shipped to Russia in cattle cars, slave laborers in an age where slavery is regarded as a thing of the past.

These refugees left behind them, too, a reminder to the conquerer: 7,000 Russians dead, over 300 tanks destroyed with homemade bombs and mines, a spirit unextinguished, waiting to burst once again into a raging fire.

Some of these refugees are with us tonight. They can tell you of their heroic fight much better than I am able to do so. And they can tell you of their continued determination to free their homeland from Russian imperialism. The U.S. Government has sped thousands of the freedom fighters to these shores, to give them a chance to live again under democracy. Many had relatives or friends waiting for them, to help them start a new life again. They have become a part of American society—laborers, students, teachers, technicians, doctors. They have joined their counterparts, those Americans of Hungarian origin who have helped to make the United States the great Nation she is.

There was Janos Xantus, who traveled into the unknown West of last century to help explore the Kansas frontier and southern Cali-

fornia. Angelo Heilprin contributed much to advance the prestige of the United States in regard to the polar regions with his studies on geology and paleontology. Then there was Joseph Pulitzer, whose name is synonomous with great journalism and literature. The theater has also experienced Hungarian talents—Ferenc Molnar, creator of "Liliom"; Adolph Zukov and William Fox, movie moguls; and Paul Lukus, an actor of rare stature. Bela Bartok, noted composer, made his home here and died here. Eugene Ormandy with his Philadelphia orchestra has been seen and heard round the world by appreciative audiences. David Lilienthal, prominent in public affairs, guided the Government's undertaking in the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Those remaining in Hungary did not give up resistance although the major fighting had been completed. Guerrilla bands, abetted by farmers, continued to harass Soviet troops. Factory and mineworkers struck, disabling the industry of the Communist regime. Many continued to be arrested and executed for his resistance. But with 50,000 to 80,000 Russian troops still patrolling and protecting their puppet regime, armed with the latest destructive weapons, most resistance has become passive, rather than overt.

The free world had attempted to aid in the fight by bringing the crisis to the U.N. This august body, sabotaged time and again by the Russians, had been appealed to by the freedom fighters. One of the last messages to come from Radio Csokonyai, called on Radio Free Europe in Munich to relay a message to the U.N. In this message, the people of Hungary appealed to the U.N. to decide the life or death of their nation. "While your sons are at peace and happy, we sons of the Hungarian nation are falling under the cruel firing of Soviet tanks and bombers. Our country has been attacked by armed forces from the outside. We turn to you, for you are our last citadel of hope * * *."

U.N. troops were urged to be sent to Hungary. The Russians were told to withdraw their forces. But each move by the United States and the other free nations was blocked by the Soviet Union in that world body. The Russian veto was all powerful. An appeal to send U.N. observers into Hungary was denied. Even today, Sir Leslie Munro is still active in his investigation of the Hungarian crisis 5 years ago. He is still being denied access to Hungary. By an overwhelming majority, a resolution of condemnation of the Soviet Union was passed, branding the Soviet Union forever as butchers and annihilators of freedom.

By this condemnation, too, the free world knows the sacrifice made by the Hungarian people. The free world knows of the deportations of its young people to Russia, of its massacred workers, of its slain freedom fighters. And the free world knows that this sacrifice was not in vain. The Russian leaders can no longer claim inviolability as being a noncolonial power. Those nations who are attempting to aline themselves with neither power bloc need only be reminded of that infamous Russian attack in November 1956 to proceed with caution and distrust toward the Soviet Union and its overtures. The tragedy of Hungary pounded home once more the savageness and cruelty of communism.

Hungary will one day experience those liberties which you are now enjoying tonight. The people will be able to speak out against Soviet tyranny as I am doing now. The Iron Curtain will shatter completely one day, never to be built again. There will no longer be barbed wire borders as there are now on the Austro-Hungarian border and in Berlin. We shall be able to walk freely through these barriers as if they never existed. Until that day, though, we must be like Anna Kethly, the only member of the free Hungarian Cabinet to escape to the West. She has not given up hope. She knows that the flame of freedom has not been extinguished. She has expressed to the world the sentiments and the will of the Hungarian people as well as those of the free people of the world on the final outcome of their struggle against despotism and slavery, when she proclaimed: "My country will yet be free."

Chicago Port Gets New Export Packaging Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the January 8, 1962, issue of the Chicago Daily Tribune:

CHICAGO PORT GETS NEW EXPORT PACKAGING CENTER

(By Thomas Wolfsmith)

The port of Chicago's oversea shipping facilities have received a boost in the establishment of a new export packaging center on the city's South Side.

Chicago Export Packaging and Service Corp. has gone into operation in 60,000 square-foot building leased from the Illinois Central Railroad in the road's Burnside yards at 95th Street and Cottage Grove Avenue.

The new company, headed by Herman Faure, president, will handle for the shippers the preparation for oversea shipment of heavy industrial equipment such as metal stamping and printing presses, and other cargo.

FACILITIES INADEQUATE

"The port of Chicago has been woefully lacking in adequate facilities for the proper handling, packaging, and storage of heavy industrial equipment for export shipment through the St. Lawrence Seaway," Faure said.

"Many metropolitan Chicago manufacturers have diverted shipment of their products to the coast ports where necessary facilities have been available," he added.

The packaging center is linked by rail and truck to Lake Calumet Harbor, Chicago's principal oversea shipping facility and interchange point for barge traffic on the Illinois-Mississippi waterway.

A major asset of the new facility is the availability of three overhead traveling cranes with capacities of 75, 40, and 10 tons for handling the heavy equipment.

CALLED BIGGEST ON LAKES

Faure asserted that the center surpasses any similar facilities at major Great Lakes ports and is the equal of such facilities at east and gulf coast ports.

The new company expects to expand its services to include packaging of liquids such as chemicals and dry bulk cargo such as soybean meal. An added provision is that Chicago Export will offer complete transportation service to shippers from their loading docks to oversea destinations, Faure said.

"We have every expectation of handling hundreds of rail carloads of equipment in the first year plus sizable truck movements," he said.

As I See It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to commend to the attention of my colleagues an address delivered by Mr. Ehney A. Camp, Jr., executive vice president and treasurer of the Liberty National Life Insurance Co., Birmingham, Ala., to the statewide housing industry meeting which was held in Birmingham on November 7, 1961.

Mr. Camp is an expert in his field. He was my roommate at the University of Alabama, and it gives me much pleasure to afford my colleagues the opportunity to read his excellent address:

AS I SEE IT

(By Ehney A. Camp, Jr.)

I appreciate so much the opportunity to appear on this program. You have greatly honored me by asking me to talk to you. This is certainly an outstanding group of homebuilders, mortgage bankers, and realtors, and I recognize in the audience many of my friends of long standing. I always enjoy the opportunity to exchange views with those who are engaged in my line of business, and I do hope that my remarks today will be of some interest to you.

I want to congratulate the Birmingham Association of Home Builders on sponsoring this statewide meeting. I understand this meeting is similar to others being held throughout the Nation under the sponsorship of the various homebuilder associations. I believe we must all agree that the homebuilders throughout the country have been most active and aggressive in disseminating information about housing and mortgage credit, and we are all indebted to them. It may be that one reason they are so aggressive is because they are the fellows who want to borrow the money. But, whatever the motive, they have certainly done a good job.

I want to make it clear that I do not come before you posing as an expert in the field of housing and mortgages. This is a most complex part of our entire economic system and every day I am impressed with the fact that I know so very little about the overall subject. I certainly am not here to give you the answers or to insist that my views are the only ones to be considered. I am just here to think out loud with you on a subject that is extremely interesting to all of us. When I was asked to appear on this program, I informed the committee that some of my views might not coincide in every detail with those of the homebuilders. I was assured that this would make no difference and that homebuilders are extremely broad-minded in their views and are anxious to hear all sides of the story. I was also told that there would be in this audience not only homebuilders but mortgage bankers and realtors. I am convinced that all of us as good American citizens are working toward the same ultimate goal and that, if we have any differences, they are differences in methods and details rather than fundamentals.

I feel sure I was asked to appear on your program because, in a small way, I represent the life insurance industry. You know without my telling you that the life insurance industry has been greatly interested and plays a big part in this whole field of mortgages and housing. I have the privi-

lege of serving on a joint committee of our two national associations, which committee deals with all subjects in the field of mortgages and housing. Up until last month, I was one of the two life insurance company members on the National Committee of the Voluntary Home Mortgage Credit Program of which the HHFA Administrator is chairman. All of the members of this latter committee are from private industry. The privilege of serving on these two committees has kept me very close to this whole picture and there is no subject which intrigues me more than that which we are talking about today.

The life insurance companies of our country have always kept a substantial portion of their funds invested in mortgages. The following table shows the high point, the low point, and the present situation of the percentage of life insurance company assets invested in mortgages:

Year	Amount (billion dollars)	Percent of assets
1925	4.8	41.7
1946	7.2	14.8
1960	42.0	34.9

I have used the 1925 figure since it represents the high point in percentage of assets invested in mortgages. The low point was reached in 1946 at the close of World War II after the life insurance companies had been investing substantial sums in U.S. Government bonds in connection with the prosecution of the war. It is extremely interesting to note that the amount invested in mortgages has steadily increased from $7.2 billion in 1946 to $42 billion at the end of 1960 which figure represents nearly 35 percent of total assets.

The investment in mortgages by life insurance companies increased nearly $3 billion in 1960 which is a gain of 6.7 percent. I was interested to note that U.S. life insurance companies owned $753 million of Alabama mortgages at the end of 1960. The increase of $60 million in Alabama mortgages during 1960 was at a rate of 8.6 percent which is well above the national increase of 6.7 percent.

I think it is interesting to note those States which have attracted the largest amounts of mortgage funds from the life insurance companies:

	Amount (billions)
California	$5.6
Texas	4.4
New York	2.6
Illinois	2.4

I think it is extremely interesting that Alabama is number 20 among the 50 States and the District of Columbia in the amount of mortgage investments owned by life insurance companies. As you know, our company is greatly interested in Alabama mortgages and has been throughout its entire history. We closed the first FHA loan in this State and have had the privilege of making loans in each of its 67 counties. During 1960, we closed 617 new loans amounting to $8.6 million and at the end of last year owned 7,503 Alabama mortgages with a principal balance of approximately $63 million. It will be noted that this latter figure was approaching 10 percent of the total life insurance company mortgage investments in our State.

In carrying out our mortgage operation, our company has been particularly interested in FHA and VA loans. In fact, the life insurance companies of the country have accounted for a substantial portion of the total Government guaranteed and insured loans. The following tabulation shows the total residential mortgage loans made by the life insurance companies since 1946:

	Amount (billions)
FHA	$13.5
VA	10.5
Conventional	22.0
Total	46.0

If we assume an average loan of $10,000, this would mean that the life insurance companies have supplied homes during this period to some 4,600,000 American families.

The market for mortgage loans changes from time to time and, in fact, differs among various types of lending institutions and in various sections of the country. As for our own company, at the present time we are receiving more than an ample supply of loans. In fact, we have had to take some fairly drastic action to reduce the volume which has been flowing to us from our mortgage correspondents and brokers. It is interesting to review the figures of outstanding investment commitments of the life insurance companies. There is a monthly report compiled from the figures of certain life insurance companies representing approximately 65 percent of the assets of all companies. The report as of August 31, 1961, showed these companies had outstanding investment commitments of $4.5 billion which is an increase of $400 million over the similar figure 1 year previous. Included among these outstanding commitments were residential mortgage commitments as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

Type loan	Commitments	Change from previous year
FHA	338	−12
VA	72	+4
Conventional	777	+98
Total	1,187	+90

You will notice the relatively small amount of outstanding commitments for VA loans. Everyone knows the VA loan has long been handicapped by a submarket interest rate. This loan is now in better favor because the interest rate is the same as that on FHA loans. However, private industry is handicapped in the making of VA loans because of the direct lending program carried on by the VA. I firmly believe that our Government would not have been called upon to make such a substantial amount of direct VA loans if the interest rate had been competitive. The voluntary home mortgage credit program did an outstanding job of placing VA loans with private lenders and relieving the Government of a portion of this huge financial undertaking as long as the interest rate was reasonably competitive and as long as the VA permitted the charging of reasonable discounts by private lenders.

As for the FHA, I am somewhat concerned about the future of this great agency. It has played a tremendously important part in the promoting of homeownership in this country and I have great admiration for the FHA. My company has demonstrated its interest in the FHA program from the very beginning by directing a substantial portion of its investment funds to FHA loans. I do feel that we are in a critical period and that we are possibly at the turning point in the history of FHA. I say this because I see this great agency more and more getting away from sound mortgage operations and encompassing weaker programs which are being developed for social and welfare purposes. I am not criticizing the motives behind those who sponsor these social and welfare programs. My concern is that I do not feel these programs should be administered as a part of the FHA program which was created in the first instance to provide a "sound mortgage credit system." As we get away from sound mortgage credit principles, the question which confronts us is whether the FHA will continue to be a vehicle for private mortgage investment and whether it can be operated on a sound business basis or whether it will become dominated more and more by strict Government controls for political and social purposes.

While we are speaking of the FHA, the question arises as to how long we need the special VA lending program. With the extremely liberal terms now provided by the FHA loan, one wonders why the needs of the veteran cannot be well served by the FHA. On the other hand, if it is agreed that we shall continue to have the VA lending program, I urge all of you to use your best efforts to see that this program is placed upon a marketable basis so that private funds may make these loans and relieve our Government of the necessity of supplying the funds.

As we look back over the history of the FHA, we see that lending terms have been liberalized from time to time to the point where many now question the soundness of the type loan being made. You will recall the FHA began with an 80-percent 20-year loan after which it was soon changed to a 90-percent 25-year loan. The terms were further liberalized to provide for a 97-percent 30-year loan and more recently to a 35-year loan and, in some cases, to loans of 40-year terms. When the 1961 Housing Act was being considered, there were some who were sponsoring a 100 percent 40-year FHA loan and it appeared for a while this legislation might be adopted. It is difficult to understand how this type of loan could be strongly advocated when we realize it would take 6 years to accumulate a 5-percent equity if we assume an interest rate of 5¼ percent. In other words, it would take 6 years to accumulate an equity sufficient to pay a real estate sales commission if the owner desires to sell the property. Of course, there would be no equity available to cover the cost of necessary decorating and repairs and other expenses connected with the sale.

On a $13,500 40-year loan, the borrower would still owe $10,000 at the end of 20 years. In fact, nearly 30 years would have to elapse before the loan balance would be reduced one-half. This means that a 45-year-old borrower would be 75 years of age by the time he had reduced his debt to one-half the original amount. Under such a loan, the balance of the loan would exceed the depreciated value of the property for more than one-half of the entire loan period. The total interest paid throughout the life of the loan would be approximately $20,000 which is one and one-half times the value of the property. I believe all of us could readily agree that this is not a sound loan and that inflation is the only thing which would save the loan. None of us wants inflation because we know the disastrous results which it brings about. Investors making this type loan would be relying solely upon the FHA insurance but we must not forget that when we are talking about FHA insurance, we are talking about the U.S. Government. The U.S. Government is nothing more than the people of this country and that means all of us right here in this room.

On a 35-year loan, only 6 percent equity is accumulated in 5 years and the borrower would still owe 65 percent at the end of 20 years. We are in the process of foreclosing at this time some section 608 loans originally made on a 33½-year term which have been on our books about 13 years. In making mortgages, an investor would certainly hope that after a 13-year period the loan would be thoroughly seasoned to the point where a serious default would not be possible. However, because the rate of amortization during this 13-year period was so extremely slow, we are now confronted with these foreclosures.

I would imagine that 30 years is the most common term on FHA loans being made to-

day. While most investors are accepting this term loan, it is interesting to note that an equity of only 8 percent is accumulated in the first 5 years and the borrower still owes more than half the principal balance at the end of the first 20 years. This slow accumulation of equity is beginning to create some real problems. Throughout most of the life of the FHA, we have been on a market of increasing values and borrowers who were transferred or who were faced with financial or other difficulties were able to sell their homes with a minimum of effort and thereby salvage reasonable equities. During the last few years, market values have been relatively stable and equities have not been created by increasing values. Therefore, we are finding that borrowers who must move from their present homes or who are faced with financial difficulties have no incentive to try to dispose of their homes. There is no equity available to them after paying a real estate commission and providing funds to place the property in reasonable condition for sale. Foreclosure of the mortgage is the only recourse left to the investor.

This same situation may create some tedious problems in dealing with those borrowers who are being called into military service. In former periods, very few servicemen availed themselves of the terms of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act. Most of them found it to their best interests to dispose of their properties and salvage their equities or rent their properties for an amount sufficient to cover the mortgage payments. The cases which are now coming to our attention would indicate that many of these men being called into service have so little equities in their properties that they cannot dispose of them at a net price sufficient to pay the mortgage. Under the circumstances, we may find a much greater number asking for the privilege of discontinuing payments and continuing to use the property with no particular desire to reinstate the mortgage after the period of service has ended.

The controlled interest rate on FHA loans has created real problems and I do not believe the FHA will ever be the economically sound type of organization it was supposed to be when it was established in 1934 until some plan is worked out for a flexible interest rate. We shall continue to have extreme fluctuations in FHA activity until the interest rate on FHA loans can go upward or downward along with the general money market. Even the high school student knows that interest rates cannot be artificially controlled but that interest rates, representing the price of money, fluctuate just as does the price of any commodity. The extreme fluctuations in the volume of loans insured by the FHA throughout its more than 25-year history have been due largely to the fact that the FHA has been operated on the basis of a rigid and controlled interest rate.

The present system of controlled interest rates results in discounts. Discounts are not good for the builder, the seller, nor the borrower. Discounts result in very awkward and tedious bookkeeping for the investor with particular reference to accounting for tax purposes. Homebuilders have long advocated a flexible interest rate and I believe they could have some real influence in bringing this about if they would now take a firm and positive stand on the subject.

The ultimate success of the Federal Housing Administration depends upon whether Congress and the public will continue to permit it to operate as a private vehicle. If more and more we see the Government making loans directly or buying FHA loans through FNMA, at above-market prices, then more and more we shall see the FHA relying upon Government in all of its phases with less and less of private support. We need only to look at the history of the Federal land banks to understand what might happen. Everyone must become impressed with the fact that the Government itself does not have an unlimited supply of money available to buy mortgage loans nor to make them directly. The only money the Government has for these and other purposes is what it is able to obtain through the taxing of its citizens. To the extent it does not levy sufficient taxes to enable it to carry on all of these programs, then the Government is forced to borrow the money and, as everyone knows, this is highly inflationary. Do you realize that in 25 out of the last 31 fiscal years, our Federal Government has operated at a deficit? If any of our businesses or any of us personally had established that kind of record, we would think very carefully before taking on additional programs costing substantial sums in excess of our income.

The only "real" money available for investment in this Nation is that which is saved by its people and channeled through the various types of savings institutions. We must continue to encourage our people to save so that there will be sufficient money available to carry on all worthwhile programs. However, the best way to discourage people in the field of savings is for the Government to continue to operate at a deficit which tends to promote inflation and tends to further reduce the desire to save.

When we are discussing residential mortgage credit, the sole question is whether there will be sufficient funds available on reasonable terms to meet the demands for housing and, at the same time, the demands from other segments of our economy. There are many factors which have a bearing on this subject but the time allotted will permit consideration of only a few of the broad principles involved.

First, it should be clear to all that when we refer to mortgage credit, we are speaking of those funds earned by the sweat of their brows by the millions of people in this country and then placed in savings with life insurance companies, savings banks, commercial banks, savings and loan associations, pension funds, and all other types of savings institutions. When the demand for these funds exceeds the supply, it is evident that our people are borrowing at a more rapid rate than they are willing to save. In such a period, it is important that we stop, look, and listen to determine the best course to pursue. For if our people continue to borrow for a sustained period at a pace faster than they are willing to save, we must face the further possibility that the spending power generated by that excessive borrowing may exert inflationary pressures which will be extremely harmful in their long-term effects.

Second, if the demand for funds exceeds savings and this excessive demand is met out of funds provided by the Federal Government or its agencies, this leads to further inflation through expansion of commercial bank credit. I believe we would all agree that under usual and normal circumstances, we shall come out better if we so plan and manage our economic affairs that there will be a proper balance between the demand for and supply of investment funds and so that the funds which are borrowed by one segment of our people will represent the combined savings of the remainder of the people without the necessity of the Federal Government having to supply the funds through some devious and inflationary method.

Speaking of mortgage credit, in the last decade we have witnessed the construction of homes at a very rapid rate requiring a great amount of mortgage credit. It speaks well for the flexibility of our economic system that our savings institutions were able to direct substantial sums of money into the residential mortgage market at the same time there were strong demands for funds for so many other important needs.

The following table shows the percentage of net available capital funds which was directed to residential mortgage credit during each of the last 13 years:

[Dollars in billions]

	Net capital market flows	Residential mortgages	
		Net increase	Percent of net capital market flows
1948	$15.1	$5.9	39.1
1949	16.0	5.3	33.1
1950	17.3	8.7	50.2
1951	18.1	7.8	43.1
1952	24.4	7.5	30.7
1953	25.9	8.2	31.7
1954	25.3	10.1	39.9
1955	27.8	13.4	48.2
1956	26.6	11.5	43.2
1957	28.2	9.2	32.6
1958	40.5	11.7	28.9
1959	42.5	15.2	35.8
1960	28.1	12.3	43.8
Total	335.8	126.8	37.8

I was greatly interested to note that in 1950, 50.2 percent of available capital was made available for residential mortgages and the figure in 1955 was only slightly less at 48.2 percent. The lowest percentage in any year was in 1958 when 28.9 percent was available for residential mortgages. I believe when we realize that 37.8 percent of available capital in the last 13 years was directed to residential mortgages that we would readily reach the conclusion that the business of homebuilders has not been neglected by the workings of our economic system.

In discussing mortgage markets, we hear a continued cry for secondary markets of various kinds. I find it difficult to understand why we need another secondary market when the Federal National Mortgage Association was established for that purpose. I am convinced that if FNMA could be operated intelligently and on a sound basis that it could function truly as a secondary market. A secondary market agency should buy when the market is tight and should sell when loans are in short supply. A secondary market agency should not artificially support low interest rates nor should it buy mortgages which for one reason or another would not be eventually acceptable for sale to the private market. I was greatly concerned earlier this year when FNMA raised the prices of its loans to an artificially high level with the stated purpose of discontinuing the sale of those loans even though a fairly good demand for loans existed at the time. By such actions, it is clear that FNMA is not yet operating as a truly secondary market and that other motives from time to time influence its decisions.

A very tedious problem facing home builders revolves around the recent recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission. If those recommendations are carried forward, they could absolutely destroy our homebuilding industry in its present form. It is difficult to see how any intelligent leaders could take this route with resulting disastrous effects to one of our great industries merely for the purpose of attempting to carry out certain social and political goals. This action definitely illustrates that when we lean too heavily upon Government for support, we must be prepared to let Government run the show. It makes us wonder just where we are heading in our form of government and our way of life. Are we slowly progressing toward those forms of society where Government does everything and controls everything and where the individual doesn't really count?

There are two problems which I hesitate to mention but which must be discussed in any meeting of this kind. One of these problems involves falsified credit reports. The existence of this problem is a strong reflection against our various businesses and we just wouldn't believe a thing like this could happen in a country like ours founded upon

solid Christian principles of integrity. Frankly, I knew very little of this problem until both the FHA and the VA had to set up some new procedures in an endeavor to protect the integrity of the credit report. These new procedures further slow down the processing of applications.

The other problem to which I am referring is that of dual contracts. Anyone who participates in falsifying sales contracts is committing a crime just as much as if he had stolen money from someone's pocket. Unfortunately, we hear of cases where people supposedly of high community standing are involved. Homebuilders, realtors, mortgage bankers, and investors must see to it that these shady practices come to an end. Our business is too important and means too much to the future of our country and its entire way of life to have it destroyed by people who have no sense of truthfulness, integrity and fairplay.

Before closing, I must comment that I feel the elimination of the one-half percent service fee on FHA loans of $9,000 and under will seriously cripple the program of building small homes with private money which means that more direct Government funds will have to be supplied if we obtain these homes. Each of you know it costs an investor just as much to service a $7,000 loan as it does a $21,000 loan but the income is three times as great on the latter. This means the small loan does not make a favorable comparison and this fundamental principle must be recognized in all mortgage lending programs.

What does the future hold for our business—the mortgage business? Will we recognize it 25 years from today? And will it change as radically in the next 25 years as it has in the past 25 years? I urge you, in this and all other phases of our economic life, let us not attempt to take the easy way, the lazy man's way. Let us keep our business geared to the free private enterprise system with its vigor, its initiative, its desire to put out, all because of the personal gain which motivates the private enterprise system.

Let us wake up to the fact that every time we turn something over to the Government, every time we abdicate our responsibility and throw it to the Government, we then give to Government the right to call the signals, to select the plays and even to make the substitutions of the players. Has it ever occurred to you that the methods now employed by private homebuilders, by private mortgage bankers and by private investors could be taken out of the game by the coach—the Government—and some of the coach's own methods substituted?

Is that the way to win the game? My answer is that is not the way we won the game in the first 185 years following that great day in 1776 when our forefathers threw off the yoke of "too much government" and embarked upon a way of life which has produced results never before equaled in the history of the world. Do we want to forsake that system now? The answer lies in the willpower and the determination of plain, old American citizens like you and like me.

Will we measure up to the dreams and aspirations of our forefathers of 1776?

Alaska's Power Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST GRUENING

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, yesterday I placed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article, one of a number published recently in the Fairbanks News-Miner, on Alaska's power shortages. This is part of a series which take up the shortages which exist in one part of Alaska, namely, the Railbelt, which includes the cities of Anchorage, Fairbanks, Seward, Kenai, Palmer, Talkeetna, and others, and includes four REA cooperatives—the Chugach, the Matanuska, the Homer, and the Golden Valley.

I ask unanimous consent that the second article in this series be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POWER SHORTAGES FACE BOTH ANCHORAGE AND FAIRBANKS

(By Paul Lien)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The second of a series of articles on a predicted power shortage shows dependable power capacities in the Anchorage and Fairbanks areas, and will explain what plans are being made to prepare for the future in power development.)

Power shortages are facing both Anchorage and Fairbanks. The Central Alaska Power Pool has been formed among utility companies along the railbelt area for the purpose of making a study of power sources most feasible.

A summary of the dependable capacities indicates a total of 71,250 kilowatts for the Anchorage area as the present power supply, and 21,500 kilowatts for the Fairbanks area. For a group of utilities it is customary to provide a reserve capacity equal to the size of the largest unit in the system or 15 percent of peak, whichever is larger.

For the Anchorage area, the largest unit is one of the Eklutna generators, or 16,000 kilowatts, which reduces the dependable capacity for this area to 55,250 kilowatts. In Fairbanks the largest unit is 5,000 kilowatts, and the dependable capacity is 16,500 kilowatts.

Comparing these values with the projected peakloads for 1962 of 58,000 kilowatts and 18,000 kilowatts, respectively, it is obvious that additional capacity is required immediately to meet the above criteria. Anchorage is even now being served without adequate reserve because of the incomplete transmission line from the Cooper Lake hydroplant.

In reviewing present generating costs, the Parsons report showed them to be excessively high in some cases. It advised to retire as early as possible the higher cost units of the present equipment to peaking status or dead standby. All present equipment must be relied upon heavily until the completion of the transmission line from Cooper Lake and the addition of the first bloc of new capacity.

The 16,500-kilowat gas turbine at Anchorage is expected to be on the line in 1963.

In case the integrated system as shown in the Parsons report is not functional by February 1, 1962, MUS and GVEA of Fairbanks have authorized R. W. Beck & Associates and G. E. Wieland & Associates of Seattle to make a further study of building a 22,000-kilowatt plant at either Healy or Fairbanks and report their findings no later than February 1.

Rural Electrical Administration funds are expected to be used if GVEA and MUS go together in this new venture. Golden Valley, as an REA member will apply for the funds. The reason for using REA money is the interest rate is only 2 percent as against the much higher rate of 5½ percent for private capital; 35 years is given to amortize the loan, as against 20 or less years using private capital.

The growth of Alaska depends upon the availability of low cost power, which would attract major industries, and affect the rate at which highways, railways, harbors, and other facilities are expanded.

Low cost power will not be available overnight, but will be achieved gradually as the market for its use is developed.

Interim power can be competitive and very useful for many years after the completion of proposed Rampart Dam. Also of great importance, interim power is needed not only to fill the normal increase in consumption, but also to provide for the boom created during construction of the Rampart project.

One of the greatest needs for the development of this area, and of all of Alaska, is communication. Roadbuilding is proceeding at an exceptional pace, and is likely to be accelerated in the years ahead.

The need for more power throughout Alaska will increase in direct proportion to the opening of new lines of communication. The impact of these increased and improved communication and highway systems will open many new areas and bring connected powerloads in places not now served or contemplated by any of the member-utility companies at present.

The Birthday of Benjamin Franklin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the Philadelphia congressional delegation calls attention to the birthday of a great Philadelphian, the birthday of Benjamin Franklin.

Benjamin Franklin, whose 256th birthday was celebrated yesterday, is remembered with grateful affection and admiration in Boston, the city of his birth, in Philadelphia, the city enriched by his residence for the greater part of his life, and in the foreign capitals of London and Paris, where his personal popularity and prestige contributed vastly to the general estimate of the United States of America in the formative years of the Republic. So many sided was Ben Franklin's genius that the Dictionary of American Biography requires seven words to categorize his career, "printer, author, philanthropist, inventor, statesman, diplomat, scientist." He was not a compartmented man, following these different vocations at different times, and in different circumstances, but a whole and many-sided man, who astounded those who knew him best by the depth of his knowledge and the scope of his activities in each field.

It is appropriate that printing is mentioned first among Franklin's activities, for printing was the first trade and profession by which he made his living, and he never ceased to think of himself primarily as a printer. As a boy of 17, when he came to Philadelphia, he was already a printer of practical experience and of outstanding skill and competence. That he looked upon himself as a printer is demonstrated dramatically by his famous epitaph on himself, with its typical mixture of sincere solemnity and quizzical humor:

The body of Benjamin Franklin, printer (like the cover of an old book, its contents torn out, and stripped of its lettering and gilding), lies here food for worms. Yet the work itself shall not be lost, for it will (as he believes) appear once more in a new and more beautiful edition corrected and amended by the Author.

Throughout his life Franklin maintained a constant interest and activity in printing, and in matters connected with printing, such as the publishing of magazines and books, his famous Poor Richard's Almanack, and the fervent support of any enterprise in furtherance of the dissemination of knowledge through reading. Libraries, learned societies, educational institutions—all owe much to the enthusiastic sponsorship of Dr. Benjamin Franklin. One of the most apt commemorations of this great Philadelphia printer and publisher is the annual celebration of his birthday by a portrait on the cover of the Saturday Evening Post, successor to a paper he had founded.

Franklin's career as an author also began early. When he was working for his brother, as an apprentice printer, between the ages of 12 and 17, he became an avid reader, not only of the pamphlets and magazines he helped to print, but of all the books he could get hold of. Fascinated by Addison's Spectator, he began of his own accord the literary apprenticeship later so enthusiastically recommended by Stevenson, and wrote essays in imitation of Addison's literary style. In this medium, so eminently suited to his own temperament and mode of thought, he soon became proficient. His earliest essays, signed with the pseudonym, "Silence Dogood," were slipped secretly under his brother's door, and, much to his delight, appeared in print. From Addison he had learned to combine elegance of expression with simplicity, and he soon mastered the art of leavening serious thought with touches of wit and facetiousness.

Franklin's reputation as a writer is great, and well deserved. His autobiography has served for the entertainment and instruction of youth for many generations, and will so serve for many a century to come. His home truths, as succinctly phrased in "Poor Richard's Almanack," and his witticisms as gleaned from his conversation and letters, are still in the common language of all of us. It is probable that Mark Twain is his only rival for the post of most quoted American author.

We are all beneficiaries of Franklin's philanthropic thoughts for the general benefit of mankind, for the establishment of governmental services, and for the education of youth, as well as for local institutions of a more specifically philanthropic character. It was he who initiated projects for establishing the city police in Philadelphia, for paving the city streets, and for improving their cleaning and lighting. He also was largely instrumental in establishing the circulating library in Philadelphia, which was the first in America; the city hospital, and the Academy for the Education of Youth which has since become the University of Pennsylvania. The eyesight of many is greatly assisted by Franklin's invention, the bifocal lens, and even after two centuries the Franklin stove remains a common object in our country places, supplying a cheery and efficient heat, with little expenditure of fuel and great ease of management.

As a scientist, Franklin was chiefly remarkable for his investigations and discoveries in the field of electricity, in which he not only worked out some important fundamental concepts, such as the relationship betwen lightning, static electricity, and electricity in its other forms and uses. His experiments, and the fascinating accounts of them in Peter Collinson's book, "Experiments and Observations on Electricity, Made at Philadelphia in America, by Mr. Benjamin Franklin," inspired immediate interest and emulation, and Benjamin Franklin was thenceforth admired and his company sought by the scientists and inventors of Europe and America.

Franklin's position as a statesman was high, even in that age of great philosophers of statecraft, and masters of eloquence and political practice. The combination of his quiet wisdom, wide renown, and humility of manner, made him deeply influential in the affairs of the American Colonies, and in the discussions and occurrences leading up to the Revolution. Even during his long residence in London, his opinions were looked to at long range, and despite the lapse of time necessary for communication at that period, as wisdom essential to the proper conduct of our affairs.

As a diplomat, Franklin was certainly one of the most outstanding successes the world has ever seen. Deeply loved in France by the philosophers and rulers, and equally by the common people, he swerved not an inch from loyal service to the interest of his country, and in a time of difficulty and tension within the French kingdom, he managed to maintain his position, and the position of the United States, as friend and ally to all. John Adams said of Franklin's reputation in France:

> His name was familiar to government and people * * * to such a degree that there was scarcely a peasant or a citizen, a valet de chambre, coachman, or footman, a lady's chambermaid, or a scullion in a kitchen who was not familiar with it, and who did not consider him as a friend to humankind. When they spoke of him, they seemed to think he was to restore the Golden Age.

When you mail or receive a letter, remember, it was Benjamin Franklin who inaugurated the postal service. When you reflect upon the fact that we live under a free and stable Government, remember, Benjamin Franklin was one of the chief influences in the Convention that built up our Constitution out of the interplay of forces of order and liberty. When you look back upon the young heroes and fire-eaters that inspired the American Revolution, remember the quiet thinker and epigrammatist who did as much as any to bring a powerful and self-sufficient country out of that conflict.

Needed: Good Stewardship of National Wealth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the President's budget message today again focuses the spotlight of national thinking upon our fiscal affairs.

The $92-plus billion budget prepared for 1963 represents, if adopted by the Congress, a whopping increase in expenditures.

As we recall, the proposed budget for fiscal 1962 was about $80 billion. According to best estimates, however, spending is running at a rate of about $89 billion—but still below the budget presented today.

In view of the skyrocketing Federal budgets, the Congress will want to take a microscopic look at the proposals and hold expenditures down to absolute essentials.

Overall, I believe that we, as a people, need to take a new look at the direction and purpose of all U.S. expenditures—both governmental and nongovernmental.

In such critical times, our Nation needs not only farsighted leadership in Government, but also a deep sense of citizen responsibility in directing and utilizing all our national wealth to best serve us individually, and as a nation.

Recently, I had an opportunity to comment in further detail on this aspect of our national spending. I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of these comments printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY URGES 1962 GOOD STEWARDSHIP OF NATIONAL WEALTH PROGRAM BY U.S. CITIZENS

Today, U.S. citizens earn and spend more money; live, eat, play, and work on higher standards; (a) than ever before in history; and (b) than any other people in the world.

In 1960, we, as a nation, had a gross national product of about $504 billion, and national income of $417 billion. (For 1961, the rates are higher: $540 billion GNP and $426 billion national income.)

Of U.S. annual income, about $80 billion plus are siphoned off for Federal taxes.

As taxpayers, we attempt to require, and rightly so, responsible handling of funds by Uncle Sam.

In these times of great national challenge, however, I believe it is equally necessary that we as citizens reevaluate our utilization or dissipation of our share of the Nation's resources.

In 1960 (the latest year for which complete statistics are available), general categories of expenditures (in round figures) were as follows:

[In billions of dollars]

Food	70.0
Household operations	45.0
Housing	42.0
Clothing, accessories, and jewelry	34.0
Transportation (private and public)	40.0

[In billions of dollars]

Medical care	20.0
Personal business (interest, insurance, etc.)	20.0
Recreation	20.0
Alcoholic beverages	10.0
Tobacco	7.0
Private education and research	4.5
Religious and welfare activities	4.6
Foreign travel	3.0

In our free Nation, every citizen, of course, has a right to spend income, without direction or accountability, to serve his own need, inclination, or goods.

As stewards of the resources of the richest nation in the world, however, we must ask ourselves: Are we using our resources for the best purposes? What changes can, or should be made for more effective utilization of our national wealth to better serve individual and national interests?

The American people and the Nation, I believe, could well benefit from a soul-searching analysis of our dollar-by-dollar spending programs. The purpose would be, as possible, to more effectively utilize annual income of U.S. citizens (which, incidentally, far exceeds in value the annual gross national product of any other nation in the world). If this were done, it would help to: (1) Benefit us individually; (2) enable citizens to assume a larger share of responsibility now generally shouldered by Uncle Sam; and (3) provide the Nation with greater strength in meeting the challenge of the times.

How We Got This Way—IX

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, the ninth—December 3—in the New York Daily News series of editorials "How We Got This Way" appears below:

HOW WE GOT THIS WAY—IX

As noted in an early editorial in this series on the political development of the United States, our Government has three branches—executive, legislative, and judicial—which are supposed to be coequal and to keep any one branch from getting too much power over the States and people.

The judicial branch heads up in the Supreme Court of the United States, and spreads down through a lot of lower Federal courts.

Our first Chief Justice was John Jay (1745–1829—served on the court 1789–95). Jay quit in disgust, because the Constitution does not clearly define or limit the Supreme Court's powers, and hence the Court in its early years was a weak and wobbly thing at best.

It remained for the fourth Chief Justice to put the Court on its feet and then some. This man was John Marshall, who was appointed in 1801 by President John Adams and served until his death in 1835.

Marshall was a Federalist—meaning a conservative and a strong believer in a powerful Central Government. As soon as he was elevated to the high bench, he set to work at persuading his colleagues to render decisions, at every opportunity, that would operate to strengthen the Federal Government.

COURT AND CONSTITUTION

Early in his judicial career (1803), Marshall engineered the decision in one of the most controversial cases in the Supreme Court's history—the celebrated suit known as *Marbury* v. *Madison*.

The Constitution does not say that the Supreme Court can order (mandamus) public officials to perform their duties. An early act of Congress tried to give the High Court that power. In *Marbury* v. *Madison*, Marshall held this act of Congress void, and said the Supreme Court can declare any congressional enactment unconstitutional.

The decision alarmed and enraged such liberal thinkers as Thomas Jefferson, who roared: "The Constitution, on this hypothesis, is a mere thing of wax in the hands of the judiciary which they may twist and shape into any form they please."

Marshall made his decision stick, though, and perhaps at that time it was just as well that he did. The United States was still weak, and still infested with persons who would have been only too happy to paralyze the Federal Government which the Constitution's framers had intended to make strong and well knit.

From *Marbury* v. *Madison*, Marshall went on to asserting for the Supreme Court the power to declare acts of State legislatures unconstitutional. Again, the Jeffersonians raged; but again the Marshall view prevailed.

The Supreme Court's power to rub out congressional and legislative enactments has been firmly established for generations, and is seldom questioned nowadays.

DON'T TRUST THIS COURT TOO BLINDLY

In fairness to the Supreme Court, it should be noted that it seldom uses this power; but when it does, a nationwide furor often follows.

Back in the 1930's, for example, the Supreme Court declared a string of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal measures unconstitutional. This enraged Roosevelt to the point of urging Congress to "stack" the court with enough additional pro-New Deal Justices to reverse the decisions of the then anti-New Deal majority.

Roosevelt lost that battle, but not without making the Supreme Court as unpopular as it ever has been.

Congress can still reverse the Court, by the Roosevelt method, by ordering the Court to keep its hands off a particular law, or getting three-fourths of the State legislatures to ratify an amendment reversing any given Supreme Court decision.

But these are difficult procedures at best. So it is a serious question whether Marshall's *Marbury* v. *Madison* decision was a good thing for the Nation in the long run, though it may been all right in the short.

Certain it is that the people and Congress cannot safely give this Court the abject unquestioning respect and reverence to which some judges and lawyers think it is entitled.

Do that, and before long we'd find ourselves slaves of the Court and hog-tied by a mass of judgemade law, many judges being as humanly ambitious as anybody else. A healthy skepticism about the Supreme Court looks like the best attitude any American can adopt and maintain toward this body of nine mortal and fallible men.

The Honorable John Riley

SPEECH

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the late beloved gentleman from South Carolina, JOHN RILEY. He was indeed a very fine gentleman—quiet and reserved—but a deep thinker. We served on the Appropriations Committee together for many years. He was a loyal public servant. Just to be left with the pleasant and cherished memories of JOHN RILEY, makes any man's life richer and fuller.

My deep heartfelt sympathy is extended to his good wife and children in their bereavement.

The Lengthening Shadow of Robert E. Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on January 14, the Friends of Stratford, were privileged to attend the annual meeting and tea of the Washington committee of the Robert E. Lee Memorial Foundation and hear an inspiring address on "The Lengthening Shadow of Robert E. Lee," by Mr. Lyon G. Tyler, Jr., the grandson of President John Tyler.

The meeting was held at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Hamilton Robinson, 2230 South Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Lyon Tyler is the assistant district attorney of Virginia and is now serving as assistant executive director of the Virginia Civil War Commission.

Because of the significance of this address in the current observance of the Civil War Centennial, I, under unanimous consent, include it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The address follows:

THE LENGTHENING SHADOW OF ROBERT E. LEE

(By Lyon G. Tyler, Jr.)

The Virginia Civil War Commission officially opened its observance of the Civil War Centennial last April with a reenactment of the acceptance by Robert E. Lee of the command of the military and naval forces of Virginia. In September we sponsored the publication "The Wartime Papers of R. E. Lee," a monumental work containing Lee's most important correspondence, orders, messages, and reports, with a connective narrative—a new style of historical work which may well set an important precedent. In the spring we will release a short film called "The Character of Lee," produced by the Virginia Department of Education, which will use Lee's own words to show what sort of a man he was to the young people in our schools.

On May 7 of last year, the board of directors of the Robert E. Lee Memorial Foundation marked the beginning of the Civil War Centennial with ceremonies at Stratford. On that pleasant occasion, Gen. Maxwell Taylor delivered a masterful summary of the qualities of military leadership possessed by Robert E. Lee. Your foundation also sponsored at Stratford last May an exhibit about the life of General Lee. The exhibit was called "The Lengthening Shadow of Robert E. Lee," a phrase which I would like to borrow as a title for my remarks this afternoon. For the life of this man Robert

E. Lee is relevant to the 20th century. His influence is still felt in this generation—and I believe that a knowledge of his character can affect our individual lives and perhaps the future of the world.

Robert E. Lee is one of our country's greatest heroes and we want to talk about some of the lessons and inspirations to be derived from the study of his life.

But first, a word about heroes. Heroes and hero worship, if you please, have a vital place in the training of those who would live in freedom. I say this although there is a school of historians who have assumed a dominant position in this century—who have rejected heroes. This group views history almost entirely in terms of waves and trends instead of in terms of individual moral choices.

Thousands of educators and sociologists have followed the same line by emphasizing adjustment to life as it is rather than stressing the importance of commitment to some great ideal. To see this trend in its horrifying fruition read the article in the December 23d edition of the Saturday Evening Post on the youth of America, the majority of whom seem to believe that nothing they do will make any difference. When historians of this persuasion consider the Civil War, they see it as the result of an inevitable configuration of uncontrollable processes, not as the result of individual moral failures. I do not believe that the Civil War was irrepressible—nor do I believe that in this present day either communism or freedom is inevitably destined to triumph. I believe that our victory or our defeat, in the final analysis, will depend upon the response which the American people make to the challenges of these restless times. This response will be determined by the leadership the country receives and by the motivations, determination and standards of our people by their knowledge of the world and of what is fundamental in life. I submit that the future of the world depends, above everything else, on what you and I do to influence that future.

Events do not happen solely because of the pressure of inexorable trends. Most events are caused to happen by the actions of men and I use the term to include both sexes of the human race. I firmly believe that a man can, at least to a limited extent, control his own destiny and I know that any man by his choice of conduct, can affect the destiny of countless others. If I believed otherwise, I would not consider the life of Lee to be worthy of my study or of yours. Nor would the life of any other great man of the past have meaning for us.

The concept of man as the prey of inevitable economic and social forces is straight from Karl Marx. This idea provides the philosophical foundation for communism and the tide of evil today sweeping across the globe. If we also use the same philosophy as the basis for our thinking, how can we possibly present the world a clear-cut answer to communism or a better solution of the problems of mankind.

America's greatness, however, was achieved by men who believed in the importance of individual moral responsibility. Americans today, more than ever before, must choose. The choice is narrow. We will accept some variety of Marxian totalitarianism—unless we take a forthright stand in behalf of the moral values of freedom. By this I do not mean that we should, in turning from the left, accept the arrogant nationalism of the right. For the far right, like the far left, also rejects the moral values upon which freedom depends for its survival, particularly the idea of trying to understand and work for the interests of all men everywhere.

Now I would like to present to you the character of Lee as a living example from the past of individual moral responsibility—a demonstration of the moral values of freedom in action.

Philip Van Doren Stern, in a foreword to a recent edition of the book, "My Father, General Lee," has written:

"America today is in urgent need of the antique virtues which were as natural to Robert E. Lee as they were to the leaders of the early Roman republic. The old and imperishable Roman virtues were: a sense of responsibility, self-control, and ability to face reality and see things as they are (the Latin word for this, oddly enough, is simplicitas), good will toward others and integrity so absolute that it can never be questioned. Implicit in these are courage, forthright honesty, and the willingness to take necessary risks. Our crassly materialistic, cynical, yet security-seeking people need these ancient virtues. With them a nation can be proud; without them it can have neither self-respect nor the respect of others. Nor can any amount of wealth or power or comfort and well-being take their place."

Let us first try to rid ourselves of several widely held misconceptions about Robert E. Lee.

Douglas Freeman relates the recollection of a little girl about a visit of General Lee. She said, "We had heard of God, but here was General Lee." I, too, was raised to regard General Lee as a god—as the noble defender of a sacred cause. But it is wrong, if we really want to understand him, to identify Robert E. Lee with the cause for which he fought. We even find it difficult today to judge with complete clarity what his cause was. Of course we know that Lee was not in sympathy with all the actions of the southern leaders. For example, he believed in the right of secession, but he certainly considered the exercise of that right an act of folly. He did believe that his first loyalty was to his State, and that his duty was to defend her from attack. His words, "Virginia is my country; her I will obey. I cannot raise my hand against my home, my children, my family."

The South, since the Civil War, has used the figure of Lee to represent its aspirations, and sometimes, I fear, its prejudices, and frequently it has deified Lee in an atmosphere of unreality. There is another side of the picture, however. Recently I was talking to a Negro educator who told me that this generation of his race had been brought up with a contempt for General Lee because they also identified him as the leader of the southern cause. And this cause, to the Negro, has often been interpreted as the cause of racial pride and unequal opportunity, which of course it was not—any more than it was absolutely perfection and nobility.

We must not view any man with emotional blinders on our eyes, and we cannot judge Lee strictly in terms of the side he joined. There was right and wrong in the background of the causes for which both North and South went forth to battle. We cannot, today, join the side for which Lee fought any more than we can the side against which he fought.

Indeed we can never live in the future by measuring the graves of our ancestors or by retracing their exact steps. The problems of our time have new dimensions; the questions are posed in different terms. But, though we cannot follow Lee by slavishly adopting the preconceptions and allegiances of another age, we can follow Lee by imitating the type of life which he lived and by understanding how he was able to live such a life.

Lee is no ethereal figure. He was subject to the temptations, the frustrations and the disappointments which afflict us all. He was not a man of phlegmatic disposition. We know he was a man of controlled audacity in battle. It was not a question of his having no temper. He had a good hot temper, but he usually controlled it. Only occasionally did his temper burst its bounds. Lee was not a man without any fear—he was a man who conquered fear. He surely must, at one time, have yearned for glory and material comfort, but in the final analysis, he overcame almost all desire for personal prestige and power. He suffered the pains of defeat, but he rose above them. He did not take refuge in resentment as so many do.

Appomattox was a crushing blow. It was not easy to go and see General Grant. "I would rather die a thousand deaths," he said. On this occasion Lee for a moment felt that life was no longer worth living. The thought of suicide flashed through his mind. "I have only to ride along the line (between the two armies) and all will be over." And then he thought, "But it is our duty to live," he said.

Lee was a sentimental man—he was nostalgic about the past. Once he wrote about Stratford:

"I vividly recall scenes of my earliest days. Though unseen for years, every feature of the house is familiar to me. In front of the house was a lawn of several hundred acres, adorned with cedars, oaks, and forest poplars. Again he was found there peering over the fence. "I am looking to see if the snowball trees are still there. I should have been sorry to miss them."

Lee was generally reserved and dignified—but he had an excellent sense of humor. He was not a storyteller like Abe Lincoln—but quick twinkles of wit came easily. He said of one of his daughters once:

"You know she is like here papa—always wanting something." And when they asked Lee what it was that he wanted, he said, "My tastes are of the simplest—a Virginia farm, no end of cream and fresh butter and fried chicken—not one fried chicken or two, but unlimited fried chicken."

Many years later, Lee had occasion to remark on the number of young men who were attending church. The minister had a pretty daughter named Grace. Lee commented:

"I think the attraction is not so much the minister's eloquence as it is his Grace."

Lee's humor was never mean. The humorous to most of us is that which tears other people down—so that we can feel bigger. But not to Lee. He could deflate the stuffed shirt—but it was said that Lee almost never spoke disparagingly of anyone, and when someone else did this, Lee usually recalled some trait of excellence in the absent one.

Gen. Joseph E. Johnston wrote: "Lee was full of sympathy and kindness, genial and fond of gay conversation and even of fun; that made him the most agreeable of companions."

Four months before Gettysburg, Lee wrote to one of his sons; "If my pants are done, will you give them to Mr. Thomas, the bearer, who will bring them up tomorrow? If they are not, keep them. I am on my last pair and very sensitive, fearful of an accident."

As President of Washington College, Lee once said, "We do not want our students to injure their health studying, but we want them to come as near to it as is possible to miss."

This then, was a real man, not a demigod. A man with human drives and emotions. But Lee was not just an ordinary man. He was a great man, and he was great because he placed his human drives and emotions in subordination to the goals of his life.

Lee was not perfect—it may be said that he lacked many things. He was not particularly interested in art or culture. He was not especially well-versed in literature and language. Perhaps he was lacking in intellectual curiosity about the natural sciences and the world about him. Perhaps his vision was not, at least viewed from our perspective, as broad as it might have been. Perhaps he should never have been a soldier in the first place. Perhaps he should have been a statesman or a religious leader, or perhaps he should earlier have directed his efforts toward education, where he did so

much in the few years after the Civil War. Yet, Lee, in spite of any possible shortcomings, stands above nearly all of the other figures of his age—on a level with the greatest men of history.

Lee was one of the most skillful commanders in military history, but he lost the war to which he gave himself. So it is not his greatness as a military leader on which I wish to dwell, but his greatness as a man. Lee was a great man because he won a victory greater than the one he would have won had the South won the war. He won a victory in the human heart. The influence of Robert E. Lee helped to create a new, united nation from the ruins of the old divided one.

One hundred years after the Civil War his example shines before us as a beacon in a confused and dangerous world.

Think of it a minute. How many generals were there in the Civil War who were free of pride, jealousy, and envy of others? How many generals refused to blame others or think of excuses for their defeats and failures? Not many, I assure you.

The history books are full of incidents of pettiness and meanness and vainglory. But remember what Lee said at Gettysburg after Pickett's charge had failed and the battle was lost. "This has been my fight and upon my shoulders rests the blame." "All this has been my fault—it is I that have lost this fight, and you must help me out of it the best way you can." What other general in history ever said a thing like that?

Most of us are what I would call reactors—not nuclear reactors—but emotional reactors. When someone opposes us we hate him. When someone mistreats or slights us we get mad. We want to get even—to justify ourselves at all costs. So we live our whole lives on the basis of the way people treat us. But Lee could "not only forgive"—he could "forget." How? Because he had set himself a course to follow which lifted him above resentment. Most of us have set some kind of a course for ourselves, but we usually have the wrong goal in view. We want to be well thought of—to be popular. We want to be seen at the right places with the right people. We want money, power, prestige, social recognition, success. This is the total end in life for most people. We are slaves to our emotions—to our jealousies or fears—or we are slaves to our greed and selfishness * * * though we rationalize so well that we can even fool ourselves about the real motives which govern us.

But Lee was not such a slave—he was a man largely without hate, without fear and without pride, greed, or selfish ambition.

How did he do it?

Let me read you what the Massachusetts historian, Gamaliel Bradford, says about Robert E. Lee in "Lee the American."

"And we are only told that General Lee was emphatically a man of prayer. He was accustomed to pray in his family and to have his seasons of secret prayer which he allowed nothing else—however pressing—to interrupt." And again, "I shall never forget the emphasis with which he grasped my hand as, with a voice and eye that betrayed deep emotion, he assured me that it (knowledge of prayer) was not only his comfort, but his only comfort, and declared the simple and absolute trust that he had in God and God alone." So I thing we may conclude that the cardinal fact of Lee's life was God. It has been said that Spinoza was God-intoxicated. It would be indecorous to speak of Lee as intoxicated with anything. But everywhere and always he had God in his heart, not so much the God of power, or the God of justice, or even the God of beauty, but the God of love, tempering the austerity of virtue, sweetening the bitterness of failure, above all, breathing loving kindness into the intolerable hell of war. There have been fierce saints who were fighters. There have been gentle saints who were martyrs. It is rare to find a soldier making war—stern war—with the pity, the tenderness, the sympathy of a true follower of Christ.

America desperately needs such men today.

Abraham Lincoln said in a proclamation which he issued during the Civil War: "We have forgotten God." This is no less true today. We are a Nation of churchgoers and contributors to worthy causes. We have a profusion of rituals and formulas. We have a heightened output of theological disputation. But how many people have a relationship with God to match that of Robert E. Lee?

Robert E. Lee was able to love people, even his enemies, and to be serene and positive under painful, difficult, and dangerous circumstances because he tried to live by God's will, not his own. This is a most difficult process, but Lee knew what Brother Lawrence, a medieval scholar, said so well; "God is within you, seek him not elsewhere."

Lee's religion was not a matter of theological speculation, nor of blind obedience to complicated articles of faith. With him it was not a question of dogmas or of ritualistic formulas. His religion was completely practical. It was a way of living.

Robert E. Lee lived by a moral code—but it was not a code of rules. His code of behavior was a continuous process of trying to live by the attitudes and qualities which he believed were in keeping with the concept of the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God. He tried to reflect these qualities in his life: love, honesty, humility, courage, personal responsibility, and self-control. These are the qualities which today are all that sustain the cause of freedom—and that is why they are so important. Lee cared about other people—his men, his family, and all others—particularly children. He gave to other people that which is the most important aspect of love—understanding. As Bradford puts it: "No one could have had his tender sympathy of human weakness, who had not known human weakness himself." This is not said to detract from the character of Lee. All of us have human weaknesses—but few of us admit them—even to ourselves. Lee never looked on himself as a model of perfection—although this is what he tried to be and in comparison with most men, that is indeed what Lee was.

Douglas Freeman writes in "Lee of Virginia":

"It probably was during this brief visit to Alexandria that a young mother brought her child to Lee and asked him to bless it. The general took in his arms the infant that personified, in a sense, the South that he and other devoted men were trying to rebuild from the ashes of war. Lee looked affectionately at the child, murmured perhaps a few words of blessing and returned the infant to its mother. 'Madam,' said he, 'teach him that he must deny himself.' That was his message to a new generation in the South."

This was a repetition of Christ's comandment, "If any man would come after Me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow Me."

Many people don't understand what this means, but it is the key to the life of Robert E. Lee. He denied himself. I don't mean that he punished himself—or that he purposely made himself miserable.

This denying one's self is a far different thing from doing without certain comforts and pleasures during certain seasons of the year. Denying one's self means committing one's self to the service of a great idea. It means living for something bigger than self. Lee always attempted to live for his God and his country, as he saw it, not for his own personal ends.

If Americans of today do not follow in his footsteps, we are doomed to lose the world—for the enemy is too strong and too dedicated—to be overcome by a people who profess one thing, yet live another.

I believe that the "Lengthening Shadow of Robert E. Lee" will play a part in the events of this century, for as it was said in the famous memorial oration of Pericles (the leader of Athens in her golden age):

"The whole earth is the sepulchre of famous men; and their story is not graven only on stone over their native earth, but lives on far away, without visible symbol, woven into the stuff of other men's lives."

Louis C. Rabaut

SPEECH

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in the recent death of LOUIS C. RABAUT, the House of Representatives lost a wise and dedicated Member, and many of us who have served long years with him feel that we have just lost a dear friend. LOUIS RABAUT's excellences were not of the flamboyant and spectacular kind. His manner of speech was characterized by gruff practicality rather than by smoothness or eloquence. Most of his work in Congress was silent, grinding work in committee, on the vital but unglamorous matter of the expenditure of funds.

LOUIS RABAUT had served in the House since the 74th Congress, being reelected to each succeeding Congress except the 80th. During the 25 years of his service, he won the respect and gratitude of each Member who had an opportunity to work with him in the Appropriations Committee, or to observe the care and fairness with which he approached his decisions.

It is gratifying that the record of a man of such high moral qualities is marked by his memorable achievement of the sponsorship of the bill adding the phrase, "under God" to the Pledge of Allegiance. To his credit, also, is the bill he sponsored, by which the phrase "Pray for Peace" is used in our post office cancellations.

In his official life as a legislator, and in his private life as a family man, LOUIS RABAUT was a person of warmly human sympathies, and of strong religious feeling. It has long been well known that, in his position as chairman of the Subcommittee on District Affairs of the House Appropriations Committee, Mr. RABAUT could be counted upon to support projects looking to the welfare of the sick, the poor, or children, so long as the need was soundly demonstrated, and the means of meeting it shown to be efficient. His concern for the needs and the education of children is reflected also in the family life he shared with his wife, the former Stella M. Petz, and their nine children. The depth of religious feeling the two instilled in their children is indicated by the fact that one of their three sons is a priest, Father Francis Dermott, S.J., and three of their six daughters

nuns, in the order of the Immaculate Heart of Mary; Sister Mary Palmyre, Sister Stella Maris, and Sister Martha Marie. Similarly, their depth of family feeling is reflected in the fact that their married children have presented Mr. and Mrs. Rabaut with the glorious total of 25 grandchildren—a fact of which LOUIS RABAUT used often to boast. He will long be held in grateful remembrance by those who appreciate how well he served God, his country, and his fellow man.

How We Got This Way—XI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, the 11th in the New York Daily News series of editorials "How We Got This Way"—published December 17—is presented below:

HOW WE GOT THIS WAY—XI

In 1870, John D. Rockefeller I, his brother William, Stephen V. Harkness, and several others organized Standard Oil Co.

Within 10 years, this concern was rapidly gaining a monopoly on all the petroleum business in the United States. Also, it was inspiring industrialists and businessmen in other fields to form similar big combines or single trusts.

A successful trust—and Standard Oil was eminently successful—could control production of whatever goods it processed or sold. Thereby, it could keep prices unreasonably high. This in turn would slow down creation of new jobs and more real wealth in a country whose population was fast increasing.

The trust, or cartel, idea didn't work too badly in Europe; but in the 1880–90 decade, most Americans came to realize that trusts could not be permanently tolerated here if this enormous Nation were to get all the good it could out of its huge natural resources and its growing stocks of brain and muscle power.

This realization led to the enactment of the most important and beneficial group of laws in the economic area that Congress has ever yet put on the Federal statute books.

THE SHERMAN LAW AGAINST TRUSTS

On July 2, 1890, the Sherman antitrust law got through Congress. It had been sponsored by, and was named after Senator John Sherman, Republican, of Ohio, a younger brother of Civil War Gen. William T. Sherman and an able statesman in his own right.

The Sherman Act flatly outlawed "every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States or with foreign nations."

It was loosely put together, and at first it was pretty largely ignored by the U.S. Department of Justice, whose duty it was (and is) to prosecute violators of this and other Federal laws.

The Supreme Court had a field day with the Sherman Act. In one decision, it held that the new law applied to labor organizations as well as to combinations of capital. In another, the Court held that the word "every" in the Sherman Act meant just that, and was not to be loosely interpreted.

President Theodore Roosevelt (served 1901–09) made a name for himself as a trust-buster. His successor, William Howard Taft, was accused of letting the Sherman Act pretty much lapse during his single term in office.

When Woodrow Wilson took over the White House in 1913, his fellow Democrats made a great to-do about reviving the antitrust agitations. One result of this renewed activity was the Clayton antitrust law (Oct. 15, 1914), which sought to tighten and clarify the original Sherman Act. The new law was sponsored by Representative Henry De Lamar Clayton, Democrat, of Alabama. Of this, more below.

COMPETE OR SINK

The most important Sherman Act amendment since Clayton's has been the Webb-Pomerene Act (April 10, 1918), aimed at encouraging export trade by exempting export associations from the antitrust laws.

Down the years since 1890, our antitrust statutes have had their ups and downs. They have been evaded, cheated, or overenforced from time to time.

But their overall effect has been far more healthy than unhealthy.

What they do is to compel competition in this country. Competition in turn compels industry and business to improve and diversify their products all the time, as the price of survival; and it prevents any one company or group of companies from getting a stranglehold on prices.

Without these much debated and, in some quarters, cordially hated laws, the United States could not have become the great and prosperous Nation that it is today.

What's the future of the antitrust legislation?

In the last 25 years, labor unions have become as powerful in some areas as the trusts ever were. James R. Hoffa and Walter P. Reuther are a couple of outstanding current examples of the monopolistic labor leader.

The abovementioned Clayton Act of 1914 expressly exempted labor organizations from liability under the antitrust laws. It may be that the next important amendment of the Sherman Act will be one bringing organized labor back under that law, where the Supreme Court once said it was and should be.

In Memory of Representative Louis C. Rabaut, Who Pledged Our Faith in "One Nation Under God, Indivisible"

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, when the name of LOUIS C. RABAUT was called, there was no answer.

His familiar face and voice have vanished from this national forum where he served the people of the 14th Michigan District and the people of the 50 States for a quarter of a century.

From the mid-1930's until 1961, with the exception of the years 1946–47, he participated in the shaping of legislation that lifted the United States from a demoralizing depression to its present position as the powerful and responsible leader of the free world.

The older Members of this House have seen many colleagues come and go. Some were with us such a brief time before the fortunes of politics or the accidents of life took them from us that our memory of them dims.

Others, with that extra quality of the born legislator that their constituents appreciate, are endorsed again and again by the folks back home.

They are the veterans who carry forward the traditions and the standards of this House.

LOUIS RABAUT was one of these dependable men.

Above and beyond his ability, and his experience as a member of the Appropriations Committee, was the faith that illuminated and inspired his every thought and action.

His special interest was the Foreign Service of the United States, and he made many official trips to inspect and study the work of our diplomatic and consular representatives abroad. He knew that the future of freedom itself would succeed or fail in ratio to our respect, understanding, and assistance to the legitimate objectives of other national communities.

In his personal life, he was an exemplary husband and father, and a devout communicant of his church.

LOUIS RABAUT was proud of his American heritage.

He saw that the great human values liberated in our open society were guided from the beginning by the American people's reverence for their Divine Creator.

That is why our departed colleague had immortal confidence in freemen and in their future.

As the author of the amendment inserting the words "under God" in the "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America," he made us aware, as never before, that our rights and responsibilities and aspirations must work together in living testament to the Father of us all.

By his achievements as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, our late colleague and friend LOUIS C. RABAUT encouraged and strengthened us to meet the obligations ahead.

His presence is gone, but his spirit will be ever with us.

In Memoriam of Dr. Thomas Dooley on the Anniversary of His Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, today is the first anniversary of the death of Dr. Tom Dooley, the story of whose life and sacrifice is one of the finest chapters in our Nation's history. Anyone who might doubt that this generation is equal to the challenge of our times will do well to read the work of James Monahan, "Before I Sleep: the Last Days of Dr. Dooley." The proceeds from this work have been signed to Medico, Inc., for the continuation and support of the

work to which Tom Dooley devoted the last years of his life. The requiescat from that work describes the sermon of Father George Gottwald and his quotation from Robert Frost's poem entitled "Stopping by Woods on a Snowy Evening," which Tom had loved and lived by:

The woods are lovely, dark and deep,
But I have promises to keep,
And miles to go before I sleep.

The promises of Dr. Dooley are fulfilled, said Father Gottwald. Dr. Dooley fulfilled his promise—we have one to make and keep. This Nation has the capacity to bring better health and hope for survival to the diseased, the impoverished and unsheltered of any land which joins us in the cause of freedom.

Call to Active Duty of the Reserves and National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. ASHMORE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, since much publicity has been given to those members of the Reserves and National Guard who were dissatisfied with their recent call to active duty, I think it most appropriate that my colleagues and the public in general be given the benefit of the feeling and spirit expressed in a recent letter to the President of the United States. This letter was signed by 35 noncommissioned officers of the 111th Signal—L.B.—Company of Greenville, S.C., now serving at Fort Benning, Ga.

With a deep feeling of satisfaction and pride, I include a copy of this letter as representing the high patriotism of my constituents:

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Infused with the gay spirits and glowing lights of this Christmas season, the light of freedom shines throughout our Nation and many parts of the world. This is true because Americans have sacrificed on many occasions in order to refill the oil in the glimmering lamp of freedom. This oil has been replenished because Americans revere freedom; it is the basic principle on which our Nation is founded.

However, during the past several weeks—during the present Berlin crisis especially—many of our citizens have turned their backs on the American way of life; they have shirked their American responsibility by developing, or conceding to, the idea that the sacrifice for freedom in Berlin, and the world, is greater than the reward. The undersigned members of the 111th Signal (L. B.) Company of Greenville, S.C., now serving actively at Fort Benning, Ga., wish to express their faith in American-type freedom; we desire it for all people everywhere and proudly make our sacrifices that this may become a reality. We are amazed, somewhat horrified, that many so-called loyal Americans have deluged the national mail and press media with complaints concerning sons, husbands, relatives, and friends who have been called to active duty.

Freedom has been preserved because our forefathers sacrificed; if the rays of freedom are to continue to fall upon the world, we, in the present day, must render our sacrifices just as our forebears did at Bunker Hill, Valley Forge, Pearl Harbor, Heartbreak Ridge, and many other places. These bold citizens faced truth in the real American tradition; their "blood, sweat, and tears" acted as oil in the lamp of freedom and helped to keep it aglow in the world.

Today, freedom's call is once more being heard, and we as citizen soldiers feel confident that she can rest well for America is awake. We call on our fellow Americans to stop this shedding of tears due to sacrifice; these tears should flow into the lamp of freedom to give strength to its glimmering light. Americans should shoulder this burden with pride and face the present challenge as a unified force. By doing so—when civilians share the burden—the load on those called to active duty will be lightened.

We call on Americans to about-face and lift the lamp of freedom to infinite heights so that its splendor will shine as never before.

Manned Bombers Still No. 1 U.S. Punch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, a B-52H jet bomber of the Strategic Air Command last week demonstrated that it remains this Nation's best and most ready long-range manned aircraft.

The B-52H and its crew set 11 new world records in a 12,519-mile nonstop journey from Kadena Airbase in Okinawa to Torrejon Airbase near Madrid, Spain. Out of the drama and excitement of this Air Force mission we see clearly illustrated the significance which the manned bomber continues to play in the deterrence of war.

The following editorial published in the Kansas City Star recently also emphasizes the importance of the manned bomber in our defense system:

MANNED BOMBERS STILL NO. 1 U.S. PUNCH

Missiles, the glamour weapons of today, still have a secondary role compared with bombers in U.S. defense. This fact is easily overlooked amid all the attention and emphasis given space weapons. Manned aircraft remain the No. 1 element in this country's striking power.

The importance of long-range bombers has just been dramatized by a record-smashing nonstop flight. This B-52H superbomber covered a distance of 12,519 miles between Okinawa and Madrid without refueling. This latest version of the B-52 will have a twofold capability. In addition to a normal load of nuclear bombs, it will carry four Skybolt ballistic missiles with a range beyond the plane's own flight of at least 1,000 miles. These new two-stage rockets are not yet operational.

A less advanced missile, the Hound Dog, can presently be launched from the B-52G against targets 500 miles away. What this means is that two models of the B-52 have been converted into airborne missile platforms. There are limits to the range of ballistic missiles fired from surface launching pads. But a B-52 can extend these limits so that nuclear warheads can be delivered to any spot on the face of the earth. A bomber flying across Communist territory would be exposed to ground antiaircraft fire. But a B-52 could cut loose its rockets while flying several hundred miles outside enemy territory.

In his state-of-the-Union message, President Kennedy cited a 50-percent increase in the number of nuclear bombers standing ready to take off on 15 minutes' notice. This country now has about 1,500 such bombers.

By contrast, the United States now has in place only 45 Atlas ICBM's and 6 Polaris submarines, each armed with 16 missiles. This means a total of 141 missiles classed as operational. The number will increase this year. The big boost will come in the form of 50 solid-fuel combat-ready Minutemen—the first of 600 in protected underground emplacements.

The United States will place increasingly greater reliance on long-range missiles during the next 3 years. The buildup of the Minuteman force and the Polaris fleet will multiply the present firepower capabilities for rockets. Also scheduled for development is a new midrange ballistic missile to be fired from trucks, railroad cars, or barges. This would be particularly effective from such oversea bases as West Germany and Okinawa.

Manned bombers, however, are expected to have an important war-deterring role for years to come. Right now, and for at least the next 3 or 4 years, these versatile aircraft will continue to overshadow missiles in military significance. They are the main reliance of the free world.

Veterans Day Dinner Sponsored by Barracks No. 2191, Veterans of World War I of the United States of America, Scranton, Pa., November 11, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the first Veterans Day dinner in the history of Scranton Barracks No. 2191, Veterans of World War I of the United States of America, was held November 11, 1961, at the Koch-Conley American Legion Post in Scranton, Pa.

During the interesting program it was my privilege to deliver the following address:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE VETERANS DAY DINNER SPONSORED BY BARRACKS NO. 2191, VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, INC., SCRANTON, PA., ON NOVEMBER 11, 1961

It is a great pleasure to join with the members of Scranton Barracks No. 2191, Veterans of World War I of the United States of America, Inc., at their first dinner to be held on November 11.

It is also pleasing to observe that Scranton Barracks has invited all veterans, their wives and friends, to join in commemorating Veterans Day, an occasion on which every American is inclined to feel a little more humble and at the same time more conscious of the debt owed to those who have defended Old Glory in every war in which this Nation has been engaged.

The traditions surrounding Veterans Day; namely, pride in American courage in

battle and the search for peace through strength, are accorded high standing in virtually every American home.

Personally, I revere these traditions with such fervor that the honor of addressing you on this occasion is one that impresses and inspires me.

Those of us who are veterans of World War I are well aware of the relationship between this occasion and that great conflict.

Veterans Day was established by Congress in 1954, to take the place of Armistice Day, an outgrowth of World War I.

The establishment of Veterans' Day does not mean that the current American generation is inclined to belittle the importance of World War I.

On the contrary, Americans continue to respect and to honor the gallant American Expeditionary Forces of 1917–18 affectionately referred to as the AEF.

What has been done is merely to recognize that the armistice on November 11, 1918, terminating World War I, the so-called war to end all wars, turned out to be something else again.

It developed that instead of ending international conflict, the 1918 armistice had merely restrained the aggressor nations for that moment, and that moment alone.

In the brief 16-year history of the Armistice Day celebration—from its inception in 1938, until its demise in 1954, we as a people, were required to send off our sons to participate in two more grueling global conflicts: World War II and the so-called Korean police action.

For this reason, we came to see that the hopeful significance of Armistice Day was lost.

We therefore sought to establish a new symbol, Veterans' Day upon which we placed renewed hope, that peace through strength might be established, once and for all.

But let us return, for a moment, to the spirit of Armistice Day, since that after all, is the basis of the Veterans' Day tradition.

I would like to point out that much of the Armistice Day spirit lives on under the banner of Veterans' Day.

All that has happened is that names such as Belleau Wood, the Marne, and Flanders Field, are now combined with other names, equally as glorious, such as Corregidor, Okinawa, Anzio, and Pork Chop Hill.

So far as individual glory is concerned, nothing shall ever detract from the luster of those who turned the tide in France in 1918.

Wars may come and wars may go, but that event, the rout of the mighty German Army by raw American troops, shall stand forever as one of the most remarkable achievements in military history.

In this regard, as you know, there is determination in the effort to increase congressional interest in the proposal to pension the heroes of that occasion, the veterans of World War I.

As a Member of Congress who has spearheaded the effort to secure approval of World War I pension legislation, it is my intention to continue my efforts to achieve our goal.

On each observance of November 11 World War I veterans recall their service in that great conflict.

Yet, aside from the courage displayed, what must we remember as the foremost features of World War I?

What, in fact, was the legacy it left to mankind?

In the military sense, World War I produced numerous mechanical and technological innovations.

Aerial bombardment for one, poison gas for another, tank warfare, and above all, the machinegun.

These were deadly military developments, all of which appeared, for the moment, certain to turn the tide of battle in favor of one side or the other.

As it ultimately worked out, however, none of these developments proved a crucial addition to the fighting capacity of either side.

In the final analysis it was plain old manpower, personal heroism, and spiritual strength that decided the issue.

So it has been since the dawn of history.

Over and over again, military innovations have appeared upon the scene to frighten and flabbergast the enemy of those who possess them.

Yet what have they amounted to in the long run?

In general, it is safe to say, that they have provided no more than a temporary advantage.

For faced with new weapons of destruction, the freedom-loving people of the world have constantly effected countermeasures to equalize the military situation, thereby enabling themselves to go on to victory, on the strength of moral principle.

Notice, if you will, what has happened to the great military aggressors of the past.

How do they stand in the world today, or in the eyes of history?

And what did they achieve as the result of their military innovations?

The Bible makes mention of the Hittites, a fierce tribe of desert fighters operating out of Turkey.

Egyptian records tell of them also, describing their entrance into Egypt upon armored chariots, riding down the Egyptian forces, who knew nothing of chariots or how to cope with them.

What else do we know of the Hittites?

Well, their rulers wrote autobiographies, which our scholars have read.

They tell of only one thing: military conquest.

By 200 B.C. however, at the height of the Egyptian empire, the Hittites were no more.

To them goes one honor, if you would call it that.

They introduced the war chariot.

No music, no statesmanship, no art.

Just chariots.

In the end it was the Egyptians who rose to power, and the Hittites who passed, unhonored, from the political and social scene.

When Athens and Sparta, the Greek city-states came into existence, the first to attract the notice of the world was Sparta, founded upon military might.

Yet all we know of Sparta today is what we are told by the Athenians, whom Sparta defeated in battle.

Militarily strong, the Spartans showed strength in no other respect, and consequently lost their power about as rapidly as they secured it in the first place.

What the freedom-loving nations of the world were finding out was that they too could utilize the machinery of war, the same as their aggressive neighbor states.

Until then, regardless of their talents, they were powerless to defend themselves.

Knowledge breeds knowledge, however, and through the study of literature, science, and religion, the freedom-loving peoples of the world were able to conceive means by which to defend themselves.

This, then, was the answer to the military aggressors: that for every diabolical weapon they conceived, their enemies could conceive a counterweapon or a practical means of defense.

When Rome perfected army organization, and thereby was able to subjugate all of southern Europe, her enemies were for a time at a loss to cope with the situation.

But then came the era of the battleax, the atomic bomb of its day.

Mastering its use the barbarians of central Europe fell upon the Roman legions, drove them back to the confines of Rome and ultimately overran them.

To offset the battleax the longbow was invented.

To overcome the longbow gunpowder was invented, and so on, each invention more terrible than its predecessor.

With the passage of time the machines of war have improved so much as to revolutionize military thinking and even, to a certain extent, the thinking of everyone.

Our own Civil War for instance saw the end of one military era and the beginning of another.

In this war you will recall, the "stand up and fight" method was employed by both sides in the early battles, with comparative safety.

At that point the soldiers involved were armed with muskets, unable to hit anything with accuracy beyond a comparatively close distance.

But midway in the war the rifle appeared, aim was perfected, and the death toll tripled overnight.

It was then that the "stand up and fight" method disappeared forever from infantry procedure.

In World War I the machinegun surpassed the rifle for the moment, as a means of defensive warfare, until both sides learned to deal with it in a less direct manner.

In World War II the people of England were subjected to the horror of constant bombing, until at last, with American aid, the Luftwaffe was driven from the British skies.

Yet in all these instances, there was a moment, and sometimes a dreadfully long moment, when the freedom-loving people involved were required to undergo untold sacrifice, until at last they were delivered from the jaws of aggression.

In the meantime they were required to hang on in the hope of success—with all the signs pointing to failure.

It is in this respect in which the cause of freedom holds an everlasting advantage, one that is yet to be overcome by any military innovation yet conceived.

It is the knowledge that every assault on freedom is a step in the direction of corruption, that to be free and to promote the freedom of others, is to defy corruption.

On this knowledge our Nation was founded almost two centuries ago.

On this knowledge it has flourished ever since.

Specifically, it was this knowledge that brought us here today to honor the men who, in the name of freedom, marched to the cannon's mouth, never to return.

In this regard it is perfectly clear how we, as veterans, can best uphold the traditions for which the fighting men of America have risked and so often, given their lives.

Ours is the responsibility of promoting the cause of loyalty to American traditions, of hailing American achievement, proclaiming our love and respect for American goals.

In discharging our responsibility we will receive the full-fledged support of the great mass of the American people who agree with this point of view.

Leadership, however, is needed and I can think of no group of men in this Nation more suitable to the task of leadership than yourselves.

As veterans of one of the greatest military undertakings in American history you faced the danger and discomfort of military life to insure the safety of our cherished principles.

Now, no less than in 1917–18 those principles need protection, and who, more than yourselves, knows how to provide protection of this nature?

In the face of Communist propaganda we must respond with proof to the world that our concept of liberty and freedom is more than just a kind of political ballyhoo.

It is shocking to listen to the repeated declarations of the so-called neutral nations, suggesting that the cold war is merely a

struggle between two big bruisers of equally wicked nature.

Apparently they regard the cold war struggle as something they can view from above, as if riding in an aerial balloon.

Yet we know well enough that many who have sought to remain above the struggle, have ultimately fallen beneath it, and we therefore must somehow, in some way, convey this message to the so-called neutral nations.

One way is to make clear the fact that Americans stand united in their deep faith in God and in their respect for the human dignity of mankind—that regardless of politics, of race, color, or national origin, we are a unit in approving the ideals expressed in the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence.

Have no doubt the world will know that we feel this way if only we speak out.

I have heard it cynically remarked, that while the whole world is watching the United States, the United States is watching television.

This, of course, is a gross overstatement.

Yet in fact the whole world is watching us, and whenever we express ourselves in chorus, the whole world knows at once how we feel, and proceeds to act accordingly.

An outstanding feature of the Communist creed is that of loyalty to their peculiar designs.

That is a fact and we must give the devil his due.

Under the circumstances, is it safe for us to underplay our own source of loyalty to our own set of principles?

What sort of picture would we present in the eyes of our Western allies, not to mention the so-called neutrals of the world, if we allowed the Communists to beat their drum with vigor, while we stood idly by taking our nationalism for granted?

Would that not suggest to them that we were listless and indifferent?

Would it not lead them to conclude that the Communists were more alive to the moment, and therefore, more worthy of cooperation?

Not, of course, if the neutrals recognized the basic fallacy of communism in contrast to the basic wisdom of the American concept of liberty and freedom.

But many of the neutral nations have not yet arrived at these realizations and it is therefore necessary to appeal to them constantly, in terms they do understand.

One of these terms unquestionably, is a vocal patriotism on our part, as a portrayal of American faith in American institutions.

To my way of thinking Veterans Day stands forth as a symbol of American zeal, of American love for principle, and for that reason is deserving of the utmost attention.

For that reason it is a pleasure to come to Scranton and to have been able to join you in expressing respect for American heroes of all our country's wars.

Their deeds shall live forever in the American heart, their faith shall stand forever as the basis, the foundation, and the fulfillment of the great American dream, "One Nation under God, indivisible with liberty and justice to all."

The Late Honorable John J. Riley

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly saddened to learn of the death of my good friend, the gentleman from South Carolina, JOHN J. RILEY. Ever since he first came to Congress we seemed to hit it off together, and when he served on the Banking and Currency Committee we became close friends. He was one of the greatest men I have known, quiet but extremely sound and patriotic. I shall miss him and extend my deepest sympathy to his loved ones.

How We Got This Way—XII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, the following is the 12th and last in the series "How We Got This Way." I appreciate the opportunity to bring these thoughtful and timely editorials to the attention of all who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the New York Daily News for permission to reproduce its series of editorials:

HOW WE GOT THIS WAY—XII

The preceding 11 editorials in this series on the political development of the United States have dealt with domestic affairs—the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and its 23 amendments, nullification and secession, the influence of the Supreme Court, and so on.

In this concluding piece, we'll discuss the two chief principles on which U.S. foreign policy was based at the outset of the Republic and for generations thereafter.

It was agreed by most Americans at the time of the Constitution's adoption (1789) that (1) the United States should be friendly toward all other nations, but should enter into entangling alliances with none; and (2) other nations should conquer and colonize no more areas in the Western Hemisphere.

The first of these principles was known as isolationism.

The second had no name until 1823. In that year, President James Monroe's administration was badly worried by two threats to freedom in the Western Hemisphere.

For one, czarist Russia, which had held Alaska since 1741, was now planting little colonies as far south as present-day northern California, and claimed the whole Pacific coast virtually down to what is now the United States-Canada border.

For another, it looked as if the Holy Alliance (Austria, Prussia, Russia) intended to back Spain and Portugal in an effort to smash the new independent governments which, beginning in 1806, had been replacing Spanish and Portuguese rule in large parts of Latin America.

MONROE'S LARGE "KEEP OFF" SIGN

President Monroe, with an important assist from Secretary of State John Quincy Adams, stated the Monroe Doctrine in a message to Congress dated December 2, 1823. It was a fairly long message; but the gist of it was expressed in a few words:

"The occasion has been judged proper for asserting, as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers."

This blunt declaration stirred up considerable fury on the European continent (Britain favored the Monroe Doctrine); but what counted was that it got the desired results.

Republics multiplied in Latin America. Russia gradually retreated to Alaska (which the United States bought in 1867). France set up its puppet "Emperor" Maximilian in Mexico while the United States was in the convulsions of its Civil War; but a show of military force on our Mexican border soon after the war caused France to desert Maximilian, who was promptly executed by the Mexicans.

What made the Monroe Doctrine work was the worldwide knowledge that the United States would fight if necessary to make it stick.

BOTH DOCTRINES DEAD, OR ASLEEP?

In the 20th century, both of these basic foreign-policy principles with which the United States started out have been gravely if not fatally weakened.

President Woodrow Wilson dealt isolationism a body blow when, in 1917, he dragged the Nation into the then latest of Europe's family fights—which thereupon turned into World War I.

Since that time, the United States has been up to its neck in the disputes, fights, and even internal affairs of innumerable other countries.

On January 1, 1959, a bearded bandit named Fidel Castro became dictator of Cuba, and at once went to work to turn the big island into a Communist fortress.

Castro's communism (which he later admitted and bragged about) was obvious within 6 months after he came to power. What had happened was that Soviet Russia, using Castro as a puppet, had invaded the Western Hemisphere and set up a colony there, with the intention of spreading its empire throughout Latin America preparatory to toppling the United States itself. N. S. Khrushchev declared the Monroe Doctrine dead.

Up to now, there has been one halfhearted and badly planned U.S. attempt to promote an invasion of Cuba and choke off this plain violation of the doctrine. It remains to be seen whether that doctrine is really dead, or whether it is only sleeping.

Each Person Is Custodian of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech by Lynn Rittenoure, of Wichita, Kans., who is a freshman at Kansas State University. Mr. Rittenoure was the winner of the 21st annual Larry Woods Speech Contest at Kansas State University. His subject was "Each Person Is Custodian of Liberty." I believe that the remarks of this young Kansan are worthy of the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives.

EACH PERSON IS CUSTODIAN OF LIBERTY

(By Lynn Rittenoure)

"Liberty lies in the hearts of men and women; when it dies there, no constitution, no law, and no court can save it; no constitution, no law, and no court can even do

much to help it. While it lies there it needs no constitution, no law, and no court to save it."

These are words spoken by Judge Learned Hand, for many years a devoted champion of liberty, in explaining that the custodians of liberty are the people themselves.

The definition of liberty is subject to the arbitrary ideas of each individual; however, we could say very simply that liberty exists when a person is free to do whatever he desires according to his wisdom and his conscience.

A more exclusive description may be to say that liberty exists when a person enjoys independent intellect, freedom of religion and speech, and autonomous morals.

The words freedom and liberty are so closely related that we may discuss the denotation of the word "free" and arrive at a better understanding of the word "liberty." "Free" is an old Saxon term connotating membership in a family, that is, in contrast to the status of the slave. It implied to be appreciated, valued, cherished—to have a role of importance, in the community. "Freedom" means the same today, to have a role of importance in the community.

We have discussed what liberty is; on the other hand, liberty is not an inalienable right; rather, it is an alienable right, one which can be lost far easier than it was gained. Judge Hand is supported in his beliefs by Herbert Hoover, who said, "Liberty is not a catalog of political rights. Liberty is a thing of the spirit."

We enjoy a government of the people, by the people, and for the people and it is left up to these people to secure their own rights and privileges. Woodrow Wilson said, "Freedom only exists when the people take care of the government."

We have established then that liberty is an individual matter. From this by reasoning logically, we see that if the individual fails, democracy will suffer bitter defeat. Liberty will not come to a people, a people must go to it. It is a blessing that must be earned before it can be enjoyed.

One may ask, How may I as a mere individual secure these freedoms that I cherish so much?

In the heyday of the KKK (Ku Klux Klan) several of its members approached a hard-pressed grocer in a small town and urged him to join.

"What kinds of things do you plan?" he asked. "Well, for one thing, there is a Catholic family living out at the edge of town and we're going to see they move," said one. The grocer replied, "I know those people and they are all right, and I don't see how I could join any group that plans to bother them.

The Klan did not put the grocer out of business, as it had threatened, rather the grocer's courage was contagious in the community and the Klan went out of business.

The crowd jeered and closed in on a neatly dressed, 15-year-old Negro girl who had been turned back by the National Guard when she attempted to enter Little Rock's Central High School. A major escorted her to a bus stop bench and went off. Then the crowd took over. But a white woman, Mrs. Grace Lorch, wife of a schoolteacher, took her place by the girl, comforted her, and gave the jeering crowd a piece of her mind.

"She's scared. She's just a little girl. Six months from now you will be ashamed of what you are doing." Finally a bus came, and Mrs. Lorch moved through the crowd with the girl. "I'm just waiting for one of you to touch me," she said. "I'm just aching to punch somebody in the nose." Needless to say, the crowd gave way.

Each person, then, is, in effect, a sworn-in policeman over his own acts; there is no room for evasion nor escape from the responsibility resting on each person's shoulders.

As American citizens, in full support of freedom, we must realize that freedom is a task rather than a gift. We must agree with the words of William Penn when he said, "We must give the liberty that we ask."

The Postal Rate Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, in the January 16 issue of the Washington Evening Star, I learn the administration has asked for an increase of $10 billion in the national debt limit, or an increase from $298 billion to $308 billion. I believe the reason given for this increase is contained in a statement by Secretary of the Treasury Dillon who stated it would have to be made if we are to meet our future obligations.

On the other hand, I learn also that one of the first measures to be considered by the House of Representatives is the postal rate bill, H.R. 7927, which is expected to bring postal receipts somewhere in line with postal expenditures.

It is indeed a novelty when this administration comes to the Congress concerned about a deficit. Those of us who through the years have advocated a balanced budget and an end to deficit spending in Government might be expected to take heart over administration support for H.R. 7927, to increase postal rates.

However, I, for one, find little encouraging about this proposal. H.R. 7927 does not really advance the cause of fiscal responsibility in Government. In fact, its enactment would serve only to blur the true issues involved in Government spending policies.

When all is said and done, this bill would place still another burden on the American people and on a vital segment of our economy. We are being asked to add to the spiral of rising costs and, in effect, to write a death warrant for scores of American newspapers and magazines.

For make no mistake about it, the proposed increase for second-class users contained in this bill will further decimate the ranks of American newspapers and magazines. In the last decade alone, 80 magazines have closed shop, not to mention the large number of newspapers, dailies and weeklies, which have been shut down by rising costs.

It would seem that instead of jeopardizing the existence of our Nation's newspapers and magazines, the administration and the Congress ought to be searching for ways to halt this decline. These publications are a vital part of our national heritage. They represent the lifeblood of American thought and culture.

Yet the administration appears to have singled out America's newspapers and magazines for its version of a "get tough" fiscal policy.

No matter that newspapers and magazines today are paying nearly twice what they paid for postal service a decade ago. No matter that they are spending additional millions to relieve the Post Office workload. What matters, says the administration, is simply that there is a postal deficit which must be eliminated.

The posture is one of stern fiscal responsibility, but the appearance is deceiving. What is proposed by H.R. 7927 is not sound and balanced Government financing, but discriminatory treatment of American business and of a basic American institution—one protected by the first amendment of our Bill of Rights.

I use the word "discriminatory" advisedly. It seems a paradox to me that this administration is urging Congress to "get tough" with America's newspapers and magazines, while we are being asked simultaneously to offer up additional funds for foreign aid recipients.

Is it not bad enough that the U.S. Government is subsidizing Communist totalitarian regimes which do not tolerate a free press? Must we do Mr. Khrushchev's work for him and bury our own?

Consider that the United States to date has given $2.4 billion to the Dictator Tito to shore up his Communist government in Yugoslavia.

Consider that the United States to date has given $900 million to the Dictator Gomulka to shore up his Communist government in Poland.

Consider that the United States to date has given $700 million to shore up the totalitarian pro-Communist government of Dictator Sukarno of Indonesia, and some $138 million to assist Kwame Nkrumah's dictatorial take-over in Ghana.

Consider that the great and good friend of peace and nonviolent means, India's Nehru—and I should add, Goa's Nehru—has received nearly $3 billion of U.S. aid, in exchange for which he has sent us Krishna Menon.

And what of our $600 million to Egypt's Nasser? And our $350 million poured into Laos in a fruitless effort to stem the Communist tide there?

I believe that such expenditures must be considered before we proceed to add new and crippling burdens to a vital American enterprise.

I am all for fiscal toughness. However, I do not propose to cut the throat of America's newspapers and magazines with one hand, and to subsidize Poland's and Yugoslavia's state-controlled press with the other.

Yet is this not the end result of the administration's double-standard fiscal and postal policies?

We are providing aid funds to totalitarian governments which suppress the free exchange of ideas, regimes with state-controlled presses. Are we not then subsidizing tyranny over the peoples of those countries?

We are giving aid to regimes dedicated to our overthrow—as are all Communist regimes, whether they operate out of Moscow, Peiping, Warsaw, or Belgrade.

Are we not then subsidizing our enemies' attack upon us?

Further, as my esteemed colleague, Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Nebraska, points out, existing Post Office policy regarding distribution of foreign Communist propaganda through the U.S. mails constitutes an added subsidy for our enemy's propaganda arsenal.

Through foreign aid we are paying for the printing, and through postal policy we are paying for the distribution of Communist propaganda. Indeed, if our Government is to adopt a "get tough" fiscal approach to the printed word, it would seem that Communist propaganda, rather than our own free American press, would be the proper place to start.

But this line of reasoning, however apparent, does not conform to current administration thinking. As I have said, we seemingly operate on a double standard nowadays.

To illustrate how this double standard works, let me quote the Postmaster General concerning the need for an increase in postal rates. In his testimony before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, Mr. Day declared:

> If the Congress decides that second-class rates shall not be raised substantially, then, by that decision Congress will have determined that the fair price for delivering newspapers and magazines must continue to be paid, in part, by the taxpayers of our Nation.

Now, although I believe that Mr. Day is sincere in his solicitude for the American taxpayer, I submit that his statement is unique in the annals of this administration's legislative appeals to the Congress.

In what other legislative area has any administration spokesman, imploring Congress to do its duty, asked that we consider the interests of the taxpayers of our Nation?

Certainly, amid all the incantations currently being invoked in behalf of the United Nations, and our need to stake that organization to another $100 million of U.S. credit, I have heard not one word concerning the interests of the American taxpayer.

And when the administration recently went through the motions of reappraising our aid to Tito and Nkrumah, I heard much learned chatter about self-determination, nonalinement, and the like, but hardly a murmur about how the interests of the taxpayers of our Nation would be affected.

Yet an administration which sees nothing wrong with the use of our tax dollars to subsidize Communist totalitarian propaganda now expresses alarm over the prospect that American tax dollars might help this Nation's free press.

Actually, contrary to Mr. Day's implications, considerable evidence exists that our newspapers and magazines are paying their fair share of the postal bill, and then some. Certainly, even the Postmaster General must concede that these publications make a substantial contribution to postal revenues each year.

Moreover, it is questionable whether the administration's proposed postal rate increase will accomplish its own purpose. Increased rates will inevitably lead to the sharp curtailment of the distribution of print, even among those publications which can survive the added costs.

These survivors of the postal increase will be able to stay in business only by raising the price of their publication or by increasing their advertising rates. In either case, there will be dropouts which will reduce circulation, earning power, and production of postal revenues.

But aside from the economic aspect of this issue, there is one vital matter of the educational and cultural contribution made by newspapers and magazines to the community and the Nation.

From the early days of the Republic, we have sought to encourage the growth of a free press through reasonable postal rates. There is no need to recite the important role newspapers and magazines have played in the growth and development of this free society.

If only for this reason, we should carefully consider any legislation which threatens to diminish this role. In other words, even if Mr. Day were correct and the American taxpayer were supporting some part of newspaper and magazine distribution, a valid case exists that this represents an investment in America's free institutions.

Consider too that the proposed postal rate increase will have its most harmful effect on our small weekly and daily newspapers, on agricultural, educational, religious, and similar specialized publications which contribute so greatly to keeping a free people informed.

How then should the administration's "get tough" fiscal approach to American newspapers and magazines be viewed?

From the perspective of newspaper and magazine publishers, they can only envy from afar the privileged fiscal status of U.S.-subsidized state-owned presses in Poland and Yugoslavia. Well might American publishers wonder why no member of the administration has questioned whether Tito's publication Borba is giving the U.S. taxpayer a fair break for our $2.4 billion.

From the perspective of the Communists, they can find encouragement in the fact that while the United States is aiding in the printing and dissemination of Red propaganda, it is sharpening its fiscal knife to whittle down the ranks of free American newspapers and magazines.

From the view of the American taxpayer, he might well look forward to a day, not too distant, when his favorite newspaper or magazine is no longer being published, although copies of U.S.S.R. and other privileged Red publications are still available.

Indeed, cultural exchange is enlightening—although its cost comes rather high.

As for myself, I do not intend to support legislation which will endanger the existence of American newspapers and magazines, so long as this administration squanders billions of dollars supporting alien and enemy countries and institutions.

If the administration is sincere in its concern for the taxpayer, then let our leaders turn their attention toward a real reassessment of where our foreign aid money is going, and whether the American people are getting their money's worth out of it.

Finally, let the administration reassess its attitude toward our own American newspapers and magazines, taking into consideration their traditional importance to a free society.

Unless such a reassessment takes place, this administration may well be known to future generations not as one which encouraged America's cultural tradition, but rather as the leadership which stifled it.

Soapy Gets in Your Eyes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Mr. Robert C. Ruark which appeared in the January 8, 1962, edition of the New York World-Telegram and Sun:

SOAPY GETS IN YOUR EYES

(By Robert C. Ruark)

LONDON.—I do not ask overmuch of the fresh year, times being such as they are. But I would be quite happy if somebody slapped a permanent muzzle on Soapy Williams, whose crewcut is almost as incongruous to diplomacy as his bow tie and his mouth. He has, as Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, made us a dirty joke in the continent he's supposed to ride herd on.

Everyone knows that the political payoff is necessary in machine politics, such as the well-greased engine which wangled Mr. Kennedy his miniscule majority, and Mr. Williams' contribution of the State of Michigan, rundown as it was after Mr. Williams' stewardship as Governor, was evidently enough to warrant a plum. But why this plum had to be tied to the toughest tree in Kennedy's orchard, Africa, is a hard one to figure.

No one has as yet come forward with an explanation why Mr. Williams was given the African job, or why the job was awarded as one of the first two Cabinet appointments, a very long time before Kennedy chose his Secretary of State and the Under Secretaries. The only thing I can figure is that Mr. Kennedy thought that Africa was a thing of momentary importance, and pretty soon it would all go away, and take Soapy with it.

You cannot, of course, complain of Soapy's ignorance of Africa and Africans, because so very few of Mr. Kennedy's political allies would be apt to know much about anything that didn't happen in the immediate vicinity of Harvard. But it does seem that Mr. Kennedy could have named a taciturn type who would be content to listen and learn instead of to proclaim his ignorance at the top of his lungs for all the world to hear and to not applaud.

Soapy's recent discovery of the Union Miniere du Haut Katanga, which afflicted the front pages recently, is a case in point. If he had sent me a stamped, self-addressed envelope, I might have told him that the Union Miniere runs Katanga, because that's where all the rocks grow that make the Congo rich, and that the Union Miniere is

a source of great money to both Katanga and to Belgium.

There was very little necessity for Soapy to say that the Union Miniere was spreading a lot of slush money around to buy a favorable view of the Tshombe government in Katanga, because Mr. Tshombe is a company-store boy, and his country lives off what comes into that store. I could have told him, too, that a great many lawmakers in England and elsewhere have shares in Belgian mining stocks.

I could have told him, as well, that most of the jumped-up new republics, while they don't have enough dough to keep the lights burning back home, have largely hired fancy Madison Avenue opinionmolders, at fancy figures, to hustle their side of the picture. They do it well, and they do it slickly.

As an example, last summer while in Africa I wrote a piece about a Somali horse I was cursed with, and mentioned that I called him Kasavubu. I called him Kasavubu because, like most African politicans, he attempted to go in all directions at once, went nowhere, and eventually had to be carried by me. This bit of jovial symbolism drew blood and fire.

One of Kasavubu's United Nations sharecroppers officially protested me, and al my client papers as well as the head office received a 2-page handout detailing my censure by the Congolese Government in the hallowed halls by the East River.

Of course, the Union Miniere spends money on public relations. So does the Central Congolese Government, to which the United Nations is currently leasing its mercenaries to knock off Katanga and the indigenous loot that grows there.

This naive discovery by our African expert is fine, and I am sure that some day somebody will explain to him that the stork does not really bring babies. But what I object to mainly is one line: "Actually, casualty figures have been held down only by virtue of United Nations restraint and discipline, which has been very good."

I say only, as a man who spends a quarter of his life in Africa, that somebody ought to wash out William's mouth with the product from which his nickname derives, and then put him back in his playpen with a toy less harmful than the continent he is supposed to be in charge of.

The Will To Survive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, on May 15, 1961, I introduced H.R. 7045, a proposal to exempt from income tax liability the costs of building home fallout shelters.

Community shelters as proposed by the administration are a step in the right direction but cannot do the whole job, particularly in suburban and rural areas. Where individuals desire to augment the community shelter program by providing home fallout protection for their families, they should be given tax inducements and encouragement.

It is interesting to note that Canada is making strides in this direction. Perhaps Canadian thinking is ahead of ours on this matter. Since we work so closely with our Canadian neighbors in a military way in Norad it seems entirely fitting that we achieve closer working relationships in other aspects of our joint defense posture.

Following is an excellent editorial on this important matter which originally appeared in the magazine Canada Month for December, 1961:

THE WILL TO SURVIVE

The history of mankind is a history of heroes. For history is made by individual men. It happens to—is not made by—what is now glibly called society. Some of our heroes are individually remembered. Most, whose heroism was local, personal, unflamboyant, were never acclaimed.

One of the reasonable definitions of a hero is that he placed his ideals above his animal existence. It follows that an extraordinary proportion of heroes, remembered or forgotten, committed and lost their lives in the advocacy of their ideals and principles.

It is hard to believe that any authentic hero simply wished to die. Heroes are not made of despair. It is more probable that the hero's will to live was brilliantly intense; he would know, intuitively, that principle is an expression of life, not death. But for each, whether for a moment or forever, when the choice was offered between timeless ideal and transient life, ideal prevailed over life.

"I would rather be Red than dead," say the cowards of our time, belittling every brave man who ever lived.

For all that nobility is within the capacity of all human beings, there is also something perverse in us. We are somehow able to respond easily to the negative proposal that the surrender of our heritage is preferable to contemplation of nuclear holocaust. It is a little harder to see that without our most cherished values life would be meaningless; and so a stand for these values must be made no matter the price.

What values? Each healthy individual rebels at some time, against his background—the things he was brought up to believe. Each healthy individual also finds in the end, that there are certain values which, after contest, still cannot be denied. Among these are nobility itself, of which every man is capable; freedom of choice and expression, which have been continually reinforced from the time of Magna Carta; the right of private property without penalty; self-reliance, without which self-respect is impossible; private enterprise, the economic expression of these values.

And is the choice really between surrender and death? We have learned from history that, in fact, appeasement, surrender without a contest, saved no one, but rather encouraged the enemy to wreak destruction upon the appeaser.

The prospect of death does not terrify the whole man. In fact when death becomes an imminent certainty, it terrifies few men. Cancer strikes indiscriminately both the smilingly weak and the seemingly strong. It is notable that the characteristic response of the cancer victim to knowledge of his impending end is to commit himself to the most responsible and useful employment of the few weeks or months that remain.

But nuclear war, even though it involves hundreds of millions of people, unlike cancer carries no certainty of extinction except for those who intend to die, and perhaps not even for all of these.

One of our readers, with eloquent simplicity, wrote of the change of mood that is growing in our country:

"We have a fatalistic view rather than being naive or callous. This seems to be true not only in Canada but also in the States. We think that if a nuclear war should develop most of the world's population would be destroyed and we would be thrown back into the Dark Ages. It is rather refreshing to see that some people (the Swedes) do not take this dim view and are taking steps to assure that they will be here after the supposed disaster strikes."

[It is important] to help change the public's fatalistic attitude and get them off their backsides and start taking the necessary precautions to make sure everything is not lost in a nuclear war.

In every Canadian city and town, the "fatalistic view" is now in decline. In this land, in December of 1961, there is a reawakening of the will to survive, not only in body but in spirit as well. The negative proposals of those who would surrender the very meaning of life are being rejected. Truth is abroad: whatever horror man may inflict upon himself, there will survive, in at least some of his number, the values that will give meaning to the lives of his children's children.

Burley Tobacco Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the importance of tobacco to the farm economy of southern Indiana has long been recognized. It is one of the area's leading money crops and has been a prime source of income to farmers for many years.

Just today, in Madison, Ind., the most successful burley sales season ever held in my district was completed. More pounds of tobacco were sold, more money was realized by growers there than ever before. It was a banner year for all concerned.

But even as the present year closed, next year was opened at a meeting held today at the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The meeting was held to discuss next year's burley acreage allotments with Members of Congress from the tobacco belt.

I am proud to say that these Members of Congress unanimously recommended an increase in the acreage allotments for next year. I was happy to join other of my distinguished colleagues from several States in support of these increases.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include my presentation to the Department of Agriculture on behalf of the acreage increase at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN EARL WILSON, REPUBLICAN, OF INDIANA, BEFORE BURLEY TOBACCO OUTLOOK MEETING HELD AT U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, JANUARY 18, 1962

Mr. Chairman, although my distinguished colleagues Mr. Watts and Mr. Chelf represent most of the tobacco growers in the State of Kentucky, I believe that I represent an even greater percentage of the tobacco growers in the State of Indiana. Over 8,000 tobacco growers are located in my district.

Tobacco means much to the rural economy of this area. It is one of the biggest money crops and the biggest cash crop in terms of farm to market money that is realized.

The tobacco farmers in my district for whom I speak are almost all satisfied and happy with the present burley program.

They are just today completing a wonderful sales season during which tobacco brought higher prices than ever before.

The reason for the record prices are readily understandable. Boiled down, it is this—the American people are using tobacco at an ever-growing rate; export markets are demanding more and more of the crop. But, while disappearance of tobacco grown has been increasing, production hasn't kept pace.

In 1957 there was a total of 217 million pounds of burley in the hands of cooperative associations. Today that supply has dwindled until there are some estimates of less than a 2 days' supply on hand. The 1961 crop report shows 88 million pounds in the association storehouses. That figure, which has dropped dramatically, isn't going to go back up, it seems. The associations have been getting only about 1 percent of this year's crop.

This means that if we are to protect the industry, if we are to continue the excellent economic progress we've been making, we must guarantee continued production at increased levels. We must make sure the tobacco farmer can supply burley for both domestic and export markets. We also need a stock of tobacco on hand as a cushion against a short crop.

Last year the United States recorded an alltime high manufacture of cigarettes—518 billion, a 22-percent increase over totals for a period 10 years ago. The export business also increased 4 percent last year while the cooperative associations got less tobacco.

This continuing increase in demand causes a constant acceleration of the disappearance of tobacco stocks. We use more each year as we grow more each year and there is less and less carryover. The total available supply of burley has now dropped for 7 years in a row.

With supply totals shrinking and demand totals expanding, the only answer is in increased production on a conservative basis.

Estimates furnished my office show the industry will need about 585 million pounds of tobacco in 1964—and that poundage must come from the crop that will be grown in 1962. With an average yield of 1,670 pounds per acre, an increase in acreage to above 350,000 acres is indicated and necessary.

These factors make an increase in tobacco acreage allotments imperative and the facts I have cited here bear out my contention that the needed increase in production will best be realized by an acreage allotment of 6 percent.

I am happy to join with my colleagues from Kentucky, Mr. WATTS, Mr. CHELF, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, and Mr. PERKINS, with the distinguished Senators from Kentucky, Mr. COOPER and Mr. MORTON, and with my colleagues from North Carolina and Virginia in recommending this increase.

In conclusion, I should like to state that the tobacco industry has been so successful, in my opinion, because of the willingness of the tobacco farmers to cooperate with and help formulate the legislation that governs this program and because of the excellent jobs being done by the Department of Agriculture, the cooperative associations, and all connected with the industry.

The President's Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the President's budget message with fear and misgivings for the future. This budget request calls for an expenditure of $93 billion in round figures, an amount which the mind of man cannot comprehend and which I am sure will result in a 1963 fiscal year deficit of at least $5 billion, added to the 1962 fiscal year deficit of at least $10 billion, making $15 billion to add to our Federal debt now a reality of $300 billion in round figures. This is more than all the other nations in the world all put together owe their federal bondholders.

As a member of the House Appropriations Committee for 20 sessions of Congress, I have seen this country of ours rolling down the bankrupt route full speed ahead. We are bound to crash and sooner than we think, I fear.

I can only promise that I shall, as always, exert my very best efforts to reduce this unconscionable budget by the billions. To be worthy of my place I can, nor will I do less.

Launching of U.S.S. "Joseph Strauss" (DDG-16) by New York Shipbuilding Corp., Camden, N.J., December 9, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, December 9, 1961, the U.S.S. *Joseph Strauss*, the fifth of six guided-missile destroyers built by the New York Shipbuilding Corp., was launched with Mrs. Lawrence Haines Coburn of Wellesley, Mass., a granddaughter of Admiral Strauss, as its sponsor.

This new guided-missile destroyer honors the late Adm. Joseph Strauss, who graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy in the class of 1885 and retired in 1925, after 40 years of distinguished service.

It was my privilege to participate in the launching program and to deliver the following address:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE LAUNCHING OF THE U.S.S. "STRAUSS" AT CAMDEN, N.J., DECEMBER 9, 1961

Launching a new warship is always a great day for the Navy and for the Nation.

That day is made even more noteworthy when the name assigned to this ship is the U.S.S. *Joseph Strauss*.

Admiral Strauss served his country well and honorably for a period of time which stretched over 50 years.

The touchstones of his long and distinguished career in the Navy were a devotion to duty—integrity—and indisputable professional skill.

He demonstrated these qualities in every post he held.

At sea he served on 14 ships with distinction and eventually rose to the commands of the Asiatic Fleet in 1921 after commanding the mine force of the Atlantic Fleet during World War I.

In this latter capacity Admiral Strauss was responsible for laying the North Sea mine barrage.

This operation contributed to the defeat of the German submarine campaign and to the breakdown of German morale at home.

With characteristic energy and competence, Admiral Strauss also directed the clearing of U.S. mines from the North Sea after the downfall of Prussian militarism.

Completion of this task earned him an extraordinary commendation from the Secretary of the Navy, Josephus Daniels, who noted that sweeping of the North Sea of mines was "one of the greatest and most hazardous tasks undertaken by the Navy" and a work which would "go down in the annals of naval history as one of the Navy's greatest achievements."

Admiral Strauss' accomplishments on land were no less important.

He discharged his duties as inspector of ordnance in charge of the Naval Proving Ground at Indian Head, Md., and as chief of the Bureau of Ordnance with consummate skill and enterprise.

In the field of ordnance, where he is best remembered, Admiral Strauss designed the first spring recoil gun mount used in the Navy and the first disappearing mount for dock guns of submarines.

He also developed the 12-inch gun which became the forerunner of the big gun main batteries and was a pioneer in the area of smokeless powder development.

Furthermore he was responsible for important innovations in submarine safety devices and salvaging operations.

Besides these admirable achievements Admiral Strauss served as a valuable and respected member of the general court martial of the Navy General Board and of the 1937 Board on Battleship Plans.

He also distinguished himself as a Navy representative to Congress for naval appropriations from 1923 through 1925.

In sum, Admiral Strauss served where and when his country needed him most.

He provides an example of steadfast and honorable service equaled by few naval officers in the history of our Nation.

The Navy, too, deserves to be commended for recognizing the work and achievements of Admiral Strauss by naming this fighting ship after him.

It is appropriate indeed that a guided missile destroyer was chosen to bear his distinguished name.

Admiral Strauss was one of the most versatile and adaptable naval officers of his time.

He could do many jobs—and do them well.

Like its sister ships in the fleet the U.S.S. *Joseph Strauss* is equipped to do a great number of jobs and, we trust, it will do them well.

The guided missile destroyer possesses the very latest long-range antisubmarine warfare weapons.

These sub killers are notable additions to our naval defense structure.

Reliable intelligence reports estimate that the Soviet submarine fleet is composed of more than 400 vessels.

It is necessary that we have an effective antidote to Russian submarine strength.

Without it our control of the seas will be challenged and perhaps ultimately undermined.

The destroyer is one of our principal answers to the submarine threat facing us—and it is a key weapon in maintaining our power over the seas.

You will recall that in the dark days of 1940 Great Britain begged for more destroyers—not cruisers and battleships—to protect herself against the devastating attacks of German U-boats.

It was the plea of a nation which had already been saved by destroyers in World War I.

We also look to these destroyers for help in escorting our amphibious forces against enemy strongholds and for supporting them after they have landed.

They can provide indispensable protection for the cargo ships which are the backbone of any effective military engagement across the seas.

Or, they can screen for our battle fleet against enemy torpedoes and aircraft—traditional destroyer functions.

Moreover, these new types of destroyers possess command, communications, and control capabilities which enable them to coordinate with and for multiple forces under various battle and weather conditions.

The missile destroyer is unquestionably a definite step forward in destroyer design.

It is an ingenious response to the requirements of modern warfare.

The Nation owes a vote of praise to the Navy for the development of this highly useful fighting ship.

The guided missile destroyer, of course, is only one aspect of the Navy's rebuilding program since World War II.

Over the past 15 years Navy experience, foresight, and resourcefulness have produced the *Forrestal* carrier, the Polaris submarine, guided missile cruisers, and a host of smaller craft for strategic and tactical purposes.

These weapons demonstrate that the Navy is here to stay—that seapower is still the key to survival in the nuclear age.

The Nation can be thankful that Navy spokesmen were not discouraged by skeptics and critics who would have scrapped the Navy in 1945.

If they had been, our present deterrent force against the Soviet Union might be severely limited in its strength and effectiveness.

The Polaris submarine and its complement of 16 Polaris missiles represent an awesome answer to any Soviet attack against the United States or its vital interests.

Already 80 of these missiles, stacked in five Polaris submarines, are on station.

They are ready to hit Communist targets as soon as they receive orders from the President.

Powered by nuclear energy, these submarines are swift and silent in the water.

They are difficult to detect and make our strategic striking force almost invulnerable to enemy attack.

It is good news to hear that the Navy will have 29 of these submarines patrolling the waters of the world by 1964.

Navy carriers, too, are important strategic and tactical weapons which should not be overlooked in assessing our naval strength.

These ships can be quickly sent to any part of the globe without violating sovereign national boundaries.

Their aircraft can carry nuclear weapons in megaton ranges or deliver conventional bombs against tactical targets in support of land operations.

The splendid achievements of the Navy during the Korean war proved the usefulness of the Navy's carrier force in limited war engagements.

The daring exploits of Navy fliers kept the Chinese and North Korean Communists from sweeping across South Korea which would have challenged our forward position in Japan.

In these troubled times—it is comforting to know that the Navy has retained the tradition of excellence and service which was established and carried forward by the ability and character of such men as Adm. Joseph Strauss.

If the past, indeed, is prolog to the future, we can continue to expect much from the Navy.

This guided missile destroyer which we launch today assures us that our expectations are not vain and empty.

We are also certain that the officers and crew of the U.S.S. *Joseph Strauss* will serve their ship and their service with the same devotion to duty that informed the life and action of Admiral Strauss.

We are proud of them.

It is with no small amount of emotion that we conclude our remarks here by wishing them Godspeed.

The Government's Role in Health Care in the 1960's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, last October the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] visited Minnesota and spoke at the Alumni Institute in Hospital Administration which was held in Minneapolis. His speech, "The Government's Role in Health Care in the 1960's," contains a review of the various programs already supported or provided by Government in health care and lists reasons why he believes the social security program will be extended to provide medical insurance for the aged.

This address is so comprehensive and so thorough a review of this case that, in my opinion, it would be helpful and useful to Members of the Senate, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the address of the Senator from Oregon may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GOVERNMENT'S ROLE IN HEALTH CARE IN THE 1960'S

(Remarks of Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, at the Alumni Institute in Hospital Administration, Minneapolis, Minn., October 26, 1961)

President Wilson, and friends of the University of Minnesota, a return to one's Alma Mater is always a time for nostalgia and fond memories, and I always bring many of them with me when I visit this campus.

President Wilson is a warm friend from the more recent days when he served as President of the University of Oregon. I know he is now providing this great school with the kind of academic leadership he gave us at Oregon, and while we regret his departure from the Oregon campus, he surely has our best wishes in his new post.

The subject matter of my remarks covers the entire range of Government's role in health care, or Government's role in medicine, if you please. I know that this conference is mainly concerned with the financing of medical care for individuals. But this subject is so fraught with fears and charges of "socialized medicine" that it is well to give some attention first to the general role of Government in medicine.

It will readily be seen that we already have a good deal of socialized medicine. Most of it is at the municipal or State level, where every individual and every family is governed by dozens of statutes and regulations telling them what they may not do and what they must do. The general impact of these governmental activities is in the area of preventive medicine, but it is surely a more socialized form of medicine than is contemplated in any present plans for financing medical care.

Is it not socialized medicine, for example, which requires vaccination against smallpox, diphtheria, and certain other contagious diseases? Is it not socialized medicine when a State health officer comes around to tell a family that its septic tank is defective and must be replaced? Is it not socialism of some sort or another which prescribes numerous and detailed regulations for the operation of a public eating place, or in fact any establishment where food is sold either in a prepared or unprepared form?

A municipal water supply and a municipal sewage disposal system are accepted forms of socialized medicine, and even the Federal Government is assuming an increasing share of this burden of insuring a pure water supply for a rapidly increasing population. This year, $80 million was provided for this purpose by the Federal Government. Every quarantine of a child with measles is a form of socialized medicine. The entire concept and practice of public health is pure socialized medicine.

There is another area of preventive medicine aimed at accident prevention which also comprises a very large area of public regulation. Industrial safety laws, traffic laws, and even the requirement that a homeowner remove snow from his sidewalks within a prescribed time are not so far removed from social medical care as one might think. Pure food and drug laws and statutes requiring the labeling of poisonous or hazardous substances must also be mentioned.

Right now one of the hottest political issues in the field of medicine—second perhaps only to the Forand bill—is the issue of fluordiation of public water supplies. Yet the doctor or dentist who thinks the Forand bill is socialism will very often be the leading voice in his community for fluoridation of water.

There are at least three other medical fields in which governments at all levels play a very large role, mainly through financial subsidy. They are in hospital construction, medical education, and medical research. All three are heavily supported at the State and local level, with additional support coming from the Federal Government.

There is not a hospital administrator in the country who is not familiar with the Federal Government's role under the Hill-Burton Act. Under this legislation, the Congress appropriated for fiscal 1962 alone $21½ million, though this figure is small compared to the money for hospitals that comes from local taxes and bond issues.

Medical education is one field where the Federal Government does not play a very active direct role, except through fellowships and research grants. However, it did provide a great deal of medical education through the military services, and even more under the GI education bills. At the State level, there is much more subsidizing of medical education through public medical schools, which accounts for almost half our 85 medical schools.

The activity of the Federal level of Government in medicine is probably most notable in medical research. The National Institutes of Health this year received $738,335,000 for research in cancer, heart disease, arthritis, mental illness, allergies, and neurological diseases to mention the major fields of study, plus $30 million more for construction of buildings and facilities.

This is not to say that the Federal Government has been the principal governmental participant in medicine, because the States, their county and municipal subdivisions do much more in the field.

But even this brief and incomplete mention of some of the things Government is

already doing makes the question of "socialized medicine" a very uncertain one. Research is considered an appropriate area of medicine for governmental activity; so is medical education, support of hospitals, and public health with all its ramifications.

Is it any wonder that the financing of medicial care is also considered by so many Americans to be an equally legitimate field of governmental activity? Here again, there is already considerable governmental activity. Local public assistance has long provided some essentials of medical care for the indigent, and the Federal Government has made a small contribution to this cost. The Kerr-Mills law of last year put the Federal Government even more completely into the health-financing picture by authorizing a more substantial Federal financial contribution to State medical programs for the elderly, along the lines of public assistance.

I am among those who believe that the bugaboo of socialized medicine will not long prevail as an argument against the addition of medical insurance to the social security program. For one thing, the social security program itself is a tremendously popular one. Every Member of Congress will tell you that the most consistent subject matter in his mail from home relates to social security. The complaints about the program are constant; but they are complaints of its inadequacies. The demand for improvements in social security is a continuing demand of the American people, even with the accompanying increases in payroll taxes which constitute the "premiums" of the social security program.

A second reason why I believe this program will be adopted is that it meets a need. Remember that it deals with only one segment of the American people—the elderly, and more specifically those who have retired from active employment. The voluntary health plans which have proved to be one of the most popular and effective means of insuring medical costs for working people and their families, are hard pressed to provide equal benefits at the same premium the individual paid while still employed. Some expansion of the voluntary insurance plans into coverage of retired people has occurred. But the needs of these people are not as likely to be met by voluntary programs as are the needs of people of working age.

There are several reasons for this, all of them probably well known to you. One is that old age brings more chronic illness, and chronic illness means longer illness and more disabling aftereffects. People 65 and over have two to three times as much chronic illness as the rest of the population. And while they are only 9 percent of the population, they include 55 percent of all persons of limited mobility due to chronic illness. The length of stay in the hospital for people 65 and over is twice the average days spent in the hospital by the general population.

Their expenditure for health services is 90 percent greater than expenditures on health by the rest of the public; for hospitals, it is 120 percent higher and for drugs it is also 120 percent higher.

This impact of increased health costs comes at the very time when the individual's income drops markedly. Census Bureau estimates of 1958 indicated that 60 percent of all people 65 and over had incomes less than $1,000 a year; only 12 percent have incomes in excess of $3,000; of the couples, half had incomes below $2,600 a year.

These facts have led to the suggestion that the social security system—which is an insurance program relating entirely to costs incurred when the breadwinner is not earning any income—include insurance against hospitalization which may come after retirement. But its benefits would be paid for while the individual is still working.

Many opponents of this proposal have called it socialized medicine, but have not hesitated to recommend substitutes which also bring the Government into the health care field. The Kerr-Mills law, endorsed by much of the medical profession as a substitute, is far more direct Government participation in the financing of medical care than the so-called Forand bill. Another substitute calls for payment by the Government of those premiums on voluntary insurance which the aged individual cannot pay himself. Is this any less socialized than social security?

When the issue gets down to what role the Federal Government should play in financing health care it should deal with how the Government can most effectively and efficiently help. The social security program has been expanded because it has proved effective and efficient.

In December of 1949, the American Medical Association opposed disability benefits under social security with the statement, and I quote: "Initiation of a compulsory Federal disability program would represent another step toward nationalization of medical care and socialization of the practice of medicine." Yet the disability insurance part of social security has worked so well that the original 50-year age limit was removed last year by Congress, without any increase in social security taxes, and without any opposition from members of either political party.

It was my privilege to have been an early Senate sponsor of the disability provision, and to have introduced the first Senate version of the Forand bill in 1958. In my opinion, the health benefit proposal will be adopted; the only question is how soon. As you know, its present version extends only to insurance against hospitalization and home nursing care. This is a minimum protection for the elderly people of America which is often desired as much by their children and other relatives as by themselves.

I do not expect it will come with the help of much of the American Medical Association because advances in the financing of medical care even through voluntary means have come in spite of its original position and not because of it. The same is true of the existing social security program. But I do expect it will come as a result of the insistence of an American population which is growing older, and which is less and less tolerant of inadequate and insufficent medical care, especially for the elderly.

Inaugural Address of Gov. Albertis S. Harrison, Jr., of the Commonwealth of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, January 13, 1962, in my home city of Richmond, the Honorable Albertis Sydney Harrison, Jr., was inaugurated as the 65th Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia. It was my privilege to be present at those ceremonies and to listen to an exceptional inaugural address. Governor Harrison dealt realistically and articulately with the philosophy of government in Virginia and with the inherent integrity that has made that government great. Governor Harrison fixed a goal for Virginians which I sincerely feel could be a goal for the entire Nation: the expansion of the minds of our people within the tradition of the Virginia character. Under leave to extend my remarks, and with a great deal of pride, I submit his outstanding address for inclusion in the RECORD:

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF GOV. ALBERTIS S. HARRISON, JR., OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, members of the General Assembly, my fellow Virginians, it is with humility that I take the oath and assume the office of Governor of Virginia. I accept the honor the people of Virginia have conferred upon me with a deep resolve to keep sacred the trust that I have assumed.

I pray that I may discharge the responsibilities of this high office with the same courage, devotion and high sense of duty exhibited by those who have preceded me as the chief executives of this State.

There are many difficult problems that call for our considered action. I shall attempt to deal with these in some detail in a message to the general assembly on Monday. I would speak here today, if I may, primarily to the people of Virginia. I earnestly solicit their active interest and trust these remarks will indicate some of the reasons their support is vital to Virginia.

From the inauguration of Patrick Henry as Governor of Virginia 186 years ago, to this date, the character of our State has been summed up in a single word: integrity.

Too often the word is taken to mean that our public officials do not steal and lie. We can be justly proud of nearly two centuries of honest, truthful men—of incorruptible men. It minimizes, however, the stature of those who have served Virginia to imply this limitation.

The virtues of honesty and truthfulness, which Virginians assume in their officials, are not enough to meet the demands of new conditions brought by successive eras. They have never been enough. Much more is demanded by integrity.

Every generation speaks of changing times, but change is a constant in the stream of time. When Henry and Jefferson took office, Virginia was changing the very nature of her political existence; we were then assuming, as a free and independent State, the separate and equal station that is implicit in the principles of sovereignty.

A decade later, in the administrations of Edmund and Beverly Randolph, times changed again, with ratification of the compact that brought our Federal Union into being. From tthat time on, the waves of political change have varied only in their intensity—and in the extent to which men measured them correctly.

We look back upon the South a century ago and see a surface similarity to the present, yet every social force that is present today was set in motion during the 70 years prior to the War Between the States, when from day to day there seemed so little change.

We must do a better job in our own time of appraisal, assessment, and evaluation. We must learn to recognize these forces of change, and to channel these constantly flowing energies to the public good. It is not an easy process; it demands of us that we do not shun the strange, simply because it is strange; and it demands of us that we do not embrace the merely novel, in impulsive fascination with its transitory appeal.

We hear much of "the shrinking world," and of "new dimensions of time and space." The world has been shrinking, in this manner, since primitive man began to explore the valleys beyond his cave. The world shrank when the first clipper ship shaved a day off its schedule. It shrinks now to the 30-minute parabola of a guided

missile. I would not underestimate the awesome problems that accompany this geophysical shrinking.

Our problem is to prevent the minds of men from shrinking; our struggle is to maintain the preeminence of mind over matter, of the spiritual over the material, of the true over the false. Our concern is that the compression of peoples, customs and things into a single physical community be not allowed to destroy perspectives and undermine basic principles.

If I were to fix one goal for Virginia during the final decades of this century, it would be the expansion of the minds of our people within the tradition of the Virginia character. And if I were to venture even the gentlest criticism of our beloved State, it would be that in times past we have not expanded sufficiently our intellectual, cultural, and social horizons.

The changes wrought by social forces and scientific developments of the past century have not wrought in us a sufficiently timely response. Some explanation may be found for this in the terrible dislocations that followed the War and Reconstruction; in that dark interlude, Virginia's desperate struggle to preserve her character and political integrity claimed all the energies of a brave and resourceful people. In that struggle Virginia succeeded, but, in achieving success, suffered certain lags in our material growth, as measured by the national scale. Some of these lags were unavoidable, but some we accepted out of preference, as part of what was conceived as the Virginia character.

It is possible that some of these conceptions have been misconceptions; and we may have erred, in some areas, by attempting to fit 20th century problems to the Procrustean bed of 18th century solutions.

I would not be misunderstood. The great political principles laid down in Jefferson's day are the principles that have guided us; individual liberty, limited government, strict construction of the Constitution, a reverent recognition of Divine plan. These principles and ideals endure; they constitute the precious lamp that guides our feet.

My thought is simply this: that Jefferson's application of the sound principle of limited government came in an era when men traveled by horse and carriage through a world of dirt roads, stone roads, and those log beds called corduroy roads.

We must recognize that he did not mean that government is unrelated to the needs of the people or the needs of the times. Jefferson was one of the most prophetic of our early statesmen with respect to the inevitability of change; in fact, his philosophy and his advocacy hastened adjustments in the social, political, and economic order that necessarily accompany such change.

The principle of individual liberty could be applied in one fashion on the Old Frontier; its applications necessarily are different on the New. I, myself, am dedicated, heart and soul, to the concept of States rights; I pledge that every ounce of my energy will be directed toward preserving Virginia's powers, as a sovereign State, from continued attrition. Yet, I would serve you poorly if I did not acknowledge, candidly and realistically, that in their application, historic principles of States rights cannot always be trimmed to fit specific problems of our own day. The powers delegated to the Central Government by the Constitution have to be exercised now in ways that were neither necessary nor proper then. I pray that Virginia will always stand on the old principles; but I would hope to see us avoid the folly of seeking always to apply them in the old ways.

Am I asking anything new of Virginia in urging a quickened awareness of our changing world? I am not. There have been these lags in our cultural and material development, our blind spots, our sometimes excessive unwillingness to put the old aside, but the record of 186 years magnificently attests the true character of Virginia and of its government. We have adapted ourselves skillfully and successfully to changes in transportation and communication. Virginia has kept her head, in terms of fiscal sanity, while some of our sister States were losing theirs. Nothing more vividly demonstrates that fundamental change can occur without violation of the nature of our society than Virginia's uneventful transition from a rural to an urban society, from the agrarian world of our childhood to the modern industrial complex of today.

This transition, I say, has been uneventful, yet many have regarded industrialization with a certain distrust. Sometimes we are a bit apologetic about material growth, about progress, and even—perhaps especially—about money. Though our State boasts much wealth and many prosperous communities, there still remains an attitude of defensiveness about the importance of industrial growth to an expanding economy. It is as if some fear lingers that equates the goal of material progress with a sacrifice of our principles.

This fear we must dispel. I would remind you that while we have endured jibes at our backwardness, and assaults on our alleged slow pace in progress, industry has been constantly assimilated into Virginia's economy without dominating it. We still have agriculture; we have commerce, and trade, and finance; and we have travel and its byproducts. Industry has stimulated the State's economy, and provided opportunity to our people without disturbing the character of our communities.

An important part of integrity in government is realism in government; it is the fixing of realistic goals, capable of being achieved; it honors tradition, but it puts aside illusion. It reveres the past, but it deals with the present, and hopefully, it builds a secure foundation for the future.

We must learn to use the advantages of our age, and to use the scientific resources available to us, within the framework of Virginia's concept of integrity, and moral and political responsibility.

The world we live in is attuned to technological advances and material benefits. Yet, plenty has brought the fear of want. This Republic was built by men who asked for the opportunity to work—to dream new dreams, to hold bold visions, to create from their own powers, to risk failure, and to take its consequences, and to bid for success and reap its rewards. Now we have come upon a time when many ask only to be protected, and plead for reassurance that harm and insecurity will never come.

No government ever conceived on earth can give man this reassurance. And no government on earth should ever try.

A fear of danger was born with the first man, and the cave was man's first sanctuary. Today we have completed the cycle from cave to fallout shelter. But nothing can be built in which man can hide from himself. The security we need today lies in the sanctuary which man builds in his own mind and heart.

Just as it is necessary for government to reexamine, realistically, its powers and limitations and changed responsibilities, so I believe it is necessary for our citizens to establish a realistic and understanding relationship with government. Inherent in the preservation of integrity in government is the enlightened participation of its people. What should the citizens expect of government? What must be demanded of himself? And where do the responsibilities of the State and the individual meet and become one?

I am convinced it is the desire of the people of Virginia to avoid the creeping encroachments of statism and the spiritual palsy of the total welfare state. Yet, the enormity and complexity of the needs met by government today inevitably have made our Government large—large in costs, in personnel, and in essential services; and our social consciousness leads us to assume, in this great complex, certain new obligations which can be discharged only through the mechanics of government.

For Virginia, the dividing line between the government's responsibility and the citizen's welfare has long been established in terms of essential needs. That line is not always clearly marked, but we cannot go far astray if we adhere to the basic concept that government is designed primarily to meet only those needs which the people themselves are unable to meet from their own resources and abilities.

The citizen should look to his government first of all for the security of his liberties, and for the preservation of law and order. Beyond that—and here old principles adapt themselves to changing times—he is entitled to expect of government the performance of certain vital, common tasks in public health, public welfare, the maintenance of public institutions, the promotion of sound economic opportunities, and education.

Of all these, at this moment in history, I consider education the most important, for it is here that the purpose of our people can become one with that of their government. In this field we have been most prone to accept and to excuse our limitations. Here our minds have failed to expand as they should. I would like to see a renaissance of education in Virginia, creating an atmosphere in which the minds of our people may grow in vision as the opportunities for the use of the mind can grow in scope.

Such a renaissance will demand vision and leadership in government; and it will demand vision and support from the people. It will demand that all of us rise above personalities and politics, and each must look realistically to what is best and finest in the Virginia tradition.

I would recall to you a familiar passage from Shakespeare—one in which Polonius offers to his son certain precepts: "This above all; to thine ownself be true; and it must follow, as the night the day, thou canst not then be false to any man."

We all know that every living organism must adapt to its environment in order to survive. But Virginia is asking more than mere survival. We ask God's guidance that we may not only survive, but grow in peace and prosperity, adjusting wisely and realistically to the social and economic changes of our times.

The character of Virginia was formed not only during an epochal forward movement, but with Virginia as a leader. Our need is not merely to meet problems as they arise. Our need is to cultivate a long-range view in which our moral consistency—integrity—is expressed in realistic goals. This demands thought, it stimulates our conscience, and it challenges our sense of responsibility. And that responsibility rests upon you, my fellow Virginians, as much as upon those of us who have been selected for office.

Virginia must take her place in the vanguard. Ours is a land steeped in heritage and tradition; rich in resources; stimulating in its beauty; blessed by sound wisdom and learning. I have an abiding faith in the capacity, integrity, and high purpose of the people of Virginia. And because of this faith, I have no fears for the future.

In the presence of my fellow citizens, mindful of the solemnity of this occasion, knowing what the task ahead means, and the responsibility which it involves, I beg your tolerance, your aid, and your cooperation.

The oath that was administered to me by the Chief Justice was reverently taken. To

keep it will be my single purpose and my constant prayer. I ask the help of Almighty God in its observance, and in this service to Virginia to which you have called me.

Science Committee Chairman George P. Miller Answers the Question Why We Want To Go to the Moon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Science and Astronautics Committee, I take this opportunity to extend greetings and warmest wishes to our new chairman, the Honorable GEORGE P. MILLER, of California, upon his assumption of leadership of this very important committee. I am certain that under his capable leadership the committee will attain a most successful record of achievements in the years ahead.

On Tuesday, January 16, 1962, Chairman MILLER addressed the American Astronautical Society. His address is centered primarily around the question: "Why do we want to go to the moon?" It is presented in a very interesting and absorbing manner and I believe that our colleagues, our scientists, and the American public generally will find it of great interest.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD Congressman MILLER's address, which reads as follows:

ADDRESS BY CHAIRMAN GEORGE P. MILLER, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS BEFORE THE AMERICAN ASTRONAUTICAL SOCIETY, JANUARY 6, 1962

As chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, I am pleased to have this opportunity of speaking to a group of outstanding specialists in a field which today has become essential for survival and in the never-ending quest of mankind for a brighter tomorrow.

As a boy, I was fascinated with the fiction then published, dealing with fanciful adventures in the universe which surrounds us. Despite my close association with the Nation's astronautical program, it is often startling to realize that today, these flights of fancy have become hard, practical realities of vital concern to you, to me, and to every citizen of the world on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

Our committee is the Committee on Science as well as Astronautics. While we may have spent more time in the Committee on Astronautics, our jurisdiction and responsibility include the scientific work and endeavors of the Government.

We appreciate, despite the cost of research, development, and produtcion of space vehicles and supporting instrumentation and ground facilities, that the byproducts of this effort will have economic, social, and defense values far in excess of the original cost.

Our need to lead in space exploration is not merely a matter of survival; it is not simply the result of a normal impulse to surpass our competitors, nor is it the result of a selfish desire for the yet undreamed-of conveniences and luxuries which the mastering of space technology can create. It arises from a broader and nobler purpose which has existed in the hearts and minds of men since the first human thought occurred—the need to know, the need to grow, the desire for fulfillment of the ultimate destiny of mankind.

We know even at this early stage of development and research that space exploration is of such immense importance to man's total knowledge that it will benefit and alter the course of his existence in ways no more foreseeable today than those which resulted from the invention of the wheel.

And yet, despite the long-term goals which underlie the space program, and the fundamental desire of our Nation to develop and share with the world the benefits arising from the exploration of space for peaceful purposes, many Americans do not yet fully comprehend its significance.

Citizens who have no difficulty in understanding the significance of the ICBM, or other defense aspects of the program, ask me, "Why do we want to go to the moon?"

Considering the fact that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration will spend more than $1,600 million this year, and that the estimated cost of putting men on the moon will amount to $20 billion or more, they certainly deserve an answer to their question.

In his state of the Union message on May 25, last year, President Kennedy ignited the fuse of what may become the world's fourth great scientific revolution. He said:

"Now it is time to take longer strides—time for a great new American enterprise—time for this Nation to take a clearly leading role in space achievement. * * *

"* * * I believe that this Nation should commit itself to achieving the goal, before this decade is out, of landing a man on the moon and returning him safely to the earth."

The Congress, American industry, and American scientific and technical personnel, within and outside the Government, responded promptly to the President's challenge. Today, although less than a year has elapsed, those in charge of our space program are confidently predicting that this goal will be met, possibly in advance of the deadline which the President set.

Great progress has already been made in Project Mercury—initial steps along the path of space exploration. Last September 13, the United States launched an unmanned spacecraft into a single orbit, returned it from space, and recovered it from the Atlantic Ocean. A little more than 2 months later, on November 29, the chimpanzee, Enos, earned his place in history by orbiting the earth twice before he was recovered from the Atlantic. Today, we are on the eve of the first manned orbital flight in the Mercury program.

From these flights our scientists are accumulating basic knowledge about the achievements possible for man in space—how well he can operate controls and instruments, what he can learn that cannot be obtained from electronic devices, how the human body reacts to prolonged weightlessness.

Initially, manned orbital flights will be limited to three trips around the earth, but as the program develops, they will be extended up to 18 orbits—27 hours in space.

Utilizing the knowledge gleaned from these manned orbital flights, the lunar exploration will be undertaken, as a part of Project Apollo, in a three-man capsule for which development contracts have already been let.

As in the case of its less refined predecessors, the Apollo capsule will first be flown in orbits around the earth, to test its components, train its crew, and develop operational techniques. Gradually, the distances from the earth and the duration of flights will be increased, culminating in manned flight around the moon which will accumulate information and experience of value in subsequent landings on the moon itself.

We are beginning to gain experience with the larger boosters which will be required in Project Apollo. On October 27, NASA launched the first Saturn vehicle—a 460-ton structure 10 feet taller than the Statue of Liberty, with eight engines which generated 1,300,000 pounds of thrust. It is the most powerful rocket stage known to exist in the world. In later flights this thrust will be increased to 1,500,000 pounds, and in orbital missions a second stage will be added.

Less than 10 days ago, I was at the George C. Marshall Space Flight Center in Huntsville, Ala., where the scientific and technical development of the Saturn is being carried on. On that trip I also visited the Michoud plant in New Orleans where several stages of the Saturn will be manufactured by private industry for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Flight around the moon will be accomplished with a three-stage vehicle generating 7.5 million pounds of thrust in the first stage, capable of placing 175,000 pounds in orbit around the earth and 70,000 pounds around the moon.

A lunar landing may be accomplished by bringing together two of these vehicles in space. The potentialities of such a rendezvous approach are being carefully considered. This would require two launches of the advanced Saturn. The first would place into orbit a large, fully fueled rocket stage. Once its orbit had been established, a second Saturn would launch the Apollo spacecraft and its auxiliary rockets into the same orbit and the crew would join it with the first orbiting stage. The largest rocket would then launch it into a flightpath to the moon.

Contracts have already been awarded for the development of a two-man spacecraft, to be called Gemini, to experiment with the rendezvous technique. Launched by a modified Tital II missile, it will be capable of remaining in orbit for a week or more. Eventually it will rendezvous with an Atlas-boosted Agena stage. Two-man flights will precede Project Apollo, which will begin with orbital flights, advance to circumlunar flights, and culminate with actual landings on the moon.

A direct flight to the moon will require an even larger launch vehicle with nearly double the thrust of the advanced Saturn. About 350 feet in height, it is called the Nova.

One of the major benefits being gleaned from this vast effort to conquer space is the stimulus which it is providing for scientific research in new and uncharted areas.

The scope of space research may be judged from the resources which it involves. Other industrial revolutions have been based upon efforts by relatively few individuals. For example, when Edison invented the first high-voltage electric bulb, there were only 2,000 industrial scientists and engineers in the United States. Today, however, it is estimated that there are more than 700,000 such individuals contributing to progress in the age of space.

This work is not related solely to our progress on the path to the moon. Much of it derives from the new knowledge of materials and techniques which has application in our daily lives.

Our accelerated scientific research in space has already produced useful knowledge which otherwise might not have been discovered in a decade, or even a century. These advances are being experienced by the housewife in her kitchen, the farmer in his field, the doctor in his operating room.

Let me give you some examples.

One of man's great concerns has long been to know more about weather, whether merely to plan a picnic, or to aid in planting a crop. Despite great advances in the process of gathering meteorological information, forecasters are still handicapped by the fact that only one-fifth of the globe is covered by land-based weather reporting systems.

Since the launching of the Tiros satellites, a wealth of new information regarding

weather conditions around the world has been made available to meteorologists.

Tiros I, launched April 1, 1960, provided television coverage of the earth's cloud patterns. Subsequently, Tiros III, orbited in July 1961, to coincide with the hurricane season, is still gathering information on the origin, development, and movement of these massive tropical storms. In fact, the Weather Bureau used photographs taken from Tiros III to analyze and track storm Eliza in the Pacific and Hurricanes Carla and Esther in the gulf and the Atlantic. In the case of Esther, the Tiros satellite provided 2 precious days of advance warning before the giant wind was observed by aircraft.

The Tiros series will be succeeded by the Nimbus satellite, scheduled for launching late this year. An advanced design, which will be placed in polar orbit, Nimbus will be able to view every area on earth twice a day. Meteorologists believe this new information will ultimately permit accurate long- and short-range weather forecasting for periods as long as a month or even a season.

A second area of great progress is that of communications.

Citizens of almost every nation have already sighted Echo I, the huge passive communications satellite launched by NASA in 1960. Echo I demonstrated conclusively that, used as communications relays or reflectors, satellites can extend line-of-sight transmissions to intercontinental ranges.

With the world's growing need for communication facilities, and for cheaper and more reliable methods of transmission, the use of satellites holds forth enormous promise. During the past decade, the number of oversea telephone calls made or received in the United States grew from 1 million to nearly 4 million a year.

It is estimated that some 5,000 or more circuits will be needed in the next 5 years. An industry expert has estimated that a single communications satellite, costing about $40 million and placed in a 22,300-mile equatorial orbit, could accommodate as much traffic as a $500 million cable system.

A number of private companies have shown interest in commercial satellite communications. For example, the American Telephone and Telegraph Co. is negotiating with NASA for use of a rocket to launch a satellite which would relay signals across the Atlantic and amplify them with power from the sun. The company has announced its willingness to spend up to $25 million this year on experiments leading to an earth-orbiting communications system.

With satellites in orbit, the postman can anticipate less difficulty with "snow, rain, heat and gloom of night." Only last November, NASA assisted the Post Office Department in an experiment with Speedmail. A letter, urging the public to send Christmas presents early, was bounced off the satellite Echo from Stump Neck, Md., to Newark, N.J.—the first letter to be processed through outer space.

Research in space may also some day be responsible for saving your life. For example, people with some types of cardiac condition already are wearing a rhythm-control device to keep their hearts functioning while they live a normal life. This device, miniaturized by space scientists, is powered by tiny mercury batteries so small that it can be sewn into the patient's body.

Space research has led to miniature instruments which continuously measure a hospital patient's heart action, brain waves, blood pressure, and breathing, permitting him to be watched by remote control. Any change in condition is instantly recorded and a warning flashed.

One drug, developed from a missile propellant, is being used to treat mental ills. The problems involved in maintaining astronauts aboard spacecraft have led to a new method of rapidly lowering blood pressure during operations.

The search for new materials of lighter weight, greater strength and resistance to high temperatures and radiation—all necessary for use in space vehicles—is leading to countless new or improved products which will add to the pleasure of life in the future.

Pyroceram, a material originally devised for nose cones, now provides the housewife with pots and pans which can be taken from the freezer and immediately put in the hottest flame without damage. A fluxless aluminum solder can now be used to repair eavespouts, flashings, and utensils which formerly would have been discarded.

Miniaturization has produced radios as small as a lump of sugar. Research in electronics for space has brought remote control television switches. It is even possible to buy a wristwatch powered by the same mercury batteries that operate a timing mechanism developed for the Explorer satellite.

The byproducts of space research seem to be almost limitless, and are certain to change the course of our lives. Most important, however, is the fact that because of the impetus of space requirements, these new materials and new products will be available for use in our own lifetimes, not decades hence.

Other space research of more basic nature will certainly produce major changes in the way we live, and offer solutions to the many problems which confront the world and its growing population.

Future spacecraft will require new sources of power, and the research now being undertaken to find these sources may very well change the methods by which we heat our homes, power our automobiles, or cook our food. Among those being studied are the fuel cell, which converts fuel directly into electrical power without machinery or moving parts. Another is plasma power, generated through use of hot ionized gas. Still another potential source is photoelectric power, to say nothing of atomic energy.

Space research may also produce new sources and uses of water. It will lead to new discoveries with respect to noise—a vital factor in human engineering. The highly specialized computers required for launching and guiding satellites have already produced electronic mechanisms capable of functions which are beyond the limitations of a human being.

All of these efforts will lead to vast changes in our economy. They already are producing new employment and new leisure opportunities. As the program advances, these opportunities will grow.

We can count ourselves fortunate that space research will pay such large dividends in scientific knowledge and practical applications, since it would probably be necessary even without them.

Man must go to the moon, and getting him there offers a challenge to every nation.

In our position as leader of the free world, the United States cannot fail to meet that challenge, for failure could only mean victory for those who seek to change our way of life.

All of us share a heavy responsibility to make certain that this is not our fate.

Hon. John Jacob Riley

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, we of the Appropriations Committee knew and respected the outstanding qualifications of JOHN RILEY by his day-to-day work. We had the privilege and pleasure of working with our distinguished colleague through many years. His level head, his common honesty, and his sterling character endeared him to all of us. His advice and clear thinking enabled this country to build our present national defense strength which the whole Nation now enjoys and stands secure.

His worth to the Nation and his great district was immeasurable. The imprint he made on the membership of the Congress will long endure. I join his family and host of friends and membership of the Congress in mourning his passing.

By Their Votes Ye Shall Know Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in presenting this report it is not my intention to prove which view is right or wrong. No Member need apologize for his position on legislation, whether it be liberal or conservative. It is important, however, that his position be truly presented to the people and that is the purpose of this compilation which makes clear the relative positions of the two parties.

The voting record in the Senate and House of Representatives proves the difference between conservatives and liberals. Every vote analysis leads to the same conclusion, that the Republican Party is controlled by conservatives and the Democratic Party is in the hands of the liberals.

The course Congress will take is determined on the first vote of every new Congress, the vote to organize the House and Senate. This is the vote to elect the Speaker of the House and the majority leader of the Senate and it is always decided on a straight party line. On this vote every Democrat, no matter how conservative he claims to be, will vote for congressional leaders and committee chairmen for the majority of committees, Senators and Congressmen with the most liberal voting records on welfare State legislation, pork barrel bills, and legislation calling for more and more centralization of Government. The only way the people can be sure Congress will enact conservative legislation is to make sure the machinery of Congress is in the hands of conservatives and the record proves that the Republican Party is far more conservative.

The people decide whether Congress is liberal or conservative on election day according to which party they put in control of the Congress. By urging the election of a conservative Congress I do not intend that we should change the present procedures of Congress. I suggest that we change those who control those procedures to more nearly reflect the attitude of the people.

This report is presented so the voter may know the facts concerning the liberal and conservative voting records of the key Members of Congress. Regardless of the individual citizen's conviction, he will be in a better position to assure that his point of view will be represented in Congress.

The following tables show the voting records according to the Americans for Constitutional Action—conservative—AFL–CIO Committee on Political Action—COPE—Human Events—conservative—Americans for Democratic Action—ultra liberal—and the Congressional Quarterly—impartial. Regardless of which table you use, from the right, left, or middle of the road, the results are the same—Republicans are conservative and Democrats are liberal.

Compare overall Republican and Democratic votes in the House of Representatives. Which party is conservative?

Human events poll on 10 key issues in 1st session of 87th Congress. The issues: First, enlarge the Rules Committee; second, administration's emergency feed grain program for 1961; third, fair labor standards amendments; fourth, Area Redevelopment Act; fifth, Federal Water Pollution Control Act amendments of 1961; sixth, Housing Act of 1961; seventh, stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small domestic producers on public, Indian, and other lands; eighth, Emergency Educational Act of 1961; ninth, Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961; tenth, public works appropriation for fiscal 1962: 167 northern Republicans, voted conservative, 85.8 percent; 7 southern Republicans, voted conservative, 90.5 percent; total 174 Republicans, 86 percent. One hundred and sixty-three northern Democrats, voted conservative, 4.8 percent; 96 southern Democrats, voted conservative, 49.3 percent; total, 259 Democrats, 21.2 percent.

AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION

ADA rated 97 southern Democrat Congressmen and 7 southern Republican Congressmen in 1961. According to ADA, judging Members on their liberal voting record, ratings for 1961: 97 southern Democrat Congressmen received a total of 317 plus ratings; 7 southern Republican Congressmen received a total of 2 plus ratings.

AFL–CIO COMMITTEE ON POLITICAL ACTION—COPE

The following data is compiled on the basis of how COPE rated Members of Congress for the 80th through the 86th Congresses. This record is based on 61 key votes in the House from 1947 through 1960, covering the 80th through the 86th Congresses:

The overall House Democrat average support rating for liberal COPE, 69.7 percent; the overall House Republican rating, 23.9 percent; 91 southern Democrats had an average support rating for COPE, 38.8 percent; 5 southern Republicans, 8.8 percent; 41 border State Democrats average support rating for COPE, 76.1 percent; 6 border State Republicans, 26.9 percent; 45 big city Democrats average support for COPE, 97.9 percent; 20 big city Republicans, 39.8 percent; 102 other Democrats average support for COPE, 94.7 percent; 121 other Republicans, 29 percent.

Comparison of ADA ratings of Republican and Democratic Party leadership in the Senate and House

Year	U.S. Senate				U.S. House of Representatives			
	Democratic		Republican		Democratic		Republican	
	Majority Leader Mansfield	Majority Whip Humphrey	Minority Leader Dirksen	Minority Whip Kuchel	Majority Leader McCormack	Majority Whip Albert	Minority Leader Halleck	Minority Whip Arends
1947	[1] 92	(2)	[1] 9	(2)	100	92	17	17
1948	[1] 92	(2)	[1] 18	(2)	83	85	15	15
1949	[1] 92	100	(2)	(2)	92	85	0	0
1950	[1] 93	100	(2)	(2)	87	67	0	0
1951	[1] 92	100	0	(2)	100	53	7	0
1952	[1] 83	100	27	(2)	92	100	0	0
1953	87	100	8	21	100	64	27	27
1954	85	100	33	31	78	67	33	11
1955	78	100	11	20	100	90	50	30
1956	86	100	21	64	100	57	67	57
1957	58	100	58	67	100	67	56	56
1958	100	100	25	42	83	75	17	17
1959	77	100	0	33	89	78	25	22
1960	75	100	17	58	100	89	22	22
1961	80	100	10	60	90	90	10	10
Average	85	100	18	44	93	77	23	19

[1] Served in U.S. House of Representatives.

[2] Prior to election to U.S. Senate.

Comparison of ACA ratings of Republican and Democratic Party leadership in the Senate and House

U.S. Senate	Consistency index on 963 Senate votes 1955–59 (84th, 85th, and 1st sess., 86th Cong.)	Consistency index cumulative total, 1955–61	U.S. House of Representatives	Consistency index on 280 House votes, 1957–59 (85th and 1st sess., 86th Cong.)	Consistency index cumulative total, 1957–61
	Percent	*Percent*		*Percent*	*Percent*
Majority Leader MANSFIELD (Democrat)	8	10	House Speaker MCCORMACK (Democrat)	0	0
Majority Whip HUMPHREY (Democrat)	1	1	Majority Whip ALBERT (Democrat)	8	5
Minority Leader DIRKSEN (Republican)	79	80	Minority Leader HALLECK (Republican)	87	86
Minority Whip KUCHEL (Republican)	58	52	Minority Whip ARENDS (Republican)	89	88

Standing committees of the U.S. Senate

Committee	Present Democratic chairman		Potential Republican chairman	
	Name	1961 ADA rating	Name	1961 ADA rating
1. Aeronautical and Space Sciences	Kerr, Oklahoma	60	Bridges, New Hampshire	0
2. Agriculture and Forestry	Ellender, Louisiana	20	Aiken, Vermont	50
3. Appropriations	Hayden, Arizona	60	Bridges, New Hampshire	0
4. Armed Services	Russell, Georgia	10	Saltonstall, Massachusetts	20
5. Banking and Currency	Robertson, Virginia	0	Capehart, Indiana	10
6. District of Columbia	Bible, Nevada	60	Beall, Maryland	20
7. Finance	Byrd, Virginia	0	Williams, Delaware	0
8. Foreign Relations	Fulbright, Arkansas	67	Wiley, Wisconsin	25
9. Government Operations	McClellan, Arkansas	0	Mundt, South Dakota	0
10. Interior and Insular Affairs	Anderson, New Mexico	89	Dworshak, Idaho	10
11. Interstate and Foreign Commerce	Magnuson, Washington	100	Schoeppel, Kansas	0
12. Judiciary	Eastland, Mississippi	10	Wiley, Wisconsin	25
13. Labor and Public Welfare	Hill, Alabama	80	Goldwater, Arizona	0
14. Post Office and Civil Service	Johnston, South Carolina	50	Carlson, Kansas	13
15. Public Works	Chavez, New Mexico	80	Case, South Dakota	20
16. Rules and Administration	Mansfield, Montana	80	Curtis, Nebraska	0
17. Select Small Business	Sparkman, Alabama	80	Saltonstall, Massachusetts	20
Average		50		13

NOTE.—According to the ADA (Americans for Democratic Action) "the voting record is offered as a guide for liberals in judging the performance of their Senators on issues of importance. A vote which ADA believes to be in harmony with liberal principles" is marked "plus." Thus, a rating of 100 percent shows complete agreement with the liberal position on key votes. As a rating approaches zero, it indicates a more conservative position.

Standing committees of the U.S. House of Representatives

Committee	Present Democratic chairman		Potential Republican chairman	
	Name	1961 ADA rating	Name	1961 ADA rating
1. Agriculture	Cooley, North Carolina	56	Hoeven, Iowa	0
2. Appropriations	Cannon, Missouri	56	Taber, New York	0
3. Armed Services	Vinson, Georgia	88	Arends, Illinois	10
4. Banking and Currency	Spence, Kentucky	80	Kilburn, New York	11
5. District of Columbia	McMillan, South Carolina	11	Auchincloss, New Jersey	10
6. Education and Labor	Powell, New York	100	Kearns, Pennsylvania	20
7. Foreign Affairs	Morgan, Pennsylvania	90	Chiperfield, Illinois	0
8. Government Operations	Dawson, Illinois	100	Hoffman, Michigan	0
9. House Administration	Burleson, Texas	10	Schenck, Ohio	0
10. Interior and Insular Affairs	Aspinall, Colorado	80	Saylor, Pennsylvania	40
11. Interstate and Foreign Commerce	Harris, Arkansas	30	Bennett, Michigan	50
12. Judiciary	Celler, New York	100	McCulloch, Ohio	0
13. Merchant Marine and Fisheries	Bonner, North Carolina	50	Tollefson, Washington	60
14. Post Office and Civil Service	Murray, Tennessee	13	Corbett, Pennsylvania	60
15. Public Works	Buckley, New York	100	Auchincloss, New Jersey	10
16. Rules	Smith, Virginia	0	Brown, Ohio	0
17. Science and Astronautics	Brooks, Louisiana	20	Martin, Massachusetts	44
18. Un-American Activities	Walter, Pennsylvania	80	Scherer, Ohio	0
19. Veterans' Affairs	Teague, Texas	22	Ayres, Ohio	10
20. Ways and Means	Mills, Arkansas	50	Mason, Illinois	0
21. Select Small Business	Patman, Texas	80	McCulloch, Ohio	0
Average		58		16

NOTE.—According to the ADA (Americans for Democratic Action) "the voting record is offered as a guide for liberals in judging the performance of their Congressmen on issues of importance. A vote which ADA believes to be in harmony with liberal principles" is marked "plus." Thus, a rating of 100 percent shows complete agreement with the liberal position on key votes. As a rating approaches zero, it indicates a more conservative position.

COMPARISON OF CONSERVATIVE-LIBERAL VOTING RECORDS OF HOUSE MEMBERS OF WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

The Constitution, article 1, section 7 states:

All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other bills.

To exercise its authority as specified in the Constitution, the House of Representatives created the Ways and Means Committee.

The Ways and Means Committee is the revenue-raising committee. Every money-raising bill, all bills dealing with tariffs and trade, all bills dealing with income taxes, excise taxes, imports, and social security taxes come before this committee. All but one of the major programs called for by the President in his state of the Union message will be handled by the Ways and Means Committee.

Money bills in the Senate are handled by the Senate Finance Committee, but the Senate is always extremely careful not to intrude upon the authority by which the House originates tax legislation and invariably postpones any hearings on money raising bills until after the House Ways and Means Committee has completed its work on these measures.

The following tables, prepared by the impartial and objective news service, Congressional Quarterly, compares the conservative-liberal voting records of Members on those committees on key issues affecting our economy from 1945 through 1961:

KEY VOTES, SCORES OF WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

1. H.R. 3240. Reciprocal Trade Agreements Extension Act. Knutson, Republican, of Minnesota, motion to recommit Reciprocal Trade Agreements Extension bill to Ways and Means Committee with instructions to report a 2-year extension of existing law. Rejected 181–212 (Democrats, 13–204; Republicans, 167–7; American Labor Party 0–1; Progressive 1–0), May 26, 1945.

2. H.R. 6556. Reciprocal Trade Agreements Extension Act. Doughton, Democrat, of North Carolina, motion to recommit Reciprocal Trade Agreements Extension bill to Ways and Means Committee with instructions to report a 3-year extension of existing law. Rejected 168–211 (Democrats, 150–6; Republicans, 16–205; American Labor Party 2–0), May 26, 1948.

3. H.R. 1211. Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1949. Simpson, Republican, of Pennsylvania, motion to recommit Trade Agreements Extension bill to Ways and Means Committee, extending trade agreements program until June 12, 1951, and repealing Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948. Rejected 151–241 (Democrats, 7–235; Republicans, 144–5; American Labor Party 0–1), February 9, 1949.

4. H.R. 1612. Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951. Simpson, Republican, of Pennsylvania, amendment to Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 directing Tariff Commission to determine minimum tariff rates for protection of U.S. industries, and require that if tariffs are lowered below that point, or if already lower and not raised to the minimum, full information shall be filed with Congress. Agreed to 225–168 (Democrats, 42–163; Republicans, 183–4; Independent 0–1), February 7, 1951.

5. H.R. 1. Reciprocal trade extension. Reed, Republican of New York, motion to recommit trade agreements extension bill to Ways

and Means Committee with instructions to require the President to comply with recommendations of the Tariff Commission, except when national security is involved. Rejected 199–206 (Democrats, 80–140; Republicans, 119–66), February 18, 1955.

6. H.R. 2151. Wool import duties. Passage of bill to suspend for 3 years the import duties on certain coarse wools. Passed 250–129 (Democrats, 147–52; Republicans 103–77), February 4, 1958.

7. H.R. 12591. Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, providing a 5-year extension of the President's authority to enter trade agreements. Reed, Republican of New York, motion to recommit the bill to the Ways and Means Committee, without instructions. Rejected 146–268 (Democrats, 61–160; Republicans, 85–108), June 11, 1958.

8. H.R. 12591. Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958. Passage of the bill. Passed 317–98 (Democrats, 184–39; Republicans, 133–59), June 11, 1958.

9. H.R. 1217. Amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to remove for 2 years the duty on amorphous graphite valued at less than $50 per ton. Passed 278–116 (Democrats, 151–95; Republicans, 127–21), February 2, 1960.

10. H.R. 84. Authorize a 4-year subsidy program for small lead and zinc mines. Passed 196–172 (Democrats, 169–49; Republicans, 27–123), August 24, 1961.

[N record vote against (nay); Y record vote for (yea); √ paired for; ? absent, general pair, "Present," did not announce or answer poll; X paired against; — announced against; CQ poll against; ‡ announced for, CQ poll for]

Ways and Means Committee members	Trade votes, 1945–61										Federal role			
	1 1945	2 1948	3 1949	4 1951	5 1955	6 1958	7 1958	8 1958	9 1960	10 1961	Larger, 1961	Smaller, 1961	Larger, 86th Cong.	Smaller, 86th Cong.
Democrats:														
Mills (Arkansas)	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	√	N	70	30	67	33
King (California)	N	√	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	100	0	100	0
O'Brien (Illinois)	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	100	0	100	0
Boggs (Louisiana)		Y	N	N	N	?	N	Y	√	Y	70	20	83	17
Keogh (New York)	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	100	0	100	0
Harrison (Virginia)		Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	X	20	80	8	92
Karsten (Missouri)		Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	100	0	100	0
Herlong (Florida)			N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	20	80	25	75
Griffiths (Michigan)					Y	Y	—	‡	Y	Y	100	0	100	0
Thompson (Texas)		Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	80	20	75	25
Frazier (Tennessee)			N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	70	30	58	25
Green (Pennsylvania)	N		N	N	Y	‡	N	Y	Y	Y	90	0	92	8
Watts (Kentucky)					N	N	N	Y	?	Y	70	30	75	25
Ullman (Oregon)						N	N	Y	N	Y	100	0	100	0
Burke (Massachusetts)									Y	Y	100	0	83	17
Republicans:														
Mason (Illinois)	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	0	100	0	75
Byrnes (Wisconsin)	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	0	100	0	100
Baker (Tennessee)				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	40	60	58	42
Curtis (Missouri)				Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	0	100	17	83
Knox (Michigan)					Y	N	Y	N	Y	X	0	100	25	75
Utt (California)					Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	0	100	8	92
Betts (Ohio)				Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	0	100	0	100
Alger (Texas)					Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	0	100	0	100
Derounian (New York)					N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	0	100	0	100
Schneebeli (Pennsylvania)										Y	10	60	[1] 0	[1] 100

[1] Not eligible for all 12 test rollcalls.

Key Votes, Scores of Senate Finance Committee

1. H.R. 12381. National debt ceiling increase. Proxmire, Democrat, of Wisconsin, amendment to establish a 20-percent withholding tax on income from interest and dividends. Rejected 34–62 (Democrats, 22–31; Republicans, 2–31), June 20, 1960. President Eisenhower did not take a position on the amendment.

2. H.R. 12961. McCarthy, Democrat, of Minnesota, amendment to repeal the 4-percent tax credit on dividend income exceeding $50 from domestic corporations. Agreed to 42–21 (Democrats, 39–12; Republicans, 3–29), June 20, 1960. A "nay" was a vote supporting President Eisenhower's position.

3. H.R. 12281. Clark, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, amendment to prohibit tax deductions for business entertainment expenses, except for food and beverages, to limit to $10 per person the amount of a business gift that is tax deductible and to prohibit deductions for dues or initiating them to social, athletic or sporting clubs. Agreed to 45–39 (Democrats, 36–14; Republicans, 9–23), June 20, 1960. President Eisenhower did not take a position on the amendment.

4. H.R. 12580. Social Security Amendments of 1960. Javits, Republican, of New York, substitute for pending Anderson, Democrat, of New Mexico, amendment (see below) providing a choice of specified minimum medical benefits, financed by Federal-State matching grants, for persons over 65 choosing to participate in the program. Rejected 28–67 (Democrats, 0–62; Republicans, 28–5), August 23, 1960. President Eisenhower did not take a position on the amendment.

5. H.R. 12360. Anderson, Democrat, New Mexico, amendment providing medical benefits for all Social Security retirees 68 and over, to be financed by an increase in the Social Security payroll tax. Rejected, 44–51 (Democrats, 43–19; Republicans, 1–32), August 23, 1960. A "nay" was a vote supporting President Eisenhower's position.

6. H.R. 3935. Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961. Goldwater, Republican, Arizona, amendment to require the Secretary of Labor to recommend import quotas or tariffs, which the President at his discretion could put in effect, if after investigation the Secretary determined that imports from low-wage countries were endangering the living standards of U.S. workers whose wages were regulated by State or Federal law. Rejected, 39–55 (Democrats, 15–46; Republicans, 24–9), April 19, 1961. President Kennedy did not take a position on the amendment.

7. H.R. 12591. Senate Committee version of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958. Payne, Republican, Maine, amendment to provide that Congress may override the President's disapproval of a Tariff Commission recommendation within 60 days by a majority vote of each Chamber. Rejected, 34–57 (Democrats, 8–36; Republicans, 26–21). July 22, 1958. A "nay" was a vote supporting President Eisenhower's position.

8. H.R. 12591. Passage of the Trade Agreements Extension bill. Passed, 72–16 (Democrats, 36–6; Republicants 36–10), July 22, 1958. A "yea" was a vote supporting President Eisenhower's position.

[N record vote against (nay); Y record vote for (yea); ? absent, general pair, "Present," did not announce or answer poll; * term expires in 1963; X paired against; ‡ announced for, CQ poll for; — announced against, CQ poll against]

Finance Committee members	Taxes			Medical care			Trade		Federal role			
	1 1960	2 1960	3 1960	4 1960	5 1960	6 1961	7 1958	8 1958	Larger, 1961	Smaller, 1961	Larger, 86th Cong.	Smaller, 86th Cong.
Democrats:												
Byrd (Virginia)	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	0	100	0	100
Kerr (Oklahoma)	N	?	N	N	N	N	N	N	50	50	79	21
Long (Louisiana)*	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	50	50	64	36
Smathers (Florida)*	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	20	80	43	50
Anderson (New Mexico)	N	Y	Y	N	Y	X	Y	Y	80	10	86	14
Douglas (Illinois)	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	100	0	79	21
Gore (Tennessee)	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	70	30	79	14
Talmadge (Georgia)*	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	20	80	21	71
McCarthy (Minnesota)	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	--------	--------	90	10	100	0
Hartke (Indiana)	?	‡	‡	N	Y	N	--------	--------	90	10	100	0
Fulbright (Arkansas)	N	Y	Y	—	X	N	N	Y	30	60	57	43
Republicans:												
Williams (Delaware)	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	20	80	0	100
Carlson (Kansas)*	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	20	50	14	86
Bennett (Utah)*	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	0	100	7	93
Butler (Maryland)*	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	0	90	7	93
Curtis (Nebraska)	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	0	100	7	93
Morton (Kentucky)	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	30	70	0	100

BRUCE ALGER, Republican, of Texas, Fifth District; age 43; House 1955–61; committee, Ways and Means; previous committee, Public Works; profession, real estate development (head of Alger Development in Dallas); experience, aviation cadet in Army Air Corps in World War II.

STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN, Republican, of New York, Second District; age 43; House 1953–61; committee, Ways and Means; previous committees, District of Columbia, Interstate and Foreign Commerce; profession, lawyer; experience, Infantry officer, World War II, Purple Heart, Bronze Star, and foreign service ribbons in European theater; councilman, North Hempstead, N.Y.

HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI, Republican, of Pennsylvania, 17th District; age 54; House 1960–61; committees, Ways and Means, Public Works (resigned); previous committee, Banking and Currency; profession, business (Gulf Oil); experience, World War II veteran, head of civic fundraising groups, school board, Grit award for meritorious community service.

MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, Democrat, of Michigan, 17th District; age 49; House 1955–61; committees, Banking and Currency, Government Operation, Joint Economic; profession, lawyer; experience, Michigan Legislature 1949–52, judge of recorder's court 1953, legal adviser for Business & Professional Women's Clubs of Michigan.

CLARK W. THOMPSON, Democrat, of Texas, Ninth District; age 65; House 1933–35; 1947–61; committee, Agriculture; previous committee, Merchant Marine and Fisheries; profession, business; experience, veteran of World War I and II, president of Galveston Chamber of Commerce, public relations counsel for American National Life Insurance Co. and National Hotel Co. of Galveston.

U.S. Lumber Mills Lose Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the lumber industry in my district, the State of Washington and the Pacific coast is faced with the serious problem caused by an invasion of the east coast markets by British Columbia lumber mills.

The seriousness of the situation is evident when you look at a few figures. In 1951, west coast producers held 93 percent of the east coast market. Last year, the west coast share dropped to 43 percent, with British Columbia rising to 57 percent.

One of the contributing factors is the Jones Act which requires that our west coast mills must ship their lumber to Atlantic coast ports on American-flag ships. On the other hand Canadian mills can use ships registered under foreign flags. The higher costs of American shipping have given the Canadians an estimated $7 to $11 per thousand-board-feet competitive advantage.

These higher costs are caused by higher wages paid American shipping employees, wages that are subsidized by the taxpayers. Our lumber mills in the Pacific Northwest, Mr. Speaker, only want a chance to meet Canadian competition on reasonably equal grounds. But when, by virtue of a subsidy paid by the Federal Government, the costs of shipping lumber are so far out of proportion as to cause unfair competition, then that cause must be eliminated.

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which, I believe, would eliminate this cause. My bill would amend the Jones Act to provide that the Secretary of Commerce shall have the authority to waive provisions of the act as it applies to any American industry when he finds after hearings that such industry is losing a substantial part of its business to foreign competitors through the application of such act.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that early hearings will be held by the appropriate committee so that action can be taken during this session of the 87th Congress. This problem to which I have referred needs to be solved if we want to keep our mills at full employment.

Ninety-four More Petitions To Stop the Red Mail Subsidy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, each day I receive additional petitions calling for an end to the subsidy for Communist propaganda. Today I have submitted 94 more petitions to the Speaker's desk for referral.

These petitions are from the following States: California, Colorado, Florida, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Texas, Washington, and Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, people are justified in their concern over this situation. It just does not make sense for the Congress to consider raising the postage rate for Americans while the taxpayer has to make up the deficit caused in part by the free delivery of Communist propaganda.

How can Congress raise postal rates without acting on the subsidy for Communist propaganda?

The United Nations Bond Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the reactions I have received after my introduction of House Joint Resolution 596, to provide that the United States shall make no loans or grants to the United Nations until all members of the United Nations have paid in full their assessed share of operations in the Congo and Gaza strip, have not been particularly surprising to me—although I was gratified at the speed with which they got underway, and the practically unanimous approval expressed.

I seem to have created the impression in a limited circle that I was opposed to the United Nations, and was being an isolationist, not to speak of an insinuation that I was even encouraging war, rather than peace.

Because I share the feeling of most people that we need the U.N., or something similar, to provide a proper forum for peaceful settlement of issues arising between nations, I feel that it has in some ways rendered a great and effective service. Along with many other citizens of this Nation, I feel the statements of principle outlined in the U.N. Charter to be as much needed today—or probably more so—than ever before in the history of the world. However, there is such a thing as facing facts. We cannot afford to close our eyes to certain developments in the U.N. The price of was is indeed too high to pay—and the price of peace is also costly. Indeed, it seems we have been paying the price for a great many nations, in addition to our own, to say nothing of the cost of our defense effort which is probably the world's greatest effective force for peace.

To substantiate my contention that the United States is paying the lion's share of the costs of the entire U.N. operation, I put together the following facts and figures from the United Nations Secretariat bulletin, entitled "State on the Collection of Contributions as at November 30, 1961":

Forty-three member nations, out of the present total of 104, are delinquent in their payment to the U.N. regular budget for 1961, for a total of $17,091,056.86. The Soviet Union assessment to this fund is $9,356,287 and $8,408,843 was unpaid as of November. The U.S. assessment is $22,532,810 and this has been paid in full.

Of the Emergency Force Special Account for 1961, totaling $18,811,197, 53 nations have unpaid balances, which total $5,712,651.

Of this unpaid balance, the Soviet Union owes $2,548,457. The United States is paid up in full. Out of the 99 nations assessed a total of $100 million in respect to the Congo ad hoc account for the period January 1 to October 31, 1961, 83 member nations have unpaid balances totaling $36,520,155.14. The Soviet Union has an unpaid balance in the exact amount of her assessment of $13,491,828. The U.S. assessment of $32,204,061 was paid in full.

Assessments in respect to the Congo ad hoc account for the period July 14 through December 31, 1960, totaled $48,431,904 to 81 member nations. Fifty-eight member nations have an unpaid balance of $18,944,208.50. The Soviet Union paid nothing on its assessment of $6,596,425. The United States paid its assessment of $15,745,211 in full.

This morning the State Department's Bulletin entitled "the Official Weekly Record of U.S. Foreign Policy," arrived in my office, and contained in this bulletin was a report on the United Nations Bond Issue. While this report is intended to justify the U.S. purchase of the U.N. bonds, I think the figures quoted indicate the disproportionate share of the cost of the U.N. borne by the United States and tend to bear out my contention that we should insist on a much more up-to-date meeting of their obligations by all the U.N. member nations.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have included, along with my remarks, the article from the Department of State Bulletin which I have just referred to:

THE UNITED NATIONS BOND ISSUE

(Statement by Harlan Cleveland [1])

The President has decided to put in his forthcoming budget a request to the Congress to authorize the purchase of United Nations bonds. This decision followed action by the General Assembly of the United Nations last week, making it possible for the Acting Secretary-General to issue up to $200 million worth of bonds to finance the U.N.'s peace-and-security operations in the Congo and the Middle East.

This decision naturally gives rise to two questions: Why does the United Nations have to issue bonds: And why is it in the national interest of the United States to purchase some of them?

I

The answer to the first question requires a word of explanation about the way the United Nations and its affiliated agencies are financed.

Essentially there are four kinds of money spent by the U.N. family of agencies.

1. There is the U.N.'s regular assessed budget.

2. There are the regular assessed budgets of the specialized agencies, which support the constructive work in such fields as food and agriculture, world health, educational development, civil aviation, telecommunications, meteorology, and others.

3. There are voluntary contributions to special programs that are not assessed against all United Nations members.

4. And there are special assessments for peace-and-security operations in the Congo and the Middle East.

Since the charter was adopted in 1945, the United Nations Secretariat has spent $784 million on day-to-day operations out of its regular budget, including the administration of the General Assembly, the Security Council, and the trusteeship system. The United States has put up $255 million of this amount; the proportion of our contribution has been going down as new members were admitted. Early in the history of the United Nations, the United States contribution stood at nearly 40 percent. More recently, it was 32½ percent. Under a resolution just passed by the General Assembly, the United States contribution will go down to 32 percent.

The 13 specialized agencies of the United Nations have spent $586 million in their regular assessed budgets since their beginnings during the 1940's, and we have put up $168 million of this sum.

Then there are the special operations—the Expanded Technical Assistance Program, the Special Fund, the Palestine refugee program, the malaria eradication program, the Children's Fund, and others—which are financed by voluntary contributions. These programs are financed by those countries interested in financing them; their cost is not assessed against all United Nations member states. The United States has put up a larger proportion of these operations—$797 million out of a total of $1.3 billion.

This year's slice of the same picture looks like this:

[In millions]

Fiscal year 1961	Estimated total expenditures	Estimated U.S. share
U.N. regular budget (assessed)	$72.7	$22.3
U.N. specialized agencies, regular budgets (assessed)	64.9	18.0
Voluntary contributions	159.0	79.8

The United Nations and its affiliated organizations have never been, and are not now, a major factor in the U.S. budget, and the Congress has provided the full amounts required from the United States to support United Nations activities. The 1961 Congress, for example, appropriated all of the funds requested by President Kennedy for contributions to international organizations and programs, both in the State Department appropriation and in the AID [Agency for International Development] appropriation.

Apart from all these regular operations, in which most of the money goes for technical and economic activities, the United Nations has two sizable peace-and-security (which is to say, military) operations.

The United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) has 5,100 troops sitting on the Gaza Strip, along the Israeli-Egyptian border, and near the Gulf of Aqaba, maintaining the precarious peace in the still unliquidated war between Israel and its Arab neighbors. UNEF costs about $19 million a year, and we put up $7.9 million of that total. No U.S. forces are engaged.

The other peace-and-security operation, now very well known indeed, is UNOC, the United Nations Operation in the Congo. It consists of about 17,000 troops provided by 21 countries, none of them great powers. During the past year we have put up about 47½ percent of its total cost, which runs $10 million a month or $120 million a year.

The United Nations is financed from year to year by an "every member canvass." Most members pay their dues regularly and promptly to the regular budget. We do, the British do, the French do, and so do the Soviets. Some countries are slow to pay, but nobody objects on principle to making these payments. The record of prompt payment is not as good in some of the specialized agencies, but again no question of principle arises.

For the operations financed by voluntary contributions, the main burden is carried by the Western Powers. The Soviets frequently do not pay at all, or they pay less than their fair share, often in rubles so thoroughly restricted that they cannot be used.

The costs for peace-and-security operations—UNEF and the Congo force—are assessed against every member of the United Nations by action of the General Assembly. (The United States also helps, by a voluntary contribution, to reduce the burden on the smaller, less developed countries.) The Soviets and their satellites take the position that they will pay only when they agree with the operation; they therefore pay nothing to either UNEF in the Middle East or UNOC in the Congo. The Arabs also do not pay for the United Nations Emergency Force, and the French and the Belgians have declined to pay their share of the Congo operation.

The U.N.'s basic financial problem is a cash deficit resulting from the unwillingness of some members to pay their share. The total of unpaid contributions, on all U.N. budgets, was about $104 million on November 30, 1961. The bulk of this sum represented nonpayment on UNEF and the Congo accounts.

The resulting cash deficit is actually funded in three main ways:

[1] Read to news correspondents by Mr. Cleveland on Dec. 28 (press release 909). Mr. Cleveland is Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs.

1. The United Nations has to hold back on paying its bills. If the United Nations were a business, we would say that it is piling up its accounts payable.

2. It has drawn down to zero its working capital fund, which previously amounted to about $25 million.

3. It has engaged in a kind of internal borrowing operation. To meet his needs for cash, the Secretary-General borrows from other U.N. agencies' moneys which these organizations have collected from their members but have not yet spent. These internal borrowings are repaid when member nations pay their assessments for UNEF and the Congo. The borrowings have not impaired the operations of the other U.N. agencies involved.

With the operating deficit of more than $100 million, the U.N.'s problem is to get the nonpayers to pay up and meanwhile to collect enough cash to enable the United Nations to go ahead and do what the General Assembly has told it to do in the Middle East and in the Congo, which are actions the U.S. Government feels are very much in the U.S. interest for the United Nations to take.

To solve this problem, Acting Secretary-General U Thant has courageously proposed and the General Assembly has just adopted a three-part financial plan. The plan was adopted over the highly vocal but ineffective opposition of the Soviet Union and its satellites.

1. The General Assembly voted a new appropriation, assessed against all members to carry the Congo[2] and the Middle Eastern[3] operations up to July 1, 1962, at the present level of expenditure. The votes were overwhelming: 67 nations voted for the Congo appropriation, and only 13 against, with 15 abstentions.

2. The General Assembly has formally asked the International Court of Justice at The Hague for an advisory opinion to settle the question whether assessments for peace and security operations are just as mandatory an obligation on governments, under the U.N. Charter, as everybody agrees the regular budget contributions have always been. A favorable opinion, which we anticipate, would help governments decide to pay up even when they are not enthusiastic about a particular operation, for fear of getting so far behind in their total contribution to the United Nations that they would be deprived of their vote under the charter's 2-year rule (art. 19).

3. The General Assembly authorized the Secretary-General to issue $200 million worth of U.N. bonds, repayable at 2 percent over a 25-year period.[4] Repayments will be an annual charge (of about $10 million) on the regular U.N. budget, which is assessed against all members.

In a nutshell, the case for the U.N. bond issue can be summarized this way:

(a) Nonpayers will still owe their dues. The bond issue does not bail them out. It merely bails out the United Nations cash position while maintaining the obligation of every member to pay up its own accumulated debt to the United Nations.

(b) The bond issue would be large enough to solve the United Nations cash problem for this year and next.

(c) The bond issue would give the United Nations Secretary-General, for the first time, a source of funds which could be drawn on rapidly in the event that a future emergency should require their use.

(d) The bond issue will be repaid out of the regular budget. The repayments are thus a binding obligation on all members under the charter.

(e) By having the bond issue repaid out of the regular budget, the U.S. contribution for peacekeeping operations is reduced from its present share of about 47½ percent to 32 percent. For a time after July 1, 1962, our purchase of bonds will make it unnecessary to ask Congress for appropriations for UNEF and the Congo operation.

(f) The U.N. bonds can be sold to nonmembers (West Germany and Switzerland, for example) and to nonprofit institutions. They will not, however, be sold to the general public.

II

Why is it in the national interest of the United States to purchase our share of the U.N. bonds?

Ever since the beginning of the United Nations, its actions and its future have been a matter for debate among Americans. Some have overestimated its usefulness, viewing is as a cure-all or a symbol of utopia. Others, congenitally gloomy about the state of the world, see in each new crisis the beginning of the end of the Organization.

Of course, no all-purpose formula fits the facts. But the record shows that each new crisis has left behind a stronger organization, better able to tackle a larger problem the next time around. A small technical services program led to a sizable special fund for preinvestment aid. A tentative peace-and-security operation at the time of Suez led to a larger capacity to act in the Congo.

There are, of course, strict limits to United Nations action, limits set by the willingness of its members to support extensions of the U.N.'s executive role. These limits are gradually widening. With the U.N.'s peacekeeping functions, particularly its Congo operation, the U.N.'s executive role has for the first time caught the widespread attention of Americans.

That U.N. actions, and the U.S. relationship to the U.N., are now an American national issue, worthy of front-page controversy and public statements by practicing political leaders, simply means that the United Nations is doing things that are important enough for us to argue about among ourselves. Far from dying, the United Nations is increasingly being recognized as a significant mechanism of international politics—which is to say one of the most important arenas for the exercise of national power.

The fact of the matter is that for 16 years the United Nations has usefully served the national interest of the United States as well as the interests of most of its other members.

In Korea it served our interest by enabling the United States and other free nations to deal effectively with Communist aggression in the name of the United Nations Charter and pursuant to U.N. resolutions.

The U.N.'s peacekeeping machinery, established in the Middle East after the Suez crisis, has been a major factor in keeping that area reasonably quiet for the past 5 years.

In the Congo the big United Nations executive operation was literally the only alternative to the direct confrontation, there in central Africa, of the military strength of great powers.

But the United Nations growing "capacity to act" goes well beyond its much publicized military operations. It provides various kinds of advice and self-starting aid for all of its less developed members. It also provides a wide range of peaceful settlement procedures, ranging from single representatives of the Secretary-General to peace observation teams, mediators, conciliation commissions, and the general supervision of progress toward self-government: The peacemaking role of the United Nations serves our interest because many of the disputes contain the seeds of war. While some of the crises taken to the U.N. continue to be dangerous, in many instances the trend has been reversed.

Because the United Nations and in particular its peace-and-security operations have been effective, the Communist bloc has sought to control or destroy it. Trying to paralyze action by misuse of the veto is one way. Trying to substitute the troika for a single Secretary-General is another way. Trying to undermine its financial structure and thereby to deny the United Nations the means to carry on essential peacekeeping operations is yet another way. We cannot afford to permit the Communist bloc to destroy—either by political or financial means—an organization that has served and continues to serve our national interest, and the national interest of most other U.N. members, in the growth of a civilized system of collective security.

For these reasons the President will propose, early in the next session of Congress, legislation to authorize U.S. purchase of United Nations bonds. Congressional approval of this proposal will frustrate the Soviet attempt to starve the United Nations into submission and will preserve the U.N. for its vital executive role in international politics.

Cultural and educational exchange to be discussed by United States and Japan

The Department of State announced on December 26 (press release 904) that the United States and Japan will hold a conference on cultural and educational affairs at Tokyo for 1 week beginning January 25. This conference is the last of three meetings agreed to by President Kennedy and the Japanese Prime Minister Hayato Ikeda when the two leaders met in Washington last June.[1] A joint meeting on economic affairs was held in November at Hakone,[2] and a conference on scientific cooperation was held in December at Tokyo.[3]

Both leaders agreed last June on the desirability of furthering cooperation between Japan and the United States in the fields of culture and education. The upcoming conference will discuss concrete ways for bringing this about. The American delegation will include: Philip H. Coombs, Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs, Ambassador Edwin O. Reischauer, Hugh Borton, Aaron Copland, Clarence H. Faust, Douglas Overton, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Willard Thorp, and Robert Penn Warren.

The conference will have as its objective the study of all phases of postwar cultural and educational exchange between Japan and the United States and will make recommendations on ways and means of broadening this exchange. Concretely, various problems will be discussed, such as intellectual interchange through exchange of persons, exchange of books, and other cultural materials and arts, studies in Japan and in the United States of the other's country, English and Japanese language teaching, and study of activities of cultural academic and professional organizations in Japan and in the United States.

Attorney General Kennedy completes, plans for February trip

Secretary Rusk announced on December 29 that Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy has completed plans for a trip that will take him to a number of world capitals in February.

Following the Attorney General's visit to Japan,[4] Mr. and Mrs. Kennedy will go to Indonesia, where they will be from February

[2] U.N. doc. A/RES/1732(XVI).
[3] U.N. doc. A/RES/1733(XVI).
[4] U.N. doc. A/RES/1739(XVI).

[1] Bulletin of July 10, 1961, p. 57.
[2] Ibid., Nov. 27, 1961, p. 890.
[3] Ibid., Jan. 8, 1962, p. 66.
[4] For an announcement of the visit, see Bulletin of Jan. 8, 1962, p. 50.

12 to 18. This visit is in response to an invitation from the Indonesian Attorney General, Dr. Gunawan, who extended the invitation personally while visiting the United States last April.

On his way to Berlin from Djakarta, Mr. Kennedy wil visit Teheran and make a brief stop in Rome. During the Teheran visit, February 19, the Attorney General plans to call on Government officials. The visit in Rome will be of a private nature.

The Attorney General will be in West Berlin from approximately February 22 to 24 and also plans a brief trip to Bonn.

A Job for Uncle Sam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, my views on the necessity for a firm policy in dealing with the Communists as expressed on this floor and throughout the country ever since World War II are, I hope, well known to this body. But with the hope that some good will be accomplished thereby I submit an editorial appearing in the Monday, January 8, 1962, issue of the Hattiesburg American, a forthright as well as great newspaper published at Hattiesburg, Miss., on "A Job for Uncle Sam."

The editorial quotes and comments with approval upon a letter from my valued constituent, Mr. William A. Powe, also of Hattiesburg, to Mr. Robert Underwood, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. Mr. Powe is qualified to speak on this subject because of his long residence in Cuba.

It is to be hoped that Secretary Woodward as well as President Kennedy will give the serious consideration to the letter and the editorial which they merit.

The editorial follows:

A JOB FOR UNCLE SAM

On January 22 foreign ministers of the Organization of American States will meet to consider the entire Cuban problem. It probably is the most important meeting of the OAS ever scheduled.

The course taken by the United States at this conference may well determine whether communism is to be pushed out of the Western Hemisphere or whether we are going to stand by and watch it spread through Latin America.

Very few people in the United States are better informed about the situation in Latin America in general and Cuba in particular than William A. Powe, of Hattiesburg, who was one of Cuba's leading industrialists for many years prior to the Castro takeover.

Mr. Powe has written a strong letter to Robert Woodward, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, urging him to sit down with President Kennedy and Adlai Stevenson before the OAS Conference "and convince them that the enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine is too important, too vital to our survival as a free country to be left in the hands of Latin American politicians."

The letter continues:

"You with your long experience in Latin America know this to be a fact, but Kennedy, Stevenson, and Rusk must be made aware of the fact that every country in Latin America, whether they like it or not, has been under the protection of the United States through the Monroe Doctrine since the day of their independence. In the days when the doctrine of the divine right of kings to conquer with arms and govern a people was loose in the world, President Monroe realized that none of the small republics of Latin America could defend themselves against the great European powers and that they would be gobbled up one by one by one of the European monarchies if we did not protect them. So it was necessary, for our own national security, to declare the Monroe Doctrine.

"Today the same situation exists except that the doctrine of the divine right of kings has been outmoded and outlawed but it has been replaced by the doctrine of international communism. Instead of a number of European monarchies, Britain, France, Spain, Portugal, Belgium, or Russia ready to pounce upon any small defenseless Latin American Republic, we today have Russia and Red China ready to pounce. Is there any doubt in anybody's mind that Russian communism would take over, one by one, every republic in Latin America if they were not afraid that the United States would go to war to protect them from outside aggression. Russia and China know that they cannot barge into any Latin American Republic without incurring the wrath of U.S. military might. They are, therefore, limited to making it appear that communism takes over from within the country, as they were able to make it appear in Cuba, and as they will make it appear in other countries. The same strategy was used in Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, and throughout Eastern Europe.

"It is military might and nothing else that rules the world today. This was exemplified only last month when India took over Goa. President Kennedy must be convinced prior to January 22 that it is completely Utopian to think that even if all of the members of the OAS can be persuaded to take a stand against the Russian satellite Cuba (and you know that they cannot all be persuaded to do so) the OAS, which has no military might, cannot be expected to keep communism from gradually, one by one, taking over all of Latin America. Sanctions will cause Cubans to suffer, but they will not overthrow Castro and his mighty militia.

"There is only one force that can keep communism out of the Western Hemisphere and that is the military might of the United States of America. Kennedy must be convinced and persuaded to make it crystal clear to the OAS meeting at Punta del Este on January 22 that the United States puts its national security above everything and everybody and that, since it is clear that our national security and survival demand that there be no Russian satellites in the Western Hemisphere, the United States will not leave the enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine, which is a U.S. doctrine (not an OAS doctrine), up to the OAS or the U.N. or anybody else. That we ourselves will enforce the Monroe Doctrine.

"By hiding behind the skirts of the OAS or the U.N., we are merely playing into the hands of international communism. We must demonstrate to the world that we will not allow a Communist government or Russian satellite to become established anywhere in the Western Hemisphere, whether from within or without, and that if such a government is established in this hemisphere we will use our military might to overthrow it."

It is to be hoped that Mr. Powe's letter will help stiffen the backbone of Uncle Sam in dealing with the problem of Cuba and further Communist encroachment in Latin America.

Equality for Women of the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in his state of the Union address to Congress, President Kennedy said:

America stands for progress in human rights as well as in economic affairs, and a strong America requires the assurance of full and equal rights to all its citizens, of any race or of any color.

The President said his administration has shown as never before how much could be done through the full use of executive power—through the enforcement of laws already passed by Congress—to secure the constitutional rights of all.

President Kennedy said he issued a comprehensive order last March to guarantee right and equal employment in all Federal agencies and contractors. He said the Vice President's committee has done much to achieve success in opening to all races new professional, supervisory, and other job opportunities.

It is shocking that the President did not pledge his support for equal job opportunities for women. It is doubly shocking that discrimination against women is tolerated within the White House, and that President Kennedy is aware of this.

I refer to the White House Correspondents Association composed of men and women reporters accredited to the White House and to the President's press conferences. Men and women reporters pay the same dues. The women members of the White House Correspondents Association have been judged equal professionally by their peers, their fellow members.

It seems incredible, but women members of the White House Correspondents Association have never been permitted to attend the White House Correspondents Association dinner for the President. In 1961, President Kennedy, his Cabinet, including Secretary of Labor Goldberg—the man who has so often lambasted private clubs—other New Frontiersmen, and Members of Congress attended the White House Correspondents Association dinner from which women members were excluded.

Beautiful Broadway and Hollywood women stars generously gave their talent to entertain at the dinner, and they were welcomed at predinner cocktail parties attended by the New Frontier. According to press reports, the President attended one of these parties.

Not one of the New Frontiersmen, nor the liberal newspapermen, who are resigning from private clubs, has ever spoken up for the women reporters of the White House Correspondents Association, who have to earn their livings. I also note that New Frontiersmen and other liberals do not seem to be resigning from their other clubs and lodges

which are segregated but outside of Washington, a notable example of which is an exclusive and segregated fox-hunting club in nearby Virginia.

The 1960 Democratic and Republican platforms call for equal job opportunities for women. Do these pledges have meaning, or are they hypocritical mouthings?

Women everywhere in the United States should be informed of these circumstances and should come to the aid of other employed women.

Premier Nehru told one woman reporter in Washington that he did not know until 3 days before he was to speak at the National Press Club that women reporters were not to be admitted to cover his speech on an equal footing with men. When he spoke, he chided the NPC by saying that India has cast aside purdah—the exclusion of women—and that he was astonished to see it practiced in the United States of America.

It is ironic that Premier Khrushchev had to speak up for American women reporters when he came to Washington. He refused to speak at the National Press Club unless some women reporters were permitted to attend the luncheon.

When President de Gaulle came to Washington, he insisted upon holding a press conference to which men and women reporters were admitted.

Let us be honest. Are people equal only in race? Are women second-class citizens? Will President Kennedy right the wrong in the White House Correspondents Association? What can he do? He can refuse to attend the traditional dinner in his honor unless women reporters are given a new deal, a fair deal, on the New Frontier.

The Late Honorable Louis Rabaut

SPEECH

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, LOUIS RABAUT is no longer with us. For 25 years he represented the 14th District of his native State of Michigan. For 25 years he graced this Chamber with his presence and his wisdom, benefiting all of us with the thinking of his keen legal mind.

LOUIS RABAUT was a kind, good man—a man that one was proud to call a friend. Today we rise to pay tribute to our departed colleague and friend with the realization that his resonant voice, his wit and friendly smile will no longer greet us when we come into this Chamber.

His accomplishments during his quarter century in this body would fill a large testament of good works. There were few important events which did not involve the energetic, good-humored LOUIS RABAUT. He was, however, a man whose love and respect for the people he represented was exceeded only by that for his family. His acceptance of life was serious but he never allowed that to prevent him from enjoying it. Words are inadequate to describe this man's deep love of his fellow man. A love which always expressed itself in his willingness to assist anyone at any time. He was a man dedicated to the common good of our country and who tried all his life to live up to the admonition "Love thy neighbor." Those of us who worked with him here knew that he succeeded. My deepest sympathy goes out to LOUIS RABAUT's bereaved family.

George Sokolsky Praises Kennedy Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD the text of a column published in the Washington Post of January 18, 1962, by George Sokolsky and entitled "The Kennedy Story."

Mr. Sokolsky, who is not usually regarded as a partisan Democrat, warmly praises President Kennedy and says that the President "is meeting the problems which face the American people soberly and with an understanding of the current problems."

The text of the column follows:

THE KENNEDY STORY

(By George E. Sokolsky)

One of the exciting evidences of public response to events these days is the reaction to President John F. Kennedy. Many conservatives are annoyed over the fact that they have to recognize that he will be in that position for at least 3 more years and possibly 7; that the Constitution gives him certain powers and that others come to him by virtue of his office and by the fact that he grows increasingly popular and influential.

What they can do about it, they do not know, but they do get excited over Cuba and Katanga and say of those who favor Mr. Kennedy that they have sold out. I was so bold as to ask one such person where and what is Katanga and apparently upset the applecart because the place is only a name and it is difficult to explain what the excitement is about.

No man, not Khrushchev or De Gaulle or Kennedy, is a free master in our very complex world. The course of events moves more swiftly than anyone can estimate in advance. According to Lenin's estimate, the capitalist system should by now be collapsing. As a matter of fact, it is gaining strength, particularly in Europe and Japan, where the production of new goods has altered the economy of nations. According to Communist calculations, the United States and Great Britain should have destroyed each other in an economic competition; instead, the United States poured billions of dollars into the British, French, West German and Italian economies, making those countries stronger than they were prior to World War II and saving them from collapse at the risk of collapsing itself.

In fact, most calculations were incorrect because it was difficult for small minds to foresee the capacity of the American mind to respond generously to historic misfortunes. It is the same lack of prescience which makes it difficult for us to grasp what we are liable to do that is broad and generous in critical periods.

For instance, President Kennedy was elected by a small majority after a fairly popular Presidency of President Eisenhower, who had no particular program but who moved along as events would permit. Mr. Kennedy's program was not particularly clear. In fact, it seems that his proposals were stronger than his actions. Nevertheless, a year of activity indicates that he has maintained peace without compromise, that he has strengthened the economy of the United States without conceding to foreign powers, that he has safeguarded the dollar without imperiling its value.

President Kennedy tripped over Cuba, but it is becoming clear that Castro has failed to achieve anything beneficial to Cuba by his cupidity. It was believed that Mr. Kennedy's Dominican program was incorrect, but it is working out. The Russians attempted to bog us down in Cuba, Laos, Vietnam, the Congo, and other places, but failed. We have prepared to meet the future, but we have not been tricked into being required to accept their battlefield.

There are those who violently oppose the President's domestic policy, suggesting that he is throwing our wealth down the drain. They despair of the future. They are frightened by his enormous proposed expenditures. But his basic task is to provide jobs for our workers.

President Kennedy is meeting the problems which face the American people soberly and with an understanding of the current problems. He is not living in 1930 but in 1962 and the world has changed sharply during the past 30 years. He recognizes that it has changed sharply. Those who want him to live way back in the days when he was elected to the Senate are not looking at the calendar. He is.

Hon. John Jacob Riley

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES A. HALEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I, too, share the loss of my colleagues in the passing of our beloved friend and colleague, JOHN JACOB RILEY. I know this man is mourned by all who were privileged to know him. He was a man of Christian character, strong religious principles, and compassion for his fellow man.

With his passing, South Carolina has lost one of her noblest sons, the United States has lost one of her greatest citizens and servants, and we of the Congress have lost one of our most respected and most effective legislators.

JOHN RILEY loved our country and the institutions which have made us a great Nation. He fought diligently to protect our constitutional Government and to preserve our States' rights.

Special tribute should be paid to the friendship he gave to new Members of the Congress for he was a personal friend and counselor to the inexperienced. I am deeply indebted to him for the many kindnesses and courtesies he extended to

me since my own arrival in the Congress in 1952. I highly valued his friendship, I respected his convictions, and I admired his dedication to sound principles of government. I shall miss him.

To his widow, his daughter, and his son, I extend my deepest sympathy.

The State of the Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Fairmont (W. Va.) Times under date of January 13, 1962:

THE STATE OF THE UNION

While President Kennedy's "State of the Union" message to Congress lacked some of the fighting qualities which marked his magnificent Inaugural Address, it is not wholly partisan exaggeration to say, as Senator MIKE MANSFIELD put it, that the speech had "the authentic earmark of greatness."

In the year he has occupied the most sensitive position in the world, the burdens of the Presidency have left their mark on the youngest man ever elected to that great office. The confidence with which he approached his task has not diminished, but he has come to the inevitable realization that not all the things he hopes for this Nation can be accomplished in months or even years.

There will be opposition to much of the bold and exciting program the President outlined to Congress. In the House, for example, it is said there are about 180 Members, a preponderant majority of them Democrats, who will support him. Another 180, which includes most of the Republicans and nearly all the southern conservatives who are elected under the Democratic emblem but don't vote that way, are almost certain to oppose anything he suggests. This leaves a "balance of power" bloc of 70 or 75 Representatives on whom the enactment or defeat of legislation depends.

President Kennedy, by his proposals for standby powers in the field of domestic and foreign fiscal affairs, is not inclined to wait until an "economic decline has dragged us down." He wants the West to take the lead in the cold war against communism and, in his expressive phrase, "seize the burden and glory of freedom."

Listening to or reading the address, one is impressed with the fact that there is more burden than glory in the task ahead. Yet there is still an undercurrent of optimism which, while not emphasized to the extent of the Inaugural Address, can be found in the very character of the President himself.

Some veteran Washington observers, without going overboard on the content of the message, suggest that while Kennedy doubtless will have his troubles on the Hill, he starts the new year with more unity on fundamentals than any other major leader in the world. There are vast natural differences in our Nation, and they will continue. There has been shouting by extremists of both the right and the left, but they tend to balance out.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy has learned many lessons since he stood before the Chief Justice of the United States that cold day just a week short of a year ago to take the oath of office as President. Experience has not dimmed his vision nor his hope, and certainly he has lost no part of the courage that has been the keystone of his whole life.

He left no doubt that serious problems confront this Nation both at home and abroad, yet he outlined a program for the future to meet them. It was a speech of vision from a man who has been learning his job the hard way, a signboard pointing the way to a better America.

The Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Leon Lowenstein, chairman of the Board of Lowenstein and Sons, Inc., sent the following letter to President Kennedy. I believe this timely letter will be of much interest to each Member of Congress:

DECEMBER 8, 1961.

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR PRESIDENT KENNEDY: Whenever there is a presidential election, or any major election for that matter, the writer votes for the candidate who, in his opinion, is the best man for the country. As you know, I voted for you and supported you. I announced this publicly prior to your election. I voted for you because, among other reasons, you are a young, vigorous man, with lots of vision. I felt that we had had enough of the Old Guard. I say this notwithstanding the fact that I know Mr. Nixon personally and am friendly with him.

I also felt that because of your naval service, and particularly because you handled yourself the way you did while in the service, you would see to it that America was strong from a military standpoint. Now, to be strong from a military standpoint and weak economically reminds me of two horses pulling a wagon, one a racehorse and the other a truckhorse. How far do you think they could go? This is the crux of what I am writing you about—the economy of America. Yes, I realize it is a complicated problem because of the State Department, our Western allies, etc., and there are a lot of other variables.

You recently addressed the National Association of Manufacturers and you spoke in a very liberal and forthright manner, and to the point. I always enjoy hearing a man talk who has something to say, particularly when he says it properly and not out of the side of his mouth.

My position is as follows: In the first place, whatever tariff you put on, you will never be able to equalize the difference between foreign labor and American labor, and we in America certainly don't want to have a labor rate such as they have abroad. Since you come from Boston, I imagine your father must have talked to you a lot about textiles over the years. That is my business. I have been in it for 62 years and am still active in it. You have known about people who had plants in the East and moved them South. At that time—there is no question about it—there was a great advantage in labor rates. In addition, there were other advantages such as freight differentials and proximity to customers. Of course, that will have nothing to do with imports because we have ports in the South as well as the East where textiles may be brought.

Now, let me go further. Whether you have a tariff or an equalization fee, these are not going to do the job. I claim that no amount of tariffs are going to be the complete answer. Import tariffs only give the low-wage exporting country an increased advantage over other exporting countries with higher standards of living. U.S. tariffs may keep out goods from England and Europe but have minor effect on imports from, say, Asia and Africa.

There is only one method, in my opinion, that will help the economy of America and not hurt our foreign friends, and that is quotas. These quotas should be set by quarters and by individual countries as well as by groups of fabrics. As part of this, there should be a provision that if a country does not fill its quota within any quarter, there is to be no extension covering the unfilled portion. In other words, whatever is unused is lost.

The sooner we arrive at an understanding with respect to free world trade, and translate it into legislation, the better. I feel that this is too important a problem to be left to the whim of an individual or a committee. I would like to have congressional action so that we all know what it is all about.

I imagine you will have your economists read this letter, analyze it, and digest it for you and give it back to you with their comments, and I am guessing that they may say this plan would push goods into the United States possibly at lower prices. My answer to that is—so what? If that were the result, then, as you so often say, the public will get the benefit. That possibility wouldn't worry me a bit because then we would only have a fixed amount of goods coming in, but the amount should be limited to a figure that will not hurt the economy of America.

America has had a problem—there is no question in my mind about it. This industry, as well as many other industries, will go abroad, just as they moved south. Possibly they will send plants to foreign countries as well as invest money, and set up full-scale operations. As a matter of fact, there are many industries, in addition to textiles, which have already done this.

So when I talk about textiles, I am not only talking about the fate of the industry but, more important, its effect upon the economy of America.

Now, regarding that cotton subsidy, naturally we have to think of our farmers as they are very important to the economy of America. But do we want to give a foreign country the benefit of X cents per pound when American cotton is shipped abroad, made into cloth and shipped back to the United States? There is no question about it—there should be no advantage of X cents a pound to a foreign country in this situation. I feel that American mills should be put on the same plane as foreign mills with respect to their costing of cotton on goods sold in the United States.

I am sending a copy of this letter to the persons listed below to the attention of all those who are interested in the welfare of our great country.

Respectfully,

LEON LOWENSTEIN.

(Hon. Kenneth B. Keating; Hon. Jacob K. Javits; Hon. John O. Pastore; Hon. Lister Hill; Hon. John J. Sparkman; Hon. Richard B. Russell; Hon. Herman E. Talmadge, Hon. Sam J. Ervin, Jr.; Hon. B. Everett Jordan; Hon. Olin D. Johnston; Hon. Strom Thurmond; Hon. Robert S. McNamara; Hon. George W. Ball; Hon. Luther H. Hodges; Hon. Robert F. Wagner, mayor, city of New York; Hon. Edward Cavanagh, deputy mayor, city

of New York; Mr. R. Dave Hall, president, American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc.; Mr. John W. McGovern, president, National Association of Manufacturers.)

The Resurrection of Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, Craig Needham, a student at Bellarmine College Prep, San Jose, Calif., recently won second place in the sophomore oratorical contest at his school. I consider this winning speech to be so outstanding that I submit it herewith:

THE RESURRECTION OF AMERICANISM

(By Craig Needham)

When I sit down and gather evidence on the "crazy mixed-up way" adults in our Government act, I begin to enjoy entering adulthood like a dentist's chair.

These adults say that communism enslaves people, makes people mere cogs in a barbed wire prison state; yet they finance these prisons. Except for their recognition, loans, and outright gifts, the Bolshevik regime in Russia, China, Yugoslavia, Poland, Ghana would have toppled long ago. And now these adults are setting up British Guiana.

People begging for help against enslavement—Hungary and Laos, for instance—the adults don't help. Tshombe in Katanga, strictly anti-Communist and pro-West, the adults are trying at this very moment to force into the Red prison. Must adults help their enemies and harm their friends?

They set up a world commission of nations to stamp out crime and made the chief criminal a commissioner with power to veto any move to stop his own crimes. If this is the way an adult draws up a charter, let me not grow older.

Washington's men endured Valley Forge and Nathan Hale stood proud to give his life for his country so that we could live our own lives free from the arbitrary dictates of a monarch. Why, then, are the adults trying to make everyone dependent upon the state, so that the state is the big "papa" which does all the planning, the thinking, and the deciding? This is monarchy all over again.

For these adults the equality which gives us the authority to rule ourselves is no longer God given; the atheist is the only first-class citizen. Equality, too, no longer means equal freedom to pursue happiness but a material homogenization of all citizens like milk or bottled orange juice, a homogenization which they force on us by playing strange Robin Hoods who take from the industrious to make everyone shiftlessly alike.

For these adults "might" means "right"; any world gangster who can keep people enslaved securely, they recognize as a legitimate, lawful head of a state. If adults reason so poorly, should I grow to be an adult?

Fortunately there is another kind of adult, an adult who is going back to Americanism, resurrecting it again.

This adult shouts that the American Government is founded on God. He cries for freedom to pursue happiness in his own way—just as long as he does not abuse someone else's right to the same freedom.

This new adult demands that America regain her self-respect, that she be unafraid to use her "might" to defend "right". He will never "negotiate" with the Reds when negotiating means letting them have what they stole. It may mean that he must fight, perhaps die, but if he is not willing to die for liberty, he knows he does not deserve to have it.

This new kind of adult, my kind of adult, is resurrecting the principles which made our country great. He is not called a liberal but he is truly the liberal. He is for freedom of the individual and against monarchy which America once threw off. He is known by almost an evil word—"conservative"—but he could be better classified as an American traditionalist, a political companion of Bellarmine, Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln.

If I grow into adulthood, may God let me grow into this type to keep wonderful America alive.

The Medical Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, in terms of service to humanity, there is no doubt that one our country's most important industries is the pharmaceutical industry. In the conviction that the position and accomplishments of this vital industry should be more widely understood by Members of Congress, who may be called upon to make legislative decisions bearing upon the health and well-being of the American people, I include as part of my remarks the text of a speech prepared by the CIBA Pharmaceutical Co., of Summit, N.J.

I commend it to our colleagues as a valuable statement of the views and position of the pharmaceutical industry, as follows:

THE MEDICAL REVOLUTION

Let me start by telling you a very brief story. For the moment I'm not going to tell you the ending. See if you can guess what it is.

My story is about a young woman in her late twenties, the mother of two small children. We see her about to enter her doctor's office. She is nervous and worried. Something is wrong—something more than the wear and tear of housework and shopping and cooking.

Thirty minutes later she leaves, smiling and feeling better already. She walks half a block and enters a drugstore.

If you were to try to figure out the ending of that story, I think you would be wrong because that young woman lives in the year 1990, 29 years from today.

Her trouble has been diagnosed as leukemia. She has a prescription from her doctor for a drug that will cure it. No wonder she seems relieved. She thought it might be something serious.

In 1990, leukemia will not really be serious. And neither will several forms of cancer or heart trouble. In that year, when our fictional young woman makes her life-saving trip to the drugstore, her child in kindergarten will swallow pleasant-tasting medicine which will protect him through life against more than one form of cancer. In that same year her golfing father, stricken as he sights down the fairway, will be saved from a fatal coronary by a tiny instrument taped to his chest to record the build-up of danger signals and to inject a preventive dose of medication into his blood stream.

Wonderful as these things sound—and they will be wonderful—drug cures and preventives for a number of forms of cancer and heart disease are only a fraction of the medical victories we expect to see by the year 2000, and probably sooner.

But if you are the kind of person who has trouble believing in predictions, I think you will be more willing when I recall some predictions that have already come true. Each of the health gains we enjoy today was, in its own way, and in its own time, as great a victory as the cures for cancer and heart disease we can expect within a generation.

So let's start again and turn back the clock. In this case we only have to go back 25 years. We'll settle down in the year 1936 and try to look ahead to the year 1961.

Nineteen hundred and thirty-six was the year the March of Dimes for polio began. What memories that recalls—summer epidemics of disaster proportions, overcrowded hospital wards, row upon row of iron lungs, wheelchairs, braces, and crutches.

Many died, many were permanently deformed. There was no way to prevent it.

But had you been able to look across the years from 1936 to 1961, you would see a 5-year-old running back to his playmates to announce bravely that the shot the doctor gave him didn't hurt at all. The shot is a vaccine to prevent polio. We take it for granted in 1961.

So now when I tell you we are today in the midst of a medical revolution, the words "medical revolution" will have practical meaning to you. They won't be just a catch phrase you heard from some fellow from a pharmaceutical company.

This medical revolution has no parallel in history. Here are just a few of the victories scored in our lifetime:

Our life expectancy has increased from 49 in 1900 to 70 in 1961. If the Nation's death rate had remained constant at its 1937 level 3 million Americans living today would now be dead. (That figure no doubt involves a few of us in the room.)

A child born today, perhaps at this moment, can expect to live 10 years longer than a child born in 1930. Deaths in children 1 to 4 years old have gone down 80 percent. Deaths in children 5 to 14 years old, down 71 percent. Deaths from influenza and pneumonia have declined 68 percent since 1930. Deaths from tuberculosis, down 80 percent since World War II.

Helping to forward this progress in medicine and health has been a spectacular advance in the discovery and use of new drugs to prevent, to cure, or to relieve disease conditions. In fact, you, the public—not doctors or pharmacists or pharmaceutical houses—coined the name "miracle drugs."

Modern drugs today actually cure scores of illnesses.

Before 1940—not much more than 20 years ago, mind you—with a tiny handful of exceptions, drugs cured nothing. You yourself did much of the fighting against many illnesses. Today on countless disease battle fronts drugs do the fighting for you.

The parade of new and better drugs has been so fast in recent years that we estimate 9 out of every 10 prescriptions written today could not have been filled in 1935. The drugs just didn't exist.

In the late 1930's and early forties, the pharmaceutical industry came of age.

We became, in fact, a new industry. With the first anti-infectives like the sulfa drugs we realized that there were no limits on future achievements if we could marshal the manpower, the brains, and the money. Within reach were drugs to wipe out disease, reduce surgery, shorten hospitalization, pro-

long life, banish pain, ward off untimely death. Overnight we were pioneers in a new field of medicine.

Between 1940 and 1953 came synthetic drugs against malaria: penicillin and streptomycin—the broad-spectrum antibiotics to fight infections—the synthetic hormones like cortisone and its derivates which restored activity to thousands crippled by arthritis, and drugs like isoniazid to cure tuberculosis.

Since 1953 have come the tranquilizers which have freed from mental institutions thousands of persons, allowing many to resume normal lives. Until then the population of mental hospitals increased alarmingly each year. The tranquilizers reversed this trend. Today there are about 17,000 fewer mental patients in State and local institutions than in 1954, thanks mainly to new drugs. This means a considerable saving in tax dollars alone for patient maintenance and construction costs.

The name "tranquilizer," by the way, was coined by a research vice president from my company to describe the action of a drug we introduced in 1953. The drug was discovered in the root of a plant thought for centuries in India to have mystical curing powers. It took millions of dollars and 7 years, but a team of CIBA scientists found the chief active ingredient which had been locked up since the beginning of time in these roots. A complicated manufacturing process now transforms them into an invaluable drug for people with high blood pressure or mental disorders.

But it doesn't make much difference where a new compound for a drug comes from—an Indian snake root, a Mexican yam, or if a team of research scientists make it in a test tube. Discovery is only the starting point of drug research.

The journey from laboratory discovery to a potent, effective, prescription product usually takes about 3 years and many dollars—sometimes running into the millions. It involves extensive laboratory and animal tests and clinical trials before we receive Government permission to make it generally available to physicians.

After a CIBA drug goes into production, the system which maintains and controls its quality involves more than 100,000 tests a year and requires a full-time staff of 50 scientists and other people.

Fortunately, the pharmaceutical industry in America has traveled this test tube to tablet road often. The result has been that in 20 years America has introduced more effective new drugs to combat or cure illness than all of the rest of the nations of the world combined. Russia by the way, has produced no new or significant drug in the 42 years of its state-controlled existence.

How has success been possible? What makes our industry tick? Much of the answer is summed up in a willingness to take enormous research risks, fierce competition, and what we call obsolescence. Let's take a quick look at each of these—risks, competition and obsolescence.

In research, the prescription drug industry accepts odds of about 1,600 to 1 against success. In 1959, for example, out of 110,200 substances tested in industry laboratories, only 63 became useful marketable drugs.

Even though the score seems way out of balance—only 63 winners from over 110,000 entries—63 truly effective new drugs are well worth thousands of failures. Any contribution to human health—the addition of even a few days to the human lifespan—far outweigh in value to mankind the dollar costs of laboratory and marketing failures.

That brings us to my second point, competition.

There are today in America more than 1,300 manufacturers of prescription drugs but no one company has more than 10 percent of the drug business. Because competition, few drugs dominate the market for more than 2 or 3 years. By then other products usually appear, each with its own particular advantages for a particular disease condition in a particular patient. Sometimes, the improvements are so spectacular they sweep the original product from the market.

We call the process of replacement and improvement obsolescence. Now what do these facts of life in the prescription drug industry mean to your life, my life, and the lives of those we love? How do we benefit from research risks, competition, and obsolescence?

First of all, unending competition in discovery and improvement places new health-giving drugs in the hands of physicians faster than any other system. In the United States, a single disease problem is attacked on many different fronts, in many different ways, by many different organizations both public and private. Under state-controlled systems, there is no such diversity and no real competition.

Second, competition to discover and to improve guarantees that your doctor has not one, but many different drugs weapons with which to fight a particular disease condition.

To give you an example, take the new oral diuretics that have saved countless lives. They help people with high blood pressure and others who are unable to excrete body fluids efficiently, a condition doctors call edema. The drug industry didn't stop with one. Today there are at least seven new diuretic drugs, including one CIBA product, made possible through research and competition. Each has advantages not found in the others for certain treatments and certain patients.

But despite all the health gains we enjoy today—gains undreamed of a generation ago—still, we do get sick and nobody likes to pay the costs of getting well. But I think you may feel better after I tell you a little more about drug costs and the uses to which earnings from prescription drug sales are applied.

Today's advanced drugs take about 20 cents of each dollar we spend for medical care. According to a U.S. Department of Commerce survey, this is a penny less than we spent for the less effective and less plentiful drugs of 1940.

The average yearly per capita expenditure for prescription drugs is only $15. That's a lot less than most of us spend to keep our automobile healthy. If you smoke a pack of cigarettes a day, you spend about six times $15 a year on tobacco. If you enjoy a cocktail now and then, you probably spend a lot more than $15 a year on alcohol (although some claim it does have a therapeutic effect.)

Average yearly per capita expenditures: Tobacco, $36; alcoholic beverages, $53; servicing and storage of automobiles, $24.

Into the price we charge the pharmacist go many things. Among these are research and manufacturing costs—expensive quality control procedures to assure the safety, potency, and effectiveness of our brand name products—salaries, transportation, and distribution, advertising, costs of plants, and equipment and many other expenses including taxes.

When all of these expenses have been paid, what remains is profit. To show you what this profit amounts to, let's take the average cost of a prescription—it was $3.25 in 1960. On the sale of that prescription the manufacturer's profit is about 19 cents. That's only a small percentage of the purchase price but I'll tell you how important it is.

First, part of that 19 cents is paid out in dividends to the shareholders who have invested their savings in the company. Another portion of that 19 cents goes to cover a contingency like this:

A company discovers a new and promising drug. It invests millions in the new plants and new equipment to produce it. Every test and trial known to medical and pharmaceutical science points to success. But in actual practice the drug fails. Profits must absorb that loss. And for new products that succeed, profits represent the money needed in advance for new buildings and equipment.

Without these profits there would be few new drugs because the drug industry could never afford to fail. It could never gamble on research odds of 1,600 to 1 against success. There could be very few drugs developed on private money—your taxes would have to fill the void.

Since I mentioned the retail pharmacist before, you might be interested in knowing what profit he makes. A recent survey (Lilly Digest, 1960) of 2,000 pharmacists showed that their average net profit before taxes was 5.7 percent.

Right now I know you're thinking, "OK, it's an expensive, risky business but I still resent paying for a handful of little pills no matter what the cost." I wouldn't argue with that. We all resent being ill and this resentment colors our thinking about all experiences in the process of getting well.

But what do you really get for the money spent for the three or four prescriptions you probably buy each year?

First, today's potent new medicines often lower the cost of being ill. Not too many years ago if you contracted pneumonia you probably spent several weeks in the hospital, plus weeks of convalescence. The bill came to about $300 or $400. Today pneumonia can often be cured by your physician at home in a short time with less than $30 worth of antibiotics.

When you buy a prescription you are also investing in the research that will produce tomorrow's miracle drugs.

This year the pharmaceutical industry will spend $225 million on research—$225 million in 1961 compared with only $30 million just 13 years ago; $225 million to press forward man's battle against cancer, heart disease, multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy, and all the killers and cripplers that plague us today.

In these terms, I think you will agree that the dollars you spend on effective drugs today—drugs that cure or give blessed relief—also represent about the finest life insurance in the world.

And we know that the wonders we predict will come true. Because a health team of the world's most skillful physicians, pharmacists, nurses, and medical technologists—brilliant research scientists—and the prescription drug industry are working to help you.

This teamwork has already given us the finest health and medical care the world has even seen—and it will produce even better results tomorrow.

The Honorable Louis C. Rabaut

SPEECH

OF

HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the death of Congressman RABAUT came as a great shock to me, as I am sure it did to the rest of the Members of the House, for, despite illnesses he appeared to us to be an indestructible rock who could always be counted on to overcome any

setback and come back to his duties here and carry them out courageously and with great compassion.

I enjoyed his friendship and treasured his advice and guidance. He was never too busy to help a new Member to become familiar with the work of the House, and as the new Member began to achieve experience here, he was always ready to suggest new ideas for meeting new problems.

Patriotism, piety, love of family, and a deep and sincere sense of friendship dominated his life. He was in the literal sense a good man. I want to take this opportunity to express to Mrs. Rabaut and her fine children my deepest sympathy. He has left a wonderful heritage of integrity and decency, both in the life he led and in the laws he was instrumental in writing as a Member of Congress.

The Migrant Farm Labor Story—Part V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article in the New York World Telegram and Sun series by Dale Wright who has described vividly the exploitation of the migrant workers:

THE FORGOTTEN PEOPLE: MIGRANT LABOR EXPLOITED BY DELAY TRICK

(By Dale Wright)

(Last April the World-Telegram assigned staff writer Dale Wright to see if the desperate plight of the migrant laborer had been eased by recent protective laws. After working and living as one of them in scores of locations from Florida to Long Island, he found these "forgotten people" still overworked, underpaid, cheated on every hand, and forced to live in filthy conditions degrading to human dignity. His report continues today.)

When I found myself stranded in a miserable Florida migrant labor camp with no work for 10 days because the tomato crop was late, my first thoughts were charitable ones.

Naively, I figured a mistake had been made, that I and the scores of other workers with me had been transported 300 miles in the good faith that jobs were waiting for us.

I've never been more wrong in my life.

It wasn't the weather and the fact that the tomatos had not ripened by the time we arrived. The simple truth was that the tomato grower and the labor contractor who hired us with his fat promises planned it exactly that way.

OFT-USED EXPLOITATION GIMMICK

It's a favorite gimmick, I discovered, to exploit the illiterate, inarticulate migrant worker. Hang him up at a camp or a farm where he can't run and then charge him for his food and lodging.

What does a migrant do? I found that most of them, in hock to somebody all their lives, are forced to go along with the only rule of life they've ever known.

They stay on, run up debts to the farmer-grower or contractor and then work off their debts with sweat and toil when the crop comes in.

And at the end? They have nothing and so they move on.

I stayed a couple of days, running up bills for food and my bed. There was no work, or no pay for anybody.

So I talked to the crew boss, the contractor who had led me to what he called the land of plenty but which I had discovered was a land of nothing. I told him I was leaving, that I was going into town.

THREATENED WITH BEATING

"Walk away from this camp, boy," (a term often used condescendingly in the South and one that always grates on the nerves) he told me, "and the cops in town will catch up with you and beat you half to death. And if they don't get you, I'll come after you myself."

He was a mean-looking fellow, over 6 feet and 200 pounds-plus. But I decided that I would leave anyway and take my chances getting into town—3 miles on foot—and moving along to another stop where was more work.

Later I heard this bully make the same threat to other restless members of the migrant crew he had gotten to the camp. About 40 of them, including a dozen small children, had straggled into the camp in a motley caravan of broken-down buses and trucks. There was much grumbling and discontent over no work.

When anyone objected too loudly, he was threatened with head-whippings. I didn't see anybody get slapped around, but there was not the slightest doubt in my mind that the boss man would do whatever he felt necessary to make his point.

Men and women I had talked with on the long bus trip up from Homestead told me that getting a fist or a club upside your head was one of the things you expected working in the fields.

OFF TO TAMPA BY BUS

I had seen and heard enough. And despite the threats of the crew boss, I left camp the next morning, walked 3 miles into Ruskin and caught a bus for nearby Tampa. I had money, of course, for travel and I was able to get away. The others stranded at the camp, stayed on and waited for the crop to come in.

On the bus, I met a 43-year-old farm worker I shall call William Lewis. He was born in a shack in a clump of trees near Okeechobee, Fla., one of 11 children of migrant parents. As soon as he was able to lift a basket of tomatoes or a hamper of beans, he had gone into the field with the rest of the family.

William had never gone beyond the third grade in school a backwoods classroom. He never learned to read or write. With his brothers and sisters he went through his early years suffering from malnutrition.

As he put it, "We was hungry lots of the time."

The hungry years had left their mark. He wheezed and snorted constantly. His arms and legs were bent and misshapen. He shambled and shuffled along in a permanent stoop.

Long ago, he said, he had lost track of his father and mother, didn't know if they were alive. Occasionally, he stumbled across a brother or a sister in a work camp or a potato field.

ONE INDELIBLE RECOLLECTION

Stamped indelibly in his memory was the recollection of the succession of filthy shacks and camps where there never was enough food to eat or milk to drink. As long as he could remember, he said, he had been overworked, cheated out of his wages and overcharged whenever he bought anything.

"Ain't nothin you can do about it," he said wearily. "You got to take what the bossman give you. Then, when the work is done, you move on. You gotta go somewhere else."

William told me he had worked in just about every State from Florida to Maine. In several states, including New York, he added, he had gone on relief when there was no work.

I asked him if he thought he could escape from the treadmill of migrant labor.

"Never escape," he replied. "I don't know nothing but picking and grubbing. I'll keep moving on from farm to farm until the day I die."

William's plight, I discovered on my assignment, was that of scores of others I talked with—Negro, Mexican, Puerto Rican, West Indian and poor white migrants who work the good earth but who get very little good out of it for themselves.

Greater Los Angeles Press Club Awards Winning Place to Edsel Newton of Great 23d District, Los Angeles County, Calif., on His Editorial Entitled "Free Enterprise Benefits All of Us"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present copy of publication on Thursday, November 9, 1961, in one of the very largely circulated newspapers in the great 23d Congressional District, Los Angeles County, which district I represent in this my 16th year in this great legislative body.

The winning editorial is by Mr. Edsel Newton, very long and always very favorably known by me. I submit the comments by the editor in connection with the publication of this winning editorial entitled "Free Enterprise Benefits All of Us." I know you and all other Members of this distinguished legislative body join with me in cordial appreciation and congratulations to the writer, Edsel Newton, on his winning, and likewise upon the statement of basic principles set forth in his winning editorial.

The comments and editorial follow:

ENTERPRISE EDITORIAL WINS PRESS HONORS

An Enterprise Publications editorial published in mid-September has won a high distinction for these newspapers and brought to its author a $250 award.

The editorial, "Free Enterprise Benefits All of Us," by Edsel Newton, has been adjudged by a committee at the National Press Club in Washington, D.C., as the best of all editorials on free enterprise to have been submitted in the annual competition of the Greater Los Angeles Press Club.

Newton is editor of the Long Beach area Enterprise newspapers.

He has received a number of citations and awards, including the first national award for news coverage of the maritime industry in 1947 from the Propeller Club of the United States.

Specifically, the award is the annual one put up by James L. Fallon, one of 19 to be conferred upon winners at the Press Club's Fourth Annual Journalism Awards banquet tonight.

The Fallon Award is given for the newspaper editorial which best defines free enterprise within the framework of the Constitution of the United States.

The award-winning editorial is reproduced here.

FREE ENTERPRISE BENEFITS ALL OF US

Never in history have the stores in our community been stocked with so great a variety of merchandise. And never in history has competition been so keen, price-wise or otherwise.

The stores in the main are thriving. Yet those conducting these many enterprises are not the only benefactors of the free enterprise system as is too often assumed by shallow thinkers.

Too often when anything is written or said about the free enterprise system the emphasis appears to be on the advantage of free enterprise to the "enterpriser."

It is too frequently assumed that the greater benefit from our economic system accrues to those who own and operate business establishments.

Too little is said about the advantages of free enterprise to the buyer consumer and wage earner. Free enterprise creates jobs.

In the absence of free enterprise the consumer is at the mercy of a state system whose bureaucrats decide, more than likely on the basis of party sympathies or affiliation, who gets what and when.

The privilege of making a selection does not exist under a state system; brand names and competition are abolished, and, inevitably, rationing is imposed upon the populace.

No state system can exist without a central core of all-powerful directors. This makes for a governing class that decides not only what one can possess or consume but which decides what he must think, and he must not think in terms of free enterprise.

How would you like to be put in a position of begging for the privilege of buying a refrigerator, an automobile, clothing or an adequate amount of food for your family from an arrogant partyliner?

In America, an impartial paycheck is the decisionmaker.

If you don't like your job you can quit it and get another; if a merchant's products or policies are displeasing you can go next door.

"Next door," in one dictatorship at least, is likely to be in Siberia.

Budget Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, as I listened today to the reading of the President's budget message, I could not but think of a statement once made by the patron saint of the Democrat Party, Thomas Jefferson. He said:

I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers. We must make our choice between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy.

Also, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Jefferson must must have read different history than those of the Democrat Party who have followed him, for he, Jefferson, said:

My reading of history convinces me that most bad government results from too much government.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Jefferson foresaw that such a budget message as this might come to the Congress when he said:

The natural progress of things is for liberty to yield and government to gain ground.

But, as you know, he also said:

That government is best which governs least.

Mr. Speaker, listening to the President's budget message, I like what Mr. Jefferson had to say.

What's Right With America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, one of the wisest statements I have read in some time is an editorial entitled "What's Right With America," which was published in the January 1961 issue of Changing Times, the Kiplinger magazine. Its author is W. M. Kiplinger.

This is a balanced, hopeful, and realistic statement—a healthy tonic to any of the distorted or exaggerated diagnoses of our society which are making the rounds from left to right. It does not seek to cover up the unpleasant, the troublesome, but it insists we see the whole America. And the whole America, as viewed so succinctly and sanely by Mr. Kiplinger, is a nation in which we, its citizens, can take great and justifiable pride even as we go about our business of making it better.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mr. Kiplinger's editorial, as follows:

WHAT'S RIGHT WITH AMERICA

(By W. M. Kiplinger)

You hear and feel it everywhere—misgivings and worries about America. It is said that perhaps we have lost our stuff, gone soft. No sense of purpose, no ideals. Even, it is said, our free-enterprise system no longer delivers the goods as effectively as it once did.

These self-doubts boil up from within, from idealistic young persons, who burn with indignation over flaws in our ways of thinking and doing. From reformers impatient over the delays in reaching utopia next week. From ordinary folks unnerved by rebuffs we get from all around the globe. And the self-doubts are aggravated by criticism from outside, from the Communists, who are smart in the ways of propaganda and who tell the world that the United States of America is a corrupt, self-centered society doomed to succumb to Marxism.

What are we to think of ourselves? What are we to say to foreign critics? Is this country really all washed up?

Are we flabby and decadent? True, we have the world's highest living standards—cars, television, washers, fancy kitchens, supermarkets loaded with food, and we like these things. But the Communist peoples like them, too, and perhaps much of the pooh-poohing of our comfortable way of life grows out of envy. Remember that the Communists are trying to ascend to softness as rapidly as possible. The big reward they hold out to their people is the chance eventually to live like the Americans.

How come we have unemployment, while the Soviet Union doesn't? Mainly because our system works too well, produces surpluses, while the Russians still struggle with shortages. Their full employment stems from inefficiency, unfilled wants, and forced labor.

How can we speak for democracy when we practice racial segregation and discrimination? The answer is that as a nation we do not believe in racial inequality. Some persons do, but on the whole, we are moving toward improvement with amazing speed.

Isn't capitalism basically selfish? True, capitalism runs on the profit motive, profit for the individual. But the demonstrable fact about this kind of selfishness is that it makes for a high degree of productivity, more things for more people. Within our free enterprise system there exists a welter of nonprofit organizations, charitable institutions, cooperatives. The selfish individuals (all of us) who run the system through governments of their own choosing impose taxes on themselves, pass laws providing for social security and unemployment insurance, raise money for symphony orchestras and start hospitals.

When you are told that we are a selfish people, a grubby people, ask yourself why we are fundamentally such a religious people, which we indeed are. This is not just a matter of maintaining thousands of churches. It is not a matter of mere surface piety. It is something of the spirit, deep within us, that prompts us to be humane—to give millions to charity, to send our substance and our citizens abroad to help the less fortunate. We have always been generous, instinctively, and we keep it up, even when we are kicked in the teeth for our generosity.

Why do we have poverty, juvenile delinquency, laziness, drunkenness, opinionated ignorance, mental illness? Well, every country has these problems—Russia included—but they stand out here because of the general well-being of the great majority. We also publicize such troubles in an attempt to find solutions, while the Reds simply pretend that they have no such faults. Dictators can suppress any mention of rotten spots. In America, everybody shoots his mouth off, gripes about the Government, puts on the line any dirty linen he wants to air. Our defects are drummed into us from press and radio and TV and pulpit. That's why we lose perspective, often think too poorly of ourselves.

To find faults in others does not excuse faults in ourselves, but it does give a sense of balance. If communism is superior as a system, why no free elections to let the people choose for themselves? Why have all Communist conquests been by military force or by guerrilla revolts in backward countries? Why has Russia fallen back on capitalist practices to get its economy moving? (Bonuses, incentives, private farming, property inheritance.) Why are our broadcasts jammed—can't the happy Russians be trusted to hear anything from the "decadent bourgeoisie"? Why do Communist countries vie with each other for selfish advantages? Where is the world brotherhood of workers and peasants the Reds promised—the brotherhood that would do away with the poison of nationalism?

If the trend of history really is toward communism, why have the most advanced nations of Western Europe turned against

communism and enjoyed their greatest boom?

Whenever you start believing that the Russians are winning, bear this in mind: We have in fact won some big rounds. Russia was defeated in the attempt to communize Western Europe. Russia's plans failed in Greece, in Nasser's Egypt, in Iraq, in the Congo. True, we have lost in China and Cuba, and we have trouble in Latin America. But the Chinese Reds show no inclination to truckle to Khrushchev, and the last chapter on the wild Senor Castro has yet to be written.

If you are tempted to despair of our system, try to see it whole, the good with the bad.

As a machine for producing things, the U.S. economic system is unrivaled. The benefits of this economic machine are distributed to many people. Our poor are fewer and less poor than the poor in the Communist countries. Our middle class has tremendously expanded, upgraded from poor, also enlarged from the ranks of the once very rich. This has put the final kibosh on the class system that we inherited from Europe. It is we, not the Russians, who are running the world's most exciting revolution, benefiting millions.

Dislocations, problems, yes. But again, we are sensitive to them and make efforts to find remedies. And our system contains within itself the capacity to find remedies. Why? Because the whole idea behind the system is that people have a right to be free. And freedom means the opportunity to have choices, to tinker with personal and national goals.

The role of freedom in our system is not always fully appreciated. Too often we think of freedom as merely the absence of constraint. It is much more than that. Freedom means, for example, that you do not have to follow your father and be a farmer or a teacher because that's what he was. But it also means you have affirmative choices to be a lawyer or a carpenter or a bum, to rise or fall on your own.

Who is in charge in the United States of America? Wall Street? big business? big unions? No. Organized groups are influential, but they are often in conflict, and no one of them is dominant. We come closer to running ourselves than any other people ever.

To sum it up: We have goods, we have services, we have more wealth per capita. Those things are tangible and materialistic. On top of them, or perhaps at the base of them, we have individual latitudes, and the common term is freedom. We are far from perfect, but we make progress. We need not moan all the time or spend our time apologizing for what's wrong. It's better to strike a balance. If we do, we stand up straight, with dignity. Then we see a good people, working and living within a good system. And that's what's right with our country.

Do as We Say

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the Lowell Sun, which serves the reading public of my hometown, has a reputation for speaking the truth and speaking it often and plainly. The following article appeared in the January 2 issue. It is worth attention:

DO AS WE SAY

The public has often registered its disapproval of Federal aid of various sorts on the ground that States rights are infringed thereby and matters which would be amenable to local determination must be referred to Washington.

Those who disagree with us argue that this is not true. They contend that the mere fact that Washington supplies the money does not necessarily mean that Washington will dictate to the State. In the matter of Federal aid to education this matter of Federal control has been discussed frequently. The average citizen maintains that "he who pays the piper calls the tune" and it is our belief that when Washington supports our schools it will also direct them. We have never known Federal funds to be disbursed without strings attached to them.

The latest pronouncement of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare supports our position. Secretary Ribicoff has recently promulgated new Federal welfare rules to which all States receiving Federal largess must conform. He has set mandatory deadlines for companies with his new rules. And, says he: "If a State does not conform then we cut off their money."

That's that.

Judicial Review of Veterans' Claims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I am including an Associated Press story which appeared in the January 14 issue of the New York Times, dealing with the activities and operations of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals.

This court was created in 1951, as the Associated Press story goes, "after a wave of complaints that basic rights of servicemen were being flagrantly violated at every stage of military proceedings. More than 15,500 cases have been docketed."

I am very much interested in the operation of this court, and I am pleased to note such a favorable press account of this new judicial body.

It brings to mind my long interest, along with other Members of the House and members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, in creating a similar court to handle claims of our veterans who have exhausted their administrative remedies in the Veterans' Administration and before the Board of Veterans' Appeals. Far-reaching and conclusive hearings, in my opinion, were held on this subject in the 86th Congress, and the bill on this subject was formally reported. I hope that in this Congress a similar measure may not only be reported but enacted into law.

I have recently advised the new General Counsel of the Veterans' Administration of my feelings in this matter. I think that the creation of such a court is inevitable. The Board of Veterans' Appeals handles between 40,000 and 50,000 cases a year, and all but 5 to 8 percent of the claims are denied. In other words, adversely decided for the veteran. In this connection, the Court of Military Appeals, according to the Associated Press story, has a record "of reversals favorable to defendants of 40 to 50 percent."

The purpose of the legislation pending before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is very simple. It is to provide a veteran claimant with his day in court after he has exhausted all of his administrative remedies. It seeks to prevent the Veterans' Administration from being final arbiter—judge, prosecutor and jury. In my opinion, it would be the greatest step forward that we could take in the field of veterans affairs.

COURT OF APPEALS AIDS SERVICEMEN

WASHINGTON, January 13.—American soldiers and sailors in trouble have a better chance for justice now, partly because of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals. It is an institution that grows in importance as the services grow but still is hardly known to the general public.

One way to understand the court and its attitude is to call on Homer Ferguson, one of its three judges.

Judge Ferguson, a 72-year-old former Pennsylvania coal miner, dresses like a judge (he is one), looks like a grandfather (he is one), and speaks with the ease and self-assurance of a professional politician (he was one).

As a judge on the Court of Military Appeals—the supreme court of the military—he has dedicated himself to the "little people," as he calls them, and the protection of their liberty and civil rights.

SET UP IN 1951

The Court of Military Appeals was formed by Congress in 1951 after a wave of complaints that basic rights of servicemen were being flagrantly violated at every stage of military proceedings. More than 15,500 cases have been docketed.

The court reviews certain cases after a Pentagon board of review has ruled on a court-martial verdict. The court's decision is final. The number of reversals favorable to defendants is 40 to 50 percent.

From his two-story, white brick home in Northwest Washington, Judge Ferguson drives daily to his $25,500-a-year job behind the green wooden doors of a trim, gray stone courthouse.

There, he and his colleagues, Chief Judge Robert E. Quinn and Judge Paul J. Kilday, set about their task of assuring men in the service their basic rights. They have done so in such decisions as these:

After a Navy machinist's mate was convicted of an offense in 1957, the court set aside the verdict because naval intelligence agents had refused to allow the prisoner to consult a lawyer before making a statement.

An airman's rape conviction was set aside in 1958 on the ground that the law officer, who corresponds to presiding judge in a court-martial, had made rulings aiding the prosecution. The military appeals court said he kept telling the complaining witness she did not have to answer defense questions that might incriminate her. "In this type of case," the court ruled, "it is proper to prove the unchaste character of the complaining witness."

In 1958 the court threw out the conviction of a Marine drill instructor accused of beating recruits because the law officer had assisted in preparing the charges against the instructor.

REFLECTS ON LIBERALISM

Is Judge Ferguson a liberal judge?

Settling back into a leather chair in his office one day recently, he gazed through

his steel-rimmed glasses and reached a verdict:

"I'm not sure 'liberal' is the proper word for a judge. I guess I could be classified as a strict constructionist of the law. Liberty is based on a fair interpretation of the law for the individual. If the law doesn't explicitly make a thing a crime, then it's not a crime. If the law says a thing and it's clear what is meant, then we have to follow it.

"I can't do as I please and determine a man guilty because I think what he did is wrong. It's up to the Government, which defines what is and what is not a crime. A judge tries to ascertain from printed words what the crime is. Some people say this is convicting or letting a man off 'on a technicality.' I don't agree.

"Thus, justice is blindfolded. I must hear what you did, not see what you are."

Judge Ferguson's devotion to facts and his tenacity at rooting for them gained him headlines in 1939 when as a Wayne County (Detroit) circuit judge, he took advantage of Michigan law to sit as a one-man grand jury. Hiring his own lawyers and investigators, he waded into an investigation of vice and corruption.

THREE HUNDRED AND SIXTY INDICTMENTS

He didn't stop until he had returned 360 indictments and convictions. The mayor of Detroit went to prison. So did the police superintendent, the sheriff and prosecuting attorney of Wayne County, three Detroit councilmen, two county auditors and numerous police officials.

Judge Ferguson, a Republican, went to Washington, where he served as Senator from 1942 to 1954.

Reflecting on the changeover from legislative to judicial life, Judge Ferguson said:

"Being a Senator is a combination of being a judge and an advocate. You advocate issues on the Senate floor—a great place—and at other times you sit in judgment of what others are advocating. When I moved to the court, it took some time for me to settle down, stop advocating and be strictly a judge.

"When I was a circuit judge in Michigan, I often had the impulse to talk too much and argue the lawyers' cases for them. Finally, I printed a sign and glued it to the bench in front of me, where only I could see it.

"It said: 'Keep quiet'."

Hon. Louis J. Rabaut

SPEECH

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I was serving on active duty in the Navy in the Mediterranean last fall when I got the word that my great friend and our beloved colleague, LOUIS RABAUT, had passed into the Great Beyond. It was a sad day for me.

LOUIS RABAUT was one of the first Members of this body with whom I became acquainted as a freshman Congressman. In that first year in the House I had the privilege of serving with him on the Board of Visitors to West Point. It was then that I came to know of his great capacity for friendship, his warm understanding, his deep love for young people, and the sound wisdom and commonsense bred from a lifetime of experience that have meant so much over the years to all the deliberations of this House. I was indebted to LOUIS RABAUT for the advice and encouragement he gave to me as a new Member.

LOUIS RABAUT will be remembered for many, many years for his service as a Member of Congress. He will be remembered for what he did in including a reference to the Diety in our pledge of allegiance—"this Nation under God"—one of his proudest accomplishments. But he will also be remembered as one who always had the time and the willingness to help anyone in need. His staff was devoted to him. His friends were legion. Here was a great man, and a good man.

This House will be the less for his passing from our scene. To his widow and his family I extend my heartfelt sympathy in their loss.

Growing Concern for Aged Ill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a timely and excellent editorial entitled "Growing Concern for Aged Ill" from the Boston Globe, January 9, 1962. I trust that the growing concern for the aged ill will be translated into legislation by the 87th Congress at the first possible opportunity. I agree with President Kennedy's statement in his state of the Union message that in matters of health, no piece of legislation is more important than the enactment under the social security system of health insurance for the aged.

The article follows:

GROWING CONCERN FOR AGED ILL

As the Congress assembles for 1962, President Kennedy finds certain areas of domestic legislation taking precedence over others. Above all, the tariff issue must be faced and acted upon if the Republic is to move forward in full economic strength. But in recent weeks the minds of many persons have been greatly concerned with the problem of medical care for the aged. In immediate human terms this, above all other national concerns, demands attention.

Thus within 3 days we find the Blue Cross Association and Senator JACOB JAVITS, Republican, of New York, offering counterplans that would provide such medical care. Both plans are, first of all, a recognition of a major sociological fact that can no longer be ignored. A sensible program for the care of the ailing aged, other than the inadequate Kerr-Mills Act now in operation, must be fashioned promptly.

There are 15 to 16 million persons over 65 years of age in the United States today, and an estimated two-thirds of them are in nowise prepared for medical and surgical bills that lie in wait for them or face them already.

Persons over 65 years of age go to the hospital more often than their younger neighbors and they stay longer. Their annual medical bills are twice that of persons under 65 years, and their income is only half as high. The problem does not apply to them alone, of course, since the burden often falls on their younger relations, if any—usually sons and daughters—and imposes frequently an impossible financial chore on a struggling married couple.

In the last session of Congress, the bill proposed by President Kennedy failed to pass. Since then he has pledged several times that he will press for the passage of the measure this year. Properly drawn and carefully managed, the bill could pass, not only because of a growing awareness of the problem, but because Members of Congress, returning to election contests in their home States in the fall of 1962, will be reluctant to acknowledge that they worked against such a bill.

The chief stumbling block has been the matter of how the program should be financed and administered. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Abraham Ribicoff has insisted on payment through Social Security tax increases, that the bill cover not merely the 10 million not prepared to pay, and that no means tests be imposed to determine who shall get the aid and who shall not.

The Blue Cross Association has offered a plan for providing hospital care by private insurance through its offices, with the Federal Government paying the premiums. The plan would thus eliminate the Government interference which has been claimed by many as the first step to socialized medicine.

But the Blue Cross stepped away from the method of financing and omits the matter of doctors' bills and surgical fees entirely. Senator JAVITS' plan offers three choices to the beneficiary, using social security to cover those persons under social security. Those who wish to participate through private companies would be subsidized to do so.

Thus are the lines of battle beginning to develop. However bitter the in-fighting may become, the victims should not again be the Nation's elderly citizens.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Aid to Latins Could Harm Economies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, at the present time Latin America has become a focal point in the struggle against the aggressive forces of communism. The great importance of this area has led to expanded programs by the United States of assistance to the Latin American States. More concentrated studies than ever before have been undertaken by committees of the Congress.

This fall the Joint Economic Committee, on which I serve, sent a subcommittee to South America to observe at first hand present activities in the economic area. Recently Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri, senior Republican Member on the Joint Economic Committee, was interviewed at length by Sid Goldberg, editor of the North American Newspaper Alliance. Major newspapers throughout the country carried reports of his impressions as stated in the interview. Among them are the St. Louis Globe Democrat and the New Haven Register on December 20, 1961; the Kansas City

Star, December 25, 1961; the Muncie, Ind., Star, December 26, 1961; and the Buffalo News, December 30, 1961.

Editor Goldberg should be commended for his interest in obtaining this first-hand report from Representative CURTIS. I would also like to commend my able colleague, TOM CURTIS, for his efforts to develop a written report on the South American trip, which will probably be issued this month and which will undoubtedly provide excellent material for all of us in the Congress.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I am enclosing an article from the New Haven, Conn., Register in the issue of December 20, 1961:

AID TO LATINS COULD HARM ECONOMIES—REPRESENTATIVE CURTIS, BACK FROM TOUR, WARNS OF DANGERS

NEW YORK.—The alliance for progress may disrupt the economic growth of Latin America unless the Kennedy administration alters the concepts of the $20 billion aid and investment program, says Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri.

CURTIS, senior Republican on the House-Senate Joint Economic Committee, has just returned from a month-long on-the-scene study of Latin American economic conditions. He had extensive talks with labor leaders, businessmen, U.S. officials, and economists in six Latin countries. Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, and Representative MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, Democrat, of Michigan, also members of the joint committee, were on the factfinding tour with him.

"The big mistake we're making in South America," he said in a lengthy interview here, "is that we're teaching these countries to solve all their problems in terms of Federal projects, when actually private enterprise, or at least action on the local government level, is what is needed to do the job.

"For example, let's look at the approach we're taking to land reform in Latin America," the 49-year-old St. Louis lawmaker said. "The important thing is that these impoverished countries are underpopulated. There are vast stretches of land, good land, not being worked today.

SUGGESTS TAX

"Now it seems to me that before we ask any country to start dividing up farms already in production we should make sure that all unworked land is brought under cultivation," he continued.

"What's the best way to accomplish that? The real estate tax. This is a tax that is nonexistent in most parts of Latin America. And, where it does exist, it is primitive. A landowner in these countries usually pays the same nominal tax on his property whether it is used or unused. No matter how many improvements he makes on his property, no matter how much income he derives from it, the tax remains the same.

"That's why everyone in Latin America buys land. It costs nothing to retain ownership and, since the land's value increases over the years, it is a good hedge against inflation. Even the factory worker or office clerk, as soon as he gets a few pesos together, sinks it into an acre or two of land he never cultivates, sort of like the French peasant hoarding gold.

"The way to bring this land into action," TOM CURTIS said, "is to start taxing it on a market appraisal basis—the way it's done in the United States. No one is going to let his land lie fallow if he has to pay a substantial tax on it each year. He's going to start working it—and the more improvements he makes on the land the higher the tax base goes, and thus the cycle is started.

"The distressing part of this is that the U.S. aid officials we send abroad know nothing about real estate taxes. There's no such thing as a Federal real estate tax in the United States—it's purely on the State and local level—so they have never had to reckon with it or understand it. Yet it is the real estate tax that pays for our schools, sewers, police forces, and the other community services," CURTIS explained.

"The only tax these people know about is the Federal income tax," he continued, "and in Latin America the income tax is not the answer to all economic problems."

CURTIS said that before revamping the income tax across Latin America, the governments should be encouraged to revamp their tax-collecting facilities, making sure they are getting all money due them. "This means building up a corps of honest, efficient civil servants, something Latin America lacks today," he said.

Land-Grant College Act Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the 100th anniversary of the beginning of congressional debate on the now famous Land-Grant College Act. Then, as today, the need for action to strengthen our institutions of higher education was sorely needed. The following article from Overview is an excellent re-creation of the atmosphere of the Congress and the Nation in 1862 when the issue was at fever pitch:

OUTLOOK GOOD FOR AID TO EDUCATION IN NEXT SESSION OF 37TH CONGRESS—REPRESENTATIVE MORRILL REVISES LAND-GRANT BILL—SECEDED STATES EXCLUDED FROM PROVISIONS—CONFLICT SEEN BETWEEN EASTERN, WESTERN REGIONS—MILITARY SCIENCE TO BE REQUIRED IN LIGHT OF BULL RUN DEFEAT—LITERARY COLLEGES NEED HAVE NO JEALOUSY OF AGRICULTURAL COLLEGES—SENATOR WADE, FORMER TEACHER, TO INTRODUCE BILL—PRESIDENT LINCOLN EXPECTED TO SIGN

(By Theodor Schuchat)

WASHINGTON, D.C., January 2, 1862.—The long fight for Federal aid to education should at last come to a successful conclusion in the coming session of Congress. Analyzing their previous defeats and acknowledging both recent political changes and military needs, sponsors of Federal aid have revised their proposals to gain additional support.

The bill introduced last month by Federal aid's original proponent, Representative Justin Smith Morrill, Republican, of Vermont, contains several significant changes. The land grant to each State would be increased from 20,000 to 30,000 acres per member of the State's congressional delegation.

The territories and seceded States would be excluded from the act's benefits. In view of the Union's need for more military officers, painfully demonstrated at Bull Run, Va., each of the so-called land-grant institutions would be required to teach military science and tactics.

It is too early to determine whether enlarging the proposed land grant will carry the bill to enactment and thus encourage the States to establish colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts. Western Congressmen will no doubt continue to demand that homesteaders come first whenever public lands are distributed.

There is also support for the proposition that land grants should be made from territorial lands only, not from the well-settled States, which would drastically cut the potential support for education if adopted by Congress.

Senator Benjamin Franklin Wade, Republican, of Ohio, a former teacher, will introduce the land-grant measure in the Senate. It was Senator Wade who led the successful fight for the bill in the Senate 2 years ago, when enactment was gained by a three-vote margin. He anticipates that western Senators will introduce a variety of crippling amendments, but he believes that, with the departure of the southerners, he now has a 2-to-1 majority in the Senate.

Senator Wade's former colleague, Senator George Ellis Pugh, Democrat, of Ohio, has been replaced by Senator John Sherman, Republican, of Ohio. Although a fellow Republican, elected with Senator Wade's support, Senator Sherman is not expected to endorse land grants for education. He will probably not vote on the measure. But Senator Wade has assurances that Senator Sherman will not offer the economy resolution proposed 2 years ago by his predecessor.

Former Senator Pugh's thrifty proposal, to delay distribution of land grants for education until the import duties collected each year are greater than the Federal Government's total annual expenditure, was defeated by a 25 to 27 rollcall vote. Despite its strong appeal only 2 years ago, this proposal is not likely to be made again this year. Military expenditures have since risen to enormous levels and the cost of the education proposal is now seen to be relatively modest.

Former Senator Pugh was also author of a proposed amendment to delete provisions of the bill specifying in some detail how funds derived from sale of the land grants should be used to finance practical education. He contended that States should be permitted to use the funds for colleges as they saw fit, a viewpoint that the Senate rejected by a narrow 25 to 27 vote. States rights arguments are no longer compelling, however, and most of the votes supporting Senator Pugh's position have departed with the Secessionist Senators.

Seccession has also ended many of Representative Morrill's problems in the House of Representatives. Hitherto, southerners and westerners have dominated the House Public Lands Committee while Representative Morrill's fellow northerners have controlled the House Agriculture Committee. Representative Morrill found it impossible to get his bill referred to the Agriculture Committee 2 years ago, and the unfriendly Public Lands Committee was then chaired by the bill's archfoe, Representative Williamson R. W. Cobb, Democrat, of Virginia.

In his speeches, Representative Morrill has skillfully countered the objections of his opponents. First, he reminds his audience that we are now competing economically with other powerful nations. "Concerted effort is necessary to educate and elevate whole nations," he has told the House. "That effort is being made abroad with governmental effort in the lead. Here, in the model republic where a free republican government is installed to guard the general welfare, no such effort is being made."

Next, Representative MORRILL answers the argument that all else must give way to military needs. "We have schools to teach the art of manslaying and to make masters of deep-throated engine of war. And shall we not have schools to teach men the way to feed, clothe, and enlighten the great brotherhood of man?"

The contention that the proposed new colleges would compete unfairly with established institutions was prominent in former President Buchanan's veto message 2 years ago. Representative MORRILL answers it with a few facts and figures. He reminds opponents that his bill has been endorsed by 13

State legislatures and that nearly 68 million acres of land have already been granted by Congress to endow and support schools and colleges of various types.

"There is no clashing of interests," says Representative MORRILL of his bill. "It is not designed to make every man his own doctor, or every man his own lawyer, but to make every man understand his own business. A lawyer is not the worse for having an intelligent client, nor a clergyman the worse for having a prosperous parishioner. Our present literary colleges need have no more jealousy of agricultural colleges than a procelain manufactory would have of an iron foundry."

With the southerners gone, the principal obstacle to passage in both Houses of Congress will be the perennial conflict between the Eastern States, anxious to share in western wealth, and the Western States, which are always fearful of unbridled land speculation. Certainly, President Abraham Lincoln does not share the views of former President James Buchanan, nor was he elected with southern support. Although he has never endorsed the Morrill bill, President Lincoln by temperament and conviction probably disagreed with the Buchanan veto message 2 years ago.

On the other hand, the President is at present engrossed and burdened by his heavy military responsibilities. Endowment of new colleges to promote scientific agriculture and the practical arts must surely not rank among his chief concerns. Educators nevertheless hope that, if the bill does finally come to him for approval this summer, President Lincoln will think of plowshares as well as swords.

The U.N. Bond Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the Antelope Valley Ledger-Gazette of Lancaster, Calif., consistently expresses some of the finest editorial thought in the country.

With unanimous consent, I should like to submit the January 12, 1962, editorial from the Ledger-Gazette in the Appendix of the RECORD. It points up the duties of this Congress and provides food for thought on an important issue soon to face us:

Money isn't everything, it is often said, and the manner in which our Federal Government (we will ignore the State government for the moment) treats money certainly indicates that our leaders do not think so either.

It isn't enough that we have a national debt that continuously keeps growing because we cannot learn to live within income, but now we are going to create an international debt that will undoubtedly keep growing because the United Nations cannot live without income.

Out of money, the U.N. has come forward with a plan to float a $200 million bond issue. The U.N. has no money but that which it collects in dues, it cannot levy taxes (thank goodness, though no doubt it will soon be suggested). Of the 104 members of the great experiment 82 are in arrears in their dues. (What a record.) And the big money-eating project of the moment, creating something in the Congo (another one of those first prize coalition governments) goes unsupported by the Russians, the French, the Portuguese, and the Belgians.

This adds up to a ridiculous situation in which everyone—particularly fearful Americans—says the U.N. is the greatest idea the world has ever known for achieving peace (whatever that is) and must go on—but the members are not willing to pay the cost of this effort at concerted world approach to the nasty little problems all around.

So if the U.N. is a good idea, not enough people are willing to put their money on its nose to make it work. And the finest ideas in the world—and there are millions—can fail for lack of the willingness to put money on the line and buy stock in the venture.

With the members refusing to pay their dues, and the support for the U.N. military action going unpaid, the U.N. had to come up with something very clever to get money from where money ain't.

Well, in the United States (old "Sugar-Daddy" of them all) when we run out of money we look at our citizens and tell ourselves they are wonderful producers, they will be producing more children shortly, and all this added population will create more markets and with more markets there will be more production of more goods and services and we can borrow today what they will have to pay back tomorrow (or go bankrupt—and we haven't done this since 1933, which one under the age of 30 can not remember!). So we float bond issues, backed by the power of the state to levy taxes to pay back principal and interest. (It is not only the way we build Feather River projects, but the way we finance Los Angeles Community Centers, music and the like, and radio and television museums for Hollywood—the people's credit is a pretty awesome thing, and besides if the people will do it wealthy individuals will not have to dip into their socks to do someting they ought to do.) Well, back to our U.N.

So the U.N. high command hit upon the splendid idea of selling $200 million worth of U.N. bonds.

That almost cracks us up!

And it ought to have all men who understand money and deal in it rolling in the aisles but for their fear that "Big Brother" may be watching, or even President Kennedy and the White House staff, and might disapprove.

If you sell bonds you have to have credit. Bankers are a bit stuffy about this, not to mention the Government that maintains a crew of bank examiners to make certain that bankers not risk the people's money they have on deposit.

But this forerunner of world government has decided that money isn't everthing and to "borrow" $200 million by selling "bonds" to that amount at a nominal interest rate of two per cent. Of course there is not a government in the world that can borrow money at that rate—only the Rural Electrification Agency of the United States gets money at two percent—but who cares, money isn't everything. But, reasons the U.N., if people want to be paid they will probably want money, and this is one way we can get it—if everyone will close his eyes to what we are doing.

Who will buy the "bonds," why old Uncle Sugar will, and John Bull will follow.

Now we always understood that the Congress had to appropriate money and that the President could not spend without congressional approval—and that all money bills have to originate in the House. But the news stories say "The United States already has decided to take half the U.N. bond issue." But a "decision" is not a decision until it is "signed, sealed, and delivered" and if Congress has to act it can not yet be a decision of the United States.

But is it?

Does our adherence to the U.N. subject us to "buy" $100 million of "bonds" worthless on their face at an "interest" rate that is not interest at all? And all this without the consent and approval of the Congress?

We think it is about time some delinquent "nations" lost their membership in the U.N. until their dues are paid up. Just like the old American custom. —W.J.V.

The Tour and Seminar Program of the Brooklyn Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, just about 3 years ago my good friend, Hon. James V. Mangano, administrative director and general clerk of the Brooklyn Supreme Court, inaugurated a most interesting program which has since then taken on the aspects of a landmark in civic education. From a simple visit of a group of schoolchildren to see the Supreme Court Building in Brooklyn, the program has developed into an outstanding public service which includes guided tours and seminars for old and young who come there to observe and study the operations of the judicial branch of government.

Mr. Mangano refers to the program as "democracy in action" and as "a new adventure in civic education." And that is exactly what it is. In the short space of two and a half years over 13,600 persons have availed themselves of this service, and have acquired an appreciation of the workings of our judicial system.

I call this program to the attention of all my colleagues, as well as Federal, State, and municipal officials who may want to familiarize themselves with it and perhaps adapt it in their States and communities as a very successful method in civic education.

The Brooklyn Supreme Court has just published a report which is devoted to this program. It contains many interesting details, letters from groups and individuals, pictures, statements, and editorials from the press. From it, I take the following which I am pleased to insert into the RECORD: First, A preliminary statement by Hon. James V. Mangano; second, an editorial from the New York Times of January 28, 1961; third, an editorial from the New York Journal-American of December 8, 1960; and fourth, also a story from the Greenpoint Weekly Star, of Brooklyn, which appeared in its issue of December 22, 1961.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the material listed above in the RECORD:

DEMOCRACY IN ACTION

(By Hon. James V. Mangano, general clerk and administrative director to the board of justices of the Supreme Court of Kings County, N.Y.)

In presenting my annual report, a report of the operation of the Brooklyn Supreme Court tour and seminar program entitled, "A New Adventure and Concept in Civic

Education." I feel that it is incumbent upon me to relate some of the background and history of this new adventure in education, as well as to pay tribute to those who helped make this venture a phenomenal success.

Shortly after the dedication of the new courthouse on January 5, 1959, inquiries were received as to whether groups would be permitted to tour and witness the operation of this $18.5 million building. After due deliberation and consultation with the board of justices, I delegated Mr. Charles Soldkin to work out the details.

Plans were developed and the program inaugurated. On March 11, 1959, the first group of schoolchildren arrived and remained a full day observing and learning at first hand the operation of the court.

It was the beginning of our experiment in civic education. It is now no longer an experiment but an established fact that there is a dire need and necessity for this program to continue on a permanent basis.

After my return in August of 1959 from my European trip to study court administration, I rendered a report embodying my observations and suggestions. I stated therein, that, while in Europe, I was made keenly aware and was deeply impressed with the tremendous respect manifested by the people toward their courts and officials.

By reason of these observations I was prompted to suggest that our educational curriculum facilities be expanded to include field trips to our courts, for all students.

I am very pleased to report that as evidenced herein many such groups took advantage of the invitation. During the first year more than 6,900 persons took advantage of our invitation to learn how the court functions. This number consisted of schoolchildren in the elementary grades, high school students, law school students, college students, civic groups, foreign guests, and jurors serving in the court a veritable cross section of human minds and intellects.

The exhibits on file unquestionably indicate that the visitors profited considerably from the experience, resulting in more knowledge of and a more profound respect for our courts and our judicial system of court administration.

More than 13,660 persons have availed themselves to date of this offer to peer into the judicial branch of governmental functions and to see how it operates. The details of the various groupings are contained in the body of this report.

DUE PROCESS

The due process of law is so frightening to the average person that he approaches a courtroom for the first time with trepidation. If he had a chance to observe the functioning of the court beforehand he would understand that the process is geared to operate in his behalf. And, in understanding, he would be assured.

An attempt to convey this understanding and assurance has been undertaken by the Kings County Supreme Court in a program about to begin its third year. The court conducts daily tours and seminars that leave the visitor with a clear conception of the jury system and the activity of the court as it affects the ordinary citizen.

These are not hasty tours in which the visitor is merely permitted to glimpse a court trial in session. It is an all-day session that includes lectures on jurisdiction, procedure and the historical development of the court. The visitor attends the selection of jurors and the trial of a lawsuit. His group is addressed by a presiding judge. For student groups, a mock trial is conducted during the noon recess. The agenda includes a sightseeing trip to the law library, the justices' board room and other parts of the impressive setting at the new Brooklyn Civic Center. The tour costs nothing and is conducted with good humor and good taste.

More than 8,000 persons have made the tours and left with a greater respect for our judicial system. Other courts would do well to study the success of a program such as this. It is performing a much-needed service.

[From the New York Journal-American, Dec. 8, 1960]

COURT TOURS

"See Brooklyn First" could well be the subtitle for the series of tours through Brooklyn's new supreme court building.

James V. Managano, administrative director and general clerk of the court, for several months now has been scheduling the program for visting dignitaries from abroad and throughout the Nation.

His personal interest in the project has made the court tour one of the highlights for visiting VIP's.

The visitors get a firsthand picture of practice and procedures in a New York State court.

Mr. Mangano is to be congratulated for promoting this very worthwhile project.

[From the Greenpoint Weekly Star, Dec. 22, 1961]

MANGANO SAYS IN REPORT: "COURT TOUR PROGRAM A SUCCESS"

A "guided tour" program begun 3 years ago in the new $18,500,000 Brooklyn Supreme Court Building in downtown Brooklyn is "progressing successfully."

The announcement was made this week by James V. Mangano, administrative director and general clerk of Brooklyn Supreme Court.

In a 34-page annual report, Mangano disclosed that more than 13,600 persons have taken advantage of the court tours and seminars arranged in the "democracy in action" program.

"Our program has had an overwhelming and enthusiastic acceptance by students, teachers, professors of our schools and colleges, as well as civic groups," said Mangano in his report.

"The purpose of these guided tours and seminars is to bring the courts closer to the people, to guide them to a better understanding of the judicial branch of government as well as to inspire our youth with respect for and knowledge of our institutions which maintain liberty under law—the courts."

Mangano also emphasized that the court tours are an informal way of giving our youth a unique form of education, thereby aiding in meeting another challenge—against juvenile delinquency.

"The effect of the 'guided tour' program," stated Mr. Mangano in his report, "is shown by the hundreds of letters we have received from students of all grades who have sung the praises of the 'guided tour' which left them with a feeling of greater respect for our courts."

The "guided tour" program was inaugurated March 11, 1959, when the first group of schoolchildren arrived and remained a full day observing and learning at firsthand the operation of the court.

Mangano had assigned Charles Solodkin to spearhead the "experiment in civic education."

"It is now no longer an experiment," stated Mangano. "The tours commence with a briefing and orientation of the day's activities by Mr. Solodkin.

"A lecture then follows during which among other related subjects are discussed—the importance and jurisdiction of this court; historical development of the court; differentiation between the civil and criminal courts; court practice and procedure and explanation of the physical arrangement of the court building and description of many departments that are now housed herein.

"After preliminary explanations the group is taken on an inspection of the actual operation of the jury system.

The actual process of jury selection is demonstrated.

An address by one of the eminent jurists of the courts, during recess, is a highlight of the day's events.

"A mock trial is reserved for the noon portion of the day's activity, during which complete and full student participation in filling all stations in the courtroom is invited.

"Each position is carefully and dramatically explained and the class is encouraged to conduct its own proceedings."

Tours begin at 10 a.m. and continue to 12:30 p.m. with time out for lunch, and resume about 1:15 p.m., continuing until about 2:30 p.m.

The tours are conducted as a public service and there is no charge attached to the program.

Where Commonsense and Justice Prevailed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the interest of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the October 1961 issue of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. It illustrates that commonsense and justice can and will prevail in those areas of our Nation which have not as yet implemented the 1954 Supreme Court school desegregation decision.

The article follows:

ATLANTA: THE DEEP SOUTH SAYS "YES"

(By Richard M. Shapiro)

Back in 1957, John Bartlow Martin traveled through the Deep South, interviewing hundreds of people on the subject of race relations for his series of articles titled "The Deep South Says 'Never'." This distinguished and sensitive reporter concluded that resistance was then so great that desegregation of the Deep South's public schools seemed "impossible in the foreseeable future."

At 8:45 on the morning of August 30, 1961, Thomas F. Welch, 16 years old, and Madelyn Nix, 15, walked silently from a black sedan toward Brown High School in Atlanta, Ga. The youth held the door open for the girl and the two disappeared inside. About the same time, seven other Negro youngsters quietly entered three other Atlanta high schools previously reserved for white students. Several hundred television, radio, and press reporters started thinking of packing up their equipment. Desegregation, without violence or howling mobs had come to Atlanta; the Deep South, finally, had said yes.

A few persons and at least two organizations had tried to organize boycotts and demonstrations. Their efforts failed dismally. The fact was, in the words of Atlanta Police Chief Herbert T. Jenkins, the atmosphere of the city that day made it almost "sacrilegious to interfere with the opening of school."

What had happened that made Desegregation Day in Atlanta so peaceful, in contrast to New Orleans or Little Rock and other cities whose D-days saw demagoguery and violence that shocked the civilized world?

Georgia, along with many Southern States, had adopted a policy of legal resistance to

the 1954 U.S. Supreme Court decision on school desegregation. In 1955, its State assembly adopted a bill which would cut off funds from any school system that carried out the decision, thus makihg desegregation a practical impossibility.

The mood of many Georgians at the time is expressed in "Background: Atlanta," a handbook for reporters covering the Atlanta school opening this year, published by a remarkable group called OASIS (organizations assisting schools in September):

"Secure in their legal maginot line, most Georgians felt the Supreme Court emphasis was on the word 'deliberate' rather than 'speed.' Schools would continue their traditional way: regional mores would remain unchanged. The bitter lessons of Little Rock and Norfolk were yet to be learned."

This dream world ended rudely in January 1958 when a group of Negroes filed suit against the Atlanta School Board to force compliance with the desegregation decision. At the time, few people realized that victory in this suit would pose an inescapable choice for the people of Atlanta: No schools—or desegregated schools.

On December 18, 1958, 18 white parents chartered Hope, Inc. (help our public schools) for the purpose of saving free public education in Atlanta. Throughout, Hope chose to make the issue keeping the schools open, rather than the more inflammatory and divisive one of desegregation. In June 1959 when Judge Frank Hooper ruled in favor of the Negro plaintiffs in their desegregation suit against the school board, Hope knew that it had a monumental job ahead.

Although Atlanta is a Deep South city, it has many qualities that made Hope more than just a pleasant-sounding acronym. Atlanta is bustling and lively. It has attracted young and vigorous people and new industry from all over the country. In many ways it is a cosmopolitan city of half a million people. In the words of Ralph McGill, Pulitzer Prize-winning columnist and publisher of the Atlanta Constitution, Atlanta "never wanted to be an old Southern city, caught like a fly in amber, and dying of quaintness and musty charms." In 1961, it was Ralph McGill—not members of the segregationist organization GUTS (Georgians unwilling to surrender)—who spoke for Atlanta.

If the schools were to remain open, the State assembly's 1955 school bill had to be changed to give local school systems the chance to open for school desegregation and still receive State aid. Hope worked at changing the attitude of the rural dominated States assembly toward local self-determination by the school systems. The 18 parents who started Hope in December 1958, were able, by their fervor and enthusiasm, to rally a great number of moderates—members of the so-called Silent South—to their side. Along with the firm leadership of Mayor William B. Hartsfield, committees of lawyers, doctors, educators, clergymen and business groups went into action. The voice of reason was brought to the people of Atlanta and the whole State. Meetings, mailings, conferences incessantly hammered home the economic and educational disasters that continued defiance of Federal fiat would mean.

Their unprecedented rallying of the moderates by Hope was aided and advised by a committee of skilled community leaders and workers in the field of human relations. The first great victory came when the Atlanta School Board submitted a stair stepping plan for desegregation of the public schools beginning with the 12th grade and Judge Hooper approved the plan. Now the basic task remained to convince the State assembly to change the 1955 law.

A crash campaign was initiated. Mayor Hartsfield proclaimed a Save Our School Week. Sparked by Hope, a tremendous grassroots movement to keep the schools open swept the State. On January 18, 1961, Gov. S. Ernest Vandiver—who had been elected to office just 2 years before on a program of keeping Georgia's schools segregated—made a dramatic change. Under his leadership, the State assembly passed a child protection plan which permitted localities to decide for themselves the issue of desegregation.

The conflict between Federal and State law had been resolved. Now the emphasis shifted to desegregation with dignity. At all costs, repetition of New Orleans outbreaks and violence had to be avoided. To meet this crucial test still another organization was brought into being—Oasis (organizations assisting schools in September). Unlike Hope it was an organization of organizations, not individuals. It had more than 53 affiliates ranging alphabetically from the American Association of University Women to the YWCA and including such groups as the NAACP and the junior chamber of commerce (and the ADL). In its relatively brief existence it stimulated hundreds of meetings which ranged in size from a collection of half a dozen anxious parents in a living room to mass assemblages in auditoriums. A group of actors under Oasis sponsorship put on desegregation skits for teenagers. White and Negro youth leaders were brought together in meetings. One payday, more than 50,000 wage earners found little blue notices in their pay envelopes, issued by the junior chamber of commerce. Their message: "Atlanta is a great city, too busy to hate. Let's keep it that way."

All of this paved the way. But more than a good climate was necessary; the hatemongers had to be handled too.

The racists were there, of course, in full force in the weeks prior to August 30. Atlanta was flooded with vicious anti-Negro and anti-Semitic propaganda put out by such organizations as the National States Rights Party and the National White American Party. Edward R. Fields of the NSRP was on the Atlanta scene; so, too, were such well-known troublemakers as J. B. Stoner, Joseph Beauharnais, Roy Frankhauser, and Robert Lyons. G. Lincoln Rockwell was represented by one William G. Cody, in town to see what mischief he could do.

Back in January 1958, the ADL Bulletin featured an article by Alexander F. Miller, ADL's community service director, called "Violence: It Need Not Happen." One of its major points was that "a community, no matter how grave its tensions, will usually avoid violence if it has a fearless police chief, backed by a courageous mayor, backed by a resolute judge." Atlanta had all three, a vital clue to its peaceful desegregation day.

The fearless police chief is Herbert T. Jenkins, an honest and unusual man. At a training institute for policemen in 1960 he made his own beliefs clear: "Personally, I prefer the status quo. I am sure that you do. But the Supreme Court has held the status quo illegal. I am prepared to yield to the judgment of the Supreme Court. Why? As law-enforcement officers, there is no other position we can honestly take."

Chief Jenkins sent emissaries from his department to other southern communities with tension situations in order to profit from their experience. The Atlantic Police Department also made use of a thousand copies of ADL's law-enforcement guide, "With Justice for All," presented to it by the Atlanta Jewish Community Council.

Three weeks before school opened, Chief Jenkins made a no-nonsense statement: "Under no circumstances will objections, discussions, or disturbances be permitted at any of the schools." The handbook for reporters covering Atlanta's desegregation, "Background: Atlanta," published by Oasis, shows the extent of police preparations for the day. It clearly marks the areas off limits to public and press around the four high schools so that no violator could plead ignorance.

On August 30, five young men—including William G. Cody of the American Nazi Party—were immediately arrested when their actions indicated that they had come to create a disturbance around the high schools. Other potential troublemakers got the message; there were no other efforts at interference.

The five young men were quickly brought before a resolute judge, Chief Municipal Court Judge Luke A. Arnold, who sentenced each to 30 to 60 days in a prison stockade on the grounds that "the law of the land has to be upheld and I have sworn an oath to the American Constitution."

The third ingredient of the formula for avoiding violence—a courageous mayor—was always in evidence. Mayor Hartsfield spoke with passion and conviction the night before school opened. His statement was consistent with all his deeds: "Atlanta is on trial—the city wants to do the right thing—men and women have worked hard to see that things come off right. If anything goes wrong, we will be sick and hurt."

In a way, the troublemakers never had a chance in Atlanta. The week before D-Day, there were daily editorials in the press calling for peaceful compliance. There were more than 700 church and synagogue discussions or sermons calling for an orderly August 30. Spot announcements filled the airways. The Atlanta Chamber of Commerce placed a full-page ad in the press. The weekend before the 30th was proclaimed by Mayor Hartsfield as Law and Order Weekend.

A fearless police chief, a courageous mayor, and a resolute judge did their jobs well. They were joined by many others, including the superintendent of schools, Dr. Frank Letson, who issued regulations to the school system which, in effect, set the climate within each school to keep the peace. There were also thousands of other persons of good will, many of them anonymous, who worked in volunteer and professional planning for the day. And the glory also lies with the average citizen of Atlanta—a citizen of his country—who, in the words of Ralph McGill displayed such a commonsense awareness of the alternative—mobs, closed schools, chaos.

Above all, Atlanta was a model of its kind, a fact noted by President Kennedy that day when a Negro boy opened a school door for a Negro girl—and no mobs screamed in hate and madness. The President broke into his press conference on August 30 to say, "I strongly urge the officials and citizens of all communities which face this difficult transition * * * to look closely at what Atlanta has done.

Doorkeeping as a Fine Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the fame of William M. Miller, our doorkeeper and reasonable facsimile of the indispensable man, continues to spread. Newspaper readers of Greenville, S.C., now have been introduced to "Fishbait" through an article by Charles McDowell, Jr., appearing in the Greenville News, which I include under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix.

Mr. McDowell, incidentally, is a Virginian whose perceptive and pungent comments are read widely in the Commonwealth, as they reach print first in the Richmond Times-Dispatch.

The article on Doorkeeper Miller follows:

FISHBAIT'S STATE OF UNION SHOW

(By Charles McDowell, Jr.)

The President's state of the Union address is our Government's closest approach to a solemn ceremonial occasion, but it doesn't approach close enough to make anyone uncomfortable.

William M. "Fishbait" Miller is one of the main reasons that the ceremony keeps its feet on the ground. He is doorkeeper of the House, and this is his show. He is chief arranger, announcer, usher, and establisher of mood.

"Fishbait" is a short man with a rolling gait, hearty manner, heavy glasses on a face of rustic and deceptive innocence, and the voice of a great frog. He is incapable of being stuffy, which has made him an object of wonder and affection in Washington for many years.

Announcing the entrances of the mighty into the House for this annual ritual while diplomats from throughout the world strain forward in the seats, "Fishbait" sounds as if he were summoning a crowd of hard-of-hearing friends to a barbecue in his native Pascagoula, Miss.

While the President is coming up to the Capitol from the White House, Fishbait stands at the main door of the House under the crowded galleries and bellows something about the Members of the U.S. Senate. They enter and he leads them down the aisle. On his way to the door, he shakes a few hands and pats a few backs.

The Members of House and Senate greet one another warmly. With uncharacteristic gallantry toward the Senate, the House members make room for the Senators in the jammed chamber. Democrats and Republicans mingle to show the outside world that we are all pulling together.

Another whoop from the door and the Joint Chiefs of Staff enter, trying hard to look unified and subdued in the presence of the civil authority.

The members of the Cabinet enter, smiling uneasily at the Members of Congress. The Justices of the Supreme Court enter wearing black robes and making the gamest effort of all to look solemn. Fishbait has been known to give a Justice of the Supreme Court as friendly a whack on the back as anyone else.

Finally Fishbait musters all his volume and Mississippi overtones to blare out, "The Pres-i-dent of the United States." Everyone stands and applauds. The President smiles at Fishbait. Then the President walks briskly down the aisle. All Presidents walk briskly at this point; if they don't people will fret about their health.

The President shakes the hands of the Vice President and the Speaker, who are seated above and behind him, and begins to read his speech. The whole U.S. Government is now on view in one place at one time, and Fishbait stands at the rear of the room looking on benignly.

The press gallery is full to overflowing. Correspondents who have not been seen since the last state of the Union address come out of hiding to fight for seats in the front rows.

What you see from the press gallery is the audience. The President is visible only from the first couple of rows, and all you see from there is the top of his head. So the press follows the text of the speech, issued hours earlier, and watches the audience.

Some keen observers watch the faces of the congressional leaders at key places in the speech, and divine thereby the future of the President's legislative program. (The whispers pass among the pundits: "BYRD winced," "DIRKSEN didn't applaud," "The Middle West is stomping its feet," "So-and-so is asleep.") Foreign affairs experts watch the face of the Russian Ambassador and take copious notes. Women's page writers watch the President's wife and consult one another about the color of her hat.

Several observers concentrate on counting the number of times the President is interrupted by applause. They compare their totals with past totals recorded in black notebooks, and arrive at vast conclusions—less than 15 times, cool reception; 15 to 25, lukewarm; 25 to 35, friendly; 35 and up, enthusiastic.

At the end of his speech, the President steps down from the rostrum, accepts congratulations from the Cabinet, the Supreme Court and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and works his way up the aisle shaking hands with Members of Congress. Some observers believe it is significant to note exactly which Members offer their hands. In any case, the last hand he shakes at the door is Fishbait's hand, and the ceremony is over.

Special House Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday I pointed out to the Members of the House the inconsistency between the position taken by Secretary of State Dean Rusk, in his letter to the chairman of the Rules Committee last August concerning the creation of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations, and that of U.N. Ambassador Stevenson in his letter of November 25 to the President of the United Nations Assembly in attacking Moscow's colonialism both within and outside the Soviet Union. However, the latest developments in the U.N., where a full-scale Communist-inspired debate on colonialism in Africa is taking place, have not received any counter-response from Mr. Stevenson or his associates at this time.

The Communist puppet governments of Yugoslavia, Poland, and Bulgaria in leading the assault on Portugal for alleged repression of natives in Angola are themselves tragic examples of colonialism as practiced by the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I insert in the RECORD at this time a Manion Forum address on "Captive Nations—Moscow's Achilles Heel," by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, which is most pertinent to the subject of the creation of a ion forum address on "Captive Nations, and which also points up the need for a thorough investigation into State Department policies regarding the Soviet Union:

CAPTIVE NATIONS—MOSCOW'S ACHILLES HEEL

(By Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky)

DEAN MANION. Time and again, over this microphone you have heard me and others repeat a simple statement of fact, namely, that our best allies in our war against the Soviet Communist conquest are the people of the captive nations now enslaved by Moscow.

The hatred of these people for the slavemasters of the Kremlin and their burning desire to be free from Communist tyranny is the best weapon in our arsenal, but our leaders continue to refuse to use it.

Rather than employ this weapon, which could give us complete and final victory without the hot, worldwide atomic holocaust that the pacifists are always warning us about, we steadily retreat and bankrupt ourselves in senseless, self-defeating efforts to buy off the Kremlin's Communist lieutenants in the Congo, Yugoslavia, and Indonesia. Nevertheless, our State Department to the contrary, Congress by unanimous resolution has made our interest in the freedom of the captive nations a matter of official concern. And, responsive to Congress, the President has proclaimed an official Captive Nations Week in this country every year since 1959. Why doesn't our State Department enforce our captive nations resolution?

The chief author of that resolution, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, is here to discuss this vitally important question. My guest is neither a Congressman nor a politician. He is a scholar; a professor at Georgetown University, and the chairman of a group of prominent patriots known as the National Captive Nations Committee, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Dr. Dobriansky, tell us why you believe so sincerely that the full implementation of the captive nations resolution could help us win the war with communism.

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. Dean Manion, let me stress at the outset that, for me, this is not just a matter of sincere belief based on good emotional sentiment or humanitarian inclination. Primarily, it is one of deep intellectual conviction and certitude supported by overwhelming evidence, by facts, figures, and tested principles.

The complete and documented story behind this resolution and how it became Public Law 86-90 was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 21, 1960 (pp. 918-923). The story goes back to August 1958 and relates how we first failed with it under the sponsorship of Congressman Cretella, of Connecticut.

But then, as now, I was convinced that the captive nations—and I mean all 22 and more—are Khrushchev's permanent nightmare and, at the same time, our 1,000 megaton political weapon. Then, as now, I felt we were allowing this weapon to rust and corrode under a heap of political clichés about simply remembering the captive peoples. We tried again and, as you know, Congress passed the resolution in July 1959. The events that followed furnish incontestable proof of the resolution's multimegatonic potency in the cold war.

To appreciate the significance of Public Law 86-90 and to grasp the new dimensions and directions for its full implementation, it is necessary to recall these events briefly. What many of us are perhaps unaware of is the fact that the succession of these events started in July 1959 and has continued into the present. The resolution precipitated a series of explosions in Moscow, then and since.

We all recall how Khrushchev exploded when the resolution became law. Vice President Nixon himself was stunned and baffled by Khrushchev's violent reaction. But how many of us realize that since then—in articles, speeches, over the air, and in the UN—Khrushchev and his puppets have repeatedly condemned the resolution?

Only this past summer President Kennedy was severely criticized for proclaiming Captive Nations Week. And our nationwide observances of the Week have proven to be

anathema to Moscow's propaganda and pretensions.

Now, have you ever asked yourself: "How is it that Moscow with all its vaunted power, its missiles and bombs, its historical Messianism and also Hitlerian methods of terrorism, should itself be terrified by a simple resolution of our Congress?" In thinking about this you will doubtless wonder about the fact that this wasn't the first time our leaders and Congress spoke in behalf of the Captive Nations. Perplexing, isn't it? And yet, not mystifying at all.

In the cold war Khrushchev perceives the full import of this resolution, if many of our leaders still don't. He is senstively aware of the decisive damage that a full, imaginative and skillful implementation of the resolution would wreak upon his colonial empire. He knows that in the eyes of the world it would destroy the projected image of the Soviet Union as a powerful, confident, monolithic state, capable of even competing with the United States.

Khrushchev also knows the tremendous leverage such implementation would provide the 115 million people of the captive non-Russian nations within the Soviet Union to assert their rights to national freedom, independence, and direct concourse with free world nations and peoples.

Khrushchev knows, too, that the resolution is aimed at all freedom-loving Russians who understand that their nation of 100 million can never be free so long as 22 and more non-Russian nations are held captive under the foreign yoke of Moscow. In short, Khrushchev fears it because it spells trouble, pressure, resistance, insecurity, and ultimate rebellion and disaster within the Soviet Union itself.

CAPTIVE NATIONS—MECHANISM FOR COLD WAR BY WESTERN POWERS

The determining fact here is this: By this resolution our Government recognized for the first time the existence of over a dozen captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. itself. There is no question but that these nations—White Ruthenia, Ukraine, Georgia, Turkestan and others—are strategically more important than those we are familiar with in Central Europe.

Make no mistake about it, many cold war channels are open to tap the boundless reservoir of patriotic nationalism and historical drives for independence in these occupied nations. All that Khrushchev fears in this respect can in time come to pass without inciting any hot war. In fact, his mounting insecurities within this subempire would definitely work against it.

Dean MANION. Doctor, this captive nations resolution passed Congress without a dissenting vote. Why has so little been done about it by the executive branch of our Government?

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. The reason for this anomalous and self-defeating situation rests on a combination of circumstances. These are faulty knowledge and basic misconceptions, outright policy contradictions and, consequently, a heavy dose of specious reasoning. In combination they add up to our grave losses in initiative, in launching an offensive, and in developed opportunities for the expansion of freedom.

Let me cite a few concrete examples. This past summer the Secretary of State wrote a letter to Chairman HOWARD W. SMITH, of the House Rules Committee, opposing the creation of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations at this time. In it he expresses concern that Moscow would not like it, particularly in the Berlin crisis. He also says that governmental and private sources have long been studying this subject anyway. On this I publicly challenge Secretary Rusk to produce any comprehensive study dealing, for example, with Soviet Russian economic colonialism within the Soviet Union. But, with contextual propriety, let me quote this from his letter. He says:

"The U.S. Government's position is weakened by any action which confuses the rights of formerly independent peoples or nations with the status of areas, such as the Ukraine, Armenia, or Georgia, which are traditional parts of the Soviet Union. Reference to these latter areas places the U.S. Government in the undesirable position of seeming to advocate the dismemberment of an historical state."

Ponder this statement carefully. It will be a classic on how to lose the cold war. The poor state of knowledge, interpretation, and vision reflected by it is well nigh appalling at this perilous juncture of our history. Each of the countries mentioned was independent in the post-World War I period, was recognized by Soviet Russia and numerous other countries, and has fought valiantly to this day to regain its independence, but the Secretary says, in effect, so what, they are traditional parts of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union has scarcely been in existence for 40 years, but Mr. Rusk deems this traditional enough to seal the fate of the first victims of Soviet Russian imperialism. If he tries to wiggle out of this by interpreting the Soviet Union as a successor to the historical state of the Tsarist Russian Empire, he is even worse off. Armenia was not a traditional part of this historical state and since when has our State Department become the sanctifier of the Russian Empire, whether white or red?

The President has declared that we support the just aspirations of all people for national independence and freedom. The Congress did the same in the captive nations resolution, which lists, among others, Armenia, Georgia, and Ukraine. Khrushchev, deeply stung by these declarations, grows hoarse telling these captives that they are independent. But some in the State Department obtusely brush all this aside and, in effect, say—don't bother about them, don't even study their plight, for they are traditional parts of the Russian Empire.

One may ask: "What has happened to the heirs of the American Revolution about whom President Kennedy spoke in his inaugural address?" Can you imagine what would have been the course of our history if the revolutionaries of 1776 had swallowed similar talk about traditional parts of the British Empire—not for 40 years, not for a century, but almost for two centuries?

FULL-SCALE CONGRESSIONAL INQUIRY INTO STATE DEPARTMENT BADLY NEEDED

We antagonize our ally, Portugal, by joining Moscow in a U.N. inquiry into Angola, a traditional part of the Portuguese Empire for 300 years, but we spare the enemy the embarrassment and even defeat in the cold war by suppressing official inquiries into his closest colonies. In my judgment, these and other contradictions warrant a full-scale Congressional inquiry into State Department policy regarding the Soviet Union.

To appreciate why we're plagued by such contradictions, let me cite another example, one among many. The State Department has a research medium titled "Soviet Affairs Notes." In the issue numbered 158, on the very first page, the reader is told the following:

"The term 'Ukraine' is itself a modern political rather than a historical term. It was invented in the 19th century by nationalists seeking to detach the southwestern borderlands of Russia from the Tsarist Empire."

Tomes have been written by French, German, English and other writers of the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries, using the term Ukraine. In previous centuries, and as far back as the 12th century, this so-called borderland of Russia was widely referred to as Ukraine. But, for our State Department experts, it is only a 19th century invention. You can draw your own conclusions from this.

Dean MANION. Doctor, tell us about Congressman FLOOD's resolution, House Resolution 211. What would it accomplish and what can our listeners do to get it passed?

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, is the original sponsor of the resolution to establish a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. I have been informed that there are about 39 similar resolutions. The Republican congressional policy committee is on record favoring such a committee.

Because of the mentioned State Department letter, action on the measure was postponed to the next session. Congressman MADDEN, of Indiana, insisted that a State Department representative appear before the Rules Committee in person, thereby giving all interested Members an opportunity for questioning, but a letter was sent instead.

It should be obvious that methodic and continuous studies by such a committee would be of great service to the State Department and other executive agencies. They would continually inform the public of developments in all the captive nations. The committee would steadily focus the spotlight of free world attention on Moscow's colonial empire and, I can assure you, given the chance, it would produce recommendations of the greatest value to our national interest.

Write to the members of the House Rules Committee and also to your own Congressman, urging them to pass this measure. Copies to Congressman FLOOD will be put to good use.

Dean MANION. Dr. Dobriansky, in your opinion, would it be helpful to the resurrection of freedom and national independence in the captive nations if we would break off diplomatic relations with these puppet Communist governments that the Kremlin has put in charge of the captive peoples?

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. As one who strongly opposes the recognition of Peiping and also Outer Mongolia, I say yes, but at the right time. Diplomatic recognition is a powerful weapon if used prudently. At the time of the Hungarian revolution the breaking off of diplomatic relations with the U.S.S.R. and its puppets, in coordination with other moves, could have liberated Hungary.

Pursuing then as now a costly policy of patched-up containment whereby we only react, are continually on the defensive, anticipate little, plan haphazardly, we ourselves reduce the power of such action.

Dean MANION. Thank you, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman, National Captive Nations Committee, 1000 16th Street NW, Washington, D.C.

My friends, the place to begin the use of our best weapon against the Communists and the Kremlin is with the passage of Congressman FLOOD'S House Resolution 211 (see Manion Forum Broadcast No. 355). Your Congressman is at home now. See him about the Flood resolution.

Omissions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to place in the RECORD a statement by David Lawrence, published in the January 22,

1962, issue of U.S. News & World Report. It is a thoughtful analysis of "important omissions" he noted in the state of the Union message delivered by President Kennedy on January 11:

OMISSIONS

(By David Lawrence)

President Kennedy's address to Congress has been described formally as a message on "the state of the Union." But was it? Were we really told what is happening to our national economy?

Mr. Kennedy endeavored to present a program of legislation which he sincerely believes will benefit the American people. His desire to achieve peace and prosperity at home and abroad is shared by his fellow countrymen, though many will be anxious to know exactly just how and when such goals can be attained. There were some important omissions in the President's address. They may be enumerated as follows:

1. No mention was made of the biggest single abuse of economic power in America today: the monopoly of private groups which fix wage costs and indirectly fix prices throughout an industry, thus stifling competition and producing a regular series of recessions.

2. No reference was made to the causes of the widespread unemployment plaguing the Nation today, though there were proposals that the U.S. Treasury should spend more money for job retraining and youth training. Both of these ignore the basic origin of the unemployment: the inability of American businesses to progress in the face of higher prices forced upon them by unrestrained wage increases.

3. No answer was given to the question of how the benefits are to be shared as productivity in our factories is increased by laborsaving devices. Shall they be divided three ways—between stockholders, wage earners, and the consumers, by means of reduced prices? Or shall unions get the entire benefit as they have repeatedly demanded in their negotiations for higher wages? The President did urge that labor and business keep "their total increases in wages and prices in step with productivity," but offered no guide on how productivity shall be measured or its benefits distributed. He doesn't say a word about the "something for nothing" movement in union labor today—a shorter workweek for the same total pay.

4. No information was given by the President as to how business is going to provide the revenues to balance the Federal budget in the next fiscal year. Does he really expect American businesses to increase their tax contributions to the Government when their profit margins are being constantly narrowed because of increased wage costs? Most of the President's proposals call for more Government spending. Little is said on how to produce more tax receipts.

5. Not a word came from the President about reducing the public debt. If an individual who owes money on his house or a business which has borrowed funds made no provision for paying off debt, would credit be granted again? What good is a balanced budget, if year after year there is no provision in it to pay off debt?

6. No comprehensive explanation was given as to the true causes of the dollar gap. Although the President spoke with satisfaction about the decrease in the deficit as between the outgo and influx of dollars in world trade, he made no mention of the real reasons behind the dollar crisis itself. Our exports greatly exceed our imports, but the U.S. Government keeps on sending more dollars abroad for foreign aid and other purposes. Nor is there any sign that our prosperous partners overseas are going to contribute a larger and larger share so that America's contributions can be cut down.

7. No proposal was made by the President for an across-the-board revision in tax rates for depreciation of plant and equipment. Yet the absence of such a sound incentive plan is the main barrier today to an expansion of the heavy-goods industries, where unemployment is larger in proportion than in any other part of our economy. Selective tax credits here and there will not begin to solve the problem.

8. No justification was given for the unprecedented proposal that the President be authorized by Congress to put into effect at any time—even in the middle of an election campaign—a reduction in tax rates among a large body of voters. When recessions come, it is not consumer spending alone that needs stimulus. It is wiser to stimulate the creation of new jobs. The President would have been better advised if he had dealt with the whole problem of taxation on a broad basis. It is not the tax rates themselves which constitute a drag on the economy, but their inequitable apportionment.

9. No action was recommended in the entire message which would lead to removal of the causes of the many recessions experienced in recent years in America. Only measures of antirecession protection were offered, to be put into effect after the recessions occur, and included were the unworkable schemes of pump priming that have never cured unemployment in the past.

These are only a few of the omissions in the President's first message to this session of Congress. It is to be hoped that he will deal fully with them in his special messages in the future. For there's nothing wrong with the American economy that couldn't be cured by fairness in lawmaking and less catering to the pressure groups that today furnish so large a part of the funds for election campaigns.

Veterans Day Program, Altoona, Pa., November 11, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was a privilege to participate in the observance of Veterans Day, November 11, 1961, at Altoona, Pa., at which time I delivered the following address:

VETERANS DAY ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA AT ALTOONA, PA., NOVEMBER 11, 1961

It is a privilege to return home on Veterans Day and to participate in the annual program in tribute to the veterans of all wars in which this Nation has been engaged.

Veterans Day, 1961, should be a most solemn national holiday.

Today we are linked especially close with the veterans organizations of the Nation as we observe November 11 with appropriate ceremonies.

No matter when or where such services are being conducted I believe that the same basic desire is lodged deep in the hearts of all Americans.

We wish to remember our past with respect and honor.

We wish to bring the meanings of the past—into the light of present day problems—so that with the old and the new—we can press forward with renewed hope in our hearts for a better tomorrow.

The beautiful granite and marble memorials in our towns and cities from coast to coast—bear the names of the men and women who gave their lives in past wars.

These stand as constant reminders—of the sacrifices made by many people for the causes of freedom—for which we—as a Nation—have contended.

Each memorial or historical marker has a beauty all its own—and is especially precious to the people—whose loved ones are remembered thereby.

Some one has said that a Nation is known by the character of the men it crowns.

Measured by this standard our Nation may claim the highest honor because of the coronation observance on this Veterans Day.

The crowns we bring here are not those that adorn the brows of kings—they are not jeweled with precious stones—but they are made of respect—eternal gratitude and loving remembrance.

Veterans Day endeavors to do a necessary and important thing in the life of America.

At the same time—Veterans Day endeavors to do a difficult thing.

The type of patriotism that stirs us today is not an every day emotion.

It is—in the words of John Galsworthy—a secret lamp—hardly to be seen when the world is at peace.

All the finest and most generous emotions of American citizens are of this type.

The most sensitive affections of human beings for one another, however, rise and fall, and such affection may be ignored, in the rush of our active lives.

However, our affections do flare up in the hour of danger, the hour of disaster,

It is when one's country is faced with the gravest of problems, that many turn to her aid with increasing desire to sacrifice.

To state in so many words, the degree and quality of patriotism we feel today is not possible.

Yet Veterans Day surely deserves no less of our support.

If the feeling of remembrance and honor, for those who served in war, wanes as each war recedes in time, and the perils of those wars are forgotten, the monuments erected throughout the Nation will serve a vital purpose in helping us remember.

Furthermore, the significance of Veterans Day will never be lost if all our fine veteran organizations, together with other responsible citizens, cooperate to stir our grateful patriotism to action.

It is common knowledge, that each generation tends to forget the war fought by the previous generation.

The failure of this country to prepare for conflict on several past occassions, bears cynical witness to this fact.

This great country of ours was founded upon certain basic and unchangeable principles.

Our Founding Fathers had long years of experience with English tyranny.

They came to the shores of a new Nation that they might reestablish the dignity of man.

They founded this Nation on a doctrine of liberty and a belief in God.

They recognized another fact, that man was not a supernatural being, that he had a mortal soul.

They recognized that liberty was not a license to be stored away and forgotten, filed away like a paid-off mortgage.

Our Founding Fathers recognized that liberty implied responsibility.

We became involved in the First World War at the sinking of the *Lusitania*, and we went into that war, because we believed in making the "world safe for democracy."

We wanted to bring self-determination to all nations of the world.

After that struggle, we looked with doubt upon certain situations, that developed in the peace that followed.

But we soon learned that we could not live in peace, unless we were prepared to defend it.

No matter how we may look upon war, the great causes served, and, at the same time, the evils involved in the execution of war, there is this fact to remember: Those who died have gven their lives for the sake of others.

So, we recall on Veterans Day the deeds of sacrifice, the ideals of those who died, and the causes for which they gave their lives, even though the causes may not have been clearly defined at the time, in the minds of all Americans.

War is an awful thing.

The inhumanities of war are beyond description.

Therefore, the people of the world should look upon the waging of war as the greatest of evils.

Nevertheless, those who have fought and died for the sake of great causes, are to be remembered for their sacrifices, and honored for their service.

They have given "the last full measure of devotion."

It is recalled that 15 years and more, following the outbreak of World War II, the people of Poland, Germany, France, England, Japan, the Philippines, and Africa, were laboring to clear away the destruction brought to them by the ravages of war.

After over 15 years, evidence still remained.

The skeletons of great buildings, stood as stark and gruesome reminders of the tragedies and suffering of war.

In this connection, I am reminded of the words of a London physician spoken during the war years:

"It takes all our time to keep ourselves fit to live—and perhaps die—for something more glorious than life."

As we look at the war memorials across our Nation—and hold our service of dedication—we are reminded of the spirit of sacrifice.

We are also reminded that they went forth—they did not always ask us why.

To complete the purpose of Veterans' Day we must in turn dedicate ourselves to the causes for which those we honor gave their lives.

We must give something of ourselves—for the causes to which they gave themselves—or else they will have died in vain.

Today our obligations are set in a strange new kind of world.

At times they represent a combination of three world-challenging situations:

1. The revolutions of those who would be free.
2. The spage age.
3. The gigantic horror of the explosions of atomic bombs by the Soviet Union.

The truth is, we have been thrust into this awesome era of human history, through varied developments.

Consider the fact that the peoples of the world have plunged into a period of revolution unparalleled in global history.

In technological change, for example, the past century has brought more advance than the 1,000 years which preceded.

One man who has discussed this idea, David Sarnoff, president of the Radio Corp. of America, has emphasized the increasing speed at which new powers, new products, and new processes, have been developed.

Mr. Sarnoff has said this, and I quote:

"It is not merely a case of continued increase, but of continued acceleration of increase."

In rapid order old orders of society are swept away and new ones are struggling to be born on every continent.

Old empires and kings have fallen.

New nations and forces are rising to change life on earth.

Revolution, sometimes quiet, sometimes violent, has become the hallmark of our time.

The world was blasted into the nuclear age with the bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945.

Through atomic fission, power was multiplied 1,000 times over conventional explosives.

Through atomic fusion in hydrogen bombs since then, power has been multiplied another 1,000 times.

Thus in a few short years man has multiplied possible power by 1 million times.

This almost incredible increase in power can be used for construction and for a better life, or it can be used for destruction and death.

Humanity was launched into the space age when the first manmade satellite was hurled into orbit around our planet in 1957.

Man's life entered new dimensions of space, and also of fear and hope.

All the potentials for good or evil are multiplied by the millionfold increase of power available through nuclear energy.

Now humanity trembles from day to day. We fear and hope. We think of life and death.

But we continue to rush into the nuclear space age.

The decisions we will make in international relations in the days ahead, and years ahead, are fateful.

They may well mean the difference between nuclear destruction of much of the human race or, by the grace of God, a world with new potentialities for human good, for more knowledge, for further exploration of the mysteries of the inner human world and outer space among the planets.

This, my friends, is the world picture we face.

But it is especially appropriate, as well as urgent, that, on this Veterans' Day, we should be particularly concerned about inaternational relations.

Once known as Armistice Day, November 11 continues to be a time for exploring ways to develop peace with justice and freedom.

Even as we recall the sacrifices of the past, we must turn our minds to our responsibility in this nuclear space age.

We must not think of Altoona, Pa., as far removed from the troubles of mankind in our other 49 States, or far removed from the troubles of mankind in the countries around our globe.

This is a privileged spot to call home.

Located as we are in the mountains of Pennsylvania, we enjoy in Blair County some of the most marvelous mountain scenery that can be seen anywhere.

From their inception, Altoona and Blair County have always maintained an enviable record for the patriotic fervor of their populations in national emergencies.

In short, we are the possessors of a great and good heritage, which must be shared with future generations.

The security of the succeeding generations who will occupy this county in the years ahead is in our hands.

The ability of Blair County to remain in a haven for law-abiding people to work and live in, is quite dependent upon the ability of the entire United States and the other nations of the world to maintain freedom in the future.

As I stated a few minutes ago, in order to complete the purpose of this Veterans' Day, we must dedicate ourselves anew to the causes for which those we honor gave their lives.

We must give something of ourselves for their sake and for the sake of the entire world.

In my judgment, there is no person who so completely neglects his duty in this troubled world as one who fails to discharge his obligations of citizenship.

Let us never forget that the sovereign power of the United States is vested in its people.

Law and the discharge of law is not, or should not be, the sole obligation of those officials of government who write the laws and put them into force.

It is rather the responsibility of all citizens of this great country to see that the laws which are adopted are those which they believe express the desires of the voting power of the country.

Our country was founded on a doctrine of liberty.

Every citizen should not only appreciate the many advantages which are the heritage of an American—but also should recognize the responsibilities which are his, responsibilities necessary to preserve the advantages.

You can do so by studying the principles of freedom, by absorbing the ideals of our country's partriotism, by voting your honest convictions, and by intelligently expressing your views on subjects of national and international importance.

Preparedness for a good future must come in many ways.

It must come not only in adequate weapons but must be nourished in the hearts and minds of a responsible citizenry.

The task before us as we commemorate Veterans Day 1961 is challenging and clear.

The battle for freedom against false doctrine of world communism is ever with us.

It is more than a battle for the minds of men.

The demands of the day are great.

Russia claims to be ready to make every sacrifice to fasten her regime upon areas of the world that are now demanding freedom and a new way of life.

Our thoughts on this Veterans Day in 1961 must conclude with a dedication to the causes of freedom, education, and justice for all people.

If we neglect to dedicate ourselves to strive with increased vigor in preserving the human dignity of mankind we shall not honor the veterans of all wars.

For in the final analysis, a listless and indifferent attitude in combating the evils of world communism can destroy any hope for a bright and peaceful future for the family of nations.

This is a challenge hurled by the Communist world which we cannot escape.

Therefore, on this Veterans Day 1961, let us fervently ask Almighty God to help us to never deliberately ignore it—lest we perish as a nation through our indifference and stupidity.

Rather let us implore from the innermost recesses of our hearts:

"Lord God of Hosts be with us yet—lest we forget.

"Lest we forget."

New York Mirror Series of "The Murderers"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the New York Mirror began a condensed serialization last Sunday, January 14, of the book "The Murderers," by Harry J. Anslinger, U.S. Commissioner of Narcotics, and Will Oursler. The book contains the inside story of the traffic in narcotics. Commissioner Anslinger has spent a lifetime battling the dope combine in this country and abroad and in this book tells the frank and fantastic story of his battles.

I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues a bill which I introduced last year, H.R. 616, to provide for grants-

in-aid to the States for the treatment of narcotic addicts in closed institutions. This bill, which is pending before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, has received wide support from organizations and individuals. I think this is the most opportune moment for the committee to hold hearings on this measure, in order to solve this problem which is destroying many young lives.

Many of our colleagues will recall reading in the press a few weeks ago of the suicide committed by the daughter of the late comedian Bob Burns. She was a narcotics addict and had reached a hopeless situation. Had my bill been adopted and the institutions provided therein established, her life and the lives of others in similar circumstances could have been saved.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the first two articles of the series appearing in the Mirror, those of January 14 and 15, 1962, which read as follows:

[From the New York Daily Mirror, Jan. 14, 1962]

"THE MURDERERS"—INSIDE STORY ON DOPE

The time: 1930.

The place: Washington, D.C.

The Senator from South Carolina rose from his seat. He waved a tin of opium.

"This was purchased only one block from where we are now deliberating" he shouted to a shocked Senate.

Harry J. Anslinger had to act fast. He had become the first U.S. Commissioner of Narcotics in history only a few weeks before. President Hoover had ordered him to war unceasingly on the dope traffic.

Anslinger moved fast. Within days, he raided 30 opium dens in the Nation's Capital—all on or near famed Pennsylvania Avenue.

This was the beginning of a war unheralded in modern times. The battlefront stretched from New York to Tientsin, from London to Istanbul, from swanky Westchester to Cairo, from Harlem to Sicily.

Opium dens became a thing of the past. In their place, narcotics agents and their undercover men found a new enemy: the ruthless syndicate.

For 30 years, the hard-hitting Anslinger kept his silence. But the inside story of this vicious menace cried aloud to be told.

And told it is in his bestseller, "The Murderers," which has been condensed for serialization in the New York Mirror.

There's the story of the striped-pants baron of dope, the gay blade of the Paris boulevards with power enough to make a premier his friend. They called him Elie. He set up Little Augie as his top sales executive in America; and $50 million worth of dope enslaved Park Avenue society matrons, diplomats, rich and poor alike, turning them into drug addicts.

He was one of "The Murderers."

Day in, day out, year in, year out, Anslinger and his agents skirmished with the dope traffickers—killers like Louis (Lepke) Buchalter executed boss of Murder, Inc.

Together with other law-enforcement crusaders, Anslinger made it so hot for Lepke that he finally surrendered, in one of the most dramatic episodes in American journalism, to the New York Mirror's Walter Winchell.

And at this moment, one of Lepke's partners in crime, deported Charles J. (Lucky) Luciano, still rules as an overlord of crime from his Naples retreat. Shrewdly, he has avoided entangling himself again, but Anslinger says, "Still we know he is the man"—the man of crime.

When Fidel Castro seized Cuba, a movie hero stood near him, his face smeared with dirt, his chin bearded. He boasted how he had fought in the revolution.

For years, Anslinger had known the sword-flashing star, now dead, had been a drug addict.

"He lost in real life not to a sword, but to a needle," related Anslinger.

There were more—Billie Holliday, the talented singer who paid $100 for a shot that cost the average addict $5 or $10, the influential Congressman who threatened to buy his rations from an ordinary pusher if Anslinger stopped his dope supply, the clergyman who phoned from the White House (without White House knowledge) and denounced Anslinger for trying to persecute a constituent who later proved to be one of "The Murderers."

Finally, there are the teenagers, who begin with marijuana and wind up as criminals and prostitutes.

It's all there in the powerful inside story told by Anslinger.

A few weeks ago a man was strangled and burned near Rochester. He was a defendant in a $150 million narcotics smuggling trial here. He, too, was one of "The Murderers."

[From the New York Mirror, Jan. 15, 1962]

DOPE—WORLDWIDE RACKET

(By Harry J. Anslinger, U.S. Commissioner of Narcotics, and Will Oursler)

For more than 30 years I have been warring against the murderers. These are the men who control the international traffic in narcotics. They range from diplomats and ladies of society to silk-shirted racketeers, killers, and the sidewalk vermin who serve as couriers and frontline vendors of dope.

I have waged this protracted campaign since 1930, when I became the U.S. Commissioner of Narcotics and Chief of the Federal Narcotics Bureau. Ours is a war fought on unsuspected battlefields, unrecognized in the midst of average communities. It may be waged in the salon of a transatlantic jet, the office of a Governor—or the linen closet of a Westchester housewife.

Many big dealers move in the most elite circles. One notorious international trafficker, responsible for the addictions of millions in Africa, Asia, Europe, and America, was virtually lionized by New York society when he dropped into the United States as a refugee at the end of World War II.

The world of dope is a misshapen, hallucinatory cosmos that thrives on its own secrecy. Which is the criminal and which the victim in it is not as easy to define as some social caseworkers insist.

Is it the Washington politician on the fringes of the crime syndicate, consorting with penthouse prostitutes who provide boudoir cocaine as a special service to customers? Is it the habitual criminal—the car thief who picked up his dope habit in prison? Is it the unseen "investor" who puts up cash needed for the raw merchandise? Or is it a flaxen-haired 18-year-old girl sprawled nude and unconscious on a Harlem tenement floor after selling herself all afternoon, in exchange for a heroin shot?

From the start I have thrown the full efforts of the Bureau not against minor characters, but against major violators, the big hoods, the top-drawer importers and wholesalers. Some have controlled whole communities and cities, police departments and mayors, judges, district attorneys, and juries.

Getting evidence to convict hoodlums who thrive in this heavily protected level, where the penalty for talking is death, remains one of the most challenging assignments in law enforcement. Yet there are those who do talk. They talk for profit, for special consideration in their own cases, help for a dying wife or mother, for revenge, or merely to salve their conscience.

Secretly they work for us, while remaining members of the mob. Such special employes of the Bureau come from every stratum of the underworld.

The job of actually bringing in the violators and securing the evidence to carried on by Bureau agents. For weeks or even years, the agent may live with narcotics gangsters. He becomes a part of the gangster's intimate life and family. One slip—one false word—could cost his life.

The syndicate which the agent infiltrates is a modern phenomenon. In 1914, when the Harrison Act was passed, narcotics trafficking in America was largely in the hands of the Chinese. Opium was the most popular addictive dope in use. Only later did the so-called white dopes—morphine and heroin—replace opium in popularity. The white dopes are quicker in effect, more dangerous, more addictive—and more profitable.

With the Harrison laws, addiction in America was curtailed drastically—from one addict in every 400 persons to one in every 4,000.

But as the figure dropped, the underworld traffickers got bolder. The hoodlums were willing to take chances because the profits were immense. They killed when they had to.

Spread out from New York to Paris, from Istanbul to Shanghai, from Rome to Roanoke, the mobs and their leaders trusted no one. One group rose to power over the corpses of another.

As the smaller mobs destroyed each other, the shadow of one grew larger with each new execution. This was the Grand Council of the Mafia, with its plan of an international cartel controlling every phase of criminal activity.

When we in the Bureau first warned the public about the neo-Mafia menace, many criminal authorities jeered. Mafia was a myth, they said. Mafia's press agents in America joined the chorus.

In 1929, I became assistant commissioner of prohibition. So long as I held this post, I labored to my fullest strength to enforce the antialcohol laws. But this was a thankless and impossible assignment.

Another danger was growing almost unnoticed. The big organized bootleg gangs were looking to the future when prohibition would be out. One lucrative outlet was narcotics. Chemical plants of Europe and Asia already were producing vast quantities of dope which came into this country by various routes and smuggling techniques.

In 1930, President Hoover asked me to take on a new responsibility—that of U.S. Commissioner of Narcotics. I had been in office only a few weeks when I found myself and the new Bureau the object of a blistering assault from the floor of the Senate.

Senator Cole Blease, of South Carolina, rose from his seat, waving in his hand a tin of opium. "This was purchased," he shouted, "only one block from where we are now deliberating."

I knew what he said was true. I had been working on the case since my first day in office. With this blunt charge, however, time was running out—if the newly formed bureau was to win and hold the respect and support of Congress and the public, it would have to act fast.

At that time the Chinese still had a virtual monopoly on the opium trade in America; opium dens could be found in almost any American city. Our preliminary investigations had revealed that the tongs and Chinese individuals were operating opium dens, gambling, and brothels, on both sides of Pennsylvania Avenue.

Working closely with the Washington Metropolitan Police, I ordered all available agents thrown into the investigations. Within a few days, we had our first taste of tong violence.

One of the On Leong Tong members had come over to our side and was working as

a special employee. Someone within his tong learned the truth, and only two blocks from the Capitol dome our man was shot dead on the street. No witnesses were available. No one was ever brought to trial.

Despite this, our agents made a number of buys of opium at Chinese establishments. Following the purchases, we obtained secret warrants for raids on 30 opium dens in Washington, all on or close to Pennsylvania Avenue.

I picked a special occasion, a night when the Chinese were holding a convention in Washington and family representatives and tong leaders from cities all over America would be on hand. Washington police lent us about 400 patrolmen. In addition, I had almost 2 dozen top undercover agents heading up approximately 10 raiding parties. It was one of the largest and most carefully coordinated actions of metropolitan and Federal authorities.

We began in the early evening. We would swoop down on a center, break in, drag out the participants, the operators, the opium-smoking paraphernalia and tote the whole business off to the police station.

While we took them off, another raiding party would launch the next wave. This went on throughout the night.

The dens were either closed up permanently or moved to other cities where we would take care of them at a later date. It was an auspicious beginning, this first victory at close quarters with the narcotics underworld. The main street of the Nation's Capital, at least, was no longer polluted.

U.S. Struggle With the Communist Conspiracy To Enslave the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, millions of American are today worried, perplexed, and vitally concerned with the negative trend of the U.S. global struggle with the Communist conspiracy to enslave the world.

At the heart of this discontent lies the wish of the American people for a more forceful, realistic, and positive application of American foreign policy, based on a firm determination of victory, not appeasement or accommodation, of the Communist conspiracy.

I believe that the majority of the citizens of our country are wide awake to the fact that our struggle for Communism has resolved itself to a life-and-death status—whether we like it or not.

For the destruction and enslavement of this Nation is without question the Soviet master plan.

It has become abundantly clear that communism offers no new experiment in government or politics, but is the instrument of a power-mad knot of fanatics in the Kremlin who have as their goal world domination.

Communism is no new political ideology to be tried by a nation and discarded if found unworkable; but a despotic, criminal type of dictatorship that once imposed cannot be changed or refuted or voted away.

It is impossible for nations to just try out communism, and if it does not work, return to some previous form of government.

In its plan for world conquest, communism is also seeking to reshape the earth in a godless image where every strata of society pays forced allegiance to the state and its atheistic leaders.

All of our ideals, values, and customs are part of the hated capitalistic system communism seeks to destroy.

Our belief in God, our family circle, our freedoms and liberties will vanish and be replaced instead with the twisted dogma of Marx, Lenin, and Khrushchev if we fail to halt the Communist threat to this Nation.

Important as they are to the overall Communist scheme, the control of Ghana, Cuba, Laos, Vietnam, or West Berlin represent only steps in the ultimate Red plan for conquest and subjugation of the last, strongest bastion of capitalism and the free enterprise system—the United States of America.

There is no question that communism has crossed the ocean and is now lapping at our very shores.

We hear and read almost daily of Red subversion, infiltration, and incitement to riot within the borders of our neighbors to the south, in Latin and South America.

I believe that the American people, awake to the danger, desire to see their Government respond with swiftness, sureness, and firmness to the Red challenge wherever it appears.

The responsibility for the American response to communism lies with our Department of State.

There has been open and honest criticism from many segments of our population, questioning the wisdom of this department in bringing the full American capability into action against our greatest foe in history.

Limiting ourselves to recent development only, we are reminded of the U.S. setbacks in Laos, Cuba, Berlin, Vietnam, and other trouble spots.

There is also much concern about the granting of foreign aid to Communist countries which profess independence of Moscow.

Americans are also disturbed about some aspects of American participation in United Nations activities which often reflect programs and policies detrimental to our interests.

With these developments in mind, it appears that a close scrutiny of State Department planning and personnel is in order with the aim of insuring that the best interests of America is obtained at all times in the continuing struggle with our Communist enemies.

In this endeavor I have submitted a House resolution which reads as follows:

That the Committee on Foreign Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the policymaking procedures, methods of assessing foreign developments, and personnel practices, of the Department of State, with a view to making such recommendations as may be necessary in order to implement more advantageously and rapidly the response of the United States to world developments, and to insure that the best interests of the United States are being served in its struggle with communism.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, or elsewhere, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

This resolution authorizes an investigation of the State Department by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the committee best suited by knowledge and preparation to handle such a program of review and examination.

It will entail small if any additional appropriations and offers a swift implementation without lengthy resort to joint, select, or standing committee application.

I respectfully urge this body to vote swift approval to this resolution.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Space: New Budget Presages Busy Year in Space—Major Rocket Shot Every 9 Days Is Foreseen in Kennedy Program—$1.6 Billion Is Provided for Manned Flights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Evening Star of January 19, 1962, by William Hines, science writer for that paper. It gives a good account of what may be expected in regard to our man-in-space program:

SPACE: NEW BUDGET PRESAGES BUSY YEAR IN SPACE—MAJOR ROCKET SHOT EVERY 9 DAYS IS FORESEEN IN KENNEDY PROGRAM—$1.6 BILLION PROVIDED FOR MANNED FLIGHTS

(By William Hines)

President Kennedy's man-in-space program will be rolling in high gear in fiscal 1963 if yesterday's budget recommendations are translated into law.

Major rocket launchings—several involving men—will be carried out on an average of one every 9 days, and minor shots will get off the pad at the rate of about two a week. Some of the big unmanned shots will be aimed at the moon and the nearby planets.

By the end of the 1963 fiscal year there should be a pretty good indication of where this country is going in the space race and how it intends to get there.

CONTROVERSY EXPECTED

Some aspects of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's budget are certain to kick up controversy. The battle of solid-fueled versus liquid-fueled rockets will be fought anew. The issue of the big—and unexpectedly expensive—Manned Space Flight Center in Texas will be debated vigorously.

But, in general, the space budget is likely to be approved pretty much as written. This will give the Government just a little more than $4 billion of new obligational authority for nonmilitary space activities. The Pentagon will be operating in addition at approximately the $1.5 billion level on space projects of its own. Actual nonmilitary space spending in fiscal 1963 will be about $2.5 billion.

The $4,064,776,000 in the space kitty breakdown this way: NASA, $3,787,276,000; Atomic Energy Commission, $192.5 million; Weather Bureau, $45 million; Defense Department, $40 million.

AEC's funding will take care of the Rover and SNAP projects for development, respectively, of atomic propulsion units for rockets and auxiliary power units for space vehicles. The Weather Bureau will support aspects of the Tiros and Nimbus weather satellite programs. And the Pentagon will work on very large solid-fuel rockets for space booster use.

OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY

NASA's new obligational authority requests fall in two categories, as follows:

Research development and operations, $2,968,278,000.

Construction of facilities, $818,998,000.

The agency's request is up 107 percent from last year's total and is nearly quadruple the fiscal 1961 appropriation. The 1963 increase in research-development-operations is about 97 percent over 1962, while construction requests are up more than 150 percent.

OPERATIONS

The NASA request for operations are under five major headings, as enumerated below:

Manned space flight, $1,624,870,000 (55.6 percent of total): Fully half of this money will go for development of spacecraft and for the Gemini (two-man) and Apollo (three-man) programs. Next biggest share will go to the 7.5 million-pound thrust Advanced Saturn, which is the principal candidate at present for boosting the moon crews on their way.

The smaller Saturn, C-1, which flew briefly last year, and the 12-million-pound Nova are down for an aggregate of about $400 million. Project Mercury, the one-man program which will reach its climax next week, will get $13 million, the last driblet of nearly half a billion dollars pumped into the program since 1958.

Manned space fight's appropriation request is up nearly threefold over last year's, the largest increase of any major category of the NASA budget.

Unmanned investigation of space, $543,761,000 (18.3 percent): Lunar and planetary exploration—Projects Ranger, Surveyor, and Mariner—account for almost eactly half this fund. Scientic satellites like the Orbiting Geophysical Observatories receive a healthy boost in funding, too. A small amount (less than $20 million) for high-altitude atmospheric sounding rockets and about $75 million for launch vehicle development also are included.

Unmanned space projects will be funded at a rate about 43 percent above last year's.

Space technology, $452,087,000 (15.1 percent): The largest single fund is for liquid propulsion of big rockets—the developed 1.5-million-pound F-1 engine, the developing 200,000-pound hydrogen-fueled J-2, and the planned 1 million-pound hydrogen M-1. NASA's end of the joint AEC-NASA atomic rocket project accounts for a slightly smaller portion of this fund ($123 million versus $163 million), bringing the total Government effort in nuclear systems technology above the $300 million mark.

Smaller sums are requested for such relatively far-out rocket concepts as the plasma jet (or magnetohydrodynamic) engine; for launch operations development, and for launch vehicle and spacecraft technology.

Space technology's funding goes up about 70 percent over the 1962 level.

Supporting operations, $158,410,000 (5.4 percent): This is primarily a fund for satellite tracking and data acquisition. The increase over 1962 amounts to about 67 percent.

Applications, $136,562,000 (4.6 percent): The department of the national space effort that gives promise of earliest payoff, applications concerns itself with weather and communications satellites.

Communications satellite projects get a healthy increase from $48 to $85 million. The weather satellite program's funding is reduced slightly, from $54 to $51 million, but with the Weather Bureau's contribution the total for meteorological orbiters approaches $100 million.

Increase for "applications" is about 33 percent over this year.

Aircraft and missile technology, $52,588,000 (1.9 percent): This is about the total extent of the "aeronautics" in National Aeronautics and Space Administration. It represents support for the Dyna-Soar and X-15 rocketplane programs. This fund is up about 27 percent over last year.

CONSTRUCTION

NASA's building fund requests are up almost exactly half-a-billion dollars over last year. The biggest single item is $359,963,000 (43.9 percent) for the Atlantic Missile Range, Cape Canaveral, Fla. This is chiefly for a construction start on pads for the Advanced Saturn and Nova super boosters. Launch facilities take almost as long to build as the rockets themselves.

AMR's building plans have expanded nearly threefold over what was done there by NASA last year.

Other major building outlays planned in support of the space program are:

Mississippi test facility, Pearl River, Miss.: $92.5 million for a start on static-firing test stands for Big Saturns and Novas to be produced at nearby New Orleans.

Lewis Research Laboratory, Cleveland, Ohio: $43.8 million for a large vacuum facility in which nuclear auxiliary power systems for space vehicles can be tested.

National Nuclear Rocket Development Facility, Nevada Atomic Test Site, Nev.: $40 million to continue development of the static test equipment for the Rover rocket program.

Michoud Plant, New Orleans, La.: $34.5 million for construction of an extra-high bay structure in which Nova rockets will be built. Existing facilities at Michoud are big enough for the Super Saturn, but not for the Nova.

Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala.: $33.4 million. Additional construction in connection with design and development of very large rockets.

Manned Space Flight Center, Houston, Tex.: $30.8 million for a special test facility for the Apollo three-man spacecraft development project. Included will be a supercentrifuge big enough to swing a three-man capsule, and a moon gravity simulator in which lunar landing attempts will be made.

Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Md.: $23.8 million for an applied sciences laboratory and a tracking and telemetry facility.

PERSONNEL

Along with substantial increases in operating and building funds, the 1963 NASA budget request contains provision for a 20-percent boost in civil service employment. The nine field installations of NASA, plus the headquarters and its west coast branch office, all seek added personnel.

NASA tabulations of 1962 authorized and 1963 requested personnel levels do not include employees of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory of California Institute of Technology. This installation at Pasadena is a "captive lab" of NASA, operated by Cal-

tech on a contract basis. It employees about 3,600 persons.

Fiscal 1963 personnel level requests for all NASA installations follow (1962 authorized levels in parentheses):

Headquarters, Washington, 1,900 (1,406); Western Operations Office, Santa Monica, Calif., 125 (119); Langley Research Center, Hampton, Va., 4,000 (3,628); Ames Research Center, Mountain View, Calif., 2,051 (1,675); Lewis Research Center, Cleveland, Ohio, 4,508 (3,608); Flight Research Center, Edwards, Calif., 550 (494); Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Md., 2,749 (2,394); Manned Space Flight Center, Houston, Tex., 2,700 (1,640); Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala., 7,200 (6,490); Wallops Station, Chinocoteague, Va., 440 (399); Space Nuclear Propulsion Office, Cleveland, Ohio, 50 (27).

Total NASA, 26,273 (21,880).

The Late John J. Riley, of South Carolina

SPEECH

OF

HON. HUGH Q. ALEXANDER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to our departed friend, JOHN RILEY. JOHN RILEY was one of the finest gentlemen I have ever known. I knew JOHN RILEY before I ever came to this body. As a leader of the American Legion in North Carolina, I came in contact with my great friend, JOHN RILEY, there.

It should be stated, I think, that the American Legion Stadium in his home city of Sumter, S.C., was named for JOHN RILEY while he was still living—one of the highest tributes, I think, that can be paid to any man. To know JOHN RILEY was to love him. When I first came to the Congress, JOHN RILEY was one of the Members who impressed me as being most helpful to a new Member of this great body. JOHN RILEY possessed all of the great characteristics and that nobility of character that make a great man. He was humble, quiet, considerate, and wise. I had an office very near his in the New House Office Building and on many occasions would go and sit and talk with my good friend, JOHN RILEY, in regard to problems which we mutually had. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I came to know how courageous JOHN RILEY was. At all times, I never knew him to vote anything but his conviction on any issue regardless of the pressure that was brought to bear upon him. JOHN RILEY rendered great service, not only service to the youth of our land in the American Legion programs, but service to his community, to his State, and to the Nation. Certainly, I am going to miss him as our other colleagues have said they, too, will miss him. I join in all the tributes that have been made to him and to express to his wife and other members of his immediate family, my sincere grief at their great loss.

AFL-CIO Opposes Policy on Japan Cotton Import

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution, adopted at a meeting of the AFL-CIO executive council held in New York recently:

AFL-CIO OPPOSES POLICY ON JAPAN COTTON IMPORT

A statement on international trade policy, adopted by the AFL-CIO executive council on February 26, 1961, noted in part:

"Sudden large-scale influxes of imports from low-wage countries have adversely affected U.S. domestic production and employment recently in such industries as textiles and apparel. At the initiative of the trade union movement, the U.S. Government has made successful efforts to have the GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) consider the problem under the heading of market disruption."

Since then economic developments in the domestic textile and apparel industry became sufficiently critical to impel President Kennedy to announce a seven-point program last June designed to prevent further deterioration. An important phase of this program was based on the desirability of working out multilateral understandings among exporting and importing nations in order to regularize international trade textiles and apparel and in order to avoid market disruption.

As the first step in the implementation of this program, a 1-year arrangement regarding international trade in cotton textiles was concluded in Geneva on July 21, 1961. Despite many weaknesses, this arrangement was a major advance in providing an international acceptable approach to the orderly marketing of cotton textiles and apparel.

First, it classified imported commodities into a minimum number of broad categories for the purpose of evaluating the flow of apparel and textile trade between nations.

Second, it obligated nations presently restricting imports from Japan and Hong Kong to provide the latter countries with access to their markets, thus broadening the base for international trade relations.

Third, it enabled participating countries to obtain relief from undue pressure of imports whenever domestic industry and employment were threatened with disruption as a result of undue concentration of shipments of special items or categories of textiles and apparel.

The arrangement, while applicable for 1 year beginning October 1, 1961, provided for further international negotiations designed to work out a long-term program. From the outset the United States contemplated special arrangements for Japan and Hong Kong in order to correct an imbalance in their relative position in the U.S. market, a situation which arose when Japan adopted a policy of moderation for its exports beginning with 1957.

Except for violations in the case of blouses and men's and women's trousers and shorts, Japan has lived up to its commitments since that time. During this period, American importers shifted part of their orders to Hong Kong.

Japan has persistently argued that the rapid rise of Hong Kong shipments in the American market took place at her expense, and she has demanded compensating increases in her share of the American market. In response to this demand, the Department of State, without consulting labor and industry most vitally affected, authorized Japan to increase its 1961 shipments of men's and women's trousers and shorts by 33⅓ percent.

At the same time it authorized an overall rise in the 1961 shipments of woven cotton apparel. This was done in spite of the comparatively poor condition of the domestic apparel markets and in disregard of the dislocations already caused by the heavy burden of apparel imports.

Japan's voluntary program is scheduled to expire at the end of 1961. In the course of bilaterial negotiations regarding the arrangements for 1962, the United States made further concessions to Japan, particularly in woven and knit cotton apparel.

The new bilaterial agreement with Japan is a serious backward step. It disregards the import classification structure painstakingly developed in Geneva. It seriously limits the ability to control market disruption. It provides for abnormal increases in Japanese imports of knit and woven cotton garments, a 14 percent increase over 1960 and 10 percent rise over 1961. It enables Japan to swing freely over a wide area of apparel products and fails to provide adequate safeguards against undue concentration of imports on any one item.

We view with serious concern this unfortunate retreat from the constructive approach initiated at Geneva. This development poses a serious threat to a successful, multilateral approach to the solution of mutual problems faced by apparel importing and exporting nations.

Unless the concessions granted to Japan are offset by substantial compensating reductions of imports from Hong Kong and elsewhere, and unless the defects in the present bilateral agreement with Japan are remedied in the future through the reaffirmation, strengthening and extension of the existing Geneva Arrangement, the forces urging unilateral solution to the import problem will be immeasurably strengthened. This would be a tragedy for the United States and for the entire free world.

The Late Speaker Sam Rayburn

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, SAM RAYBURN made an indelible mark in the history of his Nation and his work enriched the lives of millions of Americans during his own time and for the future.

SAM RAYBURN is in firm place among the American immortals. Because of his labor, millions of Americans now are living better than their fathers and are assured of greater opportunities for their children.

A statesman, SAM RAYBURN will be acknowledged always as one of the shapers of the 20th century. As a wise counselor of Presidents, he was one of the first to see clearly the role, the burdens and the promise of the United States as the leader of the free world.

His name will always be linked with that of Henry Clay, who was the first to win equal prestige for the House of Representatives with the other constitutional branches of government.

SAM RAYBURN, more than any other individual, supplied the steady hand at the helm of the House, during exceedingly difficult eras of our history. He not only preserved, but enhanced the dignity and the effectiveness of the House as a vital arm of our democracy.

The life and times of SAM RAYBURN will attract future historians. His name will grow in greatness with the years. It is safe to predict that the essence of all that will be written and remembered about him will be: The United States and all Americans gained because he lived in and among them.

Surely, no man could have a better and more deserving epitaph.

President Kennedy and His First Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, as President Kennedy enters his second year in the White House, many newsmen and writers are assessing the President's first year, his accomplishments as President.

A noted scholar and author, James MacGregor Burns, has written a perceptive review of President Kennedy's first year as the Chief Executive. This article appeared in the New York Times magazine.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include this very fine article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

THE FOUR KENNEDYS OF THE FIRST YEAR

(By James MacGregor Burns)

John F. Kennedy begins his second year in the White House with a sharpened sense of the rigors and responsibilities of the Presidency, with a confidence in his associates and in himself steeled by the trials of office, and with a feeling of renewed power stemming from his wide popularity among the people.

He begins his second year with the support, as measured by the polls, of over three-quarters of the voters. They approve the style, zest, and imagination with which he has managed the business of Government, the caliber of his appointments, the buoyancy he has shown in adversity and the constraint he has shown in success. Long forgotten are the ghosts that haunted his long quest for the Presidency—his youth, his religion, the fear that his father or the Pope would run his office.

He begins his second year amid a burst of fanaticism on the far right, whose program seems to boil down, as Williams Professor Fred Greene has said to a plaintive scream: "World, go home." He begins it amid complaints by liberal intellectuals that his administration lacks a central purpose or vision or grand design, that it has bent before every guest of public opinion instead of coming to grips with its enemies, that the Augustan age of poetry and power forecast by Robert Frost has become a managerial age of empty rhetoric and manipulation.

And he begins his second year with a full knowledge of all the above facts, with a detached view of what he can and cannot do, and with an answer to his critics.

Tilting back in his rocker, one foot up on the nearby sofa, the President looks little different from the day he entered office. He is a trifle thicker around the jaw; the lines in his forehead are etched a bit deeper; one catches the barest flecking of gray behind his temples. Otherwise, there is the same trim figure, the light cordiality, the quick restless movements of the hands and feet. He has escaped Presidential ponderousness just as he did senatorial.

Watching him in the tranquillity of his oval office, with crisis flaring in the Congo and the Caribbean and across the globe, one remembers his repeated warnings in 1960 that the new decade would be full of harsh trials, that—in one of his favorite phrases—the Eisenhower chickens would come home to roost. One remembers his call for new leadership to get the country moving, for a President who would offer action and vigor in the style of Roosevelt and other Democratic heroes. How does he feel now about the role of the President?

"I think people make a mistake when they compare this administration automatically with Roosevelt's," he said. "F.D.R. came into power in a crisis, the whole country was ready to follow him, he didn't have the stream of foreign crises that I've had. Later on, when war broke out in Europe, he had to act cautiously. He didn't look like a lion all the time. You can't—when you're dealing with the lives of whole nations."

Is he too concerned about nursing his personal popularity, too fearful of throwing himself into domestic controversies and party politics? He thinks not. He believes that his standing with the people—and he makes a great point of this—is crucial to him in dealing with foreign leaders, friend or foe, in facing down rightwing extremists at home, and in backing up controversial enterprises like the United Nations operations in the Congo.

The President has to know, his allies and adversaries must know, that he is acting from a basis of broad popular support. Perhaps his backing cannot easily be translated into congressional strength, he grants. But it has its own vital importance to his standing in Congress and in foreign capitals, and to his self-confidence.

"I don't want to hoard popularity," the President said. "Any support I have must be used. And maybe some of it will be lost in the days ahead. But it can't be used unless it is there."

Here again the President sees a contrast between his administration and earlier Democratic ones. As a New Deal and Fair Deal Democrat whose father campaigned for Roosevelt during the 1930's, he knows that business is an old target, and an alluring one. But he does not want to raise his party's ancient war cries at a time when he and the whole Nation must strain every nerve to carry through a series of urgent and exacting tasks abroad.

He wants to keep his freedom of action not only to do the things that have to be done, but—more important—not to act when extremists are telling him to throw the Nation's whole weight into Laos or Vietnam or Cuba or some other crisis area.

This conviction of the President's emerges directly from what has clearly been the main surprise that the White House held for the newcomers last winter—the urgency, complexity, variety and intractability of foreign affairs. The aids who had expected a more or less even division between foreign and domestic problems have found themselves devoting most of their time by far to the former.

For example, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., whose professional field is American history and culture has been occupied almost exclusively with foreign problems. And much of the White House talent—including the President's—has been applied to immediate brush fires abroad rather than to long-term international and domestic planning.

Does the President devote himself too much to the details of foreign policy? Not at all, he feels—it is precisely the details that are important, as in Cuba. His main practical lesson in the White House has been that he must go over the particulars of projected operations—whether United Nations operations in the Congo, a contemplated action in southeast Asia or a good-will trip to South America.

Cuba came early in his first year, before he had had much chance to assess the judgment of his military and foreign policy aids. One reason he faces his second year with renewed confidence is that he feels he has measured their capacities and has got them in the right jobs, just as long ago he learned the qualities of his political and legislative assistants. But he still does not believe in the wholesale delegation of decisions.

There is, in short, little in the mood of the White House, as the first year ends, to suggest any pronounced change in the President's methods during the year ahead. His administration will continue to be activist, pragmatic. Wide ranging, creative, without radical shifts or new departures in methods or goals.

The President plans again to throw his full influence with Congress behind his legislative program, especially the new foreign trade bill, medical care for the aged, Federal aid to education, and tax reform. He will take what he can get from Congress, postpone for another day what he cannot get, all without fighting any all-out domestic battles except those that are forced on him. And he will continue to baffle and frustrate intellectuals who want to see some broader design to his administration.

There will be no grand design in the immediate future, partly because the American political system does not lend itself easily to a single strategy of politics and program, but mainly because Mr. Kennedy has not made a final decision as to the commitment his administration will make in the year ahead. He has not made this decision because during his first year the centrifugal forces in American politics have been pushing him in several directions. It is often said that the President is many men; during the past year there have been at least four Kennedys.

One Kennedy might be described as a rhetorical radical. This is the Kennedy of the sweeping campaign promises, of the stirring inaugural address, of the whole concept of the New Frontier and the great tasks to be accomplished at home and abroad.

There will be no significant decline in the rhetoric in the coming months, as indicated by some of the President's recent speeches and by the bold words surrounding the administration's new foreign trade plan. Nor need there be—the President believes that inspiring goals should be set whatever the delay and difficulty in their realization.

A second Kennedy is a policy liberal. This Kennedy is found in his executive acts and in the specific requests he makes of Congress; for example, in education, welfare, aid to developing nations. This is the most authentic Kennedy, reflecting his forebears' concern for the less privileged, responsive to the Nation's growing urban needs and eager to hold the allegiance of the masses of voters in the cities.

A third Kennedy is a fiscal moderate. This Kennedy would like to balance the budget even while his policies demand heavy spending; institute economy cuts in Federal personnel while planning a record peacetime budget for the next fiscal year; hesitates to take the strong steps necessary for full economic growth while seeing the long-term need for it.

A fourth Kennedy is conservative, or at least orthodox, in governmental and political organization. Essentially satisfied with the system as it is, he would rather try to energize it than change it. Nor has he sponsored reforms in the archaic organization of the Democratic Party. This orthodox Kennedy becomes more understandable when one remembers that where he has asked for changes—as in long-term borrowing for foreign aid or in the organization of the regulatory agencies—Congress has dragged its heels.

There is nothing strange or alarming in these opposing drives in a President. Any leader of a big, ragged political coalition will respond to the variety of forces within it. Any American President will reflect the deep ambivalence in the country toward big government, domestic reform, and an activist foreign policy.

Nor is a many-sided President anything new. No President had a more puzzling makeup man than Roosevelt who saw—as Kennedy does today—that playing a variety of roles helped him keep his administration and his party from unduly tying his hands. Roosevelt, for example, found it politically effective to preach the virtues of a balanced budget while consistently unbalancing it. Mr. Kennedy may do the same. And, like Roosevelt, he will surround himself with a few conservatives among his liberals, a few Republicans as well as Democrats.

But history also suggests that eventually the role-takers must show the true character underneath the costumes, for in the long run the different roles are bound to conflict. Woodrow Wilson—one of the men the President most admires—took some time to decide whether he was essentially a Jeffersonian agrarian, a Bryan pacifist, an urban progressive or an internationalist; in the end he decided to be a progressive and an internationalist. Mr. Kennedy, too, must decide, because a widening gap is likely to open between the first two Kennedys described above and the second two.

For the President's shining rhetoric and his policy liberalism will continue to produce a revolution of rising expectations in this country and overseas, as he raises new goals and advances the specific policies to reach them. The liberals who run his agencies and major embassies will continue to press on him—because they know he wants them to—their dreams of what can and must be done to make the country move forward. The only question is how long the pressures on the President and in the President to realize these dreams will seem consistent with traditional fiscal policies and a sluggish political system.

It is in this respect that Mr. Kennedy is quite right in warning against false historical analogies. All the talk this past year about the "first hundred days" and the "honeymoon period" has obscured the fact that it is not in the early months that the great Presidents of this century have made their basic commitment, but in the later years, as the forces that their early actions unleashed seemed to propel them toward a broader vision.

It was not in his first term, but in the latter part of his second, that Theodore Roosevelt moved toward the strong progressive platform that was to cleave the Republican Party in 1912. It was not in his tariff and monetary reforms of 1913-14 but in his progressivism of 1916 and his internationalism of 1917-19 that Wilson was to serve his historic part in redirecting his party to the demands of the 20th century.

It was not in the emergency actions of 1933 but in the enduring legislation of the "second hundred days" of 1935, and in his dramatic efforts to liberalize the Democratic Party in 1938, that Roosevelt showed the permanent meaning of the New Deal.

Can one find in Kennedy's first year, or in the prospects for his second, the enduring meaning of the New Frontier? It is possible, of course, that continuous crisis abroad will force him more and more toward noncontroversial and nonpartisan measures and men. But this seems unlikely, for in the long run it would sharpen the President's dilemmas as the leader of the Democratic Party and its liberal constituency.

The pressure for action on civil rights, economic growth, urban problems, education, foreign trade and aid and a dozen other matters is simply too intense for a Democratic President to lay aside. It is much more probable that Mr. Kennedy, before his first term is over, will return to the central idea of his campaign.

That idea has been submerged recently in the stream of immediate problems, but it is still quite present. It is simply the idea that the most serious threat to the Nation is not immediate military attack (though that is a possibility to be guarded against) but a long attempt, stretching over years and perhaps decades, on the part of the Russian and Chinese garrison states to isolate, divide, and weaken the Western democracies, perhaps without hot war.

It is the idea that basic social and economic reforms are not only beneficient in themselves, but ways of building the Nation's long-term strength, broadly conceived as embodying education, health, resources, race relations, science, economic growth, and so on, as well as armies, navies, and weapons systems. It is the idea that foreign and domestic policy ultimately are indivisible, and hence it is a reaffirmation of the historic Wilsonian and Rooseveltian intertwining of progressivism and internationalism.

"Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman were successful in their foreign policy," Kennedy said, for example, in Ann Arbor in October 1960, "because it fitted in exactly with what they were trying to do here in the United States; the Fourteen Points of Woodrow Wilson were the international counterpart of the New Freedom; the Four Freedoms of Franklin Roosevelt were directly tied to the aspirations of the New Deal; and the Marshall plan, NATO, the Truman doctrine, and point 4 were directly tied to the kind of America that President Truman was trying to build.

"The United States in the 1960's is going to have to build a society with sufficient vigor, develop its resources with sufficient energy, provide a better life for our people with fair opportunity, with a sufficient sense of justice, if the United States is going to be in fact the leader of the free world."

The President still believes in this central idea. The question is whether his concern with short-term crisis operations, calling for wide, bipartisan support, will bar him from taking partisan and controversial and perhaps drastic actions necessary to push a big domestic program through Congress that would build strength in the years ahead.

At present there is a tendency in the White House to straddle the question. The plan is to present the administration's program to Congress and to use the traditional tools of Presidential prestige, bargaining, and maneuver to push it through. Some big bills should pass—medical care, perhaps, and the new trade bill. Other major measures may be lost, but the administration would bring them back to Congress another year.

While there would be no partisan attacks on Republicans or inflammatory appeals to the public during the legislative struggle, any bill defeated by the Republicans would serve in next fall's congressional elections as an argument for Democratic candidates.

One difficulty with this plan is that defeated bills form a poor backdrop against which to campaign. If nothing succeeds like success, nothing fails like failure. The defeat of the long-term borrowing and school bills last year did not touch off a roar of protest or rally the people to a great new effort. Rather, their loss seemed to unnerve their supporters and to dim their prospects.

But the main trouble with the plan is that off-year congressional elections are the worst battlefield for an administration attempting to rally voters to its program. As Wilson and Roosevelt both discovered, off-year elections are not really national elections; they are a jumble of local contests heavily affected by narrow interests and attitudes, confusion and apathy. And the President almost always loses seats in Congress, as Wilson did in 1914 and 1918, Roosevelt in 1938 and 1942, and Truman in 1946. It is when a strong President chooses his own battleground—his own reelection campaign, in which the congressional campaigns are drawn into the vortex of the presidential—that the President can win a mandate for his program, as Roosevelt did in 1936 and Truman in 1948.

The history-minded pragmatists in the White House know, of course, that historical trends and precedents can be reversed. It might be conceivable to some of them that a massive effort to recruit the best candidates for Congress, help them raise money, assist in organizing their districts—in short, to do all the things that the President's election aids used to do for him in his State campaigns—might bring an administration victory, or at least a standoff, in this fall's elections.

But such an effort would cruelly sharpen the President's dilemma. For such a massive commitment would require him to do precisely what he does not wish to do now: to throw himself into a great domestic struggle, to become more chief of party than chief of state and to risk alienating some of the non-Democratic popular support so vital to him, he feels, in his conduct of foreign policy.

Still, the administration in the end will have to take part in the congressional elections, at least to some extent, if only in response to the calls for help that will come from Congressmen who went down the line for White House measures on Capitol Hill and who now want the President to go down the line for them in their bailiwicks. The more the White House becomes belatedly involved in the elections, however, the more it will be stuck with the results.

If the Republicans pick up a sizable number of seats in the House, the President's foes on the Hill would hail the outcome as a repudiation of the President's policies. Such an outcome, even apart from Democratic seats lost, would further cloud congressional prospects for the basic Kennedy program. And failure of the program in 1963 and 1964 would make the administration open to counterattack by a liberal Republican nominee, like Nelson Rockefeller, in 1964.

Mr. Kennedy is not unaware of these possibilities, nor has he forgotten his central vision. But like Presidents before him he is making his way through global storms he cannot control. The great work of the Nation, he said last January 20, would not "be finished in the first thousand days, nor in the life of this administration, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet. But let us begin."

He has begun.

Harrison County Has Made Good Use of National Defense Education Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, in 1958, under the leadership of one distinguished colleague from Alabama, the Honorable CARL ELLIOTT, the two subcommittees, which each of us chaired, joined to draft the National Defense Education Act.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] has moved on from the Committee on Education and Labor to the Committee on Rules. So last year I was proud to sponsor legislation to amend and extend the NDEA.

I mention my association with this act to indicate my personal pride in the results the NEDEA, and especially title III, has obtained in West Virginia, and specifically my home county of Harrison.

Mr. Speaker, every county in West Virginia has made use of available title III funds. Some counties have established priorities and have concentrated their activities upon the improvement of a particular segment of the science curriculum, such as elementary, junior high, or senior high school science. Other counties have chosen to improve all of these areas simultaneously. Among the latter, Harrison County has been outstanding because supervisory efforts have been directed toward long-range in-service programs to insure maximum use of equipment.

Through the courtesy of Verl Snyder, State assistant superintendent of schools, I have a summary of activities in Harrison County. I ask permission to include this summary as a part of my remarks.

As many of my colleagues know, I was at one time a school superintendent in Harrison County. It is interesting to note that some of the schools were equipped 30 or 40 years ago. When these laboratories were equipped and furnished, we used the highest existing standards.

This is the perfect example of how much is needed to modernize our schools to equip them to do the job required in today's more complicated world.

I should like to cite another significant result of the title III program in Harrison County. Among many effects of the rebuilt science program one finds many more girls are taking science courses to better prepare themselves for careers in medical fields, chemistry, dietetics, and industry. It reflects the eagerness on the part of women to assume greater responsibilities in our national society. It shows that once the opportunities are present, American women are willing and able to make a major contribution to the welfare of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that it is not possible to reproduce photographs in the RECORD, for I would like for all to see the pictorial testimonial of how much title III has meant to an alert school system.

I want to publicly congratulate my old friend, Arthur V. G. Upton, Harrison County superintendent, and his assistants, as well as our board of education, for the job they are doing. I should also like to extend my congratulations to the State department of education, and particularly to the men and women who have provided the leadership to enable the maximum use of National Defense Education Act in West Virginia.

The summary follows:

A REPORT ON THE USE OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT TITLE III FUNDS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF SCIENCE INSTRUCTION IN HARRISON COUNTY

Science facilities in the Harrison County schools were limited in many schools and out of date in others. High school laboratories had been furnished 30 or 40 years ago. Science instruction in elementary schools was of an incidental nature, varying from school to school, with no definite scope or sequence suggested by the county. The junior high science program was more definite but, due to the lack of adequate materials and equipment, could be characterized as a textbook demonstration course.

Availability of National Defense Education Act matching funds enabled the county to completely refurnish and equip science laboratories in 10 of the 11 high schools. One high school was not refurnished since it will be closed upon the completion of a cosolidation program. Demonstration tables, equipment, and storage cases were placed in all junior high school science rooms. Assistant Superintendent Clyde R. McCarty supervised the reoutfitting of the science laboratories and based the selection and purchase of equipment upon requests made by the science teachers. Approximately $100,000 was spent to improve the junior and senior high school science facilities.

Supt. Arthur V. G. Upton states that teacher morale has increased with the addition of new science furniture and equipment. Science enrollment has increased with more girls electing science courses than ever before. Mr. Upton believes attractive laboratories have contributed significantly to the increased science enrollment.

Principals in the 49 elementary schools of Harrison County devoted their principals' meetings for 1 year to improvement of the elementary science program. Basic equipment was placed in all elementary schools. Additional enrichment equipment, such as books, charts, and audiovisual aids, was purchased for all schools and movable demonstration tables were placed in all larger elementary schools. The cost of this equipment was approximately $40,000.

Asst. Supt. Fountie Williams, who supervised the purchase of equipment and materials for the elementary schools, also made provision for an extensive inservice program for elementary teachers. Four elementary teachers attended the Fairmont State College Elementary Science Curriculum Workshop sponsored by the State department of education. These four teachers served as consultants in curriculum development within the county. One hundred and twenty-five teachers participated in extension courses devoted to the use of equipment and materials in elementary science teaching. These courses were offered by Salem College and by West Virginia University.

All elementary teachers in the county cooperated in developing a guide which suggested experiments and appropriate grade levels for using the equipment which had become available. The elementary schools sponsored a countywide science fair which was so successful that it has become an annual event attended by hundreds of students and adults.

Students, teachers and parents have become interested in science. It is now an important part of the elementary school curriculum, says Mr. Williams. Even though the program is greatly improved, he plans to purchase additional materials to increase student participation.

Outstanding science programs cannot be developed overnight. Ideally, every elementary science classroom should be equipped so all students can participate in science activities by working with equipment in small groups. Junior high school science courses should be laboratory courses. The total program from the 1st grade through the 12th should be sequential. Long-range curriculum planning, the purchase of necessary equipment and materials to implement the program and provision for continuous inservice training for teachers will make the good science program a reality. Harrison County is rapidly moving toward this goal.

Defacing of Synagogues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, recently Minneapolis area residents were shocked and dismayed to learn of the nocturnal defacement of a synagogue. An unknown person or persons daubed swastikas on the walls of one of these places of worship.

In my opinion a political party has an obligation to speak out against such an incitement to intolerance and prejudice. The obligation to protest rests with equal weight on political leaders regardless of their individual religious beliefs.

In discharging that obligation Republican State Chairman Robert A. Forsythe spoke as follows at Hutchinson, Minn., on January 3, 1962:

There are issues and problems in Minnesota crying for solution and for the application of wise and prudent thought and action. During the past week in Minneapolis a cynical and sinister act has pointed out to the people the threat which exists to one of the basic rights of Americans. I refer to the defacing of synagogues which constitutes a frontal attack upon the basic right of our citizens to enjoy freedom of worship in a free society.

The defacing of any house of worship of whatever faith in Minnesota must come as a shock to every person. It cannot be condoned, tolerated, or brushed aside. It is the type of action which is intended to arouse and create in the hearts of our citizens—hatred, ire, spite, and prejudice. These elements of emotion are destructive and constitute a danger wherever they might appear.

Partisans of both political parties must exert their individual and group leadership in the condemnation of such acts. But the responsibility of political leaders and work-

ers goes beyond mere condemnation. Theirs is the responsibility of action at the local level and higher levels of political activity to bring the elements of commonsense and good judgment to bear in the creation of a social, economic, and political climate within which these acts will not occur. This involves those activities which will educate all citizens to the dangers inherent in such acts, activities which will place the political parties solidly on record in opposition to such expressions, and those activities which will allow citizen leadership to be brought to bear to enhance the working elements of human understanding, cooperative enterprise in the area of human rights, and respect and adherence for and to our basic constitutional rights.

Tribute to Former Speaker Rayburn

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege, as well as an honor, to be permitted to participate today in paying tribute to the memory and services of a truly great American, the former Speaker of the House, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, whose untimely death last autumn shocked and distressed all American people, as well as all Members of Congress.

Divine Providence has permitted me to serve in the U.S. House of Representatives for 23 years with Mr. SAM, as we all lovingly called him. In most of those years he was Speaker of the House, and, as is well known, served in that official capacity twice as long as any other person in our Nation's history.

Speaker RAYBURN was a man of strong character, and even stronger faith in this Republic and its institutions. While his political affiliation was the opposite of mine, never in his long tenure of office did he use his high position for partisan advantage. Instead, he always saw to it that the rights and privileges of those of us in the minority were fully protected, whether we might have agreed or disagreed with his position and beliefs on the issue involved.

SAM RAYBURN was a kindly man. He loved the Congress of the United States, to which he gave his life. He was a good man. Never, throughout the years of our acquaintance and friendship did I ever know of him doing a little or a small thing. Instead he unselfishly extended his understanding, his help, and his friendship to all of us who served with and under him.

Speaker RAYBURN has gone from our midst to preside in a greater chamber than the one over which he presided here on this earth. Already he has become an American tradition. As long as our Republic lasts he will live in the fond memories of the American people whom he served so long and so well. In his going he has left behind for all of us in this body, the desire and the inspiration to try and measure up to the high official and personal standards he so constantly maintained throughout his lifetime.

Feed Grain Program Injures Washington State Livestock Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, shortly after enactment of the new feed grain program I began receiving reports from farmers and others in the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Washington that this program was not being administered by the Department of Agriculture in the manner expected. A number of individuals informed me they felt they were being subjected to improper pressure from the USDA to comply with the program. This is in spite of the fact that the State of Washington is a feed deficit area and that the feed grain program, by law, is supposed to be voluntary.

Since that time I have continued to receive reports that the feed grain program is doing serious harm to livestock and poultry producers in my State. In order that these reports may be fully substantiated, I submit the following material furnished me by Washington State University, including an analysis of the current feed grain cost squeeze on Washington livestock and poultry producers:

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY,
Pullman, Wash., January 8, 1962.

Hon. CATHERINE MAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CATHERINE: Mark Buchanan has shown me your letter of December 27. I am glad to send you herewith copies of materials developed here pertaining to the feed-grain cost squeeze as it applies to Washington livestock and poultry producers, together with related correspondence.

Last spring some of our agricultural economists here at Washington State University made a careful analysis of the likely effects of the new feed-grain program on Washington livestock producers. One of their important findings was that the program would be likely to place Washington livestock and poultry producers at a serious disadvantage in comparison with major corn and sorghum producing areas. It would do this, they felt, by substantially increasing feed-grain prices in Washington while making little change in feed-grain prices in the Midwest. A copy of their analysis appears as Exhibit B. Exhibit A is a copy of Director Madsen's letter of last April transmitting their findings to Secretary of Agriculture Freeman. Exhibit C is Mr. Thompson's reply.

Things worked out very much as our agricultural economists had anticipated. Exhibit E is a copy of a statement prepared by them in early November describing what happened. Exhibit D is a copy of my letter transmitting this statement to Secretary Freeman in early November. Exhibit F is a copy of Mr. Tripp's reply.

In October the situation was called to the attention of the U.S. Department of Agriculture by livestock producers in this State and in Oregon. In response, the Department of Agriculture instituted a program in which Government-owned milo was made available at $43 per ton at all rail points in Washington, Oregon, and Idaho. This action largely corrected the adverse feed cost situation for poultry producers west of the Cascade Mountains in Washington and Oregon. However, as pointed out in Exhibit E, it left the situation largely uncorrected in the major livestock producing and feeding areas of the State east of the Cascade Mountains.

Exhibit G (not printed in RECORD) is a map of the State prepared by our agricultural economists showing proposed milo selling prices in eastern Washington. These are based on barley price support differentials between the various counties and the Portland market. These differentials reflect transportation and handling costs from the surplus grain producing counties to Portland. The suggested county prices for milo are the $43 less the barley price support differential between Portland and each county. Our economists developed this map at the request of our livestock industry. The position of the livestock people of eastern Washington is that Government selling prices for milo should reflect these differentials. Such prices would bring feed-grain costs in eastern Washington in line with their historical relationship to other areas. The cattle and hog feeding enterprises east of the Cascades are based on grain costs that have, in the past, been substantially below those west of the Cascades and only moderately higher than those in the Midwest.

Since the feed-grain price discrepancies described in the exhibits have not been fully removed, our cattle feeders and hog raisers in eastern Washington are still in a difficult position. In fact, many of our hog raisers are quitting the business.

As you will note from reading Director Madsen's letter of April 20 to Secretary Freeman, our agricultural economists did not engage in these activities to discredit the feed-grain program. They recognize that the feed-grain program did bring benefits to many farmers, including some in our State. We would like to do all we can to help the administrators of Federal agricultural programs avoid policies that will injure our livestock industries. We also hope that our peculiar feed-livestock situation in Washington and the Pacific Northwest will be taken into consideration in future legislation. We produce only about 50 percent of the meat consumed in the State, but we have the potential for producing a much larger share of our needs. This is important to the economy of our State and to the livestock industry of our area.

Sincerely yours,

C. CLEMENT FRENCH,
President.

EXHIBIT A

APRIL 20, 1961.

Hon. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Your objectives in reducing surplus storage stocks of feed grains as set forth in the feed grain problem finds a sympathetic and cooperative reception here. However, Washington State's somewhat peculiar situation in respect to production and consumption of feed grain prompts a couple of questions concerning policies.

Our Agricultural Extension Service is working closely with the State Agricultural Conservation and Stabilization Committee in seeing that farmers are made aware of the provisions of the feed grain program. It becomes important to interpret correctly the program in the light of local conditions. Absence of a definite statement of policy intentions as to the release of CCC stocks makes it difficult for us to help our corn producers and poultry and livestock men plan their future programs.

As documentation for our concern and as background for Washington's situation, I am attaching a statement prepared by several of our economists. This is not offered as a definitive paper because of the shortness of time available. It may be an aid to departmental people in further explanation of two major questions.

1. Will a sufficient difference between the free-market price of these feed grains and support levels be maintained to cause the producer in States like Washington where corn and sorghum consumption exceeds production to feel rewarded by having complied with the program?

2. Will the release of CCC corn and sorghum stocks take place at locations and prices so as not to upset the competitive positions of livestock and poultry producers among States and areas within the States?

Let me emphasize that these questions are not being raised with the view of criticizing the program, but merely for clarification. We feel it is better to raise them now when there is time to adjust policy rather than to criticize later when some of the results we fear might become reality.

We do feel an obligation to explain all eventualities to our farmers, to answer their questions, and to help them decide the degree of their compliance.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS L. MADSEN,
Director.

EXHIBIT B

EFFECT OF THE FEED GRAIN PROGRAM ON WASHINGTON FARMS

Concern about the effects of the 1961 national feed grain program on farmers in Washington State arises out of two questions:

1. What price should our corn producers anticipate for free-market corn when contemplating whether or not to comply with the program?

2. Will the program place Washington livestock and poultry producers at a serious disadvantage in comparison with major corn and sorghum producing areas?

Answers to these questions will depend largely on U.S. Department of Agriculture policy with respect to pricing and availability of CCC corn to be released from stocks during the 1961–62 season. Administration officials have been quoted both as affirming and denying that the policy will be to keep the national average farm price at around $1 per bushel.

These uncertainties make it difficult for our corngrowers to decide whether to comply with the program. They also make it difficult for our livestock producers to plan their operations.

SHOULD THE WASHINGTON CORN PRODUCER REDUCE PLANTINGS?

Since Washington produces less corn than it uses, a lack of a clear pricing policy creates strong doubt in the minds of farmers as to whether next season's price of corn in Washington may not be considerably higher than support. Reduced corn production in the State creates a demand for shipped-in corn. The railroad freight on corn from Sioux City, Iowa, to Othello, Wash., in the east central part of the State is 97 cents per hundredweight. Warehouse margins for handling at the receiving end are estimated at 15 cents per hundredweight.

Thus, the cost of moving corn from the Iowa elevator to the Washington feed is $1.12 per hundredweight, or 63 cents per bushel.

Objectives of the feed grain program are usually discussed in terms of the U.S. farm price. Therefore, historical differences between the U.S. average farm price of corn and the prices Washington farmers received are helpful to understanding.

Amount by which Washington corn prices exceeded U.S. average price.

October-September season:	*Per bushel* [1]
1950–51	$0.25
1951–52	.34
1952–53	.23
1953–54	.19½
1954–55	.24
1955–56	.33
1956–57	.34
1957–58	.34
1958–59	.32
1959–60	.34
10-year average	.29¼

[1] Average of the monthly differences between Washington farm price of corn and the U.S. farm price of corn.

These differences are not as great as the cost of freight and handling for several reasons. The most important of these is that corn for shipment to Washington is purchased in whatever area has the greatest surplus and therefore the lowest price.

To the extent the feed-grain program is successful in reducing Washington corn production, it seems logical that the difference between Washington corn prices and U.S. corn prices will increase in the direction of the 63 cents differential for moving corn into the State. This would seem to be the probability unless the Department's policies are to make substantial quantities of Midwest corn and milo available at country elevators in Washington at less than support prices.

If the average differences between U.S. and Washington prices prevails, and if the U.S. corn price does not drop below $1.06 per bushel, corn prices in Washington would be at least $1.35 per bushel next season. This is based on the 29¼ cents average spread shown in the previous tabulation. We understand the support price for Washington growers is $1.29 per bushel.

COMPETITIVE POSITION OF WASHINGTON LIVESTOCK PRODUCERS

Potentially rising feed costs are not in themselves a cause for great concern on the part of Washington livestock and poultry producers. The crux of the problem lies in the possibility that feed costs may be pushed downward in the areas where CCC stocks of corn are stored, at the same time that prices of feed grains are being increased in our Washington feeding areas.

To complete an understanding of the significance of these prices, it may be helpful to relate them to the State's feed-livestock situation.

The major portion of our dairy and poultry enterprises is in the coastal and Puget Sound areas, west of the Cascade Range.

Very little feed grain is produced in the coastal area. However, our large terminal elevators are located at Seattle, Tacoma (and Portland), where some CCC corn stocks have been stored.

Most of Washington's feed grain production is found east of the Cascades—barley on diverted wheat land and corn in irrigated areas. CCC corn and sorghum has not been stored in these areas.

With the advent of the Columbia Basin Irrigation Project and increasing corn production under irrigation, cattle feeding enterprises have been increasing rapidly in the area east of the Cascades.

Most of Washington's hogs are also fed east of the Cascades on barley and corn. Hog production has been increasing, primarily because barley prices have been low enough to enable Washington producers to compete with pork shipped in. Washington has always produced less pork than is consumed in the State.

The impact of the feed grain program on the dairy industry will result chiefly from the increase in the support price for barley. If sufficient CCC corn were available on the coast at or below support levels, corn could be substituted in the dairy rations.

Higher prices for corn will directly affect our egg and broiler producers. Following the introduction of higher support prices for wheat, Washington changed from an egg exporting State to an importing State. The turkey industry declined also.

Washington's developing cattle feeding industry relies on both barley and corn for concentrate feeds. While the increased support price for barley is expected to stimulate production of that grain, it is our understanding that CCC stocks cannot be made available at less than 105 percent of support price plus carrying and handling. Therefore, it seems that the cost of barley to the feeder must be higher than last year by about the amount of the increase in support price (between $6 and $7 per ton).

On the basis of present information it appears that the gross support prices for barley in eastern Washington will range from about $42 to $44 per ton. If the feeding value of barley is 90 percent of that of corn, the equivalent value of corn would be $46.67 to $48.89 per ton, or $1.29 to $1.37 per bushel.

If the program is successful in reducing the State's corn production and no corn or sorghum is available from CCC stocks in the eastern part of the State, it seems that the cost of grain to the cattle feeder must be at least as high as the barley support price for the area. If CCC corn and sorghum were made available at coast terminals, freight and handling from there to livestock producers in the interior would add from $9 to $12 per ton or from 24 to 34 cents per bushel.

Hog-feed ratios during recent years have been such as to make Washington producers barely competitive with those of the North Central States.

The high barley ratio in Washington converted to a hog-corn equivalent (allowing for the lighter weight per bushel of barley, the lower feeding value for hogs, and the fact that barley must be ground) is shown in the following table and compared with the hog-corn ratio in the North Central States.

Calendar year	Hog barley ratio in Washington converted to hog corn equivalent	Hog corn ratio in North Central States	Washington advantage
1954	16.1	15.3	0.8
1955	13.1	11.9	1.2
1956	12.6	11.2	1.4
1957	17.0	16.1	.9
1958	16.8	19.3	−2.5
1959	12.8	13.5	−.7
1960	14.0	15.9	−1.9

This narrow competitive balance has been possible only because pork prices are higher in Washington than in the north-central States (Washington being a deficit area) and because barley prices have been comparatively lower than contemplated under the feed-grain program.

Most of the surplus corn stocks are in the Midwest. Depending on the Department's policy, corn could be made available there at comparatively low prices. If corn is made available only from present Midwest storage locations, no benefit would accrue to Washington livestock producers because of the freight differential.

If CCC stocks of corn and sorghum were made available at Washington coastal points, where the terminal elevators are located, at prices competitive with storage releases in

other parts of the Nation, the present competitive position of Washington's dairy and poultry producers could be maintained. However, the $9 to $12 per ton freight and handling costs between coast terminals and interior Washington points would place the cattle and hog feeders in an unfavorable position, unless CCC stocks were made available at eastern Washington points.

To summarize the major questions posed here:

1. Will Department policies in releasing CCC corn and sorghum stocks make it profitable for the Washington corn producer to comply with the feed-grain program? Or will the price of free-market corn during the 1961–62 season be so high that the complying farmer will feel penalized because he cooperated?

2. Will the administration of the feed-grain program create a feed-cost pattern which is advantageous to some areas and work to the disadvantage of others? Or will an attempt be made to maintain the competitive positions of various livestock and poultry producing areas?

EXHIBIT C

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
COMMODITY STABILIZATION SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., May 19, 1961.

MR. LOUIS L. MADSEN,
Director, Institute of Agricultural Sciences, Washington State University, Pullman, Wash.

DEAR MR. MADSEN: Your letter of April 20 to Secretary Freeman, pertaining to the 1961 feed grain program, was referred to this office for reply.

We have read with interest and appreciation your letter, as well as the enclosed statement prepared by your staff, outlining the feed-livestock situation and expressing concern that the new feed grain program might have adverse effects on farmers and livestock people in your area.

On the whole, we do not look for any sudden or radical changes in feed prices or feed-livestock relationships during the coming year, such as would have severe impact on the livestock or poultry industries. Some adjustments in availability of supplies for feeding may take place, but this is likely to be more gradual than the adjustments in production of feed grains in 1961.

We do not know as yet precisely the extent that farmers in each State will participate in the new program; and of course, the 1961 crops of corn and sorghum grains cannot be predicted with exactness now due to the vagaries of weather. We do know, however, that there will not be any shortage of feed grains in the country, irrespective of the reductions in output brought about by the 1961 feed grain program. The Department holds huge inventories of corn and sorghum grains. If necessary, the Department could use the sellback provision to insure that the rate of any adjustments that may be necessary in actual feed-grain availability will be moderate.

The CCC can sell from its stocks any of the four feed grains (corn, sorghum grains, oats, barley) at any location and at a time determined by the Department to be in the best interests of the program. This means that feed grain certificates acquired in one part of the country could eventually be used by CCC to offer grain on the open market in another part of the country. This is not to say that a blueprint has been prepared at this early date for future CCC dispositions. Some problems will have to be met and solved when they arise.

It will continue to be the Department's policy to keep the public fully informed on the operations of the 1961 feed grain program. Your sincere interest in these matters is very much appreciated, and we are glad to have your thoughtful comments and suggestions.

Very truly yours,

ARTHUR THOMPSON,
Director.

EXHIBIT D

NOVEMBER 6, 1961.

HON. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: You may recall that I wrote you a letter on April 20 of this year concerning the feed grain program and its likely effects on livestock, dairy, and poultry producers in the State of Washington. With that letter, I enclosed an analysis prepared by our extension economists explaining the reasons for our fears that livestock, dairy, and poultry producers in our State would be penalized by the feed grain program. I am enclosing copies of the materials prepared last spring and related correspondence.

Developments have confirmed the fears we had last spring. In fact, the feed grain program has worked even more to the disadvantage of livestock, dairy, and poultry producers in the State of Washington than we had anticipated.

At the request of the cattle feeders' organization, our extension economists have prepared materials showing the change in feed grain costs in this State compared with feeding areas in the Midwest. A copy is enclosed for your information.

Immediate steps need to be taken to prevent very serious regional maladjustments.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS L. MADSEN,
Director.

EXHIBIT E

REGIONAL FEED PRICE DIFFERENCES WORK HARDSHIP ON WASHINGTON STATE LIVESTOCK PRODUCERS

During the past year, feed grain costs have advanced sharply in the State of Washington. But they have held stable in the Nation's major livestock, poultry, and dairy areas—the major competitors of Washington producers. The following comparisons will show what has taken place. Farm prices as reported by the Crop Reporting Service are used. While our livestock, dairy, and poultry producers usually have to pay higher prices than this, the differences between the prices they pay and the farm price as reported seldom changes much. Also, the State average farm price of barley represents the farm price of barley in eastern Washington because nearly all of the State's barley is produced in the eastern part of the State. Most of the feed grain used in the State is barley.

The farm price of barley in Washington[1] averaged $39.58 per ton on September 15, 1961. This is $5 per ton higher than a year earlier. Since the feeding value of barley is about 90 percent of corn, pound for pound, this means that to secure in barley as much nutrient value as that contained in a ton of corn eastern Washington farmers were paying $43.98 (assuming that they could buy at the average farm price). For similar nutrients, the North Dakota farm price of corn was $32.14. For the West North Central States as a group, it was $35.71.

In other words, Washington farmers were operating in mid-September at a disadvantage of $11.84 per ton compared with North Dakota farmers and $8.27 per ton compared with west-north-central farmers as a whole. Washington farmers nearly always pay more for feed grains, but seldom has the difference been this great. It has not been this great at any time in the past 6 years. In fact, in the past 6 years the difference has averaged $4.80 per ton as compared with North Dakota farmers and $1.65 per ton compared with west-north-central farmers as a whole. Thus, compared with the 6-year average the competitive position of eastern Washington livestock producers has weakened greatly. Feed grain prices in eastern Washington producing areas have gone up $7.34 per ton compared with North Dakota and $7.95 compared with the West North Central States as a whole.

Last year, midwestern farmers had a greater advantage than usual over Washington farmers because of the low corn prices. But even so, Washington livestock producers are in a much poorer position this year. Their feed grain costs have increased $5.21 per ton during the past year as compared with North Dakota producers and $5.56 per ton as compared with west-north-central farmers as a group.

Hog producers in eastern Washington have been especially hard hit because of the high proportion feed grain costs are of total costs. With lower hog prices almost certain next year, most Washington hog producers will be forced out of hog production unless the feed grain cost discrepancies are corrected soon.

Farmers in eastern Washington who fatten cattle will be injured by the relatively high feed grain costs. The degree of injury will vary greatly between different feeders. Although all cattle feeders use some grain, the proportion of grain in the ration varies greatly because some have access to by-product feeds such as beet pulp and cull or diverted potatoes.

Barley price support for the 1961 crop was raised $5.83 per ton in most counties of the State. In most of the remaining counties the increase was $5.42 per ton. Since all barley is eligible for price support loans, the increase in support price has caused prices to come up $5 per ton (September 15, 1961, farm price increase over that of September 15, 1960). Washington farmers had placed 7,787,000 bushels of barley under price-support loan by October 1 this year compared with 2,775,000 bushels a year earlier.

On the other hand, the price of corn and sorghum grains in most areas east of the Rocky Mountains has been held at approximately year-ago levels. This is due in the main to large sales of Government-owned corn and sorghum grain, plus the fact that much of this year's corn and sorghum grain crops is not eligible for price support loans.

The recent actions of the U.S. Department of Agriculture have not helped the feed grain cost situation in eastern Washington measurably. The actions referred to are the $4.17 per ton reduction in the export subsidy rate at Pacific Northwest ports and the sale of sorghum grains throughout the Pacific Northwest at $43 per ton.

The reduction in the export subsidy rate did knock the price of barley down about $2 per ton at Pacific Northwest ports for 3 or 4 days. In eastern Washington, it had no noticeable effect. The reason is obvious. Barley prices were approximately at the support level. Since all barley is eligible for support loans and since there is an abundance of empty storage space, barley just cannot be bought at a lower price. But even at the ports, half of the $2 price drop was regained in a few days.

Sorghum grain at $43 per ton is no help in eastern Washington. Barley, even though substantially higher than last year and high-

[1] This is the mid-month farm price as reported by the Crop Reporting Service. It is a representative price for eastern Washington because nearly all of the State's barley is produced in the eastern part of the State.

er than average, is still substantially below the sorghum price in most parts of eastern Washington. It appears that there are only two practical ways that eastern Washington livestock producers could be assisted by the USDA in the current feeding season: (1) make corn or sorghum grain available to them at about $35 per ton; (2) raise the market prices of feed grains in the Midwest by about $7 per ton.

Sale of sorghum grain at $43 per ton will be of some help to poultry producers in western Washington. Feed grain is usually around $8 to $9 per ton more expensive in western Washington than in eastern Washington.

Farm price of barley and corn compared (as of mid-September)

Mid-September of—	Barley, Washington (per ton)	Barley-corn equivalent (per ton)	Corn, West North Central States (per ton)	Washington above or below West North Central States (per ton)	North Dakota corn, (per ton)	Washington above or below North Dakota (per ton)
1961	$39.58	$43.98	$35.71	+$8.27	$32.14	+$11.84
1960	34.58	38.42	35.71	+2.71	31.79	+6.63
1959	35.83	39.81	37.14	+2.67	33.21	+6.60
1958	38.33	42.59	36.79	+5.80	32.86	+9.73
1957	32.93	36.58	37.50	−.92	33.93	+2.65
1956	38.75	43.06	49.29	−6.23	42.86	+.20
1955	35.83	39.81	45.71	−5.90	38.57	+1.24
1955–60 average		40.04	40.36	−.32	35.54	+4.50
Growth in Washington disadvantage in 1 year				5.56		5.21
Washington disadvantage Sept. 15, 1961, compared with mid-September average for 1955–60				7.95		7.84

Similar calculations were made comparing September 15, 1961, prices with season average prices for the other years. The results were essentially the same as shown here.

After the calculations were made, the report on October 15 prices was received. Changes in the relationships between September 15 and October 15 were minor. Barley prices advanced slightly in Washington, corn prices declined slightly in West North Central States but advanced in North Dakota.

EXHIBIT F

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., November 21, 1961.

Mr. LOUIS L. MADSEN,
Director, Agricultural Extension Service,
Washington State University,
Pullman, Wash.

DEAR MR. MADSEN: This is in reply to your November 6 letter to Secretary Freeman, referring to feed grain costs of Washington livestock producers as affected by the feed grain program.

We appreciate your supplying us with the analytical material prepared by your Washington extension economists. We will be taking it into account in our current review of the cost situation in all feed grain deficit areas of the country.

The material which you supplied was supplemented here this week by direct conversation with Mr. Karl Hobson of your staff, who was attending the annual USDA Outlook Conference.

Because making feed grains available in your area may eventually involve absorption of considerable freight cost by Commodity Credit Corporation, it is not clear at the moment as to how far the recommendations you submitted may be met.

In any case, it will be the aim of the Department to administer the feed grain sales program with reasonable regard for all concerned.

Very truly yours,

JOHN E. TRIPP,
Acting Director.

Portrait of Mr. Vinson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following article with reference to our beloved senior colleague appeared in the Washington Sunday Star on January 7 just prior to the convening of the Congress:

SENIOR MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

(By Cecil Holland)

When Congress reconvenes on Wednesday Representative CARL VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia, will take his seat in the House as the ranking Member.

Now in his 48th consecutive year in the House, the 78-year-old chairman of the Armed Services Committee became the oldest Member in point of service on the death of Speaker Rayburn.

He is senior by more than 8 years to his three nearest competitors—Chairman CANNON of the Appropriations Committee, Chairman CELLER of the Judiciary Committee and Representative TABER of New York, ranking Republican on the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. VINSON, who has been dealing with the country's defense matters since 1917 when he became a member of the House Naval Affairs Committee, has served under eight Presidents.

At intervals in his long career in the House Mr. VINSON talked at times of retiring but he never got around to it. When congressional pay was raised in 1955 from $15,000 to $22,500, Mr. VINSON drily remarked: "Well, if they are going to pay that kind of money in Congress, I think I'll make a career of it."

ONE MORE TERM

Mr. VINSON has different ideas now. "I'm going to ask my constituents," he said recently, "to send me back for one more term at least, so I can round out 50 consecutive years in Congress."

If that comes to pass (and few things seem more certain than his reelection) Mr. VINSON will have set a record unmatched in American history. Senator HAYDEN, Democrat of Arizona, already has reached the half-century mark of congressional service but it has been split between the House and Senate.

Being the House's senior Member will mean little, if any, change in Mr. VINSON's well-ordered ways. Shortly before Christmas he returned, as customary, from his 600-acre Georgia farm to get ready for the second session. "We have a great deal to do," said Mr. VINSON, "so I came back to get things moving."

Appearing in the best of health, Mr. VINSON scheduled a series of hearings, including the readiness of the Nation's Reserve forces, to start right after Congress convenes.

NO. 1 AUTHORITY

In his long service, Mr. VINSON has been happy to remain in the place he has carved out for himself as probably the country's foremost authority on defense matters. He has always refused to consider moving into high office in the executive branch. "I've always been more interested in my work here," he said reflectively.

Once his friends began booming him for Secretary of the Navy. "I've got all I can say grace over right here," said Mr. VINSON. Another time he was suggested for Secretary of Defense. "Shucks," said Mr. VINSON jocularly, "I'd rather run the Pentagon from up here."

But any joking aside, the veteran lawmaker, who prefers to make the laws and see that policies are carried out, comes perhaps as near as any man, including Secretaries of Defense, in making some sense out of the vast and sprawling Defense Establishment. While he has fought for defense funds, first for the Navy and later for all the services, Mr. VINSON remains unimpressed with military brass.

With top officials, military or civilian, he can be casual. "Now, Admiral," he once told a witness, "no hemming and hawing. Let's get to the bottom of this."

Mr. VINSON, who had never seen a battleship before he came to Congress from his landlocked middle Georgia district, likes to run a taut committee, as the Navy does its ships. Rambling witnesses tax his patience; he has been known to bring their remarks to a close with a pound of his gavel.

Once Senator ENGLE, Democrat, of California, was a witness before his committee. The preceding witness, said Mr. ENGLE in opening his remarks, stated the case so well that he felt he could add nothing to it. "Thank you, Mr. ENGLE," Mr. VINSON snapped.

ON WITH THE BUSINESS

From time to time some members of the 36-man Armed Services Committee have challenged the benign autocrat who sits at the head of the table. Mr. VINSON listens, smiles, and after a time says: "All right, now let's get on with the business." At one time a colleague demanded the enunciation of a foreign policy to guide the Nation once and for all. "The only way to handle this foreign policy," Mr. VINSON retorted, "is from Saturday night to Saturday night."

The man who was once described as the "long, loud, and lonely" advocate of a big Navy was born near Milledgeville, Ga., November 18, 1883. He received a law degree from Mercer University in Macon in 1904 and began practice in Milledgeville. He

served as county solicitor, in the Georgia House of Representatives, and as county judge.

He was in the midst of his term as judge when the congressional seat in his district became vacant in 1914. Mr. VINSON won it and has been in Congress ever since. He became chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee in 1932 and the Armed Services Committee after the congressional reorganization following World War II.

Shortly after he became head of naval affairs Mr. VINSON presented a $616 million Navy bill calling for a 10-year replacement and rebuilding program. In that and succeeding years he led to fight for a strong Navy which was able to rebound from the Pearl Harbor disaster to become a vital factor in winning World War II.

THE COMMITTEE MERGER

In the merger of the Military and Naval Affairs Committee into the Armed Services, the longtime Navy champion faced no problem. "Now," he said, "I'm interested in all the services."

He has proved this in many ways. In 1949 he introduced and pushed through legislation calling for a 70-group Air Force. Last year he proposed additional steps to strengthen the country's air arm.

For all his prestige, Mr. VINSON has been one of the most retiring Members of Congress, as far as the public is concerned. His wife, long an invalid, died in 1950. While she was ill, he refused all social engagements to remain at home with her. After her death he saw no reason to change his ways.

He still lives at 9 Primrose Street, Chevy Chase, Md. A man of simple tastes, Mr. VINSON likes to do his own marketing at times. It is not unusual to see him in a market near Chevy Chase Circle.

When Congress adjourns, Mr. VINSON heads home in Georgia while many of his colleagues travel to far places in the world. He has never been to Europe but hopes to go some time. "I'm not much of traveling," Mr. VINSON explains. "I send my committee out and I require them to submit written reports. We find them very helpful."

If things run true to form, Mr. VINSON will have no trouble in setting a record of 50 years in the House. Only about once in a decade has he had opposition in his 16-county district in central Georgia and in his last two campaigns he carried every county in the district.

The reason is not hard to find. When he recently returned to Washington he was asked if he had a pleasant visit home. "I always enjoy seeing my constituents," Mr. VINSON replied.

The Late Speaker Sam Rayburn

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in the splendid tributes which have been paid here today to our late, beloved Speaker, SAM RAYBURN. Truly he was a great Speaker—judicious and courageous, with the ability to strike straight through to the point. His word was good; his rulings were fair. In the history of this Nation he will be listed as one of the ablest and most sincere leaders this Nation has ever produced. Certainly the statements made here today by his colleagues show the personal feeling and love which all of us had for him, even in those times of difference of viewpoint.

American Trade Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED MARSHALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the House a recent statement by Mr. Harry A. Bullis, former chairman of the board of General Mills, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn. It appeared in the January 13 issue of Commercial West, a banking and business weekly, as part of a preview of conditions in 1962 as seen by business leaders. Mr. Bullis' forthright remarks on American trade policy have special significance at this time:

HARRY A. BULLIS, FORMER CHAIRMAN, GENERAL MILLS, INC., MINNEAPOLIS

The year 1961 closed with a rush like that with which the sixties opened. Starting on an extremely high note 2 years ago, the economy slid down the scale following the opening quarter of 1960. At that time, businessmen overestimated the economic progress expected to follow the steel wage settlement of January 3, 1960. During the past year, businessmen underestimated both the inherent strength of the economy and the strongly upward progress that was being made as the year closed.

The consumer has been a remarkable leader in the economic upswing, but has, nevertheless, been cautious in spending his persistently rising income. Businessmen, especially in the Twin Cities, are outstanding for their steady increase of wages.

However, the increases in wages throughout the country, to a remarkable degree, kept the economy from slipping into recession. By thus holding consumption undiminished (there was a decline of only 1 percent in the total for our production early in 1961), growing wages contributed in setting the stage for a quick turnaround in the economy. The natural forces of demand, depleted inventories, and Government spending also had their influence. This is the similar pattern of each of the postwar recessions, and no other pattern has prevailed at any time.

The recovery in the first part of 1961 was delayed by the caution of consumers. Their incomes increased in the pattern I have suggested, but their spending was delayed. In the first half of 1961, consumer debt was reduced, not increased, with the rising income. Consumer savings were enlarged to the highest peacetime rates ever achieved. As a result, the rise in consumption spending by the families of America was retarded.

In the third and fourth quarters of 1961, however, spending did increase substantially. The experts in Washington were surprised by the quick pace of recovery. Retail sales in November were strongly increased and sales of automobiles broke records. Near the end of the year, therefore, the Wall Street Journal reported an expected gross national production (GNP) of $540 billion in the final quarter, up a neat $40 billion from the rate in the first quarter of 1961.

The new year 1962 will open strongly, and one of the favorable aspects is the planned increase in capital expenditures by business.

The new year 1962 will record a very high business level, with total output at the $565-billion mark. This is the hope of President Kennedy for balancing the budget. We have had three recovery years since 1949 in which budget receipts rose by more than $9 billion in a single 12-month period. The President is hoping for an even greater rise than this to escape from this fiscal year's deficit of $7 billion.

The three biggest problems the new year of 1962 will usher in are:

1. Holding the rate of our wage increases down so that we can effectively compete in world markets and therefore, stop the renewed loss of gold from the United States.

2. Negotiating with the Common Market for tariff arrangements which will keep American business in the Common Market and thereby secure for our labor the jobs dependent on exports to that market.

3. Readjustment of American manufacture in order to compete with the production of the Common Market countries.

The restaint of wages to meet the needs of our international balance of payments has received President Kennedy's serious attention. As the result of a heavy gold run a year ago, the President became quickly and abruptly aware of the need for a greater balance to pay our way in the world for our heavy total foreign spending—for military purposes, for grants, and most heavily as a single item, for our foreign investment, largely private. The steel wage agreements will come up for renewal this year.

As a result of the President's letters to the heads of steel companies last fall (a form of writing more educational than earlier presidential letterwriting to music critics), he pledged his best efforts to hold wages down to noninflationary levels if there were then no price advances for steel. To date there has been no advance in the price of steel. As a result, the steel companies have accomplished their part of a presidentially-proposed bargain, and thus they have strong claim to his assistance in negotiating a pact fair to the steel companies, the consumers of steel, and to labor.

I consider the threat to the dollar and our international economic position second only to the dangers of Communist aggression. While the threatened loss of gold, the imbalance of international payments, and the challenge presented by the Common Market are all interrelated, I foresee efforts taken to protect the stability of our currency which will involve cooperation on the part of Western European countries.

The second major 1962 problem, negotiating with the Common Market in order to retain our great exports there, also demands serious attention. That market, when successfully organized, will hold 325 million highly intelligent, technically competent people. This compares with 185 million in the United States. The new market there may start with modern machinery, the latest techniques to compete effectively with us, and the European rate of wages, about one-third of our wage rate.

To negotiate with success, President Kennedy requires broader tariff bargaining powers than those small and restricted powers still remaining under the 27-year-old Trade Agreements Act of 1934. This is the issue before the people. The first problem of wage restraint must successfully accompany its resolution, because what can be won in international trade bargaining abroad can be lost by cost-increasing labor bargains at home.

Regarding the third biggest problem that a whole readjustment of American manu-

facture may be called for in order to compete with the production of the Common Market countries, ours is a competitive profit-and-loss system and the industry which still leans upon protectionism for itself must accept society's ultimate verdict that if it cannot survive without protection in these prosperous times, it must either effect substantial economies or shift over to lines in which it can survive.

The year 1962 is a fateful year, with good enough prospects at home, difficult problems abroad.

Brussels Pact a Victory for West Wave of Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS BASS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial, which appeared in the Nashville Tennessean on Wednesday, January 17, 1962. In my opinion, this is an outstanding article and one which merits the attention of the entire Congress.

The editorial follows:

BRUSSELS PACT A VICTORY FOR WEST WAVE OF FUTURE

The agreement, initialed in Brussels yesterday, for a reciprocal 20-percent reduction in tariffs between the United States and the European Common Market, represents a cold war victory of immeasurable magnitude.

The 20-minute signing ceremony marked the end of months of difficult negotiations. The successful culmination, although still subject to expected ratification by the six-nation Common Market's council of ministers, may well have more effect on the future course of history than all of Mr. Khrushchev's 50-megaton bombs.

It represented a concrete implementation of President Kennedy's full grasp of the Common Market's importance to the future of the free world, and his determination to bring U.S. foreign policy into accord with it.

The agreement, made under the authority of the expiring Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, points up the compelling necessity of congressional recognition of the Common Market as the greatest counterthreat yet conceived to Mr. Khrushchev's dream of world conquest through economic disintegration of the West.

No greater proof of this fact can be imagined than the Soviet dictator's shoe-pounding rage in his efforts to undermine and divide the organization.

Failure of Congress at this critical stage, and in the wake of so magnificent an accomplishment, to strengthen the President's hand by giving him the broader and more flexible tariff powers he has asked would be shortsightedness almost to the point of malfeasance.

Almost overshadowded by the Brussels agreement was another tremendously significant development in the booming European Common Market.

Norway, from the beginning of the cold wa a stanch ally of the West, ahd one member of NATO which has contributed fully her share of manpower and wealth to its operations, has announced its intentions to seek full membership in the Common Market.

Norway's courage has been all the more admirable because she shares a common border with the Soviet Union. Premier Khrushchev made no secret of the fact it was Norway's solidarity with the West which caused him to pressure Finland last year for "military consultations" which would have led inevitably to making Finland another Soviet satellite.

The ultimate goal of a politically and economically unified Western Europe is indeed "the wave of the future." We can cooperate and share its benefits, or revert to 19th century isolationism and suffer the consequences.

The Migrant Farm Labor Story—Part VI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article published on October 16, 1961, in the New York World Telegram and Sun. In it Dale Wright describes some of the degrading conditions under which migrant laborers work:

SPEEDUP FORCES MIGRANTS TO QUIT JOB BEFORE PAYDAY

(By Dale Wright)

What's it like working in a potato harvest? It's monotonous, brutal, strength-sapping labor.

Toiling and sweating in the long potato rows, filling 100-pound sacks under the blazing sun, tries any man's endurance. But working in a potato grading shed was even worse.

In my travels as a migrant laborer, I found myself in the Florida town of Hastings. With 20 other workers, I had arrived there one morning last April in a bus. By early afternoon I was pushing a handtruck for Florida Planters, Inc.

As a laborer, I grew up fast in this job.

My job was to wheel the truck, loaded with four 100-pound sacks of potatoes, from the grader into boxcars and trucks. Often I had to jockey the handtruck as far as 200 feet along a loading platform, then up a short ramp into the cars and trucks.

SPEEDUP ORDERED

I held up well for 6 hours, until the grader boss ordered a speedup. Loaders who took the potato sacks off a moving belt and stacked them on my handtruck were told to increase the number of sacks from four to five. This meant I would have to push 500 pounds instead of 400 pounds up those ramps.

I have my share of muscles and I had developed new ones as a migrant laborer but this new order sounded impossible. Once, twice, three times I tried to force that overloaded handtruck up the ramp. I just couldn't do it.

The grader boss came along and told me to quit "dogging" it, to go to work. I told him the 500-pound load was too much for me. He laughed at me. I told him I was quitting.

I asked to be paid for the hours I had worked. The boss sneered.

"Boy," he said, "we don't pay around here until Saturday and that's 6 days away. You wanna hang around waitin' for your pay and doin' nuthin?"

MAKE YOU QUIT

It wasn't until later that I got the picture. Other workers in Hastings told me that employers often make the work so tough for migrants, particularly before payday, that the men quit and move on.

Rarely do they return for the wages due them. It was obvious to me that I had contributed my share of free labor.

Sometimes, I learned, a worker will come back for the money owed him only to be brushed off again. The employer or contractor can't remember ever hiring him; or the records have been lost; or payday has passed, or they're out of cash and the worker is told to come back the following week.

These are just a few of the devices used to exploit the migrant farmworker.

So I marked off to experience the $6—at $1 an hour—I had earned. It was worth it, to hear the stories of the other workers who had been swindled the same way.

FILTH AT $1.50 A DAY

I was dog tired when I limped away from that grading shed in Hastings. What I wanted more than anything else—more than the six lousy bucks in uncollected pay—was a place to rest my aching bones.

I learned quickly that a room and bath was not to be found. Such accommodations for migrants didn't exist. I settled for what I could find: A seedy, dirty, 10 by 12 closet-like room in a boardinghouse. The bare-mattress was so filthy I slept in my clothes. The price was $1.50 a day.

Nine other rooms, including some with families and children, were already occupied in the shanty. It was an ancient, one-story wood structure, supported precariously at the corners by concrete blocks.

The door to my room had no lock. It had long since been broken. To assure privacy—and to guard against theft—I jammed a broken-legged chair against the door to keep it shut.

There were kitchen facilities in the so-called rooming house, but they were unusable. The three-legged kerosene stove was charred a burnt black with grease. One corner of the stove was supported by a milk crate. A film of grime and grit covered the bottom of the stopped-up sink.

WOMEN, KIDS USED

The bathroom was even worse. After I waited my turn—hours it seemed—I stepped inside and right into a wall of stench which turned my stomach. It was too much. I went outside.

I learned many other things. During the peak of the potato harvest in Florida, men and women are worked on the grader for as long as 15 hours daily. Some of the women told me they were paid only 40 cents an hour.

I found an 11-year-old boy who was working 10 hours a day lugging 100-pound potato sacks onto trucks in the grading yard.

The Federal Labor Standards Act of 1938, I was aware, prohibits child labor under 16 at establishments producing goods for interstate or foreign commerce.

A Florida law prohibits child labor under 16 except after school hours or during school vacations. The children I saw here were working in April when the schools were in session.

WORK TILL MIDNIGHT

At another grading shed in Hastings I found 9 and 10-year-olds loading the 100-pound potato sacks. They were working after school hours all right—from 3 p.m. until midnight.

John Kemp, owner of the ramshackle rooming house where I lived for a while, told me:

"Nothin' unusual about kids workin' down here. I got four boys—9, 10, 13, and 14—all workin' in the potato fields every day after school until it gets dark. They pay 7 cents a hundred pounds. When me and my wife

and the boys all work, we can make $17 or $18 a day."

In Hastings, I learned, there are schools for children of yearround residents but none for children who come into town with their parents to work "on the season."

So these latter youngsters, despite the laws aimed at protecting them, move from farm to farm with their parents and work right along with them in the fields.

It's dirty, rotten work for adults, let alone children.

Bill Eliminates Racial Segregation Feature of the Land-Grant College Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to eliminate a racial segregation feature of the land-grant college act, the so-called Morrill Act of 1862.

The second Morrill Act of 1890 amended the basic 1862 statute ostensibly to prohibit States receiving land-grant college aid to practice racial discrimination in admissions. But the amendment provided a loophole in the form of authorization to receive funds as long as separate-but-equal colleges for white and colored students were maintained. It is this loophole that I propose to eliminate.

Mr. Speaker, I think it appropriate on two counts to introduce my bill this year.

First, the legal barriers to equality of opportunity in education are falling. The separate-but-equal doctrine whether it be in the field of education or travel or public accommodations has been shown to be a fraudulent one. It is a device that under a seemingly plausible rationale permits the pernicious practice of discrimination against certain groups of our fellow Americans to continue. This glaring vestige of segregation in an otherwise admirable and fruitful program should be eliminated. Not only is it held contrary to sound public policy but the Supreme Court in May 1954 struck down this doctrine in declaring as unconstitutional enforced segregation in the public schools.

Mr. Speaker, my bill is appropriately introduced in this year of 1962 for a second reason.

This is the 100th anniversary year of the Morrill Act. The act is regarded as a major act of accomplishment in the field of education in the United States. It provided revenue from 11 million acres of the public domain for aid and support of colleges and universities for the teaching of agriculture and mechanic arts in each State. Subsequently, it was amended to provide for direct appropriations for land-grant college States. It must be regarded as a conspicuous example of a beneficial partnership of the States and the Federal Government. It represents an effort to provide a type of higher education within the reach of and adapted to the needs of the agriculture and economy of this Nation. The act played a role in encouraging the growth of higher education at a cost within reach of students without affluence. It exemplifies an effective relationship between research, campus instruction, and adult education. And today 68 land-grant colleges and universities in the 50 States and Puerto Rico constitute a vital part of our public institutions of higher learning. More than 500,000 students are enrolled in these colleges for degree credit. Distinguished Members of Congress hold degrees from these colleges.

And, Mr. Speaker, enactment of the land-grant college proposals culminated years of discussion for some uniform method of giving Federal assistance to States for higher education. Now, Mr. Speaker, does this not sound familiar, as the Morrill Act enters its second century? Soon, I hope, Members of the House will have before them a bill to provide further assistance to higher education in the form of loans and grants for academic facilities. Subsequently, I hope, legislation for scholarship aid to worthy students will be enacted by this Congress. The Morrill Act was passed by Democratic and Republican legislators and signed into law by a Republican President and a great American, Abraham Lincoln. Now in the complex space age, another Congress, this Congress, will be called upon to act similarly in the interests of the United States.

Sioux City Third Largest Livestock Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, Sioux City, Iowa, is one of the largest livestock markets in the United States. It now ranks third, moving from fifth place to third place in 1 year. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I inclose the following news item taken from the Sioux City Journal Farm Weekly of Monday, January 15, 1962:

SIOUX CITY STOCKYARDS DOES $395,576,000 BUSINESS IN 1961

Iowa's only central public market located at Sioux City, handled an etimated $395,576,000 worth of livestock during 1961, according to estimates made by Warren Kester, Sioux City Livestock Market News foundation. This was 60 percent larger than the volume handled by all of the 180 small Iowa auctions during the year combined.

This Sioux City figure reflected the value of the 4,015,979 head of cattle, calves, hogs, and sheep handled during the year at this large terminal by the 23 commission firms and the 21 registered dealers of stockers and feeders operating on the market.

In commenting on the great impact of this central market, Kester reported general valuations of livestock handled in the neighborhood of $67,787,000 worth of stockers and feeders, $236,011,000 worth of slaughter steers and heifers, $1,869,000 worth of cows, $78,219,000 worth of butcher hogs, and $648,475 worth of sheep and lambs.

Last year, Sioux City ranked as the Nation's largest stocker and feeder, and calf market handling a record 145,074 stock calves and an estimated 400,000 head of stockers and feeders. It ranked as the Nation's third largest livestock market, moving from fifth to fourth in 1 year. A record number of 931,676 head of slaughter steers and heifers went on sale during the year and 1,919,250 head of hogs.

During the last two decades, the Sioux City market has moved from 2,712,000 head of salable livestock to 4,015,979 head, an increase of 48 percent.

Sioux City supplies are equivalent of one-third of fed cattle marketed in Iowa, one-third of the sheep marketings and one-seventh of hog marketings.

Dedication of New Post Office at East Freedom, Pa., October 21, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, at East Freedom, Pa., on Saturday, October 21, 1961, it was my privilege to participate in the dedication of the new post office and to deliver the following address titled, "The Postal System Is Indispensable in Its Mission of Public Service":

THE POSTAL SYSTEM IS INDISPENSABLE IN ITS MISSION OF PUBLIC SERVICE

(Address by Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Member of Congress, of the 20th District of Pennsylvania, at the dedication of the East Freedom Post Office at East Freedom, Pa., on October 21, 1961, 2 p.m.)

It is a pleasure to be here this afternoon to participate in the ceremonies dedicating a new post office building to the service of the community of East Freedom.

Those of us privileged to call Blair County our home county are highly pleased that it is regarded as one of the most beautiful areas of Pennsylvania.

In addition we recall with pride that many of the communities of Blair County have played important roles in the history of our Nation and its expansion westward.

This dedication program reminds us that one of the most important institutions of the Nation is the postal service, composed of many parts, including post offices both large and small, the importance of any one of which cannot be truly measured by size.

The nationwide communications system known as the postal service is only as strong as each of its parts.

One weak link would weaken the entire service.

Although this new East Freedom post office is dwarfed in size my many of the large Federal buildings, such as we find in the Nation's Capital, it is no les important to the people it serves or to the postal system.

Someone may question whether the moving of the post office to this new building warrants a dedication ceremony.

True, this building does not house a new factory to bring employment and other economic benefits to this region.

Some may say: It is only new quarters for the post office and why the excitement about that?

After all, there has been a post office at East Freedom for 120 years or more.

In reply I would emphasize the fact that this is a unique occasion in the long history

of the East Freedom Post Office because it is the first time that it has moved into a brand new building.

Besides being the first occupants of the new building, the post office has available more than twice the space of the old post office quarters.

This fine new building we dedicate today to the postal service of this community, is an example of community enterprise, having been constructed with private funds and privately owned with the post office renting the space.

At this point I wish to congratulate Mr. Kenneth Claar, of East Freedom, who was successful in securing the contract to provide this new and modern post office building.

It is a credit to the community and an example of cooperation betwen the Federal Government and the private citizen.

The post office will occupy 1,000 square feet of space instead of the former 400 square feet; 100 square feet of platform will contribute to handling arrival and departure of the mails.

It is altogether fitting and proper that we should mark the completion of this building and its occupancy for public service with dedication ceremonies.

Such an occasion offers us an opportunity to pause and reflect on the significance of the services rendered by the post office, a symbol of man's freedom and progress.

We all tend to take the many vital services of the post office for granted in our daily lives.

We are prone to forget it has been here from the earliest beginnings of the community.

It is so much a part of the community and its services so dependable as to seem commonplace.

No one thinks about it, but everybody uses it.

Therefore, I am happy to join with you in this joyous occasion marking the beginning of a new phase in the history of the post office of East Freedom.

After several years of constant effort to improve postal facilities in my congressional district—it was pleasing to me to be able to announce on August 23, 1960, that a new post office building had been authorized for East Freedom.

Today, 14 months following the date of its authorization, this fine new post office building has become a reality.

On this happy occasion I wish to extend congratulations to the patrons of the East Freedom Post Office and to Postmaster Lloyd J. Burket and the staff of dedicated postal employees of the East Freedom Post Office who, with new modern lighting and equipment, are now able to provide even more efficient postal service to this community.

This occasion forcibly reminds us that the beginnings of things are matters of interest as well as importance.

Doubtless the majority present here are familiar with the history of this community, its beginnings, its people and institutions.

But I would like to recall, briefly, some of the earlier events and people concerned with this community.

The first settlers took land grants about 1787, before we were a Nation.

Until 1838 the site which was to become East Freedom was part of the landholdings of Edward McGraw, Esq., and Valentine Lingenfelter.

As proprietor, Edward McGraw laid out a village plot in about 1839 or 1840.

The earliest building was one-room log schoolhouse built in 1835, designated locally as being at Johnstown and Bedford crossroads.

Many roads met and crossed in this vicinity over which traveled a multitude of people and a large volume of goods moving westward across the Alleghanies to portage, Johnstown, and Pittsburgh.

A building was erected to serve these crossroads' travelers known as Freedom House.

The first stage service, through what is now Blair County, was established in 1804, running from Philadelphia to Pittsburgh.

The first house built on the site of East Freedom appears to have been in 1838, when Joseph McCormick constructed a residence and saddler shop, a frame building which later became part of the Freedom Hotel.

Soon afterward a shoemaker, George Yinger, built a dwelling and George Kephart opened the Freedom Hotel, establishing the nucleus of the village.

Other pioneers included two merchants, a tanner, and a physician.

The village of East Freedom predates the county of Blair, which was established in 1846.

At that time there were 13 post offices in the county.

The community had a post office established at Three Forges in 1829, the predecessor of the East Freedom Post Office which was opened at the new village in 1840, with Robert Todd serving as postmaster.

In 1831, the postmaster at Three Forges was John McGee, who received an annual compensation of $8.05.

Ten years later Postmaster E. F. Schoenberges was paid $15.70 and the net proceeds of the post office were $26.91.

Postmaster Robert Todd, who served at East Freedom from its establishment until the last quarter of the year 1855, earned $40.82 in 1843 when net proceeds of the post office were $72.01.

William Anderson became postmaster in the fourth quarter of 1855 and served until May 4, 1861, when J. B. Kephart became postmaster.

The combined compensation paid to postmasters for the year 1861 amounted to $58.81 and there was noted a "balance due the United States" of $48.56.

The East Freedom Post Office receipts for the year 1960 amounted to $3,472 and it is rated as third-class post office.

The space and facilities which are now available to Postmaster Burket and his staff of dedicated postal employees are a far cry from the time when the early day postmasters conducted the business from home or store.

Important in the early development of this area was the completion of the main line of the Pennsylvania Railroad in 1854, which superseded the Juniata Canal and Portage Railroad facilities for transporting goods and people, including the mail, making Altoona the main distributing point for mails in Blair County.

In 1910 the Bedford and Hollidaysburg branch of the Pennsylvania Railroad was completed, serving the East Freedom Post Office and others in Blair and Bedford Counties along the line to Bedford and Cumberland.

Almost all the post offices of Blair County at one time had star route service.

The branch line of the railroad was discontinued in the county and the automobile became the mail transportation agency.

Contracts were made with individuals to transport the mails and the routes they used became known as star routes.

Now there is airmail service from airports located within the county to supplement other methods of transporting the mails.

The importance of adequate postal facilities to a community cannot be overestimated.

No other institution touches the life of each one as does the post office.

Though the postal service is a vast organization, it is made up of many local units such as the East Freedom Post Office, each a part of the community in which it is located, staffed by friends and fellow citizens of the people of the community.

The standards upheld by the local post office service make possible the high level of service attained by the whole postal system.

Innovations and improvements have marked the progress of the postal service from its beginning.

Although it is one of our oldest institutions it has kept pace with the growth of the Nation.

As early settlers pushed across the Alleghenies westward to the Pacific, the postal service followed them.

The post office of the 19th century did not merely follow the pioneers but was in the vanguard of the movement.

Where several families chose to settle in the same locale, one of the first steps in establishing a village or town was to set up a post office in one of the homes or stores.

It is recorded that in 1829, when the predecessor to the East Freedom Post Office was established, there were 8,050 post offices and 115,000 miles of post roads to serve a population of 12 million.

The Post Office Department handled nearly 14 million letters during the year.

Service was slow by modern standards; the only means of transportation available were horseback, stagecoach, ships and boats, and in some regions mail was carried on foot.

Despite all reforms possible under existing conditions, in 1837 stagecoaches were still the principal means of transporting the mails though a large part of the service was by means of post riders and sulkies.

Postage rates were still essentially the same as 100 years before when Benjamin Franklin was postmaster in Philadelphia.

Envelopes and postage stamps were unknown.

In addition to innovations in the transportation field, the post office has introduced many new services over the past 150 years, a period which nearly coincides with the existence of the East Freedom Post Office.

In 1847 the first adhesive postage stamps were issued, providing a more efficient method of paying postage.

Although prepayment of postage was made compulsory in 1855, the use of the adhesive postage stamps was not made obligatory until 1856.

During the period when postage was collected from the addressee, or later when prepaid postage was collected by both money and stamps, imagine the complications for the postmaster.

Also picture the inconvenience if, today, it should be necessary to collect the money for each piece of mail sent through our post office as the early postmasters did.

Stamped envelopes were first issued in 1853 and envelopes bearing the purchaser's return card were authorized in 1865.

Registry service became an added convenience in 1855, which did not speed the mail but made it more secure.

During the years since its establishment, the East Freedom Post Office has witnessed and been a part of the progress of the postal service.

Many of the modern postal services had their origin in the legislation of 1845, including the star routes.

Although East Freedom was not directly concerned with the pony express which was inaugurated in 1860, this service played an important part in speeding settlement of the West and was responsible for experiments which led to the railway post office car in 1862.

Rural delivery service, which started in 1896, made the post office even more important to this community as well as to many others.

We are all aware of what this service has meant and continues to mean to many people.

There is no measure of the convenience of having personal and business letters, magazines, and newspapers delivered daily to us at our homes.

Parcel post service increased the value of rural delivery to many citizens.

This rural delivery service means we are not obliged to make calls at the post office so frequently.

Perhaps this very service has caused the significance of the post office to become less apparent than in the days when everyone was required to call in person for his mail.

The list of services rendered by the postal service is far too long to detail here.

Briefly, I will mention some of the duties added to the work of postal employees aside from the handling of the mails.

Over the years these include the sale of U.S. bonds and Treasury certificates, sale and redemption of various types of bonds such as the liberty and savings bonds, sale of revenue stamps and duck stamps, collection of custom duties on parcels, registering of aliens, forwarding donations for a long list of charitable organizations, taking deer or grouse census, giving information on civil service examinations, display of posters for the armed services and of pictures of criminals wanted by Federal authorities.

The post office assists almost every other department of Government in some way and in many instances is the only representative of the Federal Government in the community.

The post office of East Freedom is part of the Nation's postal service, a service which has contributed so much to the progress and welfare of the people. Like the national postal service, the post office of East Freedom has been and continues to be a vital and significant institution in the lives of the citizens of this community.

Therefore, as a Member of Congress who has consistently sought to help modernize some 12,000 post offices considered obsolete or providing inadequate space, I share your joy on the acquisition of this new and modern post office building, and I am pleased to be here with you today to participate in the dedication ceremonies.

John J. Riley

SPEECH

OF

HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our departed friend, the Honorable JOHN J. RILEY, of South Carolina. After becoming a Member of Congress 9 years ago, it was natural for me to feel a kinship with all of my colleagues from South Carolina, since my father was a native of that great State, and in my youth I had visited there at his old home area around Florence.

JOHN RILEY was typical of a true southern gentleman. He was able: effective in a quiet, dignified manner; gracious and attentive to the many duties that were his. He was one of the most friendly men I have ever known, and was never too busy to talk with one and to give encouragement to those seeking his advice and help.

We shall miss our dear friend, JOHN RILEY, and I wish to extend to his loved ones my heartfelt expression of deepest sympathy and to pray that the blessings of divine providence may be with them, and guide and sustain them.

Lawrence: Successful Governor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Evening Star, Carlisle, Pa.:

LAWRENCE: SUCCESSFUL GOVERNOR

Though there is much criticism of the administration of Harrisburg—much of it leveled at Governor Lawrence personally—that is no strange state of affairs, as some of the citizenry and especially members of the Republican Party would like to emphasize. At the least, the present administration at Harrisburg is far more popular and has accomplished far more good for the Commonwealth than did the GOP regimes for many years with GOP-controlled legislatures. Particularly has much more good been achieved since David Lawrence took the gubernatorial chair than was during the administrations of railriders James, Duff, and Fine, and during the tenure of George Leader, who, although he fought for progress and erased fraud, also left the State in great debt.

The Lawrence administration has addressed itself to the needs of the distressed districts and has helped them through its cooperation with the Federal Government. Vast improvements have been made in the State's highway system. More industry has been attracted to Pennsylvania recently than to any other State in the Union. Our general hospitals have received assistance. The highways have been made safer through the legalization of radar. Law and order have been given a boost by an addition to the State police complement. Care of the mentally ill has been increased and the latest methods put to work to rehabilitate those in mental institutions through the use of advanced psychiatric methods, better trained nurses, and improvements and enlargements of the institutions. Education in the sciences and on-the-job training are realities.

Perhaps, however, one achievement stands out above all others. For the first time in 14 years the budget of the Commonwealth will be in balance. For this, most of the credit goes to the Governor. His fiscal aides and the majority of the members of the legislature are also to be congratulated.

When David Lawrence was on the campaign trail, he promised that, if elected, he would put Pennsylvania on a pay-as-we-go basic. He went further, taking a calculated risk, by telling the voters he would also agree to taxes necessary to free the State from debt. Since election he has carried out these pledges. Come the end of the fiscal year, because of his insistence that money bills carry with them means of replenishing the treasury and because revenues from levies approved by him during his term have exceeded estimates, the people of this Commonwealth will not be troubled by State debt. The budget may be more than balanced. There may be a comparatively small excess of funds above those required.

There are many protests concerning the Governor and his administration, the majority of them complaints of "politics" and what the protestants term "unfair" taxes. Naturally the Governor, known throughout the Nation as Mr. Democrat, does not stay away from the science he has learned so well through his many years of experience. Nor should be. Nor has any other Governor of this State, nor anyone in high office for that matter. But, he does not "play" politics for the sake of personal or party gain. He is, and has always been, in the political arena principally for the express purpose of bringing about better government and conditions generally in his home city of Pittsburgh and in his great State.

We hardly think it necessary to discuss the so-called unfair taxes. The levies which he approved were necessary to achieve the balanced budget and pay off debt. That he has proved, and it is sufficient answer to the cynics that Pennsylvania will stand "free and clear" as of June 30.

Without doubt, Governor Lawrence stands as one of the most just, fair and astute chief executives that the Keystone State has ever had the opportunity to enjoy in all its long history.

The Case of the Unavailable Pullman Reservations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, many of us have had the feeling for a long time that the railroad industry in this country deliberately goes out of its way to discourage passenger business, at the same time protesting before the ICC about the money it is losing in passenger service. It is perhaps worth noting here that those railroads which go out of their way to attract passengers, and try to make the passengers comfortable, seem to find the passenger business financially rewarding.

Just a few days ago I received a letter from a prominent resident of St. Louis on this same subject. I think it is worth sharing with the other Members of Congress interested in this issue. I intend, also to send a copy to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The letter is as follows:

JANUARY 9, 1962.

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: I am rather reluctant to bother you about this matter, but for some reason or other, I just can't let it rest. Last September, my son-in-law and daughter endeavored to make train reservations to Washington, D.C., and were told that train reservations were filled for 2 months ahead. They did not take "No" for an answer and finally they did get reservations, and were led to believe that they were lucky to get on the train. After boarding the train, they had separate Pullman berths at each end of the Pullman car, which was half empty all the way to Washington.

My wife had a similar experience when she called to go to Washington, D.C. She was told that reservations were all filled. She kept calling around until she finally did get a reservation, and found on her trip there, that there were only about 10 or 11

people on the whole car. My daughter had the same experience in making a reservation through to Los Angeles, Calif.

I am just wondering whether or not the railroads are misrepresenting matters and deliberately throwing obstacles in the path of passengers using train service so that they can appear before the Interstate Commerce Commission to abandon or cut down further passenger service. I understand that the railroads are trying to get out of passenger service to a large extent, but I don't believe they should be permitted to use such methods as above outlined.

Kindest regards.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

Have We Been Outsmarted by International Communism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to include an editorial given over the radio in January 1962 by Evangelist Dale Crowley, Washington's radio minister:

HAVE WE BEEN OUTSMARTED BY INTERNATIONAL COMMUNISM?

Let's face it, internationalism (one worldism) has not carried our country to the very brink of the precipice. The instrument of our destruction is the United Nations.

The U.N. program, as set forth in its very charter, is anti-American. It is contrary to the U.S. Constitution. When we entered the United Nations we automatically nullified some of the basic tenets of our American charter.

Led down a blind alley, the American people trusted our leaders who were obsessed with the idealism of one worldism. We followed like so many millions of blind sheep. Some of us objected but the protests were ignored.

"We must 'contain' the Communist world; no longer withdraw from them," was the cry of the midforties which reached a crescendo in the formation of the United Nations whose charter was drawn by such men as Alger Hiss, Dexter White, and other Communist conspirators.

And the American taxpayers have financed it. We have given to the enemy the knife to cut our jugular vein. Our blood-bought freedoms are being sold down the river unless we act at once to reverse the tide. If the year 1962 does not witness a grassroots-level revolution to save our Constitution, it will then be too late. Time is running out fast.

Few Americans realize how completely anti-American is the U.N. Charter. Just a glance at some of the sinister provisions in this charter will reveal how diametrically opposed it is to the U.S. Constitution. For example:

Our American Constitution gives power to declare war only to our elected representatives, the Congress. But we have nullified this provision in our Constitution by turning over the authority to the U.N. Security Council. We now engage in wars around the world without a vote by Congress, and without the consent of the American people.

In our Constitution it is stipulated that the President is the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, but the U.N. Charter revokes this power. This authority has been delegated to the Military Staff Committee of the Security Council.

Our Constitution provides that the power to interpret treaties must reside with the Federal Government. But under the U.N. Charter this power has been turned over to the Court of International Justice.

Our Constitution has always protected the citizens of the United States by providing that our elected representatives, the Congress, are authorized to make all laws respecting our Nation's dealings with international affairs. But the U.N. Charter gives this power to the appointed members of the General Assembly, which includes nations which have never known the meaning of freedom. It includes nations which are actually waging a relentless war against our freedoms. On this Committee are men who hate the very name of the American Constitution.

Under the Constitution our Government is required at all times, and at all cost, to protect the individual States of the Union from foreign invasion. But the U.N. Charter provides for rights of passage of armed troops. No border State could be defended by our Armed Forces if the U.N. Committee elected to invade.

Under our judiciary, as provided in the Constitution, every citizen has the right of appeal. And an absolute requisite to membership on the Federal bench is citizenship in the United States. But the U.N. Charter nullifies this time-honored guarantee of justice, providing instead that the World Court shall act with finality and "without appeal." On this gobalony World Court comprised by 15 members, the United States can never have more than one member, and it is conceivable that a situation could arise in which we would not have even one.

Is it not preposterous that free-born and freedom-loving Americans should allow these internationalist conspirators to whittle away the last vestige of our liberties?

Is it not paradoxical that the strongest financial backers of United Nations are the American taxpayers?

Is it not an astounding travesty that no vigorous effort, up until now, has been made by our governmental leaders and elected representatives to halt this insidious assult on our Constitution

Can it be anything but the most colossal stupidity on the part of all of us who have inherited these blood-bought freedoms that we sit idly by and allow the God-hating Reds to dictate our policies? Or, that as the avowed enemies of our Constitution which they are, that we should longer consort with them, and tolerate their machinations against us in the United Nations?

When will we, the people, rise up and demand that our leaders in Government put a speedy end to all such tomfoolery? When will we make the unequivocal demand that our Government withdraw—boot, bag and baggage—from this wholly un-American and anti-American United Nations?

Either we shall do this now, or else say goodbye to the freedoms we have known and cherished; and to the America which was forged into being by the blood, sweat, and tears of our forefathers, and for which countless young Americans have so nobly sacrificed their lives.

Can we be roused from our lethargy, quickened from our stupor? Can we admit that we have been asleep while the enemy has been busy wrecking civilization? Can we now resolve, as we cross the threshold of 1962, that we will do something for freedom's sake? For God's sake? It is not too late to reverse the tide. But there can be no delay. Time is running out fast. It is later than we think.

Education Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks which I made today before the economic and legislative conference of the AFL-CIO held at the Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D.C.:

EDUCATION PROGRAM

I am torn by two emotions this morning.

I am flattered that you have asked me to talk to you.

On the other hand, I am keenly disappointed that it is necessary for you to have me or anyone else come here to talk about the prospects of general Federal aid to education.

This was a matter that should have been settled long ago.

But it hasn't been. So here we are once more, searching, seeking for the magic formula that will permit all who believe in the proposition to muster the strength to pass a bill in the House of Representatives, get it to conference, and send it to the White House.

During my service in Congress, the Senate has on four separate occasions passed such bills. In the House, we managed to pass but one bill. And that was prevented from going to conference by a handful of men.

It is not necessary for me to review the reasons why we in the House failed in 1950, in 1956, in 1957, in 1958, in 1959, in 1960, and again in 1961.

A congressional report from the Washington office of the National Committee for an Effective Congress, issued last December, has them all up as "Reds, race and religion—the three R's of modern education." The report has pointed out, very significantly, that opponents of education have always been alert to exploit one or another of these issues.

On the other hand, the friends of education have been going off on too many tangents, political and/or personal.

Through it all, material wealth has increased and schools have declined.

Last summer, on the day the House Rules Committee tabled the administration bill, I was returning to my office from the floor. I was obviously in a depressed mood. One of my colleagues joined me and made this overture:

"CLEVE, you look unhappy. Let me cheer you up."

Whereupon he told me a slightly ribald joke. It did the trick. After the relieving belly laugh, my perspective was restored. As a former college and high school football and baseball player, I remembered the favorite adage of coaches:

"A team that won't be beaten, can't be beaten."

I realized that this was not the time to quit the fight. I began to think. When I reached my office, I called in a captive sounding board—a member of my staff. I began talking. This went on for days. When I returned from the floor, I talked; he listened. He had to.

Gradually some definite and simple facts began to take shape.

To begin with I knew, as you know, that a very large group exists who believe it is imperative that the Federal Government give

the States and local districts a lift in their efforts to improve educational systems.

Both major political parties have endorsed the principle of Federal aid to education. As far back as the Hoover administration, the attention of the White House was directed to this proposition. Franklin D. Roosevelt was for it. Harry Truman was for it. Dwight Eisenhower was for it. As a candidate, Richard Nixon was for it. As a candidate and as President, John F. Kennedy was for it. Members of Congress were for it. Last session, nearly 50 of my colleagues, from both sides of the aisle, introduced bills calling for some type of Federal grants-in-aid program.

Labor has been for it. Such business groups as the Committee for Economic Development have been for it.

Men who represent widely separated political philosophies are for it. The bill that came a cropper on the House side in 1950 was a Senate bill that had been cosponsored by Elmer Thomas of Utah, and Bob Taft, of Ohio.

Gallup and other leading opinion samplers tell us that the majority of people are in favor of Federal aid to education.

With all of this strength in back of Federal aid to education, it is just incredible that reasonable men could not get together to enact a bill. Something was wrong, very wrong, when the opposition was able to divide and conquer us.

I began thinking of all of the pitfalls that have beset bills in the past. As a result, I launched a trial balloon on a new approach in the form of remarks in a postadjournment issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I suggested that if reaction to it were favorable, I intended to translate the new approach into legislation.

I was and am delighted at the reception the proposal has received. Educators, the press, lawyers, Senators, and Congressmen are among those who have expressed favorable interest. Included are some of the most outstanding names in the Nation.

Since I am convinced that one of the ways we can muster maximum strengths is to have bipartisan sponsorship, I am consulting with some colleagues on the other side of the aisle. In any event, a bill will be introduced. I will not go into specific details, because they remain somewhat unsettled, depending upon the result of my current negotiations. However, I can talk about the basic provisions.

We have in the past developed allocation formulas based upon numbers of children, and this has always involved us in charges of discrimination. In my proposal, I plan to base the allocation formula on dollars spent in each State for public eelementary and secondary education. Thus we would be assisting taxpayers, and that includes all of us, no matter where we go to church, nor to what school we send our children.

Furthermore, it is based upon State and local effort.

I propose to allocate to each State a sum equal to 2 percent of the amounts spent within that State.

Also, I propose to authorize additional sums to be made available, on a graduated basis, to States where personal income is below the national average. While one or two bugs remain to be worked out, this would mean generally that we would be helping all States by at least 2 percent, and the State—Mississippi—where financial resources are the least, would be assisted by about 6 or 7 percent.

The Federal grants would go to each State to be spent for those public educational purposes where the need is most critical in each State. In many States, according to information which has reached me, final decision will be made at the local level. Thus, we remove the issue of Federal control.

In order to further stimulate and encourage the States, I shall incorporate a variable matching formula, and provide for a reduction in the Federal grants if any State relaxes its own effort.

I will include a second title which will provide additional grants to the States for special urban educational projects. This section will have its own authorized appropriation. Each State agency will have responsibility for determining which projects within each State shall have priority. Thus I hope we can attack the dropout problem, as well as other similar and related problems that beset our central cities, and which have received so much attention from Dr. James B. Conant and others.

The total cost of this proposal, including the central city title, probably will not exceed $500 million. Thus it is a modest proposal, well within the limits of President Kennedy's budget estimates. It compares favorably with the bill submitted by the administration last year, which authorized appropriations of $666 million, $766 million; and $866 million for each of 3 years.

The bill will be offered as an emeregncy, 3-year program, in the hopes it will get our educational systems up to the levels required, and enable the States to carry on from there.

I started this whole proposal on my own, as CLEVE BAILEY. I was not speaking and do not speak for the administraiton on this matter, only to the extent that we both seek the same goal.

On several occasions, Secretary Ribicoff has publicly seen fit to mention my proposal in favorable terms.

I am convinced, however, that it will be a bill that will attract wide bipartisan support in and out of Congress. I believe it avoids the religious issue with which we were involved last year, and with which we were involved in 1950.

The bill does not discriminate. We do not say to the parochial schools:

"The door is shut."

What we do is put the whole educational policy area squarely at the State level. We say to the private schools, in effect:

"There is a tradition in this country, as firmly rooted as if it were spelled out in the Constitution, that educational policy is determined at the State level, period. The Federal Government may grant funds to the States for the support of public elementary and secondary educational purposes within each State. Within the framework of the Constitution, your pleas should be directed to the States."

I am proposing a States rights education bill.

I am convinced, based upon reaction so far, and providing interest continues to mount, the bill stands a 50–50 chance.

I believe, if the House were to pass it, there are no insurmountable problems when we meet with the Senate in conference.

I do not believe there is anything in this proposal that would result in a Presidential veto.

Whatever the fate, I believe firmly the effort must be made.

If we fail this year, we must come back again and again.

A cause that won't die, can't be killed.

Ukrainian Independence Day: A 44th Anniversary Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, 44 years ago, on January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian Republic proclaimed its independence. Lying in the southwest of Russia, that broad and fertile territory, with its hardy population, was heir to a tradition of independence and democracy going back to medieval times.

The collapse of the Russian Empire in 1917 afforded the national and democratic leaders of the Ukraine the opportunity to realize their goal of a Ukrainian national state. The machinery of an independent government was set up, with the support of a great majority of the people. But the Soviet Government, despite its pose as a defender of self-determination, would not permit its realization in the Ukraine. The Red army eventually crushed the infant Ukrainian Republic, and the Soviets set up their own republic in the Ukraine.

Today Ukrainians living under the Communist yoke may not celebrate January 22. But let us recall it here, on their behalf, with a reaffirmation of our belief that in the fullness of time the Ukrainian people, and indeed all people, will live in the light of freedom.

A Thought on Our Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, there are many cries that patriotism is on the wane and that loyalty to democracy and the great principals which have kept this country free are beginning to be less important to some of our citizens.

In these times when many are sowing the seeds of doubt, it is good to see that many keep clear-headed and view our Nation and its democratic future in an affirmative and positive perspective.

The Murfreesboro Daily News Journal, Murfreesboro, Tenn., in the district which I have the honor to represent, in a recent editorial brought out this point very well and in a very precise manner.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include this article in the Appendix of the RECORD. The article follows:

OUR DEMOCRACY

In these perplexing times, when many sincere citizens are so aroused and emotionally stirred that they think the democracy of our country is about to collapse, and that the people around them, many of them, are consciously and unconsciously serving the Communist cause, it may be well to keep in mind several things.

Democracy evolved over a long period, as the system guaranteeing to the individual the right of dissent. It is a system of government by the majority with minority rights. It is the system whereby one may disagree with another, while at the same time being willing to die for the other's right to disagree.

We do not wish to curtail the very freedom which distinguishes our form of government from the Communist tyranny. And it should be reassuring to all those who have faith in our great system to know that there are few in America who favor the cause of communism.

Our country will not collapse. The great majority are patriotic and would die for democracy if that became necessary. Differences in views on legislation, how much government is the best amount, should not be confused with patriotism or un-Americanism or communism. Our people have differed on these same issues since the Republic was founded.

Maury, Lee, Jackson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Virgil Carrington "Pat" Jones, the distinguished author and patriot, made a superb address to the Robert E. Lee Camp No. 726 of the Sons of Confederate Veterans at the Penn Daw in Alexandria, Va., on the birthday of Gen. Robert E. Lee, Friday night, January 19. Mr. Jones called to our attention that Comdr. Matthew Fontaine Maury was born on January 14, General Lee on January 19, and Gen. Stonewall Jackson on January 21. He paid eloquent tribute to these three great Americans who have been awarded a place in the Hall of Fame of Great Americans, New York University, New York. I commend this excellent address of Mr. Jones to the entire Congress and to the country:

MAURY, LEE, JACKSON

After 1 year's postponement, we meet—and, thank God, without all that snow.

I could offer apologies as to why my wife is not here, but, after all, maybe I'm lucky. She keeps referring to me as the "gray ghost," something my age no longer permits me to gloss over without a helpless siege of embarrassment. And she still persists that I fought in the Civil War. That's one way to get back at a husband who is perhaps a bit fanatical on a particular subject.

I'll never forget an experience I had years ago, when I was covering a Confederate reunion down at Orange Court House. The meeting had hardly gotten under way before the presiding officer, old General Warfield, asked if there was a reporter in the room. I waited; no one else answered, so I stuck up my hand. Before long they had me running the meeting. I would yell out whatever General Warfield wanted to say, and then, if there were any replied, I'd yell them back at him. This had been going on for some time when I saw an old couple enter at the back of the hall. It wasn't long before they were interested in the proceedings, and it wasn't long before the old lady got to her feet. I remember so well that she was wearing one of those old slat bonnets, with an eye shield about 15 inches long sticking out in front. She sort of pushed it back on her head and said: "General, I don't see none too well, but it 'pears to me you ain't wearing your Confederate uniform."

Well, the images of the men I am to talk to you about tonight are always easier to see, so perhaps I'll have better luck. I realize my subject is not new. Every year at this time those of us who are interested in American history turn our thoughts to it. But what I shall attempt to do is single out a few aspects that as a rule do not occur to most of us.

The men who make up my subject were three great Confederate leaders whose birthdays fell within a few days of one another—Comdr. Matthew Fontaine Maury, born January 14; Gen. Robert E. Lee, January 19, and Gen. Thomas J. (Stonewall) Jackson, January 21.

They were all God-fearing men, Virginia born, Virginia entombed. You will find their names not only in the Hall of Fame in New York, but in all corners of the world where the stamp of achievement is recognized.

When the break between the North and South occurred, all three determined to defend their native State. If you will go to the records, you will find that Lee and Jackson resigned from the U.S. Army, but Maury was dismissed from the U.S. Navy. Why an Army officer could resign, while the only resort left to a Navy officer was to be dismissed, is for someone else to explain.

At any rate, they signed up with the Confederacy, and they made history. And, oddly enough, when their course had been run, the end centered in one way or another at a little valley town prominent in American history—Lexington, Va. There Stonewall Jackson was buried after his death at Guiney Station in 1863, and there Lee and Maury died, the former to be buried only a rifleshot away from his beloved Stonewall. For an even stranger coincidence, Lee and Jackson lived there at different times in the same house—the old presidents' home at Washington College, now Washington and Lee University. Lee lived there as president of the institution after the war, Jackson as the husband of the daughter of an earlier president.

Of these three, Maury was the first to gain fame. Before the war of 1861–65, even the Pope had recognized him as one of the greatest oceanographers of his day, the first "Pathfinder of the Seas," the man who told us more than we had ever known about the winds and currents of the oceans.

To some extent, all three of these men gained fame in the fighting that went on below the Mexican border, prior to our own great war. When it was over, they all came away marked for glory, Lee and Jackson to a degree that would immortalize them in the field of military strategy.

In this trio we have a scientist and two military men. It is my desire tonight to resort to comparisons, and for that reason I shall confine my remarks largely to Lee and Jackson, the militarists.

For in these two men who have in my opinion the greatest military combination in history. Lee had imagination; Jackson had the will to do. Lee approved; Jackson executed. What they did and how they did it—most of the time with armies pitifully small compared to those of their opponents—is now more a subject of study than ever before in history. Military students from far beyond our shores come here to trample the ground over which they fought.

Let's for a moment take the cover from these two men and see what sort of individuals we have—that is, what kind of human beings they were. Lee came from one of the foremost Virginia families; Jackson was of Scotch-Irish descent, born in the West Virginia backwoods, and a penniless orphan at 7.

Lee was the acme of social grace; Jackson was strange, silent, shy. Lee was tall and handsome and so striking in appearance that a girl siding with the North made the remark during the Pennsylvania advance, "Oh, I wish he was ours." Jackson was awkward, with large hands and feet, heavy jaw, strong, angular frame, of medium height.

Both attended West Point. There Lee was a honor student; Jackson on the other hand was slow to advance in his studies and finished 17th in a class of 72. Both were kind-hearted; both were religious, Jackson a religious fanatic.

Lee was a superb horseman, distinguished and austere. He walked the floor while in trouble, and he is said to have worn out a lot of carpet the night he paced his bedroom at Arlington trying to reach a decision as to whether he should fight with his home State, or whether he should remain as second in command to Gen. Winfield Scott, head of the U.S. Army.

He was meticulously neat, emotionally sensitive. He loved to have his feet and hands tickled, and for hours after dinner at night he would sit and tell stories while his children listened and tickled his feet. If one of them nodded, he would shake his foot to arouse him and then keep on talking.

He loved children, horses, dogs, cats. At one period of the war, a hen roosted under his cot and laid an egg for him each day.

He loved good food—fried chicken, game, barbecued shoat, roast beef. I don't know how chitterlings, my favorite delicacy, happened to be left out of that list.

It is often said that Lee would not indulge in intoxicating drink. That is not exactly true. He was not an habitual user, but he would take a drink. He did not use tobacco, however.

Jackson, on the other hand, tried to stay as far away from liquor as he could. He himself said this was because he was so fond of the taste of it that he feared it.

Now let's take them to war together. Lee and Jackson came into Richmond the same day, the former to command Virginia's troops, the latter as the leader of the corps of cadets from VMI, where he was a professor. But it was not until 1862, after Gen. Joe Johnston had been wounded in the fighting around Richmond and Lee had been chosen to replace him, that the two were thrown together as military leaders, and from then on, until they were separated by death, the war was a different war.

Lee and Jackson were frank with each other. Between them there seemed to be perfect understanding and perfect trust. Lee, as the overall commander, thought out plans of action or, in turn, listened to the plans of Jackson. Once they reached a common mind, they acted.

A biographer has preserved a scene that occurred between the two during the fighting around Richmond in 1862. This is his description:

"The two generals greeted each other warmly, but wasted no time upon the greeting. They stood facing each other, Jackson began talking in a jerky, impetuous way, meanwhile drawing a diagram on the ground with the toe of his right boot. He traced two sides of a triangle with promptness and decision; then starting at the end of the second line, began to draw a third projected toward the first. This third line he traced slowly and with hesitation, alternately looking up at Lee's face and down at the diagram, meanwhile talking earnestly; and when at last the third line crossed the first and the triangle was complete, he raised his foot and stamped it down with emphasis, saying, 'We've got him,' and then signaled for his horse."

That was the way they operated. Later in 1862, around Orange Courthouse, they put their heads together again, and the result was Jackson's sweep around Pope's army that resulted in the destruction of the Union supply base at Manassas and the second battle of Bull Run, a Confederate victory. And they did it again at Chancellorsville, seated on cracker boxes deep in the woodland in the cold predawn hours of a spring morning, and results were equally as fruitful. But that was the last time they were to see each other.

Military leaders down through the ages have been cautious about dividing their armies into detached units. Lee and Jackson had no qualms about such a thing. At Chancellorsville facing Hooker, the Confederate Army, vastly outnumbered, was split into 3 parts, a feat that will be talked about for generations to come.

Lee liked to tease Jackson, especially when girls were around. Perhaps he enjoyed watching the fierce Stonewall's embarrassment.

If Lee had a weakness—and no man is perfect—it was that he would not exercise his will over the generals he commanded. Jackson was quite the opposite. He believed in obedience. When 3 of his men left ranks, he had them shot and, as a warning, marched his army past their bodies.

Both Lee and Jackson had tempers. When Lee's was rising, it was indicated by a nervous jerking of the head and neck. Jackson's broke more abruptly. Once his staff was tardy about getting up to start a march at break of day, and Stonewall finally lost his patience, ordered the cook to pack up everything, throw out the coffee, a great luxury at the time, and threatened to arrest the entire staff if they did not roll out of bed immediately.

There can be no doubt that the South's star began sinking when this military combination was disrupted. While Jackson lay mortally wounded after Chancellorsville, Lee was so upset that he refused to talk about him. And then, after his death, he said simply: "I know not how to replace him."

Today, over the main gate of the barracks of the Virginia Military Institute at Lexington, Va., incised in letters sufficiently large that he who runs may read, are the words "Stonewall Jackson." Before this sally port, on the edge of the parade grounds, the great Virginian stands immobilized in bronze. Each gray-clad cadet, as he passes through the gate, renders a salute to the bronze figure. Before it, every Wednesday and on every special occasion, the corps of cadets passes in review.

On the pedestal of that statue is the inscription: "The Virginia Military Institute will be heard from today." Those words were the words spoken by General Jackson as his troops filed past him in the dim wilderness light of an obscure road that led to his last battle at Chancellorsville. As his army passed, he saw familiar faces, faces of young men who a short time before had received from him academic instruction. Yesterday they were schoolboys; today they were grown to be regimental and brigade commanders in that lean gray army that had written its leader's name large and high on the tablets of history. No doubt he stood proudly at attention then as he does now, and as he spoke those words his mind must have traveled back through his experiences as instructor in natural sciences at the Virginia Military Institute.

He must have seen in those ragged, fierce, determined columns all the exacting discipline, all the proud tradition, of his school. Those deep blue eyes must have lit with affection for those lovable youths, trained in a stern tradition of service to their State. And they, too, as they passed him, must have recalled associations with him. Many of them must have remembered a dour professor, in an ill-fitting cap, who had taught them the elements of science and artillery and who had enhanced their concept of duty.

While the South moaned the loss of a fierce military leader, a disciplinarian who drove himself so hard he fell asleep on his horse, there was a woman at Lexington, Va., who sobbed over him as a kind, soft-spoken husband, a buoyant individual and a great practical joker. Can you imagine the immortal Stonewall Jackson hiding behind a door and springing out to surprise and caress his wife? Can you imagine him, returning home from the institute in full regimental uniform, rushing at her and waving his sword over her head and then laughing at her terror? That was the man Mrs. Jackson saw.

As she pictured him, he had a quick eye for a ludicrous situation, and he got great amusement out of jokes told on himself. At his home he rigged up some of his favorite appliances for gymnastic exercise. His garden was a great source of pleasure to him. He had an elaborate calendar for planting and he grew more vegetables than he and his wife could use. Picture Stonewall Jackson, the mighty warrior, hoeing celery, lettuce, lima beans, snap beans, carrots, parsnips, salsify, onions, cabbage, turnips, beets, potatoes, and muskmelons. Theye're the vegetables the records show he planted one summer.

He loved children. He had several servants about the home and was extremely kind to them. For years, he conducted a Sunday school class for the colored people of Lexington.

About dawn April 21, 1861, the doorbell at Jackson's home sounded. It was rung by a messenger bearing an order for him to bring the cadets to Richmond to help defend the State of Virginia from an invasion from the North. To the institute he hurried to prepare the corps for the trip. He was there most of the morning. Before he marched away at 1 p.m., he returned home and read that chapter of the Corinthians beginning with the sublime hope of the resurrection. Then he knelt in prayer. When he walked over the threshold of his home that day, it was for the last time. He never crossed it again.

This was the kind of man Lee had for a right arm. In less than 3 months from the day Virginia seceded, one-third of the field officers of Virginia volunteer regiments were men who had been trained by Jackson. By the end of 1861, 20 of the 56 Virginia regiments of infantry and heavy artillery organized at that time, as well as 2 of the 8 regiments of Virginia cavalry, were commanded by VMI graduates. In other words, within 9 months, Jackson's students made up a third of the regimental leaders.

While he lay mortally wounded, Lee paid him the greatest tribute that a mortal could ask when he said: "Could I have directed events, I should have chosen for the good of the country to have been disabled in your stead."

Jackson died at the height of his fame, after his men had made their amazing sweep around Howard's XI Corps to upset Hooker at Chancellorsville; he died at a time when the smoke of battle was hanging low over many of Virginia's fertile fields, when the army of northern Virginia was accustomed to victory and was only just on the verge of the crushing defeat it received at Gettysburg. How much Lee must have thought of giving up the struggle after this double loss—the loss of Jackson, his right arm, and the loss of his objective at Gettysburg. But he didn't. He kept on for 2 more years before he finally drew up his shattered ranks and, with tears in his eyes, accepted terms of surrender at Appomattox.

Lee died in a time of peace. Maury was the last of the three to pass to the Great Beyond.

As a student at Washington and Lee University back in the late 1920's, I was one of a trio who cleaned out Lee's office, left untouched since his death nearly 60 years prior. It was as neat as it could be, reflecting his training as a cadet. One item we found there was a field kitchenette presented him by a British admirer. It had never been used. He preferred instead during the war the simple combination of a bucket, two pans, a plate, cup, knife, fork, and spoon that fitted into a compact unit.

We also found there the beginning of a manuscript he was writing on the history of the war. He went to his grave wishing that he might write in detail of the disparity of numbers between the Union and Confederate Armies in nearly every engagement. The papers we found were obviously his initial efforts.

During my student days, I also had the privilege, while working on the university's publicity bureau, of interviewing Mrs. Margaret Letcher Showill, daughter of Virginia's war Governor, John Letcher. Mrs. Showill had been present at the burial of Traveler, Lee's war horse, which outlived him a number of years. She gave me a detailed account of the incident, and I wrote a story about it that appeared in papers over the country on October 28, 1929. I recall that she told me Traveler was buried in a wooden box, and that Fitzzhugh Lee was among the mourners.

And now, in closing, I want to tell you of a little story concerning General Lee that was told me by the late Senator Henry T. Wickham while I was covering the Virginia Senate for the Richmond Times-Dispatch some years ago. Senator Wickham said he was a student at Washington College under General Lee and that, back then, each boy had to supply wood with which to heat his room. Wickham said he and his roommate had quite a stack out in the hallway near their door and that they suddenly waked up to the fact that someone was stealing it. They decided to set a trap, so they bored a hole in one stick, poured gunpowder into the hole, and plugged it up with a cork stopper. A day or two later they were sitting in class where there was a terrific explosion in the room, and the stove disintegrated. It seems the college janitor had been snitching the students' wood to heat the classrooms.

Lee heard about the incident and sent for Wickham and his roommate, for the story soon got around of what had happened. When they explained what they had done, Lee chuckled, rubbed his chin studiously for a moment, and said, "Well, gentlemen, next time suppose you don't put in so much powder."

Keep Them Flying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am on no committee which deals with transportation. Neither am I involved in any major congressional work which concerns itself with fratricidal labor complications. However, I do believe that the inevitable success of our system of government rests with the complete cooperation of labor and management to make us abler and stronger than any adversary with which we expect to compete—politically, morally, and ideologically.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I ask that "Keep Them Flying," a recent editorial published in the New York Journal-American, be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

KEEP THEM FLYING

The U.S. imbalance of payments in foreign trade already responsible for a drain of gold from this country, is threatened with serious deterioration if U.S.-flag international airlines are hit by strikes.

The possibility is imminent as major U.S. lines reach crucial negotiations involving

jurisdictional quarrels between rival pilots and engineers unions.

The half-billion-dollar-a-year oversea business of U.S.-flag airlines represents a field in which this country has already lost its dominant position since World War II. The total of foreign lines today has the edge.

Pan American and TWA, top U.S. Atlantic carriers, face the first rapid-fire deadlines in negotiations with the pilots. The pilots seek to incorporate the engineers' jobs and a Presidential Commission set up by Secretary of Labor Goldberg has been unable to reconcile the factions.

We urge all parties to this dispute to make every effort to find ground for agreement. This is a strike which must not be allowed to happen. The interests of the nation are paramount.

It would have tragic results for the U.S. economy if our planes were not kept flying and the airline business were to go by default to other countries.

Prospects in Laos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the critical plight of those prizing individual freedom in southeast Asia, and the reaction of our Government to that situation, deserve our most careful attention. In that regard, the following article by Mr. J. M. Roberts, appearing in the St. Paul Dispatch of January 17, is illuminating and useful to all of us who need to evaluate events.

PROSPECTS IN LAOS

(By J. M. Roberts)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy's statement of the chances being run in current negotiations over the future of Laos is evidence that the administration realizes it is holding the short end of the stick there.

Enough to cause foreboding is the fact that the United States agrees with the Soviet Union not only on the establishment of a government under Prince Souvanna Phouma's so-called neutralist faction, but also on allocating to it the key posts of defense and interior ministries—the entire police power of the country.

If the Soviets approve it can't be good for the United States, even if it is, as the president says, better than trying to fight a war in such a place.

Pro-Western Prince Boun Oum demonstrates by his intransigence in the face of strong American economic pressures that he believes American policy points toward a Communist takeover.

The situation reminds strongly of 24 years ago when Britain and France, unprepared to face down Adolf Hitler, were putting pressure on President Benes of Czechoslovakia to be reasonable.

The question—if it is still remains a question after many demonstrations of accord between Prince Souvanna Phouma, the Communist Prince Souphanouvong, the Ho Chi Minh regime in North Vietnam and the Soviets—is whether once in power the so-called neutralists will even attempt to retain any of that color.

A clue to the backstage atmosphere in southeast Asia was given by Ho Chi Minh's speech before the Communist party conference in Moscow last fall.

Ho strongly praised the Khrushchev regime and almost completely ignored the Peiping Communists who are at odds with Moscow but who gave Ho so much help in his fight for independence. Yet in his actions at home Ho cooperates fully with Red China and accepts its troops in North Vietam as replacements for his own men who are conducting guerrilla war in South Vietnam.

There does seem to be evidence that there is a strong concept in southeast Asia—and in India—along these lines:

The immediate menace is Red China's armed might. Ideological communism is by no means considered the menace which the West sees in it. A means of self defense, then, is offered if a situation can be established with the Soviet Union under which Red Chinese action against her neighbors also would be considered an action against Soviet interests.

The Administration's Fiscal Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it has already been estimated in many circles that Government expenditures this Congress will approve this year will top those of any previous year but 1945—the year of peak spending for World War II. It has also been stated that the administration's prediction of a budget surplus is predicated on so many "ifs" and "maybes" that it must be viewed with something other than "high hopes," if I may borrow the title of the New Frontier's campaign song.

We are told by pollsters that the President's personal popularity soars undiminished. We are wooed with reports from every source about his glamour, his intelligence, his breeding, his charm, his keen insight and his political acumen.

We are not, however, told anything about the public's reactions to the spending programs, the foreign policy failures or the welfare-state schemes of his administration.

Since we do not receive the pollsters' sanctified word on these matters, we Members of this House have to rely on other sources from our districts to test reaction to them. We must rely on letters and vocal expressions of sentiment from our constituents and on newspaper editorials appearing in our areas.

It is especially from this latter source that I have recently been getting some pertinent, arresting and detailed opinions. Newspapers in and near my district are voicing opposition to the administration's loose fiscal policy. These opinions prove to me that while the President may be personally popular, his policies and his programs are causing serious reservations, if not outright discontent and opposition.

Some of the newspapers to which I refer are small weekly publications; others are small or medium-sized dailies; another is a mass circulation daily. All have taken the same stand.

For example, let us first just scan the titles of editorials that appeared in five different newspapers on January 17 and 18 of this year:

From the Seymour (Ind.) Tribune of January 18, 1962, "Another Deficit Ahead."

From the Salem (Ind.) Leader of January 18, 1962, "Congress Should Keep Taxing Power."

From the Versailles (Ind.) Republican of January 18, 1962, "The Super Boom."

From the Mitchell (Ind.) Tribune of January 18, 1962, "There's a Hand in Your Wallet."

From the Cincinnati Post and Times-Star of January 17, 1962, "The U.S. Debt Emergency."

Even the titles tell a story. The writers of the editorials, after sounding out public opinion in their areas, are worried about the course our economy is taking. They are concerned with the increase in the national debt, the Federal-aid-for-everything approach to government, the reckless way in which tax money is being budgeted, and the callous disregard the administration seems to have for the public's pocketbook and economic well-being.

Let us go under the titles of the editorials and see what the editorial writers are saying, what the people are thinking.

The Seymour Tribune, for example, says:

There is a confusion of economic tongues on whether a big consumer buying surge is going to undergird a sharp increase in the rate of business growth. Some see that stimulus as substantial and others do not.

The budget sent to Congress by the White House tops any peacetime year and is exceeded only by two World War II years.

Presidential predictions of a balanced budget in fiscal 1963 are based on an estimated $11 billion jump in revenues * * *.

This estimate is disputed by many.

Claims of a balanced budget probably are unrealistic unless Congress takes the situation firmly in hand. What the effects of an almost unvarying deficit financing on an already unstable dollar and the Nation's world trade will be is one of the most challenging questions of the times.

The Salem Leader has another approach to the same general topic:

A couple of weeks ago we congratulated two new citizens of Washington County—the first babies of 1962. But we failed to note one important "gift" these babies get. These first babies are saddled with their share of our huge public debt—$1,603 for each baby. Isn't that a hearty welcome to any new baby, wherever born?

Yet there has been a demand made that Congress boost the limit of debt which the U.S. Government can take on. It isn't enough that our Nation is already the most deeply in debt of any nation in the world. In fact, we are reportedly in debt more than the nations we continue to help all the time. Our Federal debt and guaranteed obligations are $295 billion. It surpases by $42 billion all the debts of all other countries in the world. This is something for every one of us to think about, for Uncle Sam's load is really the load of the taxpayers of the Nation. Every dollar that our Government gives to the States or to communities, or to other countries, in whatever guise, is the taxpayer's dollar. The Federal Government

does not have a dime that it has not collected from the taxpayers in one form or another.

Now President Kennedy is asking Congress for the power to control taxes and tariffs. He wants the White House occupant to be able to raise or lower taxes as he wishes. The President says it is to enable the President to lower taxes when a recession occurs, to act as a boost for our economy. But when in history has the power to tax ever been accompanied by a reduction in taxes? Never. It has always resulted in boosts.

Our Congressmen are elected by us in our respective districts. They are more "local" people and, coming up for election every 2 years, they are more mindful of what the people want. They are more prone to heed the demands of the people than can one person in the White House, surrounded by bureaucrats, whose only interest is to "tax and tax and elect and elect and elect."

Congress should never surrender its jurisdiction over taxes. It should never delegate authority to one man or to another branch of Government.

The taxpayer can be compelled to pay his taxes, but he cannot compel his Government to stop useless spending and balance the budget. But a concerted effort by a large number of taxpayers can stop it if it is up to Congress. If our spending continues unabated, the taxpayers will be compelled to do something about it to save themselves from Government serfdom. And it's later than our Government officials would have us think. This is one Congress the people need to watch—and closely.

Evidently, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Howard Grossman, the editor of the Salem Leader, has not been won over by the results of the popularity polls. He is thinking, as are millions, about the direction our Nation is taking rather than the cut of any man's suit or the chic design of any woman's dress or coiffure.

Now let us look at the editorial in the Versailles Republican. What is this "super boom" the editor talks about?

There's at least one place where a super boom is under way. It's in the Federal Government as disclosed in the President's recent message to Congress. Unfortunately, it's a boom that the taxpayers, including taxpayers-to-be, not yet born, will have to pay.

Federal spending for the year will pass $90 billion, a new peacetime record. Next year's budget deficit will exceed $5 billion regardless of what the President says.

We're supposed to be prepared to make sacrifices in the name of national defense and of national survival. When will Washington provide even a minor example? Not until the people vote no to candidates and public officials who promote higher taxes by advocating give-away programs financed by taxpaying dollars.

Instead of giving up, saying there is nothing you can do, start writing your Congressman, or someone else's if you don't like yours, and tell him what you think.

Apparently, Mr. Speaker, someone forgot to tell this editor to pay attention only to the flowery rhetoric from the White House to which we are treated from time to time.

The Mitchell Tribune editor takes a dim view of medical care for the aged proposals and other economic proposals of administration:

Today we are besieged on every side by proponents of something for nothing. The siren song of the welfare state is heard in ever-increasing volume. With no thought for the ultimate cost or the weakening effect on the moral fiber of our people, supporters of larger and larger government benefits plunge merrily on.

We believe it is high time people took a look at the fact for themselves, rather than have those facts misinterpreted by others to serve their own ends.

Remember, the only money available for distribution from Washington is the money that has already been extracted from those who labor in our factories and offices and on our farms. The money to support these programs comes from you. There's a hand in your wallet.

"You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer. You cannot further the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred. You cannot help the poor by discouraging the rich. You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money. You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn. You cannot build character and courage by taking away a man's initiative and independence. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves," Abraham Lincoln.

In reaching back into history for words, I think no better job could have been done than that performed by Lowell Davis, editor of the Mitchell Tribune, when he quoted Lincoln's words of 100 years ago.

Let us look now at a metropolitan newspaper with high circulation in my district—The Cincinnati Post and Times-Star.

At the top of the congressional work schedule is dramatic reminder that the national debt limit does not limit the national debt. The Government can't pay its bills and can't even borrow enough under the present limit of $298 billion.

In this emergency Chairman HARRY F. BYRD, of the Senate Finance Committee, is trying dramatically to alert an electorate which has tolerated the big spending projects of pressure groups, even when there is no money to pay the bills.

As he says, "This financial emergency is the direct result of the Government's continuing failure to exercise reasonable financial discipline.

"It is not necessary to be an expert," says Senator BYRD, "to recognize the fact that we cannot continue to spend and spend, tax and tax, and borrow and borrow much longer."

The inevitable end result is more inflation, plus weakening of the dollar in world affairs, plus rising crisis in our balance of international payments, plus further drain on our gold reserves.

There, Mr. Speaker, are editorial expressions of opinion from five newspapers—all known for their moderate editorial approaches. None castigate—none calumnate—none throw political barbs. All, however, express one feeling—a growing trepidation that our Nation is being weakened dangerously by disastrous fiscal policies.

All hit at one theme—that the time has come for the Government gravy-train to be stopped dead in its tracks before it runs us all over the brink of the financial cliff and into the abyss of national bankruptcy and economic disaster.

It is this sort of opinion which is coming from the grassroots, Mr. Speaker, and this sort of opinion which should be listened to and heeded by every Member of this House and by the executive department as well.

Freemen on the Defensive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, in the December 1961 issue of the Rotarian, Dr. Charles H. Malik, former President of the General Assembly of the United Nations, discusses the urgency of the need for those who know and believe in God, truth, man, and freedom to pass to the offensive in their struggle against communism. Believing that Dr. Malik's article should be brought to the attention of Congress, I include it under unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FREEMEN ON THE DEFENSIVE

Those who have known in their lives and in their traditions the dignity of man and his freedom have tended to be too much on the defensive. Often they have talked and acted as though they were in the wrong. A certain fright and timidity—nay, a certain false modesty—have assailed them. They appear to forget that in every sphere of life the offensive, if genuinely and rightly mounted, is the best means of self-defense. Nothing, I believe, is more needed today than for those who know and believe in God, truth, man, and freedom to pass to the offensive.

There are, in my view, five fronts in which it is necessary today to pass to the offensive: the front of communism; the front of neutralism; the front of those engaged in undermining the unity of the Western World; the front of materialism; and the front of what I would term the least common denominator.

Morally and spiritually the Communists put freemen on the defensive; they make us feel guilty; they talk in terms of capitalism, imperialism, colonialism, monopolies, profits, exploitation, means of production—all purely economic, purely materialistic, terms. And how do we take up the debate? We usually answer that the exploiting capitalism of the 19th century no longer exists, that imperialism has been liquidated, that monopolies are now owned by the people, and that, as to profits, everybody now shares in them. There is about this response a pathetic air of apology, a sickly note of timidity, and those who make it clearly suffer from a guilty conscience. When we thus accept to be drawn into debate with the Communists on their own terms, we confirm them in the feeling that they are right. It is as though we were telling them: "You are right in your attack; we are sorry for our past ways; but, behold, we have now corrected them."

This will not do. The Communists should be answered, not apologetically, not as though they were right, but in terms taking them completely off their guard. They should be answered in human, moral, and spiritual terms. We should be in a position to turn on them and say:

What about freedom of thought and inquiry in your realm? Can people really

seek the truth freely? Can they really dissent? Can they really question your fundamental presuppositions?

What about freedom of conscience and religion? Do you Communists go to church? Do you fall on your knees and pray? Do you persecute those who do?

What about human rights and fundamental freedoms? Which of these rights are really enjoyed by your people?

Is there any free criticism of the government in your realm? Have your people ever been given a genuine free political choice?

What about your iron dictatorship? What about your police state?

What about the minority rule under which all Communist states languish?

What about your methods of subversion all over the world in which every dark trick of deceit and destruction is used?

What about the camps of forced labor?

What about Hungary? What about Tibet? What about the Chinese communes?

It is most important that the Communists be put on the defensive. It is most important that the total arsenal of political, moral, and spiritual values be brought to bear upon this struggle.

Those who, for whatever reason, wish to remain outside the gigantic world struggle between communism and freedom have every right to expect the rest of the world to respect their freedom. As a matter of fact, real neutralism, implying real freedom of choice and real independence of judgment, is a triumph for the idea of freedom. The free world can only welcome it.

But a neutralist, rightly asking that his will be respected, has no right himself to impose his will on others. By his own logic, he must not object if others choose not to be neutral in this great struggle. Himself refusing to take a stand, the neutralist must respect those who do. A neutralist who is all the time working to extend the domain of neutralism, especially if this extension happens to be at the expense of only one side, is obviously not neutral.

Nor will one who really wishes to—and can—stay outside the struggle, play one side against the other. A neutralist in that case identifies his interests with the division of the world. He flourishes so long as there is tension; as soon as tension relaxes, he ceases to reap much value from his neutralism.

The needed offensive here is simply to welcome and support the neutralism that is genuine; to be so strong and self-confident that one will not fall for the neutralism that is a fake; and to measure neutralism always by the radical historic struggle whose issue will determine the fate of everybody, neutralist and nonneutralist alike.

There are people and forces, inside and outside the Western World, whose effect is to undermine whatever unity there is in that world. I am not thinking of the Communists, whose very purpose is to conspire in that direction. I am thinking of the soft-headed, the duped, the tired, the frightened, the sentimental, the superficial, the unauthentic, and the perfectly innocent who mean well. If these people have their way, freedom will finally fall by sheer division and default. An offensive must therefore be mounted on this front.

England cannot be separated from Europe, France is an integral pillar of the West. Germany must not be so slighted as to begin to think of neutralism as an alternative. Far-reaching measures must be devised with a view to cleaning up the Western Hemisphere of the Communist virus and promoting the friendliest relations between Latin and Anglo-Saxon on the basis of their common civilization.

The impression is often gathered that, owing to national jealousies and conflicting national interests, the West is hopelessly divided. A vigorous offensive for unity must therefore be mounted. For what is at stake today is not this or that nation, but the entirety of Western civilization, with its marvelous traditions of man, of freedom, of truth, and of God.

I include many things under the front of materialism. Besides softness and the life of ease, besides the quest after money and material gain, besides the all-consuming passion after economic security—besides these things I include the fundamental spiritual attitude which denies real order in the nature of things, which denies that there is a real objective higher and a real objective lower, which instead derives the higher integrally from the lower, which obliterates the dimension of rank, excellence, quality, depth, and which therefore knows no rest, no grace, and no ultimate peace.

Nothing is more needed today than a mighty spiritual offensive which will put the material in its place and restore to the spiritual its original primacy and preeminence. The mind that understands and creates, the spirit that suffers and sacrifices and loves and is at peace with itself, the fellowship of the pure and free and transparent, the joy of conversation and reason and sharing, the soul that rejoices in beauty and grace and being, the goodwill that is full of light and positive intent, God, the absolute mind, absolute spirit, absolute love, absolute reason, absolute grace, absolute goodness, absolute being—these things come first, and everything else second. Man, it seems, can never learn this lesson; he must always invert the right order of values and put the lower things first.

This does not mean that I scorn or spurn or sneer at the wonderful products of industry. On the contrary, I look upon science and industry as among the most important benefactors of mankind, and upon their products as among the greatest monuments of the creative mind and spirit of man. And if I can afford it, and if I am not engaged in some mortifying exercise for the sake of something higher, I will always buy the best car, go to the best doctor, live in the finest house, and sleep on the most comfortable bed. And, what is more, I will always wish and work, not only for me to enjoy these marvelous products of industry, but also for others to enjoy them. The concept of economic and social justice is an absolutely valid concept. But he who does not know how man may become so ensnared and infatuated by these things as to lose the original, sharp edge of his soul has still much to learn.

Those who believe in man and his freedom, who know truth, and who trust in God, cannot allow the creative sources of their being to be sapped by softness and materialism.

The question of the least common denominator is the distressing phenomenon of people without an enduring backbone. Because diverse points of view in this age are mingling and challenging each other on every turn, people with a weak backbone soon take on the color of those who surround them. This is very reminiscent of the parable of the sower in the Gospel where the seed has fallen among thorns, the thorns being the other points of view which so confuse us as to depress the truth to the least denominator common to all.

Men of real backbone will never betray their fundamental convictions. They will never allow other points of view to dull or flatten their soul. They will at least remain silent, and silence often speaks a volume of words.

It is possible to be polite, without ever abandoning your convictions; it is possible not to offend, while remaining absolutely loyal to the best and deepest you know; it is possible to be understanding and helpful, without deluding others that you are one of them; it is possible to cooperate with others, while remaining firm in the truth as God gives you to see the truth; it is possible to sacrifice yourself for them, without asking or expecting anything in return.

The present moment in history requires, more than any other moment in the past, that those who know and believe in man, freedom, truth, and God pass to the offensive on every front. The battle now raging is perhaps the most decisive in history. The forces of darkness are joining hands on every side against all that is truth and God and light. We need to enter into the battle with all our enthusiasm and all our heart, realizing what infinite honor it is to be living and engaged in the battle today.

Altoona, Pa., Community Chest Campaign Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on October 5, 1961, it was a pleasure to participate in the opening kickoff dinner of the Altoona Community Chest campaign, Altoona, Pa., and to deliver the following address:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE 1961-62 ALTOONA COMMUNITY CHEST CAMPAIGN DINNER, PENN ALTO HOTEL, ALTOONA, PA., OCTOBER 5, 1961

It is a privilege to be with you this evening for the 1961-62 community chest campaign dinner.

You have to your credit two consecutive over-the-goal campaigns in the last 2 years.

Under your able campaign chairman, Roy K. McDaniel, you can expect to make it three successes in a row.

I understand that the dollar goal for this year's drive is going to be almost a quarter of a million dollars—$232,250 to be exact—and that is only as a minimum.

That is a high mark to shoot for.

And when you do achieve it—when you do go over the top—then you will be glad you set yourselves that challenging task and your satisfaction in success will be that much greater.

As I say, you have a winning streak going.

Another victorious drive this time will generate more public response next time.

Success is contagious.

Everyone is pulling for you and the more often these drives go over the top and by a big margin the harder it will be for the community to let you down.

I understand also that the possibility of a united fund for all of Blair County is under discussion.

Altoona is the focal point for this possibility.

If you do well again this year then the chances for a united fund for the entire county are that much better.

As you begin this 1961 campaign keep in mind there are 23 agencies giving health, welfare, and youth services to this community—to the people whose doorbells you will be ringing.

If these agencies have sufficient funds to support the best kind of service they know how to give; if people can be made to see the good works they are doing; then future successes for the community chest idea are assured—in Altoona and in the larger community of Blair County.

There's another point I want to make about the dollar goal you have set up for this year.

I said that this will be a challenge and a source of satisfaction when you do attain it.

The second point is this: This high mark to shoot for must elicit the full support of the whole community.

There will be a premium on 100-percent participation by all members of the community; because it is not enough that the generous donors continue to give the way they have in the past.

Their full support of this campaign cannot take up the slack which results when other members of the community for one reason or other fall far short of the contributions they should be making.

The New York Yankees are in the world's series again this year and part of the reason is that their batting lineup from the lead-off man down through the No. 8 position can be depended upon.

It is not just a case of Roger Maris and Mickey Mantle holding up the rest of the batting order.

There is also the matter of Yogi Berra and Bill Skowron.

And of Elston Howard, hitting high in the .300's, and of men like Bobby Richardson, Tony Kubek, John Blanchard, and Cletus Boyer.

These men can be counted upon to help each other out; pick each other up when necessary; and to put out a team effort which is hard to beat.

The same type of cooperation, the same working together, is what is required for a successful community chest campaign.

The effect of a sizable and generous contribution from one person is diminished when his next-door neighbor cannot be reached—or fails to understand—that he too has a duty to give.

When everyone realizes that his neighbors are depending on him, then the task—be it it in baseball or in your community chest campaign—is far, far easier for all concerned.

So your duty is to reach every person, every household, every organization, and every businessman in Altoona and show him that he must get on this bandwagon; show him that his neighbors are putting out a full effort and that he must too if this year's campaign is to be successful.

I know that these good citizens want to hear your message.

They know when they think about it how much better off this or any other community is when it can have the benefit of the humanitarian services which the 23 health and welfare agencies of the Altoona Community Chest make available.

There is always something particularly exciting and satisfying in a community project of this sort.

Part of the excitement is in the simple fact of a group of citizens getting together to achieve a useful and noble purpose and above all the great joy in achieving it.

But there is something else worthy of consideration.

Too often, it seems to me, we let our daily lives settle into a routine.

We see the same friends, engage in the same activities week after week, maybe even take the same night out for relaxation week after week.

We even begin to classify ourselves as members of certain clubs, of a certain profession, of a certain church, of a certain economic group, and we tend to overlook the fact that we have other wider loyalties or should have.

One of these wider loyalties is the town or community we are a part of.

The community chest calls this to our attention each year and gives us a new opportunity—even forces us—to meet new people and to enlarge our interests to break out of our fairly narrow circles and to become involved with other members of the community whom we might otherwise overlook and never meet.

This experience often proves to be both enjoyable and eye opening.

And it more than makes up for the occasional distress and panic-button pushing which volunteer work entails.

Maybe I can give you some idea of what a layman thinks of the community chest.

What does the name mean for the fellow on the other side of the doorbell?

What I am about to say should encourage you.

I hope it doesn't make you overconfident.

I hope it simply reinforces your personal convictions about the work in which you are engaged.

Because if each volunteer worker on his rounds can make his own conviction felt by the persons he comes in contact with, he will do a marvelous job in this year's campaign.

For one thing the man on the street knows the name of the community chest and he trusts it.

You may have been around before and if so he remembers you.

He also knows that the essence of your program is the single campaign for several worthy causes.

He thinks this is an intelligent way to operate and he respects you for considering his own desires not to be bothered by repeated and disorganized appeals for his help.

He knows that the community chest idea has brought a good deal of order, organization, and commonsense into charitable giving.

While he knows this, I sometimes wonder whether he translates it into a money contribution of sufficient and appropriate size.

We can only hope he does recognize by his donation the sensible and businesslike way in which the community chest drive is carried out.

There have been scandalous reports lately of rackets in the charity field; of organizations which swallow up in salaries and publicity fully 50 percent and more of donations collected.

These reports only serve to increase the high regard in which the community chest is held.

Your administration costs are extremely low.

As volunteer workers you are respected members of the community who simply put on a different hat and put extra hours and extra energy into this worthwhile campaign.

That is something else which the housewife and her husband—the people on the other side of the doorbell—appreciate.

So in this year's campaign for the community chest—with the high standards of performances you have set for yourself—you have every reason to be confident.

You have a fine organization with an enviable reputation.

People want you to talk to them with conviction about the part they can play in helping you reach your goals.

People are pulling for you. And with the knowledge of such confidence it is my ardent hope it will serve as an added incentive in reaching the goal in this year's community chest campaign.

Remarks of the Secretary of the Army, Elvis Stahr, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks made by the Honorable Elvis Stahr, Jr., Secretary of the Army, on Wednesday evening, January 17, 1962, at the National City Christian Church, in Washington, D.C.:

UNITY THROUGH DIFFERENCE

(Remarks by Hon. Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., Secretary of the Army)

I am grateful to the National City Christian Church for the opportunity to meet once again on such a pleasant occasion with fellow members of the Disciples of Christ. I had the great pleasure of addressing the International Convention of Christian Churches last September, and I assure you that I look forward to each new opportunity to join in Christian fellowship with old and new friends.

Since becoming Secretary of the Army, I have had many occasions to think about a striking similarity that exists between one of the fundamental principles of the Christian Church, and a concept which has had and is having a controlling influence in the lives and government of freemen everywhere. I am thinking of our right to form our own opinions and of the miraculous way it has of drawing us closer together.

When those two imigrants from Northern Ireland, Thomas Campbell and his son Alexander, together with Barton W. Stone, began to plead and plan in the early part of the 19th century for the unification of Christian denominations, they were fully aware that there could be no true unity without the freedom to differ. In a conviction that led eventually to the establishment of the Disciples of Christ, they preached that an enduring basis for Christian fellowship could not be established through complete agreement on a fixed system of religious doctrine, but must rather be built around those essential principles of Gospel teaching which all Christians recognize. An earlier writer had expressed it in these now familiar words: "In essentials, unity; in nonessentials, liberty; in all things, charity."

Whether consciously or not, Thomas and Alexander Campbell were applying a principle that has proved to be essential to unity in every field of human endeavor—the right to differ. History has shown that, although there must be a main body of belief and agreement if anarchy is to be avoided, there must also be freedom of thought, expression, and action, or tyranny will take over.

How appropriate it is for us to remember this principle as we face the challenge of our time. With the forces of a godless tyranny once again on the march, strengthened by the absolute authority to concentrate the natural and human resources within its grasp on the maintenance of a powerful fighting force, the free nations of the world are faced with the alternatives of being defeated in detail by the Soviet colossus or of standing in unity against it. It is a pretty well accepted fact that the Soviet

bloc has the military power to defeat and the potential economic ability to "bury" any other single nation, with the exception of the United States. It cannot hope, however, to match either the military strength or economic power of free world nations working together. It might be worth our while, therefore, to examine how this matter of unity through difference works by analyzing the part it plays in some of our current affairs.

No finer example of the strong unity that freedom to differ can create could be found than the Government of the United States. With its Constitution and Bill of Rights as the central core of agreement, this Nation has grown strong in unity by encouraging the voices of dissent through free speech, an untrammeled press, and open debate. As many of you gentlemen know well of your own experience, no more violently divergent opinions have ever existed than those which are freely expressed on the floors of the Senate and the House of Representatives. Those Chambers have echoed to everything from the finest orations in history to the most vicious philippics ever hurled at a near-captive audience. Men have dared to speak there against parties in power, out of power, and on the ascendancy—yet not one of them has ever been shot, hanged, beheaded, or posthumously banished to historical oblivion because of it. Through difference—though some may have been wrong—and the right to express it—though some may have done it badly—they brought strength to the Union.

The unity which has made us strong—the kind that is based on a hard core of essential principles and a recognition of the right to differ on details of execution—must be carried over with the highest degree of tolerance and understanding into the various alliances between nations. To hear the fears and doubts that are expressed when member nations of an alliance happen to bump heads on some matter, one would conclude that there is no hope for a workable agreement of any kind between nations. We sometimes seem to expect nations to eliminate all causes for conflict and disagreement and live together like the fabled "one big happy family." This, of course, is a ridiculous and unrealistic expectation. Nations—even those most closely allied—will have conflicting needs and aspirations as long as they have people in them, so what we really need to work on is the strengthening of the fundamental bond that unites and makes free nations willing to stand shoulder to shoulder—in battle, if need be—when the chips are down.

Although the charters, pacts, and agreements that formalize our alliances are the work of professional statesmen and diplomats, the real foundation on which they rest is that bedrock of international morality to which each of us adds or detracts by the way we live as members of the human family.

Like individual integrity, international morality is a blending of many fine qualities—such as honesty, loyalty, tolerance, faith, and good will. It is a canon of unwritten world law—an unspoken code of ethics that exists in some form in every reputable creed and belief, and makes it possible for a member of one to work in harmony with the members of another. Woodrow Wilson, architect of the first working plan for cooperation among all the peoples of the world, put the same thought in these words:

"What we seek is the reign of law, based on the consent of the governed and sustained by the organized opinion of mankind."

We contribute to international morality—and hence to the bond that ties the free world together—when we adhere to high standards of moral integrity in our own country, beginning with our individual lives and extending through our schools, social institutions, and all levels of Government. We detract from it each time we adopt the "So what?" attitude toward foul busines practices, low professional ethics, and the compromise of principle for convenience.

A striking example of strength and unity achieved through exercise of the right to differ can be found throughout our Armed Forces. Many drastic differences of opinion are aired and vigorously defended during the process of hammering out the defense recommendations that end up on the desk of the Commander in Chief, President Kennedy—differences of opinion that arise, you may be sure, out of the firm convictions of professional military men and are inspired by a common determination that this Nation shall have the most effective means for its defense.

Once a decision has been taken and a policy adopted, it is executed the more willingly and enthusiastically because all differences of opinion were thoroughly considered in its formulation, rather than suppressed—because the realities were fully explored in frank discussion. Our present unified defense policy, by which we seek to attain a measured and balanced degree of military power capable of coping with any form of aggression, any place on earth, evolved from quite divergent views, in many cases, among individuals and services, but it is a more broadly acceptable as well as a more effective policy than could have been created by any one person alone, or any one group with identical views, since it represents a synthesis of the outspoken wisdom of many trained minds.

An illustration of the fact that honest differences of opinion lead in the long run to the most realistic defense is Admiral Rickover's powerful and constant advocacy of the nuclear submarine despite strong opposition—a difference of opinion that led to the creation of our Polaris submarine striking force, now a major element of our vital strategic nuclear deterrent.

Another case in point is the recognition, reflected in our present defense policy, of the Army's long-term and consistently argued belief, which also encountered strong and insistent objections, that lesser forms of aggression than all-out thermonuclear attack would require a response by more limited means; that we must be armed in such a manner that we are not limited to a single course of action—forced to choose between waging all-out thermonuclear war or allowing an aggressor to achieve his purpose by piecemeal conquest.

Because able and dedicated men exercised the right to differ, not only among themselves but with time-honored concepts, we have also broken away from the tradition of peacetime unpreparedness which in the past tied the hands of the military Services until hostilities were practically under way. We have raised our military forces over the past several months to a level of balanced strength and readiness unprecedented except in time of actual war. Furthermore, we have adopted for the first time in our history a policy of strength maintained over the long term. In short, we have put ourselves in a better position than ever before to fulfill our national purpose to deter war or win a decisive victory should war be thrust upon us.

If we succeed in our determination to preserve freedom without war, it will be because those who threaten freedom can see that our intention to stand firm is backed by the military ability to do so. For the communists respect strength—and little else. And their determination to dominate the world is something they don't even try to hide.

Right here, because of my particular responsibilities as Secretary of the Army, I would like to add a special word or two in passing about the necessity for constancy in our national attitude toward defense—the new dimension of our security. It has at last become obvious to most Americans, I hope and believe, that we must forego the dangerous practice of setting our sails according to the volume and direction of the latest hostile wind and steer our course instead by the constant stars.

Although our present buildup was sparked by the Berlin crisis—and one of the simplest facts of today's complicated world is that we must be prepared to respond to that problem militarily if that should become necessary—even if some solution there were posible this very hour, we must be prepared to cope with other and new crises which the Communists have created and are capable of creating. At any moment they could quickly build up pressure in parts of the world where we have no forces—or only token forces—stationed at present, and where indigenous forces are inadequate to contain or defeat a Communist military sortie without our help. Moreover, we cannot, in any case, hope to attain our long-term goal by utilizing our strength merely to meet recurrent crises as they arise. We must, rather, prevent crises by making it perfectly obvious in advance that we have the strength-in-being—and the unflinching determination—to take whatever positive action may be required.

To allow our military strength to deteriorate in response to lessened tension at one point or at one moment would, in effect, make it possible for our adversaries to call the signals and manipulate our defenses to suit their own aims. It would make us vulnerable to being hit hardest when our defenses were weakest and the warning shortest. It would whipsaw us economically because of the tremendous waste involved in alternate increases and decreases in the force levels we maintain. It would also be extremely and unnecessarily disruptive to the lives of great numbers of our people.

A genuinely farsighted view of preparedness is imperative. Both our resolution and our ability to defend ourselves must be both evident and permanent. While adjusting quickly to new situations and developments, our capability must also clearly reflect underlying constancy of purpose—for it is underlying constancy of purpose that faces us across the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

In closing, let me say that it should be the constant determination of all Americans to remain united and steadfast in support of our Nation and its highest interests in these critical times, and to ensure the survival of the freedom to differ which is a foundation stone of true unity and strength. I am confident we shall work together to this end, and doubly sure that the Christian community, concerned as it has always been with mankind's loftiest aspirations, will continue to lead the crusade for human understanding, mutual good will, and the liberty of mind and spirit on which our ultimate hopes for a just and lasting peace are based.

Let's Not Brand It Iowa's Folly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the necessity of bridges across the Mississippi River and other inland rivers on the interstate highway is obvious. Con-

struction of the Interstate System is moving right along, but the holdup on the bridges because of a controversy on heights promises to hamstring the plans for traffic flow across the continent and between population centers.

It is no more apparent than in my own State of Iowa and Iowa's sister State, Illinois. Construction of Interstate Highway 80 bridge across the Mississippi River at LeClaire, Iowa, would be under construction by now if our State highway commissions could come to an agreement on heights. We will soon have highway construction to the water's edge on both shores of the Mississippi and no bridge to connect them. This is deplorable. Congress should be concerned.

To elaborate my point, I call attention to an editorial which appeared in the January 17 issue of the Davenport (Iowa) Daily Times under the title, "Let's Not Brand It Iowa's Folly." Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

LET'S NOT BRAND IT IOWA'S FOLLY

Residents of Iowa and Illinois have every reason to deplore Iowa's decision to fight a delaying action on the LeClaire Bridge.

The State highway commission and its chief engineer, L. M. Clauson, have announced their determination to stand pat on a 45-foot elevation for the span which would carry Interstate Route 80 across the Mississippi River near LeClaire.

The result promises to be a time-taking procedure in the U.S. Senate which undoubtedly will result in legislation requiring a 55-foot elevation. Since the House already has adopted such a measure, with Members from the South leading the way, it may be expected their senatorial counterparts will demonstrate a similar disposition to serve the river shipping interests which have fought for the greater clearance.

The adamant position of the Iowa Highway Commission and its chief engineer is defeating the efforts of Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL, of Davenport. As Congress recessed late in 1961, he moved wisely to obtain agreement of the highway departments of the two States with the U.S. Engineers on the higher elevation. This was a matter of accepting the inevitable and proceeding on a basis of practicality.

Since the Federal Government supplies 90 percent of the money, Iowa's intent in blocking the project in protest against the higher cost in providing the greater elevation is a bit obscure. It has been suggested that when it becomes necessary to yield to congressional mandate, Iowa would be in a position to claim an additional allotment of Federal funds.

The most important thing is to build the bridge, whether the cost be nearer $8 or $10 million. The proposed routing of interstate traffic over the Iowa-Illinois Memorial Bridge between Moline and Bettendorf can be a stopgap at the best. The purposes of the nationwide system of superhighways do not include the jamming of traffic through the cities.

The more quickly specifications and design are settled so work can begin on the bridge near LeClaire, the earlier motor traffic will be able to use the Interstate System with its extensions to Iowa City, Des Moines, and on across the State.

The sooner the Iowa Highway Commission and its chief engineer become realistic in this issue, the more quickly will the best interests of Iowa and Illinois be served.

The Nation's Greatest Threat: Gold Outflow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, at a time when concern for the future well-being of this great country permeates the thinking of every Member of Congress and increasingly of the American people, I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following significant analysis and warning of an outstanding national economist, the former Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Maurice Stans. Mr. Stans' long experience and intimate knowledge of the American economy are in themselves compelling reasons for granting serious consideration to the following expressed warning. His analysis, as it appeared in today's Washington Post, is as follows:

GOLD OUTFLOW, NOT BERLIN OR CONGO, IS NATION'S GREATEST THREAT

(By Maurice Stans)

The greatest threat to our Nation today is not Berlin. Nor is it Vietnam or the Congo or Laos. It is the precarious situation of our balance of international payments and with it the potential erosion of world confidence in the dollar. President Kennedy's state of the Union message, by its emphasis on foreign trade, made this evident.

The balance of payments problem is not a complex matter to understand, as many people seem to believe. It is in fact quite elementary. Americans and the American Government spend a lot of money overseas every year to import goods, travel, investments, maintain troops and give aid. We have not been able to induce the other countries to spend all of those dollars back with us. Instead, they hold the unspent difference in bank accounts and in claims against us that will have to be settled some day with goods or gold.

In the 3 years 1958 to 1960 our oversea spending and investing exceeded the inflow of our dollars at the average rate of $3.7 billion a year. Right now the net debt we owe to other countries on short-term demand is $18 billion. To pay this we have a little less than $17 billion in gold, but we already have pledged $12 billion of that to back up our money in circulation here at home. We could not pay all our current foreign debts if they were all demanded at once.

Khrushchev's pronouncements have regularly claimed that our capitalist system would go down under its own weaknesses. The most grave and chronic risk we now face is that we will not be able to extricate ourselves from our present predicament, which is of our own making. But the causes are easier to see than the cure.

The Kennedy administration is exerting strong efforts to fight a winning battle, as did Eisenhower. In this, it deserves support. But the unfavorable conditions are cumulative, and only titanic and unceasing work will reverse the trend and save us from a major setback.

Eisenhower fully recognized the seriousness of the problem. Treasury Secretary Anderson repeatedly urged that the strong nations of Europe should be required to contribute a larger share to their own and the free world's military defense, so as to permit a reduction in our foreign aid and our oversea costs. This plea was dramatized by the trip Anderson and Dillon made to Germany late in 1960, but the effort had been going on long before that behind the scenes.

In 1959 Commerce Department Secretary Mueller initiated a major program to increase American exports and to encourage foreign travel in the United States, but he was frustrated by the unwillingness of the Congress to appropriate the funds needed. The Defense Department laid down rules to reduce the number of dependents going to military posts abroad. Treasury proposed reducing the duty-free exemption to returning tourists from $500 to $100 and made other proposals to stem the outflow of gold. Above all Eisenhower recognized that the security of our position depended on maintaining confidence in our money, and he fought hard to keep the budget in balance and to demonstrate good fiscal housekeeping to our oversea creditors.

These efforts temporarily stopped the flow of gold, but they did not halt the growth of the unfavorable balance.

Since last January 20 President Kennedy and Secretary Dillon have carried on and enlarged the campaigns to encourage exports overseas and foreign travel in the United States. The Congress enacted the reduction in duty-free customs allowance to returning tourists. A new insurance plan has been announced by the Export-Import Bank to reduce the risks of loss on foreign export credits. West Germany and several other countries came through with $650 million of advance payments that Secretary Anderson had urged them to make on their postwar assistance loans.

The first 6 months of 1961 went well. Exports were up imports decreased as a result of our slight recession and the advance debt payments to the Treasury were enough to show almost an equilibrium for the period. But it is now apparent that this was only temporary improvement. The fundamental causes of imbalance had not been removed, and the actions to date were inadequate. Reducing the duty exemptions was more psychological than real, for example, as it helps to the extent of only $100 million or so a year.

Also, not all the administration's actions in the first 6 months of 1961 were toward tightening. The Defense Department withdrew the limitations on oversea dependents almost immediately to placate the military. Kennedy's proposals to increase the dollars paid out on foreign programs were defeated in the Congress, but heavy future commitments are involved in the Peace Corps and the mushrooming Alliance for Progress in Latin America. Since June imports have increased to record peaks. The deficit in the balance of payments for the second half of 1961 was again at the rate of $3 billion a year, and for all of 1961 would have been close to $2.5 billion except for the nonrecurring German debt payment. There are no present reasons to expect that 1962 will be better. The claims against our gold will grow.

In all of 1961 we lost $800 million in gold, and our reserve is at the lowest point since 1939. The claims against it are at the highest in history.

Secretary Dillon's job is to see that our oversea creditors increase their spending of dollars here. If he fails in this, he must persuade them to leave their money here, not to demand payment in gold. Decisive measures and continuing actions are required and can be expected. Some of them will be outlined in a later article.

President Kennedy's place in history will suffer badly if his administration doesn't solve this crisis of chronic imbalance. To miss or to default is to invite ruinous inflation and subsequent devaluaton and their humiliating consequences. Khrushchev's experts are surely watching the outcome with eager anticipation. Everything depends on finding the answer while there is yet confidence in the future of the dollar. In the meantime, under this pressure, we are certain to see the decline of the early 1961 gospels of economic growthmanship and unlimited Federal spending, and that is all to the good.

Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HJALMAR C. NYGAARD

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, Americans of Ukrainian descent are today celebrating the 44th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence. It provides a proper occasion for the people of the United States to demonstrate their close ties with the Ukrainian nation, and their quest for freedom and independence. Although they have been oppressed for over 250 years—first by czars, and now by commissars—they still firmly hold the hope of eventual freedom and independence for their beloved land. Their hopes are strengthened in the knowledge that the United States supports their aspirations for liberty. They can be certain of our friendship. We will not rest until the yoke of Communist despotism is lifted from the shoulders of the Ukrainian people.

Anyone familiar with history of the Ukrainian people must be inspired by their relentless struggle to remain free. If we reflect for a few moments on that history, we will be encouraged to double our efforts in the fight against Communist imperialism. We will also achieve a deeper insight into the nature of the Communist threat facing us.

After the overthrow of the czarist government in Russia, Ukrainian leaders saw an opportunity to free their country from foreign domination. These leaders organized a central council in Kiev which has since been called the first modern Ukrainian Government. While attempts were being made to aline the Ukrainian nation with the Kerensky government on a free and equal plane, the Bolsheviks under Lenin seized control of Russia. The Red government in Moscow rejected the Ukrainian desire for freedom. Lenin ordered the Red army to attack the Ukraine. It occupied the city of Kiev in January of 1918 and began to carry out mass executions of Ukrainian leaders.

With German assistance, the Ukrainian people once against reasserted their right to liberty and expelled the Bolsheviks. On November 15, 1918, 4 days after the armistice of World War I, the Ukrainian people revived the previously suppressed Ukrainian National Republic. One year later, in the wake of much hard work and sacrifice, the Ukrainian Government proclaimed the union of western Ukraine. That memorable day was January 22, 1919.

But the Soviet Union would not permit this beacon light of freedom to shine so closely to its borders. Again it attacked the Ukraine with the massive forces of the Red army. Although the Ukrainian people defended themselves bravely and to the limit of their material and human resources, the assault of the Red army proved to be too powerful. By force of arms the Soviet Union absorbed an independent and proud Ukraine.

The Ukrainian people have suffered a great deal under Communist dictatorship. They have known hunger and poverty. They have seen their nation's lands ravaged. They have felt the oppressive boot of Communist dictatorship. The suffering of the Ukrainian people provides us an example of fortitude and patience that we should follow in these bitter days of the cold war.

On this Ukrainian Independence Day we rededicate ourselves to continue the fight for freedom. If we are victorious—and, indeed, we must be—we will owe much to the Ukrainian people who have given us the courage to fight on.

One Hundred and Seventy-six More Petitions Calling on Congress To End the Red Mail Subsidy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have placed on the Clerk's desk 176 more petitions from persons throughout the country, calling on Congress to end the subsidy given Communist propaganda. For the information of our colleagues, may I say these petitions come from persons in the following areas and States: Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Puerto Rico, and Washington, D.C.

The time for the House of Representatives to act on this serious problem is fast approaching. Tomorrow the postal bill will be before the House. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee has included effective language to deal with Communist propaganda which enters this country.

I hope all Members will seriously consider the situation in which we are asked to approve higher postal rates for Americans, and I hope that my colleagues will agree with me that this is the time and place—if we must raise postal rates for our own people—to put an end to the subsidy given to Communist propaganda.

Government Support for the Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues I include two recent articles by my distinguished friend Mr. George W. Oakes. The first, from the Washington Star of November 19, 1961, concerns the fund-raising campaign for the National Cultural Center, which is being conducted under the direction of Mr. Roger L. Stevens. The other, from the Washington Star of December 17, 1961, discusses a number of currently pending legislative proposals to assist the arts, and includes a survey of existing state projects in support of the arts:

[From the Washington Star, Nov. 19, 1961]

CULTURE AND MONEY: A NECESSARY MIXTURE

(By George W. Oakes)

Roger L. Stevens, the new chairman of the National Cultural Center's Board of Trustees, long ago earned the reputation of not going into a deal unless he expected to close it. In this spirit, he has plunged into the task of raising $30 million for the cultural center.

As a good beginning, President Kennedy committed his prestige to the success of the center when he told its advisory committee Tuesday that "I would not want to be as intimately as I am in this unless I was sure it will be successful."

"I expect to spend most of my time in the next 6 months getting the fund-raising program on the road," Mr. Stevens said after the board's first meeting under his leadership. Those who worked with this lifelong Democrat on such large-scale money raising efforts as financing the two Stevenson campaigns are convinced that he will do the job. He is an ardent admirer of Adlai Stevenson.

Not only does the tall, unassuming New York real estate investor who bought and sold the Empire State Building bring to his new task keen financial acumen but also a devotion to the performing arts. As an ardent playgoer and one of Broadway's most successful producers, Mr. Stevens acquired a deep knowledge of all aspects of the theater. He has six productions currently before the footlights. His most popular Broadway shows at the moment are "The Caretaker" and "Mary, Mary."

AS A NAME PRODUCER

Mr. Stevens' fabulously successful Broadway career has been noted for quality productions that often tend toward the unconventional or serious type. He was instrumental in forming in 1951 the Playwrights Co. with Robert E. Sherwood whose hits have included such popular plays as "Tea and Sympathy." He also has backed classical productions like "Saint Joan" and "Peer Gynt." It was Stevens' initiative that was responsible for the first American presentation of the Shakespeare company from Stratford-on-Avon. He also had a lot to do with forming the Shakespeare repertory in Stratford, Conn. In an effort to raise theatrical standards in New York, Mr. Stevens had a big hand in organizing the Phoenix Theater off Broadway.

Not long ago his interest in encouraging drama throughout the country led him to urge the Ford Foundation to adopt its extensive program of substantial grants to unknown playwrights, directors, and pro-

ducers. The Arena Stage has been the chief Washington beneficiary of Ford philanthropy in the theater.

SYMPHONIES AND BALLET

But the stage also means opera, symphonic music, and ballet to him. He is a director of the Metropolitan Opera, an enthusiast for symphonic and chamber music and has a special appreciation of ballet which in some ways he likes best of all because it combines the three arts of theater, music, and the dance.

In deciding to scale down some of the earlier and grandiose plans for the center here, Mr. Stevens has decided to concentrate on a $30 million structure with three auditoriums, one for opera, one for theater, and one for concerts. Therefore new architectural plans will have to be prepared. Quality, not size, will be the standard in determining the plan for the opera house, for example, which Mr. Stevens thinks should have fewer seats than New York's Lincoln Center. One concept to be dispensed with is the proposal for a grand salon and hall of the States for the reception of official dignitaries.

UNIVERSITY THEATER GROUPS

The word "national" in the cultural center's title has an importance for Mr. Stevens as it does for President Kennedy. Both conceive of it as an artistic showcase for the entire country—a dignified locale where outstanding theatrical, musical, ballet, and other artistic organizations from all parts of the United States can present their works in a national setting.

For example, Mr. Stevens points out that thousands of theatrical groups, 800 symphony orchestras, 70 opera companies, 211 ballet companies and 14 choral groups exist throughout the Nation. Various university theatrical groups of high quality, now confined to their own campus, should have an opportunity to play before a national audience. By bringing the best of these to the National Cultural Center in Washington, local performing groups would have a greater incentive and the center would thus become an active part of hundreds of American communities. Nor is it planned that the center present only highbrow performers. The fund-raising plan accepted last Tuesday expands the definition of culture to include jazz, rhythm, blues and folk songs.

Although it is expected that local organizations like the National Symphony, Opera Society and Washington Ballet Co., will use the center, Mr. Stevens is not contemplating a separate fund to subsidize these and other groups so that ticket prices could be lowered to attract a wider audience. He considers the financing of these local musical organizations the responsibility of the citizens of Washington. In fact, he is not worried about the question of finding audiences here which has troubled some critics of the center.

He points out, on the basis of his wide experience in producing plays, that the proposed theater, for example, can be filled throughout the year because the National Theater cannot handle all the shows that want to play it. The new chairman contends that not only has Metropolitan Washington a great potential audience for cultural performances but that the 7 million visitors a year who come to the Nation's Capital find very little choice for an evening's entertainment except movies which they can see at home. The question of ticket prices does not worry the new chairman for he feels that if the attractions are good, the public will attend. However, he does expect to offer as low a house rent as possible so prices can be kept down.

WAS A FORD WORKER

Price means something to Mr. Stevens for he was among those who suffered during the depression. Although his father had been a well-to-do real estate man in Detroit, and Roger attended Choate School and the University of Michigan, his father lost his money in the early 1930's. Roger found whatever jobs he could and for a time worked on the Ford assembly line. During this period and later, he developed a love of fine literature. He went into it with accustomed Stevens vigor, reading a hundred books a year such as Shakespeare, Shaw, Proust, Mann, and Wolfe.

Although the congressional grant of land to build the cultural center is the largest domestic subsidy the Federal Government has made to the performing arts in many years, Mr. Stevens does not look upon this as the entering wedge for permanent Federal aid to the arts. In fact, he is rather dubious about this concept which is being pushed on Capitol Hill by Senators JAVITS, HUMPHREY, and PELL, and Representative FRANK THOMPSON, Jr. Mr. Stevens fears the dangers involved in his country of putting the Federal Government in the position of subsidizing opera, music, ballet, etc. He doesn't see how Federal funds could be allocated without interminable arguments and is somewhat skeptical of any American adaptation of the British Arts Council which has been operating for many years. Also, in the present political temper of Congress, he doubts whether such a proposal would ever get through the House.

THE PERSONAL APPROACH

According to former associates in fund-raising operations, Mr. Stevens' approach is an intensely personal one. Through his long experience in real estate and theatrical deals, he has a vast number of contacts all over the country. "I've seen him call a list of 20 or 30 people," one friend remarked. "He knows the people who are interested and how to approach them. He's amiable, persuasive, and the money comes in. He is one of the few nonorganizing businessmen I know. He hates administrative detail. But he's very good in forming committees. One great capacity is his remarkable memory for details. He never takes notes. He's an incurable fund raiser."

Though one of the top real estate men in the country and a financier of the southwest redevelopment in Washington, Mr. Stevens has no such ideas for the area around the cultural center. He sincerely feels that, as he put it, "so much money has been given to extend our longevity. I think it's about time that more stress was put on the humanities. We don't want to live longer if we are only cabbages."

Why did he take on the fund-raising task?

"Well, when the President asks you to do something, you don't lightly turn it down."

[From the Washington Star, Dec. 17, 1961]

A STATE-BY-STATE SURVEY—THE OUTLOOK FOR FEDERAL AID TO ARTS

(By George W. Oakes)

Secretary of Labor Goldberg's call for Government subsidies of all performing arts in this country gives an impetus to a movement already started in the last session of Congress.

The idea of Federal aid was even advanced—in a slightly different form—by President Kennedy who expressed in one of his campaign speeches last year "full sympathy with the proposal for a federally supported foundation to provide encouragement and opportunity to nonprofit private and civic groups in the performing arts."

In Congress, House hearings were held during the last session on bills sponsored by Representative FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., Democrat, of New Jersey, and supported by Chairman POWELL of the House Education and Labor Committee, that would establish a Federal Advisory Council on the arts and also authorize Federal grants in the amount of $100,000 to each State. Similar grant legislation has been introduced in the Senate by Senators CLARK, HUMPHREY, and PELL.

THE ADVISORY COUNCIL

The plan for a Federal Advisory Council (which Secretary Goldberg endorsed) originally recommended by President Eisenhower in 1955, passed the Senate a year later. At present, 14 States have an arts council, commission, or similar agency.

Proponents for Federal aid to the arts feel that such assistance will be meaningful only if Federal funds are made available. They feel that an Advisory Council would be useful but relatively ineffective.

The congressional proposal for States grants is based largely on the view that Congress will approve Government funds for the arts only if each State can share in the money. Its supporters also hope that a small injection of Federal financing will stimulate the States to increase their own efforts in the field which are more widespread than is generally known.

The State grant bills are very extensive and would allow Federal funds to be used for construction of museums and memorials, preservation of historic sites, art training programs, as well as aid for existing and new performing and visual art activities. Critics of this approach contend that, on the basis of the way the States are now spending their own money for aid to the arts, too much Federal assistance would be devoted to buildings and too little to the major arts such as music, ballet, drama, and opera.

Here is the way a representative selection of States now spend their own funds on the arts:

A STATE SURVEY

Alabama: For the 2 years ending next September 30, out of a total appropriation of $169,540 the largest amount or $91,040 went to the State Department of Archives and History and no funds to the performing and visual arts.

California: State funds in 1960 were devoted almost entirely to arts and crafts exhibits, historical monuments and buildings, restored gold-rush towns, Indian museums, and the Hearst castle at San Simeon.

Florida: The three major State cultural agencies are the Ringling Art Museum at Sarasota, the Florida State Museum, and the Stephen Foster Memorial Commission. For all these the State appropriated about $250,000 in 1958–59.

Illinois: This State spent $250,000 on its State museum in 1959 and nothing on performing arts.

Indiana: $370,000 was appropriated in 1960 only for memorials and monuments.

Kentucky: Kentucky is one of the few States that provided State money during 1960–62 for the performing or visual arts. One hundred six thousand dollars was made available for public concerts, especially for school children, by the Louisville Symphony Orchestra and $50,000 for murals in the University of Kentucky Medical Center.

Maryland: In 1960 Maryland appropriated $25,000 for the Baltimore Symphony Orchestra out of about $55,000 for cultural activities.

Massachusetts: A State agency has contracted with a local drama group for the production of plays in an open-air summer theater.

New York: New York established in 1960 a State advisory council on the arts to develop ways in which the State could encourage the fine and performing arts. The New York State Arts Council has requested $450,000 in State funds to aid opera, ballet, symphony orchestras, drama, and traveling art exhibits.

North Carolina: North Carolina appropriated $30,000 during 1960–61 for the North Carolina Symphony Orchestra out of more than $650,000 for artistic and cultural activi-

ties. Most funds were spent on the State's museums of history and fine arts.

Rhode Island: Rhode Island was the only State which made more funds available for the performing arts than for historical societies or State museums. Fourteen thousand dollars was appropriated in 1960 for free concerts for the general public and public school students, $7,000 for free public operatic performances, $2,500 for the Providence Philharmonic Orchestra, and $7,500 for Irish and Newport music festivals.

Virginia: $271,000 was appropriated in 1960 for the State Museum of Fine Arts including traveling exhibits of paintings and $15,000 for the Barter Theater of Abingdon.

HOW THE MONEY IS USED

This summary showing the distribution of State funds, which includes all those spent on music and drama, but not all that are devoted to museums, historical societies, monuments, etc., indicates that the great preponderance of State money is not used for the major performing and visual arts. Thus it seems reasonable to conclude that, if the States are given Federal funds to be spent at their own discretion, this pattern will be continued and the living arts will receive in most States only a small proportion of the Federal funds provided.

President Kennedy's campaign proposal of a federally supported foundation is oddly enough being sponsored most actively in Congress by Republican Senator JAVITS, of New York, who has been advocating this approach for many years.

The Javits bill would establish a U.S. Arts Foundation for the performing and visual arts with an initial budget of $5 million and $10 million annually thereafter. Senator JAVITS' major purpose is to bring the arts of theatrical and musical performances, opera, dance, ballet and choral recitals to those people throughout this country who reside in areas where there is no opportunity to see and hear such live performances. Convinced that a brick-and-mortar approach would be a mistake, he would concentrate on a living arts program.

In order to avoid local pressure groups, the proposed Arts Foundation would form perhaps three or four regional panels in each major arts field. These panels would decide the share of Federal funds to be given to each area for each form of art. For example, the committees of professional and public members making this determination would allocate so much money for opera in the West, or music in the South, and also judge the artistic merit of works to be presented.

The Arts Foundation, which would be a separate Government agency, could receive private donations and would be authorized to make loans as well as grants.

In explaining his proposal Senator JAVITS points out that it is "clearly analogous to the British and Canadian Arts Councils." In Britain, Government subsidy to the arts council has risen from some $650,000 in 1946, when it was established, to $4.2 million in 1960. This amounts to about 10 cents per person and is proportionately much lower than in other major European countries and even than smaller ones like Sweden, Denmark, Belgium, Holland, and Switzerland.

THE ARTS FOUNDATION

Canada formed its arts council in 1957 with $100 million split into two equal public funds—one mainly for capital assistance to universities to expand their buildings for the arts, humanities, and social sciences and the other using income of about $2.5 million per year for aid to individuals and organizations in these fields.

Music receives the largest annual Government grant of about $350,000 mainly for 10 major symphony orchestras—enabling them to perform away from their home city.

Attempting to enlist the widest possible Senate backing, Senator PELL would like to set up an Arts Foundation with a $10 million annual appropriation but allow it to grant up to $5.2 million per year to the States on a matching basis. Although Senator JAVITS does not object to this plan, he fears that it might spread the effort too thinly. Senator CLARK favors elimination of grants to the States for construction in order to concentrate the small amount of Federal money on the living arts.

Hon. Sam Rayburn

SPEECH

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the most divine and most sublime compensation of life is that luxury of enjoyment which comes only from duty well and faithfully performed. Certainly our late beloved Speaker enjoyed all the sweetest compensations of a life well spent.

I enjoyed his friendship for more than a quarter of a century and I shall cherish the memory of our moments together throughout the remaining days of my life.

SAM RAYBURN lived magnificently and by his life and labor he enriched the world. In the golden hour of his great life he passed from the Shores of Sound to the Great Realm of Silence.

Prompted by the impulses of sincere friendship, I join with my colleagues in paying a brief tribute to the man who meant so much to all of us and gave so much to the welfare of the people of the world. He will long be remembered by the simplicity of his life, the nobility of his soul, and the eloquence of his actions. By his life he exemplified all the fine and tender virtues of true manhood. He wove no illusions of grandeur on the looms of life. His life was a life of rich and rare reason. His character was a tower of strength, and his heart the core of his greatness. From his lofty abode he is looking down on this place in which he labored so long.

Although the great Beethoven charmed the world with the majesty and beauty of his "Moonlight Sonata," becoming deaf, he continued to compose the world's greatest symphonies. Although he was never able to hear the melody of his greatest composition, his "Ninth Symphony," it will live on in the music world forever. Although he was never able to hear the applause of the world—when he came to his last struggle with death, his last words were: "I shall hear in Heaven."

So today, Mr. SAM "shall hear in Heaven" the words of praise uttered here by his colleagues.

Those of us who are left behind can be comforted by the thought that we knew and loved him, and we know that a humble mound of grass in the land he loved so well marks the last resting place of our honest and faithful friend.

I extend my warm and sincere sympathy to all of his loved ones.

ADA Impact on Kennedy Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, Robert T. Hartmann, Washington bureau chief of the Los Angeles Times, has written a series of articles concerning the history of Americans for Democratic Action and the impact of this group of "collectivists" on the Kennedy administration. The series has already received wide attention; however, because the first two articles supplement excerpts from "America: Listen," by Frank L. Kluckhohn, which I placed in the Appendix of today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I think they too should be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for this day. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this as follows:

THE ADA: ITS IMPACT ON THE NEW FRONTIER

(By Robert T. Hartmann)

WASHINGTON.—"I'm not a liberal at all," protested John F. Kennedy soon after becoming a Senator in 1953. "I never joined the Americans for Democratic Action * * * I'm not comfortable with those people."

Eight years ago, American liberals were not very comfortable with the young Senator, either. Taking their cues from Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, honorary national chairman of ADA, most of their hearts belonged to Adlai in that bitter winter of Republican restoration. They also deeply distrusted the open association of Senator Kennedy's rich father and that other Joe, ADA's particular pet hate, Senator McCarthy, Republican, of Wisconsin.

Last May, as the 14th national convention of Americans for Democratic Action met in the Mayflower Hotel to celebrate the recapture of Washington by the Democrats, National ADA Chairman Samuel H. Beer reported that "ADA can be proud of the role it played in the election of John F. Kennedy."

LETTER OF WELCOME

And for the first time in 8 years there was a letter of welcome to Washington on White House stationery hailing "liberals as today's minutemen leading the way" in the "democratic social revolution as against the revolution of nihilism and totalitarianism."

Professor Beer, of Harvard's department of government, credited a 21-percent upsurge in ADA membership (to about 50,000) to "our new respectability, with so many of our leaders prominent in the New Frontier."

The roster of past and present members of ADA who occupy key appointive posts in the Kennedy administration is even more impressive because so few of them boarded the Kennedy bandwagon before Los Angeles, coming (as New York Post Editor and ADA Founder James Wechsler told the 400 delegates) "reluctantly and perhaps grudgingly to Mr. Kennedy's side."

Let us start with the White House, the pivot of power.

SPECIAL COURSE

Theodore C. Sorensen, 33, special counsel to the President and his closest confidant outside the family circle, was active in ADA's campus auxiliary, Students for Democratic Action, at the University of Nebraska, where he topped his class.

He later joined ADA, but told the Times he dropped all such affiliations, for Ken-

nedy's sake, five or so years ago. When Mr. Kennedy came fresh to the Senate he hired Sorensen on the recommendation of Senator PAUL DOUGLAS (Democrat, Illinois), and DOUGLAS' top aid, Frank W. McCulloch, both ADA founders. Since then Sorensen (who researched Mr. Kennedy's Pulitzer Prize book, "Profiles in Courage," and masterminded his presidential strategy) has been the President's alter ego.

Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., 43, administrative assistant to the President, is a former national ADA chairman, a current vice chairman, a founder of the organization and one of its most active and articulate phophets.

STEVENSON ADVISER

Also a Pulitzer winner, described by fellow ADAers as "the egghead's egghead," Harvard historian Schlesinger was a chief Stevenson adviser and speechwriter in 1952 and 1956. He joined the Kennedy braintrust in 1960 and wrote a cutting campaign tract against Vice President Nixon.

Harrison L. Wooford, special assistant to the President on civil rights, is a former ADA member. Operating in this area at the White House prior to his recent resignation was Frank D. Reeves, another ADAer, whose nomination by President Kennedy to be the first Negro Commissioner of the District of Columbia was withdrawn when it was disclosed his own District of Columbia taxes were in default.

At the State Department, ADA friends in and out of Government recently rallied around to save the key assignment of Under Secretary of State Chester Bowles, former price administrator, Connecticut Governor, Congressman, advertising executive, chairman of the 1960 Democratic Platform Committee and one of ADA's founding fathers.

Bowles' special assistant, Mrs. Katie Louchheim, formerly vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee, is a former ADA member, as are two Assistant Secretaries of State, ex-Michigan Gov. G. Mennen "Soapy" Williams (for African Affairs) and Philip H. Coombs (for Educational and Cultural Affairs). The U.S. representative on the United Nations Trusteeship Council, Jonathan B. Bingham, also is an ADA alumnus.

Two of President Kennedy's toughest ambassadorial assignments to crucial cold war battlegrounds went to longtime ADA policymakers. Harvard economics professor J. Kenneth Galbraith, who captained the intellectual backfield in the Kennedy campaign, went to India as the U.S. contact with Prime Minister Nehru, a fellow disciple of Keynesian economic theory. Galbraith was an ADA founder and former deputy of Bowles in OPA.

James Loeb, Jr., Ambassador to Peru, was also a founder and from 1947 to 1951 the full-time paid executive secretary of ADA. Before that, Loeb held the same position with a parent liberal group, Union for Democratic Action (UDA), set up in New York City before World War II to fight nazism and U.S. isolationism.

RECORD NOT CLEAR

Adlai Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, has a relationship with ADA that is tender and enduring but something less than formal marriage. The record is is unclear. ADA World, the official house organ, identified Stevenson as "one of the original founders of ADA" when he won the Illinois governorship in 1948, and as a presidential prospect 4 years later called him "a charter member of ADA." Stevenson's name does not appear on the list of founders submitted by ADA during a 1950 congressional lobbying probe, which I have taken as authoritative. And Stevenson himself wrote conservative Senator McCarran, Democrat, of Nevada, in 1952: "As for ADA, I have never been a member of it."

In an effort to resolve this contradiction, the Times asked both ADA headquarters and Ambassador Stevenson for clarification. His U.N. assistant, Clayton Fritchie, replied by wire: "Stevenson out of country. My personal recollection is that he was not a member of either." (ADA or IVI, its Illinois affiliate which drafted him into politics.)

National ADA Director Violet M. Gunther stated: "Adlai Stevenson has never been a member of ADA. He did attend one convention as a nonvoting guest and has, of course, spoken to ADA meetings." He has had ADA's warm support in both his presidential campaigns.

A FORMER MEMBER

In the realm of labor policy, ADA holds some strategic command posts. Secretary of Labor Goldberg is a former member, and President Kennedy named the chairman of ADA's National Executive Committee, McCulloch, as the new chairman of the National Labor Relations Board.

Assistant Secretary of Labor (for international labor affairs) is George L. P. Weaver, another ADA founder and former head of the CIO Committee to Abolish Discrimination. Though President Kennedy did not appoint Weaver until July to succeed George Cabot Lodge, the son of his oldtime Massachusetts rival and 1960 campaign foe, his choice was frontpaged in the January issue of ADA World—a 6-month scoop.

WOMEN'S BUREAU DIRECTOR

Assistant Secretary of Labor and Director of the Women's Bureau is Mrs. Esther Peterson, an ADA member. So is the Labor Department solicitor, Charles Donahue.

In the key New Frontier Department of Health, Education, and Welfare ADA is represented by Secretary Ribicoff, Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs Wilbur J. Cohen, and Mrs. Jim G. Aken, congressional liaison officer—all former members.

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, former Minnesota Governor and protege of ADA founder and vice chairman Senator HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, is an active ADA'er. Undersecretary Charles Murphy, an old New Dealer and Truman aid; the Deputy Administrator of Price Supports, Robert G. Lewis; and Director John A. Baker of Agricultural Credit Services are all ADA alumni.

Undersecretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler and Assistant Postmaster General Frederic C. Belen (in charge of postal operations) are both former ADA members. So is Director Charles H. Stoddard of the Interior Department's technical review staff. The Solicitor General of the United States, Archibald Cox, is a current ADA member. So is the special assistant to the director of the Civil Rights Commission, William Taylor, since 1959 ADA's paid lobbyist on Capitol Hill.

No top appointments in the Commerce and Defense Departments are held by ADAers, according to ADA headquarters, but the U.S. Ambassador to NATO, Thomas K. Finletter, is a former Air Force Secretary and former member of the ADA's national executive board.

President Kennedy's top-ranking Negro appointee, Housing and Home Finance Administrator Robert C. Weaver; his deputy administrator, Jack T. Conway, and the HHFA commissioner of community facilities, Sidney H. Woolner, are all ADA alumni.

FPC CHIEF, TOO

Other ADAers named to powerful independent regulatory agencies are Federal Power Commissioner Howard Morgan, Federal Trade Commissioner Philip Elman, and former Kansas Gov. George Docking, Director of the Export-Import Bank.

This Who's Who of New Frontier figures, which has been carefully checked with Mrs. Gunther, ADA's national director, and in doubtful cases with the individual concerned, is not exhaustive.

Nor is it cited to prove or disprove that Americans for Democratic Action is (1) a conspiracy to take over the U.S. Government, or (2) an extraordinary magnet for administrative talent.

It can be taken as reasonable proof, however, that President Kennedy has clearly overcome the discomfort he expressed about liberals and the ADA 8 years ago.

But when any 14-year-old organization numbering no more than 50,000 citizens, with a budget of less than $200,000 a year, regarded as an albatross by many Democrats and as anathema by most Republicans, holding no I O U from the presidential winner for his nomination—when any such organization can staff a new administration with 3 White House aids, 3 Cabinet officers, and 31 key administrators in vital areas of finance, labor, civil rights, public works, power, housing and foreign policy, it is worth looking into.

VIEWS FAR APART ON AIMS OF ADA

(By Robert T. Hartmann)

WASHINGTON.—What is ADA—Americans for Democratic Action?

It is easiest to tell briefly what it is not. It is not the American Dental Association, a common error which annoys both groups.

It is not a secret society nor a subversive organization, by law or traditional American ground rules. It is not a political party and not, as commonly believed, an appendage of the Democratic Party.

By its own letterhead definition ADA is, "a national, independent liberal organization" and by its constitution ADA proclaims itself "an organization for progressives, dedicated to the achievement of freedom and economic security for all people everywhere, through education and democratic political action."

OPEN TO ANY CREED

It bars Communists, Fascists, and all totalitarians from membership, but is otherwise open to "any person of any race, religion, color, or national origin" with $5 annual dues and the approval of ADA's national board.

According to a 1958 Senate Republican policy committee staff study ADA is "a group of leftwing Democrats who hope, as either the senior or junior partner of a labor alliance, to capture the Democratic Party and bring about a system which would amount to national socialism in America."

In the sympathetic but sardonic view of a liberal Democrat of impeccable credentials, who never has joined ADA, it is "an organization whose whole is less than the sum of its parts * * * very dominated by Fabian ideas * * * the 'thunder on the left,' which has become a squeak, leaving an alumni association of old New Dealers who hold annual reunions to reminisce * * * without any political influence except in Pennsylvania."

To the Communist Daily Worker (1948) the fledgling ADA was "the imperialists' fifth column inside the liberal and labor movement" and in 1949 "the confused liberalism that makes up the mish-mash called ADA."

To the 1961 California Senate Subcommittee on Un-American Activities ADA "is in no sense a Communist front, or in any way subversive [but] some of the techniques employed by ADA leaders, and the fact that it has opposed with considerable vigor almost the entire loyalty-security program of the Government * * * have made it the target of considerable criticism."

Clearly, no consensus here. So let us begin at the beginning.

DREARY WINTER

April 1947 was coming in with dogwood blossoms to brighten what had been for

New Deal Democrats a dreary winter of discontent when ADA was born in the old Willard Hotel in Washington.

Republicans and Communists were giving them double trouble. Franklin D. Roosevelt only 2 years in his Hyde Park grave had left them orphans in the postwar storm. They were unsure of Mr. Truman, whose liberalism extended mainly to old cronies who were no more egghead than he.

Sound of lung and full of fight, ADA was born with four voices at a press conference March 30, 1947. The chairman was Wilson Wyatt, ex-housing expediter, later to be Adlai Stevenson's campaign manager; another old New Dealer was Leon Henderson, Chairman of President Truman's Council of Economic Advisers; the younger spokesmen were F.D.R.'s namesake son and the new mayor of Minneapolis, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

HUMPHREY, bursting full blown on the national scene, did most of the talking. He described ADA's aims as "militant political action, from the grassroots right through to the national level, without turning into a third-party movement." He stressed ADA's domestic program.

"There seems to be a phobia [sic] in progressive organizations to wrap themselves up in pretzel knots on foreign policy only," HUMPHREY told the reporters.

At the outset ADA stressed its "independent" (not nonpartisan) character, but Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., prophetically observed "from the way the Republicans are legislating in Congress, we will be supporting many, many more Democrats than Republicans."

Later ADA testimony suggests that it was formed to purge Moscow-line Communists from the ranks of patriotic liberals. Contemporary news accounts indicate that the election in November 1946, of a Republican 80th Congress triggered the reaction. Certainly Congress became ADA's first concern when it cast off wartime economic controls (run by some ADA founders) and sought to curb labor unions (run by others).

RED CONCERN REAL

The anti-Communist concern was certainly real in ADA's formative years, though taking second rank in the 250 organizers resolution "barring Fascists and Communists from membership." In retrospect, Harvard Historian Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., now a presidential assistant, termed 1947 "the watershed at which American liberalism began to base itself once again on a solid conception of man and history."

Among the American liberals who stood at the great divide that year, 144 had met in January, led by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt and two of her children, "to map a campaign for restoring the influence of liberalism in the national and international policies of the United States." Others, including the U.S. Communist Party, formed up around the tattered banner of ex-Vice President Henry Wallace who—had F.D.R. not dumped him in 1944—would have become President of the United States.

Sunday we listed the ADA founding fathers who now surround President Kennedy in the White House, 3 Cabinet posts and more than 30 strategic administration appointments. Other well-remembered ADA founders include the first woman U.S. Ambassador, Eugenie Anderson; War Labor Board Chairman William H. Davis; Mrs. Roosevelt's protege, Joseph P. Lash; Will Rogers, Jr., son of the humorist, and Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., Washington lawyer who has always been ADA's lodestar.

LABOR FOUNDERS LISTED

Among the labor union founders were ADA Vice Chairman Walter Reuther of the UAW, CIO; A. J. Hayes of the independent Machinists; CIO Secretary-Treasurer James B. Carey; David Dubinsky of the ILGWU, AFL, and many more. Over the years unions have contributed one-third of ADA's funds.

As champions of civil rights there were the late Walter White of the NAACP, Morris Ernst of the ACLU, and George L. P. Weaver (now HHFA chief) of the CIO antidiscrimination committee. The liberal clergy was represented by Theologian Reinhold Niebuhr, Methodist Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, Rabbi Milton Steinberg, the Reverend George Higgins of the National Catholic Welfare Council, and Unitarian Dr. A. Powell Davies.

COLLEGE CONTINGENT

From Congress came Senators Lehman, Democrat, of New York, and Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois, and Representative Andrew Biemiller, Democrat, of Wisconsin, later to be ADA's lobbyist and now the AFL–CIO representative on Capitol Hill. Another founder was ex-Representative H. Jerry Voorhis, Democrat, of California, just unseated by an unknown Republican, Richard Nixon. Representative Chet Holifield, Democrat, of California, is listed as an ADA founder but told the Times he was not.

The college contingent was less conspicuous at ADA's birth than now, but Schlesinger and his Harvard colleague, J. Kenneth Galbraith (now Ambassador to India), were present.

Also on hand were many officers of organizations that preceded ADA—the Friends of Democracy, American Veterans Committee, U.S. Students Assembly, Union for Democratic Action, Independent Voters of Illinois, and like outfits in New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Michigan (where ADA strength is still concentrated).

Most significant in view of ADA's avowed political aims was the considerable number of influential editors, columnists and Washington correspondents who attended its birth.

Listed among ADA founders are Joseph and Stewart Alsop, Marquis Childs, Kenneth Crawford, Robert Bendiner, Barry Bingham, the late Elmer Davis, Edgar Ansel Mowrer, Nelson Poynter, the late Tom Stokes, Palmer Hoyt, Hodding Carter, John and Anna Eleanor Boettiger, Aubrey Williams, Monroe Sweetland and James Wechsler.

This seemingly heterogeneous assembly was drawn together by alarm at the off-year Republican success in Congress, fear that the fruits of the New Deal were withering amidst the embarrassing exposures of Communist agents masquerading as liberals in high Federal jobs, and the all but universal expectation of a Republican President in 1948.

WARTIME COLLABORATION

The wartime collaboration with Communist Russia and its U.S. branch was definitely over—by the Communists' choice—and the ADA was first blooded in savage battle with the Wallacites, whom they denounced as a Moscow-inspired lot. ADA backed the Truman doctrine for Greece and Turkey (somewhat dubiously at first, preferring United Nations action and economic over military aid, as ADA still does).

But ADA'ers as liberals were unhappy with Mr. Truman, despite Mrs. Roosevelt's early counsel not to work outside the Democratic fold.

On April 10, 1948, ADA's national board urged the Democrats to nominate either General Eisenhower or Supreme Court Justice Douglas for President. But as neither proved willing, ADA endorsed the Truman-Barkley ticket rather unenthusiastically.

GOING CONCERN

By 1950, ADA was a going concern with 32,000 members in 123 chapters located in 30 States, plus some 5,000 Students for Democratic Action members on over 100 campuses. According to ADA officials, its total membership has grown some, to 45,000 in 1955 and an estimated 50,000 today—but the latest sworn Post Office circulation statement of the monthly ADA World, which goes to every dues-paying member, was only 18,600.

ADA chapters have consolidated and closed down to about 100 in 16 States. After a spurt during the postwar GI Bill period, student groups, now called ADA's Campus Division, have dwindled to 22 chapters with some 2,000 members, largely in the east.

The formal organization and key policy-making officials of ADA have remained remarkably the same throughout its 14 year history. Its national officers are virtually all founders or early members and alternate in musical chairmanship and vice-chairmanships, though so many have been drafted by the New Frontier, some new blood may be needed.

The paid staff of 15 that operates national ADA headquarters in a converted town house at 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, has more turnover. Mrs. Violet M. Gunther, national ADA director, has worked her way up from the outset of ADA's activities, and appears to run an extremely efficient though underpaid and unpretentious office.

TOP SALARY $175

(The top ADA salary reported to Congress as required by the Corrupt Practices and Lobbying Laws was $175 a week and the total payroll for 1960 was $61,990, roughly one-third of ADA's expenditures. The rest goes mainly for routine office expenses, printing, mailing, telephone, telegraph, and travel costs.)

Only contributions of $10 or more are required by law, so ADA's financial filings do not include the $5 annual membership dues ($7.50 for couples to preserve domestic tranquillity) and do not give a complete picture of its fiscal situation. Rarely in recent years have contributions from individuals or labor unions (the UAW and ILGWU are the most regular) exceeded $10,000 and $1,000 to $2,000 gifts are more frequent. The only political expenditures exceeding $100 reported for 1960 were $1,000 to the New York ADA chapter in September and $150 to Representative Charles Porter, Democrat of Oregon. Porter lost.

Union subsidies to ADA have dried up some since National Chairman Biddle testified in a 1950 probe that labor support, essential to any liberal group's success, made up one-third of ADA's revenue. Last year ADA reported union contributions of $33,833 out of a total (extra large because of the campaign year) of $179,683 excluding dues.

Labor's decreasing interest is partly due to concentration on its own political action committees, partly to some unionists' disenchantment with ultra-liberal ADA policies such as caused David McDonald's steelworkers to drop their cash support and President Sal B. Hoffman of the Upholsterers International Union, one of ADA's founders, to resign in 1951 over the Red China issue.

ADA performs a meticulous but confusing job of double bookkeeping to steer clear of the Taft-Hartley law's prohibition of political contributions by labor unions. This was explored by the 1950 House lobbying hearings, still a useful source on ADA's birth and behavior, and sharply criticized by the GOP minority including Representative CHARLES HALLECK, Republican of Indiana, now minority leader.

NONPOLITICAL FUND

Union donations go into a nonpolitical fund and all others into a regular fund used for purposes ADA considers to be political. The 1960 congressional files show contributions to ADA totaling $179,683, including $33,833 from unions. From these nonpolitical funds $14,232 helped make up a total staff payroll of $61,991 and $18,912 was spent for educational and housekeeping purposes. Regular expenditures ran to $147,607

and ADA's total spending reported was $180,751.

The bonanza year for ADA contributions reported to Congress was 1954, when $205,-273 came in. The peak period for union gifts was $66,824 in 1952.

Correction of Military Records

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, on January 10, 1962, I introduced H.R. 9551, a bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code in order to extend for a period of 10 years the time during which military records may be corrected.

In connection with this bill I asked for comments from the American Legion. Today, I received a letter from Mr. John J. Corcoran, director, Rehabilitation Commission, the American Legion, setting forth salient facts that justify the enactment of this legislation.

The letter follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, D.C., January 17, 1962.

Hon. KENNETH A. ROBERTS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Recently your administrative aid asked that we furnish you with information and facts which, in our opinion, justified enactment of legislation to strike the delimiting date of October 25, 1961, from 10 United States Code 1552(b).

Discharge review boards and boards for correction of military and naval records have, since their creation by Congress, granted a considerable measure of relief to veterans who have applied for a review of their discharge or correction of their military or naval record. A summary of the accomplishments of these boards is given below. The correction of a military or naval record not involving a change of discharge or character of separation is not included in this tabulation.

Department of the Army:

Correction board, June 1947 to March 1957. Cases reviewed, 8,927; changes, 876.

Discharge review board, October 1944 to February 1957. Cases reviewed, 54,983; changes, 8,855.

Department of the Navy:

Correction board, April 1947 to April 1957. Cases reviewed, 6,279; changes, 826.

Discharge review board, January 1946 to March 1957. Cases reviewed, 41,699; changes, 9,337.

Department of the Air Force:

Correction board, June 1950 to April 1957. Cases reviewed, 1,374; changes, 102.

Discharge review board, June 1948 to April 1957. Cases reviewed, 15,779; changes, 1,093.

These figures include only those cases reviewed. They do not include those of which a review has not been requested. They do mean that many thousands of men and women have been issued discharges under less than honorable conditions. These carry a stigma—a life of unhappiness, rejection by industry, shame among friends and family, and an ultimate disadvantage to the Nation itself.

Every veteran should receive the type of discharge that he has earned and be entitled to such Federal benefits and standing in the community or Nation as flow from a separation or discharge under conditions other than dishonorable.

An extension of the time limitation for filing an application for review of discharge or separation or correction of a military or naval record can be justified on many points. Some of these are:

The authority granted review boards in the Department of Defense and in the Treasury Department to change the type of discharge issued or to correct a military or naval record gives Members of Congress respite from introducing many private bills and resolutions seeking relief for individual constituents.

Frequently it is learned that the veteran is not aware of an error in his record or that an injustice has been done him until years after separation from military or naval service. A need for a review of his discharge or correction of his record does not become apparent until an application is made for retirement, for employment, private or Federal, or for a Federal benefit based on service during a war period.

The age of most World War II and Korean conflict veterans is still quite young. Congress has provided benefits to which veterans may have entitlement when they become unemployed because of disability. This need will arise in their older age in most instances. A prerequisite to obtaining VA benefits is a discharge or release from the qualifying war period of service under conditions other than dishonorable. When the need arises, the delimiting date controlling applications for review or correction will have barred establishing entitlement.

Some veterans refrain from filing petitions for review or correction because of the stigma associated with the type of discharge or separation issued. Surviving dependents first learn of their nonentitlement to death benefits upon disallowance of their claim by the Veterans' Administration. This may occur years later.

Presidential pardons are slow, involving investigations with associated social stigma. The pardon does not alter the military or naval record.

Section 1552(b) of title 10, United States Code, states that a board may excuse a failure to file within 3 years after discovery of an error or an injustice if it finds it to be in the interest of justice. The Secretary of the Air Force, Eugene M. Zuckert, reporting to the Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, on H.R. 1168, 87th Congress, a bill to remove time limitations imposed for applying for correction of military records, review of discharges and dismissals, and review of decisions of retiring boards, said applications were not foreclosed by time limitations of the statute, and even when they became so, the board could waive failure to file a timely application in the interest of justice. The words "in the interest of justice," he said, are broad in their scope and intended to give the widest possible latitude for correction of errors and such words have no limited or technical meaning.

To date, however, our experiences have been that the boards are not liberally applying the authority contained in the phrase "in the interest of justice." Of approximately 40 cases submitted subsequent to the delimiting date, the Department of the Army and the Department of the Navy have yet to waive in a single case the failure to timely submit an application for correction of a military or naval record.

I sincerely hope you will find the above helpful in obtaining consideration and passage of legislation which will extend or remove the delimiting date in question. If I can be of further assistance in this matter please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. CORCORAN,
Director.

It's Time for Atlantic Alliance—Two Republicans Say Kennedy Set Sights Too Low

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, my conferences with government leaders in western Europe last October convince me that the issue of extension of our Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act provides both Congress and the President an opportunity to re-assert American leadership throughout the free world.

Senato PRESCOTT BUSH of Connecticut and Congressman Thomas Curtis of Missouri have made a constructive and bold effort to develop a much broader approach than has been evident to date—an approach which does give real meaning to the critical need for American leadership.

The Minneapolis Star for January 16 prints a synopsis of the comprehensive Bush-Curtis treatise, and I recommend it highly.

IT'S TIME FOR ATLANTIC ALLIANCE—TWO REPUBLICANS SAY KENNEDY SETS SIGHTS TOO LOW

(By Senator PRESCOTT BUSH, Republican of Connecticut, ranking minority member of the Joint Economic Committee, and Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican of Missouri, ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy)

The President's announced determination to forge closer links between the United States and the nations of western Europe merits the approval of all Americans.

Certainly, we of the Republican party are fully aware of the importance of a greater degree of unity and agreement upon common purposes in the free world. We are pleased therefore that the present administration is continuing the effort made by the previous administration to achieve these ends.

Indeed, we believe the present administration may have set its sights too low. Has not the time now come to work vigorously to form a concert of free nations within which all other freedom-loving friendly countries and the United States may work in harmony to counter the challenge of the Soviet Union, Communist China, and the Communist bloc satellites?

Now is the time, we believe, to press for the formation of such an alliance. Freed of the frustrations which beset the free world in the United Nations, it could accomplish much toward winning the cold war.

We do not recommend abandonment of the United Nations, but it is painfully evident that it is an ineffective instrument for achieving the objectives American shares with western Europe. As a forum in which tensions between the East and West may be relieved, or in which the newly developing nations may voice their aspirations, the U.N. may continue to serve a useful purpose.

We share, however, the views expressed by John J. McCloy (the President's disarmament adviser), Senator FULBRIGHT, and others that a new alliance of free nations is needed to meet the challenge of world communism which the U.N. Assembly majority has evaded.

As a start toward formation of such an alliance, we urge the administration to seek to expand the framework of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization so as to provide for closer ties between them and free nations outside the Atlantic Community.

The NATO treaty provides, in article 2, that members will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any and all of them.

Here without further ado or legislation, we already have the authority and foundation for wide economic negotiation and collaboration. The administration should press for full implementation of this provision.

The issues involved in the administration's vaguely-outlined proposals that Congress give to the President new broad and sweeping power to negotiate tariff reductions are of such gravity that partisanship centered on domestic political considerations must be rigidly excluded. These issues must be fully explored.

It would be extremely unfortunate if the debate on extension or revision of the Trade Agreements Act were to be conducted in the black-and-white terms of "free trade" versus "protectionism."

We deplore the tendency, already evident in some quarters, to picture those who refuse to accept blindly proposals which the administration itself has yet to specify as advocates of retreating to a Fortress America, allegedly cowering behind exclusionary tariff walls.

Major questions raised by the subcommittee's hearings include:

1. Is it necessary at this time to give the President broad new powers to negotiate tariff reductions with the European Economic Community (Common Market)?
2. Can increased exports solve the U.S. balance of payments problem?
3. Will American industry's ability to compete really be increased by mutual across-the-board tariff reductions by the United States and the Common Market?
4. Will Western Europe accept increased imports from Japan and other low-wage countries?
5. Can the United States and Western Europe agree on a mutual program to provide adequate markets for the products of the developing tropical countries—in Latin America and Africa?
6. Are the United States and Western Europe presently prepared to press for free trade in agriculture and in energy resources?
7. Can and will Western Europe and the United States agree on a joint policy respecting trade with Communist bloc nations?
8. Will a "trade and life adjustment" program, as hinted in vague terms by the administration, be effective in relieving the admitted hardships forced by tariff cuts?

These questions need to be fully answered. Certainly they cannot be swept under the rug in the great debate which will inevitably result from the administration's request.

Our major objection to the program as discussed to date is that it tends to focus public attention on only one problem among the many related problems which confront the United States in the task of forging closer unity among the industrialized nations of the free world.

The questions we have raised outline some of these problems, among which we would underscore the following for which solutions deserve higher and more urgent priorities:

1. The need for vigorous action by the United States toward formation of a new alliance of free nations outside the framework of the United Nations.
2. The need for a more equitable sharing of the burdens of the common defense against Communist imperialism.
3. The present lack of a unified free nations policy respecting trade with the Soviet Union, Communist China and the Communist satellite nations.
4. The persistent and dangerous deficit in the U.S. balance of payments.
5. Rigid protectionism by the United States and Western Europe in agriculture and energy resources.
6. The need for Western Europe to accept a greater share of the increasing industrial output of Japan and other lowest-wage countries.
7. The need for the United States and Western Europe to agree on the provision of adequate markets for the products of the developing nations of Latin America and Africa.
8. The need for improvement in the competitive position of American industry in world markets.

There are other problems, notably that of preserving industries and industrial skills which are essential to the national defense and whether, and to what extent, subsidies are necessary for this purpose, as in the case of the merchant marine. This vital question received little attention in the subcommittee's hearings.

We believe that instead of myopic concentration on the limited field of tariffs on industrial goods, the administration should broaden its vision to encompass the whole wide range of problems which must be resolved before the industrialized free nations can more effectively pool their resources to insure victory in the cold war.

Again, we urge the administration to take dynamic and vigorous action toward the formation of a new alliance of free nations in which these problems can be considered in proper perspective and steps taken toward a more equitable and widespread sharing of the burdens of the common defense against Communist imperialism. In such action, we believe, lies the ultimate triumph of freedom in the cold war.

Hon. Louis C. Rabaut

SPEECH

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, others have expressed here with sincere eloquence our sense of loss at the untimely passing of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable LOUIS C. RABAUT, of the 14th Michigan Congressional District—a true man of good will. I cannot forbear to add, however, a brief but heartfelt notation of my own sadness at the realization that this cheerful spirit, this bright intellect, this energetic and faithful man, has gone to rest.

Through a quarter century of our service here, my admiration and respect for LOUIS RABAUT grew. He was a superb example of the dedicated public servant. He wore proudly the badges of faith and patriotism. It was evident that he had before him always the realization that, as a man, he was accountable to the Almighty for the expenditure of each day. It was plain, too, that he regarded a hard day's work in their interest as his recurring daily debt to the people of the United States and, particularly, the citizens of his district in Michigan.

LOUIS RABAUT loved and respected his church and his Nation. He was a gentleman, but he knew that a resolute battle for the right was not incompatible with gentlemanliness. He was conscientious, earnest, and resourceful as a legislator, and the lawmaking of this Nation gained from his efforts over many years.

This was a clean, full life—nearly 30 years of public service; 50 years of happy marriage; 9 fine children, 4 of whom dedicated their lives to their church. Surely, when our beloved colleague presented himself at the eternal gates his credentials were not found wanting.

Louis C. Rabaut

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in paying tribute to the memory of our late colleague from Michigan, LOUIS C. RABAUT. His death has greatly saddened his many friends and associates in Congress and elsewhere and brings a tremendous loss to Michigan and the Nation.

As a fellow member of the Michigan delegation, I knew him as a true gentleman, an able legislator, and a devoted patriot. A member of the important Appropriations Committee, he was always helpful to the people of the Sixth District and always most kind and considerate to me personally. His interest in the welfare of Michigan was never hemmed in by party lines. But aside from the times when heavily burdened by legislative work, I remember "Uncle LOUIE," as I called him, as a lighthearted, funloving man who took great joy in getting a group together to sing around a piano.

Congressman RABAUT served his State and his country for a quarter of a century in a dedicated manner, taking a genuine interest in the problems of all his fellow men. Though his legislative accomplishments were many and he shared the responsibility for the prudent spending of billions of dollars as a member of the Appropriations Committee, he was most proud of legislation he sponsored to include the words "under God" in our Pledge of Allegiance. His deep religious and patriotic feelings which prompted him to introduce this meaningful revision in the pledge will live after him. And his adherence to the noble ideals of this Republic will serve as an inspiration to all who follow him.

I am proud to have had the opportunity to serve with him and I want to extend my deepest sympathy to the members of his family.

The Hour Is Come

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, Dr. James W. Thornton of Mount Vernon, N.Y., a distinguished citizen of my community and one of the most outstanding Negro spokesman in Westchester County, recently delivered a speech entitled "The Hour Is Come" before the Negro Civic League of his home city. His courageous and forthright approach to the problem of inequality currently existing in our country deserves wide circulation.

Dr. Thornton has been a longtime friend of mine. He has dedicated much of his time to civic welfare and to the improvement of living conditions of all people in the community. He is respected and admired by all who know him.

His speech follows:

THE HOUR IS COME

(By Dr. James W. Thornton)

About 2,000 years ago there was a wedding in Cana, a small village in the Hold Land not far from the Sea of Gallilee. It was a wedding of simple folks and these simple folks were having a good time. We know this because we read in the Scriptures that the "wine ran out."

Now one of the guests at the wedding was a saintly, kindly neighbor of the bride and groom. Her name was Mary. When the wine ran out she felt sorry and said to her son, "They have no wine." She had forgotten herself and thus was asking Jesus to perform a miracle, his very first. Jesus was taken back by surprise. He recovered Himself and rebuked Mary saying, "Mine hour is not yet come."

You see Jesus was not yet ready to set out upon His mission of teaching mankind a far nobler way of living than it had ever known. He had to prepare himself further. In His divine wisdom, He knew that for one to love mankind, one had to understand mankind and the only way to understand mankind was to share the common experiences of mankind, all his joys and sorrows alike.

But couldn't Jesus have spared Himself the agonies, sufferings, and tortures of mortal man? He who possessed the power of raising Lazarus from the dead and cleansing with the touch of a hand all the ravages of a disease like leprosy—well, of course He could. But He came here to offer hope to the meek, the humble, the poor, and the oppressed. To understand and love them, He had to share with them the injustices, the discriminations, and the brutalities which the highly placed and tyrants in all ages and climes have always practiced and inflicted upon the helpless and downtrodden. To be of them He had to endure with them their humiliation, indignities, sufferings, pains, and even death by torture. If Jesus had not done these things, the meek, the humble, the poor, and the oppressed would never have believed unto Him throughout all these centuries. They would never have followed Him. Do you know why? Because those who appreciate and prize justice most highly are those who have been denied justice. Those who respect human dignity most are those who have been degraded and humiliated the most. Those who cherish kindness and humaneness the most are those who have been shunned and even whipped for seeking a bit of charity.

Now you good folks read your Bible. You know how God consummates His will through the fate of nations and races. In the Old Testament we read of how God caused nations and races to suffer sometimes for centuries so that they might better appreciate some aspect of His teachings, cleave it to their bosoms, and practice it in their daily lives. Now democracy—real democracy—is a form of government and a way of life most closely patterned after God's own commandments. God's commandments teach us the worth of every individual created in His image; they respect human dignity; they teach us to treat one another upon the principles of justice, equality, and the brotherhood of man. And these, my friends, constitute the heart of democracy.

These blessings of democracy have been denied to us Negroes for centuries. Even today we are doled out little small tokens of democracy; you know token integration in schools and all that. Sometimes when I become discouraged with the injustices perpetuated upon our people, I ask myself: Why has God allowed it? Why has He done this to us? Then I reflect on the Old Testament—how He used nations and races for centuries to bring forth a better way of life and how Jesus shared the sufferings of mankind to understand mankind. Then—then I say to myself that God in His infinite wisdom made our race suffer for centuries in order that we Negroes through our sufferings may truly learn what democracy is, to cherish it all the more and practice it in our daily lives with one another and with all mankind. We have been denied freedom, justice, and human dignity so that we Negroes would have a far better concept and love of democracy than any other people on earth. Nobody—nobody—loves democracy more than we Negroes. Since we love democracy and know what it means because we never had it fully, is it God's purpose that He has chosen our race as His instrument to bring about, with His help and in His good time, a more effective and real democracy in these United States?

Reflect—think a minute. You know that democracy today is facing its greatest challenge. We are warned that the next two decades will determine whether democracy or communism will dominate the lives of man for the next 10,000 years. We are told that more and more nations are looking askance at a nation that preaches democracy but denies its full blessings to millions of its own citizens. Remember too that at least three-fifths of the world is nonwhite. If it be God's will that we Negroes should achieve by our efforts in creating a better democracy here in the United States, may we not be preserving democracy for the world? And saving our beloved Nation itself? I say to you the Negro is the best bet that democracy has. The Negro may be God's instrument for saving a form of government most closely patterned after His own teachings.

At the wedding in Cana, Jesus said, "Mine hour is not yet come." He prepared Himself by his sufferings and then, and only then, the Bible says, "He lifted His eyes to Heaven and said, 'Father, the hour is come, glorify thy Son that thy Son may glorify Thee.'" For centuries the Negro race suffered to learn what democracy really means and to cherish it. Our hour had not yet come. But now, I say to you, the hour is come. The time is now for the American Negro to embark on a crusade for a truer form of democracy in the United States.

Let me quote to you some facts and you'll be the judge whether the hour is come or not. Before 1945, we Negroes were in no position to effect the course of human events in this country. We were grinded to the dust first by chattel or physical slavery and then by economic slavery, the latter almost as bad as the former. But since 1945—the last 16 years—we have made more progress than in the previous 2½ centuries. Let your hearts be lifted by these facts:

First, we are educated. There are 120,000 Negroes in our colleges. That's 20,000 more than white students in all of the colleges of England.

Second, we are in the professions and in business. The number is 350,000. Negroes own $4 billion in mortgages; 2 million Negroes own their own homes. Over 5½ million Negroes are in industry, over half of whom are in skilled or semiskilled jobs. Over 600,000 Negroes are in white-collar jobs.

Third, we are in civil service. There are over 855,000 Negroes in Federal, State, or local government jobs. In Washington alone, there are 55,000 Negroes—1 in 6 has a supervisory job and over 300 in positions where policy is made.

Fourth, we are in the Armed Forces—over 200,000 of us—and over 5,000 are commissioned or warrant officers. I remember in World War I when there were only 750 of us. We served under southern officers because they knew how to handle Negroes. When peace came, they discharged all of us except one.

Fifth, we possess economic power. Our total purchasing power is $20 billion. Yes, I said $20 billion—more than the purchasing power of all Canada.

The market analyst of the New York Herald Tribune wrote this: "Economic well-being is far from being limited to a fortunate few within the Negro community. It has spread like a wave to include most of the Negro population. The American Negro has liberated himself by his own industry. Where commonsense and decency failed, the need of the businessman for profits will bring equality to the Negro. No man is going to segregate $20 billion."

Now, do you agree that the hour is come? It is here now. We Negroes now possess the education and the economic power to make democracy work. Our sufferings have given us a better concept of what demoracy should mean. We aim to put these concepts into practice beginning now. No half-way measures, no second-class citizens—nothing but full citizenship rights for every American regardless of race, creed, nationality, or economic status wherever the American flag flies.

The old line white politicians can no longer delude us with their phony ideas of democracy just for themselves. The American Negro no longer through ignorance or helplessness or grinding poverty can be led by the nose to help them carry out their policies. We can see through their deceitful schemes. We see what a mockery they have made of their own democratic principles. They rebelled against England on the rallying cry that there should be "no taxation without representation," yet in America today in the South they are taking millions of dollars from Negroes through taxation and there is not a single Negro in any of their legislatures to say how it should be spent.

Old line white politicans in the North are but a little better. Much too often have they picked an Uncle Tom or a "white hanky" among our group and elected or appointed him to office. The main qualification of these hand-picked Uncle Toms and "white hankies" is their ability to say nothing of any importance, to enjoy the empty honors of their position, and say "Amen" quickly to whatever the white politicians want. Negroes even in the most favorable places have had little to say who should represent them.

That must end. We Negroes will pick our own leaders. We will pick people who have our concepts of democracy and will fight to put them into practice. The hour is come for the old-line white politicians to treat us as equals. If not, we will defy them. * * * We

ask for no special favor for our people. We seek only equality and justice for all people. We seek only to have put into actual practice the principles of true democracy. We Negroes know what true democracy is. The hour is now for us to make it work in America, to take the leadership in our hands and go forward, unafraid and hopeful, knowing in our hearts that we stand for the right.

My friends, if we accomplish this, America will be the gainer and all Americans will enjoy a far nobler way of life, in a true democracy where all men are brothers and equality and justice rule supreme. If we accomplish this even in part, who knows but that historians of generations to come will record that democracy was saved for America and the world by the American Negro.

Yes, my friends, the hour is come. Let us lift our eyes to heaven, and like Jesus, ask God, the Father of all mankind, to glorify us that we—whose concepts of democracy He has refined and ennobled through centuries of privation and suffering—may glorify Him by effecting here in our beloved country the principles of human dignity, the sacredness of the individual, and the brotherhood of all mankind with equality and justice for all. Fellow Negroes, fulfill your mission in life. The hour is come. Rise to meet the opportunity for the sake of your race, for all of America, and for all humanity. I call upon you to join in the crusade for democracy.

The hour is come.

The Nation's Energy Resources and Economic Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the excellent remarks of James K. Carr, Under Secretary of the Interior, before New England's 16th Annual Printing and Publishing Week banquet in Boston, Mass., on January 18, 1962:

THE NATION'S ENERGY RESOURCES AND ECONOMIC GROWTH

(Remarks of James K. Carr, Under Secretary of the Interior)

A magazine advertisement this month by a leading airline points out that man has been developing speed for about 8,000 years, but only in the last 80 years—100th of the time period—has he made substantial progress. As late as 1880, the cheetah was still the speed king of the mammals, having been clocked at 70 miles per hour. Man surged ahead in 1893, when a New York Central engine ate up a stretch of track at more than 112 miles per hour. A scant 70 years later, the experimental X-15 reached 4,070 miles per hour speed—fast enough to go from Boston to Manhattan in about 3 minutes. This burst of speed resulted largely from great advances in knowledge of fuels and energy.

The substance of the magazine ad relates to mobile energy. The bulk of the energy consumed in our economy is at stationary facilities. The advances in nonmobile energy production and use, while not so dramatic as the X-15, have, in the past 80 years, made giant strides in the task of freeing man from the bondage of inadequate energy.

You are interested in the subject of energy because the relationship of energy resources to basic raw material, whether it be for the printing business, the publishing business, or the production of paper pulp, and other wood products, will have a determined effect upon the economic health of your industry. The application of energy resources to other basic raw materials will indirectly affect the entire industry which you represent. It's for this reason that your program chairman asked me to speak to you tonight on the Nation's energy resources, which are in many ways a responsibility of the Department of the Interior.

ENERGY DEFINED

Let me define more clearly the type of energy I am talking about. In a broad sense, anything with the inherent power to perform work may be called energy, but I am speaking about the commercial or efficient forms of energy and their effect on the national economic growth. The four sources of such energy are: oil, natural gas, coal, and waterpower. As yet, nuclear power does not rank as an energy source of major economic importance.

The commercial uses of energy I am talking about should also be defined. The four uses of energy significantly affecting the Nation's economic growth are for (1) industrial purposes, (2) transportation, (3) space heating and cooling, and (4) the production of electricity, as such.

RELATIONSHIPS—BETWEEN SOURCES—BETWEEN MARKETS

Petroleum is the dominant commercial energy source accounting for about 45 percent of the Nation's energy needs. Natural gas picks up another 28 percent, and coal takes 23 percent; the rest of the commercial and efficient energy supply, except for water power which is 4 percent of the total.

The primary energy markets run something like this: Industry, 35 percent; transportation, 25 percent; space heating and cooling, 20 percent; and generation of electricity, the remaining 20 percent.

ENERGY AND ECONOMIC GROWTH

This Nation's industrial progress, social progress, and its energy revolution are so tightly interwoven that it is almost impossible to separate them. A history of the economic growth of the United States could, I believe, be translated in terms of the changes in emphasis and the changes in patterns of energy supply and use. The steel industry which was the forerunner for other massive industries in this economy was based largely on coal.

Again, consider the relationship between transportation developments and growth in the energy sector of the economy. The establishment of the vast interlocking network of railroads in this country would have been impossible had it not been for the availability of adequate quantities of coal at widely separated points. Widespread use of the automobile, which has had such an impact on almost all phases of our individual lives, moved hand in hand with the growth of the petroleum industry.

ENERGY USES

I should like to discuss briefly the increase in use of energy; then the specific sources—oil, gas, coal, and water power; and some of the relationships between these sources and the particular uses.

On a per capita basis, the use of energy by the United States is approaching the equivalent of 45 barrels of oil per person per year, and the United States is responsible for one-half of the world's total energy consumption. The average for the rest of the world is one-tenth as much or the equivalent of less than 5 barrels per capita.

History shows that economic progress, social progress, and standards of living more forward wherever per capita peacetime uses of energy are greater. By the end of this decade per capita consumption of energy in the United States will have increased more than 10 percent with a corresponding population increase of 35 million people. The net result is an estimated increase in total national energy consumption of more than 35 percent in the next 10 years.

INVESTMENT IN PLANT WILL BE HUGE

You can readily realize the problems that confront us as we continue to promote and to sustain economic growth if you visualize the necessary investment in generating and transmission plants.

During the past 20 years the total expenditure for new construction of generation and transmission facilities in the electrical industry, both private and public, has been about $35 billion—I repeat billion dollars. Engineers now estimate that the total expenditure, private and public, for the next 20 years to build the necessary generation and transmission facilities will be three times that amount. With such an enormous requirement for capital the stockholders and the taxpayers must be protected by the best possible planning, both private and public. Our success in this effort will measurably affect the Nation's economic growth and our ability to compete abroad.

The magnitude of the investment problems in large measure relates to population growth. I will not burden you with numerous examples to show how fast the United States is growing, but you can gain some idea of it if you realize that the population increase of the Nation this year will be approximately 3 million people or equal to four new cities as large as Boston. Economists tell me this also means $6 billion in new spending for consumer goods.

Under Secretary of State, George W. Ball, told a joint congressional committee recently that the United States can compete with anyone and can prosper and must trade if it is to grow. This means, however, a relentless and vigorous attack on all factors of production cost to determine that they are as low as possible. It means, as President Kennedy said in the state of the Union message: "We cannot 'hang back in deference to local economic pressures.'"

ENERGY AND THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

At this point you possibly ask why the Interior Department is so intimately involved with the Nation's energy needs and supplies. Some people erroneously think the Department of the Interior is a western department.

The Federal Government's responsibilities in the energy field and more specifically with oil, natural gas, coal and the marketing of water power, as well as certain development of water power, are delegated to the Secretary of the Interior. Thus, to a great extent, the Department of the Interior is the primary energy department for the United States. There are, of course, other agencies involved, including the Atomic Energy Commission and the Federal Power Commission, but Interior has important responsibilities with respect to each of the commercial types of energy mentioned. The Department's Office of Oil and Gas, Oil Import Administration, Bureau of Mines, Geological Survey, and the Office of Coal Research, all have broad responsibilities for certain segments of our energy programs. On the water power side, we have the Department's Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, and the Southeastern Power Administration—four Federal agencies that market hydroelectric power in different sections of the United States. So you can see that the activities of the Department of the Interior touch upon almost every phase of commercial energy in the Nation.

The Department is assigned certain tasks which will assure that our country's energy

resources of coal, oil, natural gas, and water, make their maximum contribution to the Nation's economic health and growth, as well as the Nation's security.

The energy-oriented activities of the Department, however, vitaly affect the strength of our economy and contribute significantly to the ability of this Nation to maintain its place in the world. And let me say just parenthetically that Secretary Udall and the rest of us in the Department of the Interior are equally concerned over another resource—and I mean our disappearing open spaces that are so vital to this and future generations. That is why, as a conservation measure, we are proposing a last great effort to round out a system of national parks and provide aid to States embarked on similar programs. We not only owe it to ourselves, we have a responsibility to the 51 million young people in school today to see that we wisely manage this resource and hand on to them a land such as we are so fortunate to enjoy. The approval of legislation authorizing the Cape Cod National Seashore Park is a notable step forward.

CHANGING PATTERNS OF ENERGY USE

We naturally expect changes in energy use patterns over the next 10 years although the total amounts of energy used will increase considerably. Let us discuss each primary energy source separately.

PETROLEUM

The petroleum industry, until recently, was growing at a much faster rate than the total increase in energy consumption by moving into markets in competition with other energy sources. In the future, we expect a leveling out in the consumption of oil in this country, although there will continue to be rapid increases in its use in other countries.

World production greatly exceeds current petroleum requirements. Much of the new production in the world can enter markets at prices below those necessary to sustain the mature industry in the United States. Furthermore, political events in some petroleum producing nations have injected a note of instability into the supply of oil. Against this background, we cannot afford, as a nation, to lose sight of the immense importance of petroleum in times of emergency.

In World War II, fully two-thirds of all the materials of war consisted of petroleum and petroleum products. Today, petroleum represents about 50 percent of the total waterborne tonnage in international trade. The sheer volume of petroleum requirements, and the overall situation in the world today, made it necessary for the Federal Government to institute a broad program of controls on petroleum imports into the United States. These controls are designed to provide petroleum exporting nations with access to the U.S. market, while at the same time preventing the unlimited flow of oil from abroad that could seriously injure our national security posture. This vital program is administered by the Department's Oil Import Administration.

NATURAL GAS

During the past 25 or 30 years, natural gas has grown from a stepchild of the petroleum industry to a prime source of energy. This growth has been especially impressive over the past 15 years since World War II. This year it is estimated that natural gas will approach 30 percent of the Nation's energy supply. The Federal Power Commission has the principal regulatory responsibility for the Nation's interstate commerce in natural gas. The Department of the Interior conducts a substantial program of research into natural gas production and use and is responsible for the mobilization phases of the natural gas industry.

COAL

Reserves of coal in the United States are immense—enough to serve our requirements at present rates of consumption for hundreds of years. Coal was the earliest beneficiary of this Nation's energy revolution. As other sources of power arose, coal lost its dominant position. Production has fallen and unemployment in traditional coal-producing areas constitutes a serious economic and social problem.

Despite these losses in the energy market, there are two possibilities that hold promise for an early improvement in coal's position in our energy economy.

Coal is cheap at the mine compared to other fuels; its big handicap has always been the cost of transportation. For this reason, the Department is very much interested in the plan of the Consolidation Coal Co. of Pittsburgh and the Texas Eastern Transmission Corp. of Houston to build a 20-inch slurry pipeline from the coalfields of Pennsylvania and West Virginia to the large energy-consuming areas of Philadelphia and New York.

Coal in the form of a slurry has been moved by pipeline in Ohio for some years, from Cadiz to Cleveland. But in this operation the slurry has had to be put through a costly drying process before burning. Recently, a demonstration at South Amboy, N.J., proved that liquid coal slurry containing more than 30 percent water can be burned directly in a furnace, in much the same way as oil or gas.

It appears possible to increase the use of coal while better serving the energy needs of our country, by the construction of mine-mouth steam electric plants. Recent developments in extra-high-voltage transmission of electricity may make possible the movement of large blocks of power at lower costs. I will discuss this more fully as we talk about electric power.

ELECTRIC POWER

The development of hydroelectric power in this country had its beginning in the New England States. The first waterpower development of importance took place here in New England at Pawtucket, R.I., in 1790. By 1813, a city was created by the development of the Merrimack River at Lowell, Mass. In those early years, a canal was built around the falls and the water, or portions of it, passed successively over wheels or through turbines.

By 1900 we had learned to transmit power as far as 150 miles. In a moment, I will tell you of some of the programs our Government is now engaged in to encourage the private and public utility industry to better utilize and develop our electric power industry.

Hydroelectric power has provided a small but relatively stable portion of the Nation's energy requirements in the past 25 years—about 4 percent. This percentage, however, fails to convey the critical importance of hydroelectric power in some regions of the United States.

In the Pacific Northwest, fully 96 percent of electric power consumed in the area is produced from waterpower projects on the Columbia River, its tributaries and coastal streams.

In years gone by, we, as a nation, have not made sufficient use of our hydroelectric potential, a renewable energy resource that uncontrolled causes damage in many areas. This administration will not perpetuate this neglect and waste. We intend to move vigorously to develop those as yet untapped hydroresources which will yield measurable benefits to the growth of the national economy.

At the request of President Kennedy, the Department of the Interior is now reviewing the Passamaquoddy project and the potential of the upper St. John River in Maine. Department engineers are optimistic about the outcome and look forward to greater development of the water resource of New England.

EXTRA HIGH VOLTAGE—DIRECT CURRENT TRANSMISSIONS

The most modern and efficient transmission of electricity is vital to the ample supply of power at reasonable costs. A five-man group drawn from the Department of the Interior has recently completed an important study on an extra-high-voltage, direct-current intertie to link the major private and public power systems in the Pacific Northwest with those of the Pacific Southwest. The study has already had a great impact on the electric utility industry and may show a way ultimately to reduce power cost in New England and other areas of the Nation.

The proposal would involve construction of lines from the Columbia River Basin to the vicinity of Los Angeles, Calif.—a distance of almost 1,000 miles. It would be a dramatic forward step, stimulating the electric industry to more efficient and effective use of the hydro and thermal electric power resources.

Great benefits would follow from the Pacific Northwest and southern California intertie. The Pacific Northwest's firm power supply, according to the report, can be increased by up to 400,000 kilowatts by exchanging energy.

In many parts of California, peak power requirements occur during the summer months. In the Northwest, the peak energy need is during the winter months. Each of these regions now must maintain sufficient generation capacity and plant (which costs money) to meet its respective peak loads. The proposed intertie can appreciably lower the level of installed generating capacity (with investment of capital) by moving power back and forth between the two regions as required.

Also these extra-high-voltage, direct-current transmission lines might be used to take power from mine-mouth, steam-electric plants in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and other areas to eastern population centers, such as Boston, and deliver it at lower cost.

President Kennedy in his special message on natural resources last February directed the Secretary of the Interior to develop plans for interconnections and further cooperative pooling of electric power supplies in both private and public systems. Secretary Udall is giving leadership to the electric utility industry by encouraging this bold, new approach.

In candor, I must tell you that the United States has lagged behind in the development and use of direct-current transmission of electricity. Sweden developed and has been using it to advantage since 1954. A direct-current underwater cable beneath the English Channel now connects the power systems of England and France. New Zealand will soon use direct-current transmission for a distance of 360 miles. It is reported the Soviets have been experimenting with direct-current transmission since the end of World War II and have one 300-mile experimental line already built.

Inevitably, it seems the entire United States will need an electric power complex of extra high voltage in which private and public agencies can and will operate. The combined efforts of the private and public utilities will be necessary to bring about economies in the production and distribution of electric power. This administration will continue to encourage these joint efforts and recommend to the Congress that we participate financially in programs associated with the development of our water and power resources whenever it's in the national interest.

The combined result should be a more efficient utilization of the country's total generating facilities, reduced requirements for the construction of new generating plants, and significant reductions in capital investment. Savings to consumers of power should follow naturally from these advantages.

I have emphasized that energy is one of the most important elements in a dynamic economy. Your industry directly and indirectly is affected by what we do in the development of low-cost energy for the entire Nation. We must continue as a nation to discard that which is outdated or obsolete. We must adopt new technical advances wherever they promise to decrease the cost of energy to the ultimate consumer. We must, with a sense of urgency, tackle our energy-resource problems. We must look forward and go forward.

If we proceed with this spirit, we shall continue to carry the banner of freedom throughout this fast-moving world with persuasive confidence and a widespread realization that America is still in the forefront of scientific progress.

About Our National Morals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming obvious to many Americans that the split between conservatives and liberals is basically a profound disagreement over the criteria which we used to define morality.

Recently, Mr. Jenkin Lloyd Jones, editor of the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune, gave an address to a group of editors on the subject of our national morals. Although I am not acquainted with Mr. Jones, I am tremendously impressed with his depth and understanding. I am also impressed with his challenge to his fellow journalists. I think his remarks also contained a challenge to the Members of Congress, and I hope that each Member will find the time to read this abbreviated version of his remarks taken from the November 24, 1961, issue of Human Events, which, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, follows:

ABOUT OUR NATIONAL MORALS

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

I look upon our own country and much that I see disturbs me. But we are a great people. We have a noble tradition. We have much to teach the world, and if America should go down soon it would be too early.

One thing is certain. We shall be given no centuries for a leisurely and comfortable decay. We have an enemy now—remorseless, crude, brutal, and cocky. However much the leaders of the Communist conspiracy may lie to their subjects about our motives, about our conditions of prosperity, about our policies and aims, one thing they themselves believe implicitly—and that is that we are in an advanced state of moral decline.

When Nikita Khrushchev visited Hollywood he was shown only one movie set, that of a wild dance scene in "Can-Can." He said it represented decadence and I am sure he really thought so. It is a dogma of current Communist faith that America is Sodom and Gomorrah, ripening for the kill.

PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION

We are now at the end of the third decade of the national insanity known as progressive education. This was the education where everybody passes, where the report cards were noncommittal lest the failure be faced with the fact of his failure, where all moved at a snail pace like a transatlantic convoy so that the slowest need not be left behind, and all proceeded toward adulthood in the lockstep of togetherness. Thus the competition that breeds excellence was to be sacrificed for the benefit of something called life adjustment.

With what results? We have watched juvenile delinquency climb steadily. We have produced tens of thousands of high school graduates who move their lips as they read and cannot write a coherent paragraph. While our Russian contemporaries, who were supposed to be dedicated to the mass man, have been busy constructing an intellectual elite we have been engaged in the wholesale production of mediocrity. What a switch.

When was the last time you, as editors and publishers, examined the curriculums of your local schools? How did your schools rank on the standardized Iowa tests? When have you looked at your schools' report cards and the philosophy behind their grading system? Have you asked to examine any senior English themes? Have you offered any recognition to your schools' best scholars to compare to the recognition you accord your schools' best football players?

NO ONE-LEGGED HALFBACKS

For the funny thing about progressive educators is that theory vanishes when the referee's whistle blows for the kickoff. In the classroom they pretend to grade subjectively, against the student's supposed capacity, lest he be humiliated by natural inadequacy. But on the football field they never put in a one-legged halfback on the theory that, considering his disability, he's a great halfback. They put in the best halfback they've got, period. The ungifted sit on the bench or back in the stands even though they, too, might thirst for glory. If our schools were as anxious to turn out brains as they are to turn out winning football teams this strange contradiction wouldn't exist.

Having neglected disciplines in education it was quite logical that we should reject disciplines in art. The great painters and sculptors of the past studied anatomy so diligently that they often indulged in their own body snatching. And today, after many centuries, we stare at the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel or at the walls of the Reichsmusee and marvel at their works.

But this self-discipline is of little concern to the modern nonobjective painter. All he needs is pigment and press agent. He can throw colors at a canvas and the art world will discover him. He can stick bits of glass, old rags and quids of used chewing tobacco on a board and he is a social critic. He can drive a car back and forth in pools of paint and Life magazine will write him up.

Talent is for squares. What you need is vast effrontery. If you undertake to paint a cow it must look something like a cow. That takes at least a sign painter's ability. But you can claim to paint a picture of your psyche and no matter what the result, who is to say what your psyche looks like? So our museums are filled with daubs being stared at by confused citizens who haven't the guts to admit they are confused.

But the age of fakery in art is a mild cross that American civilization bears. Much more serious is our collapse of moral standards and the blunting of our capacity for righteous indignation.

PURITANS WERE TREMENDOUS PEOPLE

Our Puritan ancestors were preoccupied with sin. They were hag-ridden and guilt-ridden and theirs was a repressed and neurotic society. But they had horsepower. They wrested livings from rocky land, built our earliest colleges, started our literature, caused our industrial revolution, and found time in between to fight the Indians, the French and the British, to bawl for abolition, woman suffrage and prison reform, and to experiment with graham crackers and bloomers. They were a tremendous people.

And for all their exaggerated attention to sin, their philosophy rested on a great granite rock: Man was the master of his soul. You didn't have to be bad. You could and should be better. And if you wanted to escape the eternal fires you'd damned well better be.

In recent years all this has changed in America. We have decided that sin is largely imaginary. We have become enamored with behavioristic psychology. This holds that a man is a product of his heredity and his environment, and his behavior to a large degree is foreordained by both. He is either a product of a happy combination of genes and chromosomes or an unhappy combination. He moves in an environment that will tend to make him good or that will tend to make him evil. He is just a chip tossed helplessly by forces beyond his control and, therefore, not responsible.

Well, the theory that misbehavior can be cured by pulling down tenements and erecting in their places elaborate public housing is not holding water. The crime rates continue to rise along with our outlays for social services. We speak of underprivilege. Yet the young men who swagger up and down the streets, boldly flaunting their gang symbols on their black jackets, are far more blessed in creature comforts, opportunities for advancement, and freedom from drudgery than 90 percent of the children of the world. We have sown the dragon's teeth of pseudoscientific sentimentality, and out of the ground has sprung the legion bearing switchblade knives and bicycle chains.

Clearly something is missing. Could it be what the rest of the world's children have been given—the doctrine of individual responsibility?

RELIEF AN HONORABLE CAREER

Relief is gradually becoming an honorable career in America. It is a pretty fair life, if you have neither conscience nor pride. The politicians will weep over you. The state will give a mother a bonus for her illegitimate children, and if she neglects them sufficiently she can save enough out of her ADC payments to keep herself and her boy friend in wine and gin. Nothing is your fault. And when the city fathers of a harassed community like Newburgh suggest that able-bodied welfare clients might sweep the streets the liberal editorialists arise as one man and denounce them for their medieval cruelty.

I don't know how long Americans can stand this erosion of principle.

Nations are built by people capable of great energy and self-discipline.

The welfare state that taxes away the rewards for responsible behavior so that it can remove the age-old penalties for irresponsible behavior is building on a foundation of jelly. It is time we stopped this elaborate pretense that there is no difference between the genuinely unfortunate and the mobs of reliefers who start throwing bottles every time the cops try to make a legitimate arrest.

Finally, there is the status of our entertainment and our literature.

MOVIES ARE DIRTIER THAN EVER

Can anyone deny that movies are dirtier than ever? But they don't call it dirt. They call it realism. Why do we let them fool us? Why do we nod owlishly when they tell us that filth is merely a daring art form, that licentiousness is really social comment? Isn't it time we recognized Hollywood's quest for the fast buck for what it is? Isn't it plain that the financially harassed movie industry is putting gobs of sex in the dark-

ened drive-ins in an effort to lure curious teenagers away from their TV sets? Recently, the screen industry solemnly announced that henceforth perversion and homosexuality would no longer be barred from the screen provided the subjects were handled with delicacy and taste. Good Lord.

And we of the press are a party to the crime. Last year the movie ads in our newspaper got so salacious and suggestive that the advertising manager and I decided to throw out the worst and set up some standards. We thought that due to our ukase there might be some interruptions in advertising some shows. But no. Within a couple of hours the exhibitors were down with much milder ads. How was this miracle accomplished?

Well, it seems that the exhibitors are supplied with several different ads for each movie. If the publishers are dumb enough to accept the most suggestive ones, those are what they get. But if publishers squawk the cleaner ads are sent down. Isn't it time we all squawked?

I think it's time we quit giving page 1 play to the extramarital junkets of crooners. I think it is time we stopped treating as glamorous and exciting the brazen shackups of screen tramps. I think it is time we asked our Broadway and Hollywood columnists if they can't find something decent and inspiring going on along their beats.

IS THIS REALLY REALISM?

And the stage: They raided Minsky's so Minsky's has spread all over town. Bawdiness has put on a dinner jacket, and seats in the orchestra that used to go for six-bits at the Old Howard and Nichols' Gayety are now scaled at $8.80. Oh, yes. And we have lots of realism. Incestuous Americans. Perverted Americans. Degenerate Americans. Murderous Americans.

How many of these realistic Americans do you know?

Two months ago an American touring company, sponsored by the State Department and paid for by your tax dollars, presented one of Tennessee Williams' more depraved offerings to an audience in Rio de Janeiro. The audience hooted in disgust and walked out. And where did it walk to? Right across the street where a Russian ballet company was putting on a beautiful performance for the glory of Russia. How dumb can we get?

We are drowning our youngsters in violence, cynicism, and sadism piped into the living room and even the nursery. The grandchildren of the kids who used to weep because the Little Match Girl froze to death now feel cheated if she isn't slugged, raped, and thrown into a Bessemer converter.

LITERATURE—PEEPSHOW VARIETY

And there's our literature. The old eye-poppers of the past, which tourists used to smuggle back from Paris under their dirty shirts, are now tame stuff. Compared to some of our modern slush, "Ulysses" reads like the minutes of the Epworth League. "Lady Chatterly's Lover" has been draped with the mantle of art, and it is now on sale in the corner drugstore for 50 cents. Henry Miller's "Tropic of Cancer," which resembles a collection of inscriptions taken from privy walls, is about to join Lady Chatterly. The quick-buck boys have apparently convinced our bumfuzzled judges that there is no difference between a peepshow and a moral lecture.

And, of course, we have our latter-day historical novels in which the romance of man's upward movement from savagery is lost in a confused welter of bundlings and tumblings. The foreign reader of one of these epics on the development of the American West must marvel that our forefathers found time to quell the Comanches, plow up Kansas, and build the transcontinental railroad while spending practically all their time in the hay.

Don Maxwell of the Chicago Tribune has recently asked his book department to quit advertising scatological literature by including it in the list of best sellers. The critics and the book publishers have denounced him for tampering with the facts. I would like to raise a somewhat larger question: Who is tampering with the soul of America?

For nations do have souls. They have collective personalities. People who think well of themselves collectively exhibit elan and enthusiasm and morale. When nations cease believing in themselves, when they regard their institutions with cynicism and their traditions with flippancy they will not long reman great nations. When they seek learning without effort and wages without work they are beginning to stagger. When they become hedonistic and pleasure oriented, when their Boy Scouts on their 14-mile hikes start to hitch, there's trouble ahead. Where payola becomes a way of life, expense account cheating common, and union goonery a fiercely defended "right" that nation is in danger. And where police departments attempt to control burglary by the novel method of making it a department monopoly then the chasm yawns.

Ladies and gentlemen, do not let me overdraw the picture. This is still a great, powerful, vibrant, able, optimistic nation. Americans—our readers—do believe in themselves and in their country.

But there is rot and there is blight and there is cutting out and filling to be done if we, as the leader of free men, are to survive the hammer blows which quite plainly are in store for us all.

We have reached the stomach-turning point. We have reached the point where we should reexamine the debilitating philosophy of permissiveness. Let this not be confused with the philosophy of liberty. The school system that permits our children to devolop a quarter of their natural talents is not a champion of our liberties. The healthy man who chooses to loaf on unemployment compensation is not a defender of human freedom. The playwright who would degrade us, the author who would profit from pandering to the worst that's in us are no friends of ours.

LET'S GET IT FIXED

It is time we hit the sawdust trail. It is time we revived the idea that there is such a thing as sin—just plain old willful sin. It is time we brought self-discipline back into style. And who has a greater responsibility at this hour than we, the gentlemen of the press?

So I suggest:

Let's look to our educational institutions at the local level, and if Johnny can't read by the time he's ready to get married let's find out why.

Let's look at the distribution of public largesse and if, far from alleviating human misery, it is producing the sloth and irresponsibility that intensifies it, let's get it fixed.

Let's quit being bulldozed and bedazzled by self-appointed longhairs. Let's have the guts to say that a book is dirt if that's what we think of it, or that a painting may well be a daub if you can't figure out which way to hang it. And if some beatnik welds together a collection of rusty cogwheels and old corset stays and claims it's a greater sculpture than Michalangelo's "David" let's have the courage to say that it looks like junk and probably is.

Let's blow the whistle on plays that would bring blushes to an American Legion stag party. Let's not be awed by movie characters with barnyard morals even if some of them have been photographed climbing aboard the Presidential yacht. Let us pay more attention in our news columns to the decent people everywhere who are trying to do something for the good of others.

In short, gentlemen, let's cover up the cesspool and start planting some flowers.

Well, that's the jeremiad. I never thought I'd deliver one of these. I never dreamed I'd go around sounding like an advance man for the Watch-and-Ward Society. I used to consider myself quite a liberal young man. I still think that on some people bikinis look fine.

FED UP TO HERE

But I am fed up to here with the educationists and pseudosocial scientists who have underrated our potential as a people. I am fed up to here with the medicine men who try to pass off pretense for art and prurience for literature. I am tired of seeing America debased and low rated in the eyes of foreigners. And I am genuinely disturbed that to idealistic youth in many countries the fraud of communism appears synonymous with morality, while we, the chief repository of real freedom, are regarded as being in the last stages of decay.

We can learn a lesson from history. Twice before our British cousins appeared heading into a collapse of principle, and twice they drew themselves back. The British court reached an advanced stage of corruption under the Stuarts. But the people rebelled. And in the wild days of George IV and William IV it looked as though Britain were rotting out again. But the people banged through the reform laws, and under Victoria went on to the peak of their power.

In this hour of fear, confusion, and self-doubt let this be the story of America. Unless I misread the signs a great number of our people are ready. Let there be a fresh breeze, a breeze of new honesty, new idealism, new integrity.

And there, gentlemen, is where you come in. You have typewriters, presses, and a huge audience.

How about raising hell?

Hon. Sam Rayburn

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, as a freshman Congressman, my acquaintanceship with Speaker RAYBURN was necessarily very brief, yet one of the most richly rewarding experiences of my life, and I will be forever grateful for having had the privilege and honor of this association.

SAM RAYBURN lived his life as a man, a great man. It was not accident or inherited advantage that brought to him the true greatness which touches few men in any age, rather it was his constant dedication to our national principles of justice and liberty tempered by love and compassion for mankind. Every use of his position and authority was made with humility and respect for his fellow man, regardless of his station in life.

Though it was not my good fortune to have had a close personal friendship with SAM RAYBURN, such as was enjoyed by many of my distinguished colleagues in

the House of Representatives, I have learned much from his excellent example and deeply feel the sharp loss of this strong leader and gentle guide.

ADA Influence in Kennedy Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, infiltration of the Kennedy administration by Americans for Democratic Action, a group of collectivists whose goal is the reduction of the American people to a state of heavy dependence on the Federal Government, is discussed in "America: Listen," a book by Frank L. Kluckhohn. Last December 17 the Sydney Sun, one of Australia's leading newspapers, said of Kluckhohn in connection with the book:

There can be no question as to the author's motives or his standing as a responsible and well-known publicist.

Frank Kluckhohn for nearly 20 years was a New York Times Washington and foreign correspondent. He had the distinction of being imprisoned by General Franco, and his life threatened when he broke censorship and revealed that the Caudillo's forces in the Spanish civil war had been joined by planes sent by Mussolini and Hitler.

LIAISON OFFICER

He covered many of the Allied landings in World War II from the first one in Africa to the last in Japan, and acted as liaison officer between General MacArthur and groups interested in establishing democratic processes in Japan. He was well known to many journalists in Australia, where he maintained his headquarters during the war in the Pacific.

After the war, Kluckhohn was adviser to Mr. Forrestal when the post of Secretary of Defense was first created. From 1955 to 1961 he was a ranking officer in the State Department, as special assistant, Assistant Secretary for Security and Consular Affairs. He resigned that post a few months ago.

In chapter VI, the title of which is "The 1960 Election," Kluckhohn discusses facts concerning the ADA which I think will be of interest to Congress; hence, I wish to have excerpts from the chapter printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE ADA

Some time before the 1960 primaries, a meeting of the executive group of a left-wing organization was held in Baltimore. Two of its three cofounders, James Wechsler, editor of the New York Post, and Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., an attorney and officeholder in New Deal days, made speeches. They said that Adlai Stevenson, whom their organization had twice backed, should not again be the Democratic candidate; that the choice instead was between Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and Senator John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts.

After Jack Kennedy knocked HUBERT HUMPHREY out of the running for the nomination in the Wisconsin and West Virginia primaries, officials had a second thought about Kennedy and made an effort to try to nominate Adlai again. After Kennedy's nomination at Los Angeles, however, the ADA gave its all-out support to Jack Kennedy.

This support was important for several reasons. It made certain the labor-leader support for Kennedy because the organization counted among its original members: Walter Reuther, David Dubinsky, James Carey, and Emil Rieve.

Its most direct help, however, lay in the support among influential working members of the press and the media, and it insured the backing of probably the most vocal elements among the radical intelligentsia. Among its original press members were Stewart Alsop, Marquis Childs, Kenneth Crawford and Edgar Ansel Mowrer. Formidable and numerous additions to that list have since been made. Among its original academic members were Kenneth Galbraith and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., of Harvard.

The members, and those closely affiliated with the organization, are zealots who work hard to push the organization's collective viewpoint. Not only did they help elect Kennedy, but they also have entered his administration from the top to the bottom. Although to the Nation at large the ADA is scarcely known, or not known at all, it probably is the most influential single element in Jack Kennedy's government.

The Los Angeles Times, in an article by its Washington correspondent, Robert T. Hartmann, wrote:

"THE ADA: ITS IMPACT ON THE NEW FRONTIER—ONCE ALOOF FROM KENNEDY, IT STAFFS HIS ADMINISTRATION

"'I'm not liberal at all,' protested John F. Kennedy soon after becoming a Senator in 1953. 'I never joined the Americans for Democratic Action. I'm not comfortable with those people.'

"Eight years ago, American liberals were not very comfortable with the young Senator, either. Taking their cues from Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, honorary national chairman of ADA, most of their hearts belonged to Adlai in that bitter winter of Republican restoration.

"Last May, as the 14th national convention of the ADA met to celebrate the recapture of Washington by the Democrats for the first time in 8 years there was a letter of welcome to Washington on White House stationery hailing 'liberals as today's minutemen leading the way' in the 'democratic social revolution as against the revolution of nihilism and totalitarianism.'"

Mentioned in the article are the following members (or former members) of the ADA who are prominent in the New Frontier:

Theodore C. Sorensen, special adviser to the President.

Arthur S. Schlesinger, Jr., administrative assistant to the President.

Harrison L. Wooford, special assistant to the President on Civil Rights.

Chester Bowles, Under Secretary of State.

Mrs. Katie Louchheim, assistant to Mr. Bowles.

G. Mennen Williams, Assistant Secretary of State.

Philip H. Coombs, Assistant Secretary of State.

Jonathan B. Bingham, U.S. representative on the U.N. Trusteeship Council.

J. Kenneth Galbraith, Ambassador to India.

James Loeb, Jr., Ambassador to Peru.

Adlai Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. (Not a member, but ADA World identifies him as a founder.)

Arthur Goldberg, Secretary of Labor.

Frank W. McCulloch, Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board.

George L. P. Weaver, Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Esther Peterson, Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Charles Donahue, Labor Department Solicitor.

Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Wilbur J. Cohen and Mrs. Jim G. Aken, congressional liaison officers for Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Orville Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture.

Charles Murphy, Under Secretary of Agriculture.

Robert G. Lewis, Deputy Administrator of Price Supports.

John A. Baker, Director of Agricultural Credit Services.

Henry H. Fowler, Under Secretary of the Treasury.

Frederic C. Belen, Assistant Postmaster General.

Charles H. Stoddard, Director of the Interior Department's review staff.

Archibald Cox, Solicitor General of the United States.

William Taylor, Special Assistant to the Director of the Civil Rights Commission.

Thomas K. Finletter, U.S. Ambassador to NATO.

Robert C. Weaver, Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

Jack T. Conway, Deputy Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

Sidney H. Woolner, Commissioner of Community Facilities.

Howard Morgan, Federal Power Commissioner.

Philip Elman, Federal Trade Commissioner.

George Docking, Director of the Export-Import Bank.

Correspondent Hartmann, summing up in the rather long article on the ADA and its relationship to the Kennedy administration, comments:

"It can be taken as reasonable proof that President Kennedy has clearly overcome the discomfort he expressed about liberals and the ADA 8 years ago.

"But when any 14-year-old organization, numbering no more than 50,000 citizens, with a budget of less than $200,000 a year can staff an administration with 3 White House aids, 3 Cabinet officers, and 31 key administrators in vital areas of finance, labor, civil rights, public works, power, housing, and foreign policy, it is worth looking into."

Actually, these are only a few of the ADA members (or former members) in the Kennedy administration. In the second and third echelons of the Government, there are many more ADA-connected or ADA-oriented personnel.

The membership of ADA is composed of many honest liberals; a mass of college professors, scientists, members of the intelligentsia in general, and some politicians who have found its support valuable, particularly in the press and labor fields, and, in a few cases, the keystone of their success in politics.

Most of the membership probably believes that the Federal Government can handle most problems for the people. There is a collectivist tinge to ADA's policy as support of the Brannan, and now the Freeman, farm plans indicates. A majority of the members would deny they are "statists," although some are, and more would deny they are socialists, although a few are.

But perhaps the best gage may be found in the policies ADA has, or does, support. ADA has suggested:

Relief aid to Communist China.

Diplomatic recognition of Communist China.

Admission of Communist China to the U.N.

Ratification of the U.N. convenant on genocide.

Exclusion of Spain from the U.N.

Support of the International Labor Organization.

Opposed unilateral U.S. attempt to intervene against Castro.

The ADA has urged:

The Brannan farm plan.

Compulsory health insurance.

Federal price, wage, and rent controls.

Repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Compulsory union membership.

Giving the Executive power "to modify rates of taxes and expenditures to meet changing conditions."

Abolition of the seniority rule in granting committee chairmanships in Congress.

Unilateral cessation of nuclear bomb testing.

The amazing fact, however, is that this organization can exist, and wield such obvious influence, without most Americans being aware of it, or if they do know, not quite understanding it.

It is the leftwing counterpart of some of the rightwing organizations which have been so publicly attacked recently. It is interesting, in this connection, that ADA came out strongly against a congressional investigation of the John Birch Society, which it opposes. Such an investigation would set a precedent for an investigation of ADA's role in the present administration.

ADA has publicly declared itself to be nonpartisan. The ADA maintains its independence of either party, but has declared that the liberals are an ineffectual minority in the Republican Party, and the reactionaries, the strategically placed minority in the Democratic Party."

ADA is liberal, according to its own 1953 program, and Senator JOSEPH CLARK, of Pennsylvania, a former chairman of ADA's Philadelphia chapter, has defined a liberal as one who believes in utilizing the full force of the Government for the advancement of social, political and economic justice at the municipal, State, National, and international level.

The New Leader declared that "ADA is not a mass organization. It cannot scare candidates with hundreds of thousands of votes. It counts because of its quality, rather than its quantity. The common quality shared by all the group is the eagerness to do their share in seeing the world is run right."

Despite the enthusiasm, honesty, and integrity of most of its members, who probably believe more or less what Senator CLARK does, there are undertones in this organization as politically subtle as in some of the more conservative organizations it deplores.

ADA, in its 1961 platform, for instance, believes too much accent is placed upon "military" rather than economic and political considerations in the Far East, and questions the need for continued maintenance of American bases there. It is an interesting coincidence that Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev has long called for the elimination of such bases.

ADA for 1961 also calls for recognition of Red China and its admission into the United Nations, although both major political parties are on record against this. It is no secret that the Red Chinese are most active in Cuba and certain other Latin American countries, trying to break what has been a united front in Latin America against admission of Red China to the United Nations, and that Khrushchev wants Red China admitted.

James Wechsler, one of the three founders of ADA, was once a self-admitted official of the Young Communist League. He has since repeatedly asserted that he has forsaken communism. However, it is a matter of record that his books were used in the Jefferson Communist School in New York, long after he declared he had quit and had refused to divulge the names of his former Communist associates.

Another of the original founders, Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., an attorney, presently ADA vice chairman, defended William W. Remington of the Commerce Department, while the ADA World, then the organization's publication, proclaimed Remington's "innocence." Remington was sentenced (the sentence was upheld on appeal) to the Federal Penitentiary at Lewisburg, Pa. for lying about his Communist activities and associations. Remington was killed in prison by thugs for reasons having no relation to his sentence.

Before the Remington case hit the courts, however, ADA World gloated:

"The clearance of William Remington of charges of disloyalty to the Government was unquestionably the most important and well-publicized decision so far handed down by the Government's top Loyalty Review Board. This major civil liberties victory can be credited in large measure of Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., of the ADA executive committee."

Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., whose father belonged to 18 Communist fronts, although he himself has not belonged to any, wrote President Eisenhower on November 20, 1953, protesting against the official exposure of the late Harry Dexter White, a former ranking U.S. Treasury official, as a Communist agent.

In his letter the younger Harvard professor stated that White's exposure "threatens to make the U.S. Government the laughing stock and despair the entire free world. It has already undermined the respect of the American people in their representative form of government. Continued events of this nature will do nothing but tear our Nation apart."

Strangely, an outstanding American, former First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt, who entered ADA with her then protégé, Joseph Lash, wrote on August 16, 1948, in her column, "My Day":

"Smearing good people like Alger Hiss and Lauchlin Currie, is, I think, unforgiveable."

It seems fair to ask: If an Army general is to be punished for allegedly teaching John Birch Society ideas to his troops, why should the ADA author of the Harry Dexter White letter be permitted to hold a key position in the White House?

Meanwhile, the Boston Irish who handle official patronage appointments in the White House, throw up their hands as ADA members are mysteriously appointed to Federal posts without being cleared through them.

The Ethics of Retail Price Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks of Daniel J. Murphy, Director, Bureau of Deceptive Practices of the Federal Trade Commission, before the American Marketing Association, Hotel Biltmore, New York, on December 27, 1961:

THE ETHICS OF RETAIL PRICE ADVERTISING

(Address by Daniel J. Murphy)

I

May I take this opportunity[1] to express my appreciation for your gracious invitation to appear on this program. The lofty and inspired nine major purposes of your organization—beginning with "to foster scientific study and research in the field of marketing" and ending with "to encourage and uphold sound, honest practice and to keep marketing work on a high ethical plane"—are certainly worthy of high commendation. May you have the greatest measure of success in their practical and effective realization.

My assigned subject is "The Ethics of Retail Price Advertising." The term "ethics" itself is a term meaning many things to many people. Without getting into a broad philosophical discussion on the definition of terms, I assume we are concerned here with the retail advertising pricing practices from the standpoint of rightness and wrongness.

It is sometimes said that business cares nothing about right and wrong; that all it is interested in is making a profit; that whatever is good business is good ethics. Therefore, why talk about the ethics of business?

The majority of businessmen, like the majority of other people, have ethical standards. Much of the unethical in business is due not because the businessman means to do the wrong thing, but, because he believes it is all right for him. This simple truth is forgotten—what is right or wrong for one person is right or wrong for everyone else under the same circumstances.

Many times, also, the unethical act is due to thoughtlessness. Wrong acts are committed in good faith because the actor has never given serious thought to the matter one way or the other. He has merely conformed to the customs of the trade. A wrong is done on the supposition that it is right. If business ethics cannot make one completely objective, it can at least demonstrate what objectivity means.

II

Before entering upon this discussion, may I engage in a little historical development in regard to advertising in general.

The principle "caveat emptor" (let the buyer beware) for many years was controlling in the market place. The principle had its origin in late English law and is found in a few English decisions prior to the Revolutionary War. A significant and primary decision involved a dispute between buyer and seller over a horse trade. Probably horse trading is still going on in the advertising field.

The principle "caveat emptor" became more popular in America. Its ruggedness appeared more adaptable to the then frontier economy. Advertising in the papers of the period indicate a lack of advertising ethics and a predominance of all-embracing claims for the product offered. The zenith of "caveat emptor" was reached in 1900 in *American Washboard Co.* v. *Saginaw Mfg. Co.* (103 Fed. 281). The court stated, "If all persons are compelled to deal solely in goods which are exactly what they are represented to be, the remedy must come from the legislature, and not from the courts."

At this time—1900—the industrial revolution was causing great changes in the marketplace. Advertising was growing,[2] public indignation was rising over its lack of ethics. This lack of ethics is clearly demonstrated in the full page advertisement which appeared in newspapers the day Grover Cleveland took office as President of the United States. There is no doubt that the advertisement was entirely without the President's consent, yet, it had the appearance of a handwritten executive proclamation. It used the President's name, but it carefully avoided a Cleveland signature. Cleveland was known to enjoy a drink occasionally. He was represented in this advertisement as endorsing Duffy's Pure Malt Whiskey and endorsing it as a cure for practically everything.

The campaign against false and unethical advertising really began in the beginning of the 20th century. In 1911 Printer's Ink published its model state statute and launched the movement to have it enacted in every State legislature. Advertising groups across the nation joined in the campaign.

Footnotes at end of speech.

As part of the campaign to obtain ethical guides and to secure ethical advertising, the Associated Advertising Clubs, at their convention in 1911, adopted the slogan "Truth in Advertising." The Better Business Bureau joined in the fray and in convention assembled adopted their "Declaration of Principles" which today guides and controls the policies of all their bureaus.

As a result of this campaign, 44 States have adopted false advertising statutes. Twenty-seven States adopted the Printer's Ink statute without substantial change. This act makes false advertising a criminal offense. Seventeen additional states enacted modified versions which require additional proof that the seller had knowledge that his statements were false. The addition of the words "knowingly" seriously weakened the model statute.

Inroads were being made into the doctrine of caveat emptor by State and Federal legislation. The States have acted in many areas to obtain ethical advertising—they have acted to regulate pricing practices—19 States have adopted statutes prohibiting bait advertising. These two areas are of particular concern to the Federal Trade Commission as expressed in its published "Guides Against Deceptive Pricing" and "Guides Against Bait Advertising." Thus, the legal growth of State regulation has been substantial. While the buyer must still beware, the seller must also now beware.

III

While the first States were enacting ethical advertising statutes, the movement for Federal legislation to cover advertising in interstate commerce was gaining. This movement resulted in the Federal Trade Commission Act in 1914. This new statute made no mention of advertising or deception and proscribed only unfair methods of competition. This power was not specifically defined—nay, it challenged an adequate and all-inclusive definition. It was meant to be of a flexible and comprehensive character. It was also meant to be a living and vital organism, capable of growth and expansion, and of being applied to new and as yet unknown practices which may arise from time to time in the conduct and development of business. The primary thrust was the protection of businessmen, one from the other—the protection of the consumer was only incidental. The jurisdiction of the Commission was based upon injury to competition, actual or potential, and mere injury to or deception of the public did not constitute an offense under the statute.

This was evidenced by the famous 1931 Supreme Court decision[3] in the Raladam case. The Court held that the Commission lacked jurisdiction to proceed against false advertising where no substantial competition, present or potential, was shown to have been injured or clearly threatened with substantial injury by the advertising sought to be prohibited.

This obvious imperfection was remedied, in 1938, by the Wheeler-Lea amendment which declared "unfair or deceptive acts and practices in commerce" to be in the same unlawful category as unfair methods of competition. Since then the Commission has been able to proceed openly and directly to protect the consumer in the marketplace while at the same time it continued to eradicate competitive methods which unfairly divert trade from the honest to the unscrupulous members of the business communities.

Nevertheless, from the very outset, the Commission found deceptive advertising to be an unfair method of competition where competitors were injured. The first two cases decided by the Federal Trade Commission involved false advertising.[4]

Footnotes at end of speech.

Today we have 55 volumes of Commission and court decisions—approximately more than 70 percent of such decisions involve false advertising or other unfair and deceptive practices, including fictitious pricing. The first Commission case to reach the courts involved false advertising of prices.[5]

IV

Probably the primary evil in the field of false advertising, from a volume standpoint, involves so-called fictitious pricing. Deception in advertising must be material in order to be considered misleading. Price is one of the most material elements considered by a prospective purchaser. Therefore, false information as to price is generally misleading. Fictitious pricing may be defined generally as a representation that a selling price of a product is a bona fide reduction from a former price, when, in fact, the product rarely, if ever, has been sold at the former price in the trade area where the product was offered. The use of fictitious, comparative price claims has grown to such an extent that it is today's most serious threat to public confidence in advertising, nationally and locally.

In October 1958 the Commission initiated a new approach in issuing guides against this practice which is common to many industries. Trade practice rules and prior guides issued were peculiar to specific industries. There are 162 trade practice rules for particular industries. Forty-four of these rules have provisions relating to deceptive price representations. The guides against fictitious pricing cut across all industry boundaries. The provisions of these guides were based upon holdings in courts and Commission decisions throughout the almost one-half century of the Commission's existence.

The purpose of these guides was the elimination of price comparisons by which the consumer is misled into believing the advertiser has reduced his price or that the consumer is able to buy from a particular advertiser a product for less than what he would pay elsewhere when such statements are contrary to fact.

It was not the purpose in issuing these guides to instruct in lessons of brinkmanship. Neither are these guides rules of law. They are as their name signifies—guides. They are, if you will, codes of ethics for the advertiser of price representations. These guides have been widely distributed both by the Commission and by private interested groups.[6] I am sure you are familiar with their various provisions. There is no necessity, therefore, to review them here.

V

The guides do list certain phrases held to represent a product's usual and customary retail price. Included among such phrases are "manufacturer's list price," "maker's list price," "manufacturer's suggested retail price." In view of the current and widespread publicity, principally in trade papers, of these phrases, I would like to discuss them with you. Let me again emphasize that I am speaking for myself and not officially for the Federal Trade Commission. I do not find any material distinction between these various phrases and in the manner in which they are used. Clearly, there is no distinction between a list price and a suggested list price.

Let me state here and now that within the orbit in which we are considering the problem, there is nothing illegal per se in the mere issuance of a list price or a manufacturer's list price. It only becomes illegal by the use made of such phrases by either the manufacturer or the distributor in advertising directed to the consumer. The test is not the intent of the advertiser but the understanding of the consumer. The question to be asked and answered is, Does the advertising have the capacity to deceive?

It is not even necessary to show that any consumer has, in fact, been deceived by the dealer's use of the suggested list price. The Commission has a right to look at the retailer's advertisements which employ the list prices in juxtaposition with lower offering prices and in the light of any other relevant evidence and by exercising statutory expertise decide whether the practice of supplying such prices has the capacity and tendency to deceive.[7]

The Commission has considered the use of "list prices" by manufacturers in advertising directed to consumers, and it has inhibited their use unless they are bona fide, regularly established selling prices of the products—advertised and offered for sale as established by the usual and customary sales in the normal course of trade.[8]

There is a current case in litigation—the evidence on both sides has been completed—involving the single issue of the manufacturer's use of list prices. I do not intend to specifically discuss the facts in this case,[9] but it has received, and is receiving, wide publicity, especially in the appliance industry. This case has been called a test case. I do not so consider it a test case.

The Commission, many times, has issued complaints and orders to cease and desist involving preticketed prices by the manufacturer. I do not consider there is any difference in principle between a list price and a preticketed price. In the former, the list price is usually in the advertising, and in the latter the price is on the product or on the package. The kind and quality of evidence necessary in both cases are the same.

There is a recent court decision decided in April 1961 by the seventh circuit court involving a manufacturer of watches and preticketing at fictitious prices.[10] May I quote from that decision:

"Preticketing at fictitious and excessive prices must be deemed to have the tendency of deceiving the public as to the savings afforded by the purchase of a product thus tagged as well as to the value of the product acquired. Petitioners' practice places a means of misleading the public into the hands of those who ultimately deal with the consumer. Notwithstanding the prevalence of these practices and the familiarity therewith among members of the trade, these activities are proscribed to protect the interest of the public." (*Federal Trade Commission* v. *Winsted Hosiery Co.*, 258 U.S. 483, 494 (1922).)

"Misrepresentation as to the retail value of merchandise by means of an attached, fictitious price and deception as to savings afforded by the purchase of the product at a substantially lower price than that indicated thereon constitute unfair methods of competition." (*Niresk Industries, Inc.* v. *Federal Trade Commission*, 263 F. 2d 396, 494 (1922).)

VI

Advertisers should have proof of their price claims. Estimates, guesswork, or opinions are not sufficient. The advertiser has the responsibility for the accuracy and proof of comparative prices when he chooses to so advertise.

Any claims which state or imply price reductions from established retail prices should be based on one of two things: (1) The advertiser's own usual and customary price for the specific article in the recent, regular course of business, or (2) the usual and customary retail price of a specific article in the trade area.

These comparative claims must relate to the specific article; they must not be based on similar or comparable merchandise. Further, such claims cannot be based on artificial markups or on isolated or infrequent sales of the article.

It is a well-established principle that a deliberate effort to deceive is not necessary to make out a case against unfair methods of competition or deceptive practices within the prohibitions of the Federal Trade Commission Act. In one matter a retailer who was charged with falsely advertising fabrics as woolens defended on the ground that he did not know the advertising claims were false. The Commission held the retailer to be responsible for the claims he made in the advertisements published by him, and the Commission's findings were affirmed by a court of appeals.[11]

Consequently, a dealer who elects to use comparative prices is presumed to know the ordinary business facts of life concerning what happens to his products and he cannot avoid responsibility if the prices are fictitious by claiming lack of knowledge; he cannot shift all the blame to the manufacturer who gave him the prices.[12]

The Commission's jurisdiction is limited in this area to practices in interstate commerce. Therefore, as most retailers are engaged in businesses local in nature, there have not been many proceedings against retailers on this point except, of course, in the District of Columbia where the Commission has complete jurisdiction.

The Commission may issue a complaint and order to cease and desist against a retailer who is engaged in commerce and who uses a list price figure in an advertisement published in the retailer's[13] community, wherein the representation is challenged because it does not represent the usual and customary price of the merchandise in that retailer's community.

VII

Two of the most common arguments presently being made in justification of the use of list prices are (1) the list prices are necessary to properly identify the product, and (2) reference to the Automobile Information Disclosure Act.

In regard to the first argument: Manufacturers are urged to adopt and consumers are urged to follow other readily available means of identifying merchandise, such as trade names, model numbers, and product descriptions. It is difficult to see how a deceptive price can identify a product in a nondeceptive manner or why it should ever be relied upon to do so.

In regard to the second argument: This argument was advanced by respondents in the Baltimore Luggage Co. case now pending on appeal in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. The brief for the Commission filed in this matter answers this argument as follows:

"There is no substance to petitioners' argument that the recent Automobile Information Disclosure Act, 72 Stat. 325 (1953), 15 U.S.C. Secs. 1231–1233, evidences an intent by Congress to permit Baltimore to engage in preticketing which the Commission has found to be misleading and deceptive. The statute on the contrary was passed to protect purchasers and dealers of automobiles against deceptive pricing practices which had become current among the automobile dealers. (S. Rept. No. 1555, 85th Cong., 2d sess. 2–3 (1958).) The law is confined to the automobile industry only and deals only with the special problems in that industry. No abridgment of the Commission's broad powers to prevent deception generally is indicated or was intended. (*Cf. L. Heller & Son, Inc.* v. *Federal Trade Commission,* (191 F. 2d 954, 957 (7th Cir. 1951).)

VIII

Another area of difficulty is the use of representations of selling at wholesale prices and the representation of trade status of wholesaler contrary to fact.

We have found that many of the firms engaged in these practices are actually retailers selling to consumers and they do little or no wholesale selling to retailers. Many of those so engaged are not subject to our jurisdiction. There are four States—Michigan, Minnesota, Oklahoma, and Tennessee—that have specific statutes prohibiting the use of words such as "wholesaler," "manufacturer," or similar designations unless the seller is engaged in the represented trade.

The Commission has many times proceeded against this type of misrepresenation, the theory being that the purchasing public regards a wholesaler as one selling to retailers at a price lower than the price at which the retailer sells. The courts have agreed with the Commission's position.[14] The consumers infer from the representation of wholesale that they are buying at the prices at which retailers purchase, thereby saving an amount equal to the retailer's profit. When such is not the fact, the consumer-purchaser is deceived.

There is a second possible violation of laws administered by the Commission in this type of representation. If firms so engaged are actually retailers who represent themselves to manufacturers to be wholesalers and thereby induce a functional discount, they may be in violation of section 2(f) of the Robinson-Patman Amendment to the Clayton Act. By so misrepresenting their trade status, they may be inducing a discriminatory price to which they are not entitled.

IX

When the advertiser uses such words as "former," "regular," "usual," etc., in advertising directed to consumers, the Commission has held that they are representations, when used with a price figure, of the advertiser's usual and customary price in the recent, regular course of business.

The recent, regular course of business has been defined as the period constituting the current selling season on seasonal goods, e.g., apparel, sporting goods, etc., and not more than 12 months for nonseasonal merchandise such as furniture, jewelry, appliances, etc.

It has been held that the use of the expression "Reg." in connection with an advertisement for the sale of rugs, where such rugs had not been previously sold by the advertiser at the price described as "Reg." was a violation of section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act.[15]

If any claim is based on a past price of the advertiser prior to the recent, regular course of business, that fact should be clearly and adequately disclosed.

X

The Commission, in December 1959, issued its "Guides Against Bait Advertising." The Guides define bait advertising as "an alluring but insincere offer to sell a product or service which the advertiser in truth does not intend or want to sell. Its purpose is to switch consumers from buying the advertised merchandise, in order to sell something else, usually at a higher price or on a basis more advantageous to the advertiser. The primary aim of a bait advertisement is to obtain leads as to persons interested in buying merchandise of the type so advertised."

Sometimes this so-called bait and switch operation is difficult to recognize. The whole sales pattern must be examined to determine whether the offer is a bona fide offer to sell the advertised merchandise.

We must distinguish between the salesman's technique of trading up and bait and switch. Trading up occurs when the consumer responds to an advertised product and the salesman will advise or suggest a more expensive product. However, in a trading up situation the consumer can buy the advertised product if he so desires and the merchant has a quantity of the advertised product in sufficient supply to meet reasonably anticipated demands. This is generally not true in bait and switch advertising.

Generally in a bait operation, the advertised product is offered at an extremely low price. This is also true in loss leader situations—the leader is readily sold and its purpose is the hope that the customer will buy other products. Incidentally, the Supreme Court of the United States in dicta had this to say about loss leaders:

"The selling of selected goods at a loss in order to lure customers into a store is deemed not only a destructive means of competition, but it also plays on the gullibility of customers by leading them to expect what generally was not true, namely that a store which offered such an amazing bargain was full of other such bargains." [16]

IX

May I conclude. As I indicated my opinion in the beginning of these remarks, the average businessman has ethical standards. He does not desire to measure and determine right from wrong by economic consequences. While he realizes business must have economic efficiency—economic efficiency cannot be the criterion of ethical behavior; because something makes money, it is not necessarily good.

I think most businessmen agree that sound ethics is good business in the long run; this, of course, would include sound, honest, informative retail price advertising.

The unethical business operator might make money for a time, but business cannot mistreat the public for long and still survive. Once stung, the public has a long memory. In the long run, sound ethics not only is good business relations, it is conducive to making money. The real strength of the private enterprise system is that it rewards business over the long term when business is operated not only efficiently but in the best interests of the public.

---

[1] Remarks are personal and not official.

[2] In 1900 approximately $90 million was spent in advertising compared to approximately $12 billion in 1960.

[3] *FTC* v. *Raladam Company* (283 U.S. 643).

[4] *FTC v. Circle Silk Co.* (1 F.T.C. 13); *FTC* v. *Abbott* (1 F.T.C 16). Purchasers were misled to believe goods were made entirely of silk.

[5] *Sears, Roebuck & Company* v. *FTC* (258 Fed. 307 (1919)).

[6] One hundred and ten thousand copies by Commission and an estimated additional 500,000 by private sources.

[7] *Zenith Radio Corp.* v. *FTC* (143 F. 2d 29, 31 (C.C.A. 7)).

[8] The Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., et al., Docket 3983; The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., et al., Docket 3984; The B. F. Goodrich Co., Docket 3985; 33 F.T.C. 282, et seq. Montgomery Ward & Co., Inc., Docket 8200.

[9] The Regina Coorporation, et al., Docket 8223.

[10] *The Clinton Watch Company* v. *FTC,* (FTC Docket No. 7434 (C.C.A. 7, June 19, 1961)).

[11] *Gimble Brothers v. FTC* (3 S.M.D. 314, 116 F. 2d 578).

[12] The Orloff Company, et al., Docket 6184, 52 F.T.C. 709.

[13] Forbes & Wallace, Inc., et al., Docket 7474.

[14] *L. & C. Mayer Company, Inc.* v. *FTC* (2 S. & D. 460, 463, 97 F. 2d 365).

[15] In the Matter of Bankers Securities Corporation, D–7039 (1960); cf. also *The Fair* v. *FTC* (272 F. 2d 609 (4th Cir., 1959)); *Mandel Bros.* v. *FTC* (254 F. 2d 118 (7th Cir., 1958)).

[16] *Safeway Stores* v. *Oklahoma Grocers* (360 U.S. 334, 340).

The Centennial Story of Italy's Unification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Anthony Cama, of Lynn, Mass., which will be of interest to those of Italian blood and their descendants:

THE CENTENNIAL STORY OF ITALY'S UNIFICATION

(By Anthony Cama)

(Teacher, author, poet and philosopher; director of Italian language classes for children at the Italian Community Center of Greater Lynn.)

Italia! Italia! This is the land of beautiful music; Puccini, Verdi, Donizetti. From the majestic, snow-capped Alps, down through the lagoons of Venice and the volcanic island of Sicily, the great operas echo and reecho with the nostalgic memories of Caruso, Tetrazzini, Gigli, Martinelli. Rome, the immortal city of the Catholic faith, lives on resplendent with Michelangelo, Da Vinci, Botticelli, Raphael. Everywhere, on Italian soil, there is music and art; there is the enchantment of living within the full heavy fragrance of the vineyards bursting with the glory of wine. There is the golden yellow fluid of the crushed green olives that moves in magical, mystical streams of oil on every spaghetti-laden, salad-heavy Italian table. This is the land of a people proud of their Roman heritage; the Caesars, the civilization and the laws of Rome; the martyrs in the barbaric arenas dying for the faith of Christianity. And slowly we see the House of Savoy bring the Italian states together, slowly, emerging from the Napoleonic wars into a nation but—there is one sharp, deep thorn in Italy's heart the kingdom of the two Sicilies. This was made up by the Province of Naples and embraced the huge, fertile island of Sicily. Everywhere on Italian soil the cry to free Naples and Sicily filled the lemon-scented air. Darker and more menacing than the volcanic ash of the Vesuvius and the rumblings of Etna, was the rebellious hot blood of the Sicilian people under French rule greater than the huge, frothy whirlpools of Charybdis in the tempestuous straits of Messina was the echoing of the cries of the great patriot Mazzini "Italia. Italia." In 1860 all of the human volcanoes held in bondage by French bayonets burst forth into an irresistible river of flaming, scorching lava. At the head of this devastating torrent was Giuseppe Garibaldi, warrior, liberator and lover of freedom.

Garibaldi, truly the father of modern Italy, the patriotic man who could have been dictator of the kingdom of the two Sicilies, but, who loved his country far above any personal aggrandizement, so he graciously surrendered his conquest to Victor Emmanuel and thus brought about the unification of Italy.

CAPTAIN'S SON

Garibaldi, born within the family of a merchant captain of Nizza, when that lovely land was part of Sardinia, grew up with the salt of the sea in his blood. Not yet 15 years old and he was a seasoned veteran of sailing vessels. His love of freedom, like the winds of the sea and the waves of the oceans, led him into joining the Giovane Italia movement under Mazzini. He took part in an uprising in 1834. In this venture he and the rebels failed and he was sentenced to death. Fleeing to Marseilles for refuge he stayed there a short time and later went to South America. In that seething continent he took part in the revolt of Rio Grande do Sul against Brazil and he participated in the civil wars of Uruguay.

In 1848 Garibaldi again took up his sword to fight on the continent against the Austrian rule of tyranny in northern Italy. Defeated in this attempt, he came to the United States where he was in command of a merchant vessel. It was here that he made the acquaintance of Meucci, by many authorities credited with the invention of the telephone.

Suddenly the wars of 1859 erupted into fury. Sardinia won Lombardy. Garibaldi, with his veteran chasseurs of the Alps, contributed important military assistance. Now, with this victory and battle-trained soldiers, Garibaldi plunged into the revolt of the Sicilians. The cry of "Garibaldi!" "Garialdi" was like a sirocco storm. It filled the land with acts of valor and sacrifice. In the morning of the 6th of May 1860, out of Quarto, from the great city of Genoa, birthplace of the immortal discoverer of the New World, Cristoforo Colombo, Garibaldi set sail with 1,000 volunteers packed in two old leaky ships, and poorly equipped with arms and ammunition. The landing took place at Marsala, where thousands of cheering and weeping Sicilians acclaimed their liberator. The thousand advanced victoriously through Salemi, Calatafimi, and finally into Palermo where the Bourbon forces were routed. All of Sicily was free. The church bells seemed to fill the heavens. The Mediterranean Sea was gloriously alive and resplendently blue.

On the 26th of August 1860, Garibaldi crossed over onto the Continent, and, after many battles entered in triumph within the city of Naples on the 7th of September. The joy of the people was boundless. The magnificent acclaim of the populace seemed to have no limits for Garibaldi and his men. Finally, the last great battle was won by the liberator at Volturno on October 1, completely destroying the forces of the Bourbon King.

Garibaldi, beloved liberator, magnanimous lover of his country, met with Victorio Emmanuele II at Teano, on the 20th of October 1860. It was here that he showed his true greatness by surrendering all of his powers and he pledged his fidelity and allegiance to the King. He had proved a true cavalier of honor by maintaining his motto—"Italia e Vittorio Emmanuele."

After many battles and triumphs, the heroic Garibaldi dies on the 2d of June 1882, on the beautiful island of Caprera.

America hold nostalgic memories of his residence here. His wife, Anita, with Menotti, their newborn son, was attacked by enemies of Garibaldi one night. She leaped on a horse with her infant and fled through the woods and hills, suffering hunger and cold. Friends help her to escape to Italy, to be reunited with her husband, who, in 1849 was fighting to take Rome and unite it with Italy. Surrounded in a house near Comanacchio, in the Province of Ferra, by Austrian soldiers, Anita died on the 4th of August 1849. Garibaldi was forced to flee and leave his dead wife. His anguished cry was "Take the bones of my American warrior, a martyr of the redemption of our land." A year later he returned and brought back her remains to be buried with honors at Nizza.

From the fiery pen of the celebrated Genovese poet, Goffredo Mameli, who died at Villa Corsini from battle wounds, comes this stirring, lifting song that animated the land in its struggle for freedom:

"INNO DI GARIBALDI

"All'armi! All'armi!—
Si scopran le tombe!
Si levano i morti,
i martiri nostri son tutti risorti!
Le spade nel pugno,
gli allori alle chiome,
la fiamma ed il nome d'Italia nel cor!
Veniamo! Veniamo!
Su giovane schiere.
Su al vento per tutto le nostrel bandiere!
Su tutti col ferro!
Su tutti col fuoco!
Su tutti col fuoco, d'Italia nel cor!
Va fuori d'Italia. Va fuori, o stranier!"

Today, the blood of Italians and their descendants, flows in every artery and vein of our rich and glorious country. From Christoforo Colombo, Amerigo Vespucci, Sebastiano Cabotto, Gallileo, Galvani, Volta, Marconi, Enrico, Fermi; from the 168 Italians that settled in New York in 1656, from the Italian colonists that came to Virginia before the Pilgrims landed on Plymouth Rock; from the 200 Italian officers, including four generals, who served in the Union Army during the Civil War; from such calibre of soldiers and American patriots, as General Di Cesnola, winner of the Congressional Medal of Honor during the Civil War, who directed the New York Metropolitan Museum of Art from 1879 to 1902; from Gaetano Lanzo, brilliant intellectual, who for 29 years, was the founder and head of the department of mechanical engineering at MIT; from the 13 boys of Italian extraction who were awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor in World War II; and finally, from the rugged, hard-working, loyal immigrants sweating in farms and digging roads and pipelines all over America; these the good, bighearted people, that came to this promised land and helped to make America truly the symbol of freedom and create a "government of the people; by the people and for the people."

GIUSEPPE GARIBALDI

(By Anthony Cama)

Garibaldi! Garibaldi! All of Italy cried your name,
You, the nation's liberator, you the revolution's flame!
Born in Nizza, you knew freedom, of the great unending sea;
Of Italia, the spirit; you, the scourge of tyranny!
Of the Austrians, the victor; flagellation of the foes.
With your red-blood kerchief flying, truly mighty were your blows!
All of Sicily, from weeping, you uplifted soul and heart!
You destroyed the Bourbon cancer; every bit and every part!
Garibaldi! Garibaldi! With your thousand volunteers,
Through Messina, through Palermo—to Marsala, blood and tears!
You, the valiant arm triumphant, with Volturno's victory,
With your thousand liberators, freedom came to Sicily!
Down through Naples like a torrent, you went marching street on street,
'Till the churchbells, ringing, ringing, echoed Garibaldi's feet!
On October, at Teano, you gave homage to your King,
"Un Italia Unita!" were the words your sword did sing!
Garibaldi! Garibaldi! All of Italy cries your name!
You, the nation's liberator—you, immortal, in your fame!

CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS

(By Anthony Cama)

From far across the superstitious sea
He came at last, the man of fate,
A sailor born to fill man's destiny
And seek the route to India's great gate.

This was the dreamer's dream; a dream so brave,
That it was like a torch of lightning's flame,
For many men, the sea has been a grave
But now this man would chart it with his name.

This was Columbus with three tiny ships
That dared to sail the ocean deep and dark
But he had faith and prayers on his lips
And in his dream the valiant, spirit's spark.

And so he sailed with many stormy days,
With tired back and briney blistered hand,
Until 1 day across the ocean's ways
A sailor shouted loudly "I see land!"

And so we hail Columbus, brave and true,
Who gave to men a world of blessed sod
He had the will and faith to dream and do
And he was sailing in the light of God!

ITALY'S CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

(By Anthony Cama)

We salute you, Oh, Italia!
Land of music, love and art.
You, for centuries resplendent,
You, world's culture with a heart!
Michelangelo, Da Vinci,
Raffaelo, Caesar, Volta,
Toscanini, Donizetti,
Verdi and Caruso's voice.
Christopher Colombo's vision,
Amerigo and Cabotto.
Gallileo, Gallileo,
And Meucci and Marconi.
Hail Savoia, of Sardegna,
Garibaldi and Cavour.
With Mazzini and Mameli,
Dante and his Beatrice
With Puccini, Martinelli
How your music fills the earth
You, Italia with Roma,
You, so Catholic of birth!
We salute you, Oh, Italia!
From al lands across the sea
You, for centuries the banner
Soul of mortal's destiny!

ITALIA 1861–1961

(By Anthony Cama)

There are church bells loudly ringing;
Great their music for the nation.
Oh, Italia! Italia!
Yours the greatest celebration!
From the highest snowy mountains
To each limpid, lovely lake,
All of Italy is singing,
"Up! Arise! Awake! Awake!"
For it's Garibaldi marching
Marching with triumphant beat
He, the gentle in each conquest;
He, the noble in defeat!
With Mazzini and Mameli,
Cut the chains of tyranny!
With the good Emmanuele
Freedom came to Sicily!
Far across each mighty ocean
Far across each stormy sea
You, Italia, the glory
Music, art and history!
With you capital of Roma,
Fulgid star of faith and fame
You, Italia, Italia
Guiding light of Spirit's flame!
Hear the nation's trumpets ringing
Harvest well the sacred earth.
Oh, Italia eterna!
Yours the laurels of your birth!
Hear the pulses beating, beating
Oil and wine refresh the sod
Oh, Italia eterna!
Yours the love and faith of God!

The One-Way Street

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, recently the President spoke. He gave his usual fine presentation. He called upon Congress for action in many fields. He left no field unploughed, no furrow unturned. Now the burden is on Congress to accept or reject his proposals "for the good of the Nation."

Congress, of course, must in the final analysis make the decision as to which proposals it believes to be "for the good of the Nation."

This has been the procedure under all Presidents. Sometimes Congress passes all the main proposals but seldom puts any bills through in exactly the form requested by a President.

Thats as it should be. Under our system of Government each division of Government has its part to play.

The President represents the executive branch, the courts, the judicial, and Congress the legislative.

When each branch acts independently but cooperatively, the Nation gets its best government.

Some of us already see a move to set the domestic issues second to the foreign trade issue. This would be a tragic mistake. Nothing is more important than a strong, solvent domestic economy.

A strong military and defense program must be sustained and behind it there must be a strong economy. The economy of our country has made some major changes in the last decade. However, one fundamental truth still prevails. Our production of goods and services must keep pace with our growth or we find ourselves with unemployment, distressed areas, high taxes on individuals and production and a stagnation in our efforts to better and strengthen our social, educational and economic well being.

There are differences of opinion on just where the greater emphasis must be placed in order to keep and enlarge our system of freedom for individuals as well as enterprises.

It is already apparent from remarks, statements, and actions of our leaders in both the executive as well as the legislative branch that they consider the liberalization of the tariffs as the main issue.

This I predicted as long ago as 1958 when the 4-year extension was voted for reciprocal trade agreements.

As an observer and as a student of our trade policies I said then that the extension would not achieve the end results the proponents predicted.

I may not have the right answer but this much I am sure of, the overall drive for complete control of the tariffs and customs by the executive branch is the result of the failure of two significant moves which I opposed. Many of us fought these proposals:

First. The extension of the trade agreements for a longer period than 1 year without congressional action.

Second. The tax concessions to private investors to invest in production facilities in foreign countries with the right to export to the United States products made abroad in competition with their domestic plants and workers.

Let us see how these moves have turned out. First we were told that if we had 4 years to plan and promise we would achieve the goal sought by our Government, the lowering of tariffs and trade restrictions and the great boost in our export trade volume.

The facts are and the record if honestly told will show that more industries have been forced to reduce production, curtail expansion and research, and more chronic industrial unemployment has been created since the passage of the 4-year extension.

This is the reason another extension would be difficult to get through Congress, so a new bold approach is being made to cover up the failure of the old law and to pass a new law with greater promise.

When I was just a young man in the house of representatives in Harrisburg, I was working so much that one of my colleagues, Clint Sowers, of Philadelphia, who had been a member for many years stopped me one day and asked why I was working so hard. I told him I was trying to keep my promises to the people so I could be reelected. His answer was a classic. He said, "Young man you don't get reelected on keeping the old promises, it's the new ones you make."

Simply put that is what we are about to do on the trade issue. The Reciprocal Trade Acts reduced our effective tariff from 46.7 percent in 1934 to less than 11 percent in 1961. This is even lower when you count the additions on the free list. In fact the overall tariff rate if applied against all imports would be less than 5 percent.

Only one other competitive nation has a lower rate. This is Japan and any student knows that Japan is an importer of foodstuffs, fuel, raw materials and machine tools for production purposes. It is natural, therefore, for Japan to have an overall lower rate than a country where most of these items are on a free list or not required by the economy. Japan only imports products for two reasons, to eat or to sell to other nations.

Even so the records show that as Japan becomes self-sufficient or even partially independent of outside items its tariff walls go up. Witness the recent increase on machine tools from 15 to 25 percent ad valorem and the frank statement in defense of this action was that "its own industry had to be protected against imports that could undersell the homemade product.

Is this an isolated case? It is not, amongst nations this is the rule not the exception. For instance, our greatest friend and neighbor is Canada and yet Canada has an automatic tariff rule

which increases the tariff on all items imported if any Canadian producers reach a production of at least 10 percent of the countries needs. Why, simply to protect their industries and jobs.

Let us look at Germany—a nation that was devastated by the bombings in World War II. With our help this nation has become the number one world economy success story. What does Germany do in the matter of tariffs? We in Pennsylvania and West Virginia know because we are the victims squeezed between the United States cuts in tariffs and imports of fuel oil and Germany's $5.08 a ton tariff on our coal. What was Germany's answer when questioned about the exorbitant 100-percent tariff on coal. We have unemployed miners—8,000—and must protect our high cost production and the jobs of our miners in Germany. Allowing this to be logical and it was considered logical in this country for over 150 years, what logic can Germany give for placing a 75 cents a pound tariff on coffee which is not even produced in Germany?

Let us for the sake of the record look at tariffs as they were last reported in a public document showing the ratio of tariffs to total imports:

	Percent
United Kingdom (Great Britain)	25.6
Chile	46.0
Australia	9.6
France	10.6
India	17.3
Ireland	13.2
Israel	7.6
Italy	8.4
Mexico	20.6
Venezuela	17.8
Switzerland	8.1

These are 1951 figures and we have since reduced our tariffs 40 percent.

These figures tell only a minor part of the protectionist story because all nations have other means of restricting imports and protecting their own industries. Tariffs are the lesser of the restrictive covenants. The more restrictive measures take the form of embargoes, licensing for imports, nonconvertibility of money, and quotas.

The favorite protection measure of most countries is the quota and import license setup. For instance, the Japanese reduced tariffs on bourbon whisky from the United States from 45 to 35 percent but restricted total imports to $300,000 through the license deal and total quota setup—about as much as required for a respectable Irish wake.

This is common practice and in most of our reciprocal trade deals we cut tariffs and the foreign countries put on quotas or restricted import licenses.

The measure before Congress is just a front runner for a drive to enter our Nation in the Common Market.

I for one am not opposed to the Common Market and I will be the first to promote our entry into the market, when our economies become compatible.

In the meantime let the Common Market create a consumption market to match their production. If the workers cannot earn enough to buy their own production how can they earn enough to buy our goods?

It might be interesting to have a count on how many European factory and farm workers buy American cars, radios, shirts, suits, shoes, washers, dryers, and so forth.

Until they can buy their own products produced at their wage levels how can the Nation expose its high cost market to their production?

We enjoyed a prosperous and expanding economy because of our high incomes, not because of low prices. How many American automobiles can the Japanese electrical workers buy earning about 30 cents an hour as against an American automobile worker's purchase of Japanese transistors, radios, binoculars, and so forth. These are hard simple facts but they are basic.

It is my humble opinion that our economy rests upon five pillars of equal strength and equal importance.

These pillars of economic reason are:
First. Investment: creates production.
Second. Production: creates payrolls.
Third. Payrolls: creates consumption.
Fourth. Consumption: creates profits.
Fifth. Profits: creates investment.

At this point the process starts all over again and this has been true since man first invented the wheel and learned he could hire or use another man to push it. When all the pillars are equal the economy is balanced.

Today too much emphasis is placed upon consumption. Too many economists measure retail sales as the barometer of our economic welfare.

It is true in a sense but the volume of retail sales must reflect the production, payrolls, profit, and investment in the area of the sales.

When a percentage of our retail sales is produced elsewhere we find the depreciation shows up in the balance of our economy and the other four pillars cannot adjust to meet the upward thrust of the consumption pillar which endangers the level of the whole economy.

When any pillar is out of proportion, the economy becomes unbalanced. When the economy becomes unbalanced, it is susceptible to further damage from every breath of foul weather, whether it is a local storm or a hurricane from overseas.

You will note that the upthrust of the pillar of consumption pushes the economy out of balance.

It is a simple but true economic fact that as the overconsumption of foreign goods increases, production is raised through automation and the payrolls suffer by being attacked from both underconsumption of domestic production and automation.

The next step is a disproportionate destruction of the profits. Profits flow more to trade than they do to producers, labor, and industry.

The ultimate outcome of overconsumption of foreign-produced goods means the eventual weakening and in time the crumbling of the pillars of payrolls, profits, investments, and production in exactly that order.

It has been said that imports are only 3 percent of our gross national product. This is a false picture because we use volume dollar figures and ignore the import at the retail level, the production, payroll, investment and profit level.

I have said and repeat that I am not unmindful of our part in the world's economy. We prove this by helping other nations build their economy to a position of soundness and independence. We can not do it by weakening our own economy.

When we hear arguments to the effect that we can outproduce and therefore undersell other countries in their own markets we fail to mention the products involved.

Can we outproduce costwise, Japanese and German and other exporters tied to the Soviet Union in transistors, shoes, shirts, suits, ceramics, tile, glass, oil, rubber goods, leather goods, steel, aluminum products, autos or any number of consumer goods?

The Japanese say they create 200,000 jobs in America buying cotton, minerals, coal, machine tools, foodstuffs, and so forth, but they do not tell you how many jobs are lost by imports of the manufactured goods from Japan.

The story of most recent date to tell the graphic and pitiful plight of American workers displaced by foreign production involves General Electric and its lamp workers at East Boston, Mass. For the record I will only give the newspaper account without comment:

BOSTON.—The City Council of Boston has unanimously denounced as "heartless" the announced decision of the General Electric Co. to shut down its East Boston lamp plant in a formal resolution adopted at its December 18 meeting.

THE CITY COUNCIL CONDEMNS THIS HEARTLESS ACT THE RESOLUTION DECLARED

In its formal action the council calls on the administration to protect the jobs of these 450 workers.

It calls on the Massachusetts congressional delegation to take whatever steps are necessary to convince General Electric to rescind this heartless move.

It directs that copies of the resolution be sent to the manager of GE's East Boston lamp works and to Ralph Cordiner, chairman of the board, General Electric Co., and to the Governor, attorney general, and to appropriate city, State, and National officials.

TAKE FIGHT TO PEOPLE

Last week workers at the East Boston lamp plant, members of UE Local 224, carried their fight directly to the people of Boston with a distribution of many thousands of leaflets at key points throughout the city.

Headed "Fired for Christmas," the leaflet told of GE's pre-Christmas action against them and declared:

"Wages in Japan's lamp industry are 20 percent of our American wages, and prices of their lamps on the American market are 80 percent of our price. Profits on GE lamp production in the United States are enormous. Profits on Japanese production are even bigger. That's why GE is forcing us into unemployment."

RELIEF?

EAST BOSTON, MASS.—In announcing its plan to shut down the East Boston lamp plant in 1962, the General Electric Co. told its employees that it would spare no effort to see that they received suitable jobs either in GE or elsewhere.

To date the company has posted on its bulletin boards as suitable jobs for displaced

lamp workers advertisements for dishwashers, babysitters, carhops, and domestic servants.

This has happened many times from coast to coast and border to border. Tomato growers in California down from 35,000 acres to 2,000 acres. Mushroom packers in Pennsylvania faced with serious threat from foreign imports. Mexico embargos U.S. cars—Goodyear buys largest tire factory in Germany. Ford buys English auto plant—aluminum plant sold to American companies. Cement dumping causes labor layoffs in Pennsylvania and New York. Glass imports close U.S. plants. Eight hundred American-financed production facilities built overseas in the last 3 years.

We were advised that by investing overseas we would cut the need for foreign aid from our Government. This is not the case and the real result was a lessening of our exports of manufactured goods and an increase of imports of these items, in many cases from our own investments.

Let us see how we are helping our friends with our foreign investments.

Dollars invested abroad and the income the United States gets back

[In millions]

	Investment	Income [1]
1956–61 (totals):		
Investments in Western Europe	$5,141	$2,261
Investments in underdeveloped areas	5,552	8,794
Investments in Latin America	3,057	4,379
1960, a typical year shows the following:		
Investments in Western Europe	1,322	427
Investments in underdeveloped areas	608	1,474
Investments in Latin America	267	641

[1] Income to Americans from these investments.

When we talk about investments by year are not we really putting back into the countries about what we took out the year before? No American corporation operating in our economy would operate in like manner. It is no wonder that profits added to low wages and Government unions make oversea investments attractive.

Do these thousands of investors help our good neighbor policies or do they make a mockery out of high-sounding idealistic foreign policy? One wonders how many of the "Go Home Yank" cries came from the underpaid workers in American factories abroad.

The strangest thing in the whole trade and tariff fight is the belief by labor that it will be benefited and counts on the cutting of industry profits to meet foreign competition while on the other hand industry believes it will be benefited by increasing production and holding wages at present levels.

First an analysis of the trade balance is needed before any intelligent person can use this as a base for a vote one way or the other on the new trade program.

I refuse to take the large sum figures as any criteria of our success or failure in our trade policies.

You can get any results you want, depending upon which basis you are using to get the results you want.

For purposes of giving a seldom exposed view of our trade balances I will attempt to break down the figures in language that we can all understand.

Before I start let me assure you that I have authority for my figures.

We shall use the figures that best suit the purposes of the proponents of so-called free trade policies and accept them regardless of disagreements on the totals by some of us who have made studies that show the import figures are low and the export figures are high.

The Government figures show exports, $21 billion—minus; with imports $14 billion—plus—to use rounded figures.

If we are to evaluate the importance and effect of this trade volume we must first remove from these figures th amounts that do not reflect true trade but rather represent the volumes of trade that is generated because of actions by our own Government and which cannot be maintained without the gifts, loans, and financing by American taxpayers then the U.S. Treasury.

Of the $21 billion of exports approximately 30 percent is the type of trade. This means that over $6 billion of our exports are in fact not free trade or normal trade but rather trade that would not be possible under a true trade policy.

We therefore can honestly say that our true trade balance measures about the same with exports and imports equal, give or take 10 percent.

Using this as a true base we can say that measured by dollar volume our trade policy is economically sound.

However, does the dollar volume truly reflect the impact upon employment and industry?

Let us take a few examples of trade, item by item.

A foreign country buys $2 million worth of hides and sells this country $2 million worth of leather bags, shoes, gloves, and other items.

Which country gained employment and which country weakened its industrial economy?

Next let us analyze the export item. Whether the foreign country bought the hides or the domestic industry bought the hides, the producer of hides would have the same economic benefit measured in jobs and profits.

The difference is this. We import $2 million worth of products produced at a cost in labor of one-third the wage paid in the United States. Using the norm of 50 percent of cost of production to be wages it means that $1 million of foreign wages reduced payrolls in the United States by $3 million. This $3 million loss is first felt by the workers, second by the public treasury in tax losses, third by the industry in profit losses, again by the tax authorities in their second bite, and next by the whole communities' business, professional and personal services.

The loss in the services is seldom felt in less than 4 years except in a single industrial community such as Niland, Calif. In this community 5 years ago, 5,000 people lived and earned a livelihood entirely within the American economy of the United States. This earning was purely agriculturally based, the planting, cultivating, processing, shipping, and marketing of 35,000 acres of tomatoes.

Today, less than 1,000 people live in Niland. Only a few of these earn their livelihood from tomatoes since less than 2,000 acres are now planted.

What caused this breakdown. Simply put the competition of 80 cents a day labor in Mexico as against $1 an hour labor in California could not be overcome. Added to the labor differential was the additional cost to the California growers in payroll taxes, fuel, power, transportation, packaging, local taxes, and so forth.

The freetraders argue that the Mexicans purchased farm machinery, tools, and other American made products which in turn they paid for with the money they got for the tomatoes. In theory this is sound. In practice the naked truth is seen when the "for sale" signs, the dilapidated public buildings, the loss of income by the workers, the loss of investment by the farmers, and the loss of the productivity of the farms measures the net effort of this trade. Dollar volumes may be the same or even in our favor but what about the community—where does it fit in.

Time will not allow a complete breakdown and a coverage of the thousands of products adversely affected by our trade policies.

One thing we can say without contradiction. For every dollar of consumer goods purchased abroad, a minimum of $1½ is lost by wage earners in America. For our exports to equal this wage loss without regard to taxes, and so forth, exports must be at least three times as great as imports dollar wise for our economy to survive.

In plain words, if wages paid to workers amount to $7 billion by imports, it takes $21 billion out of our wage economy.

Let us look at another fixed cost that U.S. production must carry that is completely out of line competitively. Let us look at Japan for instance.

Japan has 70 million people with a national budget of $6 billion. The United States has 180 million people and a budget of $93 billion. The budget must come from wages, profits, and internal taxation and unless products imported are taxed at customs in the same amount that taxes add to the cost of a domestic product, that product becomes noncompetitive because of Government taxes, forgetting wages and other differentials already in excess of foreign costs.

When we talk about competition with foreign products and export-import balances let us talk less theory and nonsense and more dollars and cents.

The administration this year is using agriculture and textiles as bait in getting support for the new program.

It is stated that we export $2 billion worth of farm products to the Common

Market and we only buy $500 million from the Common Market.

However, we are not told that the $2 billion worth we sell costs the American taxpayers about $500 million in taxes in the form of farm subsidies whereas the $500 million of farm products we buy displaces farm products not subsidized, high in labor and wage costs and privately grown and marketed.

We sell wheat, corn, cotton, and so forth, all subsidized, and we buy farm products that compete with our self-sustaining and self-supporting agriculture.

In this regard let me quote from the California Farmer, January 6, 1962:

During the past 10 years, we have spent $26 billion on farm programs. During that same period, we have imported $42 billion worth of agricultural commodities.

That's free trade. We import to store.

There are no farm problems, except those created by the planners of this Nation through unfair, unequal and unjust import competition.

This sounds fantastic, but if the American farmer were permitted to raise and market a major part of the food and fiber that is consumed by the American people we don't have acres enough today to produce it. The problem is that agricultural imports have created an agricultural surplus.

Furthermore, agriculture has been so commingled with foreign aid, foreign trade, foreign relations, Government programs and State Department planners, that a bad public image of the farmer has been created. Free enterprise and agriculture markets have virtually been destroyed.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dated April 18, 1961, states as follows:

From 1949 to 1959, we imported twice as much barley as our surplus grew during that period. In fact, we imported more during that period than we had on hand as surplus at the end of 1959. In oats, we imported four times as much from 1949 to 1959 as our surplus grew during the same period—imports approximately equaled the surplus on hand at the end of 1959. The situation in rye is even more vivid. From 1949 to 1959, we produced 46.5 million less bushels than the amount of the total of this crop. Yet during this same period, our surplus increased by 4.5 million bushels, due to the fact that we imported 52.7 million bushels.

Perhaps there are some farmers in the United States who feel that the trade policy is not injurious but the record shows that not only are nonsubsidized farm products in danger but that all agriculture is suffering from these unsound trade policies.

In closing let me read from the New York Times, December 27, 1961:

The National Committee for an Effective Congress, a bipartisan organization of 35 members, gives financial and other support to liberal and internationally minded candidates for the Senate and House of Representatives. Sidney H. Scheuer, a New York industrialist, is chairman and George R. Donahue, a New York labor-management consultant, is vice chairman.

Maurice Rosenblatt, of Washington, chairman of the committee's advisory board, said the committee planned to contribute about $250,000 to congressional candidates in the 1962 races, largely on the basis of their records on the foreign-trade issue. He said the campaign funds had been supplied by 20,000 donors.

The bulletin suggested that a shift in administration tactics for dealing with Congress would be necessary to win favorable consideration of major recommendations in the international economic field.

They said the administration in its congressional liaison had relied on the wheeler-dealer spokesman, the courthouse type of politico.

They contended that it should substitute the legislative craftsman who would work with key legislators in drafting legislation.

As the issue of free trade develops, the rightwing coalition may suffer a shotgun divorce, it asserted. For the economic unity of the free world is a proposition that no clearheaded advocate of capitalism can deny—and it is a proposition that no emotional isolationist or a xenophobe can accept.

First, let me say that if the type of outright purchase of votes is put on a bidding basis we can expect the complete destruction of our system of government.

Second, the proposal to substitute "legislative commissar" for the legitimate system of contacting Congressmen spells of communism in its worst form.

Third, I find myself in the same position as the fellow who was arrested for hitting a man who had called him a hyena, 3 years before.

In explanation over the passage of time he said "I just found out what a hyena looked like."

I am in the same fix, I just learned what a xenophobe looks like.

Citizens of Wisconsin Are Proud of "Country Beautiful" a Notable New Magazine With an Inspired Approach and a Truly Artistic Format

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of the Members of the House a new and proud addition to the field of magazine publishing—Country Beautiful. In a day filled with the commonplace it is a pleasure to welcome the exceptional.

This publication—which was launched last September after extensive planning—shows in every page the sensitivity of that planning.

In a day filled with commercialism it is a pleasure to welcome a magazine which succeeds in being totally different. It deals with the values which affect the spirit. Every article published is designed to help the reader better understand his situation and to help him find ways of improving himself and his surroundings. The art work and the photography are of the highest quality and give positive representation to the beauty of those surroundings, and to the great potential in them which man can help to realize. This theme was well presented in an article in an early issue on President Kennedy's food for peace program.

It has always been a pleasure to represent the State of Wisconsin. To the many reasons for this there has now been added a new one—Country Beautiful. Bing Crosby summed it up better than I can when he said:

Country Beautiful is a breath of pure, fresh country air, in a smoke-filled world.

Proposed New Agency Would End Home Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter, and attached article from Nations Business of November 1961, which I sent to every Member of the House of Representatives and the Senate. I feel very concerned about this issue and believe my letter and enclosure should be published so that the people of this country can draw their own conclusions:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 15, 1962.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I am enclosing a reprint of an article which appeared in the November 1961 issue of Nations Business and which pertains to certain legislation before the Congress; namely, H.R. 8429 and S. 1633. Both of these bills propose the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. Both bills have been reported out of committee and will soon be scheduled for floor action by both the Senate and the House.

As you may know, I am a great believer in States' rights, and I am firmly convinced that the enactment of the proposed legislation would result in too great a concentration of power within the proposed new Department. I have no doubt that the new Secretary and his staff would administer their responsibilities and duties with integrity and sound judgment; however, there is a grave possibility that ultimately this newly established Cabinet post would attract those with more selfish motives. Should this come to pass and should the proposed Department become infiltrated by people of questionable motives, the best interests of our Nation could be severely jeopardized. The proposed new Department would effectively put an end to home rule and States' rights.

I am afraid that those who have proposed this centralization of control would be the first to rue its consequences. A new Secretary of Urban Affairs could pull strings in all of the cities throughout the United States, and then the mayors and city officials would be merely puppets directed by the new Department. Power to control city governments would be vested in Washington. People would lose personal contact with local governments which are most intimately concerned with their welfare. The proposed new Department would be powerful, and no doubt tremendously large new spending programs would evolve and sweep across the country.

There are too many such programs in this country today. In my home city of Reno the urban renewal program has resulted in absolute chaos. It has been labeled, and rightfully so, a real estate man's delight because it has been in the hands of appointed officials rather than elected officials. This naturally has created a very dangerous situation. Hundreds of homes have been condemned for resale and profit.

I have just returned from Nevada where I represent an entire State, and my people are getting tired of paying taxes to support domestic rat-hole spending and foreign aid giveaway programs. I cannot help but feel that a large majority of the American people today feel the same way.

Frankly, I have been worried for several years over an ever increasing tendency on the part of both Republican and Democratic administrations to centralize power and control in Washington. Nikita Khrushchev said 3½ months before his visit to the United States, "We cannot expect the Americans to jump from capitalism to communism, but we can assist their elected leaders in giving Americans small doses of socialism, until they suddenly awaken to find they have communism."

Big government and centralized control is certainly leading this Nation into socialism. I have opposed many so-called liberal bills. I consider H.R. 8429 and S. 1633 to be by far the most liberal proposals ever introduced into Congress. I feel that since 1932 the Congress has departed far too far from the basic principles set forth in the Constitution of this country, and fear and frustration have been embedded in the hearts of its people. The truth has been withheld from the people. They have been encouraged to dig holes in the ground for shelters and bury themselves like moles to escape annihilation. Would it not be better for the press and public officials to question what would happen to the Russians if our missiles were to land on Russian soil. We are not a Nation of cowards. Let us keep America American.

Let us turn again toward those basic Jeffersonian Democratic principles upon which this Nation was founded and resist that influence expounded by Khrushchev. Let us preserve States' rights and lessen the tendency to turn to central government for every fringe benefit. Let us remember that statement made by an American patriot following the Revolutionary War, "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute." Let us give our children as much if not more of what America stands for than that which we received so that they may have an incentive in life and the will to continue to fight for those principles upon which this Nation was built. Let us turn from vast spending programs to building a strong basic economy in this country for our children and our children's children to enjoy.

I wish you would read the accompanying reprint and then I know that in all good judgment H.R. 8429 and S. 1633 will be defeated.

Sincerely,

WALTER S. BARING,
Congressman for Nevada.

WASHINGTON REACHES FOR YOUR CITY HALL: PROPOSED NEW AGENCY WOULD END HOME RULE

Control of city governments could move to Washington if Congress votes next year to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

It's likely your city would then be less responsive to your individual needs. You would lose personal contact with the level of government which affects you most.

The new cabinet-level agency is recommended by the Kennedy administration, strongly backed by city officials and, among others, the AFL-CIO.

By establishing a direct line of communication from the mayor's office to the center of the Federal Government, it would soon become the most powerful and expensive Cabinet post. The authority of Governors, State legislatures, and other local levels of government would be demolished.

Although the backers of the proposed department put most of their stress publicly on the need for Federal coordination, planning, and research, they have in recent years been in the forefront of every fight to enlarge present Federal welfare programs—housing, urban renewal, community facilities, water treatment plants, airports, schools.

They've battled vigorously to get Uncle Sam deeply involved in dozens of new areas: helping depressed communities, combating juvenile delinquency, expanding public health facilities, modernizing and renovating hospitals, subsidizing commuter facilities, acquiring park lands. They've suggested the Federal Government take on such other chores as helping cities to relocate industry, planning public works, fire prevention, even snow removal.

Opponents of the new Department put its real purpose bluntly: to pressure within the administration, with Congress, and with the public for big new spending programs the cities have long wanted.

MOST EXPENSIVE DEPARTMENT

"To say that the bill merely conveys status to the present housing agency without transferring any functions in or out of the agency," say five Republican members of the House Government Operations Committee, "only describes the first step of the long-range strategy—a strategy apparently designed to bring the solution of the day-to-day problems of community life under the direction of centralized government."

Declares a minority report by two southern Democrats and two Republicans on the Senate Government Operations Committee: "A department of Government which will carry out the functions envisioned by the supporters of (this) plan will be the most powerful cabinet post—and it will be the most expensive."

The fight for the Department of Urban Affairs has been gathering momentum in recent years. President Eisenhower resisted it, warning that "nothing is really solved, and ruinous tendencies are set in motion, by yielding to the deceptive bait of the easy Federal tax dollar."

But the 1960 Democratic platform and Democratic Presidential Candidate John F. Kennedy made the Department of Urban Affairs a key campaign promise.

Shortly after Mr. Kennedy's election, some of his advisers started having second thoughts on the idea, and wished the administration weren't committed quite so firmly, but it was too late—particularly in view of the way the big-city leaders had delivered votes. The administration last spring recommended the plan, the two Government Operations Committees held hearings, and both approved the measure. It is ready for floor action early next year in both Senate and House.

The proposed bill would set up a new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. It would immediately absorb the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency, including the Public Housing Administration, Federal Housing Administration, Urban Renewal Administration, Community Facilities Administration, and Federal National Mortgage Association.

In addition to administering these existing housing programs, the new department would be directed to study and advise the the President on new problems in housing and urban development, provide technical assistance to States and cities, encourage comprehensive State and local planning on community development, and coordinate Federal, State, and local programs for urban aid.

The bill has been caught in a slight cross fire because all indications are that President Kennedy intends to appoint as Secretary of the new department his present Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, Robert Weaver. Mr. Weaver would thus become the first Negro Cabinet member, and this prospect has obliged some southerners who might ordinarily have supported the new department to oppose it. At the same time this prospect has brought support for the bill from some Republicans who might otherwise have opposed the department but now fear being placed in an anticivil-rights position. Unless its opponents rally between now and the time the bill will be voted on in early 1962, the odds strongly favor its enactment.

Establishment of the new department would climax a trend that has been growing steadily in recent years—a trend of cities turning to Washington for financial help.

City officials claim this is the natural result of the Nation's increasing urbanization. Today, they point out, some 70 percent of all Americans live in about 200 metropolitan areas, and practically all future U.S. population growth is expected to be in urban areas. These new metropolitan areas, they continue, expand rapidly across city, county, and State lines. Their needs for new and enlarged local services outstrip the availability of local taxes, the argument goes.

So they turn to the States, and what do they find? According to city officials, they find a legislature whose membership was set back in the days when the States were predominantly rural rather than urban areas.

Even where the States are sympathetic, the cities say, they have run out of resources or lack the power to do anything for metropolitan areas that cut across State boundaries.

So the answer is to turn to the Federal Government.

Sponsors of the bill suggest that all they want for the cities is the same sort of representation other groups already get. They say the Agriculture Department represents the farmers, the Commerce Department represents business, the Labor Department represents workers, but no one represents the city dwellers.

Over and over they promise that the only purpose is to coordinate and help plan. "No new programs would be established by the bill, nor would existing provisions of substantive law be altered," the official Senate report on the bill goes out of its way to proclaim.

"There is considerable research being carried on today," asserts Mayor Richard Daley of Chicago, "but such studies are made in bits and pieces. The results are often not widely publicized, and a Federal department could not only develop its own program of essential information but would have channels available to distribute basic research studies to city, county and State officials."

Declares Senator JOSEPH CLARK, Pennsylvania Democrat and Senate sponsor of the new department: "State or city officials with complaints will have someone to whom to turn. A local official with an inquiry will be able to get one-stop service instead of being bucked around from one Federal agency to another."

Not only do the bill's sponsors protest their innocence of new spending aims; they assert it will make things more efficient and even more economical.

Senator KENNETH KEATING, New York Republican, another sponsor, argues: "The creation of a new department to deal with urban problems does not necessarily mean

the Federal Government is going to spend more money. By bringing together under one department a number of separate agencies that now, in many cases, overlap, we may actually be able to realize considerable savings."

But opponents remain skeptical. They point to the past history of new departments, which rapidly become advocates and lobbyists within the Government for the groups they represent—the Agriculture Department fighting for bigger farm spending; the Labor Department pushing for more spending for workers; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare constantly supporting enlarged outlays in its areas. Appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the newest cabinet post, have jumped from something under $2 billion in the year ended June 30, 1953, to more than $3.8 billion in the year ended June 30, 1961, while civilian employment in the agency has climbed from some 36,600 workers to almost 63,200.

It's far more than history and normal bureaucratic trends that worry the opponents of the Department of Urban Affairs. They're more concerned over the records of the chief backers of the new Department.

The two main sponsors—the American Municipal Association and the U.S. Conference of Mayors—last year asked the Democratic and Republican nominating conventions to adopt urban affairs planks "endorsing the principle of Federal grants-in-aid as an appropriate method through which the National Government with its broadly based tax resources can fulfill its duties and obligations in helping local governments."

Specifically, the proposed plank called for Federal-city cooperation on "urban renewal, highways, mass transit, airports, water supply, air pollution, juvenile delinquency, hospital construction, atomic energy, civil defense, area redevelopment, payments in lieu of taxes, and public works."

In almost every bill considered by Congress this year in the welfare field, these groups fought for enlarged programs. For example, they called for a 5-year program of $100 million a year for airport help, with the Administrator having far more leeway in the type of projects to be helped. The previous program was $63 million a year. Congress authorized a new program of $75 million a year for 3 years.

The National Housing Conference urged that $1 billion a year be voted indefinitely for urban renewal; Congress actually voted $2 billion for a 3- to 5-year period.

Congress authorized $75 million of aid for commuter facilities and $50 million of Federal help for cities to acquire open spaces for parks, recreation, conservation and scenic areas; the urban groups suggested a $500 million, 10-year program of transportation help and a $500 million, 5-year program of open space support.

City officials urged not only continued and enlarged aid for new hospital construction but a $150 million annual program to modernize and renovate older hospitals. The municipal groups led a successful fight for more than double past Federal spending for community health services and facilities.

Advocates of the Urban Affairs Department have supported new programs of Federal spending—some large, some small—to combat air pollution, provide special housing for minority group members, build arterial streets, construct libraries and cultural facilities, subsidize public works planning, and help in locating and relocating industry.

The International Association of Fire Fighters even argued that "fire prevention in this day and age is no longer solely a matter of local concern, but is a serious national problem," and urged the Federal Government to provide technical assistance and planning aid to local communities in this field, help standardize equipment and appliances, and promote regional and interstate cooperation among fire departments.

NEED TO CUT DEFICIT

"There is a steady stream of pious protestations in Government," says the Senate minority report, "that we need to cut down the deficit and the public debt, but we will, in one sweeping gesture, create a Goliath which will drain our Treasury and which will keep a watchful police eye on every urban community and its citizens, planning, spending, directing, until citizens will not call city hall when streets need repair or a water main needs replacing, but will notify their Congressman to contact the Cabinet member handling such problems, seeking repairs and services."

Establishment of the Urban Affairs Department, opponents predict, will encourage groups pushing other new departments to lobby for their interests within the Government. Bills already are pending to set up a dozen other new Cabinet posts, ranging from a Department of Transportation and a Department of Science to a Department of Peace and even a Department of Public Relations.

Opponents use other powerful arguments, too. To the contention of the bill's backers that they want coordination, the opponents point out that two Federal agencies contributing from half to two-thirds of all residential mortgage financing are omitted from the new department—the Home Loan Bank Boards and the Veterans' Administration. The bill's critics suggest these have been deliberately omitted for the time being to avoid stirring up opposition from veterans and housing groups, but that once the bill is passed, the new agency will grab for them. The same argument is made about many other programs which logically could be expected to go into the new department but which are being left for the present in other agencies.

Thus, while the sponsors proclaim they want to give city officials "one-stop service" in Washington, they've carefully left in existing departments a long list of urban programs ranging from roads and airports to schools and water pollution treatment facilities.

The bill's backers have for the most part been carefully guarded in public about programs that might later be transferred to the new department, but every once in a while some clues are dropped. Thus Representative J. ARTHUR YOUNGER, the California Republican who was one of the department's first proponents, told the House Government Operations Committee that he thought such programs as helping cities to fight smog and polluted water "would be included, normally" in an Urban Affairs Department, and that aid for education "could well be transferred to this new department."

When the bill's adherents argue that cities deserve Cabinet representation, opponents counter that other Cabinet members such as the Attorney General, Secretary of Labor, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and others already serve urban interests, and that this new department would be the first setup on geographic rather than functional lines.

They suggest that cities should use the facilities of existing departments and, if something more is needed, it could be provided by a coordinating official in the Budget Bureau or White House—without any huge new bureaucracy set up to lobby for new spending. Cities can do far more to help themselves solve what are and must remain primarily local problems.

Finally, opponents make a major stand on the argument that the new department would undermine the traditional American Federal system. Cities, they say, would turn more and more to the Central Government, bypassing State and other local units. These would atrophy, and ultimately the cities themselves would be swallowed up by the Central Government.

"A powerful Cabinet department of this type would tend to weaken existing relationships between States and their political subdivisions and would materially accelerate the dependency of local government upon the National Government," the executive committee of the Governors' conference declared in opposing the proposed new department.

CITIES MIGHT DOMINATE

Said the National Association of County Officials: "We feel establishment of such a department may well empower large metropolitan cities to deal directly with the Federal Government, bypassing not only the States but local communities as well: Those of us at the local government level have grave concern that the proposed department, once set up, might strengthen the hand of the metropolitan core city to the extent it would be in a position, because of its close association with the Federal Government, to dominate other local municipalities which operate contiguously to or within the periphery of the core city's metropolitan area."

The Senate minority report warns that "a line of communications will be set up directly from the city mayor's office to the center of the Federal Government. County commissioners, State legislatures, Governors will be ignored." And as for the cities themselves, "If Washington pays the bill, Washington will direct the action. More than hopscotching over State and county government, this new department can eventually nullify local city government."

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of January 20, 1962:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

The U.S. budget fiscal year 1963 (July 1962 through June 1963), a summary of the President's recommendations for expenditures and estimation of receipts, reached Congress this week. Previously, as usual, each department and agency submitted requests for money, based on fulfilling existing law, previously passed by Congress and reflecting additional proposals by the President. The President proposes and Congress disposes. So now the Appropriation Committees of the House and Senate will make their respective studies and findings, and present appropriation resolutions which Congress will trim, add to, or defeat.

Some of the ironies and faults of our system include: (1) There is little, if any, real liaison between congressional committees relative to any sort of spending-income blueprint, including the budget. Rather, it is a piecemeal operation. (2) Government agencies pad their requests knowing Congress will trim to show fiscal responsibility and frugality. Result is confusing—more is spent than ever before but is less than requested, so Congressmen can have it both ways. (3) Backdoor spending, direct automatic withdrawals from the Treasury, violat-

ing constitutional procedures of going through congressional committees, now account for one-fifth of the budget ($20 billion last year though the President requested $29 billion). (4) There is no constitutional limitation to spending not exceeding income. The Chief Executive merely estimates the anticipated receipts but proposes the spending of whatever amount he desires.

The budget is not a reliable guideline, therefore, for these reasons and others, but it is a semblance of one. So we should note these particulars: (1) The cash budget shows proposed spending of $114.8 billion (not $92.5 billion of the administrative budget), and estimated receipts of $116.6 billion (not $93 billion); (2) the estimated receipts must go up $11 billion in the administrative budget, $14 billion in the cash budget just to break even. That means the gross national product, total U.S. business income, must jump from the approximate $520 billion level of 1961 to the forecasted $570 billion or Federal tax income will fall short and thus create a deficit. (I predict a deficit this year of several billions at least.) (3) Additional expenditures most assuredly will be asked by the President as the year progresses. (4) In our most prosperous year (a) no provision is being made to reduce our gigantic debt on which interest cost alone will be over $9 billion; (b) no tax reform and cuts, needed so badly, such as depreciation reform and reduction of each bracket, are planned. Indeed, the Korean wartime taxes are being asked for extension again. Further, tax increases are in prospect as well as postal rate increase.

This budget signals a rocketing into further Government tax, spending, and control. The Fabian Socialists surrounding the President obviously do not believe in individual initiative and freedom from tax and Government regulation. Fortunately, Congress has the option of cutting the spending, and the people can influence Congress, if not the Presidential aids.

The Dallas Federal Building was omitted from the budget, although approved and reapproved by the House and Senate. An oversight, of course, since the yearly rentals now paid exceed the cost of the new building by an estimated $990,000 a year. The administration, pledged to fiscal responsibility, cannot afford to overlook this economy. Nor is the convenience of central location to citizens and Federal personnel to be overlooked. I have called this to the attention of the Appropriation Committee chairman and ranking members.

The Ways and Means Committee of the House has the responsibility for both House and Senate of originating all revenue measures; that is, tax bills. Coincidentally, the key proposals of the President's program will come before this 25-man committee. Texas is fortunate to have two members on this key committee—with the Democratic election of CLARK THOMPSON—joining me. The tentative lineup of bills includes first, the President's 10-point tax proposal, public assistance welfare changes, trade and tariffs extension and alteration, public debt increase, and medical care for the aged under social security. As I see it, elements in all five of these violate constitutional principles and, therefore, must be even more closely examined. (See last week's newsletter, Alger seven-point positive program.)

The weekly television series this year will include Ways and Means Committee personnel to inform further Dallas constituents and taxpayers.

Among CONGRESSIONAL RECORD statements I presented this week is the danger confronting all U.S. citizens in the right of association as found in private clubs. If Government can prescribe such association, logically there can be no freedom of association left, including within the home.

Additional legislation I shall support this year (beyond Alger bills already in the hopper) are: (1) U.S. withdrawal from the United Nations. (2) Withdrawal of U.S. subsidy of Communist propaganda distribution in the United States. (3) Foreign aid only to nations of free people, with democratically chosen governments (and then only on a self-help basis). (4) Withdrawal of U.S. recognition of any nation taken over by the Communist conspiracy, Yugoslavia, Poland, etc. (5) Reinstate the Monroe Doctrine in this hemisphere. (6) Reunification of all Germany. (7) Protection for U.S. citizens throughout the world from bodily harm and their property from expropriation.

To all my constituents I want it clearly understood that I shall continue to defend my proclaimed legislative principles, in terms of the great issues of the day, asking no quarter, giving no quarter. I shall not engage in personal recriminations nor attempted character assassination. I shall protect all taxpayers in my district, my State, and the Nation from the selfish desires of any individual, pressure group, or groups that want their way in Federal aid or control, but are unmindful (intentionally or unintentionally) of what is best for our Nation as a whole. This course of conduct alone will preserve our Republic in a democracy and the self-respect, dignity and freedom of our people. The contrary course will only downgrade our form of Government and our free society, if not destroy it.

So it is in keeping with this policy that I believe it is vital that the people know and understand the voting records of key Members of Congress as a guide to the liberal or conservative complexion of the two parties. I inserted a comprehensive report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this week, not to challenge the right of a Member to vote his convictions, but to put an end to the confusion which exists in the minds of some because the waters are often muddied. Copies of this report are available by writing my office.

BILLS INTRODUCED BY CONGRESSMAN BRUCE ALGER, 1ST SESSION, 87TH CONGRESS, 1961

There are several approaches a Member of Congress may use in introducing legislation. Some believe it is more effective to be identified with a volume of bills and, therefore, they sponsor measures on a variety of subjects. They increase the total by cosponsoring bills with which they are sympathetic and by introducing companion bills on the same subject.

My own approach is to limit the introduction of bills to those reflecting the basic principles in which I believe, the strengthening of constitutional government and the rights and liberties of the people. I cosponsor legislation or introduce companion bills only when I believe that by attaching my name to such a bill I can materially further its cause. Consequently, the measures I personally introduce are carefully selected according to this formula and are strictly limited in number. I do, of course, work closely with Members who sponsor bills in which I believe (1) in the Ways and Means Committee, (2) by testifying before other committees and, (3) on the floor of the House, and do all possible to help get them enacted.

In my opinion, this is the manner in which I can be most effective as a legislator. It should be kept in mind, too, in assessing the success of a Representative in affecting the enactment of legislation, that it is accepted practice in the House for the chairman of the committee handling the bill to attach his own name to it when it is reported from his committee.

In order to keep you informed, I am including, herewith, a list of the public bills and resolutions I introduced in the 1st session of the 87th Congress:

H.J. Res. 11. Calling for a constitutional amendment which would make it mandatory to balance the Federal budget each year.

H.J. Res. 138. Seeking a constitutional amendment which would prohibit the Federal Government from engaging in business in competition with private enterprise.

H.J. Res. 448. A declaration by the American people that the Government pursue such policies as will insure a victory over the worldwide Communist conspiracy.

H.R. 2200. Cosponsored with Congressman SID HERLONG, of Florida, and Congressman HOWARD BAKER, of Tennessee, for amending the Internal Revenue Code to bring about personal income and corporate tax reform.

H.R. 4573, H.R. 8407. To make labor unions subject to antitrust law. The second bill (H.R. 8407) is an amended version of the first to clear up any misunderstanding as to interpretation.

H.J. Res. 512. Calling for an amendment to the Constitution to protect the sovereignty of the United States by prohibiting treaties which will supersede the Constitution of the United States. (The Bricker amendment.)

And others of more specific nature dealing with particular problems within the framework of these same basic beliefs.

Space Life Sciences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, with reference to remarks I have made earlier on the excellence of William Hines, of the Washington Evening Star, in covering scientific news, I want to offer for the RECORD two more articles by Mr. Hines concerning recent developments in space life sciences:

FLYER IS MOST RELIABLE FACTOR IN X-15, PILOT SAYS

(By William Hines)

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., January 11.—The holder of the world's airplane speed record says the pilot has proved to be "the most trouble-free component plane system."

Maj. Robert M. White made this evaluation in a talk yesterday to about 500 scientists attending a series of lectures on aerospace medicine here. Later, he told an interviewer he believes the same will hold true when men get into space operation full scale, as in the orbital flight of Astronaut John Glenn, now scheduled for January 23.

LIMITS NOT REACHED

Major White said the X-15's present speed and altitude records are nowhere near the limit for the rocket-propelled plane. He set both marks—217,000 feet altitude and 4,093-mile-per-hour speed, in the X-15 last November. The X-15s—three were produced under a $120 million contract—already have performed close to their design limits. The skin of the X-15 is supposed to withstand air friction heats up to 1,200° F. On one flight the leading edges of the wings glowed at a temperature of 1,160°, and a small area on the tail surface actually exceeded 1,200.

Major White said the X-15 would not be usable as an earth-orbitable vehicle because reentry temperatures from an orbital speed of 17,500 miles an hour would be far above the plane's capacity.

CALLS MEDICAL MONITORING VITAL

Lt. Col. Burt Rowen, who has worked closely with Major White in the X-15 pro-

gram, endorsed the flyer's evaluation of man as the key to the space program. He warned against the advice of economy-minded persons who would see medical monitoring instruments eliminated from space vehicles.

"If they are eliminated," he said, "it would be possible to lose a spacecraft and crew and never know what caused the malfunction. It would even be possible to make the same mistake twice."

Colonel Rowen, Chief of the Bioastronautics Branch of the Air Force Flight Test Center in California's Mohave Desert, discussed the tremendous stresses imposed on X-15 pilots. He showed heartbeat and breathing records taken while Major White was setting his X-15 record November 9. They ranged up to 150 heartbeats and 35 breaths per minute, or double the normal rates.

"When the President's Scientific Advisory Committee first became aware of the high heart and respiration rates (of pilots in high-performance aircraft) they became concerned with the question of success of the Mercury program," Colonel Rowen said. "But now this has come to be regarded as normal."

CITES SOLAR FLARE PERIL

A third speaker, Dr. Charles Sondhaus of the University of California, warned that an astronaut caught in space by a solar flare might age 3 years or more as a result of radiation received. Dr. Sondhaus, a physicist, added that such an astronaut "could probably finish his mission, but at a somewhat reduced efficiency."

A solar flare—the burst of powerfully charged particles from the sun—could easily give a spaceman a radiation dose of 200 Rad, Dr. Sondhaus said. Comparable doses were absorbed by natives on the Pacific island of Rongelap in an unexpected fallout shower after an American hydrogen bomb test in 1954.

"Two-thirds of these 68 persons experienced nausea, and one-tenth had vomiting or diarrhea attacks," he said.

Experiments are now being conducted to duplicate conditions that might be expected in space in event of a solar flare, Dr. Sondhaus added.

SPACE LIFE TODAY'S TOPIC

The 5-day series of aerospace medicine lectures, held at Brooks Air Force Base near here, enters its fourth day today with five papers on life in space.

A banquet tonight in San Antonio's historic old town, "LaZillita," will feature an address by Maj. Gen. Clyde H. Mitchell, vice commander of the Air Force Systems Command, Andrews Air Force Base, Md.

SPACE PARTNERSHIP ROLE ARGUED BY AIR FORCE GENERAL

(By William Hines)

SAN ANTONIO, Tex., January 12.—Another high-ranking officer has added his voice to the Air Force's campaign for full partnership in the conquest of space.

Maj. Gen. Clyde H. Mitchell told a meeting of scientists here last night that in the face of a potential Soviet threat Americans must go into space not only as scientists and explorers but also in a military role. His speech echoed one made a fortnight ago at another scientific meeting in Denver, Colo., by Maj. Gen. O. J. Ritland, chief of the Air Force's space systems division.

Generals Ritland and Mitchell are close associates of Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, the Air Force's No. 1 spaceman. General Mitchell is the immediate subordinate of General Schriever in the Air Force Systems Command at Andrews Air Force Base, Md.

GIRD FOR MILITARY ROLE

It has been apparent for some time that General Schriever has been girding his command for a role in space fully as important as that presently occupied by the civilian National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

In his speech, General Mitchell offered NASA full support for the man-to-the-moon program, but added that the Air Force would also develop "the operational capabilities that will be needed to prevent the use of space as an avenue of aggression."

At the same time, he warned against "unnecessary duplication" in the life sciences field—a new reminder of Air Force opposition to NASA's plans to develop its own aerospace medicine capability.

General Mitchell said the recent reorganization of the Air Force's space medicine setup into the Aerospace Medical Division was "an important step in bringing the management of the varied Air Force aeromedical activities in line with the demands of a rapidly advancing technology."

Some persons have expressed concern that a major life-sciences effort by NASA would place undue strain on the small pool of trained manpower in the space medicine field. This view is shared by Representative DADDARIO, Democrat of Connecticut, an influential member of the House Space Committee.

SOVIET THREAT

In his speech, General Mitchell asked the question: "Why do we need a military man in space?" and answered it in terms of "the Soviet threat in space" which he said is becoming increasingly obvious. Citing Russian-manned orbital flights, including one by Major Gherman Titov over the United States "within 125 miles of our Capitol," General Mitchell said:

"These * * * were not just isolated events. They are the latest accomplishments of a carefully planned, single-minded Soviet effort to achieve a manned military capability in space. For the Soviets realize that if they can determine a way to dominate space, they may be in a position to dominate the world."

ABILITY TO FUNCTION IN SPACE

General Mitchell outlined in broad terms the Air Force's space aims, which appear to be even more far-reaching than NASA's 8-year, $400 billion moon program:

"It is not enough merely to send a man into space and keep him alive there," General Mitchell said. "He must also be able to function in space and he must be able to leave his vehicle safely for a variety of purposes such as emergency escape, vehicle repair, transfer to another vehicle, and assembly of space stations."

"The Air Force must develop the capability," she said, "to put large payloads into space on a reliable and relatively economical basis, to maneuver, to achieve rendezvous, to dock with other space vehicles, to transfer personnel and supplies * * * to reenter the atmosphere from both high and low orbit, and make controlled horizontal landings."

A Prediction of Freedom Through Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Ralph McGill, the eminent publisher of the Atlanta Constitution, is well known for his outspoken criticism of segregation and all of its attendant evils. I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Mr. McGill which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of September 30, 1961, wherein he predicts that "The South Will Change":

THE SOUTH WILL CHANGE

(By Ralph McGill)

In the long years of the Negro's discouragingly slow advance against his country's long-entrenched practices of segregation, the historically unique feature of this struggle has been largely unnoted. It is that the Negro, a distinct racial minority, was trying to become more American—not less. He was not, like some of the minorities of Europe, seeking to be set apart, to be recognized as a separate race with special privileges and status. He had already experienced being excluded from the national life, and he did not like it. He wanted to be accepted as a citizen, which the Constitution said he was, and to have the privileges accorded other citizens—no more, no less.

Nor was this all the story. Despite rejections and exploitations, often cunning, cruel, and ruthless, the Negro stubbornly identified himself with America and its promise. He persisted in this, even though his denials often have been stupid and stultifying in coarseness and violence.

When the wars came in 1898, 1917, 1941, and later in Korea, he served as he was permitted. It was experiences of the Korean conflict which precipitated decision to integrate military services. Morale in the segregated units understandably was low. The all-Negro companies became an embarrassment as we emphasized our principles of democracy in the bloody campaign to stop Communist aggression. Jim Crow was cawing raucously and mockingly all the while.

At the conclusion of the Korean armistice, there were 21 American GI's who refused exchange and announced they were endorsing communism and going to Red China. Only three were Negroes. Studies of the 21 who stayed revealed some with backgrounds of inadequacies and educational lacks. Yet none of the white soldiers had case histories of discrimination and psychological pressures to match that of the average Negro GI. It also is true that, despite a consistent campaign by the Communist Party to convince the Negro that Marxism is his most logical political faith, the percentage of Negroes so persuaded is smaller than that of white Americans who have embraced it.

In the face of the whole record it is ironic that the canons of conformity are so fixed, so sicklied over with the pale cast of myth and the hypocrisy and falsehood of a separate but equal status, that the Negro's effort to become more American is attacked by extremist opposition as an un-American, Communist plot.

Until very recent years the Negro's total identity was with America. But once African ambassadors began to be heard in the United Nations and political leaders of the new nations began to appear in world conferences, a great many Negroes, especially the more aggressively committed students, began to feel an identification with Africa and its emerging nationalisms. This was, in a sense, healthy. It can become dangerous only if the white-supremacy extremists are permitted to filibuster legitimate civil rights bills in the Congress and if the States continue to deny the simple uncomplicated rights of equal citizenship.

The familiar rationalization against doing what is, after all, a necessary and decent thing required by—in addition to the Constitution—the ethics of Judaism, Christianity, and Western civilization long ago lost whatever dubious relevance they may have had. Yet they continue to be repeated by those whose emotional involvement prevents perspective. These irrelevancies are the essential ingredient of the White Citizens Councils' speeches and printed propaganda.

After the 1954 school decision, for example, one began to read statements by leaders of massive-defiance groups to the effect that "to admit Negro children to school would pull down the level of classroom performance. They aren't ready for it yet."

Now the irony of this rationalization was that it was, with some notable exceptions, true. What the rationalists did not realize they were doing was indicting the system of segregated education. It had been separate. It had never been equal. It had been callously, heartlessly maintained in a most unequal manner. The white schools of the South were much inferior to the national averages, but they were far better than those for Negroes. The major inequities are familiar. The amount spent per Negro student was substantially less than that per white student. Later years have seen most urban pay scales equalized, but not all are, and for many years Negro teachers have suffered serious discrimination in salaries.

In myriad other ways Negro children in the South were deprived of opportunity to participate in the race of life.

In a number of Southern States, as late as 1957, sums as low as $2 or $3 per pupil were being spent for libraries for white pupils while a few cents, or nothing at all, was being spent for Negro children.

For years after the development of school-bus transportation, 70 or 80 percent of the white children of the Deep South States requiring such service were provided it. But in some States not more than 10 percent of the Negro children were so served.

It was a common practice in a number of Southern States to supply Negro schools with used or outdated textbooks discarded by white students. Negro schools were more crowded and had more double sessions. Vocational training was rarely first class for either race.

Advanced training in medicine, dentistry, law, nursing, architecture, electrical, mechanical and textile engineering in Southern State institutions was open to Negro students only after court decisions began to crack a few doors.

Southern politicians and a dismaying number of businessmen have been heard to say that the Negro can't learn, that he is inherently incapable of achievement. For this to be said, in the face of the educational discrimination which historically has existed reveals either an unworthy ignorance of the facts or a deliberate distortion of them.

School superintendents, psychologists, truancy supervisors and juvenile court officers in the Eastern and Western States know the lacks of both white and Negro children who have come out of the average southern school—especially those of rural areas. The level of work in many classrooms has been reduced. Desegregated schools are faced with the need to create remedial classes and to screen newcomers carefully to determine the grade for which they are prepared.

This background helps explain other things, too—all very well known to sociologists and social caseworkers.

The Negro children who had no access to libraries, whose classroom instruction was poor, who had little home incentive to go to school, who had to walk long distances, who had little or no access to vocational skills are the Negro adults of today—thousands of them in big city slums, struggling in marginal jobs, or picking up what work they can find in unskilled capacities. And always there are the white products of the same system, the cruel cost of which, in human and dollar loss, daily becomes more apparent.

There is another rationalization which is an inevitable feature of the talks and writings of the prosegregationist politicans and apologists. It runs like this: "Let the Negro show some responsibility of citizenship before he is given the ballot. Let him prove himself ready to assume some of the burdens of civic life."

That this sort of nonsense should be written and spoken in heat and anger and received with applause by Klan-type mentalities is fantastic. It is even more preposterous than the arguments that the Negro is not capable of learning. After all, there were some schools. More often than not they were a disgrace to the flag that flew over them, but there were schools. But, in voting, there are to this day many rural areas where no Negro votes at all. There are others where a few are registered. And there are cities in at least four southern States where the most qualified Negro finds it extremely difficult to be registered. The depths of this deprivation lend eloquence to statistics. As late as midsummer of 1961 only 25 percent of the Negroes in the Southern States who had reached voting age were registered to vote.

During the past summer, for example, civil rights cases were filed by the U.S. Department of Justice in Clarke and Forrest Counties, Miss. Clarke County, in the east-central area, had more than 50 percent of her white citizens registered. A disputed total of not more than 6 of the 2,988 eligible Negroes was on the registration books. In Forrest County, in southeast Mississippi, about half the 22,431 eligible whites were registered. Only 25 of the 7,495 Negroes had been able to become qualified. There was, in the Justice Department files, a long record of attempted registrations that failed.

In filing suit Attorney General Robert Kennedy said, "Negroes in those two counties still are being deprived of the right to vote, the fundamental right of all American citizens. It is our responsibility under law to guarantee this right, and we will meet the responsibility * * *."

The reply of Mississippi's Gov. Ross Barnett will almost certainly be at least a footnote in the history of the time. "I don't understand why they want to interfere with local self-government," he said. "Local government is the thing that has made this country great."

It is not comforting to know that there are those who feel so alien to the United States and its principles that the fundamental rights of citizens have so little meaning.

This inability to vote has inevitable side effects. The Negro in the South has not been permitted to participate in community discussions about the problems of schools or of other civic affairs. It is only in the last few years that an occasional Negro has been elected to a school board in some of the larger cities.

Not only was the Negro barred from any opportunity to gain understanding of local government; he had to listen in public and on radio and television to demagogic speakers who tried to outdo one another in their pledges to keep the nigger (or nigra) in his place. Nor was this all. The Negro was confronted daily with a picture of government which plainly and officially, through State statutes and municipal ordinances, gave him an inferior position as a human being. It was not logical to expect him to acquire any competence or interest in civic responsibilities. Yet there are southerners today who, in the face of the record, say that the Negro isn't ready to participate in government. Let him earn the right "by demonstrating his responsibility as a citizen," they say.

That all of this is a costly piece of business to us as a country is plain. The South will pay the heaviest price. But in these days when population is used to mobility, an illiterate, untrained white or Negro boy or girl from Alabama or Georgia can quickly become a hoodlum in Illinois or California, a social-welfare statistic in Philadelphia or Milwaukee. A national responsibility for an end to discriminations in the rights of citizens and for equitable public education is inescapable. We already have a problem of two generations, adult and young, which have filled the slums of our industrial cities.

Another oft-repeated argument against citizenship rights for the Negro is based on irrational intermarriage fears, stemming from God knows what Freudian experiences and guilts. This is a real puzzler.

Do those who use the argument mean to imply that, of the 180 million Americans, only southerners need segregation laws to protect them from such marriages? Questions like this bring only recriminations, some vile and violent, never a logical discussion.

A question automatically poses itself when morality, law and economics begin to make themselves felt.

What are our chances of avoiding a continuance of irrational processes? The answer is that the chances are good. There will be much resistance to desegregation and some of it will be violent. But there are new conditions. We are not, to be honest, having too much success changing the hearts and minds of men, as President Eisenhower suggested be done to solve the problem. But we are moving. Attorney General Kennedy saved the lives of perhaps a hundred or more persons by dispatching U.S. marshals to Montgomery, Ala., where a Federal judge, native of the State, later severely reprimanded the police department for its failure to be on hand in enough numbers to cope with the mob during the freedom rider troubles. The Attorney General also made it plain that no community may support its own peculiar customs by attempts to maim or kill other citizens. The people of Alabama already are beginning to be grateful to the Attorney General for saving their State from an even more shocking excess in lawlessness. In time they may thank him publicly.

There are no evidences of wholesale integration, but this has not been the objective. Negro leadership has sought to make the Negro a citizen in the full sense of the word. Whatever integration takes place in the private sectors of life is for persons privately to determine. But if we begin with a date as late as May 1954 when the school decision was published, we can see how vast has been the change in the legal status of the Negro.

Laws and courts have declared and defined the Negro's equal citizenship.

What the Nation is just beginning to understand is that the Negro's efforts at citizenship now are being officially opposed only by those who are defying law, or clinging to contradictory State laws which have been declared unconstitutional.

That desegregation will for some time be a process confined largely to the urban complexes of the South, and the Nation, is plain. The rural areas have not yet been affected directly, although all feel the heat of change. But these eddies of semifeudal ruralism are dying. Their people are leaving to go to the cities—where resolvement will be had.

The businessmen of most Southern cities now understand that they cannot have lawlessness, violence and closed or crippling schools—and progress. They already are looking with questioning eyes at the blatant white citizens councils' leadership and at the bull-like antics of police staffs which have been party to violence.

So, as 1961 moves toward the exit, it can be said that the status of desegregation now is at the point where all who oppose it are in defiance or technical evasion of law. And room for evasive maneuver is about used up.

A lot of persons, mostly in trade, are not really concerned with the principles involved. But they are increasingly interested in a climate of law and order in which business and community life may flourish.

But while this force is most influential, it cannot be said that the moral influence is absent. All southerners, save the most obtuse and insensitive, have long carried a pri-

vate weight of guilt about the inequities of segregation. This weight now tilts many over to the side of justice and humanity.

Prejudice, bigotry, and defiance remain. But this is still a nation which understands it must live by law. It is no longer lawful to deprive any citizen of his rights to vote and to attend the public schools, parks, auditoriums, and concerts. The sit-ins and the freedom riders spotlighted economic injustice.

The excitement and challenge of the Negro's determined drive to become more American increasingly outweigh the forces which seek to influence him to abandon his identity as an American. The Black Muslims represent a religion alien to the American traditions. Christianity and the Bible have more appeal than Mohammed and the Koran. In addition, the Muslims propose a number of ghetto states. Only the most despairing and neurotic are likely to be attracted by such principles. Nor is there any sign that communism is becoming more persuasive.

Dr. Martin Luther King, the student sit-in leaders, the freedom riders, the intelligent and able leaders of the NAACP, the Urban League, and other organizations joined in common cause might well be called the abolitionist force of 1960–61. They are giving the South and the Nation a new image of the Negro. And, perhaps even more important, they have made it possible for the Southern Negro to change his own image. In time the South, which has been deceived by its local politicians into damning and fearing the NAACP and Martin Luther King, will come to appreciate the beneficial Americanism of this Negro leadership. They will come to see, as some already do, that Dr. King and the NAACP acted always from a basis of law, not violence or defiance of law. This could not be said of all the white citizens councils, the klans and the zoolike lesser organizations which sprang up to incite lawlessness. Had the Negro leadership also used violence, instead of passive resistance and the processes of law, the results would have been dreadful.

Nothing in the South is left unchanged by the changes which are occurring. And for the overwhelming majority of Negroes there is a pioneering determination to become more American, not less. The Negro also will always be a part of the South. Millions feel themselves Southerners as well as Americans. And as growing numbers of white Southerners learn to appreciate the new image of the Negro as a citizen, the South will accept him as such.

Day-by-day opposition to the Negro's rights to equal citizenship finds itself more and more in the position of opposing the law and the Constitution. Tactics of delay and defiance cannot long sustain themselves, particularly in the urban communities, where the total of qualified Negro voters grows larger and larger. The depressed rural defiance will, in good time, fall of its own weight. The end is not yet in sight—but it is there.

Articles on Space by William Hines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, one of the most active reporters of scientific news, and one of the best, is William Hines of the Washington Evening Star. I have found Bill Hines an aggressive and tenacious newsman, following leads into the depths of laboratories and of governments.

I should like to call the attention of the House to an award which Mr. Hines recently recieved for his able coverage of science stories. The American Association for the Advancement of Science has conferred upon him a special award for consistent excellence in science writing.

This is the third consecutive year that Mr. Hines has been so honored. This year he earned it with his outstanding series on the moon program. A year ago he was cited for a series on "The Atomic Years" and in 1959 for the story of "America's Astronauts."

The proper journalistic interpretion of the scientific frontier and the daily events occurring there is most important to the Nation if we are to recognize the importance of these events to our future. Bill Hines is doing a magnificent job of probing these stories, of bringing them to the public and, by so doing, enlisting public understanding and support of most difficult technological programs.

In recent weeks, Mr. Hines wrote several stories relating to the state of the art in life sciences research as it affected space medicine. They grew out of an important conference of specialists in this field. I think they are an excellent illustration of the competence and skill of Mr. Hines in his chosen field:

SPACE DOCTORS ATTEND SCHOOL

(By William Hines)

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., January 8.—About 500 of the free world's top experts in the growing field of space medicine met here today for a week of shop talk about how man will fare in space.

They converged on the School of Aerospace Medicine at Brooks Air Force Base, a burgeoning center that is rapidly becoming the "Walter Reed of the space age." In the course of 5 days of lectures they will learn the latest on:

1. The dangers facing men from cosmic rays and solar flares as they venture beyond the earth's atmosphere.
2. The bodily problems posed by prolonged weightlessness in space flight.
3. The question of life on other worlds.
4. How to plant and cultivate a garden on the moon, and
5. How to protect an astronaut's eyes from the fierce radiation in space.

Medical school professors, scientists from industrial concerns in the space field, Air Force and other Government experts and medical officers from allied military services make up the enrollment of the lecture series.

Among the lecturers will be Dr. Lawrence Lamb, heart specialist for Vice President Johnson; Maj. Robert M. White, pilot of the X-15 rocket plane; Dr. Otto Struve, head of the Green Bank (W. Va.) Radio Astronomy Observatory, and Dr. Hubertus Strughold, veteran German-born space physician.

The meeting, which opened this morning with a welcome by Brig. Gen. Theodore C. Bedwell, Jr., commander of the Aerospace Medical Division of the Air Force, continues through Friday. A total of 24 lectures will make up the series.

TITAN'S GROUND CREWS FACE PERIL OF POISON

(By William Hines)

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., January 9.—Ground crewmen for the Space Agency's Gemni program may find their work almost as dangerous as that of the astronauts themselves.

The perils confronting them will not be those of outer space, to be sure, but they will be no less real: Brain damage, jaundice, skin burns, double pneumonia. These will be the price of even a moment's carelessness in fueling the big Titan II rocket to be used in the recently announced two-man phase of Project Mercury.

This gloomy prospect developed yesterday in the course of a talk by Col. Raymond A. Yerg, deputy staff surgeon at Cape Canaveral, Fla. Colonel Yerg was a speaker at the opening session of a 5-day series of space medicine lectures at the School of Aerospace Medicine here. About 500 doctors, military and civilian, are attending the course.

Colonel Yerg did not single out the Gemini program in his discussion of "occupational medicine at the launch site." But he detailed the risks involved in handling the corrosive fuels that will be used in Gemini's booster, the 430,000-pound thrust Titan II.

So poisonous are these chemicals—hydrazine and nitrogen tetroxide—that their fumes cannot be breathed for substantial periods in concentration greater than 1 part in 1 million. For periods longer than 5 minutes, 50 parts per million is a dangerous dose. By contrast, many substances like the refrigerator coolant, freon, can be tolerated in 1,000 parts-per-million concentration.

Splashed on the skin, the chemicals cause severe burns. Breathed into the lungs, they create a blistering and watering that can literally drown the victim. In contact with the central nervous system, they can cause convulsions. And to the liver they do damage that manifests itself as jaundice.

Colonel Yerg said that despite the risks, hydazine has been handled at Cape Canaveral for some time—as fuel for the Agena upper stages of various space vehicles—without ill effects. Extreme caution is the watchword.

With the huge quantities involved in fueling Titan II, the risks will be greater. Colonel Yerg said crews probably will be required to suit up almost as thoroughly as the astronauts, sealing themselves off from the launch-pad atmosphere and working in suits that carry their own air supply.

In other aerospace medical talks yesterday, these topics were covered.

1. Weightlessness. Dr. Lawrence Lamb predicted it may be possible to get around the weakening effects of long periods in zero gravity by using a version of the simple Boy Scout tourniquet. He told of work at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio, along this line.

Pressure cuffs, probably very much like the blood-pressure recording device used by a doctor, would be built into the astronaut's uniform, going around the arms and legs. Pressure would be applied occasionally to the extremities, "fooling" the blood-circulatory system into think that gravity was being applied. This would cause the blood system to open certain cutoff valves which limit blood supply to the extremities when they are not being used.

Failure to do something like this, Dr. Lamb warned, might have severe effects on astronauts returning to an earth gravity situation after a long time weightless. "It would be like telling a person to get out of bedrest situation and play a rough football game," he said.

2. Radiation. Col. Gerrit L. Hekhuis said spacemen may have to take blood-cancer and genetic risks far above the average person's as part of doing business in space. This will result from the fact that they will absorb much more than the average person's normal radiation dose.

Though 12 times above normal in the case of leukemia risk and 5 times the average risk in the case of possible mutation in their descendants, the spacemen's actual numeri-

cal chance of trouble will be small, he said. Col. John Pickering, whose work Colonel Hekhuis cited, said the leukemia risk would be 42 chances in 100,000 as against 3½ per 100,000 in the public.

"GRAVITY STARVATION" AS SPACE PERIL STUDIED

(By William Hines)

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., January 10.—Is there such a thing as "gravity starvation" in space, similar to the hunger or thirst that assails men denied food or water?

The possibility was put forward yesterday by an Air Force medic in a lecture to some 500 scientists attending a week-long meeting on aerospace medicine here. The question of gravity-hunger's existence cannot be answered affirmatively or negatively at present because no one has been outside gravity's influence for long enough, Capt. Bruce H. Warren said.

MUST LEARN IN SPACE

The young scientist, who holds doctorates in philosophy and medicine, put it to his listeners thus:

"We know what happens to an organism if it is deprived of food, water and oxygen, but we do not know what will occur when the effect of gravity—which is just as intimately a part of daily living on earth—is removed for prolonged periods of time."

Soviet Maj. Gherman Titov was weightless in orbit for 1 day and the Russian dog Laika was in "zero-G" for about a week, and these are the records, Captain Warren pointed out.

He told of experiments simulating the weightless condition that will prevail in outer space, and said progress is being made along these lines. But the real thing—periods of zero-G in orbit for several weeks—will be necessary before outstanding questions are answered.

Capt. Warren is a staff member of the School of Aerospace Medicine at Brooks Air Force Base near here, where the lecture series is being conducted.

TELL OF IN-FLIGHT CHECKUPS

Two other members of the school staff told of methods of keeping track of a spaceman's physical condition.

"We can get better electrocardiograms today on pilots flying jet aircraft than most physicians can get on patients in their offices," Capt. Ray W. Ware told the scientists. Tiny, highly sensitive electrodes are affixed to pilots' bodies and function in flight with no discomfort to the subject, he said.

Capt. James A. Roman, like Captain Warren, a "double doctor," said such instruments are essential for space flights. "A pilot is a very poor judge of what is happening to him physiologically," Captain Roman said.

CITIES TERRIFIC STRESS

The stress placed on pilots of high-performance aircraft—and to be placed in the future on spacemen—is tremendous, Captain Roman told the scientific group. He showed blood-pressure records of a pilot flying an F-100 combat plane. In contrast with the pilot's normal pressure of 120-over-80, he reacted to the stress of uneventful level flight with a pressure of 148/96 and in the ticklish landing maneuver his pressure went up to 196/144, almost the apoplexy level for the average citizen.

"I doubt very much if you could get a man this worried in the laboratory if you stuck to socially acceptable ways," Captain Roman said.

Joe Davis Selected as "Best Citizen" In Eastern Section of Birmingham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the House an article which appeared in the Eastern Sun, a community newspaper published in the eastern section of Birmingham, about one of our many fine citizens who are making a direct contribution toward making their communities better places to live. This article is about a young man, Joe Davis. He has done an outstanding job as President of the Woodlawn Chamber of Commerce during the year 1961 and I would like to commend to the House this article about the many activities of one of my district's good citizens:

JUDGES SELECT JOE DAVIS AS "BEST CITIZEN FOR 1961"

Joe Davis has been selected as "Best Citizen of the Eastern Section for 1961."

Mr. Davis was selected by a panel of six judges, all former best citizens, after studying letters of nominations and seconding letters on all candidates, for an hour and a half Saturday. The best citizen selection is annually sponsored by the Eastern Sun.

Mr. and Mrs. Davis and their children, Diane, age 5; Danny Joe, age 3, and David Wayne, age 2, live at 5444 11th Avenue, South.

Other candidates nominated for the honor were Miles Dutton, 633 84th Place, South, and Eugene Frech, 485 Ridge Road.

Serving as judges were L. A. Corcoran, Sr., W. W. Wilson, John Thompson, Don Hawkins, Melvin Bailey, and R. H. Pogue, Sr.

Presentation of the Best Citizen award, a silver tray and a certificate, will be made to Mr. Davis at the annual installation banquet of Woodlawn Chamber of Commerce, Tuesday, January 30, by Arthur P. Cook, publisher of the Sun papers.

Mr. Davis has done an outstanding job as president of the Woodlawn chamber during the past year.

In this capacity, he worked on many projects which affected not only the Woodlawn area, but the entire Eastern section.

He also is a member of Eastern Community Council, Crestwood Civic Club, Woodlawn Masonic Lodge No. 790, and South Avondale Baptist Church.

Among the projects which Mr. Davis has actively worked upon during the year are location of the high school stadium, the fight against the chop-up of Jefferson County, definite location of the East-West Freeway route, helped to plan and carry out a 10-hour civil defense seminar, and worked to eliminate long waits for motorists at railway crossings on First Avenue, North.

The best tribute to Joe Davis comes in the many letters from those who know him and have worked with him.

Following are some quotes from some of the letters:

"People and groups of people call on him when for the good of the community. That's when Joe gets busy. He cannot sit idly by when work needs to be done for his community, his town, county, or State. He doesn't wait for the other fellow to do it—he just gets busy and does it."

"His untiring efforts have resulted in this community being a much better place in which to live."

"I watched Joe fight against the 'chop-up of Jefferson County' bill and saw him urge others to join in this battle."

"I have known Mr. Davis for 10 or more years. He is a fine Christian gentleman and an able and active leader."

"Joe Davis is very interested in local politics and is always working for good clean government."

"He has demonstrated through his many activities that he is sincerely interested in making our eastern section a better place to live."

Television Broadcasting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, on September 16, 1961, I introduced H.R. 9267, to place certain limitations on the Federal Communications Commission to delete previously assigned very high frequency television channels, to give the Commission certain regulatory authority over television receiving apparatus, and for other purposes.

Since the introduction of my bill I have received many indications of strong support for this legislation and I hope that we may be able to have early hearings on it.

In this connection I would like to insert an editorial taken from the Washington Post, dated Tuesday, January 16, 1962, and an editorial taken from the Denver Post, Sunday, December 24, 1961.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 16, 1962]

IRRIGATING THE WASTELAND

Newton Minow, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, chose the National Press Club—an institution committed primarily to that old-fashioned medium of communication, the newspaper—to present on Thursday some ideas for irrigating what he has called the "vast wasteland" of television. The ideas are challenging and constructive. They will doubtless arouse a good deal of controversy; but they deserve the thoughtful consideration of the broadcasting industry and of the public.

Mr. Minow's contention, in brief, is that "what this country needs is more television, not less," that the way to get more television is to open up the UHF (ultra-high frequency channels of which there are no fewer than 70 and that the way to open up these channels is to require by law that future television sets be manufactured to receive all channels. Most sets manufactured now—and about 6 million of them are sold in the United States each year—can receive programs only from the so-called VHF (very high frequency) channels, of which there are no more than 12.

As long ago as 1952, the FCC envisioned a total of 2,229 television stations in the

United States, 683 of them on VHF, 1,526 on UHF. But today there are only 605 stations in operation, 502 of them on VHF, 103 of them on UHF. The reason is that the receivers being manufactured currently afford scant inducement to build UHF transmitters.

It is clear, we think, that the country could benefit from expansion, increased competition and greater diversity of programing in television. The United States needs a TV system utilizing both the VHF and the UHF frequencies. It is likely to get use of both only through legislation of the sort Mr. Minow seeks. The constitutionality of having the Government dictate in this way to the manufacturers of television receivers has been questioned. We think the questioning can hardly be taken seriously, however. The Federal authority to regulate interstate commerce surely embraces authority to adopt so reasonable and constructive a remedy.

It is less clear that a dramatic increase in the number of TV stations will produce the improved programs for which Mr. Minow and the country hope. Competition may be the life of trade; but it has been pretty nearly the death of radio. The vast proliferation of radio stations—there are 3,800 AM stations on the air today—has produced a scramble for audiences which seems to have put a premium on the worst excesses of advertising sponsorship and the utmost vulgarity in program content. Mr. Minow might usefully recall an observation of Alexis de Tocqueville on the disadvantages of abundant newspaper competition existing in America in the 1830's.

"The facility with which newspapers can be established produces a multitude of them; but as the competition prevents any considerable profit, persons of much capacity are rarely led to engage in these undertakings. Such is the number of the public prints that even if they were a source of wealth, writers of ability could not be found to direct them all. The characteristics of the American journalist consist in an open and coarse appeal to the passions of his readers."

[From the Denver Post, Dec. 24, 1961]

STEVE TO FIGHT FCC ON TV BOOSTER PLAN

Gov. Steve McNichols said Saturday he is planning a campaign to preserve very high frequency (VHF) TV booster stations which serve many rural areas in Colorado and other Western States.

McNichols said recent and impending actions of the Federal Communications Commission pose a direct threat to the VHF stations. The FCC is now considering rules changes that may shift broadcasting from the VHF frequencies to the upper high frequency (UHF) channels, he said.

McNichols said such a move would mean that the more than 180 booster stations in the State would have to add expensive equipment and that reception probably would be not as good as with VHF equipment.

"Practically all television sets in the State would have to be adapted—or new ones purchased—to be able to receive the UHF signal," he said.

The Governor said he will ask the coming session of the general assembly to request Congress to prevent the FCC from requiring stations to change over.

McNichols termed the switch "unnecessary and senseless; if necessary, we will make this the biggest issue of the whole coming year."

Colorado booster stations rebroadcast signals received from a variety of home stations in Denver, Grand Junction, Pueblo, and Colorado Springs plus stations in western Nebraska and Kansas, southern Wyoming, Salt Lake City, and Albuquerque.

A Model Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently the Chicago Tribune carried a story about one of my constituents whose great work for our community can be a source of inspiration to all Americans.

The Tribune describes very vividly the activities of Mrs. Anna Strojny, who, despite her own personal physical handicap, has for years tirelessly worked for American veterans confined to the hospital and for many other patriotic causes.

We in the 11th Congressional District are all very proud of Mrs. Strojny; and it is my hope that by calling her activity to the attention of the American people, we can inspire among others the great dedication to civic duty which Mrs. Strojny so richly exemplifies.

The Chicago Tribune article, Mr. Speaker, follows:

CRIPPLED, SHE STILL AIDS OTHERS—SHE'S TOO BUSY TO SLOW DOWN

(By Robert Enstad)

The woes of a public servant may be hectic at times, but they seldom are boring—not even from a wheelchair.

That's what Mrs. Anna Strojny, 2941 Lowell Avenue, has found since she started viewing charity from the invalid side. Crippled by arthritis 8 years ago, the northwest side woman's work in helping others has continued at a busy pace.

"Gee, there is just so much to be done, how can anyone rest," she said recently. "I haven't got time for arthritis, or to run to the hospital for treatment. There's something always coming up. I need my pep."

Her chores, though, might seem a cinch to many.

HUSBAND HELPS OUT

Her husband, Martin, has done the housework for many years. Her children, a son and a daughter, are grown. In her comfortable bungalow Mrs. Strojny could enjoy a restful retirement. But she won't.

From her corner desk—she calls it home—Mrs. Strojny runs numerous charitable projects between her hospital stays. As the founder of the Mothers of Polish American Veterans club, she recently handled hundreds of Christmas gifts given to veterans and children. Presented on behalf of the veterans club, the gifts included 20,000 smokes, radios, a television set, candy, pens, and shaving lotion.

"My house was a warehouse of gifts," she added. "Ladies were tramping in and out helping me with the wrapping."

A big disappointment, however, came when Mrs. Strojny couldn't accompany her friends when they delivered the gifts to the veterans hospitals. She later went to a hospital alone—for observation.

BACK HOME AGAIN

Now home from the hospital, she is back at some of her year-around projects—helping immigrants gain citizenship, and running the veterans club she founded.

Mrs. Strojny, a lifetime resident of Chicago, began aiding the immigrant get citizenship when she was a little girl. Since then she has helped more than 12,000.

"My father used to go as a witness for persons seeking citizenship," she explained. "Once they got their papers they would come to get groceries from my father's store for a big party. He always was invited. I soon became interested in this work."

As her interest in the work grew, she began conducting neighborhood classes in citizenship. The Chicago park district later let her use the Kosciuszko Park fieldhouse where she drew as many as 600 participants.

"I finally had to quit the classes when I began to lose my voice," she pointed out. "But I have continued to give instruction on a personal basis. Most of them stop by the house when they need help. I help them fill out their papers, and give them a little test before they go for their exam," she commented.

Her tireless efforts haven't been without reward, however. "I really hit the jackpot 2 years ago when I got papers for a 100-year-old woman," she said.

Remarks Commending the Knights of Columbus and Introducing Resolution Opposing Admission of Red China to the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the Knights of Columbus, ever since the founding of their organization almost 80 years ago, have maintained a tradition of fervent American patriotism. This body of more than a million Catholic American men stands foursquare for the principle of devotion to God and country, and for the unswerving adherence of men and nations to the rules of morality.

In its promotion of private virtue, of individual citizenship, of the welfare of communities, of disaster relief, of the education of youth, and of the comfort and happiness of members of the Armed Forces, this organization has demonstrated the sincerity of its adherence to these ideals, and has contributed impressively to the physical and moral well-being of America.

In keeping with this tradition of practical action in support of moral and patriotic ideals, the Long Island General Assembly, Fourth Degree, Knights of Columbus, of which the Reverend Edward Lodge Curran, Ph. D., LL.B., is the faithful friar and Matthew F. Kennedy is the master, has sent to me a copy of a resolution recently adopted, calling upon the U.S. Government to oppose the admission of Red China to the United Nations. I heartily approve of this expression of concern, on the part of a group of public-spirited men, in a matter so deeply affecting the lives of all of us.

Further, I thoroughly agree with the position taken by this assembly of the Knights of Columbus in this matter, and am glad, in providing for the insertion of the resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to associate myself with its demand that the United States vigorously

oppose the admission to the United Nations of the so-called People's Republic of China.

I associate myself, further, with the forthright demand of this resolution that the United States make its continued membership in the United Nations conditional upon the continued refusal, by the United Nations, to bestow the privilege of membership upon that tyrannical and aggressive government, Red China, whose every doctrine and deed is hostile at once to the interests of the United States and to the ideals which the United Nations was formed to serve.

The Knights of Columbus are to be commended upon this action of the Long Island general assembly of their fourth degree, so fully expressive of the patriotic spirit and practical good sense of the order. Believing that this resolution hits the nail right on the head, and should be brought to the attention of the American people as effectively as possible, I am glad to avail myself of the privilege of inserting its text in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Whereas the effective survival of the United Nations for the purposes for which that Organization was intended is inherently conditioned upon the alliance of peace-loving nations; and

Whereas in recognition of that premise, its charter adopted on June 26, 1945, requires all applicants for admission to be able and willing, in the judgment of the Organization, to carry out the obligations of membership, which include the obligations to respect the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples and to refrain in international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State; and

Whereas the so-called People's Republic of China, existing since September 1949, has, with full knowledge accordingly of such principles and purposes of the United Nations, so conducted itself in relation to the self-determination of the hundreds of millions of people in Asian Continental China, and has committed such acts of war and aggression against Korea, and the troops of the United Nations, including those of the United States therein, against Tibet, and in supporting Communist aggression in Indochina, the Philippines, Malaya, and elsewhere, as to make any representation on the part of that "government" that it is ready, able, and willing to subscribe to such principles and purposes of the United Nations a palpable fraud; and

Whereas the admission of Red China to the United Nations and the recognition and prestige attendant thereupon would be so further descriptive of the ability of the United Nations to carry out its purposes, already hampered by the repeated and persistent obstructions interposed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and its allies, as to make the demise of the United Nations as an effective force a foregone certainty; and

Whereas there is neither need nor advantage in having the so-called People's Republic of China, so conducting itself and its affairs, as a member of the United Nations; and

Whereas recent expressions on the part of accredited representatives of the United States of America to the United Nations, and other officials of the Government of the United States, have indicated a diminishing resistance to the admission of the said People's Republic of China to the United Nations, and such attitude appears to be inconsistent with the wishes of the people of the United States and their duly elected representatives in the Congress, as heretofore widely, positively, and consistently expressed, and is considered inimical to the best interests of the United Nations and of the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Long Island General Assembly of the fourth degree, Knights of Columbus, in meeting duly convened and held in the borough of Brooklyn, city of New York, this 27th day of September 1961, hereby places itself and its members on record as being opposed to the admission into the United Nations of the so-called People's Republic of China, and hereby calls upon the President of the United States to instruct his representatives in the Security Council and in the Assembly of the United Nations to vigorously oppose the admission of the said People's Republic of China; and be it further

Resolved, That the President and the Congress of the United States are hereby urged and enjoined to expressly condition the continued membership of the United States of America in the United Nations upon the rejection of Red China's application for membership therein, to so instruct the accredited representatives of the United States to the United Nations, and to take appropriate steps to authorize and require the withdrawal of the United States from the United Nations in the event and upon the admission thereto of Red China; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these preambles and resolutions be transmitted by the faithful scribe of our assembly to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to each of the accredited representatives of the United States to the United Nations, to each of the U.S. Senators representing the State of New York, and to each U.S. Congressman representing the several districts in the area of this general assembly; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these preambles and resolutions be also transmitted by the faithful scribe of this assembly to each and every grand knight of the several councils of the Knights of Columbus established in the territorial area of this general assembly, and as well, to the supreme knight of the Knights of Columbus, at headquarters in New Haven, Conn.; and be it further

Resolved, That each and every of the councils to which a copy of the foregoing preambles and resolutions are transmitted are urged to consider the adoption of the same or similar resolutions and the transmission thereof to the President and other officers of the United States therein mentioned and referred to, and to urge their members and friends individually to write to their respective Congressman and Senators in the sense of such preambles and resolutions.

Nasser's Anti-U.S. Propaganda in Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues a most timely article entitled "Why Fool the American People?" appearing in the latest issue—No. 59, Winter 1961–62—of Prevent World War III, published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

This article sheds further light on the anti-U.S. and anti-Western policies of President Nasser's government. Irrefutable evidence is presented attesting to the fact that the anti-U.S. position of the Cairo Government is aimed at undermining our influence and standing in Africa and even in such sensitive areas as the Panama Canal. Yet, unfortunately, there are voices in high places who continue to assure the American people that all is well in our relations with Egypt. The spreading of such illusions is most harmful to the best interests of our country. In my judgment, the society is to be commended for publishing this article which calls a spade a spade. The article follows:

WHY FOOL THE AMERICAN PEOPLE?

In the spring of 1960 Mr. G. Lewis Jones, then Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs, assured a subcommittee of the House of Representatives that there was progress in normalization of our relations with the United Arab Republic. He made this optimistic assessment despite the fact that the United Arab Republic was brazenly violating international maritime law and the rights of American businessmen and seamen. Indeed, so flagrant were these violations that American seamen on their own initiative conducted a boycott against Egyptian shipping here. The State Department deplored the seamen's action but, as one newspaper put it, the episode was largely a consequence of the State Department's palpable failure to put up any real resistance to Nasser's violation of international law. About the same time that Mr. Jones was telling Members of Congress that relations between the United States and the UAR were approaching normalcy, Newsweek magazine revealed that Nasser's Deputy Foreign Minister Hussein Sabry had promised Fidel Castro help in the event of Yankee aggression. As reported by Newsweek, Sabry boasted, "we have lots of arms and ammunition, we are ready to ship it you free."

The spring of this year, too, has witnessed a return to the hopes of the previous year. The State Department issued a report that, while a visit by President Nasser to the United States was not under active consideration, nevertheless, mutual advantages might be gained from a person-to-person meeting between our President and Mr. Nasser. Unnamed States Department sources elaborated on this announcement by stressing that American relations with the UAR were constantly improving. Indeed, these sources, according to one press report, alleged that the UAR, though neutral, was a friendly nation.

It might be said in defense of this latest outburst of buoyancy that the new administration is trying to disentagle the contradictions and conflicts which have plagued the Middle East for years. Certainly, the society will support every move on the part of our Government to lessen tensions in the Middle East and to protect American interests there. However, it takes two to make friends and it is worse than foolishness to pretend that all is well when it just isn't so.

As far as Cairo is concerned, the appearance of a new administration in Washington has not affected its propaganda line. The United States continues to be the main target. Surely, the State Department with all of its sources of information, must be aware of this simple fact. Even before unnamed State Department sources characterized Cairo as friendly, Nasser's propaganda network was telling the Arab world that the United States was responsible for the U.N.'s failures. Whether it was in Cuba, Laos, or in Africa, the United States was painted as the villain which had pre-

vented the United Nations from doing its duty. "The secret behind this regrettable, searing failure, resides in the United States of America in the myopic imperialist mentality which dominates the United States. The United States is like a war profiteer whose wealth fills him with the delusion that he has become entitled to interfere in every matter. He would not listen, of course, to the voice of truth, but to that of his own interests. Thus, because of the United States, which by itself dominates the United Nations, world problems have developed from a grave but not dreadful condition to a grave but most dreadful one." (Voice of the Arabs, April 23, 1961.)

The State Department's olive branch did not decrease Cairo's vicious anti-United States barrage. On the contrary, through the past summer Cairo continued its smear tactics against U.S. policies and motives, hoping to incite other peoples against our country. These provocations, incidentally, came after our Government decided to lend a helping hand to the UAR's rocket industry.

On August 8, 1961, the UAR Government radio broadcast the following canard in Swahili which is one of the popular African languages: "The Americans are sending their stooges to Africa—about 225 followers—to come and deceive Africans in an unjustified way; Kenya will receive 11 men and 5 women. If you happen to see them in the reserves, chase them away at once. Why don't they help the Negroes in America? Yet, they pretend that they will come and help us in Africa. This is mere deception."

Four days later (August 12, 1961), another anti-Western blast was issued, this time directed to Arab listeners: "The West's friendship to the small nations is nothing but honeyed words which it sells in exchange for military bases and the domination of countries." On August 28, 1961, a Cairo broadcast to West Africa spoke about the new colonialism. As one could guess, this alleged new colonialism, according to Radio Cairo, was a U.S. product and directed toward the small African states. The broadcast charged that the major Western Powers had never promoted equality in their dealings with the African peoples "and this is particularly true of the United States, which forces certain things on the small African states to suit its political ideology. Alas. There will never be cooperation between a wolf and a lamb." The same broadcast tried to scare its listeners with the specter of a new colonialism which aimed at undermining African independence: "This is the colonialist menace: The heavily industrialized countries of Europe and the United States whose interest in Africa is very great."

Throughout September, Cairo continued to hammer at the West with particular emphasis on the United States. On September 4, 1961, the Egyptian radio, broadcasting to the Arab world, denounced an agreement reportedly made between U.S. oil companies and some of the Arab sultanates on the Arabian peninsula. It is not difficult to guess why Cairo should be opposed to these purely business arrangements, since Egypt itself has a hungry eye for the oil resources of the Arab world. Under the pretense of being concerned about Western exploitation of the Arabs, the Cairo broadcast called upon the Arab peoples to fight the U.S. agreement "lest it become a dagger in their back."

However, Egyptian propagandists concentrate, in the main, on Africa. This is in line with President Nasser's arrogant claim that he has a special mission to lead the African peoples. Cairo propaganda is certainly not modest in proclaiming the primacy of Egypt in African affairs. For example, a Cairo broadcast (September 6, 1961) told Africans: "The UAR is the only country which is waging a life and death struggle against imperialism in Africa." In another broadcast (September 7, 1961) the Africans were informed that "it is essential for every leader in Kenya to learn more from the UAR." A previous broadcast (September 1, 1961) boasted that the UAR was the main force that would "bring together the Arabs and Africans, Africans and Asians."

Cairo's holy mission to save Africa from the "white dogs" of "Western imperialism" is one of the main themes which is repeated over and over again. It has been supplemented in recent times by special attacks against the United States which is portrayed as the main enemy of African independence. On September 10, 1961, Cairo's Voice of Africa shouted: "The United States of America pursues a policy in Africa based on defending her military and economic interests and, in general, it is a policy opposed to the interests of Africa." It is interesting to note that this outrageous smear was made in connection with the warm welcome received by Assistant Secretary of State G. Mennen Williams during his visit to Nyassaland. Obviously, the Cairo broadcast was a clumsy attempt to cancel out these expressions of good will. The broadcast concluded with these words: "The experiences of all African peoples expose the truth behind the United States neocolonialism and call upon the people of Nyassaland to open their eyes to realize this fact. Imperialism will never change its nature, especially neocolonialism."

Cairo has also sought to defame the purpose of NATO in Africa. Thus, in a broadcast in Swahili (September 5, 1961) the United States and its NATO allies were roundly denounced and accused of shedding African blood. This is in line with Nasser's own estimate of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization which he termed "an alliance for enslavement" and said that it was his government's "No. 1 enemy." (New York Times, Dec. 24, 1960.)

The Cairo broadcasting network has also tried to influence the peoples of Asia against the West. In this effort it has tried to depict the United Nations as a tool of Western imperialism. This, too, is in keeping with Nasser's efforts to discredit the United Nations whose charter for peace among the nations he has been flouting ever since he seized power. On October 17, 1961, the Voice of Cairo said that the United Nations had become "the only means of achieving" Western colonialism's objectives "of seizing and colonizing territories in Asia." This charge was reemphasized toward the end of the broadcast: "The United Nations is the instrument of the Western Powers for retarding progress in Asia and in the Arab countries.

There are other anti-U.S. themes which Egyptian propaganda plays upon from time to time. A new subject for attack has been the U.S. Peace Corps. This organization, conceived by President Kennedy to render cooperation to underdeveloped countries, was hailed throughout the world as a concrete example of generosity. It is true that the Peace Corps' motives have been besmirched by the Soviet bloc but generally speaking, it has received a warm welcome. Indeed, many of the underdeveloped countries of the world congratulated our Government and indicated sincere interest in the project.

Not so with the UAR. On the contrary, Cairo launched a campaign to defame the Peace Corps in language which even Moscow might envy. Once again, the smear tactic was directed to the ears of the African peoples. The following statement, broadcast in Swahili (August 29, 1961), is illustrative of Cairo's efforts: "Brothers and sisters, it is evident that all imperialists are continuing to lose, but we must be on our guard; they are trying to rise in a different method by force. These new imperialist armies are more dangerous; imperialists who are withdrawing from Africa through the main gate are seeking to return to Africa by the back door. We are surprised to see that some of our leaders seem to agree with this useless propaganda, which is intended to bring colonialism in a new form. What kind of new colonialism in Kenya? You can see that the Americans are sending their people to make roads and to build libraries in Thika and Fort Hall."

In previous articles, Prevent World War III has shown how the UAR has sought to stir up anti-U.S. sentiment in Latin America. As a matter of fact, when Mr. G. Lewis Jones told Members of Congress that U.S. relations with the UAR were coming along fine, we published a rebuttal entitled "Cairo and the Panama Canal" (No. 56, summer, 1960). In this article we cited chapter and verse showing how Cairo through its propaganda and agents, was trying to destroy the U.S. position at the Panama Canal. There has been no letup in this attack, although at times its blatant forms are suppressed.

Thus, on September 15, 1961, the Cairo broadcasting network gleefully reported that Panamanians were once again working to oust the United States from the Panama Canal. In a sarcastic vein the broadcast noted that the United States had made a number of concessions but at the same time it boasted that Nasser's action at Suez would have a definite influence on the events at the Panama Canal. It concluded the statement by alleging that the Panamanian people were opposed to the United States which it characterized as "a foreign authority in Panama."

It might be pointed out that in describing the latest events, Cairo recounted the rioting that took place 2 years ago in Panama. However, it did not tell its listeners that it was precisely Cairo agents working in cahoots with Castro which contributed to the anti-U.S. riots. In the coming months it would be well for our State Department to keep an eye on the situation in Panama, particularly with reference to the activities of Nasser's "diplomats."

One could cite additional evidence attesting to the fact that anti-U.S. propaganda remains one of the main weapons of Cairo's arsenal. The power of this propaganda has been tragically underestimated, indeed, so much so that our radio information program does not match that sponsored by the Egyptians. This in spite of the fact that Egypt is one of the poorest countries in the world. Yet, our U.S. Information Agency has had to fight tooth and nail for a reasonable budget that would enable it to at least counter the lies and distortions emanating from Cairo as well as Moscow and Peiping. In this connection, one of Egypt's chief propagandists, Nasir ad-Din an-Nashashibi, wrote with sarcastic delight how difficult it has been for the USIA to obtain more funds in order "to compete with the efforts exerted in the propaganda field by the biggest countries in the world, headed by the UAR [sic]" (July 11, 1961).

Thus, while the USIA was pleading for additional moneys to counteract Cairo's poison, unnamed sources in the State Department were announcing clear weather ahead for U.S. relations with Cairo. But the weather is not so sunny and the challenge is unmistakable and grave. What interest do these State Department officials have in misinforming and misleading the American people? Or is it sheer blindness or stupidity?

The American people are entitled to know the simple fact that Nasser's dream of empire is based on the complete elimination of all Western and U.S. influence in the Middle East and Africa. It would also be well for the State Department to plan its strategy on this reality and not to be distracted by Nasser's smiles.

Communism in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I include a speech I delivered to the Canton, Ohio, P.E.O., with regard to the menace of communism in the United States:

WHAT CAN I DO AS AN AMERICAN CITIZEN TO COMBAT COMMUNISM?

I am delighted to have the opportunity to speak to you today and to try to help you answer the question Mrs. Parkinson gave me as my title "What Can I Do as an American Citizen To Combat Communism."

First, let me say that America was founded on a dream. A dream that free men could govern themselves with the help of God under law. That was the basic meaning of Bunker Hill, Valley Forge and Yorktown and of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. That dream has become a glowing reality. Today, America stands a beacon of freedom to the world. The nails of sweat and toil and blood built a solid government—a government based upon tolerance, fairplay and faith in God. We in America can count our blessings one by one and pledge our lives that this government of, by and for the people shall continue.

Just a little more than a hundred years ago another dream was spawned from evil minds across the sea. That dream of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels has also become a reality—a reality punctured by the bloody signposts of human slavery, concentration camps, the denial of God. Today communism encompasses one-third of the world's peoples and one-fourth of the earth's surface. Make no mistake, the challenge is total. Communism seeks to erase forever from the annals of history the ideals of our western Christian culture. If communism conquers, the world will descend into a new age of paganistic barbarism.

A very great and distinguished American appears before my Appropriation Subcommittee every year to justify the budget of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I have reference to J. Edgar Hoover. I have the greatest and highest regard for this very fine, patriotic American. He is one of the finest Christian gentlemen I have ever known and I know of no one more devoted to the task at hand than Mr. Hoover. Much that I have to say to you today is a repetition of things he has said before my subcommittee. He has said so many things that I endorse so wholeheartedly that I repeat some of them today as though they were my own statements, although the seed was originally planted by this great American.

The question in which you are interested, a very vital question, is what can we, as Americans, do to combat this Communist menace, this atheistic conspiracy.

Most important, I think we must be informed of the nature of this ideology and its method of operating. We must be cognizant of the fact that the Communist appeal in glowing promises have lured far too many unwitting persons into accepting its philosophy. We must counteract communism with the strength of our democracy, its history, its tradition, its heritage. We must be able to effectively contrast the ideal of justice and liberty with the sordid history of Communist societies. The pages of this Nation's history are replete with practical lessons in the struggle for freedom. Each of us can learn much from it.

Obviously, the exclusive use of lofty phrases upholding democracy is not enough. Our daily action must make the democratic heritage come alive. Aggressive citizenship, participation in community affairs, exercising the right to vote, careful selection of those who represent us in government is a vital factor in making the American system work. As a nation founded on the precepts of justice, equality and freedom, we must always respect the dignity of the human being and the rights of the individual. Never must we permit bigotry and prejudice to sap our society of its strength. Unfortunately, the fear of communism has sometimes led to an unfair attack on those whose views differ from the majority. Honest dissent must not be made the target of hysterical and reckless charges. Such activities merely play into Communist hands and serve to confuse and divide our society.

Our Christian tradition is a mighty bulwark in repelling the attempts of communism to capture the minds of men. Our Founding Fathers, as men of God, sought and knew the guidance of the Divine Creator. We, too, as Christians, must undergird our daily lives with the spiritual truths. Our enthusiasm and commitments must surpass the fervor of the Communists. Our words and deeds must be dynamic witnesses for the faith we proclaim. The lessons of the holy scripture can indeed be effective guides for action as we face the problems of our mid-20th century world.

Our security can be strengthened by strengthening the spiritual forces of each community. The individual must recognize that the rights and benefits which he receives by virtue of his citizenship can carry with them the necessity of discharging certain obligations of citizenship. Our Government is a miracle of faith, but it can remain strong and durable and workable only as the individual devotes his efforts to discharging his civic responsibility in his own community. In this age of uncertainty, in this age when the struggle between freedom and totalitarian enslavement is drawing toward a climax, we have need of faith as never before.

We have need of a faith of the kind that put iron into the souls of our forefathers, enabling them to meet and overcome adversity. We have need of that same faith to fortify ourselves today as we meet the Communist enemy in today's deadly contest.

In this struggle, which has long since been joined, there are many things which the individual can do to strengthen the forces of freedom. Merely keeping informed on current events which affect our Nation is one of the means of our protection, as I have said before. In addition, the truly responsible citizen will acquaint himself with the activities of the enemies of democracy so that their efforts to undermine our freedom will be recognized. For the Communist is a trained master of deceit. Communist methods of duping individuals and infiltrating legitimate organizations must be understood if they are to be combated. I can think of no better way to form a basis for this understanding than to read J. Edgar Hoover's recent book, entitled "Masters of Deceit."

Every exposure of communism's false premise, inherent contradictions, deceitful tactics, and empty promises helps to shatter its ideological appeal and to fortify against its psychological pressures.

But in this struggle for men's minds exposure alone is not enough. Exposure must be complemented by a long-range educational program with a dual purpose. This program must encompass not only a penetrating study of communism, but also a thorough grounding in the basic principles of our individual freedom under law. This educational program must be designed to train people to think and to distinguish between truth and error. Each year more colleges are offering courses which present a critical analysis of the theory and practices of communism. In at least one college, a course of this type is compulsory.

Books contrasting communism with democracy are now being published for use in our high schools. This academic instruction can be supplemented by individual study of the wealth of anti-Communist material as well as by participation in group discussions and public forums. This program of education in communism must not, of course, constitute or be confused with the advocacy of the Communist doctrine. It can and it should be limited to a critical study of Communist strategy and tactics and the materialistic philosophy underlying them.

Now let me give you a word of caution. Knowing what communism really is and how it operates will also help to avoid the danger of confusing communism with legitimate dissent on controversial issues. Communism feeds on social ferment on both the local and national levels. The Communist Party U.S.A. is continually exploiting social, economic, and political grievances for its own tactical purposes. For this reason the party line will frequently coincide with the views of non-Communists on specific issues.

We must not, therefore, indiscriminately label as Communists those persons whose opinions on a particular question may on occasion parallel the official party position. We must also guard against the tendency to characterize as Communists those who merely disagree with us or who advocate unorthodox facts or unpopular beliefs. When anyone is erroneously branded a Communist it not only constitutes an injustice to the individual but also helps communism by diffusing the strength of the anti-Communist forces. In combating communism we must beware of vigilante action. Our responsibility as citizens is to be certain of facts and report these facts to the proper authorities.

Knowledge of communism is only the first phase of the battle. This knowledge must be augmented by a continuous revitalization of our own inherently superior strength through the practical daily exercise and development of our democratic principles. Too frequently emphasis is placed on acquiring an understanding only of the mechanical functions of our Government, such as elections, the enactment of legislation or judicial review. This knowledge, important as it is, becomes a mere collection of sterile facts without a deep appreciation and continuing awareness of the reason for the very existence of our form of government.

The freedom of the individual under law, without the realization of this fundamental philosophy of freedom, such basic individual rights as freedom of speech, the press, and religion are taken for granted. Forgotten is man's bitter fight through the centuries to wrest these freedoms from tyranny. The exercise of these individual freedoms, which we often take for granted, is largely responsible for our Nation's reputation for getting things done. Many of us have seen or have even participated in programs for community improvement promoted by private organizations and civic groups. Recognizing a specific problem which required cooperative action and sparked the individual initiative, whole communities have organized, for example, to attract new industries, to eradicate blight in slum areas, to eliminate racial tensions or to improve educational opportunities.

Public officials, religious leaders and representatives of business, labor, and the professions realizing a common interest, have fused their energies and in many cases have literally transformed the communities. Significantly, however, while many of the problems these communities faced were similar, there was no set pattern in the solutions

which were devised. Just as specific local problems in resources have determined the nature of the presponse, so too, any organized program to immunize a community against Communist penetration must be tailored to prevailing local conditions.

All that is required is imagination, resourcefulness and some personal sacrifice coupled with the will to inspire positive action to combat communism and to strengthen democracy at the community level. In a democracy the importance of local communities cannot be overemphasized. It is there that the social understanding and growth take root. It is there that education, business, labor, and religion take on form and substance to influence, nourish, vitalize, and give direction to our national life. It is in our local communities that cogent and penetrative thinking should be done and should be done now to reevaluate the position of this Nation in the present world crisis. From this constructive effort can come a decisive contribution to formulating and carrying out a coordinated, comprehensive, affirmative global strategy which will insure the supremacy of freedom over all types of totalitarianism.

Communism has hurled a mortal challenge. Our response and the response of freemen everywhere will determine whether or not freedom itself survives. It is no longer sufficient for us to adopt the negative approach of merely reacting defensively to every shift in Communist tactics. We must place greater emphasis on the positive role which our democratic way of life can perform in this struggle. American reality is superior in every way to the Communist illusion. It is superior not because it is ours, but because it expresses the universal qualities of human nature.

We possess the true legacy of man's age-old struggle from slavery to freedom. Ours is an inheritance solidly grounded in the reality of man's manifold needs and aspirations and on his inherent dignity and worth as a sovereign individual. A demonstrated faith in this heritage of democracy rooted as it is in Judeo-Christian tradition is our mightiest weapon in our struggle for the minds of men. Our military might, political structure, economic resources, while effective, will not by themselves insure the victory of freedom over communism.

These weapons must be reinforced by each citizen's experience and abiding awareness in the intrinsic superiority of his society. From this awareness will develop a revitalized determination not only to continue our resistance to communism, but more important still, to make our living democracy a force of moral and spiritual persuasion which will fire the imaginations of the entire world.

There are some who in the past have criticized the church and the clergy for being soft toward communism. I deny this. To my mind, more than ever, we need as a nation a strengthening of our religious faith. If we have men and women articulate in their Christian heritage, they can meet and overcome the temptations of the Communist challenge. Far too often the Communists are able to make converts because the individual is weak. Weak spiritually, morally, and civically. The Communists have a term "improving the ideological level of the member," meaning the member must know more about Marxism, Leninism. We need, so to speak, to raise the spiritual level of our people to give them the knowledge, the inspiration, the guidance to stand on their own feet to appreciate the full grandeur and majesty of our religious heritage. Hence, the great challenge which faces ministers of the Gospel. In reality they stand on the frontline today in the fight against communism. The type of men and women we produce in America today in a large measure is their responsibility. They have the duty of guiding young lives, helping to produce aggressive, alert, meaningful citizens.

Nothing today can be more important than our Sunday schools, youth training programs, church camps and study groups. These are truly arsenals of democracy.

Joseph Addison has said, "What a sculptor is to a block of marble, education is to the soul." Here is our answer. America's clergy today are doing a magnificent job. They are helping to preserve the dignity of man as the image of God, and to mold the individual into a worthy citizen of democracy. Over the years, as could be expected, churches and religions have been and will so remain targets for Communist infiltration. The clergy of America needs the full support of patriotic Americans in our common struggle against the enemy.

Education is truly the etching pen of the human soul. We need education in the ways of men and God. An education which will make us stronger Americans and our Nation a better America.

And, so, when you ask me what you can do to combat communism, I say: First, know and understand the enemy; second, know and understand yourself and the great spiritual heritage of the United States; and third, know and understand the romance and the glories of the history of this great Republic so that you may expound upon it with the fervor of an evangelist. Such knowledge will result in great devotion to our country and that devotion, firmly planted in the spirit, will make this Republic invulnerable.

Educating Students for Personal and Economic Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interesting article by Solomon Barkin, director of research, Textile Workers Union of America:

EDUCATING STUDENTS FOR PERSONAL AND ECONOMIC GROWTH IN A DYNAMIC TECHNOLOGICAL SOCIETY

Educational facilities, goals, and methods must be attuned to the times. The more laggard they are, the more the community and the people will suffer.

In this world of accelerated change, a primary task of the leaders of each agency and institution is to keep abreast of the changes in the society which affect them. Sheer persistence in old ways, however good and tried, may be pointless. Particularly, this conservatism must be subordinated in our educational institutions preparing young people for their adult lives.

If training is to serve these prospective citizens, it must be of the type which will adapt them to the world they will enter and the society in which they will later live. The educator must therefore have a prescience of the future while he shapes present programs.

But knowledge of the developing technology and economy is only one approach to the understanding of the educator's challenge. Man himself is not static. He is also an unfolding individual. His talents and gifts are the rich soil upon which human progress rests.

Our school system has, therefore, the obligation of helping each individual in his self-realization. As society becomes more complex and diversified, the needs become more varied and the opportunities for the individual multiply. Each has more of a chance to make a mark in serving the common good by expressing himself more fully.

The human variety flows not only from the diversity of individuals but from the wider range of people participating in our society. From primitive times, we assumed that only the young need to be taught. They were thus introduced to our society. Some individual nations have taught that man must devote himself to continuing study of the eternal verities. Our present population explosion presents us with the great issue as to whether the extension of our lifespan calls for educational facilities not only for the young but also for the adults.

If they are to remain producing members of the society, will it be enough for them merely to have the training of their youth supplemented by their experience as adults?

If we will have to be productive for such long periods, do we need to change our methods so that the young shall be trained not primarily for an immediate task, but also for productive enterprise over a full lifespan?

The educator must continuously evaluate the human resources and perceive how he can be helpful in the process of personal self-realization as well as to understand the economic and social environment to help him shape his curriculum and studies.

HUMAN RESOURCES

No less important than the changes in our society are the new work groups in our midst. Our population is growing strikingly as youths marry earlier and the family increases in size. Ahead of us lies an era in which there will be many young persons under 25 years of age looking for work and an impressive expansion of oldsters in our work force seeking gainful employment. Older women relieved of their homemaking responsibilities by labor-saving facilities, the extended schooling of their youngsters, and their yearning for higher standards of living will move into the labor force in greater numbers looking for part-time and full-time jobs.

It will be a work population of people from the full span of ethnic, religious, and color groups within our society. Their educational experience will be longer and of higher quality than ever before enjoyed by our population despite the failings which may be underscored in every part of it.

Many new essential human attitudes have to be reinfroced. Tolerance for human variety and difference has to be widely shared as people of diversified ages, colors, religions, and ethnic origins mingle in our social system. They are and will be interdependent. This unity can be cemented best by the propagation of a conviction of responsibility for others.

The human stream with which we will have to deal consists no longer merely of the citizens of our own Nation. We shall have to include the tens and hundreds of millions of people in other countries, some of whom come to our shores to study and to whose lands we shall go to assist in training, research, planning, and in accelerating development to bring them ever closer to the material, cultural and spiritual opportunities which we enjoy in this country.

We shall have to be our brothers' keeper not merely as a moral obligation but to win acceptance by these newer peoples. Our ultimate freedom and security will depend upon the long-term confidence in our ways and values that we shall implant in them.

DYNAMIC ECONOMY

A changing people will be living in a dynamic technical and economic society. Many have already noted that the rate of

economic change has been hastened. Illustrative of the new challenge is the constantly rising rate of man-hour productivity. The old is being displaced by changes more quickly than ever before and we can anticipate that this process of acceleration will be increased.

In the past, we expected that economic growth would occur largely through increases in resources. More land, more people, and more capital would enrich a country. Economists thereafter instructed us in the principle of factor substitution. National economic wealth could be advanced through the replacement of the scarce and costly factors of production by the abundant and cheaper ones. Capital in replacing human labor could improve our economic output.

The story of the first industrial revolution in a large part was told by this primary experience. Machines replaced manual labor and tools; mass production and factories took over where the cottage industry and the craftsman mill had left off; custom-made products gave way to standardized wares. Machine transportation hastened movement when they replaced the animal and waterways. The manual worker with his skill gave way to the machine operator and tender. The crafts were denigrated in varying degrees. We have not yet seen the end of this process.

MACHINES REPLACE MEN

Toward the end of the last century we witnessed the introduction of a third tool for economic advance: the application of scientific management. The second industrial revolution recognized that economic incentive would induce man to increase his work effort level; introduced modes of measuring human and business performance; and promoted the specialization of management's functions as mass production had done for manual workers.

While the first industrial revolution had dehumanized the operative into a hand, the second had converted him into an economic automation. Management personnel represented the quintessence of the new age; a specialist who pursued his functions determinedly for his own self-interest often with little direction from the top.

The fourth road to economic progress is being ushered in by the third industrial revolution. Automation is the generic term for the new era. Not that the new machines, whether they be the transfer machine servomechanisms or electronic computers, represent the new period; they are only some of the tools. We are constantly adding newer techniques such as atomic energy, solar energy, newer communication and electric procedures, and the myriad of other innovations and developments of the present technological milieu.

The important attribute of the new industrial revolution is the new integrated system. It began in the military world with the weapons system and was followed by the industrial world. We are creating a new series of integrated business systems which substitute centralization for the coordination of managerial specialists.

In this new era, machines are replacing men in the performance of mental operations. Many processes of production and fields of human endeavor which defied mechanization are now being converted. Clerical, technical, and professional men are being displaced from many tasks as machines take over their operations.

Concurently, new jobs are rising in other areas. The significant fact about the new era, from the point of view of the persons preparing themsevles for employment, is that the third industrial revolution is making a machine tender out of the brain worker. Older skills and experience of the white collar worker and professional are being rendered obsolete and both blue and white collar workers are being forced to seek new fields of employment.

Another consequence of this accelerated rate of change is that it has hastened not only human economic obsolescence, but also that of localities. In earlier epochs, the shift from one technology to another tended to affect older areas. Many suffered seriously because their locational advantages were reduced or eliminated.

Mechanization grew with the broadening of the markets and local custom industries dwindled. Most dramatically, the increase in the size of locomotives and their ultimate dieselization eliminated the need for any railroad repair shops. Currently, the growth in automobile and airplane travel has caused the abandonment of many smaller railroad lines.

This trend toward geographical upheaval has been strengthened by automation. It will tend to eliminate many intermediate stages in the processes of production, communication, and services. Instructions are being increasingly given directly from central offices, despite distances along the points of communication. Records are now being assembled in one office from widely dispersed information production centers.

Many way stations in the systems of management, distribution and communication, and service will disappear. Operations are being telescoped so older plants will be closed. Older physical structures are being scrapped as designers and builders create more economic newer ones, often located in different areas.

CONSERVATION ACCENTED

As the process of technological change is causing faster and faster rates of obsolescence, the economist is recognizing largely at the instance of the practitioner that conservation is a fifth road to economic growth. While complete replacement of the obsolete may be cheaper in many instances, the increasing cost of a unit of capital of our existing industrial society causes one to hesitate.

As a result, we early accepted conservation of natural resources as a basic principle for our natural resource policy. This view is taking deeper and deeper hold on our society as we learn to make the central city more viable through urban renewal. All political parties are mouthing the wisdom of rebuilding our distressed areas. Our people are increasingly convinced that most regions of chronic unemployment must not be forsaken; they must and can be helped to redevelop.

Whatever verity there may be in this principle of redevelopment for our physical resources and capital and our economy, there is no doubt about its fundamental soundness in the case of individuals. Physical rehabilitation has proven economical and humane.

Small investments in medical care, prosthetic devices, and training have made self-supporting and self-respecting citizens out of millions. Mental hygiene has rebuilt the self-confidence and assured normal participation by many. Retraining has helped to shift many to new employment. Specialized guidance and employment services have worked wonders for many marginal groups in the work force.

We have therefore learned the important lesson that humanity and economics both teach that rehabilitation and redevelopment are sound. Such activities demand the visualization of the human as a whole and the assets as parts of a system. The principle guiding the new automated age of systems analysis has increasingly become the tool for revitalizing the human and physical assets which, in the past, we scrapped. This we can no longer afford to do.

Many basic changes have taken place in our economic environment following the process of economic growth through mechanization, the application of scientific management, automation and now redevelopment. Mass production replaced individual unit output to be followed by loose coordination, specialization and now centralized systems organizations. The processes of simplification of the units has increased the costs of the systems so that conservation and redevelopment are gaining acceptance in place of the scrap heap.

MODERN JOBS

These industrial movements will produce major changes in the nature of jobs in industry. A new type of production workers is appearing; maintenance jobs are expanding; and professional and technical employments are expanding more rapidly.

The movement from the handicraft to the mass production job meant the reduction in the amount of physical work, increased specialization of functions, and the removal of the responsibility for the manufacture of the total product. The craftsmen employed tools and controlled the quality and speed of the output.

The mass production worker, on the other hand, became a machine operator controlling, directing, steering, or tending machines. The amount of training required for them varied from little to a prolonged period, with most jobs in the former category.

The developing industrial eras initiated diverse trends. Scientific management and research increased the need for management specialists possessing longer preparation and greater mastery of specific management techniques. Research men, techcians, and professionals of different levels of responsibility are required in greater numbers. Schooling of varying lengths became a necessary introduction to active employment for larger numbers of people.

Our current age, ushered in by the automated processes particularly the computer and the servomechanism, has created a new type of production worker for whom we have to provide new schooling and a new curriculum. He is the automated machine operator and auxiliary controller. In his case, the amount of physical work and manual skills have been reduced considerably below that required of the mass production worker.

RESPONSIBILITIES INCREASED

What is significant is that his responsibility has been increased. He is either individually or as a member of a team accountable for a complete stage of manufacture. His major advance is in the use of conceptual skills. While the machine is more self-regulating, he has to be especially alert to understand its operations. His primary task is to espy impending breakdowns from causes not previously identified or allowed for. Second, he must make the fine adjustments for continuing optimum performance.

The importance of the conceptual skills is rising constantly. The operator must be able to sense and perceive disorder, whether by sight, sound, smell, touch, feel, taste, or kinesthetic senses. He must be able to discriminate between those signs which indicate loss of efficiency and those which may be taken as normal. He has to relate his sensory information to his mental picture of what is happening.

To utilize these sensory stimuli, the operator must have knowledge of his work, such as the general machine layout, the processes, knowledge of the technology, the control systems, display instruments, routines, and the signs of the breakdown and reduced efficiency. These he must relate to the actual practice.

Most significantly, he must decide on whether there is or will be a failure in operation and the action to be taken. More-

over, the consequences of slightly incorrect decisions tend to be far reaching in terms of both time and money. Finally, the machine operator is usually part of a group and must maintain good working relationships with it.

The training required of this new automation operator is in many respects, quite different from that of the mass-production worker. The specific skills are not the point of special emphasis. The man being prepared for this newer employment must be able to be trained easily and readily for the new higher order of responsibility and conceptual skills. The accent is not on the manual but on conceptual and thought processes.

A high level of technological knowledge will prepare him admirably for the variety of jobs he may have to hold. Generalized technical education at the high school level will be most useful for this purpose. In addition, the person must acquire a high sense of individual concern for the discharge of his responsibilities.

The maintenance men in this new era will also possess more intensive knowledge about the tools, materials, and technical processes. Many innovations will be commonplace and the maintenance man will have to master them as they appear. The areas of pneumatics, hydraulics, and electronics will play an increasingly more important role in the technology of the future.

Maintenance men must be prepared for them. The most expansive area among these jobs at the present time is the instrument mechanic who is being advanced from the lower ranks.

Another trend which will be accentuated is toward the all-around maintenance man who will be able to perform a wider variety of craftwork than is now customary in industry.

The present craft jurisdictions have grown up for a number of reasons. One, it was cheaper for management to have specialists; secondly, the school systems do not provide all-around mechanics; and thirdly, the craft unions favored this system. However, management is now proposing to have new, all-around maintenance mechanic classifications with higher wage rates, because they find that they perform with more responsibility and economy.

TRAINING NEEDS

Vocational training can no longer be directed merely toward preparing the individual for an immediate specific job. These are transitory. If they persist, they remain in name only. Their requirements will increase. There will be many simple jobs, but these will be on the fringe of our economy, and they will be constantly upgraded.

As a people, we cannot suffer underutilizing humans. The investment in capital, training, and social capital structure and services is too large for individuals not to be employed to the maximum of their capacity.

The extension of the lifespan will also demand an increase in the work lifespan. Our present experience indicates clearly that individuals must shift their employments as technology changes and our economy moves to newer products and services. Moreover, the decline of older industries will disgorge hundreds of thousands of individuals who must find newer employments. The markedly higher rate of geographical movement of industry will also have a similar effect.

Together, these and other trends will underscore the need of preparing young people not merely for a specific range of employments, but also for a whole lifetime of changing jobs and occupations.

SCHOOLING FACILITIES

The educational goals are to prepare the young people for a lifetime of adjustment, and to increase their capacity for "conceptualization" and the assumption of responsibility. They must acquire the skills of learning for the acquisition of newer knowledge. Teaching methods must be adapted to the learning processes of the adult who builds on past knowledge rather than through direct instruction as the young person does.

The area of greatest concern must be the vocational and industrial arts sections of our secondary school system. In them, the curriculum and the contents of study must be adapted to the newer needs of industry. The graduate must be a person who feels qualified for the newer jobs and a lifetime of continuing learning.

West Virginia's Aggressive Department of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, one of the many reasons why West Virginia has been moving forward during the past year is the aggressive work of the State department of commerce headed by the Honorable Hulett C. Smith. In the following article which appeared in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette of January 21, 1962, Hulett Smith describes the work which his department has accomplished:

AGENCY HEAD CITES NEW PLANTS

State Commerce Commissioner Hulett C. Smith predicts that economic development activity will reach an alltime high in West Virginia this year.

In a summary of his department's activities and accomplishments in 1961 and its outlook for 1962, Commissioner Smith forecast that by the year's end, West Virginia's image in the eyes of the rest of the country will be a totally different one from the way they have pictured us in the past.

"We'll be known as an aggressive and thriving State—one to be reckoned with in the highly competitive industrial and travel development fields and one in which economic development activity of all types is the keynote."

He explained that, for the first time in history, West Virginia has the tools needed to effectively combat unemployment, loss of population and other adverse factors.

"The same 1961 legislature which had the foresight to create a department of commerce and provide for separate divisions for industrial and travel development and planning and research also established the West Virginia Industrial Development Authority and provided it with funds to make loans to foster new industry," commented Commissioner Smith.

"There are three new industries in this State today which used IDA loans to help get established. And there will be more during 1962," he predicted.

The Industrial Development Division of the Commerce Department now lists 116 industrial prospects in its active file. "Before the year is over, we expect many of these to join our growing industrial scene."

The year 1961 saw plans announced for 46 new industrial facilities in the State, costing in excess of $200 million and employing 5,000 workers. During the same period, 45 present West Virginia industries revealed plans to put $134 million into expansion of their existing facilities and employ, an additional 2,500 persons.

During the same period, unemployment in the State was cut by one-third. The reduction in unemployment in the State was due, in part, to two public works programs initiated in 1961. The first is the State-financed and operated emergency employment program set up by the 1961 legislature and the aid to dependent children program, a Federal-State venture on a 70-30 matching basis.

Over 9,000 family heads had been assigned to public works projects throughout the State under the two programs by December.

One of the brightest parts of the outlook for 1962 is the fact that 22 counties have "already put their houses in order" by developing and submitting overall economic development programs, 19 of which were approved by the Area Redevelopment Administration by the end of 1961, the Commerce Commissioner pointed out.

"This means that they are now in shape to apply for ARA funds for specific projects and I foresee these coming in ever-increasing numbers in 1962. But, there are still 22 counties which are eligible and which have not yet submitted OEDP's. We hope the coming year will see all of them formulating these programs."

Twenty-three project proposals have already been processed by the Commerce Department, fourteen submitted to ARA and two have been approved to date.

Twenty-one urban planning programs, representing a cost of over $400,000, are being administered and supervised by the Department of Commerce's Planning and Research Division and fourteen have already been approved by the Housing and Home Finance Administration.

"One of the important facets of this new economic spirit is the participation by individuals and community groups in development programs," Smith stated.

He pointed out that 79 cities and towns now have development organizations. In addition, there are 12 major regional development organizations functioning.

The tempo of this development movement throughout West Virginia is increasing in direct proportion to the endeavors of the newly-created Department of Commerce.

"Coupled with this are the allied activities of the people of the State through the overall statewide clean-up program and the betterment of physical facilities for travel and industrial development," Commissioner Smith commented.

A new, comprehensive measure of economic activity known as gross State product has been established with 1957 as the base year of 100.

"In 1961," said Commissioner Smith, "our GSP was 98. In 1962, we expect this to climb to 105."

Gross State product is defined as "the market value of the output of goods and services produced by the economy of the State before deduction of depreciation charges and other allowances for business and institutional consumption of durable capital goods."

The Commerce Commissioner predicted that personal income in West Virginia will increase over 3–5 percent in 1962 to a new high and above the national average.

"Early this year we will launch an extensive advertising program to promote industrial and tourist development," commented Commissioner Smith, "and this will be a high-quality, high-geared undertaking.

"In ever-increasing numbers, people from other States are looking to West Virginia for their vacations and more tourist dollars mean more life pumped into our economy."

He pointed out that the number of persons seeking vacation information about the

State jumped from 75,235 in 1960 to 114,999 last year.

In 1961, literature was provided for travel racks in 375 restaurants, hotels, motels, and public transportation facilities.

Over and above the specific duties assigned to its various divisions, the Commerce Department, among others, in 1961 oversaw the successful Governor's wood utilization conference, designed to encourage development of the wood products industry in the State; worked in an advisory capacity with the West Virginia Centennial Commission for the State's 1963 observance; published brochures on the West Virginia Industrial Development Authority and the State's new economic development program, the latter designed to support West Virginia's bid for a better rating for its bonds; supervised the emergency employment program; and undertook preliminary steps for the State's participation in the 1964–1965 New York World's Fair.

A Tribute to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, Mr. T. H. Evans, a constituent of mine, has composed a hymn of praise to his adopted country, the United States of America.

Mr. Evans came to the United States as a young man. His life in this country has been a living tribute to both his own initiative and to the free enterprise system that has made America the land of opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD Mr. Evans' "Tribute to America":

A TRIBUTE TO AMERICA

It is my desire to pay my humble tribute to the land of courage, today, December 7, 1961, it is 50 years since my wife, myself, and three children set step on American soil.

I came to America a total stranger to its way of life, I was ignorant of any knowledge of what to expect or how I would respond to the American way of life.

What did I, a stranger in paradise, find here? Warmth and friendliness, understanding, and comradeship.

I found a land teeming with vigor, a people who had no compunction in discarding old ideas and methods, and a willingness to try new ideas and methods.

I found in America a land where snobbishness was discarded that the principles which Robert Burns set forth "A man's a man for all that," meant more than mere words.

Here I could go into the office of the president of a bank, and have a friendly hand extended to me, not kept waiting and talking outside his door.

In America I found space to expand, opportunities to grasp, and new frontiers to move into.

First I moved to Florida, from there some years later, I move across a wide and fertile land to the golden land where opportunity was ripe: Arizona, an old land made new by the courage and forethought of men who dared the obstacles of nature, mountains and desert sands.

They dared and built an empire which had become a symbol of stamina and fortitude for all the world to admire and emulate.

America has been kind to me and mine, and I hope that in some small measure I have contributed to its growth. I know that I am only one of the myriads who have sought and found the hospitable shores of this great land of ours.

People here have found that for which they sought, freedom of thought, freedom to develop their minds and ability in the direction they desired, and above all, freedom to express their convictions without being afraid of being boycotted, or thrown in prison or exiled.

America is great because it is willing to gaze into the future and consider human needs, plus the happiness of its people, and to promote those who have ability and courage to explore the unknown, and to bring the unknown to fruition.

There is both truth and poetry when I quote a fine American, Henry Van Dyke, "I know that Europe is wonderful yet something semes to lack. The past is too much with her, and the people looking back. But the glory of the present is to make the future free. We love our land for what she is, and what she is to be."

Through all the turmoil and threats of war, America will stand firm, it must be true to its own self and its standards must ever be high.

I found America a land of hope in 1911, a land of vigor and victory in 1916, a spirit no foe was able to stand up against, this spirit was repeated in 1941, and today should the need arise, America will rise to a pinnacle of strength and courage that will surpass all previous efforts.

I cannot close this tribute to the land of my adoption better than with words from that noble and soul stirring hymn,

"America, America, God shed his grace on thee,
And crown thy good with brotherhood, from sea to shining sea."

T. H. EVANS.

President's Pilot Is Native of Jefferson County, Ala.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to call to the attention of the Members the following article about President John F. Kennedy's personal pilot, Lt. Col. James B. Swindal. Colonel Swindal is a native of Jefferson County, which comprises my congressional district, and his family still live there. He compiled a very fine school record before entering the service in 1941, just after Pearl Harbor. Because of his outstanding performance as an Air Force pilot, he was selected by the President from a list of names submitted to him to be his personal pilot. Being the President's pilot is, of course, a very demanding task and I am proud that a native Alabamian is performing so admirably in this position.

The following article by Birmingham News Correspondent James Free will serve to indicate what a dedicated pilot the President has:

PRESIDENT'S PILOT—EX-TARRANT ATHLETE IS MAN BEHIND WHEEL OF KENNEDY'S PERSONAL PLANE

(By James Free)

The pilot of Air Force One—President Kennedy's official jetplane—is a lean, 44-year-old, 6-footer from Birmingham.

Lt. Col. James B. Swindal's blond hair is graying at the temples, but his weight, 170, is only a few pounds more than it was when he played guard at Jefferson County High School in 1936.

"That school is known as Tarrant High now," said Colonel Swindal in an interview. "I've kept up with it over the years. My wife, who was Emily Glover before our marriage in 1937, went to the same school. And several of her brothers have played football for Tarrant High."

When his demanding duties as the President's pilot permit it, Jim Swindal likes to play golf. He shoots in the low nineties, and his crewmen say he's still a pretty good athlete.

Versatility is one of Swindal's strong points. In football his regular position was guard, but he was called on to play several games at end. On the high school baseball team he usually played the outfield but occasionally was a relief pitcher.

One of his most poignant memories is the time he did a relief pitching stint in a game with Ramsay High. Scenting a story of a dramatic strikeout, I said, "you won, of course?"

"No," replied the colonel with a sigh. "We lost. A home run beat us."

Here obviously is a man who doesn't try to glamorize himself or his job. He doesn't have to. It's built into the terribly responsible position he holds. More on that later.

In addition to football and baseball, Jim also went out for high school track, running the 100-yard dash and the 440.

After high school, he went to work for the National Cast Iron Pipe Co. in Tarrant. He was a pipe inspector for about 2 years. For another couple of years he worked in the maintenance department of Hill Grocery Co. (His father, Samuel Y. Swindal, is a department manager for Hill.)

Then late in 1941, just after Pearl Harbor, Jim joined the Army Air Corps. In a few months he was an air cadet and on the way to a new career. His assignments in World War II included flying the hump over the Himalayan Mountains with men and supplies.

When he was promoted last year to lieutenant colonel, the rank gave him one of the qualifications required for consideration as a Presidential pilot. Swindal also had the other two musts: a minimum of 10,000 flying hours and at least 500 hours of flying time in jets.

He was chosen last December to be the President's personal pilot, being picked from a list of six submitted for the honor.

There's a lot more to it than simply being jockey to a big VC-137 jetliner, which is a special military version of the 707 commercial jet transport. Incidentally, there is no single President's plane. Four big craft—three 707's and one DC-6B—in the special air missions squadron of the Military Air Transport Service are available. They are similar in basic detail.

In the central section of the aircraft are the office and sleeping quarters of the President. To the front and rear are accommodations for other passengers: 32 well-spaced seats in the back take care of the White House staff and Secret Servicemen. To the front are 10 seats, a communications setup, one of the two galleys on the airplane and a steel cabinet that can be locked for protection of secret documents. (The plane is guarded 24 hours a day.)

Communications equipment includes a teletype machine for handling coded mes-

sages and a Presidential telephone that can reach just about every location on the globe.

Colonel Swindal's responsibilities start a long time before Air Force One (which is how the President's plane is designated in the airways) takes off and continue long after it has landed.

Safety precautions are too elaborate to detail here. Fuel is sealed 24 hours ahead of takeoff time, for example; but a sampling is tested later, just to be sure.

What happens between flights?

"Our normal day," said Swindal, "consists of 8 hours with crew training, flying missions and keeping the aircraft in A-1 shape. When a long flight is coming up the day stretches into 12 hours. If the trip is to be at a destination that we have never been, we make a practice flight, checking all radar points and so on."

Had there been any dangers encountered on Presidential flights?

Nothing serious. Once at Otis Air Force Base near Hyannis, Mass., Air Force One came down in a fog, took a slight bounce. Once at Newport, R.I., one of two tires on the double wheels blew out, but few knew about it.

The Swindals live at nearby Falls Church, Va. Jim Jr., 22, is studying physics at George Washington University. Daughter Kathryn, 11, likes to ride in her father's sports car. The colonel likes his work. "Guess I'll stick it out," he said, "for the full 30-year Air Force career." He's got 20 down and 10 to go.

U.S. Customs Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am in hearty accord with the genuine praise offered our U.S. Customs Service by Malcolm S. Forbes in the following article by him, which appeared under "Fact and Comment" in the January 15, 1962, issue of Forbes magazine:

FACT AND COMMENT

(By Malcolm S. Forbes)

U.S. CUSTOMS: BIG BUSINESS WELL RUN

As an oft-traveling American businessman I'l like to abandon the usual role of critical commentator and turn to enthusiastic backslapping. The back: U.S. Customs. They do an exceptionally difficult job extraordinarily well.

As one who comes into Idlewild—and occasionally Honolulu—several times a year, I developed a very high opinion of the efficient and courteous manner that the customs inspectors display in handling multitudinous travelers. To find facts to fit the opinion, I spent several hours the other day at Idlewild with the Collector of New York Port, Joseph P. Kelly, and his administrative officer, Frank R. Creed.

Into New York Port from foreign points come 1½ million people a year, 75 percent of them returning Americans. The port customs collects over $550 million a year, only a small fraction of it from dutiable things brought in by individual passengers. Today, with fewer employees, Customs is handling in less time a far greater volume. Idlewood itself has a force of 120 inspectors working in 5 overlapping, 8-hour-a-day shifts round the clock 7 days a week. Doing the normal clerical work there are an additional 49 men who are trained so they can function as inspectors to expedite the job at peak periods. The goal sought—and maintained—for each inspector is to take no more than an average of 4 minutes per passenger.

Complaints about U.S. customs for the most part fall into three categories.

First, there are those who complain because they feel others are being given preferential treatment—and those who complain because they think they should have had preferential treatment and didn't get it. The first part of the complaint usually stems from the fact that diplomats have immunity from customs and, therefore, are waved through. With the U.N. located in New York this happens often. Other times, when the arrival terminal is choked by the simultaneous arrival of many giant jets, the customs will, for a period of 15 minutes or a half hour, authorize spot checks, where perhaps alternate passengers open one or more of their bags while the others are passed through.

VIP'S: REAL AND PHONY

Usually the genuine very important persons are quickest and most pleasant in complying with the inspection procedures. But the would-be big shots, when they are made to open their bags like everyone else, even after they have dropped names all over the inspector, resent it.

The second category of complaints aimed at the inspector is simply a matter of the law. Plants, meats, some fruits, etc., are not permitted to be brought in under any circumstances. But the fellow bringing back a baseball-bat-sized piece of his favorite bologna sometimes feels it's taken away from him just to improve the inspector's own menu.

Often delays in getting through the line to an inspector arise because some travelers have the devil's own time getting their luggage open. They've reinforced the bulging bags with wrappings and rope and straps to keep them from bursting before arrival.

Customs also has the difficult task of enforcing the copyright act under which manufacturers can set quotas on imports of their own products, such as Jensen silver, assorted perfumes, musical instruments, etc. There are several hundred such articles and, unless the tourist has written permission from the manufacturer in this country, he cannot bring in the trademarked item from abroad. Again, some people tend to blame the inspector when he won't pass through their treasured, bargain-bought Steinway grand piano.

Every complaint that comes to customs is investigated. When somebody beefs about having had to wait an hour in line it is promptly and easily checked by checking his customs declaration, which is stamped with the time of its completion. By reviewing the time stamped on the declaration of the man in front of the complainant and the person behind, the officers can swiftly find out exactly how long it took the inspector to do his job. By this method, the order in which everyone went through every customs line can be completely reconstructed and the time involved exactly computed even weeks later.

Top boss of the New York port, Collector Kelly, often personally checks out letters of complaint that come to his attention and very frequently he can be found on line observing how the job is being handled. He has a cheerful determination to see that U.S. customs, reputation under his tenure is further enhanced.

CUSTOMS' VIEW OF THE PUBLIC

As for the other side of the coin—the Customs men's opinion of the traveling public: Procedure is based on the premise that 99 percent of the travelers are basically honest, and 85 to 90 percent of returning travelers go through the line with no complications. The others usually hit some complications by virtue of bringing improperly filled-in declarations, bringing in copyrighted goods or forbidden fruits of one sort or another.

One veteran inspector, Joseph Burton, 40 years in the U.S. customs service and now deputy collector and head man on the scene at Idlewild, estimates that no more than one out of 500 travelers is "suspicious," and he is spotted with startling consistency. Many a tourist trying to sneak in an undeclared jewel or expensive Paris gown must be ruefully bewildered at how the inspector seemed to know it. The answer has nothing to do with a secret divining rod. Over half of the time it is simply a matter of advance information. Informers receive 25 percent of whatever penalty is imposed for attempted smuggling.

UNCLE SAM'S HELPER

The suave persuasive jeweler who sold Mr. and Mrs. Gotrocks that lovely bracelet isn't content with his profits at the scene. As soon as the couple has departed his store he rushes to the phone and tips the nearest Treasury agent in the American consulate about the sale. If the store proprietor doesn't happen to think this is a nice thing to do to his foreign customers, some underpaid clerk can frequently be depended upon to supplement his income by helping Uncle Same keep American tourists honest.

The most pleasant American tourists so far as customs is concerned? Those coming in by ship. They are rested, relaxed, in no hurry. They can take all the time they want in departing from the comforts of their liner.

Air travelers, on the contrary, are usually in a hurry, and before they have been 15 minutes in the terminal are pointing out to everybody who looks official that in the same amount of time they could have gone several hundred miles on the plane they just left. In addition to which, of course, the delightful effects of the huge meal, and spirit-elevating refreshments have worn off. They view the customs man through eyes red and weary.

Surprisingly, the inspectors and their bosses still seem to have a pretty good opinion of their fellow citizens.

It certainly ought to be reciprocated.

The President's Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it is always interesting to have editorial comment on important pronouncements from different areas of the country. William R. Mathews, the well-known journalist and publisher of the Arizona Daily Star, has written a very searching and all-inclusive editorial on the state of the Union message of President Kennedy. The editorial follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

(By William R. Mathews)

President Kennedy's message on the state of the Union was notable for one outstanding fact. Instead of calling upon the American people for any sacrifices, as he once promised to do, he reassures them in a most positive manner their lives are going to be made easier.

To make life easier, he asks Congress for the authority to make income tax reductions up to 25 percent. That would be welcomed by millions of people, from the lowly work-

ingman to the fat cat in the 90-percent bracket. It would make the President still more popular.

His excuse for this discretionary power is that it would only be used to ward off a depression, which implies that henceforth depressions can be avoided by lowering taxes. Since the ultimate of such a policy would be virtually to eliminate income taxes, the question arises as to just what other taxes would be imposed to maintain the financial responsibility which he has promised so vigorously at other times.

Moreover, the establishment of such a policy at a time when the world is watching to see how financially responsible the Washington Government is going to be, could add to the growing doubt about the future value of the dollar. Instead of calling for power to reduce taxes, the President should call for power to increase them, if financial integrity is to be maintained.

The President makes this very subject an acute issue with all of the long list of additional expenditures his proposals require. He calls for increased aid for schools, when self-reliant States and communities can dispense with such additional aid. He calls for the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs, which would create a vast new bureaucracy and spending powers in behalf of cities at a time when cities should be told to take care of themselves. That such a proposal adds to an ever-increasing Federal control of activities which local communities can do best themselves, should not be overlooked.

The President calls for the U.S. Government to buy $100 million of United Nations bonds. Because other nations, notably the Soviet Union, have not paid their shares of housekeeping expenses, the United States is being called upon to do the job. If the U.N. would establish a rule that no member nation could have a vote as long as it was in arrears on its share of U.N. expenses, there might be some sense to the President's request. As it stands, it amounts to public notice that in the future the many new small nations do not have to pay, and will still have an equal vote with the United States.

Can Congress be expected to swallow such a manifest injustice?

As he calls for the power to decrease income taxes, the President calls for an entirely new appropriation of around $3 billion to promote our Latin American policy. In other words, the American people are going to indulge in increased deficit financing, ultimately weakening the dollar, by proposing to spend billions to buy the friendship of the Latin American nations.

When it comes to promoting international trade, and the need of reducing tariffs, the President is on sounder ground. For the year 1961, the United States sold something like $20 billion abroad and bought $15 billion worth of foreign goods. Since tariffs represent the intervention of the Government by giving economic aid to a selected group of industries, the movement away from that doctrine should be welcomed. As long as preferred industries get economic help, the farmers justifiably can call for help, also.

However, the President's message differs very little from those given by President Eisenhower. Both Kennedy's and Eisenhower's represent a conglomeration of demands made by those organized minorities that can get close enough to the President's advisers to plead, "Get this in, please, it will make him more popular."

The gist of what President Kennedy recommends is that at a time the American people are living in the greatest luxury of the ages, they are being told that they are going to have increased luxuries. They are not being called upon to make any sacrifices. They are being called upon only to increase expenditures and the national debt so a generous-minded President can provide a still easier life for them.

The tax aspect involves the authorization of the President to rule by decree, and to use discretionary power to make possible the magic of a reduction in income taxes. This aspect should have more attention than it is receiving. This is a gross and inexcusable abuse of the principle of rule by decree. Only in the gravest emergencies is such rule justified. Congress must not surrender this authority on a rather preposterous proposal, that implies it has lost its competence to judge when tax reductions can be made.

Anniversary of the Polish Insurrection of 1863

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, on the night of the fateful 22d of January 1863, the Polish Central National Committee, in the name of the aged revolutionary General Mieroslawski, and under the leadership of Stefan Bobrowski and Zygmut Padlewski, announced the unconditional and permanent emancipation and the complete enfranchisement of every person in Poland, without regard to race, religion, or previous condition of bondage. On that night there occurred simultaneously all over Poland uprisings of Polish soldiers within the Russian army. The insurrection extended all over Poland and late in March and all through April it looked like it might succeed.

In the meantime Lithuania had taken up arms for a reunion with Poland. On April 1, the Tsar proclaimed an amnesty to all Poles who would by May 1 lay down their arms and swear loyalty to the Imperial Russian Government, but the patriotic Poles stuck firmly to their demands. However, the diplomatic efforts of the Western powers to aid the Polish cause were unsuccessful, for the Tsar refused to deal with the Poles until the insurrection had been put down. The heroic resistance of the peasants eventualy collapsed. In August 1864 the Polish insurrection came to a tragic and bitter end, with its beloved military commander, Romuald Traugutt, hanged publicly in Warsaw with four of his colleagues. It was the end of the most heroic armed uprising in all of Poland's long history of suffering.

The uprising of 1863 was the result of hopes arising from the lenient treatment of the Poles by Alexander II, who had succeeded Czar Nicholas a few years earlier. It was supported by Polish soldiers, exiled Poles in Paris and all over the world, and—above all—by the students. But the insurrection of 1863 was no more successful than the earlier attempt in 1830–31. The czar attempted to convince the Polish peasantry that he was their friend, and sowed seeds of distrust against the Polish landlords.

But neither the Polish temperament nor the Polish character nor the high quality of Polish home life changed appreciably under the terrible lesson of 1863—nor, for that matter, have the three partitions which have been forced on Poland in recent centuries by the swirling currents of European history caused any diminution in the loyalty of the great Polish people toward their ancient homeland. Ninety-nine years after the insurrection of 1863 the Polish people are still under the iron control of their Russian overlord. I am proud to join with my fellow Americans of Polish descent in commemorating this solemn anniversary.

Pink Political Pills No One Will Buy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune and was reprinted in a recent issue of the Washington Post.

This thoughtful article entitled "Pink Political Pills No One Will Buy" sets forth some of the facts of life with regard to the medical care for the aged bill, which we hope will shortly reach the floor of the House for passage and ultimate enactment into law:

PINK POLITICAL PILLS NO ONE WILL BUY

(By Rowland Evans, Jr.)

Political propaganda is an art, requiring a special skill, a careful subtlety, a precise knowledge of how much the market will take. The oil and gas people, who should have known better, learned this vital little fact the hard way several years ago, when, so to speak, they got their hand caught in the cookiejar.

Now it is the doctors, or some of the eager-beavors among them, who show unmistakeable signs of having to learn the hard way. It is really quite surprising how devoted these medical fellows are to the task of defeating the administration's proposal of medical care for the aged and protecting the country.

"Remember, we can buy everything but time," a solid AMA-type wrote his fellow doctors not so long ago in an appeal for campaign funds to fight the great battle against the administration.

"The mournful bell is tolling out the final hours of freedom of medical practice in America * * *" and who is pulling the bell-cord? Powerful forces, including the combined muscle of organized labor, "political opportunism, and economic nihilism."

And what do the good doctors have to defend themselves (and the Nation, with its millions of aging citizens) in the final hour of freedom? Why the chamber of commerce, of course. As the letter-writing doctor says:

"Their forces are mighty * * *when their voice is raised in Washington, legislators listen * * * membership in the U.S. Chamber of Commerce is ridiculously cheap insurance against a political ideaology that is anathema to us all, and it is deductible at that."

"Deductible," it would appear, means that the cost of a membership in the chamber of commerce is a tax-deductible item. And so

it is, if membership is necessary for the conduct of business.

"A minimum membership in the chamber," the letter continues, "is $50. Fill out the application (which was included in the letter), attach a check and return it to me. I will gladly forward it to the national chamber for processing."

The last paragraph is also straightforward:

"And remember one thing if you will—we can buy everything but time." These words, without elaboration, leave themselves open to various interpretations, one of which is distinctly nasty.

The men who fought the New Deal's social security bill, the Utility Holding Company Act and some of the other landmarks of progressive legislation always went one or two steps too far, and the record of what they were saying 30 years ago makes spicy reading today. The head of the Georgia Power Co., for example, was asked what would happen if the holding company bill passed.

"Well, you would paralyze the Nation," he replied.

The great Democrat and famous lawyer, the late John W. Davis, described the bill as "the gravest threat to the liberties of the American citizen that has emanated from the Halls of the Congress in my time." And so forth.

Here we still are, not yet paralyzed. We survived the grave threat, somehow. Grass still does not grow in the streets of our cities so as you would notice it.

It is far too early to make a hard prediction on President Kennedy's proposal to raise the social security tax by one-half of 1 percent to finance hospital care for citizens over 65. But it is not too early for a soft prediction * * * that if the bill can be brought to a vote, it will pass, because the people want it.

The AMA will be on mucky ground if it claims that the bill will lead to socialized medicine; that the bill will bring the Federal Government into the doctor's examination room, between the patient and his doctor; that the bill will destroy the historic relationship of doctor to patient. Because these arguments are Halloween ghosts, and skinny ones at that.

There may be arguments, and good ones, against the proposal, but emotional drivel is not one of them. The letter which came into a reporter's hand is an unfortunate example of how far some doctors seem prepared to go. It is hard to believe that a majority of the 165,000 practicing doctors in this country would agree with the doctor from New York that those who are against the medical-care bill can buy everything but time.

Senator FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota, through a third party, was offered a $2,500 campaign contribution in 1956, no strings attached, but with an implication that a vote for the gas bill would be appreciated.

He didn't like it at all.

Tariff Proposals To Trigger Bankruptcy, Joblessness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, as we enter this new session, it might be good for all of us to get a fresh look at some old problems.

A great number of Americans believe too much monopoly in any area of our economy can be harmful to the whole economy.

One such American is Ed Wimmer, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, and a columnist for the Cincinnati Inquirer.

It is a rare occasion when a national figure speaks out against a proposal before Congress that appears to have all the power and glory of power behind it.

Those of us who find ourselves rather lonely in this fight for a more realistic approach to our foreign trade problem can be cheered a little by the knowledge that somewhere our voices are being heard.

I want to give all the Members of Congress something rare in our public press, a man who looks at the picture with clear eyes and a steady hand. We need a few more men like Ed Wimmer.

TARIFF PROPOSALS TO TRIGGER BANKRUPTCY, JOBLESSNESS

(By Ed Wimmer)

One price of proposed tariff reductions will be a loss of no fewer than 3 million jobs and bankruptcy of upwards of 15,000 small and medium sized businesses. Not only that, but some of our most important industries will be weakened to the point of virtual liquidation, with "Little Detroits" being created all over America.

No American manufacturer can pay from 3 to 6 times the wage of many foreign competitors, and 3 to 10 times as much tax per million dollar sales, and stay in the competitive race with foreigners subsidized by U.S. know-how and machinery as efficient as his own. Furthermore, if Red Russia and Red China put full steam behind their present dumping tactics the whole world is going to be turned into a free enterprise killing discount house, ravaging every market they invade in the same manner that our own markets are being ravaged today.

When you consider that American corporations have invested upwards of $40 billion in foreign plants and partnerships, and are shipping low wage, low tax goods into their own country, destroying their own home based production, you get some idea of the ruthlessness of modern merchandising, and how, in a few years, U.S. manufacturers will be exporting almost nothing from this country.

If you looked at the labels on toys, gloves, dishes, or even U.S. flags and Christmas holly, you bought or received during the holidays, I would judge that 75 percent of all items were foreign made. Yet the advocates of free trade want us to take down more bars, paying off the bankrupts and retraining the "displaced persons" who lose their jobs.

We have asked these people—"retrain them for what?" For elevator operators for hotels that are putting in automatic elevators? Make a clerk out of a steel mill worker for a supermarket that is going into complete self-service? Get them a job in a dry cleaning plant now faced with A & P's automatic cleaning and laundry operations? Loan them money to start a small business against the wolf-eat-wolf war between chains, discount houses, and chain dominated shopping centers?

Or—maybe they could find work in the newspaper, magazine and TV world, where consolidations and high costs of doing business are reducing the number of businesses every day—such as in the milk business, on the farm, or in the cotton fields?

What it all boils down to is just plain fear. Fear that Japan's economy will collapse if we don't buy what's coming off her overexpanded, subsidized, low wage, low taxed, monopoly-owned assembly lines, and fear that Japan, Germany, Pakistan, Hong Kong, and a dozen other countries will go Communist if we don't buy their goods.

The facts are that Japan will be forced into expanded trade with Red China and Russia, no matter how much we buy, and Germany and Britain will go the same direction when it becomes necessary. We must realize, also, that Russia and Red China represent the greatest industrial potential in the world today, and if we destroy our industries and weaken the resistance of the capitalistic, free, private enterprise system to Communist subsidized competition, Uncle Sam is going to end up with the biggest tin cup in history.

In Washington, Congressman JOHN DENT, of Pennsylvania, has put up a heroic battle to keep the tariff cutting advocates from pushing the country toward economic suicide via the foreign trade route. He writes: "The job is too big for us alone. The people must be aroused." H. R. GROSS, of Iowa, is equally alarmed, as are many others in Congress; while the people back home sit on their complacency in bewildered confusion.

Our pioneers fired a shot "heard 'round the world." The crash we'll make if we don't put some brake pressure where it belongs, will also be—heard 'round the world.

JOHN H. DENT, Congressman from the 21st District, Pennsylvania, is second to none in making a brilliant fight against low wage imports destroying thousands of small businesses; driving many reluctant bigs into establishing main plants abroad.

Mr. DENT is key man in congressional hearings on import threat. Real fireworks are promised. He is one man in Congress (among too few) who believes in the America first idea—not America last.

DENT knows the President is under much pressure to open gates to imports. Like others, John Kennedy is running scared on this question, however. Scared that we may offend foreign traders by protecting our industries. The scared crowd want relief money—doles for company hurt. They want retraining programs for employees. Bushwa. What we want is strong American business. We want to keep our industries. Let foreign products come in on a fair trade basis—the only healthy basis—and let's export on that basis.

U.S. nails can't compete with Japanese or German nails. German barbed wire $40 a ton under United States Steel price. Hardwood companies closing down. Carpetmakers closing. Typewriter sales going abroad. Sewing machine business about shot. Watches, cameras, gloves, textiles, fishing tackle, bicycles, automobiles, adding machines, dinnerware, transistors, tires, generators, tractors—you name it.

IBM—22 plants abroad. National Cash—plants in eight countries. Royal-McBee—foreign plants bursting with orders. German, American plants based abroad invading Latin American markets. In other words, Mr. and Mrs. America, we're in a war—a trade war—and it isn't a cold war—it's hot.

Editor Leaves His Stamp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, George Lower, of Alameda County, has decided to retire from journalistic endeavors after many years of dedicated service to the profession.

During the past 11 years, Mr. Lower has been editor of the Daily Review in Hayward, Calif. In this period of time he prepared more than 2,500 editorials for publication. These editorials were written in the interest of educating the

public on matters of vital international, national, State, and local interests.

He has demonstrated great professional integrity and a high degree of dedication to community affairs. His tireless efforts for the area were not confined to the editorial page. George Lower contributed many of his private hours to community projects. The rapidly growing southern Alameda County area is a better place in which to live due to his meritorious and memorable service.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to insert for the RECORD two editorials from the Daily Review. One editorial commends Mr. Lower and the second is his response and farewell:

EDITOR LEAVES HIS STAMP

Saying farewell today to the Daily Review and southern Alameda County is editor George Lower.

He has resigned after 11 years, with the announced intention to go to one of his favorite spots, Guadalajara, Mexico, to take it easy as long as he feels like taking it easy.

It is certain that his colleagues on the Daily Review will miss him. His many friends and acquaintances will miss him and wish him well in his new adventures.

Readers of this newspaper and friends and adherents of good government and American way of life also lose a champion at the editorial typewriter.

In his 11 years on the Review he has written more than 2,500 editorials in addition to countless news stories dealing with the affairs of the community, the area, the county, the State, the Nation, and the world.

He would be the first to admit that not all of his writings have hit their mark. Many of them have sailed astray.

But an unquestioned majority of his editorials have made their point on the side of reasoned government and enlightened community affairs. Some have felt their sting. Others have welcomed their praise.

The best opinion we receive at the Daily Review is that George Lower's approach to editorial positions have been sound. There has not been universal agreement with the editorial positions, but his integrity has been unquestioned.

In the 11 years he has seen the big growth of southern Alameda County. His editorials have helped promote, guide and interpret that growth on a growing newspaper.

He has done more than simply write of the civic and governmental growth of the area. He has participated personally and effectively in the major events during his stay here. Certainly, he always will be known as one of the prime movers who brought the college to Hayward.

It is the wish that his future endeavor will be as profitable.

D.N.

END OF AN 11-YEAR SOJOURN

No matter how inviting the prospect of another place, one cannot end an 11-year association without a tug at the heartstrings. So it is with your editor, your editor, that is, until 5 o'clock this evening. Henceforth, this page and these duties will be in other hands.

Our sojourn in the Hayward area has been a composite of many things. It has been challenging, frustrating, rewarding, and exciting. In short, it has been a part of life, with trials and satisfactions jumbled together.

We leave with a very real sense of friendship and respect for publisher Floyd Sparks, and for the fine staff members in every department of the Daily Review. And to the many individuals in the community who have given us their hand—or refrained from shooting us during moments of disagreement—we extend our thanks. We look back with regret that our work has not been better, but with satisfaction that it has at times been acceptable to many of you.

And there is a special warmth for those moments of personal association that have enriched so many days and evenings. They are now of the past, but not beyond the mind's retrieving.

And so, adios, mis amigos. May we continue together in memory.

The Forgotten People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, in October of 1962, the New York World Telegram and Sun, one of the country's leading afternoon and evening papers, ran an excellent series of articles on the plight of migrant workers. These articles were written by New York World Telegram and Sun Staff Writer Dale Wright, who for 6 months worked as a migrant laborer along the Atlantic seaboard from Florida to New York.

Dale Wright's story is a telling one, and I believe it should be brought to the attention of every Member of Congress. Therefore, I shall insert the entire series in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, one each day, in the hopes that it will attract attention to one of the most serious problems that the United States has left unresolved—the problem of America's most forgotten men, the migrant worker:

THE FORGOTTEN PEOPLE: I SAW HUMAN SHAME AS A MIGRANT WORKER

(By Dale Wright)

(Four migrant farm workers died Sunday as fire swept their squalid living quarters in a Suffold County labor camp, described by investigating authorities as shocking, deplorable. The tragedy substantiates an on-the-spot survey by this paper. As long ago as last April the World-Telegram assigned staff writer Dale Wright to work as a migrant laborer to determine if protective laws are safeguarding the interests of America's forgotten men. His articles revealing the abuses heaped on the overworked, underpaid, exploited migrant farmworker begin today).

Despite certain limited improvements—on paper—in the laws protecting the migrant farmworker, he continues to be America's forgotten man—forced to work long, tortured hours at substandard wages, cheated and exploited at every turn and compelled to live in filth and squalor and danger.

I know this because for 6 months, on-and-off from April to October, I worked as a migrant laborer along the Atlantic seaboard from Florida to New York. I saw it with my eyes, I felt it in my blistered hands, I smelled it with my nose and I rebelled at it in my conscience.

I labored with, slept with, ate with and more than once suffered with the members of this vast army of men and women and children—most of them Negroes like myself—who stoop and lift and grub from nature's earth a great part of the Nation's food crop.

THINGS REPORTER FOUND

These are some of things I found:

Many migrant workers are forced to work as many as 14 hours a day at a backbreaking task, the rewards of which are, in most cases, a string of broken promises.

They are grossly underpaid and, many times, not paid at all by conniving labor contractors who have them at their mercy.

They are cheated and exploited all along the line by profiteers in the roles of growers, shippers, packers, labor contractors, crew bosses, landlords, and merchants.

Thousands of them live in shabby, unkempt hovels and shacks, usually hidden behind a clump of trees out of public view, without sanitary or plumbing facilities.

And, despite laws enacted to protect them, their children, starting at age 6, are worked long hours under a searing sun for less than the prevailing—or promised—pay.

Under conditions inferior to those afforded cattle and freight, migrant laborers are transported from one work area to another in dilapidated, hazardous vehicles.

And at the end of the line, when all the crops are worked out, hundreds of the migrant workers wind up on relief at public expense in the northern seaboard States.

The man who sits next to me in this newspaper office, Allan Keller, has done much to improve the lot of the migrant laborer. Mainly through his efforts and the campaigns by this newspaper over a period of years, a New York State legislative committee was named to look into the migrant labor problem and recommend changes in the laws.

Belatedly, teeth were put into regulations to provide better treatment for the migrant. The State department of health was empowered to license labor camps and require that minimum sanitary and health standards be maintained. Other States took steps—also on paper, to help and protect the forgotten man of America.

HAVEN'T HELPED MUCH

The changes in the laws haven't helped much. The miserable migrants, virtually without hope for a brighter tomorrow, are still hidden behind those clumps of trees.

At this moment, the migrant labor problem is being investigated anew by a subcommittee of the House Labor and Education Committee with a view toward drafting new remedial legislation.

It's another step in the long "investigation" of the "stoop" laborer, who has been studied, surveyed, microscoped, and diagnosed over the years as perhaps the sickest segment of the Nation's economy.

But I saw little improvement in the condition of the patient. The working and housing conditions were bad enough but it was the way he's cheated that outraged me.

He's overcharged for his squalid shack, his food, his clothing, his bottle of wine at the end of a hard week of work. And he's gouged on just about every other item he purchases.

MEAGER BREAKFAST

I found workers in central New Jersey who were charged 75 cents for a breakfast of one chicken wing, a spoonful of watery rice, and a slice of bread. An extra slice cost them 10 cents more.

In the Long Island potato belt, where the four migrant workers perished in flames Sunday, I found a large crew of men and women being charged by a labor contractor with $1 weekly dues to a union which didn't exist. They also were being charged another $1.40 for social security, far out of proportion to the paltry pay they had received.

In many cases, I discovered, workers forced to pay for social security had no social security numbers at all, the payments obviously going wholly to profiteers operating at their labor camp.

In Hastings, Fla., the heart of the State's potato belt, I bunked for 2 days in a near-collapsed, insect-infested shanty for which I was compelled to pay $1.50 a night. Next door in an even more dilapidated hovel lived a married couple whose 2-month-old baby had been born there. They paid $10 a week.

WAILING INFANT

The infant wailed endlessly from dawn to darkness in its makeshift crib, a cardboard cabbage carton, as flies and potato bugs

crawled in and out of its mouth and nostrils. A ragged burlap potato sack served as the baby's blanket.

But Florida has no corner on squalor. Near Hightstown, N.J., less than 20 miles from Trenton, the State capital, I found seven men and women tomato pickers—none of them related—living in filth in a 10-foot-square tarpaper shack for which they were charged $10 a week for rent.

Everywhere I traveled I found the itinerant laborer getting a wretched deal. And being inarticulate and always on the move, he is least able among America's workingmen to have his cries heard.

A Lust for Bigness Can Hurt Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the interest of our colleagues the following article by George Sokolsky which appeared in the New York Journal American of December 29, 1961.

Mr. Sokolsky discourses on the threat to the free enterprise system of the present trend in business toward bigness rather than profits for the owners of business. He is quite correct that many of our American corporations have forgotten that the stockholders own these corporations and that management is ultimately responsible to them for its actions.

The article follows:

A LUST FOR BIGNESS CAN HURT BUSINESS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

American industry was built by individuals investing their savings in enterprises, nurturing them, occasionally combining with other enterprises, expanding out of earnings, taking out limited profits and putting savings and reserves back into the business. It was a private enterprise, designed to provide a profit but conducted prudently to guard against a risk turning into a failure.

This is the capitalist system. It is often called the profit and loss system. Its essential is that the enterprise is privately-owned and originally was owned by those who managed it; latterly widely owned by individuals unrelated to management. Its growth depended upon the character, sincerity and ability of those who owned the enterprise. Ownership and management were identical. The final responsibility rested in ownership. However, as the corporation developed and as management began to assume the responsibility of ownership, the nature of industrial management changed.

Ownership became diverse and diffuse. Paid employees assumed increasing authority, sometimes in disregard of the law, weakening initiative and absorbing parts of the profits by excessive wages, expenses, and other devices to entrench themselves in power.

In recent years, management has often neglected the principal function of the business which is to earn a profit for the owners, by burying earnings and other increments in what are called acquisitions which is the increase of an enterprise's value by purchasing other enterprises by the exchange of stock. It is often difficult to ascertain why company B, obviously profitable, sells itself to another company, sometimes less profitable than company B.

Often an acquisition is really an exchange of power within an enterprise without disclosing the shift of control. Sometimes the acquisition includes prosperous and unprofitable enterprises, the expectation being that by the acquisition the unprofitable enterprise will be buried. Sometimes, all these combinations are managed for a tax advantage, the management of the two companies taking advantage of the ownership which only reads of the astonishing rise of prospective annual income.

The empahsis on management is unsound and gives strength to those who should be subordinate employees. The emphasis on management has grown beyond reason and tolerance. Management only is legally responsible for the affairs of a company to the extent that it serves on the board of directors which represents ownership.

The trick devised here is the appointment of an executive committee which usually consists of senior officers of management who meet between directors' meetings and act for them. The executive committee often usurps the authority of the board of directors but none of its responsibilities.

Theoretically, the executive committee meets because it is smaller and more mobile than the board of directors and can put over devices which the board would resist, but which a board can never ratify because steps have been taken and commitments undertaken from which withdrawal would be costly and, in fact, inappropriate. Thus management uses the executive committee to turn a board of directors into drones or into a crony board.

Thus, the executive committee hurls a report on the table which should take many hours to study. Somebody moves that the report be approved as read; the fact, however, is that the report is approved unread, unstudied, unscrutinized. The result is hurried and unjustified action.

The cause for much of this is bigness—the lust for bigness, the show-offness of bigness. The worthiness of an enterprise is to be measured by its profits not by its so-called size or growth. Profits prove competent management and prudent operations.

When management absorbs too great a share of the earnings in disregard of the interests of ownership and the reserves of the enterprise, the business is badly managed. Those engaged in acquisitions have to be watched closely because this word, acquisitions, is a blanket for all sorts of queer practices, including the shifting of the control-power of an enterprise without regard to the protection of ownership. In fact, ownership may find itself out of control without knowing what has happened for some time. The reason for this is that in a company with a large and diffuse ownership, management can move swiftly to concentrate power through small devices and when the board wakes up to what has been done, it dares not disclose the trick lest it embarrass itself by admitting inefficiency and neglect.

All this is to be watched closely if business is not to be hamstrung in the United States.

The Military Man Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therewith a copy of an address by Gen. B. A. Schriever, commander, Air Force Systems Command, under date of January 13, 1962.

General Schriever, in his remarks to the Corps of Cadets at The Citadel in Charleston, S.C., deals with the ideological forces motivating the actions of Soviet Russia today.

Mr. Speaker, his message is so important every American should read it.

The address follows:

THE MILITARY MAN TODAY

(Address by Gen. B. A. Schriever, commander, Air Force Systems Command, greater issues lecture, The Citadel, Charleston, S.C., January 13, 1961)

It is a real pleasure to be here with you today at The Citadel. As a former ROTC cadet I always welcome the opportunity to talk to young men who are preparing to enter the Officer Corps of our Armed Forces. So I was particularly pleased when General Clark invited me to take part in the greater issues lecture series.

From my own experience I know that you may sometimes ask yourselves just exactly what the Armed Forces are accomplishing today and what will be expected of you as military men. This is a natural question, because our Nation is facing a challenge without parallel in our history, and the military profession has been called upon to play an essential role in helping the Nation meet that challenge.

It is clear today that our way of life is under attack by the most powerful, ruthless, and extensive dictatorship that has ever existed on earth. We are engaged in a global contest of utmost seriousness. Its outcome will determine the survival of freedom itself.

Basically, this contest is ideological: the Communist ideology gives an underlying strategic aim and motivating power to every Soviet action. The result is a relentless, single minded, and determined drive for world domination, in which force, terror, subversion, and deceit are employed as expedient to attain this end. Behind the bland smiles and the threatening gestures—the attempts to persuade and the efforts to intimidate—lies a restless, ruthless drive for power.

In the words of the current program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which was adopted last fall in Moscow, "The success of the struggle of the working class for the victory of the revolution will depend on how well it and its party master all forms of struggle—peaceful and nonpeaceful, parliamentary and extraparliamentary—and how well they are prepared to switch from one form of struggle to another as quickly and unexpectedly as possible."

The seriousness of the Communist challenge is conveyed not only by these words, but also by Communist actions—in Czechoslovakia, Korea, Hungary, Tibet, Laos, Cuba, Berlin, and South Vietnam. These acts—as well as their series of atmospheric nuclear tests last fall—show that the Soviets are not unduly restrained by moral considerations, by world opinion, or even by the discomfort and danger of their own people. Their aggressive actions have been stopped only when they have been opposed with determination by the free world, backed up by adequate military strength.

The task of the military man today is to help create and maintain this superior strength—both for the present and for the years to come. He must be prepared to use it if so directed, but he must also realize that our armed strength will have served its purpose if it never has to be used. A very important function of military strength today is to prevent, if possible, the war of ideas from becoming a war of arms.

For this reason, I believe that technology may be a decisive factor in our contest with the Communists. We must anticipate their future weapon developments, because a Soviet scientific or technological breakthrough could have extremely serious consequences for us and the rest of the free world.

It is obvious that the Soviets have decided to make a determined effort to attain military superiority through the use of science and technology. An important part of this effort is the Soviet space program. Twice during the last year the Soviets placed their air force officers in orbit around the earth. One of them, Major Titov, passed over the United States 10 times.

These achievements underscore the seriousness of the Soviet threat. They have been used repeatedly as part of a global campaign of propaganda, threat, and intimidation. These Soviet actions make clear that a primary responsibility of our Armed Forces is to win the technological race.

To meet this new challenge, we need a new breed of men. Several qualities are essential to the military man today.

The first of these is knowledge. Education has always been important to the military man, but today it is more essential than ever.

In my command, which is responsible for the research, development, procurement, and production of new systems for the Air Force, the importance of education is obvious. And in an increasing number of military duties throughout all the services, an undergraduate training is not enough. More and more we are calling for men with advanced degrees in a wide variety of subjects.

When I speak of knowledge, I am not referring to scientific and technical knowledge alone. The military man today needs to be more than a mere technician. He must have some understanding of the complex political, diplomatic, and economic factors that affect military decisions. He must be able to express himself clearly and concretely. And he must be able to manage men.

These qualities are products of a liberal education—an education which in Newman's words, aims at training the mind "to reason well in all things, to reach out toward the truth and grasp it." This habit of mind is produced not only by the curriculum one studies, but also by the attitude of mind with which one approaches the subject matter. This kind of education is a lifelong process.

The second quality which the military man must possess is imagination. This is a unique human attribute—no one has yet designed a computer with true creative ability. It is this ability that enables us to produce radically new concepts and to recognize their value. It is a quality that has been essential to mankind's progress through the ages, and it is particularly important today, because of the accelerated pace of scientific advancement.

Science has advanced so rapidly during the last 20 years that this period may be referred to as an era of technological explosion. Think of just a few of the historic developments that have occured in your lifetime—practical uses of new energy sources, such as atomic energy, jet propulsion, and rocket propulsion; new electronic devices such as transistors, tunnel diodes, and masers; a multitude of new discoveries in medicine; and the first steps in the exploration of space.

It takes imagination to produce such developments as these. But it also takes imagination to recognize their potential use, and we Americans have sometimes been slow to do this. For instance, when the Wright brothers first flew at Kitty Hawk, few people predicted much future for aviation. The Wright brothers themselves thought the airplane would be used chiefly for sport, for transporting light loads to inaccessible areas, and for reconnaissance in warfare.

Other nations were quick to see the military potential of aviation, and during World War I, military aircraft were thick over the battlefields of Europe. Yet not one of them was designed in America. The few we managed to build before the Armistice were produced from European plans.

We showed a similar lack of imagination in regard to another American invention—the liquid-fueled rocket. Goddard's theoretical discussions of rocket propulsion were published more than 30 years ago, and his first successful launch took place in 1926. Yet there was practically no American interest in the development of rockets until the beginning of World War II.

It was not until the German V-2 rockets began falling on London that many people began to realize the potential of the rocket as a military weapon. Even so, we lagged behind the Soviets in missile development, and by 1954, when I was sent to California to head up the development of the ICBM, we figured that they were at least 5 years ahead of us.

I hope we have learned from these experiences to be bolder in predicting future scientific and military developments. This will call for some new thinking, because as a nation we have consistently overestimated what could be achieved in a short-time period and grossly underestimated what could be achieved in a longer time period. Therefore it is doubly important for us to think ahead with imagination.

A third essential quality for the military man today is courage. I am not thinking just of heroism on the field of battle. Naturally this has been expected of fighting men throughout history. But there is another kind of courage that is needed as well. It is not as glamorous or dramatic, and it rarely wins any public notice, but in the long run it is just as necessary as the first kind.

This kind of courage is found in the staff office, in the laboratory, around the conference table, or at the test facility. It finds expression in the daring to accept new ideas, in the determination to fight for the concepts one believes to be correct, and in the persistence to stick with time-consuming, difficult, lonely work—simply because it needs to be done.

It is this kind of courage that produces results.

One can think of Robert Goddard, who persisted in his efforts to develop the rocket, in spite of neglect, public apathy, and ridicule. One can think of scientists in uniform, such as Col. John Paul Stapp, who risked serious injury or death to study the effects of deceleration; Lt. Col. David Simons, who pioneered a new phase in high-altitude research with his man-high balloon flight; and Capt. Joseph W. Kittinger, Jr., who has made daring high-altitude parachute jumps to test survival techniques for pilots of high-flying craft.

One can also think of our many test pilots, military and civilian, and the present and future astronauts. Or one can call to mind the multitude of scientists and researchers in our laboratories, whose persistence and dedication have enabled us to build the military strength we need today.

I think there is one quality that underlies and strengthens all of these that I have mentioned. It may best be called tough-minded patriotism. It means an understanding and love of one's country, and loyalty to it. It means knowing not only what one is against, but also knowing what one is for.

This kind of patriotism is not confined to pious platitudes expressed only on rare occasions. It is a 365-day-a-year variety—and 366 days in leap year.

A basic element in this kind of patriotism is a love of freedom. It is a recognition of the fact that, as Jefferson wrote, "The God who gave us life, gave us liberty at the same time." In a world where freedom is menaced as never before, it must not only be cherished, honored, and defended; it must also be held up as a beacon to all mankind. I believe America's destiny is to pioneer a new age of peace and plenty, where all men may know the dignity and freedom that is their God-given heritage.

This belief should be the motivating idea for every American military man today—whether he serves in the icy wastes of the Arctic or the steamy heat of the tropical jungle, whether he stands guard in besieged Berlin or manipulates a slide-rule in a modern laboratory. This aim—the creation of a world where all men can live in peace and freedom—should be the ultimate goal of all his efforts.

I emphasize this point for one particular reason. People today sometimes are overcome with the importance of the machine. We have machines that sell us soft drinks, wash our clothes, and figure out our income tax. Sometimes we may be tempted to think that machines alone will be able to defend us militarily.

This is not true. Machines can help, but they can never replace man. It is men, not machines, that fight the wars; and it is men who make the peace. You cannot build creative ability into a machine; you cannot design a circuit to take the place of courage; and you cannot enclose dedication to freedom in a magic black box.

I have spent more than 15 years in Air Force research and development and have directed the development of some of this country's most advanced weapons. Yet I consider man to be the most important element in our military strength today. And I believe he will continue to be.

This fact underscores the importance of the military man today. His profession is one that demands the highest qualities of mind and character. Some of you may make the military your lifelong profession; others of you may not. But the same challenge faces all of you—no matter what you do. The threat confronting us calls every American to put national security ahead of personal security. This may mean financial sacrifice, but if our Nation ever gets seriously outdistanced in weapons technology, high salaries are going to be completely meaningless, because freedom will not last very long on this earth.

I do not believe this is going to happen. As a nation we have great strengths—moral, intellectual, and economic—that we can and must use in the global contest with tyranny. I look with great hope to your generation—to your imagination, courage, and dedication to freedom. I know you will do the job that needs to be done.

The Public Interest in Uninterrupted Airline Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the importance of Miami as an international air terminus has long been established. Miami International Airport represents a tremendous investment to the taxpayer—Federal, State, and municipal.

The Miami Herald, editorially, has taken cognizance of the repercussions which would result from any unreasonable and unnecessary work stoppage at that airport. The editorial follows:

[From the Miami Herald, Dec. 30, 1961]

SEATING DISPUTE

The third man theme that plagued the airlines since 1954 is threatening to erupt into a strike that would halt Pan American World Airways' operations around the globe. Miami, the base of PAA's Latin American Division, would be particularly damaged.

The public will find it hard to understand how a dispute basically over the union af-

filiation of the third man in the cockpit, or whether the presence of a flight engineer also requires the services of a third pilot, should shut down an airline, inconvenience thousands of travelers, hurt a community's economy at its busiest season and throw 23,000 other employees out of work.

We think the public is growing weary of such disputes and is inclined to agree with a Government statement, during a similar strike some months ago, that unless a sensible, voluntary settlement was reached Congress should consider some permanent solution.

The public interest should come before the intransigence of a few individuals.

Homer M. Kerlin Selected as Western Section's Best Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. HUDDLESTON: Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Members of the House a newspaper article about one of the outstanding citizens of Alabama, Mr. Homer M. Kerlin, of Pleasant Grove. Several years ago Mr. Kerlin was forced to retire from his job because of a crippling arthritic condition, but because of his faith and his own efforts Mr. Kerlin walks today. Not only has he triumphed over his handicap but he has spent his time in recent years working for and helping others. His story is an inspiring one and I commend to the Members this fine article about him which appeared in the Industrial Press:

HOMER KERLIN IS 1961 BEST CITIZEN

Homer Madison Kerlin, 72 years of age, and a resident of Pleasant Grove this week was proclaimed "The Western Section's Best Citizen for 1961" by a five-person panel of judges.

Their statement read:

"We do hereby unanimously declare Homer M. Kerlin of Pleasant Grove, Ala., as the Western Section's Best Citizen for 1961 in view of his many unselfish services during 1961 of benefit to his fellow men, to his community and to our country. Choosing one of five outstanding persons nominated for this honor proved most difficult. It is not our intention to reflect against the other nominees and the many invaluable services which they perform without thought of personal gain or compensation. These benefit the many persons and communities in this great western section of Greater Birmingham. We heartily commend each nominee as a "best citizen" and recognize their outstanding services. We take this opportunity to thank each group or person who wrote a letter of nomination, and to the many who wrote letters of endorsement of the nominees. Signed: Dave Moxley, chairman; Mrs. Grady (Margaret) Self, Mrs. Sterling (Louise) Bennefield, C. A. Carter, Stewart M. Jackson.

WESTERN SECTION'S NEW BEST CITIZEN IS ALWAYS HELPING

He's always going somewhere to help somebody do something and it doesn't matter what kind of weather it is, he's going.

That's the description of the Western Section's Best Citizen for 1961, Homer M. Kerlin, as given by his wife, Mrs. Kerlin. She laughed and said: "Sometimes it seems like I have to make a date with him if I want to see him or talk to him."

That's quite a statement to make about a man who was forced to retire from work because of arthritis, and, one who couldn't even walk for 3 years. Listening to him talk one can readily understand that he just wasn't a man to remain down. But, we're getting ahead of the story, so here are some facts about the 1961 best citizen.

He was born Homer Madison Kerlin May 17, 1889, at Waverly, Ala. His father was a farmer, and Homer's early years were spent on the farm. His parents moved to Alexander City in 1902 and it was in that vicinity that he spent his childhood. He received his education at a school called Sunny Level near his home. (The best citizen recalled that one of his classmates was Agnes Benson, who is the mother of Gov. John Patterson.)

At the age of 21 Homer Kerlin decided to go West and seek his fortune. His father arranged a job for him with a relative in Louisiana. It was there that Homer began his first work with a railroad, one that was operated by a sawmill.

The young man didn't particularly like Louisiana. He returned to his home in Alabama and in 1917 he made his home in Birmingham where he secured employment with TCI on its Birmingham Southern Railroad. He was transferred to rail transportation in 1918 and in 1922 he went to Westfield as a car inspector. He retained that position until 1942 when he was moved to byproducts, working there until October of 1945 when he was forced to retire by arthritis and became a wheelchair victim.

Homer Kerlin had been in Birmingham 14 years when romance became a serious part of his life. He was living in Ensley at the boarding house of Mrs. R. L. Godfrey when on a blind date he met Miss Inez Holmes. She resided in Acipco. One of her girl friends introduced the two and that girl friend later confided in Inez (Mrs. Kerlin) that when Mr. Kerlin was taking her home he said:

"If I had my way I'd carry that girl to the preacher's house and then she would be mine." The young man didn't act quite that fast, but he met Inez Holmes on April 21, 1931, and on June 20 of that same year they were married in the pastorate of Rev. Perry Claxton in Acipco.

The newlyweds set up housekeeping in Ensley Highlands, then 1 year later moved to Fairfield. They were active in church in Pratt City where Mr. Kerlin taught a boys Sunday school class. Mrs. Kerlin also became a Sunday school teacher and is today. The couple moved to Pleasant Grove, where they now reside, in 1937, and have had active roles in the community since that date. They transferred their church membership to Harmony Baptist Church where Mr. Kerlin was ordained as a deacon. After arthritis struck him, he was made an honorary deacon. The couple transferred membership to Bethel Baptist Church when it was organized in the community and are active there today where Mr. Kerlin is also an honorary deacon.

"I like my church and always have," Mr. Kerlin said. "When I couldn't walk, I was carried to church regularly." That faith is the probable reason that he can walk today. After he was crippled he was told that he would never walk again. Then a friend told him of a woman doctor she thought could help him. He went to the doctor who afterward told him, "I think with the Lord's help, with my help, and with your help, you'll walk again."

She proved right.

The 1961 Best Citizen doesn't have any hobby in particular. He does like to plant a garden. He likes to grow vegetables and has a picture of a 3¼-pound tomato which he grew the other year. He posed for the picture placing the tomato atop a 40-pound watermelon, which he also grew. He planted and cared for his garden even when he could not walk. One of his friends would carry him from the house and return him. In Mr. Kerlin's opinion, there is nothing more valued than a friend.

During the time he has resided in Pleasant Grove, the Best Citizen has served as alderman on the town council. He is a charter member of Pleasant Grove Civitan Club, the largest ever chartered by Civitan International. He is a member of Florida 450 Masonic Lodge, and a Shriner, honorary member of the Order of the Eastern Star, sergeant in Pleasant Grove Civil Defense, and commissioned a special policeman in Pleasant Grove Police Department.

While he and Mrs. Kerlin have no children of their own, they readily admit that they have had many children in their lifetime. Each has long been interested in working with youth. Mr. Kerlin has a particular understanding of boys, their nature, and their actions. As he says: "I was once a boy myself."

The 1961 Best Citizen has two brothers, two half brothers, and three half sisters now living. His brothers, Ira B. Kerlin (Central Park) and Ben V. Kerlin (Avondale) are Birmingham residents. His half brothers, Broughton Kerlin and Grover Kerlin, live in Alexander City. His half sisters are Mrs. L. K. Carlton, of Kellyton, Ala.; Mrs. T. L. Basemore of Huntsboro and Mrs. Albert Eason, of Alexander City.

A brother, Harvey James Kerlin, and a half sister, Lucile Jenkins Kerlin, are deceased.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, today, January 22, we celebrate Ukrainian Independence Day. The cynical among us may be amused that we should honor the Ukrianian people and that we should applaud their continuing, albeit unsuccessful, efforts to gain their freedom. What independent Ukriane they ask? The Ukraine, they taunt, is a part of the Soviet Union.

Well, the people of the United States will not be taken in by the retorts of these cynics and pessimists. The American people know that freedom exists in the heart and in the mind. They know that the freedom they enjoy here in this great country of ours is a birthright of humanity in which the Ukrainian people share with all other people of this earth. Indeed, the Ukrainian people, through their long and difficult years of suffering under Communist rule, teach us how important freedom is in the life of men. The Ukrainian people show us the way. Their Independence Day is our Independence Day. Freedom is not safe until every vestige of tyranny is swept from the face of the earth. The Ukrainian people help the cause of freedom by keeping the hope of freedom high for themselves. Ukrainian Independence Day is a tribute to that noble hope.

Independence Day also reminds us that this Nation has been uniquely blessed. The Ukraine, unfortunately placed between jealous and greedy neighbors, has been attacked and conquered again and again. We have been, until now, protected by our oceans. Today, the Soviet Union and the insidious hand of Communist dictatorship

clutches at the throat of this proud and courageous land.

If past is prologue to the future, we can rest assured that despite communism attempts to choke liberty in Ukraine, the people of this land will not permit its spirit to die among them. They will rise again, as they did after World War I. They will throw off the painful shackles which presently bind them. And a new day of freedom symbolized today by Ukrainian Independence Day will break forth across the land. Freedom for the Ukraine will strengthen our freedom.

The people of the United States of America are therefore happy and proud to join their Ukrainian brothers in celebrating January 22 as Ukrainian Independence Day.

President Kennedy—The Leadership Is There

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the Miami Herald, a leading newspaper of our country, has published a challenging editorial concerning President Kennedy's state of the Union address:

PRESIDENT OFFERED THIS, PLUS CONTROVERSY: LEADERSHIP IN A SPEECH

Two facets of President Kennedy's state of the Union message strike us as out of the ordinary and therefore characteristic.

The President had relatively little to say about the status of the Republic, which is the usual reason for this annual ritual. Rather, he talked about improving it, asking of Congress no less than 20 new laws.

Second, the message was singularly free of special interest appeal familiar from the stereotypes of other years.

For example, rather than emphasize the plight of the farmer (supposing he has one, as politicians usually do), Mr. Kennedy talks about "the use of our land" and crop supplies. In the area of labor he talked not about repealing or redrawing Taft-Hartley, which is Democratic cant, but rather about retraining workers and getting people off relief.

We think these approaches are refreshing, for they tend to embrace the whole people, the Nation, and the public interest inseparably, rather than factions or splinters.

His program, he said, is designed to "fulfill the world's hope by fulfilling our own faith."

In spirit the message would seem to guide us in that very direction.

Yet the message is shot through with controversy.

And it is far from conservative in the usual doctrinaire sense.

Take the controversies:

One is bound to rise over Mr. Kennedy's renewed demands for medicare, or medical aid to the aged through social security. Indeed, trouble has been forecast here by the new House majority leader, Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

The President goes all the way on Federal aid to education. As Cactus Jack Garner used to tell F.D.R., "Cap'n, you haven't got the votes."

Hardly on the conservative side is a proposed $3 billion fund for Latin American aid.

He is indulging in an innovation of questionable constitutional character when he calls for the right to cut taxes and trigger Government spending in an economic emergency without the specific approval of Congress.

Of course, these are broad principles. The details will need to be examined as legislation is submitted.

We have other reservations. Yet in the main this was a statesmanlike performance by our pragmatic President. He was especially the statesman in his forthright remarks on the tariff and the necessity of meeting the challenge of the Common Market.

This was Mr. Kennedy as historian.

He played upon a historic theme again, we think, when he said that "while no nation has ever faced such a challenge (in the world about it), no nation has ever been so ready to seize the burden and glory of freedom."

In essence, this is the kind of leadership the American people expect from their President. They can take it or leave it, but it's there.

A Day of Infamy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, last New Year's Eve, when the Western World looked hopefully toward 1962 as a year which promised great progress toward the goal of freedom and justice for all men, one twisted mind of hatred busily plotted to vent his unreasoned hatred by the criminal act of exploding a bomb in a recently completed place of worship, dedicated to the honor and glory of Almighty God. During the last hours of 1961, this instrument of destruction was exploded in the new Chevro Kadisho Machzikai Hadas Synagogue at 2040 West Devon on Chicago's North Side, causing more than $25,000 damage to the structure. Man had once again demonstrated his inability to live at peace with his neighbor. The physical damage can be repaired; apprehension and punishment of the persons responsible will satisfy legal justice; but there will remain the irreparable insult to God and to those of Jewish faith, who will continue to seek true freedom in America.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I offer the following editorial by Edward Wallis, general manager of Chicago's North Side radio station WIND, as an illustration of the sentiments of Chicagoans and Americans regarding this crime:

A DAY OF INFAMY

All decent citizens recoil in horror and disgust from the act of vandalism which blasted the new Congregation Synagogue on Chicago's north side this week. WIND joins other civic interests in condemning those who perpetrated this crime against God and humanity. We earnestly hope that those responsible will be quickly apprehended and punished. Chicagoans of all faiths have expressed sympathy and have shown their deep concern in many ways. For example, Roman Catholic Msgr. Daniel M. Cantwell sent a personal check to Rabbi Julius Goldman with a note which read, "This is to help repair the insult to Almightly God and to repair your synagogue." Other expressions of help and sympathy have come from Protestant clergymen.

The kind of hooliganism which is expressed in the desecration of any house of worship must be routed out of our midst. A great world war causing the loss of millions of lives was fought and won to end the theory of racial and ethnic superiority. We cannot permit the rise of a new Nazi movement nor the expression of Nazi ideals by any individual or group of individuals in our community. This disgraceful incident is a repetition of similar atrocities committed in Metropolitan Chicago in recent years. It is to be hoped that this is the last in the series. However, it will not be the last unless the crackpots, the sick minds who have disgraced Chicago with their actions are caught and placed behind bars. WIND urges any listener who may have knowledge leading to the arrest of the perpetrators to get in touch with the police department immediately. The elimination of these neo-Nazis from the American scene will remove a deadly cancer from our midst.

Thank you.

Address by Hon. Thomas J. Lane Before the National Legislative Committee of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I had the honor of giving before the National Legislative Committee of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., on January 22, 1962:

Mr. Chairman, Melvin D. Eddy, national legislative director, John Bashara, Sr., national commander, Michael J. Dwyer, national research consultant, George LaVorce, department of Massachusetts commander, and all department commanders, members of the National Legislative Committee of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., and invited and distinguished guests, friends of the Veterans of World War I, may I extend to your national commander, John Bashara, Sr., my sincere thanks and grateful appreciation for the kind invitation extended to me to speak before this National Legislative Committee of the Veterans of World War I, U.S.A., Inc., at this meeting here at the Bellevue Hotel in Washington this morning.

I have had the greatest respect and admiration for your national officials and legislative officials for their work and their efforts in behalf of your organization, not only during the past year but in all previous years. They have worked untiringly and unselfishly in behalf of not only the organization and the veterans of World War I but the veterans of all wars here in the National Capital. They have presented to the Members of the Congress a constructive and worthwhile program which warrants the serious consideration of each and every Member of the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate in behalf of legislation to benefit these veterans.

It is difficult to understand why one administration after another in Washington suddenly becomes "economy-minded" whenever the subject of veterans' pensions comes up for consideration.

On the other hand, their generosity can hardly be restrained when it comes to giving

out foreign aid, on which the United States has spent more than $100 billion since World War II.

Now most of us agree that foreign aid is essential for the strengthening of the free world. Some of those billions, however, have been given to Communist Yugoslavia, Communist Poland, and to so-called neutralist nations who take our money and then support the Communists in the United Nations.

Recently, our Government indicated that it would ask smaller appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and would cut back on funds necessary for the operation of the Pure Food and Drug Administration, and would curtail on cancer research.

At the same time, it proposed that the United States should underwrite half of the $200 million bond issue to save the U.N. organization from financial collapse. No mention was made of exerting pressure on the Soviet Union and some other nations to pay up their dues to the United Nations, which would make this extra gift on our part unnecessary.

Again, no one questions the need to maintain a strong defense force. Of the $50 billion spent each year for national security, a few billion could be salvaged for other programs through better planning and better management.

The callup of 120,000 reservists and National Guardsmen is a case in point. This will cost several hundred million dollars, with the prospect that these men, most of whom had already served a tour of active duty, will be released later on this year.

The Army has had the honesty to admit its mistake. There was faulty paperwork that caused hardship cases, a lack of medical care and housing in some cases, and faulty distribution of equipment.

What the reservists and many other Americans could not understand was why these men were mobilized for the second time, while millions of young men who had never served their country, were available through selective service.

These are some examples of the executive department's wastefulness on some programs, while it practices pennypinching economies at the expense of the veterans. Field contact offices of the Veterans' Administration have been closed down.

The legislative branch of our Government must share responsibility with the executive branch for these shortcomings.

In most of the States, persons on public welfare receive as much as $100 per month, and are provided with hospital and medical care. By contrast, the Federal Government shows less consideration for the veterans of World War I. Many of them never received disability compensation. They suffered hardship and disabilities that they could not prove as service-connected because the Government was careless in maintaining health records covering their time in military service.

Now that our comrades have reached the average age of 67, too many of them have no social security protection, or only qualify for limited benefits. To support themselves they must depend on a small nonservice-connected pension of $66.15 or $78.75 a month, with the exception of some who, under the law which became effective July 1, 1960, are entitled to a little more. World War I widows, again with some exceptions, are receiving pensions limited to $50.40 per month.

We have justice and precedent on our side in advocating a $100 a month pension for all veterans of World War I and their widows, with income limitations high enough to provide them with security and dignity in their years of retirement.

More than 15,000 of our comrades are passing away each month. If our Nation is to provide a decent measure of security for veterans of World War I, as proof of its gratitude, and to bring happiness to their last few years, it must act without further delay.

Over 200,000 members of World War I Veterans of the U.S.A., united and determined, remind the Congress that April 7, 1962, will mark the 45th anniversary of World War I.

As a member of Lawrence, Mass., Barracks 126, I shall work with you, and with my comrades of World War I in the Congress, to persuade my colleagues in Washington that this is the year to enact H.R. 3745 into law, and other bills.

The main objective of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. is to secure the enactment of a service pension, consistent with the pensions that have been awarded to the veterans of previous wars.

We have precedent and justice on our side in asking Congress to vote for H.R. 3745. In that bill we provide reasonable ceilings on additional income, in recognition of the fact that the pension itself is the irreducible minimum for those of our comrades who must depend upon it alone to support themselves.

In speaking to the department commanders from every State who form our national legislative committee, I do not have to repeat the reasons justifying a service pension for all qualifying veterans of World War I. Neither you nor I have any illusions about the difficulties of the fight ahead of us. But we shall go forward, more than 200,000 strong, certain that our cause is right, and confident of eventual victory toward enactment of our pension bill.

Independence Day of Ukrainian Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSICA McC. WEIS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my colleagues in this observence of the 44th anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic.

It is altogether fitting that we, as Members of the Legislature of one of the great free and democratic nations of the world, take time from our deliberations to commemorate the courageous efforts of other freedom-loving peoples to throw off the yoke of oppression.

The gallant people of the Ukraine are such a people, for despite the incredible sufferings which have been thrust upon them during decades of Russian Communist domination, the spirit of liberty burns as brightly as ever in their hearts.

The people of the Ukraine should have a very special place in our hearts and in our prayers. For well over a million Americans of Ukrainian descent have brought to this country their love of freedom, their individual self-reliance, their deep spiritual values and the riches of a distinctive culture. I have seen the importance of these contributions in my own congressional district, and I am well aware of the wonderful efforts which are being made constantly by the Ukrainian-American Congress Committee of America to assist and lend encouragement to those in their homeland.

It is my hope that our remarks here today will find their way to the people of the Ukraine, so that they may know we are awake to their cause and are looking forward eagerly to the day when they will join us in the family of free nations.

Has Anyone Seen Paul Crabtree?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, in the past 6 months many people around Capitol Hill, perhaps inspired by their intensive TV-search for the elusive car 54, also turned their attention to the question: "Paul Crabtree, where are you?"

In the summer of 1961 I was the recipient of a number of inquiries about Mr. Crabtree because Paul, a former staff member of the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette, had served as my executive assistant since I first came to the House of Representatives in 1959. The inquiries have just about petered out for Paul. Not because of any waning interest in his activities, however; it's just that most people now realize exactly what Mr. Crabtree is up to, and the friends of his who are legion now understand what this ball of fire is actually doing.

Since mid-1961, Paul Crabtree has been serving as special assistant to the Governor of West Virginia, the Honorable William Wallace Barron. His central function is to head up the Washington liaison office for West Virginia. To this job he has brought energy, imagination, and an ability to communicate which seems inbred in all of the products of Prof. Page Pitt's journalism course at Marshall University. As a consultant to his office, Mr. Crabtree has available the fine talents of Prof. Conley H. Dillon, former chairman of the Marshall University Department of Political Science and now professor of government at the University of Maryland.

In the January 21, 1962, issue of the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette, Paul Crabtree has set forth the nature and accomplishments of the Washington liaison office, which I commend to the attention of the handful of people who are still wondering what Paul Crabtree is doing. The record is an impressive one. It is symbolic of the regenerated spirit which has characterized the great State of West Virginia since the onset of the administrations of President Kennedy and Governor Barron:

LIAISON SPURS NEW JOBS, ORDERS

(By Paul Crabtree)

One step toward the implementation of Governor Barron's new spirt in the life of West Virginia was the establishment, in mid-1961, of a Washington liaison office to coordinate State governmental activities with those of the Federal Government.

Since its inception, the office has consistently increased its tempo of activity and its scope of operations, with the result that at year's end, and after less than one-half year of operations, the following results have been attained:

Almost 500 Federal Government procurement opportunities have been called to the attention of West Virginia businesses and

industries, greatly stimulating the State's participation in bidding on Government contracts. As a result of opportunities uncovered by the liaison office or assistance provided to six contracts with a dollar value of more than $6.5 million have been awarded within the State—providing jobs for more than 1,200 persons.

Six industrial prospects, most of them in the fast-growing research and development field, have been uncovered by the office. There is an excellent prospect that two or more of these firms will locate within the State.

The office assisted with eight industrial development applications through the new Area Redevelopment Administration, has offered suggestions and proposals for improving and expanding ARA programs and procedures relating to West Virginia on several occasions, and has prepared a number of proposals for ARA consideration which would benefit the State greatly.

The office has been the contact point for inquiries, requests and business with more than a dozen other Federal agencies, and has served to expedite relations and action in intergovernmental relations in most of these cases.

The office has served as a travel bureau point in Washington for the State, and has contacted more than 80 travel agencies in West Virginia's behalf, in addition to handling more than 100 inquiries from individuals and organizations seeking to visit the State.

In none of these activities has the Washington liaison office deserved the sole or full credit. The office is an extension of the State government, operating under and through the Governor and his office. The mass of detailed work, and the origin of most of these projects have germinated at the State level or among the State's congressional delegation.

The office aims at speeding up action on these problems, rapid gathering of useful information for the various departments of the State government and working closely in complementary activity to the energetic efforts of the able Senators and Congressmen from West Virginia.

Several States have similar offices in Washington. Many of them have been in operation for many years, and obviously have proved to be a good investment for those States which operate them. As the West Virginia office increases the pace of its activity, we hope to prove that it also is performing a valuable and vital service to the people of our State.

Address by the Honorable Brooks Hays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, January 11, 1962, one of our former colleagues and very dear friend, the Honorable Brooks Hays of Arkansas, who is now Special Assistant to the President, honored the city of Anniston, Ala., in accepting an invitation to speak before the chamber of commerce.

Knowing of his very busy schedule, I am indeed grateful that he was able to make this appearance which I am sure will be remembered by the people of Anniston.

I would like, at this point, to insert an editorial appearing in the Anniston Star on Friday, January 12, 1962, referring to Mr. Hays:

A MEMORABLE EVENT

Last night's meeting of the Anniston Chamber of Commerce was a memorable event for some 350 residents of Anniston and surrounding area who braved the elements to take part in the 52d annual observance of our foremost civic gathering.

For in addition to the recognitions that have become traditional in areas of community service and accomplishment in agriculture, plus the changing of the chamber's guard, as it were, the featured speaker was the Honorable Brooks Hays of Little Rock and Washington, who is internationally acclaimed as a statesman-humorist and Baptist lay leader.

Presently serving as Special Assistant to President Kennedy, he delivered himself of one of the finest addresses ever presented in Anniston. It consisted of, along with much wit and humor, an eloquent statement of the case for expanded commerce, with particular reference to Western Hemispheric trade.

Analysis of the American Economy by Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, for a thorough and balanced analysis of the present status and future prospects of the American economy, I commend to my colleagues the remarks of the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, at the 1962 Savings Bonds Conference on January 19, 1962:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS DILLON, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, AT THE 1962 SAVINGS BONDS CONFERENCE, SHERATON-PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 19, 1962

I want to thank you for your interest in the savings bonds program. We value it as one of the Treasury's most important tools in managing the public debt, as well as a most effective way of encouraging individual citizens to share in the financial affairs of Government. It is also one of our country's most successful volunteer undertakings. Through the years, it has enlisted the patriotic support of hundreds of thousands of people, under the leadership of distinguished individuals like yourselves. With your help, the savings bonds program will make an ever greater contribution to the economic strength we urgently require to fulfill the heavy responsibilities history has thrust upon us.

Our ecoonmic policy plays a vital role in meeting those responsibilities, for it will determine whether the future finds us weak or strong—idling along at half speed—or running at full throttle, powered by our tremendous productive potential.

To achieve that potential, our immediate economic goals are these:

First, to reduce unemployment. We simply cannot afford the misery and waste of having a large part of our labor force idle.

Second, to reach a rate of economic growth sufficient to assure jobs for the millions of workers entering the labor market in the years ahead, to guarantee to our citizens the benefits of a thriving economy, and to build the capacity to meet our international obligations.

Third, to eliminate the deficit in our international balance of payments, and its accompanying gold loss, for a sound dollar is as essential abroad as it is at home.

And, finally, to maintain reasonable price stability, so that our citizens may enjoy the full fruits of their savings, so that our economic gains are not wiped out by inflation, and so that our goods can compete successfully in world marketplaces.

We made considerable progress over the past year toward these objectives. At the close of 1961, our domestic economy reached record highs in terms of gross national product, personal income, industrial production, and manufacturers' sales and new orders. Unemployment has finally begun to drop, and we expect it to decline further in the months ahead. Our gold loss in 1961 was just half the 1960 figure, the basic deficit in our balance of payments was cut by two-thirds, and the overall deficit by more than a third.

These gains were achieved in good measure because our fiscal and monetary policies were geared to the requirements of last year's recession and early recovery.

Largely because of increased defense needs, coupled with recession-level revenues, our national budget was in deficit—a deficit that, because of the recession, was both acceptable and inevitable. However, the economic growth forecast for 1962, with resulting higher revenues, makes it both desirable and possible—barring unpredictable international emergencies—to achieve a fully balanced budget in fiscal year 1963, as the President has recommended.

One of our most urgent national needs is a heavily accelerated flow of private investment into productive channels. A balanced budget stimulates such investment because it makes it unnecessary for the Government to tap the savings and credit that would otherwise be available for private investment. A balanced budget also facilitates the task of our monetary authorities, who strive to assure an adequate supply of funds for private investment at the same time that they guard against inflation.

Our policy of balancing the budget and simultaneously stimulating the flow of funds into private channels, reflects our firm belief that Government spending is not a satisfactory substitute for private investment. We look to private funds to finance the new factories, new tools, and new machinery that create more, better, and cheaper goods. A substantial and increasing flow of private investment is essential to economic growth in our free society.

It is disturbing, therefore, that our present level of investment is far from adequate. Over the past decade, nearly all of the major industrial nations of the free world had a substantially higher rate of domestic investment than the United States. Furthermore, their ratio of productive investment to total output has been growing, whereas ours has been declining. Investment sparked the phenomenal growth of Japan and the Common Market countries of Western Europe, by contributing to rapid modernization of productive machinery and equipment. More modern equipment means more efficient production, and lower unit cost—hence more competitive capacity. As a result, friendly foreign nations are providing increasingly stiff competition for American manufacturers, both here and abroad.

For the future, then, a major goal of our economic policy is a sharply increased level of productive private investment, because it will:

Help our balance of payments by making our manufacturers more competitive, thus increasing our export surplus.

Help speed economic growth by increasing our productive capacity.

Help reduce unemployment by providing more jobs as new markets create new de-

mand, and increased research and technology penetrate new manufacturing frontiers.

Finally, and most important, heavier investment will help to maintain price stability through lower production costs and higher productivity.

In addition to presenting a balanced budget, we are also proposing changes in our tax treatment of depreciation to stimulate business investment in productive machinery and equipment. Our program of depreciation reform involves both new legislation and the full use of existing administrative authority. On the legislative side, we are asking for an 8 percent tax credit for new investment in productive equipment. On the administrative side, we are updating depreciation schedules to take account of technological advances which have altered previous standards of obsolescence. This has already been largely accomplished for the textile industry, and we plan to announce revisions in depreciation guidelines for all other major industries this spring.

Such use of tax policy to stimulate the modernization and expansion of productive equipment is a major part of our effort to accelerate the long-range economic growth we need to achieve our true potential and to improve our balance of payments.

The heart of our balance of payments problem is this: We must generate a large enough commercial trade surplus to counterbalance our essential expenditures abroad. These expenditures include, in relative order of magnitude: First, the cost of our military forces overseas; second, private American investment in other countries; and third, that portion of our foreign aid not spent here for American products or services.

Our trade surplus—the excess of commercial exports over imports of goods and services—is substantial. But in recent years it has not been large enough to offset the balance of payments impact of our overseas operations. That shortfall constitutes the basic deficit in our international payments.

Preliminary figures indicate that last year our basic deficit was no more than a third of the basic deficit of $1.9 billion in 1960, and was far below the $4.3 billion in 1959. During the first 6 months of 1961 we actually ran a surplus in our basic accounts, as imports shrank because of the recession. During the third quarter, a sharp rise in imports brought with it the renewal of a substantial basic deficit which continued in the final quarter of the year—although at a diminished rate. With the sole exception of 1957, when the Suez Canal was closed and we exported unusual quantities of oil to Europe, 1961 provided the best record since we started running deficits in 1949. True, advance repayments of long-term debts—amounting to $650 million—were unusually large last year. However, the improvement was still substantial.

But improvement in our basic deficit is not enough. We must bring it under complete control so that we can look forward to full balance—and to surpluses whenever they may be required in our overall national interest. We can accomplish this only by enlarging our export surplus, and by reducing outpayments when we can do so without curtailing activities vitally important to our Nation's future.

Our own security and our responsibilities to the free world require us to keep our troops abroad. We cannot endanger our security by withdrawing them in order to balance our international accounts. But we can and must find every possible way of limiting or offsetting the dollar outflow that inevitably accompanies the stationing of troops overseas. We are doing just that through a combination of economies and cooperative arrangements with certain of our allies. As a result, we can look forward to a substantial reduction in the dollar drain of our oversea forces.

In the case of private investment, we do not desire to reduce the flow abroad by imposing controls that would run counter to the principles of free trade and free competition so basic to our national purpose. We can, however, lessen the special inducements to American investment in other industrial countries that are part of our present tax system. That is why we are urging tax legislation to minimize such incentives.

Although our foreign assistance programs contribute to our annual dollar outflow, they do so to a far lesser degree than their overall amount might suggest. Two-thirds of all foreign aid expenditures are now being made here in the United States. Only the remaining third affects our payments position. We are making vigorous efforts to cut the balance of payments impact of foreign economic aid still further, and we hope to get it down to approximately one-fifth.

In the long run, however, the only way to eliminate our basic deficit is by increasing our export surplus. This will require the combined efforts of management, labor, and Government. Management, and labor, must work together to assure reasonable price stability so that our exporters can maintain their price competitiveness—and, we hope, improve it. Industry must modernize at a rapid rate. I have already told you what Government is doing in the field of depreciation reform to assist modernization. Government must also help to assure a supply of export credit to our traders as good as that available to their oversea competitors. We will very soon be in a position to do so for the first time through the operation of an export credit insurance program developed jointly by the Export-Import Bank and the insurance industry. Finally American business—of which only a small percentage is now in the export field—must aggressively search out foreign trading opportunities wherever they may be. This is in the best tradition of our trading forebears, and it has never been more necessary than today.

Fortunately, the possibilities for increasing our oversea sales are excellent. The world is entering an entirely new trading era that holds out great promise for our exporters. In the case of our existing markets, we have only to look at the scope of the resurgent prosperity of Western Europe, and the emergence of the European Common Market, to see Europe's potential for our exports. And, although our markets in less-developed areas are limited today, as these countries grow and prosper, their demands for our goods will also grow.

Furthermore, in Europe and other parts of the world, thousands of American products are still virtually unknown. American business is just beginning to probe huge potential markets for them. Success in developing these markets will require bold enterprise and skillful competition.

If American business is to find new customers in Europe, we must deal with the Common Market on the matter of mutual tariff reduction. Congress must grant the President power to negotiate on a broader basis than present legislation allows. If Congress fails to provide this authority, American producers will be seriously handicapped in their efforts to retain and to expand their share of this large and rich trading area.

Now, let me turn to our overall payments deficit, which reflects both our basic deficit and short-term capital flows. Through 1959, short-term flows were small and usually favorable to our balance of payments. This was natural, since the currencies of other industrialized countries were not generally convertible, hence, not too attractive to foreign holders. However, with convertibility, money began to flow from one financial center to another in search of higher interest rates or speculative profits. The result was a substantial outflow of short-term funds from the United States, which in 1960 amounted to $2 billion.

This large short-term outflow obscured the dramatic improvement in our basic balance during 1960 and led to an overall deficit of $3.9 billion. Although altered in nature, substantial short-term outflows continued during 1961.

These short-term flows can be caused by various factors—a lessening of confidence or disparities in interest rates—as in the fall of 1960, or credits related to trade—as was largely the case this past year, when a substantial part of the outflow was in the form of bank loans to Japan to finance her growing imports.

Such short-term flows, when carried to excess, can be unhealthy—even dangerous. We have worked hard to neutralize them. We have held our short-term interest rates at levels that largely negated the attraction of foreign market rates. The Federal Reserve has increased the legal limit on the interest that may be paid on time deposits, thus enabling American banks to compete more effectively with their foreign counterparts. Our most recent step was taken earlier this month when the United States and nine other members of the International Monetary Fund agreed that $6 billion in additional resources should be provided for standby lending commitments to the Fund. These supplementary resources would be used to protect the world payments system, and would be available to the 10 participating countries, including the United States.

One aspect of our balance-of-payments deficit is worth stressing: The balance of payments is an accounting of transactions that affect the gold and liquid liability of the United States. It does not reflect long-term claims represented by U.S. investment abroad. For the 3 years 1958 through 1960, for instance, our payments deficits totaled $11 billion, of which about $5 billion represented our gold losses and $6 billion represented liquid dollar gains by foreigners. However, this loss was to a large extent matched by increased U.S. holdings of both short-term and long-term foreign assets.

Total foreign assets and investments of all sorts in the United States rose by about $13 billion from the end of 1957 to the end of 1960. During the same period, total U.S. Government and private loans and investments abroad (excluding loans repayable in local currency) increased by about $14.5 billion—a net gain to the United States of $1½ billion. However, we also lost $5 billion in gold. Thus our overall gold and international investment position showed a loss for the 3-year period of only about $3.5 billion net, in contrast to the deterioration in our current position of $11 billion as measured by our balance-of-payments account.

While this demonstrates that our long-term position is considerably stronger than balance-of-payments figures alone indicate, it in no way reduces the importance of putting an early end to the substantial payments deficits we have had since 1949. We must get our current balance in order so as to end the drain on our gold stocks.

I have outlined the principal elements of our foreign and domestic economic policy. Our prospects, both at home and abroad, are good, but we have much to do to insure that they remain so.

At home, I think everyone agrees that our first obligation is to reduce the unacceptably high level of unemployment. To be sure, for the last 2 months, unemployment has dropped close to 6 percent, after hovering near 7 percent most of the year. And we expect it to drop below 5 percent by the end of the year, as long-range expansion takes hold. However, there is a hard core of unemployment which continued expansion may not touch. That is why we urgently need a manpower retraining bill, to ease the

lingering human misery and chronic economic waste that such unemployment represents.

In addition, nearly a million young people in our country are neither earning nor learning. This dismal fact illustrates the need for a Youth Employment Opportunities Act, to insure that such frightening waste of our national potential does not continue.

And finally, although we look forward to prosperity, we cannot guarantee that there will never be another recession. To prepare for that possibility, President Kennedy has asked for three major countercyclical measures: broadened unemployment insurance, a standby program of public works, and the authority to promptly initiate limited and temporary tax reductions. These are needed in the earliest stages of recession—when quick action can accomplish effective results.

The achievement of our economic goals will not be easy. But it is our responsibility to demonstrate to the world the economic vitality of a free nation, and the value of a free enterprise society where labor, business, finance, and Government work together within the framework of a competitive price system, responding to the market forces of supply and demand.

The stimulus of competition has brought us the world's highest standard of living. Let us use our economic strength to develop our Nation to its true potential, to distribute the benefits of growth among our people, and to share our way of life with all the peoples of the world who choose the path of freedom.

Governor Barron Provides Leadership as West Virginia Moves Forward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, there is a new spirit in the old hills of West Virginia. The determined mountaineers and their sons who unlocked the great mineral resources under the surface of the soil have now teamed together to build economic prosperity from the ashes of recession.

This is a grassroots movement which has its wellsprings in the people and the local communities. To spark any such remarkable progress, however, needs leadership, and that leadership is being furnished by the State's chief executive, Gov. William Wallace Barron.

From the very day he took the oath of office as the 26th Governor of West Virginia, Governor Barron has taken the reins and directed an almost unbelievable forward surge of progress in the Mountain State. What he has done is best described in his own words, and under unanimous consent it is a distinct honor for me to bring to a wider audience the fine summary which Governor Barron has prepared which appeared in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette for January 21, 1962:

For all intents and purposes, 1961 will go down in the record books as the year that the State of West Virginia put depression and recession on the run.

I look for 1962 to bring a complete rout of these adverse factors with resulting substantial gains in all fields of economic activity.

If we did nothing more in the first year of the State's rebuilding program, we proved not only to ourselves but to the rest of the Nation that no longer does West Virginia intend to be in the "bush league," so to speak.

From here on out, our every program, our every action will serve notice to everyone that the day of apologizing for the distressed condition of our State has come to a dramatic, sudden, and complete end.

In the highly competitive race for economic development, new industry and tourist dollars, we are now in the big leagues. We intend to stay there.

The State image is changing and it is not going unnoticed. Recent weeks have brought a surge of favorable national publicity. It has been a welcome change. Instead of a State beset by chronic unemployment, little business activity, industrial doldrums, and an assortment of economic ills, we are now being pictured as one which has experienced a rebirth of confidence, pride, and self-help—a State vigorously picking itself up by the proverbial bootstraps

I have been informed by the State department of commerce that this favorable national publicity has caused a substantial, corresponding increase in the number of industrial prospects.

The year 1961, which saw unemployment cut by almost one-third, also brought a record period for both new industry and expansion of existing facilities.

Among the newcomers were such industrial giants as North American Aviation, Lockheed, Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing, Corning, and Novamont, the latter the first American operation of Italy's famed Montecatini Chemical Corp. In all, plans were announced for 46 new industrial facilities costing in excess of $200 million and employing 5,000 workers.

Our existing industries also expressed their confidence in West Virginia's future by revealing expansion plans totaling over $134 million. Among them were such well-known names as E. I. du Pont de Nemours, Food Machinery & Chemical Corp., Kaiser Aluminum, National Steel, American Electric Power, Union Carbide, and Westinghouse Electric.

We saw local initiative account for many new industries and expansions during 1961 as the people sensed this new spirit—this economic renaissance.

I predict that the months ahead will see a wave of new industrial developments not only in the Kanawha Valley area but in every part of the State as we note continued improvement of the basic elements which contribute to a better industrial environment.

Thanks to a forward-thinking legislature, we now have the tools we need to effectively combat economic ills.

In creating the commerce department, it gave us the vehicle to spearhead community, tourist, and industrial development.

With the emergency employment program, it provided the means of giving West Virginia a long-overdue "facelifting"—and an accompanying shot of much-needed pride in itself as evidenced in the cleanup program.

So that we could finally compete with other States for industrial plants and tourist dollars, it provided funds for an effective advertising program in these fields.

All of these things have enabled us to stem the tide of recession, given us a new sense of purpose and direction with which to face not only 1962 but all the years ahead.

The new north-south interstate highway, major improvements to our primary and secondary road systems, the forthcoming centennial celebration, our participation in the New York World's Fair of 1964–65—all of these will make major contributions to opening our State to a new era of activity and development.

But, far more important, each will contribute a vital part to the new image which we have so sorely needed for so long.

I look for 1962 to mark the turning point in the outmigration of our populace; to bring the number of new industries and expansion of existing ones to an all-time high; for personal income to shatter all past marks; and drop unemployment to the lowest point in a decade.

We have stamped out the stigma of unprogressiveness which has plagued our State for years. We are well on our way to the better life which all West Virginians so dearly seek—and deserve.

Rural Electric Co-Op Leaders Speak Out on Current Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, last fall some 650 farm and rural leaders met in my home district at Eau Claire, Wis., for the annual regional convention of the National Rural Electric Co-Op Association. They were representing 115 cooperatives which serve an estimated 363,367 consumer-members in the States of Illinois, Iowa, and Wisconsin.

At that meeting, delegates passed a series of resolutions dealing with problems that their co-op members believe have a real bearing on the welfare of the REA program in Wisconsin and in other parts of the country. These resolutions represent the earnest expression of the local officials who are devoting a great deal of time and effort to be of service in advancing rural electrification and the rural community well-being in our region.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include some of these resolutions in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION ON GENERATION AND TRANSMISSION LOANS

Whereas the ability of rural electric systems to fulfill their responsibilities as nonprofit organizations is directly dependent on their ability to obtain dependable low-cost wholesale energy; and

Whereas in the face of dual rates, escalator clauses and the like, the availability of G. & T. loans from REA is the only means many systems have to secure a dependable and adequate supply of low-cost energy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we commend and heartily thank Administrator Norman Clapp for strengthening the rural electric system bargaining position by adding the "security concept" to REA's criteria for G. & T. loans, and for reinstating the power supply section of REA; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the Congress of the United States to insure an effective G. & T. loan program by appropriating adequate REA loan funds to meet the rapidly increasing needs of rural America for electric power.

RESOLUTION ON HANFORD GENERATION FACILITIES

Whereas the plutonium producing atomic reactor at Hanford, Wash., will create heat sufficient to generate over 800,000 kilowatts

of low-cost electric power for which there is an immediate market; and

Whereas this country can ill afford to waste its natural resources under any conditions, and particularly at this crucial time of world crisis when we are likely to need all our possible strength; and

Whereas a magnificent opportunity exists at Hanford for the United States to demonstrate to the world our desire to do all we can to make peaceful use of atomic energy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the Congress of the United States to correct the shortsighted action taken in defeating the bill to authorize use of the Hanford heat resource and to move in the next session to authorize and appropriate funds sufficient to complete the generation facilities at Hanford so that the full 800,000 kilowatts potential may be realized.

RESOLUTION ON REA COOPERATIVE PATTERN FOR EXPORT

Whereas the NRECA Board has passed a resolution calling upon the President and the Congress to export the REA cooperative pattern as an idea for helping the developing countries of the free world; and

Whereas Congress has included in its new foreign aid bill a new policy to encourage cooperatives in these countries as a means of helping the needy masses both to improve their economic lot and to gain a sense of belonging; and

Whereas it is believed that people-to-people, cooperative-to-cooperative programs would tend to be more effective than a direct U.S. Government approach to distressed peoples in foreign lands: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the President of the United States and the Administrator of the Agency for International Development, when he is appointed, to push this cooperative program abroad with all possible vigor, working through cooperative organizations in the United States wherever possible.

RESOLUTION ON RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Whereas the development of our natural resources on a full and comprehensive basis is in the national interest particularly at a time like this when our country must be strong in order to remain free; and

Whereas the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources is one respected group among many that has pointed to the need for comprehensive water development and management of all our major river basins; and

Whereas the present administration has pledged dynamic programs in the field of resources and power and has announced its determination to revitalize the role of the Federal Government in these fields; and

Whereas approximately 475 rural electric systems throughout the United States are directly concerned in these programs because they purchase wholesale energy generated at multiple-purpose dams constructed by the Federal Government and all the rural electric systems are concerned in these programs because of the contribution these programs will make to the national well-being: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President of the United States and other administration leaders be urged to give greater attention to the need for aggressive action in the resource development field, to revitalize the Nation's resource development and take positive steps, along with the Congress, in giving the programs new life and vigor; and be it further

Resolved, That the President be urged to establish in the White House a Natural Resources Coordinating Agency or Office with sufficient power to modernize, coordinate and expedite Federal river basin development planning and construction activities; and be it further

Resolved, That the various agencies of the Government responsible for the operation of natural resource projects and programs take positive steps to coordinate their operations and to cooperate with another in the interest of all consumers; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress pass the Kerr-Trimble bill in order to institute modern, progressive standards in the place of the restrictive and outdated cost allocation procedures now used in multipurpose project evaluation; and be it further

Resolved, That the President be urged to rescind the infamous Budget Bureau Circular A-47 which time and again has been used to block resource development; and be it further

Resolved, That the President and the Congress be urged to oppose strongly all schemes that would subvert the public interest through emasculation of the preference clause, which has saved the Federal energy resources from falling completely into the control of the profit utility industry.

RESOLUTION ON RURAL AREAS DEVELOPMENT

Whereas the rural areas development program offers new hope that rural America may once again be able to play its vital role in building a great future for our country and our people; and

Whereas the rural electric systems are pioneers in rural development having originally brought light and power into the countryside and later having lent a strong helping hand to the rural telephone program; and

Whereas this pattern of rural development now can be mobilized to create new opportunity for rural communities which have been struck by farm problems, underemployment and loss of population; and

Whereas what we do will be an example to the world of free people working to build a better economy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President, the Congress, the Secretaries of Agriculture and Commerce, the Administrators of REA and ARA all be commended for their efforts and leadership on behalf of rural development; and be it further

Resolved, That the various development agencies be urged to utilize the potential of the rural electric systems by providing them with the information and guidance needed for initiating and carrying on effective local programs; and be it further

Resolved, That the President and his administration leaders be urged to move ahead quickly in streamlining the many development agencies, strengthening the REA resources for coping with its new RAD responsibilities and in presenting to Congress requests for adequate loan funds and grants to do the job.

RESOLUTION ON TERRITORIAL INTEGRITY

Whereas it is both a right and a duty of rural electric systems to serve any and all loads developing in areas which they pioneered: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the REA Administrator, Norman Clapp, be commended for his policy statements with regard to territorial integrity, and for his pledge to help rural electric cooperatives serve all developing loads in their areas and otherwise meet the problems associated with the preservation of their service areas; and be it further

Resolved, That appropriate officials in State and Federal Governments be urged to take all action available to them in exploring and promoting such measures as may be possible to protect rural electric systems against violations of territory, and in particular that they be urged to recognize that it is detrimental to the public interest to foster or to permit invasion of areas served through area-coverage REA loans; and be it further

Resolved, That the Federal Power Commission be urged to investigate the question of power company piracy against rural electric systems in order that policies protecting the rural electric systems may be formulated.

RESOLUTION ON FARM ELECTRIFICATION RESEARCH CENTER

Whereas the need for farm electrification research has constantly increased while at the same time the facilities for conducting such basic research are inadequate; and

Whereas the U.S. Senate has before it a bill introduced by Senator HUMPHREY authorizing a Farm Electrification Research Center and the Senate Appropriations Committee has decided to explore the need for such a project: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress be urged to press forward its consideration of legislation for a Farm Electrification Research Center.

PROPAGANDA ADVERTISING

Whereas the private power companies have intensified their aggressive countrywide propaganda and lobbying campaign with the ultimate design and common objective of shaping public opinion to serve their private ends of securing full public approval of all of their activities and practices; and

Whereas this campaign has reached such proportions that Members of Congress have recently spoken out on the floor of both Houses telling about the widespread pressures to which they have been put to oppose resource and other legislation designed to benefit the electric consumer; and

Whereas the cost of this propaganda and lobby campaign has to be borne by the taxpayers and the ratepayers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge Congress to undertake a complete and thorough investigation of propaganda and lobbying activities of the private power companies; and be it further

Resolved, That we favor passage of legislation which would (1) require a governmental organization to police the dishonest propaganda and lobbying activities of the private power companies, (2) amend the Federal Power Act to forbid the deduction of the costs of propaganda as an expense chargeable to electric consumers, and (3) amend the Internal Revenue Act to forbid deduction of the cost of propaganda by private power companies as an expense in computing corporation income taxes.

RESOLUTION ON COMMENDATIONS

Resolved, That we commend President Kennedy for the steps he has taken to enhance the strength and vigor of the rural electrification program and for his appointment of outstanding statesmen friendly to the public interest to important offices in REA, USDA, Interior, and FPC;

Resolved, That we commend REA Administrator Norman Clapp for the outstanding manner in which he has undertaken his responsibilities as the head of the Rural Electrification Administration, for his good judgment in selecting his assistants, for his farsighted policy pronouncements and actions and for his sympathetic understanding of our problems;

Resolved, That we express our appreciation to Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, Director of Agricultural Credit John A. Baker, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Kenneth Holum, Administrator of Area Redevelopment Administration William L. Batt, Jr., and all other agency heads and staff members for the services they have rendered for our program.

Parkersburg Powerhouse: Greasy Neale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Red Smith, sports columnist for the New York Herald Tribune, has paid a glowing tribute to one of West Virginia's finest athletes, Alfred Earle (Greasy) Neale.

Greasy Neale attended Parkersburg High School and his exploits there established a winning tradition that has been carried forward by the Big Red teams ever since.

He went on to West Virginia Wesleyan and starred on the great Wesleyan teams of 1912–13 that took the measure of such powerhouses as the Carlisle Indians, Georgetown, Washington and Jefferson, and West Virginia University. After college Greasy played professional baseball with the Cincinnati Reds, and later played professional football with the Canton Bulldogs. His teammate with the Bulldogs was the immortal Jim Thorpe.

In later years he turned to coaching with successful tenures at Marietta College, Wesleyan, West Virginia University, Washington and Jefferson, Yale, and Virginia. He also coached professionally. His Philadelphia Eagles twice won the championship of the world.

Greasy Neale has give much to the betterment of our two great American sports, football and baseball. We are very proud of Greasy Neale in West Virginia, especially in the Fourth Congressional District and above all in Parkersburg, where Greasy got his start.

Under unanimous consent I include Red Smith's column of January 22, 1962:

GREASY NEALE'S BEST

NEW YORK, January 21.—In the lofty metropolitan view of Morgantown, where the mills of the University of West Virginia grind out culture, West Virginia Wesleyan was a backwoods nest of shoeless ridgerunners whose manners were as raw as the stuff that came out of their mountain stills. As for football, not only had the clowns from Buckhannon been properly walloped every time they challenged the State university, they had never scored a point against their betters.

Back in 1912, it was the custom of many big teams to warm up against pushovers in their early games. As Army does today, Wesleyan was honored by selection as the university's second victim of the year. On the Tuesday before the game, Wesleyan's right end, a freshman, asked the coach to put in a run from punt formation, assuring him that it had worked well for B. B. Cooley, his coach at Parkersburg High. The kid was the best kicker on the squad and always dropped into the backfield on punt formation.

On Saturday the Wesleyan quarterback, Harry Stansbury, called on the rookie to carry the ball on two out of three plays. The same end was Stansbury's receiver on every forward pass, including a 20-yard scoring shot and a sleeper play where the end lay prone near the far sideline until the ball was snapped, then sprang up, caught Stanbury's pitch and ran 45 yards for the winning touchdown. He then dropkicked the extra point.

Wesleyan punted five times and on all five it was the kicker who made the tackle. Playing safety on defense, the same kid caught all of West Virginia's punts. To relieve the tedium, he intercepted two passes.

Wesleyan won, 19–14, and to this day Alfred Earle Neale, age 70, believes it was the finest game he ever played.

That would have been the day they started calling him Greasy Neale, it's more likely he got the name earlier—say in 1910 when, as captain and co-coach of Parkersburg High, he ran 80 years to beat Marietta Academy, 11–10, with 40 seconds to play.

Greasy captained Parkersburg in 1911, too. That was an undefeated team that scored 138 points against 8, with Neale as the leading pass receiver, the punter, dropkicker and ballcarrier on the fake punt.

Incidentally, West Virginia's 14 points were the only scores made against Wesleyan in 1912. Greasy made 12 touchdowns and dropkicked 14 conversions as the team rolled on, shutting out all other opponents and scoring 374 points.

The next year was rougher, for Wesleyan got big ideas and took on toughies like the Carlisle Indians, Georgetown, and Washington and Jefferson, besides knocking over West Virginia again, 20–0.

In those days, teams didn't pass as often as they do now. Against Georgetown, a real power, Greasy got a sprained ankle which was to keep him out of the next game. His limp slowed him down against Georgetown but he managed to catch 12 passes and run one 80 yards for a touchdown in a 16–6 upset.

After college Greasy broke into professional baseball and didn't play football again for 4 years. Then, in 1917, he joined Jim Thorpe and the Canton Bulldoys. The Bulldogs beat everybody they played but lost one of two games with Massillon.

In his first game in 4 years, Neale scored six touchdowns against the Columbus Panhandles. In his second, against Youngstown, he played end for a half, then shifted to quarterback. In his third, also against Youngstown, he took the injured Thorpe's place at fullback. He scored the first touchdown and Frank Mt. Pleasant the second as Canton won, 13–0. Greasy also made the only touchdown in the victory over the Detroit Heralds.

As a wartime employee with the Wright Aircraft Co. in 1918, Greasy coached the Dayton Triangles, played quarterback, punted, and backed up the line. They won 'em all.

The world's series kept him busy as an outfielder with the Reds in 1919. He was Cincinnati's leading hitter in the series and he still refuses to believe the White Sox dumped it. After the Reds won, he took over football at Marietta College, which had played and lost one game. Marietta didn't lose any more.

In 1930 Greasy was rising 40 and hadn't played in 12 years. Two days before a game with the Portsmouth Spartans of the National League, he signed on as end, signal-caller and man-of-all-work for Ironton, Ohio. The Spartans, now the Detroit Lions, had guys like Georgia Tech's legendary Father Lumpkin; Willis Glassgow, the Iowa All-America; Charles Bennett, the Indian halfback later with Chicago Bears; and huge Mayes McClain, of Iowa. Greasy's team beat 'em.

He coached at it, too. He coached at Marietta and Wesleyan and West Virginia, and Washington and Jefferson, and Virginia and Yale. His W. and J. squad tied California's "wonder team" in the Rose Bowl and his Philadelphia Eagles twice won the championship of the world.

What brings this all up is that the Touchdown Club of New York had Greasy up from Palm Beach the other night to receive the club's annual award. Yale's Clint Frank bought three tables and came on from Chicago to join other old Yales. There were old Eagles there, and old Virginians and West Virginians and Wesleyans and guys from all the places where he'd been.

When they stood up cheering him, the thought occurred that the brass of football's hall of fame has not yet voted Greasy in. Believe that or not.

Forty-fourth Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, as freedom-loving Americans, who are imbued with an abiding sense of justice and equity, we take full cognizance that today, January 22, 1962, marks the 44th anniversary of the Ukrainian Independence Proclamation. It is not so much the fact that this day is an anniversary of an important document, but more especially, we note that more than 42 million people are virtual captives of their cruel, inhuman and atheistic Soviet Russian overlords and taskmasters.

The serious plight of these fellow human beings strikes a responsive chord in our hearts when we recall their very short-lived freedom after centuries of oppression and foreign domination. The history of the brave Ukrainian people, as we know, reflects the centuries-long struggle of man to attain individual freedom. It must not be forgotten that the Ukraine is a people by itself. The Ukrainians have their own language, their own customs, their own traditions, their own history, and yet they are held in bondage by the Reds—a veritable large prison camp in their historic homeland.

The Communist enslavement of nations through the medium of totalitarian dictatorships is unfortunately well known. The Russians proceeded in this way to execute their policies of plunder and exploitation in the Ukraine. A reign of bloody terror was instituted in an attempt to destroy these brave people. It will be to their everlasting glory and credit that notwithstanding unspeakable torture and untold suffering, Ukraine will never die.

The United States became the great Nation it is through the work and genius of countless peoples whose forebears came from distant lands across the seas. Today, among the loyal, industrious, God-fearing, and best American citizens, are men and women of Ukrainian origin. We are justly proud of them and gratefully acknowledge their lasting contribution in enriching our own economy and culture.

To the entire world, we give notice that it is never too late to recognize the historic claim of Ukraine to be considered as independent. We, of the United States, join with those who remember and celebrate this historic occasion. We share their legitimate hope that Ukraine, and all the other enslaved people, will become truly free and independent and that the Communist menace will be wiped off the face of the earth.

We can best show our concern for these unfortunate victims of communism by passing the resolutions presently pending before the Congress to establish a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. Such action by this body will show the world that we are willing to give more than lipservice to the cause of freedom.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print, for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Federal Aid to Education and Separation of Church and State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on last December 8 it was my privilege to address the American Affairs Forum at West Virginia State College in Institute, W. Va. The purpose of the forum is to stimulate student thought and regard for the fundamental issues which confront American civilization today.

My contribution to the program was on the subject of "Federal Aid to Education and Separation of Church and State." Regardless of what the 2d session of the 87th Congress does or fails to do on the question of Federal aid to education—and it is my most fervent hope that we will enact a general educational aid bill for the States—the issue which I explored in my remarks will be with us for a long time to come. Nothing is more fundamental to the advancement of America than the improvement of our educational system, and nothing is more basic to the maintenance of American democracy than the separation of church and state. I therefore ask unanimous consent that my address to the American Affairs Forum at Institute, W. Va., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION AND SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE

(An address by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, to the West Virginia State College, Institute, W. Va., December 8, 1961)

Officers and faculty members and students of West Virginia State College, you are to be most highly commended for initiating this American Affairs Forum and for maintaining a focused concern on the living problems of contemporary society.

Assuredly, none is of more topical interest and enduring significance than that of preserving inviolate the wall of separation between church and state. There are many areas in which this wall may be breached—at local, State and Federal levels—though the one in which the most pressure is currently being generated is that involving Federal assistance to education. In regard to this general problem, I shall differentiate this morning between the specific aspects related to Federal aid to primary and secondary education and those bearing upon aid to higher learning.

If I may be excused from quoting myself, in 1938, writing in the periodical Liberty, a magazine of religious freedom, I stated that ". . . when we speak of the separation of church and state in the United States, we do not mean simply the absence of a church supported by Federal taxes, nor do we mean simply the rights of all men, regardless of religious credo, to the privileges of citizenship. If religious freedom is to be triumphant in our Republic, its spirit must live within the constitutions of all the component States. The judge of every local court must be imbued with it. And above all, no one of us can afford to lose sight of it as being one of the pillars upon which our Republic is founded. Our belief in the freedom of conscience is the very material of that structure."

I would now add to that statement the caveat that each of us must exercise constant vigilance against any intrusion of the church upon state affairs or the state upon the affairs of religion.

Since my statement in Liberty, the U.S. Supreme Court has rendered many decisions giving specific content to this general philosophy. One of the most notable of these was in the case of *Everson* v. *Board of Education* when the Court declared that:

"The 'establishment of religion' clause of the first amendment means at least this: Neither the State nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. * * * No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities, or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion. Neither State nor the Federal Government can, openly or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious organizations or groups and vice versa. In the words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect 'a wall of separation between church and state.' "

In his dissent in this case, with the concurrence of Justice Frankfurter, Justice Jackson and Justice Burton, Justice Rutledge issued an opinion which is even more relevant for us today than that of the majority. Referring to the history of the first amendment and the meaning which the freedom of religion clause held for its framers, Justice Rutledge stated that its purpose:

"* * * was to create a complete and permanent separation of the spheres of religious activity and civil authority by comprehensively forbidding every form of public aid or support for religion. * * * In view of this history no further proof is needed that the amendment forbids any appropriation, large or small, from public funds to aid or support any and all religious exercises." (Ibid., at 31–32, 41.)

Those who would today attempt to breach this complete and permanent separation by offering governmental assistance to parochial and church-affiliated elementary and secondary schools justify their efforts principally on three arguments: national defense, nondiscriminatory treatment of parochial and church school students, and the public welfare concept on which some States furnish school transportation to parochial students.

I would reply that we may not allow unconstitutional practices to be smuggled in under the name of national defense or equal treatment if otherwise the first amendment would keep them out. To speak with complete candor, the national defense—in the sense that term is used in the present "cold war" context—is not involved here.

The National Defense Education Act, passed in 1958 in the wake of sputnik, was primarily a convenient and timely peg on which to hang Federal aid to education in order to overcome opposition from the conservative elements in the Congress and in the country at large. Its value is principally not in contributing to the immediate national defense, but in bolstering the foundations of intellectual life throughout the range of American culture. When viewed in these terms the role of education is seen to bear directly, not on national defense, but on the security and integrity of American freedoms—freedoms which would be put in grave jeopardy if we were to violate either the letter or the intent of the first amendment clause on the "establishment of religion."

Regarding the issue of nondiscriminatory treatment of parochial and church school students, I am not insensitive to the burden which the first amendment places upon those who choose to combine religious and secular education for their children. But this is a burden which is assumed by the free choice of the parent who determines not to send his child to public schools.

It is, therefore, not discriminatory in any legal sense to deny Federal assistance to parochial schools. The public schools are available for all who desire to attend them. And the fact that some parents do not choose to send their children to public schools does not lessen their obligation to support them any more than being childless relieves a person of this responsibility. The public school system, by providing the foundation for an enlightened and informed society, serves all its members, the parents of parochial students as well as others.

Perhaps Justice Jackson made the most trenchant observation on the question of nondiscriminatory treatment, when he declared that "* * * if these principles seem harsh in prohibiting aid to Catholic education, it must not be forgotten that it is the same Constitution that alone assures Catholics the right to maintain these schools at all when predominant local sentiment would forbid them." (*Everson* v. *Board of Education*, 330 U.S. 1, at p. 27).

The third argument, which is based on what I have termed the "public welfare concept," contends that because the welfare of society as a whole is advanced by educating all our children, it is justifiable to divert tax funds to the assistance of parochial and church affiliated schools. The question inevitably arises, therefore, if the state may provide the smaller elements of educational expense—transportation, books and supplies, or laboratory facilities—why not the larger as well, and where does the process stop?

The question was also addressed by the author of the first amendment to the Constitution, when, in his "Memorial and Remonstrance Against Religious Assessments," James Madison, in 1785, queried:

"Who does not see * * * that the same authority which can force a citizen to contribute threepence only of his property for the support of any one establishment, may force him to conform to any other establishment in all cases whatsoever?"

Madison then answered his own question—to his satisfaction and to mine—by declaring that "The freemen of America did not wait till usurped power had strengthened itself by exercise, and entangled the question in precedents. They saw all the

consequences in the principle, and they avoided the consequences by denying the principle. We revere this lesson too much, soon to forget it."

It is my hope and my belief that the majority of the American people and the majority of both bodies of the Congress still revere this lesson too much to forget it.

One of the clearest expressions of the intent of Madison, who authored the first amendment, and of the other founders of the Constitution who adopted it, was offered by one of America's most distinguished jurists, Jeremiah S. Black, when he stated in his essay, "Religious Liberty," that, "The manifest object of the men who framed the institutions of this country, was to have a state without religion, and a church without politics—that is to say, they meant that one should never be used as an engine for any purpose of the other. * * * Our fathers seem to have been perfectly sincere in their belief that the members of the church would be more patriotic, and the citizens of the state more religious, by keeping their respective functions entirely separate. For that reason they built up a wall of complete and perfect partition between the two."

It is to the credit of West Virginia and the benefit, I hope, of the Nation that Representative CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, as chairman of the House Subcommittee on General Education, has advanced a plan which offers aid to the States while still maintaining the partition between church and state.

The Bailey plan would stimulate and encourage State expenditures for education by authorizing Federal grants to each of the States of 2 percent of its total annual expenditure for public education from State and local sources. Thus, the greater the efforts of the State to advance its educational system, the more assistance it would receive from the Federal Government. In addition, the Bailey plan would offer safeguards against cutbacks by State and local governments by decreasing the Federal grant by a like amount. Finally, in order to provide additional aid to those States in greatest need, the plan would provide an equalization formula based upon the degree to which the personal per capita income of the State falls below the national average.

For example, West Virginia would receive its base allotment—on the basis of our 1959–60 expenditures—of $2,435,440 and an equalization allotment of $3,653,160 (under one of the formulas proposed) for a total of $6,088,600. This is substantially less than West Virginia would have received for fiscal 1962 under the School Assistance Act passed by the Senate last year; this measure, had it passed in the House, would have provided between $10,658,865 and $11,189,660. However, Representative BAILEY'S plan offers a good point of departure, and the general method he proposes offers, in my opinion, the best prospects for cutting through the tangled web of opinions on so-called States rights and the fear of Federal control.

To turn now to the question of Federal aid to higher education, I do not propose to set forth any specific programs. Though our Senate Subcommittee on Education conducted hearings last August on several bills for aid to higher education, it is evident that there still exists a wide disparity of opinion regarding how such aid would be best utilized.

As Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, of Pennsylvania, stated in an article in the Saturday Review, in February 1961, "The absence of any widely accepted plan, up to this very moment, is to a great extent the fault of those engaged in higher education. * * * In the past, they have been immobilized to some extent by internal divisions on the basic question, first, of whether Federal aid in any form is desirable and, second, of who if it is desirable, should get it."

Both of these questions remain unresolved, though many provocative suggestions were presented during the course of our hearings. The West Virginia Association of College and University Presidents, in its Project Unity, offers, I believe, the right approach in achieving a consensus among administrators in the field of higher learning. Having put aside the conception of private and publicly supported institutions as competitive, the association—and all the professional groups in the field of higher education—will, I hope, begin to hammer out specific plans for achieving the most effective cooperative relationship between their institutions and for clarifying the role of Federal assistance therein.

Assuming that some form of Federal assistance will be forthcoming in the near future, I would now address the problem of separation of church and State in relation to institutions of higher learning. The problem is distinctly different from that which we encounter in regard to parochial and church affiliated elementary and secondary schools.

As Patrick Murphy Malin, former executive director of the American Civil Liberties Union, stated before our subcommittee.

"Church institutions are engaged in a number of other activities beside religious activities. The problem is to discover the nature of the activity rather than the nature of the sponsorship.

"The construction of churches or the maintenance of theological seminaries is obviously at one extreme a religious function and not suspectible of congressional support or restriction. Then you come to the question of the nonreligious functions of church-related colleges and universities; for example, in the maintenance and development of scientific research facilities."

It is generally acknowledged by the courts, by the public, and by ecclesiastical authorities that elementary and secondary schools maintained by church organizations are arms of the churches and are specifically designed for the inculcation and encouragement of religious faith. They are, therefore, to be thought of as religious enterprises and must be maintained free of State support or control.

With reference to colleges and universities, the question arises as to whether there is sufficient difference in degree in their activities to warrant a difference in the kind of treatment in Federal legislation.

The American Civil Liberties Union submitted to our subcommittee suggestions for establishing tentative criteria to determine whether an institution qualifies, for purposes of Federal aid, as an educational institution or a religious enterprise:

First, are students and faculty members required to be adherents of the religious group maintaining the college or university in question? If so, then it would seem that the institution in question is part of a religious enterprise. If not, then, as the ACLU statement suggested, "the college or university in question begins at least to be properly an educational institution rather than a religious institution."

Second, there must be no indoctrination in the tenets and beliefs of the particular faith as a required part of the curriculum toward earning a degree. This is not to say that the institution may not offer courses on religion for those who voluntarily enroll for them, but that such courses must not be required for graduation.

Third, the determination of curriculum and the instructional program must be in the hands of those charged with educational responsibility—the faculty and administration—rather than those outside the educational process who are charged with ecclesiastical administration.

Admittedly, these criteria are not watertight and foolproof, but I believe they offer a sound point of departure for exploring a complex field with many areas of ambiguity. The problem is complicated by the fact that around our Constitution we have developed a wide and varied pattern of religious organizations and activities, and a manifold educational system in which the churches have played an important role. The question now is to determine the essential meaning in a multitude of concrete situations of the conceptions of no restriction and no support of religious activities by the Federal Government.

This will offer one of the major tests of the quality of our democracy in the coming years. For it will require the utmost in patient examination and good will, in dedication to the goals of education, and in enlightened support of the letter as well as the spirit of the first amendment to the Constitution.

In facing these multiple issues, we would do well to bear in mind the remark of the Roman philosopher, Epictetus, who, when commenting upon the fall of Athenian democracy as caused by educating the few, observed that "The state says that only freemen will be educated; God says only educated men will be free."

Hon. Sam Rayburn

SPEECH

OF

HON. MERWIN COAD

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, those of us of the House of Representatives have possessed a special honor and privilege in that we were permitted to serve with that great departed American, Speaker SAM RAYBURN. While we knew him intimately, the entire Nation knew him well for his life is now an historical tribute to the vast good he did for this country. The entire Nation respected Mr. SAM as one of America's greats, ranking him with the long lineage of those who have placed a steady hand at the helm.

With the passing of Speaker RAYBURN, America and the entire free world have lost a friend and stalwart supporter. But Mr. RAYBURN built well as he traveled the course of life's events and in this building he made certain that there were those adequately capable of leadership about him who would take up when he lay down the command.

It was my privilege to know Mr. SAM as a friend and a counselor. Many were the times that I visited with him about matters which were relevant only to my State or to me personally but always his door was open and always he was understanding and would counsel in wisdom.

I am confident that this House will long feel the presence of our late beloved Speaker. I am confident that this Nation will long remember his contribution to its progress and welfare. I am confident that freedom in this world is a bit nearer for his having lived among us. Surely this strength will remain with us to encourage us all as we labor in the time ahead that we will be better enabled to carry out those dreams which

Mr. SAM made into realities along the way.

In this House, in this Nation, in this world we will miss Speaker RAYBURN. We must each one, therefore, be stronger and more diligent to attempt to carry through this loss.

The Water Crisis in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. HART

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that remarks prepared by me for delivery January 19, 1962, to the Michigan Association of Soil Conservation Districts, in Lansing, Mich., on the subject of "The Water Crisis in America," be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WATER CRISIS IN AMERICA

(Address by Senator PHILIP A. HART, Democrat, of Michigan, to the Michigan Association of Soil Conservation Districts, East Lansing, January 19, 1962)

This opportunity to meet with the representatives of the Michigan Soil Conservation Districts is one I appreciate and welcome. In addition to the more obvious reasons of personal friendship and esteem for the objectives of the organization, I have an indebtedness to your calling which I want publicly to acknowledge.

Back in October of 1959, there appeared at the hearing of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources, in Sioux Falls, S. Dak., a witness by the name of William E. Holiway. A lifelong farmer, Bill Holiway testified in his capacity as chairman of the Minnehaha Soil Conservation District. He gave the committee an analysis, classic in its clarity, brevity, and poetic quality, of why we have a water crisis. Directing himself, naturally, to the situation in his part of the country, he told us:

"History proves to us man cannot defy nature and survive. Our domestic cash crops do not have the vigorous root systems as compared to our native grasses. This has allowed our soils to solidify and pack, thus becoming more and more impervious to water. This does not allow the water to reach the underground streams the way nature meant it to—but sends it off over the top, taking the soil and plant foods with it and sending it downstream in flood proportions, making it poisoned and polluted and unfit for any purpose, devastating our neighbors in the lowlands, silting up and destroying the effect of the flood control works on our main streams, filling them with silt, till in time, they become useless. Now we must seek substitutes for nature's way."

I wish there were time to quote Bill Holiway in full. But the point is that this soil conservationist gave the Senate committee, and me in particular, an insight into our soil and water problem that a dozen volumes couldn't have duplicated.

What did we learn from those hearings, as we went from one end of the Nation to the other?

We learned first of all that there is no State of the Union that does not have a water problem: too little water, too much water, poor quality water—one way or the other, the time has come for all of us. When the Senate committee began its work 2½ years ago, most people in this "Water Wonderland" State saw little of importance in it for Michigan. When some of us tried to suggest that even for Michigan, water troubles were just around the corner, we didn't make much headway. But just these 27 months later, the story is quite different: A public beach is closed at Monroe due to pollution; complaints come to us that our rivers are becoming fouled from municipal sewage and industrial waste; our shoreline is beginning to suffer from the increased seaway traffic and greatly expanded recreational boating, a bitter struggle is waged as to whether a piece of our shoreline shall be set aside for industrial expansion or for wildlife and recreational purposes—and I'm not talking about Sleeping Bear; a controversy develops as to whether a pickle plant or a woolen mill shall continue to operate, providing much needed employment but also spewing sewage and poisonous wastes into nearby creeks.

The examples could be multiplied many times. It is now apparent to the most casual observer that in spite of the valiant and dedicated work of our fine Michigan Water Resources Commission, Michigan is no exception to the national water picture: it is a matter with which we must concern ourselves.

Second perhaps in importance to the nationwide character of the water crisis, our committee learned that pollution resulting from municipal and industrial wastes and from siltation is the most serious water problem confronting the Nation. This is particularly true of the industrial and relatively humid eastern and north central portions of the country. Because of huge demands for water for waste dilution, the western Great Lakes region was included among the areas in which by the year 2000 full development of available water resources will be required if the projected demands are to be met.

Our present technical knowledge is sufficient to cope with about 95 percent of the wastes which pollute our lakes and streams. We need stepped-up research to discover how to treat the 5 percent which our new industrial processes have produced and which we do not yet know how to handle. But more importantly, we need the decisionmaking machinery and the funds to deal with the 95 percent for which we do have the know-how.

This calls for decisions that will place a higher priority on the importance of water quality and will assign the needed funds to permit us to move ahead. It also calls for decisions in the realm of governmental machinery, so that industry and local, State, and Federal Governments may all be geared to making their contribution to the cleansing of our streams—with a maximum of efficiency and a minimum of redtape.

When we held our water hearing in Detroit in October of 1959, Russell Hill made a very astute observation. He said, "I think the point that stands out in the hearings to date is the fact that people seem to represent the basis of much of our problems." He was referring to the growing numbers of people, their concentration in urban areas, their increased use of water, their expansion into areas where we have the most and best agricultural land. He could have added that just as in our quest for world peace our political ingenuity is way behind our technological ingenuity, so in this field our ability to resolve conflicts between people falls far behind our engineering capacity. As the demand for water increases—it will double by 1980 and triple by the year 2000—the conflicts will become sharper and the need for sound management greater.

A third fact of life which emerged from the hearings of the Senate committee was the growing importance of water for recreation and for conservation of fish and wildlife to support increased leisure time activities of the people. In the short life of our Nation we have seen emphasis focused on water for navigation, water for agriculture, water for power, water for industry, with a continuing recognition of the need for municipal water. Our committee heard repeatedly that outdoor recreation is rapidly becoming one of the most important uses of our lakes and rivers. As we said in our report, "public expression in the committee hearings made clear that the quality of American life is important as well as its capacity for growth."

Data furnished to the committee give us the following figures:

"The report contains estimates that visits to national parks will increase from 63 million in 1959 to 240 million by 1980, and well over 400 million by the year 2000. It is also estimated that visits to national forests and national, State, county, and municipal parks will reach 8 billion per year by 1980, and 13.4 billion by the year 2000. An estimated withdrawal of 63.7 billion gallons of water will be required for National, State and county parks in 1980 and 101.8 billion in the year 2000. Although the report indicates that the total volume of withdrawal water needed is relatively minor in comparison with water needs for agriculture, industry, and other uses, the quantity and quality of water surface needed for recreational activities is great and the need is steadily becoming more and more critical."

This whole question of safeguarding the beauties of our State for future generations to have and to enjoy is not to be categorized as a question of "minnows versus industry," of "ducks versus people," or of "vacationers versus property owners." It is just not that simple. We do not diminish our concern for the one because of our concern for the other. Rather we are trying to encourage the forethought which will make it possible for both to coexist. We are seeking to avoid damage to our land and water which cannot be undone.

Few groups practice this forethought to as great a degree as do the men and women of our soil conservation districts. You understand the need to plan for the future—to assess your needs and then to take the steps that will assure proper soil and water for those needs. You realize that until our scientists solve the mysteries of weather control, the management of the raindrops will still need to start on the land on which they fall.

One of our most successful programs to provide this kind of intelligent start is the small watershed program. Last summer I was assigned by the chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee to a new Subcommittee on Watersheds. This subcommittee, composed of Senators TALMADGE of Georgia, COOPER of Kentucky, and myself was directed to consider several small watershed projects then before the committee for approval and report to the committee.

It soon became apparent to our subcommittee that this watershed program, enacted into law in 1954, has mushroomed to the point where we need more than a project-by-project green light. Twenty-six projects have now been completed; 368 have been approved for construction; 707 have been approved for planning; 1,625 applications have been filed (an average of 34 per State), and the Department of Agriculture has testified to the need for projects in nearly

8,300 watersheds covering 1 billion acres of farmland—over half of the land area of the 48 States.

Obviously, a program of these dimensions is on its way to becoming a major element in our soil and water conservation effort. Its very popularity is presenting problems: such a backlog has built up that the schedule for installation of projects after approval has been extended from 5 to 7 or 8 years, with resulting higher costs to both local and Federal participants. If this is indeed a worthwhile program, and if local initiative and interest are to be maintained, then we must devise ways to assure greater protection of local funds and effort. Since its inception, this program has had a high degree of cooperation between local, State, and Federal governments. It behooves all of us to develop ways in which its democratic character can be maintained while at the same time streamlining the procedures.

Michigan particularly would benefit from such efforts. We now have 11 applications for watershed assistance pending at the Department of Agriculture. We have a stake in seeing that personnel and funds are as available for these watersheds as they have been for other equally meritorious areas.

I hope we in Michigan will not be gun shy of Federal programs which have been approved by the Congress and the Chief Executive and which are designed to assist State and local governments and local citizens in solving problems they alone cannot solve. Rivers know no county or State boundary lines for example, nor does disease, nor ignorance. No one has put this point more effectively, in my book, than Dr. Roscoe Martin of Syracuse University when he testified at our Boston hearing. He said:

"I would like to say, first, that I regard the Federal Government as my Government. It is not a government by or for somebody else. It is a Government run by and for my neighbors and me. It is a responsible government. I suspect it might be developed that the Federal Government is as responsible as any unit of government there is, but I shan't take that one on at that point.

"I shall say just that I am not afraid to see the Federal Government do the kind of work which I think it can do best."

But in so many cases, we need not quarrel among ourselves as to whether this water job will be done by the Federal Government or by the State government or by local initiative. There is plenty for all to do. Indeed, the requirements of the future are such that they challenge us to exhaust all constructive approaches.

There are many new and useful ways of responding to this challenge. Through imaginative use of revamped and expanded Federal assistance to local governments and groups, new combinations of water programs are possible. New Mexico is doing a State water resources survey with urban planning funds. Area redevelopment and the rural development programs hold promise. The Farmers Home Administration will underwrite small community water facilities. The Community Facilities Administration and the U.S. Public Health Service are expanding their research and grant and loan programs. The really successful attack on our water problems will come as localities devise means to tap these and other opportunities in new and dramatic ways.

You are accustomed to look ahead. Ahead of us lies greatly increased demand: for soil, for water, for conservation of some of the beauty of this earth before the bulldozer crushes it. I hope we will have the vision and the strength to act responsibly.

I have toured the land together with you—have seen firsthand the product of your efforts. I am in sympathy with your cause. I congratulate you on your progress. I pledge you my full support.

Perspective on the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, to those of us who have been studying the President's budget message, dealing in many billions of dollars is an almost unreal experience. The Federal budget for fiscal 1963 represents about 16 percent of our total production of goods and services. While critics will complain that this is the largest peacetime budget ever presented, I think that they should remember that without our expenditures for national defense and space research and technology, the budget includes only $38 billion to cover the development of agriculture, natural resources, commerce, transportation, housing, health, labor, welfare, education, veterans benefits, and interest on the debt.

Mr. President, I think that a helpful discussion of the budget is contained in the New York Times for Sunday, January 21. I ask unanimous consent that it be included with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HIGH COST OF GOVERNMENT

For those of us whose idea of affluence is carrying a $500 balance in our checking account, there is an anesthetizing air of unreality about the figures in the budget President Kennedy has just sent to Congress. The $92.5 billion he considers necessary to run the Federal Government in fiscal 1963 is more money than the total national income in any year before World War II.

When old-age insurance, unemployment compensation and other items outside the regular administrative budget are tacked on, the Federal outlay for 1963 will top $114 billion. The cost of State and local government will add between $50 and $55 billion, bringing the total to $165 billion, or $900 for every man, woman and child.

It is easy to become downcast because of such stupendous expenditures and to conclude that investing almost 30 cents of every dollar of our anticipated gross national product on Federal, State, and municipal government is too much to ask of the taxpayers. Each of us, studying the Kennedy requests, will have some pet nomination of an area in which we are sure several billions could be saved without harm to the national welfare. City dwellers are always cheerfully prepared to eliminate farm price supports; farmers wonder what business Uncle Sam has in handing out money for urban mass transportation; the list of places to economize is endless.

The President's task is to make the agonizing judgments on what the country needs for security and growth within the limits of what it can afford. This is a balance made particularly difficult by the exigencies of the cold war and the emergence of costly new programs of space research. Our efforts to keep our own world from being blown up and to explore other worlds we hope will prove more peaceful are going to cost nearly two-thirds of every Federal budget dollar. Another dime will go to pay interest on the colossal debt we incurred in fighting wars and depressions.

That leaves only a little over a quarter for everything else Uncle Sam has to do. Much of that is earmarked for building a healthier, better educated, better housed America and for strengthening the economy in a period of rapid technological change. Any slump in business or any turn for the worse in international affairs will put the Government back in the red. There can be no certainties in budgetmaking because there are none in our tumultuous world.

The Budget: Balancing Factors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in a thoughtful article which appeared in the Washington Post on January 20, Roscoe Drummond has pointed out a number of factors which must be noted in considering the President's record peacetime budget for 1962–63.

In the first place, as Mr. Drummond so correctly states:

> It is not really a peacetime budget at all. It is a cold war budget, and its bigness is shaped by this fact above all else.

In the second place, Mr. Drummond continues:

> This 1962–63 budget projects a balance and there are good reasons to expect that it will remain balanced. It is premised upon increased revenues resulting from a continued upturn in the economy. This is the outlook forecast by every economic index.

It is true that during the last 10 years the Federal budget has moved almost steadily upward. It is important to note, however, as Columnist Drummond has done, that "Federal spending is at a lower percentage of the gross national product than it was 10 years ago. This means that our economy has expanded more than Federal spending has increased."

Mr. Speaker, this is an excellent analysis in many respects, and I commend it to my colleagues' attention:

THE BALANCING FACTORS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Perhaps the most startling thing about the first full budget presented by the Kennedy administration is that there is little that is startling in it.

The budget is big—$92.5 billion—the biggest peacetime budget in American history. But there are balancing factors which should be kept in mind.

It is not really a peacetime budget at all. It is a cold war budget, and its bigness is shaped by this fact above all else. The truth is that in a very real sense we are at war with the Communist world. It is a war called peace.

The budget reflects this at every crucial point—in mounting defense expenditures, in mutual assistance and foreign aid expenditures, in space, in science, in education expenditures. None of the peacetime demands in these fields would put Federal spending at its present levels were it not for the pressures of the cold war.

This 1962–63 budget projects a balance and there are good reasons to expect that it will remain balanced. It is premised up-

on increased revenues resulting from a continued upturn in the economy. This is the outlook forecast by every economic index.

Some will argue, as many Democrats did with respect to President Eisenhower's 1959–60 budget, that its projected surplus is at worst phony and at best uncertain.

The half-billion-dollar surplus rests on a whole series of premises—that Congress will pass the revenue bills Mr. Kennedy is asking, that the present recovery will continue for at least the next 18 months, that no new, costly crisis will develop in world affairs.

But these arguments which were brought against the last Eisenhower budget proved to be invalid. It was the arguments which were phony, not the budget, and similar criticism of the Kennedy budget will almost certainly not be borne out.

There are additional circumstances which help to put the Federal fiscal picture into better focus. Despite the fact that the national debt has mounted from $72 billion in 1942 to $295 billion in 1962 an increase of $223 billion—the economy of the Nation has grown so much that today's public debt is only 50 percent of the gross national product, exactly where it was 20 years ago when it was only one-fourth the size.

For all of these reasons, but primarily because this is a cold war budget in balance, it seems to me accurate for the President to describe it as "prudent" and "responsible."

It ought to be balanced. If it weren't, it would be an imprudent and inflationary budget. The core of Mr. Kennedy's defense of his budget is contained in these words from his budget message:

"The economy is moving strongly forward, with employment and incomes rising. The prospects are favorable for further rises in the coming year. * * *

"To plan a deficit under such circumstances would increase the risk of inflationary pressures, damaging alike to our domestic economy and to our international balance of payments.

"On the other hand, we are still far short of full capacity use of plants and manpower. To plan a larger surplus would risk choking off economic recovery and contributing to a premature downturn."

The President instructed his Cabinet that he wanted a balanced budget. He had to undertake a good deal of cutting back to get it. Very likely it could be trimmed further at points. The next step will be up to Congress. At the very least it should hold the line plus approving mail rates to wipe out the annual postal deficits.

The Eisenhower administration tried manfully to keep Federal spending down. The budget has moved almost steadily upward for 10 years.

There are two reasons—the demands of the cold war and the demands of a Nation with an explosive population growth. But Federal spending is at a lower percentage of the gross national product than it was 10 years ago. This means that our economy has expanded more than Federal spending has increased.

Results of a Questionnaire on the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, because of the extreme bitterness with which the United Nations has been attacked in recent weeks, in late December I conducted an "experiment" by mailing out within the 26th District of California 60,000 copies of a questionnaire on the U.N. Although in general I think very little of the value of such a poll, particularly those that require just a "yes" or "no" answer, no pretense was made that this was done on a scientific basis or was any more on my part except a desire to get an idea of how my constituents feel about the United Nations.

An attempt was made to hit all areas of my district, with no particular differentiation between men and women voters, or between Democrats, Republicans, and nonpartisans. Further, my office was more completely equipped with precinct rosters for what might be termed "conservative" areas of the district, than for the so-called "liberal" areas, so there is little doubt that, percentagewise, "conservatives" actually got more questionnaires than "liberals."

Of the 60,000 copies mailed, approximately 11 percent, or 6,600 envelopes, were returned as undeliverable. This presumably left 53,400 questionnaires actually delivered into voters' hands. Of these, 7,521, or approximately 14.1 percent, were returned, which direct-mail experts tell me is an extremely heavy return.

The questions asked and the percentage breakdowns of the replies are as follows:

	Yes	No
(1) Do you think that the United Nations offers the best hope of keeping peace in the world?	84.8	15.2
(2) Do you think the United States should continue its membership in the U.N.?	88.8	11.2
(3) Do you think that further strengthening of the U.N. would be apt to advance the cause of world peace?	87.6	12.4
(4) Do you think that the foreign policy of the United States should concern itself with attempting to achieve agreement on total disarmament under conditions of rigid international inspection?	85.0	15.0
(5) If you do, do you feel that such inspection, and the rules therefor, should be administered by a world court, backed up by an international armed force adequate to enforce the court's rulings?	87.2	12.8
(6) If you have answered these questions affirmatively, or largely affirmatively, do you think that the United States should propose such a program to the U.N., and to the world, regardless of the present intransigent position of the U.S.S.R.?	88.1	11.9

Hon. Sam Rayburn

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, on an occasion such as this there is little one can really say about such a man as SAM RAYBURN; an American, a Congressman, a Speaker of the House of Representatives, and a true Democrat. Eulogies to the career of this great man already have said it all. The feeling of the American people, both the feelings of those who knew him personally and those who know of him only by his reputation, has been set down for posterity in words far better than I can say. What little I have to say is this:

It has been my privilege to be a Member of this great body for 28 years. During that period of time I came to know and respect and cherish the friendship of Speaker RAYBURN both as a man and as a truly great leader.

SAM RAYBURN was a unique individual. He was that type of person who appears but once in a generation. He was one who by his actions and his words left his mark for all time on all that he came in contact with and in this case that which he influenced was this House of Representatives which he loved so much. Under Speaker RAYBURN the House reached a position of eminence as a legislative body. His effect on it will be felt for many generations beyond his own lifetime. SAM RAYBURN understood the House and its Members and the House and its Members understood and loved SAM RAYBURN.

I am proud to have been able to serve these many years under Speaker RAYBURN and I know I join with many others who say quite simply and honestly SAM RAYBURN was a great man, a great American, but most of all a great human being.

Drift Toward Centralized Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Don't Buy It—But" which appeared in the January 12, 1962, edition of the Shelbyville (Ind.) News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE DON'T BUY IT—BUT

Premier Khrushchev's prediction that America's grandchildren will live under socialism could very well come true—if the present drift toward centralized control of the Nation's economy continues.

The warning comes from John W. McGovern, board chairman of the National Association of Manufacturers, who added that the "virtues and values which made this Nation the greatest and most powerful in the world are being steadily whittled away."

Mr. McGovern said in a recent talk that neither the American people, the Congress, nor the administration wants socialism "any more than the previous Republican administration wanted it.

"However, the drift toward centralized government has continued steadily under both of our great political parties," he continued, "despite the earnest efforts of individual leaders in each to halt and reverse the trend.

"If it is not halted, we inevitably will wind up with government controlling and

directing our lives and our activities, even though we stop short of socialized ownership of the means of production and distribution."

The NAM spokesman said it was gratifying to note—particularly among young Americans—evidences of concern over the fact that in mid-1960 the various levels of government, Federal, State, and local, were spending 37½ cents out of each dollar the American people earned; that the Federal Government alone was spending 29 cents, and that for years the growth of government has been outrunning the growth of the rest of the Nation.

We agree with Mr. McGovern that more young Americans should be urged to become students of political and economic affairs and active participants in the process of citizenship—to the end that the trend toward greater centralization of government can be slowed, halted, and then reversed.

United Nations Day Banquet in Martinsburg, W. Va., on October 18, 1961, Addressed by Minister Plenipotentiary of the Republic of China, Dr. Yi-Seng Kiang

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on October 18, 1961, the citizens of the city of Martinsburg commemorated the 16th United Nations Day with a banquet sponsored by the Junior Board of Trade, the Kiwanis Club, the Lions Club, the Rotary Club, the Soroptimist Club, Traveler's Protective Association, and the Woman's Club.

It was my privilege to introduce the principal speaker, Dr. Yi-Seng Kiang, Minister Plenipotentiary of the Republic of China, who spoke on the topic of "China and the United Nations." Dr. Kiang discussed most effectively the contributions of that Republic to the founding of the United Nations and the maintenance of the continued integrity of that organization. He also explained with logic and clarity the reasons why the Chinese Communists should not be admitted to the United Nations as representatives of Government of China. In view of the continued significance of this issue, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks in introduction of Dr. Kiang and an article reporting his visit to the United Nations Day Banquet in the Martinsburg Journal be printed at this point in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, DEMOCRAT, OF WEST VIRGINIA, IN INTRODUCTION OF THE MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA, DR. YI-SENG KIANG AT THE UNITED NATIONS DAY BANQUET, MARTINSBURG, W. VA., OCTOBER 18, 1961

Not in the 12 years of its existence has there been a United Nations Day observance on which we faced more sombre prospects for the maintenance and viability of the United Nations itself.

The present crisis of the U.N. has been precipitated and its possible consequences accentuated, by the tragic death of Dag Hammarskjold. Yet this was not the cause. The current peril has been germinating for the past 10 years at least, and it has been acute since 1959.

The central issue—which underlies all the major problems on the agenda of this assembly—is whether the United Nations shall be a mere forum of debate or whether, acting as an agency of the world community, it will be empowered, in the language of the charter, "to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace."

It was to this end that Dag Hammarskjold worked so tirelessly and courageously, and this ideal for which he made the final sacrifice that fatal night over the Congo. Dag Hammarskjold's mission was in part—as he wrote to a friend shortly before his death—in response to the need for a "deep sense for the spiritual basis—and responsibility—of the United Nations."

At such times as now, when the United Nations is riven by the disruptive tactics of the Soviet Union and threatened by paralysis of the Secretariat, it is difficult for us to maintain the vision of this spiritual ideal to which Hammarskjold was so fully committed. Yet we must, if we are to avert the unparalleled disaster of nuclear war, maintain the vision of what the U.N. must become—an effective agency for bringing the rule of law into international affairs. Thus it is precisely at this time that the U.N. most needs the informal and vocal support of such persons as yourselves.

For there is a growing ferment of confusion and frustration among the American people when we witness the increasing complexity and difficulty of coping with the aggressive designs of the Soviet Union and Communist China. And this has generated an increasing temptation among many toward rash actions of military reprisal or, equally perilous, toward withdrawing our support from the United Nations. There is, therefore, an urgent and compelling need to communicate to the apathetic, the frustrated, and the uninformed American the significance of this "last best hope of mankind." Each of us has a place in this task of awakening our fellow citizens, for, in the words of Ambassador Stevenson, "We must all be partners, all participants in the experiment of building a civic order for all mankind."

We are extremely fortunate tonight in having as our honor guest one who represents in his own person those values on which a "civic order for mankind" must be established, and one who has worked many years to that purpose.

Dr. Yi-seng Kiang, Minister Plenipotentiary and Acting Charge d'Affaires of the Embassy of the Republic of China, is an especially appropriate speaker for this commemorative United Nations Day. Currently assigned to the 16th General Assembly as adviser to the Chinese Minister of Foreign Affairs, he is well versed in and deeply involved with the central problems which this session of the United Nations faces.

Dr. Kiang brings to this service the background of having been a participant at the San Francisco Conference in 1945 for which he drafted the Chinese version of the United Nations Charter. As Consul General in Los Angeles for 10 years thereafter, Dr. Kiang developed knowledge and insight into American culture and he helped to strengthen the bonds which unite Americans with the free people of China.

NATIONALIST CHINA MINISTER MAKES RED CHINA BAN PLEA

Yi-seng Kiang, Minister Plenipotentiary of the Embassy of the Republic of China, stationed at Washington, made a ringing plea for the cause of his government in its current case before the United Nations; expressed confidence that the U.N. can and will find a satisfactory solution of the issue; and pleaded for full American support for the United Nations, when he spoke here last night at the Shenandoah to the more than 350 persons—men and women—attending the annual observance of the anniversary of the birth of the United Nations.

He appeared as speaker in the place of Ambassador George Kugn-chao Yeh, envoy to this country, kept from keeping the engagement because he was at home on official business. He suggested Minister Kiang to U.S. Senator RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, who had been instrumental in scheduling the Ambassador. The speaker was introduced by Senator RANDOLPH.

Mr. Kiang is serving currently on assignment to the Chinese delegation to the U.N. as adviser.

He said though China is at the moment divided, he has full confidence it will be reunited on Nationalist policies, and his countrymen looked to the U.N. to help.

He also expressed his government's appreciation for the friendship of the United States.

He spoke on the theme, "China and the United Nations."

He drew certain lessons from the old League of Nations; referred to China's contributions to the drafting of the U.N. Charter; specifically referred to article 141 of the Constitution of the Republic of China pledging respect to the U.N. Charter.

He pointed out that the ROC is an original and founding member of the U.N.; article 23 provides that the ROC is one of the permanent members of the Security Council.

He also listed certain reasons his Government feels should prevent the Chinese Communists being admitted to the U.N.: They are not peaceloving; have been condemned as an aggressor by resolution of the U.N. which still stands; being un-Chinese in origin, do not represent the will of the people; their acts of subversion and infiltration in Laos and South Vietnam.

He then turned to answering certain arguments which have been advanced for admission to Communist China, and undertook to refute them point by point—such as: universality of U.N. membership; political realism; isolation of Red China leads to intransigence; peaceful coexistence (China tried it three times); disarmament (he said failure of disarmament talks is due to the uncompromising attitude of the U.S.S.R. and has nothing to do with the nonparticipation of Communist China); opinion of Asian members is overwhelmingly in favor of admission (Asia is a vast and desperate continent—no one can speak for all Asians); that the ROC is a "lost cause" (he said ROC maintains friendly relations with 50 U.N. member-states whereas Communist China has such with only 35).

He also referred to congressional concurrent resolution in the 87th session (passed unanimously in both Houses) which stated it to be the sense of Congress that the U.S. shall continue to meet its commitments to the people and the Government of the Republic of China and shall continue to support that government as the representative of China in the U.N.; that the United States shall continue to oppose the seating of the Chinese Communist regime in the U.N. so long as that regime persists in defying the principles of the U.N. Charter; that the American people support the President in not according diplomatic recognition of the Communist regime.

He said the preservation of the Charter and the U.N. will be for the statesmen of the world the crucial test; for the U.N. and for the world this will probably be the final test.

He was interrupted several times by applause.

Presenting Minister Kiang, Senator RANDOLPH recalled that the speaker had been present when the U.N. Charter was written in San Francisco and had helped in its preparation, and that his present assignment as a counselor to the National China delegation to the U.N. puts him in a position to speak authoritatively on its workings.

He also read a telegram from Ambassador Yeh, dated in Formosa, which explained that owing to an unforeseen prolonging of his stay there on official business he would be unable to keep his engagement to appear here. He said he would be glad to suggest Minister Kiang, a member of his embassy, now in charge. He wished the local meeting full success.

Mr. Kiang has been in Washington since 1960. He was born in Kiangsu in 1908, is married and has two sons. He was vice consul at San Francisco in 1931–32; held a similar post in Los Angeles 1932–37; consul in New York 1937–39; consul in Seattle 1939–46; consul general in Los Angeles 1945–46; secretary and chief, translation section, Chinese delegation to UNCIO, 1945; technical counselor, Chinese delegation to U.N. General Assembly in New York, 1946; member Good Will Mission to Central and South America, 1957; member, special mission for coronation of Pope John XXIII, 1958; member, special mission for inauguration of President Adolfo Lopez Mateos of the Republic of Mexico, 1958; director, information department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs 1956–59; Minister Charge d'Affairés, Chinese Embassy, Santiago, Chile, 1959–60; Minister, Chinese Embassy, Washington, 1960. He has been assigned as counsel to the U.N. delegation for the current session.

Senator RANDOLPH used the occasion on presenting the principal speaker to explain his own position on the importance of the U.N.

He said that not in "the 16 years of its existence has there been a United Nations Day observance on which we faced more somber prospects for the maintenance and viability of the United Nations itself.

"The present crisis of the U.N. has been precipitated, and its possible consequenecs accentuated, by the tragic death of Dag Hammarskjold. Yet this was not the cause. The current peril has been germinating for the past 10 years at least, and it has been acute since 1959.

"The central issue—which underlies all the major problems on the agenda of this Assembly—is whether the United Nations shall be a mere forum of debate or whether, acting as an agency of the world community, it will be empowered, in the language of the Charter, 'to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace.' "

There was also a stand of U.N. flags at the northern end of the Gold Room. Carlton B. Stuckey led the assemblage in singing "The Star-Spangled Banner" at the opening of the program, and the United Nations Hymn (written by Rabbi Raphael H. Levine and sung to the tune of "America, the Beautiful," printed on the program) at the close.

The local observances are sponsored by local commitees, named by the mayors, with the cooperation of the United Nations Association. Heading the committee here this year was former Mayor Paul B. Martin who acted as master of ceremonies last night.

Prefacing the program Mr. Martin said he felt the attendance demonstrated a high interest in the U.N., a sense of civic mindedness, and recognition of the U.N. as a world agency working for peace. He added that he felt the sentiment was on the side of the Republic of China in issues involving it and Red China now being debated at the U.N.

In extending official greetings to the group and the visitors Mayor Golliday expressed the hope that the United Nations would succeed in its mission. He said he interpreted the big attendance last night as well as the responses at previous dinners—as endorsement locally of the agency. He hoped the rule of reason would prevail and suggested the Golden Rule as a guide for its deliberations.

Mayor Golliday, at the close of the program, presented Martin a plaque setting forth his service to the cause. He presented a similar plaque to Attorney Robert Steptoe who headed up the committee last year.

He expressed his appreciation to all who had cooperated in the affair this year, and particularly the Norborne Garden Club, with Mrs. William G. Schneider and Mrs. William Rapp in charge of arrangements, which took care of decorations for the affair.

Mayor Golliday also presented Minister Kiang a package of Interwoven hose and a bushel of apples.

For a program of music Miss Shirley Parsons, this city, sang two numbers—"Look for the Silver Lining" (Jerome Kern) and "Ah, Sweet Mystery of Life" (Victor Herbert). Her accompanist was Mrs. William McBride, this city. She also played for the mass singing.

The invocation and benediction were by the Reverend W. W. Beale, pastor of Calvary Methodist Church.

Introduced informally by Mr. Martin and seated at the speakers' table were: Sol Fine, ticket sale chairman; former Mayor Carlton B. Stuckey; Charles Stroh, manager of the chamber of commerce; Mrs. Pauline Boxwell, treasurer of the local group for many years; and Lou Cohen, a past presiding officer of the movement, who introduced Senator RANDOLPH. Introduced from the floor were Dr. Corma Mowrey, of Washington, a present representative of National Education Association and a past president of NEA; and former Mayor William H. Peery, who originated the local observances when he was mayor.

Senator RANDOLPH has been spending 2 days in this area. He flew in with guests of Lake Central Airlines Tuesday afternoon, attended the dinner-reception, and witnessed the races that evening at Shenandoah Downs at Charles Town, spent the night at Hilltop House at Harpers Ferry, and came here yesterday for the post office building dedication. He had as his guest Postmaster General J. Edgar Day and used the morning yesterday to show him around Harpers Ferry historic spots and other places.

In the crowd last night were a number of teachers here to attend a regional meeting of the WVEA today and tomorrow, and a number from other points in the area.

Hon. Styles Bridges

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, just as the Congress was about to assemble again, STYLES BRIDGES, who had been ill, and had quite a bit of hospitalization and confinement to his home, passed away.

He had been in the Senate for 24 years and had been right along one of its most distinguished Members. It had been my privilege to work with him on appropriations bills, and in the conferences between the House and the Senate to frame the most critical bits of appropriation language for a large number of years. I have known him to come into a conference where the conferees were all at swords' points, and to bring about an agreement practically on his own. This made him one of the ablest and most forceful men in the Senate, and for many years he was in that position.

I doubt if there will be anyone to take his place so effectively and so strongly as STYLES BRIDGES. I wish to extend to his widow and his mother and the rest of his family my sincerest and deepest sympathy.

Ukrainian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, 44 years ago, on January 22, 1918, the independence of Ukraine was declared. This marked the end of a long period of unwilling subjugation to alien rulers and the fulfillment of the aspirations for freedom which had sustained the Ukrainian people throughout many adversities. Unfortunately, its nearness to the avaricious Soviets forewarned of a short life for the nascent republic.

Scarcely had a constitution been adopted, a president elected, and the work of constructing a democratic state begun when the forces of destruction of the republic took shape. In November 1918, contrary to the armistice agreement, Joseph Stalin in Moscow set up a Ukrainian Soviet Government composed of Communist leaders of whom only one was Ukrainian. By December 1, a manifesto had been declared proclaiming the Soviet Government and threatening with death anyone who obeyed the laws of the legal Ukrainian Government. The legal Ukrainian Government declared war on Soviet Russia but by November 1920 the troops of the Ukrainian National Republic had been forced into retreat by the Communists. Subsequently Ukraine was incorporated into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Although they have been forced to endure Communist tyranny and the suppression of basic civil rights, the Ukrainian people have not given up their hope that someday they will live in freedom once again. Ukrainian Independence Day is commemorated to sustain that hope and encourage the peoples living under the Communist government imposed by Moscow. It is commemorated here on the floor of Congress to show that the people in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic have not been for-

gotten and to reaffirm that a major goal of United States foreign policy is the strengthening of freedom everywhere.

Finally, I should like to take this occasion to congratulate the Americans of Ukrainian descent for their contributions to this Nation, their concern for the welfare and future of their relatives behind the Iron Curtain, and their devotion to the cause of freedom all over the globe.

President Kennedy Evaluated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to an excellent article by the noted columnist, George Sokolsky, which appeared in a recent edition of the Washington Post.

Mr. Sokolsky, who is not noted for his liberal views, makes a number of thoughtful comments in evaluating President Kennedy's first year in the highest office our Nation can bestow on any individual.

Among other things, Mr. Sokolsky states that the President "has maintained peace without compromise, that he has strengthened the economy of the United States without conceding to foreign powers and that he has safeguarded the dollar without imperiling its value."

He goes on to say that "there are those who violently oppose the President's domestic policy, suggesting that he is throwing our wealth down the drain. They despair of the future. They are frightened by his enormous proposed expenditures. But his basic task is to provide jobs for our workers. President Kennedy is meeting the problems which face the American people soberly and with an understanding of the current problems."

Mr. Speaker, these and other comments made by Mr. Sokolsky get to the heart of much that has transpired in this last year, and that is to face us in the days ahead.

THE KENNEDY STORY

(By George E. Sokolsky)

One of the exciting evidences of public response to events these days is the reaction to President John F. Kennedy. Many conservatives are annoyed over the fact that they have to recognize that he will be in that position for at least 3 more years and possibly 7; that the Constitution gives him certain powers and that others come to him by virtue of his office and by the fact that he grows increasingly popular and influential.

What they can do about it, they do not know, but they do get excited over Cuba and Katanga and say of whose who favor Mr. Kennedy that they have sold out. I was so bold as to ask one such person where and what is Katanga and apparently upset the applecart because the place is only a name and it is difficult to explain what the excitement is about.

No man, not Khrushchev or De Gaulle or Kennedy, is a free master in our very complex world. The course of events moves more swiftly than anyone can estimate in advance. According to Lenin's estimate, the capitalist system should by now be collapsing. As a matter of fact, it is gaining strength, particularly in Europe and Japan, where the production of new goods has altered the economy of nations. According to Communist calculations, the United States and Great Britain should have destroyed each other in an economic competition; instead, the United States poured billions of dollars into the British, French, West German, and Italian economies, making those countries stronger than they were prior to World War II and saving them from collapse at the risk of collapsing itself.

In fact, most calculations were incorrect because it was difficult for small minds to foresee the capacity of the American mind to respond generously to historic misfortunes. It is the same lack of prescience which makes it difficult for us to grasp what we are liable to do that is broad and generous in critical periods.

For instance, President Kennedy was elected by a small majority after a fairly popular Presidency of President Eisenhower, who had no particular program but who moved along as events would permit. Mr. Kennedy's program was not particularly clear. In fact, it seems that his proposals were stronger than his actions. Nevertheless, a year of activity indicates that he has maintained peace without compromise, that he has strengthened the economy of the United States without conceding for foreign powers, that he has safeguarded the dollar without imperiling its value.

President Kennedy tripped over Cuba, but it is becoming clear that Castro has failed to achieve anything beneficial to Cuba by his cupidity. It was believed that Mr. Kennedy's Dominican program was incorrect, but it is working out. The Russians attempted to bog us down in Cuba, Laos, Vietnam, the Congo and other places, but failed. We have prepared to meet the future, but we have not been tricked into being required to accept their battlefield.

There are those who violently oppose the President's domestic policy, suggesting that he is throwing our wealth down the drain. They despair of the future. They are frightened by his enormous proposed expenditures. But his basic task is to provide jobs for our workers.

President Kennedy is meeting the problems which face the American people soberly and with an understanding of the current problems. He is not living in 1930 but in 1962 and the world has changed sharply during the past 30 years. He recognizes that it has changed sharply. Those who want him to live way back in the days when he was elected to the Senate are not looking at the calendar. He is.

Hon. Speaker Sam Rayburn

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it was with a deep sense of personal loss that I learned of the passing of our beloved Speaker, SAM RAYBURN. He has left a marked impression on my memory as one who guided me and advised me well when I became a freshman Member of this House. His advice was always excellent and wise, and I feel fortunate in having had the benefit of his tutelage in my earlier years here. His was a personality which made him beloved, and his eminent fairness in all his dealings are well known to all of us. We shall certainly miss him, but in respect to his memory we shall continue to carry on the business of the House with the dignity and orderliness which is our inheritance from him. My deepest sympathy goes to Mr. SAM's family and to the people of the district which he so very ably represented.

Attacks on Business, Advertising, Threat to America's Free Press—Address by J. Warren McClure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, yesterday the Newspaper Advertising Executives Association, meeting in Chicago, listened to an address by J. Warren McClure, publisher of the Burlington (Vt.) Free Press. Mr. McClure spoke on attacks on business and advertising, and threats to America's free press. I do not have Mr. McClure's full address; therefore I cannot say whether I personally agree with all he said or not, but there are very liberal quotations from the address in the press release which was put out yesterday. I ask unanimous consent to have these quotations from Mr. McClure's address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I believe we must deeply concern ourselves with a basic business problem which seems to be growing every day—snide attacks against advertising and the advertising business—and against U.S. business itself. Let's not live in a dreamworld; these attacks can be—directly and indirectly—attacks against America's free press.

Sure, there have been abuses in advertising. Charges of bad taste, however, have been mostly directed against our competition—in the air.

Consider this dramatic fact: When you add up all the stipulations and indiscretions of advertisers generally, you will find only minuscule, microscopic handful of violators, in comparison to the billions of dollars in advertising placed by America's agencies.

I doubt whether any industry, the size of the advertising business, can match its clean, clear, overall record.

We just can't stand by and let these attacks go unanswered in the communities and areas we serve.

What the detractors of advertising fail to realize—or choose to ignore—is that advertising is America's essential guarantee of our most precious heritage—a free press.

Where freedom dies—so does advertising.

You won't find a thriving advertising industry in any Iron Curtain country.

Neither will you find a free press. Thanks to advertising, no newspaper or any other medium of communications in the United States or Canada has to look to special interests or Government subsidy for survival.

Let's not let anyone forget it's the pennies which people pay for our newspapers—and the billions which advertisers invest in the pages of our newspapers—which maintain and guarantee our free press.

Advertising is, and always has been, America's No. 1 sales stimulator.

It's when people don't buy, when orders do not come to the retailer, the wholesaler, and to the plant that factories close down—and men and women are out of work.

Thus, I believe the newspaper industry must work more closely with advertisers and agencies, to interpret advertising's rightful story to a frequently confused—sometimes cynical—public, and unfortunately sometimes to public servants.

For example, I believe that many in the advertising business have an inferiority complex about those two words: "Madison Avenue."

I think all of us who have to do with advertising have a job to do to help Madison Avenue mold its true image.

What should that image be?

I would like to venture that Madison Avenue is the nerve center of the American economy—the avenue to prosperity.

That's just what it is—and the record proves it. There is no Madison Avenue in Moscow. No free press, either.

We also have to concern ourselves to a far greater extent with unwarranted attacks on business.

Certainly we do not condone monopoly of any kind. There are plenty of laws on the books to police monopoly.

But to try to tear apart, to attempt to break off pieces, of a large and successful enterprise and shrink it just because it's big—that's something else again.

A business only grows big because consumers make it grow. Thank our stars for a nation where free choice is everybody's privilege.

But, let a business fail to produce more and better products, at prices people will pay—let it fail in any essential service to the consumer, let it stop advertising—and it will shrink—and eventually die.

The corporate graveyard is full of such failures.

The modern corporation is no longer a separate entity—a world unto itself. It does business with thousands of smaller companies, important to our local communities. It's policed by scores of local, State, and National regulations—and by today's army of very vocal stockholders.

I am not implying that the small business is not the lifeblood of our business—it is.

The newspapers of this country—and let's not let anyone forget this—play the major role in nurturing, promoting, and stimulating volume and profits for the small business man.

What the newspaper industry must keep in front of it, however, on the local and national scene, are these essential facts: What affects big business similarly affects small business; what affects our system of free enterprise—also affects newspaper advertising; and what affects newspaper advertising can affect our free press.

With danger signals looming on the horizon, I urge all of you to be alert.

Nobody has yet found a better system than free enterprise, of which advertising is the hub.

That's one reason the Russians built the East Berlin wall.

On one side a thriving, bustling West Germany, with a great free enterprise economy, a free press—and advertising. On the other, the withering, dreary life of East Germany. The Soviets just couldn't stand the startling comparison.

We are living in days when people who have never sold a dollar's worth of merchandise in their lives—or even engaged in any business, for that matter—are subjecting both industry and advertising to attacks and criticism, much of it unwarranted, some completely irresponsible. We can't sit by and see advertising, and the free press it makes possible, jeopardized without fighting back.

This is the job of both the newspaper business and the advertising fraternity, with industry's cooperation.

I call upon the American Newspaper Publishers Association to institute a year-round national campaign, to orient people on the importance of advertising to the American economy—and to America's free press.

I call upon the American Association of Advertising Agencies to harness the best brains in their industry, and get off dead center and orient and educate the people of this country on the true meaning, the real image of "Madison Avenue."

They should do this in as aggressive a way—in as brilliant a print campaign—as any good agency might do when it has to show a proven result.

Industrial Disaster Is Foreseen if Kennedy Gets Way on Tariffs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM V. MOOREHEAD

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the issue of trade policy will shortly occupy the attention of the House of Representatives. No other decision this Congress will make will have such a profound effect upon the economic future of our country.

For many years, southeastern Ohio has struggled with the consequences of policies that have led to lower and lower tariffs on imports competing with the products of our local industries. We know the lesson well and we hope that our experience will not be visited upon the rest of the Nation.

As this debate begins, I am calling to the attention of the Congress an article by Mr. Wilbur Matson, which appeared on January 19, 1962, in the Columbus, Ohio, Dispatch. Mr. Matson is the respected editor of the Morgan County Herald of McConnelsville, Ohio, one of Ohio's outstanding weekly newspapers. His observations are as follows:

INDUSTRIAL DISASTER IS FORESEEN IF KENNEDY GETS WAY ON TARIFFS

To the EDITOR:

Usually sane and sound on great public issues, you are again absolutely right on the inherent menace in the proposed lowering of the tariff under present world conditions.

To us, Mr. Kennedy's proposal for a bold new approach to this problem will end in industrial disaster if authority is granted him in lowering tariffs to the degree he seeks, and he exercises such powers.

A widespread discussion is bound to confront the country when the issue confronts the Congress for action. To such discussion I suggest that the rule of commonsense be applied to a solution.

Let us for the nonce forget the theoretical side of the tariff problem and rely upon the lamp of experience, our own and that of other nations.

When Bismarck was Chancellor of Germany, he sought a protective tariff, both for its value in revenue raising and as protection for its industries.

In waging his battle toward this end, the Iron Chancellor cited the example of the United States as a beneficiary of a protective system.

He directed attention to the fact, that after this Nation had fought the most expensive and devastating war of the century, it had thereafter launched forth in the greatest era of industrial growth and expansion of which the world had any record.

This great statesman gave as his deliberate judgment, the reason for this unprecedented prosperity was largely based upon its adopted policy of protection.

In urging the Germans to follow the American example, the Chancellor said in part:

"For the abstract teachings of science in this connection, I care not a straw. I base my opinions on experience, the experience of our own times."

"I see that protectionist countries are prospering, that free trade countries are retrograding and that great and powerful England, the mighty athlete, who, having hardened her sinews, stepped out into the open market and said, 'Who will fight me? I am ready for any and all'; even she is gradually returning toward protection, and will, in a few years, adopt it in order to keep for herself at least the English market."

I live in southeastern Ohio. A high tariff is father of the pottery industry, centered in this area and of special interest to Zanesville, Crooksville, Roseville, Cambridge, and Coshocton. Due almost entirely to lowering of the tariffs on ceramics, pottery after pottery has been closed during the past few years.

The potter is told to compete. He could if he had any control over wages, taxes and costs of production.

Is it not self-evident that if a Japanese potter, for instance, can obtain labor and production costs said to be one-seventh of the American market, that fair competition in world markets is impossible?

Is it any wonder that even Western Europe is seeking protection from such cost disparities and does not want to be made the dumping grounds for this sort of competition?

Supposing one were in a race, and one runner was given a start of halfway around the track, would the other have a ghost of a chance to win?

Give American industry some control over its production costs and it could undoubtedly compete with products in world markets. But, the American manufacturer is hamstrung on the go.

However, the farsighted men of vision running the Government at Washington have all the answers should the American manufacturer be forced to close and his employees thrown out of a job.

In such dire emergency, men so displaced and who have spent most of a lifetime at this particular work would be retained at some Government center.

The affected city would probably be placed in the distressed area and made eligible for relief. Should the Treasury at Washington run low through the infinite number of benevolences, saving the world through foreign aid and what have you, just borrow more money.

The debt ceiling has only been raised twice during recent months and, although bumping a $300 billion in the red, the ceiling can be given another hoist. Solutions such as

this, like those of most other grave questions confronting the Republic, currently pass as statesmanship at Washington.

Well, somehow we prefer the wisdom of Bismarck and other alltime great among the world statesmen, most of whom were protectionists and whose first interest was in the welfare of their own country.

WILBUR D. MATSON.

MCCONNELSVILLE, OHIO.

Decline of U.S. Prestige

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, there was one rather amazing statement in the President's state of the Union address; at least it was amazing to those of us who know Western Europe and South America.

The statement was that our prestige in the world was high.

How could such a thing be possible when this Nation has been humiliated and thwarted in Cuba, Laos, Berlin, Africa, and India? This is the most starry-eyed pronouncement yet to be made to the American people.

The following article by the eminent columnist, Constantine Brown, appearing in the Washington Star of January 18, gives a far truer picture. The great trouble with rank and power is that those who have them rarely hear the truth, and eventually they do not want to hear it when it is unpalatable:

DECLINE OF U.S. PRESTIGE

(By Constantine Brown)

ROME.—A European poll would show President Kennedy that our prestige has dropped many points since he visited the Continent last spring.

Until recently Washington's voice was the dominant factor in the free world. When, for instance, the late John Foster Dulles announced that this country might have to make an agonizing reappraisal of its policies toward France, the French politicians shivered. But that is in the past. Today the West Europeans, the strongest segment of the free world, still need us, but no more than we need them.

Conditions in the free world are changing. The proud British, once the determining influence in world affairs, are waiting with ill-disguised anxiety the verdict of the Common Market group for their admission to the club. Influential voices are being heard in America expressing the hope that some day we may become full partners in the European bloc. These voices represent the still subconscious fear that before the end of the century our present civilization may be faced with what General de Gaulle describes as the "tidal wave" of the Afro-Asians.

We reached the high point of popularity after President Kennedy's visit to Europe. He represented to all who met him something refreshing and possibly new in American politics. His domestic New Frontiers did not worry the European leaders who have taken that road for some time without rushing. But he was regarded as the most determined President the United States has had in many years. The consensus of Europe was that U.S. foreign policy was to be guided henceforth by a firm hand.

But this illusion was short lived. Our prestige dipped several points when the Communists caught us off base in the division of Berlin by a six-foot wall. Mr. Kennedy, the Europeans complained, talked strong and acted weak.

But it was our policy in the Congo which caused the American stock to take a dip from which it has not yet recovered. From the outset of the Katanga campaign westerners regarded the military pressure of the U.N. troops as unjustified for that body and contrary to the spirit of the Charter. The fact that the United States, the champion of the oppressed, agreed to organize an airlift to ferry troops and ammunition to the U.N. troops did not arouse as much resentment as the Washington policies toward the Katangans themselves.

Europe understands fully that colonialism has had its day and has become as extinct as dinosaurs. The intervention of the U.N. as a replacement for the Belgian authorities to maintain law and order was indorsed by everybody. But when the "blue helmets" became an oppressive force, bent on enforcing with arms what is called euphemistically at the United Nations the unity of the Congo, there was an outcry of anger all over free Europe as well as Britain.

The reports from reliable observers—newspaper correspondents, doctors, Red Cross representatives, etc.—concerning the outrages of the Asian and African contingents in the battle for Elisabethville created an unprecedented indignation against the "blue helmets" and their bosses in New York.

At this point the State Department chose to side with the propagandists who tried to excuse the actions of the U.N. troops by blaming the international mining company, the Union Miniere, for all the trouble in Katanga. Unsubstantiated accusations by responsible officials such as Assistant Secretary G. Mennen Williams and Carl T. Rowan were played up in the press of the NATO countries and caused wonderment. A highly respected publisher asked an American official in Rome whether it was not a strange coincidence that the same accusations had been printed a few weeks earlier in the Soviet propaganda publication, New Times, under the heading "Katanga Lobby."

I managed to obtain the article in question. It said among other things that "measures to strengthen the Tshombe position are being taken in the Western capitals. Most of them can be traced to the Kantanga lobby, a group of capitalists with important financial interests in Katanga."

The four-page article goes on denouncing Wall Street, Paris, London, Brussels, etc. "Will America," it continues, "at this critical juncture back up its vote for the Security Council resolution? Washington needs to make a gesture for the support of the U.N. forces.

Our policy in the Congo, our attitude that we must please at any price the newly created African republics and our weakness toward India's aggression against a NATO ally, all contribute to the lowering of America's prestige.

Case Against Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Case Against Castro" which appeared in the January 15 edition of the Hammond (Ind.) Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASE AGAINST CASTRO

Washington has not overstated its case against Cuba. Castro is a threat to the hemisphere. There is no doubt that he wants to export communism to Latin America. But Castro's pledge of communism, his declaration that Cuba is a Socialist state, failure to restore free elections, the continuing executions and suppression of liberties, have made Castroism less and less attractive to other Latin States.

Castro has built a strong regime which can maintain itself by force against internal revolution. But the same measures which perpetuate his declared Communist regime are those which repel the Latins once so attracted to him.

The Organization of American States, when it meets late this month to act on Cuba, can grease the skids for Castro if it has the will to do so.

The 50th Anniversary of Boston Wool Trade Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of President Richard I. Goodrich, at the annual meeting commemorating the 50th anniversary of the Boston Wool Trade Association on November 21, 1961:

ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT RICHARD I. GOODRICH AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE BOSTON WOOL TRADE ASSOCIATION, NOVEMBER 21, 1961

The Boston Wool Trade Association is celebrating its 50th anniversary this year, and my talk today is going somewhat beyond the scope of the usual report to the trade at this time. The reason is the wool industry is facing today what seem to be almost insurmountable problems, far beyond simple domestic situations. Problems of world trade are many and complex, and are compounded by numerous and diverse forces at work in the markets of the world.

With the European Common Market now in operation, six countries, comprising the heart of Western Europe, are united in a mutual trading pact. The objective is twofold: (1) the eventual elimination of all tariffs between these six countries, which is gradually being achieved; (2) the maintaining of tariff walls against the manufactured products of other countries. This area, with some 170 million people, is becoming a vital force in international trade, giving preference to its members' products. Great Britain, as well as the other members of the outer seven, is attempting to join the six countries of the European Common Market. If this is accomplished, it will mean some 260 million people, in 13 countries, will be bound together by economic ties, enjoying the gradual reduction of tariff barriers with the resultant free flow of goods in their area.

On the other hand, Japan is endeavoring in every possible way to increase her world trade, and with her modern, efficient machinery, her skilled and high-producing, low-

wage labor, is a threat to the domestic industry of any country.

In South America, a common market is also being organized to promote trade between member countries.

What does all this mean to our domestic wool industry, with the highest production costs of any country in the world? There is an economic philosophy now being developed and expounded in certain quarters which we believe extremely dangerous to the wool industry of the United States. This philosophy would have us lower our tariff barriers in the hope that members of the European Common Market and others will, in turn, lower their trade barriers to our goods. The fallacy of this philosophy is that if the countries of the European Common Market, the EFTA and Japan were to do away with their tariffs on woolens and worsteds and carpets manufactured in this country, we would hardly be able to export a single yard—while they would be flooding our market with low-cost wool products.

Protectionism in many places is now a dirty word, and protectionists are looked down in some quarters as were the isolationists a few years ago.

The theories expounded by spokesmen for the free trade program sound and read as though they were the panacea for all our industrial ills.

If we are going to compete in world markets against the manufactured products of countries made at low-wage levels, we must either subsidize industry and the American worker or reduce costs and wages in this country to a level where our products are competitive. This means a reduction in our standard of living, which is now the highest in the world, to the level of low-wage countries. The only other alternative is to maintain adequate, protective tariffs which reflect the disparity in wage levels between other countries and our own to keep out excessive imports from low-wage countries.

If the tariffs which are in force today, not only for wool products but for almost any other products manufactured in this country, are insufficient to keep out an ever-growing flood of manufactured products from the low-wage countries, I wonder how these exponents of a free trade theory expect our industry to survive deep cuts in our tariffs, and how they expect the highest wage scale country in the world to be able to develop large export markets, even though economic areas, such as the European Common Market, were to reduce or even eliminate the tariffs which now prevail against our exports. I submit the Russians have dedicated themselves to destroy us economically, and any deep across-the-board tariff reductions would be a long step in helping them reach their goal.

The objective of the European Common Market is to develop trade within the countries concerned and to keep out, as much as possible, the manufactured products from other areas. These industrialists are practical, hardheaded businessmen, with a definite self-interest in the development and growth of industry in their own countries. They have no hesitation in imposing any type of restriction against undesired imports, including tariffs, refusal of import licenses, restricting currency for import purposes and other means. They do not ask permission of other countries to do this, but take immediate unilateral action when desirable.

People, whether they be members of a small group, or a nation, respect and follow men of strength. The Communists lead through strength—and we, the leaders of the free world, must do likewise. We must continue our friendly relations with other nations, but we must realize the Communists are continually on the aggressive, and we must not be on the defensive. A person, or nation, who is continually on the defensive, eventually is going to get "clobbered." In our desire to "be all things to all people," we are being "bled white" by the weak peoples of the world, while the strong nations are becoming more aggressive and demanding a greater share of our markets.

It has been suggested that industries in the United States which are suffering from excessive imports from low-wage countries be aided by the Federal Government with quick writeoffs and subsidies. It is also recommended that the workers receive higher unemployment insurance and that they be retrained for other jobs. I ask the question, "Retrained for what?" A large packing company recently tried a retraining program on a small scale after one of its plants had been closed down—and it was an abject failure. People who have spent all their adult lives doing a certain kind of work, at middle age are not easily adaptable to retraining for other jobs. Even though jobs were available in some other community or State, they do not want to move from their homes. With a steady unemployment figure of nearly 7 percent, further unemployment would be disastrous to our economy.

I believe we are fighting for more than survival of an industry: I believe we are fighting for our economic way of life and our free enterprise system.

Are we not in danger of going down the road of socialism if we further dissipate our national resources and imperil our industries, with the resultant increased unemployment? This cannot occur if we believe in our system of free enterprise and the efficacy of the capitalistic system. Through Congress, we must insist that this system continue to function. It has made the United States great and made possible the highest standard of living in the world, and given dignity and freedom to the individual. Is not individual initiative more to be desired than bureaucratic direction?

President Kennedy, well aware of the crucial condition of the wool industry in the United States, issued last spring a seven-point program. In point No. 7 he invited the industry to seek relief from excessive imports by two methods: one through the OCDM (Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization) and the other through the escape clause. Meanwhile, the OCDM was stripped of a great number of its functions and was reformed into the Office of Emergency Planning. The President said that these two instruments were available to any industry which was suffering from excessive imports. He urged such an industry to present its case and each case would be decided on its merits. The woolen and worsted industry immediately sought relief through the OCDM. It sought to prove that excessive imports of woolens and worsteds have so impaired the productive capacity of the industry that the safety of the country is in jeopardy in case of national emergency. Previously, the OCDM had stated that in time of national emergency, the textile industry is second only to steel in importance. The industry has presented its case and is now awaiting a decision from the OEP.

It is strange that in a matter of national security and the safety and protection of our citizens in case of enemy attack, certain foreign countries have seen fit to present briefs to the OCDM in an endeavor to prove that imports have not impaired our productive capacity. To me, this is the height of absurdity—as what country seeking to increase her exports of woolen and worsteds to the United States would make any other claim than that imports were not impairing our productive capacity. It strikes me as presumptuous of Japan to take a leading role in endeavoring to prove that imports have not damaged our productive capacity. In the light of history, it would seem as though Japan would be most reluctant to inject her opinions in a matter of national security to the people of the United States.

Again acting on the President's seven-point program, the carpet industry sought relief from excessive imports through the escape clause. Several years ago they took action and lost their case 3 to 2. This year, the Tariff Commission voted 5 to 0 in favor of the carpet industry's plea, and recommended an increase in duties from 21 to 40 percent ad valorem, as against the former duty of 60 percent. If ever a case was decided on its merits and gained approval of the Tariff Commission without a dissenting vote, the carpet industry accomplished this. In making their decision, the members of the Tariff Commission must have felt they had adequate information to reach a decision, yet the President returned their recommendation for further information. This is to be given the President by December 2, and the entire wool industry in the United States is watching with a great deal of interest and concern what his decision will be.

While the President recommended to the industry that it seek relief through the escape clause, this has not been a very effective means for industry in the past. About 130 cases have been approved by the Tariff Commission, and only 13 have been confirmed by the President concerned.

If the two methods that the President recommended to the industry prove to be ineffective, what other means are open to the industry in its endeavor to survive?

The Congress of the United States is charged by the Constitution "to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises—to regulate commerce with foreign nations—to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers." The Congress of the United States, aware of the perilous condition of trade and industry in the United States, must take necessary action to maintain a strong domestic economy.

The entire wool industry, including woolgrowers, wool dealers, and brokers, wool manufacturers, apparel manufacturers, and labor unions, after living with the problems of the industry for a number of years, have reached one—and only one—solution as a cure for the ills of the industry brought on by excessive imports of fabrics and apparel from low-wage countries. This solution is: Country-by-country mandatory quantitative quotas and mandatory quantitative quotas by categories of fabrics and apparels. This has been proposed and reiterated by representatives of the various segments of the industry before congressional committees, various commissions, and department heads—and yet it is the one solution that has been denied the industry to curb excessive imports from low-wage countries.

Recently the cotton people have had their day in court. The woolen and worsted industry is about to have its turn, and the first meeting of the President's Wool Textile Advisory Committee, of which I have the honor of being a member, is to be held the latter part of this month.

We must maintain a strong and vigorous wool industry in the United States.

The reciprocal trade agreement is coming up for renewal next year, and it is for the American people to decide whether or not we will go further down the road in reducing tariffs and throwing open wider our doors for ever-increasing imports—or whether a realistic point of view, with the welfare of American industry and American labor, will be the paramount concern.

There is no questioning the sincerity and integrity of the men who are advocating ever freer trade policies, and undoubtedly they are convinced their plans of action are

the proper ones. Many seem to be doctrinaires of an international economic philosophy so ingrained that they are blind to other courses of action.

I sincerely hope that the recognition of the problems of the domestic wool industry which the President displayed in announcing his seven-point program for the relief of the domestic textile industry will be projected across the entire range of import problems of all the industries in the United States.

Self-interested nations will advocate only what is best for their own industrial aggrandizement, and we must display the same enlightened self-interest.

Based on personal discussions I have had with top officials of the executive branch of the Government and Members of the Senate and House, I am confident the President recognizes the essentiality of the domestic wool industry. I am sure he will not be stampeded into taking any action that will further injure our domestic industry, despite the growing pressure and propaganda of internationalist groups.

In Commemoration of the 138th Anniversary of the Birth of Gen. Thomas Jonathan "Stonewall" Jackson, January 21, 1824

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Sunday was the 138th anniversary of the birth of one of America's most illustrious sons—Gen. Thomas Jonathan Jackson. History records him as General "Stonewall" Jackson.

He was born January 21, 1824, in the western region of Virginia in what is now the city of Clarksburg, W. Va. He was the son of Jonathan Jackson, of Clarksburg, and Julia Beckworth Neale. His great-grandfather, John Jackson, the first of the line in America, by birth a Scotch-Irishman, came to our country in 1748 and located in Maryland and later in the western part of Virginia.

General Jackson was graduated from West Point where he won the respect and confidence of his fellow cadets and it was said of him at that time:

"Old Jack will at some future day command an army."

The prediction was fulfilled and his name is honored and revered in every land where patriotic heroism is recognized.

I shall not enumerate the historical events associated with the era in which he lived nor recall his brilliant accomplishments on the battlefield which gained him world acclaim as one of America's greatest military geniuses.

But my heart prompts me to affirm the sincere esteem and admiration for his character which has inspired me since my youth.

General Jackson died May 10, 1863, at the age of 39. His life ended sadly and strangely as a result of wounds inflicted during the Battle of Chancellorsville by his own troops through an unaccountable and tragic mistake.

Perhaps it is of paradoxical importance to try to envision the role he might have assumed in West Virginia's early formative years, if his life had been spared. Man is prone to speculate on "what might have happened."

West Virginia was admitted to the Union as the 35th State on June 20, 1863, approximately 1 month after General Jackson's death.

Whatever part he might have performed in official life we know that his personal contribution would have included: unselfish dedication to the common good; a firm resolve and consciousness of duty; creed matched with deed, and underlining these qualities—invincible faith with absolute reliance in God.

His own words were revelatory:

> We must think of the living and those who are to come after us and see that by God's blessing, we transmit to them the freedom we have ourselves inherited.

It has been said of him:

> Stonewall Jackson was a Christian of the highest type. With him, religion was not speech, nor doctrine, nor mystic faith, nor martyr sacrifice but, rather and gloriously, love supreme to God and service unselfish to man. His was a remarkable illustration of the power that results from the union of lofty human attributes and unfailing religious faith—the prowess of the soldier and the piety of the Christian * * *.

And so it is with satisfaction that I join with many others in expressing sincere tribute to the memory of Stonewall Jackson. It is testimony to the measure of the man that both the sovereign States of Virginia and West Virginia claim him as a son.

History may do justice to him and his fame is, in degree, perpetuated in the National Hall of Fame where his tablet is inscribed with this maxim of his life:

> You may be whatever you resolve to be. Never take counsel of your fears.

But there is a monument which bears his name indelibly—and that is found in the hearts of his countrymen.

Two Thousand Five Hundred and Ninety-four Residents of the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania Participate in Post Card Survey of Public Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, a recent post card survey of public opinion was conducted in my congressional district in Pennsylvania with the result that from 6,000 questionnaires mailed to the 3-county area, 2,594 persons responded by answering the 12 questions asked in the annual poll. The number of replies received represent a response from 43.2 percent of those polled. The result also discloses that the opinions voiced represent a good cross section of the residents of the Blair-Centre-Clearfield area.

The question receiving the greatest number of favorable replies was in response to the question, "Do you favor U.S. insistence of an adequate inspection system before disarming?" "Yes" answers totaled 2,548, while 46 negative replies were recorded, for an average of 98.2 percent "yes" and 1.8 percent "no."

The tabulation of the 12 questions representing the views of 2,594 persons in Blair, Centre and Clearfield Counties follows:

	Percent	
	Yes	No
1. Do you favor the resumption of nuclear testing by the United States?	81.2	18.8
2. Should the United States go to war to prevent being forced out of Berlin?	76.7	23.3
3. Should the United States try to place a man in space ahead of the Russians, regardless of the cost?	14.9	85.1
4. Do you favor recognition of Red China?	6.4	93.6
5. Do you favor U.S. insistence of an adequate inspection system before disarming?	98.2	1.8
6. Do you favor revising reciprocal trade agreements to decrease the importation of foreign products?	72.6	27.4
7. Do you favor providing medical and hospital care to recipients of social security benefits and paying the cost by increasing payroll taxes?	33.3	66.7
8. Do you favor Federal aid to education?	31.7	68.3
9. Do you favor giving the President the right to veto or accept specific items in an appropriation bill instead of the present requirement that he accept all or nothing?	48.2	51.8
10. Do you believe that Government controls over agriculture should be eliminated?	83.2	16.8
11. Do you favor building the Interstate Highway System on a "pay-as-you-go" basis even if it requires higher taxes?	52.6	47.4
12. Do you favor approval of a GI educational benefits program for peacetime veterans?	37.4	62.6

Mr. Speaker, the result of the public opinion poll has given me the benefit of the views of persons in various walks of life. I am grateful to all those who took the time to record their opinion and to return the questionnaire to me.

Communist Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House should have the benefit of an excellent editorial in the November issue of the St. Anthony Messenger—the national Catholic family magazine published in my district.

The editorial discusses the flood of Communist propaganda coming into this country from abroad through the U.S. mails.

Last year the House passed H.R. 5751. This legislation, which was recommended by the House Committee on Un-American Activities after lengthy and exhaustive hearings on this matter, would materially assist in neutralizing the effect of this Communist propaganda coming in through the mails. This bill is now in the Senate but from all appearances will lie there.

The editorial from the St. Anthony Messenger follows:

POST OFFICE IN THE RED

On a number of occasions during the past year, we have heard about the growing annual deficits of the Post Office. We were told that these deficits incurred by the Post Office totaled $7.5 billion in 14 years. By itself, this sounds like a very sizable debt. Yet, on the other hand, it seems like peanuts when compared to the almost $300 billion debt that the Federal Government expects to reach by the end of this fiscal year. Nevertheless, it was proposed that the Post Office Department be made to pay its way. The means suggested was the usual one—an increase in postal rates. Bills to this effect were introduced into both the Senate and the House; but, to the displeasure of some, the bills had a difficult time getting out of committee.

However, in the discussions that these bills provoked, we seldom heard any mention of one way in which the Post Office could economize without detriment to any American citizen. That way would be the refusal on the part of the Post Office to deliver Communist propaganda free of charge. This, of course, would not eradicate the debt, but it would certainly ease the burden.

No one knows the exact amount of Communist magazines, papers, and other publications that come to this country. The United States has 40 different ports of entry, and it is doubtful that anyone has checked them all. Yet, there are some figures for bulk mail available. These figures do not include first-class mail. A spot check of the New Orleans Post Office indicated that, in 1959, 300,000 packages of Communist propaganda were delivered, and these figures include only those packages that were being sent to U.S. schools and colleges. During 1955, the Iron Curtain countries sent 2,565,000 packages of Red propaganda to the United States. By 1959, this number was stepped up to 4,897,765 packages. Practically every Iron Curtain ship that touches an American port unloads Red "educational literature." Until April of this year, such propaganda, mailed in bulk, was not delivered by the Post Office unless by addressee's request. This ruling was changed in April.

Under international postage agreements, the country of origin collects the postage for all mail. The foreign country collects the postage for the mail coming to us; we, in turn, collect the postage for the mail going to the foreign country. With the free countries of the world, such reciprocity is quite satisfactory. The amount of mail going each way is pretty well in balance. With the Soviets, however, this reciprocity becomes a farce. They send tons and tons of material to this country, whereas they refuse to deliver even first-class letters without opening and censoring them. Furthermore, they also refuse to deliver any American publications to the Russian people, with perhaps the exception of their own Communist papers printed in this country. We do not know of any other country in the free world that permits Moscow to have its propaganda delivered at the expense of its own taxpayers.

Nor should we forget that propaganda is one of the chief weapons of communism. While Khrushchev may brag about his missiles and his bombs, he still depends upon propaganda for his intended conquest of the world. In each of the countries that have succumbed to the Communist regime, the takeover was managed with as little use of military weapons as possible. The softening-up process which must always precede the takeover has invariably been accomplished by the advance column—the propagandists. This propaganda machine is so important to the Red cause that the Communists employ some 500,000 people to operate it, and spend approximately $2 billion a year. The publications that our Post Office delivers for them are printed on expensive paper, written in good English, illustrated with choice photographs and artwork, and embellished with a wide use of color. They do a subtle, yet effective, job of selling the Red line. They must be given most of the credit for producing on our campuses the agitation in support of unilateral disarmament, the recognition of Red China, the defense of Castro, the abandonment of nuclear testing, the objection to loyalty oaths and the HUAC.

It is disconcerting to note in this connection that when a committee from the religious press in America (Catholic, Protestant, Jewish) approached the Postmaster General, Edward Day, on May 9, to request a reserved status for the religious press, the Postmaster General adamantly refused. The request was made in connection with the proposed increase in postal rates, since a number of the religious papers would be faced with extinction if they are required to pay higher postage rates. Their limited budgets could not stand this increase. Postmaster Day was dead set against any exemption for the religious press from the proposed rates. Yet, this same Postmaster General is willing to deliver all the Communist propaganda that comes into the country, free of charge. All of which makes us wonder—on which side are we?

Ukrainian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, we salute the courageous aspirations of Ukrainians to free their native land from the scourge of tyranny. Although the Communists have ruthlessly suppressed the independence of the Ukraine, we know that they can never extinguish the light of freedom that burns in the heart of every Ukrainian nationalist.

Commemoration of a day of independence for a nation that is now under the yoke of totalitarian rule brings sadness rather than joy. But this is a day for remembering, for encouragement, and for resolution. We are reminded that freedom is everywhere threatened and that to protect our freedoms we must pursue with vigor policies that will extend the frontiers of freedom to the oppressed.

We must encourage those who would otherwise despair. We have not forgotten the brave people of the Ukraine. We must never let them think that we have forgotten, or that we have accepted their present unhappy fate as permanent. The pursuit of freedom is a common goal; in this we are united.

So let us resolve to make every day an independence day. Let not a day go by when we do not issue a declaration of independence for the enslaved peoples of the Communist world. Today we say to the people of the Ukraine: "We are with you in spirit; do not despair; the Communists cannot win a contest against the human spirit."

Hometown Boys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. MONRONEY. Madam President, an interesting new project to keep hometown newspapers advised of the activities of their native sons on duty with the Air Force is centered in my home State, following up similar projects begun earlier by the Army and the Navy. I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD a news story describing the 1,000-stories-a-day operation from the Army, Navy, Air Force Journal of December 2, 1961.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIR FORCE LAUNCHES "LOCAL YOKEL" SERVICE; FOLLOWS ARMY AND NAVY

AIR FORCE HOMETOWN NEWS CENTER, TINKER AIR FORCE BASE, OKLA.—The Air Force has launched an all-out drive to round up its "local yokels." Potentially, there are about 860,000 of them—131,700 officers and 728,1000 enlisted men and women.

When they are cornered, their "mugshots" will be plastered in newspapers from coast to coast. The folks back home will know exactly what they've been doing.

But, if you are one of the 860,000, don't be alarmed. The resultant publicity will be less ominous than it sounds. It should, in fact, be a morale booster.

In newspaper parlance, a local yokel yarn is a story about a former local resident who has moved on to another locale, but whose activities continue to interest the friends and relatives he left behind. Far from being a yokel, the subject of the story often is a distinguished or highly regarded native son.

For many years, the Army and Navy have operated centralized command posts, which are assigned the task of keeping hometown newspapers supplied with stories about soldiers, sailors, and marines. Now, the Air Force has opened a similar shop in Oklahoma.

ONE THOUSAND STORIES DAILY

Operational only 2 months, the Air Force Home Town News Center at Tinker already is sending out almost 1,000 stories a day about the activities of Air Force officers and men. They go to nearly 9,000 newspapers—everything from big metropolitan dailies to small country weeklies—from Portland, Oreg., to Portland, Maine. And the stories they tell are about airmen in every spot around the globe.

When a member of the Air Force graduates from a special school, is promoted, decorated, takes part in some unusual operation, or is assigned to a new base or an important new job, the folks back home know about it immediately.

In the past, such news releases were the responsibility of unit information officers. But the IO's operated under a severe handicap. Their small staffs often were unable to handle large numbers of releases, and it was impossible to know which newspapers in a given area might be likely to use a local yokel story if they received one.

Also, there was duplication of effort. An IO in New York might send out a release on a sergeant being reassigned to Arizona, and the Arizona IO might send out a similar release when the man actually reported for his new assignment. Thus, editors got the story twice, and mailing costs were doubled.

Establishment of the center provided in a sense, a larger staff for all Air Force information offices by relieving field IO's of responsibility for most routine news stories and giving them more time to devote to news releases requiring special or detailed handling. It also increased hometown news coverage, eliminaed duplication of effort, and reduced mailing costs.

Activated under Col. Owen Clark in November 1960 as an arm of the office of the Director of Air Force Information, the center became operational under Col. Robert B. Good on October 1, 1961.

The long delay in getting off the ground was a necessary one. Before the center could open for business, it was essential to pull together a qualified staff, hire and train a number of civilian employees, and find temporary quarters in which to operate.

SURVEY THOUSANDS OF PAPERS

Then began an involved survey of 11,830 newspapers to discover how many papers actually wanted hometown releases, what cities and towns the newspapers were distributed in, and what, if any, special requirements they had for photographs.

Back came more than 8,800 replies to be carefully cross indexed into files which would provide a quick and efficient system for getting out the news stories when operations actually got underway. About 10 months were required to work up the material from the survey.

The end result is coverage far superior to that available under the old system.

A hypothetical example:

An IO sending out a news release under the old method about the promotion of a sergeant whose hometown was Endsville, Mo., probably would send the release only to the Endsville Gazette. The center's files may show, however, that Endsville citizens read not only the Gazette, but the Kansas City Star, the St. Louis Post Dispatch, the Endsville County Courier and the Springfield Times. So, center releases go to all five papers, provided they have asked for the service. In the first month of operation, the center sent out 30,798 releases concerning the activities of 9,192 officers and airmen. This means that each story, on the average, went to more than three newspapers.

USE ASSEMBLY LINE TECHNIQUE

The enormous output is possible because of the careful groundwork laid by the center, and the assembly line precision with which the news stories are handled.

Here is the way the center operates:

Whenever an officer or airman at any of the 280 Air Force installations around the world is involved in anything worthy of mention in his hometown paper, he is asked to fill out a news release form (under the supervision, if possible, of unit information personnel). The form lists such essential information as the man's name, rank, unit, assignment, hometown, the names and addresses of his family, his school and/or college, and a brief description of the basic news items—promotion, assignment, decoration, etc.

The form is then mailed to the center where it is received and processed along with thousands of others. As it travels along the assembly line it is checked for accuracy (it is returned to the man's unit if it poses any doubts), marked with an uncomplicated designator to indicate the newspapers to which it should be mailed and whether a photograph is desired, marked again for one of several basic formats in which the news story is written, and then turned over to a battery of civilian writer-typists trained by center personnel to write the final release.

The release itself is typed on duplimat paper and, in turn, goes to the reproduction room where machines crank out the necessary number of copies on inexpensive newsprint. The story is rechecked for accuracy and then goes to the mailroom where the copies are sorted into State, city, and newspaper stacks.

Stories are mailed only once each day, thereby eliminating the need for more than one envelope for each newspaper even though a single paper may receive several releases.

Duplication is avoided by the simple expedient of requiring field information offices to furnish news about arrivals only, and not about departures.

Colonel Good told a Journal reporter during a tour of the center that the new organization provides the Air Force with a better means of recognizing the individual. He noted that the big headline news story takes care of itself, but the people involved in making the operation a success, who work under difficult and dangerous conditions to make a project go are not always so easily recognized.

"The center," he said, "will provide the individual with the recognition he deserves, and where he deserves it—in his hometown."

Colonel Good took charge of the center last June, reporting from the Air Force Academy where he had been director of information. His staff includes many topflight Air Force information specialists.

Although the center began operations in temporary quarters at Tinker, it recently has moved into its own, newly converted building, and now has about half of its eventual complement of 45 military and 23 civilians, together with most of its equipment and supplies.

The photography lab still has no picture-making capacity, although it expects to begin such work either late this month or early in January. It is busy, however, turning out prints or photomats of photographs sent in with the newsstory forms and these, in turn, go out with the press releases to newspapers which have requested them.

RADIO SURVEY NEXT

At present, the center is preparing to send out a radio survey similar to the earlier newspaper survey. Eventually, radio and TV stations will be provided with tape-recorded and filmed interviews.

With its initial newspaper releases, the center enclosed a letter asking editors to comment on the newsstories and suggest improvements. The replies that came back were overwhelmingly favorable. A few editors suggested changes, some of which have since been incorporated in the release procedures.

The comments also underscored the wisdom of the center's decision to eliminate all Air Force propaganda from the releases, thus keeping them brief and focused on the individual. Many editors applauded this step. The comment of a South Carolina newspaper was typical: "Your brevity * * * rates your release above competing branches of the Armed Forces which tend to be verbose."

Colonel Good says the Air Force commands are enthusiastic about the center and, as information about the center's activities continues to spread, he thinks the enthusiasm and support will grow.

CENTER STAFF

Colonel Good's staff includes Maj. Floyd W. Lynch, chief, administration division; Capt. Warren J. Papin, chief, editorial/pictorial division; S.M. Sgt. Arthur G. Kircher, information superintendent and noncommissioned officer in charge, editorial/pictorial division, and seven other noncommissioned officers who are tops in the information field: M. Sgt. Cleddie V. Shelburne, managing editor; T. Sgt. Roy E. Dodson, news editor; T. Sgt. Ulysse Frederick, Jr., noncommissioned officer in charge, administration division; T. Sgt. Charlotte D. Mansfield, noncommissioned officer in charge, pictorial branch; T. Sgt. Arthur R. Ponder, noncommissioned officer in charge, radio/TV branch; Sgt. Herbert G. Patrick, noncommissioned officer in charge, media/survey branch; S. Sgt. David W. Snyder, noncommissioned officer in charge, proofreader section.

Also, S. Sgts. William E. Hart, Haliday H. Hogan, Steve Kavula, Morgan C. Padgett, Jr., Morton M. Pasco, and Frank Sedlacek, Jr.; A1c. John A. DeFusco, Jere S. Hambleton, James C. Kopchick, Doretha Lucas, Bernard A. Mehalchick, Lowell A. Pederson, Bobby R. Pittard, John B. Roberts, James H. Stockton, Robert L. Trokey, Richard Vasquez; and A2c. Carol S. Cavanaugh and William G. Hollars.

A Tribute to Vernon G. Wahlberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in inserting herewith the reprint of John Dreiske's column which appeared in the Sun Times on Sunday, December 24. It pays deserved and appropriate tribute to my friend and neighbor, Vernon Wahlberg, legislative representative of the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce.

It would be redundant for me to reiterate the thoughts of Mr. Dreiske. Suffice it is to say that I share his thoughts, as I am sure does everyone who has had the pleasure of knowing and associating with Mr. Wahlberg.

The editorial follows:

A TRIBUTE TO VERNON G. WAHLBERG

(By John Dreiske)

This year, we abandon our custom of wishing Merry Christmas to many in the column and, instead, will single out of the pack an old friend who has had a bit of trouble.

On this day before Christmas, we think of Vernon Wahlberg. We wish him the merriest holidays and, above all, a change of luck.

As legislative representative at Springfield for the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce, Vernon won a place in the governmental and political life of this State that the stroke he suffered recently can in no way diminish.

We grieve that this happenstance disqualifies him for continuance of perhaps the most demanding lobbying job in the State of Illinois. But we are cheered by information

that his friends are going to try to see to it that he can return to Springfield and apply his wealth of experience and outgoing desire to the same theater of operations.

In the many years this writer has spent covering politics, I have seen much of selfishness and self-serving striving.

In no single instance, have I witnessed such unselfishness as has become Wahlberg's hallmark. He is a lobbyist who raises that onetime somewhat degarding title to a firm level of prestige and honor.

Wahlberg is one of those sincere legislative representatives who stands for what is right. He is a storehouse of information ready to divulge any or all of his valuable knowledge for any good purpose. Wahlberg has been responsible for much good, sound, mistake-proof statutory writing because of his documented advice.

His work in committees, where the real hard labor in legislating is done, adds up to one of the most notable citizen contributions made by anyone, be he legislator, lobbyist, or State officer.

There is little doubt that this man deserves a heartfelt Merry Christmas not only from his employers who now must let him go but from the citizens of the State of Illinois from the highest to the lowest economic level.

It would be a happy new year, indeed, for this State and its business community or any other community that has vital interest in legislation considered by the general assembly if Wahlberg received another assignment to serve as he has served.

If I were to attempt to draw a list of a half-dozen of the thousands who influence legislation at Springfield who were most effective for the public good, Vernon Wahlberg would be on that list.

Perhaps his recent physical misfortune has somewhat slowed his pace—but, we'll wager, not much. A man with as much constructive know-how as there is in Wahlberg doesn't have to move fast. He just has to be there.

And it is with the sincere hope that he is there before and when the general assembly convenes for its next regular session in 1963. We hope that now, tomorrow, he can be given the responsibility of drafting a legislative program.

So Merry Christmas, Vernon—and we're going to call you Christmas Day at Gunder-4-2855 to repeat the greeting in person.

New Frontiers Become Old

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "New Frontiers Become Old" which appeared in the January 16, 1962, edition of the Lafayette (Ind.) Journal-Courier.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW FRONTIERS BECOME OLD

President Kennedy appeared and sounded confident and sure of himself and the cause of the free world as he delivered his state of the Union message before Congress.

Mr. Kennedy is the president of us all and all must wish him well, as we do. Yet there is more than a little suspicion, upon meditation, that the President approached complex domestic and international problems a little too glibly. Solutions sounded a bit too easy. Consistency appeared to be lacking. The President called for commonsense yet some of his proposals raise the question whether he himself does not fall short here on some points, giving cause for no little alarm. His striving for confidence may well have discouraged it on the part of citizens generally.

The President would extend and broaden welfarism. Government would become still bigger, which means shrinking of individual freedom. Spending would be increased. The President demanded progress which would make the Nation ready to seize the burden and glory of freedom. Such flowery rhetoric is strongly appealing. But in the next breath he asked unparalleled powers for himself and a vast program, details of which can as yet only be guessed.

On the credit side, the President provided reason for assurance. He pitched U.S. foreign policy to the goal of a peaceful world of free and independent peoples. His foreign policy proposals were keyed to the theory that prosperity must be maintained at home to counter successfully the constant threat posed by Communists. As to Berlin, he said, "we are prepared to talk when appropriate, and to fight, if necessary." He proposed to strengthen the Nation's defenses. The state, he maintained, must be the servant of citizens and not their master. Government policies would be determined by the public interest. He would build a strong America. And so on—worthy, praiseworthy and commendable goals.

But some of the goals and the method of achieving many of them are bound to stir up bitter controversy. It had been widely supposed that the President might tone down his new legislative program in view of rising conservative sentiment over the Nation, as he himself had indicated. But there was no toning down. The President requested an extensive and expensive domestic package, in the fields of health, education, agriculture, civil rights, taxes, and others. Some were repeated, after failure or inaction in Congress last year. Other programs were added. Crucial decisions were demanded quickly, which is not likely to happen.

The President requested weapons to fight inflation but at the same time proposed spending programs which must work to promote the same inflation. He paid lip service to a balanced budget, but suggested many lavish new spending programs. He would cut taxes, yet spend more and at the same time balance the budget and contain inflation.

While contending that Government should serve the people, he asked increased authority for the executive branch, in a number of fields, from taxes to tariffs.

The President covered the waterfront, offering to combat, cure, and alleviate troubles which confront the people, from polio, as it endangers children to illness for the aged.

Claims were made for notable gains during his first year in office, in varied fields. Obviously he sought to take credit for them. Yet much of his initial legislative program was rejected or not even introduced (as in civil rights), and little of anything that was done has been on the books long enough to produce positive results.

If the United Nations is imperfect, the President held that little more could be expected in an imperfect world. In some other respects, as in this, his arguments did not always seem realistic or sound.

While seeking to give assurances on the Nation's strength, and in promising to increase it, the President never once confessed that the weakness he charged during the campaign did not exist.

The President's erstwhile New Frontier has become an Old Frontier, it proves. Little if anything has been changed.

The anticipated display of concern for national unity did not materialize.

Despite the demands of the cold war, there is no indication of any contraction of domestic programs. Rather, an expansion is asked. No offsetting economies are proposed for increased defense spending.

The President's claims of progress in many fields must be discounted. Performance has not matched words. Is this to be true again? In many respects it must be hoped that this will happen.

There is a very real limit to the Nation's resources. There is a limit to the extent the people should be pampered. Projected benefits may well turn out to be exceedingly harmful. Of necessity there is a real difference of opinion as to what constitutes "public interest."

The changing trend in national thought places considerable doubt about the enactment of much of the President's program. Thinking seems to be away from much he suggests rather than for more of it.

Americans will keep in mind that the Congress is strongly Democratic in both Chambers. Responsibility rests squarely with Democrats, who control the White House as well as Congress. There is comfort in the knowledge that a conservative coalition, apparently growing stronger with each passing day, will serve as a strong and effective brake in Washington, supporting what is sound and constructive while opposing measures which threaten national security and stability and world peace.

The Late Honorable John J. Riley

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, those who established our cherished liberty and our Government have long been gone from the scene of their labors. The great trust has descended to us through countless hands. Some of these hands—Members of this House and this generation's keepers of the trust—are almost daily dropping from among us.

One of those who carried his share of this burden stanchly and well was my good friend, the late House Member, JOHN J. RILEY, from South Carolina's Second District. On January 2, at the age of 66, he was fatally stricken by a heart attack.

As longevity is reckoned today, JOHN RILEY should have been with us for many more productive years. But who can tell when the sands of time shall run out for any man? It is hard for his family, friends, and colleagues to accept the fact of JOHN RILEY's passing. But I think JOHN would like us to consider these words of Plutarch in our remembrance here today:

The measure of a man's life is the well spending of it, and not the length.

I know that JOHN RILEY subscribed to this philosophy, for he lived it fully in the span of his allotted years.

JOHN RILEY served eight terms in Congress. He was first elected to the 79th Congress in 1945 to succeed the late H. P. Fulmer. He was a conservative in the best tradition of southern Democrats. He wanted a strong country which will endure. He wanted a balanced budget. He wanted a nation which will lead wisely and well. He wanted to contribute to the making of these and he did so in full measure.

JOHN RILEY possessed a full measure of humility, described by Tennyson as "the highest virtue, mother of them all." He brought to this House a forthright spirit and what Virgil called "the noblest motive * * * the public good." As a teacher in the public schools of Orangeburg, S.C., and at Clemson College, he epitomized the criterion of a scholar's utility described by Coleridge as "the number and value of the truths he has circulated, and the minds he has awakened." The deliberations of this House and the committees on which he served have often benefited from his judicious and scholarly contributions. No wide-eyed dreamer was he. His experience and success in real estate and the building and loan business gave him a knowledgeable and practical approach to this Nation's economic and social problems. His dedication and espousal of an adequate military posture for this country was forged in the crucible of World War I in which he served in the U.S. Navy.

We shall miss JOHN RILEY's loyal friendship, his wise counsel, his many personal kindnesses, his clear vision and vigorous support of the great institutions, interests, and traditions of America. I shall mourn this good man, for I was close to him and I knew him for the sterling qualities that he possessed. He was sound. He was strong. He was good for the Nation. I share the grief which is felt in overwhelming measure by his widow and family.

Threatened Airline Strike Could Be Disastrous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, fortunately—at least for the time being—a disastrous strike affecting the scheduled airline industry has been averted. How long this truce—albeit an involuntary one—can prevail appears to be the responsibility of the Air Line Pilots Association.

As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, a Presidential Commission was duly appointed to arbitrate disagreements involving Pan American World Airways and Trans World Airlines over the problem of crowding the cockpit; in other words, the acceptance by the pilots' union of another man up forward who didn't happen to belong to its organization.

U.S.-flag carriers operating overseas have enough troubles combating their foreign competitiors—the ratio is something like 15 to 2 across the North Atlantic—without being forced to face disharmony at home. The carriers are not at fault; this is a so-called jurisdictional problem, involving differences between the ALPA and the FEIA.

The airlines and the FEIA are in agreement in principle. The ALPA has found the conclusions of a Presidential factfinding board to be contrary to its featherbedding designs.

Mr. Speaker, a gentleman more accomplished than myself in matters of international air operations has written a most commendable article on the implications of a strike affecting our international air carriers. While it is true that the strike D-day—January 9—has passed without incident, I commend to this body a most important study of the whole problem written for the Cincinnati Enquirer by its distinguished foreign news analyst, Mr. William H. Hessler. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hessler's searching article be printed in the RECORD.

THREATENED AIRLINE STRIKE COULD BE DISASTROUS

(By William H. Hessler)

A dozen U.S. airlines operate into foreign countries, mainly into Latin America and Canada. Three of them—Pan American, TWA, and Northwest, have services to Europe, Africa, Asia, and other places. These U.S.-flag airlines in oversea service are valuable as dollar earners, especially in a period when the United States is short of exports and is losing gold reserves.

They—and a few major domestic lines, too—are valuable also as a backup for the U.S. Air Force and Navy, since hundreds of their big, fast, long-range jets are specially equipped for logistic operations for the military and are always on call, with aircrews, ground crews, and valuable operating and repair installations throughout the world.

Without this ready reserve, the U.S. Government would have to maintain a much larger transport fleet, at great expense to the taxpayers. Yet the airlines, as long as they prosper or even break even, operate without any subsidy.

In oversea operations, the competition is intense and becoming more so. The U.S.-flag lines must meet the competition of government-owned or subsidized foreign-flag lines. The better foreign-line carriers pay wages only half what U.S. lines pay. The lesser ones pay only one-third.

In these conditions, the strike threatened by the airline pilots, with a January 9 deadline, poses a grave danger for the country. If it comes, it will be a pointless and needless strike, because it turns very largely on whether the third man in a jet cockpit with two pilots should be (1) another pilot or (2) a flight engineer with a pilot's main qualifications and training.

So it's a jurisdictional dispute between two elegant labor unions—the Airline Pilots Association and the Flight Engineers International Association. The case ought to be settled. First, the regulations of the Federal Aviation Agency specifically do not require the third pilot for safety. Second, the issue was explored by a Presidential Commission headed by Prof. Nathan P. Feinsinger, which on October 17 recommended a reasonable (and fairly complicated) plan for settlement.

This plan was accepted by the four major airlines then involved. It was endorsed by President Kennedy as "fair and equitable" and as "an honorable way to a peaceful settlement of a difficult union dispute which has plagued the airline industry for years." Two Presidential emergency boards endorsed the Feinsinger plan. The flight engineers' union also accepted. Only the pilots are holding out—and waiting out the 30-day cooling-off period imposed by the Government.

Pan American is the largest of U.S. airlines in oversea service, and the only large one engaged solely on foreign routes. It also is the one directly involved in the strike threat with the January 9 date on it. Some figures on Pan Am's dispute therefore will illustrate the much larger problem.

Pan Am has 23,000 employees spread through 80 countries. Of these, 1,370 are pilots—6 percent of employees. But they draw an average of $18,000 a year—18 percent of Pan Am's payroll—for an average of 54 hours a month of cockpit time. About 100 of Pan Am's pilots drew pay of more than $30,000 each in 1960. These are the cream of the elite of U.S. organized labor.

The demand for third pilots, if one is to judge by the Federal Aviation Agency's policy, is featherbedding—requiring the employment of men not needed for safe and efficient operation of the aircraft. In addition to this demand, the pilots also are asking increases in wages and reduction of working hours.

Pan Am estimates that the annual cost of the whole package—third pilots, higher wages, and additional pilots to make up for shorter work hours—would more than double the present pilot payroll of $27 million a year.

Except for some thousands of persons lucky enough to own Pan American stock, the profitability of the company is of no great moment in itself. But the whole country has a stake in this dispute, all the same, because the country needs a healthy airline industry and especially a strong overseas airline system under the U.S. flag. It needs this for commercial and military reasons alike. It also needs the oversea earnings of these airlines in worldwide routes to generate foreign exchange and so to help meet the long-term threat to the dollar.

Last year U.S. residents were spending nearly $200 million more for air transport with foreign-flag carriers than foreign nationals were spending with U.S.-flag airlines. That imbalance will be much worse if the competitive position of our oversea airlines is impaired. And it obviously will be seriously impaired (1) if the strike takes place January 9, or (2) if the strike is averted by meeting the air pilots' demands.

Domestic airlines generally are in trouble. But the U.S. Government has the means of adopting correctives, because it can reduce excessive competition on profitable lines, or change fares and freight rates, or do various other things. But our oversea airlines are bucking ever greater foreign competition—over which the United States has little or no control.

The foreign competition is not only from more foreign carriers and some rate-cutting, but also in the form of consortiums and pooling arrangements among them.

On the relatively high-density North Atlantic routes, U.S.-flag carriers moved 59.5 percent of all passengers a decade ago. Today the comparable figure is 39.9 percent. The U.S. carriers' share is going to drop further—much further—if they are priced out of the market by a doubling of their pilot payrolls.

A strike would be costly, no matter what the outcome. And some of the traffic it would divert to foreign-flag carriers could never be recovered—given the intensely competitive nature of the industry. Pan Am's 23,000 employees of course would pay a substantial penalty also, since most would be laid off for the duration of a strike.

A lot has been spoken and written in the last year or so about the adverse position to which the United States has fallen in world competition. Many sectors of our industrial plant are old and inefficient, compared to the newly built plants of Western Europe and Japan. By allowing wage rates and other production costs to soar with the inflationary trend, we have priced ourselves out of one market after another.

The European Common Market, although welcome for political and strategic reasons, is a formidable challenge. It may replace the United States as the dominating factor in the world economy.

The problem of the U.S. oversea airlines is only one segment of this larger problem. But it is crucial, for it is a unique industry. It is unique because the U.S. carriers, without subsidy, paying two to three times higher wages than foreign carriers, have managed to keep their heads above water by good, progressive management, against the rising competition of many subsidized foreign carriers.

There is no way we can protect our U.S. oversea carriers from foreign competition, as tariffs can protect many internal industries. But we at least can pursue policies that do not add to the handicaps of these airlines. Failing in this, we inevitably will be driven to the costly subsidy program we have employed for many years to keep a U.S. merchant marine in existence—because we cannot, as a matter of national security, do without a merchant fleet of the air.

Cold War Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today we are engaged in a life-and-death struggle against communism. The cold war wages on many fronts: military, economic, political, and ideological.

Historically, the United States has not engaged in large-scale efforts to export its political and economic philosophy. As a nation, we have, rather, respected for others what we will fight to preserve for ourselves: that is, the right of self determination in the formation of national programs and policies.

The global effort of communism to export its ideology and subvert the world, however, has required a change in U.S. policy. In effect, we are now attempting to encourage nations to join together in establishing international machinery for (a) combating the outspreading of communism (b) peacefully settling differences among nations, and (c) generally promoting peace and progress. As yet, however, we have not—in my judgment—developed the nonmilitary counteroffensives necessary to bring about an early defeat of the communistic ideology.

For these reasons, I have previously recommended: first the establishment of a "Citizens Council for Advocacy of Freedom" to more effectively spread the word of the ideas and ideals of freedom; or second create an Ideological Warfare Agency—to mobilize effort—on both home and international fronts—to better coordinate and more effectively execute ideological warfare to speed the ultimate triumph of freedom over communism.

I was particularly interested, therefore, to review in the Torch magazine published by the Milwaukee Advertising Club a thought provoking article on the need for—and activities of—the Cold War Council. Delineating the goals and actions of the Council, the article reflects constructively upon the great need for greater citizen—as well as governmental—efforts to win the Cold War. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COLD WAR COUNCIL: NEW CHALLENGE AND OPPORTUNITY FOR MILWAUKEE CITIZENS IN ADVERTISING

(By Henry Mayers)

WHAT DOES THE COLD WAR COUNCIL DO?

The following is excerpted from the council's excellent campaign literature which is available in the form of newspaper, broadcast, direct mail and outdoor poster publicity. See end of article.

The Cold War Council is a nonpolitical organization of liberals and conservatives who submerge their political differences and unite in eternal hostility against all forms of tyranny over the mind of man.

Both Democrats and Republicans have made grave misjudgments in the past in the face of the Soviet challenge. But the most serious mistake an American can make today is to impugn the motives of other good Americans who may have blundered in their fight against communism.

The Cold War Council is not a formal organization with membership cards, dues and regular meetings. It is a group of dedicated citizens, operating through a number of committees. Some of the committee members do writing, some make publicity or organizational contacts, others serve as public speakers, as office workers, as researchers, as expediters, as petition distributors.

Some citizens of conservative views tend to believe that neighbors who call themselves liberals are moving toward communism, while those of liberal views tend to believe that it is the conservatives who aid communism by crediting it with liberalism. Such argument over who is the best anti-Communist makes neither one of them effective. When neighbors are thus divided, the real Communists rejoice.

What the Communist conflict managers fear most is the unity of all intelligent citizens of the United States and the free world against the Soviet threat. The starting point for such unity must be with Americans, who understand that both are political parties have failed to meet that threat on any other basis than expediencies that compromise both principles and morality.

The developing mood of outrage in America must not be a mere partisan mood that accentuates differences between liberals and conservatives who share basic beliefs in liberty and justice. Those beliefs unite all Americans. They are infinitely stronger than views that divide us. The Cold War Council urges governmental action affecting our foreign affairs. It avoids all domestic political issues that divide good Americans. It unites all shades of honest political opinion.

There are numerous existing organizations to combat communism these days. What is the special area of the Cold War Council?

America faces two distinct threats from communism. One is Communist infiltration in our internal society. The other is the global threat of Soviet imperialism which could isolate the United States by gaining dominion of Latin America and other continents.

The Cold War Council is concerned primarily with the global threat, and more particularly with U.S.S.R. global propaganda which is a fundamental weapon of Communist conquest overseas.

Faced by an aggressive psychological offensive by the United States, won't the Soviets react by starting a nuclear war?

The odds are that their reactions would be just the opposite. If the Kremlin thought it could profitably launch a nuclear war, it would have done so already. It will not do so as long as we have our own nuclear deterents. Nuclear war could still grow out of a limited war, such as the Soviets might start over Berlin. If that happens, it will be largely because of the West's weakness in propaganda warfare.

The Soviets are haunted by possible defections to the West, even in peacetime. They maintain the most elaborate political espionage system within the army, to forestall counterrevolutionary thinking. If such thinking were encouraged by aggressive Western propaganda, the Soviets would be less inclined than ever to risk war. The Kremlin leaders, confronted on the psychological war front with the superior force of truthful counterpropaganda, would be more likely to resort to some face saving withdrawal, than to risk defeat. They have always done this when confronted with a determined show of force by the West.

Why can't U.S. propaganda be positive rather than negative? Why can't we merely sell the American viewpoint, rather than anticommunism?

Explaining America must, of course, be part of our message to people overseas. But to be effective, U.S. communication overseas must serve needs of the people to whom it is addressed. The people of underdeveloped countries already know that living in the United States is better than anywhere else. Many would gladly change places with anyone in America, just to get to our blessed country. However, they do not know that millions today living under communism would eagerly change places with them.

Must the United States match the volume of Communist propaganda going on all over the world all the time?

Soviet Russia spends $2 billion annually to maintain its worldwide propaganda apparatus. It takes this enormous expenditure to smother the truth about Communist aims and methods and to prove that black is white.

The free world, therefore, does not have to match communism's expenditures for propaganda. But the free world must match the Communist will to win and match their understanding of propaganda.

America's great genius and leadership in the art of mass communications should be mobilized for the conduct of propaganda warfare.

The necessary talent would be available if called on by a government that recognized the need of an all-out response to the Soviet propaganda challenge.

The U.S. information Agency is said to be spending about $100 million annually. Isn't that enough to get the truth across to the crucial continents?

That's a lot of money, but most of it is spent only to spread information about the United States. There is a vast difference between such information services and propaganda warfare, which must appeal to the self-interest of the peoples of the target countries. Our Government's failure to distinguish between information and propaganda warfare is at the heart of the cold war problem.

The massive warfare conducted by Soviet political and propaganda activities around

the world cannot be met by anything less than "massive retaliation."

The Cold War Council is an organization of private citizens of all types: business people, students, craftsmen, housewives, professionals. But, because the council was founded by professionals in advertising, public relations, broadcasting, and journalism, its founders are sometimes asked if the council itself proposes to enter the global war arena. The answer is no.

Our job is to appeal to our Government to take massive action in nonmilitary warfare. We know that our leaders must respond to public sentiment. Developing public sentiment through every channel of public communications is the purpose of the Cold War Council.

The Soviet myth can be exploded among the underdeveloped nations of the world. But it cannot be exploded by a single statement by a U.S. President, duly reported on a Voice of America broadcast, and then forgotten.

Any citizen who reads the news these days must feel concerned over that aspect of the cold war called the propaganda war. If the citizen happens to be in the advertising or public relations business, his thoughts turn in that direction more frequently. Also more critically.

In recent years I have had extensive personal and correspondence contacts on this subject with men and women in advertising and public relations. Their views vary from mild alarm to agonized despair over Uncle Sam's inadequacies in this business of communicating ideas overseas. These professional frustrations are compounded by an awareness that, as private citizens, they can individually do nothing to improve matters.

They need feel such frustration no longer. For those engaged in public relations, advertising or media work, there is on the horizon a plan whereby they can make definite contributions toward improving our Government's propaganda outlook. They can assume a much needed leadership in a comprehensive citizen-action plan developed by the Cold War Council.

This organization, founded early in 1961 by a group of California men and women in communications industries, proposes definite citizen steps toward achieving more realistic and more professional U.S. propaganda warfare. The premise of the Cold War Council is that to win such warfare, our country must go far beyond the present restricted efforts of the U.S. Information Agency. The overall aim of the council is to awaken Congress and the administration in Washington to the importance of propaganda in the cold war we have been steadily losing. The council urges specific steps that can eventually turn the world propaganda tide in our favor.

Those steps are many, starting with a complete reappraisal of why we have been losing the propaganda war so steadily. One aspect of that appraisal has already been made by a group of 12 U.S. Senators. Almost 3 years ago, they recognized that the intensity and skill of enemy propaganda is in good part due to the existence of special indoctrination schools in Moscow, Prague, Peking, and other Red training centers. Communist recruits are brought to these so-called "Friendship Universities" from all parts of the world, particularly from Free Asia, Africa, and Latin America. They get years of intensive training in political and propaganda warfare before returning to their native lands as Communist leaders.

Concerned over such infiltration of free world nations by thousands of Red "conflict warriors" annually, the 12 U.S. Senators came to an obvious conclusion: If the free world is to effectively combat these highly trained Communist agents, free world citizens, too, must have special training schools for nonmilitary warfare.

Legislation that would establish a U.S. Freedom Academy was duly drawn up and jointly sponsored by the 12 Senators, who, incidentally, represent both political parties. The Freedom Academy bill was first introduced in Congress in February 1959. Since the United States is already 40 years late in coming to grips with Communist strategy for global political warfare through highly trained agents, the Congressmen sponsoring a Freedom Academy have urged the prompt passage of enabling legislation during every congressional session since February 1959. But without success. The Freedom Academy bill is still tied up in committees. Its sponsors can only hope that it will get to the floor of the Senate and House next year.

The Freedom Academy bill is but symbolic of a number of steps that can and must be taken by our Government if we are to realistically face communism's round-the-globe and round-the-clock warfare against the free world. Yet our Government seems in no particular hurry to take any of such steps.

Why is there such apathy in Washington toward this obvious gap in the U.S. and free world defense structure? The reasons are many and involved, but one of them is fairly obvious: Most Congressmen give priority to those matters about which their constituents are clearly interested and persistently vocal. They hear practically nothing from back home about the Freedom Academy bill.

Throughout the United States, there is great citizen concern about our cold war failures, and especially about our propaganda inadequacies. But that concern has yet to be organized. It is yet to be channeled and given a voice that will be heard in Washington.

That is the job to which the Cold War Council is dedicating itself. Passage of the Freedom Academy bill is but one of the steps our Government must take if we are to start reversing the tide in the cold war.

Specific Washington actions in other areas are also advocated by the Cold War Council. President Kennedy is being urged to seize the diplomatic offensive by proclaiming to the world a "manifesto of freedom." This was proposed by a New York Times editorial 2 months ago, reprinted and circulated by the council. The council is also urging both the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee to unite in thoroughly reappraising the role of propaganda in the cold war. It is pointing out that the Information Agency was established as a peacetime information operation with a peacetime budget in 1948, and that the scope, objectives, and methods of that Agency have never since been reevaluated by top level congressional committees, in the light of the stepped-up cold war. Simultaneously, the council is urging that our Government create a top level, full time general staff for psychological warfare, coordinated with other Federal departments and agencies, but geared for independent and prompt action. (The Soviet Ministry for Psychological and Propaganda Warfare has equal status with the diplomatic and the military.)

The logic and the urgency of the above steps are thoroughly outlined in the Cold War Council's Bulletin No. 2. This 16-page illustrated pamphlet not only enlightens citizens on our cold war vulnerabilities, but suggests a number of constructive steps that any average citizen can take to help get Government action.

In the preparation of such literature the Cold War Council has been aided by a number of nationally known professionals in the international communications field, also by prominent advertising leaders like Ted Repplier, Leo Burnett, Walter Weir, James Webb Young, and Don Belding. The council seeks primarily to stimulate citizen action at local, community levels, under the leadership of committeemen largely recruited from the advertising, public relations, and media fields. In each area, such committees carry the council message to the public through local publicity, through contacts with service clubs, civic organizations, churches, labor unions, and similar citizen groups, and, above all, through contact with large business establishments.

The first major community in which this program is to be undertaken is Los Angeles, where the Cold War Council program will get underway in mid-October. Local media have already pledged press and broadcast publicity, free outdoor posters, etc. In addition to the donated media, some Cold War Council advertising will be paid for by business groups undertaking the distribution of council literature. One of the first such organizations to sponsor the Cold War Council program is the California Savings & Loan League. The board of this organization is urging its 300 savings and loan association members to purchase and distribute Cold War Council literature to account holders, and to tell the council story through newspaper and broadcast advertising, copy for which is furnished by the Cold War Council.

Other business firms and civic organizations in California will give similar cooperation to the Cold War Council's educational program in California during the coming months.

Outside of California, leading advertising people in more than a dozen cities are in contact with the Los Angeles undertaking, and report themselves ready to develop similar community level organizations in the near future. The Los Angeles headquarters of the Cold War Council responds to inquiries from citizens in all parts of the country with samples of its literature and details of its plans and progress.

The author, Henry Mayers, chairman of the Cold War Council, is president of Davis, Johnson, Mogul & Colombatto, Inc., a Los Angeles advertising agency. In 1958 the Western States Advertising Agencies Association named him Western Advertising Man of the Year. In the same year he was recruited for the executive reserve of the U.S. Information Agency. His continuous Washington contact through that Agency has been supplemented by extensive travels throughout the world, during which he has visited oversea USIS posts in 17 countries.

Mr. Mayers has long been an advocate of a more vigorous U.S. propaganda effort abroad, and has written extensively for American and foreign publications concerning the Communist propaganda challenge to the West. An article on this subject in Advertising Age earlier this year, resulted in a number of countrywide contacts from similarly minded citizens engaged in advertising and public relations work. This response encouraged him to found the Cold War Council, an organization of citizens, chiefly in communications fields, who seek to strengthen the United States in the cold war.

Mr. Mayers is also board chairman of Magazines for Friendship, Inc., a founder of its affiliates, Magazines for Asia, and Magazines From Americans, and a director of the Students International Center at UCLA. All these organizations are active in projects for improving the image of the United States in foreign countries.

Torch has asked Mr. Mayers to explain the workings of the Cold War Council in the belief that many dedicated Milwaukee advertising people would wish to see their unique talents personally involved in the great struggle of our time.

Those who desire to develop a similar community-level organization for our city are invited to use the columns of this magazine to express their views.—EDITOR.

California Tomorrow—The Challenge of Growth and the Need for Coordinated Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, California welcomes growth. But we recognize that it also brings problems. I think our attempt to meet these problems—of urban sprawl, air and water contamination, the spreading maze of freeways, the loss of farm and recreational space—is of national significance and interest.

One such effort worth attention is a report just issued by a new private nonprofit statewide organization called California Tomorrow. It documents the challenge of growth and the struggle for land, water, air, and space. I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the report be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, along with two editorials on the subject from the San Francisco Examiner and the Sacramento Bee.

There being no objection, the summary and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEWIDE COMMITTEE REPORTS ON CALIFORNIA'S STRUGGLE TO REMAIN BEAUTIFUL AND PRODUCTIVE

California Tomorrow, a nonprofit statewide organization, today issued a report which termed California's growth problems at the "crisis" stage and said the solutions are the responsibility and concern of every resident of the State.

The 64-page document, entitled "California Going, Going," was written by Alfred E. Heller, Nevada City newspaper publisher and president of California Tomorrow, and Samuel E. Wood, Sacramento, conservation and planning authority and director of the recently formed group.

The report details the various forces and pressures threatening California's "bright lands," and points to two great defects in efforts to cope with the situations being caused by continuing population increase: lack of unified and coordinated planning at all levels of government, local, State and Federal, and the fact that the problems in almost every instance outrun the jurisdictions of the many overlapping units of government.

It notes that "with growth problems that dwarf those in every other State, California spends less per capita on statewide physical and economic planning than every other State, except Indiana."

As a result, the report says, "the great State action agencies—such as the water, highway, and recreation agencies—are free to act independently in carving up California's bright land because there is no State or regional coordinating policy, no general land development plan to guide them."

The report notes that although a State development plan has been authorized by the legislature since 1959, no money has been appropriated for it.

"This is almost incomprehensible in light of the fact that California will spend some $55 billion on public works programs in the next 20 years. Can anyone imagine a private corporation spending that sum without the guidance of a comprehensive plan to make every dollar count?"

The report points to the State division of highways as a major example of single agency planning and its defects.

Noting the high degree of efficiency within the division and its highly talented personnel, the report says:

"Yet the division has been perpetually under fire, because in designing and locating freeways the division itself, lacking strong State policy direction, and sustained by the constitutionally provided gas tax fund, has too often failed to respect the plans of other agencies for the use of California lands; in building freeways it has too often failed to respect the legitimate economic interests of farmers and merchants and others of the California economic community; it has too often failed to respect the esthetic and social ill effects of its freeway locations.

"Some of the best examples of the State's single interest, single agency method of planning the use of California lands may be found in the highway division's record of failure to coordinate its construction programs with park and recreation demands. The division's attitude has helped California to delay for 20 years a worthwhile roadside rest program, although such a program has long had the backing of legislative committees and public and private organizations throughout the State."

The report criticizes the division's "user benefit" formula, a major factor in its method of choosing freeway routes, as inadequate because "plainly and simply it fails to take into account the full economic, social and esthetic effects of freeway routings.

"The motorist who may be able to drive 10 miles an hour faster and save a pittance on yearly gasoline bills under the formula is not so happy after all when he sees a freeway reduce his town to a slum, or remove historical buildings, or deface a skyline, or defile a shoreline, or, in short, reduce community values."

The report deals in similar fashion with the "single-agency" approach to planning employed by State water and recreation departments, and the various Federal agencies working in land development within the State.

Citing the need for greatly strengthening regional planning and regional government to back it up, the report comments:

"As things stand, cities and counties do not have an effective way to deal with State agencies involving the location of State colleges and freeways and parks and water projects.

"If a city could express its land-use needs in cooperation with its neighbors, in terms of regional needs, the State would be compelled to listen, and could plan all its programs accordingly."

The report notes that some decisions now being made by cities and counties, as well as decisions of Federal and State agencies, "are not based on studies of the whole area involved in the problem."

The basic problem, the California Tomorrow report declares, is this:

"In accommodating our growing population, we must somehow maintain the beauty and fertility of the land, its good water and its surrounding mantle of breathable air, upon which all California's population must depend for prosperity and comfortable life."

The report emphasizes that "to do such a job we would have to make some basic decisions early in the game—decisions not being made now and not even being seriously contemplated.

"We would have to decide where to locate our new urban areas, and how to contain, guide, and direct their growth, so that they are confined to those lands best suited for urban growth. We might have to decide how big a given city should be, in order to sponsor healthy home life, healthy business and industry, while protecting agriculture and the beauty of our countryside. We would have to decide to prepare and adopt comprehensive and coordinated land-use policies and plans for communities, regions, and the entire State.

"And Washington would have to join this grand, almost utopian effort at harmony and cooperation, for about 46 percent of California land is federally owned, and about two-thirds of all public expenditures in California are Federal expenditures. Washington, it is clear, has no small influence upon where and how our State grows."

The report heavily stresses the need for widespread public attention to the problem of proper State land and resources development.

It warns in conclusion that without public awareness and public action between one-fourth to one-half of the State's best agricultural land in the next 20 years could be overrun by the "slurbs," which are defined as "our sloppy, sleazy, slovenly, slipshod semicities."

California Tomorrow's principal aim is to bring about greater public awareness of the threats to California's natural resources. A 19-member statewide advisory board of leading businessmen, professional and civic leaders guides the work of the organization.

CALIFORNIA'S PLANLESS SPRAWL

In the beginning, California was fabulously rich, seemingly inexhaustibly so, in fertile land. It still is considered so by many. But it has expended its best land recklessly. That folly is continuing furiously. We wish, almost with a sense of futility, for words capable of proper expression of the urgency of the problem attending California's profligate misuse of its land resources.

The folly is in the fact that urban sprawl is progressing utterly without plan. Cities, towns, and suburbs, swollen by the expanding population, are a vast maw into which the finest agricultural lands are disappearing. They make no distinction between good land and productive land. In bitter fact they seize first and almost always on the priceless and precious acreage indispensable to food production, inseparable from future progress and prosperity.

We have at hand an intensely perceptive report on this problem prepared by California Tomorrow, a nonprofit organization trying to persuade the people of California to preserve the State's once incomparable beauty and productiveness. We stress the "once," because California will not always, or even long, be beautiful and productive if it continues to turn its richest farmlands into subdivisions.

The report says that California, with growth problems greater than any other State, spends less money per capita on regional and statewide physical and economic planning than any other State except Indiana. If such planning is not done regionally, it will never be done at all. That is the way California is doing it now—not at all. Typical of the utter vacuum is the fact that the legislature in 1959 authorized a program of State development but never made an appropriation for it.

Ironically, California will spend $55 billion in the next 20 years on public works, entirely without comprehensive planning.

Here are some of the specifics of the problem:

Three million acres of California's most productive irrigated agricultural land will be turned into cities before 1980.

By 1980, too, 2 million more acres will have been converted to freeways, highways, parking, etc.

Again by 1980, there will be 30 million people in the State, double the present population. California will become the most populous State in the Union before the end of 1962; 5 million new jobs will be needed; plus 160,000 new elementary schools, costing $5 billion.

Unified and coordinated regional planning, with relation to land resources, will ultimately become—possibly soon—the alternative to a dearth of productive food land, even impoverishment. We procrastinate in this at the expense of posterity—with the reckoning less than 20 years in the future.

TIME IS HERE, NOW, FOR REASSESSING PLANNING

A statewide organization devoted to encouraging more intelligent municipal and State planning took on the powerful State division of highways and the commission which oversees it in a scorching review entitled California: Going, Going—.

The organization, California Tomorrow, financed by the Heller Charitable and Education Fund and dignified by an advisory board which includes conservation, civic and business leaders in California life, says the division of highways is chopping up California for freeways without regard for human and community values.

It charges the division too often has failed to respect the plans of other agencies for the use of lands, the legitimate economic interests of communities and individuals and the "esthetic and social ill effects" of its freeway locations.

To its credit, California Tomorrow clearly foresees the destruction of the proposed north-south 2d-3d Streets freeway would impose upon Sacramento as it crashes eight lanes wide through the redeveloped west end and the historic old city. It deplores this destruction in the same breath it bemoans the disgraceful Embarcadero Freeway in San Francisco and the proposed low span Emerald Bay highway at Lake Tahoe.

The report says:

While lip service is given to the "economic and general welfare of the community", the division devotes its attention in its economic reports supporting freeway routes to its driver benefit formula. This formula translates into dollar values the savings in distance and time and safety to be gained by a driver over the proposed new route.

What this kind of assessment fails to consider, California Tomorrow incisively points out, is that a highway user not only is a driver but a human being, a member of his community.

In an assessment which should be read by every Californian the report says:

He may be a farmer, a merchant, an ordinary Joe who is more than happy to be able to drive 60 miles an hour instead of 50 over a 2-mile stretch but who is not so happy when he sees that this opportunity in the form of a freeway to drive faster and save a pittance each year may also reduce his town to a slum by taking out part of its business section, some of its historical buildings and limited developable areas as could happen in Nevada City; or deface a skyline as in San Francisco; erode a major portion of a beautiful park as in Los Angeles; defile a most breathtaking natural charm as a highway would do at the mouth of Emerald Bay; separate a great city from its commercially valuable and potentially beautiful river front as in Sacramento; or in short reduce community values.

It is this kind of so-called planning the Bee has fought, and will continue to fight. The desperate need for coordination, with land use and community values held jealously in mind, long has been a concern of the Bee and will continue to be a concern. And it should be the concern of every thinking Californian. The time for reassessment is here, now.

Oil and War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on November 13, 1961, at Chicago, my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], delivered an important and significant address to the annual convention of the American Petroleum Institute on the subject "Oil and War." I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OIL AND WAR

(An address by Hon. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, Senator from Oklahoma)

This meeting of the American Petroleum Institute takes place in the most perilous time we have ever faced—perilous for your industry, perilous for our Nation, perilous for civilization. It is a time of tension and fear, when the military forces of two mighty powers face each other across a thin strand of barbed wire at the barricades of Berlin, and all mankind trembles at the prospect of nuclear war.

I come here today to speak to you about a war—not the war for which we are prepared, and which, because we are prepared and the Russians know it, will probably never come, but about the war which is already declared: about an economic war which we do not yet fully understand. I want to discusss it at this time because I believe this very lack of understanding is our greatest actual danger. I want to discuss it at this place because you control our principal weapon.

There is no need, with this audience, to dwell at lentgh on the impressive material achievements of the Soviet Union under communism, or upon the tragic spirtual and human price which the Russian people have paid for those achievements. The story of giant hydroelectric projects where once were barren wastes, of modern factories where once were villages, of huge apartments where once were cottages, of the privation and slave labor out of which all these were built—this is already familiar to Americans today. I am convinced that Khrushchev will not knowingly pursue a course which overnight would reduce this accomplishment of 40 years to radioactive rubble. I also believe that as a dedicated Communist he does not think that resort to nuclear war is necessary to accomplish Soviet objectives. We had best take at face value his widely quoted words: "We declare war upon you in the peaceful field of trade." It was not a joke. It was a deadly serious statement of Soviet policy.

I think Khrushchev means what he says. He believes that his slave state system can drive the free world and its free enterprise system into bankruptcy, and that Communists can take over with all of the productive capacity intact. I believe this is the kind of war he intends to pursue for his Communist system through your lifetime and mine.

Many of you know some of the facts which I will ask you to think about today. In discussing them, I do not mean to be an alarmist; but the time to guard the levees is when the crest of the flood appears on the upper reaches of the river. And so I would like to discuss the Soviet weapon, Soviet tactics, Soviet strategy, and America's defense in the war which is already declared.

THE SOVIET WEAPON

The weapons in any trade war are goods for export. Russia is in the midst of a massive program of industrialization and development of its resources. Shortages are the rule, rather than surpluses. It needs machine tools and machines, both for use and to copy for production within Russia. It needs the specialized products of the West which are beyond the capability of its present industrial complex. It needs consumer goods to meet the restive demands of a population whose wants have been sacrificed to build basic industry. It needs raw materials. It needs food and fiber to compensate for the failure of Soviet agriculture. These things it can get only by barter or by purchase with hard currencies, which in turn can only be earned from exports.

While some manufactured goods may be traded for purposes of prestige, only forest products and a few minerals are available for export, and the market for them is limited. There is one exception, one product in great demand and available for export in increasing quantities. The Soviet's principal weapon in the economic war is oil. The Soviet economic offensive will succeed or fail on the basis of the amount of Soviet oil which can be exported in exchange for the goods they need.

The measure of the Soviet oil threat is its effort and success in exploration and production of crude petroleum—and the record is impressive.

Working in oil-rich virgin territory between 1950 and 1960 they added five times more reserves per foot drilled than we did, increasing proven Soviet reserves from about 5 billion barrels to 25 billion barrels. And the 400 seismograph crews working today will be 1,200 crews in 1965.

While world oil production doubled between 1950 and 1960, Soviet production quadrupled, from 700,000 to 3 million barrels per day. It is expected to reach 5 million barrels per day by 1965, an even faster rate of growth.

How great an economic weapon—oil for export—will this rate of production yield? From less than 100,000 barrels per day in 1954, exports to the free world more than doubled in 4 years to 200,000 barrels in 1958; doubled again to 400,000 barrels in 1960—supplying 8 to 9 percent of the European market. By 1965, Soviet exports to the free world could rise to a level of 800,000 barrels per day, over and above the 400,000 barrels per day supplied to the Soviet bloc. Based on this projected export capability, Soviet exports would account for about 15 to 18 percent of the current West European market demand.

THE SOVIET TACTICS

Let us consider how the weapon is used. What are the tactics? The first is to seek maximum sales to Japan and the industrial countries of Western Europe in return for machinery, steel, and hard currencies. These countries are looking for markets and bargains. The Soviets take advantage of their need to expand exports and offer them a cut-rate price.

Japan is offered Soviet crude oil at $1 per barrel delivered at the Black Sea, or $2 delivered in Japan. The Western price is $1.80 at the Persian Gulf, or $2.30 delivered in Japan.

Finland is sold Soviet crude oil delivered at $2.39 per barrel, Iranian crude oil at $3.33. Sweden paid the Soviet $3.68 for kerosene which cost $4.51 from the Netherlands. West Germany paid the Soviet $3.48 for light fuel oil which cost $4.50 from Great Britain.

After maximum sales in hard currency markets, the Soviets resort to barter of oil for food, fiber, and raw materials from underdeveloped countries. This is perhaps the most insidious and dangerous aspect of the Soviet offensive. Frequently dependent on sales of one or a few commodities for their whole economy, chronically short of hard currencies with which to buy on the world market, these countries are least able to resist Soviet techniques. And a worldwide pattern emerges:

Oil for tobacco from Greece.
Oil for coffee from Brazil.
Oil for fish from Iceland.
Oil for cotton from Egypt.
Oil for jute from India.
Oil for sugar from Cuba.
Oil for rubber from Ceylon.

This is happening today. Next year and for years to come they hope to make this list grow.

THE SOVIET STRATEGY

Even from these few examples, the Soviet strategy will begin to be apparent. It is development, disruption, and dependence.

First and foremost, they are filling the gaps in their own industrial development. Each sale for hard currencies, each barter for industrial goods contributes to the development of Russian industry and Russian natural resources. It not only helps build the industrial base, but speeds the day when they will achieve an exportable surplus of industrial products. Perhaps more important in the long run, it adds resources which may permit some investment in light industry to ease the pressure of consumer demand. Finally, the sinews of industrial competition are also the sinews of war. Consider the implication of widely dispersed industrial complexes with independent sources of electrical and petroleum energy; a bombproof pipeline system capable of delivering supplies into the heart of Western Europe or a modern petrochemical industry. You remember the military value of adequate oil supplies. General George S. Patton outran his oil supplies in his drive across France and had to stop. Pipelines now under construction will flow from the Urals toward Western Europe and could ultimately connect with pipelines for which we are spending hundreds of millions of dollars from our side of the world to fuel the NATO armies.

A second and equally obvious Soviet strategy is preemption of Western markets. Soviet entrance into the market has already contributed to softening the world price of oil. Most of the Western oil which goes into world markets is produced in areas which are politically volatile—the Middle East, North Africa, South America. If the surplus increases, price weakens, sales decline, and the receipts from their primary income source fall—who will be blamed? The Soviets, or the Western companies holding the concessions? What is your experience?

And the capture of Western markets can be but the first step in the campaign of economic disruption. The Soviets are emphasizing exploration and production, not refining and marketing facilities. In the free world the latter have been built by the international oil companies to handle their own products. The Soviets intend to use them to handle theirs. When American-owned Cuban refineries refused to process Soviet oil, the Cuban Government seized them. When Western companies in Ceylon refused to handle Soviet products, their terminal and marketing facilities were nationalized.

It is the third, and most cynical, aspect of Soviet strategy which is most alarming. While the actual tonnage now involved in Soviet barter deals may be small, the Soviets are making even deeper price cuts on long-term deals which will not only permanently shut the West off from the market, but lead to dependence on the Soviet Union. The Soviets are building both economic and political dependence in a twofold sense: first, they are building dependence on Soviet oil supplies; and, second, they are building dependence on Soviet markets for surplus local products and commodities which the Soviet Union will accept in exchange for its oil. In certain countries an alarming percentage of their inland demand is already being supplied by Russia: Iceland, 100 percent; Cuba, 100 percent; Finland, 99 percent; Egypt, 53 percent; Yugoslavia, 47 percent; Uruguay, 44 percent; and Greece, 23 percent. And where else can these countries sell the pulp, fish, cotton, wool, tobacco, and sugar which are their primary products?

We have recently seen a classic example of the spiral of development, disruption, and dependence. The bottleneck in the Soviet petroleum industry is transportation. Their tanker fleet is seriously inadequate. Pipeline construction is crippled by a shortage of large-size pipe. The Soviets—selling crude oil to Italy for $1.37 per barrel, delivered at Italian ports, against a Western price of $2.17 f.o.b. eastern Mediterranean ports—have now concluded with Italy a $200 million barter deal in which they will get 40-inch steel pipe. The Soviets will build a 2,800-mile pipeline capable of delivering one million barrels a day from the Urals to western Russia. Smaller lines will carry the oil through Poland to East Germany and to Czechoslovakia. But that is only the beginning. The Soviets will supply 20 percent of Italy's total oil needs for 5 years, and petroleum products extracted from $1.37 Soviet crude oil in Italy will be distributed throughout the Common Market as tariff-privileged Italian products. Are those who have joined their hearts and minds with us in freedom now to have their hands manacled to Russia with bonds of pipeline steel?

THE FREE WORLD'S COUNTEROFFENSIVE

So I say to you, the war is already declared. The weapon is already chosen. It is oil. The frontline troops are already drafted. They are the men and women of the American oil industry. The battlefield is already determined. It is in our export markets. We have only one choice: Whether to run or fight. If we run, we will find that financial, social, and political fallout can be deadly too.

But if we fight—as fight we must—we must first free ourselves from some delusions, and devise a Western strategy, not for defense, but for a counteroffensive. I would not presume to advise this group on the tactics of trade war. I will suggest some elements of our strategy, not because I am an oil expert, but because it may help to stimulate our reaching some inescapable and overdue policy decisions.

First, we must seek our natural allies in this economic war. The challenge presented by the Soviets is not to the United States alone. It is a challenge to the free world, and particularly to the oil-producing nations, present and future. The governments and peoples of Canada, Mexico, Venezuela, Saudi Arabia, Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Algeria, and Indonesia must be made to understand that they share our stake in free world markets, and will suffer more than we from Soviet intrusion. All of the nations of the West, whether oil producers or not, must be made to understand the nature and purposes of the Soviet offensive, for every aspect of our strategy will require the cooperation of other nations. This is a difficult task for American diplomacy, but an essential one which must be undertaken soon.

Second, we must compete with the Soviets in finding and developing reserves. I know of no more fatal error which we could make than to curtail exploration because of a current surplus of oil. Whatever the demand today, the future market is virtually unlimited. The entire free world is experiencing population growth at a rate comparable to the United States. With 10 times our population, and the same growth rate, the free world will add 250 million people in the next 10 years. Not only do more people require more energy, but the per capita consumption of petroleum is steadily rising. These nations will continue to grow. Some measure of the future market for oil is given by the fact that many nations in Africa and Asia now consume less than 1 barrel of oil per person per year. The annual consumption rate per person is only 3 barrels in Japan; only 6 barrels in Western Europe. For each person in the United States, we consume 20 barrels each year, and each year the rest of the world will come closer to that figure.

We must continue to find oil, because ultimately the greater the percentage of the total supply controlled by the Soviets, the lower their price and the greater their effect in the world market. We must be prepared to search for and develop oil in countries which now import it. It is in our long-range interest that local needs be supplied from local sources developed by American oil companies, using American equipment, trained by American technicians, rather than to find another country the oil captive of the Soviet Union.

We must seek maximum development of our domestic reserves, regardless of comparative cost, and retain or institute every incentive which will contribute to that end. We must never be dependent on others for our most vital resource for this Nation's defense.

The Suez crisis was an omen of what we may face in areas which become dependent on Soviet oil. In the last analysis, we can depend only on North American producers as a certain source of supply in an emergency, for if the Soviets cut off oil supplies to a dependent country they can be expected to use every available means to disrupt supplies from alternative sources. A healthy rate of domestic exploration will require that imports continue to be limited. We could make no greater error than to use the domestic market as an escape from the necessity to compete with the Soviets for world markets.

Third, we must compete in price. All Soviet oil is channeled through a single export monopoly owned and operated by the state. Subsidies are available from the national treasury when a decision is made to dispose of a certain quantity of oil in a particular area, whether the purpose is economic or political. There is a tendency to assume that with no shareholders to answer to and the cost of production paid out of the Government budget, the Soviets can charge whatever they please, but as a matter of economic reality there is a limit. The Soviet Union is not that rich. The Russians are offering oil today on the Black Sea for $1.10 per barrel, but that low price is subsidized by sales to Soviet bloc customers at substantially above the world price. Thus Bulgaria, Poland, East Germany, Rumania, and all the others pay substantially more than the $1.10 subsidized price.

I said we must compete on price, and I believe we can. Our operations are more efficient and our research and technology more advanced, and we are still improving. American oilmen who recently visited Russia estimated that their exploration and production costs are much higher than those in the Middle East. The average cost, without profit, of Middle East oil delivered to the Mediterranean is about $1.40 per barrel, but 73 cents of that cost is the royalty paid to the sovereign, and taxes. These are aspects of cost that we can do something

about, if the producing countries can be made to understand the nature of this struggle. The direct operaing costs, you can do something about, as you have in the past. As we negotiate around the world for necessary foreign oil concessions, I think it is foolish for our people and our allies in the grand alliance of NATO to be bidding against each other. It is like a man bidding against his wife at an auction sale.

I am not advocating a subsidy; but if it is necessary in the overall strategy for the economic war, then I would not shrink from that. More likely any need for subsidy can be eliminated by cooperation between members of the grand alliance, reorientation of military and economic aid, acceptance of two-way or three-way trade in raw materials tax policy, credits or credit guarantees, and by other means.

Fourth, we must compete in furnishing a market for basic commodities from underdeveloped countries. Just as in the case of oil, we cannot permit unrestricted entry into the American market for products already in surplus. But we can devise international price stabilization agreements which will yield these countries comparable income from reduced production of commodities in surplus. Not only would such arrangements eliminate their dependence on Soviet markets, but more important they would force the Soviets to pay the world price for the supplies they need.

Fifth, we must exploit Soviet weaknesses and take advantage of our own strength. We should take immediate steps to establish coordinated controls to minimize the flow of Western equipment and technology which is helpful in breaking bottlenecks in the Soviet petroleum industry. We cannot get total Western cooperation in this effort, and even if we could, it would not stop development of the Russian industry. But we can slow it down. We must develop the maturity not to publicly parade and deride the incidents of our failure, the examples of allies who would not cooperate; but to quietly celebrate the occasional success.

One key Soviet weakness is a shortage of tankers. The entire Soviet bloc has only one-third as many tankers as the United States alone, and only one-sixth our tonnage. Soviet tanker capacity is hardly sufficient even to satisfy Soviet-bloc oil transportation requirements. If the free world tanker owners refused to transport Soviet oil, it would pose an acute problem for the Soviets. Even a little selective pricing of tanker transportation would do wonders in offsetting Soviet price cuts. Yet when two American companies tried to discourage tanker owners from carrying Soviet oil to Cuba, they received the support of neither their industry nor their Government. We have much to learn—first, that we are at war.

THE CONDITIONS OF VICTORY

All of these strategic objectives require a common condition precedent: A partnership between the Government and the oil industry. Diplomacy must be marshaled in support of American oil companies. A steady flow of intelligence on Soviet maneuvers must be provided to the industry. Tax policy must give every possible assistance to American companies in meeting Soviet prices. We are spending $48 billion a year for the hardware and logistics of military war. We are spending about $4½ billion in military and economic aid abroad. We must be prepared to spend substantial amounts for oil and oil markets which are the hardware and logistics of economic war. The resources of the foreign assistance program—grants, loans, credits, guarantees—must be organized to support the economic war. Laws which interfere with the effective conduct of the war must be suspended.

Oil must become nonpartisan. The oil industry has been the political whipping boy of liberals; the Texas oilman, a political caricature; the depletion allowance, a political football. We must quickly outgrow such childishness if we are to survive as a world power.

But this is not a one-sided obligation. The oil industry has also been the treasury of the conservatives; the politician, an industry caricature; the government, an assumed enemy. This childishness, too, we must quickly outgrow if we are to survive.

But like all wars, victory will finally depend in the quality of the troops. You did not choose your place in the front lines, but neither did your predecessors in our Nation's battles. And the victory will depend on your performance—on your research, your technology, your efficiency in exploration, production, refining, transportation, and marketing And finally, it all depends on your willingness to work and fight.

I believe it was Voltaire who said: "The sound which history makes is that of wooden shoes going up stairs, and satin slippers coming down." Sometimes we take too much for granted our place in the sun, as though it were automatic and had been acquired without the hard fighting and slugging that a pioneering people did. Your fathers went into the slush pits and gambled all they had on their judgment and their skill. Will their working boots still fit their sons?

I think they will. I would like the chance to say to Khrushchev: "Let me tell you about the American oilman. He's a roughneck turned scientist. He's a machinist turned engineer. He's a gambler turned financier. He's a salesman turned diplomat. He taught you all you know about oil. And one more thing. He's a free man in a free society, and you can devisie no incentive to equal his self-respect. We accept your choice of weapons. We accept your battlefield. And we declare war on you, in the peaceful field of trade."

Allan H. Perley Resigns as Legislative Counsel of the House of Representatives

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL].

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I am one of the younger members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, but it could not escape anyone's attention who serves on that great committee that this man's service was exemplary service, the kind of service we would hope for from anyone whose talents are employed for the good of the Nation. If others would employ their talents in the way this great man has and give the kind of service this man has given we need have no fear for the future of this Nation or the efficiency of its administration.

I also want to say that he not only gave exemplary service himself but that he was always quick to get members of his able staff to assist in the same way. I am certain that not only we on the committee on which I am privileged to serve will miss this man as a fine public servant, but we will think of him also as a friend and be glad we enjoyed his confidence.

I know we can look forward to working with the fine staff he accumulated, trained, and inspired. The staff is composed of able personnel and will carry on in the same high tradition and capable service he exemplified.

I thank my chairman for giving me the opportunity to join with other Members of this body in paying tribute to this gentleman.

Ukrainian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. DONALD C. BRUCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, I certainly would like to join in commending the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for his perseverance and his dedication to this important cause. Certainly, the history which he has outlined of the Ukrainian people and the events that are transpiring today stress the importance of our continual emphasis upon the spirit of the millions who have been enslaved by the international Communist conspiracy.

Mr. Speaker, as he traced the history of the Ukraine, certainly those who have spent time in studying this matter recognize that the tactics that were used to bring about the subjugation of the Ukrainian people are no different than those being used today by the butcher of the Ukraine, Mr. Khrushchev. We all recall, as we read through the pages of history that the cry then was the cry of peace from the leaders of the Bolshevik movement, when the Western World was in a position to crush the threat. It is the same today—the cry of peace, the dialectic of peace of the Bolshevik tyrants—so that today the leadership of the Western World is needed to give the strength necessary to prevent the butchery and exploitation not only of the Ukrainian people but of other millions. The cry is still the same today. The cry is the Communist cry of peace, but they do not mean live and let live, and self-determination, which has been clearly indicated. They mean the swallowing bit by bit of people who have lived with the traditions and heritage of freedom. This heritage may or may not be exactly as we understand it, but it is still a heritage that is their own self-determination.

Mr. Speaker, certainly the perseverance of the gentleman from Pennsylvania in every year raising this cry again, obviously in the face of a feeling of frustration since action has not followed here at the congressional level as far as this resolution is concerned, certainly that feeling of frustration one of these days, sooner or later, is going to

be replaced with a feeling of satisfaction that there are those of us who understand the very nature of our enemy and who understand the necessity of exploiting what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] calls the Achilles heel of communism, the people who are enslaved by this ruthless tyranny presently headed by the butcher of the Ukraine, Mr. Khrushchev, with his wringing of his hands and cry of peace. Certainly, we hope success will come to these attempts to establish this Captive Nations Committee.

Perhaps we will be able in our outlook on world affairs to substitute for the errors that have taken place here through changing administrations the establishment of a movement which may give some hope to these people that there will come a day of liberation.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I thank most sincerely the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Tribute to Louis C. Rabaut

SPEECH

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have heard expressed for the past few days our sense of loss at the untimely passing of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable LOUIS C. RABAUT, of Michigan, a true citizen of good will and a longtime personal friend of mine.

Having served with Mr. RABAUT on the Appropriations Committee and having served with him as chairman and ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, I cannot but add a personal footnote to the grief that has been expressed here since his passing.

LOUIS RABAUT was one of the kindest men I have ever known. He was a warmhearted person, a conscientious legislator, a true Samaritan with an interest in his fellow man. At the same time, he was a man of cheerful spirit, bright intellect and abounding energy—but, above all, he was faithful to his God, his country, and to his colleagues.

Through almost 20 years' service with LOUIS RABAUT my admiration and respect grew. I came to know him as a superb example of a public servant. He carried proudly the banners of faith and service and patriotism and it was always readily apparent that he applied a rule to his every act. This rule was his own realization that, as a man, he was accountable to the Almighty for the way in which he used each day.

It was just as obvious that he regarded a hard day's work in the interest of his constituents as his recurring daily debt to them.

LOUIS RABAUT loved and respected his home, his State, his church, and his Nation. He was, at all times, a gentleman, but he knew that a resolute battle for the right was not incompatible with gentlemanliness.

His was a clean, full life—nearly 30 years of service to the public; 50 years of happy marriage; nine fine children, four of whom turned their lives to the church.

It can truly be said that when LOUIS C. RABAUT presented his credentials at the gates of Heaven, they were found to be in excellent order and he now sits near the throne of God.

Identical Pricing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "On Identical Pricing" which appeared in the January 13, 1962 edition of the Shelbyville (Ind.) News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON IDENTICAL PRICING

Do identical prices charged by different suppliers for similar products indicate lack of competition? Do they indicate collusion?

Considerable attention is being given to identical pricing in Washington at this time. Paul Rand Dixon, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, and Lee Loevinger, head of the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department, in separate interviews have both given the impression that such identical pricing gives grounds for suspicion of illegal collusion among the sellers.

The courts have held that such suspicions are not sufficient for convictions, in several important cases. This has left some authorities dissatisfied, and they are demanding legislation that will penalize sellers whose prices do not differ. Senator ESTES KEFAUVER has introduced a bill which would require bidders for Government business to file statements that their bids had been arrived at without collusion, and place the burden of proof upon them to prove absence of collusion if a pattern of identical prices could be found. And Representative WRIGHT PATMAN has introduced a bill, passed by the House, which requires the Attorney General to make quarterly reports on identical bids on Government business, among other things.

The wide publicity given so far to this issue may have left the general impression that there must be something necessarily unsavory about all identical pricing—and so it seems only fair that the matter be explored a bit further from the standpoint of the suppliers.

The fact that proposals have been made to hamper identical bidding and identical prices, and that they have been publicly questioned, raises a fundamental question: How could business operate in a way which would avoid identical prices?

Certainly no manufacturer could long charge a higher price than his competitor for a similar item. Customers would soon discover that the lower priced item would serve their purpose satisfactorily and the higher priced manufacturer's sales would suffer or disappear altogether. Granting the influence of brand names, quality, service and similar factors, it seems somewhat unlikely that many customers would willingly pay more than necessary for a product that serves the same purpose just as well.

By the same token, no manufacturer can long charge a lower price than his competitor. For one thing the competitor would soon be forced to meet his lower price—which would restore the equality. Or if the competitor decided to beat his price the manufacturer would be forced to again lower his price.

There are, of course, many classes of products where prices are only roughly comparably, although even in such lines as cosmetics and high-fashion clothing the differences are not as great as is often supposed. In the case of similar items sold in industrial markets or to Government agencies, however—where both buyers and sellers are fully aware of the functions and design features of all available competitive items, and where price looms as the most important factor in the purchaser's decision—it appears inconceivable that sellers will be able to do anything but meet their competitor's prices.

Since identical prices are the natural result of rational business behavior in a competitive business environment, it is difficult to see how they could be outlawed.

Are businessmen to shut their eyes to the prices offered by their competitors and never attempt to meet them? Or are they expected to keep close watch on their competitors' prices and then exert great care to quote a price which is always either higher or lower (but apparently, not "unreasonably" higher or lower)? Neither of these alternatives can be described as competitive behavior. In fact, neither of them appears to be compatible with a workable economic system.

The 44th Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 44th anniversary of Ukrainian independence. It is, therefore, fitting and appropriate that we pause to commemorate this anniversary. More importantly, this historic anniversary compels us to renew our message of support and dedication to the aspirations of the millions of Ukrainians who continue to seek independence and freedom from Soviet oppression.

The 1918 declaration of Ukrainian independence was short lived. The Ukrainian National Republic attained freedom for a mere 2 years after a 300-year struggle against oppression. But that spirit and quest remains despite Soviet captivity. Time bespeaks loudly of the indomitable spirit of these people, and it is obvious that Soviet military might will never contain that spirit.

I join my colleagues on this historic occasion to salute these courageous people, and I look forward to the day when we will join the free and independent Ukrainian people in marking this important event.

Proposed California World Trade Center Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, for some time the United States has been losing foreign markets for its products at a serious rate. While the countries of Western Europe and Japan have been increasing their share of exports to foreign markets, the share of the United States has been declining. Last year I introduced legislation designed to get our exports on the move. The Senate passed the bill (S. 1729) and I am hopeful it will receive early action in the House this year. I am hopeful also that Congress acts favorably on President Kennedy's call for a bold, new American trade policy to meet the critical need to expand our exports—and particularly to meet the challenge of the European Common Market.

Other efforts are being made around the country to promote international trade. I commend to the attention of my colleagues an editorial in the January 12 issue of the San Francisco Daily Commercial News which discusses a proposal to set up a World Trade Center Authority in California.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD TRADE AUTHORITY

(By Henry C. MacArthur)

A unified and centralized California World Trade Authority looms as a possibility for this State following the announcement of State Senator J. Eugene McAteer, Democrat of San Francisco, that he has asked the subject be placed in a special legislative call for the budget session this year. The proposed authority, which reportedly has the backing of business and civic leaders in San Francisco, would expand the activities of the San Francisco and Los Angeles World Trade Centers, which are now operative.

It was also learned that funds are to be included in the 1962–63 State budget for this new activity, and that it has the support of Hale Champion, State director of finance, who is also a member of the San Francisco Authority.

Despite the fact that Gov. Edmund G. Brown has been importuned to steer clear of matters which could only be considered in a special session of the legislature this year, the mere fact that this is to be included in his budget appears to indicate he is considering the call favorably.

While there might be some controversy on centralizing world trade matters within the State, the project nevertheless is one of major importance to the State. The sooner it gets underway, the sooner business, industry and the general public start to derive the benefits expanded world trade eventually will give to California.

The need for expanded world trade is reasonably obvious at the present time. With California soon to become the largest State in population in the Union, more export production will be necessary to support the working populace.

Senator McAteer describes the purpose of the new agency as to promote international trade, particularly exports of California manufacturing and agricultural products. The new authority would consist of 16 members and would be completely divorced from the San Francisco Port Authority. It would be completely a jurisdiction for the promotion of foreign trade.

To this end, the trade group would have authority to maintain personnel in key cities anywhere in the world. These representatives would act as liaison agents between sellers in California and buyers in foreign countries, and vice versa.

California as a State has never engaged in a promotion operation as such for its business and industry. However, many business leaders, particularly those connected with the present San Francisco World Trade Center, feel that the time is ripe for a new activity of this kind, particularly in view of prospective production in the State over and above the domestic demands.

Consequently, they feel that development of world markets is a "must" at the present time, if only to prepare for the future production anticipated for California.

The idea of a California Authority for the promotion of world trade is not new, but apparently, McAteer has concluded the time has come for action rather than conversation.

Saving the Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, with the eyes of the business world focused on the economic plight of the Nation's railroad industry, the following editorial appearing in the January 4, 1962, edition of the Washington Daily News is a timely effort to pinpoint the ills of the railroads and at the same time recommend three remedies which could go a long way in restoring them to their former economic strength.

The editorial follows:

SAVING THE RAILROADS

It is common knowledge that the Nation's railroads are in financial trouble. While 1962 and its expected prosperity may result in profits for some railroads, the long-term outlook for this vital industry remains bleak.

That is one big reason why President Kennedy is considering a transportation message to Congress. The message would apply to airlines, trucking companies and barge lines as well as railroads—but recommendations on the railroad industry would be stressed.

Despite the fact that the public has less and less direct contact with railroads—because of declining passenger business—this industry is vital to our economy.

Most railroads think mergers are one avenue of possible salvation. Indeed, a record number of merger applications are before the Interstate Commerce Commission now, and still another—the biggest of all—is expected from the New York Central and Pennsylvania.

But mergers cannot solve all railroad problems. Other remedies must come from the Federal Government.

We suggest three:

Railroads should be given the limited right to diversify. Other transportation companies now have that right; for example, the transit system here in Washington is owned by Trans-Caribbean Airways.

Railroads should be allowed more freedom in ratemaking. Rail executives charge they suffer from overregulation—and their point is valid. Such freedom would also be an answer to railroad complaints—again frequently valid—that highway truckers and airlines are in a favored position because they use—at relatively low cost—highways and airports constructed with Federal money.

Railroads should be allowed faster tax writeoffs on their equipment. Changes in depreciation allowances already are being studied by the Treasury Department.

Capital invested in freight cars now is written off only after 28 years and railroad buildings and structures up to 100 years. Airplanes can be written off in as little as 5 years, buses in 7 years, and truck equipment in 8 years.

Faster depreciation allowances for railroad equipment likely would result in heavier investment in new and modern equipment, lowering railroad costs.

Direct Government subsidies have been suggested but they would solve nothing. Subsidies merely would result in more overregulation and more taxpayer expense.

Financing of United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Study of Money and Peace" which appeared in the January 17, 1962, edition of the Richmond (Ind.) Palladium-Item.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STUDY OF MONEY AND PEACE

Old Nikita Khrushchev must have many a hearty laugh as he sees what is going on in that part of the world we consider free.

Two of the largest contributors to the United Nations find themselves footing bills to keep the inefficient and stumbling processes of this world group going.

The United States and Britain are the two United Nations members which pay the largest amounts to finance the United Nations.

During the past week representatives of both countries held conferences in Washington. It is reported that they were trying to find some way to keep the United Nations financed fairly and soundly, a matter that does not seem to keep any of the other 102 members awake at night.

Our Government and that of Britain also took a look at the kind of practices the United Nations have been using to keep the peace in a world seething with problems mostly of a warlike nature.

Even with these irritating issues officials of the two big governments took a look also at the question of how to apply international law to outer space.

We believe they might have skipped this item in view of the fact that they do not know now how to help in bringing peace to turbulent forces in all sections of the earth.

International law is not working on the surface of the earth to any good purpose.

Even the long heralded India, as the symbol of brotherly love, lost its equilibrium and casually sent troops into neighboring territory belonging to Portugal and now proclaims it will not back out since the ends they sought came so easily.

Our State Department, always worth a laugh if the danger is not too near, said our Government was trying to be realistic in its study of the operations of our worldwide peace agency, the bankrupt morally and financially United Nations.

We wonder if the subject of Cuba came up. Or would that be hush-hush in view of our President's inability to deal effectively with a bearded dictator and agitator who has taken his seat in Havana and proclaimed his Red hue?

Propaganda Curtailment We Cannot Afford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include an editorial which appeared in the Buffalo Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., on December 27, 1961, in regard to the closing of some of our information centers in Western Europe. The editorial follows:

PROPAGANDA CURTAILMENT WE CANNOT AFFORD

What seems like American propaganda in reverse—or promotion against ourselves—is the closing down of U.S. information centers in Western Europe, notably in Bilbao, Spain, where the service has been unusually popular and altogether to our advantage. The 13-year-old center in Bilbao has attracted up to 8,000 persons a week to its public lending library and its information films about America have been viewed by 150,000 persons every month. Its closing will not leave a cultural vacuum—Communist propaganda will continue to come through from Prague in Spanish language broadcasts clear as a bell.

It is anything but typical of American ingenuity to close down any kind of project doing a remarkable job of selling. The explanation given in this case is the all too familiar one of U.S. Information Agency budget limitations—but the economy effected will be canceled out in expanding Agency programs to Africa. Understandably, Spaniards are reacting with considerable resentment, giving sensitive expression to protest of being downgraded in favor of comparatively primitive and uncultured places. Spain has a fairly unique record of opposition to communism and ideologically is regarded as one of the political and military bastions of the free West. It seems strange to venture a move likely to relax American ties of solidarity with Western Europe, considering our general pattern of misadventure in winning friends and influencing people the world over.

Critics of the U.S. propaganda effort often have stressed that no other nation ever had a better story to tell but failed so lamentably to tell it, yet the Bilbao information center stands out—or has stood out—as an impressive exception to what unfortunately may be charged as a general rule. However, the fault hardly seems chargeable to Agency administration but to an unrealistic, parsimonious attitude of Congress in its appropriation for Agency programing—a policy strikingly at odds with congressional prodigality for junketing inspection tours.

In assessing defense needs, Congress has shown little awareness of the tremendous propaganda gap vis-a-vis Soviet Union enterprise in the contest for men's minds.

Poll Taxes and Literacy Tests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. McCLELLAN. Madam President, in the January 15, 1962, edition of the Arkansas Democrat there appeared an editorial entitled "Poll Taxes and Literacy Tests."

This article clearly and concisely points up, I think, the reasonableness and propriety of requiring a small per capita tax or the ability to read as a requisite for voting. I believe its contents will be of some interest to Members of this body and informative to those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the Arkansas Democrat be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLL TAXES AND LITERACY TESTS

President Kennedy spoke emotionally rather than from a reasoned basis when he said in his state of the Union message: "The right to vote should no longer be arbitrarily denied through such iniquitous local devices as literacy tests and poll taxes."

"Iniquitous" is a strong word, meaning unjust or wicked. What's unjust or wicked about requiring some ability to read or the payment of a small per capita tax as a requisite for voting? What's wrong with putting some emphasis of value on the ballot, which is the basis of our free system of government?

The President himself stressed in his state of the Union message the handicap of illiteracy on good and effective citizenship. He cited as disturbing that there are 8 million adult Americans who are "functionally illiterate", and he said this figure is reflected in welfare rolls and crime rates.

He proposed a massive attack on this problem.

As for poll taxes, they are a small fee, levied equally on all citizens in the State—one of the few taxes which is thoroughly democratic. Anybody they deter from voting hasn't much intention to vote.

And in Arkansas this payment of only $1 goes to the schools—to help combat the illiteracy which the President finds disturbing and wants to wipe out.

The worst voting scandals, the most flagrant disrespect for the ballot, are not in the literacy-test and poll-tax States. They are in States which have neither one.

"Country Beautiful" Article on the Bread-and-Butter Diplomacy of the Food-for-Peace Program Is Typical of Its High Quality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, it was recently my privilege to call to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives an inspired new magazine, Country Beautiful. I mentioned at that time an article in their issue for September 1961, on the food-for-peace program. In order that the Members may have a chance to read this article, I am inserting it at this point in the RECORD:

BREAD-AND-BUTTER DIPLOMACY—A CLOSER LOOK AT FOOD FOR PEACE, A KEY U.S. FOREIGN POLICY INSTRUMENT

(By Bernard Brenner)

In a quiet way that doesn't make headlines in this age of snarling international tensions, something new in human experience is happening. For more than a decade—thanks in part to the productivity of the American farmer and the generosity of his Government—there has been no major famine anywhere.

The world can at long last produce and distribute enough to keep its peoples alive, even when droughts and other tragedies wither the food supply of large areas.

What remains is the problem of hunger for two-thirds of the world's peoples in an era when the American farmer is shattering production records with such regularity that we no longer show much surprise at each new achievement.

Robert C. Tetro, head of the U.S. Agriculture Department's Foreign Agriculture Service, said recently that two-thirds of the world population are "suffering from poor diets and * * * malnutrition. Perhaps they have enough in terms of staying alive, but they have a woeful lack of the high-energy foods that we associate with national vigor, industry, and progress."

The peoples of the hungry nations in Asia, Africa, and Latin America are determined to improve this situation one way or another, Tetro said. In this setting has grown what the Government began under President Dwight D. Eisenhower to call food for peace—a move to share our abundance with countries struggling to improve their own food production.

Keymen today in the direction of this worldwide effort are George S. McGovern, Food-for-Peace Director on President John F. Kennedy's staff, and Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman.

"What we're doing," Director McGovern told me, "is looking for useful outlets for America's agricultural abundance, not only for our present reserves, but for the productive capacity built into our agricultural structure. Food for peace is an instrument to eliminate human hunger and promote economic growth in countries that are not producing enough food now. It must be a continuing program so long as there is hunger in the world."

"But understand this," Secretary Freeman said in a separate interview, "we should

never have the conception that we can feed the whole world. We can't do it alone. We can help, but no one country should become dependent on the United States for food."

This effort to help has already made a tremendous impact around the world, and it bulks big as a peace-promoting instrument of U.S. foreign policy. American farm surpluses have been turned into irrigation projects in Ceylon, highways in Ecuador, loans to new industries in India, a power station in Israel. The stuff we call surplus is providing milk to children in the Philippines and wages to hungry workers in Tunisia.

McGovern said, "It's as simple as this: When you relate what you have to world needs, you have a favorable impact on world opinion. And in the sense that we're in a contest with the Soviets, this sharing of food demonstrates the superiority of our institutions because the Soviets are having trouble with food production."

Added Freeman: "We might as well be as proud of a new hybrid seed that produces 150 bushels of corn per acre as of a missile to the moon. That seed might be more important to our foreign policy in the long run."

Food for peace is big now. In the 6 years up to June 30, 1960, close to $13 billion worth of food and fiber flowed from American farms to the have-nots of more than 100 nations under one phase or another of the program. The outflow will be even bigger in the future if the new Federal administration follows through on some of the plans now brewing.

"I think it's practical," McGovern said, "to talk in terms of doubling or tripling our donation programs and making a 10- to 15-percent increase in 'concessional' sales for foreign currencies."

In overall dollar terms, this means climbing from a level of about $2 billion a year to somewhere in the neighborhood of $2.5 to $3 billion a year—a 25- to 50-percent increase.

"Where the food-for-peace program is going to lead us is not blueprintable in every detail at this stage," Freeman added. "But we're going to try a lot of things. If something doesn't work, we'll drop it and try something else until we find a combination that does work."

Food for peace is already an important factor in the income of the American farmer. It could become even more important as the Kennedy administration develops its policy of focusing on the needs of underdeveloped nations rather than on disposing of the surpluses piled up under farm support programs.

Since 1954—when major legislation prepared the way for the program—food for peace has accounted for three-fourths of all U.S. wheat exports and two-thirds of all rice and vegetable oil exports. About one-third of the feed grain exports have moved under these programs.

"This has been a factor in helping to hold up prices on the domestic market," Freeman said. "These shipments have helped prevent more severe price declines than we've had. But this isn't the main purpose.

"The fundamental objective from now on is to plan the use of food as an integral part of our foreign policy. We want to produce and use the things we need—like protein foods—in proper quantities instead of having a helter-skelter production policy."

"Suppose," I asked the Secretary, "a Corn Belt farmer asks you: 'What is all this going to mean to me personally when I market hogs, for example?' "

"I'd say," Freeman replied, "that this food-for-peace program is one of the tools we want to use to get you a market on which you could earn a fair return without any Government dictation or control."

Freeman and McGovern have been critical of the way, as they see it, officials of the Eisenhower administration referred in earlier days to the food-for-peace idea as "surplus disposal" to sweep out unwanted stocks piled up under price-support programs. But McGovern agrees now that the Eisenhower administration, toward the end, abandoned the surplus-disposal theme and regarded food for peace as wise use of a national asset.

This wise-use theme is at the heart of the program as Freeman and McGovern see it.

In terms of the effect at home, however, the major new change is the idea of putting the whole range of the U.S. farmer's crop-and-livestock production into the food-for-peace pot. This policy, which means expanded Government buying of protein and oil foods, could be a strong factor in bolstering home markets for many commodities. It is already being put into effect.

Freeman recently revoked a previous Agriculture Department policy frowning on the export of chicken and other non-price-supported commodities in exchange for foreign currencies under food-for-peace agreements. At McGovern's request, Freeman announced the Government would buy up to 100 million pounds of vegetable oil for donations abroad, and the Agriculture Secretary raised price supports for soybeans and peanuts to encourage production.

For U.S. agriculture as a whole, exports account for about 11 percent of all sales, and about 30 percent of this moves under four food-for-peace programs.

These programs, briefly, are:

1. Cash sales to foreign countries, which accounted for 22 percent of all U.S. farm exports in the year ending June 30, 1960. Most of the foreign currency we get from these sales is plowed back into the customer countries for development projects.

It was under this program that the United States last year sold 587 million bushels of wheat and 22 million bags of rice to India in the biggest grain deal in history. Under this 4-year, $1.3 billion sale, more than $1 billion will be turned back to India in loans and grants for building power and irrigation developments, schools, and similar projects. When the deal was announced, one major Indian newspaper editoralized that "it is of high material value * * * it is of far greater import in terms of the spirit of faith in human ideals."

3. Donations. The basic food-aid law, adopted in 1954, authorizes $300 million a year for donations to oversea victims of droughts, floods, and other disasters. Only about a third of the available money has been used in recent years, although spending will shoot up to about $275 million this year.

The International Cooperation Administration, which administers this part of the program, has often been charged with being too cautious in donation programs—especially where school-lunch operations overseas are concerned. But the ICA can slash red tape in emergencies. Early this year, an appeal for corn came from Kenya where famine threatened in several provinces. Overnight, ICA officials in Washington had informally ok'd a 9,000-ton gift of corn, and Kenya papers headlined "U.S. Famine Help on the Way," "Action Taken on Kenya's Plea Within 24 Hours."

Two other features of the donation sections of the food-for-peace program loom large in the plans of the new administration. One is a section under which U.S. food can be used to pay wages of men on work-relief projects—building roads, dams, schools, and bridges. In Tunisia, where this program was launched 4 years ago, it gives work to 150,000 men who get two-thirds of their daily 71-cent wage from their own government and the rest in U.S.-donated food. Another key food-for-peace operation is the annual donation of some 2 billion pounds of food to CARE and a score of other voluntary agencies which operate feeding centers and school lunch programs in nearly 100 countries around the globe. In overall volume, these donation programs are relatively small. They accounted for only 4 percent of total farm exports in the year ending June 30, 1960.

3. Barter: About 3 percent of all farm exports moved last year under deals in which U.S. farm surpluses were swapped for strategic minerals, industrial diamonds, and similar commodities. Some experts think this program will slow down in the future because U.S. stockpiles of most strategic materials are already bulging.

4. Dollar credit: A year-and-a-half ago, Congress OK'd credit sales under which foreign governments could get 10-year delivery contracts for U.S. food and take up to 20 years to pay. No sales have been made yet, although some experts think the dollar credit plan can eventually become a major tool.

What new moves can we look for in these operations?

"We're going to give greater attention to expanding school lunch programs, projects in which we use food for wages, and the voluntary agency feeding programs," McGovern told me. "There's been a negative attitude here that we're going to try to correct. The greatest failure so far has been in the failure to expand school lunch programs. As far as the voluntary agencies are concerned, I'm going to make a serious effort to assure them of the supplies they need to do an adequate job."

"Something like this can have a tremendous impact in some countries," added Freeman. "There are places where parents are sending their kids to school only because they can get a free glass of milk donated by our Government for a school lunch program."

Just how tight International Cooperation Administration regulations on these projects have been is a matter of dispute. But a Presidential task force recently estimated that changing some rules would permit the voluntary agencies to distribute 5 billion pounds of food annually instead of 2 billion.

Beyond this, McGovern is turning over some novel new projects. In several Latin American countries where governments are planning to settle thousands of small farmers on new farms in land reform programs, U.S. feed grains may be donated to help feed stock during the first year or so.

"I believe the food-for-peace program will fall short if we don't see an increase in the food-producing capacity of other countries," McGovern said.

Part of the foreign currency the United States has received for food and fiber shipments has been earmarked for improving foreign farm production; about 1,200 U.S. technicians are helping modernize farming in 59 countries around the globe.

"But rural development has been neglected in our efforts to raise the living standards in underdeveloped countries," McGovern added. "Because of this, the whole economy of some of these countries has suffered, delaying the day when they can buy what they need from the American farmer through normal commercial channels."

The whole vast foreign currency sale program is aimed at building eventual "hard money" markets for American and foreign farmers. But more directly, Congress has provided for using a small part of the foreign currencies for direct, immediate oversea market promotion programs. The resulting $34 million parade of trade fairs, advertising campaigns, and demonstration programs, financed partly by Government and partly by private industry, is a story in itself.

"We're going to try to revitalize market development," Freeman told me. "This whole food-for-peace program is, in the sense that we're creating new wants, a real advertising program."

Along with the market-promotion programs, food-for-peace foreign currency receipts go into literally dozens of other projects. They buy military supplies and pay some U.S. foreign aid program expenses in some areas, they furnish loans to U.S. and foreign private enterprises for business development in the customer countries, they have paid for publication of geography textbooks in Greece and other texts in Vietnam, Turkey, Yugoslavia, and 18 other nations; they will finance a search by Israeli scientists for desert plants which may prove beneficial to dry regions of the United States, along with dozens of other research projects in scientific centers abroad.

Enthusiastic as Freeman and McGovern are about food for peace, they acknowledge that it has its dangers. There has been, despite the fact that foreign currency sales are required to be additions to normal commercial marketing, repeated worry here and abroad about damage to "hard money" markets.

"The overwhelming evidence is that this program has not really disrupted commercial markets," McGovern insists. "There may have been mistakes in a few cases, but the Department of State has leaned over backward to prevent damage to friendly countries, and our relations with exporting nations like Canada and Australia are considerably better these days than they used to be."

Despite all assurances, Freeman agreed, the worry about commercial markets "will continue to be a major problem, although we hope to minimize it."

"Yes," McGovern said, "it's only fair to say other exporting nations are 'still nervous' about our operations. But we never make a sale without first consulting the countries affected. Right now, for instance, we're preparing a big agreement with Pakistan. We'll check with 15 or 20 countries before the agreement is finally signed."

Both men emphasize this doesn't mean giving any country a veto over our decisions. And, McGovern added, "if there's a margin of error between protecting commercial markets and feeding the hungry, we ought to give the benefit of the doubt to hungry people."

Even more important, McGovern said, is the care necessary to avoid disrupting farm markets in countries where we make food-for-peace agreements. "I'm told there have been cases where our sales discouraged increases in local food production, and we don't want to do that."

Some of the worries about the hard money markets could be eased later this year. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, following up a U.S.-backed resolution approved by the U.N. last fall, is developing proposals for improved international coordination of aid-type food exports.

If the food-for-peace program works as Freeman, McGovern, and others hope, it will help the have-nots of the world build their living standards toward the level that Americans take for granted. And laid beside the picture of lagging Soviet food production and severe shortages in Red China, it could demonstrate the advantages of a free society to the world's new nations.

Aid to the Nation's Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "To Aid the Nation's Cities" which appeared in the January 15, 1962, edition of the Indianapolis Star.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO AID THE NATION'S CITIES

The proposal to establish in the Federal Government a Department of Urban Affairs refuses to be downed. It has even been hinted that President Kennedy might just go ahead and set it up, using his powers of reorganization, without waiting for Congress to authorize it.

We are somewhat in the dark as to just what such a department would do. In the lack of such foreknowledge we can't understand—much less share—the enthusiasm for the idea.

One suggestion has been that the new Department might draw together all the Federal Government's various activities dealing with cities and towns and their environs. This would indeed be a worthy project, one to be highly recommended for other fields of Government activity. The record does not indicate, however, that this is accomplished in the creation of a department.

Consider how useful it would be, for example, if land reclamation for agricultural uses, the leasing of Federal lands for grazing and crop production, and the management of farm credit activities were in the hands of the agency responsible for production controls and price supports, namely the Department of Agriculture. There might then be a bit more coordination of purpose and direction in these activities, which as things now are often drive toward directly conflicting ends.

We mention the Department of Agriculture particularly because its existence seems to stir the blood of the advocates of a Department of Urban Affairs. tI is pointed out that the distribution of population between the country and the city has almost reversed in the last 150 years, so that now about three-fourths of the Nation's population is classified as urban, with no more than a tenth actually engaged in agriculture. So, if a Cabinet department for farmers is justified, why not one for city folk?

These very figures, along with the fact that the inclination of rural people to move to urban centers still continues, suggest that the cities have been doing better without the attention af a Cabinet department than agriculture has been doing with one. It might be better to leave well enough alone.

The comparison is worth pursuing, however. The Department of Agriculture was one of the first to be established in the spreading of the Federal Government beyond the narrow bounds of its original areas of interest and operation. The Department of Interior was first in this spread, in 1849, and Agriculture was next, in 1862. It was founded for definite purposes of improving the agricultural arts, on the ground that they were basic to the country's growth. It was concerned with such things as the finding and establishment of new plants, research in farming methods and crop uses, passing new knowledge along to farm people, and so on. The success of these efforts bears no small part of responsibility for the fact that the Nation now produces, with the greatest of ease, more food and fiber than it knows what to do with.

But what are the improvements in city life and development to which a Federal department would address itself? Certainly urban growth needs no stimulation. It can well be argued that it could do with some guidance. But do we want city growth guided according to a Federal pattern? Perish the thought.

To be sure the Federal Government already is deeply involved in urban affairs. It is engaged in slum clearance, redevelopment, housing projects, sewer projects, various other public works, feeding schoolchildren and various welfare operations. It is dabbling in city transit and casts longing eyes at public education. But virtually all of these activities revolve around injections of Federal money, and that money comes mostly from urban taxpayers in the first place. The cities merely are getting back, with strings, money which came from their own pockets. The last thing the cities need is a department to do more of that.

We're for growth and progress, and we're for making all our cities more beautiful, more oderly and moe efficient. We're for having our National Government tackle its proper responsibilities, not hesitating to move in new directions when that is indicated. But we don't see that the affairs of our cities are a proper responsibility of the National Government. What our cities need is less, not more, attention from Washington.

United States Support of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, occasional voices deride the United Nations, questioning that the United States should belong or lend its support to this organization.

One of the major bulwarks against this type of thinking is an enlightened press. The Idaho State Journal of Pocatello, an outstanding newspaper of my State, recently took issue with the charge that the world is unprepared for the U.N., and in persuasive terms defined the necessity of its existence.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO'S NOT READY?

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER was again appealing the other night to those who seek simple answers to complex problems. Speaking to a packed house in the Belmont (Mass.) High School auditorium, the Senator said he saw no reason why the United States should continue participation in the United Nations. The idea was wonderful, he was quoted as saying, "but the world is not ready for it."

If the Senator ventured an opinion as to when the world would be ready for it, the opinion was not reported. The world, it should be noted, was not ready for the atomic and nuclear bombs, but they are with us and they offer potential for destruction that never before existed. The world also was not quite prepared to cope with the emergence of newly independent nations, but gain their independence they have and they are not likely to give it up for a return to colonial status. The world, in short, must cope with new forces whether it is ready or not. It is coping with them in the best way it has found so far to do so.

The United Nations has not been as effective as Senator GOLDWATER and many of his countrymen would like it to be, but its failure does not merit scrapping it, and they do not necessarily mean that the world is

not ready for the United Nations. It may mean only that Senator GOLDWATER is not ready for the difficult world in which the United Nations is trying, however ineffectively at times, to keep the peace.

America: A Wonderful Land of Freedom and Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor, a constituent of mine, Mr. Wallace S. Hirai, was inspired to write an article about "America: A Wonderful Land of Freedom and Opportunity." His article speaks of his observations of the seeming decline of the spirit and attitudes that made our country great and of his belief, faith and devotion to this country which became his by adoption. Mr. Hirai is an American by naturalization.

His comments, I feel, are a refreshing reminder to those of us who were born into citizenship and who, subsequently, and perhaps unconsciously, have taken that birthright for granted. In the hopes that Mr. Hirai's inspiring article may induce a conscious reawakening or bolstering of our individual appreciation for this great country of ours, I am submitting it for inclusion in the RECORD.

Mr. Hirai's article follows:

AMERICA: A WONDERFUL LAND OF FREEDOM AND OPPORTUNITY

(By Wallace S. Hirai)

(As seen by a naturalized citizen on the 20th anniversary of Pearl Harbor.)

The following thought-provoking editorial appeared in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin on Friday, October 13, 1961:

"Representative DAN K. INOUYE, in speeches here, presents 'shocking' evidence that might support an affirmative answer to his question.

"He has been getting letters from constituents asking how their sons could legally dodge the draft. He said that some youths have become clever enough to give wrong answers to key questions during draft examinations, thereby escaping service.

"Our Congressman is right in expressing concern about an attitude that does seem to be gaining prevalence, it is a godless, negative attitude."

Ann Landers, in her message to the millions who follow her daily column, wrote last Christmas Day: "A defeatist philosophy has threatened to capture many of our young people. This is the era of shattered ideals, broken dreams, the big sell out. The value system is under attack.

"Millions of Americans have the uneasy feeling that our society, overwhelmed by materialism, has turned soft."

And the Reader's Digest (October 1961), carries this article: What's Happened to Patriotism? It's a condensation of a speech by Dr. Max Rafferty, superintendent of schools, La Canada, Calif.

Excerpts:

"I want to talk to you about a vanishing species—the American patriot. I hope to show you what you and I have done the last 25 years to make inevitable this decline of a once noble breed.

"Had they been taught to love their country with the same passion that inspired other generations of American youth, they would not now be wondering what all the fuss is about. They would know that their country is in danger, and that would be enough. It was enough in 1861, and 1917, and 1941. It is not enough today. Too many of them neither know nor care.

"I say that we had better thank God for the Army and Navy. And—with half the world at our throats—we had better teach our children that it is not a disgrace, but a priceless privilege, to wear our country's uniform.

"The worst of our youngsters growing up to become booted, side-burned, ducktailed, unwashed, leather-jacketed slobs; the best of our youth coming into maturity for all the world like young people fresh from a dizzying roller coaster ride, with everything blurred, with no positive standards, with everything in doubt. No wonder so many of them welsh out and squeal and turn traitor when confronted with the brutal reality of Red military force and crafty cunning of Red psychological warfare."

There's little wonder that such a new crop of bewildered and indifferent Americans, lacking in patriotism, mental strength and dignity, should sprout in our midst.

They've been expecting and getting too much for too little, and taking too much for granted.

Their thinking and attitude have become so warped that they selfishly place themselves above their country—not realizing the existence, much less caring about nor cherishing the many blessings it offers them.

Take citizenship, for instance. They inherit this through birth. It comes to them that easily.

In my case, a most coveted prize for which I strived many years, it had to be earned. Consequently, it is more highly valued, more highly appreciated.

I know that as a naturalized U.S. citizen, I am a prouder American than most Americans.

Any naturalized American is apt to tell you the same thing. And in the process chances are that he will add with great pride, "It's just great to be an American, and I am happy and thankful for my good fortune."

Are you happy to be an American? And thankful?

You ought to be.

In this regard, I like particularly to recall the brave and courageous who offered life and limb willingly and unhesitatingly when the Nation issued the call to arms in all of the wars that America has been forced to defend her rights of liberty and freedom.

They are all men to be remembered unto eternity—gallant heroes bearing the shields of honor and glory who gave freely of themselves for love of this wonderful land of freedom and opportunity.

They defended her well. And preserved her. It behooves us all to make it a sacred duty to carry on the noble work of those deceased who dedicated their lives to perpetuating this Nation.

Let's guard her zealously and keep her, for there's no other country like this in the entire world. About this I am well aware of, first because this precious land, of which I am an adopted son, afforded me an equal chance as any of her native sons through my earlier years, and today I find nothing to deter me from establishing a place for myself; no prejudices, no restraints, nothing but bright prospects always, so long as I myself make the most of the golden opportunities at hand.

Even my brothers and sisters enjoyed and are still enjoying the same privileges open to all, and so did my parents who were among the early immigrants from Japan.

Of my mom, a sweet and tender woman, I'll remember her always by this: It was on the occasion of my kid brother joining the Army shortly after the Pearl Harbor debacle on December 7, 1941. As her parting words to her son who eventually wound up in Europe as a member of the famed 100th Infantry Battalion that distinguished itself along with the much-decorated "Go for Broke" 442d unit, she made what I still consider to be a classic speech.

Addressing her youngest son, she said with reverence in her voice: "You're Japanese by blood. But you're American by birth. The time will come when you would have to fight. Fight well—for America. This is your country. Japan, despite the fact that your parents came from there, is an enemy nation. If you have to die, die bravely for the United States. This I beg of you. I regret that I am a woman, and an old one at that. If I were able to serve, I would fight for America just as you are about to do. America has been home to us, and good and generous to us, so defend her to the very best of your ability. Your task will be big and heavy because you will be carrying the entire burden for all of us—your mother, your brothers, and your sisters. Your dead father too. My final request is, please fight my share for me."

She stands shy of 5 feet, my meek Mama-san, but that day she stood mighty tall and straight—an imposing figure.

She was just one mama whom I heard but in every AJA home that readied a son or sons for a similar sendoff, I imagine the very same thing must have happened.

I though my mom expressed the sentiment of all AJA mothers most effectively, most grandly.

I looked up to her in amazed consternation and admiration. She was never one to talk. But she cut loose for once in her life—and was I proud of the wee woman who turned into a dynamic, two-fisted fighter when the occasion demanded for a lusty pep talk on behalf of Uncle Sam, then in desperate straits.

She doesn't speak a lick of English. Neither does she understand it. But that day, let me tell you, she was as American as you or I, maybe better. You see, she was willing to sacrifice her son for this country's cause, and she herself was ready to lay down her life for this her adopted homeland.

No man could have done better than my mom that memorable day. She was more than a mother. She played the role of a typical old-time American patriot whom we used to read about and hero-worshipped in our history classes—strong, fearless, and courageous.

Through her fiery and heart-warming speech, she certainly qualified, in my eyes, as a devoted American citizen which, unfortunately, she is not.

A former alien who despised such an inferior classification, and for this reason always aspired to become a first-class U.S. citizen, I agree wholeheartedly with mom that this country is a most wonderful place to live. Truly, it is worthy and deserving of our utmost love, faith and devotion.

Let me repeat, I am indeed happy to be an American. Proud, too, to have had the privilege of serving this country during World War II along with thousands of Hawaii's stalwart volunteers. And prouder than anyone else that I am now an integral part of this great Nation so imbued with bravery, courage, ambition, and inspiration.

Having had a wholesome and interesting life in this glorious land of plenty, I am most grateful to America which, to me, my mom and others like us, stands as a symbol of eternal hope and opportunity for all of

mankind, irrespective of race, religion or creed.

America, forever.
Let's not forget her, forsake her.
And, if need be, let's fight for her.

Our Nation's Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. CARLTON LOSER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend remarks in the RECORD, I am including a very fine address by Mr. Ike Gentry, commander of American Legion Post No. 5, Nashville, Tenn. I believe the Members of the House will find this excellent speech of considerable interest and I hope you will take time to read it.

It follows:

OUR NATION'S SECURITY

(An address by Ike Gentry)

You, in the audience, so cherish the American way of life that you devote a generous share of your time and effort to promote our Nation's welfare and security. It is reassuring to see this alertness and active interest, for in these times we cannot afford complacency.

In these critical times, it is imperative that we be fully informed on all matters relating to our own defense.

The basic premise I want to present to you is one which, I am sure all of you will agree, is the prevention of all-out war. Today, the geographic position and extensive distance no longer separates the United States from prospective attackers. In the past, the time required to span these distances gave us opportunity to begin the development of the bulk of our military strength when hostilities were imminent or after hostilities began. Today, the effect of occurrences in remote areas can be felt here immediately, and they can be felt seriously. We must take into account the possibility of some minor aggression snowballing into a major threat directly menacing us.

Consequently, the problem of providing ourselves with security is clearly one which ranges across a wide field. In fact, it includes the need to deal with all types of aggression. At one extreme—the cold war; the other extreme—all-out nuclear war.

I believe the best way to explain just how the United States is undertaking to provide maximum security is to break this task down into component elements.

Of these, the first I would cite is the capability, if any attack on a general war scale should be launched at us, to retaliate with instant and destructive air-delivered blows at targets deep in enemy territory. This capability is provided by the Strategic Air Command. Our missile retaliatory forces can and must be made so numerous and relatively invulnerable that no missile or other attack upon them, even by surprise, can possibly eradicate them all.

Second, we must meet the requirements necessary to maintain defenses against air and missile attack on the United States or on vital objectives such as military installations overseas.

A third requirement is for a capability to react promptly and effectively in direct resistance to enemy armed forces involved in military aggression.

Next, there is the requirement to provide strong mobile reserves. They must be ready to move quickly to reinforce units already deployed overseas if hostilities should break out.

Still another, and closely related requirement, is the capability for protecting the sea and air lanes between the United States and strategic oversea areas, in order to prevent the enemy from interfering with the flow of reinforcements and supplies.

As a final requirement, I would cite the need to help other nations of the free world in developing their own military strength.

Although the United States is making maximum efforts on behalf of national security, this is no time for relaxation. This Nation still is in grave peril from the combined threat of the international communistic conspiracy and the growing Soviet military might.

World domination remains the foremost Communist goal. To think this goal has been abandoned is sheer folly. The danger now is greater than ever before because the Communists now have added the threat of military subjugation to conquest by subversion.

The American Legion today affirms, regardless of cost, our military strength for national defense must be strong for the protection of our Nation and the support of our foreign policy. No sacrifice is too great for the cause of freedom. We believe that only through strength can we maintain the peace. Only through strength can we preserve freedom if the enemy breaks the peace.

I doubt if there is anyone present here today who would question the necessity for moving ahead with alert security programs.

Today, I would place the American Legion's programs among the top as far as our Nation's security is concerned, beginning with our back to God programs, which should always be placed first in importance in our itinerary of programs and events.

In recent days, strange voices are heard in the land * * * subtle forces and hidden hands seem to be manipulating our beautiful Christian America into a position of confusion and threatened impotence. These voices tend to confuse us in the making of everyday decisions—when right is measured against wrong; they raise questions in our minds as to the rightness of the principles and foundations, on which our proud and Christian nation was founded; and they even cause doubt to rise in our minds as to the promises—both present and future—of faith in our eternal God.

Rather, they combine to encourage materialism, secularism, opportunism, atheism, and communism. Men of courage, intelligence and Christian faith must resist these forces regardless of the price.

America has been blessed. We have been made the heirs of abundance, because the founders of this country were influenced by the miraculous doctrine defined in the scripture, which reads "Seek ye first the Kingdom of Heaven and all these things will be added unto you." All these things were added unto us. We had no more natural resources than other countries, but the abundance which comes through Christian faith came to us.

Let us see how we have shown our gratefulness to a kind and generous Heavenly Father for this abundance. Let us see if we are moving back to God.

For instance, our public officials were instrumental in helping to organize the United Nations. Our Treasury financed the United Nations, but our officials and those in charge permitted the Prince of Peace to be dethroned. The name of Jesus cannot be mentioned in the United Nations building. Prayer is a forbidden part of the proceedings. Is this moving back to God?

"Peace can come without prayer" said the United Nations, whose first Secretary General was the number one exposed traitor Alger Hiss. Prayer and its spiritual implication was ruled out from the very beginning. The name of Christ was forbidden and prayer has never been permitted. What value would peace be in a world without prayer? Is this moving back to God?

Some organizations within this country of ours have organized a nationwide campaign to forbid Christian symbols on tax-supported property. They have opposed vigorously even the reproduction of the Nativity scene at Christmas time on courthouse squares and public buildings. They have persuaded many boards of education to call in their school songbooks and burn them and replace them with songbooks which do not contain Christmas carols and humble hymns paying tribute to Jesus Christ. Campaigns have been organized to forbid the offering of grace in schoolhouses at lunch time, for children who scarcely know how to eat until they have heard a prayer of thanksgiving. And in many instances, those of us who profess strong Christian faith have sat idly by and let those who would destroy our Christian Nation achieve their goals unchallenged. Is this moving back to God?

The people who founded the first colonies were people who came because they wanted religious freedom. The tradition of America is fundamentally Christian. In earlier days a person was forbidden to hold office in these colonies unless he was a believer in Jesus Christ. Today, some mind washers and materialistic manipulators are telling our children and our citizens that it is intellectually unsound to believe that the tradition of America is Christian. Again, we professed Christians often sit quietly by and keep our faith and our beliefs to ourselves. Is this moving back to God?

In this critical moment, I believe, complete devotion to Christ and Christian principle must be the force guiding all our thoughts and all our actions. Some, who think of themselves as having nothing but this life, cannot bear to risk this single life on principle. Only men, sensitized by faith to the fact of immortality, can give everything. They know that if they give all, they have not lost—they have been victorious. They know that when they lose their life for Christ, they find it, and when they seek first the Kingdom of Heaven, then all these abundant things are added unto them.

Why should we be concerned about life or death—or witness the principle back to God? The answer is simple—life is sacred. If we die in battle, or die naturally before the battle is won, we move from the terrestrial to the celestial and claim the reward as an immortal soul.

Two voices often beckon to us. One the voice of Satan, of materialism; the other the divine commission of our Lord. To Satan, let us say "No," to Christ, "Yes."

This is a movement back to God.

Let us bear these thoughts in mind today, to expose and fight communism, to safeguard American liberty, to maintain a government set up by a majority, safeguard our traditions, enforce the Constitution, and above all preserve America as a Christian nation.

THIS IS MOVING BACK TO GOD

Whoever dreamed that the United States of America, which grew out of the sacrifices and the Christian faith of our Pilgrim Fathers, would ever toy with the satanic temptations of materialism?

And, in conclusion, that we are in a war for survival has long been clear to the American Legion. The tide that runs against freedom must be reversed through the imaginative application of the dynamic forces which abound in this land.

Peaceful coexistence has rewarded our enemies richly. Surely it must be obvious to the politically naive, to the appeaser, yes, even to the perennial optimist, that to fulfill our role as a true revolutionary force for good, we need do more than heretofore.

Freedom for ourselves cannot be preserved in a world in which millions are enslaved and more millions stand in the shadow of godless communism. Military strength must undergird a concerted multidimensional campaign to meet communism in every arena of competition. Our Active and Reserve Forces must be modern, large, and efficient. Our organization for national security should be planned for the long haul with due concern for our economic solvency.

We face an implacable foe who spares no resources—human or material—to shape an awesome military and political threat to our very existence.

Let us, with renewed determination, educate our people to the nature, tactics, and designs of our adversaries. We believe the American Legion's policies and programs will provide the required understructure essential to America's lead role back.

Confident of our future as a great and growing nation, secure in the knowledge of our might and faith in God, the American Legion will continue to advance the cause of preparedness and freedom.

Soviets Produce Robots Rather Than Thinkers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Soviets Produce Robots Rather Than Thinkers," which appeared in the January 17, 1962, edition of the Evansville (Ind.) Press.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIETS PRODUCE ROBOTS RATHER THAN THINKERS

Concern, but hardly despair, is prompted by the National Science Foundation's report on the science gap between the U.S.S.R. and the United States of America.

The Soviets, according to the report, are turning out more than twice as many scientists, engineers, and professional technicians, and this technical manpower buildup "has become the principal source of Communist strength."

Reaction should be based not on Soviet bulk quantities but on our own needs. And we should keep the faith in our own remedies.

The Soviets produce scientists much like shoes or lace curtains. The bureaucratic planners slide-rule the need and issue the necessary orders. In the case of science, this means so many youngsters are directed to take specified training.

Assuming perfect judgment, this system works. But a mistake can affect the whole of Soviet life adversely. Such, for instance, as Soviet farm planning blunders which have kept the whole empire on a short diet.

In America we substitute a multitude of small, private decisions for arbitrary planning and regulation, thus preserving individual liberty and avoiding, to a great extent, the risk of big, bureaucratic mistakes which might have disastrous national effect.

When a shortage occurs, the rewards are increased, either in prices or in salaries inducing larger numbers to take commercial risks or submit to the disciplines necessary to acquire desired skills. This trend has been in effect in the teaching profession, for instance.

It gradually is raising both the pay and the prestige of teachers, tending to meet a rising demand.

Similar emphasis may be relied upon to produce adequate numbers of properly trained scientists, though the urgency of added incentives may not have been realized. In that case, the Foundation's report is a valuable reminder.

The Soviet emphasis on science produces specialized skills at the expense of general studies and the liberal arts, all valued in the West as essential to true education. It tends to produce robots, subservient to the mechanical needs of the state, rather than thinkers and leaders.

This may yet prove the key misestimate of the Soviet planners. It has been our philosophers who have produced the climate to which we mainly owe the progress of the Western World.

Air Reserve Forces

SPEECH

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say a word for some of our Reserve Forces who have been called to active duty.

We have read numerous reports in the press about problems in connection with the callup of certain reserve component personnel to active duty.

Without seeking to judge the validity or possible misplaced emphasis of some of those reports, I would like to call the attention of the Congress and the public to the Reserve Forces of at least one service which have gone about their job without any fuss but with outstanding success.

I am referring to the Air Reserve Forces—the Air National Guard and the Air Force Reserve.

With only 27,000 men called to active duty, they have added the equivalent of 11 wings to the Active Air Force. They have substantially augmented the Air Force's combat fighter strength on duty in continental Europe. Their huge cargo and troop carrier planes have increased the mobility of our ground forces and the cargo and passenger-carrying capacity of the Military Air Transport Service.

The people of my home State of South Carolina are particularly proud of our own 169th fighter group and 157th tactical fighter squadron now on duty in Spain as an element of the U.S. Air Forces in Europe.

They are at a place in M———— in the southern part of Spain, not far from that wonderful city that we all like to visit down there just outside of the olive country. It is one of our most important bases. We are equally proud of our 77th Troop Carrier Squadron, at Donaldson Air Force Base, which is flying airlift missions for Tactical Air Command.

I only mention this, Mr. Speaker, because I know that all of this is representative of all of the reserves in the service.

To appreciate just what these Air Reserve Forces have helped to accomplish, let us recall, for a moment, the events of last summer.

President Kennedy had just returned from his meeting with Khrushchev in Vienna, where the Soviet dictator had reiterated his determination to force us out of Berlin before the end of the year. It was a very serious situation and, as you may recall, the President in his report to the people on television made it clear just how serious the situation was.

Late in July, the President came before the Congress, with an extraordinary state of the Union message, to recommend a number of actions to step up our military readiness for the expected showdown over Berlin. The actions he recommended included recalling a number of Reserve Forces of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The Congress quickly passed a resolution to give the President this authority, and the Department of Defense soon issued orders to recall more than 160,000 members of the Reserve components.

I have gone in to some details on these events to help you recall the sense of urgency and concern we all felt at that time on the likelihood of war over Berlin.

But here it is January. Khrushchev's deadline for his threatened action over Berlin has passed. We may be no nearer today than we were last summer in building the foundations for peace. But, thank God, we are not at war.

The recall of our Reserve Forces in this crisis has set an historic precedent for, as the President has said, they were called not primarily to fight a war but to prevent a war. They are doing the job for which they were recalled.

The first assignment for the Air Reserve Forces was to build up our conventional air combat strength in Europe. On October 1, six Air National Guard tactical fighter wings, one tactical reconnaissance wing, two air transport wings, and a tactical control group, plus five Air Force Reserve troop carrier squadrons, entered on active duty.

Before the month was out, 11 Air Guard fighter squadrons left their home stations to fly over the Atlantic. More than 200 single-engine jet fighters took part in this historic mission—by far the largest deployment of jet fighters in history, and the biggest ocean crossing since World War II. Despite the fact that very few of these pilots had any previous experience in long overwater flights, and that the range of their aircraft allowed very little margin for error, every plane reached Europe without mishap. That is exactly 1,000 percent.

In 1951, during the Korean war, it took 3 months for the first reserve aircraft and crews to reach Korea after being recalled. Yet, in 1961, more than 200 Air Guard planes were on European soil just 1 month to the day after the units were called up.

But even this outstanding record was not to stand for long. To strengthen our air superiority fighter force in Europe, the Air Force on November 1 called up three Air National Guard groups equipped with the high altitude F-104 Starfighter. One of those groups was the 169th from McEntire Air National Guard Base at Congaree, just outside Columbia, S.C.

Just 3 days after they came on duty, an advance party left for Spain to prepare for the deployment of South Carolina's aircraft. The F-104 does not have sufficient range to make the Atlantic crossing, so it was necessary to partially disassemble the planes to be loaded into transport aircraft for the trip overseas. The first plane was on its way by November 10. By November 24, the day after Thanksgiving, South Carolina Air National Guard pilots were flying missions in Europe—just 24 days after being recalled to active duty.

I am sure you will agree that there is perhaps no better authority on the Berlin situation than Chancellor Konrad Adenauer of Germany. I would like to quote a statement made by the Secretary of Defense in a visit last month to one of the Air National Guard wings on duty in Europe.

I think you should realize how extremely important this movement has been," the Secretary said. "Chancellor Adenauer wrote President Kennedy that, in his opinion, the prime factor influencing Khrushchev in his slowdown on the Berlin crisis was the swift, decisive buildup of American forces, including this wing, standing at the ready in France. We are all proud of you and your magnificent performance."

I might add that our South Carolinians in Spain almost immediately found an opportunity to demonstrate southern hospitality as well as their military capability. Severe floods in the area of Seville, near the base where our people are stationed, had made thousands homeless, without adequate food or clothing. Our squadron commander, Lt. Col. Bob Corbett, called home to Columbia to ask the wives of squadron members to collect food and clothing. Our newspapers and radio and television stations soon joined in and the people of South Carolina contributed more than 16,000 pounds of food and clothing for the homeless people of Seville, flown to Spain by planes of the Strategic Air Command which regularly deploy between Hunter Air Force Base and Savannah and bases in Spain.

What could have been greater, what finer service could have been rendered to these poor people, and think of the fine public relations that these boys have created for themselves and the Nation.

I am proud that the members of the 169th fighter group and its 157th tactical fighter squadron are from my home State. I am proud that all members of the Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve are competent and highly motivated citizens. I am proud that the Congress had a major role in assuring that we built up and will continue to maintain strong Air Reserve Forces to meet any threat to our peace and security.

It sickens me to see dedicated Americans maligned and their patriotic motives impugned.

I passed through the Azores recently and saw the Air Guard and the Air Reserve as their planes stopped for fuel, and I read in their eyes that dedication motivated by the highest of American ideals. I saw Americanism at work. I resent, and resent vigorously, any reflection made on the motives of these great Americans. This is the exemplification of the spirit of Washington, Teddy Roosevelt, and that long line of airmen who carved immortal history in World War I, World War II, and in Korea. These men represent the traditions of this great Nation and I do not like them to be talked about, I resent it. They are serving their country and God knows we owe them a debt of gratitude.

The demonstrated capability of these units is evident proof of the effectiveness of the planning and execution of their training. The response of individual members of the Air Reserve Forces is gratifying in the extreme and indicates a clear understanding of the responsibilities of citizenship and the obligations of military service.

Let me quote briefly from a New Year's message by Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, the Air Force's distinguished Chief of Staff, to the families of Air Reserve Forces personnel:

Never before has the U.S. Air Force depended so heavily on the ability of the Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve to respond so quickly and effectively. Never before have the Air Reserve Forces met a challenge with such speed and efficiency.

Let us not allow the weeping of a disgruntled few to obscure these remarkable accomplishments of the overwhelming majority. I give humble thanks for the patriotism and professional competence of the members of the Air National Guard and the Air Force Reserve. They are ready now to help defend us and our allies. Let us resolve not only to give adequate recognition and aid to the members of our Reserve Forces for their service in this time of need but also to assure that they are given the resources and encouragement to continue to stand ready whenever they may be needed in the future.

Hon. Hale Boggs, House Democratic Whip

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. A. THOMPSON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, it is most gratifying to have our State honored in the matter of the designation of my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana, HALE BOGGS, to the position of majority whip. This appointment has received the plaudits of many in our State of Louisiana, including many of our newspapers. The Crowley Daily Signal, one of the great papers in my congressional district, has expressed the feeling of most Louisianians in the matter of this selection in such brief yet impressive style that I commend it to the attention of the membership of this body:

LOUISIANA MAN SELECTED

The State of Louisiana continues to hold importance in the present Democratic administration in Washington, D.C., as evidenced this week by the selection of Representative HALE BOGGS of New Orleans as Democratic whip in the House of Representatives.

BOGGS now ranks No. 3 in the Democratic Party leadership in the House. In his new role he will be required to help Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK shape legislative strategy on crucial issues.

Possessing an affable personality, BOGGS has for the past 17 years been one of the most-liked and most-respected of Congressmen. His ability to get along with his fellow man in the Halls of Congress will now be tested in his new appointment.

For Louisiana this means another of its native sons holding high public office. The interests of the State will be well served as a result of this appointment.

The Maritime Barometer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, an air of uncertainty with respect to the future of the U.S. merchant marine has blown across the New Frontier in recent weeks. In carefully guarded verbiage—sometimes in evasive language, official pronouncements have distinctly created the forecast—even if only an impression—that Government support for the maritime fleet might be reduced or minimized. In this climate, many ship operators and shipbuilders are having great difficulty in charting a satisfactory course, and as one newspaper observed editorially, shipping is still adrift.

Compared with contracts for 31 merchant ships awarded in fiscal 1961, it is now evident that contracts for only 13 ships will be placed in this fiscal year. Needless to say, the Congress, in recognition of the wisdom of a strong merchant marine as an essential element of seapower, appropriated funds for the construction of more than 13 vessels. One can only draw the conclusion that the barometer is falling, and unless a warmer front soon develops, stormy days are ahead for the U.S. merchant marine.

To clear the atmosphere, the Journal of Commerce, in an editorial entitled "Shipping Still Adrift" on December 28, 1961, called for a statement of administration policy incorporating the following points:

First, ship replacement is a long-range program. It cannot be subjected to sudden fits and starts and impulsive retreats and still maintain any semblance

of order or purpose. Without a long-range and reasonably stable program, there can be no long-range planning.

Second, consequent to the drift of the past decade in Federal shipping policy, the ship subsidy program today is being held to a level far below the minimum necessary to arrest and reverse the trend toward block obsolescense in the U.S. merchant fleet.

The need now is not only a program sufficient to meet the needs of the year ahead, but to repair the deficiencies of many years.

Third, the—shipping—industry itself needs from the President a positive declaration of resolve to get such a program going, even though that program may not be as ambitious as some operators might hope.

This editorial concludes that the present "state of mind could ultimately prove as dangerous to the mercantile marine arm of the national defense system as a prolongation of the current state of Federal indecisiveness in the field of maritime policy."

These are sound words.

I believe my colleagues—many of whom have consistently supported efforts to strengthen our merchant fleet—will be interested in the complete text of this carefully reasoned point of view, and, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHIPPING STILL ADRIFT

Just a year ago, when President-elect Kennedy was working hard on his inaugural address, it seemed as though the American shipping industry might be moving into smoother and more promising waters.

Behind it lay a decade of drift during which Federal regulatory and subsidy policies betrayed no particular trends toward good or bad; they betrayed, in fact, no particular trends at all. The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was still engraved on the statute books. Operating and differential construction subsidies were still paid out in accordance with its provisions.

But as the war-built fleet began to drift toward block obsolescence with no positive move to inject new vigor into the act or into its administration, the American shipping industry naturally began to worry.

It was at this point last year—just two decades after the wartime shipbuilding program began to grind into high gear—that Mr. Kennedy was preparing to take the helm.

And since he had indicated a tendency to make positive decisions, since he had a maritime tradition in his background (his father, after all, was the first chairman of the old U.S. Maritime Commission) expectations ran high that Federal shipping policy would soon get that new injection of vigor and direction it had so long and so sadly lacked.

It is now rather plain that these expectations were premature. The administration has, to be sure, paid a good deal more attention than preceding administrations to shipping problems over the past year, but not with invariably good results.

First, the administration insisted upon and got from Congress a reorganization of the Federal maritime agencies which was in some respects good but contained some serious weaknesses. Second, it supported, by and large, some pretty restrictive legislation applying to ocean ratemaking practices which was in some respects justified but in others may well—as this paper predicted during the year—create more problems than it solves.

If these two major legislative excursions into the sphere of shipping had been followed up by a more vigorous policy looking to a renewal of the aging American merchant fleet, we might say well and good.

The prospect would then be that having taken a more direct control over the merchant shipping program, on one hand, and over the rate practices of U.S. ship conference members, on the other, the Administration would then move to rev up the subsidy program. Something would have been lost, but something else would have been gained.

But to us it seemed that it was at precisely this point that the Kennedy administration began to falter.

Commerce Secretary Hodge's first step after the reorganization act became law was to hold up two previously approved ship construction subsidy awards for review. Since then the industry has heard less of positive action or preparations for action from his office than of hints of new curbs on the shipping subsidy program—hints that have been duly reported in this newspaper.

The explanations—still strictly unofficial—are that the President is planning a general economic belt-tightening for budgetary purposes and believes that the merchant shipping program should be no more immune from this than any other major Federal program.

This newspaper quite agrees that the ship subsidy program cannot be altogether insulated from the efforts of the President to curb Government spending from time to time, but we do think that three points should be made about the status of the present shipping effort in Washington.

First, ship replacement is a long-range program. It cannot be subjected to sudden fits and starts and impulsive retreats and still maintain any semblance or order or purpose. Without a long-range and reasonable stable program, there can be no long-range planning.

Second, consequent to the drift of the past decade in Federal shipping policy, the ship subsidy program today is being held to a level far below the minimum necessary to arrest and reverse the trend toward block obsolescence in the U.S. merchant fleet.

The need now is not only a program sufficient to meet the needs of the year ahead, but to repair the defficiencies of many years.

Third, the industry itself needs from the President a positive declaration of resolve to get such a program going, even though that program may not be as ambitious as some operators might hope.

We think it high time the President himself took note of the discouragement that has seeped slowly through the maritime industry these past 12 months.

This state of mind could ultimately prove as dangerous to the mercantile marine arm of the national defense system as a prolongation of the current state of Federal indecisiveness in the field of maritime policy.

Terror in the Congo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Terror in the Congo" which appeared in the Sunday, January 21, 1962, edition of the Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TERROR IN THE CONGO

If the United Nations command in the Congo could defeat Moise Tshombe's army in Elisabethville, it ought to be able to deal with the 200 or 300 mutinous Congolese troops who have been terrorizing northern Katanga in recent weeks.

Presumably it was these troops, or some of them, who butchered 13 Italian airmen in Kindu last November. On New Year's Day they slaughtered 19 European priests and an unknown number of African civilians at Kongolo, in northern Katanga. Now they have struck again. An aerial survey indicates that they have seized a mission in the Katanga town of Sola and the "worst" is feared for the mission staff of a dozen Europeans and about 40 young African girls who were being trained as teachers.

Earlier in the week it was reported that the U.N. command had offered all possible assistance to the Congolese Government in Leopoldville, and, more recently, a U.N. spokesman has said that "our best civilian and military minds are at work on what we can do and we will certainly take every possible action."

Up to this time, however, no effective action has been taken—not even in the case of the Italians who were murdered as long ago as last November. No doubt the factors of terrain and distance present a real problem in northern Katanga. But the U.N. was able to muster the weapons, the troops and the planes to blast Elisabethville and smash Katanga's relatively strong army. It ought to be able to assemble enough force in northern Katanga to destroy or disperse these murderous marauders. At least, having destroyed whatever capacity Mr. Tshombe may have had to cope with these intruders, it ought to try.

Inflation: The Seeds of Our Own Destruction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, in all of my public appearances in my district, and indeed in much of my correspondence, I have continued to emphasize the deep-rooted conviction that the financial solvency of this Nation is as vital as our military prowess in the effort to contain the insidious menace we recognize in communism.

Nikita Khrushchev has repeatedly reminded us that he intends to bury us and I have long been persuaded that he expects to be able to fulfill that threat because, given time, we will have spent ourselves into bankruptcy, and having fallen flat on our faces, he will be able to walk in and take over without firing a shot.

President Kennedy last week voiced a fervent plea to both management and labor to hold the line on wages and prices and thus contribute toward put-

ting the damper on the fires of inflation. And I am sure that every thoughtful person applauded that appeal. But then what happened? He comes up with the largest peacetime budget in history and projects Uncle Sam into the picture as the strongest member on the inflationary team.

Referring to an editorial appearing in a recent issue of the Daily Local News of West Chester, Pa., I am indebted for this fine statement on the subject of fiscal responsibility:

> If the Nation is living within its income, its credit is good. If in some crisis, it lives beyond its income for a year or two it can usually borrow temporarily on reasonable terms. But if like the spendthrift, it throws discretion to the winds, is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending, extends its taxing up to the limit of people's power to pay and to continue to pile up deficits, it is on the road to bankruptcy.

And who made that sound and forthright statement? Why none other than the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt on October 19, 1932, during his first presidential campaign. And although his actions later repudiated everything he said along that line his words are nonetheless meaningful.

The fact of the matter is that during the last 30 years our National Government has been operating in the red 80 percent of the time, actually putting its day-to-day housekeeping bills on the cuff. And this should not be. If we continue to operate at a deficit in times of reasonable prosperity what will we do if we encounter a slump? Shades of Andy Mellon, what a way to run a government.

Adolph Hitler, when he was preparing Germany for World War II, told his people that they could not have guns and butter, both. And why, if you please, should not President Kennedy tell the American people that until we have successfully routed the Communist menace they will have to forgo any new excursions into the welfare state, that there cannot be any new expansion beyond the limits already set in the fields of education, housing, and other social services. As my favorite editor, in the article already referred to, puts it:

> We can't beat communism, land a man on the moon, and guarantee a more abundant life for everybody all at one and the same time.

The complete editorial by my good friend, Henry Brinton, follows:

WHAT WASHINGTON NEEDS IN THIS CRITICAL HOUR

President Kennedy's plea yesterday for labor and business to exercise restraint in order to dampen the fires of inflation had a hollow sound. It will continue that way so long as the Federal Government indulges in deficit spending.

This column, on many occasions, has emphasized the point that business alone can't fight inflation, neither can labor nor Government. It will take the combined efforts of all three. At the moment each is going its own costly way.

And judging from the President's two recent messages to Congress there is little indication that the Kennedy administration is going to throw its full weight into the fight. It, therefore, can hardly expect much of management and labor.

With a large deficit facing the country at the end of the current fiscal year and only a slim chance of avoiding one next year, the words of a former President are appropriate.

"If the Nation," said he, "is living within its income, its credit is good. If in some crisis, it lives beyond its income for a year or two it can usually borrow temporarily on reasonable terms. But if, like the spendthrift, it throws discretion to the winds, is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending, extends its taxing up to the limit of people's power to pay, and to continue to pile up deficits, it is on the road to bankruptcy."

Those are the words of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt spoken during his first campaign for the Presidency, October 19, 1932. As a candidate he supported the wisdom of those words, but unfortunately he did not subscribe to them as President. But this fact in no way diminishes their importance.

Federal deficits since that day, 30 years ago, have been the rule rather than the exception. They continue to this day and there appears to be little prospect of a change in the near future. We repeat that neither management nor labor can do the job which is properly the Government's.

If our national leaders are serious in their attitude toward inflation, they will make very sure that their own doorstep is swept clean before they rap on the doors of either business or labor. What Washington needs is an honest system of national priorities. We can't beat communism, land a man on the moon, and guarantee a more abundant life for everybody all at one and the same time.

As a nation we must determine which has priority and which must come first. That is the only way we are going to get off "the road to bankruptcy." We can't have "all this and heaven, too" in one grand slam.

Community Planning—Federal Grants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Better Understanding" which appeared in the January 16 edition of the Shelbyville, (Ind.) News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BETTER UNDERSTANDING

Despite the paternalistic concept which has placed more and more centralized control of government in Washington hands, residents of a community, being closer to their own problems than others, naturally have a better understanding of local problems. This puts them in a better position than outsiders to come up with solutions that meet their particular industrial and community needs.

In short, these residents know best how to spend tax money so that it will do the most good for the greatest number. This almost axiomatic concept in community planning is undermined, to a certain extent, by Federal grants-in-aid programs, under which the Federal Government provides funds to State and local governments for various purposes.

With 45 such programs now in existence, as pointed out by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, communities sometimes are tempted into new spending ventures merely to get Federal dollars. This may entail expenditures for unnecessary projects—to the detriment of more worthwhile local development programs.

Thus, although the original purpose of grants-in-aid programs was to simulate local efforts, their effect can be to thwart the attainment of desirable community goals.

Federal grants-in-aid programs are also costly. They now run about $7.3 billion a year, or about one-sixth of all Federal nondefense budget expenditures.

These Federal programs are likewise durable. Some have continued on for decades and few have ever been discontinued. Also, there is a tendency for the older the program the greater the outlays that must be provided for it. Special interests are generated that tend to keep Federal programs going—whether needed or not.

Termination of outmoded grants-in-aid programs would contribute toward balancing the Federal budget, keeping taxes from rising, and in checking inflation.

Anyone really interested? If so, tell your Congressman and Senators. In case you've forgotten, here are those names and addresses: Congressman RALPH HARVEY, House Office Building, Washington 25, D.C.; Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, and Senator VANCE HARTKE, Senate Office Building, Washington 25, D.C.

Tribute to Former Speaker Rayburn

SPEECH

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege as well as a great honor for me to be able to honor today the memory and the service and the patriotism of the former Speaker of this House, a truly great American who now belongs to the ages, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, of Bonham, Tex., whose untimely death last autumn shocked us all and deprived the Nation of a true, good, and willing servant.

It was my good fortune to serve in the House for almost 20 years with Mr. SAM, and it was from him I received much advice and counsel that always, without exception, stood me in good stead. For most of the time I knew him, he was the Speaker of this House, and I would like to say that no fairer minded man ever occupied the Speaker's chair.

Mr. SAM cared not whether a Member was a Democrat or a Republican. If that Member had a legitimate cause he knew that the Speaker was always willing to lend a receptive ear. His word was his bond—when Mr. SAM told you what he was going to do you could rely on that word and proceed accordingly. I never knew of a promise he made that he didn't keep to the letter.

That Speaker SAM was a man of strong character is well known. That he was a man of great and strong faith in our republican institutions is even better recognized. While his political faith is opposite mine, I never knew of him to take advantage of his high position for partisan advantage. In his mind, the

Nation came first, this House came second, and party considerations had to wait.

Kindly and good are overworked words, but Speaker RAYBURN was both of these. He was also a forgiving man and never held a grudge, even after heated battle on the floor of this House. His help, his advice, his understanding were always available to all of us who served with him.

Speaker RAYBURN was accorded the rare privilege of becoming an American tradition—a legend, if you please—in his own time. That legend can now grow even larger and the tradition that was SAM RAYBURN can be perpetuated for history. He has left us, now, but I would hazard a guess that he has gone to sit in a chamber far greater than ours.

He has left a legacy for all of us—his own high official and personal standards, so consistently maintained, to which we all must aspire now and in the future.

Castro's Cuba: Communist Staging Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled " 'Mess' Becomes a Menace" which appeared in the January 12, 1962, edition of the Shelbyville (Ind.) News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"MESS" BECOMES A MENACE

Impressed, perhaps, by Fidel's own insistence that he is, too, a Marxist, the U.S. State Department has at long last made official by the issuance of a "white paper" the long-recognized fact that Castro's Cuba is the Communist staging area of the Western Hemisphere.

Next to our own, the State Department revealed, the Castro armed forces are the largest on our side of the world. Estimated at from 260,000 to 400,000 men, equipped by the Soviet with Mig fighter planes, heavy artillery, heavy machineguns and automatic rifles, and trained by hundreds of Communist military advisers and technicians, Castro's army, navy, air force, and militia now threaten the security of all American Republics.

Furthermore, the report states, Castro's bully boys have publicly announced their intention of conducting Fidel-type revolutions in all of these countries. They are now, says the State Department document, importing hundreds of dissident students, intellectuals, politicians and labor leaders for Communist indoctrination and training in sabotage and subversion, and who will be sent home to soften up their respective countries for the kill. Military aid from Russia and Red China is estimated at from $60 to $100 million.

The white paper was prepared in answer to the request of the Inter-American Peace Committee to all hemisphere governments for information on Cuban violation of human rights and the Cuban threat to peace.

It is encouraging to have this indication that the State Department knows what goes on. But we hope Washington is giving some high-level thought to what do we do about it.

Report on Foreign Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, recently one of our colleagues made a special report as a student of our trade and tariff policies.

The gentleman from Pensylvania, JOHN H. DENT, has worked for over a year as chairman of a special committee studying the "Impact of Imports and Exports on American Employment."

I was privileged to sit with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] as a member of this committee during its many days of public hearings.

Since the subject of trade is one of vital importance to all of the people of our Nation, I ask that the following report by Representative DENT be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD:

REPRESENTATIVE DENT REPORTS ON FOREIGN TRADE BATTLE

(By Hon. JOHN H. DENT, Democrat of Pennsylvania)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The first big fight in the second session of the 87th Congress will be over foreign trade and the vital question of the effect of imports from foreign countries on American jobs and American business. President John F. Kennedy is lining up his forces in the Congress—both Democratic and Republican—in support of a broad new foreign-trade program that would give the State Department virtually unlimited authority to negotiate tariff-free trade agreements without congressional approval. The forces opposing the proposed program include the UMWA, a number of other labor organizations, important segments of American business and industry, farm organizations, and top Representatives of both political parties in both Houses of Congress. The spokesman for the forces in favor of protecting American jobs in the House of Representatives, where the real fight will come, is Representative JOHN H. DENT (Democrat, of Pennsylvania), chairman of the Subcommittee on the Impact of Imports on Employment of the House Committee on Education and Labor. Representative DENT, a friend of the UMWA, has prepared a special article for the Journal on the subject. The article follows.)

Recently, one of the many reports being publicized in the press by a congressional committee that is promoting the new free-trade bill in Congress contained some interesting propositions. This report apparently was prepared by a young foreign affairs expert named Sam Pisar.

This report suggests a plan of treaties between free nations that would have the U.S. taxpayers underwrite any losses sustained by our friends if they refuse to sell to Russia, if Russia undersells the free nations in the world market after a price has been set on a commodity by traditional traders or by gentlemen's agreements. We recall the case of gentlemen's agreements in the electrical industry in the United States. Some persons went to jail.

If Pisar's suggestions become law, our industries will have one code of ethics in the United States and another in world trade.

Imagine paying damages to a country based on losses because they don't sell a commodity. Who would pay the damages? The American taxpayer, of course.

Never in our history has the danger to our future been so great. No person living can even start to estimate the cost of the trade-shift program advanced by the Pisar report. His plan, simply put, means that the U.S. taxpayer would pay for losses incurred by any country that will agree to stop doing business with the Soviet bloc and if the Soviets undersell the world market price on any commodity on which the so-called free nations have set a selling price.

If ever a dead giveaway of a frameup on the American people was exposed by a premature and overly zealous rush to destroy this Nation's economic independence was presented to the people, this is it.

This trade-shift plan shows how each step must follow the other in the well-conceived plan that has suckered into its tenacles many good and sincere Americans. Most of us agreed that it was the humane and proper thing to do; yet we may have fallen into a trap by being good neighbors and good samaritans. We helped our allies to regain and then to surpass their former economic level. We then were led to believe that by helping our former enemies to regain their past stature we could build up a wall against the dreaded doctrines of communism. We forgot that man is still man just a few centuries older. The truth is that our friends have been trading with the Soviets right along.

We never stopped helping. As soon as we gave our allies as well as our former enemies economic stature and industrial capacity beyond their fondest dreams, we started giving every other country, some yet unformed, dreams of industrial capacities beyond their needs and the rich plums to be picked in the never-ending demand of the American home market.

The American worker was told that there was a 'pie in the sky"; that unlimited markets for his products were being created in the faraway places. We all were told that by buying imports we created a market for our exports and riches flowed from the outside in, not the inside out. The plight of our gold supply soon exploded this fallacy. The plotters against our economy then learned another truth: Congress must be sold on this plan. The best way to keep Congress and thus, the people, lined up was to get directly to the Congress. Here, the new phenomenon appeared on the American scene.

LOBBYISTS BREED LIKE MOSQUITOES

The agents, the representatives, the native American lobbyists for foreign countries started to breed like mosquitoes in a swamp. They came from the best families, the highest echelons of the political parties, the biggest law firms and public relations experts. Some were the friends of the powers that be, some were and are the friends, or the friends of friends of Congress. Like a virus, they reached every vein and artery of the bloodstream of America.

Now we see the next phase in our walk down the one-way street to industrial, economic, and political oblivion. This phase (Pisar report) recognizes, even if the people do not, that once this country removes all restraints on imports, then the end of this Nation will be a matter of a few short years. Nothing the so-called European Common Market setup can do can stop the complete destruction of our economy by the trading deals between the Soviet bloc and the Common Market. The United States will be stuck in the middle, having to deal

with the Common Market under both its favorite nation obligations and because of the antitrading-with-the-Soviet-bloc policy.

The Common Market with its free access to our market will dump consumer goods into this market while dealing with Russia. It will barter for those products needed for the European economy at prices we cannot match or meet with our free labor in competition with sovietized slave labor. Pisar recognizes that without a trade shift or economic treaty with other nations, this country will be destroyed as an economic power by the simple procedure of being squeezed between the cheap imports from the Common Market and the coal, steel, raw materials, wheat, and other American products we can produce cheaper than the Common Market but not cheaper than the slave labor economy of the Soviet bloc.

Even the expert Pisar states that one of the conditions that has made the Common Market the cause of alarm is "the currently massive procurement by the Soviet bloc from Western Europe of modern plant and equipment embodying the latest in Western industrial technology."

Where did our Western European allies and friends get their industrial technology and modern plants and equipment? From the United States, of course. What makes these so-called foreign trade experts so foolish as to believe that anything we do will stop our friends from dealing with the Soviet bloc after we enter the Common Market?

It must be assumed that our friends who, for the past decade, have been using our know-how, our money, and our markets to make themselves economically sound while at the same time trading with the Soviet bloc will not change their ways so long as there are profits to be made. Look at what happened to France. France was buying (?) 5 million tons of anthracite from Pennsylvania's hard coal region and the United States was pouring good will and American assets into creating a sizable small-tools and machine-tool industry in France.

As soon as the French were in a position to sell this equipment, they made a barter deal and now Russia supplies the coal while France sells Russia the tools. How do the free traders plan to sell France American hard coal while our market is loaded with machine tools? Or do we start buying machine tools the same as we buy the millions of consumer items which we also have in excess of our needs.

I want to see the character of the new deals with which Americans are to be saddled. Will we allow the free entry from other countries of cotton, tobacco, peanuts, wheat, and other agricultural products, and if so, who picks up the bill for the added unemployment in this country?

Any 10-year-old kid in grade school knows that production will flow to the low wage areas and trade will flow to the consuming market with the highest wage levels.

Sooner or later, the same disease that has destroyed many of our high cost communities will destroy the whole American high-income economy. Pisar and his ilk are afraid of the closed ultraprotectionist communistic economies—and insist that the consumer lay in "common ground rules designed to remove the distortions and dislocations which accompany commerce between free and competitive economies.

Does this young man—Pisar—honestly believe that Hong Kong and Japan, with their 11- to 25-cent-an-hour wages, Latin American countries emerging as industrial nations with 80 cents a day top wages and the European Common Market with $4 a day incomes to skilled workers, are free and competitive market economies, with our $1.15 an hour national minimum wage laws, our free-union economy, and our antitrust, antimonopoly industrial straitjackets?

Markets aren't measured by the size of population, but rather by the level of economy in a given market area. Asia has a great number of people; but it cannot compare with the U.S. domestic market. We are told by the free traders that the Common Market is a threat because of its size, yet these same people are adamant in their opposition to trading with Red China with twice as many people. The Common Market is not a threat. It is just what we made it. We planned it, we sold it to the European nations, we charged it off as a bulwark against communism. It is a good thing and should have been promoted; but only as a Common Market for the common good of the participating nations belonging to the same economic group.

This nation of ours prospered and grew with over 100 years of protective tariffs, trading freely in goods, services, and peoples among the States under a common bond of trade economics, language, laws, taxes, and defense. The European Common Market is made up of separate nations, each with its own laws, taxes, armies, economics, and sovereign governments. Nothing this market does can prevent any nation from withdrawing from one or more of the trade covenants if that nation's sovereign government decides it best for that nation to do so. No State in the United States can set up its own individual tariff or trade deal with a foreign country. No State can make a treaty or an alliance without the participation of each and all of the States.

But this is not and won't be true of the Common Market. The only nation that will be tied to the Common Market without the freedom of action allowed the European members will be the United States of America. If we wipe out trade barriers between the United States and the Common Market countries, how do we maintain tariff walls against Japan and other countries outside the Common Market?

Another thing that is as sure as life itself: The Common Market countries will never allow an American product to be imported into the marketplace of any of its component nations at a price below their own selling price unless that product is one not produced in the Common Market countries.

We will get the treatment we are getting on machine tools from Japan. Japan has reached a local production capacity to take care of most of its needs on machine tools up to $80,000 in value. Without too much fanfare, the Japanese have set a new tariff on machine tools up to $80,000 or 25 percent ad valorem. When a spokesman for Japanese interests was asked about reciprocity he made this astounding statement:

"The Japanese are great believers in reciprocity and while we raised the tariff on machine tools, we are lowering the tariff on bourbon whisky from 45 to 35 percent. You see, we are not unmindful of our obligations." It was pointed out that the Japanese do not import enough bourbon whisky to keep a respectable Irish wake going for 2 nights.

IMMIGRATION WALLS MIGHT TUMBLE

Unless there is a free movement of peoples, the aims of the dreamers can never be achieved by limiting freedom to the movement of goods. All Americans should be told that the tearing down of protective walls for jobs and profits carries with it the promise to the world that immigration walls will tumble in the very near future.

Does any person believe that the peoples of the world will be willing to work, to make life easier for Americans without the right to join us in our promised ease of living? Our standard of living cannot be reached by the world peoples in the measurable future unless we reduce our standards radically, while they slowly inch theirs upward.

No nation will or can respect any nation that neglects its own welfare no matter how many leaders are giving the signals. The people are ahead of the leaders and if the plans of the Pisars and other "free traders" are put into effect they will cause a political upheaval the likes of which this Nation has not seen since the depths of the depression.

In closing, consider the situation within our own free trade area of 50 separate, but United States. You have to pay a tariff if you bring whisky from one State into another, but you can ship or bring home a gallon free from foreign countries.

Even furniture, automobiles, appliances or any other item sales taxed (tariffed) in one State cannot be purchased in another State without paying the tariff to the State in which the commodity is being moved. It's well known to Pennsylvanians that the State government adds customs officers for the holiday seasons to keep native Pennsylvanians from bringing in contraband liquors, cigarettes, etc., without properly declaring same and paying duty imposed by State law.

Why is this necessary? Simply because some States depend upon these taxes or tariffs for their payment of services rendered to the people of the State.

The new proposals which call for free movement of goods, and the payment of losses of profits for any nation refusing to do business with the Soviet bloc will make our present national debt look like a piggy bank payment on a Rolls-Royce.

Address by Danny Danenberg Representing the Western Growers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the pleasure of hearing from Mr. Danny Danenberg, El Centro, Calif., representing the Western Growers Association.

His talks reminded me of his excellent presentation before the Subcommittee on the Impact of Imports and Exports on American Employment which I have had the privilege to head during the past year.

At some later date the Members will be presented with a copy of our committee's report of the hearings. At that time they can read his excellent testimony.

Today, I believe it would serve a very useful purpose to present to the House his remarks as they are contained in a speech delivered on November 3, 1961, at the 36th Convention of the Western Growers Association, San Francisco, Calif.

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I hope that you will not accept this as a speech, but rather as an extended statement about the preservation of a way of life—a way of life that has brought more good things to more people than any other way of life that has ever been conceived. Now let me remind you that the key word in this statement is "Preservation," because these are indeed sobering times. This Nation is showing signs of weakness when it should be strongest. Our form of government is being challenged from abroad and undermined at home.

I pray with you today that none of us will see the fall of our free enterprise system where "Freedom of Choice" has endowed upon us the highest living standards and made us the leading Nation in the free world. We are at a crucial juncture in time and we must face the fact that we have in this world two strong, political, social and economic philosophies moving mankind in opposing directions. As we come to grips with these differences, we recognize that ours is the philosophy of the free world which holds that "Freedom of Choice" is the right of all men and that the purpose of the state is to serve individual opportunity and freedom.

We, in national unity, are dedicated to these principles—when I say unity, I do not mean unity for the sake of unity—I mean unity between Democrats and Republicans and Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, and I further mean unity behind a program of determination that all men are entitled to the blessings and opportunities that only a free society can offer. So as such we not only have unity of purpose, but we have national unity in their preservation and a willingness to work mightily for this preservation.

Mr. Chairman, I want to talk to you about the symptoms of planned destruction of the free enterprise system in America. These welfare staters tell us that we are better off, both in spirit and in substance and that we can look forward to a period of progress. The chapter on "How" is blank, but they say that this chapter is not important and that we must apply full power steering for the centralization of all government in Washington. That is their chapter but let me tell you that this is not only insidious but is the most dangerous thing that is happening to the American people today.

I have stated that the chapter on how is blank and let me explain what I mean. There is this business of the "business cycle." One of the beauties of this approach, from the standpoint of the numerous Keynesian (welfare staters) scholars in our midst, is that it is delightfully vague. They never bother to say whether the business cycle runs for 3 years, 5 years, 7 years, 9 years, or what. This frees them from the obligation of explaining how the budget is to be balanced over the years of the business cycle.

The California-Arizona farmers who are members of Western Growers Association have a long and proud history in not only opposing but refusing Government subsidies on our vegetable and melon production placing full faith and reliance on our marketplace and the free enterprise system. The Keynesian scholars continue their blank chapter on How by encouraging the Federal Government to subsidize business, industry, private finance, agriculture, transportation, power, housing, health, education, States, localities, and individuals. When we ride along with this posse of welfare staters and take their subsidies, we give up our independence and freedom and submit to bureaucratic control. I submit to you the fact that it is indeed a strange logic that demands obedience to rules that destroy all initiative, all purpose, and all pride.

This posse of planners carry over from administration to administration, and they carry forward a set of rules of theory which are inadequate and introduce many additional complications regardless of which political administration is in power. When they argue reciprocal trade, they argue "trade—not aid." When they want to put across foreign aid, they argue—"Aid, not trade." When they are confronted with damage to American labor, American agriculture, and American industry by large volume imports from low wage paying nations under the deceptive name of reciprocal trade, they rally to the defense by more Federal meddling and more Federal subsidies. Their motives are their business but as one who believes in freedom of choice, I say that this a one-way street and in plain words the cure they offer is worse than the disease.

The American business community has thrived on free and open competition; and the American business and agriculture community is perfectly willing to invest its money and take its risk, provided it is allowed to enjoy equal opportunity and fair competition.

It would be a very positive step for the Government of the United States to get out of those businesses which can be performed by American industry. It is fantastic for the Government of the United States to take tax money from individuals and corportations and then to compete with them in the operation of everything from ice cream plants to powerplants and industrial complexes. The growth of the competitive free enterprise system would certainly be encouraged if the obvious corrective measures were taken in this area.

GOVERNMENT APPOINTEES

In many ways, one of the most frustrating and disheartening experiences is to read the announcement of the appointment of an individual to a high Government position exercising vast authority over the business community when I know that he is hostile to the very economic beliefs upon which this Nation is predicated.

With rare exceptions, we in the business world are familiar with the economic philosophy of prominent people. We generally recognize the followers of John Maynard Keynes and Harold Laski. We read enough to identify Fabian Socialists and the followers of Hjalmar Schacht.

Mr. Chairman, may I now take the liberty of reading my "Ten-Point Political Farm Philosophy."

1. I believe in checks and balances and subscribe to our two-party political system.

2. I believe in a strong national defense and I want this great Nation to be strong, but I also believe in a "pay as you go" budget and don't want our children and our children's children mortgaged.

3. I believe that we should all accept our responsibility to mankind, but do not believe that "cradle to grave" security is a part of that responsibility.

4. I am dedicated to the principle of our free enterprise system and that private enterprise should compete fairly in our great American marketplace.

5. I concur with the ad that Federal aid to education should start with teaching arithmetic in Washington.

6. Experience has generally proven that private industry, agriculture, and our States can only accept Federal aid on a loss-of-freedom basis.

7. I subscribe to the theory that we want less Government in agriculture—not more.

8. We need international trade, but we can and must be more selective—foreign trade must be fair trade that will allow us to buy more of the things we cannot or do not produce at home.

9. I subscribe to the principle that the people should support the Government and should not have the Government support the people.

10. That there is nothing evil about profits—this is the motive power behind a free society and a free economy.

We have members of the press and today your job is indeed very, very important to the American public. We have our constitutional guarantees of freedom but this is an age of rapid communication where every day finds mass information presented to the American public. New products, new ideals, new inventions immerge rapidly but preeminent with all this we must retain one of our most important ingredients—these are the ingredients which make all other rights safe and secure and these protective ingredients are freedom of speech and freedom of press. We salute you today and your efforts to keep America informed by diligent, sincere, truthful reporting where truth prevails through the freedom of the press.

Over 100 years ago Abraham Lincoln said that if this country were ever to be destroyed it would be from within, and not from without.

Mr. Chairman, we recognize that new ideas we certainly must have. Differences of opinion we should always weigh carefully; and if they merit it, we should proffer support and respect, but we should always remember that it was ingenuity, creativity, constructive and rational thinking—combined with lots of hard work—that have brought America to her present eminence.

And finally, may I say to our assembled audience that it is time that every citizen of America who believes in our freedom of choice way realizes that any government big enough to give you everything you want is also powerful enough to take everything you have.

Extension of United Nations Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "On Paying the Policeman" which appeared in the January 15, 1962, edition of the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON PAYING THE POLICEMAN

President Kennedy's plea that Congress buy bonds from the United Nations does nothing to make the idea more palatable financially or from a standpoint of politics. In his state of the Union message, the President characterized the U.N. as an international policeman. He pointed out that no one likes an officer, particularly "when he uses his stick to restore law and order on his beat."

This is an extension of U.N. authority which is accepted by only a small group of professionals within the Secretariat of that international organization. The British do not agree. The French certainly have other ideas. The Russians have never paid any attention to this "policeman." India didn't respect the ethereal stick or nonexistent authority of the U.N.

The President's request is, then, based on an erroneously dangerous concept of what the U.N. is, or rather isn't.

He added that the bonds would be used to finance "special operations for the next 18 months." This is a polite phrase for the U.N. effort to colonize the Congo, including possible military action there. Do most Americans want to spend $100 million for such a questionable cause?

Finally, the President gave the best reason of all for letting other nations share the cost and the burden of the U.N. He argued that the bonds would be repaid with interest within 18 months from regular assessments which other nations have paid. The other nations refuse the special assessments for special operations.

Supposedly the regular U.N. assessment is a charge against each nation for the normal operation of that body. If this assessment covers normal operations, there will be no surplus left with which to repay bonds or interest. If the assessment is padded to cover the bonds which are used to finance special operations, the same nations which have refused to pay special assessments will simply reduce their regular payments. The Russians and their Communist satellites will see clearly through any such financial maneuver.

If the other nations are able to pay assessments 18 months in the future, they are just as able to make those payments right now. Every member nation should share in supporting the U.N. Congress should insist on this principle by refusing to buy bonds that won't be worth the cost of their printing.

Domestic Dictators: Our Greatest Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, in our preoccupation with the important business of meeting totalitarianism around the world we seem to give scant attention to its presence right here in our midst. We are spending fifty-odd billion a year to develop the deterrent force necessary to contain Khrushchev, Mao, and their ilk. And we are spending additional billions in the guise of foreign aid to placate or win lesser fry from attaching themselves to the Communist train.

But with all this attention to the dictators who flourish beyond our borders we seem oblivious to the threat to our freedom that is posed here at home by arrogant labor leaders of the stripe of of Mike Quill and Jimmy Hoffa. The men who are enrolled in the ranks of labor—whether voluntarily or under compulsion matters not—are in the main loyal American citizens who want nothing more than the privilege of working at gainful employment at a return that will keep them and their families in decent comfort. And I know from conversation with them that they realize that every time they are called out on strike by some publicity seeking tyrant they wind up with a loss in earnings that is never made up.

In the current situation, Mike Quill aided and abetted by Hoffa, has threatened to shut down all traffic over the Pennsylvania and New York Central railroads in the event that these two companies proceed with their plans to merge into one system. Indeed Quill's arrogance is so great and his conceit so colossal that he is not going to await the routine procedures that both companies must follow before the Interstate Commerce Commission, but has indicated his intention to bring all trains to a stop on February 4 on the mere assumption that some of his nonoperating unionists might be adversely affected. And, incidentally, why should not they be laid off if they are not needed? Indeed, it has been featherbedding, retaining railroad employees in unnecessary or duplicating jobs, that has helped to bring the railroads to their present plight. To say that men should be kept in any position on "made work" is also to argue illogically that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania should not now be in the process of losing three Congressmen in the face of an increase in population. And by the same token to deny to railroads every possible economy of operation—such as consolidation and a reduction of the working force—will only serve to speed the day when our primary transportation system will grind to a halt simply because the washout of bankruptcy has swept away the tracks. But Quill, who has no concern for corporate responsibility or management's pressing problem of trying to make a reasonable return to its investors, says that human factors transcend all financial considerations, totally ignoring the fact that they are inseparably bound together—no profits, no jobs.

As usual in cases such as this the public welfare is completely ignored by the labor hierarchy who seek primarily the preservation of their own despotic sway at salaries that match their opposites on the management side. Having just put the city of New York in its place with the threat of a transit strike, Quill now moves on the national scene. In this instance it is hoped that the occupant of the White House will not allow this despot to intimidate him as he did the occupant of Gracie Mansion in New York. The Railway Labor Act embodies all of the machinery necessary to an orderly review of this controversy with complete fairness to both sides as well as the much-abused public. And in the event existing statutes are inadequate the Congress has the clear responsibility to enact laws that will henceforth prevent all work stoppages in the field of transportation, which is so vital to our defenses and the well-being of all of our citizens. As I have already emphasized, what is the use of girding ourselves to keep the Communist aggressors within bounds if we are to lose the battle—and our freedom—to these homegrown dictators?

Progress in Ecuador—Speech by Engineer Jose Espinosa, Manager of Pasteurizing Plant, Quito, Ecuador

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, on my recent visit to Latin America, it was my privilege to spend several days in the Republic of Ecuador. I visited in the beautiful capital city of Quito, where I talked with many of the Government officials, along with representatives from industry, labor, farm organizations, student groups, and others.

One of the most interesting experiences on my visit to Quito was the opportunity to see a new dairy plant—a pasteurizing plant—which was providing wholesome and clean milk for thousands of people in Quito. This particular pasteurizing plant was constructed under a cooperative arrangement with the United Nations UNICEF and the Ecuadoran Government.

The plant manager, Mr. Jose Espinosa, gave us a detailed description of the plant and a tour of its facilities. This particular enterprise is now operated by a group of dairy farmers as a private enterprise. The capital has been provided by the city council of Quito and by private stockholders.

This particular pasteurizing plant needs to be expanded, and the management has requested a loan from the Inter-American Development Bank for approximately $400,000. This is the type of loan which is not only sound economics, but good constructive social policy.

I call this matter to the attention of the Senate only because it indicates that in Latin American countries many improvements are under way. Trained leadership from the colleges and universities of Latin America and North America are meeting the challenges of the day and moving ahead to provide a better living for the people.

I salute Mr. Jose Espinosa and those associated with him. I take this opportunity of expressing my thanks to the people of Ecuador for their hospitality and kindness and to the Government of Ecuador for its cooperation and hospitality. I came away from this country encouraged as to the future and deeply moved by the sincerity and dedication of its people.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech given by Mr. Espinosa on the occasion of our visit on Sunday, November 12, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH GIVEN BY ENGINEER JOSE ESPINOSA, MANAGER OF PASTEURIZING PLANT, QUITO, ECUADOR, NOVEMBER 12, 1961

Senator Humphrey, Mr. Hollander, Mr. Schroeder, Mr. Shuart, ladies and gentlemen: We feel particularly honored with the visit to this plant of such a distinguished person, so well known in his country as well as abroad, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. I beg you, Mr. Senator, ladies and gentlemen, to excuse my pan-American English, even though I am graduated from Catholic University of America in Washington, D.C.

In 1952 Unicef realized the importance of improving the distribution conditions and milk quality in Quito. With this purpose Unicef signed an agreement with the Ecuadoran Government for installing a milk pasteurizing plant. The Quito City Council was in charge of the building, installation of the equipment donated by Unicef and starting of the plant. Since 1956 the council could not start operations by themselves. So in May 1960 a group of dairy farmers promoted the constitution of E.P.Q.S.A., as a private enterprise. The total capital of the company right now is worth 15 million

sucres, from which 36 percent belongs to the council and 64 percent to the private stockholders.

Really this company is not an agriculture cooperative, but in a certain way approaches that kind of organization. Every producer who holds stock in this company is supposed to deliver all his milk production to the plant. With this purpose the producer bought a certain amount of shares which correspond to 100 sucres for each liter of milk that as an average delivers into the plant.

From the total amount of capital subscribed by each farmer 10 percent was paid at the constitution of the company and 90 percent in nine semester payments that more or less correspond to 5 cents reduction in each liter of milk price delivered by the producer.

It is for this reason that the capitalization of the plant is very slow and all the investments and basic needs of the plant have to be very carefully chosen, and still we could not improve the appearance of the building and grounds completely.

The three main aims of this organization are:

1. to distribute milk and milk products in a technical way, at a reasonable price.

2. to deliver some free milk to the schoolchildren in the city, according to Unicef's program.

3. to guarantee the producers a regular raw milk price all the year round, receiving all their milk at any time.

The first part has been very successful due to the municipal law enforcing only pasteurized milk consumption in the city and that almost every one of the zone milk producers holds stock in this plant, or in another pasteurizing plant in the city, all the milk including marketed, bottled, and pasteurized.

Seven months ago today, the milk was delivered raw in open cans, from which it was taken to every home in the most primitive and dirty form. People were afraid to drink milk, and it was imperative to boil it before consumption. Besides that the product was not pure most of the time, it contained flour and any kind of running water available when the surplus of milk in the city was scarce. Right now this plant delivers 80 percent of the city milk consumption, this is from 65,000 to 70,000 liters a day.

Also we pasteurize and truck milk to Guayaquil, main city on the coast, about 30,000 to 35,000 liters a day. This plant was designed for handling only 60,000 liters a day, so enlargements are required immediately.

It is very important to point out that raw milk price is about 6 cents of a dollar, more or less the same as in the States, but the bottled pasteurized milk is worth only 8 cents of a dollar, really the lowest price at least in America.

According with UNICEF's program we will start next Tuesday distributing 3,000 quarts of free milk daily to the schoolchildren in the city. UNICEF has demonstrated its satisfaction with the management of this plant, that, next year UNICEF will deliver $30,000 worth of new equipment and materials free of charge.

Even though UNICEF does not hold any stocks in the company, in our board of directors we have during the first 5 years, one of its representatives, so UNICEF is very well informed of the development of the plant. The city council has two representatives on the board, and the producers another two members.

FAO has helped us a lot with its technical assistance, so important in our country. FAO maintains in the plant a first-class milk technician, Prof. Rafael Fentoni, who trained people 3 months before we started the plant, both laborers and technical people. Right now we open a milk laboratory training course to which all milk plants in the country were invited freely to participate.

The third part of the program has also been accomplished. Milk producers, for the first time, have been allowed to deliver all their products to the plant at a good and constant price during the dry season or the rainy season. A few days ago there was some scarcity of milk in the city mainly because of the dry season and also due to the fact that water was not added into the milk. Producers are invited to improve their herds and delivered more milk as never before.

The plant does not want to make any profits. If there will be any, the city council will increase the distribution of free milk in the city, and the price of raw milk will be raised accordingly for the producers.

With the help of the Servicio Cooperative Interamericano de Agricultura we have improved enormously the hygienic quality of raw milk, visiting the farms and training people in good handling and cleaning of barns and cattle. At the beginning we received about 8,000 liters of acid milk daily; right now we only get around 500 liters of acid milk daily, even though specifications are more severe.

Under this program we are requesting a loan to the Interamerican Development Bank for about $400,000, to cool the milk immediately at each farm and truck the milk in bulk tanks every other day to the city. The improvement of milk delivery in the city is also being considered under this loan.

This is about the general layout of the organization, and we expect to have more fruitful results in the near future.

May I invite you gentlemen to visit the plant.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement delivered by me before the AFL–CIO Economic and Legislative Conference, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D.C., Tuesday, January 23, 1962:

The President, at his press conference, when asked why he did not sign the Executive order concerning the prohibition against racial discrimination in housing, replied that it was his belief he should not get too far ahead of public opinion in pressing for civil rights. When the President says he does not want to hamper or delay consideration of important bills and that pressing for civil rights would wound the sensibilities of southern Members of Congress and, therefore, induce them to vote against important legislation, he may be on practical, understandable ground, but, on the other hand, the Nation has been always expectant of strong moral leadership by the President. He must bring the weight of his high office and personality to bear on public opinion. The President understands this. He understands it because he, himself, said:

"If the President does not himself wage the struggle for equal rights—if he stands above the battle—then the battle will inevitably be lost."

In 1960, when he was a candidate, he emphasized this point of view and stated that the President must provide the spur for legislation as well as executive action. He said:

"The President cannot wait for others to act. He, himself, must draft the programs, transmit them to the Congress, and fight for their enactment, taking his case to the people if the Congress is slow."

There is no doubt that the President and his administration have gone a great way toward the prevention of erosion of civil rights. He has appointed many Negroes to high office; his Attorney General has shown exemplary wisdom and practicality in protecting the freedom riders; in causing the enforcement by the judicial process of the school desegregation case. In many ways, through executive action, the administration has rendered yeoman service to the cause of civil rights, in education, travel, employment, and voting. Those are only successive plateaus on the way to the summit. The administration cannot unduly tarry at any of these plateaus. The advance must be incessant and constant. The President, in his state of the Union message, said:

"A strong America requires the assurance of full and equal rights to all its citizens, of any race, of any color."

To bring about that assurance, much more needs to be done. There is a legislative program as outlined in the Democratic platform, which was espoused by the President, which must be carried out.

As chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, I have a duty to perform. I have offered a series of bills, together with Senator CLARK, of Pennsylvania, which would materially strengthen civil rights over and beyond the advance made by the administration through executive action. These measures include the following:

1. A constitutional amendment to eliminate payment of poll taxes as a requirement of voting in Federal elections;

2. A constitutional amendment to eliminate literacy tests as a requirement for voting;

3. A bill to require every school board operating a racially segregated public school to adopt a desegregation plan within 6 months of the date of enactment of the bill and to file the plan with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The plan would state how the board intended to achieve desegregation with all deliberate speed in each of its schools and include a schedule showing the time and the manner in which desegregation would be achieved in each class and school. To meet the requirements of the act, the plan would have to provide for "first-step compliance" at an early date. Technical and financial assistance would be given under the bill to desegregating school districts, and court enforcement would be authorized in the cases of school boards which violated the duties set forth in the act;

4. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to initiate civil injunction suits in the Federal courts to prevent the denial of any civil right on grounds of race, creed, or color;

5. A fair employment practice bill to provide administrative and court remedies for those persons discriminated against as a result of race or color. The bill would make it an unfair employment practice for any business or labor union employing more than 50 persons to discriminate in its hiring, promoting or firing practices on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin; and

6. A bill to make the Civil Rights Commission a permanent Federal agency with strengthened factfinding powers and a new directive to act as "a national clearinghouse for civil rights information". Of course, the Civil Rights Commission has already been extended for 2 additional years but it is my firm conviction and belief that it should be a permanent Federal agency with the powers I have just outlined.

I intend to press for the enactment of these legislative proposals. Regardless of present legislative priorities, I am confident that the time will arrive when all of these

measures will be placed on the statute books of our country.

In particular, at the present time, the leading priority will be the constitutional amendment to eliminate payment of poll taxes as a requirement for voting in Federal elections. As chairman of both the full House Committee on the Judiciary and of the subcommittee which handles civil rights legislation, I will call for consideration of this proposal in the very near future. I am confident that this proposal will receive early and favorable consideration, not only in my committee, but in the House of Representatives as well.

There is a current development in the field of labor and management which involves civil rights of the laboring man. I believe that the right to organize is a civil right of labor. All of you present here today, I am sure, realize the movement which is presently taking place to amend our antitrust laws so as to bring labor within the provisions from which they have been exempted since 1914. This attack on so-called labor monopolies is designed to fragmentize and fracture collective bargaining on a national scale and force collective bargaining on local union levels.

Any such amendment to the antitrust laws falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. I can assure you here that I will vigorously oppose any such amendment and I am more than confident that this attack upon the civil rights of labor will meet defeat again as it has in the past.

Consistency requires that civil rights must be protected on all levels of American life. It would be inconsistent if they were protected on the political, housing, transportation and educational levels and not on the labor level.

Castro Pushing Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Castro Pushing Communism" which appeared in the January 12, 1962, edition of the Richmond (Ind.) Palladium-Item.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASTRO PUSHING COMMUNISM

Cuba's little dictator who has put to death more than 600 persons during the period he has ruled with a Communist hand is now planning extension of his Red course.

Fidel Castro is preparing to brainwash those who are not dedicated Communists, while he sets up a system of "revolutionary instruction schools."

While Castro recently openly admitted his ties with Communists and proclaimed his government a part of the Communist world, he is shy about using the word Communist in statements from the government.

As a result he is saying that he will follow the socialistic pattern of the "Marxist-Leninist intelligentsia."

It is apparent that Cubans as a people are not too sold on the Communist pattern, but Castro has determined to make Communists out of them.

If the Government of the United States does not take steps to curb Castro in his drive to make Cuba a haven for Reds, we may find ourselves forced to deal with strong Communist opposition at our doorstep.

It would not be surprising for the Soviet Union or Red China, or both, to provide not only military equipment but also Communist leadership in an attempt to prevent our country from ultimately acting against the Red threat from Cuba.

The failure of President Kennedy to support adequately the invasion of Cuba early last year was one of the big blunders of recent years.

The Shame of Our Rural Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, James B. Carey, vice president of the AFL-CIO and president of the International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, AFL-CIO, last November gave an excellent address on the subject of our rural schools to the members of the National Committee for Rural Schools which was meeting in New York City at that time.

I feel that the message given by Mr. Carey would benefit the Members of Congress too. For this reason I would like to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This history of the fight for public school education for the youth of America is well recorded in this address—and the fact that the labor movement, since its very inception, has been in the vanguard of those dedicated individuals who initiated this fight, is something of which we current members of labor can be proud.

With the great technological advances being made—not only in our Nation but throughout the world—today, we find that this fight must be continued in an effort to assure our youth adequate educational opportunities thereby enabling them to have the proper and necessary qualifications to assume the responsibility and management which will be theirs in the very near future.

The address follows:

THE SHAME OF OUR RURAL SCHOOLS

(Speech by James B. Carey, vice president, AFL-CIO, and president, International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, AFL-CIO)

Eighty years ago today in Pittsburgh the first and founding convention of the American Federation of Labor drew to a close in a small dimly lit recreation hall built by German immigrants.

As their concluding, and most important action on that fateful November 18, 1881, the 107 delegates adopted a declaration of principles. The first principle in this declaration advocated laws permitting unions to incorporate in order to protect their property.

The second principle of the declaration called for passage of such legislative enactments as will enforce by compulsion the education of children. The third principle advocated laws forbidding the employment of children under the age of 14 years in any capacity, under penalty of fine and imprisonment.

I start with this small historical recital of an event that happened fourscore years ago today because it reveals so much about the American labor movement not only then but in its very earliest origins 80 years before that.

One of the least known facts about the American labor movement is that in its origins and early development its primary concern was with children and the right of children to a free public education. Reflect on those first three points of the AFL's declaration of principles. The first had to do with keeping union halls and records from being seized by labor's enemies. The second and third both were concerned with children—their education and their protection against exploiting employers.

Only after the interests of the Nation's children had been carefully dealt with did the declaration of principles turn to such questions as the 8-hour day, higher wages, the application of conspiracy laws to labor, and statutes requiring safety and sanitary protections in factories and mines.

Obviously children were the primary concern, the overriding concern.

No, this was no accident; it was part of a strong and sustained tradition that went back to the turn of the century and the remote beginnings of American unionism.

There was, for example, another meeting that is now historic in the annals of American unionism. It was held here in New York and the time was January 1829. The occasion was a meeting of the newly organized Workingmen's Party and it, too, adopted a declaration of principles. Here was the climax of that declaration:

"We seek," said these workingmen 132 years ago, "a system that shall unite under the same roof the children of the poor man and the rich, the widow's charge and the orphan, where the road to distinction shall be superior industry, virtue, and acquirement without reference to descent."

This became the focal point in the political platform of the Workingmen's Party and thus began the campaign for free compulsory education in the United States.

So here, too, we find—in 1829 in one of the earliest programs of organized labor—education and the protection of children taking precedence over wages and hours and other basic economic demands.

Labor, in fact, pinned its greatest hopes for its own future and the Nation's future on education. To the founders of American unionism, education was an end-all and be-all. As one labor historian has written:

"Never have a people had a greater faith in education—the greatest blessing bestowed upon mankind—than this generation of Americans. The workers could not have been more determined in demanding it for their children as a right to which they were morally entitled."

Public and tax-supported schools were indeed desperately needed in the infant Republic. They existed only in a few New England areas; elsewhere it was almost impossible for workers' children to receive a genuine education. Even in such comparatively rich areas as New York and Pennsylvania, the only educational facilities available to workingmen's children were charity schools.

Was the early labor movement's preoccupation with education a quirkish and isolated interest? No, it was as intense a matter of public concern as it was labor's. Proof of this was seen in the very first political campaign waged by the Workingmen's Party I mentioned a few moments back. Only a few months after it adopted the program I described, the new Workingmen's Party entered the New York City municipal elections and polled an astonishing 6,000 votes out of a total 21,000 cast.

Five years later labor's insistent campaign for a free public school system was victorius, but not in New York. The triumph

came, interestingly enough, in Pennsylvania where American unionism was born and where it had a longer tradition than in New York. The Pennsylvania legislature—in large part responding to labor's demands—inaugurated the Nation's first free, tax-supported school system. From then on it was a matter of other States following suit.

I realize that I have made it sound as though this historic victory was won without opposition. The truth is quite the contrary. The opposition was extremely strong, widespread, and vehement. The opposition comprised virtually all of business and industry and probably most of the commercial press. Their implacable resistance to public education was summed up by the National Gazette which angrily proclaimed that:

"Universal, equal education is impossible if trade, manufacturing, and manual labor are to be successfully prosecuted—unless the standards of education be greatly lowered and narrowed."

Free public schooling was the first victory, but that was only half the battle. Still to come was compulsory schooling. As long as free public schooling was optional and not required, hundreds of thousands of American parents—especially in times of recession and depression—were forced to send their children into factories, mills, and mines where they were savagely exploited.

That founding convention of the AFL that met in Pittsburgh just 80 years ago this week, heard its first president, Richard Powers, exclaim:

"I say that there is no crime greater under the heavens than that of employing child labor in mills, factories, and industrial establishments. Chicago is raising up an army of criminals by this very thing. Children from the tender age of 10 up to 14 are driven into factories. Boys are training for criminals and girls for prostitutes."

Another delegate said, "The saddest thing I ever saw was a little child with an old face. Oh, I have seen them by the hundreds—seen them in mills and factories."

There was another delegate to this founding convention, a young man still unknown, an immigrant cigarmaker from New York City. A few State laws were on the books against child labor, he said, but they were not enforced. Then the young cigarmaker—his name was Samuel Gompers—continued:

"Not long ago I visited the tenement cigar shops. I saw on that visit scenes that sickened me. I saw little children 6 and 7 and 8 years of age, seated on the floor in the middle of a room, in all the dirt and dust, stripping tobacco. Little pale-faced children, with a look of care upon their faces, toiling with their tiny hands from dawn till dark; aye and late into the night, to help keep the wolf from the door. I asked them how long they worked, but they did not, could not, understand. In the simplest way I talked to them and learned that they began before daylight and worked till long after dark. Often they would be overcome with weariness and want of sleep, and fall over upon the tobacco heap. Shame upon such crimes; shame upon us if we do not raise our voices against it."

Let me emphasize that what the young Samuel Gompers described here, what he so passionately raised his voice against, was an industrial nightmare and horror that existed a half-century after the start of free public education.

What was missing was free compulsory education. The child labor laws were not enforced and there was nothing else to pull those children, babies almost, out of the squalor of the brutalizing cigar shops and lead them by the hand into God's sunlight and into school playgrounds. Only compulsory education would eventually do that.

And eventually it was done, with labor's help and the dedicated help of liberal and humanitarian groups. But it was a painful, inching process. As late as 1912 the labor movement was protesting the fact that "of the 25 million children of school age in the United States, 50 percent leave school at the end of the sixth grade at approximately 14 years of age." Millions of them, of course, were grabbed by employers who exploited them for wages far below hard-won union standards.

Down through the years organized labor felt that the cause of free compulsory education was, so to speak, its own cause, a personal cause, and when victories came labor rejoiced in them as labor's own victories. John Dewey, reviewing the history of American labor's fight in this field, declared:

"I say without any fear of contradiction that there is no organization in the United States—I do not care what its nature—that has such a fine record in the program of liberal progressive public education."

But today—80 years after Samuel Gompers cried "Shame upon such crimes * * * shame upon us"—the labor movement's job is still for from finished.

Our shame today is still the millions of youngsters who are turned loose on the labor market—and too often into the ranks of the unemployed—before they have even finished high school.

It is more than shame, far more menacing than shame, to the Nation's future and to democracy itself. Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg recently termed it "the most dangerous social condition in America," and former Harvard University President James B. Conant calls it "social dynamite."

What is the problem? It is called "drop-out." Today there are 10,800,000 youngsters enrolled in grades 9 through 12; but at least 2,500,000 of these will drop out of school before they graduate.

The percentage of high school students dropping out of school before graduation ranges up to 42 percent in the 50 States. Most State laws permit students to leave school when they reach 16.

This, I think, is today's shame. It is today's shame because more than ever before—in an era demanding unprecedentedly high skills and trained capacities and aptitudes—the uneducated or half-educated young person has little or no chance to progress far in society. Instead, he is much more likely to join the 5 million to 6 million Americans currently unemployed.

Our shame is that in this year of 1961 we have not carried the principle of compulsory education at least to the point where completion of high school is required. And that shame is compounded with the disclosure by the National Committee for Children and Youth that 20 to 25 percent of the students abandoning high school before graduation have superior intelligence.

The problem is not static; it is burgeoning. The New York Times yesterday pointed out editorially:

"Youngsters are entering the job market in larger numbers than ever before * * *. The United States will need 13,500,000 more jobs in the sixties merely to keep abreast of the expected growth in jobseekers—an average of 25,000 new jobs a week."

For reasons both of straight educational principle and for economic reasons I, for one, advocate that compulsory schooling be extended to the completion of high school. I believe, moreover, that many other trade union officials are coming to that point of view. Extending compulsory education today would serve the double purpose of raising the educational level of our population and reducing the number of young people thrown on the labor market without adequate training or intellectual equipment to fit them for skilled employment.

Since the end of World War II we have grown accustomed to the idea that there is "a crisis in education." There seems to have been a whole series of crises in education. The crisis in urban education is still with us and grows worse and worse, and so does the crisis in primary education, the crisis in secondary education, and the crisis in higher education.

The overlooked crisis is the one we have gathered to discuss here today, the crisis in rural education.

From what I have recently learned, the crisis in rural education is more severe in many ways than the crisis in other educational areas. Agricultural areas take a worse financial beating in some aspects than our crowded cities.

Farm States devote nearly 2½ percent of their annual income to education compared with 1.8 percent for industrial States. This sounds impressive until it is remembered that the average farmer's income is $1,500 a year lower than that of the average city dweller.

In addition, every year for the past 30 years, more than 1 million young farm people emigrate from farm areas to cities. The meaning of this is clear. Cities profit by rural expenditures for the education of young people but they do not share in the costs of that education. One estimate has it that the Nation's farmers, over this 30-year period, have been subsidizing to the extent of $425 billion the education of youth who migrate to cities.

The crisis in rural education will deepen, also, as the result of the farmer's steadily declining purchasing power. In 1930 the farmer's share of the national product was 10 percent. Today it is 6 percent. By 1980 it will be around 3 percent.

Similarly the farmer's share in the national income is constantly falling off. In 1932 it was 10 percent of $78 billion; today it is 8 percent of $279 billion.

This dropping off of spendable income is not, of course, confined merely to agricultural enterprises. It hits small farm-centered towns as well; sometimes disastrously. Therefore, these areas—farm areas and farm towns—can afford less and less to send their youngsters to college to equip them with the new agricultural techniques that are necessary today to compete with the so-called mass-production farms.

As we of the labor movement see it, rural education has four major problems. I will discuss them and our suggested solutions as concisely as possible. The four problems, in our view, are (1) Manpower (let us instead call it teacher-power); (2) school construction; (3) transportion; and (4) services.

FIRST: TEACHER POWER

At least 194,000 elementary and high school teachers are needed today to meet the Nation's critical shortage. In the next decade at least 400,000 teachers will be needed to meet the rising birthrate. An additional 500,000 will be needed to replace those who retire or resign.

Thus the shortage for the decade to come is 1 million teachers. But we are training only 85,000 teachers a year.

And here is the significant fact for us: 80 percent of all teacher shortages are rural.

The reasons are understandable. 1—The rural teacher is lower paid. Her average salary is $2,655 a year compared with an average of $3,640 for the city teacher. 2—The rural teacher has less job security than her city counterpart; 70 percent in rural schools work on single-year contracts. 3—The rural teacher has a lower educational and training level; 58 percent have less than 4 years of college compared to the national average of 31 percent. 4—The rural teacher has poorer working conditions; only 2 out of 13 rural schools are rated as satisfactory.

What do we see as a solution? To close the teacher-power gap between urban and rural areas the Federal Government, through grants to States, should create scholarships for students in teacher-training colleges. This subsidy could be, for example, a $110-a-

month grant for each teacher for 4 years. This would cost the Government $143 million annually.

The Federal Government should supplement State funds to guarantee a decent minimum salary schedule, thus closing the gap between urban and rural scales. The Federal Government could also allocate a foundation fund to the States based on ability to pay and on need. Total Federal funds needed for this teacher program would be $569 million a year.

SECOND: SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

The national need for additional classrooms is huge. Right now 370,000 classrooms are needed for children already enrolled. For the expected population growth 50,000 new classrooms a year are needed. In addition, 20,000 classrooms are needed annually to replace obsolete facilities. This means that over the next 5 years a total of 720,000 new classrooms will be required.

In this picture the rural problem is something special. For example, of the 12,000 babies born every day in the United States, about one-third will enter rural schools. The average farm family, moreover, comprises 4.04 persons compared with 3.2 persons in the average city family.

The condition of rural schools is markedly inferior to conditions in urban buildings. For example, more than 48 percent of the one-teacher schools have no drinking fountains compared with 3½ percent of the larger schools. Fifty percent of rural school teachers have no first aid equipment. Three out of four one-teacher schools have no visual aids.

Even worse: nearly 88 percent of rural school teachers complain that restroom facilities are inadequate; and they report that one-fifth of rural schoolrooms suffer from inadequate heat, light, and ventilation.

What do we see as a solution? The Federal Government should allocate earmarked funds to enable States to finance construction of 114,000 classrooms a year for 5 years.

Also the Federal Government should launch a study aimed at correcting unsatisfactory school conditions in rural areas. This should include a study of school safety conditions and programs. This 5-year plan of support to rural schools in the various areas would be based upon school-age population and average personal income in the State. Federal support would average $1,250 million a year.

THIRD: TRANSPORTATION

Unlike city school systems, up to 30 percent of rural school budgets must sometimes be devoted to the transportation of children to and from school. But rural States have allocated as little as 2.1 percent of their budget for this purpose. In fact, 7 of the 18 rural States do not today include transportation as a school service.

Farm students must travel anywhere from 3 to 50 miles to school. The longer distances have come about as 71½ percent of the one-teacher schools have been absorbed into larger school units. Adding to the problem is the fact that 40 percent of all farm-to-school travel in 18 States today is over dirt or unimproved, dangerous roads.

What do we see as the solution? The Federal Government should pay a fair share of transportation costs based on the following formula: (1) Average distance to school, (2) percent of rural population involved, (3) average per capita income in the State.

Rural school transportation problems can be remedied with Federal support totaling around $100 million a year.

FOURTH: SERVICES

In order to prepare rural children for life in the modern technological era services must be offered in vocational training, and in such traditional areas as homemaking. There should be increased public library facilities; scholarships for deserving students; loan services to permit completion of education; excellent medical and health services; improved school lunch programs; special subsidies for the education of "exceptional" students.

This service program can be undertaken with a $934,500,000 a year Federal appropriation.

The total Federal cost of these four programs for rural schools—teacher-power, construction, transportation and services—would come to $2,853,500,000.

The appropriation would stem from the basic democratic assumption that free public school education is a right and a common heritage of all American children—and not a benefit to be conditioned by accident of birthplace, or the resources of the State, or the economic condition of the individual family.

Our country has experienced not only land erosion but population erosion in its agricultural areas. Since World War II, farm production has jumped a fantastic 80 percent. Industry has come nowhere near this advance. In 1920 the average farmer produced enough to feed himself and 8 others; 30 years later it was enough for himself and 18 others.

One result is that there are 1 million fewer farms than 5 years ago; and the exodus from rural areas over the past decade has been at the rate of 800,000 a year. Another result is that more and more small farmers are being forced to find other employment. Right now 30 percent of the Nation's farmers must work off the farm 100 days or more a year. The need for improved rural educational systems—with new technological training—becomes more and more apparent in the Nation's agricultural areas.

Finally, we of the labor movement are aware, of course, that there are more acute problems of segregation and discrimination involving rural schools than urban schools. But I think that while we have been aware of it, perhaps we have done too little about it.

To an increasing extent over the past three decades the labor movement has broadened its struggle for economic democracy and industrial democracy to encompass racial democracy.

We have involved ourselves deeply in every phase of the struggle to lift artificial barriers in our social, political, and industrial worlds. We have joined in the campaigns to wipe out second-class citizenship in education, in employment, in the use of public facilities, in transportation, and in voting.

The labor movement, I believe, would give serious consideration to withholding approval of such Federal appropriations for rural schools as I have suggested here if the States or communities involved insisted on keeping the rural schools segregated.

We of labor have rejoiced in the progress that has been made in breaking down the old antidemocratic barriers because we were a prominent part of the effort and the success.

We are gratified, for example, that out of a total of 6,599 school districts in 17 southern and border States, the number of desegregated districts rose this week to 829. That represents progress but we would like to see more of it, much more. We would like to accelerate that progress so that the last vestiges of Jim Crow and discrimination will have disappeared in our lifetime.

To insure this happening, perhaps we of the labor movement should pay more attention to our rural schools. The big city school systems have mostly claimed our attention, of course, not only because they are conspicuous and easy to assess but also because union workers for the most part are concentrated in the cities.

But we may be overlooking an area of our national life that deserves more careful scrutiny and perhaps greater democratization. I believe that from now on the labor movement will pay more attention to rural schools and rural educational systems, because we know that just as lagging pay scales in rural areas act as a drag on wage standards in unionized cities, so can lagging or retarded rural school systems slow down the advance of education generally.

Back in the early 1800's, as I have pointed out, the young American labor movement gave the ideals of democratic education a glowing priority over all other goals and objectives.

One of the labor movement's heroes in this period was the great American Educator Horace Mann. The labor movement then could acclaim his praise and his warnings about democratic education and today's labor movement, more than 100 years later, can still echo him with approval. These are his words:

"Republics one after another have perished from a want of intelligence and virtue in the masses of the people. If we do not prepare children to become good citizens; if we do not develop their capacities, if we do not enrich their minds with knowledge * * * then our Republic must go down to destruction as others have gone before it; and mankind must sweep through another vast cycle before the dawn of a better era can arise upon the world."

The Foreign Trade Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Foreign Trade Problem" which appeared in the January 14 edition of the Richmond (Ind.) Palladium-Item.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FOREIGN TRADE PROBLEM

Young Mr. John Kennedy, the President of the United States, had a few things to say about our country and its imports and exports in his state of the Union message.

He saw in the growth of the European Common Market a challenge to our country.

He told the lawmakers that we must increase exports essential to meet the costs of our commitments abroad.

Unless we adjust to this development, he said, our industries, farmers, consumers, and workers would be handicapped.

Then the President grew eloquent.

The United States, he said, did not rise to greatness by waiting for others to lead, pointing out the growth our Nation has enjoyed in various fields.

It is true we were able to trade farm products with foreign countries, but the buildup of our industrial areas became a task which was not successful until protective tariffs were set up under Republican Party administration many years ago.

The smaller industries were being ruined here at home by the stronger countries such as the British with its broad Empire.

Mr. Kennedy talks about concessions by all. He says we face an enlarged prosperity "of freemen everywhere."

The President sketched a meager outline of what he has in mind when he said that various goods to be traded would be in major categories rather than in separate packages.

He declared that there would be safeguards to protect those who might be hurt.

All of this sounds fine. The President was trying to sell us a bill of goods with the guarantee that we had nothing to worry about.

He assured us that we needed to combine our various international transactions because the "Communist economic offensive is underway."

There are many unanswered questions before we accept all of the conclusions that the President seems to have reached.

Our country now is supporting in various ways the economies of many foreign governments. Some of these are under the rule of Communists.

Mr. Kennedy's fear of the Communist "economic offensive" hardly fits in with his challenge to us to follow him in opposing the Red advance.

Neither are we convinced that what remains of the old British Empire is not out also to get all it can from us while in fact competing with us in the marketplace.

Mr. Kennedy still has much to learn about the intentions of some of our challengers in the world of commerce.

Western Mills Lose Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the forest products industry is the largest source of income and employment in the Pacific Northwest. In my home State of Washington, the forest products industry is worth more than $900 million. It provides some 65,000 jobs and approximately $349 million in direct wages. But, the health of the industry is being weakened by the Canadian capture of the Atlantic coast lumber market.

Translated into employment terms, the British Columbia capture of the major share of this market means dramatic gains for Canada and comparable loss of opportunity for employment in the west coast lumber States.

Mr. Speaker, British Columbia's increased share of the east coast market on an average basis for 1959–61 as compared with 1949–51 indicates a net gain to British Columbia in direct lumber employment of 3,340 jobs. When you include service and related community employment, we have lost the opportunity for about 12,000 jobs in the Pacific Northwest.

I believe that an editorial that appeared January 14, 1962, in the Seattle (Wash.) Times, pinpoints the major cause for the loss of Atlantic coast lumber markets. This editorial says that the Jones Act, which requires American mills to ship via American ships between American ports, gives the Canadians the advantage which causes the shift in the lumber market. It is for this reason I have introduced H.R. 9761 to amend the Jones Act.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the Seattle Times editorial in the RECORD:

UNFAIR TO U.S. LUMBER MILLS

The campaign to help the ailing Pacific Northwest lumber industry from the crippling effects of further unfair foreign competition is picking up steam.

It's time the Washington congressional delegation threw its full energies and influence into the battle.

As emphasized by the Times previously, Canadian producers in 1961 captured, for the first time in history, the bulk of the U.S. Atlantic coast lumber market.

Only a decade ago, the Canadians held only 6.9 percent of this market.

It was pointed out that factors in the Canadian upsurge included lower stumpage and labor costs and a devalued currency—but that the principal factor is the unbeatable edge in transportation costs handed to the Canadian producers by U.S. law.

The Jones Act—enacted years ago to protect American shipping, and now needing modification—requires U.S. intercoastal shipping to move in U.S. vessels.

There is nothing in the Jones Act to prevent Canadians shipping lumber to the big Atlantic coast market in low-cost foreign ships.

Thus, in the words of a major Oregon forest products concern, "The U.S. Government is holding an umbrella over the Canadian producer by keeping the American mills from competing with him."

Last month, the Norwegian freighter *Ariel* took on the largest lumber cargo ever to sail from the port of Vancouver, about 10 million board feet.

This single shipload, destined for the U.S. Atlantic coast, was the equivalent of 3 months' production by a Puget Sound sawmill employing 135 men.

About 30,675 Washingtonians are employed in sawmilling, logging and planning—the activities directly affected by maritime-law discrimination. This figure was about 15,000 higher a decade ago. Total woodworking employment in Washington is about 65,000, and the whole of the woodworking industry, of course, feels the impact of the favored treatment afforded Canadian competitors.

As long as the Pacific Northwest forest products industry operates under handicaps, unemployment can be expected to remain acute in many western Washington communities.

It might be possible to improve the competitive situation by means of quotas or higher tariffs on Canadian lumber imports; but both such methods, of course, are fraught with complications involving the whole range of United States-Canadian trade relationships.

The most practical approach would appear to be some form of amendment to the Jones Act, which has been amended many times in the past.

As William G. Reed, chairman of the Simpson Timber Co., wrote last week to Clarence D. Martin, Jr., Under Secretary of Commerce for transportation:

"The timber industry is confident that U.S. mills can compete with Canadian mills under equal conditions. But no relief can come to us until the burdensome and unequal costs of shipment imposed by our maritime laws are removed or offset."

Oregon's Gov. Mark Hatfield last week showed some needed initiative on this issue when he held a conference to receive suggestions from lumber industry leaders.

What are Washington's leading officeholders doing about the desperate situation facing this State's second largest industry?

This question might be addressed most specifically to Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, who, as Chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, is possibly in a better position than any other Member of Congress to seek modifications of a situation in which a U.S. law is preventing a key American industry from competing on equal terms with foreigners in our own American markets.

A Break in the Communist Line?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in our cloakrooms I have listened to discussion by many of our colleagues—discussion in which I have participated—about what is happening in Moscow. Rumors abound. Is Khrushchev's word not, indeed, the law? Is the Kremlin trying to play tricks with the West? Molotov has been a murderous, old school, Stalinist, and a very powerful one in his day.

Perhaps in every part of the globe the intriguing enigma of what is taking place behind the Iron Curtain and within the confines of the Kremlin is a major puzzle in which the free world is interested. And no one knows how it will be solved.

There is a very interesting discussion of this riddle which appeared in the Los Angeles Times for Sunday, January 21, entitled "A Break in the Communist Line?" written by the distinguished Washington bureau chief for that newspaper, Mr. Robert T. Hartmann. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BREAK IN THE COMMUNIST LINE?

(By Robert T. Hartmann)

Something is certainly in the wintry wind in Moscow. What it is, whether it represents shadow or substance, nobody outside the Kremlin walls can be sure. It may have changed even before this ink is dry.

But Washington and the other capitals of the West are intrigued, one might almost say bewitched, by the new guessing game. When Secretary of State Rusk emerged from a secret session with lawmakers at the Capitol on Wednesday, reporters asked him, "Do you know where Molotov is?" and Rusk replied: "I haven't the slightest idea."

Old Ironpants, one of the more printable nicknames which have been applied to Molotov during his long Bolshevik career, is merely one of the clues in the current mystery. He is not likely to supplant Khrushchev in a coup, and whether he goes back to his impotent post in Vienna or not is only slightly significant.

What has raised eyebrows is that the omnipotent and monolithic Communist apparatus does not seem able to make its mind up about him.

Khrushchev certainly has. He denounced Molotov all over again at the October party congress and demanded that he be called home and expelled from the Communist Party, which is pretty rough punishment in Russia.

Obediently, Molotov packed up and returned to Moscow where, presumably to preserve the forms of Socialist legality, he was to appear before his party peers before being formally purged. But something went haywire.

Instead of announcing its conformity with Khrushchev's decree, the party apparatus remained silent. Molotov remained a free man (in the Soviet context) and the Foreign Ministry, which he long headed and stacked with his own and Stalin's supporters, publicly said he was returning to Vienna. Later it hedged and then dummied up.

This made more than supposition the argument that Khrushchev's whim is no longer law in the Soviet Union. He had called Molotov a criminal and subversive Stalinist to the cheers of the 22d Congress delegates.

By all Communist rules, Molotov might as well have made his will. But someone, somewhere, with some independent power, disobeyed Khrushchev.

They are still disobeying him to the point of inspiring a meat-ax attack by Pravda, the party organ (as distinct from son-in-law Adzhubei's Izvestia, the organ of the Soviet state) which accused Molotov of secreting his memoirs in a Swiss bank as life insurance, a true Trotskyite trick, and assailed his opposition to Khrushchev's policy of "peaceful coexistence" as diehard dogmatism and deliberate distortion of Lenin's gospel.

But all this public controversy, swiftly spread inside the U.S.S.R. and around the world without being stopped by Soviet censorship (which has been lifted on outgoing news dispatches since shortly before Gagarin's space feat), is of a piece with Khrushchev's recent countryside confession that even he sometimes errs on technical matters and a spate of stories that Russian communism really is getting more liberal and certainly more so than Red China's version.

This may be the case. Or it may be history's greatest hoax since the Trojan Horse. Khrushchev has been remarkably consistent in trying to sell whoever happens to be President of the United States or prime minister of Great Britain on the idea that he is more civilized and reasonable than either his Chinese critics or his rivals within the Soviet inner circle. And he may be—as a few very influential Americans have long argued.

Mr. Kennedy himself revealed in his state of the Union speech how he attaches importance to the extraordinary rumbles of discord that can be heard across the Iron Curtain. His cold war policy is being imperceptibly redirected toward exploiting the supposed rift between Moscow and Peiping.

It is clear to anyone who knows the Aesopian code-language of Communist oratory that Khrushchev's open and unprovoked new attack on Molotov (or the dead and buried Stalin) was directed against more lively and dangerous enemies within the party heirarchy, just as his abuse of tiny Albania was really a tirade against Red China. But this is about all that is clear.

Khrushchev can no more separate his internal and external problems than Mr. Kennedy can, but whether his current curious behavior reflects his insecurity at home or abroad (or both), or is a clever pretense to lull the West and lure its leaders into another summit, I am not nearly so sure as some people here.

United Jewish Federation Complimented on 50 Years of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with real pleasure that I offer for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the excellent editorial of the Pittsburgh Post Gazette of Saturday, January 20, 1962, entitled "Fifty Years of Service." The wonderful service so faithfully rendered by the United Jewish Federation of Pittsburgh has the gratitude and full thanks of our community, the State, and the Nation.

FIFTY YEARS OF SERVICE

This Sunday marks the 50th anniversary celebration of the United Jewish Federation of Pittsburgh. It is the central planning and fund-raising agency of the Jewish community here for participation in health, welfare, and humanitarian programs locally and cooperatively with other similar groups around the world.

For these purposes, it raises more than $500,000 each year. In the past year, the UJF announced the additions planned for Montefiore Hospital. It has, with several of its 12 affiliated agencies, created a senior citizens housing agency, which will direct an apartment house project for elderly folk on the grounds of the Jewish home for the aged.

The UJF's half century of service has been extensive. We wish this progressive agency an even fuller future in this community.

The President's Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three editorials in the Wall Street Journal of Friday, January 19, 1962.

The coverage given the President's budget by the Wall Street Journal was very extensive and admirable and should be retained for future reference.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BULGING BUDGET

Perhaps the most important fact about President Kennedy's fiscal 1963 budget is the most obvious one: Its sheer size.

To be sure, this bulging Federal budget, as presented to Congress yesterday, is in balance, and that is far better than if it showed a planned deficit; certainly it will be important to try to keep the promise of balance. That's the rub, of course; the balance is so hairline any number of things may upset it and transmute black ink into red before the coming fiscal year ends 18 months hence.

Whatever happens to the balance, however, there is little that is speculative about the size of this budget's spending, except that it may grow greater still during fiscal 1963. At $92.5 billion, these outlays are higher than ever before in peacetime and not far short of the peak World War II spending.

The projected expenditures are $11 billion higher than the actual spending in so recent a fiscal year as 1961. They are nearly $30 billion higher than in fiscal 1955. They are more than $63 billion higher than in fiscal 1940.

And when the outgo for social security and other payments not included in the administrative budget are added, the 1963 outlays of the Federal Government come close to $115 billion.

These figures, we believe, should give everyone pause. Indeed, there is far too little public discussion of the economic impact of Federal spending of such proportions, quite apart from the question of whether a particular budget is balanced or not.

To begin with, $115 billion of Federal spending is roughly one-fifth of the gross national product. The biggest single item is defense, which is a necessary evil but certainly not an economic good. Most of the rest goes for interest on the public debt plus subsidies to political vested interests. By far the greatest part of Government spending, then, is literally nonproductive.

But though this $115 billion is nonproductive, it is by no means neutral in its effects. It takes, as it must, from the facilities that could otherwise be used for productive purposes.

We are quite aware of the argument that at the moment this doesn't matter, because even with all the Government spending the Nation still has excess plant capacity. It is a misleading argument, because excess capacity is a misleading term.

For example, a steel company will build a new plant using the most modern and efficient techniques; it may then idle an older facility, which thereby becomes excess. Production has not been diminished and may have been increased, and the older plant will also be used in an emergency or at any time that demand justifies it.

And in that situation Federal spending of this scope can cause price inflation even with a balanced budget. For it piles its own enormous demand atop private demand, pushing productive facilities to their limit and thus quite possibly bidding up prices.

Not only is Government an avid taker of products and of productive potential; it is also an insatiable consumer of the people's money. Revenues estimated at $93 billion in 1963 (for whatever the estimate is worth) are nearly one-fourth of the total income of all the people and much more if one adds social security and other taxes.

The point need not be labored that this level of taxation represents a drain of vast sums that would otherwise go into savings and investment, the very areas that need vast new sums for future economic development. But the point does need to be emphasized, it seems to us, that a budget—both its expenditures and receipts—can grow so large as to become a positive threat to national well-being, including national security.

That threat is clear enough if the budget is inflationary, since inflation weakens the economic underpinnings of defense and everything else. And increasingly economists are warning that size alone can be dangerous; they suggest that a budget taking one-fourth of national income is imperiling the Nation's economic health. Yet right now, in fiscal 1962, if we total all local, State and Federal spending, we get a figure already well beyond that danger line.

No doubt the Nation can survive this fiscal 1963 budget, though it is a little silly to preach, as Government officials do, of the need for "economic growth" in the face of this staggering deterrent to sound growth. But where is the suggestion that thereafter the Government must cut back in the Nation's interest? There is no such suggestion; on the contrary, it is freely predicted in Washington that budgets will continue to bet bigger and bigger.

If that is what we the people really want, or make no effort to stop, that is what we are surely going to get. But we ought at least to take a serious look at the towering bulk of this budget and see what it is we are really getting.

JUMBLED OBJECTIVES

A glance at the budget quickly shows some of the things the people are getting for the $93 billion in taxes they are supposed to surrender in the next fiscal year.

There are, of course, the old standbys: Nearly $6 billion to finance the national farm scandal. Over $5 billion for veterans, including the many healthy and well-off ones. Some $9 billion for interest on the enormous public debt piled up by decades of deficit spending.

In addition, the Government is finding more and more ways to get rid of money faster. One technique is just to spend more on existing programs. For example, the new budget's proposed spending for housing and community development is much higher than that for the current 1962 fiscal period and not far from triple that of fiscal 1961.

Then there are all kinds of new projects the Federal Government hopes to get into in the new fiscal year—urban mass transportation, of all things; manpower retraining; innumerable educational subsidies.

Now whatever anyone may think of individual parts of this budget's program, it seems to us beyond question that the parts add up to a jumble. Even apart from the matter of money, the Government doesn't have the intellectual resources to expand all these programs and embark on all these new ones at this rate.

Indeed, this is the inescapable impression of this budget: A grab-bag into which too many notions have been casually tossed, without sufficient thought or attempt to differentiate between what is important and what is not. For all this, remember, comes on top of the huge and rapidly rising cost of defense. That cost is what should require the relegation of numerous civilian subsidies to a low priority or none at all.

Yet in President Kennedy's expressed opinion, a proposal like Federal aid to urban mass transportation is a matter of high priority. And he says it would not be sensible to defer such expenditures. Perhaps it is permissible to inquire, Why not? What is so sensible about a budget that refuses to set up a sensible scale of national priorities?

IN DUBIOUS BALANCE

Speaking of the surplus his budget shows on paper, President Kennedy says that this black ink "is the policy which seems appropriate at the present time."

"To plan a deficit under such circumstances would increase the risk of inflationary pressures, damaging alike to our domestic economy and to our international balance of payments. To plan a larger surplus would risk choking off economic recovery and contributing to a premature downturn."

There is a somewhat apologetic flavor to these words. A balanced budget is all right at the present time but we must be very careful that the surplus doesn't get out of hand. It sounds as though deficit financing were the normal, proper, and responsible thing to do, whereas a balanced budget is a questionable and daring device to be reserved only for exceptional circumstances.

Well, perhaps the President won't have to worry unduly about any excessive surplus. In order to present a surplus of $500 million—microscopic in terms of estimated revenues of $93 billion—Mr. Kennedy and his advisers must make the most optimistic possible assumptions about everything. They must assume a decrease in the postal deficit, for one thing, and more importantly, they must assume an economic boom that gets bigger by the minute.

Any budget must of necessity be speculative, since it covers a period ending 18 months after it is presented. But to plan a balance on visions of prosperity is hardly a useful way to go about getting a balance in reality. If a balance is wanted, the way to get it is to reduce needless Government expenditures to a point where there will be a surplus even on the basis of more modest revenue estimates.

That does much to explain why balanced budgets, in theory and practice, are not highly regarded in Washington, where the trend is toward ever greater Government spending. And a convenient rationalization for this trend has been found in the notion that budget deficits are expansive for the economy, while surpluses are contractive.

We believe this is economic sophistry, President Kennedy and Lord Keynes to the contrary notwithstanding. For it omits from consideration the powerful economic stimulation that could result from lower Federal spending and budget surpluses large enough to permit significant tax reductions. It is hard to see what would be contractive about a new surge of sound economic growth.

Fingers must be crossed about the dubious balance this budget rather grudgingly foresees. There should be even more skepticism about the economic thinking it reflects.

Scouting in the Blackboard Jungle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, youngsters love adventure. But too many of our children suffer from spectatoritis. They have joined their parents at the TV set and seek adventure by the hour or half hour.

The Scouting program is one of the few socially acceptable outlets a youngster has for outdoor adventure and for identification with some group of his peers. To exploit fully the challenging experiences offered by the Scouting program, the Scoutmaster must continually be aware of the individual and group needs of his Scouts and troop. He must continually help reset individual and group goals as prior set objectives are accomplished. Only then can the Scout develop and grow in a sound, positive manner.

Challenging experiences within well defined limits provide youngsters with both a challenge and a sense of security. The Scouting program offers a continuing new frontier of challenging experiences and adventure.

The following article appeared in the October 1961, edition of Scouting magazine and demonstrates what can be accomplished by this worthwhile program:

SCOUTING

(By Herbert L. Foster)

A few Scouts dozed, others talked quietly, and some stared through the bus windows as the snow-covered countryside whizzed past. Our troop was returning to school after camping out for the day.

Suddenly, one of the Scouts grabbed my arm and pointed out of the window. "I think that's where my brother is buried," he said. "You know, the one that took dope." I looked from the cemetery to the senior patrol leader's insignia on his arm and I thought of his background, "two brothers, one dead from drug addition, another behind bars in a maximum-security prison, father not living, antisocial behavior, fights with other children, plays hooky, temper tantrums, mother uncooperative, refuses to go along with acceptable group attitudes."

Another Scout, Jimmy, was running a temperature of 103 degrees and adamantly refused to go home. "Why won't you go home?" asked the school principal. "We have a Scout meeting today," replied Jimmy. "I'm a troop officer, and I have to be there."

We finally called in our troop committee chairman who convinced the boy that it was all right to go home. This youngster had joined the troop with a background that was "destructive, fights frequently, overaggressive, many temper outbursts, resents any control, no self-respect, has resisted all approaches to his socialization."

These backgrounds are typical of the many youngsters who are or have been members of a Boy Scout troop that was organized and sponsored by the teachers of one of the New York City's special schools for emotionally disturbed and maladjusted children.

WOULD SCOUTING WORK?

What could a Boy Scout uniform offer to overcome the deprived background of these boys? What individual and group experiences could scouting provide for overly aggressive, predelinquent and delinquent boys? How did a socially acceptable organization such as a scout troop find its way into their tough, fighting gang milieu? How was the scouting program implemented so that it attracted and held these disturbed youngsters?

"Operation More" was the popular name of Project No. 22-239 proposed by the board of education's committee on juvenile delinquency. The purpose of Operation More was to attack the problems of juvenile delinquency through the use of both preventive and corrective measures on many fronts and on all school levels, providing "more" group and individual services for children.

As part of the project a troop was organized with three objectives—to rehabilitate "lost" Scouts, to bring Scouting into favor in the eyes of the majority of our children, and to demonstrate the place Scouting could play in the rehabilitation of the disturbed child.

FIRST 5 MONTHS

As teacher-Scout leaders we were aware that these disturbed youngsters had a low tolerance level to frustrating experiences. Therefore, the program structure was kept well within the frustration tolerance of our Scouts by carefully avoiding activities or experiences that might be too defeating.

We didn't emphasize advancement in rank, and patrol activities were kept to a minimum. We stressed the "out" aspect of Scouting. A hike was never canceled or postponed due to inclement weather. Our Scouts became proficient in such areas as proper hike clothing, foul weather fire starters, ingredients of a healthy meal, and methods of cooking other than frying.

After approximately 5 months of experimenting, we realized that although our progress was slow, an interest had been kindled in scouting. We had a handful of Scouts but not a real troop.

STANDARDS RAISED

In an attempt to mold our Scouts into a troop we altered our ego-protecting approach to the program. We began to use its full ego-challenging experiences.

We focused the new approach on raising group and individual standards and goals. A probation period was used with new Scouts. Advancement in rank became a regular activity at all troop meetings, and we began to weigh the overall record of each Scout before he was allowed to participate in a trip or a hike. Individual as well as troop standards were established.

Through controlled patrol activities, interpatrol competition, and service projects, we succeeded in developing a feeling of belonging and pride. We hoped this feeling would

broaden from the patrol to the school to the community, and so on.

Use of the challenging experiences described in the Boy Scout Handbook met with outstanding success. Troop morale virtually leaped ahead, and new members joined. There was a marked increase in acceptance and adoption of the Scouting program by the Scouts as well as the other boys in the school. Scouting began to satisfy the boys' quest for adventure. The need of these youngsters to belong and to be accepted was met by the socially acceptable patrol, troop, and Scout uniform. These gave them status and began to replace the "gang." In fact, the troop qualified for three standard awards and last year earned the 50th Anniversary Achievement Award. Some of the Scouts became den chiefs in their neighborhood Cub packs.

In our troop we used the adventure and fun of a hike to replace the misdirected adventure of a street-gang fight. How well we succeeded is summarized by Pulitzer prizewinner Harrison E. Salisbury in his recent book "The Shook-Up Generation." He wrote of this troop: "At first the Boy Scouts were regarded as sissies by the street boys who make up the school population. Only a few boys joined, just one with a uniform. They went on Saturday hikes and cookouts. No matter what the weather, no matter how cold, how snowy, how rainy, the Scouts went out. They began to build a 'rep' as tough guys. Bopping youngsters—tough members of the Chaplains, the Bishops, the Stonekillers—admitted that the Scouts were not 'chicken' after all. A year later, the troop had 16 members. Most of them had uniforms. Some of the Bishops and Stonekillers had joined up."

Ukrainian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, for four decades, some 42 million stout-hearted and gallant Ukrainians have suffered under the yoke of their ruthless Communist taskmasters, as their ancestors had done under czarist Russians for 250 years. This liberty-loving people has known freedom and independence for only 2 years, from 1918 to 1920, when their lengthy struggle for freedom and independence culminated in the birth of the Ukrainian Republic. The 22d of January 1918 thus became a turning point in the history of the Ukrainian people, and it remains in their annals as a national holiday. But in 1920 the young Republic was ruthlessly destroyed by the Red army, and since that date the people of Ukraine have suffered even more severely than their ancestors before them. Their worldly possessions have been taken from them and they have once more been reduced to the status of serfs, denied all the natural joys of their historic homeland, and driven to hard work for the benefit of their alien rulers.

But the Ukrainians still cherish the ideals of freedom and independence in their homeland, which were immortalized in the words of the great Ukrainian national poet, Taras Shevchenko. In the sad history of the Ukrainian people this is a most encouraging fact. On this 44th anniversary of Ukrainian independence I am happy to join my countrymen of Ukrainian origin to wish them well in their struggle for freedom, independence, peace and happiness in their homeland.

Alaska's Power Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST GRUENING

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, while Alaska will face acute power shortages in the near future and steps must be taken to alleviate them, the problem is really to take care of the immediate needs and for a period of perhaps a decade or a little more until the great dam in Rampart Canyon on the Yukon begins to generate power. I am glad to see that the administration is continuing its support of the vital studies of that great and essential project which are now being made and should be completed in the course of the next 2 years.

The third article in the series published by the Fairbanks News-Miner concerning the particular power problems of the so-called railbelt area—which includes the communities from Seldovia at the southern end of the Kenai Peninsula, those in that rapidly developing part of Alaska; Anchorage, Chugiak, Palmer, and Wasilla in the Matanuska Valley; Willow Talkeetna, Nenana, Clear, and Fairbanks together with its surrounding settlements in the wide Tanana Valley—deals briefly with the Rampart Dam.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALASKA'S POWER NEEDS—III—POWER SHORTAGES: RAMPART DAM PROJECT SEEN AS ANSWER TO STATE POWER

(By Paul Lien)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The third of a series of a predicted power shortage gives a quick review and comparison of the proposed Rampart and Devil Canyon by the Ralph M. Parson Co., power engineers.)

Anchorage has a power shortage now and Fairbanks will face a shortage no later than the winter of 1963, according to power experts in these areas.

Utilities companies in the railbelt have formed a pool for the purpose of making a study and to find a solution to the problem.

Ralph M. Parsons Co., of Los Angeles, power engineers, were authorized by this group, called the Central Alaska Power Pool, to make the study.

Plans are already going ahead in both Fairbanks and Anchorage to make an individual study of their own for immediate interim power.

The review by Parsons of the proposed Rampart Dam project showed it to be of outstanding scope and of such magnitude and concept as to quicken the pulses of power engineers and power suppliers everywhere.

Based on the preliminary estimates by the Corps of Engineers, it appears that over 4,500,000 kilowatts of power can be generated at a bus bar (at the plant) cost of 2 mills, and that large quantities can be delivered to the railbelt area and sold for a price of 3 mills.

The impact of such a project in Alaska is difficult to visualize. Marketing studies now underway by consultants employed by the Corps of Engineers will have a substantial bearing on establishing the economic feasibility of the project.

FINAL FORM

Report of this organization is expected to be available in final form by June of 1962. Results of this report will have a very substantial effect in establishing the timing, and ultimate feasibility of the Rampart project.

According to the Parsons report, Rampart Dam will not go into production at the earliest until 1971 even by the most optimistic estimates. In their own judgment, they feel it will be 1975 or 1976 when production starts. Some pessimists say the dam will never be built.

Parsons feels that people in the railbelt area would make a serious mistake in not making other plans to relieve the power shortage until the Rampart Dam is in production.

A review of the Devil Canyon project by Parsons indicated that it is not feasible as a satisfactory source of power for the railbelt area. They state that prices of the energy produced are not low enough to attract heavy power consuming industry, and is not competitive with power generated by other means.

In comparing Devil Canyon with Rampart the report showed the people of Alaska would have to purchase 580 megawatts (million watts) at a price of 7.89 mills per kilowatt for a period of 50 years, or at a price of 6 mills for a period of 65 years. The estimated cost by Parsons of Devil Canyon is $600 million.

Rampart Dam, in comparison, is estimated to cost $1,300 million.

Ukrainian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I joined the gentleman against Castro, because the gentleman from Pennsylvania was the first one to recognize that Castro was a Communist, from the beginning. This was over 2 years ago. He was not only a prophet, he was a superprophet. But, anyway, he was a prophet then and he is a prophet now.

These are pages of history, Mr. Speaker, that should not be forgotten. I do not have any of these great people living in my part of the world, but we know of them and we know of the great trials through which they have passed and the infamies visited on them by these Godless people who have captured the whole state of Russia. Not enough people know about this page in history.

The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] has been in

the forefront of the battle against communism, in Central America, in Cuba, in South America, indeed all over the world. He has always been the first to raise his voice against communism and this House and the Nation owes him a debt of gratitude. The Nation should know again and again, should be told again and again what happened to these great people. They say that less than 3 percent of the people in Russia are Communists and yet the Communists have captured over 200 million people. The point the gentleman is making today is what has happened to those people could happen here. And it must not happen here. So we owe the gentleman a debt of gratitude. The State of Pennsylvania should feel honored in having him here as a Representative in this branch of the Congress.

Soviet Anti-Semitism: Institutionalized Hate for Political Ends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that we have noticed recently the increase in anti-Semitic attacks against the Jews of the Soviet Union. Anti-Semitism has long been present in Russia and it is most unfortunate that the Soviet Government is using it for political ends. In the same manner as the czars, the masters of the Kremlin are giving sanction to the persecution of Russian Jews based, apparently, on the fear that these people are cosmopolitan and therefore dangerous to the state. The New York Herald Tribune of January 21, 1962, published the following editorial illuminating some of the many facets of the present campaign. I commend it to the interest of our colleagues:

SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM SHOWS MANY FACETS

The Soviet Union is traditionally thrifty in its use of policies and slogans, making each serve many (and sometimes contradictory) purposes. In the case of the current intensification of official anti-Semitism within Russia, two main themes are clear; there may be less overt and uglier undertones.

In the first place, the rulers of the Soviet Union want to break up, even more thoroughly than has already been done, the religious and cultural identity of the Jews within the U.S.S.R. Since this cannot be openly avowed (it would be contrary to the paper provisions of the Soviet Constitution and run counter to Communist propaganda), the synagogues have been labeled as espionage centers.

This charge serves a second purpose. The precise indictment of Soviet Jewish religious leaders has been consorting with foreign agents; namely, Israeli diplomatic officials. Although the Soviet Union was a leader in recognizing the State of Israel, at a time when this could be used as a club to beat the British and Britain's Arab allies, the present line of the Communists is to assail Israel as a nation of bourgeois imperialists and tools of the United States.

The technique is brutal and familiar. It was used by Stalin in liquidating his opponents—especially in the satellites—when virtually every trial was characterized by charges of espionage, to which the Soviet Union's principal foreign targets were linked. But now it affects a whole people, one which has suffered much in Russia and elsewhere. And this inevitably raises the suspicion that in addition to the plain purposes of the Soviet Government, there may be another, one which was used by the secret agents of czarism in the last decades of that fated system.

The savage pogroms which cost the lives of so many Russian Jews and drove so many more into exile were stimulated by the czarist police in an attempt to divert popular wrath from the shortcomings of the regime. The Soviet attacks on the Jews have thus far taken the forms of law. But it is not impossible, given the strains that have appeared behind the Iron Curtain, that the intent of the present persecutors is the same.

Naval Reserve Excellence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the President of the United States is calling up citizen reserves to strengthen our resistance to Communist aggression, we may well proudly note the outstanding achievement of one Naval Reserve Unit from my home area of Queens County, New York, Surface Division 3–76.

I was honored to be present on November 14th last, when this achievement was recognized at ceremonies attended by high-ranking military and civilian leaders, at the Whitestone Naval Reserve Center, Whitestone, N.Y.

This unit, comprised of 12 officers and 186 enlisted men, won not only the coveted Forrestal Trophy as the best Naval Reserve surface division in the country, but also three other regional and national awards for attaining the highest proficiency and mobilization readiness standards, in competiton with 177 similar divisions throughout the United States. This award is based upon achievement in the areas of on-board strength, attendance at drills, active duty for training, Petty Officer participation and advancement in rating. It is also notable that the companion Whitestone unit, Surface Division 3–77 at Whitestone, placed second in this national competition.

We must take our hats off to the able commanding officer of the winning unit, Comdr. Joseph C. Boyd, U.S. Naval Reserve. He is one of our community's finest citizens and one of the Navy's finest officers. Comdr. A. D. Oder, the commanding officer of Battalion 3–22, under which the two award-winning divisions operate, is likewise to be highly congratulated. This is the third year running that he was either the commanding officer of the winning surface division or of the battalion under which the winning division operated.

Credit should likewise go to Comdr. G. B. Lovejoy, who heads the Whitestone Naval Reserve Center, and his active duty station personnel, whose splendid support of both Whitestone surface divisions was an essential element in placing them at the top of the list.

Commending Commander Boyd and his unit, the Secretary of the Navy wrote:

That your division has achieved top honors nationally is a tribute to the total effectiveness of the division's operations and to your own devotion to duty, professional compentence, and leadership ability. Besides achieving a commendable honor, you and your men have served your country well in increasing the mobilization readiness of your command and, therefore, the defense posture of the Nation.

Adm. George W. Anderson, Chief of Naval Operations, in a letter of congratulations to Commander Boyd, said:

I, too, am indeed proud that you are being honored in this manner, not only because of the spirit, loyalty, zeal, and devotion to duty which won you this distinction, but also because you represent a strong and dedicated force which is so vital to the Navy and to our country in these critical times.

The commanding officer of the 3d Naval District, Adm. George Wales, likewise expressed his "well done," which is the Navy's highest compliment.

It is very gratifying to know that our Naval Reserve is strong and alert and standing by in readiness, and I cannot but feel proud that the best units come from my home county of Queens.

I hope that the Navy will give merited recognition to these dedicated officers and men who have done so well, and on whom so much depends.

The Trouble With Letting George Pay the Bill Is That We Find That We Are George

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I think the following thought, expressed in the copy of an advertisement by the Warner & Swasey Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, should be read by every special interest group and all those who believe that somebody else pays for Government spending and handouts:

The trouble with saying, as Americans have been saying, "Let somebody else not me pick up the check, shoulder the responsibility"—is that soon there isn't anybody else left; everybody is on that selfish bandwagon, and then it's you who picks up the check for your own past self-indulgence; it's you who has to carry the responsibility you thought you were shifting to other shoulders. No, there are no other shoulders any more—you demanded the ease; you had it for a while; now you pay—or sink.

No one to blame but ourselves, no place else to go, no one to lean on, no one left to help. The "somebody else" is you and me.

Who did we think it was going to be—Santa Claus? There is no Santa Claus. And the time for make-believe is over; the time for play is gone.

Shoulder the burden and start to climb; we brought it on ourselves. But don't let anybody ever sneak any of his burden on our shoulders again; make sure he carries his own.

More on Federal Aid to Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, I have placed in the RECORD an article from the U.S. News & World Report, containing a synopsis of a study on Federal aid to church-related schools, made by the legal department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

In referring to the controversy which has arisen on this issue, the New York Times called it this unnecessary battle. The Times went on to say:

It is a tragedy that the straightforward political issue of Federal aid to the public schools has been distorted and envenomed by the divisive and emotional issue of Federal aid to parochial schools. For the first time in the United States, the interests of Catholic education are being set against the interests of secular education in a political context. The bitterness aroused over this unnecessary battle can only weaken our country in a way familiar to many European lands but up to now virtually unknown to the United States.

I agree with the New York Times that the battle is unnecessary, and that it has been needlessly distorted and envenomed. Who, however, is responsible for this state of affairs? Are the interests of Catholic education at fault, as suggested by the New York Times? Or should the blame for the tragedy decried by that newspaper be laid at the doorstep of those who, without proper regard for our constitutional heritage, trample upon the rights of American children and their parents in the rush to give the State a monopoly over education?

The New York Times claims that the controversy over Federal aid to nonpublic schools may weaken our country. I doubt this very much. I think, however, that we stand to lose considerably if we attempt to settle this issue on the basis of slipshod interpretations of our Constitution, fuzzy thinking, and recourse to unsubstantiated generalities—such as those which characterize the article I have just quoted.

If we are going to solve this issue in the interest of our whole Nation, we must seek its resolution through careful and impartial examination of our Nation's history as it relates to the question of church-state relations, the rights of children and their parents, and the role of the Government in the field of education.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD an editorial entitled the "Unknown First Amendment" which appeared in the January 21, 1962 edition of the Register. How different is this editorial from the New York Times article which I have just quoted. It does not indulge in generalities and sweeping accusations.

On the contrary, through a calm discussion of historical facts it tries to contribute to better understanding, and thoughtful analysis, of a much-beclouded issue. I commend it to the attention of the membership of this body.

[From the Register, Jan. 21, 1962]

UNKNOWN FIRST AMENDMENT

This writer, who is just 50, can remember reading, in a progressive sociology textbook he studied in junior high school, that, for all the first amendment cares, the State of Georgia could pay the salaries of Catholic priests.

Such a statement could surprise only one who is less familiar with the language of the first amendment than with the emotional overtones that have clustered around it and in many minds have practically taken the place of the amendment.

The first amendment begins: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise therof." Notice that the amendment lays its prohibitions on Congress, not on the States.

Until 1931, the literal reading of the first amendment was accepted by everyone. In that year a series of Supreme Court decisions held that certain guarantees of the first amendment are by implication an integral part of the due-process clause of the 14th amendment, which forbids the States to deny to anyone the equal protection of the laws. It was not until 1947, in the Everson case, that any attempt was made to include the establishment-of-religion clause also under the same doctrine.

We see how the process works: First the establishment-of-religion clause is made to apply to the States (which is good); then the word "establishment" is made to include any aid to religion (which is constitutionally wrong). Finally, the "free exercise-of-religion" clause is practically ignored (which is worse yet). Preconcepts of what the amendment should mean replace the language of the amendment itself.

The burden of proof that the first amendment prohibits aid to parochial schoolchildren or aid to all religion should be on those who so allege. Language and constitutional history are against them.

Fiscal Dangers Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an outstanding column written by Mr. Lyle C. Wilson, who, in a very brief space, has given an admirable presentation of the fiscal dangers ahead.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FISCAL DANGERS AHEAD

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

Secretary of Treasury Douglas Dillon now says the administration will ask Congress soon to increase the debt limit. That is, to increase the total sum by which the U.S. Government can be in hock by reason of the years-long policy of Congress and Presidents to spend beyond Government income.

As the public debt increases, the problem of how and who is to pay it increases, too. Taxes will need to be very high, of course, to create any surplus for debt retirement. Mr. Kennedy expects the taxpayers to pour about $93 billion into the Treasury in the next, 1963, fiscal year. At most, he expects a surplus of about $400 million in that fiscal year.

At the rate of $400 million annually, it would take about 750 years to retire the current public debt. Retirement date: A.D. 2712. The United States will have to do better than that. Better, that is, if the debt is to be retired. There is an alternative. The debt could be repudiated. The Government could welsh on its bonds.

Unthinkable? Perhaps it is. But other countries have done it. It would have been unthinkable some years ago that the U.S. dollar would be debased and rotted to less than half its 1939 purchasing power. But the U.S. dollar was rotted and debased, just so. The debt already has been repudiated precisely to the extent that the dollar has been debased.

We are on our way.

Aid to Ghana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Loyalty Not For Sale" which appeared in the January 17, 1962, edition of the Richmond (Ind.) Palladium-Item.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOYALTY NOT FOR SALE

President Kennedy, after declaring his willingness to loan 133 million U.S. dollars to help finance the building of the Volta Dam in Ghana, has not been encouraged by a report laid before him.

Three U.S. Senators, all Democrats, say after visiting Ghana that if the President hopes to gain Ghana to the side of the West by such an offer he might be badly fooled.

The Senators, ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee; PHILIP HART, of Michigan; and MAURINE NEUBERGER, of Oregon; have found that handing out our money would get us nothing.

The Ghana Government is pro-Red, and the Senators declared that aid for the project would not promote more independence and individual freedom for the people of Ghana.

It is to the credit of these Senators that they took a realistic look at the situation and have returned with a frank statement.

They also said, "We do not believe American aid should be used to assist governments engaged in the systematic suppression of free expression * * * aid must be related to the basic principles for which we stand."

The Senators also said they believed that if President Kennedy had not volunteered to give the $133 million in aid, the Ghana Government would have gone further toward the Communist side than it had already taken.

The firsthand look at the situation by the Senators may be more valuable to us than we realize.

It appears that our administration in Washington believes it can buy loyalty. That does not work.

Unless the governments believe in freedom of their people it is a waste of money to offer them a bribe.

Once they took the bribe they could go along as usual with their loot in their pockets and use their advantage to do more on behalf of the Red cause now being pushed in a worldwide offensive.

It will be recalled that for a while our Government considered pouring out millions of dollars to aid in completing Egypt's Aswan Dam. But when we terminated our handouts President Nasser of Egypt, moved up closer in his relations with Moscow.

It is time for our Government leaders to quit falling for every bit of bait offered by foreign politicians who follow the way of dictatorship.

A Tribute to Adlai Stevenson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, at the present time there are many Americans who seriously criticize and question our support of the United Nations. Mr. George Sokolsky wrote the following column which appeared in the Washington Post of January 20, 1962. This is, indeed, high praise for our Ambassador to the United Nations and the success with which he has handled the delicate problems confronting us as a member of that body. I commend the column to the attention of our colleagues:

THE EMERGENCE OF ADLAI STEVENSON

(By George E. Sokolsky)

When Adlai Stevenson ran for President he was not taken seriously by conservative-minded persons. He was defeated because he could not impress his personality upon the public mind, though in certain liberal circles he appeared to be a genius who brought into politics literate language and academic knowledge and a voice that was not vulgar.

In the United Nations, Stevenson emerged as a significant statesman who is preserving the United Nations at the moment of imminent collapse. There may be those who wish the United Nations to collapse, but among them are none who have a program to offer which is a substitute for this body either as a parliament or an agency for social development.

Nothing is easier than to say "To hell with it" about anything, but that swiftly spoken phrase offers no solution to an immediate problem which may end in war. Stevenson has adopted the role of the leader of those who hold the United Nations together despite the absurditiy of 104 members, each with the capacity to maintain the peace alone.

The wrong representative of such a country as the United States can only damage such a body by presenting a chauvinism amounting to weakness while at the same time this country maintains its dignity and asserts the rights of nations in the spirit that our Constitution asserts the rights of man. Adlai Stevenson does this with wit and humor, while at no time sacrificing the stature of the United States.

To conservatives, Stevenson appeared a liberal who would sell his country down the river, but the record of 1961 and 1962 is that the United States has gained in dignity and strength and that Stevenson's role in the United Nations played no small part in that.

I once said to Stevenson that I shall probably be very embarrassed for all the critical things I had written of him. And it seems to me that that day has come, particularly as regards the entire Chinese situation, which was so badly understood by the Truman administration of which both Adlai Stevenson and Dean Rusk were members, but which is being so competently handled today by the Kennedy administration of which Stevenson and Rusk are leading members. It is possible to say that for the first time since 1932, the United States is giving Asia a good and understanding look.

The Kennedy team represents this strength; it is working out its programs; Kennedy, Rusk and Stevenson are able to formulate a policy which presents a doctrine that does not change with the wind. The President stands firm with his associates and they hold loyalty to his attitude.

It was anticipated that Stevenson would go off on his own. But he has not done that. He has postured himself as a member of a team and fought the team's battles courageously. This united front has not been usual in the United States, where, for example, William Jennings Bryan moved far away from Woodrow Wilson and John Foster Dulles was his own master. Adlai Stevenson on the contrary has strengthened John F. Kennedy all along the line.

The State of the Union Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to place in the RECORD an editorial from the Register of January 21, 1962, entitled "State of Union Message."

I agree with the Register that the state of the Union message "bespoke the energy and imagination" with which the President has attacked the grave issues confronting our Nation.

I would like to commend the editorial to the thoughtful consideration of the membership of this body:

STATE OF UNION MESSAGE

The President's state of the Union message, couched in his clear antithetic style, bespoke the energy and imagination with which he has attacked the mountainous questions of his office.

President Kennedy has a good sense of values. Enumerating the five basic sources of strength in American policy, he put first the moral and physical strength of the United States. To proposing ways to increase that strength he devoted a fair part of his address, under the titles of civil rights, health and welfare, and education.

He recommended plans for a massive attack to end adult illiteracy, estimated as having 8 million practical exemplars. He also said he would recommend bills "to improve educational quality, to stimulate the arts, and, at the college level, to provide Federal loans for the construction of academic facilities and federally financed scholarships."

These scholarships, it is to be presumed, will be modeled on GI grants, which left the beneficiary free to choose his college. The President deplored the fact that the annual cost of college per student is now averaging $1,650 a year, although half our families earn less than $5,000. He implied that the Nation must see that every youth who wants and can benefit by a college education gets one. This cannot be unless he can choose a private as well as a public university.

The President's ambitious program to advance the health of the young, to give security to the aged, to aid medical and dental colleges, to finance scholarships, to liquidate illiteracy just cannot be realized through public institutions alone. That is mathematically impossible.

For this reason we found inept as well as unfortunate the President's reference to "the right to free public education." The right to public education makes no more sense than the right to public health. All education is public, i.e., subserves the public good, just as all health is public in its effects, whether it is obtained with the help of private doctors or through a public health program.

Cheers for Ribicoff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the Miami Herald, an outstandingly astute newspaper in our country, has decided that Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Abraham Ribicoff may have something. The Herald article on this subject follows:

[From the Miami Herald, Jan. 11, 1962]

REMEMBERING 1935, RIBICOFF MAY HAVE SOMETHING—UPDATING THE NEW FRONTIER

For a New Frontiersman, Secretary of Welfare Abraham A. Ribicoff will have to count himself as something of a curiosity.

He is said to have won the approval of Senator HARRY BYRD and Representative WILBUR MILLS of 10 administrative changes in the Federal assistance program, some of which will cost more money.

Representative MILLS is chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, or the Mr. Moneybags of Congress. He is hardly less conservative than HARRY BYRD, his opposite number in the Senate.

Both reportedly have agreed to support legislation which, among other things, would increase the Federal share in the cost of providing services to rehabilitate persons on the welfare rolls.

The principle may appeal to the average layman as it does to the economy-minded Congressman. What Secretary Ribicoff is up to, he says, is to get needy families off relief rolls and onto payrolls.

We like especially the text that goes with this: "What has emerged (from his study, said Mr. Ribicoff) is a clear recognition of the fact that today in 1962 the welfare program of 1935 is out of date."

In other words, the thinking of a quarter century ago still pervades one of the Nation's costliest tax takers.

When Federal assistance began, the country was deep in depression. One aim was to shovel money into the hands of jobless spenders as quickly as possible. Another was

to induce people to retire, thus opening up jobs, on federally devised pensions.

Out of these and other depression measures came the welfare state of today.

We propose to keep our own fingers crossed until the Ribicoff changes clearly come to mean what they say—that employable people can pass up the handout for the pay window. The welfare state principle is the vermiform appendix of politics, and surgery is indicated.

But Secretary Ribicoff rates at least two cheers for effort. We commend his effort to others.

We commend it, indeed, all through the Federal Establishment, where in November Federal payrolls had risen 77,000 above the figure a year previously. That's too much like 1935 also, if you please.

What Can the People of the United States Expect for the Billions We Are Going To Pour Into Latin America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, much is being made by the administration and the press of the many benefits which will be derived from the so-called alliance for progress for which the American people are asked to put up billions of their hard-earned tax dollars. No Latin American country has been hesitant about asking for the money and in making it clear that all contributions from the Yankees are welcome. But what have they offered in return? Absolutely nothing. Friendship? No. Instead they go out of their way to heap honor and welcome upon the representative from Communist Cuba to the meeting now going on in Punta del Este, giving him a 21-gun salute and greeting him with signs reading, "Cuba, si; Yankees, no." When our own Secretary of State arrives at the same conference, he is given a stiff, cold, and very formal welcome by a small group of government representatives.

Do these countries, so eager to take our money, offer cooperation in the defense of the hemisphere? No. When we ask them to unite in imposing sanctions against the Cuban-Soviet alliance which threatens the freedom of all people in this hemisphere, they firmly tell us it is none of our business. It is evident we are not going to get support in combating the Communist threat to peace posed by Castro's Cuba. What will our position be? Will we back down? Will we once again contribute to the image of weakness by allowing the timid and the fearful leaders of other countries to decide our policy, or will we, in the best U.S. tradition, give leadership to this hemisphere by asserting that whatever means necessary to rid this part of the world of the Communist cancer will be taken?

Although I am fearful that this administration will not advance this tough, realistic policy which is in the self-interest of our own country, I sincerely hope it will. I hope that every Member of Congress and the people of the United States will make it clear to the President and his Secretary of State that we are no longer going to be patsies for every nation with its hand out for our help and its thumb at its nose when we ask that they share some of the burden at least morally, of protecting the freedom of the world.

If we are going to finance an alliance for progress in Latin America then we should lay down the rules of conduct for those participating. We should serve notice on our Latin American neighbors at the Punta del Este Conference that they cannot have it both ways; they are either on the side of freedom or on the side of the slave world of the Communists. They either join us in ending the Communist menace of Castro or we go it alone and at the same time make an agonizing reappraisal of the aid we plan to give to Latin America.

Along this line I commend to your attention the following pertinent note which appeared in this week's edition of the U.S. News & World Report, as well as a timely editorial from the same publication:

No secret is made by Latin-American intellectuals and economists of the fact that the strategy in many Latin-American countries is to blackmail the United States by threatening a turn toward communism unless aid is given.

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS OR CHAOS?

(By David Lawrence)

Twenty billion dollars—half of it to be furnished by the taxpayers of the United States—is to be spent in the next 10 years to help Latin America. This is the recommendation of President Kennedy.

Will the money be used to bolster dictatorships or to secure freedom for the people? Will it be used to aid only special interests or to help all classes?

What benefit will the American people derive? In all candor, what will they get for their money?

The simple truth is that, if the United States imposes no conditions and adheres to its policy of hands-off the internal affairs of countries that receive foreign aid, the American people might as well prepare for disillusionment as they someday find themselves just starry-eyed international philanthropists.

Basically, the mere proposal to send money to another country for use by its government is an act of intervention in the internal affairs of that country.

The word "intervention" has often been condemned as obsolete in American foreign policy, but a distinction must be drawn between armed intervention and political or diplomatic intervention.

There are circumstances when either or both kinds of intervention may become necessary. The sooner all concerned—inside our Government as well as inside the governments of the world generally—recognize the facts of international life on this point, the earlier we will make substantial progress.

For while international law for centuries has recognized the sovereign right of a nation to choose its own rulers—even a form of dictatorship—there is no right to destroy the lives and properties of foreign residents.

If property is confiscated, it must be paid for. Worthless notes are not proper compensation.

If foreign residents are placed in jeopardy or the security of the United States is threatened, armed intervention is thoroughly justified.

The United States pursued this policy in Mexico under a Democratic President, Woodrow Wilson. Diplomatic recognition was withheld by this country from the government of dictator Huerta who, in 1913, had assassinated his predecessor. Financial and business interests caused the British Government to recognize and support the Huerta regime. Undismayed, Mr. Wilson even ordered the American fleet, early in 1914, to seize the port of Vera Cruz so as to stop the shipment of arms to the Huerta government by Germany.

While this action was resented in Latin America and to this day is the subject of criticism by many Mexicans, it remains nevertheless a historic example of the duty of our Government to protect its own security and to prevent any European power from supplying military weapons to any government in this hemisphere for purposes of internal or external war.

Today Castro's regime in Cuba has entered into a military alliance with the Soviet Union. The United States has withdrawn recognition from Castro, but has taken no military measures to stop the flow of arms from the Soviet bloc to Cuba, and from there to potential revolutionaries in Latin America.

Isn't it the duty of the United States to help the oppressed people in Latin-American countries even when dictatorships take charge? If so, then we should not subsidize governments of the Communist bloc in Eastern Europe. Nor can we remain indifferent to the operations of dictatorship governments inside Africa, or tolerate the alliances which some African as well as Asian countries have made with the Communists. We should not continue to give financial aid to such governments.

It is clear that we have a right to contribute our funds wherever we please and under such conditions as we ourselves make. Let's do away, therefore, with the nonsense about attaching "no strings" to our aid abroad. Let us be frank with all prospective beneficiaries. We want a peaceful world, but we should seek some evidence that the money furnished will accomplish the broad objectives of our policies.

Let us make plain that what we want in Latin America is an Alliance for Progress, and that the word "alliance" means "allies." We should not tolerate nonalinement or secret understandings made with our potential enemies by any ally of ours.

The Organization of American States has known all about the Cuban situation for the last year, but nothing has been done by it to secure respect for international rights in Cuba. The American people are waiting to determine whether this organization is truly composed of allies. For it's not the President alone, but also the Members of Congress, who must authorize the funds.

We want an alliance for progress in which trade, economic development and democratic government will thrive. We cannot support a so-called alliance that can only bring economic and political chaos.

Vernon L. Talbertt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have sent to Mr. Vernon L. Talbertt who retired at the end of last year after more

than 51 years of devoted service in the Senate.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 22, 1962.

Mr. VERNON L. TALBERTT,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR VERNON: It is regrettable that the day of your retirement occurred while the Senate was in adjournment. This deprived your many friends in the Senate of the opportunity to bid you goodbye personally on your last official day with us.

The mark you have left in the U.S. Senate is indelible. There will be many moments in the turbulent years ahead when we will sorely miss your faithful and efficient services and, most of all, your kindly and gracious presence.

I want to wish you many years of health and contentment and to express the hope that you will come by often to see us.

Sincerely yours,

CLAIR ENGLE,
U.S. Senator.

Dallas Editor Refutes Charges UNESCO Has Been Maligned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the threat to the sovereignty of the United States in adopting the proposed UNESCO treaty is brilliantly exposed in the following editorial written by Frank Langston, editorial writer of the Dallas Times Herald in Dallas, Tex.:

THE LONG LOOK—UNESCO MALIGNED: IN JUST WHAT WAY?

(By Frank Langston)

The U.S. National Commission for UNESCO claims that UNESCO is being maligned.

And the Commission appears to be greatly disturbed over this state of affairs.

UNESCO, of course, is the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

In one of the most interesting documents to reach this desk in some time, the Commission has this to say:

"In recent months there have appeared a number of misstatements about UNESCO, some of them attaining the proportions of deliberate misrepresentation. Many of these statements repeat irresponsible charges which were long ago shown to be groundless. Some new allegations, or modifications of old ones, have also appeared."

The Commission then proceeds to set the record straight with what it calls a summary of pertinent facts.

Undoubtedly there have been some very harsh statements and charges concerning UNESCO in recent months.

But whether they are misstatements is another matter.

The Commission speaks of irresponsible charges which long ago were shown to be groundless. It does not say how they were thus shown and to whose satisfaction.

Some of us have a suspicious nature, acquired by experience, and are not readily inclined to accept as proof a whitewash summary of pertinent facts by an organization that obviously has a special interest in UNESCO.

LET THE READER DECIDE

This writer, for one, would far rather put down the facts and evidence in black and white and let the reader draw his own conclusions.

The Commission undoubtedly would class this column as one which has been guilty of misstatements and irresponsible charges, concerning a plan for international control over education in the United States. Here's what the Commission has to say, in part, about that charge:

"An allegation that UNESCO has a plan for international control of all education in the United States has been based on a complete misrepresentation of the purposes and content of a convention and recommendation on discrimination in education, the texts of which were approved by the 11th general conference of UNESCO, December 14, 1960.

"The actual purpose of these documents is to help eliminate and prevent discrimination in education and provide equal educational opportunities in countries where these do not exist. The documents were the result of a study by the United Nations and UNESCO which revealed wide variations in many countries in educational opportunities."

It notes that in some such countries there are more schools for boys than for girls.

DOESN'T APPLY TO UNITED STATES YET

"Repeated assertions to the contrary, the convention does not apply in the United States," the Commission points out. "The United States has not acceded to the convention."

This is true—so far.

"It has not been submitted to the Senate for advice and ratification nor has the Department of State ever intended to do so."

This column is well aware that the matter had not been submitted. The convention—or treaty—would be binding upon all that ratify it. This column has urged that the treaty never be ratified—because of articles 8 and 9, which the summary of pertinent facts ignores.

But whether a plan exists for such admission is unknown. This column cannot say what is in the mind of the State Department. I doubt that the Commission can.

But the same group—in the State Department and elsewhere—which advocates other controversial international controls generally favors the plan. There was a U.S. delegation in the conference at Paris that planned it.

I hope the matter never is sent before the Senate. But if it does reach that body, I would expect it to be submitted among many other matters, possibly at the end of a congressional session.

The recommendation, as the Commission points out, is not binding upon anybody but merely advice. The Commission says the United States supports this recommendation.

HERE'S WHAT IS IGNORED

What the Commission in its pertinent facts ignores is the fact that an effort is made to bring the United States, through articles under mandatory jurisdiction of the World Court, which is not bound by any particular set of laws and which at present has as its president a judge from Communist Poland.

Article 8 provides that if two signatory nations are unable to settle a dispute the matter is to be referred to the International Court of Justice.

Up to now, the United States has avoided turning over jurisdiction of its affairs to the World Court because of the Connally amendment to its court adherence, reserves for domestic jurisdiction matters of a domestic nature as determined by the United States.

But article 9 of the convention would void the Connally amendment with these words:

"Reservations to this convention shall not be permitted."

According to the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, this column is guilty of misstatements about UNESCO in charging a plan for international control of education exists.

This column, however, sees no reason to back away from its statements, particularly since the Commission ignores the threat of mandatory jurisdiction by the World Court.

The Forgotten People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, this is the second of 10 articles, part of a series which appeared in the New York World Telegram and Sun in October 1961 on the subject of the migrant worker in the United States. These articles were written by Dale Wright, World Telegram and Sun staff writer, who, for 6 months, lived and worked as a migrant worker along the Atlantic seaboard from Florida to New York.

THE FORGOTTEN PEOPLE

(By Dale Wright, World-Telegram staff writer)

On a warm, humid morning last April, a rickety old bus jolted along at its top speed between rows of carefully manicured estates along Route 1 from Miami south to Homestead, Fla. Although the vehicle had seats for 35 persons, it was crammed with 64 passengers.

I was one of them.

I was on my way to my first day of work as a migrant farm laborer in the lush tomato fields of southern Dade County. I had shaped up (reported for assignment) earlier that morning on a Miami street corner and was hired—with no questions asked—by a fat character known as a "labor contractor."

In the South, labor contractors round up crews of workers for transport and assignment to farms where crops are to be harvested.

SALES PITCH SOUNDS GOOD

"Everybody that gets on this bus," he promised reassuringly, "makes $10, $12, $15 today if you want to work. There's plenty of tomatoes to pick and there will be no cheating, nothin' taken out of your pay. And it will be clean work."

His pitch sounded good but I wanted to see for myself. The smirks on the faces of the seasoned migrant workers around me raised my doubts.

In a vast patch of ground outside Homestead our crew joined about 150 other farmworkers. They were busy when we arrived gathering a crop of "red ripes," tomatoes ready that day for shipment to the markets and canneries. It was just after daybreak and a bright sun already had begun to broil the pickers as they stooped in the long rows.

The job was to pick and pack the tomatoes into baskets that contained five-eighths of a bushel. Each loaded basket weighed 60 pounds. When we had them filled we lugged

them to the end of the row where they were loaded onto trucks. Pay promised was 12 cents a basket.

KIDS GOTTA EAT

In the row next to mine, an emaciated man of about 40 coughed and spat incessantly as he bent to his task. When I noticed the blood and spoke to him about it, he muttered:

"Yeah, they say it's consumption. It don't make no difference. I gotta keep working. The doctor, he can't do nothing for me. I got no money for medicine. I got a woman and a lotta kids. I gotta keep pickin' tomatoes."

Obviously, the man was seriously ill and belonged in a hospital. But he was trapped by the need to work for his family in the only job he knew how to do. Later, when we stood up to smoke a cigaret, he said to me:

"Been doin' farmwork all my life. Don't know nothin' else. I can't go to a hospital. Kids gotta eat."

CHILDREN SICK, TOO

He said his name was Alonzo and that he lived in a tin and tarpaper shack near Goulds, Fla., for which he paid $10 a week rent. He added that three of his children—the small ones—had dry, hacking coughs and probably had caught the misery he had in his chest.

Medical treatment? No. None of the youngsters had ever seen a doctor.

Despite his illness, Alonzo was a hard worker. As we worked along the endless rows of tomato plants, he loaded basked after basket of tomatoes and was soon far down the field from me.

Later that day Alonzo told me he soon would be moving north from Homestead because the harvest was "going down." To keep living, he explained, he'd have to load his family and his belongings onto a truck or bus going north, where other crops were ripening.

"It's the same," he said. "This job is just like the last one. Next be just like this one. Never no different. Never will be."

TYPICAL CASE

This sick, frustrated laborer, doomed long before his time, was summing up the lot of today's migrant farmworker.

The backbreaking labor of stooping close to the orange-tinted Florida earth begins as soon as a picker can distinguish red tomatoes from green ones in the grey dawn of an endless day.

His work ends when he no longer can see the tomatoes to pick them. At the promised rate of 12 cents a basket, a good picker can fill 70 to 80 baskets a day and earn—it says there—from $8.40 to $9.60 a day.

As bad as that kind of pay is, it generally worked out that the man in the fields received considerably less than the promised rate. Often the rate dropped on payday to 8 cents a basket and the field hand who actually took home $7 a day for his work considered himself lucky.

On my first day in the fields, I worked 10 hours with only a 15-minute break for what they called lunch. It was the hardest, most punishing work I had ever done.

NO TOILET FACILITIES

In the first hours of that miserable day, my hands became grimy and encrusted with the green insecticide they spray on tomatoes. It covered my khaki pants and ate its way into my legs. It collected under my fingernails, covered my shoes and socks and festered in the scratches I received from the tomato vines.

But picking the tomatoes was the easy part of the job. The hard part was lugging the heavy baskets to the end of the rows—often as far as 150 feet—to be loaded onto the trucks.

All around me were men and women—all ages—dragging themselves along the rows on their hands and knees in the near-90° heat.

Toilet facilities? There were none. The pickers, male and female, used the field whenever they found it necessary. It was more than a mile to the nearest clump of trees.

DAY'S PAY: $4.32

That lunch I spoke of? A little before noon a battered pickup truck drove into the fields. The meal consisted of greasy sausage sandwiches and warm softdrinks. The sandwiches cost 35 cents and the drinks 20 cents.

Drinking water was dispensed from a wooden barrel. We dipped our water with a sawed-off tomato can shared by some 200 other migrant laborers toiling in the fields. Because the barrel was in the middle of the field, thirsty workers had to walk as much as a half mile for a drink of water.

As I figured it that first day, we picked more than 5,000 baskets of tomatoes. After 10 hours of stooping, squatting, crawling, picking, and loading, I'd earned just $4.32.

Many of the men and women working with me had earned less.

United States Must Block Communists' Plans To Destroy the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the Miami Herald, one of the finest newspapers in our country, has remarked editorially on what is undoubtedly the biggest challenge to the initiative and skill of our leaders and all representatives of free society.

The article follows:

DARK DAYS FOR THE U.N.

The session of the United Nations General Assembly that opens in New York today may be a crucial one. The official agenda, to be sure is not overloaded with ominous issues, the most important being Portuguese Angola and the future of nearby Ruanda-Urundi, a Belgian dependency. But the unofficial question that concerns many delegates can be simply put: Is the U.N. on the way out?

Harrassed by Communist destroyers, its principles betrayed by India at Goa, torn by dissension over Congo policy and plagued by debt, the U.N. is in a dark hour.

Some of its backers in Britain are wondering aloud if the U.N. has "had its day." Criticism is rising among conservative Members of Congress and opposition is forming to our policy of all-out support.

Even our chief delegate, Adlai Stevenson, in a sad little speech during the Goan crisis, speculated whether he was witnessing the start of its final dissolution.

Reports of its early demise, we believe, are greatly exaggerated. The crisis, however, is serious enough to rally its friends and cause its critics to have second thoughts.

Rather than allow the drift to continue, the United States and Britain are working together to give the U.N. new vigor. Proposals the U.S. would like to have considered would earmark units of national armed forces as a U.N. peace army, equipped and ready to move into trouble spots as a symbol of the world's abhorrence of war. The Secretary-General would be provided with expert assistants available to mediate differences on the spot or, if their efforts failed, appeal to world opinion against aggressors.

President Kennedy has already committed the United States to help ease the world forum's finanical worries, asking Congress for authority to buy $100 million of U.N. bonds. This will be an issue in the present session. Some lawmakers are alarmed by the fact that the Afro-Asian nations now hold an absolute majority. Although we are by far the largest contributor to the U.N., we have only 1 of the 104 votes that make General Assembly decisions. This disturbs many other Americans too.

U.S. support, however, is firm. We have always anchored foreign policy on the U.N. base and this faith was expressed again the other day by Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization affairs.

"Far from dying," said Mr. Cleveland, "the United Nations is increasingly being recognized as a significant mechanism of international politics—which is to say one of the most important arenas for the exercise of national power."

The administration is prepared to back the U.N. to the hilt and Congress, though the debate may be hot, will go along.

The U.N. has had its dark times before but seems, as Mr. Cleveland says, to emerge from each crisis, stronger and better able to cope with the next. It will be a black day for the world if it does not do so again.

A Recession-Proof America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my fellow Members of the House of Representatives the following article dealing with phases of the administration's legislative program for 1962. This story was printed by the Tribune Publishing Co., of Massachusetts, and is one of the 24 New England newspapers that features a weekly column prepared by me.

As brought forth in this article, President Kennedy's state of the Union address offered for the consideration of Congress a legislative program, which if adopted, will keep the Nation on the path toward "A Recession-Proof America."

The article reads as follows:

A RECESSION-PROOF AMERICA

(By Congressman THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.)

President Kennedy's program, if adopted by Congress, will keep the Nation on the path toward "A Recession-Proof America."

On domestic affairs, the President has plainly given top priority to medical care for the aged, aid to education and the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs with Cabinet status.

The President correctly called attention to our economy when his message emphasized "The Nation is on the high road of recovery and growth. But improvement is still needed."

To do this Congress should approve legislation to retain workers displaced by machines and youths just entering the work force. It also should approve an 8-percent tax credit for investment in machinery and

equipment as a spur to modernization and the Nation's ability to compete abroad.

MASS IMMUNIZATION

Of importance to all families, the President stressed the need for a mass immunization program against children's diseases, and promised a new program "stressing services instead of just support." This project is urgently needed and will be the first of its kind in the Nation's history. This will provide vaccine for as many as 5 million babies born each year.

A spokesman for the Public Health Service presented figures that showed "if the 5 million children born annually are vaccinated childhood diseases would virtually disappear in 25 years."

Foreign affairs: As stated by the President, the Nation's military might has improved steadily last year. In the coming year, reserve programs will be revised. The Government expects to get nearly 300 more Polaris and Minuteman missiles this year.

The President affirmed this country's commitment to "a supreme effort to break the logjam on disarmament and nuclear tests." On disarmament, the President said: "world order will be secured only when the world has laid these weapons which seem to offer present security but threaten our future survival."

President Kennedy's solemn dedication to the cause of peace may be remembered in history after many other matters are forgotten . . .

In rejecting any patchwork on the Reciprocal Trade Act, the President called for a new law.

The President's words—speaking of the nuclear deadlock—will be repeated time and time again and will be foremost in the minds of peace-loving people. The statement was "The world was not meant to be a prison in which man awaits his execution."

The adoption of President Kennedy's program by Congress will be a constructive step to ward-off possibilities of future recessions.

Toward Bigger Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Toward Bigger Government" which appeared in the January 12, 1962 edition of the Terre Haute (Ind.) Star.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOWARD BIGGER GOVERNMENT

With the note of urgency to which we have become accustomed, President Kennedy yesterday asked additional powers over tariffs and income taxes and also over cities through a new Cabinet-rated Department of Urban Affairs. He promised a balanced budget—to be detailed in the budget message later—and, in general, rallied the forces of the Nation to support our allies against the world threat from the Red bloc.

For this last cause the Nation is sure to lend the President its loyal support and to accept the heavy tax load which strong defenses require.

At the same time, there is a growing sense of unease and distrust of many of the tendencies of Government which can be summarized in this way: The trend is toward more and more bigness.

Advance forecasts of the budget are that it will total $95 billion. Whether it will prove to be in balance relies on perhaps optimistic revenue predictions. What is certain is that it is edging toward the $100 billion mark. What also is evident is that, in the present thinking on the governmental level, the way to balance a budget is through more taxes, not lower expenditures.

The proposed Department of Urban Affairs is a sample of the continued trend toward bigness. It would, to a large extent, bypass the traditional rights of the States. Such a proposal has drawn broad support because the cities are eager for Federal funds and believe they would get this help most expeditiously through this department.

Regulation of income taxes for the purpose of stimulating or depressing inflationary trends within the economy represents another large transfer of power to the Federal Government. Such a proposal is sure to meet with strong opposition.

Also sure to face sharp scrutiny will be the continuing expenditures for foreign aid. Here there is a reluctance to continue what, in some cases, comes shamefully close to the payment of tribute. This has created a vested interest in these countries which would resent any decrease in aid and constantly would press for more, playing the game of international power politics

The times, of course, have brought about these trends. But hidden behind the polished and patriotic rhetoric the President employs so well, if perhaps tritely, is the unmistakable image of a growing, Hobbesian Leviathan of government.

And, after all, are not all our vast expenditures and labor intended to turn back the tide of big government under Red auspices? Would it not be ironic to do this by creating our own Frankenstein's monster?

The task before the Congress is a difficult one and the public should hear the protests of the conservatives with respect.

The Migrant Farm Labor Story—Part VII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article in the Dale Wright series which appeared in the New York World-Telegram and Sun on October 17, 1961. I have been bringing these articles to the attention of my colleagues because they vividly portray the crying need for legislation to correct shocking abuses of migrant farmworkers:

THE FORGOTTEN PEOPLE: MIGRANTS NEED FEDERAL PROTECTION—FARM STATES WON'T HELP; LABORERS ARE GYPPED EVERYWHERE THEY GO

(By Dale Wright)

The night I decided to leave Florida and move north with the migrant laborers for South Carolina was one of the worst nights in my life.

I was asleep in a filthy room near Hastings when a baby's shriek pierced the night and woke me up. I pushed open the unlocked door of the room next to mine to investigate.

There, lying on a burlap bag in an old packing case, was a baby, 2 or 3 months old, screaming in terror.

A huge bettle had crawled into the baby's mouth. Its parents were not home.

I picked up the baby, removed the bettle and succeeded in quieting the frightened youngster. There was no more sleep for me that night so I stayed with the baby and waited for his folks to return.

Beetles and roaches and chinches, they told me later, were the least of their problems. The Florida potato belt also breeds big rattlesnakes. They are likely to be found in or under any old building. Flies and mosquitoes were everywhere, buzzing around in the remnants of food and debris.

SOUTH CAROLINA WORSE

But what lay ahead of me in South Carolina was just as bad or worse.

I saw migrant farm laborers, the very old and the very young, moving into South Carolina in open trucks and battered old buses like livestock on the way to a slaughterhouse.

In the fields I saw the same kind of people I had met in Florida, working 12 to 16 hours a day, cheated on their wages and exploited at every hand.

But in South Carolina there were youngsters only 6 and 7 years old working in the fields with the grownups from early morning until it was too dark for them to see what they were doing.

Here again, there were no schools for migrant children. But the labor contractors were there with the same promises of good jobs, good pay, nice places to live. By this time their spiel reminded me of an old record.

EVILS OF CREW LEADER

In Charleston, a thriving produce center for several truck crops, I talked with Julius Amaker, an insurance executive and a former agent for the U.S. Department of Agriculture for 13 years.

Mr. Amaker, who has spent much time trying to improve the lot of the migrant worker, had some strong words:

"The worst single evil facing the migrant farmworker is his crew leader. The crew boss cheats him, shortchanges him and uses every trick in the book to separate him from the money he has earned by backbreaking toil.

"I see the crew leaders driving around in big, fancy cars. I know they make from $7,000 to $10,000 during a single season, after expenses. A lot of the money rightfully belongs to the poor, illiterate workers who can't defend themselves.

"The only solution is to take the responsibility for recruitment and payment of migrant workers away from the crew boss and turn it over to the grower or packer or processor. The employer then should be under the supervision of a trained Federal agent.

RECORDS MUST BE KEPT

"The employer should be required under penalty of law to keep accurate work records so that withholding, social security, and workmen's compensation credits can be made."

Mr. Amaker said many migrants who come to Charleston die there or land on the local welfare rolls.

"It's always the same story," he said. "Somebody's promise of better work, better pay. When they learn it's no better here, they either keep going north or get stranded here."

He's particularly concerned with the children. He pointed out that State legislation to provide schools for the migrant children was killed 2 years ago by a strong farm lobby and the action of segregationists.

FEDERAL PROTECTION

"If these youngsters don't go to school in Florida," he said, "or wherever they come from, they simply don't go at all. So they grow up in the fields and are never prepared for anything more than farm labor.

"Because no State will take on the job of protecting the migrant laborer's interests," he said, "he'd like to see Federal supervisors watch the harvesting operations as the labor gangs move north and thus protect the workers' interests along the way.

"Migrant farmworkers," he continued, "are absolutely the lowest on the American economic scale. Yet they are vital to the harvest of American crops. Without them, the farmer, the shipper, the packer, the processor, and the consumer could not exist."

Mr. Amaker sees some protection for the migrant worker in the minimum wage laws, but only if there are adequate teeth in such legislation.

"Employers," he declared, "find ways to skirt the law. The migrant worker continues to be a sorrowful victim of neglect and omission."

TRIP TO NOWHERE

"Some new approach is necessary, some code of 20th century laws to protect these people from exploitation everywhere along the line."

I stood on a Charleston street corner and watched the exodus of migrants northward to another stop on the trail. A convoy of two buses, a stake truck and an ancient, broken-down station wagon was overcrowded with people and work gear.

It was a trip to more unfulfilled promises, more cheating and more sorrows.

A bus like one of those in the convoy had crashed into another vehicle in North Carolina a few years ago. A score of workers were killed. The driver was found to have had no insurance.

Mr. Amaker had pointed out in our talk that labor contractors pick these people up along the road somewhere, then rumble off anywhere there's a buck to be made—for the crew boss.

ONE-THOUSAND-MILE TRIPS

The trip is frequently as long as 1,000 miles, both going north to harvest and returning home after the work is over.

The law does not require operators of migrant transport vehicles to carry liability insurance in Florida and South Carolina, or in most other States in the South. If passengers are injured or killed, it's just tough luck for them or their families. And while compulsory insurance laws are nonexistent, safety inspection regulations are so loosely enforced that they're almost useless.

I had seen many such caravans earlier in Florida. I was to see many more in my travels along the east coast. The great tragedy was that for many of these miserable men, women, and children, the trip was to nowhere.

Effingham City Council Protests UHF Substitute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I have received a copy of a resolution passed November 21, 1961, by the City Council of Effingham, Ill., which clearly indicates the concern of the citizens of this community in regard to the Federal Communications Commission proposal to substitute ultrahigh frequency for very high frequency television service via the Champaign channel 3 station.

I ask leave to include this resolution in the RECORD as part of my remarks:

RESOLUTION 35

Whereas the citizens of the city of Effingham, Ill., requested the City Council of the City of Effingham, Ill., to write to Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Congressman PETER F. MACK, JR., television station WCIA, Champaign, Ill., and the Federal Communications Commission opposing the changing of television station WCIA, Champaign, Ill., from a very high frequency station to an ultrahigh frequency station: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the City Council of the City of Effingham, Ill.:

Section 1. That the city council of the city of Effingham, Ill., opposes the changing of television station WCIA, Champaign, Ill., from a very high frequency station to ultrahigh frequency station.

Section 2. That the city clerk is hereby instructed to send a certified copy of this resolution to Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Congressman PETER F. MACK, JR., television station WCIA and the Federal Communications Commission.

Presented, read, and adopted this 21st day of November, A.D. 1961.

L. KELLER, *Mayor*.

Attest:

JACK J. PARKS, *City Clerk*.

State-of-the-World Message, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Buffalo Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., on January 13, 1962. Certainly present-day conditions demand closer ties with our Atlantic neighbors, and we should be ever on the alert for opportunities to further cement our mutual solidarity. The editorial follows:

STATE-OF-THE-WORLD MESSAGE, TOO

Because of the U.S. position of leadership among the free nations, an American President's state-of-the-Union message is read, at least in part, as a state-of-the-world message, too. President Kennedy's message of Thursday was perused eagerly in that light at home and abroad.

Reaction in our own country was symbolized by the fact that the longest and loudest burst of congressional applause was evoked by the President's declaration on the Berlin crisis:

"The threat to the brave city of Berlin remains. In these last 6 months the Allies have made it unmistakably clear that our presence in Berlin, our free access thereto, and the freedom of 2 million West Berliners would not be surrendered either to force or through appeasement. And to maintain those rights and obligations, we are prepared to talk, when appropriate, and to fight if necessary."

Naturally this declaration was welcomed not only in our own country but throughout the Western alliance. The concluding words of the quoted paragraph could not have been equally welcome in Moscow; but, significantly, the Soviet news agency Tass played up the President's subsequent assertion:

"We are sparing no honorable effort to find a peaceful and mutually acceptable resolution of this problem. I believe such a resolution can be found, and with it an improvement in our relations with the Soviet Union."

Mr. Kennedy followed his discussion of the Berlin crisis with a reassuring appraisal of the progress of the Western democracies toward closer political and economic collaboration:

"The Atlantic community is no longer concerned with purely military aims. As its common undertakings grow at an ever-increasing pace, we are, and increasingly will be, partners in aid, trade, defense, diplomacy, and monetary affairs.

"The emergence of a new Europe is being matched by the emergence of new ties across the Atlantic. It is a matter of undramatic daily cooperation in hundreds of workaday tasks: of currencies kept in effective relation, of development loans meshed together, of standardized weapons and concerted diplomatic positions."

We heartily approve of President Kennedy's emphasis on the necessity of closer ties among members of the Atlantic community; but we fear that he was overoptimistic in the following appraisal of the free nations' solidarity as against that of the Soviet bloc:

"The Atlantic community grows not like a volcanic mountain by one mighty explosion, but like a coral reef from the accumulating activity of all. Thus, we in the free world are moving steadily toward unity and cooperation, in the teeth of an old Bolshevik prophecy, and at the very time when extraordinary rumbles of discord can be heard across the Iron Curtain. It is not free societies which bear within them the seeds of inevitable disunity."

Mr. Kennedy displayed similar optimism when, in urging congressional approval of American participation in a United Nations bond issue to pay for the rather dismal Congo operations, he spoke of the manner in which the U.N. has "fulfilled its charter's lofty aims."

A far more realistic appeal for a closer union of the free nations to keep the peace can be found in Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller's advocacy, in an interview in Hartford, of a political and economic union of the democracies. Declaring that it is essential for the free peoples to think "beyond national borders" and in terms of "political structures larger than the Nation-State," the Governor asserted that the United Nations has failed to meet such a need because of Soviet Russia's misuse of that organization.

We are glad that President Kennedy and Governor Rockefeller see eye to eye on the need for Atlantic unity—and we hope that, in due season, the President will match the Governor's realism in championing direct action to that end.

U.S. News & World Report Points Out Fallacies in Administration's Economics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious problems this Nation faces

is the apparent lack of understanding on the part of this administraiton of our economy. Those who seem to be most influential around the President are the proponents of a planned economy, big Government spending, and strict curtailment of private enterprise. They build their whole case on the false theory that it is possible to continually increase spending and taxes without reaching a point of diminishing returns and the eventual collapse of a free economy.

The following analysis from the U.S. News & World Report is a fine analysis of the fuzzy thinking of White House economists:

White House forecast of business for 1962 is this:

Total spending: $570 billion, up $50 billion from 1961, and rising.

Personal incomes: $448 billion, up $31 billion, and rising.

Output of industry: 122 percent of 1957–59, up 12 percent.

Profits: $56.5 billion, up $10.5 billion or nearly 23 percent.

It's a prosperous year that the President sees ahead. Steel strike is about the only thing in sight that can cause an upset of the forecast. Long strike in steel seems unlikely. White House pressure will be against it.

Budget forecasts rest upon the business forecast. Budget outlook:

Year to end June 30: Outgo, $89 billion; income, $82 billion; deficit, $7 billion.

Year to start July 1: Outgo, $92.5 billion; income, $93 billion; surplus, $500 million.

That's looking ahead through 18 months and slicing estimates very thin. Chances are that outgo will be higher, income a bit lower than anticipated.

Prospect: A $100 billion budget within 3 years. Kennedy is urging on Congress around 70 ideas for new ways to spend money, or for ways that spending plans already approved can be increased.

Now add social security, highways, other special spending and you have:

Year to end June 30: Outgo, 111 billions; income, 102.5; deficit, 8.5.

Year to begin July 1: Outgo, 114.8 billions; income, 116.6; surplus, 1.8.

That's what's referred to as the "cash flow" into the Treasury and out of the Treasury. It's the spending and taxing that affect business. Effect is supposed to be stimulating now; somewhat of a restraint later.

This isn't the whole story. Add State and local spending and you get:

State and local, for year to start July 1: About 50 billions. Federal: 115 billions. Total cash spending by governments: 165 billions.

That's more than 1 Government dollar in 4 of total U.S. spending.

Underlying theory: Governments by spending large and rising amounts of money on the public sector of the economy can create rapid growth and full employment. Private sector, theoretically, will have its pump primed.

With what result? In 1934, when theory first was applied: Spending of governments was 12.3 billions; half Federal, half State and local.

Now, 28 years later: Cash spending is to be 165 billions, up 13 times. Unemployment: The hope is that it will get down to 3 million before another recession hits. Business growth: Nobody predicting rapid growth.

Even so, the long-time theory, not successful, still is being applied.

Idea is that not enough now is being spent by Government.

So, look at it another way. In the 1920's: Private property share of Nation's net product was 26 percent; Government's 12 percent; labor's 62 percent. Now: Property's share is down to 12 percent; Government's up to 26 percent; labor's constant at 62 percent. Public sector has mushroomed.

At the rate of the past 30 years it will not be so very long before the share of private property in the Nation's economy will be negligible.

The lesson: Apparently it is that expanding the "public sector" of the economy does not bring rapid growth or full employment. Also: Maybe it is time to apply tax, labor, antitrust policies that will encourage the "private sector" to venture and expand under the stimulus of private initiative.

It's been a whole generation since that approach was used.

Progress in Indian Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, much remains to be done to raise Indian health standards to those of the general population. But much has been done in recent years in this field. On Sunday, January 14, the New York Times carried an article by its Dr. Howard A. Rusk which tells of progress in Indian health since this activity was transferred, 6 years ago, to the jurisdiction of the Public Health Service.

Last month I requested the Public Health Service for a report on health standards on the northern Cheyenne Reservation in Montana. This is a reservation with few natural resources, much poverty, and severe health problems.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the December 20 report I received from the Public Health Service, and Dr. Rusk's article.

There being no objection, the article and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN INDIAN HELPED—HEALTH SERVICES GAIN DURING 6 YEARS WITH SHIFT FROM INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

In the past the United States has been severely criticized for its treatment of the American Indians. Such criticism was often justified, particularly in the area of health services.

Within the last 6 years, however, quietly and without fanfare the country has made substantial progress in improving health services for the American Indians and Alaskan natives.

Illustrative of the advances that have been made in the health of this group of citizens is the fact that the number of Indians and Alaskan natives under treatment for tuberculosis has declined 15 percent during the last year. This decline reflects a continuous downward trend since a peak in 1956.

In that year the Indian and Alaskan native tuberculosis patient census averaged 2,400. This was more than three times the average experienced in 1961.

This downward trend results partially from the new drugs and other measures that have been used so successfully in controlling tuberculosis during the last few years.

QUALITY AND SCOPE RISE

Of equal importance, however, is the substantial improvement in the quality and scope of health services for our Indians and Alaskan natives. This resulted when the responsibility for these services was transferred to the U.S. Public Health Service in 1955.

Federal health services for Indians began under the War Department in the early 1800's. In 1849 the Bureau of Indian Affairs was transferred to the newly created Department of the Interior. The responsibility for Indian health services remained with the Department of the Interior until 1955. One of the chief reasons for transferring this responsibility to the health service was to improve both the quality and quantity of professional staffing.

Today there are about 337,000 Indians of some 200 tribes scattered principally in 24 States and 43,000 Eskimos, Indians, and Aleuts in Alaska who depend to some degree on the Indian health program for health services.

The facilities from which they receive services are widely scattered and isolated. Because of this it has always been extremely difficult to recruit professional health workers to man these programs.

For example, the new $3 million, 50-bed hospital at Kotzebue, Alaska, which opened this last year, is 32 miles above the Arctic Circle and only 150 miles from the Soviet Union.

This new hospital will service 7,500 natives, mostly Eskimos from an area of 68,000 square miles containing 28 villages. There are no roads leading into Kotzebue. The only means of transportation is by air or dogsled.

Construction of a new 12-bed hospital will start this year at Barrow, Alaska, a few miles from where Will Rogers lost his life. Barrow, about 200 miles north of the Arctic Circle, with a population of 1,600, is one of the largest native villages in Alaska.

One factor that has helped the Public Health Service staff its Indian health program was the enactment of the doctor-dentist draft in 1950. Draft-eligible physicians and dentists can fulfill their military obligations in the Public Health Service. More than half of the 272 physicians and 94 dentists serving in the Indian health program are from this group.

THEY STILL DIE YOUNG

Even with the advances of the last 6 years, the average age at death is 41 for an Indian and 30 for an Alaskan native as compared to 62 for other Americans. The tuberculosis rate is still four and one-half times greater among Indians and nearly nine times greater among Alaskan natives than the rest of the population.

The infant mortality rate among this group has declined 40 percent since 1954 but is still three times greater than that of the total population of the United States.

In many ways the health problems among Indians are similar to those found in the rest of the Nation a generation ago.

Despite the high prevalence of influenza, penumonia, tuberculosis, and gastroenteritis, accident is the leading cause of death. The rate of deaths due to accidents is three times higher among our American Indians and four times higher among our Alaskan natives than in our total population.

The second largest killer is heart disease. Degenerative diseases are less frequent among this group than the general population as half of our Indian population is under 20 years of age.

Their health problems are severe. Language differences combined with limited understanding of health and disease concepts still constitute serious obstacles to health improvement. The low economic level of these groups plus their geographic and cultural isolation on 250 Federal Indian reser-

vations and in hundreds of native villages in Alaska are also great handicaps in the provision of services.

Despite these obstacles, the Public Health Service has made definite strides in the Indian health program and will make even greater advances with the extensive programs it has underway for building new facilities.

The investment that we are making in improved health services for our American Indians and Alaskan natives is a fundamental investment based on a moral obligation that for too long went unfilled.

REPORT OF DIVISION OF INDIAN HEALTH, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE, DECEMBER 15, 1961, NORTHERN CHEYENNE RESERVATION, MONT.

The Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation is located primarily in Rosebud County and a small part of the Bighorn County in the State of Montana. The Northern Cheyenne tribe has a total enrollment of 2,210 of which 1,759 reside on the reservation. This reservation together with the Crow Reservation constitutes the Division of Indian Health's "Crow-Northern Cheyenne Service Unit." The Public Health Service Indian Hospital at Crow Agency serves both reservations, but a Public Health Service Indian Health Center at Lame Deer serves only the Northern Cheyenne. Since both reservations are served under one unit, and generally reported as such, it is sometimes difficult to break down facts and figures as to specifically what medical care has been provided only for the Northern Cheyennes.

The Northern Cheyennes have available to them all the facilities of the Public Health Service Indian Hospital at Crow Agency (which is located 40 miles from Lame Deer), and an ambulance is available 24 hours a day. In fiscal year 1961, there were 1,045 patients in this hospital of which it is estimated that 380 were Northern Cheyennes.

The Public Health Service Indian Health Center at Lame Deer (22 miles west from the St. Labre Mission at Ashland) has a full-time staff consisting of a dentist, a dental assistant, two nurses, a sanitarian aid, an X-ray technician, a clerk-typist, and two driver-orderlies. A doctor from the Crow Hospital holds regularly scheduled clinics at the center 3 days a week. The center has been equipped with an X-ray, medical laboratory, and a modern 3-chair dental clinic, so it is now necessary to send patients to Crow Hospital only for further diagnoses, hospitalization, and emergencies. In fiscal year 1961, the medical outpatient load for this center was 7,487.

In addition to the above, in fiscal year 1961, $8,617 were spent for contractual medical care services to Northern Cheyennes who were referred to community hospitals. Also a contract was negotiated again with the Montana State Board of Health, Helena, Mont., to act as an agent of the Public Health Service in providing preventive health services to the Indian population of the Crow, Northern Cheyenne, and Flathead Reservations in Montana. These preventive health services are designed to carry out the general program objectives of the Division of Indian Health:

(a) To prevent the occurrence of preventable disease, disability, and death.

(b) To improve the Indian's understanding of the causes of disease, disability, and death, and increase the utilization of measures which intercept such causes.

(c) To bring about the adoption of health habits, practices, and attitudes conducive to optimum health.

(d) To increase the Indian's opportunity for managing his health affairs in his own way and under his own customs wherever these are compatible with improved health.

Other health services provided for the Northern Cheyennes include well-child clinics each month at Lame Deer, Burney, Busby, and Ashland; medical clinics held once a week at Burney health location; obstetrics clinics held once a week at the health center; school immunization programs, and an extensive tuberculin testing program was conducted in the schools attended by the Northern Cheyenne children.

One of the greatest health problems in the Crow-Northern Cheyenne service unit, is the control of tuberculosis among the Northern Cheyenne as it has been difficult to get known active cases to accept hospital care for a sufficient length of time to render the disease noninfectious. In the first 10 months of calendar year 1961, 10 new cases of tuberculosis were reported.

Included in the services provided by the contract with the Montana State Board of Health, the public health nursing—

1. Visit each case of unhospitalized active tuberculosis at least once each year, and visit each active pulmonary case at least every 6 months and more often if indicated.

2. Refer all cases, contacts and suspects for medical and laboratory supervision and followup according to the tuberculosis control procedures of the State board of health.

3. Play the major role in preparing the active cases for hospitalization.

This year there was a typhoid fever outbreak on the Crow-Northern Cheyenne service unit. Cases to date, including one carrier and one suspected carrier are numbered at 14. Eleven of the 14 cases were from the Crow, agency and 3 cases were located in one neighborhood at Lame Deer on the Northern Cheyenne Reservation.

Control measures have included epidemiologic investigations, environmental sanitation control measures, mass immunizations at special clinics, and routine immunizations in outpatient and well-baby clinics.

From July 31 through September 27, 1961, a total of 1,435 completed typhoid immunizations were given to Indians in this service unit at the special clinics. Of the total who completed this series, 587 were Crow Indians and 848 Northern Cheyenne Indians. Sixty percent of the Northern Cheyenne population received at least one typhoid injection and 43 percent received a completed series.

The following is a summary of sanitary conditions existing on the Northern Cheyenne Reservation as reported in the Comprehensive Environmental Sanitation Survey Report dated January 1959:

Resident Indians, 1,759; dwellings (mostly log and frame), 350; average rooms per house, 1; 83 percent of home water supplies are unsafe; 95 percent of homes have unsatisfactory excreta disposal facilities.

The Division of Indian Health, Public Health Service, has a full-time sanitarian aid stationed at Lame Deer who provides direct sanitation services for Indians on the Northern Cheyenne Reservation. Through home visits, talks, demonstrations, and movies, the sanitarian aid carries out educational services designed to promote an awareness of environmental health needs and to motivate the people to improve their sanitation facilities. The sanitarian aid provides technical consultation to families, groups and the tribe regarding the correction of sanitation facilities and procedures particularly relating to food sanitation, waste disposal, and water supply. Surveys are conducted by the aid to assess the essential environmental needs on the reservation. Program planning and guidance are furnished to the sanitarian aid by the area sanitary engineer and other professional members of the area sanitation staff located at the Billings area office.

The Northern Cheyenne Tribe and the Public Health Service have cooperated to undertake three construction projects under the Sanitation Facilities Act (Public Law 86-121). The first such project undertaken was an emergency water supply for the Birney School community in fiscal year 1960, which was initiated to alleviate the need to obtain water from polluted sources. This cooperative tribal-public Health Service project included construction of a new well, pumphouse, and pressure tank. The work was completed in March of 1960 and resulted in a communal source of safe water for Indian homes located in the proximity of Birney.

During the current fiscal year, two cooperative tribal-Public Health Service sanitation facilities construction projects have been initiated. One project is for the installation of a water distribution system for about 40 Indian homes in the Birney community. The emergency well constructed in 1960 will be the water source from which water is distributed and piped into the Indian homes. Also included in the project is the provision of individual-type waste disposal facilities at each Indian home. The other project is for the construction of a community well, water distribution system and individual waste disposal facilities for about 45 homes in the Busby community. This project will alleviate a situation in Busby where inadequate privies are utilized and where a limited quantity of water has been hauled from a well to the homes.

The tribe has proposed to cooperate with the Public Health Service on four additional sanitation facilities projects for the Northern Cheyenne Reservation. These projects are proposed for the Kirby area, Lame Deer area, Ashland District, and Muddy District.

Television Program "Car 54—Where Are You?"—An Insult to Police

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. HALEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the CONGESSIONAL RECORD an editorial, "Television Program 'Car 54, Where Are You?'—An Insult to Police." The editorial was written by Mr. Frank J. Schira, executive director of the National Police Hall of Fame. The editorial follows:

TELEVISION PROGRAM "CAR 54—WHERE ARE YOU?"—AN INSULT TO POLICE

(By Frank J. Schira)

For several months we have noted a series of cleverly written stories appearing in magazines and newspapers throughout the country. These articles endeavor to persuade the listening public that the new TV program "Car 54" is generally approved of by the men in blue—they intimate that only the police chiefs object, and then not too much.

As working officers, you and I know the practical problems of our everyday duties. We must enforce the law and maintain order to the best of our abilities.

If we, as policemen, acted in any way as the men in car 54 do, we would be fired immediately or committed to a mental institution. Yet, both young and adult minds are subjected to the weekly antics of these well-paid actors (who never have had to face the dangers of really doing patrol). It is degrading to us. The kids who chant "Car 54, where are you?" as the patrol car passes by are not amusing. It leads to disrespect of law-enforcement officers. Respect for the badge is being laughed out of existence.

We understand that the producer claims it is a comedy which strictly follows police

procedures. What an awful thought—if a police department even faintly resembles the one portrayed in "Car 54." In my 15 years of police experience, I have never encountered such a routine.

We urge every member of NPOAA and every law-enforcement officer to write immediately to the sponsor or his local TV station and tell them if this program offends you.

This type of program establishes a pattern which is dangerous. It could lead to a breakdown in the effectiveness of law enforcement. It defames the good character of the policeman and dishonors those men who gave their lives while performing in the line of duty.

Comedy is a powerful weapon—but the policeman is not a clown. Hundreds of thousands of young people are laughing at these "policemen"—and in these critical times when juvenile delinquency is on the upswing, we cannot afford to have disrespect. We wonder if the people who write this program realize how many good officers will be injured by the influence of "Car 54."

Retraining of Workers To Fill Automation Gaps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN A. SMITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, one of the most serious problems facing our economy today is that of finding jobs for workers who have been displaced by automation.

I discovered this fall while traveling through my own State of Massachusetts, that even in labor surplus areas, there were often jobs going begging for lack of skilled technicians. There was, however, little work available for the unskilled worker whose job had been replaced by new machinery.

The General Electric plant in Lynn, Mass., has begun a new retraining program designed to prepare its workers for new jobs if and when their own are threatened by automation or layoffs. Any employee who would like to devote 7½ hours a week of his own time for 24 weeks can receive at the company's expense classroom and shop training in the operation of machine tools.

I feel that this is the type of forward-looking approach to this problem that American industry and Congress should consider and I would like to congratulate the General Electric Co. for introducing this plan in its Lynn plant. I would also like to have unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on this program which appeared in the Boston Herald on Sunday, January 21.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GE TO RETRAIN WORKERS TO FILL AUTOMATION GAPS

The problem of what to do with the worker whose job is eliminated by automation is one that has long been under study by management and labor unions.

One solution—called for by President Kennedy and other Government officials—is retraining of employees so they can adapt to the more highly skilled, better paying jobs that accompany automation.

PILOT PROGRAM

The General Electric Co. in Lynn recently unveiled a pilot program to cope with the problem of rapidly changing job skill needs.

The pilot course calls for some 75 employees to spend seven and a half hours a week for 24 weeks learning new skills.

Employees will undergo classroom and shop training on their own time, with the entire program financed by the company.

The result—they will be prepared to step into new jobs if and when their own are endangered by automation or layoffs.

The program will provide employees with new basic skills needed to operate such machine tools as drills, engine lathes, boring mills, milling machines, radial drills, turret lathes, grinders and gear-cutting machines.

TWO HUNDRED APPLICANTS

Company officials expect more than 200 applicants for the program which will get underway in about a month. It has been in the planning stage for more than a year.

According to Robert A. Farrell, manager of employee and community relations at the GE plant, and a member of the board of directors of the Associated Industries of Massachusetts, the program will play a much-needed role.

"At General Electric's Lynn plants," he said, "it was discovered that as the level of factory skill requirements increased, people were literally being let go out one door for lack of suitable work, while those with different skills were being hired in another."

"In the 3-year period 1957–59, for example, despite a net reduction of 3,500 jobs, 2,700 new employees were hired."

"By and large the people being laid off were the less skilled, while the people being hired possessed a specific skill that was needed."

SACRIFICE NEEDED

This program, combined with others already in progress, will help the worker who is willing to sacrifice 7½ hours a week of his free time to strengthen his future job security.

Trainees are being selected on academic and occupational experience, interests and aims concerning future work, ability, and aptitude.

Although graduates of the program are not guaranteed jobs in higher paying classifications, company officials point out that one department alone, will lose, through attrition, nearly 2,400 people in hourly and piecework areas over the next 10 years.

Latest in the Fight Over Federal Aid to Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD an article which appeared in the U.S. News & World Report of December 25, 1961, entitled "Latest in the Fight Over Federal Aid to Schools."

This article contains the full text of the synopsis of a study on Federal aid to church-related schools, made by the legal department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference and released on December 14, 1961.

The synopsis aptly states that:

The present argument over aid to education has unhappily become overclouded by opinions which have tended to engender the belief that the problems here involved are to be solved by simple, absolutist interpretations of the Constitution and by generalizations based thereupon.

The fact remains that these problems will not be solved in that manner. These problems touch the very foundations of our Nation, and our constitutional tradition. We must, therefore, attempt to solve them within the framework of thoughtful and painstakingly impartial analysis of our Nation's history as it relates to the issue of church-state relations, the rights of children and their parents, and the role of the Government in the field of education.

The study made by the legal department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference contributes to this end. I believe, therefore, that it warrants our careful attention and consideration. For this reason, I wish to place the following article in the RECORD, and to commend it to the attention of the membership of this body:

LATEST IN THE FIGHT OVER FEDERAL AID TO SCHOOLS—A CATHOLIC REPORT ON SCHOOL SUBSIDY AND THE LAW

An agency of the Catholic Church in the United States, in a report just issued, renews its claim to aid for parochial schools as part of any Federal aid-to-education plan.

This signals a new fight over the whole issue in the 1962 session of Congress.

As a legal basis for the Catholic position in this forthcoming fight, the National Catholic Welfare Conference contends here that "there exists no constitutional bar to aid to education in church-related schools."

Federal aid, the report adds, also should be extended to other private, nonprofit schools, whether church-related or not.

Following is full text of the synopsis of a study on Federal aid to church-related schools, made by the legal department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference and released in Washington, D.C., December 14, 1961:

"A careful examination of relevant decisions by the Supreme Court of the United States reveals that there is no constitutional bar to the inclusion of church-related schools in general programs of Federal aid to education. On the other hand, the exclusion of church-related and other private, nonprofit schools from the secular educational benefits of any comprehensive programs of Federal aid would point the way to Government monopoly of education and to a resultant uniformitarian society.

"The precise question to which this study is addressed is: May the Federal Government, as part of a comprehensive program to promote educational excellence in the Nation, provide secular educational benefits to the public in private, nonprofit schools, church-related as well as nondenominational? Three related questions are not treated: the basic constitutionality of Federal aid to education; the constitutionality of Federal aid to education exclusively in public schools; and the constitutionality of Federal aid to religious instruction.

"While no conclusion is expressed respecting the desirability, in principle, of large-scale Federal aid to education, it is clear that it would be both needful from the viewpoint of national policy and lawful from the viewpoint of constitutionality to assist the secular aspects of education in church-related schools, if such large-scale Federal aid should be undertaken.

"The specific conclusions to which this study comes are as follows:

"1. Education in church-related schools is a public function which, by its nature, is deserving of governmental support.

"2. There exists no constitutional bar to aid to education in church-related schools in a degree proportionate to the value of the public function it performs. Such aid to the secular function may take the form of matching grants or long-term loans to institutions, or of scholarships, tuition payments, or tax benefits.

"3. The parent and child have a constitutional right to choose a church-related educational institution meeting reasonable State requirements as the institution in which the child's education shall be acquired.

"4. Government in the United States is without power to impose upon the people a single educational system in which all must participate.

"Considerations respecting policy: As President Kennedy has indicated, it is in the national interest that every American child have the opportunity for an education of excellence. But it is also in the national interest that our Judaeo-Christian moral heritage be preserved, along with the freedom to acquire education in diverse, non-State institutions.

"Herein lies the unique public value of our church-related schools. While our great public school system—built by men of all faiths—should receive the particular interest—as it does the financial support—of those who are dedicated to church-related schools, it is also true that the immense public contribution of the latter schools should be better known.

"These schools were the original source of American popular education. Far from deviating from the American educational tradition—which was one of hospitality to religious values—they stand at the very core of that tradition.

"Today, Catholic schools—the largest of the groups of our church-related schools—are providing education, recognized by the States as meeting essential citizens needs, to 4.5 million elementary schoolchildren and 1 million high schoolchildren—or around 13 percent of the total school population of the Nation.

"In 19 States whose school population represents half that of the Nation, Catholic schools are providing education to 18.6 percent of all children in elementary and secondary schools. For the year 1960 alone, the Catholic educational system saved American taxpayers $1.8 billion.

"However, one of the principal public benefits attributable to the Catholic schools is not economic but social. Typically, the Catholic schools are a meeting place for children of different economic and ethnic backgrounds, and have usually not been located according to de facto zoning which divides neighborhoods racially. They have historically proved an invaluable training ground to prepare citizens for full participation in a pluralist society. Their graduates are found everywhere in American life, contributing commonly with all other citizens to the welfare of the American society.

"If, as seems true in the current educational crisis, all of the country's means of education should be utilized to their fullest extent, then—unless constitutional considerations dictate to the contrary—sound policy requires that, if the Federal Government offers large-scale aid to education, this should include education in private, nonprofit schools, church-related as well as nondenominational.

"Considerations respecting constitutionality: Constitutional considerations fully support these policy requirements. The provisions of the Federal Constitution chiefly involved in discussions of Federal aid to education in church-related schools are the 'religion' clauses of the first amendment and the due-process clause of the fifth amendment.

"WHAT THE NATION'S HISTORY SHOWS

"Historically, it is clear that the Founding Fathers did not and would never have written into their Constitution any clauses which would be aimed at sterilizing all public life and institutions of religious content.

"Opponents of aid to church-related education, however, rely principally on the language of the first amendment that 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion.' When this clause was drafted, it was understood to mean that Congress could not create a national church or give any religion a preferred status. This 'no establishment' clause was aimed at preventing governmental transgressions upon religious liberty and not at preventing all relationships—even certain cooperative relationships—between church and state.

"Certainly it was never understood to mean that religious institutions which perform public services are disqualified to receive compensation for them through the governmental organs of the society which has benefited by the services. Neither was it understood to mean that Government may proffer its assistance to the health and education of our citizens only through secularized governmental institutions.

"No decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court contradict these last-stated points; in fact, the Supreme Court decisions which are closely relevant support them.

"There are three decisions of the Supreme Court which relate to the constitutionality of aid-providing by government, for the accomplishment of public-welfare objects through church-related institutions. Not only do none of these decisions hold such aid-providing unconstitutional, they all flatly affirm its constitutionality. These decisions are *Bradfield* v. *Roberts*, 175 U.S. 291 (1899); *Cochran* v. *Board of Education*, 281 U.S. 370 (1930); and *Everson* v. *Board of Education*, 330 U.S. 1 (1947).

"The Bradfield case held that the appropriation by Congress of money to a Catholic hospital, as compensation for the treatment and cure of poor patients under a contract, did not constitute an appropriation to a religious society in violation of the no-establishment clause. The Court expressly disavowed the view of those who brought the suit that religious institutions performing public functions cannot, on account of the no-establishment clause, be aided by government.

"The Cochran case established that the use of State funds to provide secular textbooks for all school students, including those in church-related schools, is constitutionally justifiable as an expenditure for a public purpose.

"The Everson case held constitutional a New Jersey statute which provided that reimbursement to parents might constitutionally be made out of public funds for transportation of their children to Catholic parochial schools on buses regularly used in the public transportation system. The underlying principle of the case is that government aid may be rendered to a citizen in furtherance of his obtaining basic citizen education, whether he obtains it in a public or a private nonprofit school.

"It should be noted that the Supreme Court stated in Everson that 'no tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions.' Some commentators have said that this statement was mere dictum in the case (judicial opinion on a point other than the precise issue involved), while some others have said that it meant that government may not constitutionally support public-welfare objects accomplished in church-related institutions.

"Both are plainly incorrect. The statement was part of the basic reasoning in the majority opinion. And it must be read in the light of what the Court actually decided in the case, namely, that it is constitutional to pay for school-bus service to citizens at public expense, in order to enable them to acquire the secular benefits of education, regardless of whether they attend public or private—including church-related—schools.

"Two further Supreme Court decisions, widely cited in controversy over Federal aid to education in church-related schools, are *McCollum* v. *Board of Education*, 330 U.S. 203 (1948), and *Zorach* v. *Clauson*, 343 U.S. 306 (1952). Each dealt with the constitutionality of 'released time' programs in the public schools and so is not in point with respect to the present discussion of aid-providing by Government, save insofar as each contains comment upon the general meaning of the 'religion' clauses of the first amendment.

"The McCollum case involved a released time program conducted on the public-school premises and carefully integrated into the public-school program; this was held unconstitutional. The Zorach case involved an unintegrated program conducted off the public-school premises, and this was held to be constitutional.

"Since the majority opinion in the McCollum case spoke three times of the first amendment's creating a 'wall of separation between church and state,' some commentators believed that the Supreme Court had stated a doctrine of absolute separation of church and state and that the way had now been prepared for the liquidation of fruitful relationships between Government and religion which had been the American experience of 160 years. The decision of the Court 4 years later in Zorach proved these commentators wrong.

"WE ARE A RELIGIOUS PEOPLE

"In Zorach the Supreme Court made it clear that the concept, derived from the first amendment, of separation of church and state was not to be taken in any absolute sense. The Court stated that 'we are a religious people,' and that religion and government may in various ways cooperate.

"Neither the McCollum nor the Zorach case constitutes, in any sense, precedent against the kinds of possible aid to education in church-related schools here under discussion.

"A third group of Supreme Court decisions relevant to this discussion is *Meyer* v. *Nebraska*, 262 U.S. 390 (1923), and *Pierce* v. *Society of Sisters*, 268 U.S. 510 (1925). These involved the all-important rights of free choice in selecting educational institutions.

"The Meyer case involved the violation, by a teacher in a Lutheran parochial school, of a State statute making it a crime to teach in any elementary school any language other than English. The U.S. Supreme Court reversed the conviction, stressing that there are three groups of rights which the Constitution protects against unreasonable intrusion by the State: those of the child, the parent, and the teacher. The Court struck forcefully at the view that all educational rights belong to the State, and it said that the desire of the legislature to 'foster a homogeneous people' could not be fulfilled at the expense of liberties guaranteed by the Constitution.

"The landmark case of *Pierce* v. *Society of Sisters* involved an expanded recognition of parental and child rights in education. Here an Oregon statute—which had been promoted by the Ku Klux Klan and same allied groups—required that parents send their children only to public schools. The plan of the statute was to 'Americanize' all children in what was described as the 'public-school melting pot.' Protestants, Jews and Catholics rose in opposition to the scheme.

"The Supreme Court of the United States ruled the statute unconstitutional as denying parental and child rights freely to chose education in nonpublic—including church-related—schools. The Court said that the legislature could not give the State a monopoly over education. Most significantly it said:

" 'The fundamental theory of liberty upon which all governments in the Union repose excludes any general power of the State to standardize its children by forcing them to accept instruction from public-school teachers only. The child is not the mere creature of the State.'

"The Meyer and Pierce cases thus strongly underscore the protection with which the American Constitution jealously surrounds individual rights in education. Each stresses child-parental rights and, by clear implication, attacks the concept of the statist culture which would result from the permitting of Government monopoly of education.

"Legislation as constitutional precedent: In addition to the historical tradition and Supreme Court decisions, legislative precedent should be consulted as a guide to the constitutionality of programs of Federal aid to education in church-related schools.

"The judiciary is not the sole branch of Government charged with the duty of judging the constitutionality of legislation. The legislature must itself carefully make such judgments.

"CONGRESS HAS PROVIDED AID

"No stronger answer is to be found to the argument that no aid may be afforded education in church-related schools than the fact that the Congress has in numerous ways over the years deliberately provided such aid. A list of 41 such programs—all, by the way, consisting of grants to chuch-related institutions—was issued on March 28, 1961, by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. One of these programs, the Surplus Property Act of 1944, has resulted in 488 grants of land and buildings to religious-affiliated schools belonging to 35 different denominations.

"Having thus considered present questions of policy and, in addition, the governing constitutional law, some consideration should be given to probable future consequences of programs of massive Federal aid to public education which would exclude church-related education. The predictable result would be a critical weakening of the latter, presaging the ultimate closing of many church-related schools. Since de facto, most parents would no longer enjoy the freedom to send their children to church-related schools, therefore practically speaking the freedom of parent and child protected by the Pierce decision would have been rendered meaningless.

"Moreover, a practical governmental monopoly of education would result. This would not only dangerously transform our free, pluralistic society but would also pose the most serious problems respecting freedom of belief. Freedom of belief would be endangered by the fact that virtually all children would be compelled to attend State-run schools.

"Values are inculated in all schools, not only in those in whose curriculums specific ethical or social concepts are advocated, but also in schools whose curriculums distinctly omit such concepts. For the person whose conscience dictated the choice of a church-related school, here as a matter of practicality would be the result discountenanced in McCollum: Coercion to participate in schooling, the orientation of which is counter to belief.

"The present argument over aid to education has unhappily become overclouded by opinions which have tended to engender the belief that the problems here involved are to be solved by simple, absolutist interpretations of the Constitution and by generalizations based thereupon.

"Ours, however, is a Constitution of rationality, not one of absolutes which paralyze social action. The problems here involved are predominantly practical; no constitutional bar exists to the aid herein described to education in church-related schools. Constitutionally proper forms may be found in which such aid may be given.

"Practicalities, not slogans, should govern the determinations to be made—determinations which give clear recognition to the rights of parents, the right of children, the enlargement of freedom, and the preservation of the Nation."

Pilot Demands Go Beyond Reason

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, for reasons not altogether clear to any of us, a threatened strike against one of our larger international carriers—a strike, if you prefer, against the Government of the United States and its people—was averted.

It has been my privilege to circumnavigate the globe on many occasions since I have been in the Congress. I have observed, by and large, that our American-flag international carriers do the best overall transportation job, notwithstanding that gross differentials exist in operating costs as compared with our foreign competition.

To have a strike on our foreign routes at this time, Mr. Speaker—or at any time, for that matter—would place the United States in a most disadvantageous position. Our large international carriers—Northwest, TWA, and Pan Am—go to all corners of the world. Strike one, for internal, jurisdictional, self-seeking purposes, and you ultimately strike them all.

We are already at a tremendous disadvantage in world commerce in the matter of transportation. Our maritime and air transport instruments are engaged in savage competition. They—and we as a nation—cannot long survive if ships are drydocked and planes grounded because of labor disputes. Not disputes between labor and management, but disputes between unions which flaunt the authority of the U.S. Government.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress was not in session when this illuminating editorial from the Oregon Journal was published, but nevertheless I wish to have it included in the RECORD:

PILOT DEMANDS GO BEYOND REASON

Adamant on their gold-plated, featherbedding demands, and still refusing to accept a recommendation of a presidential fact-finding commission, pilots of Pan American World Airways are threatening to strike.

The company has sent letters to its 23,000 employees all over the world warning that they face a layoff if the strike goes through, and reviewing the company's effort to reach an agreement with the pilots, who average more than $18,000 a year with an average cockpit time of 54 hours a month, and most not working more than 13 days a month.

Basic disagreement is a jurisdictional dispute between the pilots and the flight engineers. Pilots refuse to operate jet aircraft with a professional flight engineer at the engineer's station in the cockpit unless a third pilot is also carried as a member of the crew. This third pilot is not required by Federal Aviation Agency regulations.

Terms of settlement of this jurisdictional dispute, giving a fair shake to both pilots and flight engineers while protecting the safety interests of the public, were proposed by the Feinsinger commission appointed by President Kennedy. Both the company and the flight engineers accepted the terms. The pilots refused them. President Kennedy himself called the recommendations "fair and equitable."

To meet the demands of the pilots, Pan American estimated it would be required to increase the number of pilots by 50 percent at an annual added cost exceeding the present pilot payroll of $27 million.

These demands are in the face of increasing foreign competition that seriously threatens the position of American airlines in world trade. U.S. international airlines already pay wages two to three times greater than those of foreign competitors flying the same equipment and charging the same fares. Ten years ago U.S.-flag lines carried 59.9 percent of the North Atlantic passengers, while today the percentage is 39.9 percent.

By demanding unreasonable wages and restrictive practices, the pilots, the highest paid unionists in the world, can put American airlines at a further disadvantage in world trade and reduce our fleets to second raters instead of the world leaders they have been since the beginning of international flights.

American oversea airlines can compete and excel in equipment, service, and management, and have proved it over the years. But they can't if they are forced into the race carrying a featherbed on one shoulder and a bagful of restrictive redtape on the other.

A Distinguished Lady Speaks on Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I am offering for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the views of a distinguished daughter of Pennsylvania, Helen Clay Frick, of Pittsburgh, who speaks out plainly on the current trend in modern art. She raises well the issue of whether modern art is not proceeding too far in the fields of the abstract, the geometric, and the nonrepresentational.

Miss Frick, a trustee of the Henry Clay Frick Museum in New York City, donated by her late father, Henry Clay Frick, is also the benefactor and stanch supporter of the arts in the United States, and a particular benefactor and builder of the Fine Arts Department of the University of Pittsburgh. Her opinion on the policies in the fine arts are, therefore, highly respected, competent, and from a broad viewpoint.

The article follows:

THE PEOPLE SPEAK—WHY GIVE SUPPORT TO UGLY ART SHOW?

(Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Jan. 20, 1962)

As a citizen of Pittsburgh and one long devoted to the fine arts, I question what is gained by showing the "International" recently at the Carnegie Institute.

Judging from conversations with friends and acquaintances in the city, this exhibition and many that preceded it over the past years have been very unpopular. "You can't fool all the people all the time," and it would seem that the saturation point has been definitely reached.

Why should a large sum of money be spent for a show that is neither beautiful nor educational, and for one that fails to portray realistically anything known to man?

Bernard Berenson, in his book "Seeing and Knowing" (London, Chapman & Hall, 1953), wrote the following lines: "It is not likely that he (man) will be henceforth satisfied with the store of geometrical squares, lozenges, diagonals, circles, globes, trapezoids, parallelepipedons when he asks for the bread of art. No perfection in smearing canvas or wood or paper with faint colours, guaranteed to represent nothing, will replace pictures."

In the last analysis, if art is to qualify, it must be uplifting.

MISS HELEN C. FRICK.

PITTSBURGH.

Speaker Sam Rayburn

SPEECH

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, 65 years ago, in the quiet of an east Texas cotton field, a teen-aged farm lad named SAM RAYBURN decided he wanted to be Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives. That ambition, conceived in frontier America, was fulfilled in modern America. This week the House formally paid its tribute of respect to his nearly half century of service in the House, and to his 17 years of service as Speaker.

Before he was elected Speaker, SAM RAYBURN was a great Congressman. He sponsored the Rural Electrification Act, the Public Utilities and Railroad Holding Company Acts, the Securities and Exchange Act, the Truth in Securities Act, and the Federal Communications Act. These laws meant adequate electricity for rural America; safeguards against the concentration of corporate power; protection of investors from the unscrupulous few who would manipulate the stock market; and guaranteeing that the airwaves—which belonged to all the people—would be used for the benefit of all the people.

As Speaker, SAM RAYBURN was inspired by a deep sense of humanity. He was guided by mature judgment. He was the master of all time of parliamentary procedure. His reservoir of skills, insights, and friendships met the legislative challenges of the great depression, World War II, the Korean war, and most recently the deadly cold war.

I had the pleasure of meeting SAM RAYBURN on September 20, 1940, when he came to my hometown to attend the funeral of William B. Bankhead, his predecessor in the office of Speaker and for 24 years the Representative in Congress from the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, which I have the privilege to represent.

SAM RAYBURN was a southerner by birth, and by heritage. Yet, he, as few men, understood the aspirations of the North, South, East, and West. He understood the men chosen to represent all selections of our common country. His personality was both subtle and straightforward. His mind was flexible but was unyielding in its dedication to principle and to fair play. Speaker RAYBURN was faithful to the Biblical injunction: "For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall much be required; and to whom men have committed much, of him they will ask more."

I had the privilege of enjoying the friendship and respect of SAM RAYBURN from the beginning of my service in the House. I went with him through many great legislative battles where I thought the people's interests were involved. We did not always see eye to eye. We did not always agree. Our friendship was bigger than the kind that requires day-to-day agreement or day-by-day adjustment.

Men who have known Speaker RAYBURN will distill for themselves, in their own way, some essence or central message from his life. To me, his life was a fulfillment, in our own times, of a pledge made by the patriots of 1776, when they vowed:

And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

The United Nations Not Compatible With Our Constitutional Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the case against the United Nations and the threat it poses to our freedom has never been more eloquently expressed than in the following broadcast on the radio program, "Life Line With Wayne Poucher":

During the past year the United Nations has been shown in its true colors as never before. The hope held for so long by so many Americans, that this one-world organization could bring reality to the dream of peace has died hard. But it is at last dying among most of the people of the United States.

We know now that the Soviet bloc can line up the so-called neutralists and the new member nations from Africa and Asia to outvote the United States and its remaining allies at any time. One little Afro-Asian nation has the same voting power in the U.N. General Assembly as the United States has. Instead of freedom and democracy, the U.N. has achieved rule by the minority. And it has been proved quite conclusively that the efforts of the United States, carried on ever since the end of the war, to bring about a world opinion favorable to freedom, have failed.

It is regrettable that the awakening took so long. An early study of the United Nations Charter would have saved us a great deal of money and would have prevented the waste of the time that has been spent in the vain hope of making the U.N. a force for peace and freedom in the world.

We invite you to consider some facts bearing on this matter.

The conflict between the Constitution of the United States and the charter of the United Nations is fundamental and there is no way of resolving it. Our own Constitution set up a form of government for this Nation of free people. The U.N. Charter attempts to set up a one-world government covering many peoples, half free and slave. There is no meeting point for these two purposes, and it is both futile and dangerous to pretend there is.

Consider some specific conflicts:

Our Constitution places authority to interpret treaties of the United States with our Federal Government. The U.N. Charter places this authority with the Court of International Justice, the so-called World Court.

Our Constitution places power to declare war for the United States with a Congress made up of elected representatives of the people and of the several States. The U.N. Charter places such authority with the Security Council of the United Nations.

Our Constitution declares the President of the United States to be commander-in-chief of our Armed Forces. The U.N. Charter places this authority with the Military Staff Committee under the Security Council of the United Nations. (We might add that the head of this Military Staff Committee has always been a Communist.)

Our Constitution requires the Government of the United States to protect the individual States of the Union from invasion. The U.N. Charter provides for (and I quote) "rights of passage of armed foreign troops."

Our Constitution provides for the election of legislators to make all laws for the United States dealing with foreign or international affairs. The U.N. Charter places much of this authority in the hands of appointed members of the General Assembly, which includes numerous nations where the meaning of freedom has never been known.

Our Constitution provides for a republic, a government built upon the foundation of responsibility of Federal servants to the people, the sovereignty of government being derived from the people. The U.N. Charter is built upon the sovereignty of appointed representatives, the peoples of the world not themselves having any direct voice in such government.

Our Constitution sets up a judicial system with the right of appeal. Citizenship in the United States is requisite to membership on the Federal bench. The U.N. Charter substitutes the procedures of the World Court, the procedures of which are stated as "final and without appeal." The United States has but 1 of 15 justices on the World Court, and can never have more * * * and may, at times, have none at all.

Here is another conflict that needs to be kept uppermost in our minds: Our Constitution works; the United Nations cannot, in the end, work.

The U.N. governing body is composed of a widely varied collection of nations, all having equal voting powers in the General Assembly, although there are great differences among them as to population, resources, and state of civilization. Decisions are based

on no known laws or rules of evidence and cannot be enforced against a strong nation unless an equally strong nation supports them. Economic sanctions are not equally effective against all nations, and moral force of public opinion simply does not work in the United Nations.

On top of everything else, uncontrolled internationalism is tremendously expensive. When Josef Stalin was boss of the Soviet Russia, he advocated aid to backward nations to bring all within a single world economic system essential to the triumph of collectivism. We fell for that. Since the war the United States has given many billions of dollars to underdeveloped areas—and we are still doing it and they are still underdeveloped. The standard of living in many of these countries has not changed significantly and there has been no growth at all in freedom.

On the contrary, the mistaken conspirators have achieved their goal of taking over Eastern Europe. They are at least three-fourths of the way to accomplishment of their objective of taking over the masses of Asia. And they have gone a long way toward carrying out their third aim of taking over the rest of the world, including the United States. The United Nations has been an important part of their takeover machinery.

It is urgently necessary that we, the people, learn more about the dangers we face. We must try to know more about the freedom fight tomorrow than we know today. Above all, we must come to a full realization that the Communists have always planned for the U.N. to finally become the machinery, housed and paid for by American taxpayers, by which they intend to rule the world.

Embargo on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Tighten the Embargo" which appeared in the January 12, 1962, edition of the Indianapolis (Ind.) News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIGHTEN THE EMBARGO

Despite the U.S. embargo on sales to Cuba, Fidel Castro is managing to get a number of needed items from collaborating manufacturers in this country.

Business Week says Cuba has a multimillion dollar illicit trade in U.S. goods. It has managed to pick up quantities of tires and parts for autos, trucks, buses, tractors, aircraft, generators, marine motors and other equipment to keep its U.S.-made machinery going.

The Washington Government has cracked down on one or two companies caught red-handed and has withdrawn their export privileges entirely. However, as Business Week points out, there is a legal leak in the embargo big enough to drive a whole fleet of trucks through. This is the absence of any prohibition against sales to Castro by oversea affiliates of U.S. manufacturers.

And, as might be expected, a number of American firms, whose patriotism is tempered with avarice, are being perfectly legal in selling Castro goods via foreign affiliates.

The embargo on Cuba, we fear, is more ritual than reality. It not only should be enforced completely if it is to have the desired effect of bringing Castro to economic disaster. It also should be amended to close its loopholes.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

Budget Receipts Predicted Too Optimistic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy is overly optimistic in his prediction of budget receipts for 1963 as shown by the following estimates:

	In billions
Individual income taxes	$49.3
Corporation income taxes	26.6
Excise taxes	10.0
Estate and gift taxes	2.3
Customs	1.3
Miscellaneous receipts	4.2
Total	93.7

This estimate for 1963 is based upon the assumption of a $10 billion increase in Federal income. The writer predicts an increase of less than half that amount. The only source of Federal income is through taxes which are already starting to hurt.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Starting To Hurt" which appeared in the January 22, 1962, edition of the Daily Republican-Times of Ottawa, Ill.

STARTING TO HURT

It's easy to balance the Federal budget. All you have to do is estimate that income is going to show a large increase, thus covering the increase in spending.

Thus, if anyone believes that Federal income will increase by $10.9 billion—13 percent—during the coming year, then he can believe that the Federal budget will be in balance. Commonsense indicates that no such increase is likely, and that another $5 billion or so will be added to the national debt.

And if the income does increase by $10.9 billion, it should be used to reduce the Federal debt, or to make some tax cuts which the President himself has indicated would have a healthful effect on the economy.

The $92.5 billion outlays are the highest in peacetime, and not far from the sepnding peak reached in World War II. They are $11½ billion higher than during the fiscal year which ended in 1961.

But the budget does not even represent all Government outlays. Social security and other programs will bring the total Federal outlay to an estimated $115 billion.

This great compulsion to increase Federal spending, regardless of the necessity of some of the increases and regardless of the Nation's overall financial picture, completely baffles us.

No one wants to slight on defense expenditures, but this is all the more reason for casting a critical eye over nonessential spending.

It is easy to assume that everything which comes from the Federal Government is free. This, unfortunately is completely false. The cost of the new Federal budget averages $636.16 for each man, woman, and child in Illinois. This includes income taxes—money which is taken from most of us before we get it; taxes paid by business and industry which are passed on to us as consumers and could otherwise go in part for higher wages and in part for profits which could eventually find their way back into business expansion; and for the hundred and one hidden taxes on almost everything we buy.

Federal spending and the resulting taxation is drying up the investment capital which would make business expansion possible. This, and the redistribution of the money through the Federal Government, may seem to help the little guy, but it has reached the point where it is hurting him.

Let's Be Firm on Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD C. BRUCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, the January 19, 1962, edition of Life magazine contains an editorial entitled "Let's Be Firm on Castro." It singles out the alertness of our distinguished senior Member of the other body from Indiana. Certainly we all were aware of the absence of discussion of the tragic situation in Cuba in the President's state of the Union message. We must concur with the opinions expressed by the gentleman from Indiana.

The article follows:

LET'S BE FIRM ON CASTRO

President Kennedy's 34 recommendations in his state of the Union address were so concentrated on domestic issues that Indiana's Republican Senator HOMER CAPEHART could hardly be blamed for decrying a glaring omission: "Cuba, which worries the American people most, he ignored."

Well, it can't be ignored. The opportunity to outlaw Castro is at hand, and the current place for it is Punta del Este, Uruguay, where, next week, the foreign ministers of the Organization of American States (21, with Cuba) will discuss how to meet Castro's threat to the whole hemisphere.

That threat would be small, even absurd, if it came only from Cuba's small island and a local despot tyrannizing 7 million people. But it comes from a captured beachhead which Communist imperialism is daily reinforcing in arms, men, and money, to overthrow Cuba's neighbors by sabotage, propaganda, and guerrilla insurrections supplied with smuggled arms. In a white paper the State Department has just warned all these neighbors of the magnitude of this threat: a tenfold increase in Cuba's armed forces, now bristling with $60 million to $100 million of modern Soviet-bloc arms—including jet fighters, tanks, artillery—and instructed by 300 Communist technicians. Cuba's ground forces of 250,000 to 400,000 men "are larger than those of any other American Republic except the United States."

The action required to meet this threat is already clear to a majority of the Organization of American States. Only 7 of the 21 still have diplomatic relations with Cuba. At least 13 have listened favorably to the sort of strong measures Colombia has been suggesting: (1) A demand for Castro to break his Communist ties and observe current hemisphere pacts; (2) economic sanctions and severance of diplomatic relations; (3) a watchdog commission to police his compliance and check new Communist inroads elsewhere. A similar OAS move against the Trujillo Fascist dictatorship 17 months ago helped bring it down and the OAS, which lifted its sanctions last fortnight, is now moving swiftly to help the United States make the Dominican Republic a showplace of freedom and prosperity.

There is no reason why a similar unity of purpose and firmness of action cannot overthrow Castro, restore freedom to Cuba, and destroy the Communist beachhead. However, Brazil, Argentina, and Chile—neutralist and noninterventionist by reflex and fearing Fidelismo's power among their own land-hungry peons—hesitate to back any anti-Castro measures that strong. The United States, in turn, hesitates to go too far beyond the big powers' position—even though the smaller states would do so—lest the sanctions would not be enforced and thus there would be no hemisphere unity.

Well, there is no point in preserving an appearance of hemisphere unity if the price is to let the hemisphere itself be undermined and conquered piecemeal. The United States must stand firmly behind Colombia's demand for strong and effective action.

Eight years ago, at Caraas, the OAS asserted that "domination or control of the political institutions of any American state by the international Communist movement * * * would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American states, endangering the peace of America." It proclaimed that the "necessary measures" to end any such threat would be taken. That threat now exists in Cuba and grows more brazen day by day.

If the OAS cannot take the necessary measures the United States in the compelling right of self-defense, must take them alone. President Kennedy so promised last year: "* * * If the nations of this hemisphere should fail to meet their commitments against outside Communist penetration, then I want it clearly understood that this Government will not hesitate in meeting its primary obligations, which are the security of our Nation."

President's Budget Message

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, supplementing the President's message, I submit the following statistical summary:

Net budget receipts, expenditures, and deficits (−) or surplus (+), 10 years, 1954–63

[In billions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Budget receipts	Budget expenditures	Deficit (−) or surplus (+)	Public debt, beginning of year
1954 (from July 1953)	$64.4	$67.5	−$3.1	$266.1
1955	60.2	64.4	−4.2	271.3
1956	67.8	66.2	+1.6	274.4
1957:				
(a) Including highway trust fund	72.0	69.8	+2.2	
(b) Without it	70.6	69.0	+1.6	272.8
1958:				
(a) Including highway trust fund	70.6	72.9	−2.3	
(b) Without it	68.6	71.4	−2.8	270.5
1959:				
(a) Including highway trust fund	70.0	83.0	−13.0	
(b) Without it	67.9	80.3	−12.4	276.3
1960:				
(a) Including highway trust fund	80.3	79.5	+0.8	
(b) Without it	77.7	76.5	+1.2	284.7
1961:				
(a) Including highway trust fund	$80.5	$84.2	−$3.7	
(b) Without it	77.6	81.5	−3.9	$286.3
Total, 8 years:				
(a) Including highway trust fund	565.8	587.5	−21.7	
(b) Without it	554.8	576.8	−22.0	[1] (289.0)
1962 (revised estimates in 1963 budget):				
(a) Including highway trust fund	85.2	92.3	−7.1	
(b) Without it	82.1	89.1	−7.0	289.0
1963 (budget estimates):				
(a) Including highway trust fund	[3] 96.4	[4] 95.9	+.5	
(b) Without it	[3] 93.0	[4] 92.5	+.5	[2] 295.4

[1] At June 30, 1961—end of the fiscal year.
[2] Estimated in 1963 budget at $294,900,000,000 at end of fiscal 1963.
[3] Including effect of proposed revenue legislation—both new and extensions of $2,900,000,000 (see list, p. 48, pt. 1 of Budget).
[4] Proposed postal rate increase legislation, estimated in the budget at $595,000,000 for 1963, is treated as an offset to these expenditure figures rather than as a budget receipt.

DEFENSE AND NONDEFENSE SPENDING

The genesis of much of the distress of the dollar; the tenuous condition of our gold supply; the unattractiveness of our long-term Government bonds; the increasing cost of setting the dinner table, buying a home, educating the children; the budget deficits; the increases in the national debt—all these critical situations can be identified with ever-increasing expenditures over the years for domestic purposes. It is not the necessary defense and security expenditures that have unbalanced budgets and hiked the national debt and inflated the dollar and precipitated the outflow of gold. It is the nondefense items, as documented time and again. And we borrowed the money to cover them. We lacked the self-discipline to pay as we went along. The House, the press, and the country are increasingly aware of this fact.

In the 8 fiscal years 1954 through the last completed year, 1961, national defense spending increased only $500 million, but all other expenditures were up $16,200 million—an increase of 80 percent.

The budget received today proposes further increases—but, hopefully, the proportion between the two is more nearly even and, challengingly, within a budget in balance. The situation again underscores the urgent necessity of cooperating with the President to keep the balance. We owe it to the President in these critical times. We owe it to the people. We owe it to generations to come. We owe it to free men everywhere.

I include official figures in elaboration:

Defense and nondefense—Net budget expenditures

[In billions of dollars]

Fiscal year	National Defense		All other programs		Total net budget expenditures	
	Defense, military	Total	As per budget	Including highway trust fund	As per budget	Including highway trust fund
Fiscal 1953 (Korean war year)	$43.6	$50.4	$23.7	$23.7	$74.1	$74.1
Fiscal 1954 (from July 1953)	40.3	46.9	20.6	20.6	67.5	67.5
Fiscal 1955	35.5	40.6	23.8	23.8	64.4	64.4
Fiscal 1956	35.8	40.6	25.6	25.6	66.2	66.2
Fiscal 1957	38.4	43.3	25.7	26.5	69.0	69.8
Fiscal 1958	39.1	44.1	27.3	28.8	71.4	72.9
Fiscal 1959	41.2	46.4	33.9	36.6	80.3	83.0
Fiscal 1960	41.2	45.6	30.9	34.0	76.5	79.6
Fiscal 1961	43.2	47.4	34.1	36.8	81.5	84.2
Increase during the 8 years 1954–61	+2.9	+0.5	[1] +13.5	[2] +16.2	+14.0	[3] +16.7
Fiscal 1962 (revised, as shown in 1963 budget of January 1962)	$46.8	$51.2	$37.9	$41.1	[4] $89.1	[4] $92.3
Fiscal 1963 (budget of January 1962)	48.3	52.7	39.8	43.2	[4] 92.5	[4] 95.9
Comparisons:						
1963 budget estimates compared with 1961	+5.1	+5.3	[5] +5.7	+6.4	+11.0	[6] +11.7
1963 budget estimates compared with latest 1962 estimates	+1.5	+1.5	+1.9	+2.1	+3.4	+3.6

[1] Represents 65 percent increase, 1961 over 1954.
[2] Represents 80 percent increase, 1961 over 1954.
[3] Represents 25 percent increase, 1961 over 1954.
[4] Includes estimates for items of supplementals to come for 1962 and for later transmittal for 1963 (1962, $071,000,000; 1963, $245,000,000).
[5] Represents 16 percent increase, 1963 over 1961.
[6] Represents 13 percent increase, 1963 over 1961.

NOTES.—(a) Years prior to 1962 not adjusted to shift "Civil defense" to the "National defense" category; (b) highway trust fund began with fiscal year 1957.

COST OF LIVING—VALUE OF THE DOLLAR

In his state of the Union address, the President ranked inflation in the forefront of the enemies of freedom. Debasement of the dollar cannot be afforded at any price. And beginning in this session we might well heed the warning signs before it is too late. The President's recommendation that we live within a balanced budget is one of the most heartening features of today's message. We cannot live beyond our income indefinitely. That is the principal reason our dollar has become worth less and less. If we do not show some respect for our currency, how can we expect other nations to have faith in it?

These last several years we have repeatedly lived beyond income—and as a result the dollar has steadily declined in buying power.

In consequence, every businessman, every factory worker, every farmer, every family, has had to meet relentlessly higher living and operating costs with a cheaper dollar.

In calendar year 1960, the official consumers cost-of-living index hit new high water marks in 9 of the 12 months. And the buying power of the dollar has shown a persistent decline matching the corresponding increase in the cost of living. It now is worth only 46 cents.

In calendar year 1961, the official index moved up a bit further and the value of the dollar slipped a bit, though not as much as in the year earlier. The wholesale price index declined. The President advises that this is the best record of overall price stability of any comparable period of recovery since the end of World War II. And he submits the assurance that he means to maintain stability and growth in a climate of freedom from controls.

The following chart illuminates the situation:

Consumer Price Index and purchasing power of the dollar

Years	Consumer Price Index (1947-49=100)		Purchasing power of the dollar [1] (calendar year 1939=100 cents)
	All items	Foods	
1939	59.4	47.1	100.0
1940	59.9	47.8	99.2
1941	62.9	52.2	94.4
1942	69.7	61.3	85.2
1943	74.0	68.3	80.3
1944	75.2	67.4	79.0
1945	76.9	68.9	77.2
1946	83.4	79.0	71.2
1947	95.5	95.9	62.2
1948	102.8	104.1	57.8
1949	101.8	100.0	58.3
1950	102.8	101.2	57.8
1951	111.0	112.6	53.5
1952	113.5	114.6	52.3
1953	114.4	112.8	51.9
1954	114.8	112.6	51.7
1955	114.5	110.9	51.9
1956	116.2	111.7	51.1
1957	120.2	115.4	49.4
1958	123.5	120.3	48.1
1959	124.6	118.3	47.7
1960	126.5	119.7	47.0
Selected months:			
1946—June	79.8	72.1	74.4
1950—June	101.8	100.5	58.3
1952—December	114.1	113.8	52.1
1958—December	123.7	118.7	48.0
1959—December	125.5	117.8	47.3
1960:			
June	[2] 126.5	120.3	47.0
July	[2] 126.6	120.6	46.9
August	126.6	120.1	46.9
September	[2] 126.8	120.2	46.8
October	[2] 127.3	120.9	46.7
November	[2] 127.4	121.1	46.6
December	[2] 127.5	121.4	46.6
1961:			
January	127.4	121.3	46.6
February	127.5	121.4	46.6
March	127.5	121.2	46.6
April	127.5	121.2	46.6
May	127.4	120.7	46.6
June	[2] 127.6	120.9	46.6
July	[2] 128.1	122.0	46.4
August	128.0	121.2	46.4
September	[2] 128.3	121.1	46.3
October	[2] 128.4	120.9	46.3
November	128.3	120.3	46.3

[1] As measured by the BLS Consumer Price Index.
[2] New record high.

Source: Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, Office of Debt Analysis, Dec. 22, 1961.

THE BUDGET AND GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT

In recent years we have heard much about the "gross national product"—the production of goods and services—and the relation of the Federal budget to it. There is a growing tendency for some to explain away, to justify ever-increasing budgets in statistical relationship to the gross product; growth of the product justifies growth of the budget. Obviously, a country that grew from 131 million people in 1939 to 185 million people in 1962 generates more demands, requires a larger volume of public services, and boosts the national product.

But when we don't pay our own way—when we live beyond income—when we pay for public necessities by borrowing from generations not here to call us to account, as we have been doing, then we play into Khrushchev's hands.

At the heart of our public finances is a simple, inescapable fact, easily grasped by every Member—and by everyone else. It is that our Government—any government—like individuals and families, cannot indefinitely spend more than they take in without courting disaster. An inescapable lesson of history is that debasement of a nation's currency inevitably leads to chaos. We have been on the highroad toward the borders of fiscal insanity.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are glad to have a balanced budget. The cooperation the President urges will keep it in balance.

I include comparative charts of official figures bearing on the point:

Gross national product, budget expenditures, surplus or deficit, cost of living, and value of dollar, 1949–62

[In billions of dollars where applicable]

Year	GNP in then current prices (calendar year)	GNP in 1960 prices (calendar year)	Net budget expenditures (fiscal year)		Surplus or deficit (fiscal year)	Federal public debt (end of fiscal year)	Consumer Price Index (1947-49=100)	Purchasing value of dollar (1939=100 cents)
			Amount	As percent of GNP				
1949	$258.1	$334.2	$39.5	15.3	−$1.8	$252.8	101.8	58.3
1950	284.6	362.3	39.5	13.9	−3.1	257.4	102.8	57.8
1951	329.0	391.8	44.0	13.4	+3.5	255.2	111.0	53.5
1952	347.0	406.6	65.3	18.8	−4.0	259.1	113.5	52.3
1953	365.4	425.2	74.1	20.3	−9.4	266.1	114.4	51.9
1954	363.1	416.6	67.5	18.6	−3.1	271.3	114.8	51.7
1955	397.5	449.6	64.4	16.2	−4.2	274.4	114.5	51.9
1956	419.2	459.1	66.2	15.8	+1.6	272.8	116.2	51.1
1957	442.8	467.6	69.0	15.6	+1.6	270.5	120.2	49.4
1958	444.5	459.5	71.4	16.1	−2.8	276.3	123.5	48.1
1959	482.8	491.0	80.3	16.6	−12.4	284.7	124.6	47.7
1960	504.4	504.4	76.5	15.2	+1.2	286.3	126.5	47.0
1961	521.0	(1)	81.5	15.6	−3.9	289.0	[2] 128.3	[2] 46.3
1962 estimate	[3] 570.0	(1)	89.1	15.6	−7.0	295.4		
Change	+121%		+125%		−$43.8	+$42.6	+26%	−20%

[1] Not available.
[2] November, 1961.
[3] From 1963 budget message.

Sources: various official documents.

Percentagewise, budget spending has slightly outdistanced the gross national product—125 percent to 121 percent on the basis shown. But the Federal debt, on the same basis, increased by $42.6 billion. We did not comply with the doctrine of balancing the budget over a so-called cycle of economic ups and downs. And as we failed to do so, we hiked the cost of living by 26 percent in the same period and robbed the dollar—and every paycheck, every savings account, every bond, every pension—by 20 percent. That is just since 1949; the 1939 dollar is now worth only 46 cents.

In the final analysis, a pertinent question is, Do we owe more or less—aside from how much we spent or what percent of our income we spent? The statistics are arresting, and I include them here: For each person in 1960, Federal, State, and local public debt—let us include it all because the same people owe all three—the debts on a per capita basis were four times larger in 1960 than in 1940.

Federal, State, and local tax receipts, expenditures, and debt—On a per capita basis, selected fiscal years

Year	Per capita				Percentage distribution			
	Total	Federal	State	Local	Total	Federal	State	Local
1. Tax receipts:								
1940	$109	$43	$32	$34	100	39.2	29.2	31.6
1946	370	286	45	39	100	77.3	12.2	10.5
1950	369	255	60	54	100	69.1	16.3	14.6
1953	576	433	77	67	100	75.2	13.3	11.5
1960	715	499	114	102	100	70.1	15.5	14.4
2. Expenditures:								
1940	156	77	35	44	100	449.3	22.3	28.5
1946	602	502	47	53	100	83.5	7.7	8.8
1950	473	301	86	86	100	63.7	18.2	18.1
1953	707	514	90	103	100	72.7	12.8	14.5
1960	864	548	153	164	100	63.2	17.6	19.2
3. Gross debt:								
1940	483	328	27	128	100	67.9	5.7	26.4
1946	2,154	2,034	18	102	100	94.4	.8	4.8
1950	1,893	1,731	36	127	100	91.4	1.9	6.7
1953	1,925	1,708	50	167	100	88.7	2.6	8.7
1960	2,010	1,617	105	288	100	80.5	5.2	14.3

Source: Tax Foundation "Facts and Figures," 11th edition.

THE PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. Speaker, I also include official data on the trend and other selected significant figures relating to the public debt. These are timely data on the situation, especially in view of the request, forthcoming presently, to increase the debt ceiling to $308 billion for the period ending June 30, 1963.

And especially are they timely when the official estimate is that the annual carrying charge—the interest—on the Federal debt is expected to be $9.3 billion, or $400 million more than the current-year estimate. Especially so when you realize that the interest alone now takes 10 cents of every budget dollar. It has reached the point of costing us $17,690 every minute, every hour of the day and night of the year—an incredible fact.

For several years the Treasury has been on a treadmill in refunding the debt. And it is still there—and will remain there until a way can be found to lengthen the maturity of the debt. As it is, the Treasury is in the market every week of the year refinancing a part of the debt. Too much of it is in short-term paper. Right now, 75 percent of this marketable debt is due in 5 years or less. The average age of the debt is only 4 years and 7 months—essentially unchanged in the last 8 years. And this situation will remain unless means can be found to make long-term bonds more attractive.

The best hope of the moment—perhaps the only hope—is the President's request that the Congress cooperate in keeping the budget in balance in order to contribute to price and dollar stability.

THE PUBLIC DEBT—10 YEARS, 1953–1963

[In billions of dollars]

July 1953	266.1
July 1954	271.3
July 1955	274.4
July 1956	272.8
July 1957	270.5
July 1958	276.3
July 1959	284.7
July 1960	286.3
July 1961	289.0
Increase, 8 years	+22.9
July 1962 (estimated in 1963 budget)	295.4
July 1963 (estimated in 1963 budget)	294.9
Increase, 2 years	+5.9
Increase, 10 years	+28.8

NOTE.—The old debt ceiling of $275 billion has been raised 8 successive years. Currently, the ceiling is $298 billion ($285 billion is permanent and $13 billion is temporary).

President's 1963 budget message proposes a new ceiling of $308 billion, to be effective in fiscal 1962 and throughout fiscal 1963.

Federal debt on significant dates

Date	Classification	Total direct and guaranteed debt	Per capita [1]
	WORLD WAR I		
Mar. 31, 1917	Prewar debt	$1,282,044,346.28	$12.36
Aug. 31, 1919	Highest war debt	26,596,701,648.01	250.18
Dec. 31, 1930	Lowest postwar debt	16,026,087,087.07	129.66
	WORLD WAR II		
June 30, 1940	Debt preceding defense program	48,496,601,692.96	367.48
Nov. 30, 1941	Pre-Pearl Harbor debt	61,363,867,932.26	458.47
Feb. 28, 1946	Highest war debt	279,764,369,348.29	1,989.75
June 30, 1946	Debt at end of year in which hostilities ceased	269,898,484,032.56	1,911.14
Apr. 30, 1949	Lowest postwar debt [2]	251,553,319,739.98	1,690.29
	SINCE KOREA		
June 30, 1950	Debt at time of opening of hostilities in Korea (hostilities began June 24, 1950)	257,376,855,385.01	1,696.74
Dec. 31, 1952		267,445,125,544.96	1,687.90
Nov. 30, 1961	Highest debt [4]	297,325,028,223.84	[3] 1,607.31
Dec. 31, 1960	Debt a year ago	290,372,753,566.68	1,593.20
Nov. 30, 1961	Debt last month	297,325,028,223.84	[3] 1,607.31
Dec. 31, 1961	Debt this month	296,060,517,477.52	[3] 1,598.36

[1] Based upon estimates of the Bureau of the Census.
[2] Subject to revision.
[3] Represents the lowest point of the debt at the end of any month following World War II. The lowest point of the debt on any day following that war was on June 27, 1949, when the debt was as follows:

Direct debt (gross)	$251,245,889,059.02
Guaranteed debt (not including obligations owned by the Treasury)	23,876,001.12
Total direct and guaranteed debt	251,269,765,060.14

[4] Represents the highest point of the debt at the end of any month. The highest point of the debt on any day was on Nov. 24, 1961, when the debt was as follows:

Direct debt (gross)	$297,408,813,551.00
Guaranteed debt (not including obligations owned by the Treasury)	306,129,625.06
Total direct and guaranteed debt	297,714,943,176.06

INTERNATIONAL PAYMENTS DEFICITS AND TOUCH AND GO GOLD SITUATION

In the last few years, abuse of the dollar by indulging in inflationary spending was sharply called to our attention when foreign creditors demanded gold in payment. Our supply dropped over $5 billion between January 1958 and January 1961. It declined nearly $900 million more in the year just closed. Our deficits in balance of international payments lays the groundwork, but the steady erosion in the value of the dollar precipitated the outflow. They were apprehensive as to what we were going to do.

Though the President's state of the Union report on the matter is encouraging in that the outflow has subsided to a comparative trickle, he not only does not minimize the situation—it is so tenuous as to defy that—but advises in the message today that basic improvement in our balance of payments hinges to a large extent on our ability to continue a high degree of overall price stability. That can mean but one thing: Avoid further inflation. Stop cheapening the dollar. Live within income. Pay as we go. Stop spending money we don't have for things we can get along without or defer until we are willing to pay for them.

Here again, then, is a call for cooperation by the Congress in staying within the budget. The alternatives can carry us further down the high road to fiscal chaos.

I include several pertinent statistics. For instance:

Our gold supply is down to $17,000 million.

All but $5,700 million is now earmarked as backing for our money supply on a 25-percent basis.

There are possible foreign claims of $20,000 million against it.

That leaves a potential shortage—an outside extreme—of $14,300 million after allowing for the 25 percent backing provision.

Gold assets of the United States

Date or period	Assets	Change during the year or month
Dec. 31, 1957	$22,780,675,342	
Dec. 31, 1958	20,534,104,913	−$2,246,570,429
Dec. 31, 1959	19,456,135,794	−1,077,969,119
Dec. 31, 1960	17,766,797,708	−1,689,338,086
Decline in gold holdings in the 3 years 1958–60		−5,013,877,634
Dec. 31, 1961	[1] 16,888,905,838	−877,891,870
Decline in gold holdings in the 4 years 1958–61		−5,891,769,504
Trends during calendar year 1961:		
Jan. 31, 1961	17,440,954,133	(−325,843,575)
Feb. 28, 1961	17,372,724,944	(−68,229,189)
Mar. 31, 1961	17,387,999,932	(+15,274,988)
Apr. 28, 1961	17,389,617,266	(+1,617,334)
May 31, 1961	17,403,054,122	(+13,436,856)
June 30, 1961	17,550,069,960	(+147,015,838)
July 31, 1961	17,526,867,491	(−23,202,469)
Aug. 31, 1961	17,451,043,350	(−75,824,141)
Sept. 29, 1961	17,376,766,017	(−74,277,333)
Oct. 31, 1961	17,300,897,304	(−75,868,713)
Nov. 30, 1961	16,974,648,554	(−326,248,750)
Dec. 31, 1961	[1] 16,888,905,838	(−85,742,716)

[1] It was $16,838,975,978 on Jan. 12, 1962.
Source: Daily Treasury Statements.

Our touch-and-go position on gold

[In billions of dollars]

End of calendar year—	U.S. gold stock	Gold stock (above required 25-percent backing for currency and deposits)	Possible foreign claims	Potential shortage of gold with present 25-percent backing provision
1957	$22.9	$10.8	$14.9	$4.1
1958	20.6	8.5	15.6	7.1
1959	19.5	7.3	17.7	10.4
1960	17.8	6.1	18.8	12.7
3-year change	−5.1	−4.7	+3.9	+8.6
1961:				
January	17.5	6.2	18.4	12.2
February	17.4	6.2	18.4	12.2
March	17.4	6.1	18.7	12.5
April	17.4	6.2	18.4	12.2
May	17.5	6.4	18.6	12.2
June	17.6	6.2	18.9	12.7
July	17.6	6.2	19.1	12.9
August	17.5	6.1	19.6	13.5
September	17.5	6.0	19.9	13.9
October	17.3	5.7	20.0	14.3
November	17.0	5.3	(1)	(1)
December	16.9	(1)	(1)	(1)
Change, December 1957 through October 1961	−5.6	−5.1	+5.1	+10.2

[1] Not available.
Source: Department of Commerce.

U.S. balance of payments data

[Millions of dollars]

Period	U.S. receipts (recorded)		U.S. payments (recorded)					Balance on recorded transactions [net payments (−) or receipts (+)]	Unrecorded transactions—errors and omissions (net receipts)	Increase in foreign gold and recorded liquid dollar assets through transactions with the United States
	Exports of goods and services	Foreign capital other than liquid dollar assets (net)	Imports of goods and services	U.S. grants and capital (net)						
				Total [1]	U.S. Government grants and capital	Private capital				
						Total	Direct			
1954	$17,949	$210	$16,088	$3,788	$1,554	$1,619	$664	−$1,717	$167	$1,550
1955	20,003	351	17,937	4,007	2,211	1,211	779	−1,590	446	1,144
1956	23,705	576	19,829	6,017	2,362	2,990	1,859	−1,565	643	922
1957	26,733	428	20,923	6,451	2,574	3,175	2,058	−213	748	−535
1958	23,325	−27	21,053	6,153	2,587	2,844	1,094	−3,908	380	3,528
1959	23,709	709	23,537	[2] 5,152	[2] 1,986	2,375	1,372	−4,271	528	3,374
1960	27,300	200	23,327	7,454	2,750	3,856	1,694	−3,281	−648	3,929
	Seasonally adjusted annual rates									
1960: 1st quarter	26,260	724	23,700	5,896	2,328	2,776	1,376	−2,612	132	2,480
2d quarter	27,312	372	24,096	6,072	2,780	2,440	1,040	−2,484	−568	3,052
3d quarter	27,416	68	23,496	7,588	2,420	4,340	1,624	−3,600	−848	4,448
4th quarter	28,212	−364	22,016	10,260	[3] 3,472	[4] 5,868	[4] 2,736	[3] [4] −4,428	−1,308	[3] [4] 5,736
1961: 1st quarter	28,464	796	22,076	8,468	3,476	4,156	2,000	−1,284	−100	1,384
2d quarter	27,528	1,100	22,088	3,912	32	3,060	1,320	2,628	−1,636	[5] −992
3d quarter	27,884	−8	24,112	7,700	3,736	3,120	1,652	−3,936	500	[6] 3,436

[1] Includes remittances and pensions not shown separately.
[2] Excludes $1,375,000,000 increase in U.S. subscription to International Monetary Fund.
[3] Includes U.S. subscription to International Development Association of $74,000,000 ($296,000,000 at annual rate).
[4] Includes single direct investment transaction of $370,000,000 ($1,480,000,000 at annual rate).
[5] Includes advance debt repayment and interest payments on U.S. Government loans of $774,000,000 ($3,100,000,000 at annual rate).
[6] Before adjustment for receipts of principal and interest on Government loans paid in the previous quarter.

NOTE.—Data exclude goods and services transferred under military grants.

Source: Department of Commerce.

NEW AUTHORITY TO OBLIGATE THE GOVERNMENT

The most important longrun figure on the spending side of the budget is the appropriation total—the authority to first make an obligation against the Treasury. The authority comes first. Spending follows. The more familiar figures are the receipts and the expenditures; they are publicized. But the obligating authority shows the trend. The rough rule of thumb is that actual expenditures—payments—in any year will approximately divide two-thirds from appropriations for that year and one-third from unexpended carryovers of previous years.

Total new obligational authority proposed in the budget today crosses the $100 billion mark. I include a table going back several years. It includes all items—front-door, back-door, and trapdoor appropriations—everything:

Authority to obligate the Government (new obligational authority)—which precedes budget spending

[In billions of dollars]

Fiscal year	New authority as per budget basis	Highway trust fund	Grand total
1954	62.8	--------	62.8
1955	57.1	--------	57.1
1956	63.2	--------	63.2
1957	70.2	2.6	72.8
1958	76.3	3.7	80.0
1959	81.4	3.5	84.9
1960	79.6	3.0	82.6
1961	86.7	2.9	89.6
Increase, 1961 over 1954	+23.9	+2.9	+26.8
1962:			
(a) Already enacted	92.0	3.3	95.3
(b) Total including proposed supplementals	[1] 95.7	3.3	99.0
1963 total proposed (in budget)	[2] 99.3	[3] 3.6	102.9

Authority to obligate the Government (new obligational authority)—which precedes budget spending—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

Fiscal year	New authority as per budget basis	Highway trust fund	Grand total
Comparisons:			
1963 total compared with 1961	+12.6	+.7	+13.3
1963 total compared with 1962 total proposed	+3.6	+.3	+3.9

[1] Including $2,000,000,000 proposed supplemental for standby loan authority for the International Monetary Fund.
[2] Includes a net of $1,350,000,000 for "later transmittal," mostly for proposed new legislation, and including allowance for contingencies.
[3] Includes $950,000,000 for "later transmittal" for proposed legislation.

THREE WAYS TO STATE SIZE OF 1963 BUDGET

Mr. Speaker, the conventional budget totals—those used in the President's message and widely reproduced in the press—do not disclose the full magnitude of the ebb and flow of money in and out of the Federal Treasury primarily because they exclude several large so-called trust segregations of income and outgo, such as social security, unemployment, highway, railroad and civil service retirement, and the like. These special funds derive from and operate under various special laws and distinguish themselves from the generally unsegregated "budget" revenues and expenditures. And they represent a considerable share of total Treasury business volume.

The following synoptic tabulation is accordingly included:

3 ways to state the size of 1963 budget

[In billions of dollars]

	Receipts	Expenditures	Estimate of surplus
1. The administrative budget: This is the one most commonly used. Its ingredients are net budget receipts and net budget expenditures. It shows net budget expenditures against what might be termed general, unsegregated Treasury receipts. It is the one which shows the $500,000,000 surplus projection. The administrative budget totals are	$93.0	$92.5	+$0.5
2. The cash budget: This is the term applied to what the budget message refers to as "Receipts from and payments to the public," an effort to portray the magnitude of the ebb and flow of funds between the Government and the public. Briefly, this principally combines budget figures (the administrative budget) and trust fund receipts and expenditures, and then eliminates intragovernmental and intrafund transactions which do not represent flow of funds either to or from the public. (See table, p. 281 of budget.) As explained below, this method, as used in the budget, does not disclose the full magnitude. The cash budget totals are	116.6	114.8	+1.8
3. A 3d method: The cash budget calculation (No. 2 above) understates the full scope of Federal income and outgo. This is because budget receipts and budget expenditures are stated, as in the past, on a net basis. This is to say, certain receipts are not shown as "budget receipts," but rather are offset against			

3 ways to state the size of 1963 budget—Con.

[In billions of dollars]

	Receipts	Expenditures	Estimate of surplus
3. A 3d method—Continued gross budget expenditures, thus arriving at net budget expenditures. These receipts are collections of interest, repayment of loans, postal revenues, and other income (primarily from outside the Government) of Government corporations, the postal service, and various revolving funds. The budget makes the distinction in this respect basically because such receipts are available for use or reuse (respending) by the corporation or other enterprise concerned and thus are not available for general appropriation purposes. (In the case of postal receipts for services rendered, budget totals, reflect only the net deficit or surplus). Counting such receipts as receipts, rather than as offsets to expenditures, the following tabulation more fully reflects the ebb and flow of funds:			
Net budget receipts (same as item 1)	$93.0		
Receipts treated in the budget as offsets to gross budget expenditures. (See p. 359)	15.8		
Trust fund receipts (p. 271)	27.5		
Gross budget expenditures (net budget expenditures plus receipt offsets mentioned above)		$108.3	
Trust fund expenditures (p. 272)		26.6	
Subtotal	136.3	134.9	+$1.4
Deduct intragovernment and intrafund transactions not directly involving the public (same items as are referred to in "cash budget" calculation in No. 2 above (p. 281)	−3.9	−4.7	+0.8
Total (ebb and flow between Government and public)	132.4	130.2	+2.2

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, may I say in conclusion, that in response to the necessity for early adjournment of the Congress, the Committee on Appropriations has already begun consideration of the spending features of the budget assigned to it. We began hearings last Monday on several bills. We expect to expedite the bills to the floor. We urge and welcome any suggestions in respect to any item within our jurisdiction. And we want to respond to the President's request to cooperate with him and his budget recommendations. He did not ask us to raise his spending plans—he asked us to cooperate to keep the budget in balance. That is an imperative national necessity. So, we urge Members, in the national interest, at least for this session, to refrain from hammering the Committee on Appropriations to exceed the budget. We would prefer constructive suggestions that we can incorporate in the bills within the strictures of cooperation urged by the President.

And we especially ask that the legislative committees refrain from processing any "back-door" appropriations. It is spending in the dark. It is appropriating in the dark. It keeps the Congress in the dark. And it keeps the press and the country in the dark. The left hand does not know what the right hand is doing. It ties the hands of the President in the ability to coordinate his budgets. And it flirts dangerously—as the past several years so well demonstrated—with the constitutional prerogatives and supremacy of the House in money matters. The other body has never been bashful about arrogating the appropriation powers to itself.

The several revenue proposals on which the budget balance also hinges are, of course, matters for the legislative committees. But as to the appropriation items, we hope the membership will advise us by page and line, of specific ways to cooperate with the President.

Admirable Aims, Misbegotten Methods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the Wall Street Journal of January 22, 1962:

ADMIRABLE AIMS, MISBEGOTTEN METHODS

One of the major objectives of President Kennedy's budget is, in his own words, to achieve a financial plan "which will contribute to economic growth, high employment, and price stability in our national economy."

Those are admirable goals, and the only question is whether the administration's budget policy can in fact contribute to them. What is there about the fiscal 1963 budget that is, or is not, calculated to advance the aims of economic growth, high employment, and price stability?

To consider the last one first, price stability is something of a misnomer, since prices are bound to fluctuate and we would be in an economic straitjacket if they could not. What is really meant is stability of purchasing power, the assurance that today's dollar will be worth the same tomorrow. And that certainly should be an important objective of Federal policy.

But what assurance does the budget offer on this score? It proposes to spend $92.5 billion of the people's money, or nearly $115 billion when social security and similar payments are included. That is more than 25 percent of national income. Right now, in fiscal 1962, the total annual spending of Federal, State, and local governments is estimated at $173 billion—a figure heading rapidly, that is, toward taking half of the entire income of the people each and every year.

Now one rule of economic thumb is that when largely nonproductive Government spending consumes 25 percent of national income, inflationary forces come into play because of the tremendous drain on productive resources. The percentage at which inflation begins may not be precise; the effect of the inflationary forces may not be instantly apparent. But there is just no getting around the danger. And if 25 percent is cause for inflationary alarm, what is one to say of a drain within sight of 50 percent?

So much for the purchasing power stability to which Mr. Kennedy says his budget will greatly contribute.

Turning to the goal of high employment, it is perfectly true that the Government can create some additional employment of a sort. Yet it is extremely doubtful how much additional employment it can create or how economically useful it will be.

The Government could get quite a high level of employment if it took over everything and tried to make work for everyone; in other words, turned the Nation into a completely socialistic state. Even socialistic states, however, find they cannot guarantee against unemployment, for reasons having to do with the inherently unmanageable nature of the human being.

Mr. Kennedy, of course, has nothing of that sort in mind. He is thinking in more modest terms, such as retraining some unemployed people, and getting from Congress standby authority for big additional public-works spending if unemployment increases. The United States had plenty of that in the thirties, and the records show it did hardly a thing to reduce unemployment. And we are sure Mr. Kennedy would not contend that Federal make-work is a solution to unemployment.

What, then, is the way to higher employment? This much would seem plain as a pikestaff: If the tremendous governmental drain of between a quarter and a half of the people's income would be significantly reduced, there would be a corresponding increase in savings, investment and spending. In short, greatly increased economic activity which would provide additional millions of real jobs.

How else, in a free society, could you expect to get high employment? And how else, to take Mr. Kennedy's third and broader goal, could you expect to get sound economic growth?

The Kennedy budget all too fully reflects the prevalent notion that unlimited Government growth is the key to economic well-being. Unfortunately for the Nation, that theory prescribes methods which run counter to the achievement of the President's admirable aims.

Ukrainian Independence: A Reality

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, when we hail the anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day we do not have in mind the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic of today. We honor that which declared its independence on December 27, 1917, and achieved it January 22, 44 years ago. The so-called independence of that area, insisted upon at the United Nations by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to gain support for what was to be a series of Soviet vetoes, is a travesty upon the true independence of the Ukrainian people. That has been maintained not because of, but in spite of, the Soviet Union.

Overrun for centuries by the Russians, the Ukraine was never willingly a part of their territory or sympathetic with the neighbors to the east. It turned

more to the west. Its superior development and culture was more in tune with that of Western Europe; its civilization much older than that of the Russia which sought to absorb it.

Despite all efforts of its neighbors at domination, the Ukraine has remained all but superficially apart. Torn asunder as it has been, not only by the Russians to the east but by envious neighbors to the east, west, north, and south, it has yet remained an entity. Though its richer agricultural and mineral resources have been the envy of the rapacious on its boundaries, they have also been the basis for a higher degree of civilization, a superiority in social, economic, cultural, and religious development. The spirit of individuality, of independence, and of resistance to almost overwhelming odds is likewise a product of this refinement.

It was this true love of freedom and loyalty to ethnic origins and native characteristics which led to real independence 44 years ago. The consciousness of a rich and distinct heritage, a spirit of liberty have remained despite all outward political adversity. The independence of the Ukrainian people is as alive today as it has ever been; and it will ever remain. That is the true independence we celebrate.

The Postal Rate Raise Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, there are many inequities in this so-called Murray amendment, which in truth and in fact is a substitute for the committee bill, on which the Post Office and Civil Service Committee held lengthy hearings. The so-called Murray amendment had little or no consideration by the committee but was simply demanded as "must" legislation by the palace chiefs downtown.

America will rue the day if we, the representatives of the people abrogate our duties and responsibilities, as we are asked to do in this instance, even to the point of shutting off debate in the House of Representatives as all present have witnessed.

The Murray substitute is replete with inequities which, if made law, would be most detrimental to many newspapers, all shoppers guides and all sorts of publications, many of which are already struggling to stay in the black.

To attempt to raise revenue by this method, which amounts to peanuts compared to the wasteful spending program by the billions of dollars of the party in power here in Congress and downtown who show not the slightest inclination or desire to save a single penny for the already overburdened American taxpayer, is more than I can swallow.

The almost 25-percent increase in first-class mail proposed here is nothing more or less than a tax increase on the American people, and which will work a hardship on many individuals and businesses of every nature, nationwide, to the end that less first-class mail will be sent, which will reduce the claimed amount of revenue.

Mr. Speaker, after weighing this proposal carefully, I simply cannot support it, even with the Cunningham amendment included, which was cleverly slipped into the Murray substitute in the belief that by so doing Members would not dare oppose the bill on final passage. Facts are that the President could stop Communist propaganda from going through the mails simply by ordering the Postmaster General to stop it, just as was done under the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. Speaker, there is no one in America more opposed to ungodly communism and all its lowdown, lying propaganda than am I; however, I will not, I cannot conscientiously abrogate my responsibilities as a representative of the American people, as we are being asked to do in this instance, which I would be doing if I voted for this sort of unfair, unwarranted legislation. Hence should the so-called Murray substitute be adopted, I shall vote "no" on final passage.

Nineteen Hundred and Sixty-two—Year of Vital Decisions on Fiscal Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the whole spectrum of our country's fiscal policies—from tariffs to trifles—deserves close congressional scrutiny this year. We are approaching and amidst crises on many fronts. Maurice Stans, former Director of the Bureau of the Budget under ex-President Eisenhower, discusses one of these complex problems in a recent article of his current series, "Our Changing Economy."

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Stans entitled, "Gold Outflow, Not Berlin or Congo, Is Nation's Greatest Threat." It appeared in the Washington Post of Monday, January 22, 1962.

GOLD OUTFLOW, NOT BERLIN OR CONGO, IS NATION'S GREATEST THREAT

(By Maurice Stans)

The greatest threat to our Nation today is not Berlin. Nor is it Vietnam or the Congo or Laos. It is the precarious situation of our balance of international payments and with it the potential erosion of world confidence in the dollar. President Kennedy's state of the Union message, by its emphasis on foreign trade, made this evident.

The balance-of-payments problem is not a complex matter to understand, as many people seem to believe. It is in fact quite elementary. Americans and the American Government spend a lot of money overseas every year to import goods, travel, investments, maintain troops, and give aid. We have not been able to induce the other countries to spend all of those dollars back with us. Instead, they hold the unspent difference in bank accounts and in claims against us that will have to be settled some day with goods or gold.

In the 3 years 1958 to 1960 our oversea spending and investing exceeded the inflow of our dollars at the average rate of $3.7 billion a year. Right now the net debt we owe to other countries on short-term demand is $18 billion. To pay this we have a little less than $17 billion in gold, but we already have pledged $12 billion of that to back up our money in circulation here at home. We could not pay all our current foreign debts if they were all demanded at once.

Khrushchev's pronouncements have regularly claimed that our capitalist system would go down under its own weaknesses. The most grave and chronic risk we now face is that we will not be able to extricate ourselves from our present predicament, which is of our own making. But the causes are easier to see than the cure.

The Kennedy administration is exerting strong efforts to fight a winning battle, as did Eisenhower. In this, it deserves support. But the unfavorable conditions are cumulative, and only titanic and unceasing work will reverse the trend and save us from a major setback.

Eisenhower fully recognized the seriousness of the problem. Treasury Secretary Anderson repeatedly urged that the strong nations of Europe should be required to contribute a larger share to their own and the free world's military defense, so as to permit a reduction in our foreign aid and our oversea costs. This plea was dramatized by the trip Anderson and Dillon made to Germany late in 1960, but the effort had been going on long before that behind the scenes.

In 1959 Commerce Department Secretary Mueller initiated a major program to increase American exports and to encourage foreign travel in the United States, but he was frustrated by the unwillingness of the Congress to appropriate the funds needed. The Defense Department laid down rules to reduce the number of dependents going to military posts abroad. Treasury proposed reducing the duty-free exemption to returning tourists from $500 to $100 and made other proposals to stem the outflow of gold. Above all Eisenhower recognized that the security of our position depended on maintaining confidence in our money, and he fought hard to keep the budget in balance and to demonstrate good fiscal housekeeping to our overseas creditors.

These efforts temporarily stopped the flow of gold, but they did not halt the growth of the unfavorable balance.

Since last January 20, President Kennedy and Secretary Dillon have carried on and enlarged the campaigns to encourage exports overseas and foreign travel in the United States. The Congress enacted the reduction in duty-free customs allowance to returning tourists. A new insurance plan has been announced by the Export-Import Bank to reduce the risks of loss on foreign export credits. West Germany and several other countries came through with $650 million of advance payments that Secretary Anderson had urged them to make on their postwar assistance loans.

The first 6 months of 1961 went well. Exports were up imports decreased as a result of our slight recession and the advance debt payments to the Treasury were enough to show almost an equilibrium for the period. But it is now apparent that this was only temporary improvement. The fundamental causes of imbalance had not been removed, and the actions to date were inadequate. Reducing the duty exemptions was more psychological than real, for example, as it helps to the extent of only $100 million or so a year.

Also, not all the administration's actions in the first 6 months of 1961 were toward tightening. The Defense Department withdrew the limitations on oversea dependents almost immediately to placate the military. Kennedy's proposals to increase the dollars paid out on foreign programs were defeated in the Congress, but heavy future commitments are involved in the Peace Corps and the mushrooming alliance for progress in Latin America. Since June imports have increased to record peaks. The deficit in the balance of payments for the second half of 1961 was again at the rate of $3 billion a year, and for all of 1961 would have been close to $2.5 billion except for the nonrecurring German debt payment. There are no present reasons to expect that 1962 will be better. The claims against our gold will grow.

In all of 1961 we lost $800 million in gold, and our reserve is at the lowest point since 1939. The claims against it are at the highest in history.

Secretary Dillon's job is to see that our oversea creditors increase their spending of dollars here. If he fails in this, he must persuade them to leave their money here, not to demand payment in gold. Decisive measures and continuing actions are required and can be expected. Some of them will be outlined in a later article.

President Kennedy's place in history will suffer badly if his administration doesn't solve this crisis of chronic imbalance. To miss or to default is to invite ruinous inflation and subsequent devaluation and their humiliating consequences. Khrushchev's experts are surely watching the outcome with eager anticipation. Everything depends on finding the answer while there is yet confidence in the future of the dollar. In the meantime, under this pressure, we are certain to see the decline of the early 1961 gospels of economic growthmanship and unlimited Federal spending, and that is all to the good.

Unmentionable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of January 22:

UNMENTIONABLE

The speechmaking at Saturday night's Democratic rally was in the best partisan tradition. The past was reviewed with pride and the future appraised with hope. If the political opposition ever did anything worthwhile, it evidently escaped the notice of the Democratic orators. After all, the party faithful had not shelled out $100 a plate to hear about the virtues, if any, of the GOP.

We were especially interested in the remarks of President Kennedy. He linked the major programs of his administration with those of former Democratic Presidents—Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Harry Truman. He also remarked that in determining that the United States will not be second in space, "We follow Thomas Jefferson who sent Lewis and Clark to explore the Northwest."

The President, however, did not allude to other areas in which his administration, as well as those that preceded it, would have no desire to follow Thomas Jefferson. Particularly, we have in mind a Jefferson statement as quoted by C. Northcote Parkinson in his little book, "The Law and The Profits." Mr. Jefferson commented as follows:

"I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared * * * To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with public debt * * * We must make our choice between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude.

"If we run into such debts, we must be taxed in our meat and drink, in our necessities and comforts, in our labor, and in our amusements * * * If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labor of the people, under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy."

Naturally, while ringing Thomas Jefferson into the act, there would be no inclination to mention his views on economy by spokesmen for an administration which is urging Congress to raise the national debt ceiling above the $300 billion mark.

The Migrant Farm Labor Story—Part VIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the New York World-Telegram and Sun on October 18, 1961. Dale Wright, the reporter, spent 6 months living and working among the migrant farmworkers. His reports should convince this House that Congress must act to protect migrant labor:

FARM CAMP SLUM, EXPOSED 8 YEARS AGO, IS STILL HELL

(By Dale Wright)

The great dream of many migrant farmworkers, born and reared in a shack in the South, is to go North to the land of plenty—to find the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow.

On his first trip "on the season," the migrant finds that dream quickly shattered. I, too, was a dreamer when I went into the fields in Delaware, New Jersey, and eastern Long Island.

I found that, unlike the South, there were, indeed, a few laws aimed at protecting the rights of the itinerant harvester. But the truth is that these laws are so scant and so haphazardly enforced that they have little effect.

INSPECTED?

They have had no effect whatever, for example, at one camp where I found the same shocking conditions bared by another World-Telegram survey 8 years ago.

I found a mean-looking labor camp on the Enos Herbert farm near New Sharon, N.J., that a health inspector had visited the day before I did. Six inches of slimy water covered the concrete block community shower room. There was no drainage system.

About 20 percent living at the camp drew their water, for drinking, cooking, and bathing, from a handpump in the middle of the camp compound. The water tasted acrid, appeared to be contaminated. In every glassful a gritty sediment settled to the bottom.

OWES TOO MUCH TO DIE

In Cedarville, N.J., a little farm town in the southwestern corner of the State, a woman crew leader told me that after spending most of her life as a migrant, "I'm ready to lay down and die."

She said her name was Mable Brown and that she came from Pompano Beach, Fla. "I can't die now, though," she added. "I owe too many people."

An angular, work-worn woman wearing a pair of incongruous jodhpurs, Mrs. Brown said she had brought 17 laborers into Cedarville in a battered Chevy sedan and a dilapidated bus. Bad weather, she said, had held up the tomato crop and as a result none of her crew had earned any money. She was paying their food bill out of her own pocket.

Mrs. Brown's camp was worse than any I had seen in the Deep South. She repeated an old refrain: "Ain't seen any Government people around here in a long time."

The camp consisted of a row of shanties—off the main road in the woods—with no running water, no indoor toilet and no plumbing. There was a filthy community shower and a cramped, one-room kitchen which served the whole camp.

A mangy dog sprawled in the doorway of one shack. A goat and some flea-bitten sheep scratched in the dirt in front of the row of shanties. A few little children played hopscotch in the dirt with the menagerie.

NO LETTUCE FOR HIM

One of Mrs. Brown's "help," a stooped, gnarled man in his late sixties, stopped rolling a cigaret and spoke up:

"We was chopping lettuce on the Sorantino brothers farm a few weeks back, just keepin' busy till the tomatoes got ripe.

"The bossman said he was paying $1 an hour. When it came time for the money, the man didn't give up but 85 cents an hour. He didn't say why; he just told us to move on in the pay line. I guess he forgot that we were supposed to get the dollar."

Near Woodstown, N.J., a Negro farm laborer on the Jill brothers truck farm said the crew he worked for was paid 10 cents for each basket (five-eighths of a bushel) of tomatoes picked. Less than 2 miles away, at a Puerto Rican labor camp, Ruben Garcia, a husky, tattooed 29-year-old worker, told me he was paid 15 cents for the same size basket of tomatoes being harvested in the same fields for the same grower.

It was clear that there was a double set of standards on the Jill Brothers farm and on many others I found.

WHITE WORKER RARE

One of the rarities I saw in the migrant labor camps along the Atlantic seaboard cropped up in Hightstown, N.J., a prosperous little village between Freehold and Trenton. It was a white migrant farmworker.

I found him perched forlornly by the side of a railroad track. He was broke and hungry. A scrawny little man, he said between dips from a can of snuff that his name was Glenn Hubert. "Don't forget, it's spelled with two n's."

He said he was 46 years old, that he came from Madison, Wis., and that he had been "on the road for 7 or 8 years."

I hadn't seen a white migrant since months earlier in Belle Glade, Fla., when I talked with a group of them as they shaped up for work in the bean fields.

Mr. Hubert said he suffered as a white man working with migrants. He got the least to eat at his labor camp commissary and he was the first to feel the brunt of the crew leader's anger.

BEATEN FOR SLOWNESS

"I don't pick very fast," he complained, "and the bossman (his crew leader) don't stand for no slacking." He said he had been beaten with fists and clubs and pointed to a gash on his cheek.

At another stop in New Jersey—near Manalapan—a young mother of three told

in painful detail how it feels to get trapped at the end of the migrant trail.

Mrs. Inell Jennings, 27, shooed flies away from an infant asleep on a cot and declared:

"That child ain't got a chance. His daddy and me want to give him the best but we can't do no better than this." She lived with her family in a two-room tarpaper and tin shanty in "Bielson's Quarters," a row of about 20 dilapidated dwellings without indoor plumbing or sanitary facilities. The rent was from $10 to $15 weekly.

The only time the landlord visits his private housing project is on Saturday morning, to collect the rent.

REPORTED 8 YEARS AGO

The tragedy of this family's plight is that World-Telegram reporter Allan Keller had found and reported in shocking detail the same kind of conditions at the same camp 8 years ago.

Mrs. Jennings said she had been forced to make her home at the quarters 6 years ago, after coming there from Tallahassee, Fla., and getting stranded with a farm labor crew.

Shuffling down the dirt road which leads off the highway to Bielson's quarters I found Thomas Miller. He said he was 51 and that he came from Charleston, S.C. At that moment, he said, he was looking for a State trooper.

"I've been working with Daisy Durham's outfit," he said, "and now I'm gonna get her arrested." Mr. Miller said that Mrs. Durham, from Plant City, Fla., his crew leader, had charged him and six other laborers—both men and women—$10 weekly rent for a one-room shack at the quarters when the place had been condemned.

"That shack is damned," the worker said, "and Bielson's not supposed to rent it." He explained that his crew leader charged rent for it anyway and pocketed the money.

Mr. Miller's story of cheating and gouging was familiar. I was to hear it many more times in New Jersey and New York—more times than even in Florida.

Reserve Callup Program Presents a Bleak Picture of Muddled Understanding of the Nation's Reserve Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues in this House a development that has occurred during our absence which may have serious consequences. I refer to the unfortunate statements, some of them by high officials in the Defense Department, that have brought forth a plethora of slurs and misinformation relating to our Reserve programs.

I am concerned not only that such widespread comment was allowed to spread unchecked by the Department of Defense but also about decisions that are obviously being made relative to the future of our Reserve components without the knowledge of the Congress and without due process through legally constituted bodies established by the Congress only after exhaustive deliberations on the part of the Armed Services Committee.

Before going into these developments, I wish to emphasize that in my judgment the Armed Forces Reserve Act, as amended in 1955, has well withstood the test of time, and we should not be stampeded into radical changes to it because of the recent experience of the present administration with a partial mobilization that was hastily conceived and hastily executed.

Let me make it emphatically clear that I do not for one moment criticize its necessity. That decision was one of the heavy responsibilities of the President which the Congress wholeheartedly supported.

But when radical changes of national policy are made, they must be accompanied by responsible and sympathetic leadership when the lives of American citizens are suddenly affected.

The recent partial mobilization did represent a very radical change in national policy. It marked the first time in our history that Army, Navy, and Air Force Reserves were involuntarily recalled during peacetime without at least the declaration of a limited national emergency.

Even so, the Reserves of all services attached to drilling units responded magnificently.

The Army called a substantial number of units from the Army Reserve and National Guard, including three divisions. They all reported to their stations on time. An important segment of competent combat strength was added to the Army at once. Among these divisions was a Reserve training division which took over training missions which promptly freed several combat divisions for deployment.

The Navy's selected Reserve responded immediately. It provided 40 destroyer types, 18 air squadrons with 190 aircraft to the fleet. These ships and aircraft squadrons were and are manned and commanded by Reserves. They have taken their places alongside their professional contemporaries of the Regular Navy without incident and without any postmobilization training,

Some of the destroyers were off the coast of the Dominican Republic during that crisis. The naval air squadrons are antisubmarine types and commenced their ASW surveillance patrols on the day they reported. They are flying these patrols at the present moment.

This was accomplished smoothly, quickly and without complaint.

The Air Reserve Forces provided 11 heavy air transport squadrons with 88 aircraft, and 25 fighter and reconnaissance squadrons with 576 jet aircraft that became immediately operational. Many at the present time are overseas flying alongside their professional contemporaries, adding significantly to the coverage of our combat alerts and to the tonnage of our strategic airlift.

Their senior Air Force commanders have been exceptionally enthusiastic describing their competent, professional performance.

All of this marks an achievement unsurpassed in this Nation's history. It sets forth in bold relief a convincing demonstration of the readiness and effectiveness of our citizen soldiers, sailors, and airmen achieved through the provisions of the Armed Forces Reserve Act.

The complaints which caused so much unfavorable publicity emanated from the so-called fillers who were not members of units and who were called up to bring units up to strength. They were not paid reservists and they had little reason to expect to be mobilized at this time.

They came from pools of reservists with Ready Reserve obligations under the Universal Military Training and Service Act. Many of them had just completed 2 years of active duty in the Army under the draft. Not being members of the organized units, they were, of course, not oriented and disciplined for the callup. Under these circumstances an almost certain climate for complaints was established.

This was clear enough to the Congress which cautioned against it.

Nevertheless, the complaints that were received were relatively few and were magnified out of all proportion.

The morale of these recalled reservists has remained high. Reports come in from all sides attesting to this.

One may be sure however that this morale has not been sustained by any leadership from the Defense Department with such statements from high-level civilian officials as "that's what we've been paying them for," "reservists have not oriented themselves to the thought that they are called up to prevent a war rather than to fight," and "we must increase the Regular forces since we cannot rely upon the Reserves."

Relatedly a "Why Me" pamphlet has been issued by the Defense Department—perhaps to offset a tempest in a teapot of their own making that got out of control.

But let us turn to even more serious matters—the future of the Reserves.

ARMY RESERVE

Rumors persist that a wholesale reorganization of the Army Reserve has been planned and approved. The President has indicated such action. This reorganization has not been processed through the General Staff Committee on Army Reserve Policy as required by law.

Section 3033, title 10, United States Code, requires that "Each policy or regulation affecting the organization, distribution, training appointment, assignment, promotion or discharge of members of the Army Reserve shall be prepared by a committee of officers of the appropriate divisions of the Army General Staff and of an equal number of officers of the Army Reserve"—General Staff Committee on Army Reserve Policy.

This committee was not consulted even though it actually was in session during the time these decisions were being made.

This "end run" around the law has caused the Chairman of the Committee on Army Reserve Policy to write a formal letter of protest to the Secretary of the Army, according to newspaper reports.

The Reserve Forces Policy Board established by law as the advisory body to the Secretary of Defense on Reserve

affairs did not participate in this reorganizaiton. In fact, as far as I can determine, this important statutory Board was not even consulted.

And finally the Congress, which is charged with the responsibility of raising, maintaining, and regulating the services, has not been informed.

NAVAL RESERVE

This fine component of our Reserves turned in an outstanding demonstration of professional readiness. They achieved the posture through serious, rugged drill participation. One would expect that the training of those in the Selected Reserve not yet called would be increased—but what has actually happened?

The Navy's Selected Reserve was set at 135,000. The Armed Services Committee has accepted this target established by the Secretary of Defense.

Yet, the present administration limited the Navy to a Reserve budget for 1962 to maintain its Reserve at 125,000. This marked a cut of $3 million from the 1961 budget.

This was further compounded by the use of the transfer authority by the Secretary of Defense to additionally reduce this training budget, along with endless restrictions by comptrollers at various echelons.

The result has been a reduction in drills during December for the Selected Reserve, the elimination of pay for commanding officers of the Naval Reserve Officers Schools and a denial of active duty for training to officers of the Navy's specialist component even though they volunteered to take this duty without pay.

From a morale viewpoint these reservists deserve better than this niggardly treatment. From a training viewpoint it is almost unbelievable that such action should be taken when the President has indicated the existence of a situation bordering on a national emergency.

THE AIR RESERVE FORCES

These splendid reservists equalled the Navy in producing a convincing demonstration of not only of readiness but also of the important position they fitted in the Air Force military posture. We all know of the manifest need for strategic airlift and these Reserves provided just that. The Air National Guard at the same time provided the essential augmentation to fighter squadrons in Europe.

Yet each year we see them slowly choked off by steadily decreasing funds for training, maintenance, equipment, and flying hours.

The Air Force Reserve has another important facet— the recovery component. This is an all-important feature which has had enthusiastic approval of the Congress. Yet several million dollars of the funds appropriated by Congress for their training has been impounded, even though other segments of the administration are emphasizing the essentiality of an overall national post-strike recovery and recomposition capability.

CONCLUSION

The succession of events, when put in perspective, presents a bleak picture of muddled understanding of the Nation's Reserve Forces. Implicit in this is a disturbing feature of constitutional evasion.

The abolition of the Assistant Secretaries for Reserve in each of the services, the hastily and poorly handled callup, the lack of leadership accompanied by ill-considered statements, the avoidance of the use of statutory boards and the inexcusable withholding of funds appropriated by the Congress are pieces that fall into a pattern of philosophy which if fully exploited may seriously weaken the Nation's mobilization base and the ability of the Congress to control it.

It is my fervent hope that the Congress will hold extensive hearings on this subject of overriding importance and restore the firm foundation of national security that lies in our strong mobilization base: the deterrent feature which its existence imposes upon any enemy, and the ability to achieve victory which its full use, if necessary, will insure.

Room on the Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the Wall Street Journal, January 18, 1962:

ROOM ON THE RIGHT

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

The orchestrated thunder that has been unloosed upon so-called right extremism serves two purposes for the American left.

First, by exaggerating the influence of the hot-blooded anti-Communists, proponents of massive Federal intervention at home tend to shift the spotlight from their own hot-blooded activities for a socialist or neo-socialist state. Second, by using a shotgun attack on the extremists, the militant "liberals" hope the public mind will link all conservatives with the ideas of an intemperate few.

These tactics are, of course, made easier by those extremists who are receiving far more publicity than they deserve.

Those who assert that ex-President Eisenhower is an agent or dupe of communism and those who drill for supposedly imminent guerrilla warfare are obviously quite out of touch with reality. And there are, as there always have been, scurrilous little groups that try to peddle religious and racial hatred under an unconvincing camouflage of anti-communism.

But authentic conservatives who have nothing to do with such aberrations can find plenty of sound political and intellectual positions to defend on unstaked ground well to the right of the New Frontier. For today's real conservatives are those who champion individual freedom against the power of unlimited Government growth.

EXUBERANT ORATORY

Foreign visitors to America, in the first decades of the Republic, were sometimes impressed by the addiction of some Americans to braggadocio and exuberant oratory. And, perhaps as an inheritance from those times, some individuals and groups that think of themselves as conservative give voice to sweeping statements of purpose in which rational thought is at a discount.

And this plays right into the hands of those who would like to attach a crackpot label to conservative thinking in general.

But rational thought is just the quality conservatives should cultivate if they wish to meet effectively the misrepresentations and half truths of leftwingers and offer reasonable and convincing alternatives to Government policies and social trends of which they disapprove. For instance, one need not endorse everything the late Senator Joseph McCarthy said or did to recognize that some of McCarthy's targets, on their published records, were fairly chargeable with gross pro-Communist bias.

One need not subscribe to fantasies of wholesale treason to recognize that political ignorance and naivete, combined with the infiltration of Communist sympathizers into Government service, wrought much harm to American interests during and after World War II and is a real danger still.

The discriminating conservative may not believe that it would be financially advisable to eliminate the progressive personal income tax as a source of Federal revenue, given the constant necessity to keep up with and counter the military challenge of communism.

But he may quite reasonably argue that rates of over 50 percent are self-defeating and bring in little revenue. He may argue that the United States might well follow the general European practice of shifting some of the burden from direct to indirect taxation, that there is a poor fiscal case for the capital gains tax, and that the encouragement of private capital formation is a desirable objective from the standpoint of employment and production.

Again one need not be a Scrooge, out to grind the faces of the poor, to be shocked by the court ruling against the Newburgh plan to combat chiseling on relief or to challenge the epithets "inhuman" and "medieval" with which this plan has been damned in liberal circles.

What is so unreasonable or inhuman about making welfare payments for food, clothing and rent in voucher form? In some cases this might be a useful measure for the protection of the family of an alcoholic or a drug addict.

FAIR STANDARD

Why shouldn't the compensation of the lowest-paid city employe be taken as a fair maximum standard of payment for a family of comparable size on relief? Or why shouldn't the home environment, in cases of aid to dependent children, be investigated and the children removed to foster homes if conditions of gross immorality are found? If State and Federal laws rule out such reasonable precautions against abuse of public relief, these laws should be changed.

The discriminating conservative will view with some skepticism proposals to break off diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union. Such a step would make practical sense only if all hope of averting large-scale war were gone; and the situation has not yet reached that point. For the same reason he will not rule out negotiation with the Soviet Union, full of pitfalls and fruitless as such negotiations often have been.

On the other hand, the conservative will be opposed to what might be called negotiation mongering, to talk for talk's sake, and to anything savoring of negotiating under a gun. That is the way not to peace with honor, but to war after incurring dishonor.

The authentic conservative will remember the implied injunction of the signers of the Declaration of Independence to show "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind." But he will not carry this so far as to submit vital interests of the United States to the

outcome of a straw vote of the United Nations, increasingly composed as this organization is of nations which possess little in common with the United States as regards historical background and current problems.

ANTICOLONIAL CRUSADE

The intelligent conservative will recognize the accomplished fact that the former great colonial empires have gone with the wind. But he will strongly resist letting the United States be dragged into anticolonial crusades or into U.N. wars that spread devastation in the name of restoring peace and order.

Without succumbing to the delusions that adequate national defense is expendable or that peace can be had cheaply, the conservative will stand firmly for a balanced budget at a figure that will not bite too deeply into the ability of the individual to consume and to save. He will point to three obvious sources of possible saving in the public revenue: A foreign aid program of which much goes to unfriendly nations; and incredibly wasteful and cumbersome farm subsidy program; and the operations of a big bureaucratic machine.

Here, in outline, is firm ground on which American conservatives can take a stand, distinct from the aberrations of the extreme right and from the collectivist implications of the New Frontier.

First Federal of Peoria, Ill., To Stimulate Neighborhood Renewal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most progressive home financing institutions in the Nation is setting an excellent example of the American way to rebuild our cities. The First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Peoria, Ill., has announced a new program of working with neighborhood groups, church groups, and civic associations to rehabilitate entire blocks of homes in our older neighborhoods. This program does not involve any special Federal aids or subsidies.

Here is how the program works. After the citizens of the neighborhood have decided on their rehabilitation plan, the First Federal will undertake the financing whether it involves property improvement loans for one house, a new mortgage for another, or an increased mortgage for another. This association will also make available its experts in planning the rehabilitation and work, and in working out the financial details.

This savings and loan association, whose officers, staff, and members have contributed so much of their time and energy to civic and charitable projects, is to be commended, and, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the following newspaper article:

[From the Peoria Journal Star, Jan. 18, 1962]

FIRST FEDERAL TO SUPPORT NEIGHBORHOOD RENEWAL PLANS

A promise of adequate financial support through private financing for urban renewal projects was given by the president of First Federal Savings & Loan Association at the association's annual meeting Wednesday night.

If homeowners in a certain area, such as one block, got together and collectively decided to repair or rebuild their homes, the local financial institution would provide the necessary counsel and money.

A. D. Theobald, president of the association, told directors and members:

"We believe there are many areas in central Illinois where everyone concerned would benefit by organizing programs of neighborhood preservation and rehabilitation. Such programs require adequate credit support in the form of mortgage loans, additional advances on existing homes and unsecured property improvement loans.

"The concensus is that such programs, to be really successful, must originate with and be carried on by the neighborhoods concerned. However, the association promises adequate financial support and attentive counsel to all such programs and hopes some initial projects can be started in 1962."

The thinking, it was explained, is that individual homeowners may be reluctant to fix their homes if they feel so and so down the block isn't going to fix his. More liberal financing is available if all homeowners go together on the job.

First Federal would counsel them on the advisability of rebuilding to tearing down the structures and plan financial assistance, all independent of the Federal Government. Rather than being called urban renewal, a Government term, such projects would be neighborhood renewal and rehabilitation.

In a message delivered by John G. Welch, chairman of the board of directors, it was noted that First Federal completed 1961 with substantial gains in assets, loans, savings accounts, and safety reserves. During 1961 assets increased by $11,293,489 to a total of $97,111,483, an increase of 13 percent.

Other statistics were 5,638 new savings accounts started, savings increased by $7,470,425, mortgage loans granted totaled 1,388 amounting to $21,239,580, earnings distributed to savers were $3,021,774 or $297,139 greater than any previous year and safety reserve accounts were increased by $681,420 to a new high total of $6,199,248.

Theobald outlined the 1962 association program which is based on a continuation of economic recovery throughout the year. He said, "We expect our savings totals to increase less but the increase in loans to be greater than during 1961, with the real estate market expected to be somewhat more active than has been in the past 2 years."

In a pointed reference to race relations, Theobald observed, "The association repeats its policy of nondiscrimination as to home financing, savings, and employment opportunities."

He also declared that the addition to the savings building should be completed this year, substantially increasing the association's ability to serve the central Illinois area. Such service will place more emphasis on financing multifamily rental housing, housing for the aged and for Negro citizens.

All present officers were reelected or reappointed.

Promises and the Federal Payroll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the size of the Federal payroll and its effect on the budget are matters of utmost concern to all of us here in the Congress and to Americans across our land. This coming fiscal year particularly should be one of frugality in view of the closeness of our national expenditures to our income.

My attention has been drawn to a comparison of the administration's promises and its record on reducing the number of Federal employees. It will be of general interest, I am sure, in evaluating the seriousness of the administration in maintaining a balanced budget in 1963.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "Battle of the Bulging Payroll," from the Wall Street Journal of January 18, 1962:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 18, 1962]

BATTLE OF THE BULGING PAYROLL

"I am * * * especially desirous," said President Kennedy in his statement last October to Cabinet officers and agency heads, "that the number of Government employees be limited to the minimum consistent with getting the job done. There is no question that employment can be held substantially below the levels which would be possible under the funds authorized by the Congress, if strong efforts are made to achieve increases in productivity and efficiency * * * and to staff each activity with only the minimum number of employees needed to carry out our objectives. I expect each of you to make such efforts."

But somewhere along the way the deeds called for by these fine words have not been forthcoming. As our Mr. Nelson reported the other day, "Almost all signs suggest payrolls continue to inch upward despite the President's economy intentions."

Perhaps it is understandable, in view of the Government's desire to advance U.S. space explorations with all speed, that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, increasing its staff by 30 percent annually, now is busily recruiting 2,000 additional engineers and scientists. Less comprehensible, however, is what is happening among more pedestrian agencies.

For instance, the Agriculture Department's payroll by midyear will be 7,000 bigger than it is now; the Interior Department has gained 5,000 employees since January 1961; the Health, Education, and Welfare Department's announced reduction of more than 600 jobs turns out to be a cutback in positions that have never been filled; Federal Aviation Agency and Bureau of Public Roads staffs are increasing.

Some of this growth, to be sure, can be blamed on programs launched by the previous administration. But in the wake of the President's October message the push upward has not even shown signs of leveling off. The taxpayers will be looking, in Mr. Kennedy's budget message this noon, for something with more muscle than the "I expect every man to do his duty" sort of approach to payroll limits.

If they do not find it there, they can only assume that in the battle of the bulging Federal payroll, the administration is surrendering without losing a single man.

One Hundred and Fifty Years Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, there are times when a review of the past may

serve a useful purpose as a guide for the present and the future.

A poem written a century and a half ago was the inspiration for a most provocative editorial which appeared in the first edition of the "new look" edition of the West Shore Times, Lemoyne, Pa.

In it the editor reaffirms the thinking of many today that the next war will not be fought on the battlefields of earth, but, rather in the minds of men for principles that far outweigh material things. In this battle each of us has a starring role which, in turn, gives us a tremendous responsibility.

The editorial follows:

"SAY NOT THE STRUGGLE NAUGHT AVAILETH"

This is the title, and the first line, of a poem that Arthur Hugh Clough wrote a century and a half ago. It is a strange little poem, for two reasons. For one, it is found in all the anthologies of English poetry and so, by itself, has given an otherwise forgotten writer a place in what Rebecca West has called the continuance of literature—for literature, with history, goes on and on, in a certain pattern, like the links of a chain.

For the other, the body of the poem possesses an amazing symbolism that applies perfectly to the great events of the present day—and of the events and crises and defeats and victories that are to come.

Make no mistake about it—we live in a world dominated by two great and totally inimical powers, the United States and the Soviet Union. If history teaches anything, it teaches that prolonged coexistence under these circumstances is an impossibility. One power—war or no war—will become the primary power. It will lead the other nations of the world in a certain direction.

At present the cold war is being fought on an economic front. There are abundant statistics to prove that in this we, and the other Western Powers, have a superiority of resources. We are able to produce more of virtually everything the nations of the world want and need. But the East—and it must be remembered that Russia is both an Asiatic as well as a European nation—has vast reservoirs of little-tapped resources which she is now developing. So has China, with her incredible population of some 700 million slaves of the state. And the Communist powers can, and will, direct the whole energies of their dictatorships to the purposes of the dictators.

Under these conditions, it can be expected that there will be an economic stalemate—exactly as, it seems, there is a stalemate of weapons in which each side has the capacity to destroy the other. And if this stalemate occurs, where will the war be fought?

That question is easily answered. It will be fought for minds—for sets of principles which go far beyond any material considerations. The peoples of this torn world will be free to do as they choose, within the limitations long imposed by the laws of civilization—or they will be driven by their masters.

It is a queer and sorry fact that the nation which speaks out most often against colonialism, the Soviet Union, has become the greatest and cruelest colonial power of the modern age. And it is a queer and sorry fact that the new and underdeveloped nations listen to Russia's siren song and, because of ignorance or misunderstanding, so often accept it.

What we stand for—and what the West stands for—must be emphasized with all weight at home—in schools, in the churches, in government, in the labor, and business, and farm organizations everywhere.

We cannot lead if we do not first understand where we hope and intend to lead to. And we cannot qualify and limit the ideal of individual freedom if we are to remain free, and help others to become free.

The task ahead will not be easy. It will be slow, tortuous. There will be reverses. But here is where the symbolism of Arthur Hugh Clough's poem fits us now. The last two verses read:

"For while the tired waves, vainly breaking,
Seem here no painful inch to gain,
Far back, through creeks and inlets making,
Comes silent, flooding in, the main.

"And not by eastern windows only,
When daylight comes, comes in the light,
In front, the sun climbs slow, how slowly,
But westward, look, the land is bright."

That is what we must prove to confused people everywhere: "Westward, look, the land is bright."

U.S. Trade Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER H. DOMINICK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker, there has recently been a succession of articles by Mr. Henry Gemmill on the Common Market and the U.S. trade problems which, in my opinion, are well worthwhile reading. Mr. Gemmill points out quite clearly that the solution is not merely connected with higher tariffs or lower tariffs but involves the very great fundamental of reduced U.S. manufacturing and industrial costs.

I trust that all Members will have a chance to read these before the coming debate on the administration tariff proposals.

One of the above-mentioned articles follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal]

U.S. TRADE TROUBLE—COMMON MARKET CHALLENGE CAN'T BE MET BY TARIFF JUGGLING ALONE

(By Henry Gemmill)

The great debate over future American trade policy is now well underway, with much of its logic coming through as sharp and simple as a singing commercial.

Listening, one might suppose that if Congress next year will just make the right choice between two alternatives—lower tariffs or higher fences against imports—then disaster will be avoided and prosperity assured. The birth and growth of Europe's Common Market, which looms as an enormous event of this century, is treated as a neat punchline for each rival sales pitch.

Free traders sing that high-tariff isolationism could be the death of us, but there's a golden opportunity to sell oodles of wares to a booming Europe if the Common Market will make its trade wall low, in exchange for dismantlement of U.S. duties.

Protectionists chant that breaching U.S. tariff dikes while the Common Market's output is rising would bring fatal flooding of the market here at home, but the American economy can be kept snug and safe if import barriers are built higher.

POTENTIAL IMPACT

Either doctrine may be splendid for ramming legislation through Congress. But both cannot be true. And the suspicion arises that neither one adequately describes the potential impact of the Common Market; that neither prepares this Nation for major alterations—far beyond tariff tinkering—which may ultimately be forced upon nearly every sector of the economy.

To some who have been pondering more than preaching, and especially among those who have gone over and had a look at what is actually happening in Common Market factories, a dour thought occurs. It is this: The Unted States could turn either toward freer trade or stiffer protectionism (or, as may well happen, toward a hodgepodge of both) with equally dismal results—a gradual, pervasive, chronic stagnation of the economy.

Talk along this line is hardly heard amidst the din, perhaps because it can offer no attractively simple gospel of salvation. It is not defeatist, but it can fairly be called pessimistic. For it is inclined to believe that if trade policy alone is altered, if other agonizing adjustments are neglected, then America's pockets of unemployment can multiply, its business booms can fizzle, and governmental dreams of economic growth can vanish in a struggle with this stagnation.

Why is this?

Because, whichever direction the United States turns in trade policy, it encounters an entirely unprecedented economic prospect. For the first time since it became an industrial society, this Nation will find its factories at war along an enormous front against an oversea industry which before long should have an essential capability for fabricating any product, almost without exception, at lower cost. That is the meaning of the Common Market—low costs, written in giant letters not merely over the map of West Europe but the map of world markets.

Lower foreign wages we have long confronted, certainly, but industrialized America has never before faced a general pattern of lower foreign costs.

It has been a commonplace of economics, and the lingering U.S. export surplus still reflects it, that our successful manufacturers have more than overcome the wage disadvantage by mass production—with the huge Yankee assembly line achieving lower unit cost than the Belgian craftsman, with the intricate plumbing of an American continuous flow chemical works producing more cheaply than the Italian stirring his batchpot.

This mass making of things, which has hitherto enabled U.S. industry to survive and thrive and sell abroad, stemmed not from genetic superiority but from a gigantic domestic market, unique in the world. Soon, if the plain promise of the European Common Market is fulfilled, this American phenomenon will no longer be unique; on the contrary it can be shoved into a poor second place.

Western Europe, disposing of its internal trade hurdles, will by population arithmetic constitute a greater mass market than the United States and thereby gain superior potentiality for mass production. If that potential is realized in practice, America's one great saving advantage seems destined to be reduced to inferiority.

And at that turning point of history any continuing wage differential will bite with full force as never before. And remember that low wages abroad can trim not just payroll costs but the cost of transport, the cost of research for improved processes and products, the cost of building or reequipping factories.

Many of these factories are brand new, others are abuilding, most are yet to rise, embodying the most modern efficiencies, competing against aging U.S. facilities. How will a comparable host of new factories be hatched here, where industry after industry complains of excess capacity?

GLOOMY LINE

Since it deals with the future, this gloomy line of reasoning cannot pretend to be facts but at best, informed foreboding which should be probed and challenged. If it does

have substantial validity, this conclusion is hard to avoid:

An America which alters no more than the rulebooks handed to its customs collectors will before long discover the Common Market is able to offer to the world prices decisively lower than U.S. price tags, and not just for such specialties as bicycles, watches and midget autos, but for whole massive catalogs of consumer goods and of wares bought by industry, item by item through thousands of items.

In the end, U.S. producers could be left with a lingering pricing advantage only in their own specialties; it is entirely possible Europe will never develop a mass-market appetite for peanut butter.

The planned and unplanned responses America will make as it first senses and then suffers so smashing an economic impact elude full comprehension. They are every bit as difficult to assess as were the long-term military and diplomatic consequences when the Soviet tested its first atomic bomb and rocketed its first sputnik. Think back to those days; it seemed that something terribly significant had happened; yet no one knew precisely what the significance was, and years later we still do not know whether to dig fallout shelters, or whether to build B-70 bombers, nor how to manage nuclear rocket diplomacy for a satisfactory settlement in Berlin.

It may turn out, of course, that this parallel is overdrawn. It could happen that Europe will never achieve a real Common Market; the schedule of its phased creation could bog down, the Germans could swing out of it for an accommodation with the Russians, the French could have another revolution, the British could decide not to join. In which case, America's whole debate over trade policy might prove pointless.

OUTPACED BY BUSINESSMEN

But there is every indication that the Common Market will indeed become a reality, perhaps far faster than the American market can gird to meet it.

West Europe's statesmen huddle to plan merger of more nations into their Common Market, they chide each other for every delay in scheduling new steps of economic unity. Yet they are outpaced by European businessmen, whose industrial integration leapfrogs national boundaries ahead of the political schedule. And they in turn are crowded by the crush of Yankee businessmen; nearly every sizable U.S. corporation is staking out a Common Market beachhead, and blueprints of growth are in the top drawer.

An American company can of course flee the American economy; a growing number already do the bulk of their business abroad. This merely illustrates the Nation's problem, but cannot solve it.

As factories standing on U.S. soil yield to those in Western Europe the primacy of high production and low pricing, the American economy may find no easy escape.

After the United States lost its atomic monopoly, neither disarmament talks nor rearmament dispelled the unprecedented military peril from the Soviet; it seems unlikely that either lower tariffs or higher protectionism will serve as a sufficient response to the unprecedented economic challenge of Western Europe. The rival debating teams, each intent on pushing a particular tariff program through Congress, can scarcely be expected to puncture their own arguments with talk of this sort, though traces of it appear in private conversations of some participants. Yet perhaps pessimism can be sensed by peculiar indirection even in the lively public exhortations; each side sounds a good deal more convincing when attacking its opponents' proposals than when counting the blessing its own charter course would bring.

TOUGH DECISIONS

If a protectionist cries that slashing tariffs—or even leaving them unchanged—would be followed by a damaging flow of imports, one has the queasy sensation that his prediction is difficult to disprove. If a free trader declaims that raising barriers—or even leaving them unchanged—would be followed by loss of our traditional sales in Europe, it is not at all easy to think of a crushing reply. The hopeful citizen is tempted to dismiss with all his heart one or the other of these gloomy forecasts. But it is remarkably awkward to do, with the brain.

This is not to say that all is lost, or that the trade policy decision facing the Nation is meaningless or minor. On the contrary, it is essential to make that decision, but essential to do so with harsh realism and with the understanding that still tougher decisions lie ahead.

Cart Before the Horse?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. PAT JENNINGS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, considerable discussion is taking place in the press on the subject of liberalism and conservatism. Also, on the question of who is liberal and who is conservative.

An editorial recently appeared in the Sunday edition of the Bristol (Va.) Herald-Courier and Virginia-Tennessean. It is a thoughtful statement by the Herald-Courier editor, Mr. Jim Baxley. It merits the attention of all my colleagues and all who are interested, and concerned, about the current discussion of liberalism and conservatism.

I, therefore, wish to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include this editorial as it was printed on December 31, 1961:

LIBERALS, CONSERVATIVES GET CART BEFORE HORSE

(By Jim Baxley)

I am convinced that sometime in the coming year I will meet a man who describes himself as a conservative liberal. This contradiction of terms will not trouble him in the least, if he even recognizes it as such.

My friend will not be some kind of a nut. Naive, perhaps, but not a nut. Most likely, he will be a rather ordinary sort, like most of us, who has as much difficulty as anyone else in separating left from right while disdaining the middle of the road.

I think I will envy him. At least he will have ended his confusion, which is more than most of us are able to do. He will have found, albeit in his own mind, a label which permits him to be either conservative or liberal while retaining his more basic identity as an American.

This is not easy. Our wild-eyed liberals tell us it is un-American to be supremely patriotic. Our pompous conservatives tell us it is un-American to believe in the New Deal, the Fair Deal, the New Frontier, social security, or anything else smacking of what is often termed the "welfare state."

MESS OF MALARKEY

Both have a cart before the horse philosophy. Under the formulas they foster, you must decide whether you're a conservative or a liberal before they will admit you're also an American or brand you as some kind of crackpot traitor. All this, of course, is a mess of malarkey, which will win me no friends on either fringe, glory be.

It would seem to me that a man is either an American or he is not an American. It makes little difference, moving from that base, whether he is a liberal or a conservative—though I find much on each side which makes me shy away from either designation.

Even if you don't ask them, they will tell you what they believe is necessary to what I consider the simple process of being an American. Their most basic argument is that you must agree with them—which is, in itself, contrary to what being an American really means.

It is the nature of an American to be obstinate and ornery when he feels like it. An American is a man who prizes his individuality, who holds strong opinions which he will expound at the drop of an idea. He has a love of country which leads him to throw himself fearfully, yet courageously, into battle against those who would destroy his Nation. He has a soft spot in his heart which leads him to hold out a helping hand to his fellow men—but he places his fellow Americans first on this list.

PRODUCT OF PATRIOTS

Most of all, an American dislikes being told he is not an American. He is, in the final analysis, a product of Patrick Henry and Stephen Decatur and other noble patriots who might today be branded "un-American."

So it appears unseemly for those on the left and those on the right to demand that the most of us meet their qualifications if we are to call ourselves Americans.

If they want to be liberals or conservatives, that's their business. But let no one brand me un-American because I happen to disagree. If the worst comes, I may join my friend and become a conservative liberal. Right now, I'm content to be just an American—borrowing a phrase from the late Sam Rayburn—without suffix, prefix, or additive.

Putting Broadway on a Local Level

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Union, San Diego, Calif., Sunday, July 23, 1961:

PUTTING BROADWAY ON A LOCAL LEVEL

San Diego's neighborly Starlight Opera is unique on the Southland summertime calendar for one good reason: It can make the girl next door look like a Broadway star.

A good example of this is Patricia Wakeman who was dazzling as Saloon Singer Frenchy in the Starlight opener, "Destry Rides Again."

Miss Wakeman's nine dancehall queen costumes, as well as all other costumes and sets in the local production, had that Broadway sparkle because they were originally used by the national road show company of "Destry."

In fact, "Destry Rides Again" became the 10th professional collection of costumes and sets to be purchased by the San Diego Civic Light Opera Association, Inc., for Starlight use. And Miss Wakeman's gowns, which

originally cost $1,200, and the entire assembly of properties which were estimated somewhere between $50,000 to $75,000, were purchased by the association for a fraction of that price.

Since 1950, Starlight has been able to buy and use complete production properties from Broadway or road show companies.

TOP DESIGNERS' SETS AMONG COLLECTION

At least 84 large scenic drops designed by such top New York scenic masters as Raoul Pene du Bois, Jo Mielziner and William and Jean Eckert, now cover at least one-fourth of the empty space in the circular Ford Building in front of Balboa Park Bowl where Starlight performs for 10 weeks each summer. And the collection of props and costumes covers everything from a dollar feather duster to a $100 feather gown.

In addition, some 18 complete shows designed locally and built by Los Angeles scene shops are also stored in the Ford Building.

How Starlight goes about turning the Park Bowl into Shubert Theater is explained by Earl J. Cantos, a San Diego attorney who last year became president of the board of the light opera association.

Each year, the executive director (this year, Charles Cannon) and the president of the board, go to New York to see the latest musicals. They then visit the four top musical copyright firms to find out just what shows are available.

When producer and president return to San Diego, they submit their reports to a 9-man board of directors who in turn select 10 shows. This becomes the master list from which the executive producer selects the season's five.

As soon as first-production rights (those given to professional companies) on a show expire, second production rights make it available to semi- or nonprofessional companies.

SETS, COSTUMES TRIMMED TO SIZE

When Starlight requests a show, it asks the copyright firm if there will be a Broadway or touring company closing sometime before summer. When the show does close, Starlight is right on the wires, making its bid on the properties, lock, stock, and shipping cost.

At this point, Master Carpenter Carl Callahan hotfoots it to New York, Detroit, Buffalo, or wherever the show closes. He checks and okays the condition and coddles the kit and kaboodle until it arrives by train at the downtown depot.

Since most stages are larger than the odd-sized bowl opening, carpenters go to work as soon as flats and drops arrive to fit them to stage requirements. Costumes are cinched, pressed, let out, hemmed and ripped to meet local dimensions.

After the show's run, everything is packed, covered and inventoried for storage in the Ford Building or in the Old Globe's Siberia where all good sets go to lie.

An unusual service offered by the Civic Light Opera Association is a rental system through which any amateur company can rent any one of the 26 shows available. Although this service has not been used to a great extent and the nominal rental fee in no way defrays Starlight production costs, it is an encouraging proposition for smaller groups.

HE LEARNED ROPES AS STAR, PROP MAN

While Starlight brings Broadway to the park, Cantos is mindful that the backbone of this summer favorite is its local appeal.

A tall, mustachioed man, Cantos looks as if he could snarl convincingly as a theatrical villain. In fact, both he and his wife, Irene, have played in many Starlight productions and Cantos himself worked up from chorus to comedy roles, including a season as stagehand, so he could literally learn the ropes.

"Starlight will always be a San Diego affair," he says. "And it will never change. We don't feel that we have to rely on names to bring in box office returns. The talent is all right here."

"Our plans for the future aren't startling: We want to continue with what San Diego wants. We hope some day to run acting classes and to have a system of apprenticeship whereby local people can develop into directors for the shows. We feel that we should grow and change as the city grows."

Cantos spans Starlight's history with a realistic appraisal of the current season.

"At the end of 15 years," he says, "we're at the beginning of a new era. We're not the only company doing musical shows here. We want to be competitive but within our policy of offering family entertainment at prices as low as possible."

"Patrons of Starlight and of the Old Globe community theater can enjoy a special feeling of pride," he says fondly. "They can show off their local entertainment to visitors. It's a possessive feeling," he adds, "and it's a good, healthy thing."

The Cost of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., is not only a special assistant to the President of the United States, he is also one of the most thoughtful writers and critics of our time.

Not sparing either the radical right or the radical left, Mr. Schlesinger states emphatically in a recent address before the California Federation of Young Democrats:

Freedom is not only hard to get; it is hard to keep. The preservation of freedom requires the fashioning of institutions strong enough to preserve continuity, flexible enough to acknowledge change, resilient enough to transmit vitality and challenging enough to stimulate creativity. It requires, in short, a varied and subtle social discipline.

I would be disappointed—

Mr. Schlesinger goes on to say—

if, in a nation of 180 million we did not have our quota of eccentrics and extremists. But they cannot withstand the rush of history. The cold war is long, slow, and agonizing. It is an ordeal of frustration. It is unbearable for those who seek simple answers and final solutions in a complex and ambiguous world.

It is an irony of our times—

Mr. Schlesinger concludes—

that the arms race offers the only road to arms control and that our own resignation from the arms race is the one sure way to make certain that we will never attain the universal disarmament which must be the lasting foundation of world peace.

Mr. Speaker, this is a brilliant statement concerning the severely troubled times in which we find ourselves living today.

I am including an excerpted copy of Mr. Schlesinger's address, which appeared in the Washington Post on January 21, and urge my colleagues to give it their most careful consideration:

NO BACK-OF-THE-BOOK SOLUTIONS IN FREEDOM

(By Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.)

I am glad to see that the theme of your convention is "The Cost of Freedom," for a pervading illusion of the 19th century was that freedom was free, a costless benefit guaranteed by history to all virtuous and respectable men. We know now that freedom is much more complicated than that.

Instead of being the natural condition of man and societ, freedom is something that a few men in a few places have achieved through effort, dedication, self-discipline and social ingenuity. Freedom is the exception in history, not the rule; it is what men seek rather than what they have.

But they seek it nonetheless, and therein lies the hope for humanity. The instinct for self-fulfillment through free choice is obviously rooted deep in the human condition. It grows in vigor as education and economic growth and political responsibility liberate man from the chains into which most men are still born.

A FEARFUL BURDEN

Freedom is no only hard to get; it is hard to keep. The preservation of freedom requires the fashioning of institutions strong enough to preserve continuity, flexible enough to acknowledge change, resilient enough to transmit vitality and challenging enough to stimulate creativity. It requires, in short, a varied and subtle social discipline.

But it also requires self-discipline—because freedom emancipates man from external authority and thereby concentrates the obligation of responsibility on his own mind and his own conscience. "Liberty means responsibility," said Bernard Shaw. "That is why most men dread it."

Some men have found the strain of freedom intolerable. "Men will cry aloud at last," Dostoievsky's Grand Inquisitor warns us, "that the truth is not in freedom, for the fearful burden of free choice imposes too many cares, too many unanswerable anxieties."

To be free is to choose; and to choose is to make up one's mind; and to make up one's own mind in the whirling universe in which we live is to indulge in the most painful and hazardous of pastimes—that is, the taking of thought. This is perhaps the harshest cost of freedom.

"Cogito, ergo sum," said Descartes; to think is to think for oneself and to define oneself by the thought. Those who let others do their thinking for them have ceased to be free.

But the act of thought imposes its own responsibility. To think effectively is to think honestly, soberly, carefully, intelligently. Thought is one thing, emotional self-indulgence is another. Responsible democracy requires that the two be not confused.

If I were asked to suggest the first cost of freedom, I would say that it is the renunciation of easy solutions. The mark of the dogmatist is that he is still in grade school and thinks he can find all the answers in the back of the book. He knows the truth, and everyone who rejects his truth is either a knave or a fool.

Every irritation in life, he believes, had a simple cause; every obstacle a simple explanation; every problem a simple solution. One remembers Mr. Dooley's definition of the fanatic as "a man who does what he thinks th' Lord wud do if He only knew th' facts in th' case."

THE FOOLISH FEW

As a people, we are dedicated to free choice, and we can therefore hardly complain if some of our fellow citizens choose

foolishly. Throughout our history there have been those who supposed that the Republic was in some terrible danger perpetrated by a clique of sinister conspirators.

In the 1820's, honest men tried to save us from the conspiracy of the Masons. In the 1850's, the Know-Nothings tried to save us from the immigrant conspiracy. In the 1890's, the American Protective Association tried to save us from the Catholic conspiracy. In the 1920's, the Ku Klux Klan tried to save us from a conspiracy of Catholics and Jews and Negroes. In the 1930's, the American Liberty League tried to save us from the radicals. In the 1940's, the America First Committee tried to save us from the interventionists. And today the John Birch Society tries to save us from the graduated income tax, Chief Justice Warren, the fluoridation of water, and the 20th century.

I would be disappointed if, in a nation of 180 million, we did not have our quota of eccentrics and extremists. This is a cost of freedom. As Ed Howe of Kansas said years ago, "I express many absurd opinions. But I am not the first man to do it; American freedom consists largely in talking nonsense."

But I would be disappointed, too, if many people found solace in such views. For the conspiratorial theory of history is always wrong—and it is often the first symptom of paranoia. Devotees of this theory assume that history has reached its fulfillment in the world to which they are accustomed or, preferably, in some idyllic earlier period, such as the administration of William McKinley.

They regard change beyond this as the product of someone's malevolence—as the result of the secret machinations of a wicked inner ring. But they cannot withstand the rush of history. They are all, in the end, followers of King Canute, who, according to the old legend, went down to the beach and commanded the tide not to come in.

American conservatism, from the beginning of the Republic, has enjoyed the Canute complex—and has suffered Canute's fate. It resisted the extension of the suffrage. It resisted the admission of new States to the west. It resisted the abolition of slavery. It resisted the establishment of national control over the trusts. It resisted the construction of machinery to control the cycle of boom and bust. It resisted social security and unemployment compensation and minimum wages. And today it resists Federal aid to education and health assistance to the aged and tax reform and effective action on conservation and civil rights.

If anything were predictable about this present time, it is the recrudescence of this right-wing extremism. In conservative times, the radical right is dormant and disorganized, because it is always hopeful that a conservative administration will do something it wants. But when a liberal administration is in power, the radical right becomes agitated and vociferous.

President Kennedy faces in the 1960's precisely the same situation that President Roosevelt faced in the mid-1930's and that President Truman faced in the early 1950's. Only the radical right of today does not have leadership remotely comparable in skill or appeal to that provided by such paladins of the past as Huey Long, Father Coughlin or Joe McCarthy. It is hard for me to believe that America is in serious danger from a movement whose leader has dedicated himself to the thesis that Dwight Eisenhower is a dedicated, conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy.

This rightwing revival is thus the conditioned reflex of extreme conservatives in a liberal age. And the fact of the cold war, by intensifying the national anxieties, has, of course, intensified the passion for quick and comfortable conclusions.

The cold war is long, slow, and agonizing. It is an ordeal of frustration. It is unbearable for those who seek simple answers and final solutions in a complex and ambiguous world. The rightwing extremism of our day is, above all, an expression of cold war battle fatigue.

But let us not suppose that all the extremism, all the confidence in the answers at the back of the book, all the faith in simple answers and final solutions, is the property of the radical right. There are those supposedly on the liberal side who seem equally wedded to the conspiratorial theory of history, equally obsessed with primer answers to insoluble questions, equally persuaded that they are in unique and miraculous possession of the truth.

Whenever I hear talk, for example, of the power elite, I know that I am in the presence of a mirror image of the John Birch Society. The notion that a conspiracy of bankers and generals controls our destiny is as "nutty" as the notion that it is controlled by Walter Reuther and the officials of the ADA.

There are some who feel that all the world's troubles would be over if we only resigned from the arms race with the Soviet Union. Their view, as I understand it, is that our economic system requires us to invent an antagonism with the U.S.S.R. in order to maintain profits in our own economy; and that if we would only stop all this nonsense about maintaining our nuclear strength, the Communist world would relax its hostilities, and peace would descend on long-suffering mankind.

Let us first consider the economic arguments. From 1945 to 1946, the total Government purchases of goods and services in the United States declined, with the end of World War II, from $82.9 billion to $30.8 billion. This was a drop of over $50 billion at a time when the total gross national product was only a little over $200 billion. The decline in Government spending then was, in short, about 25 percent of the gross national product, and our economy rose to take up the slack.

An equivalent decline today would be over $130 billion—which is almost three times the size of our defense budget and half again as large as our total Federal budget. The American economy would thus in no circumstances have to meet a decline in public spending comparable to that which it survived in 1945–46.

And if all present defense spending should cease tomorrow, the American economy, which survived a decline in public spending amounting to one quarter of the gross national product in 1946, could certainly survive a drop in public spending amounting to one-eleventh of our gross national product today. The argument that our economy requires the cold war is, in short, a phony.

Let us look now at the second half of this case—that if we would only abandon the arms race, then all problems of world tension would vanish. The premise is, of course, that the cold war is an American initiative and that Soviet policy is purely defensive. But very little in the history of the years since the end of World War II substantiates this premise.

In 1945 we began the demobilization of the greatest military force known to history. In 1946 we offered to share our atomic monopoly with the United Nations. In 1947 we invited the Soviet Union to join with us in the Marshal plan. And through these years the Soviet Union made clear its ineradicable view—a view rooted in its theory of history—that any society based on a system of mixed ownership is inherently evil and inherently a threat to the peace.

In the years since the Soviet Union has gone even further. It has made abundantly clear that even societies based on systems of Communist ownership are unacceptable, like Yugoslavia and Albania, unless they bow to Soviet views on questions of foreign policy.

The only lasting hope for a relaxation of tensions lies in the establishment of a system of general and complete disarmament. One great issue confronting us today is how we may best negotiate an effective disarmament agreement. Those who object to our defense budget evidently assume that, if we were to permit the Soviet Union to achieve a decisive margin of military advantage, the Soviet Union would reward us by suddenly accepting a program of effective world disarmament.

As a historian, I find it hard to understand how, in view of a sequence of international actions from the Stalin-Hitler pact of 1939 to the resumption of nuclear testing in 1961, anyone can suppose that the Soviet Union is animated by anything but an aggressive conception of its own interests. There is only one way in which we can persuade the Soviet Union that it must submit to a program of international arms inspection and control—that is, by persuading the Soviet leaders that we can stay in the arms race as long as they can. If we abandon the arms race and concede the Communists' military superiority, we remove the incentive which might induce them to accept a meaningful plan of disarmament.

To persist in piling up the weapons of mass destruction is a tragic choice. But we live in a world of tragic choices, and there is no point in kidding ourselves that painful problems have painless solutions. It is an irony of our times that the arms race offers the only road to arms control and that our own resignation from the arms race is the one sure way to make certain that we will never attain the universal disarmament which must be the lasting foundation of world peace.

Effect of Mail Rate Increase on Newspaper Distribution in Rural Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the serious adverse effect of the considered rate increase for newspapers distributed by mail.

There are many daily and weekly newspapers in the Nation, and several in the Third Congressional District of the State of Washington, which rely on mail delivery to rural subscribers as the only practicable means of distribution.

Any increase in the postage rate for this class of news matter will inevitably and necessarily raise the price of keeping informed to a segment of our population living outside dense population areas.

As evidence of this situation, I wish to submit a letter from John B. Edinger, publisher of the Daily Chronicle of Centralia, Wash., a newspaper which has the typical distribution problem of which I speak.

JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. HANSEN: I have a copy of your letter of January 12 sent to Lew Selvidge requesting information concerning newspapers being delivered to subscribers by mail.

Since this is of extreme importance to the Chronicle, I have taken the liberty of answering you direct and sending a copy to Lew.

As you know, the Centralia-Chehalis trade area extends for a considerable distance, some 80 miles east to Packwood, 30 miles west to Pe Ell, 24 miles south to Toledo and Vader, and 15 miles north to Tenino and Rochester. Because of the sparse settlement of these regions, we deliver a large proportion of our newspapers through the mail. Of our total circulation of a little over 10,000 we deliver 23 percent by mail. Thus any change upward in mail rates affects us seriously. We, of course, actually pass along these savings to the subscribers as they receive the paper at a lower rate than to those who take their delivery by motor route or newsboy. We have extended motor routes throughout our area, but there are still many subscribers living on the side roads and byways which we cannot reach or who prefer the lower mail rate.

A breakdown of our mail circulation shows that we deliver 1,713 papers by mail to subscribers living inside Lewis County; 273 copies to subscribers living in our trade area but outside of Lewis County; 407 by mail to subscribers living outside our trade area in other parts of the State of Washington and throughout the United States, bringing the grand total by mail to 2,393.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN B. EDINGER.

The Events of 5 Years Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on the fifth anniversary of the Hungarian freedom revolution, the citizens of Buffalo, N.Y., were honored to hear an address by Mr. Joseph P. McNamara who spoke on the events of 5 years ago.

It is a great pleasure for me to include Mr. McNamara's address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. His address follows:

THE EVENTS OF 5 YEARS AGO

As we gather here today, on the eve of the fifth anniversary of the Hungarian Freedom Revolution, we are all aware that our free way of life is challenged by the rising tide of Red Russian despotism. That challenge is no longer a distant theory. It is a clear and present reality. That stark reality is underscored by the bold boast of Russian leadership that they will "bury us." When the Russian leaders say they will bury us they mean they will impose upon us the same form of tyranny which caused the people of Hungary to rise as one against the cruelty of their tormentors. For to live under Communist rule is to experience a living death. So we must understand that our meeting here today is much more than an act of courtesy toward the brave Hungarian people. We meet here today to serve notice that we, as a nation, shall not default in our support of those who rise up against the tyranny of the common enemy. We ask no more and expect no less than this commitment to courage from our national leadership.

Five years' time is but a moment in history, as measured against the long and costly struggle of mankind to be masters of their destiny. But it seems a long time when measured against the deterioration in American respect among the nations and peoples of the world which has taken place during these past 5 years. The Hungarian freedom revolution is a vital chapter in the prolog of our national decline as the citadel of human freedom and the bastion of hope for the oppressed and exploited masses of the world. But we who believe in the inevitability of victory for freedom's cause properly regard the lessons of the Hungarian freedom revolution as prolog to a new, bold and dynamic era of American leadership in reshaping the world of tomorrow in the image of justice for and among all the nations of the earth. This accords with our political heritage. This is our destiny as a nation of freemen.

As we turn to the lessons of the Hungarian freedom revolution we find the key to the immediate and urgent crisis on Berlin. The present Berlin crisis has been provoked by the Russians to test the courage and the will of the United States in particular and the free world in general. Khrushchev and his evil crew of conspirators against the highest hopes of the common man the world over have handed an ultimatum to the leaders of the Western World to either surrender to their demands on Berlin or face the prospects of a nuclear war. To support their ultimatum the Russians have engaged in a new series of nuclear weapons tests, climaxed by the promise to test a supernuclear bomb before this month of October is ended. This Russian technique of terror is calculated to test and break the courage of the Kennedy administration and to drive the Western Powers to a conference table where the error of concession can be compounded into a global victory for imperial Russian communism.

The month of October takes on added significance when we recall that it was in this month, 5 years ago, that the most powerful bomb ever conceived by man exploded in Hungary. I speak of the human bomb, the components of which are the hopes and aspirations of men to be free and independent—the trigger of which is the unbearable pressures generated by the inhumanities of Russian communism. That bomb has been labeled by the political historians as total political revolution. The latent power of that human bomb dwarfs the power of all the nuclear stockpiles taken together. And the stockpile of those human bombs is great, stretching from the Baltic Sea to the Pacific Ocean. They are not numbered. They are named by the people of all the captive non-Russian nations.

That is the great lesson of the Hungarian freedom revolution. That is the lesson we as freemen must understand as we now confront the Russians and reply to their ultimatum to surrender in Berlin.

Five years ago Communist propaganda had deceived much of the free world, including its leadership, into believing that popular revolt on an effective scale was impossible behind the Iron Curtain. The Russians claimed and too many others believed that there was a finality to the events which had taken place in east-central Europe during and following World War II. It was then popular to believe that 10 years of Russian occupation of central Europe had produced a generation of Soviets who were loyal to Moscow and that Red army military power could quickly suppress those who still refused to accept the finality of their plight. The conclusion of this comedy of tragic errors was that we who are free had no other course open but to accept a status quo with the Russian empire and to coexist with organized evil as best and as long as we could.

These myths were exploded in 5 historic days, beginning with October 23 and ending on October 28, 1956. During those 5 days of national courage and valor, the Hungarian people broke the back of Red army power over Hungary and drove the traitors of their liberties to a well deserved end. It was the students of Budapest who raised the national spirit to the boiling point of political revolution. It was the working men and women who moved en mass to support the try for freedom. It was little children and aged grandmothers who joined ranks with their compatriots to bring public sentiment to a boiling point. Then it was the brutal tactics of the Russian-controlled secret police who triggered the revolution by shooting down in cold blood the peaceful demonstrators who were asking for nothing more than their human rights. By October 28 the Hungarian people had driven their tormentors from their soil and had begun to reconstruct their national life in freedom and independence. So great was the shock of this victory of the common man over the forces of organized tyranny that the leadership of the free world was paralyzed into inaction. Russian myths and threats had put the leadership of the West into a deep political stupor. The failure of the Western Powers, particularly the United States, to accept the realities of the events which had taken place in Hungary, to extend diplomatic recognition to the revolutionary government and to invoke United Nations intercession to maintain the peace in Hungary, stands as a black mark in the book of human freedom.

Five days later, in the early morning of November 4, 1956, the regrouped Red army reinvaded Hungary and crushed the freedom revolution. The Hungarian people were not defeated. The entire Western World was defeated. For the cause of a free Hungary is the cause of the Western World. Victory for the Hungarian people was not lost—it was only postponed. As surely as day follows night the Hungarian people will enjoy the fruits of their victory or the entire world shall suffer the miseries which the Hungarian people have borne these many years.

It was in the month of October 1957 that the Russians launched their first sputnik. This act of Russian desperation, supported by a massive propaganda program, has dimmed the memory of the West with respect to the all-powerful stockpile of human bombs behind the Iron Curtain. The Russian specter of intercontinental ballistic missiles and the attendant threat to use them against all who resist weakened the courage and determination of the free world. This weakness was altered by the rise of a new and bold American leader who but a few months ago assumed the responsibilities of President of the United States. Khrushchev and company moved quickly to test and break that leadership before it could remold our Nation in the spirit of our political heritage. President Kennedy has refused to yield freedom's cause in Berlin. He has served notice that the day of reckoning has arrived. He has made it clear that the choice of war rests exclusively upon the backs of the Russian tyrants.

This Presidential determination to stand firm in support of freedom's cause is the reason for the Russian threat to test a so-called superbomb before this month of October is ended. They seek to terrorize us into retreat and ultimate surrender. But the month of October has become the symbol of a bomb which dwarfs the power of all the nuclear stockpiles put together. It is the human bomb of total political revolution. No Russian, no Communist, no tyrant can face the awesome power of that bomb. This is the historic lesson of the Hungarian freedom revolution. This is the lesson which we as freemen must remember as we face the future—confident of our appointment with destiny—assured of our common victory and dedicated to the belief that we shall not default in our responsibilities to those who are prepared to die that justice and freedom may dominate the world of tomorrow.

Decline of U.S. Prestige

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, during the past presidential campaign, the then Senator Kennedy made a great deal over international public opinion polls showing the decline of American prestige abroad.

President Kennedy makes very little of these polls now. In fact, Edward R. Murrow recently rushed to his aid and announced that no more polls would be taken. It is no wonder.

Since the Cuban fiasco, President Kennedy has continued his policies which are undercutting us in the eyes of the world. Constantine Brown brings home this point in an editorial appearing in the January 18, 1962, edition of the Washington Evening Star.

The editorial follows:

DECLINE OF U.S. PRESTIGE—BERLIN WALL, CONGO POLICY AND ATROCITIES SEEN UNDERCUTTING US IN EUROPEAN EYES

(By Constantine Brown)

ROME.—A European poll would show President Kennedy that our prestige has dropped many points since he visited the Continent last spring.

Until recently Washington's voice was the dominant factor in the free world. When, for instance, the late John Foster Dulles announced that this country might have to make an agonizing reappraisal of its policies toward France, the French politicians shivered. But that is in the past. Today the West Europeans, the strongest segment of the free world, still need us, but no more than we need them.

Conditions in the free world are changing. The proud British, once the determining influence in world affairs, are waiting with ill-disguised anxiety the verdict of the Common Market group for their admission to the club. Influential voices are being heard in America expressing the hope that some day we may become full partners in the European bloc. These voices represent the still subconscious fear that before the end of the century our present civilization may be faced with what General de Gaulle describes as the "tidal wave" of the Afro-Asians.

We reached the high point of popularity after President Kennedy's visit to Europe. He represented to all who met him something refreshing and possibly new in American politics. His domestic New Frontiers did not worry the European leaders who have taken that road for some time without rushing. But he was regarded as the most determined President the United States has had in many years. The consensus of Europe was that U.S. foreign policy was to be guided henceforth by a firm hand.

But this illusion was shortlived. Our prestige dipped several points when the Communists caught us off base in the division of Berlin by a 6-foot wall, Mr. Kennedy, the Europeans complained, talked strong and acted weak.

But it was our policy in the Congo which caused the American stock to take a dip from which it has not yet recovered. From the outset of the Katanga campaign Westerners regarded the military pressure of the U.N. troops as unjustified for that body and contrary to the spirit of the charter. The fact that the United States, the champion of the oppressed, agreed to organize an airlift to ferry troops and ammunition to the U.N. troops did not arouse as much resentment as the Washington policies toward the Katangans themselves.

Europe understands fully that colonialism has had its day and has become as extinct as dinosaurs. The intervention of the U.N. as a replacement for the Belgian authorities to maintain law and order was endorsed by everybody. But when the blue helmets became an oppressive force, bent on enforcing with arms what is called euphemistically at the United Nations the unity of the Congo, there was an outcry of anger all over free Europe as well as Britain.

The reports from reliable observers—newspaper correspondents, doctors, Red Cross representatives, and so forth—concerning the outrages of the Asian and African contingents in the battle for Elisabethville created an unprecedented indignation against the blue helmets and their bosses in New York.

At this point the State Department chose to side with the propagandists who tried to excuse the actions of the U.N. troops by blaming the international mining company, the Union Miniere, for all the trouble in Katanga. Unsubstantiated accusations by responsible officials such as Assistant Secretary G. Mennen Williams and Carl T. Rowan were played up in the press of the NATO countries and caused wonderment. A highly respected publisher asked an American official in Rome whether it was not a strange coincidence that the same accusations had been printed a few weeks earlier in the Soviet propaganda publication, New Times, under the heading "Katanga Lobby."

I managed to obtain the article in question. It said among other things that "measures to strengthen the Tshombe position are being taken in the Western capitals. Most of them can be traced to the Katanga lobby, a group of capitalists with important financial interests in Katanga."

The 4-page article goes on denouncing Wall Street, Paris, London, Brussels, and so forth. "Will America," it continues, "at this critical juncture back up its vote for the Security Council resolution? Washington needs to make a gesture for the support of the U.N. forces."

Our policy in the Congo, our attitude that we must please at any price the newly created African republics and our weakness toward India's aggression against a NATO ally, all contribute to the lowering of America's prestige.

Postage Revision Act, 1962

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7927) to adjust postal rates, and for other purposes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, this is a rather simple amendment. We heard quite a bit of talk today about rates being too high. By this amendment I am endeavoring to increase a rate from zero to 1 cent per pound, to replace the free-in-county privilege of newspapers. Bear in mind that this is "free in county," and I emphasize the word "free." A great number of our newspapers are entitled to send all of their papers out on the day of publication free within the county of their publication.

I maintain that at a time when we are in financial embarrassment as far as our Government is concerned, it is absolutely inconceivable that we should allow any organization to send a profit-making paper free. I happen to be a newspaper publisher. To me it is inconceivable that I should be able to send 60,000 to 70,000 newspapers a year free when I am charging $4.50 per year subscription rate.

I would also point out that this is less than what was in the original bill, H.R. 6418. I appeared on Wednesday, June 7, to testify on a bill offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], which would have charged 1½ cents per pound and one-fourth of 1 cent per piece. This amendment seeks only 1 cent a pound. We have compromised quite a bit on it, but, as I said, any increase over zero is substantial. I ask your support.

Agriculture: False Prophets, Hard Facts, and Commonsense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, in an address prepared for the convention of the National Wool Growers Association, at Salt Lake City, on Monday, January 22, emphasized that agriculture is a house divided against itself. He chose as the title of this address "Agriculture: False Prophets, Hard Facts, and Commonsense." He related agriculture's problems to the disunity among farmers themselves.

What the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture has to say is important and is especially significant at this time, as we expect to receive from the President in the next few days a special farm message calling upon the Congress to enact new legislation to maintain stability of the farm economy and to reduce the costs of farm programs. Therefore, with the unanimous consent of the House, I am inserting the text of this address in the Appendix of the RECORD, so that its contents and its message may be available to all Members of this body.

AGRICULTURE: FALSE PROPHETS, HARD FACTS, AND COMMONSENSE

It is indeed a delight, as well as a distinct honor, to appear before this convention.

In the presence of this distinguished group, I am especially aware that you people here are exceptional legatees. You are the heirs to an industry that is as old as civilization itself. Moreover, as I read and interpret history, the origin of individual and independent enterprise—the foundation of the capi-

talistic system—reckons back to shepherds tending their flocks. And organized society and culture really began on the face of the earth when the shepherds and the herders ceased to roam and settled into organized communities.

You are indeed the trustees of a proud and ancient heritage.

It is, as I have said, an extraordinary delight to stand before you. It is more than that—much more. It is an opportunity. It is a challenge. For, along with the legacy and lore of the shepherd, you people in the sheep industry seem to make it a business to perpetuate, to pass from one generation to another, a propensity and a capacity for hard commonsense. Of course the years, and the centuries, have made some changes in your business, but not in the ability of people in this business to face facts. This no doubt accounts for the vital and vigorous survival of this ancient enterprise of the shepherds.

I am here today, before you, because I want to talk facts. I want to talk hard commonsense.

I have traveled almost the breadth of this continent to avail this opportunity and to accept this challenge, before this elite group, to drive home from this platform to a broader audience in the Nation, if it be possible, the facts on the problems and the promises of agriculture, as I see them; and to raise some questions on where the responsibility shall be placed—where the blame shall lie—if the farmers of this Nation fail to regain a fair share of, and an equal partnership in, the rewards of our capitalistic system.

But let us first take a quick look at your industry—the sheep and wool industry.

As we are all painfully aware, the domestic wool industry was hit rather sharply by the recession of late 1960 and early 1961. Mill activity declined, exports went down, prices dropped. The total domestic consumption of wool in 1961 is estimated at around 500 million pounds—about 7 percent less than in 1960. Domestic consumption per capita amounted to about 2.7 pounds compared with 3 pounds in 1960.

In recent months, however, recovery has been underway. Mill activity has been rising, exports are moderately larger. The outlook is for a somewhat brighter year in 1962 with moderate increases all along the line—in domestic consumption of wool, mill activity, foreign trade in raw wool and wool products, as well as in the average prices received for shorn wool.

As for lamb, we all hope that the rough period of the past 2 years is a thing of the past. The steady downward slide of lamb prices during this period has been particularly damaging. It fostered flock liquidation—and this in turn added pressure to a further slide in market prices. USDA livestock experts tell me that the reduction in numbers may be near or at the stopping point. Market prices should be better in the months ahead and peak prices next spring, I am told, may be well above those of a year ago.

I understand that some growers are looking toward marketing orders as a possible help to solve the lamb problem. It is laudable that growers are undertaking a study, spending their own money through the American Sheep Producers Council, to find out more about the problem, its causes, and what might be done about it.

The Wool Act, of course, has been the salvation of the sheep industry.

As you know, the Agricultural Act of 1961 extended the Wool Act through the marketing year that will end March 31, 1966. Producers are currently assured a total national average return of 62 cents per pound on wool marketed until the close of the coming marketing year on March 31, 1963—the same level that has prevailed since the wool incentive program was begun 7 years ago.

This incentive price is established under legislation which directs the Secretary of Agriculture to consider prices paid and other cost conditions affecting sheep production in determining a support price that will encourage an annual production of 300 million pounds of shorn wool.

When the act was passed in 1954, wool production was only 236 million pounds—a level of output considered too low to serve the best interests of the entire Nation. Gradually over the years the gap between yearly wool production and the 300-million-pound goal has been narrowed. Production in 1961 was about 264 million pounds—12 percent more than the 1954 output.

Another important feature of the program is the wool and lamb producers' self-help promotion projects, financed by deductions from the incentive payments. This enables the sheep and wool industry to carry on advertising, promotional, and other related market activities.

I recite these facts to emphasize that your program—the wool program—has a special significance. It is a program designed to meet the special problems of a particular agricultural industry. The program, in other words, is fitted to the commodity.

This is tremendously significant. It points up the basic principle that if we expect a program to work for a specific commodity, the program must fit the needs, the peculiarities, the characteristics of that commodity. No one program can be devised to cover and serve the best interests of a dozen or a half-dozen agricultural commodities. We faced up to that fact in part of the Agricultural Act of 1961. Written into the act were these words:

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to encourage a commodity-by commodity approach in the solution of farm problems and provide the means for meeting varied and changing conditions peculiar to each commodity."

While the Agricultural Act of 1961 did not provide all the authority needed for this approach, it took a long step forward in recognizing the principle.

In the past the Nation has attacked the problems of many commodities through general farm legislation. That approach served us well in helping to lift agriculture out of the great depression and maintain stability in war and in the economic aftermaths of war. Agriculture experienced its greatest era of prosperity. For 11 consecutive years we had the law of supply and demand working for the farmer, and not against him. Farm prices were at or above 100 percent of parity in each of those years.

Farmers invested their profits from this prosperity in all the tools and skills of technology and this, mixed with their genius on the land, brought forth the biggest explosion of farm production the world has ever known. Our farmers blessed America with plenty, but this has been their own undoing. We produced vastly more than we could use. Surplus piled upon surplus, and our farmers were overwhelmed by the avalanche of their own productivity. The situation demanded change—a new approach, a commodity-by-commodity treatment of the farm problem—to keep supply and demand in reasonable balance.

But as you are aware, the political situation was such that the required and essential adjustments in farm policy were not forthcoming.

Certainly we have learned by now that the accumulation of huge stocks of farm commodities in Government hands hurts not only the producers of those specific commodities but it hurts agriculture all across the board.

Everybody, in every part of agriculture, has a vital stake in seeing these huge stocks of Government-held commodities cut down to manageable and useful size.

Now there's only one way to do this—and that is to turn off the flow of surplus commodities and see to it, meantime, that the excess supplies on hand are gradually used up.

That was the purpose of the emergency feed grain legislation of 1961. It is the purpose of the feed grain and wheat programs for 1962.

The feed grain program of 1961 was a signal success. Its job was to reduce production of feed grains. It did that job. Despite per-acre yields that broke all records, production of corn was down 7 percent, grain sorghums 22 percent, and output of all feed grains 10 percent.

The feed grain program was presented to the country as a means by which the Government could begin to cut back its stocks. And the program did that job. Instead of an increase of about 600 million bushels in feed grain stocks that would have resulted in the absence of this program, we will have a cutback of about 200 million bushels.

That feed grain production has been lowered and that Government stocks are being reduced are facts that nobody can deny. The only argument that has been advanced against the program is that it cost too much. But the fact is that it was not the 1961 program that cost too much but the programs that went before—especially the corn program that was in effect in 1959 and 1960.

Actually the feed grain program cost less in 1961 than the Government would have had to pay under the old program. And in the years ahead the cutback in feed grain production in 1961 will save taxpayers at least $500 million net.

But this program was only one of the significant achievements made during 1961.

I'm proud of the $1 billion rise in net farm income. Last year farm operators had a realized net income of about $12¾ billion—the highest since 1953.

I'm proud of the vigorous and effective use made of our agricultural abundance both at home and abroad. I'm proud of the success of the pilot food stamp plans—of the expanded school milk program—and of the greatly enlarged use of U.S. food in the interests of world peace.

I'm proud of the legislative record, the highlight, of course, being the highly significant and forward-looking Agricultural Act of 1961. Besides endorsing a commodity-by-commodity approach, it gives greater recognition to marketing agreements and orders by means of which producers can adjust their output and increase their income—without excessive cost—and at the same time provide ample high-quality supplies for the consuming public. As I've already mentioned this act extended the wool program for 4 years, and authorized the feed grain and wheat stabilization programs of 1962. It also expanded and extended for 3 years the Public Law 480 authority to use food for peace and develop foreign markets for our farm products.

I'm proud of other measures adopted in 1961, for example the improved agricultural credit facilities and the hog cholera eradication program.

I'm proud of the way the democratic process has been reemphasized in agriculture through the restoration of the functions of the farmer committees.

And one of the things I particularly like is the vigorous and aggressive way in which Secretary Freeman has set out to tell the story of agriculture's contributions, problems, and potential to the American people.

Indeed, we made a good start on the road back in 1961. But agriculture still has a long way to go to catch up with the earning capacity and the prosperity of other segments of the economy.

The plain fact is that—despite all that the Nation is now doing—and despite all that it seems feasible to do to increase the use of food and fiber at home and aborad—U.S. agriculture has the ability to produce more than the market will take at fair prices to producers.

This situation confers on Government a responsibility it cannot morally avoid. In the absence of sound programs to help farmers and ranchers balance production with need, one of two things is bound to happen: Either prices and income to farmers will collapse or stocks will mount higher and higher in the hands of Government and costs to taxpayers will continue to rise.

True, we look for the 1962 feed grain and wheat programs to make sizable reductions in these stocks. But the 1962 feed grain and wheat programs are temporary, 1-year endeavors to cut down the surplus. Now—this year—we should decide what kind of programs will best serve the Nation and the Nation's farmers in 1963 and the years beyond.

There are, broadly speaking, two general alternatives. They are:

1. Turning away from Government adjustment programs, while reducing price support to disaster levels, on the assumption that low market prices will bring about a balance between output and needs.

2. Seeking new commodity-by-commodity legislation to bring about more balanced supply and demand along with fair returns for farmers and a gradual reduction in the cost of storing and handling farm surplus.

I know a third alternative has sometimes been mentioned: Get rid of price support programs entirely. But no responsible person, to my knowledge, believes that is possible in the foreseeable future. It would mean a terrible farm depression.

The prices of farm commodities would drop by about one-third and net farm income would fall even more. Wheat prices, for example, would be cut almost in half—perhaps below a dollar a bushel.

Cattle and hog prices would fall by 25 to 30 percent below existing levels.

To put agriculture through that kind of a wringer would do incalculable damage to the rural economy, to all the small towns that depend on farm spending for much of their subsistence, and to the economy of the entire Nation.

Obviously this alternative of doing away with all price support cannot even be considered as a possible solution to the farm problem. It is completely unrealistic.

The alternative to forgo all production adjustment programs and to place price support at low levels, to me, is equally unacceptable. We have only to examine what happened during the 1950's to realize what the effects of this alternative would be in the years ahead. The result would be steadily growing stocks of wheat, feed grains, and other commodities with constantly rising costs for handling and storage.

When the lid was taken off the corn program in 1958, the result was an increase in corn output of about 15 percent in 2 years.

Even with the acreage allotment lid still on wheat—and despite the tremendous efforts of the Government to move wheat abroad—Government inventories rose from 132 million bushels at the end of 1952 to more than 1,100 million bushels in 1960.

In the absence of effective adjustment programs for wheat and corn, CCC expenditures in the next few years will increase another $1 billion merely for storage and handling charges.

This is a losing game. It would be only a matter of time until the American people would throw up their hands and refuse to throw good tax money after bad.

The only realistic approach is to develop programs which will effectively cut down surpluses while at the same time help producers to get a return more commensurate with their investments, skill, and contribution to the whole economy. We need farm programs that will cut down the carryover of wheat and corn by half a billion bushels each between 1963 and 1967—programs that will decrease the annual expenditures of farm programs.

These results can be achieved by continuing the type of program that is in effect for wheat and feed grains this year. I do not say that we should continue these programs precisely as they are in detail. But this is basically the right approach, because it combines balanced production with sustained income.

A commodity-by-commodity approach for bringing production into harmony with needs, while shoring up the income of distressed agricultural producers is the basic element of a vitally needed long-range farm program.

Another essential element of such a long-range program is the wise use of our farm abundance and our capacity to produce—to promote the health and well-being of our people at home, to foster economic growth abroad, and to serve the cause of world peace.

A third element is the efficient use of land resources. We must so use our agricultural resources as to assure adequate diets for future generations. This means the conservation and building up of soil and water resources.

These are the basic requirements of a sound and sensible farm program.

The question, now, is, Will the Congress, with the cooperation of the President and the Secretary of Agriculture, be able to enact such a program?

I said at the beginning of these remarks that I wanted to talk facts—I wanted to talk commonsense. Such talk is not always pleasant. But there are some things that must be said, if we are to understand fully the predicament agriculture is in.

Agriculture is America's largest industry, by far. Our farmers have made us the best fed nation on earth. Americans pay a smaller portion of their income for food than any other people anywhere. The productivity of our farms is the greatest stabilizing economic force in the free world. Food from our fields and grazing lands has defeated or checked communism in its tracks in important areas of the world. Khrushchev rattles his missiles, talks about Russia's great industrial strides, but you never hear him boasting of overtaking the American farmer.

Yet our farmers are the poorest-rewarded workers in our capitalistic system. And some people try to cast our farmers in the role of beggars, when they ask only a parity of income with workers in other great segments of our free enterprise economy and society.

To me this is a national shame.

I might point an accusing finger at those who have been responsible for the farmer's woes, but I shall not. It is no good now to blame those who got us into the predicament we're in. Rather, the question is: Will we avail what may be our last opportunity to pull ourselves out of this mess?

The house of agriculture has been divided. We all know this. Some of us have followed the preachings of the false prophets or the witch doctors among us. They tell us it is a violation of natural law, whatever that is, and even contrary to the laws of God, if farmers use for themselves the basic tools of free enterprise that have made this the greatest industrial giant among nations. These tools and these essential requirements for success in any productive enterprise are: (1) The ability to adjust supply to demand; and (2) the power to put a price tag on the products of enterprise that reflect costs plus a reasonable profit to the producers thereof. This is what I have been fighting for in farm programs all these years, simply to place our farmers on an equal footing with industry, by making it possible for farmers to use the supply and pricing mechanisms of industry.

But the prophets of strange doctrines have gained their followings among us. They teach and preach that farmers surrender their liberty and their freedom when they seek to make the law of supply and demand work for them and not against them. They have divided us. They have confused many in our ranks.

We farmers of America have a new opportunity for our salvation, if we will but take it.

We have a President and we have a Secretary of Agriculture who want to do something for agriculture. We have a Congress that will do something. We have the opportunity to bring farmers again into a fair and equitable partnership in the Nation's economy and prosperity, if we but banish these strange prophets that divide us and present a solid phalanx before the Congress for sound and workable programs.

It should be mentioned in this connection that when industry comes before the Congress with a proposal for consideration, there is no doubt where industry stands. And when labor brings a matter to the Congress, labor has made up its mind. But when agricultural legislation is presented to us, we are often embarrassed—after the contending witnesses have been heard—we do not know who really speaks the mind and the will of our farm people.

Agriculture simply must put its house back together. You people have been exceedingly fortunate. You have gotten the program you want, and it is a program that works. The Government payments to maintain the income of wool producers at a decent level have amounted to around $330 million since the Wool Act became law some 7 years ago. But I don't want you wool producers ever to forget that a good wheat program, a workable cotton prgram, programs for farmers producing other crops, are just as important to you, in the long run, as to farmers making these other crops. Those who have workable and profitable programs cannot withdraw from the effort of total agriculture to achieve a decent position. We're all in this thing together. If we fail in our effort to lift up the income of farmers in the many crops then certainly we shall not be able to maintain special programs for producers of a selected few.

I reemphasize that the President is ready and eager to throw the prestige of his office behind legislation that is good for farmers. It is true that the Congress now is dominated by Members who represent urban constituencies. But it is just as true that there is a substantial majority in the Congress for any sound and sensible program that is presented with the unified will and support of farmers.

In these circumstances, and I hope my words may travel far, if we farmers now fail to get a fair break in sharing the blessings of this capitalistic system which is our heritage, we may have only ourselves to blame.

I say to all my farmer friends, if agriculture continues to flounder in or on the edge of poverty, don't blame the President, don't blame the Secretary of Agriculture, don't blame the Congress; but look upon those among us who constantly stir up bitterness, uncertainty and doubt in our ranks. Look into their motives, for they are depriving us of the rewards of our enterprise.

The Nation, including many friends of agriculture—people who have fought the farmers' battles down through the years—are getting sick and tired of all this bickering, bitterness, indecisiveness and irresolution.

The hour is late for farmers. We must find unity—we must restore harmony and accord among us—or we must accept poverty as our natural and abiding lot in this capitalistic system.

It is as plain as that.

And now, confident of your fellowship in the task that lies ahead, I bid you Godspeed.

The VA Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the National Tribune-The Stars and Stripes, issue of January 18, 1962:

THE VA BUDGET

In the budget message which President Kennedy presented to Congress today he laid particular emphasis on the need for increased compensation payments for the service-connected disabled veterans of the Nation.

The President said that in the proposed 1963 budget which becomes effective July 1 of this year he anticipated the need for approximately $64 million to finance such proposed increases which would affect some 200,357,000 veterans or their survivors.

Coming to the highly controversial subject of non-service-connected pensions the proposed budget calls for $114 million increase to take care of an expected rise of 139,000 in non-service-connected pension applicants.

Getting into statistics again, the President foresaw 2,011,000 veterans or survivors receiving pensions in 1963 as compared to an actual number of 1,691,000 in 1961. He explained that these increases result in part from the raising of income limitations and from the granting of pension eligibility to survivors of World War II and the Korean conflict through the provisions of the Pension Act of 1959.

The President said that World War I veterans and their survivors constitute the largest group on the pension rolls and it was estimated that by 1963 nearly half of the 2,400,000 living World War I veterans will be receiving pensions.

While there will be additional money needed for compensation and pension increases, the overall budget for the entire veterans program will be approximately $274 million less than in 1962.

An increase in expenditures for hospitals and medical care is also foreseen as the veteran population of the Nation increases in age. Budget figures include $1,053 million for hospital and medical care, an increase of $22 million over 1962. This contemplates the construction of a new hospital in Ohio and will also serve to improve the quality of medical care in the hospitals and clinics. Also provided is $76 million for hospital construction, increasing the number of beds available by 2,380.

The entire budget figure for veterans' benefits and services totals approximately $5,526 million. This is a tremendous amount of money and is evidence of the care which the American public wants the veterans of the Nation to have. However, while the estimate for non-service-connected pensions will cover nearly half of the surviving veterans of World War I, there will still be hundreds of thousands of marginal cases for which there will be no provision for care.

We are appreciative of the steps that have been taken and the attention that has been given to all categories of veterans. We do believe, though, that some provision should be made within the very immediate future to provide some measure of security and assistance to those veterans of 1917 and 1918 and their dependents.

It will be recalled that incorporated in the platform of the Democratic Party is a pledge to grant these veterans benefits commensurate with those of later conflicts. To date, this has not been accomplished and in the proposed budget there are certainly no expenditures earmarked for this kind of an activity.

We trust the Congress will correct this omission.

Statement of Representative John R. Pillion, Fifth Anniversary of the Hungarian Freedom Revolution, Buffalo, N.Y., October 22, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on October 22, 1961, the city of Buffalo, N.Y., saluted the fifth anniversary of the Hungarian freedom revolution. One of the speakers was the Representative of the 42d Congressional District of New York, the Honorable JOHN R. PILLION, whose voice rings out in the Halls of Congress forever warning us of the threat of the Communist regime. I commend his speech to the attention of the membership of this body.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN R. PILLION, FIFTH ANNIVERSARY, HUNGARIAN FREEDOM REVOLUTION, BUFFALO, OCTOBER 22, 1961

Dr. O'Connor, Monsignor Szabo, Reverend Buto, Congressman Dulski, Mayor Sedita, my fellow Americans, I share with each of you a deep sense of sorrow on this occasion, the fifth anniversary of the tragic anti-Communist, anti-Soviet Hungarian freedom revolution.

Although 5 years have elapsed, time has not softened the brutalities and the atrocities of Budapest. Nor has time dimmed our memories of the bravery, the supreme sacrifices of the children, the men, the women of Hungary, in their heroic struggle to rid themselves of the Communist-Soviet tyranny.

No useful purpose is served, if we look back upon the Hungarian freedom revolution as, merely, another page in world history.

The same Communist-Soviet forces that machinegunned the children of Budapest are prepared to machinegun the children of Buffalo.

The Nikita Khrushchev, who ordered military mass murder attacks upon the Hungarian civilian population is the same Nikita Khrushchev who has repeatedly threatened the evaporation of the American people, you and I, with 50- and 100-megaton nuclear bombs.

The Hungarian freedom crusade should serve as a reminder to each of us, every day, every hour, that the same diabolical forces seek our destruction, too.

The United States happens to be only a few years further away, on Mr. Khrushchev's timetable.

The Hungarian revolution is more than a reminder, it is a verification of the total global war being waged by the Communist-Soviet forces against all freemen, against all free institutions, societies and nations of the free world.

Since the organization of the international Communist conspiracy in the year 1919, one nation after another has fallen into the orbit of the Soviet: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Ukraine, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Poland, Hungary, China, North Korea, North Vietnam, Tibet, Cuba, British Guiana.

Another 20 to 30 nations are on the verge of Communist seizure, ready to follow Soviet direction and dictation.

We are confronted with crises in Laos, South Vietnam, Berlin, Iran, Ghana, and many other countries in every hemisphere.

The free world is entering its darkest hours. This Nation stands in its greatest peril.

The danger is now, today.

It increases every hour, every day.

The United States and the free world has completely failed to comprehend the magnitude, the scope, the weapons of the Communist-Soviet war.

It is a war of demoralization, disintegration and destruction; it is a relentless, incessant war; it is an unlimited war of indefinite duration, a war of orthodox and unorthodox methods, strategies and tactics; a war of total enmity, to which our enemies are irrevocably committed.

This total war has two parts—two campaigns.

The major campaign is being waged by the international Communist conspiracy.

This consists of 98 Communist parties organized in almost every nation. These parties serve under the leadership and direction of Nikita Khrushchev as First Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The second phase of this total war is carried on by the Soviet and the Soviet bloc nations.

Both parts of this total war have one common purpose: our destruction.

Both campaigns have one commander in chief: Nikita Khrushchev.

Our failure to comprehend the nature, the totality of this war has resulted in one defeat after another for the free world.

The United States has been waging a unilateral campaign for peace, while the Communist-Soviet forces have been waging a unilateral campaign of economic, political, diplomatic, and psychomoral war.

We are steadily losing this war.

Our foreign policies, for the past 30 years, have completely failed to meet the realities and the practicalities of the Communist offensive.

Our foreign policies have not materially changed in the past 30 years.

They have been defensive—self-deceptive and self-defeating.

Permit me to remind you of a number of these policies:

1. Military superiority. Our heaviest losses, middle Europe, China, were sustained in the period between 1945 and 1953, when the United States had a clear military superiority.

At that time we were heavily infiltrated with pro-Communist influences in our Government and lacked a firm foreign policy to coordinate with and to match our military superiority.

2. Our military alliances, NATO, SEATO, have had some value, but they are not an effective answer to the Communist war of subversion.

3. The policy of massive retaliation is not proven to be an effective answer.

4. The United Nations is not a successful institution for blocking Communist aggression.

5. Summit meetings and negotiations have not proven effective.

6. Foreign aid, atoms-for-peace plans, international loans, disarmament negotiations are not adequate answers.

7. Peaceful coexistence is not the answer.

Our foreign policies, in the main, have been that of bribery of the Communists, direct aid to Communist countries, appeasement, negotiation, compromise, vacillation.

All of them defensive and all of them eventuating into retreat and surrender, bit by bit, nation by nation.

As a people, we have been confused, irresolute, naive, and gullible.

We have allowed ourselves to become divided, deceived, and diverted from the realities of the Communist dangers by fellow travelers, innocent dupes, and active Communists who follow the Communist mandates emanating from Moscow.

They exist in our churches, our schools and colleges, in the movies, on radio, on television, in the newspaper field, and in our Government.

It is my conviction that the steady decline of U.S. power and prestive is leading us into the desperate alternatives of either surrender or a preventive thermonuclear war.

There is a third alternative, if we have the will to accept the realities of our situation.

This third alternative is contained in my resolution, House Joint Resolution 447.

This resolution calls for a declaration of war against the international Communist conspiracy, lead by the Communist Party of the Soviet.

It would recognize every Communist, every 1 of the 98 Communist parties of the world, for what they are, sworn, implacable enemies of the United States.

This declaration would not create a new war, it merely recognizes an existing war in which we are the No. 1 target.

We cannot successfully defend this Nation, if we ignore the existence of this war against us.

We cannot survive if we limit ourselves to suffering all losses in this war and allow all victories to go to the Soviet.

We cannot formulate effective policies to counter Communist-Soviet aggressions, guerrilla wars, infiltrations and subversions, until we fully comprehend the magnitude and nature of this war, until we identify our enemies, locate the deployment of their forces.

Gentlemen, we are in a war.

Let us declare it.

Let us win it.

In the main, there are two fundamental requirements that this country must accept and adopt if we are to survive.

The first requirement is that of military superiority.

We have permitted our military power to erode until the Soviet has attained a relative parity.

The Soviet, today, is superior in the field of rocketry and intercontinental missiles.

Its army is vastly superior to that of the free world.

Although the United States excels in its Air Force, in its Navy and in its atomic capabilities, the question of overall superiority of total destructive firepower and war capability is in doubt.

Superiority depends upon the type of strategy that will be used in the event of war.

Unless we take immediate action to restore a clear military supremacy, we are inviting national and international suicide.

We should place our intercontinental missile program on a crash, 24-hour, 7-day-per-week basis.

We should proceed with full-scale atomic testing in order to further increase our lead in atomic forepower.

I have requested Chairman Seaborg and General Manager Luedecke of the Atomic Energy Commission to increase our production, not of clean bombs, but of maximum radioactive bombs with low ceilings to take advantage of the prevailing winds over Russia.

This would be a salutary answer to Mr. Khrushchev's threats to launch his 100-megaton bomb.

Our Navy is technologically obsolete.

We need a vast program to equip every vessel with nuclear power and nuclear missiles.

This program would give the United States hundreds of movable missile bases, dispersed around the world. It would divert Soviet missiles from the United States.

Our present concrete intercontinental missiles attract and invite a missile attack upon our land.

The recommendations of Governor Rockefeller and President Kennedy for the construction of fallout shelters is a confession of the gravity of our situation.

Fallout shelters may save 7 million out of 70 million. It is pennywise.

I believe in saving not 7 million but all 70 million of our citizens who might be killed in a nuclear attack.

We should not be pound foolish.

I believe that we should save every American.

We can do so only by having sufficient military power to prevent a Soviet miscalculation of our will and ability to completely eradicate the Soviet empire.

We must be prepared to not only wage a war and to win a war, but more important, to prevent against a war of any kind.

Our military superiority should be at least 1.5 to 1 over the Soviet at all times—a 50-percent superiority.

We have the wealth, the economy to maintain this supremacy.

It is the first essential for survival.

In the field of foreign policy, we need a complete reevaluation of our national goals, our foreign policies, our policymaking machinery.

There is a complete lack of orientation and coordination between our military capabilities and our foreign policies.

Our foreign policy and military capability are interdependent and must support each other to attain our national objectives.

The fiasco of Cuba is a classic example of the complete lack of coordination between the President's Office, the State Department, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the National Security Agency.

We cannot compete with the Soviet unless we can establish agencies for the development of coordinated, firm, offensive foreign policies to effectively counter Communist-Soviet subversions and aggressions in every nation of this world.

Our present policy of containment is wholly inadequate to meet the Communist-Soviet challenge.

A military supremacy, combined with a firm, tough, realistic foreign policy is the only hope for our survival.

It is the only hope for the liberation of the captive nations in Europe.

The sacrifices of the Hungarian people will not have been in vain, if we can remember freedom is not free, it demands vigilance, courage, and sacrifice.

Audubon Society Would Preserve Beauty Spots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the House an editorial appearing in the Beaver County Times, Beaver, Pa., in my congressional district endorsing the conservation goals of the National Audubon Society. These are also the goals of other national and local conservation organizations:

AUDUBON SOCIETY WOULD PRESERVE BEAUTY SPOTS

Nature lovers, conservationists and organized sportsmen in Beaver County who are concerned over America's fast-vanishing natural resources and beauty spots will applaud the goals outlined for the next session of Congress by the National Audubon Society.

These are the four goals for conservationists on which the members of the society set their sights at their 57th annual convention in Atlantic City:

1. Final passage of the wilderness bill, which was passed by the Senate in the last session but still requires House approval.

2. Enactment of legislation to protect the golden eagle, but also to preserve the bald eagle, which is the official emblem of the United States. The bald eagle often is shot in mistake for the unprotected golden eagle.

3. Creation of additional national seashore recreation areas. These include proposed national parks at Point Reyes, Calif.; Padre Island in Texas; the Oregon Dunes on the Pacific coast, and the Indiana Dunes on Lake Michigan. Congress voted in the last session to create a Cape Cod National Seashore Park.

4. Legislation to eliminate Federal subsidies for the drainage of waterfowl marshes in the Dakotas and Minnesota.

These projects would do on a larger scale what the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy is doing for our own section, to preserve natural resources and places of scenic beauty for those now living and for future generations.

Navy Finds Youth Ideas Weak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, our Nation has been fortunate to have the continued benefit of responsible leadership in the Navy. Today we are particularly fortunate to have a man serving our country who has distinguished himself throughout his career as a responsible and dedicated naval officer who gives of himself unselfishly.

In the short time since assuming the position of Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. George W. Anderson, Jr., has impressed me, and I know all of our colleagues, with his drive and effectiveness in performing the very complex responsibilities of his office. A very penetrating interview was recently printed in the January 21, 1962, issue of the San Diego Union, which confirms the confidence we have in Admiral Anderson.

Credit is also due to the distinguished editor of the San Diego Union, Herbert G. Klein and that newspaper's Washington representative, Brian Duff, for their efforts in preparing this article on Admiral Anderson.

Under unanimous consent I wish to insert this interview and an accompanying news story at this point:

NAVY FINDS YOUTH IDEALS WEAK

(The following is a transcript of an interview with Adm. George W. Anderson, Jr., chief of naval operations, by Herbert G. Klein, editor of the San Diego Union, and Brian Duff of the San Diego Union's Washington Bureau.)

Question. About this atomic task force, Admiral? Have you made a decision on which ocean it will be headquartered in?

Answer. Well, as you know, we have the nuclear-powered carrier *Enterprise* and the

nuclear-powered cruiser *Long Beach* in commission. We have coming into commission this year the destroyer leader, *Bainbridge*. These are all in the Atlantic and will temporarily remain in the Atlantic. We have nuclear-powered submarines in both oceans and will continue to have them in both oceans.

Question. Will you continue to emphasize nuclear carriers in the fleet or is the emphasis going to be transferred to submarines?

Answer. Our primary emphasis in nuclear propulsion is in submarines, both the attack submarine and the Polaris-type submarines. We have made considerable progress with the surface ships in the *Enterprise* and the *Long Beach*, and we hope we will have more nuclear-powered surface ships. When we will have funds for another nuclear-powered aircraft carrier remains to be seen.

EXPANSION STUDIED FOR POLARIS MISSILE

Question. What about some of the stories we've seen about the Navy's plans to put Polaris missiles on a wide variety of surface ships, including barges and that sort of thing?

Answer. We have many studies of the application of Polaris missiles to surface ships. So far, we are not translating any of these studies into construction programs.

Question. Do you think you may do that?

Answer. Not in the immediate future. We feel that the Polaris missile married to nuclear powered submarines is by far the greatest retaliatory weapons system in the world.

Question. Is the progress you've made with hunter-killer teams been as rapid as it has been with the submarine which can launch missiles and things of this sort? In other words, are we keeping pace in detection as well as in being able to hide a submarine?

Answer. Our progress in antisubmarine warfare leaves much to be desired. Considerable advances have been made in antisubmarine warfare since World War II. However, this is a real threat to the United States. We're working on it, but I certainly could not guarantee that all submarines that might launch missiles against the United States would be destroyed before their missiles were launched.

Question. Do you have reason to believe that the Russians are operating submarines off our coast?

Answer. From time to time we have indications that Russian submarines steam out on the high seas toward the east coast and the west coast. I do not believe that they are operating such submarines in large numbers at any given time.

RUSSIAN TRAWLERS BELIEVED SCIENTIFIC

Question. Would you say that their trawlers are an effective source of intelligence?

Answer. I think their trawlers are used for fishing and a great deal of oceanographic research. The Russians have traditionally been great scientific people and they have, we know, been conducting a great deal of oceanographic research. Obviously in doing so they observe everything they can see and record everything that they can hear.

Question. Admiral, what about the progress on the third-generation Polaris? How's that coming?

Answer. Progress is being made in the research phase.

Question. How far away is that missile?

Answer. A few years in an operational status.

Question. Would you say that the present Polaris submarines which are operational constitute a force which is as much a part of our defense now as the ICBM's that we have on land?

Answer. Oh, I believe it is a much more valued contribution to the U.S. deterrent posture and retaliatory posture at this time, much more valuable at this time.

UNITED STATES FAR AHEAD IN NUCLEAR SUBS

Question. I saw a clipping recently in which the Russians claim to have a superiority in nuclear submarines. Do you have any comments on the relative position of the submarine fleets of the nations?

Answer. The United States is far ahead in nuclear propelled submarines.

Question. Would you say it will continue to be for the next 5 to 10 years?

Answer. I certainly hope so; that depends on the funds that are made available to us by the Congress.

Question. There's been a lot of discussion about reservists recently. One ship of reservists sailed to the Pacific. Has the progress you've made with the reservists called up been sufficient to the point you think it is justified to continue that type of reserve program?

Answer. We have been very pleased with the magnificent response on our Naval Reserve to the recall to active duty. It has justified our faith in the reserve system, and I feel that these officers and men have made a valuable contribution, as the President stated, in preventing hostilities. They have acquired a great deal of training, and we hope that conditions will permit them to be released prior to the expiration of the full year. We hope, also, that, if some individuals desire voluntarily to stay on active duty, we may be able to utilize their services. But I think that our Naval Reserve and our Naval Air Reserve—and I know the Marines feel the same way about the Marine Reserve—are a fine system, and we contemplate no major changes.

Question. Do you contemplate calling up any additional Reserves in the foreseeable future?

Answer. Not under conditions as we see them developing.

PLANS FOR SEAPLANE ARE LAGGING

Question. Admiral, what are the Navy's plans for a new seaplane? Would you comment on what usage it could be put to and talk a little bit about seaplanes?

Answer. Well, the Navy would certainly like to include in its annual program the development of the seaplane. Unfortunately, we have so many requirements of what we consider higher priority that we have been unable to fund a new seaplane development for sometime. When we will be able to actually fund the development of a seaplane, I don't know. I don't see it in the immediate future.

Question. We're liable to have a deteriorating situation with seaplanes, aren't we, Admiral, with no new planes developed?

Answer. That is correct. We have as you know, considerable numbers of seaplanes that are available to us now. We have many of them laid up, for example, on North Island in a preserved status. Clearly they won't last forever. Also, we are not keeping pace with the art of airplane design in this particular field, but there just isn't enough money to do everything we would like to do.

Question. In the terms of manpower, Admiral, do you expect that the Navy will remain in its present size during the next year?

Answer. I would say approximately the present size according to present indications, that is, about 665,000 officers and men.

NO CHANGE IN SAN DIEGO STABILITY

Question. Do you expect your base in San Diego to remain stable?

Answer. Yes, I think it's going to remain just about as it has in the past. It may be necessary from time to time to move this ship to some other place or another ship from some other place to San Diego, but I see no significant changes in the San Diego picture. We are trying, as you know, to get as much stability throughout our whole system in personnel, location of our units as is possible. This makes for better business management, better personnel planning, higher morale, less disruption of programs, and greater economy.

Question. Has there been any discussion with you of the possibility of a tube or bridge in San Diego Bay between Coronado and the mainland?

Answer. Not with me.

Question. I've heard some suggestions that the Navy's training methods and facilities, because of funds again, perhaps are falling behind the equipment that you have to use these days. Does the Navy feel that this is a problem, and, if so, are they planning greater emphasis on training and training facilities?

Answer. I have just had a very comprehensive study made of the training problems within the Navy, specifically related to meeting the needs of our very complicated and sophisticated weapons systems. Obviously these weapons systems and other related equipments that we have pose a great challenge to our people. We do not have and probably will not have in times of peace the numbers of adequately experienced personnel to meet our hopes and aspirations. We must do the best we can with the people we have. We must improve our methods of training, we must improve our organization for training, we must exploit the talents of these youngsters we have in the service. You can take almost any organization that you will visit in the Navy today and you will find that the age of the enlisted man is in the low twenties. In some cases it may be even less than 20 years of age. This is a very difficult problem.

TOO MANY RECRUITS BELOW STANDARDS

Question. There's been a lot of discussion as to the physical and mental quality of young people coming into the service. Are they up to the standards that you feel that they should be?

Answer. I think that people who are familiar with the selective service process, the admission of recruits, would say that far too many young Americans cannot qualify physically or psychologically for military service. The lads we get, of course, run the full bracket of those who are the finest youngsters mentally, physically, psychologically that you will find in the United States down to the lowest limits that we can profitably use in the service. In many cases they're below that level. It's up to us, therefore, to train these people physically, mentally, morally, and to develop a motivation and a patriotism among these youngsters, which we are doing to the best of our ability. I think that the people of America must pay a great deal more attention to the mental, physical, and moral training of their sons and daughters. This is a serious problem.

Question. You mentioned patriotism. Do you find that the average young recruit understands the nature of the enemy?

Answer. To a very great degree, when they arrive in the military service, they do not understand the problems that this Nation faces in the world today. It is, therefore, up to us in the military to give them the type of training that they have to have to be good sailors, good soldiers, good airmen, good marines. This we are trying to do to the best of our ability. As a related matter, I feel that the communities in the United States have a tremendous responsibility to insure that in their school systems, in their churches, in the community life that these youngsters of America are taught the principles on which this country grew and prospered—love for their country, dedication, ideals—that frequently can be passed over in the rather hectic life that we lead today.

IMPROVED SHORE FACILITIES FACE WAIT

Question. On training, there has been the suggestion that because of the requirement to buy very expensive weapons and so forth, the Navy has necessarily put things off in the training program, such physical things like barracks, classrooms that are deteriorating, etc. Is that a problem, and will you have to spend more money?

Answer. It certainly is. It's a problem we're going to have to live with another year because, in the light of the situation which we face, I certainly feel and I know the Secretary of Defense feels, we've got to apportion funds to things that are most important to improve the readiness, to meet the critical period ahead. We know that there are many items desirable in improving our facilities, our buildings, ashore, but you can't take the buildings to sea and we just have to make do another year with pretty much what we've got coming up.

Question. Is the average age of our ships a question of danger to us? Are we building enough new ships?

Answer. We have not built enough ships, new ships, each year to take care of our numerical requirements before ships would become overage. Therefore, as you know, we have instituted fleet rehabilitation programs for various categories of ships—destroyers, amphibious ships, carriers—to modernize them, to get more life out of the old hulls and machinery. We're continuing this program; we must continue it. There's no alternative because of the very high unit cost of our ships.

Question. Admiral, as I recall, you were in command of, I believe they call it, Taiwan patrol.

Answers. When I went out there it was called the Formosa patrol force. Then in deference to the Chinese view of the name of the island they called Taiwan, it was changed to the Taiwan patrol force.

Question. This was a highly effective force in preventing the invasion of the offshore islands?

Answer. I certainly believe so.

USE OF SEAPOWER WON'T CHANGE

Question. More recently, you sent a fleet off the Dominican Republic as a protection. Do you expect, from looking at the various problems that this Nation faces in 1962, that there will in all probability have to be more use of the fleet in that way?

Answer. I would anticipate that the fleet will be used in many instances in its traditional role of showing its presence, preserving stability in an area, perhaps applying limited force in some situation, which we hope, of course, we won't have to do. But I think that the use of the U.S. Navy and the exercise of seapower will be just as important as it has been in the past, if not more so.

Question. And you are ready to put on pressure anytime you're called upon?

Answer. We are maintaining a fleet, you might say—we're not only maintaining a two-ocean Navy, we're maintaining a seven-seas Navy on which the sun does not set.

CNO SAYS NAVY MAY HAVE TO USE LIMITED FORCE

The Navy may have to use limited force some time this year at global trouble spots, Adm. George W. Anderson, Jr., predicted in an exclusive interview with the San Diego Union.

Herbert G. Klein, editor of the San Diego Union, and Brian Duff of this newspaper's Washington Bureau, recently ranged through a variety of seapower topics with the chief of naval operations in his Pentagon headquarters.

Anderson, the Navy's ranking admiral, is a member of the five-man Joint Chiefs of Staff which views American military strategy in all its scope.

Recalling that the Navy recently sent a protective task force into the waters of the Dominican Republic, the San Diego Union asked if the Navy foresees similar use of the fleet in 1962.

"I would anticipate that the fleet will be used in many instances in its traditional role of showing its presence, preserving stability in an area, perhaps applying limited force in some situation, which we hope of course we won't have to do," Anderson replied.

He also regarded the role of the Navy as possibly greater than even in 1962.

POLARIS MISSILE CALLED GREATEST DETERRENT

Anderson viewed the Polaris missile poised in its atomic submarine as far and away the greatest deterrent to a general war.

He said for the immediate future no surface launchers are contemplated and that the Navy will continue to keep Polaris hidden under the sea.

"We feel that the Polaris missile married to the nuclear-powered submarine is by far the greatest retaliatory weapons system in the world," Anderson phrased the Navy's position.

Under the Polaris concept stressed by Anderson, atomic submarines put out to sea from Scotland's Holy Loch, alternating with blue and gold crews for 60-day submerged patrols in the North Atlantic. Under radio silence, but in 24-hour touch with Washington and the news of the world, the Polaris submarines stand ready to strike back with thermonuclear warheads if America is brought under surprise attack.

"Would you say," Anderson was asked, "that the present Polaris submarines which are operational constitute a force which is as much a part of our defense now as the ICBM's (intercontinental ballistic missiles) that we have on land?"

"I believe it is a much more valued contribution to the United States deterrent posture and retaliatory posture at this time," Anderson replied, repeating for emphasis: "Much more valuable at this time."

In the interview that touched on the long-range stability of the naval installations in San Diego, the future of seaplanes, problems of trained manpower and aging warships, Anderson took up what he termed a "serious problem."

CONCERN FELT FOR UNQUALIFIED YOUTHS

The Armed Forces, he indicated, are concerned by their findings "that far too many young Americans cannot qualify physically or psychologically for military service."

Anderson, continuing, declared:

"I think that the people of America must pay a great deal more attention to the mental, physical, and moral training of their sons and daughters."

The chief of naval operations said the patriotic responsibility reaches into every school system, church, and community in the Nation.

For naval reservists called up in the Berlin crisis, Anderson had praise for their magnificent response.

"It has justified our faith in the Reserve system and I feel that these officers and men have made a valuable contribution, as the President has stated, in preventing hostilities."

Anderson hoped that an apparent improvement in world conditions will permit their early release and obviate the necessity for mobilizing additional Reserves.

Questioning Anderson on the Navy's future in San Diego, the San Diego Union got an assurance of continuing stability.

"I think it's going to remain just about as it has in the past," Anderson said. "It may be necessary from time to time to move this ship some other place, or another ship from some other place to San Diego, but I see no significant change in the San Diego picture."

The outlook for the seaplane was not so bright and San Diego could well have a stake in any Navy plans to order new ones. When Martin, maker of the Marlin P5M now operating out of North Island, withdrew from the airframe industry to concentrate on missiles in 1960, the seaplane field was left virtually to Convair, creator of the famed prewar and wartime PBY Catalina.

"Unfortunately," Anderson pointed out, "we have so many requirements of what we consider higher priority that we have been unable to fund a new seaplane development for some time.

"When we will be able to actually fund the development of a seaplane, I don't know. I don't see it in the immediate future."

Anderson conceded that the Navy faces a "deteriorating situation in seaplanes." Although considerable numbers are on hand at North Island, "they won't last forever."

Discussing fleet readiness Anderson said ". . . you might say we're not only maintaining a two-ocean Navy, we're maintaining a seven-seas Navy on which the sun never sets."

The People of Dallas County Are Firm Advocates of Fiscal Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it has always been a matter of great pride to me that I have the privilege to represent the Fifth District of Texas whose people are devoted to sound, constitutional government and fiscal responsibility. The people of Dallas County are firm believers in the great American traditions of individual freedom and initiative and commonsense which has brought our Nation to its present greatness. The attitude of the people of Dallas County is set forth in an able manner in the two editorials, which I herein insert, from recent issues of the Dallas Morning News and dealing with the President's fiscal proposals:

[From the Dallas News, Jan. 13, 1962]

KENNEDY PROGRAM IS MORE SPENDING

Of all comment my members of the Texas congressional delegation on President Kennedy's state of the Union message, that of Representative JOHN DOWDY, of Athens, was the most realistic. He simply asked, "Where's the money coming from?"

The President himself does not deny that adoption of his domestic economic program will call for a large increase in spending. For a number of years, the Government has been failing to balance the budget, even with present excessive tax rates.

Most of the President's proposals will call for additonal spending, not only for the next fiscal year but for years into the future.

The only answer to Representative DOWDY's question is higher taxation or continued deficit financing of the Federal Government with increasing national debt, now at an alltime high of more than $290 billion.

Clearly, the President's forceful leadership, as seen by Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH and some others, is based upon the alternative of tax and spend or borrow and spend as a basic national policy.

There are some, especially among the liberals, who defend this policy with the argument that the growing economy of the Nation, and tis attendant increase in wealth and income, will enable the Federal Govern-

ment eventually to make ends meet. There is little to support the argument. In recent years the wealth and income of the Nation have not increased as rapidly as national expenditures. There is little prospect of their doing so in the future.

Most important: Involvement in a world war would increase our national expenditures tremendously. Our Government has little financial reserve strength to meet such a contingency. Having a reserve to meet such an emergency is just as necessary in a preparedness program as is strength in submarines, airplanes, and nuclear weapons. We may see the day when Representative DOWDY's question is more pressing than it now is.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Jan. 18, 1962]

SECOND-RATE UNITED STATES?

Americans who are in a rosy glow over optimistic 1962 economic forecasts need to take another look at our world image. Any inclination to boast disappears in face of the declining status of the United States.

Western Europe has displaced the United States as No. 1 in monetary strength. Austerity in Britain, and the Common Market, with realistic fiscal policies in many nations on the continent, improved the gold position there. In contrast, U.S. gold stocks declined $6 billion in 4 years. Even worse is the decline in confidence in our dollar.

"Once the proudest of currencies, the greenback continued to deteriorate in 1961," says Barron's financial weekly. "The fault lies in the management of our fiscal affairs. Outsiders, for the last 3 years, with growing concern, have noted America's budgetary deficits, reserve shrinkage and gold drain. They see administration of palliatives, rather than cures; they see a nation which continues to spend beyond its means, at home and abroad."

As a center for world trade, too, Europe has replaced the United States. The realistic Japanese Trade Promotion Agency warned that Japan must gear its exports to the European Common Market. Diversify products meet the competition from Europe, industry was told.

To regain for the United States its former prestige, or even to hold our present secondary rank, Washington must take quick, drastic action. The situation calls for reduced spending, revised taxation of business, reduced, more realistic foreign aid, export-import policies adjusted to today's realities. Most of all, fiscal and monetary policies must be changed.

Many years of unsound trends will make the task difficult for Congress and the Kennedy administration. But there is no other way to prevent further descent toward disaster.

The President's budget message, going to Congress today, should be examined, evaluated and revised to restore first-rate status to the United States.

Ukrainian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, 44 years ago today a new republic was born on the Eurasian Continent. The shifts and tides of the First World War, combined with the final collapse of the decrepit czarist empire, gave the Ukrainian peoples the opportunity they had been awaiting for 250 years. On January 22, 1918, they announced their love of liberty and independence and established the Ukrainian National Republic. From its inception the valiant young Republic fought bravely against overwhelming odds. Powerful forces to the northeast were determined to trample this flower of liberty, blooming on the borders of the Russian totalitarian colossus. Finally in 1920 the stouthearted Ukrainians could hold out no longer and the Communist Russian Army swept in upon them. All freedoms of the Republic were wantonly suppressed and the nation became fused with the U.S.S.R.

Today there is no freedom in the Ukraine. But the just love of a brave people for their historic homeland cannot be crushed out of existence. Although 42 million Ukrainians are now called citizens of the Soviet Union, we must never forget that before all else they are the people of their land, which is the Ukraine. Terror and oppression cannot stamp out their love for independence. It can only inspire the noblest strivings for freedom. Truly, the Ukraine will live as long as mothers whisper to their sons, and men stand strong against tyranny. A nation like that can never die.

I am proud to have this opportunity to join loyal Americans of Ukrainian ancestry in this celebration of the 44th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day.

Sam Rayburn

SPEECH

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, it was only a short time ago—on June 12, 1961, to be exact—that it was my privilege to stand here to join with others to extend to our beloved Speaker SAM RAYBURN congratulations upon his having served longer as Speaker than any other of our distinguished Speakers. I am glad we had that opportunity to tell him personally how highly and how affectionately we regarded him. Our words then were "flowers for the living" and are more meaningful than anything I can say now.

And with the passing of this truly great statesman, his own words and deeds in his many years of service to God and country, are more meaningful than anything I can possibly say. As the minority whip it was my good fortune to work closely with him. While we were frequently on opposite sides of an issue, he always gave recognition, as our Speaker, to minority rights in the legislative process.

His place in history was attained long before he attained the distinction of having been Speaker longer than any other. Whether or not he ever became Speaker, he would have attained a place in history. His election to Speaker was merely recognition of the innate greateness of the man himself.

I am one of millions throughout the world that mourn his passing. But no one can more deeply feel this loss than I. My deepest sympathy to his family.

Why Nonpaying U.N. Members?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy has asked Congress to approve the purchase of $100 million in United Nations bonds, thus extending the concept of deficit financing to the world organization. It appears to me as though our effectiveness in securing world peace through the United Nations is decreasing while our financial contributions are being increased, even though the number of member nations has doubled since 1945. As we prepare to face this important issue, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a thoughtful editorial which recently appeared in the Davison, Mich., Index. I feel that it points out a view which should be taken into serious consideration.

The editorial follows:

WHY NONPAYING U.N. MEMBERS?

Should Congress approve U.S. purchase of up to half of a $200 million United Nations bond issue to keep that world organization solvent? President Kennedy thinks so—he said so late in December and repeated his request for such action again last Thursday as he addressed Congress in his annual state of the Union message.

As President Kennedy sees it, it is our duty to do this to keep the United Nations going. We cannot permit, he believes, the Communist bloc to destroy—either by political or financial means—this organization which has and continues to serve our national interest and the national interest of other U.N. members.

Several are opposing the President's proposal—and this includes both Republicans and Democrats—since already they have questioned U.S. contributions to the United Nations because of its stand on the Congo and India's invasion of Goa.

And Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Iowa Republican, has said Congress will insist on a justification for the request. "It should take a good look at any theory that we should 'bail out' the United Nations on an operation for which other nations will not pay their share," he insists.

HICKENLOOPER's stand is understandable. And other challengers of the legislation are certain to make themselves heard so long as the United States continues to make additional financial commitments to the United Nations while Russia and other U.N. members refuse to pay their assessments, especially on the Congo operations.

As one writer said recently: Something has got to give at the U.N. It is broke, yet it spreads its military wings (on credit) beyond the confines of its charter. Its forces—with the assistance of that one-time cham-

pion of freedom, the United States—marched against Katanga in violation of the U.N. commitment against intervention in any nation's domestic affairs and for the purpose of preventing self-determination of its people for freedom. As of now, this shameful action appears to have delivered Tshombe, his people, and his once orderly, industrious, and prosperous land over to Gizenga and his Communist-oriented Central Congolese Government. And, at the same time, the U.N. took no action against India's armed invasion and seizure of the four-and-a-half-century-old Portuguese state of India—otherwise known as Goa."

Katanga, in the eyes of the U.N., is guilty of seceding from a state it never joined. And Goa, whose elected representatives have sat in the Portuguese National Parliament since 1822, is convicted of the charge of being a colony.

And meanwhile talk continues that the U.N. might move out of the United States—land of one of the few paid-up members and one which has continuously put more into the kitty with a minimum of protest.

The present situation would seem to raise several questions. In most clubs, members are kicked out or denied the right to vote unless they keep their dues paid. If Russia, by protesting this U.N. action and that (and the Russian record in the U.N. is one long series of protests) fails to pay her dues, why isn't she denied the right to vote? Why does she continue to carry full voting rights with other nations which tax their people to keep their U.N. assessments paid in full?

Why not tell Russia to pick up her own tab? Right now U.N. delegates are teetering on the issue of admitting Red China to United Nations. There, if this game of "follow the leader" continues, would be another protesting, nonpaying member for the United States and the rest of the law-abiding, contract-respecting countries to support.

Why not give the U.N. a financial boost by insisting that every nation seated keep its assessments paid in full if it is to be allowed to vote?

Now back to the question of the bonds. When an organization is broke because so many of its members refuse to pay their assessments, is it logical to believe that these nonpaying members will buy up any of the emergency bond issue? Any bonds are as good as the organization behind them. How good will the U.N. bonds be? Will Uncle Sam buy up half of the $200 million bond issue, then guarantee to pay his country off when the bonds are due? And if he doesn't—who will?

Good Sense Takes Away a Crutch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times of January 24, 1962.

This is just one illustration of what good sense can do with governmental policies that have become outdated. President Kennedy is certainly exercising good sense by asking the Congress to remove the artificial—and unnecessary—support of silver.

The editorial follows:

LAST STOP FOR SILVER

Eight weeks ago President Kennedy went as far as he could go, on his own authority, to put an end to the silver myth. Now he has asked Congress to finish the job.

He has done so by proposing repeal of the historic statutory requirement that the Government buy, at a fixed price, all the newly mined domestic silver offered to it. Henceforth, Federal Reserve notes would gradually take the place of the silver certificates now in circulation. Silver would be used only for purposes of coinage—dimes, quarters, etc.

All this is a matter of sound commonsense. There was never any good reason for the gigantic purchases of silver which the Government was required to make. The ostensible reason for these purchases was the fictitious one that hoards of silver metal were needed to give our currency "a broader backing." The real reason, of course, was the desire of domestic mining interests to obtain higher prices for their silver, plus their ability to persuade Congress that this was a desirable field for legislation.

Now, fortunately for these same mining interests, new techniques and new industries have developed new uses for silver metal; demand is strong, and silver no longer needs the crutch of Government support. So everybody is happy, except perhaps the ghost of William Jennings Bryan.

Ukrainian Independence

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, during this week of January 22, millions of Ukrainians, as well as freedom-loving people everywhere, are celebrating the 44th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine.

In 1920 Soviet imperialism extinguished liberty and enslaved the people of the Republic of the Ukraine. But liberty, recognizing no boundaries, no race, no nation, and no master, could not be extinguished in the hearts of the people. Ukrainians have courageously maintained their goal of freedom and independence and are an inspiration to all of us.

They, unlike many freemen, recognize that colonialism, despite the vogue to think otherwise, is not a malignancy peculiar to western civilization. They, unlike many freemen, realize that Communist-dominated peoples are not immune to the spark of freedom that glows eternal in the human heart. They, unlike many freemen, know that there is nothing permanent nor inevitable about Communist colonialism except as complacent freemen make it so.

That is why we must continue to keep alive our contacts with the captive peoples, thereby encouraging internal pressure upon the regimes for domestic changes. The clear voice of liberty helps create conditions for a further growth of diversity in the monolithic Communist structure. Such diversity, increasingly visible with the passage of time, gradually cultivates the seeds of liberty and independence. And independence is a universal right as valid for Europe as for Africa and Asia.

Thus, in keeping faith with our best traditions, all Americans on this anniversary join in the prayer that the Ukrainians, as well as all captive peoples, will soon achieve liberty and independence.

Problems of Dairy Industry Affects Us All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, our Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman did an excellent job of outlining the current problems facing our dairy industry and how they affect the Nation as a whole when he spoke to the delegates to the National Conference on Milk and Nutrition on January 23. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include Secretary Freeman's speech in the RECORD:

SECRETARY FREEMAN OUTLINES DAIRY SITUATION AND ITS NATIONWIDE IMPLICATIONS

Abraham Lincoln, in recommending the Department of Agriculture be established, said it would be the department of the people. His words of 100 years ago were never more true than they are today. We are meeting here at a conference called to discuss a question in which the interest of all the people—the farmer, consumer, businessman, and worker—are closely entwined.

It is a question which began to be heard last spring when, for the first time, it was noticed that milk consumption on an overall basis was declining nationwide. By the end of the year, the trend was clearly established. The consumer had used about three billion pounds less of milk than in 1960.

And like all basic changes in our complex society, this one affects all the people—the farmer, consumer, businessman, and worker. It is important that we know why this happened and what its effect will be.

The dairy industry in the past decade has seen many changes, but the magnitude of this particular development was totally unexpected. Let us then stand back a step and take a careful look at what is taking place in the dairy industry and what it means.

Like all other farming occupations, dairying has undergone a quiet, but dramatic, revolution in the productive capacity of the individual farmer.

During the 5 years between 1954 and 1959, for example, 4 out of every 10 dairy farms ceased to operate as milk producers. Those farmers who remained in dairying, however, added one cow on the average for every three already in the herd. And, every one of those milk cows produced in 1959 a gallon and a half of milk for every gallon and a quarter in 1954.

Until 1961, the increase in population generally consumed the increase.

What has happened in the dairy industry is being repeated, of course, in the production of virtually every farm commodity. It

has meant that while 32 out of every 100 farmers left agriculture during the decade of the 1950's, output per hour of farm work has tripled.

As a result, with fewer people and fewer acres in production, the American farmer—spurred on by the new developments in technology and the discoveries of science—can actually produce more food and fiber than ever before.

The end is not even within sight. A study made recently by agricultural experts here in the Department predicts that by 1980, American agriculture will be able to meet all its commitments at home and abroad with 50 million fewer acres than are being cultivated today.

I believe most people would concede that under such conditions as have existed and will exist, the farmer is being subjected to unique economic pressures.

But in dairying, a third force has been added. Instead of a steady, gradual increase in consumption to be expected with a growing population, the total volume of milk and dairy products used by Americans has decreased this past year.

This development has implications far beyond the immediate economic effect on agriculture, on those who handle milk and dairy products and those who look to the dairy farmer as a market for production machinery and material.

Its most serious implication may well be in the long-term effect it can have on the health and vigor of the people and the Nation.

If there are times when it may appear that the Department is overly concerned with the economic prospects of the farmer, let it be understood that our responsibility is to the whole population, with strong emphasis on the problems of the farmers.

I am concerned when a new—and unexpected—development arises which will affect a complex industry. If this development brings a change which will benefit the Nation but requires an adjustment, then we should seek ways to make the adjustment with as litle disruption and dislocation as possible.

If, however, a development occurs for reasons which are not clearly established or for which there is no broad agreement scientifically, then I am concerned lest we force adjustments which we will later regret.

I am particularly concerned when anything as basic as nutritional health could be placed in potential jeopardy.

I am sure these are some of the questions which also trouble you, and I hope that through this conference today we can begin to explore them and to direct wider public attention to them.

Let me outline in brief some of the specific areas of concern.

First, we have become extremely weight conscious in this country in recent years. If the drop in milk consumption is related to this question, we ought to be greatly concerned. Weight control involves the extent to which we use our muscles as well as the amount of food we eat. Food alone should not be expected to carry the entire burden. Insofar as we reduce calorie intake, it should be of foods important chiefly for calories—not of foods that carry indispensable proteins, minerals and vitamins. The American people should not make wrong changes in their dietary habits to prevent or cure obesity.

Nutritional authorities tell us that we need to know much more than we do today about the place of butter and other kinds of fat in meeting the nutritional needs of people. They also tell us that there should be no drastic modification in diets until nutritional research can point the way with more certainty and in more detail. We know that extremes in amount used of any one kind of food may lead to trouble. Moderation and variety are two words to remember in thinking about the relationship of diet and long-term well-being.

Unquestionably, there are many people who, on competent medical advice, must certainly follow special diets. But there are countless others—both young and old—who now do not receive adequate nutrition, particularly those essential building blocks of life for which milk is the best and most convenient source. Infants and growing children especially need milk and dairy products in their diet because of the large amounts of calcium and high-quality protein required to keep up with the growth needs.

Milk contains three important nutrients—calcium, riboflavin, and protein, in addition to other essential food elements—which people get too little of for their best nutritional health, and usually because they do not get enough milk.

In fact, milk makes it easy to get the calcium and riboflavin we need. In this Nation's food supplies, milk provides about two-thirds of all the calcium, nearly half of the riboflavin and a fourth of the protein.

Another reason that milk is a necessary food source is that it contains many different nutrients in highly beneficial balance which meet one of the basic requirements of good health. The nutrients work together efficiently to meet the body's needs.

The decline in milk consumption last year was small when compared with the total supply of milk—barely 2.5 percent. But coming at a time when it is known that milk and dairy products help fill essential nutritional needs, I think everybody should be concerned.

The second area of concern relates to the basic responsibility of the Department to the generations of the future—to insure the productive capability of our farming resources and to provide adequate food at reasonable cost.

The soil and water resources of this Nation, together with the most efficient system of agriculture history has yet known—the family farm—have helped make the American the best-nourished person of all time.

The dairy industry has a vital share in the mission of American agriculture, for dairy products are a dependable and economical source of good nutrition.

The dairy farm is an exceptionally efficient means of utilizing soil and water resources to meet human needs. The dairy cow can crop the land that is too steep, too soft, too irregular for the plow and combine. Grassland agriculture yields abundant harvests of meat and milk, without the cost to the future of erosion and soil exhaustion.

The dairy industry—from farm and barn to grocery shelf and the kitchen refrigerator—performs an industrial and economic miracle. It furnishes consumers with basic food products that are highly perishable, yet reach the consumer fresh and pure and at moderate cost.

It encompasses more independent and competing enterprises than any other single industry in our economy. There are about 1 million farmers who sell milk, and over 400,000 of them receive more than half their income from dairying. Cash receipts from dairying last year were almost $5 billion. The processing and handling of dairy products before they reach the retail level provides jobs for almost 300,000 persons with an annual payroll of more than $1.3 billion.

The dairy industry is a worthy example of American agriculture, and it should be maintained and strengthened. Thus, anything which may cause it to change should be considered seriously and with cold logic, for it is a vital and highly integrated part of our national economy.

If its products endanger national health, then we should not be afraid to face that fact and the adjustments it entails; but we should not be so fearful of the unknown that we hasten to make a change which in itself may damage the physical health of our people and the economic health of the Nation.

I believe the industry already recognizes that the impact of science and technology on dairying has created a situation where the dairy farmer receives less for his investment and labor than do most other agricultural producers. For example, the return per hour of work for the operator and his family in 1960 in the major dairy regions of the country varies from less than 50 cents an hour to no higher than 67 cents.

There is a growing realization that the adjustment which will provide greater economic reward, while reducing Government expenditures to stabilize milk prices, is a program of supply management.

Thus, the industry is willing to consider changes which will improve the economic health of their industry and their community, and which will insure an adequate supply of milk and dairy products while reducing the cost of Government programs.

But, given the weight of all available evidence as to the nutritional needs of the American people, the adjustments which may be required by the current drop in consumption and the increasing productive capacity must include vigorous efforts to encourage the use of milk in the interest of good and balanced nutrition for our population.

That also is the purpose of this conference—to explore the opportunities which our abundance of milk and dairy products gives to us to raise our dietary standards, and to improve the health and vitality of our people.

I can only underscore the importance of the task you will soon undertake by saying that your concern as well as mine is shared by the President. He has felt this strongly, and we are honored that he would come personally to be with us and to speak to us.

With his leadership, we can, I believe, begin to place many of the forces now affecting the health of our people as well as the economic future of dairying in a much clearer perspective.

We Can't Win the War Against Communism by Backing Neutrals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by Ken Thompson, editorial writer of the Dallas Morning News, Dallas, Tex., clearly depicts the weakness of our foreign policy which seeks to build a strong defense against the Communist conspiracy through support of the so-called neutrals and uncommitted nations. This policy is failing and will, if we continue to pursue it, will lead, as so well stated in this article, to disaster for us and the free world.

The article follows:

BACKING NEUTRALS BRINGS DISASTER

(By Ken Thompson)

Month after month, during the last year, the West has been losing its war to save the tiny southeast Asian kingdom of Laos. At this late date, the prospects are so dim that we might as well throw in the towel, shoring

up our defenses elsewhere to prevent further Communist gains inthis critically important area of the world.

There were times when we might have saved Laos, and we were told as much by President Kennedy last March. But for a lack of courage and a firm policy, the President's pledge to defend the pro-Western government against the increasing threat of Russian- and Chinese-armed local Communist forces, the Pathet Lao, might have been carried out with success. Now it probably is too late. The only consolation we can hope to extract from the experience before the end comes is that again we have learned a lesson.

That lesson is important: Our efforts to steer a middle course in Laos—as our efforts to do the same in other areas of the world—have resulted in total defeat. If this lesson were to prove decisive in President Kennedy's education process, the loss of Laos might even be worth it. Unfortunately, there seems to have been no dent made, for the United States is pursuing a policy in the Congo which is almost identical to the policy it pursued in Laos.

Let's take a quick look at just what that policy was.

There have been three factions at war in Laos, each represented or directed by one of the three princes. Prince Boun Oum represents the strong pro-West, anti-Communist faction as premier of the royal government which is still in power, but not for long. Prince Souphanouvong is leader of the Red Pathet Lao, which is militantly anti-West and has been trying to bring down Boun Oum's government. Standing somewhere in the middle, but considerably closer to the left, is Prince Souvanna Phouma, the neutral half brother of Souphanouvong.

One would think that the State Department and President Kennedy, who represent the West, would have an easy matter of choosing between these three. The choice, logically, would be Boun Oum. But no. Having become accustomed to steering a course down the middle of the cold-war road, they spotted the neutral, and decided that here was where the interests of the West would best be served.

It should be pointed out quickly, lest we be accused of misrepresenting the situation, that, of course, the United States has been backing the pro-West government of Boun Oum. We have poured many millions into his economy and military establishment. But at the same time, we have failed to take strong enough measures to insure his victory; and, as it has become increasingly evident that without this help he is not going to prevail, our diplomatic policy has moved gradually toward the neutralist faction.

That move is now complete. Last month the United States agreed, with Russia and Red China at a Geneva conference, that it would back a coalition government with Souvanna Phouma at its head. This amounted to an acceptance of Communist rule in Laos, for the neutral prince, by this time, had moved all but into the Pathet Lao camp. The Geneva settlement was justified on the basis that this was the best we could get.

Last week the fate of Boun Oum's pro-West government was sealed by the State Department. Following Boun Oum's refusal to go along with the terms proposed for a neutralist coalition government, the United States suspended its January payment of aid to Boun Oum and threw his government deeper into economic chaos. Boun Oum had been holding out for the defense and interior ministries in a 16-man cabinet for the coalition government, a condition he might well have won had the Washington strategists not stepped in.

The withdrawal of aid, however, effectively pulled the rug out from under him and forced him to agree to meet with the other princes on a settlement—one which will most likely give the two key ministry posts to the neutralists or Communists.

This pressure, Boun Oum cried, was "intolerable." And it was. We may have poured too much money down a rat hole in Laos already, and perhaps we could never have won a victory for the West there; but having gone so far, it was an act of treachery to undermine our best ally and only hope in such a manner.

By this time, the similarity between our actions in Laos and the Congo should be clear. In the Congo we also faced a three-man, three-faction situation. Our choice there, as in Laos, has been to pin our hopes on the neutral or middle faction.

Rather than lending support to the strong pro-West anti-Communist Tshombe, or staying out of the conflict entirely—which might have been our best gamble—we have worked through the United Nations to undermine the Kantangan leader and to strengthen the hand of Adoula's shaky, suspect central government. There may still be greater hope for the Congo than there is for Laos, but we have aided and abetted the goals of the Communists by our actions in both countries.

As clear and unmistakable as our failures in Laos and the Congo have been, they are not the only lessons from which we have had an opportunity to learn the folly of taking the middle road.

In such a manner have we lost much of the free world to communism. And in such a manner will we lose more unless we wake up and reverse our whole outlook toward the cold war in which we are now engaged.

How many more countries will go down the drain before this change is made? How many more neutrals will we back, and how many times will they have to side with the Communists before we realize that the policy of courting the neutrals is the surest road to disaster?

Keep 'Em Flying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, historically, I have been sympathetic to the problems of organized labor. More often than not I have been convinced that the employer always has a little bit of the better going for him.

But when national defense, national interest and continued employment of our people are concerned I adopt a more realistic attitude.

Several days ago, Mr. Speaker, our country was threatened by a strike against Pan American World Airways and, a few days later, against Trans World Airlines by the Air Line Pilots' Association. The fact that these strikes did not materialize is immaterial. The important consideration is that they are ever imminent until rational thinkers on both sides evolve a formula—satisfactory to all—that is in keeping with recommendations made by the Feinsinger Commission appointed by President Kennedy.

The carriers are agreeable; the flight engineers have found the findings acceptable. It now remains for the pilots to become reasonable and keep our international airlines flying, in competition with the government-owned and highly subsidized opposition they face from abroad.

Mr. Speaker, the New York Mirror recently published an editorial on this subject and, under unanimous consent, I include it in the RECORD at this point:

NO ONE CAN AFFORD THIS

About the ugliest and silliest thing that could happen to our oversea airlines operations would be the pilots' strike that threatens Pan American World Airways and Trans-World Airlines.

If no agreement has been reached beforehand, Pan Am pilots will be free to strike after midnight Tuesday; TWA pilots after midnight next Sunday. Contracts have expired and a 30-day cooling-off period under Labor Railway Act procedures will have run out.

The key issue involved is a jurisdictional fight between the Airline Pilots Association and the Flight Engineers International Association, both trade unions, over the third man in the cockpit.

The pilots refuse to operate jet aircraft with a professional flight engineer at the engineer's station in the cockpit unless a third pilot, not required by Federal Aviation Agency regulations, also is carried as a member of the crew.

In the case of Pan Am, both the company and the engineers have agreed to accept settlement recommendations of the Feinsinger Commission appointed by President Kennedy. The President has termed the recommendations, "fair and equitable."

The pilots have not. In addition, demands for wage increases and fewer hours would double the present pilot payroll of $27 million.

This at a time when U.S. flag carriers are falling behind foreign lines in North Atlantic air traffic and when all business is urged by the President to redress our imbalance of payments in international trade and stop the drain of gold away from this country.

Our admiration for the skill of U.S. jet pilots is boundless. They should be well paid. The average for Pan Am pilots in 1960 was $18,000 a year for 54 hours a month; more than 100 had compensation of $30,000. But if our costs price U.S. lines out of competition with low-wage, government-subsidized foreign carriers, all our airline workers and the country itself will suffer.

No one, including the pilots, can afford the threatened strike.

Hon. Andrew F. Schoeppel

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I join in paying tribute to the memory of ANDREW SCHOEPPEL, the distinguished Senator from Kansas, whose death yesterday saddened all of us who were privileged to know this generous, warmhearted American.

Kansas has lost one of its most devoted public servants and the Nation has lost one of its most conscientious and able legislators. His long service to the people of his State, in local and State government, culminating in his election as Governor of Kansas, and his dedication to the public interest as a U.S. Sen-

ator, constitute a remarkable record of devotion to the welfare of the land he loved.

It was my privilege to come to know "ANDY" SCHOEPPEL well over the years of our service together in the Congress and I feel a deep sense of personal loss at the news of his passing. Mrs. Byrnes joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Schoeppel in her hour of sorrow.

I Vote To Deny the Use of the U.S. Postal Service for the Carriage of Communist Political Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, first I wish to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] for authoring the bill, H.R. 9004, designed to deny the use of the U.S. postal service for the carriage of Communist political propaganda, the text of which bill has been adopted by the distinguished chairman of our House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], who is the author of the Murray amendment which I voted for.

A reason I voted for the Murray amendment to raise postal rates, as specified in H.R. 7927, primarily in order to create more revenue to the Treasury of the United States and more nearly make the operations of the Post Office Department self-supporting and to eliminate a huge portion of the subsidies to certain classes of mail poundage by the taxpayers of the United States, was because the language of the proposal by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] became an integral portion of the Murray amendment.

A few years ago I was a member of a subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities which held hearings at two of the ports of entry to the United States and there heard evidence and saw exhibits of the sort of junk mail and subversive mail which was coming into our ports free and without charge for distribution thereof through our mail-handling arrangements. Such mail entered the two ports we visited by the hundreds of tons any given year, and there were 10 times as many other ports of entry through which this same despicable subversive mail was freely coming. Even though the Post Office Department representatives who met with us, and advised us, were doing some sort of a job at the time to try to meet this problem, we recognized it was not sufficient.

Granting that there will be additional administrative problems and costs to put in place and in full force and effect this amendment to section 505 of title 39, United States Code, I express my vigorous hope that the Attorney General of the United States and his aides and the U.S. postal service shall be given sufficient funds and personnel to make this international subversive-mail campaign by Soviet Russia and her satellites effective in the substantial reduction, and I hope elimination, of such distribution within our borders.

Here is the text of the Cunningham amendment which was incorporated by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee in his amendment:

In furtherance of this authority to counteract adverse usage of the mails and to reduce the domestic postal deficit, no international mail-handling arrangement, under which any postal rate, whether or not reciprocal, is established, shall permit the receipt, handling, transport, or delivery by the U.S. Post Office Department of mail matter determined by the Attorney General to be Communist political propaganda.

I compliment the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, in thus incorporating it.

The Simple Answer to the Cold War Is To Win It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, as the administration continues to follow its inept foreign policy which presents an image of the United States as a weak and indecisive nation, it may be well to ponder the truth in the following editorial from the Dallas Times Herald. As the editorial points out, we will either win in South Vietnam or we will be beaten. This is also true everywhere else in the world.

The article follows:

RED BUILDUP IN SOUTH VIETNAM POSES CHOICE: WIN OR BE BEATEN

The buildup of Red guerrilla forces in South Vietnam underscores once more the fact that we can't trust the Communists.

We can't trust them. We can't deal with them. We can't make a bargain with them and expect them to keep it.

We either must beat them or expect to be beaten by them—in one all-out effort or piecemeal.

The Communist buildup in South Vietnam now has reached huge proportions, according to Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara.

These Red guerrilla forces are in South Vietnam for one purpose—to overthrow the Government of that country and take over the entire area for the Communists.

Our own Government apparently has recognized that we cannot afford to lose South Vietnam, for with it would go most of southeast Asia. President Kennedy, in his state of the Union message, indicated that we will oppose the Reds in South Vietnam with force if necessary.

Too many Americans, looking at South Vietnam, recognize that it is a long way off and is considerably different from what we are accustomed to in this country.

Too many are inclined to sit quietly while the Reds gobble up another small nation, as they did North Vietnam, as they are gobbling up Laos, as they have done elsewhere. Too many are inclined to think saving South Vietnam—or any other country—might not be worth the effort required for as long as it would take to do the job. Too many are willing to listen to a scheme for peaceful coexistence.

A plan for peaceful coexistence might be put into effect. It might even work for a very short time. It would give the Reds time to build up their forces even more.

Peaceful coexistence, to the Reds, is no live-and-let-live proposition. It is a proposition of live—but only on Red terms.

That's the problem we face in the big Red buildup in South Vietnam.

Resolutions Passed by the 46th General Assembly of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most active and responsible religious organizations in America today is the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. At its 46th general assembly, held in Washington, November 11–16, 1961, the resolutions contained in the statement below were adopted.

The scope of these resolutions is clear evidence of the concern and interest with which the UAHC views American life and our social, economic, and political institutions. I commend them to the interest of our colleagues:

RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY THE 46TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY, UNION OF AMERICAN HEBREW CONGREGATIONS

I. THE RELIGIOUS ACTION CENTER AND ITS OPERATION

We are the inheritors of the great Jewish religious tradition which has as its ultimate goal the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth. The God whom we serve is a God of righteousness who would have us be holy as He is holy. The Torah we cherish is a comprehensive guide for spiritual living concerned with every aspect of human behavior. The prophets of Israel, dedicated to God and their fellow men, bade us pursue justice, seek peace, and establish brotherhood and loving kindness among all of God's creatures.

Judaism commands constant application of the sharp ethical insights of the prophets to the specific social problems of our time, as well as to our daily lives. Since its inception in 1873, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations has been committed to the mission of building a society based on social justice and divine mercy.

To effectuate these religious aims, the UAHC joined with the CCAR in 1949 in establishing a Commission on Social Action, which relates the ethical and spiritual teachings of our faith to the concrete problems of our congregations, our communities, our country, and the world. The Commission on Social Action, now a joint instrumentality of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, the Central Conference of American Rabbis, the National Federations of Temple Sisterhoods and Brotherhoods and Youth, has urged the creation and development of social action (or community affairs) committees which now exist in some 300 reform synagogues.

To strengthen our social action program, the 45th General Assembly of the UAHC,

meeting in Miami Beach in November 1959, voted overwhelmingly to accept the generous gift of Mr. and Mrs. Kivie Kaplan to provide for a Center for Religious Action in Washington, D.C.

Many Christian groups, both Protestant and Roman Catholic, have long maintained social action offices in the Nation's Capital. These bodies have hailed the establishment of our center as an opportunity to consult and cooperate in Washington with their counterparts in the Jewish religious agencies on the great moral issues which face the Nation and the world.

The 46th General Assembly of the UAHC herewith declares:

1. We commend the Commission on Social Action for its creative programing, for providing moral leadership and guidance to the reform movement, and for strengthening the hands of the rabbis in quickening the social idealism of reform Jews.

2. We urge that the decision of the 45th General Assembly of the UAHC in November 1959, concerning the establishment of a Center for Religious Action, be carried into effect as promptly as possible.

3. To assure the increasing effectiveness of the social action program, and at the same time to continue to safeguard congregational autonomy and the right of dissent, we affirm these guiding principles:

(a) The Center for Religious Action is an agency of the Commission on Social Action and is to function under the direct supervision and control of the Commission on Social Action.

(b) The Commission on Social Action, as heretofore, will concern itself with those subjects which fall within the scope of resolutions adopted by both the General Assembly of the UAHC and the Convention of the CCAR. Statements will be made in the name of the commission and not in the name of the Center for Religious Action.

(c) Public statements shall reflect points of view and programs adopted by a majority of the delegates of Reform synagogues at biennial assemblies of the UAHC. Such pronouncements, resolutions, and others actions of the general assemblies have, in the nature of the case, the status and weight of being neither more nor less than the corporate decisions of such a representative assembly. They are useful to the extent that they serve as a moral guide to our congregations and their members, to the Nation, and to the world. Such statements speak for the UAHC. They are not binding upon every Reform synagogue, each of which is autonomous, or upon every member of a Reform congregation. Every congregation and every member has the right and the duty to express conscientious dissent within the framework of our common commitment to Reform Judaism and to one another.

4. Social Action will succeed to the extent that in our synagogues, individually and collectively, we have the understanding and the daring to make Judaism relevant to the great issues of our time.

We, therefore, call upon every reform synagogue which has not yet done so, to speedily create a committee on social action or community affairs. The historic imperatives of our faith, the insistent moral challenge of the contemporary world and the ethical commitments of our own beloved America—all combine with fresh urgency to enjoin us to "do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with our God."

5. In order to implement and amplify these principles, be it resolved that:

(a) The religious action center shall service the social action committees of the UAHC congregations, its national affiliates, federations, and regional councils, along with their rabbis, sisterhoods, brotherhoods, youth groups, educators, and administrators.

(b) The service generally shall consist of furnishing informational materials about subjects best researched in Washington; suggestions regarding education of, and action which might be taken by, local, regional, and national social action committees; sponsor seminar workshops, pilgrimages and gatherings for youth and adult leaders of reform synagogue bodies; establish and maintain a library. As occasion may require, representatives may appear before congressional committees or other governmental bodies, but, in such event, only in the name of the social action commission and subject to all other regulations governing the religious action center and the social action commission. The foregoing shall not be considered to exclude other undertakings within the purview of actions taken by both the UAHC biennials and the conference of the CCAR.

(c)(1) There shall be established an advisory committee of six persons, which committee shall be charged with the responsibility of counseling and guiding the staff of the center in connection with its operations. The said committee shall be a subcommittee of the joint commission on social action. Three of the members of said committee shall represent the UAHC and their appointment shall be by the chairman of the board of the UAHC and three of the members shall represent the CCAR and their appointment shall be by the president of the CCAR.

(2) The advisory committee will consent with, and advise, the director in developing the program of the center. In connection with testimony before congresional committees or governmental departments where a public record is to be made, the director of the center shall consult with the advisory committee except that in the case of emergencies, consultation with the chairman shall be deemed sufficient.

(3) Public pronouncements shall be made only in the name of the social action commission of the union and the central conference of American rabbis, and shall be confined to resolutions previously adopted by or actions taken at both the UAHC biennials and CCAR conventions.

It is the confident belief of this 46th general assembly of the UAHC that these principles will enable the commission on social action and its Washington center to make an even greater contribution to reform Judiasm to America, and to our sacred mission.

II. HARASSMENT OF JEWISH LEADERS BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

The 46th general assembly of the UAHC is profoundly troubled by the steadily mounting harassment of Jewish leaders in the U.S.S.R. The recent arrests, secret trials, and convictions of these leaders in Leningrad and Moscow on the ground of "contact with foreign powers" clearly indicates the avowed intention of Soviet authorities to seal off its Jewish community from any relationship with their coreligionists throughout the world and to liquidate their spiritual and cultural resources.

We call upon the board of trustees and the commission on social action to make careful inquiry into the total problem and to take such steps, in cooperation with Jewish and other agencies, as well ameliorate the situation of Soviet Jewry.

III. GOVERNMENTAL AID TO PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS

The Union of American Hebrew Congregations has always been deeply committed to the principle of the separation of church and state, which has safeguarded religious liberty for all men in this free land.

The devotion of our union to the separation of religion and the state, and our equally deep commitment to public education as a cornerstone of the American democratic process, impel us at this 46th biennial assembly to reaffirm our opposition to any form of governmental aid to elementary and secondary schools under the supervision or control of any religious denomination or sect—Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish.

Our opposition to such governmental grants, loans, and other forms of fiscal aid to parochial schools does not imply any lack of regard or respect for religiously sponsored institutions of education. We respect the right of any religious denomination to establish and administer its own educational institutions. We applaud their contributions to the cultural and spiritual diversity of our Nation, and we urge those religious groups which have parochial schools to continue to support them without passing this responsibility onto the Government.

IV. A THREAT TO AMERICAN LIBERTIES

We view with increasing concern the growth and militance of ultra-right-wing organizations in the United States whose propaganda is antidemocratic and whose techniques of infiltration and slander are calculated to set group against group, neighbor against neighbor. At this time of grave international tension, when the American way of life is seriously threatened, our security rests in large measure on the maintenance of our rights and the guarantee of liberty and justice for all regardless of race or creed. We are fearful that rational discussion is being corrupted by the hatred and fear fomented by ultra-right-wing groups which exploit cold-war anxieties and the frictions engendered by integration and other social problems.

The most prominent of these groups, the John Birch Society, impugns the integrity and patriotism of such reputable organizations as the National Council of Churches of Christ, and such leaders of the Nation as former President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and Chief Justice Warren. It denounces the U.S. membership in the United Nations, the International Labor Organization, the World Health Organization; and attacks NATO, all foreign aid, social security, the graduated income tax, and integration. Groups such as the John Birch Society and the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade include powerful political figures, are well endowed, and exert influence on local and national levels. In the guise of anticommunism, they weaken America by stirring division and hysteria.

The democratic process requires the interaction of responsible conservatism and equally responsible liberalism, but may be endangered by political pressure groups which, in the words of Isaiah, "call evil good, and good evil, that change darkness into light, and light into darkness." To curtail their right to organize and speak out would constitute a violation of constitutional liberties, and an even greater danger to the democratic system. Our best defense lies in exposure, counterpropaganda, vigilance, and, above all, in the implementation of democratic freedoms in every area of life.

This applies with equal validity to those on the left who would subvert the American way. It is in this spirit that we refer to the House Committee on Un-American Activities. We do not question the inherent right of the Congress to investigate; we do denounce the abuse of such power. In the tradition of our faith, which gave to the world the concept of the sanctity and dignity of the individual and has always taught that respect for the rights of all men is each man's duty to God, we are duty bound to oppose a committee which has consistently disregarded human dignity by vilifying citizens and institutions, even such respected ones as the National Council of Churches of Christ, Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, Rev. John Haynes Holmes, and, posthumously, Rabbis Judah L. Magnes and Stephen S. Wise—to name but a few.

We recognize the necessity of protecting our country against criminal acts threatening its security. We are convinced, however, that the executive branch of our Government has both the authority and the facilities to investigate acts of criminal sabotage whether by the radical right or left and that the judicial branch is equally competent to determine the guilt or innocence of persons accused of such crimes under constitutional safeguards. Self-respect as human beings concerned for our country's welfare, and the imperatives of our faith as Jews, compel us to implore the House Committee on Un-American Activities on all occasions to permit men the constitutional right to speak out, to associate, and to differ without fear.

V. WORLD PEACE

The prophets of Israel first gave the world the vision of universal peace. This vision has become a stark necessity if mankind is to survive in this age of unimaginable weapons. Despite the darkening shadows and the mounting dangers of our time, we reaffirm our undimmed faith in man's capacity to establish God's kingdom on earth. True to the optimistic spirit of Judaism, we refuse to accept defeatism, to subside into numb resignation. Rather, we pledge ourselves anew to the most urgent religious challenge on the agenda of mankind: To achieve a just and enduring peace.

Accordingly, we:

1. Deeply deplore the resumption by the U.S.S.R. of nuclear testing in the atmosphere. The leaders of the Soviet Union have demonstrated a contempt for the opinions of mankind, a callous disregard for the health of generations not yet born, and a brutal effort to intimidate governments and peoples through sheer terror.

2. Commend our Government for its policy of restraint in regard to nuclear testing in the atmosphere. We warmly endorse the statement of President Kennedy that the United States will never resort to nuclear testing in the atmosphere for psychological reasons or political expediency.

3. Rededicate ourselves to join hands with other religious groups in preserving and strengthening the United Nations. The world body has been gravely weakened by the death of Dag Hammarskjold and by the damage inflicted by the Communist bloc abroad and the extreme right in the United States. Men of good will, of all faiths, must rally to keep alive the vision of a world of law and justice.

4. Commend the United States and Canada for intensified efforts to achieve universal, enforcible disarmament and urge that all such efforts be carried forward with the greatest of urgency and imagination. In this regard, we express gratification that the U.S. Congress has established an Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to augment and accelerate studies and planning in this field.

5. Pledge our support to the United Nations program of "Freedom From Hunger," which is designed to enlist the moral resources of the world behind a program to alleviate hunger which now shadows and haunts the lives of two-thirds of the people of the world.

6. Commend the President of the United States on the establishment of the Peace Corps, which is an act of vision and faith worthy of the ideals of the United States of America.

7. Pledge ourselves to study the problems threatening world peace and to seek, in all ways possible, to translate religious principles into concrete action.

VI. ACHIEVING EQUALITY UNDER THE LAW

The Union of American Hebrew Congregations has consistently opposed all forms of racial segregation because of our fundamental belief in the equality of all men under God. We have joined with all Americans of good will in continuing efforts to vindicate in every section of our land the American dream of human equality.

Recognizing that there are many approaches to the safeguarding of equal protection under law, we salute the men and women of various faiths and races who have risked their freedom and their personal safety to assert through direct, nonviolent action the equal dignity of every American under the law.

We are also deeply heartened by the significant forward strides taken in recent months by such communities as Atlanta, Memphis, and Dallas. We commend those public authorities and religious leaders in these and other cities who have courageously guided their communities through a peaceful transition and helped them to meet the moral challenge of desegregation with dignity and respect for law and order.

There are positive indications of our increased determination as a Nation to eradicate the barriers of segregation which still divide Americans from each other. The firmness of the Federal courts, the vigor of the U.S. Justice Department in defense of equal rights, the fresh initiatives being undertaken by the President in the exercise of moral and executive leadership, the strengthened program of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunities and other governmental agencies, and the spread of needed antidiscrimination laws to a large number of States and communities—all these are earnests of progress and expressions of a national will.

We especially hail the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, whose recent milestone reports have charted the urgent, unfinished business which remains in extending to every American the full measure of his dignity and rights as an American citizen. We associate ourselves with the Commission's plea for new Federal legislation to safeguard equality of opportunity for all Americans in education, housing, employment, and the right to vote.

Specifically, we support the Commission's recommendations that (1) effective legislation be enacted by the Congress to assure the right to vote to all Americans, thus ending the abuse of such devices as literacy tests to support racial discrimination; and (2) the President of the United States issue an Executive order stating the national objective of equal opportunity in housing and directing all Federal agencies to shape their policies and practices to this goal; and that this order apply to, among other agencies, the Federal Housing Authority, Veterans' Administration, Federal National Mortgage Association, and those agencies supervising financial institutions engaged in home mortgage loan business.

Gratifying as is the progress of recent years, we are painfully aware of the long climb which stretches ahead of us as a Nation. Our next biennial will take place in 1963—100 years after the Emancipation Proclamation. We are humbled by the knowledge that if democracy cannot end segregation, segregation may end democracy. We pledge ourselves, as individual Americans and as inheritors of the dream of one brotherhood under one God, to be as zealous for the dignity and rights of our neighbors as we would have them be of ours.

We appeal to our own members and congregations, as to all men and women of good will, to redouble their efforts toward the elimination of all forms of racial injustice and to strive unceasingly to complete the mission of equal rights and full opportunities under the law.

VII. JEWISH EDUCATION

Whereas the president of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations has recommended that we reaffirm the aims and purposes of the Commission on Jewish Education: be it

Resolved, That: 1. We call upon all our constituent congregations immediately to institute a searching inventory of their educational programs in their pursuit of: More extended periods of instruction in the religious schools; more intensive training in our historic and holy tongue; and more and better teacher training programs in the establishment of criteria of Jewish knowledge for contemporary Jewish leadership and in the increase and intensification of programs of adult Jewish education. The survey should further explore what, if any, requisites in this field should be deemed necessary for congregational leaders.

2. We urge that the Commission on Jewish Education be encouraged and strengthened in its efforts to develop higher standards of meaningful Jewish literacy for our children, youth, and adults.

3. We urge that every effort be made by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, in cooperation with other national organizations of Jewish education, to attract and train men and women for the career of religious school educators.

VIII. RELIGION IN PUBLIC EDUCATION

We reaffirm the positions jointly set forth by the Synagogue Council of America and the National Community Relations Advisory Council, to both of which organizations the Union of American Hebrew Congregations belongs, in their document entitled "Safeguarding Religious Liberty." We continue to cherish the conviction that the maintenance and furtherance of religion are the responsibility of the synagogue, the church, and the home, and not of any agency of Government, including the public schools.

For this reason, we continue to believe that religious practices, such as Bible reading, prayer, singing of hymns, religious holiday observances, and baccalaureate exercises, do not belong in public education.

A vigilant maintenance of church-state separation is the best safeguard of religious liberty for all Americans.

IX. A SURVEY OF THE REFORM MOVEMENT

Whereas the president of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations has recommended that a comprehensive survey be undertaken of our reform Jewish movement:

We therefore recommend that a research committee be appointed to supervise the conduct of a survey which will examine and evaluate the aims, the objectives, the present program, and the future growth and needs of our reform movement both at the national and congregational levels, to the end that there might be recommended such steps as may direct us more effectively toward our lofty and spiritual goals.

We further recommend that an invitation be extended to the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion and the Central Conference of American Rabbis to join together in this survey of the reform Jewish movement as a whole.

We recommend that this research committee be authorized to seek ways and means to implement this recommendation, employing such outside professional help as it may deem necessary to fulfill completely the above goals.

X. MIGRANT FARMERS

In recent years, the American conscience has been aroused by the many privations and discriminations visited upon America's migratory farmworkers. These men and women, who perform such useful and necessary work for all of us, experience distress and disadvantages which make them the excluded or forgotten Americans.

Because of our commitment to human dignity and social justice, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, at this 46th biennial assembly, calls upon the Federal Government, and all State governments and interstate agencies, to take vigorous action

to seek a humane solution for this important social problem.

We urge our national Commission on Social Action, and all congregations, to conduct educational programs to make our membership aware of and sensitive to the unjust abuses experienced by these workers and the human suffering involved in this social issue. We call upon the Commission on Social Action to join with like-minded groups of all faiths to ameliorate this problem of social distress and to seek through legislation and education to raise the status of these farmworkers from the present level of degradation to a position of dignity and equality in accordance with our religious and democratic traditions.

XI. REFORM JEWS IN ISRAEL

Whereas the Liberal Jewish Community in Israel, though small, is thriving; and

Whereas its ability to exist and to grow is dependent not only on financial support from Reform Jews everywhere but on moral and personal assistance as well; and

Whereas many Reform Jews, including leaders of the American Reform movement, rabbis and laymen alike, have visited Israel without visiting the liberal congregations or the Leo Baeck School, to the embarrassment and regret of the Jewish Reform Community in Israel: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That American Reform Jewry, its rabbis and laymen alike, be urged to pay special attention to supporting the cause of Israeli Liberal Jews by visiting and financially supporting them during visits to Israel and by making known their affiliation with such Reform Jews so that the people of Israel shall know that the Reform Jews in their country are part of a world wide reform movement entitled to support and respect.

XII. AID AND PROGRAMING FOR SMALL CONGREGATIONS

Whereas the Conference of Small Congregations of the northern California and Pacific Northwest region, meeting in Carmel, Calif., October 13–15, 1961, recognizes the need for special aid and programing for small congregations without rabbis; and

Whereas the conference is appreciative of the many personal and organizational services rendered these congregations by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and its regional office and council; and

Whereas the struggles of our small congregations to exist and provide a proper program of Judaism in outlying distant communities are extreme: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the congregations of the Union vigorously support the "Development Fund for Reform Judaism," some of the proceeds of which are to be expended for aid to such small congregations, and thus express the missionary zeal implicit within our faith to the benefit of these small congregations.

XIII. COMMENDATION OF JUDGE EMIL N. BAAR

Whereas Judge Emil N. Baar of New York City, after serving the Union of American Hebrew Congregations for many years as a member of its board and executive committee and as an officer thereof, has for the past 2 years served the union as chairman of its board of trustees with great ability and distinction; and

Whereas during the past several years, at great personal sacrifice, he has devoted much of his time to protecting and strengthening the union and its constitutional bodies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this assembly does hereby strongly commend Judge Baar for the services rendered by him to the UAHC over many years and particularly since the last general assembly; and be it further

Resolved, That this body does hereby express its unlimited confidence in him as chairman of the board of the union and its approval of the positions heretofore taken by him and does hereby express to him its unqualified support of him as chairman of the board of trustees.

XIV. COMMENDATION OF RABBI MAURICE N. EISENDRATH

Whereas Dr. Maurice N. Eisendrath has for the past 18 years served the Union of American Hebrew Congregations as its president; and

Whereas, during this period, he has labored beyond the call of duty to uphold the principles of our faith and to build upon the existing foundations a stronger and more meaningful religious movement; and

Whereas, in these labors, he has increased both the spiritual and numerical strength of Reform Judaism in America and all the world. Under his guidance and leadership Reform Judaism has taken a position of moral, spiritual, and religious leadership concerning many of the harassing problems in the world today; and

Whereas, in so doing, he has achieved a foremost position as a religious leader in American life, so acknowledged by men and women of all faiths: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this assembly express its gratitude to Dr. Eisendrath for the services rendered by him over the past 18 years to the reform movement and to the UAHC; and be it further

Resolved, That this body commends Dr. Eisendrath for his courage and fortitude in defending the constitutional bodies of this union and its democratic and constitutional processes. This assembly does hereby express its confidence in him and it prays that he will continue to be a great intellectual, educational, and moral leader in Reform Judaism.

It prays further that through his leadership and that of all of our rabbinic leaders we may all grow in spiritual and religious strength.

The President's Faith and Reliance in the U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the recent visit of the President with Mr. Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations in New York, merited the following thoughtful editorial of the Miami Herald:

THE PRESIDENT'S UNUSUAL VISIT: MR. KENNEDY, MR. THANT

U Thant, the acting Secretary General of the United Nations, does not have the diplomatic heft that would rate him a personal visit from the President of the United States.

Yet Mr. Kennedy is going to New York Friday to see Mr. Thant and run up a flag in his corner. The gesture is unprecedented and risky, but it just may succeed.

The new President was not a notable partisan of the U.N. when he ran for office. "During his campaign," as Benjamin Bradlee recalls in the London Observer, "he refused to make any major speech about strengthening the U.N."

This position of course has changed, but convictions if any are postelection ones. The President has been inclined to let Adlai Stevenson handle this department.

While he may realize now that this is a partial error in view of his own absorption with other foreign affairs and in view of the gaps in Mr. Stevenson's popularity chart, the country will be aware only of the presidential devotion to the U.N.

And that may be all to the good.

Mr. Thant has become a major voice in the effort to pacify the Indonesian Government and its strong-arm motions against Dutch New Guinea.

President Sukarno still talks war although he is the recipient of a Kennedy letter commending the cause of peace. The point is, so was Premier Nehru.

If the Indonesians are cooled off sufficiently, the United Nations may have performed one more rather than one last prodigy in the cause of peace. The organization can be strengthened also in the eyes of many Americans by Mr. Kennedy's personal attentions.

The President himself is on the hook. He has written a letter to Sukarno. He cannot offend the Dutch. He has called upon Congress to salvage the U.N. treasury. And he has some Stevenson elements nipping at his heels.

Elsewhere we discuss the Indonesian row. Here we think it is important to underscore a presidential visit which may make history of its own.

The Forgotten People—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, this is the third of 10 articles, part of a series which appeared in the New York World-Telegram and Sun in October 1961, on the subject of the migrant worker in the United States. These articles were written by Dale Wright, World-Telegram and Sun staff writer, who, for 6 months, lived and worked as a migrant worker along the Atlantic seaboard from Florida to New York:

THE FORGOTTEN PEOPLE—MIGRANTS LIVE HORROR STORY IN JOB TRAVEL

(By Dale Wright)

The transportation of migrant workers within a State such as Florida is a horror story.

I was in Florida last spring riding with and working with the thousands of migrant laborers who follow the harvest of crops for their miserable livelihood. Travel, for a migrant and his family, is a nightmare anywhere. In Florida, and other States which don't regulate migrant transportation, it's worse.

Item: The Federal statutes decree that drivers of interstate migrant carriers must pass physical fitness tests.

I rode in a bus with a labor crew of 17, including a young couple with a 4-month-old infant. The trip from Homestead to Ruskin, Fla., covered 325 miles. The driver, in a moment of sleepy candor, told me he was subject to violent epileptic seizures.

Item: Federal laws say that rest and meal stops must be made at least every 6 hours.

Our crew traveled 13 hours before the first stop was made. The driver stopped for gas but not people. The infant had to use for toilet purposes a filthy rag salvaged from the bus floor. As for the men and women, their experiences must go undescribed.

Item: Every State requires that bus and truck drivers be properly licensed.

The driver of the arklike vehicle I rode in admitted that his license had been lifted because of a conviction for drunken driving.

Item: Most State laws require that migrant carriers be maintained in reasonably safe and operable condition.

But on our antique bus, windows were cracked or broken. Seats had collapsed. Floorboards had long since broken away from mountings and been removed. Both rear wheels, with their smooth, whirring tires, were visible from inside the bus. The owner admitted to me later that the bus had not been inspected in the 5 years he had owned it.

Baggage and trash barred access to the rear emergency exit door. And, because the door catch was broken, it had been bound firmly shut with baling wire.

NEVER STOPPED BY COPS

And thus we migrants—I was one of them by now—rolled along Florida's roads. We passed—and were passed by—several State troopers and local police patrol cars. Not once were we stopped.

Our destination was Ruskin, next stop on our journey to the never-never land of plenty. We'd all been promised top wages, good food, a real nice place to live.

The crew boss' name was David Tuten, Jr., of St. Petersburg, Fla. He made it sound real good.

"Every man and woman of you will make $15 a day. And nobody takes nothin' out of your pay."

An old man sitting next to me muttered "Amen," which gave me a pretty fair idea what was coming.

When we arrived at the camp outside a big farm about 3 miles from Ruskin, we had been traveling—with just one stop—for 18 hours. Everybody was tired, dirty, hungry. And then we got the bad news.

The tomatoes were still green and not anywhere near being ready for harvest.

"Sorry to tell you this," said the grower, "but there'll be no work for at least 10 days."

This, I learned from friends I had made on the bus, often happens when that "land of plenty" is just around the corner of the winding road. It meant just one thing, that the workers were there on their own to wait until green tomatoes turned red.

It also meant that, at the mercy of the tomato farmer and the crew contractor, they would run up big debts for food and lodging to be paid for later when they trudged out into the fields.

FEW SHOUTS OF PROTEST

There were a few shouts of protest but not many. This had happened too often before, just as it will happen too often again.

I looked around the camp. There were no toilet facilities whatsoever. There was no kitchen equipment in the barracks like living quarters. There was no food that I could see.

The only available water came from an irrigation pump. Adequate provision had been made to water the tomatoes—but not the people. Some of the migrants washed themselves and their clothes in a muddy irrigation ditch.

The crew boss explained, without apology, that he hadn't known the crop was late or that the grower hadn't installed facilities for his workers. Nobody said anything. We were all too tired.

A man who had brought his wife and child along finally broke the silence.

"We got here broke," he said mournfully. "Everything we got is tied up in this bundle." He pointed to a tattered bedspread tied up by its four corners. "And now we're even worse off than before 'cause we got to start borrowing money to live on."

The man then walked away with his family and slowly dug a hole in the ground. Then he set up a makeshift stove by placing a piece of sheet metal on four empty cans and built a fire under it.

I watched as he tramped off into the fields. In a few minutes he was back with a small cabbage and a can of water—from the irrigation ditch.

He and his wife boiled the cabbage over the can stove. It was the first meal that they and ther child had eaten since leaving Homestead 18 hours before.

Big Brothers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, as national leaders and other civic minded persons prepare to honor the Big Brothers of America at an annual dinner here in Washington, I think it is particularly significant that we should pay tribute at this time to these persons who devote unselfish service to helping the youth of the Nation. Perhaps we should all take note of the Big Brothers motto, "No man ever stands so straight as when he stoops to help a boy."

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that last year Congress appropriated some $30 million for a study of juvenile delinquency, which has become such a grave problem in many of our metropolitan areas.

As I recall there were those who felt at that time that juvenile delinquency was becoming a responsibility of the Federal Government. This may be so, but as a former prosecuting attorney of Ingham County, Mich., it is my belief that such problems can be handled most effectively on the local level.

The achievements of the Big Brothers in 63 of our cities across the country are positive evidence of what can be done locally. Not only do I salute the Big Brothers throughout the country, but under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a recent article appearing in the Saturday Evening Post which graphically tells how the Big Brothers program helped a young man from Flint, Mich.

It was through the cooperation of the Big Brothers of Greater Flint and other persons and organizations that this fatherless youth was given guidance which helped him through the problems of his early years.

Largely because of the unselfish interest of others, the young man, Paul C. Winn, qualified for and was appointed to the U.S. Naval Academy by my predecessor, former Congressman Donald Hayworth. As a chief petty officer of midshipmen last January, he was selected to help honor former President Eisenhower as Big Brother of the Year. He was graduated from the Naval Academy last June and commissioned a second lieutenant in the U.S. Marine Corps.

I would like to commend this young officer and all who played a part in helping him to the successful beginning of his service career. I would also like to add my endorsement to the Big Brothers and other organizations which are helping youth throughout our country.

Deserving commendation for their work on behalf of Lieutenant Winn and other young men like him are the Big Brothers of Greater Flint, Joseph T. Ryder, executive director of the Flint Youth Bureau; Robert M. Layfield of Flint; Howard Sprague of Mason City, Iowa, formerly of Flint; Donald Hayworth, the Flint Community Chest, the Flint Board of Education, and the C. S. Mott Foundation, which supports many youth programs in Flint. May their good work become an inspiration for the success of other young men and other programs such as this.

The article follows:

TO HELP A BOY—HOW THE BIG BROTHERS OF AMERICA GIVE FRIENDSHIP AND GUIDANCE TO BOYS FROM TROUBLED AND FATHERLESS HOMES

(By Bill Breisky)

Of the high-spirited graduates at the Naval Academy commencement exercises on June 7 of last year, none had more reason to be jubilant than Paul Carr Winn, a scrappy and persevering young man from Flint, Mich. Academically Winn's record was mediocre—he stood 612th in his class of 786—but in his aptitude rating, a clue to his eventual degree of success as an officer, he ranked twice as high. Commissioned a Marine second lieutenant, Winn presently is enrolled in basic school at Quantico, Va.

Lieutenant Winn is an intense, spruce 135 pounder who believes the Naval Academy is the world's finest and toughest school; yet he says, "I haven't accomplished anything that any other guy in my position couldn't have done if he'd had the chance." A cliche? Perhaps, yet Paul's personal history makes his Academy record seem remarkable. Paul was only two when his father died. His mother, who subsequently was remarried and divorced, died during Paul's junior year in high school. He has been on his own since then.

The "chance" which Paul credits for his good fortune came from the Big Brothers of America, through the Big Brothers of Greater Flint, one of the largest of the 55 Big Brother agencies and a fairly typical one.

The Big Brother relationship is unique in the field of social casework. One man volunteers to befriend and counsel one boy. Usually the boy is between the ages of 8 and 17. He may be in trouble with school or juvenile authorities, or he may simply be shy and lonely. Almost always he is fatherless.

The slogan of the organization is, "No man ever stands so straight as when he stoops to help a boy." I became interested in the Big Brother movement when I saw the slogan on a Philadelphia subway-car poster in 1955. I called the Philadelphia agency to inquire and was assigned my first little brother that spring. He joined the Navy 2 years later, and recently reenlisted. My second little brother, who barely squeaked through the eighth grade last spring, but did strike out his school principal twice in a student-faculty softball game, says it would be "real sharp" if I could mention his name—Harry Martin—in this article.

The Big Brother movement was born in the men's club of a New York City church in 1904; since then it has touched the lives of some 128,000 boys. Today its national headquarters are in Philadelphia's Suburban Station Building, and its self-supporting agencies serve some 8,000 boys in cities between Boston and San Francisco and between San Juan, P.R., and Hamilton, Ontario.

A prospective little brother usually is referred by his mother, his school counselor, a social work organization or a juvenile court judge. After the agency investigates a youngster's background and environment, it matches him with a man who shares as many of his interests as possible. If the matching "takes," the big brother and the boy will see each other every week or so—perhaps for a dinner, perhaps for a homework session or a ball game—until the boy is at least 17.

Paul Winn was an undersized 7-year-old when, in 1944, the juvenile division of probate court referred him and his two older brothers to the Flint Youth Bureau (as Big Brothers of Greater Flint was known until recently). Paul had a stepfather then, which disqualified him from being assigned a big brother. But the stepfather was in the Army, and the Winn boys were getting out of hand, so the judge asked the youth bureau to include them on its Saturday outings and other group activities.

Shortly before Paul completed junior high school, his mother and his stepfather, a husky man with a police record, were divorced. Paul became so aggressive—"I liked to swing out every now and then"—that the school suspended him and notified the youth bureau. Because Paul's stepfather was out of the picture, Youth Bureau Director Joseph T. Ryder assigned Paul to a big brother—Howard Sprague, 40, a hearty, outgoing man who owned a 7-Up bottling plant.

Sprague agreed to help. He got Paul reinstated in school and, because Paul needed a steady job—his mother had a knee injury that prevented her working and his stepfather was defaulting on alimony payments—Sprague became his employer as well as his big brother. Paul and Sprague went on picnics together that summer, and Paul occasionally had dinner with the Spragues. In December, when Paul turned 16, Howie Sprague helped him learn to drive.

When the Spragues returned from a Florida vacation early in 1954, Howie learned that Paul's mother had lost the lease on her apartment and had moved in with her sister. Paul had to find quarters for himself. He decided to make his home temporarily in the Seven-Up plant. He figured he could bathe in the employees' shower and sleep in a truck cab.

"You come out and live with us for a while," Howie insisted.

For the first time in his life, Paul was part of a household where religion was important, where mealtime was a happy occasion, and where the adults, "didn't holler at the kids and smack them around." Howie's wife Dorothy, a substitute teacher, took an interest in Paul's schoolwork. "I'm not dumb," Paul told Dorothy. "You'll see. I'm gonna make good grades for you." And he did.

Paul's mother found an apartment before the school term ended and Paul moved back with her. That summer she was operated on for abdominal cancer. She died in February of 1955, when Paul was halfway through his junior year. Paul lived for a while with the Spragues; then he moved to the YMCA. The youth bureau paid for the room, and Paul earned enough to cover his other needs.

Later that year Howie Sprague moved to Mason City, Iowa, where he had bought a Coca-Cola bottling plant. Robert M. Layfield, manager of the Seven-Up plant and a boyhood pal of Sprague, became Paul's big brother. After Layfield learned that Paul's favorite recreation was dancing, he became adviser to a teen-club dance committee, then interested Paul in the club.

"Paul's last year in Central High was kind of touch and go," recalls Layfield. The unrelieved pressure of schoolwork and after school work became oppressive. His morale ebbed, and he fell into the habit of spending his few spare hours at a poolhall. Toward the end of the spring semester he was suspended for tossing a package of firecrackers into a barbershop across the street from school during his lunch period. Paul was allowed to return to his classes with the stipulation that he spend all his remaining study periods in the office of the assistant principal. He swore off fireworks and began to apply himself to his schoolwork again.

Shortly before graduation time, Youth Bureau Director Ryder called Paul into his office and said, "How would you like to go to the Naval Academy?" Ryder had a promise from Congressman Donald Hayworth that if Paul could win a competitive examination, he would get an appointment. Paul took the test. When weeks passed with no report, Paul assumed he had failed. He enlisted in the Marines, and was sent to the Marine Corps Recruit Depot in San Diego.

In mid-October Paul's Naval Academy appointment came through. So many youth bureau boosters wrote to San Diego in his behalf, trying to win his release from boot camp, that one of Paul's commanding officers remarked, "He has more blankety-blank friends than anyone I've ever met."

Paul was released from the Marines. He enrolled at the Navy's Bainbridge, Md., prep school on Christmas Eve of 1956. Six months later he reported to the Naval Academy for plebe summer. Because of his marine training, he was named midshipman platoon commander. He got off to a good start: His platoon placed first among the 36 plebe platoons in both drill competitions that summer. But the beginning of the academic year, in September, was a rude shock. Discipline tightened. Classroom work progressed at a fast pace. And some of the upperclassmen "didn't like the way I did things."

Rather than wait until he "bilged out," Paul decided to resign, and called Bob Layfield to tell him so. Layfield stalled him, then lunched with Joe Ryder to discuss strategy. They agreed to hammer home the moss-grown dictum that nobody likes a quitter. "When I dropped the ball," Paul recalls, "they threw it right back at me."

Paul stayed at Annapolis and the Layfields and the Spragues visited him there. During his 4 years at the Naval Academy he saw Norway, Portugal, the Netherlands, France, Belgium, and Greece, courtesy of the Navy. His outlook on life improved along the way. Two years ago, when he passed a group of teenagers on a Flint street corner, he said to Bob Layfield, "Boy, to think that I used to be a raunch like that."

On January 10 of last year, during Big Brother Week, President Eisenhower was named "Big Brother of the Year" at a ceremony in the White House. On hand to help Big Brothers of America President Charles G. Berwind make the presentation were Paul Winn, then a chief petty officer of midshipmen, and Howie Sprague. Ike spotted Paul's insignia and remarked, "The highest I ever got as a cadet was color sergeant."

In June Bob and Jean Layfield saw Paul graduate.

What path would Paul have followed without the help of Howie Sprague, Bob Layfield, and the youth bureau? Paul's two brothers, who never had Big Brothers, have taken diverse paths. One has a family and is selling plumbing and heating supplies in a Flint store; the other has been divorced and recently served a prison term for auto theft.

Joe Ryder estimates that Flint Big Brothers volunteered 92,200 hours of their time to little brothers like Paul Winn during 1961—a good return, he feels, on the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation's grant of $45,000. The Mott Foundation supports educational, recreational, and health programs in Flint. In 1944 it hired Ryder, then an Ohio school superintendent, to establish the youth bureau. Last year the foundation's money paid the salaries of the entire youth bureau staff—Director Ryder, two secretaries and the five fieldworkers who supervised the activity program and counseled 681 Big Brothers and their boys. The community chest provided the bureau's $8,000 activity-and-emergency fund—the source of money for Paul Winn's room at the YMCA—and the board of education provided the youth bureau's office space. The salary of the fieldworker assigned to rural Genesee County was paid by that county's board of supervisors.

The makeup of the bureau's board of directors illustrates how Ryder has rallied the Flint city government to his support. Board Member Les Ehrbright is director of pupil personnel for Flint's public schools. Board Member Tom Waldron is detective lieutenant of the police juvenile bureau. "Many times when we find a fatherless boy in trouble, but not in serious trouble, we refer him to Joe instead of booking him," says Waldron. And if a fatherless boy is booked, his case probably will be heard by Probate Judge William E. Doran, another board member.

A little Brother needn't drift into trouble for lack of wholesome activities. Flint's businessmen and service clubs provide free passes for movies, baseball games, airplane and boat rides, wrestling matches, horseback riding—almost any activity a man and boy might enjoy together. And there is a group activity—hunting, fishing, camping, canoeing, bowling, miniature golf, swimming and aqualung diving, ice skating, skiing, hotrod races—every Saturday.

The youth bureau's activity program is a means of bringing big and little brothers together on a natural and enjoyable basis. "We are in business for one purpose," Joe Ryder emphasizes, "and that is to promote, cultivate, and supervise a strong relationship between a fatherless boy and a good man. Activities that don't relate directly to that objective are not in our program."

To establish big brother-little brother relationships that will last, the youth bureau seeks as many common bonds as possible—racial and religious ties, special skills and interests, a comparable socioeconomic background. A man who had had all his teeth extracted was matched with 15-year-old who had a gum disorder and faced the same toothless future; a frail youngster who sought to strengthen himself was matched with a weight-lifting champion; a convict's son was assigned to a big brother who as a youth had done time for robbery.

Before a man can be assigned a little brother, he must go through an orientation period. The man is told, for instance, that he may buy gifts for his boy on special occasions but he must not dole out money. He must report to one of the staff workers at least once a month. And when necessary he should attend the bureau's monthly problem clinic, staffed by a psychiatrist, Dr. Paul Jordan, and four other professional consultants.

Some problems are more than a big brother can solve, as "Brad Clement"—that's not his real name—can testify. Brad's little brother, "Artie," a fatherless Flint youth, recently was paroled after serving 18 months for armed robbery. (At present he has a steady job and is living in Brad's home.) Artie was only 11 when he became a little brother, 7 years ago. His home environment was degenerate—his mother made him give up a part-time job because his income was jeopardizing her welfare payments; his sister had given birth to two illegitimate children by the time she was 15. Yet Artie seemed determined to make a success of his life—until his mother became a prostitute.

The police arrested Artie after he held up a filling station attendant with the jagged neck of a bottle. Brad visited the boy in jail. There Artie revealed that his father

had not died in an auto accident, as the youth bureau believed; he had been shot dead while holding up a bartender with the jagged neck of a bottle.

One youngster surprised his big brother in a very different way. He cherished the relationship so much that when his mother remarried, making him ineligible to remain a little brother, he kept the news a secret from his big brother for months.

Nothing pleases Joe Ryder more than having a former little brother apply to become a big brother. I met such a big brother, Dale Coote, at a Saturday morning sausage-and-pancake breakfast and turkey shoot sponsored by the Chevrolet Men's Club of Flint.

Nine years ago Dale was serving a term in a State reformatory for stealing cars. After his release he became a little brother. Today, at 25, he is in his last few months as a plumbing apprentice. He's also a father of two lively youngsters and big brother to a blond eighth grader named Dennis Bandy, whose parents are divorced. Dale and Dennis live near one another. Both enjoy swimming, both are Protestants, both have shown a knack for getting into scrapes; and they share a passion for the pizza baked by Dale's wife, Nancy Jean.

The big brothers of Greater Flint can chalk up young men like Paul Winn and Dale Coote as successes partly because of Joe Ryder's insistence that his staff should not automatically close out a little brother's case when he reaches his 17th birthday, as is the rule in a number of big brother agencies. "We do some of our best work with boys past 17 who have grown up with us. They begin to talk with their big brothers about their girls, about getting married, about getting jobs. Often you can't talk with a boy about such things until he's facing these problems and looking for answers."

Another conviction of Ryder's is that he has a responsibility to serve every fatherless referral who might benefit from a big brother relationship.

One reason for this attitude is a withdrawn Genesee County teenager who was referred by his mother. Ryder explained that the bureau was unable to extend itself into the area in which she and her son lived at that time—but when the mother persisted he said he would see what could be done. "We sent the boy invitations to join us on our Saturday trips," Ryder recalls, "but he didn't come in. Our fieldworkers had more than they could do within our area, and we just didn't get around to investigating the case."

A few months later Ryder received a note from the mother stating, "I'm afraid your help was a little slow coming to my son." The note was attached to a notice of the boy's suicide.

Joe remembers that note whenever anyone suggests that Flint's big brother program is too ambitious.

No Postal Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of my colleagues to an editorial which appeared in the New York Times for today, January 24, 1962. This editorial expresses the same views as I did yesterday when I offered my amendment to strike section 11 from the Murray substitute, the postal rate bill. I hope that the Members of the other body will agree this provision betrays a mistrust of the American people, our Constitution, and our traditions.

The editorial follows:

NO POSTAL IRON CURTAIN

A new attempt is being made in Congress to re-create a postal iron curtain around the United States. It should be defeated.

The proposal, backed by an overwhelming majority in the House yesterday, added to the postal rate increase bill a provision barring the mails to any materials from abroad that the Attorney General may rule are Communist political propaganda. The supporters of this move are thus trying to reinstate legislatively a ban that President Kennedy lifted last March on the unanimous recommendation of the State, Justice, Post Office, and Treasury Departments.

Fundamentally this move betrays a mistrust of the American people, our Constitution, and our traditions. It reflects a belief that Americans are too immature to be able to decide for themselves what they shall read, and that they must therefore be protected by wiser minds in Washington. Politically the move is an undisguised slap at President Kennedy and an attempt to rebuke him. Even more important, it would represent, if passed, a legislative intrusion and, we believe, infringement of the constitutional rights guaranteed in the first amendment. Any periodical or publication coming from a Communist-ruled land can be considered in some sense Communist political propaganda, just as every free publication is in some sense political propaganda for freedom.

Confident in the strength of our ideas, the U.S. Government under all recent administrations has sought to widen and expand the area of communication and exchange between ourselves and the peoples under Communist rule. The prohibition against propaganda that was written into the postal rate bill yesterday is a step in the other direction.

Resolution of the Michigan Public Service Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution of the Michigan Public Service Commission on H.R. 2757, H.R. 2781, H.R. 4095, and S. 666:

RESOLUTION OF THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

(State of Michigan before the Michigan Public Service Commission in the matter of proposed amendments to the Natural Gas Act at a session of the Michigan Public Service Commission held at its offices in the city of Lansing, Mich., on March 9, 1961)

"Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States, legislation to amend the Natural Gas Act, and the Michigan Public Service Commission desiring to state its position pertaining thereto hereby adopts the following resolution:

"Whereas H.R. 2757 (introduced by Representative DINGELL, of Michigan), H.R. 2781 (introduced by Representative MOSS, of California), H.R. 4095 (introduced by Representative FLYNT, of Georgia), and S. 666 introduced by Senator MAGNUSON, of Washington) are now pending in the 87th Congress; and

"Whereas said bills seek to amend the Natural Gas Act, which proposed amendments would (1) outlaw indefinite pricing clauses in natural gas contracts; (2) eliminate the prohibition in the act against suspension of rate changes applicable to natural gas sold for resale for industrial use; (3) prohibit consecutive rate increases resulting from the automatic operation of section 4(e) of the act; (4) amend section 7(e) of the act to make it jurisdictional to the issuance of a certificate of public convenience and necessity that the FPC make a specific finding upon the consistency with the public interest of the price at which natural gas is sold in interstate commerce pursuant to a certificate or certificates of public convenience and necessity; and (5) prescribe procedural requirements in the hearing and disposition of matters before the FPC; and

"Whereas the Michigan Public Service Commission has become increasingly concerned with the numerous increases in the rates applicable to the sale of natural gas which have been allowed to become effective without a determination by the Federal Power Commission as to the justness and reasonableness of the rates involved, which increased rates have a pronounced effect upon the gas consumers of the State of Michigan; and

"Whereas the House bills have been referred to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the Senate bill to the Senate Committee on Commerce; and

"Whereas we believe the adoption of the proposed amendments to the Natural Gas Act would be in the general public interest: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Michigan Public Service Commission urges the Congress of the United States to enact into law the aforesaid proposed amendments to the Natural Gas Act; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the congressional delegation from the State of Michigan; the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners; and to the several State regulatory commissions."

Dated at the commission's offices in the city of Lansing, Mich., this 9th day of March 1961.

MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION,
GEORGE E. HILL,
Chairman.
THOMAS M. BURNS,
Commissioner.
JOHN E. TORMEY,
Commissioner.

By the commission and pursuant to its action of March 9, 1961.

NORMAN BERKOWITZ,
Secretary.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson Receives Honorary Degree at Einstein College Convocation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to participate on November

19, 1961, in a convocation held at the Albert Einstein College of Medicine of Yeshiva University in New York commemorating the 10th anniversary of the inception of the college.

At that convocation the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, our Vice President, was awarded the honorary degree of doctor of humane letters for his distinguished and notable contributions to the strengthening of the precepts of democracy.

It is my pleasure to commend to the attention of our colleagues the remarks upon that occasion of Rabbi Joseph Lookstein in presenting the Vice President, the remarks of Dr. Samuel Belkin, president of Yeshiva University, in awarding the degree to the Vice President, and the reply of LYNDON JOHNSON:

PRESENTATION OF LYNDON BAYNES JOHNSON FOR HONORARY DEGREE, DOCTOR OF HUMANE LETTERS, BY RABBI JOSEPH LOOKSTEIN

Mr. President, from a humble farmhouse to the vaulted dome of our National Capital; from a shoe shine boy in Johnson City to a U.S. Senator; from a roadbuilding apprentice to a master builder of American democracy, is the proud saga of our distinguished guest—the illustrious Vice President of the United States, LYNDON BAYNES JOHNSON.

Growing up in a small town of the Southwest, shortly after the turn of the century, was no easy experience. Our candidate was no stranger to adversity and no alien to the stern rigors of life. But then, to such as he, humble beginnings are never an obstacle but a spur: material hardship is never a handicap but a challenge. Hence, for him, honor was not an accident but a deserved reward, and fame came not as a stroke of fortune but as a collective expression of esteem and admiration.

Before us is, indeed, a remarkable and brilliant product of American opportunity. We hail one who grasped that opportunity, who utilized it for personal growth, who exploited it for the public good, and who became one of the commanding personalities of our day.

It did not take his native community long to realize that in their midst dwelt a true hero of the spirit. Ere he reached the age of 30, he was appointed State administrator of the National Youth Administration by the immortal Franklin D. Roosevelt. Soon this favorite son of Texas was sent to Congress where, as a Member of the House of Representatives and of the Senate, he served for 25 years. His colleagues in those august bodies saw in him at once a natural leader of men with all the endowments of wisdom, courage, idealism, and supreme statesmanship.

Then followed national recognition. With the scintillating and almost legendary Lady Bird at his side, he won the hearts of all America. Now he is one of the captains of our Ship of State. It is conforting to know that during these dark and desperate days for our country and the world, there stands near the helm this steady and sturdy statesman, helping to steer a true course toward the happier havens of destiny.

Mr. President, our candidate is a native of the Lone Star State. Is it not appropriate for him to become the adopted son of our university, whose academic fortune lies under the constellation of the Star of David?

I have the honor, Sir, to present LYNDON BAYNES JOHNSON for the degree of doctor of humane letters, honoris causa.

REMARKS BY DR. SAMUEL BELKIN IN AWARDING HONORARY DEGREE TO THE VICE PRESIDENT

Very few people in the history of America have served more skillfully and with greater statesmanship the legislative and executive branches of our Government, than you have served throughout your mature life.

As the majority leader of the Senate, you patiently bound the wounds of your colleagues and you succeeded in inspiring them to pass legislation for the benefit of the entire country.

During the short period since you were elected to the Vice-Presidency of the United States, you have traveled to many continents so that you might interpret to the President the attitudes and strivings of the newly born nations. You have admirably succeeded in molding for them a clear image of our American democracy.

At this special convocation, we salute one of the most distinguished servants of our American heritage.

By the authority vested in me as president of Yeshiva University, I take pleasure, sir, in conferring upon you the degree of doctor of humane letters, honoris causa.

In token thereof, I cause to be placed over your shoulders the visible symbol of our high regard for you, and I hand you this diploma.

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Rabbi Lookstein, Mr. President, distinguished members of the faculty, my fellow colleagues who have received this distinguished honorary degree, ladies and gentlemen, I am deeply touched by the consideration that you have given to me and by the great honor that you do me and that you have conferred upon me.

I treasure each word. I shall prize my degree from this great institution and consider it a directive to better humane achievements. In my own humble way, I will try to be worthy of the great obligation which this advanced institution of learning has placed upon me.

TO CARE FOR THE STRICKEN

In the 10 years which have passed since the establishment of the Albert Einstein College of Medicine, there have been few periods of repose or of peace of mind in world affairs.

These have been years of change and of challenge. Yet for those who conceived the high purpose of this institution, and have served it so faithfully, they have also been years of progress and achievement.

This college has become yet another symbol of man's genius for compassion, of his desire to abridge the burden of human suffering, and of his dedication to the task of making the resources of medicine minister to the health and abundance of all nations.

These are the victories of peace which are, in the end, more significant and enduring than the pageantry of war. The progress which has filled the first decade of your labors can now be seen as the prophecy of the growth and accomplishment that will shine upon your long future.

To bear the honored name of Albert Einstein is, for any college, an incentive to excellence.

He voyaged in strange seas of thought, alone, and always he strove to bring home precious cargo that could nourish the minds and spirits of men. He said it is the first sign of genius to have the courage to begin by questioning the axioms.

Albert Einstein's audacious research plucked from science the secret of many ancient riddles and transformed our knowledge of cosmic forces. Yet he also knew that it is the first sign of a good citizen to respect the old values which add grace to our pilgrimage and nobility to our aspirations.

He was never made bitter by persecution nor soured by misfortune. Beyond the darkness of a world at strife, his vision caught the prophecy of peace. Albert Einstein, whose mind soared through the universe, could also see in tiny Israel a spiritual triumph that testifies to the unbroken genius of an old and valiant people.

PARADOX OF COMPASSION

It is a sad paradox that this man of generous sympathies and overflowing compassion was forced, by the disorders of our own iron age, to become one of the pioneers and prophets of the atomic world. We can have no doubt that he would wish us to devote our enlarged scientific knowledge to bring new hope to a stricken world, instead of threatening it with the cooperative suicide of war. That certainly is the philosophy which sustains your work in this college, and makes your progress a matter for rejoicing to all Americans.

We do well to remember that there is an honorable tradition which makes us regard the world of scholarship and of science as exempt from the rivalries of politics and the ambitions of power. We must be loyal to that tradition, even in this age of strident nationalism.

Men and women of all races and all religions have brought their gifts to enrich the treasury of our medical knowledge. Our country has grown great because we have had, ever since the days of George Washington, a government which has given to bigotry no sanction, and to persecution no assistance.

On this scroll of achievements, a position of distinction records the contributions of our Jewish citizens; and nowhere have these contributions been more extensive or more creative than in the arts of medicine.

There is a vast stirring of interest in medicine in the United States today. Since the beginning of this century, life expectancy has risen by 20 years. Many diseases which exacted a frightful toll, especially among children, have been conquered by medical genius. I looked into the eyes of a simple, plain but good man as he toured our country a few days ago and he spent a week with us. He had fathered 11 children, 7 of whom had died because they lacked medical attention. But that good man, the camel driver, said to me that if he had had the knowledge of medical science with his first eight children that he'd had for the last three, he's sure that all of them would have been spared. There is no shortage of problems that still await solution, and the needs of preventive medicine grow steadily more important.

NEW DEMANDS

As a result of the new demands that must be met by medical science, the American people will need the services of more doctors than our colleges and universities are now providing.

At present our medical schools are graduating 7,400 physicians each year. In the next 10 years, if are merely to maintain the present ratio of physicians to population, we will have to obtain the services of 11,000 new doctors annually. That is an increase of 50 percent or 3,600 doctors each year—and this increase is not based on the necessity of giving our people better medical facilities.

This increase is the indispensable minimum if we are to avoid the misfortune of lowering our present medical standards.

The 85 medical schools in the United States are under constant pressure to meet medical needs that were either unknown or far less urgent a generation ago.

In 1925 our medical schools spent less than $13 million; but in 1960 this figure had risen to nearly $320 million. Costs in the last 10 years have risen almost 400 percent, and the trend toward higher expenditures still continues.

CONTRASTS

A student must pay about $10,000 before he graduates from medical school. The student as well as the medical school is caught in this tangle of higher costs and more specialized training.

No one wishes to establish preferred positions in the family of learning. All the important branches of study have their essen-

tial contribution to make to the enrichment and progress of our Nation.

But some contrasts are too glaring to be overlooked.

A medical student pays more than twice as much as a Ph. D. student for his education. Yet the man or woman being trained as a doctor receives only one-quarter of the financial help available from scholarships and fellowships.

About 80 percent of all Ph. D. students in the physical sciences and 90 percent of all graduate students in mathematics are supported by Federal scholarships. It is not surprising therefore that many students who would like to enter the medical profession are turning, for financial reasons, to other courses of study.

We, in America, cannot allow this tendency to continue without producing overburdened doctors and serious medical shortages in many parts of the country.

The Federal Government must maintain its vigilant and constructive interest in medical research. It must provide new and larger grants to medical schools to enable them to satisfy the quickened interest of the American people in improved health services. It must, as a matter of urgency, make more adequate provision for the medical needs of our aged citizens.

With equal urgency, it must provide a system of scholarships and grants for the young medical student so that no qualified American student will feel shut out of a medical school because of the barriers erected by poverty.

All these new programs and reforms will be challenged by some powerful minority interest. But they are all in the national interest and they can be made to prevail if we pledge to them our unremitting support and high courage. The time to begin our national campaign for better medical facilities and services for the American people is now and the place is here.

CAMPAIGN WITHOUT RANCOR

We can conduct that campaign without having offensive epithets flung at us by our adversaries. We are not engaged in a campaign for socialized medicine. The false charge that we wish to invade the freedom and integrity of the medical profession has no valid place in a responsible discussion of the great issues.

It will not be easy for the administration to obtain the approval of Congress for the far-reaching health program to which it is committed and for which it is ready to conduct a valiant fight. But we do have the right to ask that our proposals be examined without bitterness, be debated without misrepresentation, and be voted upon without prejudice.

In such a fair hearing, the fundamental problems will be thoroughly considered, in the context of what is in the national interest, and the ultimate decision will advance the best interests of the American people.

Let us all strive, whatever our point of view, to conduct this national debate on our health program in a manner that respects the most generous American traditions of free discussion.

We have every reason to take comfort and pride in our varied, energetic, and dedicated medical resources in the United States. But we have a long journey still to make before we can say that our medical standards and services are fully adequate to the needs and opportunities now facing the American people.

Standing here in this great hall of learning, I congratulate and salute the dedicated members of this faculty and those who labor for this great public service institution.

Standing together and working together, in unity and in hope, we can give our medical schools and our medical profession a new radiant opportunity for service to a grateful nation.

And when we engage in a slight amount of introspection, in the sunset of this day, let us remember that of the 3 billion people who inhabit the world almost 2 billion have a monthly income of less than $8 per month. Two out of three can produce less than $6 per month. We in the United States are blessed with the opportunity and with the atmosphere that will permit us to produce better than $8 per person per day. We produce more in a day than they produce in a month.

We have an obligation, if we are to see our way of life preserved, not only to provide Christian leadership and fellowship, but to see that the genius that grows in abundance and flourishes with opportunity in our own land is extended to the lands of others. No one can better lead the way than the great men you have honored today and the faculty who have made such great sacrifices in order that this convocation could be possible and that this great university could exist.

I am totally unworthy of the recognition that you have given me. But I can assure you from a grateful heart no one recognizes that more than I do and no one will strive harder to be worthy of your confidence and to give to others some of the opportunities that you have given to me. Thank you.

President Kennedy's Bond Proposal Will Actually Reduce U.N. Contributive Share To Support U.N. Operations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Miami Daily News, one of our country's leading newspapers, raises a good point in connection with the President's proposal to purchase U.N. bonds. It deserves close study by all those taking an interest in this vital question:

U.N. BOND ISSUE WILL SAVE US MONEY

President John F. Kennedy wisely told the American people in his state of the Union message to Congress that "arms alone are not enough to keep the peace—it must be kept by men."

This was his introduction to what may be the most controversial subject before the 2d session of the 87th Congress, the subscription by the United States of $100 million of the $200 million bond issue to be sponsored by the United Nations.

The President said:

"Our instrument and our hope is the United Nations—and I see little merit in the impatience of those who would abandon this imperfect world instrument because they dislike our imperfect world."

Imperfect the United Nations is, of course. After all, the world has had all too little experience in international cooperation. First it was the League of Nations which the United States refused to join because of isolationist sentiment in this country. But then came the United Nations, born out of the travail of World War II and we were a major influence in forming it.

The surest way to abandon the ideal of a United Nations organization is to allow those who have little sympathy with its aims to starve it to death.

President Kennedy has asked Congress to approve support of the bond issue. Already there are cries of "giveaway" from those who oppose the United Nations and all foreign aid.

Actually, the American people need to be educated on the subject.

The financial crisis in the United Nations arises from failure of the Communist bloc, (including Cuba), France and Belgium to pay their special assessments for U.N. efforts to unify the Congo. Also, Middle East Arab countries have refused to pay their assessments for the U.N. force patrolling the Gaza strip and maintaining the peace between Egypt and Israel.

All members, however, will be contributing to retiring the bond issue from their regular assessments. Hence, the U.S. share in the peace-keeping operations will actually be reduced from about 47½ percent to 32 percent.

Commercial Bank Loan Rates Under Scrutiny by Antitrust Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Monday, January 22, I called upon the leading commercial banks not to increase their prime loan rate—the loan rate that governs the interest rate borrowers, large and small, in business and agriculture pay throughout the country. I based my appeal first on the lack of justification for such an increase at this time, and second as a significant amplification of the President's request to industry to withhold price increases and labor to exercise restraint in its wage demands.

Yesterday's Wall Street Journal carried an interesting article stating that the U.S. Department of Justice has initiated an investigation "in an apparent effort to determine if there is any collusion among bankers in changing the prime rate." Further information on the investigation was contained in today's New York Times.

The Wall Street Journal and New York Times articles are included below:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 23, 1962]

JUSTICE AGENCY STUDIES COMMERCIAL BANKS' PRACTICES IN CHANGING THE PRIME RATE

Leading commercial banks in at least two cities are being investigated by the U.S. Department of Justice in an apparent effort to determine if there is any collusion among bankers in changing the prime rate—banks' minimum lending charge.

Banks in New York City and Boston are understood to have received letters from Lee Loevinger, chief of the Justice Department's Antitrust Division, requesting detailed information on the banks' practices in changing the prime rate.

A spokesman for the Justice Department in Washington confirmed that a preliminary investigation has been started on prime rate practices. He stressed that the inquiry is "in its very preliminary stages."

The prime rate, currently 4½ percent, is the interest banks charge their biggest borrowers with the best credit standing. Most

other bank lending charges are scaled upward from the prime rate. Top rated national corporations are charged the prime rate. Other national, regional, and local businesses pay higher rates, usually scaled upward in steps of a quarter-percentage point to a practical maximum of about 6 percent, depending upon the lending institution's estimation of the borrowers credit worthiness.

DATES, DATA REQUESTED

In its letter to banks, the Justice Department is understood to have asked for specific dates when a bank changed the rate in past years and whether it consulted with other banks. The Federal agency also requested any memoranda or other documents prepared in connection with a prime rate change.

The Antitust Division, it was said, gave no deadline on when replies must be made, but indications were that reports would be sent in promptly.

Increases or decreases in the prime rate usually are first announced by a major bank in New York City, the country's financial capital. Other large banks in New York City and other money centers around the country generally follow suit.

The last time the prime rate was changed was August 22, 1960, when New York's Manufacturers Trust Co., since merged with Hanover Bank into Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co., reduced the prime rate by a half-percentage point to the current 4½ percent. The next day, Chase Manhattan Bank and First National City Bank, both of New York, announced similar reductions. The move by these two banks led rapidly to similar cuts by several other banks in New York, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Chicago, San Francisco, and Cincinnati, among other places.

CONFINED TO NORTHEAST

In six rounds of prime rate changes preceding Manufacturers Trust's move, dating back to the summer of 1956, the first step was by a New York City bank. In August of 1956, however, First National Bank of Boston, that city's largest, was the first among the Nation's banks to alter its basic business lending charge. The Boston bank increased its prime rate to 4 percent from 3¾ percent and other leading banks across the country followed suit the next day.

Changes in banks' basic lending charges generally accompany trends, up or down, in borrowing costs on alternative kinds of financing, such as through selling commercial paper or bonds. One reason why banks cut the prime rate, for example, is a decline in bond interest rates, making that form of borrowing more attractive to corporations than bank loans.

The general interest rate trend declines as the supply of credit in the economy increasingly exceeds the demand for credit. Conversely, interest rates move upward as increasing demand presses on the available supply. Recently, a number of bankers predicted an increase in the prime rate is approaching because they expect loan demand to intensify. Some also expressed the belief the Federal Reserve System, which regulates the credit supply, could be expected gradually to contract that supply as an anti-inflation move if business activity continues to expand, as they expect.

COMPETITION, NOT COLLUSION

New York bankers who commented on the Justice Department inquiry indicated they felt Justice Department people were misinformed if they thought uniformity in banks' basic lending charges is evidence of collusion.

"In a business as competitive as banking, uniformity of the prime rate is inevitable," said one banker. He noted that when major banks cut their basic lending charges, others act to conform in order not to lose business to those institutions. Similarly, he argued, when some banks raise their charges, others move to conform in order "not to be swamped by more business than they can handle." He also contended that because banks usually have to pay more for their money during periods of rising interest rates, any banks that held back from increasing their lending charges would find themselves making more loans at a narrowing profit, and possibly at a loss.

The Justice Department's inquiry into prime rate practices is confined at present to banks in the Northeast, according to a spokesman. The investigation comes on the heels of action by the Department concerning the establishment of lending fees and service charges by several Dallas banks as well as the setting of service charges by three small New Jersey banks.

Seven Dallas banks have been subpenaed to appear before a Federal grand jury January 22 in Amarillo and produce their records dealing with the setting of loan interest charges and service charges. Justice Department officials in Dallas gave no reason for the action, and no formal charges have been filed. But last month, the Justice Department formally charged three New Jersey banks in Califon and Clinton with conspiring to set uniform charges for checks, checking accounts, collection of checks and other banking services.

Comptroller of the Currency James J. Saxon protested early in January, when the Dallas move was disclosed, that his office should be advised before Justice Department agents start looking into suspected conspiracies among Federally chartered banks. Mr. Saxon said he believed his office was better equipped than the Justice Department to make such investigations with less publicity.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 24, 1962]

UNITED STATES ASKING BANKS FOR DATA ON SHIFTS IN PRIME LOAN RATE

At least seven major New York commercial banks have been asked for information by the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice in connection with changes in the prime rate, it was learned yesterday.

The prime rate is the preferred interest rate banks charge on big loans to large corporate borrowers. Yesterday it was a big topic of conversation in Wall Street.

Among the banks are Chase Manhattan, First National City, Manufacturers Hanover Trust, Chemical Bank New York Trust, Morgan Guaranty Trust, Bankers Trust, and Irving Trust.

Since the prime rate came into being in the 1930's these banks—with one exception—have initiated most of the changes in the prime rate. Other bank interest rates are scaled upward from the prime rate.

The Chemical Bank New York Trust Co. has not led the way in any of the 19 changes in the prime rate that have occurred since the first change was made in 1947.

Bankers Trust Co. initiated the change then, moving the rate to 1¾ percent. It had been at 1½ percent since 1934.

Fourteen of the subsequent changes were upward and four downward. The most recent change occurred on August 23, 1960, when Manufacturers Trust led the way in a reduction from 5 to 4½ percent.

Chemical Bank said yesterday its intention was "to cooperate fully in making any information available that might pertain to the request of the Department of Justice."

The request came in the form of a 1-page letter that the banks received Monday. It was signed by Lee Loevinger, Antitrust Division Chief and Assistant Attorney General.

Mr. Loevinger wrote that the Department of Justice would regard it as a privilege if it could examine any information that the banks might have in their files relating to changes "that have taken place in the so-called prime commercial lending rate."

The Chase Manhattan was the only other bank among the seven to comment on the letter. Chase Manhattan also said it "intended to cooperate and would forward any pertinent information as expeditiously as possible."

The big New York banks have initiated all but one of the prime rate changes in the last 15 years. In 1956, the First National Bank of Boston moved first in raising the rate from 3¾ to 4 percent.

It was understood that the Department of Justice letter also had been sent to a number of the big commercial banks in Boston, among them the First National Bank.

Other New York banks besides the seven mentioned also were understood to have received the query, although none of these has been a leader in prime rate changes.

Since the Department of Justice began its antitrust actions involving the banking industry early last year, most observers thought it would be only a matter of time before the Government lawyers would be investigating uniformity in bank service charges and interest rates.

The Department would be investigating whether the banks had an advance meeting of the minds in changing the prime rates in past years.

Should the antitrust investigators decide that sufficient evidence of such collusion existed, then further action against the banks could ensue. It could take the form of a complaint—a civil action—designed to produce a consent decree whereby the banks would consent to cease and desist from any action that might be deemed objectionable in view of the antitrust statutes.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 21, my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, LUCIEN N. NEDZI, addressed the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., Hamtramck and Northern Detroit branch, on the 44th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include Congressman NEDZI's thoughtful remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

I welcome the opportunity to be here today to share with you this observance of the 44th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukrainian National Republic.

Probably no ethnic group within the Soviet Union has suffered more, suffered longer, and resisted harder than the Ukrainians. The wall which today divides Berlin dramatizes to the world the oppressive nature of the Soviet state. A fact not nearly as well known is that 40 million people of the Ukraine have been walled in for over 40 years.

In my judgment, it is the duty of American Government officials to speak soberly and fairly about the realities of the world politics. They should not raise false hopes in the course of once-a-year speeches. Freedom for the Ukraine does not appear within

reach, short of an all-out nuclear war which no responsible person advocates.

Is there any hope, then, or anything that can be done? Yes. We live in days when enormous social, economic, political, and scientific forces are at work, shaking our universe to its foundations. What appears hopeless today may become possible tomorrow. There may be light at the end of the long, dark tunnel.

History teaches us that the spirit of freedom cannot be starved. The will to resist is a stubborn thing. Three centuries ago the Ukraine was independent and comparatively rich. Then, despite hundreds of years of domination by the Russian and Austro-Hungarian Empires, the hunger for freedom was maintained, Ukrainian culture and language was preserved, the nationalist drive remained alive. In 1918 freedom was briefly achieved and independence declared.

But the freedom of a nation, when newly achieved, is often as delicate as a new-born baby. It needs time to strengthen itself against outside dangers. Precious time was denied to the Republic of the Ukraine. Hunger, disease, subversion, and war choked this young nation and tragedy was the result.

We know that, despite constant persecution, the restless Ukraine still causes the Soviet Union much concern. The Russians admit it. Khrushchev, at the 1956 Party Congress, disclosed that Stalin even considered total physical extermination of the Ukrainian people.

These 40 million people need a voice. Groups such as yours, good and worthy citizens of the United States and Canada, have given them a voice. And that voice is not forlorn. The world saw, in the highly agitated Russian reaction to the Captive Nations Resolution of July 1959 which included the Ukraine for the first time, that a tender nerve had been struck.

In this country we sometimes give the Communists more credit than they deserve in the arts of propaganda and diplomacy. Although we have our problems in the Congo, Berlin, Laos, and South Vietnam, the Soviets have their problems, too. They are not 10 feet tall. Their efforts to penetrate Africa have been largely unsuccessful; they face continuous crises in agriculture; internal doctrinal disputes are shaking the Red bloc to its roots; and satellite and captive nations are restless under governments which rule by force rather than persuasion. Let it not be forgotten that 45 percent of the Soviet Union is made up of non-Russians.

Our observation of Ukrainian Independence Day is a valuable thing. On this day (1) we show the people of the Ukraine that they are not forgotten; (2) we keep faith with what is morally right; (3) we reaffirm the principle of self-determination; and (4) we help remind the newly-emerging nations of Africa and Asia, whose leaders are often unfamiliar with all but recent history, that the Sovet Union is the last big remaining colonial empire on earth.

In doing these things we serve the cause of freedom.

Thank you for inviting me to share this occasion with you.

Importance of Milk Stressed by President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am very much concerned about the decline in the consumption of milk in this Nation, not only because I represent a dairy district in the great dairy State of Wisconsin and serve as chairman of the House Dairy and Poultry Subcommittee, but also because I know that milk is a vital ingredient for a nutritionally sound diet for our citizens. I am pleased to note that President John F. Kennedy shares my feelings on the necessity of milk in the diets of both children and adults and on the safety of our milk supply from radioactive fallout.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD a summary of President Kennedy's views on the subject as expressed before the National Conference on Milk and Nutrition, held January 23 here in Washington, D.C.:

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S REMARKS AT MILK AND NUTRITION CONFERENCE

Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Ladies and Gentlemen, I want to express my appreciation to all of you for participating in this conference, which I think is most important to our farmers and to our country.

And I want to say a few words this morning about a very important subject to us all. And that is milk.

Almost every State produces milk. It provides twice as much of the cash income for our farmers as any other basic crop. It's our most nourishing food.

And last year we consumed either in the form of milk or in the form of butter, cheese or ice cream, about 125 billion pounds of dairy products. But in the year before we consumed between 2 and 3 billion pounds more. At the same time, our population increased 1.7 percent. And milk production, in an effort to keep pace with population production, increased 1½ percent. And in that same time, milk consumption declined 2½ percent.

This is a serious matter for us, serious for the dairy industry, for all of our farmers and for the United States.

First, it's a matter of concern because it implies poor nutrition and a less balanced diet.

Second, it presents problems in the area of the management of our milk production. It will require adjustment. We cannot continue to accumulate dairy products in still larger inventories. Nor can we embark upon a policy that will jeopardize the economic interest of so large a segment of our farm population. For there is a close relationship between prosperity on the farm and prosperity in the city, between economic health of our farm community and the economic health of our Nation.

Third, the drop in milk consumption has a serious implication for the best use of those soil, water, and animal resources that are now involved in dairy production. I doubt that anyone can be sure of the reasons of this sudden drop in consumption. We only know that the slow decline in consumption over a period of time became immediate and precipitous last year.

I have long been convinced that milk is an important aid to good health. This has led me to direct that milk be served at every White House meal from now on. And I expect that all of us will benefit from it.

If we are to be a vigorous and vital Nation as we all desire, then of course we must depend on the consumption of a balanced diet. And milk must be a part of it.

I am aware that there has been a good deal of public discussion about the effect of radioactive fallout upon our food supply. Most of the discussion has unfortunately used milk as an example of food products that might be contaminated. This recognizes the importance of milk in our daily diet, but it has the unfortunate effect of causing an indentification in the minds of some between fallout and milk. I should like to correct any misunderstandings that may exist about this.

The Public Health Service and other agencies have been instructed to keep the problems of fallout in food under constant surveillance. Detailed guidelines to protect the health of the people against radiation have been developed by the Federal Radiation Council. It is abundantly clear that for the foreseeable future there is no danger from present amount of exposure.

The milk supply offers no hazards—on the contrary it remains one of the best sources of nutrition for our children and for adults. And I hope that the American people will appreciate this more and more as time goes on. In addition, the Food and Nutrition Board of the National Research Council has concluded after intensive research that the association of milk consumption and coronary disease due to the increase in cholesterol level has not been sufficiently established to justifiy the abandonment of this nutritious element except where doctors have individually prescribed special diets for those found to be susceptible to special cholesterol or coronary problems.

In the past 50 years, our children have grown more vigorous and sturdy because of better diets and better health. Our young adults are now about 2 inches taller than they were half a century ago. I should like, and I am sure all of us would like, to see this trend continue.

A large proportion of our people now attain a physical condition once attained by a very few. But nutritionists tell us that 10 percent of our people still have an inadequate diet. The most serious deficiencies, I'm told, are in the very minerals and vitamins such as calcium and vitamin A—most prevalent in milk. I'm sure all of us would like to see this nutritional gap narrowed.

Those who are familiar with the needs and the problems of our older citizens also tell us that older people need more calcium than they now get. Again milk offers the best and most economical source of this vital mineral.

There are many schoolchildren today who do not participate in the school milk and school lunch programs because their schools do not and often cannot make them available. Last year we expanded these programs. I hope more and more children will be able to receive school milk and lunches in the days ahead. These find, I think, increasing support, these programs, among the people of other nations. We have encouraged this development and will continue to do so.

These are some of the areas which I hope this conference will cover. I do not say that it is an easy matter that we are now faced with, but we do want to emphasize that this is a great productive resource of our country. We're rich in a very basic food. We are anxious to have the consumption of it increased as our population mounts and I believe that this conference will help bring attention of the public to what a valuable asset we have and to make sure that we develop it more fully. And therefore I want to express my thanks to all of you for being here today.

The Urban Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, in the Ford Hall Forum in Boston, Mass., on

November 26, 1961, Administrator Robert C. Weaver had occasion to review developments in the Federal Government's housing and urban programs during the first 10 months of the Kennedy administration in relation to the goals and standards set forth by our President at the Urban Affairs Conference at Pittsburgh in October of 1960.

I am certain that this review of accomplishments will be of interest to my colleagues here in the U.S. House of Representatives, and the following are excerpts from Administrator Weaver's address:

THE URBAN FRONTIER

The title of my talk tonight—"The Urban Frontier"—comes from an address delivered just a little more than a year ago in Pittsburgh by the man who is now our President.

He was a Senator then, and a candidate for President. And in that speech he laid down the policies which he proposed to pursue in the field of urban affairs should he be elected.

Now that a year has passed since the election of President Kennedy, and 10 months since his inauguration, I think it is time to take stock of what has been done to implement what was then proposed.

And I know of no more fitting place in which to make such an accounting than in Boston, and just a short distance away from Faneuil Hall where the President's campaign came to its conclusion.

The President's proposals for the urban frontier were made before a Conference on Urban Problems attended by more than 450 persons.

The chairman of that conference was Mayor Richard C. Lee of New Haven. Edward J. Logue, who is now the development administrator for your Boston Redevelopment Authority, was one of the key figures in organizing the conference.

In his address President Kennedy recalled that Aristotle had said: "Men come together in cities in order to live; they remain together in order to live the good life."

But the good life, the President pointed out, has too often been just a dream for too many of the people who live on the urban frontier, which exists in every city in America and in its suburbs.

The President said:

"What stands between our people and the good life of which Aristotle spoke is not any lack of ability to produce consumer goods. That problem, for America, has been solved. What has not been solved are those problems which lie largely in the realm of public action—bad housing, poverty, recessions, unemployment, discrimination, crowded and obsolete schools and hospitals and libraries, inadequate recreation, the breakdown of mass transportation, polluted air and water, juvenile delinquency."

To attack these problems the President proposed a new and vital partnership between the National Government and the communities of America. In this partnership, he said: "Each community will plan its own future, but it will be helped to get there by the combined resources of cities, States and Nation."

The President called for a 10-year, Federal-local action program to eradicate slums and blight and help solve the problems of explosive metropolitan growth.

A new partnership of community and National Government, he said, should lead us across the urban frontier in five areas: urban renewal, housing, mass transportation, air and water pollution, and recreational facilities.

In each of these areas the President proposed specific actions which should be taken if he were elected. I would like to review with you the proposals he made then—and what has been done about them.

It is easy in our cynical age, to jest about broken campaign promises. For it is inevitable that some promises will be broken. Ideas that glow in the heat of a campaign can became quite dull when chilled by the responsibility of government.

Miracles are not wrought overnight. A handful of Presidential appointees do not take control of government machinery that has been neglected for eight years, and transform it in a moment to a model of efficiency and enthusiasm.

But a great deal has been accomplished, and the groundwork has been laid for a great deal more. And if anything bothers us now it is not that we have failed to accomplish more, it is that not enough people realize how much we have accomplished.

President Kennedy took office on January 20. On January 30 he went before Congress to deliver his state of the Union address. On March 9 he sent to Congress a message defining his policies for housing and community development.

On March 29 he sent to Congress the administration's housing bill, which spelled those policies out in specific legislation. On June 30 he signed the Housing Act of 1961.

That act encompassed the most comprehensive urban affairs program in congressional history. But no one should think because of the speed with which it was passed that it was an easy achievement.

Under the previous administration one housing bill after the other was vetoed. The conservatives in Congress fought the Housing Act of 1961 all the way. Only a handful of Republicans—5 in the Senate and 26 in the House of Representatives—broke with their party to support the bill. (None of them, incidentally, were from Massachusetts). It was the Democrats who carried the Housing Act to victory—53 to 38 in the Senate and 229 to 176 in the House.

In Pittsburgh on Otcober 10, 1960, President Kennedy had this to say about urban renewal:

"An expanded urban renewal program should be made effective in conserving and restoring older areas, as well as in clearing and rebuilding areas that are beyond conserving. The National Government should give a long-term commitment to urban renewal—in place of the present year-to-year approach—so that cities can make long-term plans with the assurance that aid will not be suddenly cut off."

The Housing Act of 1961 implemented both those proposals.

It did so by authorizing a new program of FHA-insured loans, that for the first time made it possible to finance extensive rehabilitation of deteriorating housing.

And it did so by authorizing a total of $2 billion in Federal assistance to urban renewal over the next 4 years—as much as was authorized for this purpose during the last 12 years.

The Federal Housing Administration has for years insured home improvement loans, and this program has found wide acceptance in this country among both lending institutions and the general public. But it has proven to be much too restricted to accomplish the extensive rehabilitation that is necessary to reclaim our housing supply and prevent the spread of blight in our cities.

These home improvement loans have, in the past, been limited to $3,500 on single family homes and $2,500 on each unit in a multifamily building. They have carried an effective interest rate as high as 9.58 percent—far more than a homeowner should have to pay for such credit.

Under the new program authorized by the Housing Act of 1961 a property owner can borrow up to $10,000 for each dwelling unit—enough to do a thorough job of rehabilitation. This loan can be repaid over 20 years. And the interest rate is fixed by law at no more than 6 percent.

There has been a tremendous response to this new program throughout the country. There is a great demand for this type of financing among those who own property. And there is an eagerness on the part of builders and architects to meet this demand.

The difficulties in the new program—and I'll be frank about them—have been in cutting through the red tape which the Government has built up around the insurance of such loans. And in persuading lenders that this is as good an investment as we think it is.

We are aware of these difficulties. And we are moving to meet them.

As far as administrative impediments are concerned, we are well on the way to overcome them. I am entirely optimistic in this regard.

Much is said these days about the competition of Government with private industry. Less is mentioned about the opportunities and exampels of cooperation between Government and private enterprise. The program for mortgage insurance for rehabilitation loans is a new such opportunity. From its earliest inception, this proposal was discussed with sources of private mortgage finance. Today we are continuing these discussions, seeking the maximum participation of private institutions. We shall continue this approach, believing that the job ahead here, as in most of our activities, is one that requires the resources and commitment of both Government and business. The success of this program now depends largely upon the participation of private capital.

While the Housing Act of 1961 provided the financial means toward practical rehabilitation, all of us in the new administration have sought to make clear that conservation and restoration were our first goals—and total clearance is to be concentrated in those areas which will respond to no other treatment or have to be cleared in order to effect a total land use pattern.

The President said in his housing message that: "Our urban renewal efforts must be substantially reoriented from slum clearance and slum prevention into positive programs for economic and social regeneration."

In speech after speech I have emphasized that one of our most valuable national resources is our existing supply of housing. We cannot hope to meet the housing needs of the future if we wastefully demolish the housing we now have. Rather we must reclaim as much as possible of what we have as the basis from which to build for the future; we must learn how to accomplish rehabilitation and conservation.

William L. Slayton, Commissioner of the Urban Renewal Administration, has said the same thing over and over again in his speeches.

We repeat this theme not because we feel it needs any justification, but because we want to convey as strongly as we can to the planners, the people who originate the urban renewal plans which eventually we are called upon to approve, that this is what we want.

We want them to know that when they propose total clearance we will look at their proposal closely and cautiously to determine if total clearance is required. And we want them to know that when they propose conservation and rehabilitation they will find a much more sympathetic reception.

However, I must add that, despite our new orientation, there are sites which will have to be cleared, where there is not enough good housing to justify any other approach, where the expansion of public facilities—Government buildings, universities, and hospitals—require clearance, or where the res-

toration of a sound economic base for the city makes it imperative to tear down an inlying area which may include some sound structures within its boundaries.

A most important aspect of housing conservation is the adoption and enforcement of building, plumbing, electrical, and housing codes.

The Federal Government has said that communities seeking Federal aid to fight slums and blight and foster growth and development should adopt and enforce modern codes. And we intend to be more vigorous in checking on this requirement than ever before.

We have recently announced that communities coming to us for the first time for certification of their workable program for community improvement—a prerequisite to many Federal aids—must adopt such codes within the first year after the program is approved.

Communities which already have had their workable programs approved are expected to meet this requirement by October 1, 1962.

In the field of housing, President Kennedy had this to say in his speech last year:

"Our housing programs should be brought into a better balance—so that they will be designed to build homes not only for higher income families, but also for lower income and middle income, not only in the newer suburbs but also in our older cities. We should be building half again as many homes as are being built this year. We need a new, effective middle-income housing program. We should meet the neglected needs of the elderly and minority groups. And let us improve the help we are giving to those families and businesses that are displaced by redevelopment and other governmental programs. The cost of projects which benefit a whole community should not be disproportionately borne by a few."

His proposals were precise and at the same time comprehensive. Let me itemize what has been done on each of them.

For persons at the lowest income levels—too low to afford good housing in the private market—the Housing Act of 1961 authorized 100,000 new units of public housing.

Under the Kennedy administration the average number of public housing units contracted for each month has been as high as the previous administration contracted for in 6 months. In the first 9 months of the Kennedy administration contracts were signed with local housing authorities for four times as many public housing units as were signed in the same period last year by the previous administration.

For persons of moderate income the Housing Act of 1961 initiated two new programs.

To those wishing to purchase their own homes it provided liberalized terms for mortgages insured by the FHA—larger mortgages with lower downpayments to be paid off over longer terms.

The maximum term of a mortgage that can be insured on a new home was extended by the act from 30 to 35 years. The minimum downpayment was formerly 3 percent of the first $13,500 of the mortgage; now it is 3 percent of the first $15,000.

The maximum amount of a mortgage that could be insured by the FHA used to be $22,500. Now it is $25,000. And for the first time—on mortgages up to $15,000—closing costs can be included under the mortgage.

As important as these more liberal terms for the purchasers of homes are the steps taken by the Kennedy administration to reduce the interest charges on home mortgages.

Under the previous administration the interest rate permitted on mortgages insured by the FHA had been allowed to climb from 4¼ percent to 5¾ percent.

President Kennedy put the weight of billions of dollars in Federal resources behind an all-out effort to force those interest rates down. The rate was reduced first to 5½ percent, and then to 5¼ percent. The Federal National Mortgage Association bought up millions of dollars worth of mortgages to encourage bankers to accept these lower rates.

The result has been to save millions of dollars for Americans who are working to purchase their own homes.

For persons of moderate income who prefer to rent, the Housing Act of 1961 created a new program of below-the-market-rate mortgage loans to finance apartment developments. These are loans insured by the Federal Housing Administration and purchased by the Federal National Mortgage Association.

They carry a rate of 3⅛ percent—well below the rate which would have to be charged by a private lender. And low enough to make possible rentals as much as 20 percent below the rentals in buildings conventionally financed.

The first apartment development financed under this new program is in Baltimore. It had been originally proposed for conventional FHA financing, which would have required rentals of $75 a month for a one-bedroom apartment, $85 a month for a two-bedroom apartment, and $95 a month for a three-bedroom apartment.

Under the new below-the-market-rate program, however, those rentals were reduced to $57.50 for the one-bedroom apartment, $67.50 for the two-bedroom apartment, and $77.50 for the three-bedroom apartment.

The significance of these lower rentals is not in the $17.50 a month that the tenant of a three-bedroom apartment will save. It is that the family which would have been able to afford only a one-bedroom apartment now can afford an apartment with three bedrooms.

These loans are made only to non-profit or limited-profit organizations to construct housing for middle-income families. Builders have been quick to see the opportunities in this program, however, for through it they can reach an enormous untapped market. So far we have received over 2,000 applications for these mortgage loans. And we have approved over 300 of them.

The President spoke in Pittsburgh about the need for more housing construction. During 1960 there were 1,258,000 units of private nonfarm housing started.

That was a level 18 percent below the year before, and the lowest level reached in the past decade. As a result of this decline one out of every six construction workers was unemployed at the end of 1960—the highest rate of unemployment in any major American industry.

This year more than 1,350,000 units of private nonfarm housing will have been started. Unemployment in the building industry has been reduced. And the impact of the higher rate of construction has been felt throughout our economy in demand for building materials.

Next year, the best informed people in the housing business expect more than 1,400,000 starts—a 5- to 7-percent increase over this year. And, believe me, that is a conservative estimate.

To meet the neglected needs of the elderly the Housing Act of 1961 took several important steps:

It increased the Federal contribution to public housing units occupied by elderly persons.

It eliminated for elderly persons the rental gap between public and private housing.

It authorized an increase from $50 to $125 million in the revolving fund from which loans are made to finance the private construction of housing for older persons.

It increased the maximum direct loan which can be made to these private developers from 98 percent to 100 percent of the project cost.

To provide for better coordination and administration of the housing programs for older persons, the Housing and Home Finance Agency established the Office of an Assistant Administrator of Housing for Senior Citizens.

Just a few figures will give you some idea of the increased activity in this field.

In the first 10 months of this year we have had applications for FHA mortgage insurance on over 26,000 units of housing for older persons, compared to applications for 15,000 units under the same program in the same period a year ago.

When the Kennedy administration took office in January loan agreements and fund reservations had been issued for only $5 million in direct loans to build housing for senior citizens. At the end of October loan agreements and fund reservations had been made for more than $24 million.

The President also followed through, both administratively and in the legislation he proposed, to improve the help being given to the families and businesses displaced by redevelopment.

At the President's direction the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Department of Commerce put into effect joint machinery to bring about the coordination of urban renewal and highway planning in communities throughout the United States.

Far too often in the past the lack of coordination between these two programs had resulted in extensive and heartless displacement of low-income families on a scale far beyond the ability of the community to absorb them in good housing.

That is a situation which we hope we have brought to an end.

The Housing Act of 1961 broadened the special FHA program to aid the construction of housing for persons displaced by Government action. The dollar limits on the mortgages on single-family homes that can be insured under this program were increased from $12,000 to $15,000—a move designed both to improve the quality of housing available under this program, and also to attract more builders to take part in it.

The Housing Act of 1961 also removed the ceiling on relocation payments for businesses, providing that the Federal Government can pay the full cost of such movements. Businesses, particularly those which have extraordinary moving costs because of heavy machinery, will greatly benefit from this provision.

In this Pittsburgh campaign speech the President gave special emphasis to the critical problem of mass transportation. He said:

"Almost every metropolitan region has a transportation crisis, but few have the resources to meet it unaided. * * * We have extensive Federal aid for highways but none for commuter railroads, bus, and streetcar service. Continuation of this unbalanced policy—or lack of policy—can only mean still further decline of mass transportation facilities and still more bumper-to-bumper automobile traffic—in a vicious circle which has no end short of paving all our cities over. Unified transportation planning should be a condition and a goal of Federal assistance."

One of the President's first acts after taking office was to direct the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Department of Commerce to undertake an immediate and extensive study of urban transportation problems to determine the proper role of the Federal Government in their solution.

That study has now been completed and is on the President's desk. From it will come, I am sure, significant Federal action in this field.

While this study was going on the President started the machinery of Government moving in the field of mass transit.

Included in the Housing Act of 1961 was authority to make $50 million in loans and $25 million in grants to help communities plan and develop their mass transportation systems.

To implement this new program an Office of Transportation was created in the Housing and Home Finance Agency. And Prof. John Kohl of the University of Michigan was named to head this office.

Professor Kohl formerly was the director of the Transportation Institute at the University of Michigan, in charge of project research and educational programs in this field.

He is now engaged in going through the more than 50 proposals and inquiries we have received from communities throughout the United States that are anxious to take part in these new programs.

The most difficult part of his job will be to select those proposals which will give us the maximum benefit from the very limited funds which are available.

The proposals we now have on hand would require between $40 and $50 million which will give you an idea of the demand existing for this program.

One of the most interesting of these proposals, incidentally, has come from the city of Ithaca, N.Y. That city has proposed an experiment with free bus service to see what effect this will have in shifting traffic from private to public transportation. This is not a Government handout to be repeated across the Nation. It is a relatively small experiment which will demonstrate the effect of cost upon the volume of use in a mass transit system.

In regard to recreation, the President said in his campaign speech last year:

"We must act to preserve and protect open spaces along our rivers, lakes, and seashores and on the edges of our expanding metropolitan areas."

Shortly after he was inaugurated President Kennedy directed the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Department of the Interior to work together to develop a long-range policy and program for assisting communities in the preservation of open space.

In the Housing Act of 1961 there was granted authority to make $50 million in grants to communities to help them preserve open space for recreation and conservation.

The amount of these grants normally may be 20 percent of the cost of acquiring this land. But it may be as high as 30 percent if the grant is made to a public body which exercises responsibility for an urban area as a whole pursuant to an intergovernmental agreement.

The purpose of the larger grant is to encourage planning on an areawide basis. The law provides that any grant for the acquisition of open land must be part of the execution of a comprehensive plan for an urban area.

The Urban Renewal Administration which is administering this program has already received applications for grants totaling more than $5,750,000 from public bodies in 12 States. In addition it has had over 170 inquiries from public bodies, citizens' organizations, and interested individuals in 27 States.

Water and air pollution, about which the President spoke in the Pittsburgh speech last year, are not part of the responsibility of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. So I am not qualified to talk in detail about what has been done by the Kennedy administration in regard to them.

But the basic facts are clear.

Last year Congress passed a bill providing for Federal aid to clean up stream pollution. It was vetoed.

This year Congress passed a water pollution bill. And the President signed it.

The new law, administered by the Public Health Service, will provide special aid to over 5,000 American communities to help them protect their water supplies against pollution. It has been hailed by conservationists, municipal officials and civic groups as the most far-reaching approach in history to stream pollution abatement.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has greatly increased its activities in combating air pollution. Under the Kennedy administration the budget for air pollution control activities has been increased from $7.3 million to $8.4 million. The air sampling network of the Public Health Service has been considerably expanded. The installation of blowby devices on automobiles has been actively promoted. Legislation will be proposed in the next session of Congress to further strengthen the air pollution program.

In his Pittsburgh speech the President said:

"I propose that we create a new and vital partnership between the National Government and the communities of America."

As soon as the first session of Congress under his administration had been concluded, the President moved dramatically and decisively to bring this partnership to reality.

In response to the requests of mayors and Governors in key areas of the country he made the highest officials of his administration available for a series of White House regional conference in a dozen major cities.

Every since the days of Theodore Roosevelt, when the first White House Conference was held, private citizens have been brought to Washington at public expense to confer with officials of the National Government on urgent national problems.

President Kennedy, instead, sent his officials to the people. And he sent them not only to tell the people what his administration was doing, but to find out what else the people wanted to have done.

The results of these conferences will be reflected in myriad ways through administrative and legislative actions in the months ahead.

The conferences demonstrated the wide support the Kennedy administration has on the local level in this country, from public officials and private citizens alike.

Your own Mayor Collins played an important part in the regional conference which was held in New York City, serving on its host committee, speaking at several of its meetings, and participating in the various sessions.

These conferences showed that a wide cross section of our citizenry is deeply concerned with the problems of urban development and the other subjects discussed.

They offered an eloquent barometer of the degree to which our Nation's domestic programs are understood throughout the country.

They offered an opportunity to explain to a large number of people of varied backgrounds the nature of the relationship between Federal support and local control of programs in urban areas.

And they provided to officials who are normally stationed in Washington a chance to hear what people want, what they do not understand, and what they hope for in the future.

It gave all of us from Washington a chance to have face to face contact with many individuals—civic leaders, and officials—with whom we had corresponded, or talked to on the telephone, but whom we never before had the opportunity to meet.

In each city there was an extremely well prepared tour, led by a responsible local official—frequently the mayor—which provided us with a chance to see developments that had been only files to us before.

And equally important—through a helicopter tour in New York and bus tours in other cities—we were able to see the relationship between the projects with which we were concerned and the community of which they are a part.

All of us returned to Washington with sharply refined criteria for the judgment of what is being done in the programs we administer, and stimulated by a wealth of ideas for future administrative and legislative changes to meet the needs of the American people.

Through these conferences, and all else that we have done, I hope we have helped to forge the partnership of community and National Government about which the President spoke in his Pittsburgh speech of October 1960.

For it is from this partnership we will derive the strength to cross the urban frontier.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Razor's Edge of Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUART SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, as we are all aware, this session will be of lasting importance to the future of our country—and thus to the fate of freedom.

We have returned newly impressed with the thinking of the citizens of our respective States.

As I traveled over Missouri, numerous constructive questions were raised about present and future policies.

Among those who saw the future as a challenge, rather than a crisis, was one to whom I would like to pay particular respect: the newly inaugurated president of Southwest Missouri State College in Springfield, Mo.

In accepting this important responsibility, Dr. Leland E. Traywick commented that—

> Mankind is truly on the edge of the razor of greatness again. The explosion can be that of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, or it can be that of a millennium of enlightenment.

Dr. Traywick felt that the factor which could tilt the balance toward destruction—rather than new discovery—was complacency; a feeling that with bombs so big, and nations so numerous, the individual had no effective role to play.

Quoting further from Dr. Traywick:

> This complacency, this presurrender, this indifference, this willingess to do nothing, this is an even greater danger than the monster bombs themselves. The trouble, of course, is not in things but in people. With a will we can survive the bombs, but we can never survive the spirit of surrender.

As we begin a new year, Dr. Traywick's advice seems particularly relevant.

Mr. President, I ask that the speech of Dr. Leland E. Traywick, given at his inaugural on November 14, 1961, in Springfield, Mo., be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THE RAZOR'S EDGE OF TOMORROW

(An address by President Leland Eldridge Traywick, Inauguration Day, Southwest Missouri State College, November 14, 1961)

Mr. Cockrill, Governor Dalton, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, thank you so very much for such a cordial reception and a thoughtful introduction. I am glad to be here and I am so very pleased and honored by you and this occasion. It is with a sincere sense of humility and deep appreciation for all that you, the board of regents, the faculty, the students, and especially the committee on public exercises have done for me and my wife on this occasion that I appear here today. If I may, I would like to pay special tribute to Dr. Harry Siceluff and his very hard-working committee of faculty, students, and many others who made these arrangements and prepared all of the infinite detail. I would like also to say a personal word of appreciation to Mr. Cockrill and the board of regents so that they know how much I am indebted to them. To Governor and Mrs. Dalton I would say a very special word of gratitude for honoring Southwest Missouri State College with their presence today.

You know, besides this inauguration, a number of other very fine things have happened to me this fall at Southwest Missouri State. These have made me really feel that I belong to the college and am welcome in a most generous way. I would make special mention of being made an honorary member of the "S" squad by the Southwest Missouri State athletes and being given an "S" blanket. You see, I never got to play football or basketball or go out for track while I was in college. This, therefore, came to me as a very special honor. Another very thoughtful thing that happened was being made an honorary member of the Southwest Alumni Association. This was done here on the day that was the 25th anniversary of my own homecoming class at the University of Missouri in Columbia. So I was especialy glad to have been here and most pleased to have gained another Alma Mater.

Now today comes the inaugural. As President Emeritus Roy Ellis knows, we do not get a new president very often at Southwest Missouri State. It is indeed an honor and a privilege to be here before you today.

During the past weeks as I searched for ideas for today, I looked for something that might be earth-shaking, something that would perhaps electrify you and send you home to think and to ponder and to act. My search was fruitless, however. Many great things have been said and they are available for you to read and study in almost any library. Then it occurred to me. I needed to transpose my emphasis. Just as the sun does not go around the earth, so also things here are not what they seem at first impression. The greatness, if there is to be any, is not to be in me or in what I may say. The distinction lies instead in you, in your being here, and in what you will do with your lives in the tomorrows that lie ahead. You have come today not for me, but to do honor to Southwest Missouri State College. This is as it should be, for here is an important place for learning.

Here we, as students, faculty, and facilitators, are dedicated to the highest of purposes. Ours is the improvement of mankind. Ours is a faith in knowledge and learning, in doubting and questioning and experimenting that will not let us rest. For somehow, with God's help and by taking thought, man can better himself and the universe in which he lives. Toward this end we work, realizing like Wolfe who overtook Montcalm on the Plains of Abraham that—

> "Heights by great men reached and kept
> were not attained by sudden flight,
> But they while their companions slept were
> toiling upward in the night."

In the many, many areas of this, our work at the collegiate level, the facets are legion. Nor is anyone to say a particular area is more important than another. Such is a bootless argument like the one of who won the war—the Army, the Navy, or the Air Corps. Or the age-old classic—"the eye cannot say to the hand, 'I have no need of you'." The importance of all members of the body, of all branches of knowledge, should be clear. As John Dewey put it, "To know one thing and to know it thoroughly is to know the universe." In other words, all branches of knowledge touch each other and are important to each other. Let no one, therefore, exalt himself or his job, or profession, or business. The finiteness of infinity has yet to be written.

This, in a measure, is a dynamic concept of the organic theory of the state, the community, and the individual. Of course, it is not that as conceived by Fichete, Comte, or Hegel, who through Nietzsche, Marx, and others would use it for the extreme of the far right—facism, or the far left—communism. This instead is an organic theory, a wholeness theory, an every-member-of-the-body theory, which would argue that the greatness of an age lies not in the choosing of important work to do, but lies in the care and the perfection of all work that is done. It argues against a judgment which decrees trivia or commendations hither and thither and reminds the listener that "for want of a nail the shoe was lost."

Let us turn, therefore, each to his or her own abilities with no quibbling about self-importance, but instead to a full realization and awe of the far-reaching consequences of what we do or say. Even as in church it is not only the minister or priest who has a contribution to make, but also the choir, the janitor, and the widow with her two mites. Knowingly, and unknowingly, the achievers are justly due their rewards beyond our poor ability to judge.

The task, then, is work. The calling is the importance of all work. The crime is the waste in being satisfied with so little. The crime is the indifference and unwillingness to work regardless of the cost and regardless of the wage the other person gets. The crime is not to have failed, but not to have tried at all. This, of course, was what Tennyson was telling us in his "In Memoriam to Arthur Henry Hallam." This is what has echoed down the eras and as much as anything brings us up short to the importance of our age. We, of all people, stand on the razor's edge of a tomorrow which could bring a Dark Ages from which mankind could never recover. Or we stand on the razor's edge of a tomorrow which could bring an enlightenment about the universe that would be a new renaissance beyond the wildest of imaginations.

Come with me for just a moment to see where we stand in this eternity of time and hence the importance of everything we do. Seemingly in the pattern of century events we are on the crest of a wave. Ours is not a century of mid-Victorian complacency. Ours is a time much more akin to the 18th century. Look at the explosions that were taking place then on both sides of the Atlantic—the French revolution and the overthrow of the ancient regime, the American revolution and the overthrow of British authority. Political democracy was breaking out in the old world and the new. The time was one of change. It was an era of greatness—that of Rousseau, Voltaire, Danton, Adam Smith, Paine, Jefferson, Franklin. Yet,

the military hero on this side of the Atlantic was to serve but two terms in office and live to see and make democracy work. He was unlike his counterpart in Europe who was to "wade through slaughter to a throne" and end at Waterloo.

Look back another 200 years. Now you see Martin Luther nailing the 95 theses on the door of the church at Wittenburg. The reformation both inside and outside the Catholic church is in full swing. Columbus has but recently discovered a new world, while on his way elsewhere. (And if I may turn aside for just a moment, have you ever noticed how many things are discovered almost by accident? Columbus on the way to India found an entire new continent. Alexander Graham Bell only wanted to invent a hearing aid for his wife. And so often it goes with the Archimedes, the Newtons, the Edisons, et al. But I must not get carried away with this theme.) The 16th century was one of greatness and great change. These were not only the days of Luther, the conquistadores, and the commercial revolution, but also of Michelangelo, Raphael, Leonardo da Vinci, Shakespeare, and Machiavelli.

Look back briefly almost another 200 years. This is the 14th century. It is the close of the Middle Ages with the death of Dante in 1321 and the opening of the Italian Renaissance with Petrarch. It is the era of Lorenzo the Magnificent, Boccaccio, and humanism. It leads to the invention of printing, the clock, chimney flues, stained glass, plumbing, spectacles, the mariner's compass, and gunpowder. These are times of great change.

Look back once more: Europe in the 12th century. It is in the midst of the great crusades.

The pattern seems unmistakable. The cycle is that of the 12th, 14th, 16th, 18th, and 20th centuries—eras of great change, great times, and great men and women. These are the beacon moments of history. One realizes, of course, that many things happened in the intervening centuries. They also had their great men and women, as, for example, the 15th century. Yet, such times were often lesser than the 12th, 14th, 16th, 18th, and 20th centuries which have generally seen more world shaking events and have had more far-reaching consequences than the other centuries. Nor would I argue that this 200 year cycle—which I would call the Traywick theory or the Traywickian cycle as I find it nowhere else—is a perfect 200 years either. My thought is only that approximately every 2 centuries there comes a culmination of men and the times which shapes the course of destiny "rough hew it how we will." In this our century we are on such a crest of events.

I would take you, therefore, to the edge of time—perhaps have for you a vision of Sir Launfal or a Cortez silent on a peak in Darien.

You have been with me and seen the watchfires of the centuries circling camps, that have builded toward the present in the evening dews and damps, and you can read the choices clearly by the dim and flaring lamps.

This is the edge of tomorrow

. Yet, you say of these, our times, we have had two world wars so far, a total depression, and totalitarianisms of the right and left. This is greatness? No, of course not. These are the tragedies of our times. The greatness is in the explosion of knowledge—of the science of nuclear physics, of outer space, of new fibers, fabrics, engines, miracle drugs, and material well-being. Put in terms of prime movers and prime materials with which man deals one would say this: the age of wood and wind has given way to that of iron and steam, and that in turn to an age of steel and diesel-electric power, and that in turn to an age of synthetics, plastics, and alloys with rocket and atomic power. Mankind is truly on the edge of the razor of greatness again. The explosion can be that of Hiroshima and Nagasaki or it can be that of a millennium of enlightenment.

The great danger though as we face tomorrow is that of complacency. With the fall-out of Armageddon now possible in our lifetimes, with a holocaust of fire and brimstone a realizable reality, with the handwriting of Belshazzar's feast all but on the wall, with possibly 75 million Americans dead in the first hour of nuclear war, the air is permeated with the words: "I just won't bother," or "Why worry? We can't survive anyway."

This, I submit, this presurrender, this indifference, this willingness to do nothing, this is an even greater danger than the monster bombs themselves. The trouble, of course, is not in things but in people. With a will we can survive the bombs, but we can never survive the spirit of surrender. We must, therefore, somehow, someway learn to live with modern science. Which is another way of saying, we must learn to live with each other.

In this, then, our present crisis, with the Russians in manned orbit around the earth, with a missile gap, with the death of Secretary Hammarskjold, we too might say with James Russell Lowell:

"Careless seems the great Avenger * * * Truth forever on the scaffold, Wrong forever on the throne * * *"

Yet, in this our present crisis, new occasions do teach new duties, time does make ancient good uncouth. Conditions do change, "And that scaffold sways the future," if we will but see it.

What then of the future? What of the razor's edge that is difficult to pass over? The future of our American democracy and our American business system depends in large measure on you and people like you. If you refuse to vote, if you refuse to take an active part in politics—and I did say politics, for out of it comes good or bad government—if you refuse to be active in American democracy, then it will fall prey to some other "ism." If, too, our business system cannot have good health, then it will fall prey to dictators. Perhaps this latter is most serious, for economic ill health touches all so quickly. Total depressions lead to totalitarianisms and they in turn to total wars, both hot and cold. The chain of events is clear: If we, too, become complacent, if we refuse to learn about, to understand, and to take an active part in the operation of our democracy and our economy, then we can fall to a Hitler even as did Germany in the 1930's.

What of the future? Let me charge you and all the colleges and universities in the land that this is in great measure in your hands. You and those who would educate and those who would be educated cannot afford indifference or ignorance. For if you do, it is at your peril and at the peril of everyone. This is the importance of education and thoughtful action. This is the race between education and disaster. In this, our great responsibility today for the tomorrow that is almost upon us, one is reminded of the Englishman, John Donne, of the 16th century:

"No man is an island unto himself
Everyone is a piece of the continent, a part of the main.
If a clod we washed away by the sea, England is the less
As if it a promontory were,
Or a manor of thine own or of thy friends.
Every man's death diminishes me for I am a part of mankind
So therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls
It tolls for thee."

Let me stress this theme of individual responsibility for a moment. It is significant that there are among us this day those who in time will be truly great if they will but permit it. They may or may not achieve fame. But this is not what is really important. The real distinction is that they will stand on the brink of the majesty of the universe in some phase of science, or human relations, or art, or music. It may be a vision of the universe with solar systems as numerous as the grains of sand on the shores of the sea. Such vastness extends beyond the grasp of most of us, even as a small child cannot comprehend the distance from New York to Los Angeles. It may be that some will plumb the depths of the molecule or the atom. Yet, others may discover the secret of the cell wherein lies the solution to the problem of cancer. But whatever your particular field of endeavor, be it education or government, business or shopwork, housework or homework, do it with all the earnestness and sincerity that lie within you. Work, too, with magnificence and creativity. Let there be no room for passiveness. Sit in no "house by the side of the road and watch the race of men go by."

But be alive. And first of all be critical of yourself. Whatever your job, keep this ever in front of you—how can I do this better? Herein lies the key to achievement. Herein lies the secret of greatness. Not fame, mind you, or popularity, for these are really not important. If you live for them, or place, or status, or riches, they will turn to ashes in your mouth. This was the poignant lesson of King Midas whose tragedy was only too clear. Let me, therefore, urge you to something better. True satisfaction lies in creativeness—however great, however small. For you will be unlocking the secrets of the universe itself. This, I say, lies within each of you. It matters little what is behind you. What is most significant is what lies ahead. Clear away, then, the underbrush of your own indifference and of your own inhibitions which fence you in and prevent the greatness that in you lies. For unless we permit something of the greatness within each of us to come from us in spite of the selfishness of laziness, we fail. And unless we are human and concern ourselves with the otherness of humanity, we fail. This, the last half of the 20th century, is no time for failure. There are no tomorrow I work promises that are valid any more than there are any meaningful pledges that tomorrow I diet. The time is today. The place is now. For if the age of enlightenment will come, it will come from just such people as you and just such colleges as SMS and those institutions of higher learning represented here today. The individuals added together make a total which is not the sum of the parts and the behavior and spirit of the group is different from that of the individual. Yet, the whole depends on the individual. This is another way of saying the outcome of this century does not depend on someone else. As Cassius puts it in Julius Caesar, "The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars, but in ourselves * * *."

There is truly therefore:

"A tide in the affairs of men
Which taken at the flood leads on to fortune,
Omitted, all the voyage of their life is bound in shallows and in miseries.
On such a full sea are we now afloat;
And we must take the current when it serves,
Or lose our ventures."

My charge to you, as an individual, therefore, is one of great responsibility, of having eyes to see, ears to hear, and in so doing to use your abilities whatever they may be.

The individual is important in the whole of everything, even as the pattern of the universe is reflected in the atom. We truly stand on the edge of the razor of tomorrow, and as the sages of India put it, "The sharp edge of the razor is difficult to pass over."

For myself and my wife, let me say how pleased we are to be in the service of Southwest Missouri State College. We would be no other place and work in no other cause. In conclusion, let me promise you in the words of Dr. Laurence C. Jones, "the little professor" and founder of Piney Woods School in Mississippi who built something for the heart, something for both hands, and something for the minds of the underprivileged, yet rare privileged Negro students: "I pledge you in the cause of humanity in this our 20th century to pray as if everything depends on God and I promise you to work as if everything depends on me."

Of you I would ask the same, I cannot ask more, I dare not ask less, for we live now in the tomorrow of a thousand years. The question of what you will do with your lives depends on you. The responsibility of this century belongs to all of us.

Let us fail not. Let us be something.

Disability Insurance Benefits

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, there is at present a requirement in the social security law that a person must be disabled for 6 months before he can be paid disability insurance benefits. The purpose of this requirement is to allow time to clear up those conditions which are essentially temporary or to allow time to show improvement in order to determine whether or not the individual will recover.

Certainly it is wise to ascertain as clearly as possible whether an injury will result in a permanent disability before benefits are paid. However, there are certain cases in which the permanent nature of the injury is obvious from the start. For example, in cases where an arm or leg is amputated, there is no doubt that the injury is permanent and that disability benefits are in order. However, under the present law no exception to the rule is made and a 6-month wait is required.

Mr. Speaker, the disability is hard enough to bear, but the attendant financial hardship to the injured person's family makes the situation even more unbearable. In instances where the nature of the injury is clear and there is no doubt that payments will eventually be made, the 6-month waiting period is unjustified.

I have therefore introduced a bill to give the Social Security Administrator authority to remove the 6-month waiting period in cases where the severity of the disability is immediately determinable. I hope that the House will see fit to act favorably on this measure, thereby allowing relief to those whose suffering is needlessly compounded by provisions of present law.

Russia as the Russians Know It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in an age in which communism—centered in the U.S.S.R. and Communist China—poses the major threat to peace in the world, there is a need to know, as well as possible, this enemy of freedom.

Recently, This Week magazine has published a series of articles on "Inside Russia." Part III of this series is an article "Revealed—Russia As the Russians Know It," by Dr. Mikhail A. Klochko—a Soviet scientist who defected from the Communist world.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVEALED—RUSSIA AS THE RUSSIANS KNOW IT

(By Dr. Mikhail A. Klochko)

(Leap to freedom: In previous issues, Dr. Klochko told the story of his decision to defect from the Communist world and of his dramatic escape to Canada last summer. Today he answers questions about Russia which many people have asked since his arrival in the free world.)

OTTAWA.—Since reaching the safety and freedom of the West, I have been asked many things about my native land. I have found that people on this side of the Iron Curtain have a number of illusions about life in the Soviet Union. I feel that it is important that the real truth be made known. Let me take up some of the questions I have been asked one at a time:

SCIENCE: ARMS AND PROPAGANDA

Some people have asked me how it has been possible for Russian scientists to make such rapid advances.

Russian progress in science is uneven—spectacular in a few fields, backward in others. The main effort has been made in mathematics and physics, which are required for the development of nuclear weapons, missiles, and space flight. This is the secret field in Russian science, and men working in it are under tremendous pressure. The carrot and stick have been used—rewards and pressure. Among themselves Russian scientists joke grimly about the much-advertised bonuses they receive. One story has it that you may be offered either a little bonus or a big bonus. The little bonus is a TV set, a refrigerator, and high blood pressure. The big bonus is a car, a country place, and a heart attack. This is not just a joke—heart attacks are an occupational hazard among Soviet scientists today.

Though Russia has made rapid advances in mathematics and the natural sciences, the West is ahead in all the biological sciences. In some aspects of physics and perhaps in the field of organic chemistry, Russia has a lead. But the West is in advance of Russia in other aspects of physics and chemistry—certainly in parts of my own field of physical and inorganic chemistry.

It is true that in the secret fields the Communist Party rarely interferes directly with scientific projects. But the idea that Soviet scientists lack nothing in the way of equipment or materials—an idea which has been frequently expressed by Western visitors—is quite erroneous. Priority is invariably given to projects with military or propaganda importance; and nonessential research, that aimed at acquiring knowledge rather than for immediate practical application, suffers accordingly. For that fundamental research it is very difficult to get equipment, assistance and space. When our institute was expanded not long ago almost all the new rooms went to those doing secret work.

And in science, as elsewhere, there is the inefficiency and favoritism that the Soviet system breeds.

MORALE: UNIVERSAL DISILLUSIONMENT

Since my defection I have found that many in the West think most Russians believe ardently in their way of life and support it strongly, that they put up with today's hardships because they believe they are forging ahead and that tomorrow they will catch up with North America and Western Europe.

This anecdote which I heard before I left Russia last August is typical of many told in the U.S.S.R. today and can be seen as an indication of the true attitude of many Soviet citizens. A man explains to a friend that Russian scholars have discovered that Adam and Eve were Soviet citizens.

"It was just a matter of deduction," he says. "They had no clothes to wear. They had only one apple between them. And yet they kept insisting they were in paradise."

Despite the efforts of the Soviet propaganda machine the Russian people know very well that their condition is far from paradise. Grumbling over living conditions is a national characteristic.

"They are going to take the letter M out of the Russian alphabet," you are told. "They just don't need it any more."

"There is no miasso (meat), no moloko (milk), no maslo (butter), no Molotov, no Malenkov.

"But, comrade, what about Marxism?"

"We can do without that most of all."

Such stories indicate a skepticism of the Soviet system that is deeprooted. Disillusionment is almost universal.

TERROR: THE THREAT REMAINS

Other beliefs about Soviet life that seem prevalent in the West are: that the strict Russian regime prevents the existence of widespread crime, alcoholism and the like; and that the terror of Stalin's days no longer menaces the people.

On these matters I have evidence from years spent in Leningrand and Moscow, and my travels to many parts of the Soviet Union.

There is much that cannot be seen on the well-beaten tourist track around Leningrad, Moscow, Kiev, and Sochi. Even trained correspondents and diplomats, restricted in their actions inside Russia, cannot get at the real truth.

The concentration camps are closed and the fear of trumped up charges and imprisonment is gone, but the apparatus of the terror remains. This is something that no wise Russian can forget. I came home to my flat one day to find a KGB secret policeman peering out of a window to watch an apartment nearby where a number of people from other Communist countries were living. The police still watch; envious and fearful people report deviationists. The dossiers grow fatter with the material that one day may again be used to incriminate those who are either blameless or who talked carelessly.

CRIME: TEEN-AGE GANGS

The most seriously judged crimes in Soviet Russia are political; consequently, the main attention of the police is focused on these. The result is that there is a great deal of ordinary crime—most of it carried out by gangs in their teens and early twenties. My own flat was robbed four times.

There have been many public scandals over the activities of gangs of footloose young

people who, using their fathers' cars, money and influence, have been dubbed the golden youth. Among them are the sons of government ministers, writers, and composers, the cream of Soviet society.

The grandson of one of the workers in our institute was found strangled. Apparently he knew of a murder that had been committed by a gang of youths, and it was feared he might go to the police.

About 5 years ago a gang of young thieves and prostitutes was arrested. Among them were the sons of the Minister of Foreign Trade, Ivan G. Kabanov, and other high-ranking officials. A number were sentenced to jail terms, but the Minister's sons were acquitted.

Nonpolitical crime is the domain of the militia, whose members are poorly paid and open to bribery. I recall a neighbor whom I knew to be an alcoholic telling me that someone had informed the militia patrolman that he was making alcohol in his house. He did not fear the consequences since the militiaman was one of his regular drinking companions.

ALCOHOLISM: A MAJOR PROBLEM

According to statistics circulated in the Soviet Union, Russia is supposed to have the lowest rate of human consumption of alcohol of any country. If this is so, the rest of the world must be far gone in alcoholism. From my observation of drinking in Russia, it has probably one of the highest rates in the world.

Profit from the sale of alcohol, principally vodka, is the largest single income item in the state budget. Anyone who has walked the streets of Moscow or traveled on buses and subways can testify that there is abundant outward evidence of this. Heavy drinking is one of the results of poor social conditions, another indication that the facts of life in the Soviet Union do not bear any resemblance to those portrayed in official statistics or other propaganda.

HOUSING: EIGHT PEOPLE IN THREE ROOMS

In Russia we were often told that in capitalist countries every man pays 20 to 25 percent of his income for an apartment while in Russia it is only 5 percent. The trouble is that very few people can get an apartment. In terms of space I was more fortunate than many, since I had one room to myself. But consider an acquaintance of mine who had two daughters.

After much effort he got sole occupancy of the three-room flat that he had shared with another family for years. Now he and his wife live in the first room. One daughter, her husband and two children live in the second. The second daughter and her husband live in the third. This family would be happy to pay 25 percent of their incomes and have apartments of their own.

In Russia a young man courting a girl does not ask if she loves him before he proposes marriage. The more important question is, "Have you a room of your own?" Any eligible girl who can answer "yes" to this question does not remain single long.

During World War II and after, many accepted the great difference in living standards between Russia and the West as inevitable. There was the great task of rebuilding factories and cities. Good housing, clothing and food would come later.

Today this argument is no longer accepted. When Khrushchev said recently that in 20 years Russian couples would be able to marry and have apartments all to themselves, young people I knew reacted angrily. They knew that more comforts of life could be available soon if national emphasis were shifted from preparation for war to the needs of everyday life.

They realize very well that West Germany was beaten into the ground during the war, yet her standard of living is now far higher than Russia's.

SOVIET INTELLECTUALS EMBITTERED

My experience is that itellectuals in particular hold the United States and Britain in high regard. Scientists returning from abroad have only praise for what they have seen, and the feeling of freedom that they sense everywhere.

I recall some time ago hearing a man in working clothes at a kiosk in Moscow saying to the newsdealer, "I'll have one of these 'Aggressors.'" He took a copy of the magazine "Amerika," which is distributed by the U.S. State Department. The broad smiles he and the newsdealer exchanged indicated clearly that both took the Soviet propaganda line with grains of salt. Today, however, "Amerika" is available only to senior Russian officials, and copies are passed from hand to hand many times.

The Russian people are intensely interested in what is going on abroad. The fact that surreptitious means must often be used to get at the truth is what disgusts the thinking people. Intellectuals, especially, suffer from a sense of frustration. There is a mock "creed for intellectuals" that is current in Russia. It goes:

"Don't think. If you think, don't speak. If you speak, don't write. If you write, don't publish. If you publish, denounce what you have written and confess your errors."

This is exactly the position in which I found myself. Educated people feel more strongly the lack of free access to knowledge than they do the lack of material things. After many years of frustration, I decided that there was no hope of a change that would enable me to carry on my science and studies without interference. To enjoy freedom of the mind it was necessary to leave the Soviet Union.

Before leaving Russia I often thought of the words of the poet Pushkin in his verse, "To My Wife."

"For a long time I, a tired slave, had thought to flee to a far away peaceful place to work and to rest."

Everyone has his own concept of heaven, and mine has always been of a place where there was an unlimited supply of books and some friends with whom it was possible to discuss ideas freely. Now, at last, I think I have found it.

Response of the Voice of Hungary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, October 22, 1961, the city of Buffalo, N.Y., officially saluted the fifth anniversary of the Hungarian freedom revolution. The event was held in the common council chambers and was arranged by the Citizens Committee To Observe Captive Nations Week, in cooperation with the Hungarian Churches and Societies of Western New York. The program of events follows:

1. Presentation of the colors by Veterans of Foreign Wars.
2. Placing of the captive nations flags.
3. The national anthem.
4. Hungarian national anthem.
5. Invocation by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Julius J. Szabo, pastor, Assumption Parish, Lackawanna, N.Y.
6. "The Events of 5 Years Ago," by Joseph P. McNamara.
7. The Kossuth Song—Boy Scouts of Piarist Fathers—Derby, N.Y.
8. Presentation of the American flag to the Hungarian freedom fighters by the Honorable THADDEUS J. DULSKI, Congressman, 41st District of New York.
9. Remarks by the Honorable JOHN R. PILLION, Congressman, 42d District of New York.
10. Recitation of the Petöfi poem "National Song" by Master Laszlo Berty.
11. Address by the Honorable Frank A. Sedita, mayor of Buffalo.
12. Response of the voice of Hungary, by Dr. Laszlo Szimonisz.
13. Retire the colors.
14. Benediction by Rev. Denes Buthy, pastor, Our Savior Hungarian Evangelical Lutheran Church, Buffalo, N.Y.

Dr. Edward O'Connor, presiding.

Mr. Speaker, everyone in attendance was very much impressed with the speech given by Dr. Laszlo Szimonisz, and it is a pleasure for me to insert it in the RECORD, as follows:

RESPONSE OF THE VOICE OF HUNGARY

(An address by Dr. Laszlo Szimonisz)

Many Hungarians in this chamber vividly remember that 17 years ago during World War II American bombers paved the way for Stalin's ferocious army in Hungary. It is a striking and enheartening contrast, indeed, that today we celebrate, here, the fifth anniversary of the Hungarian Freedom Revolution, with the delegates of patriotic organizations, Members of Congress, official and private dignitaries, who represent the American people, citizens of Buffalo, and the captive nations. Your presence here proves that there is no separate problem of Hungary, Poland, Ukraine, or Berlin; there is one question: freedom or surrender.

Representative DULSKI belongs to the majority. He was refused entry into Communist dominated Poland, because he wholeheartedly supported the brilliant resolution of Representative PILLION, who is on the opposition. Yet they fight shoulder to shoulder against Russian imperialism for a very obvious reason: both of them are Americans.

The revolution, which flared up in 1956, was Hungarian. The whole nation, including our brothers in Slovakia and Transylvania, joined the spearheading students. Russian tyranny had oppressed everyone without discrimination. It chained the worker to the machine, persecuted the educated because they were educated, kept the uneducated on the level of starvation, because they did not have education. This Russian tyranny made the farmer envious of oxen, which were not forced to participate in political seminars after hard work. It ridiculed, tortured, and put into concentration camps priests, ministers, and rabbis; transformed the flourishing country into a huge prison, surrounded with the barbed wire and minefields of the Iron Curtain.

The revolution was Hungarian geographically but its aims were those of every dignified human being. Consequently, this revolution belongs to mankind, to Baltic nations, Chinese, and Cubans. It is a lesson to free men: its message is growing more important with the growing danger to freedom.

The sad history of Hungary shows that freedom is not a gift, it is not a matter of wishful thinking: its maintenance needs fight, work, sacrifice, and dedication.

Hungarian teenagers, who never tasted freedom before, proved that there is no such thing as "it is better to be Red, than dead." If you try to coexist or be Red, it means that you are dead. You cannot leave your job for a better one, because it is considered sabotage and results in imprisonment; they brainwash you every second of the day—at work, with press, radio, television, school, church, at recreation, or at home. They pre-

scribe what to do, think, eat, read, like, and hate; there is no such a thing as finishing your job then going home. Your body, brain, spare time, wife, children, parents, past, and future belong to the party, to the almighty state. The expression of your opinion, organization of your friends, attempts to strike, equals suicide whether in Kiew, Poznan, or Budapest. You do not have friends. Fear, insecurity, suspicion, hunger, humiliation, and frustration are the basic elements of everyday life. The Hungarian revolution was the natural consequence of this totalitarian oppression.

The Hungarians revolted against the worst kind of colonialism. Before the Second World War there was no significant improvement in the economy of Soviet Russia even though they ruthlessly exploited their own people—workers, intellectuals, and farmers. The masters of the Kremlin received a new help after the war: the rich and industrialized countries of central and eastern Europe. The cruel Russian colonization of these countries was a shot in the arm for the ailing Soviet economy.

From Moscow we hear reports about the Communist utopia, the buildup of a Soviet wonderland. I feel a serious concealed danger to the free world in this seemingly irrealistic Russian prophecy. The dead heroes and living witnesses of the Hungarian revolution admonish you: watch out for your freedom, before you or your children will be forced to supply the demands of the Communist imperialism, before American blood and sweat will be used to build up the Russian wonderland.

Russia indoctrinated youth behind the Iron Curtain with the superiority and invincibility of the Red army. The propaganda balloon collapsed in Hungary. Fourteen-year-old girls and boys destroyed Red tanks, shocked and confused the plans of tyranny. Their main weapon was the famous gasoline bottle. The Communist generals needed 8 days and the complete passivity of the official West to prepare the crushing of the revolution. Let us face it: we have something more than gasoline bottles. Let us discover the fear and uncertainty of tyrants behind the thunder of atomic explosions. An Austrian friend of mine told me, that once the Americans start to show firmness, they will be surprised at their own strength. The Hungarian revolution reminds us of the truth in the famous slogan: "We have nothing to fear but fear itself."

Nasser's Perfidy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, an arresting article recently appeared in the Washington Post as a public service presentation, carrying the byline of Mr. A. N. Spanel, the founder of International Latex Corp., and presented in paid newspaper space by that company. Entitled "This Smoke Masks What?" the article reveals how Egypt's President Nasser is brazenly playing East against West to get maximum benefits from both sides.

Mr. Spanel and his firm deserve great credit for continuing awareness of the great issues of our time and for continuing devotion to the principles of free world unity and foresight. This article, as well as the many others which Mr. Spanel has authored for the information and understanding of American citizens, is a forthright expression of American interests and principles in the Middle Eastern area—interests which are consistently ignored and abused by dictators like Nasser.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 8, 1962]

THIS SMOKE MASKS WHAT?

(By A. N. Spanel)

The conservative London Daily Telegraph on December 27 frontpaged a report by a diplomatic correspondent that "President Nasser has agreed to the establishment of a Russian naval base on the Egyptian coast."

Cairo hastened to deny the report. But that does not dispose of the matter. The head of the Soviet Navy, Admiral Gorshkov, arrived in Cairo on December 12, on invitation of his Egyptian opposite number, as part of a Soviet military mission. Alarmed Western governments, we may be sure, are exploring how much fire there may be behind the smoke. Nothing is beyond the self-willed Egyptian dictator, his recklessness and arrogance long fed by freeworld appeasement.

As recent as January 3, 1962, Mr. C. L. Sulzberger, the gifted journalist of the New York Times wrote: "Egypt, which is all that remains of the United Arab Republic, has made a new arms deal with Russia, primarily involving ships. Nasser needs some coup for prestige reasons and presumably Soviet weapons serve that purpose. His renown has faded; he is at odds with most Arab states since the Syrian break; and Egypt's economy is bad. There has been practically no cotton crop. Nasser is importing cotton from the United States. Property expropriations cannot hold things together for long."

THE THREAT

Even the chance of Soviet nuclear-missiled submarines nested in the eastern Mediterranean is enough to jolt the West. The possibility will shock the American people especially, in view of the enormous aid the United States has given Egypt in dollar grants, foodstuffs, loans, and gifts, to say nothing of moral and political support.

The man whom we have seen fit to trust and strengthen is the same Nasser to whose relief we rushed blindly in 1956, hand in hand with jubilant Soviet Russia, at the moment when France, Britain and Israel were in the process of guaranteeing the Suez Canal as a free artery of navigation for the world.

As long ago as August 3, 1956—months, that is, before the disastrous Soviet-American intervention—this column warned: "In grabbing control of the Suez Canal, President Nasser of Egypt has placed a life-crushing tourniquet around the jugular vein of world commerce. He has put himself in a position to extort endless surrenders of their basic interests from the democratic Great Powers." We have repeated that warning through the ensuing years.

Unhappily these fears have been all too amply justified. The surrenders extorted by the pocket-edition Hitler on the Nile have made Russia, for the first time in modern history, a Middle Eastern power and have opened lines of Communist influence to Mediterranean Africa.

Nasser, despite occasional spats with his Kremlin mentors, has been following the Moscow lead in world affairs. He votes with the Communist bloc in the United Nations, steals Western property, indulges in wild anti-Western propaganda, treats the Suez Canal as if it were a stream on his private estate.

OUR INTERESTS AT STAKE

How long before the Suez, the free world's lifeline in Africa, will become a pawn in the Kremlin's hands? What will then be the counterbalancing bastions of the free world in north Africa? Will we then wish that the French Africa naval base at Bizerte had remained where it is now—in French possession—instead of in Tunisia's grasp? And what about the enormously strategic bases—naval, air and missile—in the Algeria which Washington has for 8 years insisted was purely a colonial area without strategic meaning for the United States or for the NATO nations dependent on American nuclear military strength?

Has public opinion in our country fully grasped the significance of Nasser's arbitrary refusal to permit passage through the canal to Portuguese gunboats rushing to defend Goa and other Portuguese enclaves against cold blooded aggression by India? Was this Nasser's way of repaying Mr. Nehru, the apostle of peace and nonviolence, who so nobly raved his objections in 1956 on behalf of Egypt against the efforts of France, England and Israel in their Suez Canal campaign?

It was a Soviet veto that prevented the U.N. Security Council attempt to halt the Goa outrage. Clearly Nasser, athwart the Suez, also acted in close concert with Khrushchev.

Have we Americans fully grasped the significance of Nasser's recent arrest of four members of a French diplomatic mission, in defiance of diplomatic immunities and civilized international conduct? Understandably, the French people are bewildered and incensed by apparent American apathy on this Egyptian insult to a traditional friend and ally. Our State Department appears to remain inert, paralyzed, while the French diplomats are languishing in prison, being brainwashed in the familiar Communist style in preparation for "demonstration trials" featuring "confessions." Not alone France but the free world will sit in the Egyptian dock.

COURAGEOUSLY MEETING THE ISSUES NOW

Our failure to halt Nasser early in his career of larceny and depredation has facilitated the Kremlin's undisguised purpose of extending its power into the Mediterranean. It has compounded the larger political error of our dismissal of the French struggle in North Africa as a "mere colonial matter," leaving France to fight a lone and desperate battle for the maintenance of free-world bastions in that critical area.

The dangerous confusion of our country in the face of the Soviet challenge in the Mediterranean continues. At this very moment there are reports that the United States is discussing seriously an Egyptian request for 400,000 bales of American cotton—the very product Nasser is exporting to the U.S.S.R. in return for military equipment. If made available to Cairo, these bales would help extricate Nasser from the cotton crisis caused by his loss of Syria and, incidentally, bolster Egyptian competition with American cotton even in Europe and other markets.

Is there truly no limit to this compulsive, illogical, self-defeating policy of appeasement of the Egyptian dictator? How long shall we remain blind to the piled-up mischief worked by the Nasser-Khrushchev axis with what amounts to blind American cooperation? How long must the American taxpayers continue to save the dictator on the Nile from the consequences of his own arrogance, inflated ambition and cupidity?

Surely the time is overripe for a searching reappraisal of American policy in North Africa and the Mediterranean. We must immediately reconsider, before time runs out, (1) our role in relation to French control of Bizerte and the Algerian bastions of free-world power, and (2) our bewildering political and economic support of the Nasser dictatorship.

Late as the hour may be, we must restore close cooperation with France, our traditional ally and the one dependable member of the Western coalition in the Mediterranean, if we are to bar communism from that all-important theater of conflict, both through Egypt and through North Africa. To do less is to guarantee the total success of a Soviet-Egyptian conspiracy against the West that is already far too advanced for comfort or complacency.

Potentialities of St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the St. Lawrence Seaway represents a milestone of major progress in creating a stronger economic lifeline between the United States—particularly the Great Lakes region—and markets, people, and nations around the globe. Overall, the seaway has served fundamental commercial, economic, travel, shipping, and a great many other interests of the Nation.

On Sunday, January 14, the Milwaukee Sentinel carried an article by Municipal Port Director, city of Milwaukee, Harry C. Brockel, setting forth future potentialities of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to ask unanimous consent to insert this article in the RECORD so my colleagues and others might see what the seaway has meant and will continue to mean to our Nation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY'S PORT RIDES HIGH TIDE

(By Harry C. Brockel)

Emerging from a record 1961 St. Lawrence Seaway shipping season, the port of Milwaukee looks forward to 1962 with confidence, tempered by a few question marks.

With total traffic through the seaway increasing 10 percent during 1961, Milwaukee's oversea trade jumped 193 percent, almost triple the 1960 volume of 230,000 tons.

The 685,000 tons which marked the high tide of Milwaukee's seaway trade in 1961 was made up primarily of grain for export, scrap metals for export, heavy machinery for export, and general cargo which moved in both directions, but which again consisted primarily of exoort of agricultural products. Some of that moved commercially, but much of it moved under Government assistance programs.

BUSINESS BOOSTERS

Working in Milwaukee's favor to achieve even higher records will be such factors as increased port capacity, newer and better cranes, favorable water depths, and active port promotion, with the city government and private interests working in complete harmony to pull more business through this port.

Three decision areas in the Federal Government hold great promise for the future, including:

Federal Maritime Administration's encouragement of more American-flag steamship services between the Great Lakes and world trade areas.

Possibly much greater utilization of lake ports by the Defense Department for military cargo.

Greater support by the Department of Agriculture for shipments of grain, flour, dairy products, and other foodstuffs controlled by the Government.

UNCERTAIN FACTORS

Still another potential lies in liquid cargo, including edible and nonedible products, such as soy bean oil, palm oil, liquid lard, tallows, and others. That field is almost untapped by this port.

Uncertain factors include:

Intensified rate competition from railroads serving eastern and southern ports; increased ocean rates, including periodic threats of rates by steamship conferences higher to the Great Lakes than to seaboard ports; the expanding trend toward branch plants by American manufacturers in many parts of the world; the uncertainties of the Common Market in Europe and new trade legislation by our Government.

Added to these small clouds on the horizon are the general vicissitudes of world trade and deep sea shipping, which are subject not only to wind and weather, but to the vagaries of the business cycle, of Government policy, and the uncertainties of the world situation.

NEW HIGHS POSSIBLE

If the political and economic factors prove favorable in 1962, the port could easily break through again to tremendous new records in the oversea trade.

It is conceded, however, that the port probably cannot continue to triple or quadruple its oversea trade every year, which has been the pleasant record of performance in recent years. For example, Milwaukee's 1961 oversea trade volume of 685,000 net tons was 10 times the volume of 1958 and 3 times the volume of 1960. Even the most vigorous of enterprisers finds it difficult to sustain such phenomenal rates of growth.

Certainly, however, there is room for more business, and confidence that it can be developed. This confidence stems, for example, from the five new deepwater berths and the 150,000 square feet of superb new general cargo terminal capacity at municipal south pier No. 2, placed in service in September 1961.

NEW CAPACITY

Even by a conservative estimate, this new facility provides new capacity for 150,000 to 200,000 tons per year of general cargo business, which has been temporarily diverted to other ports while Milwaukee was developing added capacity. This new pier also has substantial open dock space for open handling of bulk commodities, and has a fine potential for a new liquid cargo facility which is under consideration by a private terminal operator.

The port has gained stature, year after year, through fine performance by its waterfront labor. Milwaukee is a productive port and a pilferage-free port, and these high standards of port performance make a deep impression in shipping circles.

MORE TRADE SOUGHT

Port promotion in 1962 may be dramatized for the first time by a Milwaukee trade mission traveling to the shipping centers of Europe, armed with information concerning a diversified and dependable port, with capacity for growth, and with capabilities for almost any kind of cargo.

Backing up the primary effort in oversea trade promotion will be comparable promotion to pull through Milwaukee a growing volume of domestic traffic, via the Great Lakes and the inland waterways.

Both the glamorous oversea cargo and the dependables of Great Lakes trade will be pursued with equal diligence by Milwaukee port interests, shipping agents, and terminal operators.

Reduced Annuities To Provide Survivors' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on January 6, 1962, I had the pleasure of addressing the Buffalo, N.Y., Chapter No. 153, National Association of Retired Civil Employees. During the course of the meeting, the following resolution was adopted and unanimously passed:

BUFFALO, N.Y., CHAPTER NO. 153, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RETIRED CIVIL EMPLOYEES, BUFFALO, N.Y.

An effort is being made to correct an injustice which has been imposed on a U.S. civil service retiree by Public Law 854. The injustice in said law requires an employee, under the Civil Service Retirement Act, to take a reduced annuity at the date of retirement, if he desires to make a provision for his spouse, if she survives him.

Three bills were introduced in the House of Representatives, in the 1st session of the 87th Congress, which would correct this injustice; namely, H.R. 565 by Representative ROGERS, H.R. 3312 by Representative JAMES MORRISON, and H.R. 4102 by Representative J. G. FULTON, all of which failed to get out of committee.

A civil service retiree, who accepted a reduced annuity (the writer was one of them) in order to provide protection for his spouse, has furnished the following reasons in support of our contention that this requirement should be eliminated from Public Law 854.

The reasoning is that a man and his wife are 50–50 partners throughout their natural lifetime in every sense of the word, legally and otherwise. When the Government withheld money from an employees' salary as a retirement deduction, it is contended that one-half of such money withheld belongs to the wife. Therefore, she has been a contributor on a 50–50 basis with the employee since August 1920, at the time of the institution of the Retirement Act. Now, since she bore our children, nursed us in sickness, cooked our meals, mended our clothes, handled our money, paid our debts incurred in our contract in marriage; how can anyone conceive, in any respect, that she has been other than a 50–50 partner throughout our entire lifetime of living and working together as a team? To penalize us, by requiring me to take a reduction in annuity in order to offer the necessary protection for her, in the event of my predecease, is wrong, and it is further contended that it is being done with moneys that are one-half hers from the start. Railroad retirees, social security retirees, and military service retirees are afforded this protection now, without the requirement to take a reduced annuity in order to provide for a spouse who survives them.

It is respectfully requested that you use every effort possible during the 2d session of this, the 87th Congress to remove this injustice from Public Law 854.

Respectfully submitted.

GLENN T. POWERS,
President.
CHARLES W. COOPER,
Legislative Chairman.

BUFFALO, N.Y., *January 6, 1962.*

Current and Eleven Point Rivers Area in Missouri—Proposed National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, on a number of occasions I have discussed the need for action to preserve the natural beauty along the Current and Eleven Point Rivers in Missouri. Only through the National Park Service can the beauty of this area be guaranteed for future generations. Recently, the Cape Girardeau Southeast Missourian published an excellent editorial pointing out clearly the need for congressional action. Quoting from this editorial:

This is an area that should be preserved. This is land and water and occasional tilled river valley that is big beyond its residents; big beyond the State that is so fortunate to have it. This is country that should belong to all America.

Mr. President, this is country that should belong to all America, and I am hopeful that final action can be taken by the Congress to insure that we pass this great natural heritage on as a legacy to future generations. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial published by the Southeast Missourian on January 19, 1962, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CURRENT RIVER COUNTRY

Many pieces of legislation before the Congress will affect Missourians in the years ahead. None, however, will have the intimacy of the bill which would make a National Park of the Current-Eleven Point Rivers country.

No one who has been on these streams of fast-flowing water alternating with long, tranquil stretches can ever forget their beauty. The great limestone bluffs, the springs that bubble up unexpectedly along the way, the trees that march from water's edge to mountain top all form a memory that makes the visitor want to return again and again.

This is an area that should be preserved. This is land and water and occasional tilled river valley that is big beyond its residents; big beyond the State that is so fortunate to have it.

This is country that should belong to all America.

The streams will never return to the days of smallmouth bass fishing that a few fortunate knew when they hauled john boats by flat car up the Current and floated them down to Van Buren or Doniphan or to Arkansas.

The smallmouth bass is practically gone from these rushing streams. Even the palm-sized red-bellied perch isn't to be caught as it once was. Goggle-eye are harder to come by.

If the fisherman is after meat, though he can catch carp. These bottom-feeders, working their way upstream, have all but taken over the Current. More's the pity, and it is to be hoped that the Conservation Commission can do something about it. It also is to be hoped that it can become more aggressive in studies to find a way to return the smallmouth, the perch and the goggle-eye.

While the fish are important, as is the more abundant wildlife of the forest, they are secondary to the unspoiled beauty of the region. It is this the National Park will preserve, as it should, for generations of Americans to come; generations who otherwise would not be able to see it in an unspoiled State.

Many residents of the area, although not all, are bitterly opposed to the park plan, or to any which would alter the present course of the area. Others favor a national forest aproach. Another group would prefer to see the area spoiled by a lake which would cover springs and forests and a heritage of beauty due the future as a legacy from the present.

It is understandable that many residents of the area should oppose the park or other plans. This has been their home. Many of them would be affected by acquisition of land. They are due sympathetic understanding. Yet they are victims of residence in an area that is great beyond their own lives and land. It is so great in its magnificence that they must give way.

The Missourian hopes the Congress will appropriate the necessary funds to support the Ozarks National Park.

We hope Congressman JONES, who represents the principal county involved—Ripley—will take leadership along with others of Missouri's delegation in pressing for passage in the House.

The national park is needed for Missouri. It is needed for the Nation. Without it the Current-Eleven Point Rivers country will perish and a great wilderness area will never be seen by Americans in years ahead.

We, today, who have seen and enoyed this country at our own doorstep have an obligation to those who come later. The Missourian urges Congress to pass the necessary legislation.

Ukrainian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, 44 years ago, on January 22, 1918, the people of the Ukraine declared their independence and established the Ukrainian National Republic.

It was a time of strife and bloodshed. The great war was still in progress and the Bolsheviks were consolidating their rule of terror in Russia. Kiev, the capital city of the Ukraine, had been occupied by the Red army, and the Communists were carrying out mass executions there.

In the midst of this gloom and despair the courage and faith of the Ukrainians stood out as a beacon of light. They were an example to the world of the unconquerable desire for freedom that lives in the hearts of all mankind.

Unfortunately, the Ukrainian National Republic was short lived. Two years after it had been proclaimed the new state was overrun by the Russians. However, the past 40 years of Communist suppression have not broken the spirit of the Ukrainian people. They still maintain their firm belief in their right to national freedom, and on this anniversary of their independence day I salute them.

Israel Visited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Bernard G. Richards, head of the Jewish Information Bureau of New York, is one of the few remaining grand old men of the American Zionist movement. A newspaperman in his younger days, Bernard G. Richards gave over half a century of devoted service to the cause of Zionism. But it was only within the last few years that he was able to make his first visit to Israel where the Government of Israel and representatives of leading Zionist agencies did everything possible to facilitate his 2 months tour of the country.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the report on his visit to Israel, printed in the American Zionist, April 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I SAW IT WITH MY OWN EYES

(By Bernard G. Richards)

It's a long way from New York to Tel Aviv, and the distance grows and expands when you meet with various postponements and delays, and finally try to span it all at once. Even then it should not have taken me half a century to accomplish the journey. As a sort of consolation, I was, during the trip, thinking of the stories and legends of ancient voyagers and wanderers, scribes, mystics, meshulahim and mekubolim, who traveled for years and years to reach the sacred soil of the fatherland, and some of whom, despite their greater merit, never had the zchiya, the high privilege, that was to be mine to attain this goal—to come not only to Palestine but to the sovereign State of Israel.

We landed at the Lydda Airport at an unearthly hour. Four o'clock in the morning was no time to behold the first vision of the cherished land, but when through the dimness of a lingering misty and chilling night I caught a glimpse of lines of tall trees and behind them spreading bushes and stretches of inviting open fields, my spirit was uplifted and I suddenly gained a feeling of being at home.

As if to relieve my apparent discomfiture and the uneasiness caused by a linguistic handicap, the taximan burst into a volley of racy Yiddish, extolling the progress of the country, and voicing his personal happiness at being part of the nation's revival. Even a man who had lost two nights' sleep

could not remain indifferent to his enthusiasm.

But there was no salesmanship really required anywhere in Israel. When the sun rose the next day and 100,000 stately buildings gleamed in the sunlight and cast their reflections in a majestic ocean, and when later I walked through the wide and crowded streets and witnessed the continued and busy rush of traffic, commerce and industry, I knew that I was in the presence of a miracle of Jewish creativeness which had, in some unaccountable or mystic way, emerged out of the abyss of worldwide Jewish homelessness and misery.

But the great revelation was yet to come when I began my tour of the country almost from one end to the other, when I saw so many thousands of dunams or acres of land, which in some cases were formerly arid and sterile stretches of rock and gravel and sand, now turned into garden spots. The sight of these plantations, the marvel of reforestation, the fertile fields and orchards, with their profusion of fruits and flowers, the beautiful clean houses that marked the settlements, the herds of cattle grazing all around was enough to lift the most weary and desolate heart of man.

During the first long trip through the Galilee we visited a goodly number of colonies and kibbutzin leading up to and located between the cities of Acre, Safed, Tiberias, Nazareth, Haifa, all these communities with their own historic landmarks and monuments to ancient and unfading glory.

We stayed overnight in Safed, the strange and mysterious city set in stone against a mountain, still shrouded in the brooding spirit of mysticism and guarding its hoary heritage of undeciphered lore.

A trip through the enticing and fruitful valley of the Emek with Beersheba and Eskalon as our objectives yielded more enjoyment and gratification in the views of scenic beauty and human achievement, in the loving and devoted cultivation of the soil. Everywhere there were signs of agricultural and industrial advancement. To be sure, there were shadows lurking in the rear—the wretched dwellers of the maabarat, the immigrant camps, and the Malben, sheltering another part of the "Ingathering of the Exiles." In the slum-like sections of Jerusalem there were harrowing signs of squalor and poverty.

But more and more the homeless people were gradually being established on a footing of permanent residents, and the heroic efforts thus exerted are again a tribute to the valor of the Government of Israel and the staunch devotion of the various Zionist institutions. Everywhere there are evidences that the speeches, appeals, exhortation, and cries for help heard in the United States and elsewhere are being transformed into farms, homesteads, huge buildings, roads, highways and public works. Never were fancies so readily turned into realities, and most wonderful of all—none of the Zionist orators ever exaggerated anything.

The attractiveness of Israel is due not only to its restored fertility and fruitfulness, but also to its natural and original beauty. I am not attempting to describe the charming cities and villages which it was my privilege to see, nor to depict the magnificent vista which unfolds to the visitor, such as that which you behold from Rosh Pina to the Sea of Kinnereth and Lake Huleh, or the vision from Mount Carmel down to the sea, with its thousands of glistening lights reflected in the ocean, or the hills of Judea over the ancient walls of Jerusalem.

I went to Jerusalem for a few days and stayed over 3 weeks, the longest part of my stay in the homeland. I stood in silent and reverent awe before the ancient stone edifices, with their towers, spires, balconies, and cavernous courtyards; I stood before the broken walls, the haunting desolate ruins; I stood before the great places of worship and houses of study and of spiritual and cultural revival; I stood before the many new structures rising toward the beautiful skies: the new campus of the Hebrew University, the University-Hadassah Hospital and other imposing buildings like the houses for government departments; I stood before the graves of ancient saints and heroes; I stood at the simple grave of Dr. Theodor Herzl and, nearby, at the burial ground of the men who fell in the war for liberation; I stood in silence and gazed across the border of the gleaming dome and desolate and deserted structures of the old university and thought of all the depredations and desecrations inflicted upon our people in a long and somber history.

There is an enchantment, a halo, that hovers over the city of Jerusalem and perhaps that brooding sense is part of the miracle of national revival enclosing a chain of unpredictable events that defied the course of all normal actualities. How else explain the restoration of a people when it was on the brink of destruction, the revival of a language that was considered dead, the resurgence of a literature that was half-forgotten, the resurrection of a culture, a system of thought, a way of life shrouded in the shadow of a world in eclipse?

After Jerusalem I was no longer quite at ease in Tel Aviv or anywhere. The alluring sights of the great city, the visit to cherished shrines and memorials, the meetings with charming personalities in the leadership of the Government and the community, the precious attachments formed, left a vivid and lingering memory. There was the ceremony of kiddush with the Chief Rabbi, the opening of the Hebrew University, a solemn and dramatic session of the Knesseth, a midnight reception given to the Habimah players at city hall by Mayor Gershon Agron, a reception also to your visitor from New York by Berl Locker, chairman of the Jewish Agency, with leading journalists and other notable guests in attendance.

All these were experiences that will not soon be forgotten. It was no ordinary event to hear the President of a Republic discourse so learnedly and with such grace and humor on the folklore of the Sephardim and the poetry devoted to Jerusalem; to sit and chat with the President again at Beth Hanasi in the presence of his equally charming companion and fellow-Talmud student, Zalman Shazar; or to reminisce with the President about the time long ago when he and his famous haver, David Ben Gurion, lived in New York—1914–17— and helped us organize the American Jewish Congress.

From Tel Aviv I carried away pleasant memories of the friendly atmosphere of the ZOA Daniel Frisch House, the many contacts made and reestablished there and the numerous courtesies shown me at that center of cultural activities.

Reluctant to leave the country before observing more of its varied aspects and absorbing more of its spirit and atmosphere, I returned to Haifa which I had passed through rapidly on a previous trip in the gloaming of the advancing night. I went through the whole city more thoroughly now, and despite the mist and the rain I viewed all phases of the city with its rapid growth and great promise of future development.

I ascended to the top of Mount Carmel and beheld a marvelous view of the city spreading down to the sea. I saw the new campus, the beautiful and imposing structure of the Technion and thhen descended to the old institution in the city with its labyrinth of laboratories and workshops marked by memorials to the founders. Set against the wall of the main entrance was a bust of Dr. Schmaryahu Levine, the real creator of Haifa Technical Institute.

In Haifa I renewed several old-time associations and I shall long remember the evening I spent on the crest of the Carmel with our dear old friend, David Pinski, famous novelist and playwright, who at the age of 84 is still writing and planning with the vigor and mental alertness of youth.

My impressions so far dealt mainly with the outer, though extremely enticing and arresting aspects of the country. What about the people? The answer brings out the most vivid impression of all my experiences in the state.

The confidence of the people, their self-assurance and courage, their fortitude in the face of all trials and problems, their absorption in the immediate tasks and deep devotion to duty, made the most powerful impact upon and colored all my observations.

To be sure, Israel is faced by very serious problems. The struggle for security from enemies across the borders is made all the more urgent and pressing by the inner conflict, the battle for greater economic stability. These critical tasks place an enormous burden of responsibility upon the leaders of the country and, by the same token, upon all Zionists and friends of Israel everywhere.

The people of Israel are fully conscious of the gigantic tasks that confront them and upon which their future may hang in the balance, but it is a most notable fact that they are not as apprehensive, nor as fearful, nor as uneasy as their kinsmen abroad.

The clue to this attitude of the people is of course their complete self-confidence and unparalleled spirit of courage and fortitude. The people of Israel are, I believe, also fully aware of their other pressing problems, such as the conflict which divides different groups on the issues of religious beliefs and practices, the unification of the heterogeneous elements of the population, the preservation of the distinctive character of Hebrew culture against the onrush of cheap and trashy literature and vulgar music and forms of entertainment from abroad.

These questions will, I believe, find their solution in the inner moral strength, intense patriotic devotion, and rich spiritual and intellectual resources of the people. A land that is studded with innumerable bookshops, that supports and absorbs newspapers, publications literally without limit, surely has reserves of reason and judgment not fully appreciated abroad.

It was a great, a thrilling experience to see the beautiful hills and valleys and mountains of Israel, to witness both in villages and cities the unfolding of a wholesome and natural Jewish life not requiring any artificial stimulants. They were exhilarating and joyous weeks which I spent in the homeland, and my gladness turned to gloom only when, from the airplane that left Tel Aviv, the last patches of Israel's landscape and its wonderful blue skies faded from my view. But the memory of all that I had seen, the contacts and associations which became mine, the events which I had experienced will remain bright and undimmed and unforgettable for the rest of my life.

The Honorable Sam Rayburn

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, we were all shocked and distressed to learn of the passing of our distinguished Speaker. I am certain that there will

never be another man connected with the Federal Government during my lifetime who will enjoy the complete respect and authority held by our late Speaker.

Mr. RAYBURN, as has been stated on numerous occasions, held the position as Speaker of the House of Representatives twice as long as any other person who has ever been privileged to hold the position as Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I know and every Member of this House fully realizes that the Presidents serving during the time Mr. RAYBURN was Speaker must give credit to the late Speaker RAYBURN for making their programs a success. I consider it a high honor to have had the opportunity to serve under the leadership of the late Speaker RAYBURN, as he was one of the best known parliamentarians in the United States. He was also one of the outstanding legislators of our time and powerful in every respect.

The late Speaker RAYBURN will be missed by every person in the United States and throughout the world who was privileged with his acquaintance. His service as a legislator will be missed by our President, all the legislators in the Congress, and the people of the United States.

My sincere sympathy goes out to his relatives. Mr. RAYBURN will go down in history as one of our greatest statesmen who did as much or more to preserve our form of Government than any other person who has lived since our Constitution was adopted.

We Commend Our Government's Congo Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I present for inclusion in the RECORD a full page statement by persons engaged in teaching and research in African affairs, most of whom have lived in Africa for extended periods of time, which appeared in today's New York Times.

As a member of the House African Affairs Subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee, which has intensely studied the Congo situation, I fully concur in the evaluations of these distinguished citizens. The signers are to be most highly commended for the depth of their concern for and large service to the American public in countering by the publication of these facts the attempt of the Katanga lobby to completely mislead the people on our Government's position in support of the United Nations.

The statement follows:

WE COMMEND OUR GOVERNMENT'S CONGO POLICY

"Our strength and our hope—in keeping the peace—is the United Nations and I see little merit in the impatience of those who would abandon this imperfect world instrument because they dislike our imperfect world."—John F. Kennedy.

The policy of the United Nations in the Congo is consistent both with our national traditions and our national interests. It is in our tradition to support the desire of the people of the Congo to maintain their freedom and independence by upholding their constitutionally elected central government. It is in our interest to end anarchy in central Africa—anarchy of which Katanga secession is the major agent.

The public has recently been exposed to some dangerous myths:

MYTH I: THE UNITED NATIONS IS SUPPRESSING THE SELF-DETERMINATION OF KATANGA

Fact 1: The people of Katanga did determine their own fate when the political parties of the Congo, including the Conakat Party of Moise Tshombe, agreed in February 1960 that, "the Congo within its actual frontiers shall constitute an independent state, the inhabitants of which * * * possess one and the same nationality."

Fact 2: Where does self-determination end? The Conakat which demands "self-determination" for Katanga, itself refuses the same right to those who demand it for northern Katanga. The Katanga Government in its recent white book states: "Where would one end, if each of the hundreds of tribes inhabiting the former Belgian Congo wanted to erect itself as an independent state?"

Fact 3: The United Nations came to the Congo in July 1960, at the request of the Central Government which was in fact recognized by all the nations of the world. Its mission was to restore law and order. Its recent actions in Katanga are a part of this mission. On September 22, 1960, President Eisenhower stated: "In response to the call of the Republic of the Congo, the United Nations under its outstanding Secretary General has recently mounted a large scale effort to provide that new Republic with help. * * * The criticism directed * * * against the Secretary General, who has honorably and effectively fulfilled the mandate which he received from the United Nations, is nothing less than a direct attack upon the United Nations itself. * * *"

MYTH II: TSHOMBE IS PRO-WESTERN AND ANTI-COMMUNIST

Fact 4: Tshombe is pro-Tshombe. In July 1961 Tshombe's Interior Minister, Munongo, announced the sending of a mission to seek Soviet aid for Katanga. He also called for negotiations with Gizenga. Tshombe countenanced these moves to try to prevent the formation of the national coalition government of Adoula. If Tshombe now desires to contribute to peace in the Congo, he has only to abide by his agreement at Kitona to recognize the Congo constitution.

Fact 5: The Adoula Government has been trying to suppress secession everywhere—in southern Katanga, in Oriental Province, in south Kasai. If Katanga's secession were to continue, the inevitable result would be the weakening of the Congo nation and the resurgence of separatism throughout the Congo—which is the hope of the Communists. A stable central government is the best safeguard against communism.

MYTH III: THE PEOPLE OF KATANGA SUPPORT TSHOMBE OVERWHELMINGLY

Fact 6: Tshombe's Conakat won only 25 seats out of 60 in the 1960 Katanga provincial elections. The major opposition, the Balubakat Cartel, which is unrepresented in the Katanga Government, won 23. The Balubakat and allies got 134,916 votes to 91,116 for the Conakat and allies. The Balubakat opposes secession.

Fact 7: Balubakat leaders have been jailed by Tshombe. Opposition legislators are afraid to attend meetings of the Katanga legislature which has not had more than 32 members present for over 6 months.

Fact 8: The major resistance has been led by European mercenaries, not Africans. David Halberstam in the New York Times of December 13, 1961, states: "When the United Nations forces meet resistance these days, it is invariably from whites. * * *" "They (these white men) complain that a major part of their job is to keep the Africans from backing away from the fighting."

MYTH IV: THE KATANGA IS THE ONLY PART OF THE CONGO WHERE THERE IS LAW AND ORDER

Fact 9: Tshombe's government has never been able to control the northern half of Katanga.

Fact 10: The number of casualties resulting from the Congo civil war in Katanga, between Katangans, probably exceeds those incurred in any other province of the Congo since independence. The best estimate is over 30,000 Baluba killed.

Fact 11: Since September 1961, 40,000 to 50,000 Baluba have sought protection of the United Nations in camps in Elisabethville to escape molestation by Tshombe's armed forces.

MYTH V: THE UNITED STATES HAS NO POSITIVE POLICY IN THE CONGO

Fact 12: George Ball, Under Secretary of State, on December 19, 1961, defined our policy as follows:

"Our objective in the Congo, as elsewhere in Africa, is a free, stable, non-Communist government for the Congo as a whole, dedicated to the maintenance of genuine independence and willing and able to cooperate with us and with other free nations in meeting the tremendous internal challenges it must face.

"The United Nations is in the Congo with objectives that by and large parallel our own—to help the Adoula government create a stable and unified Congo and to ward off the dangers of civil war and great-power intervention. So far, the United Nations has been remarkably successful in its efforts toward this end; had it not been available for this purpose, we should have had to invent it, or the situation would already be lost. The United Nations effort deserves our support. We have given it. We should continue to do so.

"The Adoula government, the only legitimate government of the Congo, is a broadly based coalition under the leadership of an outstanding non-Communist African nationalist. This Government's objectives are fully consistent with ours. It, too, deserves our support and will have it. Before it can buckle down to its true task of pursuing the national development of the Congo, this government must cope successfully with the threat of armed secession in the Katanga and deal effectively with political dissidence in Stanleyville. We shall continue to support both of these efforts."

SIGNERS

Prof. David Apter,[1] University of California, Berkeley.

William H. Baldwin, New Canaan, Conn.

Robert S. Benjamin, chairman, U.S. Committee for the United Nations.

Dr. Elliot Berg,[1] Harvard University.

Daniel J. Bernstein, member, New York Stock Exchange.

Prof. Ray Billington, Northwestern University.

Robert L. Bliss, New Canaan, Conn.

Prof. William O. Brown,[1] director, African studies program, Boston University.

Prof. Gwendolen Carter,[1] Smith College.

John Cogley, Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

Prof. James S. Coleman,[1] director, African Studies Center, University of California, Los Angeles.

Prof. James Duffy,[1] Brandeis University.

Prof. William Dumphy, Fordham University.

Footnote at end of speech.

Prof. Rupert Emerson,[1] Harvard University.
Charles G. Fenwick, former president, Catholic Association for International Peace.
Frank E. Ferrari, New York City.
Mrs. Marshall Field, New York City.
Edward R. Garvey, president, National Student Association.
Capt. Paul L. Hammond, New York City.
Prof. Frederick Harbison,[1] Princeton University.
Rev. Donald Harrington, minister, the Community Church.
Prof. Richard B. Heflebower, Northwestern University.
Prof. Melville J. Herskovits,[1] director, programe of African studies, Northwestern University.
Mrs. W. Press Hodgkins, Lake Forrest, Ill.
Dr. Harold Isaacs,[1] Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
Mrs. Sophia Yarnall Jacobs, New York City.
Eric A. Johnston, Washington, D.C.
Dr. Francis Keppel, Harvard University.
Arthur B. Krim, New York City.
Prof. James Kritzeck,[1] Princeton University.
Rev. John S. La Farge, S.J., former chairman, Africa Subcommittee, Catholic Association for International Peace.
Mrs. Mary Lasker, New York City.
Prof. John A. Logan, Northwestern University.
Dean Edward S. Mason, Harvard University.
Prof. Daniel F. McCall,[1] Boston University.
Dr. Walsh McDermott, Cornell University.
Dr. Vernon McKay,[1] director, program of African studies, School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University.
Porter McKeever, New York City.
Arnold H. Maremont, Chicago, Ill.
Dr. Thomas Melady, president, Africa Service Institute.
Prof. Alan P. Merriam,[1] Northwestern University.
Dr. William E. Moran, Jr.,[1] dean, School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University.
Forrest Murden, Jr., International Relations Council.
Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, professor emeritus, Union Theological Seminary.
Elliott Newcomb, chairman, Africa League.
Prof. Jeanne Noble, New York University.
Earl D. Osborn, president, Institute for International Order.
Walter Phillips, chairman of board, Lincoln University.
Rt. Rev. James Pike, D.D., bishop of California.
Rabbi Joachim Prinz, president, American Jewish Congress.
A. Philip Randolph, president, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters.
Walter Reuther, president, United Automobile Workers.
Frederick W. Richmond, New York City.
Dr. Arnold Rivkin,[1] director, African Project, Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
Prof. Benjamin Rivlin,[1] Brooklyn College.
Rev. James Robinson, minister emeritus, Church of the Master.
Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, New York City.
Theodore Roosevelt III, Philadelphia, Pa.
Julius Rosenwald II, Philadelphia, Pa.
Prof. Ruth Schachter,[1] Boston University.
Prof. Franklin Scott, Northwestern University.
Dr. Paul E. Sigmund, Jr., Harvard University.
Edward Skillin, editor, The Commonweal.
Irving Solomon, San Diego, Calif.
Herman W. Steinkraus, president, American Association for the United Nations.
Tom C. Stix, New York City.
C. Sumner Stone, Jr., editor, Washington Afro-American.

Footnote at end of speech.

R. Peter Straus, New York City.
William J. vanden Heuvel, New York City.
Prof. Immanuel Wallerstein,[1] Columbia University.
James J. Wadsworth, former U.S. Representative to the United Nations.
Herbert F. Weiss,[1] Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
Peter Weiss, president, American Committee on Africa.
Lloyd G. Whitebrook, New York City.
Judge Hubert L. Will, U.S. District Court, Northern District, Illinois.
Prof. Harold F. Williamson, Northwestern University.

[1] These persons are actively engaged in teaching and research in African affairs and most of them lived in Africa for extended periods of time.

President Speaks on Rightwing Groups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I noticed in the Wall Street Journal of January 25 several interesting remarks made by President Kennedy at his January 24 press conference in response to a question concerning rightwing groups. I think the President's remarks bear repeating for the benefit of all Members of the House.

Every American wants to be sure that we are properly united in our effort not only to resist the Communist conspiracy but to go on the offensive for the concepts of freedom that we so fiercely hold in this country. Evidently, the President recognizes the merit in contributions that rightwing organizations are making in our country through their patriotic and anti-Communist activities.

Under unanimous consent I include that portion of the article in the Wall Street Journal relative to this subject in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE RADICAL RIGHT

Question. Mr. President, considering that the one ingredient in all these radical right organizations seems to be anti-Communist or possibly superpatriotism, would it be feasible or useful for you, or even for the Republican leaders, to appeal to these people to stop tilting at windmills and to make a common cause against the enemy? My question really is: Do you think there is any merit in this idea?

The PRESIDENT. Well, I did attempt in my speech at Seattle, and my speech in Los Angeles, and in other speeches, to indicate what I consider to be the challenges the United States faces, and I would hope that—there have been others who have done the same thing, and I think we should keep that up. And I am hopeful that we can turn the energies of all patriotic Americans to the great problems that we face at home and abroad. The problems are extremely serious. I share their concern about the cause for freedom. I do think we ought to look at what the challenges are with some precision and not concern ourselves on occasions with matters such as character integrity of the Chief Justice or other matters which are really not in question.

Alaska's Power Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST GRUENING

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the fourth of a series of articles dealing with Alaska's power shortages and needs, particularly in the Railbelt area.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALASKA'S POWER NEEDS—IV

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION MAKES DEVIL CANYON STUDY

Searching for more power in Central Alaska has been a problem for several months. Fairbanks and Anchorage face a power shortage in the near future.

Attempting to solve this problem utilities companies formed the Central Alaska Power Pool for the purpose of making studies.

Dependable capacities which now exist in this area have been shown to be insufficient.

The Rampart Dam proposed project, which appears most feasible for low-cost power, is in its beginning stages of study.

A feasibility report on Devil Canyon was completed in April 1961 by Daryl L. Roberts, district manager for the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior and submitted to Washington, D.C., for further study. The report contained the following information: The proposed Devil Canyon project is essentially a single-purpose hydroelectric power development, designed to meet present and anticipated future power and energy requirements for domestic, municipal, and industrial purposes in south-central Alaska.

The project will consist of two major dams and reservoirs on Susitna River, a powerplant, and transmission lines and appurtenant facilities to deliver power and energy to Fairbanks, Anchorage and other load centers.

DAM LOCATION

The location of one dam is 14.5 miles upstream from Gold Creek on the Alaska Railroad, and the second dam is proposed for construction about 115 miles further upstream near Denali where a much larger reservoir can be created. The reservoir on the lower dam, Devil Canyon, will have a smaller storage capacity.

Devil Canyon Dam will be a high concrete arch dam, rising 635 feet above its foundation.

The reason for building the second dam at Denali is the storage capacity at Devil Canyon is not adequate to control the runoff of Susitna River, and the reservoir can be created with a comparatively low (219 feet) earthfill dam.

TOE OF CANYON

A powerplant is proposed at the toe of Devil Canyon to utilize the average head of 538 feet to generate electric power.

Ultimate installed capacity of the plant would be 580,000 kilowatts, in eight units of 72,500 each.

From the powerplant two 230-kilovolt transmission lines would be built, extending about 160 miles south to Anchorage and about 190 miles north to Fairbanks.

Capacities of the Anchorage and Fairbanks substations would be 550,000 and 150,000 kilovolt-amperes, respectively.

In addition to the dam, plant, reservoir, and transmission lines, two roads would have to be built. One from the Alaska Railroad to Gold Creek and the other from Denali damsite to the Denali Highway.

PRINCIPAL RELOCATION

Principal relocation necessitated by construction of the project would be 22 miles of the Denali Highway which would be flooded by the Denali Reservoir. The 38 miles of new highway would utilize the dam to cross the Susitna River.

Construction costs for Devil Canyon is estimated to be $498,874,000 plus simple interest at 2½ percent on expenditures during construction of $28,216,000, making a total outlay of $527,090,000.

It was assumed in the study that interest charges on the money would be waived during the 15 years of the construction period.

If this waiver is not granted Devil Canyon project will cost in excess of $600 million.

The third largest feasibility study in an effort to secure more power for the Fairbanks area was completed in July of this year.

Let's Repudiate Extremism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing a great deal about extremism these days. Of course, not too much about socialism, communism, welfarism or any of the extremes which would basically alter our heritage but rather about those who are anti-Communist, pro-Constitution and pro-American. There are some extremists in our society. We all agree. The guns of the left have been turned on conservatives rather than extremists, however.

Some groups, such as the ADA, have even gone to the point where they have started to ask us to repudiate any group which in their opinion might be "extremist" in nature. The majority party's leadership at a recent $100 plate dinner in Washington announced that they would make "extremism" an issue in this election.

Some groups have delved into the past and obtained letters that some so-called extremist might have written years ago and have left no stone unturned to hang this tag on those of a different political persuasion.

Mr. Speaker, in looking through the old files of the Democratic Digest, official publication of the Democratic Party, I find this article on page 28 of the March 1936 issue:

AMERICAN GUILLOTINE

The original guillotine which decapitated King Louis XVI, loyal friend of the American Colonies when they needed a friend, was sold in France on St. Valentine's Day for $167.

With American liberties at stake it might not be inappropriate to buy that guillotine and set it up in front of the new judicial temple which frowns across the park that separates it from the Capitol.

Shades of the "impeach Earl Warren" movement, Mr. Speaker. It would seem that those who merely want to impeach a Supreme Court Justice—or even the Chief Justice—are rank moderates. Of course, we must remember that this was in conjunction with the all-out attack on the Supreme Court of the thirties following the NRA decision.

I assure you that if you read the issues of the Democratic Digest you will agree that there is nothing jocular or facetious about the presentation of the article, "American Guillotine." Of course, this was extremism of the left and as everyone knows, that is not the dangerous kind. Yes, let us all go forward and repudiate extremism.

U.S. Trade Solution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER H. DOMINICK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker, following up the articles by Mr. Henry Gemmill which I discussed with you yesterday and earlier today, I am submitting the last of the series which he wrote analyzing the problems which the United States is facing in connection with economic competition with the common market. The cure as suggested by Mr. Gemmill is not easy but something about which we should all ponder:

U.S. TRADE SOLUTION—WE CAN COMPETE ABROAD ONLY BY CUTTING PRODUCTION COSTS

(By Henry Gemmill)

A sharp question calls for a straight answer. It's about time now for those arguing about future American trade policy to pause and really listen to the question.

That question is raised by that muscular adolescent, the European Common Market, and it sounds like this: "We foreigners are soon going to throw out into world markets the greatest flood of low-cost manufactures ever seen in history; what are you Yankees going to do about it?"

The straight answer, and it does seem pretty obvious, would be this: "All right; America is going to whip its costs into line with the best you can do. Then see if you can lick us." But oddly enough, any remarks along this line have scarcely risen above a murmur.

The loud talk is about tariff tinkering; some plump for protection and the rest for freer trade. Presumably, roughly half this advice is correct—yet it's a bit like choosing the moment when the kitchen is on fire to argue with your wife about whether the front lawn needs sprinkling. You might be right, but are you pertinent?

SUGGESTED CURES

When the plainly visible elements of the foreign cost-cutting challenge do intrude on the eye, the trade disputants' suggested cures run to symptom-treating and faith-healing. It is soberly suggested that U.S. companies be banned from building more factories abroad, as if that would halt the oversea surge to mass production. Or a touching optimism is expressed that workers in Europe (despite their long tradition of genuine discipline) will soon be grabbing as high pay as those in America (where it's considered acceptably "noninflationary" to award auto workers their biggest boost ever).

This is to reduce economics to escapism. It could lead to eventual devaluation of the dollar. Any enduringly successful answer, it would seem, must come from searching examination and rigorous reform of the U.S. economy, with the plain straight objective of cutting production costs. Like all major surgery it cannot stop short of the sufficient.

But isn't the American economy already an efficient organism, the wonder of the world?

The truth of the matter is that it is nothing of the sort, viewed in the whole. The hope of the future, the prospect for progress, is to be found not in admiring its many efficiencies but in recognizing its myriad inefficiencies. Strip these away, then America can compete and thrive.

The first task is to look for them. Our vision of even admitted economic flaws is preoccupied with a need for growth, for smoothing the business cycle, for full employment. These are desirable, yet so far removed from cost analysis that they impair realistic peering at the economy. Perhaps the point requires illustration:

If the United States were to decide to produce half the bananas it eats, it could assuredly do so by subsidizing enough hothouses and propping prices for the fruit. The thousands of tons of glass and steel and the millions of bananas would all boost the magical figures of gross national product to accomplish growth, clever timing of construction could relieve unemployment.

BURDEN OF THE ECONOMY

Or, if it be imagined instead that this segment of the economy were an existing legacy from an earlier generation, then all these national yearnings could still be served by, say, accelerated tax depreciation to spur modernization and expansion of banana facilities.

It would remain an absurdity, nevertheless. And for the reason that it would be a high-cost burden upon the entire economy. Furthermore, its absurdity would be invisible to most if it were fact instead of fiction; anyone proposing to cut the banana businses out of the economy would be abused as lacking both commonsense and patriotism.

The actual absurdities, the high-cost inefficiencies of the national economy, deserve to be sought out boldly. We've considered hypothetical bananas. How about sure-enough sugar?

Is this genuine instance of high-cost domestic production less questionable? Is it not even more dubious, since the United States pays out far more than the world price not only for all its own sugar production but for all the foreign sugar it consumes? Why should our economy absorb and accept this inflation of cost?

How about the bulk of our agriculture—is it not even more fantastically warped into inefficiency? In our major commodities the United States could confront the Common Market and the world with an incomparable advantage of low cost and low price—for what other nation can match our huge farm belts, their soil and climate, their mechanization, and men highly trained in crop technology?

Yet Republicans and Democrats have long agreed to cancel the advantage. Much of the best land is forced out of the production, for which it is best suited, to sustain poor acreage. The most skilled farmer must limit his output to aid the least efficient. Prices are pushed so high that inferior foreign agriculture expands and sells at lower cost; imports are restrained only by protectionism, and subsidized U.S. production requires further subsidy to be sold abroad.

Industrial costs are every bit as vulnerable to scrutiny. Consider the Nation's expenditure for its energy requirements. Taxpayers' subsidies sponsor a little atomic

power, a lot of hydroelectric power. Efficient low-cost oil wells are sharply restrained in output; low-cost petroleum imports are curbed; the Government attacks sales of efficient gas fuel to industrial consumers. In short, energy costs are propped with the deliberate aim of keeping marginal coal mines and oilfields in production.

RULE OF THUMB

As a rough rule of thumb, perhaps any U.S. industry presently in need of subsidies, tariffs, or quota protection might be considered a candidate for abandonment or ruthless reform, if the rest of industry is to be saved from future need for protection. Encouraging cheap imports can be part of calculated national cost cutting, because by reducing raw materials expenditures and cost-of-living wage pressures it can aid the efficient sectors of the American economy to survive and expand.

Of course, since a search for cost-cutting opportunities can respect no boundaries of economic interest, geographic section, nor political party, no group is likely to give it wholehearted acclaim.

Suppose, for instance, it does become apparent that agriculture must be whipped into lean fighting condition, to help sustain the economy instead of draining it. This drive for low costs and low prices would certainly require the best farmers cultivating the best crops on the best land merged into units of the best size. This process would comb out millions of less fertile acres, thousands of less efficient farmers, and discard such fetishes as preservation of the family farm and gains in total farm income.

Conservatives and liberals could even agree on the objective yet be in utter disagreement. Is the objective best achieved by yanking off all governmental controls and letting farmers adjust to a free market? Or would such a revolution call for the most energetic governmental planning and controls?

As the high-cost sectors of industry are spotlighted, the Nation may similarly reach a consensus for action—yet debate whether the solution is to be achieved through more or less government. It will be vital to make sensible decisions, without long delay.

Beyond agriculture the Nation will have to reappraise many continuing Government policies, which are the environment for all industry, to see how accurately they aim at low costs. As a sample, consider antitrust enforcement: Should it be tightened or relaxed?

In one respect, it is arguable that businessmen should be clapped in prison if discovered in price conspiracy to protect their own inefficiencies and increase their customers' costs. But along another front, it is conceivable that corporate mergers should actually be encouraged wherever they really cut production costs. Competition is an essential incentive for cost cutting, but competition includes not just the number of competing U.S. producers but foreign competitors as well.

Government economists fret about "price leadership" by the biggest firms in various industries, yet privately they suspect that General Motors might cut auto prices except for the fear this might drive a couple of higher-cost competitors to the wall and the trustbusters would charge GM with monopoly.

CHEAPER CARS

Perhaps the U.S. auto industry would soon throw cheaper cars into domestic and world markets if this threat were removed, by redefining competition to include not just American automakers but Volkswagen, Renault, British Motors, Fiat, Volvo, and a host of others. Such a shift in antitrust policy might similarly provide cheaper steel, cheaper tires, cheaper paint—and all automakers could gain further low-cost strength in the world trade struggle.

Tax reform is also urgent business. Every executive knows his own corporation indulges in economic nonsense for tax reasons, and the Treasury knows the balance between entire industries suffers costly distortion from uneven burdens of taxation. An endless quarrel goes on between those who would reduce basic rates to diminish the pressure for odd escapes and those who would sew up the loopholes. Perhaps it is time for some of both.

Anyway, no major reform should proceed without examining its relationship to tax technicalities of the Common Market. Europe collects much of its taxes through various sales levies, which its manufactured exports escape. In contrast, American reliance on corporate income taxes weighs heavily on our factories' exports. Should not this element of high cost be eliminated, if necessary by revamping the whole manner of collecting revenue?

American taxes have been examined for their role in the business cycle, social reform, and economic growth. Now may be the time to total them up as an element of production cost, to see how they compare with tax costs of production abroad. This could be used to buttress liberal arguments for more Federal spending—and conservative arguments that lavish welfare programs burden not merely the U.S. taxpayer but production costs and prices.

LABOR AND AUTOMATION

National labor policy is obviously in flux, but has any real prospect as yet appeared that it will contribute to getting U.S. costs in shape to compete? Automation, by nature a solution, is converted into a problem to be studied by national committees whose idea of progress is to phase and limit its potential for slashing labor costs.

Featherbedding is a national joke, but what national policy attacks its most flagrant follies? As for wage restraint, Government men congratulate themselves on a doctrine which even if followed encourages pay hikes and fringes to absorb all industrial productivity gains; how does this leave room for American price cutting, or for reinvestment in new cost-cutting plants and machines?

If the fat should be cut out of U.S. labor cost; How? Should it be accomplished by labor statesmanship, by laws breaking the monopoly power of the unions, or by Government dictation of wages and working conditions?

Clearly, every question will be open to debate, and some decisions cannot be made on economic grounds alone. If, for example, a true military necessity for shipping subsidies, oil quotas, or textile tariffs exists, it should be heeded—but only after the same sort of harsh strategic review that has killed off the cavalry, the battleship, and the Snark missile. Requirements of the economic contest with non-Communist lands will not always jibe neatly with requirements of the anti-Communist struggle. Yet there will be an affinity.

The prospect of trade wars between Europe and the United States, no less than the cold war itself, imperatively poses its question. The foreign threat of low costs demands that America respond by cutting its own costs. This can be done only by making hard decisions that will not wait.

The Old World has come to life to challenge American primacy. And the Communists are in the wings.

Big Forces Seek a Share in Procurement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that three very able articles by James McCartney on procurement problems of the Defense Department which appeared in the Chicago Daily News for November 13–15, 1961, be printed in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIG FORCES SEEK A SHARE: ARMS INDUSTRY, CONGRESS, TOWNS—ALL STAKE CLAIMS

(By James McCartney)

WASHINGTON.—The Nation's multibillion-dollar defense program has created more than military might—it has generated mighty political and economic forces seeking both money and power.

Some of these forces—or pressures—emanate from industries that have a vital stake in the nearly $25 billion a year parceled out by the Defense Department to buy everything from milk to missiles.

Some of them come from Congress, where Congressmen and Senators seek to protect the economic interests—the pocketbooks—of their constituents, particularly by seeking to guarantee high employment.

Some of them come from the three hotly competitive Armed Forces—the Army, Navy, and Air Force—each frequently seeking to spend available funds in a different way in their earnest desires to assure the Nation's strength.

Some of them come from communities—like Elkton, Md., which has been thrown into economic chaos by a decision to cut $6 million from the appropriation for the nearby Bainbridge Naval Training Center.

THE POLITICS OF SURVIVAL

The story of how these forces operate in seeking to influence the amount as well as the distribution of defense dollars is the story of the politics of national defense—now called the politics of survival.

Yet political factors in the defense program are often hush-hush, rarely discussed openly, little understood. Some are so subtle that patterns are difficult to discern.

But their significance is not subtle. They have raised searching questions in the minds of both former President Eisenhower and President Kennedy.

Said Mr. Eisenhower in his final message to the Nation last January:

"This conjunction of an immense Military Establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience.

"The total influence—economic, political, even spiritual—is felt in every city, every statehouse, every office in the Federal Government.

"We must not fail to comprehend its grave implications. Our toil, resources and livelihood are all involved. So is the very structure of our society.

"We must guard," Mr. Eisenhower said, "against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex."

President Kennedy, in a special message on the defense budget several weeks later, said:

"Neither our strategy nor our psychology as a nation—and certainly not our economy—must become dependent upon the permanent maintenance of a large Military Establishment."

TERRIFIC VOLUME OF SPENDING

Yet the awesome volume of defense spending, now approaching $50 billion a year in all, about 10 percent of the national economy, makes military-industrial politics difficult to grasp.

More money is spent on military security every year than the net income of all of the Nation's corporations put together.

Defense spending makes jobs—more than 7 million of them—and jobs are part and parcel of politics.

In the year ended in June, more than 7,500,000 defense contracts were signed.

The pressure on the Pentagon becomes enormous.

The three services together get nearly 500,000 telephone calls and letters from Congressmen and Senators every year involving Defense Department plans and programs.

Many, perhaps most, relate to the problems of individuals—soldiers, for example, who want furloughs. Many others simply seek information. But many also involve contract awards.

At the same time, Pentagon procurement (supply) officers have constant personal contacts with contractors, frequently as part of expensive campaigns by contractors to get business.

Generals and admirals in a position to influence contracts rarely lack invitations to cocktails or dinner.

Many of the contractors depend almost exclusively on defense business for survival.

A report by the Senate's Joint Economic Committee lists dozens of companies that rely on defense work for more than 50 percent of their business. With many the percentage is over 90.

Lockheed Aircraft, for example, does 98 percent of its business with the Defense Department.

Boeing does two thirds. In 1959 the figure for both the Martin Co. and North American Aviation was 99 percent.

In 1959 the 10 largest companies in defense work received 37 percent of the total government business, while more than 73 percent of defense contracting was performed by the 100 largest companies.

PROMOTE WEAPONS, EQUIPMENT

Frequently the contractors work closely with the individual services to promote weapons or equipment they can build that one of the competing services wants.

And the services today have immense resources to promote their interests in obtaining more money for new weapons or weapons systems.

They have their own publicity machines, each with a bigger budget than the "public information" budget of the State Department.

The Defense Department declines to guess what its annual bill for "public information" activities is, but State Department officials have worked out a figure.

They say it runs to about $30 million a year—in contrast to the State Department's $1,500,000.

State Department officials add that nearly six times as many speeches on foreign policy questions are given by military people as by men working for the State Department—another indication of the powerful influence the military can wield.

Today highly technical, multi-billion-dollar weapons systems—like the Polaris submarine system or the Minuteman missile system—are the basic units of national defense.

A single contract for a single weapons system—even a system that has not gone into formal production—can have vast economic ramifications.

The Army's proposed Nike-Zeus antimissile missile program, for example, has not yet been cleared for production. But more than $1 billion has been spent on it already for research and development—spread among 37 States.

The competition for this kind of money is great. Plans to compete often emanate from the Washington offices of big contractors. How they work is a story in itself.

DEFENSE—EVERYONE'S BUSINESS: HOW ARMS FIRMS WOO U.S. BRASS—CONTRACTORS KEEP SALESMEN ON DUTY AT THE PENTAGON

(By James McCartney)

(The cold war requires Americans to spend almost $25 billion a year on defense supplies—from missiles to milk for troops. The pressures to share in this spending range from the three military branches themselves to industry, Congress and every State. This is the second of five articles explaining these pressures and their effect on all of us.)

WASHINGTON.—Here's how a giant defense contractor operates in Washington in seeking a share of the nearly $25 billion now parceled out annually to buy weapons and supplies for the military.

The system, at least in part, is described by a former public relations man for a firm that holds more than $1 billion in defense contracts.

"We staged huge selling campaigns at the Pentagon, lining up dozens of interviews in a single week with procurement (supply) officials," he relates.

"The campaign would be outlined in a book two inches thick, organized to the finest detail, right down to selecting the 'psychologically right' colors for charts and graphs for maximum selling impact.

"Our excuse for the meetings would be that we wanted to bring the military up to date on our capabilities. Really, we were selling."

How common this pattern may be can only be guessed, but this much is certain: the activities of big defense contractors, collectively, represent a powerful force in the politics of national defense, the politics of survival.

Contractors not only have constant meetings with procurement officials who make decisions on where money will be spent, they also frequently make contacts with Senators and Congressmen from States in which they have plants.

They seek all the help they can get. One Senator reports that he gets an average of three telephone calls a day from defense contractors.

The most frequent point of contact between contractors and the Government, however, is in the hundreds, perhaps thousands, of meetings that take place every year with procurement officials of the three armed services.

These meetings are a vital part of defense operations, particularly because private industry carries 80 percent of the load in weapons development.

They are necessary to maintain liaison between manufacturers and Defense Department buyers and most of the time, probably, they involve purely technical subjects.

Big contractors, however, acknowledge that their men, naturally, always have selling or the prospects for selling on their minds.

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara once mentioned the unequal balance that often exists between the pay of negotiating parties when contracts are under discussion.

He said he knew that the pay of a negotiator for his own former employer, the Ford Motor Co., was $80,000 a year. The man representing the Defense Department was making $10,000.

The sort of temptations this situation suggests are obvious, particularly when many defense contracts are awarded without competitive bidding.

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, has said noncompetitive contract awards create an "area of suspicion."

In the first 6 months of 1961 about 60 percent of Defense Department contracts were not competitive, according to the Senate's Joint Economic Committee.

This high percentage has been a matter of dispute between the Pentagon and some Members of Congress, in which the Pentagon has claimed that frequently there is one "best" source for a particular item and congressional critics have said this is a lazy man's way of doing business.

All parties seem to agree that "personal contacts" play an important role in defense buying decisions. Thus one of the most important jobs of a Washington company representative is always to make friends.

"It always helps if you know someone personally," says a top Defense official.

The importance of "personal contact" is undoubtedly one reason why many retired admirals and generals have been put to work by Defense contractors.

A House subcommittee found 1,400 retired officers in the rank of major or higher—including 261 generals and admirals—working for the top 100 defense companies.

How much entertaining is done to brush up those personal contacts no one knows.

In one instance exposed by congressional testimony, the Martin Co., a big contractor in electronics, acknowledged entertaining at least 26 active-duty military officers at a weekend retreat in the Bahamas.

In another case, Aerojet-General, General Dynamics, and Martin planned an off the record party with a top Air Force general, but called it off after it was brought to light.

Company representatives who go to meetings at the Pentagon are rarely registered lobbyists—in fact several of the biggest contractors have no registered lobbyists on their Washington staffs.

Lobbying, in the classic—and the legal—sense, involves dealings with Congress to influence legislation. It does not cover contacts with Defense Department agencies that make decisions on where money will be spent.

Says one House of Representatives aid who handles lobby registration: "We hardly touch the Defense Department where the real money is. The hole in the law is bigger than the Washington Monument."

Washington offices of contractors vary widely in size. The Boeing Airplane Co. has eight men in Washington, four of whom spend most of their time at the Pentagon.

General Electric has more than 60 working at the Pentagon—about 15 with the Army, 30 or so with the Air Force, and another 20 with the Navy.

Different manufacturers have different names for these contact men, but they are often called sales engineers.

Manufacturers insist that they do not lobby for contracts, but simply furnish information.

Among activities the some perform are briefing military officers of the various services before they testify before congressional committees about weapons.

The role of industry, however, is only a part of the picture of the politics of survival. Congressmen and Senators are deeply involved in influencing defense spending policies.

THE PLUM WAR: HOW LAWMAKERS FIGHT IT—THE PRIZE IS DEFENSE CASH FOR THEIR AREAS

(By James McCartney)

WASHINGTON.—Congressmen and Senators battle vigorously for defense contracts for their districts or States. They often fight openly if there's a threat to close down a military installation in their constituencies.

Some have wondered aloud on occasion whether obtaining the best defense for the

cheapest price hasn't, at times, become a secondary consideration.

Said Representative JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Democrat, of Mississippi, a member of the House Appropriations Defense Subcommittee, in testifying before a congressional committee last year:

"I am convinced defense is only one of the factors that enter into our determinations for defense spending.

"The others are pump priming, spreading the immediate benefits of defense spending, taking care of all the services, giving all defense contractors a fair share, spreading the military bases to include all sections * * *."

He added later on the House floor that special interests involved in military spending are "probably the biggest factor in American domestic policy and politics."

Former President Eisenhower also complained about this on several occasions.

"Obviously political and financial considerations" rather than "strict military needs," were influencing defense budget debates in Congress, he said in June 1959.

Later that year he said that if such forces were allowed to prevail "everybody with any sense knows that we are finally going to a garrison state."

There are many examples of congressional concern for contractors and their interests.

Senator HENRY JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington was one of the first Senators to protest strongly Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara's recent decision to stop production on the B-52 strategic bomber.

The headquarters of the Boeing Airplane Co., which makes the B-52, is located in JACKSON's home State, in Seattle.

In fairness to JACKSON, it should be pointed out that he has long been a serious student of military preparedness and is highly regarded as an expert in the field by many of his colleagues.

Some, however, have jocularly described him as "the gentleman from Boeing."

Boeing, however, is not the only aircraft company with congressional friends. Representative JAMES WRIGHT, Democrat, of Texas, is sometimes known by his colleagues as "the Congressman from Convair."

Convair, a subsidiary of General Dynamics, produces the B-58 Hustler bomber in Wright's home district in the Fort Worth area.

Wright, in a special appearance before the House Armed Services Committee, asked for stepped up production on the B-58 as "the best bomber we have."

Representative EDGAR W. HIESTAND, Republican, of California is also interested in bombers—particularly the proposed B-70 super-bomber.

North American Aviation, prime contractor for the B-70, is in HIESTAND's district.

HIESTAND wrote McNamara earlier this year to assure him of "the strong congressional support for this valued program." McNamara, however, cut back on B-70 spending.

Some Congressmen and Senators also work closely with representatives of one or another of the Armed Services and their contractors when they are seeking funds.

The Army proved that it could muster congressional support during debate on the Nike-Zeus antimissile missile system.

The Army mounted a drive earlier this year—through Army magazine, official publication of the Association of the U.S. Army—to try to get Nike-Zeus into production.

No fewer than 6 Senators and Congressmen took to their floors to urge the program on, frequently quoting the Army magazine.

Each one was from a district or State that would get at least a slice of Nike-Zeus spending.

Pentagon officials have become used to the pattern and take congressional pressure in stride.

Says one top official: "It's just a part of the democratic system at work. No Congressman or Senator would stay in office long if he didn't present the interests of his constituents."

Congressmen and Senators exhibit equal concern over military installations in their home States and districts. Two hundred and eighty-two of the 437 congressional districts have at least one military installation.

A classic example of this kind of interest was the bitter fight waged by the Illinois congressional delegation over Army proposals to move the Army Quartermaster Food and Container Institute from Chicago to Natick, Mass.

Although the institute is a relatively tiny operation, with fewer than 300 employees, the Illinois delegation tied up the entire House for hours fighting to retain it.

When McNamara announced the closing of 73 military installations earlier this year—52 of them in the United States—the Defense Department braced itself for congressional yelps.

Officials report now, however, that they received fewer than expected. They say they received a flood of inquiries from Capitol Hill but that only 10 or 12 of them could be considered major.

A major inquiry, they say, involves correspondence over a period of time and requests for meetings with defense officials.

Patterns of congressional power have been noted in decisions about the location of some military installations.

Georgia, for example, the home of the chairmen of both the Senate and the House Armed Services Committees, has 19 defense installations.

A brave general is credited with telling a congressional committee that one more base in Georgia would sink the State.

Another factor in congressional defense politics is personal ties many Congressmen and Senators have with one or another of the armed services.

There are 40 Reserve officers in Congress, including 6 generals. Many, such as Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, a major general in the Army Reserve, are spokesmen for their service.

Some of them take part in battles between the services, still another facet of the politics of survival.

Man of the Year in Service to Mississippi Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, each year the Progressive Farmer, an excellent southern publication, nominates a man of the year for agriculture in each of the Southern States. The Mississippi nominee for 1961 was James Hand, Jr., of Rolling Fork, an outstanding agricultural leader in the delta and in the entire State of Mississippi. Mr. Hand not only serves unselfishly in countless civic activities that benefit his area and the State, but he provides a practical demonstration on his own farm of the value of scientific and business methods applied to agricultural production.

Under unanimous consent I include the citation from the Progressive Farmer:

For Man of the Year in Service to Mississippi Agriculture, Progressive Farmer editors have singled out James Hand, Jr., a farmer of rich delta soil. Yes, Mr. Hand is an outstanding farmer, a big farmer. But those who know him best tell us it is his dedicated and unselfish service, his willingness to serve for the sake of serving, that makes him tower above the crowd.

There was a time when rampaging Mississippi waters spread out across rich delta land, destroying crops and property. James Hand, Jr., devoted himself to flood control for many years. Now, he's at it again, working to get underway a flood control project on the Yazoo River.

Long a supporter of the Delta Branch Experiment Station, Mr. Hand has made tremendous contributions through his service as chairman of the Delta Council Advisory Research Committee. He pushed for research on cotton production practices, and made significant contributions to cotton mechanization through progressive methods used on his own land.

Mr. Hand has served on the Advisory Committee to National Cotton Council, president of Delta Council, agricultural committee of U.S. Chamber of Commerce. He is a member of the Committee of One Hundred for Emory University.

Support for the Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the dean of music critics in the Nation's Capital, Paul Hume, make an urgent plea for Federal assistance to the musical arts, particularly opera. Under a U.S. Arts Foundation (S. 1250) such as I have proposed, this support could be forthcoming and the need to bring musical concerts and performances into areas of the country where they presently cannot afford to go would be met in substantial measure.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the comments by Paul Hume entitled "Sympathy of the Nation Needed To Support Arts" which appeared in the Washington (D.C.) Post, January 21, 1962.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SYMPATHY OF THE NATION NEEDED TO SUPPORT ARTS

Lovers of opera, whose memories go back a few years, will remember the Saturday afternoons in the middle 1930's when Lucrezia Bori began the Met's first public appeals.

During the intermission of opera broadcasts that included some of the great and memorable productions in Metropolitan history, Bori and many of her colleagues stepped up to the microphone and told the listening radio public, numbered in the millions, that if the Metropolitan was to continue it needed their money. That was a

quarter of a century ago, and the need remains today, though it now exists more urgently than ever before.

How many individual performances I can still vividly recall from those days, Ponselle as Donna Anna, Rethberg's Desdemona, Borl and Johnson in "Pelleas et Melisande," Flagstad in those matchless, golden days.

Yet in those very days, as still today, the listening public, hearing with deep gratitude, fails to respond to the Met's requests for financial assistance. A letter received recently at the Metropolitan shows how pitifully those who enjoy the broadcasts equate their pleasure with their pocketbooks. The grateful listener wrote, "Your broadcast was so wonderful I almost sent you a dollar." There was no money enclosed in the envelope.

These and other gloomy thoughts roam around my mind as I contemplate the business of raising money to get Washington's Center for the Performing Arts built.

Mr. Private Citizen today loves music more than ever, we find from every dependable indicator. He buys records, often without the slightest concern for their cost, and knows that he wants Callas rather than Tebaldi, Oistrakh rather than Stern, Cliburn rather than anyone else, or what have you. He fills Carnegie Hall, the Metropolitan Opera House, Town Hall, the Metropolitan Museum, and half a dozen other halls in New York all on the same night, and, in Washington, jams Constitution Hall, Lisner Auditorium, and the Capitol Theater at the same time.

Across the country there is the continuing, healthy desire to hear the standard classics, in combination with a constantly growing insistence upon something new or unusual. Colleges and universities include increasingly ambitious musical programs in their regular catalogs and concerts, and these in turn produce an ever-widening musical audience of discriminating taste.

Yet the cold, often cruel, facts remain that our musicians languish for lack of adequate compensation, and we do not have a vast, national demand for proper facilities in which to present all kinds of musical attractions.

When the drive for funds for the new Washington Center opens this May, there should be an instant response from individuals, from organizations and industries, from labor, and from foundations. There also should be a movement in the Congress of the United States to give further concrete official recognition to the status which the arts occupy today. It is the responsibility of the people of the country to see to it that there Capital is not a matter of real, recurrent shame for lack of decent concert, opera, and theater facilities as it now is.

It is the responsibility of the Congress of the United States to see to it that the country does not talk loudly and handsomely about what it has contributed to the arts around the world, only to bury its head in embarrassment because one of the wealthiest communities in the Nation lacks, for whatever reason, the minimum in adequate housing for the arts.

If Congress and the President can assist New York City and countries abroad to build and rebuild opera houses, theaters, and concert halls, and can provide funds for the exchange of artists, in what has proven a very useful bridging operation, then Congress and the President should not find it difficult to find ways of assuring places—which do not a present exist—for these same people to perform in the Nation's Capital.

Why should the people of Europe be able to see the New York City Ballet, one of the few great companies in the world, but not Washington? Why should Jerome Robbins' "Ballets U.S.A." be a smash hit around Europe but never appear in Washington, though it was sent abroad by the U.S. Government?

We have a lot of thinking to do, and much of it centers around strengthening our national attitudes toward the arts, their housing, and their encouragement.

Reserves Aid in Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to call attention to the important role our Reserves play in national defense.

The Reserve Officers Association of the United States will as is customary lead the Nation in the observance of National Defense Week during the period February 12–22.

This observance takes note of the anniversary of the National Defense Act of 1920 which brought the Nation's military Reserves into being, and provided the framework from which we have built the greatest Reserve forces system the Nation has ever had.

Today we have on active duty more than 150,000 reservists called up, as the President of the United States pointed out, "to prevent a war, rather than to fight a war."

It is apparent that the ready and effective response of the Reserve to this call-up, which was the first such call-up of this nature, probably has actually averted overt developments in a threatening crisis.

So, it is particularly fitting this year that we take note of National Defense Week and express particular gratitude to the Nation's reservists—Army, Navy, and Air Force—who are on duty in a demonstration designed to preserve the peace.

A brief explanation of National Defense Week and its purpose is taken from the February issue of the Officer, ROA's current magazine, and is offered for the edification of the Members of the Congress:

VICE PRESIDENT JOHNSON, OTHERS HAIL NATIONAL DEFENSE WEEK, FEBRUARY 12–22

Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson has hailed ROA's celebration of National Defense Week, February 12–22, as a time which "should prompt all citizens to a new sense of gratitude to the military reservists."

In a strong statement of support for the week which will be celebrated this month by ROA chapters and departments in all the States, the Vice President, himself a member of ROA, said:

"It is gratifying to learn that the Reserve Officers Association of the United States again plans to observe the anniversary of enactment of the National Defense Act of 1920 as the cornerstone of American security.

"National Defense Week, during February 12–22, 1962, should prompt all citizens to a new sense of gratitude to the military reservists. At this time, when the Reserves of the various services, officers and men, again are called upon to make sacrifices, incident to active service, all the people should strive for a new demonstration of unity against any foe.

"ROA has given meaningful service to the Nation for nigh onto 40 years. No aspect of its program of dedication to national security is more vital during these crises days than is the nationwide reminder of the significance of the great American—the citizen-reservist."

Capt. C. N. Whited, Director, Civil Relations Division, Department of the Navy, wrote ROA:

"Your intention to emphasize the responsibility of every citizen to national security and the importance of the Organized Reserves is indeed most timely in view of the current callup of many of our Nation's Reserve Forces and the generally unsettled conditions existing in many parts of the world. I wish to assure you that the Navy shall cooperate with and support your program as feasible within existing directives and policy as set forth by the Department of Defense."

Maj. Gen. C. G. Dodge, Chief of Public Information, Department of the Army, said that ROA is to be "commended for your continuing interest and active part in the national defense effort." He added:

"The vital role which the Organized Reserves play in the military structure rightfully should be dramatized in the program for National Defense Week. The patriotic ideals of the Reserve Officers Association have long been a source of strength of the Nation."

From department and chapter presidents came word of planned activities during the week to emphasize the Nation's need for a continuing strong national defense. The word, as usual, was to be spread by billboard posters, newspapers, radio, television, and talks before civic and other clubs.

ROA has sponsored National Defense Week for many years, and it has grown in importance each year with more and more people awakening to the need for a strong and ready Reserve. The National Defense Act of 1920 brought the Reserves into existence—after World War I proved the country weak in the number of well-trained citizen-soldiers.

Both President Kennedy and former Presidents Eisenhower and Truman, as well as the Chiefs of State before them, have hailed the week as an opportunity to remind Americans that to be strong is to be free.

Tariff Cut Seen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include the following editorial which appeared in the New Orleans States-Item entitled "Tariff Cut Seen":

TARIFF CUT SEEN

From the sketchy information available, it appears that U.S. negotiations with the six European nations comprising the Common Market are about ready to yield fruit.

Unsigned but regarded as on the way to formal acceptance is an agreement which would grant reciprocal tariff cuts of about 20 percent. Mainly involved are industrial products.

Still largely unknown are the effects of the European tariff union on U.S. exports, but if it were to exclude American-made or produced goods, the result would be havoc. Our

economy is increasingly geared to require heavy shipments abroad.

As U.S. Representative HALE BOGGS pointed out Monday, if there is rivalry instead of teamwork between the Common Market and the United States, a wedge beneficial to the Soviets will be driven between the Western free world.

While the expiring reciprocal trade law admits of this first exploratory accommodation, its scope and authority are not broad enough to bargain widely.

This week's news indicates the United States can get along well tradewise with the nations on the continent. Now less rigid tariff laws are needed to capitalize on favorable trade opportunities as they may arise.

Mr. Eisenhower Was Fuzzy When Clarity Is the Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS BASS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial, which appeared in the Nashville Tennessean, on Wednesday, January 24, 1962. In my opinion, this is an outstanding article and one which merits the attention of the entire Congress.

The editorial follows:

MR. EISENHOWER WAS FUZZY WHEN CLARITY IS THE NEED

In his statement to the Senate investigating committee studying restraints on public expressions by the military, former President Eisenhower was characteristically ambiguous, and he ended up denouncing the policies under which he operated for 8 years.

In one sentence, the former President said military men should be encouraged to speak out against the dangers of communism. He then noted the military men should speak, always under properly established policies and the general—not petty—supervision of their civilian superiors.

Mr. Eisenhower told the Senators he has come to question the practice, in his own administration as well as the current one, of the Pentagon's reviewing speeches as to content as well as security matters.

Certainly Mr. Eisenhower's administration was noted for its efforts to put a gag on military brass when their speeches or articles came in conflict with established policies or programs of the administration. In recent years, Gen. Matthew Ridgeway and Lt. Gen. James Gavin criticized defense policies and then resigned to be free to criticize further.

In the broad context, no one objects to a military man speaking out against the dangers of communism or other perils. But the question is whether the views of some about those dangers are to be left willy-nilly to whim.

Mr. Eisenhower argued that top officials have personal responsibility and "when in doubt, will voluntarily 'coordinate' proposed public statements within their own and sister departments so as to protect the Nation, their services, and themselves." Some do, but this generosity of view must come from Mr. Eisenhower the general, rather than the former President.

Surely he has not forgotten the famous revolt of the Fancy Dan admirals over budget allocations to the B-36 when these men defied their civilian superiors to denounce publicly cutbacks in the Navy budget.

The military is not always omniscient about matters of danger or of defense. For years prior to sputnik, many in the military publicly classified Russia as a bumbling, backward country whose army, it was often pointed out, still used horse-drawn wagons. Then the pendulum swung.

In Maj. Gen. Edwin Walker's case, the dangers of communism extended to such matters as U.S. membership in the United Nations and the voting records of Members of Congress. General Walker's views are not only extreme with respect to indoctrinating his troops, but they were political. Certainly his idea of personal responsibility is a strange one.

And Mr. Eisenhower took note of this in an oblique way by saying that the Communist menace could be exploited for political or other purposes, and that "extremism finds a fertile soil."

Doubtless there are instances in which censorship has been exercised too liberally where the intent of the speaker was neither political nor the results of extremism. Some within a bureaucracy always tend to carry out their duties too liberally, and perhaps a close look at this will be one of the beneficial aspects of the investigation.

The question which former President Eisenhower did not choose to deal with directly is that the Constitution, by making the President Commander in Chief of U.S. forces, has established a tradition of civilian control. Under this tradition, the military man eschews partisan politics.

If the military wants to speak out on matters involving threat to this country, he most certainly should not be trammeled insofar as his public utterances are involved. But if he cannot distinguish where his responsible role begins and ends, and if he engages publicly in partisan politics, he ought to be told to shut up or to get out. None should have more understanding of this than Mr. Eisenhower who chose to be fuzzy when clarity is wanted.

Thoughts on Our Problems and Challenges in 1962; West Virginia Journalist Looks Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is not beyond reality to predict that the year of 1962 may result in being the most important twelvemonth of the current generation. The new year may treat the United States and its allies with exceptional favor, or 1962 could be the year when America and its allies are confronted with even more difficulties and tensions on a much broader level.

It is for this reason that we, as Members of the Senate, the administration of President Kennedy, and the American people must make every effort to assure that 1962 will not be just a good year for the United States, but a most successful one.

I refer to the necessity of finding solutions for the problems facing our citizens as well as those perplexities on an international level.

At home, a remedy must be found to aid our senior citizens with respect to their medical needs. Ways must be found to assure that more of our high school graduates will be offered an opportunity to pursue a college education; and if President Kennedy is successful in his attempt to have tariffs lowered, a way must be found to offer vocational retraining for the labor forces affected as well as tax adjustments for businesses. We cannot afford to permit just a few to carry the burden if our foreign trade policy is altered for the betterment of the Nation. Pending legislation may prove to be a partial answer to some of these more important internal problems.

Equally vital is the need for the American Government to perform an even greater role in the free world's endeavor to ease the ever-mounting spread of tensions throughout the hemisphere.

To say the least, these situations are not new to us. The same problems prevailed during the past year. Progress was made toward solution of some cases and not for others. But it is important to remember that some progress was realized, regardless of whether it was considered large or small.

The United States and our allies managed to survive the year without being confronted with the third world war which was predicted by many individuals. The Communist nations were again unsuccessful in gaining United Nations recognition of Red China. And President Kennedy, through his alliance-for-progress policy, has restored the prestige among our Latin American neighbors which the United States enjoyed during the 1930's and the 1940's.

Taking these facts into consideration, it might prove advantageous for the American Government to let the policies which guided our actions in 1961 be the foundation for policies developed during 1962.

Henry W. Morrow, a capable attorney and excellent writer in Charles Town, W. Va., expressed these views in an editorial entitled "Thoughts on New Year's Eve," in the December 28, 1961, issue of the Spirit of Jefferson Advocate.

Mr. Morrow's editorial is most interesting and I feel his thoughts merit the attention of the Members of Congress and citizens in general. I therefore ask unanimous consent to include this editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOUGHTS ON NEW YEAR'S EVE

(By Henry W. Morrow)

A year ago, on this page and in this space, we penned a prediction for 1961. We did not believe in whistling in the dark. We opined that 1961 would be a year more noted for hardship and anxiety than happiness and anticipation. A new President was about to take office but we were not deluded into believing that 1961 would be a year of deliverence from the multiple problems and responsibilities that confronted us. We had no crystal ball. We did not need one. Only a fool could have, a year ago, looked ahead and seen anything but a continuation

of the struggle that grips this generation with an iron hand.

But notwithstanding this there were good things in 1961. The bomb remained untriggered although there were times when it seemed like it would not remain so. Indeed, the greatest single accomplishment of 1961 was a negative accomplishment. We managed to avert a world conflict. There were angry words from both sides. But in the words of that great statesman, Winston Churchill, it is better "to jaw and jaw than war and war."

On the even of 1962 we see little hope for an abatement of tension. The swords will remain swords and the plowshares will remain plowshares and it is not likely that the former will be converted into the latter in 1962. But there are signs in the wind; and if in 1962 man can confine his hostilities to jawing and jawing instead warring and warring in some distant year the crisis may yet resolve itself. What are those signs? One of the greatest (and least noted) is the gradual move toward a dissolution of trade barriers between the members of the Atlantic community as well as between us and our allies in the Far East. Another is the recognition by the member states of the free world of the right to disagree among themselves without being disagreeable, something that the Communists cannot do as is evidenced by the rift between Russian and Albania—and China. Still another is the surprising ease with which the attempt of Red China to shoot her way into the United Nations was thwarted. Our Asian and African policy is beginning to bear fruit.

Nineteen hundred and sixty-two will not see a universal solution of our problem. But somehow, and with reason, we feel that we are on the right track. The task for 1962 is to remain on that track in spite of what the "smarter people" say, although our patience will be sorely tested. Let us resolve, then, to make 1962 a year to continue the pursuit of the policy we have set out upon. The scent is cold. The faint-hearted will want to turn back or, even worse, find a simpler or quicker solution. But the strong must go on until sooner or later we sink our teeth into the peace and justice that have eluded us for so long. Nineteen hundred and sixty-two will not mark the end of the trial. But it can be a milestone if we will make it so.

Peril Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include the following editorial entitled "Peril Point," which appeared in the New York Times for January 16, 1962:

PERIL POINT

In describing his plans for a bold revision of this country's tariff laws President Kennedy assured Congress that he did not intend to "neglect the safeguards" provided by "peril points" or "an escape clause." What does this mean?

"Peril points" refer to a clause in existing law under which the Tariff Commission determines the level below which a tariff cannot be reduced without injury to a given industry. "Escape clause," also in existing law, provides that an industry which believes it has been injured by a tariff reduction may ask to have that tariff raised again.

These provisions are intended to limit the authority of the President in negotiating reciprocal tariff reductions under existing law and, if continued in their present form, would clearly be inconsistent with such a sweeping revision of existing procedures as Mr. Kennedy has proposed. It seems evident, therefore, that while he will not "neglect the safeguards" provided by these two provisions, he must attempt to give them a new and certainly a narrower meaning.

Actually, there is another, and genuinely vital, peril point for the American people in this whole affair. The real spirit is that we will be left behind in a swiftly changing world. "Will we in this country," in the President's own words, "adapt our thinking to these new prospects and patterns [in world trade] or will we wait until events have passed us by? * * * Our decision could well affect the unity of the West, the course of the cold war, and the economic growth of our Nation for a generation to come."

Halloween Ghosts and the Doctors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interesting article on medical care for the aged, written for the Boston Sunday Globe of January 21, 1962, by Rowland Evans, Jr.:

HALLOWEEN GHOSTS AND THE DOCTORS

(By Rowland Evans, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—Political propaganda is an art, requiring a special skill, a careful subtlety, a precise knowledge of how much the market will take.

The oil and gas people, who should have known better, learned this vital little fact the hard way several years ago, when, so to speak, they got their hands caught in the cookie jar.

Now it is the doctors, or some of the eager beavers among them, who show unmistakable signs of having to learn the hard way. It is really quite surprising how devoted these medical fellows are to the task of defeating the administration's proposal of medical care for the aged and protecting the country.

"Remember, we can buy everything but time," a solid AMA type wrote his fellow doctors not so long ago in an appeal for campaign funds to fight the great battle against the administration.

And what do the good doctors have to defend themselves (and the Nation, with its millions of aging citizens) in the final hour of freedom? Why, the chamber of commerce, of course. As the letterwriting doctor says:

"Their forces are mighty * * * When their voice is raised in Washington, legislators listen * * * membership in the U.S. Chamber of Commerce is ridiculously cheap insurance against a political ideology that is anathema to us all, and it is deductible at that."

"Deductible," it would appear, means that the cost of a membership in the chamber of commerce is a tax-deductible item. And so it is, if membership is necessary for the conduct of business.

The last paragraph is also straightforward:

"And remember one thing if you will—we can buy everything but time."

These words, without elaboration, leave themselves open to various interpretations, one of which is distinctly nasty.

The men who fought the New Deal's social security bill, the Utility Holding Company Act and some of the other landmarks of progressive legislation always went one or two steps too far, and the record of what they were saying 30 years ago makes spicy reading today. The head of the Georgia Power Co., for example, was asked what would happen if the holding company bill passed.

"Well, you would paralyze the Nation," he replied.

The great Democrat and famous lawyer, the late John W. Davis, described the bill as "the gravest threat to the liberties of the American citizen that has emanated from the Halls of Congress in my time."

Here we still are, not yet paralyzed.

Grass still does not grow in the streets of our cities so as you would notice it.

It is far too early to make a hard prediction on President Kennedy's proposal to raise the social security tax by one-half of 1 percent to finance hospital care for citizens over 65.

But it is not too early for a soft prediction * * * that if the bill can be brought to a vote, it will pass, because the people want it.

The AMA will be on mucky ground if it claims that the bill will lead to socialized medicine; that the bill will bring the Federal Government into the doctor's examination room, between the patient and his doctor; that the bill will destroy the historic relationship of doctor to patient.

Because these arguments are Halloween ghosts, and skinny ones at that. As Lincoln once said, they are "as thin as the homeopathic soup that was made by boiling the shadow of a pigeon that had been starved to death."

There may be arguments, and good ones, against the proposal, but emotional drivel is not one of them. The letter which came into a reporter's hand is an unfortunate example of how far some doctors seem prepared to go.

It is hard to believe that a majority of the 165,000 practicing doctors in this country would agree with the doctor from New York that those who are against the medical care bill can buy everything but time.

The Migrant Farm Labor Story—Part IX

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dale Wright, the reporter who spent 6 months working and living with the migrant workers. It appeared on October 19, 1961, in the New York World-Telegram and Sun and illustrates the urgent need for congressional action:

MIGRANT ACCEPTS GYP AS PART OF LIFE

(By Dale Wright.)

A migrant farmworker expects exploitation as one of the grim facts of his miserable life.

He knows he'll be cheated and he learns to live with it. He knows he'll be under-

paid for his labor and overcharged for many of the things he has to buy for himself and his family.

Because many migrants never get to school—or have to leave during the early elementary school years to go to work in the fields—they are uneducated and illiterate. For this reason they are easy marks for sharp operators.

GIMMICKS DESCRIBED

While driving along a country road through the fertile north shore potato area near Peconic, Long Island, last August, I picked up two hitchhiking farmhands who spelled out some of the gimmicks the sharpies use to separate a migrant worker from his hard-won wages.

James Taylor, 19, and Evon Washington, 31, both from Polk County, Fla., had been taken to Peconic last July to work at a potato grader. They had joined a traveling farm crew headed by a Virginia man earlier in the summer on a promise that they would be paid $1.25 an hour.

(The World-Telegram is withholding the Virginia man's name at this time because of an investigation now underway.)

Both farmhands agreed that in nearly three months of work with the crew of 67 graders and loaders they had never earned more than 50 cents hourly.

At the time I gave the two men a lift they were headed on foot for New York City, 95 miles away. Between the two they had 12 cents in cash and only the clothes they wore. They had left their camp the night before they said, because there was no chance of earning enough money to subsist.

STORY RECORDED

The stories they told were so typical of the cruel swindles I had heard many times before in other farm areas. North and South, that I brought them into New York, staked them to a room at a YMCA and tape-recorded their stories.

Two days later I rounded up some shirts and underwear and helped get them jobs at an upstate New York fruit cannery through the State Employment Service.

Here are some of the things they told me—on two hours of tape:

Their crew leader deducted $1 weekly for union dues for a union that doesn't exist. The men had not signed any union membership cards. They did not know the name of the "union" to which they paid dues.

The two said they were told that the deductions would be made for 20 weeks. I already knew the reason. It was one of the gimmicks frequently used by labor contractors to write off the expense of transporting migrants from one stop to another.

In their recruiting pitches in the South, contractors promise to bus or truck migrants "up the road" at no cost. But they get back the money in hidden charges.

ILLEGAL DEDUCTIONS

Mr. Taylor and Mr. Washington also declared that their crew leader deducted $1.40 weekly for social security benefits. Mr. Washington emphasized that although he had lost his SS card he knew his number.

"Neither the contractor nor the timekeeper knew my number," he said. "They never asked me."

The deductions were illegal even if the crew leader had known the number. The maximum legal deduction is 3 percent of gross salary up to $4800 annually. For the $1.40 deductions to have been legal the crew leader workers would have to be paid at least $46.67 weekly. The two hitchhikers insisted that they had never grossed more than $32 a week with the crew.

On paydays, the men declared, the crew boss charged his workers $1 a pint for wine which retails for 53 cents.

Though state law requires that migrant farm workers be furnished with written statements of hours worked and wages received, both men asserted they had never received such records.

NO CONTRACTS POSTED

Another State law requires that farm labor contractors post in conspicuous places, either in living quarters or at grading houses, copies of labor contracts detailing wages and hours and charges for food and housing.

Mr. Taylor, who has completed 11 years of public school education, said he had never seen a labor contract posted and did not know the procedure was required.

These are just some of the many complaints of shoddy record-keeping and questionable payroll operations that both men gave in their interviews.

Mr. Washington said he had been paid nothing for his first week of work and that at the end of the second week he received $4 for well over 40 hours of work. This was after the deduction of $13.50 for 19 meals weekly and $4 for room rent.

"Sometimes the boss would pay us whatever he felt like," Mr. Washington explained, "no matter how many hours we worked."

"Other times he wouldn't take the hours we worked as reported by the timekeeper. "He'd tell me, 'You couldn't have worked that much time.' Then he'd pay me what he wanted to."

SEVENTEEN DOLLARS IN BEST WEEK

Mr. Taylor said that for his best week of work he received $17, after union dues, social security, and food and lodging.

Both men charged that there were many others at the camp who had been bilked by illegal charges.

The two men estimated they had been cheated out of a minimum of $200 each.

One of their biggest gripes concerned what they called "waiting time."

As Mr. Taylor explained it: "If we're loading potatoes off the grader and into trucks and the trucks are late, we don't get paid for waiting. But we have to work around the shed anyway, stacking sacks of potatoes for the next trucks or just moving things around."

"There's sometimes 2 or 3 hours between trucks. We're working but we're not getting paid. The time stops when the truck is loaded and it don't start until the next one comes in."

An intense, serious young man, Mr. Taylor's summation of the exploitation of migrant farmworkers mirrors the feelings of the essential laborers (about 25,000 come into New York State every year) who harvest the Nation's crops:

"We're getting cheated and we know it. You gotta take it or leave it. We left."

I later made another visit to the camp, tucked away in the trees, to see for myself what the two men had left behind. There, glistening in the bright Long Island sun, I found an explanation: an expensive 1960 sedan was parked in front of the shabby quarters alongside a 1956 luxury car. I had been told earlier by Mr. Taylor and Mr. Washington that they were owned by the crew leader and his wife.

The Price of Protectionism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include the following editorial entitled "The Price of Protectionism" which appeared in the Wall Street Journal for January 16, 1962:

THE PRICE OF PROTECTIONISM

Let us suppose that the United States decides to end its reliance on foreign coffee. A tariff is imposed at such a high level that it is prohibitive. No more coffee is imported, and an enormous incentive is given to American coffeegrowers.

Coffee thrives only in warmer climes, so the protariff American coffeegrowers were few, operating chiefly in such areas as Hawaii and Puerto Rico. These growers immediately rush out to buy more land, much of it less suited to coffee cultivation than the land they are now working. Higher wages woo workers from other activities in the islands and even draw some from the continental United States. Large amounts of capital are invested in new machinery and warehouses.

The market looks so attractive that some entrepreneurs on the southern fringes of the United States are encouraged to run the risks of recurring frosts; some producers elsewhere even put up greenhouses to simulate tropical temperatures. Again, massive amounts of capital and labor are diverted from other activities. The average cost of producing coffee is high and the retail price shoots up to around $10 a pound.

This exaggerated example illustrates the impact of tariffs and other trade restrictions, for it differs only in degree from the real world of today. It thus helps to explain why President Kennedy, in his state of the Union message, promised to ask Congress for new and broader powers to dispose of these artificial restraints on trade.

Any tariff, whether levied on British automobiles, Japanese textiles or Swiss watches, is in effect a subsidy to American producers of such products. As such, it has significant effect on the policies and practices of those producers.

Behind a tariff wall, companies in a protected industry may and often do compete fiercely among themselves. But the tariff makes it possible for the industry to maintain a higher level of prices than would otherwise be feasible. Its incentive to modernize its plants and improve its products is less.

Producers become accustomed to relying on the artificial fence that has been erected around their market. When foreign producers threaten to scale the existing fence, the domestic companies incline toward building it higher, rather than fighting to get their costs down.

And who finances the fence? It's the consumer, of course. He pays the bill through higher prices, whether he buys domestic products or such foreign goods as can get in. The burden of this consumer tax isn't lessened one whit by the fact that it's a hidden levy.

But the worst aspect of tariffs is not that they impose hidden taxes and award hidden subsidies. It is that they dangerously distort and debilitate the whole domestic economy.

A protected industry is able to bid capital and labor away from industries where they could be more efficiently employed. Its higher prices restrict its markets both at home and abroad; this is reflected by the problems of U.S. agriculture, which enjoys the questionable benefits both of complex direct subsidies and tariff protection. Some American farm products can be marketed abroad only after the Government pays still other subsidies to exporters to permit them to lower their prices.

With the sales of protected industries thus limited and with much of the Nation's resources employed inefficiently, the inevitable result is a severe restriction on the growth of the economy. Both national out-

put and national income are held well below levels they might otherwise attain.

Admittedly, elimination of tariffs would lead to temporary economic problems in some industries. Because of this, an argument can be made for gradual removal. But however it's handled, the future health of the economy demands that a new beginning be made.

The Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to put in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have received from Newell Flather of Lowell, Mass., regarding his work as a member of the Peace Corps. It is a mighty interesting and instructive communication regarding his work in the Corps.

Newell Flather, of Lowell, Mass., the fourth of five children, was educated in the Lowell elementary schools, and the Noble and Greenough School, and was graduated from Harvard College in June of 1961.

At Harvard he participated in wrestling, crew, and house football; was chairman of his house committee, and was chosen second class marshal of his senior class.

He was admitted to the University of Virginia Law School but decided to join the Peace Corps instead. His former teachers in the Lowell elementary school have shown a deep interest in the work he is doing in Ghana. They have sent books needed for his teaching in the Winneba, Ghana secondary school and have organized correspondence between the students in this country and his Winneba students.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 10, 1962.

DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: I think your magnanimous personal interest in the Peace Corps, and the generous support from you and your colleagues merit a response from the field. It would be too pretentious to attempt to speak for all the Ghana project volunteers, but I have kept a close enough contact with a large enough number to know that my ideas and observations are not too far removed, nor my experiences and reactions too drastically different from theirs. I hope that this perhaps inadequate means of communication will give you reason to feel that your interest in and support of the Peace Corps are justified.

Six months ago my future seemed settled and secure. Fresh out of Harvard College, I had been accepted by the University of Virginia Law School, and except for a superficial spring course, I hardly knew where Ghana was. A late evening, late June telegram from the Peace Corps, 2 months training at Berkeley, 2 weeks indoctrination at the University of Ghana, Legon, and 3½ months of residence in Winneba have considerably altered this circumstance.

The training at Berkeley was interesting and enjoyable, even though I never felt pushed and often wished it were more intense. It is hard to evaluate the course realistically because so many recent Ghana events could not possibly have been anticipated last summer. However, we were prepared to expect change. Since Winneba is the heart of the Fanti region, it was an impractical waste for me to learn their customs and language. I have subsequently felt it necessary to spend time learning Fanti customs and the Mfantse language. Of course this deficiency in training was difficult to foresee. I am certain that systematic studies and thorough criticisms of Peace Corps training programs will be instituted so I will not dwell on it any longer, except to say that I am still impressed with the excellence of Profs. Robert Lystad and St. Clair Drake, as well as with the leader, Prof. David Apter.

The 2 weeks at Legon were essential but it was constantly and universally felt that anything longer would have been too much. As it was, a tremendous tension existed between the need to remain there to adjust to the climate, the food, and the strangeness of the country, and the almost overwhelming urge to get out to the stations and begin work. It was at this time, however, that the incredible Professor Drake's supreme mastery of Ghanaian affairs came to the fore. With attributes of Confucian wisdom he talked till early mornings night after night.

I find my school, my town, and my job all very interesting. The school is deep-seated in and saturated with Ghanaian revolutionary tradition. It was established by the President in 1948 as a refugee school for students expelled elsewhere for anti-British demonstrations. As History Department Chairman, I have been asked by the headmaster to write a history of the school, a fascinating undertaking with which I am currently occupied. The school now has five forms with 250 boys, 120 girls, and 15 teachers, and is hoping to add a sixth form next year. This will mean that students will be able to go directly to a university.

The location of the school is now at the center of town in a dusty, oppressively confining enclosure, but the hope is to move to new buildings in the country next term. Appointed school librarian when I first arrived, I found the school collection consisted of 30 aged, almost unreadable volumes, probably abandoned here by some missionary years ago. Since that time with the help of Lowell churches, schools, family, and friends, the number has increased to over 200. Hopefully it will reach 1,000 by the time my tour of duty is finished. The problem I am trying to combat here is not so much the absence of books as the absence of background in the students' training, which can sometimes be remedied by books.

My students are generally attentive and intelligent and thus the one barrier to progress, which seems sometimes insurmountable, is the lack of background. For some reason the Peace Corps has been slow in coming through with the promised $1,000 of teaching aids, which I would spend on a film projector for the school, another means of remedy for my greatest difficulty. I have arranged for two educational visits by the U.S.I.S. Film Unit, but because I feel the needs are beyond them I have been busy writing home hoping to find some promethean patron saint to bring us the light in a cinema form.

I feel extraordinarily fortunate to be stationed in Winneba, or Winneba-by-the-Sea as I have renamed it. Winneba is a small fishing town on the Accra Coast, undoubtedly not unlike what Rockport, Mass. was a century ago. I have already described it as the heart of Fantiland, but it is also representative of many extremes of Ghanaian life. On one hand it is considered a health resort and an excellent swimming-picnic area by Europeans; on the other hand it is an area of intense pro-government, pro-party political activity. A large number of the most prominent ministers were either born, educated, or at one time employed here; the President not only has a rest house but often comes to lecture at the Nkrumah Ideological Institute; and the town is a constant scene of party rallies and study groups. My analogy is that Accra is the rest of Ghana as Paris was to the provinces, and Winneba, of course, is Versailles. In Winneba I have been able to meet Dutch Fathers who are trained before being sent out to remote regions of the country. I have visited the new beautiful Anglican, Methodist and Catholic Churches; but at the same time, I have witnessed Fanti pagan rituals which have lived on here perhaps more strongly than in any other part of Ghana. Here a beautiful hospital functions side by side with active fetish priests and powerful African Jaju. My house is within hearing distance of the ceremonial grounds, and I can catch a late show and a late late show of magnificent dancing, drumming and chanting three or four times a week. One of the most delightful customs of the town is the Fanti equivalent to our Thanksgiving, the Homowo, which includes, or rather features, a deerhunt and barehanded kill. I have seen the 30 select fleet-footed hunters in a parade which very much resembled a day at the beach with the Washington Redskins.

The town is one of the great centers of education in Ghana. The Ideological Institute, which houses refugee Angolans and which once asked Professor Drake to be its director, is located there. This institute gathers all-African students from places as diverse as Kenya and Algeria and teaches them Nkrumahism and positive action. Also in the town there is a British influenced teachers training college, where I plan to coach wrestling next semester, and a technical training school. At the other extreme, beside these, exist the tiny villages and the palm frond dwellings of the Fanti fishermen, who appear as far removed from current events and the modern world as any persons in Africa.

Real privations have been at a minimum. My house, a 2-mile walk from the school, is without electricity, refrigeration, and transportation; but it is compensatingly located on the beautiful, grassy, warm windswept plains of Winneba and faces the distant and lovely Mount Mankoadze. Never before have I seen so much sky, eaten such good fish, or breathed so much good air. I share quarters with Louis Williams, non-Peace Corps American Negro, Antioch College and New York City, and together we are very satisfied. He is an interested and talented musician, and I hope to assist him with a production of "The King and I" this spring.

My work has fallen into a satisfactory semiroutine. In order to reach school for the morning service and the first class at 7, I rise each day at 5:30. Classes are completed at 2, at which time I return home for lunch except when I remain on duty until 9, or for student meetings which last the afternoon. My teaching, 28 hours a week of English language, French language, English literature, and British history, 1066–1485, demands many extra hours of preparation as well as corrections, since I majored in American history. Thus I usually cannot retire before 10 or 10:30. Extra activities not already mentioned include additional classes for the upper forms in English and history (often for students not officially in my classes), and being a form master, the entertainments master, and the debating union master. When we move to our new location, I hope to do some coaching of wrestling, tennis, and basketball. It has been interesting to give a few Saturday night lectures to the school. The last, a planned hour and actual 3½ hour talk on Berlin, has been the most success-

ful. I was pleased to discover how much an objective unbiased American point of view can be appreciated by an uninformed but eagerly curious group of students. I have been asked to lecture at the Ideological Institute, but feel that that can wait until I am better settled and more sure.

School excursions have included a trip to see the Queen, and then 2 weeks ago Louis Williams and I took 50 older students to see the Yugoslav and United States Trade Fairs. The Americans really received us grandly, providing fried chicken, doughnuts, rice, and milk. However, I consider my supreme achievement of the term to be the reorientation of the school's history program from British to west African. This job was left entirely up to me and it involved a good deal of reading and study in order to find the right books for the students and the right syllabus for the teacher. I am looking forward to teaching west African history next year. The vital importance of this change becomes particularly evident to me when I think how ridiculously unfortunate it would be if Americans studied British history and knew little of their own traditions and heritage.

I would prefer not to give the impression that my life here is fully occupied with Peace Corps labors. On the contrary, I have found plenty of time for private reading, travel, and friendships. I try to travel to other parts, usually to other Peace Corps stations, every other weekend. This in fact seems to be the volunteers' usual practice, and one of the greatest delights is the number of Ghanaian friends and acquaintances I have been able to make. Another development similar to the station-to-station travel is the system of inter-Peace Corps correspondence. This has made the group a close unit, and, of practical value, it has provided very effective methods of comparing experiences, testing impressions, and extending news.

The Peace Corps representatives in Ghana have been helpful. George Carter is very available when needed, yet so far has in no way interfered with our activities. Ray Parrott has provided excellent open-house facilities for volunteers. And Dr. Chin is a miracleman of sorts, constantly ready with medical supplies, which are rarely used by the volunteers but instead are distributed in quantities to students to whom the word about the Peace Corps medical kit somehow leaked. This, I am sure, is one of the most spontaneous, unpremeditated, and yet one of the most appreciated forms of U.S. foreign aid. There seems to be so much we can do at this person-to-person level. One suggestion I have made to Peace Corps administrators and about which I have had no reply is that we be given the opportunity to choose or select or recommend likely students for American schools and colleges. I would like to see a Government-supported Peace Corps scholarship fund established.

When I first accepted the Peace Corps telegram, I was sure the decision involved a sacrifice for my country. Perhaps at that time this was true, but subsequent rewards have long since removed that impression. The teaching, the travel, and the treatment from all sides have been magnificent. Ghanaians have been very receptive hosts. Ambassador Russell has welcomed us officially and warmly. Counselor James Green has extended all limits of generosity, opening his home as a place of rest for all weary, hungry shoppers in Accra; and on many nights he has bedded several volunteers. It is a fact that Ghanaians distinguish Americans from other Europeans by their casual open friendliness. The Volta loan seems to have gone deep into the hearts of Ghanaians, no matter what their previous beliefs or inclinations might have been. You may wonder what the Ghanaian reaction to the Nigerian Peace Corps post-card incident was. While not denying that it was controversial, Ghanaians were usually indifferent or amused. The day it was headlined my headmaster arrived excitedly at my house, early in the morning, with several papers. We heartily agreed that anyone in a foreign country for the first time was subject to cultural shock—he had just received a letter from his nephew in Britain who was unfavorably impressed with the food, the climate, and the people.

Of course, it is too early to pass judgment on the Peace Corps. Its proof will not be for at least 2 years, yet after 6 months of service I am definitely optimistic. The amount of good that can be accomplished by a small group of well-educated, well-organized Americans is constantly evident. However, everything is not roses and sunshine, or, as says a Ghanaian proverb, all the days are not equal. I think every Peace Corpsman would admit to times of disappointment and frustration and to brief flashes of loneliness. Often things of grand sound simply do not come up to expectation; but as often as not, these letdowns have an amusing side. The Ghana Annual Arts Festival turned out to be like the Brockton Fair, with unrehearsed Peace Corps singers as its center attraction. For weeks my students gave me rave advance notices about the school's Christmas feast, my imagination soared, and in retrospect I think yam cakes, palm wine and goat stew were an interesting if not an enjoyable change.

This letter has attempted to summarize 6 very eventful months. If you feel anything was omitted or that any parts need to be developed, I would be glad to elaborate. Now on vacation, and because our school is delaying reopening so the new buildings can be completed, I will not return to Winneba until January 19. Until then I am taking a New Year's course in African affairs at Legon and traveling in northern Ghana. At that time, I will be glad to answer further questions. In the meantime, M'engi agge dodow ha ("I am very happy here") and "May your life be splendored with fascination," (from a form 2 English essay). Happy New Year.

NEWELL FLATHER.

Marching Toward Economic Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include the following editorial which appeared in the New Orleans Times Picayune entitled "Marching Toward Economic Unity":

MARCHING TOWARD ECONOMIC UNITY

Events are moving swiftly in the economic melding of Western Europe, underscoring the necessity for prompt adjustment in U.S. foreign trade policies.

Over the weekend, negotiators in Brussels:

1. Launched the second stage of economic integration among the six Common Market countries.

2. Arrived at some understandings which will facilitate the entrance of Great Britain into the Common Market and the association of six other "neutral" European nations with it.

3. Neared or reached agreement with the United States for reciprocal tariff reductions on a wide range of industrial items.

The significance of these bargaining results lies in the fact that they add considerable stimulus to the vitality of the European Economic Community which already is bidding for the economic preeminence now shared by the United States and the Soviet Union.

Arrangement for U.S. cooperation with this phenomenally successful European venture in economic unity is essential. For the Common Market portends more political and military unity as well, a development which would mean realization of the historical goal of a stable Europe. No less important is the role, even the intermediate role, of an economically vigorous Western Europe in countering Communist economic tactics around the world.

Growth of the Common Market also represents for the United States an opportunity as well as a challenge. Its initial success, illustrated by a 36 percent increase in gross national product during its first 7 years, far outstrips the gains of any other economic unit or combine. It offers markets of great potential to nations that will cooperate but promises significant losses to those that isolate themselves behind tariff walls.

The benefits to the United States are suggested in the advantageous tariff reductions of roughly 20 percent negotiated under terms and limitations of the present Reciprocal Trade Act.

But 15 months of tedious bargaining were required with individual representative of the six Common Market nations on each of hundreds of manufactured articles, pointing up the inefficiency of 1934 trade methods in 1962's fast-paced economy.

For our own economic advantage as well as for the strength of the Western alliance in the cold war, new foreign trade policies and new methods of implementing them are essential.

Protectionism Versus Free Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER H. DOMINICK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker, following up the articles by Mr. Henry Gimmell which I discussed with you yesterday, I am submitting the second of the series which he wrote analyzing the problems which the United States is facing in connection with economic competition with the Common Market. The analysis is penetrating and I highly recommend its thoughtful consideration by all my colleagues:

PROTECTIONISM VERSUS FREE TRADE—EUROPE'S ECONOMIC THREAT DEMANDS ANSWERS BEYOND OLD SLOGANS

(By Henry Gemmill)

Let's take a trial run at calculating in some detail what the consequences might be if the United States responds to the threat of Europe's rising Common Market simply by turning wholeheartly toward protectionism.

And then let's perform a similar exercise on the opposite assumption: That America answers the opportunity of the Common Market simply by heading straight toward free trade.

As a preclude to the attempt, however, one is obliged to account for the fact that peculiarly few of the warriers struggling to reshape the rules which govern this Nation's commerce are at this moment fully

committed to either clear course. The battlefield is wildly confused by inconsistency.

The banner of freer trade has been grasped by the Kennedy administration. Cabinet officers are traveling the country talking it up. Experts are at work drafting a request to the next session of Congress for a historic new grant of Presidential authority to slash tariffs.

Yet at the same moment, Mr. Kennedy asks the Tariff Commission to consider hiking textile duties. His men weigh reductions in oil import quotas, and pressure oversea military families traveling home for Christmas to ride on U.S. airlines. Even the President's most fervid internationalists, the foreign aid folk, enforce "Buy American" rules.

As for protectionism, it has eloquently consistent advocates among lobbyists and legislators. But most of its muscle comes from men who profess no desire to drive this Nation out of the import business.

UNFAIR COMPETITION

Corporate executives swarm in to tell commissions, committees, and homestate Congressmen not that they oppose trade but that "unfair competition" is damaging sale of their particular products. Protrade labor leaders are so furious at particular imports undercutting their own members' jobs that they threaten private protectionism by boycott. Farm organizations back trade promotion, but are not about to permit the consumer to feast on foreign food.

Collectively, this is a powerful push for higher tariff "peril points," more protective "escape clauses," more and tighter import quotas, and ungentlemanly armtwisting of foreign governments to obtain more gentlemen's agreements limiting shipments to the States.

Not all the inconsistency represents muddleheadedness, exactly; some of it is smart enough. Mr. Kennedy knows how southerners can swing Congress; greater protection of their oil and textiles may buy votes for reduced protection of other industries.

Beyond political cynicism, though, lies an implicit intellectual concept—obsolescent but honestly shared in some degree by most contestants on both sides of each specific trade dispute. This is the idea that only a fraction of the U.S. industrial economy is in bad shape, severely underpriced by foreign producers, that most of it is in fairly good shape, able to match prices and stand its ground against overseas competition.

This once was emphatically true; it is less true today than supposed by folk preoccupied with particular imports; within a few years there may be scarcely any truth in it.

European production is barely emerging from the constrictions of tight national boundaries; as it takes its new measure from the giant Common Market it can gradually get in position to undercut the whole spectrum of American industry—using to double advantage its newborn mass production and its traditional lower wage rates.

If this unprecedented potential is realized in practice, the United States will not find it easy to indulge in just little extra touches of protectionism for this item and that. As the list of Yankee manufacturers underpriced by foreign competition grows longer, each significant addition can lay equal claim to the logic of import restriction—to save jobs, to sustain profits, to keep America strong. As precedents pile up, who can deny relief to still more appeals for rescue?

QUICKENING DELUGE

So it is perhaps not academic assumption but realism to suggest that protectionism could indeed become consistent, and dominant in U.S. trade policy—not so much by dramatic philosophic decision in 1961 or 1962 as by drift during this whole decade. And in the end that drift could turn into a quickening deluge.

For protectionism, like atomic fission, can not proceed far without jumping into a chain reaction. If petroleum imports are curbed sufficiently to give U.S. oil producers a price far above the world oil price, then other Yankee industries suffer a growing disadvantage in fuel costs—and some of their own product prices can be edged up into a need for protection against cheaper foreign wares. Or if U.S. textile prices are buoyed by a tariff hike, the cost-of-living impact can joggle diverse wage rates, inch up manufacturing costs, nudge prices of myriad products toward a need for protection.

Each such pressure upon American industry will seem minor, yet interaction can excite the entire mass, and not just in one wave soon subsiding but in accelerating cycles. No feat of imagination is required to picture American steel prices rising with just a small extra cost-push, and then needing protection against low-cost metal from foreign mills.

Nor would it be difficult thereafter to foresee protected high prices for steel pipe and steel cloth-making machinery bouncing back upon the oil and textile industries, helping impel them toward a still higher spiral of protection.

Of course wholehearted protectionism could, by definition, always succeed in reserving the entire U.S. market for U.S. producers. Well launched, however, it would almost inevitably assure lower total sales.

Exports to Europe could be wiped out, and not primarily because the Common Market would be able to erect its own protectionist wall in retaliation. This retaliatory peril, of which we are so loudly warned by free trade advocates, is real enough and could certainly hit hard at our vast shipments of farm commodities.

But the Europeans, if they see American industrial production becoming helplessly overpriced, might soon decide they need no wall against most manufactures.

With perfect safety the Common Market could scorn America's protectionist course and tear down most of its own external tariffs. As the best friend of free commerce, and selling cheaply to boot, it could bid successfully for the trade of Latin America, Africa and Asia; American factories would face loss of their total world export market.

The domestic implications for the United States, of course, would appear profound. Production pushed down. Unemployment headed up. Standard of living stagnant Capital moving out of the country for better rewards. And everything headed along a dead-end road, with the ruts getting deeper, less and less chance of turning around to regain international economic primacy.

Advocates of freer trade have been making what they consider a horrifying prediction: that protectionism could split the Western World into two great rival trading blocs, with many non-Communist lands tied to Europe's Common Market and the United States signing up the remainder. But conceivably this is too kind a forecast.

During the years since the idea got around the world that American military supremacy is in doubt, how many new military allies have we gained, what luck have we had in stemming the drift to diplomatic neutralism? Is it really likely that many nations would tie themselves in prolonged economic alliance with an America slipping in economic power?

CONTRARY POSSIBILITY

A contrary possibility suggests itself: that the impact of a successful West European challenge to U.S. economic supremacy could intermingle with East Europe's challenge to our military dominance; that their combined assault upon American prestige and power would leave this Nation in increasing isolation—deserted in commerce, in military collaboration, in diplomacy. In the final act of the 20th-century drama, the United States could be denied a speaking role.

Such a description of the protectionist course starts from somber premises and proceeds with pessimistic logic; its dark conclusions may be dead wrong. If this analysis is to pretend to any usefulness, it must examine with similar skepticism the doctrine that the United States can resolve its difficulties simply by moving toward freer trade.

Today's free trade doctrine takes varied forms. Some proponents say the United States should actually join the Common Market. The official view is that this would be too radical, that instead America and the Common Market should engage in mutual tariff slashing. In one respect the latter choice could in fact prove more radical, it may be noted, since any cuts in our tariffs would automatically be extended also to imports from Hong Kong, Japan and other points beyond Europe.

But, straining for simplicity, it is perhaps fair to say that the essence of either free trade scheme would be minimal trade barriers between the Common Market and the United States, pretty well blending their hundreds of millions of consumers into a single gargantuan market, and throwing most of West Europe's and North America's producers into fairly unfettered competition.

It may never happen; either the United States or the Common Market may boggle at agreeing to it—but that is the bold proposition.

Its cheerful assumption is that since the new trade rulebook would apply equally to each, Yanks and Europeans would start out even-Steven, and thereafter achieve mutual gain. Yankee salesmen would pour our products into a booming Europe. Almost parenthetically it is remarked that European wares would also flow to the States, and some of these imports could cause discomfort to our domestic producers.

To ease such pain without turning back to protectionism (and of course some free-trade fans would indeed reverse course at this crucial point), it is suggested that "small" Government loans to business might be sufficient, and perhaps there might be some Federal retraining of displaced workers.

Yet it might be discovered that any competent European manufacturing enterprise, starting out with wage rates at a fraction of the American pay scale, could murder its competitors on U.S. soil within just the time it takes to tool up for cost-cutting mass production and to set up sales outlets. Product by product, American producers could find their prices too high to meet competition.

Indeed, it is conceivable the transatlantic pricing gap could grow even faster under free trade than through protectionism, since it would permit a European factory to tackle products for which there is as yet no mass demand within the Common Market; it could first wipe up established American demand and take its time cultivating customers on its own continent. And such a European factory might well belong to a U.S. company, of course; any corporation would be less than alert if it failed to join the stampede.

FAINT COMPARISON

Searching for an image of what this could mean for America, one is reminded of New England losing business to the South. But this may be too faint by far, for the southern cost-price advantages which idled many an old mill in New England were of lower magnitude than those the Common Market could apply to all America. If every damaged U.S. business and every displaced worker is to be granted Government relief, how many will be left to finance the subsidies?

When confronted with such prophecies of calamity, the proponents of free trade can—and do—raise honest objections. At least three are worth consideration:

1. A Europe already boasting full employment cannot possibly flood America with its output; it would simply run out of manpower.

This argument has merit; certainly labor may ultimately set some ceiling on Common Market production. But the essential characteristic of any shift from shopcraft to mass production is that more goods can be turned out with less labor—and such a shift is the chief meaning of the Common Market.

2. You can count on the ingenuity of American business to counter the tide of imports by selling more U.S. goods in Europe; they've done it over tariff walls, so they can surely find a way of doing it in a Common Market with lower duties.

Never underestimate the power of the U.S. businessman. But one gets the impression his ingenuity is perforce now more occupied in choosing additional plant sites within the Common Market than in promoting exports to it.

And let a word be spoken in respect for European businessmen. The best have not lacked vigor; their limitation has been they could not make every industry strong in every little national market; it is the scattered gaps and weaknesses which afforded the widest openings to U.S. exports.

As the Common Market congeals, an American exporter of any item will encounter in the marketplace of every member nation the strongest production offensive that can be mounted in any one of them. That strength can be mobilized with astonishing speed. Europe is not lacking in huge industrial organizations, under one corporate roof or linked by cartel.

SPECIALIZED PRODUCTION

A giant such as Unilever or Philips Lamp, which has long embraced all Europe yet has hitherto been cramped by the necessity for small-scale output of nearly all of its products in nearly every nation, can now reassign each plant to specialized production on a ponderous scale.

3. American scientists and engineers will keep the United States ahead in technology; foreign producers can capture the markets for old products, but our labs and drawing boards will keep U.S. factories in business by popping up with new products.

A dismal outlook, if true. So we are to abandon settled bread-and-butter manufacturing, and must perform in a constant, costly palsy of retooling, test-marketing and introductory sales campaigns.

The inefficiency is too obvious to be long endured.

Any business in possession of its wits would snatch up the American innovation and launch its production in Europe, at lower initial cost and with prospect of sustained output.

And in the long run, would most advances originate in American minds? This Nation's technological lead has stemmed not from a clause in the Constitution but from events of this century (we scarcely probed chemistry until World War I cut off German chemical supplies). By now research and gadgetry design is laregly a function of mass production; any big producer supports a big talent stable, and can do so here or abroad.

So the theoretical model of a Common Market and United States simply linked in free-trade tandem at the worst could hand over to European factories not only the Common Market and the world market but the American market as well.

A case can be made that this need not happen, but it must rest on the proposition that far more will be changed than the trade rules. One hears hopeful talk that the Common Market will grossly inflate its wages, and by that route or another experience a wild price inflation.

It is not likely the Europeans will be so stupid, but at least this thought points vaguely toward the heart of the matter. America can indeed thrive in competition with the Common Market, and the way it can do so is to equalize production costs.

In all realism, the United States can only expect to achieve that essential parity through its own wisdom and effort. The wisdom will be hard to come by, and the effort will be agony.

The true case for freeing trade is not that it offers easy innoculation against the pending paralysis of the American economy. But merely that it could make possible—and perhaps even force—a painful cure.

Colonialism Myths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, following is one of the most interesting and sensible letters I have received since coming to Congress more than 9 years ago. It is a realistic appraisal of American views on the question of colonialism and is all the more interesting because it comes from a naturalized citizen.

Some of our State Department representatives who engage in a discussion of colonialism as the fashionable topic of the day might do well to consider the commonsense expressed in Mrs. Kout's letter. It is important that we focus the spotlight of truth upon the "Myths of Colonialism." Certainly we should not endorse it, but we should ever be careful that we do not accept something worse as its alternative.

I commend Mrs. Kout's letter to the attention of my colleagues:

SAN JOSE, CALIF., *December 29, 1961.*

Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
Bank of America Building,
San Jose, Calif.

MY DEAR MR. GUBSER: The United States of America is what it is today because 400 years ago the colonialists, often called "moneymongrels, capitalistic idiots", had the boldness to invest hard-earned money into adventurous prospects.

Thirteen years ago our family came to this great and prosperous country. We were healthy, happy, and penniless. We worked hard for companies in which capitalists had invested. Today we consider ourselves capitalists as, in turn, we bought a house and invested money, saved from earnings due to hard, cold labor.

If someone would tell us as naturalized American citizens to go back to our native country, and the U.S. Government would confiscate our property, and give it to the Indians, it would be called injustice.

The U.S. Government, however, supported this same injustice in foreign politics.

The words "independence and colonialism" repeatedly misused by the pro-Communist delegations "brainwashed" our U.S. representatives and the American public.

With the U.N., the United States forced our allies off long-established properties, confiscated investments, and rendered the land to Communist-indoctrinated natives. These, incapable without funds, turned temporarily into neutralists to beg for American dollars. Thus, our tax money provides the capital to invest in building a Communist-dictated colonial empire.

Instead, the United States could help our allies to reform colonies into a true democracy, the way the United States itself has done in the Philippine Islands.

Very truly yours,

MRS. MARIA KOUT.

The Forgotten People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, this is the fourth of 10 articles, part of a series which appeared in the New York World Telegram & Sun in October 1961 on the subject of the migrant worker in the United States. These articles were written by Dale Wright, World Telegram & Sun staff writer, who, for 6 months, lived and worked as a migrant worker along the Atlantic seaboard from Florida to New York.

The article follows:

SPEEDUP FORCES MIGRANTS TO QUIT JOB BEFORE PAYDAY

(By Dale Wright)

What's it like working in a potato harvest? It's monotonous, brutal, strength-sapping labor.

Toiling and sweating in the long potato rows, filling 100-pound sacks under the blazing sun, tries any man's endurance. But working in a potato-grading shed was even worse.

In my travels as a migrant laborer, I found myself in the Florida town of Hastings. With 20 other workers, I had arrived there one morning last April in a bus. By early afternoon I was pushing a hand truck for Florida Planters, Inc.

SPEEDUP ORDERED

As a laborer, I grew up fast in this job.

My job was to wheel the truck, loaded with four 100-pound sacks of potatoes, from the grader into boxcars and trucks. Often I had to jockey the handtruck as far as 200 feet along a loading platform, then up a short ramp into the cars and trucks.

I held up well for 6 hours, until the grader boss ordered a speedup. Loaders who took the potato sacks off a moving belt and stacked them on my handtruck were told to increase the number of sacks from four to five. This meant I would have to push 500 pounds instead of 400 pounds up those ramps.

COULDN'T DO IT

I have my share of muscles and I had developed new ones as a migrant laborer but this new order sounded impossible. Once, twice, three times I tried to force that overloaded handtruck up the ramp. I just couldn't do it.

The grader boss came along and told me to quit dogging it, to go to work. I told him the 500-pound load was too much for me. He laughed at me. I told him I was quitting.

I asked to be paid for the hours I had worked. The boss sneered.

"Boy," he said, "we don't pay around here until Saturday and that's 6 days away. You wanna hang around waitin' for your pay and doin' nothin' ?"

It wasn't until later that I got the picture. Other workers in Hastings told me that employers often make the work so tough for migrants, particularly before payday, that the men quit and move on.

Rarely do they return for the wages due them. It was obvious to me that I had contributed my share of free labor.

Sometimes, I learned, a worker will come back for the money owed him only to be brushed off again. The employer or contractor can't remember ever hiring him; or the records have been lost; or payday has passed, or they're out of cash and the worker is told to come back the following week.

These are just a few of the devices used to exploit the migrant farmworker.

So I marked off to experience the $6—at $1 an hour—I had earned. It was worth it, to hear the stories of the other workers who had been swindled the same way.

FILTH AT $1.50 A DAY

I was dog tired when I limped away from that grading shed in Hastings. What I wanted more than anything else—more than the 6 lousy bucks in uncollected pay—was a place to rest my aching bones.

I learned quickly that a room and bath were not to be found. Such accommodations for migrants didn't exist. I settled for what I could find: a seedy, dirty, 10-by-12 closetlike room in a boardinghouse. The bare mattress was so filthy I slept in my clothes. The price was $1.50 a day.

Nine other rooms, including some with families and children, were already occupied in the shanty. It was an ancient, one-story wood structure, supported precariously at the corners by concrete blocks.

The door to my room had no lock. It had long since been broken. To assure privacy—and to guard against theft—I jammed a broken-legged chair against the door to keep it shut.

WOMEN, KIDS USED

There were kitchen facilities in the so-called roominghouse, but they were unusable. The three-legged kerosene stove was charred a burnt black with grease. One corner of the stove was supported by a milk crate. A film of grime and grit covered the bottom of the stopped-up sink.

The bathroom was even worse. After I waited my turn—hours it seemed—I stepped inside and right into a wall of stench which turned my stomach. It was too much. I went outside.

I learned many other things. During the peak of the potato harvest in Florida, men and women are worked on the grader for as long as 15 hours daily. Some of the women told me they were paid only 40 cents an hour.

I found an 11-year-old boy who was working 10 hours a day loading 100-pound potato sacks onto trucks in the grading yard.

The Federal Labor Standards Act of 1938, I was aware, prohibits child labor under 16 at establishments producing goods for interstate or foreign commerce.

A Florida law prohibits child labor under 16 except after school hours or during school vacations. The children I saw here were working in April when the schools were in session.

WORK TILL MIDNIGHT

At another grading shed in Hastings I found 9- and 10-year-olds loading the 100-pound potato sacks. They were working after school hours all right—from 3 p.m. until midnight.

John Kemp, owner of the ramshackle roominghouse where I lived for a while, told me:

"Nothin' unusual about kids workin' down here. I got four boys—9, 10, 13, and 14—all workin' in the potato fields every day after school until it gets dark. They pay 7 cents a hundred pounds. When me and my wife and the boys all work, we can make $17 or $18 a day."

In Hastings, I learned, there are schools for children of year-round residents but none for children who come into town with their parents to work "on the season."

So these latter youngsters, despite the laws aimed at protecting them, move from farm to farm with their parents and work right along with them in the fields.

It's dirty, rotten work for adults, let alone children.

Forty-ninth Armored Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, one of the units ordered to active duty last fall by the President under the authority given him by the Congress, was the 49th Armored Division, a National Guard unit from the State of Texas.

The Sixth District of Texas which I represent has three units with this Division, Headquarters and Headquarters Company of the 386th Engineer Battalion of Bryan; Company A, 1st ARB, 144th Infantry of Cleburne; and Company B, 1st ARB, 144th Infantry of Waxahachie.

The following article which appeared in the January 27 issue of the Army Times, indicates the fine state of readiness of this division, and I believe should be a real source of pride to the men of the 49th.

CALLED-UP 49TH ARMORED WHIPPED INTO SHAPE

FORT POLK, LA.—Texas 49th Armored Division, the first such National Guard division ever mobilized, has taken on the look of a well-trained, combat-capable Army division after 90 days of rigorous training at this southwest Louisiana post.

The division, organized in 1947 and made up of 95 units in 74 Texas towns, is deep into its 13-week intensive combat training program that is due to bring it to a high state of combat readiness.

As the division begins to devote its time almost exclusively to field work, "a high degree of competence, experience and professional efficiency is obvious at a glance, even to the casual observer."

This was the way Maj. Gen. Harley B. West, division commander, summed up the readiness of the unit.

Several units took to the field during Louisiana's most bitter freeze since 1900. They braved snow, sleet and temperatures near zero to accomplish their training mission.

Pointing to the division's first 3 months on active duty, General West explained:

"We've been through the frustrating shakedown period, finishing firing of individual weapons, obstacle courses and the like.

"Our newly assigned personnel have become integral parts of gun crews, armored rifle squads and tank crews.

"Now we're going to put all this to work out in the field."

General West, a veteran of World War II, testified, "I've been observing field problems for 30 years. I've never seen as much interest and enthusiasm as is being displayed today on the part of the troops."

The more than 14,000 men of the armored division, 5,000 of which were reservists called to active duty to augment the unit, are presently undergoing their 10th week of intensive combat training in the piney woods of Fort Polk.

A three-day division field exercise will climax their 13-week readiness program February 15.

That will not be all, though. After the initial training program, they'll start over on their weak points.

Lt. Col. Karl E. Wallace, the division's general staff officer in charge of training, pointed out that "then begins operational readiness training which will be composed of retraining where weaknesses have been noted."

Battalions-size units now are carrying on field training exercises. Throughout these periods they are continuously harassed by aggressor forces made up of the reconnaissance battalions and other support units.

Colonel Wallace said that this unit training involves weapons firing, battlefield tactics, camouflage and concealment procedures, medical evacuation practices and proper processing of prisoners.

Before the operational readiness training is over 49ers will have completed their annual weapons qualification as well as becominng familiarized with the new M-14 rifle and the new M-60 machinegun.

Three hundred of the new M-14 rifles, which makes every man a potential machine gunner, were received by the division for training purposes in December. Familiarization firing will begin later this month.

Many problems confronted the division when it closed on Fort Polk from points throughout Texas in the waning days of last October.

The post had been closed for more than two years, Barracks weren't in the best of shape. Grass needed cutting. Euipment and clothing had to be issued.

It whipped the post into livable condition and dealt with the mountainous logistics problems created by entering active duty, the receiving of filler personnel and moving into a stripped-down deactivated Army post.

Passenger Service Curtailment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHIL WEAVER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call to the attention of the House once again the serious problem involving railroad passenger service across the Nation. By abandoning their passenger service the railroads are, I feel, not only hurting the traveling public but, in the long run, are hurting themselves by destroying one important segment of the transportation industry.

In recent years we have seen passenger service on many railroads go steadily downhill. Fewer and fewer trains are available to the traveling public. People are discouraged from using the passenger trains which are available, and the vicious circle grows worse.

I have introduced a bill, H.R. 9568, aimed at correcting this situation.

Another example of just why my bill was introduced is carried in an editorial in the Falls City (Nebr.) Journal. This editorial touches upon both the needs of the people served and the potential harm which can come to the railroad and its stockholders.

The editorial follows:

The State railway commission Friday authorized the Burlington railroad to discontinue passenger service on its line between Lincoln and St. Joseph, Mo. It was a sad day for us in Falls City, Salem, Dawson, Humboldt and Rulo. But it must have been an even sadder day for the Burlington railroad. While the ending of the passenger service will leave Salem, Dawson, Humboldt, and Rulo without any passenger trains, the loss actually won't damage anything but their pride. But they soon will get used to it—just as they previously got used to the passing of the ox team, the grocer's delivery wagon and the horse and buggy. For the Burlington, the situation is different. It can't go on indefinitely destroying its business in the name of economy and cost cutting. Yet that is the path some railroads are following, it seems to us.

Feed Grain Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MERWIN COAD

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, as we all know the 1961 feed grain program was a success. We know that while this program goes only part of the way it has done immeasurable good in the economic life of our rural communities.

We are looking forward to the extension of this program in 1962. The farmers are facing this year with greater confidence knowing this program is being extended. I should like to include with my remarks an editorial entitled "How Can the Feed Grain Plan Be Called a Failure" which was published in the Des Moines Register on November 12, 1961.

The editorial follows:

HOW CAN THE FEED GRAIN PLAN BE CALLED A FAILURE?

The emergency feed grain program is being attacked as a costly failure. Some critics are urging that it be abandoned, and others are advocating a compulsory marketing quota system for feed grains. This criticism seems premature in view of the record.

Feed grain production in 1961 is estimated to be 11 percent smaller than in 1960, despite record high yields per acre. For the first time in 8 years it seems likely that the consumption of feed grain will be slightly reduced but still exceed production. The Department of Agriculture expects the carryover of feed grains next fall to decline to 80 million tons. It was 85 million this year.

Acreage in feed grains was reduced 16 percent, a substantial achievement. If acreage can be kept at this level or reduced slightly more in the next few years, production should remain fairly well in balance with consumption.

What is more important, this reduction should check expansion in livestock production. In figuring costs and returns on the program, we should not forget its main objective—to prevent oversupply of livestock and low livestock prices.

The cost of payments to farmers is higher, of course, since there was no special feed grain program last year. The cost of price support probably will be lower, despite a higher level of support, because less corn is eligible. However, a change in accounting methods—to put them on a current basis—makes the 1962 expenditures look higher.

Before we call the program a failure, let's look at the full record—not just part of it. The voluntary method of cutting output deserves further trial.

Giving Wings to Your Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, January 11, the New Orleans Chamber of Commerce was honored by the presence of Stuart G. Tipton, president of the Air Transportation Association of America and chief spokesman for the scheduled air transport industry.

Mr. Tipton spoke about the important and growing relationship between air transportation and the city of New Orleans. I think it is appropriate that such a forward-looking industry as air transportation has joined with New Orleans in bringing the benefits of this new technology to the entire Delta area.

Although Mr. Tipton's speech discusses New Orleans primarily, his remarks certainly are applicable to any modern community in this jet age. Thus, I would like to enter this speech into the RECORD.

GIVING WINGS TO YOUR GROWTH

(Address by Stuart G. Tipton, president, the Air Transport Association of America, Before the Members' Council of the Chamber of Commerce, New Orleans, La., January 11, 1962)

As an occasional visitor to New Orleans, I have an advantage that you residents might not have. I can appreciate fully the wonders of this magnificent place—wonders that you might take for granted. I can sense with an excitement-like discovery the atmosphere of history that permeates your every street and that envelops even the new so that your heritage is constantly expressed.

I can on each visit become absorbed again with the homes, the buildings, and monuments that recall the colorful history of New Orleans, and I can appreciate afresh the traditions and institutions that make this city one of the great cultural centers of the New World. And you can be sure I explore the menus of your restaurants with the enthusiasm of the tourist.

I can also view your continuing business and industrial progress with the perspective of one looking at a series of before-and-after photographs.

I am, of course, especially interested in the progress of aviation. Upon arrival here, I found myself in the midst of a whole new dimension in air-age productivity. I looked across an improved and expanded airport, now geared to handle intercontinental air operations. I examined the modern design and functional efficiency of your imposing new terminal building. I witnessed a rhythm of flight schedules fanning out in practically every heading of the compass—fleets of jet-powered giants moving people, the products of industry, and the U.S. mails at double time.

But there's more to the busy, modern airport than meets the eye. Behind the glamor and excitement of it all is an air facility hard at work, helping to build local progress. For this is the air age in the development of transportation, and the modern aviation establishment forms the foundation upon which an area's economic prospects are built in this day.

From every corner of this industrious area, you can trace new enterprise, new growth, new progress directly to your aviation activities. I dare say, for example, that the highly sophisticated state of your aviation facilities and services was a major consideration in the recent selection of the New Orleans area as an assembly site for the Saturn missile.

Behind the scenes of the busy airport is also a story of energetic civic and business leadership, of men and women profoundly aware of the power of air transport—and intent on harnessing it for the benefit of their people, their commerce and industry, their social and cultural advancement.

This is not surprising since New Orleans has achieved greatness in large measure through transportation. As we all know, New Orleans is a classic example of the principle that cities cannot thrive without modern transportation. The founders of your city obviously knew this principle well. Locating the Crescent City on both the mighty Mississippi and the Gulf of Mexico, they took maximum advantage of the most efficient transportation of the day. At such a strategic location, it was inevitable that New Orleans would become the gateway to the new territory—over the Old Spanish Trail to the West Coast and up the Mississippi to the top of America.

Later came the railroads. Then modern highways. And then came the flying machine, and again New Orleans acted—this time to accommodate an unproved form of transportation that moved in the sky. History proves that the vision of the local aviation pioneers was sound; today the air age is full blown. Today the U.S. scheduled airlines top both the railroads and buslines combined in intercity passenger miles. Three out of every four Americans who go abroad travel by air. Air freight meanwhile, is the fastest growing form of air traffic. And the post office is turning to the airways to bring new speed and efficiency to the movement of the regular mails.

And the air age has made the New Orleans Moisant International Airport "the gateway to all the Americas."

This achievement is a tribute to a lot of people. It is a tribute to city officials over the years, the aviation planners, the airport managements. More likely than not, I fear, this achievement represents many a struggle, dragging along those who would believe, perhaps, that New Orleans could still trust in the stimulus of the Old Spanish Trail for its progress in this modern day.

The work of the air age in the progress of New Orleans is a tribute, furthermore, to the foresight and vigor of numerous civic and business organizations, and of many individuals who have been truly ambitious for the future of their city. Indeed, you, the chamber of commerce, with your single purpose of community progress, have performed a brilliant role of leadership. Your 1961 year-end report—describing some 20 major civic developments in which you have been active—indicates the determination with which you pursue your mission of local growth and prosperity.

Let us examine briefly the fruits of your labors in promoting aviation. First of all, aviation is now a prime employer in this community. The number of men and women who earn their livelihood at New Orleans airports totals well over 3,000. Their yearly income runs around $25 million. But this is just the beginning; airport activities generate many more jobs throughout the area. I am speaking of the people engaged in enterprises whose success is wholly or partly dependent upon air commerce, such as the suppliers of aviation fuel, the operators of

limousine and taxi services, and the travel agencies, to mention but a few. Using the yardstick of a leading research organization, you can figure that the number of people whose jobs are directly related to air operations runs in excess of 8,000, and that their combined income exceeds $60 million a year.

Aviation stimulates the local economy in other substantial ways. The airlines require some 100,000 different goods and services, on a continuing basis, to keep them flying. It is estimated that the airlines alone pump $20 million a year into the local economy in terms of local purchases to support operations.

As many New Orleans businesses and industries have found, the air age opens doors to brandnew markets. It enables them to sell and "deliver the goods" in distant places as swiftly as their competitors. And it permits them to compete pricewise, too, because the speed and convenience of air freight reduces the overall costs of distribution. The fact that airfreight tonnage out of here has increased by 60 percent in the past 2 years gives you an idea of how effectively the air age is stretching the distribution arms of New Orleans industry.

One of the most dramatic examples concerns the distribution of fresh foods. Thanks to the speed of airfreight, we who live in the more northerly latitudes can also enjoy in January the fresh vegetables and seafoods that you harvest here in the South.

The local service airlines are giving wings to wholesalers and distributors working out of New Orleans. These airlines permit you to make quick trips into areas which, for all practical purposes, were inaccessible via ground transportation because of the time involved.

The city with wings attracts vacationists, business travel and conventions, stimulating the tourist and retail community. As you of the chamber of commerce have noted, your air services have brought "untold thousands to this area, not only as pleasure tourists, but also on business trips." And "package vacation plans for Mardi Gras and midwinter sports carnivals have attracted thousands from points too distant to make surface travel feasible for a short stay."

Currently, the volume of passengers using Moisant International exceeds 1½ million a year. It is estimated that over one-half million of these passengers are visitors to the city. The contribution these visitors make to the New Orleans economy must be enormous. According to the International Association of Convention Bureaus, a typical delegate stays an average of 4 days and he spends $31 each day. By this yardstick, it is conceivable, therefore, that the half-million visitors who come here by air represent $67 million worth of business annually to the hotels, restaurants, shops, theaters and the other attractions of this area.

Surely this helps to explain the recent announcement by segments of the New Orleans hotel industry to expand capacity and services. In an editorial salute, you may recall, the Times-Picayune said this action illustrates the "determination to meet the challenge of accelerating city progress."

You see a great deal of evidence of the drawing power of modern air facilities—the way they attract new industry into a region. There is no doubt that Moisant International influenced the establishment of waterfront industrial sites stretching for miles in either direction of the airport. And all along the way, jobs multiply—such as the additional 5,000 employees needed for the missile project.

The location of Moisant Airport has been the chief impetus behind the tremendous growth in population and civic development of the town of Kenner. I understand the population there has increased fivefold since World War II—and that the valuation of land in that community has risen fourfold.

What the air age is doing in this region it is doing on a grand scale for the Nation as a whole. It is helping to make us a Nation of neighbors—New York with California, Minnesota with Louisiana. It is helping to create a world of neighbors. It is bringing new speed, efficiency, and economy to our defense establishment. It is assuring our Nation a powerful airlift in reserve, ready for any national emergency. The air age is giving wings to the national economy.

There is, however, a sad note of irony in this dynamic role that air transport plays in building communities and Nations. It was expressed with vivid clarity recently by one of the Nation's foremost writers on economics, Robert L. Heilbroner. He said that transportation companies are making huge amounts of money—but for others. He said that "transportation channels, when laid in, make possible an enormous surge of economic activity which was previously impossible." But he said that transportation is not sharing in the rewards of this economic growth to the extent that it should.

This is certainly true of air transportation. In the year just ended, the U.S. scheduled airlines carried about 58 million passengers a total of 40 billion passenger-miles. We carried a record total of over 1 billion ton-miles of freight. And what did we get for all this? Our domestic trunk airlines lost an estimated $30 million.

The chief cause of our problem is the failure of traffic to increase as expected—the failure of traffic to increase at anything near the rate of previous years.

Where are we going to turn for the traffic growth we need? We look first of all, of course, to ourselves. And I can assure you that airline managements are making every imaginable effort to promote business. They have made their product absolutely the world's finest in transportation. They are making revolutionary improvements in reservations, ticketing, and baggage-handling techniques. And, as the airline salesmen represented here today will testify, they are working overtime at the promotion and sale of their product.

Finally, despite some recent modest fare increases, they have kept their price down. Despite inflation, the consumer's dollar goes a lot further in air transportation today than it did 10 or 20 years ago. For instance, in 1950, the average secretary in this country could purchase 993 miles of air travel on her wages for 1 week's work. Today, a week's wages buys her about 1,500 miles of air travel—and she has better service, and more service available to her than 10 years ago.

The efforts of the airlines to promote business and revenues, by the way, have been matched by efforts to reduce costs on the other side of the ledger. I am speaking of such things as the careful control of capacity, in terms of seat-miles available, and the pooling of aircraft parts which permits them to reduce the huge, expensive inventories that each carrier must maintain at various locations on its system.

In effecting these efficiencies, the airlines do not, of course, relax on safety in any way. Despite their financial problems, they continue to devote their primary efforts and considerable expense toward providing the American public with the safest air transportation possible.

There is no such thing in the airline business as deferred maintenance. Nothing can be postponed; every airplane undergoes meticulous inspection and maintenance on a daily basis—plus extra inspections before each flight. Airlines spend about $1½ million every day to inspect and maintain aircraft. And to maintain operational proficiency, they spend millions more in training and testing personnel. Currently, the annual figure tops the $60 million mark.

By way of a tangible example of what is involved in the continuing quest for a perfect safety record, each jet airliner you see carries close to a million dollars worth of electronic safety gear.

I think the improving trend of the airline safety record over the years demonstrates the success with which the industry has pursued this primary objective. The year 1961 was one of the safest in air transport history. The fatality rate was thirty one-hundredths per 100 million passenger-miles of travel. To translate this into terms that are meaningful, let me say that you are about seven times safer flying with us than traveling in your family sedan. Or, if you began flying with us on last New Year's Day, and could fly 8 hours a day at an average jet speed of 600 miles an hour, you would have to keep flying until the year 2144 before you could expect to become involved in a fatal accident.

In addition to what the airlines themselves are doing to control costs and increase traffic, there must be a reexamination of certain Government practices that hold back traffic growth. As you know all too well, the 10-percent tax on common-carrier travel is still with us. This keeps the lid securely clamped down on a major potential travel market. The tax was enacted almost 22 years ago, during wartime, with the expressed intent of making you stay at home. Obviously, this is the worst possible period in our history to make people stay home.

There are, of course, other major obstacles that must be cleared away. There is the continuing problem of the Military Air Transport Service, or MATS, as it is called. It is the biggest airline in the free world; its cargo traffic tops the combined international tonnage of all the free world's civil airlines. A huge portion of this traffic has no business moving via this State-owned airline; and a military air arm has no business engaging in commercial-type operations. It is tantamount to the military running its own railroad tracks in Louisiana, a State already served by 13 railroads.

There is another roadblock that should be called to your attention, and this affects all common carriers. I am talking about the Government's transportation procurement practices. In buying transportation from civil carriers, the Government insists upon, and gets, a cut rate. In many cases, these discriminatory rates are forced to unreasonably low levels—often times below cost when it comes to air transportation.

There is the problem of the exempt carriers—those lines which siphon off traffic where they want, when they want. They shave prices just enough to get business, then operate pretty much as they please.

To date, it seems, the Government has tried to bend or remake the law to fit these operators. Various events and incidents in the past few months, however, have emphasized the fact that the full measure of public and financial responsibility that must be required of air carriers is lacking with at least some of these exempt airlines. The public has a right to expect that this will be corrected.

What is needed is a rebirth of values, a general recognition of the simple truth that this Nation cannot succeed in peace or in war unless its civil transportation systems are financially sound. It must be recognized that what air transport is doing for New Orleans, it is doing for the Nation as a whole.

There must be an awareness of the essential defense role of the U.S. airlines that the military is relying upon a jet-powered, financially capable airline industry.

And it must be recognized that the jet airliner is a dynamic force in efforts to create a world of nations living in peace. A visit

to your new terminal at Moisant International will show you this people-to-people exchange in action.

If this Nation expects its air industry to do all these things, there will have to be a new coordination of policies at the Federal level and a removal of practices that undermine those policies. Let us hope that this can begin now, as the administration and the Congress sit down to deliberate new policies and programs for the new year.

You people who are building New Orleans and Louisiana, who have worked so hard to give wings to your growth, have every reason to insist upon the creation of a climate of opportunity for air transport on the national level. You have a vital stake in this because you must rely more and more upon the air age for continued progress with each passing year.

I would suggest that our Federal Government take a page out of your program to promote essential enterprise for the public good, as expressed last week in one of the Nation's foremost business magazines. It was an ad in which the Louisiana Department of Commerce and Industry listed reasons why you should choose this State for expansion. The department concluded its listing with these words:

"Add labor, transportation, and abundant water for an atmosphere where industrial climate is a lot more than weather."

Lining House Preserved in Historic Charleston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks to the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to call attention to restoration work being accomplished in historic old Charleston, S.C.

The Lining House—America's first house of meteorology—is being restored by persons interested in seeing the charm and beauty of their graceful seaport city retained.

An article in Weatherwise, a publication of the American Meteorological Society, tells of the restoration efforts:

AMERICA'S FIRST HOUSE OF METEOROLOGY

It is generally agreed that Dr. John Lining of Charleston, S.C., deserves the honor of being the first in the British American colonies to make continuous daily weather observations with instruments over an extended period of time. His thermometer shelter was located at his place of residence at King and Broad Streets in the heart of old Charleston.

Lining's valuable records commenced in April 1737 and continued at least until 1753. Usable summaries of these, as well as descriptions of his instruments, were published in the Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society in London in 1748 and 1753.

John A. Cummings, meteorologist in charge of the Weather Bureau office in Charleston, wishes to call the attention of Weatherwise readers to current plans to restore the original Lining residence to its former colonial elegance:

"The Lining building contained a drugstore until a few months ago when Dr. Poulnot, the last owner, decided to retire. He sold the building to the owners of Berlin's Mens Store, across the street, who wishes to improve the property to enhance the appearance of the neighborhood.

"A strong sentiment, however, was aroused by the public for the preservation of the building as a historical monument, and the Berlin brothers agreed to give the Preservation Society of Charleston an option to repurchase the property at their cost. The society proposes to restore the building to its original appearance, most of which has been preserved and to use a part of the lower floor of the building as headquarters for the society.

National Library of Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, last month the new National Library of Medicine in Bethesda, Md., was dedicated in ceremonies which included an address by the Honorable LISTER HILL, senior Senator from Alabama. This great Library represents a monumental step forward in the progress of men in mobilizing the resources of the mind and intellect.

The National Capital, the seat of American Government and the center of the free world, also merits a great reputation for its growing scientific academic and intellectual community. The dedication of this Library adjacent to the National Institutes of Health and the National Naval Medical Center in Montgomery County, Md., is an additional asset enhancing the reputation of Metropolitan Washington as a leading center of medical knowledge.

The dedication ceremonies were attended by many of the men and women who have made this new Library a reality and who will put its facilities to work. Taking part in the dedication ceremonies were Dr. Worth B. Daniels, Chairman, Board of Regents; the Honorable Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; Senator Hill; His Excellency Alexis S. Liatis, Ambassador of the Royal Greek Government; and Dr. Frank B. Rogers, Director of the National Medical Library.

I am privileged to append in the RECORD of the House the remarks these gentlemen made in connection with the dedication of the National Library of Medicine:

DEDICATION CEREMONIES, NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE, DECEMBER 14, 1961

(Remarks of Dr. Worth B. Daniels, Chairman of the Board of Regents, National Library of Medicine, presiding)

(National anthem and invocation.)

Today we come together to dedicate a great new facility for the greatest medical library in the world, the National Library of Medicine. By happy circumstance, we are also celebrating the 125th anniversary of the institution founded in 1836 by the Surgeon General of the Army, Dr. Joseph Lovell.

The Library has had many homes during its lifetime—during the Civil War in rented rooms over the old Riggs Bank Building, then in the old Ford Theater Building, and since 1887 in the red brick building on the Mall. Now at long last the Library has a magnificent new home commensurate with its impressive programs. It is a matter of profound regret that construction has been delayed and that the building is incomplete and unfinished at this time. The actual move of library collections and operations probably cannot be completed before early spring. In the name of the Board of Regents, I call upon all those whose responsibility it is to oversee construction to see to it that this building is completed and made ready for occupancy at the earliest possible date.

We have received many messages of congratulations on this occasion from all over America and from all over the world. I cannot read them all, but there is one which I want to share with you. It is from the President of the United States, who because of the pressure of world affairs is unable to be with us on this occasion. He has written as follows:

"The dedication of the new National Library of Medicine perpetuates a distinguished history extending back to the early days of our Nation. This enterprise has my congratulations and best wishes for a new era of outstanding service to medical knowledge throughout America and around the world.

"JOHN F. KENNEDY."

For the last 10 years I have been more or less intimately associated with this Library. This has been a memorable experience, one which I am proud to have been privileged to share with many people on this platform and in this audience. It is a pleasure, on behalf of the Board of Regents, to extend our thanks to all those who have supported this institution through the years, to all those who fought the good fight and never gave up hope, to all those whose counsel served so well in planning and in bringing to fruition the programs which contribute to the Library's greatness, to all those whose efforts are imbedded in the very fabric of the Library's structure.

Many of these people are here today; I wish I could introduce them all, but obviously I cannot do that; the list is a long one.

The distinguished group at the rear of the platform is the present membership of the Board of Regents. I shall introduce by name only two of them, to represent them all.

Lt. Gen. Leonard D. Heaton, the Surgeon General of the U.S. Army. If the Army had not carefully nurtured this library for over 100 years, we would have little to celebrate today.

Dr. Luther L. Terry, the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service. Dr. Terry heads the Service which is now responsible for the stewardship of the library's activities.

We have with us today the Representatives in Congress of the Sixth District, Maryland, the district in which the library makes its new home: Congressman CHARLES MATHIAS, Jr.

(Introduction of distinguished physicians and librarians.)

The Secretary of a great Department of the Federal Government is at once the most enviable and the most unenviable of men—enviable for the vast opportunities for service which are his, unenviable for the harassment and punishing load of work which he must carry. I am proud to introduce to you a great Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, a man who serves his country with passion and skill, and who does not wince at the burden. I give you the Honorable Abraham Ribicoff.

ADDRESS BY ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, DELIVERED AT DEDICATION OF NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE, BETHESDA, MD., THURSDAY, DECEMBER 14, 1961

"With pleasure and pride, I greet you on behalf of the President of the United States.

"When he was serving in the Senate, the President coauthored with the distinguished Senator from Alabama the legislation which authorized the construction of this building. And he retains a very great personal interest in this library which enriches our lives, which contributes to our growing intellectual heritage, and which improves worldwide communication in the sciences and humanities.

"We all are proud today.

"We are proud that the National Library of Medicine is part of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. We are proud of the contributions of the Department to the library's development. We are proud of the interest and devotion of the board of regents, the library's director and staff, and its many friends who have worked so hard to make their dream a reality. We are proud for the American people in this great national resource for the public health and the advancement of medical science.

"One hundred and twenty-five years ago, as one of his last official acts, Dr. Joseph Lovell, Surgeon General of the U.S. Army, authorized a budget item which called for '$150 for medical books.' Thus simply and modestly began the amassing of the great collection which is today the National Library of Medicine. This country owes a great debt to Dr. Lovell and to generations of Army officers who followed him for their vision and perseverance.

"Great research and teaching libraries do not drop full grown from the vine. They require long, hard years of nurture—in the gathering of materials, in the assembling of a skilled staff, in the development of a wide range of facilities for the people who use the library.

"We say 'well done' to all who have carried on and who have added to the library's stature. We hope that during the next hundred years we can carry out our responsibilities with equal success.

"That will be no easy task. Medical literature has grown at an enormous rate. In the 82 years since the 'Index Medicus' was begun, the periodical literature of medicine has multiplied sixfold. There is no doubt that it will increase still further as research expands and as medical care is brought to more and more people.

"Undoubtedly librarians must occasionally wonder, in despair, how soon the time will come, as predicted by Harvey Cushing 35 years ago, 'when every tree has been felled for paper, every calf for leather, and the few long-haired and ill-nourished people left in the world will be madly making card indices of the volumes which have filled every available cranny in which they can be stored.'

"But this—or something like this—is what an institution such as the National Library of Medicine must anticipate and plan for. It must make room for an ever-growing body of knowledge. And this is why a new building, designed with an eye to the future, was such a necessity.

"In thinking about this library, I was reminded of a phrase used by the talented producing director of Arena Stage, to describe their just completed new building—'the enclosing of an idea.'

"The structure we dedicate today, like the Arena Stage, encloses an idea. This idea is nothing less than the condition of man. This idea is a living fund of knowledge, serving health workers everywhere.

"This idea is a permanent home—of the highest quality, the finest design, furnished and equipped to meet the most modern library standards—for the world's greatest collection of medical literature.

"When we think of a library, we tend to think of a repository, a storehouse. The picture in our mind is static.

"Actually, the key to greatness in libraries is movement. The most important thing about a library is not what is there but how it is used. The great library is not a hoard of knowledge but a relay station. It is more a transmitter than a receiver.

"The National Library of Medicine has passed this test of greatness with high honors. Someone has called a specialized library such as this one 'the collective memory of the profession.' Like a human memory, it sorts, sifts, analyzes, and recalls information in a purposeful way.

"The statistics on quantity and variety of materials received here are impressive, but the statistics on materials disseminated are more meaningful. Every month, despite cramped and archaic facilities in the old building, the library staff has answered more than 10,000 separate requests.

"Each of these requests comes here because this is the best—very often the only—source. Let us consider a few.

"Researchers are designing an elaborate and complex study on a form of heart disease. Thanks to this library, they learn of work reported only in an obscure European journal, in a language familiar to none of them, which enables them to redesign their project, eliminate an area already explored, concentrate on another.

"A medical educator is in process of developing a brandnew course in a swiftly evolving specialty. Thanks to this library, his students will receive the essence of the world's total knowledge on the subject.

"A surgeon, thanks to this library, learns of a refinement of a technique with which he saves a life.

"A practitioner, thanks to this library, is able to treat a patient suffering from a disease rarely seen in our country.

"A scientist, thanks to this library, takes one clue from an Indian medical journal, another from a Greek periodical, adds them to his own experience, and pioneers an entire line of investigation.

"The National Library of Medicine broadcasts thousands of capsules of knowledge every year. Who can say where and when the vibrations stop? Who can say how many lives are touched and prolonged?

"What is more, the improvement of medical communication is high on the list of this Library's objectives. A few months ago, for example, the Library proposed, and I approved, a project to develop a computer-based system for its bibliographical services. Known as MEDLARS (for Medical Literature Analysis and Retrieval System) it will make use of the latest electronic equipment. A pioneering venture in the library field, it will be designed to process several hundred thousand pieces of bibliographic information each year. I understand that in response to a specific request for publications on a single disease category, MEDLARS will be able to sort out and reproduce a list chosen from over a million possible articles in a very short time.

"Of course, it will take a few years to develop, install, and test the new system. But this is the kind of operation that the new building is designed for and that the Library staff plans to stimulate.

"Obviously the National Library of Medicine, an ancient institution by American standards, is still lively, still growing, still vigorous, ready to point the way through the jungle of medical publications. And it is ready also to think of new ways to dispense our greatest export—the export of knowledge and ideas.

"As a layman, may I say the prognosis for the next 100 years seems good.

"Mr. Chairman, congratulations to you and the present and past members of the Board of Regents who worked so hard to give the Library this fine new home. Congratulations also to the farsighted legislators who here demonstrated their concern for the progress of medical research, medical education, and medical care. And congratulations to the members of the health professions on the rebirth of this marvelous facility, which belongs to them.

"And I say to the staff of the Library: You have our best wishes. You carry our high expectations as you set about your tasks in this new building whose simple elegance of structure embodies at once the great importance and the social usefulness of your work to our country and to all mankind."

When, 5 years ago, the legislation which reestablished this Library and which assured the construction of this new building was finally passed, it was all but inevitable that the sponsor of that legislation would be the senior Senator from Alabama. No man of our generation, no man in the history of this Nation, has done so much in fashioning the legislative bases on which major advances in health are structured. I give you Senator LISTER HILL, who will present the dedication address.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LISTER HILL, NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE DEDICATION, DECEMBER 14, 1961, NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH, BETHESDA, MD.

"On this now hallowed ground that only a quarter of a century ago was a sleepy Maryland farm we are assembled today to dedicate the new home of the National Library of Medicine.

"Although this Library has been in existence for 125 years, it now takes its appropriate place among this great complex of buildings devoted to the pursuit of medical research and to the prolongation of human life.

"Five years ago, in reporting the legislation creating a National Library of Medicine, the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee summed up its importance in these words:

'The United States of America is the fortunate possessor of the greatest library of medicine in the world. The value of its contents is truly incalculable in that if they were once destroyed they could never be replaced. Its importance is immeasurable in that its services are essential to men and women engaged in medical research throughout the world; to our medical and dental schools; to practitioners in the health fields throughout America; to scientists, to scholars, to public health workers and hospital administrators, and to our departments of Government.'

"But the Library is more than this—it is the repository of medical knowledge painstakingly accumulated over the ages. Each stone of this great edifice of knowledge is solidly rooted upon the fundamental architecture of the past.

"John Morley, in his life of Gladstone, wrote that 'every man of us has all the centuries in him.' By the same token, every book in this library bears the invisible imprint of the timeless quest for medical knowledge.

"From the ancient papyri of Egypt, through the first crude anatomical drawings of the Greeks, to the early printed volumes in Europe runs the steady stream of man's slow acquisition of knowledge concerning the human anatomy and the diseases which plague it.

"There is much heartbreak in this story, for the pronouncement of new theories always runs hard into the entrenched wall of the past. A William Harvey ridiculed for his pioneer description of the circulation of the blood; a Semmelweis hounded into insanity by his colleagues who scorned his insistence

upon antisepsis in childbirth; the early surgeons of America stoned by an indignant populace for dissecting cadavers in order to probe the mysteries of anatomy—these are but a few examples of the heroic struggles which led to the medical progress we celebrate today.

"In our present age of rapid communication we sometimes fail to realize how difficult, even a century ago, the transmission of medical knowledge was.

"My father, a surgeon and practitioner of medicine for more than half a century, once illustrated the importance of such chance transmission of knowledge by telling me how in 1864 Joseph Lister, then at the University of Glasgow, when walking home with the professor of chemistry, Thomas Anderson, heard of certain papers on fermentation and putrefaction which had been recently published by a then little known French chemist, Louis Pasteur.

"Lister read these medical publications and found himself convinced that minute living particles floating in the air often turned the surgery of his day into a charnel house.

"This casual meeting with Anderson, plus the reading of a medical article on carbolic acid, led in 1867 to Lister's laying down the great principles of the modern treatment of wounds.

"Although the vast expanses once separating the countries of the world have been greatly reduced through the advances of modern transportation and communications, the chance transmission of medical knowledge is still an occasional and wondrous phenomenon.

"One night in 1949, in a Boston medical library, a prominent cardiologist read a paper by an Indian physician on the tranquilizing effects of an ancient Indian snakeroot plant. Although this snakeroot plant had been used in India over the centuries for a wide variety of illnesses—epilepsy, insomnia, mental illness—it was practically unknown to the Western World until the publication in 1949 of a scientific article on it in a British medical journal. So a chain of tenuous events across thousands of miles and hundreds of years opened the way to the present development of reserpine, which is today one of the most effective tranquilizing agents against hypertension and several forms of mental illness.

"In this connection, it is interesting that the staff of the National Library of Medicine has reported that modern researchers borrow a great deal of older material: the rare books, the publications from remote portions of the globe, and in many foreign tongues.

"As Oliver Wendell Holmes wrote, not all of the old literature of medicine is dead and not all the dead literature is old.

"Without the resources of this great library, the research which the Government is undertaking to aid its citizens to aid all mankind would, we might say, be tragically delayed. Research men might unwittingly do again what some research worker had many years ago done in a faraway land; all available pieces of information might not be brought to bear on current problems.

"This library is the collective memory of mankind. Its purpose is to provide and maintain the record, for in a fundamental sense it is the guardian of the research results that may be fruitfully exploited and incorporated in new efforts, new problems, and new achievements.

"Above and beyond its task of carefully preserving the archives of medicine, the National Library of Medicine has the obligation of bringing the right medical book into the hands of the medical man at the right time. This it undertakes in its bibliographic publications, its Index Medicus, its catalogs and its other guides to the literature.

"In recent decades, as the stream of medical publications cascaded into a flood, the library faced the challenge of developing new methods to digest this knowledge and make it rapidly available to the medical profession. Under forward-looking leadership, it has adapted a number of high-speed electronic machines to cope with the avalanche of medical literature. I am told that new electronic and computer developments just over the horizon will provide additional keys to unlocking the precious treasures piled upon the miles and miles of its shelves.

"It is most appropriate that this great library does now reside in close union with the National Institutes of Health.

"Over the past quarter century, these Institutes have been expanded into what is the world's largest research center dedicated to a mighty offensive against the many diseases which beset the family of many. This great complex of buildings is a magnificent affirmation of our country's dedication to the alleviation of the sufferings of people—not only in America, but in all parts of the world.

"Today the National Institutes of Health is the Mecca of medicine—the scientific shrine to which medical men from all parts of the world make pilgrimages each year. It stands today as a physical reminder of the truly international nature of medicine, for as the great Pasteur once wrote:

'Science does not belong to any country, because knowledge is a patrimony of humanity.'

"In the dissemination of this precious knowledge, the National Library of Medicine plays a vital role. In a discussion with John Shaw Billings, one of the original founders of the Library, a colleague remarked:

'Libraries are quite as necessary as hospitals, or armies. Libraries are the bridges over which civilization travels from generation to generation and from country to country.'

"Many of the building blocks of our civilization will be preserved here, and the record will celebrate man's eternal quest for knowledge. As John Milton so aptly said:

'A good book is the precious lifeblood of a master spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life'

"We stand at the threshold of a mighty era—a golden age of medicine. May I predict that, within a relatively few short years, the world will see a monentous breakthrough of medical knowledge that will enable us to to overcome many of the dread diseases that have plagued and baffled man through the ages. There is reason for confidence that this breakthrough will yield many answers in the battle against heart disease, cancer, mental illness and other crippling and degenerative diseases.

"In this present time of seemingly interminable crises, when we hear much, too much of the forces of destruction, it rekindles our spirit and faith to draw refreshment from the deep well of the past in venerating the memory of those who have through the centuries dedicated themselves to improving the lot of man.

"In the last decade of the 19th century, in the preparation of his monumental 14-volume Practice of Medicine, the eminent physician and renowned scholar Sir William Osler drew extensively upon the riches of this library. Let his words speak to us this day:

'We are here to add what we can to, not to get what we can from, life'

"To you librarians who are the heirs of the inspired founders of the National Library of Medicine, those immortals, John Shaw Billings, Robert Fletcher and Fielding H. Garrison, to you who are the guardians of this knowledge which has been accumulated over the centuries, and to you whose proud task it will be to preserve and enshrine the advances of tomorrow we at this hour turn over this manificent building which will be a repository of ancient truths and future discoveries. May your beacon light ever be those words of beauty, those words of profound meaning from the Old Testament:

'Great is truth and mightly above all things.' "

The history of medicine, as Senator HILL has so well indicated, is a proud history, and we of the medical professions cherish it. We cherish it not least for the humanistic insights which it fosters, and for the glimpses into the whole development of our Western civilization which it affords, and often epitomizes. We are happy today to remember that the cradle of that civilization was in Greece. And we are happy to have with us the Ambassador of the Royal Greek Government, His Excellency Alexis S. Liatis, who will make a presentation on behalf of his government.

(Presentation of cutting from Hippocrates oriental plane tree on the Island of Cos.)

ADDRESS BY ALEXIS S. LIATIS, AMBASSADOR OF GREECE, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE NEW NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE BUILDING AT THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH, BETHESDA, MD., DECEMBER 14, 1961

"It is a privilege to attend this ceremony and, on behalf of the town of Cos, formally present to the National Library of Medicine this cutting from the venerable plane tree under whose shade, according to legend, Hippocrates—the father of medicine—examined his patients and taught his students some 25 centuries ago.

"This ancient tree of Hippocrates is an imposing sight in the main square of Cos. With a circumference of nearly 50 feet, it is said to be one of the oldest and largest living trees in Europe. Its heavy branches extend in all directions around it and pillars have been built to support their weight.

"The town of Cos, with a population of about 10,000, is the capital of the Dodecanese Island of Cos, which lies in the southeast of the Aegean Sea. A prosperous port in antiquity, it was also a center of health and medicine by reason of its salubrious climate and its renowned ferrous and sulphuric springs. Among the other centers of medical science in the Greek world of the fifth century B.C., notably those of Cnidus in the nearby island of Rhodes, Crotona in Italy and also Sicily, Cos achieved the greatest fame as the birthplace and home of Hippocrates.

"Under the leadership of this great master, Greek medicine was freed from the mysticism of the past with its reliance in supernatural forces as well as from the doctrinaire approach of philosophical theory, and developed a new system based on scientific observation and experiment.

" 'Every illness,' declared Hippocrates, 'has a natural cause; and without natural causes, nothing ever happens.' Great stress was laid on the examination of pathological symptoms. Every part of the patient's body would be examined thoroughly; the symptoms of the illness would be carefully observed and compared with those of other recorded cases. When all the evidence had been gathered and evaluated, the physician would proceed to diagnosis and treatment satisfied that he had done his best and could now make a reasonably accurate prognostication as to the future course of the disease. The object was 'to say what has been, to know what is, and to predict what will be.'

"Great emphasis was also laid on hygiene, proper body care, and diet. If necessary, and only then, the Hippocratic physician would resort to drugs, cuttings, and cauterizing.

"Hippocrates' teachings are preserved in what is known today as the 'Hippocratic Collection,' a group of about 70 treatises on various medical subjects. Experts theorize that these treatises are the work of many authors; they even classify them into three distinct schools. Seven or eight of these treatises, however, can be readily recognized as the product of genius. Their authorship is attributed either to Hippocrates or to his closest disciples.

"The achievements of the medical scientists of Hippocrates' era are remarkable, particularly if one considers the limited means at their disposal and the fact that dissection was prohibited by the morals of their time. Indeed, it took mankind several centuries to advance medicine beyond the stage where Hippocrates and his contemporaries left it.

"The most enduring contribution of Hippocrates, however, is the spirit of humanity which he imbued into medicine and the high standards of ethics and devotion to duty which he set for the medical profession.

"An international foundation dedicated to the father of modern medicine was established at his birthplace a little over a year ago. It is the International Hippocratic Foundation of Cos, a private nonprofit organization. Its charter was unanimously endorsed by the delegates to the XVII International Congress on the History of Medicine held in Athens and Cos in September 1960.

"The principal objective of the foundation is to create in the island of Cos an international medical center of research and study based on the humanitarian principles of the Hippocratic philosophy and combining the spectacular achievements of modern medical science with the Hippocratic emphasis on clinical observation and close personal relationship between patient and physician.

"The International Hippocratic Foundation of Cos aspires also to operate at its International Medical Center at Cos a permanent medical seminary for students sent there on a scholarship basis from all parts of the world. Distinguished professors of medicine from all countries will be invited to teach. The foundation also plans to convene at Cos every 5 years an international conference for the discussion of medical scientific and professional subjects.

"The foundation is administered by an international general committee composed of university professors of medical history and by an executive council whose five members are elected. Physicians from all over the world are invited to become members. No membership dues are required. Only a nominal amount of one-third of a dollar is collected as registration fee.

"In concluding I should like to say that I think it is extremely fitting that this cutting from Hippocrates' venerable tree is to be planted here on the grounds of the new building of the National Library of Medicine. This act, I believe, transcents the limits of a mere act of homage to medical history. It is actually a symbolic recognition of the leading role this great country is playing today in the ever continuing struggle to relieve human suffering and to free man from the scourge of disease and pain.

"The torch of pioneering in medical science which was lit on the little island of Cos 2,500 years ago has now passed on to this country. Hippocrates, I am sure, would agree, as the citizens of Cos do agree, that it is in strong and able hands."

Thank you, Ambassador Liatis. In the spring we will plant this tree on the beautiful grounds outside this building. May this tree and this library flourish together for a thousand years and more, and may the long future be as great as the splendid past.

You have all received as a memento of this occasion a facsimile copy of the first catalog of the library. Another important catalog was published by the library last week. It is Early American Medical Imprints, 1668–1820, by Robert B. Austin. This impressive catalog lists 2,100 books which might be described as the medical incunabula of this country. I commend it to your attention.

I am happy to announce that the 1775 first edition of John Jones' Plain concise practical remarks on the treatment of wounds and fractures has recently been presented to the library through the generosity of Dr. D. Rees Jensen of New York City. This is one of seven copies of this work known still to exist. To all the book collectors in this audience I may add the gentle hint that I hope this gift marks the beginning of a trend.

We have also received a very fine gift from Dr. Chauncey D. Leake, in the form of personal papers and correspondence with many people who have made significant contributions to medical history. Materials of this kind are an important adjunct to the library's collections, and surely this library provides their most fitting and suitable home.

(Announcements and benediction.)

DEDICATION CEREMONIES, NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 14, 1961, 3 P.M.–FRIDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1961, 10 A.M.

PROGRAM

Thursday, December 14, 1961, 3 p.m.

Presiding: Dr. Worth B. Daniels, Chairman, Board of Regents.

Invocation: The Reverend William R. Andrew, Chaplain, Clinical Center, National Institutes of Health.

Address: The Honorable Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Dedication Address: The Honorable LISTER HILL, U.S. Senator, Alabama.

Presentation: His Excellency Alexis S. Liatis, Ambasador of the Royal Greek Government.

Benediction: Maj. Gen. Frank A. Tobey, Chief of Chaplains, U.S. Army.

Music by the U.S. Army Band, commanded by Lt. Col. Hugh Curry.

Friday, December 25, 1961
10 a.m.

Presiding, Dr. Frank B. Rogers, Director, National Library of Medicine.

"The Military Tradition of the National Library of Medicine," Maj. Gen. Joseph H. McNinch, chief surgeon, U.S. Army, Europe.

"Medical Librarianship in the United States," Miss Gertrude L. Annan, president, Medical Library Association.

"The Building Arts in the Service of Librarianship," Dr. Carl W. Condit, professor of humanities and english, Northwestern University.

"History, Science, and Librarianship," Dr. Chauncey D. Leake, president, American Association for the History of Medicine.

"Physicians and Books," Dr. William B. Bean, professor of medicine, University of Iowa.

"Three Who Made the Library":

J. S. Billings, Dr. Frank B. Rogers.

Robert Fletcher, Dr. Estelle Brodman, librarian, Washington University School of Medicine.

F. H. Garrison, Dr. Dorothy M. Schullian, curator of history of science collections, Cornell University.

BOARD OF REGENTS, NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

Dr. Norman Q. Brill, Los Angeles, Calif.

Dr. Harve J. Carlson, National Science Foundation.

Dr. Worth B. Daniels, Washington, D.C.

Lt. Gen. L. D. Heaton, U.S. Army.

Dr. Maynard K. Hine, Indianapolis, Ind.

Dr. Hugh H. Hussey, Jr., Washington, D.C.

Dr. Saul W. Jarcho, New York, N.Y.

Rear Adm. E. C. Kenney, U.S. Navy.

Mr. Thomas E. Keys, Rochester, Minn.

Dr. William S. Middleton, Veterans' Administration.

Dr L. Quincy Mumford, Library of Congress.

Maj. Gen. O. C. Niess, U.S. Air Force.

Dr. Robert M. Stecher, Cleveland, Ohio.

Dr. Luther L. Terry, Public Health Service.

Dr. William L. Valk, Kansas City, Kans.

Dr. Theodore R. Van Dellen, Chicago, Ill.

Dr. Warner L. Wells, Chapel Hill, N.C.

A Sockdolager

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as the years progress Congress is called on to appropriate money for more and more welfare programs and so-called charitable purposes. We have come a long way, from the original concept of constitutional appropriations, in our appropriations of taxpayers dollars. This departure from constitutional concepts was brought home to me most concisely in my reading of a recent experience in the life of Davy Crockett. I thought this article should be called to the attention of all of us in Congress who must uphold our constitutional processes. I request permission to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SOCKDOLAGER

Crockett was then the lion of Washington. I was a great admirer of his character, and, having several friends who were intimate with him, I found no difficulty in making his acquaintance. I was fascinated with him, and he seemed to take a fancy to me.

I was one day in the lobby of the House of Representatives when a bill was taken up appropriating money for the benefit of a widow of a distinguished naval officer. Several beautiful speeches had been made in its support, rather, as I thought, because it afforded the speakers a fine opportunity for display than from the necessity of convincing anybody, for it seemed to me that everybody favored it. The Speaker was just about to put the question when Crockett arose. Everybody expected, of course, that he was going to make one of his characteristic speeches in support of the bill. He commenced:

"Mr. Speaker, I have as much respect for the memory of the deceased, and as much sympathy for the sufferings of the living, if suffering there be, as any man in this House, but we must not permit our respect for the dead or our sympathy for a part of the living to lead us into an act of injustice to the balance of the living. I will not go into an argument to prove that Congress has no power to appropriate this money as an act of charity. Every Member upon this floor knows it. We have the right, as individuals, to give away as much of our own money as we please in charity; but as Members of Congress we have no right so to appropriate a dollar of the public money. Some eloquent appeals have been made to us upon the

ground that it is a debt due the deceased. Mr. Speaker, the deceased lived long after the close of the war; he was in office to the day of his death, and I have never heard that the Government was in arrears to him. This Government can owe no debts but for services rendered, and at a stipulated price. If it is a debt, how much is it? Has it been audited, and the amount due ascertained? If it is a debt, this is not the place to present it for payment, or to have its merits examined. If it is a debt, we owe more than we can ever hope to pay, for we owe the widow of every soldier who fought in the War of 1812 precisely the same amount.

"There is a woman in my neighborhood, the widow of as gallant a man as ever shouldered a musket. He fell in battle. She is as good in every respect as this lady and is as poor. She is earning her daily bread by her daily labor; and if I were to introduce a bill to appropriate $5,000 or $10,000 for her benefit, I should be laughed at, and my bill would not get five votes in this House. There are thousands of widows in the country just such as the one I have spoken of, but we never hear of any of these large debts to them. Sir, this is no debt. The Government did not owe it to the deceased when he was alive; it could not contract it after he died. I do not wish to be rude, but I must be plain. Every man in this House knows it is not a debt. We cannot, without the grossest corruption, appropriate this money as the payment of a debt. We have not the semblance of authority to appropriate it as a charity. Mr. Speaker, I have said we have the right to give as much money of our own as we please. I am the poorest man on this floor. I cannot vote for this bill, but I will give one week's pay to the object, and if every Member of Congress will do the same, it will amount to more than the bill asks."

He took his seat. Nobody replied. The bill was put upon its passage, and, instead of passing unanimously, as was generally supposed, and as, no doubt, it would, but for that speech, it received but few votes, and, of course, was lost.

Like many other young men, and old ones too, for that matter, who had not thought upon the subject, I desired the passage of the bill, and felt outraged at its defeat, I determined that I would persuade my friend Crockett to move a reconsideration the next day.

Previous engagements preventing me from seeing Crockett that night, I went early to his room the next morning and found him engaged in addressing and franking letters, a large pile of which lay upon his table.

I broke in upon him rather abruptly, by asking him what devil had possessed him to make that speech and defeat that bill yesterday. Without turning his head or looking up from his work, he replied:

"You see that I am very busy now; take a seat and cool yourself. I will be through in a few minutes, and then I will tell you all about it."

He continued his employment for about 10 minutes, and when he had finished he turned to me and said:

"Now, sir, I will answer your question. But thereby hangs a tale, and one of considerable length, to which you will have to listen."

I listened, and this is the tale which I heard:

"Several years ago I was one evening standing on the steps of the Capitol with some other Members of Congress, when our attention was attracted by a great light over in Georgetown. It was evidently a large fire. We jumped into a hack and drove over as fast as we could. When we got there, I went to work, and I never worked as hard in my life as I did there for several hours. But, in spite of all that could be done, many houses were burned and many families made houseless, and, besides, some of them had lost all but the clothes they had on. The weather was very cold, and when I saw so many women and children suffering, I felt that something ought to be done for them, and everybody else seemed to feel the same way.

"The next morning a bill was introduced appropriating $20,000 for their relief. We put aside all other business and rushed it through as soon as it could be done. I said everybody felt as I did. That was not quite so; for, though they perhaps sympathized as deeply with the sufferers as I did, there were a few of the Members who did not think we had the right to indulge our sympathy or excite our charity at the expense of anybody but ourselves. They opposed the bill, and upon its passage demanded the yeas and nays. There were not enough of them to sustain the call, but many of us wanted our names to appear in favor of what we considered a praiseworthy measure, and we voted with them to sustain it. So the yeas and nays were recorded, and my name appeared on the journals in favor of the bill.

"The next summer, when it began to be time to think about the election, I concluded I would take a scout around among the boys of my district. I had no opposition there, but as the election was some time off, I did not know what might turn up, and I thought it was best to let the boys know that I had not forgot them, and that going to Congress had not made me too proud to go to see them.

"So I put a couple of shirts and a few twists of tobacco into my saddlebags, and put out. I had been out about a week and had found things going very smoothly, when, riding one day in a part of my district in which I was more of a stranger than any other, I saw a man in a field plowing and coming toward the road. I gaged my gait so that we should meet as he came to the fence. As he came up I spoke to the man. He replied politely, but, as I thought, rather coldly, and was about turning his horse for another furrow when I said to him: 'Don't be in such a hurry, my friend; I want to have a little talk with you, and get better acquainted.' He replied:

"'I am very busy, and have but little time to talk, but if it does not take too long, I will listen to what you have to say.'

"I began: 'Well, friend, I am one of those unfortunate beings called candidates, and——'

"'Yes, I know you; you are Colonel Crockett. I have seen you once before, and voted for you the last time you were elected. I suppose you are out electioneering now, but you had better not waste your time or mine. I shall not vote for you again.'

"This was a sockdolager. * * * I begged him to tell me what was the matter.

"'Well, Colonel, it is hardly worthwhile to waste time or words upon it. I do not see how it can be mended, but you gave a vote last winter which shows that either you have not capacity to understand the Constitution, or that you are wanting in the honesty and firmness to be guided by it. In either case you are not the man to represent me. But I beg your pardon for expressing it in that way. I did not intend to avail myself of the privilege of the constituent to speak plainly to a candidate for the purpose of insulting or wounding you. I intend by it only to say that your understanding of the Constitution is very different from mine; and I will say to you what, but for my rudeness, I should not have said, that I believe you to be honest. * * * But an understanding of the Constitution different from mine I cannot overlook, because the Constitution, to be worth anything, must be held sacred, and rigidly observed in all its provisions. The man who wields power and misinterprets it is the more dangerous the more honest he is.'

"'I admit the truth of all you say, but there must be some mistake about it, for I do not remember that I gave any vote last winter upon any constitutional question.'

"'No, Colonel, there's no mistake. Though I live here in the backwoods and seldom go from home, I take the papers from Washington and read very carefully all the proceedings of Congress. My papers say that last winter you voted for a bill to appropriate $20,000 to some sufferers by a fire in Georgetown. Is that true?'

"'Certainly it is, and I thought that was the last vote which anybody in the world would have found fault with.'

"'Well, Colonel, where do you find in the Constitution any authority to give away the public money in charity?'

"Here was another sockdolager; or, when I began to think about it, I could not remember a thing in the Constitution that authorized it. I found I must take another tack, so I said:

"'Well, my friend; I may as well own up. You have got me there. But certainly nobody will complain that a great and rich country like ours should give the insignificant sum of $20,000 to relieve its suffering women and children, particularly with a full and overflowing Treasury, and I am sure, if you had been there, you would have done just as I did.'

"'It is not the amount, Colonel, that I complain of; it is the principle. In the first place, the Government ought to have in the Treasury no more than enough for its legitimate purposes. But that has nothing to do with the question. The power of collecting and disbursing money at pleasure is the most dangerous power that can be entrusted to man, particularly under our system of collecting revenue by a tariff, which reaches every man in the country, no matter how poor he may be, and the poorer he is the more he pays in proportion to his means.

"'What is worse, it presses upon him without his knowledge where the weight centers, for there is not a man in the United States who can ever guess how much he pays to the Government. So you see, that while you are contributing to relieve one, you are drawing it from thousands who are even worse off than he. If you had the right to give anything, the amount was simply a matter of discretion with you, and you had as much right to give $20 million as $20,000. If you have the right to give to one, you have the right to give to all; and, as the Constitution neither defines charity nor stipulates the amount, you are at liberty to give to any and everything which you may believe, or profess to believe, is a charity, and to any amount you may think proper. You will very easily perceive what a wide door this would open for fraud and corruption and favoritism, on the one hand, and for robbing the people on the other. No, Colonel, Congress has no right to give charity. Individual members may give as much of their own money as they please, but they have no right to touch a dollar of the public money for that purpose. If twice as many houses had been burned in this county as in Georgetown, neither you nor any other Member of Congress would have thought of appropriating a dollar for our relief. There are about 240 Members of Congress. If they had shown their sympathy for the sufferers by contributing each 1 week's pay, it would have made over $13,000. There are plenty of wealthy men in and around Washington who could have given $20,000 without depriving themselves of even a luxury of life. The Congressmen choose to keep their own money, which, if reports be true, some of them spend not very creditably; and the people about Washington, no doubt, applauded you for relieving them from the necessity of giving by giving what was not yours to give. The people have delegated to Congress, by the Constitution, the power to

do certain things. To do these, it is authorized to collect and pay moneys, and for nothing else. Everything beyond this is usurpation, and a violation of the Constitution.' "

"I have given you," continued Crockett, "an imperfect account of what he said. Long before he was through, I was convinced that I had done wrong. He wound up by saying:

" 'So you see, Colonel, you have violated the Constitution in what I consider a vital point. It is a precedent fraught with danger to the country, for when Congress once begins to stretch its power beyond the limits of the Constitution, there is no limit to it, and no security for the people. I have no doubt you acted honestly, but that does not make it any better, except as far as you are personally concerned, and you see that I cannot vote for you.'

"I tell you I felt streaked. I saw if I should have opposition, and this man should go to talking, he would set others to talking, and in that district I was a gone fawn-skin. I could not answer him, and the fact is, I was so fully convinced that he was right, I did not want to. But I must satisfy him and I said to him:

" 'Well, my friend, you hit the nail upon the head when you said I had not sense enough to understand the Constitution. I intended to be guided by it, and thought I had studied it fully. I have heard many speeches in Congress about the powers of Congress, but what you have said here at your plow has got more hard, sound sense in it than all the fine speeches I ever heard. If I had ever taken the view of it that you have, I would have put my head into the fire before I would have given that vote; and if you will forgive me and vote for me again, if I ever vote for another unconstitutional law I wish I may be shot.'

"He laughingly replied: 'Yes Colonel, you have sworn to that once before, but I will trust you again upon one condition. You say that you are convinced that your vote was wrong. Your acknowledgment of it will do more good than beating you for it. If, as you go round the district, you will tell people about this vote, and that you are satisfied it was wrong, I will not only vote for you, but will do what I can to keep down opposition, and, perhaps, I may exert some little influence in that way.'

" 'If I don't,' said I, 'I wish I may be shot; and to convince you that I am in earnest in what I say I will come back this way in a week or 10 days, and if you will get up a gathering of the people, I will make a speech to them. Get up a barbecue, and I will pay for it.'

" 'No, Colonel, we are not rich people in this section, but we have plenty of provisions to contribute for a barbecue, and some to spare for those who have none. The push of crops will be over in a few days, and we can then afford a day for a barbecue. This is Thursday; I will see to getting it up on Saturday week. Come to my house on Friday, and we will go together, and I promise you a very respectable crowd to see and hear you.'

" 'Well, I will be here. But one thing more before I say goodby. I must know your name.'

" 'My name is Bunce.'

" 'Not Horatio Bunce?'

" 'Yes.'

" 'Well, Mr. Bunce, I never saw you before, though you say you have seen me, but I know you very well. I am glad I have met you, and very proud that I may hope to have you for my friend. You must let me shake your hand before I go.'

"We shook hands and parted.

"It was one of the luckiest hits of my life that I met him. He mingled but little with the public, but was widely known for his remarkable intelligence and incorruptible integrity, and for a heart brimful and running over with kindness and benevolence, which showed themselves not only in words but in acts. He was the oracle of the whole country around him, and his fame had extended far beyond the circle of his immediate acquaintance. Though I had never met him before, I had heard much of him, and but for this meeting it is very likely I should have had opposition, and had been beaten. One thing is very certain, no man could now stand up in that district under such a vote.

"At the appointed time I was at his house, having told our conversation to every crowd I had met, and to every man I stayed all night with, and I found that it gave the people an interest and a confidence in me stronger than I had ever seen manifested before.

"Though I was considerably fatigued when I reached his house, and, under ordinary circumstances, should have gone early to bed, I kept him up until midnight, talking about the principles and affairs of government, and got more real, true knowledge of them than I had got all my life before.

"I have told you Mr. Bunce converted me politically. He came nearer converting me religiously than I had ever been before. He did not make a very good Christian of me, as you know; but he has wrought upon my mind a conviction of the truth of Christianity, and upon my feelings a reverence for its purifying and elevating power such as I had never felt before.

"I have known and seen much of him since, for I respect him—No, that is not the word—I reverence and love him more than any living man, and I go to see him two or three times every year; and I will tell you, sir, if every one who professes to be a Christian lived and acted and enjoyed it as he does, the religion of Christ would take the world by storm.

"But to return to my story. The next morning we went to the barbecue, and, to my surprise, found about 1,000 men there. I met a good many whom I had not known before, and they and my friend introduced me around until I had got pretty well acquainted—at least, they all knew me.

"In due time notice was given that I would speak to them. They gathered up around a stand that had been erected. I opened my speech by saying:

" 'Fellow citizens, I present myself before you today feeling like a new man. My eyes have lately been opened to truths which ignorance or prejudice, or both, had heretofore hidden from my view. I feel that I can today offer you the ability to render you more valuable service than I have ever been able to render before. I am here today more for the purpose of acknowledging my error than to seek your votes. That I should make this acknowledgment is due to myself as well as to you. Whether you will vote for me is a matter for your consideration only.'

"I went on to tell them about the fire and my vote for the appropriation as I have told it to you, and then told them why I was satisfied it was wrong. I closed by saying:

" 'And now, fellow citizens, it remains only for me to tell you that the most of the speech you have listened to with so much interest was simply a repetition of the arguments by which your neighbor, Mr. Bunce, convinced me of my error.

" 'It is the best speech I ever made in my life, but he is entitled to the credit of it. And now I hope he is satisfied with his convert and that he will get up here and tell you so.'

"He came upon the stand and said:

" 'Fellow citizens, it affords me great pleasure to comply with the request of Colonel Crockett. I have always considered him a thoroughly honest man, and I am satisfied that he will faithfully perform all that he has promised you today.'

"He went down, and there went up from that crowd such a shout for Davy Crockett as his name never called forth before.

"I am not much given to tears, but I was taken with a choking then and felt some big drops rolling down my cheeks. And I tell you now that the remembrance of those few words spoken by such a man, and the honest, hearty shout they produced, is worth more to me than all the honors I have received and all the reputation I have ever made, or ever shall make, as a Member of Congress."

"Now, sir," concluded Crockett, "you know why I made that speech yesterday. I have had several thousand copies of it printed, and was directing them to my constituents when you came in.

"There is one thing now to which I will call your attention. You remember that I proposed to give a week's pay. There are in that House many very wealthy men—men who think nothing of spending a week's pay, or a dozen of them, for a dinner or a wine party when they have something to accomplish by it. Some of those same men made beautiful speeches upon the great debt of gratitude which the country owed the deceased—a debt which could not be paid by money—and the insignificance and worthlessness of money, particularly so insignificant a sum as $10,000, when weighed against the honor of the Nation. Yet not one of them responded to my proposition. Money with them is nothing but trash when it is to come out of the people. But it is the one great thing for which most of them are striving, and many of them sacrifice honor, integrity, and justice to obtain it."

Ukrainian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this week Americans of Ukrainian extraction and friends of liberty everywhere will observe the 44th anniversary of Ukrainian independence with pride and sorrow.

The democratic Ukrainian Republic which was established in 1918 was indeed a landmark in that nation's long and bitter struggle against czarist and Russian rule. It is tragic that this candle of liberty was so quickly to be stamped out by Soviet oppression and brutality.

Yet, despite all the suffering and hardship, the Ukrainian people have shown great strength and resourcefulness, and their desire for liberty burns as fiercely as ever in their hearts. That this spirit of liberty can still burn so brightly, in spite of the cruel oppression, executions, purges, and deportations, should be noted by people everywhere.

To those of us who are free and secure, the flame of Ukrainian liberty should give us strength in the heavy burden of defending freedom in its most perilous hour. To those who are among the new and independent nations, the evidence of Soviet colonialism and tyranny in the Ukraine and other captive nations should well reveal the mockery which the

Soviets make of such pure words as self-determination, democracy, and freedom. And for those who are living under the cloak of dictatorship, let the spirit of freedom still flaming in Ukrainian hearts give evidence to the old adage that man was made to live in freedom and not in slavery.

I would like to join my colleagues in noting the anniversary of Ukrainian independence and reminding the captive peoples everywhere that we in America do not accept their slavery as final, that we are confident that freedom will again shine in their lands, and that they will take their place, as is their God-given right, among the community of sovereign nations.

Communist Encirclement of the United States Is Real Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of urgency that I commend the following article, written by Dr. Robert Morris, president of the University of Dallas, to the Members. I hope you will consider Dr. Morris' warning carefully so that this Congress will do whatever is necessary to strengthen our national purpose in order to save America:

THE RAISED EYEBROW

(By Robert Morris)

As Communist forces effect their encirclement of the United States, the last citadel of Western civilization, the task of the American Communist becomes increasingly easy. For, while Soviet power was the isolated force, the comrade had to work affirmatively and aggressively to aid his cause. Now that the momentum is with Khrushchev and his allies, all the American Communist need do is to induce us to do nothing.

During World War II, the Communist effort here and abroad was concentrated on opening of the second front to save their citadel. It was a prodigious effort and required a powerful campaign. Now the Committee for Fair Play for Cuba, for example, has as its goal simply the discouragement of any action that would tend to remove Soviet power from its bastion in the Caribbean.

Encouraging inaction is so much easier than moving to action. All the conventional preoccupations of our society work with the Communist when his goal is that we do nothing. For in our complex society everyone is more and more absorbed in his profession or business or in the never-ending tasks of domestic routine.

Now that the Communist is working to insure that we confine ourselves to the conventional tasks of the average man, he loses his identity as an agitator. He does not storm the Capitols of Washington or Austin. He does not advocate the overthrow of the Government at this time. He speaks for the current drift of affairs. He is for the United Nations when it invades Katanga, one of the last citadels of free enterprise in Africa. He is for our State Department policy toward Africa, which is encouraging the retreat of all Western influences from that strategic continent. To the uncritical eye he is respectable, for he is thus supporting institutions in our society that schoolboys have been taught to reverse.

Conversely, the father of a family who discerns the obvious encirclement of our country by Soviet power and the gradual surrender of our sovereignty to an international consensus that is more and more controlled by our implacable enemy, becomes the dissenter. He assumes the role of the agitator, the restless adversary of the status quo.

The powerful Communist apparatus, more easily camouflaged now than ever, plays the role of the defender of the status quo, with finesse. Concern over the deterioration of our heritage draws only the comment "Do you want war?" Well, no one wants war, so the mere expression of four words often immobilizes any effective protest against the drift toward surrender. Not only the Communists ask the disapproving question so their identity and purpose are effectively obscured.

If a person with children, contemplating the prospect of his sons and daughters becoming Soviet chattels, expresses his concern, often all that is necessary to isolate him from effective action is a raised eyebrow. For, after all, an "extremist" in today's political market is the most controversial of human beings.

Thus the raised eyebrow becomes the formula to insure acquiescence in the steady surrender of our heritage. It is a difficult one to contend with but the growing realization that the present course leads only to bondage will be generating a strong reaction in the days ahead.

Ukrainian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. FERNAND J. ST. GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to rise in tribute to the people of the Ukraine on the 44th anniversary of their Independence Day. It is an irony of our time that this great people, as well as those in other parts of Eastern Europe, are enslaved beneath the yoke of despotism after two wars fought to preserve democracy and the right of all peoples to freedom. It is an irony of our time that we salute the people of the Ukraine, and those throughout the satellite nations for their love of freedom, their search for justice, and their faith in the Almighty while the people themselves can give no expression to that love of freedom, that search for justice, that great faith.

The struggles of the Ukrainians and their hopes for the future are of great personal interest to me. My maternal heritage is Ukrainian and my association with this great people began in my home when, as a child, I learned the folklore, traditions, ideals, and history of the people and their homeland. It is a proud tradition with a great heritage. I learned of the struggles of the people for independence, their yearning for the freedom they had so seldom known, and their hopes for a future when their nation could take its place in the world of free states.

I am certain that the seething emotion in the hearts of the Ukrainian people will be given expression in the future. History has shown that when a people have the yearning for freedom this yearning cannot be subdued even by attempts to eradicate and destroy its culture, language, or religion. The forces that urge men to be free go beyond the external. The urge for freedom is part of the inner core of man that can only be subdued by the subjugation of the mind.

The Soviet Union has attempted to erase any traces of a Ukrainian cultural life. This had been attempted several times by the czars before them. It failed when tried by the czars and it will fail as the Soviets attempt the erasure. They cannot succeed because their principles are antiethical to the basic desires, hopes, and ambitions of all peoples.

My colleagues gave mention, in the past few days, of the history of the Ukraine and of its desire for freedom and justice in a world which has seen much injustice in the past two decades. They have spoken, and I speak today, in this Chamber to let the world know that the people of America have not forgotten their fellow men who are behind the Iron Curtain. The people of this Nation salute the courage and perseverance of those who remain hopeful when the passing events seem so hopeless.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the people of the world, that the people of this nation cannot and will not be complacent nor satisfied until all peoples are given the opportunity for a life under a free and just form of government.

Historical Sites—Preserve Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to note to my colleagues a marked increase in the efforts of citizens groups to preserve historical sites. After years of crying in the wilderness, preservationists are beginning to be heard. The excerpts from two newspaper releases confirm this:

Savannah (Ga.) News, December 28, 1961:

Plans for special legislation to create a historic zone in downtown Savannah to preserve the heart of the city were disclosed yesterday by Mayor Malcolm Maclean.

The proposal for legislation, reviving the long-discussed plan, was submitted to the mayor by the Historic Zoning Committee of the Trustees of Historic Savannah Foundation, Inc.

St. Paul, Minn., as quoted from the Little Rock (Ark.) Arkansas-Democrat, January 4, 1962:

As a safeguard against possible destruction of landmarks in urban renewal projects and in construction of industrial plants, expressways and parking lots, St. Paul, Minn., has

a committee making a survey of historic sites.

I wish to recommend the reading of the latest issue of Historic Preservation, the quarterly of the National Trust for Historic Preservation. Historical sites and urban renewal is the general theme of this issue. Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall is quoted as stating:

New York is not alone in suffering from the ills of the supermetropolis. In varying degrees, megapolis poisoning has become a national syndrome. The cure does not lie merely in prescribing more operations on the face of America. Let us be content to look at our age. * * * The time has come to provide machinery in our laws for the automatic preservation of such historic sites when they fall into the surplus or unneeded category; that provision be made, not for their sale, but for their addition to our great system of national parks and memorials, or their transfer to independent groups or patriotic organizations which have an interest in their preservation for time and generations to come.

Articles in the newspapers this past week have taken note of the fact that the Liberty Bell is being repaired but it will not be rung again. A number of factors, including the touching of the bell by millions of visitors to Independence Hall, have combined to silence the ringing of the bell whose famous inscription reads:

Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto the inhabitants thereof.

We must make every effort to preserve the great symbols of America's heritage. I believe that it is no more progress, in the American sense, to destroy a previous monument erected to American freedom, than it is to chip away at the foundations of our Constitution. It is with these thoughts in mind that I include a speech entitled "Historical Sites—Preserve Them," which was delivered by me at the Boston College Economic and Educator's Seminar:

HISTORICAL SITES—PRESERVE THEM

What we are basically concerned with here today is the preservation of the American tradition.

The problem before us is the perpetual emphasis in the American tradition by keeping before our people the massive, historic relics of our past.

This means buildings rich in historic sentiment and inspiration.

This means battlefields that tell the story of sacrifice and hold up examples of patriotism and honor to our youth.

It means, above all, an atitude of mind that keeps these monuments and mementos of our past in reverence and esteem.

In our respect for the grandeur and the glory of our past rests our survival for the future.

The project is, of course, a national project.

But history and geography have come together to make certain areas of our country especially rich and abundant in mementos of the American tradition.

Boston and its environs is one of these areas.

In our State we have a sensitivity and an awareness that makes us keenly and particularly conscious of the character, the stamina, the independence, the rugged patriotism that gave us birth as a nation. It is this awareness that we want to share with the whole country and indeed with the whole world.

With this in view I put all the resources of my office as the Massachusetts Congressman from the Eighth District behind Federal legislation to keep alive in our people the magnificent image of their past. And it is with this motivation that I sought to make so plain and clear the portrait of America before the world, that our enemies would find it doubly difficult to distort the true meaning of our country before the people of all countries.

As I see it, a major weapon in this incredible cold war—especially in the contest for the minds of men—is the preservation of the visual and inspiring evidences of our history as revealed in the ennobling architecture and places of our history.

Thus it was that I introduced three major pieces of Federal legislation to give effect and meaning for this purpose.

I hope with all my heart that my purpose is your purpose.

What are these measures?

The measures rather mundanely are called H.R. 5983, H.R. 5984, and H.R. 5985.

Taken in their totality the bills of course are national in their scope. The Congress of the United States—which must decide upon their passage—is representative of our whole country.

Yet I do not seek to deny that their benefits may be said to be, in some outstanding respects, local. And for that I do not apologize.

I point out that while Boston is one of the major beneficiaries of these bills—and the areas around Boston—my bills do ample justice to other areas, edifices and places that should receive Federal attention in order that the ruthless hand of so-called progress may not reduce to rubble and oblivion our great national landmarks, wherever they may be.

The idea is to perform a national service for the American people and for freedom everywhere at a moment in history charged with crisis. The idea is to make the American people themselves, conscious of their immense contribution—in free institutions—to the civilization of the West. The idea is to thwart the propaganda that defaces the picture of our country before the world. The idea is to prevent visual, living, documented proof, some of it in brick and stone, in hill and squares and heights and halls—in churches and statehouses—in homes and military sites, that freedom was for the American people always the inner soul of their being.

Not only would our own countrymen see and learn and understand from these truths expressed in stone and mortar, and locale, but visitors by the millions from abroad, would come to know the elementary truths of our tradition.

That is and remains my principal purpose.

Thus specifically there is the bill designated as H.R. 5983 introduced in this 1st session of the 87th Congress. This is the bill that seeks to provide for the preservation of buildings in the Nation's Capital which are of historic and cultural importance. Through this bill we shall see preserved some of the influence of George Washington in shaping the architectural destinies of our National Capital. The Founding Fathers lived and thought and planned on the grand scale. And the structures this bill seeks to keep for posterity give proof of a grandeur of mind that explains the beauty of our Capital.

That's bill No. 1.

Bill No. 2 is H.R. 5984. In this bill I aim to amend the Historic Sites Act of 1935. This bill seeks to provide for the preservation of buildings of regional or local historical or cultural significance. It too, as in all kindred legislation, has some other provisions. Counties and cities throughout the country will be asked, by the Secretary of the Interior, to furnish him with a list of historic sites, buildings, and objects which possess value as commemorating or illustrating the history of such county, city, town, or surrounding area. Certain agencies, private as well as governmental, are asked to participate in making determinations as to the historic or cultural value of the sites and places itemized. After public hearings the adjudication will be made in accordance with the 1935 act.

The bill declares—I quote: "It is the sense of the Congress that such list should be consulted with respect to all projects throughout their planning stages, and to the maximum extent practicable, all sites, buildings, and objects contained therein should be preserved."

Bill No. 3 in this three-sided legislative effort, is H.R. 5985.

This, too, is simple, brief, direct—and, it seems to me—effective.

This bill amends the Public Buildings Act of 1959 to provide for the preservation of federally owned buildings which are of historical, architectural, or cultural significance.

All this bill does is check the thoughtlessness that relegates distinguished Federal buildings—that have historic meaning—to the crudities of the buildings wrecker. It covers Federal real property in all the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. The bill protects historically desirable properties in any of these areas from being declared surplus property or otherwise sold or knocked down or discarded, until the Federal Administrator under the Federal Property and Administrative Service Act of 1949, shall have taken into consideration their historical, or architectural significance.

That's the status of this legislation as I speak.

I wonder if you will agree with me that what this legislation seeks to do: The preservation of the American heritage, is in fact a prodigious educational endeavor. We are not collecting museum pieces. We are not consolidating the Nation's real estate holdings. We are not providing entertainment and picnic grounds.

We are, ladies and gentlemen, preserving American history.

I believe it is no more progress, in the American sense, to destroy a precious monument erected to American freedom, than it is to chip away at the foundations of the Constitution of the United States.

There is no statistic to me so frightening, so dramatically appalling than the statistic that came to me the other day.

This is the statistic that one-fourth of the historically important buildings in existence in the United States in 1941 have been destroyed. What lends an unbelievable sense of indignation to this fact is that this destruction was done designedly by programs and projects financed either in whole or in part by the Federal Government.

This, it seems to me, is a form of cultural suicide.

For even an enemy in war to burn the Capitol of the United States and put the White House to the torch has been counted as infamy by many generations. Yet lesser symbols are as precious in the making of a nation and their destruction by our own hands an offense against ourselves.

We would never take choice instruments of our freedom, the documents we cherish and that 10,000 people see every day in the Capitol of the United States, and actually, by bureaucratic order, with deliberation, throw them into the fire.

The legislation that I introduced and that I have been talking about will prevent such mistakes.

John Kenneth Galbraith, of Harvard, now our Ambassador to India, speaking more as an educator than an economist, made a comment in the article in the New York Times magazine, in October of 1960, that I find especially to the point. Professor Galbraith

summed up one of the points of view in Adam Smith's work "Wealth of Nations." I quote: "* * * the building and maintenance of 'public institutions' and 'public works,' as a function of the State, was surpassed in importance only by provision for the common defense and the administration of justice. Thus, he ranked immediately after the warriors and lawgivers the builders and architects of his time."

If I had to choose the two places in the United States which should serve more especially as examples of the fervor to preserve our American heritage, the two places are—in my judgment—the city of Boston and its historic environs and the Capitol itself. If we in Washington and we in this State and city hold our unique and irreplaceable relics sacred and holy and forever free from demolition, we shall have set an example the rest of the country will rightly follow. But it is up to us here at the very center of these previous reservoirs of our past to create and emphasize a trend, a respect, a sence of history, that may then become the symbol of a national will.

We must not permit the cold and unimaginative eye of the historically blind to determine the destiny of our great historic monuments. Suppose some people, insensitive to the significance of a historic scene, had wiped out our old statehouse, or Faneuil Hall, or the Old North Church, in the name of progress? What a tremendous spiritual and let at the same time, economic loss our State of Massachusetts would have suffered.

It is up to us, and now is the time to speak up.

The Historic Sites Act of 1935 already arms the Secretary of the Interior, through the National Park Service, with the power to use his office to the ends I have been discussing. The legislation I have introduced merely strengthens his hand. The effect of this legislation of 1935 is extremely pronounced. The current celebration of the Civil War Centennial is made possible in no small part by the work of the National Park Service in preserving high points in the Civil War as war memorials. This is not only educational and extremely worthwhile, but it is not without its intelligently motivated, if wisely handled, economic side. The vicinity of historic sites is one of the most effective processes—visual, graphic, memorable—for studying history. It must be by its very nature 10 times more effective than history studied from a book, however valuable that may be. For if, as a wise Chinese said, one picture is worth a thousand words, how much more impact does the preservation of a historic site have on an open mind rather than a wordy description of the history of the preserved place?

It is my information, predicated upon data furnished me by chambers of commerce, that some $9 billion will be spent by tourists viewing historic scenes of the American Civil War during this centennial celebration.

Nine billion dollars.

Here is a primarily educational enterprise, saturated with historical significance, that provides as a byproduct this highly beneficial and desirable economic good.

All of this seems to me a lucrative and alluring device, apart from the standpoint of the national prestige, for reversing the flow of gold, and returning it or keeping it inside our own shores. There is within our cities and our outer areas so much to be seen, to be recalled, to be remembered, to be revered. The scene of the Boston Massacre just outside the Town House on that memorable day in March 1770, should be a mecca for tourists. This house is probably the most important public building in American history prior to the Declaration of Independence. In saying that, I am quoting from the "Final Report of the Boston National Historic Sites Commission to the Congress of the United States." I could make similar appraisals of Faneuil Hall, of North Square, of the Christ Church, or the Old North Church, of the military significance of Dorchester Heights and Bunker Hill. Nor are we less concerned about the Shirley-Eustis House or Shirley Place, and the Old Corner Bookstore, or Thomas Crease House. Here is the luster and brilliance of the past. You here need not be reminded of the Old South Meeting House and the Lexington-Concord Battle Road. The latter was made the subject of a special report by the Boston National Historic Sites Commission. And the Congress has since authorized, as you all know, the Minuteman National Historical Park in the towns of Lexington, Lincoln, and Concord. These are impressive results and we are all proud of them.

But much more needs yet to be done.

The report I have just quoted mentions historic properties of particular importance and survival value that lie on the fringe of the city of Boston, or in neighboring cities and towns—within a radius of some 12 miles of Boston proper. Some of these precious properties need the strong financial arm of the Federal authority for their maintenance and preservation.

A notable example of a privately achieved restoration that deserves high praise is that of the ancient iron works in Saugus, Mass. This dates back to the 17th century. The modern iron industry made this possible through the efforts of the American Iron and Steel Institute of New York. This industrial manifestation of history is significant becaue it was here in Saugus three centuries ago that "the successful, sustained, and integrated production of cast and wrought iron was first achieved within the limits of the United States."

It happens that my effort as a Representative from Massachusetts is on the Federal level. This is the most important of all fields for the preservation of every form of America. A national pattern of preservation and a national staff and system and standards will in the end prove most efficient and economical. But I plead as much for every facet of government and private endeavor, State and local, to pitch in for the promulgation by this method of all the glories and grandeurs of American history.

That's our central objective: the preservation of the American tradition.

Forty-fourth Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. BECKER. Today we pause to honor the brave people of the Ukraine on the 44th anniversary of their independence. Their freedom lasted only from 1918 until 1920 when it was snuffed out by the forces of Soviet Russian totalitarianism. Since then this conquered land has been a constant reminder of Soviet imperialism and disregard for the nationalistic sentiments of the peoples that border the Soviet state. The experience of the Ukrainian nation manifests the hyprocisy of Soviet claims to be the champion of national self-determination and the advocate of freedom for all peoples that live under colonial rule.

The American people, throughout their history, have been true advocates of freedom for captive peoples. The continued growth of democracy in America is influenced by our defense of freedom elsewhere in the world. If Americans ever close their ears to the cries of others who call out in the name of liberty they will also become insensitive to the threats to individual liberty that might arise in their own communities. Let us pray that this shall never happen because the defense of individual liberty and national self-determination are part of the very heart of the democratic faith which we all affirm. Today we renew our pledge of allegience to the flag of freedom as we stand together in this commemoration of Ukrainian Independence Day.

Farm Price Fixers Are in the Saddle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from an article in the Farmers Union Herald, November 20, 1961, by Mr. M. W. (Bill) Thatcher, general manager, Grain Terminal Association, St. Paul, Minn., and president, National Federation of Grain Cooperatives:

> We also have troubles in the Department of Agriculture. More and more this Department is moving into the field of marketing. Less and less do your cooperatives market your grain. We store grain for you and for the Government but more and more the Government takes grain out of storage and disposes of it in a socialistic fashion.

This quotation bears out my contention that in the midst of the somewhat confusing reports and policies of the present administration, one clear course seems to be emerging in the field of agriculture—an attempt at the Federal fixing of prices.

This is the only way that one can interpret the actions already taken by this administration as they affect agricultural prices and the requests for even greater authority in fixing farm prices.

It is rather an amazing situation which we find in Washington when on the one hand the Department of Justice is prosecuting the electrical equipment manufacturers because they are accused of fixing prices, and yet at the same time the powers of the Secretary of Agriculture are used to do exactly that. Not only that, but he is requesting additional authority to increase his scope of price fixing.

Step by step Secretary Freeman is attempting to destroy even the limited free market for agricultural commodities and to fix prices. Let us examine several examples of this effort:

First. When the emergency feed grain bill was before the Congress, many Congressmen including myself pointed to the fact that farmers were in the midst of marketing their 1960 crop of

corn and other feed grains. There was fear that the Secretary of Agriculture would use the extraordinary powers proposed in that measure to force down the cash price of corn by the sale of tremendous Government stocks on the free market. The Secretary gave pious assurances that he would not do this. He said as follows:

> You may be sure that we will not administer this program so as to reduce the income received by farmers prior to October 1, 1961, from sales of feed grains from the 1960 crop, below that they would have received if this program had not been enacted.

However, as soon as the feed grain bill became law, the Secretary proceeded to sell tens of millions of bushels of feed grains under the pretext that this was corn "threatened with going out of condition." However, any reasonable analysis of the corn that was sold reflects the fact that much of it was No. 1 and No. 2 corn not subject to that threat.

The price fixers have caused the price of 1960 crop corn to be at least 10 cents a bushel below the level it should be—below what the free market would have paid. The price fixers have taken tens of millions of dollars out of the pockets of corn producers.

The objective was obvious—the objective was to break the price of corn in order to drive farmers into the new corn program.

Second. Never at any time has the merchandising operation of all segments of the grain trade, including the cooperatives, been in such great danger. The grain trade, not only has to face tough competition from other merchandisers, but also the greatest giant of them all—the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The grain marketing system in the United States, if allowed to function, is the most efficient of all organizations ever devised in the mind of man. The Department of Agriculture is moving more and more into the field of marketing. As the USDA expands its scope, there is less and less room for the merchandising operations of the normal grain trade, and by normal grain trade I mean both private firms and cooperatives.

The small country elevator who normally sold to a feed manufacturer or to a corn processing plant is being replaced by a Government bureaucrat who can sell corn directly. The assembler of corn is fearful of owning corn because he knows that Secretary Freeman in his anxiety to hurt the corn noncooperator—60 percent of the corn producers—can break the price, and as a matter of fact has already done so. He has forced the market price of corn down to only 58 percent of parity. In his own State of Minnesota he has forced the price down to the lowest in the Nation—83 cents per bushel.

Secretary Freeman goes around the country waving a banner marked "The Free Market Must Be Destroyed." No one—no farm organization—can support a man waving a flag designed for massive Government interference and price destruction.

The Secretary is buying corn at $1.20 per bushel plus interest, plus carrying charges, plus bureaucracy, and selling corn at less than $1 per bushel. What a travesty. For the first time in history we have a Secretary of Agriculture whose objective is to drive the price of corn down.

Third. What has this done to farmers?

First, the prices received by farmers for all commodities during the 1961 marketing year were 79 percent of parity—the lowest in 22 years.

Second, the tremendous outpouring of corn from CCC stocks has forced corn prices down, and now livestock prices are following. The prices received by farmers for livestock items on December 15 were 8 percentage points below a year earlier. The Secretary has said in testimony before the House Agriculture Committee that cheap feed means cheap livestock. Unfortunately, he had accomplished both. Bear in mind that livestock provides 56 percent of cash farm income.

It is about time that the Secretary took stock of what he is doing to the American farmer and the highly delicate competitive system of marketing and merchandising grain. The bureaucrat with an unlimited checkbook should not be allowed to substitute for the private and cooperative grain trade.

We built the greatest agricultural system in the world by producing for demand, now that the Federal farm price fixers are in the saddle we see this magnificent system threatened by a philosophy that advocates producing for Government.

Val Verde County (Tex.) Library Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Val Verde County Library has brought honor and distinction to the State of Texas, by becoming the first library in Texas to be selected as a winner of the annual Dorothy Canfield Fisher Library Award of $1,000, in a nationwide competition.

The award is primarily for outstanding management of a library, and for superior library service to the community. In winning this national honor, the Val Verde County Library in Del Rio, Tex., will receive a framed plaque and $1,000 for use in furthering its service to the public. I personally worked as a student in the library of Sam Houston State Teachers College and in the University of Texas Law Library and have a great appreciation for our librarians, those underpaid torchbearers of our civilization.

The winning of this national recognition for the first time for a Texas library reflects great credit upon the librarian, Mrs. Clyde Bradley; the president of the library board, Mrs. Max Stool; and the board member who prepared the entry, Mrs. E. L. Worley, Jr. Tribute is also deserved by all other board members, the library staff members and interested citizens who worked over the years to build a library that is an invaluable and integral part of the community. Local, county, or city libraries are indispensable tools for both child and adult education. We need better support for them. I salute the dedicated persons in Del Rio, Tex., who have won this award.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix to the RECORD the following articles from the Del Rio (Tex.) News-Herald of Wednesday, January 3, 1962, entitled, "National Award Goes to Val Verde Library" and "Award Announced by State Librarian."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL AWARD GOES TO VAL VERDE LIBRARY

A $1,000 has been awarded Val Verde County Library, one of the 10 national winners in the annual Dorothy Canfield Fisher Library Award, Harry Scherman, chairman of the awards board, notified Mrs. Clyde Bradley, librarian.

A framed plaque and the $1,000 will be presented officially in Del Rio April 8, the Sunday ushering in National Library Week. A distinguished author and some eminent figure from the library or literary field will speak at the presentation. Scherman expressed the hope that a suitable ceremony will be arranged by the library with the assistance of the community and Miss Rosalyn T. Shamblin, acting assistant State librarian in Austin.

The award is given for recognition of management, service and financial need for new books, and has been commended and supported by the American Library Association.

Libraries competing forwarded entries to the State level and subsequently, two entries from each State were entered at the national level. The local library was notified several weeks ago that its entry had been chosen from the State to enter the national competition.

Val Verde County Library's entry was prepared by one of the board members, Mrs. E. L. Worley, Jr.

Mrs. Max Stool, president of the board, praised Mrs. Worley's work on the entry application. "In addition to the forms that she filled out she prepared other information, beautifully written and covering two or three pages, and we feel that was one of the important factors in our winning the award.

"We on the board of the county library feel that the honor and recognition that came with the award are not only to the library but to our county officials and to the community for support of the library. It was this support that made it possible for us to win.

"The work that made the recognition possible began many years ago with a few who started the library from very modest beginnings. They had the vision to see it grown and become an important part of the cultural life of the county. We feel that is a great compliment to our library staff, whose work has been diligent and efficient," Mrs. Stool said.

Mrs. Bradley expressed great satisfaction at the award, as did board members and County Judge Jim Lindsey.

Board members are M. S. Mooney, Mrs. Richard Reordan, Gilberto Cerda, Mrs. Robert McGaw, Mrs. Will F. Whitehead, Mrs. Albert Cauthorn, Ben Woodson, Mrs. Will O. Mills, Mrs. A. P. Haby, Mrs. Fred Harlow, Mrs. Worley and Mrs. Stool.

Libraries considered for the award must serve a population of fewer than 25,000; must be housed in a building capable of providing shelf and display space adequate for a substantial number of additional books; must be open to the public 5 days a week, including some evening hours. The community must support the library adequately and make active use of present facilities. It must serve all of the community, regardless of religion or race, free and no application was considered unless it was endorsed by the State agency having jurisdiction over the library concerned.

More than 50 of the libraries entered met the criteria established and were considered at the final level.

Top award of $5,000 went to the Jenkins Public Library of Jenkins, Ky.

Other libraries receiving $1,000, in addition to the Del Rio library, were Chapel Hill Public Library at Chapel Hill, N.C.; the Canastota Public Library of Canastota, N.Y.; the Lincoln Public Library of Lincoln, Mass.; the Josephine County Library of Grant's Pass, Oreg.; the Wilson Public Library of Wilson, Okla.; the Dakota-Scott Regional Library System, West St. Paul, Minn.; Mill Valley Public Library of Mill Valley, Calif., and the Oconee County Library at Walhalla, S.C.

Scherman wrote, in announcing the local award, "It is my very great pleasure to tell you that Val Verde County Library has been selected to receive one of the 9 supplementary $1,000 Dorothy Canfield Fisher Library Awards for 1962. The board of directors and the executive staff of the Book of the Month Club join me in extending our warmest congratulations to the Val Verde County Library and to you as its librarian."

The Dorothy Canfield Fisher award is made annually. It was established by the Book of the Month Club in 1959 as a memorial to the woman whose name it bears in recognition of the critical need of small libraries for funds to buy books.

AWARD ANNOUNCED BY STATE LIBRARIAN

AUSTIN.—The Val Verde County Library in Del Rio is one of 10 national winners of the annual Dorothy Canfield Fisher Library Award, Texas State Librarian Dorman Winfrey said today.

The award is given for recognition of management, service, and financial need for new books.

The award, $1,000, will be presented in a formal ceremony planned for April 8 in Del Rio, Winfrey said.

A Matter of Life and Death in Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, one of the saddest human frailties is the failure to appreciate the value of something until it is rare—or more often—until it has vanished.

Today Americans are making a valiant effort to preserve their own vanishing wilderness, many people are alert to the danger, Congress is working on legislation, and much progress is being made.

Unfortunately another great continent, with the most wonderful animal population of all, is in imminent danger of losing this irreplaceable heritage, perhaps even in the next decade.

Most people, even in Africa, are unaware of the fact that the great herds of zebra, giraffes, lions, and the rest of the fascinating animal life on the Dark Continent are disappearing so rapidly. This fact was substantiated when the German team, Bernhard and Michael Grzimek, performed the incredible task of counting the animals in the great Serengeti National Park.

The search for an all-Africa conservation policy would provide an opportunity for the new African nations to work together peacefully for a goal in which all have a common interest.

The Secretary of Interior, Hon. Stewart L. Udall, has written an excellent article entitled "A Matter of Life and Death in Africa," which was printed in the September issue of the National Parks magazine. In it, he vividly expresses the urgency of this situation, the reasons why we in the United States should be concerned, and what can be done to help the Africans avert this disaster.

Because I feel that this is a matter of great importance I have asked leave to include Secretary Udall's remarks and the editorial comment thereon in the Appendix of the RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

A MATTER OF LIFE OR DEATH IN AFRICA

(By Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior)

(NOTE.—Somewhere last night, a lion arose from his dinner, and mane rippling, strode into the red night sky. A hyena barked once, barked more softly, and then sighed silently as the evening's cool touched the earth under him. A hippopotamus' gray folded eyelids closed in nocturnal oblivion, and even the ubiquitous cuckoo made no sound. The teeming life of the veld spent last night as it has millions of nights before, in motionless slumber among the grasses.)

We men never cease to be awed by the natural world, by animals living untouched by the booms and bricks, the speeches and straws of our own civilizations. Many of us have never seen the great grasslands of the African Continent; but we want to, and should we never realize the opportunity, we hope our sons and daughters will one day "stand silently as the setting sun makes the veld red with fire."

Perhaps we remember our own continent as our grandparents have described it to us, unfenced and with buffalo, antelope, and timber wolf living where God and evolution had placed them. Settlers were too quick to think that earth was made for them alone rather than for all creation; and, too late, we their descendants realize that we will never know those irreplaceable forms of life.

The wilderness and wildlife resources of the world are part of mankind's natural heritage. They belong to no man, neither to keep nor destroy, but are life's gift to all. Too often men, in their ignorance, have made a wasteland of the planet that Astronaut Alan Shepard looked down upon in awe not long ago to exclaim: "It is beautiful"

Nowhere in the world is the future of wildlands and wildlife more uncertain than in continental Africa. Africa's great plains of mammals are no less fragile, no more everlasting, than were ours of a hundred years ago. Africa's population is exploding as is the rest of the world's, and more people means ever more land necessary for homes and crops. People often appreciate something of value only when it has become rare—and more often and sadly, when it has vanished.

Africa is far away, its natural resources known only sketchily, and often inaccurately, by the rest of the world. Even those working most closely with African resources find staffs too small and research too incomplete to be accurate. For example, it had long been assumed that the vast Serengeti National Park in Tanganyika held more than a million head of thriving wild mammals: lions and cheetahs, Thomson gazelles and kurdus, wildebeest and giraffes. Not until Bernhard and Michael Grzimek flew their little zebra-striped plane back and forth in 500-yard strips over the entire vast park, painstakingly counting every animal head, did the world learn that the abundant million is, in fact, only 365,000.

Might this also be true of the wildlife of the Congo? And what about all the other countless herds south of the Sahara? Do they exist in unlimited abundance? Do they exist at all?

Even the establishment of a national park does not assure protection of the natural resources within it. Often, as recently in the case of Serengeti, long after the park has been established it is discovered that the official boundaries do not encompass the annual migratory paths of the animals. There is no way to tell a zebra where it should migrate. It searches for succulent grasses, and goes where they may be found. Outside the park boundaries it is subject to numerous forms of predation, and as long as the boundaries do not cover the mammal's natural paths it can never be assured protection.

Even within the parks and reserves, wildlife cannot be guaranteed safety. It has been said that game preserves "look impressive on maps, and the plans and brochures describing them are a splendid sedative for allaying the fears of European and American naturalist organizations." Authorities usually live too far from the areas they administer and are too few to begin to control the widespread poaching that occurs in the dew of the dawn. The volumes of official regulations governing the preserved areas have never been disseminated nor enforced among the Africans who wander throughout these areas. They scarcely know the regulations, and they most certainly do not understand them.

Africans near the reserves know they can receive a few pence on the black market for elephant ivory, hooves for wastebaskets, and zebra tails for fly swatters; so they cruelly snare and slaughter for illegal recompense. Then perhaps a wealthy white Westerner drives his station wagon of trophy hides and heads through a native village, having gutted the landscape, while at the same time other whites are telling the same Africans that hunting is forbidden. The paradoxes are many, and do not earn respect for white regulations, worthy though they may be.

Western contact, at most, has brought the African an awareness of economic gain, and has little communicated itself in the realm of nonmaterial values. The African has no developed ethic toward the mammals with which he has so long shared the horizon. Poachers can be arrested and forced to pay fines, but punishment seldom helps them comprehend the reason for preserved areas.

It is important that Westerners understand the problems pressing upon the world's rich heritage of African wild lands and wild life. But it is even more important that the people of the continent itself understand the intrinsic values that can so quickly be lost through ignorance or thoughtlessness. We do little for our fellow men if we do not help them become wise before making the mistakes we have made.

Recent events of colonial upheavals, self-determination of African nations, and all the problems and vicissitudes of administrations in their infancy have left little time for cognizance of conservation needs. Yet this

very fact has made obvious the opportunity to begin conserving now, and not lose whatever has been gained through the worthy efforts of the devoted few who have established the present parks and reserves in Africa. New countries have all the more reason to develop and manage their cultural assets. Their mark in history is already being made. What would our impression of Greece be if her ancients had not left the Parthenon for posterity? Would the world not howl now if Athenians tried to tear down the ancient treasure to make room for a new cattle pasture or housing development?

Although wildlife conservation is a matter of ethics and great esthetic appreciation to some, to the present day African it is a matter of practical necessity. The African is struggling to achieve a degree of material development comparable to that of the Western World, but he is generations late in beginning. At this stage he has little time for sentimental values, but these can be preserved as the contemporary African meets his vital economic needs.

It would be a tragic economic as well as cultural waste, if African leadership did not recognize the potentials of its great land reserves. The roving mammals are an unprecedented tourist attraction, which, under careful and proper management, can draw vitally needed revenue. Africans need food, and disease-resistant, protein-producing, indigenous mammals are a far more practical source of this food necessary than imported domestic cattle that are not adequately adapted to the environment.

Africans need the opportunity to learn the reasons and techniques of sound multipurpose wild-land management. Not only are technical experts needed in quantity, but political leadership of the countries, and the people themselves, are manifestly in need of conservation understanding.

Americans should provide Africans with conservation education opportunities and scholarships here, as well as trained faculties and technical experts in Africa. We have given technical assistance and educational opportunities to Africans for direct economic development, but America has much more to give than just the knowledge of how to create dollars. If Americans lament that their "image" abroad is too materialistic, and continue to miss the opportunity to help Africans understand and preserve their wildlife heritage, they can only blame themselves.

Right now there are more than 3,000 Africans, potential social and political leaders of the emerging nations, studying in American colleges and universities. Ten of them were recently selected for a pilot program, sponsored by the African Wildlife Leadership Foundation, Inc., the Afro-American Institute, and the National Park Service, to travel to Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks in order to have a study experience of what the national parks are, and what they mean to the American people. Our parks are one of the finest manifestations of the values of democracy, and these young leaders are having the oportunity to work closely with the ranger staffs and to know the daily routine of national park interpretation and protection. None of these students is now planning a career in park management, but they will be educated citizens, making decisions in their countries, and will at least have some understanding of park values.

This is only one step. Many more need to be taken to insure that future generations may one day "stand silently as the setting sun makes the veld red with fire."

EDITORIAL COMMENT: NEW APPROACH TO A CRITICAL PROBLEM

In an article appearing in this issue of National Parks magazine, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall points up the grave threat which now hovers over many of the great mammal species of Africa—the elephant, the white rhinoceros, the mountain gorilla, the zebra, the giraffe, and many other fabled representatives of a once-rich African faunal life. Secretary Udall discusses how a beginning has been made, albeit on a small scale, in driving home the need for a sound multipurpose wildlife management program in Africa while there is still wildlife left to manage.

A further approach to the problem of preserving at least a representation of many endangered large animal species of Africa has recently been made in the formation of a group, headed by U.S. Tax Court Judge Russell E. Train, of Washington, D.C., which will attempt to raise money to send African students to American colleges for the purpose of studying conservation. Only thus, the group feels, can the indifference and the apathy of many Africans toward a vanishing part of their natural heritage—and indeed, toward a substantial source of desperately needed tourist money—be overcome.

The African Wildlife Leadership Foundation, as the recently formed group is known, hopes to obtain financial support throughout the United States. It has already made its first grant—to Perez Malande Olindo, 22-year-old native of Kenya, East Africa, one of the great game areas of the African Continent. Olindo will study biology and wildlife conservation at Central Missouri State College.

For the large mammals of Africa, the hour is late; a fact that was recognized by Judge Train when he noted that the odds on the success of such an African conservation program were terribly long. Nevertheless, it seems quite clear that a program of this kind represents the last chance for survival for many of the large African mammals, so important both esthetically and scientifically. Every sensitive person, whether conservationist by title or not, will hope that the new organization's work will prosper.

P. M. T.

Benedum Foundation Vice President David D. Johnson Addresses Ground Breaking Ceremonies for Benedum Student Union at Davis and Elkins College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on October 31, 1961, my home city of Elkins, W. Va., was witness to another memorialization of one of our State's most famous sons, the late M. L. Benedum, the great oil wildcatter.

On that day, Davis and Elkins College held ground breaking ceremonies for the Benedum Student Union which is being constructed under a grant from the Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation established by M. L. Benedum in honor of his son. The Student Union center will be another instance of Mike Benedum's devotion to the State of his birth and dedication to education and to the advancement of opportunities for our young people.

The ceremonies, which were presided over by Dr. David K. Allen, president of the college, were the occasion for a challenging and inspiring address by David D. Johnson, vice president of the Benedum Foundation and a longtime friend of the late Mike Benedum, in which he evoked the character and personality of this noted pioneer and philanthropist. Because the qualities of Mike Benedum are a valuable exemplar for all of us, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD excerpts from the address of David D. Johnson.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS OF DAVID D. JOHNSON, GROUND BREAKING CEREMONIES, BENEDUM STUDENT UNION, DAVIS AND ELKINS COLLEGE, ELKINS, W. VA., OCTOBER 31, 1961

I was privileged to serve 34 years as personal counsel for Uncle Mike (Benedum), and, in consequence, became intimately acquainted with his manifold business and philanthropic activities. These circumstances have provided a vantage point from which to speak on the human side of my hero. You may well ask, What made him tick? What precepts and traits combined to form his character? As Lord Macauley once said of a departed friend: "He was, above all, a man of character."

Celebrated by the facile pen of Sam Mallison, his biographer, in "The Great Wildcatter," fittingly portrayed in oil by the genius of famed artist Douglas Chandor, the Mike Benedum saga is more than a twice-told tale in this company. In the circumstances, it would seem appropriate to forego a biographical sketch in favor of a glimpse of his magnetic personality.

In the "office family" he was affectionately known as "the chief," an apt title, for when the inevitable shadows fell he had completed 60 years of active service as the head of the so-called Benedum-Trees Organization. Confidential advisors were aware of those rare occasions when he exhibited a mild degree of mulishness and contentiosness, but he was never the curmudgeon. Weighed in balance, his minor imperfections became insignificant when contrasted with his preeminent virtues. Among the ancients these virtues included (1) wisdom of prudence; (2) courage or fortitude; (3) temperance; and (4) justice or righteousness. And we should remember that St. Augustine considered charity as the source of all virtues.

Thus armed, he presented excellent title deeds to eminence.

Throughout the days of his years he remained a courteous gentleman, to the manner born, if you please. In Mr. Benedum's early life it was an act of simple courtesy—vacating his seat on a crowded train in favor of an older gentleman—that launched him into the oil business where he won fame and fortune. When ever was better exemplified the wisdom of the ancient adage, "It's the little things that count"?

At home, and in the office, in fact, everywhere, he was allergic to solvenly housekeeping. He came to the office, immaculately groomed, and at 5 o'clock, after handling soiled and dusty oilfield maps the livelong day, departed, still spotless. Quite obviously he subscribed to the proposition that cleanliness and godliness are close kin.

In all my circle of friends, there were few with a gentler spirit, a kinder heart, or with more patience and courage in time of adversity. With him, patience was indeed a virtue.

An inquiring mind, optimism, vision, daring, and perseverance served him well. Almost daily he would expound new, novel, and flashing ideas which he tried out "for size" on his close friends and associates. In this situation there was always the sneaking sus-

picion that one's own IQ was being quick-scored. I can bear witness to his extreme patience with stupidity. Exacting with equals but tender with subalterns spells compassion in my lexicon.

On the human side he regarded surplus wealth as a sacred trust to be shared by his fellowman, and throughout life generously practiced what he preached. By 1944, as always, he was still looking ahead. Then, in the 76th year of his age he formed a charitable foundation in memory of his only son, Claude, who had fallen victim of the horrible flu epidemic of 1918, while in the service of his country. The foundation was designed to permit the continuation of his benefactions after he had gone to rest.

Although the present and future directors of the foundation are free to exercise their own discretion in the conduct of its business, they are and will be well aware of the pattern of giving established under Mr. Benedum's personal direction during the first 15 years of operation. Certainly today's ceremonies provide ample evidence that the foundation is honoring his lifetime interest in his native State and the education of its youth, and his adherence to Christian teachings.

Throughout life he retained an unshakeable belief in the old virtues—hard work, thrift, and free enterprise, meaning the profit and loss system. He stoutly maintained that the man who carried the heaviest load developed the strongest legs. He abhored idleness. At 90 he had never considered retirement. He knew that spiritual side of work: the elation that comes from the successful completion of a task. Having contributed so importantly to the technological advances of our times, he enjoyed fully the fruits of his labor. He kept his thinking up to date. He abandoned "creekology" and embraced geology. He employed modern equipment throughout his organization.

Modern aviation intrigued him. Twenty years ago he predicted that one day man would circle the globe in less than 24 hours. Then, as now, no one can argue with a prophet. However, with new speed records being registered with great frequency, it is now theoretically possible to circle the globe in less than 12 hours. In earlier years he was an avid baseball fan, and included among his circle of friends were the great Honus Wagner, Max Carey, and innumerable other diamond stars of a former generation. During winter vacations, deep-sea fishing off the coast of Miami Beach, Fla., was a Tuesday and Friday must. In the last year of his life he was seriously flirting with the notion that a helicopter would come in handy for quick trips between home and Bridgeport and home and office. At home, he was always the perfectionist in the role of genial host.

Sometimes his friends were amazed and often disturbed by instances of rare courage. Two striking examples are indelibly engraved upon my memory.

The first relates to a west Texas venture in the early 1920's which resulted in the discovery of a major oil reservoir, known as the Big Lake oilfield, on University of Texas lands. Oil men of that day spoke of this great, barren section of the State as the graveyard of the oil industry. Its remoteness, its scarcity of water, its lack of transportation, and its dust storms and heat made it a forbidding country.

There the university owned more than 2 million acres which it offered for lease. But no one wanted them. No one, that is, except my favorite pioneer in the search for oil. This venture meant an initial outlay of more than one-half million dollars. And in this vast area, the Big Lake oilfield was discovered.

To date it has produced in excess of 100 million barrels of oil. This discovery presaged other West Texas discoveries, including the fabulous Yates field, another Benedum wildcat venture with an estimated ultimate recovery of 1 billion barrels of oil. Thus, West Texas became "oil country." It was, no longer, a graveyard.

Little wonder that today in Austin one occasionally hears the University of Texas referred to as "the schoolhouse that Mike built" for it has received literally millions of dollars in royalties from university lands. (Today the permanent fund of that distinguished schoolhouse is more than $350 million.)

The interest of Mr. Benedum and his associates in this venture was represented by their ownership of stock in Plymouth Oil Co., which controlled the major portion of the Big Lake field. For 37 years Plymouth paid regular cash dividends under the able and vigorous management of Walter S. Hallanan, another nationally known son of West Virginia. Thus it is no exaggeration to say that Mr. Benedum and his friends also prospered from this venture in courage.

The second example of courage had its genesis in a 1919 corporate reorganization from which Mr. Benedum and his former secretary, Foster B. Parriott, received slightly more than 1 million shares of Transcontinental Oil Co. stock in exchange for the properties of several moderate-sized oil and gas companies in which both were heavily interested. In the same critical year of 1919, Transcontinental made a new oil discovery in Comanche County, Tex., which for a few months was considered a major oil field but later proved to be an extremely white elephant. Before the elephant reared its ugly head, Transcontinental stock reached a high of $65 per share on the New York Stock Exchange.

Between 1919 and 1930, Transcontinental stock plunged to a low of $1.50 per share. During the same interim, the Treasury Department retained an eager interest in the 1919 consolidation, but it was not until 1930 that the Government finally concluded that the transaction was taxable, and by using $65 as the "per share" value of 1 million shares, plus interest of 11 years, arrived at the astronomical sum of $79 million as the tax liability of Benedum and Parriott.

Mr. Benedum retained his boyhood friend, John W. Davis, Democratic presidential nominee in 1924, as chief counsel to repel this unwarranted assessment.

With Mr. Davis in charge, a detailed memorandum was prepared containing a factual story of all the transactions relating to the formation of Transcontinental Oil Co. Whereupon, Treasury Department officials, realizing the unfairness and weakness of their position, suggested a conference regarding compromise. At this compromise meeting with the Under Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Davis suggested that an offer of $400,000 might be made by his client. The Treasury representatives seemed to feel that a $500,000 offer would be favorably received. Thereupon, Mr. Davis telephoned his friend, Mike, in Pittsburgh, and recommended that a compromise offer be made.

Mike countered with: "John, do you think any tax is due?", to which Mr. Davis replied: "No, I don't. But a prolonged lawsuit will involve the outlay of a million dollars or more, and, as you know, the outcome of litigation is never certain."

The next voice heard originated in Pittsburgh. Translated and expurgated the answer was crystal clear: "Not a dime."

There followed the prolonged lawsuit. The Board of Tax Appeals found the 1919 merger taxable, but fixed the value of Transcontinental at $7 instead of $65 per share. That finding reduced the tax and interest liability of Messrs. Benedum and Parriott from $79 million to $9 million.

By then the depression of the 1930's reached low ebb, times were tough all over, and Messrs. Benedum and Parriott were in no mood to liquidate a significant portion of their lifetime accumulations in order to satisfy what they considered an unjust tax claim. Accordingly, they appealed to the Third Circuit Court in Philadelphia. That court, reversing the Tax Board, held that no tax was due. Thereupon, the Government asked the U.S. Supreme Court to reinstate the Tax Board's judgment.

After two separate hearings before the highest Court in the land, there finally came on March 29, 1937, a long-distance telephone call from Washington, D.C., to Miami Beach, Fla., announcing a tax-free decision.

Thus, after 7 long years of litigation, his position had been vindicated. Apparently the outcome was never in doubt in Mr. Benedum's intuitional scheme of things. He was approaching his 70's, good humor and elation were in high gear. He said nothing except: "Let's go fishing." It was a good afternoon on the ocean blue. That day, there was laid to rest an ordeal of 18 years' duration. And courage was again triumphant.

It is with a proud heritage that West Virginia approaches her centennial in 1963 in a century, however, which has placed the human race on trial for its very life.

Nevertheless, in the expectation that the world will not commit suicide, her magnificent tradition, expressed in her seal, "Montani semper liberi," will be carried on by her youth, thus armed and informed.

Commencement Address at North Kingston High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address which I delivered at the North Kingston High School commencement on June 9, 1961:

REMARKS OF HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE, SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND, AT NORTH KINGSTON HIGH SCHOOL COMMENCEMENT, FRIDAY, JUNE 9, 1961

Distinguished guests, teachers, parents, friends, and members of the graduating class, a very wise man once said that the trouble with most speakers at commencements is that they feel called upon to sound learned and end up by being too long. What I have to say to you concerns a few simple truths which my own experience of public life leads me to believe should be stressed in our State and Nation today. And you may rest assured that I intend to express them briefly. After working for their diplomas for 4 years, the graduates deserve not to be kept waiting much longer.

I would, however, like to take just a moment to exercise the privilege of extending my personal congratulations to each and every member of this class, and to their parents. As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for Health, Education, and Welfare, I have heard a great deal of testimony about the problems of our youth and our schools in these complicated modern times. And I have devoted much time to the formation of programs of legislation which are designed to help in meeting these same problems. We need to know what is wrong in the life of our schools and our youth so that we may take practical

steps to overcome our deficiencies. But as we look at this fine school and this graduating class, we can also be thankful that so much is right with our schools and our youth.

All who have had a part in making this occasion possible—teachers, parents, and the good people of this community—have a just share in the congratulations which are traditionally extended to the graduates. Our whole educational system, from the elementary schools to the universities, is a fundamental part of the defense system of American freedom. And the high school is one of its most vital links. Studies, like the famous Conant Report, have made this very clear, and today we have a better knowledge than ever before of how important it is that all of our young people should take the fullets advantage of improved high schools. Far too many drop out, and far too many—in some parts of the country—do not have schools that are adequate to their needs.

Here in North Kingstown the members of this graduating class have persevered in their studies and are now prepared to begin a new phase of their lives, either in institutions of higher learning or in the business and industrial life of our State. That is how it should be in every American community, and I am happy to be able to join with all of you in saying "Well done" to these graduates, who represent so much of our hope for the future.

That future depends upon all of us working together for a better, stronger America. What is so often said to those who are graduating, applies to our whole country today: we cannot afford to rest upon our past accomplishments. We must look to the future together, putting aside outworn group distinctions and antagonisms. We must rediscover the common responsibility of our American citizenship.

The members of this graduating class have been well trained by their teachers so that as free citizens they will in the very near future exercise enlightened judgment on public questions as full members of our democratic society. Such phrases as "We, the people * * *" or "Government of the people, by the people * * *" are still fresh in their minds. These are not new ideas to any of us here, but the trouble sometimes is that they are so familiar that we forget to take them seriously.

The privilege and responsibility of the Government of our democracy does not belong to any one of the many ethnic groups that make up America. The common good of all, and the cause of freedom itself, cannot be well served when citizens permit political life to become a self-interested competitive struggle between ethnic factions.

Those who founded this Republic repudiated the old idea that government was the limited field of a special group. They rejected the notion of distinctions based upon birth and blood. Just a few years ago, in the Second World War, thousands of Americans gave their lives fighting against the Nazi doctrine of a so-called master race.

The most fundamental feature of the American system of government is the belief that every citizen, without regard to his birth or ancestry, should participate in the process by which the community is governed. This goes beyond the idea that a career in politics should be included among the opportunities open to all in American life. It means that the responsibility and the dignity of every citizen must never be threatened nor neglected, either through the tyranny of group domination or the failure of individuals to assert and exercise their proper roles in the tribunal of public opinion. It has been well said that the character which each one of us brings to the office of citizen is the crucial test of the ability of our Nation to survive.

Mr. C. Scott Fletcher, president of the Ford Fund for Adult Education, put the issue well when he said: "Let us ask ourselves a vital question: Are the American people using our power in the service of the cause of freedom as effectively as the Soviet people are being used to achieve the goals of the Soviet state? The answer is "No." Most of us in our private and public roles, through our various organizations and institutions, serve our ideal only by fits and starts, with only a small fraction of our attention and energy."

One of the greatest proofs of the way in which we are not serving the democratic ideal to the best of our ability can be seen in the extent to which we allow group prejudices to govern our affairs.

Looking at our country and the world today, with its newly independent nations groping for direction, the late John Foster Dulles said: "Racial discrimination in the United States is our greatest national scandal and our most dangerous international hazard." I believe that if in racial discrimination we include group prejudices of every kind, we can heartily agree with these words of a great Secretary of State.

Recent events involving racial violence in the South have made dramatic headlines. It is evident that we still have a long way to go in winning the battle for the most elementary civil rights for all of our citizens. I am happy to be identified with legislation to help bring about this, but we all know that legislation alone is not enough. Prejudices based upon race, creed, or ethnic origin do not yield to law or to reason. They can be overcome only by a fundamental change in the hearts of men. A great writer of the last century summed the matter up when he said that the greatest single need of modern society is "the consciousness that our well-being, both material and spiritual, lies in the growth of brotherhood among all men and in their harmony with one another."

This may sound very idealistic, but I believe that without the struggle to reach such an ideal on the part of all Americans, the essence of our goal as a free people will be lost. It is a direct contradiction of the whole spirit of the American Revolution and the true meaning of our history when group prejudices are, for example, permitted to dictate the choice of candidates for public office.

Anyone who takes the trouble to study the course of our national growth can see how the evil of groupism has grown up among us. Each succeeding wave of immigration, from the earliest colonists to the most recent arrivals, helped to build this country's greatness. Yet the newest group of immigrants, wherever they came from, always tended to be looked down upon. Seeking freedom from tyranny and want, they were, at first, willing to accept low wages and perform the most menial tasks, just for the privilege of living in America.

Here in Rhode Island, early in this century, laboring men and their families who had come here from abroad experienced housing segregation and many other social restrictions. It is no wonder that group differences based upon language, religion, and national origin developed. The various ethnic groups were, in effect, forced into competition with one another. They had to seek recognition by the combined force of their numbers.

The America of those earlier days was sometimes described as a "melting pot" of all nations. There was necessarily a good deal of heat and friction generated by the melting process, but as we look about us at the modern scene, I believe that we can say that we have reached a stage where the heat of group conflicts and competitions must be steadily diminished by a greater and more mature sense of our national unity.

Our influence abroad, especially among the newly developing nations, will be measured to a great degree by our ability to attain this sense of national unity at home. And our national defense itself cannot be separated from the firm foundation which such unity alone can provide.

Even the conquest of space cannot be regarded as of greater importance than the conquest of the unreasoning fears and competitive suspicions which create conflicts between ethnic groups in our own land. Here is a civic responsibility which no good American can rightly avoid. It rests upon those of us who are directly responsible for the conduct of public affairs. But it is equally the concern of every citizen, and especially of those who, like the members of this graduating class, will guide the destinies of our State and Nation in the future.

Young people today are being called upon to volunteer their energy and their skill for the work of the Peace Corps, and I certainly hope that some of you graduates have given this matter your most serious consideration. But I would like to suggest that each one of you is needed, in whatever work you may undertake, to join the company of men and women of good will who are doing all that they can to promote peace, justice, and a true fraternal charity among all Americans.

We need young people who are not indifferent to those areas of conflict where the democratic ideal of the common brotherhood of men is being tried and tested in American life today. Of course, we need mature political leadership which will not consider ethnic origins as a basis for determining fitness for public office. But political leaders are, of necessity, responsive to the expressed will of the people. For that reason, I believe that we will be well on the way to overcoming the injustices of group discrimination only when the majority of the people make it clear that they intend to vote for or against candidates on the basis of their records and abilities rather than on the basis of who their grandfathers happen to have been. We cannot be ruled by our ancestors. We have to govern ourselves in the light of our own best judgment.

There is, of course, a sense in which each of us should respect and value the national origins from which his own family may have come. If there are some things in the past which are better forgotten, we all have something of which we can nevertheless be justly proud. When the King of Belgium addressed a joint session of Congress last year, he remarked that America is not so much a melting pot as it is a mosaic, "for in it each nation, people or race which has come to its shores has been privileged to keep its individuality, contributing at the same time its share to the unified pattern of a new nation."

The beauty of any mosaic arises from the arrangement of each of its many pieces. Where one piece is missing, the design is broken. But the practical strength of the mosaic is in the cement which holds all of it together. We in America need and desire the rich variety of the distinguishing features of the various ethnic groups in our population. But in the mosaic of our national life we also need to make sure that the cement of American unity, which binds us all together, is not only strong but kept in good repair.

I am, as I feel sure each one of you is, justly proud of my own ancestral background. I have never thought it necessary or proper for any American to lack respect for the traditions of his own family or the accomplishments of other nations with which he has ties of blood. By the same token, I would have an equal respect for the traditions and beliefs of others and seek to improve my understanding of them.

It is in this mutual respect and understanding that all Americans must come together to meet the issues of our times. I am greatly encouraged by such things as

the work of the Women's Conference on Intergroup Relations here in Rhode Island. This group, now sponsored by 66 organizations of Rhode Island women, will be holding its second annual meeting at Brown University this coming Sunday and Monday. The integrity of communication between groups is of the very heart of democracy, and that is what these Rhode Island women's organizations are seeking to achieve. As one of their leaders put it, "If we can establish lines of communication, we can break down some of the barriers."

Whenever in the past our country has been attacked by a foreign enemy, all of us have put aside ethnic distinctions to defend this good land. The bombing of Pearl Harbor, for example, was a simple challenge which all could understand. What we must get firmly in mind now is the fact that the complex operations of communism all over the world are, in the last analysis, no less of an attack upon all that we stand for and believe in. This means that the process by which old group prejudices are being overcome must be greatly speeded up. Whatever divides Americans deeply against one another cannot but serve the cause of their enemies.

The members of this graduating class will, we all hope, grow to the fullness of maturity in a country where their opportunities will not be dependent upon ethnic distinctions, a country made strong against every adversary by the inner harmony of all its many people. They themselves can help to make it so by their own efforts and attitudes, but all of us must share that responsibility, not only with them but with all the young people of America. More than ever before, our country today needs the best that each of her children can bring to her. Let no barriers of group prejudice bar the way. The well-known words of Lincoln carry the same simple truth today; the house we live in must stand united if it is to stand at all.

Ukrainian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am most anxious to join many of my colleagues in the House in commemorating the 44th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine, which was attained in January 1918 but has been lost to these brave people under the tyrannical heel of the Soviet Communist Government for many, many years. The fact is obvious that we do not have to go beyond the Soviet Union's own borders to find people who are truly enslaved. Thus, for these many years, the Ukrainians have been a "captive nation" within the Russian borders, and the leaders in the Kremlin are well aware of the restless spirit and the great desire for liberty which smoulders unsatisfied in the hearts of the people of the Ukraine. I think it is right that we Americans should point up to the world the fact that the people of the Ukraine are enslaved. Khrushchev and his cohorts behind the Iron Curtain do not like to be reminded that all is not well in their own backyard; our reminding them of their misdeeds is a positive stroke in gaining the offensive in the cold war, and we should do so at every opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the people of the Ukraine soon will know once again the joys of liberty, and the bountiful rewards which come with freedom. In the spirit of our country's Founding Fathers, we should strive to this goal in the service of enslaved men everywhere. To do less would be to neglect our responsibilities as the leader of the free world.

Humphrey "Yes" Halleck "No"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as I have commented before on a number of occasions, the local papers in my district have acquired a well-deserved reputation for clear, thoughtful analyses in their editorial comment. It was with a great deal of interest that I noted a recent editorial in the La Grange (Ill.) Citizen Opinion entitled "HUMPHREY 'Yes' HALLECK 'No,'" which I wish to insert into the RECORD:

HUMPHREY "YES" HALLECK "NO"

Via television during the past week two prominent Members of Congress expressed opposite opinions regarding Congress acceptance of the old age medical care under social security financing.

Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, emphatically stated that the King-Anderson bill will pass both the Senate and the House. Congressman HALLECK, Republican floor leader, not so emphatic but still giving assurance he is convinced, says the legislation will fail passage.

HUMPHREY in his cock-sure prophecy of victory said "the majority of the people want it." That is a generalized conjecture, matching the generalized unsupported statistics quoted glibly by welfare state supporter HUMPHREY and others who fail to see, or are willing to support, the socialism philosophy in this legislation.

The confidence of the Minnesota Senator is based on the belief that this being an election year, and there being some 12 million oldsters among the voters who might benefit from the medical-care bill, that the legislators will be stampeded to support it.

The national chairman of the Democratic Party has classified the King-Anderson legislation as the most attractive issue in the 1962 campaign. This is a forthright admission that the bill is for political advantage, not for the advantage of the Nation.

That we need not give up individual freedom and choice to assure that all the aged will be assured proper medical attention was proven again this past week at the joint meeting of the American Hospital Association and the Blue Cross Association.

The medical men introduced a new concept into the problem of medical care for the aged. Whether or not it is sound, or motivated to bolster Blue Cross the plan deserves serious consideration. It should be explored and the promoters given a chance to produce solid statistics supporting their idea.

The haste in expressed desires to have the King-Anderson bill passed this session of Congress indicates that the supporters are not anxious to have their program thoroughly analyzed and that they have no desire to let present programs prove they can solve the problems. And solve them more efficiently, with benefits to all instead of only a segment of senior citizens, and without giving up our basic concepts of individual freedom.

Presently there are more than 100 different guaranteed-for-life health insurance policies and plans for people in or approaching retirement. The policies show a range in premium costs for a man age 65 from $60 for basic hospital-surgical benefits to over $200 a year for more comprehensive coverage.

In group type policies, a person 65 or older, without medical examination and for a premium of $78 to $108 a year can receive hospital room-and-board benefits for as long as 31 or 60 days, as well as additional benefits.

Under the King-Anderson social security tax bill, the benefits are limited, and also are restricted to social security clients. Persons most in need of medical care and unable to meet costs would not be benefited by this legislation.

Medical care under the King-Anderson bill has an attractive sound, and a utopian promise. But not even the promise can be fulfilled, although the cost will be greater financially and in giving up freedom of selection of who is to perform the medical service, and where, and even how.

Right To Express Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an unusually cogent and forceful expression of the right of university and college faculty members and staff to express their views as private citizens. The statement was circulated among the faculty and staff of Portland State College in my home city of Portland, Oreg., by the president of the institution, Dr. Branford P. Millar. I have known Dr. Millar for several years. I admire and respect him not only as a college administrator but also as a learned man and a man of impressive personal traits. I believe this statement of his reflects my summation of Dr. Millar and is worthy of circulation among the colleges and universities of the land at this time, especially when the rightwing groups are renewing their attacks on academic freedom.

The letter follows:

PORTLAND STATE COLLEGE,
Portland, Oreg., December 8, 1961.

To Faculty and Staff:

In the past few months, there has been a notable increase in criticism of faculty members by persons outside the college. This has come in the form of direct criticism of individuals themselves and also of complaints to administrative officers. Most of it derives from the noisy and virulent clatter of extreme rightist groups, pinning the labels of Communist (dupe) and traitor on those who do not subscribe to their sometimes hysterical dogmas. The company of those who have been indicted in this way,

as you know, includes many honorable men, and it would be surprising if an academic community did not come under this attack, since its members are likely to think independently and speak articulately.

Lest there be any doubts about the position of the college, faculty should be assured that their right of free speech is one that the college takes for granted. Each member has the right to speak his thoughts and opinions, to communicate his general and specialized knowledge as freely as he wishes outside the college, as long as he does not put himself in the position of appearing to speak officially for the college. Within the classroom, traditionally he speaks with a degree of objectivity, in an attempt to illuminate matters of partisan interest with knowledge and viewpoints providing broader perspective and an increase of understanding. Outside the college, these obligations and restraints do not apply, and he may speak more freely; he acts as a private citizen and has no obligation to the college for his opinions and actions. As a private citizen he may make important contributions to the life of the community by virtue of his knowledge and experience, and may exemplify to the community the vital force of the intellect—of learning and rationally considered values—upon practical affairs. In doing so, he will reflect credit upon the college, and the college places a value upon such activities.

For such reasons, and because the individual has the right no matter what the college's views, the college takes for granted that members of the faculty will continue to speek freely as private citizens, and that the college defends this right and has in mind no tests of conformity or popular approval. The college's administration will also continue to reject any criticisms from outside the college which attempt to interfere with this right or to discipline the individual. The college's simple requirement upon its members is the devotion of fitting attention to their academic tasks and obligations.

BRANFORD P. MILLAR,
President.

Remarks of Hon. John E. Fogarty, U.S. Representative, Second Congressional District of Rhode Island, at Annual Meeting of the Connecticut Association for Retarded Children at Sanford Barn, Hamden, Conn., on Saturday, September 23, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address which I delivered at the annual meeting of the Connecticut Association for Retarded Children at Sanford Barn, Hamden, Conn., on September 23, 1961:

REMARKS OF HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE, SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND, AT ANNUAL MEETING OF THE CONNECTICUT ASSOCIATION FOR RETARDED CHILDREN AT SANFORD BARN, HAMDEN, CONN., ON SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1961

It is heartening to see so many of you here. The fast growth of this movement to help the retarded is one of the inspiring facts I cling to in these troubled times. It gives me hope that humanity, having at last found the right way to cope with this problem, which has baffled mankind through the ages, may also muster the capacity to solve its newest problem: how to avoid destroying itself. The clue to success in both cases, I am sure, is the same—breaking down the barriers that divide us, building up the spirit of brotherhood.

No doubt many of you can recall, as I can, when the retarded child was each family's private—often even its secret—problem. Individually, every parent tried his best to solve the problem. Doctor after doctor was called upon, institution after institution was tried, until at last hope sunk into desperate resignation. There was only one ending to that private, secret road—failure.

It has been little more than a decade that a newer way has been tried on a nationwide scale—the way of cooperation, the way of banding together. Instead of the intermittent pushes of an individual parent against the hard wall of prejudice and apathy, there is now the mighty push of millions.

And the wall is crumbling. Indeed, it has already crumbled. What other area of human endeavor can show so much achievement in such a brief span of time? I can think of none.

The employers who would not consider hiring a retarded person a few years ago find many useful jobs for them now. The scientists who used to think study of mental retardation was a dead end road have discovered it's a superhighway. Classrooms for the retarded are no longer shunned but sought by some of the Nation's finest teachers. The friends of parents of retarded children, who merely offered sympathy, now join this association and give active help. Your influence has even permeated the halls of government—Federal, State, and local.

Perhaps, in fact, one of the best ways to gage the changes you have wrought is in terms of Federal action.

Just 6 years ago, the total investment of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in programs for the retarded was less than $2 million. Last year, it was $20 million. This current year, it will be over $26 million. For many years now, whenever the appropriations committee which I chair is considering these programs, the question I ask repeatedly of the agency witnesses is: "Are you asking for enough?" To the best of my ability, I want to make sure that no important progress is being delayed for lack of money. I believe I can tell you with considerable assurance that, as the potentials for progress increase, so will the funds for realizing those potentials.

Translated into action, what has this Federal aid helped communities and States to do for their retarded?

For one thing, it has helped them to increase job opportunities. Last year, vocational rehabilitation agencies placed 2,900 retarded adults in jobs. This is four times as many as were placed in 1956 and a thousand more than were placed in the whole 5-year period of 1945-50. At the same time, techniques for fitting the retarded and the job are constantly being studied and improved. Your own association has a grant to study the vocational and social adjustment of persons who leave institutions to take jobs in the outside world. Connecticut College in New London also has a grant and is using it to study the personal, social, and economic adjustments of retarded adults who live out in the community. These are just 2 of about 50 demonstrations and research projects that are receiving Federal aid through the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. And even this is a small part of the total effort which employers, unions, schools, and agencies are putting into the problem.

Federal aid has also increased educational opportunities for the retarded. Right now, at Southern Connecticut State College there are two promising students who are getting the training that will qualify them to head programs to prepare more teachers for the retarded. In other colleges and universities throughout the country, there are 160 other students like these two. For the past 4 years, at the rate of a million dollars a year, the Office of Education has been giving fellowships to these teachers of teachers. This means that the number of well prepared men and women whom school systems like yours can obtain for special classrooms will grow at a geometric rate.

Federal aid has increased treatment opportunities. The diagnostic and evaluation clinic at New Haven is one of 83 such clinics now operating in this country and 55 of them are receiving Federal aid from the Children's Bureau.

The field where Federal aid has most conspicuously changed the prospects for the retarded is research. About $10 million a year is now being spent by the National Institutes of Health on research that holds hope for the retarded. Two institutes conduct and sponsor such research. The National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness is supporting 129 projects right now, 2 of the major ones being at Yale University. The National Institute of Mental Health has 98 projects, 3 of them here in Connecticut: 1 at Yale, 1 at the University of Connecticut and 1 at Southbury Training School.

Good research men are at last working on this problem and, as I need hardly remind this group, they are getting results.

The big breakthrough on PKU (phenylketonuria) has opened a whole new vista of glittering possibilities. We may very well find that a rather high proportion of the retarded are the victims of built-in metabolic disorders—like PKU—and that most if not all of them can be corrected by diet.

Similarly, the recent discovery that the body cells of mongoloids have one more chromosone than the cells in normal people has sent researchers hot on the chromosone trail and may lead to answers not only to mongolism but to other abnormalities as well.

I could spend the rest of the evening talking about research because so much is going on in that field. I could talk for hours about the details of the Federal programs I have highlighted. And you, I am sure, could match every one of my stories with equally impressive ones of what your own association has achieved in local programs.

But rejoicing over gains made is hardly the way to assure that additional gains will be made.

The biggest job ahead, as I see it, and the job which only people like you, individually and collectively, can do, is to see that the benefits of prograss are not limited to a few families and their childdren.

This year, 200 babies will be born with PKU and, in the years ahead, they will have brothers and sisters born with PKU. Not until all babies are routinely checked for PKU can we wipe out this dreadful and now preventable defect.

Right now, in this country, there are more than a million people who have diabetes and don't know it. Some of them are going to have babies this year and some of those babies are going to have brain damage. Here again is a tragedy we could prevent. But it won't be prevented until every community is organized to find its diabetics and to give every diabetic and prediabetic pregnant woman the prenatal care that will assure her a normal child.

I have selected these two examples of unfinished business from the hundreds of examples I might have cited for a special reason. I think they point up why this associa-

tion has much to gain by joining forces with other health groups in a broader attack on our health problems.

This is a particularly propitious time to make such an effort because the Congress, just this week, passed a law specifically designed to help you. I refer to the Community Health Services and Facilities Act of 1961—a law which, in my opinion, is one of the most significant pieces of health legislation ever enacted by the Congress.

The purpose of this law is to help communities modernize their basic health structure, a structure that took form 50 to 100 years ago and hasn't changed much since. That structure worked fine when acute and contagious diseases were our prime concern, but it doesn't work so well now that long term, chronic conditions are the big health problems.

What kind of a health structure does the modern community need? My friends in the Public Health Service have a phrase for it—comprehensive health care. By that they mean a system of services provided by private medicine, by health departments, by hospitals and voluntary agencies which is so well coordinated that no gaps of neglect are left.

Such a system would assure, first of all, prevention. Just as every baby deserves a PKU check so does he deserve immunization against polio, whooping cough, diphtheria, tetanus. And when measles vaccine comes along, as I expect it will in a year or so, he deserves that too.

While the list of ills we can prevent is still rather short, there is a much longer list of conditions that can be alleviated if diagnosed early. You well know that the earlier the retarded child is diagnosed the better are his chances for a good adjustment to life. Early diagnosis is just as important for cancer, heart disease and all of today's big killers and cripplers. The modern community health structure is one that assures early diagnosis of all health impairments.

Finally, the modern health structure is one that provides the wide range of special services so many of the handicapped need. I am thinking of visiting nurses; of speech therapists, physical therapists, in fact the whole gamut of special therapists; of dietitians; of homemakers to give a few hours of freedom to those housebound mothers who have patients at home. These and many other types of services would be helpful to all sorts of people who have chronic disabilities, including the retarded.

The new law not only provides grants to States to help get such programs started but also provides project grants. These project grants are available to any enterprising group who want to test out some program that promises to be an important building block in the modern health structure.

Because your association has demonstrated so dramatically how much can be accomplished by pooling your efforts, I hope you will be among the leaders in this movement to coordinate and strengthen the community's total health effort.

The Federal Government, through this new law, makes some useful tools available to you. But, as you know, tools mean nothing unless there are people ready and willing to use them.

I know, personally, that you have some mighty effective tool users here in Connecticut, in fact right in this room. Your State director, Anne Switzer, distinguished sister of a distinguished lady, Mary Switzer, the head of your office of vocational rehabilitation; Bob Williams, your able president—but I should never have started mentioning names. Quite obviously, from your record, you are all good tool users.

They say that success breeds success and if that is true I haven't a doubt that the bright news, in a world that nowadays seems so full of bad news, will continue to be the story of your progress. Keep on proving, by your example, that when men and women of good will band together, with courage and determination, nothing is impossible.

Tax Relief for High Fidelity Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced in the House a measure, H.R. 9548, to amend section 4142 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from the manufacturers excise tax the following high fidelity and television components: chassis, speakers, amplifiers, phonograph mechanisms and phonograph record players.

This measure, Mr. Speaker, was occasioned by reports reaching me from segments of the electronic industry that the Internal Revenue Service was considering lifting in part the exemptions heretofore granted under the act to certain manufacturers of electronic equipment.

It has also been reported to me that the industry has reason to believe that the Government is considering imposing these taxes retroactively and that would probably have extremely disastrous results to the industry, particularly to many small manufacturing plants all over the country that are making an outstanding contribution to the important space-age science of sound reproduction and electronics.

I think that this segment of the electronic industry is in large part responsible for the recent unprecedented advance in sound reproduction that has brought consequent cultural and educational contributions difficult, if not impossible, to measure, since certain recent innovations have sparked widespread interest in quality reproduction of music from records, tape and FM radio.

In addition to current possible tax problems the industry is faced with sharp, and possibly very serious, competition from growing imports from both East and West, that have come about as the result of migration and utilization of new ideas in the electronic business.

The small segments of the industry are also under heavy competitive pressure from larger domestic manufacturers who are able to capitalize on the pioneering efforts of many of the small companies.

The proposed increased tax burdens facing the high fidelity industry comes. it is clear, as a result of proposed new interpretations of sections of the law which were not heretofore anticipated by the industry.

Section 4141 and 4142, IRC, cover the subject matter of these taxes and define the meaning of the term "radio and television components."

The tax has been imposed, not upon all the articles listed in section 4142, but on those enumerated articles which meet the further test of being "suitable for use on or in connection with, or as a component part of, an article enumerated in section 4141, that is, a radio or television receiving set, phonograph, or combination thereof."

The Treasury regulations define an item as being suitable for use within the meaning of section 4142, if it is, first, commonly used with any of the articles enumerated in section 4141; or, second, if it possess actual, practical commercial fitness for such use.

For the most part, the articles involved in my bill are not "suitable for use" because they do not possess actual, practical commercial fitness for use with radio receiving sets, television receiving sets, phonographs, or combinations of these.

The articles manufactured by the members of the high fidelity components industry are by their very nature of such a type and quality as to preclude incorporation or use with the articles enumerated in section 4141. Compared to these taxable articles, high fidelity components are too expensive, too complex, too difficult to install and operate. They also require too much skill to service and are of too high quality and too inherently limited in their applications. It would be commercially impractical to attempt to produce and sell a "package" radio receiving set, phonograph, and so forth, incorporating these articles which are designed and manufacturing for use in high fidelity sound systems.

This has been recognized by the Internal Revenue Service with respect to many of these articles in a series of rulings and administrative actions. The Internal Revenue Service now apparently proposes to revoke these rulings and actions and, in a number of cases, to impose taxes retroactively. In order to spell out clearly the original congressional intent in this situation and in order to prevent a great injustice to those involved, I am introducing appropriate legislation to assist this small industry by clarifying the intent of the present law.

The high fidelity industry is made up of some 45 or 50 small companies which employ, on the average, about several hundred employees. The industry has been in existence only since the end of World War II. The equipment it makes is designed, produced and sold primarily for radio broadcasters, experimenters and high fidelity enthusiasts.

The high grade, high precision, technical equipment has brought the science of sound reproduction to a point formerly considered commercially impossible.

Many advances in sound reproduction appearing in "package" radio, television, phonograph and combination sets now reaching the large consumer market can be directly traced to the pioneering done by these small companies in the high fidelity components industry.

While the so-called "package" industry, benefiting from the work of these small companies, has been enjoying unprecedented sales, the components in-

dustry is struggling for survival. In addition, there is a vigorous competition within the high fidelity components industry itself—a look into the early issues of High Fidelity magazine, published in Massachusetts, presents evidence that many fine names in the industry have already disappeared.

Thus, the small components manufacturers are faced with fierce domestic and foreign competition, by all the growth and financing problems characteristic of small business and by accelerating technological change in electronics.

To top it all, this small industry is harassed by these proposed new and adverse tax interpretations. This situation is compounded, so the industry states, by inability to obtain definitions from tax officials of "radio receiving set" as listed in the law, despite general agreement on such definition among technical authorities, the minutes of previous congressional committee hearings, and common usage within the industry.

As recently as 1958, the tax-free status of the magnetic tape recording manufacturers was safeguarded by the Congress. Committee reports indicate that this congressional action was motivated by the fact that tape recorder manufacturers were suffering from a competitive disadvantage.

The committee reports on Public Law 367, enacted in 1955, show that it was the intent of Congress to tax only those radio and television components that were sold as repair and replacement parts for radio and television receiving sets and phonographs.

It is indicated that sales of these articles, from which the tax would be removed, for repair and replacement of radio receiving sets, phonographs, and so forth are virtually nonexistent. Therefore, the revenue loss would be negligible. In addition, the taxpayer would be relieved of the burden of paying taxes on articles which the Congress never intended to tax and the Internal Revenue Service would be relieved of the burden of interpreting the statute.

The effect of my bill would be to make the intent of Congress absolutely clear and plain with virtually no financial sacrifice to the Treasury. Actually, my bill may increase tax revenues over the long run by preserving this small industry and allowing it to continue making the innovations which continue to create mass interest in better music reproduction with resulting revenue gains from taxation of set manufacturers, as set forth in the law and as intended by Congress.

I urge early consideration of this meritorious measure and hope some appropriate clarifying solution may be found.

The text of H.R. 9548 is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4142 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended to read as follows: "As used in section 4141, the term 'radio and television components' means cabinets, tubes, power supply units, and antennae of the 'built-in' type, which are suitable for use on or in connection with, or as component parts of, any of the articles enumerated in section 4141, whether or not primarily adapted for such use."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall apply with respect to articles sold by the manufacturer, producer, or importer on or after January 1, 1955.

Tributes to the Late Dr. Roy Bedichek, Texas Naturalist and Philosopher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Roy Bedichek, who died on May 21, 1959, was one of the great naturalist-philosophers of our time.

Roy Bedichek was known affectionately as "Mr. Bedi" by many of his friends and admirers and was often referred to as "the most civilized man in Texas." I treasured my friendship with Roy Bedichek for many years and was priveleged to have his counsel and support in governmental effects for a progressive democracy.

A reissue of his famous book, "Adventures With A Texas Naturalist," has been published by the University of Texas Press and will be treasured by readers of nature and by collectors of good reading, because copies of the 1947 edition had become scarce in recent years. With this reissue, the University of Texas Press has rendered another service for human understanding.

Mr. Bedichek's book has been reviewed by J. Frank Dobie, one of the leading literary scholars of Texas and the Nation, and by Lon Tinkle, an outstanding literary critic of the southwest. His work has also drawn the praise of W. D. Bedell, the talented writer and assistant executive editor of the Houston Post. They catch the spirit of Bedi that we who knew him loved.

I request unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the articles referred to Dr. Bedichek, his book, and his life.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Houston Post Sunday Magazine Dec. 17, 1961]

MR. BEDI'S RIPENED WORLD

(By W. D. Bedell)

If you were exiled from Texas and had to carry everything Texan with you in the international airline weight limit, what would you take?

Memories, mainly, of course, for memories have no physical weight. I would take the memory of an eddy in the Upper Neches at dawn and of the Window in the Chisos Basin at sunset, the memory of a sleepy morning on Highway 87 above High Island and of a brisk morning in the Panhandle, the memory of corn growing in June sun on a redland sidehill and of midnight snow in a Wichita Falls January, of the old and gone main building at the University of Texas and of the new and present Rice Stadium—a million memories.

The weight would be devoted to paper with the power of evoking memories about Texas—my personal copy of the This Is Texas Edition of the Houston Post, Sunday, January 30, 1955; a new Humble highway map of Texas; a 1961–62 paperback Texas Almanac.

Chosen from 100 or more, there would be as many other books as the 33-pound limit would allow. At least three are definite: J. Frank Dobie's "A Vaquero of the Brush Country," his first and most genuine, if not his best; George Sessions Perry's "Hold Autumn in Your Hand," an imperfect book by an imperfect man, but a book which put down as none others have done some of the emotions of life in Texas in a significant time; and Roy Bedichek's "Adventures With a Texas Naturalist."

I would be lucky to have Bedicheck's book, because it has been hard to find lately. But now the 1947 Doubleday book has been republished from the original plates by the University of Texas Press (Austin, $4.50).

The only changes are a foreword by H. Mewhinney of the Post, a list of small errors, and some marginal notes from Bedichek's personal copy, put down before his death in 1959.

Mewhinney's tribute makes very clear the value of Bedichek and this best of his books:

"Perhaps we loved Roy Bedichek mostly because, in an age of small and incomplete men, he was a full and ripened man.

"Mr. Bedi was a man who could look at a rose and remember what Homer and Herodotus, and Ausonius, and Herrick had written about roses.

"That quality made him a larger man than most of his contemporaries.

"For it is the curse of this century that most men, no matter how clever or accomplished, have little background either in nature or in art. They have never milked a cow, dug a post hole, skinned a squirrel, or heard the dogs tree a coon. They have never read Homer or Herodotus or Plato, or even Xenophon."

Roy Bedichek did all these things, and many more, before he wrote, and his bigness shines from every page of his book. It was there 14 years ago when it was new, and it will be untarnished 100 years from now.

Bedichek's chapter on "The Wing of the Swallow" is an example. In it he tells of the adaptation of the Mexican cliff swallow to the works of nature and of man. It is a drama of courage and patience of which a bird is the hero.

His description of a swallow's flight has the power to arouse a million memories in a million Texans:

"There is a silent music in the swallow's flight. He soars in still air or rides a vast commotion in front of an approaching storm with equal ease, grace, and enjoyment. He can hover, soar, dash, plunge, and play with air currents as much a master of his element as a trout in the churning water of a mountain stream.

"In late afternoon the swallow lingers even after sundown, as if loath to give up the fast-fading daylight for darkness in the tiny cavern where he must spend the night. It is in this farewell-to-day or twilight flight that he is at his best, rising now on an upward- moving current of air to higher and higher levels swooping, pulling out of the dive with a flexing of the wings which lifts him on the momentum gained nearly to the level from which he plunged—drifting, resting for a moment, and then repeating his routine, tracing time and again, but always with slight, spontaneous variations, those graceful lines against the sky. It is hardly ever a solo performance. Swallows associate in loose groups, as if enjoying their skyey sport together.

"Finally night drives them in. The show is finished and the stage is cleared. You recall and try to trace out some element, at least, of the involved pattern, but you are

soon lost in its intricacies. A musician who is also a birdlover tells me that in his memory a flight of swallows in the twilight sky tends to become something heard, not seen, more musical than graphic."

"Adventures With a Texas Naturalist" is full of authentic, timeless observations like this. It is unhurried, unlimited. It is bigger than Texas, bigger than one man, bigger than birds or flowers or trees or mountain ranges.

It is a book dealing in values beyond dollars—the value of the State's highway right-of-way in preserving plants, the similar value of the railway rights-of-way, and of fence lines and lanes, the value of Texas' artificial lakes and tanks for wild as well as domestic animals, the value of these things of nature not only in recreational terms but also in terms of the spirit.

It is most of all a book written by a man rare for the middle 20th century, a man who took the time to look around him and see what counts and what doesn't.

Reading it, you slowly come to realize that "Adventures With a Texas Naturalist" is less about Texas than it is about the same thing of which Shakespeare and Thoreau and Isaiah wrote—man in all his moods.

[From the Houston Post Sunday Magazine, Dec. 17, 1961]

ROY BEDICHEK: FLEAS TO PLATO

(By J. Frank Dobie)

He saw a great limestone slab that the root of a hackberry tree had pushed up and held firmly. The pushing process had begun maybe a half century back when a prospecting rootlet found a crevice to enter and, inching forward unflaggingly, at last came to a deposit of lifegiving soil 10 feet away from its starting point. This observation, here abbreviated, of the enormous effect of hackberries over thousands of years in breaking up limestone is but one among hundreds of illuminations that compose "Adventures With a Texas Naturalist," by Roy Bedichek.

Here's another: "Down in the pasture I see at this moment cowbirds at the nose of a grazing cow, feeding along on insects which the beast is flushing from their hideouts in the grass. I once found myself in association with hundreds of swallows on the same unilateral basis. The birds swarmed about me, darting uncomfortably close to my head in their ambition to be on really intimate terms with an animal of another species. When I stopped, they stopped; when I moved on, they played along with me. I was flattered by this attention, but a prosaic explanation of it arose when I noticed that my feet moving in the high grass started thousands of small and, to my eyes, almost invisible insects flying over the bluff. Since the swallow is not equipped to go after his insects in the grass, he welcomes assistance from any lumbering, big-footed land animal that happens to come along, man included."

It is news that Bedichek's "Adventures," out of print for some time, has just been republished—in pleasing format with a fine index at the modest price of $4.50—by the University of Texas Press. I wish some such book opening windows on the ground I belong to and arousing healthy curiosity about all things both great and small had been available when I, as a boy, always got books—good books—for Christmas. It is the kind of book that enlarges experience whether remembered or yet to come. It is a book to open eyes. Dear Roy Bedichek died in May 1956—the very day a contract to publish his last book, "The Sense of Smell" was in the mail for signing.

His talk was full of reminiscences drawn from life and literature, all impregnated with humor, wisdom, tolerance and also righteous indignation. Friends accustomed to being regaled by it often pled with Bedi to write an autobiography. He always replied that he lacked the Rousseauian genius for self-revelation. For all that, he could, like Whitman—the "poet of democracy," as Bedi called him—expose his soul. I myself can't make a hair-trigger distinction between mind and soul. Minds are interesting and bodies may be beautiful and enjoyable; souls are for heaven. I leave them to such experts as Cardinal Spellman. Anyhow, Bedi's mind played on any subject brought up—from fleas to Plato. I never forget his quoting the cowboy who said he didn't mind so much what the fleas ate as their tromping around.

He was a Texas naturalist in the sense that he began life in Texas, lived, voted, laughed, groaned, cussed, cried, observed in Texas, belonged to the Texas soil; but if anybody was ever "debtor both to the Greek and to the barbarian" it was Bedi. He had the perspective and ripeness that can come only to an intelligence grounded in the humanities. As Hubert Mewhinney, sagacious guardian of the English language sums up in a foreword to this new edition, "Perhaps we loved Roy Bedicheck mostly because, in an age of small and incomplete men, he was a full and ripened man. He loved nature first, as Landor put it in the famous quatrain and, next to nature, art. Art, for Mr. Bedi, was something that began with Homer and not with Aldous Huxley, or Ernest Hemingway, or Erskine Caldwell. Nature was the world around him."

Anybody curious as to the flow of Bedichek's talk can get a sample—somewhat constrained, it is true—from a chapter entitled "Cedar Cutter." It starts out with his philosophy of camping. The most companionable of men, he found his own company interesting and thought that one purpose of education is to enable people to enjoy their own minds. He liked to camp alone sometimes. "A stationary camp is quickly cluttered up. Stay too long or return to the same camping place too often, and the inevitable encrustation appears. You fix up a cupboard, install a bench between between two trees, improvise a table. These and other little conveniences may be nothing more than a few pimples, but they indicate that the disease of civilization is setting in. You had better be on your way again; otherwise, you may build a camp house then a summer home, then neighbors, and eventually find yourself right back where you started."

From theory on camping, the argument proceeds to consideration of a great oak under which he camped. On a walk out from it he heard strokes of an ax. Soon the binoculars picked out the chopper, tall, naked to the waist. "After a dozen strokes or so, he leaned heavily on a tree, his chest heaving. As soon as his breathing quieted a little, he resumed his chopping, slow, steady, and accurate to a hair." It turned out that he was 86 years old and had been chopping cedar posts in the region for 76 years. He was afraid to quit; his 89-year-old fellow chopper had quit—only to be taken to a hospital to die.

From this picture Bedichek proceeds to speculate, with help from the Greeks, on a nudist colony of fleshless, muscleless, wrinkled old men and women. The chapter concludes: "As I finally turned back toward my camp under the shadow-troubled live oak, the sound of the cedar cutter's ax became fainter and fainter, until it seemed to be an echo loose in the lonely cedar brake. Chop-tick, chop-tock, steady, slow, and then brief silence. Again, a dozen strokes or so and pause; until finally I could hear it no more."

How Bedi loved to discourse on tonic, flavorsome foods, to cook them, eat them. "Washing dishes disturbs my post," he says, not banality of that banality of all banalities. "When my fireplace had accumulated a supply of good clean ashes, the pot-and-pan annoyance was considerably relieved. Roasting peanuts, potatoes, and eggs in the campfire is a part of the lore of boyhood. I was surprised, however, to find the wide range of food which yields graciously to this primitive method. Cabbage, cauliflower, broccoli, indeed, all commercial species of the cabbage tribe, except collards, may be disinterred from a 2-hour burial in the fireplace, steaming and savory, with every jot and tittle of the original vitamin and mineral content readied for assimilation. Roasting ears, apples, sweet potatoes, beets, carrots, all succumb delicious to the steady heat of properly banked coals and ashes.

"It's simple. Wrap your vegetable about in plenty of tough, wet paper, nest deeply in a hollowed-out bed of coals and hot ashes, cover and tamp, and go on about your work. Two or 3 hours later rake your dinner out of the hearth, disengage the parched wrappings, transfer to plate, season to taste. After your meal, sweep up the hearth, wash plate, knife and fork, and take a nap."

The earth man named Bedichek will go on living in this wise, ripe book.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Dec. 24, 1961]

READING AND WRITING: BEDICHEK WISDOM IS AGAIN AVAILABLE

(By Lon Tinkle)

For Texans who really like to read and who are at all reflective, the most welcome book of the year will be the new reissue of the late Roy Bedichek's masterpiece, "Adventures With a Texas Naturalist." And if you are a newcomer to Texas, you will glean from this wise and strong book why that Austin trio of friends—Roy Bedichek, J. Frank Dobie, and Walter Prescott Webb—have exercised such dominion over the intellectual life of the State.

You may not know the little birds from the little flowers and not even care to, but still you will find in "Adventures With a Texas Naturalist" a ripe mind seeing in all relationships the human significance. When he writes here, delightfully as he does, of the habits of the mockingbird, Bedichek is assaying also one kind of human temperament. When he speaks of the waste from washed-away topsoil, of upsetting nature's balance, of the virtues and vices of walls and fences, Bedichek is commenting on man, the human condition.

His prose is modest and seemingly without art. And then you discover that this man who paid profound attention to everything writes like an angel.

The story back of Bedichek's book, first published in 1947, is well known. His knowledge of Texas flora and fauna was legendary. His notebooks were massive and monumental. When he was 70, some of his friends—primarily Webb and Dobie—got some money together for him and seemingly coerced him into taking a year off to write a book. Bedi, as he was called, moved out to Walter Webb's famed Friday Mountain ranch near Austin, set up his books and notes and moved his camping equipment inside the big stone house—and came through brilliantly. Two printings of the book were soon exhausted. Now the University of Texas Press offers it in a handsome edition, with the wonderful Ward Lockwood illustrations, and with two important new features.

One of these is a brilliant preface, written in flawless prose, by a longtime Bedichek friend and admirer, H. Mewhinney of the Houston Post. The other is an appendix of Bedi's list of emandations from Bedichek's marginal comments, made in handwriting, on a copy of the original text. The latter occupy only a few pages, but reveal Bedichek's unfailing dedication to precision and his near absolute good taste in matters of style.

Mewhinney's preface makes the point that Bedichek was a humanist and viewed the contemporary world from the vantage point of a real mental soaking in ancient culture. Bedichek saw relationships and knew that man loses half his worth when divorced from nature. He was not merely capable of precise scrutiny of what he observed so scientifically, he was capable of large syntheses of imagination. In this sense, he was a poet in the Greek sense, as Aristotle understood the word.

We once asserted publicly in Austin that Bedichek and Webb and Dobie are all poets in their blend of closest observation with imaginative linking of one fact to another. Several professors of English shouted us down. Perhaps the Greeks, who esteemed almost equally the knowledge of life they got from Homer and Sophocles and Socrates and Herodotus and Xenophon, might have been sympathetic.

Certainly, anyone who reads this book will see that Bedichek's primary concern was for wisdom and its use in the conduct of life. And there is no complete wisdom that ignores man's daily rhythmic relationship with nature and the land. It's all in the sense of continuity, man, in continuity. Poetry, finally, is what we do not forget when we have forgotten everything else.

Bedichek could not forget the ultimate harmony and cooperation that exists in the world of nature, the courage to endure and the capacity for renewal. Nor could he forget the senseless cruelty, of animal to animal, of man to animal, of man to man. As he describes, in fascinating detail, the devouring of a stupid frog by a too small snake, he is not advocating a Rousseauistic return to nature, but merely understanding. This is how things are, he is saying, and we had better know how things are.

One example: he has a good deal to say about fear in animals. He thinks the young are born without fear, but develop it through imitation of the parents. The colt pulls up short of barbed wire because he has seen his mother do so; the kitten spits at puppies because mama did it; the wolf cub snarls in imitation of its elders when any other animal approaches. This leads Bedichek into wise comments on education and human psychology.

Whether he is discussing the soaring power of the golden eagle, the engineering skill of cliff swallows, the pride of roosters, the virtues of eggs formed from a chicken diet of bugs and earthworms, the lip muscles of goats, the communal feeling among hogs—on whatever topic, Bedichek is precise, charming, and humanly illuminating.

Ukrainian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, the independence of the Ukraine which we celebrate is far different from that of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic of today. The farce of the establishment of that state for a vote in the United Nations sympathetic with the Soviet Union is apparent to no one more than the Ukrainian people themselves. Domination by the Soviets has been more brutal, more intent even than that of the czars. But, like that of old Russia, it is merely superimposed.

The state of independence which we honor was short lived; it lasted but a few years after World War I, but it was real; and it was the expression of that true independence of spirit, of culture, of superior economic and political development which had characterized the Ukrainians for centuries. The separateness of this people and of their area in the western part of Russia was marked by and envied for its superiority. From far back in history their civilization, based upon rich resources and an ability to develop them, had been much closer to that of Western Europue than to that of the Russian hordes that overran them. They never succumbed to Russification except nominally. Nor have the Soviets been able to eradicate either the spirit or the hope of true independence. That we salute.

Electrical Energy From Shasta Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the Bureau of Reclamation and the Shasta Dam Area Public Utility District, which is in the Second Congressional District of California, concluded a contract permitting the district, an agency of local government, to continue to serve its community with dependable, reasonably priced electrical energy generated at Shasta Dam.

The Senator from California, CLAIR ENGLE, has expressed quite well my thoughts and those of the people in the vicinity of Shasta Dam concerning the ironic situation where the people living in the shadow of one of our greatest reclamation projects were experiencing difficulties obtain electrical energy from that project.

I respectfully request that Senator ENGLE's letter to the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior, and an editorial published January 15, 1962, in the Sacramento Bee be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., January 23, 1962.

Hon. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

DEAR "STEW": Please read the enclosed editorial from the Sacramento Bee on the Central Valley project power contract recently executed with the Shasta Dam Area Public Utility District. I want you to know that I feel exactly the same about this contract.

It has the merit of continuing direct service to a public customer that has had direct service from Shasta Dam for 15 years; it eliminates the overload on the small Toyon transmission line; it follows the pattern of standard Reclamation power contracts in other areas; it is the least expensive way for the Government to serve the district and for the district to serve its customers; thereby saving money for both taxpayers and ratepayers—all without any Federal appropriation for construction.

I congratulate you and your staff and the district officials who worked it out.

With best personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

CLAIR ENGLE,
U.S. Senator.

VICTORY IN SHASTA

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall's action in signing a contract with the Shasta Dam Area Public Utility District should end that agency's long fight to get electric power directly from Shasta Dam.

The contract permits the district to build a transmission line from the Government's generating plant and to buy power on a 1 mill per kilowatt-hour discount basis, which is the same wheeling fee paid the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. for carrying power on its lines.

As Government contracts go this one is for peanuts. The line will be about 10 miles long and will cost around $180,000. The amount of power it will tap will be only a drop in the bucket compared with the total Shasta hydro output. But the principle is a big one.

The Shasta Dam Area Public Utility District, which includes the tiny communities of Central Valley, Project City, Toyon, and Summit City, has had to fight for its life every step of the way against the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. and the private power lobby in Washington, D.C.

Citizens of these communities built the first line themselves but as the population grew so grew the need for a larger power allocation and bigger facilities. Federal funds for the line were included in the budget in 1959, but were withdrawn when the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. offered to wheel the power for a price.

Tiring of waiting for congressional action, the citizens took steps to do the job themselves. For their courageous battle and for their way of pulling themselves up by their own bootstraps, they deserve a round of applause.

Resolution 334 of the Council of the Borough of Tarentum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the request of various communities within my district, I am presenting for the RECORD a copy of the resolution, No. 334, passed on January 16, by the Council of Tarentum. Like resolutions have been received from other districts. I believe that this is a very serious matter and one that should have the fullest consideration and cooperation on the part of the administration and legislative branch of the Government.

RESOLUTION 334 OF THE COUNCIL OF THE BOROUGH OF TARENTUM REQUESTING OUR CONGRESSMEN TO SUPPORT THE CONSTRUCTION OF A WATERWAY TO LAKE ERIE BY WAY OF ALLEGHENY-KISKI VALLEY

Resolved by the Council of the Borough of Tarentum, That the council request of Hon. JOSEPH S. CLARK, U.S. Senator, and Hon. HUGH SCOTT, U.S. Senator, and Hon. JOHN H. DENT, U.S. Congressman, and Hon. ROBERT J. CORBETT, U.S. Congressman, that they use the powers of their respective offices to influence the construction of a waterway from the Allegheny River to Lake Erie via

the Allegheny-Kiski Valley area in lieu of any other route to said Lake Erie for the reason a water route from Allegheny River to Lake Erie would be a more natural waterway, would prove to be more economical in all respects, would promote the industrial growth of the area involved and as a result would tend to provide a much needed growth in employment as a result of the foreseen industrial growth.

Section I. That the Secretary be directed to send copies of this resolution to all parties concerned.

Resolved this 15th day of January 1962.

BOROUGH OF TARENTUM,
By LAWRENCE ALTMAN,
President of Council.

Attest:

WILLIAM G. CLARK,
Secretary.

Examined and approved this 16th day of January 1962.

JOHN F. ALTMAN
Mayor.

Administration's Cigar-Smoking Lady Lobbyist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, apparently the New Frontier has the first cigar-smoking lady lobbyist in history. She is Mrs. Jim Grant Akin, the congressional liaison officer for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The article describing Mrs. Akin's activities and habits appeared in the January 21 edition of the Washington Post in an article by Marie Smith, as follows:

FROM CIGAR-SMOKING LADY LOBBYIST PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S PROGRAM GETS HEFTY PUSH

(By Marie Smith)

A petite, peripatetic Texas blond who smokes midget cigars and carries a midget camera wherever she goes is pounding the corridors on Capitol Hill to sell President Kennedy's legislative program.

Jim Grant Akin—named for her late oil millionaire father of Dallas—is congressional liaison officer for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. But she calls herself a lobbyist for the White House.

She is 1 of a task force of about 50 liaison officers from the various departments of Government who contact Members of Congress regularly about the President's legislative program, learning what they will accept if they won't vote for every item he has requested.

Twice a month the force meets at the White House with Larry O'Brien, special assistant to the President for congressional relations, to report on the voting moods of the Members they contact.

Jim, who is pushing 15 bills requested by the President and 15 major measures sponsored by HEW, is the only woman in the group and O'Brien usually begins his talks with "Mrs. Akin and gentlemen."

As a result of these meetings, the administration knows where each of its measures stands with Congress at all times.

Throaty-voiced and witty, Jim Akin talks to both Democrats and Republicans alike in a frank, straightforward manner that goes over big with the Members, most of whom she knows on a first name basis.

"I've never had one who wouldn't talk to me," she said, adding that she asks them "outright how they are going to vote on a special measure."

If the answer is negative or hesitant, Jim sits down and talks it out with the Congressman to find how far he (or she) will go in supporting the President.

Her bailiwick is the whole House of Representatives and specifically the important Ways and Means, Education and Labor, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees.

She said she knows the members on Education and Labor best because she traveled to Russia last year with some of them and learned firsthand what "strong personalities" they are.

"If I were not in Government service, I'd like to write a light opera about them," she confessed whimsically.

Jim Akin, whose infectious smile and dimples belie her serious nature, has developed a technique that makes it difficult for a Member to turn down her request for voting support.

She takes time to talk about the Congressman's problems—specifically the mail he receives from constituents and, as likely as not, she goes back to her office at the end of the day with an armload of letters on social security problems for the Department to solve.

"If this is done well on a day-to-day basis, it makes them happier to see me, because the social security cases are very important to them," she explained.

Education is a pet topic with Mrs. Akin, mother of two children, and she makes speeches on the subject at every opportunity. Thursday she addressed a citywide school group in Greenwich, Conn.

She likes to begin her talks by telling about Russia's education system as she saw it on her visit there last year, and she stirred up a storm in Texas by criticizing U.S. and Texas school systems when comparing them with Russia's.

"I just told them that the Russians are creating an educational elite while Americans are so sold on the Cinderella story they are going to fall flat on their pumpkins if they don't pay more attention to education," she said.

"I say no schools in the world are better than the best schools in the United States—but there just are not enough of them," she added.

Mrs. Akin feels confident Congress will pass legislation to aid higher education and provide medical school scholarships this year, but is not certain at this time about the chances for a general Federal aid-to-education bill.

A strong advocate of higher quality in education and tougher college entrance exams, Jim was, herself, a child prodigy who entered the University of Chicago as a political science major at the age of 15. And it was under the liberal atmosphere there she developed an intense interest in politics that has never waned.

From Chicago she went to Southern Methodist University and studied law before plunging into Texas politics. "The only office I've been elected to was precinct chairman," she said, but she's managed campaigns in Texas for former President Harry S. Truman, U.N. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson and Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Jim and her husband, W. B. Akin, an independent oilman, are considered the heaviest financial contributors to the Democratic Party in Texas. And there are rumors she may one day run for the Senate from Texas, Jim does nothing to stop these rumors but meets them with a wry smile and an admission that she'd "rather be a senator from Texas than the King of England."

With a name that has placed her in many amusing situations during her life, she finds it still a source of mix-ups and laughs on Capitol Hill. One day she was stepping off a crowded elevator with Representative JACK BROOKS (Democrat of Texas) when he introduced her to another member of Congress as "Jim Akin from Texas." The Member reached over Jim's blonde head and shook hands with the stranger behind her.

Her frank answer as to why she smokes cigars instead of cigarets is: "I lost an election bet." She adds that it is a good thing she learned to like cigars because she promised in the 1958 election to smoke them until the man she opposed was defeated. He's still in office, and if pressed to identify him, she names BRUCE ALGER, the Republican Representative from Dallas.

If she doesn't snap pictures of Members of Congress when she corrals them in Capitol Hill corridors to talk legislation, she shows them pictures she took with the little midget camera that makes 50 shots to a roll of film.

Her office walls are lined with autographed pictures of Congressmen, but she admits, with a modest twinkle in her brown eyes, "they're there to impress" her staff and visitors.

Mrs. Akin, her husband and their children (their daughter is named James William for her mother and father, and the boy is named John for his grandparents) are avid skin divers in summer and skiers in the winter.

"I'm not sure but what we should give all this up and become professional skiers," she says of life in Washington.

But then she thinks of her job. "It is tremendous and I love it." And she adds with characteristic candor, "I think I'm pretty good—I wouldn't enjoy it so much if I weren't doing a good job."

Mrs. Akin does not like one of our colleagues, the gentleman from Texas, BRUCE ALGER. Any American is entitled to a difference of opinion when it comes to politics, but I think it ill-behooves the Kennedy administration to have as one of its Representatives to the Congress an individual who openly practices political reprisal against a Member. The right to dissent is sacred in our American heritage. Perhaps Mrs. Akin should read some American history.

The following editorial from the January 24 issue of the Dallas Morning News is very much to the point:

CIGARS AND LIAISON

The articulate and determined Congressman from Dallas, the Honorable BRUCE ALGER, came off best, we think, in the cigar episode with Mrs. Jim Akin who parades under the title of legislative liaison officer for the Health, Education, and Welfare Department. The more accurate title is lobbyist for whatever that Department wants out of Congress—which is considerable. Its budget for 1961 was nearly $4 billion.

Mrs. Akin, a sincere and dedicated liberal, naturally does not like the conservatism of Mr. ALGER. It seems that she lost a bet in 1958 when Mr. ALGER defeated Barefoot Sanders and she promised to smoke cigars until the people of Dallas removed the incumbent. Mr. ALGER, in giving her a box, said she'd probably be smoking cigars indefinitely.

Whether Mrs. Akin likes it or not, Dallas seems to like Mr. ALGER. In our representative system, he is supposed to reflect the policies and convictions of those who send him to Congress on election day.

As an individual, acting on her own, Mrs. Akin has a right to unseat Mr. ALGER. If she would like to oppose him, she has until February 5 to file against him. We don't advise it if she's eating three squares a day in her present job.

But as a representative of a Federal agency, she ought to tend to her own business and let the people of Dallas County decide whether they like Mr. ALGER's politics or Mrs. Akin's. There is little doubt, right now, that they prefer the former.

The pressure exerted by the White House and by swarming bureaucrats against Congressmen who won't go along to get along seems to get worse.

The News disagrees occasionally with Mr. ALGER, but occasional disagreement does not mean disapproval. This newspaper admires the courage of his convictions as well as the convictions themselves. He has been true to his promises and has not bent under pressure.

As for Mrs. Akin, this newspaper recognizes she has every right to her political beliefs, but as a Government employee she must exercise those beliefs judiciously.

We trust she enjoys the cigars, whatever the brand, and we would be interested in knowing the reaction of nearby employees when she thinks of Mr. ALGER and starts flooding her office with the fumes.

A Chapter in Nasser's Anticolonial Crusade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues a most timely article entitled "A Chapter in Nasser's Anticolonial Crusade," appearing in the latest issue—No. 59, Winter 1961–62—of Prevent World War III, published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. This is a most interesting review of the immediate events leading up to the recent Syrian revolt against President Nasser's government. However, it is more than a review for it analyzes the basic causes which compelled the Syrians to break away from Nasser's United Arab Republic. The analysis cites impressive evidence that the United Arab Republic was, in reality, an instrument of Nasser's imperialistic designs. Nasser banked on this political setup to further his predatory policies, not only in the Middle East but throughout the African Continent. Syria itself became virtually an Egyptian colony to be exploited by Nasser and his henchmen. There is no doubt, as the article points out, that the Syrian revolt against Nasser has strengthened all peoples in the Middle East who cherish their freedom and independence.

The article follows:

A CHAPTER IN NASSER'S ANTI-COLONIAL CRUSADE

"No one can tell how long the Syrians will tolerate their present status. Certainly, they have a long and proud history of their own. They may regard the Egyptians as their brothers, but it is doubtful that they will accept indefinitely the role of vassal to Nasser."

This was the conclusion of a detailed study entitled "Syria's Plight," published in Prevent World War III (No. 54, summer 1959) and subsequently inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Congressman HOLTZMAN. Within 2 years after those lines were written, the dramatic break between Syria and Egypt unfolded before the eyes of the world.

EARLY DIAGNOSIS

When we originally analyzed Syria's position, we were handicapped by the paucity of information coming out of the United Arab Republic. Furthermore, our difficulties were compounded by the spate of press reports from Middle East "experts" which assured the American public that the United Arab Republic was as solid as a rock and that it was destined to guide all Arabs into a monolithic state under the leadership of President Nasser. These same experts tried to prove that Nasserism was an irresistable force and that it would be the better part of wisdom for the West to seek an accommodation with the Cairo "strongman."

Nevertheless, we were able to assemble sufficient evidence at that early date which showed that the foundations of the United Arab Republic were rickety. For example, we quoted from a dispatch in the New York Times (May 1, 1958) which reported that "the fruits of economic union with Egypt are developing a bitter taste in Syria." It should be borne in mind that this observation was made within a few months after Nasser took over. We also wrote at that time that Syria's political status had seriously declined:

"Politically, the Syrians were put into a straitjacket. Their parliament and political parties were dissolved. The top echelons in the army were purged. This was also true of the Syrian civil service. The Government of the United Arab Republic became top-heavy with Nasser's faithful henchmen."

What had been occurring in this so-called union of equals even at that early date was the Egyptianizing of Syria's cultural, political, and economic life.

Additional information in the following year (1960) strengthened our original estimates. In an article entitled "Misinformation on the Middle East" (No. 56 summer, 1960), we pointed out that the deterioration in relations between Syria and the Cairo government was proceeding apace. By this time, Nasser has virtually destroyed all independent political opposition. To enforce this draconic policy, Nasser conferred special powers on his chief representative in Syria, Marshal Amer. One of the first measures taken by Nasser's proconsul, was to make a thorough purge of the Syrian armed forces. The London Times (May 25, 1960) reported that the Syrian armed forces are now "quiet—after the transfer of the more restless elements to Egypt." Syrian leaders who had first collaborated with the Egyptians were now sacked.

It was also noted that the Syrian economy was being strangled by the arbitrary and exploitive policies of Cairo. Nasser defended his "progressive" economics on the grounds that it provided necessary reforms so as to enhance the living conditions of the Syrian people. He used the same argument when he began to nationalize private enterprise in Syria. However, the Wall Street Journal (Feb. 29, 1960) observed that, in spite of the attractive slogans which had embroidered Nasser's economic policies in Syria, these "government owned, corporate-run businesses borrow something from Mussolini's corporate-state notions."

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

Throughout the remainder of 1960 and the first half of 1961, Nasser continued his relentless drive to exploit Syria's resources for his greater glory. In June of this year, the Cairo government announced to the world that it had finally concluded an agreement with the West Germans to finance the construction of a dam on the Euphrates River in Syria. This project, so it was advertised, would help to irrigate an additional 1,850,000 acres of land and generate about 4 million kilowatt-hours of electricity annually. West Germany agreed to provide about $120 millions at 3¾ percent interest.

Aside from the economic benefits that were supposed to accrue to Syria, there are certain aspects of this deal which deserve consideration. The London Financial Times (September 6, 1961) carried the following highly suggestive comment on the significance of the project: "From a political point of view, also, United Arab Republic control over the flow of the Euphrates could be highly embarrassing to Iraq in the event of any deterioration in the relations between the two countries, such as took place in 1959–60."

As a matter of fact, the Iraqi Government called upon the United Arab Republic to discuss the implications of this project as it could damage Iraqi agriculture. The United Arab Republic, however, turned a deaf ear to these requests for discussion. It is also interesting to note that the Egyptians, while negotiating the Euphrates Dam project, also dickered with the West Germans over the construction of an oil pipeline from north Syrian oilfields to the Mediterranean coast.

THE GERMAN ENTRY

Thus, from both the political and economic standpoints, Cairo saw additional advantages to be gained through the highly advertised Euphrates Dam project. At the same time, Cairo was happy to have the West Germans come in as a partner. Indeed, according to reports, the United Arab Republic had high hopes that the West Germans would contribute DM1 billion for various development projects over the next 10 years.

The Germans were not at all bashful to accept Cairo's extended hand since it has been Bonn's ambition to become the dominant force in the Middle East. Following the agreement to finance the Euphrates dam project, the West German Government gave a dinner in honor of the Vice President of the United Arab Republic, Abdel El Boghdadi. Dr. Ludwig Erhard, the West German Minister for Economic Affairs, toasted his guest and said: "We should realize that today we have taken a great and decisive step that will be a milestone in the friendly relations between the Arab world and our country." The following day, the Vice President of the United Arab Republic gave a dinner in honor of the West Germans and the Vice President assured his German listeners: "We note with satisfaction the outstretched hand of Germany, prepared to do all it can to meet our needs." It would thus appear that the Euphrates dam project was regarded by both Cairo and West Germany as a vehicle through which they could put through their common plans in the Middle East. No wonder there was hardly any enthusiasm among the Syrians for this highly touted project.

RUMBLINGS OF UNREST

The wheels of Nasser's propaganda machine continued to turn out stories about the glories of the United Arab Republic and its still more glorious future. On the anniversary of the United Arab Republic, Nasser himself addressed the people of Syria with words of optimism: "Today the United Arab Republic is about 4 years old. Unity is getting stronger every day," [August 17, 1961]. As a realist, we doubt very much that President Nasser believes in the efficacy of the Coué system in politics. He has shown in the past that he prefers to place his trust in force rather than words. Thus, a month after he talked about the growing unity of the United Arab Republic, he dispensed with the National Union Executive Committee in Syria. The Syrian committee had its counterpart in Egypt, thus representing a

certain political equality for both regions. This political setup had been conceived by Nasser to take the place of independent political parties and so give full allegiance to the Cairo Government. But even this sham had now become an irritant and therefore, both communities were absorbed into a single group "to bolster the unity and completely eliminate regionalism" (Al Jumuriyah, September 20, 1961).

The decree eliminating the separate National Union Executive Committees was supposed to prove to the world that the merger of Syria and Egypt was now a practical reality. "The Arab people considered this unity as their pulsating heart. Every victory scored by the United Arab Republic became a victory of the Arab people and a step toward a great dream—one homeland, one people" (Al Jumuriyah).

The day after the United Arab Republic's future had been painted in the most glowing phrases, the Western press reported that there was severe conflict between Syrian and Egyptian officials which required the personal attention of Nasser himself. On the Syrian end, Col. Abel Hamid Serraj, who had been one of Nasser's most faithful followers, complained that his clique was receiving unfair treatment at the hands of Nasser's proconsul in Syria. Apparently, the inner squabble was based on jobs and personal advantage.

There is no indication that Serraj was disturbed over the humiliating position which was now the lot of his people. For him, the dispute could easily be settled if Nasser were willing to give him more status and recognition. Serraj's personal representations to Nasser did not get very far. Indeed, the Nasserites were most confident that their ruthless methods would be meekly accepted.

Reports from Cairo assured the outside world that all was calm in Syria. "These reports say that the (Syrian) army has shown clearly that its loyalty is with President Nasser" (London Times, Sept. 26, 1961). However, in the last analysis the Serraj affair had deeper roots, and this was proven by the fact that within 3 days after the above mentioned report appeared in the London Times, a full-scale revolt took place in Syria which sounded the death knell for Nasser's United Arab Republic.

THE REVOLT

There are certain aspects of this rebellion which are instructive and deserve to be recounted. Immediately after the Syrian rebel leaders seized Damascus on September 28, Nasser spoke over the Cairo radio. This was an unprecedented step on his part since he had never done so before. Yet, in his first words he sought to minimize the extent of the Syrian upheaval by assuring his listeners that only a few army units were involved. The remainder of his speech consisted of repetitive phrases reaffirming his self-appointed role as the guardian of the Syrian people.

Reminiscent of past demagogs, Nasser's speech was dotted with descriptions of his own personal reactions and emotions. It was as though this historical event was merely a duel between a handful of Syrian traitors and himself. "I am gripped with sorrow and regret," he confessed, "as I address this talk to you this morning." While assuring his listeners that he wanted "to avoid bloodshed," in that very same breath he announced that his forces "everywhere are now marching on Damascus." Again in highly emotional terms he said, "I grieve that Arab blood will be spilled but I will not say I have had enough and am dissolving the United Arab Republic. I am responsible for this union. I will not dissolve the republic." Thus, while trying to depreciate the extent of the Syrian revolution and telling his listeners that no bloodshed would be involved, he was at the same time ordering his troops to crush it.

The two faces of Nasser were now clear. In reality, of course, he was a desperate man who hoped that by a combination of sweet talk and threats he could overcome the Syrian resistance. But he had miscalculated and grossly underestimated the opposition. His initial orders to crush the uprising included the dispatch of 2,000 Egyptian parachutists plus a number of naval units. However, he soon found out that force would be met with force, and so, he confessed in a speech on September 29: "But what happened? This small movement (the Syrian revolt) was able to destroy the roots of national elements." This rather vague formulation was meant to cover up the simple fact that Cairo was kaput in Syria.

What actually occurred was that a few Egyptian parachutist units had been dropped. However, they were quickly crushed by the Syrian armed forces. It was this sharp rebuff that changed Nasser's mind. To save face, he told the Egyptians that he decided to call off punitive measures because he was opposed to the idea of Arabs fighting Arabs.

In reality, Nasser had suffered a devastating defeat, not only militarily but, most important, politically. His invincibility was shattered by the courageous resistance of all Syrians regardless of class or social status. Within 24 hours, Nasser's United Arab Republic, like the thousand year German Reich trumpeted by Hitler, went up in smoke.

It would be shortsighted to describe the action of the Syrian people as an impetuous act which will be reversed at some future date. This, of course, is what Nasser is telling the world now. But the fact of the matter is that the break up of the United Arab Republic was inevitable.

FACTORS BEHIND UPHEAVAL

The joining of Syria and Egypt in 1958 was a makeshift affair which only covered up the deep going differences between the two countries. Contrary to popular impression, the Syrians and the Egyptians are not "brothers" in the strict sense of the word. While they do share a common tongue and a common religion, there are also profound differences between them. The Syrians are a mixture of many peoples and cultures. There is a long tradition of self rule and local autonomy whereas the Egyptians have since the day of the pharaohs been a "phlegmatic and docile people" (New York Times, Sept. 29, 1961). That is why they have been accustomed to central control from Cairo.

The Syrian economy was always a more dynamic one, participating in oversea trade. This has not been true for Egypt whose economy tends to stagnate. The dynamism of the Syrians' culture and economy is reflected in her intellectuals and politicians who are freewheeling and ordinarily opposed to central dictation. There was always far greater political mobility in Syria than in Egypt.

It is true that certain Syrian leaders were enthusiastic collaborators of Nasser. Col. Abdel Hamid Serraj, the onetime strongman, symbolized that collaboration, but spokesmen for the Syrian armed forces significantly told reporters after the revolt that "Serraj was not a mirror of the will of the Syrian people" (London Times, Oct. 5, 1961). A Lebanese economist summed up the economic differences in a statement to a special correspondent of the London Times: "It was all very well to have Arab unity and cooperation when all the Arab nations were to benefit—it is an entirely different matter when everything is supposed to work to the benefit of Egypt. This seems to be the core of the Syrian revolutionary argument. She has found that Egyptian officials are dictating the economic pattern of the country; agricultural policy has been radically altered to the detriment of her farmers; and seminationalization has been effected in industry and commerce" (London Times, Sept. 29, 1961).

THE SYRIANS SPEAK

A more authoritative picture of the underlying factors which made the break unavoidable and, indeed, necessary, has been portrayed by the leaders of the Syrian revolt. The revelations of these leaders should not only be required reading for Arabs who are still attracted to Nasser's promises, but also for those in the non-Arab world who think that Nasser is an "enlightened" Arab leader. On October 5, Nasser tried to "prove" the justice of his regime in a lengthy address.

He endeavored to demonstrate that his government had gone out of its way to improve the living standard of his "Syrian brothers," but his "facts" and "statistics" were completely demolished by the Syrian Premier Kuzbari who took up Nasser's allegations point by point.

Nasser had claimed that the Syrian development budget amounted to 2,720 million Syrian pounds. The original figure, according to Kuzbari, was 1,720 million Syrian pounds. Premier Kuzbari noted that an additional sum was arbitrarily fixed by Nasser "without consideration for scientific and practical principles."

To the claim that Nasser had given large sums to Syria to cover up its deficit, Premier Kuzbari charged that these sums "were actually used to pay for Syrian exports to Egypt." In other words, this money represented the payment of Egyptian debts to Syria, and Kuzbari noted that Egypt had a habit of delaying the settlement of these debts. As a matter of fact, the Egyptian National Bank, according to Kuzbari, "which was supposedly forwarding Nasser's alleged grant, was actually granting us a loan, payable within a month, despite the fact that Egypt was indebted to us." It follows from Nasser's financial sleight of hand that he was loaning money to Syria on interest to make up a budget deficit which had been contracted by the Egyptians when they failed to pay their debts to Syria promptly.

The fraudulence of Nasser's claims of aid to the Syrian budget is further confirmed by the share of the common military burden between Egypt and Syria. According to the Syrian revolutionary command, Egypt became rich at the expense of Syria, bearing in mind that the defense budget of Syria was 54 percent of the general budget and the defense budget of Egypt was only 17 percent of the general budget.

Nasser alleged that Egyptian officials had worked selflessly in Syria without thought for reward or recognition. "On the contrary," Kuzbari declared, "they received huge salaries and abundant allowances" compared with their Syrian colleagues. To Nasser's threat that the Arab League (dominated by Egypt) would be called in to investigate his charges, Kuzbari said that he would welcome such an investigation and would produce all pertinent documents rebutting and exposing Nasser's tendentious allegations.

Kuzbari furthermore declared that his government would "reveal cogent evidence, backed by statistics and documents, showing the Egyptian ruler's claim that in 3 years they have accomplished more in Syria than Syria has achieved throughout its long history was a false allegation. What was accomplished in Syria was domination, authority, the humiliation of dignity, and the stifling of freedoms."

It is also instructive to report what the Syrian commander in chief, General Zahreddin, had to say about Egypt's aid to Syria. On October 4, he charged that Nasser pursued a ruthless policy of Egyptianizing all basic institutions of Syrian life. Three-quarters of the teachers in Arab Syria, he said were Egyptians. The schoolbooks were all printed in Egypt and they were imposed on Syrian schools by coercion. He further stated that "these books spoke of nothing but pharaohnism, and completely ignored

anything about Arabs and Arabians, a matter which was inconsistent with the requisites of Arab nationalism."

Referring to the unselfish Egyptian officers, he revealed that many of them had deposited huge sums of money. The bank account of one officer, for example, amounted to 1.7 million liras, and other huge bank accounts had been uncovered. In this connection he charged that Cairo tried to grab the gold in the Syrian Central Bank which backs the Syrian currency. "Gold was found packed in crates and ready for shipment to Cairo, but the army uprising foiled this attempt and prevented the shipment of the people's money to Cairo." He revealed, too, that Egyptians had developed a widespread spy apparatus in the Syrian army. Torture, corruption and persecution of opponents were rampant under the Egyptian terror. He declared that a book would be published which would contain all of the pertinent documentation that would lay bare the Egyptian tyranny in Syria. General Zahreddin noted that there were 2½ times as many Egyptian officers in Syria as Syrian officers in Egypt. In this connection he charged that there was a deliberate and massive purge of Syrian army officers which was part of "the plan to liquidate the Syrian army."

In a subsequent talk on October 18, General Zahreddin denounced that Cairo radio "works only to shatter the Arabs." He went on to say that the government which Nasser had foisted on the Syrian people "had no parallel in any other country. By God, I have never heard of a cabinet consisting of 50 or 60 ministers, or a national assembly where a deputy would sit like a statue, incapable of debating or approving anything because orders and laws emanated from him (Nasser) alone." Even Shukri Quwatli, the former President of Syria who had been instrumental in helping Nasser to set up the United Arab Republic, recently returned to Syria and hailed the rebellion against Nasser. In a speech delivered on October 23, to the Syrian people, he said: "Unity does not mean an act of annexation, and the presidential system does not mean the separation of the ruler from the ruled." He denounced what he called the whole system of rule which was responsible for squandering unity. "It is the system of rule which struck the foundation of unity. It is the system of rule which has 1,001 spies." Here, then, is the anatomy of Nasser's beneficent rule in Syria as described by the Syrians themselves.

REACTION IN THE ARAB WORLD

The story of the Syrian rebellion against Egyptian domination would not be complete without some reference to the reaction of other Arab States. Judging from Nasser's talks during these last moments of the United Arab Republic's life, one would have expected a wave of sympathy and support throughout the Arab world for his cause. However, this was not the case at all. Within 24 hours, the King of Jordan who, a few months ago, had personally appealed to Nasser for reestablishment of friendship, recognized the new Syrian Government. Other Middle Eastern states adopted a more prudent policy of watchful waiting.

Nevertheless, it is significant that no Arab State took any concrete action to bolster the sagging fortunes of the United Arab Republic. Once it became clear that Nasser's chances to unscramble the egg, so to speak, were nil, the various states which Nasser regards as part of his Arabdom, began to hint that they would recognize the new Syrian Government.

Foremost in this connection was the stand of Premier Qasim of Iraq. He has never had any special love for Nasser ever since the days when the Cairo dictator tried to undermine his rule after the overthrow of King Faisal. Nor did the Iraqis like the idea of Nasser's oil policies which threatened Iraqi interest. It should also be pointed out that the Egyptians deliberately ignored Iraq's protests, over the Euphrates Dam project in Syria which they feared could inflict grave damage on their own economy if Nasser chose to employ it as a political instrument.

Consequently, the events which unfolded in Syria, did not exactly perturb the Iraqis. The idea of the fertile crescent once more came out of the shadow and began to stir the hopes of the Iraqi Government. The fertile crescent concept involves, among other things, the absorption of Syria into a greater Iraq—a dream held long by Iraqi leaders. Therefore, on October 5, when Qasim was asked about Iraq's attitude toward Syria, he made a statement which, though ambiguous, was still pregnant with meaning: "Once we found our neighbor and sister free and liberated and its entity and independence firmly established with complete sovereignty, then there would be nothing to prevent us from consolidating with it on the basis of fraternity and mutual interests which we prefer." In another passage in answer to the above question, he said of Syria and Iraq: "Our history is one and our countries one."

On October 24, the Iraq newspaper Al-Ahd Al-Jadid was even more expansive in outlining Iraq's mission. "The aims of our republic have not changed. Before long, Iraq will carry out its colossal and gigantic role to achieve the Arab nation's aspirations, to raise the banner of Arab nationalism, and to serve civilization and humanity throughout the world." Such a grandiose scheme has been Nasser's "leitmotif" until now but in view of declining fortunes, Premier Qasim felt that it was his turn to take the leading role.

However, there are other ambitious Arab States with illusions of grandeur. The Syrians themselves have now put out what one newspaper called a pan-Arabian plan. According to Premier Kuzbari who announced it, this plan would involve a comprehensive voluntary Arab federation that would preserve equality and local characteristics and necessities. According to the New York Herald Tribune (Oct. 12, 1961), the plan was regarded in some quarters as an indication that "Syria might seek to get going from Damascus an Arab unity movement in place of President Nasser's." Thus, not only Cairo and Baghdad have their own ideas about Arab unity, but so does Damascus. Though it sounds paradoxical, it is precisely this fact, namely, that each of the Arab States shouts for Arab unity—but on its own terms—that makes the slogan just a slogan and nothing more.

FOOD FOR THOUGHT

The fact that the Arab States themselves have proven that Arab unity is one of those slippery propositions which always eludes its pursuers should give food for thought in Washington. The implications of Syria's breakaway from Egypt ought to be pondered carefully by U.S. policymakers.

River Basins of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, Maj. Gen. T. A. Lane, President of the Mississippi River Commission, made an enlightening comparison of the Mississippi River with other river basins of the world in a speech which he delivered before the Lower Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association at our annual meeting on December 1.

Under unanimous consent, I include General Lane's speech:

ADDRESS BY MAJ. GEN. T. A. LANE, PRESIDENT, MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION, ANNUAL MEETING OF THE LOWER MISSISSIPPI VALLEY FLOOD CONTROL ASSOCIATION, NEW ORLEANS, LA., NOVEMBER 30-DECEMBER 1, 1961.

Because you of the Lower Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association are so familiar with the work and program of the Mississippi River basin, I considered it desirable this year to vary the normal procedure of reporting on progress in the valley to try to broaden our horizons and give you a picture of other river basins of the world—what is being done to control and improve them, how the rivers and the work compare with the problems and work we have here in the Mississippi Valley.

None of the 10 largest rivers is in Europe. They are located in Asia, Africa, and South America, where backward populations, political instability, and in some cases inhospitable climate have prevented their development. Other rivers which have been highly developed are smaller than the Mississippi, such as the Rhine in Germany. I shall discuss some of these rivers in perspective relation to the Mississippi and point out for you the more interesting comparable features.

First, let us review some facts about the Mississippi River.

The Mississippi is third in length in the world, fourth in drainage area, and fifth in volume. Of the 10 largest of the world's rivers, the Mississippi is the only one in North America. Like most of the other great rivers, the Mississippi drains a broad plain sloping to the sea. The Mississippi is one of the most effectively developed river systems in the world. The potential of the other rivers of the big 10 has hardly been touched.

I want to start with the Amazon, because if drainage area and volume of flow are considered, it is by far the greatest river in the world. Its watershed (2,700,000 square miles) is nearly as large as the entire continental United States, and much of it lies in tropical regions subject to heavy rainfall (90 inches per year). Its average flow (4,250,000 cubic feet per second) is greater than our Mississippi River project flood, and its maximum (8,500,000 cubic feet per second) is nearly three times as great. It has 17 tributaries each more than 1,000 miles in length. The main river between banks averages as much as 5 miles in width over much of its length. During the height of the annual rains, belts of land as much as 20 miles wide flood on either side. Twenty-five percent of the earth's trees are in the Amazon forests. Even during the dry season, 1,300 miles of the river can be navigated by oceangoing freighters.

The exploitation of the basin is only beginning. This will require generations. In addition to the immense difficulties of river control, disease is a great problem. A program to reduce or eliminate the tropical diseases of the region was originated by the U.S. Public Health Service, and is now being successfully carried forward by Brazil.

The Euphrates is 1,700 miles long, the Tigris about 1,150. From the headwaters, Mount Ararat, mentioned in the Bible, can be seen in the distance.

The alluvial plain extends 550 miles from just above Bagdad to the sea. This area was the cradle of civilization. Six thousand years ago the Sumerians had developed a written language, were building cities and engaging in commercial activities, while innumerable canals watered their cultivated fields. Ur of the Chaldees

was at that time already a large city. Ur was at least 2,500 years old when Abraham was born there in 1996 B.C. Other great Sumerian cities were Eridu and Sumer. Ancient Eridu was a coastal port on the Euphrates, but the river shifted its course, the delta built outward at a rate variously estimated at from 75 to 150 feet per year, and the ruins of Eridu are now 125 miles inland.

The source of wealth and prosperity was the water of the two rivers. In ancient writings there are frequent references to great floods, but a considerable degree of flood control seems to have been achieved. The Euphrates was fully controlled by diversions into the Habbaniyah and Abu Dibis depressions to the northwest of Babylon and the stored water was used in the summer for irrigation. It would seem that the ancients were not able to achieve such complete control over the Tigris, but by the construction of Nimrod's dam, near Beled, they diverted a large part of its flow into the great Nahrwan Canal, which ran from Sammarah to Kut. This dam is believed to have stood for about 3,000 years. The right bank of the Tigris was protected by strong levees, leaving the floodwater to escape over the left bank.

Dams and diversion canals are now under study. It is believed that the country, if restored, can support 10 times the present population.

Although the length (4,160 miles) and drainage area (1,290,000 square miles) of the Nile are about the same as those of the Mississippi, the floodflow of the Nile is about 15 percent of the floodflow of the Mississippi. The sources of the Nile lie in the tropic rain belt. Here it receives heavy rainfall, producing an annual flood in August and September. This is a fairly regular phenomenon although it varies both in volume and date. The flow from the headwater extremities is regulated by a number of large lakes, at the outlets of which dams have been built to increase the storage and give some control over the outflow. Farther downstream on the tributaries, the flow is further regulated by a few large dams, notably Jebel Aulia Dam on the White Nile, and Sennar Dam on the Blue Nile. There is no tributary in the last 1,600 miles of the river's length, where it crosses the Sahara Desert to the Mediterranean.

Since the construction of the present Aswan Dam it has been possible to increase the irrigated acreage in Egypt by nearly 20 percent to 6 million acres, and more important two or three crops a year can be raised, versus formerly one. The yield of cotton is about 2 bales to the acre, achieved by irrigation, intensive hand cultivation, and large amounts of chemical fertilizers. A minimum of insect infestation is also of advantage in production of the Nile Valley cotton crop. Present-day irrigation is by pumping and by diversion dams, as contrasted with the ancient system of breaching the levees during floods. In the Sudan, the Sennar Dam permits irrigation of about 1 million acres of land which could not otherwise be cultivated.

Control of the Nile is made materially easier because the water comes mainly from the highlands in the tropic rain belt, where the rainfall is unusually dependable. Also, the nature of the country as the river descends from the rocky highlands, makes it possible to locate large reservoirs in deep gorges. The Nile has been given a high degree of dependable regulation. Aided by the High Aswan Dam it will be practicable to store enough water in wet years to provide for a number of successive dry years.

The Volga is the largest river in Europe and by far the most important in Russia. It is a little over half as long (2,300 miles) as the Mississippi, and drains less than half the area (570,000 square miles). The maximum recorded discharge (2,200,000 cubic feet per second in 1915, prior to regulation) was somewhat less than our 1927 Mississippi River flood (2,600,000 cubic feet per second) and is calculated to have about the same frequency of recurrence (100 years). The Volga constantly erodes its banks, and in the past it was frequently necessary to move back towns and dock facilities.

The Volga and its branches provide transportation arteries through a region in which 50 million people live. Its navigable length with connecting waterways is roughly equal to that of the Mississippi River system and connecting waterways (which we reckon as 17,000 miles not including the St. Lawrence). The Russians plan to integrate into a single system all the waterways in the European part of the U.S.S.R., and to a considerable extent this has already been done.

A report published by the Mississippi River Commission in 1909 stated that at that time a fleet of 26 dredges was in use to maintain navigable depths on the Volga. In 1926 the project depth to be ultimately attained was set at 15 feet. (This applies to main waterways only.) The Russians are in general building their canals and locks to this standard.

As of 1960, the total ton-miles of freight carried on the Volga was less than that carried on the Mississippi system (exclusive of the Great Lakes).

Further and complete development of the basin has been one of the major programs of the Russians. It has called for great effort and sacrifice, but will undoubtedly pay off in increased industrial potential and eventually in better living standards. There are, however, at least two great problems remaining. Due to ice, navigation is impossible for 3 months a year in the lower river, and for as much as 6 months in the upper river. Another great problem, which is causing the Russians a great deal of concern, is the lowering of the level of the Caspian Sea. The level of the Caspian Sea is reported to have declined in recent years by as much as one-half foot per year. It is now 93 feet below sea level. Though this may be partly a result of a long term hydrometeorologic cycle, it is also due to a decline in the flow of the Volga, which is the principal stream discharging into the Caspian Sea. Evaporation from reservoirs, and large irrigation withdrawals have contributed to this. The Soviet plans are for ameliorating this situation by diverting water from other streams. Diversion from the Pechora River is planned to begin in 1965.

Although the Yangtze is shorter (3,400 miles) and has a considerably smaller drainage basin (750,000 square miles), its maximum recorded discharge (1931) was greater than our 1927 flood. The Yangtze has its source in mountains with an elevation of 17,000 feet, and in its upper reaches the slope is very steep. Ichang, where the river enters its alluvial plain, is about 1,000 miles from the sea. Above Ichang, the terrain is mountainous. At Chungking, some 350 miles above the point at which the river enters the alluvial plain, the maximum range of water level is 117 feet, with a record rise of 33 feet a day. At Hankow, in the alluvial plain, the range of water level is 50 feet, very nearly the range of the Mississippi at Red River Landing.

Many millions of people live on the alluvial plain, and hundreds of thousands have no other home but floating junks on the river itself.

The Yangtze is China's most important artery of commerce; other forms of transportation are primitive by our standards. Numerous waterways crisscross the alluvial plain and join the Yangtze. It is connected to the Yellow River by the Grand Canal, 1,200 miles long, which was begun in 500 B.C.

The greatest flood in recent times occurred in 1931, when 150,000 people lost their lives, 100,000 square miles were flooded, and damage was in hundreds of millions of U.S. dollars. Thirty-three crevasses occurred in main river levees. The average annual damage is estimated at $30 million (1950). Since 200 B.C., serious floods have occurred on the average of once in 56 years.

I want to discuss another river in China for several reasons of comparison with the Mississippi. It is the Yellow or Hwang Ho River. The Yellow River has a length of about two-thirds, and a drainage area of about one-third that of the Mississippi River. Its maximum flood of record was less than one-half the discharge of our 1927 flood. The Yellow River is known as China's sorrow with good reason. It is unique among the larger rivers in regard to the amount of sediment carried. In time of flood it carries over 40-percent silt. At such times the streamflow is a muddy paste. The Mississippi River never carries much over one-tenth of 1 percent. The Yellow River is confined between levees in its lower 300 miles. In this area the elevation of the riverbed is as much as 13 feet above the adjacent land of the great plain through which it flows. The levees are 10 to 43 feet in height, with a top width of 33 to 66 feet. The fluctuation of the water surface in the lower river is about 20 feet from low to high, very similar to that of the Mississippi at New Orleans. The levees are spaced rather far apart, up to 13 miles, and the river swings its course very frequently within this area. Levee crevasses occur on the average more than once in 2 years. Closure work can only be performed when the flood season is over. If closure fails successively for years, the change of course becomes permanent.

The worst Yellow River flood occurred in 1887, when the river overflowed 50,000 square miles and nearly a million people were killed. There is probably no river in the world which is of so little use as the Yellow River considering the populous districts through which it flows. Thus far, people have been only partly successful in protecting themselves from its ravages. Even as a communication artery it is unimportant. The river is a tiger on a leash.

In order to achieve a better understanding of the Mississippi River Basin, I will first remind you of a point made in connection with the Nile. Regulation of the Nile is made easier because the floodflow always comes from the distant headwaters in the tropic highlands, upstream from rocky gorges suitable for large dams. In contrast with the Nile, the Mississippi's drainage basin is driest in the upper reaches and wettest in the lower reaches.

The Ohio, with 16 percent of the Mississippi River drainage area, contributes on the average 40 percent of the total flow. In a major flood its contributions may exceed 90 percent of the flow at Cairo. However, this is not always the situation. The middle and lower Missouri River and the upper Mississippi may make large contributions to our project flood. The Arkansas also may make a large contribution.

The numerous reservoirs in the Mississippi basin are built primarily for the local benefits that they provide. Some of the great reservoirs out on the Missouri can store water over a period of years. This is important for multiple-purpose uses in the region—flood control, irrigation, navigation, and power—but on some occasions it may have little effect on flood control on the lower Mississippi, because the source of the flood may be below the dam sites.

Controlling the Mississippi is an undertaking of great magnitude. Starting with individual efforts in levee building in the early 1700's here at New Orleans, it was followed by organized efforts of the local people and then a total or combined effort of the Federal Government and the people in the

Mississippi River and tributaries project since 1928.

A dependable system of levees has been constructed. There are 1,578 miles of levee and 7 miles of floodwall in the project on the main stem of the Mississippi River. We have completed 1,442 miles of these works to grade and section, making the project 91 percent complete. All of the remaining 136 miles are in place, but there are some deficiencies in grade and section by a few inches to a foot or more. As constructed, they can withstand lesser flows than the project flood, and they have proved their worth during several extremely high water periods.

Our channel stabilization program has been continued at an orderly rate, with the revetment and dike program now 67 percent complete.

About 34 miles of riverbank were revetted during the year, bringing the total to 439 miles completed between Cairo and Baton Rouge of the 607 miles presently planned. At three-quarters of a million dollars per mile, this is a costly program. It is doing what has never been done to a great river before—to stabilize its course and contain its destructive power within the levee system.

This survey of the rivers of the world shows that great cultures are built on the intelligent use of water resources.

You have been told that the review report of the Mississippi River and tributaries project will be presented to Congress early in the next session. This report recommends an increased authorization of $8½ billion for a project in which the present authorization is approximately $1½ billion. This is the current assessment of what is needed for the immediate and short-range needs of the project if we are to continue our present sound program of controlling the Mississippi River.

We are a young Nation. We are doing in 50 years what other peoples in other times have taken many centuries to accomplish. We are doing what has never before been done to a river of the size and power of the Mississippi. We have the power and the purpose. Time is short. The pressures of our growing population and expanding industry drive us to complete the development of our water resources now. We can do it.

I suggest to you from our review of the rivers of the world that every healthy civilization is a building civilization; that when people have lost the creative drive to build, they are dying. Let us in our day and time continue our program of building this Mississippi Valley into the rich heartland of America. This goal will be realized when our great river has been harnessed to the needs of our people. Let us be builders.

Dramatic Support for Milk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, most of us from important milk-producing regions have been concerned over the fact that public consumption of milk and other dairy products has been declining sharply in recent months. One of the reasons therefor could well be the popular but so far unfounded concern that has been expressed in some quarters over the possibility that the increased radioactive fallout, which accompanied Khrushchev's series of nuclear tests last fall, had "contaminated" our Nation's milk supply. Another possible reason could be the growing public interest over the reported connection between a high cholesterol diet and some forms of coronary disease.

I am indeed glad that no less a personage than the President of the United States has now seen fit to put both of these highly questionable reasons for not drinking milk or making normal use of other dairy products in proper perspective. And, at the January 23 Conference on Milk and Nutrition, President Kennedy even drank a glass of milk to prove his own confidence in this extremely important nutritional product. The story of that conference and the President's part therein, as contained in the New York Times for January 24, follows:

WASHINGTON, January 23.—President Kennedy assured the public today that its milk supply "offers no hazards" either from radioactive fallout or cholesterol content. In fact, Mr. Kennedy told the National Conference on Milk and Nutrition, milk is so delicious and nutritious that he has ordered it served at all White House meals. The President concluded his 15-minute address in the departmental auditorium here with a toast—in milk. He spoke against a background of serious concern in the Department of Agriculture, the sponsor of the 1-day conference, about a drop in milk consumption last year.

Last year, Mr. Kennedy pointed out, the American public consumed only 125 billion pounds of dairy products—milk, butter, cheese and ice cream. In 1960, he said, consumption was "between 2 and 3 billion pounds more."

These figures are the more serious, Mr. Kennedy said, because in the same period the population increased by 1.7 percent and milk production went up 1.5 percent.

"I doubt that anyone can be sure of the reasons for this sudden drop in consumption," the President said. "We only know that the slow decline in the consumption over a period of time became immediate and precipitous last year."

He said it was "unfortunate" that there had been "an identification in the minds of some between fallout and milk."

FALLOUT SURVEILLANCE

This problem was under constant surveillance by the Public Health Service and other agencies, Mr. Kennedy said, and continued:

"Detailed guidelines to protect the health of people against radiation have been developed by the Federal Radiation Council. It is abundantly clear that for the forseeable future there is no danger from the present amount of exposure. The milk supply offers no hazards."

Mr. Kennedy said that the Food and Nutrition Board of the National Research Council has concluded, after intensive research, that the association of milk consumption and coronary disease due to an increase in cholesterol level has not been sufficiently established to justify the abandonment of this nutritious element, except where doctors have individually prescribed special diets for those found to be susceptible to special cholesterol or coronary problems.

He excepted persons especially susceptible to cholesterol problems and those on special diets.

The decline in milk consumption, Mr. Kennedy said, is serious for all Americans. He said it implied poorer nutrition and a less-balanced diet, presented economic problems in managing and marketing milk production, and complicated the best use of soil, water and animal resources.

Mr. Kennedy is expected to propose next week a new milk control program under which dairy farmers would be given strict allotments on bulk milk. Violators would be fined and the fines would be used to help pay the cost of surplus disposal.

Local Initiative and Nonreliance Upon Federal Subsidies Bring Results in Hopedale, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in my congressional district at Hopedale, Ill., an almost unbelievable story of people helping themselves is bringing real results. I refer to the Hopedale medical complex which started as a 20-bed hospital in 1955 and now includes a nursing home, nurses' residence, and a residence for elderly people.

The thing that is most pleasing about the project and its success is nonreliance upon Federal subsidies. Once again I am proud to mention the contribution of First Federal Savings of Peoria to the success of the project.

I wish to include a copy of a talk by Dr. Lawrence J. Rossi, director of the hospital, in addition to a newspaper article, which tells the story. The speech and article follow:

SERVICE TAILORED TO NEED

(By Lawrence J. Rossi, M.D., medical director, Hopedale Hospital, Hopedale, Ill.)

Less than 6 months after I had established a part-time office as a general practitioner in Hopedale, Ill., a rural community of 500 population, I felt so inadequate as a doctor because of the lack of hospital and medical facilities that I decided to speak my mind freely and then close my office.

No one was more surprised than I when, after mentioning the need for a hospital, the community leaders demonstrated enthusiasm for the idea and wanted to do something about it.

So, in December 1953, we had a meeting at the townhall. About 100 persons were present. The architect, my lawyer, several ministers, two sympathetic colleagues, and construction representatives were also there. We discussed the matter openly and answered a lot of questions. A committee selected at this meeting began its work 2 days later selling bonds to raise the money for construction of the hospital.

The community saw a need and responded. We went from an idea to a complete hospital in less than 16 months. No Government aid, no high-powered fund drive—no large gifts from industry. This was a community enterprise accomplished with local talents and private funds invested by local people who needed and wanted a hospital and decided to do the job themselves.

The hospital has 20 beds and 6 bassinets. It is of fireproof brick masonry construction. It has general hospital facilities including surgery, maternity, emergency room, X-ray, laboratory, blood bank, pharmacy with a full time pharmacist, rehabilitation and physical medicine department with a psychiatrist in charge, dentist and doctor's office in the

hospital. At present, we have 8 staff physicians in attendance from the area and over 40 consultant specialists from nearby large cities.

Financially, the hospital has always operated in the black. Last year we showed more net profit than some institutions in our area that are over 10 times our size—and our charge for services is the same or lower than that of the larger institutions I refer to.

After the hospital had been in operation about 1 year, we noted among other things that we needed a residence for nurses. The need for a nurses residence was obvious. Adequate housing for unmarried nurses just didn't exist in this little country town. It was a relatively simple matter to get the job done. Money was borrowed from a savings and loan association. Some donated labor and private financing supplied the remainder. The furnishings were donated by a grateful lady. We broke ground in February 1957 and dedicated the residence in October of the same year.

The nurses residence is of fireproof brick masonry construction and features a large living room and kitchen-dining area, three double bedrooms, two baths, laundry and storage room. It accommodates six nurses.

At the end of our first year of hospital operation, we also noted that patients just weren't leaving. They stayed and stayed and stayed. Doctors were complaining that beds weren't available. The ancillary facilities—laboratory, X-ray, pharmacy, all showed decline in income, yet the hospital beds were almost always occupied.

What was happening was that patients with chronic illness had finally filled our beds. These patients needed nursing care to be sure, but they needed little else, and consequently, here was a facility equipped to render complete hospital care with expensive equipment and personnel standing by, but seeing little use. Nobody was busy except the floor nurses. A chronic illness facility appeared to be the answer to this problem.

And so it was, that in December of 1957, just 2 months after dedicating the nurses residence, we broke ground for a new 40-bed nursing home. We dedicated the nursing home a year later, in December 1958, and accepted our first patient in January 1959.

Private financing built the nursing home too. We sold certificates for $750 each redeemable for $1,000 in care at a stipulated monthly rate per certificate or payable in cash at face value in 20 years. This method supplied about half the money for construction. The remainder was borrowed from a savings and loan association.

Our nursing home is attached to the hospital and is hospital operated. All hospital facilities are available to the nursing home. All medical care is under medical staff supervision. Patients are cared for by their personal physician. A staff physician is assigned on a rotation basis to patients who do not have an attending physician. This arrangement makes possible complete hospital care at nursing home rates which, in our case, is about 65 percent lower than hospital rates.

The nursing home is of fireproof brick masonry construction, has large private and two bedrooms—all with bath. The hospital wing has electric beds and piped-in oxygen. The nursing staff include 6 registered nurses, 1 licensed practical nurse, 1 graduate nurse, 13 aids. A full-time registered physical therapist, a rehabilitation nurse, two aids and the physician psychiatrist are available to the nursing home as well as the hospital.

Not too long after opening of the nursing home, we noted that some elderly residents were there simply because they were old and alone and had no place else to go. These people do not belong among the ailing and the dying in a nursing home. Nor should they pay for nursing care which they do not need, or occupy a bed intended for someone who is ill.

How inadequate the nursing home can be for the aged was vividly pointed out to me one day when we admitted an elderly couple that celebrated their 65th wedding anniversary in our home a few weeks after their arrival. They spoke German when they didn't want anyone to know what they were saying, and as I approached them they were standing in the doorway of their room carrying on in no uncertain terms. They had refused to enter unless a situation was to be corrected immediately. The situation? They wanted to know why there was no double bed in the room. They had never slept apart in their 65 years of marriage. We compromised by placing the two single beds together. They accepted.

How old is old? You may ask. Here is another example of an oldtimer that doesn't belong in a nursing home among the ailing and the dying: A farmer, aged 88, had been admitted to the hospital for the first time in his lifetime and was to undergo oral surgery the following day. I visited him the evening before surgery to determine what shape he was in for a general anesthetic. Grandpa was a real Prussian; he was sitting up in bed stroking his walrus mustache and he was surrounded by all relatives that could possibly cram into the room. Mama, the boys, everybody was there. After all, they thought this was surely the end of the road for grandpa and they were trying to render all the reassurance possible. Taking a routine history, I was probing for evidence of heart failure and respiratory disease, so I asked, "Do your feet and ankles ever swell?" "Nope," he said and then looked around at mama and smiled. "Do you ever get short of breath?" I asked. He looked at mama, then gave me a quizzical smile and said "Ya. Ven I rrrun." I don't have to tell you he did all right and went home 2 days after surgery.

We decided that a separate residence for elderly people was the only solution if they were to be removed from a nursing home atmosphere. We broke ground for such a resident in August 1960 and dedicated it June 11, 1961—3 months ahead of schedule. Our first resident moved in on July 6. The cost to the resident is about half that of nursing home care.

Financing was simple. We refinanced all the complex properties and came up with enough money to cover the entire cost of construction. Again, the money was supplied by a savings and loan association. The entire job was accomplished with private funds.

Briefly stated, our residence for the elderly is simply a place to live. It is a residence—not an institution. Completely fireproof and of brick masonry construction, it has many features: Private entrance for each unit, air conditioning with individual thermostat control, wall-to-wall carpeting, tiled bath and shower, emergency intercom to the hospital, large parlor and dining room, barber shop, beauty shop, hobby and crafts room, a full time activities director, and outside recreation facilities. There are 4 apartments and 18 single room units.

The atmosphere in Hopedale House, our residence for elderly people, is contagious. Everyone is gay and smiling. Dignity and independence stimulates elderly people in a manner that cannot be put into words. We have proof of this. You could not believe it unless you see it. We consider this project our greatest accomplishment.

You have heard a report of what was done in a small country town by some determined old fashioned Americans. Our entire endeavor evolved from only one consideration, and that is the welfare of the individual. We learned by experience. We supplied the need as it occurred.

It is our responsibility to assist our community in providing for the health needs of its citizens as well as churches, schools, and recreational facilities. It is the responsibility of private enterprise to allocate a portion of its investment capital for these communities who are willing to solve their own problems.

A great share of the credit for development of the Hopedale Complex must be given to First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Peoria, Ill. They loaned us $400,000 for our program. I don't have to tell you that nobody loans this much money unless there is a reasonable chance of getting it back with interest. This, I consider a tribute to our operation; but even more outstanding is the fact that one of the principal reasons for making the loan was the policy of the association to contribute to the welfare of an entire community and rural area. First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Peoria, Ill., is a $100 million organization.

I cite this as an example of big business with a conscience—an example that should be heeded by private enterprise everywhere.

Getting back to the incident of the elderly couple that wanted a double bed in the nursing home: One afternoon I was walking down the corridor of the nursing home and at I passed their door, the door was open and I noticed they were both lying on the bed, fully clothed, and had fallen asleep holding each other's hand. I hesitated a moment, because the scene was very touching.

In closing, I want to pass onto you a thought that occurred to me as I watched those two old people asleep, holding hands. It may well serve as a formula for guiding all of us who have the welfare of the aged at heart. It is this: We must love and honor them, we must accept them for better or for worse, in sickness and in health—until death do us part.

[From the Pekin Times, Jan. 9, 1962]

ONE-MILLION-DOLLAR EXPANSION OF HOPEDALE HOSPITAL FACILITIES PLANNED: WILL DOUBLE PRESENT SIZE; SLATED FOR COMPLETION BY FALL OF 1963

HOPEDALE.—A new program of expansion, expected to cost more than $1 million has been approved by the Hopedale Hospital building committee and will about double the present size of the medical complex here. Tentative plans call for construction to begin in the last summer or early fall this year with completion scheduled for the fall of 1963.

Included in the expansion program will be the complete air conditioning and remodernizing of the hospital, additional hospital beds, including private rooms and a new pediatric section, a completely new hospital wing with 27 additional beds, 23 additional nursing home beds, 40 beds for the chronic diseased and rehabilitation, a new central kitchen and laundry, a new employees' dining room, outpatient facilities, additional space for X-ray and laboratory and more general office space.

C. Ralph Nafziger, chairman of the finance committee, said, "We expect to raise $250,000 in cash gifts and through the sale of bonds. Additional money will be obtained from private financing."

Staff physicians from Delavan, Tremont, Minier, Hopedale, and Mackinaw agreed that the additional facilities are sorely needed in the rural area served by the present accommodations.

Beginning with a 20-bed hospital in 1955, the Hopedale medical complex since has added a nursing home, nurses' residence, and a residence for elderly persons. The complex serves an area within a 10-mile

radius of Hopedale, consisting of rural communities and a farm population of approximately 10,000 persons.

Committee members who viewed and approved the expansion plans prepared by Architect George Poppo Wearda were Orville Augsburger, Silas Nafziger, Aaron Springer, Clarence Weihmeir, Willis Sauder, John B. Smith, Walter Patch, Mrs. Agnes Zehr, Eddie Rademaker, Mervin Haning, C. Ralph Nafziger, and Mrs. C. C. Litwiller. Also members of the committee are Allan Springer, Miss Mona Nafziger and Mrs. Marzella Griesemer.

Dynamic Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, a very wonderful Memorial Day sermon, "Dynamic Democracy," was delivered last year by the Reverend Sumner Gill to his parishioners at the First Congregational Church of River Edge, N.J. This fine statement of the history, the present challenge and the future path of democracy was given the George Washington Honor Medal Award by the Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include this sermon in the Appendix of the RECORD so that all who read the RECORD may have the opportunity of sharing its wisdom:

DYNAMIC DEMOCRACY

Appreciation of our unique national history is developing among the people of our country. Quaint old colonial towns have been restored; cobbler shops, spinning wheels, and oil lamps help crowds of history conscious people to catch the flavor of early American life. Important battlefields where major decisions were sealed have become national monuments. Documents once ignored are now treasured and preserved as sacred relics. Even our interest in antiques reveals curiosity and appreciation of a bygone era.

This perspective of history solidifies our national life, for we as a people are held together by hallowed traditions and memories as well as by our laws. Knowledge of history deepens our capacity to appreciate the long, arduous struggles which brought forth our freedoms, and we grow into responsible citizenship as we understand what sacrifices men paid. In the soul of one who understands the heroism in our heritage, solid and profound convictions replace the careless and shallow indifference in which so many take freedom for granted.

I. OUR HERITAGE

Modern democracy came as a mass reaction against centuries of oppressive tyranny. Slavery reduced men and women to the level of beasts. Absolute monarchs demanded not only obedience, but worship from their cowed subjects. Some of these monarchs who suffered from insanity knew no limits to their sadistic treatment of men. Nero set fire to his own capital city and watched the flames eat through Rome for 8 days, leaving the eternal city a mass of blackened ruins. Under the paternalistic system of the Middle Ages, feudal lords guaranteed bread in return for obedience vowed by serfs who took the oath of fealty. Ingenious and sadistic torture instruments which survive from that era make us shudder when we see this tangible evidence of man's inhumanity to man. The mass of cruel and inhuman suffering brought a tidal wave of righteous indignation and imbued our forefathers with earnest determination to win the freedom which rightfully belongs to all men.

Eventually, certain great guarantees of freedom were written into law. Broad participation in the right to vote expressed the determination of people to govern themselves. Self-government came as a new concept unknown in the ancient or medieval world. The "inalienable rights," written into our Constitution, express the conviction that we have certain God-given, natural rights outside the scope of government and upon which no government shall infringe. This lofty concept of human dignity was very slow to dawn upon human consciousness. Abolition of inherited power prevented monarchs from handing authority down the line to their children while helpless people looked on unable to choose their leaders. Limitations were placed on the tenure of office to enable us to get rid of undesirable leaders. Political power was divided into legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government to spread the base of authority and provide each branch with checks on the powers of the other two. Our forefathers forbade establishment of an aristocracy to avoid the possibility of self-perpetuating power cliques. Trial by jury recognizes our individual rights which no longer can be set aside by the whims of kings and capricious noblemen. Private ownership of property puts our economic power on a more democratic basis. Our philosophy of freedom includes faith in the freedom of speech, press, conscience, and religion, and we go so far as to say that government exists to serve the people rather than accepting the creed of dictators that people exist to serve the state. We strive for universal education to keep all of these principles alive and to prevent intellectual power from becoming the privilege of the few. All of these ideas and laws now act as monumental safeguards of our individual and collective freedoms. They grew out of dangerous and heroic struggles which deserve our reverence and dedication. One whose shallow mind sees no more in democracy than personal opportunities for self-indulgence, misses the rich perspective of history.

Our legal rights are the political and economic expressions of our Judeo-Christian tradition. Great prophets of the Old Testament, and later Jesus Christ, were strong advocates of human dignity and freedom. Jesus was known as the friend of the publicans and sinners. He broke through a caste system and respected Samaritans, who were considered a hated race. The great text, "There shall be neither Greek, nor Jew, barbarian, Scythian, slave, or free," reflects the universal tendencies of the Christian faith warring against ancient prejudices. Christ came as a true liberator, "I came to proclaim release to the captive, recovering of sight to the blind, and to set at liberty those who are oppressed."

II. DYNAMIC DEMOCRACY

When we examine the literature in early American history, we discover that leaders of public opinion were not thinking of freedom as a special privilege for themselves, but as a mission to the entire world. In their minds America should serve as a pilot project to inspire the whole world to self-government. With this vision and mission, our great experiment of democracy spread through other countries. France and many Latin American States received a powerful stimulus from the philosophy of our Founding Fathers and emerged from bondage.

Thus far we have recalled our past heritage. Let us also consider our present challenges and future hopes; for democracy is only a partial achievement. We will betray our heritage, if in subtle ways we feel that all great struggles for freedom lie in the past in the mausoleum of history, while we are free to sit down and enjoy it all with no sense of personal involvement. Each generation has its truths to know; its loyalties to follow; its convictions to hold. We stand in the living present. By itself, the past cannot save us from our problems. Modern Washingtons, Jeffersons, and Lincolns are needed. Present-day challenges and future hopes should stir us to complete our partial democracy by strong personal support of all civil liberties, equality for all races, equality of economic opportunities, universal suffrage, and a more inclusive spirit that when we say "with liberty and justice for all," we really mean it.

John Foster Dulles often described the difference between "static" and "dynamic" democracy. Static democracy implies resting on our oars and accepting freedom in a spirit of careless indifference and self-indulgence without any continuing sense of mission. But, dynamic democracy urges us to realize that freedom is only a partial achievement, and we still have a mission to an oppressed world.

Life magazine is now printing a series of articles on "Our National Purpose." These articles reflect deep concern about the spiritual power of the American people. Even as an individual may lose strength and wander in aimless circles of futility when purpose dies, so the vitality of a nation expires when strong national purposes fade away and spiritual dynamic is lost.

III. TOWARD SPIRITUAL MATURITY

Advancement toward greater spiritual maturity will help us toward the goal of a more dynamic democracy.

We are a pleasure-loving people; everybody wants to have a good time. There is nothing wrong with our love of pleasure, and religion is not the killjoy many people would like to make of it; but there is more to life than pleasure alone. Families who search for a doctor prefer one who has more to offer than a capacity for personal pleasure. We want educators who have something more substantial to offer than a good time. Although we all need pleasures, there must be more to life than mere Hedonism, for the philosophy of life expressed in Omar Khayyam, "Let us eat, drink, and be merry," will not bear the weight of a productive civilization. There are many millions of people in our country who apparently see very little more in their freedoms than private opportunities to pursue their personal pleasures, escapes, and various forms of self-indulgence. This is a national sickness. We will grow, advance and become more mature when we, as a people, can enjoy our pleasures, but with a clear knowledge that mere pleasure is a most inadequate God.

We also accent our material blessings. There is nothing wrong with material prosperity. The Christian faith is not an esthetic religion which idealizes poverty, disease, and starvation. As Jesus said, "Your Heavenly Father knoweth ye have need of all these things." But, there is more to life than our material blessings; for "life is more than meat, and the body is more than raiment." Often national progress seems to be measured almost entirely by material progress: bank accounts, new roads, skyscrapers, powerful machines, smoking chimneys, well organized factories, and jet planes. Civilization requires a soul as well as a body. The body is made up of our material strength, wealth, and achievements, but the soul must be expressed in our faith, beliefs, convictions and ideals. The body of a civilization soon perishes when the soul dies. The rubble of ancient civilizations should prove to us that the intangible qual-

ities of knowledge and spirit have more power to endure than material creations. Greek temples have fallen into ruin, but Greek thought still lives. Roman aqueducts have perished, but Roman law and language endure. We, as a people, will mature when we realize that America's future will depend far more upon its soul than its body, more upon its faith and ideals than its material power.

We will show greater spiritual maturity when we confront our spiritual fifth column. Outside military power and threats to our democracy from foreign states are no more serious than our temptations to inward decay and apathy. Because we fear conquest from the outside, we pour billions into defense and anxiously watch the race of scientists for new breakthroughs. Outside powers are a very real threat.

It is said that the guns of Singapore pointed out to sea, but the land defenses to the rear were weak. Singapore was taken from behind. The more subtle threat to our culture comes from behind. Apathy, indifference, and loss of spiritual vitality within, could be as fatal as outside attack; for viruses are as deadly as criminals.

Patriotism should inspire us to more responsible citizenship, for we undermine our great institutions when we pledge allegiance to the flag and then set out to prove our loyalty by refusing jury duty, falsifying income tax reports, playing golf when we are excused from work to vote, and restricting minority groups with a thousand legal impediments. Democracy will never be murdered. If we lose it, it will quietly expire from within for want of spiritual dynamic.

IV. FUTURE SURVIVAL

Intangible qualities of spirit will directly influence our survival as a people. Do we really believe that the world's people will run to us and embrace us because we are rich and powerful? Do we really believe that the sword could save us if the spirit weakened?

We are rapidly approaching a time when physical power may become almost irrelevant in our survival. We now have the power to destroy any potential enemy several times over, and other countries have the power to destroy us several times over. Suppose, in our progress, we soon become able to destroy another nation a hundred times over and that nation grows strong enough to destroy us a hundred times over. Then suppose in the more distant future, we are able to destroy another nation a thousand times over—a nation which could in turn destroy us a thousand times over. Whether one's country is destroyed 10 times over, or 1,000 times over, makes very little difference—once is enough. This increasing physical power will become increasingly irrelevant in the foreseeable future.

Survival of our freedoms will depend far more upon the soul of our country, its faith, ideals and beliefs. The best hope for our democracy will be in our determination to make America a pilot project again. If our commitment to freedom, respect for all men, justice, brotherhood, ideals, and genuine good will for others, shines like a light through our thoughts, literature, laws and policies, the world will run to us; for all men will see in us the hope of peace and progress. Our national purpose must be expressed in our sincerity, our genuine faith in the timeless ideals that gave birth to this country. If we be "lifted up" and exalted by this faith, we shall "draw all men unto us" into reconciliation and peace.

William S. White, Columnist for the Evening Star, Analyzes "Muzzling of the Military" Inquiry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the pleasure of hearing Mr. William S. White do a wonderful job in analyzing the liberal-conservative issue in the Congress before a group of college students.

This columnist possesses a keen insight into this conflict which exists in our legislative processes, and I believe the following article exemplifies his astuteness in this field:

TREATING CASES OF EXTREMISM—SENATOR STENNIS' INQUIRY IS CALLED A JOB OF CALM, HYGIENIC SURGERY

(By William S. White)

Two national boils are in process of careful, antiseptic lancing in the Senate's investigation of the "gagging" of high military officers by civilian superiors in the Pentagon.

The first boil results from the violent oversimplifications of far rightwingers. These people lean to the belief that if only an officer is loudly anti-Communist enough, no one has a right to check his political actions, however extreme those actions may be and even though the restraining official is his constitutional superior and is himself thoroughly anti-Communist, too.

The far rightwingers believe that men in uniform are likely to be more truly committed against communism than are others, simply by the fact of being military professionals. Thus any censorship of these officers by civilian superiors is regarded as next door to crime against the Republic.

The second boil results from the violent oversimplifications of the far leftwingers. These fellows incline to the conviction that professional military men are: (1) Witlessly determined to "provoke" war, (2) hostile to all reform and to civil rights, (3) not really liberal in any way at all—this, of course, being the ultimate of all crimes.

The far rightwingers, in short, believe deep down that military officers usually are more patriotic than civilians and that nobody—including a Secretary of Defense or a President—should really be allowed to order them about in their anti-Communist crusades.

The far leftwingers, on their side, really believe that the military should be treated as a hulking nuisance, like a football left guard at a tea party of self-elected intellectuals, and kept in a very low place.

Most of the leftwingers have never seen significant military service, and unconsciously resent those who have. Some of the rightwingers have seen such military service—sometimes distinguished service—and so think of themselves as even more galaintly martial and gung-ho than the professionals.

Either boil could be made highly dangerous—even cancerous—either by hamhanded and excessively "tough" treatment or by the absence of any treatment at all.

The job of calm, hygienic surgery is being done by the chairman of the investigating subcommittee, Senator JOHN STENNIS of Mississippi. If Senator STENNIS completes the operation as wisely as he has begun it, the country will owe him much. It might also begin to understand why it is that the sort of tradition-minded, responsible and not very partisan conservative southerner of whom he is so typical is so literally indispensable to this Nation in times of root crisis.

For two deeply traditional concerns are involved here. One is constitutional Government. The necessity here is to maintain the ancient constitutional principle that the military must always be under civil authority. The other is the physical safety of the United States in the cold war. The necessity here is to turn back those who would degrade and intellectually destroy the military—to see to it that proper military subordination to civil authority never becomes a suppression of the professional opinion and judgment of military men so vital to national security.

So, the antibiotic being used by Senator STENNIS is an antidote to crackpottery, from right and left. Only such a man is humanly equipped to measure just the right dosages. From long observation this correspondent asserts flatly that it could never be done by either a screaming ultraliberal or a howling ultraconservative. For neither set really understands the traditional values which are at issue here.

Ugly Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently the Lansing Journal, one of the local newspapers in my district which has earned a reputation for its thorough, frank, and clear editorial comment, published an editorial entitled "Ugly Facts," which, under unanimous consent, I insert into the RECORD at this point.

UGLY FACTS

The American public is finally waking up to the basic factors controlling American foreign policy. When the United States acting through the U.N., earlier this month attacked Katanga—the only African country that was pro-United tSates, pro-West, and anti-Communist—many Americans became aware of just how badly things are going for us in world affairs.

When India took over Goa, with feeble but ineffective protests from our U.N. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, Americans finally found out that the neutralist nations of the world are becoming as contemptuous of the United States and the West as the Communists have been for lo, these many years.

We now realize that our American foreign policy cannot take the initiative against the left and that we do take initiative against the right.

We cannot attack Gizenga, the Congo Communist, but we can and do attack

Tshombe of Katanga, the only friend we have in the Congo. It matters not that Gizenga is the Communist's man, that his soldiers rape Western women and eat Western men.

We can force Britain and France out of the Suez, but we cannot even try to force the Russians out of Budapest. We can vote in the U.N. against South Africa and Portuguese rule in Africa, but we cannot even introduce a motion in the U.N. on the Berlin wall, nor did we have the courage to knock it down. We officially welcome the pro-Communist Algerian FLN, but we condemn the anti-Communist pro-Europe OAS.

The same week that we start a war against pro-West Katanga, we grant a $133 million loan to the Communist Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana who had just announced his solidarity with Russia.

We can mass our fleets against the Trujillos but not against the Castros. In fact we cannot take the initiative on behalf of the right, for we have surrendered our foreign policy to the U.N. which holds the veto power over our actions.

This is not a new situation. Past administrations, both Republican and Democrat, have allowed this to happen. The State Department is so entrenched with proliberals and pro-Communists that it appears our executive department is helpless.

Only an aroused public can change the fatal course of our ship of state.

Question of Tariff and Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, knowing full well the question of tariffs and trade is going to be debated with little or no consideration as to the economics of the problem, I would like to present facts covering at least one industry in Pennsylvania, which is the second largest shoe manufacturing State in the Union.

I know by this morning's papers that Adlai Stevenson, our Ambassador to the U.N., in an address last night at Bloomington, Ill., set aside all consideration of the economics and pleaded for consideration of this important question on the basis of a moral issue with the emphasis that it is a moral issue to Americans only.

The President has just given his economic message. He predicts good times—reduced unemployment, balanced budget. He asked for social reforms in education, unemployment compensation, antidiscrimination, retraining programs for workers displaced by imports, Youth Employment Opportunities and Training Act, tax reforms, closing loopholes, expense accounts, and so forth. Further, he has asked for faster depreciation writeoffs for automation to make our industry competitive with imports, $3 billion for Latin America, alliance for progress, $100 million for U.N. bonds. On the U.N. bonds, the President explained that it would save the United States 33⅓ percent on its commitments to the U.N. for Congo action, and so forth, if we bought bonds which were payable by all the nations who now refuse to pay any special assessments. If the proposal does this, it has a very good chance of passage.

In the main, I favor the proposals of the President, However, as Representatives in Congress represent all types of districts—farming, mining, agriculture, manufacturing—a close study will have to be made after the bills have been introduced and reported to committees.

All in all, it promises to be a very busy and eventful year here on the banks of the Potomac. Coupled with elections at home and the heavy Legislative Calendar, the Members will be crowded for time to really study all the bills introduced.

It appears that the trade program will be the hottest issue this session. Although all the heavy weights of press, radio, TV, banking, government, politicos, big business, some of our top labor leaders, plus the legislative leadership, are for the President's trade program, it will not pass in the form Mr. Ball, Mr. Herter, or any other advocate of the original proposal.

This is true because right now, before the bill has been finalized, I make these predictions as against what was proposed and supported by the trade advisers to the President. They proposed joining with the Common Market. The President has agreed not to ask for this. However, the promoters will be back again. They will have to come back with the Common Market issue to cover up the failure of the tariff cutting program if the President uses the powers given him.

They proposed no peril point or escape clause hearings. It will be a miracle if this passes. They proposed no congressional power over any tariff cuts made by the State Department acting for the President. This will have a rocky road and my prediction is that Congress will not give up all its prerogatives on trade policies.

To correct an impression given by some erroneous reporting from Washington, I want to make clear that my Committee on Impact of Imports on American Employment will run until all its work is done, no matter how long the reporting and printing, and so forth takes. The only hearings that may still be held will be when we get more specific information from various departments, lobbyists, foreign trade associations, and so forth, on how many Americans get jobs from exports.

The only official report to date is the one put out by the United States-Japanese Trade Council, showing how many jobs are created in the United States by the Japanese purchases. They claim the creation of 190,000 jobs in the United States.

They do not say how many jobs are displaced by all the Japanese-made goods that fill almost all the stores in town. If they can measure how many they create, how about how many they take away. Of course, the figures are used without too much sense. For instance, they say they buy $32 million plus worth from Mississippi and create 11,000 plus jobs. They then say they buy $60 million worth from Pennsylvania and create 4,820 jobs. It looks a little off base to say that—at minimum wage levels—two-thirds of the purchase price of the goods from Mississippi represents wages.

Even if 50 percent of the selling price is labor, Pennsylvania workers would have to get $6 an hour while Mississippi workers would earn about 70 cents. It is a little hard to believe.

One thing you can be sure of and even the most rabid freetrader must admit that the money loss to the American wage earner is $3 for every item—from the Common Market—imported containing $1 worth of foreign labor. The formula is simple. We pay an average, with fringe benefits, of $2.96 an hour while the eight major European countries pay an average of 85 cents an hour, fringes and all.

If an article costing $2 to an importer contains $1 of foreign labor this means 3 times 1 or $3 is denied an American worker for the same labor contract. By this kind of "trade" we lose $3 million in wages plus salaries on every $2 million worth of products imported from the Common Market and about $6 million on every $2 million imported from Japan and Hong Kong. As a minimum, we must export three times as much as we import in the area of high-labor content products. This is particularly serious when we note the change in the character of our exports as against the imports.

In the last 10 years, the ratio of manufactured goods to nonmanufactures has completely reversed:

In 1950, we imported 37 percent manufactured goods; 53 percent other goods.

In 1960, we imported 61 percent manufactured goods; 39 percent other goods.

As each nation increases its industrial capacity, this trend will accelerate unless high cost areas by some measure, customs, or otherwise, gives its products an equal opportunity competitively in the marketplace. This is even more damaging in the imports of consumer goods where labor and management costs amount to 50 percent or better of the cost of a product. This being true, how can any advocate of a no-tariff policy argue that we are importing less than we export without measuring exports and imports on the volume of goods, costs of imported goods as compared to our costs, the displacement of income in the form of wages and salaries, plus the impact of this differential upon the economy of the community in income losses to service industries, professionals, tax revenues, and local, county, State, and Federal governments.

You will note that I have tried to stay within the impact upon our wage economy since my study has been confined to that area of interest in our trade policies. When it comes to the problems of our international diplomacy, I admit I have rather strong opinions but will refrain from detailing my opinion other than to make a few observations that show the difficulty in determining trade policies based upon international relations.

The science of economics proves that the economy within an industrial com-

plex rests upon the five pillars of economic reason. They are: First, investment; second, production; third, payrolls; fourth, consumption; and fifth, profits.

One depends upon the other and each supports the others in this formula. With one or more of the pillars growing at a more rapid rate of one or more failing to maintain its equal growth, the economy becomes unbalanced and the national welfare in all of its many phases becomes jeopardized. On the other hand, a most inexact science is the science of diplomatic relations between nations.

In this science its operation is affected by the wisp of the human deportment, national aspiration, and political revolutions. When the communities' economic necessities are subjected to the play of diplomacy, the welfare of the community shifts with the winds generated by conditions over which the five pillars of economic stability exercise a minor influence. I respect certain needs of our diplomacy and accept the effects upon our economy.

My complaint is that we lack something in our national life when we fail to repudiate the costs of the diplomatic considerations embodied in our trade policies. Let us not sell the public a trade policy based on nonexisting economic advantage. Rather, let us show the public the cost to the economy of the Nation for the benefits to be derived from diplomatic considerations as they affect the trade policies.

Some of us who oppose any further depreciation of our economic stability may very well become supporters of the trade proposals if we know what we are buying with self-inflicted unemployment and economic recessions. The present statistics of our trade volumes are not to be considered as anything but a temporary status. There are forces at work in this year of our Lord that are neither natural, normal, nor permanent.

In a later presentation I shall make known these influences and these interests. In closing this phase of my remarks, let me assure you that there is a solution to this age-old problem. This solution will give consideration to the diplomatic, the military, and the economic requirements of our Nation. This solution will give consideration to international public relations, the creation and maintenance of international good will between peoples as well as nations, the welfare and requirements of the free world in its struggle with ideologies that deprive peoples and nations of their liberties, their freedoms, and above all, their abilities to better their economic well-being.

It can be done and must be if we are to survive, to prosper, and fulfill the hope held out, not alone to our peoples, but all the peoples of the earth for a better way of life.

At this point, I will review a few statistics affecting your industry which proves my contention that in the field of industrial economies we are in a losing game in foreign trade.

The fact is that the advocates of our new trade policies admit this very fact when they exempt from the powers to cut tariffs without regard to the economies of the industries affected, the agricultural industry and the textile industry.

The shoe industry is one of the examples of the dangers involved in a noneconomic tariff policy. The following figures show three specific statistics that are a matter of record:

Total imports by period years (all footwear except certain specials and rubber boots)

1954	$6,247,000
1957 (year after 4-year extension)	16,378,000
1960	121,478,000

Imports of slippers (housewear) effect of wage differentials by countries

	1954	1957	1960
From—			
Japan	$12,368	$72,600	$2,015,000
Canada	1,388,000	365,900	203,000
All countries	1,500,000	818,000	2,828,000

You will note that as Japan's capacity to export expanded and Canada's wage levels were raised Canada lost its export trade to the United States.

Exports from the United States

1954	$4,053,000
1957	3,542,000
1960	2,266,000

These are examples of the most inflexible rule of commerce and trade both internally as well as externally. Production will flow to lowest cost production areas and sales will flow to the highest income areas.

In saying goodnight, let me assure you this is a most serious problem and will require all our energies to find a solution.

Rev. A. A. Bedikian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a recent article by M. Martin Turpanjian praising the Reverend A. A. Bedikian, pastor emeritus of the Armenian Presbyterian Church of New York City. Reverend Bedikian is a consultant of mine who resides in Leonia, N.J. This article appeared in the January 5, 1962, edition of the Hudson Gazette of North Bergen, N.J.:

REV. A. A. BEDIKIAN

(By M. Martin Turpanjian)

The Reverend A. A. Bedikian, of Leonia, the pastor emeritus of the American Presbyterian Church, of New York City, has been proclaimed as the "Pride of all the Armenians in the world." He is a historian, orator, lecturer, editor, and after-dinner speaker of great prominence.

The Reverend Bedikian writes for nearly all important Armenian magazines and newspapers.

The measure of greatness reaches always its superlative degree in the creative intellectuality of the human mind. The mind of man is the dynamo of progress.

In a world all the glory and the ascendant evolution or progressive development of civilization was achieved by the sheer force of the originality and the inherent genius of the human mind when it is constructively concentrated.

And so when we analyze the brilliant career of the Reverend A. A. Bedikian, the outstanding Armenian protestant minister, historian, orator, lecturer and author, as well as editor and after-dinner speaker, we must confess in all candor and sincerity that his intellectual contribution for the honor and glory of Armenia has created a remarkable good will of the first magnitude. He is the very essence of originality. His literary style is clothed in cultured dighity. His sermons sparkle with gems of wisdom. His philosophy is so clear and forceful and its clarity is so simplified that everyone can grasp the moral value of his logic and ethical convictions.

As a specialized Armenian historian, Rev. A. A. Bedikian has scored a tremendous success and progress. He has made the whole world conscious of the great achievements and the struggles for liberation.

Rev. A. A. Bedikian is a passionate Armenian patriot. He has a serene sense of mental equilibrium. He is cool, calm and poised and deliberate. His sermons articulate the vibrant thrill of penetrating originality and his historical essays show the very air of creative thinking. The name of Rev. A. A. Bedikian will be always treasured as the intellectual genius of the 20th century among the Armenians of the world. His name will always remain in the hall of fame of Armenia.

Role of Milk in the American Diet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday, the National Conference on Milk and Nutrition met here in Washington.

Constructively, the conference reviewed and evaluated—as well as attempted to deal with some of the difficult problems involved in the major role of milk in the diet of American people.

Among other discussions, the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, delivered a thought-provoking address on major problems in this field.

Last year, the Nation produced about 125 billion pounds of milk. Of this amount, the output of Wisconsin, the No. 1 milk-producing State, was about 18 billion pounds.

Despite a 2-billion-pound increase in production over the previous year, however, there was a 2½-percent decrease in the consumption of milk.

According to predictions, the output will be higher for 1962—possibly amounting to 127 billion pounds nationally, unless realistic creative actions are taken to increase consumption, as well as to find other constructive utilization for milk, we can expect even greater surpluses.

Believing that Secretary Freeman's remarks deserve the consideration of Congress, I ask unanimous consent to

have excerpts of the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROLE OF MILK IN THE AMERICAN DIET

(Address by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman prepared for delivery at the National Conference on Milk and Nutrition, Inter-Departmental Auditorium, Constitution Ave., Washington, D.C., January 23, 1962, 9:30 a.m.)

Abraham Lincoln, in recommending the Department of Agriculture be established, said it would be the department of the people. His words of 100 years ago were never more true than they are today. We are meeting here at a conference called to discuss a question in which the interest of all the people—the farmer, consumer, businessman, and worker—are closely entwined.

It is a question which began to be heard last spring when, for the first time, it was noticed that milk consumption on an overall basis was declining nationwide. By the end of the year, the trend was clearly established. The consumer had used about 3 billion pounds less of milk than in 1960.

And like all basic changes in our complex society, this one affects all the people—the farmer, consumer, businessman and worker. It is important that we know why this happened and what its effect will be.

The dairy industry in the past decade has seen many changes, but the magnitude of this particular development was totally unexpected. Let us then stand back a step and take a careful look at what is taking place in the dairy industry and what it means.

Like all other farming occupations, dairying has undergone a quiet, but dramatic, revolution in the productive capacity of the individual farmer.

During the 5 years between 1954 and 1959, for example, 4 out of every 10 dairy farms ceased to operate as milk producers. Those farmers who remained in dairying, however, added one cow on the average for every three already in the herd. And, every one of those milk cows produced in 1959 a gallon and a half of milk for every gallon and a quarter in 1954.

Until 1961, the increase in population generally consumed the increase.

What has happened in the dairy industry is being repeated, of course, in the production of virtually every farm commodity. It has meant that while 32 out of every 100 farmers left agriculture during the decade of the 1950's, output per hour of farmwork has tripled.

As a result, with fewer people and fewer acres in production, the American farmer—spurred on by the new developments in technology and the discoveries of science—can actually produce more food and fiber than ever before.

The end is not even within sight. A study made recently by agricultural experts here in the Department predicts that by 1980, American agriculture will be able to meet all its commitments at home and abroad with 50 million fewer acres than are being cultivated today.

I believe most people would concede that under such conditions as have existed and will exist, the farmer is being subjected to unique economic pressures.

But in dairying, a third force has been added. Instead of a steady, gradual increase in consumption to be expected with a growing population, the total volume of milk and dairy products used by Americans has decreased this past year.

This development has implications far beyond the immediate economic effect on agriculture, on those who handle milk and dairy products and those who look to the dairy farmer as a market for production machinery and material.

Its most serious implication may well be in the long-term effect it can have on the health and vigor of the people and the Nation.

If there are time when it may appear that the Department is overly concerned with the economic prospects of the farmer, let it be understood that our responsibility is to the whole population, with strong emphasis on the problems of the farmers.

I am concerned when a new—and unexpected—development arises which will affect a complex industry. If this development brings a change which will benefit the Nation but requires an adjustment, then we should seek ways to make the adjustment with as little disruption and dislocation as possible.

If, however, a development occurs for reasons which are not clearly established or for which there is no broad agreement scientifically, then I am concerned lest we force adjustments which we will later regret.

I am particularly concerned when anything as basic as nutritional health could be placed in potential jeopardy.

I am sure these are some of the questions which also trouble you, and I hope that through this conference today we can begin to explore them and to direct wider public attention to them.

Let me outline in brief some of the specific areas of concern:

First, we have become extremely weight conscious in this country in recent years. If the drop in milk consumption is related to this question, we ought to be greatly concerned. Weight control involves the extent to which we use our muscles as well as the amount of food we eat. Food alone should not be expected to carry the entire burden. Insofar as we reduce calorie intake, it should be of foods important cheifly for calories—not of foods that carry indispensable proteins, minerals, and vitamins. The American people should not make wrong changes in their dietary habits to prevent or cure obesity.

Nutritional authorities tell us that we need to know much more than we do today about the place of butter and other kinds of fat in meeting the nutritional needs of people. They also tell us that there should be no drastic modification in diets until nutritional research can point the way with more certainty and in more detail. We know that extremes in amount used of any one kind of food may lead to trouble. Moderation and variety are two words to remember in thinking about the relationship of diet and long-term well-being.

Unquestionably, there are many people who, on competent medical advice, must certainly follow special diets. But there are countless others—both young and old—who now do not receive adequate nutrition, particularly those essential building blocks of life for which milk is the best and most convenient source. Infants and growing children especially need milk and dairy products in their diet because of the large amounts of calcium and high-quality protein required to keep up with the growth needs.

Milk contains three important nutrients—calcium, riboflavin, and protein, in addition to other essential food elements—which people get too little of for their best nutritional health, and usually because they do not get enough milk.

In fact, milk makes it easy to get the calcium and riboflavin we need. In this Nation's food supplies, milk provides about two-thirds of all the calcium, nearly half of the riboflavin, and a fourth of the protein.

Another reason that milk is a necessary food source is that it contains many different nutrients in highly beneficial balance which meet one of the basic requirements of good health. The nutrients work together efficiently to meet the body's needs.

The decline in milk consumption last year was small when compared with the total supply of milk—barely 2.5 percent. But coming at a time when it is known that milk and dairy products help fill essential nutritional needs, I think everybody should be concerned.

The second area of concern relates to the basic responsibility of the Department to the generations of the future—to insure the productivity capability of our farming resources and to provide adequate food at reasonable cost.

The soil and water resources of this Nation, together with the most efficient system of agriculture history has yet known—the family farm—have helped make the American the best nourished person of all time.

The dairy industry has a vital share in the mission of American agriculture, for dairy products are a dependable and economical source of good nutrition.

The dairy farm is an exceptionally efficient means of utilizing soil and water resources to meet human needs. The dairy cow can crop the land that is too steep, too soft, too irregular for the plow and combine. Grassland agriculture yields abundant harvests of meat and milk, without the cost to the future of erosion and soil exhaustion.

The dairy industry—from farm and barn to grocery shelf and the kitchen refrigerator—performs an industrial and economic miracle. It furnishes consumers with basic food products that are highly perishable, yet reach the consumer fresh and pure and at moderate cost.

It encompasses more independent and competing enterprises than any other single industry in our economy. There are about 1 million farmers who sell milk, and over 400,000 of them receive more than half their income from dairying. Cash receipts from dairying last year were almost $5 billion. The processing and handling of dairy products before they reach the retail level provides jobs for almost 300,000 persons with an annual payroll of more than $1.3 billion.

The dairy industry is a worthy example of American agriculture, and it should be maintained and strengthened. Thus, anything which may cause it to change should be considered seriously and with cold logic, for it is a vital and highly integrated part of our national economy.

If its products endanger national health, then we should not be afraid to face that fact and the adjustments it entails; but we should not be so fearful of the unknown that we hasten to make a change which in itself may damage the physical health of our people and the economic health of the Nation.

I believe the industry already recognizes that the impact of science and technology on dairying has created a situation where the dairy farmer receives less for his investment and labor than do most other agricultural producers. For example, the return per hour of work for the operator and his family in 1960 in the major dairy regions of the country varies from less than 50 cents an hour to no higher than 67 cents.

There is a growing realization that the adjustment which will provide greater economic reward, while reducing Government expenditures to stabilize milk prices, is a program of supply management.

Thus, the industry is willing to consider changes which will improve the economic health of their industry and their community, and which will insure an adequate supply of milk and dairy products while reducing the cost of Government programs.

But, given the weight of all available evidence as to the nutritional needs of the American people, the adjustments which may be required by the current drop in con-

sumption and the increasing productive capacity must include vigorous efforts to encourage the use of milk in the interest of good and balanced nutrition for our population.

That also is the purpose of this conference—to explore the opportunities which our abundance of milk and dairy products gives to us to raise our dietary standards, and to improve the health and vitality of our people.

I can only underscore the importance of the task you will soon undertake by saying that your concern as well as mine is shared by the President. He has felt this strongly, and we are honored that he would come personally to be with us and to speak to us.

With his leadership, we can, I believe, begin to place many of the forces now affecting the health of our people as well as the economic future of dairying in a much clearer perspective.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Alaska on the Move

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, as Alaska enters upon its third year as a State, many of my colleagues have asked me the question, "How are things going in Alaska?" My answer in capsule form is that Alaska is going ahead as expected, and that new developments are producing new revenues which have helped materially in overcoming the costs of statehood. For the information of my colleagues, and as a salute to the petroleum industry which has made impressive strides in Alaska during the past 3 years, I cite a recent editorial from the Anchorage Times which reads as follows:

PETROLEUM INDUSTRY MAKES A BIG IMPACT

Hardly a day goes by that Alaskans can't witness firsthand the favorable impact that the petroleum industry has had on the new State.

The industry has brought hundreds of new citizens to Alaska, people who daily make valuable contributions to the social, cultural, educational, and economic scheme of things here.

If it is on the latter phase—economics—that the petroleum industry has gained its widest reputation, perhaps it is because the economic growth the industry is making is most spectacular.

But the value to Alaska of the new citizens brought here by the industry is also a great gain for the State.

In an important respect, the industry's contribution to the economic development of the State makes possible the growth and progress of the other factors.

The industry is responsible for an influx of population. Especially is this evident in Anchorage and on the Kenai Peninsula.

It has provided new sources of employment for Alaskans who were already here when the industry first investigated its opportunities in Alaska.

It has made an important impact on the commercial communities of the State, in the buildings it leases, in the services and supplies it purchases.

It is in the exploration and production field that the industry has made its greatest strides.

Today, only a few years after the first successful oil well was completed on the Kenai Peninsula, the industry has a flourishing program that is continuing to grow and expand.

Already on the Kenai Peninsula are an oil pipeline leading to a port terminal, a natural gas pipeline extending to Anchorage, storage facilities for crude petroleum, warehouse and yard facilities for equipment and supplies.

In the offing are a refinery for the manufacture of petroleum products, as well as additional headquarter sites and the necessary adjuncts to an expanded exploration program.

The industry has done great things in Alaska, but little has been handed to it on a silver platter.

The accomplishments to date have been made at great financial expense. Millions of dollars have been expended in one of the riskiest businesses in the world.

The State is indeed fortunate that the petroleum industry has the confidence it has shown in risking capital to develop an important natural resource. The industry, likewise, has been favored by the great potential petroleum wealth that lies under Alaska's surface—a potential, it is hoped, that has barely begun to be tapped.

The Future of our Service Bands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 26, 1962

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation which, if enacted, would provide for special pay for the members of the U.S. Army Band, the U.S. Navy Band, the U.S. Marine Corps Band, and the U.S. Air Force Band.

I am convinced that it is imperative that the legislation I have proposed be enacted immediately. The reasons have best been stated by Mr. Phil Fuller in the September 1961 issue of "The School Musician," and I quote:

4. It is important to citizens of this country that they be represented by the best and when these four major bands represent us at diplomatic, military, Government, and civic functions they should mirror the highest standards of musical and ceremonial artistry and dignity achieveable in this world. This is even more true today than ever before because every minute detail of U.S. activity is now compared to their counterparts in foreign countries—Russia, in particular. This is one phase of American diplomacy which can be superior at a very low cost to the Government.

I would like to furnish a short explanation as to why the situation today has become acute. Prior to 1960, all services in general had made the determination that messing facilities were not available for bandsmen at their permanent duty stations. As a result, they were allowed to pay a subsistence allowance "when rations in kind are not available"—$2.57 per day—instead of at the rate authorized, "when permission to mess separately is granted"—$1.10 per day. As a result of the Comptroller General's decision, on March 2, 1960, the individual services have been denied authority to pay more than the lower rate of $1.10 per day. This has meant a loss to each individual bandsman of approximately $44 per month.

In addition to this, there have been increased demands for participation by the bands for military occasions, civic occasions of national importance, and worldwide tours under the sponsorship of our State Department. Therefore, expenses incurred by the bandsmen for uniform maintenance and meal arrangements while on tour have continued to increase. The Department of Defense has completed a special study of the problem and this summer adopted a general policy in opposition to preferential treatment, including pay, for members of the service bands. The Defense Department believes that mere membership in these organizations, because of the distinction and prestige accompanying such membership, should be sufficient to attract new members and retain older, experienced members as enlistments expire. The Assistant Secretary of Defense, Mr. Carlisle P. Runge, in his letter to me of June 9, concludes by stating: "It would seem desirable to evaluate the validity of this contention before initiating any action in the premises." The contention referred to by Mr. Runge is that without special treatment new recruits will not be obtained and, most importantly, present band members with over 5 years' experience will not reenlist, but will elect to associate with symphonic orchestras or become professional teachers.

It was my hope that the Defense Department, on its own, would initiate a change in policy, which I believe the facts clearly demonstrate to be imperative. Such has not been done, and therefore, after extended discussions with the leaders of all four bands, I have concluded that if legislation such as I have proposed is not enacted in this session of the Congress, the quality of music offered by the bands will suffer. I have received from each band leader questionnaires suggested by me and filled out by each member of all four service bands. I feel this statistical information supports completely the validity of my contention.

Milk at Every Meal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 26, 1962

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I believe this editorial from the Watertown

Daily Times, of Watertown, N.Y., is a clear analysis of the problem that our dairy farmers in northern New York are faced with. I hope everyone will read it:

MILK AT EVERY MEAL

President Kennedy spoke briefly at the National Conference on Milk and Nutrition in Washington Tuesday. He was photographed drinking a toast in milk. He was quoted as saying that from now on milk will be served at every meal in the White House. The conference that the President participated in was arranged by the Department of Agriculture. Its purpose was to consider the cause of a drop in milk consumption last year.

The President pointed out that in 1961 the American public consumed 125 billion pounds of dairy products, milk, butter, cheese, and ice cream. This was 2 to 3 billion pounds less than the amount consumed in 1960. He set against these figures the fact that the population had gone up by almost 2 percent and milk production had gone up 1.5 percent. He said, "We only know that the slow decline in consumption over a period of time become immediate and precipitous last year." He then went off on a series of comments about fallout contamination and cholesterol in milk. He pointed out that the importance of either fallout or cholesterol has been clearly exaggerated.

It would be asking too much if all of a sudden after these many years, the dairy problems of farmers should receive from Washington attention comparable to what a figure of 125 billion would occasion if that total were dollars rather than pounds. President Kennedy's interest in milk is welcomed. We are happy that the White House is going to serve milk at every meal. For a solution to the one example in the American economy where prices to the dairymen today are as low and perhaps lower than they were 10 years ago, there must be more concentrated attention than there has been in the past. It is to be hoped that President Kennedy will assign one of his troubleshooting experts and confidants to this milk production problem and cut through some of the fanciful thinking that is to blame for the price and for the declining consumption which the product has experienced.

One reason the consumption of milk, particularly fluid, has gone down is its price in the marketplace. The price to the consumer has been going up in the last 10 years even though the price to the produce is dropping—1961 was hardly a prosperous year nationally, but even so the consumer paid more for his milk when he felt he should purchase it. The fluid consumption has gone down also because of the opportunity to purchase dried milk products at much more advantageous prices than the fluid milk.

As the fluid price has gone up because of handling charges, the milk industry has developed all sorts of new manufacturing uses for milk. It so happens that this milk sells at a much lower price; namely, a class 3 price, a figure that is sharply in contrast with the class 1 price. Thus, vast numbers of producers have been diverted from the fluid market into the class 3 market. As their prices reflect less and less of the fluid classification, these producers increase their production in order to have more milk to sell at the class 3 price.

Transportation has become a big factor in the cost of milk. As a result the fluid production farmers have clustered themselves around the big cities. It is their milk that is going into the milk bottle while the producers that are 200 or 300 or 400 miles from the big markets must send their milk to the manufacturing plants that convert the fluid into milk powders and lower priced manufacturing categories.

The answer to the milk problem of production and low prices rests in the development of greater consumption. The best way to get greater fluid consumption is through lower prices. How can that be done? One way to do it is to remove from the cost of marketing milk some of the locked-in costs. These locked-in costs have been allowed to increase tremendously in the handling of the product. Everybody from the collector of milk through the milk plant and out onto the routes has been given a series of pay increases, but there has been nothing available or even considered for the farmer himself. His share of the consumer dollar on milk is as low as it has ever been in history.

It has been reported that the plan on milk is one in which each dairy farmer will be given a strict allotment on the amount that he can produce. Those who produce more would be fined and the fines would be used to help pay the costs of surplus disposal. This is no answer to the milk problem. If the Secretary of Agriculture puts across this allotment program, it is predicted that 2 or 3 years from now the milk price to the consumer will be higher than it is today; the milk income of the producer will be no higher, and possibly lower. It is also predicted that those who make the allotments will carve things up in a manner by which a majority of the producers will be a victim of the minority. The dairy industry today is very closely organized at the top. That means only one thing. The allotments will take care of those at the top who will be delighted to divide up the market among themselves and at the same time push out the producer who does not happen to be a member of the closely knit association elite.

Mending Those Political Fences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CARLTON LOSER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 26, 1962

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, there has just come to my attention a most interesting and informative feature story appearing in one of the Nation's leading newspapers, the Commercial Appeal, published at Memphis, Tenn. The author is Eugene D. Rutland, a feature writer on this paper.

This story has as its principal actor the Honorable ROBERT ASHTON "FATS" EVERETT, who has the great honor to represent the Eighth Congressional District of Tennessee in the Congress of the United States.

"Mending Those Political Fences" is an interesting topic these days, especially among the newer Members of the Congress, and I believe a careful reading of this story will prove beneficial to many of us. While the subject of this story is called ROBERT ASHTON by his charming mother, Tennesseans from Carter to Shelby know him only as "FATS."

He is one of the more popular Members of the House and I thought this story would make interesting reading here in the Nation's Capital. It follows:

MENDING THOSE POLITICAL FENCES

(By Eugene D. Rutland)

It's fence fixin' time in the valley. And that valley stretches from the rocky coasts of Maine to the shores of Hawaii and from the tundra of Alaska to the sands of the gulf coast.

Fence fixin' time is that lull between the time Congress adjourns in the late summer or fall and when it begins again in January. It's a time when Congressmen have an opportunity to visit the hinterlands—those crossroad communities and cities where the fate of congressional aspirants is decided.

It's an occasion to soothe ruffled feelings—to iron out misunderstandings and to fix up some of the weak sections in their political fences.

It's a welcome opportunity to learn what the folks back home are thinking and how they feel about the way he voted on legislation in Washington.

Take jovial Representative ROBERT A. "FATS" EVERETT, Democrat, of Tennessee, from the Eighth District, who is a member of the Committee on House Administration and Veterans' Affairs and a floor leader for a bloc of Southern States.

Just what does a Representative do with his time during the lull between sessions of Congress? Want to follow him for a day? Well, come along.

"FATS," as he is known to all, has a three-room office suite in Union City. He has a secretary, Miss Hope Hart, and two assistants.

He has an early breakfast (6 to 6:30 a.m.) at home, where he lives with his mother, Mrs. Charlie Everett, a spry 72. He has a garage apartment to the rear of the Everett home. It is connected with the home by a special telephone, which permits Mrs. Everett to reach him by picking up the telephone—no dialing or calling is necessary.

"FATS" feels that with being out late many nights, it is better to have an apartment away from the house so he will not disturb his mother.

It's a man-sized apartment with specially built oak furniture from one of the craft centers in Gatlinburg. He has oversized furniture to make him comfortable, because he's one of the heaviest (320 pounds) and one of the tallest (6 feet 3½ inches) men in the Congress. His apartment includes a kitchen—just in case he needs a snack before retiring.

Up early because his constituents are rural, he's had his breakfast and is at his desk by 7. And from the amount of mail (75 letters a day), the 20 to 30 visitors and 100 telephone calls a day, he needs to get there early.

Waiting for him when he arrives is the late mail of the previous day.

"I answer every one of them myself," he said. "How am I going to keep up with the requests if I don't?" He dictates his letters.

And it's amazing how he can handle all of the facets of the requests that reach his desk. What are the folks in his district asking?

Here are some of the tasks he handles with the dexterity of an "egg dancer."

There is one from a young man who wants to go to the U.S. Air Force Academy. Mr. EVERETT knows that it's tough to get in and so he writes the young man a fatherly letter, telling what's required. He tells him he'll be happy to support him if he meets the strict requirements.

Many of the letters on his desk are requests for help in getting jobs. Of the 75 letters, 15 ask about a job—either in a country, State, or Federal area. Most of them, however, are for district jobs with companies which have large Government contracts.

One young man in the Armed Forces wanted out so he could take care of his parents, who had become ill. Another wanted to get out of the reserve because of his dependants. Another was seeking help in getting an appointment to a flying school.

Another asked, "Will you send me your autograph? I'm collecting the signatures of famous people."

That was an easy one and he signed his name.

"I receive all kinds of letters," said Mr. EVERETT. "The bulk are about pensions, social security and from people who need to break through a lot of Government redtape. I don't know what some folks would do if they didn't have someone to help get action on Government requests.

"I get only a few letters I can't read. It's got to be pretty bad before I give up."

His letters come from all over the Nation because people who once lived in his district know him and know he will take care of their request. Or perhaps the out-of-State person knows someone in his district and has asked him to help. "FATS" does his best, which is usually enough.

Then there was this one—

Can you help me get two tickets to the Tennessee-Ole Miss game in Memphis?

That could be a problem, but "FATS" has contacts and the request probably will be filled.

All of those things are part of being a Representative—it's serving the needs of the folks who elected him to his job.

When he had finished a few of the letters, the telephone began to ring.

One was a call from a friend to thank him for something he had done and to ask help in getting a relative into a veterans' hospital.

Then came the visitors—farmers, businessmen. They filled the waiting room. "FATS" greeted each one as he walked into the room.

He listens patiently and makes notes of their request and often he will call in a secretary and dictate a letter answering the request while the person is in the office. He believes in getting the job done right now and his constituent knows that he's eager to handle the request.

After 2 or 3 hours he takes a coffee break in his office from his own coffee pot. He reads while he drinks.

Then it's lunch time. He joins a few cronies to eat a light lunch. Lunch time is hand shaking time and he greets the folks with a sincere roaring laugh. You get the feeling that he likes everyone, and he does.

After lunch he's off to visit some folks in the district. He drives out to Faulkner store in the Harris-Lindenwood district. It was in this district that he conducted his first political campaign.

"I'm proud of the folks in that district. They elected me to my first public office. If I had lost that race I probably wouldn't have been elected to Congress."

There is no hurry when "FATS" is visiting—fixing his fences at the crossroads store and communities. He gets a lot of answers to problems that bother him when he's in Washington. He wants to know how the folks feel and he tries to follow their desires.

Speechmaking takes up a lot of time, but it's necessary. "I spend 15 days out of each month when I'm away from Washington making speeches," he said.

He's vitally interested in small business because most of the businesses in his district are small.

"Too many small businessmen are being forced out and we've got to do something to stop it," he observed.

He's interested in flood control and he's proud of the help he's getting from such district leaders as Archie Cultra, Obion County nurseryman and farmer.

"We are making some progress. We've got to get something done to stop the flooding of lands. It's costing the farmers too much money. Proper drainage will do it and we've got to get the money some way," he said.

After an evening of speechmaking, it's home for a little rest, to get ready for some more of the same the next day.

It's that way most of the time, but "FATS" thrives on it—meeting the people he likes and he likes them all. He's feeling the pulse of the folks back home—fixin' up misunderstandings and letting the people know that he's looking after their interests in the Nation's Capital.

Proposed Code of Federal Administration Procedure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 26, 1962

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER announced today that the Special Subcommittee on Administrative Law of the House Committee on the Judiciary would shortly consider a number of bills concerned with the administrative and regulatory agencies. One of these, an elaborate revision of the Administrative Procedure Act drafted by a committee of the American Bar Association, was introduced today by Mr. WALTER, chairman of the special subcommittee.

Mr. WALTER in the 1940's led the movement to establish a uniform administrative procedure which would protect the rights of individuals before the Federal agencies. He was the sponsor of the Walter-Logan Act which was enacted by the Congress and vetoed by the President in 1941. Five years later as chairman of the Subcommittee on Administrative Procedure he led in the passage of the Administrative Procedure Act.

In introducing the American Bar Association's proposed code of Federal administrative procedure, Mr. WALTER made the following statement:

"There is universal agreement that the administrative and regulatory agencies of the Federal Government have enormous power and by their policies and decisions affect the well-being of great industries and the everday life of our whole people. There is equal agreement that the great regulatory agencies have not functioned as effectively as they should, and have failed in many instances to serve the public interest and need. Among those who have been personally involved in the process there also is a strong sense that the entire administrative and regulatory process has proved unsatisfactory in many respects as it touches the rights and interests of individual citizens.

"The time has come for the Congress to act on both fronts. It must insure that the agencies, especially those which are in effect arms of the Congress, perform their major function of policymaking with greater effectiveness. And it must insure that the rights of individual parties to agency proceedings are properly guarded.

"The bill I have just introduced is primarily designed to secure fair treatment for anyone involved in the administrative process, both before the agencies and on review in the courts. In many respects it does no more than restate the intention of Congress in passing the Administrative Procedure Act in 1946 and correct the misunderstandings of that act and its purposes by the agencies and courts.

"While I do not agree with the bill in every detail I have introduced, I feel it will serve as an excellent basis for consideration and discussion out of which should come improvements in the law as it now stands.

"When the present law was enacted in 1946 it was contemplated that it would be reviewed in the light of experience. We have now had enough experience to know the changes that are needed to protect our people in dealing with the administrative agencies of our Government.

"We also must consider other changes in the existing laws which will have the effect of enabling the agencies, particularly the independent agencies, to achieve their broader public objectives more successfully. Certain of their problems and difficulties have been established in the course of very thorough hearings by a number of committees. The Subcommittee on Administrative Procedure intends to seek practical solutions to those problems so far as they may be within its jurisdiction.

"In an economy so complex as ours, the continued failure of the agencies to make policy wisely and with [illegible]agination is likely to involve our people in recurring crises as workers, investors, and consumers.

"It is the duty of the Congress to do everything in its power to see that these crises with their accompaniment of confusion and breakdowns and losses should not occur."

Soviet's Real Aim—Not Berlin but West Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 26, 1962

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in a most perceptive editorial on the vital subject of Berlin and West Germany, Roscoe Drummond incisively points out that "Getting its hands on all of Berlin has never been Moscow's prime objective. This is only a step toward a larger prize. The larger prize is West Germany itself—to tempt Bonn to abandon NATO and cast its future in a Soviet association."

This is why, as Mr. Drummond so cogently explains, "U.S. Ambassador Thompson's talks with Gromyko are unproductive. They are cultivating stony ground."

Mr. Drummond adds the important point that "This is why the European Common Market is such a valuable instrument. It embeds West Germany into the whole fabric of Western Europe to the incalculable benefit of all. It is the best assurance that the Kremlin will not get its hands on the prize it most wants—an alliance with West Germany and the destruction of NATO.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to read this important article thoughtfully:

SOVIET'S REAL AIM—NOT BERLIN BUT WEST GERMANY

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The real purpose of the Soviet Union in trying to drive the West out of Berlin is now coming fully into the open.

Getting its hands on all of Berlin has never been Moscow's prime objective. This is only a step toward a larger prize. The larger prize is West Germany itself—to tempt Bonn to abandon NATO and cast its future in a Soviet association.

This purpose has always been implicit in Khrushchev's Berlin gambit. Now it is visible. The second card is faceup on the table. This is the way the Soviets have played it:

They handed a 20-page memorandum to the West German Ambassador in Moscow to deliver to Bonn. They suggested that the Soviets would make it worth while to West Germany if it would cut its ties with the West; break with its NATO Allies, and make a direct settlement with the Soviet Union.

What was the lure? Why, if Bonn could only see which side of the bread the butter was on, with just a few conditions it could get back East Germany and enjoy a veritable ocean of trade with Russia.

All it would have to do would be to withdraw from NATO and join the Warshaw Pact. And why wouldn't that be a fine idea for Germany, the note suggested, since—or so the argument went—Bonn can't really trust its Western allies and, furthermore, only the Soviet Union can grant a united Germany.

The Soviets made a second move to the same end. They invited West Berlin Mayor Willy Brandt to enter bilateral talks over the fate of Berlin. Thus the Kremlin moved simultaneously to detach the Allies from any settlement on Berlin and to persuade the Federal Republic to detach itself from its Western allies in return for a promised united Germany.

This explains why the Thompson-Gromyko talks in Moscow are barren. Khrushchev cannot accept any settlement over Berlin as long as he is using the lack of settlement as bait to get West Germany to move away from its Western alliance.

This explains why in a recent speech in Washington Soviet Ambassador Menshikov stated baldly that Moscow would never accept any arrangement confirming Western rights in West Berlin.

No wonder U.S. Ambassador Thompson's talks with Gromyko are unproductive. They are cultivating stony ground. It is clear that Khrushchev wants to keep Berlin unsettled so that he can use its unsettlement to try to arouse German distrust of the Allies and persuade as many German leaders as possible that it would be good politics and good business to make a deal with the Kremlin.

Obviously Moscow's first choice would be to emasculate Western rights in West Berlin, which would give it even greater leverage over West Germany itself.

Its second choice is to keep the matter unresolved, so that it can continue to use it both as warning and as lure to Bonn.

Chancellor Adenauer is not taken in one bit, nor is he tempted by it. Neither is Mayor Brandt, now himself the head of the opposition party in Bonn. But the Kremlin is not thinking only of next month—or next year. It is thinking of future German governments. One reason for the East Berlin wall is to make it grimly clear to the West Germans that only the Russians can take it down, only the Russians can offer a united Germany.

My own conviction is that most West Germans are deeply convinced that their future is with the West and with Western Europe. But the danger of being tempted to reach into the Soviet trap is ever present. This is why the European Common Market is such a valuable instrument. It imbeds West Germany into the whole fabric of Western Europe to the incalculable benefit of all. It is the best assurance that the Kremlin will not get its hands on the prize it most wants—an alliance with West Germany and the destruction of NATO.

Speaker John W. McCormack as Seen From Skidmore College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 26, 1962

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert for the record a newspaper article that appeared in the January 18, 1962, edition of the Skidmore News, Skidmore College, New York.

The article, which was headlined "JOHN W. MCCORMACK" in the regular "Open Comment" column, was written by Valerie Burkhardt.

It is, in my estimation, an article of considerable political sophistication and perspective; moreover, it is a testimony of the value of women—and particularly young women—who take a serious interest in politics.

It was my privilege to have Miss Burkhardt on my staff last summer, and so it is with especial pride that I include the article, written by a brilliant young lady, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK—OPEN COMMENT

(By Valerie Burkhardt)

Once again Capitol Hill is in a flurry of political activity—pages running helter-skelter with new bills and messages, daily letters from constituents promising support in November if a certain bill is passed, the stale odor of cigar smoke permeating committee rooms and the aura of self-confidence on the face of last year's newcomer. Yet, despite apparent normalcy, there has been a great change. Sam Rayburn's 17-year control of the speakership was definitely concluded last Wednesday when the House of Representatives elected his successor, Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK. Mr. Sam's leadership will be greatly missed in this session, but it is generally agreed that Speaker MCCORMACK is a creditable successor.

As majority leader for 17 years, the new Speaker has familiarized himself with the ups and downs of House politics. He has won the support of many representatives by influencing their committee assignments, a part of his role as floor leader. And, he will need this support and any other support he can get in this session if any of President Kennedy's vital legislation is to be passed. His close working relations with the former Speaker and his experience last summer in running the House during Rayburn's illness have provided Mr. MCCORMACK with a sampling of what lies ahead. This brief experience will be invaluable in the first months of his tenure.

Speaker MCCORMACK is in a powerful position. In addition to being third in the line of presidential succession, he has the authority to recognize Members from the floor. By this, a Speaker can control the tone of a debate by only recognizing certain Members. Coupled with his control of patronage and committee assignments, the speakership becomes one of the most important positions in the American political scene. Backed by a strong majority, a Speaker can run Congress according to his preferences. Such men as Thomas B. Reed and Joseph "Czar" Cannon are outstanding examples of the control a Speaker can assume. That MCCORMACK will rule the House unobstructedly is doubtful, for although he is backed by a solid Democratic majority, he may encounter opposition from a conservative coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats.

Because Mr. Sam wielded great political power and prestige, he has created a precedent which his successor will find difficult to equal. Much will be expected of MCCORMACK during his first few months as Speaker, perhaps more than he can fulfill. The upcoming congressional elections will be a constant reminder to the Speaker that if his party is to retain a strong majority at the polls, he will have to make this session one of accomplishment and progress, not of floor fights and filibusters. Speaker MCCORMACK does not face an agenda of uncontroversial legislation, but with party support and skillful tactics, he can make the last session of the 87th Congress one which accepts and meets the challenges of the world today.

Transport Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO Resolution on Railroad Merger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, as one who has seen the impact of the mergers of large corporations in the last few years, I am rather concerned about the proposed merger of the Pennsylvania Railroad and the New York Central Railroad.

On January 15, 1962, the international executive council of the Transport Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, adopted a resolution which I wholeheartedly support. The resolution follows:

TRANSPORT WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA, AFL–CIO RESOLUTION ON RAILROAD MERGER

Whereas the directors of the New York Central Railroad and the directors of the Pennsylvania Railroad have entered into a $4,400 million merger pact designed to promote the financial interests of the Wall Street cliques which control both railroads; and

Whereas this pact has been worked out by selfish men who have demonstrated over the years their utter disregard of the public interest and their callous unconcern for their employees, and who have neither the capacity nor the purpose to protect the vital essential services required from national railroads; and

Whereas the welfare of the 150,000 men and their families who operate these railroads is gravely threatened by this proposed merger deal: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this International Executive Council of the Transport Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO hereby condemns the merger pact as a financial deal designed to line the pockets of a few men and concen-

trate excessive power in their hands, to the detriment of the Nation and with disastrous effect on the employees; and be it further

Resolved, That it is incumbent on the President, the Attorney General and the Congress in their separate fields, to investigate this proposed merger pact with meticulous care and in any event block any steps leading toward its effectuation until the national interest and the rights of the employees are satisfactorily protected; and be it finally

Resolved, That this International Union call upon all other unions whose members are affected to join in a common determination and in a joint fight to resist this merger pact and to use every weapon in their control including strike to protect the job security, seniority and retirement rights of every employee on the seniority rosters of both railroads and their subsidiaries and affiliates.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 26, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

LONG BEACH, CALIF.,
November 25, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I want to thank you for your effort and work to try to pass the House Resolution 211. It would be a great victory if a special committee of the House would work to help the captive nations, including my birthplace, Hungary.

God bless you for your efforts.

Very sincerely yours,

G. KERTESZ, M.D.

DIXON, DEJARNETTE, BRADFORD,
WILLIAMS, MCKAY & KIMBRELL,
Miami, Fla., November 29, 1961.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have just become apprised of a letter which you wrote to Chairman HOWARD W. SMITH of the House Rules Committee, opposing the creation of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. It is my understanding that in this letter you expressed the concern that Moscow would not like it, particularly in the Berlin crisis.

I would like to again suggest that we stop running our Government, based upon what Moscow would or would not like. It seems apparent that Moscow certainly does not run their government based upon what we would or would not like. Let's just take the current situation concerning the resumption of nuclear testing.

I understand your letter states that governmental and private sources have long been studying the subject anyway. On a radio program broadcast over the Manion Forum under date of November 12, 1961, Dr. Lev. E. Dobriansky, professor of economics, Georgetown University, publicly challenged you to produce any comprehensive study dealing with this matter, even though in your letter you state that such has been the case. If you are familiar with such a study, I respectfully request that you furnish me with information as to how I may obtain a copy.

Further, I respectfully request that you advise me what this Department of State has done to implement the unanimous captive nations resolution which listed and included Armenia, Georgia, and Ukraine. It has been my understanding of government that the executive department is to carry out the laws as passed by the legislative department and not only the portions of those laws which the executive department happens to agree with.

Frankly, it is hard for me to understand why we antagonize our ally Portugal by joining Moscow in a U.N. inquiry into Angola, a traditional part of the Portugal empire for 300 years, but we spare our known enemy, the Communist criminal conspiracy, embarrassment by suppressing official inquiries into his closest colonies. I respectfully request an explanation.

I am further advised that a State Department research memorandum, entitled "Soviet Affairs Notes," in the issue No. 158, states that the term "Ukraine" was invented in the 19th century by nationalists seeking to detach the southwestern borderlands of Russia from czarist empire. It is my understanding that many words have been written by French, German, English and others writers of the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries using the term Ukraine. If such is the case I respectfully request that you advise me why the State Department elects to treat it as only a 19th century invention.

Very truly yours,

JOHN G. MCKAY, JR.

SCHMIDTMAN CO.,
Manitowoc, Wis., November 28, 1961.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: Enclosed are copies of a request which we mailed to members of the House Rules Committee and our own good Congressman JOHN W. BYRNES. We trust sincerely that your resolution on captive nations will become effective.

Sincerely yours,

E. J. SCHMIDTMAN.

LOUISVILLE, KY., *December 4, 1961.*

DEAR SIR: We are today writing our Congressman and six members of the House Rules Committee in support of your bill, House Resolution 211, regarding captive nations.

Sincerely yours,

DR. and MRS. SELBY V. LOVE.

DECEMBER 2, 1961.

Congressman D. J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Below is a copy of my letter to Congressman CLARK MACGREGOR:

"I understand that the Republican congressional policy committee favor Congressman FLOOD's Resolution 211 for a Special House Committee on Captive Nations.

"I hope that this resolution meets with your approval and that you will vote in favor of it."

Sincerely,

B. PRENOVOST.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

DECEMBER 4, 1961.

Congressman FLOOD,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am enclosing copies of letters I have sent to Congressman WILLIAM MAILLIARD and members of the House Rules Committee, asking them to vote for your House Resolution 211.

Thanking you, I am,

Sincerely,

GERTRUDE O'ROURCKE.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

ASIAN PEOPLES' ANTI-
COMMUNIST LEAGUE,
REPUBLIC OF CHINA,
Taiwan, China, November 28, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: We wish to express to you our deep appreciation for the fact that upon your kind recommendation, the materials concerning the observance of Captive Nations Week in the Republic of China in the third week of July of this year in response to the American-sponsored Captive Nations Week movement, have been printed in U.S. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Particularly, you have our high admiration for your thoughtful proposal to set up a Special House Committee on Captive Nations with which to handle affairs on aids to captive people in their struggle for freedom. We earnestly hope that the proposed committee will be established early under your active sponsorship and support.

We are grateful to you for sending us the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in connection with our observance of Captive Nations Week, which we treasured very much. We are looking forward to a close contact with you for a concerted effort to achieve freedom for all mankind.

With best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

KU CHENG-KANG, *President.*

TOLEDO, OHIO,
November 29, 1961.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: It is imperative that you give your full support to the passage in the next session of Congress of Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD's House Resolution 211, which would establish a Special House Committee on Captive Nations.

Such a committee is needed in Congress in order to insure a continuing study of the problems of (1) obtaining greater recognition by the world at large of the desperate plight of those peoples of the captive satellite nations which are held by force within the Russian orbit, and (2) finding the most effective methods of utilizing the ever pres-

ent and extremely powerful yearning of these captive peoples to rid themselves of the yoke of Soviet domination and oppression.

In July 1959 Congress passed, unanimously, the captive nations resolution; however, since then, the State Departments of two administrations have done nothing at all to enforce or implement the resolution.

That Khrushchev and the Soviets are mortally afraid of the captive nations resolution, and what might be accomplished through its implementation, is evidenced by the violent manner in which the resolution has been attacked by Khrushchev on numerous occasions. This fear of the resolution by the Soviets is understandable, inasmuch as Khrushchev and his crowd desire only to berate all of the other countries of the world for what he likes to call imperialistic colonialism, but when the spotlight of free world attention and publicity is thrown upon the fact that Soviet Russia is the world's greatest offender as colonialist empire builder, then the shoe (Khrushchev's) is on the other foot.

The continuing study by a committee, such as is proposed by Congressman FLOOD's resolution, could provide worthwhile information to the State Department, and other agencies of the executive department, on developments within the captive nations. The proposed committee would be in a position to inform the public of happenings within the captive nations. The creation of such a committee would, in addition, provide hope and encouragement to all of the peoples of the captive nations and as assurance that the free peoples of the world have not forgotten them and their problems.

Very truly yours,

The MARTIN BROS. CONTAINER & TIMBER PRODUCTS CORP.

F. J. MARTIN,

Chairman of the Board.

NOVEMBER 15, 1961.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I have just read about your resolution 211 to establish a Committee on Captive Nations. You are certainly to be commended for your efforts in this area. If more Americans were aware of the works of people like you, we would have no cold war. I blame the conspiratorial silence of the press on what is happening in the world and in Washington. Thank God for the Manion Forum, The Wanderer, Boston Tablet, and a few other Catholic weeklies.

We shall pray that the Holy Spirit will continue to guide you and bless all your patriotic efforts.

Sincerely,

Mrs. HENRY SCHMIDT.

HINSDALE, ILL.

NOVEMBER 17, 1961.

DEAR SIR: I understand that Representative D. J. FLOOD introduced a bill to create a House Committee on Captive Nations—to study the plight of captive nations.

I urge your support of this bill. It will do much to raise the morale of prisoner peoples in these countries and it may prove to be a most important weapon in the cold war against Communist tyranny.

Sincerely,

ELAINE DUNDAS

Mrs. Joseph F. Dundas.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

LA MESA, CALIF.,
November 17, 1961.

DEAR SIR: With regard to the bill introduced by Representative D. J. FLOOD to create a committee to study the plight of captive nations, I respectfully urge that you as chairman do your utmost to bring this about. Anything which these United States can do to encourage these people and let them know we are working for their eventual freedom from Communist tyranny will strengthen their courage to resist.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. RUTH S. GALUSHA.

NOVEMBER 17, 1961.

DEAR SIR: A bill has been introduced by Representative D. J. FLOOD from Pennsylvania to create a House Committee on Captive Nations. I strongly urge that this committee be created.

We have millions of allies behind the Iron Curtain, eager to help us defeat communism. A study must be made to find a way in which these people can help.

According to the publication Inform, if given a little encouragement, the enslaved peoples would rise up enmasse—and the Communist empire would collapse from within.

Very truly,

JOSEPH F. DUNDAS.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

The Migrant Farm Labor Story—Part X

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 26, 1962

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following firsthand report by Dale Wright, which appeared in the New York World-Telegram and Sun on October 20 1961. Dale Wright's description of the plight of the migrant worker and his family—low wages, miserable living conditions, little or no schooling for the children—illustrates the urgency of legislation to protect this long-neglected segment of our population.

MIGRANTS EXIST IN DUCK SHEDS

(By Dale Wright)

A 30-page, slick paper booklet published earlier this year by the New York State Migrant Labor Committee boasts proudly that the State marches forward in long strides in its handling of itinerant farm workers.

Photographs of smiling laborers and their children beam from its pages, at work, at play, in school, and in church. The committee booklet spells out step by step the regulations under which more than 25,000 transient crop pickers who come into the State every year live and work.

The publication lists rules for the supervision of crew leaders, growers, packers, processors, and labor-camp operators. The work of seven State agencies is exhaustively outlined. Impressive statistics tell what has been done to improve the lot of the migrant farmworker in the past 40 years.

It is true that forward steps have been taken. They can be seen in eastern Long Island and other farm areas. Yet here, in perhaps the most enlightened of all the 50 States, many migrant farm people still face poverty amid plenty. They are neglected, exploited, and left hopeless.

The seamier side of the State migrant labor picture can be examined in all of its shocking clarity in and near Riverhead, Long Island, just 83 miles from Times Square.

I've been there. I've seen and talked with the migrant farmworker at two bottomland squatter communities called Griffing's Path and Tin Top, both within Riverhead city limits. The people I've seen there don't appear in the committee booklet.

MANY ON RELIEF

At a place called Warner's Duck Ranch, about 3 miles from the center of town, some 200 Negroes and a few Puerto Ricans exist in appalling misery and degradation.

In many weeks of traveling, working and living with migrants I was prepared for anything. But Warner's Duck Ranch bowled me over.

Most of the ranch tenants are migrants. Others are former migrants brought up from Southern States in labor crews, for potato, corn, and bean harvests. Because of poor crops—or poor crop prices—and peon wages, they are now stranded with little or no funds.

Many families who live on the ranch are on welfare, swelling the relief burden borne by Riverhead taxpayers.

The ranch, operated by Hollis V. Warner, is run like a pre-Civil War plantation. Mr. Warner was at one time the world's leading duck raiser. He went out of business in 1957.

"The politicians," he told me, angrily waving his hands, "boosted feed prices so high that they ran me right out of business."

Although Mr. Warner got out of duck raising, he did not abandon his ranch. Instead, he converted it into a private housing project and replaced the ducks with people.

HIDDEN BEHIND TREES

He partitioned the long, flimsy, uninsulated wooden sheds, which only 3 or 4 years ago housed ducks, into a separate units. Today they house human beings, including many families with small children.

The ranch is, typically, off the main thoroughfare and hidden behind a clump of trees.

Mr. Warner charges $10 to $15 a week rent, tenants said. Each of the converted duck sheds contains two or four rooms. There are almost no indoor toilets. Tenants must use vile outhouses in the rear of each shack.

Because of the lack of a drainage system, it is common for housewives to dump dish and washwater through the front or rear doors into the dirt street.

"This is no place for humans to live," said Louise Davis, a 3-year tenant in one of the converted duck sheds. 'Why, even the ducks couldn't make it here. But there's no other place for us to go."

STUCK FOR GOOD

Mother of two small children, Mrs. Davis said she migrated to Riverhead from Florida three years ago with a farm labor crew.

"The potatoes were late," she recalled, "and when my babies started coming, my husband left. Now it looks like I'm stuck here for good."

Mrs. Davis said she had been on welfare most of the time she had lived in Riverhead and received $61.50 weekly. Her relief check is boosted to $64.50 during winter months to pay for coal for cooking and heating. She added that many of her neighbors are also on welfare.

Edward Delaney, 62, a bent, toothless man from Durant, Miss., complained: "I can't earn enough to get out of here." He said he paid $15 weekly for a two-room waterless and toiletless shanty.

He arrived in Riverhead with a labor contractor and a crew in July of last year. Like many others, he could not find work enough in the potato fields and grading sheds to earn the fare back home.

It was the old story of overrecruitment of farm laborers so they could be worked for the lowest possible pay.

Mr. Warner, who operates a general store in one of his converted duck sheds, has a different view of his tenants. He was one of the few persons to whom I revealed my identity as a reporter.

I asked him how he could justify charging $40 to $75 monthly rents for such miserable living quarters.

EVERYBODY'S HAPPY

"These people," he said, shaking his fist menacingly, "are all happy here. They're all satisfied. I give them a place to live and something to eat. Nobody else will take them."

Mr. Warner moved closer, and as he spoke I watched over his shoulder as a tiny girl,

naked, about 3 years old, played with a ragged doll in the dirt. Scratching in the same patch was a flock of dusty, anemic-looking chickens.

The little girl was one of Mr. Warner's "happy" tenants. She lived in one of his duck sheds.

She may die in one of them.

The Health of Our Nation Is a Key to Its Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 26, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address which I delivered at the fall meeting of the Rhode Island Society of Dentistry for Children, Providence, R.I., on October 2, 1962:

REMARKS OF HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE, SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND, AT FALL MEETING OF RHODE ISLAND SOCIETY OF DENTISTRY FOR CHILDREN, JOHNSONS HUMMOCKS RESTAURANT, PROVIDENCE, R.I., MONDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1961, AT 7:15 P.M.

I am delighted to be here today, in my home State of Rhode Island and with a group that includes many personal friends.

President Kennedy has said that the health of our Nation is a key to its future.

As you know, Congress doesn't always see eye to eye with the President, and we've been known on occasion to even disagree with Mr. Kennedy. But on the matter of health and research, I can assure you, gentlemen, there is complete unanimity in Washington.

In fact, during the past several years Congress has given practical expression to this view by substantially increasing the appropriations for the National Institutes of Health which—as the research arm of the Public Health Service—have the primary operating responsibility for Federal participation in the advancement of medical and dental sciences.

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I have long held the position that no reasonable opportunity for pressing the attack on disease should be lost or delayed because of lack of funds. This policy has enthusiastic public support, and my colleagues in the Senate have consistently joined in appropriating funds to support a wide-ranging research program.

As you know, the National Institute of Dental Research is one of the seven Institutes that comprise the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, Md. In a little over a decade this Institute has become an international focal point for biologic research in dentistry. And today, it is the fountainhead of new knowledge where all segments of the dental profession—particularly those dealing with children such as most of you do—may look for better methods of diagnosis and treatment for our citizens of tomorrow.

From my vantage point on the House Appriations Committee, I have watched the progress of this Institute with a great deal of interest, and with, if you'll forgive me, a good measure of personal pride, for I have been actively involved with its appropriations since the Institute was born in 1948.

Some idea of the growth of the Nation's dental research and training programs today can be seen in the Institute's appropriation history. Ten years ago their total budget was somewhat less than $2 million. In 1956 it was still below $3 million. The following year, 1957 it jumped to $6 million, and by last year it had ascended to a little over $15 million. Just last month a joint House-Senate conference approved a budget of almost $17½ million for the current fiscal year. This is a 300-percent increase over the 1957 budget, and tonight I would like to discuss some of the broad implications of this level of support for dentistry.

But first I want to depart for a moment and say a few words about dental health in general. We all know that the American public is interested in good health—yet the high prevalence of dental neglect among both children and adults, is indeed a sad commentary. National statistics indicate that very limited attention is being paid to children's teeth at the most crucial period for protecting them against damage in later life. Public apathy about adequate dental care is difficult to understand. One obvious explanation is the fact that many individuals simply do not feel that such care is important. In 1 recent report on 16 communities in California, for example, only 3 percent of a large group of 17-year-olds were free of dental decay.

Not totally unrelated to this public apathy, I am sorry to say, is the occasional indifference of the local professions. The sophisticated public of today expects their dentists and their physicians, and the professional societies to which they belong, to initiate and take part in local and statewide health programs. They like to feel that someone cares about the health of their community as a group. Such programs—if successful—require active participation and forceful leadership from the professions—the kind we see at work right here in the great State of Rhode Island, and the kind we have represented here tonight. The Rhode Island Society of Dentistry for Children is dedicated to improving the dental health of our young citizens, and almost a quarter of all practicing dentists in the State are active members of this society. Moreover, I happen to know this is the highest percentage of participation in any State in the Union. Each of you here—by virtue of your profession, your specialties, and your affiliation with this great society—possesses a depth of knowledge about the oral health status of children. You probably know that in this country less than one child in eight needing orthodontic treatment is now being cared for. You may also know that children born with cleft lips and palates are accumulating at a rate of about 8,000 per year, and only a fraction of these tragically afflicted children are receiving the extended care needed for rehabilitation. I would wager that most of you know there is a handicapped child born somewhere in this country every 15 minutes, and the number of persons so afflicted is close to the 5 million mark. In our small State alone, it is estimated that between 13,000 and 15,000 families have an intimate knowledge of this problem. So pressing is the problem, that President Kennedy has recommended that we establish a new National Institute of Child Health and Human Development that would include a center for research in child health as well as other broad-ranging health research activities.

Proper dental care for the handicapped child is a unique problem of national importance, and here I want to say that I am extremely proud of the pioneering efforts of our own Samuels Dental Clinic in this specialized field. Their programs, under the able direction of Dr. Michael Messore, and with the enthusiastic support of this society, have in the space of 3 years established an outstanding reputation throughout New England and other parts of the country.

Also, I am proud that the State of Rhode Island was the first in the country to include a definite orthodontic program in its public welfare services. This, too, came about through the pioneering efforts of your society and the Samuels Dental Clinic.

History shows that the dental profession has consistently responded to the challenges of providing and maintaining necessary oral health for those who desire these services. Public health educational programs that emphasize dental care have stressed the importance of routine examinations and treatment. A better understanding of oral disease, improved concepts of preventive dentistry, the development of newer techniques, and the increased use of auxiliary personnel have all made it possible for the profession to offer more and better service in spite of the decreasing dental-population ratio.

Yet, there still remains an astonishing backlog of untreated dental problems. There are ominous signs of early periodontal problems in half of our 20- to 30-year-old citizens, advanced pyorrhea in half of the middle-aged population, and serious involvement with virtually every one by the time they reached retirement. Nationally, dental decay affects almost everyone, including 90 percent of school age children, and the accumulation of untreated teeth far exceeds the capacity for treatment. And, if I haven't made my point, it is a disquieting commentary that almost one-third of all who reach middle age today are without any natural teeth. Obviously the dental profession has not yet accomplished its primary objective, the prevention of oral disease. And until this is done, the dental health needs of the country can never be adequately met.

The key man in any effort to provide dental care to more people has been and will always be the dental practitioner and particularly those specializing in children's dentistry. However, to simply maintain the present level of dental care in a rising population, without allowing for an increase in demand for care, would require at least 134,000 dentists by 1975. This is about one-fourth more than can be expected at the present rate of graduation for dental schools. Today the ratio of dentists to population is adequate to provide about a third of our people with comprehensive care. Superficially, the solution would seem to be to triple the number of dentists. But even if this were a lasting solution, and it is not, it is not easily done, because dentistry is in direct and oft-times unsuccessful competition with the other professions for promising students.

The fluoridation of community water supplies has and will continue to have a profound and beneficial effect on oral health in the years ahead. Since 1950, the dental profession has had this potent weapon that reduces tooth decay by at least 60 percent. Yet in the entire country less than 25 percent of the people are protected by this safe, economical, convenient, preventive measure, and most of these people live in the larger cities. Only 5 percent of the towns under 2,500 persons are now fluoridating their water, and it has been estimated that at the present rate of acceptance, the goal of 100 percent fluoridation will not be reached for over a century. Incidentally, when I argue for fluoridation—and I often do—I know my house is in order, because 9 out of 10 persons in the State of Rhode Island are now receiving fluoridated water. But until a larger segment of the American public ceases to be impressed by the arguments of health and other faddists, that fluoridation is dangerous, immoral, unconstitutional, or unscriptural, the true potential of the health measure will remain untapped.

These things I have mentioned—increasing the number of dentists, educating the public, accepting fluoridation—they are all a necessary part of the dental health picture. But, gentlemen, they will never be enough, for in the final analysis they are only stop-gap measures.

The American Council on Education in their recent report on the status of dentistry in the United States pointed out that one scientist, if he should discover a means of preventing or reducing periodontal disease, for example, might do more for the Nation's oral health than several thousand practitioners.

This essentially is the philosophy of Congress with regard to support of our Nation's research and training programs. Such programs, supported by Federal grants have in recent years become the most effective driving force behind our total national effort in the dental sciences. A great variety of studies now underway in dental schools are generating important scientific knowledge, and new programs continue to exemplify the increasing scope of dentistry.

Many areas of research need are constantly being brought to the attention of my committee through citizens' testimony. One of these, for example, is in the field of congenital anomalies, where we are now giving particular attention to the study of the cleft lip and palate syndrome. Grants already awarded place emphasis on an integrated team approach to the cleft palate problem and, quite importantly, they are also designed to train investigators and practitioners in this complex field of inquiry.

Recognizing the manpower problem and the opportunity to increase the quality of dental services by the use of auxiliary personnel, Congress appropriated funds last year for the establishment of a new training program for undergraduate dental students. These grants are made to dental schools to establish, as an integral part of their undergraduate course, formal programs for teaching students to work effectively with chairside assistants. Here, the long-range purpose is to offset a decline in the supply of dental services. I might add that one of the important pilot studies that provided a sound basis for this national program was carried out at Woonsocket here in the State of Rhode Island. Scientists working in the new $4 million dental research laboratory in Bethesda (we just dedicated that building last May) are probing ever closer to the cause of the major oral diseases. For example, in testimony before my committee this year I was told that the specific bacteria that cause tooth decay in certain animals have now been identified. These scientists also suspect that human dental decay may be caused by a single bacteria, and if this proves to be the case, the problem of its eventual control by vaccination or chemotherapy is certainly within the realm of possibility.

The comprehensive health program which President Kennedy outlined in his message to Congress this year includes specific recommendations for substantial Federal aid to education, and there are many congressional proposals that would make Federal funds available for the building of more schools and the training of more dentists. I have again this year introduced legislation providing for wide-ranging support for dental and medical education. I have also proposed legislation that will not only bring us closer to the goal of more adequate supply but will also help us attain higher standards of dental education. One of these is a scholarship bill that will permit dental schools to select applicants of high intellectual promise from an increased number of applicants stimulated by the availability of scholarships. The second of these bills would provide operating grants to schools, make it possible to provide for expanding enrollments, and supply necessary funds to improve the quality of instruction.

In conclusion, even though I am not a dentist, I am immensely proud of my honorary membership in the American Dental Association. I am certainly not a scientist, but I have followed with keen interest the progress of dental research both in Government laboratories and in our Nation's dental schools. I am not a dental educator, although, I think I recognize the problems of molding a dental curriculum that will serve both the needs of general practice and research. But while I am perhaps none of these things, I do share a special obligation to understand your needs, and to legislate in their behalf.

As I look around this year, it seems as never before, that public health, particularly better health for our children, is very much in vogue, and this is good. I say it has been in vogue in this State and this community for a long time—due to the high professional skills and the quality of leadership associated with organizations such as the Rhode Island Society of Dentists for Children.

Gentlemen, it has been a distinct pleasure to be with you this evening.

Why Should These Co-ops Enjoy Special Tax Privileges?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 26, 1962

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by a former Member of Congress, the Honorable O. K. Armstrong, on the subject "Why Should These Co-Ops Enjoy Special Tax Privileges?" This article appears in the February issue of the Reader's Digest:

WHY SHOULD THESE CO-OPS ENJOY SPECIAL TAX PRIVILEGES?

(By O. K. Armstrong)

Last May, Frank Gallup, a fertilizer distributor at Grand Island, Nebr., appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee in Washington to complain: "I am likely to be forced out of business in the next few years. It is not because I give poor service or sell an inferior product. It is because my competitors get tax favors that I don't."

Who are Gallup's privileged competitors? They are huge cooperatives which, though they are actually big-business corporations, enjoy special income tax and antitrust privileges denied their business competitors. These greedy organizations are using their tax-free profits to take over competing private businesses that have had to pay up to 52-percent corporation tax on their income. The result is a serious and growing erosion of free enterprise.

Recently I traveled through the States of the Great Plains and the Southwest. I saw many private grain elevators standing empty and idle, while all around were elevators owned by cooperative companies, filled and busy. In many areas of the South I saw private cotton gins struggling to compete with co-op gins. Earl B. Hobbs, operator of a cotton gin in Lubbock County, Tex., explained: "I pay from 30 to 35 percent of my earnings to the Federal Government as income taxes. My competitors, the coopertaive corporations, pay practically no income taxes, but use their profits to take over private businesses."

Records kept by the U.S. Department of Agriculture on 16 co-op grain terminals tell a typical story. Since 1939, largely by purchasing competing firms, these 16 big co-ops have increased their assets from $6,600,000 to nearly $200 million. Most of this expansion was financed with millions of dollars of tax-free earnings.

Originally, cooperatives were set up by farmers to buy their supplies and sell their produce. By buying and selling as a group, in large quantities, the farmers could get better prices. The farm co-ops filled a real need for rural families. To encourage their formation, Congress granted them broad income tax exemptions.

Until World War II the co-ops' exemption was no real hardship on competitors; the tax rate was low for everybody. World War II changed that. Today corporations pay 30-percent tax on earnings up to $25,000 and 52-percent tax on all beyond that. But not the co-ops. They can escape the tax by declaring their earnings as patronage dividends. Actual payment of the dividend is up to the co-op directors and is often postponed indefinitely. Many co-ops pay their members only part of their earnings in cash—perhaps as little as 10 percent; then they give them stock or credit for the rest. The members pay income tax on the cash, but court decisions have held the credit in most cases to be nontaxable to the members, even though deductible by the co-op.

It is this untaxed retained income that many co-ops use to expand into all sorts of enterprise, in unfair competition with taxpaying businesses.

The unfair advantage enjoyed by the co-op is clear: Suppose a co-op fertilizer association and a competing private fertilizer firm each produce and market 100,000 tons of fertilizer at $68 a ton, each at $18 a ton above cost. By mere paper allocation the co-op can retain the entire $18 per ton income tax free for capital investment. But its taxpaying competitor must pay $9.30 of its $18 per ton in Federal income tax alone—with only $8.70 left for capital investment and dividends.

There are some 9,800 farm co-ops in the United States, with a membership of nearly 7½ million. Many of these cooperatives still serve the farmers primarily in marketing and buying, and offer very little threat to investor-owned businesses. But other large combines of farm co-ops, using their tax-free earnings, have expanded into manufacturing, processing, mining, transportation, warehousing. They handle every type of general merchandise. They make and supply building materials. They manufacture feed, fertilizer and petroleum products. They sell motor vehicles, and even own banks and insurance companies.

Expansion of the Southern States Cooperative, Richmond, Va., is typical: From 1924 to 1958 this organization earned $66,380,386, of which only $17,370,550 was paid to its members in cash. Today Southern States Cooperative operates seven fertilizer plants turning out more than 300,000 tons annually. It operates a supply service handling more than 2,000 items of merchandise. With two other co-ops, it owns and operates an oil refinery in Texas.

Consider another example—the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, a marketing cooperative in St. Paul, Minn. In late 1958 this co-op bought the McCabe Co., a 72-year-old grain-handling firm, for $4,800,000. The sale included elevators and feed mills at 57 locations in Minnesota, Montana, and the Dakotas. In August 1960 the co-op purchased 37 additional country elevators from another company. About the same time it moved into soybean processing by the purchase of the Honeymead Products Co.'s plant at Mankato, Minn., for $6 mil-

lion—largest soybean-processing facility in the United States. Last September it announced acquisition of the plant of the Minnesota Linseed Co., 93-year-old processor of farm produce and merchandiser of paint and varnish. The big co-op is easily absorbing the cost of building its grain empire, and it is doing so out of tax-free earnings. Explaining the sale of the long-established McCabe Co., McCabe's president said, "Our co-op competitors could spend all their earnings on plant improvement; we had to pay 54 percent of ours in Federal and State income taxes. We just couldn't compete."

Many co-ops have combined to form regional organizations and thus have the use of even more capital for manufacturing, processing, and distributing goods. A survey made by the Department of Agriculture in 1953 disclosed that the 25 principal regional cooperatives had total sales of $1,332,406,868, with net earnings of $37,057,483. Fifteen of these co-ops paid no Federal income taxes, and the rest paid only $2,379,196, or 6.5 percent of their income. If these enterprises had been taxed as were corporations in the same lines of business, they would have paid $19,045,948 in Federal income taxes, or some 52 percent of their earnings.

In recent years big regional co-ops have leapfrogged to set up plants and take over facilities in distant areas—an operation not dreamed of when tax exemption was first granted. The Cotton Producers Association of Atlanta, Ga., built up an elaborate network of affiliated co-ops operating in 10 States in the South and Southwest. They own and operate cotton gins, fertilizer-manufacturing plants, poultry and processing plants. They are also involved in pecan and peanut processing and in drying and storing grain. In December 1956 this huge co-op also took over the Georgia Peanut Co. and 12 affiliated firms.

Many officials of cooperatives attempt to justify their favored tax status by declaring that co-ops are merely agents for their members and that the earnings are the property of the patrons, and therefore not really profits to the co-op organization. Hard-pressed competitors answer that when co-ops refuse to distribute the savings due the patrons, and use them instead of expansion into manufacturing and processing of all kinds, they abandon their alleged status as buying and selling agents for small groups of farmers.

Both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy have recommended amendments to the Internal Revenue laws which would provide equitable taxation of cooperatives. Kennedy has emphasized that "this situation must be corrected in a manner that is fair and just to both the cooperative and competing business." Congressman WILBUR D. MILLS, of Arkansas, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, which must originate revenue bills, promises that legislation in keeping with the President's recommendation will be considered by this Congress.

Some leaders of the big co-ops have urged legislation that would put all the burden of taxes on the patron members, forcing them to pay on income credited to them but held by the co-ops for investment. Spokesmen for private business firms have consistently opposed this plan as unfair, if not unconstitutional. "The tax on cooperative earnings should be levied where the income in fact is, not some place else," says Paul Foreman, secretary of a fertilizer-manufacturing firm in Los Angeles. "Co-ops should be subject to the income tax upon all earnings at the same rate as their competitors."

It is virtually impossible to estimate the hundreds of millions of dollars of revenues lost by the present special co-op tax privileges. However, just treatment for all businesses, rather than increased revenue, should be the main objective.

"We in private business ask for no special favors, only for fair treatment," F. Peavey Heffelfinger, head of a large grain company in Minneapolis, told me. "We are not afraid of co-op competition if given tax equality."

The Great Adventure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the Hartford Times recently discussed editorially the serious problem that faces the Nation in educating young men and women for careers in science. It makes the point most significantly that today's frontiers are largely in the laboratory—what Dr. Vannevar Bush once called the endless frontier. I believe this editorial stresses the serious nature of the problem we face.

It makes special reference to one phase of this problem which I have studied in detail. This is the question of students and professionals in the biological sciences, to do the research necessary to the study of life forms in extraterritorial worlds and to assist the medical studies designed to aid our space pioneers.

We have a critical shortage of people capable of sustaining a major effort in this field. I have stressed the efficient use of the personnel we now have, and teamwork in seeking national goals. I also believe strongly we need an intensified effort to interest young men and women in this research and I have so stated.

I think the Times editorial is a cogent and forceful contribution to a solution of our problems. If our youngsters realize the need and the opportunities, and if the facilities and instruction is made available to them in timely fashion, we can meet this challenge:

THE GREAT ADVENTURE

("To all those who may be within the sound of my voice or who may follow your stories in the papers, I want to emphasize the great, new, and exciting field of the sciences."—President Kennedy to the press.)

It was a coincidence, no doubt, that at about the hour the President was appealing to the youth of the Nation to consider careers in science when choosing a vocation, a representative of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration was in New York City trying to recruit engineers and technicians to work on the most exciting and promising scientific venture in the history of man—the exploration of space.

Dr. Abe Silverstein, Director of NASA's Lewis Research Center in Cleveland, told reporters in New York that one of the justifications of the great expense of the American space effort is that it stimulates the training of new specialists in science.

NASA actually takes very little of the Nation's scientific and technological manpower away from industrial jobs of more immediate productivity, but it is no doubt responsible, through the glamor of its projects, for the decision of many thousands of youngsters to take up physics, chemistry, and engineering.

President Kennedy mentioned a dearth of students in the biological sciences. These, too, have their place in the plans of the space pioneers. There will be special medical studies to be made, perhaps exotic life forms to be studied on alien planets. The personnel of space exploring trips will need medical officers.

In a recent article in the Saturday Evening Post on the attitudes of American youth, Dr. George Gallup and Evan Hill reported a complacency and satisfaction with things as they are. This is not universally true, of course. There are still many young men and women whose imagination is fired by the challenge of the future and who will dedicate their lives to making changes for the better in our way of life. But the tendency to resist change is deplorable. Somehow, youth is not being taught one of the basic facts of life: There is no stasis in nature. Life never stands still. It progresses or retrogresses. This is true of biological organisms and social organizations.

All of this is just $3 language to express the need for a pioneer spirit. Today's frontiers are largely in the laboratory and its offspring, the spaceship. Crewmen for space exploration will be easy to find, for there will be few places and many applicants to fill them. But just as essential are the men at the microscope and test tube, and they are not coming forth as fast as we need them.

Some Timely Arguments Against VHF-UHF Deintermixture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I am pleased to insert herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by Mr. Lawrence H. Rogers II, executive vice president, Taft Broadcasting Co., which presents some very timely arguments against the proposed VHF-UHF deintermixture. Every Member of the House is urged to give careful attention to Mr. Rogers' comments:

Television, like all forms of radio broadcasting, depends upon use of the air for transmission.

In order to understand this phrase "use the air" we must contemplate two facets of the problem: (a) the legal or constitutional aspect, and (b) the technical aspect.

The Communications Act of 1934, as amended, makes it perfectly clear that all use of the airwaves for radio transmission must be subject to license in the public interest, convenience, and necessity. Congress, in its infinite wisdom, coined that phrase in defiance of all subsequent attempts to define it. The important thing is that the Commission must not let too many people use too much of the air at the same time, or the result would be chaos. Interference would destroy our broadcasting services and endanger the national defense aspects of radio spectrum use.

Now, in the technical sense, what is this word "spectrum"? We all recognize the light spectrum as the familiar rainbow.

Subject to refraction, white sunlight breaks down into bands of color: red, orange, yellow, green, blue, indigo, and violet. In much the same way, electromagnetic waves in the atmosphere, or beyond it, break down into such subdivisions, known as the radio spectrum. Just as there is not an unlimited number of basic colors, so there is a limit to the usable width of the radio spectrum. Every time you radiate or transmit a radio signal, you use up some of that radio spectrum; which means that particular space cannot be used for something else.

Thus, when television came along, most of the known radio spectrum was already used up for some kind of radio service. Therefore, some unoccupied spectrum space was selected by the FCC for television in what is known as the very high frequency ranges. Technically this is about from 60 megacycles to 200 megacycles. Some of this area of the radio spectrum was already in use, so we have two different sets of very high frequency channels, with regular FM broadcasting and some other services in the middle. Even after the assignments were made in 1945 for commercial television, it was discovered that the art was not well enough advanced to have solved all the problems. The first channel wouldn't even work right. So channel 1 was deleted and turned back to aviation use, and we had 12 commercial television channels, numbered for public convenience from channel 2 to channel 13.

This means that only 12 channels had to supply all the demand for television stations for the entire United States. Now why this scarcity? Well, you have to understand how much room in the air one television channel occupies. One TV channel takes up 6 megacycles. What's a megacycle? It's a 1,000 kilocycles. What's a kilocycle? It's one of those subdivisions on your ordinary AM radio set. There are roughly 1,000 kilocycles from the lowest numbered radio station to the highest numbered. Therefore, it takes six times as much space in the air for just one TV channel as it does for all the radio channels on your entire set. Thus, 12 television channels take up 72 times as much of the public's airspace as all the AM radio stations in the land; and, there are over 3,000 of them on 103 channels.

Thus a shortage of channels. The FCC doesn't believe you can adequately cover the entire United States using only those 12 VHF channels. The Commission feels that the Communications Act requires them to allow more stations, and the Commission is right.

So the Commission opened up television broadcasting to 70 new channels, still 6 megacycles wide, occupying 420 megacycles of spectrum space, or 4,000 times the space occupied by your AM radio, way up the spectrum in what is known as ultra-high frequency range, or UHF. Why did they find all this space available? Because no one had yet invented a way of generating good strong signals for broadcasting at such ultra-high frequencies. Now these channels are in operation, and it has been found that there can be television broadcasting at these high numbers. In fact, there are about 75 commercial stations on the air in these channels, including our station WKYT in Lexington. So the Commission believes it will be necessary to make more use of the UHF channels in order to satisfy the need for more stations, and we agree with the Commission.

But this is not the whole story.

The UHF frequencies provide an inferior service to the VHF because a comparable signal, able to be broadcast and received by as many people as VHF, is simply not technically possible.

When considering radio waves, you must remember that the higher the frequency the more these pesky waves resemble light. That is, at a low channel a television signal will seem to bend around a corner and roll down into a valley. A high VHF channel, or a UHF channel, will bounce off a hill and leave a shadow area behind it. In fact, in the UHF, even the leaves on the trees have a profound effect upon reception of signals.

Exhaustive studies reveal that the average VHF channel in average terrain will provide a quality service over a radius from the transmitter of 60 miles. The average UHF channel, under similar circumstances, will provide a coverage pattern over a radius of 35 miles. But this does not take into account the excessive number of holes, or pockets, in this area due to shading of hills, trees, buildings, or whatever other obstruction may dot the terrain.

Now about these studies I referred to.

In 1956 the FCC invited the television industry to join in an all-out technical attack on what it called the effort to make UHF television as good as VHF television. The FCC developed the Television Allocations Study Organization, known as TASO, which made a comprehensive engineering study. The results were published in the TASO report of March 1959. From the report and from its principal author, Dr. George R. Towne, dean of engineering of Iowa State University, came the following facts:

"Under practical conditions UHF signals are lower rather than higher, than VHF signals for the same transmitter power and antenna locations."

"Deep nulls are more frequent at UHF than at VHF.

"Data in the TASO reports show another serious problem at UHF, namely the deleterious effect of trees in the neighborhood of receiving antennas. These effects can be very serious in areas which are only moderately wooded.

"Still another factor, and probably most important, is that at and beyond fringe areas, UHF field strength falls off much more rapidly and more completely than does VHF field strength.

"The fact remains that the area served by a UHF transmitter is very substantially less than that served by a lower powered VHF transmitter."

Now we ask you to recall your school days geometry. The area of a circle is found by the formula πr^2. This means "pi," or roughly 3.14 times the radius of a circle, multiplied times itself, will give you the square measure inside a circle. Let's examine the comparison of area served by a VHF station and a UHF station, all things being equal, more or less. The VHF station will serve 60 miles times 60 miles times Pi (3.14), or a total of about 11,300 square miles. The UHF station will average out to 35 miles times 35 square times pi, or a total of about 3,800 square miles. In area alone, the typical VHF station will place a usable television signal over three times as many square miles as its equivalent opposite in the UHF.

Now, what has all this to do with you, and with us?

The FCC has made it plain it is dissatisfied with the coverage of the United States by a joint VHF–UHF system; and, therefore it intends to change all television stations to UHF assignments throughout the Nation. And in this 4 to 3 decision by the Commission there is no partisan issue. The majority was 2 and 2, the minority, 2 and 1.

At last we come to the meat of the question: The FCC's proposed shift to an all-UHF television service.

Where we differ from the FCC is in the theory that the simple answer to the problems of the industry is merely to put more stations on the air. We have heard, in radio and TV the good old chestnut monopoly rolled around so much that we have had to coin new words like duopoly, and oligopoly, to describe the real or imagined need for more stations to provide a more diversified service.

We categorically reject the notion that more stations will improve the product. Indeed, if you want the classic example of this theory in action, one need only look at AM broadcasting, wherein the number of stations on the air has increased from about 900 to 4,000 in less than 20 years. The resulting plethora of stations has resulted not in an upgrading of quality of service, but the exact opposite. It has deteriorated the technical excellence to the point where it is all but impossible to find a reliable nighttime radio service outside the shadow of a transmitter tower; and, it has spawned the cultural blight on our teenagers that is described in some quarters as contemporary progressive music, in others as rock 'n' roll, and more accurately as the "screamin' meemies." It is true that almost every town in America has its own radio station. It is also true that most cities have too many radio stations, and that economic necessity calls for programing by the lowest common denominator in all too many instances.

We feel certain the same thing will result in television if a wholesale effort is made to multiply the number of stations by deterioration of VHF standards, or by shifting all stations to the UHF. The economic facts of life do not yet permit us even to contemplate placing television transmitters in some of the small towns that now have radio stations. And even when that unlikely day arrives, it will be necessary for everyone of the present VHF viewers to buy an antenna, a booster or a new set to get any picture at all.

This is why we are convinced that nationwide competitive television means the continuance of what we have plus the orderly addition of UHF assignments as they become feasible. The shift to all UHF, we are convinced, would be suicidal—suicidal to an industry which has only begun to discover some of the operating facts of life in major markets—suicidal to the Federal Communications which puts such a plan into operation.

Now, you might logically ask, where is all the pressure coming from to make the FCC want to adopt such a drastic plan?

Mostly it comes from would-be operators who see a pot of gold at the end of every imaginary TV license. The notion that a television station means enormous profits is as widespread as it is untrue.

It also comes from UHF operators who have had, and are having, a tough time competing on an equal footing with superior facilities of VHF stations. The Commission has attacked this problem by a plan they call deintermixture, which would eliminate VHF stations in markets where there are UHF stations. This is but the first step in the Commission's master plan to eliminate all VHF assignments.

One quick answer that will be supplied by proponents of this plan is that by doing what we have described you will create a scarcity of facilities which will force the establishment of new smalltown stations in every one of the cities or towns in these new blank areas, thus giving great impetus to the diversity of local expression available to the American public via television.

This is a snare and a delusion for several reasons. Very few smalltown stations aspire to as much as a hundred thousand dollars a year of gross sales. Operating such a radio station on a minimum investment is a very tough proposition. Should an entrepreneur risk a minimum of a half million dollars for a UHF television station in one of these towns, it would still be necessary for every rsident in his town to buy a converter and an antenna to receive the station on his set. Meantime, the resident would have lost service from as many as four metropolitan stations providing regular daily competitive three-network service

to the community. It is doubtful he would be in the mood to buy anything. Equally important, the station operator, having no audience, would go through the heartbreaking costly and laborious experience that everyone who has pioneered this business before him has gone through. The vicious circle of no audience, no programs, and no programs, no audience.

Networks, with their pies sliced twice as many ways, with twice as many stations, would naturally reduce their station payments. The network franchise would become the most important key to survival; and the Federal Government would have succeeded in turning over control of an entire communications machinery to the controlling giants in New York, under the mistaken guise of spreading the ownership and control.

Again, it is the public who is the big loser because networks simply cannot force an advertiser to pay for extending his program into markets that are too small to justify his expenditure. No matter how much pressure is applied from Government, the law of supply and demand still controls the marketplace. This would require drastic changes in operation of networks, as a result of which station revenues would very likely disappear altogether, as they have done with radio networks. An all-UHF television industry will be greeted by private shouts of joy from the three networks because it would insure their absolute domination of every affiliate in every market until someone develops a quick and dirty method of programing television locally as has been done in radio. I'm sure none of you care to contemplate the possible horrors of a video equivalent of rock 'n' roll.

We believe the implications of this proposed new replacement service are entirely too clear to you for us to have to explain it further. We know that many sincere and dedicated people are working on what they honestly believe to be a serious public problem; we do not doubt the sincerity of their proposed solutions. On the other hand, we believe that if the general public knew what a catastrophic change lay in store for them that you, their representatives in the National Government, would receive a storm of protest unlike anything in history. We hope you will be sufficiently alarmed over this prospect that you will undertake to inform yourselves of every possible aspect of this problem.

Now what do we propose? Are we merely fat proponents of the status quo? Of course we are not. We are in a growth business. We are proud to serve the public, and we aspire to grow in this service and develop further growth in the size and scope of our company. We cannot do this by sitting on our hands and by asking you to preserve the status quo. And we cannot do this by removing existing TV service from millions of American homes.

We are convinced that both VHF television and UHF television are essential to the future growth of the medium, and thus to the public interest. One of the principal deterrents to the success of UHF TV until now has been the reluctance of manufacturers to spend the extra money in manufacturing all-channel receivers; and the understandable reluctance on the part of the public to buy a UHF-equipped set where there are no UHF stations to be received. It is felt that if all television sets manufactured for shipment in interstate commerce were required to be equipped to receive all television channels in the United States; namely both VHF and UHF, that this would automatically start to improve this lack of available receivers in the hands of the public. While we deplore any Federal intervention in business that smacks of discrimination or tampering with the law of supply and demand, we must recognize the need for a technical standard that will make the expanded use of UHF a practical reality. Therefore we ask that you urge the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee through its chairman, OREN HARRIS, to schedule hearings into legislation of this kind immediately. There are numbers of bills already introduced to do exactly this: namely, to require manufacturers to equip all sets for both U and V for shipment in interstate commerce. Hearings on these bills will have the effect of giving a full public airing of the problem which we have outlined to you today. It may be that most Members of Congress would reject such a requirement. We are not for it, on principle. But we are for a full hearing on the whole subject before any drastic changes are made that will have such profound effects upon your constituents, our public—in short, the entire Nation.

Secondly, we urge your support of immediate hearings into another set of bills which refers to the Commission's attempt to stampede into UHF before sufficient technical data are available to support their theories.

We have tried to explain the technical data which are now available. In addition, you granted last year an appropriation for the FCC of $2 million to conduct a technical study into the feasibility of UHF in covering large metropolitan areas and "canyon" cities such as New York. In this appropriation request, the FCC assured Congress that the study was necessary in order to solve the problems outlined here today. Yet they have already proposed the solution with this wholesale shift to UHF, while the New York tests which you appropriated $2 million to conduct have hardly begun.

H.R. 9267, introduced by Congressman ROBERTS, and H.R. 469 by Congressman GRANT, both of Alabama, speaks to both the points we have raised: all-channel receivers, and an injunction against changing stations from VHF to UHF.

Admittedly the FCC is faced with terrible problems. Among them are allocations, the full development of UHF, the usefulness of educational television, and the worldwide use of satellite transmission.

But not a single one of these problems can be solved or alleviated by this proposed shift to UHF.

You gentlemen in Congress hold the key. The key involves two immediate steps upon the resumption of the session in January:

1. Restraining legislation or a resolution requiring the FCC to complete its New York tests before any further UHF rule-making or allocations.

2. Consideration of the problem of all-channel receivers to make possible a future orderly growth for UHF.

In conclusion we would present another statement from Dr. Towne, dean of engineering at Iowa State:

"So far no mention has been made of one question which is of really basic importance. This is the question of whether or not the public really needs additional television service. This is a question of basic policy. If the public really needs, say double the amount of television service which it now receives, there should be no thought of abandoning either the UHF or the VHF region. Both should be used as both would be needed."

Ukrainian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, throughout these early months of the year there fall a number of sad anniversaries. They are the anniversaries of the birth of a number of small nations, composed of freedom-loving peoples, who found in the chaotic and kaleidoscopic events of many years a chance to forge their own affairs in liberty.

They are sad anniversaries because their freedom and liberty as nations was short lived. Indeed, tragedy stalked them, first through counterrevolution and the imposition of tyranny, then through repressive government, through war and punishment. On January 22, the Ukraine marked the 44th anniversary of its independence—but an anniversary of the type I have described above.

The spirit of freedom lives on in the Ukraine and in the minds and hopes of many who have escaped from tyranny and look forward to the day when freedom will return to their native land. I hope that day can be soon.

Constitution Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, during the 86th Congress the Honorable JAMES A. BYRNE introduced a bill—House Joint Resolution 605—providing for the creation of a Federal Commission to prepare plans for the celebration of the 175th anniversary of the creation of the Federal Constitution. It was my privilege to submit the report of the Committee on the Judiciary, which considered the bill, to the House of Representatives. The bill was passed by the Congress, signed by the President, and became Public Law 86-650.

An elaborate year-long celebration of the 175th anniversary of the U.S. Constitution will be held during 1962 in Philadelphia, where the document was conceived and ratified.

The flags of the 50 States will fly from Independence Hall during the year, and each State will be honored for a full week in order of its acceptance into the Union. All 50 will be honored during Freedom Week, June 27 to July 4, and during Constitution Week, beginning September 17.

The Governor of each State, or a representative, will attend weekly ceremonies throughout the year at Independence Hall, as one flag after another is raised. The mayor of the city will be the host.

The first program took place on Wednesday, January 3. The remaining flag raising ceremonies will be held on Tuesdays, except during Freedom Week and Constitution Week.

The Governor of Delaware, which was first to ratify the Constitution, was present at the opening ceremony. The Governor of Pennsylvania, second State to ratify, participated in the second week events.

At the end of the year will come Alaska and Hawaii, admitted to the Union in 1958 and 1959, respectively.

The ceremonies will be under the direction of the Philadelphia Committee for the 175th Anniversary of the Constitution.

Each week's ceremonies will feature a color guard, representing the different branches of the armed services. During January, there will be a Navy color guard for the flags. A band and bugler will play.

Among organizations participating will be the Sons of the American Revolution, the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Descendants of Signers of the Declaration of Independence, and the Colonial Dames of America.

The Boy Scouts of America, Girl Scouts of America, the National Commission of the 175th Anniversay of the Constitution, and the National Park Service, which operates Independence National Park, also will take active parts in the weekly ceremonies.

Who Pays for "Cheap" Gas?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that a digest of a very able article by Arthur K. Lee, chairman of the board, United Cities Gas Co., which has been published in the Public Utilities Fortnightly for January 4, 1962, be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the digest was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT OTHERS THINK: COSTLY "CHEAP" GAS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following review item is in essence a digest of a longer and more complete article by Arthur K. Lee, board chairman of the United Cities Gas Co. of Chicago. Mr. Lee's article in full text is slated for publication in our issue of January 18. The abbreviated form was also prepared by Mr. Lee.)

Efforts to revive the Harris bill for decontrol of gas producers since its veto by President Eisenhower in 1956 have met with no success, but neither has effective regulation. New contracts for gas were being written by pipelines at 12 cents to 15 cents per thousand cubic feet in 1955 versus 23 cents to 26 cents (including tax) in 1960, a unit increase of 100 percent. The average cost, because so much gas was contracted for 10 to 20 years ago at 5 cents to 10 cents, advanced only from 10.8 cents in 1955 to 15.9 cents in 1960, a unit increase of 50 percent. But the average is accelerating, indicating that the accumulated lower-priced gas purchases are being exhausted. Sales of gas in 1960 exceeded 8 trillion cubic feet interstate, and 3 trillion cubic feet intrastate, for a total of 11 trillion cubic feet, which means that the increase in average field prices alone cost consumers annually over $500 million and will, at the new purchase prices, which are being rapidly approached, exceed $1 billion.

But even this is only the beginning. Contending originally that a part of the oversupply of gas carried in partially empty lines at any price would result in saving for residential and firm industrial consumers, the two-part rate came into general use. Its chief merit today in my opinion is concealment of charges. From 1954 to 1960 it has been used by pipelines, with the consent of the Federal Power Commission, to shift or "tilt" increasing gas costs from cheap interruptible gas sales to residential and other firm consumers, with the result that today the latter are paying the major part of the increased gas costs for both themselves and the interruptible users. I believe that at least 3 cents per thousand cubic feet out of the total increase in average field prices has been so "tilted." The "tilt" of a 3-cent increase from the "commodity" segment of the two-part rate to the "demand" segment at 100-percent load factor becomes a 7.5 cent increase for a 40-percent load factor user. Residential and other firm consumers of interstate gas are therefore paying their own increased field cost and contributing nearly $150 million to interruptible gas costs and other expenses, which is greater than any possible saving from the sale of interruptible gas.

I believe in the sale of interruptible gas. It can be done profitably without subsidy from other sales. Every regulatory agency, both State and Federal, should consider that:

Every $1,000 transfer of gas costs by pipelines and/or distributors from the commodity to demand (interruptible to firm) segment of the two-part rate causes an overcharge of approximately $2,500 to residential, $1,987 to commercial, or $1,430 to firm industrial consumers or a combination thereof.

I do not say either pipelines or distributors are making unreasonable returns. I do say that by the tilt pipelines force all distributors to increase charges 2½ times as much to residential customers as both the pipe line and particular distributors realize therefrom in combined profits.

An American Gas Association task force or committee has recently published a report, stating that after exhaustive investigation it found:

1959 volume of sales of interruptible gas (million cubic feet)	2,645,917
Revenues (gross, I presume)	$747,013,000
Net revenue (profit, I presume)	$391,944,000

The report indicates that it included not only operation of interstate pipelines, including direct sales, but also 1,149,915 mm.c.f. of intrastate sales and the profit by distributors upon all these sales. No statement of expense is made but the only conclusion which can be arrived at is that it is the difference between gross and net revenue, or $355,069,000. Reducing these figures to units results in: sales 28.2 cents per thousand cubic feet, profit 14.4 cents, expense 13.8 cents. We know from Federal Power Commission reports that average field cost of all interstate shipments that year was 14.6 cents or 0.8 cents greater than committee's total expense allowance, and I know from published data and experience that there are costs in transmitting gas 1,000 miles, even though partially empty lines, such as additional compression, higher insurance and taxes, additional employees, and unpredictables. But let us say that a fair charge would be about one-half the transport charge for firm gas, and assign it 11 cents per thousand cubic feet. A charge of 5 cents per thousand cubic feet for distributors' overall expense as against about a 25-cent charge to other gas for similar expense should be more than fair.

[Cents per thousand cubic feet]

Gas cost	14.6
Transportation	11.0
Distribution	5.0
Total expense	30.6

Per thousand cubic feet versus committee, 13.8 cents. Net loss: $62,637,000 versus committee profit of $391,944,000.

The cost of overhead and operation of distribution laterals, metering stations, etc., to direct customers should approximate the distribution charge of 5 cents per thousand cubic feet on that unknown portion of direct interruptible sales which did not pass through distribution systems.

An additional charge which is being shifted from interruptible to residential gas is the difference between "average" and "new contract" gas purchases. Residential and firm industrial consumers have furnished the assured markets which have provided FPC authorization, financial ability, and earning capacity for every pipeline, and are entitled to buy their gas at the average contract inventory price thereby created. Day-to-day interruptible sales can only provide some additional profits if the gas is sold for a price not less than its maximum replacement cost at time of sale, plus a reasonable transportation charge. The sale of grain at average instead of replacement cost on a rising market would put a string of grain elevators into insolvency in 30 days. If pipelines are allowed to continue to use average costs in making interruptible sales, residential gas will have to pay 1 to 2 cents per thousand cubic feet more each succeeding year, not even stopping with 25-cent gas, to replace gas now being given away to interruptible low-priced consumers.

Another point of unfairness to residential consumers is the use of pipelines to make direct or nonjurisdictional sales. Neither revenue nor profits on direct sales by pipelines are credited to the cost of residential service. The FPC has no control over these sales although they occupy over 28 percent of firm line space, and sales are made at much below other firm sales. They should meet the same requirements and rates as other interstate gas sales.

This brings us down to the question of what to do about it. Gas is a commodity and its transportation is a service. Pipeline firm rates should be in two parts, but not a two-part rate, one fixed on average cost, the other on transportation service costs as now regulated. A second rate should be provided for line filling interruptible sales based on reduced transportation charges regulated by FPC and a competitive commodity price fixed by pipelines without FPC approval at not less than amount of the pipeline's maximum cost of an equivalent volume.

As an outline of formulas, I offer the following:

FIRM GAS

F-1 commodity: Average approved cost per thousand cubic feet during preceding year.

F-2 transportation: All other charges, including operating, overhead, and return, fixed by Commission after hearing.

INTERRUPTIBLE GAS

I-1 commodity: Pipelines may fix negotiated ratable volume and common price of gas not less than average price of their highest cost of an equivalent volume of gas during the month or year of sale.

I-2 transportation: Fixed by Federal Power Commission upon application or their

own motion as a fair and reasonable charge for that service.

The above rates, put into effect in lieu of present two-part rates, will accomplish the following:

1. Allow the complete use and filling of pipelines as is now accomplished but only on a profitable replacement gas basis.

2. Stop shifting costs from interruptible to firm gas.

3. Segregate and reveal inequitable charges now concealed by the two-part rate.

4. (a) Stop subsidizing of cheap interruptible sales in large industrial centers by high prices to residential users in smaller residential cities.

(b) Stop subsidizing of cheap interruptible sales by high prices to residential users in the same city.

5. Introduce competition which does not exist today and which cannot be effective while pipelines are allowed to sell interruptible gas based upon low-cost averages instead of cost of replacement.

6. Stop new purchase of gas by pipelines at costs and charges greater than interruptible users are willing to pay, which in turn will help the Federal Power Commission in fixing producer prices by areas.

7. Encourage producers to offer pipelines reduced seasonal prices to help meet competition if they desire to continue maximum sales during the summer months.

8. Prevent discrimination between classes by pipeline two-part rates and place full regulation of distributors' rates to consumers in State utility commissions or other local authorities only.

9. Combination of F-1 and I-1 charges will result in a consolidated gas cost equaling or slightly exceeding average for current year and will relieve residential and other firm users of later payment of high replacement costs.

ARTHUR K. LEE,
Chairman of the Board,
United Cities Gas Co.

Views on Atomic Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 26, 1962

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor, in an article published January 17, has done a great public service by calling attention to the observations of the noted Cornell University professor and distinguished international nuclear physicist, Dr. Hans A. Bethe.

Dr. Bethe has made penetrating comments on such vital subjects as Soviet testing, the "balance of terror," arms limitation, and civilian defense, and I urge my colleagues to give this article their most thoughtful consideration:

BETHE GIVES VIEWS ON A-DEFENSE

(By Neal Stanford)

There are not many natural scientists who can talk simply enough so the layman can understand them and who also have enough public experience to compete with the military and politicians for the newsman's attention.

Dr. Hans A. Bethe, Cornell University professor, national and international figure in nuclear physics, is one of this scarce breed.

So what he has to say about Soviet testing, the "balance of terror," the shelter program, arms limitation, and other subjects gets attention.

The other day he spoke at length, and with notable insight and pertinence on many matters involving the country and the world, including the following observations and comments:

The Soviet Union cut the fallout from their 60-megaton test by using a lead jacket around the fusion materials. This reduced the fallout—especially that which might have fallen on their own country.

A 100-megaton weapon exploded at 30 miles altitude would set fire to almost anything within a 30-mile radius; blast destruction would extend 20 miles; firestorms might extend to a 60-mile radius.

BOMBERS REQUIRED

A 100-megaton weapon, however, cannot now be carried by existing Russian ICBM's, but could be carried by their larger bomber planes.

The United States could build 100-megaton weapons if it wanted to. The difference is that the United States never advertised its 25-megaton weapons, while the Russians talk about "a naked show of power."

There is not much difference between 100 and 10 megatons from the military point of view. A 10-megaton bomb can destroy most any city. A simple rule is 10 megatons, 10 miles of destructive radius.

The United States has had 10-megaton weapons since 1954; the Soviets since 1958. The United States has 500 B-52's to deliver them, also 1,000 B-47's.

What prevents the Soviets from attacking the United States is our capability to retaliate, known as the strategy of deterrent. This "balance of terror" is most uncomfortable but a necessary part of life in the H-bomb-missile age.

While the United States got the headstart in nuclear weapons, the Soviets took it in ICBM's. Sputnik was in the end a very good influence, accelerating our military research and development.

The ICBM has made surprise attack easier, giving only 15 minutes warning. This puts a premium on first strike.

Also, as only part of the force of the defending party is expected to survive, force needs to be many times that actually needed in war.

But this situation is reversed by other factors.

By putting Minuteman ICBM's in underground silos, it would take a direct Soviet hit to knock one out. They are being built far enough apart so one Soviet ICBM can knock out only one Minuteman.

"The fact the Minuteman is a solid-fuel missile makes it instantly ready for use.

"It is my opinion we are building a more useful missile force than the Russians." Because of the Polaris and the Minuteman (one that can't be located, the other that can't be destroyed easily) the danger of surprise attack is greatly reduced.

SECURITY ENHANCED

Polaris and Minuteman therefore contribute to the security of the United States, to a less unsure attitude on the part of the military, and thus to the stability of the military situation.

Many of the Soviet tests were in the 1- to 5-megaton range, the range suitable for a Russian solid-fuel missile similar to Minuteman.

"I hope this is the right interpretation, for it will remove any incentive for the Russians to strike first."

Another desirable consequence of invulnerable missile sites, as Dr. Bethe sees it, is that secrecy loses its value. If the sites cannot be destroyed it will no longer be useful for the enemy to know where they are. This may make it possible for the Russians to open their country.

However, there is this disadvantage to having invulnerable missile sites. The enemy may then make the main targets the big cities.

This in turn increases the importance of shelters. The Defense Department's shelter booklet is "a very good and well-balanced pamphlet." It says correctly that no shelter program can prevent the death of millions; but it also says if war comes other millions can be saved by shelters.

"But I do not feel there is any real effective civil defense to nuclear warfare; nor is anyone going to come up with a really effective antimissile missile.

"It is not that antimissile missiles cannot be built, but decoys can make it impossible to distinguish them from missiles, and so many can be sent at one time that they saturate the radars.

"As a whole, the picture today appears to me one of increasing strength and security, but with ever-present danger."

Carl Vinson: ROA's Minuteman of 1962—No Man Has Made Such an Indelible Imprint on Structure of Nation's Military Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to pay tribute to one of our most distinguished Members.

The dean of this body is one whose innate genius and great wisdom have meant a great deal to many of us, as well as to our country.

No Member of this body has directed a more effective school for younger Members than has the Honorable CARL VINSON. It has been my privilege, and my great profit, to serve under his chairmanship since I came to the Congress in the 77th Congress. If I know anything about the military responsibilities of the Congress, and of the vastness of the Nation's military problems, it is because I had CARL VINSON as chairman of my committee—first in the Committee on Naval Affairs, and later when the committees were merged, on the Committee on Armed Services.

Many honors have come to CARL VINSON. We know for a long time he has been recognized as the "admiral" of the House. His great service to the country has been cited on numerous occasions.

One of the finest honors to come to him is in his selection by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States as the "citizen who has contributed most to the national security shared by the people of the United States in these times." "Admiral" VINSON will be given this formal award—as Minuteman of 1962—at ROA's annual midwinter banquet on March 2, here in Washington at the Sheraton-Park Hotel. Many Members of this body will join with this great patriotic organization on that eve-

ning in paying tribute to our colleague whom we admire so greatly and to whom so many are indebted.

An article from the February issue of the Officer, monthly magazine of the ROA, tells briefly of some of the highlights of his career, and is offered herewith for the information and pleasure of the Members of Congress:

CARL VINSON: ROA'S MINUTEMAN OF 1962—NO MAN HAS MADE SUCH AN INDELIBLE IMPRINT ON STRUCTURE OF NATION'S MILITARY FORCES

(Chairman CARL VINSON, of the House Armed Services Committee, will be honored by ROA as the Minuteman of 1962 at the national council banquet March 2 at the Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D.C.

(The award, ROA's most cherished, is presented each year for outstanding service to the country. It has gone in the past to Hugh M. Milton, former Assistant Secretary and Undersecretary of the Army; Bryce N. Harlow, assistant to former President Eisenhower; Chairman Richard Russell of the Senate Armed Services Committee; and David Sarnoff, chairman of the board of the Radio Corp. of America.

(The article below about Mr. VINSON was written by Louis R. Stockstill, congressional editor of the Army, Navy, Air Force Journal. Mr. Stockstill knows "Uncle CARL" well, having recently written a series on him for the journal, with a reprint by the Reader's Digest. His wife, Anita, is one of Mr. VINSON's secretaries.

(Mr. Stockstill is a veteran of the World War II 10th Armored Division. He has covered military activities on Capitol Hill for more than 11 years, prior to which he was a member of the Pentagon press corps. He also has instructed in national news reporting at George Washington University.)

(By Louis R. Stockstill)

CARL VINSON, of Georgia, is the senior Member of the U.S. House of Representatives. When he celebrates his 50th year of congressional service in 1964, he will have been a Member of the House longer than any man in the history of the Nation.

Yet, today, at 78, the powerful chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services is more vigorous and energetic than many freshmen Congressmen. He moves in a swirling vortex which engulfs and exhausts those around him. He arrives daily on Capitol Hill before some Members of the House and Senate are out of bed. He schedules appointments, meetings, conferences, hearings, and other activities in such depth and with such rapidity and lack of formality that many go unrecorded.

At times, he even becomes engulfed in his own maelstrom.

After meeting individually with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Labor, the Attorney General, a former Secretary of the Army, a sub-Cabinet officer and several lesser luminaries one day last year, he opened a textile discussion with a hundred House colleagues, herded a major bill to floor passage, dispatched his routine chores and walked to the Senate to confer with the Vice President on a critical foreign policy problem. In a brief lull at the end of the day, someone asked what he had eaten for lunch. VINSON looked nonplussed. "Why," he said, "I forgot to eat."

The enthusiasm and dedication with which VINSON embraces his daily work continually amazes his staff. He tackles routine House activities, the smallest needs of his district, even the most trivial defense legislation with the same zeal he devotes to major problems of Government. All take on an aura of excitement under his banner.

Yet the remarkable aspect of VINSON's energetic and enthusiastic approach to his job can be fully appreciated only when considered in relation to his long tenure in office, to the people with whom he has served, to the history he has helped write.

Before the fledgling Reserve Officers Association came into existence in 1922, CARL VINSON already had been a Member of the House for 8 years. He had voted to send the United States to war against Germany. He had nailed down his philosophy that a nation is only as strong as its defense, and that military requirements must be decided always on a nonpartisan basis. He had foreseen a growing role for seapower among the world's major nations.

By 1928, when JOHN W. MCCORMACK arrived on Capitol Hill, VINSON had been the ranking Democrat on the old House Naval Affairs Committee for 5 years. He had helped blueprint the future of American aviation by serving, at the request of President Calvin Coolidge, on the historic Morrow Board. He had learned firsthand from Orville Wright and a young major named "Hap" Arnold some of the mysteries the skies would unveil in the 20th century. He had earned the friendship of a young Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who earnestly believed, as he did, in the need to build a strong U.S. fleet.

When CHARLES A. HALLECK first walked into the House Chamber in 1935, VINSON had moved up to the chairmanship of the Naval Affairs Committee, where for 4 years he had been urging the construction of a U.S. Navy second to none. The arrival in the White House of his friend, Franklin Roosevelt, had helped him win approval for a permanent ship tonnage program—the farseeing Vinson-Trammell Act.

By 1940, when Harvard was awarding high honors to a member of its graduating class named John Fitzgerald Kennedy, VINSON had engineered the birth of the two-ocean Navy and had embarked on a pre-Pearl Harbor buildup of planes, pilots, and airbases for a war that was still over the horizon.

With the war successfully concluded, as 29-year-old Kennedy and a west coast contemporary, Richard M. Nixon, were being sworn in as freshman Members of the House in 1947, VINSON, then in his 33d year of congressional service, also began a new role. The old Naval Affairs Committee and the Committee on Military Affairs were joined as the Armed Services Committee, and the veteran legislator found himself with two new constituents—the Army and Air Force.

With the same unflagging devotion and energy he previously had lavished on the Navy and Marine Corps, he now turned his talents to the needs of all the services—construction of a giant air arm, unification, missile development, strengthened Reserve Forces, preservation of the Marine Corps, continued growth of the Navy, Army modernization, and a vast array of laws designed to improve the career structure of the Armed Forces. Impressive as were his earlier achievements, they soon doubled and tripled.

In the 173-year history of the Congress, no man has made such an indelible imprint on the structure of the Nation's military forces. Only three times in 30 years have bills reported by VINSON's committee been defeated on the floor. His long service has paralleled that of eight U.S. presidents, 18 Secretaries of War and Defense, 25 Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and 53 admirals and generals who have headed the land, sea, and ground forces.

VINSON was born November 18, 1883, on a Georgia farm near Milledgeville, the State's pre-Civil War capitol. By the time he reached school age, the buildings which had housed the State legislature had been converted into the Middle Georgia Military and Agricultural College (now Georgia Military) and in these historic chambers—perhaps prophetically—he received his early education. In 1902, at the age of 18, he was graduated from the Mercer University law school in Macon, 29th in a class of 50.

Back home, he launched his legal career in partnership with a local judge, but already he was attracted to the exciting world of politics. Soon, barely out of his teens, he obtained appointment as prosecuting attorney of the Baldwin Country Court, and, at 25, he won a seat in the Georgia General Assembly. In his second term, he became speaker pro tempore.

Rebuffed in a third-term bid (which he lost by five votes), he accepted appointment as judge of the Baldwin County Court and waited patiently for another chance. This time, he had his eye on Washington. When the opportunity came in 1914, he moved unhesitatingly into a fight with three wealthy opponents and the powerful political machine of Richmond County, waged a hard-hitting battle and emerged victorious. Fifteen days before his 31st birthday, he took his seat in the 63d Congress—the youngest Representative in the Nation.

In his first major floor speech on the subject of national defense, 18 months later, VINSON postulated his conviction that the country's military needs must ever be determined without political pressure. "I am a Democrat," he said, "but my country and its safety comes ahead of any party." He has never deviated from this concept.

In the same speech, VINSON looked at the great stretches of ocean separating the continents and accurately predicted the future growth of the world's navies. When a vacancy opened up the following year on the Naval Affairs Committee he moved into the seat where he was to become "the father of the two-ocean Navy," and from which he was to help guide the United States to a position of world leadership on the seas.

By 1923, VINSON was the ranking Democrat on the committee. In 1931, he became its chairman. Except for two brief periods of Republican control, he has occupied the chair of that committee or its successor, the Armed Services Committee, ever since, sternly inculcating those who serve with him in his nonpartisan approach to national security.

One of the highest tributes he will ever receive has been paid to him by those Members of Congress who served their apprenticeship at his side. Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON, Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, House GOP-Whip LESLIE ARENDS, among others, proudly label themselves "graduates of Vinson College."

Forty-fourth Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, during the week of January 22, 1962, we celebrate the 44th anniversary of the proclamation of the Ukraine as a free and independent Republic.

We recall the high hopes for freedom of the Ukraine people resulting from the historic action of their National Council of Kiev in 1918. The years of independence for this proud people were tragically brief, for in 1920, the Russians brutally subjugated the citizens of the

Ukraine and have held them in bondage since that time.

Despite determined Kremlin efforts to suppress liberties and to brainwash the populace, these freedom-loving people have never accepted the Communist yoke. During these past four decades, they have written an indelible record of fierce opposition to Soviet dictatorship.

The Ukraine is the largest non-Russian nation under Soviet imperialism with a national history originating in the 10th century. Our remembrance of this fact means much to them and serves to put the Kremlin on notice that the principle of self-determination remains a fundamental part of our foreign policy—not only for the Ukraine—but for all Communist-enslaved peoples of the earth.

Partnership in Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 26, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered by me at the National Hemophilia Foundation luncheon at the Statler-Hilton Hotel, New York City, on January 13, 1962:

REMARKS OF HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE, SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND, AT NATIONAL HEMOPHILIA FOUNDATION LUNCHEON ON SATURDAY, JANUARY 13, 1962, AT 12 NOON AT THE STATLER-HILTON HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY

It is a great pleasure for me to be invited to address a group whose interests in improving the Nation's health run parallel to my own. Not only are we all interested in assuring a healthy and prosperous Nation, but the efforts of such voluntary health agencies as the National Hemophilia Foundation illustrate the kind of hand-in-hand cooperation with the Federal Government which is particularly gratifying to those of us who are privileged to play a role in the development of Federal health programs.

In this period when some are wondering if the increasing role of the Federal Government in research may perhaps be a threat to other sources of research support. I would like to give you some impression of the ways in which Federal activities are cooperative and supplemental without being dominating. I can select no better instance of partnership in health—governmental and voluntary—than the National Hemophilia Foundation.

Let me say that my own interests in the fields of medicine and health have grown with the years. I have been in Congress, representing the Second District of Rhode Island, for over 20 years now, and for a major part of that time I have had the rare opportunity and responsibility of being chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In this period I have become increasingly aware of the ever-greater impact that the Federal research expenditures are having on research programs in the life sciences.

For those who fear a suppression of private expenditures as Federal activity increases in support of biomedical research, I can only say that there are so many problems of disease remaining before us that there are problems enough for all.

For those who say that the percentage of non-Federal funds has greatly decreased in relation to Federal funds, over the past 20 years, I have a ready answer. While the percentage of non-Federal funds has decreased, there has at the same time been a remarkable increase in the actual amount of non-Federal assistance to medical research. In 1940, some $42 million was spent by non-Federal sources for medical research; today the amount is estimated to be around $335 million. It seems to me that this is clear proof that Federal funds have stimulated, rather than suppressed, private expenditures for medical research.

For those whose doubts linger, let me come back to this foundation, whose board of trustees and those present today represent several thousand dedicated workers doing their part to combat one well-known but rare disease.

By its nature, hemophilia is a rare disease. Yet every literate man knows that its influence may well have changed the course of European history because Queen Victoria happened to carry the gene of this disease, and through her daughters carried it into the reigning houses of Spain and Russia. The bleeder's disease may appear in any family; when it appears in a family in high position—such as the last Czar of Russia—it may promote the interests of a Rasputin and influence vast events. But wherever it appears it visits tragic difficulties which those of us more fortunate hardly realize. Perhaps it is well for us to try to imagine what it would be like to be afraid that the common, everyday task of brushing one's teeth might expose us to the possibility of a dangerous loss of blood. This frightening prospect is just one of the daily burdens of the sufferer from hemophilia.

It is one of the purposes of your foundation to disseminate just this kind of information. The greater the public understanding of the disease, the greater the support of research in hemophilia.

The work done by your foundation since its inception in 1948 is impressive indeed. As members of this group you have been responsible for the raising of thousands of dollars to be used in the treatment and care of the afflicted, through your several State and local groups.

Although you are a relative newcomer in the field of public health, I am sure that the families with afflicted children never questioned the newness of your help but were grateful that someone was interested enough to give them assistance as well as helping to supply the large quantities of blood so often needed.

Although you are a relatively small organization in the field of public health, I am sure that the husbands with hemophilia never questioned the size of the organization that helped them get and hold a job so that they could be useful and productive members of society. It is not the size of an organization that is important: it is the quality and effectiveness of the organization. These qualities are needed in the alleviation of human suffering. And this foundation has been able to fill a human need which others have left unanswered.

It would be difficult to say which of your many activities is the more important. The grants and funds given for research and fellowships are important, but not more so than the financial assistance you give to hemophilia victims. Your registration of all hemophiliacs, your educational efforts with them, and your help in the maintenance of blood and plasma banks are equally important and beyond mere praise—a worthy effort of which you may be justly proud.

But all of our efforts in medical research are completely overshadowed by the problems of disease and disability still confronting us. I would like to restate my views, briefly, here, today.

The conquest of communicable diseases in the first half of this century has shifted the emphasis in medical research to the chronic, metabolic and degenerative disorders. Apart from the tragedy and unhappiness they cause, disease and disability are estimated to cost this Nation $35 billion a year. Only through medical research and its application can these losses be reduced.

In the 1930's it became apparent that a major trend in the country was toward an aging population, with more and more people subject to chronic diseases whose control would be more and more essential. Accordingly, Congress in 1937 established a National Cancer Institute, and by 1949 six additional research Institutes had been authorized for the investigation of other specific disease categories. I am, of course, referring to the National Institutes of Health, the chief research arm of the Public Health Service. The chronic diseases are reflected in the names of some of these Institutes—Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases, Cancer, Heart, Mental Health, Neurological Diseases and Blindness. And this is proper, in my view, when you realize that there are more than 70 million people in this country with one or more chronic diseases.

The role that the National Institutes of Health plays in biomedical research today is a significant one. While it is carrying on scientific work in its Institute laboratories—there are 8,700 workers at the NIH—it is supporting individual investigators throughout the Nation. To realize the pervasiveness of this influence one has only to scan the medical literature.

Now, hemophilia is one of the chronic diseases I was talking about which NIH is combatting. Practically all of the leading research scientists working on hemophilia in the United States today acknowledge the support of the Public Health Service. This support is coming from a variety of Institutes and Divisions at NIH, and covers a wide spectrum of research in hemophilia.

Again, one of the leading centers for the care and study of hemophilia has grown up here in New York City under the auspices of a variety of organizations. This is at Mount Sinai Hospital, and I am proud to note that the Public Health Service supports many of the investigations at this center.

I was also happy to learn that the National Hemophilia Foundation is supporting a project at Mount Sinai to develop a more effective means of the production of blood plasma through a new "deep freeze" project. I understand that it is hoped that by freezing and storing the blood plasma at minus 93° C.—instead of minus 20° or 40° C.—a more efficient product will be produced which will retain a high degree of coagulation factor and will store for longer periods.

Meanwhile, I have learned, the clinical center at NIH is pursuing studies on the biochemistry of blood coagulation with particular reference to the development of better forms of therapy for various congenital and acquired blood diseases.

It was tremendously reassuring to me to learn that even so rare a disease as hemophilia is being attacked by joint Federal and private efforts. This working together to overcome a common scourge is the kind of cooperative effort that is moving us all forward in our advance against illness and disease. This is an excellent example of the very kind of Government and nongovernmental cooperation which we in Congress hope to stimulate.

I am convinced that the remarkable progress that we have made in the past has been the result of this sort of sustained, cooperative effort among a variety of organizations at the local, State and National level. Many factors lie behind this remarkable growth. Among these factors is the public's interest in health, as manifest in increased tax-supported programs as well as in the rise of

the national voluntary health organizations.

As I have observed this increased interest and confidence grow through the years I have come firmly to believe that every American shares with me the desire to do everything possible to assure the best medical care, treatment, and rehabilitation for all our citizens who may be physically afflicted. By doing so we may avert some of the annual loss in human productivity, which contributes to the mainstream of our economy, but this is not our sole or even main obligation.

For, as our Nation has assumed new leadership in the medical sciences, we have demonstrated our adherence to the moral principle that human lives are inherently precious. We then have the obligation to uphold our American heritage of humanitarian concern for the handicapped—as the National Hemophilia Foundation has been so successful in doing.

In this connection, I cannot say too much in favor of the importance of the personal services that the foundation offers to hemophilia victims and their families. Local clinics and patient services mean much to a person who may need continuing care throughout life. Families have to be helped in their internal adjustments; employment and other social problems must be solved. Research and patient services are recognized by this foundation to be two phases of one program.

I am pleased to learn that the executive committee of the foundation has decided to broaden its program to include victims of a number of rare blood diseases related to hemophilia. As I understand it, all persons afflicted with inherited deficiencies of the coagulation factors will now be included in the foundation's research program. This represents your desire to serve more people who have similar problems, and it also reflects your desire to keep in step with the expansion of the Nation's total medical research effort, as outlined by the President in his message to Congress last year.

Medical science is making great strides, however small they may seem, at times, in its conquest of the dread diseases. We know much more than we knew 10 years ago, or 5 years ago, or even a year ago. But to continue to know more we must have many new research facilities, and many, many more trained investigators.

As President Kennedy said last year, "The next 10 years will require a vast expansion of this Nation's present total effort in medical research, if knowledge is to keep pace with human progress."

He concluded, in part, that "The health of the American people must ever be safeguarded; it must ever be improved. As long as people are stricken by disease which we have the ability to prevent, as long as people are chained by a disability which can be reversed, as long as needless death takes its toll, then American health will be unfinished business."

We cannot afford to slow down the research momentum that has been so carefully and painstakingly built up over the years. That is why I urge you to join me in telling the people in your organization, in the areas where you have a voice, how important it is that nothing interfere with the rising tide of medical research in this Nation.

It is, of course, gratifying to know of the President's deep personal interest in health and medical research, and I believe he is most serious in his desire to direct our best efforts toward the improvement of the Nation's health. I am fully confident that the administration will move to forward research for the benefit of all of the American people.

For my part, I shall do what I can in Congress to support medical and health related research in Governmental agencies. We cannot do without some of these Federal activities. I might mention here the recent discovery by Federal agents that unsafe blood was being processed and mislabeled in the New York area. This discovery was made because the Government maintains standards for the production of blood products which can damage or kill if they are not properly handled. Every manufacturer and every product must be approved by the Public Health Service. Fortunately the blood was detected to be faulty, in time, so that there were no fatalities or illnesses. The significance of this action will be clear to you, who work with people who must have quantities of unadulterated blood to save their lives. I think all Americans are reassured to learn that a branch of the Federal Government is safeguarding the interest of any one of us who, at any time, may have to use blood and blood products. I hope that this fact, and not the publicity over the discovery of defective blood, is the fact that remains with the American public.

I am convinced, that with research support continuing to expand, with all of us working together, there is good reason to believe that science will find the cure for hemophilia and other chronic diseases.

There are some areas of hope for a cure for hemophilia, I am told. Research may reveal a dietary supplement that may control the disorder. There is some progress in the attempt to isolate the antihemophilic factor in the blood. There are prospects for improved treatment of hemophilia, especially in the case of improved antihemophilic globulin.

But, and I repeat, to continue this progress and increase the prospects for improved treatment, we must not allow ourselves to slow down in our research efforts. Through the activities of the Federal Government, through the voluntary agencies—and, as with this foundation, through the joint activities of both—we share in the responsibilities and the rewards of the conquest of disease. Only by working harder than ever, and by working in harmony, can we succeed.

CAB Reports on Arctic-Pacific Air Lines Crash—Installment I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, material which I placed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 18, 1961—pages 18877–18901—points to the responsibility that the Federal Government must share for the October 29, 1960, crash of an Artic-Pacific Air Lines plane in Toledo, Ohio. This tragic crash claimed the lives of 16 members of the California State Polytechnic College football team. The material shows that at the time of the disaster and for a considerable period of time prior thereto subject airline was virtually insolvent and the plane which crashed was not maintained in airworthy condition. Clearly, economic regulations of the Civil Aeronautics Board and safety regulations of the Federal Aviation Agency had not been enforced by these agencies with due diligence; hence, the Government must share responsibility for the crash. H.R. 9475, a bill which I introduced in the last session of Congress, acknowledges this responsibility by providing just compensation for the victims of the crash.

On January 22, 1962, the CAB released a report—file 1–0047—on the crash which contradicts and fails to include some pertinent facts brought out in the material I placed in the RECORD. In light of S. 1969, a bill pending in the Senate—it was amended and passed by the House on September 18, 1961—which would give permanent status to supplemental air carriers such as Arctic-Pacific. I think Members of Congress should have an opportunity to compare the CAB report with facts covered in the material I put in the RECORD. I therefore, under unanimous consent, include the report in the Appendix of today's RECORD:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD AIRCRAFT ACCIDENT REPORT, ADOPTED, JANUARY 15, 1962, RELEASED, JANUARY 22, 1962—ARCTIC-PACIFIC, INC., CURTISS-WRIGHT, SUPER C-46F, N1244N, TOLEDO EXPRESS AIRPORT, TOLEDO, OHIO, OCTOBER 29, 1960

SYNOPSIS

At approximately 2202 e.s.t., October 29, 1960, an Arctic-Pacific, Inc., Super C-46F, N1244N, crashed during takeoff from the Toledo Express Airport, Toledo, Ohio. Of the 45 passengers and 3 crew members aboard, 20 passengers and the captain and copilot were fatally injured.

N1244N of Arctic-Pacific, Inc., a supplemental air carrier, was chartered to transport the California State Polytechnic College football team from Santa Maria, Calif., to Toledo, Ohio, and return. The aircraft took off from Toledo Express Airport on the return flight to San Luis Obispo in weather conditions of nine-tenths partial sky obscuration; zero visibility in fog; and weighing approximately 2,000 pounds more than its maximum certificated gross weight of 47,100 pounds. The aircraft crashed approximately 5,800 feet from the threshold of the takeoff runway, caught fire, and was destroyed.

The Board has determined that the probable cause of this accident was loss of control during a premature liftoff. Contributing factors were the overweight aircraft, weather conditions, and partial loss of power in the left engine.

As a result of this accident the Federal Aviation Agency, on October 31, 1960, suspended the air carrier operating certificate issued to Arctic-Pacific in accordance with section 609 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. Subsequently the operating certificate, which expired on November 14, 1960, was not renewed.

The FAA has also published a notice in the Airman's Guide and has instructed its tower operators to withhold takeoff clearance from an air carrier or other commercial aircraft operated for the purpose of carrying passengers or property for compensation or hire when the prevailing visibility for the airport of departure or runway visibility for the departure runway is less than one-quarter of a mile, or runway visual range is less than 2,000 feet.

INVESTIGATION

N1244N departed from the Arctic-Pacific main base at the Oakland International Airport, Oakland, Calif., on October 27, 1960. The schedule for the flight shows that it departed with a four-man crew plus one stewardess, and that Capt. Donald L. J. Chesher was the senior pilot on board. The crew on board at departure were: Capt. Donald L. J. Chesher, Capt. Robert P. Fleming, Copilot Howard Perovich, Copilot Lucien Tessier, and Stewardess Susan Faith Miller.

The schedule called for Captain Fleming and Copilot Tessier to fly the aircraft from Oakland, Calif., to Kansas City, Mo., with

intermediate stops at Santa Maria, Calif., to board the California Polytechnic College football team, and at Albuquerque, N. Mex., for fuel. At Kansas City, Captain Fleming and Copilot Tessier were scheduled to leave the flight. Captain Chesher and Copilot Perovich were then to fly the aircraft from Kansas City to Toledo, Ohio, off-load the California Polytechnic College football team, then proceed as a ferry flight to Youngstown, Ohio. At Youngstown, the crew was to lay over until the morning of October 28, and board the Youngstown University football team for a nonstop flight to New Haven, Conn. A layover of approximately 30 hours was scheduled at New Haven, Conn. Captain Chesher and Copilot Perovich were then to transport the Youngstown University football team from New Haven to Youngstown, ferry the aircraft to Toledo, board the California Polytechnic College football team, and fly to Kansas City, Mo. Captain Fleming and Copilot Tessier were then to rejoin the flight for duty back to Santa Maria and Oakland, Calif.

Investigation revealed the following schedule was flown by the aircraft from the departure at Oakland International Airport on October 27, 1960, to the time of the accident:

Airport	Time	Flight time	Ground time	Remarks
Depart Oakland	1335 Z [1] (0535 P.s.t.[2] 27th).	--------	0	Chesher in command. No flight plan filed.
Arrived Santa Maria	1435 Z 27 (0635 P.s.t. 27th).	1:00	--------	
Departed Santa Maria	1611 Z 27th (0811 P.s.t. 27th).	0	1:36	Chesher in command. 48 persons aboard.
Arrived Albuquerque	2005 Z 27th (1305 M.s.t.[3] 27th).	3:54	0	
Departed Albuquerque.	2144 Z 27th (1444 M.s.t. 27th).	0	1:39	Chesher in command. 48 persons aboard.
Arrived Kansas City	0110 Z 28th (1910 C.s.t.[4] 27th).	3:26	0	
Departed Kansas City	0242 Z 28th (2042 C.s.t. 27th).	0	1:32	Chesher in command. 2d crew disembarked at Kansas City. 46 persons aboard.
Arrived Toledo	0522 Z 28th (0022 E.s.t.[5]).	2:40	0	43 persons disembarked at Toledo.
Departed Toledo	0708 Z 28th (0208 C.s.t. 28th).	--------	1:46	Chesher in command. Ferry to Youngstown.
Arrived Youngstown	0800 Z 28th (0300 E.s.t. 28th).	0:52	0	Chesher slept in airport lounge.
Departed Youngstown.	1326 Z 28th (0826 e.s.t. 28th).	0	5:26	Chesher in command. Approximately 45 persons aboard.
Arrived New Haven	1615 Z 28th (1115 e.s.t. 28th).	2:49	0	Approximately 45 persons disembarked.
Departed New Haven.	2125 Z 29th (1625 e.s.t. 29th).	0	29:10	Chesher in command. Approximately 47 persons aboard.
Arrived Youngstown	2309 Z 29th (1809 e.s.t. 29th).	1:45	0	Approximately 42 persons disembarked.
Departed Youngstown.	2355 Z 29th (1855 e.s.t. 29th).	--------	0:46	Chesher in command. Ferry to Toledo.
Arrived Toledo	0057 Z 30th (1957 e.s.t. 29th).	1:02	0	
Departed Toledo	0301 Z 30th (2201 e.s.t. 29th).	--------	2:04	Chesher in command. 48 persons aboard. Aircraft crashed at 2202 e.s.t. during takeoff.

[1] Greenwich civil time.
[2] Pacific standard time.
[3] Mountain standard time.
[4] Central standard time.
[5] Eastern standard time.

N1244N was ferried from Youngstown, Ohio, to Toledo, Ohio, Saturday, October 29, 1960. At the time of arrival of the aircraft at Toledo, the weather conditions were: sky partially obscured, visibility three-fourths mile in fog.

Following the arrival at 1957 e.s.t.,[1] records reveal that 150 gallons of 100-octane fuel were added to the left and right center tanks, and 327 gallons of 91-octane fuel were added to the left and right front auxiliary tanks to bring the total fuel aboard to 1,062 gallons. No fuel was put in the aft tanks nor were these tanks checked for any fuel by the servicing personnel. Nine gallons of oil were added—2 gallons to the right engine, and 7 gallons to the left engine.

The meteorologist-technician on duty at the Toledo Express Airport, U.S. Weather Bureau office, stated the pilot of N1244N visited the office for a weather check between 2030 and 2100 hours. At the time of this weather briefing, the weather at Toledo Express Airport was recorded as partial obscuration; visibility one-sixteenth of a mile in fog; wind from the north at 3 knots; seven-tenths of the sky obscured by fog, runway visibility transmissometer inoperative.

The meteorologist-technician stated that at about 2115, the pilot of N1244N returned to the weather station to utilize the direct communication line to the control tower for filing a flight plan. At this time, he was given the 2100 aviation weather sequence for Kansas City. No further weather information was given during this final contact with the pilot.

Fog and/or low stratus were reported all day at Toledo Express Airport with conditions varying from ceiling and visibility zero to ceiling 800 to 1,300 feet and visibility 2½ miles. A record special observation at 1,658 showed a partial obscuration, visibility 2 miles in fog. This partial obscuration caused by the fog continued to be reported until after the accident. The visibility deteriorated steadily so that the 1,900 observation showed ¾-mile visibility; a special observation at 2037 showed 1/16-mile visibility; and all observations from 2133 until after the accident showed visibility zero in fog.

The transmissometer on runway 07 at Toledo Express Airport was not functioning properly during the briefing of Captain Chesher. This was discovered shortly after 1856 and, in accordance with existing instructions, the remark "RNVNO" was appended to all subsequent aviation weather sequence reports for Toledo Express Airport, indicating the nonavailability of runway visibility information.

Investigation disclosed that following the weather briefing, Captain Chesher returned to the Remmert-Werner ramp, where N1244N was parked, and the passengers and cargo were loadad aboard the aircraft. At this time Captain Chesher made a walking tour of the ramp in an effort to determine where aircraft were parked, and Copilot Perovich made a walkaround inspection of the aircraft. Captain Chesher then returned to the aircraft, and at approximately 2138 the engines were started.

Personnel who assisted in the refueling and starting of the engines stated they could barely observe lights at a distance of 160 feet at the time the engines were started. These witnesses state the engines started without any difficulty or backfiring. Other witnesses stated the density of the fog was fluctuating.

At approximately 2139, the pilot of N1244N called the tower for taxi clearance and was cleared to taxi to runway 25. The pilot requested takeoff on the ILS runway and was recleared to runway 07, to hold short of the runway, and to use extreme caution due to the unlighted aircraft parked on the ramp. Toledo Express Airport weather at this time was partial obscuration; zero visibility in fog; nine-tenths of the sky obscured by fog. Arctic-Pacific, Inc. minimums for takeoff from Toledo Express Airport were 300 feet ceiling and 1-mile visibility, or 400 feet ceiling and three-fourths-mile visibility on the sliding scale.

The pilot advised the tower controller that he knew the location of the parked aircraft because he had made a walking tour of the ramp. The pilot then asked the tower controller if the taxiway lights were on and was advised that everything was wide open, meaning that all lights were at full intensity. Refueling personnel with flashlights assisted in directing the pilot down the ramp to the entrance of the taxiway.

At 2150, the tower advised N1244N that they had his clearance when he was ready to copy. The pilot then asked for the magnetic bearing of the runway and was advised that it was 069°. The tower then delivered the following clearance: "44 November is cleared to the Oklahoma City Airport via Waterville Victor 47 to Findlay, Victor 14, climb to and maintain 7,000, Cleveland Center on 127.9 and on tower release; if unable, stand by on Findlay Radio."

The pilot then advised that his destination was Kansas City and not Oklahoma City and that he wanted preferred routing. The tower personnel requested a change in the flight plan from the Cleveland Center and while the change in flight plan was received, the aircraft was cleared into position on the runway to hold. At 2155, the corrected clearance was delivered to N1244N as follows: "44 November is cleared to the Kansas City Airport via Victor 92 Joliet, Victor 262, Victor 10. Maintain 8,000. Contact Chicago Center 127.45; if unable, 128.4—tower release."

N1244N was then asked by tower personnel how many runway lights he could see. The pilot of the aircraft answered, "three lights," and then asked how far apart the lights were. The tower operator replied that the lights were about 300 feet apart.[2]

[1] All times in the remainder of this report are eastern standard based on the 24-hour clock.

[2] The runway lights at Toledo Express Airport are approximately 200 feet apart.

At 2201, N1244N was cleared for takeoff with a left turn out of traffic to proceed southwest on the ILS localizer beam to join Victor 92 airway.

At 2201, the aircraft was heard to pass the tower. Surviving passengers described a swerve to the right followed by a swerve or violent swerve back to the left during the latter part of the takeoff run. These swerves were followed by an abrupt or lurching type takeoff. Passengers also described a shuddering or vibration shortly after takeoff followed by a left wing-down, nose-down attitude. Passengers aboard the aircraft and earwitnesses positioned on the airport stated they heard perceptible changes in the sound of the engine or engines. These witnesses also describe a momentary silence prior to the impact noise. The impact was described by witnesses as a "dull boom." At no time after the aircraft entered the taxiway had it been seen by any of the personnel on the airport due to heavy fog. It was 21 minutes from the time taxi instructions were requested until the accident occured. No engine burnouts are known to have been accomplished during this time.

The aircraft's left wing struck the taxiway adjacent to runway 07 on a heading of 035° magnetic and while in a left bank of from 60° to 90°. The main impact occurred at the edge of the taxiway after the aircraft's left engine struck the ground and the aircraft cartwheeled on its nose. The impact site was approximately 5,800 feet from the threshold of runway 07 and 400 feet to the left of the centerline of this runway. The two powerplant assemblies separated at impact from the nacelles with the firewalls still attached to the engine mounts. The aft portion of the fuselage separated at fuselage station 333, and continued on the impact path, coming to rest inverted on the vertical stabilizer. The forward portion of the fuselage and wings, after cartwheeling, came to rest in an upright position after sliding rearward about 10 feet. Fire engulfed the right wing, cockpit, and forward cabin areas. The 26 survivors sustained injuries ranging from bruises and shock to serious burns and fractures. The majority were thrown from the wreckage during the breakup of the fuselage. Five survivors remained belted into their seats, hanging upside down. These five evacuated the aft fuselage section through the open main entrance door.

The forward portion of the fuselage from station zero to 296.5 suffered severe fire and impact damage. The rear portion of the fuselage from station 399 to 915.8 broke loose and showed very little impact damage and no fire damage.

The left wing tore loose from the fuselage at center wing station 60. The right wing remained attached to the fuselage center section. Both wing leading edges were damaged by fire.

Both landing gears and the tailwheel were in the "down" position at impact. The flaps were in the "up" position on impact.

The left engine installed on the aircraft was a Pratt & Whitney Model R-2800-79 which was not certificated for use on C-46 series aircraft. The engine was an Air Force surplus engine which had been overhauled on January 9, 1957, under military specifications by Oakland Aircraft Engine Service, Oakland, Calif. Arctic-Pacific purchased the engine in July 1960 from a salvage company for use on N-1244N. Prior to installation on the aircraft, the engine was not adequately inspected internally in accordance with Civil Air Regulation 42-30.[3]

The engine was delivered to Newark Air Service, a certificated repair station, for installation on the aircraft; however, they failed to attest to the airworthiness of the engine as required by part 52 of the CAR's.[4] During installation of the powerplant assembly, the engine was modified by the installation of the carburetor and cylinder cooling baffles from the removed engine.

Most of the damage to the two powerplants was due to impact and ground fire, and no mechanical or internal failure to engines or accessories could be found. All the bearings and bushings of the engines were found intact and lubricated, and normal reciprocating action could be obtained. The oil system components were free of abnormal wear patterns, and there was no contamination by foreign material.

The combustion chambers of both engines showed no piston or valve burning, cylinder wall scuffing, or fusing or peening of the spark plug electrodes. The spark plugs in both engines, however, were moderately to heavily coated with carbon deposits.

The intake and exhaust manifolds of the two powerplants showed no in-service failures; however, the intake manifold for cylinder Nos. 8 and 9 of the left engine revealed the gland nut at the blower case to be completely disconnected and lying loose around the manifold. The area around the manifold was heavily sooted.

The left magneto of the left engine had approximately 75 percent of the rotor contact burned away, four electrodes were severely arced, and the carbon brush in the electrode shield was burned away flush with the brush holder. Bench tests, however, indicated all four of the magnetos were capable of normal operation.

Testing of the spark plugs revealed 11 plugs which failed to test satisfactorily. Eight of these plugs were from four cylinders. After cleaning, all tested normally except three. Six fouled plugs, three from each engine, were given rating checks. All of these fired in the rating engine after a burnout procedure was conducted.

No in-service mechanical failures to the operating mechanisms of the two propellers could be found. Both propellers were found to be on the low-pitch stop position at the time of impact.

(For remaining portion of this report, see "CAB Reports on Arctic-Pacific Air Lines Crash—Installment II" in this section of today's RECORD.)

[3] CAM 42.30-1(f) states: "No engine or other major component which has not been maintained in accordance with the maintenance manual shall be installed in a large aircraft unless such engine or component is shown to be in an airworthy condition, and that it complies with current airworthiness directives. This may be accomplished by showing that the engine or component (1) is new and of current manufacture, (2) has been overhauled within the last 90 days by a certificated repair agency holding appropriate ratings, or (3) by disassembly to the extent necessary for the assigned agent to determine the airworthiness and extent of compliance with airworthiness directives and manufacturers' service bulletins."

[4] Newark Air Service, Inc., Hanger 12, Newark Airport, Newark, N.J., possessed an FAA Class III Airframe Repair Station Certificate which indicates they were adequately equipped to maintain, alter, and repair all-metal airframe construction up to and including 12,500 pounds maximum certificated takeoff weight. They also possessed a limited airframe rating for the maintenance, inspection, repair and alteration of specific model aircraft over 12,500 maximum certificated takeoff weight. They held no powerplant rating but could install engines under their airframe repair station certificate. Part 52.25 states: "An applicant for a repair station certificate shall have an inspection system adequate for satisfactory quality control." Under Newark Air Service's airframe certificate, no powerplant modifications could be made.

Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy Reports to the President on Automation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I feel certain that every Member of Congress is vitally interested in our present unemployment problem and is anxious to find a solution.

President Kennedy also recognized the seriousness of this condition and knew that a solution must be found. In an effort to do this, he appointed the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy with representatives of industry, labor, and Government serving as members.

On January 11, this committee released its report to the President on automation and its benefits and problems.

They stated:

> Automation and technological progress are essential to the general welfare, the economic strength, and the defense of the Nation.

However, they pointed out that—

> This progress can—and must—be achieved without the sacrifice of human values * * * and this requires a combination of private and governmental action.

Among other recommendations made in this report, one specifically states that—

> Support from both public and private organizations for retraining of workers who have been and will be displaced.

Here, I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that H.R. 8399—the Manpower Development and Training Act—is now in Rules Committee and provides for a retraining program for these workers.

Other suggestions made by the committee are also included in this legislation.

I am sure that my colleagues are receiving considerable amounts of mail, just as I am, asking us to enact such a program as this, for those writing me are unemployed and have little hope in returning to work without additional education and training.

I hope that every effort will be made to bring this legislation to the floor at the earliest possible moment.

The report follows:

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON LABOR-MANAGEMENT POLICY REPORTS TO THE PRESIDENT ON AUTOMATION

The President's Committee on Labor-Management Policy submitted today its first report to the President. The report was presented to the President at the White House by the Committee Chairman, Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg, and by the Committee Vice Chairman, Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges. They were accompanied by members of the Committee.

Today's report deals with "The Benefits and Problems Incident to Automation and Other Technological Advances." The Committee believes it reflects the sense of common purpose which the President requested as a

source of strength for our Nation in time of emergency and as a climate conducive to cooperation and resolution of differences.

There was unanimous agreement among the Committee members on three fundamental points:

1. Automation and technological progress are essential to the general welfare, the economic strength and the defense of the Nation.

2. This progress can and must be achieved without the sacrifice of human values.

3. Achievement of technological progress without sacrifice of human values requires a combination of private and governmental action, consonant with the principles of a free society.

Automation and technological progress are cited throughout the report as essential to the general welfare, the economic strength, and the defense of the Nation. This progress, it notes, must and can be achieved without sacrifice of human values, individual interests or any such social consequences due to changes created by this progress.

Unemployment, it is pointed out, has increased during the past few years although total employment has reached new heights. This is ascribed to the net effect of rising output per worker, among other factors, but the report states: "We reject the too common assumption that continuing unemployment is an inherent cost of automation."

The Committee offers 11 recommendations which it believes may permit and accelerate the necessary advancement of automation and technological change without detrimental sacrifice of human values, if considered within purview of such relevant factors as costs to individual enterprises, effect on the Federal budget and influence on general price levels. These recommendations, if carried out, would constitute a combination of private and Government action.

This first report has the overall approval of all but two of its 19 members, Mr. Henry Ford II, Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Ford Motor Company of the Management group, and Mr. Arthur E. Burns, President of the National Bureau of Economic Research of the Public group. They have approved it in part and have filed statements of separate views which are included as part of the report.

Labor leaders, David Dubinsky, president, International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union; George M. Harrison, president, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees; Walter P. Reuther, president of the International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America; Joseph D. Keenan, secretary of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; and David J. McDonald, president, United Steelworkers of America, asked for some strengthening of the wording in the section dealing with hours of work in order to make it clear that should all exigencies fail, there may have to be recourse to a shorter work period.

In submitting the report the chairman and vice chairman stated:

"We commend to you the substantial public service rendered by the members of the committee, who have dedicated themselves to the work of the Committee.

"It is also a pleasure for us to report that the Committee has met regularly since it was appointed on February 16, 1961, and that the discussions at the Committee meetings have been most friendly and constructive. Our experience has demonstrated that your objective of bringing together top leaders of labor, management and the public to arrive at a fuller understanding on vital policy issues can be achieved. We anticipate that recommendations concerning the other major topics assigned to the Committee—dealing with industrial peace, economic growth, wage-price policy, and world competition—will be forthcoming in the near future."

This Committee, established by Executive order in February 1961 to encourage sound economic growth and healthy industrial relations in order to aid our free institutions to work better, has 19 members drawn from the public, labor, and management. It is chaired for 1-year alternating periods by the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Commerce.

This first report will be followed by others in the Committee's field of responsibility, now in preparation. Scheduled for submission next is the report on labor-management relations.

The President at the establishment of the Committee, deemed it "most important." It advises and makes recommendations with respect to policies that may be followed by labor, management, government, or the public which will promote "free and responsible collective bargaining, industrial peace, sound wage and price policies, higher standards of living, and increased productivity."

It was specifically directed to consider the matter of policies designed to insure that American products are competitive in world markets, as well as the matter of the impact of industrial automation.

Full membership of the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy is as follows:

PUBLIC MEMBERS

Arthur J. Goldberg (ex officio), Secretary of Labor; Luther H. Hodges (ex officio), Secretary of Commerce; Arthur F. Burns, president, National Bureau of Economic Research; David L. Cole, attorney; Clark Kerr, president, University of California; Ralph E. McGill, publisher, Atlanta Constitution; George W. Taylor, professor of labor relations, Wharton School of Finance, University of Pennsylvania.

MANAGEMENT MEMBERS

Elliott V. Bell, chairman of the executive committee, McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Inc.; Joseph L. Block, chairman, board of directors, Inland Steel Co.; Henry Ford II, chairman, board of directors, Ford Motor Co.; John M. Franklin, chairman, board of directors, United States Lines Co.; J. Spencer Love, chairman and president, Burlington Industries, Inc.; Richard S. Reynolds, Jr., president, Reynolds Metals Co.; Thomas J. Watson, Jr., president, International Business Machines Corp.

LABOR MEMBERS

David Dubinsky, president, International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union; George M. Harrison, president, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees; Joseph D. Keenan, secretary, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; Thomas Kennedy, president, United Mine Workers of America; David J. McDonald, president, United Steelworkers of America; George Meany, president, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations; Walter P. Reuther, president, International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America.

PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON LABOR-MANAGEMENT POLICY,
Washington, D.C., January 11, 1962.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are pleased to submit the first formal report of your Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy. This report, dealing with benefits and problems incident to automation and other technological advances, was approved at a meeting of the full Committee today.

When you established this Committee last year, you expressed the hope that it would help restore that sense of common purpose which has strengthened our Nation in times of emergency and generate a climate conducive to cooperation and resolution of differences. It is a source of deep satisfaction to us that this first report eloquently reflects that sense of common purpose. There is unanimous agreement among the members on these fundamental points:

1. Automation and technological progress are essential to the general welfare, the economic strength and the defense of the Nation.

2. This progress can and must be achieved without the sacrifice of human values.

3. Achievement of technological progress without sacrifice of human values requires a combination of private and governmental action, consonant with the principles of a free society.

This agreement reflects the Committee's conclusion that automation and technological change have meant much to our country. The report as a whole has received the virtually unanimous endorsement of the committee, while there are understandably some differences on implementation of these objectives. Statements of the separate views of two members of the Committee are appended to the report, and the positions of several members on one particular point are set out in two footnotes. Because the statement represents a consensus of the Committee members' views, their individual statements of position on various points covered would differ in some respects.

It is also a pleasure for us to report that the Committee has met regularly since it was appointed on February 16, 1961, and that the discussions at the Committee meetings have been most friendly and constructive. Our experience has demonstrated that your objective of bringing together top leaders of labor, management, and the public to arrive at a fuller understanding on vital policy issues can be achieved. We anticipate that recommendations concerning the other major topics assigned to the Committee, dealing with industrial peace, economic growth, wage-price policy, and world competition, will be forthcoming in the near future.

We commend to you the substantial public service rendered by the members of the Committee, who have dedicated themselves to the work of the Committee.

Respectfully,

ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG,
Chairman.

LUTHER M. HODGES,
Vice Chairman.

THE BENEFITS AND PROBLEMS INCIDENT TO AUTOMATION AND OTHER TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCES

Three central propositions have emerged in the Committee's consideration of the significance and impact of automation and other technological advances.

First, automation and technological progress are essential to the general welfare, the economic strength, and the defense of the Nation.

Second, this progress can and must be achieved without the sacrifice of human values and without inequitable cost in terms of individual interests.

Third, the achievement of maximum technological development with adequate safeguards against economic injury to individuals depends upon a combination of private and governmental action, consonant with the principles of the free society.

Automation and technological change have meant much to our country. Today the average worker in the United States works shorter hours, turns out more goods, receives higher wages, and has more energy harnessed and working with him than a worker anywhere else in the world. Increasingly, machines are relieving men of heavy

physical labor and of dangerous and repetitive work. Competition in the world markets has been possible against foreign countries whose standards of living are below our own, though this advantage is diminishing. Finally, in a world split by ideological differences, automation and technological change have a tremendous and crucial role to play in maintaining the strength of the free world.

For these reasons, we emphasize at the outset the imperative need for and desirability of automation and technological change. Indeed, increased productivity and fuller utilization of resources are urgently needed to improve our rate of economic growth. They are likewise needed to improve our competitive position in world markets. Failure to advance technologically and to otherwise increase the productivity of our economy would bring on much more serious unemployment and related social problems than any we now face.

It is equally true that the current rate of technological advance has created social problems and that an acceleration of this rate may intensify these problems.

While advancing technology has given rise to new industries and jobs, it has also resulted in employee displacement; and the fact that new work opportunities are eventually created is no comfort or help to the displaced individual who cannot, for one reason or another, secure comparable or any employment. While employment has expanded in some industries, the net effect of rising output per worker, of the growing labor force and of other factors, has been an increase in the volume of unemployment during the past few years—even as total employment has reached new heights.

The impact of technology on agricultural employment has been particularly great. Along with other factors, it has resulted in over 1,600,000 workers—20 percent of the total—leaving the farms since 1950. Yet farm output has increased 28 percent, making available to our people an abundance of food, while there was famine in some of the Communist countries. This increased output enabled this country to be of substantial assistance to needy people elsewhere in the world.

Our purpose, then, is to seek that course of action which will encourage essential progress in the form of automation and technological change, while meeting at the same time the social consequences such change creates.

We recognize that the subject of automation and technological change cannot be dealt with apart from two broader subjects: increased productivity in general, and unemployment.

We are preparing a separate report on economic growth, and only note here the basic importance of such growth to any consideration of the problems—and the opportunities—automation and technological advance present.

Regarding technological advance and unemployment, it is clear that unemployment has resulted from displacement due to automation and technological change. It is impossible, with presently available data, to isolate that portion of present unemployment resulting from these causes. Whether such displacement will be short-run depends to a considerable extent on our ability to anticipate and plan for programs involving technological change and to make better use of various mechanisms for retraining and relocating workers who find themselves unneeded in their former occupations. We have necessarily given general consideration in this report to some aspects of the broader unemployment problem and to the prospects of more effective use of the work force.

A long stride toward solution of the unemployment problem will be made if we first recognize the nature of the problem. We regard the following factors as important in this connection:

1. The recent rate of economic growth in the United States has been insufficient to reduce unemployment to a tolerable level.

2. The exact extent of unemployment attributable to automation and technological change is unknown, since it is greatly complicated by other factors, such as:

(a) The economic recession of 1960–61.

(b) The unusually high entrance rate into the labor market, caused by the great postwar population increase. In the next 10 years it is expected that there will be a net gain in the labor force of 13½ million workers.

(c) Chronic unemployment in distressed areas.

(d) The effects of the rapid advances which have been made by foreign competitors.

(e) Changing consumption patterns.

(f) The changing nature of jobs which often leaves a gap between job requirements and qualifications of applicants. During the 1950's there was a 58-percent increase in the number of skilled technical and professional workers. Unskilled workers, with only a limited education, found it more difficult to get, or hold, a job. In this connection, the Department of Labor projections indicate that unless steps are taken to reduce the dropout rate among high school students, some 7½ million of those new workers joining the labor force in the 1960's, or more than 30 percent, will not have completed high school, and over 2½ million of them will not even have completed grade school.

(g) Discrimination against workers on the basis of age, sex, race, and creed.

(h) Multiple job holding by individuals.

(i) The continuing movement of workers away from the farms.

3. Public employment service facilities have been inadequate as well as seriously uneven in their effectiveness with respect to helping workers find new jobs, counseling them as to the kind of jobs which are liable to be available in the future and advising them as to job prospects in other geographical areas.

4. The mobility of workers is reduced by factors running contrary to the demands of a dynamic society, and an economy in transition.

(a) The nontransferability of pension, seniority, and other accumulated rights may result in an employee's being dependent upon his attachment to a particular job as the sole means of protecting his equities.

(b) Desirable and essential mobility is affected by reluctance to leave home—because of personal ties, or because other members of the family may be working; by the cost of moving and possible losses on local property; and by the insecurity of jobs in a new locality.

5. Educational and informational facilities have been inadequate in that:

(a) The requirements for general education prior to vocational and professional training have not kept pace with the shift in job opportunities.

(b) The required types of vocational and technical training and retraining are often not available, e.g., for workers leaving the farm.

(c) There has been an inadequate liaison among school systems, industry, and Government with respect to future job requirements, and in fact there is insufficient information about the nature of such jobs.

(d) There has been inadequate financial support for needy students.

(e) Counseling facilities have been generally inadequate.

6. Proper retraining facilities, and a system of financial support for workers while retraining, have been lacking.

These are some of the relevant circumstances of a society in which automation and technological advance are essential motive forces. The operation of these forces within the social context creates serious displacement problems—not as a necessary price of progress but as the stern consequence of failure to recognize and provide for these problems. We reject the too common assumption that continuing unemployment is an inherent cost of automation.

We believe, rather, that a combination of energetic and responsible private and public action will permit the advancement of automation and technological change without the sacrifice of human values, and that such combined efforts can cope satisfactorily with the total unemployment problem—including whatever part of it may arise from the displacements which result inevitably from the introduction of new devices and processes.

We do not attempt here an exhaustive exploration or enumeration of all the ways and means of achieving maximum technological progress with the minimum of individual disadvantage. Our suggestions can be only representative of a broader set of possibilities. We recognize, furthermore, that the totality of any combination of recommendations must be viewed in the light of such relevant factors as their costs to individual enterprises, their effect on the Federal budget, and their influence on general price levels.

We recommend that serious consideration be given the following measures:

1. Adoption by the Government and others of policies which will promote a high rate of economic growth and fuller utilization of resources. A much higher rate of growth is essential and is the best device for reducing unemployment to tolerable levels. We will include in our forthcoming report on economic growth suggestions in this area.

2. Acceptance by Government agencies of the responsibility for collecting, collating, and disseminating information with respect to present and future job opportunities and requirements in a rapidly changing society.

3. Cooperation between Government and private organizations in the field of education in improving and supporting educational facilities to the end that: (a) new entrants to the labor force will be better qualified to meet the occupational demands of the future; (b) the dropout rate at grade and high school levels will be reduced; (c) better vocational, technical, and guidance programs will be available; (d) rural and depressed areas, where surplus workers reside, will be better served; (e) financial support will be available for deserving and needy students; and (f) there will be a general upgrading in the quality of our education.

4. Acceptance by management of responsibility for taking measures, to the maximum extent practicable, for lessening the impact of technological change, including: (a) adequate lead time; (b) open reporting to the employees involved; (c) cooperation with representatives of the employees to meet the problems involved; (d) cooperation with public employment services; (e) the timing of changes, to the extent possible, so that potential unemployment will be cushioned by expected expansion of operations and normal attrition in the work force (through separations resulting from retirement, quits, and so forth).

5. Support from both public and private organizations for retraining of workers who have been and will be displaced.

(a) Private employers and unions faced with automation or technological changes should make every reasonable effort to enable workers who are being displaced, and who need to be retrained, to qualify for new jobs available with the same employer, and to enjoy a means of support while so engaged.

(b) Where it is not possible for the employer to reabsorb displaced workers, appropriately safeguarded public support in

the form of subsistence payments should be available to industrial and agricultural workers who qualify for and engage in retraining.

(c) Unemployment compensation laws should be liberalized to permit and to encourage retraining.

6. Support from both public and private sources, with due consideration to the circumstances of the enterprise involved, for the displaced worker who is seeking new employment.

a. The duration, coverage, and amount of unemployment compensation, where inadequate, should be increased and made subject to realistic uniform minimum requirements under the Federal-State system.

b. Employer supplementation of public unemployment compensation should be accomplished through severance pay, supplemental unemployment benefits, and similar measures.

c. Attention should be given to provision for the special case of the worker who is displaced during the period when he is approaching retirement. This may appropriately include consideration of provision for early retirement, through private arrangements or social security measures; but alternative possibilities of more constructive temporary uses of such services warrant exploration.

7. Support from both private and public sources to the end that a worker's job equities and security may be protected without impairment of his mobility. This will warrant consideration, taking into account relevant cost factors, of such measures as:

a. Financial aid in the transfer of employees to other plants in a multiplant system, and protection of existing rights for individuals so transferred.

b. The use of public funds in order to give financial aid in the transfer of unemployed workers from one area to another where the result will be to provide continuing employment.

c. The improvement of public and private protection of pension rights.

d. The recognition by unions, individual employees; and employers of the necessity of adapting seniority and other rules in order to facilitate mobility of workers, while providing protection for the equities of employees.

The Committee notes particularly the need for further exploration of this vital area.

8. Vast additional improvement of the public employment service so that it can effectively place, counsel, and relocate workers both locally and across State lines. We note with approval the start which has been made in this direction.

9. Vigorous and unremitting efforts by all segments of the population—including government, employers, unions, and employees—to eliminate discrimination in employment because of race, creed, age, or sex.

10. There are pressing national needs to be met, and an abundance of manpower available to meet these needs. This matching of manpower and national needs, which is part of the vital context of the automation and technological advance problem, will obviously be affected by various broader governmental policies. Reserving fuller consideration of this area for our economic growth report, we nevertheless note here that:

(a) When technological changes or other factors develop particular pockets of unemployment, this becomes an additional reason for the undertaking, particularly at the State and local levels but with Federal assistance where this is necessary, of public development projects for which there is need independent of the employment need itself.

(b) Every effort should be made to maintain on an up-to-date and ready-to-go basis a schedule of needed public development projects, particularly those which could be started most quickly and which would be of short or controllable duration, so that the initiation of such projects can in the future be advanced, and the flow of projects already underway can be speeded up, if the manpower situation warrants this.

(c) If the operation of the economy, including the effect of automation and technological change, creates or leaves an intolerable manpower surplus, consideration should be given to monetary and fiscal measures—including the possibility of appropriate tax reductions—which would give promise of helping alleviate this situation.

(d) Governmental action along the lines suggested here, stimulated in part by the need to meet unemployment situations, would obviously have to take account of other considerations, including particularly the maintenance of national economic stability and security. We simply assert, however, the coordinate importance of stability and growth.

11. The need for goods and services must not be left unfilled, particularly in a time of international crisis. At the same time, high unemployment is intolerable. In the light of our current responsibilities to meet world conditions, and in view of our unmet needs at home, we consider the development of programs directed at the achievement of full employment as being more significant at the present time than the consideration of a general reduction in the hours of work. A reduction in the basic work period has, however, historically been one means of sharing the fruits of technological progress, and there may well develop in the future the necessity and the desirability of shortening the work period, either through collective bargaining or by law or by both methods. In connection with such a development, consideration would necessarily be given to the extent to which purchasing power could be maintained along with a reduced work period.[1] [2]

[1] Mr. Meany, Mr. Dubinsky, Mr. Harrison, Mr. Reuther, and Mr. Keenan are of the view that this paragraph should read as follows:

"The need for goods and services must not be left unfilled, particularly in a time of international crisis. At the same time, high unemployment is intolerable. In the light of our current responsibilities to meet world conditions, and in view of our unmet needs at home, we consider the development of programs directed at the achievement of maximum output and full employment as most significant at the present time. However, if unemployment is not reduced substantially in the near future we will have to resort to a general shortening of the work period through collective bargaining and by law. In connection with such a development, consideration would necessarily be given to the extent to which purchasing power could be maintained along with a reduced work period. A reduction in the basic work period has historically been one means of sharing fruits of technological progress."

[2] Mr. McDonald, Mr. Reuther, and Mr. Keenan comment as follows:

"We agree that, in the light of the considerations stated, the most desirable solution now to the problem of unemployment is the development of programs which will achieve full employment at 40 hours per week. Saying that this is the most desirable solution is not, however, the same thing as saying that we have in fact achieved that solution or that we will in fact achieve it in the near future. And only the fact of full employment—not a statement of its desirability—can properly serve as the premise for the statement that the necessity for shortening the work period will only develop in the future. If we fail, as we have so far failed, to achieve the most desirable solution we will have to move more quickly than we are now moving in the direction of shortening the work period."

We affirm our conviction that the infinite promise of automation and technological advance can be realized without loss or cost of human values. America can enjoy the fruits of higher productivity without having to accept, as the inevitable result, serious social consequences growing out of the displacement of workers.

The recommendations made here suggest our view of a broader pattern of possible courses of action which would necessarily have to be adapted to particular circumstances, but which permit the constructive and responsible uses of technology and automation. We see no barriers—except misunderstanding, timidity, and false fear—to the accomplishment of this purpose by a coordination of private and public programs wholly consonant with the essential concepts of the free society.

We assert the necessity of automation and technological development to the maintenance of American standards of living and to the fulfillment of this country's role of leadership in freedom's fight for survival. We assert equally the obligation and the capacity of Americans—as individuals and as a group—to use these new instruments and methods to enrich the lives of all of us.

We see no reason for alarm if out of a greater sense of common purpose we can achieve the good will and the determination to act together.

COMMENT BY ARTHUR F. BURNS ON REPORT ON "THE BENEFITS AND PROBLEMS INCIDENT TO AUTOMATION AND OTHER TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCES"

I find parts of this report highly constructive, particularly the recommendations designed (a) to achieve efficient and yet humane management of technological changes, (b) to improve the functioning of the labor market, and (c) to extend the coverage and otherwise strengthen the unemployment insurance system. Nevertheless, I am troubled by the report as a whole, and I consider it a dubious guide to economic policy.

The reasons for my dissent are as follows:

(1) The report fails to identify or to analyze or to assess the quantitative importance of the different causes of unemployment. Nevertheless, it conveys the impression that technological advances are a major, if not the major, cause of recent unemployment. I know of no evidence to support this view, and I deplore anything that adds to the greatly exaggerated fears that many people have of what is loosely called automation.

(2) The report suffers from a failure to link its proposed remedies to the causes of unemployment. Thus the report does not mention seasonal unemployment or ways of dealing with it. It does not mention the loss of exports by some industries or the policies needed for coping with this source of unemployment. It does not distinguish cyclical unemployment from other types or indicate how public policy for dealing with recessions should be improved. On the other hand, the report puts heavy emphasis on public works and seems to suggest that this kind of governmental spending is a good remedy for unemployment regardless of its cause. Unhappily, public works are poorly suited for dealing with mild recessions or with local pockets of chronic unemployment.

3. Most recommendations of the report are couched in such vague language that they may mean much or little, depending on how they are interpreted. But if experience is any guide, neither the vagueness of language

nor the surrounding qualifications will prevent articulate groups of our society from claiming the authority of this committee for programs that could prove damaging to our economy. If all or most of the recommendations were implemented fairly, promptly, and on a liberal scale, both employer costs of production and governmental outlays would rise substantially. The report passes over lightly the question of how such increases would affect business profits or the Federal budget or the general price level. I find this question very troublesome at the present time. The deterioration of profit margins during the past decade is already a serious obstacle to achieving a high rate of economic growth. The protracted rise of the price level has already put severe pressure on our balance of international payments. This year's projected rise of Federal cash outlays already exceeds the increase of any peacetime year in our history and, the international situation being what is is, military expenditures may soon need to be still larger. In view of these facts, unless great caution is exercised in pursuing programs that raise costs of production or public outlays, we may find that economic growth is curbed, that confidence in the dollar is weakened, and that our international political position is undermined.

4. Apart from these dangers, the report fails to analyze how its recommendations would affect the volume of unemployment itself. The report seems to call not only for liberalizing the unemployment insurance system, but also for extending private supplements to unemployment insurance, for providing public subsistence payments to workers who undergo retraining, for lowering the age at which displaced workers can qualify for social security, and for using public funds to aid unemployed workers in moving to areas where jobs can be found. I deem it a duty to point out that if all these measures were adopted in quick order and on a substantial scale, some individuals who now are outside the labor force will see an advantage in entering it, while there will be others who, having quit or lost their jobs, will be tempted to take more time in settling on new ones. In other words, unless great care and caution are exercised in implementing the committee's recommendations, the end result may well be the social misfortune of permanently higher unemployment.

5. In large part, the shortcomings of the report are traceable to the pessimistic assumption on which it seems to proceed—namely, that there is a serious possibility that our Nation's economic progress will prove insufficient to provide jobs for all those who are able and eager to work. I have greater faith in our Nation's future. A tremendous expansion of prosperity lies within our power. The degree to which we attain it will mainly depend, first, on how much work people care to do, second, on how productive they wish to be, third, on how earnestly we pursue public policies to stimulate new, creative, and more efficient economic activities by business enterprises. If the report had started from this broad but fundamental premise, it would have dealt more constructively with the economic and human problem of unemployment.

COMMENTS BY HENRY FORD II ON REPORT ON "THE BENEFITS AND PROBLEMS INCIDENT TO AUTOMATION AND OTHER TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCES"

I share wholeheartedly the concern over unemployment expressed in this report, and I applaud this committee's desire both to speed industrial progress and to spread its human benefits more widely.

Few things are as costly to our Nation, or as crushing to the human spirit, as lack of work for those who are willing and able to work.

Because I hold these views so strongly, I feel compelled to state my belief that this report does not really get to the heart of the matter.

Its major premise is the assumption that automation and technological advance are in and of themselves significant causes of unemployment—an assumption that neither history nor an analysis of current unemployment supports. Technological advance has been with us for many generations. But, popular beliefs to the contrary, technological advance has not been accelerating. Figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics show, for recent years, an increase in productivity well below the average rate for the postwar period and not much different from the average rate since 1909.

Moreover, the factual evidence strongly indicates that, while automation displaces some individuals from the jobs they have held, its overall effect is to increase income and expand job opportunities. History teaches us that, by and large, workers displaced by technological advance have moved rapidly into other employment, ultimately to better-paying jobs. This is why we have had rising personal incomes rather than mass unemployment as new technology has come into use and productivity has increased.

As Solomon Fabricant has recently pointed out (in his introduction to John W. Kendrick's "Productivity Trends in the United States"):

"Better-than-average increases in output were usually accompanied by better-than-average increases in employment of workers and tangible capital, despite the more rapid rise in productivity. Correspondingly, less-than-average increases in productivity were usually accompanied by less-than-average increases (or even decreases) in output and in the use of labor and capital resources. * * * No one concerned with the rise and fall of industries, or, to single out a currently discussed problem, with the effects of automation on employment, may ignore these basic facts."

When the economy is prosperous, displaced workers quickly find new employment. This is illustrated by the movement of workers off farms and into industrial employment when times are good, and the slowdown in this movement when times are bad.

The Committee has recognized that the general problem of unemployment is the key problem, but its recommendations are concerned mainly with the important but secondary matters of retraining and mobility. A good employment service and unemployment compensation facilitate the transfer from one job to another, but these measures, even if accompanied by massive retraining, relief, and other social programs, will scarcely make a dent in unemployment when economic conditions are poor.

If, therefore, we would help persons displaced by technological advance, we must focus our attention not on relief or even training—though these, properly conceived and administered, will help—but on creating new jobs for people who seek them and can perform in them.

When wages rise faster than productivity in the economy, costs will rise and then either prices will go up or profits will come down—or both will happen. If profits come down, then incentive to save and to invest savings in new, job-creating plants, enterprises, and industries must suffer. Moreover, unless inflationary measures are taken to support the higher wage, cost, and price levels, demand will not be adequate to maintain production and employment. And, when the integrity of the dollar is at stake, inflationary measures cannot be taken without calamitous results.

We must find ways consistent with a free economy to keep wages and other costs from causing either unemployment or inflation.

I regret that the report does not make this focal problem the primary target of its comments and recommendations. For, when we have found and placed in operation those policies and practices that can keep costs from rising and forcing us into either unemployment or inflation, we will have done much more than could be accomplished by all other measures combined.

The recommendations in this report are concerned mainly with ways of preventing and relieving technological displacement. I personally endorse many of them and the company with which I am associated has long followed practices similar to many of those recommended in the report.

Nevertheless, I have the following general reservations about the character of the recommendations:

First, they cannot solve the problem of mass unemployment because they are directed primarily at helping people to find jobs—not at the basic need for more jobs.

Second, the massive program of public and private actions called for may have unexpected consequences that the committee has not been able to evaluate. Indeed, I believe that the knowledge and experience necessary to evaluate this sweeping program do not now exist, and that it is, therefore, inappropriate and unwise for this committee to place its stamp of approval upon such a program. For example, greatly expanded Federal assistance could very well destroy incentives that stimulate private economic activity and generate individual initiative.

Third, the endorsement of comprehensive, economywide programs in very general terms diverts attention from and complicates the search for carefully selected measures to meet particular problems. For example, I believe that the main result of a large-scale, nationwide program to retrain the unemployed might be to impede the development of useful local programs carefully tailored to existing job opportunities and the needs and abilities of individuals.

In addition to these general reservations, I have misgivings about some of the specific recommendations.

With respect to unemployment compensation, I believe that duration, coverage and amount of benefits must be increased where they are inadequate. In addition, safeguards to protect against abuses should be strengthened. I do not endorse Federal standards, but believe the States should continue with responsibility for fitting their particular systems to their own conditions and needs.

I agree that in the main the recommendations for improving our school systems are good. In many areas and localities, however, the most urgent need is not more money but greater public concern with what is taught in our schools.

Arbitrarily shortening the workweek in order to decrease unemployment would be a confession of defeat. Not only a poor remedy, it is also a harmful one; for it would retard the growth needed for the safety and welfare of our Nation at this point in its history. We can and should look forward to normal increases in our leisure time, but they must come as our growing economy can afford them and not as expedient solutions to unemployment problems.

In summary, I find some things in this report of which I approve, and much of which I disapprove. Its goal of making certain that high employment accompany technological improvement and increasing efficiency has my full support. However, I believe that the general direction of its recommendations is not well calculated to achieve this goal. I believe, too, that the report's basic assumption concerning the relationship between technological advance and unemployment is in error.

Therefore, I feel it necessary to say, with reluctance, that I cannot concur in the report.

National Gallery of Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 26, 1962

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of the House, I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the fine program for the month of February 1962 which has been prepared by the National Gallery of Art.

Congress and the U.S. people should take time in their busy lives to enjoy the wonderful assets which each of us own in our remarkable National Gallery exhibitions and programs.

The Director of the National Gallery, John Walker, is to be congratulated, as well as his competent associates on the fine level of interest and culture contained in this coming program for February 1962.

A visit to the gallery is really worth while and a rewarding adventure, not only for the grownups, but the young people, as well. The enthusiastic crowds and the many out of town visitors who come daily to the gallery attest to the popularity of this fine U.S. cultural institution, and its lasting value in our national life.

If you want a real surprise, go to the National Gallery, it will really open your eyes.

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

February 1962, gallery hours: Weekdays 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Sundays 2 p.m. to 10 p.m. Admission is free to the gallery and to all programs scheduled.

Permanent collection: Paintings and sculpture comprising the Mellon, Samuel H. Kress, Widener, and Chester Dale collections, with gifts from other donors, are located on the main floor. The Widener collection of decorative arts is on the ground floor.

New exhibition: English drawings and water colors from British collections, sponsored by the English-Speaking Unions of the United States and the British Commonwealth, and from the collection of Mr. and Mrs. Paul Mellon. Central gallery, G-7 through G-13. February 18-April 1.

Continuing exhibition: Art treasures for America, from the Samuel H. Kress collection. Central gallery, G-7 through G-13, and G-19; through February 4.

New publications: English drawings and water colors. Exhibition catalogue 7½ x 10", 48 pages, with 20 black-and-white illustrations. Price $1.50 postpaid.

English drawings and water colors from the collection of Mr. and Mrs. Paul Mellon. Exhibition catalog 7½ x 10", 48 pages, with 24 black-and-white illustrations. Price $1.50 postpaid.

New slides: 2- by 2-inch color slides, original transparencies of nine paintings: Grünewald, "The Small Crucifixion"; de Hooch, "Woman and Child in a Courtyard"; Matisse, "Still Life: Apples on Pink Tablecloth"; Modigliani, "Madame Amédée"; Picasso, "Family of Saltimbanques"; "The Lovers"; Rembrandt, "The Descent from the Cross"; "Portrait of a Lady With an Ostrich-Feather Fan"; "Saskia van Uilenburgh, The Wife of the Artist." Cardboard mounted, 35 cents each postpaid.

Cafeteria: Open to the public Mondays through Saturdays 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. Sundays 4 p.m. to 7 p.m.

PROGRAM—MONDAY, JANUARY 29 THROUGH SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 4

Painting of the week: Matisse, La Coiffure, (Chester Dale Collection) Gallery 64, Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2, Sunday 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: "Theories of Rococo and Romantic Art." Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1, Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: "Introduction to the Collection." Rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3, Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "The Tempio Malatestino in Rimini." Guest speaker: Charles Mitchell, professor of art history, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr lecture hall 4.

Sunday concert: Elma Adams, pianist, East Garden Court 8.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 5 THROUGH SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 11

Painting of the week (11 - by 14-inch reproduction and text for sale, 15 cents postpaid). Louis Le Nain: "Landscape with Peasants" (Samuel H. Kress collection) Gallery 54, Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2, Sunday 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: "Theories of Modern Art." Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1, Sunday 2:30.

Tour introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3, Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "Juan Gris and Cubism." Speaker: Robert D. Kinsman, staff lecturer, National Gallery of Art, Lecture Hall 4.

Sunday concert David Abel, violinist, Sidney Stafford, at the piano, East Garden Court 8.

All concerts, with intermission talks by members of the National Gallery staff, are broadcast by station WGMS-AM (570) and FM (103.5) in stereophonic sound.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 12, THROUGH SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 18

Sculpture of the week: Desiderio da Settignamo, "Tabernacle" (Samuel H. Kress collection) gallery 17 Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2, Sunday 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Sienese Painting of the 15th Century. Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture, "A Century of English Watercolors," Guest speaker, Jonathan Mayne; deputy keeper, Department of Paintings, Victoria and Albert Museum, London, lecture hall 4.

Sunday concert: National Capital woodwind quintet with Emerson Meyers, pianist, East Garden Court 8.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 19, THROUGH SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 25

Sculpture of the week: Rodin, "The Walking Man" (gift of Mrs. John W. Simpson), central lobby, Tuesday, Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Exhibition of English Watercolors. Central lobby, Tuesday, Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the Collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3, Thursday 1, Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: Masaccio, Ghiberti and Thomas Patch: An 18th Century Englishman Discovers the Renaissance," Guest speaker, Edward A. Maser; professor of history of art, University of Chicago, Chicago lecture hall 4.

Sunday concert: Cassado Duo, East Garden Court 8.

Inquiries concerning the gallery's educational services should be addressed to the Educational Office, Republic 7-4215, extension 272.

CAB Reports on Arctic Pacific Air Lines Crash—Installment II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, today, I placed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD half of a report released January 22, 1962, by the Civil Aeronautics Board. The report concerns the tragic crash on October 29, 1960, of an Arctic Pacific Air Lines plane in Toledo, Ohio. Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that the remaining portion of the report be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for this day:

Much of the fuel system was consumed by groundfire. The fuel valves and emergency firewall shutoff valves, however, were recovered. The left fuel selector was approximately 10 degrees off the center tank position; the right selector was found positioned to the front tanks. The crossfeed valve was closed. The fuel strainers were intact and free of contamination. A sample of fuel taken from the left fuel strainer gave an octane rating of 103.5 when tested for octane rating by the motor method. No fuel was available for testing from the right strainer.

No weight and balance form for the trip from Toledo to Kansas City could be found, nor was the form available at the principal offices of Arctic-Pacific at Oakland Airport. Weight and balance forms were obtained for the Albuquerque to Kansas City trip and for the Youngstown to New Haven trip.

Since no weight and balance was available, the Board's investigators made an effort to determine what the maximum gross weight was for the departure from Toledo Express Airport. All baggage, football equipment, and cargo recovered from the wreckage was weighed. The total weight of this cargo was 1,470 pounds. In addition, 14 suitcases or frames were counted in the wreckage in varying degrees of destruction. Since it was impossible to determine their exact weights, and since this luggage contained mostly clothing, college textbooks, and other articles of personal use, the average weight of 25 pounds per bag was assigned. The total weight of this luggage was 350 pounds.

The weights of the members of the California State Polytechnic College football team were taken from the program of the game played with Bowling Green on October 29, 1960. The weights, as listed, were verified by college records to be accurate within 5 pounds.

The maximum allowable Super C-46F takeoff weight for the departure from Toledo Express Airport was 46,850 pounds. The Board estimates the actual weight at take off was 48,859 pounds, 1,759 pounds over the maximum gross weight of the aircraft and 2,009 pounds over the maximum allowable takeoff weight at Toledo.

In the investigation of this accident it was determined that no en route inspections were made of Arctic-Pacific by the FAA during the year of 1960. It was also revealed that neither the operations nor maintenance FAA air carrier inspectors assigned to Arctic-Pacific had inspected the carrier during the previous 11 months of operation because of duties with other assigned carriers.

ANALYSIS

As analysis of the facts and evidence surrounding this accident reveals that the tragedy ocurred as a result of a premature

liftoff of an overloaded aircraft from an airport where zero visibility in fog existed.

Examination of C-46 performance data for the takeoff distance required with a 5 knot headwind, at an elevation of 684 feet mean sea level, and a takeoff weight of 48,859 pounds, reveals that 2,750 feet of runway would be required to take off and climb to 50 feet. This is based on a normal takeoff under standard conditions.

Calculation of the weight and balance of this aircraft and comparison of these calculations with the two filed weight and balance manifests for the Albuquerque and Youngstown departures indicate the disregard Captain Chesher had for regulations. In each case the actual weight of the aircraft exceeded the listed weight and allowable takeoff weight for these airports.

In computing the weight and balance for this flight, using the weights of the passengers, the total weight of the cargo recovered, including the company material spares and the known fuel load, the weight is broken down in the following manner:

	Pounds
Passenger and crew	9,038
Weighed baggage	1,470
Unweighed baggage	350
Company material	154
Fuel (1,036 gallons)	6,216
Oil (60 gallons)	450
Basic weight of aircraft	31,383
Total	48,961
Less taxi and runup fuel used	−102
Total takeoff gross weight at Toledo	48,859

This weight distribution would have fallen within the centigram limits of the aircraft even had the cargo been distributed in the most undesirable locations.

An analysis of the swerves described by the surviving passengers indicates that they were the pilot's efforts to maintain the aircraft on the runway while attempting to accelerate to V_2 speed and that he was experiencing difficulty with directional control. It is believed the pilot, upon recognizing his inability to maintain the aircraft on the runway, had to elect whether to abort the takeoff at this point or make a premature liftoff. The decision was made to continue and a premature liftoff resulted. The ensuing climb to an estimated altitude of 50 to 100 feet was probably made at an airspeed below V_{mc}. Several surviving passengers stated that once the aircraft was airborne it shuddered and while turning to the left descended rapidly and struck the ground. Based on witness statements that just prior to the crash there was a moment of silence, the Board believes that the pilot retarded his throttles before striking the ground. This is a normal reaction when a pilot realizes a crash is inevitable.

The testimony of weather personnel established that the weather conditions existing at the time of the accident were: zero visibility (less than one-sixteenth of a mile) in fog; sky partially obscured; temperature 39; dewpoint 39; wind from the east-northeast at 5 knots. This condition existed for a period of 29 minutes prior to the takeoff of the aircraft. In fact, all regular air carriers operating at Toledo Express Airport had canceled all inbound and outbound flights as a result of poor visibility.

On the basis of the statements of the witnesses and the flightpath of the aircraft prior to final impact, it is obvious the left engine experienced a power loss of some magnitude, either because of some disorder, or because the throttles were retarded by the crew in an attempt to get back on the airport, or both. Since the engine examination revealed no mechanical failures, the most likely sources of engine maloperation would be the ground-fouled spark plugs, the disconnected intake pipe gland nut, and the prevailing weather conditions (particularly the moisture content in the air).

The adverse condition noted on the spark plugs of both engines was a moderate-to-heavy overlay of black carbon deposits on the insulator core noses. This condition is characteristic of long periods of ground operation at low power. When power is increased rapidly to the takeoff setting, the coating of carbon deposits on such plugs causes scattered plug firing with some power loss. These conditions would be evidenced by engine sputtering, roughness, and changes in exhaust rhythm as reported by various witnesses.

Investigation disclosed the engines were running approximately 24 minutes from the time of starting to the time of takeoff. It is obvious that the engines were ground-operated at low power for a considerable period of time, and this could have caused the ground-fouled condition. It is also obvious from the results of the tests that the majority of the plugs in both engines would have functioned normally had an engine burnout procedure been conducted just prior to takeoff.

The prevailing weather conditions at the time of the accident—low temperature and high humidity—could also be conducive to spark plug fouling. Investigation conducted by engine manufacturers on the effects of humidity on power reveal that a portion of the dry air is replaced by water vapor in the atmosphere. This causes the normal fuel-air ratio to be enriched above the normal mixture strength, and, as a result, excessive richness and partial power loss occurs. Tests have indicated that a maximum of 12 to 14 percent power loss can occur at takeoff power with the mixture set at the auto-rich position during high humidity conditions. Based on the weather that existed at the time of the accident, a power loss of approximately 2 percent could have resulted from weather conditions alone.

The disconnected intake pipe gland nut could also have caused some power loss. It is obvious that the gland nut did not become disconnected at impact, particularly since it showed no damage, and the surrounding area was sooted. It is difficult to assess the amount of power loss which could result from such a discrepancy. The presence of a moderate coating of soot around the intake pipe and its adjacent areas is indicative of backfiring and partial power loss from cylinders Nos. 8 and 9 of the left engine.

The fact that the left engine was a model not currently certificated for use in the C-46 series aircraft had no direct bearing on the cause of the accident. However, the circumstances surrounding the installation of the R-2800-79 engine indicates the disregard the management of Arctic-Pacific had for established airworthiness compliance and adherence to the Civil Air Regulations. This is evidenced by the fact that Arctic-Pacific purchased the engine from a dealer in used metals; that Arctic-Pacific requested Newark Air Service to install the engine without furnishing the engine records; and that Arctic-Pacific knowingly permitted Newark Air Service to install and modify the engine knowing that Newark Air Service possessed only Class III Airframe and Limited Airframe repair station certificates.

Newark Air Service installed the engine as verbally requested by Arctic-Pacific's director of maintenance. Regardless of Newark Air Service's instructions from Arctic-Pacific, they failed to inspect the engine for airworthiness compliance as required by the Civil Air Regulations. The Chief Inspector of Newark Air Service testified that they were dubious of the airworthiness of the engine, particularly since there were no overhaul records with the engine. Nevertheless, Newark Air Service failed to bring this to the attention of the FAA.

Although the Civil Air Regulations do not specifically require en route inspections, the Manual of Procedures for the FAA Air Carrier Offices do set forth the requirement. The Board notes that no en route inspections were made by FAA of Arctic-Pacific in the year 1960.

Since the operations inspector assigned to Arctic-Pacific was not able to inspect this carrier during the previous 11 months of operation, it is difficult to understand why the appropriate persons in the local FAA air carrier office did not apprise their superiors of this condition. This is especially true since the volume of correspondence over discrepancies noted on ramp checks at Oakland International Airport and airports other than the home base indicated deficiencies in Arctic-Pacific's maintenance program. This was also attested to in the FAA action against Arctic-Pacific.

Because of the weather conditions at Toledo Express Airport, certain economic factors confronted Captain Chesher. Captain Chesher had the responsibility for 43 passengers as well as the crew. If the flight did not depart, as planned, Captain Chesher, as agent for the Arctic-Pacific, would have been obligated to furnish lodging, meals, and transportation for these passengers. It is possible that the economic situation may well have influenced his decision to take off.

Since this accident the FAA has instructed its tower operators to withhold takeoff clearance from an air carrier or other commercial aircraft operated for the purpose of carrying passengers or property for compensation or hire when the prevailing visibility for the airport of departure or runway visibility for the departure runway is less than one-fourth mile, or runway visual range is less than 2,000 feet.

The positions occupied by the flight crew at the time of the accident were established to be Copilot Perovich in the left seat and Captain Chesher in the right seat. Normally, under adverse weather conditions, it would be expected that the captain would be in the left seat and at the controls during the takeoff under the weather conditions which prevailed. The aircraft can, however, be flown from either seat, and there is no possible way of establishing who was actually controlling the aircraft at the time of the accident. Although Copilot Perovich had over 3,200 flying hours, 1,300 of which were in C-46, held an airline transport pilot certificate, and was qualified as a copilot in C-46 aircraft, he did not possess a type rating in C-46 aircraft.

Although the accident occurred during the takeoff from Toledo Express Airport, which was to be the first flight on the return to Santa Maria, Calif., the Board made an extensive analysis of the total flying time en route time, on-duty time, and rest periods from the time the charted flight departed Oakland Airport, Calif. Four pilots were aboard the aircraft when it departed Oakland Airport but the second crew flew only the leg from Albuquerque, N. Mex., to Kansas City, Mo., and left the flight at Kansas City. Captain Chesher was listed as pilot-in-command for the entire flight from Oakland.

Utilizing the arrival and departure times (as shown under investigation), it was determined that both Captain Chesher and Copilot Perovich were on continuous duty from departure at Oakland Airport to arrival at New Haven, a total of 26:40 hours. During this period, Chesher and Perovich were actually at the controls of the airplane for 11:15 hours of the total 14:41 hours of flight time to New Haven, Conn. The remaining flight time of 3:26 hours was deadhead time between Albuquerque and Kansas City.

It is known that the crew had a layover of 29:10 hours in New Haven, Conn., prior to beginning the return trip. However, during the morning and afternoon on the day of the accident, Copilot Perovich spent some

time at the airport at New Haven attending to servicing and preflight duties.

Since the return portion of the trip from New Haven to Oakland would have been flown under the same conditions, e.g., two-man crew to Kansas City and four-man crew to Oakland, in addition to being a slower westbound flight due to prevailing headwinds, it may be concluded that the entire projected return trip would also have been flown in direct violation of Civil Air Regulation 42.48, had the accident not occurred.[1]

CONCLUSIONS

Captain Chesher was briefed on the weather conditions which were below his allowable minimums prior to departure. Visibility at time of takeoff was zero in fog. During takeoff from Toledo Express Airport the aircraft, with the copilot in the left seat, swerved to the right followed by a violent swerve to the left just before the aircraft left the ground. The liftoff was described as abrupt or as a lurch into the air, and was accomplished before reaching V_2 speed. The aircraft shuddered or vibrated (characteristic of a stall) just prior to entering a left wing-down, nose-low attitude. The crew removed power from both engines just prior to impact, which occurred approximately 5,800 feet from the threshold of runway 07.

The Board believes that the loss of power caused by the maloperation of engines not properly run up immediately prior to takeoff and the swerving takeoff run due to erratic engine performance and poor visibility resulted in a premature liftoff. The pilot was unable to remain airborne due either to a stall condition or a loss of power or both. The wreckage being 5,800 feet down the runway indicates that the above-mentioned conditions caused a longer then normal takeoff run.

The Board concludes that Captain Chesher and the management of Arctic-Pacific Airlines displayed utter disregard for the regulations set forth as to flight time limitations, minimum weather conditions, proper completion and filing of required paperwork, good maintenance and inspection practices, and for compliance with regulations concerned with insuring operation, including maximum gross takeoff weight, in a manner to guarantee safety to the public.

As a result of this accident, the FAA has published a notice in the airman's guide and has instructed its tower operators to withhold takeoff clearance from any air carrier or other commercial aircraft operated for the purpose of carrying passengers or property for compensation or hire when the prevailing visibility for the airport of departure or runway visibility for the departure runway is less than one-quarter of a mile, or runway visual range is less than 2,000 feet.

On October 31, 1960, the FAA suspended, in accordance with section 609 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, the air carrier operating certificate issued to Arctic-Pacific. Subsequently, the operating certificate, which expired on November 14, 1960, was not renewed.

[1] CAR 42.48(d) reads as follows:

"Aircraft having a crew of four pilots.

"(1) A pilot shall not be scheduled for duty on the flight deck in excess of 8 hours during any 24-hour period.

"(2) A pilot shall not be scheduled to be aloft for more than 16 hours in any 24-hour period.

"(3) A pilot shall not be on duty for more than 20 hours during any 24-hour period."

PROBABLE CAUSE

The Board determines the probable cause of this accident was loss of control during a premature liftoff. Contributing factors were the overweight aircraft, weather conditions, and partial loss of power in the left engine.

By the Civil Aeronautics Board:

ALAN S. BOYD,
Chairman.

ROBERT T. MURPHY,
Vice Chairman.

CHAN GURNEY,
Member.

G. JOSEPH MINETTI,
Member.

WHITNEY GILLILLAND,
Member.

SUPPLEMENTAL DATA

INVESTIGATION AND HEARING

The Civil Aeronautics Board was notified of this accident immediately after occurrence. An investigation was immediately initiated in accordance with the authority of title VII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. A public hearing was ordered by the Board and was held at Oakland, Calif., on February 1, 2, and 3, 1961. Depositions were also taken at Toledo, Ohio, on January 11, 1961, and at Miami, Fla., on February 24, 1961.

THE CARRIER

Arctic-Pacific, Inc., was a supplemental carrier, and incorporated in the State of Washington. It maintained its principal offices at the Oakland International Airport, Oakland, Calif. The corporation held a temporary CAB certificate of public convenience and necessity issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board to engage in the transportation of irregular passenger and cargo operations, and an FAA air carrier operating certificate which expired on November 14, 1960.

FLIGHT PERSONNEL

Captain Donald L. J. Chesher, age 38, was employed by Arctic-Pacific, Inc., in July 1957. He had been on a leave of absence from the company from the latter part of August 1960 until October 23, 1960, 4 days prior to the commencement of this series of flights. He possessed a valid FAA airman certificate with an airline transport pilot rating with airplane multiengine land, with Douglas DC-3 and Curtiss Wright C-46 type ratings. His first-class medical certificate with no limitations was dated August 3, 1960. He had accumulated a total of 6,364 flying hours.

Copilot Howard Perovich, age 30, was employed by Arctic-Pacific, Inc., in August 1960. He possessed a valid FAA airman certificate with an airline transport pilot rating for airplane multiengine land, and a Douglas DC-3 type rating. He also possessed an FAA mechanic certificate with airframe and powerplant ratings.

Hostess Susan Faith Miller had been employed by numerous air carriers and had a total of approximately 7,500 flying hours.

THE AIRCRAFT

Curtiss Wright Super C-46F, N 1244N, bore manufacturer's serial No. 22458. The aircraft was leased by Arctic-Pacific, Inc., from the Barter Island Co., Spenard, Alaska. The aircraft was powered by Pratt & Whitney R-2800-B series engines. The left engine was a 79 model engine and the right engine was a 75 model engine. The aircraft was equipped with Hamilton Standard, model 23E50 propellers with model 6491A-6 blades.

Postal Rates Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD following the adoption of the postal rate bill by voice vote, I should like to point out that I have consistently stood for a self-supporting Post Office Department. This, especially in view of the fact that it has been repeatedly pointed out that 75 percent of all first-class mail and practically all of the other classes are business or commercial items. With the comparatively insignificant cost to the individual and with corporations and other business establishments abundantly able to carry the burden, I can see no reason for subsidizing the mails through personal income and other methods of taxation.

It would be difficult indeed to adjust each rate to the entire satisfaction of everyone and to those who object to the inclusion of Government or congressional mail, may I point out that a substantial provision for such use is reported to have been made in the departmental computation of the rates submitted.

In the interest of eliminating the subsidization of business, I think we arrived at a satisfactory bill and if a record vote had been taken, I would have supported the President's recommendation for a rate revision and voted for the bill.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Let's Stand Up on Our Hindlegs and Be Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, our country can meet the challenges to our security; fulfill the needs of our citizens; and live up to our great expectations as the greatest, freest, most productive nation in the world only, first, if we adequately mobilize and utilize our manpower and material resources; and second, of equal importance, if we inspire in our people the will and purpose to fulfill the high ideas and ideals of our free way of life.

Recently, the La Crosse Tribune reprinted an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post by Ben Hibbs, retiring editor—along with its own editorial, "Declaration of Faith."

The article is entitled "Let's Stand Up on Our Hindlegs and Be Americans"—as well as the editorial—reflects analytically, constructively, and challengingly, upon major aspects of our way of life.

I ask unanimous consent to have this thought-provoking article and editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S STAND UP ON OUR HINDLEGS AND BE AMERICANS

(NOTE.—Under the title above, the Saturday Evening Post published the following editorial by Ben Hibbs, retiring editor in its year-end issue. The La Crosse Tribune requested and received permission to reprint it.)

This is our last issue before Christmas, and traditionally this should be a Christmas editorial. It will not be.

It also happens that this is the last issue of the Saturday Evening Post in which my name will appear as editor, and there are some things I want to say.

I came to the editorship of the Post in a time of national crisis—in the black early month of World War II—and now, 20 years later, I am leaving the editorship in another era of crisis and doubt.

I suppose you might call this editorial, if indeed it is an editorial, a declaration of my faith in a country that I love deeply.

* * * * *

WHEN PRIDE RAN HIGHER

There was a time when our way of life in America was simpler and easier, when human values seemed to be more nearly black and white, when the currents of national pride ran more strongly than they do now.

The younger generation cannot remember those times. I do, and while I am not ancient enough or foolish enough to wish vainly for the return of an era that is past, I think it is urgent that we recapture some of the national fortitude, the ebullience of spirit, that were so evident in the time of our fathers and our grandfathers.

As a kid growing up on the Kansas prairies of 50 years ago, I often listened to the yarns of the old sodbusters as they sat around the stove in my father's hardware store of a winter evening.

These were the leathery old pioneers who had lived through drought and blizzard and the devastation of the grasshopper years, who had subsisted on very little and who in the end had taken this raw plains country by the scruff of its neck and turned it into a gracious and smiling land.

AN ABIDING FAITH

Among them were men of foreign extraction. Some were veterans of the Civil War, which was still recent enough to be green in the memories of our elders, and some had fought, even later, in the final Indian wars of the western prairies.

Doubtless there was an element of fiction in the tales they told, but there was also a deep and justifiable pride in what they had accomplished. And above all, they possessed an abiding faith in the future of America and a profound gratitude to the country that had given them their chance.

In those days the Fourth of July orators called America "the land of opportunity" and "the greatest country on earth," and we believed them.

In our schools and churches and our homes we were taught pride in country, and on holidays the bands played and the flags waved. It never occurred to anyone that all this was unsophisticated or corny.

Although the prairie country of my youth was closer to the pioneer days than most of America, the same spirit of pride and belief in our destiny pervaded the nation as a whole during the early years of this century.

This was the atmosphere in which I and millions of other young Americans, who are now past middle age, grew up. It was an atmosphere, a state of mind, which gave meaning to life, put some purpose into toil and struggle, fired the soul of many a young man with a consuming desire to "be somebody."

WE'VE HAD TO GROW UP

Now America is no longer an insular country. In a brief half century we have had to grow up and take our place among the nations of the world, and it has been a painful, and often confusing, experience.

We have made some mistakes and have learned that we have some national faults. We have become indisputably the leaders of the Western World, and we have found that such leadership involves some awesome responsibilities.

We also have learned that a leader is always the target for criticism of all kinds, much of it captious and unreasonable.

The heads of neutralist nations come to this country and lecture us on our faults, at the same time asking for financial assistance. The press of many so-called friendly countries carries on a constant drumfire of criticism of America and its actions—and even sometimes of its motives.

We are told by people who don't really know us, who don't know what America is like, that we are all materialists, with but little desire or capacity for the finer things of life; that we are brash and cocksure; that we are psychopathic about the threat of world communism; and so on and on down the list of our sins—personal, national, and international.

THE SEEDS OF DOUBT

We, of course, can live through this senseless sort of carping. It is also true that in some cases we deserve the censure that is leveled at us. The bungled Cuban invasion of last spring is a sad example.

What worries me, however, is that this barrage of niggling criticism from abroad, this posture of superiority on the part of our friends, is having its effect on our own national attitude of mind.

The seeds of doubt—doubt of ourselves—are becoming too strong within us. It is right, of course, that we should examine our faults, and I honor our American writers who do this chore fairly and honestly.

I have published much of their work in the Post. It was in the Post, for example, that the provocative book, "The Ugly American," was first given to the public. For it is only by a free discussion of our errors that we can correct those erorrs.

MUCH TO BE PROUD OF

But throughout all this, in the name of heaven let us remember that we still have a great deal to be proud of.

We Americans have become so sensitive about what the rest of the world thinks of us that we are now inclined to lie down and roll over whenever the finger of criticism is pointed our way.

Yet there is no reason to be apologetic about America. Other nations have also made their mistakes, and it would be hard for any one of them to match the decent idealism which we have brought to our role in world affairs.

In World War II we did more than any other nation to destroy the evil forces which were determined to dominate the earth.

After the war it was our Marshall plan which helped restore Western Europe and kept communism at bay in that vital part of the world.

We have continued to pour out our wealth and our manpower in an attempt to shore up freedom and human decency in other parts of the earth—sometimes without success, but we keep trying.

AN UNSELFISH PEOPLE

We are now attempting, insofar as our resources permit, to assist the undeveloped countries and the emerging nation, and we know that the end is not in sight. We do these things because we believe they are right, not for territory or trade or the love of power.

We have demonstrated that on the international scene we are an unselfish people, and we all know, even if it doesn't occur to our foreign critics, that the wherewithal for all this comes right out of our burdensome income-tax remittances, and that in many families there is hardship because of our national generosity. Foreign legend to the contrary, we are not a nation of millionaires.

Back in 1948 that wise old statesman, Bernard Baruch, wrote an article for the Saturday Evening Post which he titled "A Few Kind Words for Uncle Sam." It was a resounding pronouncement of his pride. * * *

I think it is high time that we all start saying a few kind words for Uncle Sam whenever the occasion arises, and perhaps even when there is no obvious occasion. Some-

how we must revive in the hearts of our young people the deep pride that all Americans must have in their heritage.

WE'RE CURIOUSLY FLABBY

Elsewhere in this issue of the Post there is a fascinating survey of the attitudes of some 3,000 typical young Americans, boys and girls of high school and college age, on a variety of matters.

It is a survey that was made with scrupulous care by the Gallup organization, and it was done on such a broad and scientifically balanced base that its results can hardly be challenged.

The thing that emerges most clearly from this study is that far too many of our boys and girls these days have a curiously flabby and uninformed attitude of mind about our country, its history, and its future, and about their own lives and their own futures.

Too many are interested chiefly in security, an 8-hour day, and a relatively easy way of life. If the spark of ambition is there, it is buried pretty deep in some of them.

Now, this may be nothing more serious than evidence that the first stirrings of maturity are slower in coming these days.

But I am afraid it is a bit more than that. I am afraid that somehow we have lost the ability, or perhaps the will, to fire our boys and girls with the human spark of pride in self and country, with the urge to accomplish something and to be somebody in this land of opportunity.

And if this is true, we must not make the mistake of laying the blame entirely on the schools. The place where these things are best taught is right in the home—by example as well as by word.

DREAMS EVER AROUND US

These are bewildering times, fearful times. The shadow of atomic destruction hangs constantly over us.

I am not one of those who believe the shadow will become reality, but I cannot deny the possibility. In any event, our only safeguard is to remain strong in heart and fiber as well as in arms.

This I believe we shall find a way to do. This is the basic faith I have in America. Perhaps it is too simple, but there it is.

Last June my old friend, MacKinlay Kantor, famed novelist who writes of the Civil War era and pioneer days in the West, was given an honorary degree by Iowa Wesleyan College, and I have before me a copy of his address.

He discussed, in far more eloquent language than I can command, some of the same things I have dealt with in this editorial. His tone was one of firmness and hope.

At the end of his speech he addressed his remarks to the spirit of old Abe Lincoln, and his final paragraph was this:

"The dreams are ever around us, Mr. Lincoln. There is medicine in the breeze and an enzyme beneath the sod; and we still have a yearning and a gallantry, sir."

I like that high trumpet note from Mac Kantor. I echo it. I think we still have it in us to dream and to achieve, to be gallant and proud, to stand up on our hind legs and be Americans.

DECLARATION OF FAITH

This newspaper is privileged to reprint a moving editorial from the Saturday Evening Post—a valedictory piece by Ben Hibbs, who on January 1 retired as the distinguished editor of that magazine.

Like the Jenkin Lloyd Jones speech reprinted recently on this page, it deals in straightforward fashion with the ills of our times and the need "to remain strong, strong in heart and fiber as well as in arms."

Hibbs speaks of our bewildering, fearful era and urges us not to be "apologetic about America." He expresses concern over the self-doubt being seeded in our national mind.

"The seeds of doubt—doubt of ourselves—are becoming too strongly within us," says Hibbs. Of the foreign press interpreting America without knowing what we are like, he observes:

"We can live through this senseless sort of carping—this niggling criticism from abroad—but it is having its effect on our national attitude."

Americans, he says, have become so sensitive about what the rest of the world thinks about us that "we are now inclined to lie down and roll over whenever the finger of criticism is pointed our way."

The United States has found that leadership of the Western world imposes some awesome responsibilities. Hibbs concedes that we have made our share of mistakes, as have all nations.

"But it would be hard for any of them," he continues, "to match the decent idealism which we have brought to our role in world affairs."

Hibbs' thesis is a new declaration of faith—a declaration of faith in our country and a determination "to remain strong, strong in heart and fiber as well as in arms."

And finally: "I think we still have it in us to dream and to achieve, to be gallant and proud, to stand up on our hind legs and be Americans."

We commend his valedictory to our readers.

Current Trends in Employing the Severely Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered by William P. McCahill at the sixth annual conference of the North Carolina Rehabilitation Association, Winston-Salem, N.C., on October 19, 1961.

Mr. McCahill is the very able executive secretary of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped. This Committee, as you know, has as its Chairman our good friend Mel Haas, who has been such a driving force in this field.

This speech of Mr. McCahill, entitled "Current Trends in Employing the Severely Handicapped," is an excellent analysis and report on the advances being made on the Federal level to rehabilitate the physically handicapped. The address follows:

CURRENT TRENDS IN EMPLOYING THE SEVERELY HANDICAPPED

(Remarks of William P. McCahill, Executive Secretary, the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, sixth annual conference of the North Carolina Rehabilitation Association, Winston-Salem, N.C., Oct. 19, 1961)

Trends can be interpreted. They can be hastened. They can be directed, arrested, and programed. But they cannot be faked. When talking about trends you have to deal with facts and so when I accepted this responsibility, I went to the three major sources of facts available to our office: the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, the Bureau of Employment Security, and the Veterans' Administration. From these three cooperating agencies came a variety of facts which I shall share with you today—interpreting where appropriate from our viewpoint.

One of the most remarkable results of my request for information was that the three agencies supplied me not only with their own estimates of the situation, but also outlined what the others were doing. I believe this is perhaps the most encouraging sign of all, for it indicates that liaison between and among the Federal agencies is constant, cooperative, and informed. I would hope that the same held as true in all the States. The fact that it does not is not completely discouraging, for here the trend is definitely toward constantly improved understanding and increased interdependence.

Before I get too deeply involved in the national picture, I'd like to pay special tribute to those who have racked up such a fine record in rehabilitation in North Carolina. During the last fiscal year, as you know, North Carolina placed fourth in the total number of persons rehabilitated and also stood fourth in the number rehabilitated per 100,000 of population. This wasn't easy and certainly only came about as a result of good planning and fine teamwork. Congratulations. I am proud to number Col. Charles Warren among my personal friends. Through the years I have enjoyed his confidence and, he mine. We haven't always agreed, but we always knew where we stood with each other.

This is symptomatic of the trend for the future. We have all been working together long enough to shed much of our parochialism, or agencyism, and roll up our sleeves in a mutual effort to serve those people whom you call "clients."

Nationally the rehabilitation program fell short of its 1961 goal of 96,000 rehabilitated persons. But, the trend is constantly upward and each year a new record is set. Undoubtedly, the national effort will break through the 100,000 mark in 1962 and, as trained personnel continue to come out of our colleges, universities and rehabilitation center training courses, perhaps a dramatic breakthrough to the seemingly astronomical goal of 200,000 set in 1954 will become a reality long before this present decade passes into history.

I might say here that the rehabilitation counseling at North Carolina State, the work done at the medical schools at Duke and North Carolina Universities, and the physical therapy taught at both these universities are a credit to your State and the farsighted educators who put your State on the path of progress.

One statistic which must not be allowed to become a trend must be seriously considered and this is the fact that although rehabilitations increased by only 5 percent last year, the number of persons rehabilitated but waiting placement jumped to 17 percent. I wonder what would happen in this country if 23,875 men and women in any one county or city suddenly lost their jobs overnight. It would be a disaster of emergency proportions. Yet, when we read that almost 24,000 persons have completed rehabilitation training and are ready for work throughout our more than 3,000 American counties, we accept this as another statistic. Uncomfortable perhaps; annoying perhaps, but still a statistic. In terms of your own State this means that somewhere in this Nation trained but unemployed handicapped workers totaling more than four times the number of all those rehabilitated here last year are on our conscience.

This, of course, doesn't include the additional hundreds of thousands of unemployed or badly underemployed handicapped who

don't have the official tag of "client" after their name. These include some 60,000 veterans with service-connected disabilities of 10 percent or more, many of them severely disabled; and a large number of the employable handicapped we don't even know about.

This matter of severe disability is a growing national problem and one in which the field of rehabilitation has a special concern and responsibility. Just as examples, we have over 350,000 blind in this country, 200,000 paraplegics and an estimated 1.5 million with epilepsy. Severe disability is not limited to things which are seen. There are over 1 million people in our mental hospitals today; over 5 million are mentally retarded. There is every reason to believe that the number of severely disabled in this country will increase, and particularly because of our increasing older population who are, more than any other group, afflicted with severe disabilities.

On the national scene a number of efforts are underway to deal with severe disability, and among the outstanding is the research work financed by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. Currently underway are research projects in five States to develop improved ways of rehabilitating the severely disabled by State vocational rehabilitation agencies. There are projects in Massachusetts, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Texas. Also, OVR has three research projects whose special focus is the development of new and improved techniques in the rehabilitation of the severely disabled. These are at Tulane, Ohio State, and the Kenny Foundation in Minnesota. A number of OVR-financed research projects are dealing with the various facets of the problems of severe disability.

One of the critical issues in the rehabilitation of the severely disabled is finding suitable employment. For many, they can only do limited work and for them we need much more homebound work and many more sheltered workshops. But many of the severely disabled can go into competitive employment if they are carefully and properly placed. There is a great deal of work which needs to be done in the development of employment opportuntites for the severely disabled. First, as we all know, false ideas and fears of employers must be overcome. New opportunities for the employment of the severely disabled must be found. Finally, the placement of the severely disabled in employment requires care and professional skill on the part of rehabilitation people of the highest order.

Incidentally, the information from the last couple of paragraphs above came from Russ Dean, of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, and at the end of his memorandum were the words, "transcribed by a blind typist." This is one trend that ought to be encouraged by professionals.

The Veterans' Administration has a number of blind typists and is very proud of the fact that one out of every three handicapped workers employed by the Federal Government is working at VA. Some other up-to-date facts about VA are vital in any consideration of present trends.

Since 1960, the Veterans' Administration has undertaken a "home bound" rehabilitation program for veterans with severe disabilities. Prior to that time, the role of the Veterans' Administration in rehabilitation was a responsive one, i.e., if the disabled veteran applied for rehabilitation assistance, the VA responded by doing all that could be done. The present policy, as far as seriously disabled veterans are concerned, is to go out and find these veterans, and to motivate them to undertake training.

Working from VA records, their counselors and vocational rehabilitation specialists seek out severely disabled veterans, work with them, and in very many instances achieve remarkable success.

An example of the fruitfulness of this approach may be seen in the case of a quadriplegic who had been maimed by a land mine explosion. This veteran previously did nothing but sit propped up at a window all day long.

He was sought out by a VA counselor, and a home bound rehabilitation project in accountancy designed for him. One day, in conversation with his vocation rehabilitation instructor, this veteran said, "You know, no problem is hopeless." The instructor was about to congratulate him on his pluck in overcoming his disability, when he realized that the veteran was not referring to his disability * * * but to his ability. By a difficult problem, he meant not the loss of all of his limbs, for he accepted that as a fact of life, but to a knotty accountancy problem which he had succeeded in resolving.

A most recent development of importance was the extension in 1960 of Public Law 16, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, to accommodate severely disabled veterans and other exceptional cases who could not be rehabilitated under the original program. Many of these veterans are now benefiting from the homebound rehabilitation program.

In summarizing some material submitted in response to my request, Abe Stahler, of the Bureau of Employment Security, wrote me, "Our only concern is that your listeners be assured of the policy of the Employment Service to provide the best service possible for the severely handicapped." I think this is certainly an understandable desire on Abe's part and I shall try to prove worthy of the trust.

May I quote in part from the BES memorandum:

"A number of trends in industry, in personnel practice, and in public attitudes are favorable to increased employment of handicapped persons. None of these is new. Each has been developing progressively and soundly over the years, gradually increasing possibilities for employment of workers who are physically impaired. Their effect upon employment opportunities for the handicapped may justify stress upon them in assessing employment prospects for this group, particularly the severly handicapped."

The BES professionals in the Branch of Services to the Handicapped feel that the most effective factors contributing to enhancing employment opportunities for the handicapped are the constantly spreading familiarity with and acceptance of selective placement by employers. BES officials state that the number of employers, large and small, who recognize the basic principle of individual difference in both jobs and workers, for this is what selective placement is all about, is constantly increasing.

More and more employers are now analyzing individual jobs to determine the actual physical and other requirements for performance and assessing the physical capacities of disabled workers in order to be able to compare the workers' physical capacities with the physical demands of jobs for which they may be otherwise qualified. The results of the spread of this approach to the selection of physically handicapped workers has been to open many more opportunities to such workers rather than to restrict their employment, as frequently happened when other methods of selection were used. Today, handicapped workers, with virtually all kinds of disability, are successfully performing jobs in almost every conceivable occupation because their residual abilities have been found to be adequate for performance and their disability not to be an inhibiting factor.

An interesting concomitant of the expanding utilization of selective placement is the increasing awareness among employers of the abilities and competence of handicapped workers, even the severely disabled, when suitably placed. Such increased personal knowledge of the capabilities of qualified handicapped workers has done much to reduce the rejection of such workers which resulted from ignorance, bias, and prejudice.

In another portion of the BES memorandum is the following statement which today could have come from any one of several agencies:

"Another factor operating to help handicapped persons gain employment more easily is the increasing awareness on the part of employers and the general public of the efficacy of rehabilitation. The realization that rehabilitation can restore the work capacity of severely disabled persons, frequently enabling them to be more skillful workers than they were before impairment, has lead many employers to accept rehabilitated workers. This trend has been particularly beneficial to severely disabled persons and, as our rehabilitation program expands, promises even greater benefits."

As you no doubt know generally, the U.S. Civil Service Commission has established coordinators for employing the handicapped in most major Federal agencies; officials responsible for seeing that qualified applicants from the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation and the Employment Service or any other referral source receive equitable consideration for employment and retention. Several States have established similar programs. This is certainly a trend we can encourage not only in the State merit systems but in county, city and school programs operated for the public.

I had occasion to take part in the recent Civil Service Commission half-day conference for coordinators in the Washington area and was most impressed to see the level of representation not only from the Commission which had a dozen of its top officials on hand, including the Chairman John W. Macy, Jr., but responsible officials from all Federal establishments. At this meeting Chairman Macy read President Kennedy's statement of policy to Federal Agency heads.

Since this is hardly a trend, but a reality, I should like to share with you some of the President's statement with the hope that both the philosophy and the practice will find its way into all branches of Government and into labor-management relations. President Kennedy directed:

"Utilization of physically handicapped persons in productive employment is sound and necessary, both for the contribution handicapped citizens can make to our national productivity and for the sense of independence and well-being which they they derive from doing a job.

"It is fitting that Government, as an employer, should lead the way in selective placement of phsyically handicapped persons so as to utilize their skills and abilities:

"I ask that all levels of administration and supervision in the executive branch take part in the implementation of this policy. Federal agencies should take such action as is necessary to bring about an understanding and application of the policy by all appointment officials and others who have responsibility in hiring or reassignment of employees. In addition, agency management should make a periodic review of the manner in which the policy is being carried out."

Important as Government employment is, 90 percent of the labor force will still be employed privately. In the private sector there are certain trends which both cause concern and hold great promise.

Expanding mechanization and automation in industry, commerce, and business promise greater opportunity for employment of handicapped persons in these fields. Mechanization and automation have substantially reduced or eliminated physical effort,

manual dexterity, visual acuity, and other activities required of workers to perform many jobs. Now workers may perform an increased number of jobs with the aid of powered devices or control the production process by means of control panels. Such changes in the manner of producing goods and performing services have made, and will continue to place, a constantly growing number of jobs within the capabilities of persons with impaired or limited physical capacities. It should be noted, however, that this transition imposes greater mental and intellectual demands upon workers and requires greater educational and training preparation of the worker to qualify him for jobs involving mechanization and automation. It is significant, also, that automation and mechanization are being introduced extensively in the business and commercial fields in which professional, office, and sales jobs abound. In the current decade, such jobs are expected to have the fastest growth, and will afford many opportunities for handicapped workers, including the severely disabled.

We have observed mounting public concern for the welfare of persons recovered from mental or emotional disturbance and of the mentally retarded. This concern has resulted in intensified rehabilitation and placement efforts to assist such persons in obtaining employment. In the several years just past, considerable progress has been made in increasing employment opportunities for them. Recognition of the special need of these people for suitable employment to complement their adjustment in their communities is constantly spreading among the public and, particularly, employers. The number of employers who are willing to knowingly employ a former mental patient or a mentally retarded person in an appropriate job is gradually rising. Rehabilitation and placement agencies and other agencies providing supportive services to the victims of mental illness or impairment can help both the worker and employer in bringing about successful job adjustment through the provision of needed preemployment services and proper followup. Careful and intelligent job placement assistance to these people, based on full information concerning their behavior and characteristics furnished by the medical profession, should enable these people to widely demonstrate their capabilities for gainful employment. If this can be done, substantial enlargement of employment opportunities for them should result.

I am aware that the North Carolina State Legislature has appropriated special funds to make possible expanded services in the vocational rehabilitation of the mentally ill. Working closely with DVR and the department of mental hygiene as well as public and private hospitals, this program holds great promise and one of the most important keys to success will be found in an effective employment and placement process of mentally ill persons. I know that the North Carolina Employment Security Commission, under my old friend Col. Henry Kendall, will be an eager partner with you in your future efforts in this area.

I should like to publicly pay tribute to Colonel Kendall's contribution to the work of the President's Committee over the past several years as the representative of the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies on our executive committee. Colonel Kendall has carried out his duties with dedication and so effectively that no executive committee meeting or annual meeting of the interstate conference for the last several years has been held without some part of the program made available to the employment of the handicapped.

Another North Carolinian, incidentally, serves on our executive committee and has been working closely with Governor Sanford in connection with the recently established Governor's committee on employment of the handicapped in your State. I refer to Louis Woodbury, chairman of our workmen's compensation committee and past president of the National Association of Insurance Agents. You certainly are blessed with fine leadership here in North Carolina.

I have gone on too long, however, and must hasten to conclude. Probably the greatest hope for your work and ours is the recently inaugurated program of improvement of the U.S. Employment Service and its affiliated State employment service agencies. Congress has poured a large amount of financial adrenaline into the public employment service and the end result should be encouraging to us all.

The objectives of this program are to provide better job placement services to unemployed workers and employers and to strengthen employment service programs which can make a contribution to the solution of nationally significant employment and unemployment problems. Particular emphasis is being placed on placement activities.

Although the program of service to the handicapped has not been designated specifically for improvement, primarily because service to the handicapped involves all basic and special employment service programs, this program is not being neglected nor overlooked. It is expected that improvements achieved in basic services provided all applicants will result in better services to the handicapped, since the handicapped program depends ultimately for its success upon the quality of these basic programs.

In addition, the Employment Service is continuing its efforts to provide better services to the disabled through improvement and expansion of various program activities. State agencies are generally extending services to greater numbers of severely disabled persons. Increases in funds granted the agencies for the current fiscal year should enable them to devote increased staff time to the generally time-consuming service to such persons. It is expected, therefore, that even greater numbers of severely disabled persons will be assisted and placed through expanded job development and other placement activities.

Counseling and placement assistance to mentally and emotionally recovered persons and to the mentally retarded is receiving increased emphasis in a number of State agencies. Since the evaluation of the work capacity of such persons depends largely upon information which must be supplied by treatment or other service resources and the person is dependent upon such agencies for supportive services during the period of adjustment, most employment service agencies which have undertaken to help this group have entered into formal arrangements with institutions and agencies which serve the group. Working closely with these institutions and agencies, the Employment Service, in several States, has been able to report significant progress in placing these people. As professional knowledge and public understanding of mental and emotional illness increase, as improved techniques for placing those recovered from such illness are developed, and as confidence in the ability of those who have recovered from mental and emotional illness to perform successfully in ocmpetition with other workers grows, employment service assistance to these people will expand. The U.S. Employment Service and the State agencies, I have been assured, will do everything possible to expand these services.

I had intended to include a discussion of Goodwill and of workshops as vital and important items in any consideration of future trends. However, time has run out and I can only say that by 1970, we shall have an increase in population of between 25 and 30 million living Americans. One half of the growth will be in the age groups under 18 and over 65. There may be need here to increase the opportunity of workshops to rehabilitate the total man, to teach work habits and cultural and social patterns of behavior which are all necessary if employment is to be a goal and not a dream for both the young and the old.

In final summation, we have come a long way and have a long way to go. But we have learned a lot in coming as far as we have and with continued and increased mutual confidence, perhaps we can move faster than we have in the past, faster in training, faster in medicine, faster in placement; but always better, so that we accomplish our goal and accelerate today's trends of helping the handicapped to help themselves.

Tribute to the Late Justice G. Dewey Oxner, of the South Carolina State Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, with the passing of Justice G. Dewey Oxner, the State supreme court, the legal profession, and the entire State of South Carolina have suffered a loss of incalculable magnitude. Justice Oxner served the people of South Carolina with equal distinction in many posts, including State representative from Greenville County, State circuit judge and as a State supreme court justice. Justice Oxner was noted for his devotion to the law and for the fair and equitable manner in which he applied it to any given situation. Justice Oxner's scholarly and well-written opinions will undoubtedly prevail as some of the more authoritative interpretations and applications of the law available. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Friday, January 19, 1962, edition of the Greenville (S.C.) News entitled "G. Dewey Oxner, Judge and Man" be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

G. DEWEY OXNER, JUDGE AND MAN

Both on and off the bench, whether clad in his judicial robes or in the informal attire of the golf course, G. Dewey Oxner was an ornament to the citizenship of his community, State, and Nation and a source of warmth and delight to his acquaintances and friends.

His only diverisons from his close study and careful and compassionate administration of the law were his family and his periodic golf games. It was ironic that his death came as he was enjoying a round of golf with close friends, taking a little time off from his exacting duties as one of the senior associate justices of the South Carolina Supreme Court.

Coming to Greenville from the small Newberry county community of Kinards as a young man, Dewey Oxner (and off the bench he was simply "Dewey" to those who

knew him at all well) distinguished himself as a lawyer and as a member of the House of Representatives from Greenville County.

He was elected State circuit judge for the 13th judicial circuit (Greenville and Pickens Counties) in 1932 and earned a reputation as an able judge in the State courts. His election to the supreme court in 1944 was marked recognition of his ability and his application to the law, for there were other distinguished candidates for the position.

Justice Oxner soon became one of the busiest of the five members of the State supreme court. He wrote some of its most delicate and difficult prevailing opinions. He also wrote some classic opinions dissenting from the views of the majority of the court.

He took an active part, along with the chief justices with whom he served, in the administration of the courts of the State, a function which ultimately devolves on the supreme court. He would go out of his way to hear special matters, in which a supreme court justice had the power to act, in his chambers in the Greenville county courthouse.

His interest in seeing that justice was done caused him to assume tasks that he might easily have refused.

Justice Oxner's devotion to the law has been praised by Judge Clement F. Haynsworth, Jr., of the Fourth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, his other colleagues in the courts and by attorneys who knew him both as a lawyer and a judge. Their appraisal is based on both knowledge of the law and experience in the courts over which he was presiding.

He was essentially a conservative in his views on the law, in his politics and in his personal habits. He believed in adhering to the letter of the law as written and as a given statute was intended at the time it was enacted. When pondering an opinion, he insisted on knowing all of the facts in the case, the legislative intent of the applicable statutes and the literal wording of the law.

In his latter years he was somewhat disturbed by some of the trends in some of the courts of the land, the tendency to shape the interpretation of the law to suit the purpose of the moment. This was not for him, and he made no secret of his personal and official feelings on the matter.

Justice Oxner gave no less of himself to civic affairs, within the limitations imposed by his position, than to the law. He was an active and devoted churchman. He and Mrs. Oxner reared two fine sons. His friends over the State and Nation were counted in the thousands and he was constantly concerned with their well-being.

Dewey Oxner's death was tragic and untimely, for he was at the height of his powers, but his influence long will linger in the judiciary of South Carolina and his memory in the hearts of his friends.

American Teacher in Africa Reports on the Congo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is significant that many missionaries and teachers in Africa, including Americans, have been critical of United Nations aggression against the Province of Katanga in the Congo.

Recently I received an interesting letter from an American who for 4 years taught in Kenya. I believe the views he expresses will be of interest to many of my colleagues, and his letter follows:

NEWHALL, CALIF., *January 14, 1962.*

H. R. GROSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GROSS: Dr. Charles W. Maplethorpe informed me some time ago that you would welcome my views on the Congo; unfortunately, I have been traveling, and so this is somewhat delayed.

Until April 1961 I had spent 4 years in Kenya, where I taught at Kibabu Teacher Training Center, the mailing address for which was Bungoma, a small government administrative center 5 miles from us.

We were 33 miles from the Uganda border; the main road east from Uganda (from the town of Tororo) ran between Bungoma and Kibabu T.T.C., 2 miles from the former and 3 miles from our place.

Most of the refugees who fled east out of the Congo went across the Congo-Uganda border and thence into Kenya, and so to Europe; and these came down that road 3 miles from us.

When the Belgians withdrew, the Congo, as an entity, ceased to exist. Without the restraining hand of the Belgian Government, the tribes recommenced their old tribal warfare.

Taxes on European businesses, farms, and incomes support probably 90 percent of the cost of medical facilities, schools, and famine prevention measures, which are provided for the African at a nominal cost.

Although some hostility was aimed at the Belgian settlers and merchants (many of the latter not being settlers), intertribal hostilities accounted for much of the harassment that drove the Europeans out.

So I was not surprised to find reports subsequently note famines and widespread disease.

What did Tshombe and Katanga Province secede from? Chaos. It is more accurate to say that the rest of the Congo collapsed away from Katanga Province.

I found a few Africans in Kenya who could see that independence a la Congo was worse than no independence; they didn't believe that anything similar could happen in Kenya (I wouldn't take any bets), but they didn't want it that way. Indeed, after the Congo, the African nationalists began to speak more moderately, even going so far as to admit that Kenya needed the Europeans and Asians.

Incidentally, "Africa for the Africans" is a black nationalist slogan meaning "Africa (the continent of) for the black man and kick everyone else out." G. Mennon Williams' use of the slogan hit a lot of people where they live, and some Europeans have been in Africa for generations.

So I find entirely believable that white support went to both African candidates for the Katanga Presidency, and that Tshombe firmly believes that his best interests, and those of his tribe, and of Katanga, lie in maintaining order.

From the reports of atrocities throughout the rest of the Congo, one can readily see why the Europeans are eager to support, with their money and their blood, a President who managed to keep their house from falling when all the other houses fell.

We got many reports of atrocities against whites, and very little about atrocities committed against Africans; that, however, is normal. During the Mau Mau rebellion in Kenya, a thousand were aimed at Africans for every one aimed at Europeans or Asians; for one thing, more of the tribes fought with the government than against; besides, anything that happens to a European or Asian gets in the paper, but usually only a prominent African rates publicity.

The Belgians remained in Katanga until the United Nations started messing about there; I noted that the Belgians started leaving as soon as the U.N. started moving against Katanga, and I daresay they are wise.

The policy of the U.N. seems to be to drag the one remaining solvent portion of the Congo down to nothing.

I might ascribe U.N. policy to assininity, except for the U.N. obvious reluctance to move against Antoine Gizenga; in contrast to Tshombe, Gizenga has made overt moves against the U.N. Sizing up the reports on Gizenga, I wonder if Moscow isn't backing him.

I have begun to wonder whether we aren't helping Moscow more than Washington in backing the United Nations in its present form.

Sincerely,

PATRICK C. FEANY.

The U.N. Bond Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two excellent editorials, one from the Chicago Sun-Times, and another from the Chicago Daily News, both of January 24, 1962, supporting President Kennedy's request that Congress authorize the purchase of $100 million worth of United Nations bonds, to help save the world peace organization from bankruptcy.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.N. BONDS: INVESTMENT IN FAITH

President Kennedy's proposal for this country to buy $100 million worth of United Nations bonds to help save the world peace organization from bankruptcy is certain to precipitate angry debate in this session of Congress. Without doubt, the Nation will hear a great deal from Capitol Hill about the U.N.'s imperfections and its shortcomings, particularly in the Congo operation.

The way is open for the unreconstructed isolationists to belabor the organization as never before. Even such friends of the U.N. as Senator GEORGE AIKEN, Republican from Vermont, are in the opposition camp on the bond question. However, it should be noted that the Senator's objections are not aimed so much at the U.N. as at the theory the U.S. taxpayers should pick up the tab for obligations that Russia has welshed on.

Almost half of the U.N. deficit ($170 million by next June 30) represents money owed by the Soviet Union. For 5 years, the Reds have refused to help pay for the U.N. emergency force in the Middle East, and they have refused to pay anything for the Congo operation.

These activities largely account for the deficit which is now to be met by a $200 million issue of 25-year 2 percent bonds, of which the United States plans to buy half. We have already said on this page that Wall Street would hardly approve the purchase as a blue chip investment.

But this is not a financial transaction in the usual sense. Rather, it is an investment in the future of the U.N.; a showing of faith in the purposes and principles for which the organization was created.

It spells the difference between an effective U.N., which the free world wants and needs, and a crippled U.N., ardently desired by Soviet Russia. That is the point we hope will be emphasized in the debate.

Whatever the controversy that develops, the Kennedy administration must make unmistakably clear to Americans the need to preserve the U.N. as a growing and going concern. Meanwhile, we hope that those Members of Congress who have always regarded the organization as suspect will take another look at it. No one can sneer at its objectives or at its endorsement of "the dignity and worth of the human person."

It has had its bad chapters and these cannot be winked away. Failure to respond to India's seizure of Goa dealt U.N. prestige a heavy blow and has had the further unfortunate effect of encouraging the aggressive designs of others in the name of anticolonialism.

It floundered perilously close to disaster in the Congo but now somehow seems to have reached firm ground. A serious question remains whether the extreme military measures in Katanga were necessary and this is certain to be asked during the congressional debate.

U.N. successes, and it has had them, as in the preservation of order along the Gaza strip, have been less spectacular. Moreover, on the credit side must be the refusal to admit Red China. Also, Russia failed in its bid to replace Dag Hammarskjold with a three-man secretariat—a troika—which would have enabled the Communists to cripple the Organization procedurally, as it has tried to do financially.

It is true other U.N. nations beside Russia have defaulted on their obligations. France and Belgium have not paid their assessments to meet expenses in the Congo, for example. President Kennedy's job of selling Congress on the need for underwriting the major portion of the deficit would be eased if these and other reneging nations would show a similar sense of responsibility. And Asian and African members of the U.N., whose activities have impaired the organization's image in the United States, might show more responsibility in their dealings on the international stage, thereby helping to win popular support for the bond issue in this country.

KEEP THE U.N. SOLVENT

One of the great debates now shaping up in Congress will determine whether the United States comes to the rescue of the United Nations by purchasing $100 million worth of U.N. bonds.

President Kennedy has asked Congress for authority to make the purchase. A convincing case can be made for giving him that authority. To do less would be to declare that we are indifferent to the fate of the United Nations.

Debate on the bond proposal will provide an unparalleled opportunity for the anti-U.N. forces to air their grievances and frustrations. It becomes vital, therefore, not to lose sight of the main point. As we see it, this becomes nothing less than the continuation or the abandonment of the United Nations.

On that point, we believe there can be only one answer. Despite its obvious imperfections, the United Nations is an indispensable instrument in the political evolution of the globe.

The bond issue offers a possible road to U.N. solvency. If it works as planned, the machinery for preserving the peace of the world will be strengthened. Without it, the financial distress into which the U.N. has fallen will be compounded and the whole Organization endangered.

The U.N. money troubles stem largely from the Congo operation, for which a few nations—primarily the Communist bloc and France—have refused to pay special assessments.

The U.N. Charter provides that any member nation that fails to pay its share of the regular operating budget for as long as 2 years may be deprived of voting privileges. No such penalty attaches to the special assessments, so that Russia and others have been able to avoid with impunity any payment toward the cost of maintaining peace forces in the Congo or Middle East.

The General Assembly in authorizing the bonds provided that they would be amortized out of the regular U.N. budget, and the World Court is expected to rule that this is legal. So the delinquents, at least in theory, will have to pay their fair share of the special assessments or risk losing their votes.

No one can be wholly satisfied with the arrangement for incurring long-term obligations in the U.N. The peace forces ought to be on a pay-as-you-go basis. Even the proposed bond financing will to some extent penalize the United States and other U.N. members who have conscientiously paid their full share all along.

But all the laternatives considered by the General Assembly appear to be worse, unless one starts from the premise that either the Congo operation or the U.N. itself is not worth saving.

In our opinion, some serious mistakes have been made in the Congo and we have said so. We still believe, however, that despite these mistakes the basic decision to send a peace force to the Congo was sound. And clearly that force cannot yet be withdrawn without inviting big-power intervention that could lead to big war.

The United States has picked up more than its share of the Congo tab already. Viewed strictly as an investment, the bond purchase obviously carries risks. But the greater risk lies in failure to back the broad aims of the U.N.

Congress Should Trim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the majority of the newspaper editors of Iowa are deeply concerned by the continued profligacy of the spenders in Washington. An editorial in the Charles City, Iowa, Press—January 23, 1962—clearly and wisely points out that the first obligation of Congress is to maintain the integrity of the dollar for the benefit of American taxpayers; that this is no time to embark upon new and costly welfare programs at home or abroad.

The editorial follows:

There is never any document put together with greater optimum and idealism than the Federal budget.

The one submitted by President John F. Kennedy puts all the others in the shade in this respect.

Kennedy's budget assumes that his legislative program will get smooth sailing in Congress; there will be no major strikes or other disruptions in the economy; national income will rise steadily through June 30, 1963, without any interruptions; tax collections will reach alltime high figures; there will be neither small brush wars nor any major hot war and that Premier Nikita Khrushchev will be docile.

Our President's ambitious spending program is laid against a background of a $3.9 billion Federal deficit last year, a deficit this year of twice that amount or more, and the prospect for another deficit next year. There have been 26 deficits in the past 31 years. Surely the Nation now has reached a time of caution.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Virginia Democrat, predicts a Federal deficit of from $1 billion to $5 billion in the next Federal fiscal year. He complains that President Kennedy overestimates tax collections and underestimates Government costs. It wouldn't be the first time a President has done this.

It is almost unbelievable that the American people do not rise up in wrath against excessive Federal spending. It is astonishing that the major source of concern in the Federal Government over the prospects for balancing our budget comes from abroad instead of within this country. Yet this is true. This concern centers around the flow of gold from this country. The Kennedy administration is acutely aware of the budget balancing need not because American citizens demand it out of self-interest but because of fear of the reaction from foreign bankers. If these bankers aren't reassured they'll shift their dollar holdings into strong foreign currencies.

Congress should join the Kennedy administration in reassuring the foreign bankers by sharply cutting the Kennedy spending proposals. This is no time to expand domestic welfare programs or to embark on New Frontier ventures into new domestic fields.

The trimming of Government costs should be done primarily for the benefit of this country's taxpayers rather than to create a good impression abroad.

Insult to the Negro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, it is most unfortunate that the administration of President Kennedy has chosen to place in the arena of political expediency and the emotionalism of race relations the question of whether or not there should be a Department of Urban Affairs.

The establishment of such a Department can long occupy the Chambers of this body through a debate that need not touch on what the New York Daily News has referred to as dragging "a political red herring across the real issue."

The above-mentioned newspaper has rightly cited the attempt of the President, in naming in advance Mr. Robert A. Weaver, a Negro, as the Secretary of the yet-to-be-approved Department, as "a bald and brassy effort to buy Negro votes by adding a Negro to the Cabinet."

The Daily News continues:

Thereby, it seems to us, the President insults the intelligence of all Negro voters.

Mr. President, I would go a step further and state that the intelligence of every American, whether he be Negro or white, Republican, or Democrat, is insulted by what is a badly disguised attempt to inject the so-called civil rights issue into a proposal that apparently

cannot stand on its own merits. If the President really wants to create equity for the Negro, he can do so now by using the authority, he now has to issue an Executive order making Federal public housing equally available to all regardless of color or of race.

I hope that the responsible representatives of such organizations as the NAACP will reject this affront to the dignity of the Negro race by indicating to the President that their support for a Cabinet position will continue to be made on the merits of the individual and not on the color of skin and that the arguments for the department itself will be made on the real issue of good government instead of alleged good politics.

Mr. President, two excellent discussions of this argument appeared in recent editions of the New York Daily News and the Washington Evening Star.

I ask unanimous consent that both be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. First, an editorial from the New York Daily News, and second, a highly illuminating column by Gould Lincoln in the Star.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Daily News, Jan. 26, 1962]

J.F.K. INSULTS NEGROES

President Kennedy's pet project for a new Federal Department of Urban Affairs was turned down Wednesday by a House Rules Committee majority—five Republicans, four Democrats.

Thereupon the President, in what came as close to a fit of rage as he seems able to get, told a news conference that he will set up the new Department by Executive decree. This would stand unless either House of Congress vetoed it within 60 days.

As first Secretary of Urban Affairs, Mr. Kennedy added, he intends to appoint Robert C. Weaver, now Housing and Home Finance Administrator. Mr. Weaver is a Negro, and an able public servant to the best of our information.

Thus, the President is using Weaver in a bald and brassy effort to buy Negro votes by adding a Negro to the Cabinet. Thereby, it seems to us, the President insults the intelligence of all Negro voters.

He also drags a political red herring across the real issue in the Department of Urban Affairs dispute.

The real issue is whether this thing is needed. We believe it is not, and we aren't alone in that belief.

It would certainly freeze a new horde of bureaucrats onto the Federal payrolls and the taxpayers' backs. It would in all likelihood encourage cities to crawl to Washington for solutions of problems they should solve on their own, and give Washington a stranglehold on these cities.

We hope that at least one House of Congress will keep this real issue in mind and will massacre the new Department if the President creates it.

A SLICK POLITICAL OPERATION

(By Gould Lincoln)

President Kennedy's political strategy to get a "yes" or "no" vote in the House of Representatives and the Senate on his proposal to create a new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing is likely to bring such a result, especially in the House. But at the same time it raises a question: Good government versus politics. The issue is whether the Federal Government should take over more and more functions and activities which properly are duties and responsibilities of the local and State governments. Aside from this, there is the President's apparent determination to ignore Congress and its legislative processes if necessary to get his will in the creation of a Government Department whose head will have Cabinet status—a new Department which eventually will go far beyond the matters of housing and urban renewal recommended in the administration's bill. The House Rules Committee tabled the measure Wednesday by a vote of 9 to 6, denying it consideration by the House unless through a petition signed by 218 Members or on a Calendar Wednesday.

Creation of the proposed Department not only would bring about the appointment of Under Secretaries, Assistant Secretaries, and a large number of lesser employees, fattening the already huge Federal payroll, but it might put the Federal Government in position to tackle (and control through Federal appropriation) transportation, policing, and many other matters now reserved to local governments.

TACTIC AGAINST GOP

It was entirely clear from the President's statements in his Wednesday afternoon press conference, after the House Rules Committee's action, that he hoped to put at a disadvantage the Republicans who avowedly are seeking to increase their votes in the big metropolitan centers and regain some of the Negro vote, which in recent years has gone overwhelmingly Democratic. For the President apparently believes that the populations of the cities, as well as their mayors and other elected officials, will be glad to turn over to the Federal Government some of the problems that burden them today. Further, he announced at his press conference he intended to appoint a Negro, Robert Weaver, head of all the Federal housing agencies, if and when he is able to set up the new Department. Mr. Weaver thus would become the first of his race to hold full Cabinet office—another evidence of the Kennedy administration's desire to give recognition to Negroes.

Whether the President can get away with his maneuver to bypass the House Rules Committee remains to be seen. The Republicans in the House have been pretty solidly opposed to creation of the new Department on the ground that the Federal Government should not further extend its bureaucracy over the affairs of the people and concentrate all forms of government in Washington, the National Capital. Also they are not inclined to be impressed by the promised appointment of a Negro to Cabinet office.

They contend that the President, if he desired, could do much more for the extension of civil rights, so far as the Negroes and other minorities are concerned, by really pressing for enactment of further and stronger civil rights legislation. They join with certain liberal Democrats in saying that Mr. Kennedy has been treading lightly in the matter of such legislation.

In addition, they point out that President Kennedy, when organizing his Cabinet offered the office of Postmaster General to Negro Representative WILLIAM L. DAWSON, of Chicago, who, for reasons of his own, declined and stayed on in the House.

DEFEAT POSSIBLE

At the present writing, it appears the President may lose his fight in House or Senate or both. Admittedly the vote may be close. When the President has submitted his reorganization plan for a Department of Urban Affairs, it will remain before Congress and automatically establish the new Department, unless it is vetoed by a majority vote in one of the Houses of Congress within 60 days.

When former President Eisenhower sent to Congress his proposal for creation of the newest Federal Government Department—that of Health, Education, and Welfare—it was followed by a bill for creation of such a Department. Congress acted promptly and passed the bill. The Kennedy administration, faced with defeat in the House Rules Committee and a possible lengthy filibuster in the Senate, discarded the idea of pressing for favorable action in Congress and decided to take the chance of a veto of the new Department The House Rules Committee divided in its vote to table the administration's bill for the new Department five Republicans and four Democrats to six Democrats supporting the bill. The Committee is composed of 10 Democrats and 5 Republicans.

The Democrats are doing their best to make it appear that the Republicans are opposing the creation of the Urban Affairs Department in order to prevent appointment of a Negro to the Cabinet. It is a slick move and likely to be so recognized. As already stated, the President, when he first picked his Cabinet, offered a place to a Negro. The appointment didn't stick. At that time, it was suggested in some quarters that the whole operation was carried out with tongue in cheek.

Army Transportation Materiel Command

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, during recent months there has been considerable discussion both in and out of the Congress concerning the mounting cost of defense procurements in general and of "sole source," or negotiated, procurements in particular.

In view of this fact, it is noteworthy that one large military agency, headquarters of which are maintained in St. Louis, has accomplished, and is continuing to accomplish, singularly striking results in the alleviation of this major problem area.

I refer to the Transportation Materiel Command which exercises logistical responsibility for the U.S. Army insofar as the procurement, supply, and maintenance of transportation equipment for our ground forces is concerned.

Acting upon its own initiative, this agency last year launched an intensive attack upon the basic reason for the bulk of sole source procurements of this nature: the lack of sufficient technical data in the hands of the procuring agency to make competitive bidding possible. Its effort, known as Project Breakout, has resulted to date in an appreciable reduction of negotiated contracts and in a proportionately greater flow of procurements to firms in the category of "small business."

In accomplishing the latter objective the Transportation Materiel Command has been assisted materially by the St. Louis and Kansas City offices of the Small Business Administration with which it enjoys a close and effective working relationship. This cooperation between the two Federal agencies has

been particularly productive in bringing new contractual opportunities to firms in labor surplus areas of the country.

I am informed that, to date, Project Breakout has resulted in monetary savings to the Government of $801,290, a figure which represents the difference between the previous sole source costs and the present costs of the same items on a competitive bid basis. Still more gratifying are estimated savings of $8,246,680 which will accumulate during the supported life of the items broken out so far under this project.

As further evidence both of its determination and of its sincerity, the Transportation Materiel Command last April initiated a series of what it calls "procurement fairs" at which items broken out of their previous sole source category are put up for competitive bid for the first time. These events have been held on a weekly basis since July 28 and have proved increasingly beneficial.

It was my pleasure, and that of Representative PRICE of Illinois who accompanied me, to attend one of these fairs recently as guests of Maj. Gen. William B. Bunker and of the chief of his Directorate of Procurement and Production, Col. M. F. Boyd. We both were impressed with the large attendance of businessmen assembled there and with the well-ordered, businesslike atmosphere which prevailed throughout. Here were procurement opportunities never previously offered on a competitive basis and the firms represented obviously welcomed the opportunity to secure technical data and other details preparatory to submitting bids.

I have been informed that the Transportation Materiel Command is rapidly accelerating the pace of its breakout program with a current weekly average of about 125 items, an achievement which requires exhaustive engineering review of technical data and the acquisition of additional data essential for competitive bidding.

I have been no less gratified to learn that this agency has instituted a rigorous policy of retaining for the Government all proprietary rights as well as technical data involved in future new procurements; a policy which inevitably will result in a steadily diminishing ratio of negotiated contracts.

One of the items under consideration when Representative PRICE and I visited the Army Transportation Materiel Command was a spacer sleeve used on the Bell HU-1 helicopter. This item had previously been procured from the original manufacturer at a price of $4.96 with delivery date of 240 days. As a result of the bidding at the conference, in which five of eight bids received were less than $5, an award was made to a small business firm for a price of $1.40 each with a 45-day delivery date. While the savings on this particular transaction amounted to only $85, it does represent a savings of over 70 percent in the previous price paid.

This overall program which I have outlined is one which merits the commendation of all who have been familiar with this problem and who are concerned, as I have certainly been, with the conservation of the taxpayers' money allotted for defense purposes.

In addition to the substantial savings which I have enumerated, the Transportation Materiel Command has benefited materially from an average reduction of approximately 75 percent in the production leadtime previously recorded on a sole source basis. Neither the quality nor the quantity of the items affected has been permitted to suffer in the process.

My presentation of the facts which I have cited in some detail is sufficient evidence of my conviction that here is a program, proven under exceptionally trying circumstances, which is worthy of emulation by other Government agencies—both civilian and military—in their procurements of goods and services.

Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany, Herr Wilhelm G. Grewe, Addresses Chamber of Commerce in Charleston, W. Va., on the Implications of the Berlin Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, 20 years ago last December 11, Nazi Germany declared war on the United States. At that time the city of Berlin was a symbol for much of the world of the cruelty and oppression of Hitlerism. Today Berlin is the symbol of a divided world; West Berlin is a living memorial to the free human spirit and a token of America's commitment to the freedom of Western Europe.

This change has been accompanied also by a revolutionary change in the attitudes of the American people regarding our national involvement in the affairs of the world. Symptomatic of this change was the thoughtful and receptive response given by members of the chamber of commerce in Charleston, W. Va., to a recent speech by Herr Wilhelm G. Grewe, Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany.

Ambassador Grewe, whom I was privileged to introduce to the citizens of our State capital city, addressed himself to the Berlin crisis and the implications it holds for the unity of the Western alliance. He offered a forthright and penetrating analysis which was communicated directly to the hearts and minds of his West Virginia audience. I ask unanimous consent that my introductory remarks and excerpts from the address of Ambassador Grewe be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, DEMOCRAT, OF WEST VIRGINIA, INTRODUCING HERR WILHELM G. GREWE, AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY, AT THE ANNUAL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE DINNER, CIVIC CENTER, CHARLESTON, W. VA., NOVEMBER 9, 1961

Early last month the New York Times published an eloquent and moving editorial on the Berlin wall. The writer adopted for his theme the lines from Robert Frost's poem, "Mending Wall," in which the poet declares: "Something there is that doesn't love a wall," and adds: "Before I build a wall I'd like to know what I was walling in or walling out."

The Times editorial answered the poet's question in the present instance by stating that at Berlin "Oppression is being walled in; intolerance, hatred, fear—these are being walled in. What is being walled out is freedom of the body, of the mind, and of that soul that the Communists will not admit exists. The wealth of culture, the hope of the future, tranquillity of spirit, the joy of living—these, too, are being walled out."

Mayor Willy Brandt of Berlin has declared that the wall must come down. And so it must. But not only the wall of concrete blocks and barbed wire, but also those invisible walls of fear and distrust and hatred which divide the German nation and torture the people of many lands.

Twenty years ago, under the Third Reich, such walls existed between Germany and those countries which are now her allies. Yet in the brief span of 15 years, Western Germany has—under the leadership of such men as your speaker tonight and with the assistance of the United States—demolished those walls and undergone a miracle of economic, political, and moral reconstruction.

At the present moment of crisis, and in the months and years ahead, we in the United States, Britain, and France must not violate that trust with the German people on which the free Federal Republic has been built. Nor may we violate the hopes of the people of East Germany that they will someday be reunited with their families and friends in the West under a free, democratic, and independent government.

There are few men, in Germany or America, who have contributed more to the harmonious relations between our two countries during the past decade than has Ambassador Grewe. As a former professor of public and international law at the University of Freiburg, and later dean of the faculty of law, Herr Grewe was called to Bonn to head the German delegation which negotiated the termination of the occupation statute in 1951. He continued in this role and participated in all the negotiations until the ratification of the Paris Treaties in October 1954.

As observer for the Federal Government at the Geneva Conference in 1955 and speaker of the West German advisory delegation to the Foreign Ministers Conference at Geneva in 1959, Ambassador Grewe extended his knowledge and insight into the relations between the Soviet Union and the Western Allies.

As Ambassador to the United States since 1958, Herr Grewe has worked with diligence and great effectiveness in strengthening United States-German relations in the cause of maintaining peace with honor and advancing the rule of law in a troubled world. It is my genuine privilege and pleasure to present His Excellency, Herr Wilhelm G. Grewe, Ambassador Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the Federal Republic of Germany.

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS BY WILHELM G. GREWE

The events of August 13, were really a very hard blow to Berlin. Up to that date, Berlin was still a living unit. There were more than 500,000 border crossings each day. Now there are less than 500. Nevertheless, the vitality and viability of West Berlin is by no means shattered. It is very remarkable that for the last month (October 1961) 1,990 persons settled in West Berlin whereas the corresponding figure in October 1960 was 642. Since August 13, more people moved into West Berlin than left the city.

This is not only a Berlin crisis but a new crisis in the general context of the cold war. The fact that Khrushchev is not satisfied with the erection of the wall in Berlin shows very clearly that he has further reaching aims in mind. Namely, the permanent division of Germany into three parts; neutralizing West Germany and dismantling the NATO alliance; and finally the humiliation of the United States as the leading power firmly committed in Berlin. If we lose this struggle, it would mean, therefore, a fatal blow to the whole Western alliance. If Berlin would fall into the hands of the Communists, they would hold the symbol of German unity in their hands.

Khrushchev does not want to risk general war for Berlin, but he is determined to go very close to the brink. If it would come out that the West has the weaker nerves, it would not only mean to lose Berlin but to submit to new Soviet blackmail next year at another spot. The note to Finland has already indicated that there are other appropriate targets for the next attack. Maintaining strong nerves does also mean that one should not be afraid to negotiate.

Progress in the Space Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. CANNON

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the January 8 issue of the Dallas Times Herald be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. This is an excellent editorial, and I hope every Member of the Congress will read its contents.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AT THE FINISH

America has made rapid progress in the space race against Russia during the past year.

Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON, Chairman of the Space Council, reported the other day to President Kennedy that "the United States generated a greater rate of progress in 1961 than in any previous year or than that of any other country."

Despite the fact that the Soviet Union placed a man in space for the first time, the United States has made remarkable progress during the past year, and plans are to continue that progress in 1962.

The space effort is believed to have both scientific and military significance. In addition, the Soviet Union has used its space accomplishments for propaganda purposes.

We launched our strongest efforts late in the space race. The start of any race is important. But the finish is ever more so. The United States intends to be ahead at the finish.

The Indiana Dunes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it has recently been announced in the press that Mrs. James Buell of Gary, Ind., president of the Save the Dunes Council, has been selected a winner of the ninth annual American Motors Conservation Award for nonprofessional workers in the conservation field.

It is with warm personal pleasure that I call this to the attention of the Senate, for I have long admired the selfless and diligent work of Mrs. Buell on behalf of saving the Indiana Dunes. A lifelong resident of the Midwest, Mrs. Buell was born in Neenah-Menasha, Wis., and has lived in Ogden Dunes for 19 years. During her years of effort to protect and preserve the Indiana Dunes, with their priceless recreational and scientific values, Mrs. Buell has had the support and counsel of her husband, Hal Buell, an engineer and electric utilities industry executive.

The Midwest and the entire Nation owe Mrs. Buell their thanks for her conservation work, and I want to add, particularly, my own feelings of appreciation, and my congratulations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a newsrelease dated January 19, 1962, describing Mrs. Buell's award, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no obection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GARY WOMAN IS WINNER OF AMERICAN MOTORS AWARD

DETROIT.—Mrs. James Buell, of 1111 Ogden Dunes, Gary, Ind., is announced a winner of the ninth annual American Motors Conservation Award for nonprofessional workers in this field.

The award of a bronze plaque, one of ten given to nonprofessional conservationists each year, is scheduled to be presented to Mrs. Buell in June at the 10th anniversary of Save the Dunes Council. Mrs. Buell was nominated for the award by Dr. R. M. Strong, chairman of the Conservation Council, Chicago.

President of Save the Dunes Council, Inc., at the age of 70, Mrs. Buell is continuing her leadership to save the Indiana Dunes, on the Lake Michigan shore, from destruction by industry's bulldozers. In nine years of mustering support for this cause Mrs. Buell has organized an able conservation group. She has traveled hundreds of miles to raise funds, arrange public meetings, and plead her cause with State and National legislators.

In a letter congratulating Mrs. Buell, George Romney, president of American Motors Corp., said: "The awards program was inaugurated in 1953, as a means of publicly recognizing the material and spiritual importance of preserving our renewable natural resources. It is our hope that, as the program continues year by year, it will bring renewed inspiration not only to those receiving the awards, but also to their colleagues in conservation everywhere, and that it will help to focus public thought upon the imperative and continuing need for sound conservation practice."

Passport Ruling a Travesty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, from the Tablet, nationally read Catholic newspaper published in Brooklyn, N.Y., I have clipped a most informative and interesting editorial relating to the confusion and laxity created by the curious and altogether ineffective wording of the State Department's directive with regard to the possible issuance of passports to Communists and their agents.

Since protection of our national security is of paramount concern to all Americans, I ask that this editorial be called to the attention of the Congress and the country by being printed in today's Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PASSPORT RULING A TRAVESTY

Our leaders unique talent, however, unintentional, for often furnishing aid and comfort to the international Communist conspiracy is once more in evidence with the State Department's directive on Communist passports. Disregarding, in a contemptuous manner, congressional representatives of the people on these matters, the Department announced regulations barring such documents to party members, then in the next breath vitiated the purpose of the ruling. This is ostensibly to prevent Soviet agents from traveling to and from the Kremlin with instructions, stolen secrets, funds for propaganda, etc., an essential part of Red spy operations.

Under the new decision, only present CPUSA membership is to be considered grounds for refusal to grant the coveted "badges of honor." Since party machinery could quickly whip up a letter of purported resignation and with no membership cards issued for some years now, proof of current party activity is all but impossible to substantiate—except with the use of positive identification by FBI, CIA, or other counterspys who have successfully infiltrated the organization.

In an apparent nod to liberal-left attacks on unidentified informers, however, the State Department decided the suspected Red must be allowed to examine any evidence and confront any witnesses used against him. This is a "dream" situation as far as the party is concerned, something it has looked forward to with relish for years. Thus the passport official handling the case must, in the words of Senator KARL MUNDT, South Dakota Republican, "choose between two alternative courses of action, both inimical to our Nation's best interests. He will use the U.S. counterspys, exposing them to the enemy and thereby destroying their effectiveness and years of work involved in "planting" them, or he will grant a passport to an individual who as a Communist is a deadly, dedicated enemy of our country.

There was another hitch which the powers-that be were thoughtful enough to eliminate. The official who chooses to safeguard our undercover agents by granting the passport would have violated the Internal Security Act of 1950 which makes it unlawful to issue a passport to an individual whom he knows is a member of a proscribed organization. The Justice Department collaborated with State to remove this snag by ruling that even though the official is aware

of concrete information that the applicant is a Communist, if such is not in the official record he in effect doesn't know it. Like the proverbial monkey, he is to see nothing, hear nothing, say nothing—and the devil take our country's security.

Senator MUNDT foresees the passport authorities involved in such "impossible legal circumstances," and moral ones too, we note, the authorities may refuse to read confidential reports for fear of gaining knowledge which might at a later date make it unlawful for them to approve the issuance of a passport. "If this be the result," said the Senator, "and I do not see how such a result can be avoided under the regulation, should we not then turn the responsibilities for passport issuance over to a roomful of clerk-typists, thus stripping away any and all pretense of a security system, which in fact will not exist?"

All is not black (or red), however. Some see a slight dampening of Communist jubilation over this latest effort to satiate the civil libertarian radicals. By this directive the State Department has thrown a monkey wrench into elaborately planned and laboriously drawn up machinery, in operation some 25 years, by which the Communist Party, U.S.A. steals, duplicates, alters American passports; the Internal Security Subcommittee once stated there were no less than 36 fraudulent devices for this purpose.

Representative FRANCIS WALTER, Pennsylvania Democrat and House Immigration Subcommittee chairman, is to be congratulated on his prompt declaration to introduce remedial legislation in the matter. Such deserves the support of all Americans.

Plight of Minnesota Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED MARSHALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the St. Paul Dispatch, of St. Paul, Minn., has done a real service in reporting on conditions on the Nett Lake and Red Lake Indian Reservations of Minnesota. I call to the attention of the House the conclusion drawn in an editorial appearing on January 23, 1961:

The plight of the Minnesota Indian is serious. There are not enough jobs on the reservations or in nearby communities to develop a stable economy. Living conditions are not good, sometimes primitive. Health care is a problem and so is alcoholism.

But according to an on-the-spot survey of both Nett Lake and Red Lake Reservations by a Dispatch reporter, there are no signs of starvation among the Indians there. There were expressions of resentment that such a suggestion had been made.

Even a superficial examination of Indian problems, however, indicates that they need help to combat poverty and its concomitant problems. What is needed are not only direct relief programs to provide the food and clothes necessary to survive a harsh northern winter, but long-range, self-help programs designed to lessen their dependence on Federal and State agencies.

Many Indian leaders recognize this need and are supporting plans to attract new industries to their reservations which provide more year-round jobs and reduce reliance on seasonal occupations. Some recognize the needs but are not so sure of the methods which should be used to meet them. Other Minnesotans, concerned with these problems, are not all in agreement on the answers either.

One thing is certain. If Minnesota Indians—or Indians anywhere in the United States—are to solve their economic problems, they will require capital, educational opportunities and a coordinated plan of action. The goals of the plan and the methods to achieve them should be carefully laid out by all agencies, local, State, and Federal, with the closest possible participation of the tribal leadership.

The task is a tough and complex one. But it can be done in Minnesota if there is sufficient public interest and support.

Address by Adlai Stevenson Before the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, last Sunday, on the occasion of his receipt of the America's Democratic Legacy Award from the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, Ambassador Adlai Stevenson delivered a moving address on the essential nature of the American democratic heritage. I ask unanimous consent that this fine address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR ADLAI E. STEVENSON BEFORE THE ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE OF B'NAI B'RITH ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RECEIPT OF THE AMERICA'S DEMOCRATIC LEGACY AWARD—HOTEL PLAZA, NEW YORK CITY, SUNDAY, JANUARY 14, 1962

I am deeply grateful for this award and for all these handsome compliments, because I know what friendly feelings underlie them—and these I return in full measure.

I need hardly tell you how deeply I admire and share the greater purpose underlying this award. We live in a time when it is necessary as never before to call attention—serious, meditative, even urgent attention—to the democratic legacy of this Nation. For as the word "legacy" itself implies, our democratic principles are not an heirloom to be kept on the shelf, or a magic wand to be waved without effort, or a plushy patrimony to be enjoyed without work. It is the kind of inheritance which every generation must earn anew—by reconquering the known wisdom of the past, and by wrestling with the unknown hopes and dangers of the present.

Theodore Roosevelt once said: "The most timid rabbit alive is not afraid of a dead issue."

We are all brave enough to be against George III and Negro slavery. But the issues of our own time are another matter. They could scarcely be dreamt of when this Nation was in its first youth. They are fought out in theaters as wide as the world, and extending even to the space beyond. And they are fought out here at home, in our public policies, our schools and churches and synagogues, at our family breakfast tables, and in our secret consciences.

I will not exhaust you with one more attempt to define democracy, or to say what our national goals should be. Democracy itself will always defy definition just because every citizen has a built-in right to formulate definitions of his own.

Defining democracy is like squaring the circle—after centuries of labor, the mathematicians solved the problem by proving that it cannot be solved. And if you complain that that is a paradox, I will reply that democracy's greatest strength is in its acceptance of paradox—and in the room which it allows for the unimaginable, incommensurable possibilities of human nature.

But today democracy here at home and around the world is being strained and tested as never before. And perhaps, you may say, all this talk of paradoxical strength is pretty cold comfort in the face of the raw challenge and vaulting ambition of Communist power. Let me consider that for a minute.

Sometimes we hear the issue between communism and democracy argued as a simple question of efficiency. Communism, the argument runs, has singleness of purpose. It can organize its forces in line with a global strategy. It can mobilize its whole people, send trained agents where it will, divert men and resources secretly into armaments, and terrorize dissenters. It takes full advantage of free debate on our side of the line, but seals off its people from our truth, and feeds them whatever lies it chooses. It hangs up a curtain of secrecy while its agents help themselves to strategic information from our free and open societies.

With all these disadvantages, with all its disorderly debates and cross-purposes, is democracy becoming a luxury we can't afford any more? Is it possibly true, as the Communist leaders love to say, that history really is on their side?

Even if you ask the question in those terms—which are the terms the Communists themselves prefer—I think history since 1945 has already begun to give the answer; and the answer is No.

Communism has yet to be the popular choice of one single nation anywhere on the face of the globe. In the few places where it has extended its control, whether in Czechoslovakia, North Vietnam, or Cuba, it has been in the same classic role—as the scavenger of war and of ruined revolutions.

And we have seen, too, that the high tide can recede: Yugoslavia ceased to be a satellite; Poland achieved a certain measure of internal autonomy; and in more than one country of Africa and Asia, Communist ambassadors have been requested to go home and take their agents with them.

So even in these Communist terms, of sheer efficiency in the struggle between two supposed world systems, the score isn't so one-sided. The promised victory of communism keeps on receding into the future. The juggernaut just doesn't jug. Either democracy is less bumbling than we fear, or communism is less efficient than it claims.

But, of course, this is only one part of the argument. Because beneath this question of efficiency lies a greater and deeper question: efficiency for what? What is their purpose—and what is ours?

It is small wonder that dictatorships look efficient at waging war—whether cold or hot—because a totalitarian government is in its very essence a kind of war machine. Power is the ultimate justification for all its acts, and the extension of power is the chief article of its foreign policy.

The aims of democracy are altogether different. "As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master"—was Lincoln's idea of democracy.

We positively don't want power and domination over others. The greatest triumph of the Marshall plan was not, as Moscow then said, to enslave Europe, but to get it back on its own feet and restore its independence. Our aim in the emerging nations is basically

the same. We strive not for power, but for community—at home and among nations. For community, with all the rich variety and mutual tolerance which it implies, is the proper environment of freedom.

With such fundamentally different aims, how is it possible to compare communism and democracy in terms of efficiency? You might as well ask whether a locomotive is more efficient than a symphony orchestra.

What we do say, and believe to the center of our being, is that our aims are more valid. Democracy takes into account the factor to which communism seems so invincibly obtuse: the unsearchable depths of the mind and spirit of man, who will forever thwart the attempts of dogma and ideology to predict him or to hem him in.

This is the wisdom of humility which is one of democracy's chief glories, and which the totalitarian mind in its vain pride cannot attain. All great students and practitioners of democracy have understood it. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes was once asked by what great principle his judicial opinions were guided, and he said: "I have spent 70 years finding out that I am not God."

And Pasternak's tragic Dr. Zhivago expressed the same thing in his poignant appeal to the zealot who boasted that communism would reshape life. Zhivago answered him:

"Reshaping life. People who can say that have never understood a thing about life. * * * They look on it as a lump of raw material that needs to be processed by them, to be ennobled by their touch. But * * * life is the principle of self-renewal, it is constantly renewing and remaking and changing and transfiguring itself, it is infinitely beyond your or my obtuse theories about it."

Not only aims, but performance, too, must concern us. Let us say that our worldwide aim is a community of nations which, as the United Nations Charter says, will "practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors." Judged by that aim—our own true aim—how is democracy doing? What are the dangers it must overcome?

I think on the basis of our own American experience we can begin by disposing of certain imaginary dangers which we hear about in this country.

There is the fear of racial and cultural difference. It goes back a long way. Even Thomas Jefferson, that most humane and civilized of Americans, was afraid of the melting pots. He predicted that immigrants from European monarchies would import the very political principles from which they had fled, and would even transmit them to their children.

But of course, exactly the opposite happened. This was perceived as early as 1782 by Crevecoeur, who described Americans as a mixture of English, Scotch, Irish, French, Dutch, Germans, and Swedes—to which I think an American of our time might reply, "Monsieur, you ain't seen nothing yet."

And of this promiscuous breed, as he put it, Crevecouer wrote: "He is an American who, leaving behind him all ancient prejudices and manners, receives new ones from the new mode of life he has embraced. * * * We know, properly speaking, no strangers; this is every person's country."

Certainly today we need have no fear of cultural of racial pluralism. We have far to go—but our country has already proved beyond any possible doubt, for ourselves and all the world, that there is no barrier of race or worship or culture which the unflinching practice of democratic brotherhood cannot cross.

May the Anti-Defamation League long continue its noble work in that cause.

There are other fears, compounded of fact and fiction, which are too well known and too long exploded to detain us long. From the extreme right we still hear that the income tax is socialism, socialism is communism, and so freedom is already done for. Or we hear that the real threat is not in the truculent power of Moscow or Peking, but in the freedom of unpopular opinion—or in any authority, be it President or Supreme Court, which refuses to punish error as if it were treason.

Or we hear that the United Nations is a big Communist plot. Some plot—to organize all those votes against yourself.

If you follow that line to the end, you conclude with the discovery that the worst danger of all is democracy itself.

From the radical left, and sometimes from the radical pacifists, we hear other voices of doom. We have great armed forces, they say, therefore our freedom is doomed by a garrison state. Or we have big businesses, therefore democracy is being strangled by greedy monopolies. We have "internal contradictions," as the ideologists love to say—labor versus capital, farms versus cities, importers versus exporters—and, therefore, democracy will soon tear itself to pieces.

As if "internal contradictions" were not the very fuel that makes the engine of democracy run.

You know the fable of Chicken Little who got hit on the head with an acorn and went around screaming "The sky is falling." That's about what all these alarms are worth.

What a pity it is that the nerves of even one American should be frazzled with these mythical dangers, when there are so many real and deeper dangers for democracy to face in our time.

Whoever reads the newspapers knows what they are:

Abroad, through all the emerging world, there is the danger that the hunger for a better life will be used to bait the hooks of demagogs, to bankrupt economies before they get started—and thus to lead unsuspecting millions into communism or some other modern form of tyranny before they have even had a chance to find out what freedom is.

Among the nations of the North Atlantic, which are the economic powerhouse of the free world, there is the danger that this great trading community with its immense creative possibilities, will be frustrated by a vast trans-Atlantic economic duel.

There is the danger that racial prejudice, and the wilder forms of tribal or national chauvinism, will weaken and balkanize the peoples of Afro-Asia—and even of Latin America—and cut them off from the powerful creative economies of the North Atlantic just when this partnership is most vital to their hopes.

There is the danger, so recently illustrated at the United Nations, that the final chapters of the European colonial era will be written in violence and chaos, and the fabric of international peace and law damaged beyond calculation.

All these are dangers for the community of the free—and, therefore, they are also opportunities for the would-be burial squads of communism. We of the West must act to avert them by every means we have. One means will certainly be to evolve, on a scale never yet attempted, an enduring partnership for economic and social growth between the free industrial economies and the aspiring peoples of the world.

These are the tasks of a generation or even of a century. You and I will not live to see them completed. And, indeed, they will not be completed at all unless we Americans, in whose hands so much of the future rests, can learn certain other lessons in our own society and in our habits of thoughts.

We must remember that handsome is as handsome does. Our country has become so conspicuous that every flaw of economic or racial injustice, every debasement of quality, every blemish of bad taste, bad manners, or shoddy self-indulgence is likely to be studied and commented on in the cruel light of world opinion.

We must learn to avoid the false alternatives which sound so good in argument and mean so little in real life. Why argue about total war and total peace when sheer commonsense tells us that the first is unthinkable and the second is unattainable? Why pretend to choose between reliance on armed power and reliance on the friendships and common purposes we can develop in the United Nations when it is perfectly obvious that our national security demands both?

We must apply ourselves to the long and difficult adventure of converting the fearful and suspicious into friends and neighbors. How easy it is for the rich to turn aside from shocking poverty and to say "But they've always lived that way, and democracy is not really for them."

The brute facts of modern life cry out that all men are neighbors. And our national creed says that democracy is for any man who has the courage to attempt it. We must take it upon ourselves to live by these truths, not just where it is easy and obvious to do so, but where it is difficult and dangerous and the counsels of cynicism are loud.

There is a myth that Americans are impatient and give up when the going gets hard. Like most myths, it has some truth to it. We are impatient, but we are not dismayed and thrown into despair by unpleasant surprises.

Both our War of Independence and our Civil War seemed at the outset to promise quick victory. But it was 6 years from Lexington to Yorktown, and 4 from Sumter to Appomattox, and there were Americans available to endure it all.

When the Great Plains and the Pacific coast were opened for settlement, the land and the wealth seemed to be there for the asking. But when hunger and death and defeat came, there were pioneers who turned out to be tougher than they themselves had suspected, and the West was settled.

When the Civil War ended and the 15th amendment was passed, 4 million American Negroes emerged from slavery to what they thought would be paradise. But when they met disappointment and bitter humiliation they and their descendants, from Booker T. Washington to Martin Luther King, reacted as Americans usually do—by working all the harder to reach the goal. And that is still so today.

Sometimes I think that if we Americans had been able to foresee in 1945 what an endless train of disappointments and hard decisions and bitter conflicts we would find in the United Nations, we would never have dared to join it. Perhaps there is something merciful in our lack of foresight.

If our national habit were one of brooding over all the possible pitfalls ahead, there is no telling how often we might have shirked those forbiddingly difficult tasks which a great nation must tackle or perish.

So Americans have tackled many a big and stubborn job and stayed with it to the end. Now history has given us the biggest of all. We are destined to work for the rest of our lives, along with every nation and people who will join us, to build a community of tolerance and peace—a house of freedom which will be big enough, ultimately, for all mankind.

The house will never be finished, for freedom itself is not a static condition but a process and a way of life, utterly unpredictable in the forms which it may evolve. Indeed, the house is already in existence, in a most imperfect and precarious way—and its name is the United Nations.

The United Nations is now in the midst of a lot of criticism, at home and abroad—

much of it from people who would like to restrict the benefits of the charter to one class, one race, or one region. But the United Nations is built for the whole world, and if it tried to satisfy all the sectional views it would end by doing nothing and would soon become an object of contempt.

The United Nations is far from being an object of contempt today. It has never been more vigorous. In the Congo it has supplied the vital force at the vital moment to safeguard the future possibilities of freedom for a united Congolese nation.

Dag Hammarskjold used to say that if you don't like the United Nations, you don't like the world—because the United Nations is first and foremost a reflection of the real world of men and nations, with all their sins and virtues. But it is also something more—something very close to our democratic heritage. It is a standard. It sheds upon the real world the light of moral principles written in the charter. That light may flicker, but it will not be extinguished. And as long as we have strength, it is up to us to cope with the stubborn evils which the light reveals.

I would close with one last thought about that mysterious thing, freedom. The true genius of freedom stems, I think, not from an attitude of warlike defiance, but from an altogether different quality called loving kindness.

The very origin of the word "free" bears me out. From the beginning of recorded language, it has been related to words meaning peace and love. One of these words is "friend." In ancient times you and your family, your clan and tribe—these friends were free; all others in your village were foreign slaves captured in war. The freeman, then, is first of all the beloved, the friend, the man with whom one is at peace.

And now, under our rocket-laden skies, the family which must learn to live together in peace and in love, and therefore in freedom, is the family called man—all three billion of him.

We should not complain that the attainment of this goal is difficult, or even, in any perfect sense, impossible. Our magnificent gift of freedom was forged in difficulty and suffering, and the impossible was always its guiding light.

The St. Lawrence Seaway and Its Progress During the 1961 Season

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Members of the House and the country at large will be interested in reading a speech by Harry C. Shriver on the operations of the St. Lawrence Seaway. Mr. Shriver is general counsel for the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, Massena, N.Y.:

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND ITS PROGRESS DURING THE 1961 SEASON

(A speech by Harry C. Shriver, General Counsel, St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, delivered before the Rotary Club of Watertown, N.Y., on December 13, 1961)

Mr. President, it is a great pleasure to me to be here in Watertown today and to participate in the meeting of your club.

If you will pardon a personal reference, I moved to northern New York on August 1, 1958, and because of my ignorance at that time, your city, I regret to say was to me only a place on the map. During my first year in Massena, Watertown was a place to drive through or fly over on my tripe north and south. But in the last year or more, I have come to have a high regard for your community, and its significance in the history and development of this part of the country.

Nearby, you have some of the finest attractions in the world—a beautiful resort in the summer in the Thousand Islands, skiing nearby in the winter, plus some of the finest fishing to be found anywhere.

In my days as a student in Washington, D.C., on occasions I visited in the galleries of the U.S. Senate and heard debates in the late 1920's. On one occasion, Senator Simeon Fess, of Ohio, then the Senate whip, was being badgered by his Democratic colleagues. His colleagues wanted to know whether President Coolidge, who had previously made his cryptic announcement, "I do not choose to run" would actually run for a third term. Senator Fess said President Coolidge would not be violating the third-term tradition if he did so, since he had been elected President but once, and had served out the unexpired term of President Harding.

The debate turned to politics, and in the course of it, Senator Fess stated that Ohio had certainly contributed its share of statesmen to public life. Whereupon the scholarly Senator William Cabel Bruce, of Maryland, arose and said, "Mr. President, some men are born great, others achieve greatness, and still others come from Ohio."

This statement would be quite out of place in respect to your community. If I recall correctly, some of your native sons have truly achieved distinction in national and international affairs.

I would like also at this time to pay tribute to your club for having such an outstanding individual as Governor Bernard to head up Rotary International District 701.

OPERATIONS

Reverting now to the St. Lawrence Seaway, the past season has been the third year of operations on a toll basis. This has also been one of our most successful seasons, particularly from the standpoint of ship handling, the amount of cargo, and of finances.

It is quite evident that ocean-going vessels were not entirely welcome in some quarters during the first year of our operation or in 1960. When it is considered that the Great Lakes and the old seaway was restricted to but a few small ocean vessels, it is understandable why vessels from the four corners of the globe were looked upon by some with disfavor. Lake masters, both Canadian and United States for many years looked upon the Great Lakes as their private sea. This situation has undergone considerable change. It is now an accepted fact that ocean vessels have found the seaway to be a profitable venture, that they have a legitimate right to ply seaway waters, and that they will come again and again in frequent numbers. The ocean trade, as was anticipated by those familiar with foreign trade, will in all probability increase from year to year with the growth of the economy of the United States and Canada.

You may recall that many of the mishaps and incidents in 1959 were attributable to ocean vessels. During the past year, the seaway fortunately was almost free of accidents or groundings. Of course, there will be occasional groundings and accidents in the future. This is inevitable. We can never be entirely free of them, any more than our Atlantic coast ports, other restricted waters, or indeed the high seas. We can, I believe, look forward to a minimum of such incidents as vessel masters and pilots gain further familiarity with the waters of the St. Lawrence River and the Great Lakes.

It should, of course, be remembered that lake masters and officers were familiar, at least in part, with the St. Lawrence River before the present seaway was constructed. In addition, lake vessels lend themselves to handling more readily than ocean-going vessels, since they have less freeboard and are not so much at the mercy of the elements and the winds as ocean vessels.

By 1961 the pilots operating on the seaway have become more experienced. They have learned to know the channels better than in 1959. They have learned to know the effect of the wind, currents, and the behavior of ocean vessels.

CHANNELS

The deepening of the navigation channels and harbors in the Great Lakes enabled ocean vessels to load deeper than in previous years. This work and dredging is not yet complete and will not be until 1962 or 1963. When this is done it will further assist ocean vessels in carrying a complete payload.

OPEN AND CLOSING

Mother Nature was also of assistance in the seaway operations during the past year. I do not have any statistical data by way of support, but my guess is that there was a little less fog, and certainly less severe weather in the St. Lawrence Valley. The ice cleared the river rather early last spring and the seaway opened on time; namely, on April 15.

This fall was somewhat milder than usual. In the last few days, the water temperature has been in the forties. In past years, at the same time, we have had freezing and considerable ice in the locks.

Although the seaway closed on November 30, a few days grace was allowed, due to the fog and snow, to permit vessels to move out of the river. The last ocean vessel cleared our locks downbound, on Thursday, December 7. Meanwhile, a number of large lakers unloaded their cargo of grain at Montreal and downstream and then were permitted to move upstream into the lakes for winter berthing.

TRAFFIC IN 1961

During the 1961 season there were 7,229 paying vessel transits—cargo and pleasure craft. The cargo vessel transits totaled 6,046. In addition, there were 601 pleasure craft and 582 workboats, such as barges, tugs, scows, etc., making up the total of 7,229 transits.

The number of ocean vessels coming into the seaway increased during the last season, whereas the number of transits of lakers was slightly reduced.

During the past season trends begun in 1960 continued, namely, fewer vessels transited, but they were larger vessels. The large lakers are supplanting the smaller ones. This was contemplated before the seaway was constructed. It was envisaged that with a few exceptions the small lakers would become economically obsolescent.

Another trend is that fewer vessels now transit the seaway in ballast or partially loaded as occurred in 1959 and 1960. In 1959 numerous naval craft entered the seaway for show purposes. Numerous tramp steamers from all over the world also entered hoping to find cargo or a bonanza. Trends and traffic patterns are now becoming established.

Ocean vessels during the past season were loaded deeper. This trend will continue particularly with the completion of the dredging of the connecting channels and harbors in the Great Lakes in 1962 and 1963. The ideal situation will exist when this dredging is completed, and when ocean vessels can load to the maximum permitted by the seaway.

During the past year and to some extent in 1960 more vessels operating in the seaway have been carrying a full payload.

both upbound and downbound. Many of the large lakers carry a cargo of iron ore upbound and grain downstream.

RECENT TRAFFIC MOVEMENTS

The month of October was the highest month, in terms of traffic, since the seaway was opened. It was during this month that iron ore picked up and there was also a large movement of grain.

It is expected that the overall traffic during 1961 will exceed that of last year by approximately 10 to 12 percent. It is also expected that the total traffic, when the final figures are tabulated, will be in the neighborhood of 23 million tons or slightly in excess of this figure.

TRAFFIC VIEWS

We frequently hear reports to the effect that seaway traffic is disappointing, and that the seaway entities are not meeting the schedule of tonnage and of revenue. Most of these reports emanate from one or three sources, either from the Atlantic coast ports, the eastern railroads, or from some association that is promoting a scheme to lift the tolls. The ports and the railroads have always opposed the seaway and would like to see the tolls increased, so that the seaway would provide no competition. Spokesmen for the former groups apparently are very public minded. They are quite concerned that the seaway be self-sustaining. Their argument is that the existing toll rates are insufficient to insure the self-liquidation of the seaway in 50 years. They base their argument, however, only on 2 or 3 years of seaway operations.

The associations that I referred to would like to see the tolls lifted entirely.

TOLL CONSIDERATIONS

When we are discussing traffic and tolls it is well to remember that the toll committees which made the studies recommended the rates consisted of representatives from both United States and Canada. These committees were asked in effect to make predictions of the volume of traffic projected for 50 years, and then arrive at a rate or charges which would assure the maximum use of the seaway and the highest return.

It was always assumed that most of the seaway cargo would consist of bulk cargo, and that the big single commodity would be iron ore. It was anticipated, based on data furnished by the steel mills themselves, that there would be an initial movement of some 10 million tons of iron ore and that this tonnage would continually increase. Thus far the movement in any one year has been in the neighborhood of 3 or 4 million tons. The steel mills, I understand, during the past year have been operating at only 45 to 65 percent of capacity. It should be noted that the iron ore movement out of Quebec and Labrador for the Atlantic coast ports this year also has been below expectations. A good movement of iron ore on the seaway this year, would have put seaway traffic rather close to the operational estimates.

In my opinion it is only a matter of time when the movement of iron ore will be made in vast quantities. For this reason, the seaway entities should be slow in heeding any suggestions to tamper with the toll rates.

PILOTAGE

In 1960 Congress passed a Pilotage Act regulating pilotage on the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River. In the same year the Canadian Parliament passed a statute for the same purpose.

In each country, regulations were issued implementing these statutes. The past season was the first year of operation under this new legislation. As a whole, and insofar as the seaway is concerned, pilotage has worked out satisfactorily. There is room for improvement, but this is to be expected, and will come about through experience.

WINTER WORK

One of the questions frequently asked of me this time of year is "Now that the seaway is closed down, I guess you have nothing to do during the winter." Our Canadian friends tell me that they are often asked the same question.

By way of answer, this is far from the truth. The fact is that the winter months are a busy season. Each winter the Corporation's books are audited by the General Accounting Office. The administrative work continues. There is always correspondence to be handled, meetings with industry groups, and meetings with the staff of the Seaway Authority of Canada preparatory to the opening of navigation the following spring. During the winter months, Congress is in session and the Corporation is asked to make reports on pending bills. The Corporation also has hearings before the Bureau of the Budget and congressional committees each year.

During these months repairs are made and work is performed at the locks which cannot be done during the navigation season. The navigation aids and buoys are examined and repaired, so that they can be reset in the spring.

TOURISTS

Those of you who have visited Massena in the summer, and particularly the Eisenhower lock, know that the seaway and the power project are tourist attractions.

I do not have exact statistics at this time but I can report that more than one-half million tourists visited the Eisenhower lock last summer. This tourist trade is beneficial not merely to Massena but to the Watertown area and all of northern New York.

NEW BRIDGE

The new bridge over the North Channel of the St. Lawrence River leading from Barnhart Island to Cornwall is expected to be completed early next summer. The Massena-Cornwall International Bridge Co., the stock of which is jointly owned by the two seaway entities, plans to have an appropriate ceremony for dedicating the bridge. At that time considerable publicity will be given to the seaway as a tourist attraction.

THE FUTURE

We are living today in a period of tremendous changes, international, political, scientific, social, and industrial.

Today we have a Common Market in Europe. The world is divided politically between the Iron Curtain countries and the free countries. Trade patterns are undergoing significant changes. Foreign trade has not been spectacular, during the past few years. Ocean shipping is often a feast or famine. In 1960, I believe, world shipping was in the doldrums. Yet ocean shipping on the seaway during the last year showed an increase.

The population of our planet in 1900 was about one and one-half billion people. This figure is expected to grow by the year 2000, before the seaway is to be paid off, to more than 6½ billion people.

When we consider that approximately one-third of the population of United States and Canada can be directly served by the seaway; when we consider the vast manufacturing resources and food production in the area surrounding the Great Lakes; when we consider that the population which I just spoke of will need new schools, new hospitals, new homes, new highways, additional power, additional foodstuffs, manufactured goods, and luxuries, we can visualize, in part at least, what the potential of the seaway is.

Now that the seaway is operating successfully, many people wonder why it was delayed so long and how the United States got along without it. We need vision to see the future in the proper perspective. We should not sell the seaway short. We should not reach hasty conclusions of its possible failure. I for one am firmly of the belief that the seaway has untold possibilities.

Refresher Course on Respect to Old Glory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, under our representative form of government every American enjoys many rights and privileges. With each of these privileges there is a corresponding responsibility.

Patriotism is one of the finest virtues of American citizens.

I have read with pleasure and profit an excellent "refresher course" on the proper respect which all Americans owe to the U.S. flag. This refresher course, based on Public Law 829 of the 77th Congress on December 22, 1942, when America was engaged in a great world conflict, was written by one of Washington's most articulate journalists, Morris Cunningham of the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal. It appeared on Veterans Day, November 11, 1961.

Mr. Cunningham's work is an example of the highest type of American journalism, bringing credit to himself and to the influential newspaper he represents.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Cunningham refresher course be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REFRESHER COURSE GIVEN ON RESPECT TO OLD GLORY

(By Morris Cunningham)

WASHINGTON, November 11.—Let's say the Stars and Stripes is passing in a parade and you wish to accord it the proper tribute.

What do you do? Put your hands behind you? Hum the national anthem? Bow your head?

This rather important aspect of proper conduct is called to mind with the passage of another Armed Forces Day and the swirling international situation and its tendency to quicken patriotic impulses.

Fortunately, we do not have to guess, or to glance warily around the crowd and do what other people are doing.

The rules for the proper display and use of the flag of the United States are set forth in Public Law 829 of the 77th Congress, approved December 22, 1942. Your Congressman can supply you with a copy.

In answer to the opening question, the law says:

"During the ceremony of hoisting or lowering the flag or when the flag is passing in a parade or in a review, all persons present should face the flag, stand at attention and salute. Those present in uniform should render the military salute. When not in uniform, men should remove the headdress with the right hand holding it at the left shoulder, the hand being over the heart. Men without hats should salute in the same

manner. Aliens should stand at attention. Women should salute by placing the right hand over the heart. The salute to the flag in the moving column should be rendered at the moment the flag passes."

What about when the national anthem is played and the flag is not displayed? Here's the answer: "All present should stand and face toward the music. Those in uniform should salute at the first note of the anthem, retaining this position until the last note. All others should stand at attention, men removing the headdress.

"If the flag is displayed when the national anthem is played, the same conduct is in order plus the fact that all present should face the flag and salute."

How do you act when you're pledging allegiance to the flag? Civilians stand at attention, with right hand over the heart, the men removing their hats. Persons in uniform render the military salute.

When should the flag be displayed? Here are some of the rules:

"It is the universal custom to display the flag only from sunrise to sunset on buildings and on stationary flagstaffs in the open. However, the flag may be displayed at night on special occasions when it is desired to produce the patriotic effect. * * *

"The flag should not be displayed on days when the weather is inclement. * * *

"The flag should be displayed daily, weather permitting, on or near the main administration building of every public institution. * * *

"The flag should be displayed in or near every polling place on election day. * * *

"The flag should be displayed during school days in or near every schoolhouse."

The law also includes rules as to how, and how not to display the flag:

"The flag should not be draped over the hood, top, sides, or back of a vehicle or of a railroad train or boat. When the flag is displayed on a motorcar, the staff should be fixed firmly to the chassis or clamped to the radiator cap." (In 1942, when the law was enacted, cars still had exposed radiator caps.)

"No other flag or pennant should be placed above or, if on the same level, to the right of the flag of the United States of America, except during church services conducted by naval chaplains at sea, when the church pennant may be flown above the flag during church services for the personnel of the Navy. * * *

"The flag of the United States of America, when it is displayed with another flag against a wall from crossed staffs, should be on the right, the flag's own right, and its staff should be in front of the staff of the other flag. * * *

"The flag of the United States of America should be at the center and at the highest point of the group when a number of flags of States or localities or pennants of societies are grouped and displayed from staffs. * * *

"When flags of two or more nations are displayed, they are to be flown from separate staffs of the same height. The flags should be of approximately equal size. International usage forbids the display of the flag of one nation above that of another nation in time of peace. * * *"

The rules also call for the Stars and Stripes to be hoisted first and lowered last, when displayed with other flags or pennants. No flag or pennant may be placed above the flag of the United States or to the right of it when displayed together.

Our flag may never be used as a drapery or a cover for a ceiling. It must be displayed so that its folds will fall free.

"The flag should never touch anything beneath it, such as the ground, the floor, water, or merchandise. * * *

"The flag should never be fastened, displayed, used, or stored in such manner as will permit it to be easily torn, soiled, or damaged in any way * * * the flag should never be used for advertising purposes in any manner whatsoever."

And finally, this:

"The flag, when it is in such condition that it is no longer a fitting emblem for display, should be destroyed in a dignified way, preferably by burning."

Midland, Mich., Refuses Federal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the town of Midland, Mich., has had the courage to accept local responsibility and refuse Federal aid at a time when the present administration is doing everything within its power to promote such aid. I believe the town of Midland deserves to be complimented for the example it has set. They are saying in effect, "Do as I do, not as I say."

Radio station KGBX, in Springfield, Mo., has rendered an outstanding public-service contribution by pointing out the example of Midland, Mich., to the people in its listening area. I call the attention of Members of Congress to this editorial, which follows, under leave to revise and extend my remarks:

STATION KGBX EDITORIAL

Many cities are proving that they can solve their own problems quicker, cheaper, and better without Federal bureaus telling them what to do. This is a fact Washington certainly won't want to accept especially since the administration has laid out grandiose plans for an urban affairs program.

Midland, Mich., is a chemical center of nearly 30,000 people in central Michigan. Last summer Midland revolted against the widespread philosophy that Federal aid costs nothing and therefore should be sought at all times. The city council voted unanimously not to reach for a Federal subsidy to help build a new $2.7 million sewage treatment plant. The board of education decided to discontinue Midland's participation in the Federal-State school lunch program, thereby giving up almost $12,000 in Federal-State money and surplus foods. Midland traditionally has relied on local initiative and cooperation with surrounding communities to satisfy local needs. C. E. Arnold, manager of the Midland Chamber of Commerce said: "Our whole thought is that we should stand on our own feet and pay our own way. Whatever you get back from the Federal Government you get back at a reduced rate. There is always a brokerage fee to be paid along the way. Moreover, you can't get back from the Government what it does not have. Whatever it provides it must get from the people. When you do it yourself without Federal tax dollars, you make your own plans, dictate your own terms, and get what you want." Council member H. C. Allison, of Midland, stated: "We think that Federal aid tends to destroy initiative, responsibility, and creativity: the moral fiber of America. We strongly advise any community to be objective about considering use of Federal aid. They should ask themselves what is the cost over and above the dollars involved."

KGBX certainly concurs in these thoughts of the city of Midland, Mich. Certainly State and Federal aid has its place in financing disaster relief, road construction, airport construction and similar projects which are used by or are important to people outside of the local area concerned.

There are instances where assistance in developing areas which have potential importance to the State and Nation is justifiable. But we feel State and Federal agencies should only consider participation in the financing of those projects which are of State or nationwide concern and for the relief of distress that is caused by conditions beyond local control.

All officials, county, city, school, and township should adopt a similar stand and refuse outside aid in performing what is normally a function of local government. If we don't start opposing such offers and plans we very probably will wake up some morning to the fact that the only way to get the street fixed in front of our home is to ask Washington. Heaven only knows the redtape we could expect under such a plan—a plan that would move the city halls of every major city in the land to Washington, D.C. We can only hope that enough cities will take the stand that Midland, Mich., did and refuse Federal aid at every opportunity that could be met by local funds administered locally.

Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following script of an editorial radio broadcast, under date of January 24, 1962, by station WETZ, of New Martinsville, W. Va. I agree wholeheartedly with Loraine Eubanks and commend her for these most timely remarks:

RADIO WETZ PRESENTS LORAINE EUBANKS, RADIO WETZ NEWS EDITOR, WITH A RADIO WETZ EDITORIAL OF THE AIR

Chester Morris, the actor, presently playing in Milwaukee in a political play, "Advise and Consent," said in an interview that "Politics is a dirty game" whether it's played in real life or on the stage.

POLITICS IS NO SUCH THING

It is the art of government. It is, as Woodrow Wilson said, "The science of ordered progress of society along the lines of greatest usefulness and convenience to itself." W. E. Gladstone believed that "Politics and theology are the only two really great subjects."

There is, of course, dirty politics. There are also immoral actors, dishonest bankers, hypocritical clergymen, lawyers who pervert the law, and butchers who put their thumbs on the scales along with the steak. But that is not to condemn the stage, banking, the church, the law, or meat markets. The bad men in any legitimate field are in the minority.

One big reason why standards of government are not higher and better qualified men do not run for office is that too many people carelessly condemn politics and politicians.

Too many call politics "dirty" and don't know what they are talking about. For every bad politician there are 100 good ones. Just a dirty game? No.

The Gap in Medical Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a penetrating editorial analysis by the Harrisburg Patriot-Evening News of January 25, 1962, on "The Gap in Medical Care." This deals with a problem which has been troubling me ever since my election.

The debate is raging on whether to provide medical care under the social security program or under the present Kerr-Mills act, plus the Blue Shield and Blue Cross proposals which the medical profession and the Blue Cross have suggested, and on which those two organizations are working. But how can either of these proposals actually give real protection to the sick and injured if we lack the skilled doctors to take care of them? The promise of such care would be a delusion.

Medical missionary work is one of our best ways of improving conditions in the underdeveloped areas. Nothing can establish good will toward the United States more quickly than improving health conditions and relieving pain and suffering in those areas.

Furthermore, if we do not attempt to do this, the Soviets will undoubtedly step in. In June 1961 the Soviets graduated 16,000 doctors. We graduated 7,400—the highest number in our history. About 2,000 of the Soviet 16,000 were trained in so-called "international medicine." This means they were trained to promote Soviet political interests while functioning as doctors.

My son is a surgeon. He just come back from serving in that capacity for 6 months in Leopoldville in the Congo. He tells me that there are less than 20 qualified Western doctors for the 16 million Congolese, according to the best information he could obtain. Also, that he was the only doctor in the Congo at that time who could remove a lung.

Both from our domestic standpoint, and from our foreign relations standpoint, we must increase our trained medical personnel.

The College Academic Facilities Act is coming to the Floor on Tuesday, January 30. I can find no specific provisions in that act concerning the building of medical facilities or helping young men to attain their medical degrees. It certainly seems to me that this should be one of the major objectives of this legislation. Our space program and our scientific research are tremendously important, and I do not mean to remove emphasis on them. However, in the long run, our medical program is equally important. Again I reiterate—what real benefit will either medical care under social security or medical care under the Kerr-Mills Act, plus the Blue Cross-Blue Shield plans be, unless qualified professional personnel are available to carry them out?

There is another important consideration. I served on the board of the Capital Hospital Service—(the local Blue Cross in my area)—for a number of years. Blue Cross enabled many people who otherwise could not have afforded to go to the hospital, to have hospitalization. Blue Cross has been, and is, a fine program, but the costs have been increasing steadily because of the steady rise in the number of Blue Cross subscribers who have availed themselves of hospital facilities. Rates have always been a problem. Furthermore, this increased tremendously the occupancy of all hospitals. It was a major cause of the hospital shortage.

This is clear eidence that when the Kerr-Mills Act becomes fully operative and the new Blue Shield and Blue Cross programs take effect, there will be an inevitable and enormous increase in the demand for medical services. If medical care under social security should go into effect, the demand would be even greater. The doctor shortage is almost sure to grow more acute no matter what Congress decides to do about the medical care question.

The editorial follows:

THE "GAP" IN MEDICAL CARE

As debate centers on medical care for the aged and the means to pay for it, the less publicized issue of aid to medical schools and students tends to be overlooked.

The irony is this: Our senior citizens could find themselves better able to afford medical care but less able to find the doctors to give that care. More than that, our Nation's health in general could suffer.

For the past generation, our national ratio of physicians to population has held steady. But it won't in the future, authorities warn, unless our medical schools can turn out 40 percent more students than the 7,000 a year now graduating.

Yet as supply diminishes, need increases. Our population boom is only part of the story. People are living longer, and older persons require the most medical attention. In addition, all age groups are seeing doctors more often today. In 1930 the average adult visited a doctor 2.5 times a year; today it's twice that. Increased hospital insurance is one reason. Another is urbanization; city people see physicians more than their rural cousins.

Limited capacity of our medical schools is part of the problem. At least 20 new schools, some authorities say more, are needed by 1975. A Senate study estimated adequate expansion costs as a minimum $100 million a year for a decade. School operational costs have skyrocketed, too, rising 300 percent in a 15-year period.

Another part of the problem is today's medical students. They are declining both in academic quality and quantity.

In the past decade the number of straight-A applicants has fallen from 40 to 16 percent, while B-average applicants have jumped from 43 to 70 percent. Even more critical is the decline from 24,000 applicants in 1950 to only 15,000 in 1960.

One reason is that medicine is no longer the glamour profession it used to be. Today's hero is the nuclear physicist. But the biggest reason lies in the cost of $12,000 for today's medical education. Scholarships available cover only 5 percent of the total costs with students and their families supplying more than 80 percent of the funds needed in recent years. By contrast, a student deciding on a Ph. D. in a physical science finds numerous full-cost scholarships available. It is little wonder that the 8 percent of our families with incomes over $10,000 supply 40 percent of our doctors.

Change in medical care is already noticeable. The more patients a doctor must see, the less time he can give to them individually. In 1930 the average physician saw 50 patients a week; today he sees more than twice that. What will it be by 1975? Even more striking is the decline in home calls: from 44 percent of all visits in 1930 to 10 percent now. Again, what will it be by 1975?

Even if appropriations for new schools were made today and scholarships provided, conditions would grow worse before they improved. It takes a minimum of 3 years to plan, build, and staff a medical school. Then it takes another 5 years before its first graduates hang out their shingles.

There is no time to waste. There is no valid reason why Congress should not approve at this session legislation similar to that proposed by President Kennedy last year and reiterated by Secretary Ribicoff just this week in testimony before the House Commerce Committee. It would establish the needed scholarships and would make funds available for a building program.

Military Rivalries Spur New Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two articles by James McCartney on procurement problems of the Defense Department, which appeared in the Chicago Daily News for November 16–17, 1961, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. These articles are the final ones in the excellent series by Mr. McCartney, the first of which I inserted in the RECORD several days ago.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILITARY RIVALRIES SPUR NEW WASTES: SERVICES INSIST ON KEEPING SEPARATE SUPPLY PROGRAMS

(By James McCartney)

WASHINGTON.—Rivalry among the Army, Navy, and Air Force—amounting at times to open warfare—is visible in the raw in the procurement field.

For example, each of the services continues to maintain its own independent network of hospitals and medical services—with Army, Navy, and Air Force doctors.

A Senate committee has pointed out that more than half of the beds in the hospitals are normally empty.

In city after city in the United States half-empty hospitals of one service are within a few miles of half-empty hospitals of another.

Not long ago the Air Force Hospital at Langley Air Force Base, Va., with a capacity of 217 beds, was caring for 62 patients. Six miles away the Army has a 141-bed hos-

pital at Fort Monroe, Va., with an average of 20 patients.

Congressional committees, two Hoover Commissions, and the Budget Bureau have recommended repeatedly that medical services be combined to save money.

But the Joint Economic Committee of Congress says the vitiating effects of interservice rivalry have prevented it.

This same situation is duplicated in other ways, creating waste that costs the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars annually.

The services have refused to give up separate corps of chaplains—as though they were worshiping separate Army, Navy, and Air Force gods.

One service has a half-empty warehouse. Another service, rather than using it, is building one of its own a few miles away.

One service has surplus property—perhaps blankets. It sells them cheaply as surplus. Another service needs blankets, buys them new.

One service has too many uniform buttons, but another service buys new ones because they have buttons of a different design.

The Joint Economic Committee lays the blame on the desire of the military departments, services and agencies to remain autonomous."

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara has attacked this problem by creating the new defense supply agency, which will attempt to get the services together in the medical field as well as several others.

These examples are cited only to illustrate the depth of competitive feelings that exist among the services, feelings that contribute greatly to McNamara's problems in attempting to hammer out decisions in the national interest.

For the fact is that open rivalries among the services invite political pressures into the Pentagon that might otherwise be absent.

Says a congressional student of the Pentagon, a man who has watched the battles rage for nearly 20 years:

"The services frequently seek the aid of outsiders to help fight their battles. Each has built up its own group of Congressmen and defense contractors to help them fight for what they want."

The result is that each of the services can—and sometimes does—bring enormous political and economic pressure to bear on Defense Department officials and on the White House itself.

There are indications that this pattern is already shaping up in the Air Force campaign to get McNamara to spend money Congress appropriated for manned bombers.

Congress provided the Defense Department with $514,500,000 it had not asked for—siding overwhelmingly with the Air Force.

McNamara said "No" a few weeks ago, but some Congressmen and Senators have already indicated that they con't intend to take "No" for an answer.

At this stage the Army and Navy are simply sitting back and watching the fun, but it is certain that each has something it thinks is more important to national defense than more planes for the Air Force.

The pressures generated by the services, the Congressmen and the defense contractors almost always are in the direction of spending more for defense.

The services want new weapons, more elaborate weapons systems; the contractors want contracts; the Congressmen want to keep contractors in their districts busy and to keep employment high.

A classic example of interservice competition, with all of its complex ramifications, was turned up by a House subcommittee headed by Representative F. Edward Hébert, Democrat, of Louisiana.

The case involved an Army-Air Force dispute over two antiaircraft missile systems—the Army's Nike-Hercules and the Air Force's Bomarc.

Each of the services made contacts with Congressmen and Senators, hauled in contractors who would build the respective systems.

Executives of the Boeing Airplane Co., which was to build the Bomarc, told how they contacted Senator Henry Jackson, Democrat, of Washington, and Representative Don Magnuson, Democrat, of Washington.

"We cover every place we can cover when we have a story to tell," declared Wellwood E. Beall, Boeing's senior vice president.

On the Army's side, promoting the Nike-Hercules was the Western Electric Co., prime contractor for the project.

Western Electric executives also told of political contacts they made—including Gov. Luther Hodges of North Carolina, now Secretary of Commerce, and a Congressman and a Senator from North Carolina, where the contracts would be let.

Both companies ran advertisements in Washington (D.C.) newspapers extolling the virtues of their systems while Congress was debating which system to support with appropriations.

In a serious study of Defense Department organization, the privately financed Rockefeller Bros. fund reported that interservice rivalry is not fundamentally due to parochialism on the part of military leaders.

The fund's report said that the basic cause is that modern weapons have "tended to overlap the traditional boundaries among the services"—thus bringing them naturally into conflict.

Former Air Force Secretary Thomas K. Finletter said the same thing in another way when he observed that interservice rivalry is a built-in part of the present organization of the Defense Department.

Service pressures along with pressures from other sources, create major problems in the operation of the defense program.

At the moment top defense officials believe the pressures are being held in check, but they frankly acknowledge that they pose great dangers.

The Relentless Tide: U.S. Defense Pressure—A One-Way Road—There's No Lobby Actively Battling to Lower Spending

(By James McCartney)

Washington.—Political pressures on the defense program flow in a relentless tide—one way.

There, in a nutshell, lies the problem.

Congressmen and Senators seek defense contracts and installations for their districts or States, striving to keep employment high.

Defense contractors, understandably, seek all of the defense business they can engender and get.

The Army, Navy, and Air Force seek, in great sincerity, larger military budgets, better weapons systems.

Frequently these three great forces, with immense resources to influence spending policies as well as public opinion, operate in concert.

But * * *

There is no lobby for lower defense spending—no lobby actively seeking to hold the $50-billion-a-year defense machine in check.

Former President Eisenhower described the problem as saying that pressures for defense spending—from each of the three primary sources—were all in one direction.

Deputy Defense Secretary Roswell L. Gilpatric, who is fully aware of the dangers, agrees.

In effect, says Gilpatric, the burden of containing the pressures rests on the civilian secretaries of the Defense Department and on the President.

But few applaud if their answer to a spending request is "No."

The stakes in this game are high.

Mr. Eisenhower warned that unwarranted influence by the military-industrial complex could endanger our liberties or democratic processes.

"The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist," he said.

Gilpatric says this was the most significant message Mr. Eisenhower ever delivered to the American people, and wonders only why he waited until 3 days before he left office to deliver it.

"It's a very great risk," Gilpatric adds. "But I think our system is capable of dealing with it."

Gilpatric, a former Wall Street lawyer with a Phi Beta Kappa key from Yale, believes that only a strong executive in the White House, backed by an informed public opinion that understands the nature of the pressures, can adequately do battle.

He also believes that the pressures are inevitable in a democracy in which defense industries operate in the "private sector."

But he does not believe that the pressures are "sinister"—although he can recall exceptions—and he does not believe that they have gotten out of control.

"Pressures on the other side—opposing spending—are more generalized," he says.

"They come from the President, the budget people, the Treasury Department, and sometimes, generally, from the business and financial community.

"But," he adds, "this never translates into much support.

"The question," says Gilpatric, "is whether the counterbalancing forces, particularly the civilian secretaries of the Defense Department, are strong enough.

"It all depends on the quality of the people."

Have we had strong enough men—do we have them now?

It is difficult to answer with certainty.

Today's civilian leaders have loosened up the defense pursestrings to the extent of $6 billion this year to strengthen the Armed Forces generally and to prepare for the Berlin crisis.

But they are finding that even this sum has not satisfied many military leaders.

The three military services have reportedly requested an additional $11 billion in defense spending in next year's budget.

This would mean a defense budget of upward of $60 billion of which Gilpatric says is "out of the question." President Kennedy has said, however, that he will ask for at least some additional defense funds next year.

Stories of political influence in the Defense Department are a dime a dozen in Washington.

All a reporter has to do is talk with almost any contractor who has lost out on a contract—and there are usually several losers for every winner. Proving their charges—usually passed out on a "confidential not for attribution" basis—is something else.

There are documented cases where contracts have changed hands after political pressure was exerted—but none in which the Defense Department will admit that pressure was the reason for the switch.

A mid-level official at the Pentagon says: "Political and economic pressures play at least some role in the awarding of almost every major contract. We don't live in a vacuum."

Members of a Senate-House Subcommittee on Defense Procurement, headed by Senator Paul Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois, believe that the doors to the Pentagon are wide open to pressure because 60 percent of all defense contracts are awarded without competition.

Says Ray Ward, a procurement expert on the subcommittee's staff: "When a contract is negotiated, without competition, no one on the outside can tell what factors may have influenced the contract award."

To this Senator DOUGLAS adds: "The negotiated contract opens the door to all kinds of political abuses, to pressures from contractors, from local communities, from the military services, as well as to parochial pressures placed on Members of Congress from communities."

Defense Department officials insist, however, that there are so many checks and balances in the contract awarding system that the exercise of "influence" is nearly impossible.

Perhaps the most agonizing aspect of the entire struggle between opposing forces is that no one can be sure—least of all a civilian outsider—precisely what is necessary to guarantee national survival.

No one quarrels with need for a strong defense program in a world in which the Nation's survival is threatened.

But some want to spend more. Others believe we have already gone too far in building an economy which depends so strongly on military expenditures.

The simple and yet incredibly complex equation—how much defense equals adequate protection—is under constant review by the administration.

On a recent CBS-TV program, Mr. Eisenhower summed up his feelings about overall problems posed by the existence of the military-industrial complex.

He mentioned each of the principal kinds of pressure—those from manufacturers, the military and from Congress.

"Now this brings together," he said, "a tremendous economic unit producing for one thing * * *

"The thing we must do," he said, "is to use our commonsense * * * not to give way to these pressures * * * except as we need to.

"I'm not saying there is anything venal here. I'm just saying it's a natural influence that is created by this enormous munitions industry and by all of the people that are pushing in that direction.

"And this means that it takes strong men to stand against it if it goes too far."

Services Balk At Unified Supply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, for almost two decades congressional committees, the Hoover Commissions and others have studied the sprawling Defense Establishment and hoped that some day we would have a Secretary of Defense with the necessary energy, capacity, and courage to reorganize its many services and functions into an effective unit that would also be economical and efficient.

Many of us have been highly pleased at the results of the Secretary's first year in office particularly with respect to integrating defense supply activities under his authority in the McCormack-Curtis amendment to the DOD Reorganization Act of 1958. I am somewhat dismayed therefore in view of the record of Secretary McNamara to find that service partisans are attempting to undermine public confidence in him by giving him faint praise and the stiletto simultaneously.

The following article which appeared in the New York Times of January 18, 1962, illustrates to subtle approach to this matter:

AN UNEASY MILITARY—I: MCNAMARA'S INNOVATIONS AROUSE PLEA FOR UNDERSTANDING HUMAN LEADERSHIP

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The necessity for understanding leadership and a greater use of the human brain, human values, and military judgment is stressed in three current military articles. Two are in service magazines.

The articles, by different authors on different aspects of service problems, were published by coincidence almost the same time. They emphasize four reasons for the uneasiness that many military men have felt increasingly the last year since Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara started a quiet revolution in the Pentagon's organization and methods.

Mr. McNamara's innovations have leaned heavily on former staff members of the Rand Corp., a nonprofit, private analysis organization, which has done many studies for the services, particularly the Air Force.

Calculating machines, quantitative and qualitative analyses, a new system of budgeting called program packaging and close centralized control, with Mr. McNamara personally holding most of the strings, have characterized the new military administration.

A QUICK MIND

Mr. McNamara's quick mind, ferocious energy and decisiveness and analytical ability have made a tremendous impact on the military in his year in office.

Some things that badly needed doing have been done, and there is no doubt that our Armed Forces are stronger and readier today—at the price of course, of an increased budget—than they were a year ago.

There has been, nevertheless, an undercurrent of uneasiness in the services, particularly the Army, which is discussed in these articles.

The articles concentrate on four points that Mr. McNamara's critics have made repeatedly in private: that the Secretary thinks too much in terms of machines or things rather than people; that he is a "human calculating machine" and relies too much on operational analysis techniques; that professional military judgment and advice are insufficiently emphasized by the new Pentagon administration and that the decisionmaking process has been overcentralized in Mr. McNamara's hands.

The frankest article, unsigned, is entitled "On Understanding Armies." It is in the January issue of Army magazine, and has the following introduction:

"It is evident that our Secretary of Defense and many of the men around him are most exceptional. The Secretary himself is intelligent, decisive, and courageous. He knows organization. He has an immense capacity to absorb facts. He has a willingness to innovate. He works very hard, and he learns very fast.

"One would expect that under such a Secretary of Defense the Army would be happy. But you don't have to be a very sensitive observer to know that this isn't the case. In investigating the causes for this, we heard many ideas expressed. Some were preposterous and others lacked substance. But from our conversations the following significant theme emerged."

SUFFERED MANY BLOWS

The theme in the article states that if the Secretary and "other officials around him" do not "understand armies, they do not understand war and men at war, and it is their business to understand these things."

"Perhaps 'understand' is not the right word," the article continues. "There is a certain visceral comprehension involved, which goes beyond what the completely rational man can 'understand.' Henry Stimson [late Secretary of War] and Robert Lovett [former Secretary of Defense] had this awareness. So does Mr. Acheson [Dean Acheson, former Secretary of State]. But high intelligence does not guarantee its acquisition."

The article describes the peculiar characteristics of land armies, "their capacity for deep, prolonged, sustained continental war around the globe," their conservatism, closeness to allies and the people. It points out that in the last 15 years the Army has suffered many blows.

"At the headquarters level the past year has been perhaps the most bruising of all," the article says.

But the Army is sound, the article concludes, and "all it needs is understanding leadership."

Tax-Paying Senior Citzens of Sioux City, Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a resolution sent to me by the Tax-Paying Senior Citizens of Woodbury County, Sioux City, Iowa, expressing their views on pending legislation. Much attention is being given to the welfare of our senior citizens these days, and I thought the Members of the House might be interested in the views of this group in my district:

RESOLUTION

We the taxpaying senior citizens of Woodbury County, Sioux City, Iowa, do not see eye to eye with our President concerning certain proposals which he wishes this 87th Congress to pass and become law.

Listed below are some of the measures that we would like to see defeated:

No. 1. Medical aid for senior citizens hooked to social security. If Congress wishes to help the senior citizens let it boost the social security payments and let the citizens pay their own medical aid. We are not in favor of this country going in for socialized medicine. We believe this new proposal is one step in that direction.

No. 2. Federal aid for education. We believe that each State ought to take care of their educational programs coupled up with the local communities.

No. 3. We hope Congress will not allow Mr. Kennedy to increase our national debt to over $300 billion. We are not all born with a gold spoon in our mouth. If private business managed their business like our Federal Government does they would all go bankrupt within a very short time.

No. 4. The farm program. This is surely a mess. After spending billions of dollars trying to help the farmer the program is still a political vote-getting scheme. Why don't you do something about this mess?

No. 5. Postal rates. We can see no necessity of raising these rates. If a little commonsense and economy could be exercised

we are sure there would need to be no deficit every year.

No. 6. Tax revision. Certainly Congress will not give Kennedy or any other President full authority to raise and lower taxes as they see fit. We hope you will take off your shoe and pound your table so they will know you are around and want to be heard.

Stewart C. Rogers, 3739 Jones, Sioux City, Iowa.

Mrs. D. C. Searls, 725 38th Street, Sioux City, Iowa.

Mrs. Fritz Fritzson, 3732 Jones Street, Sioux City, Iowa.

G. H. Galbraith, 19 13th Street, Sioux City, Iowa.

Mrs. Ado Olson, 6 13th Street, Sioux City, Iowa.

Roy H. Garlock, 212 East 20th Street, South Sioux City, Iowa.

Lee Cunningham, 1716 Nebraska Street, Sioux City, Iowa.

W. G. Forster, 509 16th Street, Sioux City, Iowa.

Gordon H. Knotts, 405 23d Street, Sioux City, Iowa.

S. M. Fouts, 2113 Preice Street, Sioux City, Iowa.

L. O. Hoffman, 3206 Summit, Sioux City, Iowa.

R. D. Hissong, 3715 Nebraska Street, Sioux City, Iowa.

C. E. Mason, 1808 Nebraska Street, Sioux City, Iowa.

Luella E. Grace, 306 South Johns, Sioux City, Iowa.

Florence Schwalm, 813 17th Street, Sioux City, Iowa.

Mrs. B. B. Dodds, 2511 Virginia, Sioux City, Iowa.

Blanche Springer, 3239 Douglas, Sioux City, Iowa.

Edna Stauffer, 202 Castle Apartments, Sioux City, Iowa.

Frona Davidson, 5322 Perry Creek Road, Sioux City, Iowa.

E. E. Anderson, 1901 Douglas.

E. L. Swanson, 1700 Jackson.

Eleanor Pederson, 507 23d.

Rose Parsons, 3121 Douglas.

Florence Nye, 1923 Grandview.

Elizabeth M. McIntyre, 606 20th Street.

American Legion Contest Winner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the American Legion of Monroe County has announced the winner of its 25th annual oratorical contest. She is Sherry Ritchlin, of Pittsford, N.Y., and she will represent Monroe County in the eight-county contest to be held at Seneca Falls-February 4. Second was Gabriele Wickert, of Our Lady of Mercy High School, and John J. Attinasi, of Aquinas Institute.

The girls certainly came out on top in this contest, which is one of the fine community efforts sponsored by the American Legion of Monroe County. Excerpts from Sherry Ritchlin's winning oration were printed in the Rochester Times Union and show a high sense of purpose and idealism.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include the excerpts and a newspaper account of the contest in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the speech and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GIRL WINS ORATORICAL CONTEST

A 17-year-old Pittsford High School senior who composes tone poems for the piano won the 25th annual Monroe County American Legion oratorical contest last night.

Sherry Ritchlin, daughter of Dr. and Mrs. Raymond F. Ritchlin of 26 Butternut Drive, Pittsford, placed first among eight contestants. She will represent Monroe County February 4 in an eight-county contest at Seneca Falls.

Gabriele Wickert, 15, a junior at Our Lady of Mercy High School, was second and John J. Attinasi, 17, a junior at Aquinas Institute, was third.

The contest was based on presence, poise, personality, composition, effectiveness, accuracy, oratory and power to convince.

Sherry received another speaking honor recently when the young people of Pittsford's First Presbyterian Church chose her to give the annual youth sermon in a few weeks.

The American Legion Women's Auxiliary chose Sherry last summer to represent Monroe County at Girls State in New Paltz. She was nominated there for governor, missed by a few votes and then was elected secretary of state.

Now taking her fourth year of French at Pittsford High, she plans to major in philosophy and minor in languages at one of three colleges to which she has applied—Middlebury, Skidmore, or Oberlin. She's on the debating team at Pittsford High.

Sherry doesn't intend to neglect her piano studies while at college, her mother said. She'll study theory at college and during summers at Eastman School of Music.

Other contestants last night were David J. Hicks of Churchville-Chili; Ann S. Kastner of Nazareth Academy, Albert J. Klemmer of St. Andrew's Seminary, Joseph Mancini of McQuaid High School and Joanne Reina of St. Agnes High School.

Judges were Sister Rose Alice, Nazareth College; Rev. John P. Dorsey, St. John Fisher College; Mrs. Theodore Michelseld, Rochester Institute of Technology; John Muldoon, Optimist Club, and Mrs. Geraldine Sheer, University of Rochester.

A HARSH, STAID SOUND—BUT OUR CONSTITUTION MEANS SO MUCH, STUDENT SAYS

(Excerpts from the winning speech by Sherry Ritchlin are printed below.)

The art of communication is a strange device. It implies, in a sense, a mutual understanding of expression between two people. Just as the instrument of art is form and the instrument of music is tone, the instrument of communication is words.

But art and music are always developing new personalities and finding new outlets for expression while words remain essentially the same through the centuries with little variations in meaning or subtle nuance.

We hear them over and over again from the time we are born and we begin to apply them with a promiscuity that hardly befits their art. We suddenly begin speaking to each other in empty syllables, using the old familiar phrases in trite ways that have lost their depth of meaning.

Americans today, if they wish to move forward in the world and in time with their traditional power and dignity, must revive and develop this art once more.

The same is true in the consideration of their literature, for literature is an innate part of the culture of a civilization and is uniquely identified with its people, their triumphs, their disasters, and the ideals which rise above their mundane and prosaic existences.

The word "constitution" has a harsh, staid sound. It relates a somewhat stiff picture of legal formality, rules and regulations, and the impersonal quality of a political document.

And yet no words were ever drawn from a framework of higher ideals, deeper devotion and sacrifice, and the blood, sweat, and tears that men of the 19th and 20th centuries were shedding under a tattered banner of peace and freedom.

Man stands always with his eyes lifted above the hills and his feet plunged deep into his native earth. He is a restless spirit, searching, soaring, wondering, believing, disbelieving, and weaving an indestructible web of his own essence across the lively and barren landscapes of eternity.

Crush every living figure, and all their civilizations, muffle their laughter and drain their tears, and man will still rise from the dust and darkness to draw his web further into time and space.

Man is proud; and he has a strong will, and for the first time in all of history it was the will of the people which became the structure of their government—the will to be free, to grow, and to progress.

But because this document (the Constitution) is alive, because it is hidden in the very heartbeat of the American people, it must be nourished, protected, and worshiped by us, the keepers of its sacred ideal.

Its words are written into the common everyday life of America's cities. And every American must stop and listen to its words, speaking above the roar of the factories, the rumble of the cities, and the quiet sounds of the farm, for its supremacy is the very life of each one of these things.

There will be those who will distort it, who will attempt to mold it to new shapes, and treat it as a flexible rubberband.

But it is rigid; as rigid as the steel girders upon which our skyscrapers are mounted. It can't be changed; it can't be molded; it can't be ignored. America must progress. It is the nature of her personality.

Just as we are unable to put into words the quality which sent Americans, as well as other men, to hundreds of different battlefields throughout the world, we cannot stop at the sound of words when reaching toward our future. We must understand the words of the Constitution; we must feel the words, and, most of all, we must live them.

If the Constitution walks among us as a living, breathing, dominating creature, the art of democracy is eternal.

National Food Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we as a nation, are blessed with an abundant and invaluable food resource. The efficiency and high productivity of the American farmer has created a plentiful supply of food to meet—in fact far exceed—the needs of our people.

By contrast, there are hundreds of millions of people around the world living on inadequate diets.

Food then can—and should—not only serve us well at home; but also be utilized more effectively in support of our foreign policies.

Over the weekend, I was privileged to discuss the need for an improved food

policy over Wisconsin radio stations. I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of my ideas printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY PROPOSES NATIONAL FOOD RESERVE

Friends, our Nation today finds itself faced by broadscale challenges in many fields—at home and abroad.

Now, I would like to discuss with you a problem of major significance—not only to farmers—but to folks in the cities—or wherever you may live: that is, better utilization of our national food resources.

By mechanization and efficiency, the farmer—in Wisconsin and elsewhere in the Nation—has created the greatest food-production plant in the world. By a high level of productivity, he has provided an adequate—in fact, a surplus—supply of good, healthful foods for consumers, at moderate prices.

Unfortunately, however, the blessings of plenty have also become an "economic headache." Why? Because the stockpiling of surpluses has become costly to the taxpayer; and, also, price depressing for the farmer.

Currently, the $4½ billion worth of surpluses—including dairy products, grain, and other commodities—for example, cost over $1 million for storage alone.

The situation, too, threatens to get more serious. According to agricultural experts, the Nation—by 1980—just 20 years ahead—may be able to meet domestic and foreign needs with 50 million acres less than are now being cultivated. In dairying, also, the trend is toward fewer—though larger—dairy farms—with the output per cow increasing; since 1934, for example, output has climbed from 4,000 pounds per cow to 11,000 pounds in 1960.

How can we not only more effectively handle the surpluses, but also better utilize our valuable and abundant food resources for the future? Generally, we need more creative efforts to further improve the already high dietary standards of our people; and, particularly, "lift" the nutritional levels of the minority still, unfortunately, existing on inadequate diets; attempt to maintain a relatively good supply-demand balance; as possible, find more industrial and commercial uses for dairy and other food commodities; and, generally, utilize food more effectively both in domestic and foreign policies.

The Nation, I believe, should also seriously consider the establishment of a national food reserve. The purpose would be to more effectively and flexibly use food to serve our nutritional and strategic goals. How could such a reserve be established? By the following steps:

1. Authorizing a study by the Department of Agriculture, Office of Emergency Planning, and the Office of Civil Defense of the Defense Department, to determine the kind and size of food reserve that would best serve (a) the Nation, as a whole, in case of attack or other national emergency; and (b) our citizens, individually, under such circumstances.

2. The development of a concentrated food package, by cooperative efforts of Government and private enterprise, to meet emergencies—individual and national.

3. Citizens—individually, and as families—as well as school, municipal, or other community units, could be encouraged to invest in such a food reserve.

4. Uncle Sam, too, could accumulate a strategic reserve, to provide a safe, flexibly movable, nonspoiling and noncontaminated food supply for citizens, in event of war; feed starving people in case of flood, famine, hurricane, or other natural disaster—at home and abroad; and, generally, more effectively utilize food for humanitarian or strategic purposes in support of national policy.

Overall, the establishment of a national food reserve would, I believe, give Americans a sense of food security, not only in the event of national, but also economic, emergency; help to resolve our surplus problem; brighten the economic outlook for the farmer; and, generally, serve the interests of our citizens and the Nation.

Previously, I have suggested such a program to Federal agencies.

Although the need was recognized, adequate steps have not yet been taken to develop a realistic program.

Consequently, I shall again urge Federal agencies to give more realistic participation, guidance, and leadership to fulfilling these needs of the Nation.

Moreover, I believe that free enterprise—particularly those involved in food processing—could well serve the Nation by broader research and production in this field.

At present, a number of enterprises have tackled the problem; however, a great deal more needs to be done.

CONCLUSION

This, then, is a brief review of the food picture.

If we, individually, and as a nation, rededicate ourselves to the challenge, I believe we can more effectively and creatively utilize this invaluable resource to better serve us in the future, Senator WILEY concluded.

School Aid: Private School Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Newark Star-Ledger, a member of the Newhouse newspaper chain, has done a real service to the cause of legislative debate on the subject of Federal aid to education by offering an indication of the feeling of private school educators toward the proposals which now are before the Congress. This information, and editorial comment on it, appeared in an editorial in the January 2 issue of the Star-Ledger. I took particular interest in this editorial because of the support which was given for the idea of offering tax relief for extraordinary educational expenses. This is a proposal which is embodied in a bill I have presented, H.R. 3517, one which offers a real measure of encouragement in the field of education without taking from the individual, and vesting in the Federal Government, the determination of how these funds will be allocated.

The editorial follows:

INCENTIVE FOR SCHOOL AID

It has been charged that Federal spending for schools would drive private education out of business.

That is a serious charge, for private schools help enrich American education and their demise would represent a considerable loss.

But, because private schools are not organized to speak with a single voice, the views of private educators on the question of Federal spending have not been as solidly stated as the positions of administration officials, public school interests, and parochial schools.

Perhaps the best indication of what private educators are thinking is a new survey of 267 independent schools.

Asked whether they want Federal grants, 88 percent said "No."

Asked whether they want Federal loans, 65 percent said "No."

But, significantly, there was one area in which the educators favor Federal action. In all, 74 percent said they are in favor of special tax relief for private citizens who pay for their children's education.

That position, although obviously desirable for private schools, might be worth applying to public schools as well. If Washington wants to increase the amount of money spent for public education, additional tax benefits beyond present deductions might be an effective way of encouraging local initiative.

GOP Peace Corps Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "GOP Peace Corps Policy," published in the Barre (Vt.) Times-Argus of January 27, 1962.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOP PEACE CORPS POLICY

The Allen-Scott report, which we enjoyed during the vacation by Mrs. Sylvia Porter, notes first action by Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER since he became chairman of the Senate Republican Policy Committee. The Iowan has passed word to GOP members to lay off criticism of the Peace Corps. "His findings show that a majority of voters, especially the younger ones, favor the Corps."

This makes sense. The Republicans in Vermont have, by electing the Nation's youngest Governor, indicated they have considerable faith in the intelligence, loyalty, ambition, executive ability, and energy of our younger citizens. And while this has caused some resentment among loyal old Republicans, the results so far are good for all of us, in the opinion of this column.

In the Nation as in Vermont, there is reason to show more faith and trust in our younger voters. They are better educated than ever, more interested in civic affairs, more informed on international events, and more eager than previous generations to get along with other nations, equally willing to sacrifice personal careers for public safety, and anxious to make progress for democracy throughout the world.

This does not imply that they want to sacrifice any American principles for the sake of indecent international coexistence. They don't.

They are willing to prove, as through the Peace Corps, that this Republic is not a "soft underbelly" of modern democracy; that we are not all a people of extreme greed; that we have consideration for and interest in humanity everywhere; that we have been paying our share of the load for the sake of underdeveloped countries and will continue.

In short, the Peace Corps is a modern CCC, strengthening sinews of democracy to win world peace through demonstrations of good

will and contributions to prosperity where that kind of help is needed more than futile violence leading to tyranny, despotism, and slavery by way of communism.

Senator HICKENLOOPER has demonstrated constructive realism which, though it may be interpreted as bi-partisan support for the Kennedy Peace Corps, should also win more respect and adherents for the Republican Party among voters in their twenties and thirties—and those to come of age this decade.

The Threatened Flood At Flowood, Miss.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, true greatness of man is most often revealed in times of grave distress and tragedy.

Indeed this was the case in my home State of Mississippi when the surging floodwaters of the Pearl River threatened to engulf the city of Flowood in Rankin County, just east of the caiptal city of Jackson.

The flood crested at 37 feet against sagging banks and levees that had been built by engineers to hold back a maximum of 35 feet of water.

Among the many residents of Flowood who rallied to the cause was one in particular to single himself out among others because of his steadfast determination to "keep fighting against almost impossible odds."

That person was Chastaine Flynt, mayor of Flowood.

An editorial in the Jackson, Miss., Clarion-Ledger of December 27, 1961, pays tribute and honor to Mayor Flynt and calls him "The Winston Churchill of the Flood Zone."

Mr. President, because this fine Mississippian has taught us a valuable lesson, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"CHURCHILL OF THE FLOOD ZONE" IS THE MAYOR, CHASTAINE FLYNT

In Britain's darkest hour, Winston Churchill summoned his people to victory through "blood, sweat, and tears."

Residents of mid-Mississippi, particularly those in the actual flood zone in this recent fight with Pearl River, have nominated Mayor Chastaine Flynt, of Flowood, as the "Churchill of the flood zone."

With exhortations to work, to cooperation, to faith, and to prayer, the mayor rallied and coordinated the forces which combined to "hold that line" in true team spirit.

There is glory and credit enough for all in the really remarkable achievement attained at Flowood in the past 10 days. It was a monumental job. It appeared at times to be an impossible job. Levees built to hold back floods at 35 feet actually withstood, for the most part, the flood that crested at just barely under 37.3 feet.

Mayor Flynt said Tuesday that it probably would not have been done if the folks had known at the start that the waters would top 37 feet, but as each inch of rise was recorded, efforts were increased, and the victory was won.

Mayor Flynt himself is the first to give credit to others, modestly assigning none at all to himself. He cannot be too high in praise of the engineers who surveyed and planned each move that was made. He credits much good work to the citizens of his own community, who fought for their homes and their places of employment with fierce devotion.

Civil defense, the Rankin sheriff's staff, the highway patrol, and Jackson police all were on the job.

The prisoners brought in from Parchman and from the Hinds farm, the Governor of the State who made personal inspections and brought inspirational words to the prisoners, having ordered the State convicts to the scene, the Hinds supervisors who transported the prisoners from Raymond, all were doing their parts.

Credit goes to the National Guardsmen and Reserves who answered the alerts and worked as they seldom have before; a big share of credit must go to the reservoir board, which made the big decision to close part of the gates to the still incomplete dam, to help hold back water. Everything that was done was crucial and necessary, but this one act probably held back the waters that could well have proved the undoing of everything done before.

It goes without saying that the Red Cross gets worlds of credit for caring for evacuees and the public gets credit for helping the Red Cross in every way. The Jackson Marine Corps Reserves and the Jackson Jaycees chipped in heavily in the Christmas remembrances which were so thoroughly enjoyed and appreciated by the refugees.

The list is incomplete. Others will be cited in various ways in the days to come.

But always the heroic figure of Mayor Flynt, the sparkplug, the cheerleader, the inspiration, will be remembered in this town that will not die because its people and its leadership were too courageous to permit such a thing.

Another Ike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared under date of January 25, 1962, in the Wheeling, W. Va., News-Register:

ANOTHER IKE

In view of the fact that the speeches of military brass were subjected during his occupancy of the White House to the same censorship complained of now, former President Eisenhower is not a very persuasive witness as champion of a free military tongue.

It may be, as Mr. Eisenhower said in a statement read before the Senate committee now inquiring into charges that a tight military muzzle is being employed, that a better arrangement would be for Federal officials, both military and civilian, to "coordinate" their public statements when in doubt, "so as to protect the Nation, their services, and themselves." The fact is, nevertheless, that when shouldering the responsibility of public administration himself, Mr. Eisenhower saw no impropriety in requiring military men to submit their proposed public utterances to the same control imposed now.

Neither the committee hearings to date nor the heated controversy over military muzzling that preceded it has disclosed any dissent in either official or unofficial circles from the view that our mortal enemy is communism; that in discharge of their duty to keep those under them alert as to the identity and nature of the enemy, it is the responsibility of military men to expose communism in all its devious activities. Where the difficulty seems to lie is in drawing the line between legitimate exercise of this responsibility of pointing out the enemy and engaging in nonmilitary political activity.

When the committee hearings have run their course it probably will develop that those who are sincerely concerned about the matter are not very far apart, the objective being as free a rein to military personnel as is consistent with prudent regard for a separation of the military and political functions. In this connection it is difficult to escape the reasoning of Robert A. Lovett, Republican, who served as Secretary of Defense in the Truman administration, that there is danger in speechmaking by military men that might involve them in politics. As a matter of practical administration how can this danger be avoided save by what Chairman STENNIS of the investigating committee calls "some kind of censorship or policy review"?

Medical Assistance for the Aged in West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the Washington Post and Times Herald has published two detailed reports on the reasons for the near collapse of the Kerr-Mills medical assistance for the aged program in West Virginia. No one can reap any comfort from this situation, despite the warnings from some authorities that the Kerr-Mills plan contains some built-in invitations to trouble in administration and funding. I ask unanimous consent that the two articles by Reporter Eve Edstrom be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEST VIRGINIA MEDICAL PROGRAM REFLECTS WIDER ISSUES

(By Eve Edstrom)

(First of two articles)

Medical assistance for the aged has developed a jaded reputation in West Virginia, the State which has had the longest experience with the program.

In fact, the majority of West Virginia's doctors and hospitals deserted the program in December when their fees were cut back because the State ran into financial difficulties.

By January 23, the doctors had returned to the fold but only after these events occurred:

Increasing national attention was being focused on reports that some doctors and hospitals had abused the program.

Reports of the aged being shunted from hospital to hospital and doctor's office to doctor's office in search of needed medical care were growing in volume.

The president of the West Virginia State Medical Association, Dr. D. E. Greeneltch, warned doctors that unless they rallied behind the program, President Kennedy's health care plan for the aged under social security might pass this session of Congress.

The doctors obtained a restoration of fees—while the number of aged who could benefit from the program remained cut in two.

As part of the agreement which led to the restoration of fees, the doctors established committees to screen all invoices by doctors receiving medical assistance for the aged payments and "to discuss any problems arising from the operation of the program."

The need for such committees became obvious early in January after West Virginia Welfare Commissioner W. Bernard Smith reported that:

After a schedule of fees for the treatment and hospitalization of patients was agreed upon, some physicians and hospitals billed patients for amounts in excess of agreed-upon medical assistance for the aged charges.

Example: The medical assistance for the aged program paid $631.60 for the care of a 65-year-old patient in a Charleston hospital. When the patient was discharged, he received a bill for $619.03, which included some duplicated charges. After the patient's wife complained to welfare officials, the West Virginia Hospital Association took steps to correct this.

Because doctors received additional fees if drugs were injected, there appeared to be an abnormal spurt in the number of patients who needed injections.

Example: One doctor collected $17,000 for treating medical assistance for the aged patients during 1961. He has submitted another $5,000 in unpaid vouchers. An examination of these vouchers showed an overwhelming number of patients received either penicillin or dramamine.

The fact that other charges could be added to the bill if medicine was prescribed prompted some doctors to go into the drug-dispensing business.

Example: One doctor was paid $1,300 for medicines in 1 month and another doctor prescribed so many medicines that one patient would have had to take 143 pills daily to follow the doctor's orders.

PRACTICES ISOLATED

Medical association spokesmen pointed out that such practices were isolated, were not condoned by the profession, and would be the subject of disciplinary action if proven true.

Furthermore, the doctors countered with some charges of their own. The declared welfare officials were administering medical assistance for the aged too loosely and that eligibility qualifications for the program were too liberal.

Despite the fact that the majority of West Virginia's aged have annual incomes of $1,500 or less, they insisted that many of the aged who qualified for medical assistance for the aged benefits could afford to pay for their medical care.

They cited instances of families who insisted on paying for private hospital rooms and round-the-clock private nurses for aged relatives but then expected doctors to accept the medical assistance for the aged fees as full payment for services. They also said there were cases of aged patients who qualified themselves for medical assistance for the aged benefits by transferring cash assets to relatives.

WHO-STRUCK-JOHN

While some of the who-struck-John charges are irrelevant to the major issue of providing the best possible care to the aged who need it; there are indications that West Virginia's experience with medical assistance for the aged strongly supports congressional testimony given last July by Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Abraham A. Ribicoff.

At that time, Ribicoff said the medical assistance for the aged program—known as the Kerr-Mills bill when it was enacted by Congress in the fall of 1960 to stave off Social Security financing of health care—had some built-in dangers.

Any State which actually tried to meet the medical needs of the aged could go broke under the program, Ribicoff said. Furthermore, he warned medical assistance for the aged could become a political football, with Republicans and Democrats trying to outdo each other in election years by promising increased medical benefits.

POLITICAL FACTS

Actually, financially depressed West Virginia never would have become the first State in the Nation to adopt medical assistance for the aged if it had not been for the political facts of life as they existed in that State in the fall of 1960.

Just after Congress authorized open end Federal matching grants to States for the program, West Virginia's Republican Gov. Cecil Underwood called a special session of the State's Democratic legislature.

The session was set for October 3, 1 month before Underwood was to run against Democrat JENNINGS RANDOLPH for the U.S. Senate.

SPECIAL SESSION

In telegrams to all State legislators, Underwood said the special session was for the express purpose of permitting West Virginia to take full advantage of the medical care program.

The program is designed to help the aged who are not poor enough to qualify for public relief but do not have enough financial resources to pay for their medical and hospital bills. Each State determines eligibility qualifications and the extent of benefits.

RANDOLPH, who ultimately was successful in the Senate race, warned legislators that they would be assuming an enormous financial burden in adopting the program of benefits outlined by Underwood.

He said Underwood was underestimating the costs of the program and it was not actually as sound as financing health care under social security would be. (Originally, the legislature was told the plan would cost $5 per case but the actual cost was $67.70 per case.)

Underwood discounted RANDOLPH's warnings and Arthur S. Flemming, then Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary in the Eisenhower administration, came to West Virginia to speak for the program.

Democratic legislators were fearful of repercussions from aged voters on election day. Many of them also believed Congress would enact social security financing of health care in 1961, making medical assistance for the aged a negligible supplementary program for those who did not qualify for social security benefits.

And so the legislature adopted the program for aged persons 65 or over who had net annual incomes of not more than $1,500. But they left it up to the former State welfare commissioner, an appointee of Underwood, to establish other eligibility criteria and benefit schedules.

GENEROSITY PERILED WEST VIRGINIA MEDICAL AID FOR THE AGED

(By Eve Edstrom)

(Second of two articles)

For a poverty-stricken State, West Virginia embarked on an extremely liberal Medical Assistance for the Aged program in October 1960.

Benefits for the aged who could not pay their medical bills were not as comprehensive as plans later adopted in Hawaii, Massachusetts, and North Dakota.

But in terms of payments to doctors and hospitals as well as eligibility qualifications for the aged, West Virginia's plan was relatively generous in contrast to other States.

And it was these generous features that almost caused the plan's financial collapse last month, states West Virginia Welfare Commissioner W. Bernard Smith.

Smith, an appointee of West Virginia's Democratic Governor, had no hand in establishing the criteria for the program.

DESERTED PROGRAM

And when he tried to cut back medical and hospital fees, doctors deserted the program which has been pushed by the American Medical Association as the answer to social security financing of health care.

When West Virginia became the first State to adopt the program, Republican Governor Cecil Underwood was running for the U.S. Senate in opposition to Democratic Candidate JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

Original conservative estimates for the Medical Aid for the Aged program were shelved. Underwood's Welfare Commissioner established a program which permitted aged couples to qualify for benefits if their combined annual income did not exceed $3,000, their liquid assets were not more than $7,500 and their real property, exclusive of the homestead, was not valued in excess of $20,000.

"This qualified practically everyone in the State, including aged doctors and aged newspaper reporters," Dr. D. E. Greeneltch, president of the West Virginia State Medical Association, said.

Payment for medical services was based upon 75 percent of the Charleston Blue Shield plan. A $5 fee for house visits during the day and a $7 for night calls were allowed.

This was $1 or $2 higher than fees paid to doctors treating patients on public relief. But the most marked discrepancies existed in surgical payments.

MAXIMUM FEE, $40

For example, under medical aid for the aged, a doctor could be paid as high as $187.50 for surgery. But a $40 maximum surgical fee is allowed doctors treating relief clients.

Similar discrepancies existed in payments to hospitals. For recipients of relief grants, hospitals are allowed 90 percent of cost up to a maximum of $20 a day.

But under medical aid for the aged, hospitals received 100 percent of the average cost per patient per day. Thus, one hospital received $33.18 in medical aid for the aged funds for daily patient care.

In many instances, the hospital payment rate was more liberal than that provided by private health insurance plans.

This led to charges that some hospitals, particularly those with empty beds in rural areas, were extending the hospital stay of medical aid for the aged patients to the full 30 days allowed under the benefit schedule.

Hospital association spokesmen deny this and note that doctors determine the length of a patient's hospital stay. Welfare officials quote statistics showing that the average hospitalization for medical aid for the aged patients is 3 days longer than that of relief clients on general medical assistance rolls.

Initially, the program appeared to get off to a slow start. In November 1960, only 46 patients were treated at a cost of $366 to West Virginia and $974 to the Federal Government under the matching formula which lets Uncle Sam pick up 70 percent of the medical tab.

COSTS CLIMB

But by November 1961, the monthly medical outlay exceeded $500,000. Cases treated numbered 10,305 at a cost of $379,611 to the

Federal Government and $160,222 to West Virginia.

By the end of November, the program had cost more than $3 million and there was an estimated $1.5 million in outstanding medical and hospital bills. (Doctors, hospitals, and druggists have 90 days in which to submit bills.)

Fearing that local funds for the program soon would run out, State Welfare Commissioner Smith ordered a sharp curtailment of the program December 1. Actually, the cutback reduced the program to what had been proposed originally to the legislators.

If applicants had any real property, other than their home, they were ineligible for benefits. Limitations were placed on the amount of liquid assets an applicant could have. Such actions reduced the number of eligible persons by 50 percent.

TWENTY DOLLARS PER DAY TOP

Payments to hospitals were cut so that no hospital could receive more than $20 a day for patient care. Doctors were placed on the same fee schedule in effect for the treatment of public relief clients. This meant no doctor could receive more than $40 for surgery.

Furthermore, doctors were asked to sign participating agreements which stated medical aid for the aged payments constituted total payments and the client will not be subjected to any additional charges.

In addition, the welfare department no longer allowed payments for drugs dispensed by doctors in counties where there was at least one drugstore. And payments to pharmacies were restricted to the manufacturer's wholesale price plus a small service charge for each prescription.

With the imposition of these restrictions, doctors and hospitals boycotted the program. Eventually a few returned but as of January 19, only 33 of 125 hospitals and 192 of more than 1,500 doctors were participating in the program.

Although doctors and hospitals said no needy sick person was being denied treatment, a Beckley, W. Va., newspaper published a letter from a minister who charged that two hospitals and two doctors refused to treat an ill woman who died the following day. Subsequent published accounts quoted a Beckley funeral home director, whose ambulance driver had taken the woman to the hospitals, as saying that the two private hospitals had instructed him to bring no mode medical aid for the aged patients for care.

CHARGES IN CHARLESTON

Another newspaper reader wrote the Charleston Gazette to tell how her mother-in-law, blinded by cataracts in both eyes, had been scheduled for surgery January 19 but that on January 5 the hospital informed her that welfare patients were not being accepted.

"I read * * * the other day that no one in this country is denied medical aid because of inability to pay for it," the reader said. "I wish whoever made that statement could see (my mother-in-law).

"She sits day after day staring through sightless eyes, hoping for a door to open for her that is now closed. And day by day the cataracts are doing more damage."

Commissioner Smith asked all local directors for documented cases of ill persons being denied care.

Two cited instances of patients dying after being refused care. One of these involved a wheelchair case who "couldn't breathe" when hospital admittance was sought.

Other directors said the aged ill received care only after "a very sick patient had applied to several sources." And there were numerous reports that druggists were not filling prescriptions, even for a patient who "cries for something to relieve pain around the heart."

EXAGGERATION ALLEGED

By January 10, funds available for other welfare programs were transferred to the medical aid for the aged fund. Doctors contended the funds always had been available and that welfare officials had exaggerated the financial crisis.

By January 23 when Smith was called before the State legislators to explain welfare difficulties, he announced that he had agreed to restore the former medical fee schedule and would not require doctors to sign the participating agreement. The doctors ended their boycott of the program. Similar agreements were being worked out with the hospitals.

But Smith and his assistant commissioner, L. L. Vincent, warned that restoration of the fees to doctors and hospitals may mean a further tightening of eligibility requirements for beneficiaries, with fewer and fewer of the aged qualifying for care.

Both Smith and Vincent state that the only humane and financially feasible way of meeting the health needs of the aged is through the social security system as proposed by President Kennedy.

But neither hospital nor medical spokesmen agree. They say West Virginia's experience shows only that welfare officials were ill equipped to handle the program and that now it may be possible to work out some plan by which the Blue Cross or Blue Shield mechanism could be used to provide for medical aid for the aged patients.

Welfare Director Smith finds this extremely strange. Prior to national announcements from the American Medical Association and the American Hospital Association concerning wider application of Blue Cross and Blue Shield plans for the aged, Smith said he was unable to interest local representatives of the plans in taking on the medical aid for the aged clients.

Annual Cost of Educating a Public School Student

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news release by School Management Magazines, Inc., of Greenwich, Conn., under date of January 28, 1962. The information contained in the release is most timely and points up the ever-growing cost of educating our children. I earnestly commend its reading by my colleagues in the House:

ANNUAL COST OF EDUCATING A PUBLIC SCHOOL STUDENT

GREENWICH, CONN., January 28, 1962.—The annual cost of educating a public school student rose in 1961 from $304 to $315.

In fact, over the past 3 years, the average school district in the United States increased its expenditures by $39 per student. Unfortunately, only $16 of that amount went toward improving the schools. The rest was eaten up by inflation.

This was one of the major facts brought to light by the 1961–62 "Cost of Education Index" published by School Management magazine. School Management, which published the first national "Cost of Education Index" in 1960, is the largest circulation magazine in the school administrative field.

According to the "Cost of Education Index," 3 years ago the average school spent $276 per student on current expenses. School construction and transportation were not included in the figure. Since then, these expenditures have been increased better than 14 percent, to $315 annually, but inflation, in the form of increased costs, accounted for almost 60 cents of every $1 increase.

Any district that failed to increase its spending by at least 8.3 percent over the 3-year period is now operating on less money than it was during the 1958–59 school year.

The magazine's estimates of the effects of inflation were the result of work done by Dr. Orlando F. Furno, director of research in the Baltimore city schools and director of the "Cost of Education Index" study.

Furno developed an index of educational inflation accounting for price rises that affect the schools but over which schoolmen have no control. As an example, the magazine cites the possibility of a rise in the cost of textbooks from one year to the next. If a district buys the same number of textbooks each year, it will have to pay more the second year than the first. This is the effect of inflation.

In general, the greatest expenditures for education were found in the Middle Atlantic States and on the west coast. The Nation was divided into nine regions for the study. Higest expenditures occur in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania where schools spend an average of $440 per student for net current expenditures.

On the west coast (California, Oregon, Washington, Hawaii and Alaska) the average expenditure per student is $360. The Mountain States (Montana, Colorado, Idaho, Wyoming, Utah, Arizona, New Mexico, and Nevada) average $336 per student and Mid-Western States (Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin) average $344.

The New England States (New Hampshire, Vermont, Maine, Rhode Island, Massachusetts and Connecticut) are spending an average of $325 per pupil while in the Plains States (Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, North Dakota and South Dakota) $326 is being spent for each student.

Four Southwestern States (Louisiana, Texas, Oklahoma and Arkansas) are expending an average of $265 per pupil, somewhat more than States in the Southeast. This group (Maryland, Delaware, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida) is averaging $237 per student.

Alabama, Mississippi, Tennessee and Kentucky, comprising a south central region, are spending the least in the Nation on education—just $192 per student. Fewer than 1 school in 10 in these States is spending as much as the lowest quarter of the districts in the Nation as a whole.

A weighted measure of students was used throughout the study to account for the greater expenditures necessary for high school pupils.

HOW MUCH EFFORT IS BEING MADE?

Because of the disparity in ability to provide funds for the schools, School Management's research staff devised an "effort index" designed to show how much taxpayers across the Nation are willing to pay for their schools.

"There is a general tendency to excuse certain areas of the Nation," says Editor Paul Abramson, "by saying 'they just don't have the funds.' We wanted to find out if they were making as great an effort to raise funds—if they were spending as large a part of their limited means on education—as were their richer neighbors.

"We found that they aren't. Certain areas of the Nation not only have less money, they

have less willingness to spend what they have on education."

The magazine's "Effort Index" was based on the amount of true property valuation each district had and the income that was raised for the schools from this valuation.

"We obtained from more than 1,200 districts across the Nation an estimate of the true market value of the property they could tax," says Abramson. "This established an equal base for everyone. Then we wanted to know how much effort the citizens of each district were willing to impose upon themselves. Since almost all local revenue comes from taxing property, we asked each district to tell us how much it raised locally. By comparing how much each district raised locally with the value of its property, we were able to develop an accurate index of its effort for education. Any citizen could make the same calculation for his own district."

The School Management figures showed that the average school in the United States was able to raise 89 cents on every $100 of true valuation. In New England, taxpayers in the average district voted to assess themselves $1.49 for every $100 of true valuation. In the New Jersey-New York-Pennsylvania region, $1.43 was raised on every $100 of true valuation.

In the three regions with the lowest expenditures per pupil, the magazine found the effort for education was also low. In the Southeast, only 69 cents was raised on $100 of true valuation. In the Southwest, the average school raised 56 cents. In the States of Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi and Alabama, only 54 cents was obtained for the schools.

"Unfortunately, the great majority of districts in these three regions are failing to expend even an average effort for education," said Abramson. "Districts in these three regions cannot afford as much money for education as those in most of the rest of the Nation. But if their taxpayers value education as highly as do those in the rest of the Nation, they can make the same effort to support their schools. Apparently they have chosen not to do so."

Other highlights from the School Management "Cost of Education Index" include:

The average district is spending $47 per student on schoolhouse construction this year. Interest payments take almost a quarter of this.

Teacher salaries kept just ahead of inflation over the past 3 years. Classroom teachers are earning an average of $5,359 this year. This represents a 10.8-percent increase during the last 3 years. During the same period, inflation rose 9 percent, taking a large chunk out of the salary increase.

Smaller schools, on the average, spend less money per pupil for instruction than do the largest ones. But they have more teachers for every 1,000 students than do the bigger schools.

The average pay of school administrators is $10,000 per year.

The average school in the United States spends $14.10 per student just to transport pupils to and from the school buildings. The average small school district spends $27.17 per student on transportation.

One out of every ten school districts in the United States spends at least $454 per student for current expenditures. On the other end of the scale, 1 out of 10 schools spends less than $197 per student.

The School Management survey concerned itself with the 12,000 districts in the United States with more than 300 pupils. This represents more than 94 percent of the public school student population.

In an article on the development of the "Cost of Education Index," Dr. Furno suggested ways of improving the index for coming years. Furno proposed a Presidential commission composed of educators, manufacturers, and others interested in raising the quality of education in the United States. This commission, he states, would not only make it possible to improve the index, it would give the index the kind of stature that the Consumer Price Index now enjoys—and would give schoolmen and taxpayers—a valid and recognized tool for understanding their own school costs.

Dramatic Impact in Voice of Rushmore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the United States has few, if any, national monuments or patriotic shrines, which are better known, more highly regarded, and more widely visited than South Dakota's famed Shrine of Democracy located on Mount Rushmore in the Black Hills of our great State.

This national monument carved out of the solid granite of our mountains by Gutzon Borglum, reproducing the busts of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Theodore Roosevelt in mountain-size likenesses, has become internationally famous and each year is viewed by a million people who come there from far and near.

Last December, I proposed that consideration be given by the National Park Service to developing a professionally produced patriotic drama to be portrayed at Mount Rushmore once each evening by use of the electronic synchronization of sound and light much as the Phillips Co. of Europe has done so effectively in Egypt at the foot of the Sphinx. Much interest has been expressed both pro and con concerning this suggestion and in that connection I ask unanimous concent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most interesting editorial by Fred C. Christopherson of the Sioux Falls, S. Dak., Daily Argus Leader.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DRAMATIC IMPACT IN VOICE OF RUSHMORE

When the Rushmore Memorial was first proposed, a violent chorus of objection reverberated from peak to peak and valley to valley in the Black Hills.

"We don't want any sculptor carving up our mountains," thundered the Rapid City Journal.

"It scarcely seems possible," said the Hot Springs Star, "that such an idea is being seriously considered."

The Deadwood Pioneer-Times snorted: "Senator Norbeck and Doane Robinson must be so enamoured with this proposal that they have lost all sense of proportion."

The objection to the sculpture wasn't limited to the spokesmen in the Black Hills area.

"It's utterly ridiculous," contended the Aberdeen American-News.

The Colman Argus asked: "Who are we to try to improve on the handiwork of the Almighty?"

The South Dakota Churchman was among many other publications taking a dim view of it, but it wasn't really worried because it couldn't believe the authorities would approve such a ridiculous suggestion.

NOW IT'S DIFFERENT

That was back in the twenties. Now Rushmore graces the rugged Black Hills horizon. It is the most extraordinary project of its kind in the world. It is internationally known. Last year 1 million persons ventured into what was once a remote area to see the memorial.

Black Hills residents and Americans generally, are almost reverent in their praise of it. The memorial is better known than any other project or development in South Dakota.

From an economic viewpoint, it is more valuable even than the Homestake gold mine in the northern Black Hills.

And no one now maintains that it was a mistake to create Rushmore—an attitude quite different from that which prevailed when the idea was originally unfurled.

AN IDEA FROM SPHINX

When Senator KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, was in Egypt last November, he took advantage of the opportunity to see the pyramids and the sphinx.

A feature that impressed him deeply was the story of Egypt as told in a dramatic way by a voice purportedly coming from the sphinx.

This voice recited the remarkable events in Egyptian history—the country's troubles, glories, and ideals. The clear words booming out over the ancient Egyptian landscape had a tremendous impact on those who heard them, MUNDT explained.

Then he wondered why a similar idea couldn't be developed at Rushmore—why it wouldn't be possible to do what the Egyptians had done with a similar impact on listeners.

AN OLD STORY REPEATED

MUNDT expressed this thought in South Dakota last month. And all of a sudden there arose a chorus of objections, strangely reminiscent of the clamor that was heard when Rushmore was originally proposed.

Several newspapers took occasion to hammer away at it editorially. Some writers of letters to the editors belittled the idea. Expressions of approval were limited and the objectors obviously were in the majority.

Editor Casper Nohner of the Hayti Herald-Enterprise, however, was among those who recalled the earlier objection to Rushmore and noted a similarity in today's reluctance to accept a new idea.

Then he asked: "If we can utilize this now readymade facility to bring home to thousands of people, who do not understand, the significance of America and to instill new inspiration in the hearts of dedicated patriots, why should we not do so?"

HOW IT COULD BE DONE

A recorded verbal and pictorial program is now presented nightly during the summer in the amphitheatre at the foot of the memorial. As it proceeds, the memorial is illuminated and the majestic figures stand out in bold relief with the dark sky as a background.

How dramatic it would be if at that point—at the conclusion of the preliminaries in the amphitheatre—if the voices of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Theodore Roosevelt could be heard.

The voice of Washington could tell briefly about the brave battle by free men for national independence. That of Jefferson could describe the dignity of the individual in the American pattern. Lincoln's could stress the equality of all men under the law. Roosevelt's could describe the Nation's resources, their conservation and their development.

All of this, to be sure, should be done with professional skill and dramatic effect. It seems to me the idea has tremendous possibilities and that we aren't as visionary and imaginative as we should be if we fail to comprehend it.

The Alternative: Individual Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the freedom of the individual is the cornerstone of the American political and economic systems. Politically it is reflected in the democratic nature of governmental institutions; economically it is exemplified by the free enterprise system in which economic decisions are made in the marketplace of free competition.

This freedom is the true liberalism of today. We must strike a balance between anarchy and authoritarianism, but we must always remember that the goal is the freedom of the individual with the balance struck to enhance rather than hinder its exercise.

The Wall Street Journal of January 17 commented editorially on this goal of the freedom of the individual, finding an important role for the Republican party in championing this basic human drive by standing firm against growing statism. I believe this editorial, "Political Opportunity," deserves the careful attention of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I believe it states an area within which we can have honest and meaningful debate, in which we can draw issues that will help return to our political scene the clarity of choice which has been so needed. I am placing this editorial in the RECORD at this point:

POLITICAL OPPORTUNITY

Republican congressional leaders are expressing confidence that their party will make impressive gains in the fall elections, possibly even winning control of the House. One reason they give is the apparent "conservative" resurgence throughout the country.

That there has long been such a mood in this country is, we think, clear enough. But it has no necessary connection with the fortunes of the GOP. For the Republicans, or the dominant faction of them, have insisted on building their political "image" out of largely Democratic materials, apparently figuring that what has seemed to work for the Democrats might also work for them.

To see why it hasn't worked very well for the GOP, we might first ask what is this contemporary conservativism, to use that word for lack of a better one. Certainly it is not to be confused with those people on the so-called radical right, who are being exaggerated out of all proportion to their importance and out of all relation to the politically potent radical left. Both extremes tend toward doctrinaire, totalitarian-sounding "solutions."

What has come to be called the conservative view, and which has been around a lot longer than the newly publicized radical right, is just the opposite. Put most simply, it reflects the hunger for individual liberty, which is one of man's deepest drives. Put in political terms, it is the belief that somewhere between the poles of anarchy and authoritarianism, free men must find the kind of state that will best serve their aspirations. Put in economic terms, it is the belief that the material welfare of the people—the sum of the well-being of individuals—will be best promoted where men are freest to develop their individual potentialities.

There is nothing defeatist, reactionary or negative about such a political philosophy. Its adherents number many of history's heroes, and today's in many a grim part of the world. Translated into American political language, it offers the only positive promise of social betterment, economic growth and brighter living.

Yet for three decades this traditional American approach has been taking a beating. The individual has been shrinking before a burgeoning briar patch of Federal agencies, taxes and restrictions.

We are not here tossing about the scarewords of socialism or communism. It is simply a fact that the trend has been against the individual, and a great many Americans know it and wonder uneasily where it is leading. They know that whenever and wherever a government has been empowered to control the lives and ambitions of the people, all the plans and edicts from on high have served only to burden the land with confusion, inefficiency and mounting authoritarianism.

Today's conservative phenomenon, then, is essentially a vote for the individual and a rejection of the unwarranted notion that the Government is a social and economic Solomon, capable of eliminating life's harsher aspects while at the same time recasting human nature.

But what have the Republicans to do with such conservatism? The Democrats are most closely associated with the reactionary trend against the individual, but for the most part the GOP has just tagged along, offering more or less the same political goodies, only not quite, saying they could run the Democratic program better. They bark and snap at the Democrats, but they have abysmally failed to exploit the politically appealing possibilities of the doctrine of freedom; they have failed to offer a genuine alternative.

If there is anything the Republicans should have learned in the past 30 years, it's that when two almost identical products are offered, the voters will go for the original. But this lesson, judging by the party in Congress, doesn't seem to be sinking in any better than ever. The congressional leaders hardly seem to understand the conservative revival they talk about.

They might reflect that President Eisenhower won in part because he appeared to offer a conservative program, even though his administration veered increasingly toward the dominant-Government doctrine. They might reflect that in 1960 Mr. Nixon hastily remodeled the party platform to make it resemble more closely the extremely statist Democratic one; it didn't work, though his near-miss, as the less statist candidate, again demonstrated the latent conservative strength.

As far as we are concerned, the fortunes of the GOP as such don't matter. But it is a sad thing for the country when millions of voters have no party, whatever its name, to turn to. And right now the Republicans have a real opportunity to become the party of freedom. If they would, their election prospects might be shinier than their congressional leaders now wishfully think them.

The Migrant Farm Labor Story—Part XI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article published on October 23, 1961, in the New York World Telegram and Sun. It is the final article in the excellent series by reporter Dale Wright who spent 6 months living and working among the migrant laborers. His firsthand accounts of the exploitation of these forgotten people describe shocking conditions involved in the harvesting of crops and illustrate the need for immediate congressional action to protect migrant workers from the abuses they suffer.

Dale Wright asks:

What can be done to remedy the plight of the migrant farm worker?

Then he outlines a program which is embodied in the five bills on migrant labor which were passed in the other body.

I have introduced companion bills in the House—H.R. 8879, H.R. 8880, H.R. 8881, H.R. 8882, and H.R. 8883. I feel that the enactment of such measures is long overdue, and I hope that the House will soon have the opportunity to vote on this vital issue.

Dale Wright's series is an example of investigative reporting at its best. His initiative in seeing conditions at firsthand his lucid writing have contributed much to public understanding of this problem. I should like to congratulate him and the New York World Telegram and Sun for arousing public opinion.

The article is as follows:

THE FORGOTTEN PEOPLE—STATE COULD REMEDY CONDITIONS FOR MIGRANT LABOR

(By Dale Wright)

I saw it all—the misery and ugliness of the migrant's labor camp and the fields where he worked from Florida to Long Island.

I labored in the same bean and tomato patches with these itinerant crop harvesters. I grubbed in the rich earth with them for potatoes and I chopped cabbage in the same fields.

I shared wretched food with the "stoop" laborer and along with him I was cheated out of my meager wages for work honestly done.

I found that despite legislative efforts and the work of social and religious agencies to improve the lot of the nomadic farm hand and his family, little has been done to better their way of life.

I found that he is forced to exist in degradation without human dignity. I was touched by the hopelessness I saw in a little child's eyes.

I came away angry and sick from the tomato fields just 30 miles south of the glitter and wealth of Miami Beach. I found the same crude exploitation, the same dreadful living conditions, just 30 miles south of New York City.

The question is what can be done to remedy the plight of the migrant farmworker, whose sweat and toil—yes, and sometimes

blood—go into the harvest of this Nation's food crops.

These are the things that must be done:

Guarantee the migrant farmworker a fair wage for his labor, if necessary through Federal minimum wage laws.

Protect the migrant, the man least able to defend himself, from exploitation by his crew leader, the grower, the shipper, the packer of the processor.

Provide him and his children with an education, so they can better themselves and compete for jobs with others who have that advantage.

Treat and cure his many ailments so that he can do an honest day's work.

Give him a decent place to live where he can care for his family in peace and dignity.

There are before Congress today forward steps in this direction. Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr., Democrat, of New Jersey, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, has proposed an 11-point package of legislation designed to bring the migrant out of that clump of trees where he lives and out into the mainstream of American life where he can enjoy his rights and privileges as a citizen.

The migration division of the Puerto Rican Labor Department has set up contractual arrangements under which off-shore workers are guaranteed minimum wages and a fixed number of work hours during harvest seasons.

None of these guarantees are available to the vast-majority of migrant farmhands—Negroes, West Indians, Mexicans, Cubans, Bermudians, and a sprinkling of whites—who come out of the South or from their respective islands to labor their way North. They hope to end the summer with enough money to pay their way home. Instead many remain here as relief burdens.

Enlightened New York State should show the way in improving working and living conditions for migrants. Although seven separate agencies are at work on the job, they have only scratched the surface.

The work of these agencies should be consolidated into one all-encompassing unit with adequate powers to enforce all existing laws and press for new remedial legislation.

New Jersey often points to its pioneer role in handling the itinerant crop picker. It is true, there are some laws. But they are not being adequately enforced. I found many examples of laxity in south and central New Jersey.

The migrant farmworker has been tucked away with his family in that inevitable clump of trees and forgotten for so many years that he is unaware that he has rights and privileges as a citizen.

Can anyone expect the sweating, hard-working, underpaid tomato picker who is cheated at every hand to ask for his rights as an American when he does not know they exist?

Proposal for Settlement of Israel-Arab Disputes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement issued recently by the Brooklyn Jewish Community Council, regarding the proposal for the settlement of Arab-Israel disputes.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY BROOKLYN JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL ON MIDDLE EAST PEACE

Arab intransigence continues to foreclose the possibility of peace in the Middle East. Israel's dramatic offer, made at the United Nations, to negotiate a direct settlement of all disputes, has now been given new impetus in a resolution presented by 15 nations (8 African, 6 Latin American, and 1 European) to the U.N. Special Political Committee.

Our American stake in seeing peace come to the Middle East is urgent, its realization never more timely than now.

The Brooklyn Jewish Community Council calls on President John F. Kennedy:

(a) To reaffirm support for the concept of direct Israel-Arab negotiations which were pledged in 1952; and

(b) To instruct our United Nations delegation to actively and strongly endorse the peace resolution introduced in the U.N. Special Political Committee.

A copy of this resolution shall be sent immediately to President John F. Kennedy, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson, the U.S. Senators from New York, and the Congressmen from our community.

Hon. George A. Goodling: Pennsylvania's Farmer-Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, second only to the nice things we like to read about ourselves there is nothing that so warms the heart as the generous word in behalf of a respected friend and colleague, GEORGE GOODLING, our distinguished associate from York County, Pa., meets every test that may be applied to a successful farmer, a dedicated legislator, and a stanch friend and it is in recognition of that combined capacity that I welcome the opportunity to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this fine tribute to him exactly as it appeared in the December 1961 issue of the Farm Bureau Mirror, Pennsylvania's Farm Newspaper:

FARMER REPRESENTATIVE: EARLY LESSONS ARE CARRIED TO CONGRESS

Proof that a farmer's interests and concern can actively extend beyond the farm gate to meet, intelligently, the challenges of regional, national and international needs, is evidenced in the first-year record of Representative GEORGE A. GOODLING, lifelong resident of the Loganville area in southern York County.

GOODLING is the only full-fledged farmer among the 30 Pennsylvania Representatives in the U.S. Congress. He represents the 19th Congressional District, which currently embraces York, Cumberland, and Adams Counties.

The climb into a seat in the Nation's high legislative chair was not a happenstance. Neither was it a planned progression, nor a political circumstance. Rather, it resulted from long hours of work in the interests of his fellowmen, his community, his State and his country.

Basic principles which have characterized his forthright actions throughout his colorful career were established from the time he attended a little red schoolhouse at Loganville and learned at firsthand the disciplinary action of a switch from an apple tree, until he completed his formal education by earning a degree in horticulture from Pennsylvania State University.

Having been reared on a farm, he learned early the lessons of thrift, sound thinking and hard work which are necessary to achieve productive results. These lessons he has carried all the way into the Halls of Congress.

This, then, is one of the reasons why, in his first year as a Congressman, he so vigorously opposed deficit spending and what is known as back-door spending. In essence, the latter is a type of spending of Government funds for purposes not authorized in legislative appropriations; a spending by Executive order.

In annually producing about 8,000 bushels of apples, 4,000 bushels of peaches, and other crops, GOODLING knows the full meaning of earning a dollar. He knows, too, that Government cannot provide effective services for its people without tax dollars. But he has fought and will continue to fight, he declares, the tax waste that seems all around him in Washington.

GOODLING stands strongly for more individual action in behalf of the American way of life and for less Government paternalism which he feels suppresses our ability to grow. He consistently has backed a principle which many veteran legislators have been years in recognizing; he has called for sanity in Government spending, especially in areas of foreign aid, defense, education, and national development.

"Possibly the glasses through which I look are tinted dark, rather than rose colored," he wrote some of his constituents, "but practically every program presented to this 87th Congress is a step farther down the road to socialism, insolvency, and eventual bankruptcy."

"There has been waste, corruption, extravagance and in some cases, complete lack of planning in foreign aid programs." GOODLING reported to his farmer friends. He cited numerous cases in support of this statement and also pointed out how "so-called neutrals pay lip service to the United States in order to get their one hand in our till while simultaneously raising the other to pledge allegiance to Moscow."

"We are admonished to 'love your enemies' but nowhere do I read we should pay them to be our enemies," GOODLING said. "Since the inception of the mutual security bill, $86 billion has been spent on foreign aid, and just how much 'mutual security' have we purchased? How many friends have we won? The answer might well be found in the bill which appropriated another $47 billion for defense."

"There are times when we must be realists, not dreamers," he cautioned.

GOODLING knows whereof he speaks in this matter of Federal Government aid in education. He has served for 30 years on the school board in his home district. Further, he was treasurer of the Loganville School Board for about 15 years, he later was treasurer of his area jointure board and more recently was president of the latter organization. In these three decades, he has made detailed studies into the financial and other needs of school districts and while he well realizes the ever-increasing costs of education, he insists all programs should be based on need, not on a political whim.

The York County Representative has fought long and hard for our local and national development but he looked with much concern on the bill that promised to resolve some of the housing problems for the poor people.

"The House floor was literally wet for the sympathetic tears of these so-called poor people," GOODLING noted as proponents of the bill made their pleas. So the Congressman did some investigating on his own. Among other things, he found this example: "In the 40-year, no-down-payment plan under this bill, an individual could buy a $10,000 home. After paying interest and principal for 10 years, the individual would have only a $350 equity and a $9,650 mortgage. If the buyer lived over 40 years, the interest and principal would have cost $25,000 or more."

"If that is being helpful to these people," he wrote, "I don't want to help."

A wit remarked at this time that scientists expected to develop a slower eating termite so the homes would not be eaten before they are paid for.

GOODLING, despite his freshman status, has spoken on every major issue that has come before Congress. Unlike some Representatives, he went to Washington with some legislative experience. Since 1942, he served seven terms in the Pennsylvania House of Representatives. Before that, in addition to serving on the school board, he was an auditor and an assessor in Loganville. While in the statehouse, he served on the house agriculture and dairy industries committee, and was chairman of the fish and the conservation committees.

Experience on the latter committee stands in good stead as he now serves on the U.S. House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee which is essentially a conservation committee.

While in the Pennsylvania Legislature, GOODLING helped to write the first soil conservation bill. With John Light, he cosponsored the bill authorizing gas tax refunds to farmers. He also sponsored a bill regulating the marketing of insecticides, among others.

As a farmer, GOODLING served for many years in senior extension work and at times he was secretary and then president of the York County Extension Services. He also was secretary of the York County Fruit Growers for 30 years and for a 2-year term was president of the State horticultural association.

A member of the Grange, the Pennsylvania Farmers Association and a stockholder in York Farm Bureau Cooperative, he long has advocated that his and other farm organizations should be even more alert and active in politics.

"Most of the farm legislation in Washington has been built around the needs of the Midwest and South," he commented, inferring not enough of the Eastern farmers' story is being brought into focus for consideration.

GOODLING's home area interests have centered much around the York YMCA, his Loganville EUB Church and his family of three sons and three daughters. Two of the sons live near the family home and direct the farm operations when the Congressman must be in Washington or his York office. One of the sons, Robert, operates a mortician's establishment and the younger son, William, is a high school principal. The other son, Richard, is farming in Virginia "on a bigger operation than mine." The three daughters are Isabel, Nancy, and Patti. The former lives at home with her father.

The three sons and Patti are veterans of World War II. Patti was a nurse. The Congressman, himself, is a veteran of World War I, a long-time member of the American Legion, a current member of the Civil War Centennial Committee and a student of the strategy employed in the Battle of Gettysburg. He has great understanding of current problems in defense.

GOODLING served for 25 years as treasurer of his church and he was so active in Masonic bodies that he was made a 33d degree Mason in Cincinnati in 1956. The award was made on his birthday, September 26, climaxing a quarter century of service in the Masonic order.

What are his plans for 1962?

"I've been working ever since Congress adjourned to gather facts and study matters which I believe will come up for discussion next year," he said. "I hope to be ready for every issue."

Washington observers agree that work is no stranger to Congressman GOODLING. The lights in room 135 of the House Office Building frequently are burning early in the morning and they are still glowing on many occasions far into the night.

Obviously, this Pennsylvania farmer is constantly getting ready to discuss the issues.

School Aid Through Tax Credits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, as the Members of the Congress and people of this country well know, education is vital to our country's continuing greatness. Much was said on the subject of how best to aid and encourage education during the last session of this Congress; much more will be said this session, I trust. I am very pleased that there is this public attention directed to this vital area of our society. Certainly the fuller the debate which we have on the proposals that have been advanced, the better we will understand the problems that exist, the progress we have made in meeting these problems, and the job that remains to be done and the means we have to do that job.

One of the proposals that has been put forward is the encouragement of expenditures in the educational field by way of the tax system. I have introduced a bill (H.R. 3517) which advances this proposal. I believe that further consideration should be given this idea along with the others that have been advanced and, along this line, I am placing in the RECORD an article from the Catholic World of January 1962 by Dr. Roger Freeman, of Claremont (Calif.) Men's College. This article deals with "Tax Credits and the School Aid Deadlock." Because of the importance of this question, and the wealth of knowledge and experience that Dr. Freeman brings to it, I feel this should be shared:

[From the Catholic World, January 1962]

PROBLEMS FOR AMERICAN CATHOLICS: TAX CREDITS AND THE SCHOOL-AID DEADLOCK

(By Roger A. Freeman)

(The battle for aid to public and private schools will go on with undiminished vigor in the coming months. Senator WAYNE MORSE told a Catholic group in Oregon in November that he feels sure that Federal aid-to-education legislation will be passed by Congress in 1962. While he believes direct grants to private schools are unconstitutional, he is proposing an amendment to the National Defense Education Act that would provide loans to private schools. Roger A. Freeman, author of "Taxes for the Schools," published by the Institute for Social Science Research, Washington, D.C., here discusses the educational as well as the legal and political implications of public aid. He sees tax credits rather than grants or loans as the way out of the impasse. Dr. Freeman is director of research for the Institute for Studies in Federalism at Claremont Men's College, Claremont, Calif.)

That the denial of public benefits to private schools constitutes an injustice was more forcefully contended and more intensively and extensively debated during the past year than ever before. Does this suggest that the claims of the nonpublic schools, whether for grants, loans, tuition aid, or tax credits, are gaining in acceptance or at least in status? Has the broad airing in 1961 advanced the chances of the private schools for tangible recognition? Or has the debate merely solidified the opposition and hardened its determination to resist? Was it the soundness of the arguments that caused some Members of Congress to switch sides or to withhold their vote from the public school aid bill or was it the magnitude and vehemence of the response among large blocks of their constituents?

It is tempting to jump to the conclusions we would like to draw. But to substantiate answers to these questions, whether in the affirmative or in the negative, is difficult.

The sudden and enthusiastic emergence in force of the nonpublic school groups demanding a share of the proposed Federal school aid came as a surprise to most observers. The reaction of the proponents of public school aid was more predictable: desirous as they were of the long-hoped-for manna, they prized even more highly the principle that tax funds be allocated only to schools under public control. They declared that they would much rather have no bill than one that benefited private schools in any shape or form. Congress obliged and killed the bills.

Many of those who had been battling the omission of private schools from the allocation plans sighed with relief. They had viewed the prospect of Federal aid to education with mixed feelings or unconcealed uneasiness; given a choice they preferred the status quo. Others however, maintained that, Federal aid or not, private schools were entitled to a share of the tax funds.

As Father John Courtney Murray wrote in We Hold These Truths:

"The canons of distributive justice ought to control the action of government in allocating funds that it coercively collects from all people in pursuance of its legitimate interest in universal compulsory education. The solution to the school question reached in the 19th century reveals injustice and the legal statutes that establish the injustice are an abuse of power. In an atmosphere of reasonable argument unclouded by passion or prejudice, it must be brought to the attention of the American public that a massive problem still awaits solution."

A not inconsiderable segment of the American public has heard the arguments on distributive justice, double taxation, and interference with the freedom of choice. Are those who are familiar with the case persuaded or at least impressed?

In numerous public debates I found that these arguments cut little ice with the majority of parents who have their children in public school and want them there. The usual comeback to the "double tax" or "distributive justice" argument is that anybody who wants his share of the tax money should send his children to public school, and that the man who eschews that opportunity has nobody to blame but himself. Why does he expect the taxpayer to foot the bill for a private service of his own liking just because the Government makes a free service available to all?

When the question is raised whether this denial of support is fair to the man whose conscience requires him to have his children educated in schools of his own faith and whether it may interfere with his free exercise of religion, the usual answer is that he should not try to load the cost of his religious duties on others who may regard his church with indifference or deem it heretical. If he and his coreligionists are so strict about following their precepts, should they not be at least equally anxious to make a greater financial sacrifice? If his conscience commands him to send his children to a denominational school, does it not also command him to support his church? If so, would he ask the Government to pay for his church? If not, why should it pay for the school operated by the church?

The logical fallacy in these questions is apparent. Attending and supporting his church is a matter between man and his God. Sending all children to school is a precept of the State. If the State compels children to attend school and pays for the education of some, why should it not pay for the education of all? Parochial schools must of necessity devote a major part of their effort to teaching children the three R's and the other essential subjects taught by public schools. Religion accounts for only a minor share of the time and cost. Parents do not object to paying for the religious part, whatever it may be. But why should the State and the general taxpayer be relieved of the other, the secular part? Why should the taxpayer save all of the cost he would have to bear if the child attended public school? Might not a modest contribution stimulate private school expansion so much as to result in a net saving for the taxpayer?

The operation of private schools now saves the taxpayer more than $2 billion a year. The total could rise to $3 or $4 billion, if a slight concession or encouragement were offered. The Federal Government has used the incentive of the matching grant in many fields and stimulated desirable activities through "seed money." Recognition of public responsibility for the secular part of private school education could help ease demands upon the Public Treasury.

Some people may be swayed by such arguments; many will not. The fact is that most people do not choose sides among proposed alternative courses by abstract reasoning but by weighing the likely results. They want to be fair, but, above all, they want to achieve ends they deem desirable. So they ask: "What would happen if public funds were made available to private schools?"

Those who are concerned with the aid issue know that 80 percent or more of private school enrollment is Catholic and that, at least for the present, Catholic institutions would receive the lion's share of the benefits. Those who would not like to see Catholic schools—or other denominational schools, or private schools in general—grow faster are not likely to be persuaded by the cogency of the argument on distributive justice. In his TV debate with Leo Pfeffer early in 1961, Father Neil McCluskey came to a sudden conclusion: "Mr. Pfeffer, you are not opposed to Federal aid to Catholic schools. You are opposed to the existenc of Catholic schools."

While no argument for aid to church-related schools can persuade the nonreligious, there is at least a chance of winning support from those who believe in their own faith as deeply as Catholics believe in theirs. The inadequacy of secular schools was most clearly presented by the late Episcopal scholar, Canon George Iddings Bell. After describing how the Catholics who demanded support for their schools in the 19th century were rebuffed, he wrote:

"It was expected that this would squelch the Catholics, who were mostly poor people and would be unable or unwilling to pay twice for their schools—once in taxes for public schools and again for all expenses of their own. It has worked the other way. The Catholic (and Protestant) parochial schools have not been starved out, as was anticipated. They have grown in numbers and effectiveness, holding their young to loyalty. The damage has been to the health of protestantism. For out of the public schools, dismissing religion at Protestant insistence, come successive generations of young people born of Christian families, of the Christian tradition—and ignorant of the faith of Christianity."

Can the religious inadequacy of public schools persuade many Episcopalians, Lutherans, or Baptists to see the aid issue in a more friendly light? I don't know. But I do know that even the most eloquent plea for distributive justice and against double taxation won't convince the man who holds that only public schools are a true expression of American democracy or who considers denominational schools divisive because they segregate children by creed.

So the issue comes down to whether enough people believe that diversity rather than unity is desirable in the schools and that a strengthening of religious education is needed. Of course, few Americans nowadays will publicly admit that they are opposed to religious education as such. Such opposition commonly hides behind the wall of separation between church and state, and the constitutional prohibition of aid to religion.

The meaning of the first amendment has been much debated and even more distorted. It takes a remarkable degree of imagination to believe that men who wrote, "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged," intended by the "no establishment" clause to outlaw public aid to schools that do teach religion and morality. But the intent of these authors has long come to count little with the U.S. Supreme Court. Several of the Court's decisions and dicta leave little doubt that it would exclude church-related schools from grants for general school purposes whether at National, State or local levels. This however does not necessarily rule out consideration of other types of assistance.

Of the several briefs probing into the constitutionality of various methods of public aid to private schools, none is more curious than the report by the attorneys for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of March 28, 1961. As expected, it declares general grants to church-related schools to be forbidden. Loans and tuition payments are held to be unconstitutional if they benefit grade and high schools but permissible for colleges and universities. There is no mention of tax credits.

To find a distinction between levels of education in a Constitution which does not even refer to education is a remarkable feat of sophistry and legal legerdemain which has rightly received acid comments from lawyers on both sides of this controversy. Is there really a high wall of separation for the lower level and a low wall for the higher levels of education? The President had recommended the authorizing of loans and tuition aid for all public and private higher education. The Health, Education, and Welfare brief aimed to justify the President's recommendations. But why the distinction between private elementary and secondary schools on the one hand and private colleges and universities on the other? The Health, Education, and Welfare lawyers volunteered that private colleges enroll 41 percent of all students at their level. To omit a group that accounts for over two-fifths of the potential beneficiaries would rob the bill of support needed for congressional approval. But private grade and high schools enroll only 15 percent of all children. The other 85 percent, it was hoped, would provide sufficient votes to assure the bill's passage. That was sound political arithmetic; it just did not happen to work at the 1st session of the 87th Congress.

Why did President Kennedy rule out even a discussion of aid to private schools instead of trying to find a compromise for indirect assistance? He said at his press conference on March 1: "The Constitution clearly prohibits aid to parochial schools. I don't think there is any doubt about it. There isn't any room for debate on that subject. It is prohibited by the Constitution and the Supreme Court has made that very clear. Therefore there would be no possibility of our recommending it."

Nobody would suggest that President Kennedy is prejudiced against Catholic schools. His uncompromising position was the result of political necessity. He was being violently opposed in his campaign by fundamentalist groups which feared that a Catholic in the White House would succumb to wishes of the Vatican and the hierarchy This was his Achilles heel, as an analysis of this narrowest of elections proved. So Mr. Kennedy needed to demonstrate publicly just how independent he is of the hierarchy. The school issue seemed like the answer to a prayer. Overnight Mr. Kennedy became a hero to the fundamentalist Protestant groups for taking a far stronger stand than a non-Catholic would have been likely to take. Subsequent Gallup polls showed a sharp jump in his popularity and the following explanation was given (October 4, 1961): "The fears of many Americans about a Roman Catholic in the presidency—fears that cost Mr. Kennedy votes last November—have been largely allayed during his early months in office."

Another Gallup poll (September 24), showed that the percentage of those who said they would vote for a Catholic for President had risen from 71 percent before the election (in which only 50 percent voted for Mr. Kennedy) to 82 percent afterward. Paul Blanshard was quoted in Look magazine (May 23, 1961): "If Kennedy sticks to his guns he'll be reelected with ease—by Protestant votes."

So much for the political side. But why is there, at the grade and high school level, such adamant opposition to loans or tuition aid to private schools which meet with little objection at the college level? Because public institutions do not fear private competition in higher education; they do in the 12 grades. The enrollment share of public education is sharply rising at the college level but has long been declining in grade and high schools. Between 1950 and 1960 enrollment were—

	Percent
In higher education:	
Public	63
Private	18
In elementary and secondary schools:	
Public	44
Private	92

Despite their severe material handicaps, private schools as a whole have consistently been expanding faster than public schools, and still have waiting lists. The U.S. Office of Education projected public enrollment growth during the 1960's at 22 percent, private at 50 percent. Small wonder that those who either believe in public schools as the great unifier in our society or who have a personal stake in them (as for example, administrators) will fight to the utmost any proposal that would tend to ease the handicaps of the private schools. Much of the drive for Federal aid to public schools is caused by a desire to put private schools at a greater disadvantage.

Moreover, from the administrators' point of view, Federal aid would make them less dependent on the support and good will of their communities. Parents, boards of education, and State legislatures would find their influence on school policies waning if administrators were able to obtain financial support without their approval. A relative weakening of private schools would also reduce the competition, restrict the choice of parents dissatisfied with public school education, and reinforce the quasi-monopoly of the public schools. (Obviously, the need to maintain effective competition and the influence of communities in their own school affairs is one of the most effective arguments against Federal aid to public schools.)

That fairness in the distribution of public educational funds calls for an equal share for all children is self-evident to many who have spoken up in this debate. Will they be able to persuade a majority of the public and of the legislators that this, and this alone, represents justice in school support? Is there a reasonable prospect that the principle will some day be translated into law, despite grave constitutional obstacles, philosophical commitments and deep-seated emotional responses to the contrary? Is the prospect good enough to make the enmity, bitterness, and open hostility which this fight is creating a price worth paying?

The protagonists of nonpublic schools believe that true freedom of choice in education depends to a considerable extent on whether public policy smiles or frowns on their endeavors. They are willing to pay a high price, including an indefinite continuation of their battle. But part of the price of success may well be the setting of goals which are impossible of attainment in our society.

I doubt that National, State, or local government grants for the support of denominational schools are a realistic possibility, as far as we can see ahead. Moreover, I question their wisdom because they would inevitably prepare the way for governmental influence on or control of private schools.

Are loans the answer to the problem? They might be, if inability to borrow were a major handicap to the expansion of private schools. If it were, why have most of the loan funds available to private schools under title III of the National Defense Education Act gone unused for lack of demand? The fact is that hard loans offer little if any advantage and soft loans are up against the same constitutional and other obstacles as grants.

What is at stake here is not the right of private schools but the rights of students and their parents. Thus Government aid—if and when—should be to individuals rather than institutions.

Tuition aid has been used in higher education by the Federal Government in the veterans program and by the State of New York on a general basis. Virginia grants tuition aid to pupils in private grade and high schools—for the avowed purpose of helping parents who do not wish their children to attend integrated schools; pupils in denominational schools are ineligible. This exemplifies some of the tough problems inherent in tuition-aid plans. The constitutional issue is doubtful: Justice Douglas called tuition payments for students at church-related schools unconstitutional. Moreover, the availability of substantial tuition aid might cause another hundred or so denominations (instead of the present dozen) and thousands of private groups to start their own schools. This would sooner or later lead to some abuses, which, in turn, would force the Government to clamp down ever-stricter rules and controls, until we might not be able to tell a private from a public school. So even the tuition plan, attractive as it is, is fraught with dangers.

Only one form of public aid to students at denominational schools is free from constitutional challenge and that because it funnels out no public money and avoids contact between Government and the private school: tax credits.

Contributions to churches are now deductible from adjusted gross income for Federal income tax purposes up to 30 percent of such income. Thus a person in the lowest tax bracket recoups, by a reduction in his tax liability, 20 percent of his contribution. A person in the top bracket offsets 91 percent of his contribution against the tax. Some observers object to giving recipients of high income a relatively greater benefit than those in the low brackets—although this is simply the result of our graduated rate structure. This could be resolved by permitting tuition paid to a public or private educational institution, at any level, to be a credit against the tax itself, rather than a deduction from adjusted gross income. This would enable schools to raise their tuition to an adequate support level (up to a maximum, e.g., $300 as proposed in the Keating bill, S. 792) without placing a direct burden upon the student or his parents. Those who pay little or no income taxes could be granted partial or total exemption from tuition.

To be sure, tax credits are not a panacea and have certain shortcomings. But they avoid some of the most serious objections to grants, loans, or tuition aid and may be a more attainable objective in the drive to obtain equity for all children.

Europe Is High on Polaris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Polaris stands today as one of the free world's most vital weapons against those who would threaten our national security. The submarine-based system is a weapon which is undersea, mobile, and usually invisible to those who would endanger our shores.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to submit an article which appeared in the January issue of Navy, the magazine of seapower. The article explains results of a recent survey in Europe on Polaris and how leaders believe Polaris will permit NATO to successfully defend Europe should an attack come:

EUROPE IS HIGH ON POLARIS

(By L. Edgar Prina)

British, French, and West German leaders believe that the submarine-based Polaris is the free world's most important strategic weapons system and one which will permit NATO to defend Europe successfully should war come.

These were among the findings of Dr. Daniel Lerner, professor of sociology at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, in a survey of West European attitudes on defense and other issues.

Professor Lerner's poll, conducted in 1961, was part of a larger inquiry by the Institute of European Studies into the question of European unification. The Institute, which was created jointly by MIT's Center for International Studies and the Sorbonne, is carrying out the unification project under a grant from the Ford Foundation.

THREE HUNDRED LEADERS POLLED

Professor Lerner and his aids interviewed leaders in business, government, politics and public information media—100 each in Britain, France, and West Germany. In his preliminary report, he discussed what he calls the Polaris period in Western Europe (July-December, 1960) when the U.S. Navy's newly operational solid-fuel rocket played a very large part in the daily news, dominated parliamentary debate on international affairs and faced the political parties with issues that dividend and transformed them. The professor wrote:

"The European press depicted Polaris as something of a wonder weapon, a genuine breakthrough in the age of nuclear missiles * * * the simple fact that this missile could be fired from a submerged submarine was regarded as a decisive contribution to the defense of Western Europe."

By that time, of course, the ferocious campaign to downgrade Polaris by certain American officers who placed preservation of roles and missions ahead of preservation of the Nation, had been defeated.

The debates over the Navy's new deterrent/retaliatory rocket split the Labor Party, with the leftwing Socialists and the pacifists shouting "Polaris, no" and demanding unilateral disarmament for Britain and those, the eventual winners, who saw collective security under NATO as the best hope ranged against them.

In France, public sentiment seemed clearly to favor a NATO equipped with the Polaris system over any system of French national deterrence, according to Professor Lerner, who added that President de Gaulle pushed through his program for an independent nuclear deterrent (la force de frappe), only at the cost of serious and profound divisions within the French elite.

ROLE IN EUROPEAN THINKING

Polaris is thus credited with a major role in a dramatic transformation of European thinking. The results of the poll offer substantial support to this conclusion by the professor. For example, while the panel members saw Polaris adding little to the deterrent posture of NATO (which already was rated high), there was a different story when this question was posed:

"The decision whether or not to base NATO defenses on the Polaris system is an important one for the Western alliance. Do you think the Polaris system would substantially defend Europe?"

The replies speak for themselves: 58 percent said "yes" in Britain; 33 percent in France (where the "don't knows" totaled 48 percent) and 77 percent in West Germany agreed.

The above responses compare with a decided opinion that NATO was not now—that is, without Polaris—strong enough to defend the West in the event of a Soviet attack. In Britain, 55 percent said NATO was too weak; 53 percent in France, and 42 percent in West Germany agreed.

When a direct comparison is made, the figures show that the opinion that Polaris would give NATO an adequate capacity to defend the West doubles in Britain and West Germany and triples in France.

POLARIS IS BEST KNOWN

The poll showed, too, that Polaris was the best known of six leading Western weapons systems by a substantial margin. For example three out of four panel members could—by a knowledge of major characteristics—identify Polaris whereas only one out of four could identify Minuteman ICBM.

In one of the key questions put to the 300 respondents, they were asked to rank the following as most important, next most important, and the least important for meeting the strategic problems of the next 5 years: present surface systems, undersea nuclear systems—e.g., Polaris—and outer space satellite systems.

Again, it was Polaris all the way. Combining the results of most important and next most important, undersea nuclear systems scored 83 percent in Britain, 75 percent in West Germany, and 48 percent in France, where almost 50 percent replied "don't know." Professor Lerner's conclusion: "This constitutes powerful evidence that the Polaris system is supremely important."

The figures are even more dramatic on the response on the candidates for least important weapons system. Only 3 percent in Britain and France put Polaris in this category and just a single, solitary West German—1 percent—agreed.

Professor Lerner also tried out on his European panelists three arguments for and three against Polaris. The response to one of the "antis" was of particular interest because it has been voiced here by advocates of other, more vulnerable, weapons systems. Here is how it was phrased:

"Since the undersea Polaris is mobile and usually invisible, it would be less reassuring than present surface systems to the West Europeans it is set up to defend."

ENDING A WORRY

The respondents were asked to state whether they thought this argument was decisive, important or unimportant. In his discussion of this matter, Professor Lerner wrote:

"Now this is a question which has been debated intensely among Americans concerned with the psychological components of deterrence systems. Considerable weight has been given to the possibility that Europeans would feel less secure with a weapons system which they could not see or hear.

"The results of our 1961 survey warrant putting this particular psychological concern to rest.

"Of our 300 respondents, only one Frenchman considered this to be a decisive argument against Polaris. The great weight of opinion ran heavily against this hypothesis of potential anxiety among Europeans: 81 percent in Britain, 69 percent in West Germany, and 47 percent in France considered this argument to be unimportant."

Note that the French do not consider this argument to be important; it is rather that, as usual, a large fraction of French respondents said don't know to this question.

WOULD TRIM SOVEREIGNTY

One of the most interesting and important responses in the poll was made to the question whether Britain, France, and West Germany should give priority to collective defense (with its problem of control of nuclear warheads) or to national sovereignty when facing the choice between adopting the most effective system of collective defense now available (Polaris) or maintaining, in fact, the historic institutions of national sovereignty?

An overwhelming preference for collective defense was recorded: 84 percent in Britain, 55 percent in France and a whopping 95 percent in West Germany.

The report said that of the entire set of questions dealing with military and security matters, this one drew the most powerful consensus within each and among all three countries. Professor Lerner made this observation:

"It merits very serious reflection by Americans concerned with military policy for the Western Alliance."

We have a hunch the professor means, among others, the White House, Pentagon, and State Department.

Lack of Firm U.S. Policy Is Losing Asia to the Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, communism cannot be defeated with high-sounding speeches. The Communists understand only strength. Recent history proves that the free world has won when the United States took a firm and tough policy and backed that policy up with determined action. The Communists have won whenever we have appeared to be weak, willing to appease, or ready to trade off other peoples' freedom to gain temporary easing of tensions. I sincerely hope we can enunciate a sound policy designed to win the cold war and be ready to back it up with whatever means necessary before it is too late and the Communists have won their objective, world domination.

The following editorial by Frank Langston, editorial page editor of the Dallas Times Herald sets forth what our lack of policy and determination is costing the free world in Laos and South Vietnam:

ARE WE PREPARED FOR A TIGER HUNT?

(By Frank Langston)

Tiger hunting requires considerable skill, courage, and effort. It also requires both weapon and ammunition powerful enough to do the job.

The person who undertakes a tiger hunt with any one of these elements lacking generally ends up inside the tiger.

So does the one who takes the tiger for granted and expects it to stay away till he is ready to shoot it.

And just what does tiger hunting have to do with us?

Maybe a good deal more than you think.

Throughout the Orient February 5 on the Chinese calendar marks the beginning of the year of the tiger. This is the year that the Chinese Communists expect to drive Western freedom—or imperialists—out of southeast Asia.

The tiger has been growling in Laos and South Vietnam. Now, with stepped-up guerrilla activities it is beginning to roar.

HOW DO WE STAND?

Against this background it is reasonable to ask whether we are fully prepared for a tiger hunt. Have we the necessary skill, courage, and weapons? Are we willing to make the effort necessary to assure its success?

There have been assertions that we are adequately prepared and fully determined to halt the Reds in southeast Asia.

But there is at least one prominent observer who questions our present policy regarding the area.

Adm. Felix B. Stump, commander in chief of U.S. military forces in the Pacific from 1953 to 1958, asserted this week that the policy of containment has not been adequate to meet the Communist challenge in the Far East.

"It is high time we set for ourselves the task of achieving victory over communism in the Far East," the retired naval officer said. "We can win this victory."

FRIENDS LACK CONFIDENCE

For one thing, the admiral said in an article in the January issue of the American Security Council Washington Report, "our Asian friends lack confidence in America's steadfastness."

"As long as they do so, the situation in the Far East will remain fluid and the free world's position there will be subject to steady Communist erosion," he said.

"Events have shown that the policy of containment has not been adequate to meet the Communist challenge. Surely we have enough native American ingenuity to combine appropriate elements of our national power with that of the growing strength of our friends among the free Asian nations so as to move beyond this limited objective."

The admiral believes successful defense of the Far East requires two things:

1. Unquestionable U.S. military superiority.

2. A quiet but unswerving national determination "to use, and use promptly, such force as may be required—to include tactical nuclear weapons if necessary—to repel Communist aggression wherever it may appear or in whatever form it may occur."

According to the admiral's reasoning, this is a tiger hunt, not a bird-watching or fly-swatting event.

WE MUST RESPOND

And he stresses one point in particular: "When the Communists resort to force, whether it be overt attack or guerrilla warfare, we must respond immediately. However, we should make certain the enemy understands that this response will not necessarily be at the point of his aggression. Rather it will be tailored to the circumstances at the time, and our counterforce will be applied wherever it will be most effective."

This one point would give the United States the initiative it has lacked up to now in dealing with the Communists.

There is no easy way out, the admiral warns.

And, while he does not believe we should abandon collective defense, he insists that we should resist the temptation to shift responsibility for resisting aggression to international organizations, such as the United Nations or SEATO.

He insists that we cannot shirk the implicit responsibility of acting unilaterally, if necessary.

The Year of the Tiger undoubtedly will be a momentous one.

It just could determine whether the hunter bags the tiger or ends up inside it. The policy and determination we follow in Asia may have a lot to do with the outcome.

The People of Dallas Warn of Danger in Administration's Demand for Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the people of Dallas County are extremely jealous of the responsibilities of each branch of our Government as set forth in the Constitution. In our part of the country we believe the best way to preserve our free society is to insist that the constitutional powers of the Executive and the Congress be fully protected. No ad-

ministration has made greater effort than this one to induce Congress to grant additional power to the Executive. In my opinion we will fail in our responsibility to the people who elect us, if we abrogate any further congressional responsibilties to the President.

The following editorials, the first from the Dallas Times Herald and the second from the Dallas Morning News clearly reflect the attitude of the people of the Fifth District of Texas toward the President's demand for taxing powers not granted to him in the Constitution:

[From the Dallas Times Herald, Jan. 25, 1962]

AUTHORITY FOR TAXATION BELONGS TO CONGRESS, NOT TO PRESIDENT

President Kennedy's first economic report to Congress may find some persons nodding in agreement.

But it likely will get little support from those who have been concerned over bigger and bigger Government.

The report, which is short on facts and long on recommendations, is remarkable for two reasons:

1. It forecasts prosperity, but prepares for recession.

2. It is a bid for more Executive authority.

Mr. Kennedy envisioned a glowing U.S. economy and predicted "a brilliant chapter" will be written this year if labor and management show restraint in seeking wage and price increases.

But at the same time he called for "defense in depth" against recession—including unprecedented tax-cutting authority for the Chief Executive.

Many of Mr. Kennedy's supporters, including labor and liberal elements, seem obsessed by the threat of recession and consistently have sought to outlaw it through legislation or Executive action rather than reliance upon the free-enterprise system.

Mr. Kennedy's bid for the Presidency made considerable use of an economic scare, plus the prediction that things would get worse unless the Government did something to prevent it. Actually, the economy started its upturn about the time he took office, long before any of the antirecession measures he recommended took effect.

In asking for the authority to cut taxes, the President is making a power grab. He asks Congress to delegate its constitutional tax duty, as prescribed in article I, to the Chief Executive.

The President must be aware that tax power and vote-getting power often go hand in hand. He must be aware also that this Nation fought its War of Independence partly because of "taxation without representation."

The Constitution prescribes Congress as the body responsible for levying and collecting taxes. Let's keep it that way.

[From the Dallas-Morning News, Jan. 23, 1962]

MR. KENNEDY'S POWER GRAB

Some Members of Congress have voiced astonishment and anger over the major requests in President Kennedy's special economic report submitted to the Congress Monday. These requests are properly termed "unconstitutional, unrealistic and unsupportable" by the legislators.

Heart of the President's report are four goals the administration will seek with congressional approval: (1) full employment and prosperity without inflation, (2) a step-up in the Nation's economic growth, (3) extension of equality of opportunity, and (4) increased American exports.

Nobody can criticize these goals per se. The dispute is over the issue of how best they can be achieved.

President Kennedy evidently believes that he, and he alone, is most capable of deciding the question. Accordingly, he has asked Congress to grant him power to cut taxes temporarily and to launch $2 billion worth of public works projects. This power would be used to manipulate the economy, in order to head off a recession.

A primary objection to this request is that Congress has always been the custodian of the power to tax and to decide upon public works.

This power, written into the Constitution, has been reserved to the legislative branch of Government for a good reason: the power to tax, being equal to the power to destroy, should never be held by one man. It should be closest to the people by being entrusted to their elected representatives.

Although the President's request for tax manipulation is only for the authority to cut taxes, once this constitutional barrier is bridged it will be a short step to granting similar authority for raising taxes. When that happens, as Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, Republican of California, points out, "Congress might as well pass one law delegating all its powers to the White House, and then go home."

Both the power to manipulate taxes and that to use $2 billion worth of public works—though they are perhaps honestly requested—amount to a decisive political tool in the hands of the President. In an election year this dual authority could be used by an Executive to tip the political balance in his favor. He can even decide where and how the $2 billion is to be spent.

With all the highly touted economic advisers in his official family, it is amazing that Mr. Kennedy is unable to comprehend two elementary economic facts:

True wealth is derived only from genuine productivity, not by the manipulation of tax rates or make-work projects.

Taxation is a means of raising revenue to cover the expenditures of government, period. It was never designed as a device for manipulating a nation's economy, much less its politics.

Magnificent Reserve Performance Reflects Readiness of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, several days ago, I commented upon the wonderful performance of the Nation's Air Force Reserve units which were called to active duty.

Today, under leave to extend my remarks to the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to comment briefly on the splendid response of the Army and Navy reservists brought into service under the callup.

The Navy callup has involved only about 8,900 officers and men, yet they also were required to temporarily leave their homes and give up their civil careers in order to serve their country in uniform. These reservists manned 40 destroyer-type ships and 190 antisubmarine aircraft; they joined the fleet promptly without any post mobilization training and today are serving with competence and with fine spirit. I am advised that only a single individual requested a deferment from service, and that in his case the hardship was so obvious and acute that he promptly was excused, as he should have been.

In the Army 119,000 officers and men were called into service. In the case of the Army callup, involving as it did so many more men, there appears to have been some cases which occasioned gripes about the callup. The Defense Department and the Army advise us that these complaints came principally from the "fillers" called in, and that most of them were not in the Reserve program.

Yet, despite some flaws which developed in the callup of the Army Reserves, there is no question that the response, the demonstrated effectiveness, and the spirit of the Reserves has been excellent. They have fully justified the confidence placed in them. Their great achievement may have been largely overlooked, but it is a fact that they enabled the Army to deploy almost immediately an additional 40,000 troops overseas to bring the 7th Army and its combat support up to full support, and to free other combat divisions from basic training duties, placing them in position for further deployment wherever they might be needed.

Some hitherto unrelated aspects of the callup were reported in the February issue of the Officer, monthly magazine of the Reserve Officers Association, which I am submitting herewith for the information of the Members of this body:

THE STORY OF THE RESERVES DESERVES TO BE TOLD—MAGNIFICENT RESERVE PERFORMANCE REFLECTS READINESS OF AMERICA

(The headline above was taken from a report by Gen. James Van Fleet, special consultant to the Department of Defense, to President Kennedy. It reflects the great praise the Reserves have received the country over for their performance in the recent callup. Here are comments that tell of a job well done.)

VAN FLEET CALLS RESERVES MATURE, TRAINED, SKILLED

Gen. James Van Fleet made a special report to President Kennedy after reviewing the Reserves in action in this country and abroad. He made this statement in his report:

"The spirit of the citizen soldier in all of the units and camps visited stands out as the one indelible impression. It is magnificent and truly reflects the readiness of America to answer the call of the President in this or any other emergency. Complaints are insignificant and not representative of the overwhelming majority. The headlines appearing in the press of dissatisfaction and inadequacy of supplies are overstated. Morale is extremely high in all units.

"But I must caution that it is the initial expression of proud and patriotic hearts stimulated by the incentive of the world situation and need for added preparedness.

"The quality of these units is far above any previous mobilizations as took place in World War II and Korea. The average age of the men is 26–27 years. They are mature, well-trained individually, and with tremendous skills in large numbers.

"I have the highest commendation for the outstanding care and instruction given at our replacement training centers at Fort Jackson and Fort Knox. The training I witnessed is far superior to any in preparation for World War II and Korea.

"The Reserve Forces Act has proven a great benefit to all National Guard and Reserve units. I would not change it. A soldier never gets enough training and we can say from experience that training pays off in battle.

"The special forces at Fort Bragg are indeed a timely activity. I do have a conviction that the school is imperative to develop doctrine and tactics and general information worldwide on past, present, and future international Communist guerrilla activities and countermeasures to meet them. The training of individuals is excellent and should be a great asset to supply qualified men to various military assistance groups in friendly nations currently threatened.

"My report must include high praise for the warm welcome and assistance rendered to all units by post commanders and Regular Army troops at all stations and levels. Significant, too, is the efficient manner in which Fort Polk was opened by a Reserve station complement and the air rendered by the 4th Army."

LEMAY SAYS AIR FORCE RESERVISTS MET CHALLENGE QUICKLY

In a letter of appreciation to the families of recalled members of the Air Reserves, Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Air Force Chief of Staff, had this to say:

"Once again the men of the Air Reserve Forces—both the Air National Guard and the Air Force Reserve—have been called to duty in defense of our freedom, institutions and ideals. For many of you it has been one more Christmas that your husbands, fathers, brothers, and sons have been far away from their homes and families. Both you and they have had to adjust to a new environment for living and working in circumstances none could foresee only a few months ago.

"The President directed that these forces be fully ready for their active duty mission by January 1, 1962. I am proud to report to you that they have mobilized, they have overcome difficult training problems, and many of them have performed the complex and professionally demanding movement to oversea bases. Now what the President ordered done has been done: they are ready.

"Never before has the U.S. Air Force depended so heavily upon the ability of the Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve to respond so quickly and effectively. Never before have the Air Reserve Forces met a challenge with such speed and efficiency.

"This has not been done without some mistakes, inequities, and hardships. Solutions to these problems have been found in the professional competence and constructive determination of the Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard personnel. Without this professionalism gained through long hours of practice and study, and the loyalty and understanding of their families, their achievement would have been impossible. We are honored to serve with them and we are proud of and grateful for your support."

SOLDIERS WHO GRIPE HAVE GOOD MORALE

Eric Sevareid in the Houston Chronicle:

"When men themselves audibly complain of their own morale, then it is good. It is when soldiers fall silent that one must be aware of their spirit; when they fuss and gripe—and especially when they feel they have to publicly analyze themselves—they are all right. They are dependable. There can be little doubt that the prime cause of Khrushchev's easing of the pressure in Berlin lies in the strong American reaction, including the defiance of our troops inside that city, the reinforcements flown from this country, and the callup of the Ready Reserve at home."

DECKER INSPIRED BY RESERVE SHOWING

Gen. George H. Decker, Army Chief of Staff, speaking at a luncheon of the Army Reserve's 310th Logistical Command, in Alexandria, Va., said the reservists called to active duty have made a "significant contribution to the ready status of our Army during the recent tense international situation." He said the patriotism and motivation to performance of many reservists had been an inspiration to him.

ZUCKERT SALUTES AF RESERVISTS' DEPLOYMENT

Secretary of the Air Force Eugene Zuckert, in a message sent to commanders of the Air National Guard wings involved in the Air Fore buildup, said:

"My warmest salute to the men of your command on their highly successful deployment to Europe. The manner in which the deployment was conducted so soon after recall could only be the result of sustained superior performance.

"It is my desire that every man in your organization know of the pride the whole Air Force feels in this accomplishment."

EDITORIAL PRAISES WEEKEND WARRIORS

The New York Times, in an editorial December 23, said:

"The brighter side of the recent mobilization of National Guardsmen and reservists has been largely obscured by the loud complaints of a vocal minority. It is a pleasure, therefore, to pay tribute to a achievement little notice. On October 1, 29 Air National Guard and 5 Air Reserve squadrons were mobilized and reported for active duty to the Tactical Air Command. On October 27, 11 of these National Guard squadrons flight-ferried 218 aircraft to bases in France and Germany without loss of a man or a plane. On November 1 three more Air National Guard squadrons flying the F-104 reported for active duty and 10 days later were being airlifted to Europe. For weekend warriors less than a month away from an office desk, a flight across the ocean in the cockpit of a single seater fighter is, in space vernacular 'A-OK' even in this age of foreshortened geography. The Air National Guard and TAC have demonstrated an encouraging and magnificent readiness for duty."

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE M'NAMARA PRAISES RESERVES FOR SACRIFICES

In a yearend statement, December 27, 1961, Secretary of Defense McNamara said:

"I want to take this occasion to commend all members of the Defense Establishment for their performance during the year now ending. I am particularly appreciative of the sacrifices that have been and are being made by the reservists. As the President has said, 'These men * * * are rendering the same kind of service to our country that an airplane standing on a 15-minute alert at a SAC base in Omaha is rendering. We called them in order to prevent a war, not to fight a war.' "

LANG SEES RESERVISTS READY FOR EMERGENCIES

John Lang, Air Force deputy for Reserve and ROTC, in an article in the Army Times by Bill Olcheski, said:

"The Berlin callup supplied the American people and Congress with a definite reassurance that the citizen reservist and guardsman stands ready in time of emergency to serve quickly and effectively." Lang said he felt this realization will serve as an effective means of promoting expansion of the Reserve and Guard program in 1962 and the years ahead. He predicted an overall increase in the importance of Air Reserve and Guard forces during 1962. He said the speed with which Reserve units were able to respond to the recent callup has assured them a place in overall defense planning.

WIDOW DISPLAYS GREAT RESERVIST PATRIOTISM

Patriotism runs high among the called-up Reserves and their families, even in tragedy. Seven newly called-up reservists died in the crash of a C-124 Globemaster near Belton, Mo., December 19. Among them was Maj. Jacob T. Battenberg, one of four ROA'ers aboard. His widow, left with five children, said later in an interview in the Kansas City Star that he husband "died doing what he wanted to do. I mean it sincerely when I say Jay was doing what he wanted to do, and it gives me comfort. And it isn't as though he died a senseless death in a car accident—he died in the service of our country as surely as though the crash had been in wartime."

Major Battenberg was a construction superintendent before being called to active duty with the 442d Troop Carrier Wing October 1. It was a position he had attained after starting all over in life when he was released from the Air Force in a 1953 reduction in force. At that time he had 14 years' active service. He maintained his Air Force status in the Reserve through weekend flying. Two weeks before the crash, he achieved his lifetime ambition by being made an aircraft commander. His plans were to serve 30 years of active and Reserve duty.

CONNALLY PRAISES RESERVES

In addressing the naval district commandants at a ceremony awarding the Commandant's Trophy to Com 3, Navy Secretary Connally commented with enthusiastic intensity upon the success of the Navy's partial mobilization which sent 40 ships of destroyer types and 18 aircraft squadrons with 190 planes to the fleet immediately.

Not only were there no complaints, but the Secretary read a letter he received from several wives of Reserve crew members of the U.S.S. *Wrenn*, who said, "We, the wives of reservists recently called up, protest the emphasis and publicity given those few reservists who protested their callups. We hope that our husbands' callup has helped to reduce world tension. They were able to take full command of a destroyer. They were trusted and found capable because of the training they received in the Naval Reserve program. They have been impressed with the active Navy and what it is doing to protect our country. We are proud that our husbands are a part of it."

Connally since has resigned and his place taken by Fred Korth of Fort Worth, Tex., who was sworn in on January 4. Mr. Korth has been serving as president of the Continental National Bank in Fort Worth. The Pentagon is not unfamiliar to him as he served as Deputy Counsel for the Department of the Army in 1951–52 and Assistant Secretary of the Army, 1952–53.

Health Care for the Aged: The Issues To Be Faced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, again in the 2d session of the 87th Congress, the administration has placed a "top priority" label on efforts to institute a system of health care for the aged under social security. This proposal is embodied in the King-Anderson bills, currently under study in the House Ways and Means Committee. Extensive hearings were held on this subject in the 1st session of this Congress; unfortunately, these hearings were delayed in the printing process and the impact of the facts revealed was lessened by this delay and by a curious failure of the

press to report on them. I would urge every Member of Congress to obtain copies of these hearings—they run some four volumes—and study them. I would urge a similar exercise on my friends of the press and would further urge that they give the facts revealed the publicity they deserve.

The facts refute the claims of the bill's proponents. A number of these claims, with the facts given about them, were included in the speech of Mr. Russell H. Hubbard, a consultant to the General Electric Co., in its employment benefits division. This speech, given before the annual conference of the American Society of Insurance Management in Los Angeles in September of last year, follows:

FEDERAL LEGISLATION AND EFFECT ON VOLUNTARY HEALTH INSURANCE

(An address by Russell H. Hubbard, Jr., consultant, employee benefits, General Electric Co., presented at the annual conference of the American Society of Insurance Management, Roger Young Auditorium, Los Angeles, Calif., September 20, 1961)

Right now there are at least three key questions confronting all of us who are interested in maintaining and improving the high quality medical care we enjoy in America today.

Will Congress provide medical care benefits under social security next year?

If compulsory health care under social security is passed, will this mean the end of voluntary health insurance?

Will it signal the end of private medical care with the substitution of Government-controlled medicine for most of us?

I'm sure you do not expect me to provide the complete answers. The best I can do is to present some facts and opinions which may help you reach a conclusion. These thoughts may help you decide whether you should bother to do anything about the current situation—or just sit back and let fate handle the matter.

THE POLITICS

Let us first examine the politics involved. For over 15 years some groups have urged national health programs of one kind or another—so that this is not exactly a brand-new issue. However, as changes are made in Congress and in the Presidency—and his advisers—new factors emerge. New arguments are advanced, old ones refurbished. Congress has postponed any final action on this issue for this year although the House Ways and Means Committee did hold hearings on the administration's bill, H.R. 4222 (King) the last week in July.

However, the warmup for 1962 has already begun in earnest. On August 30, Senator MCNAMARA wrote a letter—issued shortly as a press release—to the President stating that no action would be taken by Congress this year and asked for assurances that the administration would support medical care benefits through social security with "all possible vigor." He said that such assurances would stimulate a "prompt beginning to the planning for the next session that must begin soon so that this most necessary legislation may be enacted by the 87th Congress."

The next day, August 31, the President came through with the pledge via a press release from the White House that he would assign the program "the higest priority." Then there was—in current TV parlance—a fadeout for the Democrats while a Republican entered the scene.

Five days later Senator JAVITS, of New York, filed an interesting press statement. He pointed out that on medical care for the aged during the present session, "not even a word was uttered by the President from the day he placed it on his 'must' list of legislation at this session." He then urged that a drive be launched to mobilize support so that this would not again be the "forgotten issue of 1962." Then just to make sure that the issues were nonpolitical and not forgotten, he urged the President to ask a special Committee of the Congress to reach a compromise between the Democratic plan and a Republican plan suggested by himself during the congressional recess. This should be done "instead of enmeshing the legislation in 1962 politics." He then proceeded to point out that his own self-labeled "Republican alternative" would have done the job but that the program passed Congress in 1960 and endorsed by the Eisenhower administration (the Kerr-Mills legislation) was no good at all. And this is where we stand today.

This all adds up to politics at a rather low combustion point where the electorate will have a mighty difficult time sorting out the facts and deciding what they think should be done.

Recognizing that politics will play a leading role in 1962, let us examine the facts of the case for a moment. First of all, there is no dearth of facts. I walked into our library a week ago to review some new material and found the librarian seated behind a 4-foot stack of hearings, reports, and analyses on the issue, including at least 2 feet of material published in connection with the 1961 White House Conference on the Aging.

The interesting part of all this material is that all the major arguments cluster around a handful of issues. Here are the five that seem most germane:

1. Are the aged a homogeneous group of helpless, destitute individuals who cannot or will not purchase adequate health protection?

2. Can and will voluntary health insurance do the job of providing protection at prices the vast majority can afford?

3. Is social security cheap—now and tomorrow—a real good bargain under which an employee for less than 4 cents a day (according to sponsors of H.R. 4222), can get most adequate health care over age 65?

4. Would medical care benefits undermine basic social security principles including the current principle which permits complete freedom of choice in using cash social security benefits?

5. Would the quality of general medical care be improved or impaired under Government regulated medicine?

Let us briefly examine in the short time we have each of these points.

1. ARE THE AGED LARGELY HELPLESS AND DESTITUTE?

The advocates of compulsory medical care continue to trot out the correct but totally misleading fact that 60 percent of the aged 65 and older have incomes less than $1,000. The census data on which this was based shows that 74 percent of these individuals were women, and that 77 percent of all women 65 and over had incomes less than $1,000—in fact 60 percent of all women of all age groups had money incomes of less than $1,000. (I'm sorry to say my wife also fell in that category.) This figure is derived by including all wives whose normal income is nominal.

Now if you look at the more meaningful family relationships an entirely different picture emerges. In 1959 according to January 1961 census reports the median income of family units where the head of the family was 65 and over and working was over $5,300, and the median income of all urban family units where the head was 65 and over, working or not, was over $3,300.

Almost 4 million of the 16.6 million older persons are working. Ten million receive OASI benefits. Almost 75 percent of all couples drawing OASI benefits own their own homes, 9 out of 10 without mortgages. A 1957 OASI study showed that over 45 percent had a net worth of $10,000 or more.

Many people who examine only cash income figures overlook the most significant differences in spending requirements dependent upon the size of the family unit and the age of the head of the unit.

Using new and quite sensible "equivalent income" scales to account for the wide difference, the New York Department of Labor has just released a study[1] placing this entire question of cash income and family unit spending in better perspective. It obtains equivalent income figures by using accepted estimates of how much less it costs a family of two to maintain a given level of comfort than it costs a family of three or four, etc., and how much less a person usually needs to maintain a given standard after age 65.

To illustrate, the study found that living costs (comparable standard of living) of a two-member family where the head of the family was 65 or older was about 51 percent of the costs of a four-person family. The study, based on 1957 U.S. census data and covering New York residents showed that the median equivalent income for all families where the head of the family was between ages 65 and 69 was over $7,000. This compared with a median equivalent income of about $5,600 for all families where the head was between ages 40–44 years old. Interestingly enough, the median equivalent income of all four-person family units was about $5,900—considerably less than the older age group.

Clearly, the stereotype penny postcards sent to Congress and the "sob" stories notwithstanding, the aged are not relatively worse off than other age groups—they are better off. They are by and large an independent, self-reliant group, most of whom are able and willing to take care of themselves.

2. ROLE OF VOLUNTARY HEALTH INSURANCE

The next major argument rests on the proposition made by the advocates of compulsory health care that voluntary health insurance cannot do the job. Here the facts are clearly to the contrary and rapidly making the allegation look downright ridiculous. Perhaps this provides a little insight as to why there is such a note of hysteria on the part of the proponents to push their plan through right now.

In 1946, just 15 years ago, the first Commissioner of Social Security, Dr. Altmeyer, testified that "voluntary insurance against the costs of medical care has been tried and found wanting. The principal reason why voluntary programs have not succeeded and cannot succeed is economic." At that time no more than 24 percent of the total population had health-insurance protection—today 73 percent have such protection (132 million people). One hundred and twenty-one million people have surgical benefits coverage and more than 87 million have protection for the payment of doctor bills. There are over 1,200 voluntary insuring organizations and premiums paid for health insurance now total $7.4 billion annually.

This situation, coverage of all the population with voluntary health insurance has so deteriorated from the viewpoint of national health insurance supporters that today they only talk about the 65-and-over group. Even here the picture is so rapidly changing that the advocates of compulsion have little left to really talk about.

As recently as 1952 only 26 percent of the aged were insured under voluntary health insurance plans (about 3 million people). Today 53 percent of the noninstitutional-

[1] "Income Distribution and Economic Welfare in New York State, Specal Bulletin 223," New York Department of Labor 1961.

ized population over age 65 have voluntary health insurance. This proportion has doubled in less than 9 years and today represents 9 million men and women.

Of the almost 17 million aged about 2½ million are covered under Old Age Assistance. When due regard is taken for this group plus those who will be eligible under the Kerr-Mills Act—providing for the medically indigent—plus those having voluntary health insurance—nearly all of the present aged now have some form of protection. Clearly voluntary health insurance is doing the job as you in the insurance business can more fully appreciate.

3. SOCIAL SECURITY PROTECTION IS NO LONGER CHEAP

The advocates of compulsion say that the voluntary way is too expensive and that social security is cheaper. The only way to overcome this contention is to appeal to reason, cite the facts and to point out that "you get what you pay for."

Fortunately, the facts belie the allegations. Social security is becoming more and more expensive. An individual's social security taxes in 1962—based on $4,800 of earnings—will be $150.00 ($225.00 for the self-employed) and 6 years later—without any further increases in benefits they are scheduled to be $222 per year with an equivalent amount paid by the employer. The self-employed's social security taxes will then amount to $333 per year. For many in the lower earnings levels social security taxes already exceed personal income taxes. Next year, for example, a person earning $60 a week and claiming 4 exemptions, including himself, pays $88.40 in Federal income tax and $97.50 in social security.

Under H.R. 4222 as outlined by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Ribicoff, the social security taxes levied on employees would go up to $253—over a 70 percent increase in 7 years and many believe that the costs estimates of the Government health care proposals are greatly understated.

Interestingly enough, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare voiced the opinion at the recent hearings on social security in the Senate that a combined social security employer-employee tax of 10 percent was about the upper limit of tax to which the public would agree. Under present law the combined tax will go to 9¼ percent by 1968 and under H.R. 4222 it would advance to 9¾ percent. There was some jocular interchange at that juncture in the Senate hearings and it was suggested by Senator BYRD, the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee that this one-fourth of 1 percent margin didn't leave very much for the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to do by way of increasing the expanding benefits during the rest of his stay in office. The Secretary replied, followed by laughter, that—"It looks like you and I are going to be out of business." We'll see.

As you may know the insurance industry actuaries dispute the cost estimates produced by the administration and say that a payroll tax of about 1.7 percent would be required instead of the ½ percent planned by the sponsors of H.R. 4222. They estimate a first-year cost of $2.2 to $2.5 billion and ultimate cost of about $5.4 billion as contrasted to the sponsors estimates of $1 billion now and up to $2.5 billion later. I know the Life Insurance Association or Health Insurance Institute (488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.) would be pleased to give you the careful documentation on this point.

Of course, all but the most naive person expected the proposed medical care benefits to be just the beginning. Former Congressman Forand summed up the situation in January 1961 when he said "If we can only break through and get our foot inside the door, then we can expand the program after that."

Even the eligibility conditions in the current proposal build in pressure for expansion to younger ages. Only those over 65 would be eligible.

Let us assume that two men work side by side—one age 65 and eligible for Government medical care—the other 64 or 63 or younger and not eligible. Both pay identical social security taxes. Isn't it likely Congress must extend benefits to the younger man?

Widows age 62–64 now drawing full social security benefits would be denied benefits. How long could that situation stand up?

Clearly if apparent economic need is the criterion of the proponents for Government medicine, a better case can be made for some of the younger age groups or groups with large families as outlined earlier with respect to the "equivalent income" study.

In fact, it is an absolute certainty that once the break is made to provide medical care benefits to those age 65 and over that irresistible pressures will make benefits available to all under the program. This was so with respect to the total elimination by Congress of the age 50 requirement with respect to permanent disability benefits.

To try and convince the American people that this program will be confined to just the overage 65—and to just the benefits currently proposed doesn't make sense. Like you, I have seen costs and benefits grow like Topsy in the past and I can't believe they'll stop growing in the future.

4. UNDERMINING OF SOCIAL SECURITY PRINCIPLES

Today most of us support a sound social security program providing a basic floor of financial protection, and we probably would want to preserve the following three cornerstones on which it rests:

(a) Social security benefits are paid only where there is a loss of job income, except for liberalizations in the retirement test.

(b) Social security benefits bear some relationship to earnings and taxes based on those earnings. Those who pay higher taxes are entitled to higher benefits with weighting in favor of lower income levels.

(c) Social security benefits are paid in cash—providing a complete freedom of choice in expending the benefits.

Any candid appraisal of the current proposed H.R. 4222 cannot help but admit that it violates all three of these principles. Perhaps the most serious threat is reduction in freedom of choice. This involves the substitution of service benefits—unrelated to earnings or taxes paid—for the present cash benefits.

5. QUALITY OF MEDICAL CARE

We have prided ourselves in having the best medical care available. There has not been the lowering of care, the overcrowding, the waiting, the bickering, and the redtape associated with government-controlled medicine elsewhere.

Recent reports indicate that there is a 2-to-3-year wait for elective surgery in Britain today. The British plan costs more than five times its original estimates. There are two to three Government clerks for each doctor. On an equivalent basis here, the Federal Government would have to hire nearly 2 million more clerks.

It is either just plain naive or dishonest to say that if medical care benefits are made a part of social security that there would be no Government supervision, control, or regulation on the practice of medicine or hospital services. The bill, H.R. 4222, purports to calm the fears of those interested in avoiding Government control by excluding doctors and promising medical care "without interfering in any way with the free choice of physicians," and "without the exercise of any Federal supervision or control over the practice of medicine by any doctor or over the manner in which medical services are provided by any hospital."

However, the bill also immediately thereafter specifically lists doctors working in hospitals who are included and then goes on to state that hospitals must meet such conditions of participation as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare requires.

This sounds very much like Government control to me—and should be expected if the Government is going to pay the bill.

Clearly, the quality of health care could not help but deteriorate if experience under other Government-controlled medicine is any guide at all.[2]

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

As you can see, the facts just do not justify what we would all expect simply from listening to the hysterical outpourings for medical care for the aged under social security. But that is not reason enough to relax. These facts and your opinions must be conveyed to those who do the voting in Congress.

It seems clear that not only will our social security system be weakened and medical care suffer but also the over $7 billion annual health insurance business may be on the brink of disaster.

Government expenditures for public welfare programs have expanded over 1,340 percent since 1940 (social insurance and related programs $1.58 billions to $22.8 in 1960). Federal income taxes begin at about 20 percent. Employee benefits now comprising almost 23 percent of total payroll (legally required benefits comprising 4.2 percent of that payroll). Combined social security taxes are now approaching 10 percent. With all this, it becomes clear that there is less and less stretch in the income of individuals and in available resources of employers to further expand voluntary plans if the government continues to take away increased taxes for compulsory plans.

The Social Security Administration reporting on a current survey of collectively bargained plans stated that 95 percent of employees—regardless of age—may maintain continuation of coverage after retirement. The growth of voluntary coverage of those over age 65 has been phenomenal since 1952—faster than the growth in coverage of health insurance of the population as a whole. Compulsion is just not needed.

This record demonstrates the continuing and growing public confidence in the voluntary approach. The insurance industry has rejected and I hope will continue to reject the ideas of the few who would cut corners through the use of small print and capricious insurance cancellation when the need is the greatest.

Today we have in place the means of assuring adequate medical care for all.

These means include existing and expanding voluntary health services at prices within the reach of nearly all. They include all existing public programs—general public assistance, and State medical assistance for the aged programs under the legislation passed by Congress in 1960. And lastly they include all the sources of income from savings, pensions and social security benefits.

If Congress believes that present social security cash benefits are not providing a "floor of protection" then the thing to do is to increase those cash benefits—not jeopardize the entire social security system, voluntary health insurance and the quality of medical care.

Whether Congress passes compulsory health care benefits under social security depends on you. This is a job that cannot be delegated. You can encourage others to get the facts and take action but in the long run, it is your voice that counts.

---

[2] See also "I Quit Socialized Medicine," July 1961, Nation's Business.

I am convinced that if we all pitch in now, undesirable government controlled medicine can be avoided and that we can continue to provide an ever-increasing amount of the best possible medical care within the framework of voluntary—not compulsory—action.

Frankness in the White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, Columnist Courtney Sheldon has recently written a perceptive article for the Christian Science Monitor on President Kennedy and his handling of foreign affairs. Under unanimous consent, I include the article entitled "Frankness in the White House" in the RECORD.

The article follows:

FRANKNESS IN THE WHITE HOUSE

(By Courtney Sheldon)

The frequency with which Kennedy administration officials emphasize the calculated risks in the U.S. foreign policy is increasing.

Since the time of the founding of the Republic, Presidents have at times had to choose between shades of gray. Black and white alternatives are fewer for the man in the White House than for the curbstone kibitzer.

The difference between Mr. Kennedy and most other Presidents is that he is willing to admit, quite often, his policies may not work out.

This frankness has obvious appeal to those who recognize the increasing complexities in foreign policy and admire modesty.

Mr. Kennedy's quick acceptance of the responsibility for the Cuban invasion debacle disarmed his critics. The President's popularity with the public is at an alltime high.

Whatever the President's motivations, his demeanor has proved good politics for now.

"We are taking a chance in all of southeast Asia. We are taking a chance in other areas also," President Kennedy told a press conference.

This was in answer to a question on Laos: "It would seem that coalition governments lean toward Communist control. Are we then taking a chance in supporting a coalition-type government in southeast Asia?"

The trend toward support of a coalition government in Laos began late in the Eisenhower administration. But it is the Kennedy administration which has pushed it with vigor.

The conviction grew gradually in Washington officialdom that the Lao Government the United States backed was not popularly supported. Its military forces were not felt to be overly enthusiastic in battling with the Communist Pathet Lao.

What had the millions in foreign aid, economic and military, pumped into Laos availed, it was asked.

Another prime consideration in Mr. Kennedy's thinking was the possibility of escalation of a military struggle in a place of danger of being bogged down in interminable jungle warfare.

The whole story of Laos has not yet been told. It probably won't be until more is known of what actually went on behind the scenes in Moscow last year as well as in Washington.

It is well known the Communist Pathet Lao continued to grab territory in the face of Mr. Kennedy's warning that the Western nations would not stand idly by and see Laos swallowed up. Republicans have criticized Mr. Kennedry for talking big and not following through.

High officials here have subsequently admitted the Communists, when they finally tacitly agreed to the cease-fire, could, if they wished, have swept through the entire country.

What bearing the estrangement between the Communist Chinese and the Soviet Union had on the Lao situation is not known for certain.

It is presumed the Soviets were more conciliatory with the West on Laos in order to keep Communist Chinese influence from spreading to Asia.

Mr. Kennedy's role in decisions on Laos is now becoming clearer, if reports from those who have recently interviewed him privately prove accurate.

One newspaper columnist, Marquis Childs, came out of such an interview in the oval room, reported presidential moods, and passed along this as if it came from the President:

"On Laos the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of State favored going in with force supplied by the United States and the other SEATO powers. The President waited. He weighed the situation in the scales of his own judgment—the fact that it is a landlocked, primitive jungle country with tribal people resistant to war.

"He decided for a neutral and independent Laos and he is high in his praise of W. Averell Harriman for the success he has had thus far toward that goal. It may still fail. But the President believes that his judgment was right."

The surprise in this is that Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, was on the side of using force in Laos. Several of the Joint Chiefs of Staff members were known previously to have regretted Mr. Kennedy's decision to avoid military involvement.

If it does turn out, when everyone's side of the story is better known, that Mr. Kennedy, alone at the pinnacle of government, overruled his highest advisers—civilian and military—on whether to go to war in Laos, the fate of Laos would mean much to Mr. Kennedy's future.

President Macapagal Promises To Provide Progressive Leadership for the Philippine Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on November 14 of last year, the citizens of the Philippine Republic elected 51-year-old Diosdado Macapagal as their President to succeed Carlos P. Garcia. The latter leader, in many respects, provided responsible government policies.

The United States and the nations of the free world are indeed fortunate that the new President has advanced to the position of leader of one of those countries strongest among the forces attempting to rid the world of communism.

Born of humble parents in a Pampanga barrio on September 28, 1910, President Macapagal has dedicated his life to the betterment of the people of his nation. In a statement issued after he had learned the results of the election, the newly elected President said:

I shall find reward, not in the accumulation of material wealth nor in the influence that comes from high position, but in the realization of a goal—the bringing about of a better life for the masses of our people.

What he does for his people while serving as President will be an extension of his many contributions made while a member of the Filipino Congress. He authored and sponsored for passage the present minimum wage law; wrote and sponsored the law creating the Agricultural Credit and Cooperative Financing Administration; and he is also responsible for the law creating the rural health units. He was also highly instrumental in many other articles of legislation which are by far too numerous to mention at this time.

With respect to international affairs, President Macapagal is well equipped through experience to deal with any situation which might arise. He served as chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, led the Philippine delegation to the United Nations General Assembly, was a negotiator and signer of the United States-Philippine Islands Mutual Defense Treaty, and was author and sponsor of the Foreign Service Act of 1952.

The United States can be assured that the traditional ties of friendship between the two nations will continue to exist with President Macapagal's administration.

In referring to the partnership of the two countries, President Macapagal said:

I am proud to recall that I had a hand in the conclusion of the mutual security pact between the Philippines and the United States, being a member of the team that went with President Quirino to Washington to sign the treaty with President Truman. The mutual security pact has become the nerve center of Filipino-American defense against Communist aggression and expansionism.

President Macapagal has also stated:

I believe that if our Republic is to endure and our way of life is to triumph, our country and our people must remain committed to the side of the free world led by the United States in the ceaseless struggle between democracy and communism.

Vital information about President Macapagal are brought forth in a recent article entitled "Freedom and Democracy Safe Under President Macapagal" in a special issue of Bataan magazine.

The article, written by Diosdado M. Yap, editor and publisher of the magazine, includes complete biographical data about the newly elected President as well as his views and actions on national and international affairs.

Because of the genuine friendship which exists between the citizens of our Nation and the people of the Philippine Islands, I suggest that every Member of Congress note with particular attention this helpful article.

I ask unanimous consent to include this article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY SAFE UNDER PRESIDENT MACAPAGAL

(By Diosdado M. Yap)

Diosdado Macapagal, newly-elected President of the Philippine Republic, was swept into office on a platform of honesty in government.

The election of Diosdado Macapagal was a triumph of democrary in the Philippines. It was a true expression of the popular will. Macapagal is a true man of the people, simple, guileless, and forthright. His complete integrity and honesty are among his best assets. He brings to his job boundless energy and a driving desire to improve the lot of the common people. His record has shown him to be a man of action, bold, resourseful and imaginative when he is convinced that he is fighting for a good cause.

With an unblemished reputation for personal honesty during his service in the Bureau of Lands, the Department of Foreign Affairs, in the Congress and as Vice President, the Liberal Party's leader has always been deeply concerned with the welfare of the common man and always has been, and still is, convinced that the government should not be dominated by the entrenched wealthy elements of the country.

If proof were needed of the political maturity of the 28,000,000 Filipino people and of the vitality of democratic institutions in the Philippines, the overwhelming victory of Macapagal provided it. Although feelings ran high during the campaign the conduct of the election itself was, as a whole, exemplary. There was no systematic attempt at intimidation, and if such an attempt had been made it could not have succeeded. One of the most encouraging features of the elections was the intense and spontaneous interest of the rank and file of the citizenry in assuring the unhampered expression of the popular will. The election of Macapagal was a vindication of the faith in the capacity of the Filipino people to govern themselves in a manner worthy of free men.

Not the least of the manifestations of self-discipline and of respect for the sovereign will of the people was the fact that President Carlos P. Gracia conceded the election of Macapagal soon after the Philippine Congress formally proclaimed him the winner of the November 14, 1961, presidential elections.

The new President's Reform Movement emphasizes the need to minimize the cost of winning an election. Overspending in a campaign, he says, is one of the most important causes of graft and corruption. He points out that a politician who has spent heavily to get elected will likely use his office to recoup his election expenses.

As the second Liberal Party President since Manuel Roxas, founder of the party, Macapagal feels that the party is now stronger in its organization than ever before. Its basic local strength, its solidarity and faith in the righteousness of its cause all contribute to this strength, he says.

The new President himself, was born of humble parents in a Pampanga barrio on September 28, 1910. He grew up in poverty. This he has never forgotten. Hence, his concern for the common man.

Through rigid self-denial, courage and persistence, Diosdado Macapagal obtained an education. He was a valedictorian in elementary school. He was second highest in his high school class. He holds degrees of doctor of laws and doctor of philosophy in economics. When he took the Philippine Bar Examination, he came out No. 1. Many times during his scholastic career, he received several gold medals, numerous awards for excellence in oratory and debating, a proficiency which has served him invaluably in his political career.

DISTINGUISHED LEGISLATOR

During his terms in the congress, where he was chosen one of the best congressmen each year, and the top one in the third congress, he served on the appropriations committee, the committee on commerce and industry, ways and means committee, the committee on economic planning, the committee on banks, currency and corporations, the special committee for the revision of the Bell trade act. In addition he was a member of the Philippine economic mission to the United States in 1954, and still serves as vice president of the Free Enterprise Society of the Philippines, a job he took over in 1955.

President-elect Macapagal also has extensive experience in diplomacy. He started out in the department of foreign affairs as an assistant in the law division in 1946. The next year he was named Chief of the Division.

In 1948, he served as chief negotiator with Great Britain for the return of the Turtle Islands to the Philippines. He put in a stint in Washington as second secretary of the new republic's Embassy in 1948. In 1949, he was named counsellor on legal affairs and treaties of the department of foreign affairs.

From 1950 to 1953 the President-elect was chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. He has been chairman of the Philippine delegation to the United Nations General Assembly, was a negotiator and signer of the United States-Philippine Islands Mutual Defense Treaty and author and sponsor of the Foreign Service Act of 1952, which bears his name.

VICTORY STATEMENT OF MACAPAGAL

President Diosdado Macapagal, upon learning of the results of the election, issued the following statement:

"I am overwhelmed with joy, not for myself but for the masses of our people whose burden and cause we have assumed unto ourselves.

"I want to thank the people for this clear demonstration of faith in my leadership and for granting the Liberal Party another opportunity to be the instrument of their will.

"The campaign is over. The task of building the nation now begins. National leadership is a rare opportunity and not given to many. It is a rare and serious burden granted but to a few. The concommitants of leadership include honor, duty, responsibility, authority, and dedication. The proper exercise thereof calls for the best in a man and the utmost in sacrifice and self-denial. At its best, it is the highest honor a people can grant to any man. At its worst, it is the loneliest of all tasks.

"For my part, I am prepared to assume the full weight of my position. I shall not shirk my duty, I shall not fear to fulfill my sworn duties and obligations regardless of human and personal considerations. I shall seek nothing for myself and my family.

"I shall find reward, not in the accumulation of material wealth nor in the influence that comes from high position, but in the realization of a goal—the bringing about of a better life for the masses of our people.

"With all the help of Divine Providence and the continued faith of our people, I shall not fail."

Dealing with the issue of graft and dishonesty in government, Diosdado Macapagal pledged himself to observe in office what he called the "principle of command responsibility."

Under this principle, he said, "I expressly hold myself responsible, morally, and politically, to the people, for malfeasance by members of my Cabinet, for the acts of my family and intimates, for the general state of morality of the Government, and for failure to take prompt and vigorous action."

Maximo V. Soliven, eminent and popular publisher of one of the leading metropolitan dailies of the Philippines, the Evening News, in an exclusive article while appears in the Philippines Free Press of October 21, 1961, stated that "* * * He (Macapagal) has sworn, if elected, to abolish 'pork barrel,' eliminate patronage, respect the career civil service, and revitalize the educational system."

Dr. Macapagal defines his foreign policy as a continuing partnership with the United States, adherence to the principles of the United Nations, reliance on collective security, resistance to Communist expansion, effective relations with Asian neighbors, and expanding relationship with the rest of the free world. Macapagal will need a generous measure of understanding, sympathy, and assistance from America in performing this job. I am sure these will not be withheld from him.

His domestic policy consists of "carrying out the proper policies and measures of good government for which the Liberal Party has painstakingly prepared itself during its days of defeat and weakness."

"Furthermore," he says, "the Liberal Party has leaders qualified * * * and capable. * * * They are leaders whose strength has already been tested successfully."

Speaking on the radio in 1959, the vigorous (51-year-old) new chief executive predicted his victory at the polls 2 years later.

"Surveying the political situation, the odds to be expected, and every possible political development," he said at that time, "I can hazard the statement to our partymen and to the people that, with the existing solidarity of the party maintained, our victory in 1961, by the grace of the divine providence, will be easier than the hardfought and precarious victory that we attained in the preparatory election of 1959."

Macapagal might be an unknown public school teacher today if he had taken a teaching job offered him on his graduation from high school in 1929. It was a tempting offer, and the school supervisor put a little pressure on by telling the future President that the time had come to start earning in order to help his parents who had sacrificed so much in order to provide him with an education.

Life was rough for the future solon when he turned down the offer and decided instead to go to Manila and continue his studies. After completing 2 years of preparatory law at the University of Manila, he was advised by a university doctor to quit his studies because of undernourishment.

Returning to Pampanga, the boy regained his health and spent a short period appearing on the stage with the man who was later to become his brother-in-law, Rogelio de la Rosa, who later was to become a famous Tagalog movie star and a famous member of the Philippine Senate.

De la Rosa was instrumental in aiding his lifelong friend to the top position in the Philippines, as was former newspaper columnist and now mayor of Manila, Arsenio Lacson, who acted as campaign manager.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Numerous articles have been written, and so much has been said about Diosdado Macapagal that a mere recitation of his accomplishment and record in the service of his people does not suffice to properly do justice to the man. It is inescapable that any mention of Macapagal must perforce be linked with the hopes, expectations, and aspirations of the Filipino people for a government truly dedicated and responsive to their needs. For there is a compelling force which irresistibly attracts the masses to this man whose uphill struggle for his rightful place inspires at once hope, faith, and respect.

Born of humble parents in a barrio in Pampanga on September 28, 1910, he grew up amid abject poverty in surroundings demonstrative of the plight of the common man. With courage, persistence, and rigid self-denial, he engaged in the relentless pursuit of an education, the realization of which he had constantly dreamed about whether he was tending to carabaos during the day or catching frogs for food at night in barrio San Nicolas 1st, Lubao, Pampanga.

In the acquisition of his doctor of laws and doctor of philosophy in economics degrees, he set a standard which is unmatched by politicians in the Philippines. Indeed, his notable scholastic record was a portent of what was to come in his distinguished professional and official career. He was a valedictorian in elementary school, obtained second highest honors in high school, topped the bar examinations upon finishing his law course, and was many times the recipient of gold medal awards for excellence in oratory and debating. He was the captain of the Filipino debating team which met the visiting round-the-world debaters from the University of Washington in 1934.

His election to the vice presidency of the Philippines in the 1957 elections wherein he polled the highest number of votes among all the candidates seeking national positions is unprecedented in Philippine political history. In congratulating him for the spectacular victory against his Nacionalista Party rival, President Garcia said: "Your victory under the circumstances has no precedent in our political history and I have found none in American politics."

Not many appeared surprised at the political phenomenon which he proved to be in the 1957 elections. Indeed, it can truly be said that his victory was anticipated—that it was due in recognition of his talents, unimpeachable honesty and integrity, and genuine solicitude for the masses.

The welfare of the common man had always been his constant obsession and the most significant feature of his legislative work, thus his sponsorship of such bills as the minimum wage law, the law creating the Agricultural Credit and Cooperative Financing Administration, laws creating the rural health units, rural banks, barrio councils with power to enact barrio ordinances, and other legislation designed to ameliorate the plight of the masses.

It is no source of wonder then that many citizens of the Philippines repose their hopes for reforms and leadership in him. In the brief time since his assumption of the Liberal Party Presidency he has displayed organizing ability of the highest order, building for his party an intricate and business-like machine covering the length and breadth of the archipelago.

In his public career, he is widely respected for two outstanding qualities: an incorruptive integrity and an abiding concern for the common people, from whom he sprung. The late President Ramon Magsaysay told a delegation in 1954: "I like Dadong because he is honest and a man of the masses."

In his Philippine Free Press article of June 15, 1957, a distinguished Filipino journalist and radio commentator, Mr. Leon O. Ty, wrote:

"One of the few ruthlessly honest elective officials that we have today is the personable Congressman from the First District of Pampanga, Diosdado Macapagal. He is finishing his second term in Congress but materially he has nothing to show for the 8 years that he has been a political bigshot. The Liberal Party to which he belongs was at the acme of power when Dadong Macapagal won a congressional seat in 1949. The Liberal Party continued to lord it over the Nacionalista until 1953 but one will look in vain for proof of any kind to show that he utilized his office to advance his financial interest.

"The most significant feature of his legislative work is that he has always worked for passage of laws that would benefit the common man. There is no doubt that his heart is with the masses, as borne out by the bills which he sponsored during his incumbency. The Pampanga solon authored, sponsored and fought—against stiff opposition from certain colleagues—on the House floor for the passage of the present minimum wage law. Together with the former lawmaker from Tarlac, Jose Feliciano, and Augurio Abeto of Negro Occidental, Dadong wrote and sponsored the law creating the Agricultural Credit and Cooperative Financing Administration (ACCFA). He also authored the law creating the rural health units.

"Other pieces of legislation which he either authored or cosponsored are those which provide for the establishment of rural banks; the creation of the P20-million communal irrigation revolving fund; and establishment of barrio councils which have power to enact barrio ordinances. In order to enable the government to acquire big landed estates for distribution to the landless, Macapagal introduced a bill which is now a law—providing for the exchange of government property with private estates, especially those in Luzon, in order to help facilitate the construction of more barrio roads he also introduced a bill, which likewise became a law, providing that the national government would defray 60 percent of the cost of construction while the municipal government would foot the rest of the expenses.

"The original authorship of the bill providing for a 5-day week for government employees belongs to Congressman Macapagal. He introduced the bill during the opening of the second congress. His measure was taken up in the senate by a prolabor senator who succeeded in having it enacted into law."

The entire life story of Diosdado Macapagal reads like something written by Horatio Alger. In the United States it has always been the log-cabin-to-the-White-House theme (which has happened), but today in the Philippines it's "from nipa shack to Malacanan."

PRESIDENT DIOSDADO MACAPAGAL

The story of Diosdado Macapagal, a man of humble beginnings and high intellectual caliber is highlighted by enviable achievements as law practitioner, educator, legal assistant in the office of the President, foreign affairs expert, economist, legislator, opposition leader, and Vice President of the Philippines for 4 years.

Born of humble parents in a barrio in Pampanga on September 28, 1910, he grew up amid abject poverty in surroundings demonstrative of the plight of the common man. With courage, persistence, and rigid self-denial, he engaged in the relentless pursuit of an education, the realization of which he had constantly dreamed about whether he was tending to carabaos during the day or catching frogs for food at night in his native barrio in San Nicolas, Lubao, Pampanga.

Macapagal set a standard which is unmatched by politicians in the Philippines when he obtained two doctorate degrees—doctor of laws and doctor of philosophy in economics. His notable scholastic record was a portent of what was to come in his distinguished professional and political career. He was a valedictorian in elementary school, obtained second highest honors in high school, topped the Philippine bar examination upon finishing his law course, and was many times the recipient of gold medal awards for excellence in oratory and debating.

The welfare of the common man had always been his constant obsession and the most significant feature of his legislative work, thus sponsoring such bills as the minimum wage law, the law creating the agricultural credit and cooperative financing administration, laws creating the rural health units, rural banks, barrio councils to enact barrio ordinances, and other legislations designed to ameliorate the sad plight of the masses.

In the brief time that he assumed the leadership of the Liberal Party, he displayed organizing ability of the highest order, building for his party an intricate and business-like machine covering the length and breadth of the archipelago. It can truly be said that his victory, as predicted by experienced political observers, was due to the universal respect and admiration of the Filipino people for his talents, for his unimpeachable honesty and integrity, and genuine solicitude for the masses.

The cornerstone of Macapagal's foreign policy as defined by the Liberal Party, consists of the following: (1) continuing partnership with the United States, (2) adherence to the United Nations, (3) reliance on collective security, (4) resistance to Communist expansion, (5) effective relations with our Asian neighbors, and (6) expanding relationship with the rest of the free world.

Macapagal is married to Evangelina Macaraeg of Pangasinan. They have two children: Maria Gloria, 13; and Diosdado, Jr., 10. The President has two children by his first marriage, Maria Cielo, 20, and Arturo, 18.

Pertinent data on his record of accomplishments follows:

Legal career: Assistant attorney, Ross, Laurence, Selph, and Carrascoso, 1937–40; senior partner, Macapagal & Eusebio, 1946; senior partner, Macapagal, Punsalan & Yabut, 1949; senior partner, Diosdado Macapagal & Associates, 1954 to present time (now on leave); president, Philippine Lawyers Association, 1947–49; professor, college of law, UST, 1941–49; professor, postgraduate school, UST, 1950 to date.

General public career: Clerk, bureau of lands, 1950–51; legal assistant, Malacanan, 1941; various positions, department of foreign affairs, 1946–48 (see diplomatic career); elected congressman, 1949–53, reelected congressman, 1953–57; chosen every year 1 of the 10 best congressmen by the press from 1949 to 1957 and the best solon in the third congress (1954–57); elected Vice President of the Philippines, 1957–61.

Diplomatic career: Assistant, law division, department of foreign affairs, 1946; chief, law division, department of foreign affairs, 1947; chief negotiator with Britain for the return of Turtle Islands to the Philippines, 1948; second secretary, Philippine Embassy, Washington, D.C., 1948; counselor on legal affairs and treaties, department of foreign affairs, 1949; chairman, house committee on foreign affairs, 1950–53; delegate, Southeast Asia Conference, 1950; chairman, Philippine delegation, General Assembly, United Nations, Paris, 1951 (when he distinguished himself in debates with Andrei Vishinski of Russia); delegate, General Assembly, United Nations, New York, 1950; negotiator and signer, United States-Philippine Islands Mutual Defense Treaty, San Francisco, Calif.; author and sponsor of Foreign Service Act (Republic Act 708, 1952), known as Macapagal Act.

Economic career: Member, house committee on appropriations, 1950–56; member, committee on commerce and industry; member, committee on ways and means; member, committee on economic planning; member, committee on banks, currency, and corporations; member, special committee for the revision and of the Bell Trade Act, 1953; member, Philippine economic mission to the United States, 1954; vice president, free enterprise society of the Philippines, 1955 to date.

A Tribute to Our Flag—"Old Glory Speaks"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, a friend of mine and a veteran of World War I, Mr. Amos F. Hurley, of Los Angeles, Calif., has composed the following under the title of "Old Glory Speaks."

Because of its reverence for the flag of the United States and because it contains reference to many very important historical events in the life of our Nation, it occurred to me that it was very appropriate for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In addition to his service to the Nation in World War I, Mr. Amos F. Hurley has devoted much of his time to constructive and beneficial civic affairs. I am pleased to submit herewith his composition titled "Old Glory Speaks":

OLD GLORY SPEAKS

(By Amos F. Hurley)

I am the flag of the United States of America.

I was conceived in the dreams of liberty and in the hopes of freedom. I was designed by the hands of Betsy Ross and her sewing basket was my cradle. Though I was never an orphan, I was adopted by the Continental Congress in 1777 and proclaimed the national emblem of a Nation newly born on this continent, fighting valiantly for survival and destined to bring to all mankind a new concept of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. I have been many places and have seen many things. I have witnessed every event of American history. I was there when they fired the shot heard around the world. I was there in the late twilight at Fort McHenry and inspired Francis Scott Key to write the immortal "Star-Spangled Banner," now our national anthem.

I saw Molly Pitcher take the cannon swab from the hands of her dead husband and help carry on the fight for freedom. I felt the biting cold at Valley Forge, and gave warmth and comfort to General Washington and his tired and hungry Continental Army.

I rode with Ethan Allen and the Green Mountain Boys. I saw the signal that started the midnight ride of Paul Revere.

I was flown above the decks of Old Ironsides, and from the masts of the Yankee and the China Clippers. I blazed the trail with Daniel Boone and Davy Crockett. I led the settlers coming west and crossed Death Valley in a covered wagon.

I was carried through the halls of Montezuma to the shores of Tripoli by the U.S. Marines. Once I fell to the ground at Custer's Last Stand, and there were no living hands left to pick me up. I galloped up the slopes of San Juan Hill with Teddy Roosevelt and the Rough Riders of the U.S. Cavalry. I stayed with the boys until it was over; over there, and on the battlefields of the Marne, Chateau-Thierry, St. Mihiel, and the Argonne Forest. I saw many of the youth and manhood of our Nation fall and lie still in death; they had given their last full measure of devotion. The war was over for them forever, and I kept my lonely vigil over their graves and stayed to watch the poppies grow amid the crosses, row on row, in Flanders Fields. I was raised by five brave men during the "hell" of Iwo Jima. I wave farewell to the four immortal chaplains who went down with their ship and to honored glory.

I am many things to many people. I am an inseparable link in the chain that binds men to God and country; each link welded in the fires of purity by the sacred hands of God, himself. And because I am on the side of God, the godless would destroy me, but they dare not, because I am protected by the mighty land armies of the Nation, the powerful and deadly fleet of the Navy, and the screaming eagles of the Air Force, watching and waiting to swoop down and destroy anything that would harm me.

To some, I am yesterday, today, and tomorrow; to others I am a glorious child, to some a grand old man or a most gracious lady. I have several names. I am called the Red, White and Blue, the Star-Spangled Banner, the Stars and Stripes, but I am most commonly known by a nickname given me by an old sea captain, who called me Old Glory.

I have not changed much in my 185 years. I still have my original 13 stripes, but as each State came into the Union a new star was proudly added to the constellation of my blue field. It started with 13 stars, now there are 50.

Many more things I would like to tell you, but we haven't time, but I do want to see you again. I am easy to find. I am everywhere. I am in the homes of the poor, in the mansions of the rich, in Independence Hall with the Declaration of Independence and the Liberty Bell. I am in the White House with the President, I am in all the churches, cathedrals, and synagogues, in the Council of the Boy and Girl Scouts of America, in all the schools where they pledge allegiance to me.

I draped the caskets of our Nation's heroes, borne to their last resting place; the caskets of Presidents, generals, admirals, humble privates, and the Unknown Soldier. Wherever freemen gather, whever there is justice, equality, faith, hope, charity, truth, or brotherly love, there, too, am I. A short while ago I was flown over the Nation's Capital, gazing proudly across the land of the free and waving to the homes of the brave; then I was lowered and given by a grateful nation to a great Congressman, who brought me across the continent to the shores of the Pacific, and presented me to a group of veterans of World War I, at Patriotic Hall in the City of the Angels to become their official flag, and with fitting ceremonies, was carried by tired old hands and posted in a place of honor near the Holy Bible and there I shall remain until (like the old soldier) I'll just fade away and be retired by time alone, and may history never write my obituary for I am the Stars and Stripes forever.

I am Old Glory.

Unrealities of the President's Budget Cited by Dallas Newspaper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Dallas Morning News, Dallas, Tex., is must reading for every Member of Congress. The fallacies in the budget just presented by the administration are glaringly exposed in this fine piece of writing:

MR. KENNEDY'S DREAM WORLD

Only one word can describe the "balanced" budget which President Kennedy presented to Congress yesterday: "Incredible." It isn't that we doubt that things will turn out as the President has predicted they will. It just ain't going to happen—period.

Every budget has two sides, income and outgo. Almost everyone who has taken more than a cursory glance at the President's budget message can see clearly how things shape up on both sides of this ledger.

In respect to the outgo, figures for current obligations and additional expenditures leave little room for doubt, if Congress should follow the President's requests. If any doubt exists on this side of the ledger, it is that the expenses will remain within the $92.5 billion limit prescribed by the President.

On the other side, the situation is quite different. Not only are the proposed figures for income extremely doubtful, but they depend on events and factors which are not within the President's power to control.

Let's take a quick look at some of the elements which make up both sides of this record peacetime budget.

Under expenses, the budget calls for increases of $1.5 billion for defense, $1.3 billion for space research, $200 million for foreign aid, $400 million for health, labor, and welfare, $400 million for education, and $200 million for natural resources.

These, bear in mind, are only a few of the items, and represent the increases in each, not the total expenditure.

Under income are some "iffy" items. The biggest is the expected rise in Government receipts from individual and corporate income taxes. Mr. Kennedy expects an increase of $11 billion, based on an unprecedented rise in individual and corporate profits.

An increase of taxable income of these proportions has never happened in peacetime. The last time Government tax receipts rose to this extent was in 1943, as a result of a great boost in wartime industry and a large increase in tax rates.

The President is depending on an easing of the Berlin crisis which would allow troops recalled to duty last fall to return home by June 30. The budget calls for a lowering of troop strength by approximately 200,000 and if this can't be accomplished you can add at least another billion to expenses for their pay and maintenance.

The President is counting on a drop in unemployment next year from the present 6.1 percent level to 4 percent—an optimisitc outlook, at best. He is anticipating that Congress will enact a new farm bill—not even presented yet—which will cut spending by one-half billion.

The balance also depends upon congressional approval of postal rate increases, including a 5-cent letter charge, which will provide $600 million in additional revenue. Commerce and transportation will be decreased by $400 million, it is predicted, and veterans' benefits will be cut by $300 million.

If all of these improbable predictions should come true, the President may be able to balance his budget. But even at that he will be neglecting one very important item—the national debt.

If the coming year is as prosperous as Mr. Kennedy anticipates, then some of the added income certainly should go toward paying off that debt.

Last year alone, $7 billion was added to this burden. It is interesting to note also that one of the major items in the budget message is for $9.4 billion to pay off this year's interest on that debt—or more than 10 cents on every dollar to be spent.

Instead of moving to reduce this burden, the President is asking Congress to raise the debt limit by $10 billion—a move in precisely the wrong drection.

"Incredible" is the word.

Political Roadshow Breaks Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, during the interval between the sessions of this Congress, the American people were treated, if that term is proper, to a traveling political roadshow, sponsored by the administration, designed to build support for the legislative proposals which it has offered. This propagandizing trip was billed as an attempt by administration leaders to hear the views of the people. The St. Louis Globe-Democrat's Marsh Clark attended the St. Louis chapter of the White House Regional Conferences and described how the New Frontier seeks information from the grassroots. His report, "Words Can't Describe White House Parley," follows:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Nov. 10, 1961]

WORDS CAN'T DESCRIBE WHITE HOUSE PARLEY

(By Marsh Clark)

The pursuit and capture of descriptive adjectives is the way writers make a living, but they would all go broke if they had to depend full time on covering such wanting dull events as this week's White House Regional Conference here.

The conference had a peculiar and nebulous quality that made it difficult to describe. About the best adjective the writer could apply to it would be "bla," although he would have to strain himself a bit to be that chivalrous.

The conference was attended by a veritable legion of Federal Government officials from Washington, D.C., and it occasioned the amount of long-winded talk you might expect from anyone who came such a long way.

PARTY VIEWS

The Republicans criticized the conference in numerous press releases, saying it was merely a device used by the Kennedy administration to propagandize its program. The Democrats defended it, naturally, stating they were anxious to feel the public pulse, walk barefooted over the grassroots, refresh themselves at the public fountainhead, et cetera.

During breaks in the conference, newsmen talked in the corridors of Kiel auditorium rather disconsolately, trying to locate an adjective or two to properly describe the proceedings.

This much can be said: If the administration intended to use the conference as a means of brainwashing the public to any great extent, it failed.

If it intended to evoke an outpouring of public testimony on domestic problems, it failed, too.

MEETING DISJOINTED

The conference was so disjointed in presentation that its point was lost, either in the hurricane of speeches or somewhere beneath the mountain of literature distributed.

In the course of two short afternoons (with most of that time shot by the speechifying), the conference attempted to discuss almost every domestic issue of any consequence.

There were panels of Federal experts operating simultaneously in almost every cubbyhole in Kiel. In some rooms, the panel members seemed to outnumber the audience. In every room, the panel members found it necessary to deliver themselves of speeches concerning the Federal programs within their area of responsibility.

After they had finished speaking, the sessions were opened for questions in the short time remaining. But no effort was made to schedule the questions. The result was that many questioners made little speeches of their own or wandered far afield from the particular domestic problem their panel was supposed to solve.

With rare exceptions, there were no give-and-take discussions. If the panel members go back to Washington and attempt to report to President Kennedy on what people at the grassroots are thinking, they had better know how to write fiction.

SUBSTANCE OF QUESTIONS

On one occasion, a prominent St. Louis County doctor tried to interrogate the panel members and the substance of his questions made it plain he was opposed to the Kennedy administration's program in that particular field.

He was summarily and rudely cut off and his question left unanswered.

On another occasion, a questioner was told by a Washington official "write me a letter about that one," hardly the way to bring about a free exchange of ideas on current topics.

Nobody would argue with the conference if, indeed, it was designed to get Washington officials away from their desks and give them an opportunity to listen to the people.

But as soon as any element of propagandizing enters into it, such a conference is removed from the holy, bipartisan atmosphere with which its sponsors tried to surround it.

Of the fact that there was a certain amount of propagandizing on behalf of the administration there can be no serious question.

Indeed, this was frankly admitted in so many words by Jack T. Conway, a Federal official who made the keynote speech.

Referring to President Kennedy's campaign pledge to get this country moving again, Mr. Conway said he and others have been working day and night since January to get this country moving again and came to tell St. Louis all about it.

Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Ribicoff made three speeches during the conference and two of them were pleas for public support of two pet Kennedy projects—Federal aid to education, and medical care for aged persons under social security.

And of the fact that the conference failed to provide the Washington road show with any significant amount of grassroots' sentiment there can also be no serious question.

The sponsors should have taken a cue from last year's Democratic National Committee platform hearings, one of which was held here. The sessions lasted more than a couple hours and there was a minimum of filibustering by the panel members.

Witnesses were scheduled in advance. There were experts by the dozens and there were plain old people off the street and all got a chance to say something. Information flowed from the public to the panel, not from the panel to the public. The Democratic National Committee picked up the tab, in refreshing contrast to this week's conference.

CONFERENCE ENDS

Anyway, the conference broke up here this week and the participants left town, some late Wednesday, some early Thursday, riding away to the airport, some of them in city fire department cars.

Perhaps the most appropriate thing said at the conference was uttered by Commerce Secretary Hodges, in acknowledging his gracious introduction by Governor Dalton at the concluding session. What he said might apply to the conference itself.

When he was working his way through school, he recounted he was waiting on tables and served up some piping-hot porridge to a table. One student put the hot cereal in his mouth, then spat it out, spraying the stuff all over.

Unabashed by his act, the student turned to young Hodges and exclaimed.

"You know, some damn fools would have swallowed that stuff."

What Goes on Here, Anyway?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the New York Daily News of January 29.

It brings to light vividly and factually the strange performances of the State Department in censoring speeches by the military.

After reading a few portions of the censored speeches one begins to wonder just whose side we are on, and one becomes equally sure of which side the faceless mass in our State Department is on. This is all very disturbing and is of course quite incomprehensible to our remaining friends and allies in Europe and South America.

The editorial follows:

WHAT GOES ON HERE, ANYWAY?

"I believe that if we surrender certain of our rights today, then inevitably, and soon, we shall lose what rights remain."

Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Army Research and Development Chief, wanted to include the above statement in a speech he delivered October 10, 1961.

Unnamed persons in the Defense and State Departments ordered the sentence cut of the speech when they cleared it for delivery. It was in conflict, they said, with Public Affairs Directive No. 18 on foreign policy.

This directive apparently seeks to repeal a principle proved true throughout recorded human history.

The censoring of Trudeau's speech became public last week, as the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee's investigation of the muzzling of military men got underway.

Numerous other incidents of such censorship were bared by the subcommittee—chairman, Senator JOHN STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi—at the same time. Trudeau is a vigorous anti-Communist—who believes in denouncing communism at every opportunity and in the plainest English, and therefore is hated by professional liberals and anti-anti-Communists.

On another occasion (January 31, 1961), General Trudeau wanted to say in a speech:

"Beyond a shadow of a doubt, your country and mine are the prime targets of a worldwide, allout offensive of world communism. This offensive has forced nations that glory in free institutions to join in defending these priceless values. This is why—and the simple, sole and irrefutable reason—we and our allies arm—to counter the Communist threat. Since the days of the bloody Red Revolution, the Soviets have ceaselessly increased their weapon capabilities against the day when, in Khrushchev's words, they 'will bury us.'"

ANTI-RED GAGGED BY BUREAUCRATS

This entire passage—a statement of a truth known to everybody who knows what

goes on in the world, and a truth every American should know—was cut out of Trudeau's speech on order of the State Department, without explanation.

For delivery February 17, 1961, General Trudeau prepared a speech containing this sentence:

"We must make sure that our military strength is geared to cope with the Sino-Soviet bloc threat today and in the future."

It would seem that there is at least one pipsqueak in the State Department who doesn't know that our current major enemies are Soviet Russia and Red China. Anyway, the State Department gutted the sentence by ordering out the phrase "Sino-Soviet bloc"—again without explanation.

The remark "on such theories socialism thrives" was eased out of a Trudeau speech delivered March 9, 1961, with a State Department comment that "some of our best friends are Socialists."

General Trudeau was guardedly polite—in his testimony—about all this before the Stennis subcommittee. We imagine he had Gens. Billy Mitchell, Douglas MacArthur, and Edwin A. Walker rather painfully in mind while testifying.

But there is no necessity for civilians or newspapers to be polite on this subject of the muzzling of the military by appeasers, or worse, in the State and Defense Departments.

TRAITORS—OR DUMB CLUCKS?

What is going on, obviously, is that our military men—the men who know the enemy best and may have to fight him some day—are being forbidden to sound the alarm to their fellow Americans in vigorous and convincing ways.

They are being forced to tone down and mushmouth the truths that are in their minds and hearts.

This disclosure by the Stennis subcommittee raises some very grave questions, among which are:

Is the State Department, as so often alleged, still infested with second- and third-echelon traitors who mold much of our foreign policy and are determined to sell the United States down the river to communism?

Or are both the State and the Defense Departments loaded with simple-minded, mole-eyed twerps who don't know that there is a war on?

It is to be hoped that the Stennis subcommittee will put plenty of time and effort into getting the correct answers to such questions, and will let the people have those answers uncensored by anybody in any particular.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of January 27, 1962:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

JANUARY 27, 1962.

The Postage Revision Act of 1961, the first major legislative bill of this session passed by voice vote, that is without a record vote of each Member's position. The demerits of the bill are exceeded by the demerits of no bill. Without a bill, the postal deficit would be $830 million this year. This bill (1) will decrease the deficit approximately $700 million; (2) transfer $250 million postal cost to general treasury expenses as public service (for the blind, etc.); (3) prevent Communist literature being distributed free by the Federal Government (this amendment against the administration's wishes); (4) increase first-class mail 1 cent per letter, and up second-class (magazines and newspapers) and third-class (bulk mailings and circulars).

The bill will not (1) cover any deficit resulting from other postal expenses being increased, as for example, pay boosts; (2) equalize mail users' burden since 70 percent of the increase is borne by first-class mail; (3) nor is it expected that the Senate will accept this bill; it may well be weakened; (4) it was hastily thrown together by floor action rather than in committee, a much greater chance of inequities thus being created (for example, small business may be hurt by the increased cost. We don't know); (5) was passed without a record vote, so the public will never know who was for it or against it. It is my belief that there should be a record vote on every piece of major legislation. The Republican leadership should not, as I see it, join in agreements to prevent record votes on controversial issues. On the record I would have voted for the bill, but I am quick to admit it was not a good bill. As I saw it, the good outweighed the bad, but at best, this is a sorry example of how to legislate.

The Ways and Means Committee is now working on the President's tax proposals, covering (1) investment credit; (2) entertainment expenses; (3) mutual fire and casualty insurance companies; (4) domestic corporations receiving dividends from foreign corporations; (5) exclusion for income earned from sources outside the United States; (6) gain from disposition of depreciable personal property; (7) tax treatment of cooperatives and patrons; (8) withholding on interest, dividends, and patronage dividends; (9) information with respect to certain foreign entities; (10) Treasury proposal on "tax havens." This key committee is composed of 25 members—15 Democrats and 10 Republicans. Eight States have two members, nine have one representative each on the committee, geographically covering all areas of the Nation. Texas is one of those fortunate to have two.

The Dallas Federal Building continues to get attention as it has since I was a member of the Public Works Committee 7 years ago. Patiently I am continuing the effort to (1) get the GSA and the Bureau of the Budget to recommend a budget supplementary request to include the project in the fiscal 1963 budget; (2) get the Appropriations Committee to approve the expenditure.

The cost of Government is now taking $1 out of every $4 of total U.S. spending. At the rate we are going it will not be very long before private property as a share of the Nation's economy will be nonexistent. The President's glowing economic report does not offer hope of fiscal responsibility nor a stable economy. The President sees a prosperous year ahead and promises a balanced budget, at the same time urges approximately 70 new ways to spend money, or for ways that spending plans already approved can be increased. Report in U.S. News & World Report shows the prospect of a $100 billion budget within 3 years. Budget outlook: Year to end June 30: Outgo, $89 billion; income, $82 billion; deficit, $7 billion. Year to start July 1: Outgo, $92.5 billion; income, $93 billion; surplus, $500 million. Cash budget, adding social security, highways, other special spending: Year to end June 30: Outgo, $111 billion; income, $102.5 billion; deficit, $8.5 billion. Year to begin July 1: Outgo, $114.8 billion; income, $116.6 billion; surplus, $1.8 billion. A realistic look shows the President is overoptimistic—chances are the outgo will be higher and the income lower. That isn't the whole story of taxes. Add State and local taxes for the year to start July 1: About $50 billion. Federal: $115 billion. Total cash spending by governments: $165 billion.

Government spending is not the answer to a sound economy. The answer is in giving the people their head and allowing our private enterprise system full opportunity to operate instead of trying to smother the people and the system in Government.

This is the real issue in this election year. This year the people will decide on what kind of system under which they want to live, that of free enterprise where all the people are free to exercise individual initiative in creating a better life for themselves and their posterity, the system under which we have attained the best life for more people than any other nation in history, or a planned economy, where the Government takes all you have and returns to you what it believes you need—end result, a Socialist-Communist system.

Action this week: Introduced Alger bill (H.R. 9905), to withdraw from the United Nations.

Has Seaway Helped or Hurt U.S. Seamen?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter dated January 16, 1962, from Mr. Rick Miller, vice president of the National Maritime Union of America in which he encloses an article which appeared in their newspaper the NMU Pilot:

NATIONAL MARITIME UNION,
OF AMERICA,
New York, N.Y., January 16, 1962.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: May I, on behalf of this organization, call to your attention a pressing problem which affects the economic well-being of a large part of our country.

This directly concerns people and industry in the area served by the St. Lawrence Seaway. Its effects, however, extend to a much larger area.

Briefly, the problem is that the seaway, for which the American people paid close to a half-billion dollars, has not operated to the advantage of the American people and industry. On the contrary it has caused acute hardship among Great Lakes seamen and thousands of other workers dependent on American-flag shipping. Of wider significance, far from enhancing our national economic well-being, the seaway has aggravated the outward flow of dollars, mainly into the pockets of low-wage, profiteering foreign shipping interests.

I am taking the liberty of enclosing a copy of an article which appeared in our newspaper, the NMU Pilot, concerning this question, along with a report by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers which illustrates what has happened to American shipping in what is now America's innermost deep sea port.

I hope you will be able to give this problem the consideration it deserves. I assure you we are aware of the many imposing challenges which are before the Congress, including those which require the extension

of more of our energies and resources to promoting our national interests abroad.

Our legislative representative, Hoyt S. Haddock of the AFL-CIO Maritime Committee, will be in touch with you in the course of the sessions. Please do not hesitate to contact Mr. Haddock (telephone: Lincoln 7-9090) or the undersigned if you desire any information.

Sincerely yours,

RICK MILLER,
Vice President.

FLAG OF OCEAN VESSELS CALLING AT THE PORT OF DULUTH-SUPERIOR HARBOR, APRIL-AUGUST 1961

France	6
Germany	14
Great Britain	28
Greece	15
Israel	1
Italy	7
Lebanon	1
Liberia	17
Netherlands	3
Norway	22
Panama	5
Spain	1
Sweden	7
Switzerland	1
United States (*Eranthia*, American export; *Sealady*, intercoastal shipping and trading)	2
Total	130

Source: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Duluth, Minn.

HAS SEAWAY HELPED OR HURT U.S. SEAMAN?

(By Vice President Rick Miller)

What has the St. Lawrence Seaway done for American seamen? Our Government spent $475 million in building the seaway; certainly a noble project and one worthy of support by the American public. The public, which includes American seamen (although some of our elected representatives in Washington act as if they forgot this fact) paid for their project through their taxes.

Inland cities, such as Chicago, Milwaukee, Detroit, Toledo, and others, overnight became deep-sea ports where the goods of this Nation are shipped directly to the nations of the world at a greatly reduced cost. Likewise, from every hemisphere imports are placed in the markets of the Midwest by a single form of transportation—oceangoing vessels.

One of the primary purposes of the seaway was to bring substantial savings to the consumer, which also includes American seamen (although some of our elected representatives in Washington act as if they forget this fact). Certainly no one can dispute that people have to be earning a living to be consumers. When jobs are wiped out, purchasing power is reduced.

An important part of our consuming labor force is made up of workers in the transportation industry and an important part of that is the American seaman (although some of our elected representatives in Washington act as if they forget this fact).

There are some startling figures out of the U.S. Maritime Administration which pinpoint the effect the seaway has had on jobs of American seamen. In May this year, there were barely 3,000 jobs on American ships on the Great Lakes—less than one-quarter the number for the same month in 1960. And in June this year, although the jobs on our ships had climbed to 6,210, this was still a startling drop from the 12,666 we had in June 1960.

These figures tell a story that cannot be ignored—the domination of Great Lakes shipping by foreign-flag ships, many of them owned and operated by American interests. These are the real beneficiaries of the St. Lawrence Seaway. American seamen on American ships most certainly are not, as the figures show. And the many shoreside industries which count seamen and their families as customers have likewise not benefited.

The port of Milwaukee is a good example. During 1959, the first year of the seaway's opening, 332 ocean vessels sailed from the port of Milwaukee; of these, only 26 were American flag, mainly American Export and Grace Lines. Since then, the Grace Lines has discontinued its Great Lakes operations and the American-flag share is probably even more out of line.

With the completion of the seaway, our Great Lakes become our fourth sea coast. Routes through the seaway to foreign ports were officially designated essential trade routes, meaning that adequate American-flag service on these routes was deemed essential for defense and international standing of the United States. But little has been done to promote such service and protect it from the menace of runaway-flag shipping.

Legislation must be enacted to reserve American-flag ships a fair share of the cargoes of this area. There are no bargains for this country in the cheap transportation provided by runaway ships. The area pays a price in the loss of jobs and income not only by seamen but shipyard workers and those in all the other shoreside enterprises that serve the shipping industry.

The runaways come in and take the lion's share of trade but use local goods and services only when they have no choice. Most of it they get in foreign ports where they get it cheaper.

On top of this loss, of course, is the even greater loss of security to the Nation resulting from destruction of our merchant marine. Write your Congressman and Senators and ask what their plans are to protect your interests.

The Honorable Harry J. Anslinger, of Hollidaysburg, Pa., the First Commissioner of the U.S. Bureau of Narcotics, Has Won National and International Fame for Zeal and Devotion in His Unrelenting Attack Against the World Narcotic Traffic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, devotion to duty is recognized as the prime requisite for success in any occupation and an essential attribute demanded of all public officials.

In the realm of Federal employment there is a vast network of Government agencies, the success of whose functions must depend upon the caliber of their personnel. Our Federal agencies have been blessed for years with many able and dedicated department heads and employees to whom are entrusted the conduct of the intricate affairs of the Federal Government.

Among these highly capable and greatly respected Federal officials there are none that excel the administrative ability demonstrated by Commissioner of Narcotics, Harry J. Anslinger, who is a resident of Hollidaysburg, Pa., in my congressional district.

Appointed in 1930 as the first U.S. Commissioner of Narcotics, Harry J. Anslinger has traveled extensively at home and abroad in the pursuit of his exacting duties. Prior to appointment to his present position, Mr. Anslinger served as a member of the U.S. diplomatic corps and for 3 years was stationed as an attaché of the American Legation at The Hague in Holland.

His interest in outlawing the illicit traffic in narcotics was aroused while serving as vice consul at Hamburg, Germany. He found that Hamburg at that time was serving as a worldwide distribution center for illegal drugs.

Born in my home city of Altoona, Pa., and now a resident of Hollidaysburg, Pa., the county seat of Blair County, all of us in Pennsylvania are proud of its native son who has won worldwide acclaim for his dedicated service to humanity.

At the present time, in addition to being U.S. Commissioner of Narcotics, Mr. Anslinger is also serving as a member of the U.S. mission to the United Nations on the Narcotics Drugs Commission.

The following article appearing in the January 20, 1962, issue of the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror is a deserving tribute to the successful and remarkable career of Harry J. Anslinger. It is a graphic description of a highly respected public official who is continuing to serve his country and all mankind with outstanding ability, innate honesty, and fearless devotion to duty:

[From the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror, Jan. 20, 1962]

U.S. COMMISSIONER OF NARCOTICS, HOLLIDAYSBURG MAN, CALLED WORLD'S GREATEST AUTHORITY ON DOPE TRAFFIC

It was almost impossible to keep the imagination from taking flight while talking to Harry J. Anslinger, U.S. Commissioner of Narcotics. For, even in the familiar and prosaic surroundings of Hollidaysburg, seen through the glass doors of his Pine Street home, and with a wood fire glowing cozily in the big fireplace behind him, Harry Anslinger seems to be a part of the dangerous and faraway places that have been so much a part of his life.

As he discussed pleasant and commonplace things and occasionally sipped coffee at this morning's interview, one could not write that he seemed unsuited to the role he has filled so capably since he became the first, and only, U.S. Commissioner of Narcotics in 1930.

For Mr. Anslinger has an imposing presence, developed perhaps as a natural consequence of taking his unceasing battle against narcotics from Main Street in America, to the far places of earth, and from dealing with all the variety of humanity one may meet in conflict with this ancient evil, from dope addicts to secret agents, to leading statesmen of the world.

With the carved Chinese joss table, and marvelously carved old Chinese teakwood screen lending their own oriental atmosphere to the room, it seemed quite natural to recall the words of Ulius Louis Amoss, president of an international information service, that Mr. Anslinger "is the most dynamic and capable intelligence director in the United States."

PURSUES THE ENEMY

Through the years he has operated quietly, pursuing the narcotics peddler with grim and

often terrible tenacity. And, strangely, relatively few in his home county of Blair know much about the picturesque figure who unostentatiously arrives from Washington for weekends at his home, and leaves as quietly the calm and pleasant hometown to return by plane to his office in Washington, where await the problems of the world.

Only some of Harry Anslinger's most intimate friends are aware that his life has been filled with many of the incidents which they sometimes read about in lurid paperback books about international crime, gangsters, and the dope rackets.

Not many indeed, in his home territory know that Harry Anslinger has been winning victory after victory against an adversary so old, so pernicious, and so vicious, that until he took up the battle, even international efforts to control the dope traffic were sporadic and often disorganized.

MAJOR CENTERS

As U.S. Commissioner of Narcotics, U.S. representative on, and Chairman of, the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs, Harry Anslinger has been pushing the dope traffic to the wall, until, while still far from complete victory, there are, generally speaking, only two major centers of dope addiction and peddling in this country, New York and Los Angeles. And, when he speaks of dope, Mr. Anslinger refers to heroin, a derivative of opium, and the principal addictive narcotics drug now being peddled.

The geniality departs momentarily from Mr. Anslinger as he speaks of the use and peddling of narcotics. And his eyes became hard when asked if there is any traffic in heroin in Blair County. "No. There better not be, there better not be. I have agents check here every now and then."

Mr. Anslinger said the ratio of dope addicts in Hong Kong is 1 in every 40 persons, and, in this country about 30 years ago, it was as high as 1 in 1,000. Now, he said, the estimate is about 1 in every 4,000 persons, with most in the bigger east and west coast cities. Opium smoking has disappeared from this country, he said, heroin being the major menace.

While pointing out the dangers of the abuse of tranquilizers of various kinds, and marijuana, the Commissioner regards opium and its derivatives, morphine and heroin, as the dominant perils. The abuse of some transquilizers and use of marijuana can lead directly to addiction, he said.

The average minimum cost of maintaining a dope addict is $10 a day, and many run as high as $60 daily. Since they can do little work, the addict usually resorts to crime to get money to buy his narcotics, the Commissioner explained.

He said that in New York alone, thefts by addicts often run as much as $750,000 a day.

BAD COMPANIONS

How do young people get started on the dope habit? In almost all cases, he said, through bad companions, and, he added, "Addiction follows delinquency, not usually the other way around."

Mr. Anslinger does not believe in the soft approach in dealing with this problem.

When he testified before the Senate Crime Investigating Committee some years ago, Mr. Anslinger, with considerable bitterness, told the Senators, "The narcotics peddler does not kidnap children—he destroys them."

And so, he does not believe that education of young people on the horrors of dope addiction will meet the problem alone. "It just serves many times to make those with the weakest minds or wills more interested in trying it," he said.

DESCRIBES AGONIES

Mr. Anslinger graphically described the agonies an addict suffers upon withdrawal of his narcotic. "Within about 8 hours of narcotics use, an addict must have another shot," said the Commissioner. If it is not available, he begins his suffering, as many as 18 different physical syndromes wracking his body. He told something of how marijuana affects one, saying that it destroys coordination and judgment. To the marijuana user, the distance across a rug in the room seems like a city block, and the time required to lift a cigaret to his lips may seem like an hour.

He also told how its uses may destroy the mind, as well.

In areas where education on dope addiction was emphasized, use of dope increased, he said. He has advocated hospital treatment of users, and severest penalties for peddlers.

CONTROLLED BY CRIME

Organized crime controls most of the sale of dope, he said. He urged stronger laws for years, and in 1956, the new Federal narcotics control act provided these stiffer penalties, including the death penalty.

It provides imprisonment of 2 to 10 years and a possible fine of not more than $20,000 for a first offense of unlawful possession of narcotic drugs and a minimum mandatory sentence of 5 years in prison for first offenses of illegal sale of narcotic drugs or marijuana, and 10 to 40 years for subsequent offenses, plus possible fine up to $20,000, with no probation, parole, or suspension of sentence.

For unlawful sale or transfer of heroin by a person over 18 years of age to a person under 18, the penalty is 10 years to life imprisonment, or death, at the discretion of the jury.

Major sources of heroin supply, said the Commissioner, are from Red China to our west coast, and from the Middle East, through Marseilles, to our east coast. It is distributed largely through organized crime circles.

PROGRESS MADE

But, progress is being made in the war on this cruelest of all traffics, the Commissioner has said. He recently was quoted as saying: "A 5-year survey just completed by the Federal Bureau of Narcotics shows we're achieving a major breakthrough in our all-out war with the peddlers of living death.

"The overall number of new addicts, our best gage, is declining. At the end of 1960, the number was 7,479, a drop of 1,858 from 1956. Youthful addicts under 21, an alarming 12 percent of the 1956 total, were down to 3.9 percent of 1960; teenagers under 17, came to 148, or 0.3 percent."

Nevertheless, Mr. Anslinger said the battle is far from won, that New York and California have more than 60 percent of the 44,906 known addicts in the United States, who buy some $500 million worth of dope each year, obtaining the money largely from stealing, begging, borrowing, and murdering.

He said juvenile addiction virtually has disappeared in Ohio, Baltimore has reduced its problem by 50 percent, and other areas report similar gains * * * except New York and California. He said agents of the Federal Narcotics Bureau have been responsible for Federal prosecution of 8,000 cases in the last 5 years.

CLOAK AND DAGGER

Of his agents who take this war to the enemy, the Commissioner has said: "Theirs is a clock-and-dagger operation, and even wartime espionage holds no greater risks or demands greater skills or imagination."

Their activities roll into Mr. Anslinger's desk in routine reports, in factual language, shorn of many of the "incidental" details which are in fact, the agents' risks and frequent brushes with death—such as that of undercover agents who made a surprise capture in Turkey, where they had the cooperation of the Turkish narcotics police—or that incident involving "Frankie," a young sailor who walked into the Detroit grocery store one day and greeted the proprietor, one Hussein Haidar, a Lebanese. The young sailor introduced himself as Farid Abou Chum, nickname, Frankie, a Syrian. He asked, in Arabic, for a loaf of bread. He also was an agent of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, and through his daring and ability, was able to break a dope ring before it got fairly underway.

Mr. Anslinger has received honors that would fill columns of this newspaper; he has written books and countless articles on dope, his most recent book being "The Murderers." Several years ago, he coauthored, "The Traffic in Narcotics," with William F. Tompkins, U.S. attorney for the district of New Jersey.

DELEGATE TO LEAGUE

In 1931, as U.S. delegate to the League of Nations, he led the fight and succeeded in obtaining the adoption of a convention to limit the manufacture of narcotic drugs to the medical needs of the world. By this convention, the manufacture of morphine was reduced from 100 tons to 40 tons annually and drug addiction declined throughout the world.

During World War II, he secured an effective agreement with Great Britain, France, the Netherlands, and Portugal to close down their Far Eastern monopolies where opium was sold over the counter. The United States had sought this since 1909, but for 34 years never had been able to obtain such an agreement.

Sir Leonard Lyall, president of the League of Nations Opium Board, said of Mr. Anslinger, "He is the greatest living authority on the world narcotic traffic."

IN DIPLOMATIC CORPS

For some years before he became Commissioner of Narcotics, Mr. Anslinger served in the diplomatic corps, in which he also won distinction.

He was the first, for example, to warn the British Intelligence Service of the Russian Third Internationale. During World War I, Mr. Anslinger was attaché of the American Legation at The Hague, and was directed to obtain information from behind the German lines. Under great secrecy, he was dispatched to England, and there reported to the British Admiralty, who finally notified him they would have him escorted across the North Sea with a fleet of 14 destroyers because of the submarine menace.

On the night the British Admiralty told him to pack his bags and get ready for the voyage, he was about to leave his hotel room when he found a letter under his door. Upon opening it, he found this message: "Dear Mr. Anslinger, the Imperial German Government welcomes you to the great world conflict."

Before the armistice, he was instructed to attempt to accomplish a personal communication with the entourage of Kaiser Wilhelm II in order to verify certain plans of the Germen Empire which had been reported from a neutral nation. By adroit means, never disclosed, he managed to travel with the Kaiser's entourage, being able to act as intermediary for exchange of views between his Government and the Kaiser's staff.

After 3 years' service with the diplomatic service at The Hague, Mr. Anslinger served 2 years as Vice Consul at Hamburg, Germany. Here, he became interested in efforts to control illicit drugs, for Hamburg was a worldwide distribution center for illegal narcotics.

NARROW ESCAPE

It was at Cuxhaven that he had another narrow escape from death. He had just received clearance papers to a liner bound for the United States, and was returning to the railroad station when 700 huge undersea naval mines exploded off Cuxhaven. The

blast was described as like a sheet of flame 2 miles high. Mr. Anslinger dropped into a gutter, and thought that this one was the end. Debris rained about him, windows crashed in, and the decreased air pressure from the great blast made his eyes bulge, but he escaped unscratched.

He later served a consulship in Venezuela, then, in 1926, at Nassau, in the Bahamas.

As the first narcotics control Commissioner, Mr. Anslinger set about to clean out the opium dens which then were to be found on Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington, some within 3 blocks of the Capitol, where there were a number of blocks of Chinese curio shops aimed at the tourist trade.

LED BIG RAIDS

He personally led one of the biggest raids which occurred on the eve of the national convention of the On Leong Tong. Heavy doors barred the way for the Commissioner and his agents, but, an informer was with them, and knew the signals of door knocks and passwords. As the door opened, the agents rushed in, to find opium smokers lying on bunks in a maze of tunnels which extended under Pennsylvania Avenue.

As Mr. Anslinger searched for the store of opium, which he found in a doorsill cache, he heard a stealthy sound in the darkness behind him. At first, he could not locate it, and hesitated to use his flashlight lest he give his position away, and get a knife or hatchet in the back. Finally he called out, "Stand still or I'll shoot."

NO SHOOT

A quick reply came, "No shoot * * * no shoot." And when the Commissioner turned on his light, he saw in a corner, the wizened mayor of Chinatown.

Mr. Anslinger has the most extensive and complete library on narcotics and the illicit traffic, in the world. Some time ago, the Pennsylvania State University Foundation requested his papers, books and documents, the accumulation of more than 30 years, for the university library.

Mr. Anslinger will go to Geneva in the spring, for a conference with 21 member nations of the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs. He remarked that Soviet Russia, for the first time, has been showing some recalcitrance on the agreement.

It is, however, interesting to note that Columnist Drew Pearson some time ago wrote, "He (Anslinger) probably is the only person able to get the Russians to cooperate with the dis-United Nations."

The reference was to the international agreement on limiting sale of narcotics to medicinal needs of the world.

Mr. Anslinger was born in Altoona in 1892, and his home for some years has been in Hollidaysburg, and his residence in Washington. He is a graduate of the Pennsylvania State University; School of International Relations, The Hague; Washington College of Law, LL.B.; University of Maryland, LL.D.

Men and women who know the menace of dope addiction have paid him tributes without number, but Judge Twain Michelsen of the superior court of San Francisco probably summed them all up when he once said:

"The world is indebted to Harry J. Anslinger, U.S. Commissioner of Narcotics, for the zeal and devotion with which he has pursued the dope assassin into hidden parts of the world. Handicapped as he always has been by an all too limited bureau personnel, he nevertheless has carried to many countries the light by which vigorous though limited suppression of the dirty commerce in contraband narcotics has been accomplished."

It is not given to many men to have had the world in their debt, as it has to this quiet, unostentatious Blair Countian whom so relatively few of his fellow countians know as one of the world's distinguished men, which honor has been conferred repeatedly and freely by statesmen and educators in many parts of this earth.

School Boards Association Opposes Extended Federal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from Mr. W. A. Wettergren, executive secretary of the Minnesota School Boards Association, stating the opposition of the association to further extension of Federal aid to education. I believe it important for us to learn how some of the people in education feel on this issue:

MINNESOTA SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION,
St. Peter, Minn., January 25, 1962.

Hon. ALBERT QUIE,
U.S. Congress,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE QUIE: The annual convention of the Minnesota School Boards Association was held on January 15, 16, and 17. It was the second largest convention ever held by the Minnesota Schools Boards Association. The question of Federal Aid to Education was discussed very thoroughly on Tuesday afternoon by dividing the group into 120 round table discussions.

We are currently compiling the results of the round table discussions. We did not ask any questions regarding the extension of Federal aid to education, consequently, the recorders' reports include information that is strictly voluntary on the part of the discussion group. Approximately 1,800 school board members and superintendents took part in these discussions. The tables were almost unanimous in their opposition to extension of Federal aid to education, and cited the National Defense Education Act as a good example of what happens under Federal distribution.

The tables are reporting that the rise in cost of materials that must be purchased to qualify under the program of the National Defense Education Act make the cost of the program to the school district at the same level it would have been 3 years ago, providing the school districts initiated the program with Federal assistance. I think this is reflected in the action of the association during the business session on Wednesday morning when the delegates passed the following resolution with very few votes in opposition. The resolution states as follows:

"Be it resolved, That the Minnesota School Boards Association is opposed to the further extension of Federal aid to education; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Minnesota School Boards Association go on record as favoring the continued assumption of responsibility for the general support of public education by our State and local governments."

As you know, the membership of the Minnesota School Boards Association is composed of every high school district and every graded elementary district in the State of Minnesota. The school board members of this association are now responsible for the education of 96.5 percent of all children that attend Minnesota's public schools.

We wish to express our appreciation for your consideration of the action taken by the Minnesota School Boards Association on Wednesday, January 17, 1962.

Sincerely,

W. A. WETTERGREN,
Executive Secretary.

Retarding Effect of Imports on Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article entitled "Retarding Effect of Imports on Employment," from the Potters Herald of East Liverpool, Ohio, which is the publication of the International Brotherhood of Operative Potters. This article very clearly sets forth the employment problem that confronts this country and the bearing that import competition has on it. I hope that all Members will take the trouble to read this article, which follows:

RETARDING EFFECT OF IMPORTS ON EMPLOYMENT

In all the recent redundant and one-sided public discussions and analyses of foreign trade and tariffs certain vital factors have been left out of account. One of these is unemployment and its close relation to import competition.

When employment has been considered in relation to foreign trade it has usually been examined in terms of the number of people employed in export and import activities. Less attention has been given to the displacement of workers by imports and much less to what is probably the most important aspect in the employment field; and that is the retarding effect of imports on employment expansion.

The damage attributable to imports is not confined to actual displacement of workers. More important perhaps is the number of workers who are not employed or prevented from being employed by import competition, actual and prospective.

In recent times the public spotlight has been centered on the need for industrial expansion and growth in this country. It has been assumed somewhat naively that if our output of goods increased by some acceptable percentage all would be well.

Unfortunately an extremely important exception was overlooked, namely, employment in relation to rising productivity and growth.

A reference to our national experience in agriculture will throw some much needed light on this subject.

The increase in agricultural productivity since 1950 has been truly phenomenal. The yield per acre has increased from 40 to 65 percent in our leading crops, attributable to mechanization, fertilization and wider use of pesticides. The population expanded 18.4 percent by comparison.

Farm employment dropped by 2.8 million during the decade.

This should demonstrate quite clearly that rising productivity does not of itself increase employment. It may have the exact opposite effect.

These workers unfortunately could not all be absorbed by our expanding industry, because our industry itself was replacing work-

ers by machines on a broad scale. While half a dozen growing industries, such as aircraft and electronics, were adding workers, over 30 industries were reducing their employment during the decade.

A number of these employment-shrinking industries were exerting themselves to meet import competition. Improved machinery, greater mechanization, and automation were the principal weapons for becoming or remaining competitive. It was not that these industries retrenched, so much as it represented a struggle to hold their own or to gain their share of the rising market attributable to the rising population and expanding incomes.

The fact is that the very source of our great industrial advantage over the rest of the world, namely our system of mass production going hand in hand with high wages and high productivity, was coming under severe attack because of the diffusion of our technology but not our high-wage system to the rest of the world.

Failure to see this dilemma far enough ahead permitted us to reduce our tariffs very drastically, especially under GATT, to the point where they are about 20 percent of what they were.

Now a vast spectrum of our industry is confronted with a gloomy market outlook both at home and abroad; and this fact dampens the ardor for expansion. Unless the market for a larger output can be foreseen new plants or additions to existing plants will hardly be built.

Meanwhile laborsaving devices eat away at existing employment in these industries.

Even the young new industries, the great growth industries to which we look for expansion, begin to hesitate; and they will not go as far as they otherwise would. Other countries are in the field and getting easier access to our home market while contesting us in outside markets.

In efforts to meet this challenge hundreds upon hundreds of our companies have invested overseas instead of expanding at home as they otherwise would have done. This means employing, not our own workers, but workers elsewhere.

How can we hope to solve our unemployment problem under these circumstances? We have not only the presently unemployed to place in jobs but a million or more additional ones each year.

If we do not provide a climate favorable to industrial expansion in this country by controlling imports we will face a shrinking economy thrown more and more on the mercy of the Government for survival.

How do we create a more favorable investment climate? By providing assurance that the market for expanding output will not be leeched away by imports that are produced on a wholly different wage base from that prevailing in this country.

It was this American wage base that with its highly productive machinery created the great American market and its vast purchasing power. Until other countries create a similarly attractive market we will continue to hold the short end of the bargaining stick; and other countries, by shipping in here at subversive prices, will retard our potential progress.

It is not necessary that in adopting our system of mass production the other countries should tear us down. Under the proposed tariff and trade program, that is precisely what would happen. We have enough evidence of this already if we would only look about us and acknowledge what we see.

If we are to continue to face Russia, would it be better to be weakened to a point of anemia, with unemployed workers increasingly dependent on governmental guidance and support, or to be back on the track where useful and fruitful industrial initiative is given a chance to show that it can still do what it did over the years bringing this country to the industrial leadership of the world?

That is the question. Present tariff and trade proposals of the Government face in the opposite direction, and their adoption would spell calamity to the American economy in the future.

Communism Doesn't Jug

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, some are often tempted to worry that communism is all-successful, while our own steps appear to be faltering and unsuccessful.

Not long ago, the Hartford Times carried an outstanding editorial entitled "Communism Doesn't Jug," which sets forth a clear record of failures in recent years by the Communist empire. It is an able statement of a trend which ought to be more clearly understood by our people—and especially by some consistent critics of American policy who persist in painting the bleakest picture and spreading alarm by massive efforts in all parts of the Nation. Fortunately the commonsense of the American people knows how to cope with such measures.

We should never underestimate the power of an antagonist, but we should never allow gloom to fog our perspective. The facts set forth in the Times editorial perform that service well by presenting a balanced appraisal of the world scene.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include the article, as follows:

[From the Hartford Times, Jan. 16, 1962]

COMMUNISM DOESN'T JUG

When Premier Khrushchev snatched off his shoe in the U.N. he did not expect it would prove to be a symbolic gesture. Yet, increasingly there has been a slowdown and constriction in the pace of communism which, for all its bluster, today is wheezing and limping.

Ambassador Adlai Stevenson hit it right, observing that suddenly "the juggernaut just doesn't jug."

In Washington, President Kennedy lets it be known that he senses communism's place in the world is neither quite so massive nor quite so deeply entrenched as it was a year ago.

At the root of this, of course, is the debilitating rift between Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung, but the ideological squabble is not the whole story even though it cuts many ways.

Basic to the whole Communist position is this proposition: Russia and her Red allies have forfeited the opportunity to highjack the uncommitted undeveloped part of the world, certainly by propaganda and probably by warfare.

This realization is developing slowly beyond the Iron Curtain—and who will say it is not being greeted thankfully by millions there? Yet for the supposedly militant and doctrinaire leaders this must be counted as a tremendous fault.

Rigid Communists consider any such loss of a key opportunity as the most gross betrayal.

Hence, within Russia, there are serious signs. Observers view them as the beginnings of a new internal power tilt, involving Russians, that could be as fierce and unsparing—once conditions ripen—as the Stalin-Trotsky battle of the 1920's. Khrushchev, so it is thought, may be caught off balance and faces need to reconsolidate his power. This would divert him temporarily from external adventures.

In Africa, for example, there is now nothing like the belligerent Russian policy that existed with the first explosions in the Congo. Communist front-man Gizenga has been defeated and disgraced. And as if to speed the tempo of Communist retrenchment, the Russians have been making grandiose mistakes.

They have been practically thrown out of Guinea, a nation whose President Toure they thought to be safely in hand. But Toure was the victim of a bit too much pressure and a few too many examples of Russia's shortcomings.

It was the West that he had been told was inefficient. But Russia sent a truck fleet to rust in Guinea which has few roads; from East Germany came plumbing fixtures that could not be used. The mistakes could not be made clear to the Russian technicians who could not speak the local French, although linguistic ability is supposedly a Russian scoring point.

So Guinea has become disenchanted with the Reds. Some time ago in his column, James Reston said that the free world had made its most impressive showing in the economic field. Russia concentrated on politics. But now the West's superior economic program is beginning to bear on the political outlook of the recipients, gradually but surely.

Even Egypt's Aswan Dam may finally find Russian aid bankrupt. Soviet engineers are 6 months behind schedule. They depended too much for local laborers on jobs too involved for them. Now the Communists want to pull out but they fear a propaganda disaster.

The showings of sound progress are not found in Guinea or Egypt, but in Nigeria, Senegal, and Liberia, which have received Western help and advice.

Russia cannot afford setbacks. Its future is constricted. It must overwhelm underdeveloped nations before they discover the nature of communism.

What makes the outlook so damaging to Russia is this: In Africa, in Asia, the Communists have shot their politico-economic bolt and it hasn't hit the mark.

Alaska on the Move

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, last week I called the attention of the Members of this House to the strides being made by the petroleum industry in the exploration and utilization of Alaska's oil and gas resources on the Kenai Peninsula. I did this as part of a report to my colleagues on how Alaska is doing after 3 years of statehood. On this occasion I am proud to report progress in the production and utilization of Alaska's timber resource. After publication of pertinent facts by

the Wrangell Sentinel, the following summarization was recently published by Jack Ryan, publisher of the Alaska Roundup:

Wrangell clearly established itself as Alaska's principal port for the export of lumber with shipments of 47 million board feet in 1961, up approximately 70 percent over the previous year. Of the total, some 42 million board feet were cut in the Wrangell Lumber Co. mill. Twenty-six big freighters called at Wrangell for lumber cargoes during the year, creating a longshore payroll of more than $350,000. Production was largely in spruce, according to C. R. Neill, plant superintendent, and nearly all of it went to Japan where it is mostly used in home construction, although some of the highest grade goes into musical instruments.

Further details as set forth in the Wrangell Sentinel are as follows:

Wrangell lumber shipments were supplemented during the year by approximately 2 million feet from the Schnabel Lumber Co. of Haines and the Moose Valley Lumber Co., Neill said. The local plant acquired some 70 percent of its logs for manufacture from the Ketchikan Pulp Co., 10 percent from the Alaska Lumber and Pulp Co. of Sitka and 20 percent from Pacific Northern Lumber Co. and independent loggers, Neill reported. Ketchikan Pulp, A.L. & P., and Pacific Northern hold timber blocks under contract with the Forest Service in the Southeast area. Wrangell Lumber buys in the open market.

Neill said the company is now attempting to develop Alaska hemlock into the Japanese home building market, and early sampling has been encouraged.

Payments Solution Requires Restraint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. Maurice H. Stans appeared on the financial page of this morning's Washington Post.

The article points out a few economic and fiscal facts that it is now fashionable and popular to ignore.

Unfortunately it is still necessary, eventually, to pay the piper, and when there is not enough money—gold—in the till and the creditor becomes suspicious of the debtor's paper, the fat is in the fire.

Mr. Speaker, whistling may keep up our spirits, but we had better pause and look before someone pulls the string and the paper house comes tumbling around our ears and the ears of the free world.

OUR CHANGING ECONOMY: PAYMENTS SOLUTION REQUIRES RESTRAINT

(By Maurice H. Stans)

(NOTE.—The writer served as Director of the Federal Budget Bureau in the Eisenhower administration. He is now president of Western Bancorporation.)

The place of the United States as a leader of the free world is endangered by economic pressures more serious than the present military threats. The chronic imbalance in our international payments transactions raises worried doubts at home and abroad as to how long and to what extent international claims on our dwindling gold reserves can be allowed to increase.

In an earlier article I summarized our precarious situation in which we find $12 billion of our $17 billion gold reserve frozen as backing to our currency. The remainder is what is available to meet $18 billion in net short-term foreign claims. The Eisenhower administration began and the Kennedy administration continues a strong fight to maintain confidence in the dollar by decisive measures to prevent further outflow of gold.

The only sound solutions can come from increased exports, insistence on a larger contribution by prosperous European countries to the free world's military strength and security and more suitable price, wage, and budget policies at home. The answer is not to be found in reducing imports, for this would almost surely cause a reciprocal reduction in our exports. Nor is it to be found in reducing investments overseas. These now return large dividends and in time will bring in more. Preventing the export of our capital would slow up the development of other countries and would merely make future years more difficult by cutting down investment returns.

CONVERSION TO FRUGALITY

It is these conditions that lie behind President Kennedy's determination to seek authority from the Congress to reduce tariff barriers on imports, in the hope of inducing increases in purchases of our goods overseas. It also accounts heavily for his sudden October 1961 conversion to frugality, in recognition of the importance of avoiding budget deficits and the resulting inflationary forces that would weaken international confidence in our money. It explains his announced determination to insist on restraint in future wage increases in our economy and the Federal Reserve bank's recent increase in interest rates on bank savings. It would be no surprise if the Defense Department were to reverse itself again and reduce the number of military dependents being supported overseas. It should.

U.S. balance of payments

[In billions of dollars]

	1960	1961 (estimate)
Payments for:		
Imports	14.7	14.6
Services	6.4	6.4
Private investment overseas	3.9	3.8
Military expenditures	3.0	3.0
Government grants and loans	3.4	3.6
Other (net)	.6	.6
Total	32.0	32.0
Receipts from:		
Exports	19.4	20.0
Services	4.7	4.5
Foreign investments in United States	.2	.9
Repayments on Government loans	.6	1.2
Income on investments abroad	3.2	3.4
Total	28.1	30.0
Total deficit	−3.9	−2.0
Met by:		
Sales of gold and convertible currencies	1.7	.8
Increase in foreign-owned liquid liabilities	2.2	1.2

Source: Derived from Department of Commerce data

To look further for solutions, we need again to search for causes. Why are we in this predicament, and why have we allowed it to worsen year after year?

One major cause of our present dilemma is the rapid postwar advance in wages in this country. This advance has exceeded gains in our productivity and has forced our prices higher on world markets. Normally, our increasing expenditures overseas would have induced an equivalent increase in spending here. Instead, our export psices, pushed to a competitive disadvantage by high costs, are not attractive enough to encourage an adequate return flow of our money.

Another unfavorable factor for us has been the advancing technology in other countries. For years we have rested confidently on our technological advantages and our new research to level out our wage disadvantages with other countries. But we are finding that our machines can be copied, that our improvements can be matched and that one lower paid Japanese can operate a machine tool or an automated plant as readily as one American.

WAGES ADVANCE ABROAD

Wages in other countries are advancing rapidly, it is true, but even at the present trend a long time will elapse before much of our American production can compete in world markets. We cannot wait hopefully for uncertain worsening conditions abroad to solve our problems at home. We need instead to put our own house in order.

To do this, we must curtail Government spending and the inflationary pressures of deficit financing. We must curb unwarranted wage increases and subsidies for not producing. We must end the cost burdens of inefficient management and make-work featherbedding so that our American producers, capable of competing in world markets, may do so.

Rich as this Nation is, it cannot take on every worthwhile international program. To make the attempt will only bring failure to the free world and bankrupt our country in the process. We need to develop a more restrained set of priorities by which we evaluate the international commitments we can and should assume.

All these objectives must be achieved if we are to retain our position before the world. President Kennedy realizes this. But they can be attained only if some pet domestic and foreign welfare schemes before the Congress are abandoned.

The Administration Covers Up Its Inadequate Fiscal Policies With Gobbledygook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious problems we face is the almost complete lack of understanding of this administration of sound economics. It is amazing to see with what ease the President continues to send down economic reports calling for more and more spending and the bland announcement that this can be accomplished without increased cost to the taxpayer and without further debasing our currency. How the administration is able to present its fiscal confusion is outlined in the following column from the Washington Star written by David Lawrence. A second article, from the Wall Street Journal, also points out the tricks the administration economists accomplish with budget figures:

[From the Washington Star]

GOBBLEDYGOOK IN ECONOMIC PLAN—CONTROLS ON INDUSTRY AND NO RESTRAINT ON LABOR SEEN IN PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

(By David Lawrence)

Three hundred pages of "gobbledygook" on how the Kennedy administration intends to operate, if it can, a managed economy reminiscent of the 1930's have been submitted in a message to Congress. Part of it is a statement signed by the President, and part of it is a report to him by the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

The net of it all is that the executive branch of the Federal Government intends to use its monetary powers, its controls of credit, its public works appropriations and its powers of taxation to influence the operations of American business. But not the slightest measure of restraint is to be exerted upon labor-union monopolies which bring about inflation and depreciate the dollar's purchasing power.

Congress has yet to concur in the recommendations of the message, but there are many powers already vested in the Executive branch of the Government that can make all the difference in the world between having a recession or depression and having prosperity. Typical of the astigmatism of the administration is the following excerpt from the President's message:

"When better plant and equipment enable the labor force to produce more in the same number of hours, there is more to share among all the contributors to the productive process—and this can happen with no increase in prices. Gains achieved in this manner endure, while gains achieved in one turn of the price-wage spiral vanish on the next.

"The Nation must rely on the good sense and public spirit of our business and labor leaders to hold the line on the price level in 1962. If labor leaders do hold the line industries will accept the productivity benchmark as a guide to wage objectives, and if management in these industries will practice equivalent restraint in their price decisions, the year ahead will be a brilliant chapter in the record of the responsible exercise of freedom."

But what is the "productivity benchmark"? The President's Council of Economic Advisers, in the very same report, puts it this way:

"How is the public to judge whether a particular wage-price decision is in the national interest? No simple test exists, and it is not possible to set out systematically all of the many considerations which bear on such a judgment. However, since the question is of prime importance to the strength and progress of the American economy, it deserves widespread public discussion and clarification of the issues. What follows is intended as a contribution to such a discussion."

But "what follows" is limited in scope and significantly omits all reference to the irresponsibility of trade unions and the monopoly power they wield through industry-wide bargaining. Somehow, the entire document, including the President's part of it, shows a timidity, if not a fear, about dealing with the touchy subject of union excesses. Instead, there is emphasis on management's tendency to increase prices to absorb labor costs, as if this were a sin.

Both the President and his economic consultants, however, would have been well advised to study what happened in New York a week ago and take its lesson to heart. The Star, in an editorial last Sunday, called attention to a fundamental weakness in the economy when it said:

"The 'settlement' of the electrical workers' strike in New York City is a perfect example of what's wrong with the construction industry in this country. Originally, the union demanded a 20-hour week. Now it has 'compromised,' settling for a 25-hour week plus an increase in hourly pay and assurances of 5 hours in overtime. Under the old contract an electrician worked 6 hours a day at $4.40 an hour and a 7th overtime hour for $6.60. Under the new agreement he will work 5 hours at $4.96 an hour and the 6th hour at $7.44. Should there be more than 5 hours of overtime he will make more for a 25-hour week than he did for a 30-hour week.

"The simple explanation for this result is that the union, with a monopoly of workers in short supply and entrenched behind its statutory immunity from the antitrust laws, can get away with just about anything it pleases. Had an association of businessmen tried to work any such gouge as this the Department of Justice antitrust lawyers would be sweating day and night to put them in the pokey. But in the case of the electricians not a voice of protest has been raised in official Washington."

This trend in the construction industry, just at a time when there is a lot of talk about the Government subsidizing more housing, can gravely affect one of the Nation's key industries and can spread to other unions.

On matters of this kind, the President's economic report treads lightly. Obviously, the politician doesn't want to alienate his principal source of support in political campaigns—the trade unions and their financial contributions.

This is the kind of materialism which tends to negate the professions of high idealism that are sprinkled through the administration's messages to Congress. It's one reason why all the rosy predictions of economic prosperity in the President's latest message are accompanied by requests for power to deal with expected recessions, if not depressions, as well as with inflationary trends in recovery periods that can weaken the purchasing power of the dollar.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 29, 1962]

POLITICAL MAGIC

Economic jargon can be confusing at best, but in the mouths of Government economists it is sometimes something far more serious. Mere words become shibboleths, and the shibboleths become the excuse for policies of the most far-reaching consequences.

The current case in point is the first annual report of President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers, wherein repeated reference is made to terms like productivity, unemployment, and gross national product. Though each is an extremely slippery concept, the economic advisers are quite prepared to use them glibly, with too little examination of their meaning.

They muse, for example, about the virtues of rising productivity. And they suggest, as a "guide for noninflationary wage behavior," that wage increases in each industry not exceed the trend rate of productivity increases in industry in general.

That is all very nice, perhaps. But what is productivity? The advisers give the usual definition, "output per manhour." Only in the most oblique way do they even hint that productivity rises as a result of more and better equipment for workers to work with. That is, as a result of the increasingly costly capital investment of management.

Yet this is the very key to productivity. It is certainly misleading, to say the least, to talk about rising industrial productivity and rising industrial wages as though they were all mainly the outcome of extra intellectual or physical effort put out by workers. The Government would do better to refrain from devising national policy "guides" based on this kind of misapprehension.

A much more direct "trigger" of Government action is the unemployment rate. The economic advisers spend some time making clear that they are against involuntary unemployment—do they think anyone is for it? And somewhere along the line they seem to admit that unemployment is a far more complex phenomenon than the official figures would indicate. In human as well as economic terms, for instance, it makes a good deal of difference whether the unemployed person is a housewife with a working husband or a man who has been the family's sole support.

Yet, despite the inadequacy and sometimes perversity of the unemployment measuring sticks, the economic advisers have no hesitation in accepting and using the percentage rates. Given a specified rise in the rate, they want the President empowered to pour out fresh billions of Federal spending on public works. Whatever one thinks of this dole approach, it seems strange to make the official unemployment figure the trigger for massive Government intervention without first trying to develop an accurate measure of actual unemployment.

But perhaps the weirdest shibboleth is a good old gross national product. It is truly wonderful what semantic tricks Government economists can play with this supposed measure of the nation's total output of goods and services. For one thing, they can show you that Federal outlays are stationary or even declining—as a percentage of gross national product—when the plain fact of the matter is that they are increasing hugely.

One reason the gross national product lends itself so shamelessly to such verbal legerdemain is that it includes Government spending as part of total output. Since most Government spending is nonproductive, that is an erroneous device, but it makes things easier for economic advisers. Let Government spending increase, and they can point to a rising gross national product and hence—presto—economic growth.

Nowhere in this report is there a candid recognition of the crux of the matter: That this rapidly growing burden of Government is pressing ever more heavily on the Nation's real growth potential. On the contrary, we are assured that much, much more public investment is needed to spur economic growth.

Thus the Council of Economic Advisers, sometimes subtly, and sometimes not, are making a major pitch for an extensive further nationalization of American life. It is perhaps their privilege to make that plea, though their adroit manipulation of slippery semantics is open to question.

What at least seems clear from this first report is that if the President's advisers are no economic magicians, they are nonetheless highly skilled political economists.

Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the Common Council of New Britain, Conn., recently passed a resolution endorsing the President's plan for medical care for the aged. Under unanimous consent, I insert this document in the Apendix of the RECORD:

To His Honor, the Mayor, and the Common Council of the City of New Britain:

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of New Britain, That the common

council go on record as favoring the bill presented by President John F. Kennedy for medical care for the aged and that the Congressmen from Connecticut be urged to vote in favor of this bill; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Senator and Representative from Connecticut.

PATRICK C. NOLAN.
RAYMOND L. NEWTON.

Heartening Move

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, on June 22, 1961 during the debate on the Housing Act of 1961, I offered an amendment which would require that a community have a minimum standards housing code and a record of enforcement of such code before it could qualify for Federal financial assistance for urban renewal.

At that time I contended that although a city had to submit a workable program, it was not required to adopt a housing code to prevent the spread of slums and blight.

This amendment was rejected by the House, and I regret that during the course of the debate my amendment was described as "an ingenious method thought of by those who would kill the urban renewal program." The amendment was described as "fatally defective" and pleas were made to maintain the status quo, that is, express an intention to adopt a code sometime in the future.

I was motivated in submitting this amendment because I was not satisfied with the status quo. I was aware that the Housing and Home Finance Agency, even under the preceding administration, was not insisting on a minimum standards housing code and a record of enforcement as a prerequisite for urban renewal financial assistance. I urged this amendment in order to make mandatory what was little more than a pious expression of purpose in the submission of workable programs for the prevent of slums and blight.

I was therefore heartened to read a recent address by the Housing and Home Finance Agency Administrator before the Ford Hall Forum on November 26, 1961. In this address which was inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 24, 1962, by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL], Dr. Weaver decided that he, too, was dissatisfied with the status quo. He then proceeded to relate changes in his Agency's procedures which accomplished the objective of my amendment. Dr. Weaver expressed himself on this point in the following words:

A most important aspect of housing conservation is the adoption and enforcement of building, plumbing, electrical, and housing codes.

The Federal Government has said that communities seeking Federal aid to fight slums and blight and foster growth and development should adopt and enforce modern codes. And we intend to be more vigorous in checking on this requirement than ever before.

We have recently announced that communities coming to us for the first time for certification of their workable program for community improvement—a prerequisite to many Federal aids—must adopt such codes within the first year after the program is approved.

Communities which already have had their workable programs approved are expected to meet this requirement by October 1, 1962.

On December 11, 1961, the chairman of the Build America Better Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, Mr. F. Lawrence Dow, Hartford, Conn., wrote an editorial which appeared in the association's publication, Realtor's Headlines, of December 11, 1961. In this editorial, Mr. Dow described Dr. Weaver's effort as a very heartening move toward the elimination of slums and blight.

Under unanimous consent, I include this editorial by Mr. Dow in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of these remarks:

HEARTENING MOVE

(By F. Lawrence Dow, chairman, Build America Better Committee)

Out of practical real estate know-how, realtors have developed a direct method for eliminating slums and unfit housing conditions. It is a program that calls for a variety of actions. One of them is firm enforcement of a city ordinance setting out modern, adequate, and reasonable standards for all housing.

We have stressed the obvious, if often overlooked, fact that no antislum program can make a great deal of sense unless it addresses itself to the constant ravages of neglect, and to the proper responsibilities of property owners.

That is why, in stating our policy on urban renewal at our recent convention, we reiterated our strong insistence that performance in the enforcement of a modern municipal housing code be a firm prerequisite to any measure of Federal participation in urban renewal.

It is most heartening, therefore, to note the recent action by HHFA Administrator Robert C. Weaver that will require any community seeking certification of its workable program for community improvement—the initial step in obtaining Federal cooperation—to adopt a housing code within the first year after the program is approved. Communities which have previously obtained approval of a workable program will be required to meet this stipulation by next October 1.

It is heartening, too, to note Dr. Weaver's repeated insistence that "one of our most valuable national resources is our existing supply of housing. We cannot hope to meet the housing needs of the future if we wastefully demolish the housing we now have. Rather we must reclaim as much as possible of what we have as the basis from which to build for the future; we must learn how to accomplish rehabilitation and conservation."

This is the central objective of NAREB's Build America Better Committee, whose congratulations have been sent to Dr. Weaver.

In presenting the realtor's point of view on the importance of conservation-centered urban renewal, Curtis E. Huber, of Evansville, Ind., chairman of the realtors' Washington committee, made a most forceful statement this year in his testimony before the Banking and Currency Committees of both Houses of Congress, even suggesting the language of an amendment to the Housing Act to require adequate attention to conservation in urban renewal.

Following the recent significant move of HHFA in the direction so long urged by NAREB, Mr. Huber wrote Dr. Weaver to commend the action as evidence of a desire to take every practical step to retard the growth of blight and slums. "It is particularly heartening," Mr. Huber wrote, "to note your use of mandatory language."

Urban renewal built its basic support in Congress and among business organizations such as NAREB, as a method of eliminating squalid and unfit residential environment. Certainly no program directed at this objective is realistic unless it places the responsibility for neglect where it belongs. That is why housing code enforcement is basic. That is why we have, for years, urged it as indispensable.

And that is why it is so genuinely encouraging to note the new HHFA move to make this action a definite requirement in all urban renewal programs.

Reserve Officers Association Is Proud To Be the Champion of the Nation's Military Reservists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, all of us are aware of the fact that some 156,000 reservists have been called to active duty to strengthen our Nation's military forces during these times of crisis.

We are also aware that because of the vocal protests of a relatively few reservists there have persisted many misconceptions in the minds of the general public about the character and the performance of the reservists.

This has resulted in a very unfair situation. The Reserve Officers Association has been, and is still, trying to get the record straight so that the unusual—and I might say unprecedented—service of a large number of dedicated citizen-reservists may be placed in proper perspective.

An editorial in the current issue of the Officer, ROA's monthly publication, deals with this subject. It is to be hoped that the Defense Department will take steps to set the record straight, as this editorial suggests:

MAGNIFICENT RECORD

Some years ago, when the Nation's defense capabilities were being trimmed to accommodate a political tax cut and when the country was being treated to the great spectacle known as the battle of the budget, ROA was fighting for a defense first, dollars second policy.

One of our members in the Senate was making speeches in favor of adequate military strength, and was quoting the elder statesman, Bernard Baruch, who once said something like, "I see no advantage in being the richest in the graveyard."

It was a telling campaign, and one that has surely had an impact on history. It requires no sage to speculate about our na-

tional discomfort had we not awakened to the idea that world communism was waiting for great, lazy, overconfident, free America to go back to sleep.

ROA can be proud to have had a small part in keeping America alert to keep America alive.

Our association now is engaged in another campaign, and it is in the proud tradition of ROA.

Because, obviously, it is going to be up to ROA to emphasize, and reemphasize until the country knows it that our Reserve forces stand between this great country and her enemies just as surely and as effectively as does any other element in our society. That is our purpose in our current program, a part of which is the ROA white paper, also published in this issue of the Officer.

ROA's national president and staff, with the concurrence of many others in the confidential stages, engaged in genuine soul searching before the issuance of the now widely known ROA white paper.

It was more in regret than in anger that ROA attacked the Defense Department's failure to defend the Reserve forces, which, called to active duty by the President in a crisis, had responded with what the President's adviser said was "magnificent" spirit.

ROA's white paper sought to emphasize, primarily, three points.

First, that the Reserve forces were promptly responsive to a callup.

Second, that they were in a high state of readiness.

Third, that the organized, trained, disciplined units were fully oriented and effective.

Some in the Pentagon appear to have no conception of how significant, as well as true, are those three statements. The bookkeepers to whom men are numbers have appeared not to sense the human drama in the Operation Callup.

It should have stirred the heart of every American, and warmed the cockles of the hearts of our allies. It should have chilled out enemies, because it was a demonstration that Americans have the will and determination to keep their country safe.

ROA is proud to be the champion of the reservists, working for national security in uniform in far-off places—and ready to fight and die for their country.

It will be to our Nation's overwhelming discredit if the top authorities in the Pentagon do not themselves order publication of a Defense Deparment white paper telling the people of the United States the true story of the Reserves and the reservists' great vindication in 1961.

Kansas Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, the people of the great State of Kansas today observe their annual Kansas Day. Throughout the State, Kansans will pause in their daily activities to mark this important occasion with reverence and deep thought, with reflection on the past and the future.

A particular emphasis is attached to Kansas Day this year, since the State observed its 100th birthday during the year just past, and celebrated with centennial programs in every community, rural and metropolitan.

The history of Kansas is the history of the United States. A courageous and hardy people recognized the potential of the Great Plains in the center of the Nation. With faith in God, in the land and in themselves, they endured hardships beyond measure to pass on to us the greatness and good life that is ours today.

The faith and determination of our forefathers still lives with the people of Kansas. The next 100 years will witness continued growth and prosperity in our State, and the same proud pulse will beat in this "heart" of the Nation.

I know that my colleagues join me today in paying tribute to Kansas and its people.

List of Boys From 10th District of Indiana, Who Have Been Nominated To Compete for Academy Appointments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the Appendix the list of those boys from the 10th District of Indiana, which district I have the pleasure and honor to represent, who have been nominated by me to compete for appointment to the various Academies:

LIST OF BOYS FROM 10TH DISTRICT OF INDIANA, WHO HAVE BEEN NOMINATED TO COMPETE FOR ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS

Congressman RALPH HARVEY, of Indiana's 10th Congressional District has announced the names of the young men who are nominees for appointment to the military Academies. In making the announcement, HARVEY said that his nominees must now compete in a battery of Academy-administered examinations for the vacancies available for the 10th District. This district is entitled to have one appointment each to West Point and to the Air Force Academy. There is no appointment available for this district to the Naval Academy in 1962.

Following are those who will compete for the West Point appointment: Robin Brown, nephew of Mr. and Mrs. Owen D. Brown, Rural Route 1, Mooreland; Richard Hughes, son of Mr. and Mrs. Austin M. Hughes, Rural Route 5, Greenfield; Larry Marlin, son of Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Marlin, Farmland; and Ted Orton, son of Mr. and Mrs. Dillard Orton, Rural Route 3, Liberty.

Competing for the Air Force appointment will be: Ronald Archbold, son of Mr. and Mrs. Russell Archbold, Rural Route 6, Connersville; Larry Bowmer, son of Mr. and Mrs. Richard E. Bowmer, Williamsburg; John Bredewater, son of Mr. and Mrs. Arthur J. Bredewater, Rural Route 7, Greensburg; Darrell Breithaupt, son of Mr. and Mrs. Irwin Breithaupt, 464 Southwest Fourth Street, Richmond; Robert E. Ditslear, son of Mr. and Mrs. Robert E. Ditslear, Sr., 603 North West Street, Winchester; Karl Fant, son of Mr. and Mrs. Karl E. Fant, 303 South Fifteenth Street, New Castle; Gary Fudge, son of Mr. and Mrs. Everett M. Fudge, 501 West School Street, Centerville; Robert Hampton, son of Mr. and Mrs. Robert Hampton, 531 National Road West, Richmond; Ronal Henley, son of Mr. and Mrs. Merle W. Henley, Jr., 250 South Twenty-seventh Street, Richmond; Curtis Jessup, son of Mr. and Mrs. Harold M. Jessup, 1230 Grand Avenue, Connersville; and William Strong, son of Mr. and Mrs. Fred Strong, 233 South Broadway, Albany.

James Roberts, son of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph P. Roberts, 922 South Fifteenth Street, New Castle, will be the only nominee from this district for appointment to the Merchant Marine Academy. He will compete against all other nominees, statewide, for one of the seven appointments allotted to Indiana.

All nominees have been notified by Congressman HARVEY of their nominations for possible appointments. Mr. HARVEY said that, based on the results of the competitive examinations, he will make known the names of the appointees early in April.

Murray S. Dixon, Texas Missionary in Bolivia, Rendered Service to Mankind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, by a tragic accident high in the mountains of Bolivia in December of 1961, the service to mankind of the dedicated Rev. Murray S. Dixon, of Houston, Tex., a Methodist missionary, was lost.

The statement from Dr. Ray Schiflett, medical doctor of Houston, Tex., who likewise is dedicated to the good of mankind, and the statement from the widow of the late Reverend Murray S. Dixon, state only a portion of the achievements of this dedicated church man, humanitarian, religious missionary. He was a patriotic leader in the cooperation of all the American people, regardless of nationality or religion, for the common good of the Western world and mankind.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD today the statement on Rev. Murray S. Dixon's life by Dr. Ray Schiflett, M.D., of Houston, dated January 8, 1962, and the biographical memorandum about the Reverend Murray S. Dixon by his surviving widow, Mrs. Murray S. Dixon, of Denton, Tex.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALMEDA MEDICAL & SURGICAL CLINIC,
Houston, Tex., January 8, 1962.

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR RALPH: One of the genuine pleasures that I have experienced in my life was working with an outstanding man such as Rev. Murray S. Dixon, who was, as his wife, Nova, states, a Democrat to the core.

Murry Dixon was killed while serving as a Methodist missionary in Bolivia, in December 1961. He was killed at approximately 18,000 feet, on the side of a mountain when the jeep in which he was riding was hit by a truck. At the time of his death, he was executive secretary of the Methodist Church in Bolivia, executive secretary of the Latin American consultation of life and mission of the Methodist Church,

and he was a great educator. He was one of the leaders of the youths in Bolivia, and was one of our strongest bulwarks against communism.

He and the Catholic bishop were able to put aside their differences, and were able to work together for the common good for the United States, and were able to advance our high ideals and principles. He was, above all, a great American.

The enclosed certified letter from his wife, Nova, or Mrs. Murray S. Dixon, explains how he has both been honored in the Bolivian Senate and the House of Representatives, and was given their highest award in the field of education. He is the type of man who has proven himself as being one of ideals and principles. It is this type of a man for whom we all have love and respect. Thus, I take justifiable pride in forwarding enclosed notarized letters, by certified mail, to you, whereas that you may lead the cause to pay legal tribute to Murray Dixon as a devoted, humble leader in education, high ideals, and principles, democracy, and deep patriotism for the United States and its people, in the Senate and in our House of Representatives.

Will you please have our President become aware of the things this man did, since he gave more than just a little service, and a little money: he gave his life for his country. I know that President Kennedy is very interested in our Latin American relations, as you are. Thus, I am enclosing the biographical sketch as certified by his wife with enough copies for your use as the leader in this cause of paying legal tribute to a great patriotic American, Reverend Murray S. Dixon.

Let me assure you that my friends and I take justifiable and great pride in sending this information to you. We believe in you; we believe that you will keep the faith of helping us honor this great man.

Sincerely yours, your friend,

RAY SCHIFLETT, M.D.

MURRAY S. DICKSON

1. Methodist missionary since 1942 to Bolivia.

2. Preacher for the Methodist Church for 17 years.

3. Spanish speaking pastor for the El Salvador Church in Cochabamba, Bolivia.

4. Served 7 years as Director of the American Institute in Cochabamba, Bolivia,

5. Served 1 year as Director of the American Institute in La Paz, Bolivia, during 50th anniversary of the Institute. Received Order of the Condor which is the highest education award in Bolivia.

6. Member of Inter-Denominational Protestant Committee unifying the work in Equador.

7. Board member of CALA—a literacy group for the Aymara Indians.

8. Known by the Quechua Indians as "Yankee Lio-Ca-Lio."

9. Only American president of the local Rotary Club in Cochabamba, Bolivia and was joint founder of the Paul Harris Rehabilitation Center for Children in Cochabamba.

10. Delegate for Rotary at international meeting in New York City.

11. Representative speaker for Methodist missions in Latin America at the Denver Central Conference last year.

12. At the time of his death, he was executive secretary of the Methodist Church in Bolivia, executive secretary of the Latin American Consultation on Life and Mission of the Methodist Church which is to meet in Buenos Aires, Argentina next February, executive secretary of the Latin American Board of Missions of the Methodist Church and president of the Pfeiffer Memorial Hospital.

13. His personal books on political science, education, literacy, and theology will be kept intact with Cochabamba, Bolivia for the use of the Bolivian people.

14. Was a great influence on Bolivian students coming to the United States to study and encourage American youth to go to Bolivia to work in the schools.

15. Following his death, the Bolivian Senate and House of Representatives paid legal tribute to Murray Dickson as a great Bolivian educator. He always used his deep patriotism for America and his profound understanding of democracy for the good of international relationships. Was a constant source of education for both North and South America.

MRS. MURRAY S. DICKSON.

Inept State Department Policymakers Continue To Map Strategy of Defeat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what it will take for Congress and the American people to finally demand a complete investigation of the State Department to root out those policymakers who continually enunciate policies which cost the United States victory after victory. The following article by Ken Thompson, editorial writer of the Dallas Morning News, points up just another instance of the strategy of defeat which has been fed to the Nation by the State Department for too many years:

ONE, TWO, THREE—SURRENDER

(By Ken Thompson)

One of the most incredible documents ever to emerge from the foggy corridors of the State Department is a bulletin entitled "Freedom from War: The U.S. Program for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World." As skeptical as I have always been of the measure of good sense and loyalty within the State Department, I never would have believed that these people we call our diplomats could so completely and unbashedly advocate the surrender of American rights and sovereignty until this bulletin appeared.

What it amounts to, in effect, is the official U.S. position on the subject of disarmament. More specifically, it is the basis of proposals which have already been submitted to the United Nations by the United States.

Although this bulletin was published last fall and is available for just 15 cents from the Government Printing Office in Washington, there has been very little attention paid to it.

Why, I cannot tell you, for it is certainly the most fantastic, harebrained blueprint for surrender on record.

Old Nikita himself might just as well have written it. And if more of the American people knew about this scheme there would be a nationwide uproar that would make the reaction to the Alger Hiss scandal look like another era of good feeling by comparison.

Last September President Kennedy addressed the United Nations and spoke of the desire of the United States to reach an agreement on disarmament. His stand has been echoed by Adlai Stevenson, our chief delegate and ambassador to the U.N.

Where Kennedy and Stevenson spoke in general terms, the State Department bulletin deals in specifics. It supplies the terms for those vague goals the administration hopes to gain through the U.N.

What are these terms? The State Department document summarizes the proposals as a "new program [which] provides for the progressive reduction of warmaking capabilities of nations and the simultaneous strengthening of international institutions to settle disputes and maintain the peace." This program is broken down into three phases or parts.

In the first phase, all nuclear-weapons tests by nations would be prohibited, production of fissionable material stopped, strategic delivery systems reduced, and conventional arms and armed forces would be cut.

In the second phase, present stocks of nuclear weapons would be reduced, further cuts would be made in armed forces, armaments and delivery systems and military bases and facilities would be dismantled. At the same time, a "peace force" would be established for the United Nations.

In the third and final phase, all nations would possess "only those forces, nonnuclear armaments, and establishments required for the purpose of maintaining internal order; they would also support and provide agreed manpower for a U.N. Peace Force."

This force would be "fully functioning," and would be sufficiently strong to overpower any individual nation or combination of nations resisting its will.

There you have it. One, two, three, bingo. The U.N. rules the world.

And who rules the U.N? That is the question. If for one moment old Nikita thinks he isn't going to rule the U.N., you can bet your last kopeck he's not going to fall for a trap like this.

As soon as he and Mr. Nehru, Mr. Nkrumah, Mr. Sukarno and a few other scoundrels count enough votes to come up with a winning combination, such a proposal will be a natural for them, and there won't be any more kopecks left for us to count. That's the beauty of the system—from Mr. Khrushchev's point of view, of course. It's heads he wins, tails we lose.

And speaking of votes, one of the most interesting—if not frightening—aspects of this proposal is the lineup on an 18-nation negotiating body in the U.N. which soon will be considering this disarmament scheme.

Originally, this committee was composed of five Western nations (Britain, Canada, France, Italy, and the United States) and five Soviet-bloc nations (Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Rumania and the U.S.S.R.). But the sharp division of these two factions resulted in a complete deadlock, and on June 27, 1960, the Soviets walked out.

Then somebody came up with the bright idea of adding eight "independent" nations to the committee as a compromise—two Asian, two African, two Latin American, one Middle Eastern and one European.

The future of this country—and of the free world—may very well depend upon how those eight nations line up.

At the moment the future is looking very dark. For from Asia, they picked Burma and India; from Africa, Nigeria and Ethiopia; from Latin America, Mexico and Brazil; Egypt from the Middle East, and Sweden from Europe.

Five of these nations—a clear majority—recently voted in favor of seating Red China in the U.N. and kicking Chiang out. These five nations are Burma, Egypt, Ethiopia, India and Sweden.

Moreover, Mexico was the only Latin American nation (other than Cuba, of course) to oppose flatly a resolution by the Organization of American States calling for

a foreign ministers' conference on the Cuban threat of Communist invasion of the hemisphere.

Brazil, which refused to support this same measure by abstaining on the vote, has already proclaimed its disapproval of any actions which the foreign ministers might take to deal with Castro. The Brazilian Government has officially called upon the United States and other hemisphere nations to "coexist" with Cuban communism.

How many friends does this leave the United States on the all-important U.N. disarmament committee? You count 'em. I'm sick.

Castro Foes Ask United States To Get Tough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the eyes of the world are now focused on Punta del Este and the meeting of the Organization of American States. The actions taken by the Foreign Ministers with respect to Cuba will, no doubt, influence our foreign relations with the American countries.

Recently, the Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning met with the Cuban and American Freedom Fighters to discuss the meeting at Punta del Este. I ask unanimous consent that Father Thorning's remarks, as reported in the January 21, 1962, issue of the Baltimore American, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXILED WOMEN HERE LOOK TO OAS: CASTRO FOES ASK UNITED STATES TO GET TOUGH

(By Cassie Mackin)

The day of reckoning for American nations is at hand.

This is the decided opinion of the Baltimore Woman's Committee for Cuban Freedom, Rev. Dr. Joseph Thorning, internationally known education, author, and lecturer in Latin American affairs, and Dr. Guillermo Belt, former Cuban Ambassador to the United States.

Tomorrow, the Foreign Ministers of the Organization of American States will meet in Punta del Este, Uruguay. It is expected the United States will seek the strongest possible censure of the Castro regime.

The entire world will turn a scrutinizing eye to the action taken by this body dedicated to the principles of democracy and preservation of peace.

Yesterday, the Cuban women, in exile here, met with Dr. Thorning and Dr. Belt to exchange views on the Punta del Este Conference.

Although their opinions will probably never have the impact of that "shot heard 'round the world," they should not go totally unheard.

"The United States needs a victory," Dr. Thorning said.

"Our State Department has been staggering from disaster to disaster and its officials have failed in the past and are apt to continue to fail," he said.

According to Dr. Thorning, tomorrow's OAS meeting can have a powerful consequential effect on the Western Hemisphere.

If handled properly, it can lay a solid groundwork for continued victory of democratic ideals in the future.

Dr. Thorning describes State Department officials as "going along to get along." In contrast, he is a fight-fire-with-fire man and has no apprehensions about speaking his mind.

The attitude of the American people as well as our leaders, Dr. Thorning believes, should be one of no compromise.

He feels there is no room in the West for the danger of neutrals or the horror of communistic dictatorships but only for the principles of representative government.

He said the OAS should issue an ultimatum to Castro and give him 60 days to clean up his domestic administration in Cuba and break all political and economic ties with Soviet China and the U.S.S.R.

If Castro does not comply, the American nations should effect a total air and sea blockade and cut off all supplies to Cuba of a military nature, especially oil, Dr. Thorning said.

Without oil, the industrial and farm economy of Cuba would be dashed to the ground, he added.

Dr. Thorning said tomorrow's meeting should reiterate the terms of the 1947 Inter-American Defense Treaty of Rio whereby the defense of one American people demands the defense and security of all the Americans.

The United States goes into the Punta del Este meeting hoping for a needed two-thirds backing from the 21 participating nations.

According to the Cuban women, Dr. Thorning and Dr. Belt, we can depend on 12 nations but 7 are uncertain. The latter include Chile, Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, Ecuador, Bolivia, and Uruguay.

The two remaining votes are, of course, the United States and Cuba.

They also said many Latin American nations profit by the Cuban situation and are apt to take advantage of it in dealing with the United States.

Since we shut off Cuba's sugar quota, other Latin American countries have picked up the business and would like to keep it that way, they said.

They also threaten us with the possibility of yielding to the Communists if we abandon them.

However, the Cuban women, Dr. Belt and Dr. Thorning agreed the United States can bring all nations in the OAS to their knees by turning the table and threatening to buy sugar on the world market and limiting tourist trade.

We of North America are naive, innocent, and well-meaning people, they said, but others aren't and it's time we learned how to deal with them.

Our Friends, the Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the residents of the ivory tower, in and about the White House, are for coexistence, too.

The following editorial appeared in the January 26 issue of the New York Daily News:

HOW TO GET A BID TO LUNCH AT THE WHITE HOUSE

President and Mrs. Kennedy next Tuesday are to entertain Mr. and Mrs. Alexei Adzhubei at lunch in the White House. Adzhubei is a son-in-law of N. S. "Red Hitler" Khrushchev, who never misses a chance to insult Kennedy and the United States and by his own admission is out to bury us.

Tip to Portugal's dictator, Antonio de Oliveria Salazar: If Your Excellency would like an invitation to lunch at the White House, why not try booting the United States off its military bases in your Azores Islands when the base leases come up for renegotiation this year?

Prof. Henry Wallich Views Tests Which Face America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, during the months of adjournment, there are always many important ideas, speeches and statements which deserve the attention of the Congress. During our recent adjournment one of these important statements was an article written by the very eminent Prof. Henry Wallich, professor of economics of Yale University and member—1959–61—of President Eisenhower's Council of Economic Advisors. Prepared for the Phi Beta Kappa magazine, the American Scholar, this article, "We Shall Be Tested," appeared in the autumn 1961 issue of the magazine. As this new session of Congress undertakes its work of guiding America along the paths which, we hope, will lead us to even greater national stature, I believe the words of Professor Wallich will help us better understand what we must do and the difficulties which we will face. For this reason I am placing Professor Wallich's article, "We Shall Be Tested," in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WE SHALL BE TESTED

(By Henry C. Wallich)

When President Kennedy, in his state of the Union message said that "we shall have to test anew whether a nation organized such as ours can endure," he was making a statement not only about the hazards ahead. He was making a statement also, implicitly at least, about the way our Nation is organized. A nation organized in liberty and for the pursuit of happiness is not necessarily best equipped to conduct a struggle for life against an adversary who knows only discipline and duty to the state. The coming years do indeed promise to test to the utmost the principles upon which our Nation is organized.

The historical parallels are too obvious to be labored. Arnold Toynbee has diagnosed the world's present stage as one immediately preceding the appearance of single world state. The question is, Whose state. The answer, which 15 years ago Henry Luce sought to preempt with his "American Century," is less obvious now.

The rivalry of Rome and Carthage, perhaps the most famous instance of this phase of Toynbee's pattern of history, offers little encouragement. If there is a parallel, it seemingly casts the United States, free-wheeling, pleasure loving, commercial, in the role of Carthage, and the Russians, dour, plodding, organized and purposeful, in that of the Romans. Wiser than to elaborate such

Cassandra-style visions is to remember that history often disappoints those who expect a repeat performance. Mature civilizations, to be sure, when they grew soft, have often been invaded and taken over by barbarian outsiders. But I would rather view the present impasse as another round in the long historic struggles between the East and the West, of which Thermopylae was not the first and today's cold war may not be the last. The West has met its tests before and can meet them again.

Some moral support will come to us from the realization that it is the West, and not the East, that moves in the mainstream of cultural evolution of the last 3,000 years. For much of this time, mankind's principal concern has been with the worth and freedom of man. Soviet materialism, the predominant concern with physical production by anonymous masses, is alien to this tradition upon which the United States was founded. The United States started out in history as the land of liberty. In subsequent years, the United States evolved a second major theme—the creation of material wealth. It so became the land of freedom and money. In recent years, the image of money has threatened to displace the image of freedom. We have even allowed ourselves at times to believe that freedom was good principally because of the material benefits it bestowed—because it helped to provide and efficient government and because it helped to make more money. Today, Russia is challenging us on the battleground of materialism, of production. It is telling the less-developed countries that the Russian system promises quicker development than ours can. If we have nothing to offer on our part but production, the competition may well go against us. We must give a good account of ourselves in that department also, to be sure. But the stress must be upon freedom, our unique value.

In the years to come, our faith in freedom will surely be tested. It will be tested as we realize increasingly that our form of government is not ideally designed to fight a cold war, or any other war. It will be tested as we observe that our free market economy probably is not the most efficient vehicle for rapid growth of the American economy. And if, as I believe, we shall choose freedom even at a cost, we shall be tested on our willingness to discipline ourselves in order to minimize the weaknesses inherent in democratic government and a free market economy.

Eulogies of democracy rarely fail to make reference to the wisdom of the people, which is held to be greater than that of their chosen representatives or any other small group of individuals. This proposition is difficult to sustain, even in the abstract, given election results like those of last fall. Is it really to be supposed that 49.7 percent of the voters were wise and 49.6 percent unwise? In any case, as a practical matter we do not operate our democracy on this principle. Most of us, when we ballot, vote mainly our personal or group interests. No doubt many feel compelled to clothe the nakedness of self-interest with some rationalization proving that what is good for our particular General Motors is good for the country. But the fact itself is clearly demonstrated by the kind of promises politicians make, and by the sides chosen, with creditable exceptions, by businessmen, organized workers and members of other groups. An appeal like President Kennedy's, "ask not what your country can do for you," carries emotional appeal precisely because it is so rare in our politics. Our democratic decisions, therefore, have the virtue of providing a compromise reflecting the wishes of the majority. But there is no assurance that this common denominator represents also "what is best for the country."

It has often been pointed out, moreover, that democratic decisions are apt to be best at the local level, and to become less sure footed the farther they venture from home. At the local level, voter knowledge of the issues is usually good. Majority interest and community interest quite likely coincide. Today's principal problems, unfortunately, lie abroad. Most of them demand efforts and sacrifices that have little immediate bearing upon the welfare of the voter. The continuing congressional difficulties of the foreign aid program bear this out.

One final impediment of democracy: the American form of government has been designed to provide, not maximum effectiveness of action, but minimum danger of abuse of power. The historical and analytical studies that the framers of the Constitution undertook had made them more concerned with the Charybdis of abuse of government than the Scylla of ineffectiveness. Had they been principally concerned with effectiveness, they would scarcely have chosen a form of democracy whose principal innovation was a system of checks and balances. Even a parliamentary system, whatever its defects, is better designed to make decisions. Neither, of course, can nor should vie with an authoritarian system in its readiness to take quick action for good or evil.

The achievements of the American form of government are of a kind, nevertheless, that quite refutes H. L. Mencken's remark about democracy being the only amusing form of government ever endured by man. The American system has provided the political stability that has made possible the Nation's great economic achievements. It has seen us successfully through two world wars. The U.S. Constitution is the oldest written constitution of any nation in the world. Past tests have been met with such consistent success that there is good reason to hope that those of the future also will. But we must bear in mind that the tests of the cold war, in an age that has moved from the balance of power to the balance of terror, may be different. They may compel the administration to take seriously what the President has said about sacrifice, and to invite the people to "ask what you can do for your country." Such attitudes do not come easily to politicians under our form of government. The tests ahead may be those not only of the system and the people, but also and primarily of its leaders.

While two world wars brought no serious interruption of our political practices, they did lead to temporary suspensions of the free market system. Consumption was restricted, more severely in World War II than in World War I. Price, wage, and production controls were imposed. The Government underwrote a virtually unlimited demand for output. Under these conditions output advanced very rapidly.

This experience, if nothing else, should make plain that if maximum material growth regardless of human dignity is our goal, a system more like the Russian and less like our own offers the better prospects. The secret of its effectiveness is not primarily its central direction, but its great power to form capital, by holding down consumption. The free economies of Germany and Japan, which are investing at a rate similar to the Russian, are also experiencing comparable growth. The United States has never in peacetime limited its consumption to so small a fraction of output. Undoubtedly we could increase our rate of investment. But to reach even German or Japanese rates of investment, let alone the Russian, we would have approximately to double our rate of net investment (excluding replacement), which would take an annual sum larger than present corporate profits after taxes. Short of forced draft measures of the wartime kind, we are not likely to accomplish such a miracle.

Chamber of commerce orators praising the free market system tend to overlook this, just as do Fourth of July orators extrolling democracy. The first often claim that a free economy provides maximum growth, just as the second claim that democracy produces the best political decisions. Both would be right in saying that the free market and democracy give us good growth and good government. Because free institutions are essential to human freedom, ours are clearly preferable to other arrangements. But if we were prepared to sacrifice some freedom, we could undoubtedly grow faster and act more effectively as a nation.

A free system, in other words, is not a fast vehicle, although a good and reliable one. In a world in which it is better to travel than to arrive, it is by far the best. In a world where the premium on early arrival is growing, the cost of freedom is also growing. Our attachment to freedom will be increasingly tested.

For Americans, the temptation to cut back political freedom should be very small compared with similar temptation on the economic side. On the latter front, we are already being tempted by eloquent propaganda on behalf of bigger growth through bigger government. Big government means a small but certain loss of freedom for the taxpayer, the businessman, and perhaps even for labor. It carries also the risk of a possibly large loss of freedom for everybody if big government should someday break the restraints of democratic control. As the pressures upon us mount, so will the temptation to meet them in ways that impose limitations on freedom. Ahead of us looms an acid test of our attachment to a free economy. How well we can hope to pass the test and still accomplish our national and international objectives will depend on how we conduct our free economy. It will depend on the attitudes taken by business, labor, and the intellectuals who help form national opinion. These crucial attitudes demand a closer look.

For years we have indulged ourselves in bad habits that have slowed the economy below its potential growth. One bad habit has been the inflationary spiral of prices and wages. A second is featherbedding of various sorts. A third is the production of farm surpluses. Still others have been the intransigent attitudes of business, labor, and special interest groups that have stymied tax reform, the pressure of labor for shorter hours, the pressure of certain industries for protection from foreign competition. Of all these, the inflationary spiral is probably the most serious and certainly the most irresponsible practice. In the earlier postwar years it was possible to argue that inflation really was not very harmful, that perhaps it was even beneficial. Now that we have begun to price ourselves out of world markets, with a balance-of-payments deficit and heavy gold losses, the issue is no longer up for debate. We simply cannot afford further inflation leading to large gold losses.

The discipline of the balance of payments is upon us. It has kept many members of the new administration chafing with impatience. They have wanted to take strong action to reduce unemployment and to stimulate growth. Fear of gold losses has reduced their original program to something not much more ambitious than the Republican might have been.

The inflation of the postwar period has been fed from different roots at different times. During the early years, prices were pulled up by strong demand. At that time, labor needed hefty annual wage hikes just to stay even with rising living costs. Later, the pull of demand abated. But labor and business, having got into the swing of things, continued their ring around the rosy. Wage increases required price increases, and price increases justified further wage in-

creases. With the assist of occasional strong demand in particular sectors, we have been going like this for the better part of a decade. We can keep going only at great peril to the financial structure of the whole world.

Everybody by now knows that wage increases above the national productivity average are inflationary. This productivity gain has been about 2 percent on average for many decades. Most people would concede that labor as a whole has very little to gain from the spiral. A 4-percent wage increase followed by a 2-percent price hike is no better than 2 percent with stable prices. We are told that union leaders fear to be outstripped by others, that they must bring home as thick a chunk of bacon as the others on penalty of being dispossessed of their jobs by some upstart rival. Is it improperly critical of labor to say that such arguments border on the frivolous, when they are employed to justify activities that imperil a great nation?

Aside from the wage-price spiral and lesser malpractices, we are embroiled in a stultifying dispute, relating to the proper rate of saving and investment, that seriously slows down the economy. This is a dispute not only between business and labor, but one that has deeply split the liberal front itself. The President's economic advisers take the view that more growth demands more investment. This means, by and large, a policy that encourages saving. Such a policy must abstain from tax changes that tend to equalize incomes. It must seek to avoid wage increases so high as to squeeze profits. Broadly speaking, it calls for the kind of policies that are favored by business.

Labor does not share this view. It likes to refer to it as the "trickle down" theory. It prefers more egalitarian tax policies, and wage increases at the expense of profits, both of which better serve its short-run interests. This course, however, reduces the resources available for investment and growth. To justify it, labor has been compelled to devise a theory of growth in which high consumption is the leading force while saving and investment play a subordinate role. The theory of more growth by more consumption has been actively promoted by President Truman's former chief economic adviser, Leon Keyserling.

This position has some plausibility as long as the economy operates well below capacity. There then seems to be little need to enlarge capacity. The immediate objective must be to raise demand so as to utilize fully the capacity that exists. The trouble with the theory is that it is very short run, and applicable only to depression. Over the years, the economy has made fairly full use of its productive capacity. There has been a continuing need, interrupted only from time to time, to expand capacity. Had this not been so, the economy would have ceased to grow long ago.

Labor, through no ill will of its own, is thus put in the uncomfortable position of advocating policies that many economists would consider adverse to growth. Business, without deserving special credit for it, finds that its immediate self-interest coincides with the need of growth. The administration's economists find themselves impelled to devise policies that in the short run seem to be more favorable to business than to labor. A prominent instance of this is the proposed investment tax credit that gives business a tax deduction as an incentive for more investment.

It is only in the short view, however, that this conflict of interest appears. In the longer run, labor has much more to gain from accelerated growth than from redistribution. The rapid rise in the living standard of the European worker demonstrates this. In Germany, Italy, France and also in Japan, he has accepted a tax system and an income distribution less favorable to him than that of the United States or the United Kingdom. The spectacular results of this self-denial are familiar.

For labor, therefore, one of the challenges ahead is whether it will accept these facts of economic life. This means acquiescence in adequate profits, and acceptance of tax policies that favor saving and investment.

Business, too, does not come off scot free. Business' tax proposals, by and large, happen to be of the sort that favor growth. But business has shown little sense of responsibility in the timing of it proposals. Depending on the business cycle, there are times to cut taxes and to stimulate investment, and there are times when restraint is needed. Business has pushed its demands through times appropriate and inappropriate. Its utterances evoke the experience of the mechanic in a German sewing machine factory during Germany's period of secret rearmament, who assembled a set of components in various different ways but always found them adding up to a machinegun. In a like vein, business has made proposals to cure recessions and to restrain booms, but they have always added up to a tax cut in the upper brackets.

In an economy, in short, that has given us great plenty, we all seem to have taken excessively to heart Samuel Gompers' demand for "more." As a result, we have had less than we might have had. Our chances of making the most out of our economy depend on our willingness to be less insistent and less nearsighted in our demands.

If we fall short, the outcome is predictable. The resources that our adversaries can throw into the cold war are mounting fast. If ours stagnate, we would come under increasing pressure to reach for tools that are not in the workshop of a free economy. We would find ourselves trading freedom for cold war potential. The next few years will show whether we can meet the test of properly running our economy.

Some people feel affronted by the view that a free economy may not be the fastest growing, and that a democratic form of government may not be the most effective to deal with totalitarian aggression. But it is hardly plausible that any one system should be the most effective in all directions. For every gain, something must be surrendered. Nor does there seem anything disgraceful in admitting that our economy was not designed exclusively with an eye to material benefits, nor our form of government with a view to the international power game. Our Western heritage is more truly expressed in concern for freedom and for the dignity of individuals and nations. Our institutions find better justification in serving these than more material or aggressive ends.

The United States, I said at the beginning, has been the land both of freedom and of money. Today we are being successfully challenged in the second department. We no longer possess an exclusively successful system for the creation of wealth. Our best course is to remind ourselves of the original primacy of the first, of freedom. If we can reestablish the United States, in our own mind and that of others, as the land of freedom, we shall have assumed a posture that the other side cannot copy. It gave the United States an overwhelming attraction once. Perhaps it can do it again.

Why a New Department?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. Raymond Moley is the best I have seen, so far, in opposition to the President's proposal to create a Cabinet post for Urban Affairs.

This article appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of January 28. It is temperate and scholarly in its approach.

The whole idea is simply another "power grab." It is another extravagant means of putting the Federal Government into every ward and into every minority group in the land. It is the ideal way of controlling the votes of the masses and of keeping any party in power almost indefinitely.

The Congress is again to be bypassed, if necessary, and therefore this is one more downgrading of this once great and coequal branch of Government.

The article follows:

WHY A NEW DEPARTMENT?

(By Raymond Moley)

The ever-increasing Federal control of local and State government is now proposed to be formalized in a new Department of Urban Affairs, with a seat in the President's Cabinet alongside such veterans as State, Treasury and Justice. There is no reason in tradition or logic in such a departmentalization. The many interests which the Federal Government now has in local government almost entirely pertain to individual aid in health, education, and welfare. We already have a department to care for that aid.

Let us look at the departments now in the Cabinet.

The first Cabinet was composed of the heads of departments created in the first year of the Republic. They were the Secretaries of State, Treasury, War (meaning Army), Navy, and Justice. These were charged with the administration of powers specifically designated in the Constitution. In 1829 the Post Office Department, which had been in the Treasury, was given Cabinet rank.

Then, as time went on, the vast properties of the Nation acquired by purchase and conquest and other means had become so large that in 1849 their administration demanded an Interior Department.

Up to that time, the reasons for separate departments were essentially Federal because of constitutional provisions and ownership.

A change began in 1862, when a vast economic interest was recognized in the creation of the Department of Agriculture.

Then, after 41 years, in 1903, two other interests were recognized in the creation of a Department of Commerce and Labor. In 1913 this was divided into the departments of Commerce and Labor respectively.

These three latecomers—Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor—were interests in the sense that the private businesses of the Nation had assumed an interstate character of such importance that the Federal Government's regulation and aid needed attention.

It was believed that these three divergent private interests with millions of Americans in them would have a person at the Cabinet table who would speak for them, and also that these department heads would be able to speak to the interests thus represented in the name of the National Government at Washington.

The vast expansion of our military forces, together with the changed character of military power by the rise of air power, brought about the consolidated Department of Defense in 1947.

Until that year, the logical reason for a department was well defined. But after the great depression, there was a new philosophy of personal aid by direct Federal contributions. The recipients of such aid were not in the real sense private economic interests. Nor were the private associations or State and local agencies engaged in education, health, and welfare such interests. They were numerous but not homogeneous.

Only in the fact that they all wanted Federal money could they be classed as an interest. Nor could the ministration to their wants be called a Federal function. Almost always when one of these new Federal burdens was assumed, it was regarded as temporary. And so the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare became a catchall for a vast spending congeries of bureaucracies.

Just what the Secretary of the HEW Department represents before the country and in the Cabinet is hard to understand. For the head of a big department is more than the administrator of a vast bureaucracy. Perhaps he would say he is the keeper of the great soft heart of Uncle Sam. The red, white, and blue Santa Claus. The friend of the friendless, the hope of the hopeless, and the help of the helpless. But, like Everest, he is there, and it's too late to do anything about it.

But the concept of a Department of Urban Affairs would mean another kind of definition of a representative. Cities are separate agencies of government. Is the secretary of such a department to be the lobbyist-in-chief for the mayors and councils of cities? If so, could not this be done better by getting all the city officials together and have them select a member of their group to live in Washington? Is the proposed new secretary to have a hand in planning and running the great sprawling urban districts in the land? If so, we have progressed a long way toward a unitary government.

The fact is that his department would merely be a satellite planet split off from the great sun of beneficence which is the HEW. It would be another convenient means of getting city votes. Why are city people different from other people? In short, why not leave the bureaus where they are, in the HEW?

If the purpose of such a department is to tell the cities how to run their affairs, one might well suggest that running the city of Washington by a congressional subcommittee has not been a howling success.

Keep Federal Fingers Out of Citizens' Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune last Saturday, January 27, 1962. The Herald Tribune has pointed out some of the implications of section 11 of the postal rate increase bill which passed the House on January 24. Let us bear in mind the admonition that "those who have wrapped themselves in a cocoon of fear ought to get out into the light."

The editorial follows:

KEEP FEDERAL FINGERS OUT OF CITIZENS' MAIL

In passing the postal rate increase bill, the House of Representatives wrote into it a bit of pernicious folly that the Senate ought to take out: a ban on delivery of mail from Communist countries if the Justice Department deems it propaganda.

In support of this restriction, the cry was raised that costs of handling such mail after it reaches the United States are borne by the American Government, and the taxpayers shouldn't be required to pay for the dissemination of Communist propaganda. This is a catchy argument. But distribution of international mail is a matter of treaty arrangements, and distribution of mail to addresses in this country is a matter of the rights of American citizens.

When the Federal Government gets into the business of telling Americans what they may and may not receive, on political grounds, it tramples heavily on delicate ice. Few Americans are naive enough to suppose that publications they get from Iron Curtain countries are free of propaganda taint. They don't have to be shielded by Government censors; they can decide for themselves whether they want to read the material, and if so what to make of it, or whether to throw it in the wastebasket.

Quite beyond this, the United States gets itself in a curious position if it tries, out of fear, to cut off the free flow of information (even slanted information) across national boundaries. Our aim ought to be to open new channels, not closing existing ones—and we ought to bear in mind that restrictionos can be imposed two ways. A year ago President Kennedy wisely ended a longstanding administrative ruling that had substantially the same effect as the House amendment. His was a step forward. The House action was a step back. Those who have wrapped themselves in a cocoon of fear ought to get out into the light, and get their fingers out of other people's mail.

American Agent of World Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, from all appearances, the Department of State went to Punta del Este like a bull and is emerging like a lamb.

As I have often stated before, Castro is not going to disappear because the Kennedy brothers want him to. There will have to be firm action taken by us eventually and the longer we wait the stronger Castro gets, militarily.

The following editorial which appeared in the New York Daily News on January 26 is very much to the point:

AFTER PUNTA DEL ESTE

At Punta del Este, Uruguay, yesterday, Secretary of State Dean Rusk uncorked a surprisingly powerful speech on the crimes of Cuban Red Dictator Fidel Castro and what the Organization of American States should do about them.

Rusk labeled Cuba a "smirking sycophant for the Communist bloc" and blistered the Castro regime as the "American agent of world communism." His speech raised hopes that out of this fight we might get something more than an OAS statement disapproving Castro's communism and urging them politely to mend his ways.

But if Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, and several other Latin American nations do chicken out on drastic action against the Cuban Red dictator, where do we go from here?

It seems to us that Congress should take the play at that point.

Congress can cut down or cut out all U.S. money earmarked under the President's alliance for progress plan. We believe Congress should do just that to any Latin American nation refusing to join us in moves to cut the props out from under Castro and sink his Communist regime in the waters off Morro Castle, Havana.

Congress should so act, we further believe, even if the Kennedy administration wants to turn yet another cheek to Castro. We're fast running out of cheeks for that purpose.

Big Spending by the Federal Government May Cost Us Individual Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, maybe $93 billion is just too big a figure to impress the average citizen. That is why the people cannot get more excited about the President's tremendous budget. It may mean more to all of us if we realize that the Government's unlimited power to tax can eventually lead to the loss of individual freedom for all of us. The following editorial by Dick West, editor of the Dallas Morning News, brings this thought home:

THAT BIG OCTOPUS

(By Dick West)

Every year when a President submits his budget, the boys with sharp pencils who know how to multiply and subtract have a field day. Mr. Kennedy's $93 billion budget sent an unprecedented rash of startling figures and facts into print.

If, 2,000 years ago, you had started spending $1,000 an hour, 24 hours a day, by now you would have spent only one-fifth of what Mr. Kennedy asks to spend in just 1 year.

If a business firm began with $1 billion in the year A.D. 1 (one ninety-third of J.F.K.'s budget) and managed things so badly it lost $1,000 a day, it would still have enough left out of its $1 billion to continue losing $1,000 a day for the next 777 years.

If you had $93 billion in $10 bills and stacked one on top of another, your stack would be 558 miles high.

More important, as far as your individual existence is concerned, is the phenomenal growth of the Federal octopus in Washington.

Under Herbert Hoover, spending was around $4 billion a year, the national debt $17 billion.

Under Roosevelt, just before World War II, it went up to $10 billion, and we thought F.D.R. was a spender.

Under Truman, before Korea, it hit $40 billion.

Under Eisenhower, the total reached nearly $80 billion.

Now with Kennedy, the figurt is $93 billion, with $100 billion in sight, and the debt is $300 billion.

This spending of nearly $100 billion a year out of Washington alone represents around $500 for every man, woman, and child in this country. Our population was 185,211,000 on January 1.

Fifty-three percent of this money will come from individual income taxes. The average person will work until May to pay his Federal tax bill.

The bigger this Federal octopus becomes, the more money it needs.

The more it takes from you, the more power it has.

The more power it has, the less you have, and the less your local institutions have.

If you wonder what we're driving at, remember that all dictatorships began by concentrating power in one place and in a few hands.

Where the tax money goes, the power resides. Washington hogs for itself 2 out of every 3 tax dollars spent by the American people.

To you, a working individual trying to make ends meet and preserve what few freedoms you have left, the big warning in a $93 billion budget is the power behind it.

More important than the $93 billion is who spends it, where it is spent, and how.

James K. Polk: A Great Speaker and Great President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation to name the three House Office Buildings after three former great Speakers of the House—Joseph G. Cannon, James K. Polk, and the beloved late Speaker Sam Rayburn.

James Knox Polk was the only Speaker of the House of Representatives who was elected to the presidency. He served with distinction in the House and also with distinction as President.

Among President Polk's worth while achievements was the acquisition of land out of which became the States of Texas, Washington, Oregon, Idaho, California, New Mexico, Nevada, Utah, and parts of Montana, Wyoming, Arizona, and Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, in order that my colleagues may know more about this great man—James Knox Polk—I am asking unamimous consent that a brief biographical sketch of James Knox Polk from volume III of Messages of the Governors of Tennessee, written by Dr. Robert H. White, Tennessee State historian be reprinted in the RECORD. The biography by Dr. White follows:

JAMES KNOX POLK (1839–1841) [1]

James Knox Polk was the eldest of 10 children, and was born on November 2, 1795, in Mecklenburg County, N.C. In 1806, when James was about 10 years of age, his father, Maj. Samuel Polk, along with his family emigrated to the fertile lands of Maury County, Tenn., where extensive land holdings were acquired and developed into a handsome estate. Due to a none too robust physical constitution, young James entreated his father to permit him to obtain a sound education as preparatory for a professional career. At the age of 20, James enrolled at the University of North Carolina where he won high honors as a result of native ability, diligence, and fidelity to duty. It is recorded of his college days that he never missed a day from his recitations, attended regularly devotional services held at sunrise and sunset, and completed the regular course in 3 years. He displayed a fondness for mathematics and the classics, and eagerly sought solutions of difficult and intricate topics. Blessed with a quick perception and ready apprehension, he easily excelled as a student. Friendly by nature and endowed with wit and good humor, he bore away from his alma mater the highest respect of both the faculty and the students.

Upon graduation, he decided to make law his profession. Without delay, the young man elected to pursue the study of law under Felix Grundy, of Nashville, a renowned lawyer of outstanding ability. In 1820, young Polk hung out his shingle at Columbia where, within a brief time, he advanced rapidly in his profession. Such a personable young man could not and did not escape public notice. In 1823, he was elected representative to the general assembly which numbered among its membership his legal preceptor, Felix Grundy. Two years later, Mr. Polk was elected to Congress after a warmly contested canvass in which he capitalized upon his general popularity, sound judgment, and ability to address the public with ease, facility, and persuasive eloquence. From 1823 to 1839, when he retired voluntarily, Mr. Polk represented his district in Congress. During that period he served two terms as Speaker of the House of Representatives wherein he displayed remarkable discernment in the role of parliamentarian.

At the urgent request of Andrew Jackson and other strong Democrat leaders, Congressman Polk became a candidate for Governor in 1839 and was elected over the incumbent, Gov. Newton Cannon. Two and four years later, Polk was twice defeated by "Lean Jimmy" Jones, a man far less able in general ability and all-round statesmanship. The general upsurge of the Whig Party, difficult State economic problems growing out of the 1837 nationwide depression, plus a host of disappointed capitalists and investors in railroad and turnpike stock who sought unsuccessfully State aid without complying with legal requirements were underlying factors that contributed to his defeat by the Whig candidate, James C. Jones.

With the close of his gubernatorial service in 1841, Mr. Polk returned to his law practice in Columbia. At the Baltimore Democratic Convention in early 1844, he was nominated for the Presidency of the United States and was elected as the first "dark horse" candidate. Upon assuming the heavy responsibilities of the Presidency, Mr. Polk announced five major objectives: (1) the revision of the tariff law; (2) establishment of an independent Treasury; (3) settlement of the Oregon question; (4) reannexation of Texas; and (5) the opening up of the public lands for settlement. President Polk achieved each of his stated aims, an accomplishment not attained by any other one-term President. And President Polk let it be known at the outset that he would not accept a second term of office, a factor that may have contributed to his successful administration.

For a long, long time, President Polk's achievements as President practically fell into the discard by historians. But in more recent times, his administration has been carefully evaluated with the result that Polk has emerged as a statesman of high ability. During his term of office, a tariff law was passed that had the longest life of any tariff measure in our history; an independent Treasury supplanted the U.S. Bank which had become deeply involved in high bracket politics; a compromise was effected with England whereby a long standing "fuss" was ended and the vast Northwest was added to the territory of the United States; with Texas added to the United States, the immense territories of the Northwest and the Southwest secured for the United States the lengthy Pacific coast which aided in snatching the scepter of commerce from the Old World by transferring it to the New; and the freeing of the public lands in the Great West from vexatious preemption laws enabled citizens to become owners of small portions of our vast public domains at low and moderate rates.

But the 4 years of physical and mental strain as President exacted a toll from Polk's physical strength. Upon his return from Washington, his friends and acquaintances were struck by the marks of premature old age in his physical appearance. A vivid description of his physical status was sketched in a eulogy upon his life and character by his fellow Maury Countain, A. O. P. Nicholson, delivered at McKendree Methodist Church in Nashville, on November 1, 1849. Said Judge Nicholson, in part:

"How little did I then suppose that at the end of 4 years I should see him return with lock vying in whiteness with the snow and his body bending as if under the age of many years. He returned among us literally worn out in the service of his country, and instead of finding the years of happiness which he sought in his beautiful retreat, he returned only to mingle for a few days with his friends and then find an early grave."

On June 15, 1849, James Knox Polk "slept with his fathers." Surviving him for many years was his charming wife, the former Sarah Childress of Murfreesboro, a lady celebrated for her personal beauty and social characteristics. His had been a busy and eventful life. In some respects, his record stands perhaps unparalleled in American history. In the brief span of 4 years, he had twice been defeated for Governor, had failed to obtain nomination for the Vice Presidency in 1840, had lost his own State in the 1844 presidential campaign, and yet emerged victorious as the 11th President of the United States.

[1] From "Messages of the Governors of Tennessee," ch. II, vol. III.

Beclouding the Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, unable to persuade his personally packed Rules Committee to give the stamp of approval to his proposed Department of Urban Affairs, President Kennedy has announced his intention of using the Negro population as a political pawn.

The following editorial, which appeared in the New York Daily News on January 26, meets the issue squarely:

J.F.K. INSULTS NEGROES

President Kennedy's pet project for a new Federal Department of Urban Affairs was turned down Wednesday by a House Rules Committee majority—five Republicans, four Democrats.

Thereupon the President, in what came as close to a fit of rage as he seems able to get, told a news conference that he will set up the new Department by Executive decree. This would stand unless either House of Congress vetoed it within 60 days.

As first Secretary of Urban Affairs, Mr. Kennedy added, he intends to appoint Robert C. Weaver, now Housing and Home Finance Administrator. Mr. Weaver is a Negro,

and an able public servant to the best of our information.

Thus, the President is using Weaver in a bald and brassy effort to buy Negro votes by adding a Negro to the Cabinet. Thereby, it seems to us, the President insults the intelligence of all Negro voters.

He also drags a political red herring across the real issue in the Department of Urban Affairs dispute.

The real issue is whether this thing is needed. We believe it is not, and we aren't alone in that belief.

It would certainly freeze a new horde of bureaucrats onto the Federal payrolls and the taxpayers' backs. It would in all likelihood encourage cities to crawl to Washington for solutions of problems they should solve on their own, and give Washington a stranglehold on these cities.

We hope that at least one House of Congress will keep this real issue in mind and will massacre the new Department if the President creates it.

Kentucky Mountains Marksmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE SILER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, this is terrible. We shot at the moon last week and missed it more than 20,000 miles.

Now the moon is tremendous. It is over 2,000 miles wide and that is quite a target. It is usually shining like a new dollar most any time when you might want to shoot at it. But why anyone should ever want to shoot at the moon is beyond my comprehension. The moon is beautiful and romantic. It is friendly and inspiring. It is helpful and generous. It gives light and affects the tides. It promotes courtship and saves electricity. And if you should actually hit the moon as a target, what would you accomplish? You really ought to feel sick in the stomach and woebegone like that time when you shot a doe, a young debutante deer. It was so helpless and beautiful, a creature of the Lord. And yet you shot it.

But what I started out to deplore was aiming at a bright, 2,000-mile-wide target and, of all things, missing it by 20,000 miles. I think the Lord may be shaming us. Like the current bestseller says, "You may shoot at bluejays, but to kill a mocking bird is a sin." So, we may well shoot at Castro and Khrushchev and poverty and unemployment, but to shoot at the moon may well be a sin.

Now the Kentucky mountain people thrust me into orbit and landed me up here in Washington. It was no trouble at all. They are deadeye dick on hitting their target. I actually have people in Clay County, Ky., that can drop a squirrel out of a tree at 100 yards. I have one girl that can hit a running rabbit with a rifle at a hunter's reasonable distance. What would they think if I told them that some experts down in Florida fired a big shot at the big moon way out yonder and actually missed it by more than 20,000 miles distance from the bull's-eye target? Some of them would say, "What's the country coming to—shooting at the moon? And where has marksmanship gone—missing an elephant's south end while swinging at it with a big bass fiddle?"

Well, if we should pull off this foolishness again at a cost of more millions of dollars to taxpayers, then I suggest we call in the shootingest men we got, the squirrel hunters from Southeastern Kentucky or maybe a few World War I veterans from Breathitt County, Ky., where they had no World War I draft whatever because their boys came out of the hollows, volunteered and filled up the quotas without any law at all except the law of self-respect, the law of Americanism, and the law of real good marksmanship that has always marked the men of the Kentucky mountains.

Americans Were Willing To Pay Freedom's Price

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, our citizen-soldier time and again proves his worth in the defense of our glorious country. There is no doubt but Americans are willing to pay the price for freedom.

The minuteman of today—the reservist—has again displayed his ability to stand ready for battle, almost on a minute's notice.

Members of Kentucky's 100th Division have shown just how quickly citizen-soldiers can don uniforms and get ready for active duty.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to submit for the information of this body an article from the Officer, monthly magazine of the Reserve Officers Association, which cites the spirit, patriotism, and effective state of readiness of our reservists:

ONE-HUNDREDTH DIVISION RESPONSE PROVED: "AMERICANS WERE WILLING TO PAY FREEDOM'S PRICE"

"We shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

These words from President Kennedy's inaugural address acquired a new dimension for members of Kentucky's 100th Division when the 100th became the first division-sized unit called to active duty.

There could be no doubt that Americans were willing to pay freedom's price. The unanswered question was how fast the citizen-soldiers could don their Army greens and how effectively they could serve in this age of missilry. The 100th's answer, in the words of its commander, Maj. Gen. Dillman A. Rash, was:

"The citizen-soldier has again proved his spirit, his patriotism, and his high state of readiness—as he has in every period of emergency since Concord Bridge."

Alerted on August 25, 1961, the 100th Division reported for active duty 1 month later. The 30 days of grace were utilized in preparing the unit for movement to its activation site and preparing the new duty station for the Centurymen. An advance party totaling 10 percent of assigned strength established a forward CP at Fort Polk, La., the division's original activation site. Rear CP's were maintained at the various Reserve training centers throughout Kentucky. Individuals were placed on active duty as quickly as their personal affairs permitted.

Processing personnel at home station was a one-army affair. Medical teams from Active Army and U.S. Army Reserve units gave final-type physicals to the Centurymen during weekend drills. Several civilian doctors, particularly in the smaller communities, donated their services. Specialists from Fort Knox and XX U.S. Army Corps, Fort Hayes, Ohio, helped each unit convert personnel records from a Reserve status to those of the Active Army.

More than 97 percent of the division's strength reported for active duty. The rest were released for physical or hardship conditions, most of which had developed during the preceding year.

The advance party at Fort Polk faced its own problems. Some facilities needed repairs and others had to be built. Additionally, housing for an anticipated 1,500 families needed to be coordinated with the nearby towns of Leesville and DeRider. (There are an estimated 3,000 dependents of 100th Division men now living in Fort Smith, Ark., nearest town to Chaffee.)

The advance party's efforts were abruptly stopped on September 19 when the 100th's duty station was changed to Fort Chaffee, Ark. The switch came when the 49th Armored Division (Texas National Guard) was called up. Terrain in the Polk area was ideal tank country and that at Chaffee offered good facilities for a training division.

Although the lead time had been cut in half, the advance party still had bedding, food and CP's for the main body when it arrived at Fort Chaffee on October 1, 1961. A cold rain on that Sunday might have justified an air of gloom but the Centurymen made typical GI jokes about their problems and explored their new home.

Sweat and ingenuity were required those first weeks, for time was in extremely short supply for the Kentuckians. The first cycle of basic trainees—660 men—was scheduled to arrive on October 17. An additional 440 would arrive for advanced individual training before the end of the week. No relief was in the offing, for an equal number was programed weekly for Fort Chaffee.

The final days prior to the trainee invasion were spent in a series of rehearsals. Classes and routes were checked and rechecked to insure an efficient, effective operation. Even the central issue point was tested by a skeleton group of 70 cadremen to make certain that all training gear could be drawn in the allotted time of 10 men per minute.

The first test came as the basic trainees arrived by train from the reception station at Fort Knox, Ky. Others came by bus and airplane; the full 1,100 started their formal training the following Monday.

Any veteran of the early forties will tell you that the first days are the hardest and the experience of the 100th bears that out. A few items of supply were unavailable and training had to be adjusted until those items arrived. Most of the crude, makeshift training aids were replaced before the end of the cycle by more sophisticated devices. But the mission was accomplished and the first trainees were graduated as scheduled on December 15, 1961.

In less than 3 months, the 100th had:

1. Severed civilian ties.

2. Made a 600-mile move to a new duty station.

3. With the aid of supporting units, reestablished a training center that had been inactive for more than 2 years.

4. Given a full 8-week training cycle to 1,100 men.

5. Established cooks, supply handlers and N.C.O. schools.

6. Put another 9,000 GI's into various stages of training.

But quantity of personnel is only one requirement of a modern army. Quality is just as important. The best yardstick of training, short of battle, is a series of proficiency tests given in the final week of training. A high 97-plus percent passed the examinations in a recent basic training cycle—an even higher 98.3 percent in an advanced individual training cycle.

These accomplishments are summed up by Major General Rash who said: "The enemies of freedom can find no comfort in the effective and rapid manner in which this division has responded to our country's call."

An Antitrust Legislative Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I made before the section on Antitrust Law of the New York State Bar Association in New York City, January 25, 1962:

As a New York lawyer, it is a great pleasure for me to speak before a distinguished group of New York lawyers, as well as before those no less distinguished guests who may have come from outside our State. As Chairman of the House Antitrust Subcommittee and of its parent House Judiciary Committee, I am well aware of your keen interest in the antitrust laws. If there are times when we have had differing views as to the policy, direction and meaning of those laws, it may be of solace to you to know that I, also, have had to search, examine and revise many of the proposals that have come before me.

At the threshold the question might be asked "Why should there be any antitrust legislative program?" The indisputable answer is that we, in this country, for many years, have recognized the absolute necessity of a competitive economic system. We have turned our back on the easy way of cartels and monopolies, on price-fixing, on allocation of markets. We believe in the right of men to be free of artificial restraints upon their liberty to engage in business and to practice a calling. We believe that competition gives the most for the least, that it permits one to be relatively free from Government regulation, and obviates the pressures that have led to nationalization of industries in other countries; and we believe that it has contributed to the expansion of a mobile social structure in the sense that equality of opportunity is a reality denied to other countries which deny competition as part of their economic structure.

Liberty in this field, without some guide lines, without some sanctions, cannot prevail any more than it could in traffic controls. The common law has had to have the aid of statutory law.

The statute of monopolies of 21 James I represents a legislative expression of antitrust policy to which even today we owe a great deal; and, according to Holdsworth, "The principle that trade should be free from arbitrary restraints is implied in the clauses of Magna Carta which relate to the liberty of the subject, and to trade."[1] In those days the King was a dispenser of monopolies, and his attempt to persuade the English people that what was good for the King was good for the country met with considerable resistance. In recent years a similar attempt by a former officer of our largest industrial empire has met with an understandably chill reception. I might add that England, after being forgetful of the tradition of the statute of monopolies and of its early common law, has turned its face toward a more competitive economy only during the last two decades, with the aid of a number of statutory enactments. Whether in the absence of a counterpart of the Celler-Kefauver section 7 of the Clayton Act, that face can turn very far, is questionable. I note that according to a recent newspaper announcement, Imperial Chemical Industries has offered to buy Courtoulds, Ltd., Britain's leading manufacturer of synthetic fibers. This would give ICI control of more than 90 percent of synthetic fiber manufacturing in Britain. As a partner in many a cartel it is not surprising to find ICI justifying the proposed acquisition on the ground it would avoid "duplication of effort."

In this country, in 1884, three justices of the Supreme Court concurred in the statement that the case of monopolies and the statute of monopolies: "form one of the constitutional landmarks of British liberty, like the petition of right, the Habeas Corpus Act, and other great constitutional acts of Parliament. They established and declared one of the inalienable rights of freemen which our ancestors brought with them to this country. The right to follow any of the common occupations of life is an inalienable right; it was formulated as such under the phrase 'pursuit of happiness' in the Declaration of Independence, which commenced with the fundamental proposition that 'all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.' This right is a large ingredient in the civil liberty of the citizen. To deny it to all but a few favored individuals, by investing the latter with a monopoly, is to invade one of the fundamental privileges of the citizen, contrary not only to common right, but, as I think, to the express words of the Constitution."[2]

By the end of the 19th century, however, the ravages of huge trusts and of their sponsors to our economic system impelled the enactment of the Sherman Act of 1890. With a wisdom for which that Congress deserves much praise, that statute, in the words of the Supreme Court, "has a generality comparable to that found to be desirable in constitutional provisions."[3]

Since that time other antitrust statutes have been enacted by Congress, some of which have been general in nature, some have been of a more specific nature. An example of the former is the Clayton Act of 1914. An example of the latter is the Bank Merger Act of 1960.

Your chairman has stated that, "The first unifying principle of the statutes in the field of antitrust law, whether it be expressed in the classic simplicity of the Sherman Act or in the ornate verbosity of the Robinson-Patman Act, is that their general objective is to insure to our Nation a competitive economy."[4] He has also said, "Our antitrust laws, however, have been written more with our hearts than with our heads."[5] To which I might reply that we try to use both.

We, in the Congress, are accustomed, on the one hand, to be condemned for sponsoring legislation, which, we are told, is too general because it does not single out anything, and on the other hand, to be impugned for sponsoring legislation, which, we are told, is too specific because it singles out something. Antitrust bills now pending before Congress are of both types.

I should like to say a word on this question of "certainty." I like certainty as well as the next man—albeit not to the point of monotony. But the current quest for certainty in national and international affairs, in social and economic matters, and in legislation can go too far. From Judge Learned Hand I borrow the acute observation that, "No human purpose possesses itself so completely in advance as to admit a final definition."[6]

Recently the Wall Street Journal published an editorial centering around what Prof. William H. Petersen had called the impreciseness of language in the amended section 7 of the Clayton Act—the Celler-Kefauver amendment. Neither the learned professor nor the Journal noted that, in 1914, Congress was so precise in using the word "stock" that it took 34 intervening years of deflation of statutory purpose and of frustrating corrective effort to add "asset" acquisitions to the scope of the statute. The same groups that complain about the impreciseness of the Clayton Act, fought us tooth and nail when we sought to make the act more precise by including asset acquisitions.

Precision becomes a matter of what we knew yesterday, of what we know today. But when we attempt to enumerate items of such knowledge into legislation, someone usually leaves something out, and the resulting 15-page bill is likely to engender as much interpretative legislation as a broader one-paragraph enactment. The more one tries to be specifically inclusive, the more likely one is to exclude, quite inadvertently, something important. Moreover, legislation, generally, must and should embody some anticipation of the future. Tomorrow is only 1 day later than today. We have not yet learned, however, to anticipate always precisely so that today's legislation will cover tomorrow's needs. Even when a specific problem does arise requiring remedial legislation, we can never be sure that an appropriate bill will be enacted timely or at all. One can never anticipate every contingency.

Legislation which I have sponsored in the antitrust field has run the gantlet of committee hearings and discussion on the floor of Congress. This distillation process, has, at times, led to some changes in the bills as initially introduced. All this is part of our democratic process, which I welcome. What I do not welcome is the frequent Cassandra-like chorus of doomsday prophecy when any remedial antitrust legislation is proffered. This same propensity, I am told, is manifested, when antitrust violators are brought to book in the courts. I would remind you that the Sherman and Clayton Acts were regarded as quite drastic when enacted. Too drastic, we are told sometimes, for adoption by foreign countries, contemplating antitrust legislation. Yet, today these acts are commonplace parts of our general body of law. The need for some sort of antitrust legislation has become generally recognized, moreover, in industrialized countries. The Scandinavian countries have been active in enacting such legislation since World War II. Antitrust provisions have become part of the basic enactments binding the European countries which make up the Common Market.

I think you will agree that if the economic forces of the marketplace be perverted against the interests of the public, the elective as well as the appointed representatives of the people may have to take action in their respective spheres to vindicate the public interest. Gentlemen, if your clients would have less legislation and less regula-

Footnotes at end of speech.

tion, let them pay more than lipservice to the competitive philosophy and policies of this Nation.

Before turning to the antitrust bills pending before my committee, I cannot pass by the opportunity of noting that even the Russians have recognized the importance of our antitrust laws. I suspect that the only important matter upon which your Arthur Dean and Mr. Semyon Tsarapkin could agree, at Geneva, was the desirability of Mr. Dean returning to this country to argue in the Brown Shoe Company appeal, before the Supreme Court last month that the Celler-Kefauver Act be given a narrow scope.

The Democratic platform of 1960, prepared by a drafting committee of which I was a member, contained the following pertinent highlights:

"We favor requiring corporations to file advance notice of mergers with the antitrust enforcement agencies.

"We favor strengthening the Robinson-Patman Act to protect small business against price discrimination.

"We favor authorizing the Federal Trade Commission to obtain temporary injunctions during the pendency of administrative proceedings."

All three of these pledges, authored by me, have been carried out into bills now pending before my committee.

Thirty-two bills were assigned to my Antitrust Subcommittee during the first session of the 87th Congress. The subcommittee considered 17 of these bills during 15 days of public hearings. One bill, H.R. 9096, involving telecasts of professional league sports contests, was enacted.

Hearings were held last year before my committee on H.R. 6689, the civil investigative demand bill. This bill would provide a means for the Department of Justice to have access to documents in the course of an investigation instituted to determine whether the antitrust laws have been violated. The companion Senate bill, S. 167, was adopted, with amendments, by the Senate in the closing days of the session. It is now pending before my subcommittee. The American Bar Association has approved the idea of a civil investigative demand statute. The drug bill, which has had extensive hearings on the Senate side; three bills to increase penalties for violations of the Sherman Act; a bill to broaden the interlocking director prohibitions of section 8 of the Clayton Act; and a number of bills pertaining to the Robinson-Patman Act, are among the other bills pending before my committee. Some of them already have had an extensive legislative history.

As you can see, bills pending from the first session of this Congress represent a legislative program of considerable scope, although, undoubtedly, not all will receive equal attention. Like wine, some of the bills before my committee will gain in strength and flavor. Others may ferment from controversy to the point where they are unusable, while some may become dull from lack of interest.

I should like to refer to a few bills which have evoked considerable interest. H.R. 71 is a bill which would prevent manufacturers of motor vehicles from financing and insuring the sales of their products. After 6 days of hearings, the subcommittee ordered H.R. 71 reported to the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment that would limit its applicability to passenger automobiles, including station wagons. A motion to reconsider this action remains pending.

Four identical bills, H.R. 2882, H.R. 3563, H.R. 6058, and H.R. 6698, would require prior notification of important corporate mergers and acquisitions. They would also authorize the Federal Trade Commission to apply to the courts for preliminary injunctions against mergers of doubtful legality.

I believe that existing antitrust laws have kept our competitive climate generally healthful. But finite men make finite laws. I am receptive to improvements in our antitrust laws. Like Aristotle, I believe that even though a law be written it should not always remain unchanged.

Recently, the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals held that section 3 of the Clayton Act did not reach television time tie-ins because that statute speaks in terms of commodities.[7] I understand that other decisions have similarly indicated that section 3 is not as broad as it should be. I have asked my staff to make a preliminary inquiry into the desirability of a remedial amendment.

In another recent decision,[8] arising out of the notorious electrical equipment cases, Judge Kirkpatrick reluctantly held that the benefits of section 5 of the Clayton Act—use of a judgment in a Government case as prima facie evidence—did not apply to a plea of nolo contendere. The judge felt compelled to say in this connection: "I never could myself quite grasp the logic of this distinction between nolo contendere and guilty and why one is permissible in evidence in a civil suit and the other is not. * * * I think the weight of authority really compels me to strike those allegations, although if I were entirely free and it was a new question, I might feel otherwise about it."

I have asked my staff to look into this matter also, since I share, along with Judge Kirkpatrick, difficulty in understanding why a nolo plea, often accepted over the Government's objection, should be of such benefit to a defendant and of such detriment to a plaintiff.

There is also another important aspect of any legislative program. The Antitrust Subcommittee, or which I am chairman, has general investigative, as well as legislative, jurisdiction over antitrust matters. This means that it must alert to see that the Nation's antitrust laws are vigorously enforced. Investigation may reveal that an enforcing agency has not made adequate use of the statutory tools which it possesses, or that it needs additional legislative implements. In 1955 our Antitrust Subcommittee issued a Report on Corporate and Bank Merges. The report concluded that the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice had made only a "token gesture" at enforcing the Celler-Kefauver Antimerger Act of 1950. Since that time the record of both of those agencies has been much more impressive in this respect.

I have appeared in opposition to the application of the First National City Bank to acquire the National Bank of Westchester with its numerous branches. The Comptroller of the Currency ruled against the proposed merger. Previously I had opposed the consolidation of the Bankers Trust Co., of New York, with the County Trust Co., of Westchester, with its numerous branches. The proposed merger was denied. I have also appeared before the Federal Reserve Board to urge that it preclude the Morgan Guaranty Holding Co. from laying hands upon six of the largest banks in upstate New York. I hope that the Board will reject this application.

Our investigation into certain consent decrees and consent decree negotiation procedures led to our recommendation that notice be given by the Government to interested persons prior to presenting a proposed consent decree to the court. I am pleased to see that the Department of Justice has taken steps to implement that recommendation.

Last year we held informative hearings on a program for development of a satellite communications system, a problem of fundamental national importance. We sought and will continue our efforts to prevent A.T. & T. from securing monopoly control over ownership and operation of the system.

Nearing completion and publication is a comprehensive report by the Antitrust Subcommittee containing a summary and analysis of its lengthy hearings and its detailed legislative recommendations for dealing with ocean shipping problems, for strengthening the competitive provisions of the Shipping Act and related laws, and for establishing an effective regulatory system.

A current important investigation by my committee, which I hope will lead to legislative recommendations, is concerned with concentration in news media. The announcement of two important newspapers in Los Angeles that they were ceasing publication has triggered an investigation by my committee. We seek to ascertain the reasons for such cessation. Particularly, we wish to discover whether any violation of the antitrust laws was involved in this simultaneous dual collapse. More broadly, my committee is also concerned with the growing trend toward concentration of ownerships of all the news media. This is an ominous tendency.

"Democracy can be preserved only if its citizenry is informed, as Judge Hand has said, "from as many different sources, and with as many different facets and colors as is possible."[9] In too many cities and towns there is only a single newspaper now. And in many cities TV, radio, and newspapers are joined in a single proprietorship.

Legislative proposals may come from almost any source. Sometimes proposals for antitrust legislation are inspired by a new situation in our evolving economy, to which congressional attention had not been earlier directed. Sometimes, as Milton Handler has said, "where administration discloses defects or limitations in the laws drafted by Congress with which the techniques of interpretation are unable to cope, the remedy is to request supplemental legislation."[10]

It is too early to delineate clearly the ultimate features of an antitrust legislative program for this session of Congress. From what I have said, however, you may rest assured that there will be an antitrust legislative program on the House side of Congress, and I welcome freely your comments, advice, and suggestions. I want to hear from you. None of us can disengage ourselves from the impact of antitrust matters, either as implemented or tragically ignored.

---

[1] Holdsworth, Industrial Combinations and the Law in the 18th Century, 18 Minn. L. Rev. 369, 371 (1934).

[2] *Butchers' Union Co.* v. *Crescent City Co.*, 111 U.S. 746, 762 (1884).

[3] *Appalachian Coals, Inc.* v. *United States*, 288 U.S. 344, 359–60 (1933).

[4] Van Cise, Understanding the Antitrust Laws (1958), p.2.

[5] Id., p. 1.

[6] The Speech of Justice [Dillard, The Spirit of Liberty (1960) 18].

[7] *Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc.* v. *Amana Refrigerations, Inc.*, Trade Cases, Para. 70, 142 (C.A. 7, Oct. 30, 1961).

[8] *City of Fort Pierce* v. *Westinghouse Electric Corp.*, Trade Cases, Para. 70, 143 (E.D. Pa. Oct. 23, 1961).

[9] *U.S.* v. *Associated Press*, 52 F. 2d 362, 372 (S.D.N.Y., 1943), aff'd 326 U.S. 1.

[10] Handler, Annual Review of Antitrust Developments, 16 Record of Association of Bar of City of New York, 385, 408 (1961).

Army Rocket Intercepts Phantom Warhead in Test

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Wilkes-Barre Record, Friday, Jan. 26, 1962]

ARMY ROCKET INTERCEPTS PHANTOM WARHEAD IN TEST

POINT MUGU, CALIF., January 25.—A Nike-Zeus antimissile rocket successfully intercepted a phantom warhead high over the Pacific today. The Army said this was dramatic proof that the missile killer "will do its job."

The launching was delayed 3 hours by various technical difficulties.

There was no actual target in the sky. A tape recording of the trajectory of a 15,000-mile-an-hour nose cone was played into the Nike-Zeus guidance system to provide the target.

An Army spokesman said: "Today's firing is like a courtroom drama. We've given testimony that Zeus is a killer weapon. Now we have had our corroborating witness."

Brig. Gen. John D. Zierdt, Army deputy commander for guidance missiles, said instrumentation showed the Zeus "got within killing distance of its target."

The actual distance was not disclosed. Neither was the altitude of the interception. But a spokesman said it occurred high in the atmosphere.

Nike-Zeus soon will be tested against a real target. Antimissile rockets based on Kwajalein Island, 4,000 miles west of here, will be fired on at nose cones boosted aloft by Atlas missiles launched from Vandenburg, Calif.

In these tests the incoming nose cone will be tracked by ground radar and its position relayed to a computer which will guide Nike-Zeus in flight.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided*, That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Gold Outflow, Not Berlin or Congo, Is Nation's Greatest Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, sometimes the so-called international crisis news crowds from our thinking many of the real threats to our Nation. For instance, many authorities readily agree this is true in the case of the situation—precarious situation, with respect to our balance of international payments.

I recommend to my colleagues that they give consideration to a very able presentation of this subject by the one man in the Nation most able to do so—Maurice Stans, former Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

His comments appeared in the Washington Post on January 22 and follow:

GOLD OUTFLOW, NOT BERLIN OR CONGO, IS NATION'S GREATEST THREAT

(By Maurice Stans)

The greatest threat to our Nation today is not Berlin. Nor is it Vietnam or the Congo or Laos. It is the precarious situation of our balance of international payments and with it the potential erosion of world confidence in the dollar. President Kennedy's state of the Union message, by its emphasis on foreign trade, made this evident.

The balance of payments problem is not a complex matter to understand, as many people seem to believe. It is in fact quite elementary. Americans and the American Government spend a lot of money overseas every year to import goods, travel, investments, maintain troops and give aid. We have not been able to induce the other countries to spend all of those dollars back with us. Instead, they hold the unspent difference in bank accounts and in claims against us that will have to be settled some day with goods or gold.

In the 3 years 1958 to 1960 our oversea spending and investing exceeded the inflow of our dollars at the average rate of $3.7 billion a year. Right now the net debt we owe to other countries on short-term demand is $18 billion. To pay this we have a little less than $17 billion in gold, but we already have pledged $12 billion of that to back up our money in circulation here at home. We could not pay all our current foreign debts if they were all demanded at once.

Khrushchev's pronouncements have regularly claimed that our capitalist system would go down under its own weaknesses. The most grave and chronic risk we now face is that we will not be able to extricate ourselves from our present predicament, which is of our own making. But the causes are easier to see than the cure.

The Kennedy administration is exerting strong efforts to fight a winning battle, as did Eisenhower. In this, it deserves support. But the unfavorable conditions are cumulative, and only titantic and unceasing work will reverse the trend and save us from a major setback.

Eisenhower fully recognized the seriousness of the problem. Treasury Secretary Anderson repeatedly urged that the strong nations of Europe should be required to contribute a larger share to their own and the free world's military defense, so as to permit a reduction in our foreign aid and our oversea costs. This plea was dramatized by the trip Anderson and Dillon made to Germany late in 1960, but the effort had been going on long before that behind the scenes.

In 1959 Commerce Department Secretary Mueller initiated a major program to increase American exports and to encourage foreign travel in the United States, but he was frustrated by the unwillingness of the Congress to appropriate the funds needed. The Defense Department laid down rules to reduce the number of dependents going to military posts abroad. Treasury proposed reducing the duty-free exemption to returning tourists from $500 to $100 and made other proposals to stem the outflow of gold. Above all Eisenhower recognized that the security of our position depended on maintaining confidence in our money, and he fought hard to keep the budget in balance and to demonstrate good fiscal housekeeping to our oversea creditors.

These efforts temporarily stopped the flow of gold, but they did not halt the growth of the unfavorable balance.

Since last January 20 President Kennedy and Secretary Dillon have carried on and enlarged the campaigns to encourage exports overseas and foreign travel in the United States. The Congress enacted the reduction in duty-free customs allowance to returning tourists. A new insurance plan has been announced by the Export-Import Bank to reduce the risks of loss on foreign export credits. West Germany and several other countries came through with $650 million of advance payments that Secretary Anderson had urged them to make on their postwar assistance loans.

The first 6 months of 1961 went well. Exports were up, imports decreased as a result of our slight recession, and the advance debt payments to the Treasury were enough to show almost an equilibrium for the period. But it is now apparent that this was only temporary improvement. The fundamental causes of imbalance had not been removed, and the actions to date were inadequate. Reducing the duty exemptions was more psychological than real, for example, as it helps to the extent of only $100 million or so a year.

Also, not all the Administration's actions in the first 6 months of 1961 were toward tightening. The Defense Department withdrew the limitations on overseas dependents almost immediately to placate the military. Kennedy's proposals to increase the dollars paid out on foreign programs were defeated in the Congress, but heavy future commitments are involved in the Peace Corps and the mushrooming Alliance for Progress in Latin America. Since June imports have increased to record peaks. The deficit in the balance of payments for the second half of 1961 was again at the rate of $3 billion a year, and for all of 1961 would have been close to $2.5 billion except for the nonrecurring German debt payment. There are no present reasons to expect that 1962 will be better. The claims against our gold will grow.

In all of 1961 we lost $800 million in gold, and our reserve is at the lowest point since 1939. The claims against it are at the highest in history.

Secretary Dillon's job is to see that our overseas creditors increase their spending of dollars here. If he fails in this, he must persuade them to leave their money here, not to demand payment in gold. Decisive measures and continuing actions are required and can be expected. Some of them will be outlined in a later article.

President Kennedy's place in history will suffer badly if his administration doesn't solve this crisis of chronic imbalance. To miss or to default is to invite ruinous inflation and subsequent devaluation and their humiliating consequences. Khruschev's experts are surely watching the outcome with eager anticipation. Everything depends on finding the answer while there is yet confidence in the future of the dollar. In the meantime, under this pressure, we are certain to see the decline of the early 1961 gospels of economic growthmanship and unlimited Federal spending, and that is all to the good.

Alaska Power Needs—VI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST GRUENING

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Power Shortage: Chatanika Power Co. Plans $1 Million Plant," written by Paul Lien and published in a recent issue of the Fairbanks, Alaska, News-Miner.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHATANIKA POWER CO. PLANS $7 MILLION PLANT

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The sixth of a series on a predicted power shortage deals with the proposed frozen core dam on the Chatanika River near Fairbanks, dependable power capacities in the Fairbanks area, and the small hydroplant on the Chatanika which is a seasonal operation. Utilities companies in the railbelt area have organized for the purpose of finding new sources of power. They have reached their limit of capacity of providing power for the existing population, and additional low-cost power is needed immediately. Mine mouth plants to be built at both Healy and Sutton on the Alaska Railroad seem to provide the most probable solution to this problem.)

(By Paul Lien)

The Chatanika Power Co., Inc. proposes to construct a frozen-core dam and plant on the Chatanika River, 21 air-miles west of the bridge crossing the river on the Livengood Road.

Estimated cost of the plant, dam, and transmission lines is $7 million.

The unit would produce 15,000 kilowatts, and would be used mainly as a peaking power plant, one that is cut in during hours when heavy power loads are required to serve the area.

Power is expected to be delivered to Fairbanks for 12.3 mills per kilowatt-hour for a 30-year amortization period, and 14 mills for a 20-year period.

The application to the Federal Power Commission by Chatanika Power Co. to make a study of the proposed project was dismissed by FPC November 22. Reason for dismissal of the application was that Chatanika Power Co. had not given any firm commitments for use of the power if the dam were constructed. The company will apply again at a future date.

The total power supply in the Fairbanks area at the present time is 18,000 kilowatts.

The Golden Valley Electric Association plant, which was purchased from United States Smelting, Refining & Mining Co., has a name plate capacity of 9,500 kilowatts, and the Municipal Utilities System plant has a name plate capacity of 8,500 kilowatts.

Power plants, like airplane engines, do not run at full power constantly, and therefore the amount of dependable capacity boils down to approximately 13,000 kilowatts.

The dependable capacity figure of 13,000 kilowatts is determined by taking out the largest generator unit or fifteen percent of the system, whichever is the greater, and using it for standby reserve.

Municipal Utilities System has one 5,000-kilowatt generator, one 2,000 kilowatt and one 1,500 kilowatt.

Golden Valley Electric Assocation has three 3,000-kilowatt generators and one 500 kilowatt.

Chatnika Power Co. operates a small 5,625-kilowatt hydroelectric powerplant as strictly a seasonal operation during late spring, summer, and fall.

The plant is located at mile 32, Steese Highway, and is a "run of the river" operation.

Used in the small unit is the old Davidson ditch and the Chatanika syphon, formerly used by the United States Smelting, Refining & Mining Co.

The power produced by Chatanika Power Co. is used for "dump power," which is power that is sold to Golden Valley Electric Association cheaper than they can produce it themselves.

As a "run of the river" plant the power production by Chatanika Power Co. depends upon the amount of water flowing in the Chatanika River. When the river is high, the plant runs at full capacity, and when low the amount of power production drops off.

Power is sold by Chatanika Power Co. to Golden Valley Electric Association for 10 mills when available, which is 12.9 mills cheaper than Golden Valley Electric Association can produce it.

United Nations Faces Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, we heard our President say recently that, with respect to our position in the United Nations, we stand today where Woodrow Wilson stood 50 years ago. In assessing where the people themselves stand, we may sometimes wonder how much support our Government has in its position. I submit the following editorial that appeared in the January 4, 1962, edition of the Steamboat Pilot in Steamboat Springs, Colo., as an example of some the calm and studied endorsement given to our participation in the United Nations:

UNITED NATIONS FACES CRISIS

With the dawn of 1962 the United Nations faces a crisis and there are many who would let it die and call it ineffective.

True, there are many disturbing things done by the United Nations, but on the whole it has justified its existence. A world without the United Nations would be one of chaos as it is the one symbol of all hopes for the survival of the human race. For one thing it is nearly bankrupt and there will be strong opposition to the proposed bond issue. Political capital will be made when President Kennedy presses for the purchase of half of the $200 million issue by this Nation. But that is a cheap price to keep the organization going for it is a ray of hope in a chaotic world.

Maybe United Nations action in the Congo was a mistake, but we do not know what alternative could be chosen without even more confusion. Certainly if there is to be a Congo nation Kantanga must be included for that is where the wealth lies.

It would appear that some of our Western allies are reluctant to give up their control of the province where their citizens hold tight strings on the great mineral resources. They are the ones who employ mercenaries to fight the United Nations and the stakes are great.

The League of Nations was noble in its purpose but it expired when members started quarreling among themselves and there was no way to make it effective. The United Nations should not be allowed to go the same way because of the greed of a few.

The U.N. has many specialized agencies that have been used effectively to promote higher standards of living in the world. It has been able to grant economic, technological, and educational assistance to many countries.

Russia and its satellites have been refusing to pay their share of the activities of the United Nations and that leaves the organization in financial straits. But if you think there is confusion and chaos now, it would be even worse without some international organization to deal with the problems that confront this troubled world.

Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Chippewa Valley Electric Cooperative of Cornell, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Chippewa Valley Electric Cooperative of Cornell, Wis., recently observed its 25th anniversary.

The Chippewa Valley story is one of progress by the cooperative efforts of rural people to attain common and worthy goals.

Upon the occasion of its anniversary, the cooperative published a special anniversary booklet entitled "Growing Together." Overall, the booklet reflects the way in which the members of the cooperative—working shoulder-to-shoulder, often in the face of extreme difficulties—have written a splendid record of success.

Among the special articles, is included one by former manager, R. L. Cleaves—now regrettably deceased—on the history of the cooperative.

Reflecting the spirit—as well as the action programs that has made this a real success story—I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BRIEF HISTORY

The story of the Chippewa Valley Electric Cooperative is a story of determination, of progress in the face of opposition, of building together. It is a warm and human story, a story of success. As one of the organizers of our cooperative and as its manager for the past 25 years, I take special pride in telling and hearing its story. As we celebrate our 25th year, it is fitting that we review the history of the Chippewa Valley Electric Cooperative—our cooperative.

Our cooperative had a modest beginning but a high purpose. Those ten members who attended the first organization meeting on December 17, 1936, were dedicating themselves to a project few men of that day would dare to undertake.

Their goal was to bring electricity to the rural areas at a price the people could afford. The year-old Rural Electrification Administration program offered their best—and only—hope.

This ambition but unproven new program was meeting tremendous opposition pressure from the private utilities. Its success or failure depended on local initiative and participation, the same two ingredients which were so vital to the success of our cooperative venture.

In 1936, led by President O. M. Enger and Directors L. G. Bernier, W. L. Graf, Oscar Anderson, A. C. Henrickson, Matt Turecek, John Matsche, Jr., and W. A. Kleiner, our youthful organization accepted the challenge and opportunity by applying for a $60,000 loan from the Rural Electrification Administration to build distribution lines, the first step in bringing electrical power and progress to our rural areas.

The loan was granted but our attempts to obtain wholesale power from the utilities at a fair rate encountered great difficulty.

The prospect of our lines standing idle was a severe trial to our determination.

With other cooperatives facing the same problem, we organized the Wisconsin Power Cooperative to supply our own electricity.

Wisconsin Power Cooperative was the first REA financed generation cooperative in the Nation. Thus we secured low-cost power for our members by producing it ourselves.

On March 17, 1938, all the long hours and hard work brought their reward. Our first 59 miles of line was energized. It was truly the brightest day in the history of our cooperative. One hundred twenty members rejoiced as their own electricity began working for them. A new era of progress in rural areas of Chippewa County had begun.

Since that day, ours has been a story of growth in members, in volume, and in service. The statistics included in your 1961 operating report testify to that.

We did suffer occasional growing pains, however.

When membership and power demand outgrew our capacity to supply them through Wisconsin Power Cooperative, we faced an-

other dilemma. We solved this one by expanding Wisconsin Power Cooperative through a merger with Tri-State Electric into Dairyland Power Cooperative, the world's largest generating and transmission cooperative. We are proud to have played a part in this historic development.

Today we serve 3,300 members on 880 miles of line. Over one-half of our lines were constructed by our own crew.

We are rated as one of the most financially sound electric cooperatives in the State. We have maintained or kept ahead of our schedule in repayment of REA loans with interest. We are continually seeking ways to serve ourselves better.

Has there been a secret to our success? No, not really. We cooperated to do a job and did it well. The story can be told in many other ways. It can be told by events such as our members taking stones from their fields, donating their labor, and building a new headquarters building. It can be told by the patience, cooperation, and hard work of crewmen and members during the 1958 tornado crisis. But it can be told best by watching the wonder of the modern miracle, electricity, at work in our homes and farms. In this, our silver jubilee year, we can be rightfully proud of Chippewa Valley Electric Cooperative—our Cooperative.

Sincerely,

R. L. CLEAVES,
Manager.

The Work and Achievements of Mirrer Yeshiva Central Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Mirrer Yeshiva Central Institute has been located in the city of New York for 15 years and has continued the high reputation in academic and humanitarian circles for which it was once known in Poland. I have recently received a report from the able and eminent president and dean of this institution, Rabbi Abraham Kalmanowitz, upon the recent work and achievements of the Yeshiva, which may be of interest to my colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD a statement by Rabbi Kalmanowitz.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE WORK AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF MIRRER YESHIVA CENTRAL INSTITUTE

The world-renowned Mirrer Yeshiva Central Institute was founded 146 years ago in Mir, Poland, and from its very inception established as an institute dedicated to maintaining a higher standard of Talmudic study and research, graduating teachers and rabbis to further orthodox Jewish education in communities throughout the world. The Yeshiva's miraculous rescue in its entirety from the European inferno, through Siberia, Japan, and Shanghai, was accomplished through the self-sacrificing efforts of its eminent president and dean, Rabbi Abraham Kalmanowitz, and brought to these shores in 1947, and relocated in its new home at 1791-1795 Ocean Parkway, Brooklyn, N.Y.

To its Rabbinical College, the institute has recently added an accredited high school, complete with science laboratory and library. Another structure will soon be added to its new edifice to accommodate its greatly expanded educational program.

Mirrer Yeshiva is a monument to European Jewry. Since its arrival here it has been recognized as a university in exile, and the Government has empowered it to bring many scholars from all parts of the world. The Yeshiva has recently accomplished the heroic task of rescuing many young students from the Arab dominated countries, as well as their families. The Yeshiva's record of achievement in the field of higher Jewish education is equaled only by its attainment in the field of rescue and rehabilitation, both past and present.

Mirrer Yeshiva alumni have established flourishing Yeshivas in the United States, and countries throughout the world where they perpetuate the traditions, spirit and ideals of Judaism, and preserve humanity.

Editorial of the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette Stresses the Need for Patience Yet Determined Restraint in the Long Contest Between Democracy and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, every day the President of the United States and the Congress face new and more complex problems in the cause of freedom throughout the world. These problems, as all who live with them know, cannot be solved by slogans or catch phrases. If they could, they would hardly be considered problems.

What makes them problems? Obviously, in them there is a clash between something we must gain and something we could lose. The central problem in the world today is the conflict between the democracy of free peoples and the totalitarian regime of communism. We are confident that we know the meaning of democracy, and hopefully, we understand the nature of communism. But their differences are not discovered in theoretical or legalistic definitions. It is in the quality of the individual life offered by the two systems that we find the significant differences. And it is only through constant and determined application, and the exercise of patience and restraint that we will, in the long run, extend the scope of freedom.

A baseball team that wins 60 percent of its games can be considered successful; a ballplayer who gets three base hits for every seven times at bat is certainly successful. We have won out against the Communists in the Philippines, Burma, and Malaya. We may still win—in the sense of maintaining free and independent governments—in Laos and South Vietnam. Unfortunately the cause of freedom has, for the time being, been set back in China, North Vietnam, and Cuba, but in the overall the record has been a creditable one.

Since we are not free to use the terroristic methods of communism and we must fight the battle wherever they choose to undermine independent governments, our problem is vastly more complicated than that of our opponents. But in those areas where there has been a tradition of some measure of stability in government—most notably in Western Europe and Japan—our victory has been complete.

As pointed out in a thoughtful editorial of the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette, there is uncertainty as to what is meant by total victory, the Gazette offers its own view that the phrase is "a meaningless irrelevancy unless we are prepared to conquer the world."

In its editorial "Victory of Democracy Won't Be Quick, Easy" the Gazette emphasizes the need for patience yet determined restraint on our part in the long struggle ahead. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VICTORY OF DEMOCRACY WON'T BE QUICK, EASY

Critics of American foreign policy are charging that the United States has consistently lost ground and face to Communist aggression. The junior Senator from Arizona, for instance, isn't satisfied with either U.S. policies or performance relative to communism, and he is convinced the reason the Nation isn't doing better is because its commitment to victory isn't total.

Senator GOLDWATER hasn't bothered to define what he means by "total victory" in the context of today's confusion and conflict, but everyone readily agrees it's a nice-sounding phrase and, coupled with repeated assertions that the Soviet Union continues to advance at U.S. expense, he is able to get a great deal of mileage out of both issues from people who ought to know better.

Some time ago we borrowed liberally from the arguments of Senator FULBRIGHT, perhaps the Nation's foremost expert on foreign policy, to explain the emptiness and futility of so high-sounding and plausible an expression as "total victory" and why it is a meaningless irrelevancy unless we are prepared to conquer the world—a proposal even GOLDWATER has to date shunned.

More recently Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, in an address to the Kanawha chapter of the American Association for the United Nations, took up the matter of Communist incursions, and showed the record isn't nearly as one-sided or as despairing as GOLDWATER and Soviet officials would like us to believe.

Since World War II the Communists have launched six revolutions in southeast Asia:

In the Philippines, they have been totally crushed.

In Burma, Communists no longer constitutes an internal threat to constitutional government. It is true Red China poses an external threat, but the negotiation of a treaty between the two countries last year has alleviated that danger considerably.

In Malaya, the "jungle infiltration by the Communists has been thwarted by loyal police and army units."

Laos and South Vietnam present real problems, but they have yet to fall under Communist domination.

On the deficit side, communism has triumphed in China, in North Vietnam and in Cuba. These are bad defeats and shouldn't be minimized, but the record on balance hardly justifies the pessimistic nonsense of the Goldwaters and his partisans.

Besides as William H. Stringer of the Christian Science Monitor noted in a recent article:

"Westerners sometimes forget that the Communist aim is to move forward. Therefore they suffer a defeat every time a threatened nation succeeds in maintaining its independence."

Senator Randolph also pointed out that "part of the overall balance sheet" must show "the deep ideological schism between Russia and Communist China, the failures in Soviet agriculture, the complete failure of China's much publicized 'great leap forward' 3 years ago, and the deep-seated hostility toward Russia and latent violence among the captive peoples of Eastern Europe."

In any fight it is wise not to underestimate the strength of the opposition At the same time it is bootless to fabricate a record of success that simply doesn't exist.

The struggle between communism and democracy will persist for many, many years—possibly for as long as the struggle between Christianity and Mohammedanism which, incidentally for people like Goldwater who believe every issue must be settled irrevocably, has yet to be decided and probably never will be in terms of "total victory."

If democracy is to prevail in the contest against communism, it must demonstrate its ability to withstand every challenge—not the least of which are the challenges of patience and restraint. Democracy isn't a political condition which can be imposed successfully by force upon those not enjoying its rewards and benefits. It is the fullest flowering of the political experience. As such, it comes neither quickly nor cheaply.

Hon. Francis E. Walter

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I was highly pleased to learn of the decision of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER, to offer again for reelection to the House of Representatives. I have known the gentleman from Pennsylvania, FRANCIS WALTER, ever since I have been a Member of the House or Representatives and I knew of his distinguished record of public service long before I came here. I regard him not only as an outstanding and useful member of the Congress, but I share the view of many others that he is an outstanding American whose heart and mind both are attuned to the highest good.

I have served with him on the Judiciary Committee of the House, as well as the Committee on Un-American Activities. He is the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, and the chairman of the latter committee. His position in the House of Representatives combined with his extraordinary talents are of such a nature that the country would greatly miss his services.

I am highly pleased to know that he has consented to serve with us again and I have every confidence that the people of his district will see fit to return him by an overwhelming majority.

Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the New York Post on January 28 carried an excellent article by reporter Milton Viorst on the growing need for passage in this Congress of the King-Anderson bill to provide health security for the aged. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED—WHAT THE CONTROVERSY IS ALL ABOUT —

(By Milton Viorst)

WASHINGTON.—A month ago, President Kennedy received a letter from a 68-year-old woman whose husband had just died after a long stay in a hospital.

"We had no hospitalization insurance," she wrote. "We are thrifty persons who have never received welfare aid. However, those hospital expenses have drained away our life's savings and I am now forced to sell our modest home.

"I am all alone now with no one to care for me. How will I pay the bills if I become ill and must be taken to the hospital?

"You, Mr. President, are a kind man. Please enact legislation that would reduce hospitalization costs without delay. I do not want charity but reduced costs that would fit my present income.

"I am just a voice crying in the wilderness, 'Make straight the way of the Lord,' I am just one very lonely widow facing a bleak Christmas in my sorrow. I painstakingly wrote this letter but I doubt whether it will even be read."

The Buffalo widow's letter was read and answered. But meeting her request was not nearly so easy. President Kennedy has proposed legislation such as she described. But he cannot "enact" it. That is up to Congress.

A proposal that is currently languishing before the House Ways and Means Committee, called the King-Anderson bill, would have seen to it that her small bank account was not exhausted by her husband's final illness.

This is the bill now familiarly known as medical care for the aged.

It is a controversial bill, denounced by the American Medical Association, Blue Cross, and most conservative politicians. It has been described as "socialized medicine" or, at least, a significant step in that direction. It has been characterized as a building stone in the establishment of the welfare state.

To the Buffalo widow, however, it had nothing in particular to do with politics. It would have meant simply that to her loneliness there would not have been added the fear of abject poverty and physical dependence.

Let's take the hypothetical case of a New York department store clerk who retires on social security and after the age of 65 suffers a heart attack.

The King-Anderson bill would mean that he could enter a hospital and stay for as long as 90 days, paying only $10 a day for the first 9 days, or a maximum of $90.

He could manage this under his social security pension.

After leaving the hospital he could be cared for during his recovery at a skilled nursing home where he could stay as long as 6 months, so long as the total of his hospital days and half the nursing home days did not exceed 150.

The 2-for-1 ratio, with a maximum of 150 units, is designed to relieve the pressure on hospitals, encouraging patients to go into nursing homes if their conditions permit.

The retired clerk would be eligible for the same benefits if he fell sick again after 90 days.

The plan thus aims to meet the needs of acute illness. It is not designed for the chronically sick, who might be hospitalized for years. Most illnesses, statistics show, can be terminated within the 150 units of service offered.

The plan also pays all expenses above $20 for hospital diagnostic studies on an outpatient basis. This is designed to get elderly people into the hospital early for preventive treatment, before an illness becomes unmanageable.

Finally, under the bill, the plan will pay for 240 visits a year of specialists treating an illness at home. This would include therapists, nurses and other non-doctors whose services might keep a patient from having to be hospitalized.

The mechanics of the plan would be no more complex than the administration of Blue Cross or other health insurance is now.

On entering the hospital or nursing home, the elderly patient would simply give his social security number to a hospital clerk. The hospital would later bill the Social Security Administration on the regular payment schedule, then bill the patient for the balance. Paperwork would be kept to a minimum.

The cost of this medical care would be met by each worker paying an additional one quarter of 1 percent of Social Security tax. A worker making $100 a week would then pay an extra 25 cents. His employer would pay an equal amount.

Currently, this worker pays social security tax only on his first $4,800 of annual earnings. If the King-Anderson bill passes, he will pay on his first $5,200 a year of earnings.

The extra funds that go into the social security accounts from taxes paid on the additional $400 will be used to pay him a slightly larger pension when he retires.

In all, the plan is expected to cost $1,100 million in the first year, which will be more than covered by the $1,500 million. The balance will be kept as a reserve fund. In future years, outlay is expected to catch up and equal intake.

The plan was designed to go into effect next fall. But Congress has already delayed passage for 1 year so it cannot go into operation before the fall of 1963. Anyone over 65 will immediately be covered.

Secretary Ribicoff of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has described the King-Anderson bill as the conservative way to pay for hospital costs of the elderly.

He has said flatly that the high costs of medical care for the aged must be paid. The only question is how. Alternatives to the social security plan, he declares, have been shown to be inadequate.

Senator JAVITS, Republican, of New York, for instance, has proposed a plan to give an insured person the choice of benefits for short-term illness, chronic illness, or the payment of premiums for private insurance.

Ribicoff says this would be too complicated to administer. Under the bill passed in 1960, States can administer a health plan with Federal matching funds, but this is limited to indigents who must declare they are too poor to pay their hospital bills.

Blue Cross has proposed that the Federal Government subsidize its operations and let it run hospitalization insurance for the elderly.

The Blue Cross proposal was submitted in conjunction with a Blue Shield plan to provide medical benefits. The American Hospital Association favors this and the AMA has agreed to accept it.

But Ribicoff is not convinced this represents a better method than the King-Anderson bill. He rejects the notion that the King-Anderson plan, though it provides for Government administration, is in any way socialized medicine.

He points out that the patient retains his choice of doctor and hospital, that the Federal Government exercises no control over either, that payment is essentially the same as it is under private insurance plans.

Furthermore, Ribicoff has pointed out, the King-Anderson plan will actually help Blue Cross and other private insurers because it will relieve them of paying the bills of the 65-and-over group, which have the greatest medical expenses. It might pass on savings then to the lower age groups.

Most important, it would relieve elderly persons of the fear that their health insurance might be canceled if they became ill. This practice is frequent among private insurers, Ribicoff has said.

The statistics make a compelling case for the necessity of a medical care plan for the aged. Old people's annual medical bills are twice that of persons under 65, but their annual income is only half as much. Ribicoff cites these facts:

Nine out of ten persons who reach the age of 65 go to the hospital at least once before they die.

An aged person is likely to remain hospitalized longer than a young person. Persons over 65 are hospitalized, on the average, more than 2½ times as much as younger ones.

Among couples over 65, half will have at least four hospital stays before they die.

Ribicoff points out that hospital costs have more than tripled in the past 15 years. He insists it is a myth that no one lacks medical care because of costs. Many are too proud, he says, to accept hospital care on a charity basis.

Current social security payments for the aged barely cover the essentials of life, Ribicoff says. The King-Anderson bill, with no means requirement, saves proud men and women from losing their dignity. It gives them back what they have earned throughout their lives—to prolong their lives and to spend them in good health.

Dr. John R. Hutcheson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Richmond Times-Dispatch of Monday, January 29, 1962, in respect to the life of the late Dr. John R. Hutcheson, former president of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Va.

I have known Dr. John R. Hutcheson during all of the adult years of my life, and I also knew his brother, the late Dr. Thomas B. Hutcheson. They spent much of their youth and early manhood in my native county of Halifax. They were grandsons of a former superintendent of public schools for Halifax County, the late Thomas E. Barksdale, whom I also knew quite well in his latter years as he traveled over the county visiting the homes of the county and the various little one-room schools.

The life of Dr. John R. Hutcheson, as well as his brother, demonstrates the value of hard work. They were reared in a generation where achievements came only through labor and perseverance and the practice of self-denial.

The achievements of the two Doctors Hutcheson are such as to excite the admiration of all and their lives illustrate the worthiness of intelligent and honest labor. They both will be greatly missed. Nevertheless, they left behind them at VPI and throughout the State many of their former students who are following in their worthy footsteps and will no doubt carry on the work where they have left off. The editorial is as follows:

DR. JOHN R. HUTCHESON

The death of Dr. John R. Hutcheson, former president of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and one of the superlative figures in Virginia agriculture, marks the passing of a man whose services to farming in his time might be compared to those of Edmund Ruffin in the ante bellum era.

Dr. Hutcheson and his brother, the late Dr. Thomas B. Hutcheson, dean of agriculture at VPI, were a team that was unmatched in the annals of the Old Dominion. In recognition of their extraordinary contribution, VPI named its great new agricultural building Hutcheson Hall when it was dedicated in 1957.

Speaking at the dedication, Dr. Paul D. Sanders of Richmond, editor of the Southern Planter, said:

"No two men of their generation did more to build farm income, raise the level of rural living, and enrich farm life of their beloved Virginia than Dr. Tom and Dr. Jack Hutcheson. The results of their genius and industry have been emblazoned across this great State from the mountains to the sea, touching every farm, village, and hamlet in the Commonwealth. Every farmer in Virginia is farming better today, with greater ease and contentment, because of the work Dr. Tom and Dr. Jack did on this campus. Every citizen of the Commonwealth is eating better food at lower cost and enjoying a richer, longer life because of what they did here."

Born on a farm in Charlotte County, these two boys came up the hard way in the years after the Civil War, when everyone was impoverished. Their father, a descendant of the Scottish Clan MacDonald, and a 4-year veteran of the conflict, died when Tom was 14 and Jack was 9, leaving their mother with 7 children. She was a remarkable woman, the daughter of Thomas E. Barksdale and Sarah Catherine Edmunds.

Asked a few years ago what things in life he was most thankful for, Dr. John R. Hutcheson put first of all, "that I was born poor." Next he listed "that I had a great mother."

This tells us much about Jack Hutcheson, his high character and his lofty ideals. How many of the present generation in Virginia would think of listing among their prime assets the fact that they were born poor?

Tom and Jack Hutcheson slept in the dairy barn at VPI for 2 years, as they worked their way through that institution. They milked 17 cows twice a day and went to school in between.

Both were called back to VPI some years following graduation. Dr. Tom was the research man, the teacher, who was also effective as a writer or speaker. Dr. Jack was the extrovert, the promoter. Long the director of the VPI extension division, he worked through the county agent system to demonstrate the practicability of the discoveries his brother was making in the laboratory.

In particular, the brothers were instrumental in carrying Virginia out of the tobacco and cotton economy into the much sounder domain of diversified agriculture. Specifically, they aided enormously in developing the great livestock, poultry, and dairy industries that now flourish in the Old Dominion.

With the passing of Dr. Jack, as he was affectionately known to thousands throughout Virginia, the second of the brilliant Hutcheson brothers has gone to his well-earned reward.

TV "Hasteland" Not "Wasteland"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the current hearings of the Federal Communications Commission on television indicate great public interest in this subject. One manifestation of this interest was the address of Mr. Lee Rich, senior vice president of Benton & Bowles, Inc., before a standing-room-only crowd at the Advertising Club of Metropolitan Washington on January 9, 1962.

All of us, I am sure, would agree that television today is far from perfect, but strenuous efforts are being made by private industry to improve it, with Mr. Rich very active in this endeavor.

While I am sure that none of us would agree with all the criticism made of television or of the views of every individual in the TV industry, this is a question on which there are several sides.

Mr. Rich's agency is among those which have taken the leadership in the television field and its competences are well recognized in the industry.

While this speech received great publicity in the advertising columns and in the trade press devoted to television, it may not have come to the attention of all of our colleagues.

Because of the timeliness of this subject, I insert, under unanimous consent, Mr. Rich's remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

AN ADDRESS BY LEE RICH

Gentlemen, imagine for a moment—if you will—that members of an archeological expedition digging in this area 1,000 years from now discover a document from the year 1962—and that from that document they try to determine what part television played in our culture.

On one page they read that "in a typical day an average of 90 percent of the people

in this country watched television a total of 6 hours"—and they conclude that in some way these people must have been entertained, educated or enriched by what they saw to give it that much attention.

But on the opposite page they read that television is the "source of serious problems, that it's wrecking our individual and collective moral fiber and creating a nation of stagnant spectators instead of dynamic doers."

They find side-by-side accounts of its "excessive violence"—and its commendable contributions to our national awareness; claims that it's keeping the children from their homework—yet reaching millions with academic information they might not have had access to otherwise; that it's boring—and exciting; creative—and insipid; in short, that it's a boon and a bane.

It's quite possible that the only thing future historians will ever be able to conclude about television is that it was highly controversial.

Now we could let it go at that; after all a future evaluation of television is the future's problem.

But for better or worse this crisis-ridden age we live in won't allow us to "let it go at that." In a world that continues to place an ever-higher premium on intellectual standards, we simply cannot wait for future generations to decide whether television's defenders or its detractors are right. We can't afford to be flippant about the greatest communications medium ever placed at our disposal especially when those who have threatened "to bury us" are working so hard to communicate their destructive doctrines.

Accordingly, all of us are interested in an accurate appraisal of the subject. One way of approaching that subject is to use the inductive method putting together the many bits of evidence we have available, and reaching a general conclusion.

Let's try that and see where we come out.

In the first place, television—comparatively speaking—is brand new. It's been with us, as a strong factor, for approximately one dozen years. In this short span of time it has become the 10th largest industry in the country. It is responsible for vast numbers of jobs, for the growth of entire new industries and businesses, contributing to an important portion of our total gross national product. Furthermore, television has achieved this standing three times as quickly as the giant automobile industry. It has grown at a far more rapid pace than radio, the telephone, washing machines, toasters and yes, even faster than indoor plumbing.

Since 1950, television penetration has grown from 9 million homes to almost 49 million; over 90 percent of the families in the United States have purchased 1 or more TV sets. And television service has grown from approximately 60 stations in 1950 to over 450 today. There isn't a town or hamlet in this country that cannot receive a television signal today.

With this kind of a growth a certain amount of growing pains can certainly be expected.

But television's detractors insist, nevertheless, that even in this astoundingly short period of time, the medium should be doing greater things than it is doing. So let's dispense with discussions of quantity for a moment and talk about quality.

To begin with, consider the demands that are made—day after day after day—on its quality, whatever that may be.

These 450 stations we mentioned broadcast 18 to 20 hours per day, 7 days a week, 52 weeks a year, year in and year out. This amounts, gentlemen, to approximately 10 billion words being broadcast annually. That's more verbiage than all the plays, all the novels, all the magazines produced since the invention of the printing press in the 15th century.

Television is the hungriest monster that ever devoured script. A successful play can enjoy an extended run on Broadway and then get still more mileage by means of road companies. A new movie travels the circuit of theaters over a period of months and sometimes years. A novel can be on the bestseller lists week after week. But what happens to a good television offering? It is seen once, or perhaps twice, and then is laid to rest in a vault.

I'm sure you will agree, there is no other medium of communication that exists solely on its ability to present new offerings so frequently with every passing hour.

I feel, gentlemen, that this is something to bear in mind when we're inclined to agree that television is a "vast intellectual wasteland." There's one inexorable force, remember, a relentless taskmaster which dominates it completely—namely, the clock. Because of that tyrant, it might be more fitting to call television an intellectual hasteland.

Not only must more ideas, more plots, more dialogue, more information be turned out than ever before in history, but they must be turned out in record time. There's practically no time to let new concepts season; to put promising formats aside and let them be improved upon; no time to nourish embryonic masterpieces to fruition; and no time to develop—over long years—the creative talents who must provide the television scripts demanded every moment of the day.

With every tick of that clock a deadline comes due—and perfected or not, that script must be produced.

I can assure you that we would be happy to relax the pace. But 150 million Americans have gotten a taste of television fare and they're demanding more—with every move of that second hand.

I'm pointing these things out because no evaluation of television's quality can be accurate if they aren't taken into consideration.

But let's move now to a more analytical appraisal of its standards * * *.

We're all familiar with the trend lines that are used to show quantitative things—how many people are watching, how much is spent on advertising and the like; let's imagine that the same method is used to indicate quality.

Now I learned a long time ago that two points are necessary to establish a straight line. Consequently, I don't think the direction that television is taking can be determined without using two points known as the past and the present.

Come back with me to the so-called golden age of television and look at a network program log for November 1950. * * * "This is Show Business," "Celebrity Time," "Arthur Murray Party," "Take a Chance," "Talent Scouts," "Lights Outs," "Can You Top This?" "Roller Derby," "Captain Video," "Wrestling," "Break the Bank," "Blind Date."

Sure, there was also the "Philco-Goodyear Playhouse," "Kraft Theater," "Studio One," and "Show of Shows." But when anyone is tempted to refer to these programs as a part of "Televisions Renaissance," it might be a good idea for him to check the revues of these programs on the "Day After."

Contrast this with the development of programing today: "CBS Reports," "NBC's Project 20," "The White Paper Series and Close-up Series," * * * the weekly drama and musical programs presented by the Du Pont Co. and the Aluminum Corp. of America. * * * The "special programs" being presented by Westinghouse, City Service Corp., Hallmark Greeting Cards and other companies throughout the country. * * * Weekly news analysis in prime evening time as well as the so-called Sunday Ghetto Period, daily newscasts throughout the day, weekly dramatic programs of enviable character as well as adaptation of old masterpieces. * * * Nature programs, art, science, political debates and historical analyses. These are but a few of the long roster of informative educational programs available for all of the viewing public.

There are also, of course, the popular situation comedies, action-adventure, music and game shows cartoons, and other staples of the entertainment industry. Certainly, these are not literary masterpieces that will live forever, but neither is every book that is published or every movie or play that is produced. They represent basic entertainment values to be considered as a part of the total television choice. Some of it is bad. None, in my opinion, is deliberately harmful.

Someone once said, as well as I can remember, that the rung of a ladder was never meant to stand upon; it was only meant to support one's foot until he could put the other a bit higher. The present level of television was never intended as the level at which we must remain. But we can use it—we can use the lessons we've learned and the experience we've gained to support us for that next move up the ladder. I admit that where we are is important—but so is where we are going. And I honestly believe that a comparison of television past with television present indicates that our direction is the right one.

Now let's see what can be done about taking that next step. At this time I'd like to point out something that all of us concerned with television—that is, the Government, the public in general, and the television industry, and those who use it—may forget on occasion. And that is the fact that our aims, our objectives are not the same.

It seems to me that this sometimes leads to suspicion of the other fellow—an attitude of distrust simply because he is seeking to attain different objectives from us.

But this difference of individual aims is basic—not only to our industry, but to the entire system of government under which we live. It was so fundamental to the concepts of those who founded this country, that it influenced practically every phase of the Constitution they created.

This philosophy of checks and balances, of the pursuit of different objectives is nothing new—and it's put to good use every day in this country. To illustrate:

A typical business in any field is usually a matter of management, employees, customers, and suppliers. Strictly speaking, none of these have the same objectives. Management is seeking to maximize profits; the fellow operating the machine on a piece-rate is interested in turning out more parts so his pay will be higher; the supplier wants his goods to be used in this process; and the customer wants a product that will serve his needs. Are these people wrong for wanting to achieve these things? Not at all, and the most effective operation will probably be the one in which this difference of objectives is capitalized upon.

It is only when one group is allowed to realize its own objectives completely—to the exclusion of the others—that trouble results.

The same thing applies to television. Companies with products to sell hope that television will enhance their means of doing so; the public wants to be informed and entertained; the Government wants the rights of all concerned to be preserved. And each of these has a right to pursue his own objectives—the advertiser to seek customers, if he intends to stay in business; the viewer to seek the best TV fare, regardless of whether he defines that to be a western or Shakespeare; and the Government to protect its citizens.

My point is that none of these should be penalized because he is seeking a different set of aims. The task before us is not to eradicate the differences, but the wide divergence. When they run completely contrary to each other there is a problem.

What we're really seeking, all of us, is a balanced achievement of our goals. In one sentence we hope to make the best possible television fare profitable and in the interests of the entire community.

Now just one last word about the sensitivities that some of us may have developed. There's an old saying to the effect that every man has two businesses; his own and show business. Actually, this applies to many fields. Practically everyone today has something to say about television, no matter what his own calling may be. But that's all right; the same thing has been true in politics. No matter what a man's job happens to be, he makes politics and government his own concern.

And that's very much as it should be, in television as in government.

The attention we get—in either of these fields—is certainly healthy. Let's be sure that it leads us to a balanced achievement of our objectives, so that all may benefit.

Thank you.

The Kennedy Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, one of the favorite editorial subjects during the past few weeks has been a survey and evaluation of the first year of President Kennedy's administration. One such editorial which has recently come to my attention appeared in the Daily Dunklin Democrat. Because I believe my colleagues will find this editorial of interest, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial "The Kennedy Year," which appeared on January 22 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE KENNEDY YEAR

President Kennedy's first year in office—a profile in courage, determination, education, achievement, error, and maturity.

A year ago John F. Kennedy, at the age of 44, assumed the mantle of leadership of the world's greatest nation and began to mold the Presidency to his own personality, just as his predecessors had done before him.

What kind of a year has it been for the young Roman Catholic, former Democratic Senator who won over his Republican opponent by a bare 112,000 popular votes?

To find one answer to the question above would be difficult. For there are many answers, many varying shades of personal and public opinion, and because the Presidency is of such scope and magnitude, it becomes impossible to answer it with any one sweeping statement.

In the opinion of some 78 percent of the American public, John F. Kennedy has made a good Chief Executive in the first 12 months in office. The most recent public opinion polls indicate Kennedy today has even greater popular appeal than former President Eisenhower after the same period in office. This is a remarkable achievement, in view of the fact that Eisenhower, in both elections, overwhelmingly won both the popular and electoral vote of the Nation, while Kennedy actually failed to get a true majority of the votes in his single appearance at the national election polls.

Kennedy's position 12 months ago was precarious. Winning the Presidency by a hairthin plurality, he knew neither the full scope of international problems nor understood his limitations in domestic affairs. As the Nation's Chief Executive he had neither met nor conferred with Khrushchev and other Communist leaders. As a Senator without fiscal committee background, he neither knew nor understood the complicated and oftentimes precarious responsibility of trying to match Federal budgets to party platforms.

Kennedy's greatest asset, not unlike that carried to the White House by his predecessors, was his determination to exert leadership in a nation which desperately needed it and throughout a nation which sensed the urgency of it. Kennedy's grasp of international affairs, while faulty in the Cuban disaster, enabled the United States to offer something better than retreat in Berlin, Laos, South Vietnam, and Africa. Poor appointments in key foreign affairs posts were corrected; establishment of the old Eisenhower chain of command was reinstituted and altered, and the Nation began to move in the right directions abroad.

Domestically the President began to augment some promises, but the severe limitations of funds, a nagging recession and the overpowering needs of national defense kept him off balance and still do, despite recent state of the Union recommendations to Congress, many of which will remain unfinanced at the close of this 2d session of the 87th Congress.

The Kennedy first year became, in reality, a time for the President to learn the difference between the Los Angeles Democratic convention, and all that went before it, and the realistic problems which only a President can know and only a President can solve.

Instead of moving forward with bold programs in international politics, the President learned that there are choices to be made, none of which is inherently bad or good, but varying shades of in between. He learned that once policies were determined in the White House, it became necessary to convince our friends abroad that this was the proper choice. For despite what many Americans may consider to be the enlightened path along the tricky international trail, it oftentimes becomes impossible to gain sufficient followers for the trek, even from our own free world camp.

Although he lost all but Missouri and Illinois in the hostile Midwest Farm Belt, it has been this area which has benefitted from Kennedy's determination to assist the farmer and to raise the farm income by nearly 8 percent. And it may well be Kennedy's determination to end the surplus glut, to reduce Federal participation in the farm economy, and restore markets to a semifree condition will make more long-term gains for American agriculture than any previous programs in this century. Although labeled as antifarmer before the campaign, Kennedy's concern for all economic segments of the Nation may eventually result in a realistic approach by the Federal Government to the problems of growth for agriculture.

After 12 months in office it becomes difficult for most Americans to visualize any other earlier Democratic contender serving in the White House. The leadership qualities of Kennedy, the intellectual abilities of the man and an enlightenment which discards sectional prejudices now show that Kennedy was the proper nominee for the Democrats in 1960. For the Republicans, who may be hard pressed to admit that Kennedy's initial inexperience would be superior to Nixon's kitchen debates with Khrushchev, the dissimilar backgrounds and ideals of the two men may yet convince J.F.K.'s opponents that he is worthy of support in the same manner that millions of Democrats supported Republican Eisenhower. If Nixon was the obvious choice for the Republican nomination in 1960, it seems possible that the GOP and independents found him too obvious during the campaign. Had religion been removed from the campaign, which it wasn't, the choice between a Kennedy and a Nixon would have been far less difficult for those in the mid-South and the Farm Belt. And after 12 months in office, the President has not disappointed those who stoutly maintained that he would preserve the Nation's traditional separation of church and state.

During the first year in office for John F. Kennedy, the Nation has lived through one of the most perilous times in history. The dangerous moments in Berlin, in Laos, in the Congo, and even in the United Nations, have tried and tested the ability of the free world to survive the death blows of communism. And it has been during this period that President Kennedy first learned and then grasped the awful specter of force against the West.

There is greater hope today than ever before that the United States will play its proper and necessary role in world affairs. Part of this hope can be traced to the leadership, however late in coming, provided by President Kennedy. There are signs that America has a great Chief Executive, perhaps one of the greatest in the Nation's history.

The end of the first year and the beginning of a new year for the Kennedy administration bring to the Nation, and to the rest of the Western World, a spirit of progress, determination, and hope for eventual peace.

"Eye Winks" from Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Harold L. Norman, editor of the Elmore Eye in my district, is a keen observer of public affairs and reflects, I believe, the views of most of his readers. Under the title "Eye Winks," he had the following to say in his current issue:

EYE WINKS—ALONG MAIN STREET

President Kennedy's report to the Nation last week was just another report to win votes and was not based on what is good for our country. In no way am I blaming the President, because this is par for the course with either political party, because the public is still looking for something for nothing.

The President's report showed 29 points of additional spending and one point of reducing taxes. This doesn't make sense as far as balancing the budget or trying to reduce our huge national debt.

When are we as taxpayers going to learn that you can't get anything for nothing from the Government? Somebody has to pay and in every case you pay more than you get because of the redtape and administrative costs that always are added to the cost of any giveaway program.

How far can we go in debt? What happens to the country when we pass the point of no return or when our debt is so high, that we cannot even pay the interest? We, as citizens, had better quit asking from the Federal Government and start paying what

we already owe. And, again, I say it doesn't make any difference whether it be Republicans or Democrats, they both do what they think the people want in order to get votes.

However, the Republicans are branded as "conservatives" and have held that unique title for many years. If there has ever been a time in history that we needed conservatism, just look at our national debt and you will realize this is the time.

One of the first things that could be done, would be to sell every single business the Government is in, to private industry. Sell it at a fair price, with moderate interest rates over a long period of time. This would put millions and millions of dollars in our Treasury, and would mean millions and millions of tax dollars each year instead of those we are now paying to operate them. And, by doing this, we would be taking the biggest step in years away from socialism and back to a free and independent Nation.

One of Kennedy's pet programs is free medical aid to the aged. This would be the most expensive program in the Nation's history because of the many that would take advantage of the law. Patients would be in the hospital for each and every little ailment. They would be there because they would ask for hospitalization knowing that it was free, or they would be there because many doctors would have them admitted to keep the hospital full and on a paying basis. Several doctors from England have written articles in leading newspapers and magazines telling how free medical aid changes people and doctors and how advantages are taken at every turn to fleece the Government.

I'm sure there are some hardship cases among the aged to pay for medical and hospital bills, but I don't know of anyone that has been refused these services when they were needed, and when it is necessary it can be handled on a local level, through county funds instead of again giving the Federal Government the power to rule on local situations.

Progress in Superior, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Nation today is forging ahead toward ever-higher plateaus of productivity and accomplishments.

National progress depends upon step-by-step advancement across the length and breadth of this great land.

Recently, the Evening Telegram, of Superior, Wis., published a special progress edition. The edition contained a panoramic picture of splendid progress in Superior, in a special article entitled, "Impressive Gains Set, New Goals Ahead."

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

In addition, my good friend, Clough, Gates of the Evening Telegram, wrote a thought-provoking editorial, entitled "Constant Changing for the Better"—presenting a realistic evaluation of such progress in Superior.

I ask unanimous consent to also have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

IMPRESSIVE GAINS SET, NEW GOALS AHEAD

The city of Superior moved into 1962 with keen recognition of the vast advantages the new period promises and with deep appreciation of the impressive gains in 1961.

Progressive contributions are apparent in the industrial, educational, and recreational fields, each one a fitting salute to the continued development of an already-giant world port.

The new Superior-Duluth high level bridge, a crowning point in Superior 1961 progress, is bound to give the city a terrific boost in the way of motor traffic, and is expected to increase the permanent population of the city eventually. A total of 51,000 cars clocked over the new toll free bridge from the Saturday, 2 p.m. opening until noon the following Monday. Constant traffic over the magnificent structure since indicates its potential advantages in the way of economic progress.

HARBOR

The Superior-Duluth and Ashland harbors will share during 1962 in one of the biggest construction years in the postwar history of the Army Corps of Engineers. The Twin Ports harbor channels will be dredged to depths ranging from 27 to 32 feet. The Twin Ports project calls for an estimated outlay of $2,710,000 of Federal funds and $200,000 non-Federal funds. Work is scheduled to start in the spring.

SCHOOL PLANNING

A new $4½ million high school to accommodate 1,800 students is in the progress picture for the Superior public schools system, since five rural schools have been annexed to the city system. The school will be constructed on a 40-acre tract between 24th and 28th Streets east of Catlin Avenue. Present architectural plans call for classrooms, an auditorium to seat 650 persons, a pool, and gymnasium to provide seating space for 3,000.

HOSPITAL

Construction is well underway on the million-dollar-plus Superior Memorial Hospital which is going up on Tower Avenue and 34th Street. Construction started in midsummer of 1961. Present plans are for a 74-bed structure.

An $850,000 three-story wing is being constructed at St. Joseph's Hospital, which will relieve present crowded service departments. The wing will include a lobby, administrative offices, medical library, record rooms, laboratory, X-ray department, operating room and other facilities.

St. Mary's Hospital completed a $200,000 addition this past year which includes a new X-ray room, emergency room, heated ambulance entrance and automatic elevator. The addition adds greatly to the hospital services.

CARGO FACILITIES

Superior-Duluth harbor industries have completed considerable improvements to their facilities during 1961 in view of a stepped-up seaway and Great Lakes trade during the navigation season of 1962. Cargo records for 1961 show that public and marine terminals in the local harbor handled 65 percent more oversea general and bulk cargo in 1961 than in 1960.

OIL

The Interprovincial Pipe Line Co., of Toronto, Canada, of which the Lakehead Pipe Line Co., Inc., is a subsidiary, increased its throughput in 1961. Loading at the local dock showed an increase of 45 percent over 1960 with a total of 66 cargoes.

CUSTOMS

The volume of business transacted at the Superior U.S. customshouse increased in 1961 with collections at the local office amounting to $412,000.

IMMIGRATION

The Immigration and Naturalization Service has increased its office force since the opening of the seaway to such an extent that it is now in a position to meet the demands of both Great Lakes and oversea shipping. Desertions from foreign ships, one of the Service's major early problems, dropped sharply in the last navigation season.

GRAIN RECORD

The Farmer's Union grain elevator, tallest in the world, shipped 40 million bushels of grain in 1961, an alltime high bushelwise. Prospects for 1962 are for stimulated sales and an increase in shipments over this past year. These prospects are based on the $1 million expansion at the elevator this year which allows faster loading of foreign ships.

Osborne McMillan Elevator Co., which owns elevators O and M on the waterfront off East Second Street, plans to continue improvements of its facilities during 1962 as in previous years, with maximum efficiency as the goal for loading vessels, both domestic and foreign.

DENTAL OFFICE

A new dental office was opened this month in East End by Dr. J. Richard Stariha. The office is at 2305 East Fifth Street.

SHOPPING CENTER

The Belknap Plaza, a shopping center, is scheduled to open in early June. The plaza will include a department store, a drugstore and other business places, as well as an enlarged Red Owl supermarket.

WAREHOUSE

Groundwork and test piling for a large steel warehouse on the Superior waterfront were completed in the fall of 1961. The warehouse is being constructed by Paper, Calmenson & Co., St. Paul, widely known handlers of steel products.

VOCATIONAL SCHOOL

Enrollment trends at the Superior Vocational School indicate an increased enrollment during 1962, with both day and night classes currently up by a good percentage over last year. The school has increased its educational program as well as its maintenance projects.

RAILWAYS

The Great Northern Railway Co. is continuing during 1962 to improve its Superior facilities and its main line to the Twin Cities. A project slated for completion in the spring is lengthening of the tracks in the Allouez yard. Improvements are also being made on the ore docks.

The Northern Pacific Railway will spend approximately $1 million for various improvements on its Lake Superior division during 1962.

NEW BUILDING

The old YMCA building on the corner of 14th and Ogden Avenue is being torn down to make way for a modern new building. The site has been purchased by Marion J. Kapus, Denver, Colo., formerly of Superior.

PHONE COMPANY

Added investment over the past year by the Wisconsin Telephone Co. is indicative of Superior progress. The company report shows a total investment of $3,987,000 in the exchange for an increase of $76,000 over last year.

SOCIAL SECURITY QUARTERS

The Superior Social Security District Office moved into new quarters in December in the Board of Trade Building. The move was necessitated by the greatly expanded services of the district office.

ROAD WORK

Highway improvement projects totaling $3,615,000 are scheduled for 1962 in Superior and upstate counties in districts 7 and 8 of the State highway commission. Of this

amount, $1,206,300 is earmarked for Superior and Douglas County.

A contract has been let for construction of three bridges over the Poplar and Middle Rivers in Douglas County on Highway 13, which means continued highway improvements for residents and tourists in the Superior area.

Improvement of Belknap Street west of the viaduct for a distance of 5,000 feet, which was started in 1961, is scheduled for completion by July 1 of this year.

BOWLING ALLEYS

Waletzko's bowling alleys added four lanes during the summer of 1961, which now provides a floor space area of 75 by 120 square feet.

The Village Lanes bowling alleys was constructed in 1961, providing a new facility for an ever-increasing popular sport. The lanes feature 12 lanes in an ultramodern atmosphere.

LIBRARY

Anticipated increased patronage of the Superior Public Library in 1962, based on an increase in 1961, has prompted the library board to plan for improvements to meet the needs.

AIRLINES

North Central Airlines, Inc., which serves the Twin Ports, will inaugurate this year an overall equipment program which calls for adding Convairs to their aircraft fleet at the rate of five to seven a year until all the DC-3's now in use are retired.

COURTS

The Douglas County courts have a streamlined look in 1962 with statewide court reorganization in effect. The clerk of courts is anticipating a much busier year ahead as the office takes on the new work. Over $250,000 was receipted and disbursed by the clerk of courts' office in 1961.

COUNTY HIGHWAYS

The Douglas County Highway Department made gains in 1961 toward its ultimate goal of a 100 percent sufficiency rating. With the consistent expenditure of about $120,000 per year on permanent base construction, the department expects to reach its goal in from 4 to 5 years.

EXTENSION OFFICE

The Douglas County Extension Service reported a busy year in 1961 with agents making a total of 543 farm or home visits while 1,086 persons received aid at the office in the Douglas County courthouse. Various departments grew in several ways and clubs increased in numbers.

CIVIL DEFENSE

The Superior Civil Defense Auxiliary Police Corps will aim to increase its membership in 1962 for continued services to the city. The corps at the end of 1961 had a membership of 147 registered members of which 133 are on the active status. The Douglas County civil defense office will put into action this year a far-reaching program designed to place the county on an excellent readiness basis.

Because Superior is a key point in the national civil defense warning system, present operations for the nonmilitary defense of the city and county will be enlarged in 1962. This will result in an excellent warning service and medical services, emergency operating center and preparations for the continuity of government, public information and Federal aids.

WELDING FIRM

The Seaway Welding and Tank Co., Inc., one of Superior's fastest growing industrial concerns, is studying the possibilities of adding new equipment to its line. In 1961, the firm began manufacturing plows which have proved to be extremely efficient in operation.

EXCURSIONS

Harbor excursions on the Flamingo, which operates from Barker's Island marina, proved extremely successful during the past summer season in the way of a tourist and local attraction. The excursion boat carried 10,000 passengers during the 1961 season and the owner expects to double that number in 1962.

MUSEUM

A series of interior rearrangements are scheduled for 1962 at the Douglas County Historical Museum which attracts thousands of visitors from all parts of the country each year. Registered attendance at the museum during 1961 totaled 8,437, and represented 33 States, five foreign countries and four Canadian provinces.

TREES PLANTED

A city beautification program designed through the planting of flowering Hopa trees will be continued in 1962 with schools, churches and other public buildings to be eligible for the trees. Five hundred of the trees were planted in 1961.

SHIPMENTS

Iron ore shipments, grain and coal cargoes will continue in 1962 to lead local harbor traffic. Iron ore was loaded during the past season into 1,381 vessels; grain cargoes into 459 ships.

PUBLIC WORKS

The Superior Public Works Department will continue its blacktop program, sidewalk work, and street lighting expansion during 1962. This program was carried on extensively in 1961 because of the new high level bridge and cloverleaf.

EMPLOYMENT

Employment in Superior's nonseasonal establishments was quite stable throughout 1961 and the employment picture is definitely shaping into a much improved economy, according to the Wisconsin Employment Service.

OTHER GAINS

Construction of a 44-bed rest home at a cost of $100,000 is expected to start in the spring with the building to be ready by fall. The structure will be located on Tower Avenue across from the Superior Memorial Hospital site.

One of the largest supermarkets in the Twin Ports area opened in 1961 in Superior when the City Market added three adjoining buildings to its location at the corner of 11th and Tower. The main floor covers 18,000 square feet of space.

Ross Upholstering & Carpet Co. opened a modern and attractive new building on Belknap Street in 1961.

The new convent for the Cathedral of Christ the King Sisters was completed in the past year at a cost of $300,000.

All Catholic parishes of the city shared in the construction of the Newman Club Building at Superior State College. The building is near completion.

Radio station WQMN constructed a new studio on North 16th Street in 1961. The studio contains the most modern equipment for radio broadcasting.

The Superior Water, Light & Power Co. will spend more than a half million dollars in 1962 to continue its expansion program which has been carried on for the past 3 years at a total expenditure of $3 million. Approximately $1 million was spent on this program during 1961.

SHIPBUILDING

The Fraser-Nelson Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Inc., rebuilt and extended its dry dock No. 2 on Howard's Pocket during the past year to make it the largest and most modern dry dock on the Great Lakes. Fraser-Nelson has submitted bids on construction of four new ore carriers. Talks of revival of shipbuilding at Superior, if they materialize, would mean thousands of new jobs on ship construction.

The Great Lakes Storage & Contracting Co. added a new division to its local operations. The firm now handles the selling and erection of steel buildings. The company loaded 190,000 bushels of grain from its Connor's Point dock during 1961.

The Douglas County board of Supervisors predicts an advancement in industry in Superior and the county in 1962 with the outlook the most interesting in many years.

The Superior Refinery of the Murphy Corp. will increase its output considerably with the completion of an expansion program now going on. The new facilities are expected to create jobs for an additional 15 to 20 persons. The refinery now empolys 114.

Three new programs were added to the curriculum of Superior parochial schools during 1961. These will continue as pilot projects during 1961 with emphasis on science.

A new $15,000 chiropractor building was completed during the past year at 197 Belknap Street, by M. J. Lindberg.

A number of valuable achievements were noted during 1961 at the Middle River Sanatorium in the way of additional space, new facilities and new furnishings.

Texaco, Inc., has nearly completed the construction of two new fuel oil storage tanks on the Pure Oil tank farm on Winter Street in addition to the three tanks the firm already has on the property. Pure Oil operates 10 storage tanks of their own at the site.

CHURCHES

Superior churches during 1961 have completed a wide program of construction and remodeling with a similar program slated to continue during the coming year.

The weatherman smiled throughout the year on this colorful progress picture, enfolding the city of Superior and northern Wisconsin in ideal temperatures, free from severe storms; in winter devoid of hazardous driving conditions, a summer marked by warm days and cool nights, perfect for work or play.

Superior bankers are taking an optimistic view of 1962 with their conclusions based on continued construction, expansion of present industrial facilities and a general economic upswing throughout the head of the lakes area.

CONSTANT CHANGING FOR THE BETTER

(By Clough Gates)

Those who reside in and with a progressing city such as Superior find it an inspiring experience to contemplate with newspaper writers a review of what has been accomplished in the past 12 months.

Perhaps a visitor who sees Superior only infrequently would remark on the many changes and improvements that have made it a distinctly different city from what it appeared to be only a few years ago. In the earlier years that brought the basic development the progress was often more apparent to the casual observer than to those whose home is here. The matchless harbor was awaiting the builders from the first, but even after the opening of the Soo Canal had laid the foundation for what was to come, these things awaited the opening up of an empire.

The new northwest country first required settlers by the thousands. Then men with vision and resources mapped the network of railroads that required vast terminal facilities where the products and needs of these thousands could be shipped to and fro from the harbor seemingly designed by nature to promote the use of the chain of Great Lakes now known as the Nation's fourth seacoast.

For some time the very presence of the great terminals gained attention. The lumber mills were among the first, but they were a temporary phase of the more permanent

development. The more permanent facilities were to follow. There has been a constant growth and continued change. As the years have advanced, Superior, like other cities that have moved with the procession, has come to accept change as the normal status. And so the people living with the changes are usually surprised when at the close of a year they take stock of what has actually been accomplished and accepted as merely adapting conditions, economic, social and otherwise, to the new day that is already here but is also always just ahead.

The news columns that bring the year 1961 into focus reveals much progress for Superior. The railroads that have always kept apace with the need for handling millions upon millions of tons have continuously revised their standards of roadbeds and equipment so that today over the same lines they move many times their early total. Their performance in the pioneer days was the cause of wonderment, yet the Great Northern, first of those to do big things in Superior and yearly spender of great sums, has just announced plans for spending many thousands in the coming season. This may be taken as a sample of what others that make up Superior's great transportation plant will be doing in 1962.

Highways have been a comparatively recent development that has added to the facilities of this city and harbor. The new high bridge to Duluth is an epitome of this feature of the demands for freight and passenger service at this focal point. Great things have been predicted for its influence on the whole lakehead area. It has been done largely at Federal expense, but the Wisconsin State Highway Department is already planning more than a $3 million expenditure for 1962 to improve highways in the upstate area.

Other firms and investors have plans that keep them in step with the growth of Superior's basic activities. The grain industry has given Superior a plant that equips it to serve with marvelous dispatch one of the world's greatest producing regions. It has responded to the extent that in 1961 its receipts were over 111 million bushels and its shipments practically the same amount. A portion of this came in by trucks, but the greater part by railroads. The latter also reloaded some to carry eastward, especially in the winter season. Foreign ships loaded in this harbor the most of the grain destined for Europe.

An encouraging feature is the fact that Superior's more than 45 million bushels of capacity has enabled the grain business to add materially to winter season work. Heavy shipments have so nearly emptied these great storage houses that soon after navigation closed they were ready to receive many trainloads more which in the past have had to wait until spring for accommodation here.

Local people are meeting these developments with efforts of their own to encourage the location and growth of industries that will also take advantage of Superior's fine transportation plant. The Superior and Douglas County Development Association has been established on a long-range basis to enable it to follow through, as often as has not been possible in past years. Many other things point in the same direction. Probably never, not even in wartimes, were the banks and loaning institutions of the city so equipped to do their share. Assets and available capital today total more than at any previous point in the city's history. This fact is reflected in the steady growth of home building and owning and in the type of these improvements.

Superior's comparatively new oil industry, as typified by its refinery on Stinson Avenue, has marked gratifying growth in the past year and plans for the coming year are similarly promising.

The development of this industry attests to the interest and civicmindedness that prompted the local people to first invest their money and time in this project immediately after the pipeline from Canada built its terminal in Superior adjoining the site now occupied by the refinery which recently became a department of one of the young but fast growing oil operators and now among the leaders in this industry.

One of the city's pioneer industries, the shipyards, in 1961 completed the enlargement of one of its two drydocks to make it the largest on the Great Lakes and able to handle the greatest present-day ships. The Fraser-Nelson Co., operating the plant, is now equipped for the finest repair and rebuilding jobs available anywhere, thus resuscitating an industry that played an important role in employment here in the whaleback days.

Yes, Superior's record for the past year just closed and the promise for the ones immediately ahead typify the old saying that in such a place "nothing is permanent except change." And, as to Superior's economic plant it is a constant changing for the better.

Evidence of its own citizens' belief in this is given by their constant building and improving of their own homes here. Their performance in this way well matches the faith displayed by those spending so consistently to keep the economic base up to date.

Kennedy Seems Indifferent to Cost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York World-Telegram of January 19, 1962:

KENNEDY SEEMS INDIFFERENT TO COST

(By Henry J. Taylor)

The arrival of money—"Where's the money coming from?"—has never been a problem in President Kennedy's life. The money was always there.

It is a significant fact bearing on the President's state of the Union message and his whole approach to the New Frontier.

The message has something in it ($) for almost everybody. But, again, the President neither counts the cost carefully and clearly nor shows a grief for those who have to pay it. This is not callousness. It comes from having lived a life apart from what taxes really mean if you not only have to pay them but earn them.

It is very hard to pay your way in life, protect the family, have children and put them through school, meet emergencies that somehow come one on the other, or wait a long, long time for even small wishes that are in your heart. Nearly all Americans struggle in a way that, by fate's lottery, the President has never experienced.

You must be working at it yourself really to have the endless problem a part of you. And you discover that, if you do not concentrate on where the money is coming from, you and your family are utterly lost under life's wheels. So is a nation.

A government is not an earner. A government is merely a spender—a distributor of our taxes. Anything President Kennedy says he will give to the people he must first take away from the people. In real purchasing power we will all grow steadily poorer as the inevitable result of the program. For the vital point which is passed over is that the money comes from us.

The currency-rotating process in the wastelands of Government spending passes our tax money through a sieve of Government overhead that drains off more of its value all the time. It costs the Government so much to run itself that, no matter what the spending agencies do with the money left over, great loss is sustained by the working people who supply the money in the first place.

For, already, any man who can face yesterday's bills, today's expenses and April's taxes is a miracle man. More than we pay for food we spend for government. Taxes and food alone take more than half our total earnings on the average across our country. Moreover, taxes are among the largest items in all costs of production, and therefore, in prices.

This is a major reason why our dollars have become dollarettes. We pay every penny; and at the same time we're paying more than $8 billion a year interest on the money Washington has already borrowed.

All of our Presidents through World War II taxed the people about $248 billion. This included two world wars. The Government in the brief period since then has taxed us about twice as much—that is to say twice as much as all administrations in the previous 156 years—and is currently spending more than the entire incomes of all the people west of the Mississippi River. These taxes can be sound; but they can also be robbery. It depends on what the politicians do with our money.

The profoundly wrong approach is the refusal for a variety of reasons, some undeniably political, to cut back on all the pork-barrel billions. For in the face of the Soviet threat it is not a question of "Where's the money coming from now?" It is a question of "Where's the money coming from for generations on end?"

Few compliments are so hollow and unprofitable as the one you sometimes hear at the end of a bar rail: "He was a good spender while he had it." Shakespeare made Hamlet much wiser. In his great play, act I, scene 2, he begins a speech to Horatio with a word and a warning that has never lost its importance to men or nations: "Thrift, thrift, Horatio." Until the President learns this and practices it for our imperiled Nation, our long-term survival against the Soviet Union cannot be guaranteed.

William McKinley

SPEECH

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the tribute being paid today to a former President of the United States, William McKinley, of Ohio. Indeed, I believe we may find valuable lessons for today's hectic world in William McKinley's career.

For example, Mr. Speaker, Members may not be aware that when William McKinley was a Member of Congress from Ohio he was gerrymandered out of his seat. The record shows, however, that by virtue of this very action, Con-

gressman McKinley went on to be elected Governor of Ohio.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the political heirs of Mr. McKinley in my Empire State of New York will find that on that score history will repeat itself this year.

H.R. 8900: A Statement by Arthur P. Wilcox, President of the National Association of Real Estate Boards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday of last week the President of the United States held a press conference. At that time he saw fit to announce that he would appoint Dr. Robert Weaver as Secretary of Urban Affairs and Housing should such a post be created in the future. At the time it seemed extremely strange to some of us that the President would designate an individual for a post not yet created by the Congress. The following day the chairman of the Democrat National Committee held a press conference in which he openly and blatantly charged that opposition to the proposed new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing was predicated on racial bias, and, in particular, opposition to the appointment of Dr. Weaver to a position in the Cabinet. It has, therefore, now become abundantly clear that some of the proponents of this legislation are stooping to sheer demagogery, and fanning the fires of racial prejudice in a vain effort to justify their demands for a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

I am, therefore, very pleased to note that the National Association of Real Estate Boards, through its president, Arthur P. Wilcox, has issued a statement condemning this administration tactic.

I include, therefore, with my remarks the statement issued on January 26, 1962, by Mr. Wilcox:

STATEMENT BY THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REAL ESTATE BOARDS

"The real issue, which the Congress must be permitted to consider without harassment on an extraneous subject," Mr. Willcox said, "is an attempt to open a new door to vast Federal spending, to Federal domination of local government, and to unhealthy dependence of our communities and local taxpayers on the Federal Treasury.

"As early as 1956 when this proposal was considered and discussed only as the thing it is—an unwarranted drive for expanded Federal powers—our association warned of its far-reaching dangers. On January 18 of that year, our association adopted a policy resolution asserting our belief that the role of the Federal Government in the domain of urban affairs and housing should be a diminishing one, and strongly opposing proposals then current to create a Department of Housing in the President's Cabinet.

"Again on May 17, 1960, before there had been any attempt to becloud the proposal with racial considerations, we testified before the House Banking and Currency Committee and strongly opposed the proposal then current for a Department of Housing and Metropolitan Affairs.

"Again, at our convention in Dallas on November 17, 1960, we reaffirmed our policy urging that Congress reject proposed legislation to create a Department of Housing and Urban Affairs.

"Our position has thus clearly been taken on the proposal as a measure for a dangerous change in the relationships between Federal, State, and local governments, and upon no other considerations.

"It has been argued that a new Cabinet Department of Housing and Urban Affairs would unify and better coordinate the present activities of the Federal Government in these fields. The fact that the proposed Department would in no way encompass the important housing and urban activities of the Veterans' Administration and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board testifies to the invalidity of such an argument.

"Our cities are faced with difficult and complex problems in which every civic and business organization has a responsibility. However, the assumption that a superior brand of judgment, leadership, or control may be found in Washington to solve these problems is without foundation. Federal responsibility can only weaken local initiative.

"We hope that Members of Congress may remain free to assert their right to consider this drastic proposal for altering the structure of our Federal Government without the threat that a vote on the issue will be interpreted as an expression on civil rights."

Attack on Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Lawrence Eagle Tribune:

ATTACK ON POLLUTION

If a State needs help in solving a problem of water pollution, the Federal Government is required to provide it.

This is the statement by the United Press International in reporting on a conference at Olympia, Wash., on Federal aid to the State in an attack on the pollution problem.

A representative of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, told the Olympia conference that the Federal Government has started a "broad sweeping attack" on pollution and has "an interest and responsibility" in controlling pollution even though it does not cross State lines.

These words make news for the cities and towns in the Merrimack Valley. Here we certainly have intrastate pollution and perhaps interstate pollution. Here, too, we have a problem evidently similar to that in Washington. There the Governor said that, although the State had done much about the problem of pollution, more needed to be done and the help of the Federal Government was welcome.

In Massachusetts not much has been done about the problem of pollution, except survey it and talk about it and wonder where the money is coming from to carry out practical solution. Indeed, Washington evidently has done more than Massachusetts—but Washington's application for Federal help was the first under the Pollution Control Act passed last year.

Since no State has a more serious problem of pollution than Massachusetts, we wonder why Massachusetts was not first to apply for Federal help, despite the evidence that Federal financial help is piddling compared with the need. No harm would be done, however, by applying for help. This is perhaps the only means by which we can learn what the Federal Government would do.

Dauphin Island Families First To Occupy New Homes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore gained, I am pleased to insert herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a newspaper article that appeared in the Guardian, the Oklahoma City Air Force Station's newspaper.

Maj. Gen. Thomas J. Gent, Jr., division commander, visited us in Mobile recently for the opening of these new houses. I accompanied him on an inspection not only of the Dauphin Island family homes and radar site, but also the radar site at Thomasville, Ala. General Gent is a wonderful person and we are very, very fortunate in Alabama to have him in command of our military installations there.

The above-mentioned article follows:

DAUPHIN ISLAND FAMILIES FIRST TO OCCUPY NEW HOMES—HOUSING OPEN AT 693D SITE

HEADQUARTERS, 32D AIR DIVISION.—Officers and NCO's of the 693d Radar Squadron, Dauphin Island Air Force Station, moved into their new onsite family quarters late last month.

Along with four families at Thomasville Air Force Station, they were the first to occupy the demountable homes, constructed at five division stations.

T. Sgt. John D. Simpson, his wife, and seven children made up the first family at Dauphin Island to complete the onsite move.

MORE IN THIS MONTH

The remainder of the Thomasville homes and those at Eufaula Air Force Station were expected to be occupied by the middle of this month.

Bad weather and minor discrepancies held up progress somewhat, but occupancy of the homes at Cross City Air Force Station and Crystal Springs Air Force Station is planned for the middle of February.

Early this month Maj. Gen. Thomas J. Gent, Jr., division commander, accompanied by Alabama Congressman FRANK W. BOYKIN, visited the new housing sites at both Dauphin Island and Thomasville.

In all 135 demountable homes, the first to be constructed at Air Force installations, were built. All 23 by 48, or 1104 square feet, they have such facilities as air conditioning, carport and storage room. Of the 27 homes at each site, 5 are allotted to officers and 22 to noncommissioned officers.

Family housing committees have been formed at several sites, and briefings have been given dependents on lawn and appliance care and fire regulations.

NAMES CHOSEN

Three of the housing areas have been named. Crystal Springs Air Force Station personnel have called the area Crystal Heights and dubbed the major road as Circle Drive. The unit has also named the family of S.M. Sgt. Chester R. Praley as the first to occupy quarters.

Thomasville Air Force Station members have named their housing area Falcon Heights and have designated the streets as Tiros Drive, Appola Lane, and Nova Lane.

Similar street names have been devised by Eufaula Air Force Station personnel. They are Saturn Drive, Jupiter Lane, Mars Lane, Venus Lane and Mercury Lane. The entire area is called Radar Manor.

The demountable homes are a new concept in military housing. Constructed in the factory, they are transported by truck or train to the site of usage. During shipment they are in two pieces and are joined on arrival.

Advantages of this housing are many. If conditions arise where housing would no longer be needed in an area—such as the closing down of a site—the homes could be moved at minimum expense.

The addition of the new homes brings to a total of 381 the onsite houses at division nontenant units.

This includes 27 constructed at Houma Air Force Station in 1958 and 2 of World War II vintage; and 27 each, built in 1929, at Eagle Pass Air Force Station, Las Cruces Air Force Station, Ozona Air Force Station and Rockport Air Force Station.

Also built in 1959 were 9 homes at Duncanville Air Force Station and Texarkana Air Force Station, plus 24 at Sweetwater Air Force Station and Pyote Air Force Station. Pyote also has 16 constructed about 1943. West Mesa Air Force Station received 27 homes in 1960.

Tribute to Hoblitzell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, early this month, West Virginia lost one of her favorite sons, the former U.S. Senator, John D. Hoblitzell, Jr.

Public tributes poured in from all parts of the State and Nation, but I believe the statement of James M. Knowles, his longtime personal friend, best described the accomplishments of John Hoblitzell as a youth, businessman, citizen, public servant, and friend, and best reflected the high regard and esteem in which his fellow men held him.

Therefore under leave to extend my remarks, I include this statement which was printed in the Clarksburg Telegram, of Clarksburg, W. Va.

Thomas Stafford, one of the outstanding political writers, devoted an entire column to the sudden death of Jack Hoblitzell. The heading of this tribute was "Hoblitzell Deathblow to State," which all of us very much believe the case to be. I ask that this article be included among my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, at the time I learned of the passing of Jack Hoblitzell, I said that I felt that the State of West Virginia had lost one of its truly good men and that seldom in this day do we find men of the caliber of Jack Hoblitzell, who in all of his undertakings with his family, his party, his State, and his Nation moved with such an honesty of purpose.

The statement and article follows:

KNOWLES PRAISES HOBLITZELL FOR HIS ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Among the public tributes Saturday to the late former U.S. Senator John D. Hoblitzell, Jr., who died unexpectedly at his residence, was one by Attorney James M. Knowles, Jr., a former chairman of the Harrison County Republican Executive Committee and a longtime personal friend of Hoblitzell.

Said Attorney Knowles in his statement:

"John Dempsey Hoblitzell, Jr., one of the two or three finest men I have ever known, is dead at 49. It would be difficult to find another man who did so much so well in such a tragically short life.

"Jack (even when he was a U.S. Senator people called him that) was an outstanding athlete, a trackman at Parkersburg High School. One of his teammates was the late beloved physician, Dr. John F. McCuskey. At West Virginia University Jack completed the 4-year course in 3 years, starred on the track team, founded and was captain of the golf team. Until yesterday he remained one of West Virginia's finest golfers.

"He was able, hard working, and successful in business, where he filled increasingly responsible positions in the banking and insurance fields. Had he stayed with us, there is no doubt in my mind that he would have become one of the country's leading insurance executives.

"In civic affairs, for almost 30 years he had been a driving force for better public and higher education in West Virginia. Wood County's good schools are a tribute to him. He vigorously supported Harrison County's school levy last year. He was a member and leader of chambers of commerce, area development groups, and highway associations.

"In politics he was a driving, high principled, and uncompromisingly honest man. He breathed new life into his party, long out of power before he became its State chairman. He had penetrating judgment in political matters and he could spot a phony a block away. Jack's stature can perhaps be measured by this inscription on a photograph hanging in his office: 'To John D. Hoblitzell, Jr., with warm regard and high esteem for a distinguished citizen, from Dwight D. Eisenhower.'

"But it was not his achievements and honors that endeared Jack Hoblitzell to me. It was his vitality, his genuine and enormous interest in people, his unpublished generosity, his unselfish help to everyone who sought it, his joyful exuberance, the remarkable candor with which he viewed first himself and then others, his unfeigned kindness to those who needed it most—the very old and the very young.

"All the hundreds of us who were lucky enough to know Jack well are grieved at his passing. To Charlotte and Pat, Julie and Johnny go the sympathy and prayers of each of us. It will not be soon that as fine a person as Jack Hoblitzell comes my way again."

HOBLITZELL DEATH BLOW TO STATE

Back in 1958 when he was running for the U.S. Senate, Jack Hoblitzell made a speech in one of the southern coalfield towns. Other people running for public office also made speeches on that particular night, but only Hoblitzell broke with tradition.

Where the others followed the time-honored thesis of "say nothing but say it well," Hoblitzell committed the heresy of speaking as a conservative in an area of New Deal liberality. Next day we called him to talk about it.

"What are you trying to do, Senator," we asked, "kill yourself before your campaign gets off the ground?"

"What do you mean, Sport?" he retorted jovially.

When we explained that conservatism hadn't won an election in the coalfields since Herbert Hoover, he reminded us that he couldn't break faith with his philosophy. "I'm a conservative," he said firmly. "I can't talk one way and vote another. If I have to be dishonest to win, I guess I'll have to lose."

And that, dear friends, is the late Jack Hoblitzell as we knew him—honest to the core.

Our paths seldom crossed between our undergraduate years at West Virginia University and the 1956 election campaign, but when they did he was always speaking from the heart for some particular cause. Usually it was education, but now and then it was republicanism.

He had strong convictions and was not one to keep them to himself. If he were in a crowd of 5 or 500 he spoke about them, and invariably it was in the manner of one who felt tomorrow was too late and he had to get some converts before sunset.

Hoblitzell came forcefully onto the 1956 political scene after losing in a bid for the fourth district congressional seat. He was elected State Democratic chairman, and immediately set to work building a unified party out of one that had long been beset by factionalism. He was successful in this, but unity was not his greatest accomplishment in that year of political upheaval.

He rightly sensed the mood of the times and put his people to work capitalizing on it. Public respect for the Democratic Party had been waning for some years, but it took Hoblitzell and a small group of the party faithful to turn the tide. They did it with one master stroke.

This was when, upon discovering a gray page in the past of Democratic gubernatorial candidate Bob Mollohan, they channeled the news story about it into the Democratic press. Had they followed the usual course of passing it out to the Republican press it would have had the odor of propaganda. But by doing the unusual they gave it the aura of a legitimate exposé.

Immediately the well-financed Mollohan organization fell apart, and by the time it picked up the pieces the election was over. For the first time in a quarter century Hoblitzell and his neophyte organization had put the Republicans in control of the statehouse, plus giving them a seat in the U.S. Senate and two in the House.

In the months that followed Republicans by the thousands swarmed into Charleston looking for jobs. Out of office for so long, they all thought they should sit in the seat next to the Governor, and to Hoblitzell fell the unpopular task of keeping them happy while fitting together a workable administration.

He made mistakes, as any man would under such pressure. For one thing he set up a rigid conference schedule with job seekers. Next, he made it clear that proven ability as a votegetter was no guarantee that those having it could have the gold off the dome. This angered some county and precinct bosses.

But aroused tempers didn't especially bother Hoblitzell. He and Cecil Underwood had settled on a philosophy, and it was that political integrity was to be the trademark of the administration. In other words, responsibility in office was to be the keynote, and Hoblitzell adhered steadfastly to this policy in the people he selected or recommended for important posts.

It was good for West Virginia, but it didn't bring any long-term rewards to the Republican Party. Partisans denied the rich spoils

they had long dreamed of went home and sulked right through the next two elections, and they as much as the resurging Democratic tides of 1958 and 1960 put their party out of office.

Hoblitzell gave up the chairmanship when he was named to the Senate upon the death of M. M. Neely. But he never escaped from the party's inner circle. From then until his death earlier this month he remained as fundraiser, top adviser, and the party's conscience.

During his years as a leader the Republican Party rose to new stature. He gave it something undefinable but very worthwhile, and some of it rubbed off. His death was as much a blow to the two-party system in West Virginia as it was to the Republican Party.

Rural Electrification and Telephones, or, How You Gonna Keep 'Em Down on the Farm?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in the State of Illinois, at the time REA was created in 1935, only 28,379 farms, or 12.3 percent, were receiving central station electric service. REA estimated that 152,000 farms in the State or 98.3 percent of all farms recorded in the 1959 census of agriculture, were being served by June 30, 1960. Of these electrified farms, 51.8 percent were being served by REA borrowers.

The first REA loan in the State was approved in September 1935 and the first REA-financed line placed in operation on May 6, 1936 by the Suburban Electric Corp., of Dunlap, Ill., which is in my congressional district. Up to July 1, 1961, REA had approved $134,884,525 in electric loans in the State to 29 borrowers, 28 of them cooperatives. One of these, the Suburban Electric Corp., has discharged its financial obligation to REA.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that 98 out of every 100 farm families in Illinois are served by electrical power and commend REA for their assistance in this project. Frankly, the REA and the coops it helps to finance have done such a good job that, in many places, they are running out of rural customers.

Many people are now becoming alarmed over the fact that federally subsidized electric cooperatives are engaging in a new type of unfair competition with American business. They are moving into the field of industrial development. Among those who are concerned are the 1,600,994 paid-up member families of the American Farm Bureau in 49 States.

I therefore wish to include at this point, the 1962 Farm Bureau resolution on rural electrification and telephones:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND TELEPHONES

We continue to support rural electric and telephone cooperatives organized and operated in accordance with accepted cooperative principles and practices. Further development and growth of these cooperatives call for the active and loyal support of member patrons who understand their responsibilities for supporting and helping finance them. Local ownership by well informed members is the best safeguard for true cooperative principles.

It is time to make certain that the members of rural electric cooperatives can obtain full and complete member ownership and control. Ownership and control should be clearly secured in the hands of the patrons. We recommend that member equities be made transferable to eligible persons on the books of the cooperative at any time.

We urge members of rural electric cooperatives to study the bylaws of their associations and to make certain that they contain provisions that make it mandatory to (1) allocate annually the equities of individual members and inform each member of the amount in his equity account and (2) require approval by a majority of patrons before the principal assets and business of the cooperative can be sold.

Power shortages and inadequate grids or transmission lines continue to be a major problem in supplying adequate power to farmers in many areas. We support sound and economic developments to assure farm people adequate electric service.

We urge power companies to expand their facilities to meet the increasing demand of farm people at reasonable cost. We urge efforts on the part of both the private companies and rural electric cooperatives to reach agreements that will be in the best longtime interest of all concerned.

If satisfactory agreements cannot be reached for necessary amounts of energy for farm use at competitive rates, we support the use of Rural Electrification Administration funds to finance the generation and transmission facilities farmers need. We oppose any efforts to change the present law which makes this possible.

Where further expansion or improvement of power production is contemplated, serious consideration should be given to the possibility of seeking funds for the program on an investment basis from members of the cooperatives. If revisions in legislation or regulations are needed in order to permit such procedures, we will support the necessary changes.

Many factors affecting the operations of rural electric cooperatives have changed materially since Congress authorized "area coverage" in 1944. Consideration should be given to all factors, including the interest cost of Government borrowing, when ascertaining future interest rates. We recommend that a study be made to establish criteria to determine conditions under which some cooperatives, particularly those serving sparsely settled areas, could obtain money at interest rates less than the cost of the money to the Government.

We oppose any plan or effort to convert rural electric cooperatives into a public power system.

We do not believe rural electric cooperatives should participate in financing the rural areas development program. We recommend that they confine their activities to the purposes for which they were organized.

Congressman Walter on Nonsked Airline Finances—Installment I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, Congressman FRANCIS WALTER has reviewed the financial reports of nonscheduled airlines certificated by the Civil Aeronautics Board in a statement delivered before the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Monday, January 8, 1962. Under unanimous consent, I include the statement in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE FRANCIS E. WALTER, DEMOCRAT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES SUBCOMMITTEE ON MONDAY, JANUARY 8, 1962

Gentlemen, I thank you for the opportunity to appear before you on this important matter.

As you know, my interest stems from the Imperial Airlines crash at Richmond, Va., November 8, 1961, in which 29 boys from my district were killed. Initial information about that accident was so disturbing that I began looking in detail into the nonscheduled or supplemental carriers as a group. I have decided that the most helpful contribution I can make to your investigation is to summarize for you the facts I have been able to gather thus far on these companies.

I am very concerned about what I have investigated, and I hope the matters I have discovered will help lead to early legislation that will put this house in order.

It is my understanding that there are now approximately 32 carriers holding authority as nonscheduled or supplemental carriers. Without going into details of the type of authority they possessed earlier, the present authority of approximately 25 of them consists of certificates awarded by the Civil Aeronautics Board in the Large Irregular Air Carrier Investigation, CAB docket 5132, in January 1959. Some of the certificates were for 2 years, the rest for 5. They gave each company unlimited domestic charter right, plus the right to operate 10 round trips per month in individually ticketed business on each of as many domestic routes as a carrier might wish.

The court of appeals held that this award was illegal. Before appeal from this decision could come before the Supreme Court, the Congress, at the end of the session in 1960, passed a law simply extending for 20 months the authority which had been granted by the CAB. The idea was to give Congress time to decide either to let the authority of these carriers expire at the end of the 20 months, or to enact permanent legislation governing the type of authority to be given them. The 20-month law expires March 14 of this year.

The Supreme Court, therefore, did not pass a judgment on the case. It returned it to the court of appeals which is retaining jurisdiction pending a decision by the Congress.

The authority of some of the remaining six or seven carriers, which preexisted the Board's decision, was continued pending further hearings on the qualifications of those carriers, and two are new supplements which have been certificated by the Board since its decision in docket 5132.

The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, in its Report No. 1177 of September 13, 1961, on H.R. 7318, said of the Board's decision in docket 5132:

"The so-called certificates issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board to the supplementals were illegal. This illegality was not a mere technical infraction of the act. It was fundamental. The 10-flight individually ticketed grant violated basic principles of the economic regulatory philosophy of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958."

I have made a careful and detailed examination of the past record and fitness of these companies and, while the following is by no means a complete summary, it reveals what I think will cause this committee and the entire Congress the gravest concern.

Before beginning this review, one word about "fitness". The word "fit" is not used

by mere chance. It is a word of art. It is probably the single most important word in the entire statute. The Federal Aviation Act, using precisely the same phrase as was in its predecessor, the Civil Aeronautics Act, ever since its enactment in 1938, says in part that "The Board shall issue a certificate authorizing the * * * transportation covered by the application, if it finds that the applicant is fit, willing, and able to perform such transportation properly, and to conform to the provisions of this Act and the rules, regulations and requirements of the Board * * *" (sec. 401(d)(1)).

The statute does not say "somewhat fit", or "partially fit". It says fit. One of the grounds for the Court of Appeals' reversal of the Board's decision in Docket 5132 was precisely on this basis, for the Board did not require that each of the carriers show that it was "fit" to do all the things its certificate would authorize, but instead certificated them as a group, in effect allowing one carrier to "trade" on the qualifications of another. The Court, in effect, said that by the plain words of the statute this was obvious error. Moreover, the Board not only said it would not require such high standards of fitness of this group of carriers as it does of others, but it even went further and divided this group into the "more fit", to which it gave 5-year certificates, and the "less fit" to which it therefore gave 2-year certificates. Thus the Board in effect said there are three different standards of fitness.

Now let's look at the record of each of these carriers to see just how fit they are.

First, there is a group of six that reportedly are bankrupt. These appear to be: Arctic-Pacific, Inc.; Aviation Corp. of Seattle (doing business as Westair Transport); Conner Air Lines, Inc.; General Airways, Inc.; Miami Airline, Inc.; Transocean Air Lines.

I want to make clear that I have not yet been able to see the official bankruptcy documents as to each of these carriers. However, I have been informed that each is bankrupt, and the data in balance sheets, sent me by the CAB, certainly indicates this. Miami Airlines, for instance, as of September 30, 1960, reported to the Board current assets of $16,200 versus current liabilities of $316,600. Earned surplus was minus $714,000. This appears to be its latest report to the Board. Transocean, September 30, 1961, reported $1,181,000 current assets, $16,657,000 current liabilities, and a net worth deficit of $18,079,000.

What is the relevance of this? The entire history of air transportation shows that safety is not only intimately related to financial well-being, but, in fact, just plain depends on it. The Civil Aeronautics Act itself arose largely from the bad accident record of carriers that were going broke in the mid-1930's and were consequently shaving maintenance and other expenditures without which you cannot have air safety.

Second, when a company goes bankrupt the creditors are left holding the bag, and in the case of the nonskeds, one of the main creditors has over many long years been the U.S. Government, with unpaid bills for fuel, oil, maintenance, supplies, and services of many kinds. Precisely in the amount that these bills have proved uncollectible, these carriers have obviously been subsidized by the taxpayers of the Nation. In the case of Transocean, for instance, I am advised that the Air Force has stated that $108,497 for fuel and oil alone is uncollectible, while I have a copy of a filing by the Government in the bankruptcy proceedings in which the Government claims over $365,000.

There is no better example of the relationship between safety and financial ability than Arctic-Pacific, whose crash at Toledo October 29, 1960, killed most of the members of the California Polytechnic football team. That carrier also appeared to be shot through with mismanagement and, in fact, downright indifference to whether great risks were taken. Reports were that the pilots took off below minimums, that the management suppressed or destroyed adverse ratings of pilot competence, and that unrecorded flights were conducted. The man behind the company, James Springer, then moved into another air transport operation on the west coast, listing himself as only an expediter in the company's personnel roster, apparently to conceal what later hearings indicated was his actual control of the company. Operations were flown which some pilots refused to fly as being unsafe, and a crash killing seven at Travis Air Force Base led to a CAB hearing last December in San Francisco on FAA action to ground the company.

There is an even larger group of 14 carriers which, while apparently not bankrupt, have revealed in the balance sheet they have most recently filed with the CAB conditions which merit the attention of the committee. Balance sheet dates are June 30 and September 30, 1961.

The carriers are: Airline Transport Carriers, Inc. (doing business as California-Hawaiian Airlines); American Flyers Airline Corp.; Associated Air Transport, Inc.; Coastal Air Lines; Modern Air Transport, Inc.; Overseas National Airways; President Airlines, Inc. (formerly called California-Eastern Aviation, Inc.); Saturn Airways, Inc.; Sourdough Air Transport; Standard Airways, Inc.; Stewart Air Service; United States Overseas Airlines, Inc.; Vance Roberts; World Wide Airlines, Inc.

Here are some facts about each of these companies:

1. Airline Transport Carriers, Inc., doing business as California-Hawaiian Airlines:

Earned surplus (deficit)	$167,000
Net worth (deficit)	99,800

Recently declared unfit by MATS for financial inadequacy, substandard maintenance, and marginal operating ability.

CAB bureau counsel moved on January 3 to reopen the record, in the continuation of hearings in docket 5132 to determine whether this company's authority will be continued, on the ground that investigation of the company's books by the CAB Bureau of Enforcement last October revealed incorrect balance sheets filed with the CAB for both December 1960, and June 1961. Bureau counsel stated that the carrier listed current liabilities as long-term debt, thus distorting its current ratio from an actual 1 to 6.6 to a purported 1.6 to 1.

He added that "in view of the carrier's apparent, and possibly willful violations of the Board's reporting requirement in submitting financial reports, the ability and desire of the carrier to adhere to the Board's rules and regulations becomes subject to much doubt."

2. American Flyers Airline Corp.:

Current liabilities	$252,500
Current assets	107,500
Working capital ____ deficit	145,000
Earned surplus ____ do	49,700
Net worth ____ do	44,700

3. Associated Air Transport, Inc.:

Current liabilities	354,000
Current assets	152,000
Working capital ____ deficit	202,000
Earned surplus ____ do	162,500
Capital surplus ____ do	12,400
Net worth	174,900

Recently declared unfit by MATS for financial inadequacy, substandard maintenance, and substandard quality of service. Official CAB accident reports show that this carrier has had three accidents in the past 4 years.

4. Coastal Air Lines:

Current liabilities	$29,700
Current assets	11,200
Working capital ____ deficit	18,500
Earned surplus ____ do	64,400
Net worth ____ do	55,900

The company did only $6,750 of business in 1961. It owns no flight equipment. Management is at present seeking board approval to sell its supplemental certificate in CAB Docket 12425.

5. Modern Air Transport, Inc.:

Current liabilities	$349,600
Current assets	152,500
Working capital ____ deficit	197,100
Earning surplus ____ do	38,300
Net worth ____ do	37,300

6. Overseas National Airways:

Current liabilities (including overhaul reserves)	2,848,000
Current assets	1,223,000
Working capital ____ deficit	1,625,000
Earned surplus ____ do	987,400
Net worth ____ do	887,400

This financial condition is much worse than that of two carriers which MATS has declared financially inadequate. The carrier owned no flight equipment as of September 30, 1961.

This carrier is subject to a CAB cease and desist order in The Overseas National Enforcement Proceeding, Docket 11154, for violating section 401(a) of the act by conducting foreign air transportation without authority, and section 412 by illegally entering into agreements with foreign air carriers. CAB Order E-16895 of June 5, 1961.

The company has also been involved in repeated attempts to fly charters for charter parties that included individual members of the general public, in violation of the Board's North Atlantic charter policy, which, in line with established precedent, has confined charters to members of bona fide, reasonably homogeneous groups. See, for instance, CAB Orders E-12575, E-12608, E-12654, E-12655, E-12669, E-12742, E-12992 in 1958.

7. President Airlines, Inc. (successor to California-Eastern Aviation, Inc.):

Although I requested of the CAB a balance sheet for each carrier, I did not receive one for President, and therefore assume the carrier has not filed with the CAB as required. I am informed, however, that MATS has recently declared the company financially unfit.

This is the company which stranded the Chicago charter group at Shannon Airport, Ireland, and and the Los Angeles charter group in London, last fall. As I recall, the press reported the stranding at Shannon as due to refusal of the airport authorities to release the plane until payment of delinquent landing fees and fuel and oil bills.

On September 10, 1961, a President plane crashed on takeoff at Shannon, killing 83 persons.

To the best of my knowledge, the CAB has not revoked the certificate of this carrier.

(See "CAB and FAA Negligence—Installment II" in Appendix of today's RECORD for remainder of Congressman WALTER's statement.)

Resolution Adopted by the Atlantic AMVETS Post No. 1, Atlantic, Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE ATLANTIC AMVETS POST NO. 1, ATLANTIC, IOWA

We, the members of the Atlantic AMVETS Post No. 1, meeting in a duly authorized and regular session, this 24th day of January, 1962, in Atlantic, Iowa, do hereby strongly protest the below enumerated facts:

1. Eight Yugoslav Communist airmen are being trained in America; and,

2. One-hundred and thirty-five U.S. F-86D Sabrejet fighters have been sold to Communist Yugoslavia since January 15, 1961; and,

3. Seventy Navy TV-2 aircraft sold to Communist Yugoslavia; and,

4. Since 1949, over $2 billion in loans and grants given to Communist Yugoslavia (Tito); and,

5. Tito of Communist Yugoslavia has given 100-percent support to Communist Russia and all other Communist colonial possessions, especially to the Communist regime in Cuba; and,

6. The incredible $92½ billion budget, is the largest in any peacetime history; and,

7. Committee meetings are being held behind closed doors, being kept secret from the press and the taxpaying public; and,

8. Communist propaganda is flooding the United States, without paying any postal rates; and,

9. The U.S. taxpayers are now being asked to reimburse the bankrupt United Nations with $100 million bond issues with no proper collateral and with a record of only one failure after another; and,

10. The foreign policies are being carried out by appointed men in the State Department, where much is kept secret from our duly elected representatives in Congress and the U.S. Senate, with one failure after another; e.g., Cuban fiasco, the "naked aggression in Katanga," Laos, Goa, Indonesia, Congo, etc.: therefore we, the members of the Atlantic AMVETS Post No. 1, do hereby

Resolve, That our duly elected representatives in Congress and the Senate, use the full powers of their good offices to:

1. Remove from the United States any members of the military of any Communist countries that are now receiving or are about to receive training from the Government of the United States of America; and that they,

2. Immediately cancel any contract to any Communist country for the sale of any military equipment, current or obsolete, or material that might be converted into weapons of war; and that they should,

3. Determine who in the U.S. State Department and the Defense Department is responsible for the sale of the military equipment to Communist countries and the current training of Communist military personnel, and to have those found to be responsible removed immediately from any and all offices or any duties for the U.S. Government, and to take such proper disciplinary action against such individuals found to have been responsible for such "errors" in their duties to our Nation; and,

4. Enforce, without further delay, the Monroe Doctrine this hemisphere; and,

5. If the United Nations prevents, or attempts to prevent, the United States from taking unilateral action against Communist Cuba, and if the United Nations is unable, or unwilling, to gain complete victory over worldwide communism and the Communist colonialism, now, then the United States should sever all relations with the United Nations and also sever all relations with Russian communism and the Russian communistic colonialism in their worldwide possessions—

We must get rid of Castro and the Communist regime in Cuba, and do it now; and,

6. We must win the cold war now and not wait 20 years for some negotiated peace—there is nothing to be negotiated; and,

7. Return the power of our Government back to our duly elected Congress and Senators, taking the reins of Government out of the hands of the appointed bureaucrats, with open meetings of all committee meetings, including the House Appropriations Committee meetings, to be open to the press and the taxpaying public, in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1946; and,

8. Put an end to executive sessions, except where the national security is involved; and,

9. Avoid all outside pressure groups, and Council on Foreign Relations pressures in conducting our foreign affairs. Let's all work to keep America free and strong.

JAMES L. SMALLEY,
Post Commander.
CARROLL HAYES,
Adjutant and Finance Officer.

CAB and FAA Oversight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the January 24, 1962 issue of the San Francisco News-Call Bulletin an editorial supporting my claim that the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Aviation Agency have not been enforcing their regulations which apply to operations of nonscheduled airlines with due diligence.

Under leave granted, I include the editorial to be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[San Francisco News-Call Bulletin, January 24, 1962]

FATAL NEGLIGENCE

Nearly 13 months after the tragedy, the Civil Aeronautics Board has put together a report on the plane crash at Toledo which killed the pilots, 16 members of the California Poly football team and 4 others—22 in all.

The plane, which crashed on takeoff October 29, 1960, was operated by one of the so-called nonscheduled airlines now under fire as a result of other fatal crashes. This company, Arctic-Pacific, since has gone bankrupt, and no claims have been paid, because the insurance company holds the plane was not airworthy.

The CAB blames the dead pilots and the company management for flagrant disregard of safety regulations. It blames the Federal Aviation Agency for failure to check the equipment and keep tabs on Arctic-Pacific's operation.

But the report doesn't say anything about the company's severe financial problems, which doubtless contributed to the gamble on the fatal flight and for which CAB is accountable. Even now, the CAB has not canceled the company's certificate.

The story of the crash near Richmond last November is comparable. This, too, was a chartered plane from a "nonsked" airline with a shaky financial situation. In this disaster, 74 Army recruits died—for the plane had been chartered by the Defense Department.

Neither of these "accidents" would have happened, it seems to us, if those responsible for safety and competence in the air had been doing their jobs.

There are two basic reasons for Government regulation of the flying industry: The necessity for allocating routes and the enforcement of safety. It is not the Government's function to prop up an ailing company, or to wink at its weaknesses. No more than it is Government's function to apportion the business according to some bureaucratic whim, or according to the pressure one faction or another can apply.

The CAB has been asking Congress for more power, but judging by the Arctic-Pacific report it hasn't used the power it has.

When Congress gets to legislating in this field, as it apparently intends to, it should keep in mind only two things: a maximum of public safety and a maximum of free enterprise. We don't care how many airlines there are, or what type, so long as they are competent and safe.

Foreign Investment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a memorandum on foreign investment prepared by Mr. Percy L. Douglas, president of the Otis Elevator Co., which takes issue with the Treasury Department's contention that foreign investment, particularly in advanced countries, adversely affects our balance of payments. Mr. Douglas points out that although Otis has preferred to supply foreign markets by exporting from the United States, it was at times necessary to locate abroad in order to maintain its position in elevator markets throughout the world. Despite an initial adverse effect on the balance of payments, Otis has over the past 15 years brought into the United States more than $12 million for each million sent out in loans and investment.

Mr. Douglas also points out that over 90 percent of the $63 million worth of equipment Otis has exported over the past 15 years has gone to countries where Otis has its own organization. This investment, therefore, has not resulted in an export of jobs as claimed by the Treasury Department but is the direct cause of a great many jobs which otherwise would not exist.

Mr. Speaker, we should not be too hasty to assume that so-called preferred treatment of income earned abroad by business firms is harmful to our domestic economy or to our balance of payments. The improved competi-

tive position of European manufacturers will leave many American industries with the choice of participating from within the European market through investment in Europe or leaving it altogether. Nor should we be mislead by the short-range disadvantages of foreign investment without considering also the long-range returns which they provide.

I can highly recommend Mr. Douglas' report to those in the House who are concerned with the vital issues of reciprocal trade and tax reform now before the Congress and the country, and therefore would like to insert it in the RECORD at this point:

THE COMPANY'S FOREIGN INVESTMENTS

(Memorandum by P. L. Douglas, president, Otis Elevator Co., January 20, 1962)

The experience of Otis Elevator Co. does not support the contention of the U.S. Treasury that foreign investment, particularly in advanced countries, adversely affects our balance of payments: over the past 15 years, Otis has brought into the United States $115,401,000 and sent out in loans and investment only $8,418,000, resulting in a net contribution of $106,983,000 to a favorable balance (table No. 1). In 1960 alone, the net contribution was nearly $11 million and it is expected that this net annual amount will continue to increase, provided Otis continues to increase its foreign investment in plant and equipment abroad commensurate with the growth of the economies of the countries it serves.

In 1900, due to the growth of local competitors, Otis found it necessary to establish its first factory in Europe in order to maintain its position in an elevator market that had been supplied previously by exports from the Otis factory in Yonkers, N.Y. In accordance with Otis' policy of maintaining an active participation in all elevator markets, throughout the world, more Otis factories were subsequently established in European and other countries as local competition continued to develop, and today we operate factories in 15 countries as shown on table No. 2. But Otis at all times has preferred to supply foreign markets by exporting from the United States and investments in foreign manufacturing facilities have been made only when they were necessary to maintain the Otis participation in a foreign market.

Of course, the initial foreign investment in a new area will usually have an adverse effect on the balance of payments and this may continue for a few years until the operation is established and making a profit. But thereafter for years to come, the dividends and fees generated by the investment will contribute favorably to our balance of payments positions on an increasing scale. Had more companies become interested in foreign markets 50 years ago we would have far less worry about our balance of payments today. We need to encourage more foreign investment by our industrial companies and we must realize that with the rapid growth of foreign industries the opportunities to enter oversea markets are dwindling while the costs involved are increasing. Discouraging foreign investment now will probably mean sacrificing forever an opportunity to generate substantial dollar remittances for the future. Otis, over a 15-year period, has brought into the United States more than $12 million for each million sent out and this performance can be multiplied hundreds of times over if foreign investment by other American companies is encouraged, particularly if investments are made in the developed countries before the door closes and it is too late.

The experience of Otis Elevator Co., also, does not support the contention of the U.S. Treasury that foreign investment results in the export of jobs. Over the past 15 years Otis has exported over $63 million worth of equipment (table No. 1), nearly 90 percent of which has gone to countries where Otis has its own organization (table No. 3). Furthermore, about half of our exports go to countries where Otis has its own factories (table No. 3). We are convinced that if we had not invested abroad and established our own organization with our own factories where necessary, the present volume of our exports would be only a small percentage of what it actually is.

The cost of producing identical equipment abroad is far less than the production cost in this country and, as our product has a high labor content, the differential of 3 to 1 between foreign and U.S. labor rates is a very important factor (table No. 4). A couple of years ago a trial shipment of European equipment was made for use in seven different buildings in the United States. After paying the cost of export packaging, the freight across the Atlantic Ocean, and about 14½ percent duty, Otis made more profit on the imported equipment than we would have made if the equipment had been shipped from our American plants. To reverse the process and export competitively to European markets under these conditions is obviously impossible. Nor is the situation likely to improve since the differential between European wages and salaries and those of the United States continues to widen on the basis of dollars and cents. Percentagewise the trend may indicate that the gap is decreasing, but business is done on a dollars-and-cents basis and not by percentages.

Finally, the experience of Otis Elevator Co. does not support the U.S. Treasury's contention that foreign investment detracts from investment in the United States because, as indicated above, foreign investment by Otis is invariably dictated by forces beyond our control. Investments are necessary if we are to maintain our objective of participation in all elevator markets of the world. It is only when foreign production facilities are necessary to the accomplishment of this objective that an investment is made abroad; when such investments are made, it is never at the expense or in preference to investment in the United States.

Otis Elevator Co.—Cash flow to the United States from foreign operations

[In thousands]

Year	Dividends from subs	Profit from branches	Fees and royalty	Goods and services exported	Total receipts	Total disbursed
1946	$197	$300	$109	$3,709	$4,315	
1947	96	404	175	6,668	7,343	
1948	352	260	271	5,504	6,387	
1949	857	538	255	5,502	7,152	$480
1950	1,437	376	442	3,121	5,376	188
1951	1,708	436	640	4,214	6,998	1,191
1952	1,447	485	457	6,097	8,486	67
1953	1,270	472	748	3,826	6,316	278
1954	1,885	465	675	3,960	6,985	989
1955	2,736	427	963	3,338	7,464	762
1956	2,690	607	779	4,972	9,048	1,142
1957	3,680	415	1,358	4,298	9,751	224
1958	3,390	1,056	1,385	2,785	8,616	2,379
1959	4,003	540	1,199	2,701	8,533	583
1960	5,629	432	1,991	2,755	10,807	135
Total	31,467	7,213	11,447	[1] 63,450	113,577	[2] 8,418
Repatriation of capital and repayment of loans and advances					1,824	
Grand total receipts					115,401	
Less total disbursements					8,418	
Net inflow to United States					106,983	

[1] Exports direct to agents and customers totaling $10,570,000 excluded because they involve substantial amounts of imported equipment.
[2] Comprises investment ($5,076,000) plus loans and advances ($3,342,000).

OTIS ELEVATOR CO. SUBSIDIARIES OPERATING OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Domestic

Otis Elevator Co.: A Delaware corporation with branches in the Far East, the Bahamas, Bermuda, Costa Rica, and Guatemala.

Otis Elevator Co.: A Maine corporation with branches in Argentina,* the Dominican Republic, Panama, Puerto Rico, Uruguay,* and other South America countries.

Foreign

Otis Elevator Co. Pty. Ltd. (Australia).*
Ascenseurs Otis S.A. (Belgium).*
Elevadores Otis S.A. (Brazil).*
Otis Elevator Co. Limited (Canada).*
Otis Elevator Co. (Egypt) S.A.E.
Ascenseurs Otis (France).*
Flohr-Otis G.m.b.H., Berlin (Germany).*
Otis Elevator Co. (India) Ltd.*
Stigler-Otis S.p.A. (Italy).*
Toyo Otis Elevator Co. (Japan).*
Elevadores Otis, S.A. (Mexico).*
Otis Elevator Co. (Holland) N.V.*
Otis Elevator Co. Limited (New Zealand).
Otis Elevator Co. Limited (South Africa).*
Otis Elevator Co. Limited (United Kingdom).*

* Operates a factory.

Otis Elevator Co. exports from the United States 1959–60 combined (thousands omitted)

1. By regions:	
North America	$2,322
Europe and United Kingdom	474
Other developed	410
Total developed regions	3,206
Underdeveloped regions	[1] 3,739
Total	6,945
2. By factories:	
Countries with Otis factories	3,428
Countries without Otis factories	[1] 3,517
Total	6,945
3. By representation:	
Countries with Otis offices	6,142
Countries covered by agents	[1] 803
Total	6,945

[1] Includes an undetermined amount of equipment purchased by the domestic company from foreign factories and resold to branches or agents. Such resales estimated at not over $500,000.

Otis Elevator Co.—Cost of factory labor, hourly base wage plus fringe benefits, 1961 [1]

	Otis factory average	Skilled fitter [2]
Europe:		
England	$0.91	$0.93
France	1.00	1.02
Germany	.88	1.04
Italy	.91	1.09
Pacific and Southern Hemisphere:		
Australia	1.38	1.55
Japan	.75	1.17
South Africa	.69	1.43
North America:		
Canada	2.33	2.60
United States	2.89	3.25

[1] Overtime and premium pay not included.
[2] Mechanic who assembles precision elements of driving mechanisms of elevators.

List of Boys From 10th District of Indiana, Who Have Been Nominated To Compete for Academy Appointments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the Appendix the list of those boys from the 10th District of Indiana, which district I have the pleasure and honor to represent, who have been nominated by me to compete for appointment to the various Academies:

LIST OF BOYS FROM 10TH DISTRICT OF INDIANA, WHO HAVE BEEN NOMINATED TO COMPETE FOR ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS

Congressman RALPH HARVEY, of Indiana's 10th Congressional District has announced the names of the young men who are nominees for appointment to the military Academies. In making the announcement, HARVEY said that his nominees must now compete in a battery of Academy-administered examinations for the vacancies available for the 10th District. This district is entitled to have one appointment each to West Point and to the Air Force Academy. There is no appointment available for this district to the Naval Academy in 1962.

Following are those who will compete for the West Point appointment: Robin Brown, nephew of Mr. and Mrs. Owen D. Brown, Rural Route 1, Mooreland; Richard Hughes, son of Mr. and Mrs. Austin M. Hughes, Rural Route 5, Greenfield; Larry Marlin, son of Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Marlin, Farmland; and Ted Orton, son of Mr. and Mrs. Dillard Orton, Rural Route 3, Liberty.

Competing for the Air Force appointment will be: Ronald Archbold, son of Mr. and Mrs. Russell Archbold, Rural Route 6, Connersville; Larry Bowmer, son of Mr. and Mrs. Richard E. Bowmer, Williamsburg; John Bredewater, son of Mr. and Mrs. Arthur J. Bredewater, Rural Route 7, Greensburg; Darrell Breithaupt, son of Mr. and Mrs. Irwin Breithaupt, 464 Southwest Fourth Street, Richmond; Robert E. Ditslear, son of Mr. and Mrs. Robert E. Ditslear, Sr., 603 North West Street, Winchester; Karl Fant, son of Mr. and Mrs. Karl E. Fant, 303 South Fifteenth Street, New Castle; Gary Fudge, son of Mr. and Mrs. Everett M. Fudge, 501 West School Street, Centerville; Robert Hampton, son of Mr. and Mrs. Robert Hampton, 531 National Road West, Richmond; Ronal Henley, son of Mr. and Mrs. Merle W. Henley, Jr., 250 South Twenty-seventh Street, Richmond; Curtis Jessup, son of Mr. and Mrs. Harold M. Jessup, 1230 Grand Avenue, Connersville; and William Strong, son of Mr. and Mrs. Fred Strong, 233 South Broadway, Albany.

James Roberts, son of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph P. Roberts, 922 South Fifteenth Street, New Castle, will be the only nominee from this district for appointment to the Merchant Marine Academy. He will compete against all other nominees, statewide, for one of the seven appointments allotted to Indiana.

All nominees have been notified by Congressman HARVEY of their nominations for possible appointments. Mr. HARVEY said that, based on the results of the competitive examinations, he will make known the names of the appointees early in April.

Congressman Walter on Non-Sked Airlines Finances—Installment II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I have placed Installment I of a statement by Congressman FRANCIS WALTER concerning financial reports of certain nonscheduled airlines certificated by the Civil Aeronautics Board in the appendix of today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Under unanimous consent, I include Installment II of same in the Appendix of the RECORD of this day:

8. Saturn Airways, Inc:

Current liabilities (including overhaul reserves of $46,700)	$720,900
Current assets	69,000
Working capital ____ deficit	$605,200

Saturn's balance sheet contains a statement of total liabilities and computation of net worth which is thoroughly confusing and unintelligible to me and I hereby request an immediate audit of it by the CAB. The above statement also reflects a poorer condition than that of the two carriers declared financially inadequate by MATS.

9. Sourdough:

Current liabilities	$12,000
Current assets	6,900
Working capital ____ deficit	5,100
Flight equipment totals only	20,000

The committee may want to pause to consider these figures. What kind of a plane do you own for $20,000?

In a proceeding to revoke this carrier's operating authority for dormancy, the Board, while acknowledging that the carrier had been dormant, held that it would not be in the public interest and that no useful purpose would be served by revoking such authority. Order E-14620 of November 9, 1959. The Board had announced in its 1955 decision in docket 5132, that it intended to revoke carriers for dormancy because of the repeated history of such certificates being acquired by illegal operators who continued their illegal operations under the purchased certificate upon revocation of prior authority. The Board's reason for Order E-14620 was that its decision in docket 5132 was in litigation.

10. Standard Airways, Inc.:

Current liabilities	$387,000
Current assets	251,200
Working capital ____ deficit	136,500
Earned surplus ____ do	23,500

Recently declared unfit by MATS for substandard maintenance and unsatisfactory standards of service.

11. Stewart Air Service:

Current assets reported by the carrier as minus $2,170 with cash on hand of minus $3,251. I have never heard of having an asset that is a minus dollar amount. Current liabilities are $70,594, for a working capital deficit of, I gather, $72,764.

I request a CAB audit and explanation of this balance sheet. This appears particularly necessary, in view of CAB Order E-12877 of August 11, 1958, ordering this carrier to cease and desist from violating the Board's regulations by failing to supply requested revisions, corrections or explanations to financial reports required by the Board. The company had failed to respond to such CAB requests until after docketing of the petition for enforcement in that proceeding.

12. United States Overseas Airlines, Inc.:

Current liabilities	$3,422,500
Current assets	1,526,000
Working capital ____ deficit	1,896,500
Earned surplus ____ do	1,714,000
Net worth ____ do	1,421,700

This is a financial status much worse than that of the two carriers MATS has disapproved on the ground of financial inadequacy.

One of the statutory requirements is that a carrier be fit, willing, and able "* * * to conform to the provisions of this Act and the rules, regulations, and requirements of the Board * * *" (Federal Aviation Act, section 401(d)(1)).

In 1960 there was a finding that this company violated section 403 of the act by exchanging transportation for advertising, publicity and/or promotional goods and services, thus receiving compensation other than the fares specified in its tariffs. Order E-15999, November 7, 1960, docket 10979.

Last month the Board ordered the carrier to cease and desist from operating in excess of its authorized 10 flights per month, in violation of section 401(a) of the act, on each of five of the principal routes of the country: New York-Los Angeles, New York-Oakland, New York-Chicago, Chicago-Los Angeles, and Los Angeles-Honolulu. (Order E-17822, docket 10979.)

13. Vance Roberts:

This appears to be a carrier of a size comparable to Sourdough. Current assets are only $2,942, with total assets only $41,838.

This is one of the two companies newly certificated by the Board subsequent to its decision in docket 5132. It is hard to believe that carriers of this size can be of significant value to the military. In addition, it seems fair to question whether the Government should license a company whose total assets are substantially less than the possible value of its operating authority to some illegal operator seeking to buy such authority with which to resume operations.

14. World Wide Airlines, Inc.:

Current liabilities	$110,700
Current assets	48,200
Working capital ____ deficit	62,500
Earned surplus ____ do	238,700
Net worth ____ do	49,400

In an initial decision of May 24, 1961 (docket 5132), recommending a supplemental certificate for this company despite finding that it "is in a weak financial condition"

based on a net worth deficit of $19,160, which is 60 percent less than the net worth deficit shown above, the examiner said, moreover, that the figure of $19,160 probably understated the net worth deficit by at least $105,273 since the asset side included the company's CAB operating authority, valued by the present management at that figure.

A brief history of this carrier follows: Although it has changed hands repeatedly, the CAA at one point when it was controlled by one Eric Pearson in the early 1950's stated that "We will not consider World Wide Airlines, Inc., qualified for an air carrier operating certificate so long as Mr. Pearson is in a position to control or influence the company's actions. * * *" See CAB docket 8680, trial examiner's initial decision of November 6, 1957. Its certificate was revoked June 17, 1954, as the outgrowth of a flight from Los Angeles to Baltimore with an engine not only overdue for overhaul but needing to be changed, and flown by a wildcat crew when World Wide's regular pilots refused to fly the plane. The company did not operate through 1955, 1956, and at least the first 9 months of 1957.

In a proceeding to revoke it for nonuser, the trial examiner noted that, after one abortive attempt at sale of the carrier, Pearson allegedly resold it to Melvin J. Catlett, former chief pilot of SSW, a suplemental which went bankrupt in February 1959 and was suspended by the Board in September 1959 for failure to refund tickets, canceling flights without proper notice, and abandoning its ticket offices without adequate notice to passengers holding tickets and reservations (CAB order E-14490). The examiner indicated a fear that Catlett was only a nominal purchaser, noting that, after Pearson's prior purported sale had gone sour:

"Within a 2-week period, during which the hearing was continued at the request of respondent's counsel, Pearson managed to negotiate the sale of respondent to Catlett. Most unusual about this transaction is the fact that the vendee was not required to put up any cash to seal the agreement. * * * The failure of Catlett to make a downpayment and to show, at the hearing, some evidence of financial fitness suggests the possibility that he may be a nominal purchaser. Thus, contrary to the contention of respondent, the very elements of the Board's reasoning in imposing the 'nonuser' condition in 1955 are present in this case" (initial decision. World-Wide Enforcement case, docket 8680, Nov. 6, 1957).

The examiner also said, citing other cases, that "these cases make is abundantly clear that the Board expects strict compliance with the two consecutive calendar-quarter requirement and that only under exceptional conditions will the Board entertain relief * * *."

These comments by the examiner were in November 1957 and were based on the Board's pronouncement in docket 5132 of a policy of revocation for nonuser. The Board on November 9, 1959, however, dismissed the proceeding on the same grounds as in the Sourdough dismissal. The latest stage is the examiner's decision of May 24, 1961, recommending a certificate, and stating that "the Board has recognized that the service obligations of such a supplemental carrier can be met with minimum financial strength and despite an adverse balance sheet." As of September 30, 1961, the carrier owned no aircraft.

I have previously referred to the problem of illegal combines of carriers formed for the purpose of providing scheduled or daily service while purporting that each carrier in the combine in itself does not operate in excess of its permitted 10 flights per month. This brings us to Blatz Airlines, Inc.; Paul Mantz Air Services (now Paramount Airlines, Inc.); Quaker City Airways, Inc. (now using the name Admiral Airways).

I am sure members of this committee have some knowledge of the Great Lakes-"Skycoach" combine which has been flying with flagrantly excessive frequency, apparently for more than a decade. The authority of the carriers in that combine appears finally to have been revoked by CAB orders, upheld by the Supreme Court. I think there is significant evidence of a plan to shift these operations to some of the carriers named above, just as illegal operators have transferred to other certificates in the past for continued operations despite Board revocation orders.

Lobbyist registrations filed with the Congress last summer appear to show that Paul Mantz, Quaker City, and the Great Lakes combine have the same lobbyists and law firm.

Blatz has in the past carried transcontinental passengers of Currey Air Transport, Ltd., to California destinations beyond Los Angeles, where Currey terminates. This was pursuant to an alleged charter of Blatz aircraft to Currey, which was in the Great Lakes combine. CAB Order E-12987, September 18, 1958, docket 8727. This is a consent cease and desist order which in addition recites many other serious violations of the act by Blatz.

One Charles E. Lewis now purports to own Quaker City. An individual of this name also now heads the Independent Airline Association. See the Washington Post, January 3, 1962, page B-2. It is my understanding that this association of nonskeds has been reported at one time or another to be largely controlled by the Great Lakes combine. As of September 30, 1961, this carrier also owned no aircraft.

The Board in its decision in docket 5132 said of Paul Mantz: "The examiners * * * found the applicant was not disposed to comply with the act and regulations, based upon applicant's illegal participation in the North Star combine * * *. The examiners were clearly correct in their findings of violations, and applicant's participation therein cannot be condoned."

Supposedly the present owner of Paul Mantz Air Services, which as of September 30, 1961, owned no aircraft, is one Theodore J. Bodwell. He has stated that he bought the company from Mantz December 7, 1960. But in a statement to the Congress, July 26, 1961, he said that part of the purchase money came from a loan "of a substantial amount" from one Pierce O'Carroll, of Chicago. Pierce O'Carroll was sole owner and president of Monarch Air Service which was found unfit in the examiners' initial decision of March 29, 1955, docket 5132, in part because of violating the act by participating with Currey and Great Lakes in the Skycoach combine. Bodwell also was a pilot for Great Lakes, beginning in 1953, and became chief pilot in 1959, according to his own statement.

Let us now focus briefly on carriers that the committee may deem unfit purely on safety grounds.

According to the Accident Report, Supplemental Carriers, for 1954 through 1961, by the CAB Bureau of Safety, Capitol Airways, Inc., has had 18 serious accidents, including 13 crashes, in that period. Five of these involved fatalities. The committee is generally familiar with the crash of Imperial, carrying recruits from my district, at Richmond, Va., November 8, 1961, with 77 fatalities. News reports at the time told of engine repair with automobile parts, a girl friend of the crew riding in the cockpit the day before. Also, one of the engines was not operating at the time of the crash and had been bought from an English airline which had discarded it as having been flown too many hours.

I am continuing my investigation of the background of this company.

At this point, gentlemen, I have reviewed 25 of the approximately 32 supplementals, and I am sure that by now the question of what demand exists for their service must have occurred to you.

One of the claims these carriers have repeated over the years is that they are needed by the Department of Defense. It seems to me that in addition to being fit, the other basic test of the Department's need ought to be the equipment they own. Equipment they lease is irrelevant because its availability to the Department of Defense obviously does not depend on the existence of these carriers. Much of it is, in fact, leased from the Department, through the Air Force.

As of September 30, 1961, ignoring DC-3's, C-46's, and 13 DC-4's as being obsolete, 4-engine aircraft of the DC-6 or Constellation type reported as owned by all or virtually all the carriers total 32.

This total must, however, be reduced by eight, two of which have been destroyed in crashes. One belongs to a carrier in bankruptcy, and five belong to companies disqualified by MATS as unfit.

The remaining 24 belong to 7 carriers, 4 of them—American Flyers, Modern, Saturn, and United States Overseas being among those I already have discussed. The semimodern airlift available to the Department of Defense through companies not previously discussed therefore boils down to 13 airplanes owned by 3 carriers.

That is the sum and substance of it—a sharp contrast to assertions made last summer by nonsked representatives of a fleet of around 165 aircraft.

All the facts point to one conclusion: The Imperial Airlines disaster at Richmond has dramatized the financial unfitness, unsafe operations and law violations in the supplemental airline field.

The record makes it clear that we cannot rely on the CAB to regulate this industry and clean up these conditions. I am regretfully convinced that the CAB has emphasized preserving the companies rather than emphasizing the welfare of the public, despite the fact that the public interest is its paramount responsibility under the statute.

I believe it is up to the Congress to see to it that unfit supplemental operators are eliminated and to correct the conditions which have enabled them to exist.

In my judgment this can be done only by narrowing the discretion which the CAB has in regulating these carriers and by sharply reducing the permissible area of their operations. Frankly, gentlemen, I think we are sitting on a powder keg. I urge early congressional action as strongly as I can.

In the meantime, I hereby officially request the Federal Aviation Agency to suspend immediately the air carrier operating certificate of each nonscheduled or supplemental carrier which owes over $1,000 to the Government for any goods or services whatsoever, on accounts more than 30 days old.

If a company does not pay its bills promptly, this must be taken as a prima facie case of such mismanagement of financial weakness that the safety of the operation must be in doubt which the FAA cannot permit.

The only other possible explanation would be that the carrier just did not want to pay. For the Government to grant the right to do business to a company that dodged paying bills it owes to the Government is ridiculous, and cannot be tolerated by Congress.

Further Tariff Slashes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the Trade Relations Council of the United States has prepared an excellent and vigorous document pointing out the fallacies in the President's message to Congress on foreign trade. Feeling that this document would be helpful to our colleagues for reference purposes, under unanimous consent, I insert it in the RECORD:

WASHINGTON, D.C., January 25.—The Trade Relations Council of the United States, the largest coalition of industry and agriculture concerned with the impact of foreign trade on the domestic economy, today made the following comments on President Kennedy's message to Congress:

"Today's message to Congress indicates that the President and the State Department wish to reduce U.S. tariffs, some by 50 percent and others to zero. It is another vast effort of the Executive to seize congressional authority. Our tariffs have already been reduced 80 percent since 1934. If enacted this means that we will, in effect, have 10 percent or less of the tariffs we had 28 years ago.

"Practically speaking, we are the industrialized country with the least restrictions to imports, and this proposal would all but eliminate the tariffs on which we rely.

"Even those countries which have reduced tariffs under the GATT agreements always have retained standby authority to keep out goods from the United States which are really competitive with their own.

"These nations use at least a score of other restrictive devices like licensing, currency controls, purchase taxes, and docking fees. We use none.

"Look at yesterday morning's paper. The Canadians are planning to embargo all U.S. magazines. The Germans have placed an impost of $42 a ton on every ton of wheat from the United States. The effect is to increase the price of U.S. wheat above that of German wheat. And, all flour sold in Germany must be 75 percent composed of German wheat.

"Virtually all U.S. exports of organic chemicals to Britain have been embargoed for a generation. A U.S. compact car, which sells here for $1,974, sells in Britain for $5,700; and for about the same price in France or Italy—and only when they let our cars in at all. Let's not delude ourselves about their sudden policy changes abroad.

"The stated reason for the tariff reductions is the threat of the European Common Market. Yet, that organization is a protectionist arrangement. These countries maintain restricted quotas and other devices against American goods and other non-EEC goods, and have tariffs that are many times higher than our own.

"Congress should not even be asked to write a blank check to meet the possibility that the Common Market will make reciprocal cuts in all its trade barriers—not just in its tariffs.

"We have no assurance whatsoever—and experience clearly disproves—that Europe will let us enter their markets wholesale.

"Are we to assume that granting the Executive this wide authority, taken from the Congress, will make the Europeans do a 180 degree policy switch? Should they not first cut out their own restrictive devices and decrease their tariffs to our own levels? Would this not be an indication of good faith before we make this massive tariff grant to the Executive? This is especially true when the authority is to be exercised by the State Department which has negotiated so ineffectively in the past—trading U.S. horses for foreign rabbits in international conference after international conference.

"In effect, the President also proposes total elimination of tariffs between ourselves and Common Market countries on many highly manufactured products. This includes virtually all chemicals, metals, glass, machinery, electrical equipment, vehicles, and almost any other product requiring sophisticated manufacture.

"The State Department seeks authority gradually to reduce tariffs on these items so as to have free trade in them between here and Europe, say in 5 years. By that time, Europe will have consolidated its industries in mass production units with costs even lower than present ones.

"We are given no assurances whatsoever that the other countries will go along with this, and yet this authority, if granted, could be used to injure many U.S. industries, prevent the growth of others and add to our unemployment.

"Free trade in these highly manufactured articles would mean the eventual clobbering of almost every American manufacturer affected; $20-a-day labor here can never compete with $7-a-day labor in Europe even without tariffs.

"We are also told that we must reduce tariffs to encourage farm exports. Yet, agricultural exports to the Common Market area have fallen and that area is on the road to self-sufficiency in almost all farm products by 1965.

"For internal political reasons, these countries are not about to eliminate agricultural protection—any more than we are or should. In the case of the rest of the world, our reported agricultural exports are greatly inflated. They are just given away under Public Law 480 and other "grant" programs which produce no hard money for the United States.

"The message points with pride to our exports and encourages more. It stresses the gold outflow problem. Yet, much of our so-called export surplus is not dollar producing. It concludes billions in farm produce given away, plant and equipment given away under the AID program, CARE's gifts and those of other charities, as well as equipment exported by U.S. companies for their own foreign subsidiaries.

"We are told that workers who lose their jobs because of imports should be retrained and perhaps moved to other communities. Would it not be better to keep the jobs in the first place? We are told that businesses which have to close down should be rehabilitated and go into new products. Is it not better to keep plants running in the first place? We should have a guardrail at the top of the cliff and not an expensive hospital at the bottom, financing it from the Public Treasury."

The President says:

"One out of every three workers engaged in manufacturing is employed in establishments that export. Several hundred times as many workers owe their jobs directly or indirectly to exports as are in the small group—estimated to be less than one-half of 1 percent of all workers—who might be adversely affected by a sharp increase in imports."

This statement implies that one out of three production workers owes his job to export. That, of course, is not so. Belittling of the effect on workers threatened by imports goes to the other extreme. There are millions of workers "who might be adversely affected by a sharp increase in imports." Textiles and other related fields alone have over 2 million. Chemicals, metals, fuels, stock raising, and other import-vulnerable industries have millions more employees. The President should retract this statement or revise it to express the actual facts.

Kennedy Policy Seen Dominated by Fear of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Newark Star-Ledger of January 21, 1962:

[Newark Star-Ledger, Jan. 21, 1962]

KENNEDY POLICY SEEN DOMINATED BY FEAR OF WAR

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

The future may remember the Kennedy administration as the first in American history to allow the fear of war to dominate its international conduct.

Back in January 1961, your President Kennedy said—never forget it: "We shall never negotiate out of fear." Some of us thrilled to those words. We thought he meant them.

Apparently he did not. Since then too many presidential decisions have departed from that brave principle. In his recent press conference, Mr. Kennedy admitted that he had been acting "out of fear." In Laos, we are forcing—yes, forcing—our one-time ally, Boun Oum, who made the mistake of trusting us, to turn over control of the army and police to a neutral whose whole past reveals his indulgence of communism.

Just why? Listen to Mr. Kennedy:

"We should consider the risks of * * * the possibility of military escalation (meaning stepping up the war) in a place of danger." So it's just too bad for Boun Oum. Of course he is a friend and the only reliable anti-Communist in Laos.

But unless he accepts an arrangement which even the President admits has a risk of giving the country to communism, we shall withdraw our financial support—as we just did.

Berlin? The Kremlin, emboldened by Washington's and London's nervous eagerness to negotiate a settlement, has announced that in any such settlement the U.S.S.R. expects to maintain troops of its own in West Berlin while of course treating East Berlin behind its wall as part of East Germany. This is a flagrant violation of an international agreement and should never be accepted.

But to President Kennedy that is just part of an old story. After all, he told his press conference, "the Soviet Union has had de facto control of East Berlin since the late forties." And—get this—"the United States has a very limited force surrounded by a great many divisions. You could have had a very violent reaction." Anyhow "no one at that time in any position of responsibility suggested that the United States or the other countries go in and tear down the wall."

Yielding to superior local force and waiting for underlings to suggest to a President what he should do—these did not constitute the greatness of Washington, Jackson, Lincoln, Wilson, or either Roosevelt.

Even in the Congo, where the outcome is still uncertain, this administration justifies its support of an unlawfully and monstrously acting U.N. (whose "mercenaries" bomb hospitals and sick a dog on Negro children in Katanga) on the grounds that unless we help the nationalist (and anti-Western Adoula to unite all the Congo, we may have a civil war leading perhaps to a great power confrontation that could have imperiled world peace.

So, as I said, here is a new kind of Uncle Sam. When we were weak, we successfully defied two world powers, Britain and France. Later twice struck down aggressive Germany and once aggressive Japan. Now the policy is different. Coerce the weak—Katanga, Boun Oum. Placate aggressive neutrals, India, Indonesia at the expense of allies like Portugal and the Netherlands. But for God's sake, don't accept a confrontation with the U.S.S.R. or risk the "escalation" of a war in Laos or distrub scheming Latin Americans in order to decontaminate the Western Hemisphere by saving Cuba.

Instead, peace at almost any price. Never fear to negotiate out of fear. Buy more time at the expense of the freedom of other peoples. This seems to be the new America.

Maybe it is what the American people want. But the President and his advisers should know that far from avoiding catastrophic war, he may be taking the shortest path to it.

Year of Decision for Domestic Sugar Industry: 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in my remarks a splendid article by Merrill E. Shoup, president of the Holly Sugar Corp., Colorado Springs, Colo., relative to the need for adequate sugar legislation at this session of Congress. I hope that we can act promptly and pass a bill that will meet the challenge presented by Mr. Shoup.

The article follows:

YEAR OF DECISION: 1962

(By Merrill E. Shoup)

In January, as a new year begins, Congress returns to lawmaking with the Sugar Act scheduled for early action in an atmosphere which will be far from routine. Tough new problems and demands will confront the lawmakers in the coming session when they turn their attention to sugar.

Since Cuba, through her own actions, disqualified herself as the largest single supplier of the U.S. sugar market about a year and a half ago, the sugar world has been undergoing sharp changes, and the Sugar Act expected to be written in the months directly ahead undoubtedly will shape a new pattern that will fix our course for years to come.

Never before, in the 27 years since the Sugar Act became law, has greater unity of purpose been demanded of all the segments of the beet sugar industry than it will be in the coming year, if a new law beneficial to our long-range future and the best interests of agriculture and our Nation is to be achieved.

The situation clearly indicates that the time has come to recognize the production and marketing abilities of the existing domestic beet sugar industry and to permit reasonable growth of the industry both in new and old areas. We have demonstrated our hitherto untapped ability to produce and to market and, therefore, to assure the American consumer a much larger part of his supply of this essential commodity, regardless of what happens in the war-jittery world. The Nation has leaned more and more heavily on us in the past months to keep the sugar bowl filled. During 1961 the beet sugar industry has demonstrated a marketing ability which has surprised many expert observers both inside and outside the industry. In approximately the first 10 months of the year, total sugar distributed by the beet sugar industry was more than 7 million hundredweight bags greater than for the same period of the previous year and more than 8 million bags ahead of the pace of 2 years ago.

Some have been tempted to associate this great volume of marketings with a somewhat lower price of sugar which prevailed part of the year. But a look at the facts shows that the dominant price-influencing factor is the total volume of all sugars available in the market in relation to effective demand and not the volume of beet sugar which accounts for only about 25 percent of the total supply.

This was demonstrated late in the year when two principal actions taken by the Secretary of Agriculture resulted in an immediate firming of prices. First, the Secretary announced that the consumption requirements estimate for 1962 would be 9,500,000 tons, somewhat below the actual level of expected needs, and a half-million tons below the inflated estimate for 1961. Secondly, it was announced that non-quota importations from four foreign nations holding special allocations to replace the former Cuban supplies had been reduced by a total of 130,000 tons.

Tone of the market firmed immediately with raw prices, which determine the level of all refined prices, moving upward within a matter of days. This demonstrated again the basic premise of the Sugar Act, which is that price levels which will maintain and protect the domestic sugar industry and which are at the same time fair to consumers, can be achieved by regulating the total quantity of sugar available to the market.

The most opportune time to have achieved our goals opening the way to reasonable and healthy growth was during the last session of Congress. But no action came, other than a brief extension of the law. This means that the job ahead will be even more difficult than it would have been several months ago.

When Cuba was removed from our list of quota suppliers about a score of other foreign nations were given nonquota allocations which enabled them to bring sugar into this country and to enjoy the attractive prices existing here. Now, for the second year, these foreign newcomers have enjoyed a place in the U.S. market, and they would like to stay in the picture, and think they have persuasive and legitimate reasons for expecting to retain a good share of sugar business in this country.

Each month that passes, these foreign suppliers, some of them located halfway around the world from us, feel a strengthening of their position, and denying them a share in our market becomes more difficult.

Not 1 ounce of the former Cuban quota was reassigned to the domestic beet sugar industry, but if we are to grow and expand, as all rational appraisals of the situation indicate we must, some adjustment must be made to enable us to supply a portion of that sugar formerly supplied by Cuba. But we will run into strong opposition from those foreign countries who have enjoyed the Cuban windfall and who would like to continue to enjoy that profitable business.

The alternative to a larger beet sugar quota in this country is a cutback in production. We can't stand still on dead center. Our technological progress is gobbling up our slowly expanding quota faster than our share of the market will absorb our annual increase in output. Not only does this mean that present producers will have the lid clamped on them, but it also means that new producers will find it impossible to gain a beachhead in their own nation's sugar market.

Demand for sugar in the United States is increasing at a rate in excess of 150,000 tons annually, and some 3¼ million tons of Cuban quota has been temporarily reassigned to foreign producers—including such remote lands as India, Australia, Formosa, and others.

In these two amounts—the annual growth and the former Cuban quota—lies the key to our future. As a strong, vigorous, growing industry which contributes tremendously to the overall economic strength of our Nation, we must be given the opportunity to grow, and we must go out and work hard for that goal. Reasonable opportunity should be made for those farmers in newly developed irrigation areas—whether under reclamation or private development—who want a chance to help supply our Nation with sugar. Almost half the sugar we consume now is imported from foreign sources.

There is ample room within the bounds of the former Cuban quota to accommodate the reasonable growth and development of all segments of the domestic sugar industry, including the refiners, the cane producers, and beets, old and new. And this can be accomplished even while holding in trust a portion of the market for some future reestablishment of sugar trade with Cuba, should the time come when that is desirable and in the national interest.

Therefore, the opportunity exists to move ahead, but success will not come of its own volition. Our best efforts will be demanded in working with our elected representatives in Washington and, above all, there should be, among all elements of the U.S. sugar industry, complete and aggressive unity of purpose and willingness to compromise lesser differences so that we can all go forward, shoulder to shoulder, to strive for a brighter tomorrow.

Workmen's Benefit Fund Urges Adoption of Health Care Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by branch No. 96, Chelsea, Mass., of the Workmen's Benefit Fund of the United States of America, as presented to me by Mr. Octave Beaudoin, secretary-treasurer.

WORKMEN'S BENEFIT FUND OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—RESOLUTION

One of the most important and pressing problems which this country faces today, is finding the means to insure a life of dignity and decency for our older citizens. The number of Americans over 65 years of age has been steadily mounting. We have a social and moral obligation to provide the means whereby the elderly may enjoy a decent standard of living, free from con-

stant anxiety over what will happen in time of serious illness.

To meet the need of adequate hospital, nursing home and surgical services, we urge the speedy adoption of the health care bill, submitted by President John F. Kennedy and introduced in both Houses of Congress by Senator Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico, and Representative Cecil R. King, of California.

Therefore be it

Resolved, That our branch of the Workmen's Benefit Fund of the United States one of the oldest fraternal societies in this country, petition you to support the Anderson-King bill to finance health care for the aged by amending the Social Security Act.

We earnestly urge you to use all your efforts to assure the passage of this important bill.

The Resolution Approving the So-Called Reciprocal Trade Program Adopted Last December at the AFL-CIO Biennial Convention, Miami Beach, Fla., Is Not an Unqualified Endorsement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the debate on foreign trade relations at the AFL-CIO biennial convention held December 11, 1961, Miami Beach, Fla., resulted in approval with important reservations of the so-called reciprocal trade program.

The following excerpts from the debate on the third day of the convention are taken from the convention proceedings, pages 51-67.

The debate reveals that the resolution approving the principle of the proposed reciprocal trade program cannot be regarded as an unqualified endorsement. As a matter of fact, definite doubt was expressed concerning the merit of the proposed program and especially in regard to retraining workers in American industry affected adversely by the importation of cheaply manufactured foreign goods that destroy the jobs of American wage earners:

EXCERPTS FROM AFL-CIO DEBATE ON FOREIGN TRADE RELATIONS, DECEMBER 11, 1961, BIENNIAL CONVENTION AT MIAMI BEACH, FLA.

Mr. E. L. Wheatley, president, International Brotherhood of Operative Potters:

"We are not anti to any foreign nation. We are anti to having the rights of Congress turned over to the State Department.

"You can talk of giving money to help distressed people and train them to come into new industries. * * * We do not think that program will get there in time to do any good in the way of offering relief for our people.

"But you people remember how long it takes the American labor movement to even raise the minimum rate here, and that is too long * * * to assume that the pottery workers and the other thousands and millions of workers who are being deprived of their job opportunities are going to sit and wait on the relief lines while some labor organization in these other nations brings up a decent minimum."

Mr. George Baldanzi, president, United Textile Workers:

"We are not for isolation. We believe in reciprocal trade. But our definition or reciprocity is that we will supply nations with products that they do not have, and we will buy from them products which we need and we do not have.

"We do not interpret reciprocal trade to be a concept under which we will permit low-wage areas or no-wage areas to destroy the economy of entire industries in this country, merely for the purpose of having friends.

"With due respect to President Kennedy, who I firmly believe has a feeling and a grasp of the problems of the world, I do not believe in the principle that we should give to any President the right as an individual to wipe out any kind of tariff or controls as an individual administrative act, because who may be President today may be one type of personality. Who may be President tomorrow or 5 years from now may be a completely different personality.

"When there are corporate interests * * * investing millions of dollars in the Common Market of Europe, that are establishing plants that are more modern than ours today, unless we get some safeguard against wholesale importation into this country, there is no guarantee that 5 years from now these same automated factories that are being built in many parts of the world * * * will not curtail operations in this country and dump all the cheap goods right back here in the United States."

Mr. Enoch Rust, vice president, United Glass & Ceramic Workers:

"Well, I went to Washington and I didn't have to stay long until I found that we did not have a trade program based on the law as written, the reciprocal trade program of 1934 and amended several times thereafter.

"Why are we excited? There was enough window glass imported in 1959 and 1960 to furnish over 4 million six-room dwellings. * * * In that period of time (1959 and 1960) over a million automobiles were imported into this country carrying 30 million square feet of glass and carrying 5 million rubber tires replacing thousands of rubber workers, thousands of glassworkers, thousands of textile workers and thousands of automobile workers.

"We were told by Khrushchev that he was going bury us economically. What did we do to help him to do it? We gave him a spade to dig the hole with and to throw the dirt in our face."

Mr. George Burdon, president, United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum & Plastic Workers:

"In the rubber industry we are experiencing a serious challenge from the growing imports of rubber footwear. * * * Imports totaled 50 million pairs in 1959 and doubled to 100 million pairs in 1960.

"We have an average of $2.50 an hour versus an average in some other countries of 23 cents an hour. We cannot compete with that kind of competition."

Mr. George Fecteau, president, United Shoe Workers of America:

"In 1949 we imported 3 million pairs of shoes * * *. We exported 6 million pairs.

"Last year, 1960, we imported 30 million pairs * * * and our exports had dropped to 3 million pairs to all countries, so that the balance we have been speaking about certainly is not in favor of the shoe industry.

"Many of our companies in the shoe industry—the large companies, those who can afford to move—have moved to Japan. They have moved to Italy. They have moved to other foreign countries. Many of them have closed shoe factories here in the United States. * * * These companies are moving for profit reasons.

"We have estimated that unless some protection * * * comes about * * * the shoe industry here will become extinct as the dodo bird within 8 years.

"It is suggested that the people employed in those industries can go to other industries. As one who has been in the field and has seen factory after factory close down, and has seen the efforts of our union and these workers to place themselves in industry, I know that such talk is a lot of damned foolishness. It is not practical or just."

Mr. William Pollock, president, Textile Workers of America:

"Since 1934 we have been for reciprocal trade; but we feel as an industry and as representatives of the workers in that industry that we should not be offered up as a sacrifice on the altar of international trade.

"You know, it is all very well to be for international trade, but we represent workers * * * and they are told that in the interest of international trade we must accept the imports from other nations, and 'To protect you we will retrain you and prepare you to go into some other industry.' Well I think this is fine, it is as it should be.

"But when you get an individual that has spent 20 or 30 years learning a skill * * * only to find his job shipped to some other nation and he is to be trained to go, maybe to the electronics industry, where they are barely paying a minimum wage, it is pretty hard to convince him that this is a sacrifice he must make in the interest of world peace.

"I know that in 1962 when we have to elect a full Congress, if the representatives of our unions go to a Congressman in that congressional district and find that he is going to vote for a liberal trade program that will export their job to Europe, that he cannot count on their votes to send him back to Washington."

Mr. George Meany, president, AFL-CIO:

"If you read this resolution carefully, you will see that we are setting forth stipulations that we feel should go in this legislation.

"We call for retention of the escape clause provision in the new legislation, and then I would like to point to section 4 of the proposed resolution, that, 'The new legislation should direct the President to take whatever action is necessary to mitigate problems of market disruption.'

"To all these organizations, I can say to you that when the legislation comes up * * * that our legislative department, our research department, our economists and everybody concerned will cooperate with these organizations and try to get in the legislative safeguard to protect them to the maximum extent that is possible.

"But we cannot * * * depart from the idea of a reciprocal trade pact with the other nations of the world."

Mr. George Harrison, chairman of the resolutions committee:

"This resolution goes further than any other trade policy resolution adopted by this federation, in the direction of protecting our industries against undue hardship because of reciprocal trade agreements.

"If you will look at paragraph 6 you will find that it says: 'In all phases of tariff and trade policy, the U.S. Government should seek to safeguard the absolute historic levels of production of significant industries.'

"Now that means only one thing. Certainly imports shall not be permitted to the point where it causes serious injury to any of our historic industries."

When Are We Going To Take a Stand?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, shades of Stephen Decatur and Teddy Roosevelt.

When are we ever going to stand up to these apologists for pipsqueak Castro and tell them to either get on our team or go peddle their collaborationist fish? My insistence that the only type of foreign policy worth mentioning is the kind that refuses to have our Nation assume the role of mendicant humbly beseeching a favor—at the very time we are pouring out our billions to shore up tottering regimes or trying to enlist cooperation from doubtful allies who cannot seem to make up their minds on which side of the fence they want to land—is nothing new with me. I am indebted, however, to Mr. Lyle C. Wilson, UPI writer, for his article entitled "Crackdown of Castro Sought by United States Sputters Out," since he effectively brings this entire diplomatic fiasco into focus and points up just how silly we are making ourselves appear in the eyes of both our friends and our enemies.

Apparently, Secretary of State Rusk went to Punta del Este with good intentions but since the Secretary has not been particularly noted for firmness in such circumstances—and especially with his Department already infiltrated with these apologists for the soft line—he apparently is going to come out of that inter-American gabfest with little more than the pious agreement that something should be done about the Cuban megalomaniac but that it would be unwise to put him in his place just now. In a word, the usual south-of-border "mañana"—do not do anything today that can be postponed until tomorrow—or next year—or until it is too late. And that is the crowd that we are trying to do business with—a crowd that butters up to dictators of the left while at the same time privately referring to Uncle Sam as the Colossus of the North.

Indeed, as I have previously tried to point out, the philosophy of some of our neighbors to the South—as it also often appears to be within certain diplomatic areas within our own country—seems to be one of firm opposition to so-called rightest dictators while rejecting anything that would effectively discipline, or at least contain, dictators of leftist persuasion. As a case in point, Mr. Wilson points to the drastic action taken by the Organization of American States to isolate and punish the late Trujillo of Santo Domingo and emphasizes that while the slain dictator may have been a bum and a general no-good he certainly was no Communist. And the worst of it is that we went along with that infamous deal with the expectation that a majority of the other American nations would join in similar treatment of the Cuban tyrant, only to again be left holding the bag.

My colleagues, it seems to me that this foolishness has gone about as far as I can stomach. Heretofore, I have with pretty fair consistency supported our foreign aid programs and I especially want it noted that I supported the initial appropriations of $600 million voted last year so that President Kennedy would have something with which to bargain when he undertook to set up his Alliance for Progress. The latest maneuver in Uruguay, however, leaves me completely disillusioned and I intend to withhold my vote from support of any more foreign aid until I can be persuaded that the administration is going to take a new line—not necessarily hard but certainly realistic. Congressman OTTO PASSMAN, I think you have got another convert.

The Lyle C. Wilson article follows in full:

OAS DISAPPROVES: CRACKDOWN OF CASTRO SOUGHT BY UNITED STATES SPUTTERS OUT

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

WASHINGTON.—There stands Uncle Sam with a bag full of money, U.S. dollars to the number of 20 billion.

Uncle Sam is pleading with the foreign ministers of his sister American Republics to crack down on Fidel Castro's Communist operation in Cuba before Fidel builds up enough oomph to crack down on some of the sister republics.

This is taking place in Punta del Este, Uruguay, where the foreign ministers of the Organization of American States are in formal session.

U.S. HARD LINE

Uncle Sam's interpreter at Punta del Este is Secretary of State Rusk.

Rusk took what will have to pass for a hard line when he arrived on the conference scene. That bag full of money mentioned above is what the Kennedy administration plans to distribute over 10 years among Central and South American Republics in the Alliance for Progress program.

Rusk told the foreign ministers that the success of AFP depends on the security of the Western Hemisphere against outside interference. That is to say, if the hemisphere is not secure against Communist penetration spearheaded by Castro, the $20 billion program could not accomplish its objectives. It would require more than $20 billion perhaps.

The overall objective is to improve social and living standards in Central and South America.

SOME ALARMED

Dispatches reported that Rusk's remarks alarmed those foreign ministers who were dragging their heels against a real OAS crackdown on Castro, as sought by the United States. They were alarmed because they feared their share of the AFP bundle might depend on how they voted on the U.S. proposal to hit Castro hard. Absurd, of course. The United States wouldn't do such a thing.

The absurdity of thinking that the United States would use its money power to persuade sister republics aggressively to help protect themselves against Communist penetration was too obvious.

SETBACK APPARENT

The alarm soon subsided and the hard-nosed crackdown on Castro sought by the United States will not be approved. The United States will accept with thanks whatever the OAS finally agrees to support in opposition to Castro's penetration of the sister republics. The distribution of the AFP bundle will come thereafter on a fair share basis of sweetness and light.

The United States will claim that it never expected to obtain a real crackdown on Castro. And so the Punta del Este OAS conference will be written down as another triumph of U.S. foreign policy.

CASE OF TRUJILLO

The history of the OAS is strange indeed. In 1960, the OAS had Dictator Trujillo and the Dominican Republic before the bar of Western Hemisphere justice. Trujillo was a tyrant and may have been a bum, but he was no Communist. The OAS ministers threw the book at Trujillo and hit him right on the nose. Trujillo is no more.

The ministers voted unanimously to break diplomatic relations with the Dominican Republic, to impose penalties called sanctions and to embargo the sale of arms to the Dominicans.

This was adopted with a single-purposed whoop of enthusiasm, Trujillo being no Communist but more like a Fascist and, undoubtedly, a no-good.

With Castro, the OAS seems to deal differently, Castro being no Fascist but, undoubtedly, a Communist and a no-good, to boot. Very strange.

Here's $125 the U.N. Is Not Going To Get

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Newark Star-Ledger of January 21, 1962:

BETWEEN THE LINES—HERE'S $125 THE U.N. IS NOT GOING TO GET

(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I'm cashing in my Federal savings bonds at my bank. It's my protest against your plan to sink $100 million of U.S. Treasury money in bonds for the insolvent United Nations.

What's more, I consider it my moral duty to persuade other investors to do the same unless you give up your scheme to lend the U.N. any Treasury money against which I own a demand claim.

I believe I can count on thousands of farmers, workers, small businessmen, housewives, and other investors like myself who dislike the diversion of our dollars to wipe out anti-Communist Negroes in Katanga and to finance an international bureaucracy interlaced with spies, socialists, and mediocrities.

What would happen if millions of bondholders like me turned in our bonds?

I asked this question of a banker friend. He told me that: "Out of a debt of $298 billion, the Treasury reports that almost $48 billion is owned by small investors in U.S. savings bonds of all types."

This clearly means that 16 percent of the Federal debt is owned in a form which constitutes a current demand liability against the Treasury.

Then my friend turned sort of green and he said, "Hey wait a minute, that would bring all business to a halt. Everything in the country would stop moving. The boys in Washington wouldn't have a cent."

I informed him that this would be a mighty good thing. I told him that once I cut off the allowance of my daughter, Margot, for 2 weeks when she had spent it on comic books of a low sort and other projects of which I disapproved.

Of course, I only have a $25 savings bond and two $50's to cash. But there are millions of small investors like myself—the "little people," financially speaking, who stand most to lose by international giveaways and the inflation they help to create.

Here are some key facts about the money power we still possess:

There are about 450 million U.S. savings bonds, series E and H, held by the public

indicating that these bonds are widely owned by small investors.

Of the total number of U.S. saving bonds, nearly $48 billion owed by the Treasury, 85 percent or about $40 billion of series E and H combined, are in denominations of $1,000 or less.

Since the working Treasury balance is about $6 billion, then the stone cast by David Small Investor against Goliath Supergovernment might be a blow for fiscal responsibility.

I'm sending copies of this letter to Secretary of the Treasury C. Douglas Dillon, Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee Harry F. Byrd, and Chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee Brent Spence. Surely, you and they have a greater responsibility to the American taxpayers and the present creditors of the U.S. Treasury than to irresponsible U.N. borrowers.

Respectfully yours,

SMALL INVESTOR.

P.S.—After selling my bonds I will take the money and buy local school or improvement bonds or, Mr. President, I will invest in American free enterprise.

County Agents, First Congressional District, Saluted by Congressman Boykin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, the counties in Alabama's First Congressional District—Choctaw, Clarke, Marengo, Mobile, Monroe, Washington, and Wilcox—made a magnificent contribution to the agriculture of this State last year.

The work that county agents and their assistants carried out with farmers and their families—and all others interested in promoting agriculture—was done in a splendid way.

Annunal records point out the agents outstanding accomplishments. Let us look at a few examples. Clarke County Agent O. C. Helms assisted in some way all 1,494 farms in his county during 1961. Mobile County Agent Charles J. Brockway made an excellent record of 2,254 farm visits in his county. In Monroe County, Agent A. V. Culpepper assisted 2,183 out of 2,873 farm families sometime during the year. County Agent D. O. Estes in Washington County was real active in 4-H work. He has an outstanding number of 42 4-H Clubs in the county. County Agent R. M. Barnett in Wilcox County was called on 3,030 times by farmers.

Statistics for the entire district are even more impressive. For example, this district reports to me that county agents have made 11,725 visits to help farmers with their pressing problems. They have distributed 56,083 different bulletins over the counties, and have held 3,293 meetings throughout the district with the attendance totaling about 128,000. District No. 1 also has 191 active 4-H Clubs. This is an average of 27 clubs per county.

Timber was the districts' highest income source. This item brought a total of $14,500,000. The beef cattle total was second with $14,293,000. Other items which contributed to the district's rural income were cotton, dairying, poultry, hogs, sheep, grain crops, peanuts, fruits, vegetables, and other truck crops.

Congressional District 1 throws out to these agents and their assistants a vote of thanks for their outstanding work for the year of 1961.

It is with a great deal of pleasure and appreciation that I salute F. M. Barnett, Charles J. Brockway, A. V. Culpepper, D. O. Estes, F. M. Jones, O. C. Helms, and Matthew Sexton.

Secretary of Agriculture Demands Apology

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the January 20 edition of the California Farmer contained a letter to the editor from Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman and the editor's answer which I think the Members will find quite interesting:

SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE DEMANDS APOLOGY

I have at hand the November 4 issue of the California Farmer, and the editorial entitled "Secretary Picks Up Powerful Enemies."

You are right—the packers and the chainstores are powerful enemies, but I would hope that you would agree if they are violating the law, they ought to be made to account for so doing. That such violations existed was disclosed by a very long and thorough investigation by this department. They are now entitled to and will receive a detailed hearing.

I note your paragraph stating that Freeman acted in a sneaky way because the industry had been promised some kind of private hearing when field investigations were completed at the time the investigations began 2 years ago. You then went on to say that the Secretary violated his promise and smeared the charges all over the Nation through the daily press. Might I remind you that I have only been Secretary of Agriculture for 10 months, not 2 years, and at no time made any such agreement with the packers or chainstores?

Many of us disagree, and on occasion vigorously, as to policies. That a man keeps his word is, however, a very basic and fundamental thing. I have always made it a point to keep mine, and sometimes have resisted great pressure to do so. That you would personally charge me of violating my word, when obviously I have only been here for 10 months, is a piece of perfidy for which you ought to be not only ashamed but publicly apologize. I'll be waiting.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.

Thanks, Mr. Secretary, for your letter of December 14. I know your life is particularly hectic, and unfortunately everything seems to be breaking over you during the Christmas season.

I recognize that you stepped into the toughest job in the Nation, second to that of the President, and one job for which there is not an immediate easy answer.

You object to the word sneaky, and I don't blame you, but the fact remains that as undisputed head of your Department you are responsible for everything that comes out of that Department, and I personally would consider it top major policy if I were attacking the Nation's biggest food processors and distributors.

As far as my information is concerned, I acknowledge that you personally did not make the agreement to confer with the packers before breaking the story of your findings, but I think my information is correct that important underlings of your Department did make such an agreement.

My own personal thought is that by stepping in and blasting this story to the press, you created a lot of unnecessary agony. You are either stupid, have poor liaison with your own Department, poor liaison with those you are attacking, or your own underlings have sabotaged you.

This reply is being written during the Christmas season, and I would like to add a personal note. I do apologize for calling you sneaky. I think that was a poor choice of words. I believe you have been sincere, but I am sorry to say in my opinion you have failed in a format of failure tried before you. My State of California is totaling up one of her richest agricultural years, and her biggest gains will be in those crops that are not controlled by the Federal Government. May the future be good to you.

Personal regards,

JACK T. PICKETT.

Conflict Between Lower Tariffs and Higher Wages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the move of the Kennedy administration to reduce tariffs raises many questions as to the effect this action may have on our national economy. Harold B. Dorsey, a New York investment analyst and president of the Argus Research Corp., recently presented his views in a byline article in the Washington Post. Because of its timeliness I present it for the RECORD.

It follows:

CONFLICT BETWEEN LOWER TARIFFS, HIGHER WAGES

(By Harold B. Dorsey)

As the administration steps up its efforts in behalf of legislation giving it broader powers to reduce tariffs, investment managers are worrying more. This is one of several reasons advanced for the decline in the stock market since the first of the year.

The investment manager is not so much worried about the effects of lower tariffs per se. While some industries in each country would be hurt and others helped, there would be a net increase in the total volume of goods moving into consumption.

There is also a fairly broad recognition of the damage that could be done to our international trade if an expanding Common Market in Europe holds up, or raises, the tariffs against our goods while reducing the tariffs of the member countries. They can-

not be expected to reduce their tariffs against us unless we reciprocate.

However, if we contemplate the effects on the domestic economy of lower tariffs in conjunction with rising labor costs, we have a combination that is really something to worry about. The temporary effects of adjustments which individual industries will have to make in connection with lower tariffs would probably be noticeable in any case. A higher cost-price structure in combination with lower tariffs on imported goods would make the adjustments of individual industries much more difficult.

It is unfortunate that the drive for the new tariff legislation coincides with labor demands for a shorter workweek, more fringe benefits and higher wage rates. For example, the electrical workers in New York City have now obtained a contract giving them a 5-hour day, with one and one-half times the increased hourly wage rate for an additional 1 hour per day worked. The net effect would be a 14 percent per hour increase in the labor cost.

A recent analysis of the labor cost problem by David L. Babson & Co. points out: "Over the years, there has been a growing public acceptance of the idea that, where wage increases in an industry are no greater than the gains of productivity in that field, they are noninflationary and therefore are acceptable. The truth is that a wage boost in any major industry in an amount exceeding the growth in the productivity of the economy as a whole is definitely inflationary."

This report observes that there are hundreds of businesses where it is impossible to raise productivity via labor-saving machines—sales clerks, policemen, barbers, etc. "But they, too, will want pay increases comparable to those in the mass production industries * * * even though they have been unable to contribute to productivity improvement."

While the administration has stated the need for a termination of rising labor costs, statements of labor leaders continue to emphasize the erroneous concept that pay increases are required to lift the worker's ability to buy the growing production of American industry, and that shorter hours must be obtained to combat recession-level unemployment. Clearly, that policy means higher costs. The consequent pressure for higher prices would reduce the volume of demand and the number of jobs for workers.

At any date, it is quite evident that investment managers are looking with alarm at the prospect of lower tariffs in combination with rising labor costs, because that combination would have an adverse effect on our international trade balances and would probably reduce the total volume of demand in our economy for goods and services. In that eventuality, corporate earnings and the value of stocks would be reduced.

The Postal Rate Raise Bill as It Would Affect Our Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I shall include a most enlightening letter to me from Mr. Richard J. Babcock, president of the Farm Journal.

Many people believe that such magazines pay little for their mail service. I am sure they will be surprised to learn the Farm Journal spends an average of almost $300,000 per year for postage and that they have operated at a loss for the past 2 years.

Farmers in every section of the United States have for decades depended to a large degree on the information and advice furnished them in farm magazines, and since all well-informed people know that farming is our basic industry, it ill behooves this Congress to legislate these important periodicals out of existence, as the postal rate bill which this House passed on last Wednesday will help to do. At that time I made a determined effort to get some time to read the following letter into the RECORD, while the bill was being railroaded through the House, but failing to get the time, I have decided that since this matter is of such far-reaching importance to our farmers, duty demands that I insert it in the RECORD.

A number of farm magazines have already been forced to quit business because of high overhead. Now, Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope no more of them will be forced to close shop because of the imposition of piling more overhead expense on them.

I hope Members of the Senate will read this letter, and then enough of them vote to kill the bill, for this and many other reasons.

The letter follows:

FARM JOURNAL, INC.,
Philadelphia, Pa., January 19, 1962.

The Honorable BEN F. JENSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In 1955 there were six major farm magazines: Farm Journal, Country Gentleman, Successful Farming, Capper's Farmer, Progressive Farmer, and Farm and Ranch. Now there are only four. Country Gentleman (2,500,000 circulation) and Capper's Farmer (1,400,000 circulation) have gone out of business.

Of the four which are still in existence, the one with the largest circulation (more than 3 million), the one with the largest advertising revenue (more than $9 million), Farm Journal, has operated at a significant loss during each of the last 2 years.

I can speak precisely about our own publication and based on my knowledge of this business I have no hesitation in stating that this situation is general throughout the industry. The continued existence of these great farm magazines is now being threatened by a crushing increase in postal rates under the proposed postal bill, H.R. 7927, for no prudent investor is going to keep money tied up indefinitely in a business that at least does not break even.

We wonder if you and the other Members of Congress are aware of the plight of the farm magazines—why postal increases have an even greater impact on farm magazines than on other magazines?

To begin with, 100 percent of Farm Journal's circulation is mail delivered. We have no newsstand circulation whatsoever. Any increase in second-class rates effects 100 percent of our circulation.

Moreover, most of the families we reach live in sparsely settled areas, which severely limits our opportunity to call upon them, economically, in person. Thus we must depend heavily on the use of third-class mail in obtaining new and renewal subscriptions. Our expenditures for third-class mail alone has averaged nearly $300,000 per year in each of the past 5 years.

Many people seem to believe we could recover the proposed increases in second- and third-class mail by raising our advertising rates. They simply have not been given the facts.

The volume of advertising (number of pages of advertising) in these four farm magazines has decreased by 26 percent in the last 5 years; Farm Journal right along with the others.

In an effort to offset this loss of volume, and also to meet the increased costs of paper, printing, engraving—and postage, we and our contemporaries have been forced to raise our advertising rates in each of these years. And again for 1962.

We aren't guessing. We know we have reached if not passed the point where we can net any gain through increased advertising rates for while our type of magazine is virtually indispensable to the agricultural product advertiser, the fact remains that nearly half of our advertising pages come from consumer product advertisers. We must have their advertising in volume, too, if we are to survive.

And more and more consumer product advertisers are finding it more and more difficult to justify paying higher and higher rates in magazines. TV is tough, low-cost competition for the consumer product advertising dollars in magazines. We're fighting for our lives and hanging on by a thread.

Some people seem to believe we can offset the proposed postal increases by raising our subscription price. Again, they simply have not been given the facts.

The prevailing basic subscription price of the major farm magazines is $1 for 1 year.

During 1957–58, Farm Journal elected to raise its basic subscription price from $1 per year to $2 per year.

What happened? Folks sent in the same sum of money as before but it paid for only half as long a span of time. And the added cost of going back for an order twice as often resulted in a substantial loss.

Instead of netting more money at the higher subscription price we found it was costing us a great deal more per year.

Thus we know, by actual and recent experience that we cannot hope to offset increased postage costs by increasing the subscription price of our magazine.

Who will be hurt if farm magazines are put out of business?

Let me use Farm Journal as an example.

To be sure, the 501 people who are on our payroll in various parts of the country. And of course, the people who work for the firm in Chicago which produces Farm Journal. We paid this firm $2.4 million last year for engraving, typesetting, printing, binding, and shipping. The men who cut the timber and run the mills that make the 322 freight cars of paper which Farm Journal uses every year.

Then, too, there are the railroad men and the truckers who haul this paper to the printers.

But, important as the existence of Farm Journal may be to the livelihood of all of these people, this does not begin to measure the hurt its weakening and even possible demise would bring to the Nation as a whole.

The Russians may or may not be ahead of us in rocketry now. They may or may not be evidencing a faster rate of growth industrially.

But one thing is certain. The Russians are way, way behind us in agricultural know-how and productivity. And what country can reasonably expect to achieve or maintain a position of leadership and strength industrially without an efficient, knowledgeable, low-cost, and productive agriculture?

Not one but all of the surveys which have been conducted among farm families by the agricultural land grant colleges over a period of years reveals the same thing: farm publications rank way ahead of all other sources, including even the county agents, as the place where most farm families get the ideas which they put into practice.

In Russia, the state owns and operates agriculture. In the United States, 96 percent of our 3,700,000 farms are family-owned businesses operated by individuals.

It is highly important to the social, as well as the economic fabric of America, that the family farm pattern survive. It can do so only with the help of the Nation's farm magazines which are written expressly for them.

Agriculture is our Nation's biggest business. It is also this country's most essential business.

It is the way our families farm that has permitted us to make an abundance of food and fibers at low cost to consumers with less than 10 percent of our national work force on farms. This is what has permitted and propelled our Nation's industrial development, made possible the high standard of living for all which exists only in America.

Farm Journal has played a unique and very important part in this development during the past 85 years.

While there are many good farm publications in the United States—State, regional, and those that specialize in one kind of farming—Farm Journal is the one and only farm magazine which circulates in volume in every part of the Nation.

Farm Journal is the only farm publication that has the widely dispersed editorial manpower and printing facilities with which to gather the important news of agriculture wherever it happens and deliver it, while it is still news, to wherever it matters.

No general magazine, no newspaper, no string of newspapers, no TV station or network, and no other farm magazine or collection of farm magazines has the capacity to perform this vital service to farm families everywhere and anywhere in America.

And never has it been so important for farmers, with constantly increasing investments and constantly growing costs, to have quickly all the ideas, all the help they can get from wherever available.

How can anyone overstate the importance of such a magazine, not only to farm families but to the country at large?

By watching every item of expense, eliminating every ounce of waste, and without reducing the uncommon service we are rendering our farm family readers, we had hoped for a very modest profit in 1962. But if the proposals contained in H.R. 7927 were to be put into effect it would not only wipe out every vestige of profit for 1962 but virtually every hope for the future.

As we have pointed out, we mail more than 37 million copies of Farm Journal each year. Our present third-class expenditures are averaging close to $300,000 per year. If H.R. 7927 were to be passed it would very likely be the straw that breaks the camel's back for this and many other worthy magazines. Please don't let this happen.

Should you wish, I shall be more than happy to meet with you and review any and every fact presented herein.

Respectfully yours,

RICHARD J. BABCOCK,
President.

Resolution in Behalf of Freedom for Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

RESOLUTION IN BEHALF OF FREEDOM FOR LITHUANIA, LATVIA, AND ESTONIA

Whereas the Baltic States were occupied by the armed forces of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia are desperately struggling to regain their freedom and independence; and

Whereas so many countries under colonial domination have been or are being given the opportunity to establish their own independent states, the Baltic Nations having a great historical past and having enjoyed the blessings of freedom for centuries are now subjugated to the most brutal colonial oppression; and

Whereas the people and Government of the United States of America have a long and established record in aiding oppressed people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America urge the President and the Government of the United States to take all the necessary steps to put the Baltic States problem on the agenda of the United Nations requesting that: (1) The Soviet Union withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; (2) return all Baltic exiles from Siberia, prisons, and slave-labor camps; and be it further

Resolved, That the United Nations conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under its supervision.

Foreign Trade Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, as we near the day of reckoning in our search for a reasonable answer to an old problem it gives me an opportunity to keep the Congress aware of the fact that even the trade picture has two sides.

It seems as though, because we have traveled the one-way street so long we have forgotten there is a road back. The road back in this case is one of necessity. The road back is sometimes even more important to the peoples of a nation than the road forward when the road forward is a blind one-way street.

The old Pennsylvania Dutch have a way of putting it much more eloquent than I. When directing a person out of a place with only one opening and the car is headed the other way, they say, "Back up straight ahead."

That is all some of us are asking for. We want our country's economy to "back up straight ahead." Let us quit looking at the greener grass in the fields of our neighbors overseas while our fields go to seed.

Not one of us in public life can justify a position that has created a situation where consumption is up, employment is down, investments in our economy have to be subsidized to keep even a semblance of free enterprise alive in what has been heralded as the greatest Democracy on Earth.

It is a pleasure for me and might be lesson for all of us if we will read again and again the other side of the story.

Mr. Speaker, I present an address by Carl A. Gerstacker, chairman of the board of the Dow Chemical Co., Midland, Mich.:

DOW CHEMICAL HEAD ASSAILS PROPOSAL TO REDUCE TARIFFS

U.S. foreign policy trade policy will be subjected to the most revolutionary plowing up in many years when Congress decides what is to follow when the President's authority to reduce duties under the Trade Agreements Act expires next June, Carl A. Gerstacker, chairman of the Board of the Dow Chemical Co., Midland, Mich., told the Synthetic and Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association last December 7 in New York City. Employes of the Dow plant in Midland, Mich., numbering some 7,000, are members of District 50, Local 12075.

A totally new concept has been suggested. Cut duties across the board, not product-by-product. Never mind whether an industry is injured or whether it dies. Relocate and retain its workers. Domestic industry, domestic jobs would be frankly—and, I submit, recklessly—made a tool of one international commitments.

In the 1950's we lowered our tariffs to help the dollar gap. It was said foreigners didn't have enough dollars—we should have trade—not aid. Now it is said we should lower our tariffs to protect the dollar because foreigners have too many. How can sane people belive such reverse gobblidigooh?

I do not—and I am sure no thinking man in our industry does—downgrade the seriousness or the lightning-fast pace of the international scheme. It calls for the utmost vision, but it also calls for the utmost hardheadedness. We cannot squander our economic strength. It is our ultimate material power and it is one of the essential sources of our internal political stability.

The synthetic organic chemical industry is vital to the Nation's economy, to its military strength, and to its capacity for growth into the unknown where science will lead us as a country and as a world.

The Kennedy administration wants a faster rate of growth in the economy. It wants more employment and less unemployment. It wants an improved standard of living, a strong dollar and a strong and competitive America.

The previous administration wanted this also—in fact, don't we all?

How are we doing? We are doing poorly. Our rate of growth is not accelerating. Hard core unemployment is increasing. The picture improves when we recover from recessions, but each recession or business pickup has a higher percent of unemployment than the previous one.

We are getting less competitive in the cost of production all the time. The root of the evil is that we are overpaying ourselves, when compared to salary and wage costs in foreign countries. This reduces employment, hurts production, and weakens America competitively.

The present Administration wants to encourage more imports of foreign goods, even though they agree it will hurt industry and put more workmen out of work. They suggest a dole for companies and people hurt, and retraining for workmen. Where in our country will the retrained people find jobs? The cost of the unemployed accelerates the problem because it raises the production costs and, therefore, weakens our competitive position. Mr. Ball, an Under Secretary of State, said recently that America's most successful export industries are those in which wage rates are the highest and that the industries that claim to suffer the most from import competition tend to pay low wages; and that we should find a way of shifting manpower out of the industries which cannot stand up to foreign competition into those which have stood the test.

The American chemical industry is a high wage industry, but we have suffered from imports. I think we can stand up to fair competition as well as anybody; and so I wonder—to what industry Mr. Ball believes that our manpower should be switched.

MUST WORK HARDER TO EXPORT

Other people say we American businessmen must work harder to export. This is a fine statement, but I think most of us don't know how we can work any harder at exporting. The Europeans apparently feel we are trying pretty hard despite the fact that our wages are three times theirs.

Prices are dropping on many chemicals and patents are in jeopardy. This certainly discourages expansion. Mr. Robert Kennedy claims that he is not antibusiness, but his actions certainly have discouraged business, its expansion, and total employment.

Everyone—including Presidents—plays golf these days so let me try a golf analogy.

Our country is like the golfer who consistently loses on his golf bets. In golf, we have handicaps to equalize ability and make fair competition. We in American industry need a handicap—or tariff—to equalize foreign advantages in taxes, depreciation, labor rates, etc. Our country has been losing consistently and in a big way with our present handicap—our gold loss is serious. But, Mr. Ball says we want less strokes from our opponents. What will this mean?

You know the answer—the golfer would go broke, with even less strokes, and so will our country if we reduce our tariffs and, therefore, lose even more gold.

We may lose our tariff battle—the battle to keep our industry and our country strong. The battle to preserve American jobs. Will our conscience be clear? Not entirely, because obviously we will have done less than was necessary to win the battle. But in part, our conscience should be clear because we have been trying and we must keep trying with all our energies. Fundamentaly, I'm an optimist—and I believe we will win, and can win, if we try hard enough—because we are right.

Minnesota Newspaper Cites Rate Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, small town newspapers have their full share of problems, and this week the Adrian Review in southern Minnesota reported another version of the problems they confront.

Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial as follows:

SUBSCRIBERS PLEASE NOTE

The Post Office Department has raised the rate from 5 to 10 cents for notifying newspapers of the correct address for your paper—that is, when you move from one location to another. The Post Office Department furnishes forms for you to fill out when you change your address, so be sure to fill one out, or else notify your newspaper direct, or otherwise we will be forced to cancel the extra month we give on your subscription as we can't pay 10 cents for having the post office notifying us.

Just to show how they treat a newspaper, here is an example: The Central Telephone Co. office at Slayton is a subscriber to the Review, and this week we received a notice from the Slayton post office, which cost us 10 cents, to put the box number on the address label. The paper has been sent for 10 years without the box number and they always received it, then along comes the postal department with this silly change. Besides, the box numbers are rarely marked on the inside of the post office box you rent—just the name.

No wonder the postal department is operating in the red every year, with higher postage rates yet poorer service, and don't be surprised to see higher postal rates in the near future. We can truthfully say, however, that we have no complaints with the service at our local post office.

The Bulging Federal Payrolls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Derrick, Oil City-Franklin-Clarion, Pa., January 26, 1962:

THE BULGING FEDERAL PAYROLL

The bulging Federal payroll has been a source of continued concern to those, in Congress and out, who are laboring for a sounder fiscal policy in government and an end to deficit spending.

Latest available reports show that upward of 2,400,000 civilian employes are on the payroll of the Federal Government. Payroll costs in fiscal 1961 reached an all-time high of $13.6 billion. This was equivalent to $242 for every U.S. family, a sharp contrast with the per family cost of $134 as recently as 1947.

In a statement to Cabinet officers and agency heads last October President Kennedy himself took notice of the mounting payroll costs when he said:

"I am * * * especially desirous that the number of Government employees be limited to the minimum consistent with getting the job done. There is no question that employment can be held substantially below the levels which would be possible under the funds authorized by the Congress if strong efforts are made to achieve increases in productivity and efficiency * * * and to staff each activity with only the minimum number of employees needed to carry out our objectives. I expect each of you to make such efforts."

The action called for by the President has not been realized. Reports indicate that the number of civilian employees and the costs thereof continue to rise.

The Agriculture Department, for instance, will have 7,000 more on the payroll by midyear than it has now, over 5,000 employees were added to the Interior Department's payroll last year; the Health, Education, and Welfare Department's announcement of a cutback of more than 600 jobs now turns out to be a cutback in positions that have never been filled; staffs of the Federal Aviation Agency and the Bureau of Public Roads are increasing steadily.

So it goes, all up and down the line. The upward surge in the civilian payroll doesn't seem to have leveled off one bit since the President's statement urging that employees be limited to the minimum.

Available data certainly indicates that a substantial cutback in the civilian payroll can be effected without impairing essential services. But it's obvious that more than words of admonition to agency heads is necessary to bring about a reduction.

FLIGHT OF THE DOLLAR

While you're concentrating on the flight of astronauts and space achievements, take a few seconds to read this and follow the flight of the dollar.

In 1961, according to data disclosed by the National Industrial Conference Board, an income of $12,510 was needed for a married couple with two children to have the same purchasing power—after Federal income and social security taxes—that a $5,000 income, provided in 1939.

The taxes on $5,000 in 1939 amounted to $59, leaving a balance of $4,941. Out of a $12,510 income last year, taxes took $1,912. That left $10,598.

Because of today's higher prices, however, the report of the Conference Board says another $5,657 must be taken out of the $10,598 remaining after 1961 taxes in order to adjust it to the buying power of the 1939 dollars.

That ought to provide plenty of ammunition for a fight for tax rate reform.

Our International Trade and Dollar Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, international trade and our dollar positions constitute one of our major matters of concern today. Seldom these questions are discussed in language and in terms that only complicate our thinking on them. One of my constituents, Dr. Lewis E. Lloyd, a brilliant economist, made a splendid presentation of the subject in the December 16 issue of the magazine of Wall Street.

In fact, it was so well presented that the editors said:

We have yet to see such a clear and simple explanation of the trade and dollar position of the United States in relation to the rest of the world as given in this article—and we are delighted to be able to present it to our readers because of the great need for understanding this critical situation, both as businessmen and investors.

In this illuminating feature, Dr. Lloyd explains the complex balance-of-payments problem in easily understood terms—shows what has caused it—presents a forthright case telling why he rejects the low tariff policies advocated both by the Government and most theoretical economists—what steps he believes should be taken until various distortions in the system of free world trade can be removed—and what solutions must be considered by President Kennedy.

This very thoughtful reexamination helps us to clearly see both sides of the situation and makes a real contribution to clear thinking on these vital economic issues.

I would like for my colleagues to have the benefit of Dr. Lloyd's study and under unanimous consent I am presenting it for consideration:

WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE TO SOLVE OUR INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND DOLLAR POSITION

(By Dr. Lewis E. Lloyd)

A year ago we faced a temporary gold crisis when gold which is pegged at $35 per ounce sold at a premium for several weeks on the London market and briefly reached a high of $41 per ounce. Since then the press has given considerable attention to our balance-of-payments deficit. What is not generally recognized, however, is that this problem is imbedded in the fundamental economics of trade.

Foreign trade consists of the exchange of economic goods and services between nations. Money becomes involved in two ways: as a standard for evaluating diverse products and as a medium of exchange. Simply stated, the equation of exchange takes the form: goods ⇆ money ⇆ goods.

It is important to note that the economic exchange process is not complete with merely exchanging goods for money but only after the second step of exchanging the money for another economic good.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS DEFINED

Balance of payments is the term applied to the accounting of the exchange of goods, services, and capital transfers between a given country and other countries. If the sum of all these exchanges does not balance, then there will be a shift of the exchange medium, money, into or out of the country.

The balance of payments is made up of the net of trade, the net on tourism, the net on services such as shipping charges, insurance, etc., the net of capital flow for investment, interest payments and dividends, and the net of unilateral transfers (foreign aid and personal gifts). In recent years the dollars which foreigners have obtained from our imports, from tourists, capital transfers, and foreign aid have far exceeded the total dollars which have returned; and so we have had a substantial negative balance of payment—an outflow of dollars.

This large and growing outflow of dollars which have not come home indicates that we are noncompetitive. If our goods were not overpriced relative to world markets, most of these dollars would have been used to buy from us.

How has it come about that the United States, the greatest industrial Nation in the world, has become a high cost producer? The answer to this question requires an examination of the changing economic and political situation in the world.

HEIGHTENED FOREIGN COMPETITION; REDUCED TARIFF BARRIERS

In recent years we have seen a breakdown in the colonial system which for two centuries had integrated the underdeveloped and industrial nations into an economic unit. At the same time we find a resurgence in the industrial nations. Europe and Japan have replaced their war-torn plants with new, modern, efficient ones. During World War II they were unable to continue to supply the export markets which they had built up around the world. We filled the gap. Now they want their export markets back whereas we are determined to hold onto them and even to expand our exports.

In the past two decades while these sweeping changes were taking place, we have rapidly reduced our tariff rates. They are now more than 75 percent below 1930 levels and average only a little more than 10 percent on all dutiable items. These reductions, which have been made under the Trade Agreements Act, will be extended under administration proposals, which call for further across-the-board tariff cuts in another major step toward complete free trade.

According to prevailing theory, free trade is supposed to maximize economic efficiency through extension of the principle of the division of labor.

TARIFF REDUCTION THEORY BASED ON UNREALISTIC ASSUMPTIONS

This is a fine theory and sounds very plausible in the classroom. Unfortunately, few proponents of free trade realize that its application will advance economic efficiency only if all the assumptions upon which it is based are met. The necessary conditions involve a free market in essentially all the contacts and relations between nations.

For example, there should be:

1. No embargo or tax on raw material exports;
2. No world cartels or commodity agreements;
3. No immigration restrictions;
4. Similar tax burdens and laws governing business in all countries;
5. A completely free market in currency exchange;
6. No overriding defense requirements; and
7. Finally, no government subsidies for the economies of the trading partners.

No one of these conditions is fully met even in the free world today, and the one single factor of exchange controls and pegged rates is sufficient to bring consequences not intended by the free trade theory.

By way of example: When six nations in Europe decided to form the European Economic Community (the Common Market), they found that they could not accept free trade without taking account of the assumptions underlying the theory.

As a consequence, the Rome Treaty proposes the free and unrestricted movement of workers from country to country, and the equalization of indirect costs to producers so that fringe benefits, social taxes and the like will not make a producer noncompetitive in one country as compared to others in the Market.

They also had to recognize exchange problems. The only practicable answer was "gradualism," for too rapid an adjustment would have brought undesirable and unnecessary hardships—unemployment and economic dislocation.

IMPORTANCE OF STABILITY

Another matter important in regulating world trade is stability. There is considerable doubt that, given a free choice, people everywhere would choose maximum efficiency, because the highest division of labor, to get maximum efficiency, also maximizes instability and risk. Communities, companies and even individuals find it desirable to spread the risk, to diversify. The maximum international division of labor would not necessarily be the most desirable state in the economic relationships between nations.

Stability is becoming an increasingly prominent objective for our own American society, although maximum stability would be stagnation. We need constructive change at such a rate that it will not cause undue hardship. The adjustments that are required in foreign trade relations are no exception; while our foreign competitors stand still in the race for improved productivity.

A second way in which we might regain competitiveness would be for foreign wage rates to rise rapidly so that unit costs overseas would match our own.

This would be an almost ideal solution. Foreign workers would realize rapid increases in purchasing, power, broadening their mass markets. This, however, is only daydreaming or at most shows promise only in the distant future. It is true that in recent years the percentage increase in wages in Central Europe has been larger than in the United States. But this is of small comfort when the absolute gap remains so large. For example, if wages in Germany at 75 cents an hour should increase 10 percent, it would add only 7½ cents per hour to the labor cost. In the United States a 5-percent increase on a $3 wage means a 15-cent-per-hour increase. This is little remedy on a short-term basis.

Another alternative would be to have reductions in prices, both of labor and products, in this country.

A very neat solution would be to have all wages and prices reduced by a constant fraction, say 25 percent, as of some particular morning. Obviously, with the monopoly power which resides in big labor, which year in and year out has won wage concessions in excess of productivity, we are not likely to obtain any wage rate reductions. So this method offers no possibility as a practical solution.

There is a way, however, in which the same purpose might be accomplished without affecting the wage and price relationships in this country. This would be to readjust the exchange rate between the dollar and other currencies. Last summer a responsible Swiss financier estimated that the dollar would sell at more than 25 percent discount relative to the Swiss franc on a free market basis. Were this to happen, we would get a readjustment downward of our wage rate and prices relative to that of the other countries of the world. In a free market, the exchange rate adjustment would continue until our products on the average had become competitive again in world markets and the total dollar outflow was roughly balanced by the inflow.

WEAK GOLD POSITION BLOCKS NATURAL EXCHANGE RATE ADJUSTMENT

If this solution is so easy and sound, why hasn't it been done? It hasn't been done and isn't being contemplated because of the large short-term foreign claims against our gold.

If the dollar were trading at a substantial discount relative to gold in foreign markets, these dollars would be tendered as claims against our gold. If we did not repudiate our promise to supply gold at $35 per ounce, we might well lose all of our gold supply and still be short of meeting our commitments.

A primary factor in our negative balance of payments in recent years has been our foreign aid. The data on our foreign obligations indicate that we cannot and have not been able to finance this level of charity.

In the early days of the Marshall plan, practically all of the aid dollars were spent in the United States and thereby at least supported jobs in this country. As industry was rebuilt overseas, less and less of the aid dollars have been spent here, until by 1959 only about 30 percent came back to support American jobs. If we are going to continue this massive international dole, the least we could do is to require that all of it be spent in the United States so that it will support jobs in this country and not add to the problem we now face in our balance-of-payments deficit.

DO WE HAVE THE FORTITUDE TO FACE REALITY?

At this critical time we need to face reality. We must recognize the importance of a strong, vigorous U.S. economy as a bulwark of the free world, and take the necessary steps to maintain our strength.

To this end we should above all avoid further Government deficits and monetary inflation. Only by displaying the kind of monetary integrity and fiscal responsibility which we for so long have preached to others can we hope to prevent further loss of confidence in the dollar and the probability of a run on gold.

Secondly, we must reshape our foreign trade policies. Any continued foreign aid should be in terms of goods, for which we have excess capacity, not in dollars. We will need to maintain orderly markets for our domestic production to safeguard jobs, until we can adjust to the point that we are again competitive. We must maintain a sound footing ourselves if we wish to remain the pivot man in the free world.

If Lincoln, Like Kennedy, Had Invited "Guidance"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the issue of "muzzling the military" is receiving much attention these days. A lighter side of the issue was presented in today's New York Times by the able correspondent, Arthur Krock. It might be termed "A Whimsical Exercise in Group-Think":

IF LINCOLN, LIKE KENNEDY, HAD INVITED "GUIDANCE"

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 29.—President Kennedy's statement at last week's news conference that even the highest civilian officials and military officers should circulate their proposed speeches through the Government for "guidance," as he did his state of the Union message, has happily brought to light an anonymous paper on this subject, worthy of having been inspired by Bob Newhart's idea of how Madison Avenue would have edited the Gettysburg Address. The anonymity is attributed to the continued presence of the author in the State Department's "speech-guidance group."

The work is a speculation of interdepartmental comments Lincoln could have received on the address if he and it were contemporary with present times and the "guidance" system. There is room here for only the subjoined few of these might-have-been guidelines, which seem less imaginative than they would have before the Stennis subcommittee assembled:

Comments by the State Department. (1) The phrase "brought forth on this continent," while technically correct, implies that the United States feels it owns the entire territory. This conflicts with our hemisphere policy and should be changed to "an area bounded on the north by 49 degrees N. latitude," etc., etc.

(2) The use of "dedicate" five times is tautological, which should be corrected by the alternate use of "apotheosize." Since "nation" is a popular term without basis in international law "member state" should be substituted. On the other hand, "our poor power" implies self-admission that the United States is not a major power, and the Secretary has directed the staff to work on a substitution. "The world will little note" invades the Department's statutory assignment to make such evaluations; substitute "There probably will be only a few people who will note," etc.

(3) The requirements of international harmony call for the elimination or modification of phrases such as "conceived in liberty," "created equal," "birth of freedom," "Government of * * * for * * * and by the people," etc., because a number of our member states do not believe in liberty, freedom or equality and would properly take offense. The same objection applies to the words "under God." And, "conceived," "brought forth" and "new birth" are open to interpretation among some of our NATO allies as offensive references to some recent irregular goings-on in their high official and motion-picture circles.

MORE GUIDANCE

Other department commitment: (1) The Department of Defense urged the elimination of "We are now engaged in a great civil war." The passage recalls to the people the cost of our Military Establishment, particularly undesirable in this budgetmaking period. The words should be changed to "We have entered upon a period of civil uncertainty involving fairly high mobilization." For the same reason "brave men, living and dead," "honored dead" and so on are ill chosen; they unnecessarily call popular attention to a byproduct of war the people don't like. And "all men are created equal" must be excised because it is objectionable to the Air Force.

(2) The Navy Department deplored the misleading impression, created by stress on land operations, that there were no engagements at sea. It proposed mention of air-sea rescue. The Department of Commerce reported it would take years to coordinate the interests of all its units so that they could be safeguarded in the address, but meanwhile had compiled 253 suggested editorial changes. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (joined by State) asked that the speech be postponed until it could locate all its officials with titles conveying supreme authority.

(3) The Budget Bureau proposed the address be turned over for complete revision to a working group from State, Defense, Treasury, Post Office, Labor, and Commerce, explaining the Bureau did not seek membership on the group because it could make whatever changes it chose later. Meanwhile, however, Budget counseled against figures of specific commitment such as "Fourscore and 7 years ago"—advising "A number of years" instead—against "we cannot hallow this ground" as in conflict with Secretary Freeman's plan, and reminded the President that only Congress can "highly resolve"—or "resolve" at all.

If the luck of the United States is holding, the anonymous author of this paper is still in the State Department.

Don't Relax Legislative Hand on Pursestrings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call attention to the very timely editorial which appeared in the Williamsport Sun-Gazette of January 23:

DON'T RELAX LEGISLATIVE HAND ON PURSESTRINGS

The most dramatic proposal of President Kennedy's state of the Union message was his request for standby presidential authority to reduce personal income tax rates to combat business downswings.

The idea of granting discretionary authority to the President to cut taxes in hard times is favored by many economists. It was recommended last year by the Commission on Money and Credit.

This is a proposal which may have merit, for high taxes won't help our economy recover when it runs into a depression. Temporary tax cuts at such a time might prove to be a stimulant to private business.

However, Congress can handle tax cutting as easily as it deals with tax levying. Both jobs belong to it. Whatever merit, therefore, there may be in the idea of temporary tax adjustments can be realized without relaxing the hand of Congress on the Nation's pursestrings.

The Federal Constitution deposits with the National House of Representatives the power of levying taxes. We ought not to tamper with that provision.

If, in the opinion of the President, a fluctuation in the national economy warrants cutting personal taxes, let him first convince Congress of the wisdom of such action. Under this system of checks and balances, we can expect to enjoy the benefits of the President's new idea without weakening our constitutional form of government or giving up the protection that comes from a coequal Congress.

Railroad Buying and Our National Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to me, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix an article by John W. Scallan, president of the Pullman-Standard Corp., entitled "Railroad Buying and Our National Prosperity," carried in the January-February 1962, issue of Railway Materials and Equipment, of Chicago, a fine national magazine for railway executives.

As Mr. Scallan underscores dramatically, the national economy is dependent to a measurable extent on the railroads and the huge amounts of goods and services which the railroad companies, taken as a group, purchase from other companies each year.

Some idea of just how much this market has shrunk can be gained by realizing, as Mr. Scallan points out, that this was a $3 billion a year market only a short time ago and now it is well below the $2 billion a year mark. This is, as he emphasizes, a terrific loss to the general economy and is severe in terms of jobs in many, many industries.

As I have asked before, and as I intend to ask again, how long can we allow the plight of the railroads to be subordinated in Congress? We must put the problems of the railroads on a priority basis, for thousands of jobs are at stake, not only on the railroads, but in many, many industries which have depended upon railroad purchases for their profit. I congratulate Phil Murphy, the editor of Railway Materials and Equipment, for carrying this article and other articles which underscore vividly the problems of this vital industry and of all those industries which serve the railroads.

The article is as follows:

RAILROAD BUYING AND OUR NATIONAL PROSPERITY

(By John W. Scallan)

When a $3 billion market shrinks, over a period of years, to well below $2 billion the repercussions on the overall economy of our Nation are bound to be severe. Such a loss in market has been suffered by the railway supply industry since World War II.

I submit that this situation is a serious threat to our national prosperity on the basis

that all segments of the economy are tied in together; and when one becomes weakened, the entire structure is threatened.

At one time the railroads were widely known as the 20-percent industry because they purchased approximately 20 percent of the Nation's steel; 20 percent of our timber, coal, brass, copper, metal products, lubricants, rubber, and a host of other items.

However, in more recent years, particularly since World War II, the industry might properly be called the $2 to $3 billion industry because the railroads, from 1946 to 1957, consistently spent from $2 to $3.5 billion per year for plant, equipment and supplies. In 6 of those 12 years, their purchases exceeded $3 billion.

But what has happened since the $3 billion year of 1957?

In the 4 years, 1958–61 (1961 estimated), the average spent by class I railroads for equipment, roadway and structures and materials and supplies (except fuel) was $1,791,534,000 annually.

For the first half of 1961, available figures show that railroad capital expenditures were down 22.9 percent as compared with 1960—in actual figures about $102 million. Expenditures for equipment were off 23 percent and for roadway and structures 24 percent, as compared with 1960.

Estimates for all of 1961 indicate that capital expenditures of the class I railroads may be 29.3 percent below the previous year's figure—a drop of almost $269 million in this item alone.

REDUCED RAILWAY PURCHASES HURT PEOPLE

Now, it is not difficult to translate the above figures into terms of lost employment in railway supply manufacturing plants around the country. When railway orders are reduced or postponed, we are forced to lay off workers and curtail expenses in every possible way. When workers are laid off and production facilities are mothballed in our industrial communities, local retail and wholesale trades are adversely affected. Thus, the fires of recession are fueled.

In short, when you remove a billion dollars, or three-quarters of a billion, or even half a billion, from circulation in our economy someone is bound to get hurt—in fact, many people and many concerns have been hurt badly. Because one of the vitally important sparkplugs of our economy (the railroads) has been missing in recent years, our national "motor" has lost a good deal of power.

It is interesting to note precisely what industrial centers are affected by an increase or a decrease in railway purchases. Recently, the Railway Progress Institute, in preparing to testify before the Senate Committee on Commerce, conducted a quickie survey of the entire railway equipment and supply industry. With a 46 percent return on a simple questionnaire, it was found that 914 production facilities of the supply industry are located in 468 cities in 45 States.

A concentration of plants in our Nation's great industrial areas was apparent. One-hundred and twenty-five plants were located in the Chicago area; 76 in the New York City and northern New Jersey area; 43 in the Pittsburgh area; 39 in the St. Louis-East St. Louis area; 21 in Cleveland; 19 in the Kansas City area; 18 in Los Angeles and a like number in northwestern Indiana; 17 in Detroit; 16 in Buffalo; 15 in Philadelphia; 13 in Milwaukee; 12 each in Birmingham-Bessemer, Baltimore, Bridgeport-New Haven, and Minneapolis-St. Paul; 11 each in San Francisco, Cincinnati, and Houston; 8 in Louisville; 6 each in Columbus, Indianapolis, and Sharon-Greenville, Pa.; and 5 each in Denver, Huntington, W. Va.; Memphis, Pueblo, Rochester, and Toledo.

It is in these important industrial areas that any curtailment of railway purchases hits first; and conversely, any increase in purchases is felt quickly as our plants get busy on railroad orders.

I think it significant that so many of the plants of the railway equipment and supply industry are located in industrial areas where there has been a disturbing amount of unemployment recently. The Bureau of Employment Security of the Department of Labor, in its April 1961, report, listed 17 major cities in the continental United States as having substantial and persistent labor surplus. Our industry has plants and production facilities in 11 of these 17 cities. I know that we have been forced, by the recent dearth of railway orders, to contribute to that unfortunate situation.

SPENT RAILROAD DOLLARS FAN OUT THROUGH OUR WHOLE ECONOMY

My entire business life has been spent in the railway carbuilding business, and it is, therefore, natural that I think in terms of freight cars when trying to measure the effect of railway purchases on our national economy. Some time ago I asked our own purchasing department to make a study of all the people who supply carbuilders, the companies which supply all the materials and parts that go into the manufacture of freight cars—box, refrigerator, flat and piggyback cars, covered hoppers, tank cars, all kinds of special cars. My purpose was to determine how quickly railroad dollars spent on new cars would fan out through the entire economy.

I confess that I was amazed by this check of where the major items used by carbuilders come from. For instance, steel products are made in 27 States. We customarily think of steel as coming from a few great industrial centers like Pittsburgh, Gary, and Youngstown. Yet we find that fabricators of steel items for freight cars are located all over the country. They make the underframes; the coupler, the brake beams, the wheels, the sides, ends, roofs, and doors of boxcars; the truck frames, bolsters, and springs; the draft gears, the rivets, bolts, nuts, washers, nails, and screws, plus other items that must be a part of any freight car.

And, of course, the same is true for the lumber that goes into the floors and linings for boxcars; the rubber products that go into door seals, air brake hose and snubbers; the paint and chemicals, the lubrication products, the cotton and cotton products, the aluminum and alloy metals that are being used more and more in freight-car construction. These items are manufactured, not only in the major industrial areas, but in many cities in many States.

Bear in mind, too, that I am speaking only of the items that go into railway freight car construction and not the raw materials that go to make up these items.

Now, multiply all of these products by 100,000 cars a year (the number mentioned by most railroad men as necessary to modernize the Nation's car fleet), and you can readily imagine what a stimulant such production would be to industry, employment and local prosperity in almost every State in the Union.

Very much the same story could be wrapped around any other major item on the railroads' shopping list; with locomotives, yards, centralized traffic control, signals, track, shops, terminals and so forth. In every case, the dollars spent by the railroads quickly fan out through our entire economy, providing jobs and payrolls in literally hundreds of communities in our land.

I mentioned earlier that the Railway Progress Institute recently made a quick check of the entire railway equipment and supply industry. Two simple questions were asked: (1) Where are your production facilities located and how many employees are now working in each plant? (2) how many people were employed in these same plants in your maximum production year since World War II (1946)?

On the basis of the initial 46-percent return on this questionnaire we determined that there has been an average reduction of 29.5 percent in employment in the 914 railway supply plants for which figures were made available.

Another illustration of the amazingly widespread effect of railway purchases on business in this country is to be found in the records of individual railroad purchasing departments. One large railroad recently showed us its current vendor list. It contained the names of 4,452 supplier companies located in 721 cities in 40 States, plus 19 cities in two Canadian Provinces. Just one railroad normally buys the products or services of more than 4,000 suppliers—and we have more than a hundred class I railroads in this country.

Well, I think the point has been made. All of these figures illustrate the far-reaching effect of railway purchases on the Nation's economy, particularly on those industrial areas which of late have been plagued with unemployment. The figures show, I think, that the dollars spent by the railroads for cars, locomotives, physical facilities, materials, supplies, and fuel, immediately permeate the whole industrial structure of our country; provide payrolls and jobs in almost every State; and power a chain reaction of prosperity and progress throughout our world of business.

This, then, is the problem. And, of course, it is only a reflection of the problems that beset the railroads themselves. I need not outline here the discouraging statistics on decreasing share of transportation market, shrinkage in freight car fleet, loss of revenues and smaller return on net capital investment. One fact will serve to point up what effect these problems have on the national prosperity: in 1960 the average number of employees of class I railroads was approximately 780,000, down 43 percent under 1946. What more need be said?

What I have outlined here, of course, really presents nothing that anyone connected with the railroad industry does not already know. But I do hope that it does make everyone more aware of the large stake that our railroad supply industry, and in turn the economy of this country, has in the railroads' well-being. We are a large industry. We employ almost as many as the railroads themselves. It is therefore a matter of enlightened self-interest that we suppliers give all the help possible to our customers in the fight for freedom from those regulatory burdens and tax policy inequities—placed on them by local, State, and Federal governments—which have frustrated so much progressive effort on the part of the whole industry.

And if the State and Federal Governments are so concerned about unemployment, as I am sure they are, it should be a matter of enlightened self-interest on their part to realize that the righting of a few simple, but important, legislative wrongs could put a lot of people back to work almost overnight.

EQUIPMENT DEPRECIATION RATE UNDER 3 PERCENT

Take the matter of depreciation. We suppliers are admittedly vitally interested in getting Washington to shorten the tax write-off period for new investment. We believe that such an action would stimulate the railroads to start buying a lot of equipment which is sorely needed to upgrade the fleet, as well as a vast amount of other purchases necessary for railroad plant modernization.

Railroad depreciable property, in general, is assigned a most unrealistic long life by the Internal Revenue Service. Freight cars, for example, must be depreciated over periods up to 35 years, with a consequent de-

preciation rate of well under 3 percent. This slow rate of recovery has made it difficult for railroads to obtain financing for the new equipment badly needed to keep the industry efficient and up to date. Since freight cars, like everything else, cost about four times as much today as they did in the thirties, this kind of tax treatment forces our customers to use the depreciation allowances from several old cars to meet the current payments on a single new one.

But the disparity between the original base of depreciation and the current cost of equipment is only one part of the overall depreciation problem. Another factor which must be considered is that of economic obsolescence. Because of the vast amount of technological advancement made by the industry since World War II, a substantial percentage of the present day freight car fleet is, in truth, economically obsolete.

Through research, invention and development in the supply industry, new concepts of material handling methods have been applied to railroad equipment. The means for recovering traffic lost to other forms of transport and for capturing new business are available in the many new types of freight cars developed in recent years. But an unrealistic depreciation policy makes it difficult, if not impossible, for the railroads to purchase these new products. It is a frustrating situation because the railroads' low net earnings do not produce enough funds to buy equipment which would place the industry in a position to increase earnings.

In recent years the supply industry has produced all kinds of new freight cars. These include: boxcars with 30-inch cushion travel, wide-door boxcars, full-door boxcars, 60-foot boxcars (84-foot cars are on the drawing boards), all kinds of aluminum cars, stainless steel covered hoppers, extra large tank cars, center-dump covered hoppers, piggyback flatcars, bi- and tri-level auto rack cars, container cushion cradles, skeleton cars for containers, pressure vessel tank cars, mechanical refrigerator cars, and a whole host of lading protection device cars.

And why all of these new types of equipment? For one reason only. The railroads have become more and more alert to the material handling problems of their customers, the shippers. In short, America's railroads have become more and more marketing conscious.

TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCES WASTED THROUGH LOW DEPRECIATION

All of these recent products of research and development attest to the fact that the interdependent railroad and supply industries have not been lagging in their efforts to progress technologically. And I have been using only the example of the freight car. The same technological advances have prevailed in the passenger-car field, in locomotives, signals, right-of-way, and other facilities.

But what good are all these developments if America's railroads are to be hamstrung in the effort to do a successful marketing job because they are not financially able to purchase the proper tools in the needed amounts.

Certainly today, in the rapidly changing dynamics of transportation, service life and depreciation rates cannot be judged properly in terms of physical exhaustion of assets alone (although when it is considered that automobile rack cars are traveling as much as 10,000 miles per month, compared to less than 1,400 miles for the average freight car, depreciation rates should be changed on that basis alone).

Consideration must also be given to the factors of obsolescence and useful economic life. Depreciation rates must be based on present experience and expectations rather than on past history. Private enterprise cannot be expected to make the large investments required in the railroad plant if depreciation deductions are geared to periods double and even triple those justified by economic efficiency.

But so much for depreciation. There are other battles to be fought and won before the railroad industry, and the railroad supply industry, can really do the efficient job of which they are inherently capable, and can thereby enjoy the economic health to which they should be entitled.

I need not outline here the absurd Government policy inequities that plague the railroad industry. Nor need I go into a description of the Magna Carta for Transportation or the legislative proposals contained therein. That document is, I am sure, familiar to every responsible person in either the railroad or supply industry.

No, rather than take up your reading time in describing these proposals, I would prefer to alert you to be ready for action when this program comes before the Congress. The climate appears to be good for some degree of remedial legislation. I believe the public is more prorailroad minded than in any time of history.

But we—all of us, railroader and supplier—must be ready for a fight. To be right will not be enough in this battle. We will have to be right in vast numbers. And in partnership, the railroads and their suppliers can produce those vast numbers. This is the type of crusade labor and management can work together on. Family and friends can be enlisted in the cause.

We must take a page from 1958 when the railroad and the supply industries stood shoulder to shoulder to win passage of that year's Transportation Act and continue our cooperative efforts until the legislation needed for this great segment of the economy is an accomplished fact.

Representative Arends and the Reserves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the problems concerning the maximum and intelligent utilization of our Reserve Armed Forces have been brought home by the calls to active duty of the past several months.

Representative LESLIE ARENDS, of Illinois, the ranking senior minority member of the House Armed Services Committee, is one of those who have been giving particular attention to these problems and has suggested that the committee study the Reserve situation in all of its ramifications.

With reference to his proposals, I would like to submit an editorial taken from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Monday, January 15, 1962:

REPRESENTATIVE ARENDS AND THE RESERVES

Although the military Reserves of this Nation are certainly useful, they might be made more so. Representative ARENDS, Republican whip and member of the House Armed Services Committee, therefore is on sound ground with his demand for an exhaustive study by the committee of the entire reserve program, which involves both National Guards and reservists.

"We do not presently have a fully efficient reserve force in a complete state of readiness and it is imperative that remedial action be taken at the earliest possible date," Mr. Arends says. His opinion seems well substantiated in light of the recent call-up. The readiness potential, of which so much had been said, was not nearly as high as is desirable under present world conditions.

President Kennedy spoke last May of almost doubling the Army's strength by increasing the potential of the Reserves. If Congress carefully studies the lessons of the call-up and ponders expert military testimony, it should find ways to approach the goal Mr. Kennedy set.

Kennedy Demands for Power May Be the Epitaph for the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, as it becomes increasingly clear what the administration has in mind in the way of a strictly planned and controlled economy we had better be warned that it may mean the end of the America we have known. If the social planners who evidently direct the President's thinking are successful in substituting Washington bureaucracy for the free enterprise system, we will have taken the final plunge into a socialistic state.

Difficult as it may be to believe, the President and his advisers simply do not understand a free society economy. What makes this whole thing more amazing is that one of the architects of the new order upon whom the President evidently leans is Walter Heller whose ideas for a planned economy, the same he is now trying to impose on the United States, failed in Germany and ignoring his advice the West German Republic, giving full reign to private enterprise has made one of the most remarkable economic comebacks in history.

This Congress faces a tremendous challenge in saving the American way of life in face of the pressures by the administration to experiment with total planning and total controls. I hope we have the courage to resist this attack on our free competitive system which has given more opportunity to more people than any other system devised by man.

The following article from this week's U.S. News & World Report shows how far the administration has gone and plans to go in changing our system:

GOAL FOR UNITED STATES: PLANNED ECONOMY, KENNEDY STYLE

What Kennedy planners have in mind is becoming clearer.

Big need, in their view, is to make the U.S. economy more "flexible," able to adjust faster to new conditions.

Their answer: Let Washington manage things, more and more.

A managed economy, with overall direction from Washington, is being proposed by President Kennedy.

If Congress agrees, there will be flexible taxes, flexible public works, flexible unemployment insurance.

There will be, in addition, control over wages and prices by official persuasion, not

by law. Supply and cost of money will be controlled as now.

Into this pattern fits a more aggressive use of antitrust laws.

All of this, then, is to be fitted into something called the national-income budget. This type of budget, employing a different measure of Government income and outgo, is to approach balance well before the United States approaches full employment; to move out of balance when and if unemployment rises.

To fight recessions President Kennedy is asking Congress now for power to do the following things if recession threatens:

1. Cut taxes of all individuals, temporarily, by $5 billion.

2. Order a big stepup in Federal spending on public works.

3. Increase unemployment benefits for millions of jobless workers.

The new measures would give the President more power than ever before to counter swings in business activity.

President Kennedy could spur consumer buying by ordering a tax cut for everyone. To perk up construction and building, he could order the spending of up to $2 billion for public works. If unemployment became "widespread," the President could proclaim an extended period of jobless benefits for hundreds of thousands of unemployed.

Once business began to pick up, the President could slow down public works spending—or halt it entirely.

GETTING GOING

The new requests for authority fit into President Kennedy's aim of "getting the country going again."

To achieve this, the President believes there must be more direction of the economy by Government. National goals are being set. Federal planning is reaching out to cover more and more activities. For example:

Wage formulas are now being put forth by the White House. They take the form of "general guidelines" for private wage and price policies.

It is recommended that wage gains in industry generally should be limited to increases in overall industrial "productivity"—the rate of output and efficiency of industry.

Since the end of World War II, productivity of all industry has gone up an average of about 3 percent a year.

Under the official "guidelines," then, industries generally are expected to hold wage increases to 3 percent a year.

Pricing policies of business and industry, too, are affected.

Under the guidelines, industries that show a larger-than-average gain in productivity are expected to reduce prices. To illustrate—

Say an industry increases its productivity 6 percent a year. That industry, it is recommended, should hold wage increases to 3 percent, and cut the prices of its products.

NOT-SO-NEW IDEAS

Wage-price formulas are the latest evidence of the trend toward more "guidance" of the private economy.

Actually, far-reaching moves have already been taken.

Take the area of national goals. The Kennedy administration has already set two major targets:

Economic growth of the United States should be increased to 4½ percent a year in the 1960's.

Unemployment should be brought down to 4 percent of the labor force by mid-1963—and then reduced further.

The overall aim is to achieve a state in which men and machines all across the country are fully employed.

President Kennedy, in his Economic Report just submitted to Congress, estimates that total output of goods and services at the end of 1961 was "short of potential" by more than $25 billion.

That calculation reveals another new kind of planning: measuring what the country is actually producing compared with what it could turn out if it operated at peak levels.

Walter Heller, the President's chief economic adviser, calculates that a fully employed U.S. economy in 1963 would produce $620 billion worth of goods and services—$100 billion more than in 1961.

That is not put forth as a goal for the United States. But it is held to provide some useful guides to policy.

SECTOR BY SECTOR

If some sectors of industry are found to be operating far below potential, Government policies and programs are to be developed to increase the performance.

You find dozens of examples of this kind of action.

Consider the field of investment in plant and equipment by business. The lag in this kind of spending in recent years, compared with major countries in Europe, has been one factor in the slower rate of growth in the United States.

President Kennedy has now come up with a tax credit plan covering investment in modern machines and equipment. In addition, depreciation rules are being revised to give businessmen more incentive to buy new equipment.

Planners have found dozens of areas around the country where men and machines are idle: Result: A new Federal program—with Federal direction and control—for redevelopment of these areas.

JOB TRAINING

Officials see that thousands of workers each year are displaced by mechanization and automation. Result: President Kennedy has requested authority to set up a new manpower-training program.

It's much the same in the case of young people without work. Government planners find 1 million young Americans out of a job, and they see 26 million young workers entering the labor market in the 1960's.

To get these people trained and on the job, adding their contribution to economic goals, then, is seen a Federal responsibility. Result: The President has asked Congress to pass a "Youth Employment Opportunities Act."

URBAN AFFAIRS

The problems of cities are another example. The Government has developed a program to help cities tear down slums. There is another program for helping cities fight air pollution. Aid for mass-transit systems is now being proposed. To head up the whole operation, President Kennedy is now calling for a new Cabinet-level post—the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

It all adds up to a growing role for the Government in the affairs of cities.

President Kennedy wants authority to make broad reductions in tariffs. Recognizing that some U.S. workers and companies might be hit hard by the resulting inflow of imports, the President is now proposing new Federal programs to give financial assistance to those hurt by foreign imports.

Antitrust laws are being applied more vigorously. One example: The Justice Department is now investigating whether banks in New York have gotten together to fix charges on business loans.

New wrinkles are showing up in official efforts to shape the pattern of interest rates. Officials, for the first time, are attempting to hold up short-term interest rates in order to keep capital from flowing abroad to seek a higher return. Such capital outflows add to this country's balance-of payments problems.

At the same time officials are trying to keep long-term interest rates low. Reason: Low long-term rates make it easier for businesses to borrow money to build plants and for States and localities to raise the money to put up schools, build highways.

THE NEW-STYLE BUDGET

Planners are using the "national income budget" to get a better idea of the impact of Federal spending and taxes.

This budget blends tax and spending figures with estimates of total output of goods and services. Adjustments are made for differences in timing between the flow of funds, as show in the "cash" budget of the Government, and the actual impact of taxes and spending.

For example, if the Government orders 10,000 trucks, defense contractors may take on workers and buy materials before the Pentagon writes a single check. The trucks may me be delivered before—or after—final payment is made.

The Government's regular budget would show the spending when payment was made. The "national income budget" records the value of the trucks as work progresses. This is considered to be a more precise measure of the effects on business activity of the truck order.

Government officials, thus, have a new "tool" to use when charting the effects on business of Federal spending and taxes.

And so it goes in one field after another.

More and more, the American economy is becoming a planned economy—with direction from Washington.

Lack of Gumption

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I submit this editorial from the Antelope Valley Ledger-Gazette of January 19, 1962.

The basic thread of the editorial—the need for quick, decisive action in a time of peril—must be an essential cornerstone of our national policy:

If ever there was a time when a nation ought to be thinking in terms of military action to settle some dust important to us, it is now. How we Americans got this air of quiet detachment and disinterestedness is beyond us.

One day we are hell bent to send our money, our young people, and our Socialist do-gooders unto all the world. The next day when we ought to be sending out military forces no one with nerve enough can be found.

The Dominican Republic is showing signs of reverting to terror—terror mind you that is instigated by adults and carried out by children, just the kind of terror we would expect Communists to mastermind.

A show of power, and a landing force of U.S. military units would settle the matter of maintaining peace there so quickly that it would make everyone's head swim.

But no one seems to have the guts.

President Sukarno of that rabble of Indonesia is acting like Nehru of India and says he is about to bring peace to Dutch holdings in New Guinea. This is a made-to-order situation for Uncle Sam to say "Hold on a minute, we happen to patrol that bit of the

world and we will not have any military action without our sanction." And we can do it, too. And we have a vital interest. We have put a lot into the Philippines, and they lay "just beyond."

But have Uncle Sam's gutless wonders said anything?—not insofar as the American people know, and they certainly have the right to know. And they have the right to feel that where the peace can be kept with a show of force that we will keep it, even if it does mean waving a gun. Rest assured that everywhere the Russians maintain the peace that the locals know that it is done with a gun. All they have to do is to step out into the street and take a look at the local monument to liberation. It usually carries a figure of a Russian soldier in his greatcoat waving a tommygun—very striking against the sky—and very salutary in effect.

Cuba is slowly putting together a military force that will in time upset things but good in the Caribbean, but are we doing anything about this cancer right at our door? Not a thing. And again our gutless wonders sit in Washington D.C. and wring their hands.

For some reason they cannot get it into their small heads that things work out the way we want them to work out—not the way we think they ought to work out if wishing would make it so. Americans are the greatest of wishful thinkers in this nuclear age if we take the action of our Government as any measure.

They will be wiped out—and if we do not get a change soon—we will go with our "leaders."

Almost daily the newspapers report experts predicting that the Communist world is about to split—even our President has stated that all is not well within the Russian Empire.

But have you thought of what this means? What this split is about?

The issue is between winning the world through "peaceful coexistence," or through direct military action, not whether the Russians will dominate China, or China dominate Russia. In either event the Western World (that's us) is scheduled for the fight of its life—and as of now we ain't fightin'—which chills us to the bone.

If China has her way we will be at war as soon as she can determine the date. And once at war Russia will be close behind because she is Communist. If Russia has her way, and peaceful coexistence wins out and we keep losing, peacefully, as we do every day, in Laos, Cuba, Conao, Dominica, New Guinea, Goa, and Algeria, China will fall in behind, because she is Communist.

So if you are one who thinks we can throw our tommyguns on the refuse pile when China and Russia take each other on in dialectic arguments, have another think, for it is the same thing as the political arguments Americans have—they are Americans still.

It is reported in Human Events of January 20 that "President Kennedy is so popular that he dare not even try to put through Congress this year the radical program for which he campaigned. The folks at home think of him as—to use J.F.K.'s own words—the 'father of Caroline'; and as a simpatico young man struggling with a sea of troubles. 'Folks just have to sympathize with any President when the burdens of office seem more than one man should carry'—so ran the perceptive analysis of Ted Lewis, Washington bureau chief of the New York Daily News, on January 9."

We care not a whit about how "simpatico" President Kennedy is. If he cannot do the job it will do us no good to weep about his sea of troubles—for his sea of troubles is our sea of troubles also, and we are not about to sink in that sea with him if we can help it.

The road to Hell is paved with good intentions; many are the fine young men who were unable to do the tasks they started out to do, and were shunted aside by someone more able—no one cried himself to sleep over such "injustices." It is accepted as part of life in a free nation where everyone has the right to try to gain the top that a sweet young man also has the right to fail and slip back to his proper level.

So, Americans, stop weeping for J.F.K. for the bell that is tolling also tolls for us.

W.J.V.

Analysis of "My Life on the Blacklist"—Article by Ring Lardner, Jr., in the Saturday Evening Post, October 14, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, in the October 14, 1961, edition of the Saturday Evening Post, Screenwriter Ring Lardner, Jr., makes a dramatic attempt to cast himself in the role of a martyr for having served a prison term as a result of his contemptuous defiance of Congress during Committee on Un-American Activities hearings on the motion picture industry in 1947. His article, entitled "My Life on the Blacklist," is replete with false and misleading inferences about the Communist conspiracy, and it completely ignores the compelling reasons which prompted the congressional investigation of the film capital. Mr. Lardner now admits that he was a member of the Communist Party at the time he appeared before the committee, but claims that he broke with the party in 1950. His continued active support of Communist causes and ideology up to this day strongly indicates otherwise.

I sent a lengthy, documented reply to the Lardner article to the editors of the Saturday Evening Post, but was advised by them that space limitations permitted the publication of only part of my remarks. For the benefit of my colleagues, I include the full text of my reply to Mr. Lardner in the RECORD:

ANALYSIS OF "MY LIFE ON THE BLACKLIST"—ARTICLE BY RING LARDNER, JR., IN THE SATURDAY EVENING POST, OCTOBER 14, 1961

In an article in the October 14, 1961, issue of the widely circulated Saturday Evening Post, Ring Lardner, Jr., has engaged in the fantastic attempt to create "heroes" out of a group of identified Communists, including himself, who were discharged from employment in the Hollywood motion picture industry.

Lardner's "heroes" are writers, directors, producers, technicians, and other employees in the motion picture industry, who, according to solid evidence obtained by the committee, were simultaneously members of concealed and conspiratorial Communist cells formed by the Communist Party for the purpose of promoting subversive Communist objectives within the industry.

It is significant that Lardner's heroes do not include the sizable number of employees of the industry who were lured into membership in the Communist Party, who eventually left it in disillusionment and disgust, and who subsequently alerted the public and the industry to the designs of the Communist conspiracy by their forthright testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Lardner's eulogies are for those, like himself, who have refused to disclose whether they have been and still continue to be members of the conspiracy when questioned under oath before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Lardner treats with scorn the eminent screen director, Robert Rossen, who according to Lardner "conceded that 'no one individual can even indulge himself in the luxury of individual morality' and proceeded to spill into the record all the names he could think of" during testimony before the Committee on Un-American Activities. Mr. Rossen, who appeared as a witness before the committee on May 7, 1953, did indeed declare that a previous refusal to respond fully to committee questions was based on what he "considered to be individual morality" and he no longer felt he could indulge himself in that luxury. It is interesting, however, that Mr. Lardner carefully restrained from giving the full context of Mr. Rossen's remarks which puts the testimony in an entirely different light:

"I don't think, after 2 years of thinking, that any one individual can even indulge himself in the luxury of individual morality or pit it against what I feel today very strongly is the security and safety of this nation."

Needless to say, there is also absolutely no reference in the Lardner article to Robert Rossen's testimony regarding the immorality of communism and the methods by which the Communist Party exploited Rossen and his important position in the motion picture industry during his 10 years of party membership. Mr. Rossen had in fact testified that the Communist Party sought, though its members in the motion picture industry, to build the power of the party in Hollywood and eventually influence the very films which were made. He also showed how Communists already within the industry were used to recruit new party members, and how the prestige and financial success attained by party members in the industry were utilized to further the basically subversive Communist objectives in Hollywood.

It might further be noted that Rossen's double role as party member and motion picture director netted the Communist Party no less than $40,000—which is Rossen's estimate of his direct financial contributions to the party and its front organizations. Hollywood was characterized by the committee in 1951 as "one of the principal sources of funds for the Communist Party of the United States."[1] It is regrettable that Lardner's Saturday Evening Post article provides no information on the extent of the Communist Party's financial gain as a consequence of Lardner's own party membership while he drew a $2,000 weekly salary from the motion picture industry.

Lardner's major heroes are the so-called Hollywood Ten—a group of motion-picture writers and directors, including himself, who were subpenaed to appear before the Committee on Un-American Activities in 1947, were questioned by the committee on the basis of such solid evidence as their own Communist Party registration cards, but refused to answer any questions pertaining to present or past membership in the Communist Party. The 10 were subsequently convicted of contempt of Congress and in 1950 began serving prison terms after the

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

U.S. Supreme Court refused to review the lower courts' decisions. Lardner also pleads the cause of hundreds of others whose lives have been scarred, he maintains, because they have been denied employment in the motion-picture industry as a result of (1) their failure to answer questions on Communist Party activities when subpenaed as witnesses before the Committee on Un-American Activities, or (2) even though never witnesses, their silence after being identified as Communists by former fellow conspirators in sworn testimony before the committee.

Lardner extols the recalcitrant witness group for having resisted "assaults on freedom of thought" by the Committee on Un-American Activities which he claims is intruding on traditionally private "beliefs and associations" in the realm of a "political activity."

While the courts, including the highest court of this land, have found to the exact contrary in decisions respecting the committee's inquiries in the field of Communist subversion, the falsity of Lardner's position can be demonstrated simply by reference to the testimony of another member of the Hollywood ten.

Motion Picture Director Edward Dmytryk must have qualified for Lardner's "hero" category when he went to jail with the rest of the Hollywood ten rather than respond to committee questions in 1947 regarding his Communist activities. But Dmytryk certainly fell from grace when he reappeared before the committee on April 25, 1951, for he then frankly discussed the Communist operation in Hollywood of which he (and Lardner) had been an integral part. Mr. Dmytryk does not rate mention in Lardner's article in the Saturday Evening Post. Yet here is what Mr. Dmytryk had to say regarding the chief purposes of the Communist Party in the Hollywood motion-picture industry:

"The first one was to get money. Hollywood is a very wealthy community, and it is a great source of capital.

"The next one was to get prestige.

"And the third and most important one was, through the infiltration and eventual taking over of Hollywood guilds and unions, to control the content of pictures. The only way they could control the content of pictures was to control studios, and the only way they could do that was to completely take over the guilds and the unions."

Mr. Dmytryk's reasons for disclosing the identity of fellow Communists within the motion-picture industry are also pertinent in view of Lardner's sneering portrayal of congressional investigators of subversion as "unordained confessors" who require witnesses to become "informers" and compete in namedropping as a "penance" for "past political misconduct."

A member of the Committee had asked Mr. Dmytryk whether the test of credibility of a witness purporting to be a former Communist who has changed his opinions would be "the willingness to name names, places, and circumstances surrounding such membership." Mr. Dmytryk replied:

"I personally believe so. That is why I am doing it. I think if a man says that he is convinced that the Communist Party is a subversive or criminal organization, that he certainly shouldn't mind giving names.

"I know that there have been comments—I don't mean by the Communists but even among certain progressives and liberals—that people who talk are in effect informers. I heard that so much that I went to the dictionary and looked up the word. An informer, roughly speaking, is a man who informs against colleagues or former colleagues, who are engaged in criminal activity. I think the Communists, by using this word against people, are in effect admitting they are engaged in criminal activity. I never heard of anybody informing on the Boy Scouts."

Mr. Dmytryk's reasons for refusing to answer questions during his first appearance before the Committee in 1947 are also interesting. He had left the Communist Party in 1945, he said, but he had not broken completely with the Communists until 1950. He had been persuaded that the party in this country was not a menace, while at the same time he believed the Committee on Un-American Activities was improperly invading the field of free speech and free thought. The subsequent step-up in the cold war, the outbreak of actual Communist military aggression in Korea, together with revelations of Communist espionage by individuals acting "for love of the party" convinced Mr. Dmytryk that a party encouraging such actions "is treasonable." "I do believe," declared Mr. Dmytryk in 1951, "* * * the Communist Party is conspiratorial, subversive, and even in certain cases treasonable."

In contrast, Ring Lardner, Jr., writing in 1961, refuses to describe the Communist Party as anything more than a "political activity"—

"* * * in whose ranks I had found some of the most thoughtful, witty, and generally stimulating men and women of Hollywood. I also encountered a number of bores and unstable characters, which seemed to bear out Bernard Shaw's observation that revolutionary movements tend to attract the best and the worst elements in a given society."

Lardner unfortunately is less frank with the American public than he has been when he writes for the Communist press, as will be demonstrated later. First, however, some important findings regarding the true nature of the Communist Party should be recalled in view of Lardner's semantics serving to glorify the Communists.

The Committee on Un-American Activities and its predecessor, the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, have conducted investigations and hearings with respect to the Communist operation in the United States ever since 1938, and published committee findings beginning as early as January 1940 have warned the Congress and the American people that the Communist Party was, in essence, "a foreign conspiracy masked as a political party."

In 1950, the Congress of the United States passed the Internal Security Act, thereby setting up certain registration and disclosure requirements for the Communist Party and its front organizations in an effort to protect this Nation from the conspiratorial and deceptive practices of the Communists. In the preamble to this act, which states the necessity for the legislation, there is a finding by the Congress of the United States that the "Communist dictatorship of a foreign country" has established and utilizes in various countries "action organizations which are not free and independent organizations, but are sections of a worldwide Communist organization and are controlled, directed, and subject to the discipline of the Communist dictatorship of such foreign country." These local organizations, the Congress also found, "endeavor to carry out the objectives of the world Communist movement by bringing about the overthrow of existing governments by any available means, including force if necessary, and setting up Communist totalitarian dictatorships which will be subservient to the most powerful existing Communist totalitarian dictatorship" (50 U.S.C. 781).

Under the authority of this Internal Security Act, a newly created quasi-judicial Government agency, the Subversive Activities Control Board, held hearings to determine whether the Communist Party of the United States could properly be designated as a Communist-action organization as above described and thereby become subject to requirements to disclose its membership, finances, etc.

After extended proceedings, during which the Communist Party was afforded such judicial safeguards as the right to present testimony and documentary evidence and cross-examine Government witnesses, the Subversive Activities Control Board, on April 20, 1953, found the Communist Party to be a Communist-action organization within the meaning of the Internal Security Act. The Board declared that:

"Upon the overwhelming weight of the evidence in this proceeding, we find that [the Communist Party] * * * is substantially directed, dominated and controlled by the Soviet Union, which controls the world Communist movement * * * and that [it] operates primarily to advance the objectives of such world Communist movement."

The Board also found that the Communist Party "* * * has and does at the present time teach, advocate, and carry out activities having for their objective the overthrow of the U.S. Government and other governments which are designated as 'imperialist' by the Soviet Union, pursuant to directives of the Soviet Union, all for the purposes of defending and protecting the Soviet Union and of establishing in the United States (and other countries) a dictatorship of the proletariat patterned after that in the Soviet Union."

Members of the Communist Party "consider the allegiance they owe to the United States as subordinate to their loyalty and obligations to the Soviet Union," the Board further determined. It also had something to say on the subject of misrepresentation of the Communist Party as a purely domestic political activity, which is instructive in view of such misrepresentation in the Ring Lardner article:

"Since the late 1930's, when it was faced with adverse legislation * * * [the Communist Party] has become increasingly diligent and resourceful in its efforts to appear as a domestic political party while continuing its subservience to the Soviet Union." (Subversive Activities Control Board, docket No. 51-101, report and order, April 20, 1953.)

On June 5, 1961, the Supreme Court of the United States handed down a decision upholding the constitutionality of the basic registration and disclosure provisions of the Internal Security Act. The decision, which resulted from long-drawn-out litigation brought by the Communist Party to avoid compliance with the act, also gave judicial recognition and sanction to the general findings by the Congress and the specific findings by the Subversive Activities Control Board regarding the true nature of the Communist Party of the United States. Justice Frankfurter, who wrote the majority opinion, referred to Congress findings that the world Communist movement establishes action organizations in various countries dominated from abroad to bring about the overthrow of existing governments and employing methods of infiltration and secretive and coercive tactics. He then declared:

"It is not for the courts to reexamine the validity of these legislative findings and reject them. * * * They are the product of extensive investigation by committees of Congress over more than a decade and a half. * * * We certainly cannot dismiss them as unfounded or irrational imaginings. * * * And if we accept them, as we must, as a not unentertainable appraisal by Congress of the threat which Communist organizations pose not only to existing Government in the United States as a sovereign, independent nation—if we accept as not wholly unsupportable the conclusion that those organizations 'are not free and independent organizations, but are sections of a worldwide Communist organization and are controlled, directed, and subject to the discipline of the

Communist dictatorship of [a] * * * foreign country,' * * * we must recognize that the power of Congress to regulate Communist organizations of this nature is extensive."

Although he dissented from the majority opinion on other grounds, Justice Douglas accepted the specific findings of the Subversive Activities Control Board, regarding the Communist Party with these words:

"The Subversive Activities Control Board found, and the court of appeals sustained the finding, that petitioner, the Communist Party of the United States, is 'a disciplined organization' operating in this Nation 'under Soviet Union control' to install 'a Soviet-style dictatorship in the United States.' Those findings are based, I think, on facts; and I would not disturb them."

An attempt has been made by Ring Lardner, Jr., to appear as a champion of constitutional liberties in his refusal to testify frankly before the Committee on Un-American Activities in 1947. "I had taken the position," Lardner writes in the Saturday Evening Post, "that, while public servants are answerable to the people, citizens cannot be summoned, in the absence of even an allegation of an illegal act, to account to government for their beliefs and associations—matters that have traditionally been an American's own business." Although Lardner admits that he lost the "arguments" by serving a prison term for contempt, he nevertheless seeks to create the impression that he was a martyr to the cause of constitutional liberties. Conversely, according to Lardner's chronicle, the House Committee on Un-American Activities—or the inquisitors and "unordained confessors" as he refers to the committee—is made to appear destructive of civil liberties.

Lardner offers his readers a stirring quotation from a U.S. Supreme Court decision which he fails to explain was rendered in 1943 with respect to the refusal of a member of a religious sect to salute the American flag. But he refuses to remind his readers of a number of important Supreme Court decisions directly involving the power of Congress to investigate and legislate in the field of Communist activities and the effect of such inquiry upon the Communists' first amendment rights such as free speech, peaceable assembly or association.

The majority of the U.S. Supreme Court, for example, in an opinion handed down on June 8, 1959, in the case of *Barenblatt* v. *United States*, upheld the contempt conviction of a witness whose refusal to answer committee questions concerning his Communist Party activities was based on a challenge of the right of the committee to inquire into his "political" and "religious" beliefs or any "other personal and private affairs" or "associational activities."

The Supreme Court majority opinion declared that the committee inquiry had not transgressed the provisions of the first amendment. The Court found that Congress had "wide power to legislate in the field of Communist activity in this country, and to conduct appropriate investigations in aid thereof," a power which, the Court said, stemmed in the last analysis from the right of a society to preserve itself. "Justification for its exercise," the court noted, "in turn rests on the long and widely accepted view that the tenets of the Communist Party include the ultimate overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence, a view which has been given formal expression by the Congress." Observing that "this Court in its constitutional adjudications has consistently refused to view the Communist Party as an ordinary political party," the Court concluded that "the balance between the individual and the governmental interests here at stake must be struck in favor of the latter" (360 U.S. 109).

Those equipped with the facts regarding the Communist Party's operation in America, and in the Hollywood motion picture industry in particular, can only be repelled by Ring Lardner's narration of how he and other identified Communist writers, actors and directors continued over the course of more than 10 years to trick the motion picture as well as the television industry into employing their services. Lardner's boastful account of how he and other identified Communists continued to maintain connections and make a comfortable living in our Nation's entertainment industry by employing ever-changing aliases and go-betweens; maintaining bank accounts in their false names and even registering in hotels under false names will not be admired as a kind of Robin Hood bravery. It will be greeted with the same scorn Americans hold for the shady dealings of underworld racketeers.

It is hardly by inadvertence that Mr. Lardner fails to inform his readers that he pursued his admittedly "cloak and dagger" activities despite finding by the courts that his discharge from the motion picture industry was justified. When Mr. Lardner was discharged from Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp. following his conviction for contempt of Congress, he sued the film company. Although a jury awarded him damages, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit on November 9, 1954, held that Twentieth Century-Fox was justified in discharging the writer under the "good conduct" clause of his contract; the court held he had violated the contract by having been found guilty of contempt for refusal to tell the House Committee on Un-American Activities whether or not he was a member of the Communist Party (216 F. 2d 844). The Supreme Court of the United States refused certiorari on February 15, 1955 (348 U.S. 944) and denied a rehearing on March 14, 1955 (348 U.S. 965). This denial of certiorari and of a rehearing had the effect of upholding the decision of the court of appeals that Lardner was justifiably discharged.

The only newsworthy aspect of the Saturday Evening Post article by Ring Lardner, Jr., is his public admission that he was indeed a member of the Communist Party when he was summoned to appear as a witness before the Committee on Un-American Activities in 1947. Almost lost in his rhetoric about his alleged concern for constitutional liberties is another admission that his refusal to answer committee questions at that time was also based on the fact that the relationship between members of the Communist Party had been a confidential one. This is certainly a euphemistic reference to the secret and conspiratorial nature of the Communist Party operation, but an important admission nevertheless.

Lardner's admissions demonstrate that the committee was correct in believing that Lardner possessed information which, if presented to the committee in sworn testimony, would assist the Congress in studying possible legislative measures to counteract the subversive efforts of the Communist conspiracy. Unfortunately, Lardner as a Communist did not supply any information which would be helpful to the committee, the Congress and ultimately to the American people.

Lardner alleges in his Saturday Evening Post article that he terminated his membership in the Communist Party when his contempt case was lost (in 1950). But he evades explaining his disaffiliation—declaring the matter had no particular pertinence to this story—and proceeds to deceive the American public with a completely distorted picture of the Communist operation in Hollywood. Mr. Lardner's credibility on the matter of disaffiliation remains to be established, particularly in view of his publicly recorded activities in behalf of the Communists, both before and after the year 1950.

On October 30, 1947, when Ring Lardner, Jr., appeared as a witness before the Committee on Un-American Activities in Washington, D.C., his Communist Party registration card for the year 1944 was read into the record. Public records cited at that time also attested to Lardner's service in the party's complex network of front organizations. These organizations included the Hollywood Writers Mobilization; the American Youth for Democracy; the Civil Rights Congress; the American Friends of Spanish Democracy; Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade; League of American Writers; Artists' Front To Win the War.

Subsequent to Lardner's appearance as a witness, and in the course of the committee's continuing investigation into Communist operations in the California area, Lardner's role in the Communist Party was sworn to by a total of 15 witnesses. These individuals for the most part were motion picture employees and one time bona fide party members who had personally associated with Lardner in party activities in Hollywood in the 1930's and 1940's.[2]

Screenwriter and former Communist Richard Collins told the committee in 1951 that Lardner had been one of the Hollywood Communists instrumental in importing the Communist Party line into the Screen Writers Guild during and after World War II. This important union was actually under the complete control of the Communists for a period, testimony before the committee revealed. Two other witnesses, Charles Daggett and George Glass, who were members of the Screen Publicists Guild in Hollywood, testified regarding Ring Lardner's efforts to recruit them into the Communist Party. Both had agreed to attend party meetings on Lardner's persuasion. Mr. Glass told the committee that he hoped "whatever legislation this committee recommends" would make it impossible for Communists to obtain recruits under false pretenses as to the real nature of the party. Mr. Glass said:

"Persons with humanitarian instincts can get trapped into something of that nature very easily when it is presented to them in that kind of candy coating such as we got at Mr. Lardner's house. We were served communism on a democratic platter" (testimony, p. 2492).

In the years immediately following Lardner's 1947 appearance before the Committee on Un-American Activities, Communist publications record his continued public activity in behalf of Communist-front organizations such as the Civil Rights Congress, the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions, and its chapter in Hollywood.[3] These activities, reported for the period 1948–49, are quite understandable in view of Lardner's admission in the Saturday Evening Post that he was still formally enrolled in the Communist Party of the United States. However, if Lardner actually left the Communist Party in 1950, as he claims, it is difficult to believe that disaffiliation also involved "disaffection" in view of his statements in Communist publications after 1950 and his activity in behalf of front organizations of the Communist Party also subsequent to that date.

In view of Lardner's obvious knowledge of Communist Party practices and techniques, he cannot claim to be one of the innocent dupes which usually make up the bulk of supporters of a deceptive Communist-front operation. He knows that Communist fronts extend the Communist Party's subversive influence into segments of our population which would not knowingly abet a Communist enterprise; that they provide a base for recruitment of additional party members and for utilizing the prestige and funds of non-Communists for party pur-

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

poses. The House Committee on Un-American Activities noted in its annual report for 1951 that four of the Communist-front organization which have operated in the State of California had been able to collect approximately $1 million from members of the Hollywood motion picture industry.

Just what were Lardner's motives, therefore, in continuing activity in Comunist-front organizations, such as the following:

1. The west coast Communist organ, the Daily People's World, on September 17, 1951, announced that Ring Lardner, Jr., would be "prominent on the picketline" which would form part of a mass demonstration against hearings then being held in Hollywood by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. The demonstration was under the sponsorship of the Southern California Chapter of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, a Communist front officially characterized as such by the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Internal Security Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee. The Los Angeles Times of September 18, 1951, reported that Lardner's name appeared, in connection with the demonstration, on a press notice issued by the Arts, Sciences, and Professions Council which described the committee as "subversive."

The Communist Daily Worker declared on November 13, 1952, that Lardner would also be one of the featured speakers at a reception to be held on November 16, 1952, under the auspices of the New York chapter of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.

2. A brochure issued by the Civil Rights Congress, New York chapter, listed Lardner as one of those former political prisoners who invited the public to attend a reception sponsored by the New York Civil Rights Congress in December 1952. The Civil Rights Congress was characterized as subversive by the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Subversive Activities Control Board also found it to be a Communist-front organization and ordered it to register as such with the Attorney General. In the autumn of 1951, Lardner's name also had appeared as one of the signers of an open letter to the Attorney General of the United States protesting the imprisonment for contempt of court of four trustees of the bail fund of the Civil Rights Congress of New York. The open letter appeared as a paid advertisement in the non-Communist press in October 1951 with the notation that the advertisement was paid for by the "contributions of signers." In its findings regarding the Civil Rights Congress, the Subversive Activities Control Board had observed that the organization, created and established by the Communist Party, had not only raised more than $1 million for legal defense and bail for Communist Party leaders and members, but also employed mass campaigns to arouse support for the party and its policies.

3. In 1952, Lardner endorsed a book printed by the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, which included his statement of support in its publishers' announcement. Long before 1952, the VALB had been cited as a notorious Communist front by the Attorney General, the House Committee on Un-American Activities and its predecessor, the Special Committee on Un-American Activities. After extended hearings on the organization, the Subversive Activities Control Board cited the VALB as a Communist front in 1955, concluding that it was "directed, dominated, and controlled by the Communist Party of the United States."

4. The Communist Daily Worker (Oct. 20, 1954) listed Ring Lardner, Jr., as among the "distinguished personalities" who had appeared on the program during an annual banquet held by the Communist-front publication, New World Review, in October 1954, in New York City. Lardner and others "were there to pay homage to Eslanda and Paul Robeson," the Daily Worker revealed. The Communist-front character of the sponsoring publication, New World Review, has been the subject of official findings by the Subversive Activities Control Board, the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

5. Ring Lardner, Jr., appeared as a featured speaker at a propaganda rally held under the auspices of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee in Newark, N.J., on December 10, 1955. Numerous notices in the Communist Daily Worker proclaimed Lardner would be a speaker at another rally scheduled under the auspices of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee in the Bronx, New York, on October 19, 1956.

The organization was officially characterized as a Communist-front organization by the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. The House committee, in its annual report for 1958, noted that the avowed purpose of the organization "is to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities and discredit the FBI" and that it has also "repeatedly assisted, by means of funds and legal aid, Communists involved in Smith Act violations and similar legal proceedings."

(6) Lardner authored a book review for the December 1956 issue of Mainstream, which the Committee on Un-American Activities characterized in its 1958 annual report as a monthly cultural and literary organ published in New York under the auspices of the Communist Party. In his book review, Lardner made the following interesting observations regarding the television program based on the experiences of Herbert Philbrick, former FBI undercover agent within the Communist Party:

"But faking in television assumes much more serious proportions than this. * * *

"Or, to take the most flagrant example of all, 'I Led Three Lives' states at the beginning of each episode that it is based on the true experiences of Herbert Philbrick as a police-spy in the Communist Party. Yet each story is conceived and sold, at fiction rates, to the producers by a professional writer in the same way that he might sell an episode to 'Lassie' or 'Superman'. Mr. Philbrick, on whose credibility as a witness men have been sent to jail, earns a tidy income from an outright lie, repeated in his name each week. Theoretically, the Communist Party of Massachusetts could sue for gross libel, but it would have to find a court dedicated to the rare principle of equal justice for all * * *

"The networks have not yet offered their facilities to the Communist Party to reply to the fraud called 'I Led Three Lives.'"

7. Lardner appeared as a featured speaker in New York City on December 6, 1961, at a rally under the joint auspices of the New York Council To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Youth To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee. The National Committee To Abolish the Un-American Activities Committee, of which the New York council is a branch, and the Youth To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee have been cited by the HCUA as created and directed by the Communist Party.

The above-described activities are hardly consonant with disaffection from the Communist Party. But they are entirely consonant with Lardner's statements to the Communist Party newspaper, the Worker, which were published on March 18, 1956, some 6 years after his alleged disaffiliation from the party appartaus.

In a lengthy letter to the editor of the Worker,[4] Lardner referred to himself as an "American Marxist" and manifested a continued devotion to the cause of the Communist Party of the United States and the world Communist movement which it serves.

For those unfamiliar with the internal situation of the Communist Party as of March 1956, it should be noted that Communists in the United States and throughout the world were debating the merits of their past actions—following the lead of Nikita Khrushchev who had roundly denounced the late Joseph Stalin and many of his policies in a "secret" speech to the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party in February 1956. Communists in the United States argued for a time on whether their role in the world Communist movement required a certain amount of friendly criticism of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union or their continued unwavering support and praise for all Soviet policies. The argument was resolved later in favor of the traditional puppet role for the Communist Party of the United States.

In his letter to the editor of the Worker, Lardner joined in this debate on the side of those Communists who proposed a certain amount of objective criticism of the Soviet Communist Party.

He demonstrated his personal concern with the affairs of the Communist movement in America through such statements as the following:

"You have had some comments in your columns on the worldwide implications of the developments at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, but what this individual reader has missed is an analysis of the meaning of those developments to American Marxists and the Communist Party of the United States.

"But more pertinent for American Marxists, it seems to me, is the possibility that we may have alienated some potentially close allies in an American democratic front by treating any expression of doubt regarding Soviet judicial procedure as an unforgivable sin."

It should be recalled that Khrushchev, in a deliberate effort to smash the Stalin idol, in 1956 confirmed many of the harsh facts about the Stalinist regime which had long been publicized by anti-Communists yet steadfastly denied by the Communist faithful throughout the world. In the course of his denunciations of Stalin as a "capricious" and "brutal" tyrant, Khrushchev confirmed that the late dictator had been responsible for the execution of thousands of completely innocent Communists and non-Communists in the Soviet Union. Trials were rarely granted to these hapless victims, whose death sentences rested solely on false confessions extracted from them by threats or physical torture, Khrushchev admitted in 1956. Such "purges" were conducted periodically in the Soviet Union from 1934 until the very eve of Stalin's death in 1953.

Lardner acknowledged to the Worker his embarrassment at the Khrushchev revelations; he stated that "American Marxists" had an obligation to face up to their own participation in, and lack of critical attitude toward, Stalin's errors. Lardner undoubtedly had in mind his own signature on the "Open Letter to American Liberals" which was issued by American Communists and fellow travelers in 1937 and which ridiculed a demand by many liberals for a complete and impartial investigation of the Moscow purge trials then in progress. Lardner and others had denounced any such investigation as "political intervention in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union with hostile intent."[5]

Footnotes at end of speech.

Although Khrushchev confirmed the falsity of this Communist position of past years, what is Lardner's chief regret as of March 1956? His concern, as expressed in the Communist newspaper, is over the non-Communist support which the Communists in this country may have lost as a result of a harsh attitude toward non-Communists' expressing "doubt regarding Soviet judicial procedure."

Lardner's statement contains no criticism of Stalin, whose behavior was described as "monstrous" by his former henchman, Khrushchev. In fact, Lardner's communication to the Worker offered possible excuses for the late dictator's excesses:

"Perhaps the cult of personality, as expressed in the near deification of Stalin, was necessary to the unity of the Soviet people during the critical campaign for collectivization, during the great war effort so magnificently personified in his indomitable spirit, and during the reconstruction of a stricken nation in the shadow of a cold war threat. * * *"

With respect to the injustices suffered by thousands of Soviet citizens who were physically exterminated and the millions more who languished in prisons under the Stalin regime, Lardner displays a callousness which is completely incompatible with his pose as a civil liberties crusader in the Saturday Evening Post.

Instead of expressing sympathy for Stalin's victims, Lardner coldbloodedly confined the assessment of Stalin's crimes to (1) those which were "necessary" byproducts of a regime which seeks the general progress, and (2) those which hindered the advance of communism.

"It is admittedly difficult to figure out [Lardner wrote to the Worker] just which errors cited by the Soviet leaders were necessary byproducts of a fateful struggle and which ones may have been actual impediments to the victory of socialism. * * *

"The admission in Moscow that some old Bolsheviks were unjustly treated may raise the issue of whether it is an inevitable part of a revolutionary struggle that individual reputations and even lives be sacrificed to the general progress. * * *"

Such statements contrast strangely with Lardner's self-portrait as a civil liberties devotee in the pages of the Saturday Evening Post. However, a double standard with respect to civil liberties has always been a special feature of the Communist Party's propaganda and agitation in this country. Communists have ceaselessly sought to portray themselves as stanch defenders of constitutional rights supporting every repression of freedom that occurs under the aegis of communism.

In writing to the Worker in 1956, Lardner referred to William Z. Foster, then national chairman of the Communist Party of the United States, as "America's outstanding working-class leader." Lardner's words in behalf of the Communist bloc of nations and the post-Stalin Soviet leadership, furthermore, match the fervency of Foster's own statements at this period. Lardner told the Worker:

"Of course, the Dulles contention that the [20th Soviet Communist Party] Congress revealed the weakness of the Socialist world is ridiculous. I certainly do not question Mr. Allen's [Daily Worker Columnist James S. Allen] characterization of the Congress as a 'dynamic, bold openminded approach to all problems, old and new.'"

In the light of his declarations in the Communist press, Ring Lardner's alleged disaffiliation from the Communist Party in 1950 obviously involved no diminution in his loyalty to Communist objectives. The American public, and the motion picture industry which he admittedly continues to exploit, have every reason to take a skeptical view of Lardner's propagandizing as an ex-Communist until he sees fit to speak frankly to them on the exact nature of his present relationship to the Communist Party—preferably under oath.

AMERICAN LEFT SHOULD REEXAMINE SELF, SAYS RING LARDNER, JR.

DEAR EDITOR: You have had some comment in your columns on the worldwide implications of the developments of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, but what this individual reader has missed is an analysis of the meaning of those developments to American Marxists and the Communist Party of the United States. I am made more conscious of this lack by James S. Allen's column in the Worker of March 4, in which he writes:

"Marxists abroad are supposed to be embarrassed by the party congress just concluded in Moscow, according to what I read in the newspaper. I must confess that I have no sense of embarrassment."

Well, I for one am embarrassed. It is admittedly difficult to figure out just which errors cited by the Soviet leaders were necessary byproducts of a fateful struggle and which ones may have been actual impediments to the victory of socialism. But this is not, in a primary and direct sense, our function. Much more urgent for American Marxists is the obligation to face up to their own participation in, and lack of critical attitude toward, those errors.

Perhaps the cult of personality, as expressed in the near deification of Stalin, was necessary to the unity of the Soviet people during the critical campaign for collectivization, during the great war effort so magnificently personified in his indomitable spirit, and during the reconstruction of a stricken nation in the shadow of a cold war threat. But even if that is true, it would still be questionable whether the American Marxist press should have reprinted, without qualification or critical commentary, so many of the cloying panegyrics which marred his 70th birthday celebration.

And in that connection, recalling the damage done in this country through leadership by personality, I wonder if some of the rather maudlin testaments to William Z. Foster on his recent birthday are really the most mature and effective way of acknowledging the respect due America's outstanding working-class leader.

The admission in Moscow that some old Bolsheviks were unjustly treated may raise the issue of whether it is an inevitable part of a revolutionary struggle that individual reputations and even lives be sacrificed to the general progress. But more pertinent for American Marxists, it seems to me, is the possibility that we may have alienated some potentially close allies in an American democratic front by treating any expression of doubt regarding Soviet judicial procedure as an unforgivable sin.

Again, if the Soviet-Yugoslav friction was occasioned at least in part by the unwarranted attempt of one Communist Party to dominate another, on whom did the obligation of objective criticism rest more squarely than on a party detached by distance and immediate interest from the smoke of that battle?

It is enough for Mr. Allen as a historian to say that the Soviet Communists are beginning "a basic reappraisal of their own history in the light of the new requirements of the transition to communism in the Soviet Union and the problems of assuring world peace." Was there not a very strong suggestion in the incomplete reports we have read so far, that distortions of revolutionary history had unfortunate effects in relation to old requirements as well? And don't we have to make a distinction between the changes of emphasis, on the one hand, which may alter our view of the past from one historical period to another, and actual misrepresentation of fact?

Of course, the Dulles contention that the Congress revealed the weakness of the Socialist world is ridiculous. I certainly do not question Mr. Allen's characterization of the Congress as a "dynamic, bold, open-minded approach to all problems, old and new." But if the relation of force in the world has so changed as to make Soviet Communists reexamine themselves from a position of strength, cannot some of the strength and independent critical judgment rub off on the American left?

RING LARDNER, Jr.

---

[1] Committee on Un-American Activities, Annual Report for 1951, pp. 7 and 8.

[2] The 15 witnesses and the dates of their appearance before the Committee on Un-American Activities are: Richard Collins, Apr. 12, 1951; Budd Schulberg, May 23, 1951; Frank Tuttle, May 24, 1951; Martin Berkeley, Sept. 19, 1951; Charles Daggett, Jan. 21, 1952; George Glass, Jan. 21, 1952; Sol Shor, Mar. 12, 1953; Pauline Townsend, Mar. 12, 1953; David Lang, Mar. 24, 1953; Max N. Benoff, Mar. 24, 1953; Robert Rossen, May 7, 1953; Roland Kibbee, June 2, 1953; Judith Raymon, Sept. 11, 1953; Stephen Wereb, July 1, 1955; and Virginia Viertel, June 6, 1956.

[3] These organizations were cited as Communist fronts by the Committee on Un-American Activities in its official reports based upon its investigations and hearings. The Civil Rights Congress was also subject to proceedings before the Subversive Activities Control Board, which found it to be a Communist-front organization and ordered it to register as such with the Attorney General.

[4] A reproduction of this letter is reprinted in its entirety at the conclusion of this analysis.

[5] The text and signers of the Open Letter to American Liberals may be found in the Communist-front publication, "Soviet Russia Today" dated March 1937.

Paul P. Pavia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, on January 18, Stamford, Conn., suffered a heavy loss in the death of its postmaster, Paul P. Pavia. In tribute to the memory of his life of service to his community, I ask that the following editorial from the Stamford Advocate be reprinted in the RECORD.

PAUL P. PAVIA

Paul P. Pavia, who died Thursday, was born in Stamford 65 years ago. It was probably his natural liking of all he met that led him into an active political and fraternal life. He began his public career by enlisting in the Navy during World War I. He closed it with 7 years as postmaster of Stamford.

His conduct of all his offices, elected and appointed, was marked by a calm competence. He was consistent in placing first the interest of his fellow citizens. He was a happy man who liked clean sports and good companions. He was also, in his quiet way, a man of courage.

Paul Pavia was devoted to his family, his church and his community. He showed this devotion by the way he lived. He will be missed by his multitude of friends and by the people of the community he served.

Postmaster Woodrow Sutton Tells Irwin County Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRIS FAIRCLOTH BLITCH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, the Cracker Postmaster is the official publication of the George chapter of the National Association of Postmasters of the United States. It is prepared and edited by duly elected officers, and features stories and articles written by the postmasters and by postal employees. Two thousand copies are published and circulated among postmasters and key Post Office Department personnel in 708 Georgia towns and cities. The postmasters of Georgia have every reason to be proud of this fine monthly publication.

The December 1961 issue of the Cracker Postmaster contains a generous tribute to Irwin County, Ga., located in my district. Postmaster Woodrow Sutton of Ocilla was called upon to sponsor this particular issue and the fruits of his efforts were outstanding.

There are four articles in the magazine relating to Irwin County which deserve commendation for their historical value. There is a report of the origin of Irwin County, the early days of the county, and the progress that has been evident through the years. Also there is a story about Jefferson Davis Park, located in Irwin County, site of the capture of the president of the Confederacy. Judge James Whitley, ordinary of Irwin County, who has served longer than any other elected official in Georgia, relates an early experience with Georgia's late Senator Walter George. A final story is Postmaster Sutton's message of thanks.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include for the consideration of my colleagues in the Congress and the general public these four articles from the Cracker Postmaster:

OCILLA: THE HEART OF THE SOUTH

(By Woodrow Sutton, postmaster, Ocilla, Ga.)

In the central section of south Georgia is one of the State's most productive agricultural areas. Irwin County, which centers this fertile section is one of Georgia's leading producers of tobacco, cotton, peanuts, corn, and truck crops, and in recent years livestock farming has become an important part of the county's economy.

It was nearly 150 years ago that the Creek Indians ceded to the United States a land area between the Chattahoochee River and Wayne County, bounded on the north by a line running from Fort Gaines east to the town of Isabella, bounded on the east by the Ocmulgee and Altamaha Rivers, and on the south by the Florida State line. Three counties were formed from this Indian territory and Irwin was the central of the three.

Irwin County was organized in the year 1820 and named for Gov. Jared Irwin, and the first census, taken the year the county was officially organized, showed some 79 families living in this vast county area.

In 1840, two mail routes were opened in the county—one running from Irwinville to Lowndes County and the other from Irwinville to Pindertown in Dooly County. Mail was carried about once a week over these routes, and in most instances by horseback. In 1857, another "pony" express route was opened from Irwinville to points in Ware County.

In these early days of the county, Irwinville, which was the third county site, was the metropolis of Irwin. Three courthouses were built in the community over a period of 53 years.

Located in the county, however, was another little village, the name of which had been changed some seven times since 1832. The hamlet, which the Indians had named Assile, then Aglie, had also become Axilla, Aqualil, Ochile, and finally, Ocilla. Established in the heart of a vast virgin pine acreage, Ocilla was beginning to grow rapidly from a sawmill village to an important trade area, centrally located in the county. A railroad—the Ocilla Southern—enhanced the community's importance as a business center and mail deposit center for the county. It soon became apparent that Ocilla was being pushed for consideration as the new county seat.

In 1906, an important election was conducted in Irwinville to determine whether or not Ocilla would become Irwin's fourth county site. It was a bitter contest, and one which attracted much attention. When the final returns were counted, Ocilla had been chosen as Irwin County's new court area. In 1910 the courthouse was built.

Today, Ocilla is a city of some 3,200 population, outstanding for its neat appearance and cleanliness, and more important, the friendliness of its citizens.

In competitive bid for industry, Ocilla points out that it is centrally located in the heart of south Georgia. The community is only 75 miles north of the Florida State line, 75 miles south of Macon, 125 miles west of the Atlantic coast, and 105 miles, east of the Alabama State line. This central position in the south Georgia area has been attractive to numerous salesmen representing Georgia and national concerns, who have settled here because of its accessibility to the area they serve. This central location, Ocillians believe, is important to industrialists and can mean much progress for the community.

The city of Ocilla is governed by a mayor and a five-man council which meets each month to dispose of city business. The county is governed by a three-man board of commissioners. Assisting these governing bodies of the city and county a six-man planning commission—three from the county and three from the city—determine the areas which need attention and development. Through this arrangement, it is felt the area can develop more systematically.

Numerous civic clubs in Ocilla are also devoting their attention to the growth and development of Ocilla. Among them are the Irwin County Jaycees, Ocilla Lions Club, Masons, Shrine Club, Ocilla Garden Club, and veterans organizations. These organizations center their attention on projects which will promote the welfare of Ocilla and attract outsiders to it. Just recently, through the efforts of the Irwin Growers Association and Ocilla Civic Clubs, Georgia's first sweetpotato festival was held here.

A greater percentage of the county's population are members of the many churches in the area which offer spiritual sanctuary for followers of practically all faiths. Churches of practically all denominations may be found in the city of Ocilla, in the county, or in somes instances, in nearby Fitzgerald. The churches include Baptists, Methodists, Primitive Baptists, Church of God, and Congregational. In Fitzgerald, 10 minutes drive north of Ocilla, a Catholic church and Jewish synagogue, have many members from Ocilla.

Serving the Irwin area is a modern, well-equipped 24-bed hospital, built in 1953 under the Hill-Burton Act. The hospital, land, and equipment are valued at $331,327, and it is in the plans made possible by a trust fund, to add two additional wards at a cost of $75,000.

Ocilla is served by four principal United States and State highways, the Seaboard Airline Railroad which connects with the Atlantic Coastline Railroad in Fitzgerald, and by two buslines.

One of the finer attractions of the community is the variety of recreational facilities the year around. In Cumbee Park, swimming and picnicking facilities are offered in season; in nearby Lake Beatrice, three additional swimming pools are available, plus bowling alleys and skating rink, air conditioned for all-weather use. Northwest of the city, Crystal Lake, a natural attraction, offers acres of white, sandy beaches, with ample picnic and camping facilities.

One of the State's finest nine-hole golf courses is located in Ocilla and two annual tournaments are sponsored by the golf club. The course, as well as the tournaments, attract numerous golfers from neighboring communities. In the county, numerous fish ponds are open to the public and the Alapaha River and Willacoochee Creek, which flow through the county, offer fishermen many hours of sport. In season, hunters find an abundance of quail, dove, deer, and duck in the county.

Jefferson Davis Memorial State Park, located near Irwinville, marks the spot where Jefferson Davis, only president of the Confederacy, was made a prisoner by Union soldiers. The park contains a statue of Davis and an attractive museum which house relics of Civil War days. The park attracts many tourists each year.

While the city of Ocilla has gained in population over the past few years, its citizens have become concerned with the decreasing county population. They have accepted the challenge of combining the agricultural and natural resources of the county with an industrial development effort, and feel certain that the future of the community will be a bright one with the energies of its citizens turned to that goal.

JEFFERSON DAVIS PARK IN IRWIN COUNTY, GA., AND THE DATE OF JEFFERSON DAVIS' CAPTURE

(By Jacob A. Clements, tax collector of Irwin County)

About 1 mile north of the little town of Irwinville, Ga., stands the hallowed spot where our President, Jefferson Davis, spent the night of May 9, 1865. There the Southern Confederacy ended.

As is commonly known by all of those that study history, Jefferson Davis was traveling by coach from Washington, Wilkes County, Ga. He intended to reach some southern port and embark for England with his family. President Davis, along with the party that was traveling with him, decided to make camp and arrived at the above-mentioned place on May 9, 1865.

You can well imagine how the Old South looked in those days. Tall, towering, longleaf pines stood upon the most of this fertile region. Occasionally a small farm would be seen from the coach windows as Mr. Davis and his party traveled southward. You can also imagine the thoughts that our Honorable President had as they arrived at this spot of ground. We, here in the South, love all of the 12 months in each year; but seemingly May is one of the prettiest months that we have here in the South during the year.

As is customary when a nation is defeated the leader or ruler of that nation is sought after and captured as President Davis was. So, on the morning of May 10, 1865, the Yankees had learned that President Davis was located nearby. Their soldiers camped the night before up about Bowens Mill which is now in Ben Hill County. One squadron of the soldiers of the Northern Army arrived ahead of Mr. Davis so they turned back northward just this side of a branch or small stream that flows through Jeff Davis Park. The other squadron traveling southward at about this time ran into their comrades. During this confusion and each squadron thinking that the other was Confederate soldiers from the South began firing at each other. The battle was fought between themselves until daylight came. Finally, through the dim and beautiful daylight, the Yankees saw what they had done. They had been repeatedly told that Jefferson Davis had no one with him that was offering resistance. So now they were made to realize that there were those who still told the truth in the Deep South, and to their dismay they found that they had killed several of their own men. Soon after this, President Davis was captured; and the story has been told so many times that this humble, honorable man was captured dressed in women's clothing, which we are sorry to state, is so misleading. As President Davis was dressed for the early morning and it being somewhat cool, he was wearing a cape or a McIntosh as it was called in those days. Mr. Davis, in no way made any attempt whatever to disguise himself, or escape at that time or any other time. A Mr. Clute, a Union soldier who was one of the Michigan Cavalry who captured Mr. Davis, said that the story was very false.

My father, the late Cornelious Clements, having just returned home on sick leave from the War Between the States, heard the firing of the Union soldiers' rifles when they were shooting each other, my mother, the late Una Melissa Paulk Clements, who was the great-aunt of our esteemed postmaster, Hon. Woodrow W. Sutton, of Ocilla, Ga., was a very young lady at this time. They did not know what the shooting was all about until word came that Mr. Davis was caputured and was being carried back to the North.

A lot of the same stately, towering pines are still standing today on this beautiful spot of land. True many balls and other bullets have been found that were used during this useless fight between the Union soldiers. Many people from both North and South visit regularly this hallowed spot. Today the swords of both North and South lie still.

This war that took such a great toll of fine young men from both North and South was so useless.

Come, visit Jefferson Davis Park and see the beautiful monument that stands in honor of Jeff Davis as well as the museum and buildings that have been erected on this beautiful spot, located about 1 mile on the Jefferson Davis highway north of Irwinville, Ga., the little town that was created about 1830.

We do not regard this southern memorial as belonging entirely to the South, as today we are a nation that is not divided.

SOMETHING NEW

(By Woodrow Sutton, postmaster, Ocilla)

Hon. James Whitley, ordinary of Irwin County, Ga., holds the record for continuous service for an elected official of this State, according to Mrs. Bryan, director of the State archives and history department. Judge Whitley is the only ordinary most people living here can remember. He was elected in 1903 and has served continuously since that time. With the expiration of his present term he will have served 60 years, having opposition for this position only twice.

While talking to Judge Whitley one day, he was discussing lawyers, past and present, with whom he had come in contact. A number of years ago, he related to me, he was quite impressed with a young solicitor general of the Cordele circuit (Irwin County was in the Cordele circuit at that time) who had one of the most alert minds he had ever seen. He said to himself, this young man could, if he would apply himself, go far in the practice of law or in politics. This young man was later elevated to the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia, then was elected U.S. Senator and later served as the U.S. Ambassador to NATO—this man was none other than the Honorable Walter F. George, our own beloved statesman.

Judge Whitley's philosophy could most nearly be described as always doing that little something extra above and beyond the duties required of him by the office he holds. This could well be the philosophy of all 708 postmasters in the Georgia chapter. I try to remember, after a particularly hard day, when everything seems to go wrong; someone comes to the officer after closing time, with what appears to be no excuse for not having come earlier. I remind myself of this poem I keep on my desk. The author is unknown to me.

"JUDGE NOT

"Pray do not find fault with the man that limps, or stumbles along the road,
Unless you have worn the shoes he wears, or struggled beneath his load.
There may be tacks in his shoes that hurt, though hidden away from view,
Or the burdens he bears placed on your back, might cause you to stumble too.
Don't sneer at the man who is down today, unless you have felt the blow that caused his fall, or felt the pain that only the fallen know.
You may be strong, but still the blows that were his, if dealt to you in the selfsame way at the selfsame time, might cause you to stagger too."

IF I MAY SAY, THANK YOU

(By Woodrow Sutton)

I would like to thank the people of my county and town for the privilege of serving them as their postmaster. This has given me the privilege to work with the grandest group of people in the world, the postmasters of Georgia. Thanks for the friends who made it possible for me, as postmaster, to sponsor this issue of the Cracker—thereby making it possible for me to appreciate the tremendous job Ada Cheney and Hillyer King are doing for our organization 12 months of the year. Thanks for the privilege of working with officers like Fred Peterson, our efficient State president, and Tommie Kelly, our competent secretary, and many others too numerous to mention. Thanks for the fellowship of traveling companions like Harry James, Norwood Miley, and John Whigham on the trip to Denver, for one of the most enjoyable experiences of my life at the national convention. Thanks for the golf games I have enjoyed with Wendell Leggett, Earl Tolbert, Clarence Brown, and Luther Turner. Thanks for the wonderful new post office facilities provided for so many of our towns and the prospect of many more to come. Thanks for the guidance and leadership of our regional officials who always stand ready to assist us in our day to day problems. Thanks to Jack Carter, Jarrett Pryor, Bernys Peters, and Rudolph Grimsley for lending me forms of which I never quite seem to have enough.

We're thankful for the excellent attendance at the organizational meeting of the fourth district, to see this district again organized, one that has furnished such excellent leadership for our own chapter, Alton Harvey, Lonnie Jamison, and others. Thanks for the wonderful seafood dinner prepared by Essie and Harry Vickers for the State convention committee and when other members of the committee were unavoidably absent, Verna Roberts, Marjorie and I were forced to gleefully take double portions. Thanks for the excellent job done by Frank Gallaghan, J. M. Peacock, Bob Ray, and Harry Vickers serving as hosts for our district meeting.

I shall always be grateful to friends like Harry Vickers, Mark Stubbs, Louis O'Connell, Lannie Jamison, Frank Chappell, Harry James, and others whose storehouse of experience I so heavily lean on for guidance.

Marjorie, the girls and I wish for each of you the most joyous holiday season.

DEDICATION OF NEW COBBTOWN POST OFFICE

(By A. D. Finley, publicity chairman)

New post offices are being dedicated all over the country but nowhere are new offices appreciated more than in small communities.

The dedication is an opportunity for cooperation among all the citizens and if you want a real demonstration of southern hospitality, you need go no further than the dedication of a new post office in a small town.

Cobbtown, Ga., was the scene of a communitywide demonstration on Sunday afternoon, November 19, 1961, when their new modern post office was officially dedicated with the fine Fort Stewart Army Band furnishing the music and the good housewives and the American Legion furnishing the barbecue supper.

The program began at 2:30 p.m. with the music by the Fort Stewart band. The welcome address was given by Mrs. Alene W. Moxley, the charming postmaster of Cobbtown. Eurel Sikes did a fine job as master of ceremonies and the invocation was given by Rev. Otis J. Dasher of Cobbtown.

The large crowd of several hundred people who had gathered for the occasion was welcomed by Mayor Kermit Yates and Henry Moxley introduced Hon. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN, Representative in Congress from the First District, who gave a most interesting address. Mr. E. V. Harvell, field services officer, gave a message from the Postmaster General and officially dedicated the post office for the use of the community. Congressman HAGAN presented the new flag to Mrs. Alene Moxley, postmaster, and the local American Legion post officially raised the flag over the new building.

Prior to the presentation of the flag, Charles Coleman rendered an Ode to the American Flag which was very timely and the Fort Stewart band played the national anthem as the flag was being raised. The benediction was given by Rev. R. L. Stansell of Cobbtown and the large crowd was then invited to visit and inspect the new office where several lovely ladies served refreshments.

The street in front of the new post office was roped off and the ladies of the community and the local American Legion post served a very sumptuous barbecue supper to more than 500 attending.

Among some of the out of town postmasters attending were Fred Peterson, president of the Georgia chapter, Vidalia; Mrs. Eunice Shuman, Hagan, Ga.; Beecher Collins, Collins, Ga.; Thurmon Mobley, Glennville, Ga.; Mrs. Jean Deloach, Claxton, Ga.; Mrs. Oka Eason, Manassas, Ga.; H. C. Hern, Bellville, Ga.; Norwood Miley, Hahira, Ga.; W. Louie Smith, new postmaster at Reidsville; Paul Miles, Metter, Ga.; and other postmasters from neighboring towns.

REPORT ON MEMBERSHIP CAMPAIGN KEEPS THE ROUND ROBIN MOVING

(By Woodrow Sutton, State membership chairman)

Someone has reported on a spot survey that was being made in an apartment area of a great city. The census taker knocked on the door of one apartment and was greeted by a young teenage girl. "How many people live in this apartment?" he asked. "Well", she replied, "there are Mary and Joe and Ruth." "Wait a minute," he said, "we don't want names, we want numbers." "Mister, we haven't run out of names, yet."

In a world of organization, automation, and industrialization we often wonder how much we count. The answer is that we count "one" like every other person. No matter how big the organization it is always made up of individuals. It is the combined total of 708 persons that make the Georgia Chapter of the National Association of Postmasters what it is today. It is the responsibility of each member to put his or her personality into the working of the group so that no one becomes just a number on a list.

The calls on our time are so great today that everyone is burdened each night by the things he forgot to do that day. We once advised people not to put off until tomorrow what they could do that day, but it seems necessary now to caution ourselves not to put off until this afternoon what you can do right now. This afternoon might be lost in a maze of things as we continually come and go. Don't wait to send in your membership dues as soon as you receive the "Round Robin"—keep it moving. Let's make our secretary, Tommie Kelly, happy by helping her get this membership drive complete at the earliest possible date. Of course, we can't improve on the Georgia Chapter's membership record of 100 percent, for the past 12 years. We can only get the job done quicker.

CHRISTMAS

(Ada Cheney, editor)

It is Christmas again and with it comes the realization of how much it means to have the friendship and good will of folks like Georgia postmasters. To me, the meaning of Christmas is deeper and our friendship stronger because of 1961. May we pause humbly, and really believe that because of Christ in Christmas our hopes are brighter.

Accept my sincere thanks for your kindness in the year, and good wishes for a "Merry Christmas" and a "Happy New Year".

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WOODBRIDGE, N.J., *January 9, 1962.*

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I would like to express my strong approval of the House Resolution 211. As a voter and a citizen I believe there is a genuine need for a special House Committee on Captive Nations. I wish you success with the resolution hoping that the American people will recognize its importance, as I, a teacher, do.

Very truly yours,

Miss JOY R. STOCKEL.

MIAMI, FLA., *January 14, 1962.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I am very much interested in House Resolution 211 and would greatly appreciate it if you could send me a copy of this resolution.

Thanking you in advance for same, I am,

Respectfully yours,

C. R. MILTON.

MIAMI, FLA.

UNION, N.J., *January 9, 1962.*

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I was very much impressed when I learned of House Resolution 211 through a friend giving me the "Manion Forum." I endorse the resolution for a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. Best wishes for success.

Sincerely yours,

Miss HILDA LENZ.

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 12, 1962.*

DEAR SIR: In deep conviction that the fate of our United States is closely tied with the fate of the captive nations, subjugated both within and outside the modern colonial empire, the so-called U.S.S.R., I take herewith the liberty to thank you on my family's and my behalf for your House Resolution 211, proposing the creation of a special House Committee on Captive Nations.

We commend you, sir, most emphatically, in spite of the alleged expertly objections of our State Department, an agency notorious for being wrong, more often than not, on matters pertaining to combating the Russo-Communist menace on the international arena.

The experts of that Department have, in fact, been so wrong, so often, that, paradoxically, it seems, we have an infinitely better chance for getting back on the right track by doing just the diametrically opposite to what they recommend.

Enclosed please find a copy of the article "Is the State Department Failing Us in the Cold War?" authored by Mr. Frank L. Kluckhohn in January 1962 issue of the Reader's Digest, which elucidates some aspects which we have in mind. No wonder we are losing the cold war. Unfortunately, we cannot afford to lose very much more at the rate we have been going.

The Russians leave no stone unturned making a mountain out of a molehill of anything that happens in our country. If we are to survive we can do no less than to focus our people's and the world's attention upon the plight of the slaves in the clutches of Moscow—the captive nations—the soft underbelly of the Moscovite colonial empire.

If we are to rid Cuba, Vietnam, Laos, etc., from the Communist cancer it is imperative that we study meticulously the cradle, the hotbed of that cancer; and that hotbed is no other than the Russo-Communist slave concentration camp and the most appropriate body to study it can be none better than a congressional Captive Nations Committee.

In what almost amounts to an exercise in futility, we are vainly dissipating our national strength all over the world; it's like Don Quixote fighting the windmills. But we have, at this late hour, failed miserably to get down to the brasstacks and to successfully neutralize the very source of the Red growths, springing up all over the globe like the mushrooms after the rain; and that source, again, is no other than the prison of the peoples—Communist Russia. The first step in neutralizing Russia, and doing it successfully, is to form the congressional Committee on Russia's Captive Nations.

Realizing full well the almost inexhaustible potential, as our true allies, of all the captive nations, the utilization of which in this cold war has been classically neglected by our State Department with its typical shortsightedness, and considering that the very survival of our Nation is at stake now, we trust you, sir, will advance your No. 211 in the current session of Congress.

Respectfully yours,

EUGENE PALY.

KENNETT SQUARE, PA., *January 8, 1962.*

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Through Mr. R. Douglas Doherty, a student of Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University, I have become aware of your sponsorship of House Resolution 211. Undoubtedly a Special House Committee on Captive Nations is vital in our struggle for world peace. You have my enthusiastic support.

Would you be so kind as to send to me a copy of the resolution or a résumé of its contents. Several interested persons have requested more information on the resolution and I would like to have it available for them.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Miss MAXINE PIERCE.

Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD an editorial from the Ab-

erdeen (S. Dak.) American-News of January 11, 1962, with reference to a recent address made by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board of Coca-Cola Export Corp., before the Chicago Rotary Club:

[From the Aberdeen (S. Dak.) American-News, Jan. 10, 1962]

FARLEY STILL SPEAKS WITH AUTHORITY

James A. Farley, who spoke with wisdom and authority on political subjects in the 1930's, speaks today with wisdom and authority on matters of current interest.

The New Yorker, who managed Franklin Roosevelt's first two campaigns for President and served as his Postmaster General, has retained a lively interest in public affairs while distinguishing himself in the business world.

Last week in Chicago he urged steps to prevent Fidel Castro's Communist regime from realizing profits from properties seized in Cuba from foreign investors.

As keynote speaker at a Rotary Club meeting he said the best way to protect foreign investments is to permit free enterprise to defend itself.

"More particularly," he said, "when an American plant or business is seized by a foreign dictator, as in the case of Cuba, the Cuban Communists ought not to be allowed to sell its products in the free markets of the world.

"It is one of the prime economic weapons of the Communists to seize factories and institutions of a free people and then use the sale of the products in the free market to purchase the means to overthrow the free markets themselves. This is being carried out, right this minute, on a scale so monstrous as to be unmatched in history."

Farley said the remedy is immediately available. Congress, he said, should pass a law allowing American firms to sue in American courts so that they could seize any products shipped here from their own Cuban factories or businesses confiscated by Castro.

Farley also recommended that other free nations do likewise. He said it would effectively bar world markets to the Communist dictatorship.

Farley, 73, is chairman of Coca-Cola Export Co.

He gained a wide acquaintanceship in South Dakota when he came here in the interests of lining up convention support for the nomination of the only man to serve more than two terms as President.

Farley broke with Roosevelt on the third term issue.

[From the Marion (Ind.) Leader-Tribune, Jan. 11, 1962]

TIME OF CHALLENGE

James A. Farley at 73 is entering the ranks of elder statesmen. The architect of the first two Franklin D. Roosevelt victories and former Postmaster General took on the prophets of doom in a speech in Chicago the other day and had something to say about the challenges that Americans have faced in the past that should hearten Americans today.

"I cannot bring myself to believe that this generation faces greater challenge than the Continental Army at Valley Forge—freezing in the snow and with three major cities—Boston, New York, and Philadelphia—in the hands of an invading army," he said.

"I cannot believe that this generation, or the ones succeeding, are likely to encounter heavier tests than our country invaded, the White House in flames, and an American President driven from Washington (in the War of 1812).

"Consider the Americans who crossed the plains in Conestoga wagons, or walked across the infested jungle paths of the isthmus to settle our own Far West. I say that if we are not made of such stuff then we have failed our heritage. Certainly, this is a time of challenge; and, for myself, I welcome it."

Speech Delivered Before the Manufacturing Chemists' Association Meeting, November 21, 1961, by Mr. A. E. Albright, Vice President of the Stauffer Chemical Co. at Hotel Commodore, New York City on Subject "Mergers, Joint Ventures and Product Integration, From the Chemical Industry Viewpoint"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include in there, a great speech by my friend, Mr. A. E. Albright, vice president of the Stauffer Chemical Co. The Stauffer Chemical Co. is a great company and their interests are worldwide, and I believe they have been and are doing as much good as any of the great companies in this Nation or any other nation are doing, and without such companies as the Stauffer Chemical Co., the Olin Mathieson Chemical Co., the Geigy Chemical Co., and so many others I could mention, I just do not know how we could have possibly made the great progress that we are making.

I had the pleasure of meeting all of the officials of this great company, and they are from every part of this country and many other countries, and especially France.

We down in the first congressional district, where they have a plant on the Mobile River and the Southern Railroad, a few miles north of Mobile, Ala., one of the great seaports of the earth, are very proud to have the Stauffer Chemical Co. down in our district where they have a beautiful plant that is doing great work that helps many men and women. Their great plant there in LeMoyne, Mobile County, Ala., runs day and night and their beautiful buildings are an inspiration to the thousands of people that drive by that plant on the beautiful four-lane highway that is just being completed by the Honorable Sam Engelhardt, director of the great Alabama State Highway Department. Then, the Southern Railroad, like this great highway, runs just a few hundred yards from this great plant, and boats and barges of all sorts go up and down this river at all times of day and night and see this wonderful work that goes on at the great works of Stauffer Chemical Co., at Mobile, Ala., and I am so glad that this great man, A. E. Albright, vice president of the Stauffer Chemical Co., clearly states and I quote:

It clearly refutes the general trend of news emanating from the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and other Federal Bureaus that integration and mergers are stifling competition.

We know this is true, and we know that when two of these companies, large or small, merge, it helps to save overhead and helps to make a bigger and better company; something that we all want, not only do we have mergers and joint ventures and products integration, of our great chemical industry, who have spent millions on research and have and are doing so much for all mankind. I take pleasure and great pleasure in inserting Mr. Albright's great speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that will go to every library in this Nation and many others.

I wish we had a story from the great Courtaulds of Alabama, Inc. They have a tremendous plant sitting right beside this Stauffer plant, and I am going to write the officials of the Courtauld's Co. to give us a statement and a story about their great operation. The officials of the Stauffer Co. have told me also many times what a wonderful customer the great Courtaulds of Alabama, is of Stauffer. I believe Courtaulds is the largest rayon plant in the world.

Then, we move up the river to the Tombigbee at McIntosh, Ala., where we have the great salt dome and there we have the Nichols Works that we just dedicated a few weeks ago. The chairman of the board of this great company, the Olin Mathieson Chemical Co., is Thomas N. Nichols who visited us last month at the dedication of the great Nichols Works of the Olin Mathieson Chemical Co., at McIntosh, Ala. Also with us at that time was Roy T. Parker, of the Geigy Chemical Co., of New York, another worldwide chemical company, and who are building, Mr. Speaker, if you please, nine new plants, and all nine will be completed this year.

Our great Senator, JOHN SPARKMAN, spent the day with my son, Dick Boykin, and me, and like all of us, was simply fascinated by this fantastic chemical development in the First Congressional District of Alabama, and I think that Vice President Albright's speech is very timely and I believe it will be enjoyed by everybody just as it was by so many of us here that read it this morning.

Just think, Mr. Speaker, everyone of these great chemical plants I have mentioned: Stauffer, Calabama, Olin Mathieson, and Geigy, have plants practically in every country in the world and it is so pleasing and gratifying that we have these wonderful, beautiful plants in Alabama where it means so much to all of our people not only there but wherever their goods are shipped, which is all over this world.

I congratulate Vice President A. E. Albright, of the Stauffer Chemical Co. on his great speech that will certainly enlighten a lot of us who are so anxious to help not only the chemical industry, but all industry in this great land of ours:

MERGERS, JOINT VENTURES, AND PRODUCT INTEGRATION: FROM THE CHEMICAL INDUSTRY VIEWPOINT

(By A. E. Albright, vice president, Stauffer Chemical Co.)

Two terms seem currently to dominate all discussions of the chemical industry—the profit squeeze and product integration. Incredibly, to me at least, the profit squeeze appears to be widely accepted as an inevitable result of the maturing of the chemical industry. Equally incredibly, product integration appears to be increasingly accepted as the best, if not the only, solution to the problem of improving chemical profits. For example, at the recent Lake Placid meeting of the American Institute of Chemical Engineers, one of the speakers stated flatly, "We have come to the conclusion that in the light of our company's resources and capabilities, our best opportunity for enhancing profit potential lies in forward integration." Similarly, another commentator recently stated, "What is needed are wider profit margins and recapture of rates of return more characteristic of past performance. [The chemical industry must] shift from its traditional position as mainly a producer of intermediates and semifinished goods. It [must] shift toward a new position as a fabricator of end products, many of them branded and directly sold in consumer markets."

If, indeed, the urge to integrate stems largely from declining profit margins, I think we should pause briefly to examine the nature and origins of this horrendous blight that has afflicted our industry. While the problem is too complex to cover in a few minutes with simple generalizations, I, for one, cannot bring myself to concede that the chemical industries' profit problems are merely the result of "growing up."

With limited exceptions, the decline in chemical profit margins has not been due to product obsolescence. On the contrary, the consumption of most chemicals has increased substantially during the past 20 years. What then has been the evil? Generalization is always hazardous. But in my judgment, the decline in chemical profit margins has been due to a large extent to ill-conceived and ill-timed additions to productive capacity far in excess of current or immediately prospective demand, followed by an equal ill-conceived price competition. Both, in my judgment, reflect a lack of industrial statesmanship—or even plain horsesense.

What prompted these additions in the first place? Again, the problem is too complex to permit a simple quick answer. But there are three aggravating factors which merit particular comment.

First, I submit that the financial community has to bear a substantial share of the blame. It has been all too easy for promoters to obtain financing to build plants which aggravate an already overproduced market. The long-range economic contribution or impact of the new venture is of secondary importance to the investment banker. The principal criterion is—Can the security shares be sold?

Second, many large consumers of chemicals, with profit problems of their own, have proven to be eager customers for the engineering firms who can sell packaged chemical plants off the shelf. Attracted by glowing cost estimates, these chemical consumers have built plants to supply their own requirements, and then have moved into merchant chemical markets with their incremental tonnages, which are often necessarily priced at distressed levels in order to penetrate an already saturated market.

Third, in recent years, chemical companies have been confronted with problems of finding investment opportunities for the large cash flows—i.e., depreciation and retained earnings—they have been generating. Most chemical companies have been frank to admit that their own research efforts have not been able to produce sufficient new investment opportunities. Consequently, they have started looking at profitable product lines of other companies in the industry, particularly when it is a purchased raw material. I question whether some of the backward integrations of recent years would have been made in the absence of this pressure of surplus cash.

A corollary of this problem is the proclivity on the part of the chemical industry to overbuild, as a result of the apparent capital savings on the excess capacity. The president of one chemical company recently explained it this way:

"Say it costs $20 million to get 50 million pounds of capacity for product X, and it only costs $25 million to get twice that much. You naturally go ahead and build the bigger plant, and leave the extra space until you need it. But then companies believe they ought to fill their full capacity quickly so they begin cutting prices to raise their volume."

In any event, here we are in the year 1961, with excess capacity in virtually all major product lines and, with limited exceptions, intense price competition. While some of the traditional chemical producers would like to attribute their profit problems to the interlopers, I believe that a large share of the blame rests with ourselves. The inability to maintain a stable price structure in the face of excess capacity and incidentally, also in the face of rising costs, reflects on the good judgment and maturity of the industry. We might well look to the steel industry for instruction in this area.

It has been suggested that the membership of the chemical industry, unlike that of the steel industry, is much too fluid to hope for statesmanship in pricing practices. I, for one, am reluctant to accept that judgment.

But given excess capacities, price competition, and declining profit margins—is product integration the easy, uncomplicated solution?

In my judgment, integration may not be desirable or necessary for some product lines at all—or, if so, only to a limited extent. For other product lines, it may be the best solution, but it seldom will be easy or uncomplicated.

In the first place, when integrating backwards to producing raw materials formerly purchased, the amount of capital invested is frequently large and does not result in substantial addition to sales dollars. For commodity-type raw materials, which are under industrywide price pressure already, the amount of profit gained by the integration may produce a low rate of return on the capital invested. In addition, the use of this capital for backward integration may limit the company's ability to undertake more profitable forward integration opportunities, or opportunities for diversification into newer products. A careful study of future capital availability should therefore preced any decision to backward integration.

I believe that some chemical companies have become overconcerned with backward integration to captive raw materials' production, merely for integration's sake. The danger here is that too little concern is given to the merits of the process to be used, the economics at the volume level of captive use, or the economics of continued purchase.

Another obvious danger in backward integration is that this may force the former supplier to integrate forward to your product, thus adding unnecessarily to the total production capacity. This is particularly true when your purchases represent a large percentage of the supplier's sales of a given product.

Finally, many companies, particularly those on the fringes of the chemical industry, have inadequate understanding of the true costs of production by established suppliers as related to costs in their own new plant. As I pointed earlier, these economics are often supplied by an engineering company who hopes to sell the plant, and the buyer may not have a full understanding of their significance in relation to established plants.

The risks in forward integration to end-products are equally numerous, although the rewards promised apparently are greater. First, we may lack adequate knowledge of the new field, particularly in how to market the product. A company experienced in production of basic chemicals may easily underestimate the problems and costs involved in selling, advertising, servicing, and maintaining end-product markets. The consumer field must be approached with particular caution.

Also, in contemplating a forward integration move, consideration must be given to the simple loss of customers who now find that you have become their competitor—and who may feel compelled in turn to integrate backward.

Despite these pitfalls, however, it seems clear that integration is here to stay—only more so. Like a thermonuclear explosion, it is difficult to stop the reaction once it has started. A customer integrates backward, so the supplier integrates forward to protect his market—or vice versa. Once a competitor has integrated, every other producer feels that he must do the same to stay competitive—and so it goes.

In the case of some product lines, to be sure, there are clear benefits from forward integration, where continuity of technology, quality, service, etc., are important all along the pipeline to the point of use. This is particularly true in the case of synthetic fibers and plastics—and I firmly believe that we will see more rapid integration in these areas. In my judgment, however, the economic or logical forces for integration are less clear in other product lines, particularly in the inorganic chemical field. If integration becomes widespread in this area, the principal motivation will be cannibalistic competition—rather than logic or economics.

I am not about to get involved here in a discussion of the antitrust laws, but I should like to leave with you the question of whether we can afford to assume that our present system of unrestrained competition, which has spawned these profligate additions to chemical productive capacity, is adequate to meet the challenge of allout economic warfare with Soviet Russia. At a time which would seem to require the maximum utilizaiton of our capital and human resources, one cannot view with complacency the enormous productive capacities in the United States which are presently unused—particularly when many of them should never have been built in the first place. Further, can we reasonably expect to prevail in the struggle for world markets against one State-controlled industry, when U.S. producers must operate in a climate which discourages or prohibits industry cooperation and collaboration? This, indeed, is a most delicate, sensitive question. I suggest only that the urgent circumstances of our day compel a searching reexamination of the validity of the rules of competition laid down by our forefathers in another century. By this, I do not mean a complete abandonment of the competitive system in favor of State regulation or private cartels. I am merely raising the question of whether a modification of our present system is required to meet the realities of our own time. The stakes here may be far more important than finding a solution to our declining profit margins.

Historian's Startling Confession Tells How the Constitution Was Subverted by Rewriting History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr, Speaker, I call to the attention of every Member of Congress the following article from the U.S. News & World Report, February 5, 1962, edition as a warning as to how far some are prepared to go in subverting the Constitution and in using any means justified by a desired end. Here we have the startling confession of a historian that he was used by the NAACP to rewrite history in order to influence the Supreme Court desegregation decision of 1954. Thurgood Marshall, the Svengali behind this scheme, has now been nominated as a judge of the Circuit Court of Appeals of the United States, nominated by President Kennedy. With the courts and the executive branch brazenly in support of such tactics and prepared to reward those who willingly subvert the Constitution, the danger to our form of constitutional government is made increasingly clear and this article should arouse a wave of indignation across the land among all those who believe in a government of laws, not of men, the only kind of government that can guarantee continued freedom for all our citizens.

The article follows:

WHEN THE SUPREME COURT ORDERED DESEGREGATION

(By Dr. Alfred H. Kelly)

(Here is an inside story of events that led up to the Supreme Court's ruling of 1954 that outlawed school segregation. It comes from a historian who assisted NAACP lawyers preparing a brief for argument before the Court. Aim of the brief, he says, was to provide a "plausible" historical case for ruling that the 14th amendment was intended to forbid racial segregation.

The historian tells how this was done by "bearing down on facts, sliding off facts, quietly ignoring facts and, above all, interpreting facts in a way" that would "get by" the Justices of the Supreme Court.)

One day in early July 1953 I received a letter from Mr. Thurgood Marshall, [then] general counsel of the Legal Defense and Educational Fund of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Would I be willing, Mr. Marshall inquired, to prepare a research paper on the intent of the framers of the 14th amendment with respect to the constitutionality of racially segregated schools?

The U.S. Supreme Court, Mr. Marshall explained, had recently heard arguments on a series of school-segregation cases, four of them on a peal from the States and one of them from the District of Columbia. Instead of deciding the cases within the merits of the longstanding "separate but equal" rule, however, the Court had returned the cases to opposing counsel for reargument, posing to the lawyers on both sides the following question, here somewhat paraphrased: What had been the intent of the framers of the 14th amendment with respect to school segregation?

At stake [in the Supreme Court case known as Brown v. Board of Education] was the venerable "separate but equal" rule which the Supreme Court of the United States had written into Federal constitutional law in 1896 in the now-celebrated case of Plessy v. Ferguson. Justice Brown's Plessy opinion, in considerable part, had rested upon a historical interpretation of the intent of the framers of the 14th amendment.

It was self-evident, he had said, that Congress in writing the equal-protection clause into the Constitution had not intended to destroy legalized segregation.

Plessy stood like a rock of constitutional law for almost half a century, but by 1950 it had become apparent that the foundations of the opinion at long last were crumbling away under a protracted legal assault which reflected in turn a profound revolution in the role of the Negro in American society.

It was becoming increasingly apparent in a pragmatic sense, that if the Court were to go much farther with the legalized breakdown of segregation, the "separate but equal" rule itself would have to fall. And that meant something like a revolution in constitutional law. It would entail a piece of judicial lawmaking which could be justified only by a philosophy of extreme judicial activism—and this at the hands of a Court wherein several of the Justices had repeatedly expressed their disapproval of judicial activism and lawmaking by Court-made fiat.

Nevertheless, if the revolution in the Negro's legal status were to proceed much farther, the attempt had to be made.

The NAACP did not do well in its new approach in the lower courts.

The five [school segregation] cases came up to the Supreme Court early in 1953 and were argued there by counsel along much the same lines as in the lower courts. Instead of handing down a decision, however, the Supreme Court handed them back to opposing counsel with a request for reargument on the question of the historical intent of the framers of the 14th amendment.

It was at once apparent that the NAACP and its lawyers had scored a tremendous breakthrough.

What the Justices' request really seemed to say, the lawyers and scholars at work on the case presently were to agree, was something like this:

"We would like to dispose of the Plessy rule, for once and for all.

"But we are fearfully embarrassed by the apparent historical absurdity of such an interpretation of the 14th amendment and equally embarrassed by the obvious charge that the Court will be 'legislating' if it simply imposes a new meaning on the amendment without regard to historical intent. Therefore, learned counsel, produce for us in the Court a plausible historical argument that will justify us in pronouncing, in solemn and awful sovereignty, that the 14th amendment properly was intended by its authors to abolish school segregation, or at least to sanction its abolition by judicial fiat. * * *"

As a constitutional historian, I knew, of course, that the 14th amendment had evolved in some considerable part, out of the Civil Rights Act of 1866. Accordingly, I went to work on the 1866 volumes of the Congressional Globe, reading anew the story of the debates that winter and spring for clues concerning the intent which [Lyman] Trumbull, [John A.] Bingham, [Thaddeus] Stevens and the other congressional radicals might have had with respect to legalized segregation and school segregation in particular.

I did not really expect to find very much of anything.

As any reasonably competent historian could have told the court and the lawyers on both sides, the historical questions they had framed did not necessarily have very much relevance at all to the issues that seemed consequential then to the embattled radicals who had hammered out the Civil Rights Act and the 14th amendment that spring of 1866.

WHAT THE OLD RECORDS DISCLOSED

To my surprise, the debates reprinted in the 1866 volumes of the Globe had a good deal to say about school segregation. Unhappily, from the NAACP's point of view, most of what appeared there at first blush looked rather decidedly bad.

The original civil rights bill, as reported out on the Senate floor by Lyman Trumbull early in 1866, had indeed been so broadly worded that it obviously would have struck down and outlawed entirely all State segregation laws.

But when the civil rights bill reached the House, John A. Bingham bitterly attacked the measure on the grounds that Congress utterly lacked the power to legislate against legalized segregation in the States.

Bingham's attack sent the bill back to the House Judiciary Committee, where the disputed ambiguous language was stricken out.

The conclusion for any reasonably objective historian was painfully clear. The Civil Rights Act as it passed Congress was specifically rewritten to avoid the embarrassing question of a congressional attack upon State racial segregation laws, including school segregation.

It looked as if John W. Davis—counsel defending segregation before the Supreme Court—would win the historical argument hands down.

To be sure, there was a little more to the matter than the foregoing, fortunately quite a little more. In the Senate (Jacob Merritt) Howard of Michigan, substituting for (William Pitt) Fessenden in presenting the amendment to the floor, had asserted categorically that the first section, with its equal-protection, privileges, immunities, and due-process clauses, was intended to destroy all class and caste legislation in the United States. Certainly that included school-segregation statutes.

And in the Senate, in particular, the radical Republicans throughout the debate cast their argument in extremely broad terms, talking grandly of the Declaration of Independence, of the equality of man, of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, and the like, and avoiding all questions of specific legislative and statutory consequence.

Here, by all odds, was the best possible answer to a narrow construction of the amendment, although I fear I did not see it very clearly at the time.

The paper I prepared for the September conference—with Mr. Marshall in 1953—was not adequate by any standard. I was trying to be both historian and advocate within the same paper, and the combination, as I found out, was not a very good one.

I was facing, for the first time in my own career, the deadly opposition between my professional integrity as a historian and my wishes and hopes with respect to a contemporary question of values, of ideals, of policy, of partisanship and of political objectives. I suppose if a man is without scruple, this matter will not bother him, but I am frank to say that it bothered me terribly.

The NAACP office had sent out a call to about 125 leading scholars in the country—historians, constitutional lawyers, political scientists, educators, and the like, and a great number of men, several of them first-rate professional figures, had responded.

The conference, held at the Press Club on 43d Street in New York and with headquarters at the thoroughly desegregated Algonquin Hotel, was organized in a series of seminar discussions around the so-called scholarly papers which five historians had prepared.

I found myself in such a seminar with a group of NAACP lawyers, all of them heavily concerned with the central problem they would have to argue before the Court—the meaning of the Civil Rights Act, its relationship to the 14th amendment, and the intent of the first section of the 14th amendment itself.

To my relief, I found that the lawyers present did not at all resent the fact that I had exposed a considerable difficulty in the argument they would have to make before the Court. On the contrary, they obviously wanted me to clarify as far as possible the difficulties they would confront were John W. Davis and his staff as well prepared as they might be expected to be.

I left the September conference expecting to have no more to do with the segregation cases beyond what I might read in the newspapers.

Ten days later, early in October, however, I was surprised to receive a phone call from Thurgood Marshall. In the curiously winning manner so characteristic of the man, he informed me that, since I wasn't doing anything anyhow, I might as well come on down to New York for 4 or 5 days and waste my time there. My help, he said with careful flattery, was needed very badly on the brief. My vanity thus touched to the quick, I came.

PUTTING TOGETHER NAACP'S CASE

This time there were only about a dozen of us. Among them were Marshall himself; Robert Carter, then assistant counsel of the NAACP Legal Defense Fund and now general counsel of the NAACP; Spottswood Robinson, now dean of the Howard University Law School; Constance Baker Motley, another NAACP lawyer; Jack Greenberg, who since Marshall's elevation to the Federal bench has become general counsel of the NAACP Legal Defense Fund; Louis Redding, who had lately won a case in the Delaware Supreme Court; and Robert Ming, Jr., a former law professor at Howard and at the University of Chicago.

For several hours they picked my brains on American constitutional history.

They wanted hard questions and hard answers of the kind they might encounter from the Justices and opposing counsel.

There were several such conferences in the next 5 evenings.

On the morning after the first evening conference of this sort, Marshall called me early and, when I reached his office, informed Ming and me that he wanted us to sit down and hammer out a draft of a brief for the Supreme Court.

To this end he locked us up, so to speak, in an isolated suite of offices over at the NAACP's main headquarters on West 40th Street. Ming and I spent the next 3 days there, with no one else present but a stenographer, walking up and down, dictating, arguing and orating to one another. The brief drafting was mostly Ming and comparatively little Kelly.

After 5 days, I went home completely exhausted, again expecting to hear no more of the school segregation cases. But early in November, Marshall called me.

This time a still different task awaited me. I met Thurgood Marshall in his office, where we were joined by John Frank, then of the Yale Law School, a nationally known lawyer and legal historian and author of a number of leading monographs on the 14th amendment.

Marshall informed the two of us that Ming's draft was fine as far as it went, but that it didn't go far enough. Ming had proceeded on the theory that it would not do to get too far involved in specific historical detail with respect to framer intent, and that the association's case might best be cast in very generalized terms with a deliberate avoidance of the particular.

This tactic, Marshall now informed us, might get past two or three of the Justices, but it would darn well never get past [Justices] Frankfurter or Douglas. "I gotta argue these cases," Thurgood said, "and if I try this approach, those fellows will shoot me down in flames."

AIM: AN ADEQUATE GLOSS OF EVENTS

I am very much afraid that for the next few days I ceased to function as a historian, and, instead, took up the practice of law without a license. The problem we faced was not the historian's discovery of the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth; the problem instead was the formulation of an adequate gloss on the fateful events of 1866 sufficient to convince the court that we had something of a historical case.

It is not that we were engaged in formulating lies; there was nothing as crude and naive as that. But we were using facts, emphasizing facts, bearing down on facts, sliding off facts, quietly ignoring facts and, above all, interpreting facts in a way to do what Marshall said we had to do—"get by those boys down there."

There was one optimistic element in all this, as Marshall pointed out: It was obvious that the Court was looking for a plausible historical answer.

In other words, Marshall said, we didn't need to win an historical argument hands down—all we needed was a face-saving draw. "A nothing-to-nothing score," Marshall put it, "means we win the ball game." I believe, by the way, that this was a correct interpretation of the Court's mood.

Gradually, in the next 3 days, we hammered out a strategy.

The 14th amendment, we told ourselves, had been necessary to accomplish a vast sweep of purpose far beyond the Civil Rights Act. Here we came down hard on Howard's announcement that the purpose of the amendment had been to abolish all class and caste in the United States. And we pounced on a phrase Jay Graham (a constitutional historian) had dug up: Bingham, in defending the amendment in the House, had indeed said Congress now was writing a constitutional provision, not drafting a statute; that statutes are writ sharp and narrow and specific, but constitutions are writ broad for ages yet unborn.

In our mind's eye, Bingham almost seemed to be speaking for our purposes, saying to the Court in the 20th century that if your age, far beyond our span of time, sees in this amendment a new birth of liberty it will be altogether legitimate for you to use it for that purpose.

This is the argument, essentially, that you will find incorporated in the historical portions of the NAACP brief as it went to the Court. This is the argument Marshall used in oral argument in answer to the questions from the Justices.

RESULT: "ESSENTIAL MEASURE OF TRUTH"

I am convinced now that this interpretation, which we hammered out with anything but historical truth as our objective, nonetheless contains an essential measure of historical truth.

History is art as well as fact; everyone in this room knows that the facts do not automatically arrange themselves without the historian's creative leap, which occurs in our craft as well as in the exact sciences.

There is not much more to the personal side of my story.

In May came the now-historic decision in *Brown* v. *Board*, in which Mr. Justice Warren, speaking for a unanimous Court, threw out Plessy and announced that, henceforth, State statutes supporting school segregation were declared to be unconstitutional under the 14th amendment.

Warren's opinion noted briefly that there was a general disagreement among opposing counsel and historians about what the amendment as of 1866 had been intended to mean, and thereupon proceeded to junk the historical approach entirely and instead of settle the question of segregation on straight-out sociological grounds. Racial segregation in the schools, in the context of the 20th century, bred social inferiority for the Negro and must, therefore, be outlawed.

This does not mean the historical argument was without meaning in the Court's opinion. It seems probable, at least, that had historical inquiry resulted in a general inability on the part of the NAACP to make a plausible case—shown, in short, that the 14th amendment clearly and obviously had not been intended to touch segregation—the Court's embarrassment would have been great enough to cause it to put over the critical decision to discard segregation under the amendment, at least for a time.

But the historians had produced at least the "draw" that Marshall and his colleagues had asked for. It was all they needed in order to win.

So we historians can assure ourselves, I think, that we had something to do with the victory. Thurgood Marshall, at all odds, presently wrote some of us letters of thanks, assuring us that enlisting the history profession on his side had been the NAACP's smartest move in the whole complicated case.

Increase in Prime Loan Rates Could Upset the Administration's Recovery Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the administration's recovery program, as set forth in the President's message transmitted to Congress January 20, could be seriously upset by a rise in interest rates charged by banks on commercial loans to business and agriculture.

Recently, a number of major banks hinted that a boost was about to be made in the prime loan rate. This is the fee charged by banks to the biggest borrowers with the best credit ratings. Changes in the prime loan rate, however, as I demonstrated last week—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 22, pages 520–523—affect the rates charged business borrowers, large and small, throughout the country. An increase in the prime loan rate at this time, therefore, would have repercussions throughout the economy.

Yesterday's Wall Street Journal provided further indications of a movement toward higher bank interest rates. Charles E. Walker, executive vice president of the American Bankers Association, was quoted as follows:

> The prospect of higher interest rates is a very real thing.

Carl A. Bimson, chairman of the executive committee and a former ABA president, was reported as stating that his bank, the Valley National Bank of Arizona, has set higher rates on agricultural production loans and expects to in-

crease interest rates for other types of loans as demand increases.

The Wall Street Journal also reported that—

A Salt Lake City banker says his bank already is asking one-half of 1 percent more interest on many small commercial loans as they come up for renewal, due to higher rates the bank now is paying on savings accounts and because of increased borrowing by business.

In my statement of last week, I urged the bankers to exercise restraint to curb their natural appetite for increasing interest rates, just as the President has called upon labor and industry to exercise restraint in wages and prices. In my view, this is a necessity if we are to continue our economic recovery and remain export-competitive, for interest is a crucial item of cost which permeates the whole economy. We must not get into a new cycle of increasing interest rates which would enter into the cost of the items we produce for export, bring pressure for higher prices, with the consequent loss of foreign market opportunities.

The recent action of the Federal Reserve to lift interest rates on savings deposits also threatens to bring about hikes in mortgage loan rates. It is imperative that these upward pressures on interest rates be held under restraint, and leading bankers throughout the land can make a great contribution to the public interest by holding back on interest rate increases at this time.

NO SHORTAGE OF FUNDS

Certainly the bankers cannot justify an increase in interest rates on business loans by a shortage of funds. Free reserves during the past 3 weeks averaged $465 million, not far below the recent peak of $696 million reached a year ago when business was at a low ebb. Significantly, the Wall Street Journal article to which I have referred at two points carries major headings to this effect. The article states, "plenty of money available." It reiterates, "no shortage of funds." According to the Wall Street Journal:

But there's plenty of money for most would-be borrowers. This is demonstrated by the number of bankers who report they're still trying to put more of their loanable funds into mortgages. When demand for credit starts overtaking supply a great many banks curb long-term lending such as mortgages—despite mortgage loans' generally higher interest rates—in favor of more business loans which cost less to service.

DEMAND FOR LOANS REMAINS SPOTTY

Recent reports indicate that the demand for business loans is quite spotty. However, the bankers are anticipating better business and preparing to capitalize on it. But, most significantly, the threat of a steel strike figures large in their anticipations.

Thus, says the Wall Street Journal:

The threat of a steel strike has triggered hedge stockpiling in a variety of industries. "Big corporations such as General Motors and General Electric told steel fabricators and suppliers to get in bigger steel inventories," states Allen P. Stults, executive vice president of American National Bank & Trust Co., of Chicago. "This showed up in several commitments we made to component manufacturers and to steel warehouses."

The contract of the United Steelworkers of America with major producers doesn't expire until June 30 and bankers believe that if negotiations show signs of stalling, steel stockpiling will leapfrog.

PRIME LOAN RATE MAY BE RAISED ALMOST ANYTIME OR MAY NOT COME UNTIL THE THIRD QUARTER

It appears that whether the prime loan rate will be raised is now a matter of heated discussion among bankers. These discussions may involve matters of demand and supply, but they may also revolve around the Department of Justice's recent investigation into whether the setting of the prime loan rate has run counter to the antitrust laws. In any case, the Wall Street Journal says that, on the one hand, the chairman of the First National Bank of Chicago feels the increase could come almost anytime. On the other hand, Mr. Bimson, head of Valley National Bank of Arizona, figures a rise in the prime loan rate may not come until the third quarter.

BANKERS EXPECT FEDERAL RESERVE TO TIGHTEN CREDIT SOON

But if the Wall Street Journal is correct, the Federal Reserve may come to the assistance of the bankers by tightening up credit. The Wall Street Journal says:

Many bankers expect the Federal Reserve System to start tightening up on credit before too long. Normally the Federal Reserve does this, in a variety of ways, when business activity expands rapidly; the goal is to keep inflation in check. In the view of some observers, the economy now is approaching a situation where the money managers will worry more about inflation than expansion.

I hope this prognostication is not true. Surely the Federal Reserve has not forgotten the lessons of 1959–60 when the tightening of credit led us into recession. Moreover, increased interest rates are actually inflationary, for they increase costs for business, agriculture, and government.

The Wall Street Journal article, from which I have quoted, follows:

BRISK BORROWING: BUSINESS UPTURN SPURS LOAN DEMAND—BANKERS SEE INTEREST RATE RISE—FLORIDA BANK REVERSES USUAL FIRST QUARTER LAG—CLOSER LOOK AT DETROIT APPLICANTS—PLENTY OF MONEY AVAILABLE

(By Kenneth G. Slocum)

CHICAGO.—Spring outlook for business borrowers: A little more difficulty lining up loans; slightly higher interest rates but no important shortage of loanable funds.

That, at any rate, is the assessment of many men who will be doing much of the lending—bank presidents and loan officers who compared notes on the national credit picture at the American Bankers Association credit conference that wound up here last week.

"There seems to be little question that loan rates are going up," states Philip L. Butler, vice president of LaSalle National Bank in Chicago. "Some rates already have felt the upward push. Some loans that would have commanded a 5.5 percent interest rate a few months ago are now going for 6 percent."

"We're pretty certain to get choosier about borrowers as we get further into the year," says J. Donald Orth, senior vice president of Detroit's Manufacturers National Bank. "Probably the first step will be to favor those borrowers who maintain compensating balances." Such a balance is a portion of a loan, often about 20 percent, which banks require borrowers to keep on deposit; it has the effect of raising the bank's interest return on a loan and, thus, the borrower's cost.

NO SHORTAGE OF FUNDS

But there's plenty of money for most would-be borrowers. This is demonstrated by the number of bankers who report they are still trying to put more of their loanable funds into mortgages. When demand for credit starts overtaking supply a great many banks curb long-term lending such as mortgages—despite mortgage loans' generally higher interest rates—in favor of more business loans which cost less to service.

Of several score bankers questioned at the credit conference, four out of five report mounting demand for business loans. These bankers figure that, on the average, the business loans their institutions will make during the first quarter of 1962 will show an increase of about 12 percent over the like period a year ago.

Even more significant, a great many report business loan demand has become more brisk since the first of the year. The first 6 months or so of a year often see a seasonal reduction in the volume of business loans a bank has outstanding as merchants and manufacturers use income from heavy fall and Christmas selling seasons to pay off obligations. But that is frequently not the case this year. "Outstanding business loans are already up 3 percent from yearend and we figure we'll be at least 10 percent to 12 percent above the year-end figure by March 31," reports J. Gordon Warner, vice president of the Bristol Bank & Trust Co., Bristol, Conn. "Last year we were off from year-end totals about 3 percent at this point and by the end of the first quarter business loan volume was down roughly 7 percent. We were strong at the end of 1961 but we are still going up."

A LITTLE MAGIC

"There has been a little magic in the start of this year," says Randall Roberts, vice president of the Valparaiso State Bank not far from Pensacola, Fla. "Our outstanding business loans are now up about 2 percent from year end, when typically we should be down about the same proporation. We have enough commitments already to put our outstanding loans 5 percent above a year ago by March 31."

Business loans usually provide a good indication of the probable trend of business in general over the coming 6 months or so. Strong demand for bank loans usually is a harbinger of brisk business to come, though business can expand considerably without a matching expansion of borrowing when—as is the case now—many companies have sufficient funds on hand to finance their immediate needs internally.

At the moment, there's a seeming paradox in the bank loan picture. Recently, banks in some key money centers have recorded declines in weekly business loan totals, at the very time bank officials generally were reporting more-than-seasonal demand for such loans. But neither the bankers nor the figures were fibbing.

Part of the explanation is that the declines were smaller than they were a year ago. In the week ended last Wednesday, for example, commercial and industrial loans by major New York City banks dropped $95 million from the previous week, according to the New York Federal Reserve Bank. But this was an improvement over the like 1961 week, when the drop was $104 million. Comparing the New York banks' lending volume for the last 6 months also reveals the presently accelerating borrowing pace. Last Wednesday, the New York banks had $10,673,000,000 in business and industrial loans outstanding. This was up $125 mil-

lion from mid-1961. A year ago this type of loans outstanding in New York totaled $10,490,000,000.

FORCES BEHIND RISING DEMAND

Rising demand for business loans reflects such varied forces as incerasing industrial output, rising retail sales, some hedge buying against a possible steel strike, higher prices for feeder cattle, and even missile testing activities, according to bankers from all parts of the country.

"One loan customer nailed a couple of major contracts to build chambers for missile testing and came in for very sizable loans as a result," reports Clarence C. Jones, vice president of the Valley National Bank just outside Los Angeles. "Our outstanding business loans at the yearend were 15 percent above a year ago but by March 31 we expect to be topping year-earlier figures by 25 to 30 percent."

The threat of a steel strike has triggered hedge stockpiling in a variety of industries. "Big corporations such as General Motors and General Electric told steel fabricators and suppliers to get in bigger steel inventories," states Allen P. Stults, executive vice president of American National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago. "This showed up in several commitments we made to component manufacturers and to steel warehouses."

The contract of the United Steelworkers of America with major producers doesn't expire until June 30 and bankers believe that if negotiations show signs of stalling, steel stockpiling will leapfrog.

Rising retail sales are encouraging bigger inventories, which also mean larger loans to manufacturers who supply merchants. "We're loaning out more to textile producers and the cotton brokers because they are expecting good sales and improved profit margins," comments Yates W. Faison, Jr., senior vice president of North Carolina Bank in Charlotte, N.C.

The business loan upturn also prevails in farm areas. "We thought cattle feeders wouldn't buy as many head this year because of high prices," says Robert E. Larsen, assistant cashier of Omaha National Bank. "But on the contrary, they are buying more, which is reflected in our loans." Arthur W. Lucht, president of the Union Story Trust & Savings Bank, Ames, Iowa, says loans to a silo manufacturer soared this month because in the past 3 weeks the firm sold as many silos to farmers as it had in the first 5 months of 1961.

The Waterbury National Bank, Waterbury, Conn., says better business for brass fabricators in that area is resulting in bigger loan applications for tooling-up costs. The bank expects first quarter business loans to top year ago figures by roughly 10 percent.

AUTOS AND FURNITURE

Many bankers say they're receiving heavier loan demands from auto dealers and finance companies, stemming in most cases from expectations of highly improved car sales in 1962. Retail auto sales in the first third of January were the highest for the period since 1957.

"We're preparing to loan out 10 to 15 percent more funds in the first quarter this year than we did a year ago," reports Walter Behnke, vice president of Old Kent Bank & Trust Co. in Grand Rapids, Mich. "We're getting bigger loan demand from producers of auto parts and components because they are having a better year. And furniture manufacturers booked much bigger orders at the January market so they are asking for heavier loans."

What all this rising loan demand does to interest rates and availability of credit depends on whether bankers' current expectations do indeed come true. And that, to a very large extent, depends on the Nation's money managers in Washington.

There's no doubt that bankers are anticipating interest rate increases. "The prospect of higher interest rates is a very real thing," states Charles E. Walker, executive vice president of the American Bankers Association. "Banks are loaded up on loans at a time when the upswing in the business cycle will create more demand for credit. All this makes for higher prices for credit."

A Salt Lake City banker says his bank already is asking one-half percent more interest on many small commercial loans as they come up for renewal, due to higher rates the bank now is paying on savings accounts and because of increased borrowing by businesss. Under a new Federal rule, commercial banks now are permitted to pay up to 4 percent interest on savings accounts; many are doing so.

HIGHER FARM LOAN RATES

The Valley National Bank of Arizona, in Phoenix, has set higher rates on agricultural production loans and expects to increase rates for other types of loans as demand increases, according to Carl A. Bimson, chairman of the executive committee and a former ABA president.

A good many bankers foresee an increase in the prime rate, the interest rate banks charge their biggest and most credit-worthy borrowers; but there's little agreement on when such a boost might come. The prime rate now is 4.5 percent; most other bank lending charges are scaled upward from this. An increase in the prime rate could come almost any time," Homer J. Livingston, chairman of the First National Bank of Chicago, has stated. But Mr. Bimson, of Arizona figures a rise in the prime rate may not come until the third quarter. Prime rate changes usually start at one of New York's major banks, with institutions in other parts of the country following quickly. The present 4.5 percent prime rate has been standard since the fall of 1960. Before that it was 5 percent, the level many bankers predict will return sometime this year.

Many bankers expect the Federal Reserve System to start tightening up on credit before too long. Normally the Federal Reserve does this, in a variety of ways, when business activity expands rapidly; the goal is to keep inflation in check. In the view of some observers, the economy now is approaching a situation where the money managers will worry more about inflation than expansion.

President Asked To Declare Mobile County a Disaster Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have just received an urgent communication from my good friend, Charlie Brockway, the county agent for Mobile, Ala. He has informed me that many of the nurserymen in the First Congressional District were recently hard hit by the freezing weather.

As an example, Mr. Tom Dodd, Jr., of Semmes, Ala., who is one of our larger and more successful nurserymen in the State, has suffered a tremendous loss. This loss is estimated between $300,000 and $500,000. Mr. Dodd employs an average of 100 men per day. But this is only an example.

These men are going to need help to make a comeback from the tremendous losses they have suffered. Mr. Speaker, with the disastrous situation at hand, I urge the President to declare Mobile County a disaster area for this tremendous hardship caused by the recent freeze.

Brigham Young University Students' Success on the "College Bowl" Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH R. HARDING

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, recently four students from my alma mater, Brigham Young University in Provo, Utah, have thrilled graduates, student body and friends of the university with their success on the General Electric's "Quick Recall" program entitled "College Bowl."

The Brigham Young University College Bowl team, ably coached by Prof. Robert Thomas of the English department, had disposed of four worthy opponents, including the University of Maryland a week ago Sunday. Last Sunday they were up against an excellent team from little DePauw University, an outstanding small college from Greencastle, Ind. In an exciting game, Brigham Young University students were defeated in their attempt to win their fifth straight game and retire as undefeated champions in this national scholarship contest.

The Brigham Young University team was composed of Capt. Todd Britsch, who is majoring in political science and is an accomplished musician. Todd's father is a professor in the Department of English at Brigham Young University and has provided an atmosphere of scholarship and love of fine arts in the Britsch home. Todd's accomplishments include being a finalist in both the Fulbright and Danforth scholarship contests.

In addition to Todd Britsch, the Brigham Young University team is composed of Dave Stone, Bob Despain, and Mrs. JoJean Loflin, all of whom are outstanding students.

Dave Stone, who was born in Buenos Aires, Argentina, and educated in that country, is presently teaching Spanish and studying English at Brigham Young University.

Bob Despain planned to be an engineer and was studying this field at the California Institute of Technology. However, he soon found he was taking more English than engineering and was advised by one of his professors that Brigham Young University had one of the finest English departments in the West. So Bob Despain transferred to the Utah school.

The fourth member of the College Bowl team, Mrs. JoJean Loflin, is also a senior

majoring in English. JoJean's mother was an English teacher and instilled the love of education in her outstanding daughter. Her earliest memories are of reciting poems like "America for Me" and "O Captain! My Captain!"

I am sure that yesterday was not a completely happy day in Provo, Utah, where the student body and townspeople were waiting to greet Brigham Young University's College Bowl team. Some of the glamor of the homecoming celebration was dimmed by their unexpected defeat the hands of DePauw.

However, our pride in this fine team of young people remains justified, and I would merely remind them to always remember, "The smile when you win comes quick as a whip, but the smile when you lose, that is sportsmanship."

The Public's Rights in TV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, on September 16, 1961, I introduced a bill—H.R. 9267—to amend the Communications Act of 1934. This bill, if enacted, would require the Federal Communications Commission to cease the program to deintermix. Presently, it is the plan of the Commission to deintermix some eight cities now enjoying VHF reception and being required to utilize UHF which restricts area coverage and could cause a blackout in many rural areas of the country. Further, if the Commission order is permitted to stand, the proposed deintermixture will spread to all areas of the Nation. Following is an editorial appearing in the New York Times on Monday, January 29, 1962, which I believe is excellent and in general covers the picture. It also covers another section of my bill which would require manufactures of television receivers engaged in Interstate Commerce equip sets to receive both VHF and UHF channels:

THE PUBLIC'S RIGHTS IN TV

For once Newton N. Minow, chairman of the Federal Communication Commission, and Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, are in agreement on something. They both think Congress should encourage the use of more television channels by requiring manufacturers to make sets that will receive all channels.

In the long run, the only way to have more stations is to take advantage of the 70 ultra high frequency (UHF) channels reserved for television as well as the 12 very high frequency (VHF) channels on which most stations now broadcast.

So far UHF has been caught in a vicious circle. Broadcasters have hesitated to get into the service because almost no one has a television set capable of receiving it. The public has seen no reason to buy sets equipped for it because virtually no programs are broadcast on UHF.

One way to get out of that circle is the one urged by Messrs. Minow and Stanton. This would be for Congress to pass a law requiring television manufacturers to make only sets capable of receiving all channels, UHF as well as VHF.

There is natural concern at the idea of the Government prescribing what manufacturers may make. But Government already fixes the technical standards for television broadcasting, as it must. Without some outside force to equalize the risk, no single manufacturer is likely to push sets costing considerably more than its competitors'. Once the vicious circle was broken, the growth of UHF would be a boon to setmakers as well as to the audience.

Department of Labor To Train Tractor Operators in Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, recently one of my constituents, Mr. Merritt D. Hill, vice president and general manager, Tractor and Implement Division, Ford Motor Co., called my attention to a plan announced by the Department of Labor to train 1,200 farm tractor operators in Mississippi.

This plan, approved by Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg, calls for an 8-week training course costing $435,000 in Federal funds, in addition to administrative expenses. Covered would be 16 counties in the Yazoo Delta of Mississippi.

The Secretary of Labor, in his press release, expressed the hope that the training "would provide workers with year-round employment with daywork provided for members of the operator's family to help achieve rural family stability in the years ahead."

Mr. Hill wanted to save the Federal Government some money and possibly some time. So he suggested to the Secretary of Labor that the approximately 160 farm equipment dealers in the area covered in Mississippi be utilized at a minimum cost to the Federal Government.

He also questioned the necessity of an 8-week course of instruction on how to drive a tractor, as he stated that a high school boy, with car-driving ability, can master a tractor in less than a week.

Further, Mr. Hill pointed out that using the Labor Department's own press release as a source for data, there simply are not enough tractors to go round for the men who already are tractor operators. An estimated 40,000 persons are now operating the 30,700 tractors in the Yazoo Delta area. The upgrading of 1,200 of these persons would seem to accomplish merely the displacement of 1,200 less well trained men, without any increase in the number of jobs.

In addition, Mr. Hill pointed out that there is now an excess of 9,300 persons at least partially trained in tractor operations for which tractors are not now available.

Mr. Hill offered to come to Washington, or to send one of his firm's experts to our Nation's Capital, to discuss this matter further with the Department of Labor and the Office of Education to see if more efficient training methods could be worked out in a cooperative venture with farm equipment companies, presumably at little or no cost to the Federal Government.

Since his letter to the Secretary of Labor more than 2 weeks ago, Mr. Hill has not as yet even received the courtesy of a reply.

It is too bad that some of the Departments of our Federal Government are quick with the requests for information and can compile reams of statistics to justify their expenditures for the coming fiscal year, yet appear to be turning a cold shoulder to a plan which might save them some money, might make their training programs more effective and which would provide excellent training with up-to-date equipment on the spot.

U.S. Failure To Lead Opens the Way for Communist Victories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, once again in the conference now going on in Punte del Este, the United States has failed to exert a firm position of leadership and has, instead, compromised, tried to win over the fainthearted and those who are determined to do nothing adequate to stop the spread of the Communist conspiracy in this hemisphere. The result will be a slap on the wrist for Castro, no action that will contain communism in Cuba or prevent his continued subversion in neighboring countries.

Until the United States is prepared to take a bold and firm stand in defense of freedom, with or without the support of our neighboring countries, we can expect the Communist bulwark in Cuba to grow in strength and prestige until other countries are engulfed and the Communist timetable for encirclement of the United States will maintain its schedule.

The following editorial from the Dallas Morning News is an eloquent review of the weakness of our stand in Punte del Este:

[From the Dallas Morning News, Jan. 27, 1962]

THE BEST WE CAN GET

Secretary of State Dean Rusk has proposed a four-point program of action to the inter-American conference of foreign ministers designed to cope with the threat of communism in the hemisphere by dealing a blow to Castro. Any self-respecting nation genuinely interested in halting the advance of communism in the Americas could consider Rusk's proposals as a minimum program of action.

The largest and most powerful of the Latin American nations, however, look upon the program as an absolute maximum and have dragged their feet on major points of Rusk's proposal. Whatever action is taken at Punta del Este, the hemisphere will be split down the middle.

The very countries which might be able to deal effectively with Castro will be reluctant to exercise tough sanctions.

Mr. Rusk's current proposals call for: (1) Recognition that Cuba's alinement with the Communist world is incompatible with the inter-American system; (2) exclusion of the Castro regime from OAS functions; (3) interruption of trade between Cuba and the rest of the Americas, particularly in arms; and (4) establishment of individual and collective defense acts against political and indirect aggression in the hemisphere.

The Rusk program represents the third major strategy change adopted by the U.S. delegation since the conference opened last Sunday.

Our first attempt was to seek immediate political and economic sanctions against Cuba. What we are now proposing is a watered-down version of this earlier goal, for the political and economic sanctions are not as broad, and we have backtracked on the call for tough and immediate action. Many of the nations don't want to impose any time limit at all.

Yet we seem to have convinced no one by the compromise. Strong opposition is still expressed by the so-called "Soft Seven"—Brazil, Argentina, Mexico, Chile, Bolivia, Ecuador, and Uruguay—those nations which still maintain diplomatic relations with Cuba. In addition, one nation which has broken off diplomatic relations with Castro, Haiti, is opposed to effective action.

These seven nations represent 75 percent of the population of the hemisphere, exclusive of the United States. They have received more than two-thirds of the $4 billion in foreign aid which the United States has poured into the hemisphere since World War II and are likely to receive a similar proportion of the $20 billion alliance for progress aid.

Such massive assistance, we have been told, has been necessary to win over good friends in the hemisphere and elsewhere in the world. Our current plight in the Americas should be sufficient proof of the mistakes we have made on this score.

Another mistake has been the policy of adjusting our strategy to "world opinion." No nation has ever achieved greatness by such a policy.

The great have become so only by leading and shaping the opinions of others and by taking the initiative.

Since World War II our strategy of following the world and committing ourselves to abide by the decision of collective groups of nations has gone a long way toward undermining the position of power and leadership we once possessed.

By swearing that we would never, never use the veto in the United Nations, or take action independent of that body, we have allowed the Soviet to gobble up great masses of land areas and hundreds of millions of people.

By pledging ourselves to accept the whims of international disarmament agencies, we have neglected the maintenance of our own national security.

By hog-tying ourselves to the Organization of American States, in violation of our own Monroe Doctrine, we have opened the door to further Communist victories in our own back yard.

Textile Roadblock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Camden Chronicle, Camden, S.C., of January 26, 1962:

TEXTILE ROADBLOCK

Much of the talk about a liberalized foreign trade program centers around the advantages to be gained from increased foreign competition. Little is said, however, about the kind of competition.

Foreign competition today might well be likened to a hurdle race, with our man going over the high hurdles and the competitor from overseas going over the low hurdles. They come away from the starting line on even terms, because neither has a distinct advantage in the way of modern plants and equipment of modern mass production know-how. The finish line is the same. Each competitor has a similar product and his goal is the American marketplace.

It's during the race, from start to finish, that our man is at such a disadvantage. While the foreign competition is skimming over the low hurdles, our man is negotiating such hurdles as higher raw material costs, higher labor costs, higher taxes, and higher plant and equipment costs. The U.S. textile industry provides a good example. The American manufacturer pays $42.50 per bale more for American-grown cotton than does the oversea manufacturer and his wage rates are as much as 10 times higher.

As a result, the oversea competition breaks the tape in the American marketplace with a lower price for his goods. It's not competition in quality, styling, production efficiency or consumer appeal but competition in price alone.

American business and industry grew up on competition, to the continuing benefit of the American consumer. But the rules of the game were the same for all. Some day, when standards of living around the world are more nearly equal, visions of the world as one great marketplace may be realized. Meanwhile, we cannot ignore the basic economic facts of foreign competition and the disadvantage at which they place American industry. U.S. trade policy should, at the very least, seek to equalize the conditions of competition to assure a growing economy and expanding job opportunities here at home.

Powers of Congress Seized by Executive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an excellent editorial from the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch:

POWERS OF CONGRESS SEIZED BY EXECUTIVE

Increasingly, and at an accelerated rate, the executive branch of the Federal Government is seeking to take over the powers of Congress, and to a large extent succeeding.

Under the Constitution, Congress has the sole power to make the Federal laws.

This authority includes the levying of taxes, including the duties on imports, to provide funds with which to "pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States"; to regulate commerce with foreign nations; to coin money "and regulate the value thereof," to declare war, to provide, maintain and regulate an Army and Navy, and "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing

POWERS OF CONGRESS SEIZED BY EXECUTIVE

The President's legislative powers are limited, as set forth in the Constitution. He is required to "give to the Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommend * * * consideration (of) such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient."

He has the power "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur." He can veto an act of Congress, but Congress can override the veto by a two-thirds vote.

Obviously, the Constitution made the executive and legislative branches of the Government coordinate, with specific authority, powers and obligations assigned to each and with restrictions placed on the powers and authority of each.

But more and more the executive establishment looks upon Congress as a necessary rubber stamp on whatever acts, policies, commitments, programs, and ventures it decides to make or undertake.

More and more, the President and his appointees are presenting Congress with accomplished facts and saying: "Here, ratify these." Or, if they are not accomplished facts, they are widely publicized commitments which Congress is told: "We've promised; now you must keep our word."

This executive preemption of power began with a vengeance in the 1930's under the Roosevelt New Deal. The excuse then was the economic depression. The times, it was said, required extraordinary measures. Then came the war, and the pretext was the same.

The late President Franklin D. Roosevelt once went so far as to tell Congress that he hoped it wouldn't let a question of constitutionality stand in the way of one of his specific proposals.

After Mr. Roosevelt, came Harry S. Truman, who insisted that there were inherent powers in the Presidency which superseded the powers of Congress, but in at least one notable instance, the third coordinate branch of the Government, the courts, overruled him on that point.

General Eisenhower, who next succeeded to the Presidency followed the trend to a lesser degree, not being the bold executive type, but in the field of foreign affairs he, too, tended to take over the prerogatives of Congress, or to present it with a fait accompli.

Now, President Kennedy is carrying the trend further toward the ultimate relegation of Congress to the role of rubberstamp. In his state of the Union message he asked for authority to lower the income tax whenever, in his opinion, this manipulation would be of benefit to the national economy. In other words, Congress would relinquish its stipulated constitutional power to set the tax rate.

He also asked for surrender to him of the power to levy duties on imports, by authorizing him to make deals with blocs of foreign countries to eliminate tariffs on some goods entirely and to reduce others as much as 50 percent.

By its spending, the executive branch of Government nowadays obligates the Nation so deeply it has to keep asking Congress to raise the debt ceiling.

Our roving ambassadors make treaty deals behind closed doors, then Congress, which has not been privy to the negotiations, is briefed and told it must go along or we shall lose face or that the consequences will be dire—maybe even a global war.

Our State Department promises to buy $100 million worth of an unprecedented issue of bonds by the possibly moribund United Nations and Congress is told it must comply under pain of dire consequences to global peace efforts.

Troops are stationed in almost any part of the world. Congress later is let in on the

why and wherefore and asked to sanction and finance the operation.

Now specific rates on specific items of goods exchanged in commerce are to be bargained against a background of international politics and intrigue, with considerations of the marketplace only one feature of the involvement. To do this, Congress is asked to give up its constitutional prerogatives, probably under the U.N. Charter or some other international agreement, and to turn over the field to a mass of appointive bureaucrats who are more or less permanently embedded in the Federal Establishment.

In France, De Gaulle has superseded the national legislature. Are we going to follow suit? Are the elected Representatives of the people, in Congress assembled, going to hand over all authority to the executive branch?

It's time Congress stood up for its rights—the rights accorded it by the Constitution and which it has the duty to the people of the United States to preserve.

It's Your Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, during 1961, Mr. Garth A. Shoemaker, president of the National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, spoke at NARW chapter meetings on the subject "It's Your Choice." The wide acclamation with which the listeners received Mr. Shoemaker's address, and the message it contains for every American, prompts me to include the text here.

Mr. Shoemaker is executive vice president and treasurer of the Hygeia Refrigerating Co., of Elmira, N.Y. Beside serving as president of his association, he is now in his 11th term as president of the Citizens' Public Expenditure Survey of New York State. In 1957–58 he served as president of the Refrigeration Research Foundation. In 1950, Mr. Shoemaker received the Coronet magazine award for outstanding civic service, and in 1952 he received the Freedoms Foundation award.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the above-mentioned address, as follows:

IT'S YOUR CHOICE

(By Garth A. Shoemaker)

There is little disagreement among people that the number one problem in the world today is the ideological struggle going on between Russia and the Iron Curtain countries, and the Western World. In spite of this unanimity, there seems to be a great confusion, a great difference in thinking that is terrifying in its threat to our inherent freedoms.

In all the talk we hear and articles we read of summit meetings and compromises, condonation and concession, there emerges one mistaken idea, an idea held by all too many in government and certainly by all too many of those who are in the position of molding public opinion. That is the idea that we are at peace with our ideological enemies, although, admittedly, an uneasy peace. These misguided and misinformed individuals set forth the opinion that we must conduct ourselves so as to preserve that uneasy peace and work toward that some far distant day when the Russian bear will become a lamb and world tensions and the cold war will evaporate.

The plain and simple truth is that we are at war right now, and we are losing that war simply because we don't or won't accept the fact that we are in it. This is a strange war, fought with unusual weapons and unique strategy, but nonetheless a war. In this struggle every move, every word of the Russians is a calculated maneuver aimed at furthering their declared campaign of world conquest.

We can't kid ourselves—this is a declared war. They have told us in their writings, they have told us in their talks, they have told us by their very actions that communism and capitalism cannot exist in the world together.

Fortunately, this is not a shooting war yet, because we have stayed militarily strong. Russia, up to now, has not dared to add direct armed conflict to her tactics and strategy for fear she would be defeated. But don't be misled. This is not too frustrating to the men of the Kremlin. Mr. Lenin, the interpreter of Karl Marx, never placed outright military assault very high in the strategic plan of things. In 1923 Mr. Lenin said that the Russians would take eastern Europe, next organize the hordes of Asia, then surround the United States, and he predicted, "that last bastian of capitalism will not have to be taken. It will fall into our outstretched hands like overripe fruit."

Now hear this. Eastern Europe has been taken. China is a Red giant. All over Asia lesser countries follow the pattern of first neutralism and then a quick switch to pro-Russian, anti-Western government. Cuba has become a Red beachhead on our very doorstep. Daily reports come in of riots and leftist demonstrations in other Latin American countries. And remember this: not a single Russian solider becomes a casualty.

The simple truth is that Communists believe that victory is inevitable. They are convinced that we are abandoning our democratic institutions one by one under the stress of constant pressure. Nitkita Khrushchev said: "We cannot expect the Americans to jump from capitalism to communism. However, we can assist their elected leaders in giving Americans small doses of socialism until they suddenly awake to find they have communism."

A quick lesson in history is in order at this point. The great historian Arnold J. Toynbee in his monumental work, "A Study of History," writes of the change which took place in the governmental administration of the Roman Empire during the two centuries following its establishment. The Empire as originally conceived was to be an association of self-governing city-states and principalities, with the burden of administration left to local authorities. Mr. Toynbee points out that this policy was never deliberately revised. It was never the intent and purpose of the central government to change that administrative structure. Yet at the end of 200 years, unmarred by any wars or major disruptions within the boundaries of the Empire itself, local government had completely eroded. The principalities had been turned into provinces. The local rulers had been replaced by imperial governors, and the administration of the city-states had been taken over by managers appointed by the central administration. In the end, the whole administration of the Empire had passed into the hands of an organized bureaucracy spawned by centralized government.

Everyone knows what followed. An empire which contained within itself the entire civilized world of that time, an empire that had possessed all the culture, all the education, and all the scientific knowledge that had yet been discovered, rotted from within and fell apart at the seams, was conquered and overrun by tribes of barbarians who plunged the human race into darkness from which it did not recover for a thousand years.

We should remember the other fact about the Roman Empire that went hand in glove with its centralized government by bureaucracy and contributed in large part to its downfall. The drain of taxes into the central treasury bled the people white and left the provinces and the city-states completely impoverished.

We are not living in the Roman Empire of 1,800 years ago—we are living in the United States of America in the last half of the 20th century. Let's take a closer look at what is happening to us.

If you will think about it for a moment, you will recognize that up until the lifetime of men now living most of our citizens had practically no contact with the Federal Government unless they traveled abroad, engaged in interstate or foreign commerce, or joined the armed services. The only Federal department that directly affected their daily lives was the Post Office. State government was almost as remote. Our towns and cities administered just about all the government there was, and unless some unfortunate was sent to the State penitentiary there was little occasion to travel any further up the line than the county seat.

Today almost every phase of our life feels the stultifying hands of government regimentation and interference. More and more and more we have turned to central government for the answers to all our problems. Today we are faced with a collection of internal powers and bureaucratic institutions against which the average citizen is absolutely helpless. This power, under whatever name or ideology you choose to call it, is in truth the very essence of totalitarianism.

Talk about a Roman Empire bureaucracy. Do you know that one out of every eight employed persons in the United States today is on a Government payroll, Federal, State, or local? When you look at all the things Government is doing and planning to do, you wonder how it can get along with so few.

The establishment of Government-paid medical care was one of the first steps in imposing statism on our people. In this country today, there are few open advocates of socialized medicine, and yet our Veterans' Administration hospital system is the costliest medical program of its type in the world. There is no disagreement among people that a man wounded or disabled in the defense of his country is rightfully entitled to the finest medical and hospital care that we can provide. There was little disagreement some 30 years ago when it was proposed that a needy veteran, not disabled in the service but needing hospitalization, should be allowed the use of a VA bed if that bed was not required for a service-connected disability. Today three out of four VA beds are occupied by patients suffering diseases or injuries neither originated by nor aggravated by military service. Each year's budget authorizes more millions of dollars for more VA hospital beds, and yet there are only some 40,000 service-connected disabilities in the United States.

Counting the 23 million veterans, one-fourth of our citizens are entitled to some form of Government-paid medical or hospital care. It is now proposed that all participants in social security join a compulsory health plan to provide Government-paid medical care upon reaching the age of 65. This, of course, is proposed in the name of emergency and dire need. A picture is evoked of millions of our elderly citizens unable to have the medical care they require and thus only a comprehensive Federal program can possibly meet the challenge. To be sure, there is a problem, but actually it

concerns only about 10 percent of our elderly citizens. Nearly 70 percent of that age group are among the more than 127 million people who come under some kind of private medical or hospital insurance.

Social security was conceived to provide that destitution should not result from the death, unemployment, or old age of a worker. It was never intended to supplant private savings. It was never intended to supplant pension plans or insurance. It was intended to provide a foundation upon which security could be achieved. Truly, the temptation to buy elections by urging people to vote themselves a raise has been irrestible to many politicians.

In 1959, many, many years before it was believed likely, social security payments exceeded income. In 1943, the actuarial experts predicted that social security outgo by 1957 would be $1.2 billion. The actual outgo came to $7 billion. The present participants in our so-called social security program will collect between $300 and $600 billion more than they are paying in. In its promotional activities, the social security system still refers to itself as an insurance program. However, in arguments before the Supreme Court, the social security officials contended that it is not an insurance program but that the money paid in is a tax, and that participants have no rights as such. Benefit payments are designated by the Congress and can be changed or canceled at any time by congressional action.

The National Defense Education Act of 1958, costing only $900 million at the start, is in fact a real governmental foot in the door for Federal aid to education. Little attention was given to the fact that more than 99 percent of the school districts of this country have not reached the limit of their bonded indebtedness. Little heed was paid to the fact that in the last 10 years a 35-percent increase in students has been met by a 134-percent increase in local and State spending for schools. Classroom space for 15 million students has been built to meet an increase of only 10 million youngsters. There are today 500 colleges in the United States that can take an additional 200,000 students without having to add a chair or a desk.

Today the Federal aid to education lobby is one of the most powerful and largest spending lobbies in Washington. These exponents of Federal aid to education deny that Federal control has any place in their thoughts. But one should remember that the Supreme Court has, in the case of *Wickard* v. *Filburn*, established the principle that what the Government subsidizes the Government can control. Homer Wadsworth, former Chairman of the President's Advisory Committee on Youth Fitness, said: "It is necessary that national standards for education be established in order for the United States to maintain its strength in the struggle for power against Russia. As much as we desire to retain local management of our schools, the competition with Russia makes this impossible."

In another area of Government activity we have programs to reduce farm surpluses—programs that make it so financially attractive to produce surpluses that we now have over $9 billion worth of Government-owned agricultural products in storage. Not too long ago the Government, with some 17½ million pounds of butter in storage, found it necessary to go into the marketplace and buy half a million pounds to feed the armed services. The Government has enough wheat in storage to make 25 loaves of bread for every man, woman and child in the world today.

A short time ago, in New Mexico, citizens were renting land from the State for 25 cents an acre, then applying for and receiving $9 an acre in soil bank payments for not planting anything on the land. The largest subsidy check for $1,300,000 went to citizens of a foreign land that were not even residents of this country. A Big Flats, N.Y., farmer bought a 1961 Cadillac with the subsidy check he received for not growing 104 acres of corn.

Farm spending is one of the biggest single items in our Federal budget, outside of defense, and yet only 20 percent of agriculture comes under Government regulation and subsidy. The last session of Congress saw a drive on the part of people who think the solution of the farm problem is to take control of the other 80 percent of agriculture, which now operates on some semblance of a free market of supply and demand. The aim was to bring about a permanent system of Government control, with Government licensing the farmer, regulating prices, and limiting production, all of which it is estimated will cause a rise of 15 to 25 percent in the retail prices of food.

In still another area, our Government owns and operates more than 19,000 businesses in direct competition with its own taxpaying citizens. These tax-free subsidized corporations range from the manufacture of fertilizer to surgical equipment, from rum distilleries to tin smelters. Annually they lose billions of dollars, all of which is made up from the taxes we pay. The estimated book value of 700 of these Government corporations is $262 billion, and that represents about one-fifth of the total industrial capacity of the United States. The Hoover Commission, appointed under two presidents, described itself as working in a fantastic nightmare of regimented chaos. They recommended liquidation of scores and scores of these corporations, to little or no avail.

The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1952 opened the way for using roadbuilding funds for projects outside the United States. The next time you get caught in one of those terrific traffic jams, take comfort in the fact that you helped build a six-lane highway from Madrid, Spain, to a fancy gambling casino 15 miles away.

The fodder upon which Government has fed and grown beyond the consent of the governed is provided by a tax system which has long since ceased to be a system. It is now an almost incomprehensible hodgepodge of conflicting levies and contradictions. In our lifetime we have seen the income tax grow from a law of 31 words to a compendium of interpretations of more than 440,000 words.

We tend to accept an income tax on the theory of "the more you make the more you pay." This theoretically is fair, proportionate taxation. However, our present progressive system cannot be justified on any moral grounds. Our Hebrew and Christian religions are based on the practice of tithing. Both the Old and the New Testaments describe the giving of the 10th: "If the Lord prospers you 10 times as much you give 10 times as much." Under our progressive system, however, Caesar's share is computed on a little different basis. If a $5,000 a year man today is "prospered 10 times" his income tax increases not 10 times but 53 times. History reveals that no nation has ever survived a tax burden that amounted to one-third of its income. Today taxes take 31 cents out of every dollar earned in the United States. Of that 31 cents, almost 23 cents goes to the Federal Government, leaving but 8 cents for the State, county, and local community to share.

Again quoting from our No. 1 adversary, Mr. Lenin said in 1923, "The way to destroy capitalism is to debauch the currency. Through a process of planned inflation a government can quietly and unobservedly confiscate the wealth of its citizens."

In the last 20 years our dollar has lost more than half of its purchasing power. Of course, we are told that incomes have kept pace and that we are earning twice as much, so we're still holding our own. This faulty reasoning completely overlooks the part played by this progressive tax, which is based on the number of dollars earned and not their value. The man who earned $5,000 a year in 1940 must earn $14,000 today to break even and pay his increased taxes. The lucky man who earned $10,000 in 1940 now must earn $31,000 to pay his increased taxes and maintain the same purchasing power and the same standard of living he had in 1940.

Perhaps you would like to project these figures ahead to the year 1975, keeping the same annual rate of inflation and, of course, the same tax rate and even protend that our system of free competitive enterprise will still exist. Assuming these things, the $5,000-a-year man will have to earn $33,000 in 1975 and the $10,000-a-year man will have to earn $84,000 just to maintain the same purchasing power and the same standard of living they had in 1940.

The philosophy of our Founding Fathers, that the least government is the best government, is rejected by all too many of our citizens and politicians today. They feel that the proper function of government is to direct and control the economy. There are some of these liberals who claim that our citizens are not intelligent enough to spend their own money properly. They feel that government should take the money through taxation and then buy the welfare programs which they claim the people are not smart enough to buy for themselves.

When the old-fashioned idea of living within our means and paying something on the national debt is suggested, these same liberals tell us that only State and local debt is bad. Through some strange and exotic bookkeeping methods, they seem to feel that the Federal debt is meaningless and that we are sacrificing our security on the false altar of a balanced budget.

If you had a 4-inch stack of thousand-dollar bills in your hand, you would be a millionaire. If you could see the national debt of $293 billion before you in thousand-dollar bills, the pile would be more than 18 miles high. And, as Maurice Stans, former Director of the Budget said, "This debt is only that part of the iceberg which shows above the surface." Legislation already enacted into law has obligated our Government to more than $750 billion. Add to this the local debts and the State debts and the debts of our private citizens, and you will find that actually we are mortgaged in an amount more than double the present market value of every tangible asset and every foot of real estate in the United States.

Our free economy is the very basis of our strength and the security of the entire free world depends upon the fiscal stability of the United States. As Thomas Jefferson once said, "We must make our selection between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude." James Madison, speaking before the Virginia Legislature in 1777, said: "Since the general civilization of mankind, I believe there are more instances of the abridgment of freedom of the people by gradual and silent encroachments of those in power than by violent and sudden usurpation."

And so in 15 short years we have seen the number of public employees increase by 50 percent. We have seen the public payroll go up by 170 percent. We see one out of eight of the Nation's work force employed by Government. We see one-fourth of our people entitled to some form of Government paid medical care. We see one-fifth of our industrial capacity owned and operated by Government in competition with private enterprise. Senator BYRD has estimated that some 40 million Americans receive some form of direct cash payment from the Central Government.

Can anything be done about all this? The answer is yes. We, the people, can do some-

thing about it if we have the will to do it. The No. 1 thing that must be done is to keep ourselves informed concerning the proposals submitted to the Congress, to our State legislatures, and to our local legislative bodies. Each one of these proposals must be weighed by the people, weighed not only as to the price in dollars but, more important, as to the price in individual liberty. One of the basic concepts of our Founding Fathers was that "Government should do only those things that the people cannot do for themselves." Every new proposal at every level of Government should be measured against this concept.

Having informed ourselves and weighed the proposals, we should each inform our elected representatives of our feelings. The Communist Party boasts that it can put 50,000 letters into Washington in 72 hours on any issue it chooses. Let us determine to send 100 times that number.

We can form small informal groups who think as we do. We can inform each other of proposed measures and then make sure that everybody we know informs their elected representatives. Most important of all, we should concentrate our main efforts on reducing Government income and halting deficit spending. We should demand real honest to goodness tax reform which will reduce the amount of money government has to spend. Remember, governments don't tax to get the money they need. They always need the money they get.

Do all within your power to strengthen local government. The closer government is to the people the better government we will have. In this great land of ours there occurred the only true revolution in man's history, the only revolution that did not just exchange one set of rulers for another. Ours was the only revolution that recognized that man has the dignity and sacred right to determine his own destiny as an individual, with the least interference from government.

There can be only one end to the war that we are fighting. Either we win it or we lose it. In another short 10 years or maybe sooner, the world will be headed either in the direction of freedom or slavery. Peaceful coexistence on Russia's terms is a satanic, diabolical device of the enemy to blunt our sword while he moves into position for the kill. Freedom is never more than one generation away from extinction. We have a choice. We either save it now or spend our sunset years telling our children and our children's children what it was like when men were free.

There's an old story about the chime clock that somehow slipped a cog and kept right on striking 12, 13, 14, 15. A little girl in the house heard it and became tremendously excited. She cried, "Wake up, everybody, wake up. It's later than it's ever been before." I am not prophet enough to tell you how late it is. You are intelligent and informed individuals. I will not even presume to tell you that it's later than you think. But I would leave with you this thought, "It's later than it's ever been before."

Is Cuba Harmless?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I call to the attention of my colleagues a provocative column written by George Todt of the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner.

It is amazing how some of our officials here in Washington have forgotten—or at least have forgotten to mention—the tragedy of Cuba. This cancerous condition exists only 90 miles away from our shores and presents a clear and explosive danger to the security of the United States and all of our hemisphere.

Mr. Todt's column, which appeared in editions of January 22, warns us of this danger.

IS CUBA HARMLESS?

(By George Todt)

("An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure"—American proverb.)

It is one thing for the administration to express grave concern about global disaster spots such as Berlin, the Congo and Laos—but why is next to nothing in a military sort of way being done about the potentially more dangerous Cuban missile bases being constructed now?

Who is being penny wise and pound foolish?

It is quite possible that Nikita Khrushchev is keeping the global pressure on us in the first 3 areas mentioned in order to get us to take our eye off the ball—which is Cuba in this instance. Now why should he be concerned about this mission?

The answer is bound up in some simple, elemental arithmetic—and nuclear hardware now being aimed at us close to home.

A STALEMATE

For years Mr. K. has been able to deploy intermediate range ballistics missiles (IRBM's) against our NATO allies in Europe. But not against us. The reason: this kind of deadly bird only flies in the neighborhood of 1,500 miles.

An intercontinental ballistics missile (ICBM) is one which can do 5,000-plus miles in a single arc of flight.

Now we have deployed IRBM's against the Red slave state from NATO missile bases in Europe and the result there is a relative stalemate.

The same is true with reference to the longer-ranged ICBM's we have based on the North American continent vis-a-vis the enemy's Eurasian sites.

BIG ADVANTAGE

But mark this factor which heretofore has been entirely in our favor: In the event of war, we can clobber Mr. K. with both ICBM's and IRBM's, while he can only reach the United States with ICBM's alone. And he is now revealed to be in considerably shorter supply of same than he was deemed to possess in 1961, an election year.

This gives us a considerable advantage over the Red warlord up to the present time. But what if he succeeds in gaining a modern version of what Winston Churchill once called "an unsinkable aircraft carrier" in Cuba and supplies it extensively with Soviet IRBM's?

I think this is what he is accomplishing now 90 miles off our Florida coast.

When he has done his work there, a great portion of our present deterrent will have vanished into thin air.

For then Khrushchev will have most of our important cities east of the Mississippi River zeroed in with his nuclear warheads.

This includes our vital industrial complex which extends in a rough triangle along the lines of Pittsburgh-Chicago-Memphis. Also Omaha, which is the headquarters of the U.S. Strategic Air Command (SAC). New York and Washington are within IRBM range, too.

CASTRO'S NAVY

Two months ago I sat in the audience of the annual meeting of the California Loan Association and listened to a knowledgeable and patriotic young American businessman tell us that only a few days before he had received information that 10 large Russian ships had come to Castro's Cuba from Murmansk and unloaded missiles.

This man was Glendale's Frank Gard Jameson, former president of the U.S. Navy League, and an authority who knows what he is talking about. I reported the matter in this column.

Why is nothing being done about this crucial item now?

Frank Jameson indicated in his well-conceived speech that the missiles ought to be ready to go within possibly a 2-month period. That might be right now! Why no preventive action on our part?

If the Red rat, Castro—which this column successfully identified as a Communist and Kremlin stooge several years ago and long before it was popular to do so—succeeds in accumulating nuclear hardware in any quantity, we will be blackmailed on a scale which will dwarf anything which has hitherto been hurled against us.

NO QUIBBLING

Fidelisimo is madness and the neurotic dictator is quite capable of pulling the trigger by himself and vaporizing a few American cities on his own. Khrushchev, of course, would be expected to disclaim responsibility. Then what would be our course?

Actually, I think it comes close to a dereliction of duty by our responsible leaders if they allow Castro to construct missile bases for Khrushchev in our own backyard. How about that?

Away with quibbling about a matter so important to our survival as a nation—and as just plain people. It is time for action!

When will the "guardhouse lawyers" wake up to learn that cruel and predatory world communism has declared war on us? Why wait?

Humanitarians Doing First-Rate Job Outlawing Animal Brutalities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial by James and Ann Free concerning the work of humanitarians in outlawing animal brutalities. This column was distributed nationally by the McClure Newspaper Syndicate and presents an excellent picture with regard to animal brutalities.

HUMANITARIANS DOING FIRST-RATE JOB OUTLAWING ANIMAL BRUTALITIES

(By James and Ann Free)

WASHINGTON.—Don't underrate the political power of humanitarians.

They've been doing a first-rate job in the last few years to outlaw brutalities to animals. And it is largely overlooked by those who still think of the stereotype image of the bleeding-heart fuddy-duddy.

Not only have their efforts helped animals, they are helping this Nation in the eyes of the world. For example, their recent successful efforts—even to calling on President Kennedy for help—to eliminate clubbing

from the annual rabbit roundup at Harmony, N.C., is saving this country from some embarrassment.

They have prodded the U.S. Government into signing the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil. Thousands of sea birds have died a lingering death because ships discharged oil in areas where birds often alight. A new law prohibits the discharge of oil within 20 miles of shore and in some areas up to 100 miles.

They were successful recently in persuading the Congress to appropriate funds for the Food and Drug Administration to build proper quarters for its hundreds of test dogs. For years they have been confined without relief in tiny cages in a subbasement.

A few years ago, thousands of letters—and not all written by members of humane societies—flooded Congress demanding a law to provide humane methods of slaughter of meat animals. Fifteen other countries, including the Fiji Islands, have such laws. Federal legislation, however, does not cover all animals, therefore legislation is or will be sought in 38 States that to date have not passed State humane slaughter bills.

WILD HORSES

Then there was the passage of the "wild horse" bill, which forbids the rounding up by airplanes of wild horses still left on the plains and rimrock. This success prompted the last Clark Gable film, "The Misfits."

And at the end of the last session of Congress President Kennedy signed a law making surplus grain available to prevent starvation of game birds and other wildlife during blizzards.

Much of the recent progress is due to the entrance into the field of several new national humane organizations. Also many church and civic groups, including the General Federation of Women's Clubs, have backed humane legislation. Pope John recently gave his blessing to the 3-year-old National Catholic Society for Animal Welfare.

Many humane campaigns still lie ahead. For example, humane groups take a dim view of the Department of the Interior's recommendation that sea lions in Alaskan waters be slaughtered for mink food. Experimental slaughter action left many animals maimed. Legislation will probably be introduced to outlaw—as it is in several countries—the steel leg-grip trap, asking that the more humane instant-killing traps be substituted. In Western States such as Wyoming, there is a move afoot to outlaw "steer busting" exhibitions that cripple and kill steers.

Two bills are now pending in Congress to regulate the care and use of animals used for research. Proponents claim that medical science will not be set back, but furthered by better provisions for care and for control of fear and pain.

The record to date of humanitarians in obtaining animal protective laws is leading many Congressmen to the same conclusion. It is, they realize, both morally and politically sound to heed their constituents' and their own unquiet consciences in working to forbid cruelty.

Gov. Donald G. Nutter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, on January 25, the State of Montana and the Nation lost a great man when a National Guard C–47 crashed near Wolf Creek Mountain and killed Gov. Donald G. Nutter. Also killed in this fatal accident were the Governor's administrative assistant, the Honorable Dennis Gordon, the Honorable Ed Wren, commissioner of agriculture for the State of Montana, and the plane's crew of three.

I would like to express the sympathy, not only for myself but for all of the people of Alabama, to all of the people of Montana, and to Governor Nutter's widow, Mrs. Maxine Nutter and their son, Johnnie.

Mr. Speaker, this was a terrible accident; however, a valuable lesson should be learned from this accident. This accident has been in the making for many years. The Air National Guard has made available, for the purpose of flying Governors and other State officials on official State business, the C–47 aircraft. These C–47's are old, inadequate airplanes. I feel that all C–47's should not be used by chief executives and a more modern aircraft such as the C–54 should replace these aircraft at once.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the Department of Defense and the National Guard Bureau to replace these aircraft at once, in order to prevent a recurrence of this accident.

Alabama on several occasions, has come very close to losing its chief executives through malfunctions of the C–47, both Governor Patterson, our present Governor, and former Governor Folsom, have had to make forced landings due to malfunctions of these aircraft.

Mr. Speaker, this is an intolerable situation, and I feel one that all of us here in the House of Representatives feel should be investigated.

Catholic Transcript Supports Health Care Program Under Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK KOWALSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, a most respected voice in Connecticut is that of the Catholic Transcript, the official publication of the archdiocese of Hartford, the diocese of Bridgeport, and the diocese of Norwich.

In a highly significant editorial in the current issue of this splendid weekly newspaper is an editorial strongly endorsing Federal legislation to establish an insurance program for medical and hospital care for senior citizens, under the social security system. The editorial is entitled "Proper Answer to Acute Need."

As one who has fought for adoption of such a program since I entered the Congress, I commend the editorial in the Catholic Transcript to the attention of my colleagues.

This editorial, Mr. Speaker, provides a strong, cogent statement of why the country needs a health care insurance program under Social Security. I am proud that a leading newspaper in my State has offered such an admirable summary of the case for a great social need.

Following is the text of the editorial from the January 25 issue of the Catholic Transcript:

PROPER ANSWER TO ACUTE NEED

No plan for medical insurance for the aged is practical and acceptable which makes provision for payment of doctors' fees but none for payment of hospital bills. If the only feasible method of meeting hospital costs in such cases is under social security, then to this we must come, and the sooner the better. For the plain fact is that great numbers of old people cannot have requisite hospitalization unless its costs are defrayed by insurance payments.

It is well known that more and more of the population is living longer. It is equally well known that those advanced in years have more illnesses, are ill for longer periods, have greater need for hospital care. This means that their hospital bills exceed, and in general greatly exceed, those for the average of their juniors. At the same time, as inescapable as the expenditures they face is the diminution of their income. When this particular demand is greatest, the means to meet it are least. What is to be done about the old people in this situation? Here is a national problem which is in danger of becoming a national disgrace.

There are those who simply will not face the problem, or at least the most practicable and equitable solution—an insurance scheme under the Social Security System. They maintain that private, as distinguished from public, plans are adequate. This is to blink the truth. Obviously they are not. Did they suffice, there would not be for countless thousands the acute difficulties now besetting them. Or these critics see in any public plan the sinister prospect of socialism. What actually is proposed is socialization—a pooling of resources, under Government auspices, to resolve an intolerable condition which has definitely proved not susceptible of resolution by individual or private group resources. This is legitimate and desirable.

What the administration proposes is sensible and fair. It does not involve socialism—galloping, creeping, or of any other ilk. Rather, it promises well as an answer to a desperate need.

Do Schools Need Federal Aid?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the following editorial from the Jeffersonian Democrat of Brookville, Pa., under date of January 25, 1962:

DO SCHOOLS NEED FEDERAL AID?

Those who want a strong central government to control just about every phase of our lives have put out so much propaganda in favor of Federal aid to local schools that many people have come to believe that such assistance is both desirable and necessary. Only rarely is the question raised: Do the schools really need Federal aid?

But the question ought to be asked more often. Supporters of Federal intervention in public school education are downgrading the achievements of American teachers, school boards and communities in building the finest educational system the world has ever known. This is not to suggest that our school system should not be constantly improved.

The truth is that there are more classrooms, more teachers, a lower pupil-teacher ratio, and a higher level of education in the United States than ever before in history. In the last 10 years the number of public school pupils increased 48 percent. The number of classrooms jumped upward by 60 percent. Teachers' salaries rose 72 percent, to an average of $5,389 a year. Money spent per pupil increased from $224 a year to $390 a year. And American communities approved the highest volume of school bond issues in history during 1960. Even so, less than one percent of America's local school districts have reached their maximum bond limitations.

All this has been done without Federal intervention, Federal dictation—or the Federal control that surely must follow Federal subsidy. It has been done with the local taxpayers' money, taxpayers who are interested in seeing the schools in their local communities improve and expand. We need to increase teachers' salaries. The need to improve and expand school facilities is also great. The local communities are moving to meet these needs—perhaps they need to move faster. However, those who fall for the Washington politicians' promises will be even more sadly disappointed than those who have left such things up to the local politicians in the past.

My Republican Strength Shall Be the Strength of 10

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote a line from Alfred Lord Tennyson's classic, "Sir Galahad." "My strength is as the strength of 10."

Though I do not believe that the President considers the 5 Republicans on the Rules Committee with such high regard as that mythical character of old, he has indicated that they are possessed of the same strength. The President credited these 5 Republicans with the strength of 10 when he blamed them for the defeat of his Urban Affairs measure in the Rules Committee. As you well know, Mr. Speaker, there are 10 Democratic and 5 Republican members on that committee.

To further demonstrate the absurd nature of the President's contention, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the Omaha World Herald on January 26, 1962:

WHAT CITIES NEED

A year ago, when the dew was still on the blossom of the Kennedy administration, the President's supporters packed the House Rules Committee with Democrats in order to expedite his liberal program, or so they thought.

The Democrats emerged with 10 members of the committee to the Republicans' five. The new appointees supposedly were favorable to the Kennedy program.

But the Rules Committee Wednesday blocked the President's plan to establish an Urban Affairs Department at Cabinet level, and did so by a vote of 9 to 6. Southern Democrats joined with the Republicans to form the majority.

So who was to blame for the administration defeat?

The Republicans, said Mr. Kennedy at his press conference. The five Republicans had whipped his 10 Democrats by the remarkable score of 9 to 6, and the President strongly implied that Republicans should be ashamed of themselves for not carrying out the pledge of the Democratic platform.

The President announced that the fight was not over. He said he would submit the proposal as an executive reorganization plan, which he can do under the laws which grew out of the Hoover Commission's recommendations to streamline the Government.

But this move is another curious twist of Presidential logic.

How can the creation of a new arm of the Government be called streamlining? That would be proliferation of government.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare provides an example of just how this proliferation is carried out. HEW was also created by Presidential fiat less than 9 years ago on the pretext that it would coordinate and slim down the scattered bureaucracy which attended to matters of health, education, and welfare. In 1953 the new department had 37,500 employees. Today it has 61,000. It is reasonable to assume that a Department of Urban Affairs might grow at similar speed.

The only serious argument advanced to support creation of an Urban Affairs Department is that cities are looking increasingly to Washington to solve their problems. But they do so because the Federal Government has preempted the most lucrative tax sources and because it takes five-sixths of the taxes which are collected in this Nation. Cities look to Washington because that is where the money is.

Cities managed to handle their own problems until recent years. They could do so again if Washington would stop siphoning off their substance.

What the cities need is less Federal interference, not more. That thought may well have been in the minds of the nine Congressmen who blocked Mr. Kennedy's plan in the Rules Committee. We hope that at least half the House of Representatives will think the same way, and thus block the formation of an Urban Affairs Department when that proposal comes before them in a reorganization plan.

Responsible Editors Favor Reasonable Adjustment of Newspaper Postage Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, during the postal rate debate many magazine and newspaper publishers expressed opposition to any increase in newspaper mailing rates despite the fact that this class of mail now pays less than one-fourth of the cost of handling. I have noted with a good deal of satisfaction that many newspaper publishers around the country did not join this chorus and in fact several of them suggested editorially that an increase was justified. Indeed, our colleague from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK], a publisher himself, suggested in the January 23 debate that certain newspaper rates should be increased. In this connection I insert for the information of my colleagues the following editorial from the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, January 25, 1962:

THE RISE IN POSTAGE RATES

There is no reason on earth why the United States should not have the best postal service on earth, and equally no reason why the American people will not pay its cost gladly. There is no reason why this should not be so, save politics.

As Congress gets around to the point where it appears it will pass a postal bill hiking the rates to bring in $700 million more to help meet the current deficit, it should be reassured to go ahead and do it. The American people are not opposed to paying for a 1-cent increase in first-class postage, and a 1-cent increase in airmail postage rates.

The opposition to the increase comes mainly from magazines, newspapers, and those direct mail advertisers who send out their floods of junk. The Arizona Daily Star is quite willing to pay its share of this increase, because it realizes that if the Nation is to have the best mail service in the world, it has to employ intelligent, hard-working men and women. They are worthy of their hire.

What the Nation wants is not only good mail service, but the best. The people, the voters, are willing to pay for it. Surely the time has come when Members of Congress should stiffen their backbones against the pressure of a few organized interests. Congressmen will not lose any votes when they set a standard of making the post office pay its own way.

The One-Way Street

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the new tariff proposal is now official. It means giving the State Department full power over all import restrictions.

In essence it will eliminate all American tariffs and pave the road for our entry into the Common Market.

The Common Market is the first step to a new nation to be called Euramerica. The drums are already beating for the new country. We will hear more about this just as soon as the new tariff-cutting plan gets underway.

It is logical, because this new tariff plan is a face saver for the disastrous 4-year extension on the trade agreements voted under Eisenhower. The Democrats are being asked to bail out the last administration's trade policies.

The next step will be to use the failure of this present plan to sell the Common Market approach.

It is the old story, when your promise does not hold up, make new ones.

This statement I can make from the testimony in my possession. It takes $3 worth of exports to equal $1 worth of imports in wages in the pockets of American workers and in dollars in the domestic marketplace.

I believe any across-the-board tariff cutting powers, any further reduction in congressional authority in the field of tariffs and customs, any long-term extension of even the present Trade Agreements Act will weaken our economy and in the end, will prove the most disastrous action by Congress in our generation.

I say this without restraint or apology, even in the face of contrary positions by almost every academician, professor, advertising agency, international lawyer, theoretician, political leader, big business, big labor and big press. Why do I say this and feel so strongly about it? Simply because of our history in trade matters, our present plight after 27 years of tariff cutting from an overall of about 50 percent on dutiable goods to 11 percent, from my own congressional district's experience, from my experience of over 25 years of active legislative work, starting with my chairmanship 26 years ago of a committee from the Pennsylvania General Assembly which studied the flight of industry from Pennsylvania. This committee learned as any other committee has and will learn if it does a thorough job of study and research that simply put, trade is a commercial venture, goods for trade will be produced in the area of lowest cost production and will be sold in the area of highest prices and greatest consumption.

This is an economic fact and no amount of academic language can hide this when the question before us is the problem of job opportunity, investment, and profit. Most other considerations of the trade problem stem from persons and groups, some sincere, some theoretical, who are convinced that trade is peace, trade is diplomacy, trade is profit and trade is something the ordinary citizen does not comprehend. It is a great political issue for keeping the people from considering too seriously their problems stemming from chronic unemployment, reduced workweeks and the feast-and-famine economy of the last decade.

At this very moment, with the great upsurge in our economy in steel, autos, and other production lines, you can sell anything to the American public, the press, and the Congress. However, very few persons in this country will predict a continuing prosperity. When anybody is bold enough—outside of the soothsayers of the Economic Council, State Department, and other Government agencies—to predict a growing economy with any assurance, the following restrictions and ifs are included in the prediction:

First. If there is no steel strike or major work stoppage on the part of the unions.

Second. If we hold the wage and price line.

Third. If industry will modernize, increase production without increasing costs. At this point, you will note the exact opposite position taken by President Roosevelt during the depression. We curtailed production to give consumption and purchasing power a chance to meet production. Today we are forgetting consumption of our production and demanding more production under the misguided theory that we can undersell our foreign competitors in their own markets as well as our own.

Fourth. If we can maintain Government spending at somewhere near the 30 percent of our national product. Without this, our trade balance would be more realistic.

Fifth. If we increase our exports and decrease our imports. This is the dream of all dreams.

Sixth. If we have confidence and let loose of our consumer dollars. This is what our parents were told in the late 1920's and then were humiliated because they had not saved for the rainy day.

These are but a few of the "ifs" that are always put into predictions for tomorrow's successful economic comeback. Frankly, if all the above conditions are met, the best we can achieve is the status quo. There is no room for growth. Unless the wage and profit economy expand with our production of goods, consumption will fall away, and the roots of recession will start sprouting all over again.

I have not touched on the most vital of all the issues that accompany the free trade program being promoted by the State planners for Congress to act upon. This is the area of foreign investment. In a newsletter a few years ago, I predicted the very situation that is now admitted by the same group who fought me when I opposed the Boggs bill (H.R. 5) and who are now opposing me again in my fight against the new trade bill for across-the-board tariff cuts.

I said then that the only reason any American corporation or individual would build overseas would be for profit. I said then that the more investment abroad, the more profit and the harder it would be for Americans to protect our own domestic market, our jobs, our industries, and our way of life. Can any person honestly say I was wrong then or that I am wrong now when I say that foreign investment will be the straw that will break the camel's back in foreign good will and our domestic economy. Most of today's leaders admit to the danger to our economy by foreign investments; few, if any, admit to the danger to our international prestige.

I said, and repeat, that the exploitation of foreign workers would sow the seeds of distrust, revolution, and hatred of the American people. Need anyone review the events to date, the universal appeal of "Go home Yank," of the mobs. They have not yet articulated the battle cry of the militant American labor leaders who fought valiantly and courageously against slave wages, long hours, slums, epidemics, and exploitation of the American worker by the greedy exploiters. Until they do their wage levels will be a threat to American jobs.

Let us take a look at some figures that tell a story that will haunt this administration and the American people unless the President of these United States does what he is capable of, and I believe courageous enough to do. Stop the sowing of seeds of hatred and the exploitation of the very peoples we are spending ourselves poor to help, by a small segment of the American investors.

Here are the figures that should scare every American who knows the depth of the feelings of people who work for exploiters and whose produce is taken without fair compensation. American investments as against incomes from the three investing areas. Latest figures, 1960.

WESTERN EUROPE

Investments, $1,322 million. Income returned to United States, $427 million. Income flowing back to United States, only $1 out of $3 because Western Europe was considered safe investment climate and the rest of profits poured back into expansion, new facilities, and expense accounts.

UNDERDEVELOPED AREAS

Investment, $608 million. Income taken out, $1,474 million. Investors taking no chances. They know the history of Cuba, Mexico, and so forth, on expropriation; so they take all they can out of these countries.

LATIN AMERICA

Investment, $500 million. Income taken out, $770 million. This does not include earnings held back for expansion. Foreign securities with extremely high dividend rates and of moneys loaned at exorbitant rates of interest; in some cases as high as 2 percent per month.

The 6-year totals show that this is about the normal profit of foreign investors.

WESTERN EUROPE

Investments, $5,141 million. Income returned to United States, $2,261 million.

UNDERDEVELOPED AREAS

Investment, $5,552 million. Income taken out, $8,794 million.

LATIN AMERICA

Investment, $3,057 million. Income taken out, $4,379 million.

How long would any American labor union, Congress, or any administration sit still allowing any American production facility an earnings ratio anywhere near the above examples of our friendly aid to friendly nations. Are we helping the underdeveloped areas or are we exploiting them.

The reason we have the demand for a lowering of trade barriers is because our American investors abroad have to sell in the market to make such enormous profits, either directly or indirectly. Not only are we exploiting the foreign worker with our payment of wages from 10 to 30 percent of the going average American wage, but we are exploiting the American economy by underselling the 96 percent of the nonexporting American firms whose higher wages maintain the American consumer economy.

While the State Department talks about good will and containment of communism, let us see what one business executive is quoted as saying in summing up the foreign investment policy.

It's the opportunity to make big profits that gets us over there, it's a market decision for the great majority of us, not a tax decision (hearing records of Congress on Impact of Imports).

Bluntly put, this means exactly what I have been preaching, exploitation of low wage production, a free American market, exorbitant profits and the devil take the hindmost. In this case, it can very well be the American unions, American small industry and yes, even the Democratic Party.

When a man loses his job he does not often look up a dead mule's throat to see what killed it. Frankly, there is little difference in our approach to the trade and aid programs of the Republican administrations. We may have new slogans and some new faces, but we are doing the same things and for the same peoples.

The public may take the same view as the polly parrot, after spending many years as a pet in a public dancehall, was loaned to a society matron as atmosphere for a private society dance. Looking the crowd over, the wise old bird commented rather wryly, "new girls, same guys."

How long can we face up to the Castros if we go into a nation for the sole purpose of taking out big profits. How can these nations' little people ever become self-sufficient if we put in $1 and take out $2. How can we answer Castros when they point to the low wages paid by American enterprise abroad which in many cases, are negotiated before the investments are made.

I had a visitor not too long ago, a highly placed labor leader in a European country who bluntly told me:

Your American plants in our country are no help to our aims for a higher share of the profits of industry. They make deals, backed by the government and our own manufacturers' groups, guaranteeing not to raise wages above the domestic industries' scales. They give the local industries the leverage to keep us in line. They not only agree on wage terms, but they join the cartel's controlling prices and markets.

Personally, I'm here on a tour of your industries as a guest of the State Department. I came to your office because I've read of your trade fight. One thing you can be sure of, the average workers in my country can't buy our own products, let alone your high cost imports.

You will never undersell us in our market, even if we remove all tariffs. In the first place, do you think your own American enterprises that own so many of our facilities are going to close down to let your domestic plants ship into our market?

At this point, I asked him if our money was needed for development of their economy. His reply rather startled me. He said:

No. Absolutely no. There are enough rich people in our ocuntry to create any production facility we need. They hide their money, one way or another, and use your money. Why, even today, our investments in other countries may equal the investments Americans are putting in our country. You see, Mr. Congressman, it's easier to take exorbitant profits from a foreign country and to exploit a foreign worker than it is in your own country. In my opinion, the wage level of the American will be lowered long before the European wage level is raised.

Much more was said, but one thing I learned that worries me no end. Are we Americans going to be the goats in this international profits race? We are told by the promoters of free trade that unless we join up with the Common Market we are doomed. Nothing could be more idiotic and economically unsound than to tie our high economy up with the European low economy in a free market.

Even our planners admit this because, at this moment, they are setting aside Common Market entry until a future date. I predict that the across-the-board program will not succeed and its very failure will be used as the excuse for demands for entry into the Common Market. When we do join and unless the American people look at the trees instead of the forest, we will join, how then do we treat Latin America, Far East, Near East, Africa, Asia, and Canada.

When we hear of the great potential of the European Common Market because of its lure for expanding sales and profits we fail to consider one very important fact. Wiping out all tariffs between the European market and the United States will not increase our opportunities one-tenth of what we increase the foreign producers' chances in our own market.

We are told that Common Market potential is great because of 300 million consumers, an unsaturated market for cars, radios and major appliances. What assurance do we have that American enterprise will manufacture these items in the comparatively high wage economy of the United States for shipment to the European market rather than in the European market itself and lacking a protective policy in America, what will stop these same products from coming back to the United States. The Common Market is and will be a protective market. We know or should have known that much when we created it.

Facts show that in most cases of an exporting-importing firm in the United States that has foreign production facilities, their exports to foreign markets are going down while their imports are going up. Back as far as 1954, over 30 percent of all imports into the United States were produced with American backing. Today, no one will give an estimate because if the truth were known, the new trade pact would die-aborning. If all we need for prosperity are large markets based upon population, maybe somebody ought to count the people in Red China and Russia.

Because of our open invitation to come one, come all, into our marketplace, every nation seems intent upon working out its own salvation at the expense of our own economy. We have tried being all things to all peoples, and it is paying off in distrust, embargoes, restrictions, double dealing, false promises and above all an utter disregard of our sometimes unsound, but always "noble" intentions.

Look, for instance, at these items gathered from 1 day's mail, and news media:

Developing countries turn to U.S. research for aid in attracting foreign investments.

Agriculture is offering new incentives for foreign investors—50 percent tax cut for new investments.

U.S. banks helping new business get under way in developing countries.

In essence, these are the "noble" ventures and our high aims exemplified by our policies which all countries are happy about.

However, let us see how they treat us after we have fulfilled our promisory notes of good will and development help.

Brazil's Chamber of Deputies has delivered a staggering blow to foreign investors. A recent bill cuts drastically the amount of profit to be taken out of Brazil (100 percent), and (20 percent) withdrawal of capital investments in any one year.

U.S. business community shocked, predicting end of foreign companies in Brazil. Penalties range from confiscation of property to prison terms. On top of this, foreign businessmen are barred from raising money locally.

Mexico just recently barred more American cars from the Mexican market and tariff protection for domestic industries reaches as high as 100 percent ad valorem on American imports.

Canada wants more drilling equipment to be manufactured in Canada. Protection is promised to local manufacturers against foreign imports. Wants U.S. companies to license plants within Canada rather than American production being shipped.

Wonder where the freetraders will increase their exports under these arrangements?

U.S. firms losing orders worth millions. They are out-financed by European competitors.

U.S. business executive says:

We helped Europe recover, now they have financial reserves. They are giving deals we can't hope to meet.

In fairness, the free traders ought to explain how we build our exports under these conditions without more Government spending and guarantees.

Indies Investment Center in New York has 27 industrial proposals to offer U.S. investors.

U.S. Steel, G.E., Westinghouse, Koppers, and others competing for Pakistan's steel development.

How do we export more steel to Pakistan after we build a new steel facility, or do we buy steel from Pakistan to give dollars to pay off the American investor?

Businessmen are told they must sell more abroad. In fact, we have got the "old E" back again, this time it stands for exports. This is necessary because when the American people learn that only 4 percent of American employers are exporters, while 96 percent of the U.S. firms operate within our economy they may not be able to sell the big lie that an export trade makes millions of jobs while imports only replace a few hundred thousand workers.

It seems we are shifting our emphasis from the five pillars of support for our economy: Domestic investment, employment, production, consumption, and profits, to an economy based upon foreign trade, loans at interest and nonreturned foreign profits. When told to export more, one question needs to be answered. How? By subsidies, of course, we export more cotton, wheat, tobacco, and so forth, because we subsidize against the world market price.

With European wage rates about 30 percent of ours, lower taxes, deprecia-

tion allowances giving leeway for the most modern production facilities obtainable, with trade walls going higher against imports and suckering the United States into lowering trade walls on their exports, the American exporter is going to have a tougher and tougher job ahead. Average wage of eight European countries, fringes and all, 85 cents an hour, American rate on the same basis is $2.96 an hour.

No one who has studied the 27-year record of our free trade agreements has illusions about what kind of tariff cuts the common market will agree to. They will cut tariffs on what they sell and increase or hold the line on products they buy. That, Mr. Speaker, is the real reason for the demand by the agents of foreign countries and exporters and others, for across-the-board tariff cut powers. If they win, then the people will be told that Common Market and United States agree to a 20 percent—or any other figure—flat cut across the board without spelling out the items—or worse, use a basket category.

I have seen some of the proposed cuts and one will mean cutting tariffs on automobiles, but raising customs on machine tools and certain types of finished steel and aluminum. The across the board program ignores every concept of economic law, whether it is domestic or international. This is pointed out in a speech made by Secretary Goldberg to the AFL-CIO convention in December:

> There cannot be a single wage policy in the United States. That is perfectly clear. All employers do not begin from the same position or enjoy the same abilities to provide wage increases or have the same success in earning profits.

If this is true and I agree with Goldberg, how then can he or anyone else argue for across the board tariff cuts. Do not the same conditions exist? Are not all emyloyers on a different base in their ability to compete with external competitors for markets, the same as they are for wages internally?

It seems either shortsighted, politically inspired, or completely ignorant of the historical economic facts to deny any American industry or its workers a day in court by establishing across-the-board tariff cuts without regard to the "ability to provide wage increases or to earning profits," to quote Mr. Goldberg.

That this fact is recognized even by the proponents of this new so-called broad—sometimes mistaken for bold—approach to tariffs and trade, let us look at recent remarks of the chief spokesman for the new policy, Under Secretary of State George W. Ball.

He said that if we are going to give development capital to underdeveloped nations, it will be necessary for us to help them market their produce. Their work will be mostly in the primary industries like textiles, mining, and light manufacture. Advanced nations like the United States should willingly abandon these industries to the underdeveloped nations, though textiles is our second largest employer. Of course, our Government would have to compensate our abandoned industries, and help transfer them to new activities. Fortunately the machinery for such Federal intervention in industrial new activities and growth has already been voted by Congress in the area redevelopment bill. The Federal Government can now create depressed areas to its heart's content, and buy off the opposition of industry, labor, and local government officials with its development assistance for Americans.

Under Secretary Ball's earlier statement leaves no doubt of the goal—the United States is to give up its economic boundaries and let itself be merged with the world economy, without any ability to protect itself, except through aid provided from Washington.

He asked specifically that the President be given authority, as follows:

1. Strike much broader and more ambitious bargains with other governments. No more product-by-product agreements which are too easily followed by Americans.
2. Direct negotiations with areas, like Latin America.
3. Federal aid for industries and areas hit by the proposed tariff reductions.

Some of us living in the depressed areas of Pennsylvania and West Virginia would like to know why our distressed areas have not been given new industries, retrained workers and the prosperity we are promised if we pass this legislation and get hurt by imports. In our areas, we are hurt.

I know that I make myself the target for charges of isolationism, protectionism, and reactionism. I have been labeled by one newspaper as a profile of protectionism. I do not mind and I will admit to some of the charges. I want every American worker to be given the same type of protection we provide for workers in cotton, wheat, peanuts, and so forth. I believe that a glass worker has a right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. In my book, happiness comes from doing the kind of work you like best and feel best suited to, not as in West Virginia's retraining program where coal miners, glass workers, leather tanners, and so forth were being retrained as gas station operators, typists, and waiters on tables.

It has been said that it is isolationism to fight for a coal miner's right to dig coal rather than to let the oil companies make more money importing fuel oil, giving cheaper fuel to New England. If this is true, then why should the West Virginian and Pennsylvanian buy New England products instead of buying shoes, shirts, and small tools from Japan when they sell cheaper than New England products?

There are many protectionists in America. Most of them would fight a lot more viciously than a glassworker if Congress attempted to wipe out State lines in the practice of law, medicine, accounting, insurance and other protected interests and jobs. These same persons are not only protected by local and State laws, but have a Federal protection against overcrowding of their job opportunities by the Immigration Act. What is the difference in having a high tariff in the form of an immigration embargo on people as against the importation of that person's production?

Does any American believe that we can have free trade without free movement of people? Already the drums are beating for special treatment for special skills and the lowering of work restrictions between nations. In fact, if I believed in free trade, I would demand free immigration at the same time. The one without the other will never achieve the aims of the free traders, one market, one economy, and in essence, one world.

In my hearings I noted that few persons came forth as witnesses for lower tariffs except those whose personal incomes were influenced or traced directly or indirectly to foreign sources. I have looked over some of the lists of foreign agents and representatives.

In this fight, some of us are going to be forced to fight under very difficult circumstances. I, for one, do not look with pleasure upon the prospect of differing with my President or my political party leaders.

I would be tempted to give up the fight except that the unemployed in my district are very real and very worried. If the cures offered for injuries caused by imports to both industry and labor have any value, then let the proponents prove it before we vote.

If subsidies to industry and retraining workers can take care of the areas distressed by imports, why have not these projects been started. Do it now—prove its value, put the unemployed back to work. I can assure you that if this is done and our people and our economy can better be served by the free trade movement in this year of our Lord, 1962, I shall be the first to take the pledge and vote for the whole venture.

We have 6 months, name the new industries to be created, create them, retrain the displaced worker for his new job, and give him or her the job. This is the only honest thing to do. If it can be done later, why not now.

I close with one prayer, whatever we do, we must do for the good of our country first. First, I am an American; second, I am anything they want to call me.

New York State Benefits From Our Exports to Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, many people fail to realize how much the United States, and the State of New York in particular, benefit from our exports to Japan. In the past 5 years the United States has exported more to Japan than to any other country except Canada. Our commodity exports to Japan amounted to $1.3 billion in 1960, and $1.7 billion in 1961. In 1960, 190,000 jobs were created for American workers by these exports to Japan, and this figure rose to 250,000 jobs last year. By 1970, it is estimated, our national exports to Japan will exceed $3 billion. Except in 1959, the balance of our trade with Ja-

pan has been favorable to us since 1950. In 1960 our exports exceeded imports by $200 million; in 1961, by $600 million.

Our own State of New York, in 1960, exported commodities valued at $78 million to Japan, with 6,800 jobs created by this trade. Our exports included: machinery, $25 million; metal scrap, $23 million; chemicals, $9 million; agricultural products, $7 million; photographic goods, $5 million; metal products, $5 million; copper, $3 million; and scientific instruments, $1 million.

If we are to have the benefits of these expanding exports to Japan, we must ever be mindful that trade is a two-way street. If Japan is to continue to take our exports and pay for them, Japan must be able to export on her own behalf. For us to stifle imports from Japan by the erection of tariff walls would be to kill the goose that laid the golden egg. It would deprive Japan of the dollars needed to purchase American goods and would end by forcing Japan into the arms of the Soviet bloc. Japan must export in order to survive economically. If we shut out her products she must seek markets elsewhere—and today this means the markets of Red China and Red Russia.

Morale of Reservists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, despite many official statements concerning the morale of reservists recalled to active duty, my mail continues to contain many protests, and I believe well-founded and bona fide protests, from these men.

I have talked with several of them personally and find that none is being used in the specialty for which he was trained and several were not being used at all except to wash windows, pull weeds, perform KP, and generally relieve other troops of the more onerous duties of Army life. If it is strengthening our military service, or our position vis-a-vis the Soviet Union, to take these men from useful, and promising civilian occupations to make them police the area like so many juvenile recruits, I fail to understand it.

In support of these remarks, I will quote four letters received this week.

The first is from a young private whose name and duty station will not be revealed. He writes:

Enclosed you will find a clipping from a local newspaper telling the public of a so-called surprise visit to Fort ——— by Representative ———.

We are sick and tired of the lies that are printed in the paper.

This was no more a surprise visit than Astronaut Glenn's shot into space. We were told 2 days before to stay out of certain areas with our cars. Men were also sweeping and spit shining for this visit.

As you read on it says he ate lunch with the men who had shown no unpleasantness. For your personal information, this unit went on a hunger strike while he was here.

Also, this surprised post had to go looking for M-1 rifles for the honor guard to use to meet this man.

Mr. Bow, the one thing I do not believe the President and the U.S. Army understand is that they have men in this big mishandled muff. We are businessmen, not high school children, and we have families and friends who are also old enough to vote. The Democrats are going to be very much surprised after they start counting up the votes this time.

I know you do not have anything to do with what is printed in the papers, but this is what is really going on in the service.

The point is, we want out now.

And there are a few more comments equally revealing of the state of mind of this young man who has been called from his family and business to do absolutely nothing.

Here is another:

Many of us are not contesting the callup, but expect good faith in return for our efforts. Instead we get a steady decline in the draft call each month, the reinstatement of the 6-month program, and no positive information concerning our status.

We are not needed and the Army has given no evidence that it can utilize us. Second, the President announced that we would get out early, but no positive information has been issued. Morale is low while people jump at each rumor of a date of release. No such announcement should have been made unless the Army was prepared to give dates. Men have weddings coming up, leases expiring, etc.

We are not inclined to wait as political tools while the President tries to save face after his own Department of Defense admitted it was an error to recall us. I may sound bitter, but I think I represent a large part of the feeling here. We are not pleased with the Army but will do our job as needed. But we are not needed. We see our futures delayed and, in some cases ruined, while we wait. If the Army wants us to sit, we can do that at home just as well as here at Fort ———.

The reaction of a father is equally to the point:

I completed your questionnaire. Thanks for your interest.

But I have a pet gripe—my son was married about 4 years ago, purchased a home, and entered the insurance business. You would know he would have a tough time financially for the first 5 or 6 years.

Knowing he was subject to the draft, the Government gave fellows like him the opportunity of joining the Army Reserve for 6 months training and then subject to 1 night a week training at the Reserve center for about 5 years.

This was time wasted.

He served his 6 months, and then McNamara called up the unit. My son and others' sons went to Fort Knox. Most in the outfit were professionals, married, had children, had to sell their homes, scatter their furniture, give up their jobs at a substantial loss of pay. Remember, they're trying to get going in their business. Imagine the economic loss to each family.

Keep in mind that all of these fellows had loans on their properties, their business. This is for the birds. FRANK, do you know how I feel? "The hell with it." My morale is low.

I think, and I have talked to a lot of people whom I serve, and I find they would like to see one program, and one only, where you would draft all the boys, no deferments, unless physically unfit for service, at age 18, or at the end of the fourth year of high school, train them for 1 or 2 years, and really teach them something worthwhile. After training, send them home to build their futures without interruption.

By so doing, you would eliminate a lot of juvenile delinquency. As you know, most boys out of school cannot get a job any more, because the corporations won't hire them, because of the cost of training and then losing them to the draft. While these boys out of high school are laying around waiting to age they buy a car and get in all kinds of trouble. They cannot plan for the future, so they become irresponsible. Let's give them college subjects and college credits in the Army.

The fourth letter, from a constituent in the Reserves, included a copy of the booklet, "Why Me?" He writes:

Recently the enclosed pamphlet was distributed to all members of my unit. This pamphlet is supposedly the Army's answer to any question an individual may have for being called back into service. After reading it, one cannot help but get the impression that our leaders really do not understand the Reserve program. * * *

I was called in with a medical unit to which I was assigned upon being discharged from active duty. Why I was assigned to this unit I have no idea, for I have an Infantry MOS. There are at least 20 others here in this unit in the same situation.

Would somebody please explain to me why I was called back? The pamphlet doesn't answer the question to the slightest degree.

Mr. Speaker, these are samples of the sentiment in the 16th Congressional District among men who would be willing to serve, or have their sons serve, if they were given any evidence that their services were necessary. I hope this Government will never again interrupt the lives of active, busy young citizens in order to fritter away their time in Army camps. These men are not making a contribution to our military strength, they are not fooled, and you can bet your life that the Kremlin was not fooled either.

Distinguished Service Award to Employers Mutuals of Wausau, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the Employers Mutuals of Wausau, Wis., in my congressional district, has been chosen to receive the Distinguished Service Award of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped. The Employers' Mutuals is one of the largest workmen's compensation insurance carriers in the Nation and has done an outstanding service in promoting the hire the handicapped program.

The following news release on the award and the remarks by Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, U.S. Marine Corps Reserve, retired, Chairman of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, on the presentation of the Distinguished Service Award to Employers Mutuals of Wausau,

reflects the challenging accomplishments of this company in promoting the program for employing the handicapped:

INSURANCE FIRM TO RECEIVE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD

Employers Mutuals of Wausau, Wis., has been chosen to receive the Distinguished Service Award of the President's Committee for its long record of service in promoting employer and public understanding of the employment capabilities of the handicapped.

Last spring the firm produced and sponsored, as a public service, a 14-minute color film "Proud and Tall." The documentary, which has had many showings on television throughout the country, tells how a man blinded as a result of an accident is rehabilitated, and how he gets his old job back with the help of his employer and his employer's insurance company.

The film which was premiered at the President's Committee's annual meeting last April in Washington, D.C., and which has also been viewed at meetings of many organizations, is available for loan through the President's Committee, Washington 25, D.C. It is a 16-millimeter film.

In addition, Employers Mutuals has sponsored two advertisements titled "The Wausau Story" on employment of the handicapped which focused attention on handicapped individuals on the job earning a weekly salary. One ad was produced in 1958 and the other this year. Both ran in several national magazines with combined circulation over 6 million in late September and early Otcober.

As one of the largest workmen's compensation insurance carriers in the Nation, Employers Mutuals of Wausau has helped the hire-the-handicapped program by explaining to its clients that workmen's compensation insurance is based only on the relative hazard of the work in which a firm engages and its accident rate, not on the condition of a firm's employees. Furthermore, through its leadership in the field of rehabilitation, the firm has helped to demonstrate that properly trained and qualified handicapped workers are safe workers as well as excellent workers.

The company's working philosophy can be best explained by this statement contained in a speech made by its president J. M. Sweitzer.

"The real argument against class discrimination in employment policy, whether its victims be handicapped workers or any other 'labeled' group, is not social or moral or legal. It is purely economic. Any systematic selection that overlooked or rejects or fails fully to explore every prospective source of competent help deprives the employer of potentially valuable assets. His refusal to hire workers in any given area or class hurts the businessman just as directly as would his refusal to sell his merchandise to customers of that area or class. It is a surrender of major advantage to his competitors, and no businessman can afford it."

Several officials of the company have been active as members of the President's Committee as well as members of the Wisconsin Governor's commmittee.

PRESENTATION OF DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD TO EMPLOYERS MUTUALS OF WAUSAU, WIS., BY MAJ. GEN. MELVIN J. MAAS, U.S. MARINE CORPS RESERVES, RETIRED, CHAIRMAN THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED, AT MEETING OF WISCONSIN GOVERNOR'S COMMITTEE, MADISON CLUB, MADISON, WIS., JANUARY 30, 1962

It is a real pleasure to be back in Wisconsin. My colleagues sometimes refer to Wisconsin as being next to the best State in the Union, a slight deference to my Minnesota background. Just a week ago in testifying before the House Subcommittee on Appropriations, it was my happy privilege to mention this pending award to the distinguished ranking minority member, Congressman MEL LAIRD from your own State. Both Congressman LAIRD and I put some very complimentary remarks in the congressional hearings about Employers Mutuals of Wausau. Even at this distance from Washington, this should be of more than passing interest to the Wisconsin Governor's Committee which, through the years, has been one of the finest of those cooperating with the President's Committee.

Two generations ago an Englishman came to the United States, took a quick look around, sniffed, and proclaimed that in America "private vices become public virtues."

Bernard de Mandeville was not, by any stretch of the imagination, being complimentary. He saw us as a nation under the thumb of "big business", motivated by greed, avarice and the dollar sign; but even worse, a nation taking those evil characteristics and terming them "virtues."

Well, every man has the right to his opinion, misguided as it may be. But de Mandeville's slander has done America great harm * * * in fact, more so today than when he uttered his glib untruth.

"Private vices become public virtues"—these are the words they're whispering about us today, on the other side of the world. With these words, the Communists today are attempting to woo the newly emerging uncommitted nations of the globe—nations that some day may mean the difference in the balance of power between democracy and totalitarianism.

"Stay away from them," the Communists whisper about us. "They're so tricky they even call their vices virtues."

Shades of 1984.

How do you combat such canards? How do you show the world that the United States of America is not an avaricious nation, dominated by the dollar, sugarcoating its vices by sweet-smelling names? These are important questions. For it is important, vitally important, what the rest of the world thinks of us. War or peace can depend on what they think of us.

How, then, do we spread the truth about America?

One way is to proclaim far and wide the stories of such eminent examples of democratic free enterprise as Employers Mutuals of Wausau; to show the world, by your example, that American business is a mature and responsible and worthwhile force in our Nation—and in the free world, for that matter.

The achievements of Employers Mutuals of Wausau, Wis., tell all the nations that yes, democratic free enterprise is in truth a blessing; that yes, it can be a philosophy of hope and promise and a better life for many lands.

For your achievements you have earned the Distinguished Service Award—the highest honor of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped. Let me underline that word "service." Yours has been an entire way of life, motivated not by personal gain, not by a drive for higher and higher profits—but by service.

I, of course, do not have to tell you what Employers Mutual of Wausau has done to merit this award. But let me for a moment speak over your heads to all America and, hopefully, to all the world.

Your national advertisements have carried high the banner of equality of employment opportunity for the handicapped. Let some of the critics of advertising study your ads; then hear them change their tune.

Your excellent new film, "Proud and Tall," in strong and dramatic terms spreads the truth about the capabilities of the handicapped. I heartily recommend this film not only to employers everywhere, but to the handicapped everywhere who may need an occasional injection of hope.

The rehabilitation center which you operated demonstrated, with more force than scores of speeches, your high sense of responsibility. Your concern was not merely with the collection of premiums and the paying of claims. Your concern was with people; with handicapped people who needed a helping hand toward independence. Further, your center gave an impetus for others to establish in the area; and so it served a valuable double purpose.

And, your own employment policies of giving equal consideration to the handicapped indicate that you believe in what you tell others. "Hire the handicapped," you say, "We do it ourselves."

What I like particularly about Employers Mutuals of Wausau is your down-to-earth modesty and practicality about what you do. You are essentially "doers," not "sayers." You don't frame your actions in high rhetoric. Your president, and my good friend, J. M. Sweitzer, once said that the real argument against class discrimination in employment policy, whether its victims be handicapped workers or any other "labeled" group, is not social or moral or legal. He said it is purely economic—and that no businessman can afford the luxury of discrimination.

Amen, Mr. Sweitzer.

And, no nation can afford to neglect its handicapped citizens, either. Our consideration of the handicapped can give the lie to the behind-the-back whispering of the Communists. What we do for the least among us—for the sick and disabled and crippled—can tip the scales in our direction; can lead to a strengthening of democracy throughout the world; can lead to a brotherhood of nations, under which all men and women will be considered equal, the handicapped and the able-bodied alike; and can lead to a strengthening of peace.

Yes, the stakes are that high. And victory lies not alone with our leaders, but with ourselves. With our actions. Even with the thoughts in our hearts.

America Needs the Faith of Its Fathers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Wanda Wallon has written a most sound and inspiring letter to the editor of the Repository, Canton, Ohio, and I am indebted to Glen Powell of Hartville, Ohio, for calling it to my attention so that I may share it with readers of the RECORD.

The article follows:

LETTER TO THE EDITOR: AMERICA NEEDS THE FAITH OF ITS FATHERS

America is a Christian country. The men and women who braved an unchartered wilderness to carve out this Republic were rich in faith. With a Bible under one arm and a musket under the other, they were willing to fight for their faith and their freedom as well as talk about it.

Today, the leftwingers and liberals, in far too many instances, interpret separation of church and state as separation of state and God. This is the opposite of the original meeting of this great principle and doctrine. Patriotism and Christianity are very close to each other. It is impossible to be a true Christian and not a true patroit.

Our forefathers followed the Biblical admonition of Jesus: "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness and all these other things shall be added unto you." They heeded the warning in Psalms 9: 17: "The wicked shall be turned into Hell and all nations that forget God."

The American dream has had progressive fulfillment because of the Christian faith of this Nation and the personal freedom to plan our own affairs. Everywhere you look in American history you find examples of people accepting responsibility for themselves.

Communism, however, has come along with the insistence that America no longer look toward God, but toward government. Communism, through its associates, liberalism, progressivism, socialism and modernism, is creating class warfare within America, fomenting hatred, stirring up various so-called "social crises," destroying love of country, perverting morals of young and old, casting aside beloved traditions, banning the Bible from American schools, and in general reducing the proud and free American citizenship to an insignificant, helpless, hopeless, pawn of giant government.

The very spirit of the American Constitution reflects the teaching of Christ. In fact, the U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that "this is a religious nation."

The overwhelming majority of American citizens are members of the Christian faith, and these Christian citizens are paying 70 percent of the Nation's taxes. Yet, little by little, degree by degree, America is denying God and turning its face away from the Saviour of the world. If God's people will remember the faith of their fathers, God will heal their land.

Seldom are the sacred, patriotic songs of the land of the free such as "America," "The Star Spangled Banner," "America The Beautiful," "God Bless America," and "Faith of Our Fathers," sung in public meetings, colleges, theaters, or even churches any more because those songs glorify God, bless God, thank God, and praise God "from whom all blessings flow."

America can be saved by doing the opposite to the will of the Communists. Instead of turning away from God, turn toward God. As a matter of fact, the antidote to almost every Communist intrigue is to do the opposite, for all of communism is based upon a lie.

Are we ashamed of our Nation? Are we ashamed of our flag? Are we ashamed of our God? Are we ashamed of the faith of our fathers?

America's greatest need in this dark and deadly hour is continuous, prevailing prayer asking God to help us turn from our immoral ways and protect our beloved land. The truth is, America is in mortal, deadly danger and unless America turns back to Jesus Christ and to the defense of our freedoms the hour now upon us will soon close the book of freedom on this great and stately land.

I'd rather count on God than on President Kennedy to protect my beloved America.

MRS. WANDA WALLON.

Department of Urban Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, once again the President has demonstrated an appalling lack of understanding of the private enterprise system or what makes people tick.

The establishment of a new Cabinet post for urban affairs is not under any circumstances going to improve urban affairs. Our private economy operating at the local level can do this job far better than any bureaucrat or combination of bureaucrats directed out of Washington, fueled by money which must come from the same localities, since the Federal Government is broke.

Nor does the President's endeavor to enforce his will on the Congress by this reorganization plan come with particularly good grace after the Rules Committee rejected the establishment of such a new Government department. Nor do I believe the creation of a new Cabinet post, no matter how talented the new Cabinet head, will solve anything that cannot be done better at the local level.

This message, as in the case of so many from the White House, shows a complete lack of confidence in the initiative and ability of our people to do for themselves, and on the contrary shows complete confidence in the Federal Government being able to run the lives of the people. I reject this concept of the role of Federal Government in our lives. I happen to believe that people must be left free to improve their own home, their own neighborhood, their own schools, their own city as they see fit with their money, rather than having all this forced on them by the Federal Government using their money.

U.S. Foreign Policy Toward Tito: Ruinous for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the predominant position that foreign affairs holds these days is certainly accentuated by the legitimate criticism being levied against U.S. foreign policy, especially in regard to diplomatic aid and trade relations with Communist nations.

It is my thought that our State Department experts might well turn for advice and counsel to individual American citizens or groups possessing special knowledge of certain areas of the world.

It is with this thought in mind that I place into the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the October 15, 1961, issue of Liberty, the organ of the Serbian National Defense Council of America.

In view of the sale of jet planes to Yugoslavia, the training of Yugoslavian pilots and other recent steps accentuating aid to Tito dictatorship, this knowledgeable commentary by people vitally concerned with Communist persecution of the peoples of Yugoslavia is especially pertinent.

The editorial follows:

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY TOWARD TITO: RUINOUS FOR AMERICA

There are hundreds of thousands of American citizens of Yugoslav origin and descent living in the United States, and raising their families for nearly a hundred years. They have been educated in American institutions, and taught by the free press and free schools that the American system of government, although not perfect, is the best that mankind has been able to establish so far.

We have been told that we should cherish American ideals of freedom and democracy and leave them as a heritage to our children and grandchildren. By doing so, we would keep America's unity at home and assure her survival in the international jungle of foreign ideologists, conspiracies and intrigues.

Our administration in Washington has changed many times but these fundamental principles have remained unchanged and deeply imbedded in the life of all our generations. But times have changed and so have the concepts of these ideals by those who direct our American destiny. The time has come, when our own State Department, in order to safeguard America from communism, is at the same time and in a roundabout way teaching indirectly its own citizens to appease and finally adopt the Communist way of life.

This sounds absurd but nevertheless it is a fact.

His Grace Bishop Dionisije, head of the Serbian Eastern Orthodox Church for the United States and Canada in his recent pastoral letter states:

"Communist propaganda from Tito's consular centers in the United States and Canada is very great. Their agents and representatives are entering our Serbian communities, visiting our social and cultural workers and trying to impose on them their Communist ideology. They are portraying the Yugoslav Communist regime as being very beneficial to the people and thus try to weaken our struggle against communism in general. They already have their sympathizers in some of our national organizations and church parishes, thus creating discord and friction."

This means that the Yugoslav Communists are now underminding with their ideology our churches, parochial schools, patriotic and humanitarian societies and our homes, thus cutting the roots of our very life in these United States. The agents and emmissaries of the Yugoslav Communist regime are everywhere: In Racine, Wis.; Seattle, Wash.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; San Francisco, Calif., and numerous other places.

These agents are telling our people here that they should not give their hard earned money to the priests who poison their minds, that they should not collect aid for our conational escaping from Communist tyranny in Yugoslavia, and that our stand against communism is useless and unpatriotic in view of the fact that our own State Department is helping Tito to remain in power, etc.

We are now at a crossroad: Are we going to extend the policy of our State Department by helping Tito's agents here in America establish communism, the same way our State Department is helping Tito to perpetuate Communist tyranny upon the people of Yugoslavia, or are we going to disagree with our President and his staff of experts on foreign policy and defend our free institutions from the Communist menace?

It is our belief that the foreign policy of the United States should not favor foreign governments and tolerate communism to such an extent as to injure the interests of its own citizens and their organizations. And this is precisely what we are doing.

The Yugoslav Communist regime has the privilege of sending its agents to our vari-

ous communities to tell the people that our free system is inferior to theirs, which has now attracted so many great and small nations in a common cause of coexistence with communism. If this privilege is granted to Tito's agents in the United States shouldn't we have similar privileges in Yugoslavia? Shouldn't we send our agents and agitators to tell the enslaved people of Yugoslavia what real freedom is and encourage them to organize a new political party to oppose the present Communist rule?

Of course not, because our policymakers cling to an absurd idea that you can buy every man's soul with money, forgetting to look into American history books and see that revolutionary zealots could not be bought with money. Can we convert Tito by appeasing him?

The policymakers further believe that the industrialization of Yukoslavia will bring about general prosperity and switch the regime and the people to our side. Can we get a lesson from Cuba? During the last 60 years we have industrialized Cuba and brought prosperity to the people there, but in spite all we have done for Cuba, Communists have grabbed the country. Are we now going to apply the same formula in Cuba and try to buy the Castro regime with another billion or two as we tried to buy Tito?

It is about time to reappraise our policy toward the Yugoslav Communist regime and use every means at our disposal to come in direct contact with the people, help them to endure their misery and demand of Tito that free and unfettered elections be held in Yugoslavia under the auspices of the United Nations as provided by the Yalta agreement.

Food for Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, confusion along the Potomac is growing by leaps and bounds under the lack of imaginative leadership of the New Frontier. Certainly the new brainstorms in the field of argiculture deserve special consideration. In view of the complex problems which our surplus production cause not only in domestic markets but across the world as well, I feel that an editorial in the Saturday, January 27, issue of the Chicago Tribune contains penetrating observations on this phase. I insert into the RECORD the editorial "Food for Foreign Aid":

FOOD FOR FOREIGN AID

George McGovern, Director of the food for peace program, has notified President Kennedy that the State Department and the Agency for International Development are planning to substitute surplus food for dollars wherever possible in foreign aid programs. In fact, said Mr. McGovern, they would like to use more food in foreign assistance than the Department of Agriculture believes it can justify on a "concessional basis."

The term refers to sales of surpluses for inconvertible foreign currencies, which bring no cash return to the Treasury, and to using commodities instead of money to pay workers in various foreign development projects.

Agriculture Department officials apparently fear that the increased cost of giving away more food abroad will arouse public clamor to cut the already huge costs of the farm program. They maintain that if surplus food is to become an instrument of foreign policy, the cost of buying and storing it should be transferred to the State Department budget from that of the Agriculture Department.

This country's farm exports now are at a record level. In the 1961 fiscal year ended last June 30 the value of agricultural exports totaled $4.9 billion. That was 9 percent above the value of exports in the preceding year and 4 percent above the previous record set in 1957 when exports were stimulated by the Suez crisis. In the current fiscal year exports are expected to exceed $5 billion.

Of the $4.9 billion worth of commodities moved last year, $1.5 billion worth were sold for foreign currencies, bartered, or donated, and about $3.4 billion were commercial sales for dollars. In order that major products, such as wheat, cotton, and feed grains, could compete in world markets, the Commodity Credit Corporation paid export bonuses, in cash or in kind, or sold stocks at less than domestic market prices. An estimated $2.3 billion worth of exports moved in this subsidized way, including $1.3 billion of the dollar sales.

The export assistance, principally in the form of export payments, totaled nearly $650 million, an amount not included in the value of the exports.

Exports of farm commodities for foreign currencies, barter, and donations are authorized under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 [Public Law 480]. Up to last year about $13 billion worth of surpluses were exported under the act. Last year Public Law 480 was extended for 3 years with an appropriation of $4.5 billion.

Desipte these shipments, the stockpile of Government-owned farm surpluses has continued to grow because of domestic programs of high fixed prices and subsidies which have stimulated overproduction. Now, instead of a method of surplus disposal, the export program is coming to be regarded as a part of foreign aid.

There may be benefits in using the surplus food now available instead of dollars. However, it is clearly not in the best interests of American agriculture to continue domestic programs that encourage overproduction for the sake of foreign assistance. If the administration wishes to play international politics with food, it should buy it in the open market and avoid programs that merely perpetuate this country's costly farm surplus problem.

Speech Given to Auburn University Seniors by Gen. Emmett Cassady, Commander, MOAMA, Brookley Air Force Base, Ala.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of representing the First Congressional District of Alabama, and a portion of my congressional district includes Mobile, Ala., the second largest city in the State of Alabama. In Mobile is located Brookley Air Force Base, where the Air Materiel Area is located. MOAMA is commanded by my good friend, Brig. Gen. Emmett Cassady. General Cassady is a Texan by birth, but an Alabamian by adoption.

Recently, General Cassady traveled to the northern section of Alabama to Auburn University, the home of the famous War Eagles. The purpose of this visit was to speak to the senior engineering class at Auburn University. Mr. Speaker, this was an excellent speech. I think so much of it, that I would like very much to make it a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I would like for all of the people of my district to know just what part Brookley plays in the entire defense of the United States.

General Cassady points out that F-105 fighter aircraft take off at 1 o'clock in the morning from Mobile, Ala., and fly nonstop to Europe to join tactical fighter squadrons there. Also, he tells of the maintenance of the Jupiter missile which is now located in Mobile. We are very honored and proud of the part Mobile is playing in the defense of our country. Also, Mr. Speaker, we are all very proud of General Cassady.

I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, include in my remarks the speech given by General Cassady to the seniors of Auburn University on January 18, 1962:

ADDRESS BY GENERAL CASSADY

On Monday of this week, President Kennedy voiced his concern over the fact that this country was not producing enough scientists, engineers, and technical people. With that announcement, the President officially recognized a situation that has been troubling some of us in the military for many years.

Today, it's practically impossible to pick up a newspaper or look at television without being reminded that we are engaged in a race for space; a race for scientific achievement and technical excellence. We hear of the so-called missile gap and read with awe that some writers say we're behind but are closing the gap steadily.

I'm not here to comment on whether we're behind or not, but I will echo and strongly underline the President's concern over the relatively small number of scientists and engineers that are graduating each year from our Nation's colleges and universities and this at a time when the world we live in is becoming more technically complex and the future promises that this trend will continue—gaining momentum every year.

I've read somewhere that the Soviet Union is graduating 2½ times as many engineers as we are. They start their training in high school. Listen to this typical course for a high school engineering student in Russia: 4 years of algebra, 3 years of physics, 2 years of chemistry and calculus. In addition, their high school students graduate with a substantial working knowledge of geometry and trigonometry. Remember, that's high school. Beyond that is 4 years of highly specialized college training.

Always before we've been able to bank on the difference in quality. Our engineers and scientists were simply better than theirs. But how long can we count on this—someday we may find ourselves running second best—and both you and I know that we can't settle for second place.

I've said this before, but I want to emphasize it here: The United States is not a second-class country! We have a first-class

Government. As a people we have first-class aims and objectives.

To support these first-class aims and objectives, we must have first-class public servants—people of quality, skilled in their jobs, with dedication and know-how.

Frankly, it takes this kind of person to make the grade in Civil Service today. Our work has become more complex, our weapons more intricate and technical, our tools more modern.

For some years now, there seems to have been sort of a stigma attached to people who have chosen careers in the Government. In my years in the personnel field, I've heard of cases where a person was advised, when he couldn't quite make it in the world of business and industry: "Well, you can always work for the Government."

Let me put this straight, direct and emphatically. In my opinion, the civil servant of the Air Force of today is among the most honored and respected citizens in any community. His job is challenging and rewarding. Few careers can match the satisfaction a person gets from knowing their work is directly benefiting the defense of the country.

Just understand this: You will help mold the future. As a senior you probably are giving some pretty serious thought to what you're going to do in life. If you're not, you should be! Since the next 15 years are probably the most critical for you, let's look at some of the things our scholars and scientists are predicting by 1975.

We'll have a busy country, and there'll be more startling advances in technology, medicine and merchandising. From the laboratories will come breakthroughs in every field. There'll be more electronics in production, management and government. We'll see houses with more push buttons, higher TV antennas and larger mortgages. There'll be more cars and not enough freeways and superhighways. There may even be some electronic highways, allowing you to sit back and enjoy the scenery while your car is operated automatically.

In the military, there is also going to be some startling advances. Fifteen years ago no one dared to predict some of the weapon systems we have today—the vast arsenal of supersonic aircraft and missiles. But as today gives way to tomorrow—we now believe we have knowledge enough to envision some of the changes that will occur. We believe that man will conquer space. We only hope and trust that we can do it ahead of some of our potential enemies and ideological opponents in order that we can assure that we can keep space free, just as our country is free.

In the Air Force today, the development of missiles and supersonic aircraft had caused us to put our weapons support job in its proper perspective. We call it air logistics. Intensive planning, modern management and lessons we've learned from history have brought a new look to the Air Force. We now use electronics, fast communication, faster transportation and a host of other modern tools to achieve greater reliability in our weapons.

But our key to success is still keen, skilled minds and dedicated individuals. They are the keynote; the one absolute necessity in the defense of our country. Second class people just won't do—they can't meet the challenge of the space age. The preparation of our defense system in the air and in space is our responsibility; and it possibly could be yours if you really want it to be. I can testify there's no career more satisfying, more challenging, than public service. For we hold in trust the security of the Nation and we work for the people of the United States.

Let me list just a few of the things that my headquarters is currently working on just to give you some idea of the nature of the Air Force mission.

From Mobile we are conducting operation high-flight, the deployment of new F-105 supersonic, all-weather fighter-bombers to Germany. We're getting them ready to go and to date, over 100 of these new weapons are in Germany with more on the way. Later this year, this new fighter will be sent to the Far East.

From our Army friends in Huntsville, we've inherited a great Alabama weapon, the Jupiter missile. This potent weapon is being deployed to countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Quite often we discover design changes that must be made and our engineers and production people work them out and put them into effect at the missile sites in Europe.

There are others. Since we are responsible for all USAF watercraft, we design and see to the manufacture of nose cone recovery boats and apparatus.

We are responsible for numerous types of USAF aircraft all around the world. These planes must be kept up to date and functioning properly which takes a topnotch engineering and technical team.

Can you conceive, by any stretch of imagination, that we can do these things with second-rate people? Absolutely not. We have some of the best minds and skills in every field—and in our recruiting efforts we must emphasize our constant and steadily growing need for quality people.

That's why we've come to Auburn.

When we go out to talk to young men and women, we realize that we are in competition with private business and industry. I think that's good. For unless we can get you to want to work for the Government, to realize that it is an honor and privilege to serve your fellow citizens, we don't deserve the best people.

And perhaps even more important, if you are not fully convinced chances are that you would not be very successful as a public servant today. The standards are too high for us to accept people who think they might like to work for the Government since nothing else seems to be available. I've known people like that and they didn't get very far.

Just let me emphasize that horizons are unlimited in Government service. If I thought for 1 minute that I was selling you a second-rate outfit I can guarantee you that I wouldn't be wasting my time talking to you right now. But I'm not and if I can give you one inkling of understanding what public service means to those of us who are engaged in it, whether or not any of you ever achieve a Government career, my time would be well spent.

I've heard some people say they preferred a career with industry because of the thrill of competition and the desire to make a profit for their company which would be rewarding to them, both monetarily and in recognition.

Well, that was certainly their prerogative and their decision. But I can tell you this. There's no greater competition than that our country faces today with communism and the Soviet Union. We are competing in virtually every field of human endeavor. The biggest arena is in the military and that's where you'll find the stakes are the highest, for the reward could be survival of freedom loving people and our democratic way of life.

And one other thing. There is a profit motive in Government. People usually think of Government activities as being nonprofit in nature. In one sense of the word that's true. But this does not mean that Government business can be conducted any less effectively than private industry. In fact, the great impact of Government business on our destinies as citizens requires that our work be conducted even more effectively than if profit were the motive. In today's international competition, we cannot afford to be second best because we have not given an honest day's work. That's a rule that applies to every civil servant—that's our profit motive.

There are Government careers in virtually every known field. But possibly the greatest need in the Air Force right now is in the engineering and technical field. For example, we received a letter the other day from Dayton, Ohio, Air Force Depot and the San Antonio, Tex., Air Materiel Area. They have openings and jobs currently available for 60 engineers and physicists. The engineering vacancies run the gamut into just about every engineering field. You don't have to be an aeronautical engineer to work for the Air Force.

When these people are hired they will be working directly with the first line weapons of our country. The needs range from work in calibration to inertial guidance in some of the missile systems. They include work in design changes for missile aircraft and their electronic components. These people could be working on fire control systems, propulsion systems, and radar. A host of problems are encountered every day and the defense of this Nation depends on our ability to solve them. I've heard it said that you engineers are not happy unless you're confronted with problems and by an extremely powerful and energetic competitive force. The international competition of today will provide you with plenty of challenge—if you become a public servant.

If you are people who are concerned about the welfare of your country, if you think you would enjoy working to achieve victory in the race for aerospace supremacy, then there might be a place for you in Government.

But under no circumstances are we interested in members of the society of "Give me mine and to hell with everybody else." There's no room for this kind of person in the fraternity of public service.

Now I ask that you think about Government in your consideration of career. It could be that you will find happiness and achievement to make a tremendous success of your life. No person can ask for more. Thank you.

Texas Legislators Oppose More Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago Dr. J. W. Edgar, commissioner of education in Texas, stated that the State of Texas does not need any additional Federal assistance for its public schools. Last week the Texas House of Representatives approved a resolution to the same effect.

This should furnish conclusive evidence of the lack of need for additional Federal aid for public schools in that State. In order that the membership of the House may have the benefit of the expression of the Texas legislators, I include the resolution as a part of my remarks:

Whereas the 87th Congress has convened its 2d session and among the numerous measures scheduled for consideration will

be certain proposals to provide Federal aid for school construction, pay raises for teachers, school health programs, and other programs relating to the States' school systems; and

Whereas the 57th Legislature of Texas, during its 2d called session, provided substantial pay raises for Texas teachers and school administrators, and the legislature, in subsequent sessions, will continue to make provisions to assure for Texas a high standing in the area of public education; and

Whereas grants and loans of the Federal Government for Texas schools can only be provided through the use of funds derived from taxes paid by Texas citizens, even though they are collected and administered by the Federal Government, and the depreciated tax dollars returned to Texas become Federal control instead of Federal aid; and

Whereas Texans are generally wary of growing Federal encroachment and look with trepidation on the many moves by the Congress toward control of our public education system, which could be but a step away from control of the minds of our Texas youth, the leaders of tomorrow: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Texas, 57th Legislature, 3d called session, That the Texas delegation in the U. S. Congress exert its full strength and influence in opposition to any measures which may be introduced during this 2d session of the 87th Congress providing Federal aid to public and private schools of the States; and be it further

Resolved, That this body is bound by the belief that the schools should receive support from State and local levels only, in order that full control of curriculum and administration be maintained within the State; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be prepared and sent to each Member of Congress from Texas.

Oklahoma Loses Civic and Industrial Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, funeral services were held today in Bartlesville, Okla., for one of our State's outstanding civic and industrial leaders, H. C. Price, a former resident of the Nation's Capital.

The founder and chairman of the board of the H. C. Price Co., Mr. Price died suddenly at his home Sunday morning. He was 73 years old, and without a doubt one of the true greats in the petroleum industry and in the civil life of Oklahoma.

A past president of the Pipeline Contractor Association, Mr. Price made his greatest contribution to America's economic development by pioneering the manufacture of electric-welded pipe—recognized today as the lifeline of oil transportation and marketing.

In his adopted hometown of Bartlesville, however, he was equally well known as a true friend of young people—a founder of Little League baseball, a solid booster of Boys Club and 4-H Club programs, and a constructive worker for civic progress.

For many, his boldness and imagination were best exemplified by the striking building which houses his company's main offices, the Price Tower in Bartlesville. Designed by the late Frank Lloyd Wright and completed in 1956, the Price Tower is a handsome, modernistic structure of steel and glass which is an Oklahoma landmark today.

A fine tribute to H. C. Price appeared in the Tulsa Daily World for Monday, January 29, 1962. With the deepest sympathy for his family, that tribute is made a part of this RECORD today:

FABULOUS CAREER OF STATE OILMAN CLOSED BY DEATH

BARTLESVILLE, January 28.—H. C. (Hal) Price, whose visionary ideas and rugged determination made him one of the largest pipeline contractors in the world, died suddenly Sunday morning at his home here. He was 73.

Price, chairman of the board of the H. C. Price Co., was stricken without warning. His attending physician listed a heart attack as the apparent cause of death.

The career of the Bartlesville industrialist, whose revolutionary method of electric welding of oil storage tanks and transmission pipelines for oil and gas made his name familiar in petroleum circles around the world, embodied the drama and conflict contained in fictional accounts of success.

He started with almost nothing, went into debt when one of his first ideas failed to work—and in the end headed a multimillion-dollar firm which plays an active role at virtually every point on the globe where oil has attained status.

BORN IN WASHINGTON

Price was born December 28, 1888, in Washington, where he received his early education. He later attended the Colorado School of Mines at Golden for two reasons: He wanted to live in a mountainous climate in order to build up his frail health and he wanted to learn about the minerals which lie under the earth's surface. He received his mining engineer's degree there in 1913.

His first job after graduation was as a chemist and engineer for the Pennsylvania Mines Co., at Montezuma, Colo. He later went to work for the American Metal Co., at Salida, Colo., as a chemist.

In 1915, Price moved to Bartlesville as a chemist for the zinc oxide plant of the Bartlesville Zinc Co. In 1915, the oil industry was in its infancy—and Price envisioned the use of electricity in welding metal storage tanks for oil and joining sections of pipe used to transport oil from origin of production to refineries.

SERVED IN WORLD WAR I

He worked at his job as chemist and in his spare time he experimented with his electric-welding idea. He was compelled to put aside his dream when the United States entered World War I. He went into the Army and served as a first lieutenant of coast artillery.

At the end of the war, he returned to Bartlesville and his job with the zinc firm. However, the company went out of business in 1921 and Price found himself without a job. It was then that he made the decision that would change his life and fortunes—and also effect a sweeping change in an essential category of the petroleum industry.

Price borrowed $2,500 and started his own electric welding business in a small building on Bartlesville's Second Street. He installed equipment and went to work to prove that his electric-welding idea would work. His big chance came soon on a pipeline welding job.

STUCK TO EXPERIMENTS

Results of the welding job, however, were disappointing. The welding device failed to produce sufficient electrical current because of an error in assembling the equipment. Furthermore, the welded pipe joint developed leaks from pin holes.

The initial failure, instead of cooling Price's faith in his idea, made him all the more eager to prove that his idea was sound. He went back to work to pay off the borrowed $2,500—and in his spare time he looked for the reasons that kept his electric-welding device from performing properly.

He kept experimenting with welding rods and materials and, with the aid of the J. F. Lincoln Co., he developed a shield arc—a coated electrode—which protected the welding rod from the atmospheric gases producing oxides and nitrides which prevented tightly-welded joints.

HEADED HUGE PROJECT

Today, the H. C. Price Co. is synonymous with success throughout the oil-producing world where welded pipe is the lifeline of oil transportation and marketing.

During the early stages of World War II, the H. C. Price Co. was one of three prime contractors in a huge organization—Bechtel-Price-Callahan—employed by the U.S. Government to build the Canol project, the staggering immensity of which later was shrouded by a fog of political squabbles.

The project called for construction of a 1,700-mile pipeline from Norman Wells, Canada, across the Continental Divide to White Horse. The purpose: to carry vitally needed fuel for U.S. air and ground forces in the Aleutians.

The project included not only the pipeline, alone a tremendous undertaking, but roads, airfields, communications facilities and other components necessary for successful prosecution of the war effort. A total of 25,000 persons worked on the huge job.

The immensity and significance of the project faded at the end of World War II, with political factions at a national level disagreeing on merits and achievements of the arduous undertaking.

In 1952, at a time when many men of 63 begin thinking of a curtailment of business activities, and retirement, Price conceived one of his most ambitious dreams—an 18-story building of steel, glass and masonry to be known as Price Tower. The structure was designed by the late famed architect Frank Lloyd Wright. More than three and one-half years went into the planning and construction of the modernistic building. It was completed in 1956.

HONORED FOR YOUTH WORK

Price, throughout his lifetime, was a tireless worker in the interest of the Nation's youth. Recognition of his efforts in this respect was accorded him with the presentation of the Boys Club's Silver Keystone award and an honorary life membership in the 4-H Club organization. He was the founder of Little League baseball in Bartlesville and a Little League playing field bears his name.

He also was holder of a distinguished service award from the Colorado School of Mines, and was an honorary member of Tau Beta Pi fraternity at the University of Kansas. He was a past-president of the Pipeline Contractor Association, past-president of the Bartlesville Chamber of Commerce, a member of the board of directors of Jane Phillips Memorial Hospital and an honorary member of Rotary International. He was a 32d degree Mason.

He is survived by the widow, Louise, of the home; two sons, H. C. Price, Jr., and Joe Dudley Price, and six grandchildren.

Funeral services to be attended by personal friends will be held at 2 p.m. Tuesday in the Colonial Chapel of Keeley-Neekamp Funeral Home. Interment will be in Memorial Park Cemetery.

The Fourth "R": Red Challenge to American Education, a WSBT-TV Public Affairs Program, South Bend, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the passage by the House of Representatives on January 30, 1962, of H.R. 8900, the bill to provide loans and grants to colleges and universities for the construction of academic facilities is a long step ahead for higher education in the United States. Because this legislation is now being acted upon by Congress, I believe that Members will find relevant the observations of three distinguished American educators with whom it was recently my privilege to appear on a public affairs television program produced by station WSBT-TV in South Bend, Ind.

The panelists were: Dr. Frederick L. Hovde, president of Purdue University; Prof. Paul C. Rosenbloom, of the University of Minnesota, who has been an outstanding contributor to the effort to revise and improve the teaching of mathematics in our schools; and Dr. George Shuster, a noted historian and former president of Hunter College, who is now a special assistant to the president of the University of Notre Dame, the Reverend Theodore Hesburgh.

The moderator of the program was Mr. Harry Kevorkian, of the news bureau of WSBT-TV.

This program entitled, "The Fourth 'R': Red Challenge to American Education," was produced in South Bend following a panel discussion which was arranged there by the Advisory Group on Higher Education of the House Education and Labor Committee.

The transcript of the program follows:

THE FOURTH "R": RED CHALLENGE TO AMERICAN EDUCATION

Mr. KEVORKIAN. The launching of the first Russian sputnik a few years ago, say some educators, was the best thing that could have happened to American education, and now a congressional study group, made up mostly of Congressmen, just returned from a Russian tour, is considering recommendations for legislation which would strengthen American higher education especially in science and technology. The advisory group was formed by the chairman of the House of Education and Labor Committee, ADAM CLAYTON POWELL. "Concentration by Communists on scientific education," he said, "makes it essential that Congress take action in this field." With us to discuss the potentialities of such a study are Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS, Third District of Indiana, who is chairman of the advisory group; the president of Purdue University, Frederick L. Hovde, a scientist in his own right; professor of mathematics from the University of Minnesota, Paul C. Rosenbloom; and George Shuster, special assistant to Notre Dame president, Rev. Theodore Hesburgh. Dr. Shuster is former president of Hunter College of New York, a historian and considered a leading Catholic educator. To start off, we will ask Congressman BRADEMAS to give us some background of the study group and what they hope to accomplish.

MEETINGS WITH EDUCATORS

Representative BRADEMAS. Harry, the purpose of our bipartisan advisory group on higher education which is composed of five members of the House Education and Labor Committee, is to look into what needs to be done at the next session of Congress, which begins in January, as you know, toward strengthening the universities and colleges of the United States. Our job is to come up with specific legislative proposals; and in order to do this job, members of our group are consulting with outstanding educators from the Midwest and will also be meeting in Washington, D.C., with educators from other parts of the Nation.

Mr. KEVORKIAN. What bearing will your Russian tour have on your considerations?

Representative BRADEMAS. All I can say is, as one person who had a chance recently to see the Russian school system, that I am convinced that the Soviet commitment to education is the fact that they are working very hard at education and they put a great deal of their emphasis on science and technology. This means that we in the United States have to do far more than we have been doing to strengthen our resources for higher education, not only to meet the Soviet challenge, but also because we have to meet the needs of our own economy and our own society.

Mr. KEVORKIAN. I wonder—is it generally agreed among the educators that to strengthen the higher education of America is vital to our national security, Mr. Hovde?

Dr. HOVDE. Well, I think, of course, it has been proved through two world wars, and the subject of history after World War II was over, that the scientific strength of the nation is one of the principal elements with respect to its total security; but science also has a role to play in winning the peace, it seems to me, because the needs of the whole world and people everywhere can be best answered by the application of science and technology to the benefit of people everywhere, provided the people of the world are wise enough to do it. Science has its role to play in solving some of the great problems that not only divide men but also have plagued men for centuries. So the payoff is going to be great if we know how to do it.

Mr. KEVORKIAN. Dr. Shuster, speaking as a Catholic educator, how do you view this?

PREPARING FOR PEACE

Dr. SHUSTER. Well, I think that it is perfectly obvious that in the normal process of human evolution higher education has come to assume an importance which it never has before. The college laboratory, library, classroom is the little red schoolhouse of 75 years ago. This is true the world over. We can neither be prepared for peace, as Dr. Hovde said, or for war or for whatever may lie between, unless we have met this problem squarely face to face. I myself am much more impressed with developments in Western Europe than I am with those in the Soviet Union. I think that this represents for us the major industrial and intellectual challenge; and, as for my part, I would like to see us be prepared to meet it amicably.

Mr. KEVORKIAN. Then it is a challenge economically or culturally and not necessarily with a power that may want to take us over, when you refer to West Germany as opposed to the Soviet Union.

Dr. SHUSTER. I think the whole of the emerging new Western Europe. Everything as represented by the Common Market, etc., offers just as much of a challenge to Russia as it does to us, if we say that the first thing we have to do is to prepare for war, I would agree; but we shall all hope that the war doesn't come and, therefore, in the meantime, we ought to focus on preparing for the future, which is as much, I trust, a matter of living into a magnificient new future as it is a momentary halt in the scheme of amity.

Mr. KEVORKIAN. Professor Rosenbloom, would you like to add to this?

THE ECONOMIC MACHINE

Professor ROSENBLOOM. Well, certainly one has to be prepared militarily. Still in Khrushchev's addressing the 21st Party Congress, he explained that they would bury us in terms of swamping us economically by 1975 and one of the main elements in this is that he thinks that they can make their decisions from the top while setting up a much more efficient economic machine much faster than we can by 1965 and he is talking about an economic system in which they will have 10 scientists and engineers to every production worker.

Mr. KEVORKIAN. That brings up a question in my mind—we have heard so much about the missile gap. Do we or will we have an education gap unless we move ahead quickly?

Professor ROSENBLOOM. Well, of course, this commitment that Congressman BRADEMAS mentioned goes far back—as far back as Lenin's Diaries of 1922, about the necessity for improving the status of the teacher at every level and see to it that, no matter how well the rest of the population fares, the teacher should be well paid, well housed, and have the material comforts of life.

Dr. SHUSTER. Was this all predicated on the assumption that the teacher was to teach communism only?

Professor ROSENBLOOM. No, he was looking at the relation between literacy and productivity.

Mr. KEVORKIAN. To get to our study at hand now, in relation to the legislation which might come out of Congress next year—is there a general agreement among the educators as to what is needed—the number of facilities, the number of teachers, and how much should be spent, Mr. Hovde?

AGREEMENT ON NEEDS

Dr. HOVDE. I can say that there is only one area in which you would find almost universal agreement, in the realm of higher education, and that is that a higher educational plan consisting of public and private institutions of all types and kinds must have the facilities to take care of the students that are coming into the institutions during the remaining years of this decade. By 1964 and 1965, this oncoming flood of students from our high schools will reach proportions and will pose problems of admission the like of which we have never seen in our higher educational system before and facilities are required and needed, and they must be started now—we can't delay any longer because it takes 2 to 3 years to plan and build a building and put it on stream, so to speak, and so the highest priority and the highest urgency now, on which there is almost universal agreement, public, State, private, philanthropy, and so on, to build the necessary plan to take the necessary care of the youngsters that come along, and the thesis behind it is a very simple one—we want the opportunity for advanced education of all types and kinds for our youngsters of today, just as we had it when we were young.

Mr. KEVORKIAN. Congressman BRADEMAS, since there appears to be this agreement, at least on the need for facilities, would this make it politically feasible to get at least that much through?

Representative BRADEMAS. My own judgment is that it will. Indeed, one of the hopeful things that we are talking about—this advisory group on higher education, as I see it, is that there is considerable bipartisan agreement on the part of Members of Congress of both sides of the aisle for Federal support for strengthening the facilities of universities and colleges. For example, on

our five member group, there are three Democrats and two Republicans, and I know I am accurate in saying that all five of us, regardless of our parties, support Federal funds in the form of either grants or loans or some combination thereof to the colleges and universities of the country to build academic facilities. At the present time, I think it is interesting to note that colleges and universities can borrow funds from the Federal Government to build housing facilities, dormitories, and dining halls; however, the other need, as President Hovde pointed out, is terrific in the field of libraries, classrooms, and laboratories.

BIPARTISAN

Mr. KEVORKIAN. I know you are in the early part of your considerations—is there any working figure you have as far as the size of the package in terms of money?

Representative BRADEMAS. Well, let me say this, we have not resolved on what the sum ought to be, but we have some guidelines because, last year, in our committee—the Education and Labor Committee—we favorably reported out with bipartisan support, a bill introduced by Congresswoman GREEN of Oregon, that would have provided over a period of 5 years, if my memory is correct, a sum of $300 million, part of that money to be in the form of loans to colleges and universities for academic facilities and the rest of the money to be in the form of grants to be matched by the colleges and universities. So that gives you some idea of the size of a package that is so seriously considered that it has already been favorably reported by a congressional committee.

Dr. HOVDE. But that sum of $300 million is a drop in the bucket, John. I think Mr. Kevorkian wants to know the magnitude of the facilities needed to equip our institutions to take care of a doubling of our total college population by 1970. This has been studied. I think a careful report was made and an examination of this problem was made several years ago and I think the bill is in the billions of dollars, all the money required of all sources.

Mr. KEVORKIAN. The Council for Financial Aid to Education puts out these figures: that the full enrollment of college students in 1960 was 3.6 million, and, in 10 years—1970—it would be 6.4 million. They propose or say that what we need is $500 million a year for each of those 10 years.

Representative BRADEMAS. I might say that a few days ago a commission for the study of higher education in the South—in the southern part of the United States alone—came out with a report that said that southern colleges and universities would have to spend $2.9 billion a year over the next 10 years, or at least by 1970, if they were going to meet their needs—in the South alone—now, I would be glad to support the funds that we require to do the job, but, of course, we in Congress have to dwell in the world of reality and there many pressures on our Government for funds defense and all the rest, so we have to be careful about how much money we spend. We would be glad to get as much support as possible. I'll say that.

THREE QUESTIONS

Mr. KEVORKIAN. I think that we have come up to three important questions with the money that might go out—it is the usual one of, will there be strings—and will there be Federal control with the outlay of Federal money—will we again have the issue over loans or grants to private or parochial schools as we did in the last session and the usual bugaboo of civil rights and segregation of the South. Considering those three problems, how could you overcome them and what are chances for higher education in the next session?

Representative BRADEMAS. Let me make a point on one of the issues—the religious issue—and then maybe Dr. Rosenbloom wants to say something about the issue of control or someone else. There is a lengthy tradition of Federal support for universities and colleges in the United States, regardless of the denominational religious ties. Now there are historical reasons for this, but the fact of the matter is that Notre Dame and Goshen College—one a Roman Catholic, one a Menonite College—here in this congressional district have both received federal support either in the form of scholarships or direct research grants and so on, and there has been no serious questioning of this, and I, for one, would expect to support continuation of this very American tradition.

Mr. KEVORKIAN. Professor Rosenbloom.

Professor ROSENBLOOM. There are a number of mechanisms already existing in the Federal Government, for such Federal aid without Federal control in ways which benefit the general population, no matter what kind of institution the money is granted to. For example, here at Notre Dame and at Purdue, we have summer programs for in-service education of high school teachers with the Federal grants—essentially, the Federal Government does not tell you what you should do—whether you should have such a program or if so, what you should teach in such a program. You have to make a proposal to the National Science Foundation, saying what you want to do. You compete openly on the basis of merit with institutions from all over the country, and, since you do have among the best programs of that kind, you get the money in preference to some others.

Mr. KEVORKIAN. Dr. Shuster, will you add anything to that, speaking as a Catholic educator?

NO DISPUTE

Dr. SHUSTER. Well, I am not going to speak as a Catholic educator, but I would rather speak against a background of a long period in municipal education. Insofar as Federal grants to higher education are concerned, nobody has ever raised a question as to whether they are to go to religious schools, to public schools, to private schools, and I don't think anybody would like you to do so and the reason for that is a simple one—we have, in the United States, over a period of years, developed frank and full and cordial relationships between all segments and sectors of higher education and I think if anybody began to discriminate against one part of our show, the rest of us would rise in protest against the discrimination. This is a magnificent achievement for which America does not always give higher education sufficient credit.

Representative BRADEMAS. Dr. Hovde, I would be interested in your reaction on this Federal control problem. Your institution is one that has received some of that Federal money.

Dr. HOVDE. Well, of course historically, Purdue University grew out of the Federal act; namely, the Morrill Act, which we celebrate its 100th birthday, so one can say that, while Purdue University is a State public institution, it had its birth in the Federal act and, of course, we have received moneys for specific programs, particularly in the field of agricultural research and agricultural extension work. Direct appropriations from the Federal Government for many many years and one can say that the Federal support of these programs has been an unqualified success because, in the technology and science of agriculture, we do lead the world and will continue to do so. In all these years, there has never been, to my knowledge, any kind of Federal control which controls the nature of the teaching, the program, the projects that we worked on, and so forth, and the results have been worth every dollar that has been spent in terms of our being able now to feed our people with only 13 percent of our people on farms. In fact, we have an economy of plenty. This is our problem, rather than the other. In this whole field of Federal aid to education, I can say that there has been no kind of Federal control that is deleterious in any way. Now, one must always admit that, where the money comes from, you have a responsibility to that source and the recipients of Federal money will have a responsibility to our people and our Government in carrying out the general objectives for which the money is named. This is a requirement based on the private institution as well as the public one.

Mr. KEVORKIAN. Would you agree with that, Dr. Shuster?

POLITICAL LIMITATIONS

Dr. SHUSTER. Yes. I think I would like to, if I may, add something to what Dr. Hovde said. Just in order to make the situation clear—there are certain things that grow out of Federal assistance to education, which we must accept. For example, insofar as the National Science Foundation is concerned, it cannot make a grant for study in the fields of religion, race, or sex. These are political limitations which are placed on the Federal Government for action in the first place. Once these limitations are announced, in my judgment, there has never been a single instance in which the Federal Government tried to deviate from these things.

Representative BRADEMAS. I might add that it is likely that in legislation that we devise, you can't use any Federal funds to build a chapel or something of that sort.

Mr. KEVORKIAN. Well, from this area of agreement, I would like to go on to another field, as our time is running short. What about strengthening or aiding high school curriculum leading toward college classwork, especially in science and technology? Are you looking into that also?

Representative BRADEMAS. Yes, we are. And we gave a lot of time to that problem in our panel discussions. The other day in South Bend I talked to a high school principal and he told me that he had just finished talking with one of his chemistry teachers, who just got back from one of the summer institutes sponsored by Federal funds for improving the quality of teachers in science, and this teacher said, "I should not have been permitted to teach chemistry for the last 15 years." He was that far out of date. I think we hope to help improve curriculum course content. We hope to undertake some kind of program that will give teachers a chance to improve their knowledge of what is going on right now in the sciences. I think you've got one of the top experts in the United States in Dr. Rosenbloom here on this subject, so I will defer to him.

NEEDS AND PROGRAMS

Professor ROSENBLOOM. Well, in the science and mathematics in the schools right now, I think existing Federal programs, at most, would have to be changed qualitatively to handle what needs to be done, except with respect to the undergraduate education of science and mathematics teachers. Here is one area in which existing programs do not take care of the needs. You are going to have to experiment with the kinds of support that you can give to programs to produce more and better teachers of science and mathematics than we now produce. The existing programs on training of teachers are mostly remedial programs for the teachers we already have. On curriculum, existing Federal mechanisms right now can take care of most of the needs in science and mathematics except, as I said, possibly for the amount of money. The most urgent thing that we need, however, is corresponding activities to be going on in the social sciences and the humanities. According to a confer-

ence that we held a couple of months ago, the biggest gap seems to be in the social sciences and in the arts.

Representative BRADEMAS. Dr. Shuster smiled at that point.

Mr. KEVORKIAN. The emphasis on your charge from your chairman is to look into science and technology. Are we going to ignore or disregard the humanities? Should we not encourage philosophers?

Representative BRADEMAS. Yes; I agree that we should; and you put your finger on one of the most difficult problems of all of us as legislators. The emphasis is on science and technology. The National Defense Education Act was passed with a basis of science and technology. This is one I think that will continue to bubble along in this country. Dr. Shuster is a great representative of the humanists and I think he may have something on that.

Dr. SHUSTER. Well, may I relate a little anecdote. I went to Egypt, came to a temple which was built by Egyptian engineers more than 4,000 years ago. There is, in process, a modern engineering development which will raise this temple 200 feet. That is, pick up the whole mountain and raise it up. Now, if you have an engineering world in which there is no humanity, you have only the second, and I think this is worthy even of the attention of the Congress.

RELEVANCE TO DEFENSE

Professor ROSENBLOOM. Well, if you want to relate it to national defense, I think I can refer you to Jeremiah and Ezra. One of the things Jeremiah recommended was for national defense. He recommended to circumcise the heart. He recommended to inscribe the law in the soul of each person, and then you have, in Ezra, the practical implementation of this program, by taking literally the words in Dueteronomy, "to teach these words which I command thee this day shall be a part of thy heart and thou shall teach them diligently unto thy children." Each parents responsibility for knowing the law and teaching it to his children.

Mr. KEVORKIAN. You think something will change in your recommendations as far as toward the humanities?

Representative BRADEMAS. I hope very much that, what we do in Congress next year will conduce to the strengthening not only of science and technology in our colleges and universities but to the strengthening of the humanities. The scientists and technologists can perhaps help blow the world apart but it takes the humanists to put it back together again.

Mr. KEVORKIAN. We will be very interested in seeing how all of this turns out. Thank you, Congressman Brademas, President Hovde of Purdue, Professor Rosenbloom of the University of Minnesota, and Dr. Shuster of Notre Dame.

United Nations-United States Congo Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the continuing controversy over the U.N. activities in the Congo, especially since the atrocities against Catholic missionaries could be traced directly to U.N. forces' interference with military and police units of Katanga Province, which leaves large areas without effective government authority, I feel that a resolution passed this month by the Illinois Federation of Republican Women, should be of extreme interest to us. I place this resolution into the RECORD at this point:

UNITED NATIONS-UNITED STATES CONGO POLICY

Whereas the Kennedy policy in the Congo is to use American money, planes, equipment, and U.S.-paid Gurkha mercenaries to force the anti-Communist Katangans into a coalition government with Communists; and

Whereas under this same policy, the Kennedy administration is forcing the anti-Communists in Laos to join in a coalition with Communists; and

Whereas this is the same Truman-Acheson policy that delivered China to the Communists when General Marshal forced Chiang Kai-shek to take Communists into his government;

Resolved, That the executive committee of the Illinois federation call for an investigation of the State Department and a rejection of Kennedy's proposal that the United States buy $100 million of worthless U.N. bonds to finance the bankrupt Congo operation.

The Forgotten People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, this is the fifth of 10 articles, part of a series which appeared in the New York World Telegram & Sun in October 1961, on the subject of the migrant worker in the United States. These articles were written by Dale Wright, World Telegram & Sun staff writer, who, for 6 months, lived and worked as a migrant worker along the Atlantic Seaboard from Florida to New York:

THE FORGOTTEN PEOPLE: MIGRANT LABOR EXPLOITED BY DELAY TRICK

(Last April the World-Telegram assigned Staff Writer Dale Wright to see if the desperate plight of the migrant laborer had been eased by recent protective laws. After working and living as one of them in scores of locations from Florida to Long Island, he found these forgotten people still overworked, underpaid, cheated on every hand, and forced to live in filthy conditions degrading to human dignity. His report continues today.)

(By Dale Wright)

When I found myself stranded in a miserable Florida migrant labor camp with no work for 10 days because the tomato crop was late, my first thoughts were charitable ones.

Naively, I figured a mistake had been made, that I and the scores of other workers with me had been transported 300 miles in the good faith that jobs were waiting for us.

I've never been more wrong in my life.

It wasn't the weather and the fact that the tomatoes had not ripened by the time we arrived. The simple truth was that the tomato grower and the labor contractor who hired us with his fat promises planned it exactly that way.

It's a favorite gimmick, I discovered, to exploit the illiterate, inarticulate migrant worker. Hang him up at a camp or a farm where he can't run and then charge him for his food and lodging.

What does a migrant do? I found that most of them, in hock to somebody all their lives, are forced to go along with the only rule of life they've ever known.

They stay on, run up debts to the farmer-grower or contractor, and then work off their debts with sweat and toil when the crop comes in.

And at the end? They have nothing and so they move on.

I stayed a couple of days, running up bills for food and my bed. There was no work or no pay for anybody.

So I talked to the crew boss, the contractor who had led me to what he called the land of plenty but which I had discovered was a land of nothing. I told him I was leaving, that I was going into town.

THREATENED WITH BEATING

"Walk away from this camp, boy" (a term often used condescendingly in the South and one that always grates on the nerves) he told me, "and the cops in town will catch up with you and beat you half to death. And if they don't get you, I'll come after you myself."

He was a mean-looking fellow, over 6 feet and 200 pounds-plus. But I decided that I would leave anyway and take my chances getting into town—3 miles on foot—and moving along to another stop where there was more work.

Later I heard this bully make the same threat to other restless members of the migrant crew he had gotten to the camp. About 40 of them, including a dozen small children, had straggled into the camp in a motley caravan of broken-down buses and trucks. There was much grumbling and discontent over no work.

When anyone objected too loudly, he was threatened with head whipping. I didn't see anybody get slapped around, but there was not the slightest doubt in my mind that the bossman would do whatever he felt necessary to make his point.

Men and women I had talked with on the long bus trip up from Homestead told me that getting a fist or a club "upside your head" was one of the things you expected working in the fields.

OFF TO TAMPA BY BUS

I had seen and heard enough. And despite the threats of the crew boss, I left camp the next morning, walked 3 miles into Ruskin, and caught a bus for nearby Tampa. I had money, of course, for travel and I was able to get away. The others stranded at the camp stayed on and waited for the crop to come in.

On the bus, I met a 43-year-old farmworker I shall call William Lewis. He was born in a shack in a clump of trees near Okeechobee, Fla., one of 11 children of migrant parents. As soon as he was able to lift a basket of tomatoes or a hamper of beans, he had gone into the field with the rest of the family.

William had never gone beyond the third grade in school, a backwoods classroom. He never learned to read or write. With his brothers and sisters he went through his early years suffering from malnutrition.

As he put it, "We was hungry lots of the time."

The hungry years had left their mark. He wheezed and snorted constantly. His arms and legs were bent and misshapen. He shambled and shuffled along in a permanent stoop.

Long ago, he said, he had lost track of his father and mother, didn't know if they were alive. Occasionally, he stumbled across a brother or a sister in a work camp or a potato field.

ONE INDELIBLE RECOLLECTION

Stamped indelibly in his memory was the recollection of the succession of filthy shacks

and camps where there never was enough food to eat or milk to drink. As long as he could remember, he said, he had been overworked, cheated out of his wages, and overcharged whenever he bought anything.

"Ain't nothin' you can do about it," he said wearily. "You got to take what the bossman give you. Then, when the work is done, you move on. You gotta go somewhere else."

William told me he had worked in just about every State from Florida to Maine. In several States, including New York, he added, he had gone on relief when there was no work.

I asked him if he thought he could escape from the treadmill of migrant labor.

"Never escape," he replied. "I don't know nuthing but picking and grubbing. I'll keep moving on from farm to farm until the day I die."

William's plight, I discovered on my assignment, was that of scores of others I talked with—Negro, Mexican, Puerto Rican, West Indian, and poor white migrants who work the good earth but who get very little good out of it for themselves.

The Spanish-Speaking Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that the Kennedy administration plays politics with ethnic groups.

The following editorial, which appeared in Long Island's Newsday on January 27, rightfully criticizes another bald political power play for the Spanish-speaking vote.

Every American citizen should speak the English language.

ENGLISH SPOKEN HERE

Anybody who wishes to vote in the continental United States, Alaska, and Hawaii should be able to read, understand and speak English. It is the language of this country.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat of Montana, has therefore done a disservice to the concept of American citizenship by pairing some sound legislation to curb literacy tests in the South (where they are used to disenfranchise Negroes) with a proviso that would allow Puerto Ricans to vote in the North although unfamiliar with English.

The Mansfield bill alleges that citizens are being deprived of their right to vote "by virtue of their birth and education in a part of the United States in which the Spanish language is commonly used." This is Puerto Rico, where Spanish is the dominant language. But Puerto Rico is only a tiny fraction of the United States, and it is not yet a State.

There is the added fact that one of the great handicaps facing Puerto Rican immigrants—citizens though they are—is a lack of knowledge of English. This condemns them to menial jobs until they do learn the dominant language of this country. The Mansfield bill would simply slow their integration, would discourage their assimilation—and must be considered a political move, designed to attract votes to the Democrats.

There is nothing chauvinistic in insisting upon English as the language of all Americans. We are not, like Switzerland, a nation of many languages; or, like Canada, a country with a large French-speaking population. How many millions of immigrants over the past century have had to learn English? The number is incalculable, but we all must recognize that had our laws not insisted upon it as a prerequisite to citizens rights, the United States today would be a tower of Babel.

The Mansfield bill should be revised promptly to eliminate this unfair come-on to a voting bloc of citizens who deserve less baldy political treatment.

A Report to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

A REPORT TO MY CONSTITUENTS ON WORK ACCOMPLISHED FOR 1961

Your continued faith and support have caused me to become chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, 1 of the 20 committees in the House of Representatives, U.S. Congress.

My chairmanship (1) represents the results of united voting strength; (2) extends to you, my constituents, your most powerful Federal influence; (3) gives forceful and effective expression of minority problems to the Federal legislative process.

The power and influence of my office has been used, in addition to regular duties, to (1) express your feelings and demands concerning all Federal legislation in the vital areas of Education and Labor; and (2) declare your discontent with all conditions that deny you the rights of full citizenship.

LET'S LOOK AT THE RECORD

Specific accomplishments in the area of equality in employment and education

Investigations and hearings conducted by the Committee on Education and Labor have revealed that equal opportunities in education and employment are vital to the development of America and indispensable to the economic survival of the Negro and Puerto Rican.

Among the key accomplishments of my committee in this area are:

In Government

1. After investigation and hearing by my committee, the U.S. Department of Labor, District of Columbia Apprenticeship Training Council admitted that each application on file for apprenticeship training were coded to reflect the racial identity of the applicant. As a result of this disclosure the Secretary of Labor immediately abolished this system of recording.

2. After our investigation of the National Guard, the Pentagon, Washington, D.C., it was revealed that of the 86 officers assigned to the Bureau, there were no Negroes.

The Committee received assurance from the Assistant Secretary of Defense that "There is no question but that you can be assured that Negro officers will be in the National Guard very shortly pursuant to my direction."

Following this communication and as a direct result of my investigation three Negro officers were assigned to the National Guard Bureau.

3. Upon receipt of a complaint of racial discrimination against Negro employees in the civilian branch of the U.S. Army in Paris, France, the committee dispatched a team to investigate the matter. The investigation revealed that a Negro civilian had received a notice of dismissal and procedures had been instituted to effectuate same.

As a result of the committee's intervention, the employee has been relocated with a promotion.

4. During the course of FEPC hearings by the committee, a representative of the NAACP testified as to discriminatory actions by the State employment office located in Dallas, Tex. Upon receipt of the testimony, and during the course of the hearings, I dispatched a team of investigators to Dallas, Tex., who confirmed the allegation made at the hearing. An order was immediately issued by the State employment agency in Texas terminating the discriminatory practices.

5. On November 29, 1961, I addressed a letter to the President of the United States, stating "after almost 1 year of trying to work out this problem with the Pentagon, I must now appeal to you. Members of the Defense Establishment continue to use not only the question of the individual's race, but also the race of his spouse. Repeated objections by me have met with no success."

On December 13, 1961, I received a reply from Alfred B. Ditt, Deputy Under Secretary (Manpower) stating "the requirement that a married service school applicant state his wife's race, if different from his own, will be dropped."

In industry

1. The Harlem liquor dispute had been the source of deep tension between the liquor industry and the Harlem community for the past 15 years. Unsuccessful efforts were made in the past by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the State Committee Against Discrimination, the Commission on Inter-Group Relations, the New York State Liquor Authority, the Urban League and the courts.

As a direct result of my entrance into the matter the dispute was settled on January 4, 1962. The settlement provided for an additional $15 million in gross sales and over $400,000 in commissions to Negro salesmen.

2. The committee caused the reemployment of 260 workers (Negro and white) by the Interstate Container Corp., New York City, after committee investigation revealed that the discharge had been unreasonable.

3. The committee's investigation revealed unfair treatment and other abuses involving migratory laborers by crew leaders in Riverhead, Long Island, New York City, and Glassboro, N.J.

I forwarded letters to Governor Meyner of New Jersey and Governor Rockefeller of New York. In addition, our findings were filed with the NAACP and SCAD.

The New York State Employment Service advised the committee that this condition would not reoccur and that a close scrutiny of all migratory labor camps under their jurisdiction would be maintained.

4. The investigation of the committee revealed that the Aluminum Corp. of America and its subsidiary, Wear-Ever, Inc., discriminated in its hiring policy as to race by refusing to employ Negro salesmen. It was further revealed that the company would not sell to Negroes on deferred credit or budget terms, irrespective of their credit rating.

Through the efforts of the committee, the company announced that as of January 12, 1962, the company hired its first Negro salesman and discontinued is discriminatory credit policy.

In unions

1. Investigation and intervention by the committee led to the acceptance of two Negro carpenters by Local 2710, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, New York City. Prior to the admission of

the two Negroes, only one other Negro had ever belonged to the local.

2. Investigation and intervention by the committee caused the acceptance of a Negro youth into apprenticeship training by the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Washington, D.C., after the applicant had repeatedly failed to gain admittance on his own initiative.

3. The committee effectuated the admission that the New York State employment office had committed negligence in causing 33 Puerto Rican migrant workers to be paid less than the proper wage in Virginia and further caused the workers to be subjected to substandard living conditions.

4. After investigation and hearing, it was revealed that the Consolidated Edison Co. of New York conducted a pattern of discrimination in hiring and promotion with respect to Negroes.

This revelation caused the company to announce a new policy granting equality in employment and the introduction of a program to train Negro executives within the company.

FEPC bill

The Committee on Education and Labor is now working on a fair employment practices bill, with the widest scope and most effective enforcement provisions ever introduced in the House of Representatives. This bill prohibits discrimination on the part of labor unions, employers, and employment agencies on account of race, color, creed, or age.

Jobs and salaries

The Committee on Education and Labor is comprised of an integrated professional staff, including educators, lawyers, and specialists conversant with the problems of minorities.

The committee staff of 48 employees had a 1961 payroll of $412,000.

On my personal staff the total 1961 payroll was $47,149.77.

I have secured approximately 45 appointments in various agencies in the city of New York with a total payroll of approximately $125,000.

Key Negro appointees in the Kennedy administration from New York City

Through my efforts 11 persons from the city of New York received top level appointments through the Kennedy administration with salaries totaling $115,000.

Throughout the Nation

As of September 1961, over 65 Negroes had been appointed to positions ranging from $10,000 to $20,000 a year. A leading official in the Democratic Party involved in these appointments stated: "ADAM POWELL has played a key part in every one of these appointments."

General legislation

In 1961 my committee reported 23 bills to the House. Of these, 12 became law. This represented a greater volume of bills within an 8-month period than the previous committee reported in the 10 preceeding years.

Your stake in key bills

reported by the committee passed by Congress and signed into law by the President was:

Salary

1. The first minimum wage legislation since 1938, establishing a minimum wage of $1.25 an hour, and extending coverage to thousands of employees. If you were in this group, your salary was raised.

Our children

2. The Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Act authorized $30 million over a 3-year period, to establish a program for the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency.

Education

3. (a) A new teaching hospital for Howard University. This bill which became law on September 22, 1961, transferred Freedman's Hospital to Howard University. This bill also authorized construction and remodeling to provide a modern hospital with a capacity of 500 beds.

(b) The extension of the National Defense Education Act. Among other things this act provided for: (1) loans to talented and needy college students; (2) Federal financial assistance to States in order to acquire equipment and facilities to promote education in science, mathematics and modern foreign language.

(c) Extension of aid to Federal-impacted areas. This extended the current law which provides assistance to school districts which are burdened by new or increased Federal activities, such as defense and military projects.

Investigative task force

I have created an investigative task force directly under my jurisdiction with offices located at Foley Square, New York, and in Washington, D.C. The duty of this task force is to investigate discrimination and irregularities in Government, labor, and industry.

To date this task force has received over 2,000 telephone complaints and over 1,000 personal complaints.

In order to more effectively combat the forces of discrimination I have provided space in the committee's New York office for representatives of the New York State Committee Against Discrimination, the National Labor Relations Board, the Wage and Hour Division of the U.S. Department of Labor, and the Bureau of Labor-Management reports. Thus, in New York City for the first time a complainant has access to four distinct agencies, Federal and State working cooperatively to hear his grievance.

Re United Nations Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, few messages have come from the White House with which I was more in disagreement than the request for the United States to authorize and appropriate up to $100 million for the purchase of United Nations bonds.

Inasmuch as I have introduced a resolution demanding that the United States withdraw from the United Nations, I am in complete disagreement with any further subsidy to the United Nations.

The reasons are manifold and self-evident. Any earlier hope or dreams on our part have long been shattered by a union of nations that seems more bent on destroying freedom and the leader of the free world, the United States, than for any other purpose. This can be proven, to my satisfaction at least, by a simple recitation of the actions taken by the United Nations over recent months, indeed over the years since its inauguration.

Tribute to the Honorable Sam Rayburn

SPEECH

OF

HON. J. IRVING WHALLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues from both sides of the aisle in paying deserved tribute to that great American, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN. He has served as Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives more than twice as long as any other person in the history of our Nation.

His patriotism and integrity has served as a guiding light to Americans everywhere.

Mr. RAYBURN will be greatly missed by all of us.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Address by Senator Jennings Randolph, Democrat, of West Virginia, at the Christian American Heritage Seminar, John Brown University, Siloam Springs, Ark.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on November 25 it was my honor to participate in the Christian American Heritage Seminar at John Brown University in Siloam Springs, Ark. The purpose of the seminar was to explore methods and means by which Christian Americans can contribute to the perpetuation and extension of the values of the American heritage.

It was appropriate that this seminar be conducted at John Brown University, an evangelistic and interdenominational institution which offers Bible-centered Christian instruction with the traditional 4-year liberal arts and sciences curriculum.

John Brown University, which is today administered by the dedicated son of the founder, was founded by John E. Brown in 1919. Since its modest beginning in a frame structure in an Arkansas cornfield, this school has become a full-fledged institution of higher learning, offering baccalaureate degrees in the arts, science, music, and education. The faculty members are capable and devoted. Its graduates serve throughout the world in the ministry, in business and in the professions.

The theme of the seminar in which I participated was "Freedom's Day of Grace," the topic of my address being "Faith and Freedom." I ask unanimous consent that my remarks be printed at this point in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAITH AND FREEDOM

(An address by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, at the Third Annual Christian American Heritage Seminar, John Brown University, Siloam Springs, Ark., November 25, 1961)

Dr. Brown, members of the Christian American Heritage Seminar, faculty and students of John Brown University, and ladies and gentlemen, the founder of John Brown University would, I believe, be truly gratified by this fruition of his early hopes and aspirations.

This joint inquiry being conducted on the theme of "Freedom's Day of Grace" is an authentic manifestation of your university's commitment to the education of the whole person. I hope that my contribution to your seminar will be of some help in exploring the relationship between faith and freedom.

I surmise that the title of the theme of this seminar assumes that freedom is currently enjoying a day of grace—that it has not been granted any eternal or permanent assurance—and that our actions and those of our fellow citizens therefore will determine whether American freedoms and the values of democracy in the world will survive and persevere. In this context, therefore, I ask you to think with me regarding the role of faith in the perpetuation and extension of human freedoms.

I do not speak of faith in the strict or narrow theological sense of the assent of the mind to revealed truth. Rather, I am using the term in the broader sense in which Paul spoke to the Hebrews, that "* * * faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen."

In this context I speak of the Christian faith that the individual person and the meanings and values associated with the free human spirit have an enduring significance which surpasses the mundane conditions of our present existence. To explore the relationship between faith of this kind and the cause of human freedom, we must know first the nature of the contest in which freedom is engaged, second, the ingredients of faith, and third, the applications of faith in the political struggle of our age.

The conflict of our era is not merely between capitalism and communism. The basic antagonism between the Soviet-Chinese bloc and the free world lies in our divergent concepts of the nature of man and the nature of history. It is in essence the conflict between our view that man is free to create history, and the dialectical view that history creates man.

Whether man will be bound to the iron chains of circumstance and the inexorable laws of a malignant fate—or whether we will have the freedom to choose a world of our own and create that world in the image we choose—that is the option offered humanity today.

We in the United States have already cast our ballot in the name of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. But let us be quite clear that Mr. Jefferson and the founders of the Constitution did not construe liberty to mean the absolute and unabridged right to do as one pleases and to pursue purely personal pleasures and profit at the expense of others. Nor did they interpret happiness to mean the hedonistic activities and the seminarcotized state so prevalent among some members of our society today.

Liberty, among the early founders of American democracy, meant the freedom to achieve the fullest possible refinement of the human virtues. Happiness meant—and it is our duty thus to reaffirm—the opportunity for fulfillment of the distinctively civilized capacities of man—love, esthetic enjoyment a decent regard for one's fellow man and respect for the truth.

These are the values at hazard in the contest before us. Their loss under the dominance of the Communist autocracy would mean the fixation of human morality at a level less than human. These are the stakes for which we are playing—stakes which are surely high enough to call from each of us the utmost in intelligence, self-sacrifice and determination that he has to give.

Justice Learned Hand once referred to a comment by the historian, James Harvey Robinson, to the effect that mankind arose from the ape because, like the ape, he was always "monkeying around." But man, unlike the ape, was able to remember the results of his meddling curiosity, to record them, and to pass them on to subsequent generations.

America is the rightful heir to this legacy of mankind. For this, I believe, is the nugget of liberty—the right to be meddlesome—to be dissatisfied with the established forms and customs and to search, according to one's own disposition, for ways of creating a better world.

This is uniquely the American heritage, for all Americans are either noncomformists or the descendants of nonconformists—the meddlesome, maverick and malcontented people who in some way—religious, political or economic—opposed the established forms of their society and believed in the ability of men to improve on these forms. They believed in the ability of men to create a new image of man, and they believed in the power of men to fashion society in the light of that image. This is the permanent revolution of America, and this is the revolution feared by autocracy everywhere.

By referring to this as a permanent revolution, I intentionally imply that it is not and will never be finally won. For the rights and responsibilities of democracy are by their very nature, impermanent possessions. And it is for this reason that faith is necessary—faith in the capacity of man to create justice, to abide by truth, and to live with love.

Now what are the ingredients of the faith that we would summon to the task?

First, faith is an intensely personal quality of experience. It must always be faith "in" something or "about" something. In the context of the struggle between communism and the free world, this means that the individual American must have faith that the Government is serving not only him and is concerned not only with his problems and aspirations, but also with the more embracing values of democracy.

This condition imposes a twofold obligation. It requires officials in government—both elective and appointive—to maintain a constant awareness of the function of the state to serve the citizen rather than master him. And it requires the citizen not to give ear to those extremists who would spread fear and suspicion throughout the land by assailing the motives of those in government who disagree with their opinions.

Secondly, faith involves some action, some doing, some participation in the flow of events, for "* * * faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone" (James 2: 17). Therefore, faith in relation to the cause of human freedom means supporting one's beliefs with more than the use of the ballot every 2 or 4 years. This is necessary, but it is not sufficient. For one person, the works of faith may mean participation in the PTA and contributing special efforts to the development of our schools. For another it may mean engagement in the affairs of the League of Women Voters, analyzing and promoting understanding of public issues. For still others, it may mean added contributions of time and energy to the building of a community park, to slum clearance, or to urban renewal programs. But for all, the test of faith in man's ability to create a better

world and one in which freedom will prevail is to engage actively in creating that world.

Third, faith requires a sense of assurance that methods can be devised to bring the experiencing of the goals of the individual and society. Assurance here does not mean a conviction of absolute certainty, but rather, a commonsense reasonable expectation by the individual that his lifetime will see some change in the desired direction.

In terms of the world role of American democracy we must work to communicate this sense of assurance to the landless peasant and the impoverished and disease ridden slum dweller of the underdeveloped countries. For these are the people, more than any other whose faith must be sustained by the evidence of accomplishment and improvement in the conditions of their own existence.

Fourth, if faith is to be enduring, a goal must serve as a steppingstone to other goals; it must be part of an ongoing process toward richer and more encompassing ideals. "A goal is a signpost," said the philosopher John Dewey, at the age of 90. It is testimony to the lack of faith on the part of those who proclaim that America must hold to what we have and not venture forth toward new horizons and frontiers. Those patriots who cry alarm and declare that we are on the verge of bankruptcy because we spend three-fourths of 1 percent of our national product on foreign aid, are less than summer soldiers, for they reveal their own fear and distrust of the capacity of America.

Fifth, in order to be maintained, faith requires a sense of significance of the self. The individual must know that he counts for something, that his weight is felt in the determination of events. And he must also have some base of reference, some anchorage point within himself.

Here, perhaps, we encounter the area of greatest vulnerability in American civilization, and also the area where the American Christian heritage has the greatest potential contribution to make to American freedom. There seems little question that the growing complexity and gigantism of American life has in many ways begun to overwhelm the individual, leaving him isolated, alone, and divorced from the currents of action that sweep around him. This may well be the source of much of the apathy, frustration, and hostility that is noted by many critics of American culture today.

The Christian heritage can make its best contribution not by solving the individual's problem on the blackboard of an eternity in another world, but by communicating an understanding of eternity as now. Faith will be renewed to the extent that each invidual harbors the knowledge that he is absolutely unique, that he has a contribution to make in this world that no other can make, and in this knowledge each moment partakes of eternity.

Finally, faith is made viable when hope is confirmed. And hope is confirmed through the experiencing of the consequences of action. If action does not sooner or later offer the sense that hopes are being realized then faith is abandoned and the individual reverts to apathy or to the politics of despair in which he embraces one of the authoritarian alternatives. It is for this reason that democracy must continually probe the limits of new attainment. For even in America there are still pockets of want and deprivation; as these are filled we must reach beyond our own shores to the "have-nots"—materially and spiritually—in other lands if we are to render our own values secure. The sternest lesson in life, in the life of the individual and in that of the Nation, is that there is no security in standing still. The only security is in growth; and the only security for freedom is in the growth of freedom.

And there is no easy alternative. Democracy still remains the most difficult and demanding form of government that man has created. In the history of man's affairs the failures of democracy outnumber by far its successes. It is not a form of society decreed for man by a benificent cosmos—but a way of life which men have won at great cost, and will maintain only with continued courage and imagination. And it is a way of life which men who are less than men have always sought to avoid—as the psychiatrist, Erich Fromm, noted some years ago in his book, "Escape From Freedom."

I do not know of anyone who has better phrased the challenge than did Justice Learned Hand in his essay on "The Spirit of Liberty," written some 20 years ago, when he stated:

"We may not stop until we have done our part to fashion a world in which there shall be some share of fellowship; which shall be better than a den of thieves. Let us not disguise the difficulties; and, above all, let us not content ourselves with noble aspirations, counsels of perfection, and self-righteous advice to others. * * * We shall need the wisdom of the serpent; we shall have to be content with short steps; we shall be obliged to give and take; we shall face the strongest passions of mankind—our own not the least; and in the end we shall have fabricated an imperfect instrument. But * * * the history of man has just begun: in the aeons which lie before him lies limitless hope or limitless despair. The choice is his; the present choice is ours: it is worth the trial."

I have attempted to summarize the nature of the struggle between two civilizations. I have indicated the ingredients of the faith which we bring to the cause of freedom. Now, what principles of action are implied by our democratic faith?

I would suggest five general principles that we might observe in combatting the Communist autocracy and in revitalizing the quality of American democracy.

First, we must maintain our regard for the Anglo-American tradition of the rule of law. For when the respect for law begins to crumble the people become the victims of the perversion of power. In this regard, the intemperate attacks on the Supreme Court that we have occasionally witnessed in recent years have not served the cause of freedom, whatever one may think of some of the Court's decisions.

Second—and this is the cornerstone of Western civilization and the main cultural contribution of the Christian heritage—is the traditional respect for the individual. Nowhere in the lexicon of communism is the word individual acknowledged as meaningful—always it is the masses, the proletariat, the bourgeoise, the capitalist, the progressive, or the revisionist—never is it the average sensible man or woman who experiences the fullness of the emotional and spiritual life.

Third, we must maintain the integrity, and the spontaneity of the good life of friendship, compassion, and love. For this is the very antithesis of the class hatred which the Communists seek to inculcate and on which their subversive designs are predicated.

Fourth, we must seek to extend the principles of civil liberties and economic and social justice to all of our citizens, regardless of race, color, creed, or sex. For only thus can we present to the world at large the true America. And let us not forget that approximately two-thirds of the world's population are composed of people of color—most of whom have only recently been freed from the white man's dominance.

Finally, we must seek to extend these ideals to other nations within the international community and to live with knowledge of the aspirations of others beyond our shores. The true and really permanent revolution was that of 1776—a revolution in the spirit of man, and not in the ownership of the means of production. If we but maintain the faith in the Revolution of 1776, we will have the necessary armament to combat the Communist probes, whether psychological, political, economic, or military.

Yet, important as this struggle is, one may not end on the theme of mere opposition to communism. For while man is always finite, the most significant feature about him is that he always seek the infinite. There is a spirit in him that transcends nature, history, reason, and experience. It seeks what William James called "the wider self through which saving experiences come."

Wherever this experience ends, it begins with a sense of kinship with a larger whole. The Christian tradition has given articulation to this sense through the belief in one Father and one brotherhood of man. The final meaning of the American experiment in government, and that to which our faith in democracy is ultimately directed is that our form of government represents man's greatest advancement yet in making that brotherhood a reality in this world.

College Academic Facilities Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8900) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, and to authorize financial assistance for undergraduate study in such institutions.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I feel that there is a major inconsistency in this bill, to wit: On page 7 of the report it states under paragraph 2(c) that the construction will be economical and it will not be elaborate or of extravagant design or materials. This presumes, Mr. Chairman, that neither shall there be an expenditure for elaborate or extravagant labor costs. Yet page 14, section 121 of the report states that "before making a loan or grant the Commissioner will obtain assurances that the laborers and mechanics employed by contractors—and subcontractors—in working on a project will be paid wages at rates as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act."

The history of that act in my State of Missouri—especially in rural areas—has been that it has artificially increased labor costs on public works projects by imposing wage scales in metropolitan areas on smaller communities where such construction is planned or instituted. Undoubtedly, this will increase construction costs and seems directly contrary to the "economy" statement on page 7. It would seem that "wage standards," should be "prevailing wages," in individual areas with local determinations based on normal bargaining between employer and the union represent-

atives without third-party interference, on the part of the Government.

The Missouri prevailing wage law had a drastic effect on local school construction and caused definite increases to the taxpayers for such construction, thereby causing a limited amount of funds to construct "less building." The Federal law generally tends to be even more arbitrary than the State law. In any event, I feel that there should be an effort by all of the Congress to strike out part C establishing labor standards, including section 121 (a) and (b) on page 23 of this bill.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that this section is already the law in similar construction legislation which this body has passed in more or less the same form, as in the Hill-Burton Act, the College Housing Act, Depressed Areas Act, and in somewhat similar form even in the Highway Construction Act. Therefore, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

Alaska's Power Needs—VII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST GRUENING

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, developing Alaska requires the generation of more electric current. With the only Federal hydro project granted Alaska during its long period of territorialism—the Eklutna Dam sponsored by the Bureau of Reclamation, which supplies power to the metropolis of Anchorage, and to the two adjacent REA cooperatives, the Chugach and the Matanuska—Alaska is running short of power. A series analyzing this situation in that central portion of Alaska known as the railbelt, which includes the cities of Seward, Kenai, Soldatna, Anchorage, Palmer, Fairbanks, and numerous other communities, have been appearing in the daily Fairbanks News-Miner. I have inserted the first six articles in the Appendix of the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that the seventh article be likewise so inserted in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARSONS DIVISION HEAD TELLS OF NEED OF MORE POWER

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—M. S. Umbenhauer of the Parsons Co., who made the survey for the Central Alaska Power Pool gives his view of the future of power here and which sources are most feasible. This is the seventh of a series of 12 articles on a predicted power shortage.)

The major utilities companies in central Alaska have all gone together and formed a pool, called the Central Alaska Power Pool, for the purpose of finding new sources of fuel supply which is reaching a critical stage.

Hydroelectric and mine mouth plants seem to be the only solution to the problem at the present time. However, hydroelectric plants will take years in building. It is conceded that power furnished from the proposed dam at Rampart will provide the cheapest power supply.

Power is needed immediately—and as cheaply as possible. For this reason it was decided to explore the possibility of building mine mouth plants at both Healy and Sutton on the Alaska Railroad. This was said to not only provide power at a reasonable cost but also, could be put on the line in no more than 3 years.

In the past several articles the News-Miner has shown the number of power units operating in the railbelt area, and the units proposed for development in the future.

For the purpose of further clarifying the power shortage facing the railbelt area, interviews with several persons most prominent, interested and active in the power field were held.

M. S. (Sam) Umbenhauer, manager of the power division of the Ralph M. Parsons Co., had this to say:

"By 1980 there will be a need for 300,000 kilowatts in the railbelt area, extending from Homer in the Kenai Peninsula to Delta Junction, 100 miles south of Fairbanks on the Richardson Highway.

"In our report we have tried to give an impartial viewpoint of what we need for our immediate power needs.

"We are not taking any sides as to whether we should build hydroelectric, mine mouth coal-fed steam, or atomic plants.

"The problem, as we see it, is to bring power into this area as soon as possible at the most reasonable cost."

CHEAPEST SOURCE

"Hydroelectric plants usually provide the cheapest source of power, but initial costs are very high and construction of the dams takes from 10 to 20 years.

"Atomic plants are still in their experimental stage, have excessive initial costs, and do very little to bolster the economy of the country.

"For instance, the mine mouth plants we have recommended for building at Healy and Sutton, plus the gas turbine at Anchorage, all together have an initial cost of $40 million compared to $600 million for the Devil Canyon project.

"Cost of delivering power in Fairbanks from Healy will be approximately 11.7 mills per kilowatt-hour as against approximately 10.8 mills per kilowatt-hour from Devil Canyon, but the steamplant is completed in 3 years against 10 years or more for the hydroplant. Actually I feel the steamplant at Healy can provide cheaper power.

"It is conceded that Rampart Dam will probably be built, but again 12 to 20 years will be needed to finish the project.

"You need power immediately—and the quickest and most economical plant is the mine mouth.

"Another factor which we should not overlook is the use of one of your most abundant natural resources—coal.

"It would be foolhardy to destroy a budding industry, when it plays such an important part in the economy of the area, and all of Alaska."

IN ADDITION

"In addition to having power in this area within a comparatively short time, power can be sold at Rampart during the construction period. It is estimated 150,000 kilowatts will be needed.

"Money for the project will probably come from the Rural Electrification Administration. Private capital is too costly—and, besides, the private investor might consider this risk capital with the Rampart project looming in the horizon and available for 3 mills per kilowatt-hour in the Fairbanks area.

"With an integrated system as suggested by the Central Alaska Power Pool, financing by the Rural Electrification Administration may be easier, than if each unit decided to go on its own.

"You eliminate duplication of effort in this kind of planning. For instance, if Healy and Sutton were to build individual plants, an additional generator would be needed. If they go together, only one is necessary for standby, and a saving of $3 million is made and eventually passed on to the consumer."

WHO OPERATES

"In setting up a generation and transmission cooperative to run the system the question usually is—who will run it?

"Members of the CAPP will organize the GTC and select a board of directors. From this group a manager will be chosen. This is a nonprofit organization which will make application to the REA for the loan, and take care of planning and operating the new power system.

"Sometimes in a large group like this you have conflicts of personalities, and it takes broad, long-range vision to make for a smooth-working organization.

"The REA operates like a bank. You have to meet their standards. They will provide all the funds necessary if feasibility of the project is shown—and will allow 35 years to amortize the loan. The rate charged for power must be sufficient to take care of this," said Umbemhauer.

College Academic Facilities Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8900) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, and to authorize financial assistance for undergraduate study in such institutions.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, the most important argument for Federal aid to higher education is that the intellect of the young is an essential natural resource that must be developed as equipment for future service in society. Economic justification for Federal assistance is a secondary point.

Our college-age population is expected to double over the next 10 years, and already our institutions of higher education are crowded. Although the colleges and universities themselves are making every possible effort to extend quality instruction to the maximum number of students by better utilization of faculty and facilities, the present capacity can care for only a small percent of the expected increase in student body. The need for additional funds for instruction has already taken precedence over physical facilities to the extent that about 12 percent of our college and university buildings are in need of replacement and another 10 percent are in need of serious renovation. This is in addition to the need for new construction to enlarge existing institutions or establish new ones in strategic geographic locations. The

traditional sources of State revenues and private philanthropy, while making great efforts, will not be able to keep pace with demands of the magnitude expected. Many States with the least resources out of which to pay are already making the greatest effort, percentagewise, in support of higher education.

Increased tuition, when it rises faster than the cost of living as it has for a number of years, defeats the ultimate national goal by making college impossible for many. Presently, with the advent of junior colleges and with increasingly high tuition in private colleges, about two-thirds of the Nation's college students are in public institutions; and it is estimated that much of the anticipated enrollment increase in the next decade will occur in public colleges and universities, with the problem of financing falling on the already overburdened State governments unless the Federal Government gives some assistance—and gives it now.

In the fall of 1961, Rhode Island had almost 20,000 degree-credit students enrolled in its 11 colleges and universities. This was an increase of only a little over 2 percent over that of the previous year, compared with 7.8-percent increase in the Nation as a whole. Forty-four percent of the degree-credit students in Rhode Island were in its two public institutions.

Rhode Island property taxes as a percent of personal income are slightly higher than the national average, and we have a 3-percent sales tax; but still the demands for public service in the State are such that we simply do not have the money needed to expand low-cost public higher education to the extent this is needed if Rhode Island is to provide its share of the human resource development needed for the country's growth.

We have no public junior colleges and only two institutions designed specifically to offer terminal-occupational training below the bachelor's degree. In a State as heavily populated and as heavily urbanized as Rhode Island, we are desperately in need not only of funds with which to expand the facilities of existing institutions but, more especially, of funds with which to extend within commuting distance of more of our young people higher education programs of a type and quality to insure that none of our vital human resources are wasted.

America the Beautiful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial in support of the wilderness bill S. 174 which appeared in the January 19 issue of the Hungry Horse News, published by Mel Ruder in Columbia Falls, Mont.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA THE BEAUTIFUL

It is unfortunate that a major conservation issue, the wilderness bill finds itself a political issue.

We believe in the two-party system, and the good people who aren't Democrats are Republicans, either way. Furthermore, great early-day conservationists were two Republican Presidents, Theodore Roosevelt and William Howard Taft.

The Hungry Horse News has not been an avid champion of the wilderness bill. We don't believe it will make any particular difference to Glacier National Park or the Bob Marshall Wilderness. Furthermore we don't know of any major differences that will result in western Montana, if and when the bill is passed.

Volume 1, No. 7 of the Montana Republican must be painful to conservationists who are Republicans. Next to the page 1 picture of Governor Nutter is this article; and we quote:

"And now the Government plans the greatest landgrab of all.

"There's a wilderness bill coming up bebore the House early in 1962 (its already passed the Senate) that would remove from all productive use almost 60 million acres of public land.

"If this bill passes, then the opportunities for expansion, growth and development by individual Americans will surely be lost in the wilderness.

"It will mean loss of jobs, of homes, of schools, of entire communities.

"What's behind this bill, anyway?

"It's stated purpose is to maintain huge areas of present wilderness as a wilderness forever. The bill specifies it is an 'act to establish a national wilderness preservation system for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes.'

"That's where the Federal-sponsored bill loses us. What other purposes could there possibly be?

"We already have magnificent national parks, monuments and recreation areas, totalling 22 million acres. And we have more than 24 million acres in game ranges and refuges. We're happy about that vast land of wilderness. We go along with the majority of American people who favor setting aside places of awesome beauty as wilderness areas.

"But which means more to all of us: additional wilderness for a few of us to visit—or jobs for many?

"The facts of forest life are these: The American economy depends on products from public lands. Forests provide products necessary for paper, chemicals and clothing. And these areas are potential sources of petroleum, uranium and other valuable mineral resources. The forest industries now provide 10 percent of all the jobs in manufacturing in the Nation."

The Montana Republican article concludes: "Our timber companies have spent many millions—and many years—developing forest preservation methods. They plan, scientifically, to keep a balance between old and new trees to assure continuing harvests, generation after generation. We suggest strongly that you protest this landgrab to your Representative before it's too late." So ends their article.

The Hungry Horse News has been and continues to be well aware that lumber is the basic industry of this country.

What job here in the Flathead is in jeopardy if the wilderness bill becomes law? We don't know of any contemplated economic status change of a single acre in this area, if the wilderness bill becomes law.

Legislative Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I keep citizens of the 10th District of Michigan aware of my views on developments here in Washington through legislative reports. My first report of this session follows:

JANUARY 31, 1962 LEGISLATIVE REPORT FROM YOUR CONGRESSMAN

I have delayed this session's first congressional report until the President's state of the Union and budget messages were presented. From the requests in these two messages it is obvious that your Federal Government is headed for unprecedented peacetime spending and a record deficit. The balanced budget promised by President Kennedy is, in my opinion, unrealistic. This view can be substantiated by the anticipated request for authority to increase the debt limit $10 billion so we can borrow more money with which to operate the Government. President Kennedy's new budget includes a request for an additional 46,000 Federal employees. During the first 10 months of this administration 84,831 new employees were added to the Federal payroll. This does not include the thousands recalled to the military service. The administration's request for money for domestic nondefense purposes is 38 percent higher than the amount spent in this category in 1960. While rising costs of national defense have been a substantial factor in budget increases, we now find spending for domestic nondefense purposes an even greater factor in the growing Federal budget.

I recognize that some budget increases may be necessary as our country grows and that our defense requirements must keep pace with technological advances. However, in my opinion the President's requests far exceed these necessities. As an example, his request for a new Department of Urban Affairs is unwise and unnecessary. I can think of nothing we need less in Washington than a new Department. This would establish a new Cabinet member, with all of his assistants, and would undoubtedly add many thousands of employees to the payroll. The House Rules Committee voted down this proposal. Then President Kennedy announced he would form the new Department under reorganization plan authority. Congress has 60 days in which to reject his proposal. He even announced the appointment of the head of this agency—Mr. Robert C. Weaver, a Negro—before Congress authorized the new Department. This is a blatant move to politically blackmail Members of Congress into voting for this new Department by using a vote against it as a vote against a Negro as its head. To the best of my knowledge, Mr. Weaver is a capable man and would be well qualified for the post, if created. This kind of political chicanery is to be deplored.

The President's request for an increase in postal rates passed the House of Representatives. Republicans successfully insisted that the bill contain an amendment prohibiting free mailing of Communist propaganda in this country, a privilege granted by this administration about a year ago. The bill, in addition to increasing first-class rates, substantially increases second class as well as third class (often referred to as junk mail). The present postal deficit is $900

million. The new bill as passed by the House raises $691,300,000 additional revenue.

The President's trade message requests broad authority to reduce our tariffs. World trade is, of course, necessary. However, I am reluctant to grant any President this broad authority which is expressly reserved to the Congress by the Constitution. A visit to almost any store will indicate the flood of imports already coming into our country. How the United States, with its high standard of living—of which we are proud—can compete with cheap foreign labor without some reasonable protection, has yet to be explained to me. We have exported our technological know-how all over the world and have lost our former advantage in this area. I realize this is a complicated subject and I intend to study it thoroughly. The United States already has some of the lowest tariffs in the world, and I am anxiously looking for some indication from the Common Market nations as to their intentions of reducing their tariffs which are, in most instances, higher than ours. In addition to tariffs, many use quotas and other devices to limit our goods going into their countries.

As these and other issues come before Congress, I would welcome your comments.

Procurement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, last month the Denver division of the Martin-Marietta Corp., one of the Nation's largest national defense contractors, sponsored a meeting that spells good news for the American taxpayer and for the national defense effort.

Martin manufactures the Titan intercontinental ballistic missile at a site just a few miles southwest of Denver. Dr. William L. Whitson, Martin vice president in charge of the Denver division, called together more than 200 Titan subcontractors for a special cost reduction symposium.

Dr. Whitson and the other top officials of the Martin Denver operation gathered together some outstanding military and civilian authorities on production costs to tell Martin personnel and subcontractors that every effort must be made to abolish waste from our gigantic Titan program. And they exchanged ideas on how this could best be done.

Mr. President, I want to call attention particularly to one of Dr. Whitson's keynote remarks. "Defense contractors," he said, "have the solemn duty to make the taxpayers' dollars go as far as possible in buying adequate defense. Every unnecessary overrun on a defense contract subtracts from our total national strength. And if we fail to grasp opportunities to save money simply because we are within our contractual budget, we have not fulfilled our obligations as citizens."

These are heartening words, Mr. President. To my mind, this is evidence of a new, aggressive approach to the problems inherent in our constantly rising budget for national defense.

If more defense contractors would take positive action as Dr. Whitson and his executives have done, many Americans would feel a good deal better about the national defense budget.

Many of us in Congress have deplored waste in military procurement for years. Some of us, notably Senator PAUL DOUGLAS and Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK, have led repeated legislative efforts to set up improved machinery to discourage waste in our gigantic military budgets.

It seems to me that there is a new awareness of this problem. Last summer, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara did what some of us had been urging his predecessors to do for many years. He set up a centralized Defense Supply Agency to eliminate confusion and overlapping in procurement by the armed services. Hundreds of millions of dollars may well be saved by this agency's actions.

Even this Agency, however, cannot by itself whip a problem so large in scope. In fact, the Defense Supply Agency does not handle major military hardware like Titan missiles.

Thus it is most encouraging to see greater evidence of cost consciousness such as the Martin Denver symposium. Some tough, direct talk was heard at this meeting, and I hope it will echo and reecho across our land.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two press releases summarizing highlights of the Martin Denver cost symposium, and an editorial from the Denver Post of December 13, titled "Where Waste Is Really an Enemy."

There being no objection, the summary and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TITAN PROGRAM CONTRACTORS TOLD TO REDUCE COSTS

DENVER, COLO., December 7.—Top members of the Air Force-industry Titan ICBM production team Thursday issued a cost-reduction challenge—and a mandate—to all firms involved in the program.

The strongly worded demand came during a Titan cost-reduction symposium called in Denver by the Martin Marietta Corp., associate contractor under the Air Force Systems Command for Titan.

More than 200 representatives of program contractors and suppliers, and Air Force-Department of Defense management organizations, participated.

A warning of tough Department of Defense cost-reduction policies for the future—in all types of defense contracts—was sounded in an address written by Lt. Gen. Mark E. Bradley, Jr., Air Force Deputy Chief of Staff, Systems and Logistics.

(The address was read by Brig. Gen. Robert G. Ruegg, Director of Procurement and Production, headquarters, Air Logistics Command; General Bradley is hospitalized for injuries received in an auto accident.)

General Bradley said congressional appropriations for fiscal years 1961 and 1962 contained procurement cuts which were in effect a penalty for inefficient procurement practices.

In the future, he said "the monkey is going to be on the backs of industry—and I mean that with all the force at my command. The Air Force is trying to create the appropriate contracting atmosphere, and we are insisting that our (Air Force) people do a far better job than they've done in the past in managing contracts. In the final analysis, however, industry has to make cost reduction possible.

"Of course, we will always be in the position to cancel or cut back a program—and I assure you we will take such steps if necessary. However, such steps represent emergency actions rather than efficient management. We hope not to use either—and we won't, except as a last resort. But we will take that last resort if nothing else works.

"With contracts yet to be signed, you can bet your boots that we mean to have competition. If big companies can't compete with the small ones, the small businesses will get the contracts. The attitude we are being forced to take is 'get competitive or get out.'

"When I say this, I am confident that my position will be supported at both Air Force secretariat and Department of Defense levels."

Bradley said a cost reduction program now in operation at Martin Marietta—aimed at cutting overall Titan production costs by 10 percent in 1962 "is a vigorous step in the right direction. What I'd like to see is a cost-reduction spirit, like the one here, spread throughout the entire fabric of the defense industry."

Col. John L. McCoy, Titan system program director for the Air Force Ballistic Systems Division, Inglewood, Calif., said Air Force teams "shall continue to exercise our prerogatives as managers to spell out for industry any deficiencies noted in performance, particularly in the areas of cost control.

"An applied cost-reduction program, conceived with imagination and carried out conscientiously, should be pursued by every contractor engaged in Air Force business. There are no exceptions."

Dr. W. L. Whitson, Martin vice president at the Denver division, said his firm—as Titan program associate contractor—means to extend its cost reduction program to the point where more than $40 million will be saved in 1962.

"We mean business," he said. "We mean to save millions of Titan program dollars. And we mean to have the assistance of every vendor and supplier who gets so much as a single dollar under the Titan program."

He said cost reduction is directly related to industry efficiency. And beyond the immediate goals of more defense for the dollar, cost reduction may turn out to be a deciding point in the survival of free enterprise against demands that defense industries be nationalized.

Harry B. Gunther, Denver division materiel director for Martin, warned industry representatives that, in the future, Martin "cannot do business with people who cannot perform, and we shall use our performance records to the maximum degree in selecting sources for future business."

Other Martin Marietta speakers—all from Denver—were George E. Smith, plant general manager; Thomas P. Hudock, director of finance; Lester J. Lippy, director of fabrication; Joseph T. Keeley, systems operations section manager; and G. Stephen Weller, manager, engineering operations department.

Among Air Force and Department of Defense participants were Brig. Gen. Milton B. Adams, deputy director of systems development, Headquarters, U.S. Air Force; Brig. Gen. Gerald F. Keeling, commander, western contract management region; Col. Fred Porter, Titan system project officer, Headquarters, U.S. Air Force; Col. Harvey Shelton, military assistant to the Assistant Secretary of Defense, deputy director, Defense Research and Engineering; and Col. Bobbie J. Cavnar, Air Force plant representative at the Denver Titan production plant.

Other top-level Martin representatives were J. Donald Rauth, vice president in charge of the Titan ICBM and space booster programs; E. D. Carter, corporate director of materiel and procurement; and Earl Uhlig, vice president, finance. Rauth is head-

quartered in Denver; Carter and Uhlig are from Baltimore, Md.

Industry participants in the symposium will submit reports on their individual cost-reduction programs to Martin Marieta in about a month.

Of all funds expended in the Martin Marietta Titan program, about 40 percent goes to subcontractors and suppliers.

CONSERVATION OF DEFENSE DOLLARS CALLED DETERRENT TO COMMUNISM

DENVER, COLO., December 7.—Air Force and Martin Marietta Corp. officials Thursday told more than 200 Titan program subcontractors that conserving U.S. defense dollars is as much a deterrent against communism as the production of the huge ICBM itself.

Gathered at a Martin Marietta-sponsored cost-reduction symposium in Denver, the industrial representatives were reminded firmly that the Nation's strength is directly related to the best utilization of the defense budget.

Dr. W. L. Whitson, Martin vice president at the Denver division and symposium keynoter, said defense contractors, as Americans, "have the solemn duty to make the taxpayers' dollars go as far as possible in buying adequate defense. Every unnecessary overrun on a defense contract subtracts from our total national strength.

"And if we fail to grasp opportunities to save money, simply because we are within our contractual budget, we have not fulfilled our obligations as citizens."

Further, Whitson said, the defense industry has a moral obligation to give the customer—in the case of the Titan program, the Air Force—the best possible bargain for his money.

"I have no patience with little men who assume that the Government is some kind of grab bag and fair game for the greedy," Whitson said.

George E. Smith, Denver division general manager for Martin Marietta, opened the meeting with announcement of a $40 million cost-reduction goal for Titan program contractors during 1962.

Smith presided during a Martin Marietta presentation on its highly successful internal cost reduction program. This formula was offered to all members of the Titan industry team as a pattern.

Effectiveness of the Martin Marietta Titan production cost reduction program was underscored by Col. John L. McCoy, Titan system program director for the Air Force Ballistic Systems Division, in a luncheon session speech. McCoy said in 1961 Martin Marietta and its subcontractors have achieved a $15 million saving in Titan development. As for the future, McCoy said:

"I remind you that the fiscal year 1962 appropriation for the Titan program is $1.2 billion, which is more than the combined expenditures of the Departments of Commerce and Labor during 1960.

"Our responsibility in managing this sum of money is exceeded only by the responsibility we hold for the security of our Nation. In the Titan program these go hand in hand. The more judiciously we handle our fiscal resources, the more deterrence we shall buy for the dollar."

McCoy said the people of Martin Marietta "have now demonstrated that they intend to do something about weapon system costs. Let us all get on their bandwagon. Let every other contractor represented here today strive to lead the parade."

WHERE WASTE IS REALLY AN ENEMY

Economy is not a word that goes easily with national preparedness and it is almost always left out of discussions justifying the defense budget.

This, when the cold war adversary is the Soviet Union, is not always a bad thing, but the tendency to eliminate economy from all consideration of military spending results too often in the kind of waste that can impair our position as seriously as the most rigid pennypinching.

Waste as a dangerous enemy was recognized last week by both industry and the military at a symposium on cost reduction at the Martin Co.'s Denver plant. Comments by Pentagon brass as well as Martin executives deserve an audience much larger than the 200 contractors and suppliers of the Titan ICBM program who heard the talks. Almost any taxpayer would applaud.

A warning of tough Defense Department cost reduction policies for the future was contained in an address written by Lt. Gen. Mark E. Bradley, Jr., Air Force Deputy Chief of Staff, Systems and Logistics.

"The monkey is going to be on the backs of industry—and I mean that with all the force at my command," the general emphasized. Addressing himself directly to defense contractors, he noted that the Department in the future would insist that they "get competitive or get out."

General Bradley's clear call for a "cost reduction spirit" was echoed throughout the symposium. Dr. W. L. Whitson, vice president of Martin's Denver division, warned contractors he expected the Titan program would be cut by $40 million in 1962. "And we mean to have the assistance of every vendor and supplier who gets as much as a single dollar under the Titan program," he said.

The speakers commented on the threat which waste and inefficiency represented to the free enterprise system and warned of increasing demands that defense industries be nationalized.

But their most telling points were those which spotted conservation of U.S. defense dollars just as effective a deterrent against communism as the production of the Titan itself.

It is gratifying to take note when industry spokesmen call on subcontractors to bend every effort to see that the American taxpayer's dollar goes as far as possible in the purchase of an adequate national defense, when they correctly identify every unnecessary overrun on a defense contract as a subtraction from our total national strength.

The symposium amounted to both a warning and a pledge.

This is the kind of healthy talk which should spread throughout every industry that is even touched by the defense effort. It says in effect that economy needn't take a holiday just because we're in a race with the Russians.

It goes even further and says economy is not inimical to the production of superior missiles and other weapons of defense but vital to that production.

Action Needed on Wiretap Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Buffalo Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., on November 19, 1961, regarding the dire need for amending our wiretap laws. This legislation is long overdue, and I urge its passage early in this session.

The editorial follows:

ACTION NEEDED ON WIRETAP LAWS

Need for the revision of the Federal Communications Act never was more dramatically pointed up than it was in New York City the other day when District Attorney Frank S. Hogan was forced to drop the prosecution of seven defendants accused of being top men in a multimillion-dollar narcotics ring.

Assistant Prosecutor Irving Lang told the court that the wiretap evidence obtained by police established the guilt of the defendants "not only beyond a reasonable doubt, but beyond all doubt." Then he pointed out that wiretap evidence is inadmissable because of the Federal Communications Act which would place the district attorney in violation if he were to present such evidence.

As a result seven of the most depraved type of criminals will be free in a society which under present laws is virtually powerless to put them behind bars where they belong. For too long legislators have discussed possible remedies for a law which extends protection to the criminal and in so doing places law enforcement officers in the role of violators.

Certainly the Federal Communications Act never was intended to give aid and comfort to the lawless; but the way it is worded it does just that. Further, it negates the laws governing wiretapping by police in New York and a number of other States.

If law enforcement agencies are to be successful in their never-ending battle against powerful crime syndicates they should be provided with the legal tools needed to win. The privacy assured citizens under our laws was intended to insure against unwarranted invasion of private rights, not to make it easier for the criminal to carry on his nefarious operations.

If police have the right to enter a home when they have reason to believe a crime is being committed, then it would seem logical that they should be able to tap into a telephone conversation which is being held for the purpose of planning or executing crime.

Several proposals have been introduced in Congress which would give law enforcement agencies the right to tap wires and to present such evidence in the courts. The best of these proposals should be dusted off and passed as soon as the lawmakers reconvene. The sooner it is accomplished the sooner such bums as those who benefited from unwarranted protection in New York City will be serving time and society will get the protection it wants and deserves.

The Teacher Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in This Week magazine of last Sunday, January 28, 1962, there is a most timely, informative, and challenging article entitled "A Crash Program To Beat the Teacher Shortage," written by Gen. David Sarnoff. We know how able, wise, and farseeing General Sarnoff is and we have many evidences of his devoted services to our country. I hope that his article may be widely read and I ask unanimous

consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CRASH PROGRAM TO BEAT THE TEACHER SHORTAGE

(By Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff as told to Albert C. Lasher)

An urgent manhunt is going on today in the Nation's schools. The search is for teachers trained in mathematics and in science, and your child's future and the future of this Nation hang on its outcome.

U.S. welfare and security depend on our technical achievement. Our children today must be inspired to become the scientists of tomorrow. But we don't have enough teachers to go around. The National Education Association reports that the public schools need an additional 138,000 teachers—and the greatest shortage is in science and in math.

A new high school in Washington, D.C., was short a physics teacher when classes opened this fall. The post was filled after frantic weeks of search—by a student from Georgetown University.

West Hempstead Junior High, on Long Island, is short of fully qualified math teachers. The school is considered to have an outstanding math program. But 3 of the 14 teachers in the department have no background in the subject other than required college courses. They stay a jump ahead of their pupils by taking special instruction from their department head.

Stories like these are repeated in city after city. The tragedy is that your child may have an important science potential that he never gets to realize because there is no science-trained teacher to awaken his spirit of inquiry.

We've got to do something, fast.

CONSIDER THIS PLAN

I would like to make a proposal. I suggest that scientists and engineers in industry and in government volunteer an hour or two a day to teaching in nearby schools, and that their employers grant them time off to do the job with no loss in pay.

No organization would be asked to release more than one man from any research unit, and he would not be expected to serve more than 1 academic year.

If the program I suggest is adopted generally, the Radio Corporation of America would gladly participate in it. I know RCA scientists and engineers around the country would eagerly volunteer. And I would do everything in my power to clear the way. Such a program would be the best investment any company or research organization could make to help insure for themselves and for America a future supply of scientific manpower.

There is one facet of the plan that I think offers an especially exciting prospect: the presence of a scientist in the classroom. Can you imagine anything more intriguing for an aspiring young biologist or chemist than to spend an hour a day with a working scientist? Such a person can make the textbook spring to life for young students.

Working scientists are already helping out in some classrooms. Many schools invite experts in for occasional lectures on specific subjects, or ask them to meet after hours with scientific clubs.

It's ironic that many schools suffering from science-teacher shortages are located in areas swarming with skilled technicians. The two schools I mentioned above, in Washington and on Long Island, are literally surrounded by research laboratories. I'm sure their needs could be met by volunteers. Though there are sections of the country where my plan wouldn't work simply because the scientific manpower isn't available, I say that where it is available the schools should try to tap it.

And big companies aren't the only source of supply, though they may be the most obvious. Smaller companies could get in on this, too. Radiation Applications, Inc., of Long Island City, N.Y., has only 50 technical men on its staff, but I am told that the company's president, Munroe F. Pofcher, would gladly release 1 of his researchers to teach school part time.

There are some ways school administrators can make it easier for industry to help them. They could schedule volunteers' classes early in the day, provide lesson plans and other teaching aids, and give the volunteers special instruction in basic educational theories and practices. They might also help by having exams corrected by advanced students or volunteers.

WHAT DO TEACHERS THINK?

Some educators I've talked with told me they feared regular teachers might feel chagrined about high-salaried personnel from industry, with no teacher training, taking over classes. However, I'll take the word of Webster W. Keefe, district principal of the Somers (N.Y.) Central Schools, that: "Most teachers teach because they like children. This is a terrific idea to help solve a serious problem for some schools, and teachers would welcome it because it's good for their students."

How would a school know that the scientist-volunteer had the ability to teach? College administrators already have experience in selecting teachers who hold full-time jobs in other fields. Dr. John G. Truxal, a prominent scientist who heads the department of electrical engineering at the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, suggests that before a volunteer is chosen to teach in a high school, he should be invited to lecture before a class or a student science club.

'You can reach a fair conclusion after listening to a guy for an hour," he says.

HOW TO FIND THE "VOLUNTEERS"

This proposal for easing the shortage of science and math teachers requires no complicated organization, no coordinated national effort, no large sum of money. Its success, in my view, depends on the effort of the individual school administrator. His first step would be to contact the heads of research organizations and companies in his district. The educator and the executive could then jointly map the best way to approach the technical staff. Some candidates might be found through a staff survey or through professional sources such as universities or learned societies.

This plan is an emergency measure. But we're faced with an emergency. Of course, no responsible school official would relax his search for permanent, fully qualified instructors. But we must draw on every national resource to accomplish the scientific breakthroughs needed to preserve our way of life. Such technical advance begins with a spark of curiosity in a child's eye. Volunteer teachers from business and government research laboratories can generate this spark and fan it into great human achievements.

Dr. Marshall Muir

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, Dr. C. Marshall Muir, minister of the First Presbyterian Church of East Orange, N.J., has won the affection and admiration of not only his congregation but of the whole community for his tireless concern for the well-being of all the people of his lovely city. He has been a vigilant defender of the right and a profound influence for good by his deeds and example.

Dr. Muir's outstanding qualities have been recognized in his election as moderator of the Permanent Judicial Commission of the United Presbyterian Church at its 173d general assembly. All the people of East Orange are proud of the signal honor that has been conferred upon their beloved clergyman, who has made a lasting contribution to community progress and development. A resolution adopted by the Assembly of the State of New Jersey reflects the esteem in which Dr. Muir is held, and I should like to insert it in the RECORD with my felicitations and best wishes for many more years of eminent service in the public interest.

The resolution reads:

A RESOLUTION INTRODUCED BY ASSEMBLYMAN MATTHEWS AND ADOPTED BY THE ASSEMBLY OF THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Whereas Dr. C. Marshall Muir, minister of the First Presbyterian Church of East Orange, has been elected moderator of the Permanent Judicial Commission of the United Presbyterian Church at its 173d general assembly; and

Whereas this is a position to which only the most deserving are appointed; and

Whereas Dr. C. Marshall Muir has devoted himself unstintingly, without regard to personal health and welfare, to the civic betterment of his own city of East Orange; and

Whereas the works of Dr. C. Marshall Muir have borne fruit in the form of having East Orange become a better place in which to live: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey extend its congratulations to Dr. C. Marshall Muir on his selection to a high post in his church; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, signed by the speaker and attested by the clerk of the general assembly, be forwarded to Dr. C. Marshall Muir.

Cecil F. Poole, U.S. Attorney, Northern District of California, Address to NAIRO Conference: "The Changing Metro-Urban Complex: Power and Politics"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention and to that of our colleagues, the remarks of Cecil F. Poole, U.S. attorney, northern district of California, to the 15th annual conference of the National Association of Intergroup Relations Officials which recently met in San Francisco.

It was my privilege, Mr. Speaker, to introduce Mr. Poole at the Conference. At that time, I found Mr. Poole's remarks both incisive and thought provoking. Upon rereading his careful, analytical

statement I feel many Members of the House of Representatives will find his penetrating observations of great value.

The remarks follow:

THE CHANGING METRO-URBAN COMPLEX: POWER AND POLITICS

The urban phenomenon of the past decade which has figured so large in your discussions here has been that of internal change and external growth of our cities. Faced with unprecedented population shifts from rural to metropolitan areas, metropolis city quickly outgrew its original configurations.

Its traditional layout usually found a core of business and industry, surrounded by the older rings of mixed mercantile establishments and ancient tenements. Toward the fringes lay the lower middle-class residential areas. And in the exclusive peripheries, the abodes of the upper middle class, the wealthy, and sometimes the great.

Into the inner ring have come the migrants: the poor whites, the racial minorities, abandoning farm and South in a steady confluence of streams, seeking, if not riches, at least a chance at self-improvement or relief from the southern yoke. That their odyssey has with mounting bitterness ended in frustration and disillusionment has left its searing stigmata. It has not stemmed the tide.

And these newcomers, striving to put down roots in hard and barren soil, already drained and plundered of its sustenance, have with slow, almost haematomic accretion, exerted ever-increasing pressure against the boundaries which traditionally have marked the limits of their communities' expansion.

And as the migrant tide has slowly seeped across the imaginary but well-understood lines, the older inhabitants have deplored, they have resisted, they have fought. But, inevitably, they have retreated. They have been displaced.

And in lesser degree, and for different reasons—but with a common base in America's foolish efforts at preserving a caste system based on wealth and its advantages—the lower middle classes, also retreating, have in their turn pressed against the areas hitherto reserved for their betters. Until at length, there is no more running room. The walls have been reached. And so begins the flight into suburbia.

And there, like mushrooms, new developments have grown wherever the bulldozer can reach, making the crooked straight, the rough places plain. Field and farm have blossomed into neat country row houses, with no downpayment. Ranch has become the locus of ranch-style monstrosities. Almond and orange grove have become battleground for speculators. For who needs nut or fruit tree when the asphalt-circled super market provides them both, and in such neat and attractive packaging—short-weighted, but pretty.

And so, at last, the countryside has now become almost one vast, spreading, interlocked conglomeration of urban clusters, sprawling each into the other, linked by toll road and freeway, a bit of open space for those with means enough to buy, fortunate enough to be racially eligible, and time enough to travel over the choked throughways from home to office and back.

But what of those left behind? What of the newcomers, the racial minorities, the poor, those who cannot, and the still great majority who will not, join the trek to the country?

They still must face the now-exacerbated problems of the core city in dislocation—housing, jobs, schools, recreation, finance, transportation, slum clearance, urban development and urban renewal. The names of the actors have changed. The basic plot and the classic tragedy remain.

It is this intensification of struggle, this need to cope with renewed stresses and strains of shifting, finely triggered human relationships, this imperious call to blend—before it is too explosively late—the divergent streams of human emotions and ambitions into meaningful and productive channels: this is what has brought you—our newest professionals—into existence, calling for your help where we have so long failed.

And though you have identified accurately the needs and the generalities of the cure, it seems to me that you simply have not gone far enough in translating good analysis into action.

What is more to the point, I think that you, in particular, and people, generally, have completely failed to synchronize your social and service programing with parallel political developments in those very areas in which you operate.

For while the core city has remained relatively stable in size and the population growth has been mainly in the outer metropolitan areas, the city has not remained static. New forces have come into being and are operative in the citadels from which the upper classes have departed.

For though, as I said, the plot remains the same, the names of the actors have changed. But something else has changed, too. The new actors are the young people, the city-locked workers, the old who do not leave, and the racial minorities: Negroes, Mexican-Americans, Nisei Japanese-Americans, Puerto Ricans. The disfranchised are, by bitterest irony, succeeding to the franchise.

For if it is true that nearly 70 percent of America now lives in cities or metropolitan areas, it is also true that the satellite communities of the outer reaches are still perforce dominated by, dependent upon, and must gravitate toward the inner core. And this is crucial in terms of all the giant problems of urban living. It means that the growth and direction of commerce, effective planning for mass transportation, improvement in communications, conservation of State and National water resources, protection against the noxious spread of smog and water pollution, even nuclear survival programs—these are not only influenced by but are in greatest measure significantly dictated by the needs of the core city.

And with the sensational increase within that core of the proportion of racial and economic minorities, there has come a corresponding political power which more than anything else can help actually to put across those programs of which you have talked so much this week. For with rapid amazement, the sophisticated professional politicians have perceived that a completely new era has dawned in this great old game of gathering votes.

Look at New York, New Jersey, Chicago, Detroit, Philadelphia.

Nowhere in this country is the fabric of life more distorted than in those communities. Nowhere are the restless dynamics of social, political, and philosophical change more gravely evidenced. But nowhere either, is there a more potent and more rapidly expanding concentration of power in power blocs.

And the real measure of power—in politics or physics—is not how much energy may finally and under optimum conditions be combined in mass: it is the amount of thrust that can be effectively applied when necessary at a given time and in a given place.

Energy applied in massive political thrusts has shifted the balance of political power in every industrial center where that balance has been in issue.

For America has very efficiently made it painfully clear to its minorities for so long a time that they are "different"; that they may expect differential treatment; that in this or that location, or endeavor, or situation, minorities "don't belong"; that here or there they "wouldn't be happy"; that to recognize their right to free occupancy of housing would somehow carry with it a privilege for the occupant to marry all the sisters of the world.

Is it any wonder, therefore, that, impressed with perpetually patent or latent hostility, with insane insistence that a "line" be drawn to separate certain humans from others and to stigmatize them by color and race, that the separated finally unite in common effort?

Though unintended, this is precisely what has happened in the vitals of our cities.

Mayors, Governors, and Presidents cannot continue oldtime policies of excluding Negroes, Mexican-Americans, or other minorities from sharing in government—whether they do so by plan, by stupidity, by ignorance, or simply viciousness—without driving large numbers of them into defensive political alliance which often will challenge, and even defeat, vital and worthwhile programs.

The olden days have gone. With the shifting of political strength in the core city, never again can a political candidate be sure of success without considering these new forces. And something else: the time has just gone, vanished, disappeared, when a politician could control these forces simply by making a Sunday morning appearance at the largest store-front church, or by uttering pious declarations that he knows and likes "you people."

For in city after city Mexican-Americans, Negro-Americans, and others, have a new awareness of the meaning and benefits of political activity.

Twenty years ago, almost the only Negroes who to any extent were recognized by the official structure of either major party were those few who had been elected to office, or the chosen few who were puppets bound hand and feet to the political bosses who selected them and upon whose largesse they depended for their spineless survival.

Not so today. In the teeming major cities of the East and Midwest, and increasingly in the population centers of the West, members of minority groups constitute important segments of county central committees. They belong and attend the annual or biannual meetings of State central committees. They hold offices ranging from chairman down. They have learned where policies are made and who makes them. And they are voting their way into this select company.

They are working the political streets. And they are working them with skill, with confidence, and with earned respect.

Just 3 days ago, Mayor Robert Wagner won reelection in New York City—that solid bastion of the Democratic Party which has been the greatest nemesis to the hopes of any of the great leaders of the Republican Party, including Rockefeller, Ike, and that southern Californian.

Mayor Wagner won by 400,000 votes. And it is significant that his campaign manager for the borough of Manhattan, with responsibility from the Battery to the Bronx, was J. Raymond Jones, a Negro, and one of the most skilled political strategists of our time.

Negroes in Michigan with Reuther, Mennen Williams, Diggs, and a host of political activists in and out of labor; Negroes in Chicago with Bill Dawson; in Pennsylvania with Dave Lawrence, Bill Green, and Nix; in New York with Adam Clayton Powell, Mayor Bob Wagner, Jones, and their associates; and now, too, in California, with Gov. Pat Brown, Byron Rumford, Gus Hawkins—are writing whole new pages in American history by the use of this new-found power drawn from the depths, from the

underprivileged, from the precincts of the core city which many Americans have abandoned.

In the New Jersey gubernatorial campaign, our west coast newspapers had given us to believe that the minority groups of that State were leaning toward the candidacy of former Secretary James P. Mitchell, or at least were hopelessly divided. But somebody failed to read the signs correctly. Mr. Mitchell lost by 40,000 votes, due largely to the very successful efforts by Mrs. Madline Williams, Judge Hughes' associate campaign manager, and Phil Weightman, of COPE, who were busy working while others were sanguinely predicting a Republican victory.

And Louis Martin has told me that in the big Negro districts of Trenton, and Newark, and Jersey City, the votes went something like 2,000 for Mitchell, 10,000 for Hughes; 5,000 for Mitchell, 18,000 for Hughes; and so on.

I need not remind you of the importance of the minority votes in the recent presidential campaign. And it is not necessary to claim here that President John F. Kennedy, Mayor Wagner, Governor-elect Hughes, or Congressman Gonzales were elected by the votes of Negroes or Mexican-Americans alone. But the fact is that when the chips were down the Negro votes and the "viva-Kennedy" votes were there, when needed, on time.

And suffice it here to say that in politics, what counts is the tally on the ballot, or the electronic marking on the voting machines. Show a politician where the voting blocks are bunched and mainly he can show you victory.

Moral victories and near-misses are good. But it's the score that counts in politics.

Whether it be Democrat or Republican it must now be crystal clear that sentient and understanding minds in the fields of professional government and politics have a new respect for and a new interest in embracing minorities at all the levels of Government.

This was true of the Kennedy campaign which, in its overall occupancy of every available segment of the political spectrum of every accessible group, accomplished the most remarkable feat in this century, by harnessing power when and where it was needed.

And that this is a new kind of political sagacity and involvement which recognizes that this is a permanent and not a transitory change, is evident by the manner in which the new administration is continuing to deliver on its campaign promise that it would bring government to all the people and all the people into government.

It would unduly protract this theme to mention by name the new and dramatic areas into which Negroes and others have now for the very first time in our national history been introduced. But I might mention in passing, Andy Hatcher, Associate White House press secretary; Dr. Robert Weaver, Housing Administrator, and possibly the first Negro Cabinet officer; George L. P. Weaver, Assistant Secretary of Labor; Carl Rowan, Assistant Secretary of State; or the new Negro Commissioner of the District of Columbia; or newly appointed judge of the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, Thurgood Marshall, or Federal District Judges MacCree in Michigan or Parsons in Chicago.

This ever-growing list of top-caliber appointments, greatest for minorities since the country began, has been matched in even greater numbers by many, many bread-and-butter appointments. Together they demonstrate the results which may be anticipated from the massing and recognition of political power.

And here in California, we provincials of the west coast have seen the same kind of results from an administration cognizant of the shiftings of political emphasis and convinced of the moral soundness of making democracy available to all the people—not just because it is politically productive, but because it is right. I speak here with something more than generalized information. For in the 30 months I spent in Sacramento with the administration of Governor Brown, I saw this new kind of conscience, this new recognition of and respect for minorities actually at work. And I believe it has been more meaningful, in terms of both appointments and helpful programs, than any other governor's administration in the long history of California.

From these observations then, I point out to you that, beyond discoursive methodology and didactic eclecticism, you still have not mastered the challenge which is to make your programs work, to bring theory into practice.

You have shown us what is in the interest of the people. Politicians know that people will support that which is proved to be in their self-interest.

Your further obligation, then, as I see it, is to bring home to the new soldiers on the political fields the necessity of subjoining their interests in human relations matters with the practical problems of the core city. You must help them to appreciate that it is not enough that a newly activated public insist only upon fair employment practices or fair housing legislation. To strive only for these is to abandon all the other important programs—which are part and parcel of the struggle for man's elevation—to the same kind of insensitive control which has been responsible for preserving the crude dichotomy between the diverse strata of American life.

You must help to see that the support of minorities is not committed simply because one or two, out of numerous acutely needful programs, are promised. You, too, must be mindful how precious votes are, and that they are just as decisive whether they are cast for usual human relations objectives or for civic financing, or for school bonds, or for candidates for public office.

None are better equipped than you to insist that those who court the public's support be committed to the total public need. And you—the brilliant ones, the articulate ones, the scholars and practitioners—must help the rest of us to relate these immediate goals of intergroup principles to the long range, not quite so clear, but equally necessary, additional headaches of the core city.

And motivation must begin at the grassroots. It must be in the wards and precincts, at the PTA and church meeting, at the political club caucus, and at the State party convention. It must be inculcated where county and State committeemen are discussed, selected, elected. It must be more than a something to be dusted off whenever a special pitch is to be made to Negroes or Mexican-Americans or to trade unionists.

But you can be a real force in this tightening struggle for decency and dignity. And the people, all the people, need your help.

The promise will often fall short of the performance. But the reach of man should exceed his grasp. Robert Browning asked, otherwise "What's a heaven for?"

Let us not kid ourselves. The road to realization of those noble objectives which you have propounded during this week in San Francisco is rocky and tough. It is hard to travel far along it at a single time. There are pitfalls on either side. And, as the Latin poet wrote, "Facilis est descensus in averno." Which, roughly translated, means, "It is so easy to go to hell."

I have faith in the promise of the new day which is come to America. I have faith in the basic strength of people, and that they will not be content to remain quiescent and docile in the face of the mounting challenges for survival in today's world.

Once, there was cast into a beautiful song the dream of a new city, a city "foursquare," where—

"The light of God was on its streets,
The gates were open wide;
And all who would might enter,
And no one was denied."

And from its mighty avenues there rang forth the voices of children, untroubled, happy, free, blessed with the fulfilled promise of all their anxious yesterdays.

How far off in distance and time it may be before our children come to that fair place, I do not know. But you and I, because we cared to come here, and all those who work with us in common cause, may perhaps even now be doing our bit to bring that dream to pass.

Your meeting with us has been inspiring. And as you return from our western climes to your several homes, we give to you our thanks, we wish you well in all your new endeavors, and bid you farewell, and God speed you safely on.

Foreign Aid and the Fight Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, last fall Station WBBF and WBBF-FM in Rochester, N.Y., held an essay contest for people under 22. The winning essay was written by Philip E. Neuscheler, of Irondequoit High School, who lives at 65 Radcliff Road.

Philip is a 17-year-old who hopes someday to join our Foreign Service. He wrote a very perceptive and stimulating essay on the subject of foreign aid and the fight against communism.

Station WBBF deserves much credit for sponsoring and carrying out this competition designed to contribute to the better understanding of foreign policy problems. Philip Neuscheler deserves hearty congratulations for his hard thinking and effective writing on a subject of vital national importance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the winning essay of the WBBF contest.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN AID AND THE FIGHT AGAINST COMMUNISM

Since 1945, there has been a revolution in the expectations of the world. People's horizons have been widened by new developments in transportation and communication: passible roads have been constructed, there are more trucks and buses, radio and movies are used more often, education is easier to obtain. Citizens of underdeveloped areas can now see that there is something better to live for. They want a better diet and more healthful living conditions. They want eduaction and social justice. They want jobs and land. They are not satisfied with old methods and ancient slogans.

Their desire, however, is beset by impediments. Population rises at a rate which produces squalor. Key crops have declined in

price while agriculture remains stagnant—Harper's Magazine (July 1961) reports that food production has fallen off in Latin America. Economics are faced with balance of payment problems. People whose ancestors have lived under primitive conditions for centuries demand too much too soon.

The importunate thirst for improvement is not quenched by reasoning. Rather, it becomes disillusioned with the existing order. Here is where the dreamy utopias of communism become go to strive for. Here is where the seductive promises of the demagog strikes fire into men's hearts. Communism moves into the vacuum created by failure and lost hopes. It promises new ways to replace old ones that seem to have failed.

The traditional tools of foreign aid—money, arms, and trained men—have heretofore been used against communism. They were aimed at short range cold war goals. This negative philosophy has had limited success in combating communism and has often created lassitude and contempt. It has not, according to "New Republic," stimulated economic progress or self-sustaining development and has not initiated the economic and social reforms essential to such growth and to political and social stability. Foreign aid now must be aimed at a positive goal—elimination of the disillusionment that plagues the people in the underdeveloped nations. A victory over communism simply keeps the embers of discontent from bursting into flame, but a victory over discontent eliminates it.

Our Declaration of Independence holds that "all men are created equal" and "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." In order to maintain this importance of the individual, aid must be directed toward the individual. Frequently to much aid that has been given to the top has stayed there, with little filtering down to the people. Stress to build hydroelectric plants and superhighways should be removed in lands where people are starving. Everyone should be able to see the application of aid. Examples of projects are new seed and livestock brought in on the village level to increase food production, trained teachers and organizers to build schools, begin anti-illiteracy campaigns, and teach the fundamentals of public health and scientific farming. This individual approach was used by Drs. Doolittle and Seagreaves. People need something that will benefit its full meaning.

The key to success of work aimed at the individual is to get the individual himself involved. People not only have specific needs, but also pride, self respect, and a great capability if properly lead. The situation in the developing countries today is not unlike that in the America of the 1830's. It was of that period that the Frenchman DeToqueville observed "a vast number of associations are formed and maintained." The strength of the association is not only that it stimulates group activity at the present time and shows people their strength, but also that it stays on and can be used in the future to overcome other difficulties and perpetually encourages group investment.

Full improvement cannot be obtained, however, by simply helping the individual and including him in the plans. Projects must be carried out that are spectacular, that will thrill the populace to greater efforts. Such a project is one that can be pointed to so as to show that real progress has been made. Individual projects must be on a grand scale—central teachers' training schools and model farms are projects of this type. The many problems must be assigned priorities.

This "weeding out" of problems takes planning—it cannot be started "willy nilly" as suggested by G. Mennen Williams. Before now, aid has been a political grab bag, America has given aid to every nation that has threatened to begin relations with Communist nations. This method was unproductive, cynical, and often wasteful. Countries, like people, have morals—friendship has no price. There is a way to promote positive goals and reduce politics at the same time. Experts of the country or group of countries involved, with the advice of the U.S. experts, should decide where funds should be placed. A symbolic relationship such as this was advocated by J. Gilbraith (April 1960 "Foreign Affairs"), P. Drucker (July 1961 "Harpers") and was successfully used in the Marshall plan. Where possible, these groups should be grafted onto existing organizations such as the Organization of American States or our military and trade organizations. As progress occurred, more and more control would be given to the nationals, and American advisers would fade into the background. It is probable that goals would be improved as nationals found that they were helping themselves.

At home, planning must be aimed at long range goals. Communism seems to be the wave of the future simply because it plans for the future. To date, allocations for aid have been shackled to slight changes in the public atmosphere and a lot of yearly wrangling in Congress. Funds must be thought of in terms of 4 or 5 years in order to carry out plans in terms of decades (our most successful aid plan, the Marshall plan, took 13 years.) Without recurrent doubt about capital, newer and greater things can be accomplished.

Foreign aid should not become an end in itself, nor should it become overly independent. American foreign aid should be a unified part of the Nation's whole foreign policy. It can do its best if it is supported by and supports other foreign action such as diplomacy and military action. American aid could reap dividends by coordinating its activities with private aid groups such as CARE and church groups.

In planning for aid, care should be taken to make note of the action of the United Nations and affiliated groups. Above all, American foreign aid must be coordinated with that of its European allies. The old colonial powers—France, England, and Belgium—are experienced in helping the newly independent nations of Africa and Asia. "West Africa—is kept ticking because of British and French advisers and technicians—Belgians have kept the Congo's economy on its feet."[1] American aid, combined with the work of other organiaztions can greatly increase its benefits.

Steps have already been taken along the path that is urged here. The "Alliance for Progress" is molded on the idea of cooperation and self-help rather than giving. The Peace Corps is an example of a group of experts that can use the personal approach. President Kennedy's new borrowing program will enable him to loan aid without risking an uproar in Congress. Popular discussion and support of a new kind of aid program is growing. A continuance along these lines will produce foreign aid with much more far reaching effects.

Foreign aid should not serve the negative aim of combating communism, but the positive aim of increasing the well being of those it aids. It can do this by concentration on the individual, long range planning, coordination, and full mobilization of its potential. Even then, foreign aid cannot provide an easy victory over the troubles of today, but it can go a long way toward bringing the promise of modern life closer to the subsistance of many and raising the position of the individual to face the problems of tomorrow.

---

[1] Stewart Alsop in "Saturday Evening Post."

Address for Dedication of the New Addition to Anniston Memorial Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on January 14, 1962, Congressman KENNETH A. ROBERTS made an outstanding speech at the dedication of an addition to the Anniston, Ala., Memorial Hospital. Because I feel that this speech delivered by Congressman ROBERTS is so worthy, I ask unanimous consent that the entire speech, related editorial, and the newspaper account of the event be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address, editorial, and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEDICATORY ADDRESS BY HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE, FOURTH DISTRICT, ALABAMA, ON THE OCCASION OF THE DEDICATION OF NEW HOSPITAL ADDITION TO ANNISTON MEMORIAL HOSPITAL, JANUARY 14, 1962

I am glad to be at home with you today and to participate in dedicating the new addition to the Anniston Memorial Hospital.

After all the snow, sleet, and ice, I am glad to be here on this beautiful day of sunshine and although I cannot take the credit for it, I am happy that this splendid day has been blessed with good weather.

I appreciate the high honor of being chosen as the principal speaker on this program, but had it been possible for our senior Senator to be here I would gladly have taken second place and would have been happy to say a few words in introducing him to this fine group of people.

We are grateful to Senator HILL for the splendid contribution he has made in the field of health and medical science. I said on one occasion at the dedication of the District Four TB Hospital that I was grateful for the fact that Senator HILL did not follow in the footsteps of his illustrious father, the late L. L. Hill, and enter the medical profession. I know he would be a wonderful doctor, but I feel that in his more than 30 years in the Congress of the United States, he has accomplished even more in behalf of the suffering people than he could have as a member of the profession of the healing arts.

He personally expressed his desire to be present on this occasion and asked me to say that he made every effort to be here, but due to the pressure of affairs in Washington he was unable to be with us today.

I am happy to be Senator HILL's counterpart in the House of Representatives, where, as chairman of the Health and Safety Committee, I have the privilege of steering most of the health legislation which is then acted upon by the Members of the House and sent to the Senate.

Senator HILL is a sound advocate and one of the most able men in the history of our country for better health for all.

I am sure that most of you are familiar with the history of the Anniston Memorial Hospital which is now near completion of step one of a multimillion-dollar expansion program.

I congratulate the hospital board of trustees, the city commission and the county commission for the insight shown in the construction of this basic facility. This unit will someday expand into a 400-bed in-

stitution. Completely equipped, this first unit cost over $1.8 million. It was jointly financed by the city of Anniston, Calhoun County, the State of Alabama and the Federal Government through a Hill-Burton grant.

The hospital board of trustees: Mr. Marcus Howze, chairman; Dr. Sam Crabtree; Mr. Richard Monk; Mr. T. J. Laney; Mr. William F. Andrews; and the late Mr. Lee Tanner; the city commission: Mayor George T. Morris, Mr. William S. Weatherly and Mr. Claude F. Dear, Jr.; the county commission: Mr. Dan Gray, Mr. Roscoe Simmons and Mr. Earl S. Morgan, and the administrator, Mr. W. Boyd Jones have done a fine job in providing Anniston with the best of medical facilities. With their continued support and the support of the many interested people and agencies, this is becoming an outstanding medical center serving much of the southeastern area. Even today the Anniston Memorial Hospital is serving many patients from out of the State and many others make long journeys to the hospital from other parts of Alabama to receive the services that are provided here.

Due to the efficient operation of the hospital charges today are below those of other hospitals of similar size. This being accomplished by working into a complete program of automation that incorporates the use of electronic data processing equipment. Today, medical records, the patient billing, payrolls, inventories and other accounting programs and controls are part of this operation. There are many unique enterprises which make the Anniston Memorial Hospital a leader in the field.

The hospital is now receiving a Federal grant for a study which is the only one of its nature in existence. The study is of the correlation and interrelationship of the general acute hospital, the convalescent hospital and the nursing home. This hospital is now sponsoring a nursing scholarship program and is providing scholarship loans to 10 nursing students in schools of their choice.

One other program which the hospital takes great pride in is the hospital auxiliary. The "Pink Ladies" are doing an exceptional job in and for the hospital.

Another factor that makes Anniston Memorial the hospital that it is, is the outstanding quality of the medical staff serving the hospital. Presently, there is a medical staff of 60 members which includes consultants on all specialties. There are 40 active members of the staff of which over half are board qualified physicians.

The Anniston Memorial Hospital is one which every citizen in the area should feel a great deal of pride and comfort in knowing that they have such a facility serving the needs of the sick and injured. They can look to the future knowing that their health needs will be met by the hospital and its staff.

The final completion of this hospital will probably be done in four steps. The first, which is being completed now, is providing the service areas for the 400-bed complete unit. Included in the new structure will be surgical, obstetrical, X-ray, physical therapy, laboratory, and emergency room departments. X-ray is now an outstanding department and in the near future will incorporate a radioisotope laboratory not now available in most hospitals. X-ray film will be processed by an automatic device called the X-O-Mat which will give a completely processed dry film in 6 minutes. Cutting the time required in X-ray processing will facilitate smoother operations in areas where X-ray findings are mandatory. For special work there will be a Polaroid cassette which will give a processed film under certain conditions within 60 seconds.

The physical therapy department, which will be an added department of the hospital, is a service seldom found in hospitals of this size. This will be the only such institution in this area of Alabama.

The laboratory facilities will be in the new unit and will be equipped to do the latest in laboratory procedures. This laboratory will serve other hospitals in the area in providing specialized work.

This hospital will be completely air conditioned with necessary mechanical facilities for rooms throughout the building to provide the maximum comfort for patients. The latest in heating and cooling equipment is being installed in the new structure. The emergency room is being relocated into the new unit so that it will be in the closest proximity to the major traffic lanes of the city.

The hospital, which is a city within itself, will house modern laundry facilities providing clean and sanitary linens. Each patient in the hospital will use about 10 pounds of clean linen daily. There is adequate storeroom space being provided.

Many hours of planning, selecting colors, matching furniture, working out the traffic flow, and determining the best location of facilities to serve the largest number of people have been incorporated in the planning.

This unit, which we are dedicating today, is a start on an institution which will be modern in every respect and will stay abreast of current medical developments and will bring to Anniston the very latest in hospital treatment.

I would like to pay tribute to the builders, the architect, the contractor, and the workmen whose handiwork we see in this beautiful structure.

This construction is typical of the Hill-Burton program which is an outstanding landmark in the field of health legislation. This program is one form of Federal-State cooperation which proves that there are areas in which the Federal and State Governments may join hands for the benefit of the people.

It is my understanding that out of a total cost of over $1,800,000 for this new addition, the Federal share is in excess of $860,000.

It might interest you to know that for the fiscal year 1962, the Federal Government will contribute for hospital and medical facilities construction in the State of Alabama almost $6½ million.

A hospital is more than bricks and mortar. It is more than furniture and equipment. It is a place where health services are rendered to bed patients and outpatients. It is important not only because of the fact that breadwinners are restored to health but also in terms of our total national economy. Hospital operations are the fourth largest industry in the United States with expenditures over $8 billion annually.

Mankind is in a constant battle against disease and the Congress is constantly trying to find answers to the ravages of cancer, heart disease, arthritis, and other crippling and killing illnesses.

In my opinion, the Hill-Burton Act is now permanent legislation and will be continued into the future as it has won the approval of the Congress. Other efforts will constantly be made to expand medical services to meet new challenges on the health front.

The Subcommittee on Health and Safety on which I serve as chairman is interested in enlarging medical services to the aged and the infirm who need some care but require less than full-time hospital services. We are seeking to provide this care through the Community Health Services and Facilities Act of 1961. This will furnish new and improved home nursing services which will be rendered in nursing homes and in the private homes of the patients.

There are still other ways of looking at a hospital: a hospital is a training facility for the health professions. Interns and residents, registered and practical nurses, therapists, and others receive an important part of their professional training in a hospital. I am particularly glad to know that our own hospital is now sponsoring a nursing scholarship program and is providing scholarship loans to 10 nursing students in schools of their choice.

Our committee is very much aware of the great need for more health personnel: there is a shortage of doctors, dentists, registered nurses, practical nurses, and other health personnel. In a few days our committee will start hearings on legislation recommended by President Kennedy which is designed to increase opportunities for training personnel. The contemplated program provides for the construction of medical, dental, osteopathic, and public health teaching facilities. It also provides for scholarships in these fields.

I have introduced a bill known as the National Defense Nurses Training Act which will provide for grants in the form of scholarships to increase the supply of nurses. This bill is awaiting the report from the Surgeon General's Commission before further action may be expected.

Insofar as practical nurses are concerned, Congress during the last session enacted Public Law 87-22 which extends to July 1, 1965, the program of Federal aid to practical nurse education which was begun in 1956. I am very proud of the fact that the initial authority for this program was included in legislation which was reported favorably by our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and that the program has proved to be an outstanding success.

A hospital is not only a facility for the treatment of diseases. It can also be used as the focal point for programs for the prevention of diseases. Community programs for the inoculation of children against diseases can be based on hospitals as to the extent that adequate facilities for such purposes can be made available. We, on the committee, agree with President Kennedy that every child should have the benefit of modern medical research and feel that improvements in the field of prevention should be made to as many persons as possible. Our committee is planning to consider legislation authorizing Federal grants for community projects which have as their objective the inoculation of entire age groups in such communities against polio, whooping cough, measles, tetanus, and other diseases for which effective vaccines are available.

Our experience in this country with polio vaccine has demonstrated that the availability of the vaccine by itself does not assure that all or even most of those who are in the most susceptible age groups actually will be inoculated. We must find ways to make certain that the fruits of research in the prevention of disease will benefit our entire population, and that large segments of our population will not remain unprotected for whatever the reasons may be: ignorance, lack of diligence, lack of facilities, and personnel, or lack of financial means.

One of the most important efforts on the part of the new administration is the bill on which I will hold hearings calling for the creation of a new National Institute of Health in the field of child health. This institution will do much to improve the lot of handicapped children—the blind, deaf, and retarded child. I believe this new bill will receive almost unanimous support in the Congress.

Research into prevention of diseases, however, is not the only field of prevention in which our committee has been greatly interested. Our hospitals know very well that accidents take a frightful toll, and that many beds are occupied by victims of accidents, automobile accidents, industrial accidents, and accidents in the home. I have introduced a bill which is now pending before our committee to establish at the Na-

tional Institutes of Health a National Accident Prevention Center. I feel very strongly that expanded research in this field can pay huge dividends not only in preserving human health and happiness but also in terms of dollars and cents saved. The cost of accidents is startling, and we can do a great deal more than we have been doing in order to prevent accidents altogether, or prevent at least the worst physical and economic harm which results from accidents.

Last but not least, we should be thinking of hospitals as places where individuals highly skilled in different health professions learn to work as a team for the benefit of the patients as well as for purposes of improving the performance of their respective specialties. The time has long passed when the lone practitioner treated patients. More and more the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of diseases requires the wholehearted cooperation of the various health professions and the hospital is certainly one of the places where such cooperation is practiced.

A hospital in the best sense thus is a facility which offers endless opportunities for cooperation—cooperation to render services, cooperation to conduct research, cooperation between Federal, State, and local governments and private groups to make possible the construction of these facilities, cooperation to prevent diseases, and cooperation to train health personnel.

In this world of ours where cooperation is so badly needed to assure not only a better life but to assure survival itself, in this world—we are proud yet humble to point to the symbol of cooperation which we are dedicating today.

WE MUST NOT STOP

All Annistonians were filled with a sense of pride Sunday afternoon as they were given the privilege of inspecting our new multimillion dollar hospital. It was well, too, that prime credit for such an excellent institution should have been given to W. Boyd Jones, a leader in that field.

But while we are felicitating some of the other leaders who have made possible this great advancement in public health, it is well to look back and give a tribute to some of the pioneers in hospitalization, whose work should not be forgotten.

Prime credit, in the opinion of this paper, should go to the Sellers brothers who built and operated what was our first accredited institution of that kind. Drs. Bowcock and Huger followed in the wake of the Sellers with a makeshift hospital in the old Barr House at 14th and Leighton.

That institution having been found to be inadequate, another hospital building was erected at 12th and Quintard. But that, too, was found to be too small for our needs, so then the city as a whole undertook the establishment of an accredited hospital at the site now used for permanency.

In this latter movement we should not forget, along with the doctors, the late Gen. R. E. Noble, one-time Acting Surgeon General of the U.S. Army, and the late Col. George O'Connell, who helped get the needed funds, and who later became head of public health in this part of the State.

There were, of course, many others who helped to convert the W. W. Stringfellow home on the old Anniston High School site, into a nursing home, for which purpose the old Sellers building and others are now being used.

There were, also, scores of good citizens who helped to bring into being the excellent structure that was dedicated Sunday. And among them were Senator LISTER HILL and Congressman KENNETH ROBERTS, who are now working together in the Senate and House, and whom we should remember at election time.

HOSPITAL ANNEX OPENED, IMMEDIATE USE IS PLANNED

(By James Chisum)

Hospital authorities expected to begin moving patients into the new addition to Anniston Memorial Hospital today.

Dedication ceremonies were held Sunday for the addition and J. R. Frye, assistant administrator, said some patients entering the hospital this week will be placed in the spanking-new wards and rooms.

Frye estimated that up to 5,000 people toured the four-story addition Sunday afternoon following the dedication ceremonies. Approximately 1,000 persons heard a dedication speech by Representative KENNETH ROBERTS, remarks by local officials, and symbolic acceptance of the addition by the hospital staff.

The large turnout for the rites was probably due to the pleasing weather—only a bit cloudy when the ceremonies began at 2 p.m., with the sun flashing out occasionally, and the air outside almost balmy after the freezing temperatures of the past week.

Representative KENNETH ROBERTS, in a brief dedicatory address, lauded the people who had a hand in building the new addition, cited it as an excellent example of cooperation between local, State and Federal governments, and described forthcoming legislation in the field of health.

Early in the speech, the Congressman noted the contributions of Senator LISTER HILL.

Citing his gratefulness that the Senator had not become a doctor, ROBERTS said, "I know he would be a wonderful doctor, but I feel that in his more than 30 years in the Congress of the United States, he has accomplished even more in behalf of the suffering people than he could have as a member of the profession of the healing arts.

"This construction is typical of the Hill-Burton program which is an outstanding landmark in the field of health legislation," he said, adding, "This program is one form of Federal-State cooperation which proves that there are areas in which the Federal and State governments may join hands for the benefit of the people.

"It might interest you to know that for the fiscal year 1962, the Federal Government will contribute for hospital and medical facilities construction in the State of Alabama almost $6½ million," ROBERTS continued.

He told his audience that hospital operations are the fourth largest industry in the United States and that expenditures in the field total over $8 billion each year.

BILLS ARE LISTED

Pointing to the efforts of Congress in finding answers to the problems of health, the Fourth District Congressman then described a number of bills and acts in the field.

"I have introduced a bill known as the National Defense Nurses Training Act which will provide for grants in the form of scholarships to increase the supply of nurses," he said, adding that the bill is now awaiting a report from the Surgeon-General's Commission before further action can be taken on it.

Referring to the efforts of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—of which he is a member—ROBERTS said some legislation is designed to prevent diseases.

"Our committee is planning to consider legislation authorizing Federal grants for community projects which have as their objective the innoculation of entire age groups in such communities against polio, whooping cough, measles, tetanus and other diseases for which effective vaccines are available," he said.

"One of the most important efforts on the part of the new administration is the bill on which I will hold hearings calling for the creation of new National Institutes of Health in the field of child health," the Congressman said.

"This institution will do much to improve the lot of handicapped children—the blind, deaf and retarded child," he said, adding, "I believe this new bill will receive almost unanimous support in the Congress."

BILL IS INTRODUCED

The Representative said he has already introduced a bill to establish a "National Accident Prevention Center" at this Institute.

ROBERTS, a well-known advocate of safety features on automobiles, was presented a plaque at the hospital dedication ceremonies by a nationwide insurance company, citing his "safety crusade."

Mayor George Morris, of Anniston, introduced ROBERTS. The program also included remarks by Don Gray, chairman of the Calhoun County Commission, who said "We started 12 years ago having meetings about this addition, and this is the result."

Marcus Howze, chairman of the hospital's board of trustees, presided over the ceremonies. He introduced a number of local officials who were present, read a congratulatory telegram, and noted the receipt of others.

The Reverend J. Phillips Noble pronounced the invocation and Dr. R. Laurence Dill the benediction. Members of the emergency and rescue squad and the Boy Scouts helped visitors find a parking place and ladies of the hospital auxiliary assisted in conducting tours of the new addition.

The U.N. and the Congo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial in the New York Times of today, entitled "The U.N. and the Congo."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE U.N. AND THE CONGO

In one of its finer hours, the United Nations Security Council has sharply rebuffed Soviet attempts to instigate new violence in central Africa by refusing to dignify with a debate the Soviet complaints about developments in the Congo.

The Council thus endorsed the protests of Premier Adoula and a score of other African governing heads denouncing the Soviet demand for a new war against Katanga as an unfriendly act which could disturb the peaceful settlement now underway. The majority of the Council, in indefinitely postponing debate, heeded Ambassador Stevenson's advice to allow those now conducting the vigorous and skillful U.N. operations in the Congo to continue their work without interference.

What is especially significant in the adjournment vote of 7 to 2 is that the Russians were able to rally on their Rumanian satellite to their side and were left in the lurch by their principal African supporters, the United Arab Republic and Ghana, which abstained. The heads of these two states, Presidents Nasser and Nkrumah, are the main leaders of the far-left Casablanca group which is boycotting the Lagos summit meeting of 20 less doctrinaire African countries seeking African unity. Their action in the Council is a hopeful indication that they are

becoming aware of Soviet designs in Africa and that all African States may yet stand together in resisting political intervention from the East no less than from the West.

Times and Change—Then and Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOFFMAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we read and hear every day the expressions "rightwing" and "leftwing" to describe our colleagues, organizations, and individual citizens. With the change of times and events history repeats itself. One of our eminent statesmen, Thomas Jefferson, admired by both great political parties noted changes in his day. His observations are recalled in the guest editorial by Robert H. McGimsey in the Phoenix Gazette reprinted in the Chicago Daily Tribune of January 24. Were he living today some no doubt would place him in the category of "rightwing."

The editorial follows:

GREATEST RIGHTWING EXTREMIST OF ALL

(By Robert H. McGimsey)

The United States grew and prospered for about 150 years when along came a few politicians who began changing it from a democracy, owned and operated by the people, to a welfare state, owned and operated by willful men in Washington, D.C. These men are political deviates who have much to gain from their plans. In a very real sense they are trying to quietly overthrow constitutional government and put in its place a centralized bureaucracy which they will operate as they think best.

These willful men insist on silencing all opposition. Anyone who speaks out against their radical schemes and policies is called a rightwing extremist. Seldom have the freedom-loving people in this country been so severely tongue lashed by their President as recently when he called them rightwing extremists merely because they resist present attempts to take away their rights and express their concern over the steady advances of communism.

The New Frontier can be regarded as a movement of secession from the constitutional government of the Union. It attempts to abrogate much of that contract entered into in good faith between the States, and set up a different sort of government in place of the one agreed to by them. The following words of Thomas Jefferson sound as though he were talking today:

"I see * * * with deepest affliction, the rapid strides with which the Federal branch of our Government is advancing toward the usurpation of all rights reserved to the States, and the consolidation in itself of all powers, foreign and domestic, and that, too, by constructions which, if legitimate, leave no limits to their power. Take together the decisions of the Federal court, the doctrines of the President, and the misconstructions of the constitutional compact acted on by the legislature of the Federal branch, and it is but too evident that the three ruling branches of that department are in combination to strip their colleagues, the State authorities, of the powers reserved by them, and to exercise themselves all functions foreign and domestic * * *."

If Thomas Jefferson were living now, he would doubtless be looked upon by some as the greatest "rightwing extremist" of all.

Survey of Newspaper Readership in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we, as a nation, enjoy—and benefit from—the most varied, informative and authoritative information media in the world.

Over the years, newspapers—even with the innovations of TV and radio—have continued to be a major mainstay in our public information program.

By creative research, reporting, writing and editing, these publications provide the U.S. readers with a rich reservoir of timely news, features, editorials, commentaries and other articles of informative, intellectual, cultural and spiritual value.

Recently the American press published an informative survey on the significant role which newspapers continue to play in the daily lives of Americans.

I ask unanimous consent to have the articles printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOST WIDE-SCALE STUDY EVER MADE OF NEWSPAPER AUDIENCES SHOWS READERSHIP FAR BEYOND EXPECTATIONS

Rich man, poor man, beggar man—all find a daily newspaper to be almost as important as their daily bread. If they can't afford to buy it they borrow it or pick it up on trains or buses—but few Americans go through a day without partaking of the mental diet of news and features offered by the Nation's newspapers.

Although this fact has been generally accepted in a hazy sort of way, not until last month was the full impact of newspaper readership set down in concise, statistical form—based on the most exhaustive study ever made of public reaction to newspapers.

And the reaction was found to be amazingly good. Anyone who ever had the idea that newspapers might be on the way out and TV on the way in will certainly abandon such a viewpoint when they realize: 86.6 percent of U.S. households still buy or borrow at least one daily newspaper on the average day; only 28 percent of those interviewed said they would "feel lost" without their TV; 49 percent, however, said they would "feel lost" without their favorite newspaper—and the newspaper has its greatest appeal to the higher income groups. Add these facts together, and there is no doubt that newspapers are still way out front and have been hurt little, if any at all, by the advent of TV.

But comparison with TV was only a sidelight of the survey. Its chief aim was to measure, from every angle possible, the who, what, why, when, and where of newspaper readership.

The study was financed by six Canadian paper companies through the organization which they formed 5 years ago, called the Newsprint Information Committee, and was conducted by the Audits & Surveys Co. in consultation with the Advertising Research Foundation. The foundation is an unbiased fact-seeking organization backed by leading national advertisers and advertising agencies.

First presentation of the findings was made to leading manufacturers and advertising agencies at a meeting at the Waldorf-Astoria in New York on November 29. The presentation was made, with the visual motion process, by two leaders of the Bureau of Advertising of the American Newspaper Publishers Association—Charles T. Lipscomb, Jr., president of the bureau, and Dr. Leo Bogart, vice president for marketing, planning and research.

This is the first successful attempt, Mr. Lipscomb said, to measure the full scope of a major communications medium through all of its individual vehicles. The threefold objective of the research, he added, was: to provide an accurate description of the true pattern of newspaper reading behavior; to describe the role daily newspapers play in the lives of people as citizens and consumers; to measure the full dimensions of the daily newspaper as a national advertising medium.

"The companies which have underwritten this research," said Mr. Lipscomb, "have made an outstanding contribution to accurate measurement of the daily newspaper's full dimensions. Advertisers, agencies, and newspapers will all benefit from this forward-looking effort."

Member companies of the Newsprint Information Committee are: Abitibi Power & Paper Co., Ltd.; Anglo-Canadian Pulp & Paper Mills, Ltd.; Anglo-Newfoundland Development Co., Ltd.; Donnacona Paper Co.; MacMillan, Bloedel & Powell River, Ltd.; and St. Lawrence Corp., Ltd.

The project involved a probability sample of 4,826 interviews with individuals 15 years of age and older, representing 2,449 households drawn from 622 sampling points.

Among the many significant facts about the daily newspaper's readers uncovered by the study are these:

SCOPE OF READERSHIP

Of the 54 million households in continental United States, 86.4 percent read at least one newspaper on an average weekday; 80.4 percent of homes buy and read at least one paper each day; and another 6 percent read one or more papers on a passalong basis.

Four out of five adults, 21 and over, and 72 percent of the country's 13 million individuals between the ages of 15 and 20 read a newspaper on any given weekday. In the course of a 5-day period, 88 percent of adults read a newspaper on one or more days.

Total newspaper readings by adults on every weekday are 125,500,000 and by the teenagers, another 12,750,000.

Eighty and one-half percent of American men, and seventy-nine percent of the women read a newspaper daily.

The average reader reads 1.4 newspapers a day.

Readership among Negroes runs closely behind readership in white families.

Highest concentration of daily primary readership is in the East North Central States with 88.7 percent of all households. The similarly rich marketing areas of the Middle Atlantic and Pacific States also average high readership—respectively, 85.4 and 85.2 of all households.

Readership of Sunday newspapers is also impressive. By purchase or passalong, more than 72 percent of American households get a Sunday paper.

READERS BY INCOME GROUPS

The kinds of people who make the best customers read the paper most thoroughly, read more papers, and spend more total time reading. The greatest readership intensity is reached among those who are better educated, earn more money, and have more responsible jobs.

Two-car households have 91.1 percent readership and one-car households 81.4.

Newspapers are read significantly in households of all income levels. However, heaviest concentrations is in households with $7,500 to $9,999 income—94.1 percent. In homes with incomes of $10,000 and over, daily readership is 92.9 percent.

Households in the $5,000 to $7,499 bracket average 86.9 percent primary readership. Of the householders making $3,000 to $4,999, there is 77.7 percent primary readership plus 8.2 passalong.

Under $3,000 households average 60 percent readership and 9.9 percent passalong.

By occupation, households headed by higher executives and business managers are 97.3 percent newspaper readers.

The percentage remains high through the gamut of occupations, even unskilled laborer households registering 72.7, with an additional 10.5 percent passalong.

USE OF NEWSPAPER

Regarding the actual use of the newspaper, the study reveals that apparently Americans do more than just read it. They actively use it in a number of ways: 53 percent report they have clipped some item other than advertising out of the paper in the past 3 months; 27 percent still have the clipping at home; 18 percent have sent or passed along a recent clipping to someone else; 28 percent have clipped advertisements, and 15 percent recall buying the product.

Four out of five like to look at the newspaper ads even when they do not plan to buy anything. Within the past 3 months, 23 percent of the people have bought a newspaper-advertised item by mail or phone.

READERSHIP BY LOCALITIES

Average-day readership of daily newspapers is high in metropolitan areas and smaller communities alike.

The highest rate is in places of 50,000 to 499,999 population—88.2 percent of all households buy a newspaper. Another 5.3 percent of the households get the paper through passalong.

In the bigger cities—places of 500,000 or more population—there is daily readership by 84.9 percent of all households with another 5.7 percent as pass-along or secondary readers.

Suburbanites scored high as newspaper readers, with 84.2 percent of all households, plus 5.2 percent secondary readership.

In nonmetropolitan areas, the perusal of newspapers is a daily habit in 79.7 percent of homes in areas of 2,500 to 49,999 population. In areas of less than 2,500 population the percentage is 65.1 with a high added passalong readership of 7.3 percent.

SOURCES OF NEWSPAPER

Seventy-one percent of the time, the newspaper reaches the reader by means of regular home delivery—by newspaperboy usually, and by mail. In 25 percent of the cases, the newspaper is bought at a store, a newsstand, or a self-service rack. "This regular pattern of home delivery," Dr. Bogart commented, "provides the basic context for the social role of newspapers as a family medium."

READING HABITS

Two-thirds of the people have an habitual time for reading the newspaper. It takes place at every time of the day. However, the newspaper is not normally read in a single sitting. The typical reader picks up and looks into his paper 2.4 times each weekday.

PERSONAL CONTACT

The newspaper emerges from the study as an important hometown institution with which the public comes into intimate contact in a variety of ways: 43 percent have visited the paper's office or plant; 45 percent have placed classified ads; 23 percent have written or phoned the newspaper for information; 8 percent have written letters to the editor.

People have an intimate relationship with their newspaper. Half of all readers report that they are regular readers of a particular writer or columnist, and most of these feel a strong personal attachment to him.

These are only the highlights of the study, the results of which will be presented to groups of advertising men in leading cities throughout the country.

This is one of two newspaper studies sponsored by the six member companies of the Newsprint Information Committee which produce about 40 percent of Canada's newsprint output. Douglas W. Ambridge, president of the Abitibi Power & Paper Co., Ltd., who is current chairman of the Newsprint Information Committee, said that they are putting up approximately $100,000 for these studies, because they feel it is to the interest of newsprint producers to work closely with their prime customer in helping to maintain and better the newspapers' competitive position.

Headquarters of the committee are at 150 East 42d Street, New York City.

An On-the-Go Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the team of President Kennedy and Vice President JOHNSON—the merger of Boston and Austin—is a fine example of how the President and Vice President of this Nation can operate smoothly and efficiently for the national interest.

There were some who were quick to say the combination of Kennedy and JOHNSON would not work. I am pleased to say that from the first days of the Democratic Convention in 1960—and even earlier—I felt this was an unbeatable team at the polls and in the White House. After a full year of this teamwork, it has been proven that individually and together they serve ably and well and both have done much to advance the interest of this country and the free world.

Their close association and the large amount of responsibility that the President has placed in the Vice President is clearly indicated by an excellent article by Cecil Holland which appeared in the Sunday Star.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

JOHNSON KEEPS ON THE GO AS PRESIDENT'S NO. 1 MAN

(By Cecil Holland)

A few weeks ago Vice President JOHNSON was jogging over his Texas ranch when he was overtaken by a telephone message.

President Kennedy was calling from Palm Beach, Fla. He wanted the Vice President to join him, Secretary of Defense McNamara, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff in a final review of the 1963 defense budget. Soon the Vice President was on the way.

Last August he was sitting with the ailing Speaker Sam Rayburn when the President called. It was a critical period in the continuing Berlin crisis and the President wanted Mr. JOHNSON to fly there. The West Berliners, it had been decided, needed a boost to their morale and reassurances that the United States was standing firm.

SEEN EFFECTIVE MISSION

The next night after a round of conferences at the White House, the Vice President took off. He regards this as one of the most effective missions he has performed for the President.

Such assignments have become commonplace in the Vice President's life on the New Frontier.

As the Kennedy administration moves into its second year, the President and Vice President appear to have developed a close working relationship. They describe it repeatedly as a partnership.

Some people, who have wondered how the Vice President would adjust to the role of second man after years of bossing the Senate, have suggested that Mr. JOHNSON was showing signs of restlessless in his new job.

Mr. JOHNSON brushes aside such comments as idle gossip. "I don't know anybody who could enjoy life more than I do," he tells his friends, "or be more occupied."

AMONG BUSIEST YEARS

The first year in the new administration, he says has been one of the busiest in his life. At the behest of the President he traveled 75,000 miles outside the United States and visited 14 foreign countries.

His office estimates that the Vice President has made more than 250 speeches, 43 of them major ones. He has represented the President at many events and ceremonies, in this country and abroad. Social and other engagements take the Vice President out nearly every night when he is not entertaining at home in line with his desire "to try to show up at some of the places and take a little of the load off of the man."

Associates of the President and the Vice President say their relationship has been a smooth one. The President has praised Mr. JOHNSON from time to time as the most effective Vice President the country has ever had.

CLOSE RELATIONSHIP

A close relationship began developing right after the election. As President-elect, Mr. Kennedy called Mr. JOHNSON to Palm Beach to consult with him about the new administration and members of the Cabinet without asking him, however, to approve those he eventually named.

When Mr. Kennedy decided he did not want to sit on the Space Council, the law was changed at his instance and the Vice President was named in his place. In many other ways the President has given expression to making the Vice Presidency something more than figurehead or ceremonial office.

For his part, the Vice President offers advice only when asked, and he sees his role as working as closely as possible with the President in carrying out the administration's program. "It is one thing to be a pilot," he remarks to friends, "and another thing to be the copilot."

In addition to his trip to Berlin the Vice President considers his work as Chairman of the President's Commission on Equal Employment Opportunities and his round-the-world mission which took him to India and Pakistan as the other highlights of his first year in office.

AGREEMENTS OBTAINED

Under his direction the commission has obtained pledges of nondiscrimination from companies employing more than 3 million workers. Before the current year ends the Vice President expects to have signed agreements from other companies including the automotive industry employing 1.3 million more.

The trip to southeast Asia, undertaken at the President's request, was for the purpose of negotiating agreements to strengthen defenses against communism.

An unexpected byproduct of this mission was the Vice President's meeting with Bashir Ahmed and an invitation for the Pakistani camel driver to visit the United States as his guest.

WEARS MANY HATS

The Vice President wears five or six hats, including advising the Peace Corps.

In 1 recent week he was called to the White House on 5 separate days. At a luncheon there for Democratic leaders he said the merger between Boston and Austin was the last Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy had allowed. The President repeated the comment at the Democratic fundraising dinner that night and added "it has been one of the most successful."

Since this is a decisive legislative year for the administration, the Vice President may not be doing as much traveling as last year. But no one can say "This fellow," the Vice President says, "wants everybody around him to earn his salary."

The Peace Corps in Ghana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Chicago Defender newspaper, under recent date, by Enoc P. Waters, one of the outstanding newspapermen of our time.

The substance of the article confirms my conviction that the organization known as the Peace Corps has done and will continue to do an outstanding service in the area of better understanding between people of the United States and the officials and the people where they serve.

In addition thereto, this exceptionally fine corps of young people will revitalize the principle that all of us are in truth our brother's keeper.

GHANA'S PEACE CORPS HEAD EXPECTS EXPANSION TO 200

(By Enoc P. Waters)

While a rash act by a naive American girl had excitable Nigerian students looking for sinister motives behind the Peace Corps, 50 other youthful volunteers in nearby Ghana were quietly demonstrating how effective the controversial Peace Corps program can be.

Philadelphia-born George Carter, obviously pleased with the success of the Peace Corps program he directs here, glowed over requests for 70 more volunteers and reported he expects that their ranks will swell to 300 by the end of 1962.

Like its counterpart in Nigeria, the group here is composed of secondary school teachers, most of them fresh out of college.

Mr. Carter's contingent which got an open-arm reception when it arrived in August, quickly adjusted immediately and buckled down to its classroom tasks.

The 29 young men and 21 young women, including two married couples (one of which was joined together in holy wedlock while I was here, with Mr. Carter giving the bride away) and two Negroes are spread out thin over 27 villages, towns, and cities in 33 schools over a 180,000-mile area.

As typical of America as hotdogs and baseball, they come from 14 widely scattered States, all types of family backgrounds, worship God in many different ways and were educated at schools as widely different as Harvard and West Texas Teachers College.

But in one thing all their differences become meaningless, their mission: to fill a void by sharing their knowledge with others less advantaged. It's not greatly rewarding financially ($38 per week plus $75 per month banked for them at home) but it is handsomely enriching in experience.

Living intimately among a people with a different cultural heritage and in many cases far off the beaten track they'll emerge in 2 years smarter in the ways of Africa than many of today's so-called experts.

And, having to devise many of the teaching aids available at home and revise many of the methods they learned to suit the peculiarities of the people and the area, they'll also wind up much more resourceful.

So the rapport that has been established between the two groups—the American and the African—is mutually beneficial, each enriching the other.

Carter, who studied toward a doctorate in philosophy at Lincoln University, Pennsylvania, and Harvard, is a 5-year traveler in Africa and Asia, worked with the American Society for African Culture, the World Assembly of Youth, and as a consultant on Africa and Asia before joining the Peace Corps.

Here with his French wife and two children, his job is that of shepherd to a flock of youthful (average age: 24) idealists. Their teaching assignments, their classroom duties, their housing, and their pay are all the responsibilities of the Ghana Government.

Mr. Carter will mediate any differences that might arise between the neophyte teachers and their employers (none has arisen), is responsible for their off-duty conduct (all good so far), and looks after their general welfare (like expediting the return home of a youth whose father died).

Though his headquarters is in Accra, Mr. Carter spends more than a third of his time visiting the schools where the volunteers teach, and trying to provide for them some of the tools they need to do an effective job.

Starting his rounds in September, he completed the circuit recently when he delivered a jeep to Ray Spriggs of West Chester, Pa., one of the two Negro teachers, who had to trudge 16 miles a day back and forth to his classroom. (The other is Ophelia DeLaine of New York City.)

Since Richard and Antoinette Port were husband and wife when they came here, Mr. Carter saw to it that they got assignments in the same school.

He had no such problem in the case of Lucille Carmichael who married Thomas Miller, an American contract teacher, at the same school where she was assigned. But as a matter of routine he had to approve the marriage, and at the couple's invitation gave the bride away.

The Ghana contingent was the first to go into action in a foreign field and indications are that it is setting the pace for all the others through its warm acceptance, its effective accomplishment and the urgent requests of the Ghana Government for more of the same.

What's the Secret?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of January 29, 1962:

WHAT'S THE SECRET?

Representative JOHN E. MOSS, Democrat, California, as chairman of the House Government Operations Committee, has been insisting that the Federal Government should tell the people what's going on. As a foe of the coverup, he uncovered a peach of a case of stupidity recently when he found out the Peace Corps was entitled to classify its documents.

This means the Peace Corps has a Presidential order allowing it to hide reports and records on the ground they are top secret. R. Sargent Shriver, Corps chief and brother-in-law of the President, had the gall to claim this order was necessary because the Corps conducts negotiations with foreign governments.

Nonsense. The Peace Corps is an idealistic organization, mostly of young collegians who aren't quite missionaries, nor are they point 4 engineers. They have volunteered to help underdeveloped countries catch up with the 20th century and the top secret billing is absurd. More power to Representative Moss as he battles to clear away the unnecessary iron curtains in Washington which separate the people from their own Government.

Breakdown in West Virginia of the Kerr-Mills Federal Medical Assistance Program for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend the Washington Post and Times Herald published two articles by its able Welfare Reporter, Eve Edstrom, on the breakdown in West Virginia of the Kerr-Mills Federal medical assistance program for the aged. Once again, Mr. Speaker, we have an illustration of the inadequacy of this program as a response to the urgent need to provide a sound comprehensive program of medical and hospital benefits for the retired.

Piecemeal legislation is inadequate. Mrs. Edstrom's articles show this through the West Virginia experience. Several weeks ago I introduced in the RECORD an article in an Oregon Labor newspaper, showing the pitiful inadequacy of the Kerr-Mills approach as it is applied in my home State of Oregon. I am certain that the program as it operates, or perhaps better as it does not operate in other States adds further evidence that the Kennedy administration's recommendations in this field should be enacted this session. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that these two articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WEST VIRGINIA MEDICAL PROGRAM REFLECTS WIDER ISSUES

(This is the first of two articles on how the Medical Assistance for the Aged program is working out in West Virginia. Material for the articles was gatered from official records and interviews.)

(By Eve Edstrom)

Medical assistance for the aged has developed a jaded reputation in West Virginia, the State which has had the longest experience with the program.

In fact, the majority of West Virginia's doctors and hospitals deserted the program in December when their fees were cut back because the State ran into financial difficulties.

By January 23, the doctors had returned to the fold but only after these events occurred.

Increasing national attention was being focused on reports that some doctors and hospitals had abused the program.

Reports of the aged being shunted from hospital to hospital and doctor's office to doctor's office in search of needed medical care were growing in volume.

The president of the West Virginia State Medical Association, Dr. D. E. Greeneltch, warned doctors that unless they rallied behind the program, President Kennedy's health care plan for the aged under social security might pass this session of Congress.

The doctor obtained a restoration of fees—while the number of aged who could benefit from the program remained cut in two.

As part o fthe agreement which led to the restoration of fees, the doctors established committees to screen all invoices by doctors receiving MAA payments and "to discuss any problems arising from the operation of the program."

The need for such committees became obvious early in January after West Virginia Welfare Commissioner W. Bernard Smith reported that:

After a schedule of fees for the treatment and hospitalization of patients was agreed upon, some physicians and hospitals billed patients for amounts in excess of agreed-upon MAA charges.

Example: The MAA program paid $831.60 for the care of a 65-year-old patient in a Charleston hospital. When the patient was discharged, he received a bill for $619.03, which included some duplicated charges. After the patient's wife complained to welfare officials, the West Virginia Hospital Association took steps to correct this.

Because doctors received additional fees if drugs were injected, there appeared to be an abnormal spurt in the number of patients who needed injections.

Example: One doctor collected $17,000 for treating MAA patients during 1961. He has submitted another $5,000 in unpaid vouchers. An examination of these vouchers showed an overwhelming number of patients received either penicillin or dramamine.

The fact that other charges could be added to the bill if medicine was prescribed, prompted some doctors to go into the drug-dispensing business.

Example: One doctor was paid $[illegible]00 for medicines in one month and another doctor prescribed so many medicines that one patient would have had to take 143 pills daily to follow the doctor's orders.

PRACTICES ISOLATED

Medical association spokesmen pointed out that such practices were isolated, were not condoned by the profession, and would be the subject of disciplinary action if proven true.

Furthermore, the doctors countered with some charges of their own. They declared welfare officials were administering MAA too loosely and that eligibility qualifications for the program were too liberal.

Despite the fact that the majority of West Virginia's aged have annual incomes of $1,500 or less, they insisted that many of the aged who qualified for MAA benefits could afford to pay for their medical care.

They cited instances of families who insisted on paying for private hospital rooms and round-the-clock private nurses for aged relatives but then expected doctors to accept the MAA fees as full payment for services. They also said there were cases of aged patients who qualified themselves for MAA benefits by transferring cash assets to relatives.

WHO-STRUCK-JOHN

While some of the who-struck-John charges are irrelevant to the major issue of providing the best possible care to the aged who need it there are indications that West Virginia's experience with MAA strongly supports congressional testimony given last July by Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Abraham A. Ribicoff.

At that time, Ribicoff said the Medical Assistance for the Aged program—known as the Kerr-Mills bill when it was enacted by Congress in the fall of 1960 to stave off social security financing of health care—had some built-in dangers.

Any State which actually tried to meet the medical needs of the aged could go broke under the program, Ribicoff said. Furthermore, he warned MAA could become a political football, with Republicans and Democrats trying to outdo each other in election years by promising increased medical benefits.

POLITICAL FACTS

Actually, financially depressed West Virginia never would have become the first State in the Nation to adopt MAA if it had not been for the political facts of life as they existed in that State in the fall of 1960.

Just after Congress authorized open-end Federal matching grants to States for the program, West Virginia's Republican Gov. Cecil Underwood called a special session of the State's Democratic legislature.

The session was set for October 3, one month before Underwood was to run against Democrat JENNINGS RANDOLPH for the U.S. Senate.

SPECIAL SESSION

In telegrams to all State legislators, Underwood said the special session was for the express purpose of permitting West Virginia to take full advantage of the medical care program.

The program is designed to help the aged who are not poor enough to qualify for public relief but do not have enough financial resources to pay for their medical and hospital bills. Each State determines eligibility qualifications and the extent of benefits.

RANDOLPH, who ultimately was successful in the Senate race, warned legislators that they would be assuming an enormous financial burden in adopting the program of benefits outlined by Underwood.

He said Underwood was underestimating the cost of the program and it was not actually as sound as financing health care under social security would be. Originally, the legislature was told the plan would cost $5 per case but the actual cost was $67.70 per case.

Underwood discounted RANDOLPH's warnings and Arthur S. Flemming, then Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary in the Eisenhower administration, came to West Virginia to speak for the program.

Democratic legislators were fearful of repercussions from aged voters on election day. Many of them also believed Congress would enact social security financing of health care in 1961, making MAA a negligible supplementary program for those who did not qualify for social security benefits.

And so the legislature adopted the program for aged persons 65 or over who had net annual incomes of not more than $1,500. But they left it up to the former State welfare commissioner, an appointee of Underwood, to establish other eligibility criteria and benefit schedules.

GENEROSITY PERILED WEST VIRGINIA MEDICAL AID FOR AGED

(Second of two articles)

(By Eve Edstrom)

For a poverty-stricken State, West Virginia embarked on an extremely liberal medical assistance for the aged program in October 1960.

Benefits for the aged who could not pay their medical bills were not as comprehensive as plans later adopted in Hawaii, Massachusetts, and North Dakota.

But in terms of payments to doctors and hospitals as well as eligibility qualifications for the aged, West Virginia's plan was relatively generous in contrast to other States.

And it was these generous features that almost caused the plan's financial collapse last month, states West Virginia Welfare Commissioner W. Bernard Smith.

Smith, an appointee of West Virginia's Democratic Governor, had no hand in establishing the criteria for the program.

DESERTED PROGRAM

And when he tried to cut back medical and hospital fees, doctors deserted the program which has been pushed by the American Medical Association as the answer to social security financing of health care.

When West Virginia became the first State to adopt the program, Republican Gov. Cecil Underwood was running for the U.S. Senate in opposition to Democratic candidate JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

Original conservative estimates for the MAA program were shelved. Underwood's welfare commissioner established a program which permitted aged couples to qualify for benefits if their combined annual income did not exceed $3,000, their liquid assets were not more than $7,500, and their real property, exclusive of the homestead, was not valued in excess of $20,000.

"This qualified practically everyone in the State, including aged doctors and aged newspaper reporters," Dr. D. E. Greeneltch, president of the West Virginia Medical Association, said.

Payment for medical services was based upon 75 percent of the Charleston Blue Shield plan. A $5 fee for house visits during the day and a $7 for night calls were allowed.

This was $1 or $2 higher than fees paid to doctors treating patients on public relief. But the most marked discrepancies existed in surgical payments.

FORTY DOLLARS MAXIMUM FEE

For example, under MAA, a doctor could be paid as high as $187.50 for surgery. But a $40 maximum surgical fee is allowed doctors treating relief clients.

Similar discrepancies existed in payments to hospitals. For recipients of relief grants, hospitals are allowed 90 percent of cost up to a maximum of $20 a day.

But under MAA, hospitals received 100 percent of the average cost per patient per day. Thus, one hospital received $33.18 in MAA funds for daily patient care.

In many instances, the hospital payment rate was more liberal than that provided by private health insurance plans.

This led to charges that some hospitals, particularly those with empty beds in rural areas, were extending the hospital stay of MAA patients to the full 30 days allowed under the benefits schedule.

Hospital association spokesmen deny this and note that doctors determine the length of a patient's hospital stay. Welfare officials quote statistics showing that the average hospitalization for MAA patients is 3 days longer than that of relief clients on general medical assistance rolls.

Initially, the program appeared to get off to a slow start. In November 1960, only 46 patients were treated, at a cost of $366 to West Virginia and $974 to the Federal Gov-

ernment under the matching formula, which lets Uncle Sam pick up 70 percent of the medical tab.

COSTS CLIMB

But by November 1961, the monthly medical outlay exceeded $500,000. Cases treated numbered 10,305, at a cost of $370,611 to the Federal Government and $160,222 to West Virginia.

By the end of November, the program had cost more than $3 million and there was an estimated $1.5 million in outstanding medical and hospital bills. (Doctors, hospitals, and druggist have 90 days in which to submit bills.)

Fearing that local funds for the program soon would run out, State Welfare Commissioner Smith ordered a sharp curtailment of the program December 1. Actually, the cutback reduced the program to what had been proposed originally to the legislators.

If applicants had any real property, other than their home, they were ineligible for benefits. Limitations were placed on the amount of liquid assets an applicant could have. Such actions reduced the number of eligible persons by 50 percent.

TWENTY DOLLARS PER DAY TOP

Payments to hospitals were cut so that no hospital could receive more than $20 a day for patient care. Doctors were placed on the same fee schedule in effect for the treatment of public relief clients. This meant no doctor could receive more than $40 for surgery.

Furthermore, doctors were asked to sign participating agreements which stated MAA payments constituted total payments and the client will not be subjected to any additional charges.

In addition, the welfare department no longer allowed payments for drugs dispensed by doctors in counties where there was at least one drugstore. And payments to pharmacies were restricted to the manufacturer's wholesale price plus a small service charge for each prescription.

With the imposition of these restrictions, doctors and hospitals boycotted the program. Eventually a few returned but as of January 19, only 33 of 125 hospitals and 192 of more than 1,500 doctors were participating in the program.

Although doctors and hospitals said no needy sick person was being denied treatment, a Beckley, W. Va., newspaper published a letter from a minister who charged that two hospitals and two doctors refused to treat an ill woman who died the following day. Subsequent published accounts quoted a Beckly funeral home director, whose ambulance driver had taken the woman to the hospitals, as saying that the two private hospitals had instructed him to bring no more MAA patients for care.

CHARGES IN CHARLESTON

Another newspaper reader wrote the Charleston Gazette to tell how her mother-in-law, blinded by cataracts in both eyes, had been scheduled for surgery January 19 but that on January 5 the hospital informed her that welfare patients were not being accepted.

"I read * * * the other day that no one in this country is denied medical aid because of inability to pay for it," the reader said. "I wish whoever made that statement could see my mother-in-law.

"She sits day after day staring through sightless eyes, hoping for a door to open for her that is now closed. And day by day the cataracts are doing more damage."

Commissioner Smith asked all local directors for documented cases of ill persons being denied care.

Two cited instances of patients dying after being refused care. One of these involved a wheelchair case who couldn't breathe when hospital admittance was sought.

Other directors said the aged ill received care only after "a very sick patient had applied to several sources." And there were numerous reports that druggists were not filling prescriptions, even for a patient who "cries for something to relieve pain around the heart."

EXAGGERATION ALLEGED

By January 10, funds available for other welfare programs were transferred to the MAA fund. Doctors contended the funds always had been available and that welfare officials had exaggerated the financial crisis.

By January 23 when Smith was called before the State legislators to explain welfare difficulties, he announced that he had agreed to restore the former medical fee schedule and would not require doctors to sign the participating agreement. The doctors ended their boycott of the program. Similar agreements were being worked out with the hospitals.

But Smith and his assistant commissioner, L. L. Vincent warned that restoration of the fees to doctors and hospitals may mean a further tightening of eligibility requirements for beneficiaries with fewer and fewer of the aged qualifying for care.

Both Smith and Vincent state that the only humane and financially feasible way of meeting the health needs of the aged is through the social security system as proposed by President Kennedy.

But neither hospital nor medical spokesmen agree. They say West Virginia's experience shows only that welfare officials were ill equipped to handle the program and that now it may be possible to work out some plan by which the Blue Cross or Blue Shield mechanism could be used to provide for MAA patients.

Welfare Director Smith finds this extremly strange. Prior to national announcements from the American Medical Association and the American Hospital Association concerning wider application of Blue Cross and Blue Shield plans for the aged, Smith said he was unable to interest local representatives of the plans in taking on the MAA clients.

Bellamy Flag Award to Topeka, Kans., High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, in 1953, Annapolis High School of Annapolis, Md., received the 12th annual Bellamy Flag Award, and last year a representative of that school participated in the presentation ceremony at which the 20th annual award was made to Topeka High School of Topeka, Kans. The Marylander who participated in this event was Neil M. Brennan, president of the Annapolis High School Student Council.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of his address be printed in the Appendix of today's RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I bring greetings from the State of Maryland, the birthplace of our national anthem, and from Annapolis, its illustrious and historical capital.

Founded in 1649 and chartered in 1708, Annapolis has grown to national and international prominence.

It is the home of St. John's College, established in 1696, and now recognized as one of the Nation's leading classics and fine arts centers of learning. Francis Scott Key, the author of "The Star-Spangled Banner," was an alumnus of St. John's.

Annapolis is also the home of the U.S. Naval Academy, established in 1845.

Because it is the capital of Maryland, Annapolis is a noted political center and has played an important role in the Nation's affairs since early colonial days.

Today Annapolis boasts of a prosperous seafood industry, a growing electronic industry, and is one of the finest ports on the eastern seaboard, offering advantages in boating, fishing, crabbing, and oystering. It is also the home of Annapolis High School.

Annapolis High School, recipient of the Bellamy Award in 1953, is ranked scholastically as one of the highest in the State. Many prominent lawyers, doctors, and scientists have attended our Annapolis High School. Dr. George Basil, a medical missionary to China and now on the Johns Hopkins medical staff; Dr. Robert Bass, a Rhodes scholar was selected in 1960 as the Young Maryland Scientist of the Year; and Prof. Edward T. Heise, a member of the staff of the U.S. Naval Academy Foreign Language Department and the author of a French textbook now being used in our school, were all graduated from Annapolis High School.

The foreign language courses at Annapolis High include French, Latin, and Spanish, and next year we hope to add German. Our science courses of physics, chemistry, zoology, and biology are complemented by a $140,000 science laboratory. Courses in mathematics include calculus and analytical geometry. We at Annapolis High are proud of our school, proud of our city, and proud of our State.

What is the U.N. Worth?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to an outstanding editorial written by John McCormally of the Hutchinson News, Hutchinson, Kans. His views are genuinely American, and serve to remind us that the United Nations is a worthwhile effort toward peace:

WHAT IS THE U.N. WORTH?

How popular is the United Nations in the United States?

BARRY GOLDWATER wants to write the U.N. off as a failure. So do many other spokesmen on the far right in this country and their strange bedfellows abroad, the Communists.

But do the American people believe in the U.N.? Do they have faith in its future? Would the most vocal supporters of the U.N. put their money where their mouths are?

Why not try to find out by asking the American people voluntarily to invest their money in the organization? The United States has been asked to buy $100 million worth of U.N. bonds being issued to help the U.N. out of financial difficulties. The purchase is being debated in Congress. Chances are it will be approved and the bonds will be bought, indirectly, by the American people through their taxes.

But how much more emphatic before the world would be this gesture of support if it were made directly—if our Government would authorize the U.N. to offer its bonds for sale directly to the American people in small enough denominations to allow nearly everyone to participate.

It might backfire, of course, if Americans did not respond. But I believe they would. The bond issue, after all, is less than 60 cents per person in the country. Even an imperfect effort for peace is worth that.

More Farm Folly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy's special message on agriculture is more notable for what it does not say than for what it does say. It raises more questions than it answers.

The Nation's wheatgrowers will certainly want to know much more than is set forth in the message about the details of the program proposed for them. They will want to know, first, how much of a further reduction in wheat acreage they will be called upon to take. Will the national wheat acreage allotment be 45 million acres, or 35 million or even 25 million? The message does not specify.

The President says that "marketing certificates would be used to assure growers a price support level between 75 and 90 percent of parity on the domestic allotment and up to 90 percent on the export allotment." Thus, while the range of flexibility in price supports for the domestic allotment is set forth, there is no indication as to how low supports for the export allotment might be dropped. The figure could, presumably, be set anywhere between 0 and 90 percent of parity.

I believe farmers will also want to know how much Government-owned wheat would be removed from inventory each year and dumped upon the market. The authority to do this could be used as a club to depress prices artificially and thereby force farmers to divert additional acres from wheat production.

Farmers will want to know more about the President's proposal to establish a "mandatory acreage allotment on all feed grains." Even the present feed grains plan is supposedly voluntary, although the Government has, in fact, saturated the market with its own holdings as a means of herding farmers into the program. Many farmers utilize on their own farms all of the feed which they produce. Mandatory feed grain production controls would, for these farmers, also become mandatory controls over their livestock operations.

Implied in the section of the message relating to land utilization is the ultimate diversion of perhaps 50 million acres or more of cropland "to recreational, aesthetic, and economic purposes." Farmers, I am sure, will want to know how many of them will be retired from agriculture under such a program.

As the President noted, each year 1 million people move from the farm to the city. If this rate is to be stepped up, perhaps underlying the administration's proposal to create a Department of Urban Affairs is the recognition that a new agency will be required to deal with the problems of displaced farmers.

Fritz Kreisler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, last Monday, January 29, the music field lost an outstanding contributor with the death of Fritz Kreisler. The passing of Mr. Kreisler, whom I was proud to have as a constituent, will be felt by the whole country.

Fritz Kreisler's contributions have brought richness, power, and grace to American music. Few, if any, have demonstrated the talent to equal that of Fritz Kreisler as a violinist and composer.

A fine tribute to Mr. Kreisler by Mr. Harold C. Schonberg appeared in the New York Times on January 30 and I should like to insert it in the RECORD:

FRITZ KREISLER STOOD APART FROM THE MAINSTREAMS OF VIOLIN PLAYING

(By Harold C. Schonberg)

The art of Fritz Kreisler was unique, and among his colleagues he was unanimously considered the greatest violinist of the century. He was the product of no school, and was one of the most individual performing musicians in history, apparently having formed his style from the very beginning. His earliest recordings, made around the time of World War I, contain much the same elegance and aristocracy that one remembers of his playing from the 1930's.

He was apart from the two mainstreams of 19th-century violin playing. The Paganini style, with its emphasis on technique and slam-bang virtuosity, was one. The classical school of Louis Spohr, continued by Joseph Joachim, was the other.

Kreisler was neither a fiery virtuoso nor a classicist, though he had plenty of technique and could play Mozart, Beethoven, and Brahms with as much musicianship and knowledge as any classicist.

Where he differed from all other violinists was in his charm, and in the sheer aristocracy of his musical conceptions. That aristocracy extended to his platform manner. There was something regal about Kreisler on the stage; and yet, without condescension, he could take the audience into his confidence and give each member the idea that he was playing for him and him alone.

His tone was of unparalleled sweetness. Generally he used rather short bow strokes, with a pronounced but not too heavy vibrato. Above all violinists he had an infallible sense of rhythm and rubato. Rubato is the subtle alteration of rhythm without losing the basic metrical pulse of the music, and it was this use of rubato that lent such charm to Kreisler's playing.

With his innate taste, he never distorted a musical phrase. His interpretations were natural, unforced, and glowing. Everything about his playing was natural. He once said that he practiced very little. Perhaps that is what lent the incredible spontaneity to his playing.

When Kreisler stepped on stage to play a Mozart Concerto or a Beethoven Sonata, he seemed to be recreating the music. One would follow the printed page with growing amazement. Kreisler apparently did nothing that no other violinist did, yet he accomplished results that none of them seemed to come near accomplishing.

His playing went far above tone or technique. There were in his day, and today also, violinists with bigger tones and more spectacular techniques. As always, it devolved to the man.

As a musician, Kreisler had more of the imponderable elements that go into great playing than any of his contemporaries. His conceptions reflected the charm and aristocracy of his nature—a charm that contained elements of the Vienna of Franz Josef's day, of Paris in the 1880's, of a more relaxed century and a more gracious way of doing things.

And yet there was nothing dated about his playing. To his very last days on the concert stage he never could be called an anachronism, because his conceptions were so utterly musical, so completely lacking in eccentricity, and so convincing on their own terms. There was not a living violinist who did not bow to Kreisler as a master.

As a composer he wrote what might be described as transfigured salon music. If the test of music is longevity, Kreisler's music bids fair to be immortal. He would have been the last to claim that his "Liebesleid," "Liebesfreud," "Schoen Rosmarin," and "Caprice Viennois" were tremendous intellectual contributions to music. But they are as good as anything written in that genre, they have given great pleasure to millions, and they will be played as long as there are violinists who can lift a bow.

And thus at least one aspect of Kreisler will live on, even though his playing will only be a faded memory on a handful of old phonograph records. But even that memory will be cherished, for through those records comes a measure of the essence, fragrance, charm, and purity that went to make up a Fritz Kreisler.

Naming the Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, traditionally letters to the editors of our newspapers have been a forum for the American public. I read these letters faithfully because they usually are enlightening and they indicate what is foremost in the minds of the people.

This morning, Mr. Speaker, a short letter was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald. This letter, written by Mary McD. Brouse, of Charles Town, W. Va., concerns the naming of the airport under construction to serve the Nation's Capital City. I agree with what she has to say, and under leave to extend my remarks include it in the RECORD:

NAMING THE AIRPORT

I was grieved to read that the great name of John Foster Dulles may be dropped from the airport named for him. He certainly gave heart and soul to his country and should not be forgotten so soon.

Are we imitating the Russians and trying to obliterate the names of those who do not agree with the present status?

MARY McD. BROUSE.

CHARLES TOWN, W. VA.

Rural Radio Threatened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHIL WEAVER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues what could be a crippling blow to the voice of rural America. The Federal Communications Commission is at the moment considering a proposition which could forever silence that voice as we have known it for the past generation or more. If the Commission acts to still this voice, there will be a great void in the lives of the farm citizens of the United States.

I refer, Mr. Speaker, to FCC Docket 14419, a proposal to amend rule 3.87, dealing with the so-called daytime only or daylight broadcasters in this country. The idea is to limit these broadcasters to the period from official sunup to official sundown each day.

I am deeply disturbed by this proposition because it will affect the everyday lives of many thousands of my constituents, and will affect hundreds of thousands of others who have chosen to live in our rural areas. These are the men and women who have plunged their roots deep, not only into the soil of our Nation, but into its history and its future as well.

The farm citizens and residents of small, somewhat isolated communities throughout the country, do not have the benefit of early morning delivery of a daily newspaper. In large part they must depend for early-morning news on the local radio stations which are dedicated to strictly localized service. These stations operate on low power for the most part and serve as their primary market area a very limited community. Because their market area is so limited in scope, they must perform services which are not performed and cannot be performed by other radio stations across the country—or even in cities located close to them.

Many farm families in our State of Nebraska have written to me and have told me that they depend for their daily planning as well as for general world news and entertainment on these local daylight broadcasting stations. The early morning weather reports are of vital concern to every farmer. He must know, for example, how much rain has fallen and how much is likely to fall in the area immediately surrounding his farm and between his farm and the nearest town or the nearest main highway. He cannot afford, through lack of this knowledge, to mire his truck or other equipment in the mud. His knowledge must be precise and it must be strictly localized.

Although every major radio station includes in its coverage area and farm territory some market information, this information usually deals with Chicago or Kansas City quotations. This is material of importance to all farmers. Equally important, however, is precise knowledge about market conditions in his immediate area. The major radio stations just do not have time to provide the market quotations for every small market across America and, so, the farmer is without this vitally needed information unless he can, during the early morning hours, listen to a local radio station.

Again, in many hundreds of cases, the only local radio station is a daytime-only station.

Residents in small towns across the country also gear their daily lives to the information which they can get only through their local radio stations. In many of these communities there are weekly newspapers or afternoon dailies. However, the morning papers must come from some distant point and contain little that is strictly local in the way of news.

Likewise, radio stations located in some distant city do not have the time to devote to the local happenings in some small town in Nebraska. Let me cite an example—just one of many. In McCook, Nebr., there are daytime-only stations which provide local news, weather reports, and other information. The full-time stations, to which the people can listen with the greatest ease, are located in Denver, New Orleans, and Oklahoma City.

It would be impossible for these stations to provide a list of parent-teacher workshops that might be planned for McCook that morning, or some meeting at the Red Willow County courthouse which might be of extreme importance in McCook but would not create a ripple in Denver, New Orleans, or Oklahoma City. Obviously, they must depend in large part—particularly for last-minute changes—on the local stations to provide them with this type of information.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the engineering problems involved in the postsunset hours. Interference mounts rapidly during the minutes immediately after sunset and continues at a high level until about midnight. From midnight on, there is a sharp decline in the amount of interference which a midwestern or western radio station can make in the operation of any station to the east of it. In fact, in the hour or two immediately preceding sunrise, the only possible stations where interference would be any serious factor at all would be those stations in the same time zone with the daylight broadcaster.

This matter has been before the Commission for many years. Dozens of these daylight broadcasters have had their licenses for decades, and they have been renewed from time to time by the Commission. Never, until now, has the question of interference in the presunrise hours been such that the Commission has refused to renew the licenses of these stations on a broad scale.

In Nebraska alone there are some 15 such daylight stations outside of urban Omaha which would be affected directly should the Commission deny them the right to the airwaves prior to actual sunrise. Many of these stations are old-line stations. One, I can cite, WJAC, Norfolk, Nebr., has had a license as a daylight station for some 40 years. There are many others which have served the public for a great length of time.

Under existing rules, these stations, or at least many of them, have the right to open as early as 4 a.m. They do, however, have to close down at sunset, but at least can provide the kind of early-morning broadcasting service needed and appreciated.

These stations depend, in large part, upon this early morning service for their operating revenues. I have been told by one station manager that if his station is cutback to sunrise-sunset operations, it will cost his station some 132 hours of broadcast time monthly. He estimates that this will immediately lower by 20 percent the revenue of this station and because of this, his station will no longer be able to provide early morning service and thus attract the early morning farm audience. Therefore, conservatively it will amount to a further 10 percent cut in revenue because once an audience is lost, it is almost impossible to regain it.

All of this will mean, I am afraid, that his station will have to cut its staff by about 25 percent. This staff cut will mean a further reduction in the amount of service the station can provide, and the circle gets more and more vicious.

This is the story of just one radio station. It applies, as well, to stations throughout the country. It will be repeated time and time again across our land unless the Commission sees fit to follow the history and the tradition of the past and allow these broadcasters to retain their present operating hours.

Mr. Speaker, unless they are allowed to continue providing this service and through that service receive a normal, fair, and reasonable revenue, these stations one by one will go off the air. The voice of rural America will be stilled—all Americans will be the losers.

Is This Trip Necessary?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland Plain Dealer, of January 29, 1962, carried a very timely editorial concerning the forthcoming world tour of Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial as follows:

IS THIS TRIP NECESSARY?

Robert F. Kennedy, Attorney General of the United States and younger brother of the President, soon will be off on a world junket. Thus he joins, unofficially, the already bulging corps of diplomats charged with keeping the President informed on situations around the globe.

Not only does the trip imply the President doesn't have confidence in his appointed diplomats but young Bobby's trek gives the impression the United States, internally, is in great shape—such great shape that the head law man can take time out to size up the rest of the world and straighten out the kinks. This is contrary to what Bobby has been shouting for the past year. He has been pleading for tougher laws and more power to combat interstate crime. He has said that things are in a mess, crimewise, in our country.

There is tradition of a minor league variety in sending a President's brother on oversea missions because former President Eisenhower sent Milton Eisenhower to Latin America as an emissary and factfinder. But Milton wasn't a Cabinet officer with definite responsibilities in the internal affairs of the country. Bobby Kennedy is so charged. Milton Eisenhower wasn't spectacularly successful in his mission and we don't expect anything else from Bobby.

We wonder what Bobby can find out in Europe, Africa, Asia, the Middle East, the Far East that Ave, Chester, Soapy, or any of the other traveling specialists couldn't uncover and we wonder if this trip, no matter who pays for it, really is necessary?

Private Initiative Creates a Healthy Economy With More Jobs and a Better Living for All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fuzzy economic plans of the President's economic advisers, the only way we can build a healthy economy, create more jobs, and continue to give our people the highest standard of living in the world, is to unleash the full power of private enterprise. Government cannot create wealth or prosperity. Only a free people, allowed to operate in a free society with sufficient reward for risk and initiative can maintain prosperity. Along this line the following editorial from the Dallas Morning News offers some pertinent thinking:

NO PROFITS, NO PROGRESS

Will profits of corporations, before taxes, total $56.5 billion in 1962, one-fifth higher than last year? Businessmen would like to think so, though few are so optimistic. This increase is assumed by the Kennedy administration which counts largely on these profits for more tax revenue to finance more spending.

Taxes, however, are one of the biggest detriments to the very business expansion and corporate profits that Government must have for tax income.

"Our present tax system places an enormous drag on our economy," Walter E. Hoadley, vice president and treasurer of Armstrong Cork Co., told a conference of American Bankers Association in Chicago.

Unless the tax system is modified soon, he continued, "to strengthen incentive and reward risktaking, the much-desired speedup in our national growth rate may be farther away than any of us like to think.

"We must allow the most powerful growth incentive our system provides—profits—to stimulate more innovations."

What profits do to help everyone was emphasized recently by Roger M. Blough, United States Steel Corp. board chairman.

Calling profits "the tonic and energizer of our economic lifestream," he cited an analysis of the 10-year employment record of 50 large firms. The 25 most profitable enterprises had increased employment by 20 percent. In the same years, the 25 least profitable firms reduced employment almost 10 percent.

Business must provide jobs and tools for 13,500,000 new employees in the next decade. Investment of $20,000 per worker is necessary, which means that additional capital investment of $270 billion must be provided by industry. But in 1950, corporate profits after taxes amounted to 9 percent of national income; by 1960 they had dropped to 5½ percent.

For progress, there must be opportunity to profit. This is true of the farmer, who can grow in size and efficiency only if he has incentive and means to buy land and tools. It is true of small business, even more than of the larger industry. Most of all, the Federal Government must have profitmaking private enterprise, retaining a fair share of those profits, as the essential foundation for national strength and growth.

Profits today are viewed with suspicion by too many Americans. There is nothing wrong with profits—and many things right with them. Profits should be popular, for profits are the sparkplug that keeps private enterprise functioning. And private enterprise makes the United States strong.

This Will Bear Watching

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a column by Mr. Tom Griffin, editor and publisher of the Ramona Sentinel. Mr. Griffin points up the dangers of the continued delegation of power of the executive department. Mr. Griffin is a Democrat, but is not dazzled by the administration's grab for unlimited power:

THIS WILL BEAR WATCHING

President Kennedy is asking Congress to grant him authority to increase or decrease income tax rates, as a method to control recession or inflation. In my opinion, to give the Chief Executive this scepter of power would be to perpetrate a perilous encroachment into the rights of citizens to govern themselves.

Traditionally, there has been a militant resistance to Presidential intrusion into congressional taxing power. Mr. Kennedy seeks to soften this opposition with a new formula he hopes will be acceptable.

The President believes that it takes too much time to push tax legislation through Congress under the present system, which requires writing a bill, providing hearings, balloting, etc. Kennedy is correct in assuming that congressional tax legislation is sometimes tedious to an administration "in a hurry." The fact that the President wishes to save time is commendable. But to abscond with the citizens' rights to govern themselves through their congressional representatives to save time is a tragic departure from representative government, and should be resisted assiduously by Congressmen and the individual at home.

The Office of President of United States was never conceived as a station of monarchial power. The requested new power to manipulate taxes; the subtle grouping together of governmental agencies; the effort to unify the armed services under one authority; the plans to control welfare, education, and medicine, and other schemes to bypass traditional procedures, to eliminate the delays and exasperations confronting the President, if more convenient to him are extremely dangerous to our constitutional government and they presume the infallibility of the President. To be sure, the smoothest-running governments today are the totalitarian socialist. These governments have succeeded in eliminating all opposition and redtape confronting the dictator's programs—programs in which the citizens' opinions are not sought. It would be most convenient to the President to bypass congressional procedures altogether, but would be disastrous to the Nation. We must withhold such power from him.

Though right or wrong, the Chief Executive has plans which he intends to carry out. To hold the reins of the economy in his hands, to manipulate business by his raising or lowering of taxes is to presume that the free enterprise economy of the United States is now devoid of vitality, and unable to right itself under conditions of fluctuation. It presumes also, that fluctuation in the economy, seasonal or otherwise, is evil. It refutes the idea that economic fluctuation inspires rededication by this Nation's business people, which in turn promotes efficiency, better products, keener competition, and attitudes attuned more to future planning.

The tax control plan, in my opinion, can be the steppingstone to eventual administrative control of commerce and of the whole economy—socialism exemplified.

All-American Canal Study Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a proponent for the construction of an All-American Canal, linking Lake Erie and Lake Ontario, I wholeheartedly concur with the recommendation made by the Army Corps of Engineers that a detailed survey should be made.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Buffalo Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., dated January 16, 1962, in support of this recommendation:

ALL-AMERICAN CANAL STUDY NEEDED

The door to further examination of the feasibility of building a canal through the

Niagara Frontier on the American side to link Lake Erie and Lake Ontario has been kept open by the Army Corps of Engineers. It is now up to various interests here and elsewhere in the United States to press for an appropriation of Federal funds to finance a detailed survey of the proposal.

Preliminary studies by the Buffalo District Office of the Corps of Engineers have determined that a detailed survey report on the all-American route is warranted. It is estimated that the study would cost about $2 million.

Mindful that many years passed without any substantial appropriation of funds for improvement of Buffalo Harbor after the economic feasibility of its development had been established, we think it is imperative that western New York interests allow no grass to grow under their feet in besieging Congress for an appropriation for the canal study if hopes to capitalize fully on the seaway's construction are to be realized. The Niagara Frontier had a long history of opposition to the seaway based on the opinion that it would be economically injurious to the area since traffic to and from Lake Erie would pass via the Welland Canal in Canada. A modern passage on the American side clearly would be a boon to seaway shipping and would put Buffalo and the surrounding area directly on the big shipping map of the "Nation's fourth seacoast."

Decade of Change on Great Lakes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, over the past decade, the Nation has experienced extensive changes in its transportation system.

This is particularly true of waterborne traffic on the Great Lakes.

A major factor, of course, has been the development and completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway—a passageway for deep-sea vessels into the hinterlands of the continent.

As a result, the Great Lakes region is now becoming America's fourth seacoast. As yet, however, we have not undertaken the necessary changes in our transportation programs and policies to take full advantage of shipping opportunities on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system.

A major deficiency is the lack of U.S.-flag vessels on the lakes.

Action is needed now, in my judgment, to revise shipping—especially subsidization policies—to enable U.S. carriers to profitably handle Great Lakes traffic, to obtain fair treatment in relation to Federal policies for Atlantic Gulf and Pacific coasts, and to complete with foreign-flag shipping.

Recently, Harry C. Brockel, port director of Milwaukee, Wis., and member of the Advisory Board of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, published an informative article in the Government-Private publication.

Reflecting constructively upon major changes—and the developing problems—of Great Lakes transportation in the last decade, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECADE OF CHANGE ON GREAT LAKES—ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY CONTRIBUTED TO TRANSFORMATION IN SHIP TRANSPORTATION ON INLAND WATERWAYS

(By Harry C. Brockel)

Depending on regional viewpoint, the St. Lawrence Seaway has been described as an economic boondoggle or as an economic miracle. It is recognized as an engineering achievement of the first magnitude, capturing the falling water of the Great Lakes for power purposes, and opening a new navigation route to the very heart of a continent, lifting huge lake and ocean ships more than 600 feet between salt and fresh water.

There is another impact, however, which is increasingly engaging the attention of the shipping world and which will undoubtedly cause furrowed brows in the Maritime Administration and in the committees of Congress dealing with the American merchant marine and domestic transportation. This is the combined impact of the seaway and of modern transportation technology on the ships of the Great Lakes fleet.

Ten years ago, the lake freighters of U.S. registry engaged in the bulk cargo trades on the Great Lakes numbered 266, with a single-trip carrying capacity of 2,635,000 gross tons. In 1960, the U.S. fleet on the Lakes had dropped to 229 ships, with a single-trip carrying capacity of 1,765,000 tons. The Canadian segment of the Great Lakes fleet continued to expand, and in 1960 represented 28 percent of lake fleet capacity, the largest proportion in history.

The story of the Great Lakes fleet is much the same story as automation in industry—large numbers of small, slow, obsolete units being replaced by relatively few, large, and fast units.

A medium-size ore vessel with a capacity of 10,000 tons per trip would require 7 days to make the round trip from Lake Superior to a Lake Erie iron ore port, with a crew of 33 to 36 men. The modern supercarriers which have entered the trade in recent years will carry 25,000 tons per trip, will cruise at 18 knots, will make the round trip in 5 days and will require no more crew than the unit it is displacing.

MANPOWER SAVINGS

Again, the comparison with automation in industry: The slow, 10,000-ton capacity ship will use about 230 man days per voyage to move 10,000 tons of ore; the 25,000-ton carrier can do the job with 175 man days. This is the inevitable answer in the Great Lakes trade to ships costing $8 million to build and operated by $400 per month deck hands.

With 75 ships retired during 1961, and only a handful of new supercarriers entering the trade, it is obvious that some personnel problems are presented. Masters of lake ships are sailing as third mates or are seeking shore jobs, and a much smaller complement of men will find careers on the Great Lakes in future years as the fleet shrinks.

The lake fleet is contending with very high capital costs—$8 million for a new ore carrier, as compared to $1 million a few years ago. It is confronted with wage scales in the lower stratosphere—porters and deck hands in the range of $400 a month plus keep, captains up to $20,000 per year. Mechanized cargo handling still keeps shore costs favorable.

LOWER CANADIAN COSTS

Canadian shipping has an advantage in the lakes, with lower building cost, lower wage scales and lower freight rates, further buttressed by a new program of government support, which is stimulating shipbuilding in Canada for lake service. Canadian carriers dominate the movement of iron ore from eastern Canada to American mills on the Great Lakes, and in fact, the movement of Canadian ore into American ports by an American-flag carrier is by far the exception, rather than the rule.

The huge movement of grain from the upper lake ports into world trade is accomplished by two methods—direct shipment by salt water vessels, or movement by lake-type ships to transshipment ports in the St. Lawrence River. In the case of grain coming out of American ports and moving to Canadian or oversea ports, the American ship operator meets the competition both of the Canadian lake freighter and of low-cost salt-water carriers. The U.S. Great Lakes fleet is currently disturbed over its declining participation in eastbound grain movement.

CANADIAN ADVANTAGE

Hundreds of salt water vessels are entering the Great Lakes, interested primarily in direct oversea carriage, but eligible also to carry cargo between United States and Canadian ports. A proposal that interlake trade be reserved to United States and Canadian carriers by treaty has been rejected by the State Department, which fears retaliation against American ships all over the world, if we were to rebuff foreign flags in their new ventures into the Great Lakes. Within the lakes themselves the Canadian shipbuilder and operator has a decisive advantage over his American competition.

It is for these reasons that the Lake Carriers' Association, and American operators on the Great Lakes, will for the first time in history plead for new legislation to provide Government support for purely domestic carriers. Suggested are construction subsidies, accelerated depreciation, and realistic tax policies.

Time is fast running out for the whole Great Lakes fleet, and the inexorable forces at work point clearly to a transportation revolution.

Divergent Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOFFMAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the problems of balancing the budget, providing employment for those able and willing to work and attempting to keep our economy on an even keel are faced, not only by legislators but by business, labor, and individual citizens. The January 24 editorial of the Chicago Daily Tribune illustrates the difficult position we face in convincing the general public we are cohesive in our efforts.

The editorial follows:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Jan. 24, 1962]

MR. DILLON ON CLOUD 9

We could hardly have expected Mr. Dillon, who has managed to coexist peacefully with Republicans and Democrats alike, to find serious fault with the Kennedy budget when he appeared on Meet the Press Sunday. But neither did we expect the Secretary of the Treasury, of all people, to accept with such apparently unquestioning faith a pro-

gram which, at best, rests on hopes and uncertainties.

He did concede that a long steel strike would throw the budget out of kilter, but barring this, everything seemed to be rosy. The administration's assumption that business would grow so fast this year as to yield an increase of about 20 percent in tax receipts, he said, was "reasonably conservative."

But on the same day Stanley Ruttenberg, chief economist for the AFL–CIO and normally a supporter of the New Frontier, said that the President was overly optimistic about the economy and that the balanced budget was unlikely to materialize.

Mr. Dillon conceded that our balance-of-payments-deficit in the last quarter was running at an annual rate of $5 billion, but assured us that much of this was artificial, caused by yearend adjustments. Mr. Dillon himself took this deficit a good deal more seriously last fall when he pleaded with the International Monetary Fund to take steps for the protection of the dollar in an emergency.

The Secretary echoed the familiar assertion that our main problems are unemployment, economic growth, and price stability—but apparently saw no danger that the President's programs to cope with the first two problems might actually make price stability impossible.

Mr. Dillon saw nothing but goodness and light in the Kennedy plans for foreign aid and farm price supports, both of which have been characterized by waste and inefficiency, and he seemed confident that Congress would raise postal rates even though it refused to grant the 5-cent rate for Mr. Eisenhower.

Mr. Dillon can't be so naive as to believe that things are as rosy as he made out for the television audience. There is no magic way out. There are going to be serious problems and to a large extent they are going to be his own problems. His position and responsibility call for a more honest and realistic appraisal. The Secretary of the Treasury should be more than a promotor of sedative propaganda tablets.

The National Symphony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the National Symphony under the direction of Howard Mitchell performed John Pozdro's "Third Symphony" last night. This morning Paul Hume, distinguished and able music critic of the Washington Post, reviewed the Pozdro work, and I am proud to bring that review to my colleagues' attention. I also invite attention to the fact that the symphony will be performed again tonight, and then tomorrow afternoon, here in our Nation's Capital. John Pozdro, the composer, is a member of the music faculty of the University of Kansas, in Lawrence, Kans.

(By Paul Hume)

Mitchell opened the evening with the first Washington hearing of John Pozdro's "Third Symphony." The composer is a member of the music faculty of Kansas University. His symphony is one of a series of works commissioned by the American Music Center under its Ford Foundation grant.

There are a number of unusual factors about Pozdro's symphony. It is brief and relatively quiet. It stands completely within the idiom of the tonal symphony of Sibelius or Prokofiev, both of whom could be heard in the distance during its course. It is a work of classical design, constantly touched with novel ideas and beautifully allocated throughout the orchestra.

There is surprisingly little sense of motion in the music, with its finest ideas expressed in leisure tempos. The closing of the outer movements was abrupt in both cases, and the allegretto needs further amplification for its fullest meaning to be clarified.

The solo writing, from the opening bassoon onward, is lyrical and appealing. The composer was on hand to thank Howard Mitchell and the orchestra, as well as the audience for its reception of his work.

The evening closed with Kodaly's "Dances of Galanta," played with elastic ease and a gorgeous sound.

Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors Wants S. 1969 Amended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I have been advised of the passage of a resolution by the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County relating to S. 1969 and H.R. 7318—S. 1969 is pending in the Senate, having been amended and passed by the House on September 18, 1961. There is a great deal of concern in California about this legislation which would give permanent status in the airline industry to nonscheduled airlines. This concern arises not only from the tragedy that occurred when a plane of Arctic–Pacific Air Lines crashed on October 29, 1960, in Toledo, Ohio, carrying 16 members of the California State Polytechnic College football team to their deaths, but also from occurrences involving Civil Aeronautics Board and Federal Aviation Agency supervision of nonscheduled airline operations. Under unanimous consent, I include this resolution in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that other Members of Congress may be aware of the feelings of the official governing body of the county of Los Angeles:

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

On motion of Supervisor Bonelli, unanimously carried (Supervisor Dorn being temporarily absent), it is ordered that the following resolution be and it is hereby adopted:

"Whereas present legislation permits independent supplemental airlines to operate under substandard conditions; and

"Whereas the Civil Aeronautics Board has failed to require such airlines to provide evidence of sound financial responsibility and satisfactory safety practices; and

"Whereas Senate bill 1969 and House Resolution 7318, now receiving congressional consideration for final passage, would give permanent legal status to such airlines under the current inadequate fitness requirements: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles does hereby declare its opposition to Senate bill 1969 and House Resolution 7318; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles urges that the proposed legislation be amended to impose greater responsibility on the part of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Aviation Agency in requiring evidence of financial ability and air-safety practices from supplemental air carriers."

GORDON T. NESVIG,
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, State of California

Growth of the Southern California Edison Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert an editorial from the Orange Daily News dated December 15, 1961, commenting upon the successful growth of the Southern California Edison Co. over the last 50 years in the field of private power.

It should be noted that the Southern California Edison Co. is serving the most rapidly growing area in the United States, and has successfully kept abreast of this growth by long-range planning and financing. It should further be noted that this company has never missed a dividend on its preferred and common stock, and pays more than 20 percent of its gross income in taxes, and still maintains reasonable service charges.

The editorial follows:

FIFTY YEARS AGO AT BIG CREEK WE GOT OUR POWER TO GROW

It was just 50 years ago this month that a team of hardy civil engineers tackled the problem of running a railroad 56 miles up into the High Sierra Mountains, 248 miles north of Los Angeles, to supply construction crews on the Big Creek hydroelectric development.

In celebration of this feat and the rest of the project, completed over the years by the Southern California Edison Co. totally without Federal aid or subsidy at a cost of $214 million, we reproduce some facts furnished by Joseph Long, Edison's division manager in these parts, and Glenn Musselwhite, manager of Edison's Orange office.

The Big Creek project, near Fresno, actually is a whole group of projects—dams, powerhouses, and manmade lakes—which capture and harness the power of snow and rain runoff from 1,200 square miles of rugged High Sierra country.

It has generated more than 85 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity during the past 50 years.

To really put this project in focus from our point of view, we must realize that the village of Orange in 1911 had a population of just under 3,000.

The Edison Co., which had been incorporated only 2 years before, had only 500 meters in use here the year the Big Creek project got underway (1911).

Today, Orange has grown to 35,066 population and its residents and businesses are hooked to the Edison Co. (and to Big Creek) by 12,752 meters.

Though the company has many other electricity generating sources—not the least of which is the steamplant here in Orange County at Huntington Beach—it doesn't take much imagination to see that much of the growth throughout southern California and right here in Orange has been made possible by the perseverance of the little band of engineers and construction men who 50 years ago carved Big Creek out of the Sierra wilderness.

We salute the project for doing these impossibles 50 years ago:

Ramming a railroad 56 miles into the mountains around 1,100 curves in 157 days to be named the San Joaquin & Eastern (S.J. & E.) and nicknaming it the "Slow, Jerky & Expensive."

Driving a 13-mile tunnel through solid granite to meet in the middle of a mountain more than 2 years ahead of schedule, digging from both ends and within an inch of perfect alignment.

Designing a complex of eight powerhouses which reuses the same water as many times while dropping it from 7,600 feet to 1,000 feet and making it "the hardest working water in the world."

These things we salute today because they represent the typical American "can-do" approach to tough problems, because the answers were provided through free enterprise and because the resulting electricity gave the Southland the power to grow.

T.Mc.

Student Urges United States To Join Common Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Tom McEntire, 17 and a junior at Falls Church High School, Falls Church, Va., presented a thoughtful comment on the religious aspect of the foreign trade question during a unique youth worship service Sunday morning, January 28, at Knox Presbyterian Church, Falls Church.

His comment is especially timely in view of the President's request for broadened authority in adjusting tariffs.

Tom and his fellow students will soon have the full privileges—and the obligations—of American citizenship. It was reassuring to me to hear his presentation, and I am sure my colleagues will enjoy reading this transcript from his talk:

There are many questions in the conduct of the world today that cause difficulty for the people running Government. If their solutions are placed in the context of "What is the Christian thing to do?" the solutions do not always fit the pattern.

Government is not to blame because Government is the people. We should blame ourselves. For a bill to pass Congress, the people must want it. But is the bill for the good of the country?

Many people who try to influence Congressmen are looking out only for their own interests. The bills sometime show it. These people are concerned about things of personal importance such as jobs and wages. Oftentimes we, as people, do not look to the future, but only at the present.

Is this the way to run a country so that it will always come out on top when not coming out ahead is fatal?

President Kennedy has asked for a reduction of this Nation's tariff walls so that we will be able to compete with the Common Market of Europe. In previous years, the tariff has averaged as high as 48 cents on the dollar value of imported goods. Now the average is down to 10 cents. This is still not low enough to enable us to compete with a market consisting of European countries that are now reducing internal tariff walls.

Many influential people in America are opposed to tariff reduction by our Nation. Some farmers, some unions, some leaders of management, and some factory workers fear competition from cheap European labor. Many of these groups try to get their Congressmen to oppose the tariff proposal. Some of these people do not look into the question as deeply as they should.

Lowering our tariff walls would help, but what we should do is to join the Common Market. This would be a giant step forward in the fight against the sinister influences of the Communist doctrine. The men supporting the Common Market are not businessmen interested in greater profits. Rather, they are politicians with a greater goal. Their ultimate aim is not a tariff-free Europe, but a united Europe—united against the threat of communism.

The European States were a collection of jealous feuding nations with only a mutual distain in common. Yet, those who proposed the idea of a Common Market saw that in the area of production—economics if you will—lay the seed of survival.

In Rome in 1957, six European countries joined in an agreement which aimed at a joint trade program which would stimulate the industrial potential of the six. Three more nations are now seeking admission. Soon all free Europe may be encompassed in the market.

The ties today are economic. Other ties will develop. Eventually, the long dreamed of, and desperately needed, United States of Europe may develop.

If we in the United States fear the competition of the six-country Common Market, we should pause to reflect on the implications of a unified Europe.

The time for our Nation to join hands with our friends in Europe is now. The first step is lowering tariff. There are those in the United States who will fight this. Tariff reduction may not come in this session of Congress—or even the next. It may be that any agreement will be so encumbered with protective restrictions that the real purpose will be obscured.

We must remember this is a Government by the people and for the people. We must take this into account when we make decisions. We are the Government. We must decide what is proper to do. We must think not only of today, but of tomorrow as well. This is our challenge.

Why State Medical Aid System Flopped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interesting editorial from the February 3, 1962, issue of Labor, an international weekly newspaper published in Washington, D.C.:

WHY STATE MEDICAL AID SYSTEM FLOPPED

Some weeks ago Labor reported that the West Virginia program of medical care for the needy aged, undertaken with Federal help under the Kerr-Mills Act, was collapsing for lack of funds at the very time that the American Medical Association was proclaiming the Kerr-Mills program to be a big success.

Why did the West Virginia plan buckle under? Some significant light was cast in a column by noted writer Murray Kempton in the New York Post.

"The State program," he said, "provided a $10 extra fee for treatment by a specialist. Thereupon, a majority of West Virginia's doctors declared themselves specialists.

"The State program granted hospitalization at $35 a day for up to 30 days. Whereupon there was a remarkable rise in patients whose illness required exactly 30 days' hospital treatment.

"West Virginia paid for all drug prescriptions (for the needy aged). Many doctors then discovered a sudden passion for pharmacy. One collected $1,300 a month from the State fund just for drugs."

As a result of such raids by the medicoes on the joint State-Federal program, West Virginia ran out of money and hence slashed medical fees under the program. Whereupon, as Kempton pointed out, the doctors "walked out of the program en masse; only 132 of the State's 1,800 doctors are still participating."

The Washington (D.C.) Post, in several articles about the West Virginia failure, made similar points, but added some later developments. This included information that the program—launched originally by former Republican Governor Cecil Underwood—has since been drastically tightened up so as to slash in half the number of aged eligible for benefits.

Also, funds were diverted from other welfare purposes to the medical aid setup; the higher fee schedules of the doctors were restored, and the medicoes thereupon ended their boycott of the program.

However, West Virginia papers reported many desperate cases of sick aged being barred from treatment under the revamped program, and of some dying after being refused care.

Meantime, at Charleston, W. Va., State Welfare Director W. Bernard Smith declared: "Our experience shows a definite need for handling this problem under social security. A State just doesn't have the resources to carry out an adequate program."

A check with the welfare chiefs of most States would undoubtedly bring the same response. The West Virginia experience is simply one of many facts which underscore the need for health care to the aged under social security and railroad retirement. When will Congress look the facts in the eye and legislate accordingly, instead of bowing to the will of the American Medical Association?

The Cultural Future of Brooklyn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement of timely im-

portance on "The Cultural Future of Brooklyn," delivered by President James M. Hester, New York University, to the Downtown Brooklyn Association, 33d annual meeting, January 22, 1962:

THE CULTURAL FUTURE OF BROOKLYN

(By President James M. Hester)

I wish to invite the attention of this important gathering of Brooklyn leaders to a subject of major concern throughout our country. Our society is becoming increasingly urbanized, or, if you wish, suburbanized. This process has many crosscurrents which are distributing various economic and cultural groups in new locations. In many cases, cities are not growing as rapidly as the suburban areas around them; yet the cities remain the focal points of population growth over increasingly large metropolitan areas. The economic and cultural levels of suburban areas are rising, while the substantial populations that remain or come into the cities tend to be of lower income groups. There are reverse currents in this process, the results of which are evident in those sections of Brooklyn, for example, which are enjoying a renaissance. But these are exceptions to a larger process that began several decades ago. As a result, in Brooklyn, as in many other cities, there are large sections in which the normal stratification of society has broken down. Those who ought to set the pace for behavior and cultural aspiration are either isolated or no longer present. A population that needs guidance in establishing standards is often left largely to its own limited resources.

The social problems that this has brought about are well known to us all. They are receiving serious attention from responsible leaders here and throughout the country. I am merely adding my voice to many that are asking for greater attention to the needs of those who reside at the centers of our great metropolitan areas.

My argument is this: Whether or not the populations of the cities are growing as rapidly as the populations of the suburban areas, city dwellers are and will remain a substantial part of our total population. Whether or not some businesses and industries are moving to suburban locations, our urban centers will remain vitally important to our total economy and to the livelihood of millions of persons who live both inside and outside the urban centers. I support the view that the cities themselves will continue to be the most imporant centers of cultural life, not only for those who live within them, but for those who reside in the suburban areas around them.

It is doubtful that it is possible to create the quantity of high-quality cultural facilities that would be required to give each suburban community the type of activities that can be supported by larger concentrations of resources. Obviously, we cannot abandon our cities as hopeless conglomerations of insolvable problems. Rather, as I am sure you agree, we must discover how to make urban life as healthy and attractive as possible. There are at least two compelling reasons for doing this:

First, our cities are right now the homes of millions of our future citizens, whose future is our future and the future of our children.

Second, the whole world is becoming urbanized, and our city, New York, is the most urban of all world population centers. This places on us a responsibility to lead the way in discovering what is required to make modern city life a life worth living. If the leaders of this community cannot deal successfully with this problem, they shall be forsaking not only a great proportion of the youth of this country, but also an opportunity and responsibility to set a standard which urban centers throughout our country and the world can emulate.

It is in this context that I wish to discuss the cultural future of Brooklyn. Admittedly, this is an audacious subject. The cultural future of Brooklyn is a highly complex topic which could only be fully examined on the basis of far more information, wisdom, and clairvoyance than I possess. There are persons here today whose long experience with cultural affairs in Brooklyn equips them far better than I to deal with this question. However, I am keenly interested in it, and I have been given this opportunity to speak.

I came to Brooklyn as a virtual stranger 4½ years ago. I knew the stereotype of the community presented in novels, plays and movies. I did not then know of the tremendous cultural wealth that Brooklyn possesses. I did not know, as I do now, that many of Brooklyn's secondary schools, public and private, are among the best in the country, and that they annually produce students who stand at the top in national scholastic competitions. I did not know that Brooklyn has 12 institutions of higher education which enroll more than 60,000 students. Today we are honoring the president of the oldest of these, the Packer Collegiate Institute, whose founding dates back to the establishment of the Brooklyn Female Academy in 1845. I was unaware of the excellent system of public libraries, which extends out from the beautiful main library at Grand Army Plaza to all parts of the borough.

Perhaps the most impressive institution to a newcomber is the Institution of Arts and Science, which administers the Academy of Music, the Brooklyn Museum, the Children's Museum, and the Botanic Garden. No other city in the United States possesses a single organization which provides cultural opportunities of such variety for the whole community.

The Academy of Music conducts an amazing program of concerts, recitals, lectures, and dramas with a total annual attendance of more than 400,000 persons. In recent years the academy has sponsored the establishment of an orchestra, opera company, ballet company and repertory theater, in Brooklyn and for Brooklyn.

The Brooklyn Museum is world renowned for many of its collections and exhibits. During the past year, 561,000 persons visited the museum.

The Brooklyn Children's Museum is the first and largest of its kind in the world. During the past year it was visited by almost 300,000 children.

Last, but certainly not least, the Institute of Arts and Science administers the Brooklyn Botanic Garden. A million and a half persons visit the Botanic Garden each year.

I have come to know that there are hundreds of cultural institutions in Brooklyn—churches, temples, lodges, clubs, community centers, and smaller public and private groups of many kinds. A detailed description of Brooklyn's present cultural life would probably amaze the best-informed Brooklynite. Brooklyn is unusually fortunate in its inheritance from past generations, whose leaders appreciated the very problems with which we are concerned and who sought to make provisions for their solution then and now. Brooklyn owes a debt of gratitude to those, like Dr. Shafer, who have labored here to sustain and enhance that inheritance.

Although we must feel a deep admiration for Brooklyn's institutions, we must also ask whether the current level of Brooklyn's cultural activities is adequate for the future. In my own opinion, it is not, and I am not alone in this view. Few, if any of the institutions with which I am familiar here are satisfied with either the quantity or quality of the services they can offer in view of the need for them. With few exceptions, Brooklyn's cultural institutions are not adequately financed.

For example, during the past 10 years the Brooklyn Museum and the Academy of Music have jointly produced an annual deficit of approximately $70,000, despite increasing city appropriations toward their maintenance and operations. Because of deficits during the past 25 years, the endowed reserves of the Institute of Arts and Science have been reduced by more than a million dollars, resulting in residual reserves of less than a million dollars.

When, a few years ago, the institute employed a professional firm to advise on fundraising to correct this problem, the trustees were told that there was not sufficient support for the work of the institute in Brooklyn to warrant a general fundraising campaign. Other cultural institutions in Brooklyn have received the same discouraging counsel. There have been a few shining examples of success, for which several of the men in this room are largely responsible, but I believe it is accurate to say that by and large, awareness, appreciation, and support of Brooklyn's cultural institutions are at a disappointingly low level.

This is not a condition peculiar to Brooklyn. Educational and cultural institutions throughout the country have encountered the same problem. Rising costs, plus the effects of taxation on the large fortunes that once served as sources of endowment, have produced the same results everywhere. In some instances, foundations have filled the gap, but their resources are inadequate for the total task. What must come now, and is building up in many places, is a new pattern of support: annual gifts from a large number of corporations and individuals coupled with a larger number of individual bequests.

In other words, one of the effects of increased taxation is the necessity for a broadened base of support to our cultural institutions. The alternatives are the extinction of many of them or their absorption by agencies of Government, which, in turn, means greater taxation.

This state of affairs does have certain stimualting aspects. It is a challenge to civic leaders to help local institutions make their mission, potential, and problems known to those who can support them. It is a challenge to those who administer cultural activities to conduct their programs in a manner that warrants broad-based support.

A question that might be asked is whether Brooklyn has special problems in building support for its own institutions. Every community has special problems; Brooklyn has Manhattan. It is an old story that in becoming part of Greater New York, Brooklyn lost part of its civic identity. Brooklyn has always had strong local communities, but the effect of Manhattan's proximity has been to weaken the cohesion of Brooklyn and to emphasize local community life. Many of Brooklyn's separate communities are full of vitality and prosperity, but none is large enough alone to support the facilities of a great city. Yet Brooklyn is a great city and possesses facilities which require great city support if they are to survive and prosper.

There is a thought which is heartening to anyone who contemplates Brooklyn's history and future. Brooklyn has gone through many phases of development. Repeated waves of newcomers have moved to Brooklyn, have worked and struggled here and many have prospered. Perhaps more than any community in America, Brooklyn has demonstrated resilience, a power of adoptation and redevelopment which must always be remembered in assessing Brooklyn's future. Too often, I believe, this is forgotten. Some observers are too easily disheartened when they limit their thoughts entirely to the worst of present conditions. The easily disheartened can imagine a future Brooklyn as a wilderness of lost souls, existing in a

community without structure, without civic pride, and without the cultural standards and opportunities that inspire young people to develop their finest abilities.

Of course it is sad to see what has happened to some parts of Brooklyn, as well as to communities in all of our older cities. It is sad to see beautiful old homes turned into tenements. It is sad to see some new housing developments become the breeding grounds of delinquency. It is sad to see fine old institutions running into debt. It is sad to see struggling young institutions unable to finance healthy growth in a community that needs them. But sadness is no posture for vigorous people in a time of challenge.

The cultural future of Brooklyn is the same as the cultural future of Manhattan, or the Bronx, or Philadelphia, or Chicago, or Detroit. It is as bright as the vision of its leaders—civic, financial, and cultural—and as strong as their willingness to work to achieve that vision. If the natural leaders of the community, the men whose businesses and professions are supported by the community, assume the responsibilities our free society imposes on them, if they will support the institutions which sustain the cultural health of the community, then a bright future is assured. If those who prosper here forsake the community and spend the profits of Brooklyn enterprise primarily on interests outside the city, then the cultural future of Brooklyn is as dark as the future of the suburbs may be bright. But can the suburbs be healthy if the metropolitan area is sick at its core?

I, for one, have been impressed by Brooklyn's cultural wealth in institutions created by community leaders of earlier days for the benefit of their own and succeeding generations. I have been privileged to know some of the present leaders of Brooklyn who are working to sustain and develop those institutions. They labor, however, against tremendous odds—odds that can only be altered by more widespread support for their efforts.

One of the great virtues and justifications of our capitalistic system is that it puts into the hands of those who have succeeded in private enterprise the financial power to support those activities which their communities need. I would argue, therefore, that the cultural future of Brooklyn is a challenge to free enterprise and to those who have benefited from it in Brooklyn.

Let Us Begin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the President has proposed a broad review and revision of this Nation's trade policies. As is always true with large issues there is disagreement; all will agree, however, that something must be done. I believe that the President's proposal is the challenge and opportunity of our time to strengthen our domestic economy. On January 28, 1962, the New York Herald Tribune published the following editorial, a ringing endorsement which brings to mind a phrase from President Kennedy's inaugural address "Let us begin."

The editorial follows:

NEW INSTRUMENT FOR WORLD TRADE

The simple economics of a day when Alexander Hamilton was proposing to promote American industry by tariff protection or when Sir Robert Peel caused a political and economic revolution in Britain by repealing the corn laws have long disappeared. The trade of the world today is enmeshed in a web of tariffs, subsidies, barter agreements, blocked currencies, loans, and gifts. This web has outmoded the old American system of compiling a tariff law, item by item. It has gone beyond the Reciprocal Trade Act, with its straitly limited flexibility for executive bargaining with other countries. Quite apart from the Common Market, a wholly new instrument, to use President Kennedy's phrase, would be required to maintain and expand American trade through mutual concessions.

But the Common Market has made the need urgent. Many of America's best customers are in Western Europe—and so are this country's keenest competitors. The example cited by the President is pertinent: the efficient industries of West Germany and the United States have met on a common footing behind French tariff walls. But if those walls are breached for the Germans and maintained against the United States, through the Common Market, the disadvantage could be crippling for America.

By the same token, the United States cannot negotiate item by item for tariff concessions with the Common Market—that organization, particularly when and if Britain becomes a member, will have made arrangements too complex and marked by the reconciliation of too many differences among its own members to permit a piecemeal approach.

Consequently, the United States must be ready to make far wider breaks in its own tariff walls than the Reciprocal Trade Act contemplated and to give far greater authority to its bargainers than that act allows.

That, facing the Common Market, the reduction or leveling of tariff barriers protecting American industries and the revision of trade practices applying to American agriculture will enhance the general prosperity seems certain. That it will involve certain hardships for producers of particular products is equally certain. The Common Market countries recognize that their own economies will encounter similar difficulties, and have planned programs of subsidies and the like to avert inequities during the transitional period. President Kennedy proposes a similar program for the United States.

All this will require the rethinking of traditional attitudes in Congress and among the American people. But the perils of refusing to meet the situation adequately are too great, and the rewards for doing so too rich, for Americans to hesitate. Not only economically, not only so far as the European market is concerned, will America and the free world profit by realistic courage now. For America can be the indispensable link between the Common Market and the other free nations; America can maintain leadership on a sound basis of mutual benefit through enhancing trade everywhere.

This is the great challenge and opportunity of our time. Nearly every major goal—strengthening the American domestic economy, the assault upon poverty in underdeveloped lands, the stern competition with communism, the attainment of peace with freedom—will be affected by the way in which Congress shapes and the administration uses the new instrument. Sober thought is demanded before this instrument takes final form—but it must be thought, not prejudice or narrow selfishness or mere delay. President Kennedy has produced a plan which in its broad outlines seems suited to the vast occasion. It should be made ready for action as speedily as possible.

Refugee Sets Pace in Good Neighbor Demonstration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, a refugee from East Germany, whose "sightseeing" tour in West Berlin wound up in my hometown of Bay City, Mich., has set an example with his expression of gratitude and hospitality.

Mr. Ditmar Kubb, a 23-year-old East German, who got out from behind East Berlin's Red Curtain on a "sightseeing" excuse recently entertained 500 Bay City residents who befriended him since his arrival in this country.

The event was on the occasion of his call for duty with the U.S. Navy to fulfill his reservist obligation.

How the refugee feels about his "second home" and its people is described in an article in the Bay City Times which follows:

NAVY-BOUND REFUGEE GIVES PARTY FOR 400

How many people could live in a community 5 years, then invite 800 friends and acquaintances to a party, and have 400 show up on one of the snowiest, stormiest days of the year?

Bay City's Ditmar Kubb, 23, who somewhat resembles Elvis Presley, and therefore is often called "Elvis" by his friends, did just that.

He gave the party on a Sunday afternoon at Bangor Township Hall as a going away party for himself, prior to reporting to Philadelphia for 2 years active duty in the Navy.

Kubb has been in the Naval Reserve unit here since August 29, 1960.

How he came here after fleeing East Germany is a story in itself.

It seems Kubb was working in the shipyards at Stralsund, on the Baltic Sea, as an apprentice shipbuilder. Upon completing the requirements for shipbuilding journeyman, however, he was informed that he would be conscripted into the East Germany Army.

Not caring for the political and ideological loyalties required of him, he decided to escape into West Berlin. At that time, the wall was not built and it was not difficult.

He merely told the guard he was going sightseeing, then failed to come back. He reported himself as a refugee and was placed in a refugee camp.

Later he obtained a job in Bremen, again in the shipyards and worked there for 2 years until 1956.

With his ability to win friends, Kubb struck up an acquaintance with a man who turned out to be the secretary of the American consulate. Upon hearing Kubb's story he arranged for him to come to this country under the sponsorship of the World Council of Churches.

Kubb was invited to come to Bay City and was given a place to stay with the Reverend Leonard T. Sanders, of the First Methodist Church. He stayed with the Sanders family for the first 4 months he was here, and was sponsored by the church's men's club.

"The first thing I did was start learning English," he recalls. "Reverend Sanders couldn't speak any German and I couldn't speak any English. We had to use a dictionary to communicate."

Kubb found employment with Schepper's Copper & Sheet Metal Co., now know as General Mechanics Co.

After he was here for a short time, Kubb purchased a car, first completing a course in driver education at Central High School.

Since July 1957, he has worked as a sheet metal apprentice and later journeyman at K. & R. Metal Engineering Co., 815 South Henry Street.

As for the party Kubb gave, he sent out 500 printed invitations and estimates he made as many as 300 verbal invitations.

"I invited all the people who have extended hospitality to me since I have been in Bay City, as well as almost all the Naval Reserve unit officers and petty officers, and a lot of other friends and acquaintances."

LeRoy Maxon's band provided the music without charge.

Kubb estimates the party cost in the neighborhood of $300 but declares: "It was well worth it."

Kubb says he has been promised his job back at K. & R. Metal Engineering Co., and intends to come back to Bay City to live when he completes his duty tour.

"I'd like to thank everyone who has made my stay here so enjoyable," he added, "especially Reverend Sanders, the Methodist Men's Club, Lt. George Campbell, commander of the Bay City Naval Reserve unit, and Mr. and Mrs. Matthews, 48 State Park Drive."

Kubb explained that the Matthews had provided him with "what I call my second home."

In case anyone has any lingering doubt that Bay City has done a good job of winning Kubb's affection, he also added: "I intend to apply for my citizenship papers after I finish my tour of duty."

Peace and Disarmament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure for me to meet with my constituents and to discuss with them matters of importance and interest.

Recently, a group of women from the Bronx, N.Y., called to see me regarding a matter close to the hearts of all of us. I quote the resolution they left with me, so that all Members of Congress may read it:

Several thousand women from New York City are in Washington today along with thousands of women from all over the world demonstrating in the hope that 1962 will be a year of peace and disarmament. We are resolved that there cannot be any nuclear solutions to any world problems today. The way to achieve peace is to work for peace. Shelters are for war; testing is for war. We urge that the money, effort, time, energy, and thinking that goes into the planning for war be used instead in the effort to achieve peace.

We urge continued negotiations with all world powers to achieve peace. War means death. In the name of our children, in the name of all those who desire to live, in the name of the hopes and aspirations of people throughout the world for peace and disarmament, we urge you to do everything in your power as a legislator to erase the fear of nuclear destruction and replace it with the prospects of raising our children in a peaceful, beautiful world.

I shall do all in my power to attain the objective of a lasting peace and security for the world, without jeopardizing our security as a free nation.

The One-Way Street

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, recently I spoke before a group of Americans interested in all facets of our trade problem.

I drew from testimony and information supplied in the main by Mr. Danny Danenberg of the Western Growers Association for facts relating to the basic problems of agriculture and foreign trade as well as observations on the general welfare.

Following is the main part of this address:

Because I am a public official, I trust that you will not accept this as a speech but, rather, as an extended statement regarding a preservation of a way of life, a way of life that has brought more good things to more people than any other way of life that has ever been conceived. Now let me remind you that the key word is "survival" because these are indeed sobering times.

It is with natural dismay that I note that Government releases for the period ending December 15, 1961, report the lowest farm parity ratio in 22 years. Representing many farmers, I am beginning to wonder if low prices are not closely related to the destruction of our free enterprise system here in America. As I ponder over that situation, I pray with you here today that none of us will see the fall of our free enterprise system and the important role that free American agriculture has played with "freedom of choice" in endowing upon us the highest living standards and made us the leading nation in the free world.

I believe that you will agree that we are in national unity dedicated to these principles. When I say unity, I do not mean unity for the sake of unity—I mean unity between Democrats and Republicans and, Catholics, Protestants and Jews, and, labor and management and the poor and the rich. I further mean unity behind a program of determination that all men are entitled to the blessings and opportunities that only a free society can offer. So, as such, we not only have unity of purpose, but we have national unity in their preservation and a willingness to work mightily for this preservation.

The American business community has thrived on free and open competition; and the American business and agriculture community is perfectly willing to invest its money and take its risk, provided it is allowed to enjoy equal opportunity and fair competition. This has not been possible because a posse of planners that carry over from administration to administration set rules of theory which are inadequate and introduce many additional complications, regardless of which political administration is in power.

When this posse of planners argue reciprocal trade, they argue "trade, not aid." When they want to put across foreign aid, they argue, "aid, not trade." When they are confronted with damage to American labor, American agriculture, and American industry by large-volume imports from low-wage-paying nations under the deceptive name of reciprocal trade, they rally to the defense by more Federal meddling and more Federal subsidies. Their motives are their business, but I do say that the time has come when we must fully examine the record because it is a one-way street, and the cure they offer is much worse than the disease.

COMPETITION

The American agricultural and industrial community has thrived on free and open competition. We, at the same time, recognize that the concept of a free market also requires the need for affording reasonable incentives and protection against invisible and uncontrollable conditions and that these incentives and protections should come from realistic policies concerning foreign imports. This implies that in the vital area concerning foreign trade agreements and tariffs, there must be a reexamination and a placing on a truly reciprocal basis.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

That the trade agreements are reciprocal in nature is theoretically true but in practice is translated to numerous instances where foreign countries have nullified concessions granted to us, i.e., tariff reduction by limiting imports by other methods such as exchanged controls, import licenses, and import quotas. Even today one of the free trading nations, which has a low tariff, restricts imports by simply setting a limit to the amount that may be imported and refusing to grant the exchange for additional imports beyond a set quantity. While European countries also reduce their tariffs, they also resort to other devices to limit imports. A complete review of Agricultural Handbook No. 132, published by the Foreign Agricultural Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, on the subject "Agricultural Policies of Foreign Governments," is a 141-page book which reviews trade policies on agriculture throughout the world, and is an example of proof that reciprocal trade does not exist and that various protective devices are used.

Because of the mistaken notion that our trade policies aid agriculture, I propose to examine the statistical "hocus-pocus" on agricultural exports.

The contention that agricultural exports during the past fiscal year 1960–61 reached record proportions at $4.9 billion; and that 78 percent of this was sent to countries with which we made trade agreements; while imports of competitive agricultural products amounted to $1.8 billion, needs some reexamination. The $4.9 billion export figure is official and need not be questioned. However, in a publication of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, "The Demand and Price Situation," for August 1961, page 9, stated that about 60 percent of these exports received some form of Government assistance. This consisted of outright subsidies such as those that apply to our exports of wheat and cotton of which we exported over $2 million in 1960; outright grants (gifts), etc. Only 40 percent of the total was sold for dollars with no governmental assistance. This part of our agricultural exports was slightly below the previous year.

To attribute our agricultural exports and specifically their expansion to the benefits of the trade agreements program is, of course, wholly unjustified in view of the pertinent factors as above stated. Actually, the need for subsidation in order to export is proof that the trade agreements have not opened foreign markets to our farm productions; we do not have reciprocal trade on agriculture; quite the contrary. Only our subsidies have succeeded in doing that.

Our imports of agricultural commodities are classified by the U.S. Department of Agriculture as supplementary or complimentary. The complimentary imports are those that do not compete with domestic farm prod-

ucts—examples: coffee, tea, crude rubber, cocoa, etc. These are all free of duty. Nevertheless, importation of these products gives the foreign countries dollars with which to buy our products. Once again, the trade agreements program has nothing to do with these products because we have no tariff on these imports.

RECIPROCAL TRADE IN AGRICULTURE AND SUBSIDIES

The above stated that in fiscal year 1961, there was duty-free imports of $1.8 billion which should give rise to exports of a like volume by supplying other industries with the necessary dollars. This should therefore be deducted from the $4.9 billion of exports for fiscal year 1961, if we seek to determine the influence of our trade agreements program. The export figure then would come to $3.1 billion.

It further stands to reason that this surplus of exports would not have occurred without the subsidation to which we have resorted. The cost of the wheat and cotton subsidies between them come to more than $550 million in 1960. Before we subsidized the exports of raw cotton our foreign market was fading rapidly. Our average exports of cotton from 1950–52 was 5 million bales per year. In 1956 these exports dropped to 2,214,000 bales. Then we began to subsidize the rate of 6 cents per pound in 1957. Exports jumped to 7,598,000 bales. This was followed by another drop in 1958–59 to 3,129,000 bales. On August 1, 1959, we increased the subsidy from 6 cents per pound to 8 cents. Exports again responded. In 1960, our exports leaped back to the 7 million bale level.

What did our trade agreements have to do with this? Nothing. Our record agricultural exports are the result purely and simply of our subsidation and governmental assistance. As recently as fiscal year 1958–59, our agricultural imports exceeded exports by $300 million. Imports were $4 billion; exports $3.7 billion. It is safe to say that the increase in exports has been the direct result of heavier subsidies and other governmental assistance. Witness the U.S. Department of Agriculture report already quoted; namely, "the proportion of unassisted dollar sales was slightly below the previous year," referring to fiscal year 1961 over fiscal year 1960.

ESCAPE-CLAUSE RELIEF

The biggest fraud of all upon a slumbering Congress and an uninformed people is the escape-clause relief fiction. The statement that any concession granted in negotiations is subject to the further safeguarding procedures of the escape clause under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Act when it can be shown that economic injury from imports to domestic producers has resulted from the negotiated tariff reduction ignores the record under the escape clause of the Trade Agreements Act regardless of which political administration has been in power. Since its inception in 1947, the record shows that the odds are almost 10 to 1 against getting relief under this procedure. The Tariff Commission itself has failed to find serious injury in 70 cases out of 110. The White House turned down 27 of the remaining cases coming to it from the Tariff Commission with a reocmmendation for a higher duty. This left 13 cases on which some affirmative action was taken. A summary of investigations on agriculture productions is provided below as initiated under section 7, Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, 1956–60:

Year, commodity, and results:

Garlic, 1957: Escape-clause relief not granted.

Red fescue, 1959: Escape clause relief not granted.

Lamb, mutton, sheep, 1960: Escape-clause relief not granted.

Cantaloup, 1961: Escape-clause relief not granted.

Watermelons, 1961: Escape-clause relief not granted.

In 1961, the cantaloupes and watermelon growers, assisted by the California Department of Agriculture, presented two very strong cases before the U.S. Tariff Commission for relief from these excessive imports. Although, beyond any reasonable doubt, serious injury was proved, the Commission, consistent with policy, granted no relief and denied the petitions as stated above. It is extremely interesting to note that Congressman BAILEY of West Virginia, the author of the escape clause, stated in Congress on April 27, 1961, and I quote: "Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in my mind that the escape clause has been virtually sabotaged by its administration. It has been twisted almost beyond recognition. Its purpose, which is to give relief when a tariff reduction backfires, seems to be forgotten or ignored. Congress has legislated to no avail. We should take a long look before we again entrust the executive with so much power; and we should also pay more attention to the treatment given the laws we pass here by the agencies set up by us to administer them, especially if the executive branch is not in sympathy with the objective of the particular law."

To this every Member of Congress should add a sincere "amen."

EXPORT VALUES AND FOREIGN VALUES

In October 1961 a report by the Nationwide Committee on Export and Import Policy covering the subject of "Import Competition Employment," covered this subject very well by stating, "In weighing these trade statistics we should keep before us the fact that the import values are foreign values, i.e., the sales choice to our importers exclusive of duty, ocean freight, marine insurance, etc. This fact tends to shrink the impact of imports in terms of man-hours required to produce them. For example, in 1960, our imports of shirts were valued at $14 million. What did this mean? What are $14 million dollars worth of shirts? How many shirts? In this country, it would mean 7 to 9 million shirts at factory prices. How many employees would be needed to make that many shirts? But wait. The imports were not 7 million or 9 million shirts, but 24 million. At our value, they would have represented $36 to $48 million. Innumerable other examples could be given. In terms of man-hours required to produce the 1960 imports of $14.6 billion, exports of perhaps triple that value would be required to balance the account."

Is it farfetched fantasy to state that the Nation with the highest economy in the world can fairly compete with foreign producing areas having the advantage of low tariffs and wages often 10 to 20 times less than our American industry. This type of competition poses a real serious problem and one which has been created, whereby these foreign imports result in oversupply and destroy the marketplace. This is not only a serious economic problem for industry, but is one with which labor certainly has a self-interest in as well. I have not argued in the past, nor do I argue now that our labor costs are too high. In preference to this, I would rather say that it is the extremely low wages in the foreign producing areas which have advanced this problem.

In August of 1961, the USDA in Bulletin No. DPS-80 issued the following release. This is important because the hope of the proponents of this destructive legislation cannot win unless the farm members are completely and purposely broadminded:

"Agricultural exports moved abroad at record volume during the fiscal year ending June 30. At $4.9 billion, exports were about 9 percent above the previous year."

"Roughly three-fifths of these exports received some form of Government assistance. A little over 30 percent moved under Public Law 480 and the Mutual Security Act. A somewhat smaller proportion represented assisted dollar exports, receiving subsidies in cash or kind, or sold from CCC stocks below domestic market prices (about 1 percent moved under short-term dollar credits). All wheat and cotton and the major proportion of rice and dairy products were subject to Government assistance. The remaining 40 percent of agricultural exports sold for dollars with no direct Government assistance. In this category are exports of most livestock products, soybeans, tobacco and horticultural products. The proportion of unassisted dollar sales was slightly below the previous year.

Foreign aid, in the form of agricultural commodities or loans, grants and credits of foreign currencies deriving from their sale, represented about two-fifths of the aggregate value of gross economic aid extended by the United States during the past year.

I say there is no farm problem as such; this sounds fantastic, but if the American farmer were permitted to raise and market a major part of the food and fiber that is consumed by the American people, we don't have acres enough today to produce it. The problem is that State Department officials are enticing agricultural imports into this country which have created an agricultural surplus. Permit me to explain briefly what I mean: The ratio of U.S. agricultural exports reached $4.9 billion in 1960, an alltime high and accounted for one-fourth of U.S. exports. Imports are just about in balance with exports; so the experts say that the American farmer is exporting as much as is being imported, but let's look at a few facts.

1. Approximately three-fifths of all agricultural exports included in the export total are very heavily subsidized, such as wheat at 60 cents per bushel, cotton at 8 cents per pound, or were exchanged for foreign currency, or were completely given away to foreign nations under the provisions of Public Law 480. Thus, only about 40 percent of our agricultural exports are sold under a commercial basis, and the 60 percent balance move on some subsidy, grant, loan or giveaway basis.

2. During the past 10 years, farm support programs have cost the American taxpayer $26 billion. During the same period, we imported agricultural products valued at $42 billion. While this was going on, we piled up in Government storage 1.1 billion bushels of wheat, 1.4 million bushels of corn, 2.6 million pounds of tobacco, and about 336 million pounds of butter, cheese, and dried milk.

3. The bulk of the feed grains, other than we have in Government storage today, has been imported. Our disappearance of feed grains over the past 10 years has been greater than our production, yet, we, as taxpayers, are paying some $20 million a year to store what is termed "surplus" feed grains. It is surplus, to be sure, but not a surplus created by the overproduction of the American farmer. It is "created" by imports. Although my district is considered industrial, my 20-odd years in the Pennsylvania Senate taught me the importance of agriculture to the "common good."

FOREIGN TRADE—FAIR TRADE

Now, if we are to meet Soviet competition in the free world, we can only do it with an economy that is safe and sound. We need international trade, but we must be more selective. Foreign trade should be fair trade. Let us buy much more of the things we do not make, but which we need or can use. We, in Congress, want a good, well-

balanced foreign trade and foreign relations policy without leaving American agriculture, American labor, or American industry as sitting ducks at home. May I also add: There is no good or sound reason why American labor, agriculture, and industry, which is in trouble over imports, should not have a logical remedy that will save its industry and safeguard the jobs of our workers in accordance with the American standard of living.

FREE ENTERPRISE FACTS

Foreign policy

From July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1960, the United States has made available to foreign nations a sum of nearly $86 billion in various types of foreign assistance, grants, and loans. We shall make available an estimated $5 billion in fiscal year 1961 for a total of nearly $91 billion. After all types of repayment and returns of grants have been considered, by June 30, 1962, our net foreign assistance program will represent the astronomical sum of $86.5 billion. Such a staggering sum of money is virtually impossible to comprehend.

National debt

This is not a forum to discuss the political existence of some of the economic decisions which are involved. We must be realistic though, and realize that this great Nation is accumulating a national debt which is approaching $300 billion—a figure, incidentally, which is larger than all of the combined national debts of all the nations of the world since the beginning of recorded history.

Foreign policy and trade agreements

There is every indication, as the years go by, that the American economy will be forced to compete with the state-controlled economy of the Soviet Union in many areas of the world. American business can only participate in such competition as it is allowed to grow and expand. The vital area of our foreign policy which has been commingled with trade agreements and tariffs must be reexamined and placed on a truly reciprocal basis if American industry is to compete, not only with our opponents, but also with our friends. The subject of reciprocal trade as it particularly relates to agriculture has been fully stated in a separate part of this report.

In the areas of produce, manufacturing, wages, marketing, research and taxes, we must comment on Government programs which will assist our economy in expanding or which, conversely, will cause it to contract. Under all circumstances, any Government action promoting business stability and growth benefits the Nation as well as industry. Government action, on the other hand, that causes business and industry growth to contract, certainly undermines our economic strength and tends to choke off employment as well as the source of tax revenue on which the Government's own manifold programs depend. We, therefore, feel that there are certain areas which require evaluation because they do have a direct and vital impact upon the free enterprise subject as a whole.

In considering the above problem, I am greatly concerned relative to the impact that foreign competition is having upon American labor, industry and agriculture. I feel that the above observation emphasizes that we, in industry, recognize this as a mutual problem, and as such, a very strong relationship exists in our national economy between the wheels of agriculture, labor and industry. We feel that our self interest is best served by having a vital interest in the factors relating to American labor and employment. This implies that we have strong feelings regarding the fact that trade is a two-way street between labor and industry. We fully recognize that in the marketplace, they represent our consuming public. By the same token, recognition must also be given to the fact that industrial labor and the farmers are the largest purchasers of what American industry and American labor produce. When you find farm income down 25 percent, declining steel production, textile mills shut down, industrial unemployment and depressed areas, it certainly is time to conscientiously call attention to the impact of foreign imports upon our economy. I respectfully request that the significance of this problem be fully recognized, because certainly there is no good or sound reason why American labor, American industry and American agriculture, which are in trouble over imports, should not have a logical remedy that will save its industry and safeguard the jobs of our workers in accordance with our American standard of living.

In concluding, I would like to state my personal economic philosophy as it relates to our free enterprise concept of economic well being:

THE NATION'S ECONOMY RESTS UPON FIVE PILLARS

1. Investment: Without investment, there can be no production.
2. Production: Without production, there can be no payrolls.
3. Payrolls: Without payrolls, there can be no consumption.
4. Consumption: Without consumption, there can be no profit.
5. Profit: Without profit, there can be no investment, and there the cycle starts all over again.

Legislation To Protect Consumers From Monopolies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues and for those who may be interested, I have prepared an analysis of bill H.R. 9271. This bill amends the Sherman Act, Clayton Act, Norris-LaGuardia Act and Taft-Hartley Act to lift antitrust immunities from labor organizations and to mesh congressional policies in order to preserve desirable union practices and to prohibit those specific acts which are combinations in restraint of trade.

By enumerating specific acts which are to be outlawd by unions and employers, Congress will not only add clarity to what is lawful and unlawful, but will make clear the basic purposes of the act. Among the most important of these is the purpose of preserving collective bargaining as a legitimate and important method of employer-employee relations in America.

The first paragraphs of H.R. 9271 point out the detrimental effects of monopoly, especially national or regional work stoppages caused by combinations of employers which deal with combinations of labor organizations. It recites that monopolistic practices engaged in by labor organizations or by employers, or by both, restrain trade, lessen competition, and lessen local labor-management determination; that Government intervention into strikes does not eliminate monopolistic combinations and practices which are their cause; that in order to prevent monopolistic concentrations of bargaining power, strikes, and interruptions that imperil defense, safety and health, it is intended to establish a national policy to limit combinations of employees of particular employers and their representatives with those of other employers and their representatives and likewise to forbid employers to combine as to collective bargaining matters in a manner forbidden to employees and their representatives.

Section 2 of the bill amends section 1 of the Sherman Act—26 Stat. 209 (1890); 15 U.S.C. 1—which bans every contract, combination and conspiracy in restraint of trade. The amendment specifies that the section shall apply to labor organizations when they engage in such conspiracies, combinations, and restraints by defining the activities covered, which are: first, interferences with or control of production, except by a lawful strike; or, second, limitations on the number of persons who may work at a particular occupation, trade, or calling; or, third, controlling or fixing prices that employers may charge for their goods or services; limiting the area in which or the persons through whom there may be distribution of goods or services; or limiting the number of employers who may engage in a particular business or for whom union members may work—lawful strikes for other objectives are specifically made exceptions; or, fourth, imposing any featherbedding practice causing employers to hire more than needed help, to pay for services not performed or needed, to pay more than once for services, or to restrict the use of products or materials.

Section 3 of H.R. 9271 adds an amendment to section 2—15 U.S.C. 2—of the Sherman Act to make it illegal to monopolize, attempt to monopolize, or conspire to monopolize trade or commerce among the States. The amendment makes illegal collective bargaining arrangements: first, when any employer acts in concert with another employer; second, when any employer and a labor organization act to affect the collective bargaining matters of another employer; third, which permit any labor organization currently representing employees of one employer to represent or attempt to represent employees of another employer; fourth, which allow labor organizations to obtain bargaining concessions from an employer even though such organizations are affiliated with the same federation unless they represent employees only of a single employer.

Section 3 does not forbid bargaining by employers combining with each other or labor unions combining to bargain with employers within a single standard metropolitan area as defined in the Standard Industrial Classification Manual[1] provided that the places of employment in the affected industry within such area do not constitute more than 25 percent of an entire industry and the

[1] Published by the U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census.

unit involved has been found appropriate by the National Labor Relations Board. Two or more employers are treated as one under section 3, moreover, where there is common voting stock control and they operate as one employer. An employer and union are therefore organizationally equal in their bargaining.

Both labor organizations and employers are expressly allowed to exchange bargaining information, make surveys and affiliate with national, regional, or international bodies of such as long as the collective bargaining activities are not subject to control, approval, or financial support. Penalties are set forth for violation of section 3.

Section 4 of the bill incorporates references in the Clayton Act (38 Stat. 730 (1914), 15 U.S.C. 17; 29 U.S.C. 52), and the Norris-LaGuardia Act (47 Stat. 70 (1932), 29 U.S.C. 101–115) into the new provisions of H.R. 9271 amending the Sherman Act. The added language provides that the provisions of H.R. 9271 shall have effect without regard to related sections 6 and 20 of the Clayton Act and without regard to the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act.

Section 5 of H.R. 9271 amends relevant sections 6 and 20 of the Clayton Act by specifically providing that they shall not nullify the provisions of the Sherman Act, as amended. Section 6 adds language to the Norris-LaGuardia Act to provide specifically that it shall not apply to activities made illegal by section 1 or section 2(b) of the Sherman Act, as amended.

Section 6 of the bill specifies that it shall have no effect on section 16 of the Clayton Act—such section 16 giving the specific right of injunctive relief with respect to threatened loss or damage from antitrust violations. The Norris-LaGuardia Act's agency rule which requires clear proof of actual participation, authorization or ratification to hold an organization responsible for unlawful acts of officers, members or agents, is made inapplicable to injunction proceedings affected by the section.

Section 7 of the bill amends the Taft-Hartley Act by prohibiting bargaining units which include employees of more than one employer, but allowing such multiple units of employers and organization of employees of more than one employer in single standard metropolitan areas if the places of employment involved do not constitute more than 25 percent of any industry. Provision is also made that where there is common stock control and operation as part of an enterprise, two or more employers may be deemed one employer.

Any labor organization that represents employees of more than one employer may, within 6 months, designate a local or other subdivision as its successor to represent the employees of any such employer. Nothing in the amendment shall authorize or compel the NLRB to combine employees into single units which have been constituted previously as plant, craft, or departmental units.

Section 8 provides that the amendments to the Sherman Act's section 2(b)(3)—which forbid labor organizations from representing employees of more than one employer—is to become effective within 6 months after enactment.

Section 9 specifically protects the right of the individual employee or the right of a group of employees to quit work for any reason or because of dangerous working conditions.

Section 10 states specifically that the NLRB is not authorized or required to place all of an employer's employees in a single unit or to combine former separate plant, craft, or departmental units into one unit; also that parties are not excused from bargaining with respect to a unit defined as appropriate under the amended National Labor Relations Act nor allowed to force any person to bargain with respect to a unit not defined as appropriate.

Section 11 of H.R. 9271 sets forth for "employer," "employee," "labor organization," and "affecting commerce" the same meanings that the amended National Labor Relations Act gives them.

Section 12 exempts those employers and employees now covered under the Railway Labor Act from the amendments here set forth.

When most of all the employers in an industry deal with a single union, each is reasonably certain that the union will enforce substantially similar demands against his competitors. Consequently, as long as each is reasonably certain that overhead costs will be either absorbed by all firms or passed along to hijack the public in the form of higher prices, each is more willing to submit to the labor organization's demands.

The incentive for an employer to resist unreasonable and extravagant demands is likely to be more if there were greater danger that his concessions might put him at a competitive disadvantage. The employers' lessened resistance reduces materially the protection that employers should provide to consumers against uneconomic demands of labor monopolies.

When employers combine together to bargain collectively, each may be certain that he and his competitors suffer the same costs of labor. There simply are no limits to the concessions they make, passing the costs on to the public, as long as they do not price themselves out of the market. The lessened incentive to resist uneconomic demands because of "equal assessment" against competitors, means that the public suffers not only a higher price but also must bear the price of reduced output. Any restrictive practices and featherbedding provisions in negotiated contracts are no less uneconomic than excessive demands. H.R. 9271 will prevent these hindrances and protect the consumer. It will also help to eliminate national emergency strikes.

There are several ways to deal with so-called emergencies due to regional, industrywide, or national strikes. The legislative and executive branches have tried several ways already. In 1946 the President asked Congress to authorize him to draft striking railway employees into the Army and force them to work; in 1947 Congress passed the Taft-Hartley Act which contains an injunction provision which has been used 19 times, although the deficiency of that law is obviously the end of the 80-day injunction period. The President has tried fact-finding in steel, but we had a strike anyway. We have tried White House intervention which some call conciliation and others call fascism. The War Labor disputes of World War II provided for seizure but it did not prevent strikes or even discourage them.

But, in all of these attempts, instead of going to the root of our problem we have been trimming off the branches. We have been using expedients and have not attacked the problem itself. H.R. 9271 attacks monopoly power and will indirectly limit the undesirable effects of strikes themselves. It would affect the results of labor monopoly which year after year, with or without the connivance of employers, stifles competition by forcing uniformity of labor costs and increases in excess of productivity upon the consumer. My bill discourages monopolistic combinations by employers or unions to restrain trade.

I would deny the great national and international unions' power to bring pressure to dictate terms throughout an industry or region. I would do this by restoring collective bargaining to the company level, where the employer and the representatives of his employees can bargain and reach agreement in the light of their wishes, their needs, their circumstances; and not according to the dictates of the labor leader far away from the workingman.

I would prohibit employers from combining to accomplish results that, if not disguised as collective bargaining, our antitrust laws would forbid. When employers agree upon threat of strike to a uniform industrywide wage cost, they fix that cost just as surely as they would get together and fix any other cost or the price of a commodity.

I would not abolish national or international unions. I would not forbid them to furnish wage, statistical, or other information to their locals, similar to the manner in which trade associations furnish information to their members.

Let me refer you to an imminent problem in the steel industry. The collective bargaining agreements of the steel companies expire on June 30, 1962. A strike is a possibility and some believe a probability. We are informed that this Nation will suffer an unbalanced Federal budget if there is a steel strike. Everywhere people are asking whether a strike will occur.

There is more to be concerned about than a strike. We must be concerned about price stability and wage stability. We must be concerned about foreign products made of steel competing in price with ours.

The president of the United Steel Workers Union has already served notice that the chief goal of the union is a 4-day, 32-hour workweek with wage increases, as well as fringe increases. But, President Kennedy indicated that he is for a 40-hour week, and that he wants the steel companies to hold the

line on prices. He wants unions to hold wage increases down to the gain in productivity to prevent inflation.

Mr. Speaker, will a reduction to a 32-hour week, with a corresponding reduction in output, but with an increase in pay and fringe benefits, hold the line on wages that now average $3.22 per hour—so that prices can be held down? We understand that it will not.

I believe that industrywide use of the Steelworkers' power over wages and fringes cannot be challenged under present law. I believe under my proposal that union power can be challenged, and yet collective bargaining and the right to strike to back up demands continued. H.R. 9271 would have each company and union working out its own agreement; agreements would be made with an eye toward competition and not connivance or prior knowledge of a competitor's price of labor. Each union might strike, but making it possible to have different contract expiration dates would make it likely that strikes would be limited in scope to single companies. This Nation would not have to contend with all the companies in an industry involved in a strike causing widespread disruptions of national emergency proportions.

This Nation is concerned with this big union, big power problem. They are concerned with a balance of power between labor and management. They want to preserve capital and labor and collective bargaining with a minimum of Government intervention or interference. Yet, they know that the right to collective bargaining is the right to strike to back up demands made. They want to preserve this right. I believe my bill, H.R. 9271, is worthy of serious consideration because it preserves collective bargaining but meets the problem of monopoly power and national emergency strikes.

Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Death of Gen. Wladimir Krzyzanowski, Civil War Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 75th anniversary of the death of Gen. Wladimir Krzyzanowski, highly praised hero of the American Civil War.

It is fitting that we should pay tribute in Congress today to this Polish patriot who came to our shores at an early age, imbued with the ideals of freedom and liberty, and joined the great cause in the Civil War when the very foundation for those freedoms was being threatened by internal strife.

In paying tribute to General Krzyzanowski on this 75th anniversary of his death, we again have an opportunity to reflect upon the men and women of many nations who have contributed so much toward the development of our United States.

General Krzyzanowski was born in Roznowo, Poland. He grew up in an era when his native land, just as today, was enslaved by Poland's warring neighbors. But the indomitable spirit for freedom so characteristic of the Polish people through their 1,000 years of history found true expression in young Krzyzanowski, who, from his early youth, helped organize strong student underground movements to rid his native land of her oppressors.

In 1846, when he was branded a conspirator and hunted by the secret police, the youthful Krzyzanowski fled to America. He came here as a humble immigrant at the age of 22 and immediately took on the difficult task of learning the English language. Under the most difficult conditions, he completed a course in engineering; and because of his physical strength and burning desire to succeed, he took on the tedious job of helping chart railroad lines as our Nation expanded westward.

His career was interrupted by the outbreak of the Civil War, and 2 days after President Lincoln's first proclamation, he volunteered as a private, but quickly advanced to the rank of captain of his own company, which was made up for the most part of men from the Washington area.

There were two basic reasons which prompted this young soldier to join the Union Army at once. First was his strong love of freedom. With the indignity of servitude spent in enslaved Poland as a youth deeply rooted in his memory, Krzyzanowski pledged himself to help save the freedom he came to know and respect in America. The second reason was his knowledge of engineering, which later proved invaluable to the Union Army.

Today, 75 years after his death, General Krzyzanowski's dedication to the cause of freedom is rightfully a source of inspiration not only to Americans of Polish descent, but to all Americans who see our freedoms threatened by the insidious movement of international communism. In his devotion to the dignity of man, his great attributes as a soldier in defense of liberty, his great personal sacrifice on the altar of freedom, we of this generation and future generations can find strength and courage to sustain us in our present hour of danger.

In the fall of 1861, Krzyzanowski took over the command of the 58th New York Infantry, with the rank of colonel. His regiment was attached to Blenker's Division, then encamped at Hunter's Chapel, Va. He took part in Fremont's "hunt" after Stonewall Jackson in the Shenandoah Valley in the spring of 1862, and distinguished himself at Cross Keys on June 8, when he personally, bayonet in hand, led a successful charge on Ewell's Confederates.

Through subsequent changes in the high command in the Army of Virginia, he became commander of the 2d Brigade, 3d—Schurz's—Division, and took part in the second battle of Bull Run.

Official reports speak with the highest praise of his gallantry on the first day of the battle, August 29, when he repelled frequent and fierce assaults of the enemy; on the following day he fought with equal bravery and while showing his men how to face the enemy, had his horse shot under him. Krzyzanowski's valor in this battle was so outstanding that President Lincoln nominated him brigadier general, but, according to Schurz' relation, the Senate failed to confirm the nomination because none of the Senators could pronounce his name.

"Kriz," as Krzyzanowski was popularly called in the Army, did not take this injustice to heart.

A son of foreign and far-off land—

He wrote in his memoir—

I fought for ideals, for freedom and liberty.

In the disastrous battle of Chancellorsville, May 2–4, and at Gettysburg, July 1–3, 1863, Krzyzanowski again distinguished himself. Schurz attests that the only real fighting at Chancellorsville, which for about an hour delayed Jackson's progress, was done by foreign brigadiers, Schimmelfennig and Krzyzanowski of Schurz' division, and Buschbeck of Steinwehr's division. At Gettysburg he was active during the entire 3 days of the battle. It was his corps that opened the battle. On the second and third day he occupied the pivotal position at the Cemetery Ridge and took part in the bloodiest struggle; he saved a battery from being captured by the enemy. General Howard, commanding the XI Corps, singled him out for bravery, faithfulness and efficiency in the discharge of duty.

Krzyzanowski spent part of 1864 defending the Nashville and Chattanooga Railroad, the "cracker line" of the Army. It was a hard task, demanding constant vigilance against guerrilla bands and usually accompanied by hunger and privation. For weeks his troops had to use powder for want of salt; horses died of starvation. On March 2, 1865, after other important military missions in the South, he was breveted brigadier general for gallant and meritorious services. He left the Army on October 1, 1865, with his health impaired.

Upon his return to civil life he occupied various offices in the Treasury Department. Settling in California, he helped Helena Modjeska, the famous Shakespearean actress, in her early American career. There he also met Henry Sienkiewicz, the author of "Quo Vadis," and exerted some influence on his writings. In 1879, he was customs inspector at Panama, and in 1883, received an appointment in the customs office at New York, at which post he died on January 31, 1887. Carl Schurz, who remained his warm friend until his death, delivered the funeral oration at his grave.

Mr. Speaker, we Americans can find strength in the knowledge that the one most significant factor which distinguishes us as Americans from all other social orders in the world today is the fact that our people have come from all corners of the world, from virtually all cultures, from all religions, from all races; and because we believe so strongly in the dignity of the individual, we are

closely knit into a single Nation of people working together for the survival of freedom.

Gen. Wladimir Krzyzanowski reflects the full glory of our country—past, present, and future.

Presentation of the Gold Medal to Dr. Paul David Shafer by Andrew S. Roscoe, President, Downtown Brooklyn Association, January 22, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert an address by Andrew S. Roscoe, president of the Downtown Brooklyn Association at the annual meeting of the association held at the Towers Hotel on January 22, 1962, in connection with the presentation of the annual gold medal for distinguished service to Brooklyn to Dr. Paul David Shafer, president of Packer Collegiate Institute, together with Dr. Shafer's response.

The address and response follows:

PRESENTATION OF THE GOLD MEDAL TO DR. PAUL DAVID SHAFER BY ANDREW S. ROSCOE, PRESIDENT, DOWNTOWN BROOKLYN ASSOCIATION, JANUARY 22, 1962

We who meet here today, at the 33d annual meeting of the Downtown Brooklyn Association, are servants of our community. We proudly reflect every improvement, every service, and every just cause that makes our borough in general, and the downtown area in particular, a better one, a finer one, a stronger one.

How wonderful it is that, today, we can greet a person, Dr. Paul David Shafer, who has given to our people its noblest adventure, education, education devoted to our youth, education devoted to better living through more knowledge, and higher ethical and moral standards.

After his graduation from Bethany College (A.B. and LL.D.) he earned the degree of doctor of philosophy at Yale University.

His career commenced as a teacher in Chester (W. Va.) High School. Later he was associated with Wesleyan University; Collegiate School (New Haven); and Milford School (Connecticut). He was headmaster at Milford. Dr. Shafer was a lecturer at Yale Graduate School and he assumed the presidency of Packer Collegiate Institute in 1938.

It is our privilege, today, to welcome to Brooklyn's Legion of Honor, Dr. Shafer, a new member, the 32d. The qualifications in this group are many and exacting. But its most rigid demand is service beyond the call of duty, selfless service, and absolute integrity.

Dr. Shafer has devoted his life to education and has earned the highest esteem of not only those whom he has taught, but their parents, as well as his colleagues who have recognized in him the energetic leader of many professional societies.

He was:

President, New York State Association of Independent Schools.

President, Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools; vice chairman, Commission on Institutions of Higher Education.

President, board of trustees, Brooklyn Public Library.

President, Junior College Council of the Middle Atlantic States.

Hearing officer, Alien Enemy Hearing Board (World War II).

We know him, too, as one who has worked among us, giving himself generously and without personal let, to civic and social improvement.

He is:

President, board of trustees, Brooklyn Hospital.

Member, board of trustees, Pratt Institute.

Member, board of trustees, Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences.

Member, board of trustees, First Presbyterian Church (Brooklyn).

Member, governing committee, Brooklyn Botanic Garden.

Member, board of managers, Brooklyn Central YMCA.

Member, board of trustees, Brooklyn Savings Bank.

During World War II, he was chairman, Public Information Committee for Brooklyn, Voluntary Civil Defense Organization.

As I take great pleasure in presenting Dr. Paul David Shafer with the Gold Medal of Downtown Brooklyn Association for most distinguished service to Brooklyn, let me add on this occasion one brief sentence in Latin, the motto of Lord Nelson.

"Palmam qui meruit, ferat."

"Let him who deserves the prize, bear it."

DR. SHAFER'S RESPONSE AT LUNCHEON AWARDING HIM THE GOLD MEDAL BY DOWNTOWN BROOKLYN ASSOCIATION

Mr. President and friends, I appreciate more than I can say the honor I have just received. This award is like many things that come to a person that are pleasant, encouraging, satisfying: they come by Heaven's grace, and thorough the thoughtfulness of friends, and one can only hope he merits them a little bit. I wish I more fully deserved it, but whatever my deserts, I am deeply grateful. This medal certainly gives me something to live up to.

As I accept it I am very conscious that anything I have done has been made possible by the support, the hard work, the affection of others. I have had the encouragement, the confidence of Imogene, Mrs. Shafer. My Packer associates, who share my educational and hence my major responsibilities, have been very tolerant of my extracurricular activities, and have been helpful in more ways than I can possibly number. In every activity and organization where I have had a part, I've known the day-to-day cooperation of the administrators and the staff members, the real workers. I've been wisely taught by the men and women who have been my fellow committee members or trustees. I've been very fortunate. For whatever I have done that has been worth while, all of these are greatly responsible.

And, incidentally, my associations have been, and are, so pleasant that receiving a medal for the experience is certainly like getting a double measure of frosting on the cake.

Those persons with whom I have worked, my neighbors and associates and friends here, have taught me something: they have taught me that the real strength of Brooklyn resides in a spirit. It is a spirit of friendliness and helpfulness, a spirit that seeks improvement and tries to make that improvement hold, a spirit that doesn't hesitate before the difficult and the discouraging. That spirit expresses itself in cooperative effort for the common good. It is illustrated by the very important part this Downtown Brooklyn Association has played in the transformation of this section of our borough, and in this association's continuing plans. The spirit of a community determines what that place is and what it ultimately becomes. As I thank you and your associates, Mr. President, my hope is that this spirit of today's Brooklyn will endure for a long, long time. Thank you very much.

The Consumer and the Department of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, it is heartening to read that the interest of the administration in the consumer and his problems continues. Secretary of Agriculture Freeman recently addressed the New Jersey State Board of Agriculture and a great portion of that address was concerned with the stake of the consumer in the program of the Department of Agriculture.

I ask unanimous consent that a portion of that speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I suspect that one of the best kept secrets in Washington is that the Department of Agriculture carries out more activities which are of direct benefit or indirect service to the consumer than any other department or agency in the Federal Government.

A congressional committee last year surveyed the various services performed specifically in the consumer's interest and found that one out of every six is a job which Agriculture does.

It may surprise you to know that we spend a greater amount from our annual budget for direct consumer services than any department or agency. In fact, 1 out of every 10 employees in the Department is primarily assigned to protecting or advancing the consumer's interest.

I do not say these things to impress you with the money we spend or the number of things we do. I say these things to make one point which very few people in this country today fully appreciate: the Department of Agriculture plays an exceedingly important role in the daily life of every American—not just those who live on the farm. Yet, the impression which many urban families have is that the Department of Agriculture is concerned only with farming and, therefore, rarely touches their day-to-day activities.

By the time the Kennedy administration arrived, the farmer had become one of the most misunderstood of Americans and the Department was viewed as more of a gigantic storage bin than a department serving both farm and city.

It is not surprising that many people, particularly those in the cities and off the farms, failed to recognize the magnificent power which the farmer had given the Nation in his ability to produce an abundance of food and fiber—enough so that for the first time in the history of man we can see clearly that famine and hunger no longer need to be feared.

Nor is it surprising that Americans are only beginning to realize that farm products are responsible for one quarter of all exports from the United States. Our country is the leading exporter of food and fiber—and without this trade, our favorable balance of payments would be seriously impaired.

Nor, I suppose, is it surprising that the consumer activities and services of the Department either are taken for granted or are unrecognized, even though without them the American people would have to buy meat without any assurance of quality and would find outdoor recreational opportunities more limited and probably very expensive.

Let me describe for you some of the consumer activities carried out daily in every section of the country under the direction of the Department of Agriculture.

One of the primary reasons that we have a consistently high quality level of meat and poultry available to consumers is the fact that all meat and poultry handled in interstate commerce is inspected by some 5,000 trained inspectors who reject diseased animals and unfit carcasses from processing into food products.

In addition, many of the food commodities purchased in supermarkets and grocery stores are graded and labeled under supervision of Department employees. These grades, such as "USDA Choice" for beef, "Grade A" for poultry, and "U.S. Fancy" for fruit and vegetables, are standards of quality that shoppers can and do depend on.

While agricultural research often is considered primarily of benefit to the farmer, one of the most logical arguments that can be made for it is that the consumer today can buy a wider variety of food and clothing only because of the progress made through research. Because of it, we are constantly developing better strains of crops, livestock and poultry as well as new products to meet changing consumer tastes.

We often hear of industries today which make the bulk of their sales in products not in existence 10 years ago. In agriculture, many of the varieties of crops now being grown were not even known to farmers 10 years ago. Yet they must have them today because the old strains have virtually been wiped out by disease—and without the new varieties, consumers would have less choice and probably higher prices.

Agricultural research has put many familiar food products within the easy reach of consumers. An outstanding example of production efficeincy is the country's boiler industry. In 1940 it took 13 weeks to produce a 3-pound broiler. Now only 9 weeks are required and we can do it on half as much feed as in 1940. Most American consumers also have benefited from development of the family-sized turkey and leaner pork products from the meat-type hog.

I am sure that farmers will agree with the economists that the benefits of research to produce more efficiently have largely passed through the farmer to the consumer. Broilers and turkeys, for example, have never been so low in price as in the past year.

Consumers' needs have encouraged the research development of such convenience foods as frozen concentrated fruit juices, potato granules and flakes, powdered eggs, and cake mixes.

Chemists of the Department of Agriculture also have had a leading part in developing the techniques of flame-proofing cotton and making it resistant to soil and rot. It has been made water repellent and wash-and-wearable. Because of these findings, cotton is competing favorably with the synthetic fibers, both in wearing apparel and for industrial uses.

Just last week the Department announced two new developments in treatment of cotton fiber. One is a procedure which will make collars and cuffs on men's wash-wear shirts last longer—a development which will please the wives, I'm sure. The other is a single treatment process that gives cotton wash-wear properties at the same time it dyes, starches, and adds other finishing agents to the fabric.

Thus, I think it is fair to say that agriculture provides many services which are indispensable to the consumer in this day and age, and, in addition, has succeeded beyond the wildest dreams of man's imagination in providing an abundance of food and fiber at reasonable costs.

Since becoming Secretary of Agriculture, I have sought to carry this one simple message to the families of America who live in our cities and suburbs. I consider it one of the most important tasks that we who are concerned with the future of agriculture can undertake.

Food is one of our most abundant and plentiful resources, and it is reasonably priced. It is a bargain in relation to the cost of other things which the American public buys. But after years of being told that the farmer is taking advantage of the consumer, the city dweller is reluctant to believe these facts.

Yet, the facts are there to substantiate that food is a bargain.

The retail value of farm food products, as reported in market basket calculations in 1961, was only 4 percent higher than it was 10 years earlier (1951). Yet living costs generally had risen 19 percent in that same period.

Cause of the smaller rise in food costs was the fact that farm value of that same food declined 19 percent in the 10 years. Breaking it down by commodities, the retail value of dairy products in the market basket was up 10 percent in the 10 years, while farm value was down 6 percent. Most extreme example is poultry and eggs on which retail value dropped 27 percent in the 10-year period and farm value dropped even more—36 percent.

Let me repeat the total figure again: Retail value of farm food products was up only 4 percent in 1961 over 1951 while farm value of the same foods had dropped 19 percent. And this at a time when all living costs had gone up 19 percent in the 10 years.

Would you not say, then, that relatively speaking, food is a bargain? Another way to compare it is with wages for factory labor. In 1947–49 it took 59 hours of pay from factory work to buy a month's supply of food for an average family. Today it takes only 38 hours of factory pay—a third less—to buy the same amount of food.

I believe that we can make the case that the consumer has an important stake in agriculture, but I emphasize that unless we make it no one else will do it for us.

Exactly 100 years ago this year, President Abraham Lincoln established the Department of Agriculture. In signing the act creating the USDA, he spoke of it as "the people's Department." That phrase is even more appropriate today in many ways than it was in Lincoln's time, for ours truly is the people's Department.

The services which agriculture performs in food and forestry are of direct and primary benefit to the consumer. We are considering recommending in this centennial year, therefore, that the name by which the Department is identified be broadened to include these important interests.

I also believe that it is about time now to begin organizing and coordinating the many and varied services which the Department performs for the consumer as a means first, of insuring that vigorous action be continued to protect and advance the consumer's interests where the Department is responsible; second, of providing more adequate information to consumers regarding those services they can get and should expect to obtain; and, third, of pinpointing the need for additional services at the time the need arises.

Why an Urban Affairs Department?—Merits and Demerits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, in all the hue and cry and breast beating over whether or not we should have a Department of Urban Affairs—some very pertinent reasons why we should not seem to have been overlooked.

This whole issue has assumed an aura of "political infighting"—due to the President's handling of the matter—which is not admirable in days such as this when crisis after crisis has arisen all over the world.

To quote a column by Roscoe Drummond in the Washington Post this morning:

> Mr. Kennedy took a Roger Maris stance and knocked two out of the park. He gleefully recorded his "surprise" that the five Republicans on the Rules Committee should unanimously oppose the Urban Affairs Department at a time when he thought the party was trying to do something about winning back the big-city vote. (He succeeded in containing his surprise that four Democrats voted the same way.)

I join many Members of Congress in the belief that political power is moving to Washington rapidly enough now without creating a means of speeding up the process. States still do have some responsibility which the Federal Government does not need to take over or assume—just to win votes. Far from admiring the President for his "shrewdness" in trying to nail down the complete Negro vote, I am inclined instead to wonder why this more-than-able young man feels free to use his office as President to create more class friction. It appears to me that legislation should be able to stand on its own merits if it is good legislation—not blatantly linked with its vote-getting appeal.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include with my remarks an editorial from today's Wall Street Journal, entitled "Why an Urban Affairs Department?"

WHY AN URBAN AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT?

A lot more heat than light is being generated around the administration's efforts to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. The President, now that the House Rules Committee has pigeonholed a bill to create the new agency, is trying to win his point by setting up the Department by Executive decree. So it is a good time to review just what this program involves and to see what its implications are.

The proposal provides for transferring to a new Cabinet-level Department the functions of many existing Federal housing agencies. The Secretary would be charged with studying the Nation's housing problems and development of urban communities, advising the President, and providing leadership, technical assistance and information to State and local governments.

Proponents of the plan themselves have advanced, unintentionally, persuasive reasons why it is neither desirable nor necessary. For they have said again and again that the plan would create no new Federal programs nor would it alter substantially existing laws on Federal housing and urban development. If that is so, as the National Association of Manufacturers and others have observed, there surely is no crying need for a whole new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

But a much more likely prospect is that the proposed Department would actually be a device by which the Federal Government could extend and consolidate control over its far-flung housing and urban redevelopment projects, at the expense of urban areas. Since the plan defines an urban area as a city or township of any size, whether incorporated or unincorporated, it would cover a pretty broad territory.

The President himself hinted at the possible extent of this Department's invasion of localities when, commenting on the Rules Committee action, he referred to the administration's "concern for some effective management and responsibility of the problems of two-thirds of our population who live in cities."

The Government might well be concerned. For just such massive intrusions into municipal affairs as a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would be empowered to make have helped to contribute to the urban mismanagement and irresponsibility with many cities are well acquainted. Too often political machines have become involved with millions of dollars of construction contracts with scandalous results. Nor is the profligate example of the Government itself one that suggests prudent management to municipal governments.

What the cities need far more urgently than Federal "concern" for their failings is a hard look by their own administrators and citizens at what Federal housing programs already are doing to them. What is happening as the result of paper plans imposed upon them from Washington whether relevant to local problems and conditions or not? What has been the effect of municipal rubber-stamping of Federal standards and specifications, imposed under the threat of withdrawal of Federal funds? What has been the effect on cities of swallowing projects which in the absence of local control had been better not begun at all?

That sort of realistic appraisal is the last thing the localities can expect from the Federal Government. And it surely would not come from a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. What would inevitably come are still more and more elaborate paper plans, more Federal standards and specifications, more Federal say-so about where, how and for what the taxpayers' dollars are used. The only logical end to all this is complete abdication of municipal control over urban development.

It may be vain to expect that the Federal housing and urban "improvement" juggernaut as it now exists can be rolled back. But its further invasion, under the banner of a new Cabinet-rank Department, can be checked. Now that the President, in a message yesterday, has notified Congress he is setting up the Department, the House or Senate has 60 days in which to reject it. On its merits alone, rejection is what it deserves.

The Forgotten People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, this is the sixth of 10 articles, part of a series which appeared in the New York World-Telegram and Sun in October 1961, on the subject of the migrant worker in the United States. These articles were written by Dale Wright, World-Telegram and Sun staff writer, who, for 6 months, lived and worked as a migrant worker along the Atlantic seaboard from Florida to New York:

MIGRANT WORKERS NEED U.S. PROTECTION

(By Dale Wright)

The night I decided to leave Florida and move north with the migrant laborers for South Carolina was one of the worst nights in my life.

I was asleep in a filthy room near Hastings when a baby's shriek pierced the night and woke me up. I pushed open the unlocked door of the room next to mine to investigate.

There, lying on a burlap bag in an old packing case, was a baby, 2 or 3 months old, screaming in terror.

A huge beetle had crawled into the baby's mouth. Its parents were not home.

I picked up the baby, removed the beetle, and succeeded in quieting the frightened youngster. There was no more sleep for me that night, so I stayed with the baby and waited for his folks to return.

Beetles and roaches and chinches, they told me later, were the least of their problems. The Florida potato belt also breeds big rattlesnakes. They are likely to be found in or under any old building. Flies and mosquitoes were everywhere, buzzing around in the remnants of food and debris.

SOUTH CAROLINA WORSE

But what lay ahead of me in South Carolina was just as bad or worse.

I saw migrant farm laborers, the very old and the very young, moving into South Carolina in open trucks and battered old buses like livestock on the way to a slaughterhouse.

In the fields I saw the same kind of people I had met in Florida, working 12 to 16 hours a day, cheated on their wages and exploited at every hand.

But in South Carolina there were youngsters only 6 and 7 years old working in the fields with the grownups from early morning until it was too dark for them to see what they were doing.

Here again, there were no schools for migrant children. But the labor contractors were there with the same promises of good jobs, good pay, nice places to live. By this time their spiel reminded me of an old record.

EVILS OF CREW LEADER

In Charleston, a thriving produce center for several truck crops, I talked with Julius Amaker, an insurance executive and a former agent for the U.S. Department of Agriculture for 13 years.

Mr. Amaker, who has spent much time trying to improve the lot of the migrant worker had some strong words:

"The worst single evil facing the migrant farm worker is his crew leader. The crew boss cheats him, shortchanges him and uses every trick in the book to separate him from the money he has earned by back-breaking toil.

"I see the crew leaders driving around in big, fancy cars. I know they make from $7,000 to $10,000 during a single season, after expenses. A lot of the money rightfully belongs to the poor, illiterate workers who can't defend themselves.

"The only solution is to take the responsibility for recruitment and payment of migrant workers away from the crew boss and turn it over to the grower or packer or processor. The employer then should be under the supervision of a trained Federal agent.

RECORD MUST BE KEPT

"The employer should be required under penalty of law to keep accurate work records so that withholding, social security, and workmen's compensation credits can be made."

Mr. Amaker said many migrants who come to Charleston die there or land on the local welfare rolls.

"It's always the same story," he said. "Somebody's promise of better work, better pay. When they learn it's no better here, they either keep going north or get stranded here."

He's particularly concerned with the children. He pointed out that State legislation to provide schools for the migrant children was killed 2 years ago by a strong farm lobby and the action of segregationists.

FEDERAL PROTECTION

"If these youngsters don't go to school in Florida," he said, "or wherever they come from, they simply don't go at all. So they grow up in the fields and are never prepared for anything more than farm labor."

Because no State will take on the job of protecting the migrant laborer's interests, he said, he'd like to see Federal supervisors watch the harvesting operations as the labor gangs move north and thus protect the workers' interests along the way.

THEY'RE NEEDED

"Migrant farm workers," he continued, "are absolutely the lowest on the American economic scale. Yet they are vital to the harvest of American crops. Without them, the farmer, the shipper, the packer, the processor, and the consumer could not exist."

Mr. Amaker sees some protection for the migrant worker in the minimum wage laws, but only if there are adequate teeth in such legislation.

"Employers," he declared, "find ways to skirt the law. The migrant worker continues to be a sorrowful victim of neglect and omission.

"Some new approach is necessary, some code of 20th century laws to protect these people from exploitation everywhere along the line."

I stood on a Charleston street corner and watched the exodus of migrants northward to another stop on the trail. A convoy of two buses, a stake truck, and an ancient, broken-down station wagon was overcrowded with people and work gear.

It was a trip to more unfulfilled promises, more cheating, and more sorrows.

A bus like one of those in the convoy had crashed into another vehicle in North Carolina a few years ago. A score of workers were killed. The driver was found to have had no insurance.

1,000-MILE TRIPS

Mr. Amaker had pointed out in our talk that labor contractors pick these people up along the road somewhere, then rumble off anywhere there's a buck to be made—for the crew boss.

The trip is frequently as long as 1,000 miles, both going north to harvest and returning home after the work is over.

The law does not require operators of migrant transport vehicles to carry liability

insurance in Florida and South Carolina, or in most other States in the South. If passengers are injured or killed, it's just tough luck for them or their families. And while compulsory insurance laws are nonexistent, safety inspection regulations are so loosely enforced that they're almost useless.

I had seen many such caravans earlier in Florida. I was to see many more in my travels along the east coast. The great tragedy was that for many of these miserable men, women, and children, the trip was to nowhere.

Race and the City's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention and to the attention of our colleagues an article entitled "Race and the City's Future," by Frank Quinn, executive director, Council for Civic Unity of San Francisco, as printed in the San Franciscan.

There is much written these days regarding the great changes occurring in our cities. Whole volumes have been devoted to this urgent topic and journals of opinion are full of analyses by an army of experts.

I have seldom, however, come upon so cogent and compelling a statement regarding one aspect of urban change as that to be found in Mr. Quinn's excellent article. In a few brief paragraphs he depicts the sorry future awaiting any American city that does not put democracy into full practice; that does not afford true equality of opportunity for all its residents, regardless of race, religion, or national origin.

Sober reflection upon Mr. Quinn's article should move all of us who are concerned about our cities to immediate and constructive action. The price we have already paid by tolerating injustice is high. The price we will have to pay in the future if discrimination continues will be a prohibitive one: morally, economically, and culturally. San Francisco's problems are those of every American city. I commend Mr. Quinn's carefully reasoned call to action to your earnest attention:

RACE AND THE CITY'S FUTURE

(By Frank Quinn)

Will San Francisco follow what has become a classic pattern for other northern metropolitan regions? A central city, with a high proportion of nonwhite residents, ringed in by white suburbs?

Census figures just released show that the bay area is already well on its way down this trail.

Percentage of nonwhite

	1950	1960
San Francisco	10.5	18.4
Oakland	14.5	26.4
Berkeley	15.4	20.1
Richmond	14.3	21.9
Pittsburg	7.8	21.1
Marin County	2.0	3.9
San Mateo County	1.9	4.3
Contra Costa County (exclusive of Richmond and Pittsburg)	5.4	3.0

According to newspaper reports, San Francisco's director of public health has stated that from his preliminary review of the 1960 census the makeup of the city's population in 20 years could resemble that of Washington, D.C., which is 70-percent colored.

What are the consequences of sharp racial differences between urban center and suburb? We have only to look at Chicago, Detroit, Philadelphia, and New York for an answer.

Nonwhites—primarily Negroes—have had to overcrowd in the oldest neighborhoods. With high profits to landlords, new slums have developed rapidly; schools and public housing have become segregated, not by legislative fiat, but by residential composition. Social tensions have risen; lack of normal contact between persons of different races breeds prejudice and misunderstanding. Political questions have become racial issues to the detriment of the whole community; city-suburb cleavages have deepened. Following the whites to their suburban retreats, businesses and industries have moved from downtown locations leaving them barren soil for honky-tonk developments. City tax sources have depleted while welfare and service costs have expanded to meet the needs of large numbers of low-income families. Cultural life has suffered and the cities have lost some of their charm and attraction for visitors.

While the main causes of the white drift to suburbs are the attractions of new housing and escape from aging streets, racial prejudices aggravate the exodus.

Residential segregation is wanted by few people—white or colored—yet it is on the gain. Why?

Nonwhite population increases in cities have resulted largely from migrations from an agitated South. Being younger families, they have high birth rates and low death rates. (San Francisco had these birth rates in 1959: White, 15.2; Negro, 44.0; Chinese, 27.4; Japanese, 31.2; other races, 71.1. Death rates were: White, 12.78; Negro, 8.32; Chinese, 6.67.)

The metropolis has always hosted groups of migrants from other lands or the Nation's rural regions. The normal course of events has been for migrants to live in certain districts with individuals gradually fragmenting off into the larger middle-class society. The assimilation process is now blocked because of the high visibility of the more recent newcomers—their color.

The housing market of both city and suburb is not open to nonwhites. In a survey made by the Council for Civic Unity of San Francisco, not one of 62 realtors interviewed would handle the sale of the first Negro family in an all-white neighborhood—despite that family's financial and social qualifications. Homebuilders and lenders gave the same answer. In trying to locate rentals for nonwhite families, council of civic unity called or visited hundreds of landlords. With few exceptions, apartments were available only in designated minority neighborhoods. People of Oriental ancestry find housing easier than do Negroes—but all nonwhites must expect to pay more for their home or apartment than white San Franciscans. Some Negro and Oriental families have managed to move throughout the city, but census tract figures reveal higher nonwhite concentrations than at any time in San Francisco's history.

In a council of civic unity study on employment practices, racial discrimination was found to be the norm in all jobs but those on the lowest level of skill.

Barriers erected on the two main paths of assimilation, employment and housing, are then at the root of high residential concentrations.

This was clearly indicated by the experience of the redevelopment agency in relocating some 8,000 people from the first western addition clearance site. Sixty percent were Negroes, twenty percent were other nonwhites; most went into public housing or the blocks immediately around the razed area. These are the very blocks now being considered for a second redevelopment agency project. The original neighborhood had been integrated, but the net result of redevelopment there was to cause the compacting of Negroes together while the new building on the site will become essentially all white because of high rentals which few Negroes can afford. The first western addition project was impeded by racial discrimination. It may well be that a second project cannot be accomplished because there will not be enough housing available for the large number of Negro families to be displaced. Legislative threats are also posed by assemblymen who recognize the harmful effects wrought on minorities and low-income families by redevelopment projects throughout the State. Some of the legislative proposals now in Sacramento might serve to derail permanently any future redevelopment projects, leaving cities without an effective means of rejuvenation.

What can be done to reverse the trend toward segregation?

The answer lies in equal opportunity in employment and housing for all people without regard to their race, color, creed, or national ancestry.

How can we reach this lofty, but crucial, goal?

California now has a fair employment practices commission to administer a nondiscrimination law. Rather than wait until a complaint is lodged, business and union executives should change their employment and membership practices now to meet the spirit, not merely the letter, of California's public policy and law. These are a number of organizations to advise and help on employment by merit—the FEPC, Bay Area Urban League, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Japanese-American Citizens' League, Council of Civic Unity.

Bills on discrimination in housing are now in legislative hoppers of Sacramento. Most important is assembly bill 801 which would establish a law, to be administered by the FEPC, prohibiting discrimination in all rental and sale housing except that occupied by the owner. San Franciscans should study assembly bill 801 carefully and advise their assemblymen, State senators and the Governor.

Proper city planning can frustrate segregated neighborhoods. If homes and streets are fixed up with the help of urban rehabilitation programs, integrated neighborhoods can be maintained; a strong factor in the move-out of whites is the physical quality of their blocks not just the move-in of nonwhites. Council of Civic Unity has recommended that the next western addition redevelopment project not proceed until new private housing to meet the needs of the low-moderate income families to be displaced can be constructed there. This would assure a continued balance in San Francisco's population—economically, culturally and racially.

Council of Civic Unity has a housing orportunities program to help nonwhite families find rentals and sales in neighborhoods and suburbs now restricted. In cooperating with this free service by listing your apartment or home, you will widen the range of choices for qualified minority families and thus take a direct step for an open housing market.

San Francisco need not go down the skids leading to an extreme racial schism. Our patterns are not yet so rigid that they cannot be reversed. We have a golden opportunity—to ignore it would be to sell short the city's future for all of its citizens. Let's get to work.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a very interesting question-and-answer article from View magazine in Yonkers, N.Y., on the subject of Federal aid to education. In it Father Ignatius McCormick examines many of the questions and objections which frequently arise when the issue of Government aid to private and parochial schools is raised. Father McCormick's position on each of the questions in the article is timely and substantive. I am sure that it will be of interest to many other Members of the House:

EDUCATION: A QUIZ ABOUT FEDERAL AID

(By Father Ignatius McCormick)

On January 6, President John F. Kennedy's task force on education proposed that Congress enact a program of Federal aid to public schools. The bill to the American taxpayer: almost $6 billion.

A few days later, Cardinal Spellman assailed the plan as unjust, because it would exclude children attending nonpublic schools. Parents of these children, he pointed out, "will be taxed more than ever before for the education of their children, but they cannot expect any return from their taxes unless they are willing to transfer their children to a public grade or high school."

There are nearly 7 million American children in private and parochial schools.

The cardinal's statement, in turn, was vigorously attacked. Aid to nonpublic schools would be a "violation of a basic liberty which is essential to our American heritage," replied Rev. W. Hubert Porter, Baptist. Other Protestant clergymen charged that such assistance would constitute a violation of the "traditional American policy of church-state separation."

View does not take any stand, pro or con, on the general question of the necessity or wisdom of Federal aid. But, we do strongly believe that if such aid is voted, it should be for the benefit of all student-citizens, regardless of the school their parents choose for them.

The question is bound to stir up considerable controversy, in which there is danger of more heat than light. View offers the following brief questionnaire to throw more light than heat on the subject and its historical antecedents.

"Would not aid to nonpublic schools set a new and dangerous precedent in American education?"

Aid to nonpublic schools was the original American manner of assisting in the education of children. At the opening of the 19th century all New York schools were operated by religious groups and received State aid. The same was true in practically all the other States.

"Did Catholic schools receive support from public taxes?"

Yes. In 1806, St. Peter's School in Barclay Street applied for and received aid from public funds. Ten years later, St. Patrick's School was also receiving State aid.

"But wasn't this against the principle of separation of church and state as demanded by the first amendment?"

The men who were closest to the Constitution did not seem to think so. The first amendment merely states: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion." In other words, America was not to have a national church such as existed in England and other European countries.

"When did the public school system begin?"

The public school, as we know it, is a late comer on the American scene. It came into existence in 1842.

"What led to the establishment of public schools?"

In the early decades of the 19th century a number of New York families belonged to no religious group, or were members of sects too small to maintain their own schools. To provide for their children, the Free School Society was founded in 1805. Its express purpose was "to provide for the education of such poor children as do not belong to or are not provided for by any religious society." In the beginning, at least, its aim was not to supplant, but to supplement the works of the religious schools.

"Were the schools of the Free School Society the first secularized schools?"

Not exactly. Even the Free School Society provided religious education as part of its regular academic program. Tuesday afternoons were devoted to religious instruction, and arrangement was made for the children to attend church services. Later the society's name was changed to the "Public School Society," although it was operated by a group of private citizens. It was recognized by the State and allowed to share in public funds with religious schools.

"How long did this situation last?"

Until 1814. In that year the Common Council of the City of New York voted to cut off aid from the religious schools and to make the Public School Society (a private organization) the sole recipient of tax support. In effect, this meant economic pressure to close all religious schools and to compel parents to send their children to the schools of the Public School Society. In the course of time most Protestant schools succumbed to the squeeze. Catholics, at the cost of immense sacrifices, maintained and developed their school system.

"Did Catholics accept this arrangement as just?"

By no means. Bishop John Hughes made a mighty effort to have the free choice of parents in educating their children respected. In 1840, New York Catholics had 8 schools, enrolling 3,000 children. Bishop Hughes claimed public support for these schools, not as a religious corporation, but as groups of citizens, in the same capacity as that by which they were taxed for the general school fund. He offered to operate his schools on the same condition as the schools operated by the Public School Society, open to inspection by that organization. The only difference would be that his schools would include religion in the curriculum.

The result of an appeal to Albany was that the State legislature took away the monopoly of school funds from the Public School Society and created a city board of education which was to establish and maintain public schools, in which no sectarian doctrines would be taught. This marked the birth of the public school system, 1842.

"Well—you must progress in education as in other areas of American life."

Yes, but progress in the direction of democracy, not totalitarianism. From the idea that education is a function of the state, there is a short and easy step to the idea that the state has the exclusive right to education, a basic principle of every totalitarian regime.

"Now you are exaggerating. No American Government would claim exclusive right to educate. It can't happen here."

But it has happened here. On November 7, 1922, the State of Oregon amended its education law to read that every parent was obliged to send his children to the public schools. Violators would be punished by fines and imprisonment.

"Is that law still on the books?"

No. The Supreme Court of the United States, in 1925, declared the Oregon Education Law unconstitutional. Its decision is extremely important in that it spells out the natural rights of parents. Said the justices: "The fundamental theory of liberty upon which all governments of this Union reposes excludes any general power of the State to standardize its children by forcing them to accept instruction from public teachers only. The child is not the mere creature of the State; those who nurture him and direct his destiny, have the right, coupled with the high duty, to recognize and prepare him for additional obligations."

"Shouldn't Catholics rest satisfied with that?"

Gratified, but hardly satisfied. The death sentence was averted, but economic sanctions continue and threaten to increase. What kind of freedom of education do you have when you are penalized for making use of your freedom?

"Which means?"

Parents who send their children to a nonpublic school must bear the full burden of their education. At the same time they must contribute their full share to the maintenance of the public schools. This is double taxation.

"The church has supported its own schools up to now."

That does not justify an unjust situation. Moreover, several factors are now at work which will make it increasingly difficult for Catholic and other nonpublic schools to survive. The proportion of lay teachers in Catholic schools is on the increase, with a consequent sharp rise in salaries. Moreover a multibillion-dollar Federal aid program will mean higher taxes and less money in the pockets of citizens to support independent schools.

"Well, what is being done in other countries?"

In England teachers in denominational schools are paid by the state for the secular subjects taught in these schools. The British Government also pays 75 percent of the cost of the construction of religious schools.

In the Province of Quebec the taxpayer designates which school system is to be the beneficiary of his school tax. Corporation taxes are divided in proportion to the various school populations.

Similar plans are in effect in West Germany, the Netherlands, and Belgium. Even France is recovering from decades of anticlericalism and has voted aid to religious schools.

The unsavory fact is: America is about the only free nation that discriminates against parental rights in education.

"Haven't we made any progress toward recognizing parental rights?"

Yes. The Supreme Court decision on the Oregon law was an important landmark.

Then in 1930 the Supreme Court upheld a Louisiana law that provided free textbooks to children in church and other private schools.

And, in 1947, the same High Tribunal upheld a New Jersey law that provided that tax money could be used to pay bus fares for children attending church schools.

The famous GI bill of rights paid for the education of veterans in the college of their choice.

New York State, and some other States, use public funds to provide scholarships

available to all students, whether in public or nonpublic schools. And these scholarships are valid in church-conducted colleges.

But we still have a long way to go before we catch up with the liberal educational policies of other Western democracies.

"Do you think Congress can be sold on the idea of Federal aid to nonpublic schools?"

Yes, if we stop talking in terms of systems and talk in terms of student-citizens. Federal aid should help citizens, not systems, educational or otherwise. The GI bill of rights shows that it can be done. If we could allocate funds to veterans to attend the college of their choice, what's to stop us from helping children go to the primary and secondary school of their parents' choice? The details would have to be worked out. The principle is there.

"Can the ordinary citizen really do anything?"

Absolutely. He can write a firm but respectful letter to his Senators and Congressman urging justice for all American children, regardless of the school they attend.

Catholics are not alone in recognizing the injustice of the present educational setup. Citizens for Educational Freedom, a nationwide organization dedicated to the working for parental rights numbers many Protestants as well as Catholics among its members.

As far back as January 28, 1939, a noted American educator, Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, wrote in the Saturday Evening Post: "Since we want all American children to get as good an education as they can; since we know some children will not voluntarily attend public schools, and since we are not prepared to compel them to do so, it is in the public interest to give the States permission to use Federal grants to help them to go to the schools they will attend and to make those schools as good as possible."

Russia as the Russians Know It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I comment to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Dr. Mikhail A. Klochko. Dr. Klochko is a noted scientist who defected to the West last year. His assessment of morale and morals within the Soviet Union should be of interest to all.

The article appeared in This Week magazine January 21, 1962:

REVEALED: RUSSIA AS THE RUSSIANS KNOW IT

(By Dr. Mikhail A. Klochko)

(Tourists, correspondents, and diplomats are allowed to see little of the real U.S.S.R. Here at last is the truth about life in Russia, revealed by a noted scientist who escaped to freedom.)

OTTAWA.—Since reaching the safety and freedom of the West, I have been asked many things about my native land. I have found that people on this side of the Iron Curtain have a number of illusions about life in the Soviet Union. I feel that it is important that the real truth be made known. Let me take up some of the questions I have been asked one at a time:

SCIENCE: ARMS AND PROPAGANDA

Some people have asked me how it has been possible for Russian scientists to make such rapid advances.

Russian progress in science is uneven—spectacular in a few fields, backward in others. The main effort has been made in mathematics and physics, which are required for the development of nuclear weapons, missiles, and space flight. This is the secret field in Russian science, and men working in it are under tremendous pressure. The carrot and stick have been used—rewards and pressure. Among themselves Russian scientists joke grimly about the much-advertised bonuses they receive. One story has it that you may be offered either a little bonus or a big bonus. The little bonus is a TV set, a refrigerator, and high blood pressure. The big bonus is a car, a country place, and a heart attack. This is not just a joke—heart attacks are an occupational hazard among Soviet scientists today.

Though Russia has made rapid advances in mathematics and the natural sciences, the West is ahead in all the biological sciences. In some aspects of physics and perhaps in the field of organic chemistry, Russia has a lead. But the West is in advance of Russia in other aspects of physics and chemistry—certainly in parts of my own field of physical and inorganic chemistry.

It is true that in the secret fields the Communist Party rarely interferes directly with scientific projects. But the idea that Soviet scientists lack nothing in the way of equipment or materials—an idea which has been frequently expressed by Western visitors—is quite erroneous. Priority is invariably given to projects with military or propaganda importance; and nonessential research, that aimed at acquiring knowledge rather than for immediate practical application, suffers accordingly. For that fundamental research it is very difficult to get equipment, assistance, and space. When our institute was expanded not long ago almost all the new rooms went to those doing secret work.

And in science, as elsewhere, there is the inefficiency and favoritism that the Soviet system breeds.

MORALE: UNIVERSAL DISILLUSIONMENT

Since my defection I have found that many in the West think most Russians believe ardently in their way of life and support it strongly, that they put up with today's hardships because they believe they are forging ahead and that tomorrow they will catch up with North America and Western Europe.

This anecdote which I heard before I left Russia last August is typical of many told in the U.S.S.R. today and can be seen as an indication of the true attitude of many Soviet citizens. A man explains to a friend that Russians scholars have discovered that Adam and Eve were Soviet citizens.

"It was just a matter of deduction," he says. "They had no clothes to wear. They had only one apple between them. And yet they kept insisting they were in paradise."

Despite the efforts of the Soviet propaganda machine the Russian people know very well that their condition is far from paradise. Grumbling over living conditions is a national characteristic.

"They are going to take the letter M out of the Russian alphabet," you are told. "They just don't need it any more."

"There is no miasso (meat), no moloko (milk), no maslo (butter), no Molotov, no Malenkov."

"But, comrade, what about Marxism?"

"We can do without that most of all."

Such stories indicate a skepticism of the Soviet system that is deep rooted. Disillusionment is almost universal.

TERROR: THE THREAT REMAINS

Other beliefs about Soviet life that seem prevalent in the West are: that the strict Russian regime prevents the existence of widespread crime, alcoholism and the like; and that the terror of Stalin's days no longer menaces the people.

On these matters I have evidence from years spent in Leningrad and Moscow, and my travels to many parts of the Soviet Union.

There is much that cannot be seen on the well-beaten tourist track around Leningrad, Moscow, Kiev, and Sochi. Even trained correspondents and diplomats, restricted in their actions inside Russia, cannot get at the real truth.

The concentration camps are closed and the fear of trumped up charges and imprisonment is gone, but the apparatus of the terror remains. This is something that no wise Russian can forget. I came home to my flat one day to find a KGB secret policeman peering out of a window to watch an apartment nearby where a number of people from other Communist countries were living. The police still watch; envious and fearful people report deviationists. The dossiers grow fatter with the material that one day may again be used to incriminate those who are either blameless or who talked carelessly.

CRIME: TEENAGE GANGS

The most seriously judged crimes in Soviet Russia are political; consequently, the main attention of the police is focused on these. The result is that there is a great deal of ordinary crime—most of it carried out by gangs in their teens and early twenties. My own flat was robbed four times.

There have been many public scandals over the activities of gangs of footloose young people who, using their fathers' cars, money, and influence, have been dubbed "the golden youth." Among them are the sons of government ministers, writers, and composers, the cream of Soviet society.

The grandson of one of the workers in our institute was found strangled. Apparently he knew of a murder that had been committed by a gang of youths, and it was feared he might go to the police.

About 5 years ago a gang of young thieves and prostitutes was arrested. Among them were the sons of the Minister of Foreign Trade, Ivan G. Kabanov, and other high-ranking officials. A number were sentenced to jail terms, but the minister's sons were acquitted.

Nonpolitical crime is the domain of the militia, whose members are poorly paid and open to bribery. I recall a neighbor whom I knew to be an alcoholic telling me that someone had informed the militia patrolman that he was making alcohol in his house. He did not fear the consequences since the militiaman was one of his regular drinking companions.

ALCOHOLISM: A MAJOR PROBLEM

According to statistics circulated in the Soviet Union, Russia is supposed to have the lowest rate of human consumption of alcohol in any country. If this is so, the rest of the world must be far gone in alcoholism. From my observation of drinking in Russia, it has probably one of the highest rates in the world.

Profit from the sale of alcohol, principally vodka, is the largest single income item in the state budget. Anyone who has walked the streets of Moscow or traveled on buses and subways can testify that there is abundant outward evidence of this. Heavy drinking is one of the results of poor social conditions, another indication that the facts of life in the Soviet Union do not bear any resemblance to those portrayed in official statistics or other propaganda.

HOUSING: EIGHT PEOPLE IN THREE ROOMS

In Russia we were often told that in capitalist countries every man pays 20 to 25 percent of his income for an apartment while in Russia it is only 5 percent. The trouble is that very few people can get an apartment. In terms of space I was more fortunate than many, since I had one room to myself. But consider an acquaintance of mine who had two daughters.

After much effort he got sole occupancy of the three-room flat that he had shared with another family for years. Now he and his wife live in the first room. One daughter, her husband, and two children live in the second. The second daughter and her husband live in the third. This family would be happy to pay 25 percent of their incomes and have apartments of their own.

In Russia a young man courting a girl does not ask if she loves him before he proposes marriage. The more important question is, "Have you a room of your own?" Any eligible girl who can answer "yes" to this question does not remain single long.

During World War II and after, many accepted the great difference in living standards between Russia and the West as inevitable. There was the great task of rebuilding factories and cities. Good housing, clothing, and food would come later.

Today this argument is no longer accepted. When Khrushchev said recently that in 20 years Russian couples would be able to marry and have apartments all to themselves, young people I knew reacted angrily. They knew that more comforts of life could be available soon if national emphasis were shifted from preparation for war to the needs of everyday life.

They realize very well that West Germany was beaten into the ground during the war, yet her standard of living is now far higher than Russia's.

SOVIET INTELLECTUALS: EMBITTERED

My experience is that intellectuals in particular hold the United States and Britain in high regard. Scientists returning from abroad have only praise for what they have seen, and the feeling of freedom that they sense everywhere.

I recall some time ago hearing a man in working clothes at a kiosk in Moscow saying to the newsdealer, "I'll have one of these 'Aggressors'." He took a copy of the magazine Amerika, which is distributed by the U.S. State Department. The broad smiles he and the newsdealer exchanged indicated clearly that both took the Soviet propaganda line with grains of salt. Today, however, Amerika is available only to senior Russian officials, and copies are passed from hand to hand many times.

The Russian people are intensely interested in what is going on abroad. The fact that surreptitious means must often be used to get at the truth is what disgusts thinking people. Intellectuals, especially, suffer from a sense of frustration. There is a mock "Creed for Intellectuals" that is current in Russia. It goes:

"Don't think. If you think, don't speak. If you speak, don't write. If you write, don't publish. If you publish, denounce what you have written and confess your errors."

This is exactly the position in which I found myself. Educated people feel more strongly the lack of free access to knowledge than they do the lack of material things. After many years of frustration, I decided that there was no hope of a change that would enable me to carry on my science and studies without interference. To enjoy freedom of the mind it was necessary to leave the Soviet Union.

Before leaving Russia I often thought of the words of the poet Pushkin in his verse, "To My Wife."

"For a long time I, a tired slave, had thought to flee to a far away peaceful place to work and to rest."

Everyone has his own concept of heaven, and mine has always been a place where there was an unlimited supply of books and some friends with whom it was possible to discuss ideas freely. Now, at last, I think I have found it.

Statement by City Manager Joseph McD. Mitchell, Clarifying City's Position on NBC White Paper No. 9, "The Battle of Newburgh," January 29, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following detailed answer to NBC's so-called white paper No. 9, called "The Battle of Newburgh," should go into the RECORD at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I called the attention of the House yesterday to this extremely partial and one-sided presentation, and to the indignation it has caused among the people of the city of Newburgh.

The following statement explains the main objections to the program:

The NBC so-called white paper No. 9, called "The Battle of Newburgh" and broadcast nationwide January 28, has resulted in overwhelming public indignation. The general reaction of the public is that this film was biased, distorted, misleading, and in all respects damaging to the reputation of the city. There follows a brief critique of this film:

1. Approximately 60,000 feet of film were taken and 2,000 or less were used. In this clipping process most of the prominent civic leaders who were very articulate on this subject and who were filmed in support of us were cut out.

2. Those leaders who were used were by and large biased. I refer specifically to a former Congressman, a former judge and a pastor, whose wife works in the welfare department. These people were not identified as to their interests and philosophies which were contrary to us, and were made to appear as typical citizens.

3. The use of cases was highly emotional and no proper explanation of the case history was given. For example, in the family last shown where the man cried, this is a family which has been on relief for years and which has made no constructive contribution to the city. His statements were partially lies. This man's appearance was arranged by the head of a local charitable agency for the express purpose of damaging our case.

4. Extended efforts were made to refute the city manager's position by showing him making a statement followed by a specially arranged shot to attempt to disprove what he said. This was emphasized by the accent and emphasis of Chet Huntley. ("No truly needy person has suffered" followed by crying man).

5. The budget data used was false. It made it appear that two-thirds of the recipients were old age or blind, and that only a very small fraction were aid to dependent children. The facts are that one-quarter were aid to dependent children and a good proportion, approximately 17 percent, was going into administration.

6. The beauty of the city was ignored, its historical background was ignored, and its many advantages were ignored. Efforts were made to show the entire city as a slum. Many beautiful residences were not photographed. Three-quarters of the city was left out of the film and the result was to give the city the appearance of complete decay.

7. Most of the city manager's detailed statistics in reply to charges made against his program were left out.

8. The producers and directors of the film broke two solemn pledges to the city manager; these pledges were that the film would not damage the city and that it would be completely impartial.

9. The migration factor was distorted. The city manager has positive facts to show that migration from the South has been one of the contributing factors to the city's problems.

10. The impression was given that we persecute the aged and the blind. One old woman walking away from the welfare department was made to represent the entire old-age group.

11. The muster or rollcall of recipients was distorted. The film failed to note that many recipients rolled up in Cadillacs, expensive cars of various kinds and taxicabs. They gave the impression that nearly everyone in the line was crippled, disabled, blind and aged, etc.

12. The true popularity of our program among the people as reflected in our successful election based on this issue and as reflected in the popularity of the city manager's speeches throughout the Nation, has been covered up.

13. None of the 13 points were explained, either in their wording or the meaning of them, or the purpose of them.

14. Our success as reflected in cutting taxes, reducing the budget and reducing the rolls without hurting anyone, was completely ignored.

15. Our principal defense took place in a bar and of course the impression to the public was that the articulate, intelligent, informed public was represented by those who are against us and the only ones in favor of us were those sitting around bars drinking.

16. All through the film opinions were emphasized with facts distorted or omitted.

17. The city manager was personally ridiculed time and again. For example, in one case where he was quoted as saying that anyone who wanted a job could find it, and then they quoted the U.S. Department of Labor as saying that Newburgh city was a surplus labor area. This is an absolute lie—the area of Newburgh is a surplus labor area, but they fail to point out that we have reduced the rolls while this area unemployment rate has remained the same.

18. Migration statistics were left out and it was made to look as if there was no migration and then very little from the South and very little impact on welfare. This is the party line of those who oppose us and it even disagreed with the statements of the school superintendent.

In all respects, this was a film which took the guise of a "white paper" which means that it should be impartial, but it was the most partial and partisan effort on record in the welfare field, it played into the hands of the welfare leaders who would create bigger welfare programs and spend more money and it was a deliberate attempt to destroy a man, an issue and a city.

What Goes Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOFFMAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we learn that the President will ask

the Congress to again raise the national debt limit. This raises a question which I am asked many times and propounded in the guest editorial of the New York Daily News reprinted in the Chicago Daily Tribune of January 24. I commend it for your thoughtful consideration.

The editorial follows:

WHAT GOES UP

President Kennedy is asking Congress to hike the national debt limit again this year, from the present $298 billion.

Suppose we'll ever have a President who will ask for a debt limit reduction; or does this ceiling lifting just go on, on, and on until the national financial roof falls in?

The Reserve Officers Association of the United States Has Issued a Statement Presenting Facts and Fiction Regarding the Reserves and Their Response to the President's Callup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said already, and a great deal more probably will be said in the future about the callup of the Reserves last fall to cope with the acute crisis involving the Berlin question.

As many of us in this body have noted, this Nation has every reason to be proud of its military Reserves. However, the distortions about the conduct, and the response, of the Reserves which occurred during the first weeks of October have persisted.

The Reserve Officers Association of the United States recently issued a White Paper on this subject. ROA is a voluntary, independent association known to the Congress for its patriotic program, and for the character if its presentations, in whatever form they may be made. It is to be hoped that this ROA White Paper may result in some constructive changes in the handling of the Reserves.

I am inserting the statement of the ROA in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point because I believe it should be given wide circulation and especially among Members of Congress and military personnel:

A STATEMENT BY THE RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES—"FACT AND FICTION" REGARDING THE RESERVES AND THEIR RESPONSE TO THE PRESIDENT'S CALL-UP

The Reserve Officers Association throughout its history has worked for adequate preparedness as the only means of maintaining peace and national security. The Reserve program is an integral, effective part of our deterrent force to prevent war while insuring our national survival. In the current callup of Reserve Forces by the President, the performance of the Reserves is demonstrating the soundness of these programs. ROA has twice issued public statements in support of the President, whose reliance upon the Reserves in a crisis was fully justified. Yet, the administration of the callup and the attendant distortion of both the performance and the character of the reserve accomplishment has created a widespread national libel. In spite of this genuinely magnificent performance and the efforts of some military leaders to keep alive the reservists' fine spirit, many distortions persist.

Therefore, the time has come to set the record straight with regard to the Nation's Reserve Forces, and their performance in the recent callup.

It is unfortunate that the Secretary of Defense has permited to go unchallenged many public misconceptions about this program. The widespread result of unfairly discrediting reservists, reserve organizations, and the reserve programs as a whole, threatens a severe undermining of morale in the Reserve components. In our view this is a serious setback to the cause of national security.

The Secretary of Defense should be the first to present in proper perspective the Nation's reservists, and to deal fairly with them, their families, and their reputations. Since he has not seen fit to do so, we propose in this paper to provide this urgently needed information.

The Armed Forces Reserve Act became legislation in 1952. The legislation became necessary because of gross mishandling of the Korean callouts by the services under the direction of the then Secretary of Defense.

The act did not become really effective for the Army and Air Force until it was amended in 1955.

Briefly, it established two major classes of reserves: the Ready and the Standby. Within the Ready Reserve it established two major subdivisions—the drilling Reserves and the Ready Reserve pool.

It also established firmly by law the recall provisions for each category.

The Ready Reserve was made liable for recall upon the declaration of a national emergency by the President and he was limited in the numbers that he could call.

The Standby Reserve was made liable for recall upon the declaration of a national emergency by the Congress.

These provisions of law have been used as a source of indoctrination for reservists and became the basic platform upon which the national reserve plan was developed and sold by the Eisenhower administration, spearheaded by the former Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Reserve Forces) the Honorable Carter Burgess.

The national reserve plan was accepted by the reservists—it became their "bible" so to speak.

It also became the "bible" of the services and they made their plans upon its many premises.

What is not generally known and has not been publicized by the Secretary of Defense and his public information staff in their statements and background briefings, is that the Armed Forces Reserve Act, as amended, was not used in the present callup.

Instead, the Secretary of Defense appeared before the congressional committees in closed sessions and requested the Congress to authorize the callup by means of a joint resolution of the Congress.

Both Houses of Congress fully supported the President. However, in their reports the Secretary of Defense was cautioned against the callup of reservists of long active duty service who were not members of drilling units.

This advice was agreed to and promptly discarded by the Secretary of Defense. The Reserves have been confused and the press has been confused.

Here are some prime examples:

1. The performance of the Reserves in the callup has demonstrated their unreliability.

The Army called to active duty over 400 units from the Army Reserve and National Guard, including 3 divisions. They all reported to their stations on schedule. The Army could not have achieved its rapid buildup and maintained its professional competence without them.

In this partial mobilization, the Navy-selected Reserve provided 40 destroyer types, 18 air squadrons with 190 aircraft to the Fleet. These ships and aircraft squadrons commanded and manned by Reserves took their places alongside their professional contemporaries of the Regular Navy without incident and without any postmobilization training. This was accomplished smoothly, efficiently, and without complaint.

Similarly, the Air Reserve forces provided 11 heavy air transport squadrons with 88 aircraft, and 25 fighter and reconnaissance squadrons, with 576 jet aircraft that became immediately operational. Many were performing 24-hour alerts at overseas bases just weeks after their callup.

This marks a signal achievement in this Nation's history and provides a convincing demonstration of the readiness and effectiveness of our Reserves.

2. The Reserves took pay for training but tried to evade the callup (the "gripers").

Virtually all the gripes came from the "fillers," not the paid reservists. These fillers who were called up to bring units up to strength were not paid reservists. They came from pools of individuals with a remaining service obligation under the Universal Military Training and Service Act. Many of them had just recently completed two years of active duty under the draft. They were not members of the organized units whose regularly assigned personnel were trained, disciplined, and oriented for the callup. The fillers who had been called up, without the training and orientation may well have been expected to gripe. The Senate report on Senate Joint Resolution 120 stated clearly the desire of Congress that the burden should not fall on the people who had already given service to their country. The Defense Department chose to ignore this and called up large numbers of fillers for the Army and a smaller number for the Air Force. The result provides direct evidence of the wisdom of the Senate Armed Services Committee. Most of the gripes came from the Army, a few from the Air Force, and virtually none from the Navy, which did not use fillers at all.

3. The Reserve program is extremely costly.

This is obviously false. Defense Department officials at the highest levels have repeatedly testified, for administration after administration, to the economies achieved through the use of Reserves. Man for man the cost is appreciably much lower; the Reserve budget, even at highest figures, is less than 3 percent of the total for the Defense Establishment.

4. The callup response has demonstrated the unreliability of the Army Reserve combat divisions.

Out of 10 combat divisions in the Army Reserve, none were called. One Reserve training division was called, and it demonstrated beyond question or doubt its capability in taking over basic training missions from the Regular Army, thus freeing several combat divisions for deployment.

5. The reservist can retire on half pay after 20 years service.

No member of the Reserve Forces can retire until he reaches the age of 60. Then he receives only modest pay based upon his actual service. For practical purposes it takes 7 years of Reserve service to add up to 1 year of equivalent active service credit. The only reservist who retires upon half

pay after 20 years service is the one who has completed 20 years of active duty in the Active Forces (Regular), and then he gets the same retirement pay as a regular officer with the same active duty.

6. Reservists have not oriented themselves to the thought that they are called up to prevent a fight, rather than to fight.

This callup marked the first time in our country's history that Reserves have been mobilized in peacetime to prevent a war rather than fight one. It represented a radical change in the Reserve concept.

In a free country such as ours, such changes can usually be digested only after careful explanation and indoctrination. Otherwise such an involuntary change in the constitutional status of individuals would precipitate serious and sustained criticisms.

The policy was changed, suddenly, and unexpectedly. Nevertheless, our Reserves responded effectively. A few criticisms have been magnified out of all proportion.

The real need for orientation is in the Department of Defense. The impatience expressed with the Reserves reflects a long existing need for greater attention and understanding of their character. Reservists are human beings—not numbers, nor checkers—nor even employees. Sound personnel practices should be applied in their cases as well as for any other segment of our society.

CONCLUSION

There has been no secret about the desire on the part of some authorities in the Defense Department to undermine and to eliminate from the national defense complex the Reserve programs. These elements are understood to operate largely from the comptroller level, where their orientation and training is in the fiscal field. Their views have been reflected in the continuing efforts during the post-Korean period to substantially reduce—and actually to phase out over a period of several years—the Reserve Forces. These individuals undoubtedly are gifted in the fields of financial management; we question their qualification to determine national defense policy, upon which this Nation relies for its survival. Yet these people now appear to have reached the zenith of their influence.

Careful management of our Nation does not rest upon a dollar management alone; it involves the directing of many facets of our society, the most precious of which is personnel, and the most indispensable of which is spiritual. The people of this country will supply whatever resources are necessary to survive, if they are granted the right to participate in their Government, and if their will to win is carefully nurtured and kept free and wholesome.

The patriotic dedication which is characteristic of the men and women of the Reserve Forces is sensitive although robust; it deserves much more than the harassment to which the Defense Department bookkeepers have subjected them within the past few years.

Every officer who has ever commanded a platoon, or a company, knows how delicate is this matter of handling men to insure best combat morale and how disastrous is this failure of leadership. The chiefs of our military services, all of whom have had this leadership experience up through the ranks, are best qualified to act with authority in this field.

The failure of a full understanding of the broadest aspects of the Reserve program on the part of the Department of Defense has followed the abolishment of the offices of Assistant Secretary for Personnel and Reserves in the various services, and the obvious downgrading of the Reserve consideration at all levels. This has denied the citizen-reservist concept a fully informed champion and spokesman in the shadowy recesses of the Pentagon, where decisions are reached by mysterious methods not shared with the American people—or even with the Congress. Much of the present threat to our traditional—and successful—reliance for national safety upon the citizens of this country could be ended by a reversal of present procedures and a restoration on the secretarial level of each service of a statutory spokesman for the Reserves.

Of equal importance, the Secretary of Defense has bypassed the Reserve Forces Policy Board which was established by law to "be the principal policy adviser to the Secretary of Defense on matters pertaining to the Reserve components." The RFPB by all means must be called upon to participate in formulative stages, as well as in arriving at decisions in these major matters affecting the Reserves.

A need for greater utilization also exists in the offices of the service secretaries, who have been given by statute, Reserve policy committees with similar responsibilities.

There is even a need for closer coordination of program planning with the appropriate congressional committees, in order that the Congress may adequately meet its constitutional obligations in providing for the national defense.

Our reliance upon the citizen-reservist is more than a cherished tradition; it is a demonstrable strength. No civilization has ever survived through a reliance solely upon the professional military organizations, however skilled and dedicated they might have been.

In the prospectively long conflict with world communism, the economic burdens of an unusual and continuing requirement for military expenditures is lightened by the Reserves, whose proportionate cost is much less than that for the Regular.

The United States, since the days of the first minutemen, has relied upon its civilian military force to safeguard our freedom. It is more important today than ever in history that there be a more ready, widely dispersed military capability. We need a trained Ready Reserve of many millions of men and women and any potential enemy must be aware of our preparedness—if national survival is to be achieved.

Dallas Editorial Questions President's Motive in Setting Up New Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, if it was the intention of the President to play politics, as some have indicated, in calling for the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and naming the Secretary in advance, his principal achievement has been to create more confusion as shown in the following editorial from the Dallas Morning News:

UNBORN BABY

From President Kennedy's remarks at his press conference, it is not clear whether he wants a new Department of Urban Affairs for its own sake or to reward the present head of the Federal Housing Agency with a Cabinet post.

The issue is clouded by Mr. Kennedy's revelation that he already has a Secretary in mind for his unborn Cabinet baby. He is Robert C. Weaver, whose Housing Agency, as the President points out, would be the most important part of the new Department.

If this is his primary aim, it would be far less costly to taxpayers if the President were to name Mr. Weaver to the next vacancy occurring within the present Cabinet. But if the proposed new Department is to stand on its own merits, the 9-to-6 adverse vote in the House Rules Committee appears to be a fair idea of what Congress as a whole thinks of it.

Frank Cusumano, Citizen and Patriot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD a brief article about my good friend, Frank Cusumano, which was published in a recent issue of the Key West (Fla.) Citizen.

Frank Cusumano is a singer of repute and at one time made a notable career as an artist in this field, singing as a tenor with the San Carlo Opera Co. In the fall of 1959, when I headed a congressional delegation to the International Astronautical Federation Congress in London and from there proceeded to visit Poland, the U.S.S.R., and other countries, Frank Cusumano accompanied me on the trip.

On several notable occasions during our visit to the Soviet Union he broke the tension by his vibrant melodious voice, his good naturedness and his pleasant way with people. He even dared to sing in the Kremlin in Moscow—and I understand he was the first to do so—and he was applauded by parliamentarians present.

Frank Cusumano also sang at the Bristol Hotel in Leningrad, and over the radio in Moscow from the Prague Hotel. His repertoire consists of classical selections.

He was always a great patriot of this country, but after having seen Russia and the miserable conditions of life under communism, he has become even more conscious of his citizenship and loyalty to America and very often speaks before civic groups about his experiences during that trip and how much better our way of life is compared with that of the Russian system.

Mr. Speaker, the article from the Key West newspaper reads as follows:

HI-NOONERS ENJOY SONGS BY CUSUMANO

Highlighting the first noon luncheon meeting of the Hi-Noon Lions Club in the Garden of Roses was the appearance of Frank Cusumano, owner of the Lani Apartments here and well-known active opera and concert singer, who presented beautiful vocal selections with Kingman Curry accompanying at the piano.

"The Lord's Prayer" was sung by Cusumano as the invocation. During the luncheon meeting, the talented and highly rated singer delighted the club members and their guests with several numbers, including "My Wild

Irish Rose" and "When Irish Eyes are Smiling."

The district governor's cabinet meeting will be held January 28, in the Disabled American Veterans' Hall at Hialeah. At this meeting the local Hi-Noon Lions will present the program, which they have prepared for the district governor's weekend to be held in Key West April 6, 7, and 8.

President Enoch H. Walker urged any of the members at the luncheon to attend the cabinet meeting in Hialeah.

A meeting has been scheduled for Thursday night at 8 at the Lions Den with the Key West Lions for the planning of the program to be persented at the district governor's weekend. Fred Sponsoltz is committee representative chairman for the Hi-Noon Lions Club.

Cusumano told the group, "I love Key West and hope that I am a part of Key West." Cusumano, a constant visitor in Key West, and his wife are presently visiting with their daughter, Mrs. Ryder Murphy, and five grandchildren.

Cusumano, resident of Baltimore, Md., has sung with many great artists including the world-famous baritone, John Charles Thomas, who before his death was a director and one of the founders of the Bio-Ram Drug Co. for which Cusumano is chairman of the board of directors.

The Lani Apartments were purchased in 1954 by Cusumano, who realized the need in Key West for apartments to meet the demand for good living.

Cusumano offers his services generously to the people of Key West as an opera artist, singing for various civic and religious organizations.

Cusumano said, "In 1959 I accompanied the chairman of the airspace congressional committee to Russia, where I had the privilege of being the first American artist to sing in the Kremlin, which is in the U.S. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD."

Other guests at the Hi-Noon Lions Club luncheon were James Atkinson, Lawton T. Thornley, Joe Allen, and John Parker.

The Impossible Became Indispensable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial from the December 31, 1961, issue of the Los Angeles Times concerning the Big Creek hydroelectric system in the Sierra Mountains in California.

The story of the development and growth of Big Creek is impressive. The project symbolizes the great contribution to our progress in the power field made by private enterprise.

The editorial follows:

THE IMPOSSIBLE BECAME INDISPENSABLE

Fifty years ago this month work began on a railroad into the rugged Sierras northwest of Fresno. There were only 56 miles of track but they led to what has become one of the most impressive engineering achievements of the century—the Big Creek hydroelectric system.

In the years that followed, 15 major dams, 6 manmade lakes, and 10 major tunnels were built for the Southern California Edison Co. facility. Its eight powerhouses can now develop a total of 700,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, sufficient to serve a city of nearly a million people.

More than 85 billion kilowatt-hours of energy have been created at Big Creek by harnessing the water resources. It is too often forgotten, however, that electric power itself is not a natural resource. It is a manufactured product whose development only begins with water supplies. To make it and deliver it requires vast amounts of work and equipment. The investment in the Big Creek system alone now amounts to $214 million.

Big Creek, moreover, has served southern California and central California in other ways than producing essential electricity. The system helped halt the disastrous floods that once caused heavy damage in the San Joaquin Valley. And by utilizing those waters it has made possible new irrigation projects and created a new recreation area for fishermen and campers.

These achievements are made even more impressive by the fact that the entire undertaking was done without Federal aid, solely by private investment. There were no Federal subsidies or tax advantages. Instead Big Creek has provided more than $200 million in Federal, State, and local tax revenue.

When it was first discussed the Big Creek project was described as "impossible." Half a century later the description is "indispensable."

New York's "Rockymandering"—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, Congressman FRANK CHELF, Democrat, of Kentucky, has filed a petition to enlarge the House membership from 435 to 469. Approximately 165 Members have signed this petition, which would, if successful, bring up for consideration his bill to increase the membership to eliminate many inequities and gross injustices. Not since 1911 when the membership was increased from 386 to 435 has there been a change in the numbers of congressional Members. The population in 1911 was 91 million and today our population is 183 million and the number 435 remains the same.

Under our Constitution, the House of Representatives sets the number of its membership and the State legislatures of the respective States delineate and fix the congressional districts. The membership of each State depends upon the ratio of its population to the national population. By reason of the increase in population since 1950 and because of the shifting population, some States are entitled to increased membership, others lose membership. Sixteen States find themselves losing one or more Members.

Every State, with the exception of Massachusetts, has taken legislative action to redistrict congressional lines. As a result of redistricting and because of backroom politics, many Members find themselves without recognizable districts or are located in areas in which likelihood of election is negligible. Where there is a division between the legislature and the Governor, certain States have adjusted and worked out their differences reasonably. Where one party dominates both the legislature and the executive department, raw politics has entered into the determination. My State, New York, is in this category.

The Republican-dominated New York State Legislature under the firm hand of a politically ruthless Governor has redistricted the congressional districts in an attempt to bring about the election of Republican Congressmen far in excess of their actual numbers. Mayor Robert F. Wagner, Democrat, from New York City, has attempted to correct this political injustice and has directed the corporation counsel of the city of New York to take legal action to set aside the political decision taken by the legislature and the Governor in the special session in November of 1961. The "Rockymandering" of the congressional districts is designed to scuttle President John F. Kennedy's liberal program by bringing about the election of reactionary Republicans who will oppose the liberal programs. A Biblical statement discloses that "man proposes, but God disposes." Perhaps Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, who has demonstrated a political ruthlessness comparable to the cutthroat tactics of the economic barons of the 19th century, may not eventually succeed.

The New York Times, one of America's great newspapers, in a series of editorials indicated its sense of outrage by this political redistricting and highlighted some of the most glaring inequities perpetrated by the Republican legislature and the Republican Governor of New York State.

While the New York Times omitted to mention the Republican preference shown to the Republican Congressman in the 17th Congressional District in carving out a district with 50,000 less residents than the adjoining districts and in incorporating a section in the south and north which seemed most favorable to Republicans and would divide the opposition, the editorials hit hard and exposed the political grab. The first of the three editorials follows:

NEW YORK'S GERRYMANDERING—I

A letter on this page by George M. Shapiro, a distinguished Republican lawyer, defends New York's recent realinement of congressional districts by virtually ignoring the gerrymandering and pointing to the one respect in which proper standards did rule—relative equality of population.

Representative government requires more than this. It presumes that those entrusted with lawmaking powers are reasonably representative of the interests, thinking, and aspirations of the people in whose name they legislate. The Republican legislature violated this principle in fixing lines for many of the 22 districts outside New York City. These were so drawn that Republican candidates are now favored in 20 districts and Democrats in only 2, even though the Democrats ordinarily poll 40 to 45 percent of the congressional vote in these areas. Not only do the new lines thus fail to meet the test of fairness in party balance, but a number also ignore the desirability of creating districts in such a way that the voters represented have major interests in common, as in a river basin or a natural marketing area.

The new 35th District, for example, stretches for nearly 200 miles from Ontario County on the west through Montgomery County on the east. The counties at the western end are part of the Rochester industrial and commercial area; those in the center have natural ties with Syracuse and Binghamton; the eastern end has little in common with any of these cities but a great deal in common with Utica, Schenectady, Albany, and the Mohawk Valley generally. The new district's absurdity may be judged by its inclusion of parts of 3 of the State's 10 judicial districts and of 5 State senate districts. The judicial and senate districts, in general, are areas in which the people are linked by common interest. The same yardstick ought to apply, within reason, in considering congressional boundaries.

The only credible explanation for the lines used in the 35th District lies in the demands of partisan politics—a desire to benefit Republicans and to prevent the return to Congress of Representative SAMUEL S. STRATTON, a Democrat from Schenectady and a rising light in State politics. This is a reason that reflects no credit on the Republican leadership at Albany. In subsequent editorials we shall discuss other districts where partisan considerations resulted in violence to proper standards of apportionment.

The Budget: Plan or Politics?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, Raymond Moley in his column in the current issue of Newsweek magazine makes some pertinent comments on the President's budget. Among other things, he points out that there seems to be no definite pattern or plan for the future in the proposed expenditures. Yesterday's debate on H.R. 8900, the bill to provide Federal aid for the construction of academic facilities in institutions of higher learning seemed to emphasize this point. We now have some 40 Federal programs of Federal aid to higher education. This would not seem to indicate definite planning in the past and I agree that the budget does not reveal specifically a plan for the future.

The budget does reveal that the President has an eye for advocating programs and expenditures which appeal to a broad segment of the voters. I think this has been the primary objective of the plans for Government spending during the past 30 years. I think the President's budget does follow a plan perhaps more specifically designed to appeal to the voters than to socialize our economy, but it seems to me the results have been pretty consistent. More and more of our people and more and more of our officials in high places in Government seem to have lost faith in private enterprise. This seems fantastic at this particular time since we are witnessing in Western Europe the amazing achievements of a free enterprise economy. In spite of this present proof of the worth of a system that has proven its value time and again through recent history, the present administration goes on down the line of more Federal spending and more Federal regulations as the answer to everyone's problems.

The budget may not reveal a plan for the future, but it does reveal a consistency.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the column by Raymond Moley:

BIG—BUT WHAT IS IT?

(By Raymond Moley)

As the new Kennedy budget reveals itself in the press, we pause for identification. For now, in the estimates for fiscal 1963, we see the first genuine pattern of New Frontier ideas and purposes. The President's budget for 1962 presented a year ago was a hasty revision of the budget prepared under the Eisenhower regime. Now there can be no suggestion of haste or improvisation. For the President, his budget bureau, and the various departments and agencies have had a year to put together their plans for the sort of Nation they want to establish. In short, to implement their philosophy—if they have one. What emerges?

It is certainly big. The spending the President asked for is $11 billion more than the year ending last June and $16 billion more than the last full Eisenhower year.

Is this socialism? No, although there is some socialism in it. Generally, the pattern is not to take over means of production except in such areas as the production and transmission of electric power. The philosophy which has replaced socialism is not to undertake the immense responsibility of running the means of production. Instead, it is the easier process of taking the product of private production in money, through taxation.

Is it the welfare state? No, although there is a lot of welfare in it.

NO CONSISTENCY

Is it a return to the planned economy which so many were hopeful of establishing in the 1930s? No. To call this great indiscriminate mass of benefits and projects a plan is to desecrate a good old word. Nobody planned all this. It was not created; it simply accumulated.

That becomes clear when we examine the list of innumerable odds and ends for which money is to be spent. There is nothing homogeneous about such a collection. There is no likeness or interrelationship among such items as subsidized transportation for city and suburban dwellers, rural telephones, school lunches, a National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, the preservation of life among ducks and bears, retraining workers displaced by automation, and aid to speculators in land through urban renewal. There is provided not only money for stopping juvenile delinquency but for the enlargement of prisons; for buying tombstones and for studying the Greek Orthodox Church in Alaska.

I prefer to call the new Federal establishment, which is casting its shadow over the Doric simplicity of our original constitutional system, by another name. This was suggested more than 40 years ago by Dean Pound of the Harvard Law School: The super-service state. Abundance there is, but consistency there is not.

Its limit is described by Parkinson's "second law," which holds that in modern governments expenditures rise to the limits of income. In the case at hand, if revenues from taxes fail to meet expenditures, a capital levy on savings is enacted through inflation.

SEMANTICS

There is also in the new dispensation a depreciation in the meaning of old words by a simple revision. A very large proportion of the increase in this budget comes because of back-door spending. These expenditures really take money from the Treasury, and the schoolboys of the Nation will read in their Constitution that no money is to be taken from the Treasury "but in consequence of appropriations made by law." Back-door spending since 1932 has been accomplished to the extent of more than $100 billion by the simple device of not calling these expenditures "appropriations."

In the President's state of the Union message he referred to the prospective purchase by the United States of $100 million of United Nations bonds. He admitted that many members of that organization do little to support it but that in order to have the right to sound off and vote they pay their dues. Those dues would, he said, pay the interest on the bonds. And then the President said that such borrowing with the payment of interest would keep the U.S. solvent. Since I never heard of anyone becoming more solvent by borrowing money, I sought Webster. It says that to be solvent is "to be able or sufficient to pay all debts." Thus we move into the frontier of semantics.

New York's "Rockymandering"—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial published in the New York Times of January 24, 1962. It is the second of a series of editorials exposing the political chicanery of the Republican Party in congressional redistricting.

The editorial is as follows:

NEW YORK'S GERRYMANDERING—II

In modern cities people of similar interests, culture, or income tend to live close to one another and to develop close-knit neighborhoods. Over the years these form harmonious and durable political ties with surrounding neighborhoods of somewhat different cultural background. The people in such groups of neighborhoods have every right to expect that the State, in readjusting congressional and legislative districts, will take cognizance of their historical associations and common interests so that any change will entail minimum disruption of their traditional political pattern.

Any such natural hopes entertained by Brooklyn voters were shattered by the legislature in its recent revision of congressional district lines in that borough. Population shifts made it necessary to reduce Brooklyn's representation by one seat, but the way the reduction was accomplished affronted the canons of sound reapportionment.

Instead of enlarging the present Eighth District (which used to take in Greenpoint, Williamsburg and parts of Bushwick and Ridgewood) by adding contiguous areas, the legislature has tacked on Red Hook, South Brooklyn, and Erie Basin. Now the district, renumbered the 14th, consists of two distinct parts that have never before shared representatives in Congress or the legislature. One faces the East River and Queens; the other Upper New York Harbor. Their link is a narrow, unpopulated corridor skirting Brooklyn Heights. Incongruous as is this political merger of Greenpoint and Red Hook,

the new 16th District outdoes it in violence to the principles that should govern congressional apportionment.

The 16th consists of Staten Island, which has too little population to warrant a Representative of its own, and a jagged slice of Flatbush, Flatlands, and Canarsie in Brooklyn. Manifestly, the linking of Staten Island with Bay Ridge, as it existed in the old 15th District, constituted a far more logical grouping. Bay Ridge looks across the Narrows to the island and soon will be joined to it by the Verazzano Bridge. Those who live in the Brooklyn section of the new 16th District will have to cross at least two other congressional districts to reach Staten Island unless they swim down Coney Island Creek and across the Narrows.

Obviously, the only purpose of the monstrous changes in these two districts was to permit the revision of the old 12th District, now the 15th, to give an advantage to Republican candidates. Another area that was subjected to the distortions of political redistricting by the Republican leadership at Albany will be discussed in a subsequent editorial.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided*, That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

The U.N. Bond Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I read in the Near East Report of January 30 a very interesting presentation in support of the United Nations bond issue.

The material presented is so practical that I recommend it for reading by all the Members:

THE U.N. BOND ISSUE

President Kennedy today asked Congress for authority to purchase $100 million of the United Nations $200 million 25-year bond issue. The United Nations needs the money to pay off $110 million in back debts and to put its fiscal house in order.

On practical grounds, this proposal is in our national interest.

The United Nations regular budget in 1961 was $72.7 million. All member states contribute. We paid 32.5 percent—$22.3 million.

The cost of U.N. operations in the Congo for 10 months was $100 million. Because the Soviet bloc, the French, the Belgians, and others do not contribute, we paid almost half the bill—$47.5 million.

The 1961 cost of the U.N. Emergency Force which guards the Gaza-Israel frontier and the Straits of Tiran was $19.7 million. Again, because the Soviet and Arab blocs won't contribute, we paid more than 40 percent—$7.9 million.

The United Nations has asked the International Court to rule that the Soviet Union and other nations should pay for all U.N. operations even though they disapprove of them. This would make it unnecessary for our country to carry more than its fair share.

The bond issue would help accomplish the same objective because the cost of amortizing the bonds would be paid out of the regular assessments which all nations now pay.

The amount is small indeed. It is dwarfed by the billions we spend for defense, missiles, moon shots, and for journeys into space. We should be ready to spend money in the affirmative search for peace.

Practical considerations aside, the bond issue is urgently commended by principle.

The United Nations is not a perfect instrument. The world was already bitterly divided when it came into existence in 1945. The United Nations has made blunders. It has suffered frustration and defeats. Yet it continues to be the world's major agency for peace. As long as it exists, there is a forum in which nations can talk to each other, air their conflicts and—by persistent effort—resolve them.

The United States emerged from drugged isolationism long ago. We no longer imagine that we can live alone. We are committed to collective action to deter war. If the United Nations is not adequate or effective, we should be trying hard to repair its imperfections. We should not handicap it by withholding financial support.

A positive response by Congress is worth infinitely more than a loan of $100 million. It is renewed attestation of our support for the charter and the institution created to uphold it. We need to heighten respect for the United Nations in our own country. We need to strengthen its prestige and authority everywhere. What Congress does will be watched by parliaments and cabinets in other lands. It would be unfortunate if other nations should come to believe that we are indifferent or unconcerned.

Andrew F. Schoeppel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT DOLE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, the high esteem Kansans had for their recently departed Senator, Andrew F. Schoeppel, transcended party bounds, and had no sectional limits. Tributes to his splendid service to Kansas and the Nation have since appeared in papers all across our State from Republicans and Democrats alike.

One splendid testimonial to the high regard in which Senator Schoeppel was held, was made by one of the leading Democrats of Kansas, Mr. Jerry E. Driscoll of Russell, and appeared in the Russell Daily News on January 23, 1962. Mr. Speaker, I request it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

OUR FRIEND ANDY

A tribute now to Andrew F. Schoeppel, Kansas Senator, comes easily. There's no conscience pang for the late Senator was on a first-name basis to most of his constituents. He was Andy to thousands of Kansans and, because of it, knew pretty well what kind of a job he was doing for the folks back home. Unlike many whose death is lammented in the press, Andy found the time to talk and counsel with his friends. He wasn't the sort of man to whom one offered praise to his face and reserved more candid opinions.

Political lines were no barrier to his friendships. Significant and typical of the feeling of Kansans for Andy Schoeppel is shown in the following tribute from Jerry E. Driscoll, Russell attorney, lifelong political opponent and warm friend of the Senator. It shows, we believe, a reason why Kansans feel so deeply the State's loss.

A TRIBUTE TO ANDY SCHOEPPEL

Kansans were shocked by the recent death of my personal friend, Andy Schoeppel. He was a capable, hard-hitting and conservatively bent, two time governor of Kansas, and thrice elected U.S. Senator.

His professional career began in Ness County, where he was considered "one of our own." We were associated in many legal battles in Western Kansas, and I found him to be a big man, in every sense of the word, and thereafter, his successful career in public office speaks eloquently of the high esteem in which he was held throughout the entire State, and the respect accorded his sincerity by Senate colleagues speaks equally well of his recognized ability.

We were on or connected with opposing athletic teams while he was a student, at the University of Nebraska, and I was a student at Kansas University. Shep was born on a farm near Claflin, in Barton County, approximately 7 miles south of the farm where I was born in Russell County, and our fathers were friends during the early day farm life and hardships.

My nephew later married a cousin of Andy Schoeppel; while Senator Schoeppel and I represented different political parties, it, in no way, affected the personal friendship which I am happy to say existed between us at all times. I had always admired the deep and sincere convictions he held on Government matters and the fact that he fought for these with all of the vigor at his command.

While Governor of Kansas and without solicitation on my part, he appointed me and reappointed me as a member of the Board of Regents of the State of Kansas. Seldom did he ever visit Russell without paying me a visit. By reason of his death, the Nation has lost another individual who honestly believed in the traditional American free enterprise system. That was my friend, Andy Schoeppel.

JERRY E. DRISCOLL.

The B-52—Still Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which was aired this week by KAKE television and radio in Wichita, Kans., entitled "The B-52: Still Needed." I believe that my colleagues in the House will be most interested in reading this excellent expression of opinion on the continued importance of the manned airplane:

THE B-52: STILL NEEDED

So great are the distractions of the cold war and the space age that few of us paid much attention to that giant Boeing Stratofortress bomber which smashed many a record recently by flying nonstop and without refueling—half way 'round the world.

We do not even recognize the names of Maj. Clyde T. Evely and his crew. They flew the newest version of the Strategic Air Command's finest bomber from Okinawa to Spain.

Other personalities—like Astronaut John Glenn—now occupy center stage.

Still, a swell flight by some old-fashioned birdmen has a deeper meaning than the records they broke. The feat demonstrated afresh the ability of the H model of the

B-52 to carry the 1,000-mile air-launched Skybolt ballistic missile—wherever necessary.

The fuel efficiency of this craft is a match for its accuracy. It can approach its targets 11 miles high—or at nearly treetop level, beneath the beams of defensive radar.

All these homely but reliable attributes—especially its standoff capability, through which it can loose its missiles beyond the range of the enemy's defensive missiles—give to the newest B-52 an immunity, for the time being, from technological obsolescence.

Reckless is the prophet who says that the piloted plane is no longer needed.

To Achieve Excellence in Education the Fine Arts Must Have Equal Status in Our Public Schools and Colleges With Such Credit Courses as Science and Modern Foreign Languages, as Well as With Football, Basketball, Automobile Mechanics, Typing, Bookkeeping, and Shorthand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, to achieve excellence in education, the fine arts must have equal status in our public schools and colleges with such credit courses as science and modern foreign languages, as well as with football, basketball, automobile mechanics, typing, bookkeeping, and shorthand.

In his state of the Union message the President said he would recommend to the Congress proposals to stimulate the arts.

Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg, in his December 15, 1961, arbitration award in the Metropolitan Opera dispute, made a number of excellent suggestions for stimulating the fine arts.

I have now introduced a bill, H.R. 9906, which is based on one of Secretary Goldberg's suggestions. My bill, however, would support the arts in the public schools and colleges of this country, and it will provide more than $6,520,000 for this purpose without a cent of Federal appropriations.

Dr. Ralph G. Beelke, executive secretary of the Art Department of the National Education Association, has written to the White House in support of my bill, saying:

> A little over 1 year ago, I visited the Soviet Union as part of a U.S. delegation to study arts education programs. My reaction was similar to the reactions of other U.S. observers of Soviet education in other fields. I was impressed by the strong support given by the Soviet Government to the arts in general and especially to educational programs. Our delegation also had the opportunity to talk with Madam Furtseva, Minister of Culture, and she told us of plans to increase the educational programs in all areas of the arts.
>
> I would not want to recommend that we support the arts and arts education because it is done in the Soviet Union. I would, however, strongly encourage the use of the arts to support and achieve our national goals to the same degree that the Soviets use the arts to achieve their purposes. The views of the two countries relating to the arts differ in the same manner that they differ in other fields. In our country, however, we have not allowed the arts to make the contribution to the strengthening of our national life which they are capable of making. It is time now that we did something about this, for the struggle in which we are engaged is too great for us not to use every means at our disposal to achieve our ends.

It is certainly true, as Secretary Goldberg pointed out, that the principal source of support for the arts now and in the future must be the private citizens who together constitute a vast and widely diverse audience.

If the private citizen is to support the arts to the fullest extent he must be an educated citizen and the fine arts must be an integral and basic part of his education. This was seen by the Founding Fathers, particularly Presidents Washington and Jefferson who were outspoken on the need for the arts in the education of young Americans.

In his first annual address to Congress on January 8, 1790, President Washington said:

> There is nothing which can better deserve our patronage than the promotion of science and literature. Whether this desirable object will be the best promoted by affording aids to seminaries of learning already established, by the institution of a national university, or by any other expedients, will be worthy of a place in the deliberations of the Legislature.

At another point, President George Washington said:

> The prosperity of our country is closely connected with our improvement in the useful arts.

And President Washington declared that:

> The arts and sciences essential to the prosperity of the state and to the ornament and happiness of human life have a primary claim to the encouragement of every lover of his country and mankind.

While I do not think that the $6 million plus provided annually by my bill, H.R. 9906, will really balance the great emphasis given the sciences in our colleges and universities by the more than $2 billion which the Federal Government annually spends on scientific research this relatively small sum will indicate that the Federal Government is finally heeding President Washington's sound advice as to including the arts in the education of our young people.

I introduced H.R. 9906 at the request of Dr. Ralph E. Purcell, chairman of the department of political science, University of Delaware. Dr. Purcell is the author of the highly regarded book, "Government and Art," an authoritative work on the history and development of the art activities of the Federal Government.

I am pleased that Dr. Ralph G. Beelke, past adviser on art to the U.S. Office of Education, and now executive secretary of the art department of the powerful National Education Association, also favors my bill.

I include here explanatory material on H.R. 9906:

THE NATIONAL ART EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., January 31, 1962.

Re H.R. 9906.

Mr. HENRY HALL WILSON, Jr.,
Administrative Assistant to the President, White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WILSON: In his state of the Union message to the Congress, President Kennedy said that he would recommend bills "to stimulate the arts." A bill supporting the arts was recently introduced into the Congress by Congressman HARRIS B. McDOWELL, Jr., Democrat, of Delaware, and it is my hope that the President will give his support to this legislation as part of his program of arts stimulation.

The bill to which I refer is H.R. 9906, a bill to provide for the establishment of a National Arts Agency in the U.S. Office of Education to aid in the creation and understanding of, and education in, the fine arts. This bill differs from other arts legislation of recent years in that it aims to support the arts where it will do the most good in the long run, namely, school arts programs.

Our association has for years supported efforts to encourage Federal recognition of the arts as an important part of our national life. Last year the association presented a special citation to Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., of New Jersey, for his efforts in this field, and the records of congressional hearings are testimony to our sincerity. We believe, however, that the principle of "reciprocal reinforcement" operates in the arts as it does in other fields and that our cultural life will be vigorous and strong in direct relationship to the strength and vigor of education programs in the arts.

While I cannot speak officially at this time, I am confident that, on the basis of previous resolutions passed in our convention, our association will go on record soon in support of this legislation.

As an individual, I also feel quite strongly about the need for encouraging school arts programs. A little over 1 year ago, I visited the Soviet Union as part of a U.S. delegation to study arts education programs. My reaction was similar to the reactions of other U.S. observers of Soviet education in other fields. I was impressed by the strong support given by the Soviet government to the arts in general and especially to educational programs. Our delegation also had the opportunity to talk with Madam Furtseva, Minister of Culture, and she told us of plans to increase the educational programs in all areas of the arts.

I would not want to recommend that we support the arts and arts education because it is done in the Soviet Union. I would, however, strongly encourage the use of the arts to support and achieve our national goals to the same degree that the Soviets use the arts to achieve their purposes. The view of the two countries relating to the arts differ in the same manner that they differ in other fields. In our country, however, we have not allowed the arts to make the contribution to the strengthening of our national life which they are capable of making. It is time now that we did something about this, for the struggle in which we are engaged is too great for us not to use every means at our disposal to achieve our ends.

I hope you will convey to the President my support of Mr. McDOWELL's bill and my support of the President's program of general arts stimulation. He can be confident that he has the support of art teachers throughout the country in his efforts to stimulate arts activities. If we can in any way help in these efforts, we hope the President will feel free to call upon us.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH G. BEELKE,
Executive Secretary, the National Art Education Association.

H.R. 9906

(In the House of Representatives, January 25, 1962, Mr. McDowell introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor)

A bill to provide for the establishment of a National Arts Agency in the United States Office of Education to aid in the creation and understanding of, and education in, the fine arts

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby established in the United States Office of Education a National Arts Agency to advance the creation and understanding of, and education in, the fine arts.

Sec. 2. All writings, including music, now or hereafter in the public domain shall be the property of the United States as copyright owner and be used for the benefit of the public and to advance the creation and understanding of, and education in, the fine arts.

Sec. 3. The United States, acting through the National Arts Agency, shall collect royalties on the writings, including music, which it owns as copyright owner, and utilize the proceeds in such amounts and in such manner, including holding national competitions and festivals in the Nation's Capital, as best to advance the creation and understanding of, and education in, the fine arts, and to pay for administering the program authorized by this Act.

Sec. 4. The President of the United States shall appoint a board of eleven members which shall formulate the policies for carrying out the purposes of this Act. The Board of the National Arts Agency shall appoint a Director and staff to administer such policies. The Commissioner of the United States Office of Education shall be Chairman of the Board of the National Arts Agency, ex officio. Members of the Board of the National Arts Agency shall, while attending its meetings or while engaged in activities authorized by this Act, receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare but not exceeding $75 per diem, and shall be paid travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently. Members of the Board of the National Arts Agency shall be appointed from among citizens of the United States who are art educators or who are otherwise recognized for their knowledge of or experience in, or for their profound interest in, one or more of the fine arts.

Sec. 5. This Act shall be known as the "National Arts Agency Act of 1962".

Congressman Harris B. McDowell, Jr., Democrat, of Delaware, this week introduced a bill, H.R. 9906, which would provide more than $6 million annually, without a cent of Federal appropriations, to help achieve excellence in education. The foundation-type program, which the bill would establish, is designed to enrich the curriculum, improve teaching and the training of teachers, and provide other aids to the Nation's public schools and colleges.

It would give the arts equal status with such credit courses as science and modern foreign languages, as well as football and other athletic programs, automobile mechanics, home economics, typing, bookkeeping, and shorthand.

The McDowell bill embodies a concept which has been followed for many years in European countries, notably France.

It provides that all writings, including music, now or hereafter in the public domain shall be the property of the United States as copyright owner and be used for the benefit of the public.

The bill would establish a National Arts Agency in the U.S. Office of Education to administer the licensing which would be required. The U.S. Commissioner of Education would be chairman of the board of the new arts agency, ex officio.

Congressman McDowell said today he had introduced the bill at the request of Dr. Ralph E. Purcell, chairman of the department of political science, University of Delaware. Dr. Purcell is the author of the highly regarded book, "Government and Art," an authoritative work on the history and development of the art activities of the Federal Government.

Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg recently recommended similar though not identical legislation which was introduced in the 85th Congress by Senator J. W. Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Secretary Goldberg said, in his December 15, 1961, arbitration award of the labor difficulties at the Metropolitan Opera in New York City, that:

"At this period when the entire body of copyright law is under study, it would seem appropriate to give further attention to this attractive proposal for supporting the arts."

Congressman McDowell explained that under his bill:

"The United States would collect royalties and utilize the proceeds in such amounts and in such manner, including holding national student competitions and festivals in the Nation's Capital, as best to advance art education in the Nation's schools and colleges."

"It would give the arts equality with such credit courses as science and modern foreign languages, as well as football and other athletic programs, automobile mechanics, home economics, typing, bookkeeping, and shorthand."

It has been estimated that 10 percent of the music broadcast by radio and television stations today is in the public domain and this music would come within the purview of the new McDowell bill.

Labor Secretary Arthur Goldberg, in his December 15, 1961, arbitration award estimated at over $6,520,000 annually the total potential income to be realized from music alone by legislation such as Congressman McDowell introduced this week. He said that the income would be distributed as follows:

Popular music (records), $1,100,000; sheet music (classical), $3,420,000; and classical music (records), $2 million.

Congressman McDowell went on to say:

"The Constitution in article II, section 8, provides for the progress of science and the useful arts by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive rights to their respective writings and discoveries.

"U.S. copyright law provides protection to authors and composers for a period of 28 years, at the end of which time protection is granted upon request for an additional 28-year period. In European countries the protection runs for life plus 20 to 50 years.

"After the present period of protection has expired my bill would provide that writings, including music, would become the property of the United States and be used by it to help achieve excellence in education and to raise the quality of education in the Nation's public schools and colleges."

Congressman McDowell concluded by saying:

"I feel I am on safe ground, inasmuch as the Founding Fathers, for instance, Washington and Jefferson, believed that the fine arts were essential in the education of young people. Washington in his will provided funds to establish a national university which would educate young Americans in the fine arts as part of a balanced education program. Jefferson developed legislation for a public system of education which included a public art gallery and a Department of Fine Arts.

"In his first annual address to Congress, January 8, 1790, President Washington said, 'there is nothing which can better deserve our patronage than the promotion of science and literature.'

"At another point Washington declared that, 'the arts and sciences essential to the prosperity of the state and to the ornament and happiness of human life have a primary claim to the encouragement of every lover of his country and mankind.' "

UHF Versus VHF

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable discussion and action in connection with the proposed action of the Federal Communications Commission to deintermix eight major cities of this country and deprive many of their citizens of television reception and, for others, poorer quality reception. This is to be accomplished by taking away from these areas very high frequency reception and providing inferior ultra high frequency reception which not only has shorter range, but is not now capable of producing the quality of very high frequency. Recently, Broadcasting magazine, the business weekly of television and radio, contained an editorial on this subject which I should like to have printed herein as I believe it points up some of the issues involved in the proposal of the FCC:

Unlocking UHF

For 7 years prodigious but futile efforts have been made to induce manufacturers to produce all-channel receivers capable of tuning the full 82 channel television allocations and thereby to encourage development of the 70 UHF channels.

Manufacturers have resisted on constitutional grounds, arguing this would constitute interference with free competitive enterprise. Congress has been sympathetic but unwilling to venture legislation in this sensitive area. In 1955 Chairman Magnuson, Democrat, of Washington, of the Senate Commerce Committee proposed a voluntary plan for all-band receivers, offering, as inducement, repeal of the 10 percent excise tax on such sets while retaining it on very high frequency-only models. This died aborning because the Treasury said it couldn't afford to lose the revenue.

There is reason for optimism at this new session of Congress. FCC's young and embattled Chairman, Newton N. Minow, has made the all-channel receiver his agency's No. 1 legislative goal. Competent lawyers, in and outside of Government, insist that such legislation is constitutional under the power given Congress to regulate interstate commerce. Prompt hearings are promised in the House on several pending bills which, among other important considerations, would require all-channel sets when sold in interstate commerce.

We agree with Mr. Minow's objectives, just as we had agreed with his predecessors. This is not to say that we concur in all of

his arguments, however, or in the bare bones bill drafted by the FCC.

It is necessary to provide greater opportunity for more stations, and the all-band receiver would accomplish this. The alternative is more stringent regulation, if that is conceivable. In its 1952 final allocations, the FCC thought it had provided assignments to accommodate foreseeable allocations demands. But the land rush came for VHF channels in the most desirable markets, and many UHF stations went dark because of lack of "circulation" and economic support. Other UHF construction permits were turned back because of these experiences.

Although all-channel legislation is just as controversial this session as it has been during the past three Congresses, another significant action has aroused this new Congress. Last July, the FCC initiated proceedings for the deintermixture of eight cities by proposing to withdraw their single VHF assignments. Nine bills and resolutions have been introduced in the House to block the deintermixture moves, and five of these incorporate the all-channel set proposals, these aside from the bill introduced in the Senate and House at the request of the FCC that relates only to the all-channel legislation.

If the bill introduced by Representative ROBERTS, Democrat, of Alamaba, and strongly supported by his colleagues in the eight cities marked for deintermixture is passed, it would accomplish the result sought by the FCC—mandatory manufacture of the all-channel receiver. But it would do much more. It would knock out the eight deintermixture cases and presumably future VHF deletions (except for reasons other than technical allocations). It would limit the FCC's authority over manufacturers to the all-channel television receivers.

It is this bill, we believe, that warrants prompt consideration by Congress and the support of all television broadcasters, as well as of the FCC.

Speech Commemorating the Independence of the Cameroon Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, January 1 marked the second anniversary of the independence of the Cameroon Republic, and on this occasion we send felicitations to the President of Cameroon, Mr. Ahmadou Ahjdjo, and His Excellency Aime-Raymond N'Thepe, the Ambassador to the United States.

After many years of control by foreign powers, the Republic became established as one of the first of the newly independent states of Africa.

Along with independence have come problems and responsibilities of government. The 3½ million people of Cameroon are meeting these challenges with the courage and conviction of a people characterized by a courageous motivating spirit. The Government is bravely resisting the efforts of Communist-backed groups intent on creating chaos in the young nation.

The Cameroon Republic is made up of people representing many diverse cultures and attitudes. We should take satisfaction in the fact that the Government is striving to overcome the problems created by these differences.

On this happy occasion, we wish the Cameroon Republic the very best in its hard struggle for peace and prosperity.

His Name Is Uncle Sam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the January 31 issue of the Washington Post contains an article by the Columnist George E. Sokolsky that I recommend for reading. Mr. Sokolsky in this article shows that the real Uncle Sam is not the carricature of editorial cartoonists but the symbol of the democratic virtues that has propelled this wonderful country of ours to greatness. Very often, the history and traditions of the United States are misread. But in this article Mr. Sokolsky has distilled the elements of greatness in our country—its hope for the oppressed, its dynamic promise of opportunity for the future, and its striving to provide for all its citizens the decent civilities that secure loyalty and allegiance.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

HIS NAME IS UNCLE SAM

(By George E. Sokolsky)

One of the truly great editorials of all time appeared in the New York Sun in reply to a child, Virginia, who wanted to know whether there is a Santa Claus. The truth of the matter, of course, is that there is a Santa Claus, but he dwells only in the heart of the generous. He has no form, no style, no nationality, no particular religion. He is the embodiment of love.

Now along comes Robert G. Smith who wants to know if there is an Uncle Sam. He writes to ask:

"My name is not Virginia and I'm considerably more than 9 years old but I, too, have a momentous question regarding a well-known character:

"Is there an Uncle Sam?

"You know who I mean—the tall, rugged, white-haired figure in red-and-white-striped trousers, blue coat, and star-spangled hat—traditional symbol of the American way of life.

"Is he still around? Or is he hiding out in the green mountains of Vermont? Or some other place like that?

"Some say Uncle Sam is a back number. They say Uncle Sugar Daddy is now top man in Washington—doling out his assorted 'goodies' to his many nephews and nieces, his country cousins and foreign relations.

"They say patriotism is strictly for the birds—the vanishing bald eagle, that is.

"I suppose it's the old-fashioned Connecticut Yankee in me, or maybe my 4 years in the Navy during World War II, but I'm kinda hard to convince."

Of course, there is an Uncle Sam. He is a simple fellow who has built a great country with his own hands. His ancestors crossed an ocean to find an alien shore here. Everybody who ever came here had to cross a frightening ocean.

In the old days, Uncle Sam's ancestors found Indians and forests and wild beasts; today, those who come find large cities, with good roads to connect them, with railroads and airplanes. In the old days, each man built his home and his schoolhouse and his church by his own sinews and sweat; today he moves into a house of the most modern devices.

In the old days, Uncle Sam had to find a place for himself, where he could farm for food and clothing, where his wife could cook and spin and sew; today, his wife finds what she requires in a supermarket, while he earns a wage and builds a family.

In the old days, Uncle Sam crossed mountains and rivers and valleys, carrying his goods and folks with great hardship until he found a place for himself, risking limb and life to conquer a continent and make it a glorious granary; today, he finds ample facilities to take him from place to place and wherever he goes there are mines and mills and factories and stores to provide work, and wherever he goes there are schools and colleges and technological institutes for those who require such facilities and have the ambition to use them.

And there are churches, too. There are prayer houses of all varieties of religion, each man either following freely in the ways of his ancestors, or choosing his own way, or none at all. Freedom of choice is the doctrine that guides our people and those who would limit freedom are regarded as hateful creatures, not true descendants of Uncle Sam.

Is there an Uncle Sam?

More than 50 races of man have found a free life here, freedom of opportunity, freedom of choice, freedom of movement, freedom to work, freedom to read and write and speak. And to give glory to it all, for each there is freedom to worship God, each man as he chooses, whether Jew, or Christian, or Moslem, or whatever.

Is there an Uncle Sam?

How can one doubt it?

Yes, Uncle Sam is in the hearts of those who believe that freedom and equality are qualities which come to us from God and will survive all the errors of stupid and selfish men and women.

Connecticut's Biggest Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, the mail of a Member of Congress always is interesting, and each of us could provide, and many do in their newsletters and in speeches, select excerpts which are striking and significant for one reason or another.

My own mail I find always interesting. Some of the writers are glad, some are mad, but almost all of them are seeking information, preferably information which pleases them.

One day this week, I received a letter from a young Connecticut citizen who is not a resident of my district, but who sought information on a subject which many of his elders have discussed with great concern.

Because of the widespread interest in this subject, I would like to include now,

in accordance with the permission granted to me, the text of a news release which covers the reference which I have made to my young correspondent, and my reply to him:

Congressman HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR., had a direct question from a Connecticut schoolboy named Tommy today that went to the heart of what candidates in this November's election may spend hours talking about; and he gave a direct answer.

The eastern Connecticut Republican placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today a brief letter from the boy, who lives in a Connecticut town outside SEELY-BROWN'S congressional district which recently has seen the dissolution of its principal industry, founded nearly 100 years ago.

Tommy, whose last name was kept confidential by the Congressman, in accordance with office practice, wrote:

"DEAR MR. BROWN: For my social study project, I was asked to write to you and ask you, What is Connecticut's largest problem and what is your solution to it? Would you please answer this letter by return mail.

"Thanking you,

TOMMY."

Replying Congresman SEELY-BROWN said:

"DEAR TOMMY: Thank you for your letter requesting certain information for your social study project. In my opinion Connecticut's biggest problem is to provide proper and steady employment for those who want to live and work in Connecticut.

"My solution is to create an atmosphere at every level of government which will (1) encourage existing business to expand its operation and thus provide more jobs for our people; (2) prevent business from leaving our State and thereby throwing people out of work, as is presently the case; and (3) encourage new plants and factories to move into our State.

"If I can be of further proper assistance at any time, please let me know.

"With all good wishes.

"Very sincerely,

"HORACE SEELY-BROWN, Jr.,

"Member of Congress."

Plumbing Research an Environmental Health Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a speech which I delivered at the Plumbing and Heating Wholesalers of New England luncheon, Sheraton-Copley Hotel, Boston on January 29, 1962:

REMARKS BY HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY, OF RHODE ISLAND

I deeply appreciate the privilege of meeting with your organization to discuss problems of mutual interest. Your program chairman, however, took a calculated risk in failing to assign a specific subject for discussion.

With your permission, I should like to direct my remarks to the changing problems of the environment and their increasing significance and impact on health. My reasons are two-fold: First, as an important segment of the building industry, you are in a position to influence directly many of these environmental factors. Second, as hard-headed businessmen and professional leaders in your communities you have a real responsibility for initiating and supporting health programs generally.

The press, journals, and magazines have been filled with dire predictions on the hazards associated with our population explosion, the immigration to metropolitan areas, the mental trauma and difficulties associated with urban living, and other equally disturbing forecasts. We could get quite gloomy about it all, if we didn't remind ourselves that these problems are not entirely new and that, so far at least, the American people have managed to cope with them. Our population has been increasing ever since the first colonists landed not too far from where we are meeting today. Industry has been expanding and as a result has given us the highest standard of living of any nation. The population shift has been going on ever since the first mechanization took place on the farm, as opposed to the songwriters' protestations that Paris was somehow involved.

Let's admit to the changes; let's admit that, for the most part these changes have been desirable. Nevertheless, the changes now taking place create health hazards that are more complex than any we have known before and it is high time for us to devote our attention to the task of coping with them. Let's start thinking about the cities of tomorrow we are building today and how we can make them the places where we want to live. This requires new knowledge and techniques. We must step up research and we must see that the results of research are promptly used in solving the problems at hand.

The role of Government in health is necessarily circumscribed. But it is a legitimate and primary concern of the Congress to establish programs for the study of health problems of national concern. It has been my privilege to be the chairman of the congressional Appropriations Subcommittee that deals with public health appropriations. I have been on that committee for a period longer than any other present Member of the Congress. I am deeply grateful that, together with my House colleagues and with our sister subcommittee of the Senate, chaired by the distinguished Senator from Alabama, the Honorable LISTER HILL, we have had many opportunities to contribute to the betterment of the public health. Over the years that I have worked with health officials, I have been impressed with the changing character of health problems and with the importance of keeping our public health programs adjusted to the problems of today and tomorrow.

Many of you are familiar with the Federal programs of medical research and the advances being made in finding the causes and—hopefully—the cures for cancer, heart disease, mental illness, and others. The National Institutes of Health of the Public Health Service have done a remarkable job not only in conducting research but in supporting research on a nationwide basis—in medical schools, foundations, and universities—to provide the answers we need.

I am proud of my part in getting them the funds they've needed. It is money well spent. For example, we used to have about 2,000 babies every year, born prematurely, who became totally blind when they were just a few weeks old. That doesn't happen anymore. We used to have about 400 babies every year who seemed normal at first but by the time they were 2 or 3 years old were idiots or morons. That problem, too, is on the way out. It used to be that if you were told you had cancer, you figured that was the end. Not anymore. Out of every six people who get cancer now, two are saved; and half the victims could be saved if full use were made of all the knowledge about cancer produced by research. The marvels of heart and brain surgery; the vaccines that protect against polio and soon will protect against measles—all these and other advances have come directly or indirectly as a result of the big push on medical reserach which began about 25 years ago when we set up the National Cancer Institute, first of the seven big national institutes of health. Hundreds of thousands of people have benefitted.

But studying the effect of disease in man is only one part of the job. The other part is studying how conditions in the environment may cause disease. This part—and it is just as important—has been neglected. We are never going to clear up some of the mysteries of disease unless we launch a full scale study of the health effects of the environment. Why is it that people in some places get certain types of cancer, heart disease and other conditions that are not contagious while people in other places are spared? Take a specific example, cancer of the bladder. In some parts of Egypt this is a big problem and it has been noted that the people in these parts bathe in streams that contain infected snails that cause swimmer's itch. Offhand, you might say, the answer to this one is easy—stay out of such water. But how do you explain the fact that in some places in this country, cancer of the bladder will be twice as prevalent as in other nearby places? Particularly when there are no infected snails and no cases of swimmer's itch in either place? And why are cases of multiple sclerosis almost always found in northern communities, almost never in southern?

I don't think it is just accident that changes in the kinds of diseases that are most threatening to us today have come about just at the time when changes in our environment have been occurring most rapidly.

Let's take a moment to examine what some of those changes have been and what problems they present. The population of the United States now exceeds 180 million. By 1970—8 years hence—it will approximate 215 million, with two-thirds of the population concentrated in metropolitan areas. The impact of this population growth on the building industry of the Nation will be tremendous. We shall have to provide housing and ancillary facilities equivalent to that of 50 cities of the size of Boston, Mass. We will have to adjust to an almost continuous metropolitan area extending from Bangor, Maine, to Richmond, Va. The logistics of the expansion will strain our capacity to provide in adequate quantity and quality the four basic elements of the environment, namely: water, air, food, and shelter.

In fact, we are already finding it hard to meet those four basic needs.

Take water. We have drinking water standards set by the Public Health Service. If water meets those standards, we know it is safe to drink. It used to be that the main thing the standard setters had to worry about was bacteria—germs that would cause typhoid fever and other contagious diseases. Just as we were getting on top of those problems, we learned that a lot of contagious diseases were caused by viruses, which are very much harder to screen out of a water supply. On top of that, the chemical industry began to grow like Topsy and a whole lot of new and potentially dangerous chemicals had to be dealt with. Then, on top of that, came radiation from fallout which also gets into the water supply. Setting water standards that will assure protection against all these hazards is getting harder and harder. And if we don't step up our research on these newer contaminants, the day may well come when setting standards will become just plain impossible. Personally, I'm not sure that day hasn't already arrived.

And it isn't as if we could reach out some place and find water that wasn't affected by all these changes in our civilization. We have just as much, and no more, water as the first settlers had and the only reason we can get by with this limited amount is

because we've learned a little about how to treat and reuse it. But we are going to have to learn a lot more because we are using more water all the time. Nature gives us about 600 billion gallons of usable water for daily use, but it doesn't distribute it to our convenience. We now use 320 billion gallons a day and by 1980 we will need to use every drop of the whole 600 billion. Water used to be cheap and plentiful and we became a wasteful nation. Now it is scarce and costly. We wouldn't be thinking about taking the salt out of the ocean if the problem wasn't pretty serious. You know it costs about a dollar per 1,000 gallons to do that.

The problem of air is much the same as the problem of water. "Free as the air," we say, but believe me, getting air that is fit to breathe in a city is far from free. I know. We have a good air pollution control program in Providence, R.I. They are working on the auto exhaust problem. They see that industries don't pollute the air unnecessarily. But even in Providence where we are spending money on this problem and getting good results, we don't have really clean air. No place does. What we most need is control of the stuff that spews out of the tailpipes of the trucks and autos, but this problem seems to get Z priority as far as the auto industry is concerned. Finally, after being prodded and coaxed and threatened, they are at last beginning to move, but it still remains to be seen whether anything short of a Federal law requiring exhaust controls will get the kind of action we need. In Congress we are waiting; but we are also watching.

Cutting down on the pollution caused by auto exhaust won't solve the whole problem. The fact is, we are throwing all sorts of chemicals and other pollutants into the air at a faster rate than the air currents can carry them off and we just don't know what effect all this has. Maybe it is one of the reasons why cancer, heart disease, asthma, and other problems are more common in some places than in others. Maybe it isn't. Until we step up research, we won't know.

After this fine lunch, I hate to suggest to you that there are also a lot of question marks about the food we are eating these days. But there are. Think how the whole process of providing food has changed just in our own lifetimes. All the fertilizers and pesticides used on the crops. All the things that happen to food after it is harvested. For example, those trays of food they serve you on the airliners. The whole tray, except for the salad and maybe one or two other items, is stockpiled—thousands of those trays in every airport in big deep-freeze vaults. Maybe they'll stay there a year, maybe 2 or 3 years before they get loaded on a plane and popped into the quick heating unit by the stewardess who serves you. The whole thing is just about as amazing and wonderful as the jetplane itself. I'm all for it and for all the other changes in food processing and distribution. The only thing that bothers me is that we are making them before we know what the full effects may be. What causes the million cases of food poisoning that are reported to the Public Health Service every year and the millions of others that occur but don't get reported? Are they caused because, somewhere along the line, old-fashioned methods, known to be unsafe, were used? Or are they caused because some new-fashioned method was used before its dangers were discovered? We don't know and, without more research, we aren't going to find out.

Complicating all these problems—water, air, food—is that most baffling of all problems, manmade radiation. The more we study it, the more we are impressed with its dangers. Yet we can't turn the clock back. Peace or war, there is bound to be more and more radiation and the only way we can control its danger is to learn more about it. But we have barely skimmed the surface of knowledge about its health effects.

Even the simple problem of refuse disposal is creating difficulties for our metropolitan areas. Two miles out of Boston Bay is an island which many passing boatmen will agree has admirably earned its name, Spectacle Island. This island over its entire 50 acres has been the recipient for the past 37 years of much of the refuse produced by the city of Boston. It is now stacked to a height of 30 feet. This points up the growing problem all American cities face in disposing of refuse. We are currently spending some $2 billion a year to dispose of our unwanted refuse.

The only real advance that has been made on the refuse disposal problem since the days of our grandparents we owe to your industry. We owe to you that wonderful modern device, the garbage grinder. But even if every home had a garbage grinder—and they ought to have—it would still solve only 25 percent of the refuse disposal problem. Moreover, if we are going to have a garbage grinder in every home, we have to have the kind of sewage systems that can take the load; and in most places, sewage systems are overtaxed already. You can't be for garbage grinders and against improvement and expansion of sewage systems.

I've been talking a lot about research and I've talked in terms of finding out the things we don't know. There is also some value in research that simply proves the things we think we know. It won't be any news to you people that plumbing contributes to health, but believe it or not, the solid proof of it is rather new. Studies down in Prestonburg, Ky., proved conclusively that families have less diarrhea and other intestinal disorders as they have more indoor plumbing. Homes with just one tap of running water had less disease than homes with none; homes with kitchen sinks and bathrooms have still less disease.

What was the point of proving this? You knew it all along. I'll tell you one point—it makes it much easier to get some serious consideration of the proposal to invest Federal funds in plumbing research. The taxpayer is not about to have his money spent for studies that will simply line your pockets. But clear-cut proof that plumbing research will help him, the taxpayer, is something else again. Health is the strongest reason why we need federally aided research on plumbing. But it is not the only reason. Water conservation is another reason. Economy is another. Think of the water that could be saved if 5 gallons didn't go down the drain every time anybody flushed a toilet. Think of the dollars that could be saved if plastic could safely be used for all types of pipes and for bathroom fixtures. Think of all the shelter space that could be saved—and that's money, too, when you have to think in terms of enough added population to fill 50 Bostons in just 8 more years—anyway, think of the housing space that could be saved by wall-hung toilets and other innovations.

With some solid evidence, produced through research, maybe we could even modernize the plumbing codes in this country. Most of those codes were written in the horse-and-buggy days and they haven't been changed since.

You can't separate out these problems. If research produces ways to get good plumbing cheaper, maybe it is going to put a little more money into your pockets, but it is also going to put more plumbing into the homes that need it and that are disease-ridden for lack of it. Some parts of plumbing research, of course, you can screen out and say it is industry's job because it is clearly to industry's benefit. But much of the needed research cannot possibly be stimulated by the profit motive. Yet it is definitely to the public's interest to have it done. It is this part of the job that I think needs the encouragement of Federal aid. And it is one of the things I would expect to see included if we can build up research in this whole field of environmental health to the proper scale.

I have a strong suspicion that a lot of these mysterious viruses, these maladies that get everybody down for a day or two and then go away and are forgotten, may be due to some kind of breaks in our sanitation defenses. Maybe some of the things that get through the water treatment plants aren't as harmless as we think. Maybe something happens as the water travels from the service line to the building to the fixture where it is used. Maybe all this interlacing of water supply and drainage pipes required by all the new houses, apartments, factories, and shopping centers we are building is causing problems we are not even aware of. This is out of my line, I admit, and I wouldn't worry about it if the people who do understand these things were working on them. But they aren't. They can't, until we decide that we are going to make the kind of a push on the environmental side that we are already making of the medical research side.

Not that everything depends on research. We could be making a lot more use of the knowledge we already have. There is no reason why we need to let our metropolitan areas grow in the haphazard way they are growing. Everyone knows that it is cheaper, in the long run, and certainly much more satisfactory to plan them. Go to the outskirts of almost any city and you'll see the slums of the future. Talk to suburbanites who thought they were going to save money with their septic tanks and private water systems. Lots of them are still paying but they are also paying for public water and sewage systems. They want to know why they weren't warned that the private system wouldn't work. They're mad. And they have a right to be.

Your industry is intimately and directly involved in the construction of the homes, the factories, the commercial establishments, and the other physical facilities which, when added together, constitute the environment in which our population lives.

You can be tremendously influential in seeing that your communities are planned communities with built-in features that will assure health, beauty, and pleasant living for generations yet to come.

I am confident you are throwing your influence in that direction and that you will continue to do so. And I want to assure you that I, too, am doing and will continue to do everything I can in Congress. I want to be sure that the Federal Government doesn't take on that part of the job which rightly belongs to industry and to States and communities. But I want to be equally sure that it doesn't fail to do that part of the job which only the Federal Government can do.

I urge you, as I urge the people down in Washington, to get on with the job. The longer we let these problems accumulate, the bigger they will grow, and the tougher it will be to deal with them. We've drifted too long. It's time—it's overtime—for action.

Fifteen Years of UNESCO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, in recent months there has appeared

a number of misstatements about UNESCO, some of them attaining the proportions of deliberate misrepresentation. Many of these statements repeat irresponsible charges which were long ago shown to be groundless.

Some new allegations, or modifications of old ones, have also appeared. To set the record straight, I have a statement by the distinguished Chairman of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, Mr. George V. Allen. In his statement he sets down factually what are the goals of UNESCO. In addition, I have an editorial in the St. Louis Post Dispatch of January 1962, entitled "Myths About UNESCO." In addition, the New York Times of January 1, 1962, carried an article which contains accusations and UNESCO replies. I have excerpts from that article.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert these materials in the Appendix of the RECORD:

FIFTEEN YEARS OF UNESCO

(Statement by George V. Allen, Chairman of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO)

Fifteen years ago, on November 4, UNESCO officially was brought into being in an effort to achieve a better and more tolerant understanding among nations and peoples.

It may appear that during the 15 years which have elapsed since that lofty effort was launched, our goal has receded rather than come closer to realization. I believe the appearance is deceptive. We have reason to be dissatisfied but not to feel discouraged. Even though lasting peace has not been achieved, the world's educational, scientific, and cultural fabric has nevertheless been measurably strengthened.

UNESCO has increased communication among scientists, scholars, and educators through publications, professional organizations, conferences, and research programs.

Agreements have been reached among governments to improve international copyright protection and to reduce tariff duties on educational and scientific materials and equipment.

Substantial efforts have been made, in cooperation with U.N. agencies, to assist newly developed countries in expanding their educational systems.

UNESCO recently launched a new program—the most far reaching yet undertaken—to advance African education at the request of African countries themselves. A 5-year plan drawn by African states will require about $4.1 billion, of which $2.8 billion will be provided by the African states and $1.3 billion from outside sources. This is only a beginning.

It is a tribute to UNESCO's growing strength that the new nations, which have boosted its membership from 80 to 100 in the last 6 years, have been eager to join that organization as one of their first international obligations.

Now, more than ever, UNESCO offers the United States a unique opportunity for exerting leadership. We can help develop a sense of unity among these nations and gain their good will, friendship, and respect. By working together in areas where we can best serve mutual goals, we can counteract misunderstandings and criticisms of our policies. We should not forget that our mission, as Americans, coincides with that of UNESCO. We seek educational and social betterment throughout the free world. While we help to reduce disease, poverty, and illiteracy, we can help, at the same time, to create a sense of cooperation and tolerance among mankind.

To achieve order and progress in any community, large or small, many agencies must exist to do a lot of different things—to maintain schools, regulate commerce, adjust or adjudicate disputes, and police the streets. In a world community, a variety of instrumentalities are being developed today for a variety of purposes—economic, political, social, and military. The world has a police force in the Congo today, but it has also important—I should say vital—work there in the fields of education, science, and culture, which are UNESCO's province.

The story is told in India of a cow being chased by a tiger. The cow came to a tree, from which a monkey called down: "Climb up. Climb up." The cow said she could not climb a tree. The monkey replied: "This is one tree you've gotta climb."

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Jan. 13, 1961]

MYTHS ABOUT UNESCO

Since its founding 16 years ago, UNESCO has been a favorite target for isolationist groups and a great deal of misinformation has been circulated about the international organization. To answer these misrepresentations, the State Department has prepared a brief factual summary to set the record straight.

A charge frequently made is that UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization) has a plan for international control of education in the United States. This charge is apparently based on the 1960 UNESCO Convention and Recommendation on Discrimination in Education. The purpose of these documents is to encourage equal educational opportunities in nations where they do not now exist. The convention, however, does not apply to the United States. It has not been submitted to the Senate for ratification and the State Department does not plan to seek ratification. The recommendation, which the United States supported, has no binding effect on governments or school boards. It is merely a list of suggestions which may be adopted by the proper authorities.

UNESCO literature is used in underdeveloped countries but there is no known case of use by schools in the United States of UNESCO books and manuals. The pamphlet allegedly containing the master plan for domination of American schools is volume five of a series "Towards World Understanding," published in the 1940's. The volume is a collection of views of participants in education seminars. Volume five was studied by a committee of the American Legion which concluded it was as subversive as the tales of Hans Christian Andersen.

The 102-nation agency has four major projects underway. Work is in progress to improve primary schooling in Latin America. UNESCO is working with 33 countries to reclaim arid lands.

It is studying ways for orientals and Western people to understand each other better. A crash program has been undertaken to combat illiteracy in Africa. To charges that UNESCO is dominated by the Communist bloc, the State Department points out that the Soviet Union frequently criticizes the agency for not being responsive to its interests and demands. UNESCO is no more Communist-dominated than it is American-dominated; but as an international enterprise doing valuable work in nonpolitical fields it is fully entitled to American support.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 1, 1962]

UNESCO IS TARGET OF NEW ATTACKS—COMMISSION SAYS PERTINENT FACTS DISPROVE CHARGES

(By Fred M. Hechinger)

Severe attacks against the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization have been resumed in many parts of the country, according to reports from the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO.

The attacks, which led to frequent local clashes in the early 1950's, and often involved questions of educational policy and charges of procommunism, had diminished in recent years, a Commission spokesman said. Their revival appears to be linked to a resurgence of ultraconservatism and isolationism.

The Commission, in commenting on the irresponsible charges, declared that action was required to set the record straight with a compendium of pertinent facts.

A staff member of the Commission said that charges of Communist infiltration of and interference with American education are well publicized in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and then picked up in the editorial pages, without examination of the facts.

The Commission was established by an act of Congress in 1946. Its current chairman is George V. Allen. UNESCO, with headquarters in Paris and a staff of about 1,000 from about 60 countries, devotes much of its effort to education in underdeveloped countries and to publications about educational and cultural problems.

Typical of the impact of the revived attacks is a recent letter from a California school superintendent, a Commission spokesman said.

The superintendent wrote that "statements are being made in this community to the effect that UNESCO plans to control educational policy in the United States."

"This sounds somewhat ridiculous to us," he added, "but nevertheless we hear it so frequently that we are asking you to give us accurate information in what UNESCO plans to do with respect to local education in the United States."

The U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, calling the current attacks on UNESCO "irresponsible charges which were long ago shown to be groundless," has drawn up detailed replies to them.

It declares that the Convention on Discrimination in Education does not apply to the United States. This country has not acceded to the convention, it adds, and none of the recommendations against discrimination have any "binding effect on the Government, school boards or anyone" in the United States.

In answer to a charge that UNESCO manuals have infiltrated American public schools to teach "worldmindedness," the Commission says that UNESCO supports the production of text books only at the request of member states, mainly the underdeveloped countries.

SCHOOLS USE OPEN TO DOUBT

"The United States has never requested any such assistance and no instance is known of the use by the schools of UNESCO books and manuals in this country," the Commission adds.

It points out that general UNESCO publications are for sale in the United States and anyone may buy them, including teachers and pupils.

The Commission asserts that the pamphlet "World Understanding," the UNESCO discussion most frequently attacked as subversive, was published in the late 1940's and is long out of print. It adds that the pamphlet was declared by a special committee of the American Legion to be as subversive as the tales of Hans Christian Andersen.

The Commission voices the view that the charge that UNESCO literature teaches world government is based on the frequent use of the term "world understanding."

"Such understanding is greatly needed in the world today and is in no way inconsistent with the American way of life or the teaching of American citizenship," the Commission comments.

Cour ering accusations that UNESCO is atheistic and materialistic, the Commission points out that the 102 member states represent many different faiths and that

"UNESCO does not promote religion any more than the American public schools, where the same principle applies."

At the same time, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the Synagogue Council of America, and the National Council of the Churches of Christ are represented on the Commission, its statement cites.

"PARTISAN" INFLUENCE DENIED

"There is no evidence that the citizens of any one nation or bloc improperly influence the development or accomplishments of these [UNESCO] programs in any partisan way," the Commission says.

"In fact, the Soviets and their supporters frequently and sharply criticize UNESCO as not being responsive to their interests and demands."

The Commission cites attacks concerning the six-volume "History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind," under preparation since 1947, with the first volume, on prehistoric times, expected to be published in London in 1962 and later by Harper Bros. in New York.

"There are no members of the Communist bloc countries participating in the writing of any of the volumes, though all member states of UNESCO, including the U.S.S.R., have the right to submit their views to the editors," the Commission asserts.

These publications are not designed for textbook use and they are not suitable "because of their scholarly nature" for use in primary and secondary schools, the Commission adds.

Speech Commemorating Independence Day of the Republic of Sudan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, January 1, 1962, marked the beginning of the sixth year of independence for the largest—in area—country in Africa—the Republic of Sudan. We pay tribute and send felicitations, on this occasion, to Sudan's President, Gen. Ibrahim Abboud; its Ambassador to the United States, Dr. Osman El Hadari; and to this nation of proud people, for a most commendable record of firm, peaceful, unpretentious progress.

Unlike some of the other newly independent nations, the Sudan has, from its inception on the first day of 1956, placed primary emphasis on economic, not military development. So while other, more foolish young nations amass arms and debts at skyrocketing rates, the Sudan has been quietly forming the most stable economy in Africa. Its leaders have worked diligently to insure that the 12 million Sudanese have bread, not bullets, to eat.

Politically, too, the Sudan has demonstrated a marked degree of stability. Lt. Gen. Ibrahim Abboud, the Sudan's leader since 1958, has suppressed corruption, instituted many social reforms, adopted a foreign policy friendly to all, and, above all, begun to lead slowly toward a constitutional government.

Thus, as it begins its sixth year of independent rule, we take off our hats to the Republic of Sudan—a quiet, friendly, steadfast worker in a world of frenzied foes. "Sudan" may mean "black" in Arabic, but this virile country's future prospects look quite to the contrary.

Nehru and Feet of Clay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, many of us were appalled when India moved into Portugal territory.

George Todt's December 20, 1961, column in the Los Angeles Herald-Express contains some thought which is worth careful consideration. A careful appraisal of our foreign policy is not only desirable, but necessary.

The column follows:

("Do as we say, and not as we do."—Boccaccio, Decameron.)

It must come as something of a shock to the ADA (Americans for Democratic Action) contingent of elite intellectuals in the Department of State, headed not so long ago by their pampered, ideological darling, Chester Bowles, to learn that supposedly pacifist Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru of India has gone to war with Portugal.

The ADA crowd has practically built its hopes on the brave, new world of the future around peace-loving Nehru.

He was their kingpin in Asia. Socialist that he is, Nehru felt right at home with Fabian Socialists anywhere—including our homegrown variety of same.

Ah, how Pandit Jawaharlal longed for peace in the good, old days.

COLOR OF RED

Hardly a time that Adlai Stevenson or Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt ever returned from a sojourn at the feet of the sage that they had not some of the master's advice for us:

"Let America prove her good intentions to the world."

Coming from peace-loving Nehru, such a pronunciamento meant a lot.

Right from the horse's mouth, no less.

Of course, there was that sticky matter about the lovely Vale of Kashmir—coveted by India and our SEATO ally, Pakistan.

It did seem to some of us that Nehru appeared to love not peace less, but Kashmir more. And the former could go to.

But then, it was allowed, we all have our little idiosyncracies. And after all, Nehru was born in Kashmir, wasn't he? Didn't that make up for the fact that the region was overwhelmingly Pakistani in population? And why bring up that old-fashioned (reactionary, it says here) idea of self-determination of peoples at a time like this? Trying to rock the boat, huh?

SHOWS THROUGH

Anyway, for some reason or other, the image we have been presented of Nehru in the past coincided with mankind's dream of universal peace, and we might have been pardoned for imagining that here was the supreme architect, himself.

But now we find the hero has feet of clay.

For him, the double standard of morality.

When the shoe is on the other foot, look out.

Nehru is the voice we have yielded to in United Nation's councils to ease up on our nuclear testing, vital for our Nation's survival in the world jungle we live in today. And all to prove to the world that we respected neutralist ideals.

Now we ought to wonder why? Have we taken leave of our senses to follow the contemptuous and self-defeating advice of this phony doubledealer on the world stage? What do we owe him?

MANY WHO FED

At this late date, we Americans should heed the counsel of our wisest military leaders—not dangerous appeasers and pacifists—and take whatever steps are necessary to insure our world leadership at any needed cost.

We must listen to the kind of advice which places first the interests of the Republic of the United States, period.

One of the smartest things we might do would be to stop listening to the endless bleats of Nehru and other neutralists.

Let them come aboard our ship, or go their own way.

But why pamper them any longer?

What do they do besides blackmail us whenever we are weak enough to kowtow to them?

In the case of Nehru, what kind of supposed friend is he?

He is the brother-in-law of vicious, American-hating Krishna Menon—his Minister of War, incidentally—who is so far out in left field he is very nearly invisible to our side.

US ANOTHER HUE

Practically everyone I know who is aware of the extent of the criminal Communist conspiracy to conquer the world will tell us that Krishna Menon is a bona fide member of the international Red hierarchy.

One authority who told it to me was John McGovern, former British Socialist Labor Member of Parliament. We had breakfast toegther at a Los Angeles organization several years ago.

"We would not touch Menon with a 10-foot pole," he informed me. "We have never had any doubt that he was a Communist. He tried to infiltrate us many years ago—but we just laughed at him."

Nehru is a big voice in the U.N. Time to take a second look?

In Canada They Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, a few years ago the Government of our great neighbor, Canada, appointed a royal commission of six men to study and make recommendations for overhauling the transportation policies and regulations of that country.

The royal commission has recently submitted its second report and recommendations to the Canadian Parliament, with the third report to follow.

A résumé of the commission's work to date is explained in a story published in the January 23, 1962, edition of the St. Thomas Times-Journal. Of particular interest is this statement therein:

> The commission urged that all rail freight rates be set free, subject only to a ceiling on rates charged against so-called captive rail traffic.

Under the plan, present freight rate controls would be largely scrapped as obsolete, thus giving the railroads a free

hand to set most freight rates as ordinary businesses would set their price.

Here in the United States we have just about regulated and taxed our railroads out of existence. We persist in hanging on to regulations imposed upon them before the advent of air, highway and large-scale inland waterway transport.

Our country has studied the transportation problem over and over again. In fact, we have just about studied the railroads to death. Those studies would fill a room, but what we need now is action.

Under unanimous consent, I include the article describing the Canadian royal commission's recommendations in the Appendix of the RECORD:

RECOMMEND SWEEPING OVERHAUL OF TRANSPORTATION REGULATIONS

OTTAWA.—A sweeping overhaul of Federal transportation policies and regulations, aimed at freeing Canada's railways for a sink-or-swim competitive battle against other forms of transport, was proposed today by the MacPherson royal commission.

In its second report, tabled in the Commons today by Prime Minister Diefenbaker, the six-man royal commission on transportation unveiled an overall transport blueprint with immense economic and political implications for the nation.

The recommendations, scattered through the 289-page, 85,000-word report, are based on the commission's chief conclusion—that competition, not government, is and should be the main price regulator in transportation.

In its key recommendation, the commission urged that all rail freight rates be set free, subject only to a ceiling on rates charged against so-called captive rail traffic.

WOULD SCRAP CONTROLS

Under this plan, present freight rate controls would be largely scrapped as obsolete, thus giving the railways a free hand to set most freight rates just as ordinary businesses set their price.

Released from most regulatory restraints, the railways would be tossed into a free-for-all fight against trucks, ships, planes, and pipelines.

The second volume rounds out the commission's main report to the Government on its 2-year public and private investigation of Canada's transportation troubles. The first report was made public last April. A third volume, giving results of special research studies, is expected later this year.

A dissenting view on some aspects of the second report was filed by Commissioner Herbert Anscomb, of Victoria, a former British Columbia finance minister. Otherwise recommendations were unanimous.

Regina lawyer M. A. MacPherson, a former Saskatchewan Cabinet Minister and onetime contender for the national Progressive Conservative leadership, was chairman. Other commissioners were Archibald Balch, Fort Erie, Ontario, railway union leader now retired; Rene Gobeil, Quebec City, forestry engineer; Howard A. Mann, Ottawa, chairman of the National Harbors Board; and Arnold Platt, Lethbridge, farmer and farm leader.

URGES NATIONAL POLICY

In addition to its freight-rate plan, the commission proposed:

1. A new national transportation policy aimed at creating an efficient land, water, and air transport system through competition and with a minimum of government regulation or intervention.

2. A national transportation advisory council to judge and assess the impact and effect of decisions of all transport regulatory agencies as well as establish priorities for public investment in transport facilities.

3. A fresh look by Parliament at the effect on transportation of the Maritime Freight Rates Act of 1927, with an eye to withdrawing federal subsidies on goods moved within the Atlantic Provinces but keeping them on westbound traffic and extending the subsidies to all carriers.

4. Special subsidy aid for Newfoundland to reduce high costs of transport, plus federal assistance for a major roadbuilding program on the island.

5. Coordinated provincial regulation of trucking, scrapping all controls except those dealing with safety and performance, with no restriction on rail entry in road transport.

6. Federal tax concessions for industries—chiefly the prairie grain handling industry—facing serious and costly adjustments because of railway abandonments of branch lines.

7. Assessment of adequate user charges for all modes of transport using public facilities such as roads, airports, canals, harbors, and so on.

CONTROLS MAIN POINT

However, the central proposal of the second volume was a radically new plan for minimum and maximum freight rate control.

"The implementation of this recommendation will see the end of general permissive horizontal percentage rate increases and the expensive and protracted hearings which accompany them," the report said.

The new rate formula was tied directly to actual costs incurred by the railways in hauling any specific shipment, a major departure from the old rate structure founded largely on the value of service principle.

The rate floor would be the point at which the railways would start losing money. This was defined as their longrun out-of-pocket costs for any particular movement. The main purpose of the minimum was to prevent a rate war in the transport industry.

The rate ceiling, open to annual upward adjustment if costs rise, would apply only to shipments formally declared captive to the railways. It is defined as out-of-pocket costs plus 150 percent.

Within these controls, the Commission said: "The railways will be free to set individual rates by ordinary business standards and to adjust them upward or downward as the competitive conditions and changes in cost patterns require."

ISSUES WARNING

In advancing its maximum rate plan, the Commission sounded a strong warning:

"There is a very real danger that either through misunderstanding or inadvertence the recommendations for maximum rate control * * * will be only partially implemented or superimposed on top of existing regulation.

Nothing could in our view be more harmful nor less in keeping with our findings and recommendations."

The report also emphasized that the second volume's conclusions and proposals are founded on implementation of the recommendations in the first volume, made public 9 months ago.

The first report called for a series of shrinking Federal subsidies for the railways, starting at almost $100 million in the first year, dropping to $47 million after 5 years, to $22 million after 15 years.

GRAVE CHANGE SEEN

"A period of grave change faces the railways in Canada if they are to achieve a truly viable place in the transportation complex," the report said.

It predicted that the new maximum rate plan will facilitate at least an evolution, if not the revolution that seems necessary, in the approach to regulation of our railways.

"The Government, the shippers, and perhaps even the railways themselves must begin to treat railways more as normal commercial operations," it said.

Although the report ranges over a wide field, its main theme is that competition now is a dominating force in transportation.

This concept, as advanced by the commission, sees all modes of transport competing in an open struggle for business, with the efficient surviving and the inefficient collapsing in bankruptcy.

The report recommended that a special committee, composed of representatives of Federal regulatory agencies, the transport and justice departments, thoroughly scrutinize and revise the Railway Act and the Transport Act in the light of competitive transportation.

Also recommended were:

1. Repeal of the CN–CP Act of 1932, which the commission found no longer useful to the railways as a device for eliminating wasteful competition or for pooling services and facilities.

2. Repeal of the $7 million a year bridge subsidy on noncompetitive traffic moving by rail across northern Ontario.

3. Repeal of the $20 million a year rollback subsidy on rail shipments as soon as the new overall transport policy is implemented.

4. Reexamination by Parliament of the effect and aims of the feed grains assistance program, which provided $19 million in Federal help for shipments of feed grains last year.

Mr. Anscomb, now a Victoria businessman, expressed a dissenting view on the commission's recommendations on Maritime freight subsidies and the feed grain assistance.

College Academic Facilities Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. KENNETH J. GRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8900) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, and to authorize financial assistance for undergraduate study in such institutions, and for other purposes.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8900. Before giving my reasons for supporting this worthwhile measure I want to highly commend the gentlewoman from Oregon, Mrs. GREEN, the subcommittee chairman, the members of the subcommittee, and certainly would not want to leave out the chairman of the full committee, Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, for their hard work, extreme foresight to our needs, and the expeditious manner in which they have brought this bill out of the Rules Committee so early in the session. I also want to thank our leadership for their support.

Mr. Chairman, legislation authorizing additional assistance to institutions of higher education for construction, rehabilitation, and improvement of academic and related facilities is long over due. I am fortunate enough to repre-

sent a district in southern Illinois that is the home of Southern Illinois University. When I came to Congress 8 years ago, this school had an enrollment of less than 4,000 students. Today the enrollment at two campuses is over 15,000 students. Growing pains is not the word. We have found a great need for additional classrooms, additional dormitories, and other related buildings. The people of Illinois have fulfilled their responsibility by recently floating a large bond issue in an effort to keep pace with the large influx of students, however, additional finances are sorely needed. This bill that will provide loans and grants will be of tremendous help to institutions such as Southern Illinois University. As Chairman POWELL so ably pointed out on the floor today, we are at least 7 years late with this legislation. A journey of a thousand miles starts with the first step—so let us begin.

Independence Day of the Republic of Chad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, our warm felicitations to President Francois Tombalbaye, of Chad, and to Mr. Adam Malick Sow, Chad's Ambassador to the United States, and to the country of Chad.

CHAD—courage, honor, amity, democracy. These four letters, and these four qualities stand for Chad, the young African republic which on January 11 celebrated the end of its second year of independence. Here is a fledgling nation which has had the courage to come out from under the protective wing of France and start its solo flight on still wet pinions.

A workman that needeth not to be ashamed is Chad. Herein lies the honor—the honor of diligent, honest toil. The struggle for self-improvement—individual and national—is a noble one, and by the free people of Chad it is nobly pursued.

The people of Chad are diverse in culture, creed, and race. Yet Negro and Arab, Christian, Animist, and Moslem all work together, strive together in friendship toward the common betterment of all. Not content with internal cooperation alone, Chad citizens joined in confederation with two ex-French neighbors, the Congo and the Central African Republic, to form the Union of the Republics of Central Africa. And, not one to bite the hand of its longtime former feeder, Chad has maintained mutually beneficial friendly relations with France.

And by what means is Chad achieving its ends? By those means through which the individual's worth is most valued, best employed—by democratic means.

Therefore, we pay tribute to the Republic of Chad for its courage, honor, amity, democracy. It has shown wisdom and purpose far beyond what might be expected of a nation so newly on its own.

Proposed Construction of the All-American Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the late months of 1960, the New York State Legislative Committee on Commerce and Economic Development held a public hearing in Buffalo, N.Y., concerning the proposed construction of the All-American Canal, and it was wholeheartedly approved.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a resolution which was unanimously passed by both Houses of the New York State Legislature in 1961 approving the construction of the All-American Canal. The resolution follows:

Whereas the United States has assumed an obligation with its good neighbor, the Government of Canada, to contribute its full share toward the successful operation of the St. Lawrence Seaway-Great Lakes shipping route; and

Whereas the only existing navigable facility connecting Lakes Erie and Ontario is the Welland Canal which has been sorely pressed to meet the increasing demands of shipping; and

Whereas the construction of an alternate ship canal would make a major contribution to the security of the United States as well as Canada, because (1) in the event of breakdown or destruction of the existing Welland Canal, the commerce of the entire Great Lakes area of the United States and Canada west of Lake Ontario would be denied access by water transportation to the St. Lawrence Seaway and international shipping lanes; (2) it would provide a more secure inland route for the movement of iron ore in the event of war; (3) it would ease the strain on congested rail facilities and east coast ports in the time of emergency; and (4) it would allow the construction and repair of oceangoing vessels in the more secure areas of the Great Lakes; and

Whereas the construction of the canal would contribute greatly to the prosperity of commerce, industry, and agriculture, not only in those states bordering the Great Lakes, but throughout the entire Nation; and

Whereas the commerce of the lake ports of New York State—Buffalo, Rochester, Oswego, and Ogdensburg—would be increased by the benefits accruing to the St. Lawrence Seaway-Great Lakes shipping route; and

Whereas the construction of the canal would stabilize employment, provide job security, and expand job opportunities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (*if the assembly concur*), That the Legislature of the State of New York hereby respectfully memorializes the President and Congress of the United States immediately to provide adequate funds to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for the necessary surveys and plans for, and to initiate the construction of, the canal, as aforesaid; and be it further

Resolved (*if the assembly concur*), That copies of this resolution be transmitted as follows: To the President of the United States; to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, and to each Member thereof from the State of New York; to the Governor of the State of New York; to the commissioner of commerce of the State of New York; to the chairman of the Port Authorities of Buffalo, Rochester, Oswego, and Ogdensburg; to the Governors and State legislative leaders of the States of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota.

Others, Too, Like Old Walks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to insert an article from the Rockland County Journal-News of January 20, 1962.

The article follows:

OTHERS, TOO, LIKE OLD WALKS

There are some days that are better than others, and this is one. It was made by a letter we received from "Mr. Democrat," known also as Big Jim and more formally as James A. Farley, former county, State, and National Democratic chairman and a first baseman from Grassy Point away back. He was writing of a piece we wrote a while ago about "Looking Back Is a Long Walk."

"I read with interest and pleasure because whenever I make one of my altogether too infrequent visits to Grassy Point, the same memories come back to me as related by you in your story. I can still picture every house on the street in that community and can recall the names of all the people who lived in them and the names of the various families, most of them, I am sorry to say, have passed away.

"There are not over a half-dozen families left who were playmates and associates of mine during the years I lived in that community. It does us good to go back every once in a while and renew the memories of those pleasant years."

Big Jim Farley means what he says, because no matter where his interests have ever taken him, he always comes back to his old hometown. Whenever possible he's on the dais of any Haverstraw Elks affairs and many's the time an afternoon is spent over cokes down at Jimmy Cullen's of the restaurant of that name.

And no matter where the old pro is, he is in touch with Rockland through this paper. Big Jim is on the top of many a list both as a person and a politician. It is nice to know that though he has visited every State and many countries, Rockland is still on top of his list. When nominations for U.S. Senator are opened next year, we have our own personal candidate. Some people feel that our man may be a little too old at 73, but it says here that sometimes the calendar doesn't reflect age. We should be so young as Big Jim.

It's a coincidence that we should hear from the Rockland President-maker the morning after we heard an oration on Americanism by Carol Anderson, winner of the county Amer-

ican Legion oratorical contest. How much she said—and said very beautifully, by the way—applies to the career and contributions Mr. Farley has made in his career, from Grassy Point to Washington, D.C.

Is the United Nations Worth Saving?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks I include an article on a very important subject which due to its sound logic is both constructive and effective. "Is the United Nations Worth Saving?" by Gould Lincoln appeared in the Washington Evening Star on January 30, 1962.

The article follows:

IS UNITED NATIONS WORTH SAVING?

(By Gould Lincoln)

Within a brief time the question: "Is the United Nations worth saving?" will come before Congress in a very tangible, matter-of-fact, down-to-earth way. For Congress will have to decide whether it will agree to President Kennedy's recommendation that this Government subscribe to one-half of the $200 million bond issue which the U.N. proposes to float so it can pay for its forceful action restoring order in the Congo. Obviously, the U.N. cannot continue to function in the red. The bond issue is not an assessment. Nor is it a financially profitable investment for the bonds, which are to run for 25 years and pay 2 percent interest.

One-half this bond issue is a very large share to be taken by one nation out of a membership of 104. But obviously the Communist bloc, led by Soviet Russia, will not subscribe, since it has been opposed to this action in the Congo. And for a good reason in the Communist mind—any successful democratization in the Congo means less opportunity for the Communists to take over this newly independent part of Africa. How far the British and French (who have been lukewarm, to say the least, about the operation) will wish to subscribe remains to be seen. Other than the United States, these are the larger nations able to contribute most to the U.N.

It seems entirely clear that if the United States fails to take up a large part of this bond issue, the U.N. will go broke. While there has been opposition in this country to the Congo operations, particularly so far as the Katanga Province is concerned, this is a time to rally to the support of the United Nations. If we do not like the bond issue, we should find some other way of contributing the necessary funds. But the bond issue is the most feasible method of raising the money yet suggested.

THE COMMUNIST THREAT

It is time for real hard thinking about what will be the situation if the United Nations is allowed to go down the drain—to follow the old League of Nations as the latest effort to find a way to world peace and justice. Where would the loss of the United Nations leave the free world—that part of the world opposed to international communism? The Communist bloc is welded together by a single purpose and that is to take over the entire world. This is true despite the conflicts in opinion which have arisen between Red Russia and Red China and Albania. Their differences are as to the method of seeking to dominate the world. While Russia's Nikita Khrushchev talks of a peaceful coexistence—apparently to lull the free nations to a condition that Communist subversion and conquest may be easier—the Chinese are demanding more direct action.

Without the U.N., will it be easier for the Russian Communists to pick off one free or so-called neutralist nation after another, thus avoiding war and gaining their desired end? Would it be more to the interest of the free world to create a separate alliance, opposed to the Communist bloc? Such a plan has been suggested. Always the Communists seek to pit one nation of the free world against another—to play on the self-interest of one nation as against that of another.

INVALUABLE FOR PEACE

The United Nations was conceived in the idea that, after the Second World War and its terrible cost in life and treasure, it would be possible to create a really workable international organization for peace with justice. The U.N. charter was written in San Francisco in 1945 and great hopes were expressed for its future. It was only a matter of months, however, until the recalcitrance of the Russian Communist government came into full view. It has progressed with each year. Nevertheless, the U.N. has proved its value again and again on the side of peace—frequently on the side of the free world.

The U.N. has fought one war—the war to preserve the Republic of Korea. The United States provided nearly all the Armed Forces and the money to fight that war. We took the lead. Because of our position then in the Far East, only we could take the lead. We could have won a decisive victory had the conflict been carried to the sources of the Communist supplies. In the end, however, the Republic of Korea was preserved and has not fallen to the Communists to date. In that war the Red Chinese provided men and the Russians provided weapons for the Communists of North Korea.

The United States has tried to make the U.N. a real agency of peace. The Communist bloc has tried to use it only for propaganda, and to stall off peaceful settlements in international disputes. This, however, is no good reason for junking the United Nations. It may be necessary to revise the charter of the U.N., and wise to do so. But unless the world is prepared and intends to go to a hot war, the United Nations is worth saving.

UHF Versus VHF

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I have been particularly interested in these last few days to note statements made by the president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., Dr. Frank Stanton, and Mr. Robert W. Sarnoff, chairman of the board of the National Broadcasting Co. Both of these gentlemen have been appearing in public hearings before the Federal Communications Commission here in Washington in connection with our nationwide television system. Although there have been many interesting comments made by them in the course of their appearances, I would like particularly to call the attention of the House to statements made by each of them in support of proposed legislation now before the Congress which would require that television receivers shipped in interstate commerce be equipped to receive channels in both the VHF and the UHF. The FCC has stated that such legislation is important if we are to preserve and fully develop our television resources. In that connection I have introduced a bill, H.R. 9267, which would amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to give the FCC the authority it requests but which at the same time insures that the American public not suffer the loss of the wide area television service they now enjoy.

Since both Mr. Sarnoff and Dr. Stanton have publicly stated their support of legislation which would give the FCC authority to specify all-channel receivers, I felt that the House would be interested in noting with me the comments made by these two gentlemen in their recent appearances before the Commission. Consequently, I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD statements on this subject which they have made.

The statements follow:

EXCERTPS FROM STATEMENT OF FRANK STANTON, PRESIDENT, COLUMBIA BROADCASTING SYSTEM, INC., JANUARY 23, 1962

We believe that the widespread use of all-channel receivers would be an important step to encourage the use of UHF frequencies. In this connection, we must look at television as a total system—not in terms of separate hardware components of transmitters and receivers, but in terms of standards which apply to both transmission and reception. These standards embracing both VHF and UHF areas of the spectrum are the system for television today. Full utilization of this system requires that sets be able to receive signals transmitted in all parts of the spectrum assigned to television. In 1954, we supported legislation to remove the excise tax from UHF converters and all-channel sets as a means of meeting that requirement. With that route apparently closed, we support the Commission in its efforts to persuade the Congress to enact legislation which would result in the manufacture of only all-channel receivers.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT W. SARNOFF (CBS) BEFORE THE FCC RE ALL-CHANNEL RECEIVER LEGISLATION, JANUARY 29, 1962

In response to a question by Commissioner Lee: "Does NBC have a position in respect to all-channel receiver legislation?"

Mr. SARNOFF. "NBC supports the objectives of the proposed legislation for requiring television sets shipped in interstate commerce to be equipped to receive channels in both the VHF and UHF. We recognize that the purpose of the legislation is to foster the development of UHF—a purpose we strongly favor. We have always felt, and continue to feel, that television's potential can best be realized by maximum utilization of both the 12 VHF channels and the 70 UHF channels; and that a system limited to either the VHF channels or the UHF channels would be an undesirable limitation on the medium itself.

"This has not only been NBC's stated position over the years, but we have matched it by our development and furtherance of UHF from the beginning. In 1949 NBC helped UHF get started by constructing and operating the experimental UHF station in Bridgeport, which was the first such station to present regular programing. We made substantial investments to promote UHF operations in intermixed markets through two UHF stations NBC acquired and operated for

a period of years, and we were the last network company to relinquish its own UHF operation.

"Although we support the purposes of the legislation, we do have a reservation about the principle involved, since it would result in requiring all purchasers of television sets to pay more for them whether or not they want—or can use—the added feature of UHF reception.

"However, as the objective is to foster better utilization of the UHF band without reducing the value of the VHF band for television, we feel that in balance its advantages outweigh its disadvantages and on this basis we support it."

Science Group Opposes Tests in Atmosphere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post on January 31 brought us news that the council of the Federation of American Scientists has urged President Kennedy not to order a resumption of nuclear tests in the atmosphere.

Mr. Speaker, this is a valid precautionary statement that I hope the various agencies of the Federal Government involved in policy will take heed of. We are witnessing the frantic race of great powers seeking additional individual security by policies and programs that breed even greater insecurity. Greatness is expected of a great nation. Ours is a great Nation, Mr. Speaker, and in such perilous times when the future of mankind itself is implicated then the United States as a great Nation is capable of a supreme act of self-restraint. And it is no excuse to say that we must resume testing because the bully nation up the street conducted a serious of tests beginning last September. There is a body of scientific opinion that holds that the Soviet Union gathered little tangible gain from its nuclear testing. There is, as well, ample evidence that its demonstrations appalled the world and alienated world opinion. I suggest we do not follow the Soviet example.

Under unanimous consent, I include this article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

SCIENCE GROUP OPPOSES TESTS IN ATMOSPHERE

Spokesmen for 2,100 American scientists and engineers yesterday urged President Kennedy not to order a resumption of nuclear tests in the atmosphere.

The council of the Federation of American Scientists based its appeal upon the conclusion that political and propaganda losses from such an act would far outweigh technical gains in U.S. nuclear arms.

Of particular concern to the council is the possibility that if the United States resumes atmospheric testing, the Soviets might reply in kind leading to what disarmament experts call the escalation of the arms race. "Should the United States try to get ahead again, for a little while, or is this a good time to stop as long as the Soviets will follow our example?" asks the council in a statement approved at its annual meeting in New York City last week.

The Federation of American Scientists is a national organization of scientists and engineers who are concerned with the impact of science on world affairs. John H. Toll of the University of Maryland's physics department is chairman of the federation.

"It is important to realize," the statement holds, "that in the present advanced state of nuclear weapons no step comparable in terms of weapons yield to the thermonuclear breakthrough is foreseeable. In fact, an increase by orders of magnitude in the amount of energy released from matter is excluded by one of the most thoroughly established laws of physics."

The council also took cognizance of the nonmilitary factors to be considered and made these points:

If the United States refrains from testing, the Soviets will be deprived of an excuse to resume their own test program. This act of self-restraint could also help to convince the Soviet leaders that the United States "is in earnest about slowing the arms race and sincere in its dedication to disarmament."

Resumption of U.S. atmospheric tests now cannot help but foster the impression in the public mind that the Nation's security can—in the long run—be maintained solely by military strength.

Atmospheric tests produce global fallout whose hazards would affect some persons, most of whom have no voice in the decision to test.

A Bill To Provide for the Acquisition and Preservation of the Ansley Wilcox House in Buffalo, N.Y., as a National Historic Site

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, memorializing Congress to approve the bill I have introduced providing for the acquisition and preservation of the Ansley Wilcox House in Buffalo, N.Y., as a national historic site. The resolution follows:

ITEM 142

Resolution memorializing Congress to purchase Wilcox Mansion

Whereas Congressman THADDEUS J. DULSKI has introduced a bill in Congress providing for Federal acquisition of the Ansley Wilcox House, 641 Delaware Avenue, Buffalo, N.Y.; and

Whereas it was in the library of this home that Theodore Roosevelt took the oath of office as President on September 14, 1901, following the assassination of President William McKinley; and

Whereas it is one of four sites outside of the Nation's Capital where the Presidential oath has been administered, and it was built in the 1830's as the major's house of the old Poinsett Barracks; and

Whereas said Wilcox mansion is one of the few remaining historical monuments in the city of Buffalo and should be preserved; and

Whereas there is danger of it being demolished; and

Whereas the American Institute of Architects has recommended preservation of the Wilcox House and support also has been pledged by the Buffalo and Erie County Historical Society, National Trust for Historic Preservation, New York State Historical Association, American Association for State and Local History, Frederick M. Houghton chapter of the New York State Archeological Association, the Buffalo Federation of Women's Clubs, Sons of the American Revolution, Daughters of the American Revolution, Society of Colonial Wars, the Mayflower Society, Daughters of American Colonists, Society of New England Women, and the Society of Colonial Dames: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Common Council of the City of Buffalo memorialize the Congress of the United States to approve the legislation as proposed by Congressman DULSKI of Buffalo, N.Y., and appropriate the necessary funds to preserve the Wilcox Mansion, and that a copy of this resolution be transmitted by the city clerk to Congressman DULSKI and the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress.

WILLIAM F. LYMAN.

Let's Suppose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the December 1961 issue of the Surplus Record contained a reprint from the Economic Facts of Life, the American Economic Foundation, which I feel is especially timely and thought provoking. Under unanimous consent, I include this article "Let's Suppose" in the RECORD at this point:

LET'S SUPPOSE

(By Fred G. Clark and Richard S. Rimanoczy)

Let's suppose that the astronauts found a cushy little uninhabited planet with plenty of oxygen, a good climate, fertile soil, and a fine water supply.

Let's suppose that a million Americans started a new nation by migrating to this planet, taking with them all their movable possessions. To have a money supply they turned their currency into silver. The silver was deposited in the banks that had been formed on their arrival. This gave them a money system—they could check their earnings in and out, or, if they chose, take it out in silver.

One of the first things they would have to do is elect a government and give it enough powers to protect their freedom but not enough to take it away. One of those powers would have to be the power to tax because the only money government has is what it takes from the people. Now let's suppose that some of the politicians did not want government spending to be limited to tax money.

Let's suppose that they said: "The government must have the power to get extra money by putting its I O U's into the banks and getting checking balances in return." This would raise the question of whose money would be taken out of the banks

when the government wrote its checks. The answer would be: "Nobody's money. It would be newly created money. Every I O U would be a legal addition to the bank's money assets."

This would raise the question of why the banks would be willing to do this. The answer would be: "Because the Government will pay the banks interest for accepting the I O U's and issuing the checkbook money."

This would raise the question of how this unearned money would get its value. The answer would be: "By sharing in and reducing the value of all the other money."

This would raise the question as to how and when the I O U's would be paid off and the value would be restored to the other money. The answer would be: "They might never be paid off. When they came due other I O U's would be substituted. The bank wouldn't care as long as the interest was paid."

This would raise the question of whether or not this was not only taxation but also confiscation of savings. The answer would be: "In a way, but this is necessary because the people might not stand for more taxes at times when we needed more spending money."

This would raise the question of how the people could protect the value of their money. The answer would be: "They couldn't. That would be controlled by the politicians and the Government economists who are the best judges of what it should be. Moreover, if the economy expands fast enough, the people will never notice it."

Let's suppose that somebody then said: "This whole idea is crazy." The answer would be: "Not at all. This is what has been done in the United States ever since it abandoned gold-redeemable money."

This raises the question as to whether the American people have gone crazy.

You'll have to answer that one.

Commemorating the Independence of the Union of Burma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to the President of Burma, Mr. U Win Mayung; and Burma's Ambassador to the United States, Mr. U On Sein. Earlier this month, Burma, a country old in tradition and young in spirit, celebrated its 14th year of independence. On January 4, 1948, the Union of Burma emerged into the world, a republic destined to play a major role in southeast Asia.

The Burmese are a resourceful people. They are gradually strengthening their country economically. They realize that a sound economy creates a sound nation. In doing this, the Burmese have demonstrated great courage as they have attacked problems that, on the surface, seem insurmountable.

The Government of Burma is extremely proud of its status as one of the great democracies of southeast Asia. Burma follows the parliamentary system, with her government headed by a President and Cabinet. Ever since it achieved independence, Burma has taken a leading role in striving to maintain peace in troubled southeast Asia. Furthermore, her statesmen have become prominent in the attempt to maintain peace in the world. The Nation has gained the well deserved respect of the countries of the important southeast Asian area as well as of the nations of the rest of the world.

As long as the Burmese people are able to combat their problems with the courage exhibited in the past, we of the United States can take comfort in the fact that world peace has an ally in Burma.

The Joy Ride

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, from time to time, it is my privilege to commend to the attention of my colleagues the editorial writings of Leo Lerner, one of Chicago's leading editors.

Two of his most recent columns entitled "The Joy Ride" and "No War and No Peace" are of current and national interest and are a thoughtful commentary of the frustration of our times and the need for a new approach in our thinking in the postnuclear world. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following articles for insertion in the Appendix:

THE JOY RIDE

(By Leo A. Lerner)

There are a great many articles in the press and magazines these days about what is called the new conservatism.

I ran across one in a magazine to the effect that young people's going conservative is due to the increasing population, which creates a yearning for individualism, a sort of dying gasp for private freedom in a world that is rapidly congealing.

In the long run, says the writer, the youthful conservatives, being well educated and intelligent, will veer away from their present sponsors, who are selfishly concerned with fighting taxes and social security, and turn toward human considerations and Western individualism.

I cannot argue with philosophy, and this may be so, but today this is hard to swallow.

After all, whence do the organized conservatives derive? They come from the old guard in the Republican Party, which in our day hardened into a fusty and frustrated core during the Presidency of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Their image was a mixture of Father Coughlin, Gerald L. K. Smith, the dog-in-the-manger press, the Texas oil billionaires, and an assortment of right-wingers who included the late Senator McCarthy.

During the days of the First World War, the people in this group frequently found excuses for Hitler, displayed a wide strip of rather open anti-Semitism, and were domestically on the side of those interests who were busy reaching into the people's pockets.

They did then, as they do now, hate the Govrenment. (Their criticism of the American Government and Russia's attacks on it often sound alike.) In fact, hating the Government and distrusting it, Democratic or Republican, is a characteristic of the new conservatism. They claim they are against the Communists, but they strongly oppose the Government's preparations to defend us, have encouraged the draftees to complain and have otherwise attempted to obscure and obfuscate efforts to find a way to make peace, to make the United Nations effective, and, domestically, to defeat unemployment and poverty.

Listen closely to the vast outpouring of ultraconservative propaganda (it is strange that the worst of it and the best of it, when boiled down, sound so much alike), and you will find that nearly all their programs end up with the elimination or some strangulation of the income tax. If there is room for only one domestic program plank, it is elimination of the income tax; if there is room for another, it is to put an end to all Government competition with private business, from the TVA to the post office.

Americans who are fond of playing detective don't need to be Sherlock Holmeses to find the motive. The motive is money. The Texas oil people couldn't be in just for the joy ride.

I suppose that it isn't really so odd that the profit motive should appear in this modern drama dressed in the disguise of patriotism. It's really nothing new in American history.

The only difference between the ancient Tories, the Copperheads and the dunderheads is that the new conservatives are richer. They can buy more pamphlets, hire more halls, and find more devious ways to prove that they are living dolls. It may not be a new trend at all, as that magazine author suggests, but merely inflation.

The Reds are a menace, and all good Americans should oppose them with all their might, but there is a moral question involved in the Birchers and their ilk being right for the wrong reasons, and through the employment of wrong methods.

Heaven help us if that is the wave of the future.

NO WAR AND NO PEACE

(By Leo A. Lerner)

In the old days, before the absolute weapon was invented, it was possible to make peace. The formula was to have a war, no matter how terrible, and then make peace when everybody was exhausted fighting.

Now that is not possible, and it explains Walter Lippmann's speech to the Women's National Press Club in Washington several weeks ago when he said that we are living in a time when we cannot have a war and we cannot have peace. "A war cannot be fought and a peace cannot be achieved" is the way he put it.

Then he said quite plainly what this does to all of us. It forces us to realize that neither the United States nor the U.S.S.R. must push the other beyond the tolerable limit of provocation and humiliation. Even the sanest nation, said Lippmann, can be provoked and exasperated to the point of lunacy where its nervous system cannot endure inaction—where only violence can relieve its feeling.

The advice contained in this declaration by one of our leading political thinkers is clear: Governments must find where that line is and stay well back of it, for the sake of the whole human race.

More importantly, the duty of every citizen of any country becomes clear. It is his personal duty to do nothing that helps push his country's nervous system into violence to relieve its feelings.

Often I hear people say, "What is going on is none of my business—what can I do about it?"

But there is something we can do, or at least not do. We can be sober about responsibility to our country. We can ask ourselves, "Is what I am about to say and

what I am about to do good for my country in the most delicate period in American history? Am I contributing to provocation and exasperation to the point of lunacy? Am I helping to push our side in one way, or the other side in some other way, beyond the tolerable limit of provocation and humiliation?"

This is admittedly a question I have been asking in various forms for some time, but here it goes again. Are you a prenuclear or a postnuclear person? Are you still thinking the way people thought before the ultimate weapon was contrived, or have you altered and broadened and adjusted your outlook to the way things really are now? "Only a moral idiot with a suicidal mania would press the button for a nuclear war," says Lippmann.

There is no cause to give up our belief in reason, intelligence, truth, and high principles. But there is cause to avoid crudeness, thoughtlessness, braggadocio, bullyism, and needless provocation. We may have to live a long, long time in a period of no war and no peace.

Not only that, but we should develop the patience to blunt provocation and crudeness when they come from others.

Keep the bomb in mind, keep in mind the need for patience no matter what the provocation, keep in mind that if used properly, modern science is creating something new in the world, a debrutalization of international and interpersonal relations.

They used to say that freedom in America consisted of the right to spit in somebody's eye and tell him to go to hell. The nuclear bomb has changed that.

Now freedom has a higher meaning. It consists of the right to refrain from the temptation of spitting in somebody's eye and telling him to go to hell. It consists of finding a better way of dealing with people and of defending freedom so that we do not contribute to the confusion and frustration of the times.

This is a challenge to live, not die. As Jean Monnet, the founder of the Common Market, said, "We cannot build our future if we are obsessed with fear of Russia." Restraint yes, fear no.

We might resent restraint, but we know what the inevitable alternatives are. They are something from which nobody will derive any satisfaction or any victory.

Isolationism Outgrown: An Address on Foreign Trade Policy by Gov. Matthew E. Welsh, of Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD excerpts from a speech on the importance to Indiana agriculture and industry of extensive revision of the Reciprocal Trade Act delivered by the distinguished Governor of Indiana, the Honorable Matthew E. Welsh, on January 9 at Lebanon, Ind., at a meeting of the junior chamber of commerce of that city.

Governor Welsh's remarks follow:

AN ADDRESS BY GOV. MATTHEW E. WELSH, OF INDIANA

In years past Indiana acquired a national reputation, along with other midwestern States, as a center of isolationism. We were, so other areas of our Nation thought, unconcerned about the rest of the world and happiest when we were left alone.

World War II and the Korean war shattered this philosophy because we found by bitter experience that world problems could reach into Hoosier homes and call men out fight in every corner of the earth. Tens of thousands of Hoosier men and women saw active service in Europe, Asia, Africa, Latin America, and through the island chains of the Pacific.

The long and vital cold war struggle has removed any doubt in Hoosier minds that our own future lies tied to the worldwide conflict of political, social, and economic systems.

But while these developments were going on, Indiana industry was expanding to meet the growing needs of our Nation in war and peace and to tap world markets for our share of expanding commerce.

In 1960 Indiana firms exported more than $300 million in manufactured goods. As great as Indiana's stake is in agricultural exports, Hoosier industry's dollar volume of exports is twice as much.

JOBS FOR HOOSIERS

This foreign trade means jobs for Hoosiers. Over half of our more than 540,000 manufacturing workers are employed in industrial plants in which part of the production is for export. For example, we are one of the Nation's great producers of industrial machinery. Yet more than 10 cents out of each dollar of our industrial machinery sales comes from foreign trade.

The production of finished goods for overseas is not only critical to the Hoosier economy, but likewise the making of component parts for industrial machines as well as consumer goods that finally find their way into foreign markets is important to maintaining a high level of employment and business activity in Indiana.

The attraction of additional industry to our State is important, of course, but equally so is maintaining and expanding the level of production of our present firms. And a vital part of this production now is for eventual export.

A new combination of nations for trade purposes has appeared in the world. It is changing foreign trade patterns and threatens even more serious shifts in the years ahead. As business people, and I am an officer in a Vincennes corporation that manufactures electronic training aids for oversea as well as domestic sales, we must be aware of the challenges to our businesses and do something to meet them.

COMMON MARKET RECRUITS

This new combination of nations, the European Economic Community or Common Market as it is sometimes called, consists of France, West Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, Belgium, and the Netherlands. Several other nations including the United Kingdom are seeking to associate with this new economic alliance.

It now appears that this national combination will contain a highly industrial complex of 300 million people—almost twice the population of the United States. These nations today represent a substantial share of our foreign market and we need to sell to them.

The problem for us is created by the fact that these nations are grouping themselves into an economic unit by decreasing and eventually eliminating all trade barriers among themselves to permit the free flow of goods, capital, and labor across their boundaries—as between our States now. At the same time, they are uniting on common external trade barriers or tariffs that permit them to protect their internal markets.

Our present Reciprocal Trade Act worked satisfactorily when we were dealing with these countries individually on an item-by-item basis. We can no longer negotiate with them for favorable trade terms for American goods on a product-by-product basis. We must negotiate and bargain for favorable trade terms for our products on a much broader basis, such as by whole classes of goods, for example.

The President, who is charged with the responsibility for tariff negotiations, does not now have the authority to do this. With the present trade tools he has, he cannot meet—for us—the challenge of the Common Market. And, incidentally, the tremendous economic spurt experienced by the Common Market countries makes this challenge a formidable one to American businessmen, workers, and farmers alike.

SEEKING FAVORABLE TERMS

In his annual message to the Congress in the next few days, the President will ask for the authority U.S. negotiators need to get for us continued favorable trading terms in the European Common Market and with other nations of the world. What the Congress does in granting or withholding this essential authority will determine to a significant degree the future of that part of Indiana's production (industrial and agricultural) that eventually reaches foreign markets.

I am convinced, as I know you are, that American businessmen, workers, and farmers can compete successfully with any foreign nation or combination of nations. We are masters of production and industrial and farm technology. A new trade policy can and would cause some domestic shifts in production, but, if we know our business—and we do—we cannot only meet competition, we can expand our markets. Our failure to meet this challenge by permitting the free world to be divided by tariff could cost us heavily in Indiana.

Increasingly, Hoosiers are recognizing their personal stake in both world affairs and in foreign trade. Many of us have served in the armed services during the hot or cold wars and many of our incomes are dependent to some degree on foreign trade.

When the debate rages in the Congress on trade policy, it would be most useful for Hoosiers to inform themselves of the effect of the outcome on them and their businesses, farms, or jobs. For the issue is not remote from Main Street, Indiana. It is very directly our affair too, and we should be heard.

The Turtlelike Speed of Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, in today's Nutley (N.J.) Sun there appears an excellent editorial properly criticizing the longstanding Federal practice of continuing important officials for long, indefinite periods in "acting" capacities instead of giving them permanent status in a reasonable time.

While in no way wishing to participate in the selection of officials anywhere, within the Internal Revenue Service, it seems to me that this editorial presents another excellent argument for ending this unwise practice.

Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD.

THE TURTLELIKE SPEED OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Almost weekly for the past 6 months we have been receiving in our mail publicity releases from the U.S. Treasury Internal Revenue Service office serving our area and located at 1060 Broad Street, Newark.

When space permits, the releases are published. We consider it a public service to print them since the subject matter is intended to aid our readers, and does.

For these past 6 months every Internal Revenue Service publicity release includes a legend which never changes—the title of the release's author—"Acting Director Kenneth O. Hook."

Mr. Hook has been serving as Acting Director ever since the death last summer of his superior, the late IRS Director Joseph F. J. Mayer. Mr. Hook is a career Treasury Department employee and has served as Assistant Director of the Newark office for 4 years, and upon the death of Joseph Mayer was made Acting Director.

His present "acting" title reminds us of the time 6 years ago when the late Joseph Mayer held a similar shaky title back in 1955. For about 14 months Mr. Mayer was an Acting Director. To make matters worse Mayer's understudy, former Assistant Director Roy Brine was Acting Assistant Director for 18 months.

Regardless what level of government we speak of, the "acting" status of any public official executive is bad for department morale, and it is bad for the taxpayers who are served by the various departments and levels of government.

As in the case during the Eisenhower years in 1955 when we believed Joseph Mayer's performance in the job as Acting Director of the Newark IRS office merited a permanent appointment to the position, in the current situation we believe that Mr. Hook, after serving 4 years as Assistant Director and now completing 6 months as Acting Director of the Newark office, merits the permanent appointment.

If Hook, a career Treasury Department employee, is good enough to be Acting Director for 6 months he is obviously sufficiently competent to attain permanent status in the position. From where we sit it is as simple as all that, unless of course there exist extenuating circumstances above and beyond the call of public performance that have escaped us.

Two million taxpayers and 1,000 Internal Revenue Service employees embraced by the Newark district office are entitled to a permanent Director—and the sooner the better.

The Forgotten People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, this is the seventh of 10 articles, part of a series which appeared in the New York World-Telegram and Sun in October 1961 on the subject of the migrant worker in the United States. These articles were written by Dale Wright, World-Telegram and Sun staff writer, who, for 6 months, lived and worked as a migrant worker along the Atlantic seaboard from Florida to New York:

THE FORGOTTEN PEOPLE: FARM CAMP SLUM, EXPOSED 8 YEARS AGO, IS STILL HELL

(By Dale Wright)

The great dream of many migrant farmworkers, born and reared in a shack in the South, is to go North to the land of plenty—to find the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow.

On his first trip "on the season," the migrant finds that dream quickly shattered. I, too, was a dreamer when I went into the fields in Delaware, New Jersey, and eastern Long Island.

I found that, unlike the South, there were, indeed, a few laws aimed at protecting the rights of the itinerant harvester. But the truth is that these laws are so scant and so haphazardly enforced that they have little effect.

INSPECTED?

They have had no effect whatever, for example, at one camp where I found the same shocking conditions bared by another World-Telegram survey 8 years ago.

I found a mean-looking labor camp on the Enos Herbert farm near New Sharon, N.J., that a health inspector had visited the day before I did. Six inches of slimy water covered the concrete block community shower room. There was no drainage system.

About 20 persons living at the camp drew their water, for drinking, cooking, and bathing, from a handpump in the middle of the camp compound. The water tasted acrid and appeared to be contaminated. In every glassful a gritty sediment settled to the bottom.

OWES TOO MUCH TO DIE

In Cedarville, N.J., a little farm town in the southwestern corner of the State, a woman crewleader told me that after spending most of her life as a migrant, "I'm ready to lay down and die."

She said her name was Mable Brown and that she came from Pompano Beach, Fla.

"I can't die now, though," she added. "I owe too many people."

An angular, work-worn woman wearing a pair of incongruous jodhpurs, Mrs. Brown said she had brought 17 laborers into Cedarville in a battered Chevy sedan and a dilapidated bus. Bad weather, she said, had held up the tomato crop and as a result none of her crew had earned any money. She was paying their food bill out of her own pocket.

Mrs. Brown's camp was worse than any I had seen in the Deep South. She repeated an old refrain: "Ain't seen any government people around here in a long time."

The camp consisted of a row of shanties—off the main road in the woods—with no running water, no indoor toilet and no plumbing. There was a filthy community shower and a cramped, one-room kitchen which served the whole camp.

A mangy dog sprawled in the doorway of one shack. A goat and some flea-bitten sheep scratched in the dirt in front of the row of shanties. A few little children played hopscotch in the dirt with the menagerie.

NO LETTUCE FOR HIM

One of Mrs. Brown's help, a stooped, gnarled man in his late sixties, stopped rolling a cigaret and spoke up:

"We was chopping lettuce on the Sorantino Bros. farm a few weeks back, just keepin' busy till the tomatoes got ripe.

"The bossman said he was paying $1 an hour. When it came time for the money, the man didn't give us but 85 cents an hour. He didn't say why; he just told us to move on in the pay line. I guess he forgot that we were supposed to get the dollar."

Near Woodstown, N.J., a Negro farm laborer on the Jill Bros. truckfarm said the crew he worked for was paid 10 cents for each basket (five-eights of a bushel) of tomatoes picked. Less than 2 miles away, at a Puerto Rican labor camp, Ruben Garcia, a husky, tattooed 29-year-old worker, told me he was paid 15 cents for the same size basket of tomatoes being harvested in the same fields for the same grower.

It was clear that there was a double set of standards on the Jill Bros. farm and on many others I found.

WHITE WORKER RARE

One of the rarities I saw in the migrant labor camps along the Atlantic seaboard cropped up in Hightstown, N.J., a prosperous little village between Freehold and Trenton. It was a white migrant farmworker.

I found him perched forlornly by the side of a railroad track. He was broke and hungry. A scrawny little man, he said between dips from a can of snuff that his name was Glenn Hubert. "Don't forget, it's spelled with two n's."

He said he was 46 years old, that he came from Madison, Wis., and that he had been "on the road for 7 or 8 years."

I hadn't seen a white migrant since months earlier in Belle Glade, Fla., when I talked with a group of them as they shaped up for work in the bean fields.

Mr. Hubert said he suffered as a white man working with migrants. He got the least to eat at his labor camp commissary and he was the first to feel the brunt of the crew leader's anger.

BEATEN FOR SLOWNESS

"I don't pick very fast," he complained, "and the bossman (his crew leader) don't stand for no slacking." He said he had been beaten with fists and clubs and pointed to a gash on his cheek.

At another stop in New Jersey—near Manalapan—a young mother of three told in painful detail how it feels to get trapped at the end of the migrant trail.

Mrs. Inell Jennings, 27, shooed flies away from an infant asleep in a cot and declared:

"That child ain't got a chance. His daddy and me want to give him the best but we can't do no better than this." She lived with her family in a 2-room tarpaper and tin shanty in "Bielson's Quarters," a row of about 20 dilapidated dwellings without indoor plumbing or sanitary facilities. The rent was from $10 to $15 weekly.

The only time the landlord visits his private housing project is on Saturday morning, to collect the rent.

REPORTED 8 YEARS AGO

The tragedy of this family's plight is that World-Telegram Reporter Allan Keller had found and reported in shocking detail the same kind of conditions at the same camp 8 years ago.

Mrs. Jennings said she had been forced to make her home at the quarters 6 years ago, after coming there from Tallahassee, Fla., and getting stranded with a farm labor crew.

Shuffling down the dirt road which leads off the highway to Bielson's Quarters I found Thomas Miller. He said he was 51 and that he came from Charleston, S.C. At that moment, he said, he was looking for a State trooper.

"I've been working with Daisy Durham's outfit," he said, "and now I'm gonna get her arrested." Mr. Miller said that Mrs. Durham, from Plant City, Fla., his crew leader, had charged him and six other laborers—both men and women—$10 weekly rent for a one-room shack at the quarters when the place had been condemned.

"That shack is damned," the worker said, "and Bielson's not supposed to rent it." He

explained that his crew leader charged rent for it anyway and pocketed the money.

Mr. Miller's story of cheating and gouging was familiar. I was to hear it many more times in New Jersey and New York—more times than even in Florida.

Chippewa Valley Electric Co-op Celebrates 25 Years of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on February 2, Chippewa Valley Electric Co-op at Cornell, Wis., will celebrate its silver anniversary. The many achievements of this cooperative in the rural electrification field are symbolic of the achievements of the 9 other rural electric co-ops in Wisconsin's Ninth Congressional District, and of the 986 rural electric cooperatives across the land.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD the message given to Chippewa Valley's 3,300 members at their 25th annual meeting by Henry E. Grape, who is president of their board of directors:

WORKING TOGETHER AND GROWING TOGETHER

(By Henry E. Grape)

This, the 25th anniversary of the Chippewa Valley Electric Cooperative, brings forth one's pride, not only in a quarter century of progress, but in the accomplishments of rural people—rural people working together toward a common goal for the good of all. Your accomplishments, and I mean your accomplishments, because you were all part of it, are nothing short of outstanding. Cheers should be shouted for the many who gave freely of themselves, their time and energy, to a cause, to a dream, beyond the reach of rural America. That is why I say, "your accomplishment," because no one person could have worked the miracle of electrifying rural America, or Chippewa County.

A younger generation is taking over now, who take these things for granted. In the glow of electric lights, even my memory of those early days is dimmed. It would seem the battle has been won, the goal reached. It has. But the rising sun of tomorrow will bring a new challenge. We have reached a high plain of accomplishments from where we must hold the achievements attained and prepare for the next struggle.

In the past 25 years, 3,300 rural farms and homes in our service area have been connected to central station electricity. Not one rural home is deprived of this service. More than 95 percent of rural America enjoys this type of electric power. In 1936, when only 11 percent of the rural population were being served, a great many hours were spent by a great many people, signing up members, telling the story and the dream of electricity in every rural home. We vaguely hoped to have lights and maybe a pump plus a few small appliances to make life a bit more enjoyable. None of us could begin to visualize the tremendous strides that would be made once we had taken those first uncertain steps.

Rural electrification has definitely made its mark on the farm economy as well as the economy of the Nation. No other factor has contributed so much to our high standard of living, health, and convenience.

Along with our success have come heartaches and in some cases bitterness, which accompanies such a story. But to those who have given of their time, their efforts and their interest to the cooperative, this 25th anniversary has a special meaning.

To our late manager, R. L. Cleaves, the Chippewa Valley Electric Cooperative was his pride and joy. No one person gave so much of his time, energy, or effort to make the cooperative a success. Hours of work, miles of travel, or personal sacrifice meant nothing when problems needed to be solved during any of the 25 years. He took a great pride in the fact we never had a bad year. We should all enjoy this pride, for you all helped establish this fine record.

Mr. Cleaves left his mark on our cooperative and on other cooperative organizations in the State and Nation. It is a pity after all his effort and accomplishments, he was not granted the day to help celebrate our silver anniversary.

The future of the Chippewa Valley Electric Cooperative is in the hands of its members and those served by it.

Challenge of Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, a perceptive editorial which clearly expresses a central fact of national life that "science outruns the number of trained individuals needed," appeared in the January 26 edition of the La Porte Herald-Argus in the city of La Porte in the Third District of Indiana which it is my privilege to represent.

The editorial follows:

CHALLENGE OF SCIENCE

In the amazing world of technocracy in which we all live, old knowledge and training so often no longer serve or prepare. We have moved swiftly into a new age of electronics, of applied science which speaks a new language and demands a wholly new preparation.

In a metropolitan newspaper a management consultant firm advertised for "creative minded individuals at the Ph.D. level interested in advancing the state of the art" in such areas of knowledge as "reliability analysis and prediction," "electrophysics display techniques," "solid-state memory development," "microwave data transmission," "polymer chemistry synthesis," "diagnostic programing techniques," "solid logic and thin films," "nonnumerical mathematics on computers," "symbol manipulation," and so on and on; strange things but a part of today.

Science outruns the number of trained individuals needed. Its challenges are so strong and demanding we lag behind in our ability to meet them. It concerns itself not only with defense requirements but with a whole new complex of knowledge to make human life more productive and which can make it more creative and worth while.

Because we know what we must do to meet the demands of the new science, it saddens us to read that Indiana is losing $2 million in Federal money for science, mathematics, and foreign language teaching and equipment provided under the National Defense Education Act for those school systems which claim it. The Indianapolis school system, for example, has for 2 years refused its share for these purposes.

In La Porte there has been no such reluctance to ask for and use money which can bring an improved curriculum in these vital areas of training for young people. And local school authorities, wise in their decisions to utilize available funds, need never apologize in the least for those decisions.

If there is any truth which must be accepted in the common mind today it is that education must continue to expand in scope and in quality if there is to be much hope that Western civilization shall not crumble and fall. And that education includes not only the building of new bodies of knowledge and the creation of many more machines but acquisition of insight into man's life with man to the end that all human personality shall have a far better chance for fullest growth and expression.

James M. Cox Newspapers Support Investigation of Foundations by House Small Business Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Dayton Daily News, which is one of the James M. Cox newspapers, carried an editorial on Saturday, January 27, 1962, entitled "Tax-Dodge Gimmick," concerning the foundation study and investigation being conducted by the House Small Business Committee.

It is as follows:

TAX-DODGE GIMMICK

Congress is taking the right view in wanting to know more about the financial dealings of tax-exempt foundations in this country.

Particularly does Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of a Special Committee on Small Business, want a better insight into what effect the foundations are having on the national economy. Since they often are set up by commercial firms, one fear is that they're squeezing small businesses out of existence.

Another suspicion is that some of them are more interested in avoiding tax payments than anything else and are using their status as a gimmick for foiling Uncle Sam's tax collectors.

It's interesting, for example, that in just 8 years—from 1952 to 1960—the tax-free foundations jumped from 12,295 to 45,000.

Apparently the committee is already well along on the job of gathering information. Representative PATMAN last summer sent out a questionnaire to 500 of the largest foundations. The replies to this inquiry should give the committee a good start in determining the holdings and income of these foundations.

But other information also may be needed, and if so the committee has the necessary subpena power to get it.

The committee's mission, it would seem, is not to make it rougher for foundations that have a legitimate reason for being, but to put the squeeze on those that may be abusing the privilege.

Refuge Stamp Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today designed to expedite and to help finance the establishment of essential refuge areas for the conservation of our endangered wildlife resources. It proposes to establish an annual national wildlife refuge stamp to be sold for the modest fee of $2 to persons wishing to use the national wildlife refuges and national game ranges for recreational purposes such as bird watching, camping, picnicking, and fishing.

The acquisition of refuge lands is now financed by the duck hunters who annually pay $3 for their sport which is made possible by the refuge system. Many other persons use and enjoy the refuges and the wildlife thereon. I concur with the belief of the National Audubon Society, which has advocated the kind of legislation introduced today, that these other people are as willing as the hunters have been to share in the cost of conserving our wildlife. The Audubon Society, one of the largest of our national conservation organizations, is generally recognized as the foremost spokesman for the nonhunting friends of wildlife, although that fine organization does have many good sportsmen among its members.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD some representative editorials from newspapers that have joined in advocating the refuge stamp plan:

[From the Havre, Mont., News, Oct. 31, 1961]

A BIRD CONSERVATION STAMP SUGGESTED

In a speech before the 57th annual convention of the National Audubon Society on Monday, President Carl W. Buchheister listed as one of the four "goals of conservationists" in the next session of Congress, final passage of the Wildernes bill.

That is a goal which should be of interest to all Montanans since a large portion of our State is listed as wilderness.

We do not have to be facetious to say that the National Audubon Society is for the birds for that is just what the society is doing—exerting every effort to protect our feathered friends. One of these birds is the golden eagle and his cousin, the bald eagle. The former is not protected in some States and the latter which serves as the official emblem of the United States is often shot by mistake for the golden eagle.

Mr. Buchheister proposed that Audubon members and affiliated groups study a new proposal that a $2 wildlife conservation stamp be issued by the Federal Government as a license or pass for bird watchers, picnickers and others who visit national wildlife refuges.

As yet, the conservation stamp plan has not been introduced in Congress. According to Mr. Buchheister it has been discussed with Federal wildlife officials and some Members of Congress. Its purpose would be to raise additional funds for the system of refuges administered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Most of the money for Federal refuges and all of the money currently used for the acquisition of new areas has come from the $3 duck stamp by which sportsmen are licensed to hunt waterfowl.

We think that Mr. Buchheister's position relative to a conservation stamp plan is laudable. It would have been easy for such an ardent conservationist to say—Let the hunters foot the bill. They go out and reduce the waterfowl population even if it is controlled. But he wants all Americans to pay their fair share.

Mr. Buchheister in his speech yesterday said "I am convinced millions of other Americans who benefit from the refuges, but who do not hunt, would be equally willing to contribute to the program."

It is his suggestion that a conservation stamp be issued annually, each year depicting a different nongame species such as a songbird, wading bird or shorebird. Traditionally duck stamps depict a species of wild duck or goose which are the quarry of hunters.

It is proposed that the new stamps would be sold at post offices, as are the duck stamps, and would entitle the purchaser to visit any national wildlife refuge any number of times for recreational purposes during the year. Hunters who have duck stamps would have the same visiting privileges and children below a certain age would be exempt.

We hope that the conservation stamp plan becomes a reality because not only does it afford a means of revenue for a conservation activity but gives the stamp owner the feeling that he actually belongs to a movement to preserve some wonderful birds which are becoming extinct whether he belongs to the Audubon Society or not.

H.C.W.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Evening Globe, Nov. 1, 1961]

FEES FOR BIRD WATCHERS

The National Audubon Society's proposal that bird watchers pay a fee of $2 for using national wildlife refuges will startle many of the thousands who follow that pleasant and instructive recreation. On second thought, however, doubt will very probably yield to approbation. For the society's plan will in no way interfere with bird watching outside these sanctuaries; and the modest fee suggested will go toward improving conservation programs now sustained only by proceeds derived from duck hunters' stamps.

Some 10,750,000 persons visit the Nation's wildlife sanctuaries each year. That is sound evidence of popularity. The acquisition of more marshes, breeding and resting areas used by migrating birds and other wildlife, will be possible if the society's project is adopted. A small license fee would assist that venture substantially.

[From the Decatur (Ill.) Herald-Review, Nov. 5, 1961]

A SANCTUARY FOR THE BIRDS

Charge the user is a popular solution to many an unpopular financing problem.

Motorists wheel to a stop at toll gates; campers cough up 50 cents to pitch a tent; and duck hunters, with, perhaps, some enterprising exceptions, do not duck the license fee.

Now, however, the president of the National Audubon Society has risked ruffling a few feathers with a proposal that bird watchers and other users of national wildlife refuges be required to pay an annual fee of $2.

It does seem too bad to charge money for merely tramping about wood and bog, peering here and there at the olive-backed thrush or the nesting crested pewit.

But anyway it's getting so a bird can't pipe his song in peace, without some peripatetic peeper coming along at the short end of a pair of binoculars.

So mightn't it be a good idea, after all, to charge the $2?

Then with its new-found funds the Government could establish a few more bird sanctuaries—maybe this time just for the birds.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Dec. 24, 1961]

FEE FOR NATIONAL REFUGES?

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The National Audubon Society is advocating a $2 annual admittance pass to national wildlife refuges because "the refuge program needs additional funds."

The proposed wildlife conservation stamp for refuge visitors would supplement the present $3 duck stamp sold as a license for hunters. Carl W. Buchheister, Audubon Society president, listed two other reasons behind the recommendation:

This kind of fee system can be useful in preventing too much public use of a refuge when too many trampling feet or to many automobiles would damage the habitat.

A certain number of citizens make special recreational use of the refuges because the refuges make wild animals accessible, available and visible. It seems only fair that these citizens make an extra contribution to the establishment and maintenance of the refuge system.

He said the proposed stamp would be sold through post offices, as is the duck stamp, as an annual pass for adults wishing to enter the refuges for bird watching, wildlife photography, fishing, or other recreation. Holders of duck stamps would be entitled to the same privileges, so no person would be required to buy both stamps.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—As regulations now stand at the Horicon National Wildlife Refuge, the public is not permitted within the refuge boundaries except during special hunting seasons. It might be in the best interest of the refuge to admit the public to specific areas during the summer and fall when wildlife is abundant.)

[From the Scottsbluff (Nebr.) Star-Herald, Nov. 2, 1961]

PROPOSALS TO BE SUPPORTED

President Carl W. Buchheister of the National Audubon Society in a speech at the society's 57th annual convention, listed four goals for conservationists in the next session of Congress.

He also asked Audubon members and affiliated groups to study a new proposal that a $2 wildlife conservation stamp be issued by the Federal Government as a license or pass for bird watchers, picnickers and others who visit the national wildlife refuges.

The four goals are as follows:

1. Final passage of the wilderness bill, which cleared the Senate in the last session but still requires House approval.

2. Passage of legislation to protect the golden eagle. A protective law is needed, not only to save the golden eagle which is becoming scarce, but also to preserve the bald eagle, the bird which serves as the official emblem of the United States. The bald eagle is often shot by mistake for the unprotected golden.

3. Creation of additional national seashore recreation areas. Buchheister named specifically proposed national seashores at Point Reyes in California, Padre Island in Texas, the Oregon Dunes on the Pacific coast and the Indiana Dunes on the south shore of Lake Michigan. Congress voted in the last session to establish a Cape Cod National Seashore Park.

4. Legislation to eliminate Federal subsidies for the drainage of waterfowl marshes in the Dakotas and Minnesota.

The Audubon leader called upon local groups to be vigilant, vigorous and voca' in fighting to save essential wildlife habitat,

some of our scenic grandeur and some of the remnants of wilderness.

He urged educational efforts stressing ecology—the science of the interdependence of living things—as a means of preventing mistakes by control technicians who become "pop-eyed with new toys such as airplanes loaded with chemical pesticides."

As an example, he criticized a plan by the Utah and Wyoming game departments to dump rotenone poison into 300 miles of the Green River in an effort to kill all "trash fish" above the new Flaming Gorge Reservoir. He said this plan threatens the extinction of three species of fish found no other place on earth. They are the giant Colorado squawfish (Ptychocheilus lucius), said to be the largest North American member of the minnow family; the humpback (gila cypha), and the humpback sucker (xyrauchen texanus). All are unique to the turbulent waters of the Upper Colorado River Basin.

Americans have been careless and wasteful of all the vast natural resources which have blessed their land. The National Audubon Society has no one's personal axe to grind. The proposals are logical and should have the support of everyone who wishes to protect the natural beauties and animal and bird life which still survive. Unconcern now could be fatal, so rapidly is our civilization encroaching upon them.

Francis E. Walter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I was in attendance upon committee obligation on January 29 at the time that the tribute was made to the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and other high honors and responsibilities which he holds, as apepars on pages 986–987 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that day. If I had been on the floor I would have cordially joined in a word of tribute about him and of the fact I too was very happy he was looking forward definitely to being back in the Halls of Congress for the 88th session thereof.

It has been my pleasure to serve on the majority side of this very vital Committee on Un-American Activities for going on 15 years and I know that the chairmanship of that important and necessary standing committee of the House is demanding and exacting of the very utmost which a chairman thereof can possibly muster or apply to the committee's obligations and responsibilities. Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER has applied this sort of service and ability to the committee's functioning and since the nature of the work of the committee is such that it demands the utmost attention by a chairman because of emergency matters so frequently coming up of great import and necessary decision, I say it has been remarkable that he has been available to render his wisdom and wise discretion to all those matters as they have arisen and have frequently arisen several times a day.

Since it has been publicly announced by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, Mr. MORGAN MOULDER, that he is not seeking reelection to this great legislative body, indications are that if I am reelected to my ninth term in this House at the forthcoming California elections, then I will have the pleasure and responsibility of being the ranking majority member of the committee with Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER as chairman. This relationship, duty and service I look forward to rendering.

I wish the gentleman from Pennsylvania many years of continuing improved health and service in Congress.

The Voice of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, last week I happened to hear the participants in the Voice of Democracy contest present their prepared speeches, and one young man's presentation and material was particularly impressive; however, all the contestants were excellent. In fact it was most inspiring and encouraging to see today's youth actively interested in not only their own future, but the future of the Nation.

I was delighted to learn that the young man, who impressed me so greatly, had also conveyed his feelings of sincerity and concern to the judges and they selected him to represent the District of Columbia in the finals of this contest, which is sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

I would like to insert in the RECORD the address given by Robert Baker, of 4419 Springdale Street NW., Washington, D.C., for I feel my colleagues would like to know how today's youth—who will be tomorrow's leaders—feel about democracy.

The address follows:

THE VOICE OF DEMOCRACY

(By Robert Baker, Wilson High School, Washington, D.C.)

Democracy is the state in which freemen face problems. By considering the various choices, people make free decisions which will result in greater democracy.

This definition of the United States applies in all circumstances at all times.

If men are free and desire to remain free, then they must make the decisions to continue freedom. Thinking, free choice, and decision on an individual basis prevent tyranny.

With public education and uncensored knowledge, any citizen should be able to resolve problems and extend his own freedom by thinking for himself.

Education plays such an important part in a democracy that you could say that education equals democracy.

Then tyranny is evidentally restricted education as in communism, or inadequate education as in the United States.

To cite this shortcoming, consider the ignorance of purpose on the part of the high school student; he remains in school only to please his parents; he does his homework only to please his teachers.

Then, to listen to students mouthing, parrotlike, untruths about communism or not even knowing its substance—to learn that the only District class on communism, devoted entirely to that complex subject, is taught in the sixth grade for fear of converting older students—then is to know that our school system is in trouble. Then so is our freedom.

How secure can this country remain if the high schools graduate hundreds of thousands of young adults who will not see the crisis of approaching tyranny because they cannot understand it?

Our public education and, with it, our democracy are defeated if citizens do not develop educational freedom by thinking for themselves.

If they cannot recognize what is wrong with tyranny, because they do not know what is right with democracy, how will they ever defend themselves from internal subversion?

As an example, consider the superpatriots.

Supposedly educated people become John Birchers, or minutemen, who grope in their unenlightened dark and call anyone they touch Communists.

They say atheistic Communists have permeated our Government.

Whether right or wrong, they are guessing. They're guessing because these superpatriots are ignorant of the characteristics of communism and they do not recognize the difference between communism and liberalism.

Superpatriots are one symptom of educational failure.

During the Korean war, captured GI's were brainwashed and became Communists. To this day, some have not renounced their false god.

They stand as another great educational failure.

Our soldiers could not defend their democracy against communism in the jungle; how will we defend ourselves at home?

The final symptom is our own failure to speak out and convince our Representatives in Congress of the vital importance of school improvement.

Instead, Congress allows an aid to education bill to die.

Our future depends on the ability of any citizen to think democratically for himself.

Superpatriots are ignorant of communism; those ex-GI's are ignorant of democracy; we students are ignorant of why we should be in school; and our Congressmen are ignorant of why we are.

If we will look the other way, as in Cuba, Laos, Red China, North Korea, North Vietnam, if we will passively graduate students unable to reason out personal and national crises, if we will watch the freedom of thought shrivel, then we will suffer a negative utopia.

I could be criticized as an alarmist.

But, I criticize these failures of democracy in the idealistic hope that, somehow, they will be corrected. Such constructive correction is characteristically democracy.

I criticize these broken links of freedom because a man is not human once he has lost his independence.

Freedom demands full knowledge, because freedom is full knowledge.

Education is the most outstanding characteristic of democracy, and we are neglecting it.

In speaking out for democracy, I would rather evaluate and correct a worthy system that might fail than sit silently and watch it fail.

Milton Viorst on Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of my colleagues an interesting and informative article by Milton Viorst, of the New York Post, on one of the most urgent problems facing our country today. We all realize that adequate measures for the medical care of our senior citizens are needed. This article is a comprehensive review of recent proposals to correct this need. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article which appeared in the New York Post for Sunday, January 28, 1962:

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

(By Milton Viorst)

WASHINGTON.—A month ago, President Kennedy received a letter from a 68-year-old woman whose husband had just died after a long stay in a hospital.

"We had no hospitalization insurance," she wrote. "We are thrifty persons who have never received welfare aid. However, those hospital expenses have drained away our life's savings and I am now forced to sell our modest home.

"I am all alone now with no one to care for me. How will I pay the bills if I become ill and must be taken to the hospital?

"You, Mr. President, are a kind man. Please enact legislation that would reduce hospitalization costs without delay. I do not want charity but reduced costs that would fit my present income.

"I am just a voice crying in the wilderness, 'Make straight the way of the Lord.' I am just one very lonely widow facing a bleak Christmas in my sorrow. I painstakingly wrote this letter but I doubt whether it will even be read."

The Buffalo widow's letter was read and answered. But meeting her request was not nearly so easy. President Kennedy has proposed legislation such as she described. But he cannot enact it. That is up to Congress.

A proposal that is currently languishing before the House Ways and Means Committee, called the King-Anderson bill, would have seen to it that her small bank account was not exhausted by her husband's final illness.

This is the bill now familiarly known as medical care for the aged.

It is a controversial bill, denounced by the American Medical Association, Blue Cross, and most conservative politicians. It has been described as socialized medicine or, at least, a significant step in that direction. It has been characterized as a building stone in the establishment of the welfare state.

To the Buffalo widow, however, it had nothing in particular to do with politics. It would have meant simply that to her loneliness there would not have been added the fear of abject poverty and physical dependence.

Let's take the hypothetical case of a New York department store clerk who retires on social security and after the age of 65 suffers a heart attack.

The King-Anderson bill would mean that he could enter a hospital and stay for as long as 90 days, paying only $10 a day for the first 9 days, or a maximum of $90.

He could manage this under his social security pension.

After leaving the hospital he could be cared for during his recovery at a skilled nursing home where he could stay as long as 6 months, so long as the total of his hospital days and half the nursing home days did not exceed 150.

The 2-for-1 ratio, with a maximum of 150 units, is designed to relieve the pressure on hospitals, encouraging patients to go into nursing homes if their conditions permit.

The retired clerk would be eligible for the same benefits if he fell sick again after 90 days.

The plan thus aims to meet the needs of acute illness. It is not designed for the chronically sick, who might be hospitalized for years. Most illnesses, statistics show, can be terminated within the 150 units of service offered.

The plan also pays all expenses above $20 for hospital diagnostic studies on an outpatient basis. This is designed to get elderly people into the hospital early for preventive treatment, before an illness becomes unmanageable.

Finally, under the bill, the plan will pay for 240 visits a year of specialists treating an illness at home. This would include therapists, nurses, and other nondoctors whose services might keep a patient from having to be hospitalized.

The mechanics of the plan would be no more complex than the administration of Blue Cross or other health insurance is now.

On entering the hospital or nursing home, the elderly patient would simply give his social security number to a hospital clerk. The hospital would later bill the Social Security Administration on the regular payment schedule, then bill the patient for the balance. Paperwork would be kept to a minimum.

The cost of this medical care would be met by each worker paying an additional one-fourth of 1 percent of social security tax. A worker making $100 a week would then pay an extra 25 cents. His employer would pay an equal amount.

Currently, this worker pays social security tax only on his first $4,800 of annual earnings. If the King-Anderson bill passes, he will pay on his first $5,200 a year of earnings.

The extra funds that go into the social security accounts from taxes paid on the additional $400 will be used to pay him a slightly larger pension when he retires.

In all, the plan is expected to cost $1,100 million in the first year, which will be more than covered by the $1,500 million. The balance will be kept as a reserve fund. In future years, outlay is expected to catch up and equal intake.

The plan was designed to go into effect next fall. But Congress has already delayed passage for 1 year so it cannot go into operation before the fall of 1963. Anyone over 65 will immediately be covered.

Secretary Ribicoff, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has described the King-Anderson bill as the conservative way to pay for hospital costs of the elderly.

He has said flatly that the high costs of medical care for the aged must be paid. The only question is how. Alternatives to the social security plan, he declares, have been shown to be inadequate.

Senator JAVITS, Republican, of New York, for instance, has proposed a plan to give an insured person the choice of benefits for short-term illness, chronic illness, or the payment of premiums for private insurance. Ribicoff says this would be too complicated to administer. Under the bill passed in 1960, States can administer a health plan with Federal matching funds, but this is limited to indigents who must declare they are too poor to pay their hospital bills.

Blue Cross has proposed that the Federal Government subsidize its operations and let it run hospitalization insurance for the elderly.

The Blue Cross proposal was submitted in conjunction with a Blue Shield plan to provide medical benefits. The American Hospital Association favors this and the AMA has agreed to accept it.

But Ribicoff is not convinced this represents a better method than the King-Anderson bill. He rejects the notion that the King-Anderson plan, though it provides for Government administration, is in any way socialized medicine.

He points out that the patient retains his choice of doctor and hospital, that the Federal Government exercises no control over either, that payment is essentially the same as it is under private insurance plans.

Furthermore, Ribicoff has pointed out, the King-Anderson plan will actually help Blue Cross and other private insurers because it will relieve them of paying the bills of the 65-and-over group, which have the greatest medical expenses. It might pass on savings then to the lower age groups.

Most important, it would relieve elderly persons of the fear that their health insurance might be canceled if they became ill. This practice is frequent among private insurers, Ribicoff has said.

The statistics make a compelling case for the necessity of a medical care plan for the aged. Old people's annual medical bills are twice that of persons under 65, but their annual income is only half as much. Ribicoff cites these facts:

Nine out of ten persons who reach the age of 65 go to the hospital at least once before they die.

An aged person is likely to remain hospitalized longer than a young person. Persons over 65 are hospitalized, on the average, more than 2½ times as much as younger ones.

Among couples over 65, half will have at least four hospital stays before they die.

Ribicoff points out that hospital costs have more than tripled in the past 15 years. He insists it is a myth that no one lacks medical care because of costs. Many are too proud, he says, to accept hospital care on a charity basis.

Current social security payments for the aged barely cover the essentials of life, Ribicoff says. The King-Anderson bill, with no means requirement, saves proud men and women from losing their dignity. It gives them back what they have earned throughout their lives—to prolong their lives and to spend them in good health.

Ukrainian Independence Day Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the resolution adopted on January 21, 1962, by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., at the observance of the 44th anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic.

The resolution follows:

Whereas, January 22, 1962, will mark the 44th anniversary of the proclamation of the free and independent Ukrainian National Republic, and the 43d anniversary of the act of union by which Western Ukraine was united with the Ukrainian National Republic in Kiev, capital of Ukraine; and

Whereas, Ukraine, after years of struggle and resistance, became the first victim of Russian Communist aggression; and

Whereas, Ukraine continued through the decades of Communist oppression and continues today her struggle against Communist Russia, which now mortally threatens the security of the United States of America and all other free nations of the world; and

Whereas, In this Nation, citizens of Ukrainian descent have been in the forefront of the battle against Soviet Russian colonialism and imperialism: Now, therefore

We Americans of Ukrainian origin, gathered on Sunday, this 21st day of January, of the year 1962, at U.N.C. "orlyk", 9740 Conant Avenue, Detroit 12, Mich., urgently request our Government, our representatives in Congress and the American people to fully support the enslaved Ukrainian nation in its struggle for the restoration of a free and independent state of the Ukrainian people.

Our Spendthrift National Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an excellent editorial by Mr. Elmer Price in the Lincoln County (Oreg.) Leader:

[From the Lincoln County (Oreg.) Leader, Jan. 25, 1962]

OUR SPENDTHRIFT NATIONAL BUDGET

President Kennedy's recordbreaking budget of $92.5 billion, presented to Congress Thursday, in our estimation represents a tremendous hoodwink upon the American public.

The budget itself is not the hoodwink, but the official buildup to its presentation and the administration's soothing assurance that it would be balanced are both ridiculous.

A few days prior to the unveiling to the public and Congress, President Kennedy made quite a point of assuring the American people that he believed that taxes could be cut and asked Congress for authority to do this in certain areas.

When he presented the budget he made a big point asserting to legislators and the people that his budget would balance because the Nation's economy would rise by some $50 billion in the coming year and that the easing of the Berlin crisis by midsummer would save vast expenditures here.

On neither score are his views shared by many qualified observers.

Economists outside Government do not see the economy making such broad gains in the year ahead, and others close to the international situation, would not bet a wooden nickel that the Berlin situation will change for the better by midyear or by the end of the year for that matter.

The truth of the matter is, of course, that the administration simply wants to spend tax money in greater volume than ever before. And the sad part of it all is that it would spend money not yet earned by the people or collected by the Government. This is one of the prime reasons that government rarely is able to live within its income. It spends its money before it gets it and always in greater amounts than it takes in.

If the average citizen ran his personal financial business in such a slipshod way, he would be bankrupt within a matter of months. And government cannot get away with it in the long run any more than individuals can. History clearly documents case after case of swollen and spendthrift governments eventually bankrupting not only themselves but their people as well.

Why leaders of nations, responsible and students of history themselves, do not recognize this when the picture is so clear, we shall never be able to understand.

New York's "Rockymandering"—Article III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following excerpt of an editorial published on January 25, 1962, in the New York Times. It is the final article in an excellent series of editorials criticizing the political ruthlessness in congressional redistricting. Congressman FRANK CHELF, Democrat, of Kentucky, has filed a petition to increase the Membership of the House to eliminate the injustice to States.

Not since 1911 has the membership of the House been increased. At that time the population of the United States was 91 million as compared to 183 million in 1960. Republican Congressmen, whose seats are protected because the legislatures of their home State and the governor control the process of redistricting, have refused to support the Frank Chelf petition which would eliminate the inequities. Sixteen States are losing representation by reason of a relatively small increase in population and a shifting population. Despite the fact that the State of New York loses two seats because of relatively small increase in population since 1950, the Republican dominated legislature, led by a ruthless Governor, Nelson Rockefeller, has redistricted the congressional districts so that it might be possible for seven additional Republican candidates to win. If this should happen, President John Kennedy's liberal program would be endangered. Some of these districts have 50,000 less residents than the adjoining congressional districts and are "rockymandered" in such a way that it is believed the districts are safe for Republican candidates. Other districts have 100,000 less residents than districts in other areas. As it was stated so eloquently by Robert Burns in his poem "To a Mouse":

The best-laid schemes o' mice an' men gang aft agley
An' lea'e us nought but grief and pain for promis'd joy.

Perhaps Republican plans will not succeed and their diabolical plans will go awry.

The New York Times, which has a reputation for truthful reporting and high editorial comment, editorialized about the political lack of morality by the New York State Legislature in the reapportionment of congressional districts. The editorial follows:

NEW YORK'S GERRYMANDERING—III

As redrawn by the State legislature, with the cheerful assistance of the Republican county organization, the new 24th Congressional District in the Bronx resembles a slightly tattered gingham dog. Except for a scrawny neck, its head is separated from its body by a narrow sliver of the adjoining 23d District. Its tail wags feebly in Long Island Sound and one ear juts into neighboring Westchester County.

Most of the territory in the new district used to be part of the old 25th, now represented by PAUL A. FINO, who, by coincidence, also happens to be the Republican chairman of Bronx County. A tender solicitude by Mr. FINO's Republican friends in the legislature to extend into a second decade his 10 years of congressional service is reflected in the revised district lines.

The strange sliver of the 23d that separates the dog's jowls from his shoulder appears designed solely to keep out of the new district Edenwald Houses, a subsidized public housing project for low-income families, who tend to vote Democratic. An arrowhead-shaped addition to the district south of Fordham Road seems intended primarily to give a group of families of Italian origin and Republican leanings an opportunity to support Mr. FINO. Some decrease in the size of the district was justified by population shifts, but no principle of fairness in representation, compactness or logical grouping warrants the manner in which the lines were laid out. The only logic was in the systematic exclusion of as many public housing developments and other new apartment houses as could be kept out. The tenants of apartments built in the last decade, having displayed little appreciation of the blessings of Republican representation, are now being consigned to the district of the county's Democratic leader, Representative CHARLES A. BUCKLEY.

Mr. FINO's old bailiwick contained 5½ public housing projects (half of Marble Hill houses is located in New York County); the new 24th has only one. The retention within the district of Throgg's Neck Houses presumably was decided upon because even the ingenuity of the Republican leadership could not conceive a way to transfer it to another district. Nonetheless, the new 24th gives the Bronx another reason for boasting: it now possesses as outstanding an example of congressional gerrymandering as is to be found in the United States.

Teenager's Song for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a song written by a 16-year-old constituent, Agnes Friesen. This song is indicative of the impact the threat of atomic war has had on America's youth. It shows that our youth share with us our determination that every effort be made to preserve world peace and strengthen the brotherhood of man:

WILL YOU WORK FOR PEACE OR WAIT FOR WAR

(By Agnes Friesen)

Come all you good people and answer to me
Will you work for peace or wait for war
Humanity's threatened by a terrible fate
Will you work for peace before it's too late

CHORUS

Will you see your family, your children be killed
Will you watch your cities come tumbling down
Will you work for peace or wait for war
In your concrete coffins down under the ground

Will you die in the explosion or bake in the blast
When your homes, your schools and your factories fall down
Will you leave your cities and die in the woods
Or crawl into your coffins down under the ground

(Chorus)

Can we live like brothers or die like dogs
In a puff of smoke and a deafening roar
Can we find a new way for mankind to live
In a country of peace and a world without war.

(Chorus)

America, the Unwitting Tool of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an excellent and thought-provoking address by my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA], delivered at the annual dinner of the Milford Chamber of Commerce.

The address follows:

AMERICA, THE UNWITTING TOOL OF COMMUNISM

(Speech by Hon. WILLIAM H. HARSHA, JR., delivered at Milford Chamber of Commerce annual dinner, January 25, 1962)

It should be obvious to everyone by now that we are engaged in a life-or-death struggle for survival with the international Communist movement. We cannot hope to prevail in this struggle unless all Americans in every field of endeavor are absolutely convinced beyond any shadow of a doubt that we are not engaged in a popularity contest with a competing economic system; that we are not faced with certain annoying adjustments which should be made so that we may coexist with a different system of government; but that we are now in a death struggle with an enemy the like of which we have never before encountered.

To fully understand the grave threat of communism, one must understand the weird philosophy of the father of modern communism, Karl Marx. To achieve his goal of welding humanity into a gigantic conformist society, Marx openly professed two requirements.

First, he said there must be total annihilation of all opposition to this society through the destruction of all existing governments, all economics, and all existing concepts.

"This accomplished," Marx wrote, "I shall stride through the wreckage as a creator."

Second, and this is important to remember, the achievement of his goal of totalitarian conformity would require a new kind of human being, one who can be blindly motivated into immediate action by the mere command from his master. This involves, of course, an obliteration of individual free will, ethics, morals, and conscience. The process of creating this type of human being and welding him into a collective society of similar human beings, as Marx visualized, has been carefully implemented since he established the blueprint for communism more than a century ago.

And, unfortunately, the United States has been serving as a catalyst to this implementation.

The Communist philosophy has recklessly, ruthlessly, slyly, and deceitfully wormed its way into the lives of countless millions across the face of the earth today. And, as a cancer, has left disease or destruction of a free society wherever it is permitted the slightest contact.

Communists have repeatedly expressed confidence that freedom can be defeated by nonmilitary methods, notably by subversion and economic competition, or rather economic chaos.

The Communist conspiracy is primarily concerned with a struggle for the minds and souls of men, and a failure to understand this fact renders the individual defenseless against it.

One of the most effective weapons used against us in this onslaught has been the intensive, massive, and vicious Communist propaganda assault on the United States.

Since 1948, the U.S. Customs Bureau has been under orders to screen Communist propaganda coming into this country and to intercept unwanted and unsolicited material. On March 17, 1961, this order was rescinded which now permits tons of Communist propaganda to flow freely throughout this country. This propaganda is very cleverly and subtly written with the avowed purpose of brainwashing, warping, and destroying the minds of our citizens, both young and old. And the ironic, unbelievable fact is that you, the taxpayer, are subsidizing this effort to destroy the very thing you cherish the most—freedom.

High school and college students throughout the United States are supplied with Communist propaganda delivered free of charge by the U.S. Post Office. The House Un-American Activities Committee reported that "every school and college in the United States is directly or indirectly the recipient of some of these Communist propaganda publications." Thus, the Communists have discovered how to make American taxpayers finance a Red pipeline to the minds of our students.

The U.S. Bureau of Customs in a 12-month spot check of Moscow's literature through New Orleans counted at least 300,000 packages of Communist propaganda destined to schools and colleges. Each package contained 5 to 15 different publications of youth leadership for communism.

New Orleans is one of the lesser ports of entry from the standpoint of Communist propaganda. A heavier volume of this material is coming into the United States via approximately 50 other ports of entry.

The endless lists of our students are compiled and addressed through the World Federation of Democratic Youth, a pro-Communist front organization, and by the International Union of Students in Prague, Czechoslovakia. Both of these major international Communist-controlled youth organizations publish at least 40 periodicals, which are disseminated regularly in schools and colleges.

The Communists' propaganda campaign has all the priority and impressiveness of their missile program. Russia and Red China can produce about 3,600 million books a year, more than 1 book for every person on earth. The Senate Internal Security Committee reported that "the various forms of Communist propaganda throughout the world involve a personnel of about 500,000 and an annual expenditure of approximately $2 billion." This propaganda has created the intellectual climate for the San Francisco student riots against the House Un-American Activities Committee, for the movement of certain Smith College students in petitioning Members of Congress to curtail the activities of this committee, and for the mushrooming on the campuses of Communist fronts in support of unilateral disarmament, Castro, and recognition of Outer Mongolia and Red China, and against nuclear testing, ROTC and loyalty oaths.

Under international postal agreements, the country of origin collects the postage, and our mailmen deliver mail from door to door without any charge in the United States and our territories. With non-Communist countries, this is a satisfactory arrangement because we collect postage here for mail going overseas. With Soviet-bloc countries this reciprocal agreement is a farce. Does anyone believe that Soviet Russia, the master of deceit and prevarication, will deliver first class letters from the United States without first censoring them? Certainly we're not naive enough to believe she will deliver American propaganda to Russian citizens. Our postal deficit for fiscal 1961 was approximately $843 million. Contributing greatly to this deficit is the great volume of Russian propaganda and mail shipped into this country. Less than half of this Red propaganda actually comes from Soviet-bloc nations—the balance comes from subversive groups within the so-called free world.

During the year 1960 there was imported into the United States from Soviet-bloc countries printed matter, whether or not propaganda, averaging 1,341,298 pieces per month. To date there is no accurate count of how much comes to the United States from the free world. The lifting of the ban in March of 1961 will permit additional unsolicited tons of subversive material to be delivered to our citizens. No other country in the free world would permit Moscow's subversive material to be delivered at the expense of its own taxpayers.

We are not only granting the Communists the fullest advantage of our constitutional rights—freedom of expression—but we are also subsidizing that expression and at the same time denying our own citizens that same privilege by muzzling our military experts. The effect of such a confusing and contradictory policy as this is to put ourselves in the position of a catalyst for the Communist movement.

A Mexico city newspaper editorialized that this propaganda situation makes America like "a man who invites a thief to his house and shows him the places where the valuables are hidden."

Our greatest treasures are the minds of our youth. The future of America lies in their hands and we certainly should not allow them to be unwittingly victimized by Communist propaganda subsidized and delivered by U.S. citizens and taxpayers.

We are also unwittingly being duped into economic chaos. I say unwittingly because I choose to be charitable in this instance, but sometimes I wonder. The Communists have publicly stated that it will not be necessary to fire a shot to take the United States—that they will make us spend ourselves into economic bankruptcy, and then we will turn to communism as a solution to our financial problems.

How are they accomplishing this? First of all, by adding to the postal deficit and while we subsidize the Communist propaganda effort in this country on the one hand,

we turn around with the other and spend approximately $140 million per year through the U.S. Information Agency trying to combat and defeat Russia's unrelenting propaganda drive against freedom. Second, by creating certain international crises and causing our Government to become emotional about foreign aid expenditures which are a terrific drain on our economy; third, by duping the United States into providing its tax-subsidized farm commodities to feed the Communist governments. When we provide this food to Communist governments at subsidy levels and below market costs, it means simply that we spend your tax dollars to do it and take that money away from some proper governmental expense adding to the deficit, and it means that we strengthen the Communist control of that foreign country and make it possible for the Communists to use their funds in building their military and propaganda machine, and frees Communist farmers to work in missile plants. When we provide foreign aid to Communist countries, it defeats the very purpose for which foreign aid was devised and perpetuates an evil system. We have a policy in the United States of not interfering with the internal affairs of any foreign government. As a result of that policy, we give the aid in the form of money and supplies to the government in control at the time, with the result that the controlling government uses the aid to strengthen its control and dictatorship. The needy and underprivileged are made to conform—they have to conform to exist. Here again, this simply strengthens the Communist domination over these people and releases Communist funds to build up their military and propaganda structure, while at the same time adding to our national debt.

Fourth, ever time an international crisis arises, we wind up sending more money, materials and troops overseas; this accelerates our balance-of-payments deficit, and in turn creates demands on our gold reserve, all of which will be reflected in a devalued dollar and inflation. And what are these troops doing? In the instance of Germany, they've been watching the Berlin wall grow higher and the passage narrower.

Every time we vacillate or appease Soviet Russia, she grows stronger in the eyes of the so-called uncommitted world, and we grow weaker, losing prestige and respect among our allies.

Let us never forget that the absolute and positive goal of communism is world domination. And we must remember that every Communist tyrant from the beginning adopted an orderly timetable of world conquest and pursued it with deadly fixation, just as the Kremlin is doing today. Recent successes of the international Communist conspiracy have resulted in its prophecy that time is running out for the free world. Hence, we must coldly and bluntly face the fact that there are but three courses left open to us.

First, we can meekly capitulate as both individuals and nations have done.

The second is pursuing a program of peaceful coexistence at any price.

The third is setting a determined course of opposition to communism wherever it exists.

Perhaps choice No. 2 is not too far removed from the first choice except in time and circumstances.

Most Americans agree that the survival of free nations is dependent upon a determined course of opposition to communism. There are those, of course, who would construe this statement to be a warmongering position. This is, in fact, what the Communists would have all of us believe, for the official statement of the Communist Party of America, as published in "The Fundamentals of Communism," sets forth, and I quote: "Every war of the Soviet Union is a war of defense. Even if it is conducted with offensive means."

We cannot afford to be naive about the fact that communism employs every conceivable tool and every method of deceit, fraud and subversion to achieve its ultimate goal. In short, the ends justify any means. You need only to analyze the statement of Lenin taken from his works concerning the tactics the Soviets would use in preference to outright war in overthrowing any government. He said when directly faced with the question, "What methods can best be used to overthrow a government adverse to communism?" And I quote: "Riots, demonstrations, street battles and detachments of a revolutionary army. Such are the developments of a popular uprising." Sounds familiar, doesn't it—as if I were reading the front page of today's newspaper. And he went on to say that combining a mass political strike with an armed uprising is the most ideal circumstance for a successful insurrection.

Now, what do I mean by a determined course of opposition to communism?

Primarily, this means complete cessation to the coddling of Communists at all levels of our society. Public exposure of Communists and fellow travelers has been criticized by certain groups, but certainly the public has the right to know the identity and activities of those who would wreck our free society.

How often have we witnessed the hypocrisy of those, who, when faced with evidence of their Communist activities, promptly hide behind the very Constitution they seek to destroy? And weakness in dealing with Communist activities within our own society is, in fact, no different than what we have experienced internationally. To conquer communism we must be informed. Information is a vital thing. A person can in fact, neither defend nor attack a philosophy or a way of life unless he possesses information about its precepts. This is especially true of the political and ideological philosophy we call communism. Therefore, our military as well as our political experts must be permitted to speak freely on communism. Certainly they should have the same rights our Constitution grants to Communists.

We must continue to stiffen our national backbone in dealing with communism both within this country and abroad.

Where we have been firm and stood our ground, the Communists have retreated. Where we have displayed weakness and vacillation, we have suffered setbacks, as in Cuba and Laos.

We can expect one crisis after another in the years ahead. The reason is obvious. It is a part of a carefully devised Communist plan to create incidents and situations to influence the United States to spend itself into oblivion. In the world in which we live, trouble spots are easy to create. Hence, as long as we are faced with this situation, it becomes more and more necessary that our policies in dealing with the Communists be right, concise, and above all, firm. We must stop pushing the panic button every time a new crisis is created. We, as a nation, must discard the silly practice of adopting one spending program after another, both domestic and foreign, to meet some new claim of the Soviet Union. We must stop subsidizing any Communist government or aiding and abetting them in any form. Improvisations in both our foreign and domestic policy stimulated by emotion must be discouraged.

Just as the Communist society is not designed to provide the many advantages of free enterprise and freedom of choice, so we, as a nation, must pursue our strength in the light of the longterm benefits and advantages it offers rather than attempt to ape our adversary.

Unfortunately, we have in our midst some timid souls who have so little faith in the strength of our democracy that they would have our country yield to international threats and intimidations. Fear, apologies, appeasement, defeatism, and cowardice are alien to the thinking of true Americans.

If we are to meet and repel the forces of communism we must start acting like Americans and patriots. We must be willing to stand firm and defend our heritage regardless of the consequences.

As William I. Nichols said, "Better brave than slave."

Let's Take Birth Control Out of Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the October 10, 1961, issue of Look magazine. The author, Rev. John A. O'Brien, is a cochairman of the National Conference of Christians and Jews and research professor of theology at the University of Notre Dame.

The article follows:

LET'S TAKE BIRTH CONTROL OUT OF POLITICS

(By the Reverend John A. O'Brien)

In Poughkeepsie, N.Y., in 1952, a Roman Catholic hospital presented seven Protestant physicians with an ultimatum to quit the Planned Parenthood Federation or to resign from the hospital staff. Three agreed, but four declined and were suspended. After a flood of protests, they were reinstated at the beginning of 1953. The peace of the community was badly disturbed, and people across the Nation, reading of the incident, felt uneasy.

In New York City in 1958, the city's commissioner of hospitals refused to permit a physician to provide a Protestant mother with a contraceptive device. He thereby precipitated a bitter controversy involving Protestants, Jews, and Roman Catholics that continued for 2 months, until the city's board of hospitals lifted the ban on birth-control therapy.

A year later in Albany, N.Y., a Roman Catholic hospital barred an orthopedic surgeon because of his connection with the Planned Parenthood Association. Immediately, the religious groups of the city were embroiled in an angry dispute over the alleged invasion of a man's right to freedom of religious belief and conscience.

These incidents, typical of many others, dramatize the distressing fact that no controversy during the last several decades has caused more tension, rancor, and strife among religious groups in this country than the birth-control issue. It has flared up periodically on the front pages of newspapers in communities divided over birth-prevention regulations in municipal hospitals and health and family welfare agencies. It has erupted on the national level in the matter of including birth-control information and material in foreign aid to under-developed countries. Where it is not actually erupting, it rumbles and smolders in sullen resentment like a volcano, ready to explode at any moment.

The time has come for citizens of all faiths to unite in an effort to remove this divisive and nettlesome issue from the political and social life of our Nation.

The first step toward the goal is the establishment of a new atmosphere of mutual good will and friendly communication on other than the polemical level. Instead of emotional recrimination, loaded phrases and sloganeering, we need a dispassionate study of the facts, a better understanding of the opposite viewpoint and a more serious effort to extend the areas of agreement until a solution is reached.

"All too frequently," points out James O'Gara, managing editor of Commonweal, "Catholics run roughshod over Protestant sensibilities in this matter, by failure to consider the reasoning behind the Protestant position and, particularly, by their jibes at the fact that Protestant opinion on birth control has changed in recent decades." All too often our language is unduly harsh.

The second step is to recognize the substantial agreement—frequently blurred by emotionalism and inaccurate newspaper reporting—already existing between Catholics and non-Catholics concerning the overall objectives of family planning. Instead of Catholics being obliged or even encouraged to beget the greatest possible number of offspring, as many non-Catholics imagine, the ideal of responsible parenthood is stressed. Family planning is encouraged, so that parents will be able to provide properly for their offspring.

Pope Pius XII declared in 1951 that it is possible to be exempt from the normal obligation of parenthood for a long time and even for the whole duration of married life, if there are serious reasons, such as those often mentioned in the so-called medical, eugenic, economic and social "indications." This means that such factors as the health of the parents, particularly the mother, their ability to provide their children with the necessities of life, the degree of population density of a country and the shortage of housing facilities may legitimately be taken into consideration in determining the number of offspring.

These are substantially the same factors considered by non-Catholics in family planning. The laws of many States permit birth control only for medical reasons. The Roman Catholic Church, however, sanctions a much more liberal policy on family planning.

Catholics, Protestants, and Jews are in agreement over the objectives of family planning, but disagree over the methods to be used. The Roman Catholic Church sanctions only abstention or the rhythm method, also known as the use of the infertile or safe period. The church considers this to be the method provided by nature and its Divine Author: It involves no frustration of nature's laws, but simply an intelligent and disciplined use of them. With the exception of the Roman Catholic and the Orthodox Catholic churches, most churches make no moral distinction between rhythm and mechanical or chemical contraceptives, allowing the couple free choice.

Here is a difference in theological belief where there seems little chance of agreement. The grounds for the church's position are scriptural (Old Testament), the teachings of the fathers and doctors of the early church, the unbroken tradition of 19 centuries, the decisions of the highest ecclesiastical authority and the natural law. The latter plays a prominent role in Roman Catholic theology and is considered decisive, entirely apart from scripture, in determining the ethical character of birth-prevention methods.

The Roman Catholic natural-law tradition regards as self-evident that the primary objective purpose of the conjugal act is procreation and that the fostering of the mutual love of the spouses is the secondary and subjective end. This conclusion is based on two propositions: that man by the use of his reason can ascertain God's purpose in the universe and that God makes known His purpose by certain "given" physical arrangements.

Thus, man can readily deduce that the primary objective end of the conjugal act is procreation, the propagation of the race. Moreover, man may not supplant or frustrate the physical arrangements established by God, who through the law of rhythm has provided a natural method for the control of conception. Believing that God is the author of this law and of all laws of nature, Roman Catholics believe that they are obliged to obey those laws, not frustrate or mock them.

Let it be granted then that the theological differences in this area between Protestants and Roman Catholics appear to be irreconcilable. But people differ in their religious beliefs on scores of doctrines, without taking up arms against those who disagree with them. Why is it so different in regard to birth control? It is because each side has sought to implement its distinctive theological belief through legislation and thus indirectly force its belief, or at least the practical consequences thereof, upon others.

It is always a temptation for a religious organization, especially a powerful or dominant one, to impose through the clenched fist of the law its creedal viewpoint upon others. Both Roman Catholics and Protestants have succumbed to this temptation in the past.

Consider what happened during World War I, when the Protestant churches united to push the prohibition law through Congress. Many of them sincerely believe that the use of liquor in any form or in any degree is intrinsically evil and sinful. With over 4 million American men away at war, Protestants forced their distinctive theological belief upon the general public. With the return of our soldiers, it soon became apparent that the belief was not shared by the great majority of citizens. The attempt to enforce that belief ushered in a reign of bootleggers, racketeers, hijackers, and gangsters that led to a breakdown of law unparalleled in our history. The so-called "noble experiment" came to an inglorious end.

That tumultuous, painful, and costly experience, shows clearly that a law expressing a moral judgment cannot be enforced when it has little correspondence with the general view of society. That experience holds a lesson for us all in regard to birth control today.

Up to the turn of the century, contraception was condemned by all Christian churches as immoral, unnatural, and contrary to divine law. This was generally reflected in the civil laws of Christian countries. Today, the Roman Catholic and Orthodox Churches stand virtually alone in holding that conviction. The various Lambeth Conferences, expressing the Anglican viewpoint, mirror the gradual change that has taken place among Protestants generally.

In 1920, the Lambeth Conference repeated its 1908 condemnation of contraception and issued "an emphatic warning against the use of unnatural means for the avoidance of conception, together with the grave dangers—physical, moral, and religious—thereby incurred, and against the evils which the extension of such use threaten the race." Denouncing the view that the sexual union is an end in itself, the conference declared: "We steadfastly uphold what must always be regarded as the governing considerations of Christian marriage. One is the primary purpose for which marriage exists, namely, the continuance of the race through the gift and heritage of children; the other is the paramount importance in married life of deliberate and thoughtful self-control." The conference called for a vigorous campaign against the open or secret sale of contraceptives.

In 1930, the Lambeth Conference again affirmed the primary purpose of marriage to be the procreation of children, but conceded that, in certain limited circumstances, contraception might be morally legitimate.

In 1958, the conference endorsed birth control as the responsibility laid by God on parents everywhere.

Many other Protestant denominations preceded the Anglicans in such action. In March 1931, 22 out of 28 members of a committee of the Federal Council of Churches ratified artificial methods of birth control. "As to the necessity," the committee declared, "for some form of effective control of the size of the family and the spacing of children, and consequently of control of conception, there can be no question. * * * There is general agreement also that sex union between husbands and wives as an expression of mutual affection without relation to procreation is right."

Since then, many Protestant denominations have made separate pronouncements, in which they not only approved birth control, but declared it at times to be a religious duty. What determines the morality, they state, is not the means used, but the motive. In general, the means (excluding abortion) that prove most effective are considered the most ethical.

This development is reflected in the action taken in February 1961, by the general board of the National Council of Churches, the largest Protestant organization in the United States. The board approved and commended the use of birth-control devices as a part of Christian responsibility in family planning. It called for opposition to laws and institutional practices restricting the information or availability of contraceptives.

The general board declared: "Most of the Protestant churches hold contraception and periodic continence to be morally right when the motives are right. * * * The general Protestant conviction is that motives, rather than methods, form the primary moral issue, provided the methods are limited to the prevention of conception."

An action once universally condemned by all Christian churches and forbidden by the civil law is now not only approved by the overwhelming majority of Protestant denominations, but also deemed, at certain times, to be a positive religious duty. This viewpoint has now been translated into action by the majority of people in this country. Repeated polls have disclosed that most married couples are now using contraceptives in the practice of birth control.

For all concerned with social-welfare legislation, the significance of this radical and revolutionary change in the thought and habits of the vast majority of the American people is clear, profund, and far reaching. To try to oppose the general religious and moral conviction of such a majority by a legislative fiat would be to invite the same breakdown of law and order that was occasioned by the ill-starred prohibition experiment.

This brings us to the fact that the realities we are dealing with lie not in the field of civil legislation, but in the realm of conscience and religion: They are moral judgments and matters of theological belief. Conscience and religion are concerned with private sin: The civil law is concerned with public crimes. Only confusion, failure and anarchy result when the effort is made to impose upon the civil authority the impossible task of policing private homes to preclude the possibility of sin. Among the chief victims of such an ill-conceived imposition would be religion itself.

The greatest hope of ending the battle over birth control is in the increasing recognition that this controversy lies in the field of theology, not in the domain of politics or civil legislation. Professional theologians can debate this matter with dispassionate

objectivity, with no breach of personal friendship and no rift in the public peace. This is a view now being expressed by an increasing number of leading Catholic scholars, journals and magazines.

Writing in the scholarly journal Theological Studies, in June 1960, Father John J. Lynch, S.J., points out the failure of the Connecticut and Massachusetts antibirth-control laws, enacted by Protestants some 80 years ago, to prevent the sale of contraceptives or their widespread use. "To regret," he says, "that the prohibition was ever incorporated into civil statute would seem altogether consonant with our own juridic principles."

Agreeing with the foregoing, Father John Maguire, C.S.S., associate editor of Ave Maria magazine, states that such laws prevent persons from acting in a way that their consciences prescribe or permit.

In an editorial in The Sign, published by the Passionist Fathers, the author states that it would be a relief if public disputes over birth control could be softened. Such acrimony helps neither religion nor public morality. "The fact," continues the editorial, "that contraception is contrary to natural law is not in itself an argument for banning it by law. It is not the function of the State to prevent all evil or seek all good, but only to act in matters that affect the general welfare." Friction between religious groups could be lessened, the editorial concludes, if the issues were discussed in terms of public policy, since "differences in private moral codes would then cease to be matters of political discussion."

In "Life, Death, and the Law," an outstanding study of law and Christian morals in Britain and the United States, Norman St. John-Stevas, a brilliant scholar of Oxford, Cambridge, and Yale Universities, and a Roman Catholic, points out that a law banning use of contraceptives, such as that in Connecticut, violates Catholic principles of jurisprudence.

"Catholics," he says, "in campaigning for the maintenance of such laws, gain little for public morality. They do, however, increase the fear of Catholicism in the minds of non-Catholics and increase the likelihood that when Protestants visualize the church the image will not be that of a religious body, but of a political power structure. This is a high price to pay for the maintenance of ineffectual statutes."

These views are typical of those expressed by a mounting number of leading Roman Catholic scholars, theologians, journals, and magazines of wide circulation. They are in substantial agreement with their Protestant and Jewish counterparts that the time has come to take the birth-control issue out of politics, out of the field of civil legislation, and confine it to its legitimate domain of conscience and religion.

To help speed that consummation, it would be well to settle the policy of public hospitals and health agencies on this point in a conference of local Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish spokesmen. The objective would be to respect the rights of conscience of all concerned.

Some progress has been made in this direction. In New York City, where the Board of Hospitals authorized contraceptive service, Roman Catholic doctors, nurses, and patients are not required to participate. Later, the New York Department of Welfare adopted a like policy. Similar arrangements have been adopted in public hospitals in Denver and the District of Columbia. In such conferences, the details of a sound policy for family welfare services, medical research and foreign aid programs could also be amicably established.

St. John-Stevas points out that it is wholly unwarranted and a grave infringement of individual liberty for a Catholic hospital to prohibit a non-Catholic doctor on its staff from giving advice on the contraceptive practice of birth control in his private practice or to extend hospital jurisdiction to activities carried on outside. He stresses the importance of respecting scrupulously the rights of conscience and of religious freedom for all, and especially of those with whom one differs.

On the other hand, within States, Roman Catholic legislators might well find themselves within the moral consensus in continuing to uphold the ban on advertising of contraceptives, on their sale from slot machines, and on their sale to minors and unmarried persons. On the national and international scene, Catholic statesmen might well oppose appropriations made to tie in contraception to foreign aid programs.

There is a further development of significance and promise. In an admirable gesture of friendliness and good will, Protestant Episcopal Bishop James A. Pike proposed that the National Institutes of Health launch a research program to render the rhythm method as simple and effective as any of the contraceptive methods. If that were accomplished, Bishop Pike would probably favor, in the interests of national unity, concentrating on the rhythm method in our foreign aid to underdeveloped nations.

Bishop Pike's constructive proposal echoes in part a plea implicit in the words uttered by Pope Pius XII in 1951, when he affirmed the church's sanction of rhythm and added, "One may even hope that science will succeed in providing this licit method with a sufficiently secure basis."

It is a great pity that the major scientific breakthrough along these lines, made independently by Dr. Hermann Knaus of Austria and Dr. K. Ogino of Japan, was not followed up with intensive research. Outstanding physicians regarded their findings as affording a vastly superior method to that of the artificial contraceptives. In the Journal of the American Medical Association, February 10, 1934, Dr. Emil Novak, chairman of the section of gynecology and obstetrics, stated that "the Ogino-Knaus (rhythm) method is a great boon and is certainly the one that should be recommended by physicians."

The editor, Dr. Morris Fishbein, urged clinics to concentrate their research on this method. "From the point of view of medicine, psychology, and esthetics, there have been fairly well sustained criticisms against all techniques thus far made available. * * * The possibilities (of the rhythm method) seem more promising than promoting the sale of various mechanical devices, chemical substances, and other forms of intricate manipulation, which have not met any of the critical criterions."

Some refinements have been made in the use of rhythm. A study conducted at the Free Hospital for Women in Brookline, Mass., disclosed that the risk of pregnancy for women using the rhythm method was 14.4 percent, as compared with 6 to 7 percent for those using contraceptives.

The National Institutes of Health had a budget of $560 million for 1961. If it devoted but 1 percent for research to render the rhythm method simple and effective, many scientists think that great strides would be made toward achieving that important and widely desired objective. If Congress or the administration would direct the NIH to launch a crash research program to render the rhythm method 100 percent effective, there is every reason to believe that the problems of family planning and of population control could be solved. The Federal Government spends $3 million a year on the program to control foot-and-mouth disease. A program to perfect the rhythm method, which promises much for the peace and happiness of the world, surely should receive as much Federal support.

Until this vital and urgent objective is achieved, however, we can all live in peace by respecting the rights of all to freedom of conscience and religious belief and by refraining from seeking through legislation to impose our particular religious creed upon others.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

West Virginians Have Faith in President Kennedy and the Democratic Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 2, 1962

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on Saturday, January 27, 1962, I had the honor of addressing the First Congressional District Democratic Women's Workshop, in Wheeling, W. Va. It was an inspiring affair, and it was indicative of the growing support, in West Virginia, for the principles and actions of the Democratic Party in the State and in the Nation.

My address related some of the accomplishments of President Kennedy and the Democratic Congress. These accomplishments demonstrate how Democratic officeholders, and the Democratic Party, are helping to bring about an economic renaissance in West Virginia. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have my remarks before the First Congressional District Democratic Women's Workshop printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BYRD OF WEST VIRGINIA, TO THE DEMOCRATIC WOMEN'S WORKSHOP, WHEELING, W. VA., JANUARY 24, 1962

The faith of the people of West Virginia in John F. Kennedy, and in the Democrats of their congressional delegation, and in the Democratic administration of Gov. William Wallace Barron, is being repaid in the coin of economic progress. The clouds of adversity that have hung over our State for so long are being pushed back. New employment opportunities for our people are arriving almost daily. An atmosphere of despair has given way to the exhilarating air of hope, because the Democratic Party is making good on its promises to revitalize the economy of West Virginia.

Here are the facts:

New industries are being encouraged to come to West Virginia by Senator Jennings Randolph and I, and by Governor Barron, and by our Democratic Congressmen, including your Congressman from the First District, Cleveland Bailey. To date, those we have succeeded in bringing to the State provide almost 5,000 new jobs. Moreover, we have been actively seeking Government contracts for the established industries of our State, and those which have already been awarded, should mean employment for at least another 5,000 workers.

The previous administration in Washington vetoed all efforts on the part of Congress to enact an area redevelopment program. On the other hand, President Kennedy and a Democratic Congress moved quickly to enact such a program. Now $798,740 "seed" money in the form of loans and grants has been made available by the Area Redevelopment Administration for West Virginia projects. The ARA is currently reviewing several other West Virginia projects, and may soon act upon them.

The economic renaissance of West Virginia is being spurred in all possible ways by President Kennedy, by Governor Barron, and by the Democrats of your congressional delegation. All Government agencies are keeping our State in mind when formulating their various programs. This is plainly evident by the following facts:

In calendar year 1960, the Small Business Administration made 31 loans in our State, for a total of $1,830,000. This, of course, was during the last year of the Republican administration. In calendar year 1961, under a Democratic administration, that agency made 57 business loans to West Virginia firms, about half with local bank participation, for a total of $4,782,000.

Moreover, in calendar year 1960, the Small Business Administration helped 34 West Virginia firms to get Government contracts worth $2,620,000. But in 1961, under Democratic leadership, that agency helped 69 firms in our State to get Government contracts worth $3,709,000.

Fortunately, there were no natural disasters in West Virginia in calendar year 1960. However, last year, when a sudden flood hit the Charleston area, the Small Business Administration saw to it that 100 disaster loans, at the low interest rate of 3½ percent, were immediately made. These loans now total $575,000.

Then there is the case of the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads. In fiscal year 1962, in a budget prepared by the previous administration, $27,135,000 was allocated to that agency for interstate highway work in West Virginia, and another $8,123,000 for the State's primary and secondary roads. In fiscal year 1963, in President Kennedy's budget, $36,024,000 is being requested for the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads for interstate highway work in our State, and $8,689,000 is also being requested for our primary and secondary roads. In other words, a Democratic administration is seeking an increase of $9,455,000 for more road work in West Virginia than was allotted to the State in fiscal 1962.

The fiscal year 1963 budget for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, to carry out projects and programs in and affecting West Virginia, is also being recommended for a substantial increase by the administration. In fiscal year 1962, for the same purposes, the Army Engineers were allotted $38,574,600. Now $42,105,200 is being requested—an increase of $3,530,600. You can be sure that I, as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, will make every effort to secure these budget recommendations for West Virginia.

The projects and activities of the U.S. Department of the Interior in West Virginia have always been of prime importance to our State. This Department is concerned not only with the conservation and development of our natural resources, and the safety of our mines, but also with aid to our State parks, and with the improvement of hunting and fishing in the State. Thus, an examination of that Department's fiscal year 1963 budget also gives heartening evidence of the administration's determination to aid West Virginia. It is requesting $4,843,463 for work in the State—$362,435 more than was allotted to it for such purposes in fiscal year 1962.

The efforts of President Kennedy and your Democrats in Congress in behalf of West Virginia would take too much time to relate. Let us not forget his memorable action to increase the amount and the kinds of surplus foods to the unemployed, an action he took on the very first day he assumed the Presidency. Let us also remember the legislative program he urged Congress to enact, and which a democratic Congress did enact, aid to dependent children of the unemployed; a temporary extension of unemployment insurance payments; increased social security payments to widows and surviving children, and to the disabled; and the lowering to age 62 for voluntary retirement with reduced benefits, a measure of great importance to many of our elderly citizens, and a measure I am proud to say I originally introduced in the House of Representatives in 1953.

Today, thanks to President Kennedy's program for economic recovery, gratifying gains are being made by both business and industry. By the end of this calendar year, our gross national product may reach the unprecedented height of 560 billion. This is undeniable economic progress.

Understandably, President Kennedy has a warm spot in his heart for West Virginia. State officials and businessmen coming to Washington, have found, and are continuing to find, the doors of government agencies open to them.

But, understandable, too, is the warm spot which West Virginians have in their hearts for John F. Kennedy. For, under his strong hand, the people of our State are finding new confidence in themselves, and new assurances of a better, more productive, and more abundant future.

There are many persons in this audience tonight whom I would wish to thank, to congratulate, and to commend—not only for myself, but for all Democrats in West Virginia. But I must mention one in particular. She is your associate chairman of the State's democratic executive committee, Mrs. Thelma Hall.

From the moment Thelma Hall assumed this office, she has worked ceaselessly to organize the Democratic women of West Virginia into a vital working force. Her success in these efforts is a matter of record.

And now, both she and Mrs. Virginia Mae Brown, are heading Operation Support, which has been discussed with you today, in order that West Virginians, particularly West Virginia Democratic women, may have a direct voice in the formulation of our Nation's legislative policy.

Now, I want to talk about another top-notch Democrat, and to say of him that his record in the House of Representatives, in behalf of the people of the First Congressional District, as well as in behalf of the people of the Nation, is one of remarkable achievement—Congressman CLEVE BAILEY. He is a man for whom it can be truthfully said: "There is no substitute for experience."

His record of accomplishments is far too long to enumerate. But let me tell you about some of them:

CLEVE BAILEY is the author or coauthor of all educational legislation approved by the Congress in the last 14 years—including the National Defense Education Act, and Public

Laws 815 and 874, which deal with school impact bills. In fact, in September 1960, he was awarded a national citation for his activities in the field of education by Parents magazine. He also sponsored legislation to enlarge the program of vocational education, and to establish rural library service, including bookmobiles.

He was the author of legislation providing for a $40 million, multiple-purpose reservoir on the Elk River at Sutton, which was recently completed. And together with me, he sponsored a $50 million, multiple-purpose reservoir on the Gauley River near Summersville.

CLEVE BAILEY sponsored the Bureau of Mines building at Mount Hope, Fayette County, which cost $1 million.

Moreover, he sponsored channel clearing projects at Cairo, Ritchie County; at West Union, in Doddridge County; at Wyatt, in Harrison County; at Elk Creek, in Harrison County; at Stone Coal, in Lewis County; and upstream development projects at Salem, in Harrison County; at Bond's Creek, in Ritchie County; and at Polk Creek in Lewis County.

As I have said before, Cleve Bailey's record of accomplishments is far too lengthy to relate. But in addition to education and conservation, his accomplishments embrace veterans' affairs; health and welfare legislation; social security; agriculture; labor-management relations; and postal and civil service.

We want to keep CLEVE BAILEY in Congress. We need his experience. We need his seniority on the committees of Congress. We need his devotion to the people of West Virginia. Let all of us work hard to assure the victory of CLEVE BAILEY in the First Congressional District in November. There is no worthier cause to which we can dedicate ourselves.

Debt and Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 2, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Debt and Taxes," which appeared in the January 18, 1962, edition of the Indianapolis News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEBT AND TAXES

How can President Kennedy's promise of a balanced budget square with his simultaneous demand for raising the ceiling on the national debt? If there is going to be no deficit, why are steps being taken to prepare for one?

The debt stands now at the astronomical high of $298 billion. Even should a determination to pay it off or even reduce it materially set in right now, our children and grandchildren would still be paying for our profligacy. But there is no such determination. The dangerous sophistry that bills can be paid indefinitely with borrowed money has seized our Government officials. Administrations in 25 of the last 31 years have managed to chalk up deficits.

Economy-minded legislators set up the statutory limit in the hope that it would somehow force administrations to live within their income. Instead of that, the debt ceiling—raised by successive Congresses as a "temporary" measure—has become virtually meaningless.

Administrations borrow and spend the money for ever-bigger welfare schemes. Then they tell Congress the Treasury will be insolvent unless the ceiling is hiked again. That is the situation now.

This is the fundamental issue of our domestic economy. If it faced up to it, Congress could stop the deadly cycle. By withholding new borrowing power and by declining to make appropriations for unneeded spending, a courageous Congress could compel the spendthrift bureaucracy to live within the Government's income, which is already sky high.

This should be made a No. 1 objective of the "loyal opposition"—the Republicans and conservative Democrats—in the present Congress.

Proposed Purchase of United Nations Bonds by United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 2, 1962

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the "ABC's of the U.N. Bonds United States Is Asked To Buy."

This is taken from the U.S. News & World Report of January 29, 1962, and I think it is a concise and accurate statement of the proposal.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABC'S OF THE U.N. BONDS UNITED STATES IS ASKED TO BUY

American taxpayers are being asked to buy $100 million worth of a proposed $200 million bond issue of the United Nations. As controversy develops over whether to buy or not to buy, questions are being raised. Congress must decide.

Why a bond issue?

The United Nations is about out of money, and has an army to pay in the Congo.

Can't the regular dues be raised to take care of that?

They could be. However, Russia refuses to pay anything for police operations. France, the Arab States and some other nations balk at paying, too.

How will bonds solve that problem?

The theory is that the United States and some other countries will buy a big share of the bonds to provide ready cash. Then, according to this theory, the World Court will decide that assessments to pay off the bonds will be mandatory under the U.N. Charter, and that all members will have to pay up or lose their vote in the U.N. Not everyone agrees with this theory. Some who oppose U.S. purchase of the bonds argue that Russia and others who have refused to pay their share of the Congo expense could still duck the assessment without losing voting privileges.

Who is expected to buy the bonds?

Sale is planned to be made to member nations. Nonmembers, including West Germany, Switzerland, and Spain, will be eligible to buy, too. Sale is not to be made to the general public.

What are the terms and the security offered?

The U.N. bonds would be for 25 years at 2 percent interest. There is no backing for the bonds other than the U.N.'s ability to pay. It is not proposed that a mortgage be placed on the real estate holdings of the United Nations.

Is there a rush to buy?

No. Up to now, only Canada and the United States have publicly announced an intention to buy. Canada is in debt to the U.N. for $6.2 million, and says it is willing to buy that amount of bonds. Soviet Russia claims the whole thing is illegal. Belgium, Great Britain, Portugal and some other members are inclined to take a negative attitude.

Might this be a new way to finance police actions of the U.N. around the world?

It could be. U.N. armed forces now are operating in the Gaza strip between Egypt and Israel. They are in the Congo. Trouble appears to be ahead over Netherlands New Guinea, and any policing done there would involve naval and air operations. Such operations can be very expensive.

Are all U.N. members up to date on regular assessments?

No, they aren't. Out of 104 members, 82 are in arrears on their payments. Many of the countries that have fallen behind are so-called new nations that do not have enough money to pay up even though their assessments are small.

How about Soviet Russia?

Russia is in arrears on everything except assessments for actual running of the U.N. machinery. The assessment for Russia in the 1961 operating budget of the U.N. was $10.9 million. This sum compares with $22.3 million for the United States. Russia and her group of satellite countries pay only what they want to pay for "peace and security" operations of the U.N. Russia's debt to the United Nations as of last December 12 was $41,271,180.

Is the United States all paid up?

Oh, yes. U.S. taxpayers have put into the U.N., since its start, $1.6 billion. And this figure does not include the tremendous expense of the Korean war. U.S. payments included $255 million of the $784 million that has been spent on day-to-day operation of U.N. machinery. The United States put up $168 million of $586 million spent by specialized agencies of the U.N. It also supplied $797 million out of $1.3 billion spent on U.N. operations financed only by countries interested in underwriting them.

And now what?

Now the United States is asked to bail the U.N. out of its financial crisis by buying half of the bond issue.

Just how far in the red is the United Nations?

The deficit at the end of 1961 was $107 million. The U.N.'s working capital fund—which previously amounted to about $25 million—was down to zero.

Would the bond issue solve the U.N.'s financial problem?

The bond issue would be just a stopgap. The State Department says that the bond issue would "solve the United Nations cash problem for this year and next." After that, it seems to be taken for granted, more improvised financing will be needed.

What argument is made by the Kennedy administration for buying the bonds?

The gist of that argument, as given by an Assistant Secretary of State: "Congressional approval of this proposal will frustrate the Soviet attempt to starve the United Nations into submission, and will preserve the U.N. for its vital executive role in international politics."

The administration contends that the bond issue would compel all U.N. members to pay their share of the costs of "peace-keeping" operations.

What argument is made by those who oppose the idea?

Opponents contend that the bond proposal is financially unsound. These oppo-

nents maintain that it would not accomplish what it is designed to do. They argue that, if Russia wants to withhold funds from the U.N., the Communists will do so regardless of any bond issue.

Progress Through Urban Renewal in Seattle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 2, 1962

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, few programs have made the impact upon our cities for today and the future that the urban renewal effort has made.

We see the changes which are made from day to day. Whole areas of our cities are rebuilt. Modern housing is replacing substandard.

Federal, State, and municipal governments are working together to provide leadership, to pool knowledge, and to develop programs which can be adapted to meet the needs of widely varied communities.

I ask unanimous consent that the Seattle urban renewal story be printed at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEATTLE TAKES ACTION

In 1946 a group of citizens in Seattle formed the Jackson Street Community Council. Members of this organization worked with neighborhood groups, the chamber of commerce, the Seattle Real Estate Board, and businessmen to lay the foundation for action programs to follow.

In January of 1958, Mayor Gordon Clinton appointed an urban renewal coordinator for the city of Seattle and formed a citizens' advisory committee; these were the first official steps toward an urban renewal program. The citizens' advisory committee then became the Seattle Urban Renewal Enterprise in 1959—a citywide, nonprofit citizens' group. The committee members became the first board of trustees for Seattle Urban Renewal Enterprise (SURE) and the director of the Jackson Street Community Council accepted the post of executive director for the new organization.

SURE GOES TO WORK

Following extensive survey work by SURE volunteer members, two projects were recommended to the city council by SURE and the city urban renewal coordinator. One was the area known as Cherry Hill—Cherry Street to Yesler Way and 18th to 23d Avenue. Here SURE was financed largely by private memberships, with some assistance through a contract with the city of Seattle. Work done by SURE in the Yesler-Atlantic area—Yesler Way to Lake Way and 14th Avenue to Rainier Avenue to Empire Way—was again chiefly financed through memberships, plus a contract with the Federal Government.

In cooperation with neighborhood groups and the Jackson Street Community Council, meetings were held with residents in every block of the proposed project areas. Groundwork for this actually had been started in 1956 when the Jackson Street Community Council had formed their block organization. By 1958 when Mayor Clinton appointed his advisory committee, residents of both project areas had been alerted to the potential for improvement and were ready to cooperate in every way.

EFFECT ON CITY

The areas involved in the two projects are very close to the central business district. Both were early residential areas. As the years passed, the city expanded far beyond them, and many of their buildings were allowed to deteriorate. This community of approximately 3,000 homes became a melting pot of races; overcrowding in schools and playgrounds made them quite inadequate by present-day standards. Poor streets and street lighting, insufficient traffic control, scant police protection, accumulation of refuse in vacant lots and alleys—these were the rule.

Crime and disease rates increased—property values sank. As blight progressed banks refused to loan money for repairs; without money available to those who cared, the result could only be more blight. This was the situation when SURE came into the picture.

BUSINESS TAKES A NEW LOOK

SURE's first work was among the residents of the community, giving them advice and counseling both on individual and community problems. Residents began to take a new interest in their homes and neighborhoods. Clean-up, paint-up and repair campaigns were sparked, and the neighborhood appearances began to improve.

One businessman, sure that this was good business, bought a pair of dilapidated houses within the Cherry Hill project. He remodeled them extensively, leased one to SURE for $1 per year to be used as office and demonstration house, and offered the other one for sale. It is interesting to note that this property drew many inquiries from outside the project area, whereas for years the trend had been only outward, away from the area. Other businessmen—bankers, architects, contractors, real estate people—began to take an interest as they saw rising property values and increasing opportunities for sound investments. Banks which 3 years ago would not even accept an application for a loan in either area now agreed to make 6 and 7 percent loans to property owners who wished to build or remodel. New apartment houses are appearing throughout the areas, others are in the planning stage and all have a waiting list of tenants who desire clean, modern quarters. Two new churches have been constructed—surely a sign of faith in the future of the communities.

A NEW APPROACH TO CITY ACTION

In some cities where urban renewal has been adopted, the city governments plan the programs and make their recommendations to the residents of the affected areas. In Seattle the cooperative approach has been successful. The Neighborhood Analysis Committee of SURE, with the Jackson Street Community Council, studied the two project areas, then recommended an informal hearing before the public safety committee of the city council. All interested persons were invited to present their views at this hearing. Residents of the areas had full opportunity to voice their feelings with regard to the suggested changes. Because there was no dissent, in January of 1959 the city council approved Cherry Hill as a conservation project. City urban renewal aides were then sent to survey the area in cooperation with the Jackson Street Community Council who arranged appointments for the surveyors to enter homes in the area.

CONSERVATION PROJECT FINDINGS

Findings of urban renewal aides in the Cherry Hill project were encouraging. Although 50 percent of the structures were substandard, only 5 percent of these were found unfit for human habitation. Twenty percent needed only minor repairs to be brought up to minimum housing code standards—a code which was drafted jointly by a committee of SURE experts and city officials. The other 25 percent needed major repairs or remodeling to meet standards, but by this time enough private capital was available to make an effective start on the job. In the 11 months which followed, council approval of the Cherry Hill project, approximately half a million dollars of private money was invested in remodeling, repairing and new construction. This was almost unbelievable in the light of investments made during the preceding decade—actually less than 10 percent of that amount.

FHA CERTIFIED FINANCING

Final certification of FHA section 220 financing for the Cherry Hill conservation project was received by the Mayor on December 13, 1960. Even before this assurance of Federal backing, the big business boom had begun. Private investments up to this time had given clear indication of a strong faith in the future of the community as businessmen and property owners went to work. On one street alone—just 5 blocks long—$50,000 had been spent in remodeling residences.

This is Cherry Hill, designated as a nonassisted conservation project—not earmarked for Federal funds but eligible for section 220 financing. Action has been taken in time to prevent severe blight.

YESLER-ATLANTIC BECOMES REHABILITATION PROJECT

In the Yesler-Atlantic area a similar but more comprehensive story unfolded. After a study by citizen and official groups, it was recommended to the public safety committee of the city council at an informal public hearing that the Yesler-Atlantic area be declared a rehabilitation project. This action was taken by the city council in June of 1959. In this area Federal moneys are being invested, matching city funds 2-for-1. A new junior high school is in the planning stage, including a playground and a park. The total estimated cost for this is set at approximately $3 million. Federal funds will match city money in providing paved streets, sewers, better recreational facilities, and elimination of property unfit for use through acquisition, clearance, and sale for redevelopment.

SCOPE OF PROGRAM INCREASING

Throughout both areas changes are already apparent. These include increasing property values and sounder investment potential, but the changes do not stop there. As ancient, unsanitary plumbing facilities are replaced, vermin breeding spots destroyed and other hazards to health and safety eliminated, a healthier environment is being created. Children have cleaner, safer places to play. Sociologists predict that urban renewal programs will have a long-range result in reduced incidence of crime. Health officials predict a lower disease rate as living conditions are improved. The relationship between environment, character, and health has been demonstrated conclusively.

NEW PROJECTS RECOMMENDED

With two programs well underway, Seattle is looking ahead to further achievement in urban renewal. An informal hearing before the public safety committee of the city council in August 1960, saw a recommendation that the council apply for funds to survey two areas for clearance projects. One area borders Seattle University, the other is adjacent to the University of Washington. The Housing and Home Finance Agency was requested by the city to loan approximately $90,000 for each area to determine the de-

gree of blight. The survey is expected to take 1 year. If blight exists in sufficient degree, these areas may become Seattle's first urban renewal project under section 112 of the U.S. Housing Act, enabling both of these "landlocked" universities to expand. Past expenditures for land by the universities would be considered as the local one-third share, and HHFA funds would provide the other two-thirds.

In other areas of Seattle, SURE is assisting numerous neighborhood groups to organize and survey their own communities. The Leschi district in the eastern sector, Madison-Minor-Madrona to the north and the Youngstown area in west Seattle have received such help and guidance in community analysis and organization.

When preliminary surveys in local communities by neighborhood groups indicate the degree of blight and the need for public facilities such as parks, playgrounds and schools, SURE's neighborhood analysis committee will then review the findings according to professional standards and present their recommendations to the city.

CONCLUSION

Seattle has already become a better place to live because decaying residential areas have been upgraded through urban renewal. Urban renewal will have a lasting influence upon the economy of this area, for such revitalizing of a city draws new industry, creates jobs, and promotes spending.

Cities like Seattle and citizens like those who have worked so tirelessly to bring success to the urban renewal program have not only improved their own environment—they have proven once again that America's greatest resource is her people.

OAS Blacks Castro's Eye

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 2, 1962

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "OAS Blacks Castro's Eye." The article was written by Gould Lincoln.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OAS BLACKS CASTRO'S EYE

Cuba's Castro and his Communist government were battered by resolutions of condemnation at the OAS meeting in Punta del Este—a good job. Only the Cuban representatives voted "no"—even on the disputed resolution to bar Cuba from all agencies of the Organization of American States. The vote on that resolution—which seems to give the Cubans some degree of satisfaction—stood 14 nations in favor, 1 nation (Cuba) voting against, and 6 nations abstaining. None of those 6 nations, it should be noted, voted with Mr. Castro.

If the United States did not get all it went after at the Uruguay meeting of the OAS, it did get much. Decidedly, it was a good step forward in opposition to the effort of international communism's efforts to take over Latin American States as it has, even according to Castro himself, taken over Cuba. The Cuban dictator—more cruel even than others who have gone before him—may now decide to take himself and his government out of the OAS, not waiting for formal ouster action which is expected to follow the resolution of Punta del Este. But whether he does or not, he will be out.

NO DOUBT OF MEANING

In some quarters it is argued that the fact the 6 Latin American nations which abstained from the ouster vote have a combined population of 138 million, 2½ times as large as the 13 Latin American nations which voted for the resolution, is a blow to OAS solidarity. The vote in support of the ouster still remains 14 to 1, far more than the necessary two-thirds vote. And the tone and meaning of the other resolution favored by the abstaining six constitute very definite condemnation of communism.

They gave promise, too, that the other Latin American nations will band together to prevent Castro attempts, by subversion and force, to take other Latin American countries into the ranks of the Communist bloc. This kind of assurance should be helpful to those smaller nations bordering the Caribbean, some of which already have had to repel Communist-controlled invasions launched from Castro's Cuba.

In considering the results of the OAS conference at Punta del Este, it is necessary to ask what would have been the situation had the United States and the 13 other American States which supported the Castro ouster resolution come away without any definite action. Castro would undoubtedly have thumbed his nose again at the United States and pictured himself as the big man of the Western Hemisphere. It is true that many of the anti-Castro American States, including the United States, had hoped for the use of economic sanctions against Castro's Cuba through united action of the OAS. The next best thing, however, has been accomplished—the ouster of Communist Cuba from the OAS agencies.

BIPARTISAN U.S. DELEGATION

President Kennedy wisely included in the U.S. delegation which went to Uruguay for the OAS meeting Democratic and Republican Members of Congress whose duties involve them closely with inter-American affairs. Senators MORSE, Oregon Democrat, and HICKENLOOPER, Iowa Republican, and Representatives SELDEN, Alabama Democrat, and MERROW, New Hampshire Republican. It happens, also, that Senator HICKENLOOPER is chairman of the Republican Policy Committee of the Senate, not a bad man for the Kennedy administration to have along in any international meeting. Before the delegation left Washington, it was well understood that the congressional Members were in favor of the strongest kind of action that could be obtained against Castro and his Communist-dominated Cuban Government.

The six nations which held out against the ouster resolution and which "abstained" when the vote was taken are Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Bolivia, and Ecuador. Their opposition, their spokesman said, was based on legal grounds—that there was nothing in the OAS agreement constituting the American agency providing for the ouster of a signatory to the agreement. Secretary of State Dean Rusk, who headed our delegation and worked hard for unanimity of action against Castro, argued, on the other hand, that the Foreign Ministers had an implicit right to make a decision and to act on it.

All of these six nations have taken part in the formation of the Kennedy proposed $20 billion Alliance for Progress, designed to give material aid to help their countries to greater economic strength and improvement for the masses of their people. The United States is to take the lead in this program, and it has been understood that $3 billion would be asked of Congress this year to launch it.

It remains now to be seen how the President and Congress will look on the provision of financial aid to the six abstaining nations, all of which had favored with enthusiasm the alliance for progress program. Such a program, however, would be far from the effective instrument it has been pictured if these six large Latin American countries should be left out.

A County Builds Its Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 2, 1962

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in this day when many rural areas of America are, through the area redevelopment program, seeking new ways to build their economies, I would cite an example from my own State of Washington.

Lester N. Liebel, the county extension agent in rural area development, supplied me with the results of the successful effort made by Stevens County, Wash. His report makes interesting reading. It provides an excellent blueprint which others can follow.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Liebel's statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATTRACTION OF A NEW INDUSTRY TO A SMALL COUNTY—A CASE HISTORY

(By Lester N. Liebel, county extension agent in rural area development, Colville, Wash.)

Stevens County situated in northeastern Washington, is by no means small, as far as size in square miles is concerned. It is approximately 90 miles long and from 25 to 50 miles in width. Its area of 2,521 square miles makes it slightly larger than the State of Delaware and over twice the size of Rhode Island. The terrain is rugged with small patches of fertile land and long narrow shoestring valleys. Such land is used for farming, but the people in the area have had a great struggle to make a good living unless they have been fortunate enough to own a good piece of land or some member of the family has an outside job. The county has an expanding agriculture economy based primarily on livestock, general farming and forest products. Part-time farming supplemented by forest industry work, mining and seasonal construction employment is another major characteristic of the rural economy. Approximately 80 percent of the 17,000 inhabitants of the county are considered rural.

Stevens County is characterized by a large proportion of workers residing on farms and dividing their labor between agriculture and off-farm work. In this forested and mining area farmers have some seasonal opportunities to work in nearby sawmills, logging operations, stone quarrying and mineral processing plants when they are in operation.

The history of Stevens County's industry has been the preparation of its many natural resources for further processing at many locations outside of Stevens County. Much of the mineral ore is shipped out of the county to be processed or smeltered at other locations. Dairy products are being transported to Spokane and Moses Lake for processing. Much of the timber has been shipped out in raw form.

Technological developments in the lumber industry have cut down on the number of

people employed. Many of the younger working age groups migrated from Stevens County—probably as a direct result of the poor job situation. This trend is being reversed—resources are being utilized, industries are being developed, and jobs have been created. Yes, social and economic development is taking place as a result of people helping themselves at the grass roots level.

In October 1957, a group of interested citizens representing organizations throughout the county were called together by the county extension service to discuss the future of Stevens County. They accepted the rural development program for Stevens County as the pilot county for the State of Washington. This group recommended that the county commissioners appoint a steering committee of 9 persons within a radius of 25 miles from Colville. Membership on this steering committee included a farmer, a motel operator, housewife, a city councilwoman, a livestock rancher and auctioneer, a welfare administrator, a postmaster, a district manager of a power company, a banker, and a district supervisor of the state department of natural resources. In order to involve more people and stimulate countywide planning, an organization known as Stevens County Rural Development Planning Council (RDPC) with 2 representatives from 19 different areas was organized. A 15-man executive committee was elected with staggering terms of 3, 2 and 1 year. Subcommittees were set up to study and report back to this council. Situation—the problems that relate to the situation, the objectives and goals of the people, and recommendations for a solution of the problems on both the long and short term basis, were reported from 5 different committees.

One problem for sure was pointed out by all committees—more employment opportunities were needed. This could be done by developing industries to utilize local resources.

This stimulus for needed industry furnished by the rural development program led one of Colville's local citizens to contact the operator of the Wood Engineering Co. in Seattle and invite him to attend the rural resources development day program in March of 1958. This program sponsored by the Colville Chamber of Commerce and Pomona Granges was designed to explore any and all possibilities for developing the social and economic well being of Stevens County. The co-owner-manager of Wood Engineering Co. attended this day-long program. Members of the Rural Development Steering Committee supplied a lot of information and showed him around the area. After 3 days he went back to Seattle and talked things over with his partner and finally decided to move. One month later he was in Colville in full production. During his first visit to Colville there were many items for which information was needed the labor supply and situation, and the availability of raw materials were the two main factors that he considered. In the words of Dan House, "Stevens County is where the pine grows and labor here is more harmonious than on the coast. We have a 20-percent saving on rent and 25-percent saving on labor costs and 100-percent saving on raw material transportation."

The Wood Engineering Co. of Colville is now the largest manufacturer of pole sockets and sanitary base shoe corners in the United States today. Its products are marketed in every State in the Union plus Canada, Hawaii, and Alaska.

The pole socket is an easy way to put up that rod in your clothes closet and the sanitary base shoe corner is a great aid to the housewife in keeping the room corners clean in every house.

The Wood Engineering Co. manufactures around 3 million pieces a year to keep up with the demand for these two products. This company utilizes mill-ends and other waste woods that previously went into the sawmill burners. During the first year of operation in Colville, over 300,000 board feet of timber went into the production of base shoe corners and pole sockets.

It is interesting to note that when local millowners have not been able to supply materials to this company they have gone out of their way to locate other sources of supply for them.

On the average the Wood Engineering Co. employs seven men and two women with a total payroll of over $33,000 for the first year of operation. In addition, the economy of the county is boosted by the purchase of locally produced waste wood and millends. Since this company sells most of its products outside of the State of Washington this is new money being pumped into Stevens County.

In the spring of 1959 Mr. House added a new item to his production line. Three-inch wooden drawer pulls for cabinets and chests. Also during this period he constructed a new 36- by 48-foot building for storing and drying of wood. The financial needs were handled through one of the local banks.

During May of 1959 Mr. Lyle Gould of Colville purchased the outstanding stock in the Wood Engineering Co. in order to make this company completely locally owned and locally operated.

In 1960 another item was added to the production line. That of the child's space chair. This is the world's newest patented highchair, it's compact, folds into a neat unit for easy transportation, it's stable, cannot fall or come loose from the table, and can be used anywhere—restaurants, trailer houses, and homes. Every grandparent should have one.

Two new products were added to Wood Engineering's production line in 1961—One, a diamond-shaped decorative piece. These can be used on front doors, garage doors, or they can be used to add to the decor of any room. The other item—wooden flower box brackets.

What the Wood Engineering Co. will manufacture next—only time will tell.

Is Dan House happy with his move from the west coast to Stevens County? Here are his words and I quote, "I like it here and I plan to be here a long time. People have been wonderful to me, to my family, and to my son. You don't have the rush here in Stevens County that exists on the west coast."

This company could have located in any other community in the Pacific Northwest, but the people of Stevens County saw the need for industrial development and did something about it.

This operation has been a useful tool in demonstrating to local people what a small industry can do for a community. Here's what happened during the last 4 years:

A brain child of the Forest Use and Management Committee resulted in the establishment of Shriner Bros. post and pole treating operation 3 miles west of Colville, Wash. It is the only one of its kind in the inland empire. This operation is adding a great deal to the economy of Stevens County by creating employment for many families, encouraging better woodland management and tree farming, and providing a ready market for materials that previously went to waste. Since getting into operation, in May of 1959, this concern has peeled and treated thousands of round posts and poles. These have been supplied from farm woodlands by more than 30 different individuals. The operation is so set up that four men can peel 1,500 posts per day. Posts are seasoned from 30 to 90 days before being treated with Pentachlorophenol—this material penetrates and seals wood pores and keeps moisture out and protects wood from dry rot, termites, and power post beetles. Shriner Bros. treat poles full length to 16 feet and butt-treat poles of any length. This concern not only supplies materials for building good farm fences and corrals, but also supplies materials for fencing yards, making car ports, milksheds, loafing sheds, haysheds, garages, industrial buildings, and others.

Bergman Enterprises of Chewelah established production of a decorative type fence made from small wood poles turned round on a lathe.

Herb Ziebel and Ross both of Chewelah have established wood pallet manufacturing plants utilizing low-grade lumber.

Two wood molding plants have been established and one shake mill during the last 3 years.

Ideas promoted by the Rural Resources Development stimulated members of the Cattlemen's Association to establish a local market outlet for livestock. The Colville Auction Yard organized in May 1958, had 8,379 head of livestock sold through its gates during the first year of operation, the second year 11,515 head, and 12,871 head during 1960. This operation has benefited the tri-county area in many ways.

After several attempts to establish custom slaughter facilities in this area Colville Meats, Inc., was organized with community backing of $70,000 in stock matched with a local bank loan and Small Business Administration loan to construct a plant in Colville. This custom killing plant opened operations in late October 1961. This facility is bringing trade into the area as well as furnishing a much needed service.

Jerry McMillan organized Colmac Industries, Inc., to manufacture automatic laundry and drycleaning equipment which he invented and patented. These include Cover-all-Matics that press coveralls from wet to dry in 60 seconds; a waterproofing and sizing machine for garments; and an automatic pants presser. In 3 years Colmac Industries has increased its employment from 3 men to 50 men and women. This number will increase because Jerry has several other items on his drawing board.

It has been said that the man with an idea, with perseverance and courage to carry it through is the most valuable asset a community can have.

The towns of Chewelah and Colville conducted clean-up, paint-up campaigns in 1959 to make this area more attractive to tourists and industry. Community-minded citizens of Chewelah also placed redwood planters on the sidewalks in front of their place of business to improve the appearance.

Community industrial development companies have been organized in Chewelah, Colville, and Kettle Falls to help promote industry in this area.

Getting things done requires more than wishful thinking. It requires thoughtful planning based on facts about a community and its resources.

Facts furnish the basis for united community action, for confidence and willingness to move ahead. Furthermore, facts acquaint local people with resources for self-help. They provide local leaders with information needed to evaluate the strong points as well as the weak ones and to know what a community has to offer to an industry, a new business, an investor or a tourist, and too, young people are better able to see and evaluate the career opportunities open to them at home.

Outdoor Recreation Questions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 2, 1962

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the long-awaited report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, created by the 85th Congress, has been released. The document, which has been received by Members of Congress, is more of a policy declaration for future recreation development than it is a blueprint. The Commission was ably described the need for closer coordination of agencies concerned with recreation and more careful planning of resource uses.

The task remains to clothe these policy proposals with specifics. I will look forward to receiving the administration's detailed program for implementing the recommendations of the Commission. The need for national seashore recreation areas, parks, and other facilities has been generally recognized for some time. Questions as to exactly how this unfilled need will be met are yet to be answered.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD with my remarks, an editorial from the Washington Post of February 2, 1962.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUTDOOR RECREATION NEEDS

We are a highly urban country; 63 percent of our people now live on 10 percent of the land. As our communities become more crowded, we are increasingly conscious of a need to leave them behind us, whether for a few hours at a time or a matter of weeks. Our parks, beaches and open water are not a luxury. To a nation of city dwellers, they are a necessity.

By the year 2000, the Outdoor Recreation Commission has calculated, our population will have doubled and its demand for fresh-air recreational facilities will have tripled. There is a great deal of open land available for public recreation. But some of it is being misused and most of it is in the wrong places, far from the great metropolitan centers.

The Commission was established by Congress to develop a policy. It has spent 3½ years, and $2.5 million, in this pursuit. The Chairman, Laurence S. Rockefeller, has now presented the final report.

This report, unfortunately, is a disappointment. Its main recommendations are the creation of another Federal bureau and Federal grants-in-aid, for purposes not altogether clearly defined.

The financial sections are inexcusably vague. What kinds of parks will the teeming nation of 2000 A.D. require, and where? The answers are the broadest possible generalizations. How much ought we expect to spend? No answer at all. Where does the Federal responsibility end, and the States' begin? The matter is not discussed. Where should the money come from? The Federal money is proposed to come from general Treasury funds (unlikely), and the State money from user charges (unspecified). The report ought to have put forward an explicit schedule of Federal user charges to be funneled into a trust fund, like the interstate highway fund.

The report endorses the principle on which the wilderness bill is founded, and will undoubtedly help it toward passage. But the Commission did not address itself directly to the issue lying behind the long fight over that bill, the reconciliation of conservation with the exploitation of natural resources.

The report makes a number of useful, if secondary, suggestions. It outlines a constructive system of zoning for parklands. It makes the very good point that in urban areas such relatively small touches as bicycle paths along expressways can create an environment that invites people out of doors.

The Commission's greatest service has been to suggest the necessity of prompt action, particularly near the cities, and to secure the agreement of a highly varied membership to the need for Federal action. It has commissioned specialized research reports, to appear over the next 6 months, that will provide the factual basis for future legislation. Secretary of the Interior Udall is now preparing the administration's program for the development of the Federal park and recreation system. Where the Commission was general, it is now up to Mr. Udall to be specific.

Foreign Aid and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 2, 1962

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Steven H. Broomell to the editor of the Casper Tribune-Herald. The letter deals with foreign aid and communism.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTERS FROM THE PEOPLE

CASPER TRIBUNE-HERALD:

This is a reply to the letter from Ulis Stewart in your issue of January 24.

Being a newcomer to Wyoming, I feel I am not familiar enough with the elk situation to express any confirmed opinion. However, your statements regarding our international situation have twisted a thorn that has been in my side for some time.

I object strongly to any attempt to withdraw foreign aid, whether it is in the form of money or manpower (Peace Corps or otherwise). Foreign aid is one of the few effective weapons against communism that we have.

There are very few democracies in the world today that were not democracies before communism became a serious problem at the end of World War II. At the end of World War II the Communist world consisted mainly of Russia. Since that war, communism has enfolded so many people it is now either the most powerful governmental form, of the second most powerful. Only a world war III could determine which is the case at the present time.

The reason communism is so powerful is easily understood when you examine a few facts. The Communist nations have a fantastic foreign aid budget, at tremendous expense to their own citizens. The Communist nations spare no expense when attempting to influence a nation that is hungry, plague infested, and poorly clothed.

The Communists are right in the middle of things, demonstrating the good points of their governmental system, while the good old U.S.A. is trying to decide whether the country in question even rates an Ambassador. Let's face it, to an African or southeast Asian who has never tasted meat or seen a pair of shoes, the communistic system has a lot to offer.

So does a true democracy, but to the people involved it's simply a matter of who gets there first with the most. The United States has a horrible habit of getting there last with the least. Presto, the people get ready for a change, and you have another Cuba.

At the risk of being branded as a fellow traveler, I will say that communism is not evil and is therefore not doomed to extinction merely because democracy is good. Communism is neither good nor evil, it is simply a governmental system. It is highly repressive of competition, but it is nonetheless a system.

Communism is not evil because it suppresses Christianity—it actually only ignores Christianity. Communism fights religion only when religion threatens communism's position. We do the same thing in this country. The vast majority of Americans are good Christians, but let religion try to affect our Government and our screams can be heard in Moscow.

A person could conceivably be very pious, but still be a loyal Communist. People in Russia are atheistic because of personal belief, not political belief. Christianity never was popular in Russia, and it was unknown in most parts of that country. Our churches once sent missionaries to Russia until the Bolshevik revolution.

Communism will not lose because it is atheistic and evil. It will lose only if democracy is willing to work to win. Withdrawing foreign aid is tantamount to ignoring the peeping Tom at your window. Shooting the peeping Tom is easy. So is starting a war with Russia. But why risk a billion lives when we can achieve the same thing with a little tax money and personal effort.

After one has analyzed the situation, one sees the world as a giant department store. The Communistic world is displaying its products. Democracy is displaying its products in this same department store. My faith in human nature tells me that the world will buy the better product, democracy. But if we never even come around to show our wares, we have no right to be shocked when we find ourselves as a lonely warehouse in the middle of our competitor's property.

STEPHEN H. BROOMELL.

Financing of United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 2, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Borrowing Trouble," which appeared in the Terre Haute Star on January 18, 1962.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BORROWING TROUBLE

It was inevitable. Debt is about to be internationalized. This would not be so bad if Uncle Sam could get the United Nations to

take over his national debt, but this isn't exactly what the U.N. has in mind.

Tipoff to the new development came in a memorandum sent by U Thant, Acting U.N. Secretary General, to the five permanent members of the Security Council. He asked them to comment on meeting the crisis over financing of the U.N. Emergency Force in the Congo by issuing $200 million in bonds to meet the growing deficit.

When everybody else is in debt, why should the U.N. be an exception? But if the U.N. cannot pay its bills for a minor foray like that in the Congo, how will it pay for others that will occur in years ahead and still pay for debts left it by present-day members?

Unless, of course, permanent universal peace is just around the corner. In that event there will be no difficulty—but also no need for the U.N.

Big Surplus of Farm Meddling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 2, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Big Surplus of Farm Meddling" which appeared in the January 23, 1962 edition of the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIG SURPLUS OF FARM MEDDLING

One of the alluring prospects which were held out when the New Frontier was selling itself in the last presidential election campaign was a bright new horizon for the American farmer.

Well, the first year of the administration's new farm approach put an extra billion dollars into the farmers' pockets, all right, but it cost more than a billion dollars of taxpayers' money to do this. Meanwhile, there were side effects just about as grim.

Higher support prices on dairy products cost half a billion dollars in 1961, and as might have been expected, consumers responded to the higher prices by buying less. Government stocks of surplus dairy products soared, as farmers increased production in response to the higher supports.

The same thing happened in soybeans. The feed grains program did trim output of corn and such slightly, but many of the farmers switched to soybeans at their new high support level, and so the result was merely a surplus in a different crop.

All this is a familiar story. For 30 years, the Government has been trying to solve the farm problem by similar means, with similar expensive and unhappy results.

Now the President's state of the Union message calls for a broader farm program which will have provisions for each crop. Many crops are not now under any Government program at all, and these are doing well in a free market. It's difficult to see why a formula which doesn't work must now be substituted for one that is working.

City people may be inclined to blame the farmers for this state of affairs, but this is generally unjust. There are some farm organizations which scream for Government cash, but the American Farm Bureau Federation, the largest of the lot, year after year tries to get the Government to embark on a program to phase out all farm supports and return farming to a free market economy.

The bureau would prefer to have the whole thing dropped at once, except for the fact that farm economies have become so messed-up by Government meddling that it will take some time to make the transition.

The farmers, the taxpayers, and consumers will be better off if this Congress begins to reduce farm controls rather than extending them into new areas.

Bellamy Award Presentation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 2, 1962

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address of Miss Mary Ann Ward, Cradock High School's representative at the 20th annual Bellamy Award presentation on October 13, 1961, in Topeka, Kans., also Miss Ward's article "What the Bellamy Award Means to Me."

There being no objection, the address and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT THE BELLAMY AWARD MEANS TO ME

(By Mary Ann Ward)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Mary Ann Ward, Cradock's Bellamy Award representative, recently attended the presentation in Topeka, Kans. The following letter consists of her viewpoints and ideas of the Bellamy Award.)

DEAR MISS MILLER: When you first explained to me about this letter I was a little leery about it. How on earth could I summarize how I felt about the Bellamy Award? Having participated in the ceremony I now understand.

I began to feel the deep meaning of this award on Thursday at the Naturalization ceremony. When the aliens stood up and took the Oath of Allegiance it made me stop and think. All these years, "citizen" had just been another word in my vocabulary, but on Thursday I was deeply proud that the word described me. Those people pledged to give up all ties and thoughts of homeland. Deep down inside I wondered if I loved this country as much as they, and if I too would be willing to make so great a sacrifice. Then on Friday I found the answer to my wondering.

As the choir sang the "Battle Hymn of the Republic", I was so proud to be an American and live in such a wonderful country. I knew then that my forefathers had not fought and died in vain. Many years and many people had made my country what it is today, for which I thank God.

About this time my eyes came to rest on the quiet field of blue, mounted with stars. How one piece of cloth could represent so much amazed me. Our flag is stronger than any defense ever devised by man, for its strength comes from within the souls of the people it represents. Under its waving folds every man, woman and child can find a haven of safety and peace.

Surprisingly enough I didn't feel alone in my thoughts. I believe every person in the auditorium felt the same as I.

Miss Miller, as a result of the Bellamy Award ceremony, I know what it is to be an American. I love my country and all it stands for. Our "Pledge of Allegiance" will no longer be a group of words to hurry through, but more of a silent prayer of thankfulness for the experience I have had and a tribute to all I hold dear.

ADDRESS TO TOPEKA HIGH SCHOOL ASSEMBLY BY MISS MARY ANN WARD, NATIONAL HONOR SOCIETY, CRADOCK HIGH SCHOOL SERVICE AWARD, ADVERTISING MANAGER THE ADMIRAL (YEARBOOK), HONORED QUEEN INTERNATIONAL ORDER JOB'S DAUGHTERS, VIRGINIA BETHEL 11.

When I think of Kansas there comes to my mind the once vast distance which separated our two States. The colonists crossed the ocean and founded the first Thirteen Colonies. Many came in search for gold and land. The thirst for wealth and exploration caused the frontiers to move westward, again into a vast unknown.

Today, distance is no barrier. Not only modern inventions tie our States together but patriotism, the strongest tie of all. In Abilene we find the Eisenhower Museum extending a hand to clasp that of the soon-to-be MacArthur Memorial in Norfolk, Va. Thus we commemorate two famous war heroes.

To help keep our land free, in Kansas there lies a great aircraft industry which provides for our Nation's defense. In Virginia, and in my own city of Portsmouth, we find the Naval shipyards.

Our States are tied together by pride in heritage. Virginia pictures the old South with her plantations, cotton and southern belles. A pleasing contrast is Dodge City, cowboys and the famous old cattle trails.

These past few days I have gotten to know you and your school. Naturally, I would like to introduce my own school, Cradock High. Cradock proper, a nautical community, was named for a British admiral, Sir Christopher George Francis Maurice Cradock, who went down with his ship in a naval engagement off the coast of Chile during World War I. Cradock is laid out in the shape of an anchor. The streets are in alphabetical order bearing the names of such famous naval men as Farragut and John Paul Jones. My school also follows this nautical theme.

The Cradock High athletic teams are known as the Fighting Admirals. Our newspaper is the Shipmate, our magazine the Log, our handbook the Quartermaster and our yearbook the Admiral. This year our yearbook is a first-place winner among group I schools in the State.

One of our players made the high school All-American football team. In a contrasting activity, our affirmative debate team has won the State title for two consecutive years.

May I say to the Trojans, congratulations on the high honor you are receiving today, the 20th annual Bellamy Award for your State. May it ever remind you of the first and strongest bond holding our Nation together—patriotism.

Alaska's Power Needs—No. VIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST GRUENING

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 2, 1962

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in the course of a series of articles on Alaska's power needs and impending shortages, the Fairbanks News-Miner has rendered an important public serv-

ice. I have inserted in the RECORD the first seven of these articles, and I now ask unanimous consent that the eighth article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STUDY MADE OF FEASIBILITY OF MINE-MOUTH POWER PLANT

(By Paul Lien)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following is an interview with Ralph Stefano, who made a survey of the proposed Healy mine mouth plant together with the Ralph M. Parsons Co. for Usibelli Coal Mines, Inc. It is the eighth of a series of articles dealing with a predicted power shortage here.)

Urgent need for power in central Alaska is of prime concern of all utilities companies in the area.

Whether the power is hydroelectric, atomic or steam plants, everyone concerned wants something done immediately.

Of course the cost of power is also to be considered.

It is conceded that the larger the power units the cheaper the cost to the consumer.

Another important factor is which can we get the soonest?

Mine mouth plants seem to be the answer to the problem for the present.

Hydroelectric plants are years in the building, and atomic power units are still in the experimental stage.

Most of the people interviewed leaned toward the use of mine mouth plants—at least for interim power.

Ralph Stefano, who made the feasibility report on a joint venture with the Ralph M. Parsons Co. for Usibelli Coal Co., Inc., is very optimistic about the proposed tie-up of utilities systems in the railbelt area.

"The main reasons for an integrated system," said Stefano, "are cheaper cost to the consumer; attract new industry, new business and new jobs; utilize natural resources already available; and expand existing industries and promote larger tax bases from existing industries.

"Utilization of resources is the prime objective and Alaska has a natural in coal.

"Water, gas and coal are the three natural resources for power which are most feasible for low-cost power.

"We are faced with an economic growth and we must have three things: communications, transportation, and low-cost power.

"The use of either gas or hydro plants would no doubt be cheaper in the long run, but there is an element of time to consider.

"In using gas you must be assured of an ample supply. Several gas wells must be available to justify the building of a plant. One or two wells would not be enough.

"Loss in transmission of gas through the lines is costly and is expensive if the users are too far away from the source of supply.

"Even if gas were available in the Kenai or the Gubik oilfields, it is doubtful if it could be used as a cheap source of power supply in this area.

"The steamplants proposed for both Healy and Sutton could be converted to gas at very little cost if in the future a gas supply was discovered here.

"As for using hydroelectric power, the time element is to be considered.

"NEEDED IMMEDIATELY

"Power is needed immediately. Rampart and Devil Canyon require long range planning and construction would not be completed for 10 or 15 years.

"The use of mine mouth steamplants seems to be the only answer to our problem for interim power," said Stefano.

Battle for Minds in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 2, 1962

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on Friday, January 19, Mr. N. Paul Neilson, Assistant Director, Far East, U.S. Information Agency, spoke before the chamber of commerce in Seattle.

Mr. Neilson—as does any other Seattle visitor, these days—had much to see. This is our World Fair year.

But he also had much to tell, because this is another important year in the continuing battle for the minds of those—more than half the world population—who live in Asia.

The occasion for Mr. Neilson's visit was a chamber of commerce luncheon honoring the SS *Washington Mail*, which made her maiden voyage to Seattle on January 19.

I ask unanimous consent that Paul Neilson's remarks be printed at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY N. PAUL NEILSON, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, FAR EAST, U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY, BEFORE THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, SEATTLE, WASH., JANUARY 19, 1962

Twenty-five years ago—August of 1937, to be exact—several hundred Americans milled around a wharf at Shanghai. War was engulfing that fabulous city of China and evacuation of foreigners was underway. As frightened children and worried parents streamed to the shore of Shanghai, they found the harbor jammed with Japanese warships, troop carriers and freighters. Their only path to safety lay down the Whangpoo River, and even that path was under bombardment. Suddenly and dramatically, a small tender was seen weaving through the crowded harbor. That tender was provided by the American Mail Line.

Down the Whangpoo the *President Jefferson* of the Old American Mill Line churned at anchor in choppy seas, its crew waiting patiently for the evacuees. Time after time the American Mail tender ran the gauntlet of fire between the wharf at Shanghai and the ship. One woman later wrote for the Manila Daily Bulletin:

"Death hovered over the first contingent of American women and children to leave Shanghai. The thought uppermost in the heart of every mother was that an attack might be staged while the tender chugged down the Whangpoo to the *President Jefferson* and safety. * * * There was crossfire as we went down the river. Then we entered the choppy waters where the Whangpoo meets the Yangtse. The pilot tried desperately to circle the *President Jefferson* in an effort to reach the leeward side. The waves were proving too much. Then with one mighty heave the little tender came under the overhanging stern of the *Jefferson*. Never was a haven of refuge more welcome."

One week later that American Mail Line vessel, crowded with refugees from war-torn China, eased alongside pier 7 at Manila. But before embarkation could be completed, disaster struck again. The worst earthquake ever to hit Manila threatened to crumble pier 7. The crew of the *President Jefferson* rose to this emergency with the same cool courage with which they had effected the initial evacuation of war-torn Shanghai.

Another news account in the Manila Daily Bulletin had this word of praise from Mr. Charles Forster, director of the Philippine Red Cross, who helped in the evacuation of Shanghai: "The arrangements for the boarding and accommodation of the refugees on the *Jefferson* were wonderfully done." Forster praised the work of the American Mail Line and the many officials who worked night and day for the embarkation.

Forgive me for injecting at this juncture the fact that Charles Forster's son Cliff is an officer of the U.S. Information Agency's Foreign Service. He is a very capable member of my Far East staff in Washington, after serving for more than 10 years in the U.S. Information Service posts in the Far East. It was Cliff, by the way, who found those quotes from the Manila Daily Bulletin earlier this week in the newspaper files of the Library of Congress. He was born in the Philippines and made his first voyage to America at the age of 3, aboard an American Mail Line ship. In reminiscing the other day, Cliff told me that American Mail Line ships were old friends to most Americans who lived in the Far East in the 1930's.

Well, I know that the flag of the American Mail Line still is an old friend, not only to Americans but to countless Asians from Korea and Japan, down through southeast Asia and over to India. I have seen that red-white-blue flag within a black-yellow circle on the funnels of ships in Hong Kong, Saigon, Manila, and Djakarta.

And so it was with particular pleasure that I undertook to participate in the civic welcome the city of Seattle has arranged for the SS *Washington Mail*. This fine, new vessel soon will be as familiar a sight in Asian ports as her eight sister ships. She joins a fleet which for 40 years has provided a major link between our west coast and the countries of Asia.

Using the Pacific Northwest as a gateway, the American Mail Line between 1950 and 1960 carried close to 6 million cargo revenue tons to and from the Far East and more than 5,000 passengers. I understand that it invests annually more than $10 million in the Pacific Northwest for services, stevedoring, repairs and supplies.

But these are facts will known to you, and in recording them I probably am only "carrying coals to Newcastle." What is of interest to me, in my profession, is what such companies as the American Mail Line carries, and where.

I have spent most of the past 14 years either serving in the Far East and for the Far East from the U.S. Information Agency headquarters in Washington. I can assure you—if indeed such assurance is necessary to this particular group of dynamic businessmen who have a real interest in the Far East—that one of the most significant events of our times is the emergence of Asian nations. Hundreds of millions of people are engrossed in what has been aptly described as "the revolution of rising expectations."

The United States has two major roles to play in the tremendous upheaval: (1) To assure the freedom of the revolution; (2) to give such cooperation and support as we can to the orderly social, economic and political development of the emerging nations. The form of U.S. cooperation is varied. It ranges from technical assistance programs to outright grant aids; from enlightened trade policies to food for peace. These and other programs could permit emerging nations to find a market for their products and to become a marekt for our own.

And here we come back to the occasion today—marking the maiden voyage across the Pacific of the SS *Washington Mail*. The merchant marine is very much a part of the role the United States plays in foreign affairs.

What do vessels of the American Mail Line carry? The cargo includes wheat and flour for hungry people of Asia; DDT in the war to wipe out malaria in Asia; machinery for the developing industries of emerging nations. This food, medicine, and machinery, among other cargo, are prime examples of our Nation's dedication to freedom and progress—of our friendship, support and cooperation which Asia will need in the year ahead.

Asia truly is a dynamic area. It abounds in political complexities. It is rich in ancient cultures and traditions. It is stamped by massive movement, turbulence, and, unhappily, violence.

Asia is a vast area in which live more than half the world's population. Eight of the 15 so-called Far East countries gained their independence since World War II. Three of them are literally divided on the issue of freedom versus communism: China; Korea at the 38th parallel; Vietnam at the 17th parallel. And at this very moment American diplomats are working night and day at Geneva to see that a fourth country, Laos, can become united and free, rather than divided tragically. Asia is the only geographic area where people are dying daily in the struggle against Communist aggression.

Asia also is an area of sharp contrasts. To the north there is dynamic, industrial Japan; far to the south, tribes still in the stone age roam the mountains of New Guinea and the "outback" of Australia. Per capita annual income ranges from around $400 in Japan to $20 in Laos.

Finally, this is an area dominated in some ways by China—that is, the land mass and population of mainland China, now ruthlessly ruled from Peiping by Mao Tse-tung and his Communist cohorts.

Red China has a major objective: To drive the United States out of the western Pacific, believing that the nations of east and south Asia then could not resist Peiping's hegemony over more than half the world's population.

The U.S. Information Agency has a part to play in the application of U.S. responsibilities in Asia. Put simply, that part is to tell America's story to Asians. In the words of our Director, Edward R. Murrow, USIA seeks to make U.S. policies everywhere intelligible and, wherever possible, palatable. Our purpose also is to associate our people, in their daily lives, their progress, and their yearnings, with the legitimate aspirations of all peoples everywhere.

I hasten to add that we do not seek to have other nations mold their image in that of the United States. That would be the very antithesis of our purpose. The purpose of our Nation is to aid other nations to develop, out of their own heritage, out of their own resources, out of their own aspirations, the way of life they want for themselves. USIA tries to put that story across, among others.

To do this we employ all the aboveboard techniques of modern mass communications, when and if possible: libraries, press releases, feature articles, magazines, radio, movies, television, exhibits, the arts, and so on. Most important of all is the contact, person to person, by USIS officers with the people of the country. More than a thousand USIS officers are hard at work at 219 posts in 99 countries around the world as spokesmen for America.

You may be interested in the fact that 22 natives of the State of Washington currently are serving overseas at U.S. Information Service posts. They include three young ladies who are secretaries; Voice of America technicians at our radio relay bases; and general information officers.

I'd like to take a few moments to tell you about two of them. Believe me, the fact that they were born in Seattle is purely coincidental.

Jack O'Brien is now serving as Director of the U.S. Information Service program in Rangoon. Born in Seattle in 1918, he attended the University of Washington and then became a newspaperman. He went to Japan in 1946 as a political affairs information officer, remaining there until 1952 when he joined the U.S. Information Agency. He has headed our information program in Indonesia and has served in Washington with both our press and broadcasting media. He and his family are among the fine Americans representing the United States today in Burma.

Herb Baumgartner, born in Seattle in 1914, also came out of journalism here at home to join our Agency. A graduate of the University of Washington, Herb's pregovernment career included freelance writing, publicity director for civic fund campaigns and, I believe, a stint as a writer for Comedian Shelly Berman. Herb has served in Korea and Indonesia and now is in Vietnam as Deputy Director of USIS. His son is at a preparatory school here in the States.

Jack O'Brien, Herb Baumgartner, and their colleagues are at work on the critical, frontline defense of free world values. They must be masters of many trades, and they must be able to communicate effectively in languages and climates and cultures far different from those here at home.

Their work often is unglamorous, but it can also be dangerous. Frank Corrigan, a native of California, was killed in a plane crash in Laos nearly 2 years ago. He was carrying USIS films to Royal Lao Government troops who were fighting Communist-led rebels deep in the jungles.

The story these information officers have to tell is America's story, in all its variety and dynamism. Too much time would be involved to go into detail on what we do and how we do it regarding all the facets of our way of life. So, perhaps a few examples in the sector of economics will suffice.

Our press service prepares a column on the economic scene in the United States and sends it every week to posts around the world. There, USIS officers may either place it in a local newspaper, or use it in their own periodicals. In Japan that column appears regularly in the equivalent of the Journal of Commerce in Japan, and is read by leaders of the Tokyo-Osaka business and financial community. Last month President Kennedy spoke before the National Association of Manufacturers. His subject was "A New Approach to American Trade Policy." Even as the President spoke, the full text of this important speech was being relayed by the USIA international wireless file which radios some 10,000 words daily to each of five major world areas.

The President, in that speech, stated that the United States has embarked on a stepped-up campaign of promoting our exports and our trade fair exhibits. USIS posts around the globe have developed informational programs in support of those objectives.

When the Century 21 Exposition opens here in Seattle next April, the full story of this imaginative and exciting world's fair will be told overseas by USIS—by Voice of America broadcasts, by special press feature stories, by documentary films, by photographs.

Your own mayor, Gordon Clinton, and leading citizens of Seattle have played prominent roles in the development of the highly successful Japan-American Conference of Mayors and Chamber of Commerce Presidents. USIS in Japan has told the story of these conferences, and how much they mean to strengthened ties between the two countries, throughout the islands of Japan.

Candor compels me to underline the bald fact that the U.S. information program overseas can only reflect what we do and say here in America. We must talk with the tongue of truth; we do not distort or modify or cloak. The story we have to tell is, really, your story.

Today's story is a happy one, and we in USIA will be happy to tell it. It is the story of a new ship; a wonderful addition to the American merchant marine; further evidence of the dynamic character of the Pacific Northwest; another contribution to America's trade capacity. I believe what we see here today in Seattle and what you project for the future is responsive to the challenge we face in the Pacific community.

President Kennedy's State of the Union Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 2, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "More of the Same," which appeared in the January 19, 1962, edition of the Shelbyville (Ind.) News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE OF THE SAME

Hopes that President Kennedy might appear before the joint session of the reconvened 87th Congress with his demands of a year ago greatly watered down, evaporated into the air of the crowded Chamber long before he completed the reading of his second state of the Union message the other day. And presumably the previously reported uneasiness of the newly installed Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK and Majority Leader CARL ALBERT lest they may be unduly blamed for upsets to the White House program, grows as its magnitude is revealed and opposition becomes apparent from within the President's party as well as from the Republican ranks.

Assured in manner, President Kennedy ranged over the full spectrum of national issues—both domestic and foreign—with the glaring exception of Cuba.

In addition to the repeated demands for Federal aid to education, health care for the aged under social security, and Federal manpower training to combat unemployment, the President's most startling proposal, of course, was that he be given authority to adjust income tax rates—subject to congressional approval.

Shortly after the address, this latter request was branded as unconstitutional by Virginia's Democratic Senator HARRY F. BYRD.

Mr. Kennedy asked for the establishment of a new Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, promised a new farm plan, plugging of tax loopholes, an 8-percent tax credit and "planned depreciation allowances" to businesses undertaking modernization, and appeared confident of increased postal rates. He would add 300 Polaris and Minutemen missiles and 2 Army divisions to the Nation's defenses.

He would, he said, submit a balanced budget for the 1963 fiscal year which starts July 1—and that budget, sent to Congress just yesterday, totals $92.5 billion—a peacetime record for size.

Whether the President's assurance stemmed from reports of his growing personal popularity or whether his aggressiveness was based on the belief that it is good strategy to ask for more than you expect to get, is a matter of speculation.

But the fact is that the Congressmen, in preparation for the fall elections, have been earnestly checking the temperature and pulse of their constituencies. And many, certainly, must have found reason to believe that a reaction against extravagance, foreign and domestic, against the unceasing pressure for Federal expansionism, is a factor of growing significance.

There may well be a wide gulf between public enthusiasm for New Frontier policies and personal sympathy for an earnest young man who is doing his best as he sees it to master the world's toughest job.

The Three D's of County Government—Dollars, Development, and Direction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 2, 1962

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Honorable Ed Munro, one of the King County commissioners, in Washington State, delivered the keynote address at the National Association of County Officials western regional district meeting in Phoenix, on January 26, 1962.

He had been assigned the topic "County Leadership in Community Development," but reduced this to "The Three D's of County Government—Dollars, Development, and Direction."

The way Commissioner Munro, former chairman of the ways and means committee of the House of Representatives of the Washington State Legislature, defined the role of each in helping communities and their county to grow should be of prime concern to all of us.

I ask unanimous consent that Commissioner Munro's keynote address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE THREE D'S OF COUNTY GOVERNMENT—DOLLARS, DEVELOPMENT, AND DIRECTION

(By Ed Munro)

County government, sorely beset on the one side with onrushing metropolitan problems and on the other with archaic laws handicapping its role in government, faces into the future uncertain and groping for answers. As if these problems were not enough, individuals elected to county government every few years must continually stay abreast of their political barometer or face extinction. Perhaps because of this, and many other discouraging factors could be added, it is particularly hopeful at this time that the rumblings and stirrings have caused county government to bestir itself and look around.

In the survey of jobs that were not done and problems that were not met, many people discovered that county government had a basic structure that may, and I say "may" advisedly, be the answer to community development and metropolitan problems. Many people discovered that the incorporation statutes could be used to freeze the status quo of our living into a mold retaining a rural flavor. In many cases these incorporations did nothing more than attempt to halt the flow of the metropolis into rural areas. With so many of these incorporations moving ahead, thinking individuals in county government looked at its hold card and found that cities could not answer these problems and that in many cases only a concept of government, such as metropolitan authorities, could answer their problems, or perhaps county government.

These problems—water, recreation, water safety, open space, sewage, mass transportation, flood control, parks, police protection, fire protection—forced themselves on county commissioners, whether they liked it or not. Those county commissioners that rose to meet the issues head on discovered that within their old, weak structure they had one thing which no other existing governmental unit had; namely, overall geographic and political authority, and some commissioners gave thought to expanding this to political, economic, and sociological authority. For county government could be unique.

It could move to be an overall coordinating authority on many levels and still work within the local framework.

The problems of today are essentially problems of developing an urban society within a relatively short time. It used to be the American dream for every farm boy to earn enough money to live in the city. Nowadays it is our dream to earn enough money to move back to the country. But when we move back to the country, we want all of the conveniences of the city—water, lights, flush toilets, paved streets, fire protection, police protection, parks, schools, etc.

County Commissioners can provide leadership in community development when they realize that the public's understanding of county government changes from that of the graveyard of political ambitions to one of an exciting new development of local responsibilities. Too often we think only of the details of our job—the patronage, the political considerations in terms of being good to our friends and also our enemies—the details of keeping house—without the understanding that a new structure must be built. This challenge is up to us—if we do not rise to it—then some other form of government, such as an authority or a metropolitan authority, may move in. The needs of the 1960's are going to be met whether we like it or not and the people in the suburban areas are going to keep on clamoring for them.

A demonstration of what I mean is the way King County government has moved in the area of flood control. With an understanding of the problem, the commissioners moved directly to the people, passed a multimillion dollar levy, then moved to the legislature and received the authority to move ahead. We met with the Corps of Engineers on one project and moved ahead with that; we met with the cities and towns in another part of the county and accepted sponsorship from the Soil Conservation Service of the USDA for that project and ordered our flood control section to move on with a comprehensive overall program.

What does this require of us? First, it requires understanding. Second, it requires determined action to move ahead. Third, it requires that we occasionally risk our political necks; namely, we must change our image from that of being political hacks to that of decisive and understanding politicians. By politicians, I mean one who understands the art and science of government.

In considering the topic assigned to me for this morning of "County Leadership in Community Development" and in looking over the session's full agenda, my thoughts consistently kept falling into three categories—dollars, development, and direction.

Although my years as a county commissioner have been very short indeed compared with many in this room, the greater part of my time has been involved in public activity or service of some kind; many of those years in the Washington State Legislature. A part of that legislative experience involved the chairmanship of the powerful ways and means committee which would tend to explain the nature of my reaction to our program. In any case, I would like to direct my remarks then to what might logically be considered the prime objectives of county officials in meeting their public responsibility, and, to what I feel this conference is all about—dollars, development, and direction.

These are the three basic tools with which we, as county officials, have to work. Sometimes the first, dollars, are pretty scarce. The second, development, we've inherited from the previous administration. And the third, direction, is a definite variable depending upon the agreement of the other county officials with your particular viewpoint.

But of the three, direction has the greatest potential for bringing about the kind of an economic, physical and political climate or environment which will attract the kind of development you would like to see.

Dollars, or county revenue from all sources are primarily dependent upon the type and extent of development. But the most effective use of that tax dollar is dependent upon direction.

Development in turn is also dependent upon direction to a very large extent, with the obvious exception of the limitations imposed by an area's natural resources, human resources, and geographic location.

The type of leadership exercised by county officials, I would submit, is the key point of emphasis and should be the attitude in which we should approach these workshops and panels.

What kind of direction of leadership are we talking about, as it relates to community development? Promotion? Not particularly—this more logically falls in the hands of the chamber of commerce and similar groups. Providing industrial lands at little or no cost to potential industrialists? Not necessarily, although this may be a byproduct of a related effort by other groups. Tax differential benefits to entice development? Possibly, but this, too, is a byproduct.

Our primary role of direction should concentrate upon creating a public image of county government which denotes vigorous leadership, economic stability, and the ability to pinpoint responsibility. This type of an image cannot be artificially created, but must come from a demonstrated ability to intelligently direct the affairs of the county.

In order to do this we must first know what we are now—physically, socially, and economically. This must be a very clinical approach if it is to be accurate and lay a firm foundation for evaluation. It is equally important to know what our deficiencies are, as it is to know of our strengths.

It then becomes important, upon an analysis of this information, to spell out what our objectives should be in terms of development. What are those things about our county which we value? What deficiencies should we try to overcome? What characteristics do we wish to protect, perpetuate, or improve upon? In other words, what is it about our county that makes us want to live, work, and play here; and, which would make it attractive for others to want to share in this environment?

At this point, I'd like to digress for a moment to my own county and illustrate the point. We've been advised by our economist that the most important long-range resources we enjoy in the Puget Sound Region is our natural beauty—those natural amenities which make our area a pleasant place to live and work, and which will be determining in attracting the footloose industries to our area—that is, those industries such as research, electronics, et cetera, who are not dependent upon specific locations for marketing or natural resources, but whose primary concern is to locate in a pleasant working and living environment.

As a result, we've attempted to determine specifically what these so-called amenities are, and through that identification, set up a program to protect and perpetuate them.

We are working out cooperatively with our abutting counties and cities, a set of regional development goals designed to accomplish exactly that. A preliminary summary statement just released deals with such elementary goals as: (1) Maintaining clean air and cleaning up our air pollution, (2) maximumizing the recreational value of our many lakes and streams and of Puget Sound, (3) taking greater advantage of our topography in residential development to realize scenic benefits heretofore taken for granted, and (4) encouraging greater use and protection of our natural vegetation in development to perpetuate the visual feeling of greenness and openness.

Many other similar goals dealing with our natural amenities have also been identified. These are complemented by a series of goals dealing with utility, i.e., the efficiency of movement, the general workability of the arrangement of the uses of land, and the adequacy of public services.

After obtaining a concensus on these broad goals we will inquire into the governmental problems we could expect in accomplishing them—problems in terms of legislative capability, financial abilities, and political abilities.

A shakedown of these goals will then be translated into a body of policy to provide guidelines for decisions, as we carry out the plan of action finally determined.

In other words we are attempting to extricate ourselves from the vulnerable position of always having to react to immediate needs and pressures, and instead to put ourselves in a position of leadership whereby we can anticipate our needs, and help to shape our future development.

With a clear plan of action before us, we're confident we can maintain an attractive environment which will encourage the kind of development desired. At the same time we hope to be in a better position to get the most mileage out of our tax dollar. This will require better physical and fiscal planning and programing.

It is with this in mind, that I look forward to this conference. We're anxious to learn more about how to harness our human assets; how to evaluate our economic resources; what is occurring elsewhere in establishing a plan and perfecting planning machinery; and what are the mechanics of establishing a long-range capital improvement program.

These are the areas in which county government can operate most effectively. To take this type of vigorous approach will require unity of action by the legislative body and singleness of direction by the administrator. We no longer can afford to function as a multiheaded, quasi-legislative, administrative body with no central administration.

Nor can we hope to solve our problems alone, ignoring the influences of our adjoining city and county neighbors and our mutual problems.

County government has been, and should continue to reevaluate its responsibilities, and reorganize to meet them more effectively. I don't expect there will be any one single answer as to how this should be done. But certainly the demands now being made upon county government will result in many cases in either another level taking its place, or the county taking on a more active and encompassing role than it has been historically willing to do.

The answer as to which course of action will be taken depends primarily upon us in the kind of leadership we choose to exercise as county officials.

Thank you.

Federal Debt Dwarfs Local Bond Totals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 2, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Federal Debt Dwarfs Local Bond Totals," which appeared in the January 17, 1962, edition of the Evansville Courier.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL DEBT DWARFS LOCAL BOND TOTALS

No matter how solvent you may think you are, the fact remains that you owe somewhere around $1,750 you aren't likely to pay off soon. So does every other member of your family.

The $1,750 represents your approximate share of Federal and local government debt. The Federal debt is hovering somewhere near the $300 billion mark. The total for government units in Vanderburgh County, estimated recently by Tax Research Bureau, is between $25 and $26 million.

These figures are too big for most of us to comprehend. It is of little use to be told that you could spend $1,000 a day for the next 777 years to get rid of a billion, or that a billion-dollars worth of $10 bills would make a stack 5.7 miles high.

It makes a little more sense to be told that a billion dollars breaks down to $5.41 for every man, woman and child in the United States.

In those terms, it is possible to make some comparison of Federal and local government debt. Of the $1,750 or so that you owe, $1,586 is tied up in the Federal debt. The $25 million or so that local government units have borrowed adds an extra $162.

Recall once again that you have a $5.41 stake in every billion dollars the Federal Government handles. That means a saving of a mere $5 billion a year—less than 6 percent of total Federal spending—would be enough to wipe out all local government debt in 6 years.

The figures go far toward explaining the bitter battles that will be fought, during the next few months, over seemingly insignificant hundreds of millions in the Federal budget. The role of the Federal Government has become so large that even a slight change in its spending policies has a vast effect upon the Nation.

Again and again, we are reminded that more effective local government is a promising method to prevent the growing centralization of our society. We are told somewhat less frequently, though, that this is a question of dollars and cents as much as it is a matter of abstract theory.

As long as the Federal Government collects an overwhelming share of tax revenues and contracts for an overwhelming share of the public debt, it is bound to play a dominant role in our everyday lives. It's the only unit of government that can afford to.

The struggle for economy, then, is more than just a question of a few extra dollars of take-home pay. It's also a question of whether cities, counties, and States are going to get a large enough share of the national income to let them meet the problems that confront our citizens on the local level.

A Test of the U.N.'s Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 2, 1962

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in the New York Times of January 29 there was published a very thoughtful editorial entitled "A Test of U.N.'s Future." The editorial deals with the question of the United Nations' bond issue, a matter which will be before the Senate before very long. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TEST OF U.N.'S FUTURE

The present strength and future vigor of the United Nations is at stake in the $200 million bond issue which was sanctioned by the General Assembly last December and has now been formally offered by Acting Secretary General U Thant.

These bonds will run for 25 years at 2 percent interest. They are for sale to governments, and President Kennedy is asking Congress to authorize the administration to buy up to $100 million of them.

The need for this money arises out of the refusal of certain governments to pay their share of the cost of the U.N. Emergency Force in the Gaza Strip and of the U.N. forces in the Congo. Specifically, Russia and other Communist countries, and likewise most of the Arab States, have failed to contribute to the Gaza patrol. Russia and other states, including France, Belgium, Portugal and South Africa, have boycotted the Congo operation.

The frankly expressed theory of the dissident governments is that no U.N. member need pay an assessment for any activity of which that member does not approve. If this opinion were to be upheld by the World Court, to which it has been submitted, the U.N. would either end in bankruptcy or survive as a partisan alliance or a powerless debating society.

If, therefore, the United States buys any of the proposed bonds it runs the risk of losing its money—or something less than 60 cents per capita of our population. Some of this money will come out of our own pockets, anyhow, since we furnish nearly one-third of U.N.'s regular revenue. And Russia, so long as she continues to pay most of her assessment for U.N.'s routine expenses, cannot be deprived of her General Assembly vote, as provided in the charter for members falling 2 full years behind. What she can be deprived of, if the World Court so rules, is the moral sanction for her recalcitrance.

As for ourselves, the purchase of these bonds would be an act of faith. It would be an affirmation of our belief in even an imperfect United Nations as against anarchy. It would state our hope for the future.

Cuba Condemned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 2, 1962

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Cuba Condemned," which was published yesterday in the Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CUBA CONDEMNED

It is difficult for us to follow the reasoning of those who interpret the actions taken at the conference of OAS foreign ministers as a blow to the prestige of the United States.

True enough, our delegation, ably led by Secretary of State Rusk, did not get all that it would have liked. One seldom does in gatherings of this sort. And on the key resolution—that to exclude Cuba from the Organization of American States—we just managed to muster the necessary two-thirds vote. But even this was a considerable achievement—much more than was in reach a year ago. Furthermore, those countries which refused to support the resolution—Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Mexico, Bolivia, and Ecuador—did not vote against it. Instead, they abstained—not because they wanted Cuba in the OAS but because they doubted the legality of exclusion without amendment of the OAS treaty, and also because of political considerations in their countries.

This more hopeful estimate of the Punta del Este meeting is supported by the vote, unanimous except for Cuba, to condemn Castro's Communist regime and to declare it incompatible with inter-American principles. In addition, we obtained favorable action on several other resolutions—perhaps of lesser importance but all contributing to an indictment of Cuban communism, an indictment which, in our opinion, heralds a significant awakening throughout Latin America to the threat which Castroism raises, not just for one country, but for all.

No one supposes, of course, that the walls of the Communist bastion in Cuba will start crumbling tomorrow as a result of the Punta del Este decisions. The fact remains, however, that the Castro regime has been ostracized, has been branded, in effect, as a hemispheric outlaw, and the possible long-range benefits from this should not be underestimated.

There is perhaps one other point worth mentioning. Those who take a pessimistic view of what has been done say the unwillingness of six countries, including the biggest in Latin America, to vote with us reflects an emerging spirit of independence and means that they will no longer docilely follow the lead of the United States. Assuming this to be the case, it hardly follows that it is a blow to our own country. We would suggest that, if anything, it is a blow to Fidel Castro. For it will make it more difficult for him to peddle his propaganda line that the OAS is nothing but a complaisant tool of "Yankee imperialism."

Imperfect Is Right

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, Congress cannot in conscience vote $100 million of U.S. Treasury funds for the purchase of United Nations bonds. Such action would only serve to preserve the membership of Soviet Russia and other delinquents—and I use the word advisedly—in an organization whose service to mankind is becoming questioned even by its once most ardent advocates. At the conclusion of these remarks I should like to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Sunday Star of January 14, 1962, as an indication of the reappraisals that are being made in the light of the United Nations record.

There is, of course, the argument that, in order to be consistent, a nation that has contributed $3 billion to Communist Yugoslavia in the past decade or so, should not hesitate to put another $100 million into the U.N. pot. That type of sophistry contains more logic than the other reasons advanced for our underwriting the spy center in New York City.

What the United States must decide, Mr. Speaker, is whether the national interest benefits by our membership in an organization that—by its record of the past year, at least—has for its primary purpose the destruction of colonialism where anti-Communist colonials are involved. But why confine our analysis to the past year? From the time that the United Nations was conceived and organized under the auspices of Josef Stalin and Alger Hiss, there is no record of its serving as a bulwark against communism or to advance the cause of freedom.

Better that we had surrendered our membership during the fiasco in Korea. The very nation that exercised veto power over every attempt at a fair determination of United Nations policies stood firmly behind the bandits of Red China who attempted to overrun the peoples we had pledged to protect in the Korean Peninsula. By one of the strangest dicta in the history of warfare, an opposing force was forbidden to pursue its attackers across a specified line. And what has the United Nations done to release American prisoners who have been held these many long years since the so-called Korean truce? What did the United Nations do to assist in the abortive attempt of Hungarian patriots to free their country from the yoke of their oppressors—or to dissuade the Kremlin from crushing the valiant uprising with tanks manned by Russian personnel?

Mr. Speaker, if one will but list the advances of communism as against the gains of anticommunism since the founding of the United Nations, he will have no difficulty deciding whether to award another million dollars to the exchequer of that organization. Look at what has happened to Tibet, Laos, Berlin, Cuba and Vietnam. In no instance did the United Nations seek to intervene in the cause of freedom. In the case of Goa, Nehru's unwarranted invasion met no objection at the U.N. and is apparently a closed matter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if there are any anti-Communist gains of note, they too should be listed in the ledger so that a proper accountancy can be made before another contribution is to come from the American taxpayers' pocketbook. We have been carrying the load for this band of brigands from the start. We had been given to believe that delinquency on the part of a participating nation would result in its dismissal, but now failure to live up to one's obligations would be rewarded by the purchase of bonds by the U.S. Government to cover the deficit. If, as President Kennedy suggests, the bond proposal has any material value, then why does the United Nations not place the issue on the world market for public sale? Here is an opportunity to find out just how popular the United Nations is among the people who are paying for its upkeep. As for the sale of the bonds in this country, we must insist upon a provision that will not permit buyers to write off for tax purposes any losses that might be incurred. If the bonds are sufficiently attractive, they will sell without any such concessions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you will notice that I have made no reference to the Congo in this discussion. The original United Nations position was to bring into submission the one province that sought to avoid the Red beartrap. Later, the U.N. muzzles were pointed in the direction of Oriental. I have not yet had an opportunity to read the evening newspapers, so I cannot be sure of prevailing action to continue the Congo confusion. It is safe to assume, however, that given continued interference rights, the U.N. will provide the mechanism for Communist infiltration and eventual supremacy in the Congo when the dust has cleared.

President Kennedy himself indicated his distrust of or lack of confidence in the United Nations when he dispatched a special emissary to the Congo during the height of the military action against Moise Tshombe.

I will vote against giving the White House authority to tap the U.S. Treasury for $100 million to buy bonds to pay Russia's bills in the U.N. or anywhere else. Failure of the Kremlin to meet its obligations in this capacity would seem to offer an excellent opportunity to get the entire Red delegation out of the United Nations once and for all. So long as this criminal element remains in membership, the United Nations has as much chance of succeeding in the cause of liberty and integrity as a police commission which has murderers, racketeers, and thugs assisting in the formulation of its policies and exercise of its duties.

The Star editorial follows:

IMPERFECT IS RIGHT

The President, in the course of his report on the state of the Union, said that the United Nations is "our instrument and our

hope" in keeping the peace. And then he added: "I see little merit in the impatience of those who would abandon this imperfect world instrument because they dislike our imperfect world."

This strikes us as an imperfect analysis of the reasons why many people are losing confidence in the United Nations.

It is true, we suppose, that most of us dislike this imperfect world. Only the village idiot could think it is the best of all possible worlds. But this has very little to do with the public's disenchantment with the U.N. If the President really believes that the disaffection can be attributed merely to dislike of an imperfect world he is deluding himself—and helping to dig the U.N.'s grave.

The reasons, we think, go deeper. The United Nations will not retain respect and support in this country if it is to be influenced by considerations of expediency as opposed to principle. The distinction between that which is right and that which is wrong must be made. The clamorous and often irrational demands of the so-called newly emerged countries cannot be satisfied at the expense of justice to other countries. The U.N. must not become a sounding board and a vehicle for Communist propaganda—aided and abetted by delegates from the nonalined countries who ought to know better, but who apparently do not.

Above all else, as we see it, the United States must not let itself be caught up and swept along in the treacherous currents that are running through the U.N. It was wrong for us to support the resolution on Angola—a resolution which we knew to be inequitable but which we voted for in the hope of harvesting some good will in the Afro-Asian bloc. We were wrong in voting for the unjust resolution of November 24 on Katanga because we did not want the Congolese representative in the U.N. to "go home empty-handed."

Our guess would be that not too many Americans, as of this time, want to abandon the U.N. But the number will increase, and increase rapidly, unless there is a change for the better in the U.N. itself. Mr. Kennedy, instead of blaming it all on dislike of an imperfect world, should be insisting upon and leading the demand for such a change—especially as far as the role of the United States in the U.N. is concerned.

Freeman's First Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 2, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Freeman's First Year" which appeared in the January 19, 1962 edition of the Indianapolis News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEMAN'S FIRST YEAR

For the American farmer, the returns now are in for the first Kennedy year. Farm prices—under the Freeman feed-grain fiasco and other price tinkering—averaged 79 percent of parity in 1961—a 22-year low.

It is necessary to go back to the prewar year of 1939 to find a lower average return for farmers.

On the other side of the ledger, farmers had record costs in 1961. They reached 302 percent of the 1910–14 average. Increased prices for the things farmers have to buy—like used automobiles and trucks, feed and motor supplies—more than offset lower quotations for building and fencing materials.

On the taxpayer and Government-cost front, there was a tie for the alltime high in farm production, despite the promises of Freeman et al that the feed-grain miracle dosage would cut the price-depressing surpluses in the Government bins.

The first Kennedy farm year was a huge and costly flop, not only to the farmers but to everybody who pays taxes.

It is a warning signal. The people, through their Congress, have every reason to beware of the so-far-unrevealed new second-year Kennedy-Freeman farm quackery. The uncertainty itself, in view of the damage done last year, is enough to discourage farmers as they sit down this winter and try to plan another year.

The more the Government tries to run our agriculture, the worse it gets. The only cure is a staged return to free production and free marketing. We hope our Indiana farmers let their Congressmen know what they know—that another year of Kennedy-Freemanism in their affairs could spell ruin for many of them.

The Federal Road to Bankruptcy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 2, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "The Federal Road to Bankruptcy," by Mr. Gordon Hanna, editor, which appeared in the January 19, 1962, edition of the Evansville Press.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FEDERAL ROAD TO BANKRUPTCY

(By Gordon Hanna)

I wonder how many of us really grasp the size of the Federal budget—the amount of money President Kennedy is proposing that the Government spend in the next fiscal year?

I'm afraid we have gotten so used to reading about government spending in terms of billions that we have become calloused. And the new budget figure, $92½ billion is so astronomical that to an individual it is almost meaningless.

The average person, if he can bear to think about the Federal budget or try to understand it at all, is probably more concerned about how much it is up or down than in the total size. And the budget has seldom been anything but up in recent years.

In just 10 years, since Dwight Eisenhower was first inaugurated as President, Federal Government spending has increased almost 50 percent. And when Ike took office we were involve in the Korean war. Since then the nation has been at peace.

It is true that the threat of world communism has forced us to increase the size of our military forces, develop new weapons and race Soviet Russia to conquer space. All this has cost billions and will cost billions more.

But the biggest increases in spending have nothing to do with our national security. They are the result of new and expanded schemes through which the Federal Government attempts to become more and more involved in the daily lives of more and more people.

The causes are frequently as questionable as the results obtained.

Trouble is that we are doing much of this with money we really haven't got. Since World War II we have ended a few years with rather meager surpluses in the Federal Treasury. But most years there have been deficits, ranging as high as $12 billion.

We spend more and more and the national debt grows bigger and bigger. And as it grows it pyramids. Already the interest is taking 10 cents out of every dollar the Government collects in taxes.

Most disturbing is the fact that there are many in our society—including some in places of high influence in Washington—who are not concerned. With their gobbledegook and way-out theories they preach of the need for even more spending "in the public sector" and pooh-pooh those who advocate fiscal responsibility.

They have been riding high since Franklin Roosevelt first dismissed any worry about the Federal debt with a smile and the statement that "we owe it to ourselves."

The fact is, of course, that this is not true. What is true is that we have really borrowed from our children so we could spend wildly today. We have mortgaged their future for a good many generations.

They will have had no voice in how the money was spent, and quite possibly receive no benefit at all as a result of that spending.

President Kennedy has submitted what he calls a balanced budget, despite its size. If he and his financial advisers really believe this, they must be the wildest of dreamers.

Even if revenues make the predicted jump upward and exceed expenditures this year, it will be a situation that cannot last. Every year cannot be a boom year in the revenue department. And built into this budget is the start of a variety of programs that will go on and on. Even bigger spending lies ahead.

There is big spending in the good years because, the public sector boys will say, the time to develop new programs is when we can afford them. And the Government spends big in the lean years because it is needed to bolster the economy.

How much longer can all of this go on? None of us can say for sure.

An individual living beyond his means, and with 10 percent of his income committed just to interest on his debts, could not long avoid bankruptcy.

The case of the Government is not entirely different. Yet the Government can and does control the economy to a large degree.

When a Government's credit is impaired it can issue more money. But the money isn't worth as much, so the result is runaway inflation. More and more dollars buy less and less goods and services.

The almost certain route to such catastrophe is continued deficit spending—paying out more year after year than we take in.

A great many have tried, but nobody, nowhere has ever succeeded in spending himself rich.

Protestant Church Work in Slums of Brazil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 2, 1962

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in the past year our attention has been focused

to a considerable extent on the problems in Latin America and upon our efforts to alleviate some of those problems.

In the January 17 issue of the Lutheran there is an article by Stewart W. Herman entitled "Cold Charity Is Not the Answer," which discusses some of the work being done by Protestant church groups in the slums or favelas of Brazil.

In view of the pertinence of this work to our overall program in Latin America, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLD CHARITY IS NOT THE ANSWER

(By Stewart W. Herman)

Fortaleza on the northern coast of Brazil has charm and vitality. Not the pulsating staccato of supermodern São Paulo, nor the quaint antiquity of an Ouro Preto, but the natural vigor and vivid color of equatorial America untrammeled by tourists. Its rich people have not been demoralized by luxury nor its poor by laziness. Fortaleza is not self-conscious. This quality is rare in a world full of communities which feel compelled to live up to what the travel posters say about them.

The big thrill of a Fortaleza day is not to watch planes land at the airport, nor to gather near the station when the trains come in, but to stand on the beach as the fishing fleet comes home with the day's catch. The boats are rough-cut balsa rafts rigged with a tall sail on a curved mast and they ride the rollers right up to the shore under full canvas.

There in the deep sand a slithering, silvery deep-sea harvest is equitably divided among the three- or four-man crew. Baskets of fresh fish are then hawked through the narrow streets around the main square or offered in the public market from which—under the tolerant eye of a gaudy Virgin—nothing salable seems to be excluded.

It is unbelievably picturesque. But to the west of the city, behind the municipal cemetery, sprawls the favela of Pirambu which has some electric lines but no sewage system. A favela is a homemade slum.

To the south is another city of squatters on land which appropriately belongs to the navy because it is occasionally inundated. When high water comes the people move out of their shacks for a few days until the water subsides and they can return to repair the damage. Even this looks picturesque. Squalor is almost impossible to catch on color slides.

Average family income comes to about 40 cents per day—when things go well. One father catches a few fish and sells them. Another is a water carrier to regular customers (like a milk route), drawing his supply from a public well and carrying it from door to door.

Washerwomen earn their living beating out clothes on the bank of the placid tropical inlet. It is surprising how many slum dwellers seem to be able to eke out an existence. Above all, people generally like to live together.

Even more picturesque are the slums of Manaus, a thousand miles up the Amazon River in the midst of a thinly populated jungle. During the rubber boom nearly a century ago a fabled opera house was built and world-famous singers traveled there by river steamers to collect fat fees. That pink and white theater, recently redecorated, is still the city's jewel, far more beautiful and better situated than the cathedral.

But today there is a second Manaus consisting of houseboats linked by haphazard boardwalks, which is even more incredible than the original rubber port. Fifty thousand people are reported to be living on the rent-free water, although an empire of emptiness stretches all around them beyond the city limits.

We asked one man why he settled here. Two years ago a daughter—one of seven children—fell ill and needed "city" treatment, so he paid the equivalent of $80 for the two-room flatboat but hopes to return to farming. Can he do it?

The big problem of Amazonia is communications. Waterways have not yet been replaced by highways. The romance of living in a palm-thatched hut built on stilts near the bank of a mile-wide river carries with it certain disadvantages, especially the absence of educational and medical facilities.

Such homes may be surrounded by banana, cocoa, rubber, and brazil nut trees but the sense of isolation from civilization is overwhelming. Until more of the amenities of modern life can be transported into the back country, the country people will be drawn to the city even if it means festering around its meanest edges.

Even the river holds hidden dangers in the form of small fish, the Piranha, which, when aroused, can strip a man or a cow to the bones in a matter of minutes.

What is the business of the church is this situation? One Baptist pastor, whose ramshackle church stands in the midst of a favela, organized the Amazon Foundation to plant schools and clinics among the poor and send a motor launch up and down the waterways to minister to people and cope with emergencies.

One such school—a tumbledown wooden structure—is located in a shantytown of 50,000 people, including 12,000 children. Of these only about 1,000 know what going to school means. Like most schools in rural Brazil, it is also a UNICEF milk station.

Our guide for 2 days was the Provincial Vice Governor, Joel Ferreira, with a fascinating lifestory to tell. Born of a poor family, he could neither read nor write until at the age of 16 he began to educate himself. At the same time he had come into contact with Protestant missions, and is today a leading member of the same Baptist church whose pastor launched the Amazon Foundation on a shoestring.

Today he presides over the Provincial legislature—the first Protestant to do so—and his constituency is still in the slum areas where he is building schools and clinics. He strongly supports any appeal for American food and clothing, but only if it is distributed in a responsible manner through the churches and contributes to a solid self-help program. No cold charity.

All through northern Brazil a series of Protestant social welfare councils has been organized, looking toward the arrival of relief shipments from Lutheran World Relief and Church World Service. The committee in Manaus consists primarily of two Presbyterian and five Baptist missions, as well as the Assemblies of God and Salvation Army.

There is no regular Lutheran work here, but the person responsible for this plan on the national level is an American pastor, John Nasstrom of the Augustana Church, who first went to Brazil in 1959 on behalf of CWS and LWR. He was later elected first secretary of the Brazilian Protestant Social Welfare Department. His salary is now being paid by the Division of LWF Affairs of the National Lutheran Council.

Brazilian Lutherans are entering more and more actively into cooperative Christian social action. They provide Pastor Nasstrom's secretary and have taken special offerings for the stricken areas. But the problem of urban slums is just as acute in southern Brazil where most of the Lutherans are concentrated as it is in the north. This is the temperate zone and more highly industrialized.

One morning Pastor Koch and I toured the favelas around Porto Alegre, booming city of the southern coast. The pattern was much the same as up north, except that the houses in their crowded alleys were, on the average, slightly more substantial than those nearer the Equator. Winter winds and rains come to Porto Alegre. Also, there was more of an organized effort at self-help.

In one favela a cooperative had been established, involving membership and monthly contributions which were carefully dispensed toward community projects such as installation of water taps every couple blocks, or the equipment of a sports club and social center. But the only church we saw was a very small Assemblies of God chapel. Since our visit Pastor Koch writes that the men of his congregation have decided to plant a Lutheran social center in that favela.

What the Baptists have done for the slums of Manaus or what the Lutherans can do in slums of Porto Alegre may seem to be little more than a tiny drop in the vast bucket of Brazil's need. But what all the Protestants—or all the Christians—can do in the way of pilot projects can add up to a very great deal. Here is one of the new missionary frontiers of the church.

Some of the urban shantytowns have been in existence for years. We talked to one family living in a favela of 2,500 souls who said they had squatted on the swampy land for 20 years, and many of their neighbors too. One mother told us that six of her eleven children had died in the filthy shack, and her 20-year-old daughter was expecting her third baby. The first two had already died. We heard similar stories dozens of times.

But now the spotlight is being turned on Latin America. Millions of people are beginning to ask themselves whether such conditions must be tolerated any longer. This is a part of the complex social revolution about which there is so much talk.

The concentration of so many disinherited families on the outskirts of America's great cities is regarded by thoughtful people not only as a social blight but as political dynamite. No wonder governments are worried. But for the Christian church the issue is as simple as this, "Whosoever seeth his brother in need."

Sound Advice on Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 2, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Briton's Sound Advice on Foreign Aid," which appeared in the January 23, 1962, edition of the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITON'S SOUND ADVICE ON FOREIGN AID

Our Washington Government's persistent obsession for scattering foreign aid billions indiscriminately all over the world and throwing our country more and more into shocking multibillion-dollar debt in

doing so, indirectly received a highly pertinent rebuke from a distinguished Briton serving his country in a diplomatic capacity in the United States.

He is the Right Honorable Sir David Ormsby Gore, British Ambassador to the United States. When he was asked whether his government contemplated a more extensive program of aid to less-developed countries his answer indeed should be most seriously considered by our naive foreign-aiders. Sir David said:

"The first thing to say in answer to this question is that, of course, you can't do a great deal in the way of aid until you are earning a good surplus. You can't invest a deficit in foreign countries * * *. I think if you look at our record—we come second only to the United States of America—and we would, of course, like to increase the amount of aid that we give. But I think our first priority at the present time, is to strengthen our own economy, so that we do generate the resources which will enable us to expand the help we are giving."

In sharp contrast the United States continues to spend more and more billions on foreign aid, even though we do not have the money. For last year the amount approved by the Congress at the request of President Kennedy, was $3,914,600,000. It requires but little imagination to visualize how much this contributed toward the deficit in the operation of the Government last year.

And the President and the Congress certainly should begin to realize what the continuous flow of gold from the U.S. Treasury into those of foreign countries is going to do to our American dollar. And here is where the British Ambassador's sound advice most pertinently applies. For we certainly can no more afford to invest a deficit in foreign countries than the British can.

For our American dollar is no more exempt from immutable economic laws than is the British pound.

Across the Line Fence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Earl Beall, assistant general manager of the Mississippi Federated Cooperatives—AAL—has presented very effective arguments in favor of an appropriation of $250 million to continue during fiscal year 1963 the agricultural conservation program at its present rate.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Beall's column which appeared in the January issue of the MFC Co-Op News:

ACROSS THE LINE FENCE

(By Earl Beall)

For many years past the Congress has appropriated $250 million annually to cover the Government share in carrying out soil building and soil conserving practices under the agricultural conservation program. In the most recent years the Bureau of the Budget, which is an arm of the White House, while recommending increases for foreign aid, urban development, and Federal aid to education has at the same time recommended regularly a cut of $100 million in the funds available for carrying on the agricultural conservation program. We think that this action rests upon a mistaken belief that the farm vote of this country can be ignored in future elections and Government funds spent in other areas in the hope that the city vote and the leftwing vote will outweigh the loss of the farm vote. It is distressing to think that the subject of the natural resources of this country should be considered in a political atmosphere, but such seems to be the case.

It is expected that the Bureau of the Budget will again this year recommend cutting the funds for the agricultural conservation program by $100 million and again it will be the responsibility of Congress to restore the needed funds for that vital work.

It has been reliably estimated that efficiencies in production during the past 20 years have resulted in increasing the value of farm products by $13 billion annually. Of course, that amount of money has not been realized by the producers themselves. The savings of improvement in productive efficiency has gone to the consumer, in spite of the fact that many of those savings have been wiped out by added costs of marketing and distribution.

The producers of food and fiber in this country are subsidizing the American public billions of dollars every year through the sale of efficiently produced, high quality, low-priced farm products. The expenditure of $250 million annually to conserve and improve the soil, where these standard of living commodities are grown, seems to be the wisest of investments.

High Aim: Freer World Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, our country through the years has faced momentous challenges, the responses to which have set the course of the Republic. In the past, our Nation has rallied to meet these challenges with understanding and resolve. Today we are again faced with a challenge upon which our very future as a free nation in a free world depends. I refer to the Soviet resolve to extend its influence throughout the world by an extensive economic offensive designed, as Khrushchev boasted, to "bury" us.

To meet this challenge, President Kennedy, on January 25, sent to the Congress a special message outlining a wholly new plan as our answer to Khrushchev's threat.

The distinguished chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, the Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS, of Arkansas, on the same day, introduced H.R. 9900 which may go down in history as one of the most important pieces of landmark legislation upon which we will act in the decade of the sixties. Now, this country stands at the eve of a historic national debate. Upon the outcome of this debate will depend the economic strength of the free world and the political unity of the West.

The national magazine, Life, joins the debate in an editorial entitled "High Aim: Freer World Trade." This editorial provides a wise analysis of the new factors which we now face and sets forth the reasons why the President's program provides the basis for a national policy. The editorial concludes that, "friends of free enterprise, of a stronger U.S. economy and of world prosperity, will back it all the way." Because it is my firm conviction that editorial statesmanship of the high order exhibited by Life in its current issue is a public service and should be made as widely available to the American public as possible, I include it in the RECORD of these proceedings.

HIGH AIM: FREER WORLD TRADE

The President has now spelled out his new policy for foreign trade and thus launched the most important congressional debate of 1962. It can, as he says, "affect the unity of the West, the course of the cold war and the growth of our Nation for a generation or more to come." It's a long time since a tariff debate could be described so urgently.

For the first 150 years of this Republic, the tariff question was a recurrent but scarcely a national issue. It was notoriously "a local issue." The tariffs set by Congress (usually high) were the result of local and sectional logrolling, not a national consensus. Not even John C. Calhoun tried to argue theoretical free trade, or pretended that the low tariffs he wanted for the sake of cotton exports were good for the infant industries of the North. After 1934 this ancient local issue became no issue at all. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act took the rates away from the logrollers and gave them to the President; but at the same time tariffs ceased to be important in international trade. They were eclipsed by the more powerful devices of quotas and exchange controls, which governed trade patterns for nearly 30 years, especially in Europe. It is a measure of Europe's recent progress that it has dropped most of its quantitative and exchange controls and so made tariffs important again.

Tariffs are now doubly important because the Common Market, in suppressing its members' tariffs toward each other, increases their effectiveness against imports from nonmembers, especially the U.S. Western Europe now takes 30 percent of our exports. It will take a lot more as its Common Market prosperity goes on rising—but not unless its common external tariff goes down. To bargain it down with reciprocal concessions, Kennedy needs more tariff-cutting power than a President has ever had.

He asks for a general power to cut any tariff by as much as 50 percent and a specific power to eliminate some tariffs entirely. He will use this power only to win comparable concessions by other countries, including the removal of their remaining quantitative restrictions. He will especially seek hospitable treatment of U.S. farm products. In view of our own balance-of-payments problem, which demands a substantial increase in U.S. exports, the administration will have every reason to be a tough negotiator with the Common Market. But U.S. negotiating power must be beefed up first.

Kennedy's bill contains many loopholes and exceptions to make it more palatable to the protectionists; he may even have gone too far in this respect. The mechanics of the program will be clarified in the coming debate. But in following this debate, the disinterested citizen should keep in mind three major facts about the new policy as a whole.

First, a U.S. President is being forehanded for once. The new Common Market tariff structure has not yet begun to hurt our exporters (many of them, even more forehanded, have sought sanctuary by building new plants in Europe). The President could have waited out this election year until some cries of pain forced him to act. But he decided to act at a time when U.S. policy can shape events instead of being shaped by

them. "If we are to retain our leadership, the initiative is up to us." Acting now, we can influence the Common Market in a direction of freer trade and mutual expansion, thus minimizing the danger of the kind of protectionist wars that ruined world trade in the thirties.

Second, this is a policy that promotes free enterprise, both at home and abroad. Unlike other Kennedy proposals it is not part of the welfare state. On the contrary, it will force many American and European businesses out of their present brick foxholes. This goes for labor as well as management. The life of trade is competition and its aim is to buy cheap and sell dear. The larger the area over which these rules apply, the greater the general prosperity. The U.S. free enterprise system has thrived, in the main, on the constant discovery of new frontiers. Foreign trade, the most expansible frontier on our horizon, involves intensified competition with foreigners. But that should hold no terrors for our economy. Once we enlarge our concept of our economic boundaries, the spirit of progress through competition that has served us so well in our home market will serve us even better in the new.

If the consumer is still sovereign in the U.S. economy, we will welcome Europe's imports for his sake. We will welcome them also as a check on the chronic threat of inflation in the United States. The wage-price spiral will be disciplined by this objective test of our efficiency. It will be a rare industry, under this discipline, that can afford a 25-hour week.

Besides being forehanded and good for free enterprise, the new trade program is a national policy, not a regional one. Unlike the old RTA, which disturbed few trade patterns and hurt almost nobody, Kennedy's program will actually damage some foxhole industries for the greater efficiency of the economy as a whole. It aims to steer the economy in the direction of a wider division of labor. It provides plenty of adjustment help for import-injured industries and their employees, and Congress can be relied on to minimize the hardships. But through the gradual (over 5 years) reduction of tariff protection, it will spur the mobility of labor, raise real (as against apparent) wages, and stimulate our national growth rate.

Moreover, it is a national policy in the sense that it preserves the U.S. interest in a worldwide trading system, not just a North Atlantic one. It aims to generalize the benefits of lower U.S. and European tariffs to other non-Communist nations, notably Japan and Latin America. This aim is not popular in continental Europe, which is now more exclusively Atlantic minded than the United States. But Kennedy is right to insist on a global as well as an Atlantic pattern of expansion, and on an "open partnership" in which all who meet the standards of free, fair competitive trade can share.

Such are the admirably conceived aims of Kennedy's trade program. Sectional and selfish interests will grumble and whittle at it. Its mechanics will take much careful working out. But friends of free enterprise, of a stronger U.S. economy, and of world prosperity will back it all the way.

The Yen for Executive Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 2, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Yen for Executive Power" which appeared in the January 19 edition of the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE YEN FOR EXECUTIVE POWER

There is something about the Presidency of the United States that instills in many Chief Executives an overriding obsession for more and more Executive power, with a corresponding less measure remaining in the Congress. Not all of our Presidents have become thus afflicted—as such exceptions as Herbert Hoover, by contrast, dramatically prove.

Franklin Roosevelt was thus strongly afflicted—yes, more so than any other President in our history. Harry Truman also had a yen for personal power but not nearly so much as F.D.R. Dwight Eisensower had sporadic, though minor attacks of the malady, his lesser affliction being due principally to his not wanting to be burdened too much by the Presidency in general.

President John Kennedy's first year passed without his grasping for too much personal power while he was feeling his way in what he liked to term his "great new responsibility."

Now, however, his honeymoon with the Congress is over and he is seeking a blueprint of individual authority which if exercised to the full measure of its possible scope, could well mark his administration as exercising the greatest degree of Executive power in our history.

For what he actually wants is to divorce Congress of its inherent legislative power and transfer it to himself.

"The time to fix the roof is when the sun is shining," said Kennedy as he asked Congress to surrender its taxing power to him. "The roof doesn't leak and therefore no such radical repair job is necessary," in effect, a few Members of Congress quickly pointed out.

The President not only wants virtually unlimited Executive spending powers, but also broad discretionary powers to cut tariffs, both of which if carried to their ultimate possible conclusion could indeed wreck the economy of the Nation irreparably.

Many of those who tacitly support the President, do not deny that his request is a big grab for executive power, but they argue that the existing times make sweeping Executive power necessary because emergencies can happen so quickly and extensively that Congress cannot cope with them, and that in any event there would not be time enough for Congress to take action. Some of them even cite that depressions (in these times) can descend so speedily that the Nation cannot wait for Congress to cope with the situation and the President must act immediately. And also they contend the same continuing immediate emergency exists in the matter of quickly cutting tariffs and making immediate imperative decisions on international questions. A contemporary pertinently cites that:

"Critics—and a majority of the Congress seem to be critical on this issue—point out that Congress can act in a matter of hours if such speed is required. But many of them see in the President's request the clear implication that he is not concerned with congressional speed so much as he is with congressional competence. They infer that the White House regards the Members of Congress as not sufficiently wise to exercise the taxing power which the Constitution entrusts to them exclusively."

A like White House attitude is obviously implied in the President's request for more sweeping tariff authority than any other Chief Executive has ever had. The only tenable presumption can be that the President is much wiser than any, or all of the Members of Congress collectively. It completely ignores the time-honored axiom that "two (or more) heads are better than one."

And the only logical conclusion must be that the same attitude of the executive branch obtains in the pressure to require congressional committees to hold joint hearings on key matters, notably appropriations, instead of holding separate hearings before the House and Senate committees.

The best possible construction on this theory (and it certainly isn't very good) is that the time of the executive branch bureaucrats is much too valuable to be wasted in answering the questions of two committees, and that therefore, the express distinction between the two Houses should be ignored. Making the House cut the Senate in on its hearings, would, of course, trample roughshod over the constitutional duty of the House to initiate all money bills.

We firmly believe that the majority of the present Congress has enough willpower, enough commonsense and enough reverence for the Constitution to ignore at least some of the more drastic of the Presidential requests.

The Proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the Vicksburg (Miss.) Evening Post in an editorial has cogently presented sound reasons why creation of a Department of Urban Affairs is unwise.

Under unanimous consent, I include this fine editorial from the January 29 issue of the Vicksburg Evening Post, and commend it to the attention of the House:

THE PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND HOUSING

President Kennedy has proposed the creation of a new Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. This measure failed to be reported out in the Congress by the committee, and Mr. Kennedy showed considerable irritation at this in his news conference last week. So much so, that he made it clear he would present a plan of reorganization, which would bring the matter to a vote in the House, thus bypassing the committee.

The charge has been made that southern Democrats on the committee, teaming up with Republicans, bottled up the measure in committee because of the fact that Robert Weaver, a Negro, would be the President's appointee to the new Cabinet post. The charge will also be made that any southerner, or southern newspaper that opposes this new Department, would do so only because a Negro would occupy the Cabinet post. But there are other considerations regarding this proposal that far outweigh the race or color of one appointed to a Cabinet position. The creation of this new Department would bring about increased Federal interference in matters which pertain only to local affairs. Such a new Department would be just another addition to the overall trend toward Federal participation, and eventual control, over every phase of our life. Legislation to back up the creation of this new Department would have the effect of breaking down community self-reliance, for it would increase the subsidy programs, which, in the words of one observer,

"are turning some communities into foster children of the Federal Government."

One of the tragedies of the subsidy and giveaway age, is the weakening of local responsibility. Our States and our cities and towns are not only invited, they are even urged and pressured into receiving all kinds of Federal aid. In effect, the Federal Government has taken the attitude that the problems of local and State conditions cannot be solved by the people affected, and only the paternalistic beneficence of the all-powerful Federal state, can handle the problems. This doctrine is being drummed and drummed into people, and an all too prevalent attitude has been created, wherein the habit has been formed to look toward Washington for assistance in problems and projects that are purely local in character.

Our Nation was built by our forefathers who met their responsibilities and who had self-reliance and the courage to solve their problems. We hear the universal cry of a mounting big government, yet the general trend is to perpetuate it by seeking Federal assistance for almost everything, and by supporting the pet projects of a government which is rapidly becoming one of centralization of power.

The appointment of Robert Weaver to the proposed Cabinet post provides the least serious objection to the creation of this new Department. The new Department proposed is not necessary. It would jeopardize and weaken the efforts of communities to handle their own problems. It would be just another link in the chain of centralized government, and weaken the self-reliance, and the eventual freedom of the citizens of our cities and towns.

Instead of adding to an already top-heavy big government, the greatest service which can be rendered these United States, is to find ways and means of trimming it down, returning supervision and control to the various States and localities, and abiding by the Constitution, which spells out the roles of the Federal and State Governments in clear and unmistakable language.

Dangers Lurk in Shadows of Kennedy's Spending Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 2, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Dangers Lurk in Shadows of Kennedy's Spending Plan," which appeared in the January 18, 1962, edition of the Evansville Press.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DANGERS LURK IN SHADOWS OF KENNEDY'S SPENDING PLAN

When General Eisenhower was running for President in 1952, he set as a goal a Federal budget of something like $60 billion.

He never made it, although he did get down to less than $65 billion.

When the 1958 Eisenhower budget was sent to Congress, the Secretary of the Treasury, George M. Humphrey, predicted that unless the Government's spending trends were reversed, "you will have a depression that will curl your hair."

Now the President of the United States proposes a budget of $92.5 billion—more than 50 percent above Mr. Eisenhower's goal of 10 years ago.

At the same time, Mr. Kennedy proposes raising the debt ceiling to $308 billion—nearly $40 billion over the World War II peak, at the end of 1946.

This, in summary, is the story of the spending explosion which has been generated in Washington—$11 billion over 1961, $16 billion over the last full year of Eisenhower.

All this is being done in the name of the national security. Yet in 1952 the shooting war in Korea was in full swing. In 1952, Government spending was $65.4 billion—nearly $30 billion less than President Kennedy now asks.

It is also being done in the name of economic growth. Yet it was precisely concerned with economic growth which prompted Mr. Humphrey to his "curl your hair" forecast in 1957. The Government then was taking so much money out of the economy, he said, he feared there would not be ample capital to supply the plant, tools, and machinery to meet the needs of the growing population.

The theory locked in the Kennedy budget is the opposite of Mr. Humphrey's worries. It is that the Government, and only the Government, can spark the economy into the pace Washington thinks it should be setting. This by spending.

Banking on an unprecedented $10.9 billion increase in tax revenues (without raising rates) Mr. Kennedy offers Congress a balanced budget. He estimates a surplus of $500 million at the end of the year—a hairline margin. This is based on an assumption that the economy is off on another record-breaking boom. If the assumption is in error (as like assumptions often have been the surplus becomes another big deficit.

Deficits have become a way of life in Washington. Since 1930, there have been only six skimpy surpluses.

Interest alone on the Federal debt is estimated at $9.4 billion in the new budget. This is a dime out of every tax dollar. It is $50.80 for each man, woman, and child in the country.

Yet nowhere in the budget is there even a suggestion that sooner or later the debt must be reduced. We simply pass on to future generations much of the cost of all the lavish programs now being enlarged.

Treasury Secretary Dillon, in answer to a question, could not even foresee in the next 3 years paying off so much as $5 billion (about one fifty-ninth) of the national debt. The President, in his budget message, almost apologized for estimating any surplus at all. He said to plan a larger surplus would risk choking off economic recovery and contributing to a premature downturn.

This is the premise of the budget from end to end: That deficits are good for us, and surpluses could be bad for us. That it is healthy to postpone current expenses for children still unborn to pay.

Implicit in this budget are two very real risks:

1. That the rapidly rising debt will turn on the spigots of inflation, washing away even more of the dollar's shrunken purchasing power.

2. That the widening ambition of the Government to manage the economy more and more directly will lead to an increasing catalog of Government controls over more and more phases of American life.

In the fiscal year of 1963, the Federal Government expects to collect more than $116 billion from the people, including social security and other receipts not computed in the $92.5 billion budget itself.

This is nearly as much as all levels of Government—State and local included—collected from the people as recently as 1957. It is more than a fifth of the cash value of all the goods and services purchased in the country at recent rates, including those purchased by all branches of Government.

The President ascribes most of the increase to defense and space needs. But the budget includes increases in a host of other areas—many of them handouts to meet local problems. More for education, more for city transportation, a half-billion-dollar pay raise for Federal employees.

The message says "many desirable new projects and activities" have been deferred, but the Budget Director would not (or could not) name any of substance. The budget sweeps across the whole gamut of broadening Federal activity, an urgency label hung on every usage.

It is a budget hitched precariously to a rocket of soaring debt.

No Help to Court Declared

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, very recently the city commission of the city of Birmingham, Ala., Mayor Arthur J. Hanes and Commissioners J. T. Waggoner and Eugene Connor, issued a statement giving the position of the commission as regards the desegregation decision of the U.S. Supreme Court.

This statement represents the feelings of the citizens of Birmingham and Jefferson County.

I, therefore, wish to insert in the RECORD a newspaper article which contains the text of the statement of the city commission.

NO HELP TO COURT DECLARED

(By George Cook)

City commission yesterday—in a statement defining its position with regard to racial problems present and future—declared it will take no steps to aid the U.S. Supreme Court in enforcing its decisions calling for integration of the races.

"As responsible officers of the city of Birmingham," the commission declared, "we take the position that since the Federal judiciary have declared this to be the law and now by the power of their writ of injunction and through the arms of their servitors, the Federal marshals, and the terror of their jails and Federal prisons have undertaken to enforce it, we shall allow them to carry that grievous burden unaided by us."

At the same time, the commission said it recognizes "that it will do no good to our city or to our people or ourselves to oppose this violent and arbitrary seizure of raw power by the Federal judiciary by other violence or lawlessness—two wrongs never made a right—and, hence we call upon all citizens to keep the peace."

WILL OPPOSE PROPAGANDA

"We shall, in every lawful way we can, oppose, and urge all patriotic men to oppose, and attempt to redress the propagation and spreading of this spurious, false and illegal 1954 judges' flat, masquerading in sheep's clothing, as the law of the land," the commission declared.

The full statement, signed by Mayor Arthur J. Hanes and Commissioners J. T. Waggoner and Eugene Connor, follows:

"Because of the rapidly shifting and complex race relations scene now confronting us, the City Commission of Birmingham states its concept of the principles involved and which will guide its actions in this field."

SEPARATE BUT EQUAL

"From the time of the Civil War until 1954, the principle of segregation and the doctrine of 'separate but equal facilities' was the law of the land, enunciated by every court, both State and Federal. We believed in it, we lived by it, and we built our lives and our institutions by it.

"According to the U.S. Constitution, the 'law of the land' remains the 'law of the land' until it is changed by an amendment of the Constitution or by an act of a legislative body such as Congress or the State legislatures.

"This time-honored principle of segregation and 'equal facilities,' the 'law of the land,' has not been changed by amendment of the Constitution or by act of Congress or the legislature, and, it is the true 'law of the land' today. This has been attested by the greatest legal minds of our times."

NO LAWMAKING POWER

"The Federal judiciary from the highest to the lowest is appointed. They are named by the President on recommendation of the Attorney General. They are in no wise responsible to the people and they hold office for life.

"By the very nature of their offices they are set apart from the people. They ought not to have, and our country believed for over 150 years that they, in fact, did not have any lawmaking, or legislative powers.

"But in 1954 the top echelon of the Federal judiciary, namely, the Supreme Court of the United States, usurped and by a sudden coup brazenly arrogated to themselves the power to change the 'law of the land' with respect to segregation and the basic right of each citizen freely to choose his own associates."

CLEAR USURPATION

"This was as clear a usurpation of power by the Federal judiciary as has occurred in an English-speaking country since the Stuart dynasty in England, asserted the right of absolute power over the lives and fortunes of their subjects under the theory of the divine right of kings.

"This cost the head of King Charles I and resulted in the bloody Cromwellian wars. Englishmen of that day fought and died for their freedom.

"But, unfortunately, the Supreme Court judge-made law of 1954 was fortuitously popular with the political bosses in the vote-rich ghettos of the northern cities of the United States where our national elections are now decided."

NONE DARES TO RISE

"No politician of national aspirations therefore dares to rise to challenge this revolutionary usurpation of power by the Federal judiciary. This statement stands, unfortunately, for some of our southern Senators.

"The judicial fiat of 1954, of course, cuts deepest and wrecks most havoc to the established institutions and more of the people in the South where the weight of the Negro population is heaviest. It remains therefore for us, the people of that region, almost leaderless on this issue as we are, to oppose as best we can this wicked and illegal invasion of our rights.

"History records that whenever tyranny appears, whichever of its varying forms it takes, there are those ready, for fear or for favors, who, for another dollar in the till, public duty, to bend their necks to the yoke and to kiss the hand of the tyrant.

"If there are those among us who for another dollar in the till, or for another industry in our city, or for fear of the printed or broadcast tongue lashing of those who, contrary to Biblical injunction, set themselves up as our judges, would yield to this cacophony of intimidation, bribery, cajolery, economic compulsion, clerical suasion, and outright threats of fine and imprisonment, let them answer to their consciences.

"If there are those among us who, as they have the right to do, approve this judicial attempt to make us over in the image drawn by Myrdahl for the Supreme Court, go your way—but go in peace.

"We accord to you the right to your convictions as we ask you to give us the right to ours.

OUR PURPOSE

"But feeling as we do, it shall be our purpose as individuals and as commissioners of the city of Birmingham:

"(1) To recognize that it will do no good to our city or to our people or ourselves to oppose this violent and arbitrary seizure or raw power by the Federal judiciary by other violence or lawlessness—two wrongs never made a right—and, hence, we call upon all citizens to keep the peace.

"(2) That we shall, in every lawful way we can, oppose, and urge all patriotic men and women to oppose and attempt to redress the propagation and spreading of this spurious, false, and illegal 1954 judges' fiat, masquerading in sheep's clothing, as the law of the land.

"(3) That, as responsible officers of the city of Birmingham, we take the position that since the Federal judiciary have declared this to be the law and now by the power of their writ of injunction and through the arms of their servitors, the Federal marshals, and the terror of their jails and Federal prisons have undertaken to enforce it, we shall allow them to carry that grievous burden unaided by us.

"(4) That, as aptly stated by the Governor of this State on a recent occasion, with reference to his own conduct as the chief officer of the State, no word or deed of ours, public or private, shall ever consciously aid or abet this alarming and unprecedented seizure of power by the nonelective, life tenure, remote and fearsome Federal judiciary.

"(5) That it is our earnest hope and prayer that the wise providence which has surely guided our Ship of State through many storms and tumults for more than 9 score years past will still stay the hand of the bigot, the blind fanatic, blind still, even though honest and power-hungry Chief of the judicial branch of our Federal Government before irremedial mischief results from wrong to our form of government."

Ireland Understands Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 2, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Ireland Understands Competition," which appeared in the January 18, 1962, edition of the Indianapolis Star.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IRELAND UNDERSTANDS COMPETITION

The debate over the relationship between the United States and the Common Market of Europe has just begun. In many respects, the situation is entirely strange for this country, since America served as the political leader, military bulwark, economic producer, and central banker for most of the world during the last 20 years. Suddenly, we are being asked to share these functions.

The real essence of the argument will revolve about the likely economic effects which will be felt in this country. It is interesting to learn that the problem which faces the United States is not unique. Ireland is facing the choice of whether it will become a member of the European Economic Community, and the words of the Irish Prime Minister, Sean F. Lemass, seem to be well worth weighing here.

Speaking early in December, Lemass said, "We cannot hope to maintain sales either at home or abroad of any products unless they can meet the test of competitiveness of price. That is the hard inescapable fact which must henceforth govern every policy and every decision."

He then went on to point out, "There will be some people who will say that the government should use powers to control prices. We must not, however, ignore the lessons of our own experience. Control over prices * * * is very difficult to mak effeffective, and necessarily involves interference in the day-to-day working of the national economy which is nearly always restrictive in its effect. Whenever higher wages have to be paid, except where their effect on costs is offset by higher productivity, a rise of prices cannot be avoided. Nobody should try to fool the people into thinking that there is an easy way of preventing prices going up. The inexorable working of economic laws cannot be prevented by government decree.

"We must try to find some method of dealing with our problem other than an elaborate and probably unworkable apparatus of government controls. I do not think I have said anything which will not be fully accepted and agreed by everyone who has been giving serious thought to the nation's future whether he looks at it from the viewpoint of a manufacturer, farmer, worker, or trader."

President Kennedy, whose ancestors came from Ireland, would be wise to bring the truths spoken by the Irish Prime Minister to the people of this country at an early date. In that way, everyone would understand clearly that the United States is ready to rely upon free enterprise rather than restrictive governmental controls in its dealings with the new market in Europe.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

The Dairy Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. WILEY, Mr. President, last week the administration presented its farm recommendations to the Congress. The message, of course, covered major features of the agriculture picture. Of particular interest to the State I represent, Wisconsin—the No. 1 milk-producing State, with an output of about 18 billion pounds—are these proposals relating to dairying.

In a weekend broadcast over Wisconsin radio stations, I was privileged to discuss the President's recommendations, some alternatives, and the general outlook in dairying.

I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of my talk printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY SAYS OUTLOOK DIM FOR PRESIDENT'S DAIRY PROPOSALS

I want to utilize this get-together with you for a discussion of problems and challenges in an industry which has helped to make Wisconsin famous; provides hundreds of millions of dollars in income; creates a livelihood for over 100,000 farm families here in Wisconsin; results in thousands of nonfarm jobs; and provides our Nation with one of its most rich and vital food resources: the dairy industry.

During this week, the President delivered a farm message to Congress. The message contained recommendations on the major features of the agricultural picture. Of particular interest to Wisconsin—the No. 1 milk producing State, with an output of about 18 billion pounds of the Nation's 125 billion pounds of milk—of course, are those proposals relating to dairying.

The dairy highlights of the President's message included the following:

1. A recommendation for continuation of the present level of price supports of $3.40 per hundredweight until December 31, 1962. To prevent further decline of dairy income—now disproportionately low in relation to the cost of operations—there is, in my judgment, a need to maintain support prices at at least the current level. To accomplish this, I will support a recommended joint resoltuion in Congress.

2. The adoption of a milk marketing allotment system for dairying. I believe such a program—in itself controversial—would: (a) be extremely difficult to administer; (b) provide inadequate safeguards against extreme price drops; or foreign producers taking over U.S. markets—in the event production is too greatly curtailed; (c) it is extremely doubtful whether such a program could be successful in equitably eliminating the supply-demand imbalance; and (d) the farmers, themselves, must have a determining voice in the adoption of such a program and consumers, too, have a stake in such considerations—particularly as this may affect the price of milk and other dairy foods.

The outlook for such a marketing allotment program—in my my judgment—inadequate and possibly dangerous for lack of protection against "extreme price reduction" or competition from abroad is extremely dim.

ALTERNATIVES

Now, what would be constructive alternatives?

Generally, we recognize the need for a new program to continue to provide the U.S. consumer with an adequate supply of dairy foods at reasonable prices; to provide the farmer with a fair price for his products; to reduce surplus stockpiles; and to diminish the annual cost of the price support program to the American taxpayer.

How can these steps be accomplished?

Personally, I believe by adoption of the following measures:

1. A new dairying-governmental cooperative effort to increase consumption levels.

2. Carrying forward and, as necessary, expanding, the special school milk, school lunch, food-for-the-needy, and similar programs which serve as useful outlets for the surplus dairy foods.

3. Greater utilization of dairy—as well as other food surpluses—as "strategic weapons" in our foreign policy. In a hungry world, food can be a more effective "persuader" than a gun.

4. Explore for new markets abroad and at home.

5. Expand research by the dairy industry itself to find new and more effective ways to step up consumption and utilize dairy products.

6. Enactment of the Wiley bill, S. 2414, to establish a Dairy Research Laboratory at Madison, Wis. The purpose would be to find more commercial and industrial ways to utilize dairy products.

7. Prevent public scares on milk utilizations—for example—as a source of cholesterol, creating heart problems (recent reports of activities by the Public Health Service refute such allegations).

8. Maintaining an adequate price support program, until such time as these steps promote a favorable supply-demand balance.

9. The public policy of utilizing milk too much as a "measuring stick" for radioactivity—conveying the false impression that milk—far more than other foods—carries strontium 90. This must be stopped.

10. The bad habit of folks on diets unreasonably limiting their intake of milk, too, should be discouraged. Actually, milk is unrivaled in nutritive value—being one of our best sources of minerals, calcium, and vitamins.

CONCLUSIONS

Generally, then—I believe—the adoption of these programs would better serve the American public; reduce, as possible, the cost of the price support program to the taxpayer; and brighten the outlook for the dairy industry—an important segment of our agriculture and national economy.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address:

RADIO ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE HENRY C. SCHADEBERG, FIRST DISTRICT, WISCONSIN

I would like to talk to you at this time in regard to a standing committee of the House of Representatives which has one of the most outstanding records of achievement of the many committees of the House—the Committee on Un-American Activities. In spite of its record, the tremendous work it has done on behalf of the American people to preserve our political and social, and yes—our religious way of life—and perhaps precisely because of its outstanding success—this committee and its members have been the subjects of continuing bitter and vitriolic attacks. These attacks have been leveled at the committee and its individual members with little or no basis in fact. When publicly called upon to document their criticisms, the committee's opponents either stumble and falter or at best dwell upon carping minuscule details of human error.

Probably one of the most publicised criticisms of the committee is what its opponents call "unfair treatment of witnesses." Yet, the truth is that this committee, while adamantly abiding by its constitutional responsibilities, has accomplished more for the protection of the rights of congressional witnesses than any of its predecessors or contemporary bodies.

It is significant that this committee, accused by its detractors of being unfair in its treatment of witnesses, was the first to adopt written rules of procedure. These rules of procedure were adopted in order to assure every witness equal and fair treatment while giving testimony. The rules governing the committee's work were based upon research done by the Brookings Institution. Now, the Brookings Institution is a nonprofit, nonpolitical organization devoted to economic, legal, and constitutional research. These rules of procedure, written and adopted by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, have proven to be so sound in practice that many other committees of both the House and Senate have adopted similar procedural criteria. Indeed, the House of Representatives, as a body, incorporated many of these procedures into the entire body's rule II which governs the activities of all committees of the House. It is of interest to note that the Rules of the House of Representatives are part of the law of the land and are included in the United States Code.

This committee, whose procedures are being questioned, was first to disallow the

one-man subcommittee. The device of the one-man subcommittee had long been considered suspect both from the standpoint of fairness to a witness, and from a legislative standpoint. This was especially true, of course, in the case of investigatory committees. It was through the pioneering efforts of the Committee on Un-American Activities that one-man subcommittees are no longer allowed to sit. Now, when a subcommittee of the House has less than two members present, it is automatically adjourned.

Regarding the attacks on individual members of the committee, both now and in the past, it suffices to sight a few of the following facts: This committee was established 23 years ago. Over these 23 years a great number of different Members of the House of Representatives have served on the committee. Is it even slightly reasonable to believe that all of these Members, elected by U.S. citizens, have been racists, Facists, and antisemites? Of course not. Yet the tormentors of the committee would have you believe this is the case.

The present chairman and eight other members of the committee span the entire spectrum in their political views. Past members of the committee have risen to high positions—a former Vice President of the United States, several Senators, the present chairman of the National Republican Party.

These items of facts serve to demonstrate how truly ridiculous are the baseless attacks on the committee.

The faith which the Members of the House of Representatives have in the committee was demonstrated early in the last session of the Congress when the resolution continuing the existence of the committee was adopted unanimously. When the vote was taken on the appropriation to continue the work of the committee, it was passed overwhelmingly by a vote of 412 to 6. This year there were no dissenting votes. These votes of confidence on the part of the House of Representatives should indicate that as citizens we all owe it to ourselves and our country to know all the facts on the work of this and other bodies which are engaged in the work of protecting our security.

Further, we can support the work of these bodies by practicing respect for the views of others. This means that everyone who is politically liberal is not a Communist, and by the same token everyone who is a political conservative is not a Facist. However, we should not allow ourselves to be lulled into believing there is no threat to our Nation. It is important to realize that the constant haggle over whether our greatest threat is internal or external is missing the true picture of our enemies. There is just one threat, and that is international communism. It manifests itself in many ways, and two of these are internal and external. They are not separable. That is why this committee must continue its work. That is why it must be supported and strengthened by every American who takes the time to get the facts.

The Medical Care Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a column written by Mr. Maurice H. Stans, former Director of the Budget.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR CHANGING ECONOMY—EMOTIONALISM FOGS MEDICAL CARE ISSUE

(By Maurice H. Stans)

President Kennedy has repeated his request to the Congress to write a new law putting medical care for the aged under social security. It is likely to be one of the hottest and least understood issues in the current session.

Ever since medical care for the aged became a political issue early in 1960, it has generated an atomic lot of heat and a minimum of reality. Even today many people wrongly seem to believe the issue is medical care or no medical care. This is the result of another case of undue emotionalism in Washington—a surge of sympathy misdirected toward an excess of government.

There are no facts or figures, of course, as to how many people there are over 65 who need and want medical or hospital care and don't get it. Whatever their number, no one in this enlightened country wants anyone to suffer from that lack. The problem has been, and is, how to find the most sensible way to see that they don't.

We do know some facts. There are nearly 17 million people over 65. A large proportion of them are not medically indigent. Those over 65 account for 9 percent of our total population, and, despite the retirement majority, they still receive 8 percent of all personal incomes.

More than half of those over 65 have coverage under some form of health insurance, and the number is increasing rapidly. Millions more are safeguarded by their own wealth, the resources of their families, and services of local welfare and church agencies. Other millions are assured of present or future benefits by their rights and privileges under veterans' benefit programs. The number without adequate health protection is proportionately small. It will grow even smaller as those now under 65 and holding an even greater degree of coverage of their medical needs move into the over-65 bracket with retirement protection.

KERR-MILLS BILL

Under these conditions, the White House and Secretary Flemming in 1960 developed a plan that would fill the medical gap, whatever it might turn out to be. Under it, the provision of medical and hospital services to all those in need of assistance would be left to local communities. The State would advance the cost, and Washington would pick up 50 to 80 percent of the bill, variable according to the wealth of the States.

Depending on the scope of the benefits covered and the estimates of numbers of beneficiaries, the Federal Government's share would be something over $200 million in the first year of the program and about $400 to $500 million in later years. And it was accepted that under a widespread program like this, these costs would include a fairly substantial amount which would not represent new protection but merely a transfer of responsibility from existing sources to the State and Federal Governments.

With some changes, the Flemming plan was enacted as the Kerr-Mills bill in the 1960 session of the Congress. It is now in operation in 26 States and a dozen others are moving toward it. Unfortunately, the continued agitation for a more expansive plan under social security has slowed up action in some States. But there is no evidence that the present program is inadequate.

NO TEST OF NEED APPLIED

The social security proposal is entirely different in a fundamental way. It applies no test of need and gives everyone over 65, regardless of wealth, income, or other means, the vested right to submit medical and hospital bills to Washington to be paid. The cost would be paid by another increase in social security taxes, already scheduled to rise to 9¼ percent by 1968, to be shared equally by working people of all ages and their employers. The total annual cost of this plan has been estimated to be from $1.5 to $2.5 billion at the start and rising in later years to $5 billion or more.

I have never been able to understand why the social security way would make sense, or why any workingman would support it. It would multiply the tax collections and payments for medical care eightfold, tenfold, only to provide added funds to give to those who didn't need them.

It would, in other words, set up a program that benefited 8 or 10 people for every 1 that needed help. To cite an extreme, it would cover payments to the Fords, Rockefellers, Morgans, Harrimans, and other wealthy individuals over 65. It would mean that workingmen and women would dig up taxes to cover such expenses for Maurice Stans when he reaches 65 and for millions of others who ought to meet their own bills. It would double the social security bureaucracy, which now has 32,000 employees and a vast forest of electronic machines.

THREE MILLION UNPROTECTED

Despite this, it would fail to protect 3 or 4 million people over 65 who are not eligible for social security. And the program, I feel sure, would not stop at age 65. Let's not deceive ourselves. Within a year or so after it were operative, the drive would begin to lower the age qualification, especially since the taxes would be paid by younger employed, and the pressure could continue until everyone was covered. And certainly the administrators of the funds would have to fix limits and standards on the kind of medical care and hospital services that would qualify.

By degrees we would move into a socialization of medical and hospital practices. I can understand why the medical profession does not want this, and, with the ever-increasing cost experience of Britain and other countries as evidence, we should beware of it here.

Putting medical care for the aged under a mandatory social security program would be the beginning of the largest single step we could take toward government paternalism and the centralized state. If we want to preserve our personal pride, our sense of character and responsibility, our freedom of choice and decentralized government, we ought to oppose this to the fullest. And no one will suffer, because the machinery already in law will take care of everyone who needs help at a lot less cost to the taxpayer.

United Nations Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, on January 26 I had the honor of addressing the 65th annual convention of the American National Cattlemen's Association at Tampa, Fla. I returned to Washington before the end of the convention, so I was not present when the resolutions presented to the convention by the reso-

lutions committee were discussed and acted upon.

I was very gratified to learn today upon receipt of a copy of the resolutions adopted that Resolution 2, which was unanimously adopted, urged Congress not to approve the purchase of any United Nations bonds. This pleased me, since I have joined with other Members of the Congress in introducing a joint resolution that would have the effect of prohibiting purchase by the United States of any U.N. bonds until all member nations have paid up their assessments. I think this fine organization of livestock people from all of the major cattle producing States of the Nation are to be commended for taking their stand. It has also been gratifying to me that my office has received a flood of mail indicating approval of my resolution. People all over the country recognize that the U.N. can only be an effective force for peace if it is supported by all the member nations.

Under unanimous consent, I include with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD Resolution 2, passed unanimously on January 27, by the American National Cattlemen's Association assembled in annual convention, at Tampa, Fla.:

RESOLUTION 2

Whereas the President of the United States has proposed that the United States purchase $100 million of United Nations bonds, designed to keep the United Nations alive and to pay its expenses; and

Whereas the United States has subscribed more than its fair share to the support of the United Nations; and

Whereas the strength of the United Nations depends upon the wholehearted support of all member nations; and

Whereas it seems unrealistic for member nations to expect that they can make their individual determinations as to their membership responsibilities; and

Whereas past performance would indicate that it is unlikely that the bonds will be redeemed: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge Congress not to approve the purchase of these United Nations bonds.

White House Picketed by World Peace Groups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter to the editor, which appears in the Washington Post of today, signed by Robert Perrin, of Silver Spring.

This letter deals with the subject of White House picketing by world peace groups. I believe that it contains some timely thoughts on this subject.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR: IS PURPOSE SERVED?

President Kennedy showed admirable restraint by limiting his comment on the women peace "strikers" at the White House to the point that "their message was received." While one cannot presume to speak for the President, it would seem to me that a leader must look upon such displays with some personal alarm or at least misgivings.

Not that one can object to the women (or men) indicating that they are for peace, disarmament, and a nuclear test ban. But the point is: What are they trying to show? And to whom? By picketing the White House, bravely marchining in a downpour or giving up cherished Christmas vacations, are these peace marchers implying that President Kennedy is not for peace and that he must be convinced? This, after all, is the most common concept of picketing—that the picketee is somehow unfair to their cause. But one hardly can be illogical enough to assume that the President wants war, bigger bombs, and an atmosphere laden with radioactive particles.

What, then, is the purpose of the "strikers"? To show that they are aware of the precarious balance of world peace and the consequences of the ghastly alternative of nuclear warfare? Excellent. We need a greater public awareness of these desperate problems.

But one cannot help wonder whether the picketing peace marchers are, albeit unconsciously, giving more aid and comfort to Mr. Khrushchev than they are giving the President. For the greater the peace demonstrations become, the oftener the marches on Washington with their attendant publicity, the more they tend to undercut the President and restrict his flexibility in dealing with the Communist world.

Can the President convince Khrushchev that we will fight to protect our rights or honor our commitments to our allies if, while he is taking this firm line, hordes of picketers are parading at the White House demanding peace? Might not Khrushchev feel our President does not have the people behind him, and thus feel more confident to challenge us?

If such demonstrations were accompanied by similar displays of opinion by the Russians outside the Kremlin, perhaps the ladies would have a good thing going. But up to now, anyway, it is a one-sided show. Sincere as they are, how then can they best wage their battle? By telling the President that they support him in his deadly serious struggle for peace—a struggle that will be won with logic of right, the will to negotiate, and even the clenched fist—but not with the picket sign.

ROBERT PERRIN.

SILVER SPRING.

Do We Take Patriotism for Granted?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, love of country, alike by those who are Americans by birth and those who are Americans by choice, has been one of the greatest forces in making our Nation and in generating a dynamic democracy that is, in every sense, the hope of the world.

Love of country is, with love of God, among the deepest of feelings. Often it cannot be expressed in words, but only in action and deeds. In our present era, however, there have been some manifestations which to me are most disturbing, and which sound a warning that love of country cannot be taken for granted in everyone, that it is not spontaneous, and that we cannot take it for granted that in the present generation and in the generations to come, boys and girls, men and women will love their country as ardently as we know that our forefathers did.

Patriotism cannot be taken for granted any more. Patriotism must be taught, from earliest childhood. It must be taught by mother and father, who are themselves patriotic. It must be taught, even as an unseen and uncredited part of every course, in our schools. It can be taught, and should be taught, and strengthened, in a variety of ways, whenever and wherever Americans get together.

There has come to me in the last few days a distressing example which points up my argument.

A resident of my State, although not of my district, wrote to me about an incident which in recent weeks has created much excitement in Fairfield County, particularly in the two towns which comprise regional high school district No. 9.

These towns are Redding and Easton. The high school is situated in Redding, which was founded almost 200 years ago, after being for 130 years before that a part of another town. It was the scene of one of the battles of the War of the Revolution, when British troops burned Connecticut towns. Gen. Israel Putnam and his army spent one winter in camp in Redding.

The high school is named for Joel Barlow, very properly, it seems to me, because Joel Barlow, a revoluntionary patriot who served his country in war and in peace, was born there in 1754. While a student at Yale, Barlow and fellow students responded to the call for volunteers by Connecticut's Governor Trumbull 38 days after the Declaration of Independence was signed at Philadelphia. In the 37 years that followed, he married, was successful in business, earned recognition as a distinguished poet of that era, and served his country with distinction in the foreign service in Europe and in Africa.

As in most high schools, the students at Joel Barlow High School publish a school paper, the name of which is the Patriot.

What has caused the excitement in Redding and Easton, and, I would hope, far beyond the limits of those towns, is an editorial which appeared in one of the latest issues of the paper, written by a young lady, the student editor.

The editorial was entitled "A Higher Loyalty," and it began:

To be a patriotic American in the latter half of the 20th century is to be a blindly stupid human being.

At this point I should like to insert the complete text of that editorial:

A HIGHER LOYALTY

To be a patriotic American in the latter half of the 20th century is to be a blindly stupid human being. It is to be an arrogant, selfish, self-centered person, full of potential hate. It is to be irrational, intolerant, unloving, and un-understanding. It is to be the self-righteous executioner of all life on earth.

Patriotism has a narrowing effect on people. It confines love to one specific area of land or to one specific set of ideals. It limits the number and type of people one may love and the philosophy one may live by. It allows an American to approve of free enterprise and capitalism but not of socialism and communism. It allows an American to love Americans but not Russians and not Communist Chinese. Patriotism is the love of one's country to the exclusion of all others. There is no room in a patriotic American's heart for love and concern for Communists: the starving Chinese get no American grain.

And so the narrowness of patriotism breeds selfishness and hatred and blindness. Love of nation becomes akin to love of self: it grows and grows, driving out all thought of others. The national ambitions of a patriotic nation, like the personal ambitions of a person filled with self-love, become more and more important and result in selfishness. It is the stated policy of the United States of America that it does not spend a penny on foreign aid unless the United States profits from it. And it is the stated policy of the United States of America that if the United States of America cannot have freedom, then no one can have anything, for the United States of America will blow up the earth.

Patriotism is a type of love which will admit no imperfections in the object loved. A patriotic person is wont to regard his nation has perfect. His way of life is God-given truth. He is reluctant to believe that any other country may be as great. He becomes blind to the fact that he and his country are not always right. A picture of perfection, however is a bad image for anyone to have of his nation. It tends to produce confused, irrational thinking which makes him believe that, because his nation is perfect, it may do anything and that whatever it does, including the waging of war, is morally correct. Americans have become so blind that they actually believe it is good and right that the United States bomb Russia to "protect" that perfect, ultimate achievement of mankind, the American way of life.

In a patriotic person, the lack of love for the rest of mankind which is the result of his patriotism becomes active hatred at the slightest provocation. Threatening or aggressive acts arouse a patriotic people's dormant hatred, and once aroused, it grows stronger and stronger until it creates greater patriotism which in turn creates greater hatred until finally this monster of hate and patriotism unleashes war and death and destruction upon the world. As Americans watch each new Russian act of aggression and are afraid, their hatred of this thing which threatens them grows and they remember the cliches which tell them what a good life they, as Americans, have and how much they stand to lose, and their patriotism grows and so their hatred grows, and eventually this monster they're raising will be full grown and will turn around and devour them.

Patriotism has outlived its usefulness. It was a good thing during the period of history when small areas of land were uniting to form large nations. Then in order to create a viable Federal Government and so to eliminate internal fighting, it was necessary to replace loyalty to the community of state with a higher loyalty, loyalty to the Nation. Today, in order to create a workable world government and thus to eliminate fatal warfare among the peoples of the earth it is necessary to replace loyalty to the Nation with an even higher loyalty, loyalty to the world. We must take the next step in the long process of unification which began when families organized themselves into communities and which probably won't end until all the worlds of the universe regard themselves as one.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, there were protests. Of course there were indignant meetings of the board of education, and indignant delegations of parents and of patriotic organizations in the two towns who waited upon the board to protest.

What good did the protests do? None. The damage had been done, and, it would appear obvious, no one could assess how far afield the effects would be felt. The damage was not done by the editorial in the school paper. The damage had been done long before that, by what influence or by what neglect we do not know. The editorial merely brought out into the light the serious erosion that has taken place, in that community and no doubt in others, of the ingrained patriotism that we have taken for granted.

There is a difference between mere flag waving and sound, systematic patriotic instruction, from the cradle to the grave if need be. We never are too young or too old to grow in love of our country.

Study of Structural Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, currently the Nation, and many of our citizens, individually, are suffering the impact of still too-high unemployment—estimated at about 4 million nationally, including about 70,000 in Wisconsin.

Although the Nation is progressing—moving ahead with promising increases in productivity—the unemployment situation regrettably has hardened and unemployment has failed to appreciably diminish.

Because of these factors we must, I believe, undertake a relentless effort to better understand and resolve such problems of high-rate unemployment.

Currently, the University of Wisconsin is constructively undertaking such an analysis—focusing its studies upon joblessness that stems from technological changes, immobilities in the labor force and other factors.

Recently, the Milwaukee Journal published an informative editorial on the study and its purposes. Reflecting the way in which the University of Wisconsin—one of the greatest educational institutions in the country—is undertaking one more constructive effort to deal with a difficult national problem, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY GROUP STUDYING STRUCTURAL UNEMPLOYMENT

There is no more serious domestic economic problem confronting the United States than structural unemployment—joblessness that stems from technological change, immobilities in the labor force, and other related factors, rather than from a dearth of demand.

The attack on structural unemployment, however, has not been vigorous, partly because of limited knowledge of its causes and cures. Now a group of University of Wisconsin professors, operating through an interdepartmental university unit called the Industrial Relations Research Center, have put together a major research program to investigate structural unemployment. Their idea is to find ways to make the labor market function more smoothly and effectively.

Here are some of the things they are studying:

The impact of automation on white-collar employment.

The feasibility of collecting and systematizing data on specifically which manpower areas are growing and which are shrinking and where (now a big gap in labor market statistics) so the information is current enough to be of use to educators, workers, and the public employment service.

A followup on the unemployed in La Crosse to determine why they have stayed there after the Electric Auto-Lite Co. plant closing in 1959 and what have been the psychological effects of long-term unemployment on the wage earners and their families.

The effectiveness of retraining programs under the Federal Area Redevelopment Act in West Virginia.

The potentialities of teaching machines in retraining older workers.

The mobility and trainability of older workers.

The labor market behavior of specific professional groups.

The studies are being undertaken by economists, psychologists, sociologists, and lawyers. They are paid for by public and private grants.

L. Reed Tripp, professor of economics at the university, is director of the center. Tripp believes that the present unemployment rate of about 6 percent could be cut to 4 percent if the problems of structural unemployment were intelligently and vigorously attacked. Although up to a point he does not quarrel with those who would reduce unemployment by stimulating demand, he believes that before that can drive unemployment to a satisfactorily low level, it will cause inflation which the country cannot tolerate because of its need to maintain its international balance of payments position. An attack on structural unemployment is the solution to the problem of achieving a low jobless rate without inflation, he feels.

Tripp and his associates are engaged in important work—work from which the Nation could benefit greatly.

R.S.V.P. St. Louis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on February 1 Republicans gathered at dinners in 17 of this country's major cities to start the party's

victory drive for 1962. I had the opportunity and honor of addressing the Republican gathering in St. Louis and I would like to share the remarks of that occasion with Republicans, and other interested citizens, throughout the country to help point the way to more meaningful discussion of the issues in 1962 and the political contentions to follow. The text of this speech which I delivered at the Republicans' start victory program dinner in St. Louis follows:

(R.S.V.P.)

(Remarks of the Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS, at the R.S.V.P. dinner, St. Louis, Mo., February 1, 1962)

There are two basic falsehoods promulgated by the Democratic leaders about Republicans that we must challenge constantly, at all times and on all occasions by whoever repeats them until we so demonstrate their untruth to the people that they will pass from the American political scene.

Until we do this, my friends, I am afraid national debate on the crucial issues of the day will be unproductive in helping our society to reach the proper conclusions.

The first untruth is that Republicans care for money and that Democrats care for people. The truth is that all Americans by and large, including Republicans, care for people and that they recognize careful care of money is probably the most effective way to care for people, as Jesus' parable of the talents seeks to teach us. Certainly we know that a disregard for money and fiscal matters is the quickest way to bring about human misery and bring a stop to human progress.

So when we Republicans talk about balanced budgets, fair taxes at lower rates, fighting inflation and excessive Federal expenditures, we are doing so because we do care for the people, and particularly the "little" people. The issue involved in fiscal and monetary matters should never be presented to the people as the Democratic leaders have done for years, as if it were a question of who is for people and that their opponents were against people. Indeed, I charge that anyone who seeks to put national debate on this level is, by that very act, an enemy of the people. He seeks to rob and does rob the people of a clear understanding of the issues that trouble us.

No one is ever really certain that he is right in a matter. A real student seeks out debate to test his facts and his logic. But he is robbed of this necessary endeavor if his humanity, instead of his facts and logic, is made the issue.

Now, my friends of the Americans for Democratic Action have taken up the cudgel, in the name of freedom of speech and debate, to ward off attacks upon the patriotism of those who advance certain ideas and programs. When certain overenthusiastic Republicans a few years back accused Democrats, particularly the ADA brand which dominates this administration, as being soft on communism because they opposed certain programs designed by the authors to curb Communist infiltration, I took the floor of the House to rebuke my colleagues and to defend my Democratic friends, I did so in the name of freedom of speech and debate.

Is attacking one's humanity, one's religion, one's Christianity, a lesser offense to freedom of speech and debate than attacking one's patriotism? I think not.

I call for a halt on this business of attacking either the patriotism or the humanity of those who differ in public affairs. Let's get on to a discussion of the facts as both sides see them, the arguments and logic they use in each issue. There is plenty of room for honest debate.

Let's drive the matter home, Republicans. We care about people. We care about decent housing. We care about education. We care about health. We care about people having jobs. We care about low interest rates. We care about progress. We care about humanity.

It's because we do care about these things that we differ so deeply with the programs the Americans for Democratic Action, working through and with the Kennedy administration, are trying to get through the Congress.

We think these programs will produce less, not more, cheap adequate housing for our people, less and poorer education, less and poorer health, less and poorer jobs, and much less overall progress. The programs are less designed to preserve the peace and provide harmonious international relations.

And now we come to the second big lie, the Democratic leaders have been hammering home to the people about Republicans.

The Democratic leaders say the Republicans are against everything. They have no program of their own.

This is a more difficult lie to dispel, because it is certainly true that Republicans, by and large, are against the programs the Democrats advocate which rely more heavily on the Federal Government.

The Republican programs do not have the drama and oversimplification that the Democratic proposals have: let the Federal Government do it. How easy it is, particularly for a politician, to answer all problems—all questions—by saying, let the Federal Government do it. And ward off all critics who disagree or who honestly want to examine into the matter by saying:

(a) You have no heart, you aren't interested in humanity.

(b) You have no alternative proposal.

The Republican proposals rely more heavily on the private sector of our society to accomplish the desired results than do the Democrat's proposals. The Republican proposals rely more heavily upon State and local government when governmental, rather than private, action is required, than do the Democrats.

By these very facts the Republican proposals have many points and many facets. They are far from oversimplified, if anything they are complex because they rely on the individual initiative of millions of human beings, instead of the initiative of a few chosen Federal bureaucrats.

Let me illustrate by a brief discussion of how we meet the problem our older people face in obtaining and paying for their health care. The Democrats came forward with their pat, unimaginative, oversimplified solution—let the Federal Government do it—through social security. This is followed by the pattern of warding off opposition I have described as:

(a) Those who disagree have no heart, have no humanity. They don't care about the aged. They want to cast them out. This is a dastardly lie, ladies and gentlemen, and it is time all Republicans, whatever their own ideas of how to meet the problem might be, called the Democrats' hand on this.

(b) The Republicans have no program.

Let me answer the lie that the Republicans have no program. Since when is the health care program presently existing in our society, no program? It's such a fine program that its very amazing success has created the problem we are now directing out attention to. Why has health care for the aged become a problem? Because of the failure of our health care program? Not at all. It's because of its success—people are living 10 to 15 years longer than ever before. It is a blessing, not a curse.

The real issue is this: Can the program which produced the success solve the problems that the success has created? Or must we radically change this program in order to meet the new problems? This is an issue worthy of study and discussion.

I am satisfied that any objective study, and the Ways and Means Committee has conducted such a study, reveals rather conclusively that our health care system not only can meet these new problems, but that it is rapidly doing so. The studies further reveal that a switch to a heavy reliance upon the Federal Government through a compulsory hospital care program—not medical—not doctors—as is being proposed by the Democrats would radically change our program. This would result in a slowing down of further progress in medical advancement; it would lower the quality of the care we presently have, not only for the older people, but for all of us. It would only solve the problem of the aged by shortening the years of their life to finance.

Now, there are some in this audience and many around the country who would dispute my analysis. That's fine. Let's get to the debate. We're no longer talking about who is for people and who has a program. We are talking as we should. We are all for the people, and we both have programs. We are trying to figure out which program is better, the tested or the untested.

What has the debate as far as the Democratic leaders are concerned, come down to? That the doctors are against people and are uninterested in advancing further into medical care? That the hospitals are against people? That our great drug industries which have done so much for us in giving wonder drugs are against people and progress? How can sense or reason come out of such diabolic and unsubstantiated accusations?

And now I want to move to a conclusion. There is another part of the technique of the Democratic leaders opposed to national debate which I must mention. I have mentioned the two lies; that those who disagree with them have no humanity and that they have no program. The third part is also a lie. It is based upon the dangerous process of downgrading the United States, dangerous because if our enemies or the uncommitted nations believed it, it would endanger the peace and our security. It seeks to downgrade our health institutions; to make it appear that our present program is inadequate, as I have pointed out. It does the same with education—note the failure to point up the success of our educational system based as it is on local control—the greatest educational system in any society. It does the same with housing. The same with military defense. The same with our private enterprise system economy.

The President's Economic Report filed January 22, 1962, talks about the recession and lavishes great self-praise on himself, the author, for the wise, compassionate Federal program he instituted as President, which brought about recovery. Hidden in the body of the report—this part written by economic scholars—was the truth. The recession—the mildest since the end of World War II, by the way—bottomed out in February 1961. It was impossible for any Federal program or Federal action to have had any marked effect on the operation of our great dynamic American economy. President Kennedy has sought to rob our people of the success that their initiative, their ingenuity and their institutions brought about, and to lay claim to this success for himself and the massive Federal expenditure program he is advocating. It is not complacency for us to praise, as I do, our society, if our praise is justified. This accusation of complacency is the only answer my Democratic friends seem to have when they seek to rebut the arguments I have spread before you. We aren't

satisfied. We have much to do, many problems to solve, many inequities to correct. Nor is it to say that the Federal Government has no part to play in meeting these problems. It has a part, but a selective part, a limited part, an ancillary part.

Proposed Potomac Reservoir at River Bend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times, entitled "Let's Forget River Bend."

I fully agree with this editorial.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent, also, to have printed a preliminary analysis prepared by the Loudoun County Board of Supervisors on the impact of the proposed Potomac Reservoir at River Bend.

There being no objection, the editorial and analysis were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S FORGET RIVER BEND

The Army Engineers have come up with new combinations of proposed dams for the Potomac River, but once again they are pressing for a big reservoir at River Bend, a few miles upstream from Washington, D.C.

More than local interest is involved. The Potomac is not only an interstate stream; it is truly one of our national rivers. Not the least of the national treasures along its course is the historic and beautiful Chesapeake & Ohio Canal.

The proposed River Bend Dam would inundate 35 miles of the old canal with its antique locks and scenic towpath, all of which have become a mecca for sightseers, students of Americana, picnickers, and other recreationists. Last summer the Senate passed a bill to enlarge the Federal holdings along the canal and create a national historical park extending from Washington to Cumberland, Md. Recommended by the National Park Service, this bill now awaits House action.

The Engineers have admitted, in alternate plans for the Potomac, that the future water supply of the Washington metropolitan area can be assured, the infrequent floods controlled, and the pollution abated without building the River Bend Dam. The hydroelectric potential is small.

The natural, undammed upper Potomac is unique in scenic and recreational resources. Above the Great Falls, in the area that River Bend Dam would turn into an artificial lake, one finds broad, quiet pools dotted with islands, fringed with marshes and framed with forests, while between the pools are long stretches of rocky rapids and swirling chutes that offer exciting canoeing and good fishing.

We recommend that the Engineers put River Bend Dam in the dead file and forget it.

PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS: IMPACT ON LOUDOUN COUNTY OF PROPOSED POTOMAC RESERVOIR AT RIVER BEND

LOUDOUN COUNTY
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,
Leesburg, Va., November 27, 1961.

INTRODUCTION

The Loudoun County Board of Supervisors, on November 20, 1961, requested the chairman of the County Sanitation Authority to make a preliminary analysis of the impact on Loudoun County of the reservoir proposed by the Corps of Engineers to be constructed on the main stem of the Potomac at River Bend or at an alternate location near Seneca Creek. The board also authorized the Burns & McDonnell Engineering Co. to collaborate on this work.

The purpose of this analysis is to prepare material for use by the board of supervisors in placing before the Engineer Corps and the public, at a meeting to be held on the night of November 28, 1961, in the city of Washington, a general statement, or perspective, of the very serious and far-reaching social and economic problems with which Loudoun County would be confronted and the damages that would result to the county were the proposed reservoir to become a reality.

RESERVOIR CHARACTERISTICS

A very brief description of the proposed reservoir and a map showing its location and extent are presented in "Information Bulletin—November 1961—Potomac River Basin Study" issued by U.S. Army Engineer District, Baltimore, Md.

Aditional information has been obtained from the office of the district engineer, as follows: (a) Normal pool elevation, 226 feet; (b) maximum pool elevation, 246 feet; (c) spillway elevation (approx.), 200 to 205 feet; (d) elevation to which it is proposed Government acquire land (in general), 231 feet; (e) flood easements—area between contours 231 feet and 246 feet would be controlled by flood easements which would permit use for agricultural and recreational purposes, but would preclude use for habitation, residents, hotels, or motels; (f) drawdown—maximum drawdown would occur from June to December. Pool would rarely fall below elevation 200 feet. Fifty percent of the time drawdown would not amount to more than 5 to 10 feet below normal pool elevation of 226 feet.

LOUDOUN COUNTY ECONOMY

In considering the impact of the proposed reservoir, there are several salient facts regarding Loudoun County and its basic agriculture economy which should be kept clearly in mind.

Notwithstanding the vigorous official protests and opposition of the county, the Federal Government located the Dulles International Airport largely within the county. This action of the Government not only resulted in taking some 7,500 acres of agricultural land off the tax rolls, but, far worse, it is bringing a population influx which, within the next few years will much more than double the total population of the county, which is now approximately 24,600. Thus there has been thrust upon the county the staggering expenses of proportionate increases in its school facilities and all other services to the public, a burden which agriculture cannot bear if it is to continue to survive anywhere in the county.

The only practical solution to this problem is to broaden the tax base by bringing in high class industrial development of the type representing large capital investment in plant facilities and employing highly paid specialists. The area meeting the requirements for such development, as dictated by the location of the airport, its main access and north access highways, and the State highway facilities; by the potomac interceptor sewer; by an abundant supply of water of excellent quality; and by the topography of the terrain is the lower Broad Run area. Recent substantial land acquisitions in this area by developers substantiate this statement.

FLOODED LAND AREAS

The total area of Loudoun County that would be flooded by the proposed impoundment is some 14,900 acres. That property lying below elevation 231 amounts to approximately 8,600 acres and is nominally the amount to be purchased by the Federal Government and removed from the tax rolls. As a practical matter, when an allowance is made for squaring up and purchasing whole properties the total may well reach 10,000 acres.

Easements would be obtained on the balance of the 14,900 acres and this land would be restricted to agricultural or recreational use. With the preclusion of improvements, and because of excessive shore line variations resulting from fluctuations of pool elevation over very gently sloping terrain, the tax valuation of this strip of land cannot be expected to rise higher than that for second-grade agricultural land.

Of the above total of 14,900 acres, 4,560 acres are in the heart of the Broad Run district, the area of proposed high-class industrial development. This land is presently selling at from $1,000 to $2,000 per acre in sizable tracts and up to $5,000 per acre in small tracts.

The total area of Loudoun County below elevation 231, which was temporarily inundated by the 1936 flood, was some 4,430 acres. It should be pointed out, however, that most of this property is productive and all is taxable, and that such a flood has a calculated probable frequency of 100 years. (See Engineer Corps studies of Potomac flood profiles and frequencies.)

LOSS OF AGRICULTURAL LAND

The proposed reservoir would take large areas of Loudoun's richest farm land permanently out of production at a time when serious concern is being expressed throughout the United States over the drastic decrease in available agricultural land balanced against the rapid rise in population. Economists are already anticipating the times when every acre of good agricultural land will be desperately needed.

DISPLACED FAMILIES

A preliminary survey of the total area of Loudoun County subject to flooding by the proposed reservoir indicates that some 306 families would be displaced from their homes. A substantial number of major livestock and dairy buildings would also have to be abandoned.

LOSS OF TAX REVENUE POTENTIAL

Loudoun County cannot afford to absorb the expected tremendous increase in population without establishment of a far broader tax base. In general, except for the more expensive residences, the tax revenue derived from private homes falls short of providing the funds necessary to meet the expense of schools and other county services to the public.

Without the threat of inundation of a large part of the lower Broad Run valley, Loudoun County has assurance of a way to accomplish the vitally necessary increase in its tax revenues. Investors have purchased and are continuing to purchase thousands of acres in the Broad Run valley for industrial park type of development. It is expected that this development will

consist of interrelated industrial establishments of a highly desirable type, principally engaged in research and development and associated effort, and employing highly paid personnel, thereby fostering a higher type of the inevitable community developments. The capital exepnditures in the foreseeable future are expected to aggregate some $175 to $250 million.

It is this tax base that Loudoun County depends upon to withstand the impact of Federal establishment of Dulles International Airport.

The construction of a dam which would inundate or make unusable a large part of this valley would deprive Loudoun County of tax revenues which it must have to continue its existence as a solvent jurisdiction. This proposed reservoir would either severely curtail plans for industrial development or would cause investors to abandon their plans altogether. This area was chosen by them because of its proximity to the airport, its water supply and sewerage, its limited-access highways, and its railroad.

Even the areas left in the Broad Run Valley would be less desirable because of the existence of the fluctuating arms of the reservoir. It might be argued that a lake, notwithstanding its many disadvantages, would make the remaining area highly desirable from a scenic or recreational standpoint. In the Broad Run Valley however, because of its gentle slopes, the fluctuations which must be expected of all multipurpose lakes would leave unusually broad expanses of mud, cracked mud, or undesirable weed growth which follow lake drawdown.

It is anticipated that in addition to occasional rises in the lake level to elevations much higher than 231, drawdowns of 10 feet would not be at all unusual and drawdowns of 25 feet would occur with ever increasing frequency as the water demands of the Washington Metropolitan area increase. The former drawdown would leave, in vast areas, expanses of mudflats 1,000 to 1,500 feet wide, while the latter drawdown would leave the entire valley floor exposed. Lakes with such excessive shore line variations do not lend themselves to the use of pleasure boats or other types of recreation.

Water supply from this arm of the lake for industrial purposes would be entirely undependable. Indeed, except for power generation below the dam where released water might be used for cooling, the main stem of the lake itself would not be a desirable supply of water for industrial needs. Even assuming such use would be permitted, the large fluctuations up to 50 feet or more, of the lake would create a serious problem in construction of intakes and in providing for widely varying pumping heads.

SEWERAGE AND WATER DISTRIBUTION

Plans have been developed by the Loudoun County Sanitation Authority for providing gravity-flow sewers in the lower Broad Run service area to serve the anticipated industrial, commercial, and residential development. If the proposed reservoir were to come into being a far more expensive sewerage system would be required to serve the remaining usuable area, notwithstanding the reduction in size of the area served.

For comparative purposes, the layout of sewers anticipated without the reservoir is shown in exhibit B (not printed in RECORD). A layout of sewers, lift stations, and force mains anticipated in the event the reservoir is constructed as described, is shown in exhibit C (not printed in RECORD). The extra construction cost of the system shown in exhibit C over that shown in exhibit B is $2,961,000. This extra cost is brought about by several factors; namely (1) the rough, irregular terrain along which the sewers would be required to follow locations more or less paralleling the reservoir shortline; (2) the extra rock excavation required with the sewers located on the hillsides where the soil has been washed away and is quite thin over the shale and diabase rock so prominent in the area; (3) the marine construction required across arms of the reservoir to reach the Potomac interpreter now under construction; (4) sewage lift stations required where terrain and reservoir configurations render gravity flow infeasible.

It will be noted that the layout with no reservoir is entirely by gravity. Such a simple system is not feasible if the reservoir is constructed. The peninsulas of land separated by arms of water lead to a pattern of sewers requiring either lift stations or inverted siphons across the arms of the reservoir and to the Potomac interceptor. Lift stations or siphons would have to be constructed with fail-safe ftatures to prevent a sanitary hazard to metropolitan water supply. Maintenance and operation of these features, including the power for operation of the lift stations, would add substantially to the cost of service. This additional cost is estimated at approximately $45,000 to $50,000 per year when the system becomes fully developed.

Plans have also been developed for serving the lower Broad Run service area from a water supply facility owned by the city of Fairfax. This facility, now in operation, consists of a dam and reservoir on Goose Creek, a treatment plant, and a transmission main along the Washington & Old Dominion Railroad right-of-way to the city of Fairfax. The Loudoun County Sanitation Authority will be required to add transmission and distribution mains as the area develops, many of which will cross the valleys to be inundated by the reservoir, if constructed. Water mains installed across the reservoir arms would have to be made fail-safe and would be expensive to construct. Some mains would have to be diverted around arms of the reservoir. The extra cost of this construction is estimated at $325,000.

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

On the basis of information obtained from the office of the District Engineer, the Corps of Engineers, through the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads, is obtaining from the State department of highways of each of the several States affected by the proposed Riverbend impoundment, estimates of cost of the necessary raising and bridging of primary and major secondary roads that would be subject to inundation of the project. The cost of such construction is to be included in the cost of the reservoir.

Aside from these communication routes, however, the impoundment would cut the lower Broad Run Valley in two parts. This would severely hamper the intercommunication which would be such an important factor in the anticipated industrial development.

It would be economically infeasible to bridge the various arms of the lake created by stream valleys entering Broad Run. Developments which might occupy the peninsulas created by the lake would find themselves separated by many roadway-miles from their neighbors on adjacent peninsulas.

These longer distances would greatly impede transportation operations and would increase the costs for roadbuilding and maintenance as well as the length and costs of power and wire communications lines. Increases in cost of this nature would plague the county far into the future.

EFFECT ON MASTER PLAN

The proposed reservoir would completely disrupt the master plan designed for the development of Loudoun County in such a manner as (a) to meet the staggering expense burden thrust upon the county by the Federal Government in locating the Dulles International Airport within its boundaries and (b) to permit the survival of agriculture in the upper portions of the county.

DAMAGES TO LOUDOUN COUNTY

The damages which would result to Loudoun County were the proposed reservoir to be constructed would run into many millions of dollars. These damages should be fully assessed and capitalized and included in the estimated cost of the project. To make such an assessment would require a thorough engineering-economic study, which is beyond the scope of this preliminary analysis.

Respectfully submitted.

HARRY H. BLEE,
Chairman, Loudoun County Sanitation Authority.
BURNS & MCDONNELL,
Engineering Co.
By EDWIN J. RUNYAN.

Inequity in the Wheat Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat disturbed upon reading the President's agriculture message last week to find that no recognition seemed to be indicated for a variation in the treatment of farmers producing different classes of wheat. I have been gravely concerned for several years as it became more and more evident that there was a great variation in the percentage of domestic use and the percentage of contribution to the surplus of different classes of wheat.

Eighty-percent of the hard spring wheat which is generally raised in North Dakota is used for domestic consumption whereas only some 40 percent of the winter wheat raised in the Southern Plains is used for domestic consumption. While the surplus of hard spring wheat is less than double what it was 10 years ago, the surplus of hard red winter wheat has multiplied over 10 times during this same period.

Mr. Leonard H. Murray, president of the Soo Line Railway Co., pointed up some of these inconsistencies in our wheat program at a speech made in Minot, N. Dak. on January 25. Inasmuch as I believe Mr. Murray's remarks provide valuable information for all Members of Congress as we start consideration of the administration's new proposals for farm legislation, I include the text of Mr. Murray's address with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

CONSIDERATION OF THE ADDRESS BY LEONARD H. MURRAY

MINOT, N. DAK., January 25, 1962.—The policy of the Federal Government in reducing wheat acreage on the basis of total U.S. wheat supply instead of developing different programs for winter and spring wheat is damaging the economy of North Dakota, the Minot Chamber of Commerce was warned yesterday.

Leonard H. Murray, president of the New Soo, urged chamber members and all North Dakotans to seek promptly a Government crop program which would increase the production of Hard Red Spring wheat in North Dakota. He pointed out that North Da-

kota's principal cash crop could be in short supply in the world market if the 1962 crop in the United States and Canada does not exceed that of 1961. Yet, he said, present Federal policies of restricting acreages for planting wouldn't permit North Dakota farmers to grow the wheat to satisfy the world demand.

Mr. Murray spoke at the Minot Chamber's 1962 annual meeting. He related his railroad to the State's economy: The New Soo operates more than 1,300 of its total of 4,800 miles in North Dakota, has a payroll in the State of well in excess of $5 million annually, and pays about $350,000 in taxes within the State each year.

"While North Dakota properly looks to the production of petroleum and the expansion and diversification of other industries as significant factors in a growing economy in the State, agriculture—and particularly the growing of grain—at present represents the major source of income," Mr. Murray said. "I am confident that the people of North Dakota want their agriculture to become stronger and more important, along with their industries.

"It is a matter of vital importance for all of us whose prosperity is intertwined with North Dakota to promote the intelligent use of its land for wheat and other small grains and the development of markets for high protein wheat."

North Dakota traditionally has produced more than half of the Hard Spring wheat grown in the United States and shipped to domestic and world markets which require its characteristic high protein content. Canada, the only other major producer in the free world, produces about 3 times as much high protein wheat as does the United States.

The Nation's huge grain surplus contains relatively little Hard Red Spring wheat, yet the current wheat production program of the U.S. Department of Agriculture draws no distinction between high-protein spring wheat and lower-protein winter wheat, Mr. Murray said. In June, 1962, the winter wheat surplus is expected to equal about 4 years' domestic consumption. On the other hand, the total United States and Canadian supply of spring wheat in June 1962 is expected to equal little more than half of the current year's consumption.

"Canadian agricultural authorities are alert to this potential shortage and have urged farmers to increase their output for the next 2 years," Mr. Murray said. "Contrast this position with that of the Department of Agriculture, which is placing in effect a single restrictive program for virtually all wheat producers in the country. This program is based on confusion and faulty analysis. It is premised largely on a substantial oversupply of grain of a character which is not grown to any extent in North Dakota.

"The acreage reductions of the past 10 years and the ignoring of the need for Hard Red Spring wheat in the world cry for correction," Mr. Murray declared. "There is not much use of your considering the impact of this upon your farmers, your communities, your business, and your State unless you do something about it. There is not much use in North Dakotans talking to each other about it unless you carry your thoughts into action.

"We are in a tremendous period of change in the world with respect to trade. The European Common Market is emerging as a monumental economic force. The handwriting is on the wall that international trade barriers are going to be lowered.

"Competition will increase in our domestic markets and in world markets as a result. Obviously our Nation must be efficient, productive, and financially sound to preserve its markets and to enable its producers to sell competitively here and abroad.

"North Dakota has many capabilities, but at the same time it does not currently have many opportunities to produce a wide range of products. If it is to be strong, and it must be in the economic era we are embarking upon, it should be allowed to do effectively that which it can do well and for which it has a comparitive economic advantage. This makes it mandatory for the U.S. Department of Agriculture to establish a separate program for Hard Spring wheat tailored to the particular facts involved."

A Word About Ourselves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, at a time when newspapers are decreasing in number in the United States, the emergence of a new newspaper on the American scene is an important event. It is doubly significant when the newspaper is a new kind of publication—a national weekly newspaper.

The first issue of the National Observer was published yesterday. The publishers, Dow Jones & Co., are well-known and widely respected for maintaining high journalistic standards. It is a pleasure to welcome this new national publication and to wish it success in its efforts to contribute to an informed public and thus, to the vitality of our democracy.

I ask unanimous consent that the National Observer's first editorial, "A Word About Ourselves," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A WORD ABOUT OURSELVES

Today the National Observer joins the family of Dow Jones & Co., publishers of the Wall Street Journal. So we think we should begin by saying a few words about ourselves and our intentions.

This is not just fond pride, although that is a natural feeling. The National Observer is not only a new publication but a new kind of publication for this country. And since there is already no shortage of publications to compete for your money and your reading time, we believe these words are due you as a reader, so that you may know what we hope to be and how we hope to serve you.

First of all, this is a newspaper.

What this means is that it is designed primarily to tell you what is going on now in the whole wide world around you. We hope that we can also entertain you, and that we can offer you some things that are just plain good reading to either stimulate or relax the mind. But we are not in the entertainment business. A newspaper's chief reason for being is news.

This, all by itself, offers a limitless expanse. News includes the great events that shake the world, the important happenings in the Nation, the ideas men have about exploring space or their thoughts about the organization of society. But it embraces, too, everything else that interests people—the fortunes of the Green Bay Packers, the fate of the latest fashion show in Paris, books and music, and the things that happen to ordinary people every day and which, because the news of them makes us laugh or weep, give us an insight into the tragedy and joy of life.

All these things, in their infinite variety, will be grist for the National Observer:

Yet this only partially explains our intentions. For there is today no lack of some kind of news about all of these things. On the contrary, there are times when everyone feels inundated with "news." What is hard to find in the flood is understanding.

We know that nothing can surpass radio and TV in the immediacy of its news about the bare event. No national publication can replace the local newspaper in telling you about your community or your neighbors. Magazines of all kinds play their useful roles.

The problem of most readers is to find their way through the sheer bulk. And we believe that a weekly national newspaper can help those who are interested in the world around them to see it whole and to understand it better. The National Observer hopes to do this by virtue of the fact that it is a newspaper and not a magazine, a weekly and not a daily, that it is national and not local.

The newspaper format has many advantages. Its wide pages and its headlines help the harried reader to see the whole of the news in a sweep. He can learn a great deal, and quickly, from a well-written headline. He can then pause or pass on, as his interest moves him. He can skim or reread. And the newspaper press can speed the news to him before the avalanche of events relegates it to history.

In a weekly newspaper the news does not come in broken bits and pieces. What the President said about Berlin on Tuesday is not lost amid the events in Germany on Friday; the hurricane sweeping the country is not a series of isolated disasters but can be seen and measured as a unified drama in the life of the Nation.

This time to sift the news, to put it in perspective, to present it in a manageable package, has always been the great advantage of the weekly paper. It is our oldest form of journalism and it endures as a vital part of many communities. We will differ from the familiar weekly paper in that our community is the whole Nation. We will treat the news in exactly the same way for the reader in Portland, Maine, and the reader in Portland, Oreg.

Yet these advantages are not enough unless we succeed at what a distinguished American editor, almost a century ago, called "this art of making a good newspaper."

The editors must have available the resources to report the news of the world in all its many aspects. So the National Observer will make use of the Associated Press, United Press International, Reuters, the resources of its own organization that already publishes the Wall Street Journal and operates the Dow Jones News Service, and a network of its own correspondents. We will use pictures, when pictures speak more clearly than words or when they illuminate the news. In distribution we can use all or any combination of seven printing plants placed strategically around the country, as the demands of our subscribers dictate.

Thus we propose to assemble all the news of the world from as many sources as are, or as may become, available to us. But if news is anything that may concern, astonish or amuse mankind, then there is far too much of it for any newspaper to print, weekly or daily. And if it could be produced, no one would have the time to read it. No newspaper, then, can avoid the responsibility for selection.

Our standards of selection are our own, and the success of this newspaper depends on the integrity of those standards. They are the standards which we think will best serve our readers, whom we take to be all

those with a ceaseless curiosity about the world around them. They may be young or old; they may be infinitely varied in learning or in their supply of information about the subjects in the news. But they would not seek out better ways of seeing the world, in any form, if they did not have an intelligent desire to satisfy their curiosity, a yearning to understand more.

We seek to match their needs. That is, we hope that our standards of selection will be those which the readers themselves would adopt if it were possible for them to drop all other pursuits and set for themselves the task of collecting and studying all the available information about what is going on in the world.

Integrity demands that all this news shall be honestly reported. That, in turn, demands that we exercise judgments; even in the Congo not all riots are of equal importance, and the editor who treats them all as of equal importance performs no service of value for his readers. Some stories we will tell here in short compass. Some we will treat in far more length than most newspapers do. We make no apologies for these judgements. We will be ashamed only if we fail in the accuracy of our facts or in the precision and clarity of writing about them.

In this particular space where we offer our observations on events, we will make judgments of a different kind. We lay no claim to infallibility or even of special wisdom. Yet it is the business of newspapermen to devote their whole time to the flow of the news in the world around them, and out of this—if they do not shirk the responsibility of thinking—there come ideas on what it all means, and whether a thing is good or bad for their neighbors or their country.

In other columns, other views. Our letters column will be open to readers who do not agree with us, and from time to time we will publish special articles by people with some special competence in a particular field even if we do not agree with their conclusions. But here, in these columns, we will speak our own thoughts, speaking from an admitted prejudice that a free society and a free economy can do more for the welfare of men than any other form of society ever devised. We make no apologies for our convictions. We will be ashamed only if we fail to express our ideas clearly and forcefully.

So, with these words, here is the National Observer. We hope it will be a success. But our first imperative is to make it interesting and rewarding. For we know that the only way to success is to put out a good newspaper.

How Important Is Advertising?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Advertising Federation of America will hold its fourth midwinter conference here in Washington, D.C., day after tomorrow. Advertising affects the lives of all of us either directly or indirectly. Advertising, I believe, has contributed greatly not only to the economic and industrial growth of this Nation but also has contributed to our educational, political, and social history.

But it is in the field of economy to which we normally attach the connotation of the word "advertising." Recently John C. Hadley, assistant managing editor of the Rochester (N.Y.) Democrat and Chronicle, won first prize for an essay in a contest open to editors, editorial writers, and copyreaders of the Rochester newspapers, and to the staff of the Washington bureau of Gannett News Service.

Honorable mention included Frank Dostal and Richard Dougherty, of the Democrat and Chronicle, and Irv Wilcover, City Editor John Dougherty, and News Editor Abe Miller of the Times-Union.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this winning essay is of particular interest at this time because it tells how important advertising is to our economy in terms of a newspaperman.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include Mr. Hadley's essay in the RECORD:

HOW IMPORTANT IS ADVERTISING TO OUR ECONOMY?

The dictionary's definition is simple: "Advertising—To tell people about or praise, as through newspapers, radio, etc., usually to promote sales."

Seldom do plain English words miss by so much; seldom has a definition failed so completely to keep pace with its subject.

The original advertisement was a cold, printed notice. A single advertisement today may be that same cold, printed notice. But advertising, in all its sweeping power, has burst from the cold, physical bonds of word, type, and picture. It has become the vital and vibrant medium through which we have developed our American way of life, the cornerstone of our hopes for maintaining that way of life.

Advertising does promote sales. It moves mountains of soap, oceans of cereal, unending rivers of automobiles and appliances.

Advertising does inform and praise. It fights for our ideals, it rallies us to our causes. It helps give us the choices we make in our elections and our referendums.

But advertising today is so much more. Today it is the lifeblood of our economy, the mainstream of our individual lives.

It is advertising which welds our entire country—from coast to coast and border to border—into one, mighty marketplace. It is advertising which guards and promotes the competition so necessary to free enterprise. It is advertising which guarantees our priceless heritage of free opportunity. It is advertising which transforms the products of our industries and our business into sales, sales into payrolls, payrolls into the necessities and luxuries by which we live. It is advertising which shapes each and every phase of our lives. It creates and maintains the jobs at which we work, builds and furnishes the houses in which we live, puts the food on our tables, clothes our bodies, protects our health, influences our recreation and relaxation, plans our retirement, even lays us to rest at the appointed hour.

Advertising is billions of dollars, multimillions of items, thousands upon thousands of figures and lines on graphs and charts. It is a fabulous breathtaking industry within itself.

But advertising is a thousand times more vital and important as the producer of revenues in many other industries, especially in the great field of communications—newspapers, magazines, radio, and television.

It is the flesh and the blood that makes our newspapers strong, independent and alive. Without it, we would not have the magazines we read by the millions each week and each month. It makes possible the millions of dollars which make possible the programs we see and hear on the air.

Thus, advertising is the mainspring, the powerplant of our economic system. Like the pebble tossed into the water, advertising is the force which ripples into every facet of our economy, our American way of life.

This, then, is what the dictionary did not say: "Advertising—The power and the strength, the money and the manpower, the greatest single factor in the greatest economy in the history of man."

Savings and Loan Associations in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in the February 1962 issue of the National League Journal, publication of the National League of Savings & Loan Associations, is an article written by William Kerwin entitled "Why the United States Should Help Establish Savings and Loan Associations in Latin America."

The article gives a very good analysis of the work being done in Latin America now, having been encouraged by provisions we wrote into the foreign aid bill and also in the housing legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY THE UNITED STATES SHOULD HELP ESTABLISH SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS IN LATIN AMERICA

(By William Kerwin)

The United States is the best housed nation in the world. From coast to coast, border to border, there is no shortage of housing. The United States is probably the only major nation in the world free of a serious housing shortage.

In terms of quantity and the quality of its housing inventory, the United States is unsurpassed. Roughly one-third of the total number of homes in the Nation have been constructed since the end of World War II. This tremendous volume of home construction—approximately 20 million dwellings—eliminated a critical postwar housing shortage and gave the United States its present high standard of housing.

More important from the standpoint of national interest is the fact that 62 percent of the Nation's families own or are purchasing their own homes. It is a recognized fact that homeownership has made capitalists out of every home owning family and thereby has contributed substantially to the effort to strengthen the country against communism.

A major factor in the achievement of the Nation's homeownership objectives has been the savings and loan industry. Savings and loan associations currently are providing 45 percent of all home financing. They are the Nation's principal and primary source of funds for home financing and have held this position for many decades.

The hand-in-hand spectacular growth of homeownership and savings and loan associations in the United States strongly indicates that our system of thrift and homeownership could be applied with success to the underdeveloped nations to alleviate long-

festering housing problems. At the very least, the United States' experience suggests the appropriateness of some experimentation in this area.

Already, a start in this direction has been made in a dozen countries of Latin America. A summary of these activities is included in this report. All experience to date indicates that the savings and loan program in Latin America should be expanded both in terms of U.S. loans to individual nations as well as the establishment of an International Home Loan Bank to provide new capital and leadership for this program. Broadly speaking, the international bank would be authorized to channel funds—obtained from savings associations in the United States—into new savings and loan associations in Latin America. This program has the active sponsorship of Senator GEORGE SMATHERS and hearings are expected to be held on this proposal in 1962.

In capsule form, here are some of the compelling arguments for broadening the savings and loan program in Latin America:

1. Continuation of deplorable housing conditions in Latin America provides a continuous source of grist for the Communist mill and thereby give aid and comfort to the Communist campaign. Unless some effort is made to alleviate the housing problem, communism will spread in Latin America—posing a new and intensified threat to the United States.

2. The housing problem in Latin America is not insoluble. It has been estimated that the Latin American housing shortage approximates upward of 12 million dwellings. Latin America requires construction of 1.3 million homes a year. Current annual output probably measures less than 200,000 units. An expanded program of financial assistance together with intensive technical training could substantially increase housing output within a period of 5 years with geometric impact.

3. Any acceptable solution to the housing problem must include some form of savings and loan associations to open the way for private home ownership which is the mainstay of the middle class. The importance of savings and loan associations in the United States is illustrated by the industry's home financing leadership. In mid-1961, savings associations held $60 billion—or almost 41 percent—of total outstanding mortgage debt on one-to-four family homes.

In 1925, savings associations held $4 billion—or about 30 percent—of the $13 billion in outstanding home mortgage debt. Since 1925, the United States has constructed 26 million homes, an achievement made possible only because of a continuous ever-expanding supply of funds for home financing from savings and loan associations.

As a result, 62 percent of the Nation's families own their homes as contrasted with 44 percent in 1940. Conversely, the number of families renting shelter has fallen from 56 percent to 38 percent. This substantial gain for homeownership has given real meaning to our capitalist society.

4. Other nations which have fostered development of thrift-type institutions have similarly enjoyed better housing conditions. Actually, the savings and loan concept was first developed in Europe and was born in the United States in 1831. Today, thrift institutions can be found in 27 countries including the British Commonwealth nations, Western Europe, and South Africa. There is a "building society" in South Africa with resources of more than one-half billion dollars.

5. Savings and loan associations—with their twin objectives of thrift and homeownership—are indispensable to sustaining a middle class in any nation. Without the opportunity for home-ownership, a nation does not fully develop economically, socially, and politically. Savings and loan associations provide that opportunity.

6. The "seed capital" loans which have been granted and are contemplated by the United States are neither handouts nor are they subsidies. These loans are fully repayable to the United States in dollars and in immeasurable social and economic values. In addition to opening the door to homeownership, savings associations also perform the important function of encouraging thrift, an objective important to any economy—particularly in the fight against inflation.

President Miguel Ydigoras: 1962 New Year's Message to the People of Guatemala

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as a student of Central American history, I have long appreciated the dream of its statesmen to bring about the union of the countries in that important region. It was, therefore, with the greatest interest that I read the 1962 New Year message of President Miguel Ydigoras to the people of Guatemala, in which he gave a vision of the great future that awaits them with the reunification of the Central American states.

The message follows:

It is an honor and privilege to give my New Year's greetings and those of my wife and family to all the Guatemalans, men and women, without discrimination of political banners, and also to send them to the children and the foreign residents.

I want to mention most especially those who will not be by the Christmas tree or close to the nativity of Jesus tonight, surrounded by their folks; my companions in arms who are on watch in their barracks, guaranteeing the public order; the telegraphists on service and the devoted white-clad men and women on duty in the hospitals and emergency posts.

I shall include three main themes in this message: Central American, Belize, and Castro-communism.

There is nothing more encouraging than to see the tiny seed sown in arid lands germinate and, little by little, by dint of patient labor, love of peace, mutual understanding and mutual friendship, grow and bind together, since 1958, the Central American peoples and especially their leaders, my illustrious colleagues, Presidents of El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua and Costa Rica and our new sister the Republic of Panama.

The economic integration and the common market work beautifully, as well or better than in Europe, because our peoples speak the same language, have the same religion and do not compete with one another, producing the same goods, be it capital goods or trinkets.

Soon—very soon—when Costa Rica and Panama join this common market, 14 million Central Americans will be economically united, from the Mexican to the Colombian border. The unionist current is so strong that it will not be imposed by the governments, but by the very peoples who will request from us, the leaders, or from our immediate successors, the political union. Guatemala, as it has always done, has striven to the utmost to reach this divine objective: the Central American Union.

With regard to Belize, our plan is on the way for the recuperation of this indivisible part of our territory. We do not rely on Great Britain, whose arrogance and treacherous diplomacy have had us lose more than 150 years in talks and more talks. We do not reckon with the material strength of huge armies to destroy 450 years of Christian civilization, as has been done a few days ago in Goa; we do not count with international military forces like those launched on Katanga by the United Nations.

We just rely on two words, greater than the Andes and more powerful than nuclear bombs, with two words: reason and justice. We also rely on the moral support of our Central American neighbors, on the support of South American countries and of other nations. We also count with the good will of those thousands of prisoners confined in that hideous concentration camp under the rule of British jailers, the name of which is Belize. Those miserable men, women, children of colored blood have been kept shackled by the English by means of invisible, but heavy chains. During one century and a half that they have occupied that country, they have kept those people in darkness, in the deepest ignorance, poverty, and humiliation. Let us see the latest example.

A few months ago, they played the trick of establishing a Government with a Prime Minister, using for this role one of the few self-educated men. When suddenly in November a hurricane destroyed the city of Belize and other less important ones, the English Governor decreed martial law, ignored and neglected completely the Prime Minister, his Cabinet, and the Legislative Council, entrenched himself with the white people in the highlands, where they availed themselves of the emergency material sent by Guatemala: food, medicines, and other supplies, obliging the inhabitants of Belize, impelled by hunger, to plunder the shops, and obliging Guatemala to present a claim to the United Nations.

Such a frightful picture as that of the hurricane made us realize that the Belizeans never will dare to disclose—even by means of secret referendum—their eagerness to get rid of the English yoke.

Besides the moral support of the Central American peoples, we appeal to them all to help us materially, if it be necessary, for the following historical reasons:

During the colonial era, the Englishmen, after having invaded Belize, did the same in Omoa, Trujillo, the Bay Islands, the Laguna de Taratasca in Honduras, several times, and along the San Juan River, San Carlos Fortress, its mouth and coast in Nicaragua, also occupied several times; and the Serapiqui River in Costa Rica. Capt. Gen. Don Matias de Galvez, with strong contingents of Guatemalan troops and other less important Central American forces, cleaned up, in the course of memorable campaigns, all the territory of the "Reyno de Guatemala," which included the modern Central America. He could not free Belize, because, as he was preparing an expedition, a truce was signed by the Governments of Great Britain and Spain.

In the era in which was born the new Central American Federation, there were many battles in which Guatemalan troops shed their blood to expel the Englishmen from the above mentioned coasts of Honduras, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica and from some of the islands of the Gulf of Fonseca, where the British lion had stuck its greedy claws. Then the British perfidy invented the "King of Mosquitia," the most degrading and putrid political farce ever perpetrated against the Central American integrity. In Belize, at least they never imposed such humiliation; they only maintained British gauleiters to

rule the country. The Government is going to publish a booklet entitled "Central America Under the Impact of British Imperialism in the 19th Century," by the historian, Octavio Aguilar, in order not to let Central Americans forget the affronts suffered by their forefathers during the last century.

The drama, or rather the tragedy, of Central America, which was the result of the English invasions, was the 5-year war called the Filibusters' War, fought to free Nicaragua and Central America from the British voracious claws.

If Costa Rica, with her Procer Mora, started the campaign, Guatemala soon sent her own contingent, which was progressively increased, in spite of losses due to war and to cholera morbus and to her being the most distant of the engaged republics. On September 12, 1857, when the Filibuster William Walker surrendered, the proportion of forces (officers and soldiers) sent by the Central American armies was more or less as follows: Costa Rica, 200 men; Nicaragua, 300 men; Honduras, 180 men; El Salvador, none, for having withdrawn previously her troops several months before. Guatemala generously contributed with her blood and properties to eradicate from Central American soil the ignominious imprint left by the foreign boot.

But no one helped Guatemala either in that century or in the present, to rid her territory of the English yoke. The Central American peoples are indebted to us.

Besides the deeds and sacrifices performed on the altar of the fatherland during the 19th century, Guatemala can remember without false pride that, in 1921, Costa Rica was threatened by a Panamanian invasion due to border incidents. Costa Rica called upon the other sister republics and the only one to answer was Guatemala, who promptly sent a large boat filled with arms, munitions and food supplies, having the courtesy of appointing Col. Rafael Alvardo Tinoco, of Costa Rican descent, as the commander of the expedition.

In 1958, a guerrilla expedition, consisting of two boats sailed from a Cuban port. The illustrious Panamanian Government, seeing the new Communist Filibusters drawing near her coasts, appealed to the neighboring governments to come to its rescue. Guatemala was the only one that sent planes filled with arms, munitions and volunteers—officers and troops—whose presence helped prevent an invasion, and took more than 200 Cuban war prisoners.

If I mention these historical facts it is not to annoy our neighbors—central American peoples and governments—praising all Guatemala has done, the blood shed, the properties destroyed, to preserve the holy and sovereign land of the isthemus. But it is to remind them that Guatemala still has a part of her territory in the hands of the ancestral foe who soiled beaches and lands; that Guatemala is alone, small defenseless, prepared to die alone before the altar of the central American fatherland, to recuperate a part of her territory, and that Guatemala, in her unionist eagerness and her desire to give to the Belicenians better conditions of life, offered to accept them as an associated state, whilst Central America reorganizes her unity, so that Belize can enter into the federation as the sixth state.

Guatemala hopes to receive, at least, the moral support which will make it possible for her to be heard in the international meetings as the voices of a choir as strong as those of our cannons in all the battlefields of Central America.

In view of the actual wall of misunderstanding behind which Great Britain has entrenched and sheltered herself, Guatemala will grudgingly have to break her diplomatic and commercial relations within a short time.

But let us look now at a chapter of contemporary history and a problem of our daily life: Castro communism.

After Panama, Guatemala began to receive the exports of the Cuban revolution. There have been two governments here which started tobogganing down the Socialist slope to fall to the lowest depths of communism. What Castro did rapidly in the course of 2 years, in Guatemala required 10, on account of the passive resistance put up by the people and the religious creeds. Once cleaned up, at least partially, by Col. Carlos Castillo Armas' sword, Guatemala remained soiled by a Communist residue which, even reduced as it is at present, dims the horizon and, with the exterior financial aid, makes possible any prostituted alliance.

This unhealthy group was favored by the sympathy of Castro's allies in Guatemala. This cancer started in Cuba the first of January 1959, and, a few months later, germs of subversion broke out in Guatemala. There were strikes and more strikes, plots, personal attacks, and gradual Communist indoctrination in some sectors.

Guatemala and her Government could not remain innocently waiting for the flash of lightning to strike. In such circumstances the Guatemalans may be daring and gallant. We broke diplomatic relations with the usurpers of the Cuban Government and my Government, publishing the news of the rupture, said that "we do not wish to maintain relations with a government de facto which changes the president as a boy changes his underpants."

First we had to defend ourselves and then to cleanse our territory from backbiters, guerrillas, terrorists, conspirators, all of them eager to profit from Cuban money.

We stimulated the thousands of Cuban exiles so that, instead of lamenting their bad luck, they started fighting to recuperate their own fatherland.

This is the first time my Government speaks about the training of armed Cuban contingents in Guatemala, inspired by a firm anticastrist faith. We agreed with the Cuban leaders in exile and they obtained the help of a friendly government which could supply the military material and support the training campaign and the subsequent operations.

They applied to my Government and very soon a secret camp was organized with another one openly established. There could be no doubt that such a favor upon our part should attract on our leaders the anger and mortal threats from Castroists as well as from Communist Russians and Chinese who are known to be bold and dangerous. But we had to value our services. My Government did not hesitate; I had thought it over beforehand; to solicit the assistance of that friendly government to convince Great Britain that she ought to return us Belize, under certain conditions accepted by the majority of the inhabitants of the colony.

The Guatemalans who live in the neighborhood of the camps and especially of that situated close to the city of Retalhuleu kept perfectly silent; nobody asked them to do so, but they observed a collective discretion which represented their contribution to our military efforts. Ten thousand mouths hermetically closed.

At the same time, a division took place in our armed forces which cleared the faithful part agreeing with our invasion program from the reddish and Communist elements opposed to our plan. A rebellion broke out on November 13, 1960, after the rebels had slaughtered some of the loyal chiefs and officers of our army. Not one sector of our people followed them. The faithful land, sea, and air forces, especially the latter, attacked the rebels trying not to hit the troops, which understood the situation and started coming back to us. Only the leaders of the rebellion fled to the borders and our armed forces happily got rid of these elements.

The day came when the Cuban troops were launched to the attack—April 17—and that battle was fought which is called the battle of Cochinos Beach, to the southwest of the unfortunate island of Cuba.

In the eyes of any neophyte in the military art this was a debacle. For the pro-Communist entrenched in the press and in some of the public offices of the United States of America, this was a debacle. For those who advised to stop the air support which had been offered, this was a defeat. For Castro and his followers, it was a victory. For those, authentic strategists and tacticians who examine the final results, it can be stated that it was a tactical defeat, but the analysis of the results obtained shows that it was an authentic victory. And I shall show it.

From that day on, the Castro military activities were stopped outside Cuba. Castro and his men developed a complex when they understood that the enslaved Cubans would have backed the rebellion should they have had a little more courage and a better organization, and would have risen with the same energy they showed in the era of Marti and Maceo. That battle of Cochinos Beach is a victory like the Jutland naval battle between Germans and Englishmen in the First World War. The latter lost more boats, the Germans won tactically, but their losses were proportionally more severe and the German Fleet did not get out of its ports until it was taken prisoner to Scapa Flow when the truce was signed. There are many such examples in military history.

Our Government kept silent as was usual in such a case, but the hysterics with which the North Americans react whenever they suffer an injury (Pearl Harbor, Bastogne) provoked by their noisy press and stirred by the American pro-Communists, produced a climate of defeatism and debacle. The press and public officers started recriminating and forgetting the elemental reserve, courtesy and companionship, mentioning the name of Guatemala as a training zone and imputing to us the origin of the invasion. Such impudence had never been seen. There were no possible explanations to be given to the American people, one only could whisper a few expiatory words to Khrushchev and to Castro.

President Kennedy, with the sudden impulse of a great leader, publicly declared that he assumed the responsibility for all that had happened. More could not be expected from a great man. He intended—and was successful—to clean many of his staff members from the putrid mire spilled by their own compatriots of the press, radio, and television sectors.

Now it was our turn to speak to the Guatemalans. We do not accuse anyone. The greatest captain in the world can lose a battle.

Our most famous leader, the invincible Gen. Rafael Carrera, said that the military school had been for him the school of his defeats.

But President Kennedy still has to assume the responsibility of another sequel: the promise made to Guatemala has not yet been fulfilled; he must take into account that the Cochinos Beach battle was a victory and not a defeat, and, having started under such good auspices, has to go on carrying out the great task of exterminating communism from that portion of American territory. There are also promises entered into with South America.

What is to be expected from the new meeting in Punta del Este? Those protocols could change the problem and find a solution to it as the Korean one, where many nations jointly fought with gallantry and crushed the Communists. Who knows whether the fights carried on in Korea,

Greece, Laos, Vietnam, have provoked the Berlin dilemma?

Now Guatemala is awaiting the results of the Punta del Este meeting, but also expecting the fulfillment of obligations which cannot be paid with gold—only with good will. Let us fulfill our obligations, all of us.

Commendation by the President of Oklahoma Air National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, all Oklahomans share in the pride given us as a result of the wonderful record achieved by Oklahoma National Guard units both in peacetime and during war. Even now, the 138th Air Transport Group (H) of the Oklahoma Air National Guard is on active duty at Tulsa to strengthen this country's defense posture in the Berlin crisis.

Recently, too, members of the Oklahoma Air National Guard serving at Oklahoma City were commended by the President of the United States for providing communications support during his successful trip to South America. They were crewmembers of the *Talking Bird*, a communications aircraft under the command of Lt. Col. Doyle W. Hastie, of Oklahoma City.

Mr. President, I congratulate Colonel Hastie and his crew on this commendation by the President and ask unanimous consent that the letter from the White House and the names of the crew of the *Talking Bird* be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 3, 1962.

Gen. CURTIS E. LEMAY,
Chief of Staff,
U.S. Air Force, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL LEMAY: The President has asked me to thank the members of the crew of *Talking Bird* for their outstanding communications support of his recent visit to South America.

Lt. Col. Doyle W. Hastie, aircraft commander, and his crew provided invaluable assistance to the White House staff, the White House Army Signal Agency and the U.S. Air Force through radio-phone patch link between Venezuela, Colombia, and Washington prior to and during the President's visit to Venezuela and Colombia.

The President requests that appropriate commanders be advised of this letter and copies be placed in the official records of Colonel Hastie and each crew member.

Sincerely,

GODFREY T. MCHUGH,
Brigadier General, USAF, Air Force Aide to the President.

CREW MEMBERS OF THE "TALKING BIRD"

Lt. Col. Doyle W. Hastie; Capt. Roy B. McKanna, Jr.; Capt. Hugh J. Cunningham; Capt. Karl V. Keller; 1st Lt. George P. Graves; 1st Lt. Thomas R. Webb; S. Msgt. Edward L. Horne; S. Msgt. Ernest P. Quine; S. Msgt. Don A. Stover; M. Sgt. Roscoe F. Simpkins; M. Sgt. Max Terry; M. Sgt. Earnest G. Wolf; T. Sgt. Samuel N. Blackburn; T. Sgt. Charles E. Martz; T. Sgt. Jon W. Wright; T. Sgt. John L. Oltmanns; S. Sgt. Loyd D. Gravitt; S. Sgt. Larry J. Leonard; S. Sgt. Gordon E. Fanselau; S. Sgt. Samuel H. Green; A1c. Charles R. Butcher; A1c. Donald L. Green; A1c. Noel R. Noe; A1c. Charles R. Shinn; Mr. John F. Westbrook, civilian technical representative, Collins Radio Corp.

Effect of Oil Imports on Our Domestic Oil Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, today America faces the problems of national preservation with growing awareness of the many intricacies involved. One aspect is the maintenance and preservation of our natural resources and the allied industries therein affected.

Specifically, we must do all in our power to strengthen this Nation's ability to be self-sufficient in the production of power. Thus, the domestic oil industry must not, it cannot, be sacrificed.

We cannot afford to continue to import 26 percent of the oil which is processed for domestic and foreign consumption. Also, I believe we must maintain the 27½-percent depletion allowable on oil.

Today in my own Oklahoma the small oil companies and many allied and dependent industries are suffocating from the stranglehold of those interests which push for more importation of foreign oil.

As Mr. Harold Freeman, chairman of the Oklahoma Corporation Commission, said in a statement before a subcommittee of the Small Business Committee on November 28, 1961:

> The conditions are that Oklahoma's job-producing, tax-producing, business-producing oil and gas industry needs help. The allowables are down, the bankruptcies are up, rigs are stacked, oilworkers are idle and scattered, the operator's well average is deeper, the costs are greater, money is harder to borrow, the interest rates are higher, and the excessive imports of foreign oil and petroleum products has got its foot on our necks. Excessive imports is the plague, itch, and cancer wrapped up all in one for those of us charged with the responsibility of keeping our domestic oil industry virile and responsive to national emergency.

During the Suez crises in 1956, Oklahoma's oil production shot up from 500,000 to 631,000 barrels daily. That daily increase, calculated on a yearly basis, would represent something like 40 million barrels of crude oil.

From 1957 through 1960 Oklahoma lost $6,460,200 in tax revenue primarily because of the decrease in crude oil production. In 1960 Oklahoma produced 21.7 million barrels fewer than in 1957.

The oil and natural gas producing industry faces not only the normal business hazards of trying to keep income ahead of costs. It also must carry, at its own expense, the capacity to produce far more than peacetime demand requires.

Any thinking person knows that we cannot count on Arabian oil to come surging across the sands like a knight in black armor to save us in case of war. With the blocking of the Suez, bombing of pipelines, submarine control of the Mediterranean, or by direct Soviet invasion, the Near East oil supply could be shut off in a matter of hours or days.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is absolutely essential for this Nation's security that we continue to promote incentive for the search of deposits of oil and gas by both large and small companies.

This can be done by maintaining the 27½-percent oil depletion allowable and the reduction of foreign oil imports.

The 27½-percent oil depletion allowable gives incentive to all oil companies. It must be maintained to help balance with the tremendous costs of wildcatting and exploration.

The 26-percent importation of foreign oil should be slashed to 14 percent of the domestic market. It is unrealistic to eliminate oil importation but, on the other hand, it is suicide to destroy the American oil industry.

Ladies and gentlemen, we cannot fail to heed the gasping sound of this basic industry. We cannot be so blind as to sit idly by while the oil that runs our business, agriculture, and military is shut off like water through a faucet.

The Man From Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, it was fitting that 98 years after the "Man From Illinois" made his memorable address which will live through the ages, another Illinoisan stood on the exact spot, this past November 19, and paid him a glowing tribute. His was a unique tribute in that he compared the challenges of those days to many we face today, using every highlight of that address to assure us that since that long-ago time we have faced crisis after crisis and, because we are a nation founded on liberty and equality, we have endured.

Senator DIRKSEN, in his own eloquent way, painted the beautiful word picture which follows:

> ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, U.S. SENATOR FROM ILLINOIS, AT GETTYSBURG BATTLEFIELD ON THE 98TH ANNIVERSARY OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN'S GETTYSBURG ADDRESS WHICH WAS DELIVERED ON NOVEMBER 19, 1863
>
> Four score and eighteen years ago this day, the man from Illinois stood in this place, the destiny of a nation upon his shoulders and the cares of conflict graven upon his face.
>
> From thousands of patriot graves, men who had fallen beneath a July sun were speak-

ing to him. From his anguished soul he was trying to speak to and for them.

He was uneasy. In ink and pencil he drafted and redrafted the remarks which he was invited to make. His mind struggled to embody in few words a mesage suited to the occasion, setting forth the reason for the conflict, the duty still at hand, and the hope for the future. Yet, out of deep humility, he was impelled to say that it was not the words of the living which would be noted and remembered but only the deeds of heroes who had fallen here for the Union.

Consider then his words. He spoke of our forefathers—those who were here before him and brought forth a new nation. They were but one of many generations who had gone before, a part of the endless stream which flows through time and history and gives continuity to our national life.

Each generation added to the inheritance which it received from those who had gone before, enriched it and transmitted it to those who were to follow. They dug the wells and planted the fields and vineyards from which those who came after were refreshed; they built the roads by which others traveled; they built the railroads by which people and things were transported; they tilled the soil from which came food and subsistence; they founded the industries where men worked; they gave the law for commerce and conduct and built the schools by which culture, classics and communication might become an open book to all. This they did — those generations who marched before—for our legacy and our trusteeship.

The new nation which they wrought was conceived in liberty and dedicated to equality.

How freely those words come to the tongue in all parts of the earth—liberty and equality. And what strange meanings are read into them.

Men speak of liberty even as it is being extinguished before their eyes. They speak of liberty, even as it is being transformed into a strange gospel. Men speak of liberty, even as her domain shrinks and she struggles for survival. Men speak of liberty even as such heresies as "Better Red than Dead" rise up to be embraced by those who have forgotten freedom's price. But the man from Illinois spoke only of that liberty which ennobles and dignifies the individual and preserves his godly image.

The man from Illinois spoke of a nation dedicated to equality. Is it a hollow word with which to beguile multitudes or does it have meaning? If it means anything, it must mean equality before the law, equality of opportunity, and equality of rights or it departs from the concept to which the new nation was dedicated. Narrow the meaning of the word as we will, struggle against its fulfillment as we may, hedge it with conditions and exceptions to strangle its full import, it could have but one meaning to the man from Illinois who stood here 98 years ago and that is equality under a just God, equality under man's law, and equality in the enjoyment of life, the enjoyment of liberty, and freedom for each to pursue happiness in his own way.

Then came the deathless question which continues to roll down time's corridor with each generation. Can a nation so conceived and so dedicated long endure?

What strange doubts assail this timid generation of today as it beholds the challenges to both liberty and equality.

We seem beset with fear not faith, with doubt not confidence, with compromise not conviction, with dismay not dedication.

We are drenched with the literature of fear and doubt. Survival has become the main theme. The fallout shelter from which the stars of hope and courage cannot be seen has become the symbol of our fears and misgivings.

Are we to become fearful, unworthy legatees in a blessed, united land where the earth is fertile to our every need, where the skills and ingenuity of men are boundless, where the burdens are bearable, where decent living is within the reach of all, and where the genius to produce is unlimited?

Perhaps we have lost our sense of continuity? Perhaps we have forgotten that we move in that same endless stream which began with our forefathers and which will flow on and on to embrace our children and our children's children. If we have, there will have gone with it that sense of individual responsibility which is the last best hope that a nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to equality can long endure.

Comes then the reminder from the man from Illinois. Men died here and men are sleeping here who fought under a July sun that the Nation might endure, united, free, tolerant, and devoted to equality.

The task was unfinished. It is never quite finished.

Freedom is never fully won at any given time or place. From Runnymede and the Magna Carta until now is seven and one-half centuries. Has there been a generation in which liberty has not been challenged in one form or another?

In the day of our forefathers, the challenge was from a king and his ministers to a people.

When our Capital was burned by the British in 1814 it was an imperious sovereign against an infant land.

When the man from Illinois stood here 98 years ago, it was the challenge flowing from one of the unsovled problems in the Constitution.

Three score years ago, it was a helpless island people against a foreign tyrant.

Twice in our own time, it was the challenge of autocracy and dictatorship versus freedom and self-determination.

And today, it is the challenge of cold war born strangely enough in the crucible of hot war. It is the challenge of a despotic, deceitful system with its own prophets, its own holy book, its own specious promises of salvation, its own image of man as a creature without dignity or the everlasting hope of another more glorious life.

But the challenge to freedom is not limited to forces from without. It embraces also those individuals and groups who are unceasing in their efforts to expand the powers and functions of the Central Government and have it intrude more deeply into the affairs of the people.

These, all these, are the continuing challenges to freedom and the task of the defenders is never finished.

Comes now the shining hope and the duty with which the man from Illinois charged his countrymen.

The hope—a new birth of freedom. But can there be a birth without labor and pain?

Dare we in this soft age believe when men shrink from pain and sacrifice that a new birth of freedom and a new sense of mission can come without pain?

And then the further hope that self-government shall not perish. He did not mean government of the few but of all. He did not say government by the few but by all. He did not say government for the few but for all.

But the key to all is government by the people for the certain way to lose the precious power of self-government is failure to use it.

So spoke the man from Illinois 98 years ago this day.

His imperishable words are as fresh today as when they were uttered.

The problem today is the same as in his day—whether in this uneasy, fevered world, this or any nation founded on liberty and equality can long endure.

The duty is the same—the duty imposed upon us as a part of that endless procession of men and women to build and ennoble this good land and carry on the unfinished work.

The bonds are the same, for the living cannot separate themselves from their obligation to the dead.

The need is the same—for a new birth of freedom as the lamps of liberty go out in many places, either by force and brutality or by default.

The challenge is the same—for this generation to come out of the gloomy shelters of defeatism and despair and assert freedom's cause under God to all the world with the same vigor and purpose which marked the course of the man from Illinois.

His name you know—Abraham Lincoln.

Taxes and the Lathe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, we are confronted today with the great issue: How can we compete effectively in the burgeoning new markets of the world?

One of the most important responses we can make is to modernize our tax structure so that American industries can compete effectively overseas.

Mr. Donald I. Rogers, a perceptive and able columnist for the New York Herald Tribune, has written an article on this subject which I think is particularly interesting. Mr. Rogers' article is entitled "Taxes and the Lathe." In it, he describes how depreciation allowances work and tells how important they are to the maintenance and strengthening of American industrial resources. I ask unanimous consent that this excellent article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAXES AND THE LATHE

(By Donald I. Rogers)

The President has indicated that he will place before the reconvened Congress several matters for urgent consideration, among them, a request for revisions of the tax law to permit greater depreciation allowances. It's an old appeal, this one for increased depreciation, so old and so constant, in fact, that the public may have lost sight of its importance.

For openers, it might be said in all fairness, that there is nothing in the President's program of transcending importance. It might also be said that, if nothing is done about depreciation allowances, America might soon be forced out of competitive world markets.

W. Cordes Snyder, Jr., chairman and president of Blaw-Knox Co., writing in the current issue of the Exchange, the magazine published by the New York Stock Exchange, cites, for instance, the example of a turret lathe purchased recently by his company.

It replaced one bought in 1928 at a cost of $8,140. It has been fully depreciated—that is, the tax people had allowed Blaw-Knox to set aside a sum each year against its replacement—and in addition, the company realized $675 from its resale. Thus there was available a total of $8,815 for the purchase of a replacement.

The cost of the new lathe, however, was $46,915.

Mr. Snyder explains that, while the replacement was somewhat larger and more flexible, it has roughly the same capacity as the old lathe. Just to stay even, then, the company had to invest an additional $38,100 to get a new lathe.

But, to be able to invest that $38,100, it had to earn about $80,000 before taxes.

The cause of this problem? Obviously, the depreciation is too slim and is spread over too long a period.

"This situation," says Mr. Snyder, "illustrates a problem which, unless satisfactorily resolved, threatens investors with deteriorating values and workers with constricted employment opportunities."

To explain depreciation: It is a charge made to income to reflect the cost of capital goods consumed in production because they are long lived and are consumed over a long period of time. The tax laws recognize this and allow a portion of the cost of capital goods to be added each year to the cost of production.

But there are two weaknesses: First, depreciation is based on original cost and fails to recognize the effects of inflation, as in the case of Mr. Snyder's turret lathe. Second, depreciation is based not only on original cost but also on the estimated useful lifespan of the piece of equipment concerned. Even in ideal circumstances, useful life is hard to estimate and in a period of rapid technological change such an estimate is arbitrary and unreliable.

A steel company president reported that in 1927 his company built a rolling mill at a cost of $3 million. In 1957, it was decided to replace the mill with a new one. The old mill had been fully depreciated so that, in effect, $3 million was available for purchase of the new facility. The new mill was actually larger, more modern, but it was estimated that it would cost $12 million to replace the 1927 mill with one of comparable capacity. Thus, to stay even, $9 million in new money had to be invested. In order to accumulate that $9 million, the company had to earn $18,750,000 before taxes.

Another steel company had an open hearth furnace built 25 years ago for $10 million. To replace it would cost $64 million. To stay even $54 million in new money needs to be invested. Says the president: "Now we have to earn $112,500,000 before taxes to get that $54 million. Now the Government says that $112,500,000 is profit and they tax it as profit. But it isn't profit at all. It is our seed corn."

"It does not go to our stockholders or to our workers or to expanded production for our customers or to make new jobs. It does not change a thing. It does not finance progress. It is merely the cost of standing still."

Mr. Snyder cites the different views taken by foreign nations which compete with us in world markets. Their tax structures, unlike ours, have been designed to encourage investment and discourage consumption. In the United Kingdom, basic depreciation rates range from 7½ percent to 25 percent, but special allowances permit recovery of up to 45 percent of the cost of new equipment in the first year of its use.

France, if anything, is even more liberal than the United Kingdom. Under French law, up to 57.8 percent of new equipment can be depreciated over the first 3 years of useful life. In addition, France recognizes inflation by allowing depreciation rates ranging up to 2,430 percent for assets dating back to 1914. Even property formerly fully depreciated can have a restored value for additional appreciation.

Germany, which had most liberal depreciation procedures immediately after the war, today has tightened up a bit. The basic rate is 10 percent annually, but this is boosted by allowing 25 percent in the first year and 58 percent in the first 3 years under special provisions.

Says Mr. Snyder: "It can be assumed that the encouragement of capital accumulation and reinvestment has played a large role in the amazing recovery of these nations. We are already feeling the sting of their competition and, unless we revise our attitudes, we may well awaken to find our competitive position seriously compromised."

Is There an Uncle Sam?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, when talking about the Communist form of government as opposed to our republican form of government, it is important to be articulate in expounding the virtues of our system. Many seem to be at a loss in this field. This may result partly from ignorance as to what communism really is. It may, sadly enough, result from ignorance as to what our system of government exemplifies, or even from a lack of deep-seated belief in what our Constitution provides. In any event, it is not enough to point out that we have many more material advantages, such as more washing machines, more television sets, or more automobiles. A true American knows these are not sufficient reasons to believe in any form of government because they are not reasons, they are the results of our free enterprise system. Our reasons go much deeper, and are bound up in the spiritual as well as the materialistic benefits.

Because I know this, I was much impressed with an almost poetic dissertation on the subject by one of our columnists.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks a column "These Days," written by George E. Sokolsky, and printed in the January 31 issue of the Washington Post, entitled "His Name Is Uncle Sam":

HIS NAME IS UNCLE SAM

(By George E. Sokolsky)

One of the truly great editorials of all time appeared in the New York Sun in reply to a child, Virginia, who wanted to know whether there is a Santa Claus. The truth of the matter, of course, is that there is a Santa Claus, but he dwells only in the heart of the generous. He has no form, no style, no nationality, no particular religion. He is the embodiment of love.

Now along comes Robert G. Smith who wants to know if there is an Uncle Sam. He writes to ask:

"My name is not Virginia and I'm considerably more than 9 years old but I, too, have a momentous question regarding a well-known character:

"Is there an Uncle Sam?

"You know who I mean—the tall, rugged, white-haired figure in red-and-white-striped trousers, blue coat, and star-spangled hat—traditional symbol of the American way of life.

"Is he still around? Or is he hiding out in the Green Mountains of Vermont? Or some other place like that?

"Some say Uncle Sam is a back number. They say Uncle Sugar Daddy is now top man in Washington—doling out his assorted 'goodies' to his many nephews and nieces, his country cousins and foreign relations.

"They say patriotism is strictly for the birds—the vanishing bald eagle that is.

"I suppose it's the old-fashioned Connecticut Yankee in me, or maybe my 4 years in the Navy during World War II, but I'm kinda hard to convince * * *."

Of course, there is an Uncle Sam. He is a simple fellow who has built a great country with his own hands. His ancestors crossed an ocean to find an alien shore here. Everybody who ever came here had to cross a frightening ocean.

In the old days, Uncle Sam's ancestors found Indians and forests and wild beasts; today, those who come find large cities, with good roads to connect them, with railroads and airplanes. In the old days, each man built his home and his schoolhouse and his church by his own sinews and sweat; today he moves into a house of the most modern devices.

In the old days, Uncle Sam had to find a place for himself, where he could farm for food and clothing, where his wife could cook and spin and sew; today, his wife finds what she requires in a supermarket, while he earns a wage and builds a family.

In the old days, Uncle Sam crossed mountains and rivers and valleys, carrying his goods and folks with great hardship until he found a place for himself, risking limb and life to conquer a continent and make it a glorious granary; today, he finds ample facilities to take him from place to place and wherever he goes there are mines and mills and factories and stores to provide work, and wherever he goes there are schools and colleges and technological institutes for those who require such facilities and have the ambition to use them.

And there are churches, too. There are prayer houses of all varieties of religion, each man either following freely in the ways of his ancestors, or choosing his own way, or none at all. Freedom of choice is the doctrine that guides our people and those who would limit freedom are regarded as hateful creatures, not true descendants of Uncle Sam.

Is there an Uncle Sam?

More than 50 races of man have found a free life here, freedom of opportunity, freedom of choice, freedom of movement, freedom to work, freedom to read and write and speak. And to give glory to it all, for each there is freedom to worship God, each man as he chooses, whether Jew, or Christian, or Moslem, or whatever.

Is there an Uncle Sam?

How can one doubt it?

Yes, Uncle Sam is in the hearts of those who believe that freedom and equality are qualities which come to us from God and will survive all the errors of stupid and selfish men and women.

Patriotism and Good Will Toward Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Horning Speaks Before More Than 300 at Chamber's Annual Dinner" which appeared on page 1 of the

January 25, 1962, edition of the Seymour (Ind.) Tribune.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HORNING SPEAKS BEFORE MORE THAN 300 AT CHAMBER'S ANNUAL DINNER

A Hoosier farmboy who made good returned to his hometown of Seymour to speak to more than 300 persons Wednesday night at the Seymour Chamber of Commerce annual dinner.

Lawrence William Horning, vice president of the New York Central Railroad, extolled patriotism and good will toward men and said the great bulk of the world's good work is done by common, ordinary everyday people like those in Seymour.

His audience was by far the largest ever to attend an annual dinner of the Seymour Chamber. Horning, who started his railroad career 42 years ago as a platform attendant, rose to the executive ranks of the New York Central, but he still has a big place in his heart for Seymour.

"Two score years and five have passed since I left Seymour, to return only as an occasional visitor," the 63-year-old executive said. "It is, therefore, with great nostalgia that I have returned to my 'home country' today. I attest the truth of that old Hoosier saying, 'You can take the boy out of Indiana, but you can't take Indiana out of the boy.'"

He reminisced about his boyhood in Indiana and the farm on which he grew up just 6 miles south of Seymour on the Muscatatuck River. His talk was sprinkled with anecdotes amusing to his large audience.

"I sometimes think that if you were born without inheriting home, money, or anything much that men desire in the way of opportunity—and yet if you were born in America, particularly in a place like Indiana, you were born with a silver spoon in your mouth," he told the gathering.

"Today behind the Iron Curtain," he said, "there is fear, not freedom; slavery, not initiative; suppression, not motivation; terror, not happiness; restrictions, not help to progress. We have developed individual enterprise because of our form of Government, not because we inherited great resources.

"Anyone born under the American flag can get just as far as his talents and ambitions carry him. He is not tied down by tradition, by dictators or by unfriendly overlords."

Horning, who quoted President Kennedy's famous statement, "Now is the time for Americans to ask what they can do for their country, rather than what their country can do for them," was disturbed that nearly 20 percent of Americans eligible to vote in the 1960 presidential election did not exercise that right.

In some States, he said, less than 50 percent of eligible persons voted. "I suggest that most Americans, including ourselves, take too little interest in our Government and how it is run."

He said that of 5,715,618 young Americans given physical examinations for military service between October 1948, and June 1960, 2,216,110 or 38.8 percent were rejected. Of the 129,209 called in Indiana, 42,377 were rejected, or 32.8 percent.

"Are Americans getting soft?" he asked, "Have we become victims of easy life?"

Speaking of good will, Horning said there are two kinds, entirely separate and distinct. But both play an important part in human life.

"There is, first, the goodwill of trade concerning which we hear so much about in business circles," he said.

Horning added, "Greater by far than the other is that good will of which the Galilean shepherds sang, when in the silent night as they kept watch over their flocks, they announced the advent of a newborn King, the dominating principle of whose reign was set forth in the benedictory proclamation—'On earth peace, good will to men.' From that eventful hour until now, we have spoken of the benevolence of the human heart as 'good will.'"

In explaining how the ordinary, everyday people achieve great deeds, Horning said, "It is not the four-leaf clover which feeds the cows and the bees giving us milk and honey.

"Rather, it is the three-leaf clover, the common, ordinary garden variety that feeds the cows and the bees. And the great bulk of the world's good work, both physical and spiritual, is not being done by a few men of genius but by a great host of common, ordinary, everyday people, like those in Seymour, who have taken the pains to grow up."

He also said the youth of the Nation need help and counsel and that we are failing them. "The figures with regard to teenagers involved in serious crimes are startling.

"Let us as good citizens, do our best to train them by precept and example to be good and able citizens. Tomorrow, the fate of America will rest upon the shoulders of our children—have we done our best to train and to prepare them for that awesome responsibility?"

The veteran railroad executive was introduced by John H. Conner, who called him a self-made man who enthusiastically praises his hometown and is often known as "Mr. Seymour."

Walter L. "Bud" Surface, 1961 president of the Seymour chamber, was in charge of the program, introducing some of the notable persons in attendance. They included Senator Homer E. Capehart, Republican, of Indiana; Charles O. Hendricks, Indiana secretary of state; W. Spurgeon, joint State senator from Jackson, Scott, and Washington Counties; Robert F. Speckner, joint State representative from Jackson and Brown Counties; J. Ralph Thompson, Seymour, president of the Indiana State Chamber of Commerce; and Harold E. Riley, 1962 president of the Seymour chamber.

Riley presented an engraved plaque to the outgoing chamber president and then gave a brief address, stating the success of a community depends on the active participation of its chamber of commerce committees.

Following Horning's speech, Surface presented the speaker an engraved sterling silver cigarette box. In his closing remarks, Surface said the local chamber is solvent and that its industrial committee is doing a good job.

FIVE HUNDRED MORE EMPLOYED HERE

He reported the new Gardner Box Co. produced 1.5 million boxes last month. Also, he mentioned the new Arvin Industries north plant and said the Amoco Chemicals Corp. Propellants Division plant has doubled its employment. In November 1961 there were 500 more people employed in Seymour than in November 1960.

Surface also cited the growth of Seymour's financial institutions, the cooperation of the city administration regarding the city parking lot, the cooperation of Freeman Field with the industrial development committee, and the addition of churches and new businesses to Seymour last year.

Resolution by Republican Women's Federated Clubs of New Hampshire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Republican Women's Federated Clubs of New Hampshire at their annual meeting.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the United States has carried the greater financial burden of the United Nations over a number of years; and

Whereas there is an increasing prospect of the United Nations being controlled by enemy and so-called neutralist countries; and

Whereas the present administration in Washington will request the United States to authorize the purchase of up to one hundred million dollars of the two hundred million dollars of the United Nations' bond issue; and

Whereas Representative EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Republican, from the State of Illinois, will introduce legislation opposing and prohibiting the United States from purchasing United Nations bonds; and

Whereas we are deeply concerned over the huge deficit, the frightening outflow of gold, the staggering tax burden that is put on the American citizens and the problematical value of those bonds; therefore

Resolved, That the Republican Women's Federated Clubs of New Hampshire, at their annual meeting held in Concord, New Hampshire on January 15, 1962, express their strong opposition to the United States buying any of these bonds, and commend Representative EDWARD DERWINSKI for his forthright stand in bringing before the Congress of the United States, a bill prohibiting the United States from purchasing these United Nations' bonds; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Senator NORRIS COTTON, Senator MAURICE J. MURPHY, JR., Representative CHESTER MERROW, Representative PERKINS BASS, and Representative EDWARD J. DERWINSKI.

Is the U.N. Worth Saving?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, a few days ago there appeared in the Washington Star an article by an eminent columnist and political writer, Gould Lincoln. That column has been reproduced in the Montgomery Advertiser of February 3, 1962. The article is entitled "Whether the U.N. Is Worth Saving." I wish to read only the opening of Mr. Lincoln's statement, which is as follows:

Within a brief time the question: "Is the United Nations worth saving?" will come before Congress in a very tangible, matter-of-fact, down-to-earth way. For Congress will have to decide whether it will agree to President Kennedy's recommendation that this Government subscribe to one-half of the $200 million bond issue which the U.N. proposes to float so it can pay for its forceful action restoring order in the Congo. Obviously, the U.N. cannot continue to function in the red.

It is a very readable article. In my opinion, it presents the subject in the most realistic manner. I commend its reading to my colleagues in the Senate and, in fact, to everyone.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHETHER THE U.N. IS WORTH SAVING

(By Gould Lincoln)

Within a brief time the question: "Is the United Nations worth saving?" will come before Congress in a very tangible, matter-of-fact, down-to-earth way. For Congress will have to decide whether it will agree to President Kennedy's recommendation that this Government subscribe to one-half of the $200 million bond issue which the U.N. proposes to float so it can pay for its forceful action restoring order in the Congo. Obviously, the U.N. cannot continue to function in the red. The bond issue is not an assessment. Nor is it a financially profitable investment for the bonds, which are to run for 25 years and pay 2 percent interest.

One-half this bond issue is a very large share to be taken by one nation out of a membership of 104. But obviously the Communist bloc, led by Soviet Russia, will not subscribe, since it has been opposed to this action in the Congo. And for a good reason in the Communist mind—any successful democratization in the Congo means less opportunity for the Communists to take over this newly independent part of Africa. How far the British and French (who have been lukewarm, to say the least, about the operation) will wish to subscribe remains to be seen. Other than the United States, these are the larger nations able to contribute most to the U.N.

It seems entirely clear that if the United States fails to take up a large part of this bond issue, the U.N. will go broke. While there has been opposition in this country to the Congo operations, particularly so far as the Katanga Province is concerned, this is a time to rally to the support of the United Nations. If we do not like the bond issue, we should find some other way of contributing the necessary funds. But the bond issue is the most feasible method of raising the money yet suggested.

It is time for real hard thinking about what will be the situation if the United Nations is allowed to go down the drain—to follow the old League of Nations as the latest effort to find a way to world peace and justice. Where would the loss of the United Nations leave the free world—that part of the world opposed to international communism? The Communist bloc is welded together by a single purpose and that is to take over the entire world. This is true despite the conflicts in opinion which have arisen between Red Russia and Red China and Albania. Their differences are as to the method of seeking to dominate the world. While Russia's Nikita Khushchev talks of a peaceful coexistence—apparently to lull the free nations to a condition that Communist subversion and conquest may be easier—the Chinese are demanding more direct action.

Without the U.N., will it be easier for the Russian Communists to pick off one free or so-called neutralist nation after another, thus avoiding war and gaining their desired end? Would it be more to the interest of the free world to create a separate alliance, opposed to the Communist bloc? Such a plan has been suggested. Always the Communists seek to pit one nation of the free world against another—to play on the self-interest of one nation as against that of another.

The United Nations was conceived in the idea that, after the Second World War and its terrible cost in life and treasure, it would be possible to create a really workable international organization for peace with justice. The U.N. Charter was written in San Francisco in 1945 and great hopes were expressed for its future. It was only a matter of months, however, until the recalcitrance of the Russian Communist Government came into full view. It has progressed with each year. Nevertheless, the U.N. has proved its value again and again on the side of peace—frequently on the side of the free world.

The U.N. has fought one war—the war to preserve the Republic of Korea. The United States provided nearly all the armed forces and the money to fight that war. We took the lead. Because of our position then in the Far East, only we could take the lead. We could have won a decisive victory had the conflict been carried to the sources of the Communist supplies. In the end, however, the Republic of Korea was preserved and has not fallen to the Communists to date. In that war the Red Chinese provided men and the Russians provided weapons for the Communists of North Korea.

The United States has tried to make the U.N. a real agency of peace. The Communist bloc has tried to use it only for propaganda, and to stall off peaceful settlements in international disputes. This, however, is no good reason for junking the United Nations. It may be necessary to revise the charter of the U.N., and wise to do so. But unless the world is prepared and intends to go to a hot war, the United Nations is worth saving.

Response From South America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Subcommittee on Inter-American Economic Relationships of the Joint Economic Committee released its report on its recent 2-week trip through six Latin American countries. As a member of Joint Economic Committee and a participant in this trip, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the report of the subcommittee and the supplemental views which I added.

As a result of this trip, and the remarks which I made about it both during and after the trip itself, I have had several very interesting letters from persons knowledgeable in South America, its politics, economics, people and, most importantly, its future. There is one of these letters which I would like to share with my colleagues and with the people of this country. At the request of its author, an American citizen presently living and working in one of the countries visited by the subcommittee, I am not disclosing his name. Nevertheless, I think it is worthy of the attention of those interested in framing a workable policy for our relations with Latin America.

The letter follows:

Hon. THOS. B. CURTIS,
The U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The local press has published translation into Spanish of a recent interview by you in which you warn against erroneous policies in "alliance for progress." Feeling you might like to have it, I attach the clipping.

Your criticisms are well taken, and they substantially agree with those of Henry Hazlitt to a speech by Chester Bowles (see Newsweek, Nov. 20, 1961). It is outright Communist propaganda to affirm, as it is often done in your press, and voiced by your "presidential advisers," that the only alternative to "reforms" and to the virtual annihilation of everybody with vested interests (implicitly including the budding middle class in these countries) is castroism. These opinions raise immediately the question whether it is the permanent policy of the United States of America to fight to death for Vietnam while allowing a by now clearly acknowledged Russian outpost in this continent. You can well understand that so long as we are not quite clear on this point—and your President's recent declarations to Adzhubel in favor of "pacific connivance" give rise to serious questions—we cannot sleep in peace. Castroism does poison youth not only in Cuba, but throughout Latin America, and this is a grave threat to the future of this continent, so particularly in countries which, like this one, number in their populations almost half youth below the 20 years' age.

If you are interested in reading what criticisms are directed to alliance for progress here by writers of the Red persuasion I can supply clippings for your information, naturally, in the Spanish language. They may highly interest you.

What we need here is not a stream of perhaps well meant propaganda from your side which goes to fan unrest, threats of social war, illegal occupation of productive land, more or less "clean" forced expropriation to favor the "few," etc. What we need is a firm requirement of honest bureaucracy and administration, stability, policies direct to increase, not to stifle free enterprise. Above all, we do positively need to know whether, in spite of much talking, you have written off this continent by allowing Castro virtually to rule with armed threats, subversion and example.

It may be feared that your President, who patently does not know at all this end of the world, is not at all well informed by his "advisers" who evidently know even less. Latin America is exceedingly difficult to understand, for its problems are in every respect baffling to the average American. It may be that Puerto Rico is an "example," but you should never forget, against those who stress it, that Puerto Rico stands before the United States of America in the position of a minor before an adult. In Puerto Rico, the sky is not the limit, which is by no means sure elsewhere when the ball starts rolling.

I would above all suggest that you never lose sight of one, very main point: you deal in this end of the world with two different things which need not be confused. One, is a genuine need for certain reforms to which virtually every sane mind will not object. The other is a ruthless, very clever campaign directed by Moscow, and intended to capitalize on every mistake you may make. You appear to be aware that here the things are quite true, and very different, but few Americans—your President and his advisers in the number—seem to be clearly aware of this substantial difference between what genuinely is, and what is being made of it to your own ultimate discomfiture. The more you err, the longer will be the cold war, and so, naturally, the risk of an eventual atomic war. Probing on and on, Krushchev may try and reap, until the fat will be in the fire.

Yours truly,

——— ———.

Emotionalism Fogs Medical Care Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Maurice H. Stans, former Director of the Budget in the Eisenhower administration, has written the following article in connection with the medical care issue, which I am sure will be of interest to all Members of the Congress.

I noticed that he was referring to the Forand bill and not to the King-Anderson bill, because the latter bill which is the administration bill now before the Ways and Means Committee, provides only for hospitalization, and while it is termed a "medical care bill," it has nothing to do with the payment of doctor bills:

OUR CHANGING ECONOMY—EMOTIONALISM FOGS MEDICAL CARE ISSUE

(By Maurice H. Stans)

President Kennedy has repeated his request to the Congress to write a new law putting medical care for the aged under social security. It is likely to be one of the hottest and least understood issues in the current session.

Ever since medical care for the aged became a political issue early in 1960, it has generated an atomic lot of heat and a minimum of reality. Even today many people wrongly seem to believe the issue is medical care or no medical care. This is the result of another case of undue emotionalism in Washington—a surge of sympathy misdirected toward an excess of government.

There are no facts or figures, of course, as to how many people there are over 65 who need and want medical or hospital care and don't get it. Whatever their number, no one in this enlightened country wants anyone to suffer from that lack. The problem has been, and is, how to find the most sensible way to see that they don't

We do know some facts. There are nearly 17 million people over 65. A large proportion of them are not medically indigent. Those over 65 account for 9 percent of our total population, and, despite the retirement majority, they still receive 8 percent of all personal incomes.

More than half of those over 65 have coverage under some form of health insurance, and the number is increasing rapidly. Millions more are safeguarded by their own wealth, the resources of their families and services of local welfare and church agencies. Other millions are assured of present or future benefits by their rights and privileges under veterans' benefit programs. The number without adequate health protection is proportionately small. It will grow even smaller as those now under 65 and holding an even greater degree of coverage of their medical needs move into the over-65 bracket with retirement protection.

KERR-MILLS BILL

Under these conditions, the White House and Secretary Flemming in 1960 developed a plan that would fill the medical gap, whatever it might turn out to be. Under it, the provision of medical and hospital services to all those in need of assistance would be left to the local communities. The State would advance the cost, and Washington would pick up 50 to 80 percent of the bill, variable according to the wealth of the States.

Depending on the scope of the benefits covered and the estimates of numbers of beneficiaries, the Federal Government's share would be something over $200 million in the first year of the program and about $400 to $500 million in later years. And it was accepted that under a widespread program like this, these costs would include a fairly substantial amount which would not represent new protection but merely a transfer of responsibility from existing sources to the State and Federal Governments.

With some changes, the Flemming plan was enacted as the Kerr-Mills bill in the 1960 session of the Congress. It is now in operation in 26 States and a dozen others are moving toward it. Unfortunately, the continued agitation for a more expansive plan under social security has slowed up action in some States. But there is no evidence that the present program is inadequate.

NO TEST OF NEED APPLIED

The social security proposal is entirely different in a fundamental way. It applies no test of need and gives everyone over 65, regardless of wealth, income or other means, the vested right to submit medical and hospital bills to Washington to be paid. The cost would be paid by another increase in social security taxes, already scheduled to rise to 9¼ percent by 1968, to be shared equally by working people of all ages and their employers. The total annual cost of this plan has been estimated to be from $1.5 to $2.5 billion at the start and rising in later years to $5 billion or more.

I have never been able to understand why the social security way would make sense, or why any workingman would support it. It would multiply the tax collections and payments for medical care eight- or ten-fold, only to provide added funds to give to those who didn't need them.

It would, in other words, set up a program that benefited 8 or 10 people for every 1 that needed help. To cite an extreme, it would cover payments to the Fords, Rockefellers, Morgans, Harrimans and other wealthy individuals over 65. It would mean that working men and women would dig up taxes to cover such expenses for Maurice Stans when he reaches 65 and for millions of others who ought to meet their own bills. It would double the social security bureaucracy, which now has 32,000 employees and a vast forest of electronic machines.

THREE MILLION UNPROTECTED

Despite this, it would fail to protect 3 or 4 million people over 65 who are not eligible for social security. And the program, I feel sure, would not stop at age 65. Let's not deceive ourselves. Within a year or so after it were operative, the drive would begin to lower the age qualification, especially since the taxes would be paid by younger employed, and the pressure could continue until everyone was covered. And certainly the administrators of the funds would have to fix limits and standards on the kind of medical care and hospital services that would qualify.

By degrees we would move into a socialization of medical and hospital practices. I can understand why the medical profession does not want this, and, with the ever-increasing cost experience of Britain and other countries as evidence, we should beware of it here.

Putting medical care for the aged under a mandatory social security program would be the beginning of the largest single step we could take toward government paternalism and the centralized state. If we want to preserve our personal pride, our sense of character and responsibility, our freedom of choice and decentralized government, we ought to oppose this to the fullest. And no one will suffer, because the machinery already in law will take care of everyone who needs help at a lot less cost to the taxpayer.

The Power of God: Our Ultimate Weapon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, in these times when both our internal and external security are constantly threatened by the menace of communism, I like to recall the words of that great patriot, Thomas Jefferson, who said, "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

Part of being vigilant is being informed. And, in this respect I want to congratulate and commend the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce. This organization, which has its national headquarters at Tulsa, Okla., has devoted the January issue of its national publication, Future, to informing its members on communism.

In this issue, Editor Tom Campbell and Associate Editor Harry Orbaugh have chosen a wide variety of informative articles on communism including one by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover entitled "The Power of God: Our Ultimate Weapon."

Mr. President, I commend this article to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POWER OF GOD: OUR ULTIMATE WEAPON

(By John Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation)

"And there went out another horse that was red: and power was given to him that sat thereon to take peace from the earth * * *." Revelation 6: 4.

Today, riders of the red horse of communism dominate a quarter of the land surface of the earth and a third of all its people. Of the remainder, Nikita Khrushchev has said, "We will bury you."

Born in blasphemous denial of the existence of God, communism has erected upon this false premise a doctrine so diametrically opposed to truth and so morally perverted as to be intrinsically evil.

Man is, therefore, faced with two imperatives: To fight the Communist as one would a mad dog, out of sheer self-preservation, and to fight communism in the discharge of our moral obligation, to do so as children of God.

Victory in the conflict with communism cannot be cheaply bought. The stakes are too high and the forces in collision are too great and complex to permit a merely negative attitude toward the enemy.

What, then, can the conscientious American citizen do to insure that he is responding effectively to the Communist challenge? Here are some basic suggestions:

Know your enemy.

You cannot well resist or counterattack what you do not understand or are unable to identify. Study accurate accounts of communism; its nature, goals, and methods of operation. Learn its strengths and weaknesses. Arm yourself against deception—communism's primary weapon.

Acquire a knowledge of and appreciation for your American heritage—then use it. Spread the awarness of our possession of priceless rights and liberties which have been

denied to the majority of mankind since the fall of Adam. Never, through any act of religious or racial intolerance, cheapen that for which virtually every generation of Americans has shed its blood—the inherent dignity and equality of every man before God.

Recognize the fact that the task of building our Nation has not yet been completed.

Unfortunately, incidents of inexcusable inequities and violations of civil rights still occur. Every such happening harms our entire Nation as well as the individuals who have been victimized. The lies of a vitriolic Communist propagandist can be exposed. The truth cannot long be hidden and, in fact, to attempt to do so is an additional failure. America is best served when every source of injustice discovered is rooted out and eliminated.

Participate in your Government.

The moral obligation to exercise the voting privilege is elementary. The citizen who fails to do so without good reason is a disgrace. He has thrown away a birthright for which hundreds of thousands of Americans have died. Such apathy makes easy the way of the corrupt, venal politician and the Communist seeker after public office.

In the past, certain Communist tactics have been so successful in the United States that they are now in constant use. It is vitally important that every citizen be able to quickly recognize these stratagems:

THE "FRONT" GROUP

Communists know that they will have great difficulty in obtaining support for any proposition clearly identified as being of Communist origin. Disguise is necessary. The solution has been the "front" group. A name is selected which contains words that will evoke a favorable response from every citizen; for example, "American," "peace," and "democracy." The group is then named "American League for Peace and Democracy." Nothing Communist sounding about that. The next step is to solicit the support of prominent persons. They are appealed to as community leaders, and, flattered, they lend their good name to the "front" group. From that time on whatever reputation that citizen enjoys in his community is working for the Communist cause.

INFILTRATION OF LEGITIMATE ORGANIZATIONS

Whenever an organization is achieving support for its work in behalf of desirable goals, it becomes a target for Communist infiltration. Those members of the organization who fail to attend meetings and to take an active part in its management greatly assist the Communists. As soon as the organization has been dominated, it becomes another arm of the Communist conspiracy.

Infiltrating Communists are difficult to identify, but their aims are not. Be alert. Do not permit your organization to fall to the enemy by default.

AGITATION

Turmoil and discord are fertile ground for the sowing of Communist seed. Where real peace and tranquillity exist, the populace is even less attracted to the violent doctrines of communism. Hence the calm and orderly resolution of genuine issues must be disrupted and false issues raised to induce dissension capable of exploitation for Communist ends.

SMEAR CAMPAIGNS

Since Communist dogma is essentially absurd, it is impossible for Communists to persuade others to their point of view through the use of truth and rational argument. A favorite tactic, therefore, is the ad hominem argument—if you can smear the speaker, people will not listen to what he has to say.

Examples of this technique are the labeling of responsible, anti-Communist Negro leaders as "Uncle Toms"; businessmen as "capitalist warmongers"; honest labor unions as "Wall Street stooges"; and law-enforcement agencies as "Gestapos."

The most severe danger to our country from U.S. Communists arises from the fact that they are the agents of a foreign power. They form a ready reservoir of personnel available for use in espionage and sabotage.

Such activities are carried on by two categories of agents: those legally in the United States, such as native-born American traitors and foreign diplomatic personnel; or those illegally in this country, as was Col. Rudolph Ivanovich Abel, the Soviet master spy.

VIGILANTES NOT WANTED

There is no place in America for "vigilante" action, the spreading of gossip or amateur attempts at counterespionage. Such irresponsible actions can cause severe injustices to innocent persons and seriously jeopardize existing investigations.

The greatest danger presented by the rash and emotionalist response to the Communist menace is that a particular act of recklessness on the part of one extremist may create such revulsion in the vast majority of responsible people as to cause them to withdraw their vital support from the proper authorities engaged in this task.

Should you obtain information which leads you to believe that the internal security of this Nation is threatened, you are urged to furnish it immediately to the FBI. The telephone number of the FBI office nearest you is listed on the first page of your telephone book.

I deeply believe we must never forget that in the battle against atheistic communism our ultimate weapon is the power of Almighty God. His enemies sit astride the red horse of communism. Your prayerful vigilance can unseat them sooner.

Success of Voluntary Health Insurance in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Voluntary Health Insurance in the United States: A Success Story," which was published in the Metropolitan Field magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOLUNTARY HEALTH INSURANCE IN THE UNITED STATES: A SUCCESS STORY

Back in 1938 few people in government circles thought that voluntary health insurance had much of a chance in this country. Only 8 percent of the population had some form of health insurance protection, and a National Health Conference of that year predicted that future growth would be limited to only a small fraction of those who need its protection.

By 1948, however, voluntary health insurance had grown to the point where 42 percent of the population had some form of coverage. Federal authorities, though, were still skeptical. An official report to President Truman in that year estimated that "at a maximum, only about half the families in the United States can afford even a moderately comprehensive health insurance plan, on a voluntary basis."

Today, despite those pessimistic predictions 134 million persons have voluntary health insurance—some 73 percent of the population—and these numbers are constantly rising.

How well have the voluntary insurers done in the over-65 field? The record speaks for itself. As recently as 1952, 25 percent of the population age 65 and over was covered by some form of voluntary health coverage. Today, this figure has climbed to over 50 percent, and the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has estimated that by 1970, it will rise to about 68 percent.

Our country is unique—no other nation at any time has had voluntary health insurance so diverse, so vital, so flexible, and so broad in its coverage as the United States has at the present time.

The history of the development of voluntary health insurance over the past 20 years establishes the fact that the insurance business has both the capacity and the will to provide the aging and the aged with sound and economic means for paying their health care expenses.

Need for Middle-of-the-Road Vision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to an outstanding editorial written by Edwin Shear, editor and publisher of the weekly, Hillsboro Sentry-Enterprise, Hillsboro, Wis.:

NEED FOR MIDDLE-OF-THE-ROAD VISION

One of the most critical political struggles within the United States these days is against the extremists—those who would lead the Nation to the far right or to the far left.

Because of their heritage, most Americans are moderates and, no matter their party affiliation, could quite accurately be classified as "middle-of-the-roaders." This does not means that they are unwilling to adapt to changing times. In fact middle-of-the-roaders have always been ready to meet the challenge of any era and to take forthright steps when necessary as was illustrated in the measures approved to combat the great depression. But they have never rushed to extremes—and this great majority has kept America on an even keel through all the years.

To win control the extremists must overcome two groups. These include the other extreme and the folks who qualify as moderates. That is why the moderates or traditionalists so often find the rightists calling them Communists and the leftists calling them reactionary capitalists. The moderates are too conservative or too liberal for those who oppose them.

Neither of the extremists could subdue the moderates without gaining control either through legislation or employing some more direct use of power. For that reason it is especially important that the people of this Nation be especially vigilant in charting the course of the future. For that same reason, both President Kennedy and former President Eisenhower have warned against the dangers of extremism.

The way of the moderates—practical, yet openminded, conservative regarding principles and liberal in its compassion for fellow-Americans and also nations less privi-

leged—is the way tested by time. It is also the way of freedom, for which countless Americans in various generations have died, worked, and sacrificed. In this day, when the propaganda mills of the extremists pour forth a frenzied, hate-filled poison of nanational dissension—it would be wise to harken to the voice of conscience, and the commonsense practices which have made this Nation both free and great.

Tax on State and Municipal Obligations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter written by an esteemed citizen of the city of Shreveport, La., who is, at the same time, a partner in one of the leading investment houses of that city. The letter was written to the editor of the Daily Bond Buyer. I am struck by the clarity of the reasoning expressed in this letter and would like to associate myself with his remarks by inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I hope all my colleagues in this distinguished body read the contents that follow and I hope they are as impressed as I am.

The letter follows:

EDITOR,
The Daily Bond Buyer,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: The comments of the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City favoring the elimination of the tax-exempt status of State and municipal obligations overlooks a whole area of precedent and law which created the present situation.

It presumes that money that goes into tax-exempt bonds is sterile. This is not so. The muncipalities and states which borrow the money use it in the main for construction purposes which puts the funds into the channels of trade.

It overlooks the fact that we have a dual system of government consisting of the sovereign states and the sovereign national government. The founding fathers created it that way deliberately in order to protect our freedoms. Operating under free enterprise, the people take care of themselves better than does an all powerful central government operating from a distant point. To permit the Federal Government to tax the income from State obligations is to make the State government subservient to the national government and end our dual system. The Federal Government passed a 10 percent tax on the circulation of bank notes which ended the circulation of those notes in the early days of this country. A similar tax on State and municipal obligations could force all State and local borrowings into the hands of the Federal Treasury. It is the nature of man to grab for power. The recent spectacle of Charleston, W. Va., refusing adequate market bids for it bonds predicated upon a lower rate being available from the Federal Government indicates exactly what will happen whenever the Federal Government has the power to control local borrowing. The result obviously will be that local governments will have to come on bended knee to the all powerful in Washington for authority to handle local needs. The inequity and waste of Federal control of finances is clearly depicted in the absurd offering of Federal aid to areas designated as depressed, such as Tyler, Tex., and Wink, Tex.

There has been a great deal of talk about danger from communism without. The danger is not without. The danger is from within, with the wholesale acceptance of the ideas that the Federal Government should do everything for everybody.

The American people have been sold the idea that democracy is good government. Democracy is not good government. Democracy is bad government. The founding fathers tried to create a republic to protect us against the dangers of both democracy on the one hand and dictatorship on the other.

On his recent trip to South America, our naive President sang the praises of democracy and castigated the evils of dictatorship and failed to take into account the fact that dictatorship is the form of government that has been most effective and stable in Latin America. A republic can only be operated by an enlightened people. The politicians who are working to increase the power of the Federal Government are doing more to lead this country toward communism than all the efforts of Mr. Khrushchev. They have swallowed the idea that the Federal Government is more able to govern local affairs than local government. Mr. Kennedy wants Congress to surrender to him its right to judge the timing of tax cuts. The move to tax municipal bonds is part and parcel of this whole mistake. Our freedom is involved for the sake of arithmetic and vindictiveness toward those who have accumulated wealth. The real reason why the wealthy are not putting their funds into risk enterprise is that the high rate of our income taxes and our estate taxes have killed incentive. Our problem, therefore, is not how to tax municipal income. The problem is how to reduce the extravagant welfare expenditures by the Federal Government and how to reduce income and estate taxes so that individuals can do the business that the Federal Government is trying to take over.

In conclusion, I believe that you would do a service if you would emphasize that our freedom is involved in the battle of Federal taxation of income from State and municipal bonds.

Very truly yours,

WM. R. BARROW.

How To Receive Educational TV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an excellent editorial from Co-Op Newsletter, Beltsville, Md., of January 17:

A CO-OP ASSIST—THIS IS HOW TO RECEIVE EDUCATIONAL (UHF) TV

It is easy, and in most cases, relatively inexpensive, to convert your set for UHF reception.

But it is important to know the possibilities and problems.

The UHF signal is a weak one. The so-called UHF converters are in effect boosters which add to the strength of the broadcast. Similarly, the kind of aerial, its position (indoors or out), and the location of your home, interrelate to the kind of reception you get.

In a talk with the chief engineer at WETA, he volunteered the following rule-of-thumb for good UHF viewing.

If your home is located within a 5-mile radius of the station (in Arlington), chances are you can use a standard booster (unamplified converter) and an indoor antenna.

Within the 5- to 15-mile radius, you will need an amplified booster (two-tube converter) with an indoor antenna, or a standard booster with an outdoor antenna.

From 15 to 30 miles away, you will probably need both a booster-type converter and a relatively low priced outdoor antenna. From the 30- to 40-mile area, it is possible to receive the signal, but expert service is required to recommend the type of aerial for best results.

Within these classifications, there are exceptions. For instance, if you live in the lower floors of an apartment house, just a few miles from the station, but on the side away from it, you probably cannot receive the signal except with the assist of a good roof antenna.

Some apartment houses, responding to the requests of tenants, have already erected UHF aerials for common use. If a few apartment dwellers in one building get together and approach the rental agent, there is a good chance of a favorable result, if experience of others is a guide.

If you live in a low area, even within a reasonable distance of a station, you may not be able to receive the signal even with an amplified booster and an indoor antenna. An antenna hung in the attic, or outside, might be the answer.

In order to help our people equip their present sets with converters, we have just concluded a careful study of available equipment, their quality and utility.

We have chosen the Blonder-Tongue converters on the basis of experienced engineering advice, both the standard and amplified, to be stocked in the Danish furniture departments in Penn Daw and Takoma Park. There, the salespeople will be schooled to answer any questions customers will want to ask. In addition, through the courtesy of the chief engineer of station WETA, a set of do-it-yourself instructions will be available in quantity geared to a variety of area home locations. They are free for the asking.

For the most complicated situations, potential listeners are invited to call WETA at DI 7-5271 for further information.

We will also have on a tap a list of skilled technicians equipped to install outdoor antennas at their flat rate schedule. Of course, we cannot guarantee the work, but the reputations of the various TV repairmen have been checked.

The small standard converter will be priced at $17.95 (list $23.95), and the amplified model, $29.95 (list $39.95). Of the two, the larger is easier to tune and is currently outselling the smaller in the local market many times over.

If people want to try the standard model, they can do so, and, if they find it inadequate, return it for credit on the amplified booster.

We will also stock two antennas—small donut model retailing at $2.49, and a larger type with a stronger draw priced at $3.95. If these antennas fail to produce a clear picture, they are returnable for cash refund and customers can then turn to technically equipped service agencies.

We believe this informative approach will provide a service and a saving to our members, as well as a needed service to the UHF station and the community it serves.

Buy American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE SILER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, I am now calling attention to House Resolution 25 that was adopted in the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky under date of January 25, 1962.

This resolution urges the purchasing of all equipment and necessary material to be used by TVA within the United States of America. I agree wholeheartedly with the sentiment of this resolution and I think it is very poor policy and quite un-American for any governmental agency to make purchases of material or equipment that have not been made by American workmen. It will certainly be a late afternoon in "Juvember" when I buy a trinket made in Japan or a family automobile made in Europe. The only way we can show American workers that we love them and their homes and that we stand staunchly behind them at all times is to buy their products and encourage their skills and efforts to earn livelihoods for their families.

The resolution mentioned is set forth below:

H.R. 25

Whereas the TVA on various occasions has to the detriment of the U.S. economy purchased generators, parts, and sundry equipment from foreign nations; and

Whereas the taxes of the American people are being used by TVA to make purchases in foreign lands; and

Whereas TVA pays no income taxes, but takes the income from others and spends it for purchases outside the United States of America; and

Whereas such practices by TVA is in disregard to the interest and prosperity of American labor and industry, creates unemployment, reduces national and personal income, and creates an imbalance of gold shipments; and

Whereas TVA pays little respect to the substance and sources of its creation and places it's own interest above the interest of American labor and industry and the prosperity of the United States of America; and

Whereas such policies of TVA adversely affect every person of the Republic, the common good of the Nation, and the prosperity of the United States of America; and

Whereas TVA is an agency of the U.S. Government, and is, and of right ought to be, subservient to the President, Senate, and House of Representatives of the United States, and responsive to the will of the people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

SECTION 1. That the President of the United States, the Congress, Chairman Herbert Vogel of the TVA, and the Kentucky Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States are urged to use their good offices and authority to propose and effectuate a policy whereby all necessary purchases of equipment, materials, and supplies required by the TVA shall be made from businesses and organizations within the United States of America.

SEC. 2. That the clerk of the house of representatives transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Senate and House of the Congress of the United States, Chairman Herbert Vogel of TVA, and all Senators and Representatives of the Commonwealth of Kentucky in Congress.

Another Loss To Mourn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, one of Kansas' most capable editorial writers, and strong voice for conservatism, is Mr. Dwight Payton, editor and publisher of the Ellsworth (Kans.) Messenger.

Mr. Payton is a forceful crusader for the preservation of those principles that have made America the showcase of democracy and the free enterprise system.

In an editorial entitled "Another Loss To Mourn," of January 31, Mr. Payton decries the change in editorial policy of the Saturday Evening Post as evidenced by the recent attack upon the medical profession by Editor Fuoss. Countless Americans who admired the frankly conservative policy of the Post under former editor, and Kansan, Mr. Ben Hibbs, will join Mr. Payton and mourn the loss of this once strong voice in the field of American journalism.

Mr. Speaker, I include "Another Loss To Mourn" in the Appendix of the RECORD.

ANOTHER LOSS TO MOURN

What's happened to the Saturday Evening Post? some of my friends are asking.

What happened? The Post changed editors and in the process changed editorial complexion from the blended hues of midwestern red, white, and blue to the bloodshot pink of liberalism's fantasy world.

Kansas conservatives like myself, mourning the loss of a conservative Senator, might mourn the more for loss of a conservative voice in the great Saturday Evening Post. The Post was one of the last frontiers of conservatism in the big time journalistic field. It wielded a mighty influence. And now it is just another syrupy voice for the liberal left.

Post Editor Fuoss zeroed in on doctors and the American Medical Association last week. In typical liberal manner he wiped out argument by simply stating that no ground for argument exists. There aren't two sides, there is only our side, so say the liberals. He calls attention to the increase in malpractice suits, which makes me think is it too bad there isn't a legal recourse for editorial malpractice. The liberals could be sued right out of their socialistic pants.

The Fuoss editorial on the American Medical Association is a perfect example of the liberal attack. All the way through Fuoss beats words together in clamorous assertion of appreciation of the great contribution doctors have made, are making, and will make to the world at large (far, far greater, be it confessed, than the Fuoss ilk ever did or ever will). With his love of the Dr. Kildares and semblance of fairness established he moves in for an operation of his own and with surgical skill proceeds to perform a bloody characterotomy on the medics and their national organization, the American Medical Association.

He cites the doctors for having been opposed to everything, including medical insurance—no proof, and utterly unprovable because it is untrue. Then, with grand sweep, completely cutting away all vestige of historical fact, he remarks, "The doctors as a group have in essence been against almost everything that America is for." How "mal" in practice can you get, Mr. Fuoss, one wonders? This in the essence of what surely will be known later as the great smear age.

I know four doctors here in my hometown and have known many more over State and Nation and I have never known a single one of whom it wouldn't be rank libel as well as gross untruth to state that he is against everything America is for. On the contrary, the men I know have been against the socialistic fungus that is trying to destroy America, and have been for the great glory of American individual initiative, independence, self-reliance, honesty in financial matters, personal and governmental; have been steadfast in faith that the climate of freedom holds assurance of higher living standard, more of security and needed medical attention for everyone than any other system on earth.

The Post editor shows that he is a disciple of that fastidious liberal practice of the great lie told in mild voice as if here is something so obvious no one needs shout about it. "So far as we know," says Fuoss, with tranquilizing calmness, "there is no serious support anywhere in America for anything resembling socialized medicine."

Oh, brother. How big can even a big lie be? Of course, Editor Fuoss goes on next to assert that the miscalled medicare bill is just a simple prescription of old-fashioned Americanism to be taken regularly each morning before breakfast.

But enough said. Let's leave our doctors on the operating table, cut open from conviction to patriotism, from ideals to love of freedom. Mr. Fuoss has said he loves them, admires and respects them so surely he will see to it that only a few infected sponges and surgical instruments are left inside for festering before sewing up the gaping wounds he has inflicted.

We readers carry away with us the implanted suggestions that socialism is really Americanism of higher order, that regimentation with free medical service is "responsible statemanship," and that all would be for the best in this best of all liberal worlds if the docs would start communizing their attitude and the American Medical Association.

Hell, liberalism.

Western New York Group Calls for Investigation of State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, on January 29, 1962, the United Anti-Communist Action Committee of Western New York held a meeting in the Buffalo Statler-Hilton, to deliberate upon a matter of grave concern to every citizen of this Nation. This outstanding patriotic group is led by Felix Mindy, chair-

man; Walter V. Chopyk, public relations director; and Albert J. Weinert, speakers bureau director.

The following is the text of an article covering the committee's meeting which appeared in both the Buffalo Evening News and the Buffalo Courier-Express:

At a general meeting of the United Anti-Communist Action Committee of Western New York in the Statler-Hilton last night, the group agreed to cooperate wholeheartedly with the Buffalo Junior Chamber of Commerce in their current sponsoring of a cold war strategy seminar to be held at the University of Buffalo and Kleinhans Music Hall on March 30 and 31. The group was particularly well pleased to acknowledge that in this endeavor, the junior chamber of commerce will bring to this community some of the Nation's outstanding experts on psychological warfare and on the techniques of Communist imperialism.

The balance of the meeting was devoted to a discussion of current problems in the fight against communism. The incredible policies of our Government in supporting the U.N. operation against Katanga, the only stable and anti-Communist government in the Congo were referred to. It was then pointed out that the United States seems to be following an equally incomprehensible and dishonorable course in Laos. Last spring the people of the United States were informed that they must resign themselves to the loss of Laos because the Lao are too poor, to primitive, and too religious to fight in the cause of freedom. Now it appears that the United States is trying to coerce the only anti-Communist in Laos, Boun Oum, to give the army and police of his country to a known neutralist with Red leanings. It was pointed out that the history of the past 16 years has been marked by a series of similar policy decisions on the part of the U.S. Government that have been harmful to the cause of freedom and helpful to the enemy.

The group was thus moved to adopt the following resolution unanimously:

"The Congress of the United States bears primary responsibility for the defense of the country. We therefore ask that our Representatives, Senators, and Congressmen, undertake immediately a thorough investigation of policymaking groups and individuals in an attempt to lay bare the sources of a pattern of retreat which reaches from Yalta, to Cuba, Katanga, and Laos.

"In all of these cases the pattern is the same. We hurt our friends and the friends of freedom, in order to placate, and, in the end, benefit our enemies."

Planning for Disorder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal, Friday, February 2:

PLANNING FOR DISORDER

As President Kennedy says, the Government's strategic stockpile has long been hidden in secrecy. It's time a bright spotlight were turned on it, and Mr. Kennedy is wise in ordering an investigation by his own people and asking for a Senate inquiry as well.

Even before the studies start, however, we think a couple of comments are in order concerning this $7.7 billion hoard of materials.

First, there are hints in Washington that, since the Kennedy administration is so newly in office and is taking the initiative in the matter, an investigation will inevitably reflect on previous administrations. Perhaps it will. But any hopes that this issue will be used for election year partisan advantage ought to be scotched right now.

The truth is that the faults of the stockpile program are bipartisan ones. They involve both White House and Congress, plus private pressure groups, over the past 15 years.

It all began soon after World War II, on the Truman administration's perfectly sound premise that the Nation needed a reserve of strategic materials to have on hand in case of future wars. That premise is as valid today as ever.

What went wrong with the stockpile, as these columns have observed over the years, is that the political hand of Government perforce sent it spinning out of control. One result is that the stockpile, according to Mr. Kennedy, now exceeds presently foreseeable requirements by a shocking $3.4 billion. How did it get out of control?

We see immediately, for one thing, the perils of central planning. Figuring on a long-term shortage of aluminum, the Government entered into long-term contracts to feed the stockpile. But the shortage turned into abundance; the Government was deluged with the stuff a few years ago and is still acquiring some. The President says the Government has $347 million worth of aluminum beyond the amount needed for a 3-year emergency supply. Similar tales can be told of other materials.

Once the Government is so deeply involved in private business, it becomes an important factor in the market. Let the Government try to get rid of some of the excess stocks, as the Eisenhower administration did try, and the very whisper of its desire may depress prices.

More than that, any such announced intention evokes howls of protest from the producers of the affected commodities, some of them foreign but many domestic. In the case of a foreign material, the Government promptly has a diplomatic crisis on its hands. In the case of domestic producers, they run to their Congressmen, who must approve of any disposals. And they get results. According to one calculation, Congress has been asked for disposal approval 50 times and granted it only once.

For, of course, the stockpile intended to help protect the Nation has long since degenerated in a gigantic subsidy for certain segments of the population. Now they can't live without it, they say. Just like the farm program. Only more so; the value of the various stockpiles add up to more than the Commodity Credit Corporation's fabulous cache—and that's going some. In fact, the stockpile itself, among other things, is all balled up in bartering surplus farm goods for strategic items from abroad.

Unquestionably there is a dilemma here. How do you have a stockpile for security needs without its becoming just such a disrupter of markets and subsidizer of producers? At this stage, it seems plain enough that long-term contracts are a dubious procedure, that disposal rules need to be eased, that Washington must develop a more hard-headed attitude in the interest of the whole Nation.

These and other matters the investigators will presumably explore. But in the process it is to be hoped that the main point will clearly emerge. At a time when so many are singing the praises of Central Government planning of the whole economy, the stockpile story once again reveals the same old lesson: Not effective planning but wild disorder ensues when Government meddles in the marketplace.

The Managed Abundance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, we have had presented to the Congress an extensive bill, which, if passed, is to be cited as the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962. President Kennedy and Secretary Freeman feel this is the answer to our farm problems. The list of achievements expected of this legislation is truly impressive. To quote from the heading on the bill, this measure is expected "To improve and protect farm income—to reduce costs of farm programs to the Federal Government—to reduce the Federal Government's excessive stocks of agricultural commodities—to maintain reasonable and stable prices of agricultural commodities and products to the consumers—to provide adequate supplies of agricultural commodities for domestic and foreign needs—to conserve natural resources—and for other purposes."

In my opinion, this whole heading could have been shortened and the truth about the bill stated clearly if it said instead "To completely control our agricultural system in the United States of America."

In other words, if our present system of partial control is not efficient and has not worked—the only logical thing to do is to completely control our agricultural system.

I cannot help thinking how nice it would be for a change to have someone at the helm who had not lost faith in our system of free enterprise. Our former President Dwight D. Eisenhower—who saw so many times and at firsthand the results of lost freedoms—said something which I feel is an eloquent statement of fact: "Suffocation of human freedom among a once free people, however quietly and peacefully accomplished, is more far-reaching in its implications and its effects on their future than the destruction of their homes, industrial centers, and transportation facilities. Out of rubble heaps, willing hands can rebuild a better city; but out of freedom lost can stem only generations of hate and bitter struggle and brutal oppression."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have included with my remarks an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of Monday, February 5, entitled "The Managed Abundance":

THE MANAGED ABUNDANCE

President Kennedy's proposals to Congress for solving the problem of recurring farm surpluses and their mounting costs to the

Federal Government somehow bring to mind those World War II days when the Office of Price Administration was in flower. The Government found, then, that once you embark on a program aimed at artificially stabilizing prices, there is no end to it. The choice soon gets to be between extending controls over just about everything, or abandoning them altogether.

Faced with what Mr. Kennedy describes as "the present patchwork of short-run emergency measures" that have brought about a "drift toward a chaotic, inefficient, surplus-ridden farm economy," the administration has made the expected choice. It recommends still more controls over agriculture to correct the problems that a hitherto limited control program has done so much to intensify.

Now, to be sure, the farmers do not have to accept the proposed new marketing limits on wheat, the new mandatory acreage allotment plan for feed grains or new marketing controls over milk. But if they take the long view and reject them, the Government will remove price supports from wheat and feed grains, and sharply reduce its buying of milk products. And the Government, in order to get rid of its surpluses, could dump grains on the market for whatever price they would bring.

This prospect of a temporary period of severe price readjustment may, to many farmers, appear to be too formidable to take a chance on. Offered the opportunity of immediate federally-guaranteed price security as opposed to the future benefits of a free market, many undoubtedly will commit themselves to extension of Federal control over their operations.

But those who do should be prepared to accept all the consequences: The inevitable increase in supervisory, or policing machinery broad new controls will require, the penalties for noncompliance, the increased dependence on the Government to make decisions on how much of which crops shall be grown and marketed. In short, acceptance of the administration plan will be an endorsement of increased regimentation for agriculture.

That is not how the program is described. It is called "an opportunity to manage abundance, rather than scarcity." History presents no evidence that efforts of Government to manage scarcity—as in the case of the OPA—have ended in anything other than confusion or worse. Nothing in the present chaotic farm controls suggests that much stiffer controls would manage abundance any better.

Emotionalism Fogs Medical Care Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHERINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the Washington Post this morning, February 5.

This is the best analysis I have seen of the proposed legislation for medical care for the aged under social security, as well as the best analysis of the Kerr-Mills bill which was enacted in 1960, for which I voted.

EMOTIONALISM FOGS MEDICAL CARE ISSUE

(By Maurice H. Stans)

President Kennedy has repeated his request to the Congress to write a new law putting medical care for the aged under social security. It is likely to be one of the hottest and least understood issues in the current session.

Ever since medical care for the aged became a political issue early in 1960, it has generated an atomic lot of heat and a minimum of reality. Even today many people wrongly seem to believe the issue is medical care or no medical care. This is the result of another case of undue emotionalism in Washington—a surge of sympathy misdirected toward an excess of government.

There are no facts or figures, of course, as to how many people there are over 65 who need and want medical or hospital care and don't get it. Whatever their number, no one in this enlightened country wants anyone to suffer from that lack. The problem has been, and is, how to find the most sensible way to see that they don't.

We do know some facts. There are nearly 17 million people over 65. A large proportion of them are not medically indigent. Those over 65 account for 9 percent of our total population, and, despite the retirement majority, they still receive 8 percent of all personal incomes.

More than half of those over 65 have coverage under some form of health insurance, and the number is increasing rapidly. Millions more are safeguarded by their own wealth, the resources of their families and services of local welfare and church agencies. Other millions are assured of present or future benefits by their rights and privileges under veterans' benefit programs. The number without adequate health protection is proportionately small. It will grow even smaller as those now under 65 and holding an even greater degree of coverage of their medical needs move into the over-65 bracket with retirement protection.

KERR-MILLS BILL

Under these conditions, the White House and Secretary Flemming in 1960 developed a plan that would fill the medical gap, whatever it might turn out to be. Under it, the provision of medical and hospital services to all those in need of assistance would be left to the local communities. The State would advance the cost, and Washington would pick up 50 to 80 percent of the bill, variable according to the wealth of the States.

Depending on the scope of the benefits covered and the estimates of numbers of beneficiaries, the Federal Government's share would be something over $200 million in the first year of the program and about $400 to $500 million in later years. And it was accepted that under a widespread program like this, these costs would include a fairly substantial amount which would not represent new protection but merely a transfer of responsibility from existing sources to the State and Federal Governments.

With some changes, the Flemming plan was enacted as the Kerr-Mills bill in the 1960 session of the Congress. It is now in operation in 26 States and a dozen others are moving toward it. Unfortunately, the continued agitation for a more expansive plan under social security has slowed up action in some States. But there is no evidence that the present program is inadequate.

NO TEST OF NEED APPLIED

The social security proposal is entirely different in a fundamental way. It applies no test of need and gives everyone over 65, regardless of wealth, income or other means, the vested right to submit medical and hospital bills to Washington to be paid. The cost would be paid by another increase in social security taxes, already scheduled to rise to 9¼ percent by 1968, to be shared equally by working people of all ages and their employers. The total annual cost of this plan has been estimated to be from $1.5 to $2.5 billion at the start and rising in later years to $5 billion or more.

I have never been able to understand why the social security way would make sense, or why any workingman would support it. It would multiply the tax collections and payments for medical care 8- or 10-fold, only to provide added funds to give to those who didn't need them.

It would, in other words, set up a program that benefited 8 or 10 people for every 1 that needed help. To cite an extreme, it would cover payments to the Fords, Rockefellers, Morgans, Harrimans and other wealthy individuals over 65. It would mean that working men and women would dig up taxes to cover such expenses for Maurice Stans when he reaches 65 and for millions of others who ought to meet their own bills. It would double the Social Security bureaucracy, which now has 32,000 employees and a vast forest of electronic machines.

THREE MILLION UNPROTECTED

Despite this, it would fail to protect 3 or 4 million people over 65 who are not eligible for social security. And the program, I feel sure, would not stop at age 65. Let's not deceive ourselves. Within a year or so after it were operative, the drive would begin to lower the age qualification, especially since the taxes would be paid by younger employed, and the pressure could continue until everyone was covered. And certainly the administrators of the funds would have to fix limits and standards on the kind of medical care and hospital services that would qualify.

By degrees we would move into a socialization of medical and hospital practices. I can understand why the medical profession does not want this, and, with the ever-increasing cost experience of Britain and other countries as evidence, we should beware of it here.

Putting medical care for the aged under a mandatory social security program would be the beginning of the largest single step we could take toward government paternalism and the centralized state. If we want to preserve our personal pride, our sense of character and responsibility, our freedom of choice and decentralized government, we ought to oppose this to the fullest. And no one will suffer, because the machinery already in law will take care of everyone who needs help at a lot less cost to the taxpayer.

Interest in Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, there is an old adage, "All the world loves a lover." By the same token we can say "All the world hates a chiseler," and, as far as possible, the chiseler should be eliminated. Whether or not vast numbers of people should be penalized to detect a comparatively few chiselers raised serious problems.

Will the next return justify the effort? Every financial institution, every corporation, in short, anyone paying dividends or interest will in all probability be required to employ more help, thus raising operating expenses which, in turn, is reflected in lower taxpayments.

As the Wall Street Journal suggests in an editorial of February 2, this might well be a deterrent to thrift—a word that

meant a great deal in building the America we like to think of—but gradually appears to be becoming obsolete under a "Do something for everybody government."

The editorial follows:

INTEREST IN SPENDING

With Federal spending for the coming fiscal year pegged at the record peacetime level of $92.5 billion, the Government is searching high and low for every additional tax dollar it can lay its hands on.

Symptomatic of this revenue fever is the bill just approved by the House Ways and Means Committee, imposing a 20-percent withholding tax on income from interest and dividends. On the theory that a great deal of taxes due on such income presently go unreported, the Government proposes to take its share right at the source. Well, it may be asked, What's wrong with that?

For one thing, the Nation's tax laws already are a tangled web of confusion; this scheme would add new complexity. For another, it would pile new inequities atop the old.

No withholding statements would be issued to individual taxpayers, it would be up to them to figure out whether the Government had taken too much, and, if so, to apply for a refund. If an individual's modest savings account had earned but a few dollars interest, and he owed no overall tax, the Government still would impose upon him the trouble of recovering the small sum wrongfully taken. As with all tax withholding, the Government's impatience and distrust also would deny the citizen the use of his money when he might want or need to use it.

But the worst flaw in this measure would be the powerful deterrent to saving. An administration that keeps talking about more rapid economic growth, as this one does, should be seeking ways to make investment more attractive, rather than discouraging it with cumbersome levies.

Yet there is a consistency of sorts. A government wasting billions obviously has little interest in encouraging thrift.

The Motion Picture Producers Scrap the "Waldorf Policy"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent request to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a speech given by Mr. Tom Hoag, Jr., of Anaheim, Calif., to the American Youth Rally at Glendora, Calif. Mr. Hoag is a member of the American Committee of the American Legion, Department of California, and in the following talk he points up how the "Hollywood 10" who had been identified as Communists and who were prosecuted and convicted of contempt of Congress for refusing to answer questions about their Communist affiliations, have found their way back into the writing, directing, and producing of films in spite of the agreement by the moving picture industry that no such persons would be employed in the industry.

THE MOTION PICTURE PRODUCERS SCRAP THE "WALDORF POLICY"

The American Legion is convinced that the major producers have it within their power to stop employment of identified Communists and fifth amendment Communists, at any time the tremendously powerful Association of Motion Picture Producers really wants to stop it. It was done in 1947; it can be done today. Because of this, and because the American Legion gave widespread publicity to the issuance of the pledges made by the film industry in the "Waldorf declaration" the Legion is duty bound to inform the American public that these pledges have not been kept. The widest possible publicity must be given to the fact that the American Legion will not be a party to a lie.

Nineteen hundred and forty-seven was the shameful year of the "Hollywood 10": Dalton Trumbo, Albert Maltz, John Howard Lawson, Alvah Bessie, Ring Lardner, Jr., Adrian Scott, Herbert Biberman, Lester Cole, Samuel Ornitz, and Edward Dmytryk. In 1947 the Hollywood 10 arrogantly, insolently refused to affirm or deny their part in the worldwide Communist conspiracy, despite the fact that photocopies of their actual Communist Party membership cards were introduced, under oath, into the record of the hearings being conducted by the House of Representatives Committee on Un-American Activities.

Because the sneering 10 thumbed their noses at the Government of the United States, the House voted that they were in contempt of Congress. The Department of Justice prosecuted them. A Federal jury indicted them. A Federal court found them guilty. They were sentenced to a Federal penitentiary. As usual, they carried their pleas through the courts of appeal, up to and including the Supreme Court of the United States. These pleas were denied and the Hollywood 10 went to prison.

So revolted was the public by the Ten's disdain for Congress that people began to stay away from Hollywood films in droves. And not just from films on which the Ten had worked; the boycott extended to all pictures from the motion picture capital. The result was that an industry hard hit in the box office promised to clean out the studios forthwith. It was November 26, 1947, when Eric Johnson, then as now, president of the Association of Motion Picture Producers, issued the famous "Waldorf Declaration" from the producers' headquarters in New York's Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. The Society of Independent Motion Picture Producers joined the majors in the Waldorf pledge.

It reads in part: "Members of the Association of Motion Picture Producers deplore the action of the ten Hollywood men who have been cited for contempt * * * their actions have been a disservice to their employers and have impaired their usefulness to the industry.

"We will forthwith discharge or suspend without compensation those in our employ, and we will not reemploy any of the 10 until such time as he is acquitted or has purged himself of contempt and declares under oath that he is not a Communist.

"On the broader issue of alleged subversion and disloyal elements in Hollywood, our members are likewise prepared to take positive action.

"We will not knowingly employ a Communist or a member of any party or group which advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods.

"We will invite the Hollywood talent guilds to work with us to eliminate any subversion * * * and to safeguard * * * a free screen."

This position was reiterated officially in March 1951, in September 1951, and in the spring of 1952, and in June 1956. On each occasion the reiteration came from the industry's spokesman group, the Motion Picture Council. The council, still frightened, even beefed up the Waldorf declaration by declaring (in September 1951) that "we have no sympathy for those who stand on the first or fifth amendments."

And who signed this statement? Who signed many other statements on the same subject? The Association of Motion Picture Producers, the Artists' Managers Guild, the Hollywood AFL Film Council, the Independent Motion Picture Producers' Association, the Independent Office Workers, the Screen Actors' Guild, the Screen Directors' Guild, the Screen Producers' Guild, the Screen Writers' Guild, the Society of Independent Motion Picture Producers, the Society of Motion Picture Art Directors, and the Unit Production Managers' Guild.

Taking the motion picturemakers at their word the public once again offered its patronage. Millions of dollars flowed into the box offices. Then came the great betrayal. Covertly at first, the producers started to rehire members of the Hollywood Ten. Dalton Trumbo, who had certainly not been acquitted nor "purged himself of contempt" submitted the first draft screenplay of "Spartacus" under the name of Sam Jackson. Did Kirk Douglas know that Sam Jackson was Dalton Trumbo? Of course he did. Did Universal-International Pictures know this? Of course they did. Soon the days of covert action came to an end. The name Dalton Trumbo appeared flagrantly upon the screen as the writer of the screenplay. It appeared in advertisements and on the posters in front of every theater where "Spartacus" was shown. Dalton Trumbo was reinstated as a member in good standing of the Screen Writers' Guild. He was openly employed by Otto Preminger to write the screenplay for "Exodus" and there was no objection offered by United Artists who released the film. He was again employed by Kirk Douglas to write "The Day of the Gun," released by Universal-International.

Dalton Trumbo to this day has never retracted a single statement made by him in 1947 before the House of Representatives' Committee on Un-American Activities. There has been no change in the arrogant, insolent attitude which forced the House to vote him in contempt of Congress. He has never denied his membership in the Communist Party. Yet today he is firmly entrenched as a working member of the motion picture industry.

Trumbo is not alone. Scores of persons, totally unemployable by the standards of the Association of Motion Picture Producers in their own Waldorf declaration are today being employed in the American motion picture industry. To name but a few (for the list of working Communists is endless); Stanley Kramer boasts that he hired Howard Fast (who pretended to have renounced communism, but who took the fifth amendment when questioned by the House Committee on Un-American Activities after his alleged break with the international Red apparatus) for "My Glorious Brothers," from Fast's book of the same name, written (as was Spartacus) while Fast was the public darling of the Kremlin. Kramer also openly used Ned Young, alias Nathan E. Douglas, on "The Defiant Ones," and now has hired Young for another film.

Mr. Young was also the writer of the film "Inherit the Wind" which was last year nominated for an Academy award. Enjoying a favorable run at the box office today is the motion picture "The Children's Hour." Screen credit is given to Lillian Hellman, another identified Communist. In the past 4 years the major and independent studios have placed before the American public 23 first-run features that were written, directed or produced by persons identified, under

oath, as members of the Communist conspiracy.

In American Mercury, November 1954, appeared Harold Lord Varney's article, "America's Master Blunder—the United Nations." On page 38 there is the statement that Alger Hiss was the central U.N. figure. He was named Secretary General of the San Francisco Conference. As Director of the State Department Office of Special Political Affairs, Hiss was given the authority to organize the U.S. delegation. With smiling-faced efficiency he ran the show at San Francisco, where all the important decisions were made, not on the conference floor but in Secretary Stettinius' penthouse at the Fairmont. Among those whom he recommended to Stettinius was Dalton Trumbo, later to go to prison in the Communist "Hollywood 10" case. Trumbo ghost-wrote Stettinius' speeches at San Francisco.

The scope of the Communist Party is vividly illustrated in the above incident, wherein an identified member of the Communist conspiracy in Washington, D.C., used the talent of another identified Communist in Hollywood to help place this country within the United Nations.

The American Legion is not making a blanket condemnation of the motion picture industry. In fact, at our last national convention held in Denver, Colo., we presented an award to Mr. Jack Warner and commended Warner Bros. Studios and John Wayne Productions. But we do criticize those studios and producers who have sacrificed their integrity for box office receipts. Nor is the American Legion saying that the Communists have used the motion picture industry as a vehicle for their insidious propaganda on the screen; but we know they are keeping the great American way of life off of the screen, which in these critical times is more dangerous.

Dealing With the Frustration of Our Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 26, 1962

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I had the great privilege of attending the annual dinner of the Women's National Press Club and listening to an address by that distinguished columnist and noted elder statesman, Walter Lippmann.

Mr. Lippman discussed the frustration of the troubled times in which we find ourselves living today; a frustration based on the fact that, "For as long a time as we can see into the future, we shall be living between war and peace, between a war that cannot be fought and a peace that cannot be achieved. The great issues which divide the world cannot be decided by a war that could be won, and they cannot be decided by a treaty that can't be negotiated."

If this is the case, which I substantially believe it to be, how then do we deal with the issues which confront us?

Mr. Lippman has responded with the pointed reminder that the answer lies in the nature of the struggle between the Western and Communist societies; a struggle between two very different economic systems and ways of life for the minds and souls of men.

He goes on to suggest that, "The historic rivalry of the two societies and of the two civilizations which they contain, is not going to be decided by what happens on the periphery and in the outposts. It is going to be decided by what goes on in the heart of each of the two societies. The heart of Western civilizations lies on the shores of the Atlantic Ocean, and our future depends on what goes on in the Atlantic Community. Will this Community advance? Can the nations which compose it work together? Can it become a great and secure center of power and of wealth, of light and of leading? To work for these ends is to be engaged truly in the great conflict of our age, and to be doing the real work that we are challenged to do."

Mr. Speaker, this was and continues to be a stimulating, thought-provoking address, and I urge those of my colleagues who have not already done so, to study it carefully.

DEALING WITH THE FRUSTRATION OF OUR TIME

(By Walter Lippmann)

It is an honor, which I greatly appreciate, to be asked to speak on this occasion. It is also a personal kindness. For Congress is about to convene, and that means that there will be many speeches in the months to come. Experience has taught me that it is always a good idea to be able to speak early in the program. By the time Congress has adjourned next summer, adjourned in order to go out and make more speeches in the constituencies, your bright and eager faces may not be so bright and eager at the prospect of hearing yet another speech, I am happy to catch you while you are still in such robust good health.

When I sat down to prepare this talk, I considered and rejected the idea of delivering a kind of preliminary message on the state of the Union. I remembered that this will soon be done with much more authority by the husband of a former newspaperwoman. So I decided to talk to you tonight about the state of our minds, the state of our nerves, and perhaps even about the state of our souls.

I am moved to do this by a letter I received just before Christmas. It was from a friend of mine who was a great hero in the First World War. He has been an extraordinarily successful man since then, and his letter began in this cheerful fashion: "My dear Walter: Another year of frustration, confusion, and compromise is about over."

I know that my friend is not alone in feeling this way and that during the coming session of Congress there will be many who will say what he says and feel as he does. At different times, I suppose all of us share his feelings. There is indeed much frustration, much confusion, and—because we live on earth and not in Heaven—there is, of course, much compromise.

FRUSTRATIONS NOTHING NEW

I could have written back to my friend, reminding him that in every year of which there is any historical record, there has been much frustration and confusion and compromise. Anyone who thinks he can get away from frustration, confusion, and compromise in politics and diplomacy should make arrangements to get himself reborn into a different world than this one. Or if that is beyond his powers, he should move to some country where there are no newspapers to read.

However, it is certainly true that in our own time we are experiencing a very special frustration and confusion. There is, I believe, a reason for this. Certainly, if we knew the cause, we might feel better, even if we cannot do quickly something drastic to end the difficulty.

The age we are living in is radically new in human experience. During the past 15 years or so there has occurred a profound revolution in human affairs, and we are the first generation that has lived under these revolutionary new conditions. There has taken place a radical development in the art of war, and this is causing a revolutionary change in the foreign relations of all the nations of the world. The radical development is, of course, the production of nuclear weapons.

As a scientific phenomenon the nuclear age began with the explosion at Los Alamos in 1945. But in world relations the nuclear age really began about 10 years later. For during the 1940's the United States was the only nuclear power in the world. But by the middle fifties and in the years following, the Soviet Union has created an armory of nuclear weapons and has built rockets which have made it, for all practical purposes of diplomacy, a nuclear power equal with the United States.

The essential fact about the appearance of two opposed great powers armed with nuclear weapons is that war, which is an ancient habit of mankind, has become mutually destructive. Nuclear war is a way of mutual suicide. The modern weapons are not merely much bigger and more dangerous than any which existed before. They have introduced into the art of warfare a wholly new kind of violence.

Always in the past, war and the threat of war, whether it was aggressive or defensive, were usable instruments. They were usable instruments in the sense that nations could go to war for their national purposes. They could threaten war for diplomatic reasons. Nations could transform themselves from petty states to great powers by means of war. They could enlarge their territory, acquire profitable colonies, change the religion of a vanquished population, all by means of war. War was the instrument with which the social, political and legal systems of large areas were changed. Thus, in the old days before the nuclear age began, war was a usable—however horrible and expensive—instrument of national purpose. The reason for that was that the old wars could be won.

In the prenuclear age, right down through the Second World War, the victorious power was an organized state which could impose its will on the vanquished. We did that with Germany and with Japan. The damage they had suffered, although it was great, was not irreparable, as we know from the recovery after World War II of West Germany and Japan and the Soviet Union.

But from a full nuclear war, which might well mean 100 million dead, after the devastation of the great urban centers of the Northern Hemisphere and the contamination of the earth, the water and the air, there would be no such recovery as we have seen after the two World Wars of this century.

The damage done would be mutual. There would be no victor. As far in the future as we can see, the ruin would be irreparable. The United States has the nuclear power to reduce Soviet society to a smoldering ruin, leaving the wretched survivors shocked and starving and diseased. In an interchange of nuclear weapons, it is estimated coolly by experts who have studied it, the Soviet Union would kill between 30 and 70 million Americans.

A war of that kind would not be followed by reconstruction, it would not be followed by a Marshall plan, and by all the constructive things that were done after World War II. A nuclear war would be followed by a savage struggle for existence, as the survivors crawled out of their shelters, and the American Republic would have to be

replaced by a stringent military dictatorship, trying to keep some kind of order among the desperate survivors.

To his great credit, President Eisenhower was quick to realize what nuclear war would be. After he and Prime Minister Churchill had studied some of the results of the nuclear tests, President Eisenhower made the historic declaration that there is no longer any alternative to peace.

AN IMPOSSIBLE INSTRUMENT

When President Eisenhower made that statement no one of us, I think, understood its full significance and consequences. We are now beginning to understand them, and here I venture to say is the root of the frustration and the confusion which torment us. For while nuclear weapons have made war, the old arbiter of human affairs, an impossible action for a rational statesman to contemplate, we do not have any other reliable way of dealing with issues that used to be resolved by war.

It is enormously difficult to make peace. It is intolerably dangerous and useless to make war about the fundamental issues.

That is where our contemporary frustration and confusion originate.

We are confronted with an extraordinarily tantalizing and nerve-wracking dilemma.

For as long a time as we can see into the future, we shall be living between war and peace, between a war that cannot be fought and a peace that cannot be achieved. The great issues which divide the world cannot be decided by a war that could be won, and they cannot be settled by a treaty that can be negotiated. There, I repeat, is the root of the frustration which our people feel. Our world is divided as it has not been since the religious wars of the 17th century and a large part of the globe is in a great upheaval, the like of which has not been known since the end of the Middle Ages. But the power which used to deal with the divisions and conflicts of the past, namely organized war, has become an impossible instrument to use.

President Eisenhower and President Kennedy are the only two American Presidents who ever lived in a world like this one. It is a great puzzle to know how to defend the Nation's rights, and how to promote its interests in the nuclear age. There are no clear guidelines of action because there are no precedents for the situation in which we find ourselves. And as statesmen grope their way from one improvisation and accommodation to another, there are masses of people who are frightened, irritated, impatient, frustrated and in search of quick and easy solutions.

The nuclear age is only a few years old. But we have already learned one or two things about how to conduct policy in this age. It was once said of a British admiral in the First World War that if he made a mistake, he could lose the British fleet and with it the whole war in an afternoon. Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Kennedy are in a similar position today. In a few days or so Mr. Khrushchev can lose the Soviet state and the promise of a Communist economy. He can lose all the work of all his Five-Year Plans, his Seven-Year Plans, and his Twenty-Year Plans. In that same time, Mr. Kennedy can lose the Constitution of the United States, the free enterprise system and the American way of life and along with them all the frontiers, old and new. I don't think I am exaggerating. A full nuclear war would produce by far the biggest convulsion which has ever occurred in recorded history. We cannot understand the realities of the Khrushchev-Kennedy encounter, which has been going on since they met at Vienna last June unless we remind ourselves again and again of what war has become in the nuclear age.

The poor dears among us who say that they have had enough of all this talking and negotiating and now let us drop the bomb, have no idea of what they are talking about. They do not know what has happened in the past 20 years. They belong to the past, and they have not been able to realize what the present is.

In this present, only a moral idiot with a suicidal mania would press the button for a nuclear war. Yet we have learned that while a nuclear war would be lunacy, it is nevertheless an everpresent possibility. Why? Because however lunatic it might be to commit suicide, a nation can be provoked and exasperated to the point of lunacy where its nervous system cannot endure inaction, where only violence can relieve its feelings. This is one of the facts of life in the middle of the 20th century. The nerves of a nation can stand only so much provocation and humiliation, and beyond the tolerable limits, it will plunge into lunacy. This is as much a real fact as is the megaton bomb, and it is a fact which must be given great weight in the calculation of national policy. It is the central fact in the whole diplomatic problem of dealing with the cold war. There is a line of intolerable provocation beyond which reactions become uncontrollable. It is the business of the governments to find out where that line is, and to stay well back of it.

Those who do not understand the nature of war in the nuclear age, those who think that war today is what it was against Mexico, or Spain or in the two World Wars regard the careful attempts of statesmen not to carry provocation past the tolerable limit as weakness and softness and appeasement. It is not any of these things. It is not softness. It is sanity.

But it leaves us with a task: because we cannot make war, because we cannot achieve peace, we must find some other way of meeting the great issues which confront us. For life will go on, and if the answers of the past do not work, other answers must exist and must be found.

The answer lies, I believe, in the nature of the struggle between our Western society and the Communist society.

It is often said that the struggle which divides the world is for the minds and the souls of men. That is true. As long as there exists a balance of power and of terror, neither side can impose its doctrine and its ideology upon the other. The struggle for the minds of men, moreover, is not, I believe, going to be decided by propaganda. We are not going to convert our adversaries, and they are not going to convert us.

The struggle, furthermore, is not going to be ended in any foreseeable time. At bottom it is a competition between two societies and it resembles more than any other thing in our historical experience the long centuries of conflict between Christendom and Islam. The modern competition between the two societies turns on their respective capacity to become powerful and rich, to become the leaders in science and technology, to see that their people are properly educated, and able to operate such a society, to keep their people healthy, and to give them the happiness of knowing that they are able and free to work for their best hopes.

The historic rivalry of the two societies and of the two civilizations which they contain, is not going to be decided by what happens on the periphery and in the outposts. It is going to be decided by what goes on in the heart of each of the two societies. The heart of Western civilization lies on the shores of the Atlantic Ocean, and our future depends on what goes on in the Atlantic community. Will this community advance? Can the nations which compose it work together? Can it become a great and secure center of power and of wealth, of light and of leading? To work for these ends is to be engaged truly in the great conflict of our age, and to be doing the real work that we are challenged to do. I speak with some hope and confidence tonight. For I believe that in the months to come we shall engage ourselves in the long and complicated, but splendidly constructive, task of bringing together in one liberal and progressive economic community all the trading nations which do not belong to the Communist society.

MAGNETIC ATTRACTION

I dare to believe that this powerful Western economic community will be able to live safely and without fear in the same world as the Soviet Union, and that the rising power and influence of the Western society will exert a beneficient magnetic attraction upon eastern Europe. This will happen if we approach it in the right way. Jean Monnet, who is the original founder of this movement, has put it the right way. "We cannot build our future," he said, "if we are obsessed with fear of Russia. Let us build our own strength and health not against anyone, but for ourselves so that we will become so strong that no one will dare attack us, and so progressive and prosperous that we set a model for all other peoples, indeed for the Russians themselves."

At the same time the wealth and confidence of the new comunity will enable the Western society to assist and draw to it the societies of the Southern Hemisphere, where social and economic change is proceeding rapidly.

You will have seen that I do not agree with those who think that in order to defend ourselves and to survive we must put a stop to the progressive movement which has gone on throughout this century. This movement began in the administration of Theodore Roosevelt. Its purpose was to reform and advance our own social order, and at the same time to recognize that we must live in the world beyond our frontiers. We shall lose all our power to cope with our problems if we allow ourselves to become a stagnant, neurotic, frightened, and suspicious people. Let us not punish ourselves by denying ourselves the hope, by depriving ourselves of the oldest American dream, which is that we are making a better society on this earth than has ever been made before.

Is all this conservative? Is all this liberal? Is it all progressive? It is, I say, all of these. There is no irreconcilable contradiction among these noble words. Do not Republicans believe in democracy, and do not Democrats believe in a republic? Such labels may describe political parties in England; they do not describe political attitudes in the United States.

Every truly civilized and enlightened American is conservative and liberal and progressive. A civilized American is conservative in that his deepest loyalty is to the Western heritage of ideas which originated on the shores of the Mediterranean Sea. Because of that loyalty he is the indefatigable defender of our own constitutional doctrine, which is that all power, that all government, that all officials, that all parties and all majorities are under the law—and that none of them is sovereign and omnipotent.

The civilized American is a liberal because the writing and the administration of the laws should be done with enlightenment and compassion, with tolerance and charity, and with affection.

And the civilized man is progressive because the times change and the social order evolves and new things are invented and changes occur. This conservative who is a liberal is a progressive because he must work and live, he must govern and debate in the world as it is in his own time and as it is going to become.

Must Work With Lisbon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully commend to the attention of my colleagues in Congress an editorial from the January 24 edition of the Standard-Times of New Bedford, Mass., titled, "Paying for Propaganda," the editorial applauds the distinguished Member from Nebraska, the Honorable GLENN CUNNINGHAM, for his determined stand against Red propaganda in the U.S. mails. The newspaper cites background and statistics in support of this stand that are worthy of the thoughtful consideration of the Congress:

PAYING FOR PROPAGANDA

The House Republican Policy Committee has done well to insist that any bill to increase postal rates include a ban on handling propaganda mail from behind the Iron Curtain.

The administration bill would provide for postal rate rises estimated to total $621,200,000 a year. The rate for first-class mail would go from 4 to 5 cents an ounce and for airmail from 7 cents to 8. There would be increases of some degree in all classifications of mail.

Even if reducing amendments are passed, the total increase still would amount to $550,700,000, which is a considerable sum.

Since so much money is involved, why should any part of it be used for subsidizing Communist publications, the intent of which is to divide Americans and overthrow their Government?

This is what now is happening. Since the postal service loses money each year, U.S. taxpayers actually are helping to support a program which floods the United States with Iron-Curtain propaganda, most of which is unsolicited and unwanted.

The proposed ban is sponsored by Representative CUNNINGHAM, Republican of Nebraska, a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, which has available impressive testimony on the amount and distribution of this propaganda. Mr. CUNNINGHAM contends "Americans don't want to pay higher mail rates to help the Government subsidize the distribution in this country of unsolicited propaganda originated by Communist groups overseas."

He is right.

If the question of censorship appears to be involved, at least establish a special rate for the tons of junk mail that come in from Peiping and Moscow attempting to convince Americans that what Communists have is better than we have. Let them support their own propaganda program by charging them whatever is necessary to cover the cost of getting this mail from the dock or airport to the homes of addresses who don't want it anyway.

One hopes it is unlikely that any American would be influenced by this claptrap. In any event, there is no reason why an American dollar should go for a pro-Communist, rather than an anti-Communist cause. If the postal service needs more money, fair enough, but let's make sure it helps Washington and not Moscow.

Has President Kennedy Also Adopted the Fatal Illusion That It Is Possible To Appease the Soviet Union?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Edgar Ansel Mowrer, entitled "President Sold on Appeasement":

PRESIDENT SOLD ON APPEASEMENT

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

January 31, 1962, may become famous as the day when President Kennedy made clear that he was committed to the same foreign policy of make-believe as his predecessor—only more so.

By make believe, I mean the pretense that aggressive communism can be stopped by "time, talk and patience," by personal contacts, summit meetings, endless negotiations; by wishful thinking about ending atomic tests and general disarmament and—latest and biggest illusion—by a real rift between Red Russia and Red China.

Almost 18 years of history—since the Soviet grabs in 1944—have demonstrated that this is baloney. Nonetheless, President Kennedy persists in following the same losing line. In the process, in just over a year in office, he has invited disaster in Cuba, bartered away the Lao ally, permitted communism illegally to bar off Berlin. Friendly critics have been inclined to attribute this to his inexperience—even after a quite unnecessary but revealing meeting with Khrushchev in Vienna last spring.

Now—since January 31—even they are compelled to admit that the President's choice of appeasing advisers follow from his conviction. For at his press conference on that day, Jack F. Kenedy revealed the full depth of his commitment to the policy that has lost for the last 18 years.

He believes that if he can change the atmosphere in Soviet-American relations, he can relax tensions. This ignores the fact that the only cause of tensions is communism's insistence on expansion. We are back in the beautiful nonsense era of Mr. K.'s American visit in 1959.

Our President believes the U.S.S.R. wants a neutral Laos—regardless of the Soviet air drop of weapons to the Lao and Vietnamese Communist rebels.

He is still making "every effort" to get a test ban agreement despite the evidence that during almost 3 years his gullible predecessor and he have been systematically hoaxed by a cunning Kremlin and in the process gave away a large section of our previous military superiority.

He won't visit the U.S.S.R.—not yet. But let the Kremlin ease up on the Berlin situation and our Chief Executive will go scooting off to visit the Butcher of Budapest who was Stalin's hatchetman in the Ukraine. Meanwhile he "takes pleasure" in welcoming the Butcher's son-in-law Aleksei I. Adzhubei. (I wonder how he would have felt if F.D.R. in 1939 had "taken pleasure" in welcoming Heinrich Himmler.)

So there we are. Small wonder that an astute writer in the Washington Post speaks of a "new turn in relations between the administration and the Khrushchev's Soviet leaders."

Small wonder that Pentagon censors have been removing from generals' and admirals' public speeches all references to the "evil of communism" or to our need for "eventual victory," or beating the "Communist challenge," in short, to winning the cold war. Or that most of our retired generals and admirals are in despair about our present policy.

President Kennedy knows all these things, of course. He is a man of personal courage. But he is surrounded by inexperienced "intellectuals" who think of men and affairs as they ought to be rather than as they are. These people consider the danger of nuclear war is "imminent" (which is simply absurd so long as the U.S.S.R. is not notably stronger than the United States). They believe that this danger is greater than that of being nibbled to death by creeping communism. And they have swallowed whole the current legend of a coming Soviet-Red Chinese rift which will make the Kremlin ready for disarmament and peace with the West.

Now it is evident that the President, having lost the advice of certain really experienced concilors, is relying on those whom history will call appeasers. Only a thoroughly alarmed and vocal citizenry can make him change his course.

Fritz Kreisler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, on January 29, 1962, the music world lost an accomplished artist, violinist and composer in the death of Fritz Kreisler, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

FRITZ KREISLER

Is it possible to overemphasize the contributions of Fritz Kreisler to the world of music over the past 80 years? I think not. For in that time this gifted man established a musical criterion that shall stand for centuries to come. In that time his talent electrified the contemporary world, bringing joy to the hearts of millions. Moreover, through the magic of recorded sound, it has been possible to preserve the evidence of his genius for the future listening pleasure of millions yet unborn. Here, beyond question, was one of the few artistic giants of the 20th century.

Fritz Kreisler is no longer with us, having passed away (January 29) following 87 years of vigorous and energetic living, filled to the brim with love for beauty and humanity. The fact of his departure arouses a sorrowful response in every corner of the world touched by the force and grace of his talent, the charm of his manner. Yet the glory of his music lingers on.

Born in Vienna, the son of an eminent physician, Kreisler from the start gave signs of brilliance, constructing a violin with his own hands at the age of 4. It is said that he learned to read music before he knew how to read words. By the time he was 7 he was ready for his concert debut, and 6 years later appeared in America, a graduate meanwhile of the Vienna and Paris conservatories.

Success was not immediate, however, and soon the boy wonder was back in Europe,

casting about for another profession. He tried art; he tried military life; he tried medicine and then, luckily, returned to the violin. His second debut was made in Berlin, in the year 1899. But it was not until his American tour from 1901 to 1903 that he established himself as one of the great violinists of the day. Following the tour he was invited to London, to receive the Beethoven Gold Medal from the London Philharmonic. Society. Thereafter, with the exception of service in World War I as a captain in the Austrian army, he was to devote the rest of his career exclusively to music.

From 1919 to 1924 Kreisler remained in the United States, and in the years that followed he would return here again and again, never forgetful that this was the land that first acclaimed his talents.

Nor were these talents limited to the field of musical performance alone. In 1935 the music world was startled by the revelation that Kreisler had himself composed and recorded a great many pieces, jokingly attributed to such classic masters as Viveldi, Pugnani, Martini, Porpora, Couperin, Francoeur, and others. A great row ensued, in which Kreisler was at first attacked for mimicking the classics. But the final effect was to add to his reputation because of the perfection with which the hoax was executed. Indeed, he had shown that a mere 20th century fiddler could conceive musical inspirations equal in quality to those of the masters, themselves.

In May 1943, Kreisler became a citizen of the United States and the following year made his first appearance on radio, to the delight of millions. It was then that he became known not only to the musical intelligentsia in America, but to the American people as a whole, who came to revere his genius and adore his personal charm. Indeed, of all America's adopted sons, few have ever captured the heart of the entire population as did the redoubtable Fritz Kreisler in the last two decades of his life.

A master not only of music, but also mathematics, art, medicine, engineering, languages, philosophy, and philology, Kreisler appeared in essence, a throwback to the ancient Greeks, who were never satisfied until they learned how to do just about everything. Yet, for all that, his heart was clearly in his music; a fact that has left his music in our hearts.

The Golden Age Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, over the past several years there has come into being in the Fordham section of Bronx County in New York City an active and vigorous organization known as the Golden Age Club. The purpose of this club is to take full advantage of the fine contributions that our senior citizens can make to the community wherein they reside and to the State and Nation of which they have been a part so many years. The Golden Age Club has its headquarters in the parish of Our Lady of Mercy and is in the district which I have the honor to represent. Its membership has grown steadily since its inception and it is now providing through its members a real contribution to local civic affairs.

Each year the club designates one outstanding individual to receive its Golden Age Award. This year the award for "over 50 years of dedicated service to the community" was given to a man whom I have known for a long, long time and a man who truly deserves such an award. He is the Honorable Ernest E. L. Hammer, former justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

Judge Hammer by his life and his actions truly epitomizes what is meant by the award. He has dedicated his time and his interest and his entire career to the betterment of his fellow man and the society in which he lives. He has been an outstanding lawyer and a distinguished jurist. His career at the bar of New York covers better than 55 years as he was admitted to practice in 1906.

In 1913 Judge Hammer was elected to the Assembly of the State of New York. Thereafter, he continued his public career by serving as public administrator of Bronx County for a period from 1914 to 1925. For the next 28 years from 1926 to 1954 he served as a justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York with distinction and honor. He retired on December 31, 1954, but since that date has continued on as actively as when he was in public service. The list of his activities is too numerous to be cited. He has devoted his years in retirement to actively promoting those things that will be the greatest help to the most people. He has been honored by his church, by his fellow professional members, and by the citizens of the community in general. He has raised a fine and distinguished family of four children, the Reverend Edmond F. Hammer, Ernest Harrer, Jr., Harry F. Hammer, and a daughter, Mrs. John White.

Judge Hammer epitomizes the true citizen of the community. His life is a lesson for all of us as an example of fine devotion to public service. I am proud to have known him over the years and I am prouder still to congratulate him on this well-deserved award. I wish him many more years of continued work in what to him is a labor of love—helping his fellow man.

What Freedom Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an essay entitled "What Freedom Means to Me" written by Leif Wade, a high school senior, in Sparks, Nev. This essay won first prize in the "State Voice of Democracy" contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. This young man shows a remarkably clear understanding of what freedom means, and of what responsibility the people themselves in this country have in maintaining our democracy as founded by our patriotic forefathers, who authored our Constitution, and which we must uphold today if our democracy is to survive.

The essay follows:

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

(By Leif Wade)

"United we stand, divided we fall." These words echo down the corridors of our country's evolution as a warning to member States of our Nation that they must stand together by resolving their differences as best they can.

To hold firmly together as a nation is to do or to die, but is this Nation made stronger by a people that resolve their differences in stereotyped society? To make my country strong is not only to take—to take ideals, to have standards given to me, to find my morals on the printed page. My country is made strong by a people who can and will dare to find their own pattern of life.

I speak out in defense of freedom because by it I am given the right to be different. I am given the privilege of believing in what I choose, and I am given the duty of deciding for myself what things I shall hold important.

One vital part of this gift of freedom is the responsibility to accept the decisions of others though far different from my own.

You, my friend, have a right to speak out against me, and you, my friend, and you, my enemy.

What this concept should mean to every American cannot be expressed in spoken words because in practice it is not only words. It is expressed in a humble American's thoughts, actions, and prayers.

What freedom meant to our infant Nation could never be imagined. Our Nation is great today because in its first moments it took it upon itself to be different, to try something so different it only vaguely resembled earlier democracies; and today, if its people rot in the bacteria of pacifism, our Nation will grow to something that only vaguely resembles any democracy. You may differ with me, you may not like having the blame laid on the people, but I must find fault with the people because there is no weakness in democracy's basic concepts. Fault is not in the foundation laid by our forefathers. Fault is not in what other nations have done to us. Fault lies with the people. The people who don't believe it is fair and just to oppose don't believe in our right to be different, our privilege of believing what we choose, and our duty to decide for ourselves. The fault lies with the people who will continue to stereotype society for their own convenience.

Our United States is a land of inequality, inequality of position and status. In our Nation we always have a higher level anyone can reach through desire expressed by hard work and full use of talents. Where would we be if we had nothing but uniformity, no matter how hard or how little we worked? We would stay on the same level with our fellow citizens. If that were so, we would be on the same level where we were when the idea of a capitalistic United States was born in men's minds, and we may regress to that stage if the idea of stereotyped masses is not put aside.

Our Nation can and will survive because we will act as a Nation as any one citizen would act as an individual. I have the right to live as I please as long as I do not stop anyone from exercising his right to be different. This is liberty.

My Nation has a right to its form of Government as long as it does not try to force other nations to accept it. This is policy.

The United States will have its democratic form of government no matter what the opposition. This is my prayer.

It is the right of the people to be different. If they are strong and demand this right, they will have it. A nation is only as strong as its people. If our people are strong, our Nation will have strength. If our people continue to be individuals, our country will survive. It is the right of the people to be different. If they are weak and let their learning be through dictation, they will lose that right.

Our Nation has a right to any form of government it desires. If the people are weak and fall under the threat of tin gods, unreal tradition, and blind faith, our Nation will lose the only form of government it desires. If the people do not band together as individuals, they will fall together as a dead, decaying mob, and our country and our democracy and mankind's freedom will fall with them.

West Virginia Council on Children and Youth Holds Significant Conference—Justice Clark and Governor Barron Speak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it was my privilege to have been afforded opportunity to participate on January 26, 1962, in sessions of the West Virginia Council of the White House Conference on Children and Youth at Charleston.

It was my further pleasure to have had the honor of introducing the Honorable Tom C. Clark, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The principal discussion theme during the 3-day meeting was the important subject "The Unemployed, Out-of School Youth."

As Tom Cummings of the Charleston Daily Mail staff wrote for the Friday afternoon, January 26, issue of that newspaper:

Evidence accumulated shows that dropout from public school is a chronic educational ailment in West Virginia. Those attending a 3-day conference (of the West Virginia Council of the White House Conference on Children and Youth) to study the problem are probing for an answer. At the moment there appears to be no exact formula for a successful preventive.

But, Mr. President, the subject was appropriately and cogently discussed by Associate Justice Clark, Gov. W. W. Barron of West Virginia, and other conference speakers, including Dr. Donald M. Burke of Elkins, council president; Rev. Stacy L. Groscup of Morgantown; Phares Reeder, executive secretary of the West Virginia Education Association; Hon. Hulett C. Smith, commissioner of the West Virginia Department of Commerce; David L. Francis, president of Princess Coals, Inc., and former mayor of Huntington, W. Va.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my remarks on the occasion of introducing Justice Clark; also extracts from Justice Clark's significant address; and briefs of other speakers' contributions on the subject as reported by Mr. Cummings in the Charleston Daily Mail and by John W. Yago, staff writer for the Charleston Gazette.

There being no objection, the comments referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, DEMOCRAT, OF WEST VIRGINIA, INTRODUCING ASSOCIATE JUSTICE TOM C. CLARK AT MEETING OF THE WEST VIRGINIA COUNCIL OF THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH, DANIEL BOONE HOTEL, CHARLESTON, W. VA., JANUARY 26, 1962

Governor Barron, Dr. Burke, Justice Clark, ladies and gentleman, I am grateful for the opportunity to be a participant in this conference on the subject of "The Unemployed, Out-of-School Youth." I fully realize the seriousness of the problem of the increasing number of students who fail to graduate from the schools of our State. It is most gratifying to know that a solution for the situation is being sought. Your task is challenging and the positive results will be a rewarding achievement.

Your planning committee for this meeting should be congratulated for its choice of our guest speaker. I can think of no American more devoted to the welfare of the youth of the Nation than the Honorable Tom C. Clark, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Justice Clark's efforts on behalf of the boys of America is best exemplified by his selection as "Big Brother of the Year" in 1950. Much of his work with youth is centered around the Boy Scouts. He now holds several high-ranking positions in this splendid organization, such as a member-at-large of the National Council and as a member of the Committee on Rural Service. He was awarded the "Silver Buffalo" by the Boy Scouts of America in June of 1960 in recognition of his leadership.

Justice Clark has also helped awaken our country to the necessity of expanding juvenile opportunity. Probably his best known endeavor was his sponsorship of the "Freedom Train" which has carried the original historic documents on exhibition across the United States.

Of course, the success attained by Justice Clark is not confined to his work with young people. The accomplishments of this native Texan have been many since he first joined the U.S. Department of Justice as an attorney in 1937. He advanced within the ranks of the Department during an 8-year period, and in 1945 was appointed Attorney General of the United States by President Truman.

During his tenure as our Nation's Attorney General, this celebrated jurist was recognized for his work for civil rights and better citizenship, his support of public education against crime, and his aggressive attack against the infiltration of communism.

In 1949, President Truman nominated Justice Clark to the Supreme Court of the United States. He succeeded Justice Frank Murphy as an Associate Justice of the Court, and has been serving in that capacity with distinction in the law and devotion to public service.

It is a personal pleasure and an official privilege to present our esteemed and eminent jurist Tom C. Clark, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS BY HON. TOM C. CLARK, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES BEFORE THE WEST VIRGINIA COUNCIL OF THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH, CHARLESTON, W. VA., JANUARY 26, 1962:

Your excellency, Governor Barron, Senator RANDOLPH, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, 8 months ago today Dr. James Bryant Conant told 500 men and women gathered in Washington from all over the country "that the problem you are here to discuss poses a serious threat to our free society * * * The existence of thousands of youths * * * who are both out of school and out of work is an explosive situation."

We gather here today under the auspices of the West Virginia Council of the White House Conference on Children and Youth to discuss the same problem—the unemployed, out-of-school boy and girl. As Dr. Conant said to the Washington group, which was brought together by the National Committee for Children and Youth, "Especially shocking * * * was the discovery that the problem of youth is literally nobody's affair." This is, as Dr. Conant said, indeed unfortunate.

I am happy to see that here in West Virginia responsible citizens such as yourselves, from the Governor on down, are making it their affair. This is particularly encouraging in view of the appraisal of Dr. Conant that the problem is social dynamite. This is a tag that he placed upon it after receiving special reports indicating that in one area of our country 59 percent of the boys between 16 and 21 years of age were both out of school and out of work, while in another area the boys and girls out of school and out of work reached 70 percent of those in the same age brackets. I note that a report of your division of vocational education indicates that there is a consistent dropout among students of some 60 percent from the 1st through the 12th grade. This is indeed distressing. What is more, the percentage of dropouts between the ninth grade and high school graduation seems to consistently run over 40 percent. Apparently these figures are on a statewide basis. In my view, until we have an accurate statistical picture about the unemployed, out-of-school boy and girl, we are not going to be able to effectively improve the situation. This, I believe, is the first task of every community, namely, to find out block by block, school by school, city by city, just what the facts are about the unemployed, out-of-school youths.

It is also most encouraging to note that your 3-day program, beginning yesterday, is an intensive one of wide coverage. It is the more impressive to me because it has attracted here the leaders of your great State. Participating in it are many public officials, religious leaders, educators, social workers, criminologists, physical education and recreation experts, and business leaders and their industrial organizations. I mention business leaders and their organizations last because they are, I believe, most important to the success of any program aimed at the transformation of unemployed, school dropouts to employed, dropin students. I congratulate you on the organization of such an impressive conference. I am honored to be a part of it and I hope that it may become the means of alleviating the distressing problem that faces West Virginia youths today.

I read and hear much about juvenile problems at the national level. Some States seem to think that it is a national problem and should therefore be handled by the Congress. The Congress has been giving some thought to the problem, as evidenced by the introduction last session of the Youth Employment Opportunities Act of 1961 and a bill by Congressman PERKINS authorizing pilot training and employment programs for youth. I am happy to see, however, that you the people of West Virginia are not awaiting or depending upon the passage of Federal legislation. Rather than passing the buck to Washington you have started an affirmative program of your own. Certainly the National Government has a role in the youth problems of today, but, as our Vice

President said a while ago, it should be one of leadership, not of domination. As I see it, the situation is a local one varying by communities and dependent largely on the local economy. The Federal Government should and I am sure will render indirect and supplemental assistance such as the States may need in public education, employment services, and the creation of a favorable national climate for the promotion of an effective local program.

Many people suggest that we need more Federal criminal laws; others advise that we should enforce State and local laws, give police more authority, enact registration statutes, and adopt loitering and curfew ordinances. It seems to me, though, that one of the solutions is the attack that you are making on the unemployed, out-of-school youth.

As I see it, the representatives of business, labor and public education can get this job done. In addition to transforming the unemployed drop-out to an employed drop-in, they can build up the morale of our youth, carry on a continuous program of job training, and through a cooperative stewardship bring about a lessening of the number of youths that today face life with such a dark vision.

These are just a few random suggestions which I am sure your experts have already considered. Let me say again I do not have the answers. I do know that we must arouse the public at the local level to the necessity of action. Meetings such as you are having here today can do much to bring this about; indeed the answer to the question that you probe into today rests in your hands. If from your gathering can come a determined effort and an organized plan to go after this problem on a statewide basis. I am sure that you can solve it. In addition, I believe that your program can be organized so that it will bring home to all mothers and fathers the importance of their children mastering a trade as well as obtaining at least a high school education. In this manner your long-term target can well bring a stop not only to the unemployed drop-outs but also to the juvenile delinquency problem that is increasing throughout the nation year by year. I am sure that the National Committee for Children and Youth can render you great assistance in this regard. In addition, I am greatly gratified to know that the President has recently appointed two committees, which likewise I am sure could be of great service to you in your work. The first is the President's Committee on Youth and Employment, and the second is the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. They are each made up of distinguished citizens who are dedicated to young people, and many of whom devote most of their time to their problems.

In closing let me say that I bid you God speed in your work. I am sure that as you continue it there will be created among all of us a more genuine attachment to youth in their problems and a real desire to assist in their solution. Yes, I know it will take some years of hard work, but I for one believe, as do you, that our boys and girls are worth it.

Gov. W. W. Barron Delivers Keynote Address at West Virginia Council of White House Conference on Children and Youth

Governor Barron, who spoke at the first general session in his role as honorary chairman of the council, said dropouts represent one facet of West Virginia's backwardness.

"Unemployed, out-of-school youth are not just a school problem," the governor asserted, and remarked: "These boys and girls represent a symptom of the larger problem in West Virginia—the need for modernizing and updating everything that holds progress back."

Noting that the greatest rate of school dropouts is between the 6th and 10th grades, Governor Barron said that "this is the impressionable age for most children" and he declared that youth in this age category are easily misled into believing that economic security is better than educational stature.

The governor suggested a better educational pattern to hold the interest of the growing children and admonished that "we cannot accept the philosophy that most dropouts are people who can't do quality school work."

He pointed to statistics showing that more than half of group of dropouts studied recently were fully capable of continuing in their school work—had they been properly motivated.

Governor Barron expressed the candid opinion that "West Virginia is overproducing undereducated people," and he urged coordinated activity by government and other groups to overcome the school dropout problem. He said the fact that the State's educated people are leaving in too great numbers while those who drop out of school and swell the ranks of the unemployed threatens the future leadership and well-being of the State.

The governor noted that West Virginia's high rate of public school dropouts is not an isolated fact and he declared: "It is simply the visible symptom of a whole social, economic, and educational complex that was never intentionally put together, in its present form, by anyone."

The dropout problem, he said, has never before been seriously considered because it posed no great problem for the State. But advancing industrial technology and automation, he added, now have eliminated a labor market for the undereducated.

"Too many of our public school products—the dropouts—are no longer salable on the labor market," Governor Barron asserted. He noted the seriousness of the problems by citing statistics showing that of the 57,825 pupils who enrolled in the first grade in 1948 only 22,107 of them graduated from high school in 1960. He said that only 14 of the State's 55 counties graduate at least half of their first graders.

"We are failing in the business of modern government," the governor admonished, "and we are failing in modern education when our product is neither salable on the labor market nor a solid, self-sustaining member of our society."

Governor Barron then offered these suggestions:

Build eight regional vocational schools and establish mobile vocational schools for other areas; create branch colleges to bring more educational opportunities to youth at the community level; extend the influence of colleges and universities to the technical and precollege level; expand on-the-job training; establish new courses in the schools and provide more counseling services.

A War Over This?

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, one of the trouble spots of the world is Dutch New Guinea where Sukarno, who rules over Indonesia, is making threatening gestures. Sukarno is a dictator who plays footsy with the Reds and who has received great quantities of weapons from them. He has also received much more than his share of American foreign aid. He is another of the neutrals who helps himself from our Treasury while making deals with the Reds. Apparently, no one ever told him the United States has a right to expect a quid pro quo for its largesse. Sukarno is following the pattern ambitious dictators generally follow. In order to make up for shortcomings at home and to keep his subjects relatively pacified, he has to think up new worlds to conquer. Dutch New Guinea fits in well with his plans to solidify himself at home by playing the hero.

American efforts to curb this new-day would-be conqueror apparently have been as weak as water. The U.N. has invited both Indonesia and Holland to talk out their differences. This Holland has agreed to do. Not so the Indonesians. Some of our allies in the Far Pacific have indicated a relatively simple solution to this problem. They ask why the United States does not station units of the powerful 7th Fleet across the approaches to New Guinea and say to both litigants:

There just isn't going to be any war. We are here to stop it. We intend to stop it if it starts. You can settle your differences in the U.N. Take your troubles there, and stop this silly talk about war.

This, of course, is so simple and down-to-earth that it is not going to appeal to the striped-pants boys. After all, it might hurt Mr. Sukarno's feelings and that would never do. Personally, I think it would do Mr. Sukarno and a lot more of his ilk good for someone to tell them just where to stop. Trying to please everybody and trying to avoid offending anyone is about the worst way I know to keep troublemakers in line. Leadership carries with it some responsibility. Sometimes it means kicking the lethargy out of the lethargic; insistence upon quid pro quo for those who are recipients of American aid; pointing up a goal and driving to its realization. It can mean firmness to the point of drawing a line and saying this is as far as you go. Today's growing group of new dictators have not had anyone to talk to them in this fashion. They think they can get everything they want by yelling and kicking up their heels. The American people have just about reached the end of their patience in dealing with this crowd of irresponsibles. The public would welcome stronger diplomacy and stronger leadership from the American State Department.

I am impressed with the job the Secretary of State is doing. And I am impressed by the fact that the President is seeking to lift the State Department to a new level of aggressive determination in the conduct of foreign affairs. But it appears to me there is inertia and resistance to change within that agency which make the job of the President and the Secretary of State doubly difficult.

The U.S. News & World Report of February 5 carries a significant story on

Dutch New Guinea. I submit it for reprinting at this point in the RECORD. It is well worth reading:

A WAR OVER THIS?

(A war between Indonesia and Holland over West New Guinea would be one of the silliest wars ever fought. That's the way it looks at the scene. There is no good place to fight, and not much that is worth fighting for. As for the natives, they'd rather be let alone. Robert P. Martin of the international staff of U.S. News & World Report, flew into New Guinea as Indonesia's President Sukarno was stepping up preparations to attack. In this cabled dispatch, Martin takes you on a tour of a primitive, poor, forbidding island that is the world's latest crisis spot.)

HOLLANDIA, NEW GUINEA.—To an American long accustomed to the relative backwardness in much of Asia, it comes as a shock to find the Indonesians spoiling for a fight with the Dutch over half the island of New Guinea. This is, undoubtedly, one of the most worthless and underdeveloped pieces of real estate on earth.

Step off a jet transport at the Dutch base on Biak and, in 10 minutes, you are in a village where each morning the fishermen go through magic rituals—to insure a good catch—before setting out in their hand-hewn dugouts.

Or take a 2-hour flight out of the city of Hollandia and you are in the heart of stone age culture where some of the people wear bark girdles and still practice mystic rites.

UPROAR WITHOUT SENSE

The overall impression: Even though the international uproar over New Guinea is very real, it makes little sense.

Indonesia doesn't need west New Guinea. The island is poor in natural resources and will be difficult to develop. It has been a financial drain on the Dutch for years. It has no value to Indonesia's President Sukarno except as a symbol of Dutch colonialism he wants to wipe out.

The Dutch, for the most part, would be happy to get out. But they need a face-saving device so they can give up gracefully, and not under fire.

You don't have to be here long to realize that self-determination for the Papuans—as the natives of West New Guinea are called—is absurd.

There is not a single positive element of civilization, no distinguishing skill or trait, no custom or tool that is common to all the estimated 700,000 Papuans. Tribes and clans—ranging in size from a few hundred people to the largest, which has about 10,000—are isolated from each other. And they like it that way.

CANNIBALS AND CHRISTIANS

Some Papuans are still headhunters and practice cannibalism. But there are also third-generation Christians among other islanders. Most Papuans are very dark, have frizzy hair, and deep wrinkles around their noses and mouths. The greatest barrier separating them is language. There are at least 250 different languages spoken here.

The Dutch are trying to rush through reforms that will give the Papuans self-determination—to decide for themselves whether to stay with the Dutch, join Indonesia, or be independent.

West New Guinea has been renamed West Papua. A 28-member council with limited powers was established last April. West Papua has its own national anthem and a flag that bears a startling resemblance to the Stars and Stripes. Dutch marines are training the first battalion—220 men—of a projected Papuan defense force.

But there still is no Papuan national leader, no hard core of university-trained natives, not even a Papuan newspaper.

An American who has lived here a long time was asked how the Papuans would vote on self-determination.

"First," he replied, "you would have to catch each Papuan, and then you would have to tell him how to vote."

At first glance it appears the Dutch are getting ready not only to stay here but to fight if the Indonesians attack.

Commercial flights from Holland into Biak carry a score or more of young Dutchmen each trip. They wear civilian clothes, but uniforms are packed in their duffelbags. Antiaircraft guns on the bluffs above Biak are manned. An air-raid siren has been installed on the roof of a one-story building, but it has not been tested for fear of frightening the populace.

BOMBERS READY

Rows of new houses for Dutch officers are being built at Biak. A World War II bomber field that is closer to Indonesia than to Biak has been reopened. Every day, American-built planes equipped with radar patrol the waters between New Guinea and Indonesia. A squadron of British-made jet fighters fly practice missions regularly.

The Dutch are contemptuous of the Indonesians' fighting quality. They gave the Indonesians a bloody nose in the latter's first fight for New Guinea. In a 15-minute engagement on January 15, the Dutch sank one Indonesian torpedo boat, routed two others.

But the Dutch are impressed by the quality and quantity of arms and equipment the Indonesian Navy and Air Force now have—supplied them by Russia. A Dutch naval officer said the Indonesian commanders of the torpedo boats demonstrated "good gunnery and good seamanship."

After that January 15 clash, a young Dutch Air Force officer remarked: "If the Indonesians send their air force over we can take them, up to 4 to 1. But 5 to 1 might be a different matter."

Flying along the coast of New Guinea, you can see why Indonesians have not yet invaded the island. The two nearest Indonesian bases are about 500 air-miles from Biak. Biak is on a small, easily defended island, and bars the sea route to Hollandia, the administrative capital.

From the air, New Guinea appears to be a vast tropical forest scarred by bare patches where heavy rains have eroded mountains. Much of the southern coastal belt is swampy lowland—unhealthy and thinly populated. Farther inland are some of the loveliest mountain valleys in the world, cut off from northern New Guinea by a mountain chain that rises to 16,000 feet. Here, glacial ice-caps—almost unknown in the equatorial belt—can still be seen.

LACK OF HIGHWAYS

There are no roads through the mountain barrier, Papuan trails, seldom used, wind through the rugged range.

In all of New Guinea there are less than 300 miles of highway, and slightly more than 2,000 buses, trucks, and cars. Most of the road system was part of the military complex the United States seized from the Japanese in World War II and then expanded. Hollandia—once the headquarters of Gen. Douglas MacArthur—contains about a quarter of all the roads.

Commerce is almost entirely dependent on coastal shipping, on very shallow-draft boats for the few navigable rivers, and on airplanes. Twin-engine planes make regularly scheduled stops at 11 airports. Lighter planes go into small landing strips. Some parts of the interior are completely dependent on air drops.

Missionaries in the interior—including several hundred Americans—have developed their own air transport.

THE EASY LIFE

Life in West New Guinea is relatively simple and easy. The Dutch live in red-roofed houses surrounded by small gardens. They have their movies, clubs, and tennis courts.

Papuans in the towns live in huts made of metal scraps left over from the time when the United States had World War II bases here. Those in the interior live in huts made of bamboo and palm leaves. In the swamps and along the coasts, the huts are perched on stilts.

The climate is hot and damp. Even the nights are far from cool. But the Papuan doesn't have to work hard for a living. He gets food from the sago palms. Vegetables and fruits are plentiful. So are fish along the coast. Almost every family has its own pigs.

The Papuans have not mastered pottery. Most grill their food or use bamboo vessels to cook a sago-palm porridge.

How far the Papuans are removed from civilization is shown by the experience of a Dutch marine colonel, Wilhelm Van Heuven, who is in charge of the Papuan self-defense force now being trained at Camp Manokwari. The men all volunteer between the ages of 16 and 20 and with at least 3 years of schooling—arrived at camp underfed and ridden with malaria, leg sores, and other tropical diseases.

"Some of the Papuan soldiers never had a bath in their lives," said Colonel Van Heuven. "They were so fascinated with faucets they would turn them on and let them run for the fun of it. Now that they've solved the mystery of water taps and flush toilets, they take two baths a day.

"When we gave them polish for their brass buttons they smeared it all over their uniforms. Shoes were a problem. None had ever worn them—or much of anything else. We decided to give them shoes because the police have shoes, and if the Army didn't we would have an explosive political problem on our hands."

FOR SIGNALS: BIRDCALLS

The recruits look fine in their sweeping camping hats with black brushes, red bands, and red shoulder boards. In the jungle, they look even better. When the Dutch tried to teach them to use passwords, the Papuans insisted on birdcalls.

The Dutch get along well with the Papuans. But the Papuans are independent minded and dislike discipline. In Biak, for example, almost all the 34 prisoners in the jail are there for drunkenness. The Dutch use the prisoners on street-repair gangs because life in prison with free food would be no penalty.

The Papuans in the coastal towns are friendly and gregarious. Rest temporarily in a village and you are quickly surrounded by laughing natives.

In the interior, the people are more aloof, distrust other Papuans, and live as isolated a life as possible. Human heads and sea shells are currency, often used to buy brides. In some areas wives are killed when their husbands die.

NO LAND OF TREASURE

New Guinea's 160,000 square miles are no treasure house of the East. Oil has been found on the western tip of the island. But output and reserves are so limited, and bringing the oil to the surface is so expensive that production has been stopped. An investment in excess of $130 million—60 percent American and 40 percent Dutch—has been written off.

United States and Dutch companies have shown interest in developing nickel and cobalt deposits. Lumber, cocoa, and copra are potential exports of value. In most of the explored areas of New Guinea, however, the soil is so poor there is little likelihood of

making the island highly productive without heavy use of fertilizers. Papuans have shown no interest in developing the country, on their own.

If Sukarno attacks the island, the Dutch will probably put up a good fight—particularly at Biak. Tough, well trained, and confident, they could probably hold out for 3 months.

But they admit it would be a losing proposition in the end. Indonesia has more than 90 million people. The Dutch have only 5,000 to 6,000 fighting men in all of New Guinea. Even among the Dutch who want to stay in New Guinea, there is no feeling that the island is worth fighting for.

Several thousand Eurasians holding Dutch citizenship who fled here from Indonesia in 1957 and 1958 are abandoning their hope of making a new life on the island under Dutch control.

A handful of Dutch businessmen are hanging on. The remaining Dutch are Government officials and technicians. And most of them are becoming reconciled to the idea of leaving, eventually.

DUTCH GIVING UP?

Explained a young Dutchman:

"We committed ourselves to giving the Papuans self-determination. It costs us the equivalent of $30 million a year to stay here. Holland is small, and not a rich country. People at home are tired of footing the bill. When it comes to money, the principle of self-determination means very little to the average Dutchman."

Such talk is becoming common. The best guess here is that, in the end, Sukarno is going to get New Guinea.

Missouri Presidential Elections, 1916–60

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, in the summer, 1961 issue of Nemoscope, the publication of the Northeast Missouri State Teachers College, the Honorable Clyde Burch, assistant attorney general of Missouri, included a timely and well-rounded discussion of an important phase of Missouri history in presidential elections.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the complete article:

MISSOURI PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS, 1916–60

(By Clyde Burch)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Mr. Burch, a 1949 alumnus of the teachers college has been a social studies instructor in the Fulton High School for the past several years. He was appointed assistant attorney general in June of 1961.)

A study of presidential elections in Missouri from 1916 through 1960 reveals some very interesting facts. In these 12 presidential elections the Democrats carried the State 8 times and the Republicans carried the State 4 times. This indicates that although Missouri may lean toward the Democratic Party in its political loyalty, it is by no means a one-party State. The Democrats carried the State in 1916, 1932, 1936, 1940, 1944, 1948, 1956, and 1960. The Republicans carried the State in 1920, 1924, 1928, and 1952. Sixty-five counties have gone Republican in more than 6 of these 12 elections, while the Democratic candidate for President carried 45 counties in one-half of the 12 elections, if the city of St. Louis be treated as a county. Thus it appears that in presidential elections, 65 counties tend to be dominated by the Republican Party and 45 counties tend to be dominated by the Democratic Party. There are 5 counties, Henry, Texas, Buchanan, Cole, and Macon which have been carried 6 times by each party in the last 12 presidential elections.

Several counties in Missouri are almost unanimous in their allegiance to one political party. Fifteen counties went Democratic in all of these 12 presidential elections. They are: Audrain, Boone Callaway, Howard, Lewis, Lincoln, Marion, Mississippi, Monroe, Platte, Ralls, Randolph, Ray, Reynolds, and Shelby Counties. Seven counties; namely, Douglas, Gasconade, Hickory, Ozark, Putnam, Taney, and Warren, went Republican in each of the presidential elections, from 1916 through 1960.

Missouri has an enviable record as a State which usually votes for the winner in presidential elections. Missouri has voted for the winner in every presidential election since 1904, except in 1956 when it favored Stevenson by a narrow margin over Eisenhower. Only four States can come close to Missouri's record. Maryland voted for the winner in every election since 1888, except 1948. Ohio followed the Nation in every election since 1892, except 1944, and 1960. Wyoming did likewise since 1896, except in 1944 and 1960. Idaho has voted for the winning presidential candidate in all elections since 1900 except 1960.

In Missouri, the Governor is elected for a 4-year term in each presidential election year. In the 12 gubernatorial elections, the Democrats won eight times with Frederick D. Gardner, Guy B. Park, Lloyd C. Stark, Forrest Smith, Phil M. Donnelly (two terms), James T. Blair, Jr., and John M. Dalton. The Republicans have won four times with Arthur M. Hyde, Sam A. Baker, Henry S. Caulfield and Forrest Donnell. Thus each party had precisely the same number of victories in the governorship elections that it had in the presidential elections.

Missouri has 10 roughly ascertainable geographical areas which are particularly meaningful in the study of politics in the State. Five of these areas are generally Republican and five are predominantly Democratic.

The five Republican areas are: the northwest Missouri corn belt, the southwest Missouri Ozark hills, the east central Missouri area, and Clark and Butler Counties. The northwest area has generally been Republican because most of the early settlers in this area were Republicans. This was the last of the rich agricultural areas to be settled in Missouri. It was less accessible to the new settlers from the South than the area in the eastern half of Missouri along the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers. Therefore, the northwest area was chiefly settled by nonslaveholders from the Northeastern States. In addition, as farmers moved out of this area, they were usually replaced by farmers from Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, or Nebraska, all predominantly Republican States.

Another Republican area is the southwest Ozark hills. This is a large, but for the most part poor, agricultural region. For this reason early settlers from the South avoided this part of Missouri. A later wave of settlers from the upper South finally settled the southwestern part of the State. Most of this group were from eastern Tennessee and Kentucky and western West Virginia. They came from a poor agricultural area and generally had few ties, either economic or social, with the Old South. Politically they tended to be hostile to the southern democracy.

The east-central part of Missouri is the other important Republican stronghold. This is a triangular shaped area, more particularly described as bounded by a line beginning at Jefferson City, then proceeding southeasterly to Cape Girardeau, then north to St. Charles, and west to Jefferson City, the point of beginning. The only exceptions to Republican dominance of this area are: Jefferson County, Cole County, and St. Louis City. This area was first settled very sparsely by the French. Next a slightly larger number of settlers from the South came into the area. The group which finally came to dominate it were the German immigrants. In 1860, Missouri ranked sixth among the States in the size of its German population, most of whom were in this area. They strongly opposed slavery and secession and hence generally joined the Republican Party. Many had been the victims of civil upheaval and strife in their homeland and were now anxious for stability.

The other two minor Republican areas are Clark and Butler Counties. Clark borders Iowa and Illinois and many Republican farmers from these States have moved into the county. Butler is something of a political oddity since it is surrounded by Democratic counties. It had a slightly larger number of Republicans among its early settlers. Democratic leaders there also became resentful and broke with State and national leaders over the silver question during the William Jennings Bryan period.

The five Democratic areas are: Little Dixie, Greater Kansas City metropolitan area, city of St. Louis, southeast cotton belt and the eastern Ozark region. The Little Dixie region was primarily fertile farmland and was accessible to the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers. Southerners were the first settlers coming to Missouri in large numbers so they settled in this attractive area. This area had a considerable portion of slaves. There was strong southern sentiment in the area during the Civil War. The author contacted a substantial number of people in northeast Missouri and asked for opinions as to the counties or parts of counties which were part of Little Dixie. The political and civic leaders who were contacted are as follows: Dr. Robert Karsch, University of Missouri; Kenneth Scott, Bowling Green; Louise Taylor, Paris; Lee Welch, Silex; H. Dean Cissna, Palmyra; Dr. J. J. Wimp, Kirksville; Mrs. John Briscoe, New London; Russell Rowe, Louisiana; Clem Burges, St. Charles; and Carl Burchfield, Mexico.

It appeared from this poll that the following counties are most generally considered to be a part of Little Dixie: Audrain, Callaway, Boone, Lincoln, Pike, Ralls, Marion, Shelby, Monroe, Randolph, Howard, Chariton, and one county south of the Missouri River, Saline. All of these counties have gone Democratic in every one of the presidential elections 1916–1960, except Pike County went Republican in 1928 and Chariton County went Republican in 1952. There is some feeling that Lewis County belongs in this area since it has gone Democratic in these 12 elections, also.

The Greater Kansas City metropolitan area is another Democratic area. It includes: Jackson, Cass, Clay, Ray, Clinton, Buchanan, and Platte Counties. This was a rich agricultural region and many settlers from the South moved up the Missouri River to settle there. Most of the remaining Missouri slaves were to be found there before the Civil War. Later Irish and other immigrants moving into the counties tended to become Democrats. Labor unions have exerted an important influence in this area, in recent years and this has generally benefited the Democrats.

The city of St. Louis is generally considered Democratic for much the same reasons that Kansas City is Democratic. Another Democratic area is the southeast cotton region. Many of the early settlers of this region were from the Old South. And, this area has very close economic ties with the South.

The other Democratic region is the so-called eastern Ozark region. This is an area lying generally east from Texas County, north from the Arkansas line, west of the southeast region and south of the east-central Missouri Republican area. The eastern Ozark region was settled primarily by Democrats from Tennessee and Kentucky. The area is not rich agriculturally and has little industry; therefore, it is sparsely populated. Like the southwest Missouri area it has great possibilities as a recreational area, but, Missourians have been slow to recognize its potentialities.

The 1930 census indicates that 7 of the 10 political areas are definitely losing population. The three areas which are gaining population are: East-central Missouri Republican area between Jefferson City and St. Louis; the Greater Kansas City Democratic section; and the southern part of the Little Dixie area. It would appear that these regions will play an increasingly important part in State politics in the future.

In summary, it can be said that Missouri counties have generally been either consistently Democratic or Republican. Rapid migration and changing economic trends have relaxed the strong party loyalties in some counties. However, for the most part, political traditions in Missouri have changed very slowly.

Federal Power Versus State Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article "Federal Power Versus State Power."

FEDERAL POWER VERSUS STATE POWER

(By Lucile Hosmer)

Political and national know thyself is the most important knowledge which we must have today if we are to hold fast to our liberties.

From the beginning of colonial history, government in the United States has been dual. From the beginning, also, it has been largely Republican and from 1776 wholly so. Accordingly, these United States are a Federal State or more specifically, a Federal Republic Government, both National and State, is constitutional. Nothing short of a written Constitution created in the most solemn and formal manner would have satisfied the American people.

Our Federal Republic contained the following features:

Each State or member of the Union was wholly independent of the other members and of the Union in all matters which concerned itself only, but was subject to the National Government in all matters which concerned the member States collectively. Within its own sphere each State was wholly independent and sovereign; in the national sphere it had no independence or sovereignty whatsoever. Each member State made its own constitution and enacted and executed its own laws; but this constitution and these laws had to be in conformity with the National Constitution and laws.

So you can see that our Republic was established with a dual system of government. This was unheard of in European countries. It is still not understood by them. In fact, today there are too few Americans who understand or appreciate the absolute necessity of maintaining the proper balance between Federal (national) power and State power as planned by our forefathers.

Neither part of this complicated system is a complete government; neither one can be understood without the other. Each one is essential to the other and to society, and neither one is more essential than the other. The individual citizen is always subject to the two jurisdictions. Were the national jurisdiction destroyed, he would have no protection against foreign powers. Were the State jurisdiction withdrawn he would be at the mercy of a despotic centralized government. The Nation might assume the power of the States, or the States might become independent nations. But, if this were to happen, the characteristic features of our political system and those political functions upon which our Republic has established itself, would be destroyed.

Do you know how to differentiate between the powers of the State and the powers of the Federal (National) Government?

In the beginning, the States were more powerful than the Union or Confederation itself. The Confederation fell into disrepute during the Revolutionary War, because it had no power to pay its bills; as at this time, the States quite overshadowed the Union. When the Constitution was adopted, the Union or National Government assumed a new importance, which slowly increased up to the time of the Civil War. It was that event which gave it so much support in its power which it had never had before and which it has never relinquished.

Our Republic is neither a national system nor a State system. It is a dual system, a combination of the two.

In its foundation, the Constitution was partly national and partly State. This was because the Constitution was ratified by the people, but by the people as constituting 13 States and not one consolidated Nation. This same method is used today to ratify amendments to the Constitution, by the people as residents of their individual States.

In the sources of its powers, the duality appears again. One branch of the legislature (the House) represents the national aspect while the Senate represents the States. Furthermore, these two elements blend in the election of the President.

In the operation of its powers, the Constituition is national and not State, because it acts on the people as individuals and not as States. In the extent of its powers, it is partly national and partly State because the powers granted to it are limited in number, leaving a great mass of powers to the people (i.e., power of local self-government) and to the States, but unlimited in application. This residual power left to States and individuals of these States is the power of local self-government. As has been said before in the manner of amendments, it is neither wholly State nor National because both Houses of Congress and the State legislatures are necessary. There is no other government in the world more difficult to explain than our dual system which is an integral part of our Republican system. Our forefathers recognized the many complexities of the system but believed that they were necessary to the preservation of the liberties of the individual.

Daniel Webster once put it very effectively when he said: "Nothing is more dangerous than the pretense of a desire to simplify government. The simplest governments are despotisms; the next simplest limited monarchies. But all republics, all governments of law, must impose numerous limitations and qualifications of authority and give many positive and qualified rights." In other words, any free government is necessarily complicated because all such governments establish restraints on the power of government as well as on that of individuals.

It has been said by historians that if we want to abolish the distinction of branches and have but one branch * * * if we want to abandon jury trials and leave all to the judge * * * who will decide that the legislator himself shall himself be that judge; and if we will place the executive power in those same hands, we can easily simplify the complexities of our government. We will also have, at the same time, pure despotism. But a separation of departments so far as practicable and the preservation of clear lines between them is the fundamental idea in the creation of all our constitutions. It is believed by many political scientists that the continuance of liberty depends upon maintaining these boundaries.

This principle that our United States is a Union of indestructible States is basic. The Constitution and all of its judicial interpretations have held that the Federal Government is vested with limited and specified powers and with only those unspecified powers as are implied or necessary to carry out the specified powers. Under the Constitution, the States reserve to themselves all other powers not given to the Federal Government or denied to the States. This, again, is the residual power of local self-government.

Thomas Jefferson is quoted as saying that the purpose of our dual system was "to make us several as to ourselves, but one to all others." We all know that so many complexities have arisen as the vastness of our size has increased. With this increase in size has come, also, a great increase in interests and a great diversity of those interests varying from area to area. This, in reality, has increased the vital need of the people that the government shall be maintained locally in these various areas, responsive to the needs and desires of the people in these areas, which can be only if the government is local.

Referring once more to Jefferson who said, "Were not this country already divided into States, that division must be made that each might do for itself what concerns itself directly." He wrote also, "A single consolidated government would become the most corrupt government on earth."

In the 10th amendment to the Constitution it states: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people" (i.e., the power of local self-government). This 10th amendment was adopted so that there would not be any question as to where the undelegated powers of government were to be.

It is believed that 1898 was the turning point in our political and constitutional history. Up to that time, the trend had been toward more individual liberty and protection against the powers of government.

Today, we have reached the point where there is hardly any individual protection against the power of the Federal or National Government which cannot be set aside by the Federal Government at its own will and discretion as the Federal Government may determine. In principle, the Federal Government is now autocratic.

Going back to our basic doctrine of the dual system of government of our Republic, we find that the State is sovereign in its local affairs, precluding the National Government in this area. At this point, it is well to remember that governments, local, State, and National, derive their "just powers from the consent of the governed." Hence, we must keep government as far as possible under the control of the people in the exercise of its powers as well as in the length of time in which its representatives can hold office. It can clearly be seen that as bureauc-

racies grow in size and strength, perpetuating themselves, with no limit on the time they can hold office, with no curb on them by the consent of the governed, as to the rules and regulations which they pass, and with no real background nor knowledge of the diversified problems and circumstances in the individual local communities, then tyranny and despotism begin to flourish. Remember that government, both local and national, derives its just power from the consent of the governed.

One of the principles of American constitutional law was, until this century, that the individual citizen in these United States was exempt from any power or control of the Federal (National) Government, except when such power or control was given by the Constitution of the United States.

There were three general areas in which the individual citizen was protected from the Federal Government. The first area was the protection the individual had in respect to his property. He was not to be deprived of his right to own property without due process of law. The second area was relative to the protection of the individual respecting his physical person or his right to life, which could not be taken from him without due process of law. The third area of protection or immunity from the Federal (National) Government was in respect to his mind or thoughts or expression, freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom of assembly * * * i.e.; right of liberty (the right and power of free action). These were all regarded as the inalienable rights of man, given to him by his Creator, not by Government. The encroachment of the Federal Government upon private property has been mainly through the power assumed by the Government to tax and take property from the individual as well as the State. Also, it has assumed the power to fix the procedures to deal with private property if it wishes to acquire it either from the State or from the individual (i.e.; the wilderness areas).

At the turn of the century, constitutional law was interpreted to mean on these particular points, that the Federal Government had no power to define private property within the States of the Union except in regard to patents and copyrights. Also, it had no power to prevent an individual from acquiring private property in anything. In other words, as our Constitution was interpreted at that time, the Federal Government did not have the power to enter upon a socialistic program of taking and redistributing the individual's private property (class legislation).

It was still considered as a well-understood principle in the early 1900's that our Constitution only permitted the Federal Government to exercise such authority and power as was granted by it; all other authority being reserved to the States of the Union. In the system of a Federal Republic, the residuary power of the government, (the power of local self-government), must in the interest of individual liberty belong to the States of the Union. This is true, especially so, when the territory of the Union is of such vastness and when the inhabitants of its many political divisions or component parts have situations and problems of which only they can be aware and understand. The powers granted to the Federal Government (always referred to as the General Government) had to do with matters concerning relations with foreign countries, relations between the States of the Union and between the citizens or inhabitants of the different States of the Union. The only matters within the several States over which the General Government had jurisdiction were limited to those which were considered to be of fundamental interest throughout the whole country. The only duty and power of the Federal (National) Government within this intra-State (inside the State) sphere was its authority to prevent any State from depriving any person within its jurisdiction of "life, liberty or property" without "due process of law" or denying to any person equal protection of the laws. So you can see that within these limitations set up against the Federal (National) Government practically the whole domestic life and habits of the people were left entirely to the jurisdiction of the State, except when some regulation was forbidden to the State by constitutional prohibition.

Our Republic and our Constitution were both designed to protect the rights and freedoms of the individual in a number of ways. One of the most important ways, it was believed, was the assurance of State sovereignty thereby protecting local self-government.

Going back once more to the 10th amendment, the Supreme Court once declared of it, "Its principal purpose was not the distribution of power between the United States and the States but a reservation to the people of all the powers not granted to the Federal Government." In other words a reservation to the people of local self-government.

How would you, today, determine where the line should be drawn between Federal (National) power and State power?

Would you feel that the State should retain the power of meeting the social needs of its local communities? Should they be responsible for the education of their children? Should they provide for the social welfare of the needy within their boundaries? Should they determine the rules by which this welfare should be given? Should the State be responsible for the passage and execution of the laws required for the proper functioning of the many communities within their boundaries or should the Federal (National) Government determine these things?

Is there anything anywhere in the Constitution of the United States which delegates any of these powers to the Federal (National) Government? A speaker recently said: "There isn't anything that the local government can do that the bureaucrats aren't trying to convince the people that the Federal (National) Government can do better."

Since 1937 the Supreme Court has limited the use of the 10th amendment ("the powers not delegated to the U.S. by the Constitution, nor prohibited to it by the States, are reserved to the States, respectively or to the people"; i.e., local self-government), when attempts have been made to curtail Federal power in the field of taxation and interstate commerce. In fact, as recently as 1956, the U.S. Supreme Court voted unanimously, twice, and declared that when the Federal (National) Government preempts (takes over) any field of law making, that the State government cannot pass laws on the same subject.

David E. Lawrence in U.S. News & World Report commented at that time "This is creeping usurpation. It is a denial of the rights which have long protected the States against the tyranny of intolerable majorities in Congress." He continued his remarks by stating that this unanimous decision "moved a step nearer to the complete erosion of the rights of State sovereignties in America." This, of course means, also, the destruction of local self-government.

Why did the delegates to the Constitutional Convention insist upon this dual delegation of power in the first place?

They had tried to unite under the Articles of Confederation but found that they were not strong enough. There was nothing to bind them together. If any one of the States did not agree with what the others wanted, it would just pull out and that was that. The heated and vigorous debates of the delegates during the convention showed how much they feared centralized government. As a result, during the convention, the dual form of government, in which specific powers were assigned to the National Government (called Federal, today) where it would be "sovereign in its sphere" and other specific powers which were to be left in the hands of the individual States where they were to be "sovereign in their spheres" was determined. They gave to the National (Federal) Government only those powers which they believed were necessary to make it an effective general government and whose main purpose was to protect these United States. Their intent was that the individual citizens in each State would have the right to elect their local and State officers who were to be the only agents who could make the laws which affected them locally, who would administer them and select the judges who would interpret them.

It can be seen that the architects of the Constitution protected the sovereignty of the States and local self-government of its citizens as an integral part of the Union of the States with the power to exercise those functions. Another proof of the plan of local self-government is the manner in which the Constitution provided that the presidential electors were to be chosen by the States and their manner of choosing to be determined by each individual State. Equal representation was given to each State in the Senate with the Senators chosen, originally, by the individual States and not by popularity contests. And just to be more emphatic, there is a provision in the Constitution that no State can ever be denied its right to equal representation in the Senate without its own consent.

So, it can be seen that the federation of these United States was for the purpose of strengthening and protecting the Union of the States but was never intended that it should or would usurp the powers of the individual States. The purpose was to create a general government which was dependent on the States * * * not the other way around. A general government which would hold together the individual States but not dominate, control, nor dictate to these States

Let us imagine for a moment that we have 50 separate and distinct bricks; let them represent our individual States. Let us assume that we intend to build a brick wall. We want that brick wall to be strong and sturdy and smooth. Let our National (Federal) Government be represented by the cement which holds the bricks together, smoothly and evenly and makes the brick wall strong and sturdy. Without the cement they could fall apart or become chipped, uneven or dangerous. Having used the cement does not change the character or the responsibility of each individual brick * * * all it has done is to hold them together so that they will be strong and smooth.

Take yourself, you are a Californian. You are also an American. Too much independence as a Californian could mean civil war. Too much American with all power delegated to the Federal (National) Government could mean dictatorship and tyranny * * * the destruction of the State of California, the enslavement of the individual.

Let us go back to the brick wall. Too much cement and you no longer have a brick wall. You have a cement wall with a few indeterminate bricks scattered around in it.

The framers of our Constitution feared governmental tyranny above all else whether that tyranny was represented by one man, a small group of men or a majority. For this reason, they incorporated into our Constitution the "limitation of powers," the "prohibition of powers," and the "division of powers" to the National (Federal) Government which they felt would safeguard our political liberty as a nation. They believed that they had been successful and that they had created an "indestructible

Union of indestructible States." They concurred in the statement of Thomas Jefferson when he said "Let me hear no more of confidence in men but bind them down from mischief with the chains of the Constitution."

Some historians believe that the trend which has meant such a reversal of these principles has been very closely tied in with what they have called the debasing of the Supreme Court of the United States. Its first lowering of its standards appeared to be when it accepted the manner in which the 14th amendment was forced (many say illegally) into the Constitution. Again its status was visibly shaken by the attacks of F.D.R. on the "nine old men" when he wanted to replace the existing members of the Supreme Court with appointees who would agree with his philosophy of government. To many students of government and history, it has appeared that the decisions of the Supreme Court have done more to shift these United States away from the Union of States and a dual form of government toward complete centralization of power in the National (Federal) Government. It seems to be overlooked by the group in the Supreme Court that if complete centralization or nationalization does occur that there will be no more need for maintaining a Supreme Court than there would be for maintaining the machinery of State or local governments. The Supreme Court could then be eliminated as useless and unnecessary, too.

It was never intended that the Supreme Court should or could substitute interpretation and decree for legislation. It was intended that the sole and whole duty of the Supreme Court was to "construe (interpret) the law" according to the principles set forth in the Constitution itself. In recent years, one of the reasons so much doubt has been cast upon the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court has been due to the fact that the Court has relied upon what it has been pleased to call modern authority. For example the use of Gunnar Myrdal, the Swedish sociologist as the authority in the segregation case by the Supreme Court, instead of U.S. constitutional law, caused much criticism and dissension in the eyes of many jurists and historians. These same historians, as well as many political scientists have pointed out regardless of an interpretation of the Supreme Court concerning some point of constitutional law, the Court cannot compel obedience to it without legislative support of the Congress as well as that of public opinion.

The assertion by a member of the Supreme Court that "separate educational facilities are inherently unequal," is obviously not true but merely the opinion of one individual or a small group of individuals. There is no proof that a boys' school or a girls' has an inherent disadvantage if compared to a coeducational school. The Supreme Court decision that a State may not determine to which school any individual may go could, very easily, result in the abandonment of public education as a power or function of the State. This would mean, of course, that in time the Federal Government would move to establish national schools which means the collapse of our Federal Republic and Union of States and the establishment of national socialism.

The fear of such decisions as these by the Supreme Court has resulted in the revival of a doctrine which was used frequently during the early days of our Republic. This doctrine is called interposition and can be invoked by a State to obstruct an act of the Federal (National) Government. This is done by questioning the constitutionality of a policy as established by the Federal (National) Government. It applies to any act the State wishes to challenge and acts as a formal declaration of the sovereignty of the State as being interposed between its citizens and the distant authority of Washington. In other words you as a Californian challenge the authority of those who are representing only the National (Federal) side of our dual form of government and this can be used to force Congress to clarify the constitutionality of a Supreme Court decision or force the Supreme Court to rule on the constitutionality of an act of Congress.

Without "interposition," our constitutional system of checks and balances would be incomplete. The President is subject to check by both the Court and Congress; the Congress is subject to check by both the President and the Court. For these reasons, the right to challenge any apparent usurpation of power on the part of the Supreme Court must, in turn, be the responsibility of the individual States. In other words, separation of powers was intended not to promote efficiency but to prevent any exercise of arbitrary power by any branch of Government.

It must be remembered that the Founding Fathers put restraints on government so that the governed could remain free.

In these United States, each individual State should be regarded as a pillar holding up this Union. Each has its own duty and responsibility to its people and its communities within its borders. Together with other States of the Union, it supplies the strength, the character, and the vigor which maintains the balance of our dual form of government in these United States.

Richard Frothingham wrote in 1890 in his "Rise of the Republic" what is to my mind the perfect summary of Federal power versus State power. In describing the formation of our Republic, he states: "All through this popular movement, the Union is seen acting in obedience to the primal law of self-preservation, clinging to life, frowning on whatever tended to destroy life. Yet, in all the enthusiasm roused by unfurling a national flag and the prospect of attaining independence, there is manifested no desire for such consolidation as would weaken the old self-government. The intelligent grasp by the public of the fundamentals in a republic is seen in the sagacious reservation by each colony of the right to regulate the internal police, or to frame the local law. In this way the people as they entered the solemn covenant which recognized a common country marked the outline of two spheres of political power * * * the two orders of trusts which they intended to establish in a new American system * * * local governments for the States and a general government for the Union. Neither language nor acts could have been desired to show more conclusively that both political units, the State and the Nation, were designed to be paramount, each in its allotted sphere."

SOURCE MATERIAL—BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Commentaries of the Constitution," Joseph Story; "Civil Liberty and Self-Government," Francis Lieber; "The Federalist," James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, John Jay; "The Rise of the Republic," Richard Frothingham; "The American Government (National and State)," B. A. Hinsdale; "Recent Changes in Constitutional Theory," John W. Burgess; "Constitution of the United States," James Mussatti; "How To Keep Our Liberty," Raymond Moley; "Freedom and Federalism," Felix Morely; "Language of Dissent," Lowell Mason; and "Power Unlimited," Sylvester Petro.

The Defense Supply Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD an excellent article from the February issue of Nation's Business entitled "Streamlined Defense Buying Can Help You." This article commends the establishment of the new Defense Supply Agency and reviews the long struggle which you, Mr. Speaker, and I and many others in the Congress, in the executive branch, and in private life have had in bringing about such an agency to manage common-use supplies and related services for our Military Establishment.

In thanking all of those who worked so hard for this, I wish especially to mention the efforts of the Bonner subcommittee and Senators Douglas and O'Mahoney in the period 1951–52.

The final breakthrough which crowned these efforts with success came in the passage of the McCormack-Curtis amendment to the Defense Reorganization Act of 1958 which gives the Secretary of Defense ample authority to do the job. I believe the Congress has done a fine chore in enacting this provision and now must look to see that its enactment is followed by proper execution. Let us not be deceived that the issuance of a regulation or directive insures success of this program. Unremitting toil, understanding and top-level support will be required to achieve the necessary result.

The article follows:

STREAMLINED DEFENSE BUYING CAN HELP YOU

Taxpayers, businessmen, and 2.8 million servicemen are beginning to feel the effects of Defense Department action to unify its supply management.

Taxpayers will benefit from more economical use of military tax dollars.

Streamlined channels should speed supplies to the servicemen.

The Department and businessmen will profit because the new setup may cut purchasing decision time by two-thirds.

"Certainly by one-half," says Paul H. Riley, the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Supply and Services.

Three levels of procurement administration—the technical service, general staff, and service secretariat—have been compressed into one.

As a result, a businessman with a problem that cannot be solved in the field can come to Washington and discuss it in one place. Previously he might have had to make trips to the Army, Navy, Marines, Air Force, and General Services Administration.

Expected to accomplish all this is the new Defense Supply Agency (DSA), established last October after 15 years' urging by business organizations, congressional committees, and the Hoover Commission.

The new Agency is charged with managing procurement and distribution of certain common supplies and services. It consoli-

dates 12 existing organizations and creates a unified electronics supply center.

Estimates of dollar savings the change will bring vary widely. Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara predicts "substantial improvement and economy in our logistics management."

Lt. Gen. Andrew T. McNamara (no relation to the Secretary), is head of the new Agency. He told Congress he expects $25 million savings in annual operating expenses and an initial $200 million inventory reduction. Under the new supply structure, DSA is primarily the wholesaler of soft goods and secondary items. Each service retains control of the development and management of weapons and related hardware. Each also retains its retail and oversea distribution.

DSA's purchases are expected to total about $2.7 billion this year and should increase at least fivefold in the future.

This year it will manage 1.8 million items, almost half of the Defense Department's total; a $3.2 billion inventory; disposal of surplus property that originally cost $6 billion; $700,000 for transportation of personnel and property.

DSA is now responsible for food, clothing and textile, medical and dental, petroleum, general (housekeeping), and construction supplies and the Military Traffic Management Agency. It has consolidated the activities of 34 surplus sales offices, and the Armed Forces Supply Support Center (cataloging).

On April 1 it takes over industrial supplies and on July 1 becomes responsible for both electronic and automotive supplies.

BROAD AUTHORITY

The new Agency is authorized to determine whether industrial production equipment, chemical supplies, and aeronautical spare parts should be under its management. The directive establishing the Agency also states that DSA shall be responsible for "the organization, direction, management, administration, and control of such other commodities and services as may be directed by the Secretary of Defense."

The 12 supply and service organizations, now operating in varying degrees, are expected to be in full operation about 2 years from now.

The Defense Electronics Supply Center is schedued to be fully operational by September 1964. Before that time the agency expects to review 1,020,000 items and reduce this total to 680,000 standard items.

If this can be done on schedule, DSA estimates the center will manage a $400 million inventory in 1963, increasing to $500 million in 1964.

DSA's operating expenses are included in the Defense appropriation and a new stock fund finances supplies procured by the agency.

Many businessmen, Congressmen, and military leaders consider a DSA-type organization long overdue.

The need for thorough reorganization of military supply first received widespread recognition in 1945 as a result of Gen. Brehon B. Somervell's difficulties during World War II in overcoming monumental problems to bring order out of the hodgepodge in the Army logistic system.

A congressional subcommittee that studied the problem in 1953 found a "totally unrealistic concept" in planning and spending by the separate services.

In 1955 the Hoover Commission recommended that "Congress should enact legislation establishing a separate civilian-managed agency, reporting to the Secretary of Defense, to administer common supply and service activities." The Chamber of Commerce of the United States endorsed the recommendation and pressed for its adoption and implementation.

SINGLE MANAGER SYSTEM

The Defense Department insisted that this proposal would mean more paperwork, less efficiency, higher costs, increased duplication. As a substitute, it promulgated a single manager plan for commodities. Eight assignments were made during the next 6 years, with the Army directing five and the Navy three.

Critics called the single manager concept a fragmentary approach which failed to give adequate authority to each manager, although the Department claimed annual savings of $24 million.

A 1958 amendment to the Defense Reorganization Act gave the Secretary of Defense authority "to place under one agency or one department any activity common to more than one of the military services."

Then in 1960 the congressional Joint Economic Committee reported that the Defense Department wasted from $2 billion to $3 billion annually and recommended that the Secretary use his broad authority to consolidate common supply activities into a common agency.

Secretary McNamara did so, and DSA, which absorbed the eight single managers, was announced 7 months after he took office.

What are the chances that the taxpayer will get more for his military dollar? There are at least five promising ways:

1. Standarization

Maj. Gen. Oliver C. Harvey, Executive Director of DSA's Defense Clothing and Textile Supply Center, points out that "You can't get a correlation of what the separate services are buying until you look at the whole picture under one agency. Then you can see where the duplication is."

This organization was under the single manager system for 5 years but its Executive Director had no power to standardize.

"In some cases," a staff member said, "he had to do a public relations job with the services. He had to sell, cajole, ask, beg. It might take him 2 years to convince the services. In other cases, service receptiveness was fine."

The staff looks forward to "a tremendous standardization impact" due to DSA urging executive directors to make on-the-spot decisions.

Potentialities for standardization in clothing and textiles, with expenditures estimated at from $300 million to $350 million in 1962 and 1963, are unlimited. Four years ago 88 percent of 32,000 items were used by only 1 service; today it is 75 percent of 28,000 items. A recent step was to reduce the number of frocks for meatcutters from four to one.

The Defense Industrial Supply Center has eliminated 600 paint items even before it comes under the agency's control.

2. Inventory reduction

The Defense Department claimed that the single manager system cut inventories by 27 percent during a 3-year period compared with 19 percent for nonunified supply organizations. One-time savings, largely resulted from inventory reduction, were said to total more than $545 million.

DSA officials anticipate further substantial reduction although they don't expect the "dramatic rate of recent years" to continue.

3. Personnel reduction

DSA expects to operate with fewer personnel than were formerly employed by its components.

While officials are cautious about playing this numbers game, the goal is to function with 23,000 employees in July 1963 compared with 26,290 now. If this materializes, and Secretary McNamara has established personnel controls aimed at its success, the annual saving is estimated at $18 million.

Most of DSA's manpower is civilian, but representatives of the four services are assigned throughout the agency. The Director is an Army general, the Deputy Director is an admiral, and civilians hold three key jobs—counsel, comptroller, manpower.

4. Increased use of computers

The Defense Petroleum Supply Center, now part of DSA, began evaluating jet fuel bids and determining contract awards with computers a year ago, and claimed a $5 million annual saving compared with manual solution.

The system is being extended to aviation gasoline and lubricating oil. A similar system is being tested for food bids and awards.

Among the improvements claimed are reducing solution time from 7 to 5 weeks, with 3 weeks considered possible; allowing industry to submit bids closer to delivery time; accepting last minute changes in input; and, a guaranteed least-cost award and distribution pattern.

5. Reducing duplicate, triplicate, and quadruplicate procurement

The records of the congressional Joint Economic Committee are crowded with documentation of cases where the services bought similar items individually, each paying considerably more per item than a consolidated purchase would have cost.

Mr. Riley says the opportunities for concurrent buying ought to be reduced whenever several procurement organizations are consolidated.

QUICK DECISIONS

What changes are ahead for defense contractors?

DSA is expected to advance a general attitude toward business of competitiveness, not size; capability, not power; decentralization under centralized management; quality control by producers; qualified manufacturer's lists.

"The basic concept of the organization is to decentralize to the maximum practicable extent," General McNamara says.

"There will be greater authority in the field and many things that previously trickled to Washington will be decided there.

"However, if a problem comes to me, I'll make a decision within a week after it lands on my desk."

Among the actions requiring higher review or approval are: negotiations of research and development, classified, and industrial mobilization contracts; contracting protests by officers on certificates of competence issued by the Small Business Administration; matters relating to fraud, criminal conduct, suspension, debarment; matters pertaining to discrimination in employment by contractors; protests regarding practices designed to eliminate competition or restrain trade; protests after award.

Until DSA, all these cases slogged through several administrative layers in Washington. Now, some go directly to DSA for decision, some go to DSA and then directly to the review or appeal body.

Streamlining channels enables congressional queries to go directly to the agency's divisions instead of passing through at least four administrative layers.

"There will be more responsiveness to business," a legal official says. "Where a matter might have taken, say, 3 months to decide, now it might take only 24 hours with a phone call.

"DSA should also help the businessman because he'll know exactly where his case is. Previously he might convince one level about the merits of his case only to find it had moved to another level. He'll have fewer people to convince."

One of DSA's aims is to get more quality control stipulations written into contracts. Hitherto the approach by buyers varied—sometimes quality control by manufacturers was mandatory, sometimes voluntary, often none was required.

"Quality control policies accent contractor responsibility," a Defense official said. "They are based on the concept that the contractor must establish proof that his production processes are properly controlled and that his product satisfies Department requirements."

DSA will also emphasize qualified manufacturer lists in a continued effort to minimize contract delinquencies.

MORE MILITARY STRENGTH

How could DSA strengthen national security?

Savings made by the new agency can be used to increase the number of missiles, planes, guns, tanks, and combat troops, and hence increase the efficiency of the armed services.

Defense officials are confident that another benefit will be quick reaction time getting common supplies to field forces.

General McNamara cites a recent incident to exemplify the responsive energy of his agency:

Because of political developments in a foreign country an aircraft carrier was ordered to sea as fast as possible from Mayport, Fla. The officer in charge of the nearby Jacksonville food office was informed about 2 p.m. on Saturday that the ship would need 60,000 pounds of frozen food and 60,000 pounds of fresh produce before midnight. The produce market, trucking company, and cold storage plant were closed.

The officer contacted management personnel, employees were notified, purchasing agents were sent to the market. In about 5 hours the ship got everything required except for a few hundred pounds of rabbit and a small quantity of lamb loins.

Overall success of DSA is enhanced by these factors: Secretary McNamara, General McNamara, congressional support, enthusiasm of the majority of officers, and business support.

The crucial role of the two McNamaras was pinpointed by Gen. Robert E. Wood, former Quartermaster General of the Army, former president and chairman of the board of Sears, Roebuck & Co., and now a director. He was a member of the Hoover Commission's Defense Committee that recommended procurement be consolidated.

General Wood has said he is "very much in favor" of DSA, but "its success will depend on its backing by the Secretary of Defense and the type of man who heads it."

If the agency is to be successful, the Comptroller General of the United States says it must be vested with decisionmaking authority.

The Secretary has placed DSA's Director in a unique position—on a level with the service Secretaries and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. General McNamara reports directly to Secretary McNamara; they meet at least once a week.

The general, wise in the ways of Washington convolutions after 14 years in the Capital, including 4 as Quartermaster General of the Army, appears certain of his authority—"I take my orders straight from Mr. McNamara"—and knows how to use it—"I'll probably have to step on some toes."

Soon after he assumed command, the general had to decide among three differing proposals by the services for a common belt buckle. He chose the plainest and cheapest.

"And make them all black," he ordered.

"But, general," an aide said, "no one has asked for a black buckle."

"Tell them," he replied, "that if they don't want me to make this kind of decision, they should make the decisions themselves."

The use of firm and forthright authority in defense supply is strongly supported by four legislators active in exposing military waste. They are House Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK, Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT, Democrat, of Louisiana, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, and Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri. Their views are echoed by many Senators and Congressmen.

"The establishment of DSA is a big step taken in reducing waste in defense," Speaker McCORMACK has said.

"The step that has been taken with regard to DSA is a token of what may be done in such areas as financial management, medical and hospital service, weather and engineering services, intelligence, communications, publications."

Businessmen have expressed their willingness to cooperate.

The critical factor seems to be whether or not the services drag their feet.

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE (Democrat, of Wisconsin), summed up a widespread attitude when he said:

"There is enthusiasm because at long last a constructive step has been taken to set the Pentagon's procurement house in order, to reduce wasteful spending and eliminate overlaps.

"But the optimism is guarded because in no field is it more necessary to adopt a rigorous show-me attitude before hailing accomplishments. Military procurement policies have been reformed before, without significant gains in the actual strength achieved for each U.S. tax dollar spent."

For years the notion of a single supply service has been bitterly controversial.

Many military officers have feared the establishment of such a service under the Secretary of Defense and independent of the individual services would handicap the supply of air, ground and sea forces and would be the first major step in the establishment of a single military service.

Many officers of the Army's technical services and the Navy's bureaus see DSA as a real threat to their domains, but today the attitude among military and civilian supply officers is reflected by more than 1,700 requests by civilians for DSA assignment.

Their spirit is epitomized in a statement by Rear Adm. John W. Crumpacker, Chief of the Navy's Bureau of Supplies and Accounts:

"Of one thing I am absolutely sure—every individual engaged in Navy supply will render enthusiastic, maximum cooperation to help make DSA the most effective and most responsive wholesale military supply support system for common items ever created."

DSA officials have found the only foot-dragging so far has been a reluctance by the Army and Navy to provide lower echelon officers of talent. In the main, General McNamara has found "stanch support and nothing barnacled."

The outlook for DSA, according to some observers of the Pentagon, is that the top brass won't buck it as presently constituted. But there will be a nasty battle if its boundaries are rapidly expanded; for example, in the area of ammunition.

Summary of Evidence Given by the Honorable Saburo Chiba, Member of Parliament for Chiba Prefecture and Chairman of the Constitutional Committee in the Japanese Diet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

In December 1961, I attended the Assembly of the Americans for the Moral Rearmament of the World held in Rio de Janeiro. There I was staggered by the amassed evidence of what has been achieved in Latin America through MRA in the last 10 months. The Japanese play "The Tiger," written by the revolutionary students whose rioting kept President Eisenhower out of Japan and who later met MRA and changed, has now been seen by 1,650,000 people and has reached millions more through television, press, and radio. There is no doubt that MRA is having a decisive influence in turning the tide of communism and anti-Americanism on that continent.

I am including here a brief report of their historic journey.

MASSIVE IMPACT OF THE TIGER IN LATIN AMERICA

The Japanese play "The Tiger," written and produced by the revolutionary students of Japan who took part in the riots of 1960 which stopped the visit of President Eisenhower, has been operating in the Latin American Continent for the past 10 months.

Before going, they apologized publicly to former Press Secretary Hagerty in New York and to General Eisenhower, who received them at Palm Springs, Calif. He said to them, "This is the last act of the June riots and it has a happy ending. I am 100 percent with you." He encouraged them to go to Latin America.

"Operation Tiger" started in Sao Paulo on May 1, the day Khrushchev declared that he would communize the continent within 2 years. The MRA force swept across the Northeast and the Amazon regions of Brazil, and through Peru, Bolivia, and Chile. One million six hundred and fifty thousand people have so far seen this play on the stage. In Manaus it drew a record crowd of 90,000 on the day of the anniversary of the Cuban revolution. The same day the Communist rally close by had only 40 people. The Air Forces of Brazil and Peru, the Brazilian Navy, Army, and police in every district cooperated fully, transporting the cast and equipment, distributing leaflets and offering accommodation. Marshal Juarez Tavora, national hero of Brazil and presidential candidate in 1956, declared when he visited the Pope in Rome that, at the time of President Quadros' resignation, "The Tiger" and the force of moral rearmament saved Brazil and the Latin American Continent from communism and civil war.

In Lima, Peru, the Japanese students went into San Marcos University, a hotbed of communism where students stoned and spat on Vice President Nixon 2 years ago. I personally visited the university in September and was surrounded by hardcore Communist

leaders. Through the Japanese students they met a superior ideology to communism, and many top leaders of Communist activity changed and left the party. Some came down to Rio de Janeiro for the Assembly of the Americas. There they created a play called "El Condor," in which they described the reality of the ideological struggle in Peru and its answer. Mrs. Nixon, mother of the former Vice President, was attending the Assembly and accepted the apology of these students for what they had done to her son. They told her, "We students would like to pay our respects to Mr. Nixon through his mother. Tell Mr. Nixon that he can once again take up his contact with Latin America. We invite him and his mother to take part with us in this transformation of the world."

They went to Cuzco, high in the Andes Mountains and capital of the ancient Inca civilization. Castro has declared he will make this region the Sierra Maestra of Latin America. Moscow broadcasts 21 hours a week in the Quechua language, and there is deep Communist infiltration. Seventy thousand saw "The Tiger," coming by bus, truck, and on foot from up to 60 miles away. A policeman said, "You have performed the impossible in this Communist stronghold." The national paper La Cronica said in an editorial that the presence of MRA in Cuzco was a heavy blow to the Communist cause in Peru and noted that the acceptance of MRA by the people meant they condemned openly and in vast crowds the activities of the Communists in this place.

In Bolivia they were received by President Victor Paz Estenssoro. He told them, "Bolivia has reached the stage in her history in which she needs the things you are fighting for. You must go to all parts of Bolivia." He and other leaders asked the MRA force to go particularly to Catavi, center of the tin mining industry which, with other minerals in the area, represents 80 percent of Bolivia's income. Communism has maintained control of the union for some while through a reign of terror. One trade union leader said, "Men are finding new courage through what they saw in 'The Tiger.' Many have become disappointed with communism. You have given us the courage to stand up for what is right again."

After visiting the key mining areas of northern Chile where, according to Chile's leading daily El Mercurio, practically the entire population saw 'The Tiger,'" the force went to Santiago. There 30,000 attended a mass demonstration in the national stadium. El Mercurio, in a full-page article with pictures, said "MRA is a synthesis, an international movement through which, by its ideological strength, it is possible to stop the Red danger that is threatening the countries of Latin America."

I also enclose a more detailed report of the Moral Re-Armament Assembly of the Americas in Rio.

When I was in Peru earlier in the year, I met President Prado, the Speaker of the House, and many other leaders. I asked them what was the reason for the tremendous response to "The Tiger." They immediately replied that where communism captured the intellectuals, Moral Re-Armament was capturing the masses.

In this statement by Peruvian leaders I found an answer to the question that has worried me for a long time. For 6 years I was Chairman of the Security Committee in the Japanese Diet and fought to save Japan from communism. However, I had to face the fact that I never had a fundamental answer to communism, so the battle was a very difficult one. But moral rearmament succeeds because it changes the thinking of the masses and so brings the answer.

For instance, in the Japanese student organization called Zengakuren less than 1 percent are Communists. Ninety-nine percent are indifferent, cowardly, and opportunistic. It is the same in all walks of life in the free world. Where those 99 percent go will decide the fate of freedom for nations. By showing ideological plays with casts, from both Communist and non-Communist backgrounds, fully committed to the ideology of MRA, it is possible to turn the thinking of the majority immediately in the right direction.

Asia is on fire. We desperately need a similar offensive there. I am now leaving for the MRA Assembly in Kerala, South India, where state leaders plan a demonstration for moral rearmament of 100,000 in the capital city of Trivandrum. Prime Minister U Nu of Burma and President Ayub Khan of Pakistan have both requested saturation programs of MRA for their nations. President Diem of Vietnmam, who recently received an MRA delegation, asked too for the submission of a program of moral rearmament which, he says, is of equal importance with the material and military help he needs to keep his country free.

I am certain that the masses of Asia will respond in the same way as they have in Latin America. Therefore this is the way to preserve freedom in the immediate future.

I have also been very impressed everywhere I have traveled with moral rearmament to see the permanent reconciliations of the bitterest enemies and the sound and lasting solutions found to some of the most difficult international situations through the application of this ideology. That is why I am also convinced that MRA is the only basis for the future peace and stability of the world.

ASIAN CENTER FOR MORAL REARMAMENT

Leaders of Japan including former Prime Minister Kishi, Governor Sogo of the National Railways and Governor Yamagiwa of the Bank of Japan feel keenly the need for Japan to take ideological initiative for the Asian Continent. They are building a Center for Moral Rearmament at Odawara near Tokyo and plan to call for the first assembly for Asia and the world in October 1962. Already many leaders of Asia have expressed their intention of coming to this assembly. The Japanese Government is backing it fully.

We will attempt through the operation of this Center to shift the thinking of the Asian Continent from Peiping to a superior ideology. I personally feel that neutralism, which has been the main thinking of the Asian Continent for the past decade, is now coming to a turning point. Mere neutralism obviously does not save nations from communism nor meet their needs. Leaders of Asia now feel keenly the need for a superior thinking and living.

If Japan, with the United States of America and other free nations, takes on the task of the moral rearmament of the Asian continent, she can affect the whole course of history.

Dr. Frank Buchman, Pennsylvania-born initiator of moral rearmament, rightly said that Japan should be the lighthouse of Asia. I pledge my life to fight that my nation rise up and meet this challenge.

Humiliation at Punta del Este

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Madison Avenue boys around the White House are trying to tell the people of the United States what a great victory was achieved at Punta del Este. I happen to agree with the conclusion reached by Newsday, the largest daily in my congressional district, which thinks that the Nation was humiliated. Coming, editorially, from a paper that generally supports the Kennedy administration adds strength to the views expressed on February 1:

PYRRHIC VICTORY

"Another such victory, and we are undone." (Pyrrhus, King of Epirus, referring to his dearly bought victory at Asculum, 280 B.C.)

The wisdom of the ancients never loses its timeliness, as our victory at Punta del Este amply demonstrates. We indeed succeeded in ousting Cuba from the Organiaztion of American States—by one vote. The original proposal of Secretary of State Rusk, that the Americans impose economic sanctions on Cuba, sank without a trace. It was, in the words of Little Peterkin, "a famous victory."

Look who helped us: Guatemala, El Salvador, Panama, among other small countries. The only significant votes for our side came from Venezuela and Uruguay. We enlisted almost all the little nations, but none of the really big ones. The vitally important and influential A–B–C states (Argentina, Brazil, Chile) abstained. So did Mexico, our next-door and presumably good neighbor. These larger countries don't like Fidel Castro, but they are uneasily aware of dangerous ultra leftwing movements at home. Governments might have been overthrown had they gone along.

Thus atop the humiliation of the Cuban invasion fiasco, we have now piled a diplomatic defeat. We have not saved face by bringing about the ouster of Cuba. We have lost face. For if, in its own hemisphere, the United States cannot enforce its will, the rest of the world is bound to pay less attention to us.

This disaster could have been averted. If, months in advance, the Latin American nations had been polled carefully, we might have had time to persuade at least more of them. Or to abandon the idea of a conference until such time as we could be sure of success. Open diplomacy may be great in theory, but in fact there is no substitute for secret diplomacy as its forerunner. A great conference of nations, called to penalize a malefactor, makes no senes unless the penalty is assured in advance.

The first lesson this country can learn from Punta del Este is that something obviously is wrong with our Latin American intelligence, and that Latin American experts in the State Department lack judgment. The second is never again to expose ourselves to such humiliation—needless humiliation, to boot.

Bad Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with the national election years discussions of civil rights, it is not surprising that the Kennedy administration has proposed a politically motivated proposal intended to cover up for the fact that it has yet to produce a practical, working civil rights program. The fact that the ad-

ministration's civil rights bill, which was introduced the past week, is open to substantial question, is most effectively discussed by the Chicago Sun-Times editorial of February 5. I ask leave to insert this editorial "Bad Rights Bill" into the RECORD:

BAD RIGHTS BILL

As encouraging as it is to see the Kennedy administration begin to move on civil rights, we question the legal soundness of a bill introduced by Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat of Montana, to eliminate literacy tests as a requirement for voting. The measure provides that completion of a sixth grade education, in either Spanish or English, in an accredited school, must be accepted by a voting registrar as evidence of literacy.

A serious question can also be raised as to whether it is a good or bad bill in its terms, regardless of how worthy its aim may be. More on that later.

Article I, section 2 of the Constitution provides that the electors (voters) in each State who are entitled to vote for members of the U.S. House "shall have the same qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." This language very pointedly leaves to the States the question of determining the voter qualifications of their respective inhabitants. Precisely the same language was used in the 17th amendment providing for the popular elections of Members of the Senate.

Congress does have authority to alter State laws prescribing "the times, places, and manner of holding election for Senators and Representatives" but this does not empower it to set up qualifications for voters, other than those specified.

The constitutionality of the Mansfield bill is doubtful, and if the administration is serious about ending abuses of voting privileges through phony literacy tests it should offer a constitutional amendment for this purpose. Such a proposed amendment was introduced a year ago, got no administration support, and died in committee.

It would be a mistake, of course, to write any kind of educational requirement for voting into the Constitution, but it would be reasonable to assign to Congress the power to establish standards for balloting in national elections, after which the proper legislation could be drawn.

This leads to the second question: What particular sense is there in setting the literacy requirement at the sixth-grade level? Individuals vary, and there is certainly a wide disparity in school standards in various sections of the country. Who is to say that everyone who manages to get through the sixth grade in whatever school can understand the enormously complex issues of these times?

As for non-English speaking citizens, why provide only for those educated in Spanish? What about the Poles, Lithuanians, French, Dutch, etc.? The effort here, of course, is to take care of Puerto Ricans, native-born citizens all, who come to the mainland with no language facility other than Spanish. Except for literacy tests in such States as New York, they are as eligible to vote as other citizens once they fulfill the residence requirements.

However, as residents of the United States they should learn the English language. It is sufficiently difficult—sometimes impossible—for voters versed in English to understand the election issues in a manner which permits anything like intelligent voting. It is impossible for those who do not.

There is no question that literacy tests have been misused, chiefly as a device to prevent otherwise qualified Negroes from voting in the South. This is an abuse which should not be tolerated. It can, and should, be corrected by specific action directed to the particular inequity and not by action, of doubtful legality at best, which smacks more of political maneuvering than anything else.

Kennedy Administration Is Not Convincing the Russians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I think the President might recommend to the Congress the establishment of a new Cabinet post: "The Office of Wishful Thinking." This is especially true when it comes to the childlike behavior of the Kennedy administration in trying to bat down the Communist empire by being sweet to its rulers. The following article, which appeared in the January 29 issue of the Long Island Daily Press, stresses the juvenile approach of the Kennedy administration to the subject:

DOES SOVIET REALLY FEAR ATOM WAR?

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

My friend the late Jan Masaryk, son of the great Thomas Masaryk and himself Czechoslovak Minister of Foreign Affairs when the Commies took over, used to quote a Czech proverb:

"If my aunt had whiskers, she would be my uncle."

He meant that if the facts in a given situation were as his opponents stated they were, he would agree with them. Since his aunt lacked whiskers, he was forced to conclude that she was not his uncle.

This story comes back to me in trying to understand the paradoxes of the Kennedy administration.

Just why, I ask myself, after Khrushchev's repeated threats and provocations at Berlin and other places, does President Kennedy invite Mr. K.'s son-in-law, Alekshei I. Adhubei, to lunch with him at the White House tomorrow? Does not our President know that thereby he strengthens an already overreadiness of the American people to underestimate the Communist danger?

Why does John F. Kennedy believe that we can find a new arrangement for Berlin advantageous both to the Russians and ourselves?

Why, after the Soviets duped us into stopping atomic tests so that they could go ahead in weapons does the U.S. administration hesitate to resume atmospheric testing? Why does it permit the State Department to put out a pamphlet called "The Nucleas Test-Ban Treaty: Gateway to Peace," when there is almost no chance of reaching a test-ban treaty and it would not necessarily lead to peace?

Why then are our President and Secretary of State so earnestly seeking a disarmament in which the U.S.S.R. has demonstrably not the slightest real interest (except as a further means of handicapping the American arms effort) instead of bringing the West's immensely superior resources to the task of creating a political and military preponderance?

For a long time—to repeat—I have been asking myself why J.F.K. persists in hoping that my aunt will grow whiskers? Now I think I have an answer. My colleague Walter Lippman, whose views are said to impress President Kennedy, recently wrote:

"Neither they (the Russians) nor we (the Americans) can live indefinitely on the brink of nuclear war."

This implies that the Soviets today fear nuclear war as much as we do.

Perhaps they do—theoretically. But at present they do not need to fear such a war for they have a practical certainty that short of an attack by them on a major ally, we will not start such a war.

It is therefore a mistake to believe that they fear nuclear war as much as we do. They do not.

Therefore, before they can seriously consider making "peaceful coexistence" really peaceful, still less accept any serious arms control or larger disarmament, the United States must first convince them that they cannot win any kind of war.

Secretary of Defense McNamara seems to know this. He recently told a Senate committee:

"We are resolved to continue the struggle in all its forms until such time as the Communist leaders * * * are convinced that their aggressive policies, motivated by their drive to communize the world, endanger their security as well as ours." And he might have added—until they realize that they cannot win by force or subversion or propaganda.

Fiscal Responsibility Is the Only Answer to Meeting Our National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, there is only one way we can ever hope to pay off the national debt, reduce taxes, and protect the solvency of our currency, and that is by exercising fiscal responsibility, living within our means and by cutting out unnecessary Federal spending. All the doubletalk in the world by the fuzzy economists now writing our national policies will not alter the plain commonsense that you cannot continue to spend more than you take in without going broke. Along this line I would like to call your attention to the following commonsense editorial from the Dallas Morning News:

IT COMES AS NO SURPRISE

The bad news has come from David E. Bell, President Kennedy's budget director: Don't be surprised when the Federal budget hits the $100-billion mark.

There is very little in the way of news coming from Washington that surprises anybody any more. It would be no surprise if Mr. Bell had told us that the Federal Government will be spending $100 billion next year; in spite of the President's promise to balance the 1963 budget at the precarious peak of $92.5 billion.

Last year, we seem to recall, the promise was for a balanced budget or a small surplus. And now, it turns out, the experts who predicted the outcome a year ago are admitting that they were wrong by something in the neighborhood of $7 billion.

That's how it has been going for quite a while. President Franklin Delano Roosevelt

made regular promises each year to balance his budget and cut nonessential spending.

But in the 12 years that he was in office there was never a balanced budget, and the spending increased regularly every year.

President Truman's record was similar, as was Eisenhower's. Do we have any good reason to believe that President Kennedy's will be any different?

In the last 31 years there have been 25 deficits. At the same time, the national debt has grown from $11 billion to nearly $300 billion. This year, the amount of money which the Federal Government will spend on the interest on the national debt alone is larger than the entire Federal budget for 1938.

It is larger than the total expenditures for all Governments—Federal, State, and local—in 1922. And it is almost as large as the total expenditures by the governments of all of the 48 States in 1948.

Today every family in America is in hock to the tune of $7,000—if the national debt (which we owe to ourselves, according to the folks in Washington) can be spread out evenly over the entire population.

The proportions of this debt have gone a long way toward undermining public confidence in the U.S. dollar—both at home and abroad.

Will this trend toward bigger Federal budgets and more burdensome public debts ever be reversed? Certainly not as long as David E. Bell, the man who told us to expect a $100 billion budget soon, is occupying the post of Budget Director.

Bell has been quoted as saying that "it would be in serious error of public policy as well as false economy" to reject Federal programs on the grounds that "we cannot afford them."

He has said that spending programs are needed not necessarily for welfare purposes, but for achieving economic growth as well.

He has condoned Federal deficits because he believes that foreign banks would regard drops in Federal expenditures as unsound.

As the President has said, these are uncertain times—filled with danger and challenge. It would be unwise, certainly, to make drastic cuts or even fail to make necessary increases in defense spending.

But at the same time we should take the President at his word when he calls for sacrifice. We should be willing to do just that—to sacrifice unnecessary nondefense spending in order to meet the needs of the crisis.

Moreover, we should be careful to analyze our dangers and do the best to meet them without panic.

Governments have a tendency to manufacture crises to justify deficit spending. To allow this to happen year after year is sheer folly. It is the certain road to ruin.

President's Defense of William Wieland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the President is human in wanting to get his name in the paper all of the time. Perhaps before making statements, in which he wants to appear as an expert on all subjects, he should first study all the facts. The following article by George E. Sokolsky, which appeared in the Long Island Daily Press on January 29, proves my point:

KENNEDY'S STARTLING FLAREUP

(By George E. Sokolsky)

It is difficult to understand President Kennedy's defense of William Arthur Wieland at his press conference last Wednesday. It is more difficult to understand why the Eastland committee does not make public the vast amount of unfavorable material it has in its possession on the subject of Wieland's activities.

This congressional committee has held long hearings concerning Wieland and Castro in executive session. It is the duty and obligation of the committee to make its data available to Congress and the public. Had such data been disclosed, the controversy between the President and Mrs. McClendon at the Wednesday press conference could not have taken place.

The question that Mrs. McClendon raised is whether two security risks are actually employed by the State Department. The argument hinged over the term, "security risks." Public opinion has long decided that William Arthur Wieland is a security risk. The testimony of Ambassadors Arthur Gardner and Earl E. T. Smith clearly substantiate this.

On September 19, 1960, I wrote an article in which I asked: Who in the United States helped Castro take Cuba? On the following day, I continued the subject.

This was not the earliest discussion of Wieland's role in Cuba in this column. Smith had appeared before the Eastland committee and about this I wrote:

"Smith's testimony established the point beyond question that it was the United States through the State Department that brought Castro to power. Time after time, he was questioned with regard to that and always it was clear that Assistant Secretary of State Roy Rubottom and William A. Wieland, the deskman in charge of Cuba, preferred Castro.

"Regarding Castro, Ambassador Smith testified:

" 'Castro was a revolutionary and a terrorist.

" 'From the time that he was a university student, he was a guntoter. I was informed by a diplomat that he had killed one nun and two priests in Bogotá during the uprising in 1948.' "

On December 21, 1960, I began telling the story of William Arthur Montenegro, which was a pseudonym for Wieland. I wrote:

"William Arthur Montenegro under that name and under another name wrote for the 'Havana Post' from 1933 to 1937. That is a good place to start if anyone needs a tip. There are articles in that newspaper which were contributed by such a person.

"The State Department has a technique for covering up and for evading scandals. When a State Department official goes wrong or is caught with bloody hands, the trick is to send him to other parts of the world, far from news centers until those who are interested forget about him, get interested in something else, or die. Then the career official who went awry may return to Washington."

There is no need to go further in this material. It has been available to the State Department since about 1959. Despite that, Wieland was promoted from a Foreign Officer 2 to a Foreign Officer 1.

The plan then was to send Wieland to Zurich as a consular officer. This the President undoubtedly stopped, because Wieland never went to Zurich. He has been appointed to a management reorganization team, which was an improper appointment because this involved in effect an investigation of himself.

The Wieland situation is now out in the open. The Eastland committee has all the data on Wieland and why it has not printed the hearings and made them public, I do not know. But there can be no doubt but that the evidence, if brought before a court, would be very embarrassing to all parties. At least three former Ambassadors would have to testify against Wieland or perjure themselves because they have already testified before the congressional committee.

It is unfortunate that the President permitted himself to lose his temper over this issue. Either the Wieland testimony before the Eastland committee should be made public or the matter should be brought into a court.

President Kennedy cannot bear the burden of all the mistakes made by all public officials during the past 30 years. It is too great a task for any man.

Built-In Costs of Production for American Goods Make Tariff Cutting Impractical

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, no matter how attractive the President's plan for cutting tariffs seems to be, there is one weakness he has failed to comprehend. At least he has given no evidence that it is a factor in the cost of American-made goods. The built-in costs saddled on American manufacturers through continued pressure for wage increases and unrealistic taxation keeps us from being in a competitive position with low-wage, low-tax nations. The Government cannot expect our people to engage in free trade while shackled by Federal controls and tied to costs beyond the control of good management. The following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune on this point makes pertinent reading.

TARIFF CUTTING ISN'T A CURE-ALL

Mr. Kennedy's general plans to promote trade by cutting tariffs will probably receive a more sympathetic reception than any of his other economic schemes, for expanded trade is one field in which the Government can work to public advantage. But if the American economy is to meet the challenge of a world which grows increasingly competitive, much more will be required than tariff adjustments.

The President requests authority to negotiate reciprocal agreements reducing existing tariffs by 50 percent and asks additional authority to cut or eliminate altogether tariffs on products in which the European Common Market and the United States account for 80 percent or more of world trade. Unquestionably this policy has been forced on him by the success of the Common Market. Without some leeway in relaxing tariff restrictions, the United States might find itself frozen out of many existing trade outlets.

So the general idea is to make the United States competitive. But the tariff message is only the beginning of that job. We wonder if even Mr. Kennedy appreciates the full implications of his proposals.

For one thing, if trade is to be liberated of tariff restrictions, the Government itself will have to junk a lot of its restrictive economic policies. Trade can't be free across the water, but handcuffed at home. There is too much disposition in Washington to tinker, to meddle, and to regulate. Competition may be the essence of economic

freedom, but it won't come wholly alive as long as Government keeps getting in the way.

It is obvious that if competition is to govern, it must function under conditions of a market economy. Yet the administration's fundamental economic outlook is antipathetic to such freedom. It always conceives of government as steering the economy, as stimulating the economy by expenditure, as allocating, thru its own spending programs and its defense and space requirements, a considerable portion of materials and labor.

While it adopts a harsh and restrictive policy toward profits and some prices, such as that of steel, it operates at the same time a jerry-built system of price props and subsidies in other areas of the economy, notably in agriculture. Its tax policies discourage retention of earnings—that is, savings, capital accumulation, and the formation of investment funds for expansion and renewal of the economy.

Parallel with these policies is outright political inaction in dealing with union monopoly power to boost wages and slacken effort. We have seen how this operates in the 25-hour week forced by construction electricians on New York City—a grab that was only possible by restrictive union membership practices in a specialized field. The President wrings his hands over this horrible example, but he does nothing whatsoever to compel the unions to cease writing price boost into almost every article that must compete with the products of countries with far lower labor costs.

It is idle and unavailing to seek tariff reductions to make American goods competitive if constantly rising labor costs offset trading opportunities by making the same goods noncompetitive.

The one hope is that competition will expose the weaknesses in the economy created both by Government policy and union grabbing and force their correction in time. The administration is already on notice from European countries that it must achieve fiscal self-discipline if Europe is to continue to help defend the dollar. That will require retrenchment in spending and Government withdrawal from many of the preserves it has invaded to inhibit economic liberty at home.

It simply will not work if the White House, having obtained the tariff powers it seeks, commands the economy to run free but meanwhile keeps on the hobbles which prevent it from running at all.

International Trade Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am indebted to Mr. John D. Biggers and Mr. James M. Ashley of the Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co. for the following excellent analysis of our international trade policies:

IS THE UNITED STATES REALLY BEING PRICED OUT OF WORLD MARKETS?

During the past few years, there has been bitter argument as to whether U.S.-manufactured products were being priced out of world markets, and are unable to defend their home markets. Some industry leaders have said that, as far as their products were concerned, their labor costs, compared to those abroad, made it impossible for them to match the prices of foreign competitors. Others, notably State Department personnel, have disputed this. They admit that hourly wage rates in the United States are substantially higher, but assert that superior U.S. productivity—the amount of goods each worker can produce in an hour—more than offsets the higher wage rates. They deny that labor cost per dollar of product produced is higher in the United States. This is the hub of the argument.

There should be evidence in annual export-import statistics, to show which point of view is correct. If it is true that labor costs per dollar of product—as opposed to hourly wage rates—are really handicapping U.S. industry, then U.S. comodities with high labor content should be falling behind in the international race for sales, as compared to U.S. commodities with low labor content. That is the subject of this study.

By comparing statistics on imports and exports, product by product, in years separated by enough time to allow economic factors to come into play, trend lines should become evident to show which industries are moving ahead by capturing a larger share of market, and which are falling behind by capturing a smaller share of market.

If there is substance to the industry contention that the United States is being priced out of the market by reason of high labor costs, then the share of market in most products with high labor content should, after the passage of time, show a loss in share of market.

It is obvious that a steel beam has higher labor content than the same number of dollars worth of pig iron from which steel is made. It is obvious that plywood has higher labor content than logs. If U.S. labor costs are pricing us out of the international market, U.S. steel beams and other products with substantial labor content should show greater losses (or smaller gains) in share of market than pig iron and other products with lesser labor content.

Between the years 1951 and 1960, U.S. foreign trade—the sum of all that we buy from foreign countries and all that we sell to foreign countries—increased from $25,679,760,000 to $34,951,674,000. In 1951, the U.S. export share of that trade was 57.9 percent. In 1960, the U.S. share of this trade was 58.1 percent. Not a significant change—two-tenths of 1 percent.

What is significant, and what the official figures of the Bureau of Census show, is that the character of our exports has changed. U.S. exports have registered large gains in share of market in raw materials and manufactures with relatively low labor content. Live animals, hides and skins, furs, fodders and feeds, nuts, crude synthetic rubber, natural gums, resins and balsams, oilseeds, raw cotton, goat hair, manmade fibers, logs, paper base stocks, pig iron, scrap iron, aluminum and other nonferrous ores.

We have registered large losses in share of market in exports of manufactures with relatively high labor content. Leather manufactures, fur manufactures, grain manufactures, rubber manufactures, cotton manufactures, products made from manmade fibers, food manufactures, steel mill products, metals manufactures. All kinds of machinery except agricutural. All kinds of vehicles except aircraft, photographic goods, scientific apparatus, toys, firearms.

This is true in small industries as well as large, as the footnotes to the main product groups amply show. In specific product after specific product imports capture a larger share of market where labor content is high. Exports capture a larger share of market only where labor content is low.

The kind of exports in which we are gaining ground are those ordinarily associated with underdeveloped countries. The kind of exports in which we are losing ground are ordinarily associated with highly developed countries. The common denominator of the difference is labor cost—not hourly wage rates—labor cost.

The low tariff policies followed by the United States under the Trade Agreements Act have finally caught up with us. Foreign manufacturers, paying wages far below even the U.S. legal minimum wage, and insuring high productivity by using the latest, most efficient machinery in many cases provided by the Marshall plan and subsequent giveaway programs, are able to best American manufacturers in our home market as well as abroad—wherever there is enough labor employed to make a significant difference in the cost of the finished product. There is no other conclusion to draw from these data.

Now the administration proposes drastically to accelerate this frightening trend by the immediate further reduction and eventual elimination of import duties on most manufactured products. To accomplish this, various arguments are used—some uninformed, some purposefully misleading.

The inclusion of $181 million of goods paid for by private U.S. charity (see the final footnote in the tables that follow) points up the incorrectness of using total U.S. export figures to sell the public on the importance of export trade. Used in that manner, the totals become an annual report of goods sold. The Securities Exchange Commission would take a dim view of a corporation which falsely reported its annual sales in order to push up the price of its stock on the New York Stock Exchange. Yet by failing to point out that the reported export figures contain very substantial amounts for which the United States is not paid, highly placed administration officials have done precisely that.

Under Public Law 480, the Government "sells" agricultural products to other governments for currency which is not convertible. In other words, we are paid in wooden nickels. Yet these exports are included in the official figures and should not be referred to by politicians as if they made a contribution to the economy of the United States. To our military security, perhaps. To our reputation as a charitable people, perhaps. But not to our economy.

The Government buys what domestic cotton manufacturers cannot consume at a price which guarantees the cotton planter a floor to his prices. This support price in 1960 was 6 cents per pound above the world market price. Every pound of cotton reported as exported in 1960 was sold at the world market price. Consequently, we lost 6 cents per pound on every pound sold. In 1960, we sold 7,816,899 bales of cotton weighing 500 pounds per bale. This adds up to a loss of $234,506,970. Perhaps it is proper for the taxpayers of New York and Pennsylvania and Ohio and other States where cotton does not grow to make this contribution to the prosperity of southern cotton planters. But it is not proper for administration officials to fail to mention this fact when they speak of the economic importance of U.S. exports. "Stockholders" are entitled to know when merchandise in such quantity is sold at distress prices and below cost.

It has recently been admitted by administration officials that "a substantial part" of the $1,262,152,770 listed among the other export figures as "special category type 1 or type 2" is given away. These are items whose nature or destination is not divulged for reasons of military security. Few thoughtful citizens object to giving away even a billion dollars if such gifts are truly in the interests of national security. But it is misleading to include the dollar value of these shipments as "sales" in order to justify some legislative proposal.

We pay cash for what we import. When we discuss the balance of trade, it is proper to compare the value of imports and exports only if just those exports are included for which we are paid for in cash—real cash—convertible currency; certainly not these items paid for by U.S. citizens either out of tax money or by private charity.

The falsely inflated export figures are being used by the administration to urge upon Congress a trade program which looks to the drastic further reduction and eventual elimination of import duties in most manufactures. From this study of U.S. exports and imports of all commodities, 1960 versus 1951, we see that U.S. industries are already losing their share of market in the export of virtually every product which has high labor content. Demonstrably, our import duties are already too low to compensate for the foreign labor cost advantage. Without any import duties to partially offset this cost advantage, the downward trend in share of market for U.S. manufactures will be further accelerated.

This country cannot live on the productivity of its farmers. It cannot survive for long by exporting the raw materials which are its natural resources. It cannot retrain workers displaced by their foreign counterparts if all manufacturing industry is losing share of market. It cannot look for growth to provide employment for the million new workers who enter the labor market each year if the growth is absorbed by foreign competitors.

Capital is resourceful and flexible. Capital can survive by following the billions already invested overseas where cost factors make it possible to compete. As long as the cost of relocation can be amortized in a relatively short time because of manufacturing cost advantages, it will continue to move abroad. Management may regret the resulting loss to U.S. employment. But management is compelled as a last resort to make such moves.

Labor must stand and fight in this country. Two choices are open to labor. Labor must either accept lower wages so that foreign workers with high productivity and low wages cannot take their jobs, or it must insist that the advantage which accrues to foreign products in this market because of lower labor costs be offset by import duties which neutralize that cost advantage. There is no other choice.

No political realist believes that labor will willingly surrender the wage scales for which they have fought so long. Nor is it in this country's interest to have workers receive the marginal wages paid abroad which allow them to buy little more than the necessities of life. The great market in the United States for consumer goods has been created by workers' ability to buy homes, cars, television sets, washing machines, vacations in Yellowstone Park. Our domestic economy would collapse, and our financial institutions would fail if the average wage of U.S. production workers—$2.96 per hour—were reduced to 75 cents.

The alternative is within labor's power. Labor has the strength to demand that their jobs and their wage scales be preserved. Few politicians would fail to heed such a demand.

The figures cited in the following tables tell a complete and accurate story. They are not as pleasant to read as some of the glib propaganda put out by the professional apologists for free trade. They are not based on economic theory drawn from a college text book. They are the record of what has actually happened. They tell a story whose implications are as plain to any knowledgeable businessman as are the symptoms of cancer to a medical diagnostician. They mean that the administration's trade program is based on fallacy and misunderstanding and must be so modified as to provide real safeguards for American jobs which now stand in serious jeopardy.

The figures in the following tables are taken from the official export and import data published by the U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census. Exports of military defense items are omitted as not being pertinent to the study. The figures should speak for themselves.

Foreign trade in any commodity is the sum of what the United States buys and what the United States sells. For example, if U.S. cattlemen sell $5,753,000 worth of live animals abroad in a given year, and if U.S. packers buy $52,887,000 worth of live animals abroad, the sum of those figures, or $58,640,000, is the total U.S. foreign trade in live animals during that year. In that case, the U.S. cattlemen's share of market would be 9.8 percent as is shown in the first item in the following table.

If, a decade later, U.S. cattlemen sell $19,130,000 worth of live animals, and U.S. packers buy $62,623,000 worth of live animals abroad, for a total of $81,753,000, the U.S. cattlemen have a share of market of 23.4 percent. As compared to a decade earlier, they have gained 13.6 percent in share of market.

GROUP 00

[Dollars in thousands]

Commodity	1951 export-import trade in commodity	1951 export share	1960 export-import trade in commodity	1960 export share	U.S. export gain or loss (−)
		Percent		*Percent*	*Percent*
Live animals	$58,540	9.8	$81,753	23.4	13.6
Meat and meat products	289,225	20.7	449,441	27.9	7.2
Dairy products (1)	145,926	81.4	118,784	73.1	−8.3

GROUP 00

[Dollars in thousands]

Commodity	1951 export-import trade in commodity	1951 export share	1960 export-import trade in commodity	1960 export share	U.S. export gain or loss (−)
		Percent		*Percent*	*Percent*
Fish, shellfish, and products (2)	$185,208	14.6	$329,995	7.7	−6.9
Other edible animal products (3)	43,108	84.0	35,440	79.0	−5.0

NOTE 1.—Exports of fresh milk and cream increased 64 percent 1951–60. Exports of manufactured dairy products decreased 29 percent.

NOTE 2.—Exports of fresh and frozen fish increased 223 percent 1951–60. Exports of canned, boned, filleted fish decreased 22 percent. Imports of fresh and frozen fish decreased 9 percent. Imports of canned, boned, filleted fish increased 258 percent.

NOTE 3.—Exports of eggs in the shell decreased 15 percent. Exports of processed eggs decreased 65 percent.

It appears from the foregoing table and footnotes that exports with lower labor content show greater gains in share of market. "Live animals" registered a gain—1960 over 1951—of 13.6 percent. There is, of course, labor in raising live animals and in getting them to the point of sale, whether that be at a dock or at a slaughterhouse. But in order to turn live animals into meat or meat products, more labor must be added. The fact that "Meat and meat products" did not show as large a gain in share of market—1960 over 1951—as "Live animals" supports the thesis that "the more labor content, the less chance the United States has of competing successfully."

The footnotes, dealing with divisions of the major categories, also support that idea. What is the difference between fresh milk or cream and evaporated canned milk? More labor is required to change the former into the latter. Fresh milk exports increased while manufactured dairy products exports declined.

Fresh and frozen fish require less labor than boned, filleted, and canned fish. During the decade, U.S. exports of fish increased where there was less labor content and declined where there was more labor content. Exactly the reverse was true in imports. We bought less fresh and frozen fish from foreign sources and more boned, filleted, and canned fish.

Eggs in the shell are a chore to collect, to clean, to pack and ship. But still more labor is required to process them further. It is true that U.S. exports of eggs in the shell declined over the period. But the export of processed eggs, with higher labor content, declined more than four times as rapidly.

An examination of one product group does not provide enough evidence for any conclusion. All product groups must be subjected to the same scrutiny. If the difference between "Hides and skins" and "Leather" is value added by additional labor, then industry people would expect "Hides and skins" to show a greater gain (or smaller loss) in share of market as a decade passed. And if "Leather" becomes "Leather manufactures," like shoes, through the addition of still more labor, "Leather" should show a greater gain (or smaller loss) in share market than "Leather manufactures."

GROUP 0

[Dollars in thousands]

Commodity	1951 export-import trade in commodity	1951 export share	1960 export-import trade in commodity	1960 export share	U.S. export gain or loss (−)
		Percent		*Percent*	*Percent*
Hides and skins, raw	$145,491	8.8	$147,041	52.0	43.2
Leather	44,259	44.4	73,247	43.4	−1.0
Leather manufactures	41,682	50.3	121,918	17.8	−32.5
Furs	135,972	20.9	147,058	30.2	9.3
Fur manufactures	9,181	42.8	9,041	28.3	−14.5
Animal and fish oils and greases	100,072	85.9	130,302	95.7	9.8
Other inedible animals and products (1)	109,900	8.1	100,761	19.3	11.2

NOTE 1.—Exports of animals for breeding increased 63 percent, 1951–60. Exports of feathers, crude, undressed, increased 121 percent. Exports of feathers, manufactures, decreased 100 percent. Imports of feathers, crude, undressed, decreased 78 percent. Imports of feathers, manufactures, increased 491 percent. Imports of shells, not processed, decreased 77 percent. Imports of shells, manufactures, increased 584 percent. Exports of shells, not processed, increased 808 percent. Imports of ivory, crude, decreased 43 percent. Imports of ivory, manufactures, increased 158 percent.

GROUP 1

[Dollars in thousands]

Commodity	1951 export-import trade in commodity	1951 export share	1960 export-import trade in commodity	1960 export share	U.S. export gain or loss (−)
		Percent		*Percent*	*Percent*
Grains, unprocessed	$1,275,871	90.4	$1,302,911	97.2	6.8
Grains, manufactures (malt, meal, hominy, sorghums)	348,505	97.1	392,295	95.2	−1.9
Fodders and feeds	75,978	44.6	91,109	82.2	37.6
Vegetables, fresh, frozen, dried (1)	87,636	64.2	135,128	66.6	2.4
Vegetables, canned	48,582	55.4	55,032	34.0	−21.4
Fruits, fresh	134,574	43.1	217,196	51.1	8.0
Fruits, canned, concentrate and juice	93,081	62.1	197,073	72.5	10.4
Nuts	67,815	15.6	89,927	22.8	7.2
Vegetable oils and fats, edible	78,799	81.6	108,868	69.9	−11.7
Cocoa, coffee, tea (2)	1,619,359	.4	1,260,145	1.6	1.2
Spices	59,350	1.6	53,740	4.3	2.7
Sugar and related products (3)	483,409	8.1	590,625	3.4	−4.7
Beverages	138,240	7.2	277,993	6.0	−1.2

NOTE 1.—Of the $13,663,000 gain in fresh vegetable imports, $10,197,000 is in tomatoes which have the largest labor content of any garden vegetable.

NOTE 2.—Imports of cocoa beans declined 27 percent. Imports of processed cocoa increased 100 percent. Imports of coffee beans declined 35 percent. Imports of processed coffee increased 13 percent. Exports of green coffee increased 3,037 percent. Exports of roasted coffee declined 4 percent.

NOTE 3.—Exports of honey increased 32 percent. Exports of candy declined 10 percent. Imports of candy increased 186 percent.

GROUP 2

[Dollars in thousands]

Commodity	1951 export-import trade in commodity	1951 export share	1960 export-import trade in commodity	1960 export share	U.S. export gain or loss (−)
		Percent		*Percent*	*Percent*
Crude rubber, natural and synthetic	$836,925	1.7	$652,911	33.8	32.1
Rubber manufactures (1)	134,133	94.8	284,143	52.2	−42.6
Gums, resins, and balsams, crude (2)	83,753	57.3	96,689	70.4	13.1
Herbs, bark, leaves, roots, crude (3)	31,916	10.2	30,036	15.1	4.9
Oilseeds and expressed and essential oils	416,750	23.3	632,433	57.1	33.8
Dyeing and tanning extracts	32,007	2.9	12,686	2.1	−.8
Seeds, except oilseeds	28,673	28.1	32,475	58.4	30.3
Nursery and floral stock	11,290	10.1	20,698	26.0	15.9
Tobacco	410,952	79.2	493,899	76.6	−2.6
Tobacco manufactures	59,407	95.5	103,501	94.3	−1.2
Miscellaneous vegetable manufactures (4)	42,379	62.8	28,365	55.6	−7.2

NOTE 1.—Exports of tires and tubes increased 13 percent, 1951–60. Imports of tires and tubes increased 921 percent. Imports of rubber boots, rubber-soled shoes, etc., increased 18,460 percent.

NOTE 2.—Exports of chicle and chewing gum bases increased 132 percent. Exports of chewing gum, manufactured, declined 8 percent.

NOTE 3.—Imports of crude drugs declined 32 percent. Imports of finished drug manufactures increased 6 percent.

NOTE 4.—Imports of rice, wheat, and potatoes (except seed potatoes) declined 75 percent. Imports of rice, wheat, and potatoes, starch, increased 5,768 percent. Imports of broom corn declined 95 percent. Imports of brooms increased 693 percent.

GROUP 3

[Dollars in thousands]

Commodity	1951 export-import trade in commodity	1951 export share	1960 export-import trade in commodity	1960 export share	U.S. export gain or loss (−)
		Percent		*Percent*	*Percent*
Cotton:					
Raw	$1,188,956	96.4	$1,014,324	97.4	1.0
Semimanufactured	107,589	88.9	66,768	80.4	−8.5
Manufactures (1)	453,899	84.0	482,062	47.8	−36.2
Vegetable fiber (jute, flax, hemp, ramie, and manufactures) (2)	376,523	4.7	236,757	2.6	−2.1
Wool (U.S. comparable export, goat hair)	743,885	.1	212,756	7.4	7.3
Semimanufactured	46,446	37.8	79,944	27.5	−10.3
Manufactures	111,268	16.7	217,177	4.1	−12.6
Hair and manufactures (3)	20,313	23.0	12,496	40.1	17.1
Silk and manufactures (4)	58,002	3.7	102,922	3.6	−.1
Manmade fibers:					
Semimanufactured (yarn, tow, etc.)	86,868	47.9	149,009	86.8	38.9
Manufactures	191,683	96.4	216,131	75.3	−21.1
Miscellaneous textile manufactures (5)	76,724	71.6	122,417	43.6	−28.0

NOTE 1.—Imports of cotton manufactures as a whole increased 247 percent. Imports of cotton wearing apparel increased 744 percent.

NOTE 2.—Imports of raw jute, hemp, ramie, sisal, etc., decreased 70 percent. Imports of jute, hemp, ramie, sisal, etc., manufactures decreased 7 percent.

NOTE 3.—Imports of hair, not manufactured, decreased 56 percent. Imports of hair manufactures increased 17 percent.

NOTE 4.—Imports of raw silk increased only 30 percent. Imports of silk manufactures increased 106 percent.

NOTE 5.—Imports of partly finished straw and natural fiber hats decreased 26 percent. Imports of fully finished straw and natural fiber hats increased 2,342 percent. Exports of linoleum decreased 24 percent. Exports of impregnated cloth decreased 6 percent. Exports of nonrubber waterproof outer garments decreased 50 percent. Exports of elastic webbing increased 642 percent. Exports of garters decreased 60 percent. Exports of absorbent cotton and sterilized bandages decreased 40 percent.

GROUP 4

[Dollars in thousands]

Commodity	1951 export-import trade in commodity	1951 export share	1960 export-import trade in commodity	1960 export share	U.S. export gain or loss (−)
		Percent		*Percent*	*Percent*
Wood, not manufactured	$40,439	27.3	$60,197	57.7	30.4
Wood, sawmill products	308,971	31.2	413,621	24.9	−6.3
Wood, manufactures (1)	119,641	30.6	252,685	20.3	−10.3
Cork and cork manufactures (2)	25,352	17.9	12,305	23.9	6.0
Paper base stocks (pulp, wastepaper, etc.)	465,793	11.2	500,063	32.7	21.5
Paper and paper products	723,029	24.6	1,018,308	25.1	.5

NOTE 1.—Imports of furniture increased by 254 percent. Imports of plywood increased by 750 percent.

NOTE 2.—Imports of cork, not manufactured, decreased 72 percent. Imports of cork, manufactures increased 19 percent.

GROUP 5

[Dollars in thousands]

Commodity	1951 export-import trade in commodity	1951 export share	1960 export-import trade in commodity	1960 export share	U.S. export gain or loss (−)
		Percent		*Percent*	*Percent*
Coal and related fuels	$601,161	99.2	$361,463	98.8	−0.4
Petroleum products (1)	1,384,167	56.6	1,543,078	23.7	−32.9
Stone and products (cement, lime, gypsum, etc.) (2)	26,093	47.5	37,507	13.6	−33.9
Glass and glass products	85,421	74.7	165,628	50.8	−23.9
Clay and clay products (3)	59,602	58.3	169,972	31.0	−27.3
Other nonmetallic minerals (4)	232,068	49.2	597,410	26.8	−22.4

NOTE 1.—Imports of crude oil increased 139 percent. Imports of refined oil products increased 187 percent.

NOTE 2.—Exports of stone and gypsum, not manufactured, increased 113 percent. Exports of stone and gypsum manufactures decreased 67 percent. Imports of stone and gypsum, not manufactured, increased 50 percent. Imports of stone and gypsum manufactures increased 292 percent.

NOTE 3.—Exports of clay, not manufactured, increased 86 percent. Exports of clay manufactures increased 4 percent. Imports of household china increased 76 percent. Imports of restaurant china increased 7,288 percent. Imports of tile increased 719 percent.

NOTE 4.—Exports of asbestos manufactures declined 18 percent. Exports of crude gypsum increased 13 percent. Exports of gypsum manufactures decreased 38 percent. Exports of mica, not manufactured, increased 70 percent. Exports of mica manufactures increased 1 percent. Exports of sulphur, crude, increased 29 percent. Exports of sulphur, crushed, refined, decreased 27 percent. Exports of quartz crystal, not manufactured, increased 2,113 percent. Exports of quartz crystal manufactures increased 17 percent. Exports of talc, crude, increased 195 percent. Exports of talc manufactures decreased 37 percent. Imports of talc, crude, decreased 85 percent. Imports of talc manufactures increased 30 percent. Imports of corundum ore decreased 72 percent. Imports of corundum refined and manufactures increased 572 percent. Imports of pumice, crude, decreased 69 percent. Imports of pumice manufactures increased 30 percent.

GROUP 6

[Dollars in thousands]

Commodity	1951 export-import trade in commodity	1951 export share	1960 export-import trade in commodity	1960 export share	U.S. export gain or loss (−)
		Percent		*Percent*	*Percent*
Iron ore and concentrates (1)	$90,250	33.9	$379,268	15.2	−18.7
Pig iron	51,473	.7	24,214	21.4	20.7
Iron and steel scrap	22,275	40.8	247,179	97.9	57.1
Steel mill products (2)	898,385	69.4	1,116,151	54.7	−14.7
Metal manufactures (including nonferrous mill products) (3)	383,403	69.2	784,196	53.9	−15.3
Aluminum ores, scrap, billets, etc., crude	68,820	4.0	336,664	53.1	49.1
Copper ores, scrap, billets, etc., crude	346,365	21.9	669,388	47.7	25.8
Brass and bronze scrap, billets, etc., crude	5,485	61.8	66,154	89.7	27.9
Lead ores, scrap, billets, etc., crude	75,545	1.1	76,028	2.3	1.2
Nickel ores, scrap, billets, etc., crude	101,050	5.1	178,341	17.7	12.6
Tin (4) ores, scrap, billets, etc., crude	162,397	1.8	121,605	2.2	.4
Zinc ores, scrap, billets, etc., crude	83,851	20.6	96,983	24.1	3.5
Other nonferrous ores, billets	139,502	6.4	244,597	35.4	29.0
Precious and semiprecious metal ores	38,609	6.0	37,852	9.8	3.8
Jewelry and similar manufactures (5)	16,832	24.1	43,728	11.4	−12.7

NOTE 1.—Since iron ore is one of very few raw materials in which our export sales show a loss in share of market, 1960 versus 1951, it may be pointed out that this reflects the partial exhaustion of the Mesaba Range and the development, by U.S. companies, of new iron ore mines in Labrador and Venezuela.

NOTE 2.—Imports of steel beams increased 62 percent. Improts of steel beams, machined, increased 3,947 percent. Imports of pipe, tubes and fittings increased 97 percent. Imports of nails increased 439 percent.

NOTE 3.—Imports of handtools increased 320 percent. Imports of cutlery increased 554 percent. Imports of builders' hardware increased 366 percent. Imports of copper tubing increased 6,000 percent.

NOTE 4.—Imports of tin ore for smelting decreased 62 percent. Imports of tin pigs and bars increased 41 percent.

NOTE 5.—Imports of precious and semiprecious metal ores declined 6 percent. Imports of jewelry increased 201 percent.

GROUP 7—MACHINERY AND VEHICLES

[Dollars in thousands]

Commodity	1951 export-import trade in commodity	1951 export share	1960 export-import trade in commodity	1960 export share	U.S. export gain or loss (−)
		Percent		*Percent*	*Percent*
Electrical machinery and apparatus (1)	$543,384	96.7	$1,061,698	74.7	−22.0
Power-generating machinery	196,992	99.1	236,612	96.3	−2.8
Metal-working machinery	206,015	93.7	405,071	90.9	−2.8
Textile, sewing, and shoe machinery	165,789	86.9	216,678	71.6	−15.3
Other industrial machinery (including U.S. construction, mining and oilfield machinery (2)	857,947	96.7	1,886,657	93.0	−3.7
Office, accounting, and computing machines	125,463	95.3	277,083	75.3	−20.0
Agricultural machinery	228,091	61.7	233,243	62.2	0.5
Tractors and parts	328,054	97.2	433,387	89.3	−7.9
Automobiles, trucks, buses, trailers and parts (3)	1,197,111	99.2	1,843,353	66.0	−33.2
Aircraft and parts	28,529	67.0	613,565	89.8	22.8
Other vehicles including watercraft	83,288	88.0	255,181	75.2	−12.8

NOTE 1.—Imports of Christmas tree light bulbs were enough for 5 for each house in the United States (243,000,000). This year GE closed down and abandoned its plant making Christmas lights.

New inventions kept the U.S. exports of electric apparatus from a worse performance. Between 1951 and 1960, exports of electronic parts increased 2,100 percent, and television sets even more. By contrast, telephone instruments increased 10 percent, household appliances 2 percent, X-ray and therapeutic devices declined 18 percent, batteries declined 56 percent, radio receiving sets declined 81 percent.

By contrast, imports of radio sets and parts increased 1,900 percent.

NOTE 2.—Sales to foreign factories of $77,000,000 worth of industrial indicating instruments, $26,000,000 worth of physical properties testing and inspecting machines, $21,000,000 worth of packaging and wrapping machines disputes the idea that the foreign plants are backward.

NOTE 3.—Exports of trucks and buses declined 2.1 percent. Exports of passenger cars declined 30.3 percent. Exports of parts to be assembled in foreign countries increased 40.8 percent.

GROUP 8

[Dollars in thousands]

Commodity	1951 export-import trade in commodity	1951 export share	1960 export-import trade in commodity	1960 export share	U.S. export gain or loss (−)
		Percent		*Percent*	*Percent*
Coal tar and other cyclic chemical products (1)	$133,424	59.6	$225,688	69.6	10.0
Medicinal and pharmaceutical preparations	293,202	96.0	300,402	91.1	−4.9
Chemical specialties and industrial chemicals	562,914	78.9	1,091,932	89.1	10.2
Pigments, paint, and varnish (2)	108,498	95.1	123,135	87.7	−7.4
Fertilizers and fertilizer products	148,007	31.1	227,019	50.4	19.3
Explosives	1,628	0	8,437	46.2	46.2
Soap and toilet preparations	26,600	74.3	37,599	66.1	−8.2

NOTE 1.—Exports of crude coal tar products increased 746 percent. Exports of coal tar dyes and stains declined 32 percent. Imports of coal tar dyes and stains increased 51 percent.

NOTE 2.—Exports of ready-mixed paints declined 14 percent, although exports of the paints and varnish category as a whole showed a slight increase, 5 percent.

It is difficult for anyone but a chemical engineer to reach an accurate conclusion with respect to the effect of labor content in chemical products on their import-export trade. There are too many products in each major category, many are by-products of others, and presumably the labor content of individual products in any category would vary widely. This suggests that to advocate sweeping "across the board" tariff changes is the approach of an economic dilettante.

However, it would appear logical to a layman that coal tar products, as a group, would have less labor content than medicinal products, as a group, and that fertilizers would have less labor content than paint and varnish. If this is true, the above statistics support the thesis that the more labor content, the worse off American industry is in international competition.

Further, the footnotes to the above table seem to reinforce that conclusion.

GROUP 9

[Dollars in thousands]

Commodity	1951 export-import trade in commodity	1951 export share	1960 export-import trade in commodity	1960 export share	U.S. export gain or loss (−)
		Percent		*Percent*	*Percent*
Photographic and projection goods (1)	$77,075	77.9	$185,279	70.0	−7.9
Scientific and professional instruments	73,677	86.7	153,158	72.4	−14.3
Musical instruments and parts	36,065	61.7	69,094	61.0	−.7
Toys, athletic and sporting goods (2)	24,312	64.4	107,975	39.2	−25.2
Firearms, ammunition and accessories	8,364	51.0	20,612	31.3	−19.7
Books, maps, pictures, and other printing	87,062	77.4	183,823	74.2	−3.2
Miscellaneous commodities (3)	566,247	61.4	1,095,177	50.1	−11.3

NOTE 1.—Imports of cameras maintained in 1960 the 2-to-1 dollar advantage over U.S. camera exports they enjoyed in 1951. Exports of opthalmic goods declined 21 percent. Imports of opthalmic goods increased 1,800 percent. Exports of optical instruments increased 51 percent. Imports of optical instruments increased 245 percent.

NOTE 2.—Imports of dolls and toys increased 640 percent. Exports of dolls and toys increased 86 percent. Imports of baseballs (not rubber, used in sport), increased 2,100 percent. Imports of footballs (not rubber, used in sport), increased 3,215 percent. Imports of baseball gloves increased from less than $4,000 to more than $4,000,000.

NOTE 3.—Imports of watches and parts had already wrecked the U.S. industry in 1951. Imports actually declined 7 percent between 1951 and 1960 (from $64,000,000 to $60,000,000). However, imports of clocks and movements increased 288 percent. Imports of clockwork mechanisms (time switches, devices to measure electrical current, taximeters, etc.), increased 1,057 percent. Imports of ink increased 1,000 percent. Exports of ink declined 3 percent. Imports of buttons increased 149 percent. Exports of buttons declined 61 percent. Imports of pencils increased 570 percent. Exports of pencils declined 41 percent. Imports of umbrellas increased 721 percent. Exports of umbrellas declined 31 percent. Imports of brushes increased 186 percent. Exports of brushes declined 10 percent. Exports of food, clothing, bedding and, similar products, paid for by private U.S. charity (not by the Government) increased 175 percent (from $65,000,000 in 1951 to $181,000,000 in 1960). There is no comparable import figure.

Architectural Barriers: A Personal Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and interesting speech delivered by Mr. Charles E. Caniff, executive director, Conference of Rehabilitation Centers and Facilities, "Handicapped American of the Year for 1960," at Evanston, Ill.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARCHITECTURAL BARRIERS: A PERSONAL PROBLEM

(By Charles E. Caniff)

The theme of this convention is "Breaking Down Barriers."

The topic for this session is "Architectural Barriers."

To most of you in this room, this topic is academic. To others of us here, it is a vital issue which has fundamental influence on our ability to fulfill our responsibilities as citizens, to achieve our constitutional rights, to participate in social groups, or to earn a living.

According to the National Health Survey, there are approximately 5 million people in our country who have limited mobility. As one of these 5 million, allow me to illustrate how architectural barriers affect our lives.

I, as you, am a taxpayer. The fact that I use a wheelchair as a means of locomotion in no way reduces or limits my responsibilities to pay taxes. My income tax reports are subject to the same scrutiny as every other citizen. In fact, my last report was scrutinized and I was instructed to report to my local internal revenue office with evidence to support claims made in my tax statement.

I arrived at the proper address on the appointed day. I found an impressive building, the Federal courthouse. It covered a whole city block. It had huge entrances on each block—that could only be reached by climbing an equally impressive flight of steps. Finally, I located a vehicle entrance to the basement of the building. Hoping my wheelchair would be approved as a vehicle, I went down a precipitous incline, dodging postal trucks on the way. In succession, I negotiated a ramp, a loading dock, the building's boiler room, and finally reached a freight elevator that did not stop on my floor. After going up two additional floors, transferring to a passenger elevator and going down another floor, I finally reached my destination.

The return trip out of the building was by the same circuitous and sometimes dangerous route, made easier by my previous experience and my relief in knowing that the tax collector had agreed my tax report was in proper order.

These were the architectural barriers I faced in complying with the law.

Voting is a right and a duty for qualified citizens of our country. In my State, all qualified voters were recently required to re-register in order to maintain that right.

On the apopinted day, my wife and I arrived at the designated address to complete our registration. It was a public school—obviously of recent construction. This time I did not encounter the flight of steps until after we had entered the front door. Registration was finally accomplished by my wife serving as messenger and going to the polling place, plus considerable effort and confusion on the part of the officials in bringing the materials and carrying out the ceremony of registration to vote at the foot of a flight of steps in the foyer of a new school building. I still have to face the problem of getting to the voting booth on election day.

I wonder how many of the 5 million didn't register or vote because of this kind of architectural barrier.

The postal service is recognized as such a vital public utility that it is operated by our Federal Government. It is maintained at a considerable financial deficit in order that this means of communication can be available to every citizen. The post office is one of the landmarks and most used buildings in almost every community in our land. But I cannot buy a stamp in the post office in the village where I live—because one has to negotiate 15 steps to get inside. The village hall and police station are equally inaccessible. Although our taxes help pay for all of these buildings, the physically disabled are effectively barred by architectural barriers from using them.

But the lack of mobility does not eliminate the 5 million as prospects for building fund drives and membership campaigns of our community and civic groups. Campaign workers, with their pledge cards for a new YMCA, or an addition to the museum, or a new parish hall for the church—do not ignore us. We are also equally welcome as supporters of their operations through the community fund drives, the membership campaigns, and the weekly collections. But all too often, we find that the funds we gladly contribute are used to build and operate buildings which effectively bar us from entering and participating in their programs. The YMCA in my community has developed a national reputation for its excellent program. I would like to swim in its wonderful pool. I would if I could have ready access to its building, rather than be excluded through the barrier of a flight of steps.

The city of Chicago has many wonderful museums, galleries, and educational facilities that have been established through private philanthropy. The Museum of Science and Industry, the Field Museum of Natural History, and the Art Institute are only three of many examples. But thousands of Chicagoans and visitors from all over the country are barred from ready access to these buildings because of the architectural barriers. It is possible, with ingenuity and perserverance to circumvent these barriers. My 12-year-old son and I have visited these centers, plus many others. It has required a preparatory phone call, including a switching from office to office until finally someone on the staff is found who knows of a service entrance where freight is brought in and trash and garbage hauled out that has no steps. Then, upon arrival at the museum, my son goes in, finds a guard, who forwards a message to the appropriate custodial staff to go to the service entrance and unlock it. Then follow trips through coalbins, warehouses, boiler rooms, service tunnels, and freight elevators, until finally we emerge into the museum proper.

My son is a Boy Scout. It was a great night for him when he attended his first court of honor to receive his first badge of achievement. But when I went to the parish hall of our church which sponsors the troop, to share with him this recognition of his accomplishments, I found not only a flight of steps to go up to get into the parish hall, but a second flight of steps to be descended in order to get to the meeting room. When our family recently moved into a new community, the question of selecting a place of worship was not based on proximity to our home; rather it was to find one of the few that provided ready access with no architectural barriers. In all too many instances, "you have to climb halfway to heaven before you can get in the church." I wonder how many of the 5 million are barred from the church of their choice for this very reason.

I think I am personally most outraged by architectural barriers when I visit a hospital, nursing home, or chronic disease center with flights of steps at every entry, excepting at the emergency entrance or the freight doors. Recently I visited an aged friend of mine, crippled severely by arthritis, who was living in a new multimillion-dollar nursing and convalescent home for chronically disabled patients. This building is the pride of the community. It is in a beautiful setting, with grounds laced with paved walkways among flowers, trees, and shrubs. But I found my friend effectively barricaded from ordinary access in his wheelchair to these shaded walks, because at every entry but one, a flight of steps made them as inaccessible as if he were surrounded by iron bars. I could not help but wonder, in an emergency in that building, how all of the nonambulatory patients could be safely brought through a single doorway at one inconvenient location that had the only ramp out of the building.

But steps and stairs are not the only architectural barriers that affront the disabled. Recently, I had an appointment at an office in one of the famed skyscrapers in downtown Chicago. This time no steps barricaded my entrance, and there were many doorways. The only problem was that every door was of the revolving type with no other means of access. Finally, by enlisting the aid of a helpful passerby, who went into the building and brought the custodian, we got the doors broken down so that a wheelchair could go through. This took an extra 15 minutes and considerable inconvenience, not only to myself but to several other busy people.

Then let us consider some of the more personal needs of the disabled. In this hotel where this meeting on "breaking down barriers" is being held, the bathrooms in the guestrooms are completely inaccessible to persons in wheelchairs because of a narrow doorway—only 21 inches wide. This situation is not uncommon; rather it is a standard experience. The same type of problem is equally as common in restroom facilities in public buildings.

This recital of experiences in relation to architectural barriers could go on and on, but I hope I have illustrated my point. Who can name a department store, a supermarket or shopping center with an imposing flight of stairs at its entryway. At these buildings, architectural barriers are almost never present. The designers and operators know that the architectural barriers we have been discussing, not only keep out the disabled; they discourage all persons from entering. Yet, we are continuing to see public buildings that we are forced to support through taxes and community buildings that we are implored to finance through contributions, being erected with these ridiculous and anachronistic impediments to full usage.

At the present time, there is an intensive campaign, implemented by the executive authority of our Federal Government, to eliminate signs and regulations in public buildings in one region of our country that restrict entry or use for certain people. Yet in every city and community in our country are buildings, without signs, that have physical barriers preventing free access for millions of citizens and taxpayers. Is it not time for action on this even more universal problem and the elimination of these barriers?

Big Spending Envisioned in President's Budget Increases Federal Control Over Individuals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the huge budget proposed by President Kennedy, the largest in our history, is full of inconsistencies and protends great danger to our free way of life in the increased Federal controls the many programs call for in regulating the lives of our people. A clear analysis of the budget, its fiscal weaknesses, and its hidden dangers is contained in the following series of editorials gathered from the Wall Street Journal over the past several weeks. I commend them to you for a better understanding of what big spending will do to us:

JUMBLED OBJECTIVES

A glance at the budget quickly shows some of the things the people are getting for the $93 billion in taxes they are supposed to surrender in the next fiscal year.

There are, of course, the old standbys: Nearly $6 billion to finance the national farm scandal. Over $5 billion for veterans, including the many healthy and well-off ones. Some $9 billion for interest on the enormous public debt piled up by decades of deficit spending.

In addition, the Government is finding more and more ways to get rid of money faster. One technique is just to spend more on existing programs. For example, the new budget's proposed spending for housing and community development is much higher than that for the current 1962 fiscal period and not far from triple that of fiscal 1961.

Then there are all kinds of new projects the Federal Government hopes to get into in the new fiscal year—urban mass transportation, of all things; manpower retraining; innumerable educational subsidies.

Now whatever anyone may think of individual parts of this budget's program, it seems to us beyond question that the parts add up to a jumble. Even apart from the matter of money, the Government doesn't have the intellectual resources to expand all these programs and embark on all these new ones at this rate.

Indeed, this is the inescapable impression of this budget: A grab bag into which too many notions have been casually tossed, without sufficient thought or attempt to differentiate between what is important and what is not. For all this, remember, comes on top of the huge and rapidly rising cost of defense. That cost is what should require the relegation of numerous civilian subsidies to a low priority or none at all.

Yet in President Kennedy's expressed opinion, a proposal like Federal aid to urban mass transportation is a matter of high priority. And he says it would not be sensible to defer such expenditures. Perhaps it is permissible to inquire, Why not? What is so sensible about a budget that refuses to set up a sensible scale of national priorities?

A CLEARER FISCAL VIEW

In the face of the largest Federal budget in peacetime history, Congress would do well to give its support to the proposal of Senator BYRD of Virginia for a thorough review of the Nation's financial condition.

For what he is asking is, essentially, simple and reasonable: A searching appraisal to determine how Federal spending, taxation, and borrowing are now affecting the Nation's economy. And, perhaps even more important, an estimate of just where we are going.

The truth is that although the administration's budget figures are set down for all to read, hardly anyone in or out of Congress bothers to ask whether the Nation really can afford to proceed along the fiscal path it is taking, and if it can, for how long. Or, if evidence suggests it cannot, just what ought to be done, and how.

One of the reasons Government spending has reached its present level is that by acting on the budget in piecemeal fashion, Congress is never quite sure what effect its day-to-day, month-by-month actions are really having on the Nation's economic and financial condition. No one takes time for a long, hard look at the budget as a whole.

It is, to be sure, unrealistic to imagine that even a review of the sort Senator BYRD proposes is going to halt forthwith the current upward trend of Federal spending. But if nobody takes the first step toward viewing the Government's finances in terms of the Nation's economy, there is little reason to believe that the present disturbing drift will ever be halted, or even retarded.

IN DUBIOUS BALANCE

Speaking of the surplus his budget shows on paper, President Kennedy says that this black ink "is the policy which seems appropriate at the present time."

"To plan a deficit under such circumstances would increase the risk of inflationary pressures, damaging alike to our domestic economy and to our international balance of payments * * *. To plan a larger surplus would risk choking off economic recovery and contributing to a premature downturn."

There is a somewhat apologetic flavor to these words. A balanced budget is all right at the present time but we must be very careful that the surplus doesn't get out of hand. It sounds as though deficit financing were the normal, proper and responsible thing to do, whereas a balanced budget is a questionable and daring device to be reserved only for exceptional circumstances.

Well, perhaps the President won't have to worry unduly about any excessive surplus. In order to present a surplus of $500 million—microscopic in terms of estimated revenues of $93 billion—Mr. Kennedy and his advisers must make the most optimistic possible assumptions about everything. They must assume a decrease in the postal deficit, for one thing, and more importantly they must assume an economic boom that gets bigger by the minute.

Any budget must of necessity be speculative, since it covers a period ending 18 months after it is presented. But to plan a balance on visions of prosperity is hardly a useful way to go about getting a balance in reality. If a balance is wanted, the way to get it is to reduce needless Government expenditures to a point where there will be a surplus even on the basis of more modest revenue estimates.

That does much to explain why balanced budgets, in theory and practice, are not highly regarded in Washington, where the trend is toward ever greater Government spending. And a convenient rationalization for this trend has been found in the notion that budget deficits are expansive for the economy, while surpluses are contractive.

We believe this is economic sophistry, President Kennedy and Lord Keynes to the contrary notwithstanding. For it omits from consideration the powerful economic stimulation that could result from lower Federal spending and budget surpluses large enough to permit significant tax reductions. It is hard to see what would be contractive about a new surge of sound economic growth.

Fingers must be crossed about the dubious balance this budget rather grudgingly foresees. There should be even more skepticism about the economic thinking it reflects.

THE BULGING BUDGET

Perhaps the most important fact about President Kennedy's fiscal 1963 budget is the most obvious one: Its sheer size.

To be sure, this budging Federal budget, as presented to Congress yesterday, is in balance, and that is far better than if it showed a planned deficit; certainly it will be important to try to keep the promise of balance. That's the rub, of course; the balance is so hairline any number of things may upset it and transmute black ink into red before the coming fiscal year ends 18 months hence.

Whatever happens to the balance, however, there is little that is speculative about the size of this budget's spending, except that it may grow greater still during fiscal 1963. At $92.5 billion, these outlays are higher than ever before in peacetime and not far short of the peak World War II spending.

The projected expenditures are $11 billion higher than the actual spending in so recent a fiscal year as 1961. They are nearly $30 billion higher than in fiscal 1955. They are more than $83 billion higher than in fiscal 1940.

And when the outgo for social security and other payments not included in the "administrative" budget are added, the 1963 outlays of the Federal Government come close to $115 billion.

These figures, we believe, should give everyone pause. Indeed, there is far too little public discussion of the economic impact of Federal spending of such proportions, quite apart from the question of whether a particular budget is balanced or not.

To begin with, $115 billion of Federal spending is roughtly one-fifth of the gross national product. The biggest single item is defense, which is a necessary evil but certainly not an economic good. Most of the rest goes for interest on the public debt plus subsidies to political vested interests. By far the greatest part of Government spending, then, is literally nonproductive.

But though this $115 billion is nonproductive, it is by no means neutral in its effects. It takes, as it must, from the facilities that could otherwise be used for productive purposes.

We are quite aware of the argument that at the moment this doesn't matter, because even with all the Government spending the Nation still has "excess" plant capacity. It is a misleading argument, because excess capacity is a misleading term.

For example, a steel company will build a new plant using the most modern and efficient techniques; it may then idle an older facility, which thereby becomes "excess." Production has not been diminished and may have been increased, and the older plant will also be used in an emergency or at any time that demand justifies it.

And in that situation Federal spending of this scope can cause price inflation even with a balanced budget. For it piles its own enormous demand atop private demand, pushing production facilities to their limit and thus quite possibly bidding up prices.

Not only is Government an avid taker of products and of productive potential; it is also an insatiable consumer of the people's money. Revenues estimated at $93 billion in 1963 (for whatever the estimate is worth) are nearly one-fourth of the total income of all the people and much more if one adds social security and other taxes.

The point need not be labored that this level of taxation represents a drain of vast

sums that would otherwise go into savings and investment, the very areas that need vast new sums for future economic development. But the point does need to be emphasized, it seems to us, that a budget—both its expenditures and receipts—can grow so large as to become a positive threat to national well-being, including national security.

That threat is clear enough if the budget is inflationary, since inflation weakens the economic underpinnings of defense and everything else. And increasingly economists are warning that size alone can be dangerous; they suggest that a budget taking one-fourth of national income is imperiling the Nation's economic health. Yet right now, in fiscal 1962, if we total all local, State and Federal spending, we get a figure already well beyond that danger line.

No doubt the Nation can survive this fiscal 1963 budget, though it is a little silly to preach, as Government officials do, of the need for economic growth in the face of this staggering deterrent to sound growth. But where is the suggestion that thereafter the Government must cut back in the Nation's interest? There is no such suggestion; on the contrary, it is freely predicted in Washington that budgets will continue to get bigger and bigger.

If that is what we the people really want, or make no effort to stop, that is what we are surely going to get. But we ought at least to take a serious look at the towering bulk of this budget and see what it is we are really getting.

ADMIRABLE AIMS, MISBEGOTTEN METHODS

One of the major objectives of President Kennedy's budget is, in his own words, to achieve a financial plan "which will contribute to economic growth, high employment, and price stability in our national economy."

Those are admirable goals, and the only question is whether the administration's budget policy can in fact contribute to them. What is there about the fiscal 1963 budget that is, or is not, calculated to advance the aims of economic growth, high employment and price stability?

To consider the last one first, "price stability" is something of a misnomer, since prices are bound to fluctuate and we would be in an economic straitjacket if they could not. What is really meant is stability of purchasing power, the assurance that today's dollar will be worth the same tomorrow. And that certainly should be an important objective of Federal policy.

But what assurance does the budget offer on this score? It proposes to spend $92.5 billion of the people's money, or nearly $115 billion when social security and similar payments are included. That is more than 25 percent of national income. Right now, in fiscal 1962, the total annual spending of Federal, State, and local governments is estimated at $173 billion—a figure heading rapidly, that is, toward taking half of the entire income of the people each and every year.

Now one rule of economic thumb is that when largely nonproductive government spending consumes 25 percent of national income, inflationary forces come into play because of the tremendous drain on productive resources. The percentage at which inflation begins may not be precise; the effect of the inflationary forces may not be instantly apparent. But there is just no getting around the danger. And if 25 percent is cause for inflationary alarm, what is one to say of a drain within sight of 50 percent?

So much for the purchasing power stability to which Mr. Kennedy says his budget will greatly contribute.

Turning to the goal of high employment, it is perfectly true that the Government can create some additional employment of a sort. Yet it is extremely doubtful how much additional employment it can create or how economically useful it will be.

The Government could get quite a high level of employment if it took over everything and tried to make work for everyone; in other words, turned the Nation into a completely socialistic state. Even socialistic states, however, find they cannot guarantee against unemployment, for reasons having to do with the inherently unmanageable nature of the human being.

Mr. Kennedy, of course, has nothing of that sort in mind. He is thinking in more modest terms, such as retraining some unemployed people, and getting from Congress "standby" authority for big additional pubcreases. The United States had plenty of that in the thirties, and the records show it did hardly a thing to reduce unemployment. And we are sure Mr. Kennedy would not contend that Federal make-work is a solution to unemployment.

What, then, is the way to higher employment? This much would seem plain as a pikestaff: If the tremendous governmental drain of between a quarter and a half of the people's income would be significantly reduced, there would be a corresponding increase in savings, investment and spending. In short, greatly increased economic activity which would provide additional millions of real jobs.

How else, in a free society, could you expect to get high employment? And how else, to take Mr. Kennedy's third and broader goal, could you expect to get sound economic growth?

The Kennedy budget all too fully reflects the prevalent notion that unlimited Government growth is the key to economic well-being. Unfortunately for the Nation, that theory prescribes methods which run counter to the achievement of the President's admirable aims.

WHAT WASHINGTON SAYS IS GOOD FOR YOU

If there is one common binder in the economic preachments of the administration—from the budget to the economic message itself—it is that high taxes and high Government spending are the magic keys to prosperity.

Thus, while the budget offers a modest surplus, the President explains that this is only justified because of our foreign balance-of-payments problems; the needs of economic growth demand that spending be kept high. Again in the economic message we are told that if business turns downward the Government will have to pull out some new spending projects. So our high taxes pay not only for military defense but economic defense as well.

Such, anyway, is the publicly proclaimed doctrine. Yet when you look at some of the special proposals made by the President, you begin to wonder if the administration officials really believe their own propaganda.

Take this proposal for new investment incentives. President Kennedy wants Congress to allow a special 8-percent tax credit to business on investments of certain types of new equipment, and he speaks of changing the accounting rules in a number of particulars in regard to depreciation for tax purposes.

The reason given for this is quite sound. It is nothing more than the recognition that new investment is the key to the economic growth which the administration prizes so highly, that new plants, new tools, new equipment of all kinds, are the key to new jobs. The various Government proposals are designed to help business get the new capital for this investment.

But this is also an acknowledgment, however disguised, that the present rates of taxation on business stifle the growth of this capital. With lower tax rates—the Government now takes up to 52 cents from every dollar earned by business—there would be no need to think up special gimmicks like tax credits to let businesses keep and reinvest a little more of the cash they generate.

Or look at the tortuous logic behind the President's request that he have the authority to reduce personal income taxes in time of recession.

We are told, on the on hand, that the high and steeply progressive personal income taxes are not hurting prosperity; after all, doesn't the Government redistribute this tax money in the form of public works, military expenditures, welfare payments, and all the rest? Yet on the other hand we are told that if we fall into a little less prosperity, and need some more of it, then the President ought to be able to get more of it by having the discretionary power to cut people's taxes.

This amounts to the nonsensical argument that high taxes are healthy but if we want to be more healthy we should have less of what is making us so healthy.

The explanation of this curious behavior, of course, is that here again some of the realities of economic life have begun to intrude themselves into long-preached dogma. The objective is growth. Growth demands new capital. New capital requires savings, both by people individually and by joint corporate endeavors. Savings require something left over after the tax collector has been around; taxing Peter to pay Paul may increase the velocity of money but it slows down the development of capital which is essential if this country is to grow the way it should.

That the economic planners in the Government have begun to recognize these simple realities is a sort of progress. But if they really believed that honesty is the best policy in politics, they wouldn't have to resort to gimmicks. They would just step up and admit publicly the falsity of the doctrine that high spending and high taxes are good for you.

IT INCLUDES VAST NEW DOMESTIC PROGRAMS PROMISING EVEN BIGGER OUTLAYS IN FUTURE

(By Lindley H. Clark, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy's new budget charts Federal spending of $92.5 billion in fiscal 1963, a total exceeded only in the war years of 1944 and 1945. But the document's portrait of the coming year may be of less significance than the picture it paints of the more distant future.

In many and varied ways, the budget points to a continuing increase in Government spending. For one thing, the President's budget message yesterday declared that he held back on some spending proposals to help achieve the budget's precarious $500 million surplus. "Many desirable new projects and activities are being deferred," Mr. Kennedy said.

Some new projects are not being postponed. The budget calls for a start on new programs in a number of areas, among them education, urban mass transportation, and manpower retraining. Like most Federal programs, these projects are expected to start small and get progressively bigger.

The budget also asks Congress for the power to spend a good deal more money on a lot of existing programs; space research and exploration is only one conspicuous example. A lot of this new money would not be spent in fiscal 1963; it takes time to place orders and get projects rolling. All told, the budget asks for new obligational authority—NOA in budget lingo—totaling $99.3 billion in fiscal 1963. That would be a jump of $12.6 billion from the NOA total for the year ended last June 30.

UNASSIGNED FUNDS

With Congress okaying even bigger spending authorizations, the amount of this money lying around at the end of each year is steadily rising. Some of this money, in

effect, has already been spent; contracts have been signed and the Government is committed to make payment when work is completed or products are delivered. But a lot of the money is as yet unassigned, though the Government in most cases has a good idea where it's going.

All told, the Government expects to start fiscal 1963 with a total of $81.7 billion of obligated and unobligated spending authority, up from $78.3 billion a year earlier. By the start of fiscal 1964, if the budget's forecasts are borne out, this Federal kitty will have grown to $87.5 billion. This trend can only portend bigger actual outlays.

But some of the evidence of spending's upward thrust lies outside the regular budget accounts. It's tucked away in the figures on the Government's fast-growing trust funds. Each of the funds operates much like an individual business, keeping track of its own income and outgo. Included are such diverse outfits as the social security funds, the highway trust funds, and the veterans' life insurance funds.

UPWARD TREND

Taken together, the trust funds are expected to spend $26.6 billion in fiscal 1963, over $1 billion above the estimate for the current year and more than five times the figure for fiscal 1953. And the trend seems sure to continue upward, especially if Congress goes along with the administration proposals for providing medical care for the aged under social security.

At a prebudget press conference, Budget Director Bell would not be specific about the projects Mr. Kennedy was planning to postpone. He declared that in no case was the Nation's security being sacrificed for simple reasons of economy. But he indicated that some generals may have to forgo new private planes another year or so, and some military bases may have to get along without new landscaping or other refurbishing for a while.

However, other high Government officials ocer more detail on this year's budget paring. When the spending proposals of the various agencies were totaled, they came to about $96 billion. This figure, the officials say, was cut to $94 billion without a great deal of difficulty. But then the budget planners began to find the going rougher, and some of them began to wonder if a balanced budget was possible without deep cuts at the Pentagon.

An escape hatch was finally found. The planners drew up a list of "discretionary civilian" spending increases. These included more money for Rural Electrification Administration loans to telephone systems, along with more funds for agricultural research, soil conservation, community health facilities, the National Institutes of Health, the Army Engineers, Indian reservations, reclamation projects and the Area Redevelopment Administration.

The budget planners then set about slicing these "discretionary" increases by varying amounts. The ARA, for example, was told that its proposed rate of spending was too rapid and should be stretched out into later years. Many other deferred items also seem sure to help boost later budgets.

TACTICAL MOVE

Another tactical move was to defer the proposed start of an upward adjustment in Federal pay scales. Initially, the plan was to begin July 1. The budget now pushes back the starting date to January 1, so that only a half-year's impact of the increases shows up in the 1963 budget.

Other new spending proposals reflect a similar onward-and-upward trend. The budget, for example, provides funds for a start on the public elementary and secondary school aid program that the administration proposed last year. The proposal calls for a 3-year program involving $2.1 billion in Federal grants for teachers' salaries and educational facilities. In fiscal 1963, actual spending is listed as only $90 million. But the budget proposes that $600 million in new spending authority be granted during that year.

Also in fiscal 1963, the administration aims to get going on a program to improve the "quality" of education. This program involves an expansion of supplementary training of teachers and use of improved teaching media, techniques and curriculums. For the coming fiscal year, spending is set at $40 million but a total of $120 million in new spending authority is to be sought.

WATER RESOURCES PROJECT

For the Corps of Engineers, the budget includes $30 million for 36 new water resources projects, with a total estimated Federal cost of $492 million. A total of $4 million is included for starts on five new projects by the Bureau of Reclamation, with a total estimated cost of $85 million.

The administration last year proposed a program of on-the-job training and instruction in vocational schools for unemployed workers. To get started on such a program, the budget includes spending of $60 million in fiscal 1963—and new obligational authority of $100 million. For a 3-year program of training youth in local works projects, in conservation camps and in on-the-job training positions, the budget lists outlays of $60 million in fiscal 1963 and new spending authorizations of $75 million.

As for expansion of existing programs, the budget calls for outlays of $2.4 billion on space research and technology in the coming fiscal year, more than triple the figure for the year ended last June 30. And it recommends new obligational authority of $3.8 billion in fiscal 1963.

Other increases in current programs are less spectacular, but they are widespread. The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife proposes to accelerate its acquisition of lands for resting and nesting areas for migratory waterfowl. The food stamp program would be expanded into new areas. And the National Science Foundation expects to spend $164 million on basic research in fiscal 1963, double the figure for fiscal 1961, and is seeking new spending authority totaling $247 million.

It would be wrong to tag the Kennedy administration with full responsibility for the spending trend; past administrations have supplied much of the upward impetus. But it is clear that the new budget does little to alter the outlook, either for fiscal 1963 or the years beyond.

Federal Home Affairs Bureau Would Hamper Local Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of the country are beginning to realize the brazen manner in which President Kennedy has injected the racial issue for political purposes into the discussion on the proposed Urban Affairs Cabinet position. I believe it is especially appropriate that we obtain the comments of local civic and community leaders on the question of the need and validity of this proposal. I ask leave to insert into the RECORD, an editorial in the Blue Island Sun-Standard of Thursday, February 1, entitled "Federal Home Affairs Bureau Would Hamper Local Government."

FEDERAL HOME AFFAIRS BUREAU WOULD HAMPER LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The Sun-Standard approves of the emphatic stand taken by the Blue Island Chamber of Commerce against the Federal Government's proposed Urban Affairs and Housing Cabinet post or Department.

Congress, itself, in its House Rules Committee voted 9 to 6 against creation of such a Department some time back, and let the proposed bill die in committee.

President Kennedy, however, saw fit to bring the matter up again, by Executive order, and over the weekend signed papers to set up the new Department.

Nevertheless, if Congress goes on record by a majority vote within 60 days against it, the Urban Affairs action will still go out the window.

The chamber of commerce says the new Cabinet agency was recommended by the Kennedy administration and is backed by some city officials and the CIO and AFL, but many others, including our own local officials are opposed to it.

The chamber of commerce feels that this bureau or Department, if created, would weaken existing relationships between the States and their political divisions, and accelerate the dependency of local-level government upon the National Government.

The arguments in favor of the new Department is that the structure of the U.S. Government needs to be reoriented to reflect the physical transformation of the Nation as a whole.

These people say that the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs will make Federal participation and assistance "more readily available."

Without associating the Sun-Standard with the political considerations of the measure, we feel that such a Department would not be to the best interests of our citizens.

President Kennedy Returns to Secret Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, government by relative or classmate can be dangerous. The Presidential Cabinet is there to be used, but thus far, beyond politicking, it has not been used in the constitutional sense of the word. The following article by David Lawrence which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on February 1 points out the pitfalls involved:

KENNEDY SEEN BYPASSING OWN AIDS ON MAJOR ISSUES

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—The Kennedy administration may not realize it but an image of helter-skelter is being created by its own publicity apparatus. The idea is being conveyed that what is good for the political machine is also good for America.

Several things have caused a raising of eyebrows here, and a feeling of concern is beginning to spread throughout the country. Questions like these are being asked:

1. Why is the administration seeking to tighten its control of all the political organizations in the larger cities of the country by building up a Department of Urban Affairs that could conceivably dictate to municipal governments and take from the local authorities the control of their own cities?

2. Why is the President bypassing the Department of State and the U.S. Information Agency, for which Congress expends annually a lot of money on the theory that the conduct of foreign relations and the carrying on of information programs, respectively, are the direct responsibilities of those two executive agencies in the Government?

3. Why did the President recently conduct a series of inner Government conferences, including 52 of the top policymaking officials, and set forth the policies of the Government in the cold war without making any explanation to the American people or to Congress of the important decisions he has reached on foreign policy?

CURIOSITY AROUSED

The newspapers were given background information on these inside conferences, and naturally such dispatches were read with considerable curiosity in Congress and by allied governments abroad, if not by the Moscow government as well.

Subjects like our preparations for limited and conventional war and counterguerrilla operations have certain aspects that need not be publicized, but it would have been helpful to the understanding of American policies throughout the world if the firm words attributed to the President during his conferences with high officers of the Government had been put in some official form for the rest of the world to read.

The bypassing of the Department of State and the U.S. Information Agency has been revealed in the announcement that the President's press secretary, who doesn't speak Russian and who has had no experience in the foreign service, is suddenly to undertake a high-level negotiation with a top Soviet personality on the matter of exchanging television and other information programs. Why isn't a task like this performed by Edward R. Murrow, Director of the U.S. Information Agency, through the American Embassy in Moscow?

Representative BRUCE ALGER, Republican, of Texas, in a speech in the House of Representatives on Wednesday charged that the President is "indulging in more secret diplomacy with the Soviets," and added:

"We cannot take a chance that a young and inexperienced White House publicity man will be able to deal successfully with the tough representatives of the Kremlin."

Mr. ALGER said he is concerned about the meeting between Khrushchev's son-in-law, who is editor of Izvestia, and the press secretary of President Kennedy. The Texas Representative declared that the United States needs "experienced negotiators, a sound policy based on American self-interest, and honesty with Congress and the American people as to just what is going on and what the President hopes to accomplish."

There is a tendency at the White House to bypass the Cabinet officers charged by law with certain responsibilities. There is also a tendency to conduct conversations with high officials of other governments through intermediaries who have not been trained to overcome the language difficulties and who may not know how to avoid the pitfalls of an interchange of views on policy questions.

SEEN TAKING CHANCES

The Kennedy administration, in violating the customary rules of international intercourse, is taking chances. Sooner or later the allied governments will be hearing indirectly through Soviet ambassadors that the United States is ready to concede on this or that point. This will not, of course, be accurate, but the Soviets will not worry about this as they see how much mischief they can perpetrate out of information obtained in confidential conversations between the President or his press secretary and various Soviet spokesmen. Not a single deviation from Khrushchev's policies, it may be confidently assumed, will ever be made by the Communist emissaries who are wined and dined at the White House, but what the President says in polite conversations will be twisted to mean that he is getting ready to make concessions to the Soviet viewpoint.

Care in dealing with the Soviet Government is essential and, when the President has anything to say to Moscow, it is better that it be said through a man like Llewellyn Thompson, the American Ambassador, who not only speaks Russian fluently but knows the Soviet Premier's personality and can deal with him effectively in the interest of the United States.

American Morality and Nuclear Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, as a part of the Wilson College, Chambersburg, Pa., Given Foundation Lectures, the Honorable Clare Boothe Luce spoke on October 27 of last year on the subject "American Morality and Nuclear Diplomacy." The keen observances of this American stateswoman are well worth the attention of the Congress and the people of this country. Speaking from a long background of public service, Clare Boothe Luce offers some important thoughts in the speech which follows:

AMERICAN MORALITY AND NUCLEAR DIPLOMACY

(By the Honorable Clare Boothe Luce)

Today the two strongest nations in the world are drawn up in full battle array, facing one another across half the world. Their bombs testing in air, their rockets' red glare, seem proof to the world that war may be near.

Wrote Churchill in "The Gathering Storm": "Statesmen are not called upon to settle easy questions * * * it is when the balance quivers, and the proportions are veiled in mist that the opportunity for world-saving decisions presents itself."

The same opportunity presents itself to the American people.

In a democracy, the vital decisions of statesmen are seldom taken in defiance of the public will. Whoever changes his own opinion in a national crisis, by just so much changes the public will and, by just so much, influences the decisions of statesmen.

The purpose of this paper is to raise the question of the morality of America's attitude in this century toward the uses of force, in international affairs, to submit that our morality has been a fuzzy if not false one, and to suggest that unless that attitude does not soon change, we dare not hope that American diplomacy can win the cold war.

What is the historic American attitude toward force, toward the purpose of force, the possession of force, and the use of force? In speaking of force, I am speaking not only of America's armies-in-being at any given moment since the turn of the century, but of America's warmaking capacity, its total realizable military potential.

Until most recent times America's attitude was that the sole purpose of American force was the military self-defense—of America; that the possession of force was solely for a deterrent to military aggression—against America; and that the only use to which American force could ever morally be put was retaliation against military aggression—on America.

Morality in respect of force consisted in not striking the first military blow. Conversely, any nation who struck the first military blow against America, ipso facto established its own immorality.

Consequently, the only moral casus balli, or cause of war, which the public will has fully supported is the initiation of war on the United States. For almost a century, statesmanship has been constrained, diplomacy has been confined, and patriotism itself has been defined, by the moral necessity of waiting for Pearl Harbors.

There are, of course, many explanations of this attitude. Even if there were time I could not do justice to the whole of this complex problem. A review of it would begin with Gen. George Washington's unique role in insuring that the military forces should be absolutely subject to the civil Government; that of the two hats the President wears, his Commander in Chief hat should be kept in the closet of Congress. The scholar could then go on to show that one of the strongest of American feelings was always its antipathy toward the militaristic traditions of Europe. Indeed, throughout most of history, the flaunting of military power was closely tide to old world dynastic, monarchial and feudal institutions and rivalries. From the beginning, the United States sought to set a new example to the world, an example not only of democracy, but also of repudiation of war as the normal, more or less continuous, instrument of government policy. To all such considerations as these, most historians would add the fact of America's geographical isolation. During the first century and a half of our history as a nation, the United States was perhaps not so isolated as historical generalizations make out, but it can certainly be agreed that from President Washington's time to President Wilson's there was a firm determination not to involve ourselves in what we called the power politics of Europe. This led in turn to a diplomatic isolation from Europe's political problems, and this aloofness from European power politics—which meant world power politics—resulted, it could be said, in a national ignorance of how the world is run and of how, mutatis mutandis, it must be run.

Consequently America in this century has twice failed, with a third time threatening, to prevent the outbreak of world war. And to prevent the outbreak of world war was our moral duty and our prime task as the world's strongest nation. America failed because the public will would seldom support a foreign policy or a diplomacy which would permit our statesmen to introduce the subject of the warmaking capacity of the United States into the normal conduct of international negotiations. We would not allow—we positively forbade—our diplomats to convert our tremendous physical power into diplomatic or political victories for peace.

Have we always been blind to this necessity? No, we have not.

Let me give you an elegant historical example of wise American statesmanship: the proclamation of the Monroe Doctrine, on December 2, 1823. This was a clearly stated political and diplomatic warning to all the nations of the world that the United States would rapidly raise armies to fight any nation which, for any reason good or bad, sought any conquest in this hemisphere. We said, in effect, that we would not wait until a

conflict situation, involving a European power, developed in South America to determine whether our interests were affected. And we certainly would not wait until we ourselves were hit. We would, on the contrary, act at the first sign of European aggression in our hemisphere. This positive warning, because it was believed in all the chanceries in Europe, discouraged even the smallest military adventure in our part of the world. No armies were raised in the United States, no taxes were paid to support vast flexible defense systems designed not only to repulse massive attacks on the United States, but to participate in faraway "brushfire" wars in South America. None were needed. The clear unambiguous political warning to Europe that America stood ready to convert its potential power into actual firing power if the general peace of our hemisphere were threatened helped to keep our country at peace for almost 100 years. In fact, so well did that political warning preserve peace in this hemisphere, that over the long years we quite forgot to what we owed our security. We forgot that the best deterrent to aggression of any serious nature is a firm political warning, uttered well in advance, that a nation stands ready to go to war to protect not only its own shores, but the general peace in a whole area where its interests are involved.

A vast, rich, self-contained, self-sufficient, and ever-growing country, we ourselves did not need to use force against other nations to acquire territory, trade, or raw materials. To be sure, when there was anything America wanted that lay conveniently near, we did not hesitate to use force to get it. Our second-class citizens, the Indians, still living on reservations, and the Mexicans from whom we wrested New Mexico can testify to that. But gradually, despite these lapses on the score of force, we began to make a virtue, not of our necessity but of our lack of necessity for using force in the world. We did not fight or threaten to fight anyone in Europe or Asia. We were a nonaggressive, nonmilitary, thoroughly moral nation. Morality consisted, therefore, in not going to war or threatening war. It also consisted in not getting mixed up in the wars of warlike nations, which by historic definition included every nation in the Old World. We began to pride ourselves on our superior moral attitude toward the rest of the world. Force was something decent nations never used except in the case of overt attack. And America, the most decent nation in the world, would never use force until America herself was attacked.

"There is such a thing as a man being too proud to fight," said Woodrow Wilson in the spring of 1915. This was certainly a statement which the embattled French and British heard with dismay and contempt and bitterness. How can a man be proud not to fight while his friends are being killed and even conquered in a war they did not start? America was not too proud to sell guns, make loans, ship supplies to the Allied side, and to heap abuse on Kaiser Bill—a procedure which American morality permitted us nevertheless to call neutrality, since neutrality also consisted entirely in not joining the fighting until war came.

Even after World War I, America clung to the idea that the unilateral renunciation—America's renunciation of the first use of force—would preserve peace in the world.

But by 1937, World War II was plainly in the making. Once again American statesmanship and diplomacy were confronted with the stern necessity of taking a firm stand against the outbreak of hostilities in Europe. What stand did we take? I do not know how clearly you remember Franklin Roosevelt's famous "quarantine" speech in that year. But let me read a sentence to you: (Said President Roosevelt) " * * * the mere fact that we rightly decline to intervene with arms to prevent acts of aggression does not mean that we must act as if there were no aggression at all * * * There, are many methods short of war, but stronger and more effective than mere words, of bringing home to aggressor governments the aggregate sentiments of our people."

The record, which includes Pearl Harbor, shows that the "many methods short of war," which the United States used between 1938–41, did not bring home "the aggregate sentiments of our people." Does this mean that war was inevitable? No. Because the "mere words" to which President Roosevelt referred were never tried. These words would have been exactly the strongest and most effective thing to have prevented World War II. What words? Why, the very opposite words from the ones Mr. Roosevelt used when he said, "we rightly decline to intervene with arms * * *" The quietly spoken words of American diplomats in Rome and Berlin and Tokyo and Moscow—that if Hitler plunged Europe into war, Germany would have to reckon with American military power because America would rightly decide to intervene on the side of the Allies. This warning never came.

As late as 1939, Mr. Roosevelt said, "At this moment there is being prepared a proclamation of American neutrality. * * *" And in October 1940, after France had fallen, and when Great Britain alone held the fortress of the West against Hitler's Germany, our President said, "I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again: Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars."

But just as we had in World War I, we again sent guns, supplies, money to the Allies. We opened the Burma Road, embargoed aviation fuel to the Japanese, thus stalling their war machine in China. Again, the American press and the American people heaped words of scorn and hatred on the Germans and Japanese.

The whole world pondered all over again America's strange definition of a "foreign war" and "neutrality." Except in respect of shedding her blood, America had plainly taken the sides of the Allies.

What Europe did not understand, what the world did not understand was that when it came to war—the use of military force—the American people sincerely felt that while it was not immoral to fight a war, it was immoral to start one. The public will would not support diplomatic efforts to prevent war, and would not fight it until America was first attacked.

We must note here that the American idea that, however well prepared, a country is not justified in going to war against another country who is preparing to fight it until that country has first rammed our front teeth down our bloodied throat, has never before been known in history. Other nations have consistently viewed this attitude as cowardice or selfishness—or worst of all, stupidity on America's part. Most of the nations of the world consequently regarded Pearl Harbor, not as "a day of infamy," but as a day of awakening for America.

Isolation and its resulting ignorance or naivete about the political and diplomatic uses of power do explain much about the ambiguity of the American attitude toward force in both pre-World Wars I and II days. But equally certain by 1945, a thorough reexamination of the morality of our position was in order. All the historical evidence showed that neither the Kaiser nor Hitler nor Mussolini would have started World Wars I and II in the first place, if American diplomacy had been permitted by the public will to warn them that America's warmaking potential would be mobilized on the allied side if they did so. A stern warning from American diplomats might have prevented even the war in Ethiopia, the taking of the Rhineland, and the Anschluss. I have spent many years in Italy. I never knew an Italian who did not insist that if the United States had given Mussolini a firm warning that the United States would, sooner or later, stand against Hitler, Italy would have stayed out of the war.

A good deal of the blood that was spilled in World Wars I and II must be laid, and is laid by responsible historians, at the door of America's strange morality about force.

Unhappily, America did not learn from the terrible lessons of these two wars. The proof we gave ourselves that our morality paid off lay in the fact that we not only won both wars but emerged from them stronger and richer and more powerful than ever.

Despite the warnings of history, we have held to our morality, and we have done so until this present hour. The Kaiser and Hitler began our education in the political uses of military power. They were not tough enough to finish it. It is now being finished by Mr. Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung.

Like the immortal killeeloo bird that always flies backward because it can't tell where it is until it sees where it has been, let us go back to the year 1945.

That year the United States emerged from the war as the first atomic power in history. One American A-bomb was 1,000 times more destructive than any "blockbuster" dropped in World War II. Never before in the story of mankind had one nation possessed such a monopoly of decisive military power, and the means of delivering it anywhere on the globe.

How did we view the purpose of this power? As self-defense, quite proper. How did we view the possession of this power? As a deterrent to the use of force against ourselves and our allies by others. So far, excellent. But what political or diplomatic use did we make of this power? Very little. Let us review the record.

The war had no sooner ended in 1945 than it became plain to many students of the international scene that Soviet Russia—in spite of the grievous wounds she had sustained (10 percent of her population had been killed in the war)—had not abandoned her dream of the ideological conquest of the world. The world balance of power was again being threatened: world war III was in the making. The warnings came early. First, U.S. armies executed their habitual retreat to the homeland. This fact destroyed the credibility of America's intention to remain in Europe until Russia ceased to be a threat. Russia did not disband her armies. The Russian divisions which were affronting Germany at war's end were maintained, still facing west, against her recent allies. No doubt our atomic power in the immediate postwar period did deter Red armies of "liberation" from an easy march to the channel. But it did not automatically disband, no less roll back those armies. Why not?

Said Harry Truman in 1945: "In our possession of this [atomic] weapon, there is no threat to any nation * * * we regard [it] as a sacred trust * * * the thoughtful people of the world know that trust will not be violated."

The Russians, being a thoughtful people, wondered if this meant that America, even after Pearl Harbor, intended to cling to her moral view that she would wait patiently, permitting all forms of political aggression in Europe and elsewhere, until Russia was ready to strike the first atomic blow. It seemed too good to be true. But that was exactly what it did mean.

In 1946, troubled about her monopoly of so much destructive power, the United States offered the world the Baruch plan—a plan to share our atomic secrets with the whole world, for peaceful purposes. This wonder-

fully generous plan contained one very logical feature: It was, in Mr. Baruch's words, "an international law with teeth in it." Like all laws, it proposed punishment for those who used atomic energy for making weapons. The Russians turned it down. That was our second warning. The plan went into the wastebasket; the teeth, the United States threw in right after it.

By 1947, any doubt that the American people may have had on the score of Russia's ultimate, not to say ulterior, political intentions had been largely dispelled. It was clear to the majority of Americans that Russia was determined, if not destined, to be America's No. 1 political and military enemy. Every passing day gave its own savage proof that bomb or no bomb, Russia intended to pursue her goal or world conquest by every means her sovereign will could command. Lacking atomic capacity herself that meant by subversion, infiltration, propaganda, and a diplomacy based on ruthless deceit. The mere possession by America of atomic supremacy may have deterred an all-out Russian hot war on land against our European allies, but it did not halt Russia's cold war anywhere in the world, nor her agitation of lukewarm wars and Red revolutions in Asia.

How did the United States react to this situation in which Russia was clearly rearming for a hot war against America, while fiercely pursuing the cold war? Able to reduce Russia to rubble in hours, did we permit our diplomats quietly to warn Russia to halt and desist lest she risk bringing down destruction upon herself? No, we did not.

American foreign policy promptly geared itself to fight the war Russia chose to fight—the cold war. For every cold war tit of the Russians there would come a cold war tat from America. We went into "partnership" with the nations of the free world against communism. They provided the ocean of economic demands. We provided the ships full of supplies.

By 1948, the Marshall plan, originally conceived as an economic rehabilitation measure for the destroyed economies of both European friend and foe, was being primarily used as a political tool to thwart Russia's effort to communize countries outside the Iron Curtain. Beefed up with billions and changed into the MSA (Mutual Security Administration) it was used lavishly in an effort to bolster up weak governments and calm down revolutionary ferment among needy peoples by raising their living standards.

Nor was the United States laggard in responding to Soviet world propaganda. Tooling up the most formidable propaganda machinery that the U.S. Congress would buy, the United States struggled valiantly to save the ears of the world from Red contamination. USIS, the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, the Voice of Liberty, delivered a tittle for every Russian tattle.

The bill for America's political efforts in this cold war has so far run into $85 billion.

Nevertheless, despite our prodigious cold war efforts during the years 1945 to 1950, the years of U.S. atomic supremacy and superiority, Russia not only maintained the Iron Curtain around Eastern Europe and China, but also launched subversive attacks on a dozen countries such as Indochina, Malaya, and even France and Italy. Soviet Russia and Red China also supported the Red invasion of South Korea.

Our overwhelming military power here and there translated itself into regional military power: in Greece, in Turkey, and of course into the formation of NATO. Where military aggression threatened or military initiatives were taken we responded in kind, or reacted. But our prodigious war capacity simply did not translate itself into political cold war victories. Indeed, in the very shadow of the mushroom cloud, Soviet Russia proceeded to her political goals with a confidence that became with every passing year more arrogant.

On what was Russia's confidence based? It was certainly not based on ignorance of what the A-bomb could do and would do to Russia if war came. Americans, on the record, had had little compunction about slaughtering millions of defenseless men and women in order to achieve a war objective, even if that objective might have been won by less frightful means.

Russia knew (and had not forgotten) what all the world knew (and has not forgotten) that the A-bomb was a proven weapon. We had already used it to slaughter and maim over 300,000 defenseless noncombatants in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and when the war was all but won—when General MacArthur's huge armada was almost ready to strike at the Japanese heartland.

Russia's brash and increasing confidence in pursuing her cold war goals was based largely on one thing: her shrewd understanding of U.S. morality—or the American public will—in respect of the initiation of war.

When we look back now on the past 15 years, we can see that the prime goal of Russian psychological warfare at any given time was to encourage this simple bit of morality. So long as Americans held to it firmly, Russia had only to refrain from a direct attack on the United States—on U.S. military personnel abroad—or on formal U.S. allies. And she need fear America's A-bombs, bombers, or navies less than the rotten eggs which a frustrated American or two had sometimes thrown at Russian envoys.

We American citizens will never understand the failure of our cold war diplomacy to stop Russia, until we are willing to recognize that our own morality in respect of force politically castrated our colossal atomic power. We ourselves subtracted our overwhelming power to warn the wrongdoer that he would be punished from the international political and diplomatic equation. We refused to convert it into diplomatic and political terms. We renounced a priori our responsibility as the world's greatest power to restore order and stability to a suffering world. Just as we had done in the days when Hitler was rising, once again we talked of "quarantining aggressors" and "containment of aggressors" but what we really did was to quarantine the only strong police force in a lawless world: American power. In short, we proclaimed, in 1945, a de jure atomic stalemate.

To this point of view, it will be objected that our own allies approved—at least partially—this de jure stalemate.

Publicly, no nation, including Soviet Russia, will ever admit that it intends to initiate war. And, indeed, no nation wants to fight a war if the advantages it hopes to achieve can be had by negotiation. All statesmanship consists in seeking advantages, short of war, if possible. But—and do let's try to get this clearly in mind—the clear diplomatic warning that force will be used if all the processes of diplomacy, negotiation, and reason fail—the Monroe Doctrine type diplomacy, is the only thing which can hope to discourage the inordinate ambitions of other nations. After 1945, only one nation in the world was strong enough to utter the warning to Russia that she must abandon her desire for world conquest. It was never uttered. On the contrary, not only did we not warn, we reassured her that we would never fight until (a) Russia became as strong as ourselves and (b) we, or our allies, were first struck.

The diplomatic consequences of renouncing force, and setting ourselves goals which only the discreet backing of force made realizable, were dismal indeed. American diplomats were often as ineffective as the diplomats of the smallest and weakest nation in pursuing their goal of making friends and influencing peoples. They sometimes found that they could not achieve the simplest political objective, even in respect of an ally, unless they were willing to pay dollars for it through the nose. The resut was economic blackmail.

There were other consequences. Our deterrent concept which logically led to the concept of an unlimited war of retaliation against Russia, left us with vague military policies, confused tactics and inadequate weapons to fight the limited or brush-fire wars which Russia (to whom our morality granted everywhere the military right-of-way) instigated against her world neighbors and ours. We had no clear military design to stop the small Russian gobbling of bits of the earth, except to gobble up Russia herself—a thing which morality forbade us to do until Russia took her first big bite from our hide. And even then, our morality held that "we won't use anything on you you don't use on us." We responded to the war initiative of the Red Koreans by letting them choose the caliber of weapons, determine the battle area, and blow the cease-fire whistle when they began to fall behind.

In 1949 Russia detonated her first atomic bomb and ended our atomic monopoly. There was no question in any American's mind what target her bombs, when they came in sufficient numbers, were designed to find. This must have been a bad moment for Russia. Would America, Russia must have wondered uneasily, snap out of her strange moral attitude? Would American see at last that Russia was at war with her, even though Russia had fired no shot at us? (If we didn't see that in 1949 we see it now: The fallout of 30- and 50-megaton bombs exploded by Russia, inside Russia, is headed our way now. Our frontiers have been militarily crossed, have they not, by death-dealing Russian fallout?) Would America see that in this war, nuclear time must soon run out? Would she come to her military, if not moral, senses? Would America permit her diplomats to warn Russia that she still possesses superior strength, and that unless Russia halted and desisted her bomb testing, unless she signed an atomic agreement with adequate safeguards, the American people might see the necessity of this force? Would America take any diplomatic action to prevent Russia from arming for America's destruction? Another very bad moment, indeed, for the Russians. But all went well. President Truman had said in October 1948: "We hunger for peace. The world knows that the United States will never use the atomic bomb to wage aggressive war * * *." In 1949 he said: "The purpose of what we are doing is to prevent world war III. Starting a war is no way to make peace." American morality prevailed. Our diplomats were hamstrung. They could not warn Russia. Aggression, even atomic aggression, the most fearsome form of aggression which ever threatened America, was again, by definition, dropping the first atomic bomb. The President was, of course, supported again by the public will. Americans were quite ready, indeed eager, to wait patiently until Russia was in a better position to knock out all America. Well, Russia is now in that position. We now have the very situation we encouraged.

As a proof of the sincerity of our position and the purity of our intentions, we pursued that long series of disarmament negotiations which began with the Baruch plan, but which have today ended in utter nothingness.

When the policy of general atomic disarmament failed, we began at last to threaten Russia. But again, not diplomatically with the prospect of a war which even as late as 1952 we might still have won without too much damage to America. We threatened Russia with military reprisals. We swore a mighty oath: Our retaliation would be supercolossal, stupendously massive. We would make bigger and more ter-

rible bombs. And if war came we would give two nuclear tits for every Russian nuclear tat. A bigger bang for a billion bucks. By 1953 Russia had made our de jure stalemate of 1945 the nuclear stalemate de facto.

In Eisenhower's regime the nuclear armament race began in earnest. As Prof. Henry Kissinger pointed out at the time, our failure to incorporate our atomic power into military, political, and diplomatic thinking led to a ghastly paradox: Having refused to warn Russia that if pressed too far, we might have to fight a war, which we could certainly have won, we began to arm for a 10-million-ton nuclear bomb war which nobody could win.

During his 8 years in office, time and time again President Eisenhower reiterated America's moral position on war. "There is no alternative to peace," said the President in 1956. Commenting dryly on this, Professor Kissinger wrote, "to the extent that this is taken seriously by the Soviets as a statement of American intentions, it will remove a powerful brake on Soviet probing actions, and any incentive for the Soviet to make concessions." We meant it seriously. The Russians made no concessions. Summitry had to fail.

Our attitude in 1945 that it was immoral to alert the Russians to the fact that we might strike first unless a real peace could be negotiated, our long refusal even to warn an avowed enemy, an enemy whose intention to bury us and the free world had been clear from the beginning, had paralyzed our diplomacy, saw 600 millions of peoples dragged into slavery behind the Iron Curtain, intensified the cold war throughout the world, neutralized many countries, brought Russian power to our very own shores in Cuba, left us inert and humiliated before Castro—and now has at long last carried the whole suffering world to Armageddon.

Was, then, this moral attitude just?

Our allies in pre-World War I and II days did not think so. Fortunately they survived it * * * because we got hit. But after 1945 many other nations, in Robert Tucker's words saw "no moral virtue" in a foreign policy which renounced the diplomatic uses of force and thus jeopardized what little security for them had existed.

If we wish to find one big cause for America's unpopularity around the world today, especially in the captive nations, we can find it in the image of the really Ugly American: the great big man with the great big gun in his hand, who watched for a decade while a hoodlum raped the children in the neighborhood. And then passed out lollipops to the next victims on the list to comfort them, and slingshots to ward off the hoodlum when he showed up again. Ask any Hungarian, any citizen of the captive countries, any free Cuban, if this is not their image of the Ugly American.

The idea that a nation, although the mightiest power on earth, has no moral obligation to warn, no less to punish the international hoodlum who is raping the independence of nations whose interests are closely tied to its own, until it is first attacked, the idea that by waiting until its own shores are bombarded, it then gains a moral advantage which gives it the right to plunge everyone into all-out war, guerre a l'outrance—all this is so far from being moral, that it has long been viewed in the chanceries of the world as a moral aberration, of a peculiarly stupid—and dangerous—sort. And indeed, some hubris, or pride, ignorance, and selfishness do lie close to the root of it.

As to whether or not this attitude has paid off since the end of World War II, we have only to remind ourselves that all Americans are being urged today to build fallout shelters. Moral or not, sheer commonsense must tell us that our attitude was imprudent.

And now, before we come to the future consequences of holding to it, let us consider what a moral idea of force should be.

A correct moral attitude toward force must begin by the clear and never-to-be-forgotten truth that force is itself neutral. The fact that men can now make use of nuclear energy does not alter this truth by one jot. Nuclear energy is force. Force is neutral. It is not something that uses man. Man uses it. In international questions force can be used to exert diplomatic pressures which can, and often have prevented wars.

Every nation claiming to be in any serious or responsible sense sovereign organizes military force in time of crisis. But again, the organized military force is itself neutral. It is probably true that the existence of military force sets up a bias for its own use—that is for war. But if anything is clear historically, it is that in America the influence of the Military Establishment upon national policy is minimal.

Our Military Establishment, huge though it is, will not move, would not know how to move, except at the direction of the civil power—and that means you and me—the public will.

We are faced then with ourselves—with our share in forming the public will on the use of force.

Today, our diplomats and statesmen can no longer warn Russia that if she persists in her plan for world conquest we may wage a war on her which she would lose and we would win. They know, and we know, the threat would be empty. The use of nuclear force would result in the destruction of America as well as of Russia. All our statesmanship and diplomacy today must be directed toward preventing nuclear war. Whether we wait to be struck, or strike first now, it will come in the end to the same thing—the end of our way of life—the death of America, possibly the end of Western civilization.

What is the public will now? The public will, or so it seems to me, is to prevent the nuclear war, and at the same time win the cold war. How good are our chances of doing so?

Let us take the most recent dramatic incident in the United States-U.S.S.R. conflict: the building of the Berlin wall.

Symbols are more mighty than words. They are a universal language. They are the quintessence of human communication. The Berlin wall is far more than a wall. It is a symbol. Everyone knows what it stands for today. It stands for the permanent division of Germany, a thing we have vowed to prevent, not only for all Germany's sake, but for our own sake. West Germany, offered unity by the Russians in 1952, freely chose our side, on one condition—that the United States would never recognize the division of Germany. The wall is the symbol to them and the world that we view West Berlin as a ghetto of freedom, and that we have accepted the slavery of East Berlin. Above all, it is the symbol that the Iron Curtain cannot be raised by an American diplomacy that does not dare even to destroy one small brick wall, for fear now of risking a nuclear war.

The wall was built brick by brick—one brick at a time. And American diplomats, American soldiers, American statesmen stood by, paralyzed, watching it go up.

What is the official U.S. explanation of this incident that has now become a symbol to the world? That Russian tanks were in the background; that the United States of America feared to create a disturbance lest any disturbance in West Berlin might—might what? Trigger world war III and never forget, Americans, that one 10-million-ton Russian bomb would certainly destroy any American city. And, fellow Americans, was the wall worth that?

Let us be brutally honest with ourselves. Until the nuclear stalemate is ended, the United States and the U.S.S.R. will remain in conflict over many issues, at many points, in many situations around the world. No particular brick, no particular wall, no particular group of people, indeed no particular nation, not West Germany, not France, not Great Britain, certainly not Laos or Vietnam, or Quemoy, or Matsu, or Cuba, if thrown by Russia into the balance, one at a time, will seem to be worth the destruction of Washington, New York, Los Angeles, or for that matter, Chambersburg.

If you have followed my argument so far, you will not misunderstand me. I am not saying that in the future we must risk nuclear war everywhere, or that we must yield nowhere. Each risk must prudently be calculated. And the more desperate the cold war, the more difficult the lukewarm wars that are proceeding in Asia, the more tactical retreats may have to be made. What I am saying is that an unbroken string of tactical retreats must add up, in the end, to a strategic defeat.

The chain of destiny is forged link by link. And so is the chain of captivity.

Surely we see now, at long last, that for 15 years we have been locked in a life-or-death struggle with Soviet Russia. Surely we see now that we have imprudently sacrificed, in the name of a fuzzy and egocentric morality, all the political and diplomatic advantages that our monopoly of power once gave us. We have long since passed the point of no return.

Nevertheless our great task remains. It is to take down the Russian wall around the world in the same way that Russia built it. Not overnight, but brick by brick. And, of course, first the loose bricks. Far from abandoning our nonmilitary tools—economic, political, and cultural—we must increase them in size. But what I am saying is that we must be prepared ourselves as a people to risk war at every hour while we use these tools for all they are worth.

The President has said that we must win the cold war with the nuclear sword of Damocles hanging over us. Let us remember that Russia built the wall we must now breech with the sword of Damocles hanging over her head only. Shall we be less courageous now that it also hangs over ours?

The greatest virtue we can bring to the struggle now is courage. That side will win who least fears to be threatened, who most fearlessly takes the initiative in every cold war effort. That side will win who turns not a profile but a full face in courage to the struggle. American diplomacy can win the cold war if the public will now support its President and its diplomats in showing our determination to win, in spite of the nuclear risks. Armed with this courage—which only we can give them, they will make the right decisions. We may safely leave the details of carrying out these decisions to them and to our diplomats. It will take time, so we must also have the virtue of patience.

Our moral attitude toward nuclear war must be that there are moral values worth dying for. Our moral attitude toward the cold war must be that there are moral values worth great economic sacrifices. For if this be not true, then morality itself will die at our own hands.

Said Abraham Lincoln, 100 years ago, America is "the last best hope of earth * * *." It still is.

The one great and decisive force which we must now translate into political and diplomatic action is the force of our free spirits.

Nation's Press Raise Serious Questions Concerning President's Department of Urban Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, editorial comment from some of the country's leading newspapers on the President's proposal to create a Department of Urban Affairs points up some of the weaknesses of the plan and the danger it presents for further Federal control over our people. Under leave to extend my remarks on this subject I include an editorial from the Dallas Morning News, the Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) News, and the Wall Street Journal:

[From the Dallas Times Herald, Jan. 2, 1962]

"NO" TO KENNEDY

The President insists upon establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs—even in the face of the rebuff it received from the House Rules Committee.

The proposal is for a Department to be headed by an official of Cabinet rank. The Department purportedly would serve cities by helping them to solve certain problems of an urban nature.

As a matter of fact, though, it would result in further intrusion of the Federal Government into purely local government, with the local taxpayers shelling out the cash for this interference.

After the House Rules Committee turned down the scheme, the President took another route, to place the burden for action upon Congress by submitting the proposal as a reorganization plan. Unless specifically vetoed by either House or Senate within 60 days it will become law. Obviously the executive branch is in no hurry for action.

Congress now has the plan before it. It should act promptly to make the meaning of the House Rules Committee doubly clear.

Its answer should be given now. It should be a firm "No."

[From the Fort Lauderdale News, Jan. 26, 1962]

CONGRESSMEN SHOULD REFUSE TO PERFORM AS PUPPETS FOR THE WHITE HOUSE

When the House Rules Committee this week slapped down President Kennedy's proposal to create a new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, it may have signaled the start of a no-holds-barred battle between the President and the Congress that is certain to have a lot of reverberations before it is finished.

Within minutes after the powerful House committee had rejected the President's plan, Mr. Kennedy grimly informed reporters at his press conference he was going over the heads of the committee members and resubmit his proposal to the full Congress in the form of a reorganization plan.

Furthermore, the President announced, he was definitely going to appoint a Negro, Robert Weaver, present housing administrator, to the new Cabinet post that would be created under his reorganization plan, thus making Weaver the first Negro to ever hold such a high administrative position.

The political motives behind Mr. Kennedy's actions are obvious for all to see. By submitting his proposal to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing to the Congress as a reorganization plan, the new Department will automatically be created 60 days after it is submitted unless, within this period, either the Senate or the House adopts a resolution of disapproval.

Thus, the President will put both Houses of the Congress on the "hot spot." With this being an election year, and with the racial issue being directly injected into this controversy by the President with his flat statement he will appoint a Negro to this new Cabinet post, many Congressmen who might otherwise be inclined to vote against the President's reorganization plan will be afraid to do so for fear of being labeled anti-Negro in the fall campaigning.

It is regrettable that the racial issue has been thrown into this fight but it well demonstrates just how far the President and his liberal advisers are willing to go to steamroller their legislative demands through the Congress.

This is a "blackjacking" deal pure and simple and it stands as just another illustration of what Mr. Kennedy meant when he stated in his state of the Union message that his administration "has shown as never before how much could be done through the full use of Executive powers."

All over this Nation today strong and valid objections are being voiced against the establishment of a new Federal Department whose sole objective will be to deal in urban affairs. These objections are not concerned in any way with the racial issue. They stem from the fact that many people don't believe the Federal Government has any business trying to stick its long nose into the affairs of city and municipal governments, and that any department established to carry out this function will eventually become another bureaucratic monster shortchanging the people out of their tax money and trying to tell them how to run their lives right down to the community level.

The House Rules Committee recognized the legitimacy of these objections when it rejected by a 6 to 3 vote a bill to set up this new Department by regular legislative processes.

But this only stirred Mr. Kennedy's ire and his determination to shove this deal down the throat of Congress, regardless of consequences, all the further. Apparently, he doesn't believe the House Rules Committee represents the sentiment of the Congress as a whole even though it was stacked with administration supporters just last year.

So now he is trying a different approach and injecting the racial issue into it, knowing full well that all House Members and one-third of the Senate membership have to stand for reelection this fall with many of them representing areas of substantial Negro population, most of whom will be apt to judge a vote against the President's reorganization plan as a vote against giving a Negro a Cabinet position.

If this is the way the President is going to play ball with Congress this session we certainly hope the Members of Congress have enough guts to resist this kind of power politics. This whole business of trying to create another bureaucratic monstrosity to further increase the power of the Federal Government at the local level is not only unnecessary but is just another step toward the socialistic state that the Harvard professors and the liberal do-gooders around the President want to create.

Ours is not a government wherein the executive department is supposed to be the supreme authority. It is still supposed to be a government of checks and balances, with the Congress acting as a check on the executive department's seizure of too much power.

To exercise such a checkrein, however, we need men in Congress and not mice. And, in our book, when Mr. Kennedy starts boasting of how much he can do through the full use of his Executive powers we think it is about time the Members of Congress started acting like independent men instead of conducting themselves like puppets controlled by strings leading from the White House.

JACK W. GORE

KENNEDY'S PLANS FOR AID TO STATES, CITIES MAY SPUR CENTRALIZATION OF GOVERNMENT

(By Lindley H. Clark, Jr.)

State and local governments are being urged to lean a little harder on Uncle Sam. And there's some question whether any significant number of Americans want to halt this trend toward centralized government.

The latest suggestion that States and cities should become more dependent on Washington comes from President Kennedy, and it will be implicit in a number of the administration's legislative proposals that will be considered by the current Congress.

Mr. Kennedy is asking funds to help States and cities build bomb shelters and schools and embark on a variety of improvement projects. Among the items tabbed for improvement: teachers' salaries, school lunches, public welfare programs, the quality of education, and public transportation in urban areas.

Past experience indicates most State and local governments will accept the new Federal handouts, if Congress goes along with the President's plan to provide them. Total Federal aid to lesser governmental units then could zoom to $9.9 billion in the year starting July 1, an increase of 14 percent from the estimate for the current fiscal year and more than triple the figure of a decade ago.

A STRAIN ON SOME BUDGETS

In some cases, the aid programs require State and local governments to put up funds of their own to supplement the money from Washington. New demands may strain the budgets of some governments that already are having fiscal difficulties. But the States and cities that pass up new Federal aid, for financial or other reasons, are likely to be in a tiny minority.

Federal aid is popular with State and local officials for a number of reasons. It helps them provide services and facilities that at least a certain segment of their citizens consider desirable. It may spare them the sometimes politically dangerous task of raising taxes to finance such new spending. Or, in the alternative, it allows them to avoid the chore of cutting outlays on other projects.

Inevitably, Federal grants are speeding the trend toward centralized government. In 1913, State and local governments collected about two-thirds of all tax revenue, while the Federal Government accounted for about one-third. Now, these shares are almost reversed. Then, too, Washington more and more is deciding how State and local governments should spend their money.

AN EARLY AID SCHEME

Though Federal aid to States and cities has expanded enormously in the past few years, it is no recent invention. As long ago as 1837, at the close of Andrew Jackson's administration, Washington was handing the States sizable sums, at least by those days' standards. At that time, the Federal Government was embarrassed by, of all things, an accumulated surplus. Protectionists, led by Henry Clay, feared that freetraders would use the surplus as a pretext for cutting import duties, then the Government's chief source of revenue. So they launched a successful drive to hand most of the surplus to the States.

The distribution, which came to $28 million, led to chaos. When the Federal Government shifted funds from the banks to State treasuries, the banks were left in a shaky position and the money market was tightened sharply. The States used the funds to add already existing inflationary pressures, either by handing them out to their citizens or by launching big capital

spending programs. The distribution was suspended when a financial panic broke out late in 1837.

In later years, the Federal Government was seldom to hand the States gifts without strings attached. Grants and loans were made for specific purposes and, increasingly, Washington began to look over the shoulders of State and local officials to see that the money was spent as the Federal Government intended.

For a long time, the Federal handouts remained small. As late as 1914, total grants-in-aid amounted to only $8 million. In the next few years, however, subsidies for highway construction were greatly expanded, and Washington began providing funds for programs in vocational education, maternal and child-health care, forest-fire prevention and other areas. By 1925, grants had reached an annual total of $100 million, a figure then considered staggering.

GRANTS CLIMB IN 1930'S

During the depression of the 1930's, grants-in-aid shot upward anew, with the initiation of many new programs in social welfare, education and public works. By 1940, the annual total had reached nearly $900 million. During World War II Federal tax revenue, spending and borrowing continued to expand while State and local fiscal activity, as a percentage of the total, shrank sharply.

The Federal Government now is tapping many revenue sources so heavily that the States and cities could ill afford to reclaim any significant number of the services they have allowed, willingly or unwillingly, to come under Federal control. President Eisenhower in 1959 initiated conferences looking toward handing the States both some revenue sources and some spending responsibilities, but so far nothing has come of this. Now the trend toward centralization seems stronger then ever.

Consider some of the programs outlined in President Kennedy's new budget last week:

Public school aid: The administration is backing a 3-year program involving $2.1 billion of Federal grants for teachers' salaries and educational facilities. The only stipulation, according to the budget, is that each State's own effort or contribution must be maintained or increased.

Quality of education: Federal grants are proposed to pay for supplementary training of teachers and for provision of improved teaching media, techniques and curricula. Spending is set at $40 million in fiscal 1963, but the administration is seeking authorization to spend a total of $120 million.

Bomb shelters: "For 1963," Mr. Kennedy said, "I am requesting * * * $460 million for a new cost-sharing program with State and local governments and private organizations to provide shelters in selected community buildings, such as schools and hospitals."

Urban mass transportation: According to the budget, the administration will propose legislation to provide new Federal aid to urban mass transport. Outlays in fiscal 1963 were estimated at $15 million, but the administration will ask the power to spend a total of $100 million. Federal studies, according to the budget, indicate "the inadequacy of local and private resources to restore balance in urban transportation systems as long as Federal aid for urban transportation is exclusively for highway programs."

This only-Washington-can-do-it theme has taken Federal Government agencies into some rather unusual areas. The Commerce Department, for example, plans to hand out $4.6 million next fiscal year for control of outdoor advertising along highways. The Housing and Home Finance Agency is scheduled to spend $42 million in fiscal 1963 to acquire open areas around cities and thus help cope with a problem that Mr. Kennedy calls one of our most pressing: the provision of adequate outdoor recreational facilities.

And there's no indication that this trend toward centralization of power in Washington is likely to be halted or even slowed, whatever the lingering protests of States rights advocates.

The United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, much is being said and written these days about the United Nations and our membership in that body.

One of the best discussions I have read about this very important issue is that provided by Mr. Fred C. Morse, of Austin, Tex., in his "Personals" column which he is good enough to publish in the American-Statesman of Austin. This particular column appeared on January 21, 1962.

Mr. Morse is a well-known banker and much admired civic leader of Austin and Texas. He takes a keen interest in public affairs and his columns each week are thoughtful comments on a wide range of important issues confronting the people of our city, State, and Nation.

The column to which I refer is as follows:

THE UNITED NATIONS

Shall we junk the United Nations? Most emphatically, we say "no." The Soviet Union has done so much to wreck it we are inclined to believe they would vote for its dissolution. They probably hesitate as the international group furnishes them a screen for them to work and plot behind. Many Americans are now actively advocating that the United States get out, arguing that the world is not ready for an international union. Even Adlai Stevenson seems to be inclined to weaken in the defense of his organization.

The Communist nations refuse to pay any part of the expense of the United Nations. They smart under the lashing the organization gives them whenever such questions as Hungary and others of their satellites come up. However, they still attend the sessions and make long speeches about the imperialists on the other side of the table. It would seem to us that they would hesitate to show up at a meeting where they refuse to carry their part of the load and where they are so unpopular. There can be no question that their reasons are anything but altruistic. Considering their attitude and that of the other Communist nations they must have some ulterior motives which influences them to stay with it.

Well, what have we to gain by furnishings the millions of dollars necessary to defray the expenses of the United Nations? It is certain that we have no pecuniary interest and we do not need the protection, if any, that our membership in the organization gives us. Americans are idealists; we hate war and anything that furthers the cause of peace appeals strongly to us. We have no selfish ambitions to serve and, being a wealthy nation, we do not want any of the territory of other nations. We are a Christian nation and believe in helping the weaker nations of the earth. Without an international organization it would be hard to protect the smaller nations. We are trying to put an end to war so all nations can live together in peace.

We have after great effort, built up an organization of nations which has already done great good. More than once we have been able to avoid war by using the good offices of the United Nations. The world has advanced to a stage where some kind of world government is desirable and necessary. For many years we have worked and fought for the rights of free nations as against powerful dictators. Recently it would appear we have stopped the progress of anarchy in central Africa. The United Nations has done a great deal of good curbing the ambitions of predatory nations so why should we throw away all that has been accomplished? If we throw away all that has been gained by our sweat and tears now the rights of men will be set back a hundred years. We know that it will only be a few years before another United Nations association will be organized if this one is discarded for all men recognize that the idea is good. So why not go forward and use what we have learned toward perfecting what we have? Ultimately the rights of men will triumph and the present Communist nations will gradually rid themselves of their dictator rulers. Then, as Tennyson has it:

"Till the war drums throbbed no longer
And the battle flags were furl'd
In the Parliament of man,
The Federation of the world."

President Stoops to Political Chicanery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Daily News is the largest circulated newspaper in the United States. Published as it is in the largest city in the United States, its editorial on President Kennedy's new cabinet office is both revealing and timely, as it appeared in today's issue:

THUMBS DOWN ON THIS ONE

On Tuesday of last week, President Kennedy sent Congress notice of his plan to reorganize the Housing and Home Finance Agency, christen it the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, and thus add an 11th member to the Cabinet.

Either House of Congress can kill off the plan within 60 days from last Tuesday (January 30), by a straight majority vote. Lacking such a thumbs-down by either the Senate or the House within the time specified, the new Department will be established.

The President has promised to name the esteemed Robert C. Weaver as first Secretary of Urban Affairs. Mr. Weaver, a Negro, is at present Chief of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The President is supposed to have performed a brilliant political maneuver, by pinning an anti-Negro label in advance to any Senator or Representative who votes to slaughter the urban affairs scheme.

In our opinion, the President has attemped a cheap peanut-political trick, which is an insult to the intelligence of Negro voters, and which well may blow up in the President's handsome face.

Also in our opinion, the urban affairs gimmick would be bad no matter who its pilot might be.

The President argues that this country has changed from chiefly a farm and smalltown setup to a nation loaded with big- and medium-size cities. Therefore, he says, we need a Federal department to help the cities solve their problems of housing, slum clearance, transportation, etc.

Interestingly enough, Mr. Kennedy doesn't propose to cut down or cut out the Department of Agriculture, now that we've become so citified. The farmers don't need all those Agriculture bureaucrats riding herd on them, but the bureaucrats certainly need those jobs, or think they do.

GREAT BRAIN STUFF AGAIN

The proposed new Department would blanket a new flock of bureaucrats into a lot of shiny new Government jobs. These persons would at once begin empirebuilding, making work for themselves (or what looks like work), and swelling the urban affairs payrolls and appropriations from year to year.

Each city and town in the Nation has its own problems, most of which differ from those of other cities and towns. These problems can be best solved by the local people and their elected public servants. A great brain in Washington cannot solve them, and in most cases can be counted on to make them worse.

Imagine Mayor Wagner and the board of estimate, for example, having to take orders from a bunch of "experts" in Washington, most of whom couldn't find their way out of the Grand Central terminal.

All of which is to say that one or both Houses of Congress can best serve the American people by slapping down this revival of New Deal great brainism, within the 60-day time limit mentioned above.

More of the Strange Economic Philosophy of the President's Key Advisers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune calls attention to some more of the strange and unrealistic economic philosophy of those who are now directing our national policy. This editorial proves once again that the President and his keymen do not understand our free enterprise system nor its economics.

GETTING RICH BY GOING BROKE

Last week two of the medicine men of New Frontier economics dedicated themselves to instructing Congress that raising the national debt limit $10 billion to an alltime high of $308 billion isn't anything to worry about, nor is the debt itself growing more burdensome despite its constant rise.

It is, of course, a fact that interest on the debt takes close to 10 cents of every tax dollar, but this also, in the Pollyanna view, is something we can live with without worrying much.

The two apostles to the congressional Philistines are Walter Heller, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, and David E. Bell, Director of the Budget, and their argument goes like this:

It is true that raising the statutory limit on the debt signifies an increase in the debt if only dollars are considered, but the more constructive way to look at it is that the debt is really going down in proportion to a rise in the gross national product.

Well, you say, now isn't that interesting, and what is the gross national product? The way the Washington soothsayers view it, the gross national product is an index of national well-being. The bigger it gets, the more prosperous we are all supposed to be.

By their definition, the GNP is the total output of goods and services. In the last quarter of 1961 the GNP was placed at $542 billion, and Mr. Kennedy, in his economic message a week ago, predicted that it would increase to somewhere around $565 billion in the second quarter of this year.

The debt now stands at $298 billion, soon to press upward toward the new limit Mr. Kennedy seeks, but, according to the Heller-Bell theory, the debt, as a percentage of GNP, is actually diminishing. Thus, in 1954, a debt of $271 billion represented 74 percent of a gross national product of $363 billion, whereas the present debt of $298 billion is only 55 percent of the fourth quarter GNP of $542 billion.

On this theory, the deeper we get into debt, the better off we should be, just so long as the GNP keeps rising at a faster rate than the debt.

This certainly sounds comforting, but, as Senator GOLDWATER recently remarked, the gross national product would more appropriately be known as "the gross national lie." For one reason, because Government spending is counted as part of the GNP; for another, because the same transactions are counted as many as six times in computing the GNP.

The rationalizations of the apologists for spending and debt are as phony as the base from which they launch them. The Constitution says that Congress has the power "to borrow money on the credit of the United States." The way things have been going, the day will come when there won't be any credit left.

Communism and the Threat To Combat It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 26, 1962

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, not the least of the many signal contributions J. Edgar Hoover has made to our Nation is his ability to state clearly and succinctly the responsibilities of citizenship and the dangers of subversion. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Mr. Hoover from the Retired Officer magazine, the publication of the Retired Officers Association:

COMMUNISM AND THE KNOWLEDGE TO COMBAT IT

(By John Edgar Hoover)

When a citizen of one country dies in a country other than his own, it might be expected that authorities would be gracious in offering assistance and in discharging any essential formalities. In the absence of exceptional circumstances, a death abroad receives no particular attention, apart from the humane amenities.

A few months ago an event of this type occurred in the capital city of a foreign power. It was treated in anything other than routine and matter-of-fact fashion, but few Americans appeared to take note of it. The item, relegated to the obituary columns on the back pages, was brief. One newspaper carried a seven-paragraph report by one of the wire services. Another devoted five paragraphs to the same story.

And what was the story?

An aged and ill American citizen had died in Russia. The press reported the man's funeral in normal fashion, but there was nothing ordinary about the final obsequies accorded William Z. Foster, former national chairman of the Communist Party of the United States, and, at the time of his death, Chairman Emeritus of the Party's National Committee.

According to press reports, the body of the aged Communist lay in state in the Hall of Columns in Moscow's Trade Union House. Black chiffon veiled the crystal chandeliers. A hundred-piece symphony orchestra played dirges as thousands of men and women filed past. The wife of Russia's ruler, garbed in black, sat on the mourners' bench. Dictator Khrushchev himself headed the top-ranking Communists who stood as honor guards. According to one press report, this honor guard "read like a who's who of Russian power."

Consider this incident as it was presented by the press and ask yourself why the most powerful totalitarian rulers on the face of the earth should pay tribute to William Z. Foster who, as a citizen claiming the rights of an American, owed full allegiance to the free United States, not to Soviet Russia.

A reasonable person could conclude only one thing: a servant was being rewarded. William Z. Foster, who followed every devious twist of the Communist Party line, who devoted his life to the advancement of totalitarian communism, who predicted in the dedication of a book that his great-grandson would live in a Communist United States, and who at the time of his death was under indictment for a crime which, in essence, charged him with conspiring to teach and advocate the destruction of our free Government, was receiving the award for his lifelong labors.

The picture presented by the press of brutal totalitarian dictators mourning the demise of a man who spent his lifetime working against every principle on which our Republic is founded should be remembered. That picture should be called to mind when apologists for communism seek to persuade the uninformed that the Communist Party is "just another political party like the Democratic and Republican Parties."

The Communist Party is not "just another political party." It does not accept or abide by democratic processes. And Communists are not liberals. They are not progressives. They are not social reformers. Above all, Communists are not American, despite their use of every Aesopian trick in the nook to trap the unwary into accepting a doctrine of absolutism falsely labeled "American."

Communism represents everything abhorrent to the American ideal. Whenever it gains the ascendancy it ushers in totalitarian dictatorship with its rigged elections, purges, slave labor camps, brutality and all-pervading fear. Yet this ultimate in enslavement, which by treason and trickery seeks to destroy this great Republic and force the United States of America to grovel under the absolute domination of a brutal philosophy of materialism, continues to portray itself as the ultimate good for mankind. Unfortunately, there are many American citizens who as yet have no real understanding of this totalitarian menace which threatens to engulf civilization and who accept such propaganda at face value. Unthinking people assume that it is the intent of Communist regimes to reform and improve existing institutions. They do not understand that communism intends to destroy existing institutions, to remake mankind and to change the world.

Americans can utilize and preserve their own free government only as long as they understand the philosophy on which it was

founded and accept the responsibility inherent in its operation. Similarly, they can combat totalitarian communism effectively only when they have gained a true understanding of the philosophy which motivates Communists. Communist attitudes, Communist conduct and Communist activities remain relatively incomprehensible until the individual becomes fully aware of the basic ideas which undergird the current Communist political mechanism.

There are eight such basic ideas. These ideas are repeated again and again in the volumes written by Marx, Engels, and Lenin. Let us sum them up briefly, for one must understand them and their implications in order to know and understand the deadly evil we call communism.

In briefest terms, the groundwork of the Communist philosophy is as follows:

Nature is all. There is no God—no creator. Man was not made in His image for He does not exist. Rather, man is the product of the ceaseless interaction of chemical and physical elements. Man differs only in degree—not in essence—from a clod of earth, the twig on a tree, or the cat in the jungle. He has no soul. Mind and soul are not grounded in reality. Matter is the only reality—matter which is in contant motion and which changes form. Mind is a function of matter and is wholly dependent upon matter. The material body is all. God does not exist. The soul does not exist. Religions originated in superstition. They are false and harmful and must be ruthlessly destroyed inasmuch as belief in religion hinders the advance of communism.

The supernatural does not exist. All existing moral codes derived from supernatural concepts are false. There is no such thing as an absolute right or wrong . Since the Ten Commandments are rooted in a concept of God, they must be rejected. The moral laws derived from them are invalid. Proletarian utility constitutes the sole acceptable moral code. Licentiousness, theft, falsehood and murder are not inherently immoral. Indeed, each becomes moral if it serves to advance or maintain the Communist social order. Each becomes immoral only when it in any way hinders the revolution or weakens communism.

The only correct interpretation of history is the materialistic interpretation; that is, history originates, is controlled and is directed by the immutable laws of economic determinism. All human institutions, political, cultural, social, moral and religious, have their origin in the economic factor. History is the story of class struggle. It does not reflect the spirit of man.

Private ownership of property is largely responsible for the ills of the world. The capitalist state grew out of savage class struggles over private ownership. The capitalist state is an instrument of oppression and must be destroyed along with such instruments of capitalism as free schools, free press, and the church. Cultural organs must be controlled. Private ownership must be eliminated. A dictatorship of the proletariat must be erected to supplant the capitalist state.

Owners of property are not likely to surrender their privileged position peacefully; therefore, revolution and a revolutionary method to achieve that revolution are necessary. There must be agitation of the entire social order, development of class warfare, use of hatred as a weapon and utilization of dupes who, unaware of ultimate Communist objectives, can be used to help translate the theory of revolution into reality. Party members must infiltrate all phases of the existing social order. Proceeding according to a pattern which is flexible in practical programs as adapted to different localities and situations but which is wholly inflexible as to principles and objectives, such Communists must work themselves into strategic positions. Once in such positions, they will be enabled to exert their influence on vast numbers of people. Indeed, their influence will be out of all proportion to their numbers. The efforts of these individuals will develop the revolutionary situation to the proper pitch, at which time these persons will direct the violent and bloody action by which communism comes to power. Once communism is in full control, all other social orders will be liquidated inasmuch as only a worldwide Communist social order conforms to the nature of man, meets the needs of life and is adequate.

This, then, is the reality of what freemen face from encroaching communism. We must know the nature of the enemy. We must acquaint ourselves with the activities of the enemy. We must seek to understand how Communists can dupe the well-meaning but uninformed into doing their work. We must learn to be wary of propaganda, and we must become aware of the fact that every organization and institution is a target which the Communist conspirators hope and expect to infiltrate.

We must never underestimate the Communist menace, yet in the course of combating this deadly enemy utmost care is imperative. We can harm ourselves and our Nation by yielding to the panicky fear which results in hysteria, witch hunts and vigilante activities. We can do grave injustice to the innocent by repeating idle rumor and malicious gossip. Indiscriminate inquiries and private investigators similarly can be harmful to the innocent. In addition, such actions very well may jeopardize the vital work of responsible security agencies. The person who secures information relative to espionage, sabotage or subversive activities should report it immediately to the FBI without attempting to take individual action.

We can do much to enhance our security merely by strengthening the spiritual forces in our separate communities. We can teach youthful Americans to understand and appreciate this miracle which is our free Government. We can help them to understand why individual rights are permitted to exist only under governments predicated upon a philosophy which acknowledges the worth and dignity of every living soul. In short, through knowledge we can do much to combat communism, the deadly evil which afflicts our age.

American Tradition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in this period when emphasis seems to be on problems of the Nation rather than on the advances we are making, I believe it important to continually reappraise economic conditions and in a calm fashion properly interpret the changing economic situation. The Southwest Messenger Press, publishers of a chain of independent community newspapers in south suburban Cook County, provides just such a service to the public in an editorial of Thursday, February 1, entitled "American Tradition." I ask leave to insert it into the RECORD at this point.

AMERICAN TRADITION

While the world is being bombarded with fantastic claims about Communist accomplishments, and Russia's ability to wipe out the human race, it is refreshing to read the following constructive remarks by Burl S. Watson, chairman of Cities Service.

"It is in the American tradition not to be satisfied with less than maximum achievement. At the same time, it is well to remember that economic progress is never one of the uninterrupted flight forward. Rather it is the sum total of advance, pauses, and even some slipping back.

"Since the turn of the century, the United States has experienced a financial panic (1907); a stock market crash (1929); a subsequent 'depression'; and along the line, less violent reversals generally styled 'recessions'. In this period of time, however, living standards reached the highest levels ever achieved.

"Three out of every five American families have become owners of their own homes, compared to one in three in 1900. Far better educational opportunities are being offered to American young people.

Newspapers Question Wisdom of President's Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the President's farm program, like so many of the other proposals he has sent to Congress this year, again offers the same tired formula of meeting every problem with the solution of more Federal controls. After nearly 30 years of trying to solve the problems of agriculture through Government fiat and abandoning the freedom of farmers to produce and sell in a free marketplace, would you not think we would give up? But not the bureaucrats, farming from Washington desks. If a program has failed, their solution is to add to the program, figuring that by increasing a formula that has been proved wrong, the end result will be right. The best way to solve the problems of agriculture is to free the farmer from Federal controls and give American agriculture its head. I would much rather trust the intelligence, the experience, and the proven know-how of our farmers who created the greatest agricultural plant on earth than the bureaucrats and the theorists whose efforts have been marked by nothing but failure.

The following selection of editorial comment on the President's farm proposals offer much food for thought. The first, "Not as Easy as ABC," is from the Dallas Morning News. The second, "The Managed Abundance," from the Wall Street Journal, and the third, "Managed Chaos," the Chicago Tribune:

[From the Dallas Morning News, Feb. 2, 1962]

NOT AS EASY AS A B C

An A-B-C-D program for the 1960's in agriculture is offered the Nation by the Kennedy administratio.n Abundance, balance, conservation and development—the goals

listed in the farm program submitted to Congress Wednesday—are things upon which practically everyone agrees. Who would dare oppose—or have reason to be against—fair income for farmers, reasonable prices for consumers, abundance for future generations and ending rural poverty?

The methods proposed to achieve this beautiful dream are questionable, complicated and controversial. For the big "problem" commodities, where previous controls have failed, more and more restrictions are the suggested solution. Producers of feed grains, wheat and dairy products, for example, would vote in referendums either to accept stringent regulations or to do without price supports which have been propping up agriculture for almost 30 years.

Comments from farm leaders and Members of Congress suggest some of the reasons for the widespread opposition that is certain to grow.

More controls are offered, when fewer controls are the necessary objectives of agriculture if it is ever to achieve stability.

No real choice is offered farmers who vote in the referendums. Sure, they can vote for freedom from Washington. But when they do, they will be voting away so much of their income that they will commit economic suicide. After decades of dependence upon Washington's sugar-tit, agriculture can stand gradual weaning, but not sudden starvation.

"Naked coercion," in the words of the head of a major farm organization, is held over agriculture's head for failure to go along with the Kennedy program. And the hook for support from the economy-minded rank and file is baited with a highly questionable promise that the new commodity controls will cost $5 billion less than the $12 billion cost, without such controls, during the next 4 years.

Squeezed between rising costs of labor, supplies and other necessities, but weakening values of their products, farmers face a serious situation. They are trying to find solutions that are fair, sound and lead to free enterprise. Farmers do this through responsible, conservative organizations such as American Farm Bureau Federation and the National Cotton Council.

Ignoring such counsel, the Kennedy administration is proposing a plan advocated by the more-radical economists and farming elements. Its trend is away from the fundamentals of economic soundness, no matter how glowingly it may be depicted in the President's message.

[From the Wall Street Journal]

THE MANAGED ABUNDANCE

President Kennedy's proposals to Congress for solving the problem of recurring farm surpluses and their mounting costs to the Federal Government somehow bring to mind those World War II days when the Office of Price Administration was in flower. The Government found, then, that once you embark on a program aimed at artificially stabilizing prices, there is no end to it. The choice soon gets to be between extending controls over just about everything, or abandoning them altogether.

Faced with what Mr. Kennedy describes as "the present patchwork of short-run emergency measures" that have brought about a "drift toward a chaotic, inefficient, surplus-ridden farm economy," the administration has made the expected choice. It recommends still more controls over agriculture to correct the problems that a hitherto limited control program has done so much to intensify.

Now, to be sure, the farmers do not have to accept the proposed new marketing limits on wheat, the new mandatory acreage allotment plan for feed grains or new marketing controls over milk. But if they take the long view and reject them, the Government will remove price supports from wheat and feed grains, and sharply reduce its buying of milk products. And the Government, in order to get rid of its surpluses, could dump grains on the market for whatever price they would bring.

This prospect of a temporary period of severe price readjustment may, to many farmers, appear to be too formidable to take a chance on. Offered the opportunity of immediate federally guaranteed price security as opposed to the future benefits of a free market, many undoubtedly will commit themselves to extension of Federal control over their operations.

But those who do should be prepared to accept all the consequences: The inevitable increase in supervisory, or policing machinery, broad new controls will require, the penalties for noncompliance, the increased dependence on the Government to make decisions on how much of which crops shall be grown and marketed. In short, acceptance of the administration plan will be an endorsement of increased regimentation for agriculture.

That is not how the program is described. It is called "an opportunity to manage abundance, rather than scarcity." History presents no evidence that efforts of Government to manage scarcity—as in the case of the OPA—have ended in anything other than confusion or worse. Nothing in the present chaotic farm controls suggests that much stiffer controls would manage abundance any better.

[From the Chicago Tribune]

MANAGED CHAOS

President Kennedy's farm message to Congress envisions the most far reaching Federal intervention, including the toughest controls, ever proposed for American agriculture. In one respect it resembles his state of the Union message. There is something in it for everybody.

Farmers are to have higher incomes. Taxpayers, so the President says, are to get relief through reduction of present surpluses and lower costs of handling them. Consumers will have a continued abundance of food. Schoolchildren will have better diets. The needy at home and abroad will have more to eat. And the public generally will benefit through wiser use of land and water resources for conservation and recreation.

All this is to be accomplished through Government dictation and regulation as divined by the bureaucrats in the Department of Agriculture.

The whole scheme betrays an utter lack of faith in the market system under private enterprise, which has made our agriculture the most efficient and productive in the world. Nowhere in the message is there any suggestion that farmers should ever be free to manage their own farms without large doses of Federal aid and controls. On the contrary, they are to become more dependent than ever on Government for their livelihood.

Implicit in the message are catches and contradictions that will not be lost on either farmers or taxpayers. Farm income is to be raised through higher fixed prices and subsidies, but at the expense of greater Government dictation in determining how much of certain important commodities each farmer could produce and market.

The type of strict controls proposed might reduce costly surpluses, but any savings to taxpayers likely would be more than offset by the huge costs of the subsidy programs proposed for feed grains, wheat, milk, and cotton, and the rural renewal programs patterned after urban renewal programs.

Mr. Kennedy maintains his proposals are designed to permit "maximum freedom and flexibility" in individual farm operations. Undoubtedly, they would minimize freedom and flexibility by freezing production patterns through the use of unfair historical base periods. This emphasizes an obvious contradiction—namely, that while the programs would restrict expansion of domestic markets for farmers, the President is advocating expanded trade and commerce throughout the world.

For the first time, mandatory planting and marketing controls would be imposed not only on corn, but also on other feed grains [oats, barley, grain sorghums], as well as on milk, and stricter controls would be placed on wheat. These would be accompanied by built-in devices designed to coerce farmers into accepting them, whether they wish to or not. The choice is simply to take the controls and subsidies, or face an abrupt cutoff of most price supports and other aid, without an alternate choice to allow for gradual elimination of Government from agriculture.

Moreover, although the programs would be subject to approval by a two-thirds majority of producers voting in referenda, farmers are put on notice that if they don't vote "yes" the Secretary of Agriculture will have authority to dump hundreds of millions of bushels of feed grains and wheat on the market to break prices. This is a brazen attempt to blackjack agriculture into surrendering to regimentation.

The President says the alternative to this program of "managed abundance" is a "drift toward a chaotic, inefficient, surplus ridden farm economy." His program would be an irretrievable plunge toward chaos and inefficiency in agriculture. Congress should reject this scheme in its entirety and start moving fast in the other direction.

It Is a Naked Act of Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, many so-called neutralist nations have tried to create the impression that neutralism is a device to acquire world peace. The Indian assault on Goa showed the way that government completely disregarded legal rights and principles of international diplomacy.

There has been enough saber rattling in India to expose that neutral and its Napoleonic-minded leader as being anything but a peaceful minded neutralist. I insert into the RECORD at this point an article from the Washington Daily News of Monday, February 5, entitled "It Is a Naked Act of Aggression," by Robert C. Ruark:

IT IS A NAKED ACT OF AGGRESSION

(By Robert C. Ruark)

LONDON.—The last time I was in Jakarta I did not bother to go ashore. I don't particularly care to be robbed by force, frisked, and hustled on currency by uniformed panderers who are dignified by uniforms sanctioned by President Sukarno of Indonesia.

It was easier to stay on the ship and listen to the complaints of the other unwary passengers who came back battered and generally bereft of any valuable, such as the cameras they took on a sightseeing tour.

You can almost unvaryingly judge a country's general administration by the habits of the small men in uniforms who wear guns and work in the customs and currency controls. Where banditry is open and rampant, the government cannot be far behind.

RIDICULOUS

In Sukarno's Indonesia a few years back there was a ridiculous rate on the rupia which the legal money changers themselves hinted you'd be stupid to accept. There was an almost logical rate which the boys were prepared to offer behind their hands, and if you wanted to really reach the true value of exchange, a proper black market was available to accommodate you.

You were shaken down by unabashed thugs who hinted broadly that it would be nice if you gave them your camera instead of having it taken from you by force. Nice, stupid tourists had their clothes removed, and their persons intimately investigated for the sin of thinking that going ashore in Jakarta might be educational.

SUCH RIGHTS

Indonesia, under the noisy globe-girdler, aid-money spender, Sukarno, has roughly as much right to Dutch New Guinea as he has to Australia on the one side and the Philippines on the other. The black Papuans of New Guinea never heard of Sukarno; they do not share his faith or blood or color.

Perhaps they do not belong to the Dutch, either, but the Dutch have as much right to govern them—and with considerably more skill—than the Indonesians, who have made a miserable joke of their own so-called independence under an absentee warlord, Sukarno, who knows more street names in Tokyo, Moscow, New York, London, and Washington than he does in his own graft-ridden, literally ungoverned country.

It is a land which has come along well under colonialism and trusteeship on the Australian half, with the unbelievably primitive people being gentled into such things as roads, bridges, pants and a kind of old-school propriety which frowns on killing your neighbor for fun.

NO, NO

But not, I should say, under the stewardship of the likes of Sukarno and Indonesia, which is a morass of splinter parties, varying faiths, political immorality, and deep ignorance of basic population.

Sukarno's repeated intentions to annex Dutch New Guinea under the name "West Irian" is as naked an act of aggression as was ever flourished by the Germans, the Russians, or, more latterly, the Red Chinese in India or the United Nations in Katanga.

Tito's Arrogance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial by Verne McKinney, of the Hillsboro (Oreg.) Argus:

TITO'S ARROGANCE

President Tito, of Yugoslavia, revealed both his ignorance and his arrogance again recently when he blasted "certain circles of capitalists and other reactionary people in America" for delaying aid to Yugoslavia in the form of wheat.

This is not the first time Tito has demonstrated his ignorance about the United States and his ignorance of the democratic system. He has been making just such remarks for more than 10 years.

In spite of Tito's arrogance, in taking shots at the American people and American capitalists, this country has continued to provide aid to Yugoslavia for many years now, on the reasoning that Tito was at least an independent Communist, who was also fighting with Moscow.

But it cannot be denied that he is a Communist, and that he holds dangerously prejudiced and warped views about the United States and the American people and their history. He is the victim of Communist propaganda about the free enterprise system and the democracies to such an obvious and ridiculous degree that it is strange that some of his own countrymen do not enlighten him, at least to some extent, as the years go by.

Stockpiling Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot about stockpiling from the President—although he failed to admit eight out of nine votes he cast for it while Senator.

Donald Rogers, in the New York Herald Tribune on February 4, discussed the whole subject matter in depth—something which President Kennedy did not do at his last press conference.

KENNEDY IMPALED ON OWN STOCKPILING PETARD?

(By Donald I. Rogers)

There can be no doubt that the stockpiling proclivities of the U.S. Government are—and always have been—something to merit not only constant supervision but frequent investigation. It is an amusing part of the legend that until a few years back the Army maintained a fairly substantial stockpile of cavalry saddles along with its unused hoards of canned hamburgers and tinned willie-beef.

Unless there is a big scandal brewing, however, as Washington correspondents have been hinting, President Kennedy displayed unusual irresponsibility in his purely gratuitous and unsubstantiated statement that there had been "unconscionable profits" in the stockpiling program.

If Mr. Kennedy wants an investigation of stockpiling, he should have asked for it.

If, however, he wanted to make an indictment of the business community, whose support he has been wooing, that is exactly what he did.

With his ill-advised indictment of the businessman, though, he also indicted his own administration, for he clearly pointed up the fact that the Government, which he wants to have supervise economics for everyone everywhere, can't even handle its own economic and business affairs properly.

For the stockpiling is done by Government, not by business. The Government does the buying; business, the selling.

Government buying of strategic materials has been based on two basic ideas: (1) To stockpile things that must be shipped to this country from foreign ports and thus might be in doubtful supply during a war; and (2) to stockpile things mined or produced domestically that, normally, were not mined or produced in sufficient capacity to enable the country to fight a war.

In the case of the former, the profits involved were turned over to the foreign producers. In the case of the latter, (domestic producers) prices paid by the Government were usually destitute prices, paid to keep an operation in business or to increase capacity.

This was not particularly true in aluminum (as it was in silver and other metals), but since the President singled out aluminum, it might be well to give that area some consideration.

At the outset of World War II aluminum was in desperately short supply. As a result, the Government created several multi-billion-dollar aluminum-producing plants.

It built up the producing capacity of the American aluminum industry and even went so far as to create plants in other parts of the world nearer the source of supply (Ghana, for instance).

At war's end, anxious to get out of business, the Government sold its aluminum plants to Reynolds, Kaiser, and others at less than cost, and obliged them to go into business against an established giant like Alcoa.

Betimes the stockpiling of aluminum continued—at the behest of Government, at prices fixed by Government.

But what is the biggest problem besetting the aluminum industry today? It is overcapacity.

Overcapacity is the problem in uranium, too, though it was only a few years back that the Government couldn't buy enough of it.

It wasn't until Uncle Sam had urged prospectors to go into all parts of the globe seeking uranium ores that it was discovered that the one-thing the old world seems to be loaded with is uranium. We didn't need so much. Stockpiling ended.

This is only to point out that stockpiling requirements change from week to week, month to month. Only a short time ago, the Government couldn't buy enough lithium because it was regarded as the best of the high energy fuels for missiles. Later, scientists changed their minds. The stockpiling ceased.

Some armchair strategists say we should stockpile for a 3- to 5-year war. Others say we needn't bother because any war of the future may be ended in a few days.

Yet commonsense indicates that it isn't war we're concerned with so much as source of supply. Take tin. The principal supply comes from Latin America where, anyone must admit, the possibility exists that the United States could become persona non grata. The second, and to all practical purposes, the only other source of supply of tin is from the Congo. This is an area where the source could be shut off at any time.

Under these conditions, who's to measure the length of time a stockpile should serve us?

The important thing is that most of this strategic stockpile has a market value. If we have overbought in any ore, metal or product, most of them can be sold at current market prices, and that should mean, in most cases, that they can be sold at a profit.

So what's so bad about all this?

Speaking of Stockpiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with the President's belated acknowledgement of the cost and inherent waste in our program of stockpiling, and with the gentle reminder from Senator WIL-

LIAMS of the President's support of the program while serving in the Senate, it is appropriate that we look into other factors, including the inconsistencies practiced by Senator SYMINGTON.

Obviously, this whole issue involves complex mechanism and certain debatable decisions. The Chicago Tribune, in its editorial of February 3, most effectively points out some pertinent thoughts. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this editorial entitled "Speaking of Stockpiles" into the RECORD:

SPEAKING OF STOCKPILES

After a year in office Mr. Kennedy has suddenly discovered, with every appearance of righteous indignation, that the Government stockpile of strategic materials, which has been building up since 1946, is a national scandal and a potential source of "unconscionable profits" to someone.

The stockpile, he finds, has grown to $7.7 billion worth of 50 materials, which is about twice as much as would be needed or could be used in a 3-year war. One must assume that the magpie traits of the procurement officials continued in full play throughout Mr. Kennedy's year in office, but he evidently seeks to shift whatever blame there may be upon the predecessor Republican administration.

He has therefore called upon Senator STUART SYMINGTON, chairman of a Stockpiling Subcommittee, to investigate. Mr. SYMINGTON recognizes some possible embarrassments, as is evident from his preliminary maneuvers. It is not only the Republicans have recalled that, as a Senator, Mr. Kennedy voted eight out of nine times against curtailing stockpiles. There are also some other worries.

There is, for instance, the fact that if there is any congressional supervision of the stockpiling process, it would fall upon Senator SYMINGTON's own committee. But this body has no full time staff members and no investigators, and, if Mr. Kennedy's complaints are justified, part of the onus obviously is to be attributed to the negligence of Senator SYMINGTON and his colleagues. As vast windrows of materials built up, the subcommittee was looking the other way.

Another source of possible embarrassment is that, while Mr. Kennedy objects to a $7.7 billion stockpile of strategic materials, he is obliged to reconcile this indignation with his utter tolerance of another stockpile of equal dimensions, created and maintained by the policy of the Democratic majority in Congress and his own Secretary of Agriculture. This is, of course, the stockpile of surplus agricultural commodities.

The Department of Agriculture reported as recently as January 12 that price support loans and inventories represented an investment of $7,647,236,000, and that of this total inventories accounted for $5,441,013,000. Thus the farm stockpile is almost the same size as the other inventory which stirs Mr. Kennedy's wrath.

Mr. SYMINGTON, discerning this flaw in logic, hurriedly endeavored to cover up the inconsistency by stating that the agricultural stockpile would be more important in the event of war than "any surplus of metals and minerals." He also took the poetic license of describing the materials stockpile as exceeding the agricultural stockpile by "many billions of dollars," though, as we have seen, they are of almost equal dimensions.

Apparently waste itself isn't what bothers the New Frontier: It's the kind of waste. There is "good" waste, as in Secretary Freeman's farm operations, and "bad" waste, as in hoards of materials which certainly possess at least the advantage to be derived from salvage.

Thus we are notified in advance that any villains are to be, preferably, Republicans, and that it is unthinkable that the former Republican Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, who tried for years to bring the agricultural waste under control, should be allowed to emerge as a hero. In other words, Mr. Kennedy is proceeding on the familiar base of politics as usual, and, speaking of excessive outlays and attendant waste, please don't mention that $92½ billion budget he has just presented.

Pro-Reds Support Racial Agitators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, persons fronting for the Communist Party work hand-in-glove with groups working for compulsory mixing of the races.

Jack Lotto, writing in the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News has performed a distinct public service by exposing the manner in which members of the Communist Party and organizations promoting freedom rides, sit-ins, and other racial agitation movements, closely coordinate their activities.

Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Lotto's article which appeared in the January 27, 1962, issue of the Jackson Daily News:

PRO-RED "ABOLITIONISTS," DIXIE MIXERS HOBNOBBING

(By Jack Lotto)

To help its readers keep on guard against propaganda, the Daily News brings you an authoritative weekly roundup of pro-Communist activities.

The "wreckers" have moved into Washington.

The smashers call themselves the National Committee to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee, which tells their goal and target.

A bigger batch of pro-Communists would be hard to find. At least six top leaders of this group have been identified as Communist Party members by the House committee.

They are Harvey O'Connor, of Little Compton, R.I.; Rev. William Howard Melish, of New York; Miss Florence Luscomb, of Cambridge, Mass.; Russ Nixon, of Washington; Richard Criley, of Chicago; and Frank Wilkinson, of Los Angeles.

The pro-Red lobbying in the Nation's Capital is aimed at scuttling the House committee by the wide-door method—getting its budget chopped to the point where it would become inoperative.

They, of course, would prefer to try to get Congress to kill the committee outright, but they know they don't have a chance on this goal this year. So, they decided the realistic short-term project should be to concentrate their fight on the funds.

The Washington office is being used by these birds and some affiliated pro-Red organizations to coordinate the cut-the-budget campaign.

Meanwhile, a hero's welcome was being prepared for the "big brains" behind the overall abolition drive—whose jail term ends on February 1.

The "coming out" parties are planned for Wilkinson, an identified Communist Party member, and another imprisoned partner, Carl Braden, of Louisville, Ky.

Braden, identified under oath as a Red, is active in the anti-House committee drive and integration propaganda in the South.

Both received 1-year prison terms, which end Thursday, February 1, for contempt of Congress.

Wilkinson will be hailed at a New York reception the night he gets out of jail. A pro-Communist Chicago group does the honors the next night, with a welcome-home party scheduled in Los Angeles, on February 14, among others.

CHEERS FOR BRADEN

Braden isn't being overlooked either in the cheers department. Braden will be the honor guest at a New York reception sponsored by a group called the New York Committee of the Friends of Southern Conference Educational Fund.

The star attraction is field secretary of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc., of New Orleans, cited by a Senate committee as a national Red front.

Listed speakers at the Braden party are Rev. Wyatt T. Walker, executive secretary of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Ella J. Baker, of Atlanta, member of the executive committee of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, and Bob Zellner, southern student recently jailed in McComb, Miss.

Muzzling the Military

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, the recent controversy over the so-called muzzling of the military has brought forth an outpouring of comment and discussion in the national press. In the Chicago Tribune of January 30, a distinguished citizen and resident of my district, Prof. Jeremiah Buckley, gave a cogent reply to those who would wish to change our traditional policy of leaving the discussion and formation of national purposes and aims to civil authorities.

Professor Buckley, my old friend and law school professor, often takes pen in hand offering a learned commentary on national affairs. His views frequently appear in the "Voice of the People" and other publications. His letters to the editor are an exemplification of the spirit of an informed citizenry partaking in the democratic process. Therefore, it gives me great pleasure to bring the following letter to the attention of my colleagues and to have it included in the Appendix of the RECORD:

MUZZLING THE MILITARY

CHICAGO, January 25.—Former President Eisenhower, contrary to the policy followed by himself when Chief Executive, takes issue with the Kennedy administration for "muzzling the military" by denying it the right to criticize administration policies in dealing with Communist countries. The ex-President further contends that "our military is singularly well trained to provide to the public, as well as to the Armed Forces, the implications of the extreme threat of Communist imperialism."

Traditionally, the political indoctrination of the American people has not been considered a legitimate function of the Military

Establishment. It should not be made a function in the name of "anticommunism." The very zest with which political generals, such as former Major General Walker, seek to indoctrinate us should warn us of the danger of this trend.

Anticommunism seminars conducted in the Chicago area on military stations have contributed materially to the creation and fostering of such reactionary organizations as the John Birch Society. Military officers have no right to donate public facilities for the advancement of either rightwing or leftwing groups.

Our Founding Fathers wisely made the discussion of national aims and policies the function of civilian authority. The place of the military in their plan was one of obedient subordination to the civilian. They remembered what we must not forget: That when the legions began discussing politics, the death of the Roman republic was at hand.

JEREMIAH BUCKLEY,
Professor of Law, De Paul University.

NASA's Candor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, we are now in the critical years of our national space program. In the months ahead the wisdom of today's decisions and the selection of approaches to the solutions of technical problems, great and small, will be minutely tested.

NASA's great effort to venture out into the far reaches of space will cost the American taxpayer more than $3.7 billion for the coming fiscal year. The American people have not been kept in ignorance of why the United States must lead the way in the exploration of space nor how we are going to accomplish our objectives.

As we all know, the NASA, in contrast to its Soviet counterpart, has conducted its manned space flights openly and before the whole world through the press, television, and radio.

The House Committee on Science and Astronautics has, since its inception, taken every step to make sure all possible information associated with committee hearings and investigations has been made freely available to the press and the public.

NASA has also maintained a very enlightened and vigorous policy on the dissemination of information, both to the press on its day-to-day operations and outstanding personalities, and also to the scientific communities of the world of the unmatched body of scientific data gathered from space by NASA satellites.

An editorial in the January 23 Washington Post has candidly and maturely expressed awareness of the press of the of the forthright and straightforward attitude of NASA officials in keeping the American public informed of our progress in space exploration.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Washington Post are to be commended for their unceasing efforts to tell the American people without reservation about the successes, and the failures, of our space program. Here, again, is a reaffirmation of the credo that has been woven into the fundamental philosophy of our country—give the people the facts, because from truth comes wisdom and moral strength.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to include the following editorial from the Washington Post of January 23, 1962.

NASA's CANDOR

The people of the United States, whose taxes pay for the costly experiments of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and whose survival may turn on American achievements in the space age, finally are being treated as though space ventures are of some concern to them.

They are being told what NASA is trying to do, when it is trying to do it, and why, upon occasion it is necessary to revise its plans and intentions when unexpected difficulty is encountered. It may be possible for a totalitarian regime to conceal such vast plans and preparations and such a regime may succeed in making it appear that every experiment in this field is successful. Concealment is not possible in this country and even if it were possible no American would be gulled into believing that chancy undertakings of this kind can be uniformly successful.

As space ventures proceed and the risks become even greater, it is inevitable that the exploration of the remote regions of outer space will involve mishaps and disasters. The public mind must be prepared for this. These undertakings are not child's play. No amount of preparation and foresight can eliminate dangers inherent in such unprecedented experiments. Citizens of a democratic society, made aware of these dangers, possess the maturity and fortitude to bear them. Candor is a compliment to that maturity; secrecy would be both insulting and futile.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of February 3, 1962:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, February 3, 1962)

The President asked Congress this week for $100 million to buy United Nations bonds. Inasmuch as I have introduced a resolution demanding that the United States withdraw from the U.N., I am in complete disagreement with any further subsidy to that organization. Any earlier hope on our part that the U.N. would keep peace in the world has long been shattered by a union of nations that seems more bent on destroying freedom and the United States as the leader of the free world, than for any other purpose. A review of recent actions of the U.N. and a simple recitation of the anti-U.S. actions over the years and the subservience to the Soviet Union is enough to prove to my satisfaction membership in and subsidy for the United Nations is not in the self-interest of our own Nation.

No amount of flippancy on the part of the President in attempting to justify authorizing Pierre Salinger, his publicity man, to meet with the Russians is going to keep the American people from remembering these important facts: (1) We have never won by talking with the Communists. They always have gained while we made concessions. Result of the Vienna Conference between President Kennedy and Khrushchev was the building of the wall in Berlin, and a further setback for the free world. (2) There is nothing in Salinger's background or experience (and he is not an official responsible to the people) which leads us to believe he can successfully deal with the Soviets. (The President did not answer this in his press conference.) (3) Secret diplomacy has always failed. I believe the people have the right to know, the press has a duty to discuss, the President's goals in following his present course of courting the Kremlin's royal family through his news secretary. While we appreciate humor, the American people find nothing funny in the many times the Communists have used such meetings as now proposed to gain respectability and further their dedicated aim of enslaving the world.

On the Dallas Federal Building: It is a mystery to me why the President, who is calling for a balanced budget, would oppose a project which will save the taxpayers $990,000 a year in present rentals. Although the President asked Congress for 70 new ways to spend money in his budget and economic messages, he seems reluctant to include a project which will save money. I will continue my efforts to get approval by the Appropriations Committee of this project which has been proven on its merits to be right.

My Committee on Ways and Means is deeply involved in writing a tax bill. Unfortunately, the end result is not going to be desirable as it should be. What is needed is complete tax reform and revision, not the hit and miss method we are now employing. Examples of where we will fall short: (1) Foreign investment. People will be forced to pay tax on money they do not have. The tax is too high and will only breed new troubles and inequities. (2) Tentative approval has been given to cut entertainment expenses in arbitrary 50 percent with no regard to legitimacy. If entertainment expenses are not legitimate, why should we allow a 50-percent deduction? If they are a legitimate business expense they should be fully deductible. A better approach to this and other tax problems, enactment of the Alger-Baker-Herlong bill for tax reform and eliminate deductions such as entertainment expense.

The House passed H.R. 8900, the College Facilities bill. My opposition was based on: (1) The principle of taking Federal money to stimulate education is wrong. Our national debt is nearing $300 billion. Taxes are already too high. We are reaching the breaking point financially. (2) Public expenditure of Federal money to support colleges is killing private expenditure and will eventually replace private contributions to the detriment of higher education institutions. (3) Federal regulations must follow Federal expenditures, but are wrong when imposed in the educational field. Education of free men must remain free and that means free of Government control. (4) The necessary separation of church and state now conflicts with the denominational schools of higher education receiving loans or grants. (5) Imposition of further Federal regulation in imposing Davis-Bacon Act provisions in building college facilities. Secretary of Labor will set wages for construction and there is no recourse in any court from his arbitrary decision. In opposing this poorly written bill I am for higher education

and the right of every student who wants a college education to get it. But they must want and seek it. It cannot be a gift from the Federal Government and still give us the hope of maintaining a free society and private enterprise system.

The establishment of a new Cabinet Post for Urban Affairs as demanded by the President is not going to improve urban affairs. Our private economy operating at the local level can serve people in our cities better than any bureaucrat or combination of bureaucrats directed out of Washington can. The President's attempt to make this a poltical issue by injecting the race question is in poor grace and will not, I am sure, fool the people.

New York-Montreal Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 2, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the harbor of New York is one of the greatest in the world. Because of it, industry has boomed, business has flourished and food supplies have reached the whole eastern seaboard. Since the St. Lawrence Seaway came into existance, a great deal of the port business of the city of New York has been diverted from the port of New York.

One of the world's great needs is cheap water transportation. The St. Lawrence River has afforded cheap water transportation on the northern frontier of the United States. A great need exists for an inland route and cheap water transportation from New York harbor to the north. The proposed New York-Montreal Seaway, which connects New York Harbor with the St. Lawrence River, is a natural step in cheap water transportation. The proposed route would utilize the Hudson River, the Champlain Canal, Lake Champlain and the Richelieu River in Canada. It would enter the St. Lawrence River at Sorel, about 46 miles northeast of Montreal. It would cut the water distance from Montreal to New York by 1,350 miles.

For many years interested organizations have been attempting to convince both Canada and the United States to cooperate to obtain approval of the New York-Montreal Seaway. Plans and surveys have been made. Those plans and surveys have been updated, and it seems that a quarter of a century of efforts may now be within reach. It is my intention to bring about legislation to provide appropriations for a development of this Montreal-New York Seaway.

In addition to economic advantages, such a seaway project can play a vital role in respect to our national survival. Trade could not be interfered with inasmuch as it is an inland seaway and interference by submarines in the Atlantic Ocean would be forestalled. I have recently received a communication from one of my eminent constituents, Lt. Col. W. L. Rich, U.S. Army, retired, a consulting engineer and investment counselor who received his preliminary engineering training at the Sheffield Scientific School, Yale University. It sets forth in detail the history of the proposed seaway, its feasibility, and its advantages not only to Canada and the United States but to the world. This letter from Mr. Rich which follows I believe will prove interesting and informative:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SANTANGELO: The Committee for the New York-Montreal Seaway, of which I am chairman, has been advocating this proposed deep waterway since 1956. We are proposing that it follow the route of the present waterway that has been in use since 1609, when it was discovered by Samuel de Champlain. That route goes from New York City to Montreal, Canada, via the Hudson River, the Champlain Canal, Lake Champlain, down the Richelieu River to Sorel, Province of Quebec, Canada, where it joins the St. Lawrence River and thence up that river to Montreal, Province of Quebec, Canada.

Six months after we had decided to propose that this waterway be built and to recommend that it follow that route, we were informed that an interim report, made by the International Joint Commission in 1936, had recommended this same route. This Commission had surveyed five proposed waterways and had recommended the route that we had chosen, as "the most practicable from an engineering standpoint and the least impracticable from an economic point of view," and "that it be authorized to retain jurisdiction over the matter until the St. Lawrence waterway had become an accomplished fact and the Commission has had an opportunity of studying the effect of it's operation upon the proposed Champlain waterway."

After a study of that 1937 Interim Report, we decided that the first thing that should be done was to have that 1937 survey updated. We, therefore, concentrated our efforts on that project, with the result that a bill, authorizing the U.S. Army, Corps of Engineers to update that survey was signed by President Eisenhower on July 3, 1958.

In compliance with that authorization, the Army Engineers drew up a plan of procedure for making a new survey. At that point they were instructed by the U.S. State Department not to proceed any further until "an expression of interest" in this new survey had been received from the Canadian Government. All progress was halted.

Now, at last, after 3 years of concentrated effort on our part, progress can be resumed. With the announcement made on December 18, 1961, by Prime Minister John Diefenbaker of Canada, that "The Government of Canada has decided that action is due and that the subject of the Richelieu Waterway should be referred to the International Joint Commission for study," we have secured "an expression of interest" on the part of the Canadian Government in our proposed New York-Montreal Seaway project.

We must now, after the 3-year delay, endeavor to secure, during this session of Congress, an appropriation of moneys to defray the cost of updating that part of the 1937 survey, which deals with this proposed waterway.

When this new survey has been completed, a decision as to the practicability and desirability of proceeding with this proposed seaway can be made, based upon facts, developed through this survey and not upon opinions.

Our committee is convinced that the construction of this seaway, now, is of vital importance to the future progress of the eastern part of Canada and our United States and that its completion will play an important part in providing the much needed economical and financial stimulation that eastern sections of our two countries, at present, lack.

This new deep waterway will provide greater accessibility to the ports of "The Fourth Coast," via the St. Lawrence Seaway, for the commerce of the world and thereby will stimulate the growth of the Lake ports, through expanded trade, provided this waterway is designed to have "adequate capacity."

Adequate capacity, to us, means a capacity, at least, equal to that of the St. Lawrence River at Montreal, Canada, which in terms of depth, at present, means not less than 37 feet deep.

The Canadian Government, when in 1844, it first began, by dredging, to open up the St. Lawrence River for the larger "Salties," decided that the required minimum depth of the river at Montreal, should be 37 feet. Recent developments, there, have proven that any depth less than 37 feet is not practical and that the 37 foot depth has got to be maintained as a minimum.

The Associated Press, Montreal, July 15, 1961, states that "Marine engineers, worried by a steady fall in the level of the St. Lawrence River, are preparing a detailed study of the 54-mile stretch of the river channel east of Montreal. The dropping level, the engineers say, could seriously reduce the effective operation of the port of Montreal, if it continues.

"Herbert Land, chief channel engineer, said officials are particularly concerned about the water level this year. The channel is supposed to be at least 35 feet deep in the shipping season to give the large ocean-going vessels access to Montreal. But, on the basis of the last 10 years' experience, Land's office has predicted the level could fall to 34 feet this season, making the channel unusable for many vessels." Since 1844, when dredging began, the water level has fallen 3 feet.

A correction of this condition, with the restoration of the required minimum depth for the river at Montreal, is an integral part of this project and it presents no unsurmountable obstacles.

This seaway project has many facets that make it a "must" and it should be started without any further delay. One facet is that of national survival, that I will not go into at present.

This proposed waterway will stimulate greater use of New York as a port of entry and thereby necessitate the modernization of the port facilities.

It will offer a shorter deep-water route from the ports on the "fourth coast" to the ports around the world, by some few up to 2,700 miles for a round trip, with accompanying reductions of shipping costs.

As for an example, 1 million tons of newsprint could be shipped yearly, via this short-cut, to the New York metropolitan area, at a saving, according to Mr. Lawrence Tombs, vice president of Guy Tombs, Ltd. of Montreal, Canada, of from $9 to $10 per ton, or a saving of from $9 to $10 million in freight charges alone, to the New York publishers, per year. At present only 25,000 tons are shipped yearly over this presently restricted route.

It will make available to New York City a new supply of fresh water, which will be much needed in the near future, and will eliminate the necessity for New York City to draw any additional fresh water from the Delaware River watershed, thereby making more fresh water available to supply the future demands on the Delaware River for Philadelphia, Camden, et cetera.

It will, if of adequate capacity, reduce the number of locks along the proposed route from the present number of 23 to not more than 6 and possible only 5—the final actual number of locks will depend upon the topography of the region along the proposed route.

It will make seaports possible at any point along its route, from which direct ship-

ments can be made to any port in the world.

Its completion will eliminate an annual loss, estimated to be $850,000, due to flooding in the Lake Champlain-Richelieu River vicinity—$600,000, Canadian; $250,000, American, and an annual flooding of Canadian land, around the shores of Lake Champlain and along the banks of the Richelieu River, estimated to be of at least 45,000 acres, that do not dry out in time to be put into production. The collective losses in this region due to flooding, since 1938, when work was stopped due to the last war, on the Fryers Dam across the Richelieu River, are estimated to amount to more than $20 million dollars.

Its completion will result in the stabilization of the water level of Lake Champlain, recommended to be at 98 feet above sea level. That stabilization will allow the building of permanent docks that can be kept in use during all the open season because, from then on, there will always be a constant level of water at their sides.

Its stabilized water level will also minimize the annual destruction by ice along the shores of Lake Champlain and along the banks of the Richelieu River.

Annual flooding of the Richelieu River will be eliminated by adequate flood control made possible by its completion.

The problem of an adequate supply of water to operate this proposed seaway has been successfully concluded and enough water can be made available for its operation, through not less than two solutions of that problem.

The use of Bascule type of bridges across this waterway will allow the passage of tall-mast sailboats through this waterway and make the waters of Lake Champlain available to both Canadian and American mariners.

This deep waterway will open up new tourist routes, to and from Canada and the Great Lakes and will make this fourth coast region accessible for tourists from the eastern shores of the United States and from Europe and the rest of the world.

Referring back to adequate capacity, the present St. Lawrence Seaway was not so constructed or the future necessity for twin-locking it and deepening it would not now be under discussion. It was to have been planned to have a controlled depth of 35 feet, and because of considerations, it was finally built with a depth of only 27 feet, in spite of important opposing opinions, which time has proven to be correct. A number of recent items tend to indicate that inadequate capacity has been the cause for the St. Lawrence Seaway not living up to the expectations of its sponsor.

The weekly news magazine Time, of July 14, 1961, under the heading, "The Unspectacular St. Lawrence," states, "many a Midwestern grain exporter still prefers to barge his payload down the Mississippi to New Orleans, where the cargo can be put aboard 60,000-ton vessels that sometimes offer cheaper rates than the 15,000-ton ships plying the St. Lawrence."

The obvious interpretation, the shippers want boats of larger capacity but because the seaway, under compromise, was built with its present control depth, the larger boats cannot get up into the Great Lakes and be available to the exporters.

Last July 13, 1961, as reported in the Milwaukee Journal, Mr. Joseph M. McCann, the then Deputy Administrator of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, stated while inspecting the port of Milwaukee, that "within 10 years, traffic will be so heavy in the seaway that its locks will have to be twinned and possibly its channels deepened from 27 to 35 feet. Such twinning may have to be done earlier on the Welland Canal."

By that statement, Mr. McCann indicated that he recognized that the present capacity of the St. Lawrence Seaway is not adequate to permit the passage of ships of large enough capacity, and for them to get up into the Great Lakes and there be available to the shippers.

Now, we urge that serious consideration be given to the following points:

1. That the design of this proposed deep waterway provide it with an ultimate capacity, at least equal to that of the St. Lawrence River, with which it must compete to justify its existence as a "shortcut" for the "salties."

2. That the locks have a sill depth of not less than 40 feet; the present depth of the St. Lawrence River plus a 3-foot factor of safety. That sill depth will make it unnecessary to rebuild the locks when traffic demands that the capacity of this waterway be increased to equal that of the St. Lawrence River.

3. That the initial depth of this waterway be, at least, 32 feet between the locks. That depth is the depth that the Hudson River is being deepened to, from New York City to Albany. Of the 450 miles length of this proposed waterway, within a short time more than half of that mileage will be 32 feet deep or deeper.

4. That provisions be incorporated in the planning that will allow the use of this passageway by small as well as the large boats.

5. That the bridges, necessary for the passage of vehicular traffic across this waterway, be of the bascule type, so as to eliminate any restrictions in overhead clearances and that their footings be placed far enough back from the banks of this waterway to permit free and clear passage of any ships that can make use of this waterway.

6. That provisions be incorporated in the design to assure the maintenance of a constant water level at both the Albany, N.Y., and the Sorel-Montreal, Canada, regions.

7. That the number of locks along this route be kept down to the minimum, to possibly only 2 large locks along the Canadian section, in place of the present 11 small ones, as the total lift in this section is not more than 80 feet, because of the level of the St. Lawrence River at Montreal, Canada, is 20 feet above sea level. The New York State section may only require 3 large locks in place of the 12 small ones, because there the total lift will not be more than 98 feet, and because the water level of the Hudson River at Albany is only plus or minus 1½ feet, due to the tidal fluctuations. This 98 feet maximum lift, which is the lift up to the proposed level of Lake Champlain, is secured by the leveling off of the hump in the route of the present Champlain Canal, making the water level of Lake Champlain the maximum water level of the whole route.

8. That provision be made in the design layout of this waterway for the future twinning of the locks, without their rebuilding, when the increase in volume of traffic so demands.

9. That this seaway be set up as a self-liquidating project and to be so amortized that the initial tolls can be kept down to a minimum to stimulate its use as a shortcut.

You ask, What is my interest in the seaway project?

It is, to try to assure that this waterway shall have a capacity adequate to justify its existence.

That the mistakes, inherent in the design of the St. Lawrence Seaway, be not repeated in this seaway project, particularly the lack of consideration given to the basic requirements for the proper navigation of large longboats through a restricted waterway.

For confirmation of that last statement, read "The Freshwater Cruise" of the U.S.S. *Macon*, by Capt. J. C. Wylie, U.S.N., in the April 1960 number of the U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings. The *Macon* escorted H.M.S.S. *Britannia* up the St. Lawrence Seaway for the opening passage in June 1959.

We are aware that some interests historically oppose the use of waterways for commercial purposes, because they represent competition, but, when it can so easily be proven, that when any region is opened up and it prospers economically and financially, all means of transportation prosper and gain new business.

Let all of us cooperate to assure that this seaway be so designed that it will not have to be rebuilt in the foreseeable future.

WILLIAM LATHROP RICH,
Chairman.

To Be a World Leader the United States Must Lead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, we have attended another conference, this time in Latin America, where it has again been made painfully clear that we have not yet adopted a policy of strength and determination which will inspire other nations to trust our leadership. At Punta del Este, we implored, we wheedled, we compromised, but we did not lead. Until we adopt policies which command the respect of other nations, until we forget about being popular but let the whole world know that we intend to remain free and to win the cold war, we will never attain the world leadership expected of us and necessary to our survival as a free nation.

Much food for thought on the results of the Punta del Este Conference is contained in the following editorials from the Dallas Times Herald, the Fort Lauderdale, Fla., News, and the Chicago Tribune:

[From the Dallas Times Herald, Feb. 1, 1962]

THE LESSON OF PUNTA DEL ESTE: UNITED STATES MUST STAND BY HARD LINE

Communist Cuba has been branded an outlaw by the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

It has been kicked out of the inter-American system.

And now what happens?

Specifically, what can we expect in Cuba? What will happen in the nations that voted for Cuba's expulsion? And what will happen in the nations that favored a soft policy toward the Castro regime?

Expulsion of Cuba, of course, is a serious step—for both Cuba and the rest of the hemisphere.

The Communist regime would have preferred to remain a part of the Organization of American States—not because of any idealistic feelings toward the rest of the hemisphere but because OAS membership would provide a convenient channel through which to carry on its revolutionary expansion tactics. The OAS also could have served as a forum from which it could sound off against "imperialistic" countries—specifically the United States.

The final action taken at Punta del Este was a disappointment to the United States, in many respects.

Twenty nations unanimously condemned Cuba's Communist regime.

Nobody but Cuba voted against the plan for immediate expulsion. But six nations abstained from voting—leaving a two-thirds majority.

The 14 nations that stood together for immediate expulsion probably can be depended upon to continue the fight. Individually they probably will take appropriate action to put some teeth into outlawing of the Castro government.

The six nations that failed to cast a vote on the expulsion motion are Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Mexico, Bolivia, and Ecuador.

There will be a great deal of speculation on why they abstained. Was it out of sympathy or out of fear?

Probably both elements had something to do with their soft attitude.

Many Latins have found it fashionable to kick the shins of Uncle Sam, knowing that he will not kick back.

But each of these nations has a strong Communist faction, with Castro connections. Brazil has a pro-Communist president, who has been stripped of some of his power. It also has a strong Communist element in northeastern Brazil. Argentina still contends with a strong Peronista element. The Chileans have an economic and political problem which is accentuated by the Red element.

Mexico's President Lopez Mateos has been walking a tightrope between the leftists headed by former President Cardenas and the rightists headed by former President Aleman. Bolivian politics is influenced by the Red-dominated miners union and has a leftist vice president. Ecuador, which has long had a strong Communist element, recently has turned a little more to the left.

Each of these nations undoubtedly is concerned over trouble at home.

Each undoubtedly will be a Castro target in the months ahead.

We got less than we had hoped for at Punta del Este. The Reds undoubtedly will attempt to make much of the claim that they have split the ranks of the Organization of American States.

The problem for us now is to convince the other nations of the hemisphere that our insistence upon a strong stand against Cuba was right.

It is late—but not too late—to do so.

[From the Fort Lauderdale News, Feb. 1, 1962]

FOR UNCLE SAM, CONFERENCE AT PUNTA DEL ESTE WAS A HUMILIATING EXPERIENCE

Weary U.S. diplomats finally succeeded this week in getting Fidel Castro's Communist government of Cuba kicked out of the OAS, but the nature of their triumph isn't such as to cause the boys to come back home wearing any halo of victory around their heads.

The ouster resolution did not get the overwhelming support our delegation had hoped to secure when the conference convened a couple of weeks ago. In fact, it passed by only the barest of margins with six of the biggest Latin-American nations refraining from voting and Cuba, itself, casting a negative ballot.

The final vote, therefore, was 14-1 which just met the two-thirds majority required by the OAS charter.

It is probable that, as a result of this action, the American people are going to be subjected to a big blast of publicity emanating from the State Department terming the ouster of Cuba as a clear sign that the American states have now proclaimed their firm opposition to the Castro regime and to any attempts by the bearded madman and his followers to spread their evil doctrines throughout the rest of the hemisphere.

If this happens Americans should take it with a great big grain of salt. It is true that the smaller nations of Latin America have had their bellies full of Castro's Cuba and are solidly united in wanting to get him out of their hair.

But these smaller nations represent only a small fraction of the population of this hemisphere, and when one considers that Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador and Mexico all refrained from voting on the ouster resolution, the scope of our so-called victory at the OAS conference is narrowed down to virtually nothing.

In fact, if a person cared to be perfectly truthful, this so-called victory could just as easily be termed a defeat, for early in the session we had to abandon our announced plan of securing sanctions against Cuba because none of the bigger nations of the hemisphere wanted to go this far.

So what, in actuality, did we gain? A moral victory, perhaps, but since Fidel Castro had already publicly torn up and thrown to the winds the treaty papers binding his nation to the OAS, the resolution adopted by the OAS isn't going to bother him very much.

Nor is the action taken by the member nations in denying any arms shipments to Cuba going to bother the bearded dictator a great deal. He is already getting all the military hardware he can possibly use from his Communist connections in Europe, so he doesn't need any arms from Latin American nations to help keep him riding high in the saddle.

Cuban President Osvaldo Dorticos pretty well summed up the ineffectiveness of the OAS action when he told the delegates:

"You may succeed in establishing this bloc, but you will not succeed in erasing us from the Americas' geography. We may not be in the OAS, but socialistic Cuba will be in the Americas."

And then Dorticos said something that will grate on the nerve of Americans to an even greater extent.

Scornfully he declared: "The imperialistic Government of the United States will continue to look at revolutionary, socialistic Cuba, 90 miles from her coast."

How true and how sad this is. By our own admission at the OAS Conference we professed to a great unwillingness to take unilateral action to slice the Castro cancer out of Cuba. By our own admission we let the rest of the world know that the long-established and heretofore revered Monroe Doctrine has now been abandoned as an official American policy.

This was not done with any express permission of the American people. It was not done by the American peoples' representatives in the Congress. It was done by diplomatic representatives who have apparently forgotten how proud and how strong this Nation of ours once stood and who now believe that compromise accomplishes more in the long run than standing firm on principles of justice and integrity.

We can't much blame Secretary of State Dean Rusk for what occurred at Punta del Estes this week. He was fighting a losing battle from the very start, and while he may have fought hard and was able to salvage something of a moral victory out of the Conference, our prestige and our influences in the big nations of Latin America are no longer the proud heritage they used to be.

This is just another indication of how badly we are faring in the cold war without the Soviets even having to fire a shot against us.

Twenty years ago it would have been absolutely inconceivable that a communistic Soviet-dominated government could be established and nurtured to full health in nearby Cuba without bringing strong and effective action from our own Government to blot it out.

But now, in this year 1962, we must beg and we must plead for the help of other nations to get rid of a growing cancer right on our own doorstep. And when that help is not forthcoming from those we have every right to expect it from, we shrug our shoulders and do nothing except to make more plans to give more millions of our dollars to these uncooperative nations in the vain hope we can buy what we cannot win through respect and friendship.

Is this the hallmark of a great and powerful nation? Is this the America that makes a citizen's heart leap with pride when his flag goes by? We do not think so. It is just another sign of the moral weakness that grips our Government and so many of our people today. It is the Chamberlain-with-his-umbrella attitude of compromise that permits a thief to keep his ill-gained loot in the vain hope he won't go out and steal some more.

So, let's don't call what happened at Punta del Este this week a victory for our side. Rather than being a victory it was the humiliating experience of having to accept the fact we are losing ground and respect in Latin America, and unless we find some way to reverse this trend there will be more Fidel Castros thumbing their noses at us and laughing up their sleeves at our futility.

JACK W. GORE.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune]

THE OAS AND THE OBVIOUS

After 9 days of applying hammerlocks and half nelsons on the reluctant Latin Americans, Secretary of State Rusk finally succeeded in wringing a declaration from the Organization of American States that Castro's Cuban communism is "incompatible" with the inter-American system. This is about as startling as a finding that Typhoid Mary would not be a desirable addition to a debutante ball.

The resolution further calls for the "exclusion" of the present Cuban dictatorship from the organs and agencies of the OAS. In particular, Castro is to be shut out of the inter-American defense board—an empty gesture, since Cuba hasn't attended board meetings since last April.

Beyond this, the OAS agreed to an embargo on trade and traffic in arms with Cuba—also relatively meaningless, since Cuba has built herself into the largest military power in Latin America by the acquisition of armaments from the Soviet bloc.

These pallid responses to the Communist threat of infiltration and subversion from Cuba were obtained by a minimum two-thirds majority vote of 14 nations, among them the United States, on the key resolutions. The largest and most influential countries of Latin America, notably Brazil, Argentina, and Mexico, refused to go along.

Mr. Rusk was obliged to pull in his horns on his original demands for tougher action. He had gone to the conference at Punta del Este, Uruguay, seeking a collective rupture of diplomatic relations and the application of economic sanctions. The OAS had been equal to such stiff measures against the tinpot dictatorship of the late Trujillo in the Dominician Republic, but it had no stomach for similar action against the rabid Castro.

The Secretary of State had also started out calling for individual and collective measures of defense against political and indirect aggression mounted by Castro against the hemisphere. This would have committed the OAS to some sort of action, but it was lost in the shuffle. The result is that Castro is to be ostracized as socially unacceptable, but that he is to be left unscratched.

Mr. Rusk, ironically, had no trouble mustering the votes of every member of the OAS except Cuba for a proclamation in support of Latin American adherence to Mr. Kennedy's alliance for progress. Inasmuch as this calls for $20 billion in economic aid, mostly to be supplied by the U.S. Treasury, there was no reason to expect resistance.

But on the really important question of taking relevant and effective action against Castro, there was no similar accommodation. Four of the major Latin American nations even argued that Cuba could not be expelled from the OAS under its existing charter, inasmuch as the charter made no provision for excluding or suspending a member state. This argument will provide Castro with useful ammunition for propaganda in the United Nations, where the Communist bloc will be glad to join him in a renewed volley of accusations against U.S. imperialism.

After the Cuban invasion flopped last April, Mr. Kennedy warned that if the OAS refused to meet its commitments against Communist penetration, the United States would feel free to go it alone. The OAS has done only the allowable minimum. In doing even that, the United States and 19 other American countries have signified that communism is a negotiable matter in this hemisphere.

That is a far cry from the bold warning of the Monroe Doctrine to European despotisms that "we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to American peace and security." That has happened, by the very terms of the declaration at Punta del Este. But the President does nothing. He is as derelict as his laggard partners in the OAS.

Censorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to draw the attention of my colleagues to an editorial which appeared in the New York World-Telegram and Sun on January 30, 1962. This is another editorial deploring the passage of section 11 of the postal rate increase bill. I believe that the World-Telegram and Sun presented the heart of the matter in stating:

Enforcement of a rule such as the one proposed by the House * * * would give one man—whoever happened to be Attorney General at a given time—the power to say what all the rest of us are going to read.

CENSORING THE MAILS

A depressingly low opinion of mass intelligence in the United States is indicated by an amendment to the postal rate bill, just approved by the House.

It would bar from the mails any matter judged by the Attorney General to be Communist propaganda. There was a frightened rush to avoid being considered soft on communism. The amendment was adopted with only two dissenting votes.

Foreign mail is distributed in this country through cooperative agreements which insure delivery of American mail abroad. As President Kennedy noted at his press conference this week, we sent 16 million pounds of mail (including food packages) to Iron Curtain countries in the 12 months ending March 31, 1961—and got back only a little more than 2 million pounds.

Enforcement of a rule such as the one proposed by the House could invite countermeasures, severely curtailing international mail service. But that isn't the worst of it. It would give one man—whoever happened to be Attorney General at a given time—the power to say what all the rest of us are going to read. It implies that the American people are so soft in the head they are liable to turn Commie after reading, for instance, a Khrushchev speech, any one of which is 100 percent Communist propaganda.

This is a timid and probably unconstitutional plan which, if strictly enforced, simply would deprive the American people of information as to what is going on in large sections of the world—what they are saying about us and planning to do to us. The Senate should knock that amendment in the head.

False Smile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with continual emphasis by our State Department, with suggestive comments of U.N. Ambassador Stevenson, it is apparent that the Kennedy administration is intent on ignoring the lessons of history by blindly plunging into agreements in the area of peaceful coexistence with the Communists. This blindness of the administration's foreign policy can be seen in this afternoon's newspaper stories dealing with Laos and South Vietnam, where the coalition government that our State Department has attempted to achieve in Laos is not only moving toward Red control of that country but would make our military position in South Vietnam substantially more dangerous. The Lansing Journal, an independent weekly newspaper in Lansing, Ill., covered the issue of peaceful coexistence with a most effective, thought-provoking editorial on February 1. Under unanimous consent, I include this editorial, "False Smile," in the RECORD:

FALSE SMILE

Too many people have interpreted the smile of Nikita Khrushchev as an indication that he is really a good fellow at heart. They reason that one who appears so jolly and enjoys himself and others is bound to be in favor of peace or at least of "peaceful coexistence."

Let us examine this theory in some detail. Just what does "peaceful coexistence" mean to smiling Khrushchev? It means complete submission to mistaken rule. It means the end of freedom. And remember this: Whether he smiles or not, Khrushchev is a Communist, and he is just as dedicated to the cause, as were Marx, Lenin, and Stalin.

The mistaken mind rejects international fair play except as a means of gaining time. Stalin said: "Diplomacy is the art of using good words to hide bad deeds." Thirty years ago, Dimitri Manuilski, one of the most articulate Communist prophets and a professor at the Lenin school of political warfare in Moscow, wrote about how communism would conquer the world. He said that Russia would first come forward with a peace offensive so disarming as to electrify the world. All nations, wearied by a long cold war, would come rushing forward, eager to make friends with the Soviets. Then, as soon as their guard was down, the Communists would strike them down with clenched fists.

We think of that plan and somehow Khrushchev's smile seems less heartwarming, and loses its pleasant charm. A Communist's word is of no value. Certainly, the long history of betrayals in this connection should convince us that no Communist promise is worth anything.

In 1945, for instance, right after World War II ended, sixteen members of Poland's government were invited to Moscow to conduct negotiations. Although they were non-Communists, they were allies—or they thought they were—in the war just ended. But Communists have no non-Communist allies. Upon arriving in Moscow, the 16 Polish leaders were imprisoned. They have not been heard of since.

Hungarian leaders of the 1956 anti-Communist uprising were promised safe conduct when they were invited to negotiate terms of the withdrawal of the Red Army from Budapest. The conference was held under a whit flag of truce. The Hungarian leaders were seized and shot.

One of these incidents took place under Stalin; the other under Khrushchev. The Communist purpose has never changed—it is still world domination.

Kennedy Administration Learned No Lesson From Stalin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in the February 1 issue of the New York Herald Tribune there appeared an account of the incredible naivete of the Kennedy administration—especially of the public relations man, Pierre Salinger—in thinking that we will persuade the Communists to stop plotting our destruction by being nice to them. Students of history know that Lenin's thinking still dominates Russian thinking.

Let us be firm and strong and let us keep the public relations men where they are supposed to be—not being super-duper Secretaries of State overnight.

The articles follow:

STRANGE DUET, SALINGER OF THE WHITE HOUSE AND ADZHUBEI OF SOVIET; EXCHANGE OF CHILDREN NEXT? RED EDITOR HOLDS A PRESS CONFERENCE

SOME FANCY FOOTWORK

(By Rowland Evans, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—If the scientists don't soon come up with a formula for perpetual motion, they'll turn to Pierre Salinger as the next best thing.

One evening last spring, after a 12-hour day, Mr. Salinger popped into the President's office to get last-minute instructions for the next day. He was wearing a dinner jacket.

The President had no instructions for his press secretary and Mr. Salinger popped out again, all 185 pounds of him.

A moment later he returned, a trifle chagrined.

"Mr. President, I left my black tie at home this morning, and I forgot to ask you if I could borrow yours. In fact, Mr. President, I hope you don't mind, but I've already taken the liberty of borrowing it. I have it on now."

The President laughed.

"And where are you going tonight, Pierre?"

That night Pierre was going to an embassy reception. Now he's going to Moscow, probably the first press secretary in history to undertake a top-level scouting expedition of this kind. Purely "informal," of course.

For months he and Alexei Adzhubei, editor of Izvestia and son-in-law of Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev, have been engaged in some of the fanciest footwork this town has ever seen. It started off when NBC got the two of them together last June on an unprecedented television debate. That led to the President's agreement to offer an exclusive interview to the Russian. That led to the return visit of Mr. Adzhubei this week, lunch at the White House, dinner at Mr. Salinger's, lunch at Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy's.

In between, Mr. Salinger wrote Mr. Adzhubei a letter, and Mr. Adzhubei brought Mr. Salinger a present from the Soviet Union—a handsome mahogany box filled with an assortment of Armenian brandy. Mr. Salinger, in short, has now established a solid relationship with Mr. Adzhubei, without which there could be no trip to Russia.

For example: After their television debate last June, Mr. Salinger brought Mr. Adzhubei to Washington for a visit. On the first evening, the press secretary, who prides himself on his culinary arts, cooked a Salinger meal for the Russian.

Mr. Adzhubei proposed an exchange of the Salinger and Adzhubei children—the former to go and live with Mr. Adzhubei's family in Moscow for a couple of months while the Salingers took care of Mr. Adzhubei's children in Washington. Mr. Salinger thought it sounded like a good idea. One of the main reasons for his trip to Moscow, after all, is to encourage more and better exchanges between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. He agreed to think it over.

The following evening, Mr. Salinger borrowed one of the President's Potomac boats, the *Patrick J.*, and took Mr. Adzhubei on a trip down the river to Mount Vernon. The Russians are suckers for music, so Mr. Salinger's 9-year-old boy, Stephen, played "The Star-Spangled Banner" on his violin as the craft sailed past Mount Vernon.

The other Salinger children are Marc, 13, and Suzanne, 10. Mr. Adzhubei has three boys who are a little younger than the Salinger children.

When Mr. Adzhubei came to Washington last Thanksgiving to prepare for his interview with the President at Hyannis Port, he went straight to Mr. Salinger's place, an attractive modern, split-level house on the edge of Lake Barcroft, Va. Mrs. Salinger cooked the meal.

So when the Soviet editor returned this week, for the third inning in the Salinger-Adzhubei series, the foundation for a trip to Moscow was already in place. Only the finishing touches were needed, and these were supplied at lunch at the White House on Tuesday.

Some of the oldtimers around here are genuinely astonished by all this. It took long enough to get used to the freehand style of James C. Hagerty, who ran President Eisenhower's press relations with unprecedented latitude.

Mr. Salinger is something else again. The President's words at the press conference yesterday are worth noting. He was asked about criticism of Mr. Salinger by a Republican Member of the House, Representative BRUCE ALGER, Texas. According to Representative ALGER, Mr. Salinger has no business going to Moscow because he is only a "young and inexperienced White House publicity man."

Mr. Kennedy replied: "As I saw the press, it said that Mr. Salinger's main function was to increase my standing in the Gallup poll. Having done that he is now moving on."

A PROMISE AND DEFENSE

(By Marguerite Higgins)

WASHINGTON.—Soviet Editor Alexei Adzhubei, Premier Nikito S. Khrushchev's son-in-law and a believer in competitive coexistence, climaxed a visit to President Kennedy's meeting with newsmen yesterday by staging his own impromptu press conference, which included this headline prediction:

"There may be a solution soon in Laos—sooner than you think. And it will be a good beginning."

Earlier, Mr. Adzhubei, accompanied by his wife, Rada, had listened impassively as President Kennedy warned of the serious consequences of renewed Communist attacks in Laos and the danger that renewed hostilities could cause all efforts for peace "to go up in smoke and fire."

The Izvestia editor, who, like Mr. Kennedy, was in exceptionally robust conversational form yesterday, was surrounded by a crush of correspondents as he left the new State Department auditorium. Among other things he had heard President Kennedy defend with vigor—and humor—the forthcoming visit to Moscow of his press secretary, Pierre Salinger, who will be Mr. Adzhubei's guest.

Said the President: "I know there are always some people who feel that Americans are always young and inexperienced and foreigners are always able and tough and great negotiators. I don't think we need worry so much about Americans traveling abroad. They take care of themselves and so will Mr. Salinger."

Then he added with a mischievious smile and a glance at the distinguished Soviet visitor: "There may even be people in the Soviet Union, who are concerned at what Mr. Adzhubei may be doing over here."

"Nonsense," retorted Mr. Adzhubei to the reporters who thronged around him after Mr. Kennedy's exit. "Nobody worries about my trip here. After all, such worries could not exist in my country, for in the Soviet Union we have freedom."

Asked what he thought of the President's performance, Mr. Adzhubei shrugged his shoulders, smiled and said: "After all, I am no stranger to press conferences." And he proved forthwith he certainly wasn't.

What he had to say on Laos to reporters caused a stir in official Washington. This is because the Izvestia editor is considered an authentic spokesman for Mr. Krushchev and because no Soviet official has been publicly so outspoken in predicting that the latest flareup in Laos can be contained and a solution found—at last.

On another subject—the reported crisis in the Kremlin—Mr. Adzhubei set a precedent by tackling the subject with some candor, saying "None of the antiparty group—either Molotov (former Foreign Minister), Kaganovich (former labor czar) or Malenkov (former Premier) are of any political importance today in the Soviet Union. Therefore, they cannot constitute a threat of any kind to the regime."

This is the first time that all of Mr. Khrushchev's onetime rivals of any importance in the antiparty group have been lumped together in the category of nonimportant political personalities.

Mr. Adzhubei's greatest caution was on the subject of Berlin and nuclear testing: "Ah, those are matters that will require a very long conversation."

But on peaceful coexistence he was brimming with optimism.

"Our countries can do great things for the world," he said. "Our social systems are different. But that should not hold us back from coming to agreement on the basis of state relations. We are for peaceful coexistence, but not because we are afraid of the United States. We do not believe the United States wants war. So let us get together and talk."

The blond, tanned; and stocky Russian has been receiving the red-carpet treatment in Washington, having dined Tuesday at the White House and yesterday with Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy.

But although the President welcomed his presence at the press conference with courtesy, Mr. Kennedy was not in the least inhibited from frank comments on communism and Soviet bloc affairs.

Thus Mr. Adzhubei heard Mr. Kennedy:

1. Praise the Punta del Este meeting of hemisphere Foreign Ministers for "declaring with one voice that the concept of Marxism-Leninism is incompatible with the inter-American system."

2. Say that a Presidential trip to the Soviet Union did not seem advisable until a real breakthrough is achieved that will lessen tensions in the cold war.

3. Assert that the Soviet Union does not appear to have any desire for the moment to achieve progress on the issue of Berlin and Germany.

The principals at both press conferences were in agreement on the importance of maintaining contacts at all levels between Soviet and American citizens.

The President said: "I believe that any exchange of information, any exchange of views, any cooperation of any kind in these very hazardous times will be very useful, so we are glad for them."

In an introduction that brought a laugh from every one, including the Adzhubeis, Mr. Kennedy greeted the Soviet editor, who will proceed from Washington on a Latin-American tour, in this fashion:

"Mr. Adzhubei is the editor of the Russian paper which carried the interview with me last November. He is also a member of the Central Committee, and therefore combines two hazardous professions, politics and journalism, and also Mrs. Adzhubei, who is the daughter of Chairman Khrushchev. We are glad to have them here to observe an ancient American custom."

Floating Sales Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, following is an editorial which appeared in the Philadelphia Bulletin on January 28, commenting on legislation which I have introduced to establish a Floating American Trade Fair.

This proposal has been very enthusiastically received throughout the country, and it is clearly apparent to me that the small manufacturers of America do want to participate in the stream of international commerce if an opportunity is afforded them for such participation.

I hope that the committee will give serious consideration to this legislation.

The Philadelphia Bulletin editorial follows:

FLOATING SALES CORPS

An idea worth exploring has been advanced by Representative ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, of Illinois, that the Government and American industry jointly outfit one or more ships as floating trade fairs. To stimulate American exports, they would travel to the major ports of the world, anchor for a time and show U.S. goods.

These floating merchandise marts, with convention space in them rented to as many

as 1,200 exhibitors, in Congressman PUCINSKI's outline, would be largely subsidized by the Government, with exhibitors paying a nominal fee. Use of them would mean that the expense of temporary exhibits on land would be curtailed, and the costs of transportation minimized. The exhibitors would not be at the mercy of a foreign bureaucracy, such as has hampered American demonstrators at recent foreign trade fairs.

Foreign trade fairs are regularly held in several European cities, and provide an important stimulus to world trade. The suggested ship fairs would carry the idea a step farther and into new areas.

If such an American program is worked out, Philadelphia manufacturers and shippers, and the port facilities of the city of Philadelphia itself, would surely be interested.

Is Space a Challenge to Religion?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on Friday evening, February 2, I had the great pleasure of addressing the Fathers Club of the Ursuline School in New Rochelle, N.Y., on the subject: "Is Space a Challenge to Religion?"

The meeting was presided over by Mr. Gabriel Bundschuh, president of the Fathers Club of the school, and I was introduced by my old friend, the Honorable Peter Campbell Brown, former corporation counsel of the city of New York, and also well remembered by my colleagues for his distinguished service here in Washington as Chairman of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

I accepted this invitation because another dear friend of mine, Dr. Alexander J. Conte, wrote me that the Sisters of the Ursuline School, together with the 400 men comprising the Fathers Club, would be overjoyed to have me address them on the subject of space.

The pleasure was all mine.

Following is the text of my address:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN VICTOR L. ANFUSO IN NEW YORK, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1962

Mr. Chairman and friends: I want to discuss with you today a subject which, I believe, all of you will find interesting and thought provoking. As you know, I am a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics and since being appointed to this committee I find the field of science extremely exciting and I keep thinking about it more and more.

I am also a deeply religious person, as are all of you. It is for this reason that I have chosen as my topic: "Is Space a Challenge to Religion?" This is not a simple subject. It is actually the old problem of "Religion and Science." Each time there is a significant advance or a major breakthrough in the scientific world, we again take up the question.

In recent years it is the exploration of outer space which has captured the imagination of people all over the world. At the same time, it has set many of them to think about religion. Some profess to see in all this a challenge to religion. Theology is not my field of specialization: my interest in this field is limited to that of the ordinary layman and devout churchgoer.

The great American poet and philosopher, Carl Sandburg tells the story how he once met with the famous physicist, Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, who played a leading role in the development of atomic energy. Sandburg asked him this question: "Tell me, when you finally shattered the atom, which is the smallest particle of matter, and it came apart, what were the pieces?"

Dr. Oppenheimer replied: "When the atom was split, it didn't come apart in pieces; it came apart in things that never existed before."

To this day we don't know all the secrets of God's universe, anymore than we know the secret's of God's ways. It is true that in recent years we have made great progress in scientific research. We have learned a great deal about outer space, we are aware of the difficulties involved, we know of the explorations being undertaken now and those planned for the future. And yet, the more I learn about all this, the more I come to the conclusion that mankind still needs to pray—and, if we are wise, we should pray very hard.

In one of his last annual Christmas messages to the world, the late Pope Pius XII, speaking of the divine grandeur and its meaning to mankind, said this:

"There is reason, indeed, for asking with fear and anxiety if modern man is still disposed to allow himself to yield to a supernatural truth so sublime, to be penetrated by the joy it has to offer; who is so sure of himself and his future, he dares all, urged by an insatiable desire to know nature's deepest secrets, to bend its forces to his own will, eager to penetrate in his own person the interplanetary spaces. In truth modern man, precisely because in possession of all that the mind and labor or man have produced, ought to recognize even more the infinite distance between what he can do and what proceeds from the limitless power of God."

This, to my mind, constitutes very sage and sound advice. Unless we recognize the infinite distance between what man can do and the unlimited powers of God, we shall digress from the belief in God and turn to the belief in some all-powerful man—a belief based more on fear than on conviction. We need not look too far afield for this possibility. The present order in Soviet Russia and Communist China, based on a Godless philosophy and a way of life which is devoid of religion, are perfect examples of men living in fear instead of freedom, of men living with brutal power instead of with God's words of truth and love.

Having said all this, I do not mean to convey to you the idea that man must not continue to probe the secrets of the universe in which he lives. This is definitely desirable and should be encouraged.

Let us consider the proposal to explore the moon. The national program of exploring the moon, with manned and unmanned spacecraft, has captured the imagination of the world. Since it will also capture a sizable chunk of the Federal budget, it is being discussed, pro and con, in every city and hamlet across the land.

The question is often asked: Why go to the Moon? or what can a man do on the Moon that instruments can't do? If you look at a man with an engineer's eye, you will probably conclude that human beings are extremely fragile creatures to bear the strains of space flight. Certainly, they are not very reliable, compared with some machines. Considered as computers, they are both slow and inaccurate. Above all, from a moral standpoint they are not expendable; this country, at least, would never send a man into space unless it expected him to survive.

Then why should we try to put a man, and not just instruments, on the Moon? The main reason is that people are unparalleled for versatility and selectivity, especially in observation, making repairs, and coping with unforeseen problems. In addition to the logical reasons for sending man into space, there are psychological factors that are not so rational. Man may not really trust his machines, and he wants to go along for the ride.

But let us assume that man himself is the best available means, you may still ask: "Why explore the Moon?" Specific answers have been given at length by James E. Webb, the National Space Administrator, and others. I'll review them briefly, and then consider the values of spaceflight beyond the Moon.

Scientists look at the Moon as an object of study and a useful laboratory. They tell us that close study of the moon—which has changed relatively little through the ages, and so preserved the records of its early history—may throw much light on the origin and nature of the Earth and of life itself.

The Moon has economic value as a new rich source of metals and minerals, oil and gases, and other useful materials which would enrich mankind on Earth.

Although this is a controversial question, there seems to be little doubt of the Moon's strategic value. For instance, Professor Guy Stever of MIT, a former chief scientist of the Air Force, says that putting a man on the Moon is a military necessity and whoever conquers the Moon can conquer the Earth. If this is true, then we don't want the Russians getting there first.

The Moon could also be used for many practical applications in photography, communications, weather forecasting, medicine, navigation, and research on materials and electronic components.

Then, there are psychological reasons for going to the Moon. In addition to the challenge, the voice of adventure telling us to explore the Moon "because it is there", we know that the manned exploration of the Moon would add immeasurably to our national influence and prestige throughout the world. We cannot overlook this factor. Look at what the Russians have done with their sputnik, the Moon shot and their astronauts, all the propaganda they have gotten out of it and how they used it to build up their prestige in the world.

From the standpoint of our national space program, the Moon would be very useful as a way station, a platform for the assembly and restaging of vehicles going beyond the Moon to the planets. The cost and energy requirements would be much less for Moon-staged flights than for direct flights from the earth to (say) Mars and Venus.

At this point in my talk, I'd like to digress for just a moment, and give you a bird's-eye view of the national space program. In the coming fiscal year, which begins on July 1, some 12 percent of the total Federal budget (of $92.5 billion) will be spent on missiles and space. That's about $11 billion. The NASA budget alone will be roughly twice as much as the year before. I think we should note, though, that NASA will spend only about $300 million for its own expenses, while letting contracts with industry of more than $3½ billion.

These are large amounts of money. You can well imagine their impact on the national economy. Since a large part will be spent for research and development. I am sure you can appreciate the stimulus that the space program will give to scientific and technological progress, and in fact to every phase of economic activity. Communities all over the country will benefit from it.

This money will pay for many different projects. You may have read their names in the newspapers. For unmanned exploration of the Moon, NASA is developing the Ranger and Surveyor and also, for later use, the Prospector and Voyager.

NASA plans to launch three Rangers in 1963. The first of these will carry cameras,

which will take 180 pictures of the Moon from distances of 2,400 to 15 miles as they plunge to destruction on the surface. These pictures will be televised back to the Earth. Equipment which (it is hoped) can survive the crashlanding will relay back additional information on (a) the Moon's radioactivity, (b) the lunar surface, (c) Moon quakes, and (d) the impact of meteors on the Moon.

The NASA budget for research and development on manned exploration of the Moon will rise next year from $147 to $863 million. This program includes project Mercury (one-man craft), Gemini (two-man craft) and Apollo (three-man craft). Project Mercury has become famous through the exploits of Astronauts Shepard and Grissom (and Glenn). Now it is already phasing out. The Mercury budget reaches its peak—over $68 million—in the current fiscal year, will drop next year to some $13 million.

The next major NASA project—and one that people don't hear much about—is Mariner, for the unmanned exploration of Mars and Venus. There are also major projects for communication, weather, and navigation satellite systems, and for scientific satellites and sounding rockets.

I've already mentioned the technical and economic impact of the space program. Let me give you a few examples.

More than 700,000 people are already now employed in the various industries engaged in space technologies. Their number will grow even larger in the years to come. These industries include most of the aircraft companies and a large part of electronics, plus a number of industries that many people seldom think of in connection with space, such as plastics and ceramics. Some are virtually new industries created by the space program—one example is cryogenics (the technology of very low temperatures).

This upsurge of industry, mostly in research and development has produced a number of new materials, devices and processes. For instance, remote-control television switches enable us to turn a program on or off without moving from our chairs. These switches are an offshoot of space technology. Another example is a drug developed from a missile propellant—hydrazine—and now used to treat mental illness and tuberculosis.

In fact, many byproducts of space technology are finding applications in medicine. Incredible as it may seem, even the hazards of spaceflight promise in time to help us cure the ills of mankind. This possibility seems such a paradox to people who first hear it that it deserves a few minutes' consideration.

The best known hazards of spaceflight are radiation and weightlessness.

Below the Van Allen belts, where all manned orbital flights will probaby be made, the earth's magnetic field gives good protection from radiation. Even direct passage through the Van Allen belts should not be dangerous, because it can be made so quickly, and because there are "holes" in the Van Allen belts around the earth's polar regions. But at higher altitudes, astronauts will encounter cosmic radiation and solar flares. It is on really long trips, beyond the moon, that solar flares will represent the big danger.

This country has not had much experience with weightlessness—in fact, only about 5 minutes each for the Shepard and Grissom flights. Soviet reports indicate that prolonged weightlessness causes some disorientation and nausea, as well as some irregularity of heart action, but nothing really serious. We must remember, though, that even Titov's flight lasted only about 24 hours. For flights to Mars or Venus, which will take weeks or months, the problem of weightlessness may be more serious, as indicated by the experiences of bedridden patients and the "simulated weightlessness" of subject experimentally immersed in water. The results of "simulated weightlessness" include reduced minerals in the bones, reduced nitrogen in the muscles, and a reduced tolerance of g. forces (referring to the force of gravity).

Perhaps an astronaut's ability to withstand g. forces will have to be built up again, before he can return to the earth. A familiar parallel is the bedridden patient, who can seldom walk right after he gets out of bed, but has to regain his sense of balance and muscular control by degrees—for example, by sitting up for a few minutes every day, and taking a few steps around the room while leaning on a cane or an another person. Some of our space planners have thought up a similar way of rehabilitating weightless astronauts. The idea is that an astronaut would not return directly to the earth from outer space, but would first spend some time on a space station in orbit. If the space station rotated slowly, like a top, centrifugal force would stimulate the earth's gravity—that is, it would overcome weightlessness. By controlling the rate of spin, the astronaut's tolerance to g. forces could be gradually built up until he became able again to withstand the earth's gravity.

On the plus side, it should be noted that weightlessness can prolong life by as much as one-third of the present average span because of the release of pressure on the heart. It has been calculated that man expends about one-third of his total energy production in overcoming the force of gravity. It may interest you to know that the higher up you go into space, your weight is reduced and the pressure on the heart is similarly reduced. A simple example, which might surprise you, is the knowledge that a person's weight is a trifle less in the upstairs bedroom than in his downstairs living room. Nevertheless, I would not advise you to get rid of your one-story split-level rambler home so soon.

Another interesting point for you to know is that an athlete can clear a bar on earth (and I mean a bar you jump over, and not a certain other kind of bar) at the height of about 7 feet. The world's record is 7 feet 4½ inches. On the moon, an ordinary man can clear a bar at 42 feet. Think of it, you'd be flying around up there like angels.

Someday it may be possible to send heart patients into orbit for treatment, or they may be ordered by their doctors to live on the moon or on some small planet where gravity is weaker than on the earth. In much the same way, the radiation of outer space may be used to treat diseases, just as X-rays are used today.

A principal hazard is psychological. It arises in part from the feeling that man was not made to go into space. I'd like to devote the remaining moments of my talk to this question.

Of course, it is true—again, if you look at a man with an engineer's eye—that the human frame was not designed primarily for space flight. I have no doubt that this will prove to be the limiting factor in the manned exploration of outer space. On the other hand, was the human frame designed to climb the highest mountains—where man has been—or descend to the farthest depths of the sea—where man has been?

Astronauts and highflying aviators tell us that they sometimes have a sense of isolation out there—of being cut off from the world. They also tell us about another feeling that comes to them on such occasions—a feeling of being closer to God.

For me, the ethical rightness of exploring space was settled in 1956, when His Holiness Pope Pius XII made the following pronouncement at a special audience in Castel Gondolfo:

"The Lord God, who placed in the heart of man the insatiable desire for knowledge, did not intend to limit man's efforts in the process, as he said, 'submit the earth.' It is the whole creation that he has placed at his command and that he offers to the human mind, so that he may see it through and thus may understand always more profoundly the infinite grandeur of his Creator."

In line with those inspiring words which I have just quoted, it is my firm belief that the exploration of the moon and planets will bring vast benefits, many times greater than their cost, to the Nation, the scientific community, and to all of mankind.

Which in conclusion brings me back to my original question: Is space a challenge to religion? I do not see it as such. I see the exploration of space as a furtherance of human knowledge, as the opening of new vistas for human achievement and the attainment of abundance for all. I see it as God's hand in helping man to understand the universe in which he lives.

Space exploration is not a challenge to God. It is a challenge to man. And the challenge consists not only in obtaining knowledge, but in utilizing it properly and justly, to bring real peace on earth, according to the word of God.

The Forgotten People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, this is the eighth of 10 articles, part of a series which appeared in the New York World-Telegram and Sun in October 1961, on the subject of the migrant worker in the United States. These articles were written by Dale Wright, World-Telegram and Sun staff writer, who, for 6 months, lived and worked as a migrant worker along the Atlantic seaboard from Florida to New York.

MIGRANT ACCEPTS GYP AS PART OF LIFE

(By Dale Wright)

A migrant farmworker expects exploitation as one of the grim facts of his miserable life.

He knows he'll be cheated and he learns to live with it. He knows he'll be underpaid for his labor and overcharged for many of the things he has to buy for himself and his family.

Because many migrants never get to school—or have to leave during the early elementary school years to go to work in the fields—they are uneducated and illiterate. For this reason they are easy marks for sharp operators.

GIMMICKS DESCRIBED

While driving along a country road through the fertile North Shore potato area near Peconic, Long Island, last August I picked up two hitchhiking farmhands who spelled out some of the gimmicks the sharpies use to separate a migrant worker from his hard-won wages.

James Taylor, 19, and Evon Washington, 31, both from Polk County, Fla., had been taken to Peconic last July to work at a potato grader. They had joined a traveling farm crew headed by a Virginia man earlier in the summer on a promise that they would be paid $1.25 an hour.

(The World-Telegram is withholding the Virginia man's name at this time because of an investigation now underway.)

Both farmhands agreed that in nearly 3 months of work with the crew of 67 graders

and loaders they had never earned more than 50 cents hourly.

At the time I gave the two men a lift they were headed on foot for New York City, 95 miles away. Between the two they had 12 cents in cash and only the clothes they wore. They had left their camp the night before, they said, because there was no chance of earning enough money to subsist.

STORY RECORDED

The stories they told were so typical of the cruel swindles I had heard many times before in other farm areas, north and south, that I brought them into New York, staked them to a room at a YMCA and tape-recorded their stories.

Two days later I rounded up some shirts and underwear and helped get them jobs at an upstate New York fruit cannery through the State employment service.

Here are some of the things they told me—on 2 hours of tape:

Their crew leader deducted $1 weekly for union dues for a union that doesn't exist. The men had not signed any union membership cards. They did not know the name of the union to which they paid dues.

The two said they were told that the deductions would be made for 20 weeks. I already knew the reason. It was one of the gimmicks frequently used by labor contractors to write off the expense of transporting migrants from one stop to another.

In their recruiting pitches in the South, contractors promise to bus or truck migrants up the road at no cost. But they get back the money in hidden charges.

ILLEGAL DEDUCTIONS

Mr. Taylor and Mr. Washington also declared that their crew leader deducted $1.40 weekly for social security benefits. Mr. Washington emphasized that although he had lost his social security card he knew his number.

"Neither the contractor nor the timekeeper knew my number," he said. "They never asked me."

The deductions were illegal even if the crew leader had known the number. The maximum legal deduction is 3 percent of gross salary up to $4,800 annually. For the $1.40 deductions to have been legal the crew leader workers would have to be paid at least $46.67 weekly. The two hitchhikers insisted that they had never grossed more than $32 a week with the crew.

On paydays, the men declared, the crew boss charged his workers $1 a pint for wine which retails for 53 cents.

Though State law requires that migrant farmworkers be furnished with written statements of hours worked and wages received, both men asserted they had never received such records.

NO CONTRACTS POSTED

Another State law requires that farm labor contractors post in conspicuous places, either in living quarters or at grading houses, copies of labor contracts detailing wages and hours and charges for food and housing.

Mr. Taylor, who has completed 11 years of public school education, said he had never seen a labor contract posted and did not know the procedure was required.

These are just some of the many complaints of shoddy recordkeeping and questionable payroll operations that both men gave in their interviews.

Mr. Washington said he had been paid nothing for his first week of work and that at the end of the second week he received $4 for well over 40 hours of work. This was after the deduction of $13.50 for 19 meals weekly and $4 for room rent.

"Sometimes the boss would pay us whatever he felt like," Mr. Washington explained, "no matter how many hours we worked.

"Other times he wouldn't take the hours we worked as reported by the timekeeper. He'd tell me, 'You couldn't have worked that much time.' Then he'd pay me what he wanted to."

Mr. Taylor said that for his best week of work he received $17, after union dues, social security, and food and lodging.

Both men charged that there were many others at the camp who had been bilked by illegal charges.

The two men estimated they had been cheated out of a minimum of $200 each.

One of their biggest gripes concerned what they called waiting time.

As Mr. Taylor explained it: "If we're loading potatoes off the grader and into trucks and the trucks are late, we don't get paid for waiting. But we have to work around the shed anyway, stacking sacks of potatoes for the next trucks or just moving things around.

"There's sometimes 2 or 3 hours between trucks. We're working but we're not getting paid. The time stops when the truck is loaded, and it don't start until the next one comes in."

An intense, serious young man, Mr. Taylor's summation of the exploitation of migrant farmworkers mirrors the feelings of the essential laborers (about 25,000 come into New York State every year) who harvest the Nation's crops:

"We're getting cheated and we know it. You gotta take it or leave. We left."

I later made another visit to the camp, tucked away in the trees, to see for myself what the two men had left behind. There, glistening in the bright Long Island sun, I found an explanation: An expensive 1960 sedan was parked in front of the shabby quarters alongside a 1956 luxury car. I had been told earlier by Mr. Taylor and Mr. Washington that they were owned by the crew leader and his wife.

Peace Corps Lauded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Bill Moyers, of Marshall, Tex., 29-year-old former aid to Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON, has been Associate Director of Public Affairs for the Peace Corps since the creation of the new agency.

During this period many difficult decisions have faced Sargent Shriver, Mr. Moyers, and the rest of the Peace Corps staff. None has been more difficult than the choice between teaching people the needed kinds of skills or seeking out individuals who already have these skills.

Of interest is the editorial comment made by the Marshall News-Messenger, one of Texas' outstanding newspapers, on January 26, 1962:

PEACE CORPS

The Peace Corps has a big pool of applicants, some 16,000 men and women who say they want to serve their country by helping abroad. Though this is heartening evidence of dedication to a good cause, it now appears that even as big a pool as this does not contain enough of certain kinds of specialists needed by the Peace Corps.

Teachers are much in demand overseas, and fortunately two-thirds of the 750 volunteers [are] in training or already abroad. But various projects may have to be cut back because there are not enough medical and agricultural technicians, engineers, surveyors, plumbers, and so on. There is a shortage of applicants skilled in these and several other fields.

One possible solution would be to train unskilled volunteers to handle work in such specialties. It is good to know that Peace Corps officials have decided against any such training program. They have made the wise decision to go out looking for skilled personnel. We are confident that America has enough people with such skills, and willing to exercise them abroad in their country's behalf, to meet the need. Here is an opportunity for them to serve in a meaningful way.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

The Vote by the Organization of American States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a very fine editorial published in the Eugene Register-Guard entitled "A 14–1–6 Vote Is Not a Setback," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. It is excellent analysis of the particular problem as it arose at the Punta del Este Conference.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A 14–1–6 VOTE IS NOT A SETBACK

Who is the better poker player? Is it the man with a high degree of skill who takes home two-thirds of the money in the game? Or is it the player of less skill, but who also has a revolver and who thereby takes home all the money?

These are questions we might ask ourselves as we contemplate the so-called setback this country received at the Organization of American States meeting in Uruguay. We did get the required two-thirds of the members to go along with us in calling for an immediate removal of Castro's Cuba from OAS activities. Only Cuba voted against us. Six nations did not vote at all. A somewhat weaker resolution, apparently without the immediate feature, passed 20 to 0, with Cuban representatives absent.

It was our failure to get a 20-to-1 vote on everything that is being called a setback for our prestige.

This country probably could have blackjacked the six abstaining nations into voting our way. We could have used economic pressures, even military threats, had we wanted to play that way. But a victory won by such methods would not have been a victory at all.

We must, moreover, note which countries abstained, and why. In no case were the abstentions an expressed admiration of Castro. Mexico, whose vote we never did really expect, has important trade ties with Cuba. This bread-and-butter issue looms much larger in the Mexican mind than does the question of political virtue among the customers. Brazil, Chile, Bolivia, and Ecuador share flabby economies, including impoverished masses that have expressed interest in the things Castro has promised his Cubans. The regimes in these countries have resisted the Castro forces—so far. But they don't want to stir them up, either. The last thing they want is to make Castro angry enough that he regards their countries as next on his Red timetable. The abstentions of these governments may have been motivated more by nervous fright than by any implied approval of Cuba. The sixth nation to abstain, Argentina, is harder to understand. The United States went to the Conference hoping for Argentine support. Was this support perhaps modified because Argentina's big neighbors, Brazil and Chile, felt as they did about it?

The very fact that this country did not come away from the Conference with all the money on the table may, in the long run, be to our advantage. One of the loudest notes in Castro's symphony has been the repeated charges of "Yankee domination" of the other nations of the hemisphere. The events at this Conference give the lie to Castro's charges. We did not bully our friends into voting with us.

We could have used whatever prestige might have been attached to a more overwhelming vote, of course. But we don't need that prestige half so much as the abstaining governments need the prestige they gained. Theirs was a prestige among their own people, a demonstration to the people at home that their governments are not beholden to Uncle Sam. Except for Mexico, the abstaining nations share the problem of governments which have only the limited confidence of their citizens. Their quasi-defiance of the Yankee colossus may be of value to them.

It is the Register-Guard's opinion that in the long run we shall look back on the Punta del Este Conference of 1962 as a fortunate meeting. The snub of Cuba may have been less important than the demonstration that the alliance for progress is truly an alliance of independent nations and not just a Yankee steamroller.

Dynamic Strength of Our Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial which recently appeared in the Clarion-Ledger of Jackson, Miss.:

DYNAMIC STRENGTH OF OUR AGRICULTURE

Most of us are inclined to bewail the problems of American agriculture but when we get right down to it, the main problem is that our farmers are just too efficient. Ours is a problem of surplus in a world where the mass of human beings exist on substandard levels or the brink of starvation.

There is no more remarkable story than the vitality and value of our agricultural system. Our ability to feed this Nation and then go on to create an economic problem of overabundance is simply fantastic in view of world food supply conditions.

Within recent months there have been numerous reports of mass starvation, inadequate food supply and political turmoil created by underfed people in Communist China. That Red regime has been forced to purchase some 235 million bushels of wheat and barley to sustain the meager diet of inhabitants. And recent speeches of Nikita Khrushchev have severely criticized Soviet agricultural performances which fell far short of expected output.

It is a strange paradox that we are put on the run in defending our American system in the face of such gross inefficiency by our Communist competitors. There should be no race at all for leadership. We have the means, ability and scientific know-how to lift the entire world out of the morass of hunger through agricultural production.

This leadership does not mean we should fail to take vigorous steps toward improving, updating and making our basic farm programs less costly and even more efficient.

A really significant part of our situation is that the vast majority of our governmental activities in the agricultural area are concerned with reducing, eliminating, storing and purchasing surplus output. Contrast this with mandatory cooperatives on State-owned land, highly organized, dictatorially directed and unable in many parts of the world to produce enough food and fiber for even the most basic needs of domestic populations.

We have our agricultural headaches, to be sure, but they are relatively trivial when compared with those of other countries today.

The True Function of the Nation's School Systems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in accordance with unanimous consent granted during the delivery of my speech on the higher education bill, I present the article entitled "The True Function of the Nation's School Systems," written by the Reverend Joseph Lennon, O.P., dean of Providence College, and published in the Providence Bulletin of January 24, 1962.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TRUE FUNCTION OF THE NATION'S SCHOOL SYSTEMS

(By the Reverend Joseph L. Lennon, O.P., dean of the college)

(With this article, the first of a weekly series from members of the faculty at Providence College. The Evening Bulletin resumes its Wednesday presentation of columns from the campuses of Rhode Island's colleges and universities. In previous years, the Bulletin has printed columns from Brown University and the University of Rhode Island. Next winter, columns from Rhode Island College and the Rhode Island School of Design will be printed.)

We are often told that the main function of the school is to produce good citizens. How acceptable is this statement? Since a normal life means a life lived in society, including political society, education for citizenship is undoubtedly a valuable and even

a necessary aim. But is it adequate as the sole aim, or even as the main aim of education?

Before we can say what the primary aim of education should be, we must find out what we are educating. We are educating a man, a human person, a free rational being, capable of knowledge and love through the spiritual principle of his nature, transcending the determined material order, possessing an intrinsic liberty, having a destiny beyond the temporal world, an independent whole and not merely a part of nature, an end, and not merely a means.

A SOCIAL ANIMAL

Because he is what he is, man is naturally a social animal. He tends to society, both domestic and civil, because he is a man. It is true that society is natural to man because it satisfies his material needs through making possible the division of labor, and because it satisfies his intellectual needs through making possible the office of teaching. But society is also natural to man because it allows greater scope for his specifically human powers of knowledge and love; it allows him to communicate his thoughts to his fellows and to express his natural generosity and love to them. Society exists to enable man to give, as well as to take, and thus to reach a fuller degree of human development.

Society then is human society, erected by the free consent of human persons and having as its aim the common good of its members, the providing of the conditions of the good life through which they can most completely develop their human potentialities. A citizen, then, must first be a man before he can be a citizen, and the better man he is, the better citizen he will make. Those schools which aim only, or even first, at making a citizen are motivated by a false view of the nature of man and of society. They are putting the cart before the horse.

Good citizenship is best achieved by aiming at something else. An education that aims at making the student first a fully developed man, by stressing his intellectual and moral training, also will make him a good citizen; an education that aims first at making him a citizen by stressing exclusively, or even chiefly, his social training will only make him a slave by stunting the growth of his intellectual powers. It will make him the slave of inhuman forces by regarding and training him as a being whose role is to adapt himself to his environment rather than to form his environment by the free exercise of his human intellect and will.

This leads to another and even more serious criticism of the conception of citizenship as the sole or the primary aim of education. This conception implies that man is a means and society his end; it denies in effect, if not in intention, the fundamental liberties of the human person, and sees in him only a tool of the state. And if education is for citizenship, then the state of which the student is a citizen quickly will become the power that decides what type of education its citizens shall have. Education for citizenship will come in practice to mean education of the type that a particular state demands, a type subservient to its desires in lending itself to its particular aims. This is what happened in Mussolini's Italy and Hitler's Germany, and what is still happening in Russia and China today.

Consciously or unconsciously, education for citizenship implies the totalitarian conception of man and of the state. It is based on the tenet that the state has given the individual everything he has, and consequently that it rightly may demand all in return. If citizenship is allowed to become the sole aim, or even the primary aim, of education, it will lead inevitably to the totalitarian state. Was it not Mussolini who said: "Nothing above the state, nothing beyond the state, nothing outside the state."

A MATTER OF GIVING

By this, I do not mean to derogate from the importance of good citizenship as an aim of education, even though it is a partial and subordinate aim, a by-product, as it were, of more universal objectives. Let me explain. The purpose of citizenship is the common welfare of the state in which citizenship is enjoyed. A state is its citizens; rulers and ruled, united in the pursuance of a common social peace and well-being. It is to be conceived in terms of motion; it is a directed movement aimed at a goal. It is the common good which gives reason for citizenship and is the determinant of the goodness of the citizen. He is a good citizen who is well disposed in regard to the common good. In conformity with the nature of the citizen as he is a man, this disposition must be rational and voluntary; in order that it be constant and efficacious, it must be a virtuous attachment, an habitual inclination to meet the demands of the common good.

"Unselfish love of the common good," says Thomas Aquinas, "makes a good citizen." The common good is in some degree an actuality, and ideal, a good to be achieved by organized cooperative activity on the part of the citizens. Both as an actuality and as an ideal, it is a good and consequently an object of love.

ONLY A BYPRODUCT

An unselfish love means no more than a constant effective desire to do good to another. It is not a matter of getting for one's self; it is a matter of giving, of spending one's self for another. He who truly loves the good of the state does not wish to control or corner it. He is not looking to receive. He desires to preserve it in all its integrity and to advance it as much as it is within his power to do so. His attitude and attachment is the direct opposite of that of the tyrants, big and small, who, bent solely on personal advantage, and void of all vision and generosity, would absorb the common good. President Kennedy expressed it eloquently when he said: "Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country."

This love of the citizen must, of course, like all love, be preceded by knowledge. It is here that our schools can be most helpful. The citizen has to be profoundly conscious of his dependence upon society; he has to recognize himself as incomplete, as insufficient unto himself. He has to see civil society as it is, a unity of men like himself who desire to live the good life and who join for the purpose of offering mutual help toward the realization of a common social and cultural well-being in which all may participate. The student has to be taught that the progress which has been made is the product, in no small degree, of the efforts of men who have gone before, men who have left their achievements as a heritage, not to be squandered or lost, but to be appreciated and enhanced. We are all indebted to these men. They are, in a very real sense, our heroes. Every citizen should be acquainted with the great men of his land, should know the history, the traditions and the ideals of his country. To impart this knowledge is a fundamental duty of the schools.

Moreover, it is important for the citizen to understand that dependence upon society does not mean personal helplessness. A society entirely or even largely comprised of dependents would have little upon which to depend. The development of one's own abilities and resources is bound up with the furtherance of the good of society, for unless one can help himself, there is little hope of his helping others. In other words, the citizen should realize that there is a true individualism which means social progress. The commonwealth is fostered by private works. Each man's job, however seemingly insignificant it is, assumes importance when it is seen in its relation of the whole. One's private vocation, whatever it may be, as long as it is within the law and consequently good, is not only a private work, it is a post of public duty. To be a good citizen one must realize the element of public good in what he does.

The Russians perhaps have succeeded more than we have in impressing upon the individual the larger signficance of his job, no matter how menial it might be. Being conscious of the meaning and worth of his work, and its connection with the progress of his country, the worker is willing to labor with might and main, happy in the thought that he is contributing to the success of Communist objectives.

A MAJOR TASK

A society that gages the worth of an individual according to the scale of jobs—the less worthy the man, the more menial the job—makes it more difficult for the worker to determine the true value of himself and his work in relation both to the common good of society and the end for which he was created. A different criterion is needed. As John W. Gardner states in his book "Excellence": "Human dignity and worth should be assessed only in terms of those qualities of mind and spirit that are within the reach of every human being." A good plumber is just as necessary to our society as a good philosopher; we need both. In order to get both, the plumber must be as convinced of the worth of his plumbing as the philosopher is of his philosophizing.

By reason of his status as a part of the whole, the positive influence of the private citizen in the procuring of the common good is only partial. Nevertheless, it is important. It is so important that consciousness of it should not be left to chance. One of the major tasks of the school in our democratic society is to impress constantly upon the student the active role he plays, indeed, must play, in achieving the common good of his country.

Six Stars for General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of January 18:

SIX STARS FOR GENERAL MACARTHUR

Last fall, the American Legion at its national convention voted unanimously to ask Congress to raise General of the Army Douglas MacArthur to six-star rank. This has been urged by the Globe-Democrat for the past many years.

At the conclusion of World War I, Gen. John J. Pershing, the commander in chief of American forces in that conflict, was awarded the rank of General of the Armies by act of Congress.

During World War II, four generals, MacArthur, Eisenhower, Marshall, and Arnold—and four admirals, Nimitz, King, Leahy, and Halsey—were raised to five-star rank to correspond to the equivalent rank of field marshal and admiral of the fleet among our allies, and as a mark of special recognition

for the Nation's most eminent military commanders.

Without in any way detracting from the perfectly magnificent contributions of the other great generals and admirals who held five-star rank in World War II, General MacArthur's contributions to his Nation are unique in our history and unquestionably will never be equalled again.

General MacArthur served in the active Military Establishment for half a century. The youngest general officer in World War I, he rose to the highest position in the Army, that of Chief of Staff in President Hoover's administration, and retired as a four-star general in 1935.

He was immediately drafted to aid the Philippines, where he was given the rank of field marshal and was recalled to active duty in the American Army by President Roosevelt in 1941.

He led American forces from the tragic defeats of Bataan and Corregidor against overwhelming Japanese forces, all the way back from Australia through New Guinea and the Philippines, to the surrender of the Japanese in Tokyo Bay in a series of brilliant campaigns spanning 4 years and more than 5,000 miles.

Following the end of hostilities, General MacArthur was appointed supreme commander in Japan, where for 6 years his wise administration converted a fierce and defeated enemy into a loyal and stanch friend of the United States and the free world, in what is unquestionably the outstanding achievement of military government in the entire history of the world.

The contributions of this great man, in war and peace, have won every accolade of the American people and of governments throughout the world.

General MacArthur served longer and in more positions of authority than any military commander in all the annals of history. His genius will stand as long as courage, valor, and fortitude are honored.

In the twilight of a life well lived for the United States, General MacArthur should receive this fitting tribute from a grateful Nation. The Globe-Democrat and countless millions of Americans hope that the Congress will pass, early in the current session, the legislation which is presently before it conferring six-star rank on America's greatest military hero.

Soviet-West German Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Mr. Edward H. Sims, editor of the Times and Democrat in Orangeburg, S.C., and owner of the Sims News Bureau in Washington, is currently visiting West Germany and in doing so is writing a series of articles on political developments in this important part of the world. Mr. Sims has written an excellent article on talk of an alinement between the Soviet Union and the West German Government. I call this article to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for all to read.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HINT OF RUSSO-BONN REAPPROACHMENT HAUNTS WESTERN CAPITALS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the first in a series of special reports from Germany by Edward H. Sims, depicting Germany's rise to power, again, her foreign policy, the problem of reunification, Germany's relationship with Russia—the subject of this report—and other subjects which are of vital interest to Americans, especially because of Germany's position today as the leading continental power once again.)

(By Edward H. Sims)

WEST GERMANY.—Early in December the Soviet Ambassador to West Germany conferred with Chancellor Konrad Adenauer for over an hour. Afterward he reported a "fruitful improvement" in Soviet-West German relations.

Ambassador Andrei A. Smirnov's additional comments were more specific: "I was able to confirm progress in essential questions. I left the Chancellor's office very satisfied."

These unusually warm words from a Soviet diplomat, following Premier Nikita Khrushchev's November suggestion for a reapproachment between the Soviet Union and West Germany, plus reports the Russians have suggested Chancellor Adenauer come to Moscow for talks with Khrushchev, focus attention on the possibility of a new turn in Russo-German relations. They raise anew the question of West German neutralism.

How much chance is there that Germany will, in the years ahead, turn to neutralism?

In his recent, provocative book, The New Germany and the Old Nazis, T. H. Tetens says there is a very real possibility that Germany will not only turn toward neutralism, playing East against West, but also turn away from democracy.

Tetens says the nightmare of the Western Powers, which haunts statesmen and diplomats in all the Western capitals, is the possibility of a reapproachment between the Federal Republic and the Soviet Union. And he quotes the co-founder of the Christian Democratic Union (Adenauer's party), Prof. Friedrich von der Heydte, as saying that, basically, the Germans do not cherish democracy—that they may well follow another German strong man, if he should come along.

The Bonn Government's reaction to the Tetens book has not been officially expressed. But the many Germans to whom the writer has spoken are almost unanimous in their conviction that it paints only the gloomy and pessimistic side of the West German picture. They scoff at suggestions that former Nazis and extreme nationalists are today a significant force in West German politics.

Certainly the policy of Chancellor Adenauer has been consistently, the opposite of neutralism—one of close alliance with the West, of building German strength within the framework of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

And as far as the Adenauer government is concerned, most observers on the scene in West Germany agree there is little chance of a major turn in the field of foreign policy. However, there is almost unanimity in the forecast of an unpredictable course of events in West Germany when the 85-year-old Chancellor steps down.

Will Adenauer's successor, for example, be able to resist the bait of possible agreement on German reunification, with which Moscow might lure Bonn? Russia is, of course, the only country in a position to unify Germany. If Khrushchev decided the stakes were high enough (to warrant abandonment of East Germany), he could, by his own decision, end the division of Germany.

Such a move is highly unlikely, of course. It would violate a basic tenet of postwar Soviet policy toward Germany—the maintenance of a divided and thereby weakened Germany. But the continued growth of German power and the emergence of Western Europe as a third great economic and nuclear force could conceivably tempt Khrushchev to make a play to remove the strongest continental power from the NATO alliance.

Germany, in fact, is already the dominant power in Europe again. With a resurgence of national strength, the nationalists, the expellees from the east and the traditional expansionists have become more vocal. Already some are openly advocating a policy of neutralism.

Adenauer's policies have thus far prevailed over those of the rightwing groups but his popularity is slipping—as the September elections showed—and he will be retiring in a year or two. The void his retirement will leave is certain to be great.

For he has been West Germany's only Chancellor since the war, having assumed the post in Allied-controlled West Germany in 1949 and having continued as sovereign West Germany's Chancellor in 1955—a position he still holds today. He is the traditional strong man of German politics, not like President Hindenburg in many ways but alike him in that both men have represented unobstructed leadership and authority to the German people.

A responsible American correspondent in Paris recently reported the French are already concerned with prospective developments in Germany after Adenauer vacates his office. One reason why the French will, in the end, welcome British participation in the European Common Market, he wrote, is because they want someone else with them "in the cage with the tiger."

The resurgence of West Germany, then, is already causing sober reflection among some of Germany's neighbors. The critical question for them, as it was at the turn of the 1930's is whether West Germany's democracy will survive the post-Adenauer period or whether new German politicians will undermine its structure, and perhaps leads the Federal Republic down the road to neutralism as well.

History contains many examples of Germany playing East against West. Hitler provided the latest example, in 1939, when he signed a nonaggression pact with archfoe Russia, removing the last major obstacle to war in Europe.

In 1922, at Rapallo, the Weimar Republic shocked the Allies by effecting a reapproachment with Russia. And both Bismarck and Frederick the Great reached accord with Russia. There are many precedents in German history, then, for a policy of playing East against West. This is not, of course, to pass on the moral justification of such accommodations, or the logic inherent in them from the German point of view.

The task of those shaping U.S. foreign policy in the State Department and also in the White House, is to help sustain the popularity of democracy in West Germany, as far as might be possible, and to maintain an unshakeable partnership with the Federal Republic in the face of the international Communist challenge.

Washington policy was long ago committed to the calculated risk that German democracy will succeed. Because of the great need for Germany in the common front of the West against Communism, the United States must inevitably accept West Germany as an equal, and trustworthy, sovereign partner in the anti-Communist front, or run the risk of a reaction among the people of West Germany—a reaction to the kind of treatment which brought about Rapallo.

U.S. policy is also closely tied to the hope of most Germans that Germany will somehow, someday, be reunified. Washington has officially favored free elections in all Germany, and final delineation of German boundaries at a peace treaty, since the war's

end. Though not reaffirmed often lately, until the November communique following the Kennedy-Adenauer conferences at least, these are cardinal principles of our foreign policy for Germans, which are sometimes taken too lightly in the United States.

Chancellor Adenauer, in turn, has sold the German people on the theme that Germany's future hope for reunification and a promising future lies in a policy of solidarity with the United States and the West. That is why the most disturbing event in many years in Washington—for many Germans—was Secretary of State Dean Rusk's apparent flirtation with a modification of U.S. principles on free elections and Germany's final boundaries.

In his three talks with Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko, Rusk explored the possibility of an agreement between Russia and the United States on some kind of general security arrangement for central Europe, and for a disengagement.

To many Germans, this amounted to an abandonment of vital principle, to appeasement, and the Rusk-Gromyko conversations were a major cause of the crisis of confidence which arose between Bonn and Washington in October, and which was only dispelled by the Kennedy-Adenauer conferences, after the crisis had reached serious proportions.

The danger that future leaders in the Federal Republic will revamp German foreign policy along neutralist lines is certain to be increased by any suspicion that the United States will not faithfully adhere to its traditional policy in favor of free elections for all Germany, and for a peace treaty to determine Germany's final boundaries. The possibility of a neutral Germany will also be increased by any U.S. policy which does not accept Bonn as a sovereign, trustworthy, and equal ally.

This, of course, immediately brings to mind the question of West Germany's possession of nuclear weapons. Should the German people be expected to forever accept a second-class status in this respect, in relation to Great Britain and France? Fortunately, Adenauer is not pressing for such weapons at the moment, though he is pushing a plan which would give all NATO members a share of control over nuclear weapons and their use. Washington is reported in the European press to oppose this German proposal.

There are many, in practically all countries, who shudder at the vision of a rearmed Germany, possessing nuclear weapons. Already the growth of German power disturbs them. Historically, of course, their fears are more than justified.

U.S. policy, however, is based on the realization that there is no course open today which does not involve risks, and that the international challenge of communism is the greatest immediate threat to democracy and the free enterprise system.

And Chancellor Adenauer has won the confidence of many by renouncing the use of force as a means of changing Germany's present boundaries. He has, moreover, put all German military forces under international command, and pledged that no nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons will be manufactured in the Federal Republic.

Germany democracy could fail again, as it did in 1933, and new leaders could convert West German policy to one of neutralism. If Washington is to succeed in avoiding such a turn of events, U.S. policy will have to be calculated to maintain the trust of the German people and also a solidarity between the two countries on the Federal Republic's basic goals of reunification and final boundary determination—no matter how distant fulfillment of these hopes may be.

Blueprint for Regimentation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, the Kennedy administration's blueprint for the regimentation of American agriculture has now been introduced in the House of Representatives as H.R. 10010—a 106-page document which spells out in horrifying detail a program of harsh production controls, coupled with fines and jail sentences for farmers who run afoul of its provisions.

The measure tells farmers flatly that the alternative to this Federal straitjacket is no Federal price support assistance at all.

Apparently this administration has decided farmers are becoming an increasingly smaller minority in the United States. If farmers do not accept the production and marketing controls set forth in the new farm bill they would be denied future assistance under Federal price support programs, while, if farmers bow to this pressure and accept the program, they run the risk of fines or imprisonment for violating its many technical provisions.

The wheat section of the bill, would, for example, subject farmers to four specific penalties ranging from liability under civil action to "a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment of not more than ten years, or both." Under the bill, wheat growers and dairy producers would be singled out for much harsher fines and penalties than could be assessed against producers of other commodities.

The bill specifies "the Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this—wheat—subtitle including, but not limited to, regulations governing the acquisition, disposition, or handling of marketing certificates". It further provides that any person who violates "any regulation governing the acquisition, disposition or handling of marketing certificates shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000 for each violation."

In other words, if a farmer should inadvertently violate a Secretarial regulation relating to marketing certificates published in the Federal Register, he could be subjected to a fine of not more than $5,000 for each offense.

Never before has the Federal Government sought to impose such penalties upon American farmers.

The wheat program which would be submitted to farmers for their approval in a referendum is outlined in the bill but it leaves much to be answered. Although the producer would receive from 75 to 90 percent of parity for wheat consumed as food in the domestic market, wheat moving into export and other uses would be supported at 0 to 90 percent of parity. A national wheat allotment would be set and it would be perhaps 20 percent below the present allotment of 55 million acres. If growers turned down this entire package in a referendum, all price supports on wheat would be terminated and, to make the price situation even more chaotic, the Government would be empowered to dump 200 million bushels of wheat into the marketplace each year.

For producers of grain sorghums and other feed grains, the alternative choice is equally disastrous. If growers refused to approve a program calling for mandatory controls on all feed grains, price supports would cease and the Government could dump up to 10 million tons of feed grain into the marketplace each year.

American farmers deserve a farm program which offers them a better choice than complete regimentation or disaster in the marketplace.

Apparently this administration is determined to impose its solution upon farmers. The Kennedy-Freeman farm bill contemplates a so-called land use adjustment program which would have the effect of drastically reducing the number of farms and farmers over a period of years. Should Congress enact this legislative monstrosity, the liquidation of millions of small, family farm people, would undoubtedly be achieved in even less time than the administration contemplates.

Tribute to H. Woodle, Clemson College Agronomist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on January 14 of this year, Mr. H. A. Woodle, who was professor of agronomy at Clemson College and a former classmate of mine, passed away. His loss is sorely felt, not only by the faculty at Clemson, but by his numerous friends throughout South Carolina and the Nation. He was held in high esteem by all who knew him, both personally and professionally. His achievements in the field of agronomy and related activities are too numerous to mention, and the loss of his knowledge will be keenly felt by the farmers of South Carolina who benefited greatly as a result of his work.

Mr. Woodle possessed a brilliant mind and was first honor graduate of his class. He was a man of honor and integrity and had a host of friends who mourn his passing. Having been closely associated with him in college and since that time, I feel a deep personal loss in his death.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "The Agronomist" from the January 16, 1962, Columbia (S.C.) State, which notes some of Professor Woodle's achievements, be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AGRONOMIST

The organic changes in agriculture in South Carolina have tended to make less useful, and used, the term, "agronomy." It was the accurate and comprehensive description of what was largely a row-crop agriculture in the State in the past.

But it could have meant more even in those days. Webster defines agronomy as follows: "That branch of agriculture dealing with the theory and practice of field crop production and soil management." It can be seen that that is a very broad function.

The death Sunday of H. A. Woodle, the very able Clemson agronomist, is a loss to farming in South Carolina. He had rendered high-grade and productive service to his State. Mr. Woodle demonstrated that a man designated as an "agronomist" could operate fruitfully well beyond the scope of row crops. And the Webster definition gives that sort of latitude.

Nevertheless, the new agriculture of South Carolina, with its forestry, its fruits, its pastures, its poultry, does go well beyond the once-accepted limitation of row crops for the term, "agronomy." And today at Clemson College more young men are studying forestry than agronomy.

Mr. Woodle transcended the area formerly known as agronomy by achievements in pasture grasses and in a variety of field crops in which his knowledge led to vast improvements. As recently as 1953 a man designated an agronomist was voted the "Man of the Year" in South Carolina in agriculture. It was Mr. Woodle—and South Carolina had long since moved importantly into fields other than "row crops," or largely cotton and corn. He had shown that agronomy means more than that, and it still does.

School Aid: A Reminder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times under date of February 1, 1962:

SCHOOL AID: A REMINDER

The House of Representatives vote to provide loans and grants for the construction of academic buildings in the Nation's colleges and universities meets only one part of the Federal responsibility toward education. With what consistency can Congress give its support to the colleges and at the same time ignore the schools? Surely, the old myths about the dangers of Federal control through Federal aid should not be able to survive the legislators' now stated confidence that no such controls will accompany support of higher education.

To aid only higher education is like putting a roof over a house without solid foundations. The level of American mass education must be raised, and raised from the bottom up. The issue is that simple. Aid to the colleges ought to be merely the prelude to the essential Federal support of the public elementary and high schools.

Worth Looking Into

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, since the President delivered his proposal last week to create the Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs, the air has been charged with an emotionalism that has often obscured the fundamental issues behind the proposals.

Amid this emotionalism has been some very responsible writing by the press. And, numbered among such writings are two editorials that appeared in the Newark, N.J., newspapers. The first appeared in the Newark Evening News, Wednesday, January 31; the second, in the Newark Sunday Star-Ledger, on February 4. I commend these editorials to my colleagues at this time when they will be studying the President's recommendation:

The function and powers of the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing that President Kennedy wants to create are left somewhat uncertain in his message to Congress. He has spoken often of the need for a Cabinet-level Department that would help with all city problems, but the scope of his new agency was only vaguely defined yesterday.

For example, the President asserts that city problems "are as complex as they are manifold." He mentions among them mass transportation.

But his enumeration of the programs and responsibilities that would be transferred to the new Department includes only those of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. There is no indication in the message that the existing office of Under Secretary for Transportation in the Department of Commerce is to be transferred to the proposed Department. This office embraces not only the Bureau of Public Roads but all phases of mass transportation not assigned to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Certainly there is room for coordination in the Government's programs for urban areas. As an instance, Federal highway plans have conflicted with Federal renewal plans. It might be desirable, too, for representatives of cities to be able to take all their urban problems to a single point of decision in Washington.

But unless the President plans to widen the new Department's powers, it woud have complete and final jurisdiction only in the field of housing and in the allocation of funds for transit surveys, just as the Housing and Home Finance Agency has now.

These matters are, of course, vitally important, but as outlined, the new Department would not be the comprehensive, centralized agency big city mayors think they want or, apparently, the all-powerful institution rural legislators fear. One thing is certain. Opposition to the Department should not rest on politics or, above all, on the identity of the man the President plans to name as its head. In fact, the prospective elevation of the highly qualified Robert C. Weaver to Cabinet rank is one of the things to commend the President's proposal.

Having neatly suggested that anyone who opposes an Urban Affairs Department is somehow an enemy of civil rights, city dwellers and progress, President Kennedy has handed Congress his proposal for such a department.

Unless Congress rejects the plan within 60 days, the new Department will come into existence.

Despite the false issues that have been raised, it should be possible for Congress to consider this proposal on its merit.

The need, it would seem, is for some sort of Federal office to keep Washington's programs affecting cities in order, and out of conflict with each other. An example of the conflicts that can arise was seen last year in North Jersey, when Federal road officials approved an Essex East-West Freeway layout that would have gone directly against the advice of Federal urban renewal officials.

At this point, it is not clear that the President's plan would account for all such possibilities. His proposed Department seems to lack control over roads and some other Federal activities that heavily affect cities. Such activities include airport projects (on which Washington wants to spend $75 million next year), fallout shelters (in the budget for $460 million), pollution control ($29 million), youth projects ($66.5 million) and local public works (a modest $2 billion). That many projects, and that much money, could cause considerable confusion unless they are properly coordinated.

Congress ought to look at the President's plan and see whether it fills the bill in that regard.

Congress might look also at effects such a department might have on local politics and constitutional rule.

It has been charged, for instance, that the new Department would be the opening wedge toward massive Federal control of local government. That charge has been denied, but some loose ends remain.

For example, it has just been contended that the new Department is needed because State legislatures, firmly dominated by rural interests, have neglected cities to a point that only Washington can set things right.

Washington, of course, is not without its share of rural domination, but the thinking seems to be that something would be gained by making city governments more dependent on the Central Government in return for allowing cities to bypass their traditional constitutional responsibilities to State governments.

It might be that rural legislators in State capitals don't have that much to do with the problem. It might simply be a matter of money, which is not as readily available to any State faction as it is to the vastly powerful tax collectors of the Federal Government.

As Washington controls the money, it might be concluded that Washington already controls the futures of our cities, and that we simply need to make Washington exercise that control in a better way.

Congress certainly should look into all of this, especially since the President says the plan would actually increase the activities of State governments. Since the States at present aren't doing much in the way of urban renewal, shelter construction, or medical care for the urban aged, it's not readily obvious how they will get new authority and prestige as a result of an expansion program in Washington.

A searching examination of the President's plan could do no harm and much good. Certainly, if the plan fails to provide the necessary coordination of Federal activities,

a better plan should be devised. And, if the proposal is adequate, a congressional inquiry can bring that out and, in addition, give us a better idea of where we're going.

Proposed Potomac River Dam Near Great Falls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech made by Mr. Justice Douglas before the Daughters of the American Revolution on January 10, 1962.

This relates to the proposal of the Corps of Engineers to construct a high dam on the Potomac River at River Bend near Great Falls.

I regard this as a very concise, accurate and able statement in opposition to this project in which I fully concur.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY MR. JUSTICE DOUGLAS TO THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 10, 1962

Pollution of the Potomac River is the foremost problem confronting all of us who live in the metropolitan area. It is also a problem for every citizen who has pride in the Nation's Capital. The Potomac River, though having some of the charm that George Washington knew, is now a national disgrace. At places it is an open sewer. At points the sewage sludge is 10 feet deep on its bottom. The Public Health Service standards for drinking water is a 5,000 bacteria count per 100 milliliters. The bacteria count at Great Falls, where Washington, D.C., gets most of its drinking water, is about 7,000 per 100 milliliters.

The Corps of Army Engineers proposes a high dam at River Bend near Great Falls. Its primary function will be to supply water to wash the sewage down the river. The dam would back the river up 40 miles, flooding choice grasslands, farms, and homes of Virginia and Maryland that must be condemned at very high prices. The water level would fluctuate as much as 35 feet, for the water flow in the Potomac is irregular. Think how ugly the silted mudbanks of that lake would be. Think how awful they would smell. It is said that the water level in the summer months would fluctuate only 5 feet. A vertical fluctuation of only 5 feet means much wider margins of mud on the sloping banks of the river. Think how awful even that exposed area would look and smell. Think how dreadful the sight and smell, as the water level continues to go down in fall and winter when recreational needs are still great.

Thirty-one communities upstream from the Metropolitan Washington area have no sewage disposal plants and dump raw sewage into the waterways.

There are 20 communities in the Potomac Basin which have sewage treatment plants but which give only primary treatment and thus discharge sewage effluent into the waterways that contain 60 to 70 percent of the original contamination. Of these 20, 14 are above the Washington metropolitan area and discharge their sewage effluent into the river above the District's water intake.

Thirty-one communities in the basin have sewage disposal treatment plants that give complete treatment. Of these 31 communities, 22 are above the Washington metropolitan area. Even when a sewage treatment plant gives so-called complete treatment, it is only 70 to 80 percent effective. To put the matter another way, a sewage disposal plant which serves 1 million people pollutes the river at least to the extent of raw sewage produced by 300,000 people. So the combination of raw sewage plus sewage effluent heavily contaminates the river.

Sewage consumes oxygen in any water. Silt, by covering up bottom plants in waterways, also tends to reduce the oxygen content of rivers. Sewage plus silt creates a serious problem for any river. Some of our rivers have zero oxygen. Then even the hardiest of fresh water fish—the buffalo fish—leave the water. I have seen fish leave the Potomac and thrash until death on the bank.

As the Potomac passes Mount Vernon it is unfit for swimming and too polluted for fish. In warm weather the stench that greets the visitor is appalling.

This is a sorry condition for George Washington's river. It is also a needless condition.

Recently proposals were made to dam Trappe Creek in Worcester County, Md. After a study, the Water Pollution Control Commission of Maryland recommended against the dam. The commission reported that the stream is too heavily polluted by sewage and industrial waste.

The same would be true of the River Bend Dam. The pollution of the Potomac at Great Falls is getting worse with each passing year. The area behind the high dam at River Bend would concentrate this pollution; the lake it would create would be so ugly and so ill smelling that no one would ever want his name associated with it. * * *

Checci & Co. has submitted a report to the Governor of Maryland dated November 13, 1961, endorsing the River Bend Dam. It bases its recommendations on the "economic significance of tourism and recreation" which it says will come from the River Bend Dam. That report proceeds from one fancy hypothesis to another, claiming that millions of people would be attracted to the lake area above the dam and bring millions upon millions of dollars into Maryland. But that report is only a cheap beating of brass. For it overlooks the basic problem; viz, that people would never be attracted to a reservoir surrounded by mud banks that have the stench of sewage on them. It also fails to realize that there exists even greater recreational potentials along the estuary once it is cleaned up; it fails to appreciate the fact that access and facilities are the key to recreational development. A pool 8 miles long now exists west of Seneca that can provide the same benefits for recreation that are proposed for a River Bend dam. All that is needed is access and development of facilities. This can be done with no destruction to farms, grasslands, and homes and at a much lower cost.

Some will say, "Let's build the dam and clean up the river." But if the river is cleaned up—as it must be—there will be no need for the dam.

The real need of the metropolitan area is a stable water supply and a healthy water supply. We can have it now, and in the year A.D 2000, and in all future years without any dams—if we will only clean up the Potomac and the Patuxent.

A Nation that can conquer outer space and put a man on the moon certainly should be able to clean up its waterways. This cannot be done overnight. What we need is a full-fledged overall program so that in the near future we can have a clean river. This requires the following:

1. Prohibition of any raw sewage from any source being discharged into the waters of the Potomac Basin.

2. The adoption of sewage disposal systems for all communities in the Potomac Basin so that the so-called complete treatment would be given all sewage in the near future, and a system of treatment which would remove 100 percent of the contamination should be prepared for the next decade or two. The latter is possible by putting the effluent through distillation or other methods that may be developed. It will give our grandchildren, if not our children, a clean and healthy waterway.

If this is done, and there is no reason why it cannot be done at a cost no greater than the cost of the dams which the Army Engineers propose, there will be an abundance of water for all our metropolitan needs.

The estuary of the river can be divided into two parts: the lower and upper. The lower estuary extends from Chesapeake Bay to about Indian Head, approximately 30 miles below Little Falls, and is brackish or saline. In time—and probably a shorter time than we now appreciate—economic desaltation will be available. It is being used extensively in Israel today. The town of Freeport, Tex. has desalted water in its entire metropolitan water system. So has a small town in California. So has St. Thomas in the Virgin Islands. The scientific know-how is available. The problem is one of getting the cost lower; and the experts say there is a solution for that which is just around the corner. When that happens, all the estimates of the water needs of the entire country, including the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, will change.

But in the meanwhile we have in the upper estuary an abundant supply of potable water, if the river is only cleaned up. The upper estuary extends from Indian Head to Little Falls, where a new pumping station has been installed in recent years. This 30-mile strip of river contains a minimum of 75 billion gallons of fresh water. Once the river is cleaned up and restored to the beauty that George Washington knew, we would have a reserve of 75 billion gallons of potable water; and that is enough by any estimate to satisfy any use, normal or emergency. Whenever the natural flow of the river above Little Falls became inadequate, the present pumping system need only be shifted to the upper estuary.

Flushing a dirty river is not the answer to our problem. We need a clean wholesome playground for the 4 or 5 million people who will inhabit the metropolitan area. We need clean swimming holes, waterways for canoeing and boating, picnic sites for old folks. We need a waterfront toward which people will turn their faces, not their backs. We need the esthetic values of the Potomac. We need to preserve the historic shrines scattered along its whole length. We need them as reminders of the men who fashioned the Nation. We need these wild lands at our back door so that we, too, can find places for relaxation. Dams are sometimes necessary. If dams were necessary so that people could drink and bathe, all of us would subordinate other desires. But there is no such need on the Potomac.

Selfish interests distort the Potomac picture, making people believe that only dams provide salvation. Dams on the polluted Potomac would bring shame and disgrace to their proponents. Dams on a Potomac that was not polluted would be bad enough. When the pollution is ended, the need for dams disappears both at River Bend and on the several wilderness tributaries upstream from Washington, D.C. * * *

Honoring Papermakers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, Wisconsin today stands as the No. 1 papermaking State in the Nation.

In addition to serving the Nation, the papermaking industry also is tremendously significant to the economy in Wisconsin.

We recognize, of course, that in papermaking—or any other industry—leadership and progress is dependent upon the work, sweat and ideas of dedicated people.

The president of Badger Paper Mills, Inc., Walter Adrian, recently presented one such group, 11 members, with 20-year pins, for service in the papermaking industry.

I ask unanimous consent to have an article from the Green Bay Gazette on this aspect of progress in the papermaking industry printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERAN PESHTIGO EMPLOYEE CITED

PESHTIGO.—Walter F. Adrian, president of Badger Paper Mills, Inc., presented 11 new members with Twenty-Year Club certificates and pen and pencil sets at a recent dinner party at the Dome, Marinette.

New members honored were Clarence L. Borneman, Cyrillus E. Boulac, Paul L. Carter, Otto P. Dohr, Harold W. Fritz, Howard E. Kain, Clifford B. May, Elmer L. Meck, Arden D. Nelson, William J. Van Dyck, and Michael A. Weber, Jr.

Four new members: Myrtle E. Alswager, Edward G. Drafz, Inez McGuire, and Frances L. Powers, were taken into the Quarter-Century Club and given watches and certificates.

Catherine L. Bishop, Richard A. Gehler, Harold L. Lindberg, Robert L. Murwin, Oscar C. Oakeson, Walter O. Oakeson, Ervin W. Polzin, Otto R. Pottratz, Bernard G. Ruechel, and Byron O. Yeazel were welcomed into the Thirty-Year-Club and presented with scrolls, service pins, and a check.

Adrian's report on 1961, to the 292 members and guests present, stated that Badger had always been a successful venture and that the courage, wisdom, and integrity of the founder, E. A. Meyer, had provided them with gainful employment and a thriving community in which to live and that the members of the three clubs made up the backbone of energy necessary to carry on the many and varied activities.

He told them they should be proud to be associated with the company, its quality and performance, and to be constantly alert to keep it that way. During the preceding 12 months the company had made many improvements, some of which were a new engineering and laboratory office, a chlorination system, an automatic bulk-handling system for starch and clay, a new acid tank, the latest model Cameron rewinder, and automatic ream-wrapping and carton-sealing machines.

Some of the changes planned for 1962 to improve quality and production were told to the group.

In 1961 Badger employees received $2,634,000 in wages in addition to fringe benefits such as group insurance, social security, and safety bonuses. During the same period taxes paid to the city of Peshtigo, State of Wisconsin, and the Federal Government were $1,051,000.

The employees' profit-sharing trust had been increased by Badger during the year by $320,031, which brought to $2,890,325 the total amount going into the trust since it was established 14 years ago by Meyer.

Adrian cautioned the group to strive harder than ever to give the customers their money's worth with the best in quality and service, which would not only provide continued steady employment but would also successfully meet the challenge of a weakened price market and increased costs.

Changes in production and duties will take place, he stated, and asked for cooperation in these as they came along; otherwise, leadership would vanish when outmoded tools and methods were insisted upon.

The occasion was concluded with a musical program presented by the Peshtigo Grade School orchestra and the Peshtigo High School choral group and band members, all under the direction of Calvin Siegrist.

Don Henry Drukker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested by the entire New Jersey delegation in the House of Representatives to make the following statement about my illustrious predecessor Dow Henry Drukker, February 7, 1962, marks the 90th birthday of this illustrious citizen.

Dow Henry Drukker was born in Sneek, Holland, and was brought by his parents to the United States when he was but a few months old. The Drukker family settled in Grand Rapids, Mich., where young Dow attended the public schools.

At the age of 25 he came to Passaic, N.J., where his talent for community leadership was quickly noticed and his dedication to public service soon appreciated. Within a decade Dow Henry Drukker was elected to the Passaic County Board of Chosen Freeholders and served from 1906 until 1913, most of the period as its director.

On February 5, 1914, the death of Representative Robert G. Bremner created a vacancy in the Seventh—now Eighth—Congressional District of New Jersey. The people immediately looked to the popular former freeholder who since 1909 had been the president of the Union Building and Investment Co. Representative Dow Henry Drukker took his seat in the House of Representatives on April 22, 1914. He was reelected for full terms later in 1914 and in 1916. He was not a candidate in 1918 and retired on March 3, 1919.

In the almost 5 years of service within this Chamber it was a mutual pleasure and honor for Representative Drukker to serve with the late, beloved Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable Sam Rayburn, of Texas; the learned Representative from Georgia, the Honorable Carl Vinson; and the distinguished Senator—then Representative—from Arizona, Carl Hayden.

Still vigorous and active, Representative Drukker is the publisher of the Passaic-Clifton Herald-News, which he acquired in 1916. He still holds the position of president of the Union Building and Investment Co. Queen Juliana of the Netherlands knighted this native son as an officer of the Order of Orange-Nassau for services rendered in the great flood of 1953.

Representative and Mrs. Drukker reside now both in Clifton, N.J., and Lake Wales, Fla.

Mr. Speaker, it is a high privilege to salute this great American.

Who Calls the Tune?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I submit to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial from the Los Angeles Times of January 31, 1962.

Some of us have long wondered: Just who is calling the tune in foreign policy matters? Negotiations with the Soviet Union have always been distressing and, we might add, disastrous.

Not only the Los Angeles Times is wondering: When will we learn? The editorial follows:

WHO CALLS THE TUNE?

Our wise men have advised us that we should always negotiate with the Russians but it seems sometimes that our well-meaning Government overdoes it, like the patient who reasoned that if a little of the prescribed medicine helped him, larger doses would make him well sooner.

Consider our Government's recent negotiations with the Russians over a nuclear test ban with inspection. The conferences in Geneva cooled off when the Russians started firing enormous test shots last fall in Arctic Siberia—shots they were preparing while test ban talks were going on.

The Russians told us then that the Geneva talks were getting nowhere and that the only way to an agreement would be to consider nuclear weapons as an item in a conference on general disarmament. Our experience of such conferences was frustrating (a U.N. commission had kicked disarmament around fruitlessly for years). But obeying the rule of negotiation without reasoning why, the United States and Britain offered to enter a general disarmament conference.

Then, having made us look doubly foolish, the Russians declined to enter the negotiations they had proposed. Why not warm up the moribund nuclear conference at Geneva?

We went along; the prayer wheel at Geneva began to revolve again—until Monday, when the Soviet delegate walked out saying, "This is the end."

Now what?

We suppose that if the Russians propose another conference, no matter how absurd

the agenda, our Government will go running like a little boy who has heard the chiming of the ice cream cart.

Negotiation with Russia has lost all rational meaning; our response to the summons is a conditioned reflex.

International Morality and National Dignity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, during the period of his distinguished and dedicated service in the Congress it has been my privilege and pleasure to serve with the Honorable LEONARD FARBSTEIN, of New York, on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. He has made an outstanding contribution to the deliberation of that committee on the issues that embody the foreign policy of our country. Especially in the area of the Near East, the free access of the ships of all nations, including those of Israel, to international waterways, and the application of the moral law to our relationship with nations to which we give aid, the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Illinois have seen eye to eye. It has seemed to me, as it has to him, that a sense of international morality, as well as a due regard for our national dignity, should forbid the giving of our aid to countries that seek to enforce upon us their own discriminations along the lines of religion, race, and station.

By unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include the following column from the Jewish Times of January 26, 1962:

CAPITAL SPOTLIGHT

(By Harold Eidlin)

WASHINGTON.—One of the universal truisms about Jews—whatever they are, or whoever they are—is that their conclusions invariably will be similar.

But when it comes to the Department of State, American Jews and Israelis might just as well be talking about two entirely different matters. For it has become abundantly clear here that American Jews see one kind of State Department, the Israelis another. And each have excellent reasons for their viewpoints.

From the Israel vantage point, Amercan-Israel relations are excellent. From where Americans sit, however, the State Department has been less than forthright in its dealings with Arab nations. Motivating feelings on both sides are pure and simple parochial interests.

Israelis feel, for example, that a true atmosphere of cordial relationships exists between their nation and the United States. Israel, they say, is not only now a fact recognized by the State Department, but a welcome fact. There is common agreement on both sides, they believe, that the best interests of Middle East stability can be achieved by keeping the area as quiet as possible. The longer there is stability, the increasing absences of crises, will have a long-range balming effect, say the Israelis. In short, both subscribe to the theory that time is a great healer.

Only in the day-to-day relationships—and the various tactics which may be employed by the State Department in solving a sudden blowup—do occasional differences manifest themselves. And, say the Israelis, what the Department might do one week with respect to a given Israel-Arab situation is not nearly as important as the long-range objectives on which both sides find themselves in total accord.

U.S. INTERESTS

Israelis point out, in fact, that what may often be interpreted as an anti-Israel action by the Department of State may be completely justified and necessary from the standpoint of the United States own best interests. They recognize, they say, that in addition to its Middle East regional interests and objectives, the United States has global interests and objectives. And it is inevitable, they believe, that the latter may sometimes be in conflict with the former.

Even in terms of Nasser, Israelis believe their Government and the State Department share a common view, namely, that the Egyptian leader should clean up the mess in his own backyard before going off on his oft-threatened and sometimes executed expansionist adventures. Occasionally there are differences of opinion as to tactics in dealing with Nasser, say the Israelis, but of only a minor nature.

This attitude of the State Department extends to all its dealings throughout the Middle East, in the United Nations, in some respects to Africa, and its appraisal of the relationship of external forces—Russia—in the Middle East, Israelis say.

This meeting of the minds dated from the Sinai incident which found Israel and the United States for the first time on opposite sides of a major issue. But it was the last time that the State Department saw Israel and the United States able to establish what may be called normal relationships. And thus it is today. Israel is said to enjoy the respect and friendship of the State Department in the same way as does any nation friendly to the United States.

The burning issues which bother American Jews—Nasserism, Arab discrimination against American Jews as individuals, Arab boycotts of Jewish-owned American business firms, to name just a few—are of concern, of course, to Israelis, but hardly in the same sense that they outrage the American Jewish community. The feeling is, quite frankly, that when an American Jew is forced to make a roundabout detour in his travel plans so as not to land in an Arab country, this is an American, and not an Israeli, problem. As one longtime student of Washington-Israel affairs who now holds an important nonelective post on the Capitol puts its: "Israelis are not particularly concerned when Elizabeth Taylor is placed on the Arab movie blacklist."

A NASTY NUISANCE

While to Israel, Nasser may be only a nasty nuisance without whom the Middle East would be better off—a view supposedly also held by the State Department—to American Jews he is an opportunist who sells his favors to the highest bidder and pushes a policy of discrimination against American Jewish businessmen.

Israelis may sometimes be unhappy with the lack of steady State Department prodding of Arab nations on various issues, but they listen tolerantly to the Department's explanation that constant needling of the Arabs will not change a thing and might even possibly result in provoking the Arabs still further.

While the American Jew, however, may also understand the reasons for the State Department's policies and actions he is hardly tolerant. He is unhappy about it and says so.

One of the most articulate and outspoken commentators on State Department Middle Eastern policy is New York Democrat LEONARD FARBSTEIN. A member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, who says flatly that the Department's policy of constantly looking the other way on Arab boycotts, blacklists and travel bans against Jews "takes the easy way out" Congressman FARBSTEIN says the Department has "followed the line of least resistance—operating on the principle of retaining friendships and not irritating them."

It is a matter, he says, of who can exert the greatest pressure. And thus far, American-Jewish pressure has had little effect.

In one of the most recent public statements on the issue, the State Department last November indicated it had no plans to act on the Arab boycotts unless it was shown that a boycott was based on religious discrimination and not on affiliation with Israel.

Congressman FARBSTEIN thinks the whole matter has been very satisfactorily handled. The rights of American citizens are not being adequately protected, he says.

In an effort to remedy the issue he says he is now thinking seriously of introducing in this session an amendment to the Mutual Security Act which would require by law the automatic discontinuance of aid to any country guilty of discriminating against an American Jew or Jewish-owned firm. The current law gives the President such authority to be used at his discretion. But that provision—now 2 years old—has never been invoked on the advice of the State Department, despite numerous instances of Arab discriminatory actions during that period, asserts FARBSTEIN.

Research on Disposal of Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution of the Oregon Association of Sanitarians adopted in December 1961.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE OREGON ASSOCIATION OF SANITARIANS

Whereas the proper storage, handling, and ultimate disposal of community solid waste is basic to a clean and healthy environment; and

Whereas the problem of collection and ultimate disposal of community solid waste is becoming increasingly acute and more expensive to solve because of rapidly growing population and metropolitanism and the restrictions imposed by more rigorous requirements for air and water pollution in many areas of the United States; and

Whereas costs of collection and disposal of community solid wastes constitute a major part of municipal expenditures and total approximately $1.2 billion annually, almost no research has been done to improve and lessen the cost of the antiquated collection and disposal methods that have been used in this country for decades; and

Whereas U.S. industry allocates about 5 percent of its total annual expenditures to research and development, expenditures for research and development either directly or through grants for refuse storage, collection, and disposal on improvements is less than 0.1 percent of amount expended by the

United States in collection and disposal of solid wastes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Oregon Association of Sanitarians adopt this resolution and that the secretary be directed to prepare a letter to Oregon's Congressmen with a copy of this resolution attached, urging them to approve Senate bill No. 2009. A copy of the letter and resolution to also be sent to the National Association of Sanitarians.

Toward a Soviet America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet blueprint for subverting our free institutions and imposing international communism on us was laid before our people in 1932. It appeared in the form of a book by William Z. Foster entitled "Toward a Soviet America."

Until recently the book was all but impossible to obtain—seems the book is so revealing that the Kremlin sent out an order to destroy every copy of it—in libraries, in bookstores, in private hands. Thanks to Elgin Enterprises, Inc., Post Office Box 182, Balboa Island, Calif., it has been republished.

George Todt discusses the book in an article printed in the December 15, 1961, issue of the Los Angeles Herald-Express.

Mr. Todt comments follow:

TOWARD SOVIET AMERICA

("The so-called freedom of the American women is a myth. Either she is a gilded butterfly bourgeois parasite or she is an oppressed slave."—William Z. Foster, "Toward Soviet America.")

Would you like to know what the Communists themselves plan for the Republic of the United States if the cowards among us decide the future date of the Nation on the basis of "better Red than dead"?

Then read it straight from the horse's mouth. Or would "Trojan horse" be more appropriate here?

I am referring to the old windbag, William Z. Foster—once commissar of the Communist underground apparatus in the United States—who wrote a revealing book some years ago.

WHEN RUSS SAY

It was entitled "Toward Soviet America."

I told the story too well.

Communist bookburners, upon orders from the Kremlin, were sent out to destroy every copy of this book—in libraries, in bookstores, even in private hands.

Today it is all but impossible to find a copy of the original.

That is why Elgin Enterprises, Inc., Post Office Box 182, Balboa Island, Calif., has republished this book. Foster's original text is now to be seen in full.

This book is no argument for communism—but to help Americans defend themselves against Marxist totalitarianism.

Its foreword is written by Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

"This is the book the Communists tried to destroy," writes WALTER. "They had the best of reasons for destroying it. It tells too much.

"William Z. Foster put the text of 'Toward Soviet America' on paper. The book's real author was Karl Marx, with the collaboration of Nikolai Lenin and Josef Stalin. It is the poisonous ideas and destructive plans of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin—not merely those of Foster—that makes this book so meaningful and so frighteningly authentic."

THEY'LL LIQUIDATE

The book was first issued in 1932. The present work is not a reprint, it is a republication. There are, however, some additions: The story of the book, the story of its author and comments on the chapters by writer Maurice Ries. The latter is former executive director of the Motion Picture Alliance and a HUAC consultant.

Here are a few quotes from the book selected at random: "The final aim of the Communist International is to overthrow world capitalism and replace it by world communism. The Communist Party of the United States is the American section of the Communist International.

The Communist International carries out a united revolutionary program on a world scale.

BETTER MAKE HAY

"The American Soviet government will be organized along the broad lines of the Russian Soviets. Under the dictatorship all the capitalist parties—Republican, Democratic, Progressive, Socialist, etc.—will be liquidated. Likewise will be dissolved all other organizations including chambers of commerce, employers' associations, Rotary Clubs, American Legion, YMCA, and such fraternal orders as the Masons, Odd Fellows, Elks, Knight of Columbus, etc.

"Lawyers will be abolished. The press, the motion pictures, the radio, the theater, will be taken over by the government. Studies will be revolutionized, being cleansed of religious, patriotic and other features of the bourgeois ideology. The decisions of the Soviets are enforced by the armed Red guard.

"Citizenship is restricted to those who do useful work; capitalists, clericals and other nonproducers being disenfranchised."

Foster died in September of this year and his ashes were deposited in the Kremlin—the third American traitor to be so honored.

PROTECT YOUR FATE

Read his revealing book and find out what his Soviet masters had planned for us. Forewarned is forearmed. Learn the facts.

I hope the newly arrived patriotic bookstores in this area will avail themselves of the opportunity to stock up on this item.

Let's learn the truth about our Red oppressors—and beat them.

"Watchdog" Committee for the CIA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a fine editorial from the Eugene Register-Guard entitled "Now To Question the Unquestionable," dealing with the problem of the need for a "watchdog" committee for the CIA.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOW TO QUESTION THE UNQUESTIONABLE

Among the inquiries of Congress this year, expect an inquiry into American "intelligence," that activity that tells us what even our best friends won't tell us. There is congressional distrust of our chief agency for gathering hard-to-get information, the Central Intelligence Agency. The distrust stems largely from two incidents, the U-2 spy plane case of 1960 and the disaster in the Bay of Pigs last April. In addition, Congressmen are expressing moral and philosophical dissatisfaction with the way the Agency is being run.

After the Cuban affair, in which the CIA played a leading if not impressive role, Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT spoke of a moral problem he found in tearing a leaf from the totalitarian book. He said he thought it ill fitting that we use the methods of those we presume to despise. At about the same time, Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY justified the pressure for an investigation of the CIA. He said, "Under the Constitution, Congress is called upon to participate in a declaration of war. In modern times, war is not declared. Congress, therefore, has a continuing and very substantial responsibility for policy decisions with regard to the cold war or conducting foreign policy by any other means." (The Supreme Court some day may have something to say about the application of the warmaking power, which belongs to Congress, to problems of old-line foreign policy, which belong to the Executive.)

The end of November, Allen Dulles, himself one of the century's most celebrated spies, stepped down as Director of CIA in favor of John McCone, a businessman whose previous Government service had been in agencies that have less to hide. It might be that the presence of a new Director will lessen congressional curiosity. But it is more likely that it will not, although it may take some of the rancor out of the investigation.

Congressmen, jealous of their purse power, know how much they don't know. They don't know how much money the CIA spends, what it is spent on, even who some of its high officials are. All these matters are scattered throughout the general budget. It is unlikely that Congressmen who study the magnitude of CIA operations will ask that detailed information about the CIA and its activities be made public. For to make such detail public would be to ruin an agency that must operate in the dark.

What Congressmen are more likely to ask is that the Agency have another kind of check upon it, as assurance that somebody will ask it questions. As has been set up, the CIA is both a factfinding organization and a semimilitary organization. It acts upon its own advice. Sometimes, and this may have been the case in Cuba, it's so blinded by its own brilliance that it can't achieve any perspective.

How different the Cuban adventure might have turned out if, in the planning stage, somebody not connected with the CIA had stood up to ask some hard questions. But one doesn't press one's own boss too hard, especially when the boss is feeling pleased with himself.

British intelligence, which has been notably successful for many years, does not operate the way CIA does. It is a factfinding organization. Period. When those facts are acted upon, that acting is done by one of the other agencies, perhaps by an arm of the military, perhaps by the Foreign Office. It seems quite likely that something of this sort is what Congressmen will demand of our Intelligence Agency, too.

In an imperfect and sometimes perfidious world, "intelligence" of the CIA type is something we must have. We don't have to be especially proud of it. But we do have to have it. And, as Cuba proved, we have to have the best system we can get.

Freeman's Agriculture Program Will Kill Off Small Towns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, in the State of Minnesota there are many small towns and rural communities. And in these small towns and communities live people who have displayed, over the years, a strong and abiding faith in the little man, the country village, and farm families. One such man is Clifford Bouvette, editor of the Kittson County Enterprise in Hallock, Minn. Clifford Bouvette may disagree with your politics, but he never disagrees with the important role the small towns of our country have played in the past and should play in the future in making our democracy the envy and idol of every freedom-loving man in our world. Clifford Bouvette has long been a defender of the rural hamlet, of farm families, and of the role each should play in the preservation of our constitutional freedoms.

I noted a recent editorial by Mr. Bouvette in the Wednesday, January 31, 1962, issue of the Kittson County Enterprise that is a further indication of his consistent belief that the vitality of our economy depends, to a large extent, on the degree to which our Nation's small farmers and rural communities prosper. The contents of this editorial, I know, will be of interest to every Member of Congress, and to everyone who has a concern for the improvement of the economic well-being of farm families, small towns and rural communities throughout the Nation.

The editorial is as follows:

FREEMAN'S AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM WILL KILL OFF SMALL TOWNS

Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, former Minnesota Governor, has come up with a triangle farm plan which he intends to submit to Congress this month. This plan, still on the secret list fell into the hands of the Wall Street Journal in some way or other, subsequently was given wide publicity by that newspaper, not a word of which has since been denied by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The plan, if enacted will kill small towns such as we find in Kittson County, including county seat towns in the sprawling area known as the Red River Valley and also in all other segments of our economy where farming constitutes the lifeblood that nourishes these towns. This is the first time in many years we have heard a Democrat talk in these terms.

The triangle program uses as its base what is called supply management to end and avoid future surpluses. Land use adjustment is characterized as one side of the triangle and food for the people the other side of the triangle.

Under this plan the basic supply management goal is not intended to achieve a parity price utopia for farmers who remain on the land. It is aimed at cutting Government surplus holdings 50 percent by 1967, thereby reducing storage costs from $1 billion a year to half that figure; reducing overall price support costs from $2.5 billion a year to $1.3 billion and maintaining net farm income close to the $12 billion level of 1961. The plan calls for farm prices stabilized around present levels with some adjustment between commodities, wheat down a little, livestock and livestock products up some.

Advocating a plan of this kind tends to make the former Minnesota liberal Governor look like Ezra Taft Benson, but the dynamite in his plan indicates that Mr. Freeman has forgotten his Minnesota farm friends.

Freeman advocates in his plan migration from farms to cities with training for both farm youths and elders for city employment.

His plan advocates the removal of small units and fewer farmers left on the land at the end of such a 5-year program. The fewer larger farmers left on the land under this program would be expected to have better incomes because the little farm support that would be left would be cut into fewer slices among these remaining larger farmers left on the land.

Under this Freeman plan, what use will be made of the lands left vacant by small farmers who will have been channeled into the ranks of city laborers? The plan calls for under the terms of a confidential memorandum for the White House, to convert 34 million acres of crop and pasture land into forests, parks, wildlife refuges and other uses by the year 1969. In other words, to do things to this farmland which will, insofar as it is possible to do it, to wreck this growing capacity of this land. It is just short of pouring sulfuric acid on this land, the basic scheme to remove it from farm production by conversion to forests, parks, wildlife refuges, etc. The cost of this scheme is estimated at $23.3 million next year for a trial run (fiscal year 1963 starting July 1, 1962; $488 million 2 years later and topping at $707 million annually in 1969.)

This plan is timed with a report by Outdoor Recreational Resources Review Commission set for release this month, January 31, indicating need for 15 to 20 million acres of land for recreational purposes in the next few years which tend to support Freeman's USDA case. These plans and ideas will be submitted to Congress this month.

If this plan materializes then what must we expect? The plan provides a rapid conversion of our farmlands to other purposes and at the expense of removing not only these farmlands from our way of life but also removing the farmers who farm these lands to cities where they will work as laborers after they have been trained, apparently at Government expense.

For generations of time, Red River Valley businessmen have depended upon small farmers, their life of trade. Thousands of these farmers have managed to maintain creditable homes. They have lived well, providing their tables with wholesome foods. It may be true that most of these farmers have never thought of accumulation of great wealth. They love their farms, they are in most cases enjoying a measure of happiness. They do generate trade in small towns. If we take them off the land, then what will happen to these small towns, including country-seat towns? Just like a plant, denied water to nourish its roots, the towns will wither and dry up, eventually they will cease to exist. In the midst of the parks and wildlife refuges the scheme will give us, we will have many ghost towns, deserted completely. Eventually we will see counties merged, doing away with county government by centralization of that government to preside over many counties whereas each has its county seat today. Who is it that creates the surplus?

The small farmer has never created any surplus farm commodity. Here in the Red River Valley we grow No. 1 Hard Northern wheat, which is our chief cash crop. This wheat must be hard to mix with the abundance of Soft wheats grown in many States in order to make the soft grain of milling quality. There is not a kernel of Hard wheat in the vast storage basins maintained by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. All Hard wheat is completely consumed every year. Small farmers raise very little Hard wheat. Small farmers diversify their farming activities. They raise cattle, sheep, hogs, on a small basis, yet large enough to provide a good, comfortable way of life. They raise mostly oats, barley, little wheat and the oats and barley they raise they feed to livestock, practically none of it goes into Government surplus storage. It is the large farmer that produces the surplus but not large Hard wheat farmers. Large Hard wheat farmers that produce barley and oats contribute to the surplus. The larger they grow, the more efficient they become, and they are quick to use new and more efficient machines to further improve their production ability.

The classification known today as large farmers can produce surplus grains at a fraction of the cost incident to raising grains on small farms and that is one reason why small farms diversify and restrain from trying to produce storage grains, rather than feed what they produce. Large farms probably do not need Government support prices of any kind.

Resolutions of the Oregon Woman's Christian Temperance Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD resolutions of the Oregon Woman's Christian Temperance Union adopted in September 1961.

There being no objections, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON WCTU RESOLUTIONS, 1961

We, the women of the Oregon Woman's Christian Temperance Union in the 78th annual convention assembled at Cannon Beach Bible Conference grounds, September 12 through 15, 1961, wish to express our gratitude to God for the blessings of the past year and for the strength He supplies with the responsibilities He gives us. Our many concerns include the following resolutions:

"GENERAL

"Public opinion

"Whereas the public mind through the wide use of false propaganda seems to be imbued with the idea that there is no harm in alcohol except in large quantities, we urge that the toxic effects of any alcohol be emphasized by newspapers, the church, educational systems, and welfare institutions rather than the popular emphasis on excessive use of and overindulgence in alcohol.

"Social freedom

"Desiring to lead the way to social freedom in all entertainment patterns, we urge the glamorizing of the natural fruit beverages in their preparation and serving, making them popular to serve on every occasion.

"Broadcasting athletic events

"We urge action to eliminate liquor and tobacco advertising in connection with the broadcasting of athletic events or paid inter-

views with athletes and that it be labeled 'false advertising.'

"NATIONAL AFFAIRS

"Liquor in the armed services

"Realizing the stalwart and noble purpose of men and women called to serve with the armed services, and the pressures upon them to drink socially, we strongly recommend the banning of all alcoholic beverages from any and all installations of the armed services and in the vicinity of such areas.

"National trust

"Whereas we note that 'In God We Trust' has been omitted from series 1935-F $1 bills, we request that this omission be corrected on this or any other series and that this currency be recalled.

"National legislation

"We urge our members to continue their support of legislation to ban alcoholic beverage advertising, the use of alcohol on aircraft and the lavish appropriations for the serving of alcoholic beverages in diplomatic service.

"INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

"Peace

"We wish to reaffirm our former resolution 'that we appeal to Christians everywhere to seek and to pray for a peaceful solution of international differences, and for the application of atomic energy to peaceful purposes.'

"Peace Corps and diplomats

"We respectfully petition the President of the United States that in making choices of persons for the Peace Corps and the diplomatic service consideration be given to their character and sober behavior as well as their skills that they should be truly representative of a nation under God.

"Tourists and vacationers

"We urge tourists in foreign nations and those on vacations in this country to consider the picture of American life they are portraying and to refrain from rude conduct and public drinking spectacles.

"STATE AFFAIRS

"Liquor and hunting

"Because of the annual unintentional tragedies during the hunting season, we beg that laws be passed to suppress the carrying of alcoholic beverages and/or imbibing same in the woods by hunters during this period.

"Liquor and athletic events

"Inasmuch as logic demands that sports be on the basis of a clear mind and physical fitness, we deplore the connection between athletic events and liquor, especially as relative to youth; and we urge that the ideal be fostered of separating sale and drinking of alcoholic beverages from athletic facilities.

"Gambling and racing

"We resolve to protest the extension of the time period for animal racing in Oregon and the lowered resistance to gambling of all kinds. We ask that character-building groups make a new effort to educate the public as to the effects of all such activities upon our time-honored American attitude of thrift, honesty, and self-respect.

"Liquor and food dispensing

"We are disappointed that there is no legal stipulation regarding the sales percentage of food and alcoholic beverages in restaurants, clubs, and taverns and anticipate some positive action in this regard.

"Chaplains and institutions

"Because of the need of mental and spiritual rehabilitation for those confined in correctional and health institutions, we petition our State board of control to appoint resident chaplains in all such State domiciles.

"Farm home chapel

"We are saddened at the loss by fire, of the chapel at the Children's Farm Home at Corvallis. However, we wish to express our joy and appreciation for the way the children at the home, friends in the community, and others throughout the State are rallying to rebuild the chapel."

Great Decisions: 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a free country, if it is to formulate and execute effective domestic and foreign policy, must have the understanding and support of the majority of its citizens.

For this reason, I believe there is a special need, in these fast-changing times, to keep U.S. citizens abreast of the facts of life in today's world.

Today, I would like to commend one such effort, a splendid program, sponsored by the University of Wisconsin Extension Center and the Press Gazette, and WBAY-TV, of Green Bay, Wis.—the presentation of a public affairs service entitled "Great Decisions: 1962."

The program will provide a series of eight discussions designed to help individual Americans better understand the foreign policy role of the United States.

Recently, the Green Bay Gazette published an informative article on the program and its objectives.

Reflecting a commendable effort to meet a crucial need in these critical times, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREAT DECISIONS: 1962 OUTLINES ROLE OF UNITED STATES IN FOREIGN POLICIES

"Great Decisions: 1962" will be brought to Green Bay through the sponsorship of the University of Wisconsin Extension Center, the Press-Gazette and WBAY-TV.

The program is a series of eight discussions designed to help individual Americans better understand the foreign policy role of the United States.

"Great Decisions" is prepared by the Foreign Policy Association, a 42-year-old organization that long has promoted individual participation and understanding of the great decisions which face the United States.

The Press-Gazette will publish a series of eight United Press International articles beginning this Sunday on the eight critical areas where foreign policy will center in 1962.

Station WBAY will present a television program of one-half hour on the same topics beginning Sunday, February 11.

The extension center, along with St. Norbert College and Lawrence College, will promote discussion groups among students and adults in an attempt to further their understanding of U.S. foreign policies.

A program designed to help individual Americans understand and help determine the great decisions facing the United States begins its eighth year on February 4 under sponsorship of the nonprofit, nonpartisan Foreign Policy Association.

Under the title "Great Decisions: 1962," the program will have the participation of leading newspapers throughout the country and expects to reach 300,000 persons in active study groups.

Participating this year for the first time will be 58 noncommercial television stations, using as their central theme:

"Only through a knowledge of the human aspirations, human fears, human prejudices, and human motivations involved can the great decisions be made."

PROGRAM OUTLINED

The program, prepared by the Foreign Policy Association—World Affairs Center, divides its subject material into these decisions facing the Nation in 1962:

"Vietnam—Win, Lose, or Draw?"

"Red China—Third Greatest Power?"

"Brazil—Which Way Half a Continent?"

"Nigeria—Democracy in a New Climate?"

"Iran—Middle East Pivot?"

"Berlin—Test of Allied Unity?"

"United Nations—Independent Force?"

"United States—New Directions in Foreign Policy?"

In its introduction, the program notes that for the first few years after World War II, the United States was the world's only "superpower" in terms of vigor, wealth, and its atomic monopoly.

Despite hindsight differences of opinion over how that power was used, the Foreign Policy Association notes:

"The United States did not impose its singular power on the rest of the world, preferring instead to confer as an equal sovereign state with others on the common problem of reconstructing a wartorn world. The rich United States did not hoard its wealth, preferring instead to invest in the rebirth of both its former allies and its former enemies, and the birth of new societies in the underdeveloped southern two-thirds of the globe."

HOPE TO GUIDE CORRECT COURSE

"The powerful United States did not destroy its emerging new enemy, communism, when it perhaps had the nuclear monopoly to do so, preferring—to war—the difficult and equally uncertain struggle of ideas, politics, diplomacy, economic competition, and moral force."

Noting that the decisions program is less concerned with an attempt to fix blame for actions of the past than in helping to fix a correct course for the future, the introduction notes:

"Politically the world has exploded into a host of independent states—some of them with ancient and stable cultures, many of them virtually unequipped—domestically or in foreign policy—for the responsibilities of modern nationhood.

"Technologically, the world has also exploded. Advances in transport have shrunk the globe to a 24-hour circuit by plane and a half-hour trajectory by rocket or missile. Advances in communications have expanded one man's immediate audience from those thousands who can fill a public square to those millions who have access to radio, TV, and the press."

IMPACT ON WORLD

"For the first time in history, every man alive faces the prospect that he—or at least his children—may one day live better than generations of ancestors.

"What America does—or does not do—has a resounding impact on the rest of the world. The decisions America makes will help deter-

mine, not just our own future, but also the future shape of the world we live in."

Each of the decisions studied during the 8-week program is accompanied by fact sheets, containing maps and other pertinent detail necessary to an understanding of the questions involved.

Participants then are urged to "say what you think, give others the same privilege, don't be afraid to disagree, relax, you're among friends."

Finally, it urges all to let their own Congressmen and others in authority know of the decisions reached.

PEOPLE SHOULD MAKE THEIR OWN DECISIONS

The introduction notes that the American system requires for its own preservation that its people "think and decide and act as individuals in a society constructed for the protection and encouragement of individual thought, decisions-making and action."

The system, it notes, also imposes a discipline which is:

"If we must destroy our freedoms in order to survive physically, then it isn't worth it; on the contrary, we must learn how to win over totalitarianism without becoming totalitarian ourselves."

Discussing the relationship between public opinion and national policy, the Foreign Policy Association philosophizes over the differences in the efficiency of a democracy vs. totalitarianism.

The difference, it says, is that "democracy is self-correcting; it distills wisdom and a sense of direction from the participation of its millions of citizens in a continuing dialogue. A totalitarian society, by contrast, is by its very nature capable of monolithic and stupendous mistakes—from Hitler's to Mao Tse-Tung's."

EXPECT TO FOLLOW

The program's introductory note concludes with the belief that citizens of a democracy expect to be led but they also expect to be consulted.

The "Decisions" program, it says, "is a contribution to the continuing national debate on American foreign policy. It is not a substitute for citizen action, but is intended as a stimulus to thoughtful, independent citizen action."

Just the Facts, Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Exeter Echo, Exeter, Pa., a weekly publication in my congressional district, published a most thoughtful and impressive editorial on its front page in the edition of Thursday, February 1, 1962, which should be of interest to all. The subject of the editorial is the problem those 45 years of age and over face when seeking employment and I was most gratified and delighted to read this editorial where a series of myths regarding this widespread problem are destroyed. It is through such editorials as this that improvements in the extremely vital area of employment will be made for the benefit of contemporaries as well as subsequent generations. I congratulate the Echo for its forthright position in this vital matter.

The editorial follows:

[From the Echo (Exeter, Pa.), Feb. 1, 1962]

JUST THE FACTS, MEN

Here's welcome news. Someone is doing something about the job of encouraging employment opportunities for the fast-growing labor force of mature workers—the men and women 45 years of age or older.

That "someone" is the National Association of Manufacturers. That's the organization made up of more than 18,900 member companies—most of them small. And here's the official NAM policy on employment practices for mature workers:

"Employers are urged to observe voluntary hiring practices which give consideration to skills and abilities rather than to any arbitrary age factors."

In a first-rate study just published, entitled "The Productive Years—Ages 45–65," the NAM's industrial relations division explodes a few myths surrounding the desirability of hiring mature workers.

The myths—and the actual facts—are eye openers:

Myth No. 1: "I can't take a chance on an older worker—he's liable to be absent too often."

Fact: Such fears are groundless. As a group, older workers are absent fewer times each year than younger counterparts.

Myth No. 2: "I'm afraid for the safety of the older worker. He's more accident-prone."

Fact: All available research shows the older worker to be more safety-conscious, less accident-prone.

Myth No. 3: "I have to keep production at a high level. An older worker might not keep up with the rest."

Fact: If there is any difference in the rate of production of an older worker, it does not show until after 55. Even then it is an individual factor.

Myth No. 4: "I need versatility. Too many older workers are set in their ways."

Fact: Some older workers are inclined to be inflexible; so are some younger workers. The important consideration is the individual's outlook—his functional age.

Summing it up, friends—since when did a few gray hairs cut down creativity—and production? Let us all act our age when it comes to giving mature job applicants a fair shake.

Alaska's Power Needs—IX

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST GRUENING

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, hydroelectric power development in the 49th State, during its long years of territorial government lagged far behind that in the 48 older States. Only one Federal project was authorized. It supplies the metropolis of Anchorage and two adjacent REA cooperatives. This region and its adjacent areas north and south—the so-called rail belt—will shortly be without power. Methods to meet this impending shortage have been discussed in a worthwhile series of articles by Paul Lien published in the Fairbanks daily News-Miner. I have inserted the first eight of these and I ask that the ninth be likewise printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSULTANT IS ADVOCATE OF COOPERATIVE POWER

(By Paul Lien)

More power sources are needed immediately to take care of the power shortage which is facing us in the near future.

A power system extending from Homer in the Kenai Peninsula to Delta Junction is proposed to utilize power sources in the railbelt region.

Everyone is agreed as to the immediate need, but at the same time they wish to reduce the cost to the consumer, and if possible take advantage of our natural resources.

The use of coal in steamplants established at mine mouth seems to be the most feasible solution for low-cost power in the shortest length of time.

A strong advocate of the generation and transmission cooperative is Brene Canaday, consulting engineer for GVEA.

"The Parsons report recommends that we all go together, pool our resources, build the inner tie, and create our generation in the largest units possible," said Canaday.

"As I see it—this is the only way we can provide cheaper power to the consumer in the near future.

"Using REA money for this project tends to relieve the financial burden of the municipalities, who must raise bonds to build any additions to existing plants.

"In an integrated system, where we all pool our resources, we can build larger units, which in turn produce far cheaper power than small plants.

"Cost of building a 22,000-kilowatt steamplant is approximately $8,500,000, whereas for 50 to 60 percent more money you can put in a 44,000-kilowatt unit and have double the capacity.

"If we all go off by ourselves, we will continue to have high power costs.

"Actually maintenance and operation of a 44,000-kilowatt plant is very little more than the same for a 5,000-kilowatt unit.

"The continued addition of small plants to the system will not lower the cost of power to the consumer.

"Our main goal is to help the consumer. By no other method can this be done in the immediate future. In a period of 3 years at least one-third of the cost of electricity is eliminated.

"We are setting January 1, 1962, as the new target date for an additional feasibility report from Parsons. This will give us a firmer figure on costs in establishing mine mouth plants at Healy and Sutton, and the gas turbine plant at Anchorage.

"By February 1, 1962, we expect to receive a verbal report from the Rural Electric Administration as to whether or not they will provide money for the venture. Final approval of the financing by REA is expected by June 1, 1962.

"If all goes according to plan we should have the plant at Anchorage completed by the fall of 1963, and the plants at Healy and Sutton by December 1, 1964," said Canaday.

"As for the Generation & Transmission Cooperative operating the integrated power system, I would be heartily in accord with that principle," said H. C. Purcell, manager of Golden Valley Electric Association, Inc.

NUCLEAR POWER

"I do not wish to discount nuclear power, but if costs are anywhere near the same—we should use coal to fire the plants," continued Purcell.

"If business gets low cost power the saving is ultimately passed on to the consumer.

"Electricity is like a lot of other things—it's cheaper by the dozen—and our goal is to cut the price of power to the consumer in half within the next 10 years.

"If we should go off on our own rather than join the cooperative, we would not achieve this goal.

"Eventually, when we get the cost of power down, people will be able to use electricity for house heating. At present this is too costly," said Purcell.

Bailing Out the U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, soon we shall be considering the President's suggestion that the United States purchase $100 million of the U.N. bonds and there will be much emotion and argument not only here in this House but all across the country. All sides must be well considered, and to be considered they must be presented. To this end I am including with these remarks a very pertinent editorial in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of January 31:

BAILING OUT THE U.N.

President Kennedy's message urging the purchase by the United States of half of the proposed $200 million United Nations bond issue went to Congress yesterday and hearings will start next week in the Senate.

Nobody will claim that this would be a sound investment from a financial point of view. As Senator BYRD has pointed out, it is not good business to sell U.S. bonds bearing nearly 4 percent interest in order to buy U.N. bonds which will return 2 percent interest.

However, the United States is not making an investment in United Nations bonds in the hope of making a quick profit. We are supporting the United Nations because it is the only worldwide organization with a potential peace-keeping capacity. This may have seemed tenuous at times, but it is in our interests to keep it alive. And now we are asked to help bail it out of a bad financial situation because of the refusal of some nations to pay their assessments for special operations, such as those in the Congo and along the Gaza strip.

According to the plans, the nations which have shirked their assessments eventually will have to pay them if they want to retain their voting privileges in the U.N. This is because the repayment of the bonds, plus interest, will become an obligation of the U.N. general funds, which are financed by membership dues, and the Charter provides that any nation which has not paid its dues for 2 years may have its voting privileges suspended.

There is also a possibility that the shirking nations may be encouraged to pay up if the World Court hands down a favorable ruling on the assessments. The U.N. has asked the Court to decide whether special assessments are obligatory and a decision is expected this summer. A ruling by the Court would not be enforceable, but it might have great influence on public opinion.

At any rate, we cannot let the United Nations expire from bankruptcy. Those who want to kill it should have guts enough to say so and present a resolution calling for its disbandment, or withdrawal of the United States from membership.

The United States and the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD remarks I delivered on the United States and the United Nations, before the Portland State College Convocation, Portland, Oreg., November 20, 1961.

There being on objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNITED NATIONS

(Remarks of Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, before the Portland State College Convocation, Portland, Oreg., November 20, 1961)

Faculty, students, and friends of Portland State College, there is no greater pleasure for me than to return to the stimulating atmosphere of an Oregon campus, and this visit to Portland State is no exception.

The growth of this institution is one of the encouraging signs that higher education will not be allowed to lag behind population growth. As chairman of the Senate Education Subcommittee, it has often seemed to me that we have been bound to a somewhat stagnant concept of making big schools bigger instead of creating new 4-year universities that will take their place beside the traditional ones.

We do not hesitate to build new homes or highways for a bigger population. Why should we hesitate to build new universities? I feel that Portland State is proving that this is indeed the appropriate way to keep up with our needs in the field of higher education.

To this audience, however, I want to devote my principle remarks to foreign policy problems. Never in our history has there been more interest and concern with international affairs among Americans than today. This is true because we are the most powerful nation in the world and also because we are self-governing. Where decisions are made for a people by an imposed set of rulers, they may not need to know the why and wherefore of the decision; but where a government is elected in a free election, there is no substitute at all for an informed public.

Probably the one new and basic fact which has changed American thinking about international affairs more in the 15 years since the end of World War II has been the advance in Communist technology and production which now enables the Soviet Union to deliver upon the territory of the United States by long-range missile the frightful destruction of nuclear weapons.

This is a relatively new factor for Americans to consider. Prior to World War I, and prior to World War II, we were bystanding witnesses to the military might which swept over Europe and over Asia. We watched it; we debated whether it would eventually threaten our own territory. We considered at what point we should enter the fray ourselves so that the battle with Germany and Japan might be won before it ever reached the United States proper.

Today, it is the United States itself which is a central target of armed might, and it is an armed might that carries more destruction than any in history. We have an even more overwhelming nuclear force at our command. But I think it is safe to say there is no chance at all that either the United States or the Soviet Union can strike the other without being struck in return, no matter who unleashes the first blow.

That Americans are beginning to understand this basic change in our position is evident from the hot and heavy debate over civil defense, a subject we have scarcely even considered before.

Those of us who serve on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee recognize that military technology and civil defense are part of the raw material from which foreign policy is made. The old tradition that war is just one more means of pursuing a national policy is, however, rendered pretty invalid by modern warfare. Our use of war has been for defense. War today, however, and I mean a nuclear war with the Soviet Union, will not defend what we want preserved. If we can destroy the enemy by means of war, the war itself will destroy, too, what we like to call the American way of life.

The dismal alternatives and the preoccupation with them by so many people has given rise to what I think is a highly falsified debate over whether it is better to be red than dead, or vice versa.

This preoccupation has also given rise to an old familiar refrain about stopping Communist advances by investigating the American State Department. For many people, it is unthinkable that anything can happen anywhere in the world unless it is willed by the United States, and every change that appears to them as a threat to their sense of permanent American superiority is assumed to have occurred only because of connivance by Americans.

The plain truth is that both Russia and China are very large nations, with populations that greatly exceed our own. Once industrial technology and mass education was applied to these vast numbers of people and to their extensive natural resources, the result was a rise in their industrial and military power. We could investigate every person who works for the Department of State until the cows come home, but it would have no impact on Communist advances. We got on that merry-go-round about 10 years ago, and the only result it produced was to make the United States a laughing stock among people who did not see why they should be impressed with American foreign policy when the American people did not trust their own State Department.

This is no time for us to emulate the Communist folly of devouring its own. Actually, the free world has benefited from that Communist practice. The campaign to eradicate Stalin from history and even change the name of Stalingrad to Volgagrad probably has some unknown roots in the twists and turns of Communist doctrine. But the result has been a revelation of how ridiculous communism can get. It has also given rise to new questioning of present Communist policy. The party line is going to have to be buttressed with more logic and information than in the past, because the party faithful in many countries are already asking why they should believe in the present Soviet leaders any more than they should believe in Stalin. We should take every advantage of this confusion in Communist ranks instead of creating our own counterpart.

We help the Communist world by firing on our own State Department from the rear while the Communist fire on it from the front.

I have never been among those who believe that a democracy can find scapegoats. Many prefer to find scapegoats than to think. Many find it easier to argue with loyal Americans than with Russian Communists. But disunity, witchhunting, and suspicion at home will never improve our standing abroad.

Instead of this neurotic insistence on investigating individuals, what we really need is a national investigation and debate by all the American people of the policies our State Department should pursue, because the men and women who happen to work there are not separate from the American people.

We do need more public investigation of foreign policy issues and problems. We need some hard thinking about alternatives to the choice between "red or dead." We need to learn more and debate more what policies and devices are open to us that will really save what we want saved of American life. This is a job that the whole American people must do.

One of the alternatives which I do not think has been fully appreciated and used is the United Nations. I have been critical of the State Department policy myself in this respect. But we need to have a realistic picture of the United Nations, of what it does, what it could do, and what it cannot do.

First of all, too many people who are critics of the United Nations and too many who ardently believe in it seem to regard the U.N. as representing chiefly the neutral or unaligned nations. Too often, when we speak of the United Nations, we have in mind a so-called third force of countries who are party to the cold war. Many individuals think these nations, being militarily weak, should be ignored and therefore the United Nations should be ignored.

On the other hand, some Americans tend to ascribe to this bloc of nations some special pure and lofty motives, untarnished by self-interest, unsullied by the taint of ownership of nuclear weapons. This romantic misconception of the so-called neutral bloc also leads to some serious mistakes in our thinking about the United Nations.

Neither of these attitudes is sound. The fact is that the cold war between the Communist world and the free world is over the future of these presently unaligned countries. If they lack military power, they still contain a huge proportion of the world's population and natural resources. What American who today says we should ignore the neutrals, would ignore any one of them which is taken over by a Communist form of government? Let that happen, as it did in Cuba, and the howls for American action will go up.

But neither are these nations any different from the United States or the Soviet Union in the pursuit of what they think is their national interest. Let us never forget that among the new nations of Asia and Africa, and in Latin America, too, nationalism is probably the strongest single driving force. Their nationalism is no less rampant than the nationalism of the Soviet Union nor of the United States.

If they are critical of the two great powers for failing to settle their differences, the small countries have not settled their differences, either, and they have not used the United Nations for peaceful settlement of them any more than we have.

That the United Nations remains as the center of world politics in spite of the nationalism of great and small powers is testimony to the universal need by all these powers to have a single agency which will tend to moderate conflicting nationalisms. It also points up the one common need of every nation—the avoidance of nuclear war. Nuclear war is the enemy of every country's national aspirations.

In this respect, the United Nations is as important to us as the so-called neutral countries. This is why we have supported it financially, and in fact, the United States has been by far the largest single source of U.N. financing. Since assessments are levied on the basis of ability to pay, however, we are contributing no more than our share.

But the Communist bloc, and some of the colonial powers, refuse to support any U.N. function of which they disapprove. This policy has been weakening to the organization. It has been restrained by the provision of the charter which deprives a nation of the right to vote in the General Assembly if it falls 2 years behind in its regular assessment. Unfortunately, such expensive operations as that in the Congo are not considered as part of the regular budget and so Russia and its satellites and France have simply refused to pay their share. This is one of the most serious problems the organization faces.

A second major problem of the United Nations is the veto power. When it was written into the charter in 1945, it was at our insistence as well as that of the Soviet Union. But it has hamstrung effective United Nations action in many areas. It has resulted in the withering of the Security Council as an operating body, and caused the U.N. to use the General Assembly for the making of policy which the Security Council was supposed to make. It has also forced the Secretary General to assume supervision over police actions authorized by the Assembly which were intended to be authorized and supervised by the Security Council.

As one who opposed the veto power in 1945, I continue to believe it should be eliminated, and that this country should constantly seek its elimination,

Above all, it should not be extended to the office of the Secretary General, and the fact that it was not is due to the outstanding diplomacy of Ambassador Stevenson, plus the conviction among the small nations that the secretariat must not be reduced to the impotency of the Security Council. Yet this battle was won only temporarily, because U Thant of Burma will only fill the unexpired term of Mr. Hammarskjold. In April of 1963, the battle against the "troika" will begin anew.

It is evident from a discussion of these two major problems facing the United Nations that they arise from the efforts of Soviet Union to prevent effective United Nations action which tends to block their own objectives. A third manifestation of Russian dissatisfaction with the U.N. is its effort to move it out of New York City to Moscow, or some other place where Communist riots and demonstrations may more easily be organized as a means of influencing and intimidating U.N. delegates. Those ill-informed Americans who call for getting the U.N. out of the United States fail to understand how much we have to gain by having its headquarters in the United States, and how much advantage the Soviet Union would gain throughout the world if it were moved to Moscow.

The point of what I am saying is that because we do not want to compel other nations to be like us, but only want them to be independent, we share with them a common interest in the United Nations. It is the focus of common interest that has yet to be developed in American foreign policy. The unaligned nations, being weak, are susceptible to Communist terrorism, as we saw when the Russian resumption of nuclear testing achieved much of its purpose at the Belgrade conference. It is an old American belief that in unity there is strength. We must see to it that the United Nations is an instrument that will reflect this commonly-held desire for peace, and opportunity for national growth.

We can best do that by taking to the U.N. the big international issues that threaten the peace. We should not let these nations remain in the role of passive bystanders to the East-West struggle, where they are most likely to feel that since it does not involve them, they should merely bring pressure on whichever side is most reasonable to give in to the side which is more implacable. This tendency is all too evident among the neutrals.

Because we say, and believe, that in defending the freedom of West Berlin we are defending freedom for all nations, we should put these nations into Berlin with us. This is why I have often urged that we try to put the whole city of Berlin under the jurisdiction of the United Nations. It is why I have consistently urged that before we send American troops to one trouble spot or another which is outside the requirements of our immediate self-defense, that we first try to get the United Nations to act.

The right of self-defense is fully recognized by the U.N. Charter and will always remain our right and obligation. But the advances of communism elsewhere in the world must be met by something else. That something else must be a sense of unity against aggression, including subversion, and the strength to back it up. We have the strength, but when we use it unilaterally in matters outside our territorial defense, we fail completely to get others to see that they, too, have a stake in the outcome.

A hot war, in other words, which ends in mutual destruction has no victor. A cold war can be won or lost. It cannot be won, however, by the United States alone but only by the community of nations, and the community of nations today is the United Nations.

Amarillo Daily News Supports House Joint Resolution 447

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, on February 2, 1962, the Amarillo Daily News carried an editorial entitled "If a Nation Is at War, It Ought To Be Allowed To Defend Itself." The article, written by Miss Louise Evans, urges the active participation of every American citizen in this war for survival against the international Communist conspiracy. The text of the article follows:

"IF A NATION IS AT WAR, IT OUGHT TO BE ALLOWED TO DEFEND ITSELF"—POLITICUS

(By Louise Evans)

"We cannot win this war by ignoring its existence, or even by policies limited to defense. We must aggressively prosecute this war against the enemy, even as he is prosecuting it against us."

With these words, JOHN R. PILLION, U.S. Representative from the 42d District of New York, introduced a resolution into the House on June 12, 1961, which expressed a declaration of war against the "Communist parties constituting the international Communist conspiracy."

Representative PILLION outlined the weapons systems of the Communist parties—almost none of which included arms—ranging from psychological warfare to infiltration.

And granting that no state of war exists between the United States and its avowed enemies, how can one use the constitutionally granted tools which we do have to meet such hidden warfare—if one is not at war, there can be no treason, no spies, no alerting of the citizenry to the danger.

Take advantage of the 75-cent rate Western Union has extended to send a telegram to your Senators and Representatives asking that they get House Joint Resolution 447 to the congressional floors for open debate. Lets see how our representatives feel about this problem—if they have caught up yet with the people, who darned well know who the enemy is. And you might write Representative PILLION in Washington and thank him for stating the premise.

And here is the Pillion resolution:

"Whereas the Congress of the United States finds and proclaims that: There exists a world Communist movement established at the Third Communist International held in Moscow in the year 1919; and

"This Communist movement is a political entity which is irrevocably committed to impose a Communist dictatorship upon all nations of the world, including the United States; and

"This Communist movement is an international conspiracy engaged in the demoralization, disintegration, and destruction of all non-Communist nations, and all other economic systems, all religious bodies, and all other social structures; and

"The international Communist conspiracy is composed of, and utilizes an alliance of 98 national Communist parties in a joint and several campaign of infiltration, espionage, terror, deceit, and all other forms of revolutionary and guerrilla war techniques against the peoples and governments of the free world, including the United States; and

"These 98 national Communist parties constitute a force of 36 million member agent-provacateurs who are rigidly trained and highly disciplined, revolutionary activists; and

"These 98 national Communist parties and these 36 million agents repudiate all allegiance to non-Communist nations and pledge their single allegiance to the international Communist conspiracy; and

"The international Communist conspiracy, since its inception, has repeatedly declared and re-declared war against freedom and freemen everywhere; and

"The international Communist conspiracy redeclared this war in its Moscow manifesto of December 5, 1960, and called for an intensification of the prosecution of this war; and

"Pursuant to these declarations, the international Communist conspiracy is openly and avowedly waging an incessant war of extinction against all peoples and nations of the free world, including the people and the Government of the United States; and, the actual enemy of peace in this world is the international Communist conspiracy which by its relentless war, is confronting the free world with the desperate alternatives of either an unconditional surrender or thermonuclear war; and as a last hope for survival and peace for all of this world: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That:

"The United States formally recognizes the de facto total global war being waged by the Communist parties of the world, jointly and severally, against each and every government of the free world, its citizens, and its institutions; and

"The United States formally recognizes the de facto war being waged specifically against the United States, its citizens, and its institutions, by the Communist parties of the world, jointly and severally; and

"The United States formally and solemnly declares that a state of war exists between the United States and the Communist parties of the world, jointly and severally, namely:

"The Communist party of the Soviet Union, the Communist party of the United States of America (we will not print the remainder of the list of 98 names, which includes all of the known Communist parties of the world, but Representative PILLION lists each one separately).

"The United States hereby pledges all the resources of its Government, and its citizens, to defend, anywhere and everywhere, the freedoms, the institutions, and the governments of the free world against the international Communist conspiracy; and

"The United States resolutely pledges all of its resources to the defeat and the destruction of the Communist parties of the world as herein named; and

"The United States, with supreme confidence in the courage, dedication, and wisdom of its citizens, entreats each of them for a unified and equal sacrifice, in defense of its families, its homes, its freedoms; and

"The United States calls for immediate concerted action on the part of all people of the free world who cherish freedom, all people under Communist tyranny who aspire to freedom, all people who value religion and morality as pillars of human happiness, all religious bodies who would defend their faiths, all unions and members thereof, who oppose state monopolistic control over labor and the fruits of labor, all societies, organizations, institutions, and associations of human beings who believe in a free expression of their ideals and aspirations, all governments who would resist conquest and exploitation by the Communist power system, to join in this cause; and

"The United States seeks for all mankind a true peace on earth, an enduring peace, a peace with spiritual satisfaction, a peace that will bring material abundance to all people, a peace of freedom, and everlasting hope.

Literacy Test and Poll Tax Have Proper Role in Our Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include an editorial which recently appeared in the Clarion-Ledger of Jackson, Miss.:

LITERACY TEST AND POLL TAX HAVE PROPER ROLE IN OUR GOVERNMENT

Liberals are fond of insisting that emotionalism has no proper role in government, yet President Kennedy spoke emotionally rather than logically in his state of the Union message when he said: "The right to vote should no longer be denied through such iniquitous local devices as literacy tests and poll taxes."

Logic and fairness must dispute the use of the offensive word "iniquitous," which means unjust and wicked. There is nothing more unjust or wicked about prescribing a reasonable literacy test for voters, who should have some ability to read and reason.

Mr. Kennedy himself pointed out in his state of the Union message that some 8 million adults are functionally illiterate, adding that this figure is reflected in national crime rates and welfare rolls. The President favors a massive attack on this problem and State literacy tests have a real part in its solution. Certainly it is proper to put more emphasis on the value of the ballot and intelligent citizenship which is the very basis of our Government.

Senator STENNIS, of Mississippi, rightly warns that if the proposal for arbitrary abolition of the literacy test is adopted and upheld by the courts, then the Constitution will be gone. The qualification of electors is clearly within the power of the States under the Constitution and Congress has no proper business in this field. If voting qualifications are to be altered, they should be changed upward instead of downward.

As for the poll tax, it is a trivial fee—$2 in Mississippi—levied equally on all citizens and is one of the few taxes that is thoroughly democratic. Our State earmarks all poll tax money for the support of public education, thus it helps combat the illiteracy the President finds so shocking and wants to eradicate.

It is ridiculous to argue against a tax on voting, when citizens are heavily taxed for the right to work and earn their daily bread. Mississippi's $2 poll tax is no barrier to any person who really values the right to vote and respects the obligations of citizenship.

In this connection, the Arkansas Democrat at Little Rock points out that the worst voting scandals, the most flagrant disrespect for the ballot, are not in the literacy test and poll tax States but in States which have neither requirement.

It is increasingly apparent that this country needs more rather than less responsibility in government and in individuals. The literacy test and poll tax definitely encourage a sense of responsibility among our State's electorate.

Proposed New Department of Urban Affairs and Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President I invite attention to an editorial and a column by Mr. James Reston in the January 31 edition of the New York Times concerning the President's proposal to establish a new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

I would like to comment on a few points raised by these two pieces. As the editorial states:

It is difficult to understand why so many Republicans in Congress are so deeply outraged by President Kennedy's intention to set up a new Department of Urban Affairs.

Indeed it is. It is especially difficult to understand Republican outcries that the President "injected the racial issue" into the proposal by announcing that he would appoint Dr. Robert Weaver as the new Secretary if the Department is created. I think it ought to be pointed out that for months now, nearly every newspaper article on the subject has been reporting that Dr. Weaver was in line for the job. Surely the President's announcement, in response to a reporter's question, could not have come as a surprise, and surely the Republican critics would agree that Dr. Weaver is eminently qualified for the position.

Mr. Reston discusses at some length the argument that the Department would weaken the role of State governments.

I would like to underscore the point that the exponents of this view, who

argue that the cities ought to redouble their efforts to gain fair representation in State legislatures, can scarcely be called the strongest supporters of the cities in this regard. These critics are usually the very ones who attempt not only to close the "pipelines" from the cities to the Federal Government, but also preserve the rural dominance in State legislatures.

But the most fundamental point in this issue is the fact that the creation of a Department would have nothing whatever to do with whether States are strengthened or weakened. It is the Federal aid programs which Congress approves that have a bearing on this question, and in my judgment most of our Federal aid programs of concern to cities have stimulated and strengthened State governments, rather than the reverse.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article and editorial I have referred to be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW DEPARTMENT

It is difficult to understand why so many Republicans in Congress are so deeply outraged by President Kennedy's intention to set up a new Department of Urban Affairs. The Republican Party's own platform of 1960 recommended "a stepped-up program to assist in urban planning, designed to assure farsighted and wise use of land and to coordinate mass transportation and other vital facilities in our metropolitan areas."

To be sure, this Republican plank did not specifically suggest the idea of forming a new department. But the activities it described as needing to be "stepped-up" are precisely the activities which Mr. Kennedy is now talking about. Certainly the most logical way of "stepping-up" such activities is to bring them together, under the direction of a responsible Cabinet officer, within the framework of a single department.

The Federal Government is already deeply involved in urban affairs—think of housing, for example—and it is surely going to be still more deeply involved as time goes by—consider what it will soon be asked to do in the matter of salvaging metropolitan transportation and keeping the commuter lines alive. It is perfectly clear, as the President said in his message to Congress yesterday, that "in a few short decades we have passed from a rural to an urban way of life and in a few short decades more we shall be a Nation of vastly expanded population, living in expanded urban areas in housing that does not now exist."

Since a shortsighted and highhanded Rules Committee in the House of Representatives has destroyed the hope of early action on an administration bill to establish the new Urban Affairs Department, we welcome Mr. Kennedy's course in proceeding alternatively under the Reorganization Act, as he has every right to do.

HOW TO LOSE ELECTIONS WITHOUT HALF TRYING

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, January 30.—In their fight against President Kennedy's efforts to create a Federal Department of Urban Affairs, the Republicans have based their argument on very insecure political and historical grounds.

They are right enough in saying that President Kennedy is "playing politics" with this issue; everybody is. They are also correct in saying that a powerful Federal department dealing with urban affairs would tend to weaken the State governments.

Finally, it is probably true that such a system would encourage the cities and suburban communities to look to Washington even more than they do now for the solution of their urban problems, and thus help break down the Federal-State constitutional pattern that has worked so well in most fields until now.

But why are the urban communities turning to the Federal Government to deal with their rising population, transportation, housing, and other complex problems? Because most of the States have failed them; because the unrepresentative State legislatures have increasingly favored rural interests to the detriment of urban interests, and the cities have bypassed the State capitals and turned to Washington.

A PROPHETIC WARNING

It is a serious and unfortunate trend in the Federal system, but the fact is that the Republicans and conservative Southern Democrats, who also favor the rural interests, have helped to weaken the States rights they constantly profess to uphold by refusing to deal effectively and fairly with this migration of voters to the cities.

Shortly after the end of the last war, 59 percent of the population of the country lived in urban areas but elected only about 25 percent of the members of the State legislators. The imbalance has gotten worse since then and the urban problems have increased.

President Eisenhower's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations warned the Republican administration of this problem back in 1955. "If the States," it said, "do not give cities their rightful allocation of seats in the legislature, the tendency will be toward direct Federal-municipal dealings. These began in earnest in the early days of the depression. There is only one way to avoid this in the future. It is for the States to take an interest in urban problems * * *. If they do this, the cities will find a path to Washington as they did before, and this time it may be permanent * * *."

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, pointed a year later to the paradox of the States righters weakening the States authority by refusing to deal adequately with urban problems.

"It is very interesting," he said, "that those who complain most about Federal encroachment in the affairs of the States are most often the very ones who deny to the urban majorities in their States the opportunity to solve their problems through State action. Until the State legislatures have been reformed, the plea for Federal action will remain strong and just."

Politically, the Republicans have a better case, but even here their arguments tend to be overwhelmed by the obvious crisis of transportation, and housing in the cities.

KENNEDY'S ACE

Not only today but for some time Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, of Illinois, and Representative CHARLES HALLECK, of Indiana, the Republican leaders in Congress, have been needling President Kennedy about failing to keep his campaign promise to issue an Executive order ending racial discrimination in federally assisted housing. This was fair enough, but it put the President on the spot on the civil rights issue, and he devised a strategy to meet it.

He refused to sign the housing order now, not because he is waiting for a "national consensus," as he says, but because he does not want this controversial issue to interfere with his trade expansion and medical care bills on which he needs the support of legislators who do not want an Executive housing order.

Accordingly, he countered with the proposal to create a Department of Urban Affairs and let it be known that he intended to appoint a Negro to head it once it was established. This turned an important issue over the relative authority of the Federal and State governments into a political row over who was for the city folk and the Negroes.

Had the Republicans concentrated on the main issue—dealing with city problems and doing so as much as possible through the States—they would have been faithful both to the needs of the city voters and to their belief in States rights. But they chose to play it the other way and Kennedy, who is no amateur at political infighting, saw a way to turn the issue to his advantage.

Also, he retains the decisive "sleeper" in this whole argument. For he can always sign that Executive order, ending racial discrimination in federally assisted housing, after this session of Congress and before November's congressional elections, and anyone who wants to bet against his doing just that can get even money around here, and maybe even better.

Communism in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, the battle is on to save Latin America from international communism. Cuba has already fallen into Kremlin hands. Now we must move quickly and with firm resolve to give our friends to the south the guidance they need to achieve economic and political freedom. Our task is to help them to understand the meaning of free enterprise and constitutional government. Our task is to show them that capitalism is the best economic system yet devised by man.

David Lawrence has discussed the Communist threat to Latin America in an article which appeared in the January 30 edition of the Evening Star. I think Mr. Lawrence's article should be brought to the attention of every Member of Congress. I ask, therefore, that the article be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

OAS AND THE COMMUNIST THREAT: HESITANCY OF LEADERS OF LARGER NATIONS BLAMED ON FEAR OF LEFTIST GROUPS

(By David Lawrence)

Cuba is only an incident—an example. The real battle today is to save Argentina, Brazil, Chile, and Mexico, which are the rich prizes the Soviet Union has set out to win in Latin America. If they should succumb, the other countries would be expected to collapse soon thereafter.

This is one reason why the United States has endeavored to line up the Organization of American States behind some action that would show the Soviets, as well as their followers in Central and South America, that the invasion of this hemisphere is not to go unchallenged.

It has come as a surprise to most people in the United States that there should be any hesitancy in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, and Mexico to go along with this country in applying economic sanctions to Cuba. This hesitancy certainly isn't because the Governments of those four nations do not understand what has happened in Cuba. It is

primarily because they face from within their own countries such formidable opposition from Communist-inspired groups and factions that they fear for their own political future. A series of events recently in Latin American countries shows how the Communists topple or attempt to topple a regime friendly to the United States.

What matters most at the moment is not whether the United States can achieve a victory for a resolution at the Conference at Punta del Este that would impose an economic embargo on Cuba, but whether the viewpoint of this country has been sufficiently impressed on Argentina, Brazil, Chile, and Mexico so that their respective Governments will begin to see that they cannot hesitate any longer. They cannot flounder indefinitely between sympathy for the position of the United States and fear of their own malcontents. For such weakness can only mean an eventual takeover by the Communist-led groups inside their own countries.

Economic sanctions or the embargoing of trade is not easy to impose anywhere in the world, even among the nations of Western Europe. There are businessmen inside Argentina, Brazil, Chile, and Mexico as well as other Latin American countries who see bankruptcy ahead if interference with trade is sanctioned inside the hemisphere. These men have political influence within their own governments, and much as they may appreciate the viewpoint of the Washington Government, they would like to see a less drastic course pursued.

This is why a controversy over the action to be taken at the Punta del Este Conference has been inevitable. The draft resolution presented by the United States for the signature of all the foreign ministers minced no words. It read as follows:

"The ministers have been able to verify that the subversive offensive of Communist governments, their agents, and the organizations which they control, has increased in intensity. The purpose of this offensive is the destruction of democratic institutions and the establishment of totalitarian dictatorship at the service of extracontinental powers."

That's the story in a nutshell of what the United States, after many years of patient observation, has finally brought out into the open. It isn't easy for any of the Latin American nations to swallow this accusation, though they know it to be true.

So at last a start has been made toward a crusade for freedom from Soviet interference throughout Latin America. Cuba, it is reasoned, will in due time collapse, either through internal discontent resulting from economic chaos or from effective revolutionary activity carried on from bases in other Latin American countries where exiles are daily planning measures that can enable them to return to their native land.

There is a strange paradox in all this. Thus, inside the United States the fight against communism has met with legal hurdles that Latin Americans cannot understand. They wonder how it is that Communists can conduct public meetings advancing their ideological doctrines and can, even with "evil intent," teach and advocate the forcible overthrow of the Federal Government and get away with it as long as they cannot be proved to have instigated action to that end. These distinctions may be clear to our Supreme Court justices, but in Latin America they ask: "How can you expect us to deal with subversion when you tolerate it in your own country and characterize as 'extremists' people who fight communism?"

It may be said in reply that perhaps the United States does not consider the Communist menace likely to make as much headway here as it already has in other countries in this hemisphere less able to police themselves.

What counts at the moment, however, is the firm declaration of President Kennedy made to the American Society of Newspaper Editors last year, which might well have been given emphasis at the Punta del Este Conference. He said on April 21, 1961:

"Should it ever appear that the inter-American doctrine of noninterference merely conceals or excuses a policy of nonaction—if the nations of this hemisphere should fail to meet their commitments against outside Communist penetration—then I want it clearly understood that this Government will not hesitate in meeting its primary obligations which are to the security of our own Nation."

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

FAIRFIELD, CONN., *January 13, 1962.*

The Honorable DANIEL FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: First permit me to congratulate you on your sponsorship of House Resolution 211, calling for the establishment of the Special House Committee on Captive Nations. I have written my Congressman, the Honorable ABNER SIBAL of Connecticut, urging him to support the passage of this measure. I am enclosing a copy of the above-mentioned correspondence in the hopes that you can put it to some use.

Again congratulating you.

I am sincerely yours,

ANDREW S. PIRETTI.

FAIRFIELD, CONN., *January 13, 1962.*

The Honorable ABNER SIBAL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.,

DEAR SIR: At present there is a resolution (H. Res. 211) pending before the House calling for the establishment of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. I wholeheartedly urge you to support this measure and to work for its passage as it is essential to the success of the United States in the cold war.

The existence of the captive nations provides us with a great weapon in our cold war with the Soviet Union. Khrushchev is repeatedly condemning the Western nations for being imperialist, colonial powers. But no country could be more guilty of colonialism than the Soviet Union. It holds within its grip 22 nations. This fact is useful in showing the so-called neutral nations that, in fact, it is Russia and not the West which is the greatest imperialist power. A strategic approach to the utilization of this fact was Adlai Stevenson's letter memo to the members of the United Nations which he distributed last November. In one of the finest documents ever presented by a U.S. delegate to the U.N., Ambassador Stevenson capably outlined the extent of Russia's colonial domain. But this was only one step forward; more must be taken if we are to be victors in the cold war.

It may also be noted that the captive nations are a potential powder keg upon which the Kremlin sits. Khrushchev was noticeably upset by the passage by Congress of the captive nations resolution in July of 1959. Perhaps, by his own adherence to Communist doctrine, he is upset by being called a colonial power. By the Communist philosophy of nature and Lenin's theory on the dynamics of colonialism, we can see why they are troubled. In the philosophy of nature, the Communists hold that there are opposing forces which keep nature on the move. Lenin incorporates this into his theory on colonialism, stating that the two opposing forces are the colonies and the nations which control them. Lenin says that these elements will come into conflict and the colonies will destroy those countries which now control them. Thus, perhaps, they see conflict inherent in their relations with their colonies and therefore become disturbed when others emphasize the existence of a colonial relationship.

But in our logically thinking, Western minds, we can see that the friction exists, not because of any materialist law of nature, but because it is the nature of man to be free and these people are suppressed and in chains. These people cry for freedom. Thus, any inkling that the outside world is interested in their cause will spark new hope into their lives. The establishment of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations would provide such an indication. And Khrushchev fears it because it spells trouble, pressure, resistance, insecurity, and ultimate rebellion and disaster within the Soviet Union.

Thus, the import of House Resolution 211 cannot be overemphasized. The committee provided for in this resolution would steadily keep a spotlight on developments in the captive nations. It, also, would focus attention on Moscow's vast colonial empire.

Therefore, I again urge you to support this measure and to do all in your power to aid its passage.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely yours,

ANDREW S. PIRETTI.

SUMMIT, N.J., *January 16, 1962.*

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: This letter is being written in avid support of resolution 211, concerning the captive nations. I want to heartily congratulate you and your coworkers not only on the recognition of these nations but also on the recognition of the plight of these nations. Public Law 86-90 precipitated explosions of worry in the U.S.S.R. Your resolution should set off the most destructive charge.

Recently, in my position as manager of my university's radio station (WGTB-FM), I contacted at their U.S. offices several heads of the free exiled governments of the captive nations. I invited them to be on a panel to discuss their countries' problems. Some of these men said they appreciated the offer, but would not appear themselves since they were fearful less something be said to endanger their standing with our government. It seemed to me at that time that they thought the United States was merely enduring their existence and wasn't truly interested in their situations. Now, with House Resolution 211, we can show them that we are not only interested but willing to help them. As Adlai Stevenson said before the U.N. last November, we should keep the spotlight on Moscow and her colonialism.

I am sending a letter to my Congressman expressing my support of your resolution, sir. If I can help in any way, please let me know.

Wishing you the best and also a quick, successful passage of House Resolution 211, I remain.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN O'C. NUGENT.

PUEBLO, COLO., *January 23, 1962.*

Hon. DANIEL FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: It has come to my attention that you are sponsoring House Resolution 211, which calls for a committee to be formed dealing with the captive nations.

I heartily support your recommendation and hope for its immediate passage. If there is anything I can do to help, please let me know.

Respectfully,

JOHN L. CRUM, Jr.

ST. LOUIS GLOBE-DEMOCRAT,
St. Louis, Mo., January 21, 1962.

Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I thought you might be interested in a copy of this column which I write weekly, on the side, for several diocesan weekly newspapers. I'm sorry that none of them are in your district, or in Pennsylvania, for that matter.

I hope you have success with your committee proposal, and I certainly will make a point of seeing what I can do for it.

Cordially,

JOHN COSTELLO,
Editorial Writer.

WHAT COLONIALISM?

"Seldom have we been faced with such an example of brutal colonialism," the speaker cried, with a great show of indignation. He had the floor in the plush, domed hall of the General Assembly of the United Nations in New York City.

And of whom was he speaking?

Of the builders of the ugly wall that cuts in half the once great city of Berlin?

Or of the tank commanders who crushed the revolt of the Hungarian patriots, many of them boys and girls in their teens, in the streets of Budapest?

The speaker was Behdan Lewandowski of Red Poland. He is one of the new generation of Quislings who serve Communist masters, instead of Nazis.

Lewandowski was not speaking of Berlin or Budapest—or Warsaw.

He was discussing Angola, an oversea Province of Portugal.

It is one of the areas of Africa that has never been given its independence. And the 104 members of the U.N. General Assembly had come back to New York, after a long Christmas recess, almost solely to browbeat Portugal into freeing Angola.

What the U.N. should have been discussing, if colonialism was on the agenda, was Communist colonialism.

In Lewandowski's country, for example, the Soviets keep 28 million Poles under their thumb only by the bayonets of the Red army.

And the subjugated Poles have plenty of company.

Last year, the Assembly of Captive European Nations, issued a booklet on the new Red colonialism. Since 1939, it pointed out, 41 nations that were once western colonies have gained their freedom.

More than 800 million people live in those newly independent lands.

In the same period, however, the U.S.S.R. and Red Chinese have assembled a vast empire that embraces almost as many people as the West has freed.

The list includes (country and population): Albania, 1,421,000; Bulgaria, 7,667,000; Czechoslovakia, 13,353,000; East Germany, 18 million; Hungary, 9,812,000; Rumania, 17,829,000; Poland, 26,535,000; North Korea, 9,150,000; North Vietnam, 13 million; Outer Mongolia, 740,000; Tibet, 1 million.

Since ACEN compiled this list, Cuba has been added to the Communist bag. In addition, the U.S.S.R. has annexed East Poland, and its 12,775,000 people.

Chinese Communists, by force of arms, not ballots, took over mainland China and Manchuria. Thus, some 600 to 800 million more were added to the inmates of the vast Red prison camp.

Many Americans do not realize that at least half of the people in the U.S.S.R. are not Russians at all. The Soviet Union has swallowed up nearly a dozen nations and nationalities—some with a history that goes back more than 1,000 years.

Moscow did not snuff out Ukranian independence until 1920, long after the October revolution. Georgia held out until 1921.

And Turkestan, in central Asia, fought off the U.S.S.R. and the Red army until 1924.

Moscow is very touchy about these captive peoples inside her own borders. Why? Because many of them still hate the Russians.

They are a potential fifth column capable of inflicting great damage to the U.S.S.R.

Once, in the U.N., Canadian Prime Minister John Diefenbaker rubbed this raw spot when he criticized the U.S.S.R. for demanding an immediate end to colonial regimes. He quoted Soviet Premier Khrushchev's remark:

"It will always be the Soviet stand, that countries should establish systems of their own free will and choosing."

"What of Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia," Diefenbaker asked.. "What of freedom-loving Ukrainians and other eastern European peoples. I ask Mr. Khrushchev to give these nations under his domination the right of free elections."

His statement was blacked out in the Soviet press.

But Radio Liberty in Munich repeated it for several days in broadcasts aimed at the Ukraine. Apparently the word got through.

The reaction was volcanic.

Communist Ukrainian newspapers unleashed a savage attack on the Canadian. Radio Kiev made the air blue with its abuse of him. So did 10 other provincial radio stations.

Protest rallies were organized. Prominent Ukrainian authors and artists were dragged out to throw rocks at him—but their words were often suspiciously wide of the mark.

The U.S.S.R.'s restless satellites and captive peoples are its Achilles heel, some believe. But does the West exploit this weakness?

No, it doesn't. Until recently, Voice of America beamed only one 15-minute program a day to Soviet central Asia. It was in Uzbek.

Nothing in their own tongue was broadcast to the Kazakhs, Turkmenians, Kirghiz or Tadzhiks.

BBC was also silent.

Only Radio Liberation broadcast to them in all five main languages. But its signal is weak, and often jammed by the Soviets.

Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, Pennsylvania Democrat, has one suggestion. He wants to establish a special House Committee on Captive Nations to keep the spotlight on the new Communist colonialism.

He introduced a bill for it March 8, 1961.

So far, it has gone nowhere.

JANUARY 18, 1962.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I want to congratulate your original sponsorship of House Resolution 211 to establish a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. I learned of this House resolution and your sponsorship of same through the "Manion Forum" dated November 12, 1961.

The fear of this captive nations resolution was brought out very clearly in a Saturday Evening Post article on the current Berlin situation by Alsop dated December 16.

I wholeheartedly support this resolution and wish you success. If I can be of any aid in your campaign for this resolution, please let me know.

I will forward a copy of this letter to my Congressman. Also please send me several copies of this resolution. Thank you.

Very truly yours,

R. DOUGLAS DOHERTY.

BRIDGETON, N.J.

Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the International Woodworkers of America in October 1961, relating to the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 21

Subject: Senate bill No. 1138 "Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act."

Convention action: Concurrence.

Whereas veterans after January 31, 1955, are not entitled to a grant to further their

education as they had been prior to this date; and

Whereas many of these young men and women went into the service of their country at a time when they could have gone to college; and

Whereas upon their return they were financially unable to continue their education due to available jobs and/or scholarships having been taken by their contemporaries while they were in the service; and

Whereas Senate bill No. 1138 "Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act" provides educational grants for those persons serving in the Armed Forces between January 31, 1955, and January 1, 1963; and

Whereas this bill has passed the Senate: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge our Representatives to act on this bill as soon as possible; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Representatives of all the States.

Submitted by: IWA Local 3-7.

WILLIAM DALE NIPPER,
President.

MIRIAM CONWAY,
Secretary.

The Future of Socalism: III—The Perspective Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, mistakes are often made in high places. We all are human and this is an imperfect world. Nonetheless, I think all of us as Americans have a right to demand that those making high policy share with us our fundamental objectives as a free people.

Socialism is alien to the free enterprise system of America. I cannot trust the advice of anyone who sincerely believes that socialism must save capitalism. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., a top adviser to the President, wrote in the Partisan Review of 1947, an article entitled "The Future of Socialism: III—The Perspective Now." I am placing the entire article in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks, so that there can be no question as to the context of Mr. Schlesinger's comments. Let me, however, quote at random for the discomfiture of my colleagues:

"If socialism (i.e., the ownership by the state of all significant means of production) is to preserve democracy, it must be brought about step by step in a way which will not disrupt the fabric of custom, law, and mutual confidence upon which personal rights depend. That is, the transition must be piecemeal; it must be parliamentary; it must respect civil liberties and due process of law. Socialism by such means used to seem fantastic to the hard-eyed melodramatists of the Leninist persuasion; but even Stalin is reported to have told Harold Laski recently that it might be possible. * * * There is no sign * * * that the capitalists are putting up a really determined fight. * * * There seems no inherent obstacle to the gradual advance of socialism in the United States through a series of New Deals. * * * But the New Deal greatly enlarged the reserves of trained personnel; the mobilization of industry during the war provided more experience; and the next depression will certainly mean a vast expansion in Government ownership and control. The private owners will not only acquiesce in this. In characteristic capitalist panic, they will demand it. * * * The process of backing into socialism in the contemporary world is not so simple as it sounds. Too many forces are working, some wittingly, some not, to obstruct that process."

I do not believe the American people want to "back into" socialism. I do not believe the American people want a man writing our President's speeches, guiding our foreign policy with reference to Cuba or the Conference at Punta del Este, who believes what Mr. Schlesinger apparently believes. To my knowledge, Mr. Schlesinger has never repudiated nor modified the position he took in this article. I ask President Kennedy to take cognizance of this article and to give serious consideration to replacing Mr. Schlesinger in his inner circles of advisers.

In any event, the American people have a right to know the direction in which Mr. Schlesinger would like President Kennedy to steer our Ship of State. The full text of the article follows:

THE FUTURE OF SOCIALISM: III—THE PERSPECTIVE NOW

(By Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr.)

The Soviet experience has put the century-old debate between capitalism and socialism in a useful new perspective. Before the First World War, the case against socialism was generally made in terms of efficiency, the case against capitalism in terms of morality: that is, socialism was conceded to be good in principle but to work; capitalism was conceded to work but not to be good in principle. After the Second War, we see a reverse tendency—a disposition to admit the inefficiency of capitalism and justify it as providing the margin on which liberty and democracy may subsist; a disposition to believe that the very efficiency of socialist management necessarily squeezes out freedom. After all, which system has more successfully dehumanized the worker, fettered the working class, and extinguished personal and political liberty?

The very shift in polemics suggests that both arguments have indulged in what Whitehead has called the fallacy of misplaced concreteness—the error of mistaking abstractions for concrete realities. The fact probably is that a great many of the criticisms urged against the abstractions capitalism and socialism alike are actually the defects, not of a particular system of ownership, but of industrial organization and the postindustrial state whatever the system of ownership. Industry and government are the basic evils; they institutionalize the pride and the greed, the sadism and the masochism, the ecstasy in power and the ecstasy in submission, which are the abiding causes of the troubles of the world.

In this light anarchism becomes the only faith for a moral man. Organization is man's solution to his sense of guilt. The very fact of organization attenuates personal moral responsibility; and, as organization becomes more elaborate and comprehensive, it becomes increasingly the instrumentality through which moral man indulges his natural desire to commit immoral deeds. "A crime which would press heavily on the conscience of one man, becomes quite endurable when divided among many." The state is only the climax of secular organizations—that "semihuman tiger or ox, stalking over the earth," Thoreau called it, "with its heart taken out and the top of its brain shot away"—and the totalitarian state concentrates in itself all the evil of organization by annihilating all the gaps and rivalries which make for freedom in a more loosely organized society.

The socialist state is thus worse than the capitalist state because it is more inclusive in its coverage and more unlimited in its power. Organization corrupts; total organization corrupts totally. The socialist state justifies itself on the ground that the concentration of power is necessary to do good; but it has never solved the problem of how you insure that power bestowed to do good will not be employed to do harm, especially when you remove all obstacles to its exercise. Soviet socialism has the added disadvantage that it was born in violence. The emotions of revolution in an industrial age can no more be localized than the emotions of modern war itself. Violence breeds its special hatreds and aggressions, which twist the normal hatreds of society into new and ugly forms. The habit of violence is hard to abandon, especially when it has worked in the past. A revolutionary elite always has the wistful conviction, based on experience, that it is easier to dispose of opposition by firing squads than by arguments.

The trouble with anarchism is, not at all that it is wrong, but that it is irrelevant. It may have its values as a mystique, but it is nonsense as a way of meeting the explosive problems of an atomic age. Its overt expressions, such as conscientious objection in times of war, tend to be morally vulgar and intellectually contemptible. Industrial organization and the postindustrial state are here to stay. The problem is not how to escape them but how to master them—or, more probably, how to live with them.

IS DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISM POSSIBLE?

Is there another possibility? Has non-Communist, libertarian socialism a future? Abstracting the question for a moment from current political actualities, one must answer that there is no inherent reason why democratic socialism should not be possible.

The classical argument against gradualism was that the capitalist ruling class would resort to violence rather than surrender its prerogatives. Here, as elsewhere, the Marxists enormously overestimated the political courage and will of the capitalists. In fact, in the countries where capitalism really triumphed, it has yielded with far better grace (that is, displayed far more cowardice) than the Marxist scheme predicted. The British experience is illuminating in this respect, and the American experience not uninstructive.

Liberal alarmists who feel that the clamor of a political campaign or the agitation of hired lobbyists constitutes a determined fight should read the history of Germany. In the United States an industrialist who turned a machinegun on a picket line would be disowned by the rest of the business community; in Britain he would be sent to an insane asylum. Fascism arises in countries like Germany and Italy, Spain, and Argentina, where the bourgeois triumph was never complete enough to eradicate other elements who believe in what the bourgeoisie fears more than anything else—violence, and who then used violence to "protect" the bourgeoisie.

In 1933, Frances Perkins has reported, the coal operators pleaded with the Government to nationalize the mines. They offered to sell "to the Government at any price fixed by the Government. Anything so we can get out of it." The Government was not ready to take over the coal mines in 1933, as it was not ready to take over the banks, as it was not ready to keep the railroads in 1919.

Government ownership and control can take many forms. The independent public corporation, in the manner of TVA, is one; State and municipal ownership can exist alongside Federal ownership; the techniques

of the cooperatives can be expanded; even the resources of regulation have not been fully tapped. The more varieties of ownership the better: liberty gets more fresh air and sunlight through the interstices of a diversified society than through the close-knit grip of collectivism. The recipe for retaining liberty is, not nationalization, but muddling through—a secret long known to the British who, as D. W. Brogan has put it, "change anything except the appearance of things."

Socialism, then, appears quite practicable within this frame of reference, as a long-term proposition. Its gradual advance might well preserve order and law, keep enough internal checks and discontinuities to guarantee a measure of freedom, and evolve new and real forms for the expression of democracy. The active agents in effecting the transition will probably be, not the working class, but some combination of lawyers, business and labor managers, politicians, and intellectuals, in the manner of the first New Deal, or of the Labor government in Britain.

But we must return this question to the actualities from which up to now it has been abstracted.

THE DEATH WISH OF THE CAPITALISTS

Marxist folklore, we have seen, has always overrated the bourgeoisie. The capitalists have certainly been great organizers of production and, in this process, great exploiters of the downtrodden. But their confidence, intelligence, and ruthlessness have always dwindled as they got further away from the factory or countinghouse. They have constituted a plutocracy, not an aristocracy. They have never been, in the political sense, an effective governing class.

A plutocracy is trained to think in terms of business dealings and not of war, in terms of security and not of honor, in terms of class and not of nation. With their power dependent on the continued convertibility of pieces of paper, they dread anything which might upset the fragile conventions of economic society. They lack the instinct, energy, and courage to govern. The shift which saved Britain in 1940 suggests some of the contrasts. Chamberlain reflected the sentiments of the business community—the longing for quiet, the hatred of violence, the terror of social upheaval. Churchill's instincts were those of an imperial aristocracy, bold, vigorous, somewhat contemptuous of trade, with power founded, not on finance, but on land, tradition, and sense of nationality. "There is something to be said for government by a great aristocracy which has furnished leaders to the nation in peace and war for generations," Theodore Roosevelt once observed; "even a democrat like myself must admit this. But there is absolutely nothing to be said for government by a plutocracy, for government by men very powerful in certain lines and gifted with the 'money touch,' but with ideals which in their essence are merely those of so many glorified pawnbrokers."

The bourgeoisie consequently has always had to turn for protection to some nonbourgeois group. Without such protection, as Schumpeter puts it, it is "unable not only to lead its nation but even to take care of its particular class interest. Which amounts to saying that it needs a master." In England the business classes have had the aristocracy, and now the Socialists, to protect them. In America when the chips were down the businessmen have always been bailed out by the radical democracy, often under aristocratic leadership—the Jeffersons, Jacksons, Lincolns, Wilsons, Roosevelts.

This normal political incompetence of the capitalists has recently been exaggerated by a gradual disappearance of the capitalist energies themselves; it is this combination which justifies the term "death" wish. Not only does the bourgeoisie lack the skill to protect itself; it is increasingly lacking in the will to protect itself. The capitalist system, in effect, has killed its own interest in survival. The rise of big business, the development of mass production and mass organization, have slowly taken the guts out of the idea of property. The spread of nationalism has set in motion a skepticism which holds no social authority sacred. Capitalism at once has strengthened the economic centralization and loosened the moral bonds of society. The result is a profound instability which invites collectivism as a means of restoring social discipline. As Schumpeter puts it, capitalism "socializes the bourgeois mind." Eventually the roots of capitalist motivation will wither away.

Even in America, the capitalist fatherland, the death-wish of the business community appears to go beyond the normal limits of political incompetence and geographical security. After the First World War Trotsky predicted that American capitalism would now make its stunning debut on the world stage. Instead American capitalism crept back into bed and pulled the covers over its face. It responded to the challenge of nazism by founding the America First Committee; it responded to the opportunities opened up by the Second World War by rushing to dismantle the instrumentalities of American military and economic influence in the name of balancing the budget.

The foreign policy of the business community is characteristically one of cowardice rationalized in terms of high morality. The great refusal to take on the Russians today is perfectly typical. That dean of American capitalists, Joseph P. Kennedy, recently argued that the United States should not seek to resist the spread of communism. Indeed, it should "permit communism to have its trial outside the Soviet Union if that shall be the fate or will of certain peoples. In most of these countries a few years will demonstrate the inability of communism to achieve its promises, while through this period the disillusioned experimenters will be observing the benefits of the American way of life, and most of them will seek to emulate it." On this ground Kennedy has opposed all foreign loans from the British loan on.

We are confronted today with the picture of New Dealers trying to launch a positive foreign policy over the vigorous protests of the business groups which that policy will protect. Fearing change, fearing swift action because it might portend change, lacking confidence and resolution, subject to spasms of panic and hysteria, the American business community is too irresponsible to work steadily for the national interest, or even for its narrow class interests. At least the English business community has been persuaded by experience that it should accede to the political leadership of the aristocracy or, more recently, of the Socialists—of any group which will govern. But the American business community continues to resist the radical democracy, like a drowning man threshing out at his rescuer.

In so doing, it may destroy the possibility of a peaceful transition to socialism. In its panic it may yield to the most ruthless blackmailer—externally to the Soviet Union, internally to any political gangster promising security—and thereby dissipate the Nation's capacity to control its process of change. "Experience shows that the middle classes allow themselves to be plundered quite easily," Sorel wrote, "provided a little pressure is brought to bear, and that they are intimidated by the fear of revolution." This growing capitalist irresponsibility is the symptom of the death-wish: it is Samson in the temple.

THE BETRAYAL OF THE INTELLECTUALS

Official liberalism was the product of the enlightenment, cross-fertilized with such things as unitarianism, science, bourgeois complacency, and a belief in progress. It dispensed with the absurd Christian myths of sin and damnation and believed that what shortcomings man might have were to be redeemed, not by Jesus on the cross, but by the benevolent unfolding of history. Tolerance, free inquiry, and technology, operating in the framework of human perfectibility, would in the end create a heaven on earth, a goal accounted much more sensible and wholesome than a heaven in heaven.

This rejection of the dark and subterranean forces in human nature acquired a kind of protective coloration in a century of peace and prosperity, like the 19th. Insight into evil became the property of a few disreputable esthetes and a few obstinate Christians. But the rationalists were betrayed by their own god in the 20th century when history went back on them and unleashed the terror. Freud, Kierkegaard, Sorel, Nietzsche had charted patterns of depravity while the sun of optimism was high in the sky. As it sank, practical men, like Hitler, Stalin, Mussolini, transformed depravity into a way of life.

Much more than a generation divides the liberals who denied evil from those who accept it. The word "evil" is here a designation, not an explanation; but, whether you use the vocabulary of religion or psychoanalysis or antirationalism, whether you invoke Augustine or Freud or Pareto, there are moody and destructive impulses in man of which official liberalism has taken no serious account. Louis Jaffe recently wrote of Justice Brandeis, "One felt that nothing in his system prepared Brandeis for Hitler." Brandeis was among the more realistic of his generation: how much more unprepared were the readers of the liberal weeklies, the great thinkers who sought to combat nazism by peace strikes, the Oxford oath, and unilateral disarmament.

The type of the official liberal today is the fellow traveler or the fellow traveler of the fellow traveler: see the columns of the New Republic and the Nation. For the most chivalrous reasons they cannot believe that ugly facts underlie fair words: however they look at it, for example, the U.S.S.R. keeps coming through as a kind of enlarged Brook Farm community. Nothing in their system has prepared them for Stalin. The official liberal differs from the Communist, who knows what he is doing. He differs from the New Dealer, who has learned some of the facts of life from the exercise of responsibility and is consequently deeply hostile to the Communist. The official liberal runs interference for the Communist with a system of intellectual evasion and subterfuge that results directly from a desperate attempt to square a superficial and optimistic creed with a bitter century.

Many contemporary radicals have rejected these sunny meditations. Silone, Koestler, Malraux, Niebuhr, Orwell, Dos Passos, Hemingway, Macdonald: the very names suggest a range of perceptions and anxieties unknown to the columns of the New Republic. In this new version, man becomes at once greater and more pitiable, more aspiring and more frustrated, more hallowed and more doomed. This image stands up better in the century of Buchenwald. But the men who are possessed by it are still under official malediction as tired liberals, judases, and apostles of disillusion.

If you believe man to be essentially good, you commit yourself to the endless task of explaining why he does not always behave that way. A simple way out is to affirm that, in spite of appearances to the contrary, he really is performing the good. In the course of this solution the liberal intel-

lectual generates myths which he comes to prefer to actualities, especially if the actualities are uncomfortable (as they usually are). The addiction to myth is of course increased by the fact that the liberal has denied himself such traditional outlets for credulity as religion.

The susceptibility to wishfulness, the need for the sustaining myth, the disbelief in man's urge to destroy—all combine to reduce the capacity for critical judgment which the intellectual's detachment from social loyalties should confer upon him. This is the real trahison des clercs. Instead of contributing clarity, logic, and rigorous insistence on facts, the liberal intellectual has been more and more devoting his ingenuity to laminating his favorite myths. He has failed wretchedly to live up to his obligation to provide intellectual leadership.

One myth, to which the liberal has clung in the face of experience with the imperturbable ardor of an early Christian, is the mystique of the proletariat. This myth, given its classical form by Marx himself, so characteristically a bourgeois intellectual, states that the action of the working class will overthrow capitalist tyranny and establish by temporary dictatorship a classless society. Its appeal lies partly in the intellectual's sense of guilt over living pleasantly by his wits instead of unpleasantly by his hands, partly in the intellectual's somewhat feminine fascination with the rude and muscular power of the proletariat, partly in the intellectual's desire to compensate for his own sense of alienation by immersing himself in the broad maternal expanse of the masses. Worship of the proletariat becomes a perfect fulfillment for the frustrations of the intellectual.

Of course, this is not the whole story. There was considerable prima facie support for the myth. The beginnings of trade union organization at one time may have promised a serious future for an organized proletariat. But there is no point in keeping up the pretense a century later. The trade union movement is as clearly indigenous to the capitalist system as the corporation itself, and it has no particular meaning apart from that system. In a socialist society its functions are radically transformed: it becomes, not a free labor movement, but a labor front. Even in England, as Sir Walter Citrine remarked on joining the coal board, strikes can no longer be trade union instruments in a nationalized industry. Unions inevitably become organs for disciplining the workers, not for representing them.

Indeed, the whole conception of the proletariat as an agency of change is meaningless. The technical necessity for organization instantly sets in motion a tendency toward oligarchy; separate interests arise between leadership and rank and file; and a working class committee after a short time will stand for, not the working class, but its own bureaucratic instinct for survival.

Moreover, workers as a mass have rarely had the impulses attributed to them by Marxism. They too often believe in patriotism or religion, or read comic strips, go to movies, play slot machines, and patronize taxi dancehalls. In one way or another, they try to cure their discontent by narcotics rather than by surgery. Thus they are rarely swept by the proper mass emotions. The general strike is in principle the most potent weapon in the world, but it always remains potent on principle. The great moment for the general strike was perhaps 1914; but, even had Juarés survived, the working classes would have succumbed to the bugle, the flag, and the military parade. Marx recognized that many workers were not Marxists and so invented a classification called the lumpenproletariat in which were dumped those who did not live up to theory. Lenin recognized this, too, and so invented a disciplined party which, announcing itself the only true representative of the proletariat, ruthlessly shot down dissenters. No country has more spectacularly abandoned a belief in the working class than the U.S.S.R.

For these various reasons, the mystique of the working class has faded somewhat since the First World War. In its place has arisen a new mystique, more radiant and palpable, and exercising the same fascinations of power and guilt; the mystique of the U.S.S.R. Each success of the Soviet Union has conferred new delights on those possessed of the need for prostration and frightened of the responsibilities of decision. In a world which makes very little sense, these emotions are natural enough. But surrender to them destroys the capacity for clear intellectual leadership which ought to be the liberal function in the world. In an exact sense, Soviet Russia has become the opiate of the intellectuals.

THE COUNTERREVOLUTION OF THE SOVIET UNION

The capitalist death-wish and the liberal treachery are more or less unconscious obstacles to a tranquil passage to socialism. The role of the Soviet Union, on the other hand, is highly intelligent, purposeful, and determined. The U.S.S.R. perceives clearly that the most deadly foe of communism is not the reactionary, whose blind folly will only speed the disintegration of his own society. The serious enemy is really the radical democrat who proposes to solve the problems of unemployment and want without enslaving the masses and setting up a police state.

So long as Churchill lived in Downing Street, Moscow knew that Britain offered no competition in the struggle for Europe. But the victory of the Labor Party in the summer of 1945 brought new hope to all the people of Europe who still had freedom of political expression. It signalized an alternative to Moscow which promised the same economic advantages—and with political liberty in place of the NKVD. It was at this point that the U.S.S.R. stepped up its attack on the Socialist Parties and began its concerted policy of hammering at the weak points, strategic and ideological, of the already crumbling British Empire.

The Communist war against the Second International has been a brilliant success. The Social Democratic Parties of Europe have remained steadfast in their traditions of caution, feebleness, and inactivity. They appear to be doomed today, because the working class does not trust their determination to resist communism. When the Communists do succeed in finally absorbing or destroying the Socialists, they will have virtually attained their objective of destroying the center and reducing the alternatives to the red and the black. The crime of the U.S.S.R. against the world is its determination to make experiments in libertarian socialism impossible.

What are the motives of the Soviet campaign against the West? "The trouble with Russia," Schumpeter has observed with considerable truth, "is not that she is socialist but that she is Russia." If the Romanovs had pushed through industrialization and ridden out its political consequences, Russia would be confronting the world with much the same immediate problems of expansion—with the same thrusts into western Europe, the Mediterranean, the Middle East and China. But czarist Russia would not have been able to multiply its national strength with the tremendous political weapon of communism.

The exception makes a good deal of difference. Imperial Russia could be dealt with like imperial Germany; its objectives would have been inherently limited by the clash of one nationalism with another. But nazism gave Germany a potent ideological weapon, and communism is infinitely more exportable than nazism. As a social faith, it can penetrate to every corner of the world and rally its fifth columns wherever injustice and poverty exist. Communism gives Russian expansionism its warhead. On a prearranged signal, the Russian drive can explode internally in every country on the globe.

Russian national objectives are limited; Communist international objectives are not. Experience has shown that a nation can sustain unlimited objectives for only a limited time. The fervor of a crusade wears a people out; after a time the country relapses from the messiah business into its national routine. The problem is to prevent the Soviet Union from breaking out of the reservation during its period of messianic intoxication.

THE ROLE OF THE ARMED TRUCE

British policy under Chamberlain presents a model of how not to undertake a campaign of containment. The United States is faced with the same situation today, only the geographical margins of tolerance are greater with the U.S.S.R. than they ever were with Germany. Reduced to its fundamentals, the American problem is to arrange the equilibrium of forces in the world so that, at every given moment of decision, the Soviet general staff will decide against aggressions that might provoke a general war on the ground that they present too great a military risk. At the same time, the United States must not succumb to demands for an anti-Soviet crusade nor permit reactionaries in the buffer states to precipitate conflicts in defense of their own obsolete prerogatives. Fascism has receded, but it has not disappeared.

The United States must maintain a precarious balance between a complete readiness to repel Soviet aggression beyond a certain limit and complete determination to demonstrate within this limit no aggressive U.S. intentions toward the U.S.S.R. It must commit itself, economically, politically, and militarily, to the maintenance of this balance over a long period. Given sufficient time, the Soviet internal tempo will slow down. The ruling class will become less risk minded, more security minded. Greater vested interests will develop in the existing order; Russia itself will begin to fear the revolutionary tendencies which modern war trails in its wake. The squabbles between the gallicans and the ultramontanes will dilute the ardor of national Communist Parties; they too will develop stakes in an existing national order, if only in order to hold on to a mass following. At the same time, U.S. backing to the parties of the non-Communist left and U.S. support for vast programs of economic reconstruction may go far toward removing the conditions of want, hunger, and economic insecurity which are constant invitations to Soviet expansion.

Can the United States conceive and initiate so subtle a policy? Though the secret has been kept pretty much from the readers of the liberal press, the State Department has been proceeding for some time somewhat along these lines. Both Byrnes and Marshall have perceived the essential need to be firm without being rancorous, to check Soviet expansion without making unlimited commitments to an anti-Soviet crusade, to invoke power to counter power without engaging in senseless intimidation, to encourage the growth of the democratic left. The performance has often fallen below the conception, but the direction has been correct. Men like Ben Cohen, Dean Acheson, Charles Bohlen have tried to work out details and whip up support for this admittedly risky program.

It is risky. It may at any moment tumble over into the ideological crusade. In addition, its proponents must combat the death wish of the capitalists, as exemplified by Mr. Kennedy, and the befuddlement of the fellow

travelers, as exemplified by Mr. Wallace, both of whom unite in opposing a policy of resistance to Soviet expansion. The triumph of either the Kennedy or the Wallace views, if there is much difference between them, would mean the triumph of the radical expansionists in the Politburo, for it would remove all present obstacles to the Soviet conquest of Europe.

But can the United States embark on any program of resistance to Soviet expansion without itself moving toward fascism? There is certainly a short-run tendency in critical situations toward reliance on reactionaries as counter to Communists, because they are the only people who can match violence with violence. In a divided land like China or Greece the non-Communist left, men who believe in debate and civil liberty, cannot stand up for long against men, whether of the extreme right or of the extreme left, who believe in rifles.

But over the long term the United States cannot develop a dependence on the right, if only because the right is a bad practical investment. A program of containment requires a ring of stable and satisfied countries around Russia—countries whose internal well-being provides a first line of defense against Communist penetration. At this stage in the world's history, the right cannot provide such governments. The very logic of events may force even a right-wing government in this country to support leftwing governments abroad, just as the Truman government is entertaining the thought of giving Greece the New Deal it has driven out of Washington. Far from leading to fascism at home, a program of containment may after a certain period lead to greater power for American labor. Just as it was necessary to bribe the business community to take part in the struggle against fascism, so it may be necessary to bribe the labor movement to take part in a struggle against communism. Whatever else may be said about a "permanent war economy," at least wages are high, employment is full, and the economy is relatively stable and productive.

All this presupposes, of course, that Marshall has not only the ability to develop his policy but also the backing to carry it out. The backing, rather than the policy itself, presents the serious question. A democracy is politically unreliable at best; the American democracy is notoriously unreliable on all question of maintaining a continuous foreign policy. Between the irresponsibility of the capitalists, the confusion of the intellectuals, and the impotence of the working class, there may arise a state of irresolution which produces a political vacuum; and a political vacuum inevitably attracts activists—gangsters, terrorists, and totalitarians.

At this point the responsibility of the intellectual becomes manifest. Someone must serve as the custodian of honesty and clarity in a turbulent and stricken society. Someone must restore a serious sense of the value of facts, of the integrity of reason, of devotion to truth. Someone must provide intellectual leadership. As capitalism crumbles through the world, we know that any path which can preserve peace and freedom is narrow and hazardous. Our instruments must be as precise as possible, our analysis as dispassionate, our conclusions as honest and objective as we can make them. One false step may plunge the world into atomic war or deliver it into totalitarian darkness.

The intellectual must not be deflected from his responsibility by inherited dogma. It is clear today that Marx's method was often better than his own application of it. Experience is a better master than any sacred text. The experience of a century has shown that neither the capitalists nor the workers are so tough and purposeful as Marx anticipated; that their mutual bewilderment and inertia leave the way open for some other group to serve as the instrument of change; that when the politician-manager-intellectual type—the New Dealer—is intelligent and decisive, he can get society to move just fast enough for it to escape breaking up under the weight of its own contradictions; but that, when no one provides intellectual leadership within the frame of gradualism, then the professional revolutionist will fill the vacuum and establish a harder and more ruthless regime than the decadent one he displaces; and that the Communist revolutionist is winning out over the Fascist and is today in alliance with an expanding world power which will bring every kind of external pressure to block the movement toward democratic socialism.

These seem to me the actualities of the day. If their acceptance means discarding Marx, let us by all means discard Marx. Too much leftwing political "thinking" is a form of scholasticism. We must make our own prognosis. If you say that the intellectual is a frail reed upon which to lean, you are probably guilty of understatement. But at least serious thinking is his job. Let him work at it for a time. He is more likely to escape from his confusion than the capitalist from his irresponsibility or the worker from his impotence. Serious intellectual direction may give our politics a cogency and a firmness which will maintain the equilibrium of forces and avert the war with Russia. If we can avoid this war, if we can contain the counterrevolution of the U.S.S.R. within clearly marked limits, we have a good chance to test the possibilities of a peaceful transition into a not undemocratic socialism. But, if our leadership and determination falter, neither democracy, socialism, nor anything else will have any more of a future than Hiroshima or Nagasaki.

Project Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, Project Hope has stirred all the world with its battle against disease, which recognizes no international boundaries. I am proud to come from a district that has furnished supplies and personnel to this work and it is with great pleasure I offer the following remarks, that I believe will be of interest to all the Members.

The speeches that follow were made at a luncheon given last month by the Danbury Chamber of Commerce to honor the work of Acousticon, International, and Dr. William B. Walsh, the founder and president of Project Hope. Acousticon is embarking on a drive throughout the country, using its more than 400 distributors to obtain used hearing aids for HOPE. Those will be reconditioned by Acousticon's Danbury plant and distributed through Project Hope to the hard-of-hearing in Peru, Indonesia, and South Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, this is another example of how American business and industry have contributed to the success of project Hope and I commend it to the attention of every Member:

REMARKS OF MR. MALTE J. CARLSON, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS, DICTOGRAPH PRODUCTS, INC., DANBURY, CONN., AT DANBURY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE LUNCHEON AT THE FOX HILL INN, ON JANUARY 17, 1962

I would just like to say a few words while we are waiting to hear Dr. Walsh. Actually it is with a real deep sense of honor that we are here today as far as our company is concerned and to know that we will have some little part in Project Hope which Dr. Walsh has so wonderfully brought into being.

In my own experience, I have developed a very deep respect and admiration, particularly, for the medical profession, for the wonderful things that are being done in this country, and the project that Dr. Walsh has taken upon himself—it takes a lot of devotion. Dr. Walsh was telling me about the help that he has received from some of his associates and his coworkers. Believe me, without a deep sense of devotion this would not be possible. We feel a bit this way about our own little company. We feel that we are contributing to humanity as well. It is a rather odd coincidence that a commercial enterprise should feel that they are contributing to the welfare of our fellow human beings. Dr. Walsh, I want you to know that we consider it a real honor and we really welcome this opportunity that you have given us to join with you in doing something for the hard-of-hearing in these countries that you are going to visit. We feel it is actually our duty to do this. We feel that we have something to offer them. Just for a moment, shut yourself off from sound, picture what it is to be hard-of-hearing. Better hearing will bring these people into a new world.

I receive letters from all over the country, and all over the world, from people who have been brought back into a new life through the use of a rather simple device, a hearing aid. For this reason, frankly, we feel sincerely devoted to our end of the business in supplying the product that goes to help humanity this way. Again, Dr. Walsh, I want to say we appreciate immensely the opportunity of working with you in this project. Godspeed.

REMARKS OF MR. PETER M. MOFFITT, PRESIDENT, DICTOGRAPH PRODUCTS INC., DANBURY, CONN., AT DANBURY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE LUNCHEON AT THE FOX HILL INN, ON JANUARY 17, 1962

Ladies and gentlemen, I am Acousticon's newest employee, since I have only been president of Dictograph for about 6 weeks, so it is with a certain sense of humility that I come before a public gathering, since I am still trying to get the feel of the chair here at Dictograph.

I would, for a moment, like to disgress and express to the Chamber and the government officials of the city of Danbury our appreciation for the way that they have taken us in. I had some little to do with picking Danbury as the new location for our company, and we certainly would like to express our appreciation for the help they have given us and let them know that we appreciate the honor that they have recently bestowed on our company. Mr. Carlson made mention of the fact that we of Dictograph feel, above and beyond loyalty to our company, a deep sense of feeling for the hard of hearing. We are really very gratified for the help that we and our distributors throughout the country are able to give to those people. We have statistics, with which I won't bore you, but people have been restored to health, to better jobs, to greater usefulness to the community, and their country, by being able to hear better.

We can think of no better way for us to express some of this appreciation than to join with Project Hope and its voluntary medical mission throughout the world.

I would like to take just a moment to read to you some of the many greetings which have come from some other people here in Connecticut, to Dr. Walsh and to Hope.

Gov. John Dempsey, of Connecticut, said, briefly, "I am most familiar with the wonderful work of Hope and congratulate the Danbury Chamber of Commerce on this program. Best wishes to Dr. Walsh."

Senator PRESCOTT BUSH of Connecticut said: "I am very sorry to miss the opportunity of meeting Dr. Walsh, whose Project Hope has done so much for the underdeveloped nations in Asia. You and Danbury have every right to be proud of the part that your product will play in aiding the mission of *Hope* to Peru. Best wishes to Dr. Walsh and the continued success of his project."

I don't want to read them all—we have good wishes from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, several Members of Congress, Senators, and our former Gov. Abe Ribicoff who is now Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, was kind enough to send this message: "Please convey to Dr. Walsh my best wishes for the continued success of Project Hope. This inspired leadership reminds us once again of the great contribution that voluntary groups have made in bringing the blessing of better health to people throughout the world." I would like to tell you, now, the personal side of how we got into Project Hope. Acousticon, International has many dealers who have been with us for many years, scattered throughout the country. Two of these people are here today, Mr. Nelson and his mother from Burlington, Vt., and this is the beginning of Project Hope with Acousticon. They have a friend, a doctor from Burlington, who went on the first mission to southeast Asia. While in Saigon he met a teacher who needed a hearing aid. Since there were no hearing aids aboard the SS *Hope*, the doctor wrote back to Mr. Nelson: "I need a hearing aid for a teacher with a hearing loss." The doctor wrote, "Could you obtain one for us, or a used one, so that I can help this man do his work?" And Mr. Nelson did that and more: they informed the company and asked if we could do something about it, and that's where the idea originated. Mr. Nelson and his mother got up at 4 or 5 this morning to be with us today. I wanted to tell you this story so that you would know that this is some of the spirit uniting our company to Project Hope, and that it's spreading out to all our dealers and distributors throughout the country who are participating with us. I think, Dr. Walsh, that you will be interested to know that the message of Project Hope will be in the windows and on the store counters of Acousticon dealers across the country, and we are giving substantial recognition to our people all around the country. So it goes beyond the town of Danbury, and, in effect, will tie the town of Danbury with our dealerships around the country.

I think we would be derelict if we did not also mention that Project Hope needs not only hearings aids, which we hope to supply in sufficient number, but it genuinely requires the support of every American citizen. If you are hard of hearing, or know someone who is hard of hearing, and they can spare a hearing aid, tell them that Project Hope needs it. And as for the rest of us, who are blessed with good hearing, I think we should think a little about sending a small check to this worthy project and speed them on their way.

REMARKS OF DR. WILLIAM B. WALSH, PRESIDENT AND FOUNDER OF PROJECT HOPE

Mr. Bragg, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Moffitt, ladies, and gentlemen, it is customary upon receiving an award such as this to accept it with great humility which I, of course, do; but, I accept with more than humility. I accept it, really, with a spirit of great pride because the pride is not mine, it's yours. You people who are sitting in this room, are the citizens of the United States who really made this project possible. In particular, those who are more deserving of this award than I, at least three of whom you have met today: Miss Rosseau, Miss Campion, and Dr. Tisher. They are the ones, together with you, who made what was a dream of mine become a reality. Because without their service (they themselves served under some of the most trying circumstances you can imagine) HOPE would have been named "Suspense." And there were times, I think, when they all felt it was. Particularly, Dr. Tisher. But we do have a great deal of satisfaction because we started from nothing, because we believed in the American people—not only as a humanitarian people or political people but as people who are sincerely interested in helping anyone who is willing to help ourselves. We've heard a lot about this in the last few years—Americans have always done this.

It's only recently become, and I don't mean this in a slurring way when I say it, "fashionable" to talk about helping those who help themselves. But it's a philosophy which has been held very dear in this country. We felt that voluntary agencies (private enterprise) could better do this job in the small field in which we are in than the Government could do it. We felt that the missionaries of all faiths had already shown that this could be done. They frequently saved a soul by first curing a bellyache and then getting the population willing to listen. We don't go quite this far. We are not a propaganda agency, we distribute no pamphlets. What we do distribute is knowledge. In each instance, in any country to which we go, a portion of the responsibility must be borne by the country to which we go—and we go only by invitation. The portion may not be proportionate, from the standpoint of dollar outlay, but is more than proportionate from the standpoint of responsibility. If HOPE were to fail in any country to which it went, the political embarrassment, for example, to a new government doesn't have to be very great to cause that government to fall. The political embarrassment of those who are involved in committing themselves to help HOPE in these countries would have been very great had HOPE failed. HOPE did not fail, because of the dedication of the people who were on it. But they were not there just as do-gooders, they were not there to simply sell democracy, they were there to teach and to heal; but above all, they were there, I think, deep in their own hearts, to show people that Americans were not two-headed monsters, were not there to exploit their populations but simply presented themselves as American citizens who were anxious to do something to enable this country or that country to help themselves and then, frankly, become less of a burden perhaps on ourselves.

I think you have to realize that while we tend to think that life is cheap in the Orient, life is not cheap in the Orient. They cry when they're sick, they die; they are sad when their families are ill. The feed their blind and they feed their crippled. Population control is not going to correct their problems. We felt that one pathway, down which we could go, would be to perhaps make the population which was existing a more productive one. If each blind person that Dr. Tisher was able to make see could go back and work in the rice paddy, this blind person was much more quickly to become a capitalist than to despair because he was unable to help himself and not have to depend on handouts. He immediately contributed to the economy of his village. This is true of anyone whom we helped in a surface way.

In each instance in which a man was trained, however minimally trained (and we don't make an effort to raise the level of medical practice in these countries to tremendous heights, which you couldn't do in a short period of time, but to raise it even minimally and give the people the confidence to do what they can for their own population). The economic productivity of a country was increased because it starts with people and this is exactly what we, after all, believe in as a democracy in our own country. This is what we hope the rest of the world will believe; but they have to get a chance to practice it before they can believe it.

In the past year, we were in two difficult areas: in Indonesia, where I think our entire staff grew to have a really sincere affection for the Indonesian people, despite what you may read in the papers or despite the activities of the president of the country; these are a very gentle people and the country is third in natural resources throughout the world. Most of these people had never before seen an American. Their first visions of Americans were those that we carried to them on board the *Hope*. Each of these people on the *Hope* was given the burden of really selling America by their individual behavior, not only as doctors and nurses or medical technicians, but also as citizens and I think that virtually without exception we can say that everyone of them did a job which each of you should be proud and certainly of which I was proud.

In Vietnam the situation was different. We were in a country which was literally in the midst of a conflict which is getting worse. Once again, our people were put pretty much on their own much more so, I think, than they bargained for when they went there. But again, in no instance were they disappointed. It was here that Acousticon, for example, came into the picture through Dr. Morrow, from up in Burlington, Vt. Despite the fact that there was a rather violent political war and shooting war going on, Dr. Morrow had the compassion to feel that one educated Vietnamese with the aid of the hearing aid could make a much greater contribution to his country. Just the faith of someone like Dr. Morrow that it was important to get a hearing aid for one man in a country that the rest of the world was already writing off to the Communists.

As you have a telling effect on very many people in such a country, you'd be surprised how fast this news travels. If it's worth getting a hearing aid to help this man, it serves as a manifestation of faith in America and Americans that Vietnam is not being written off. This is equally as important as all the guns, all the tanks and all the planes we can send them because if you believe in people you give them something for which to fight and something for which they are willing to die. If you don't believe in them they are not willing to make a sacrifice for you and I think this is a perfectly sound philosophy.

Next year, or I should say this year, this spring, we are taking the ship to Peru. Once again, we'll be doing much the same thing. We are going to northern Peru where we are taking over a school which is a school that has just completed its first 2 years of medical education. They don't have a hospital to carry on their third year. They started to build it but it wasn't finished. Now, they've asked us to come and take over their third year, to open a school of nursing for them and to open a school of hospital administration. This is a big task. We decided to do it because we felt that in this country, a country which was desperately trying to convince its population that in America we believed in them. We will be there in April; and because we promised

to go there, they have increased the shift on their hospital construction from a one-shift job to a three-shift job so that they will have their hospital completed by the time HOPE finishes the academic year for their students which begins in April. This fulfills, really, something that we in HOPE actually dream about doing because they're using Peruvian money to build this hospital and Peruvian labor. None of this is being built with American dollars or borrowed American dollars; it's being built with Peruvian donations.

I received a letter just yesterday in which they are building another small installation, some 400 miles south of Lima for which they have already raised the money, which requires two doctors and two nurses and they are naming it the HOPE Clinic. They want us to accept this responsibility until we train people to carry it on. In this instance, we have a new twist because we also received a fully operating dairy farm as a gift to support the hospital. It supposedly grows enough and has enough cows, and one thing or another, to give all the food needs for this small clinic and hospital. The only catch is we now have to bring two farmers—who would be able to put in intelligent methods.

Now I have a reputation, particularly among these people, of not being able to say "No" to this type of thing. I say "Yes" and our staffers work 26 hours out of 24. We're going to take this on because it's an interesting challenge and I think that we can do a good job of it. And we'll get two farmers to go with us. I don't know where yet, but we'll find them. Once against this will serve an entire community area; and once again, we'll staff it. But only until they are able to staff it themselves.

We are continuing, despite what's in the papers, to staff hospitals in both Vietnam and Indonesia; mostly with volunteers who serve without pay. We are continuing to supply the drugs which are gifts from the pharmaceutical industry, from one end of this country to the other. And it's a very comfortable feeling to know that we have companies like this behind us. I could keep you here all day but schedules, neither yours nor mine, will permit it. I want to thank you, Mr. Bragg, for giving this award not to me but to us. We'll treasure it, actually, as a memory of the support of citizens of Connecticut as spoken through the voice of Danbury. Thank you very much.

An Unfriendly Act of the Philippine Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, early in 1961, a group of 7 tobacco companies located in Tennessee, Kentucky, North Carolina, and Virginia sold approximately 7,000 hogsheads, worth $7 million of burley and Flue-cured tobacco to a Philippines cigarette manufacturer consigned to a Philippine importer. The tobacco was shipped from the United States during the period October-December and received in Manila prior to December 31, 1961.

This tobacco met all legal requirements of the Philippine Government in the fall of 1961 insofar as its import was concerned and the importers offered to pay the correct duty assessed on the tobacco. Importation was not permitted due to a pending injunction suit before the court of first instance in the Philippines.

Following the change of administration in the Philippine Government in January 1962, the tobacco was ruled illegally imported by the new Philippine Government. In the case before the court of first instance in Manila a decision was rendered on January 22, 1962, ordering the release of the tobacco to the Philippine importers for entry into the Philippines.

The new Philippine Government now has ordered the reexport of this tobacco which would cost the American exporters approximately $1 million in loss involving shipping charges, storage, insurance, and other expenses incident to the reexport.

The Philippine Government has stated that the American exporters had acted in good faith although they insisted that the Philippine importers had illegally imported the tobacco, despite the complete official approval of the shipment by the Philippine Government in the fall of 1961.

This appears to be a clear case of discrimination against American exporters by the Philippine Government and in view of the President's foreign trade program urging American companies to export more of their products it is a severe blow to American tobacco dealers who while acting in good faith have been caught up in what appears to be local politics.

The United States has imported in 1961 approximately 10 million pounds of Philippine tobacco and we are presently about to loan the Philippine Government a $300 million stabilization loan.

It seems amazing to me that the Philippine Government, a friendly ally, would take this method of slapping American exporters in the face, in view of the fact that they have acted in good faith, made a bona fide sale, met all legal requirements, and have followed President Kennedy's urgent directive of attempting to build greater foreign markets for American products.

This is a serious and terribly expensive blow to a group of American tobacco dealers and exporters, seeking to find foreign markets for our agricultural products. The State Department was aware of the action of the Philippine Government concerning this tobacco at the time that the loan was negotiated on January 17, 1962. I feel our own Government has indeed let down, in fact pulled the rug from under, Americans seeking to carry out the very policy enunciated by President Kennedy in seeking foreign trade.

In view of these facts, I urgently demand that the State Department reconsider its present program of assistance to the Philippine Government until assurance can be received that the tobacco shipment in question will be allowed to be received by the bona fide importers and Philippine manufacturers. An additional assurance in the form of a written agreement to set up long-term yearly quotas for importation of U.S. leaf tobacco for blending purposes should be forthcoming from the Philippine Government.

Then this matter can be cleared from the record in a manner satisfactory to those Americans who trusted in the good faith of the Philippine Government in making this sale.

Migrant Farmworker Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, substandard housing is one of the most troublesome, yet important, parts of the migratory farmworker problem. In my work with the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, I have seen numerous examples of migrant farmworker housing in various States. Substandard housing is not uncommon for these citizens; sometimes, it is even below the level of human decency. Substandard housing is, in fact, so commonplace in areas affected by the seasonal influx of migratory farmworkers that few question the reasons for its existence.

In the midst of such apparent complacency, it is extremely encouraging to see the emergence of those few individuals who willingly contribute pioneering leadership for the improvement of conditions under which our migratory farmworkers live.

Such an individual is Harry F. Byrd, Jr., State Senator from Virginia and the son of our distinguished colleague, the U.S. Senator from Virginia. Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr., has recently introduced in the Virginia Legislature a bill which would provide minimum standards for migratory farm labor camps and authorize State and local health departments to supervise such camps.

The Senator's proposal has received well deserved attention in an informative article entitled, "Byrd, Junior, Asks Checks Over Migrant Camps," which appeared in the Washington Post on February 1, 1962. A more comprehensive account of the Senator's proposal appeared in an editorial in the Winchester (Va.) Evening Star on February 2.

The Washington Post article points up the fact that Senator Byrd, like his father, is a prominent member of Virginia's apple growing industry and that many migratory farmworkers are employed in that part of his State's economy. That the State senator recognizes the importance of the migratory farmworker to Virginia's agricultural economy is, I believe, clearly indicated by the senator's new legislative proposal. Furthermore, it would indicate that he is willing to work for the needed reforms.

The Evening Star editorial notes that minimum standards of sanitation are needed to protect migratory farmworkers themselves as well as the per-

manent residents of the communities to which they come for work. In presenting the merits of Senator Byrd's proposal, the editorial refers to the legislation as "a commendable step in the direction of insuring the economic and the public health of our citizens and protecting the many migrant workers during their annual visit."

Because Senator Byrd's positive efforts to improve the living conditions of migratory farmworkers and their families is auxiliary to other efforts being made in Virginia to relieve the plight of these citizens, I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post article and the Evening Star editorial appear in the Appendix at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Winchester (Va.) Evening Star, Feb. 2, 1962]

STATEWIDE HEALTH STATUTE GOVERNING MIGRANT CAMPS IS A STEP WORTH TAKING

Every year, thousands upon thousands of migrant farmworkers pick their way northward, from Florida and Georgia, through the Carolinas and into Virginia, and on up the line. These workers and their families are important to the economic health of the Old Dominion; it would be impossible to harvest our agricultural yield without them.

Virtually all of this temporary labor must be provided housing. Much of this shelter is furnished through public camps operated by local farm bureaus or other agricultural groups. The remainder are cared for through privately owned migrant camps. There are, for example, six large public camps—four in the two counties of the Eastern Shore, one near Norfolk, and one near Winchester operated by the Frederick County Fruit Growers. To complement these are some 200 private camps.

Several years ago, Delaware and Maryland adopted certain health and sanitary regulations for their camps—both public and private. Both States have found the establishment of common regulations beneficial to both State and local health authorities in the prevention of the spreading of disease and protection to the migrants themselves.

At the present time, Virginia has no State health law regarding these camps. As far as the valley is concerned, none has been needed, for the quarters provided by fruitgrowers are considered better than the norm.

Earlier this week, State Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr., introduced a bill in the general assembly which would establish certain health standards for all future camps. His proposed legislation would permit Virginia health authorities generally the same scope as those already provided by Maryland and Delaware statutes. His bill was drawn up after consultation and with the advice of the State health department.

When he introduced the bill, State Senator Byrd assured the senate that the proposed legislation "would create no great hardship on any individual grower or on any farm organizations who maintain these camps. The State health commissioner, Dr. Shanholtz, informs me that these proposed regulations—and I quote him—'are sufficient to protect the health and welfare of migrant laborers. I believe that it is an advantage to have regulations such as these which parallel those of Maryland and Delaware, since the stream of migrant laborers on the Eastern Shore flows from Virginia into these States.'"

Already the State health department has the responsibility of caring for these migrants while they are in Virginia—providing for prenatal and maternal care where necessary as well as controlling disease. Statewide regulations regarding the basic health and sanitation conditions at the camps, Dr. Shanholtz believes, should assist the State and county health agencies in this work.

He also says that—with these regulations—the intent of Mr. Byrd's proposed legislation could be enforced without additional cost to the State.

There is a desire among all reputable growers and their organizations to provide sanitary and suitable facilities for these workers. This legislation would prevent possible fly-by-night camp operators from taking advantage of the grower as well as the laborer.

It is a commendable step in the direction of insuring the economic and the public health of our citizens and protecting the many migrant workers during their annual visits.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 1, 1962]

BYRD, JUNIOR, ASKS CHECKS OVER MIGRANT CAMPS

RICHMOND, January 31.—State Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr., today introduced a bill providing minimum standards for camps for migrant labor and authorizing State and local health departments to supervise such camps.

Byrd, like his father, U.S. Senator HARRY F. BYRD, is a grower of apples. Many migrant laborers are employed in the gathering and packing of fruit in Virginia.

In a brief statement to the State senate, Byrd, Junior, said an important segment of Virginia's agricultural economy is dependent upon the crews of migrant laborers who travel north with the harvest each year.

"These crews number thousands of persons," he said. "For example, the State employment commission tells me that 21,503 migrant laborers and their families used the Little Creek ferry to go into the Eastern Shore. Barely more than half this number were men. Fifty-four hundred were women, and more than 3,000 were children under 16 years of age. In the valley, fruit growers employed last year some 1,700 temporary laborers.

"The majority of this temporary but necessary labor must be provided housing. The eastern shore has four public camps operated by local farm bureaus. The Frederick County fruitgrowers operate one public camp near Winchester. The Norfolk area has another. The rest of the migrants are accommodated in possibly 200 private camps.

"Two years ago, Maryland adopted certain minimum regulations for these camps to insure adequate and sanitary quarters for these migrants.

Step Toward Atlantic Community Is Taken

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under the shadow of communism free men are continually meeting to exchange ideas in an effort to maintain and secure liberty as we know it. Their energy and passion for freedom is timely recalled by the NATO Atlantic Convention held in Paris this past month. With these remarks I am including an article by Mr. N. R. Howard appearing in the Cleveland Plain Dealer which reviews the work of this convention:

STEP TOWARD ATLANTIC COMMUNITY IS TAKEN

(By N. R. Howard)

Prof. Oliver Schroeder of W.R.U., one of the Congress-elected delegates to the NATO Atlantic Convention at Paris this month, has sent me the Declaration of Paris adopted by the 15-nation members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, or free world, after, he writes, 2 weeks of strife and agonizing argument.

This looks like the step which would be to a permanent Atlantic community what the 1944 Dumbarton Oaks meeting to agree on limited principles and prepare an agenda was to the 1945 birth of the United Nations. If so, Paris is an improvement over Dumbarton because of the absence of Russia (and China, too) and brought forth a ringing declaration.

Eighty-five of the ninety participating delegates voted for it; five withheld their votes. The most colorful propositions in the declaration are that the new order should be named "the Atlantic Community" and that a restored Acropolis in Athens should be either its shrine or capitol.

TWO THINGS U.N. LACKS

The declaration immediately acknowledges the "survival of freemen" and "progress for all men" as reasons for creating the Atlantic community "within the next decade." Its "ad hoc" action was to ask the participant governments to set up a special commission to draw a blueprint within 2 years for the structure of the Atlantic Community of law, economics, and culture, as contemplated by the delegates.

Whatever the present usefulness or power of the U.N., there have been two things it has not been able to do in its 17 years—contemplate a system of law binding all its members and explore any possibilities of removing intercountry trade barriers.

The emergence of the European Common Market, and the interest in it engendered in England, the United States, and the north countries resulted in part from this deficiency in the 1945 world plans. Now a governmental internation order which is more than military has set out to determine united or mutual agreements as to law.

The declaration of Paris likewise attached its support to the growing European Common Market and took note of President Kennedy's enthusiasm for it in this country.

RIGHTS OF FREEMEN

Nothing in the statement of joint principles in the declaration should arouse the most isolationist Member of Congress, and a great many of the purposes will rally the people growing nervous about U.N. intentions and diversions; for, mind you, these are the delegates of the free world doing the speaking, which infers morality, private free enterprise, the rights and duties of free men and women.

In its preface, the declaration declares us the heirs of Greece, Rome, the Renaissance, our spiritual traditions, and the true beginnings of science. All of these in time, it says, produced the supremacy of law, social justice, and respect for individual rights; whatever is really moral and cultural has been acknowledged by the nations of the West.

It notes the Communist menace and says the West must now close ranks; that it can do so with a community of nations joined in political, military, economic, moral, and cultural ways.

TWELVE RECOMMENDATIONS

It recommends to the 15 participant nations (1) defining the common principles, (2) creating a common high council, (3) developing the conferences of delegates into a permanent assembly with advisory powers, (4) setting up a high court of justice to arbi-

trate international arguments, (5) harmonizing of political, military, and economic policies, (6) establishing an Atlantic community agreement speedily as to nuclear weapons, (7) welcoming the European Economic Community and American cooperation, (8) helping new nations with governmental aid, private investment, and trade cordiality, (9) committing itself to less economic inequality among nations, (10) standing for liberty and self-determination of the "captive" lands, (11) making and exchanging programs for education, culture, and youth welfare, and finally, (12) proposing the multination commission to produce this agency structurally in 2 years.

It is a lot to plan for, perhaps too much; perhaps, even, there isn't any leadtime for it, the way the world is going. But it is a free world blueprint of a kind we have not had. Something might come of it.

The Social Security Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the International Woodworkers of America in October 1961, relating to the social security law.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 18

Subject: Social security.

Convention action: Concurrence.

Whereas the social security law presently provides a small monthly sum at the age of 65 for workers who are covered by the law and who retire from work; and

Whereas many of these men have to continue to work past the age when they are eligible for social security benefits since their wives are not old enough to receive benefits; and

Whereas IWA, AFL–CIO, Local 3–7 believes that the Social Security Act was meant to mean real security for the working people; now therefore be it

Resolved, That this 22d constitutional convention of the International Woodworkers of America, AFL–CIO, actively support the following changes in the law:

1. Any man reaching the retirement age stated in the Social Security Act shall obtain, by his application for social security benefits, the maximum benefits for his wife also, regardless of her age, provided their marriage has taken place at least 10 years prior to the minimum age requirement for social security benefits.

2. That the age requirement for maximum benefits be set at 60 for all persons who have been paying into the social security fund since its inception.

3. That provisions for medical care be integrated with the social security program; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Senators and Representatives of all the States.

Submitted by: IWA Local 3–7, Bend, Oreg.

WILLIAM DALE NIPPER,
President.

MIRIAM CONWAY,
Secretary.

Merits Readership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to insert an editorial from the Saginaw News, Saginaw, Mich., written November 13, 1961, which I feel deserves a few minutes' time of all the Members.

The editorial follows:

HOW MUCH FEDERAL AID DID THE PILGRIMS GET?

There should be a national roll of honor for the cities and counties whose people protest indignantly the Department of Commerce depressed area label hung on them uninvited and unsolicited.

Last week lively Petoskey's Chamber of Commerce spoke the sentiments of Emmet County leaders in expressing resentment of the tag.

Petoskey, a wondrous winterland and glorious summer vacationland, is also a bustling business community whose people constantly are using their own initiative to drum up more business and entice new industry to their scenic surroundings.

They don't want any Department of Commerce stigma knocking down their efforts—or the economic state of their area. They believe they are doing fine, on their own.

Petoskey's rocketing reaction recalls a recent reply by a Cleveland business firm to its publicly asked question: How much Federal aid did the Pilgrims get?

The firm of Warner & Swansey, Inc., supplied its own answer:

"All they had was character. All they did was work. All they wanted was self-respect.

"The sum of these traits became America.

"But what," asked this American business firm, "is going to be the sum of the traits you see today—the traits of character, or rather lack of it, that demand more money for less work, put security above self-respect, pamper self-pitying criminals instead of punishing them, give away resources we desperately need to protect ourselves, listen to weaklings that want Government to take care of them when they should take care of themselves?

"Long years of early American self-respect and work built America, but the traits you see today can destroy it in half the time."

As a Federal Reserve Bank official said last week in commending Second National on the occasion of its 90th anniversary, Saginaw surely would have been declared a "distressed area," when lumbering played out, had people and Government reacted in those days as they do today.

But, since nobody dreamed of such a self-pitying term, they did the natural thing, learned by their heritage—they set about to rebuild the town's economy. Look at us.

Last week several hundred plush homes in southern California's most exclusive—and wealthy—residential districts went up in flames. Estimated combined loss was $20 million. But hardly a racking tragedy leaving human destitution in its wake. Not in those insured brackets. And not a life was lost, thanks to the firefighters.

But the reflex action reflecting today's loss of the stamina to face reversals was almost instantaneous. Governor Brown declared it a "disaster area" and appealed immediately to Washington for aid.

How poverty stricken in our traits of character can we get?

The Nation is going to need a lot more Petoskeys and still more Americans willing to ask publicly: "How much Federal aid did the Pilgrims get?"

Keep the Record Straight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am submitting a thought-provoking column by Bill Sumner, a former Pasadena, Calif., newspaperman who has recently joined the Ridder Publications Washington, D.C., bureau.

Mr. Sumner's delightful, hard-hitting columns have entertained and informed Pasadena area readers for years. Now he has turned loose his talent and his typewriter on our Nation's Capital.

One of his early Washington columns, appearing in Pasadena Independent editions of February 2, 1962, is particularly appropriate to readers—and inserters—of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mr. Sumner will pardon the insertion, we are sure, in order that we might press home his point:

KEEP THE RECORD STRAIGHT

(By Bill Sumner)

WASHINGTON.—There have been no attempts to reform the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD within the last few days, so we'll have to heap the honors for timeliness this week on Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, New York Republican.

What he advocates is simple but shocking. He thinks that it is all right if Congressmen plant speeches in the RECORD that they really haven't given on the floor. But he wants inserted speeches clearly labeled as such. He suggests using different typefaces to distinguish between the insertions and those speeches given orally.

"I have looked with growing concern," he said, "on the practice of Members of the House inserting in the RECORD speeches which appear to have been delivered on the floor when in fact they are not. For all anyone knows, the Member was in his office, back home in his district, or sitting in an air-cooled movie."

LINDSAY feels that, by labeling these phony speeches for what they are, there would be fewer of them and that it might stimulate greater attendance. He stated:

"Hopefully, the new rule would make it less attractive for Members to stay in their home districts on Mondays and Fridays, appearing in Washington for only 3 days and 2 nights in the middle of the week, as is the practice now of the well-known Tuesday to Thursday Club."

He refers here, of course, to the legislators, as from New York State, who live an hour or so from the Capital by plane and take advantage of it often.

The practice of inserting speeches is an old one. It is done by Congressmen anxious to show the folks at home they are active. To give you an example of how it affects the RECORD, the House was in session about 40

minutes the other day, but enough speeches were placed in the RECORD to have consumed a full day if given orally.

And judging by the content of most of the speeches, the fact they were merely inserted—not orated—can be called a blessing.

There is another practice you have heard of by which Congressmen and Senators extend their remarks. LINDSAY would not end this practice, but it actually consumes more space at times, in the Appendix, than all of the debate of the day and inserted speeches combined.

Congressman BRUCE ALGER, of Texas, appears to be the champion extender. While it wouldn't be fair to award a title for the week without an actual count—and there are better things to do than count these things—I would bet that ALGER would win such a contest. I doubt if there is another editorial writer or columnist on any of the Dallas newspapers who hasn't been extended in to the RECORD this week by Mr. ALGER.

Other Congressmen pick worse things than newspaper articles, of course. They may read of a constituent who addressed the State hay dealer's convention back home and hasten to print his remarks. Perhaps there is a constituent who writes poetry. Newspapers shy away from this sort of thing, but the RECORD doesn't. Another Congressman read what he thought to be an interesting article on Andrew Jackson and inserted that this week.

It is flattering, of course, to be in this great RECORD of the Congress of the United States and it doesn't hurt the Congressman who puts you there.

A thousand years or so from now, of course, someone is going to stumble onto these carefully preserved documents and wonder what sort of people we were. On translation, he will have to decide that we were a pretty windy lot. Well, we weren't that windy.

Special Treatment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, as I am sure all Members of this body know, the so-called Du Pont bill has passed the Senate and been signed into law by the President. This law provides special tax treatment in the case of the court-ordered divestiture of General Motors stock by the Du Pont Co. I believe it is unfortunate that the Congress chose this means of proceeding to correct what was almost unanimously accepted as an unfair situation. We have corrected only one situation by specific legislation in a field in which there are many such situations better corrected by general legislation.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch, in an editorial on January 30, commented on this matter. It expresses with clarity the feelings of those of us who urged a general solution to a general problem and who are disappointed that this matter was treated on such a narrow basis. The editorial follows:

FOR DU PONT ONLY

After a 4-month delay, the Senate has joined the House in passing the Du Pont-General Motors tax bill. It is now up to the Federal district court in Chicago to decide just how Du Pont and General Motors shall be divorced, and we hope that the method chosen will effect a true divestiture, not a sham. Meanwhile Congress has done well to remove a tax penalty that would have fallen upon individual Du Pont stockholders who receive General Motors stock as a result of the divestiture. Such a stock distribution will be treated as a return of capital and not as ordinary income, taxable at much higher rates.

But though equity called for this legislation, the final form in which it passed is regrettable. The bill started out as a general measure applying to any distribution of stock made as a result of a court decision ordering divestiture under the antitrust laws. That is how it should have remained. The Department of Justice, however, declined to support a generally applicable law, and so the Du Pont-General Motors bill was tailored exclusively to fit those companies—never a sound rule of legislation.

If the principle was good for these two companies, why is it not good for any similar cases? The Justice Department argued that general legislation might provide an incentive to future antitrust law violations. If a business executive knew that divestiture would entail no special tax penalty, he might be tempted to enter into an anticompetitive merger more readily than otherwise; so ran the argument.

The argument is not convincing. In effect, it amounts to saying that a special and inequitable tax situation relating to certain divestitures should be perpetuated for the purpose of discouraging violation of the antitrust laws, and should only be corrected in particular cases after the fact. But if the tax situation is unjust, it ought to be repaired for everybody, and not just for giant corporations like Du Pont with the resources to wage a 6-month battle for legislative relief.

Corporate divorces required by legislation—such as the divorce of utility holding companies from operating companies—are not subjected to such a tax penalty. Why should the penalty be applied to corporate divorces ordered by the courts?

Let Us Not Be Afraid To Speak Up for the American System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, let us stop apologizing for our country, our people, the system which has given more benefits to its people than any economic system on earth. We need not be ashamed of the accomplishments of capitalism. We win no victories from the Communists by letting them scare us into trying to hide our achievements. I think we ought to shout so all the world can hear of the great strides which have been made under capitalism. Far from being a nasty word, as the Communists try to get us to admit, it is a word of promise for all men everywhere. Capitalism is the system which offers unparalleled opportunity to each individual who is limited as to his place in life only according to his own initiative, ability and willingness to do and dare. I am proud to advocate capitalism. The alternative is communism or slavery. The following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune points up some reasons for having pride in supporting capitalism:

"CAPITALISM" AS A NASTY WORD

George Romney, president of American Motors, who is the subject of an interesting Tribune profile by Chesly Manly, thinks that the Communists have corrupted the meaning of "capitalism" to such a degree that Americans should no longer apply it as a term descriptive of their economic organization.

It is our guess that Mr. Romney, who may be about to embark on a political career in Michigan, has been reading the instructive booklet recently released by the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, entitled "Wordsmanship; Semantics as a Communist Weapon." This is the product of Dr. Stefan T. Possony, director of international studies at the Hoover Institution, Stanford University.

Dr. Possony recalls that a medieval French king remarked, "He who can't dissimulate, can't rule." Language, says this scholar, is nicely adapted to the purposes of artificial manipulation. It can be used, or abused, as a weapon to mislead, to create false impressions, and to induce false thinking. It is more subtle and less immediately destructive than nuclear bombs, but it has the power of eroding society.

"The Communists like powerful weapons, especially when they come cheap," Dr. Possony says. "To the Communists, words are tools to achieve effects, not means to communicate in search of truth."

He then cites as a specific example the word "capitalism." In the American dictionary, this means what is also termed "the free enterprise system." A person's incentive to advance himself economically is the key to the success of capitalism. In this system, individuals and corporations own property and use it, by their own free will, to invest, sell, buy, build, trade, associate, and enjoy life.

But, according to the Communists, capitalism is a system in which a few property holders have absolute rights, make the laws to please themselves and achieve maximum profits, and exploit the toiling masses. The Communists would have people believe that the consumers have no rights because they have no money, so that the majority suffers economic deprivation and is sinking ever lower.

Of course, the Communist interpretation is a travesty on the facts. It is a loaded definition intended to persuade masses of people that communism is the instrument to liberate them from a form of slavery. The Communists themselves don't believe this, but they hope the credulous will. They know that what they call capitalism has been a success which has spread abundance and well-being, while their own collective system, under dictatorial direction, has been a failure. Even Khrushchev has grumbled that "the slaves of capitalism live well."

So capitalism has been transformed by the Communists into a nasty word, and Mr. Romney thinks we should have another in its place. He proposes "consumerism," which is an awkward invention. We don't know why anybody has to knock himself out trying to find a term descriptive of the American system. In practice, it is a market economy in which the choices of the consumers determine prices and allocations of goods and services. It provides incentives to the producer. It rests upon freedom, both political and economic.

There are "freedoms to" do the things one chooses, and "freedoms from" restrictions and oppressions, whether originating with Government or with the trespasses of others upon an individual's right. Khrushchev knows the distinction, however communism

may seek to distort meaning. He acknowledged it when he promised socialism to American grandchildren, but freedom to the grandchildren of his Soviet subjects. Freedom is what the Communists haven't got, nor is it likely that their subjects will ever have it.

Soviet Multimegaton Bomb Testing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter to the editor written by Mr. Jack DeMent printed in the Oregonian of November 3, 1961, entitled "Bomb Can Make Quakes."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOMB CAN MAKE QUAKES

TO THE EDITOR:

Western reaction to Soviet multimegaton bomb testing has been almost uniformly the same in one respect: Namely, that there is no military use for superbombs. This thinking is both shallow and extremely dangerous, for there is every reason to believe that the U.S.S.R. has a very clear-cut goal in mind when it shoots the big ones.

Aside from "fallout blackmail"—which the Reds obviously realize can have a whiplash effect, but are willing to risk—the striving for a mammonth "point source" of explosive energy in itself shows that there is a very definite rationale behind the building and exploding of these huge hydrogen bombs. Their use against most surface targets is, of course, foolish from a military standpoint, for when destruction is to be wrought it is done methodically by the application of many smaller bombs in pattern designed for the target. You just don't kill a fly with a sledgehammer.

But, thinking from the "point source" approach, there is one potential military use which rears its ugly head. It may very well be the reason for the seemingly irrational testing going on. And that is the use of H-bombs to trigger earthquakes.

The idea that man might trigger an earthquake arose independently of the atomic bomb. In 1946 a Johns Hopkins geophysicist, A. J. Shneiderov, published a short note in the journal "Science," telling that shortly after Pearl Harbor a plan to induce an earthquake in Japanese waters and to ruin the key industrial centers of Japan was seriously considered. When Shneiderov's paper appeared it was greeted by what amounted to a roar of laughter from scientific colleagues. Nothing more was heard about the subject. Now, some 15 years later, the notion of a man-caused earthquake is certainly no laughing matter.

The World War II plan was offered as feasible if between 3,000 and 5,000 metric tons of TNT were exploded near the Pacific shores of Japan, presumably as close as possible to a known earth fault. The power of 5,000 tons of TNT is about 1.9 followed by 25 zeros "units of action" (ergs per second)—a number so large as to have no name. This amount of explosive power was claimed to exceed by 10 to several hundred times the energy liberated in the California earthquake of 1906.

Take 5,000 tons of TNT and multiply it by 10,000 and you get the explosive punch of a 50-megaton hydrogen bomb. By clustering several of these or many more smaller H-bombs—such as the "nominal" one-megaton firecracker—the sky's the limit for a "point source" of earthquake-triggering explosive.

Manmade earthquakes triggered just offshore offer the greatest potential for destruction. It may be for this reason that the Soviets have geared to atmospheric shots—arriving at the necessary information for seaquake triggering by projection.

If a rupture in the ocean bed, caused by H-bombs, is deep enough, exposing the heated subsurface earth, the flow of sea water into the fissure might produce steam—which in turn would deepen and broaden the crack. The larger part of the steam would of course escape to the surface as a giant bubble, which could result in a tidal wave.

There are many targets which lend themselves to attack by manmade earthquakes. Japan is but one of these. The Pacific coast is yet another—from British Columbia down through Oregon and into California.

How would an enemy go about setting up a country as a pigeon for toppling by manmade quake? One answer is immediately apparent: The quake-triggering H-bomb is stealthily laid offshore by submarine. It could be a timed-fused device or, in a few instances, set to explode upon radio command. In the meantime, a monstrous kind of blackmail could be perpetrated against the target country, which would have no way of knowing whether such a stunt was really in the offing, or even would work if true. But as a panic, fear, and blackmail weapon the hydrogen quake would be incomparable.

JACK DE MENT.

A Significant Anniversary: The 100th Year of Banking by Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, a significant anniversary, of interest to the U.S. Post Office Department, the Nation's banking community, and the American people, will occur on April 9 this year.

On that day, banking by mail in the United States will have reached its 100th anniversary. This fact in itself is worthy of commemoration but the circumstances surrounding the beginnings of this now taken-for-granted enterprise should be of interest to all our citizens.

Banking by mail has been an important factor in developing greater habits of thrift among our people. It has simplified the making of deposits for hundreds of thousands of persons for whom it is difficult to make periodic visits to savings institutions; it has contributed to the growth of the savings bank idea; in short, the privilege of banking by mail provides people with a convenient means of saving regularly for life's emergencies.

However, 100 years ago the law prohibited such practices by specifying that deposits in savings institutions had to be made in person by the man or woman under whose name the account was held.

On April 9, a trustee of the Bank for Savings, the oldest mutual savings institution in New York State and one of the oldest in the country, succeeded in having introduced and passed in the New York State Legislature a bill which provided for the following change in the banking laws:

Resolved, That the requirement that the depositor shall be present and subscribe to the regulations of the bank shall be dispensed with in the case of persons in the naval and military service of the United States, whether regular or volunteers from the respective States.

This bill, designed for the convenience of men in the service during the Civil War, continued in use after the war ended, and eventually was applied to all depositors—thereby becoming the forerunner of present-day banking by mail.

I wish to call this important anniversary to the attention of my colleagues in this House and to the American public and focus attention on its historical significance. Since the facts which inspire this presentation are of patriotic interest to all Americans and of historic value to the Post Office Department, I am calling upon the Government to authorize the issuance of a special commemorative stamp, marking the 100th anniversary of banking by mail and honoring its invaluable contribution to the American way of life.

Guard the Power To Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Windom (Minn.) Citizen raises serious question as to the advisability of giving the President—any President—freedom to change income tax rates. I am placing the editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

GUARD THE POWER TO TAX

We are somewhat alarmed over the recent suggestion that the President be given authority to reduce or increase the income tax rate, at his own pleasure. The Kennedy administration points to this as a quick and sure way of regulating the economy, and mentions that sometimes a reduction of rate can prevent recessions.

We'll grant the truth of that. But an increase in rate can also lead an administration into a spendthrift program that brings on ruinous inflation. Mr. Kennedy might handle the matter all right; that we do not know. But putting the power in the hands of anyone with political ambition would be a big mistake. The fact also remains that there would always be the temptation for a President anxious for another term to cut tax rates just before election, sometimes with permanent damage to the economy.

If we always had perfect Presidents, if they served only one term, and if they were not human but superhuman, perfect in wisdom, it would be a different matter. But they're not. We prefer to leave the setting of rates in the hands of Congress, our constitutents who represent us directly. Who was that wise man who said that "The power to tax is the power to destroy"?

The United States Has Nothing To Gain by Continuing Its Membership in the U.N. Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, before we vote to authorize the spending of $100 million to bail the United Nations out of the hole, I think we should ask ourselves what the United States has to gain by saving the organization. It seems to me that as long as the Soviet Union is able to dominate the U.N. and the weak sisters and neutral nations would rather line up with the Communists than with the champions of freedom, we only jeopardize our own liberties by financing the club. Let us forget about voting $100 million to make sure the Communists can maintain a worldwide forum at our expense and let us go further by passing the joint resolution which I had the privilege in sponsoring along with my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT], and withdraw our membership completely from the United Nations. In the meantime I commend for your reading the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal:

USING OR BEING USED?

The administration is rightly making the United Nations bond issue a question of Congressional confidence in the U.N. itself. We hope the debate, set off in hearings slated to begin today, will cover both the narrow financial question and the broad political one. Indeed, it is hard to separate the two.

In view of the U.N.'s financial straits, Acting Secretary General Thant proposes a $200 million bond issue. President Kennedy is asking Congress for authority to buy up to half that amount. Some of his arguments are simple and obvious; some are more complicated.

It is obvious, for example, that the money involved, while huge by private standards, is fairly piddling for the U.S. Government. With Federal budgets rapidly heading toward $100 billion a year, $100 million more or less is not of itself a great issue—though there are indications it may be only a beginning.

Less obvious, but nonetheless interesting, is another administration argument. Mr. Thant has linked the bond issue into a wider program, which involves getting an opinion from the World Court whether nations delinquent on special assessments—like that for the Congo operation—must pay up or lose their voting rights. The United States hopes that the Court will advise that they must.

The administration, as we understand it, is here saying something like this: If we help rescue the U.N. by buying these bonds, and if the World Court advises as we would like, then we will be in a rather happy position vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. The U.N. would have to tell the Russians to put up or shut up. Either way, we are one up on the Kremlin, for once.

Beyond this maneuver is a more general consideration along the same lines. The Soviets don't like the Congo business; indeed they don't like to much of what is going on in the U.N., having been defeated so far on their troika deal and other disruptive efforts. This is an extremely poor time, the administration seems to argue, for Congress to vote no confidence in the U.N. by rejecting the bond proposal; we ought to be supporting it when it is rubbing the Russians the wrong way.

Now all this sounds pretty sensible and hard headed. This newspaper is all for taking the most practical and realistic possible approach to the U.N., as an instrument of American diplomacy in the cold war. Unfortunately the administration arguments, persuasive as far as they go, do not resolve all the relevant questions.

Congress will have to ask, we think, what sort of club this is whose members—not just the Soviet Union—won't pay their dues, which must resort to deficit financing? Far more important, do our involved ideas for putting the Soviets on a spot of sorts really count for much? Is not the real struggle with the Kremlin taking place in arenas—battlefields in some cases—outside the U.N. and beyond the U.N.'s power to reach?

And, most important of all, can we in fact use the U.N. as an instrument of policy, no matter how practical our approach, or will we end up being used ourselves? Once we could command an automatic majority in the General Assembly, but no more; now that the membership has swelled to 104, the possible majorities are often of nations not exactly wild about us. What may this mean in practice?

President Kennedy himself gave a hint, and not an auspicious one: "It is impossible to say where or when the United Nations may be called upon again for emergency action to preserve or restore the peace."

That sentence is literally true—and full of danger signals. We cannot say into what dubious enterprises, into what wrong wars for others' purposes, we may be led by an organization in which we can always be outvoted.

None of this is meant as a rebuttal of the administration argument for buying U.N. bonds. The administration, like most Americans, is concerned with one thing mainly: How best to preserve and enhance the security of the United States. That is what Congress must keep uppermost in mind if it hopes to find the right answers to all the questions it must now ask about the United States and the U.N.

Trade and Commonsense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, we face this year momentous decisions on trade policy which will affect the fortunes of all our citizens for years to come. In this connection, I commend to the notice of my colleagues a perceptive editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Virginia Farm Bureau News, official organ of the Virginia Farm Bureau Federation.

The editorial follows:

A STAR ON THE HORIZON

When the problems of international trade are discussed all sorts of images are conjured up. One of the darkest thoughts brought about is that of the goods imported and the harm that can possibly be done to domestic competing industries. However, the bright images are so great and numerous that even the most staid "protectionist" would have to agree that the balance of international trade weighs heavily in favor of U.S. markets.

In 1960, agricultural products alone accounted for over $4.9 billion worth of American exports. This was the equivalent of one-sixth of all cash receipts from farm marketings or the production from more than 60 million acres of U.S. cropland.

In Virginia in 1960, export sales in all categories from Virginia to Japan alone accounted for more than $20 million worth of trade which created employment for 1,930 Virginians.

The prospect for this year and ensuing years is for increased sales through foreign trade, provided of course that the Reciprocal Trade Act is renewed and provided that the U.S. Government and all phases of American production do not demand high protective tariffs to insure against imports from those who buy from us.

This gimmick of trying to restrict imports while at the same time trying to increase exports is as foolish as trying to hold water in a sieve. It is unrealistic to expect foreign countries to buy from us if at the same time we raise high protective tariff walls to keep them from selling their goods to us. The history of protective tariffs has been that of foreign countries restricting our trade when the United States has restricted their trade to us. Thus, through this process many of our markets are dried up. When this situation occurs, agriculture stands to lose and suffer more than probably any other industry.

One pertinent fact all business men, farmers included, should keep in mind about imports and exports is that even though their particular product or commodity isn't exported; the fact that others are keeps the exports from competing in the domestic markets with those products not exported. Indirectly at least, everyone is affected by international trade through the creation of more markets for more products.

The United States has been involved in reciprocal trade agreements for a good many years. The programs we have operated under have usually been on a short term basis. The present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is due to expire this year. It is therefore mandatory that we in the realm of agriculture work diligently to see that the act is extended or renewed.

This piecemeal method of developing foreign markets may have been sufficient in the past but we must now, with 20th century problems, face the situation in a 20th century fashion. For several years now, there has been developing in Europe an agreement among several of the nations to create a common market to mutually lower tariffs on goods sold within those countries. To date this involved program has worked with such success that other European nations are joining or preparing to join, bringing the total to 13 countries mutually cooperating to help lower tariff barriers and bring about a freer and more beneficial flow of trade to all involved.

The United States has been working in concert with these nations for many years on this vast and complicated project and now the President of the United States is pressing to have the U.S. economy mutually alined with this great step forward in the world economy. The movement is now being pressed to have an even more effective union of Atlantic nations working together in a common market. To forward looking people, a concert of many of the free nations of the world working together to create a common economic climate through which the economy of each of the participating nations can grow and be strengthened, to the mutual advancement of each, is indeed the ultimate in international cooperation.

With the arena of international reciprocal trade growing among free economies, trust,

faith, and reliance will be strengthened among the participants. Where nations can trust and respect each other in the field of economics the area for differenecs in the political and ideological fields will become yet smaller and less explosive. Probably the most important of all the facts is that a free concert of voluntary cooperation, that is even now being perfected, can only exist among nations that know and practice freedom of liberty and are ruled by law and not by men. For only under these conditions can free enterprise exist and this is the prime requisite for successful reciprocal international trade.

By our cooperation with the European Common Market and a larger Atlantic union of free nations, the economic and political ties of the free nations of the world can be developed into such a powerful organ for freedom, prosperity and justice that all the noise of Khrushchev's 100-megaton bombs and all of his rantings and threats will be reduced, in comparison, to a muffled unpleasant burp.

HEW Ignores Private Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the January 24 issue of the Wall Street Journal made a particularly important point about the continuing debate over finding the best means to finance health care for our senior citizens. It notes that great progress has been experienced in past years in the advancement of means for meeting the costs involved in health care. These are familiar to any student of this matter—catastrophic health insurance, noncancellable policies, prepayment. Progress in this area continues in the private sector of our economy but, unfortunately, this progress is entirely unrecognized in the public statements of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. This silence is especially significant, and even more unfortunate in the light of honest consideration of the question, when it is viewed in the context of the Department's continuing fight to place financing health care for the aged under Government control. I commend the health insurance industry for the great strides it has taken and urge the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to take notice of the progress that has been made by our private economy, praising it for the constructive advances it has made.

I am inserting the Wall Street Journal editorial at this point in the RECORD:

A QUESTION OF COMPULSION

Over the years there has been a big growth in private health insurance plans, both in the variety of policies offered and in the expansion of group coverage. The latest type to be announced is a Blue Shield program to pay the full cost of medical and surgical services for people over 65 whose incomes are low.

Since the administration is much concerned with medical care for the aged these days, you might suppose it would applaud the increasing availability of this and other types of health insurance. The problem of medical care for the aged is a very real one for the fraction of the population it affects; if private groups are able and willing to fill the need, that would seem preferable to a costly, cumbersome and compulsory system through Social Security.

But no; the administration is demonstrating it has little if any tolerance for private efforts. Health, Education and Welfare Secretary Ribicoff calls the Blue Shield plan inadequate and says it will not change the Government's own plans to provide coverage on a Federal basis, mandatory for all regardless of need. Other advocates of the compulsory approach scarcely conceal their scorn for private attempts to relieve distress.

This attitude inevitably raises the question whether Washington's chief interests is in the aged or merely in further extending Government control over everyone.

A New Congressman From Texas Has Some Ideas on Juveniles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, our new colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GRAHAM B. PURCELL, is already on his way to finding his proper place among us. We like him and we respect the way he goes about his business. We learn that he is extremely versatile. He was trained first in the great Texas A. & M. College. Later he chose the legal profession, a career in which he made an enviable record. It is of particular interest to note that as a District Judge he was especially good at handling juvenile cases. These problems are prominent in the minds of all of us who read the Washington papers. An article in last Sunday's Washington Star shed some interesting light on the manner in which Congressman PURCELL handled this particular phase of his job. It is of such timely interest that I believe that it should be perpetuated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I submit it herewith.

A NEW CONGRESSMAN FROM TEXAS HAS SOME IDEAS ON JUVENILES

(By John McKelway)

It is generally accepted in most circles that things are just different in Texas.

One of the most recent examples occurred two Saturdays ago when the people of the State's 13th District (which lies below the Oklahoma line) elected to Congress a judge who had picked up a reputation by sentencing juvenile delinquents to the barber's chair.

Such a practice—in most circles at least—would be considered political suicide. But GRAHAM B. PURCELL, JR., 42, the judge and a Democrat, won by 10,000 votes over a conservative Republican businessman from Wichita Falls, hometown of the even more conservative and the first Republican Senator to arrive from the Confederate States since the Civil War—JOHN G. TOWER.

The election was held to fill a vacancy, created when former Democratic Representative Frank Ikard, a soft-spoken but highly regarded Congressman, left his native land to take up duties here as executive vice president of the American Petroleum Institute.

Representative PURCELL, sworn in last Monday as a Member of Congress, did not give exactly the impression he was the only law west or east of the Pecos—wherever it might be. He wore a red carnation in his lapel and was quite solemn.

THE FRESHMAN FEELING

By his third day in office he sat in a rather bare office and admitted he was thoroughly confused by the ritual on the floor of the House.

"The last time I felt this way," he said sadly, "was during that first week at college."

The condition is not expected to last too long. He's been living with the Vice President, another Texan and a former teacher.

Mr. PURCELL, a father of four, is slender and tall without boots and he has a fine pair of cold blue eyes. He has that rich, low Texan voice that can be turned to good advantage. He could easily be mistaken for a cattle or oil baron or at least a cowboy who smokes rugged cigarettes.

Actually, the new Congressman grew up on a farm of only 500 acres which in Texas is so small it's considered a "stock farm" and not a ranch. He does not drink and smokes only an occasional cigar—which he goes at with much satisfaction.

HEADLINE VICTIM

In his current bewilderment, Mr. PURCELL seemed relieved to talk of home and his reputation as a judge—and those delinquents he had sent to the chair.

He credits a headline writer on a newspaper in Wichita Falls with getting his name circulated by writing over a two-inch story on page 1:

"Judge Sentences Youth to Chair."

The story was probably of sufficient length, although it did note a change in the local approach to delinquency problems in Wichita County.

For Judge PURCELL had ordered a youngster, up before him on charges of theft, to have his ducktailed haircut removed—in a barber's chair if necessary—before he would even conduct a hearing in the case.

"That hair," the former judge recalled the other day, "had been down around those ears for so long there was a white streak running around his head when they cut it off."

To many in the Far East this probably sounded like brutal treatment—for the story was distributed nationally.

But the people of Wichita—if not its youngsters—liked the idea. And the judge, sensing acceptance, improved on the approach as he went along.

"Down home," he said, "the kids were wearing their blue jeans half off. But if they came in my court, I told them to get themselves a belt and wear it where God meant it to go. I ruled out those black leather motorcycle jackets and made them get a jacket and a tie—if they could afford a tie."

The road to the often frustrating job of dealing with juveniles was a long one for Mr. PURCELL.

After attending public schools in and around Archer City—population 2,000—he set out for Texas A. & M., picking up a degree just before World War II in animal husbandry.

During the war, he was an infantry officer and fought through Tunisia and up through Italy. He came out a major in 1946.

Back home, he attempted to talk a younger brother into the practice of law. He convinced himself, instead, and was off to Baylor, graduating there in 1949.

A DISTRICT JUDGE

For 2 years he practiced in Big Spring and then moved to Wichita Falls in 1951. By 1955, he had been appointed to the bench as a district judge and in Texas they handle everything from murder to joy riding.

He immediately made his mark in his handling of juvenile cases.

Besides haircuts—he also ruled out boots for those who spent their young lives some distance from the nearest steer—he began trying to instill responsibility.

Not only did the teenagers of the county begin to feel and respect a new toughness but parents found themselves thoroughly involved.

"If I placed a kid on probation," Mr. PURCELL drawled, in a matter-of-fact tone, "he would have to agree he could only go to school or church without his parents. Any place else he went he had to be accompanied by his mother or father.

"I had them sign a statement. And they signed practically in blood and it was a solemn thing," Judge PURCELL said with a flicker of a smile.

The trial or hearing was conducted in the somber atmosphere of a very high court. It was never on a chat basis, in the judge's chambers, or on the same level in the court.

When some boys were caught at the traditional practice of busting school windows, "I had the boys and their daddies fix the damage," Mr. PURCELL said.

THE AIRMEN'S CASE

After a gang had "jumped" some airmen at a nearly base and were arrested, he gave the boys 30 minutes to get from school to the court. For weeks, every afternoon, they studied in a room at the courthouse. Their parents had to come and pick them up around 5:30 p.m.

"The first time the boys came down," Mr. PURCELL said, "the whole school followed them down. They stood around outside the court and yelled and the boys hung out the windows. They were heroes.

"Well, I had the bailiff go outside and bring every one of those kids inside the court. We took their names down and I told them if we caught them around the court again they could come in and study. And I told them if they ever went into the service they were going to be in a strange place someday and maybe they wouldn't like it so much if a gang jumped them. They never came back."

If a youngster was picked up for stealing, the judge ordered him to go to work and pay it all back—and it was the judge who often got the job for the boy.

He had his troubles. He failed to get a bill through the Texas Legislature which would have given him power to waive a juvenile under 17 to adult court, in cases of a serious offense. To get around that, he explained in criticism of Texas law, Texas judges often have to merely wait until a jailed juvenile has a birthday and can then be turned over to the grand jury. He was also unable to get a separate juvenile court for his county.

FAILURE OF BILL

But the community, apparently, accepted his methods—as the vote in his last election indicates.

In nonsupport cases, he demanded cash payments by delinquent fathers.

"A juvenile judge," the Texan said, "has got to be fair and consistent. You can't play favorites and you've got to work like hell. You've got to teach children to respect authority and accept responsibility.

"It's their job to fit into the community and not the community's job to accept them," the Congressman said.

Mr. PURCELL is not about to claim his methods would work elsewhere—in a big city situation where the number of cases are overwhelming. He does feel he accomplished something in Wichita Falls.

Mayor Mitten Receives Citizens Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to read recently that the Wabash, Ind., Chamber of Commerce has bestowed its Distinguished Citizen Award for 1961 on Mayor J. Robert Mitten. If ever an award was justly deserved, it was this one, for Mayor Mitten has served his community in an outstanding manner.

He has an unusual devotion to his community and works incessantly for its progress. His interest in youth is well known and his contributions to the youth of the area is indeed great. Besides his many hours of work for the Boy Scouts and other youth groups, Mayor Mitten stands as a fine example to the young people of the area.

Mayor Mitten is truly a distinguished citizen of Wabash and of the Nation. I congratulate him on his honor, and I salute him for the characteristics which made the award his. The following article which appeared in the Wabash Plain Dealer on January 25, 1962, is indicative of the high regard in which he is held in the Wabash community.

MAYOR MITTEN RECEIVES CITIZENS AWARD

The Chamber of Commerce Distinguished Citizens Award for 1961 was bestowed on Mayor J. Robert Mitten at the chamber's annual dinner Tuesday night in Honeywell Memorial Center.

The mayor, obviously moved to emotion, credited his friends, neighbors, and family with making it possible for him to receive the award in his brief acceptance remarks.

"I want to thank you from the bottom of my heart," said Mitten.

Mitten received the award from the winner of the honor for 1960, Robert M. Curless, superintendent of White's Institute, who cited Mitten's interest and activity in civic and community affairs and his work with the youth of the community.

"The accomplishments of his administrations are well known to each of us if we will only search our minds and hearts," said Curless in presenting the award to Mitten.

Curless began his remarks by noting that the person to be honored was well known and observed that listing his contributions to the community's welfare and improvement in the past few years would quickly reveal his identity.

TRACES CAREER

He briefly traced Mitten's personal history from his childhood days when he attended school at the old Miami building, to his graduation from Wabash High School and Indiana University. He noted that the mayor was born in Wabash and lives in the home where he was reared.

Curless pointed to Mitten's membership in the Boy Scout Council and remarked that he had befriended many young people, aided a number of them in their college courses, and made a truly conscientious effort to encourage many to amount to something.

"Long a member of the Wabash Rotary Club, he served as president and during his tenure encouraged and succeeded in establishing the Rotary Club in North Manchester," Curless said.

He praised Mitten for his selfless obligation to his mother, his participation in the city's centennial in 1939, and his hard work in reviving fireworks displays in Wabash.

Mitten, serving his second term as mayor, spent many of his adult years with G. M. Diehl Machine Works where he served as treasurer for several years and currently operates a billboard advertising business. He is chairman of the Wabash County Democratic Central Committee. He is a member of the Wabash Christian Church.

Let's Stand Up on Our Hindlegs and Be Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, there recently appeared an editorial in the Saturday Evening Post, December 30, 1961, which I feel is well worth our review. This editorial was written by the Post's distinguished, and recently retired, editor, Ben Hibbs. His editorial, "Let's Stand Up on Our Hindlegs and Be Americans," follows:

LET'S STAND UP ON OUR HINDLEGS AND BE AMERICANS

This is our last issue before Christmas, and traditionally this should be a Christmas editorial. It will not be. It also happens that this is the last issue of the Saturday Evening Post in which my name will appear as editor, and there are some things I want to say. I came to the editorship of the Post in a time of national crisis—in the black early months of World War II—and now, 20 years later, I am leaving the editorship in another era of crisis and doubt. I suppose you might call this editorial, if indeed it is an editorial, a declaration of my faith in a country that I love deeply.

There was a time when our way of life in America was simpler and easier, when human values seemed to be more nearly black and white, when the currents of national pride ran more strongly than they do now. The younger generation cannot remember those times. I do, and while I am not ancient enough or foolish enough to wish vainly for the return of an era that is past, I think it is urgent that we recapture some of the national fortitude, the ebullience of spirit, that were so evident in the time of our fathers and our grandfathers.

As a kid growing up on the Kansas prairies of 50 years ago, I often listened to the yarns of the old sodbusters as they sat around the stove in my father's hardware store of a winter evening. These were the leathery old pioneers who had lived through drought and blizzard and the devastation of the grasshopper years, who had subsisted on very little and who in the end had taken this raw plains country by the scruff of its neck and turned it into a gracious and smiling land. Among them were men of foreign extraction. Some were veterans of the Civil War, which was still recent enough to be green in the memories of our elders, and some had fought, even later, in the final Indian wars of the Western prairies. Doubtless there was an element of fiction in the tales they told, but there was also a deep and justifiable pride in what they had accomplished. And above all, they possessed an abiding faith in the future of America and a profound gratitude to the country that had given them their chance.

In those days the Fourth of July orators called America "the land of opportunity"

and "the greatest country on earth," and we believed them. In our schools and churches and our homes we were taught pride in country, and on holidays the bands played and the flags waved. It never occurred to anyone that all this was unsophisticated or corny. Although the prairie country of my youth was closer to the pioneer days than most of America, the same spirit of pride and belief in our destiny pervaded the nation as a whole during the early years of this century. This was the atmosphere in which I and millions of other young Americans, who are now past middle age, grew up. It was an atmosphere, a state of mind, which gave meaning to life, put some purpose into toil and struggle, fired the soul of many a young man with a consuming desire to be somebody.

Now America is no longer an insular country. In a brief half century we have had to grow up and take our place among the nations of the world, and it has been a painful, and often confusing, experience. We have made some mistakes and have learned that we have some national faults. We have become indisputably the leaders of the Western World, and we have found that such leadership involves some awesome responsibilities. We also have learned that a leader is always the target for criticism of all kinds, much of it captious and unreasonable.

The heads of neutralist nations come to this country and lecture us on our faults, at the same time asking for financial assistance. The press of many so-called friendly countries carries on a constant drumfire of criticism of America and its actions—and even sometimes of its motives. We are told by people who don't really know us, who don't know what America is like, that we are all materialists, with but little desire or capacity for the finer things of life; that we are brash and cocksure; that we are psychopathic about the threat of world communism; and so on and on down the list of our sins—personal, national and international.

We, of course, can live through this senseless sort of carping. It is also true that in some cases we deserve the censure that is leveled at us. The bungled Cuban invasion of last spring is a sad example. What worries me, however is that this barrage of niggling criticism from abroad, this posture of superiority on the part of our friends, is having its effect on our own national attitude of mind. The seeds of doubt—doubt of ourselves—are becoming too strong within us. It is right, of course, that we should examine our faults, and I honor our American writers who do this chore fairly and honestly. I have published much of their work in the Post. It was in the Post, for example, that the provocative book, "The Ugly American," was first given to the public. For it is only by a free discussion of our errors that we can correct those errors.

But throughout all this, in the name of heaven let us remember that we still have a great deal to be proud of. We Americans have become so sensitive about what the rest of the world thinks of us that we are now inclined to lie down and roll over whenever the finger of criticism is pointed our way. Yet there is no reason to be apologetic about America. Other nations have also made their mistakes, and it would be hard for any one of them to match the decent idealism which we have brought to our role in world affairs.

In World War II we did more than any other nation to destroy the evil forces which were determined to dominate the earth. After the war it was our Marshall Plan which helped restore Western Europe and kept communism at bay in that vital part of the world. We have continued to pour out our wealth and our manpower in an attempt to shore up freedom and human decency in other parts of the earth—sometimes without success, but we keep trying. We are now attempting insofar as our resources permit, to assist the undeveloped countries and the emerging nations, and we know that the end is not in sight. We do these things because we believe they are right, not for territory or trade or the love of power. We have demonstarted that on the international scene we are an unselfish people, and we all know, even if it doesn't occur to our foreign critics, that the wherewithal for all this comes right out of our burdensome income-tax remittances, and that in many families there is hardship becauhe of our national generosity. Foreign legend to the contrary, we are not a nation of millionaires.

Back in 1948 that wise old statesman, Bernard Baruch, wrote an article for the Saturday Evening Post which he titled "A Few Kind Words for Uncle Sam." It was a resounding pronouncement of his pride in his country. I think it is high time that we all start saying a few kind words for Uncle Sam whenever the occasion arises, and perhaps even when there is no obvious occasion. Somehow we must revive in the hearts of our young people the deep pride that all Americans must have in their heritage.

Elsewhere in this issue of the Post there is a fascinating survey of the attitudes of some 3,000 typical young Americans, boys and girls of high school and college age, on a variety of matters. It is a survey that was made with scrupulous care by the Gallup organization, and it was done on such a broad and scientifically balanced base that its results can hardly be challenged. The thing that emerges most clearly from this study is that far too many of our boys and girls these days have a curiously flabby and uninformed attitude of mind about our country, its history and its future, and about their own lives and their own futures. Too many are interested chiefly in security, an 8-hour day and a relatively easy way of life. If the spark of ambition is there, it is buried pretty deep in some of them.

Now, this may be nothing more serious than evidence that the first stirrings of maturity are slower in coming these days. But I am afraid it is a bit more than that. I am afraid that somehow we have lost the ability, or perhaps the will, to fire our boys and girls with the human spark of pride in self and country, with the urge to accomplish something and to be somebody in this land of opportunity. And if this is true, we must not make the mistake of laying the blame entirely on the schools. The place where these things are best taught is right in the home—by example as well as by word.

These are bewildering times, fearful times. The shadow of atomic destruction hangs constantly over us. I am not one of those who believe the shadow will become reality, but I cannot deny the possibility. In any event, our only safeguard is to remain strong, strong in heart and fiber as well as in arms. Thus I believe we shall find a way to do. This is the basic faith I have in America. Perhaps it is too simple, but there it is.

Last June my old friend, MacKinlay Kantor, famed novelist who writes of the Civil War era and pioneer days in the West, was given an honorary degree by Iowa Wesleyan College, and I have before me a copy of his address. He discussed, in far more eloquent language than I can command, some of the same things I have dealt with in this editorial. His tone was one of firmness and hope. At the end of his speech he addressed his remarks to the spirit of old Abe Lincoln, and his final paragraph was this: "The dreams are ever around us, Mr. Lincoln. There is medicine in the breeze and an enzyme beneath the sod; and we still have a yearning and a gallantry, sir."

I like that high trumpet note from Mac Kantor. I echo it. I think we still have it in us to dream and to achieve, to be gallant and proud, to stand up on our hindlegs and be Americans.

Much Ado (About Nothing)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Walter Lippmann is one of the most astute and most highly respected American columnists writing today. I commend to the interest of our colleagues the following column by Mr. Lippmann which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of February 1, 1962.

A Department of Urban Affairs is a necessity in a nation which has the large cities that we have. The problems faced by these cities can no longer be handled in a hodgepodge, catch-as-catch-can way that separate agency functioning has produced in the past.

The column follows:

MUCH ADO

(By Walter Lippmann)

In the political hullabaloo about the proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, it is useful to remember that the Department will possess no new Federal powers and will possess no new money to spend. All the powers which are to be in the new Department have long since been voted by Congress. These powers will come from four existing agencies and all the Department will be able to spend is what Congress has authorized these agencies to spend. For this is a reorganization and not a new grant of power.

What ground, then, is there for thinking that the new Department creates anything new? Can it do anything which cannot already be done by one of the four constituent agencies? The answer is, it seems to me, that it can focus attention on the mounting problems of the cities and of the metropolitan areas. It can bring together and encourage those who know and care about these problems, and it can do much to get them a hearing.

The new Department will have no power and no money to replan the old cities and to plan the development of the new metropolitan areas. But it can promote the studies which must precede the replanning and the development. This will have to be done in order to make life decent and convenient for the three-quarters of the American people who live in urban areas. Over and above the work of the old agencies which would be grouped in the new Department, it would be essentially a department of research and education in urban affairs.

Why, it will be asked, is this a good thing to have done from Washington? The answer is that it cannot be done adequately, and as a matter of fact is not being done adequately, by the States and municipalities. There are several reasons for that. One reason is that in the State legislatures the urban voters are grossly underrepresented as against the rural voters. Another reason is that the expanding metropolitan areas overlap State and county and municipal lines, and if they are to be governed properly, development must be planned on a

metropolitan scale. The planning and development cannot be done merely by the localities of the past which are now being swallowed up by the metropolis.

As for the politics which now swirl about the proposal, the fact is that there would have been little of it had the Republican leaders not made so much ado about nothing. It was wrong and it was foolish of them to gang up with a few southern Democrats in the House Rules Committee in order to refuse to let the Houes vote on the proposal. On what principle, constitutional, moral, or political, can it be argued that the House of Representatives should not be allowed to vote on a proposal made by the President of the United States?

This wrong was a silly one to commit because the Republican leaders seem to have forgotten that the President could force the House to have a chance to vote by doing with the Department of Urban Affairs what President Eisenhower did with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—to send it to Congress under the Reorganization Act of 1949. If there was any political trap in all this, the Republican leaders laid the trap into which they have fallen. They should not have forgotten the Reorganization Act of 1949.

I do not know what part the proposed appointment of Mr. Weaver has played in promoting the coalition of southern Democrats and Republicans. Mr. Weaver is already the head of the Housing Administration, which will be the largest component of the Department, and a refusal to promote him when he is so preeminently qualified could have been explained only as racial discrimination.

Nevertheless, he is no doubt the main reason for the opposition of the southern Democrats. But he cannot be the reason for the opposition of the Republican leaders who are making all sorts of gestures, no doubt sincerely, to prove themselves to be friends of the Negro voters.

I cannot help thinking that the Republicans did not stop to consider what they were doing, and that they acted on their reflexes, which take it for granted that any new proposal to deal with the changing world is automatically undesirable.

Legislative Program of the Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure this morning to introduce to the House Veterans' Affairs Committee Mr. Robert E. Hansen, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. Mr. Hansen lives in south St. Paul in my congressional district, and it was a distinct honor for me to introduce him, Mrs. Hansen, and his father, Chris Hansen, to the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

The commander in chief presented to the committee the legislative program of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and under unanimous consent, I include at this point his presentation to the committee in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I also include a resolution by the national welfare and service committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in the Appendix following the text of Commander Hansen's presentation:

STATEMENT OF ROBERT E. HANSEN, COMMANDER IN CHIEF, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, first, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Speaker of the House, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, for his kind consideration and cooperation in making this caucus room available to us for these hearings.

With me today are my fellow national and department officers who constitute the leadership of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. They come from every State in the Union. Many of these State leaders will soon be assuming the mantle of national leadership and will continue the great traditions and purposes of the VFW. We have been here for several days attending our annual midwinter conference which is one of the highlights of each VFW year. This opportunity to meet with this committee helps make it a highly successful event.

Our organization consists of veterans of the last four major conflicts in which the United States has participated. The VFW was founded by veterans of the Spanish-American War and has grown progressively larger down through the years. We are proud that a prerequisite of membership in the VFW is service overseas or in hostile waters during the periods of grave national emergencies.

Congresses have recognized service in the Armed Forces during these periods by granting certain rights and benefits. This committee and its predecessors has initiated and approved the most generous and comprehensive benefit program for our war veterans that the world has ever known. These programs have not only benefited veterans but have contributed to the overall welfare and common good of the entire Nation. One example is the medical research programs being conducted in Veterans' Administration hospitals. Others are the GI bills of World War II and the Korean conflict, without which the United States would be lagging far behind in many fields.

The problems and needs of veterans and their dependents are nevertheless constantly changing as reflected by the resolutions of our delegates to each VFW national convention. Generally some 300 separate resolutions are adopted, the majority of which pertain to veterans' programs coming within the jurisdiction of this committee. At this point, it would be deeply appreciated if a digest of the approximately 300 resolutions adopted at our 62d national convention held in Miami Beach, Fla., last August be made a part of my remarks.

It has been the tradition for many years for each VFW commander in chief to appoint VFW committees of outstanding American citizens and VFW members to formulate and recommend a priority program of legislative objectives. This year I instructed three national committees; namely, the national legislative, headed by E. K. Collins, an outstanding attorney and State senator of Laurel, Miss.; national security, headed by Past Commander in Chief and Judge Merton B. Tice, of Mitchell, S. Dak.; and national civil defense, headed by Past Commander in Chief and State Civil Defense Director Charles C. Ralls, of Seattle, Wash., to review these resolutions and suggest a priority program. This was done during the month of December, and with your permission I would like to read the key legislative goals which the VFW will be seeking to have accomplished and carried out during this year of 1962. These are: Establish Veterans' Affairs Committee in Senate; U.S. withdrawal from U.N. if Red China is admitted; full support of an effective civil defense program; service-disabled compensation increase; separate pension program for World War I veterans, and liberalized Veterans' Pension Act of 1959; additional veteran hospital facilities, including provision for long-term care; maintain the freedom of the people of West Berlin at all costs; maintain most powerful balanced Armed Forces; vigorous support of Joint Chiefs of Staff system; strict enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine.

Time does not permit a discussion of each and every VFW resolution. Consequently, I am going to mention only in some detail those which are of priority and paramount interest to the VFW at this time. Three of these are among the key legislative goals which I have just enumerated. Since the establishment of a Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee can only be resolved by the other body, I will mention in passing that the VFW extremely regrets that veterans and their dependents do not have representation on the Senate side similar to the great service that this committee is rendering here in the House.

One glaring example of the need for this committee is what happened in the Senate to the bills for a compensation increase to our disabled veterans during the 1st session of the 87th Congress. The VFW is very deeply disturbed over the impasse that has resulted because of the Senate action on these bills. Here was a proposal recommended by the President of the United States. It was to benefit some 2 million veterans who were disabled in the service. Yet the Senate on three occasions took action which has led to these bills becoming loaded down with unrelated and controversial matters. It seems to me it's a sad day when the Senate of the United States sees fit to take action which proves detrimental to those veterans who are still suffering from the injuries and diseases they suffered while serving on the battlefields in the defense of our country.

Right here and now I can state, without any equivocation, the VFW is not going to stand idly by and watch this compensation increase go down the drain. As commander in chief I am going to use every VFW resource to have this increase approved at the earliest possible opportunity. It is my strong conviction, despite opinions to the contrary, that I, as commander in chief, speak for most veterans when I say that a compensation increase should never be delayed or defeated because of some other controversial or objectionable legislation trying to ride through on the coattails of benefits for our service disabled. The VFW's stand is clear and steadfast. Legislation benefiting 2 million service disabled should not be sacrified to help pass unrelated and controversial veterans programs. Each must pass or fail on its own merits.

Since the end of World War II, the VFW has adopted year after year resolutions calling for the Congress to enact legislation to create a separate and more liberal pension program for the veterans of World War I. So far as I know, the VFW is the largest veterans' organization still supporting this proposal. The remaining numbers of these veterans are dwindling each year and like their predecessors, the VFW believes the veterans of World War I should be treated for pension purposes on a basis separate and distinct from veterans of later wars.

The VFW has singled out several provisions in the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959 for review or repeal. When the VFW lent its support to the passage of this act it did so with certain reservations. One of the compelling reasons behind our support was the contemplated large numbers of pensioners who would elect the higher benefit under this new pension act. The VFW has been disappointed that such an apparent large group of veterans and widows have failed

to elect to come under the new program as anticipated.

Notwithstanding this disappointment, the VFW favors modifying several of the provisions in this act including the corpus of the estate test, counting all of the wife's income over $1,200 as part of the veteran's income, and counting certain retirement benefits for purposes of pension entitlement. These and other pension resolutions were unanimously adopted at our convention and are a part of the pension program which the VFW hopes will be approved by the Congress.

I am aware that your committee will meet again in the near future to continue your deliberations with respect to all pending pension bills. May I urge this committee to favorably consider these views when you meet.

With more and more older veterans, the hospital and medical needs of veterans has changed markedly since the end of World War II. It is the VFW position that there should be additional hospital facilities with particular emphasis on the chronically ill who require long-term care. The VFW congratulates this committee on its long outstanding record of continuing study of the hospital needs of veterans. May I extend the warmest appreciation of the VFW for the role played by the chairman and fellow members of this committee and your leadership in having the $5 million which was cut from the VA appropriation for hospital construction restored by an overwhelming floor vote during the first session. Every member of this committee lined up with its chairman in helping to restore the proposed cut which would have crippled the 12-year VA hospital construction and renovation program. Again this year the VFW will be vigorously supporting the recommended budget the President submitted to the Congress including $75 million for this hospital construction program.

Veterans and veterans groups do not always agree on all issues concerning veterans welfare. One issue on which we all unite is that veterans programs should be administered by the Veterans' Administration. It has recently come to my attention that the Administration has recommended that a veterans educational program should be assigned to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I refer to the advice of the Administration in response to the Senate's request for its views on H.R. 848, a bill reported by this committee and approved by the House last session. This bill would simply extend the vocational rehabilitation programs of World War II and Korea to include veterans who have become disabled since the end of the Korean conflict. The VA has a high degree of success with this program and so far as I know there has been no responsible objection raised concerning the administration of Public Law 16 and Public Law 894 as these programs were called for World War II and Korean conflict veterans.

The VFW lent its full support to the creation of the Veterans' Administration in 1930 and we will resist every attempt to take away any veterans programs from the VA. The VFW has noted a trend in recent years to transfer other veterans programs out of the VA. The VFW believes that the VA which takes care of all the problems of veterans and their dependents with one stop at one agency has been a highly successful program. Transferring one of these programs to another agency would be a first giant step toward dismembering the Veterans' Administration. May I commend this committee for the resolution which you adopted last June 28, 1961, in which you expressed your strong opposition to any attempts to transfer functions which belong in the VA to other agencies. The VA has carried out and performed its programs with a high degree of satisfaction. The VFW will resist to the last man taking away veterans programs from the Veterans' Administration.

These few comments represent some of the examples of the views of the VFW concerning programs for veterans and their dependents. May I again extend my sincerest thanks for this opportunity to appear before this committee and for our leaders to witness for themselves this great committee in action. Many will be visiting you later on today. In addition it is my sincere hope that this meeting has also been very beneficial to the 51 Voice of Democracy State winners who were previously introduced. These young boys and girls represent a generation who were born during World War II when the vast majority of us were engaged in a life and death struggle to preserve our way of life. They have grown up since that time and the VFW is proud to have sponsored the Voice of Democracy contest which has culminated in their being present today. We believe this particular program is a shining example of furthering our great purpose to maintain and extend the institutions of American freedom upon which this great Nation was founded and has perservered. There will be four top awards with the winner delivering his or her brief but strong and meaningful message to you on "What Democracy Means to Me" at our dinner tonight.

As you know, tonight at the Sheraton-Park Hotel, we are having our annual dinner honoring those Members of Congress who served in the Armed Forces. Every Member of Congress has been invited to attend and I hope that each and every one of you will be with me and my fellow comrades tonight. The hours have been changed from previous years with the hospitality hour beginning at 6 o'clock and the dinner at 7 o'clock. Again my sincerest thanks in behalf of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED FEBRUARY 3, 1962, BY THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES NATIONAL WELFARE AND SERVICE COMMITTEE

Whereas the cost of living has substantially increased during recent years, and

Whereas salary rates of civilian employees of the Federal Government and of other public and private industry employees have also increased, and

Whereas disability compensation rates for veterans suffering from disabilities incurred in service have not been increased since 1957, and

Whereas failure of the Congress of the United States to enact legislation granting increased disability compensation rates for service-connected veterans is deplorable and primarily due to internal bickering in the Congress involving attempts to include nongermane provisions in any bill designed to increase compensation rates: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Welfare and Service Committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That the Congress of the United States be implored to recognize the injustice to the veterans concerned as a result of such jurisdictional dispute, and expeditiously consider and promptly enact legislation granting a substantial increase in the disability compensation rates; and be it further

Resolved, That Robert E. Hansen, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, be commended for his continuing aggressive efforts to persuade the Congress of the United States to favorably consider such legislation.

United Nations Resolution Against Portugal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, despite diplomatic niceties, it is a fine thing that our freedom of the press permits American newspapers to call a spade a spade. Certainly, Columnist Walter Trohan of the Chicago Tribune did just this in his Monday, February 5, report from Washington, which I insert into the RECORD, as follows:

"What is past is prologue" is the majestic and inspired legend carved on the base of one of the four heroic figures around the classic beauty of the National Archives Building in the Capital.

If the structure and its monumental figures were moved to Moscow, the words of William Shakespeare would have to be rewritten to something like, "What is past is buried, and sometimes the deeper the better."

This week Russia conveniently forgot its recent bloodstained past in inspiring the introduction of a strongly worded resolution against Portugal. The United Nations General Assembly passed, by a 99-to-2 vote, a resolution calling on Portugal to "cease repressive measures against the people of Angola."

The resolution is open to question as passed, but if Russia had had its way, the U.N. Assembly would have had all member countries refusing "any support and assistance" to Portugal, and would have instructed the U.N. Security Council to consider the imposition of sanctions against Portugal.

RESOLUTION OFFERED BY POLAND

The resolution was introduced by Poland, where patriots were put down by Russian bullets in an uprising in Poznan. Further, Poland is occupied by divisions of the Red Army, whose task it is to see that Poles remain Communists whether or not they like it. Bulgaria, another slave state, joined Poland in introducing the resolution, which received only 26 votes, while 43 nations voted against it. Thirty-two nations abstained and three, including Portugal, were absent.

Among the nations voting for the Russian-dictated resolution was Hungary, where Russian planes and tanks mowed down embattled patriots in the fall of 1956. Russian tanks and soldiers also put down the June 17, 1953, East Berlin revolt, to mention only a few of the Russian crimes since the founding of U.N.

Portugal contends the unrest in Angola was inspired by Communists and was confined to a relatively small area in the African colony, which is about twice the size of Texas. Unrest in the colony ebbed weeks ago.

LINEUP FAMILIAR TO STUDENT OF NEUTRALS

In its action, Russia was supported by its bloc of slave states and satellites, including those nations which are reportedly cool to some Kremlin policies—Yugoslavia and Albania. The resolution was supported by 10 African countries, which is understandable, because they would like to welcome Angola as a sister republic. It also had some Arab support from Iraq and Egypt. Cuba, whose Castro has proclaimed himself a Marxist, alined itself with the Russian bloc,

which also was no surprise. Nor was the vote of Indonesia, whose Dr. Achmed Sukarno is invariably neutral against the non-Communist powers.

India voted with Russia. This, too, was to be expected, because Jawaharlal Nehru, who once fancied himself the dove of peace, has moulted and revealed himself something of a hawk of aggression by sending bullet-spraying troops against Goa, Portugal's Indian colony, a few weeks back. Nehru is only a pint-sized aggressor compared with Russia's Khrushchev, but he has revealed himself worthy of the company he has so often kept.

Readers might wonder how Russia could undertake to condemn another nation when her own hands are so red they could not be washed clean by the border waters of the Arctic and the Pacific oceans and the Black, Baltic, and Caspian Seas. The answer lies in semantics. As a Communist nation, Russia is wedded to the dogma that no socialist country can be an aggressor or an imperialist. These are crimes which Red dialecticians reserve for freedom loving capitalist nations which have any concern for justice.

U.S. Role in the United Nations and its Effect on Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech I made at Springfield, Oreg., before the League of Women Voters, on the "U.S. Role in the United Nations and Its Effect on Our Foreign Policy."

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. ROLE IN THE UNITED NATIONS AND ITS EFFECT ON OUR FOREIGN POLICY

(Speech of Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, to the League of Women Voters, Springfield, Oreg., October 11, 1961)

Taken as a whole, and relative to other nations in the world, the role of the United States in the United Nations has been one of very active participation in this world organization. Reserving for a moment the question of whether we could or should channel more of our foreign policy through the U.N., the fact remains that our record of performance at the United Nations is a good one.

Certainly the United States provides the major financial support for the United Nations and its various operations, and without this support, the U.N. would probably collapse. Last fall when Senator AIKEN of Vermont and I served as U.S. delegates, Senator AIKEN was assigned to the budget committee of the General Assembly, the fifth committee. In our report, we pointed out that the United States pays about one-third of the regular annual U.N. budget of $63 million, which excludes the various police force activities, and as much as 72 percent of certain relief activities. Of course, assessments are handed out to member nations on an ability to pay basis, which means that we are assessed somewhat more than a third of most U.N. budget. But beyond this, it was the Rockefeller family which made possible the present U.N. headquarters in New York City and an interest-free American loan further helped to get the organization established in these new quarters.

The question of moving the headquarters out of New York—to Moscow, or Geneva, or Berlin—has usually foundered on the simple financial consideration that the United States has provided generous quarters for the organization and no other nation has backed up its offers or recommendations for a new site with the financing of comparable quarters.

One of the worst failings of some member nations—and happily it is one we are not as yet guilty of—is their refusal to contribute to U.N. activities to which they are opposed. The most obvious offender in this respect is the Soviet Union. Neither Russia nor any of its satellite countries has contributed 1 red penny, if you will pardon the phrase, to the very expensive U.N. operation in the Congo. This operation was possible only because the United States has financed about half of it. The Communist governments make it a regular practice to withhold funds from any U.N. program with which they disagree, and this practice has greatly weakened the U.N.

But the Communist countries are not the only ones which do this. The Arab countries refuse to support the U.N. police force in the Gaza strip because they refuse to recognize Israel as a country at all, and oppose the U.N. peace mission there. The annual cost of this U.N. Emergency Force is about $19 million. France, another country with a rather large assessment, also refuses to pay its share of activities it opposes, and has contributed nothing to the Congo operation.

Then there are a few countries in Latin America and Africa which plead poverty, as does Nationalist China, and have fallen rather far behind in their obligations. However, neither this group nor the Communist countries have fallen so far behind as to bring into action article 19 which states that the right to vote in the General Assembly shall be forfeited if they fall as much as 2 years behind in their dues.

The result has been that the United States bears an unduly large burden in the financing of the U.N. This is bad for us, and bad for the other members. It is bad for the United States because it tends to accentuate the feeling that if the body takes any action or position we do not like, we should withhold financial support. It deepens the feeling that because we pay so much to the piper, we ought to call the tune.

Most Members of Congress, including myself, receive occasional mail calling upon this country to withhold contributions to U.N. technical assistance programs in which Cuba is a participant. We receive even more mail calling for an end to all American financial support to any international body of which Communist China is a member. In fact, a provision to this effect was put into the foreign aid bill in the Senate this year, but was quietly dropped in conference with the House of Representatives.

I think we have been wise in rejecting that policy. In the first 15 years of the United Nations, the United States has never been on the losing side of a really important vote. We have never had to cast a veto in the Security Council. Yet, we cannot always expect to have our own way. It would do us more harm than good to let the threat go out that unless another government is rejected for representation, we will pick up our marbles, and for all practical purposes, quit the United Nations.

But, neither should the United States be expected to pay the cost of an organization whose nonpaying members may decide its policies and then bill the United States for the cost of those policies. This problem of collecting assessments is one that the organization is going to have to come to grips with. If it does not, then it must expect the feeling to grow in the United States that this country, too, should follow the policy of supporting only those U.N. activities we favor.

Even this, of course, would be quite different from withdrawing from an organization because another government is admitted. It would be hard to imagine a more ignorant and shortsighted action, yet the cry is being heard more frequently that we should withdraw if Red China is seated in the United Nations.

Those who raise it have never, in my opinion, understood what the cold war is about, understood the role of the United Nations in the world, nor appreciated the possibilities of the United Nations as a part of American foreign policy. For many of them, the Red China issue is really just an excuse for something they have long favored and that is American withdrawal from the U.N. and a return to unilateral power politics.

Nonetheless, the very question forces a reexamination of what role the United Nations can and should play in American foreign policy. I think it raises first the question of what is at stake in the contest with the Communist world.

One of the least understood facets of it is the role of the so-called neutral or nonalined nations. The recent Belgrade Conference, where the unalined powers met almost in the light and heat of Russian nuclear tests, was a great disappointment to Americans, including myself, because it failed to apply to the Communist world the same standards it applies to the Western World. As a result, there has been a somewhat increased opinion in the United States that we should stop worrying about what these countries think of us, stop considering what their reaction to a given American move might be, and go about protecting our own interests as best we can.

That leads to the question of what our interests are. Most of the critics of these neutral nations might well have said, 3 years ago: "Why worry about what Cuba thinks. What difference does it make to us what kind of government the Cubans have? It's Russia that counts."

Or they might have said: "Who cares about Laos, or South Vietnam? Let's stop worrying about what those people think, and concentrate on Red China."

Yet, today we find ourselves very much worried about what kind of government the people of Cuba will support, and whether or not the people of Laos and South Vietnam are willing to support non-Communist governments.

That is, after all, what the cold war really is. It is a struggle between the West and communism not over Russia and Red China on the one hand and the NATO countries on the other, but over all the world in between. The hot war may not develop between the two behemoths, but the cold war for control of what now lies on neither side will continue.

That is why we must be concerned about what the unalined countries want and think. One might say today that we should forget about the neutrals; but tomorrow that same person will charge that we had no business letting the Communists take over another nation.

The sad fact is that too many Americans really do not care much about the rest of the world until a given country does show signs of going Communist. Latin America is a particularly bad example of this. The former British colony of Guiana was about as unknown to Americans, including Members of Congress, as any part of the world until the recent election there and the establishment of a largely independent government brought into charge of its affairs a man who is reputed in some quarters to

be a Communist sympathizer. Now, we suddenly find a great interest in Congress in British Guiana.

Much the same is true in Africa. We pretty much ignored several of the new countries of Africa until they turned to the Communist world for support.

So I think we really do care what the other nations of the world think of us, and what kind of governments they have. If we do not, then we are in effect saying to the Communists that as far as we are concerned they are welcome to do whatever they wish in Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, and Asia, and that we will not interfere so long as they do not set foot on American shores.

Yet that policy would be a disaster. We simply have no choice but to seek to influence the countries outside the Communist bloc.

Probably the most important single way and place where we can try to exert some influence with them is in the United Nations. This is the one arena in which the dozens of small nations of the world have a chance to be heard, to take their equal place with the rich and powerful giants of the East and West.

Now, these small countries know, too, that the United Nations is where they are important. That is why they have supported such U.N. activities as the Congo operation. It is why they supported Dag Hammarskjold against the Communist tirade for his resignation.

It is why I think they will continue to support a strong and active United Nations against Communist efforts to cripple it with further extensions of the veto power.

It has not been any accident that in recent days, and especially since President Kennedy's magnificent address to the General Assembly, the Soviet Union has considerably modified its demand for a three-headed Secretariat.

Let us remember that these unalined powers are also the target of Soviet intentions, and that Russian policy has bent before the winds of neutralist objections before at the United Nations.

Even in the case of the Belgrade conference, I think Russian policy was carefully calculated to influence the conference. Many Americans have said that the resumption of nuclear testing by Russia on the eve of that conference was a deliberate insult to the neutrals, calculated to show Russian contempt for them and for their opinions. I do not think that was the case at all. I think it was only a difference between what this country would have done and what was a typical Russian Communist power play. Instead of appealing to the oft-expressed objections of the neutrals to nuclear testing, the Russians simply terrorized them. The Russian display may well have been calculated to frighten those nations into the position that anything would be better than a nuclear war, and that any price should be paid by the West to avoid it. If that was in fact the Russian intention, it came uncomfortably close to succeeding. The neutrals have demonstrated that they can be frightened into the abandonment of principle and abandonment of the very elements of self-determination which they demand for themselves.

Perhaps the result will be a more realistic attitude toward them by the United States. It certainly should not be an attitude of disinterest, of writing them off to communism. But it should take into account the limitations of these countries, the narrowness of their interests, and their own type of power politics which has been described as the tyranny of the weak.

Least of all should we quit the one place where we have a chance of exerting an influence—the United Nations. It is unthinkable, to me, that we should so easily be driven from the field where we have long dominated the play. Our ability to fight the cold war will depend in large part upon our ability to distinguish between what is fatal to our interests and what is not.

We should learn a lesson from a mistake the Russians made once and never repeated, and that was to walk out of the Security Council in the early stages of the Korean invasion. The result was that the rest of the U.N. acted against Soviet wishes and the Russians promptly walked back in again.

Walking out of the U.N. is the surest way to lose many times the influence we lose when another government walks in.

This is not to say that I think Red China is about to be seated, because I think its efforts will be defeated. But I do reject the suggestion that this country should inform the U.N. that whenever it admits Red China we will leave. The rest of the world knows we cannot afford to leave the United Nations, any more than Russia can, unless we are prepared to admit defeat in the cold war.

Because I believe the United Nations will continue to be the major forum of American policy in spite of the many dangers which confront the U.N., I also believe we should take more foreign policy problems to the United Nations.

The record of the U.N. in supporting American desires has been pretty good. The organization has been frustrated by the Soviet use of the veto. But when we have taken a firm position in support of principle, we have largely won the support of the organization.

Why not do that with such issues as Berlin? Why not do it with the troublesome question of Quemoy, Matsu, and the future of Taiwan? I would like to see the United States be the first to propose a U.N. settlement in Berlin, one that perhaps would put the entire city of Berlin under U.N. jurisdiction and move some U.N. activities to that city. I know that most editorial reaction to this proposal is highly negative. Strangely enough, it is usually opposed on the ground that the Russians would never agree to it. But the Russians agree to little of what the West stands for, and I think it is time we asked ourselves not: "what are the Communists for," but "what is the United States for."

Too much of American policy is based simply on opposing something the Soviet Union is advocating, or vice versa. Today we are standing firm in Berlin because the Communists want us out. If we are not careful, we are going to find ourselves standing before the United Nations trying to beat down a Russian proposal for United Nations action that would force us out of Berlin.

We have an opportunity now to present our own solution, one that would call upon the Communists to make their sector a part of a single city once again. After all, the same agreement which put the Western Powers in Berlin put the Communists in Berlin too. Their rights in East Berlin have exactly the same legal basis as our rights in West Berlin. Any change in one part of the city should be extended to the entire city.

But unless we start now to make this point we are going to see the discussion revolve around West Berlin alone.

Another advantage we would gain would be to broaden the world interest in access into Berlin. Today, we have only the rights of three conquering powers on which to stand. We would be in a much stronger position if we were suggesting that all members of the United Nations have the same access into Berlin which we have.

Conceivably, we could fail to obtain such a solution. Conceivably, it would be opposed and even defeated by the Soviet Union by one means or another. But it is vital to American interests in Europe that we stop talking about what concessions the United States should make in the name of peace and start talking about some concessions the Soviet Union should make, or that both parties should make.

We know perfectly well that an aggressive action by the Communists against our access in and out of the city will bring on war. Not limited or conventional war, but nuclear war because that is the kind that both sides are ready for in Europe. Should such an aggression occur, we have our answer ready. But what we are not ready for are arguments and proposals pressed by the Soviet Union that require the West to abandon Berlin in whole or part in the name of avoiding nuclear war. It is in this realm that we remain entirely on the defensive.

World opinion is a nebulous indefinite, intangible, and much-maligned force. But it cannot be ignored and it is not ignored either by us or the Communists, because it is the prize both of us are seeking short of war. It has its base in the United Nations. To the extent that we wish to oppose communism short of war, we will do that primarily in the United Nations. We have numerous mutual defense treaties with which to deal with direct aggression, but the weapon of propaganda, internal discontent and internal revolution cannot be defended against with such treaties. This is why we must be concerned with what the people of these countries think and what kind of government they will support.

For these reasons, I expect the United Nations to remain a focal point of American foreign policy. The extent to which we make it such a focal point may well determine the success of American foreign policy for the foreseeable future.

What's Wrong With Saving the Taxpayers $380,000?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, we have become so used to spending billions that we seldom take the opportunity to save a few thousand, or a few hundred thousand dollars. Maybe we could reestablish regard for thrift and commonsense spending if we looked more closely at some of the demands for minor amounts of money to determine if they are really needed. Once we get into the habit of turning down requests for small sums of money it will be easy to take a whack at the billions we so blithely appropriate annually. The following editorial from the Wall Street Journal calls attention to an area where we can save $380,000 of the taxpayers' money. Why not take the chance and do it?

HOW TO SAVE THE TAXPAYERS $380,000

It's easy to say, "Let's make a survey." Which is, perhaps, why there are so many of them. But it is less easy to judge when a survey is likely to be a sheer waste of time, and money.

The Federal Power Commission, for instance, is planning a survey of the Nation's electric power systems. As explained by FPC Chairman Joseph C. Swidler, the survey would determine where demand for electricity is growing fastest, which areas are bringing in power from other areas and

which are "exporting" excess output, and what capacities can be expected from existing and proposed power generating and transmission systems.

Now the electric industry has something in common with baseball. It is one of the most statistics-minded enterprises there is. So its members collect figures on electric power with the thoroughness and avidity of the fan who assembles and memorizes batting averages. Therefore if the FPC really wants to know the score on electric power, it doesn't need an elaborate survey to find out. The chief object of the proposed survey, then, would seem to lie in other directions.

The survey, Mr. Swidler said, would indicate where new powerplants ought to be built, what size they should be, and how they should be tied together. There won't be a national system, he said, unless its growth is planned by a Federal agency.

The United States, he observed, is "probably the only civilized country in the world that does not have a coordinated national electric system." Although the FPC Chairman did not say so, this is because the United States is about the only country remaining where the Government hasn't taken over power production and distribution, from turbines to light bulbs. However, it is interesting to note that private industry's share of U.S. power output has dropped from 93 percent in 1930 to 77 percent today.

This uncoordinated power system came about, the Chairman suggested, because the industry developed "in a spotty kind of way." Which, of course, it did. But so did the automotive, aviation, steel and most other U.S. industries. Meanwhile, private utilities are planning to spend about $8 billion of their own money over the next 8 years to develop interconnecting transmission systems. By 1970 it's expected that all major U.S. electric systems will be linked. In other words, the industry is doing just what the FPC would like to see done.

In view of all this, it's hard to see why the FPC's proposed survey is needed at all. It would cost $380,000, which Congress has yet to appropriate. If the lawmakers want to save the taxpayers a modest sum, and this is modest as Federal sums go, here is a fine opportunity to do just that. And also to head off what looks like a Federal move in the direction of a nationalized power industry.

Urban Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I had the pleasure and good fortune of participating recently in a conference in Dayton, Ohio, on urban development problems with Dr. John C. Kohl, who was appointed last year as Assistant Administrator to head up the newly enacted mass transportation program for the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Dr. Kohl has had a long and distinguished career in the field of urban transportation, having served for the last 9 years as Director of the Transportation Institute at the University of Michigan.

At the Dayton conference, Dr. Kohl gave an excellent talk on the development of a balanced urban transportation system and the proper role of all the different components of such a system.

I think the perspective Dr. Kohl has given in this talk is exeremely valuable, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY JOHN C. KOHL, ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR, TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY, TO THE MONTGOMERY-GREENE COUNTY AREA PLANNING WORKSHOP, BILTMORE HOTEL, DAYTON, OHIO, MONDAY MORNING, JANUARY 22, 1962.

It is a distinct privilege to be permitted a part in this regional planning workshop devoted to serious consideration of growth and change in the Montgomery-Greene County area. I did have some serious doubts about this privilege when I received, a few days ago, a clipping from one of your local newspapers; its headline "Urban Pains Workshop" implied that you would be discussing troubles rather than the outlook for vigorous growth. Should I, I wondered, attempt to dwell upon the gloomy side of urban development and wax melancholy over cities seemingly doomed to slow death from traffic strangulation, if not from civil opthalmia.

Then, I recalled the instructions of Dick Sage, your program chairman, which were in effect: "To define the role of the present transportation system and the nature and extent of its influence upon the economic and social development of the urban complex." All this was apparently to be accomplished within the space of 30 minutes or less, if I was to avoid delaying your luncheon and imposing inconsiderately upon the time of your distinguished luncheon speaker, Hon. HARRISON WILLIAMS, Senator from New Jersey.

Finally, I concluded that I could best serve the purposes of this workshop by devoting some effort to the clarification of certain urban transportation concepts, and by describing in some detail the present Federal program administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency under the leadership of Dr. Robert C. Weaver, Administrator. This afternoon, I understand, there will be opportunity to discuss any questions aroused by these comments.

The term "urban transportation" means many things to many people. Among the professionals concerned with well-directed growth and change, it will be agreed, I believe, that the transportation system of any urban area, regardless of size, should be comprehensive and extensive, rather than fragmented, either by exclusive concern for any single form of transportation, or by uncoordinated and independent local efforts within the metropolitan area. While the makeup of any individual system should be tailored to local conditions and needs, so that generalization is particularly difficult, the following five elements must, it would seem, be considered in the rational development of the community's urban transportation facilities and services:

1. A well-distributed network of roads and streets, including carefully located and designed expressways (some one has said that we can't call them freeways when they may cost millions of dollars per mile) along with connecting arterials. Obviously, the traffic capacities must be related to realistic estimates of demand generated by the developing land uses.

2. An adequate system of terminal facilities, including off-street parking, commercial loading zones, bus and truck terminals, so integrated with the highway network to provide convenient transportation service without conflict with traffic flow.

3. A centralized, yet highly flexible, traffic control system whereby both pedestrian and vehicle movements can be safely accommodated and expedited. Not all congestion can be avoided, particularly at periods of peak demand but much can be done to keep it within tolerable limits.

4. A public transportation system, including mass transit and taxis, to serve not only the "journey-to-work" but also the increasing segment of our population unable to command direct use of personal transportation.

5. And, finally, some form of rapid transit on an exclusive right-of-way to serve high-density, separated developments imposing demands above the capacity of surface-street transportation. This rapid transit could take the form of improved rail rapid transit or commuter railroad service, advanced types of bus operation on separated roadways, or eventually some radically new form which may achieve a practical state through augmented technological efforts.

Implicit in the recital of these five elements of transportation planning consideration—streets, terminals, traffic control, public transportation and rapid transit—are the assumptions that highway vehicles—autos, taxis, buses and trucks—will continue to predominate the urban scenes for the reasonably foreseeable future, and that there is no inherent long-range conflict between public transportation and highways, much as certain antiauto "intellectuals" would have us believe.

The motor vehicle is too deeply a part of man's personal tools to be quickly or lightly dismissed. Consider this seldom realized fact that in the United States there were last year, at least, more motor vehicles than telephones—some 72 million vehicles and almost 63 million telephones. It is estimated by the Census that 77 percent of U.S. families have one or more automobiles, in comparison to the 75 percent of the households connected with telephones.

Truly, the motor vehicle and its highway network provide an enormously valuable transportation resource, both urban and interurban, which should not be impaired by emotionally inspired arguments and hasty decisions.

Nevertheless, the increasing urbanization of the United States strongly indicates that any system of urban transportation based solely upon personal auto use cannot serve all needs for movement. Public transportation, including rapid transit in many areas, is an essential part of a dynamically balanced urban plan—one looking progressively forward and not on dead center.

While it is trite to cite statistics to any such audience as this, it seems desirable to utilize them to underline the trend in our growth, and to emphasize that we cannot view our transportation needs in past or present terms.

Although the 1960 census confirmed the fact of our urban character by finding 125 million persons, or 70 percent of the U.S. population, living in our cities, the significant aspect transportationwise is the concentration in urbanized areas. Over 54 percent of the urban population in 1960 was resident in the 213 "urbanized areas" each containing a core city of 50,000 or more population.

By 1980, it is estimated that at least 30 of these areas will each have populations in excess of a million persons, and that some 13 will have developed as "strip cities" with over 2 million persons in the smallest. The appearance of these "metroplexes" presents a far different situation for transportation than today when we regard the four or five largest cities as exceedingly special cases, not typical of the national picture.

Even the makeup of this urban population poses new problems of transportation. As vehicle and human population rises and traffic accidents increase (in total if not in rate), there will undoubtedly be increasingly

higher standards of driver licensing with consequent limitation of personal transportation in large groups of the population. A large number of teen-agers below driving age and a rising number of oldsters beyond effective licensing can, by 1980, make up some 25 percent of our population; add to this number, all those whose driving faculties are impaired, even though they are within the so-called "driving age", 18 to 65 years (impaired incidentally for economic as well as physical reasons). Consider, too, the unnumbered persons who today are driving out of sheer desperation—without adequate public transportation, they are marooned in their immediate neighborhood and even deprived of proper commercial and community services unless they drive their own cars; they are actually afraid in traffic but they fight back their fears to drive timidly and poorly rather than stay at home waiting for a ride; many fit the definition of the modern Centaur—"half woman, half station wagon."

Thus, over one-third and perhaps almost one-half of our mobile urban population may in the near future be deprived of any real choice of local transportation service if it is largely provided by the automobile alone. In this light, public transportation assumes a much more significant role and must be intelligently redeveloped in its own right—not as a substitute for auto transportation, but again as one of the major forms of urban transportation serving the needs of our growing and changing population.

Here, let me emphasize that there is neither intended, nor implied, any curtailment of highway transportation in this claimed need for a revival of public transportation. Much of it will be accomplished in buses utilizing the road and street systems which can most certainly be improved to accommodate transit needs far better than they are met today. Other forms will complement rather than compete with highway transportation if they are properly planned. Until that planning can be capably accomplished, the preservation of existing facilities—commuter rail lines especially—is of utmost importance; once lost, the later assembly of such rights-of-way will add tremendously to the costs of providing urban transportation. Emergency financial measures to conserve existing service must be devised.

It is not suggested, however, that such support either emergency or long term, for public transportation be drawn from highway funds as has been advocated in certain quarters. The problems of highway economies are already sufficiently difficult without further complicating them by attempting to stretch the available road funds to cover transit needs.

Basically, urban transportation requires balanced development deriving from planning of the highest order. And it must be recognized that, today, we really are not sure of our formulas for balancing the transportation needs of any community with any particular mix of facilities for personal and public transportation. Far too little is known about such factors as the desirable spatial relationships of urban land uses, the resulting variations in demand for transportation services, and the overall economics of community development. Comprehensive regional planning approaches, backed by continuing research, are essential.

A major step in support of such planning was provided by the Congress, when, at the urging of President Kennedy, it included the so-called mass transportation provisions in the Housing Act of 1961. There are three important programs: Urban transportation planning assistance, mass transportation demonstration grants, and a transportation facilities loan fund.

Section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 was amended to extend planning assistance specifically to transportation planning functions. This amendment has provided a stimulus for greatly enlarged planning efforts in which transportation elements are receiving a much more comprehensive consideration. Many of you are already aware of this program, and some have utilized "701" funds in your work.

A feature which has yet to be fully developed, however, is the practical pooling of such "701" transportation planning funds with the so-called 1½ percent and other highway funds to provide resources sufficiently large that truly intensive, regional transportation studies can be competently conducted. Both the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Bureau of Public Roads are strengthening their transportation planning sections, and are developing joint regional committees to facilitate specific area studies.

Despite this increased Federal participation, it should be noted that this program is still one of assistance to the local area and not a national planning effort dictated from Washington. Variations in quality and comprehensive character of the resulting plans are common, because of the absence of rigid controls; many plans represent unimaginative work and indicate a need for substantial improvement.

To provide the leadership and training necessary to support improved transportation planning, a cooperative effort of the Bureau of Public Roads and the Office of Transportation of the Housing and Home Finance Agency is in the process of establishment. Very shortly, it is hoped, definite announcement can be made of a new regional training program. Without such training, the realization of effective transportation plans will be long delayed by the shortage of qualified personnel rather than money.

This workshop, it may be remarked, is a noteworthy attempt to upgrade and to enthuse planning personnel.

The second of the new Federal programs is intended to support the transportation planning process by providing through actual demonstrations a better factual basis for answering many questions. Many of our important planning decisions—for example, the character of urban development that requires and will support a rapid transit line—are based upon obsolete, incomplete, and even nonexistent factual data. Too many assumptions have been made without opportunity for verification until demonstration grants for mass transportation were provided in the 1961 legislation.

Authority to make grants aggregating not more than $25 million was provided to the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency for demonstration projects which will assist in carrying out urban transportation plans and research for the development of data of general applicability on urban transportation needs, improvement of mass transportation service, and the contributions of such service to the total economy of the community. Except for the prohibition on major, long-term capital improvement, this fund offers a reasonable opportunity for practical planning research.

Grants up to two-thirds of the cost of approved projects can be made to qualified agencies having legal authority to undertake such projects and to contract with the Federal Government. Interested private organizations, in addition to public, may participate in such projects so that broadly representative interests may be utilized. Competent professional direction is required so that complete records and useful conclusions may be expected.

Major areas in which those demonstration projects can contribute to the transportation planning objectives are: (1) Studying of service improvements such as increased frequency and better transfer arrangements; (2) testing pricing policies, particularly in holding or lowering fares; (3) improving transit flow through specialized traffic controls, exclusive rights-of-way for buses, and modern signaling; (4) coordinating transportation services, such as integrated scheduling of rail and bus transit, park-and-ride, and local package delivery services; (5) experimenting with new technological developments; and (6) exploring other aspects of urban development for transportation influence and reaction.

An information bulletin outlining this program and procedures for submitting project requests is now available. It may be obtained from the Office of Transportation, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington 25, D.C. Inquiries are invited and cooperation of that office is assured in the development of suitable and meaningful projects.

The third program of loans for the acquisition, construction, and improvement of mass transportation facilities and equipment carried an authorization of $50 million. That sum alone should dispel any illusions that it was a "bailout" for commuter railroads for the total amount, of which considerably less was actually appropriated for fiscal 1962, would not save even one medium-sized system. Instead, the loan program was intended for a limited financial assistance and is an incentive to the planning process because eligibility is contingent upon the existence, or the active development, of a program for a comprehensive and coordinated regional transportation system.

It is recognized that this three-phase program is neither a permanent nor final answer to the question of the Federal role in urban transportation. The widespread interest and response to this initial program is providing much useful guidance in developing the more definitive recommendations sought by President Kennedy when he directed the Housing Administrator and the Secretary of Commerce to undertake a joint study of the urban transportation problem and report to him their findings. That report is in the process of final preparation and promises to provide a basis for White House action during the present session of the Congress. Unfortunately, its progress has not yet reached the conclusive stage to permit any direct reference.

Regardless of the particular form of those recommendations, it is obvious that urban transportation is regarded as a major problem of our times. There is general feeling that improvements are possible and can be accomplished with intelligent planning and effective public support and effort within the individual communities utilizing a measure of Federal financial and technical assistance.

VFW Urges Fair Policy for Dependents of Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, in these perilous times, when the survival of our Nation, and the free world, depends in such large degree upon our armed services, it is highly important that our military personnel serve under fair and equitable policies.

One of the most difficult things for our military personnel to understand is why, under current Pentagon directives, Government officials in nonmilitary agencies

are permitted to have their families with them in the same oversea areas where military dependents are not permitted. It would appear that if servicemen are not permitted to have their dependents with them, then the same restrictions should apply to all governmental officials.

This matter of restricting military dependents overseas is extremely important from the standpoint of the morale of our servicemen, and thus relates directly to the overall strength of our armed services.

It is, to me, and I am sure to other Members of this House, a matter of deep satisfaction to know that the cause of equitable treatment for servicemen and their dependents has been so vigorously and effectively advanced by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. One of the most significant and wholesome recent developments concerning our national security has been the manner in which the Veterans of Foreign Wars, consisting entirely of oversea combat veterans, has taken an increasing role in protecting the legitimate interests and rights of our active duty military personnel.

In so doing, the VFW performs a most valuable service. It is well recognized that military personnel on active duty are, by the very nature of their professions, not in a position to defend publicly their own interests. By taking on this task, which the Veterans of Foreign Wars is doing so judiciously and effectively, the VFW provides another example of its constructive endeavors in matters of national security.

There is, I am glad to say, indication that the Pentagon is reviewing the present policy concerning military dependents overseas. This current review is something which the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Mr. Robert E. Hansen, has officially advocated. On January 15, 1962, Commander Hansen spotlighted the inequity in the Pentagon restrictions on military dependents by disclosing, through a nationally distributed press release, that although senior officers from the U.S. military services assigned the 1962 course at the British Imperial Defense College in England are not permitted to have their families with them, a U.S. State Department official assigned to the same course was authorized to have his family accompany him.

Very logically, VFW Commander in Chief Hansen urged that the Pentagon review its dependents' policy and suggested that if it is concluded that the present restrictions should be continued, then President Kennedy apply the same rules to personnel of all Government offices.

This action by VFW Commander in Chief Hansen was both timely and helpful. It is encouraging to read in the service publications that the Pentagon has undertaken a review of this matter. It is pertinent to point out, also, that this latest action by the VFW is fully consistent with the action of the VFW just about a year ago in urging the relaxation of restrictions on dependents which were then in effect. As Members of the House will recall, those prohibitions on dependent travel were then temporarily lifted.

The mature and straightforward manner in which the VFW has taken an interest in the problems of military personnel and their families is a credit to the VFW and a source of reassurance to servicemen and their families.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include at this time an article from the Navy Times of February 3, 1962, entitled "VFW Head Hits Discrimination on Dependents"; an item from the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal of January 20, 1962, pertaining to the statement of VFW Commander in Chief Robert E. Hansen in connection with the restrictions on military dependents overseas; and the full text of Commander in Chief Robert E. Hansen's press release of January 15, calling for a review of current regulations restricting the travel of military dependents.

[From the Navy Times, Feb. 3, 1962]

VFW HEAD HITS DISCRIMINATION ON DEPENDENTS

WASHINGTON.—The commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars has slapped the discrimination against military personnel in having dependents overseas.

Robert E. Hansen called on the Defense Department to take a new look at Government policy since "our military men are not being accorded the same treatment as are employees in other Government departments."

"For instance," he continued, "there are senior officers from the military services scheduled to attend the 1962 course at the British Imperial Defense College in England. These officers, because of the Department of Defense restrictions on dependents overseas, are prohibited from having their families accompany them, as has been the previous practice.

"However, it is disturbing," Hansen said, "that a State Department Foreign Service officer who is assigned to the same course has been authorized to have his family accompany him.

"Military men know that personal sacrifice is an essential part of service to our Nation," the VFW chief said. "However, it is difficult for them to rationalize a policy of 'selective sacrifice' in which the military bears the burdens not placed upon other Government personnel," he added.

He said that if a review of dependent travel restriction shows they should be continued, then President Kennedy should apply the same prohibitions to the personnel of all Government agencies.

[From the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal, Jan. 20, 1962]

RESTRICTIONS ON DEPENDENTS

Families of military officers attending the 1962 course at the British Imperial Defense College will be left at the dock, but the family of a State Department Foreign Service officer attending the course has been authorized to accompany him. Scoring this double-standard under which members of the Armed Forces are treated as second-class citizens, VFW Commander in Chief Robert E. Hansen has urged the Pentagon to review its restrictions on military family travel. If such restrictions are justified, Hansen said, then President Kennedy should "apply the same prohibitions to the personnel of all Government agencies."

STATEMENT BY COMMANDER HANSEN

Robert E. Hansen, South St. Paul, Minn., commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States today called on Defense Department officials to take a "new look" at Government policy regarding military dependents.

Commander Hansen, in calling for immediate action by the Department of Defense, pointed out that his position regarding military dependents is based upon extensive conversations with officer and enlisted personnel, both in the United States and overseas.

"Our military men," Commander Hansen emphasized, "are not being accorded the same standards of treatment as are employees in other Government departments.

"For instance there are senior officers from the military services scheduled to attend the 1962 course at the British Imperial Defense College in England. These officers, because of the Department of Defense restrictions on dependents overseas, are prohibited from having their families accompany them, as has been the previous practice. However, 'it is disturbing,' the VFW commander in chief said, 'that a U.S. State Department Foreign Service officer who is assigned to the same course has been authorized to have his family accompany him.' "

Commander Hansen said "the VFW, consisting of over 1,300,000 overseas combat veterans, strongly believes that military personnel should not be discriminated against with respect to dependents, or any other matter." Continuing, Mr. Hansen stated, "the matter of military dependents overseas is one which is vitally important to military morale. We members of the VFW know that all the military expects or wants is a 'fair shake'. Military men know that personal sacrifice is an essential part of service to our Nation. However, it is difficult for them to rationalize a policy of selective sacrifice in which the military bears the burdens not placed upon other Government personnel.

"On behalf of the Veterans of Foreign Wars," Commander Hansen continued, "I urge that the Department of Defense immediately review the restrictions on dependent travel. If such review in the opinion of the Secretary of Defense justifies the continuation of restrictions on dependent travel then I suggest that President Kennedy apply the same prohibitions to the personnel of all Government agencies. Only by so doing," Commander Hansen concluded, "is it possible to avoid continuing the double-standard policy by which military personnel are treated as second-class citizens."

Carlos Romulo, Top Diplomat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Oland D. Russell which appeared in the New York World-Telegram of February 2, 1962, and which pays well-deserved tribute to a distinguished diplomat, Gen. Carlos Romulo, who recently resigned as the Philippine Ambassador to the United States:

CARLOS ROMULO, TOP DIPLOMAT

(By Oland D. Russell)

Not since the Marquis de Lafayette of Revolutionary War fame departed these shores has any foreign citizen packed his bags in such a blaze of glory as Gen. Carlos P. Romulo.

Both served in the U.S. Army. The country's gratitude and emotional feeling for General Romulo are exceeded only by the $224,424 and 23,028 acres of Florida land we gave Lafayette.

Yesterday was General Romulo's last day as the Philippines Ambassador to Washington. He has been in this country off and on for 42 years—as a university student (Columbia), representative of the preindependence Philippines Government, Army officer, Resident Commissioner, chief delegate to the United Nations (president of the General Assembly in 1949), and for two tours as Ambassador, the latter beginning in 1954.

He comes to New York from Washington for a final round of ovations, including a tickertape parade on Broadway next Wednesday. In April he returns to Manila to become president of the University of the Philippines.

He will carry back with him to the Philippines unprecedented honors from the country in which he has served. Among these is a historic session of the U.S. Supreme Court handing down the unanimous decision that the United States "has no better friend than Gen. Carlos P. Romulo."

Coupled with this were two further tokens never before accorded a departing Ambassador. One was a luncheon given and attended by the entire membership of the Court, the other a large photograph autographed by the nine justices.

Equally unprecedented, President Kennedy not only wrote him an unusually friendly letter but received Mr. Romulo in rocking-chair audience and told him: "No other Ambassador to Washington has interpreted the ideals of his country as well as you."

In his letter Mr. Kennedy told General Romulo: "You are identified with great moments in the history of my Nation—with the emergence of the Philippines as a free and democratic Republic, with the resistance to aggression during the Second World War, and the formative years of the United Nations. You leave behind not only good friends but imperishable memories."

At his own farewell party for General Romulo, Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON gave the Ambassador a gold chain and key bearing the Vice Presidential Seal.

In the course of his farewell calls, General Romulo paid a visit to Washington's District Commissioner Walter Torbriner, the equivalent of mayor. With characteristic thoughtfulness, General Romulo thanked him for all the public services, police protection, sanitation and utilities that otherwise might be taken for granted by a temporary resident.

Replying, Mr. Tobriner told General Romulo: "There are 101 Ambassadors of foreign nations in this city. Never before in my knowledge has any one of them ever come around to say thank you for anything on their departure."

In the Senate, Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, in a eulogy of General Romulo, said: "In my opinion no Ambassador has ever made a better impression, developed closer friendships, or will leave with so much sorrow on the part of his friends."

These are only samples of the tributes galore, plus the parties and receptions, that have been given General Romulo in the past weeks.

As far as his Washington post is concerned, General Romulo's departure is a many-splendored thing.

As Philippines President Diosdado Macapagal sees it: "Romulo is the best man we've got. We will always utilize his services." This, from the winning candidate of the 1961 presidential elections when General Romulo was politically on the other side, should say much for the Romulo years ahead.

The Stock Exchange Community: A Look at 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on Monday evening, January 22, 1962, it was my pleasure to have attended the Washington dinner of the Association of Stock Exchange Firms. It was a highly enjoyable and very informative affair and two of the speakers of the evening were Mr. G. Keith Funston, president of the New York Stock Exchange, and Mr. B. C. Eustis, member of the board of governors, Association of Stock Exchange Firms.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make as part of my remarks the addresses given on that occasion by Mr. Funston and Mr. Eustis.

The addresses follow:

THE STOCK EXCHANGE COMMUNITY: A LOOK AT 1962

(Remarks by G. Keith Funston, president, New York Stock Exchange, before a meeting of the Association of Stock Exchange Firms, Monday evening, January 22, 1962, Washington, D.C.)

There is an unusual and delightful aspect to this meeting for me. As you probably know, one of the occupational hazards of being president of the stock exchange is the probability of being invited to attend hearings in Washington on a wide range of matters. And over the past decade or so I have sometimes found myself facing many of the outstanding legislative leaders whom I see here this evening—men whose great personal charm did not at all conflict wtih their fine inquisitorial abilities.

For those of you who have never appeared as a witness at a hearing, let me say that it can be a most interesting, instructive, and awesome experience. The proceedings begin in an atmosphere of good will and friendliness. The Congressman from your home State or with whom you have been fishing may even comment favorably about your standing back home. You then present a statement to which considerable time and thought have been given. And the committee listens with flattering attention and courtesy.

And then begins the question-and-answer period. In preparation for your appearance you have, of course, tried in advance to marshal every pertinent fact and figure you might be asked about—like a diligent student cramming for an exam. What occurs, though—if I may carry the allusion a bit further—is that the questions often seem to come from every conceivable source except your textbooks. And one learns that one's standing in his own community is no passport to his standing in Washington.

My testifying experience has reminded me of the little boy, whose mother, concerned about his premature preoccupation with little girls, took him to a psychiatrist.

The doctor placed an ink blot before the child. "Now, Johnny," he said, "what does this look like?"

"Two bees making love," came the prompt reply.

Without comment, the doctor showed the boy another ink blot. "How about this?"

Johnny studied it for a moment. "Two birds making love," he said.

A bit perturbed, the psychiatrist showed him a third and larger ink blot. The child frowned, looked at it closely, and finally declared triumphantly, "Two horses making love."

At this, the doctor lost patience. "Young man," he thundered, "I think you're just a little too concerned with sex."

Johnny turned innocent eyes on the psychiatrist. "Why are you hollering at me?" he complained. "They're your pictures, aren't they?"

The fact is, it's pleasant to have this chance to draw a picture of my very own before this audience knowing that this time there won't be the usual opportunity to question me.

As we enter a new year—the Nation's 186th and the New York Stock Exchange's 170th—I would like to tell you about some of the important steps the exchange has taken in the recent past and about our outlook for the future. And, my earlier remarks notwithstanding, I will certainly be available to answer any questions after dinner.

In many ways, 1961 was the most successful year in recent exchange history and will have important implications for the future.

The number of shares transacted during the year, for example, was the second highest in history, approaching the all-time record levels of 1929. This is not at all surprising in view of the tremendous increase in both the total number of shares listed on the exchange—and the number of the Nation's shareowners.

What is surprising, in fact, is that volume remained so low under these circumstances—and that only about 15 percent of the 7 billion shares listed on the exchange changed hands during the year. To put this figure into perspective, in 1929, when less than 1 billion shares were listed, the turnover ratio was 119 percent.

One important conclusion to be drawn from these figures is that today's market is used principally by investors, both individual and institutional, who are venturing their funds for the long term. Recent exchange studies, I might add, reinforce this conclusion in specific detail. Despite a brief and narrowly limited flurry of unsound speculative activity last spring—which the exchange community actively helped to dispel—there is convincing evidence that the overwhelming majority of investors are approaching the market soundly. They are determining their objectives carefully, seeking responsible advice and tailoring their risks to the degree they can afford to assume.

The exchange's public transaction study last September showed that margin transactions dropped to the lowest level recorded since September 1952; that generally credit was being extended to those best able to take the risks; that short-term trading had declined sharply from the previous year; and that institutional activity—by banks, insurance and investment companies, pension funds, and so forth—had recorded an all-time high of over 25 percent of all transactions.

This profile of the market is certainly gratifying in view of the size of the Nation's stockholder family—some 15 million individuals who own the shares of America's publicly held companies. This number, I might add, is more than twice the 6.5 million owners recorded 10 years ago. Later this year, the exchange will publish the results of a new census of shareholders. We expect this new survey will show further important increases in the Nation's stockholding population.

It is fortunate that so many Americans are becoming share owners, because huge sums will be needed from them to finance the fu-

ture growth of American industry and to maintain present living standards for our growing population. For several years, exchange estimates have pointed out that in the 1960's U.S. corporations will require a 50-percent increase in new equity capital over levels of the previous decade.

Dr. Simon Kuznets, in his recent landmark survey made under the auspices of the National Bureau of Economic Research, points out the following: The United States has fallen considerably short of achieving its economic potential because capital formation has been allowed to lag. This is due in part to public policies which have reduced the incentives to save and invest. He maintains we are short of capital goods, not because investment opportunities have been lacking—but, rather, because of the limited availability of savings. It is clear, I think, that many potential investors simply have not found the incentives to save and invest sufficiently attractive to forgo increased purchases of goods and services.

Share-owner growth and industry's burgeoning capital needs, of course, are dramatically reflected in the heavy demands on the exchange's facilities. It has become increasingly clear that the exchange is literally outgrowing its present home.

Our membership has authorized the accumulation over the next 5 years of a $29 million fund to provide initial financing for new facilities. Just 18 days ago, exchange members voted, by more than 2 to 1, to build this fund by increasing their dues and initiation fees. In addition, other member charges will be raised and other funds will be appropriated from present reserves and future revenues.

Another major development during the year—to which Jim Eustis referred a few minutes ago—was the inauguration of the Securities and Exchange Commission's study of the securities industry.

At the New York Stock Exchange we are, of course, following the progress of these inquiries very carefully with a particular regard for our own procedures. And there is nothing in what we have learned from disclosures made regarding practices elsewhere in our industry that lessens in any way our faith in the integrity of the exchange's auction market, or our confidence that this marketplace is operating efficiently, fairly, and effectively in the public interest.

Moreover, we believe that tough self-regulation and rigid enforcement provide the most practical means for policing all segments of the securities industry. Such self-policing has been, is, and will be the cornerstone of our New York Stock Exchange marketplace. That is not to say that in the New York Stock Exchange community of 100,000 people across the country occasional irregularities will not occur. But we are aggressively seeking them out, and when we discover them we move to correct them—quickly, decisively and, according to some outside observers, even harshly. We believe that the New York Stock Exchange's rules and their enforcement represent the most stringent code of self-regulation in effect on the American business scene today. They are serving both the public and the exchange community well. More than that, these rules are under constant review and revision to make them more responsive and effective.

As a matter of fact, I believe that throughout the securities industry infractions are the exception, rather than the rule. The vast preponderance of securities industry business is conducted competently by responsible people. Therefore, whatever steps are taken to lessen the number of infractions must be accomplished without undermining the public's confidence in the entire structure of the securities industry. We believe that the Securities and Exchange Commission's recent reaffirmation of the desirability of self-regulation is enlightened and practical, and we pledge ourselves to do all in our power to strengthen this concept.

Against this background of heightened public interest in the market, the New York Stock Exchange community—and the securities industry as a whole—can look forward to expanded opportunities to serve the Nation's growing family of shareowners and the growing need for capital funds. And with broad shareownership still in its early stages, we can and do look forward to participating intimately and vigorously in the Nation's accelerating economic development.

In accepting this challenge, each of us—in the securities industry, in business, and in government—can look forward to playing a greater role in charting a course of sound and meaningful progress for America.

ADDRESS OF B. C. EUSTIS AT THE WASHINGTON DINNER, JANUARY 22, 1962

Thank you, Bill, for your kind introduction. It is a real pleasure to be in Washington once again for a meeting of our board of governors and I want you to know how much we appreciate all that you and your associates have done to make this dinner such a splendid and memorable affair.

I was glad to hear you mention in your opening remarks that the association exists for the purpose of helping New York Stock Exchange firms to establish and maintain high standards of service to the investing public and that not only its members but, also, their representatives on the board of governors, come from every section of our great country. An indication of the seriousness with which our board members regard their association responsibilities is to be found that there are present in the audience tonight 33 of our present 35-man board and that they have come from some 16 cities to participate in our business sessions. In scanning through the program a few minutes ago, I noted that 33 former governors are also here, adding many more cities to those having representation in the audience tonight. If I seem to stress unduly this wide geographical distribution of our membership, it is because I want to make it abundantly clear that we are a national organization and that our problems and interests are those of a membership with offices in 49 of the 50 States as well as many foreign countries.

Seated on the dais here tonight is a man who, when he headed the New York Stock Exchange as its president, characterized the association as the exchange's "strong right arm." We are grateful to you, Emil Schram, for the trust you placed in the association and we have constantly endeavored to merit that distinction. Under the leadership at the stock exchange of our good friend, Keith Funston, this spirit of mutual helpfulness and confidence has grown even stronger in the past decade.

As the membership of the association and the New York Stock Exchange parallel each other, we naturally endeavor through close liaison and cooperation to avoid duplication of effort. Through the years it has become clear to both organizations where lie their inherent strengths and their prime responsibilities. For example, the association neither has nor covets any regulatory powers. These, appropriately, rest entirely with the exchange itself and with the Government. Anything affecting the public interest is, however, of definite concern to the Association. We use every power at our command, short of actual rulemaking, to see that such interest is kept foremost in the minds of our members.

We have, of course, been following carefully the SEC's study of the securities industry. We cannot condone anything that impairs the confidence of the investor, not only because integrity is a principle upon which our industry has been built, but on the more material grounds of self interest as well. Anything that undermines public confidence in one segment of our industry is certain to have an impact on all other areas of the business.

I think it is fair to say that stock exchange member firms view the study as an opportunity to demonstrate both how efficiently our machinery of self-regulation works and how it serves the public. If the glare of the spotlight of publicity is uncomfortable at times, we feel it will also serve to illuminate the strengths in our industry and make them better known. In short, we believe a conscientous and effective job of safeguarding the public interest has been and is being done in our marketplace.

Our approach to the SEC's study brings to mind an incident that happened to me almost 2 weeks ago. As Bill Coe told you in introducing me, I came from New Orleans where recently they experienced the coldest weather in 60 years. Relatives of both my wife and myself graphically relayed to us all the hardships and inconveniences they endured; particularly the lack of water due to frozen and broken water pipes. Attempting to explain this distress to our grandchildren, I commented: "You know, your cousins weren't able to take a bath for 6 days." I am afraid the oldest one wasn't duly impressed, for he said: "What's so bad about that?"

Now I don't mean to draw a strict parallel between the SEC's study of the securities industry and the plumbing situation in New Orleans, but I think the story illustrates the fact that how you approach a matter of this kind depends a great deal upon your point of view.

Although, as I mentioned earlier, regulatory responsibilities lie principally elsewhere, legislative developments affecting our members and the 15 million investors who are our customers, are very much a matter of direct concern to the association. A few words about some legislative areas in which the association has been active might interest you.

For many years our industry was vexed by problems stemming from the desire of parents to give stocks to their children. Laws which had been on the books for many generations often intervened to make such gifts impractical, except at the trouble and expense of setting up formal trusts. Under the laws of most States the purchase of stock for a child was a risky business and the subsequent sale of the securities frequently required a court order. It is not surprising, therefore, that many parents, torn between the desire on the one hand of making gifts of securities to their children, and their unwillingness on the other hand to incur all sorts of legal complications and expenses, often abandoned their plans in favor of some less worthy but simpler type of present. This situation certainly worked to the detriment of both the parent and the child, not to mention the stockbroker himself.

Several years ago a unique type of legislation came to our attention, making it far easier for parents to give securities to their offspring. The merits of spreading the advantages of such a simplified procedure were quite obvious, both in terms of the educational effect such gifts would have upon youngsters who at any early age might be acquainted personally with the risks and rewards of share ownership, as well as the effect upon our members' own pocketbooks of the new business which was certain to result.

Our members throughout the country quickly seized upon the opportunity to suggest the advantages of such legislation to as many State legislatures as could be persuaded to listen. Within a few years, working at the local level, uniform legislation to

simplify stock gifts to minor children was introduced and adopted in every one of the 50 States, very largely as a result of the association's endeavors.

Delighted with the success of these efforts, we encouraged our members to undertake another somewhat similar project, again at the State level, to press for the introduction and enactment of a uniform law in the various States where security transfers by persons acting in a fiduciary capacity were subject to an enormous amount of redtape and endless documentation. Here, too, seemingly outmoded laws conspired to turn a basically simple transaction into a complicated and expensive legal procedure. Today, as you may know, in the 36 States and the District of Columbia where the Uniform Act for the Simplification of Fiduciary Security Transfers is in effect the situation has been reversed and the paperwork materially reduced. We look forward to the prompt adoption of the Uniform Act in the remaining jurisdictions still without any kind of simplification legislation, so that the benefits of these new procedures will be available to all.

The American Bar Association and the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws have a number of other simplification projects under study. It is our intent to cooperate fully with these organizations and to do all we can to achieve uniformity in practice throughout our industry and, wherever possible, help our members in streamlining their operations.

I have mentioned these projects not because they necessarily represent the most important function of the association, but because I thought that with so many legislators in our audience mention of our activities in this direction might hold the greatest interest. A further reason is that assembled here tonight are so many people who worked long and hard in their respective States to interest their lawmakers in the merits of such uniform legislation. This is a splendid opportunity to thank you publicly for the outstanding job you have done and to express the hope of the association that you will continue to take an active part in these worthwhile endeavors in the future.

Some few years ago it would have been inconceivable that a trade group such as ours would concern itself with more than the day-to-day routine operating problems of the industry. Today, however, our horizons know no bounds and our areas of service to the membership and the investing public are constantly expanding. To make the most of these opportunities is an exciting challenge to which we, on the board of governors, are pledged to devote our best efforts.

Thank you.

United Nations Peace Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK KOWALSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States and to afford an opportunity for the people of the United States to participate in the purchase of United Nations bonds, to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945.

The President has recommended enactment by Congress of a bill to authorize and appropriate up to $100 million for the purchase of United Nations 25-year, 2-percent bonds to finance special operations in the Middle East and in the Congo.

This method of financing was approved by the General Assembly and has been formally offered by Acting Secretary General U Thant.

The need for this means of financing the United Nations expeditionary force and the United Nations operation in the Congo arises both from the refusal of some member states, and the inability of others, to pay their special assessments.

The United Nations bond issue will enable the United Nations to continue these special operations for which the General Assembly has granted authority. It will obligate every nonpaying or delinquent member state to pay its accumulated debt. It will reduce the U.S. contribution for these operations from approximately 47½ percent to a more equitable 32 percent. It is hoped that this remedial financing will encourage a greater sense of financial responsibility among member states.

I support the President's recommendation to Congress in the belief that the United Nations, however imperfect, is today an essential instrument of our national security and of our national policy, and in the hope that it may be made more perfect in the days ahead as mankind's best hope of finding an alternative to war.

I support our Government's participation in the bond issue, knowing that the United Nations is proving a powerful weapon against Communist imperialism and confident that in those instances where we have suffered reversals we can, through patience, wisdom, and courage, make them yield new victories for the cause of peace.

The refusal of Russia and its satellites to pay their assessments for U.N. operations in the Congo and in the Middle East are a crude confession of the effectiveness of U.N. actions.

It is argued that the United Nations bonds are a bad risk, and who would deny it. But I cannot think of a better diversified investment. We are risking $52 billion in a Military Establishment that, should war come, would not prevent massive destruction to America. We are risking $500 million in a civil defense program that may prove ineffectual in saving the 50 million Americans it is designed to accommodate.

Let us look at the far graver risks our failure to support the bond issue would entail. U.N. operations would be halted in the Middle East and in the Congo and new operations could not be launched to meet new crises. A war between Israel and the Arab States, direct U.S. intervention in the Congo or writing it off to chaos or to communism, these alternatives are perilous too.

It is debatable whether the United Nations could survive our lack of confidence or loss of hope. If not, what are the chances of mankind surviving?

Has anyone estimated the cost to us if the U.N. operations fail? How much more will we have to appropriate for our staggering new defense budget to allow for the greater risk of global war?

What thought has gone into an alternative policy should these special operations end or the United Nations collapse?

Or how might we strengthen the United Nations?

It is time the Congress gave these matters some thought.

United Nations bonds buy that time to think.

The United Nations bond issue offers the United States a priceless opportunity to build a better United Nations by reinforcing our collective responsibility through individual participation in its support, and in so doing set an example for other member states.

With this purpose, I introduce a bill that would, following approval of the President's request, authorize the Treasury to issue for sale to the general public United Nations peace bonds in denominations of $25, $50, and $100 and bearing 2-percent interest compounded semiannually, which would offer to the American people an opportunity to underwrite any portion of the $100 million appropriated to the Treasury. The Treasury would thus have available a large sum that could be appropriated for other worthwhile programs.

I believe these peace bonds would give the people of America, as individuals, a long-sought, tangible, and potent means to share in the tasks and the objectives of the United Nations.

The ever-present threat of thermonuclear annihilation haunts the everyday thoughts of our men and women and children. In fact of this threat, it has been suggested that private citizens or the Government construct fallout shelters.

Serious questions have arisen in the minds of many people about the effectiveness, the strategy, the morality, and the humanity of such a defense. Whatever the validity of these questions, the fact is virtually no shelters have been constructed.

The constant menace of a nuclear catastrophe, coupled with a vision of the remoteness of the Government and the United Nations, instills a growing sense of helplessness or of outrage among our people, who want to take an active role in their own defense short of burrowing into the ground. Unless these energies are tapped, our Nation's strength and resolve will be seriously impaired.

United Nations peace bonds would allow the average American a concrete means of coping with this threat, of participating more closely with the Government's support of the United Nations, a way of making a personal investment in the task of positively and constructively building a shelter of peace through the United Nations.

It should further be considered that the man on the street could thus demonstrate convincingly to the world the overwhelming support of Americans for the United Nations. Such a clear, popular demonstration might encourage other member states to offer similar bonds to their citizens and thus not only make it easier for less prosperous nations to participate in the United Nations bond issue through public subvention, but also greatly enhance the possi-

bilities for peace throughout the world community.

Making United Nations peace bonds available to the public would, moreover, obviate any possible suspicion that the Government's purchase is a "profitmaking venture by capital exporting nations, who will purchase the largest share of the bonds."

Finally, it would exert the strongest moral pressures on recalcitrant member states to pay their accumulated debt. I believe that if the American workingman and the American housewife and the American schoolboy buy United Nations peace bonds, their Russian counterparts will take a new look at America, and at themselves and their own delinquent government.

I am not in sympathy with those who argue against new proposals because of their novelty or who expect all things to be accomplished effortlessly, forgetting there are rewards that are most satisfying if they are commensurate with our efforts.

I am in sympathy with those who will offer better approaches to the problems and possibilities I have suggested.

In sum, I am convinced the issue of the United Nations peace bonds will strengthen the average American's personal commitment to the United Nations and set an example to the governments and peoples of the world. I ask your support for the bill I am introducing:

H.R. 10097

A bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor, and to afford an opportunity for the people of the United States to participate in the purchase of such bonds.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, without fiscal-year limitation, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $100,000,000 for the purchase of United Nations bonds. Amounts appropriated pursuant to the preceding sentence shall be used for such purchases at any time that the President determines it necessary. This determination shall not be contingent upon the sale of peace bonds nor any proceeds to be derived therefrom.

SEC. 2. Amounts received from the annual repayment of principal and payment of interest due on United Nations bonds shall be deposited into the Treasury of the United States in a special fund which shall be available for redemption of peace bonds. Amounts not needed for such redemptions shall be deposited into miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 3. The United Nations Participation Act of 1945 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"UNITED NATIONS PEACE BONDS

"SEC. 9. (a) For the purpose of providing an opportunity for the public to provide support for the activities of the United Nations, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to issue special obligations of the United States, designated as 'peace bonds,' in accordance with the provisions of law applicable to United States savings bonds except that peace bonds shall mature not more than twenty-five years from the date as of which issued, and shall be issued on a discount basis such as to afford an investment yield not in excess of 2 per centum per annum, compounded semiannually when held to maturity.

"(b) Peace bonds shall have a face value of $25, $50, and $100 when held to maturity, and may be issued in such other denominations as the Secretary of the Treasury may from time to time determine.

"(c) Amounts realized by the Secretary of the Treasury from the sale of peace bonds shall be deposited in a special fund in the Treasury, and shall be available for use in the purchase of United Nations bonds."

President Kennedy Farm Proposals: A Comment From Upstate New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, those of us in Congress who have the honor to represent districts which include farming areas are of course greatly interested in the proposals recently made by President Kennedy to deal with the farm situation. This is especially true in my district of upstate New York with respect to those portions of the President's recommendations relating to dairy products, since dairying is the single more important industry in New York State.

I am sure that all of us who represent such areas, and who will be studying the President's proposals with great care in the weeks ahead, will want to know the reactions to these proposals from those most directly affected, the farmers themselves, and those most familiar with our dairying farming industry in upstate New York.

For that reason I read with great interest the other day a thoughtful editorial in the Oneonta Star, one of New York State's great newspapers serving the heart of our important upstate New York dairy area. Believing that the Star's comments on President Kennedy's dairy farm proposals may also be of interest to my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent to include this editorial, from the Oneonta Star of February 3, 1962, at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial follows:

J.F.K.'S FARM LAW NEEDS HARD LOOK

Fairness throughout the Nation, including dairymen of this area, sometime in the near future will have to make up their minds on whether they will accept a management program for their industry.

The Star believes that some kind of management system is an imperative. It appears that the program offered by the administration may well be the most feasible. It is certainly worth a great deal of thoughtful consideration.

It also is worthy of serious debate—the kind of debate that generates light, not heat. Name calling on either side will do no good; will do tremendous harm. The supporters of the proposal have offered the program after careful consideration and in a sincere attempt to provide a sensible and final solution to the problem of constant production above the need of the market.

No individual farmer, no matter what his farm produces, can possibly be in a position to judge the market demand, and what his share of the market can be. Technological advances have made it imperative that a central body be employed to make that management decision. We are in favor of the general idea. We think time should be given for thorough study of the proposed means of putting that idea into effect.

There is one charge, already leveled, that gives us pause. We do not like the implied "threat" of reprisal should farmers reject the plan. If the farmer should accept it, he must be allowed to do so freely of his own will, not with a pistol at his head—or pocketbook.

Persuasion and reason, we believe, can work most effectively. Force, be it economic or political, can win only a superficial victory. It would generate most resentment and efforts to circumvent the program and thus do more harm than adoption of the plan would do good under that circumstance.

We repeat, pending an opportunity further to study its details, we favor a management plan but it should not be forced on the farmer against his will.

The Candid Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents has sent me a beautiful satire by Charles McDowell which appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle on February 2, 1962.

I am sure that it will strike a sympathetic chord with many a colleague. The article follows:

THE CANDID CONGRESSMAN

(By Chas. McDowell)

A mythical fellow known as the candid Congressman made a mythical speech the other night in his home district, and the mythical text follows:

"Friends, enemies, and independents, frankly, I am here because I hope to be reelected this fall, and this dinner is part of the ritual. If I can catch the mayor after dinner, while he is still floating on the updraft of his own oratory, maybe I can get him committed to do some work in the campaign.

"My conscience hurts at being away from Washington now because my committee is starting on some important work that most of you wouldn't understand. I hope you wouldn't anyway, because I have to do a lot of compromising on that committee, and constituents tend not to approve of compromise. Most constituents want a foursquare Congressman who sees everything in blacks and whites.

"Anyway, if Congressmen were as sure of their opinions as most of you are of yours, we would not be able to agree on when to meet. I try to keep abreast of your opinions by reading my mail. Your powers of indignation amaze me. If Congressmen had the same powers, our sessions would be an endless street riot.

"I confess that there are times when I am not sure what is right, when I see reasonable Members of Congress on both sides of an issue. So I consult the mail and find mostly indignant people all saying I will vote with them if I have a vertebra left.

"You may not know how hard it is to represent you. It is the consensus of this district, for instance, that we should have lower taxes and more defense, fewer Federal aid programs and more Federal money spent in the district, less bureaucracy and more jobs for deserving constituents.

"I am interested to see several independent voters in the audience—slumming, I suppose, among what they regard as the party hacks. You know, independent voters play a fascinating role in our form of government. They take no real part in politics until the time comes to pick 'the best man regardless of party,' as the saying goes. Meanwhile, they are free to criticize the mediocrity of party politics and the candidates it produces.

"These noble independents don't sully themselves by working at politics to develop candidates and programs that would meet their high standards.

"Well, you have been good to listen to me without throwing your dessert plates. I shall subside now and attend a private meeting upstairs with some local statesmen who want me to reduce taxes, hold down postal rates, increase mail deliveries, get more Federal contracts for the district, build a bridge and dredge the harbor, and get the mayor a job in Washington, or anywhere. Good night."

Edward Hunter on Fulbright Memorandum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, Clarence Manion, a former dean of the School of Law at Notre Dame University, recently had Edward Hunter as a guest on his weekly radio program "The Manion Forum." Hunter, an expert on Communist brainwashing who has testified on several occasions before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, made some comments concerning the "Fulbright Memorandum" which I think should be brought to the attention of Congress. Under unanimous consent, I include his comments in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

MR. EDWARD HUNTER—FULBRIGHT MEMORANDUM AN INSIDE JOB—WITH DISASTROUS POSSIBILITIES

Dean MANION: Last July 11, in an executive session, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the United States Senate interviewed Mr. Edward Hunter. The subject discussed was the current drive to smear and discredit anticommunism and anticommunist organizations which had been ordered by the World Convention of Communist Parties in Moscow on December 5, 1960.

After this directive against anti-Communists was reiterated by the Soviet Communist Party on, last July 29, the Senate Security Subcommittee printed and released Mr. Hunter's testimony to the newspapers and to the public on August 27. This is a sensational document which every patriotic American should read carefully and completely.

The witness, Edward Hunter, has been a renowned foreign correspondent for American newspapers for 40 years. His special field of investigation has been "Communist brainwashing," a phrase coined by Mr. Hunter himself to describe an involved psychological process which is an important weapon in the Communist conquest.

Mr. Edward Hunter is with me here at this microphone now to describe the so-called Fulbright memorandum as that document relates to the Soviet-directed drive against effective anti-Communist teaching and organization. This distinguished author and world reporter has been our guest on a previous occasion. (Manion Forum Broadcast No. 232) Mr. Hunter, welcome back to the Manion Forum.

Mr. HUNTER: Thank you, Dean Manion. What has become known as the Fulbright Memorandum was never intended to be made known to the public or to Government officials generally. Yet, it repudiates the basic conception of our form of Government, and its implementations would make us a dictatorship of a deceiving, slyly-sophisticated, self-proclaimed character.

To my knowledge, nothing so contemptible nor so dangerous has ever before been attempted in high places of the American Government. It would kidnap our free Government and subordinate it to the will of a small, self-considered elite who would act in the name of the people, whether the public liked it or not.

What distinguishes this coup d-etat is its subtlety and streamlined approach. It doesn't rely on anything so crude as proclaimed intentions and the seizure of Government offices physically. Instead, in accordance with the strategy of modern psychological warfare, it operates under cover, clandestinely, through word-of-mouth contact in high places among those who have the authority to put it into operation and have the cunningness to befuddle the uninformed by double talk and a politically pious jargon.

These are drastic statements, I know, but I know of no other way to present the ghastly truth about this maneuver that, through a streak of good fortune, became known outside the little circle for whom alone it was intended. The Fulbright memorandum was gotten up in the Foreign Relations Committee, without the knowledge of other members, and it was sent to the White House to be relayed to the Department of Defense for implementation.

This is the sort of operation, developed in World War II, that was technically known as black or gray because of its concealed nature, and it was for use against the enemy only. The target has now become the American press and public.

The document makes its philosophy plain. It is simply this: The nuclear age is assumed to have given rise to new, unprecedented problems that can be handled only by a few in the know. What they, out of their great wisdom, want done would be rejected by the public if given the opportunity to decide.

So, circumstances have to be created whereby interpretation of existing statutes, revision or abandonment of our traditions, and careful manipulation of press channels, will make it possible to put these decisions into effect anyway, with the appearance of national consent. This will be "voluntary" in form—in the conditioned reflex manner of the Pavlovian experiments with dogs and lights.

Whether Senator FULBRIGHT realizes it or not, this is the Communist way, as prescribed by dialectical materialism, with Fascist arrogance added to it. It is Communazi. Let us not be afraid to call a spade a spade on matters that determine our existence.

In the corridors of the Senate, it is said that Senator FULBRIGHT doesn't really feel the way the memorandum more than implies. He hadn't realized it would become public, or he would have been more careful about the language used.

If this be so, it makes him a hypocrite instead of a conspirator. What could have been more sleazy than his original attitude when the paper was disclosed by the politically heroic efforts of Senator STROM THURMOND? This was a patriotic matter above sectionalism and I, as a northerner, find it significant that it was a southerner who brought it to the attention of the Nation. Sectionalism has moved to the North, I am afraid. Senator FULBRIGHT assumed a hurt pose and said he was shocked to hear the paper being referred to because it was only a "personal communication." Let me stress the quotation marks; those are his words.

DOCUMENT SHOULD HAVE BEEN RETURNED BY WHITE HOUSE TO FULBRIGHT

If such a document be a personal communication, then our Government, indeed, is on the way to being circumvented and kidnaped. Frankly, it should have been returned to him by the White House. Our Executive Offices had no right to be a party, directly or indirectly, to any such subterfuge.

The document should not have been sent by the White House to that extremely capable organization man, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara. If it is true that Senator FULBRIGHT had already spoken with the Secretary of Defense, who had requested that the document be routed this way, it makes Mr. McNamara a conspirator too. On such a fundamental matter, what right had he to engage in circumlocution, circumventing the Congress, the press and the public?

The 13 minutes available to me for this talk do not allow time to read the Fulbright memorandum. Listeners should make a point of finding out all they can about it and the incident, for it is a glaring example of the softening up being attempted on the American public. This is a softening-up process whether our Fulbrights know it or not. Softening up is one of the two processes in brainwashing, the other being indoctrination.

The softening-up of the American people has been going on for some time now. The grassroots, anti-Communist movement, being fought so bitterly by a Moscow-directed, Red anti-Communist drive, is evidence that our people still retain their healthy instincts and their sense of right direction. These are under assault. If they can be sufficiently crippled, the conception of a guided democracy or a controlled society, as sought by the Fulbright memorandum, will have no effective opposition.

What we must realize is that the memorandum's implementation was begun at once by Mr. McNamara, as Secretary of Defense. His testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, where I was present, was full of evasions. These are harsh words, but again, on this basic issue, it would be inexcusable if I did not make myself plain.

Secretary McNamara has the responsibility of repudiating the Fulbright memorandum, specifically making it plain that it is not to be further used as a directive. He should rescind what actions were based on this secret document and return it to Senator FULBRIGHT. The Congress, and especially the members of the Armed Services Committee, have the duty to insist upon this.

Senator FULBRIGHT owes himself a self-examination, a procedure which the Reds have copied from us and perverted into a control mechanism. He should use it in the manner of our Christian heritage. If he does not believe what he put his name to, if he had been careless in his trust of collaborators or had been willing to turn over to others, for their political ends, the channels of government made available to him by his high eminent post, he should come out boldly and repudiate the document. He can do no less if he wishes to detach himself from its fundamentally un-American concepts.

Read the document. The big prestige newspapers that follow the anti-anti-Communist line have not published it. Some, like the New York Times, make a point of printing basic documents in full. The Baltimore Sun received a long letter saying literally: Please print the Fulbright memorandum so we can make up our minds on it as responsible citizens. The letter was printed, but not the document. You can get a copy by writing Senator STROM THURMOND, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., and asking for his CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reprints of speeches from July 26 to August 17. Ask him also for his three other reprints on the controversy over the gagging of American military officers.

SO-CALLED "LIBERALS" SUSPECTED OF BEING PROMOTERS OF FULBRIGHT MEMORANDUM

Disclosure of the Fulbright memorandum was a lucky break for the American people. How it came to be written, who helped in it, what outside elements were involved, would go far, if disclosed, to expose the machinations of the whole anti-anti-Communist complex in our country, and the so-called "liberals."

These so-called "liberals"—I have carefully quoted the word "liberal"—are the main elements involved. This document presents their ideology. I call them the new liberals to distinguish them from the liberals of my youth. I was then a liberal and I still am. I have noted that people who call themselves conservatives these days seem, in most cases, to be trying to conserve those old liberal traditions and principles of our early American history and of my youth.

The "new liberal" is as distant in thinking processes and objectives from true liberalism as the "new democracy," proclaimed by Mao Tse-tung, is from ordinary democracy. The "new liberalism" of today is the haven of the political cad, who arrogates to himself special privileges denied to others on the basis not of blood, as in the old class society, but of intellect. These are those to whom the term "egghead" is applied, and properly so—in a derogatory sense. In their unlimited arrogance, they can deprive us of our rights and destroy America. They are the most useful front the Communist enemy has in our land—not out of intent, but out of their downright, down-to-earth stupidity and shortsightedness.

We can safely trust our time-proven ways of constitutional government, adapting these in a manner that strengthens, not weakens it. Above all, let us become informed. There is no substitute for information in a free society. The responsibility for getting information is not somebody's else, but each person's, if he would be free. Each of us should use all his influence and insistence on having the facts made available, then getting, studying and using them.

This is the alternative to the Fulbright memorandum, to the continued softening-up of the American people and to their brainwashing. The Fulbright memorandum would disarm us mentally while the enemy, in its negotiations, seeks to disarm us physically. What can be of greater concern to an American citizen, man or woman?

This is a matter of personal responsibility, a matter of character. We like to think of ourselves as persons of initiative. When it comes to the test, are we kidding ourselves?

The Fulbright memorandum says: "The American people have never really been tested in such a struggle." It goes on to say that we must be restrained, which means put under controls. This is just what communism does. Let us submit to no such controls by those who seek by subtle ways to disarm us morally and mentally so they can indulge in deals that sell our heritage.

In this kind of contest, a person without information, without the facts, is as disarmed as a soldier without a gun. An American who has the opportunity to get the facts and fails to do so is as culpabable as an American soldier who throws away his gun.

Knowledge of the Fulbright memorandum can destroy it, and destroy the noxious, un-American, materialistic, Socialist ideology it contains.

Dean MANION. Thank you, Mr. Edward Hunter. My friends, you should read Mr. Hunter's authoritative books on Communist brainwashing, as well as his testimony before the Senate subcommittee. Sources for these important materials are listed below:

"Brainwashing: In Red China," Vanguard Press, Inc., 424 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., $3.75.

"Brainwashing: From Pavlov To Powers," Bookmailer, Box 101, Murray Hill Station, New York 16, N.Y., $5.

"The Story of Mary Liu," Farrar Strauss & Cudahy, Inc., 101 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

"The Black Book on Red China," Bookmailer, $2.

"The Past Present," Hodder & Stoughton, Ltd., London, England.

"In Many Voice," Dixie Printing Co., Tallahassee, Fla.

"Communist Psychological Warfare" (Brainwashing), Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 15 cents.

Corporations and individuals are urged to order quantities of this speech for distribution—and to ask recipients to write U.S. Senator JOHN STENNIS, of Mississippi, Washington, D.C., protesting against the silencing of our Armed Forces officers in teaching troops the aims and evils of communism.

From 1 to 9 copies, 15 cents each; 10 to 99 copies, 10 cents each; 100 to 499 copies, 9 cents each; 500 to 999 copies, 8 cents each; 1,000 or more copies, 7 cents each.

Subscription rates for weekly radio speeches of the Manion Forum—26 weeks, $3.90; 52 weeks, $7.80.

Trial subscription—6 weeks for $1.

It is suggested you order in bulk and distribute to friends, business associates, students, teachers and fellow employees.

Commonwealth Edison Co. of Chicago Seeks Cut Rate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week the Commonwealth Edison Co. and its Public Service Co. division in Chicago asked authority to reduce electricity rates for more than 600,000 customers in the Chicago area.

In a petition filed with the Illinois Commerce Commission, Commonwealth said the rate reductions would mean an immediate saving of about $4 million a year to users of electricity in Chicago. The company said that while the consumers will benefit from this rate reduction, the company hopes that increased sales, stimulated by the rate cuts, would offset the loss of revenue to the company.

It is indeed refreshing to see this very large privately owned utility take the lead in bringing down the cost of living. I believe the Commonwealth Edison Co. deserves the highest commendation for this action.

I believe this Chicago-based, privately owned utility is giving full meaning to the principles of private enterprise, and the example set by Commonwealth Edison demonstrates the full scope and meaning of private enterprise.

This is a big gamble for Commonwealth Edison, but I think we can all agree that it is this type of leadership that has given strength to the concept of free enterprise as contrasted with the highly controlled doctrine of economic development preached by those who would seek to weaken the structure of the American capitalistic system.

I offer today, Mr. Speaker, a story on this subject which appeared last week in the Chicago Daily News and an editorial which appeared this morning in the Chicago Tribune.

The articles follow:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Feb. 6, 1962]

LOWER ELECTRIC BILLS

The Commonwealth Edison Co. and its suburban affiliate, the Public Service Co., have asked for permission to reduce the rates paid by those who use relatively large amounts of electricity and by those who use it for water and space heating. About a third of the 2 million customers would shave savings of about $4 million.

For years the peak demand for electricity was in the winter. In order to use its plant most efficiently, the company set about building up the summer demand. Now, thanks to air conditioning and refrigeration, the situation is reversed; to meet the summer demand, the company must maintain greater capacity than it needs in winter.

The company chairman, J. Harris Ward, believes that the lower rates will stimulate people to use more electricity, especially in winter, thereby offsetting the loss of revenue and at the same time promoting operating efficiency.

For the company, this is a gamble. So is almost every corporate decision to risk money in the hope of eventually earning more—including Commonwealth Edison's large investment in nuclear power. But collectively the public can't lose. If they think it is to their advantage to use more electricity, they will. If they don't, they will keep on using gas or oil or doing without whatever appliance they were thinking of getting. The company will then have to look for a new idea; in private industry a venture doesn't last very long unless it helps both the company and the customers.

This can't be said of the Government. There is no incentive in Washington to give up a program that doesn't work. Mistakes must be perpetuated if the politicians aren't to lose face and the payrollers aren't to lose jobs; and they will be perpetuated until the voters realize that as taxpayers and consumers they are footing the bills for programs which may at best be inefficient subsidies of favored groups and, at worst, totally wasteful.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Feb. 2, 1962]

EDISON CO. ASKS RATE CUTS—600,000 HERE WOULD BENEFIT

(By Horton Trautman)

Commonwealth Edison Co. and its Public Service Co. division asked Friday for authority to reduce electricity rates for more than 600,000 customers in the Chicago area.

In a petition filed with the Illinois Commerce Commission, Commonwealth said the rate reductions would mean an immediate loss of about $4 million a year in revenue.

But it said it hoped that increased sales stimulated by the rate cuts would offset the loss.

Commonwealth said the rate reductions would trim individual electric bills by amounts varying from a few cents to a few dollars, according to the season and the volume of electricity used.

The proposed rate reduction would directly affect all residential customers who use more than 350 kilowatt-hours of electricity in a month.

The company proposed that the rate be cut from the present 2.25 cents per kilowatt-hour over 350 to 2 cents.

Other reductions proposed included:

Reduce the charge for Public Service Co. served about space heating from 1.6 cents per kilowatt-hour to 1.5 cents.

Abandon separate meters for water heating service and reduce the rate for this service from 1.25 cents per kilowatt-hour to 1.05 cents.

Commonwealth Edison Co. and its Public Service Co. division has 1,900,000 customers in Chicago and northern Illinois.

The rate reductions, according to company officials, would not have much affect on the electricity bills of apartment dwellers.

The company said the rate reductions also were aimed at promoting the use of heavy load electric services such as water and space heating.

In this way, they said, they hoped to counterbalance the present "peaks and valleys" rate of electrical use that goes up with airconditioning in summer and declines in winter months.

Address by Gov. Edmund G. (Pat) Brown, Governor of the State of California, Before the League of California Cities Conference on Metropolitan Issues, at Sacramento, Calif., on February 2, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the text of an address by the distinguished Governor of my native State of California, Hon. Edmund G. (Pat) Brown, before the League of California Cities Conference on Metropolitan Issues on February 2, 1962. It so clearly depicts problems which the State of California faces in population and other strategic matters that I am sure, as rapidly growing California faces these problems, so, many other States face the same problem, even though all the same existing factors may not always be present:

ADDRESS BY GOV. EDMUND G. BROWN BEFORE LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES CONFERENCE ON METROPOLITAN ISSUES

A few weeks ago I was privileged to make an announcement of historic importance to the State of California. I announced that by the end of the present year, California would surpass New York as the most populous State in the Union.

As you might expect, widespread attention has been paid to California's new leadership. Some of you may have seen it reflected this week in the newspaper pictures of billboards recently put up in Iowa. They read: "There is no California. Stay in Iowa."

We know better. We know there is a California and it is gaining citizens at a rate of almost 1,700 every day. We know that our population, which has doubled every two decades, may well reach 30 million by 1980.

We know that we must provide for 200,000 new schoolchildren a year—or better than a new school every school day. And, as you well know, there are roads to build, water to convey, and essential services without end to provide.

We know, too, that we are in the midst of a massive swing to urbanization. Three quarters of our population is concentrated in less than 2 percent of the State's land area. And this trend will continue.

It is, of course, exciting and gratifying to lead the Nation in population. But for those of us in State government who are pledged to make "growth" mean "progress"—the leadership also means challenge.

Are we facing up to the effect of population growth and urbanization?

We must do so. We must indulge in no wishful thinking when we look around us—for this is what we see:

We see that the city streets and freeways are congested with vehicles.

We see that the air above our metropolitan centers is congested with air pollutants.

We see that much of our farmland is going haphazardly into subdivisions.

We see beaches and parks crowded with more and more people.

We see the world's greatest system of metropolitan freeways. Yet in 1900 a man could drive to work through one of our major cities in a horse and buggy faster than he can today in an automobile.

We see the world's finest housing in some of our metropolitan suburbs. Yet within the core cities, great numbers of our people are hemmed into racial ghettos that spawn crime and hopelessness.

We see—as the New York Times put it recently—that the city is constantly demolishing itself and increasingly devouring the men who build it.

Now, in some circles it is fashionable to hold the dark view—to cry "havoc." But I can tell you today that I strongly disagree with this hopeless passivity.

It is wrong to say that the results of human actions are beyond human control. It is right to find the practical, constructive, economically feasible proposals that will save our cities—and enrich them as centers of industry, culture, and family homes in the future.

I suggest no easy panaceas. We won't have the relatively simple task of those who drew lines across an empty landscape when they planned the dream city of Brasilia. Nor can we indulge in the luxury of bulldozing it all down and starting from scratch.

What I do suggest can be put very simply.

If growth is to mean progress—and not deterioration and decay—then we must meet it by effective planning and action. We must meet it soon. And we must meet it together with all the strength of our allied resources.

This brings me to a basic tenet of our philosophy of government in California about which I want to be very clear. I speak of home rule.

As a former district attorney, I am familiar with this principle at first hand. I have reason to know that it works.

As Governor, I have taken many actions which have directly affected the cities and counties. In every one of them, I have fully recognized the need to keep government within the reach of the people. I will continue to do so.

Local government can provide many services which closely affect every citizen: Police and fire protection, streets and parks, comfort and cleanliness. In short, most of the things that make a community progressive and pleasant.

But there are other challenges which we must meet by joining our efforts—and here I speak of the city, the county, the State, and the Federal Government.

I speak of transportation and rapid transit, water supply and flood control, air pollution, regional recreation, regional planning. All these transcend the jurisdictions of the several cities and counties.

I believe, too, that all levels of government recognize the nature of metropolitan problems.

Committees of the State legislature have studied them for many years.

Both this league and the county supervisors association have continually called for more effective plans and for action.

And I must commend, too, the work of my own commission on metropolitan area problems. This distinguished group released a report after 2 years of study. It generated new interest and awareness of metropolitan problems throughout the State.

Many of you know that Bud Carpenter served as a member of the commission. He was a most conscientious and cooperative adviser.

Bud did not concur in all the specific recommendations made by the commission. But he does agree that cities must play a key role in a coordinated, areawide attack on our statewide problems.

And all these groups have agreed on certain basic principles:

We must preserve the benefits of home rule within our urban areas. And, at the same time, we must organize all the forces of the community to correct the conditions which threaten the health and the life of metropolitan areas.

We can't correct them unless we marshal the vital resources of the entire metropolitan community—not only its financial resources, but its leadership and its public concern.

Now, let me speak of the role of the State—what we have done, what we hope you will do, and the goals we have set for the future.

First, water. With the approval of the $1.75 billion State water bond issue, we have started to build the Feather River project of the California water plan. This project will be the largest earth-filled dam in the world. And it will carry water 700 miles to the South—leaving new cities, and new wealth, in its wake.

Second, planning. The staff of the State office of planning is being augmented to facilitate progress on the State development plan. This will provide a framework within which all single-purpose plans for highways, water, recreation and conservation can be related one to the other.

We plan a series of local hearings to obtain the reactions of local officials and citizens to the proposed boundaries of major regions of the State in which future plans can be developed. When these have been designated, we will make them available to you for your own planning efforts.

Let me emphasize that this office was created by legislation which I signed in 1959. It has made a good beginning on one of the most important programs of government. And it has been responsible for administering more than $1.3 million in Federal planning assistance grants to more than 100 cities, and many counties, throughout the State.

I have been pleased to observe a quickening of interest in planning in recent months. We welcome this interest and want to encourage it.

Third, housing. I recently appointed an advisory commission on Housing. It will

study the need for various kinds of housing and home financing. Its report will be submitted to the legislature in 1963.

Fourth, transportation. A program for the development of a comprehensive statewide transportation plan is being prepared by the State department of public works. And we intend to pay close attention to the continuing need for mass rapid transit.

I am directing the State highway transportation agency to study ways and means whereby they can further help to expedite rapid transit.

Within the agency, we have assigned an official to give it special attention. He has been instructed to work closely with the Bay Area Rapid Transit District in San Francisco, the Metropolitan Transit Authority in Los Angeles, and other mass transit developments throughout the country.

These programs have run into obstacles and will face more in the future. But the State stands ready to consider their proposals and to give them every possible cooperative assistance.

When two great metroptolitan areas are the home for nearly two-thirds of our residents, they have a proper claim on the cooperative interest of the State.

I have supported the requests of the local districts for Federal help in acquiring mass rapid transit. And whatever the outcome, the State will stand ready to give what assistance it can.

A few weeks ago it was my privilege to take part in the preliminary drilling for a rapid transit system for Los Angeles. Before we have the final product, time will pass and money will be spent. But we will have it. And we will have it in San Francisco and wherever else it is needed.

Let me mention, too, that we will soon have a long-needed report from our committee on scenic highways. They will propose a statewide system of scenic routes to give enjoyment to our citizens and tourists and to preserve the beauties of our landscape. This will also yield economic benefits from tourists in scenic but underpopulated parts of our State.

Today I cannot speak of each metropolitan problem. But I want to emphasize that we must find agreement on the need for a regional approach to the problems—and the way to equip you with the tools to attack them in your own city halls.

When we speak of regional action, we should mean cooperative action.

We should mean the reasonable approach being taken, for example, by the association of bay area governments. Here, we see a successful attempt by regular agencies of Government to work together in tackling regional problems. They are taking on such matters as regional planning and recreation from the local point of view. And I can tell you that the State views such an organization as a partner.

For we are partners: I as Governor, and you as local public officials. We cannot solve any metropolitan problem working alone or at cross purposes. We must work together.

The State is well aware that you do have serious problems of your own.

We know that the revenue structure of the cities must be strengthened so you have the needed finances to meet such a challenge as urban congestion. We can solve this tough one only through cooperation.

And I think we must both work with the Federal Government to be sure that available dollars are spent with the maximum possible effect.

What else can we do in a program of cooperative action?

I think we should support the President's proposal for a Department of Urban Affairs. Such a department would extend our partnership and give you a new voice in the President's Cabinet—but in no sense would it weaken home rule.

I think we should be sure that this conference does not stop today. I will discuss with officials of the University of California the possibility of organizing a series of metropolitan area conferences throughout the State.

And I think we should take note, on the record, of the resistance of the radical right to any kind of regional organization. I have particular reference to the fate in 1961 of the proposal to form multipurpose metropolitan service districts.

That proposal was received with charges that it would subvert local government—but this was poppycock.

The particular law involved would be invoked solely at the discretion of the cities and counties. And the elected representatives of the cities and counties would be in charge of the district they themselves had formed.

In good conscience, we must meet the unfair charges with the truth. Those wedded to the status quo must not be allowed to impugn the patriotism of anyone who favors metropolitan organization. And they must be challenged to frank discussion of the substantive proposals for regional cooperation.

I may add that in 1963, I hope the legislature will again consider the multipurpose district bill presented last year. It is still potentially useful. It is still needed.

Let me emphasize, finally, that the metropolis—despite smog and congestion—is here to stay.

It is far from perfect, as the eloquent critics like Lewis Mumford point out. But it is the expression of our civilization.

Let us be sure that we are not expressing organized chaos. Let us be sure that the metropolis of 1980 is not an ugly, unfriendly, uninviting environment. Let us be sure that the cores of our cities do not continue to sicken. Let us not accept urban sprawl as inevitable.

Rather, let us organize and coordinate our activities so that our urban areas are good places to live, good places to work, good places to bring up children.

The way isn't easy. The problems are hard. But we will solve them as we will always solve them in a free country. Here, let me remind you of Winston Churchill's statement: "Democracy is the worst form of government except for all of the other systems that have been tried."

We are really concerned with the building and the strengthening of democracy when we strengthen our cities.

And remember this:

Unlike the East, which is suffering under a burden of obsolescence, California has the golden opportunity to build right the first time. We can make California's future environment what we want it to be.

And in our attack on metropolitan problems we have the same golden opportunity if we proceed without prejudice and with courage.

Thank you.

How To Understand Your Neighbors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most beloved of American humorists is Harry Golden, a delightful gentleman who lives in Charlotte, N.C., where he edits and publishes the Carolina Israelite. In the November 1961, issue of Pageant magazine his article entitled "How To Understand Your Neighbors," appeared. In it, Mr. Golden demonstrates his good commonsense and illustrates something that we can all profit by.

The article follows:

HOW TO UNDERSTAND YOUR NEIGHBORS

(By Harry Golden)

The obvious function of a society, wrote Samuel Butler, is to get along with itself. For so simple a statement, this remains a hard lesson for society to learn.

A friend once said to Charles Lamb, "Why do you dislike that man, you don't even know him?" Lamb replied, "And I don't want to know him for fear I may get to like him."

It should be perfectly clear to us from our experience throughout the world that the way to get along with others is to know them.

I hasten to add that this does not involve the violation of privacy. What it does involve is an understanding of the point of view of others: their ideas, and above all something of their aspirations.

A few months ago I gave the commencement speech at the Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School in Maryland. I told the 600 graduates that, "at this very moment millions of parents in Asia, Africa, and Europe have the same dreams for the welfare of their teenage sons and daughters as your parents here have for you; and if you understand that, you will have won a great victory both for yourself and for America."

In one of the large southern cities the high school for the white students has a linotype machine for those boys who would like to learn that highly technical trade. The high school for the Negro students does not have a linotype machine. When the white men discuss the race problem they talk about mongrelization and when the Negroes get together they talk about a linotype machine.

The secret in getting along with others is the realization that while you may be different, your interests are not. This is a principle outraged more than utilized.

When William J. Gaynor ran for mayor of New York City around the turn of the century, only one newspaper backed his candidacy—Joseph Pulitzer's New York World. (It was a three-cornered race. Gaynor was the Democratic—Tammany—candidate, Otto T. Bannard was the Republican, and publisher William Randolph Hearst ran on the Independent Party ticket.)

Arthur Brisbane, one of Hearst's editors, had a brilliant idea as the race grew hotter. He proposed to Pulitzer that the pro-Gaynor World run one column a day sympathetic to Hearst, and Hearst's Evening Journal run one column a day sympathetic to Gaynor.

Pulitzer agreed. He saw that this gambit would not only build circulation for both papers, but allow Gaynor additional publicity that he badly needed.

Pulitzer plastered the city with 6-foot posters announcing this campaign innovation.

Arthur Brisbane's articles in the World were so hot against Gaynor that after he was elected mayor of the city, Gaynor filed suit for libel.

Pulitzer handled the distressing matter beautifully: "Now the World is glad that it was the only paper in New York supporting Gaynor. Any man who can sue his only friend for libel is the kind of mayor we need. He will show the same courage in suing the corporations for delinquent franchise taxes which they have been avoiding for years. We need a man who is not afraid of lawsuits, not even against friends."

Mayor Gaynor was never noted as a man who got along with people and did not win

subsequent elections, good mayor though he was. He just didn't see—as one example—where his interest coincided with Pulitzer's, though indeed it did.

People have refused to get along with each other for so long that it is no longer a cause for despair, only wonder.

Chief among the reasons they don't is that they already believe they do. Those white men in the southern city quite truthfully would insist they have no malice in their hearts. They may rise to zealous heights against a nonexistent threat, but they never think of that segregated linotype machine.

It might seem at first that some of the ills in this world occur because we have too little communication with one another. But it is hard, nevertheless, to believe listening will solve these ills, particularly when love has not. We have some vague idea about loving others, not because they merit it, but because love itself is supposed to be a good thing. The love of our fellow man is then supposed to pay off in large premiums, but love has never really been attractive as an investment. Because it is so unattractive, we have substituted for love concepts like "togetherness."

Anyone who has lived on the Lower East Side of New York or in a tar paper shack in South Carolina knows the disadvantages of togetherness. Togetherness means sleeping with your brothers on the fire escape on a hot July night or squeezing into the cool milk porch—that's togetherness.

But togetherness has brought us the Sunday afternoon barbecue presided over by father in a chef's hat rather than increased attendance at school board meetings; it has brought us the joys of the tenement beer party rather than an effective slum clearance program; and it has led editors, in their attempt to show the new value of togetherness, to ignore the external and internal problems that send so many nice Americans to the analyst's couch.

The problems of these Americans involve the very tedium of togetherness because formulas are not working out according to plan. The good jobs, the wonderful gadgets and appliances, the beautiful highways, the millions of cars, the accumulation of possessions and other wealth—all of it seems only to increase the tension and heighten the fear. We have not resolved the most pressing problems of our generation, to find some balance between the miracle of science and the greater miracle of human kindness.

In the 1920's, I remember, Henry L. Mencken was the great iconoclast and an object of veneration. He used to make us laugh at the "yahoo"—the semiliterate southerner who ran into the woods shouting, "Jesus saves."

What Mencken did not realize was that this was a most profound expression of protest; protest against feudalism and poverty in the only way this southerner could express himself—through his faith.

A few years later, when the great depression engulfed America, most of us realized we did not have a much better protest to utter. Had we not laughed with Mencken but listened to the "yahoo" we might have alleviated some of our subsequent sufferings.

No society or historical sect has ever been without a formula for insuring it will get along with itself.

Perhaps the Hebrews offered the first most succinct one: "Do not do unto others as you would not have others do unto you," which the Christians, with characteristic clarity, reduced to: "Do unto others as you would have others do unto you."

Certainly I have no better formulation to offer. But much depends upon its interpretation. It can mean "equal justice under law," or it can mean the Orwellian dictum "All animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others."

It depends on how many people you want to get along with—everybody or a special few. If a special few, I suggest you have wasted your time reading this article; if everybody, I suggest you remember you are a part of society—and society is derived from the Latin noun "socius," which means "partner."

And it is really not hard to act accordingly.

One Hundred Billion Dollar-Plus Budgets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Derrick Oil City-Franklin-Clarion, Pa., on February 3, 1962:

ONE HUNDRED BILLION DOLLAR-PLUS BUDGET

Budget Director Bell certainly was on safe ground the other day when he remarked that "none of us should be surprised" when the Federal budget tops $100 billion in a few years' time.

At the rate we're going, the only surprise would come if the budget were held under the $100 billion mark. At the figure of $92.5 billion set by President Kennedy for fiscal 1963, the budget will be nearly $30 billion higher than it was for so recent a year as 1955. It will be $63 billion higher than in fiscal 1940.

While not surprising, there certainly is a disconcerting fact about these leaping budgets. And that is the complacency with which they are viewed by the bureaucratic spenders in Washington. They continue to view the uninhibited budget growth with continued deficits, mounting debt, and increasing drain upon the economy's productive resources as quite all right.

It's significant to note, however, that many economists are warning that a budget taking one-fourth of the national income is imperiling the Nation's economic health. And right now, the combination of local, State and Federal spending is above that danger line.

Rather than complacency, there should be real concern about the massive growth in government spending. In 26 of the last 31 years, the Federal Government has operated in the red. There was a $3.9 billion deficit last year. The deficit this year will be approximately twice that figure. And it's almost certain there will be another deficit next year.

The Federal debt is now approaching the $298 billion mark. It will go beyond $300 billion this year. That it will go still higher under present spending policies is indicated by the fact that the administration has asked Congress to hike the legal debt limit to $308 billion.

Assuredly the question must arise as to how much longer we can go on spending beyond our means and increasing the debt before the financial roof caves in. Of course, there'll be no surprise at that either unless some semblance of stability is implanted into the fiscal affairs of government.

Dedication of New Post Office at Newry, Blair County, Pa., February 3, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on February 3, 1962, a new post office was dedicated at Newry, Pa., in my congressional district, at which time I was pleased to deliver the following address which, under leave granted, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

It is pleasing to participate in this dedication program, since it is a memorable occasion in the history of the Borough of Newry.

The post office we are dedicating today is evidence of the progress of a postal modernization program inaugurated in 1953 that promises to revolutionize the operations of this indispensable American institution.

At that time it was found that 12,000 of the Nation's 36,000 post offices indicated the need for modernization or replacement because of lack of space or outmoded quarters and equipment.

Since Newry was among the communities in need of modern postal facilities, it was pleasing to me to be able to announce on April 29, 1960, that a new post office had been authorized for this community, in keeping with the postal modernization program.

This modern post office building was constructed under the Post Office Department's commercial leasing program, which means its owner will pay county, borough, and school taxes on it the same as other Newry taxpayers.

This modern post office provides the residents of Newry with the latest in modern postal improvements, assuring patrons more convenient mail service, as well as providing adequate facilities and improved working conditions for Postmaster E. J. Miller and those who assist him.

On this occasion it is appropriate to recall that Williamsburg is the only town in Blair County older than Newry.

Founded in 1795 by Patrick Cassidy, a native of Newry, Ireland, this community, which was incorporated as a borough in 1876, has nurtured generations of God-fearing men and women whose spiritual roots were imbedded in various religious faiths.

Their intense love of country is recorded in the history of the community as evidenced by the patriotic service of Newry's manhood and womanhood in every national emergency.

This display of patriotism by every generation recalls to mind the stirring example set by Newry's founder, Patrick Cassidy, who fought on the side of the colonists in the American Revolution and thus aided in securing for posterity our cherished ideals of liberty and freedom.

In dwelling briefly on the history of the postal service in Blair County, we are reminded that in 1846, when Blair County was formed from parts of Huntingdon and Bedford Counties, there were 13 post offices, including Newry, within its borders.

From 1846 to 1917, 44 additional post offices were established, bringing the total to 57 offices.

In 1962 or 106 years after the founding of Blair County, due to the establishment of rural delivery service and the consolidation or abolishment of post offices, the number of offices has been reduced to 15.

It is significant to state that in 1846 the original 13 post offices in Blair County served an estimated population of about 16,000.

Today, after 106 years of its existence, Blair County has a total population of 137,270.

Despite the amazing growth of the postal service, coupled with the expansion of its facilities which has brought increased demand for postal service, the 15 post offices provide efficient daily service for the entire population of the county.

Speaking of the increased demand for modern postal facilities, it is realized that exciting things are happening in the field of communications.

In the not too distant future instantaneous transmission of messages and pictures will be possible on an international scale.

Postal research is discovering new ways to apply recent technological breakthroughs in the field of space communications to our postal operations to make its service more useful and efficient.

Postal improvement has been a continuing process since the establishment of the American postal service.

The quality and extent of postal operations in the United States has grown—as our country has increased in size, population, and wealth.

Our postal system, which began with only 75 post offices and less than 2,000 miles of post roads to serve an area of some 868,000 square miles, has become a large and complex operation.

The U.S. postal service now handles over 63 billion pieces of mail and is the largest single communications system in the world.

The area served now extends beyond the boundaries of the North American Continent to include the Hawaiian and other islands in the Pacific.

The number of people who depend on this great service for the majority of their written communications has grown from a mere 4 million in 1790 to 185 million.

Throughout our history the post office has been the mainstay of our system of communications despite the introduction of a number of other media such as the telephone, the telegraph, the radio, and the television.

It has been able to retain this position by continually improving its modes of transport and expanding its operations to keep abreast of the increases in demand for its services.

We have now entered a new era in transportation and communications.

To meet the challenge of the space age our postal service is currently engaged in a research and modernization program that will have far-reaching effects on mail service in the next decade.

By 1970 our postal system will probably be using two completely new concepts of mail transmission.

Experimental use of both of these has proven they are technically practicable, but refinements are needed to make them economically feasible.

One of these involves the use of guided missiles to transport mail to areas not now readily accessible by conventional modes of transportation and communication.

The first successful mail delivery based on rockets and missiles was made in June 1959, with a Regulus missile launched from a submarine, a hundred miles off the coast of Florida.

The other recent major technological breakthrough in mail transmission is based on the use of space satellites.

A worldwide communications network linked by space satellites orbiting thousands of miles above the earth will make revolutionary changes in many forms of communications, including the postal system, possible within the next 5 or 10 years.

These satellites will act as microwave relay stations to serve as channels for teletype, telephone, radio, and television.

Mail transmission that utilizes this same principle is currently under study at the Post Office Department Laboratory.

The system developed to date involves converting written messages into electronic impulses, scrambling them for privacy, and relaying them by microwave to another post office.

When the satellite communications network is put into space this system of instantaneous electronic transmission will make it possible to send written messages across oceans and continents within minutes instead of days.

Truly the new post office structure we are dedicating today is an excellent symbol of the postal progress that is still underway.

This new building stands as a tribute to the constant process of postal advancement and to our country's scientific and economic achievements that make it possible.

Therefore, I wish to congratulate Postmaster E. J. Miller and those who assist him, as well as borough officials and businessmen, on this admirable addition to the area's postal facilities.

I wish to congratulate Mr. Kenneth Claar, of East Freedom, who was successful in obtaining the contract to construct and lease this new and modern post office building.

In addition I warmly comemnd the Newry Lions Club for sponsoring this dedication program and the businessmen and residents who aided the sponsors.

As a Member of of Congress interested in providing adequate postal service through modern facilities, I am pleased to have been invited to join with you in dedicating your new and modern post office.

The Borough of Newry has gained a valuable and attractive asset and one that reflects credit on this community.

The New Industrial Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an excellent editorial published on February 3, 1962, in the Boston Globe. We are currently experiencing a new industrial revolution. One of the byproducts of rapid technological advance, described by such terms as "automation" and "cybernetics," is a growing hard-core unemployment among lower skilled workers.

The recent House Republican policy committee study on "Employment in the Dynamic American Economy" suggested a number of measures to prevent structural and frictional unemployment. A major step in this direction is the retraining of workers in the skills of the future. The Keynesian approach of huge Government deficits to raise total aggregate demand is not adequate to meet the new problems of unemployment.

It is important to note that automation increases jobs though many people believe the reverse to be true. But the job-creating effect of automation does not occur automatically and painlessly. Those with simple skills, who lose out for a time to the machines, usually cannot be hired again without improving and upgrading their labor. The hard realities of retraining must be recognized. I commend this enlightening editorial to your serious attention:

A NEW INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

If there is a constant running through human affairs, and many believe there is, the man who designed the first wheel more than likely crushed his foot beneath it before he learned to ride. So it was with the first industrial revolution. So now with automation. This time, at least, man is conscious that he is grappling with a Frankenstein monster which he must bend to his will before it smashes his maker.

One of the problems is the growing hard-core unemployment among unskilled and semiskilled workers. Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg, in his appearance before Congress, emphasized that although overall unemployment is at its lowest rate in 16 months, 5.8 percent, the number of persons unemployed for 4 months or more has not dropped.

This phenomenon, a dangerous one, is a result of automation.

The word "automation" was coined not two decades ago by a student at the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration; the word "cybernetics" 10 years ago by a professor of Masachusetts Institute of Technology. The first has been defined as the art of controlling machines by other machines. The second has been defined by its inventor, Norbert Wiener, as the science of communications and control in men and machines.

The first pertains to technology; the second to pure science. Both have become of immense importance to the economies of Europe and the United States and in the lives of their working peoples. In World War II, both were vital to the survival of freedom. Now they threaten, by prodigious growth in their applications to production and business, to shackle the economy and smite the workers.

Properly managed, says Congressman ELMER J. HOLLAND, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, chairman of the Subcommittee on Unemployment and the Impact of Automation, they can open unbelievable vistas for the peoples of the world.

Recently a new warning was sounded, emphasizing the importance of the next 20 years in the struggle between men and machines. Donald N. Michael, a director of the Peace Research Institute in Washington, is author of "Cybernation: The Silent Conquest," a study published by the Fund for the Republic, source of many brilliant studies on domestic problems in the United States.

He warns that the initial stages of the struggle are upon us. The chief social problem resulting from automation is the displacement of the unskilled worker and his growing restlessness. In the long run, he holds, automation will not cause unemployment but will upgrade unskilled workers to skilled jobs, and provide better living.

The upgrading of workers, however, is falling fast behind the layoffs of workers in our changing technology. More and more men are finding themselves out of work and more of them are being classified as "long-term" unemployed. The special committee on unemployment has filed a bill aimed at offsetting the mounting costs of growing unemployment among the unskilled.

The bill provides for a Federal program for the training of long-term unemployed who presently are not permitted to take retraining courses while receiving unemployment compensation. Under its terms, the Federal Government would continue the State payments at the end of their customary expiration, at the same time providing vocational training not to exceed 52 weeks. The skills taught would be aimed at the increasing skilled-job opportunities. The bill offers a wise approach to the cure of an economic illness in a nation otherwise prosperous.

Why an Urban Affairs Department?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, a very fine and learned gentleman residing in the 10th Congressional District of Virginia has brought to my attention an editorial appearing in the Wall Street Journal on Wednesday, January 31.

The gentleman, Mr. Joseph D. Houghton, of Arlington, in a brief note suggesting that this editorial be included in the RECORD, commented further on the "plain foolishness" inherent in the creation of a new Department of Urban Affairs, and concluded with a request for my views on the subject as his Representative in Congress.

To Mr. Houghton, and to my colleagues in both House and Senate, may I state simply and without equivocation that I concur with the opinion expressed in this editorial and I commend it to my colleagues for their careful consideration:

WHY AN URBAN AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT?

A lot more heat than light is being generated around the administration's efforts to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. The President, now that the House Rules Committee has pigeonholed a bill to create the new agency, is trying to win his point by setting up the Department by Executive decree. So it is a good time to review just what this program involves and to see what its implications are.

The proposal provides for transfering to a new Cabinet-level department the functions of many existing Federal housing agencies. The Secretary would be charged with studying the Nation's housing problems and development of urban communities, advising the President, and providing leadership, technical assistance, and information to State and local governments.

Proponents of the plan themselves have advanced, unintentionally, persuasive reasons why it is neither desirable nor necessary. For they have said again and again that the plan would create no new Federal programs nor would it alter substantially existing laws on Federal housing and urban development. If they is so, as the National Association of Manufacturers and others have observed, there surely is no crying need for a whole new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

But a much more likely prospect is that the proposed Department would actually be a device by which the Federal Government could extend and consolidate control over its far-flung housing and urban redevelopment projects, at the expense of urban areas. Since the plan defines an urban area as a city or township of any size, whether incorporated or unincorporated, it would cover a pretty broad territory.

The President himself hinted at the possible extent of this Department's invasion of localities when, commenting on the Rules Committee action, he referred to the administration's "concern for some effective management and responsibility of the problems of two-thirds of our population who live in cities."

The Government might well be concerned. For just such massive intrusions into municipal affairs as a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would be empowered to make have helped to contribute to the urban mismanagement and irresponsibility with which many cities are well acquainted. Too often political machines have become involved with millions of dollars of construction contracts with scandalous results. Nor is the profligate example of the Government itself one that suggests prudent management to municipal governments.

What the cities need far more urgently than Federal concern for their failings is a hard look by their own administrators and citizens at what Federal housing programs already are doing to them. What is happening as the result of paper plans imposed upon them from Washington whether relevant to local problems and conditions or not? What has been the effect of municipal rubber-stamping of Federal standards and specifications, imposed under the threat of withdrawal of Federal funds? What has been the effect on cities of swallowing projects which in the absence of local control had been better not begun at all?

That sort of realistic appraisal is the last thing the localities can expect from the Federal Government. And it surely would not come from a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. What would inevitably come are still more and more elaborate paper plans, more Federal standards and specifications, more Federal say-so about where, how and for what the taxpayers' dollars are used. The only logical end to all this is complete abdication of municipal control over urban development.

It may be vain to expect that the Federal housing and urban improvement juggernaut as it now exists can be rolled back. But its further invasion, under the banner of a new Cabinet-rank department, can be checked. Now that the President, in a message yesterday, has notified Congress he is setting up the Department, the House or Senate has 60 days in which to reject it. On its merits alone, rejection is what it deserves.

Dorothy Head Knode on U.S. Net Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, sporting events are most valuable in the increasing efforts to create better international understanding. The niece of one of my constituents, Mrs. Dorothy Head Knode, has won honors for herself and has also made a valuable contribution to international good will.

Mrs. Knode has recently won recognition for the excellence of her participation in the Bermuda Lawn Tennis Club's invitational tournament and the Coral Beach competition. This was a culmination of 15 years of active and successful competition in tennis tournaments throughout the world.

Now Mrs. Knode is returning to her temporary home in Tokyo. No doubt she will continue her great interest in tennis and in being a sports ambassador of international harmony and good will.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD an account of her visit to the United States and Alameda, Calif., as recorded in the Alameda Times Star of recent date:

DOROTHY HEAD KNODE ON U.S. NET VISIT

Tennis players, like doctors and old soldiers, never retire.

Old soldiers, as the barracks ballad goes, just fade away.

Doctors are always called back into service because an old friend is sick or the daughter of one of his favorite patients is about to have a baby.

When tennis players feel the slowing process creeping into their game, bravely announce their retirement from tournament competition.

But no matter where they go in the world, or what they do there is tennis—and a tournament—so they are soon again batting the bouncing ball with gut-laced racquet.

A year after she won the 1960 National Clay Court championship for the second time, and her husband was transferred to Tokyo, Mrs. Donald P. Knode, known to her Alameda friends as Dottie Head, announced her retirement from the net sport.

But the lure was too great to chop off with one stroke, and the isolation from tournament competition was so compelling she returned from Japan to win the women's singles and doubles titles in the Bermuda Lawn Tennis Club's invitational tournament and the Coral Beach competition recently.

Now on her way back to Tokyo, Mrs. Knode plans to visit Dr. and Mrs. J. C. Knode, 953 Coast Boulevard, La Jolla, Calif., her father and mother-in-law, and Mr. and Mrs. L. C. Farrer, 1815 Harvard Drive.

Mrs. Knode, now the mother of two—7-year-old Karen, and Kim Brett, born on June 15—will soon be playing back in Tokyo.

Highlight of the noncompetitive year for Mrs. Knode was the presentation of the Marlboro award for the 15 seasons of good will she created for America on her tennis travels around the world.

In the story announcing the presentation of the award in a three-page spread, including pictures of her career highlights. Tennis World, the international net magazine, described Dorothy as follows:

"During her 15 years of tennis travels, Dorothy 'Little Flower' Knode has been an American ambassador of good will as well as an international tennis star. The dilemmas of the tennis player abroad are comparable to those of the American Ambassador to the Congo. They include the rewards of diplomatic dinners (Dottie has been feted by a king and a maharajah), the penalties of recall (the USLTA once insisted that she return to the States immediately), the international crises (during a USO tour, a well-meaning private sat on her glasses and broke them, thus rendering her helpless at net for 4 days), the honors bestowed (she battled the intricacies of the U.S. Wightman Cup team), the diplomatic niceties (she battled the intricacies of Turkish grammar for over a year when she was an Istanbul housewife), the art of conducting negotiations with foreign powers (she arranged her tournament itineraries with skill and tact), and the entertaining of visiting plenipotentiaries (dozens of players have been hosted by the Knodes, including the entire British Wightman Cup team).

"Throughout her career in the Foreign Service, Dottie served (no pun intended) with modesty, warmth, and dignity. She never performed ignobly on or off the court and she was never guilty of an unsportsmanlike or unkind deed. As a successful ambassador, now retired from active duty, she made a hundred friends throughout the world."

Changes in Atlantic County, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the New Jersey seashore has attracted many visitors for many years for many reasons. We of the Garden State are proud that this great tourist attraction has given so much enjoyment to so many persons.

Within the past few months we have found that the area around Atlantic City has become a new center for our retired citizens. The statistics show that 22,548 persons of the 160,800 population of Atlantic County are 65 or over. Only the Tampa and St. Petersburg metropolitan area in Florida has a greater percentage of senior citizens. The 1960 census showed that almost one out of every seven persons in Atlantic County was 65 years or older.

This great influx has been caused by many reasons. It will probably become greater as the years go by, and new adjustments in the social structure will be made. These changes have already started in Atlantic County, as they have in many individual municipalities of New Jersey and other States. All our citizens are preparing for these changes, not only those elderly citizens directly affected by them. It was my good fortune last October to conduct two hearings of a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Aging, and I received many heartwarming descriptions of community response to the new and growing needs of our elderly citizens.

The Atlantic County situation is of particular interest. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two articles and an editorial describing the changes in the county and the many ways in which citizens and community leaders are responding to that change. One article is from the January 22 edition of the Atlantic City Press; an editorial from the January 23 edition of the same newspaper is also included. The final article is from the February-March issue of Modern Maturity, a magazine published by the American Association of Retired Persons.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMEMBER THEIR SUMMERS: WHY DO OLD FOLKS RETIRE TO RESORT?

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The 1960 census showed that the Atlantic City area had the Nation's second highest percentage of residents over 65. AP's Atlantic City correspondent, Dorman Cordell, talked with these senior citizens about their lives in the resort. Here is their story.)

(By Dorman Cordell)

"You go out, you sit around, or you walk, you eat, you sleep—it's the same thing every day," the white-haired widow said in a soft voice with a tone of resignation.

"But it's better than Philadelphia. Here you can get the sunshine and the fresh air. And in the city, people wonder if you're crazy if you take a walk every day."

The widow sat looking out on the deserted winter beach from a lounge on the city-owned Garden Pier. Others like her, elderly men and women, occupied the other chairs in the lounge, talking together or reading or just sitting.

In an adjoining game room, 20 or 30 elderly men played checkers, chess, and dominoes. The buzz of quiet conversation filled both rooms.

There are hundreds like them—people over 65 years old who have decided to spend their retirement years here. Their number becomes especially evident when the resort crowds of summer leave.

The 1960 census showed that almost one out of every seven persons in Atlantic County, which includes Atlantic City and is suburbs, was over 65.

FOURTEEN PERCENT OVER 65

Of a population of 160,880 in the county, 22,548, or 14 percent, were over 65. The only metropolitan area with a higher percentage was Tampa-St. Petersburg, Fla., with 17 percent.

The older people here usually talk freely about their lives and their problems, but many of them prefer not to give their names.

Most of the elderly group come from either Philadelphia, 60 miles away, or New York, 120 miles away. That's one reason they come here. Many of them have been here before for summer vacations and are familiar with Atlantic City.

And since the larger cities are near, they are closer to relatives than they would be in Florida or other places with warmer climates than New Jersey.

"It's 10° warmer here most of the time in the winter than it is in Pennsylvania," one woman said. "I can tell the difference, too."

"I went to St. Petersburg once after my husband died," said the white-haired widow from Philadelphia. "But I thought there were too many bugs, so I came back and came here."

LIKE BOARDWALK

Ask almost any retired person why he came to Atlantic City, and he will mention the boardwalk, which stretches for 7 miles along the beach. Elderly people like it because there are no cars and trucks to dodge and because benches are scattered along its length.

Except on the coldest days, they fill the benches.

"You've got to remember that most of us live on small pensions, or social security, or maybe from savings," said one woman. "The place where I live is just one small room. That's all I can afford, and there's nothing to make you want to stay in it when you can get out.

"I think most of us live about like that. That's why we like the boardwalk. It gives us some place to go."

Most of the old people have little else to do. "You know they won't hire anybody as old as us to work when even some young people can't get jobs now," the woman said.

However, some find other things to do. "You're all right as long as you have a hobby, I say," Mrs. Irene Hughes of Philadelphia said, "Mine is autographs. I started with Valentino's (the late motion picture star Rudolph Valentino) and now I've got 9,000 of them. I'm 77 now and I haven't quit yet."

Morris Couf, a grocer from Atlantic City who retired in his hometown, said "Golden Age Clubs" are popular. Atlantic City has several of them. Couf said he belongs to one with about 500 members which meets on Tuesdays for entertainment and on Thursdays for a social gathering.

But a woman who sat with a book in her lap said, "Those Golden Age Club people are too lively for a lot of us. Some of them are livelier than people a lot younger."

Irving Spivack, director of the Federation of Jewish Charities which works closely with the problems of the aged, said he feels the resources offered by this group are overlooked.

ASSET TO AREA

"These people, if they're properly approached, could be an asset to the community," Spivack said. "They offer brain power and a history of leadership and success."

Spivack said the elderly offer economic advantages, too. "Today, retired people often are those who have considerable economic assets," he said. "They contribute to the economy of the county."

The Social Security Administration alone reports payments of $18 million a year in Atlantic County, most of it in retirement benefits.

Money isn't everything, however. "Some of the hotels don't like to have too many old people," said a 70-year-old woman who gave her age but not her name. "They feel it creates an atmosphere that drives off younger people."

City officials say and do little either to discourage or encourage the influx of the elderly, except to mention occasionally that more housing for them is needed. The rooms on the pier and a day center at a school were established at the instigation of clubs and charitable organizations.

But still the elderly come. The percentage of them in the population has increased steadily for several years. Spivack predicts the increase will continue.

"Older people seem to gravitate naturally toward places where other older people are," he said.

SENIORS ACTIVE IN ATLANTIC CITY

The Zonta Club of Atlantic City area, after being in existence for 2 years, appointed a committee to search for a project which would be a real service to their community. They decided that in this area where many retired persons come to live, there was a need to do something for those lonely people to become acquaninted with each other. So the first Golden Age Club in Atlantic City was formed.

As Zonta's first Golden Age Club grew, they took a survey to find out just what their members liked to do most. They found they liked to travel, to dance, to play cards, to create things with their hands, to sing because they all love music, but most of all to be accepted back into society and be part of their community. They wanted to be busy. Most of them were accustomed to working and the long leisure hours seemed to become a burden for them. We decided that these folks could be a real service to their community by doing things for others.

A number of women liked to knit and crochet so the Zonta Club supplied them with wool and asked them to make afghan squares and every few weeks they brought them in and sewed them together to make either full or lap size afghans, which they distributed to wheel chair and bedfast Golden Agers in hospitals, nursing homes, old age homes, chronically ill hospitals, or wherever they hear of a Golden Ager who can use one.

Through a special arrangement with the public library, the librarian kept them sup-

plied with books and the Golden Agers have appointed a sunshine committee who take turns bringing books and reading to persons who are shut-ins in the entire community.

Through the guidance of the Zonta Club these folks learned to develop their talents by creating and making all types of articles for sale. These were sold in a loaned store on the boardwalk. The money was used for their traveling project, which enables the entire group to take trips together to interesting places which they could not do by themselves.

Twice the Golden Agers have held a covered-dish luncheon. Each member prepares her specialty dish and the public is invited. The proceeds from these affairs were used to buy wheelchairs, hospital beds, exercise bicycles, etc. for any Golden Agers who are chronically ill and need them but cannot afford to purchase or rent them.

They also decided to have an antique show and all the members dug up something that was old and had some kind of history behind the article. They charged 50 cents admission and the money was used to establish a fund which is used for Golden-Agers who need help from time to time. Those in need apply to a chairman and a committee discusses it privately so no other members know anything about it, and then a loan is made to the person. They pay it back just as they can afford it.

Any holidays such as Easter, Thanksgiving, and Christmas, a telephone committee contacts all the Golden-Agers in the area to see that no Golden-Ager has dinner alone. The last meeting of the club before Christmas, every member either donated in cash or brought some type of food, and 10 baskets were delivered to Golden-Agers who must live on limited income and maybe would not be able to have the little extras they might like to have for the holidays.

These folks are very thorough and they make sure every detail is carried out. If a member misses a meeting because of illness, they immediately get their telephone committee into action and within a day everyone is ready to help in any way they are capable. One member recently needed blood and it was announced at a meeting. The next day 37 Golden-Agers applied to build the blood bank in case any other Golden-Agers should need it.

This group ranges in age from 60 to 96 years old—both men and women. They come to the meetings from towns within a radius of 30 miles.

Because of the need of some of these folks for additional income, a Golden Age Employment Service was established and an ad was placed in the local daily paper stating that this service had a 24-hour-a-day telephone service. This has produced wonderful results. Many members who are able and wanted to work, have found steady and part-time employment which has helped to supplement their limited incomes. They have been placed in positions as: practical nurses, companions, waitresses, cashiers, baby sitters, watchmen, maintenance men, part-time clerks, accountants, carpenters, etc. Some of the members who had no families and lived alone, have been placed in permanent homes as housekeepers, governesses, children's nurses, etc., as the result of this ad.

The theaters give the Golden-Agers a special rate of 50 cents rather than the usual price of $1.25. Each member is given a movie card with their name, address, and picture of themselves, which serves as an identification card for them.

Every special day such as Valentine's Day, St. Patrick's Day, Lincoln and Washington's birthdays, Columbus Day, Mother's Day, Father's Day and all other holidays, a party is held and the ways and means committee prepares decorations and refreshments especially for the occasion. The last Wednesday of each month they have a birthday party with a huge birthday cake, ice cream, and all the trimmings for all the members who have birthdays during that particular month.

They are firm believers in old-fashioned hospitality and on several occasions have entertained other Golden Age groups from the surrounding area.

The Golden-Agers have helped on the Cerebral Palsy, March of Dimes, Heart, and Cancer Fund drives by sitting at the booths in the street, in the banks, the post office and wherever they are needed. They have been ready and willing to help with any worthwhile project at any time.

Their goal, in the not too distant future, is to have a modern housing project for these people—near enough to all the activities the community offers—with a large enough Golden Age Center where these folks can meet and participate in their hobbies and talents such as art, crafts of all kinds, knowledge, sports, and various social activities.

MORE FACILITIES NEEDED FOR THE ELDERLY

Thought should be given to housing for the elderly in considering future redevelopment projects contemplated under Atlantic City's master plan.

The resort holds considerable allure for senior citizens, as evidenced by census figures showing one out of every seven persons in the area is over 65. Only metropolitan area with a higher concentration of elderly is the Tampa-St. Petersburg, Fla., region.

An Associated Press writer who interview some of the local oldsters found their preference for Atlantic City was due to number of reasons. It afforded them climatic advantages, a boardwalk on which they could stroll without traffic dangers, and proximity to relatives in nearby cities.

His story appeared in the Press the other day and was made available to AP papers in New Jersey, New York City, and Philadelphia. Obviously greater numbers of elderly could be attracted to the city if more attention was paid to their recreational and social opportunities, and to adequate housing at moderate rentals.

Among special features recommended in residential accommodations for the elderly are the absence of any need for climbing stairs, level thresholds to guard against tripping, doors wide enough to allow easy passage for a person using a wheelchair or crutches, floors of nonskid material. Shelves or cupboards should be at levels that do not require stretching, climbing or bending low. Bathrooms should be equipped with grab bars, and all fixtures such as towel and shower curtain rods should be capable of supporting the human frame.

An old person's need of privacy, of a chance to "be himself" and choose his own mode of living, while at the same time maintaining normal family and social contacts, has come to be generally recognized. The assumption that most old people want to spend their time "sitting in the sun" is a notion that is rapidly being discarded. The opinion is growing that most people are more contented if they remain in, or near their home cities after retirement and have opportunity for participation in formal or informal organizations of the community.

The oldsters with their savings and retirement incomes exert a marked stabilizing influence on the year-around economy of the resort. More should be done to provide facilities that will encourage them to settle here.

Setting the Record Straight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a letter which I have written to the national commander of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., regarding a memorandum which he circulated to Members of the House about a bill 9923, which I introduced on January 26, 1962, "by request." I think it is important that this letter be printed in the RECORD to correct the commander's erroneous belief that this bill was introduced at the request of the American Legion and also to correct his erroneous belief that a bill introduced "by request" necessarily reflects the views of its author.

My letter of February 1, 1962, follows:

FEBRUARY 1, 1962.

Mr. JOHN BASHARA, Sr.,
National Commander, Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., Washington, D.C.

DEAR COMMANDER BASHARA: Yesterday an employee of your organization hand delivered to my office a memorandum addressed to "Congressmen" dated January 31, 1962. This memorandum referred to H.R. 9923, which I introduced on January 26, 1962, and made the following statement:

"Congressman OLIN E. TEAGUE has introduced H.R. 9923, which will amend 86-211, sections 521 and 541, title 38. He has increased income limitations in some scales and reduced the pension in other groups. It is interesting to note, that with all the propaganda by veterans' organizations like the American Legion and others regarding providing for the needy veteran, there is no increase for the veteran or widow who are in the $0 to $600 class. They are supposed to be the group placed in the most needy class but they have been overlooked."

In addition to the memorandum referred to above, news items appeared in the National Tribune which are based, apparently, on information furnished by your organization.

You seem to be under the impression that I am sponsoring H.R. 9923. Undoubtedly you fail to understand the procedure of introduction of legislation "by request." I introduced H.R. 9923 at the request of AMVETS. The American Legion had nothing to do with this bill and I am personally critical of the bill for the reasons you outline; namely, that it is devoted chiefly to raising income limits rather than helping those who need help the most.

As chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs I have introduced 36 bills for various individuals and organizations. I do not agree with many of these bills. I do follow the procedure followed by most chairmen, however, of introducing bills "by request" in order that a group or individual can have its bill printed and brought before the Congress. Your assumption that this bill is my bill and represents my views is in error and thus has led you to write a letter to Members of Congress based on these erroneous assumptions.

Very truly yours,

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman.

Candid Congressman Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch in my congressional district is the home base of one of the country's finest newspaper columnists. Flattery will get me nowhere with this gentleman of the press, but I do feel that Charles McDowell, in taking a lighter-than-air approach to the issues of the day, makes a great deal more sense than many of our weightier-than-air pundits. For my frustrated colleagues, who have been wanting to make a speech of this kind for a long, long time, I commend a recent McDowell column entitled "Candid Congressman Speaks." Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert it for your pleasure:

CANDID CONGRESSMAN SPEAKS

(By Charles McDowell)

A mythical fellow known to us as the candid Congressman made a mythical speech the other night in his home district, and the mythical text follows:

Frineds, enemies, and and independents, I shall begin by thanking the mayor for that thorough introduction. As a man who "needs no introduction," to quote the mayor's felicitous phrase when he began his oratorical flight 13 minutes ago, I can't help wondering what the mayor would do for a man who did need an introduction.

If I am as great a statesman as the mayor said I am, I also wonder why he has been unwilling to do any real work in my behalf in my last two campaigns, but never mind.

It is a middling pleasure to be here.

Without straining, I can think of several places I would rather be but Washington is no bed of roses either, I console myself with that thought.

Surely everyone knows I didn't come here for the joy of eating a hotel meal or listening to the mayor be alliterative. It is too early to report sensibly on what is going on in the new session of Congress, and heaven knows I am not interested in putting myself on the record yet on the hot issues.

I want to leave town as I came—on the train, not riding on a rail with feathers in my hair.

Frankly, I am here because I hope to be reelected this fall, and this dinner is part of the ritual. If I can catch the mayor after dinner, while he is still floating on the updraft of his oratory, maybe I can get him committed to do some work in the campaign.

My conscience hurts at being away from Washington now because my committee is starting on some important work that most of you wouldn't understand. I hope you wouldn't, anyway, because I have to do a lot of compromising on that committee, and constituents tend not to approve of compromise.

Most constituents seem to want a four-square Congressman who sees everything in neat blacks and whites and takes a loud, righteous and unyielding stand on everything. Often what you are getting is oversimplification, which can be worse than straddling.

Anyway, if Congressmen were as sure of their opinions as most of you are of yours, we wouldn't be able to agree on when to meet.

I try to keep abreast of your opinions by reading my mail. Your powers of indignation amaze me. If Congressmen had the same powers our sessions would be an endless street riot.

I confess that there are times when I am not sure what is right, when I see reasonable Members of Congress on both sides of an issue. So I consult the mail and find mostly indignant people all saying I will vote with them if I have a vertebra of my backbone left.

You may not know how hard it is to represent you. It is the consensus of this district, for instance, that we should have lower taxes and more defense, fewer Federal-aid programs and more Federal money spent in the district, less bureaucracy and more jobs for deserving constituents.

I am interested to see several independent voters in the audience—slumming, I suppose, among what they regard as the party hacks.

You know, independent voters play a fascinating role in our form of government. They take no real part in politics until the time comes to pick "the best man regardless of party," as the saying goes. Meanwhile, they are free to criticize the mediocrity of party politics and the candidates it produces.

These noble independents don't sully themselves working at politics to develop candidates and programs that would meet their high standards.

Well, you have been good to listen to me without throwing your dessert plates. I shall subside now and attend a private meeting upstairs with some local statesmen who want me to reduce taxes, hold down postal rates, increase mail deliveries, get more Federal contracts for the district, build a bridge and dredge the harbor, and get the mayor a job in Washington, or anywhere. Good night.

Resolution of the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received the following correspondence from Mr. Phil Campbell, secretary-treasurer of the National Association of State departments of agriculture; I desire to share Mr. Campbell's letter and enclosures with my colleagues who may be hesitant in opposing certain proposals of the Department of Agriculture:

Hon. RALPH HARVEY,
Member, House Agriculture Committee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HARVEY: Enclosed is a copy of a resolution passed by the executive committee of the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture at its December 1961 meeting in Washington, D.C., which points up a serious condition from the standpoint of State departments of agriculture as to the complete disregard, in many instances, by the Federal Government of excellent State programs in operation which are financed by State funds.

An illustration at the present time is that States are beginning to set up State meat inspection programs, similar to State milk and State egg inspection programs, in order to insure quality meat for the consuming public in the States the same as quality milk and eggs which are presently inspected under State programs at State expense.

If the Federal Government is to take over all such programs in the future, the cost to the Federal Treasury will certainly be tremendous.

This action by the executive committee of the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture is being sent to you for your information.

Yours truly,

PHIL CAMPBELL,
Secretary-Treasurer.

MOTION PASSED BY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE DEPARTMENTS OF AGRICULTURE, WASHINGTON, D.C., DECEMBER 17, 18, 19, 1961

Moved by Commissioner Gill and seconded by Director McIntyre, that the executive committee express its grave concern at action and attitudes by Federal agencies in carrying out programs such as the red meat inspection program which ignore similar State programs as adequately conducted as the Federal programs, resulting in the discouragement of State legislatures to enact such State programs and to finance them with State tax money, causing greater demands on programs from the Federal treasury alone rather than by Federal-State agreements with State governments helping to finance these programs with State taxes. It is felt by the executive committee that Federal-State cooperative inspection programs should be encouraged rather than having Federal action which discourages the State legislature from authorizing and financing such cooperative programs:

"RESOLUTION RELATIVE TO THE INSPECTION OF RED MEAT

"Whereas it is desirable that all red meat slaughtered in the United States shall be properly inspected and passed as wholesome and fit for human consumption; and

"Whereas a number of States have been vitally interested in instigating mandatory State red meat inspection programs, with some States having actually begun mandatory State red meat inspection programs; and

"Whereas several of the States provide a voluntary State red meat inspection program; and

"Whereas without Federal inspection or recognized State inspection, red meat processers may not move in interstate commerce and are limited to intrastate markets; and

"Whereas with a combination of Federal inspection and State inspection programs, all of the red meat processers and handlers might compete in the market on an equitable basis; and

"Whereas only by complete cooperation between the States and the Federal Government can an overall red meat inspection program, whether State or Federal, be accomplished to protect the consuming public and to benefit the producers, processers, and sellers of red meats: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Executive Committee of the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture in session assembled,* That every effort be made to bring about the greatest cooperation possible between the Federal and State governments to the end that an adequate red meat inspection program will be accomplished so as to fully protect the consuming public and to benefit those engaged in the processing and sale of red meats; be it further

"*Resolved,* That the accomplishment of an adequate cooperative red meat inspection program be attained at the earliest possible date and that all officials having any authority in relation thereto utilize every facility

at their command to accomplish this purpose at the least possible cost and with the least duplication of services, while at the same time maintaining standards adequate to accomplish this purpose; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be furnished to the Secretary of Agriculture and to other affected persons.

"Done at Washington, D.C., this 19th day of December 1961.

"PHIL CAMPBELL,
"Secretary."

Medical Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from the Board of Christian Social Concerns of the Methodist Church, Detroit Conference, as well as a resolution adopted at their annual conference session on June 17, expressing their support for medical care for the aging under the social security program.

BOARD OF CHRISTIAN SOCIAL CONCERNS,
Detroit, Mich., January 29, 1962.

The Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: The Detroit Conference of the Methodist Church with 529 congregations in eastern and northern Michigan, has gone on record favoring the principle of a social security approach to medical care for the aging. The resolution that was adopted at our annual conference session on June 17, 1961, is enclosed.

That you may know that many of our people have given considerable thought to this matter, here is how our resolution was conceived and adopted. In February 1961, 100 of our pastors and laymen studied the medical needs of the aging at workshops sponsored by our Board of Christian Social Concerns. Informal polls at those sessions showed strong support for a social security approach to medical care for the aging. A month later a resolution was discussed and adopted by 40 church leaders at a meeting of the Conference Board of Christian Social Concerns. The action was taken at the request of the board's social welfare committee. In June, the resolution was submitted to and endorsed by the annual conference, made up of the ministerial and lay delegates from all 529 churches. Thus, as you can see, the enclosed resolution represents the convictions of many Methodists.

As medical care for the aging is one of the most urgent issues on the agenda of Congress this session, the Detroit Annual Conference of the Methodist Church sincerely hopes that sound legislation along the lines recommended will be adopted.

Sincerely,

A. THEODORE HALSTED,
Secretary, Social Welfare Committee.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGING—A RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE DETROIT ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE METHODIST CHURCH, JUNE 17, 1961, AND PRINTED IN THE CONFERENCE JOURNAL ON PAGE 431 ("THE AGING," PAR. 3, SEC. (D))

To meet adequately the costs of health care for the aging, we concur with a recent (February 1961) statement adopted by the General Board of the National Council of Churches, which endorses, unanimously, the use of the Federal Social Security system to supplement voluntary medical plans for men and women over age 65. * * * Since voluntary plans cannot meet the problems for about three-fourths of the aged, the National Council of Churches supports "in principle, legislation which will extend the benefits of old age, survivors, and disability insurance to include adequate health care for retired aged persons." We also urge that arrangements be worked out to provide adequate health services for elderly persons not covered by social security legislation, local, State, and Federal, in equitable combination.

Chicago Police Force Now One of the Finest in the Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed proud today to call the attention of my colleagues to a spectacular job of policework performed in Chicago in the speedy arrest of three men who recently kidnaped the wife and two children of a Chicago merchant.

The story which appeared this morning in the Chicago Tribune on this excellent example of determined and dedicated policework demonstrates the great changes that have occurred in Chicago's Police Department since Mayor Daley reorganized the entire police force.

I am calling attention of my colleagues to this particular accomplishment because too often both here in Congress and in other forums we hear only the shortcomings of policework, but the worthy accomplishments of dedicated policemen go unnoticed.

The entire Nation was shocked 2 years ago by exposures of dereliction by a small group of policemen on the Chicago police force, as well as similar scandals in other large metropolitan areas. However, because of the swift and decisive action by Mayor Daley, this situation was quickly corrected, and the people of Chicago today can look upon their police force as perhaps the finest in the country and the world.

The speedy manner in which this atrocious kidnaping for ransom was solved by the robbery detail of the Chicago Police Department, which is headed by Capt. Howard Pierson, should bring comfort and confidence to the thousands upon thousands of Americans who have occasion to visit Chicago annually that they can indeed feel secure in their visits.

Captain Pierson and his aids, in capturing three men responsible for this kidnaping, demonstrate again that great things are happening in Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune account of this excellent example of effective policework follows:

KIDNAPING SOLUTION TOLD: POLICE GIVE DETAILS AS THREE ADMIT CRIME—SPREE ON RANSOM MONEY FACTOR

The flashing of ransom money by a brazen kidnaper, plus persistent police work, resulted yesterday in the arrest of three men and the solving of the kidnaping of a South Side mother and her two children.

By using many informants and questioning scores of persons, robbery detail detectives, under Capt. Howard Pierson, solved the kidnaping early Friday of Mrs. Gloria Chaneson, 41, of 2054 East 90th Street; a daughter, Eileen, 18, a University of Illinois freshman; and a son, Larry, 14, a Bowen High School freshman.

THREE MEN CONFESS ROLES

Three men confessed their parts in a crime, which started out to be a robbery and turned into a kidnaping. Detectives sought a fourth man as a participant.

In addition, they recovered $880 of the $4,600 ransom, the bag in which the money was withdrawn from a bank, and the sawed-off shotgun, two revolvers, and a German Luger automatic pistol used in the crime.

Details of how the quartet planned the crime, as told in the words of one of the kidnapers, were obtained by the Tribune.

MANY POLICEMEN ON CASE

The arrests came after more than 3 days of detective work by Captain Pierson, Lt. Jack Sheehy, Sgts. Elmer Kirk, Charles Dean, Frank Lueken, and Mervin Horsman, and 20 detectives.

Those under arrest are Robert Hall, 28, of 9538 Perry Avenue, the man who furnished the information for the crime; William Evans, 28, of 417 East 46th Street, described as the gang member who directed the kidnaping, and Joseph Dear, 19, of 3449 Indiana Avenue.

Detectives were seeking Ulysses John Robinson, 26, of 8110 Evans Avenue, as the fourth member of the gang.

IDENTIFIED BY VICTIMS

At a showup in Grand Crossing police station, Evans and Dear were identified by the Irving Chanenson family and Chanenson's father, Meyer, who was also held prisoner in the home at the time of the gang invasion.

Evans was identified as the gunman who gained entry to the Chanenson home through a ruse, wearing a false mole on his face and a beatnik beard, and then remained behind to negotiate for the ransom after the abduction of the three.

Irving Chanenson also identified Hall as a former employee.

SEIZE MONEY DESTROYER

Also in custody was Alex Gordon, 32, of 609 West 61st Street, who tried to destroy $80 of the ransom money in his possession when arrested. Detectives said, however, that they did not believe Gordon played an active part in the plot.

Evans' common law wife, Miss Nona Butcher, 21, who furnished a detailed description of how the loot was divided by the gang, also was held.

The first break in the solution to the crime came when detectives learned that Hall, an ex-convict, had been employed as a laborer by Irving Chanenson, 41, husband and father of the kidnap victim and owner of a tire supply business at 1851 East Street. Hall had been laid off last August.

From their informants, detectives learned that last Friday, only a few hours after Mrs. Chanenson and her children were freed unharmed, Hall had displayed large amounts of money. He had also purchased, with $100 bills, a used automobile in a car lot at 25th Street and Western Avenue and clothing for a girl friend.

Once Hall had been arrested in his home Sunday night, the case began to fall into place.

The arrests of Evans, Dear, Miss Butcher, and Gordon followed swiftly. Hall, Evans, and Dear all signed statements given to Joseph Gill, an assistant State's attorney.

Gill described Evans as the most talkative of the trio in custody for the crime.

WHY IT BECAME KIDNAPING

In his confession, Evans related that the plot had developed originally as a robbery instead of a kidnaping. But after the trio invaded the Chanenson home late Thursday, they decided to kidnap Mrs. Chanenson and her children because Chanenson could offer them only $600.

Evans, who is an ex-convict and a narcotics addict, told detectives that he met Hall in a south side tavern January 29.

"We got to talking," Evans said. "Hall told me 'I know a guy that's got lots of money and a real nice home. I used to work for him, but I got laid off last August.' "

Evans said he told Hall, "I've got the equipment to make the money," referring to the weapons used in the kidnap plot.

Evans said that he and Hall then got into a car and drove to 95th Street and Perry Avenue to discuss the crime further.

CASE HOME ON WEDNESDAY

Last Wednesday, Evans said, he and Robinson again met with Hall at the same intersection. They discussed the plot and drove past the Chanenson home.

At noon Thursday, Evans said, he and Robinson rented an unheated, unfurnished apartment at 6445 Kenwood Avenue for $21 a week. At this point, Evans said, he was still planning a robbery but considered kidnaping—"just in case."

Hall refused to have any active part in the crime, so Evans contacted Dear on Thursday afternoon. That night they invaded the Chanenson home.

Evans rang the front door bell, posed as a deliveryman, and insisted that Chanenson had to sign for a package that was shown to him.

"After I got in the house, I ducked downstairs to the basement and slipped out the door," Evans told police.

TWO FORCE WAY IN

Meanwhile, Robinson and Dear had forced their way through the front door before Chanenson had a chance to lock it.

Evans joined them after running around to the front of the house, removing his false beard, and appearing as the third gunman to confront Chanenson.

The action occurred so quickly that Chanenson did not realize at the time that one of the gunmen was, in fact, the delivery boy.

Soon after the gunmen entered the home and announced a "stickup," Chanenson gave Evans $600. Evans said he pocketed $100 of it to "short" his colleagues, telling Robinson and Dear he had gotten only $500.

The gang stayed in the home until about 4 a.m. Friday, trying to get more money from Chanenson, whose family looked on in terror.

"I finally told Chanenson, 'I'm convinced you don't have any more money here,' " Evans told detectives.

"So I told Robinson and Dear to take the woman and the kids to the apartment. Then I told Chanenson to go to the bank in the morning and get as much cash as he could.

"I told him to meet me at 9:45 a.m. in a gas station at 916 East 79th Street. Then I left.

"I drove around until it was time to meet the man."

Chanenson turned $4,600 over to Evans.

"I took $500 of that and stuffed it in my shoe," Evans said. "I told him that if anybody asked later he was to say he'd given me $4,100."

Under a prearranged plan, Robinson and Dear left the kidnap victims alone in the Kenwood Avenue flat at 10 a.m. and the group met at Robinson's apartment on Evans Avenue soon after.

Miss Butcher told detectives she witnessed the division of the loot there about 11 a.m.

She said Evans kept $1,700, Robinson got $1,700, and Dear got $800. Hall received $300 for furnishing the information.

Police recovered $80 from Gordon and $400 each from Evans and Dear. Hall had none of his money left. The shotgun and one revolver were found in Evans' home along with the money bag. The other revolver and the Luger were found in Dear's home.

When Chanenson withdrew the ransom money, he obtained the serial numbers of the bills. Using this list, detectives definitely identified the recovered money as being part of the ransom.

Edward J. Egan, first assistant State's attorney, said direct indictments for aggravated kidnaping, which carries a maximum punishment of death, and robbery would be sought this week against the gang.

Chanenson was profuse in his praise for Captain Pierson and the robbery detail detectives who solved the plot.

A New Approach to McNaghten Versus Durham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the interest of our colleagues the following article by Sol Rubin which appeared in the December 1961 issue of the Journal of the American Judicature Society. Mr. Rubin is counsel for the National Council on Crime and Delinquency and presents here an interesting and reasonable approach to a problem that has been vexing the Congress for some time.

The article follows:

A NEW APPROACH TO MCNAGHTEN VERSUS DURHAM

(By Sol Rubin)

(AUTHOR'S NOTE.—I want to express my appreciation to two members of the advisory council of judges of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency for their help. Laurance M. Hyde, chief justice, Supreme Court of Missouri, brought to my attention the importance of the opinion of Judge Weintraub in relation to the ACJ approach to McNaghten-Durham; and Amos N. Blandin, associate justice, Supreme Court of New Hampshire, brought to my attention the experience of Dr. Murray as an analogous demonstration of the validity of the approach taken here.)

The debate over the advantages and weaknesses of the McNaghten and Durham rules seems interminable. Perhaps it does not progress because the issue is being argued under misleading conditions. The focus seems wrong in several ways that we here examine. With a new focus we arrive at the conclusion that McNaghten should be applied at the point of trial, and that a concept such as the Durham rule is better applied at the point of sentencing.

1. In practice the question of responsibility is in the main limited to capital cases. The issue being fought is therefore usually not the straightforward issue of legal responsibility, but rather the question of whether the defendant will be subjected to the penalty or not. In effect, the prosecution argues for a finding of responsibility so that the defendant can be convicted and executed, and the defense argues insanity so that death can be averted.[1] We should be looking for a rule that would be generally applicable to offenders who survive, and that would be useful in dealing with them constructively.

2. The defendant held not criminally responsible by reason of his mental condition is committable to a mental hospital under either rule. More defendants come within the Durham rule (suffering from mental defect that caused them to commit crime) than M'Naghten (so mentally diseased as not to know what they were doing or that it was wrong). In *State* v. *Lucas*[2] a jury rendered a verdict of guilty of first degree murder with a recommendation of life imprisonment. One question raised on the appeal was the defense of mental defect. The New Jersey court rejected the Durham rule, saying:

"Until such time as we are convinced by a firm foundation in scientific fact that a test for criminal responsibility other than M'Naghten will serve the basic end of our criminal jurisprudence, i.e., the protection of society from grievous antisocial acts, we shall adhere to it."

In a concurring opinion Chief Justice Weintraub likewise declares that:

"None will dispute that society must be protected from the insane as well as the sane. The area of disagreement is whether a civil or a criminal process should be employed when forbidden acts have been committed."

This comes closer to the problem. And how do we determine when a civil or criminal commitment is better for certain offenders? From a practical point of view, we judge by what serves the interests of society and the individual best, and we hope that the answer to that question coincides with an acceptable legal concept. This requires that we examine the qualities inherent in the respective rules as they impinge on problems of rehabilitation of the offender and the protection of society. This suggests that consideration of the disposition is involved, as well as the trial issue of responsibility.

3. The main argument on behalf of the Durham rule is not that it supports a superior treatment concept, but that it is up to date, psychiatrically, and thus facilitates the introduction of psychiatric testimony. But psychiatric testimony, especially when limited to the issue of responsibility, is not thus heightened.[3] It does not become more substantial, and it does not have any weight for the sentence. The Durham and M'Naghten rules require that the psychiatric evidence be introduced in the context of a criminal trial, in the usual adversary procedure. As illustrated by the trial in the popular but authentic novel, "Anatomy of a Murder," by Judge John Voelker of the Michigan Supreme Court, writing under the pseudonym of Robert Traver, a trial under the irresistable impulse rule is no improvement over M'Naghten; and the difficulty is the same for Durham.

Justice Weintraub puts his finger on a very important point when he writes:

"If we could think of conviction simply as a finding that the mortal in question has demonstrated his capacity for antisocial conduct, most of the battle would be decided. What would remain is the employment of such postconviction techniques as would redeem and secure him if he cannot."

And again:

"Until a basis for personal blameworthiness can be scientifically demonstrated, I would not tinker with the existing law of

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

criminal accountability. Rather I would permit the scientist's growing knowledge of human behavior to have a wider sway in the area in which it can safely be utilized with evident fairness to society and to the individual. I refer to the postconviction disposition of the offender."

Again we are led to the sentence or disposition.

Unfortunately, the issue before the New Jersey court, as before every court that has to choose between McNaghten and Durham, does not relate to postconviction disposition but rather to the question of whether or not there is criminal responsibility. In his keen concurring opinion Justice Weintraub suggests that the correct place for the question of consideration of the mental condition of a defendant who is not insane is in the postconviction procedure. The point seems eminently correct. Unfortunately again, heretofore no postconviction—i.e., sentence—procedure seemed particularly helpful. However, a sentencing plan being developed by the Advisory Council of Judges provides the kind of postconviction procedure that seems to resolve the issue successfully.

The Advisory Council of Judges of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency is a group of 50 appellate, trial, Federal, and State judges that has been providing leadership on questions of sentencing, court and correctional services, and related matters. It has published two books for the guidance of judges, "Guides to Sentencing," and "Guides for Juvenile Court Judges." It has other publications in preparation, one of which is a "Model Sentencing Act." It is the work on the "Model Sentencing Act" that bears upon the current issue. The act has been in preparation for several years, and is soon to be completed for publication.[4]

The "Model Sentencing Act" establishes categories of dangerous offenders who may be subjected to long terms of confinement and treatment. For most of those categories it is required that the court, before imposing a long term, must find that the defendant is suffering from "a severe personality disorder that may cause him to commit further crime." To obtain the necessary diagnostic material upon which such a finding may be drawn, the act provides that certain defendants shall be committed to a diagnostic center for clinical study. It is on the basis of the clinical study and other material that the sentencing judge may make his necessary findings.

When the committee drafting the Model Sentencing Act met in March 1960, to work over the statutory form of its sentencing idea, the writer suggested to the committee (which he staffs as counsel to the National Council on Crime and Delinquency) that the McNaghten-Durham question was, indeed, being asked in the wrong place, but that upon the formulation of the sentencing plan which we have here sketchily set forth, a situation exists by which the question can be asked in the right place. This was an unforeseen but very valuable result of the drafting of the Model Sentencing Act which became evident when the plan was fully visualized.

DEFECTS IN OUR PENOLOGY ARE APPARENT

What the Model Sentencing Act approach does is to make clear that it is not so much the rule of responsibility that is behind the times, but our penology. As Judge Weintraub points out, neither McNaghten nor Durham deals with the individual on the basis of what the community needs and what the individual needs. As he says, the area of disagreement is whether a civil or a criminal disposition should be employed when forbidden acts have been committed. Both the McNaghten and Durham rules attempt to separate those who have committed criminal acts into two groups: those who should be dealt with through penal-correctional services, and those who should be dealt with in mental institutions. The McNaghten rule would exclude from correctional institutions only those who are laboring under such a defect of reason, from disease of the mind, as not to know what they are doing or that it was wrong. The Durham rule would exclude those suffering from mental defect which caused them to commit crime.

The defects in sentencing, particularly its hit-or-miss nature, have been pointed out many times. Neither M'Naghten nor Durham really helps solve this problem. They attack only the problem of responsibility, and the psychiatric testimony is limited to this issue. But the Model Sentencing Act not only provides a much more precise way of determining the dangerousness of offenders, it also opens the way for a flexible, ample use of psychiatric evidence—on the sentence consideration. Under the Model Sentencing Act if the judge is going to commit a defendant to a long term as a dangerous individual he must obtain psychiatric evidence, developed at a diagnostic reception center, where the defendant is studied and out of which a report to the court is made. With other material, particularly the presentence report of the probation department, the judge proceeds to sentence. A hearing may be held on the sentence, but it is not rigidly curtailed by trial evidentiary rules, particularly the restrictive artificiality of the "hypothetical question," and it is all addressed to the discretionary judgment of the sentencing judge.

Once the improved sentencing plan of the Model Act is available, it can be seen that it facilitates much more precise sentencing, especially in detecting dangerous offenders, and those who are mentally ill. It also envisages that such defendants shall be given special treatment, following clinical diagnosis, in a suitable therapeutic institution. In other words, a mental illness test fairly close to Durham ("severe personality disorder that may cause him to commit further crime") would be applied at the point of sentencing, rather than at the trial on the question of responsibility. It is the postconviction procedure that Judge Weintraub said must exist for this riddle to be solved.

Assuming one accepts the foregoing (the merit of the sentencing plan, the advantage of using "Durham" at the point of sentence) we are still left with the question of which rule is most appropriate on the trial of the question of criminal responsibility. We suggest that the Model Sentencing Act also clarifies this issue. Returning to Judge Weintraub's language:

"If we could think of a conviction simply as a finding that the mortal in question has demonstrated his capacity for antisocial conduct, most of the battle would be decided."

What rule would be more supportive of effective therapy? What rule would support the effort to make the offender able to control himself? Certainly such a course is supported by the legal adjudication that he did something wrong (criminal conviction), rather than a civil commitment that in effect says he was not responsible for his act.

The defendant who does not have a consciousness that he committed a criminal act is not at all helped by a conviction; and both Durham and McNaghten agree that he should not be convicted. The McNaghten rule declares that one who is so far removed from reality that he does not know the nature of his act does not have the mentality to be adjudged responsible. Such a holding is inevitable because of the requirement of mens rea. But the Durham rule would exculpate a defendant who does know the nature of his act. For the law to tell such a person that he is not responsible for his act is likely to deter anti complicate his rehabilitation, because it contradicts commonsense fact. To declare that such a defendant is legally responsible, but, because of his mental illness, is subject to special treatment is more consistent with reality and more likely to support his rehabilitation. To say to such an individual—"You are not a criminal; you are sick" (Durham), is much less realistic than to say to a mentally ill offender who is not within the McNaghten rule—because he understands the nature of his act:

"You committed a crime; but you are sick; your sickness has something to do with your criminal behavior, and we will endeavor to determine how sick you are. You will be subjected to psychological and correctional treatment for your cure while you are serving your sentence."

The latter seems to engage the defendant's own resources much more than the former. (We must keep in mind that we are talking about a rule for dealing with persons who have committed antisocial acts, and who will be dealt with by means other than killing them.)

We have an interesting application of this approach as a therapeutic matter in the work of Dr. John M. Murray, Chief Consultant in Psychiatry of the U.S. Air Forces, at the Air Force Convalescent Hospital, at Fort Logan, Denver, Colo., during World War II. The hospital had 1,700 operational or flying fatigue cases under treatment. The hospital had dealt with the men as deserving of freedom of the hospital. They had done a magnificent job overseas, were told they were not responsible for their condition, and were not subject to ordinary controls. The result was such extensive aggressive behavior by the patients that the administration was planning to shut down the hospital.

When Dr. Murray took over, he ordered court-martials in three pending cases.

"They have gone against regulations—let them have the book. Then, after court has passed a sentence on them, I'll see each one of these boys individually. When we tell them they don't need controls, we're wrong. They need controls, but as a result of their sickness they can't hold the controls, and they break down in defiance in these brawls. They have to recognize us as kindly and understanding individuals—not mauldin in any sense of excessive sympathy, but kindly and understanding. But—we are the exponents of adequate controls, and if they are not in such condition that they can maintain these controls, they are not ready to go out and mingle in society at this time. They are in need of further treatment."

In the course of the next 5 weeks they had five more court-martial cases, and after that, none.[5] These men had apparently come to recognize, among other things, that all their antisocial actions involved unpleasant consequences to themselves.

"People with severe mental illnesses continue to have a sense of responsibility," note Drs. Ernest M. Gruenberg and Frank G. Boudreau, in presenting a striking report on how that sense of responsibility can be increased by methods of care, particularly the opening of mental institutions.[6]

A recent study in the correctional field draws exactly the same conclusion. Drs. Emanuel Messinger and Benjamin Apfelberg, in an article entitled "A Quarter Century of Court Psychiatry," write:

"Our distinct impression, gained from observing thousands of recidivists in the clinic and elsewhere, is that stern penological measures usually have a more salutary and longer-lasting restraining effect than hopeful but misguided 'psychiatric guidance.' This impression is particularly true for psychopaths, who characteristically welcome the intercession of the psychiatrist or prison psychologist as a means of escaping or mitigating punishment or of manipulating their environment to evade responsibility."[7]

Footnotes at end of speech.

Finally, when we consider the administrative application of the approach we here suggest, we have another instance of the M'Naghten-Durham controversy being presented "in the wrong way." When the whole consideration of the defendant's mental condition occurs at the trial, almost everything involved in the trial is at stake. This is obvious in the commonest situation, the capital cases. Prosecution and defense rally all their resources over the issue, and objectivity goes out the window. But under the Model Sentencing Act plan most of the hot controversy is avoided. The issue of mental capacity is left for the sentence, where psychiatrists may explain, and not merely answer yes or no. Under the Model Act the defendant would hesitate to put up a doubtful defense of insanity where mental illness would be one of the criteria for a long term. If he loses, he has helped nevertheless (by his evidence of the defendant's mental illness) to build up a case for a mentally ill defendant, hence one who may be committed for a long term.

As we said above, at the present time the issue of McNaghten-Durham arises mainly in capital cases. Neither rule is particularly helpful in arriving at sound decisions in lesser offenses. Whereas in a capital case the defense is interested in establishing insanity to avoid the death penalty, it may well be just the contrary in a lesser case, particularly if the offense carries a fairly minor penalty. In such a case the defense would be more interested in submitting a guilty plea, carrying a maximum sentence of perhaps a year or a few years, rather than face an indeterminate civil commitment for insanity. Defense counsel may suppress his social responsibility to disclose mental illness, if under the Durham rule it means an indeterminate civil commitment.

Under McNaghten the problem is more readily disposed of, if correctional services contemplated and made possible by the Model Sentencing Act are available, including the State diagnostic center. If the defendant is actually seriously disturbed, it is to the interest of the State to have this known to the court at the time of sentence. Under the Model Sentencing Act a defendant who is mentally ill but not dangerous may be committed only for a relatively short term, the same term applicable to a defendant who is not ill. Defense counsel therefore need not fear an indefinite commitment if he helps the court understand and deal with the mentally ill defendant.

The policy of the Model Sentencing Act is that the correctional system ought to deal with criminal offenders, difficult personalities or those who are good prospects for rehabilitation. It should be equipped with necessary staff to deal with all offenders. Both diagnostic and treatment services for offenders with personality disorders should be in correction department facilities, always with the commonly available possibility of administrative transfer to mental institutions in certain cases.

We note two instances in which the withdrawal of criminal responsibility from the mentally ill results in countermeasures that are highly questionable. In the District of Columbia, home of the Durham rule, alarm over the change in the rule of responsibility led the 84th Congress to pass Public Law 313 (D.C. Code Ann. 24-301 (d)), providing for mandatory commitment of those found not guilty by reason of their mental condition, removing the previously existing judicial discretion to release a person who, though insane at the time of the offense, has since recovered completely. This may "plug the loophole" of the defendant who succeeds in deceiving the court about his mental condition; but it deprives the court of the possibility of releasing an individual who should, considering his condition and the safety of the public, be released, perhaps on probation.

The second instance is the recommendation of the American Law Institute Model Penal Code. The draft provision is that a person is not responsible for criminal conduct if at the time of such conduct as a result of mental disease or defect he lacks substantial capacity to appreciate the criminality of his conduct or to conform his conduct to the requirements of law.[8] The section goes on to declare that "the terms 'mental disease or defect' do not include an abnormality manifested only by repeated criminal or otherwise antisocial conduct." The comments explain that subdivision (2) is designed to exclude from the concept of "mental disease or defect" the case of so-called "psychopathic personality." For a legislature to be as absolute as this hardly solves the difficult problems in understanding the psychopath; and it seems to be an invitation to a legislature to go further in classifying mental illnesses into good ones and bad ones. As we pointed out above, not all psychopaths are dangerous. The question of a person's dangerousness must be considered along with his mental condition. We have pointed out how this can be done, under the Model Sentencing Act Procedure. Again it underscores that when we have such a sentencing procedure we do solve the problems we try to solve, but cannot, by maneuvers around responsibility.

---

[1] A good deal of sympathy is felt for the Durham rule by those who consider the application of the death penalty too harsh, or would abolish it altogether. In urging a new approach to the McNaghten-Durham controversy, I come out in support of McNaghten, and, in a sense, find a better use for the Durham rule than to use it in place of McNaghten. I oppose the death penalty, but do not thereby adhere to Durham as a partial remedy. The only remedy for the injustice of the death penalty is repeal. We must think in broader terms, of which rule is socially more worthwhile for criminal defendants generally. See "Mental Competency Proceedings in Federal Criminal Cases," by Charles F. Smith and Kenneth R. Strawberry, Public Health Reports, July 1960, for the problem in a jurisdiction in which a substantial number of nondangerous offenders are committed civilly on being found not criminally responsible because of mental defect.

[2] 30 N.J. 27 (1959).

[3] See: "Variability of Psychiatric Diagnosis," by J. V. Wallings, U.S. Armed Forces Medical Journal, September 1956; "Psychiatry and Criminal Responsibility," by Jerome Hall, Yale Law Journal, May 1956; "Responsibility and Law: In Defense of the McNaughten Rules," by Jerome Hall, American Bar Association Journal, October 1956; "Psychoauthoritarianism and the Law," by Dr. Frederic Wertham, the University of Chicago Law Review, winter, 1955; "A Psychiatrist Looks at Psychiatry and the Law," by Dr. Frederic Wertham, Buffalo Law Review, 1958, No. 1; "Durham Plus Five Years: Development of the Law of Criminal Responsibility in the District of Columbia," by Dr. Andrew S. Watson and Dr. Charles Savage, the American Journal of Psychiatry, October 1959. In *State* v. *Lucas*, supra, Judge Weintraub wrote, "I am not willing to let the security of society depend upon a science which can produce such conflicting estimates of probable human behavior."

[4] By the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, New York.

[5] Unpublished paper.

[6] Preface to "Steps in the Development of Integrated Psychiatric Services," Millbank Memorial Fund, New York, 1960.

[7] "Crime and Delinquency," vol. 7, p. 343, p. 348, October 1961.

[8] Proposed Final Draft No. 1, sec. 4.01 (1). In fact the Vermont Legislature, working from the American Law Institute draft, adds that "the terms 'mental disease or defect' shall include congenital and traumatic conditions as well as disease" and it substitutes "adequate" capacity for "substantial" capacity. Vermont Public Acts, 1957, Act 228.

Standards for Making Buildings Usable by the Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, of the many projects which come to the attention of the Appropriations Committee one was brought to my attention by Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, Chairman of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, which strikingly illustrates our thoughtlessness in our relationships to those less fortunate than we. I mean the physically handicapped. I refer to the architectural barriers project which General Maas' committee initiated some 4½ years ago and for which building standards were approved and released by the American Standards Association on October 31, 1961.

The President's Committee's interest in this subject first was aroused in May of 1957 when the late Hugo Deffner, an insurance man from Oklahoma City, was selected to be the Handicapped American of the Year. When Mr. Deffner was brought to Washington to receive the President's trophy from President Eisenhower, he could not negotiate the many steps of the departmental auditorium, where the ceremonies were held, because he was in a wheelchair. A way was found to get him into the building by having two husky marines carry him in.

The experience with Mr. Deffner led the Committee staff and specifically K. Vernon Banta, Deputy Executive Secretary, to take steps to see if a ramp entry to the auditorium could be constructed to provide access to the building for persons with ambulatory disabilities. Letters from General Maas were sent to Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell and GSA Administrator Franklin Floete asking for early action in making the auditorium and the main Labor Building accessible to the handicapped.

In January 1958, the subject of architectural barriers was placed on the agenda of the President's Committee advisory council for discussion. On recommendation of the council members, Chairman Maas appointed an ad hoc committee with VA Administrator Sumner Whittier as chairman to study the problem and make recommendation for action. Mr. Whittier assigned Dr. H. Dwight York, an assistant, to make a detailed study of the subject and prepare a tentative guide for discussion and

review. In exploring the final review of the guide and in developing a plan of promotion, Mr. Banta came up with an idea for the development of building standards under the auspices of the American Standards Association. He interviewed officials of the association and arranged a meeting of selected organizations which might have an interest in the subject. Mr. Cramfield Frost, civil engineer, represented the association and discussed the procedures for developing standards.

Following the meeting, the President's Committee was joined by the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults in cosponsoring the project with the society providing funds for the secretary and technical assistant. Sectional and steering committees were appointed with Leon Chatelain, Jr., former president of the American Institute of Architects, as chairman; members of the steering committee were: T. J. Nugent, University of Illinois; Miss Jayne Shover, National Society for Crippled Children and Adults; K. Vernon Banta, the President's Committee; Dr. H. Dwight York, Veterans' Administration; Philip Klieger, M.D., Office of Vocational Rehabilitation; and Clinton Cowgill, American Institute of Architects.

The American Standards Association was ably represented in the development of the standard by Adm. George F. Hussey, managing director; Cramfield Frost, civil engineer; and H. Warner Dailey, engineer.

The national society has been ably represented on this project by Dr. Dean W. Roberts, executive director, and Miss Jayne Shover, associate executive director, who have spearheaded their plans.

General Maas has given much of his time to the project with K. Vernon Banta, deputy executive secretary, devoting much time to guiding the development of the standard and the plans for promotion and adoption.

The first copy was presented to General Maas representing the President's Committee and to Gen. Joseph Foss, president of the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults, at the society's convention in Denver on November 18.

Copies of the Standard are being mailed by the President's Committee to all registered architects, building contractors, and building code officials. The Governors' and local committees are participating in the nationwide educational and promotional program. The National and State Easter Seal Societies are developing intensive community survey plans to interest community leaders in the problem, to locate building barriers, and to stimulate action to remove the barriers.

Today, the Standard is a reality, but it must be translated into action. President Kennedy, in a letter to General Foss read at the convention, put it this way:

Yet, we must remember that standards remain nothing more than words and phrases, unless they are translated into action. To serve the purpose for which they were created, they must be adopted. They must be put into use in designing new public buildings and in remodeling old.

The acceptance and adoption of these standards now become the business of citizens and governmental authorities everywhere. I am sure they will rise to the challenge.

I can further assure you that the agencies and departments of the Federal Government that come under the jurisdiction of my office will give full support to this worthy project.

Mr. Speaker, the standards for making buildings usable by the physically handicapped follow:

AMERICAN STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS FOR MAKING BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES ACCESSIBLE TO, AND USABLE BY, THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

1. SCOPE AND PURPOSE

1.1 Scope

1.1.1 This standard applies to all buildings and facilities used by the public. It applies to temporary or emergency conditions as well as permanent conditions. It does not apply to private residences.

1.1.2 This standard is concerned with nonambulatory disabilities, semiambulatory disabilities, sight disabilities, hearing disabilities, disabilities of incoordination, and aging.[1]

1.2 Purpose: This standard is intended to make all buildings and facilities used by the public accessible to, and functional for, the physically handicapped, to, through, and within their doors, without loss of function, space, or facility where the general public is concerned. It supplements existing American Standards, and reflects great concern for safety of life and limb. In cases of practical difficulty, unnecessary hardship, or extreme differences, administrative authorities may grant exceptions from the literal requirements of this standard or permit the use of other methods or materials, but only when it is clearly evident that equivalent facilitation and protection are thereby secured.

2. DEFINITIONS

2.1 Nonambulatory disabilities: Impairments that, regardless of cause or manifestation, for all practical purposes, confine individuals to wheelchairs.

2.2 Semiambulatory disabilities: Impairments that cause individuals to walk with difficulty or insecurity. Individuals using braces or crutches, amputees, arthritics, spastices, and those with pulmonary and cardiac ills may be semiambulatory.

2.3 Sight disabilities: Total blindness or impairments affecting sight to the extent that the individual functioning in public areas is insecure or exposed to danger.

2.4 Hearing disabilities: Deafness or hearing handicaps that might make an individual insecure in public areas because he is unable to communicate or hear warning signals.

2.5 Disabilities of incoordination: Faulty coordination or palsy from brain, spinal, or peripheral nerve injury.

2.6 Aging: Those manifestations of the aging processes that significantly reduce mobility, flexibility, coordination, and perceptiveness but are not accounted for in the aforementioned categories.

2.7 Standard: When this term appears in small letters and is not preceded by the word "American," it is descriptive and does not refer to an American Standard approved by ASA; for example, a "standard" wheelchair is one characterized as standard by the manufacturers.

2.8 Fixed turning radius, wheel to wheel: The tracking of the caster wheels and large wheels of a wheelchair when pivoting on a spot.

2.9 Fixed turning radius, front structure to rear structure: The turning radius of a wheelchair, left front-foot platform to right rear wheel, or right front-foot platform to left rear wheel, when pivoting on a spot.

2.10 Involved (involvement): a portion or portions of the human anatomy or physiology, or both, that have a loss or impairment of normal function as a result of genesis, trauma, disease, inflammation, or degeneration.

2.11 Ramps, ramps with gradients: Because the term "ramp" has a multitude of meanings and uses, its use in this text is clearly defined as ramps with gradients (or ramps with slopes) that deviate from what would otherwise be considered the normal level. An exterior ramp, as distinguished from a "walk," would be considered an appendage to a building leading to a level above or below existing ground level. As such, a ramp shall meet certain requirements similar to those imposed upon stairs.

2.12 Walk, walks: Because the terms "walk" and "walks" have a multitude of meanings and uses, their use in this text is clearly defined as a predetermined, prepared-surface, exterior pathway leading to or from a building or facility, or from one exterior area to another, placed on the existing ground level and not deviating from the level of the existing ground immediately adjacent.

2.13 Appropriate number: As used in this text, appropriate number means the number of a specific item that would be necessary, in accord with the purpose and function of a building or facility, to accommodate individuals with specific disabilities in proportion to the anticipated number of individuals with disabilities who would use a particular building or facility.

Example: Although these specifications shall apply to all buildings and facilities used by the public, the numerical need for a specific item would differ, for example, between a major transportation terminal, where many individuals with diverse disabilities would be continually coming and going, an office building or factory, where varying numbers of individuals with disabilities of varying manifestations (in many instances, very large numbers) might be employed or have reason for frequent visits, a school or church, where the number of individuals may be fixed and activities more definitive, and the many other buildings and facilities dedicated to specific functions and purposes.

Note: Disabilities are specific and where the individual has been properly evaluated and properly oriented and where architectural barriers have been eliminated, a specific disability does not constitute a handicap. It should be emphasized that more and more of those physically disabled are becoming participants, rather than spectators, in the fullest meaning of the word.

3. GENERAL PRINCIPLES AND CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Wheelchair specifications: The collapsible-model wheelchair of tubular metal construction with plastic upholstery for back and seat is most commonly used. The standard model of all manufacturers falls within the following limits, which were used as the basis of consideration: (1) Length, 42 inches; (2) width, when open, 25 inches; (3) height of seat from floor, 19½ inches; (4) height of armrest from floor, 29 inches; (5) height of pusher handles (rear) from floor, 36 inches; (6) width, when collapsed, 11 inches.

3.2 The functioning of a wheelchair

3.2.1 The fixed turning radius of a standard wheelchair, wheel to wheel, is 18 inches. The fixed turning radius, front structure to rear structure, is 31.5 inches.

Footnotes at end of speech.

3.2.2 The average turning space required (180° and 360°) is 60 by 60 inches.

Note: Actually, a turning space that is longer than it is wide, specifically, 63 by 56 inches, is more workable and desirable. In an area with two open ends, such as might be the case in a corridor, a minimum of 54 inches between two walls would permit a 360° turn.

3.2.3 A minimum width of 60 inches is required for two individuals in wheelchairs to pass each other.

3.3 The adult individual functioning in a wheelchair [3]

3.3.1 The average unilateral vertical reach is 60 inches and ranges from 54 to 78 inches.

3.3.2 The average horizontal working (table) reach is 30.8 inches and ranges from 28.5 to 33.2 inches.

3.3.3 The bilateral horizontal reach, both arms extended to each side, shoulder high, ranges from 54 to 71 inches and averages 64.5 inches.

3.3.4 An individual reaching diagonally, as would be required in using a wall-mounted dial telephone or towel dispenser, would make the average reach (on the wall) 48 inches from the floor.

3.4 The individual functioning on crutches [3]

3.4.1 On the average, individuals 5 feet 6 inches tall require an average of 31 inches between crutch tips in the normally accepted gaits.[4]

3.4.2 On the average, individuals 6 feet tall require an average of 32.5 inches between crutch tips in the normally accepted gaits.[4]

4. SITE DEVELOPMENT [5]

4.1 Grading: The grading of ground, even contrary to existing topography, so that it attains a level with a normal entrance will make a facility accessible to individuals with physical disabilities.

4.2 Walks

4.2.1 Public walks should be at least 48 inches wide and should have a gradient not greater than 5 percent.[6]

4.2.2 Such walks shall be of a continuing common surface, not interrupted by steps or abrupt changes in level.

4.2.3 Wherever walks cross other walks, driveways, or parking lots they should blend to a common level.[7]

Note: 4.1 and 4.2, separately or collectively, are greatly aided by terracing, retaining walls, and winding walks allowing for more gradual incline, thereby making almost any building accessible to individuals with permanent physical disabilities, while contributing to its esthetic qualities.

4.2.4 A walk shall have a level platform at the top which is at least 5 feet by 5 feet, if a door swings out onto the platform or toward the walk. This platform shall extend at least 1 foot beyond each side of the doorway.

4.2.5 A walk shall have a level platform at least 3 feet deep and 5 feet wide, if the door does not swing onto the platform or toward the walk. This platform shall extend at least 1 foot beyond each side of the doorway.

4.3 Parking lots

4.3.1 Spaces that are accessible and approximate to the fa cilitysho
proximate to the facility should be set aside and identified for use by individuals with physical disabilities.

4.3.2 A parking space open on one side, allowing room for individuals in wheelchairs or individuals on braces and crutches to get in and out of an automobile onto a level surface, suitable for wheeling and walking, is adequate.

4.3.3 Parking spaces for individuals with physical diabilities when placed between two conventional diagonal or head-on parking spaces should be 12 feet wide.

4.3.4 Care in planning should be exercised so that individuals in wheelchairs and individuals using braces and crutches are not compelled to wheel or walk behind parked cars.

4.3.5 Consideration should be given the distribution of spaces for use by the disabled in accordance with the frequency and persistency of parking needs.

4.3.6 Walks shall be in conformity with 4.2.

5. BUILDINGS

5.1 Ramps with gradients: Where ramps with gradients are necessary or desired, they shall conform to the following specifications:

5.1.1 A ramp shall not have a slope greater than 1 foot rise in 12 feet, or 8.33 percent, or 4 degrees 50 minutes.

5.1.2 A ramp shall have handrails on at least one side, and preferably two sides, that are 32 inches in height, measured from the surface of the ramp, that are smooth, that extend 1 foot beyond the top and bottom of the ramp, and that otherwise conform with American Standard Safety Code for Floor and Wall Openings, Railings, and Toe Boards, A12-1932.

Note 1: Where codes specify handrails to be of heights other than 32 inches, it is recommended that two sets of handrails be installed to serve all people. Where major traffic is predominantly children, particularly physically disabled children, extra care should be exercised in the placement of handrails, in accordance with the nature of the facility and the age group or groups being serviced.

Note 2: Care should be taken that the extension of the handrail is not in itself a hazard. The extension may be made on the side of a continuing wall.

5.1.3 A ramp shall have a surface that is nonslip.

5.1.4 A ramp shall have a level platform at the top which is at least 5 feet by 5 feet, if a door swings out onto the platform or toward the ramp. This platform shall extend at least 1 foot beyond each side of the doorway.

5.1.5 A ramp shall have a level platform at least 3 feet deep and 5 feet wide, if the door does not swing onto the platform or toward the ramp. This platform shall extend at least 1 foot beyond each side of the doorway.

5.1.6 Each ramp shall have at least 6 feet of straight clearance at the bottom.

5.1.7 Ramps shall have level platforms at 30-foot intervals for purposes of rest and safety and shall have level platforms wherever they turn.

5.2 Entrances

5.2.1 At least one primary entrance to each building shall be usable by individuals in wheelchairs.

Note: Because entrances also serve as exits, some being particularly important in case of an emergency, and because the proximity of such exits to all parts of buildings and facilities, in accordance with their design and function, is essential (see 112 and 2000 through 2031 of American Standard Building Exits Code, A9.1-1953) it is preferable that all or most entrances (exits) should be accessible to, and usable by, individuals in wheelchairs and individuals with other forms of physical disability herein applicable.

5.2.2 At least one entrance usable by individuals in wheelchairs shall be on a level that would make the elevators accessible.

5.3 Doors and doorways

5.3.1 Doors shall have a clear opening of no less than 32 inches when open and shall be operable by a single effort.

Note 1: Two-leaf doors are not usable by those with disabilities defined in 2.1, 2.2, and 2.5 unless they operate by a single effort, or unless one of the two leaves meets the requirement of 5.3.1.

Note 2: It is recommended that all doors have kick plates extending from the bottom of the door to at least 16 inches from the floor, or be made of a material and finish that would safely withstand the abuse they might receive from canes, crutches, wheelchair foot-platforms, or wheelchair wheels.

5.3.2 The floor on the inside and outside of each doorway shall be level for a distance of 5 feet from the door in the direction the door swings and shall extend 1 foot beyond each side of the door.

5.3.3 Sharp inclines and abrupt changes in level shall be avoided at doorsills. As much as possible, thresholds shall be flush with the floor.

Note 1: Care should be taken in the selection, placement, and setting of door closers so that they do not prevent the use of doors by the physically disabled. Time-delay door closers are recommended.

Note 2: Automatic doors that otherwise conform to 5.3.1, 5.3.2, and 5.3.3 are very satisfactory.

Note 3: These specifications apply both to exterior and interior doors and doorways.

5.4 Stairs: Stairs shall conform to American Standard A9.1-1953, with the following additional considerations:

5.4.1 Steps in stairs that might require use by those with disabilities defined in 2.2 and 2.5 or by the aged shall not have abrupt (square) nosing.

Note: Individuals with restrictions in the knee, ankle, or hip, with artificial legs, long leg braces, or comparable conditions cannot, without great difficulty and hazard, use steps with nosing as illustrated in figure 1a, but can safely and with minimum difficulty use steps with nosing as illustrated in figure 1b.

5.4.2 Stairs shall have handrails 32 inches high as measured from the tread at the face of the riser.

Note: Where codes specify handrails to be at heights other than 32 inches, it is recommended that two sets of handrails be installed to serve all people. Where traffic is predominantly children, particularly physically disabled children, extra care should be exercised in the placement of handrails in accordance with the nature of the facility and the age group or groups being serviced. Dual handrails may be necessary.

5.4.3 Stairs shall have at least one handrail that extends at least 18 inches beyond the top step and beyond the bottom step.

Note: Care should be taken that the extension of the handrails is not in itself a hazard. The extension may be made on the side of a continuing wall.

5.4.4 Steps should, wherever possible, and in conformation with existing step formulas, have risers that do not exceed 7 inches.

5.5 Floors

5.5.1 Floors shall have a surface that is nonslip.

5.5.2 Floors on a given story shall be of a common level throughout or be connected by a ramp in accord with 5.1.1 through 5.1.6, inclusive.

Example 1: There shall not be a difference between the level of the floor of a corridor and the level of the floor of the toilet rooms.

Example 2: There should not be a difference between the level of the floor of a corridor and the level of a meeting room, dining room, or any other room, unless proper ramps are provided.

5.6 Toilet rooms: It is essential that an appropriate number [8] of toilet rooms, in accordance with the nature and use of a specific building or facility, be made accessible to, and usable by, the physically handicapped.

5.6.1 Toilet rooms shall have space to allow traffic of individuals in wheelchairs, in accordance with 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3.

Footnotes at end of speech.

5.6.2 Toilet rooms shall have at least one toilet stall that—

(1) Is 3 feet wide; (2) is at least 4 feet 8 inches, preferably 5 feet, deep; (3) has a wide and swings out; (4) has handrails on each side, 33 inches high and parallel to the floor, 1½ inches in outside diameter, with 1½ inches clearance between rail and wall, and fastened securely at ends and center; (5) has a water closet with the seat 20 inches from the floor.

Note: The design and mounting of the water closet is of considerable importance. A wall-mounted water closet with a narrow understructure that recedes sharply is most desirable. If a floor-mounted water closet must be used, it should not have a front that is wide and perpendicular to the floor at the front of the seat. The bowl should be shallow at the front of the seat and turn backward more than downward to allow the individual in a wheelchair to get close to the water closet with the seat of the wheelchair.

5.6.3 Toilet rooms shall have lavatories with narrow aprons, which when mounted at standard height are usable by individuals in wheelchairs; or shall have lavatories mounted higher, when particular designs demand, so that they are usable by individuals in wheelchairs.

Note: It is important that drainpipes and hot-water pipes under a lavatory be covered or insulated so that a wheelchair individual without sensation will not burn himself.

5.6.4 Some mirrors and shelves shall be provided above lavatories at a height as low as possible and no higher than 40 inches above the floor, measured from the top of the shelf and the bottom of the mirror.

5.6.5 Toilet rooms for men shall have wall-mounted urinals with the opening of the basin 19 inches from the floor, or shall have floor-mounted urinals that are on level with the main floor of the toilet room.

5.6.6 Toilet rooms shall have an appropriate number[8] of towel racks, towel dispensers, and other dispensers and disposal units mounted no higher than 40 inches from the floor.

5.7 Water fountains: An appropriate number[8] of water fountains or other water-dispensing means shall be accessible to, and usable by, the physically disabled.

5.7.1 Water fountains or coolers shall have up-front spouts and controls.

5.7.2 Water fountains or coolers shall be hand-operated or hand- and foot-operated. (See also American Standard Specifications for Drinking Fountains, Z4.2–1942.)

Note 1: Conventional floor-mounted water coolers can be serviceable to individuals in wheelchairs if a small fountain is mounted on the side of the cooler 30 inches above the floor.

Note 2: Wall-mounted, hand-operated coolers of the latest design, manufactured by many companies, can serve the able-bodied and the physically disabled equally well when the cooler is mounted with the basin 36 inches from the floor.

Note 3: Fully recessed water fountains are not recommended.

Note 4: Water fountains should not be set into an alcove unless the alcove is wider than a wheelchair. (See 3.1.)

5.8 Public telephones: An appropriate number[8] of public telephones should be made accessible to, and usable by, the physically disabled.

Note: The conventional public telephone booth is not usable by most physically disabled individuals. There are many ways in which public telephones can be made accessible and usable. It is recommended that architects and builders confer with the telephone company in the planning of the building or facility.

5.8.1 Such telephones should be placed so that the dial and the handset can be reached by individuals in wheelchairs, in accordance with 3.3.

5.8.2 An appropriate number[8] of public telephones should be equipped for those with hearing disabilities and so identified with instructions for use.

Note: Such telephones can be used by everyone.

5.9 Elevators: In a multiple-story building, elevators are essential to the successful functioning of physically disabled individuals. They shall conform to the following requirements:

5.9.1 Elevators shall be accessible to, and usable by, the physically disabled on the level that they use to enter the building, and at all levels normally used by the general public.

5.9.2 Elevators shall allow for traffic by wheelchairs, in accordance with 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, and 5.3.

5.10 Controls: Switches and controls for light, heat, ventilation, windows, draperies, fire alarms, and all similar controls of frequent or essential use, shall be placed within the reach of individuals in wheelchairs. (See 3.3.)

5.11 Identification: Appropriate identification of specific facilities within a building used by the public is particularly essential to the blind.

5.11.1 Raised letters or numbers shall be used to identify rooms or offices.

5.11.2 Such identification should be placed on the wall, to the right or left of the door, at a height between 4 feet 6 inches and 5 feet 6 inches, measured from the floor, and preferably at 5 feet.

5.11.3 Doors that are not intended for normal use, and that might prove dangerous if a blind person were to exit or enter by them, should be made quickly identifiable to the touch by knurling the door handle or knob.

Example: Such doors might lead to loading platforms, boilerrooms, stages, fire escapes, etc.

5.12 Warning signals

5.12.1 Audible warning signals shall be accompanied by simultaneous visual signals for the benefit of those with hearing disabilities.

5.12.2 Visual signals shall be accompanied by simultaneous audible signals for the benefit of the blind.

5.13 Hazards. Every effort shall be exercised to obviate hazards to individuals with physical disabilities.

5.13.1 Access panels or manholes in floors, walks, and walls can be extremely hazardous, particularly when in use, and should be avoided.

5.13.2 When manholes or access panels are open and in use, or when an open excavation exists on a site, particularly when it is approximate to normal pedestrian traffic, barricades shall be placed on all open sides, at least 8 feet from the hazard, and warning devices shall be installed in accord with 5.12.2.

5.13.3 Low-hanging door closers that remain within the opening of a doorway when the door is open, or that protrude hazardously into regular corridors or traffic ways when the door is closed, shall be avoided.

5.13.4 Low-hanging signs, ceiling lights, and similar objects or signs and fixtures that protrude into regular corridors or traffic ways shall be avoided. A minimum height of 7 feet, measured from the floor, is recommended.

5.13.5 Lighting on ramps shall be in accord with 1201, 1202, 1203, and 1204 of American Standard A9.1-1953.

5.13.6 Exit signs shall be in accord with 1205 of American Standard A9.1-1953, except as modified by 5.11 of this standard.

---

[1] See definitions in sec. 2.

[2] Extremely small, large, strong, or weak and involved individuals could fall outside the ranges in 3.3.1, 3.3.2, 3.3.3, and their reach could differ from the figure given in 3.3.4. However, these reaches were determined using a large number of individuals who were functionally trained, with a wide range in individual size and involvement.

[3] Most individuals ambulating on braces or crutches, or both, or on canes are able to manipulate within the specifications prescribed for wheelchairs, although doors present quite a problem at times. However, attention is called to the fact that a crutch tip extending laterally from an individual is not obvious to others in heavily trafficked areas, certainly not as obvious or protective as a wheelchair and is, therefore, a source of vulnerability.

[4] Some cerebral palsied individuals, and some severe arthritics, would be extreme exceptions to 3.4.1 and 3.4.2.

[5] Site development is the most effective means to resolve the problems created by topography, definitive architectural designs or concepts, water table, existing streets, and atypical problems, singularly or collectively, so that aggress, ingress, and egress to buildings by physically disabled can be facilitated while preserving the desired design and effect of the architecture.

[6] It is essential that the gradient of walks and driveways be less than that prescribed for ramps, since walks would be void of handrails and curbs and would be considerably longer and more vulnerable to the elements. Walks of near maximum grade and considerable length should have level areas at intervals for purposes of rest and safety. Walks or driveways should have a nonslip surface.

[7] This specification does not require the elimination of curbs, which, particularly if they occur at regular intersections, are a distinct safety feature for all of the handicapped, particularly the blind. The preferred method of meeting the specification is to have the walk incline to the level of the street. However, at principal intersections, it is vitally important that the curb run parallel to the street, up to the point where the walk is inclined, at which point the curb would turn in and gradually meet the level of the walk at its highest point. A less preferred method would be to gradually bring the surface of the driveway or street to the level of the walk. The disadvantage of this method is that a blind person would not know when he has left the protection of a walk and entered the hazards of a street or driveway.

[8] See 2.13.

The Lighter Side of Life in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, in these days of frustration and uncertainty, it is always pleasant to look on the brighter side of things. Hence, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose herewith an article which appeared in the U.S. News & World Report of February 12, 1962:

BARRY GOLDWATER "ACCEPTS"—THE LIGHTER SIDE OF LIFE IN WASHINGTON

(Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, a leader of Republican conservatives turned up as a political satirist and humorist at a meeting of Washington's Alfalfa Club.

(The club, a social group that includes many of the Capital City's most prominent citizens, annually holds a mock "national convention" to nominate the "Alfalfa" candidate for President. This year's nominee was the Arizona Republican.

(Text of an address before the Alfalfa Club in Washington, D.C., on January 20, 1962:)

Mr. President, fellow members of this convention, guests: Thank you, Mr. Graham [Philip L. Graham, president of the Washington Post and Times Herald]. Believe me, it is an honor to be nominated by a man of your distinction, and I am very grateful to Herblock [Post and Times Herald cartoonist] for giving you the evening off to perform this vital task. While seated at the table I turned to my friend and able colleague from Kentucky, THRUSTON MORTON, and remarked that there are a lot of Republicans here tonight and he quickly commented that Republicans cannot afford $100 dinners and settled for this $25 one.

This is the most exicting thing that has happened to me since [Walter] Reuther made me an honorary Auto Worker. Frankly, I feel that I am long overdue for this nomination. But in my modesty I can't believe that there are not others better qualified. Personally, I think Nelson Rockefeller would make a wonderful President. Although I don't know how the White House would look with those gas pumps out in front.

I notice that Mr. Kennedy and his chief scout aren't here tonight and if someone can carry the word to the President, tell him he would have been in no danger appearing with me tonight—we're not on television. I understand the President and Vice President are out raising money to pay off the campaign debt. They could each give up 1 week's allowance and take care of that.

Now, gentlemen, if my voice trembles a little at this historic moment, I'm sure you will understand. Emotion chokes me when I think that you have chosen a barefoot boy from the Arizona "valley of fear" to lead this underprivileged, undernourished, underhoused, underclothed, and over-Kennedied Nation of under 190 million underlings back to the old frontier of McKinley's day. The undertaking, naturally, overwhelms me. It takes my breath away even though I feel the White House is ready for me since Jacqueline remodeled it in an 18th-century decor, and I feel this is a double honor since I've never even been to Harvard.

But this has been a genuine draft—not just the kind felt by reservists—and I have yielded to it in the sincere belief that no man with a drop of patriotism in his veins could turn down such a golden opportunity to advance his family. Of course, the Goldwater clan is not as large as the Kennedy clan. And my brother Bob doesn't want to be in Government—he promised dad he'd go straight. Besides, somebody has got to mind the store. Which reminds me, I must have the books audited.

But I have a lot of uncles and cousins and in-laws whom I wouldn't mind shifting to the Government payroll. Anything at all—Peace Corps, Justice Department, Senator from Massachusetts—just anything so long as it isn't one of those dollar-a-year jobs. And don't forget I have a sister named Carolyn and a granddaughter named Carolyn, which I figure puts me two up in that department.

Since the Attorney General's famous parachute jump from the dome of the Capitol, we now have a three-party system—Republican, Democrat, and Teamsters. This opens a whole new vista for elections. Before, the Democrats had to carry away their own ballot boxes. Now the Teamsters can do the job, whether they dump them in the Illinois River or the Rio Grande.

Which reminds me, I have a grandson who's too young to vote but too old to be Attorney General. This may be an asset.

Now right at the beginning let me scotch one bit of campaign slander the opposition has come up with. It is perfectly true that, during the heat of the preconvention maneuvering, I said that, if nominated, I would not accept and, if elected, I would not serve. But that statement was lifted out of context and deliberately distorted.

In the first place, when I said it things didn't look so good. But do they tell you that? Of course not. They claim that I meant it. What I really said was that Sherman had said it first, Eisenhower had said it in 1948, Adlai had said it in 1952—and wishes to God he'd stuck to it—and Nixon is saying it now. It beats me how they can take a clear-cut sentence like that and distort it. Why, even Pravda garbled it in translation and they usually get things right.

I will not deny that I've thought about the Presidency. Somebody ought to think about it. And I'm not afraid of the Presidency. They say it's the loneliest job in the world. But those who say it have never been a Republican in this Senate. Besides there are many risks to being President—I saw that President Kennedy was Time magazine's "Man of the Year." Did you see his picture on the cover? I didn't even know that EVERETT DIRKSEN could paint.

I would not be truthful if I said that I was fully qualified for the office. I do not play the piano. I seldom play golf, and I never play touch football. I hope you will find it in your hearts to accept a President who just sits behind a desk and works.

Now, I must take note of the fact that my opponents call me a conservative. If I understand the word correctly, it means to "conserve." Well, then, I'm just trying to live up to my name and conserve two things that most need conserving in this country—gold and water.

I don't apologize for being a conservative. I can remember when "conservative" and "mother" were clean words.

Now let me turn to my campaign platform: As you all know, I have argued for some time that we should do away with the cumbersome and lengthy, unmeaningful and platitudinous promises that the platforms of both parties have become. We need bold, brief statements that all Americans can understand.

With this in mind and hoping to avoid any floor fight over the platform, I called the two gentlemen who wrote the 1960 Republican platform and asked the hopeful next Governor of California to have a midnight meeting with the current and next Governor of New York.

These things are no good, apparently, unless they are done at the witching hour of midnight.

Well, that was 2 weeks ago, and they're still arguing. They have a tentative draft that runs over 1 million words. You see, Dick has just written a book, which he thinks would make a good platform, that runs 500,000 words right there. And, of course, Nelson wants equal time.

And I gathered that they were both thinking of 1968, so I said, "The hell with that" and sat down and wrote a platform with only three planks. I've eliminated all the usual gobbledygook and tried to make it concise and concrete so that everybody will know just where I stand.

The first plank fits neatly on one page, but I think it's basically sound and honest. It will mean the same thing to you whether you live in the North or the South, whether you're a farmer in Maine or an industrial worker in California. It says, and I ask you to pay close attention: Elect GOLDWATER.

That's it. No nonsense, no shilly-shallying, no hairsplitting—just elect GOLDWATER. It's got a nice ring to it that I sorta like and is there anyone, from the highest to the lowest, from the ordinary schoolchild to the lowliest Harvard professor, who can possibly mistake this meaning? I'll go even further. Is there anyone in this room who doesn't understand it?

The other two planks deal with labor, education, foreign policy, and the farm problem. Here's plank No. 2: Elect GOLDWATER. Now you may notice a certain similarity between the first plank and the second, and I want you to know that that was deliberate. It has been my experience that the public is confused if you offer too many issues. The thing to do is to get hold of one good one and stick to it. Hammer it home. Repetition is the way Madison Avenue sells toothpaste and soap and it's the way the New Frontier stays in the limelight. But when repetition occurs at the White House—and it has since 1932—it's not a sales pitch, it's a giveaway. You don't even have to guess the price.

And now for the final plank—plank No. 3. This is the bellringer and it's even shorter. It just says ditto.

There you have a campaign platform in five words—elect GOLDWATER, elect GOLDWATER, ditto.

Just to keep things symmetrical, I think I'll hold the budget to five figures. Jayne Manafield's for openers and I'll accept nominations for the other four.

Now, no campaign could get rolling without some slogans—words to quicken the patriotic pulses of the people and get them steamed up to go out and elect GOLDWATER.

You'll notice that they are set with the compass bearing of the New Frontier wagon train and some of them may even strike terror in the heart of Mr. Khrushchev.

The first one I borrowed from my friend L.B.J. It reads: "Forget the Alamo."

Others that are equally inspiring are: "Surrender, hell, I have not yet begun to negotiate." Or "Millions for defense, but not 1 cent for victory." And "54-40 or a reasonable compromise."

One more, "Damn the torpedoes—we're unilaterally disarmed."

Now, my inaugural address will establish precedent by the same kind of brevity. When I'm sworn in by Earl Warren—who will no doubt regard this act as a violation of his oath of office—all I intend to do is raise my hand and say, "I do."

That's all I said when I was married and it's all I've been able to say around the house ever since. But it's worked out rather well.

Now, I think you're entitled to know something about the caliber of men I will have in my Cabinet. In presenting the list, I'd like it understood that it is confidential. Also, all the men on this list have already leaked the information to the press and I have promised to respect the priority of their leaks.

For Secretary of the Treasury, I think I can do no better than to keep Mr. Dillon. Primarily because he has demonstrated that he possesses the one quality so badly needed in these days when we are being pulled one way by the extremists of the left and the other way by extremists of the right. Mr. Dillon is flexible. In fact, you might call him an extreme middle-of-the-roader.

My hat is off to any man who can argue under Eisenhower that we must beware of the inflationary tug of the mounting national debt and then make a rebuttal under Kennedy by saying a mere $7 billion added to the debt won't hurt us a bit. I believe that Secretary Dillon belongs in Government—I don't think private industry could afford him.

For Secretary of Defense, I'm sure you'll agree I couldn't do better than Linus Pauling. I figure if we give him 3 weeks on the job he'll give us a defense without going to the expense of nuclear weapons or bomb shelters, or anything else. That would save us about $60 billion right there and it ain't to be sneezed at.

Also I rather like his notion of replacing General Walker with Cyrus Eaton. If we're going to indoctrinate the troops, let's do it right.

Postmaster General is up for grabs. Adlai Stevenson is mad at the Post Office. He couldn't get back the Christmas card he

sent to Nehru. It couldn't be delivered anyway because Nehru was at a peace conference—that's where he spends his time between invasions.

For Secretary of the Interior I certainly would be loyal to a fellow Arizonian and ask Stew Udall to stay on—I'll need that oil money anyway. But only if he promises to stay off Mount Fuji and other people's private property. If he does a good job, we might even build a statue for him.

I haven't picked a Secretary of Agriculture yet. I'm waiting to see what Governors are unemployed.

As for the State Department, I've been going over their records and have come to the conclusion we ought to abolish the whole damn thing.

I don't claim to have all the answers, but, since this administration took over, I don't even understand the questions.

And another thing: How is it that our Government did better against General Electric than they did against Cuba?

I don't want to seem critical. But our first ambassador in space was a chimp. And so far he's the only one in the State Department who hasn't made a mistake.

If I do have a State Department I guess I could keep Chester Bowles. He's the mystery guest in the Cabinet; in fact, he's going on "What's My Line?" as soon as he finds out what his line is. Of course, if the State Department doesn't work out I can always close it and keep the store open nights.

I think it's only fair to tell you I intend to be the President of the whole people and can promise you a nonpartisan administration made up of the best men obtainable. If there are some good scouts in the New Frontier—and I have my doubts—I'll ask them to stay even if they have to be approved by Walter Lippmann.

For example, I have some definite plans for Professor Galbraith, Ed Murrow, and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. I can't reveal these plans, because if there's a leak they might get out of the country before I'm inaugurated.

I have some other notions that I shall reserve for my first state of the Union message. For example, I'm going to propose a constitutional amendment that any decision of the Supreme Court must make sense. I know it will be controversial, but I think it deserves an airing.

Further, I will state to the people, "Ask not what your country can do for you but rather what you can do for your country." I think I've heard that somewhere. Then I'll ask for a new Government agency to study and make recommendations on new things the Government can do for the people. This may take considerable research.

I think it's time to dust off that old shibboleth, "The people are too damned dumb," and really apply ourselves to the task of taking their property, spending their money, and living their lives for them. It's time they face up to the realties of life and start making some sacrifices.

The Kennedy administration has only scratched the surface in this field. Actually, as we mark the first anniversary of the New Frontier, I must say it's been a wonderful year. I wish we could afford it. Now I know why they call it the New Frontier—we're having a harder time crossing it than "Wagon Train."

Now, I suppose no acceptance speech would be complete without a reference to the candidate's background. Very simply, I think I'm in the American tradition. I was born in a log cabin, which I had moved to Phoenix, and, except for some air conditioning, a swimming pool, a bowling alley, a bar, a shooting range and a golf course, it remains the simple log cabin it always was.

I have nothing against millionaire Presidents. I'd just like to see the day return when people other than Presidents can be millionaires, too.

I've never hesitated with an answer. When anyone asks me how I stand on integration, I've only got one answer: Where are you from?

Now, gentlemen, I have told you the story. The rest is up to you. Go out and work from now to election day and fulfill our campaign pledge—elect GOLDWATER. Find more of those districts such as the one the New Frontier turned up in Cook County—the one that had 22 residents but came up with 77 votes. That's the sort of stuff I mean.

Gentlemen, I'm flattered that you thought first of my name. I have every confidence that, with all of you behind me, I could be another Alf Landon.

Do your share, and, I pledge you, I will do mine.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

What Freedom Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, last night I was privileged, along with many other Members of Congress, to see and hear some truly outstanding young Americans participate in the National Voice of Democracy speaking contest, which was held at the VFW annual national dinner.

As a Member of Congress and as an American, I was deeply moved and tremendously proud of all of these fine youngsters. It is with an even greater sense of pride and personal happiness that I can report that one of the best presentations last night was made by a young man from my district, Eric Alpert of New Bedford, Mass. His speech, evidencing a sense of history, imagination and a fundamental understanding and appreciation of the American way of life, was awarded fourth prize and a $500 scholarship.

It is titled "What Freedom Means to Me," and is well worth the attention of my colleagues:

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

"From every mountainside let freedom ring." These immortal words are contained in one of our Nation's most beloved songs. But what is freedom? Why is it that millions have sacrificed their very lives for its preservation? To me, freedom is something which God intended for mankind, for the Bible teaches, "Proclaim liberty throughout the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof."

I feel extremely fortunate to have been born in America, a land where men are free from the rule of tyranny, a land where men can assemble when and where they choose, say what they feel, worship as they please, elect whom they want to represent them, and, in fact, do whatever they like within the bounds of reason and morality. Even if, perchance, a man is accused of overstepping his bounds, he knows assuredly that he will not be unjustly punished with no questions asked, as is the case in some parts of our world, but that he has the privilege of coming before a court of unbiased persons, stating his case, and receiving fair verdict and punishment.

"Liberty and union, now and forever, one and inseparable." These words of Daniel Webster exemplify my belief that from freedom there emerges brotherhood, and from brotherhood there emerges unity. In a truly free society, where the freedoms I have previously mentioned are fervently upheld, every man can understand his neighbor and live compatibly with him, regardless of any difference of creed or color. If this type of brotherhood is prevalent throughout a nation, then peace and unity must result, crime must disappear, wars must cease eternally. But it is not so. There is war, there is crime, there is strife. Why? Is it because freedom is failing? No, it is only because men have their own failings that there must be prejudice, jealousy, and strife. We may never see a truly free society; there may never be one, for it would symbolize perfection, a state unattainable by man, but, nevertheless, a goal toward which he stubbornly aims, for he is never satisfied.

America has been referred to both as the cradle of liberty and as the land of opportunity. Is there a definite connection between these two qualities? Yes, I think so, for even though our free society is imperfect, one of our prime American axioms is that all men are created equal. Every person has the opportunity to decide how he wishes to direct his own life, and I feel that this enhances the speed of man's progress, since, with education available to all, the cobbler's son may become President, the President's son a cobbler, for freedom erases hereditary power and bestows honor based upon the achievements of the individual. Great gifts to mankind have come from men such as Edison and Einstein, who were free to use imagination and curiosity to probe into science, pushing back humanity's frontiers of knowledge and opening the doors to the worlds of electricity and atomic energy. Yes, freedom cries for originality and advancement by encouraging men to use their own creativity to better themselves and their society in a constant struggle to achieve worldwide unity.

I therefore strongly support the principles of freedom and the American way of life, for I feel that each and every citizen, from the poorest to the richest, by being able to express his candid opinion, owns a share in democracy and in the destiny of our country. I echo the words of Benjamin Franklin, who said, in 1776, when freedom was grasping the colonies, molding them into the United States of America, "Where liberty dwells, there is my country."

ERIC ALPERT.

Railway Museum, Green Bay, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the history of railroading provides an informative, exciting, and significant saga of the development of the U.S. transportation system—and, particularly, the contribution by our railroads.

Recognizing the importance of these features of U.S. progress, the citizens of Green Bay, Wis., have undertaken a constructive effort to establish a National Railroad Museum. The purpose of the museum is to portray the development of the railroad industry and its contribution to our progress; provide exhibits, including rare locomotives—that is, steam woodburners, electric, diesel—to give the public an authentic picture of the development; serve as an educational institution displaying printed material, photographs, models, and other information; present a chronology of the lives of inventors, investors, managers, and workers who made outstanding contributions to the progress of the railroad industry.

There will, of course, be many more significant features of the museum.

During the previous Congress, I introduced legislation designed to request congressional recognition of this new museum—of great historical, educational, and cultural significance not only for the people of Wisconsin, but the entire Nation.

Unfortunately, the Congress failed to give approval to the proposal.

Nevertheless, I am proud to report that the citizens of Green Bay have not "waited on Uncle Sam," but, rather, have gone ahead constructively and realistically to develop—and make available to all U.S. citizens—a splendid, panoramic picture of railroading in the United States.

Recently, the Green Bay Gazette published a splendid article by John Torinus entitled "Future Looks Bright for Railroad Museum." I ask unanimous consent to have this printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FUTURE LOOKS BRIGHT FOR RAILROAD MUSEUM

(By John Torinus)

There could not be a better man to take over the presidency of the National Railroad Museum for the coming year than Vern Bushman. He is the energetic president of the Ahnapee & Western Railroad, and the traffic manager for the U.S. Plywood Co. In addition, he is a powerhouse in the Short Line Railroad Association of America.

Vern has been active in museum affairs almost since its origin here and he almost singlehandedly persuaded the Short Line Association to donate the Hood Junction depot at the museum and supervised its construction.

This building represented the first real break for the museum, and served as the lever to get the whole project off the ground. It was the museum's first recognition by a national railroad organization.

Back in 1959, Vern had persuaded the Short Line Association to hold its national convention in Green Bay in the fall of 1960. And he kept prodding museum officials here to have something concrete to show the visitors by that time. It was this which led to the construction in 1960 of the standard gage passenger track on the museum property to go with the depot building.

Vern reported to the directors at their annual meeting recently that the Short Line Association is still contributing to the museum as an active supporter. And now Vern is going after support of class I railroads.

There is considerable competition in this railroad museum field, but at the moment Green Bay is leading the pack.

The biggest rival is the National Museum of Transport, in St. Louis, which has accumulated a large collection of railroad equipment. But the locomotives and rolling stock are now stashed on a couple of tracks 40 miles out in the country outside St. Louis.

FUNDS SOUGHT BY ST. LOUIS

The museum supporters in St. Louis are currently trying to persuade the taxpayers of that city to include several million dollars in a bond issue for a site in downtown St. Louis for the museum. The question hangs in the balance, and at the moment their chances of success do not appear too good.

In the meantime the museum here is open and operating and growing each month. Vern feels this is the critical year, that if our museum can have a successful year this coming summer it will convince the railroad industry that this is where they should throw their support.

The museum directors at the meeting here heard optimistic reports on plans for 1962. A master plan for long-range development of the property is now being completed. Several groups are taking on individual projects within this plan. Among the first new projects will be completing two trestles across Dutchman's Creek and completing the track loop south of the creek and a roundhouse to house the operating equipment.

The State historical society has offered to take a larger hand in operation of the museum this year, including orientation lectures for museum visitors and guided tours.

EMPHASIS ON ROLLING STOCK

A number of new exhibits are in the offing, including two more steam locomotives, one of them in prime operating condition. Plans are underway to use this engine for several steam excursions in the area.

The emphasis now will be on acquiring a complete exhibit of rolling stock for the museum. A completely renovated refrigerator car has already arrived here as a donation from Swift & Co.

And our friend, Bill Riley, has donated one of the pickle cars which have been operated around the country for many years by his company, W. D. Riley & Sons.

Raising the necessary funds to build the museum has always been the major problem, but progress was also reported on this front. The museum still owes money for part of the construction work done to date, but the debt is shrinking all the time. And fundraising efforts are now spreading out around the State, with several thousand dollars already in from the Milwaukee area, where Frank Ladky is running a one-man campaign.

This past year the museum receipts totaled almost $30,000 from contributions and gate receipts. This means that almost $150,000 has now been invested in the project here.

The future looks bright for the museum to become the tourist attraction here which its founders predicted some 5 years ago.

Character Counts With the Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, from February 7 through 13, the Boy Scouts of America will celebrate their 52d anniversary. Last week I had the honor of being presented with a Scout badge by Johnny Blaine, a Cub Scout belonging to the Ryland Methodist Church Pack of Washington, D.C. I am proud to wear the Scout badge during Boy Scout Week as I know of no other organization which has done more over the years for the physical and spiritual well-being of the youth of our country than the Boy Scouts of America.

I have met and known many boys like Johnny in the Second Congressional District of Kentucky, which I have the honor to represent, and these boys, from Cubs to Explorers, deserve our wholehearted support, encouragement, and respect. From the very beginning of the scouting movement, the purpose of this organization has been to promote the ability of boys to do things for themselves and others, to train them in scoutcraft and to teach them patriotism, courage, and self-reliance, and to emphasize the need for character development, citizen responsibility, and physical fitness. It is my belief that these high ideals and purposes have been fully met, and the success of this organization can be measured not only in terms of its phenomenal growth but in the achievements of the individual boy. Scout training and adherence to the principles of the Boy Scouts of America have a profound effect on the development of our future citizens, and it is absolutely imperative that we use every resource at our command to develop men who will have the moral fiber to meet the challenges of the space age. Our Nation's strength lies in the character of its people, and the work being done by the Boy Scouts of America in preparing our youth to meet the ever-increasing demands of world leadership cannot be overestimated.

Boys from so-called less-chance areas where juvenile delinquency is high have responded enthusiastically to the scouting program. A police inspector in Philadelphia has said:

> For the first time in many years crime and delinquency in "the Jungle" show a decrease. * * * This can be directly attributed to the amount of personal and community responsibility demonstrated and practiced by the increased numbers of people and institutions working hand in hand with scouting.

Good citizens have replaced future criminals.

While the beneficial results of Scouting are perhaps more dramatically illustrated in overcrowded cities, an active program of rural scouting in our farm areas of equal importance. Scounting's basic appeal is as a "school of the woods," the only national organization for boys that places its major emphasis on camping, hiking, fishing, nature study and physical fitness, and it is in our rural communities that the greatest opportunity exists to explore all the wonders of nature.

The impressive growth and accomplishments of scouting would not be possible without the services of thousands of men and women who give unstintingly of their time and effort to make this program work. The high caliber of the men who dedicate themselves to the scouting movement is noteworthy—these men are exceedingly well-equipped both mentally and morally to be entrusted with the training of our youth and we owe them a debt of gratitude for the outstanding work they are doing.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to salute the Boy Scouts of America on their 52d anniversary, and to wish them well in all their future endeavors. These boys and their leaders know that in order to "strengthen America—character counts."

Problems Involved in Planning and Constructing Fallout Shelters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution passed by the National Association of State Contractors Licensing Agencies at a convention held in Salt Lake City September 7, 1961.

The members of the association are quite familiar with the problems involved in planning and constructing fallout shelters and I believe the Members of Congress will want to give careful consideration to the suggestions of the association.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION AS TO FALLOUT SHELTERS

The National Association of State Contractors Licensing Agencies in convention duly assembled at Salt Lake City in the State of Utah on the 7th day of September 1961, did unanimously adopt the following resolution:

"Whereas the world is facing the imminent threat of atomic testing and possible atomic attack caused by the irresponsible actions of the dictators of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in their ceaseless attempts to prolong their personal control of the peoples now subject to them and in their attempts to forcibly and violently overthrow the established governments of the world not now subject to their nefarious control; and

"Whereas the continued existence of mankind is jeopardized by such testing and civilization as it is now known could be entirely wiped out by atomic attacks; and

"Whereas a properly designed fallout shelter constructed in readily accessible places is the only known method by which a substantial number of the citizens of our countries can be protected from the fallout effects of an atomic attack; and

"Whereas it is therefore to the best interests of the world, of the United States of America, and of the respective State governments that the construction of fallout shelters be promoted in every possible manner; and

"Whereas each municipal, county, and State government have varying restrictions, regulations, and conditions affecting the construction of buildings and structures which, due to lack of uniformity and desires for

local revenue, greatly increase the cost of construction of such fallout shelters; and

"Whereas the one greatest obstruction to the construction of such shelters is that there is no one governmental agency which has established approved standard plans and specifications which must be recognized by local and county building departments; and

"Whereas each local and county building department has either failed to establish standards or have established widely varying standards of construction; and

"Whereas each and every local government has established setback ordinances where no construction is allowed; and

"Whereas as fallout shelter is constructed below ground and the most convenient and often only convenient and practical place for construction of said fallout shelter is within the setback area; and

"Whereas the national and State welfare demand that the construction of such fallout shelters be encouraged and expedited in every possible way; and

"Whereas the construction of such fallout shelters at Government expense is impractical and the construction by private individuals of such shelters of either the most simple or most elaborate design will serve the interest of the State and National Governments by protecting the lives of their citizens and insuring the continuation of mankind's existence: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the National Association of State Contractors Licensing Agencies should do everything possible to promote the construction of fallout shelters by public agencies, by private employers, and by private citizens and that the association should recommend to the responsible State authority in each State that the said State shall by regulation or law provide as follows:

"1. That the Governor of each State shall appoint a committee of several civil and structural engineers to receive all drawings submitted to them for check and approval, when accepted they will stamp each drawing approved; and

"2. That fallout shelters designed by any licensed civil or structural engineer, and accepted be considered as complying with building codes and regulations; and

"3. That such fallout shelters which are constructed more than 3 feet below grade and which are so designed as to be at least 90 percent covered by 3 feet of soil upon completion may be located at any place upon any property, whether within or without any municipality and that such location shall not be affected by setback or side line or rear line ordinances, provided that the location thereof is certified to be safe by the certificate of any civil or structural engineer and further that no building department need approve plans and specifications so certified prior to construction, and further that nothing herein provided shall prevent any such building department from requiring the filing of plans and from inspecting the construction under such plans and taking such steps as are necessary to enforce compliance with the plans and specifications and from charging fees at actual cost for any enforcement procedures found necessary due to lack of compliance with such plans and specifications; and

"4. That any State-licensed contractor may install such fallout shelters; and

"5. That the fallout shelters when completed, whether simple or complex, together with the furnishings and supplies therein, shall not be included in valuation for property tax purposes; and

"6. That the cost of fallout shelters, the fixtures, equipment, and supplies therein shall be deductible for income tax purposes as actually paid, whether financed or not; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the officers of this association be and they hereby are authorized and directed to send a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Governor of each State, to each Member of the Senate of the United States, to each Member of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Director of Civil Defense of the United States, to civil defense director of each State and to provide for copies thereof to be furnished to all legislative bodies and agencies of State or local governments and to further provide for the dissemination hereof in the public press."

ALLEN H. RHODES,
Secretary.

Approved.

MARK C. NOTTINGHAM,
Chairman.

JOHN H. CHASE,
President.

Dynamiting Dreamer Gets Things Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, out in the mountain vastness of South Dakota's beautiful Black Hills, a gigantic monument to the heroism and courage of the American Indian is slowly but surely taking shape.

James C. Rippey had an article on this subject in a recent issue of the Sioux Falls Daily Argus Leader. It is a fascinating human interest story and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DYNAMITING DREAMER GETS THINGS DONE

(By James C. Rippey)

Korczak Ziolkowski is a bearded bull of a man. He'd have been an imposing figure in any age, but in 20th century America, he's a towering paradox. There are times when his friends cuss him, and he regularly confounds his enemies. A dreamer, he's using dynamite and a bulldozer to carve a South Dakota mountain into a statue that will be larger than the largest pyramid, eight times as tall as the Sphinx.

No State or Federal funds are involved. No giant foundation or wealthy art patron is furnishing the money. Instead, for 14 years, 53-year-old Ziolkowski has juggled a variety of activities to keep the prospect going. His wife and most of their nine children share in the hard work.

Located in the Black Hills 4 miles north of Custer on highways 16 and 385, the monument will show the Indian chief, Crazy Horse, on his steed; it should be finished by 1978. The late Sioux chieftain, Henry Standing Bear, originated the idea. He wanted posterity to be reminded "the red man had great heroes, too." In Korczak's mind, however, the huge sculpture is only the first phase of an even more colossal project.

ENVISIONS UNIVERSITY

He visualizes the carving as the focal point of a vast campus. As a tourist attraction, it will bring in the funds to finance a medical center and university dedicated to the welfare of the modern North American Indian, also a museum to preserve his cultural heritage.

It's a grandiose scheme and there are times when Korczak sounds like a fanatic. But doubters should beware. This man has already done "the impossible."

He built his log home with timber cut on the land, then inched a 35-story (741-step) staircase up the sheer face of the mountain. He figures he carried 29 tons of lumber on his back. The stairway was the only way up until Korczak rigged a homemade cable car that terrified everyone but him. For years he was nagged by the thought of how much more rock he could move if he had a bulldozer up there. Experts said it couldn't be done but Korczak blasted a torturous path up the mountain during the winter of 1957 and since then he has used the dozer to shove a million and a half tons of granite over the edge. That's four times more rock than was removed in the entire Mount Rushmore project.

BECOMING VISIBLE

Airhammers are used to drill holes in the rock. Dynamite is set off in the holes, then the dozer pushes away the loosened boulders, some of them weighing several tons. Purpose of blasting is to create a rough outline of the figures. The Indian's head and outstretched arm are visible now; the horse's head will be next and then the sculptor will open the hole between the arm and the horse. A 10-foot layer of rock separates the rough outline from the eventual finished surface.

In 1953, Korczak bought a dairy herd but couldn't get a loan to build a mechanical milking parlor. He and his wife, Ruth, built it themselves, then persuaded a milking machine company to supply the equipment on credit. Now the dairy is a source of income (and milk) for the family and also helps pay for the work on the mountain.

In 1957, Korczak bought his wife a sawmill in nearby Custer. The experts predicted failure and were wrong again. Korczak was so intrigued with the mill that he designed and built another one near his studio. Then he induced a Wisconsin firm to build a plant that converts sawmill odds and ends into chips for making paper pulp. It's a half-million-dollar business that runs "on stuff people used to burn," Korczak chuckles.

Mrs. Ziolkowski's sawmill is still operating but Korczak's was temporarily idle this summer. The money that might have been used to buy logs was needed for the mountain.

ONE-FAMILY SCHOOL

A chronic shortage of money put the sculptor in the education business. He calculated he could run his own school for less than what tuition and transportation to town were costing. So he hauled in a one-room schoolhouse and hired a teacher. All the pupils are Ziolkowskis.

Of Polish ancestry, Korczak was born in Boston. Both his parents were killed in an accident when he was 3. His fame as a sculptor was established when he won the First Sculptural Award at the New York World's Fair in 1939 with a half-ton marble bust of Paderewski. (This is one of the dozens of Korczak's works which visitors may see at his Crazy Horse studio.) In 1941 he completed the largest one-piece marble statue since Michelangelo created his famous David 450 years ago. It is the Noah Webster statue in West Hartford, Conn.

The Connecticut experience was a warm-up for the Crazy Horse endurance contest. In West Hartford, Korczak had offered to donate his labor if the materials were furnished. But he got into a feud with the

city council and ended up spending $7,000 of his own money and mowing 700 lawns to finish paying the bills.

UNKIND DESCRIPTIONS

His artistic temperament and single-mindedness have prompted people to call him ruthless, arrogant, tyrannical, and ill-tempered. Will Robinson, South Dakota State historian, puts it this way: "I have cussed him to his face and behind his back, but I have never had occasion to abandon my opinion that here was a fellow who knew how to get things done * * * a man who will make any sacrifice necessary to carry out his purpose." Despite his dedication to the mountain, Korczak is also described as "the father of a supremely happy family."

The least that can be said is that he is a rugged individualist. He turned his back on the possibility of a $10-million Federal grant because it would have meant giving up his plans for the university and medical center.

So the project remains a private partnership that teams the sculptor with the American public. Adults pay 75 cents to visit the observation platform, tour the studio and museum. Last year tourists paid in $28,000; the work on the mountain cost $44,000. Korczak's income from the dairy and sawmills made up the difference. It costs $340 a day to provide drill bits, compressed air for the hammers, blasting powder, wages for one or two helpers and the never-ending repairs.

Finances of the project are audited by the nonprofit Crazy Horse Foundation. Korczak draws no salary. And even though his other interests are his livelihood, they frustrate him.

"I didn't come out here to run a dairy or sawmill," he says. "I came out here to carve a mountain."

Who Are the Extremists?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, the fad among collectivists in this country is to call anyone who dares to criticize the welfare state an extremist. These people would have us believe that it is wrong to stand for the principles of individual political, religious, and economic freedom expressed in our Declaration of Independence and Constitution. Such irresponsible name calling serves only to aid and comfort our mortal enemy, international communism.

Who are the extremists? This question is answered in an editorial which appeared in the February 13, 1962, issue of National Review. Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WHO ARE THE EXTREMISTS?

Reading the papers lately, we have found ourselves idly noting:

1. Three hundred and fifty "beards and leotards" (as described by the Herald Tribune), clad in dirty jackets, sagging sweaters, and sloppy blouses, staged a general strike for peace by tramping in disorderly lines down the sidewalk and half the roadway of New York's Fifth Avenue. They carried glass-globed peace torches, placards denouncing nuclear tests, arms, and fallout shelters ("Dogs et al. Want To Be Active, Not Radioactive," "We Declare Peace Against Russia and the United States"). Jostling pedestrians aside, they crowded around Pete Seeger, the Communist Party's favorite folk singer, to join in chanting "You Can Dig Your Grave in Your Own Backyard" and the stirring new student chorus, "I Ain't Gonna Study War No More." A march leader explained to reporters that they were calling on the people to walk out on their Government and on their armies.

2. On the Connecticut Turnpike, two self-described pacifists, Bram Luckom and Henry Wershaw, were (illegally) soliciting rides at peril to themselves and oncoming traffic. When State policemen tried to get them off the road, they lay down. They had to be carried into court and carried out after a hearing. Last August, Luckom and a number of others had attempted to board the nuclear submarine *Ethan Allen* at its commissioning at Groton, and then too had to be dragged from the scene.

3. At Southern University (all Negro), the administration and students were locked in bitter struggle because the president, pursuant to the law, had suspended seven undergraduates who had been arrested after taking part in disorderly and violent riots in nearby Baton Rouge.

4. Several thousand furcoated ladies "paraded for peace" ("Peace or Perish," "We Believe in People") before the White House. Said Mrs. Gage-Colby, "international coordinator of Women Strike for Peace": "Since the war all the calls for peace have come from the East" (meaning Moscow).

5. In spite of court orders, students, acting under the strategic guidance of CORE (Congress of Racial Equality) maintained a 24-hour sitdown in the corridors outside the office of the chancellor of the University of Chicago. Their professed complaint was the "gradualness" of the university—which has a notorious record of liberality on all racial and civil rights matters—in opening all housing it owns to total integration.

6. Addressing 1,500 antiarms demonstrators blocking public highways opposite U.N. headquarters, Harold Taylor, former president of Sarah Lawrence College, told them to demand immediate unilateral disarmament (unilateral: disarmament by this country, whether or not the Soviet Union and China disarm).

7. Municipalities in various parts of the South continued to try to deal with the relics of expeditionary forces from northern cities which have entered their precincts in deliberate offense to local custom and ordinance.

8. Nine hundred professors of universities on the eastern seaboard denounced in large newspaper advertisements and press releases the idea of building any sort of fallout shelters.

9. SANE, recovering from its fainting spell after last autumn's Soviet nuclear tests, backed up the antishelter campaign, and demanded that we continue our unilateral test ban.

10. The Fair Play for Cuba Committee, after greeting with a month's discreet silence Castro's open announcement of his Communist allegiance, resumed its campaign in favor of the Castro regime.

Now it may be noted that various and sundry persons have in some or most of these episodes (a) advocated policies that would strip this country of the means by which it could defend itself against actual or possible enemies; (b) given aid and comfort to this country's declared enemies; (c) launched unconditional attacks on our Government's laws and policies; (d) put forward crude, oversimplified, and irrational slogans; (e) appealed to fear, envy, and ignorance; (f) used methods highly offensive to many of their fellow citizens, disruptive of public order, and in many instances palpably illegal.

We have so far failed to find any published dispatch, editorial, or column that designates any of the persons involved in these or similar episodes as "extremists."

In the recent new edition of Webster's Unabridged Dictionary, its editors frankly adopted "current usage" as the only standard for the meaning of words. For their next revision we commend to their attention the proper definition of "extremism": "n. Quality or state of being to the right of Harvard."

Alaska's Power Needs—No. X

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST GRUENING

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I am asking unanimous consent that the 10th article dealing specifically with Fairbanks in the worthwhile series on Alaska power needs by Paul Lien, which have been published in the Daily Fairbanks News-Miner, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUNICIPAL UTILITIES MANAGER SAYS "TIME ALREADY RUN OUT"

(By Paul Lien)

Fairbanks and Anchorage have joined together with all the larger cities in central Alaska for the purpose of eliminating the power shortage which faces all.

Hydroelectric, atomic, and steam plants have all been considered, but time is the most important factor.

Mine mouth plants seem to be able to provide the cheapest source of power in the quickest possible time. Building hydroplants is a long-drawn-out process, and atomic plants are in their experimental stage of development.

Development of one of our most abundant natural resources, coal, is also a factor in favor of mine mouth plants to bolster our sagging economy.

Robert Wade, manager of the municipal utilities system of Fairbanks, says time has already run out for getting power into the Fairbanks area before the shortage occurs.

"We expect a power shortage in the winter of 1963," said Wade, "and in the meantime we may have to supplement our present power supply with an additional unit.

"Our engineers have been authorized to join together with engineers from Golden Valley Electric and bring in a report on the feasibility of constructing a 22,000-kilowatt plant at either Healy or Fairbanks to supply power here as soon as possible.

"WITHOUT POWER

"We will be glad to join the Generation and Transmission Cooperative when it is established—but we can't take any chances of being without power if the GTC proves to be nonfunctional.

"Any way that we can introduce low-cost power into this area will be welcomed.

"Cost of power in Alaska is highest in the United States with a cost of 4.3 cents per kilowatt-hour, and we consume 4,273 kilowatt-hours per person per year. Massachusets is second highest, with a cost of 3.46 cents per kilowatt-hour, and each person

consuming 2,533 kilowatt-hours per person per year.

"By comparison, in the Tennessee Valley where cheap power is available, the cost is 1.03 cents per kilowatt-hour, and 8,932 kilowatt-hours per person per year is consumed.

"In the State of Washington the cost is 1.09 cents per kilowatt-hour and average consumption is 8,932 kilowatt-hours per person per year.

"From these figures you can readily observe that the lower the cost to the consumer, the more power he uses.

"FAIRBANKS POWER

"Cost of power in Fairbanks was 4.16 cents, or 41.6 mills per kilowatt-hour for the 12 months ending October 31, 1961. Production costs were 19.6 mills, debt service 6.8 mills, and other costs, including depreciation, accounting, and billing, distribution (outside lines), and common plant (miscellaneous building, etc.), 15.2 mills, making a total cost to the consumer of 41.6 mills.

"Residential average for the 12 months preceding October 1 was 5.48 cents per kilowatt-hour to the consumer.

"Regardless of what power units we have on hand when we join the integrated group, Fairbanks power will always be used for baseloading, peakloading, and for heating purposes," said Wade.

Proposals by the Federal Government Concerning Electric Power Production Across the Country Will Have Immediate and Long-Range Effects on Our Nation's Fuel Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the proposed program of the Federal Power Commission, outlined in the President's 1963 budget message, is attracting nationwide attention because it envisions the creation of a nationwide coordinated and interconnected electric power system rather than on a local area basis. The following interesting article on the FPC program appeared in the February 1, 1962, issue of the United Mine Workers Journal:

UNITED STATES MOVES TO STEP UP POWER PROGRAM

Two potentially controversial proposals by the Federal Government concerning electric power production across the Nation that will have immediate and long-range effects on the coal and other fuel industries are now under consideration.

A special Interior Department task force has recommended that Congress vote money next year to create an extra-high-voltage, direct-current interconnection between the power systems of the Pacific Northwest and California. The 1,000-mile electric power intertie would connect the Los Angeles area with Columbia River power dams.

The coal industry's biggest customer is the electric power industry and a major portion (54 percent) of the electric power in the Nation is produced by readily available, low-cost bituminous coal.

Of greater importance on a long-term basis is the proposal for a national power survey looking toward creation of a nationwide, coordinated and interconnected electric power system. This proposal was announced by Federal Power Commission Chairman Joseph C. Swidler.

The FPC program, proposed in President Kennedy's 1963 budget message to the Congress, outlines how the Nation's 3,600 electric power systems can key their future expansion plans to a national scale rather than on a local area basis. The survey will be completed in the summer of 1963, published and made available to the Congress, the entire electric power industry and the general public.

In line with its traditional position on such matters, the coal industry has called for an investor-owned power grid in keeping with the best tradition of the free enterprise system. The industry will continue to oppose unnecessary extension of federally subsidized power projects whenever needed additional power can be provided by privately owned electric companies.

FPC Chairman Swidler has invited the coal industry and other fuels industries to submit their views on the nationwide power grid to the FPC.

The power survey will be made by the FPC staff and consultants from industry if Congress appropriates the $380,000 requested for it in the President's budget.

Aim of the program would be to have available ample supplies of low-cost electricity throughout the Nation by 1980. By that time the power industry will be three or four times its present size and will use energy equivalent to 900 million tons of coal annually. If coal continues in its present place as the Nation's No. 1 electric power producer (54 percent) this would mean that the power industry by 1980 will be consuming between 450 and 500 million tons of coal annually. At the present time gas (21 percent), water (19 percent), and oil (6 percent), altogether do not produce as much electric power as coal. Atomic power production (less than three-tenths of 1 percent), of course, is still in the high-cost experimental stage and is expected to stay there for many years to come.

Swidler stated recently to coal industry representatives: "Anyone who looks at projections of energy use must realize that coal is on the verge of burgeoning on a period of growth * * *. Home-heating electricity will grow. Whatever you can do to make low-cost energy available is to your interest. What you may not get today (in increased business) you will inherit tomorrow. The tonnages of coal required for power production in the 1980's will make you fellows hustle to get coal out of the ground."

In connection with the proposed intertie between the Pacific Northwest and California, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall said the Nation's depressed coal mining areas stand to benefit most from the proposal. Udall said the direct-current lines offer dramatic possibilities for long-distance transmission of power which could help market electricity produced at coalfields and transmitted over extra-high-voltage power lines to the cities.

A shorter distance high-voltage transmission line is already being planned in the East by the Virginia Electric Power Co. VEPCO has announced it will construct a 350-mile high-voltage line to link a new coal-burning generating plant in Grant County, W. Va., with Richmond and northern Virginia at a cost of $50 million. VEPCO expects its system to be the first in this hemisphere to carry 500,000 volts of electricity. At present the usual power over longer distances is 230,000 volts.

WHY EXTRA-HIGH-VOLTAGE DC POWERLINES?

Extra-high-voltage, direct-current electric power transmission lines, such as the 1,000-mile electric power intertie proposed by the Federal Government between the Pacific Northwest and California, do not exist in the United States at the present time. One direct-current line is in service in Sweden; one is being completed under the English Channel, and two other direct-current lines are under construction in New Zealand and Russia.

Direct-current transmission eliminates the technical limitations imposed by distance and magnitude of power now being carried by proven alternating-current lines. Extra-high-voltage generally means in excess of 230,000 volts. There are about 2,000 miles of 345,000-volt alternating-current circuits now in use in the United States.

It is not economical to transport electricity over long distances on low-voltage circuits because the power is lost due to conductor resistance and other characteristics common to the movement of electricity. In the case of steam-generated electricity (using coal as the fuel) it usually has been more economical to transport the fuel to the generating plant before converting it into electricity.

The higher the voltage of the transmission line the less loss there is of the power transmitted. And high-voltage systems designed for direct current show an even higher efficiency than those carrying alternating current.

Extra-high-voltage transmission systems are economically feasible only when the capacity can be used for transmitting large blocks of power long distances from remote plants or for interconnection of large systems where there must be a means of moving large quantities of power back and forth as the need arises. Direct current is especially suitable for high-voltage, long-distance transmission of large quantities of electricity.

Congress and the Central Intelligence Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, last week, on the occasion of the confirmation of the nomination of John A. McCone as Director of the Central Intelligence Aency, I noted that the manner in which to deal with dangers of that office which may exist is to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence. Senate Joint Resolution 77, which would do this, was introduced, as I noted, by Senator McCARTHY last session and I, along with some 20 other Senators, am a cosponsor of the measure.

An editorial in today's New York Times supports this bill on the same basic rationale and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS AND CIA

The Central Intelligence Agency, under its new Director, John A. McCone, is opening a fresh chapter. Though without prior experience in the intelligence community, Mr. McCone is an able administrator. He has already made changes in personnel and methods which are hopeful, and others are impending.

But the Central Intelligence Agency cannot live by itself. It is not a policy-formu-

lating agency. It must provide many of the facts upon which policy is built. Its secret operations can influence policy; and it requires, as do all executive agencies, the close supervision of Congress.

For a variety of reasons the CIA has not had that supervision in the past. The system of division of powers upon which our Constitution was founded must not be eliminated, or minimized, in the name of secrecy. And secrecy does not preclude effective congressional control.

Today the CIA is monitored by four subcommittees of the Armed Services and Appropriation Committee of House and Senate. Cuba alone would appear to offer ample evidence that these divided committees do not exercise adequate supervision. What is clearly needed, as we have said many times, is establishment of a Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence, a "watchdog" committee similar to the one on atomic energy. Such a committee, continuously functioning, thoroughly informed, scrupulously discreet, could be the CIA's "conscience," its legislative monitor.

If war is too important in the atomic age to be left to the generals, secret intelligence is certainly too important to be left entirely to its own devices.

Russians Eager To Buy Complete Factories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the U.S.S.R.—despite boasting about economic progress—still attempts to obtain from the West the technological know-how to meet the needs of its economy.

According to reports, for example, the Soviet Union is now "scouring" Western Europe in attempts to buy "packaged," complete plants for industry. Why? This is necessary, largely because the Soviet economy is oriented—to such a large degree—toward the output of military equipment that it lacks the capability for adequate creative technological advancement.

By attempting to buy up complete plants from the West, the Soviet Union, then, accomplishes the following purposes: First, the Red economy may continue to concentrate upon production of scientific-industrial equipment of military value; second, the Reds are saved the great, and sometimes long, trial-and-error experimental periods for developing technological advancements; and, third, the attainment of complete production plants enables them to move forward faster than otherwise could be done under the Soviet economy.

As of now, there are no signs on the horizon of abdication of Red goals of world conquest and "burying" non-Communist ideologies and systems.

Consequently, I believe it is absolutely essential that the United States encourage its allies to take a new, careful, cautious look at any and all offers from the Communist countries. Why? To cut off materials which would strengthen the ability of the Soviet Union to commit aggression.

Realistically, the sale of a nail and bolt, or a factory, by the West, to Communist-dominated nations could—and probably would—be utilized to construct "coffins" designed for "burial" of the West.

Recently, the Milwaukee Journal published an article from the North American Newspaper Alliance entitled "Russ Eager To Buy Complete Factories."

Reflecting this effort of the Communists to benefit from technological progress by the West, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUSS EAGER TO BUY COMPLETE FACTORIES

DUESSELDORF, GERMANY.—Russia is on a buying spree for complete factory installations in what appears to be a desperate effort by Premier Khrushchev to place the Soviet Union abreast of the Western economies.

The Soviets experimented with the buy-a-plant trade gambit 3 years ago, contracting with Krupp for construction in the Soviet Union of a pilot synthetic fiber plant.

Success of the Krupp experiment apparently triggered the Russian chase after Western technology in the large economy package.

ROVE OVER EUROPE

The Soviets have contracted with West German steel and engineering concerns for construction in the Soviet Union of two chemical plants, a pulp and paper factory, a tubing mill for manufacturing broad-gage oil pipelines, and a brewery.

Moreover, Russian agents are now roving all over Western Europe on plant sprees. The latest Soviet acquisition is complete equipment for a $5 million tire factory to be built at Volgagrad (formerly Stalingrad) by Simon Handling Engineers of Britain.

This is the third plant the Simon engineering group has undertaken to build in the Soviet Union. Simon is building a $3 million corrugated container plant and an $8 million pulp and board mill.

FRANCE AND ITALY

From other British engineering concerns the Soviets are purchasing several complete plastic plants, including polyethylene and drip-dry synthetic fiber processing centers.

Russia is also buying complete factory installations from France and Italy. French firms are constructing in the Soviet Union an automatic production line for truck parts, a cement factory and two factories for manufacturing concrete panels used in rapid method construction.

Italy is supplying five plants to produce chemicals, pulp, pipelines and remote control equipment.

The Struggle Against Communist Domination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of a speech by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER before the Notre Dame University student body in South Bend, Ind., on February 6, 1962.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF A SPEECH BY SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER, OF ARIZONA, BEFORE NOTRE DAME UNIVERSITY STUDENT BODY, SOUTH BEND, IND., FEBRUARY 6, 1962

In our struggle against Communist domination, what do we Americans really champion?

What do we really believe?

What do we really stand for?

Is the rest of the world getting a true picture of our national character?

I don't think there is a single person here today who doubts that there is a serious misunderstanding throughout the world regarding the fundamental aims—the fundamental philosophy—of the American people.

Is it enough to tell the world that we can build a better lawnmower? Now a good, cheap lawnmower has its place. We can all agree on that.

Is it enough to tell the world we can build a more efficient tractor? All of us know that more efficient tractors are important. We can all agree on that.

But it a cheaper lawnmower, or a more efficient tractor the symbol that expresses the essence of America?

Distinguished foreign observers, like Dr. Charles Malik of Lebanon, have said that all too often our American publicity men have represented this Nation in the wrong light. They have too often pictured us as a nation primarily interested in only material gain.

On the contrary the story of America and her accomplishments is the story of men with deep spiritual motivations—men who sought freedom to pursue their own ideals and their own aims as the children of God. Some historians, blinded by materialistic considerations, have written about my own State of Arizona and the whole West as though this vast area was opened only as a result of men driven by a desire for gain. Fascinated by stories of the gold rush, land hunger, and buffalo hunting, they ignore the real story—the story of pioneers with the spiritual fiber to overcome impossible material obstacles to carve a civilization out of the wilderness. I think of the Mormons whose spiritual strength brought a whole desert into bloom.

The same sort of materialist vision which distorts the true meaning of the opening of the West, is presenting a picture of America to the world which interprets the ideals of America in purely economic terms.

We have seen a worldwide publicity campaign which offers a mail-order catalog as the quintessence of the American dream—a sort of materialist substitute for the Bible.

Somehow the idea has gotten abroad that the way to share the American ideal is to become bigger, fatter, and more luxurious. People are beginning to believe that to be American is simply to have more food and more complicated gadgets.

It is no wonder that, presented with these claims, many people in the Moslem world or the Buddhist lands or even Europe ask themselves, "What, after all, is the difference between the Communists and the Americans? They both tell us that life is for material prosperity and for military superiority; and they use almost identical phrases."

I suggest we Americans have been our own worst apologists.

Are we really nothing better than materialists? Do we genuinely believe that the test of a nation's virtue and greatness is its gross national product or its modern military gadgets? Are wall-to-wall carpets and space capsules the be-all and end-all of American civilization? Do we, in short, truly believe in anything beyond the material aims of the Communists?

If not, why do we oppose the Communists? If material progress is our only aim, why not join them?

It is true that we still are richer and stronger than the Soviets—though their standard of living has increased somewhat, and their military power has increased greatly. Well suppose then, 10 years from now, the Communists achieve a standard of living higher than ours, and an army and an air force and a navy better than ours. (I do not expect them to; but suppose this for the sake of argument.)

Should we, in such circumstances, admit their superiority and yield to them? If prosperity and material power are the prime summits of human striving, it follows that we might just as well throw in our lot with the Communists. In fact, there are so-called liberals in America today who have come to this conclusion. They say they would rather be Red than dead.

But I cannot agree that material prosperity and armed might are the indexes of personal and national greatness. I do not believe that any mere standard of living, in itself, is worth dying for. I deny that goodness and truth are determined by the magnitude and number of hydrogen bombs. I suggest that we Americans, and our Christian and Western civilization, stand for truths nobler and more enduring than these material satisfactions.

I suggest that if you must choose, it is better to be poor and free than to be snug and a slave.

I suggest that if you must choose, it is better to live in peril, but with justice, than to live on a summit of material power, but unjustly.

I suggest that if you must choose, it is better to stand up as a suffering man than to lie down as a satisfied animal.

Now to compete in bragging with the Communists is lost endeavor; at that game the most practiced liar always wins. And to adopt Communist standards for such a bragging match is folly. To cite tables of figures about our low prices and our high wages converts no Communists, and impresses few neutrals, and does not convince even ourselves: indeed, this may rouse envy throughout the world, without creating friendship. To demonstrate that our Globemasters can fly in enough Gurkhas and guns to discourage the Katanga gendarmes and smash the Katanga hospitals is no proof, either to Africans or ourselves, that we have any cause worth fighting for. And I believe it is time for us to tell our allies, and our adversaries, and ourselves, just what we Americans really are ready to sacrifice for—and, if need be, to die for.

This Nation does not live for the sake of butter, nor for the sake of guns. The United States of America, on the contrary, has for its moral object the high dignity of man; and for its political aim, ordered freedom—liberty under God and under the law—with justice for all. I think it is impossible to maintain freedom and order and justice without religious and moral sanctions. And surely it is not possible for man to enjoy true dignity without a model that is more than human and a hope that is more than earthly. Man is made for eternity; he does not perish like the flies of a summer; therefore he enjoys dignity. Every human being is a person, made in the image of God; therefore every man enjoys certain natural rights.

Are we ashamed nowadays to confess this?

Ought we to conceal our moral and cultural heritage, Jewish and Christian and classical, as something old fangled and impractical and irrational? To judge by the propaganda of certain gentlemen in our information services, one would so assume. Muttering vaguely about the wall of separation between church and state—which idea they carry far beyond any possible constitutional interpretation—these publicists discard as so much rubbish the moral and theoretical foundation of the American cause. And having nothing else left, such propaganda experts offer to the world a mess of pottage compounded of production statistics and firepower. And so do the Soviet propagandists.

In what way do we differ fundamentally from the Communists? Cardinal Manning said once that all differences of opinion are theological at bottom. True when he said it, this statement has grown even truer in our century. The great gulf fixed between the American Republic and the Soviet Union is a theological Grand Canyon. The Communist says that man is a thing, who exists to have his belly filled; and who may be manipulated and altered and, if need be, liquidated for the sake of efficiency. Such a creature does not need freedom; he wants only creature-comforts. "Freedom?" Lenin mocked. "Freedom? What for? What for?"

But to the American who has faith in his national traditions and the wisdom of our ancestors, who believes that our civilization is not morally and intellectually bankrupt, man is a being quite different. Man was made to know God, and enjoy Him forever. Man is not a thing, but an immortal essence. And freedom, ordered liberty, is man's birthright; for without true freedom, man could not choose between good and evil; he could not become fully human; he would remain, at best, childish. There exists a natural order for man, with natural rights. Worldly powers and dominations are not morally entitled to treat man as a pawn in a social chess game: the masters of the state have no right to deal with human beings as if they were animals—no right to manipulate and alter and liquidate human persons.

Here, I suggest, is the stone wall of demarcation between the Communists and Americans; we have hearts and consciences. If, by new inventions or slave labor or territorial conquests, the Soviets should grow richer and stronger than ourselves, and if we then should be asked, "Why not unite with them? Theirs are the kingdoms of the earth."

If we are men, still we will stand firm. If it comes to the test, we ought to die rather than to submit to a collectivistic anthill, no matter how glistening, or filled with up-to-date comforts.

For the object of the Communists is to reduce human nature to the material elements alone. And the object of thinking Americans and their allies is to preserve and strengthen the spiritual elements of human nature. The material conception of man and the spiritual conception of man cannot be reconciled. For this reason I have said that only through victory will we secure ourselves. More than a century ago, Abraham Lincoln declared that this Nation cannot endure half free and half slave. Today that solemn fact is true of the world.

Between Communists and men who believe in a transcendent order there can be no enduring compromise; for Communists will not tolerate religious belief, unless they find it so weakened and tamed that it seems harmless; and men who discern natural rights will never be able to live under communism. This eternal hostility was expressed far better than I can put it by a brilliant and God-fearing American for whom I have great personal admiration, a man who lies buried here in the chapel at Notre Dame, Orestes Brownson. Only a few months after the "Communist Manifesto" was published, Brownson—who had been a radical in his youth—denounced as heresy the philosophy of Marx and the sociologist ideology in general.

Brownson saw at the outset that Marxism was a political substitute for religion, caricaturing Christian doctrine. And Brownson knew that the terrible power of this ideology could be resisted only by true religious understanding—and by willingness to sacrifice for the enduring things. With a gift almost prophetic, Orestes Brownson declared that the struggle of the future would be betwen socialism and Christianity. In 1962, the fate of humankind is in the balance, and this contest seems to draw toward judgment.

The competition between the Communists and what we call the free world is clearly not being decided by living standards or even by the big battalions. The issue will be determined by power of conviction: the conviction of men who fear and love God, or the conviction of materialists who detest anything higher than themselves. And if our faith and our culture are to prevail, we must take our stand forthrightly on certain moral truths and ancient ways.

First, we must stand for the real brotherhood of man, which is possible only under the fatherhood of God.

Second, we must stand for personal freedom, which in essence is the right and duty of moral choice.

Third, we must stand for the Judaeo Christian and classical principle of justice: to each man the things that are his own by nature.

Fourth, we must stand for charity: the toleration, the mercy, and the giving which are the products of love.

Fifth, we must stand for the wisdom of our ancestors, sound authority and experience, what Edmund Burke called "the bank and capital of the ages."

Sixth, we must stand for variety; for diversity, which includes the right of men and nations to differ, and, as Chesterton put it, of "every potty little man to be his own potty little self."

And finally, we must stand for honor and the dignity of man.

This brief catalog of mine does not exhaust the roster of our duties and our first principles; but it may suggest that there are irreconcilable differences between the Communists and ourselves. It is for this reason that we can speak only of victory, never of any fundamental compromise.

As you may have expected, I am commending to you a conservative position in this crisis of our fate—what I believe to be a healthy and imaginative conservatism. I am commending to you the courageous and responsible conservative principles for which Orestes Brownson spoke. I am asking you to think of liberty as Brownson described it, in his long essay on the origin and constitution of government:

"By freedom, regarded as the end of government," Brownson wrote, "we understand the ability of every man to discharge, without other let or hindrance than his own moral delinquency, his special functions as a human being. All men have the equal right to be men, and each man has the equal right to be the man his Maker designed him to be."

This is not the conservatism of suspicion, or of selfishness, or of smugness. Rather, it is the noble conservatism of Edmund Burke and of George Washington. It is founded upon belief in a God who has given us our nature, our rights, and our duties; upon belief in a freedom which is moral in origin, and which is intended for our full development as human persons, each man and woman after his bent. And this is a world apart from the dreary slave-equality of Marx and of Lenin.

The real line of division in the modern world is not between liberals on the one hand and totalitarians on the other. Instead, it is between all those on the one hand who believe in a transcendent order of things and an enduring human nature; and on the other hand all those who would treat man as a mere creature of appetite, self-created or chance-created, to be dealt with as advanced social planners wish. It is between people who know themselves to be part of the great continuity and essence, and, on the other hand, people who live in the nightmare realm of an existence with

no meaning but material appetites and power over bodies and minds.

What do we stand for? If we are true to our civilized heritage and to ourselves, we stand for order and freedom and justice, founded upon religious understanding. Our prosperous economy, our technological achievements, our leisure and pleasures, our military defenses—all these are by-products, at bottom, of religious belief and of knowing the dignity of man. If we fail to stand by these deep enduring principles, then the Communists will bury us—and we will deserve to be buried.

No, the first principles of our moral and social order cannot be reconciled or blended with those of communism. Communists deny the divine origin of man; for the Communist, there is no more logical reason why a man should be dignified than there is why a pig should be dignified.

If we are strong in our faith and correspondingly strong in our preparations, the Communists will not bury us. For the Communist respects just one thing: power. And power of spirit is a greater force than the power of weapons. The Communist will not press for a final showdown with men whose spiritual power renders them invulnerable. For Communists, this life on earth is everything: death in a great war would mean the end of existence for them, for all time. In that sense, the Communists are at a disadvantage by the side of the religious man, who believes that death is no evil in itself: everything depends on how you die, for none of us live forever.

And if we are strong and resolute, demanding freedom from the Communist rather than yielding ground timidly before their bullying, we can triumph without any terrible devastation—without a final holocaust. For the nature of things is on our side. I mean that the Communists are operating upon false principles: upon illusions concerning the nature of man and the nature of the good society. Sooner or later, anyone who lives by false premises betrays himself. Men and women are not the mere animals and puppets that Communists would have them be. Human nature reasserts itself, given a little time, under even the most merciless tyranny. Behind the Iron Curtain, discontent will increase. If we Americans stand prepared and resolute, we can help the oppressed back toward a decent civil social order.

Within the core of the Communist structure—within Russia and China—the more energetic and talented and generous natures cannot be suppressed forever; and if we have prevented the commissars from establishing a world domination, those better natures in the rising generation ultimately will work their way to order and freedom and justice—given some help and encouragement—even in Moscow and Peiping. So the present question is not whether we want a devastating war, but rather whether we Americans have the intelligence and the fortitude to stand by ideas and institutions that were not born yesterday. Communism, a political religion, denies the providential order of existence; and so providence, sooner or later, will make an end of communism, if you and I do our part.

Perhaps you are thinking, "What can I do?" There are many tasks that can be yours—and many sacrifices you must make, of time and money and comfort, if we are to win our ultimate victory over the powers that would dehumanize man. But the first thing to do—and this is the especial province of university students—is to grasp clearly and firmly the grand principles of the moral order and the social order.

Our conservative task of saving mankind from a collective degradation will not make you rich; probably it will not make you powerful; and possibly it may mean that you will live harder and less long than if you were content to be a slave or a coward. But this task has one high reward: the consciousness of being fully human, in the cause of truth and justice and of man as God meant him to be.

You have the talent and the training for the duty that is yours. I am confident you will not fail to stand up for the things which make life worth living.

Investigators Must Have Integrity, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, there has been thundering around the heads of Members of Congress storm clouds with respect to the Federal interstate highway program. Just last week an article appeared in Parade magazine entitled "The Great Highway Robbery," which recited some of the facts supposedly uncovered by our colleague, Representative JOHN BLATNIK in his investigation of the Federal highway program.

West Virginia occupied a very prominent place in this article written by Jack Anderson even to the extent of showing a picture of a supposedly "new bridge" which had been constructed with Federal highway funds and which had collapsed. The best evidence obtainable with respect to this so-called new bridge is that it was constructed 30 years ago and the original plans were drawn in 1927 and that it was completed without Federal aid.

In order that the Members of the House might have benefit of an editorial written in response to the Parade magazine article, I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks this editorial entitled, "Investigators Must Have Integrity, Too," written by William D. Evans, the distinguished editor of the Fairmont Times, Fairmont, W. Va. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues will find this interesting reading:

INVESTIGATORS MUST HAVE INTEGRITY, TOO

West Virginians are indignant—and rightfully so—about two references to the State which appeared in the current issue of Parade magazine, a Sunday supplement which has national circulation with a number of newspapers. The article, called The Great Highway Robbery, was written by a Washington correspondent named Jack Anderson, and presumably was based on the investigations made by a committee headed by Representative JOHN BLATNIK, Minnesota Democrat.

BLATNIK has achieved a great deal of notoriety from his investigation into alleged graft connected with the Federal interstate highway program. It may be true, as Anderson says, that the Congressman has been "running a scrupulously fair investigation" and has given strict orders against his probers conducting a "witch hunt."

If, however, Representative BLATNIK's investigators have been no more "scrupulous" in their inquiries elsewhere in the country than in the two items they turned up in West Virginia, the entire examination will be suspect. A picture accompanying Parade's piece showed a broken-down bridge, with the caption, "Horrible example. New bridge on U.S. 50, West Union, W. Va., collapsed during high water. Luckily, dynamite truck had crossed minutes before. Investigators blamed faulty standards."

The body of the article contained this paragraph: "The proper people of Ripley, W. Va., rejoiced when a new highway cut through a notorious bawdy house outside town. But the State paid the madam such a generous price that she was able to open a far fancier establishment. It was whispered later that her clientele included certain road officials."

State road commission officials were quick to recognize that the new bridge on U.S. 50 at West Union actually had been constructed 30 years ago. The original plan, dated 1927, indicates that it was completed without Federal aid. The bridge, to be sure, was washed out in a flash flood in the spring of 1960, but there was nothing to show that it had been constructed to faulty standards when erected in 1930.

As for the Ripley bawdy house, law-enforcement officers in that quiet community assert that the story is a complete fabrication. Few rights-of-way were bought for Interstate 77 in the Ripley area, and if a disorderly house existed there it remained wholly undetected, an unlikely possibility in the small, conservative Jackson County seat.

The honest exposure of graft will be welcomed by all right-thinking citizens no matter where it occurs. The West Virginia interstate highway program already has been brushed with scandal over the legal fees and rights-of-way prices paid during a former State administration.

The editors of Parade say in defense that the bridge picture was erroneously identified through an unfortunate misunderstanding of the investigators' reports. It does not disclose where the Washington writer got his information about the Ripley establishment.

The Blatnik committee is going to defeat its own purpose if it relies on patent inaccuracies, whispers, and unfounded rumors on which to base its findings. Its own way of doing business may prove to be a greater scandal than the irregularities it turns up.

Regrettably, not many newspapers which carry the supplement would ever bother, as did Parade's West Virginia clients, to check out the mistakes. Thus the State will receive another national black eye it doesn't deserve.

In his quest for personal publicity, Representative BLATNIK should insist on the same standards of integrity among his investigators that he seeks among the States and contractors engaged in the gigantic Federal interstate highway building program.

A Balanced Budget?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. MURPHY, JR.

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, there appeared in one of New Hampshire's newspapers, the Littleton Courier, on February 1, 1962, an editorial entitled "A Balanced Budget?"

I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BALANCED BUDGET?

The President's proposed Federal budget for the fiscal year beginning next July will be balanced. And that, of course, is good news.

At the same time certain reservations need to be registered. For one thing, this budget looks a year and a half ahead—and enormous changes, which no man can now anticipate, can take place in that length of time.

For another, the revenue picture the budget presents is based on the assumption that profits and incomes will be much higher than in the immediate past, and that, consequently, Government tax revenues will rise. That may be the case. Even so, optimistic predictions of economic gains have been sadly wrong on many an occasion.

To come to the point: Balanced budget or no balanced budget, one of the greatest needs of our time is for the Government to reduce or eliminate every expense possible. It's got more than enough to do in handling the affairs and problems with which only Government can deal.

United Nations Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, recently President Kennedy asked the Congress to authorize the purchase of half of a $200 million bond issue to finance the United Nations Congo operation. My first impression toward this proposal was one of disapproval. However, I am suspending final judgment until I have had the opportunity to hear a detailed explanation.

The General Assembly of the United Nations has voted to ask an opinion of the International Court of Justice as to whether all members of the United Nations would be liable for the bonds. I, too, am interested in learning this opinion although I doubt if such an opinion would guarantee payment.

In weighing the issue, Mr. Speaker, I have read an editorial which appeared in the January 31, 1962, issue of the Bellingham (Wash.) Herald.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this editorial in the RECORD:

BOND DEAL UNATTRACTIVE BUT ALTERNATIVES WORSE

The cartoon on the adjacent columns of today's editorial page may be interpreted from two viewpoints, both of which are understandable.

One citizen may see it as corroboration of President Kennedy's stand that the United Nations must have financial support in the form of subscription by the United States to half the proposed $200 million bond issue for financing the Congo operation.

Another citizen will see the point of the cartoon as the fact that it always seems to be the U.S. taxpayer who steps in to bail out the U.N.

We recognize the validity of the second point of view and its corollary proposition: that other nations should start pulling more of their weight in return for their privileges as members of the United Nations.

But as long as the U.N. operates as a forum for discussion and the attempted settlement of disputes between nations—we think it serves a useful purpose as such—the United States is committed to using its prestige and resources to try to make it work as well as possible.

Congress probably will go along, though reluctantly, now that there is some evidence the U.N. expedition in the Congo may indeed stabilize that strife-torn land under a friendly central government. And Britain's announcement that it will buy $12 million worth of the bonds also is helpful.

Americans understandably may grumble about picking up half of this $200 million check, but it appears to be the least of the evils involved. Congress should honor the President's urgent request.

Knights of Dunamis Urge an Offensive Fight Against the International Communist Conspiracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, there has come to my attention a resolution recently passed by the Knights of Dunamis, national Eagle Scout society, urging that we take the offensive in our struggle against the international Communist conspiracy. This excellent resolution should be brought to the attention of Congress. Under unanimous consent, I include it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

KNIGHTS OF DUNAMIS RESOLUTION

Whereas the Boy Scouts of America is chartered by the Congress of the United States of America and is considered to be one of the leading youth character-building organizations in America today; and

Whereas the Knights of Dunamis, the national Eagle Scout honor society, is a nationwide organization made up of Scouts and adults who have reached the rank of Eagle Scout, the highest rank in Scouting; and

Whereas the Knights of Dunamis is a nationwide organization, dedicated to service to Scouting and the building of character in American youth; and

Whereas the international Communist conspiracy, under target youth, is conducting a full scale operation to undermine the morals and character of American youth in all media and through unsuspecting well-meaning Americans; and

Whereas said offensive is meeting with great success with uninformed youth, teachers in our schools and colleges, ministers in our churches, representatives in government, leaders in our communication media, and thousands of others who influence or come in contact with our Nation's youth: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of chapter 65, Knights of Dunamis, meeting in regular session this 3d day of December in the year of our Lord 1961, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the above-named individuals, the national officers of the Knights of Dunamis, the national training committee, and other individuals deemed interested; and may it further be

Resolved, That this chapter request a local, regional, and national program of vigorous and inclusive study to inform the youth of America of the true meaning and program of the international Communist conspiracy which operates under a program of lies, deceit, falsehoods, threats, distrust, and hate which is contrary to our Scout Oath and law. The aim of such a program would be to turn the current tide of public opinion to true patriotism, freedom, and place America on the offensive in this war against Godless communism.

Rear Adm. Alfred W. Chandler: Dedicated American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the saga of many of our fine Navy men ofttimes slips by unnoticed in the slipstream of life.

Recognition for their years of hard work and dedication to duty is often slow in coming to the attention of the public.

But devotion to the Navy does not go unnoticed, and the untiring efforts of these fine men do not escape their just reward.

Today, I would like to single out one of our fine naval officers—a man dedicated to his Navy, his God, his country, a fine citizen, and a credit to his uniform.

I speak of Rear Adm. Alfred W. Chandler, Dental Corps, U.S. Navy, retired.

Admiral Chandler recently was presented the Legion of Merit by Rear Adm. Thomas H. Robbins, Jr., commandant, Potomac River Naval Command. The presentation was for the Secretary of the Navy on behalf of the President during a ceremony at the Naval Weapons Plant.

Admiral Chandler's outstanding accomplishments are a reflection of his dynamic personality and leadership abilities. Aside from extensive improvement in the Dental Corps, he made highly effective contributions in the successful efforts of BuMed to gain increased recognition for staff corps achievements, including authority to use the term "commanding officer" for selected positions of great responsibility.

Thus, all staff corps of the U.S. Navy received benefits from Admiral Chandler's dedication to progress.

Mr. Speaker, the record of this outstanding American is one of which our citizens, our Navy, and the Congress can be justly proud. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to insert his citation from Secretary of the Navy John B. Connally for all America to read:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington.

The President of the United States takes pleasure in presenting the Legion of Merit to Rear Adm. Alfred W. Chandler, Dental Corps, U.S. Navy (ret.), for service as set forth in the following citation:

"For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service from August 1946 to July 1952 as Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery for Dentistry and Inspector General, Dental. Displaying extraordinary professional ability and resourcefulness, Rear Admiral Chandler skillfully directed the adjustment of the Naval Dental Corps to meet the trend of the times and the demands levied upon his organization incident to the Korean conflict. Making a marked contribution toward elevating the standards of dental care in the Navy and Marine Corps to the present-day high level, he was responsible for inaugurating many major improvements, including the establishment of a distinctive rating structure for dental technicians; obtaining the title of 'commanding officer' for staff corps officers in command; the development of naval regulations providing for dental departments in ships and shore stations; the establishment of the first dental school for technicians; and the development and administration of training programs for dental officers and technicians, including the first Navy motion picture used for that purpose. Under Rear Admiral Chandler's strong and capable leadership, the dental service of the Navy has achieved maximum readiness to respond to any demand that may be made upon it. In the field of dental research, he has been the guiding and driving spirit responsible for many and diverse advances and improvements. His outstanding achievements reflect the highest credit upon himself and the U.S. Naval Service."

For the President.

JOHN B. CONNALLY,
Secretary of the Navy.

The Big "E" Is Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday when the committee was considering the bill providing for an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce, I reported to the committee that some of the radio and television stations were carrying as a public service a slanted propaganda statement from the Department of Commerce.

The station that carried the "free ad" to which I happened to be listening placed it on the air immediately following the CBS news at 6 p.m. and it could almost have been mistaken for a news item.

The ad, which to me is pure and unadulterated propaganda, was prepared and written, it was duplicated and distributed at taxpayers' expense. Not only that, it was delivered at Government expense.

I have asked unanimous consent to insert the entire ad in the RECORD in order that all Members might be able to see just where it originated, how it was handled, and how it was intended to fool the public. If Federal departments are permitted to use the force of their organization to propagandize the public for or against any political proposal then the least these stations can do is to provide equal time to private enterprise and organizations to present the truth to the public.

As the Department of Commerce says there is no question but that "exports make jobs" but by the same token "imports eliminate jobs," imports lower the living standards when they create unemployment and so forth.

This is a vicious, illegal use of public funds. It must be halted.

THE BIG "E" IS BACK

Yes, President Kennedy has revived the famous Army-Navy flag that once flew so proudly as a symbol of America's wartime production.

Yesterday, "E" stood for excellence, honoring the men and women here at home who produced the guns and tanks and planes that helped us win the war over there.

Today, a new "E" banner leads our country into a different kind of battle—the fight to keep America strong.

President Kennedy's "E" stands for export. It honors Americans in companies and business organizations, on farms and in labor unions, for helping to increase our country's share of international trade.

An important battle? You bet it is. Exports make jobs. Exports keep living standards high. Exports strengthen our leadership in the free world.

Learn more about what the new "E" means to you.

Write today to: President's "E" Program, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington 25, D.C., or your nearest Department of Commerce field office.

"Sam" for Mayor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Camden Chronicle, Camden, S.C., of February 5, 1962:

"SAM" FOR MAYOR

President Kennedy has asked that Congress "speak its will" on his demand for a new Cabinet-rank Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. It is, of course, the proper duty of Congress to do just that—to say whether or not it favors ultimate federalizing of our cities and cutting the umbilical cords that connect them with the sovereign States of which they are presently a part.

Since our Congressmen and Senators are perforce residents of our only Federal city, Washington, D.C.—and which has been the charge of Congress since its founding in 1790—they have a unique opportunity to study Federal municipal management at close range.

They are aware, of course, that no city in the world has been blessed with more opulent buildings and monuments, or so many of them, at public expense. They know, too, that Government being the principal industry, the Federal payroll makes the city economically bombproof. Yet, in the face of these peculiar advantages, they will see in official reports—if reluctant to look about them—a city of expanding slums, poor schools, rising delinquency, flourishing crime as well as the usual metropolitan ills that include an out-of-hand transportation problem.

And likewise our solons are in an excellent position to weigh the argument that since farmers who are a minority, have their Department of Agriculture, city people, now in the majority, should have a Cabinet Department, too. The lawmakers, aware of Agriculture's $6 billion a year effort to solve the farm problem, and the fact that it remains, after 30 years, as baffling as ever, may properly despair of benefits to the taxpayer from Federal interference at city hall.

But, most of all, our Representatives in Washington should recognize—in what appears on the surface to be merely the merging of two existing Federal agencies, the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Federal Housing Authority—a further grab for centralized power. And they should reject it, flatly and decisively.

Success of Brigham Young University in College Bowl Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Deseret News in Salt Lake City of January 27, 1962, concerning the success of Brigham Young University in the College Bowl competition.

Utah was justifiable proud of the remarkable showing that Brigham Young University made in this intellectual competition, winning four successive times.

I believe the producers of "College Bowl" are to be congratulated for this program which seeks to give publicity to the aspect of collegiate endeavor which is, after all, the real reason for a university's existence.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUCCESS TO BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY'S "BRAIN TRUST"

The success of Brigham Young University's College Bowl intelligence team in the nationwide intercollegiate television competition brings rare distinction to the university and the State and helps to bestir interest in intellectual achievement all over the country.

The Brigham Young University "brain trust" panel is in New York City to make its fifth and final appearance in a match against DePauw University of Greencastle, Ind., after having won four previous skirmishes against Wyoming, Long Island University, Maryland, and Villanova. If it wins this weekend, the team will retire undefeated.

Educators, scientists, and others have long deplored the reluctance of young Americans to go the whole distance in the quest for knowledge. The quality of man's thinking, be it lowly or exalted, generous or selfish, as the moderator explained at the College Bowl match, can always be improved. This intercollegiate intelligence competition aims to help bring about this improvement.

Any activity, competitive or otherwise, that stimulates thinking should be encouraged. The resultant development of minds benefits all. What we do with our minds, according to some philosophers, is strictly our own business. But that is not true. Actually,

it is the business of all with whom we are associated.

Most people do not realize it, but their minds are being examined all the time. Families, friends, business associates, and unknown strangers all depend upon our mental strength or weakness. All of our fellow citizens have a vital interest in our minds because upon the quality of our thinking depends their future and ours.

Our compliments to Brigham Young University's "Intelligence Bowl" team for its outstanding achievement in reaching the final round in this intellectual competition, a greater achievement, perhaps, than any of the "Y's" fine athletic teams could score in sports tournaments. Congratulations, also, to all the "brain trust" panels that have taken part in these tests. They have set us all "a-thinking."

Kern County Farm Bureau Opposes S. 1969

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, there is pending in the Senate a measure which would give permanent status in the airline industry to nonscheduled or supplemental airlines certificated by the Civil Aeronautics Board. This measure, which is identified as S. 1969, was passed by the House last September 18. The Kern County Farm Bureau of Kern County, Calif., has passed a resolution which supports my contention that the bill must be amended to require the "nonskeds" to operate on a financially responsible basis and to adhere to sound safety practices.

I wish to insert the resolution in the Appendix of the RECORD:

A RESOLUTION

Re CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, proceedings and debates of the 87th Cogress, 1st session, September 18, 1961, concerning supplemental air carriers.

We believe that present laws are not strict enough and that the CAB is guilty of gross negligence in failing to demand financial responsibility and evidence of good safety practices on the part of supplemental airlines. These independent supplemental airlines are permitted to fly because of special legislation and have not been required to furnish adequate evidence of financial responsibility or adhere to sound safety practices: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we oppose H.R. 7318 and S. 1969 which are now pending in Congress which would give permanent status to supplemental air carriers.

We would approve and support an amendment to these bills which would impose greater responsibility on the part of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Aviation Agency in demanding evidence of financial ability and air safety practices from supplemental air carriers.

Certification: The above resolution was passed at the regular monthly meeting of the Kern County Farm Bureau on January 5, 1962.

WARREN P. WEGIS,
Secretary-Manager,
Kern County Farm Bureau.

Is "Right to Work" a Promotion Racket?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I submit a report of the National Better Business Bureau, Inc., of New York City, relevant to the nationwide operations of the National Right to Work Committee, Inc.

This right-to-work committee, as it is called, is the spearhead of segments of reactionary management that is seeking to impose antilabor laws on many of our States. The right-to-work committee is now actively promoting passage of the discredited right-to-work laws in Oklahoma, Idaho, Delaware, Vermont, Maine, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, New York, Illinois, New Hampshire and many other States, according to their own boasts.

They are also threatening to organize a campaign in my State of Indiana seeking to outlaw management-labor negotiations of the "agency shop" in collective bargaining to meet labor's need for union security.

The so-called right-to-work committee has been active in more than 25 States in the past few years with recurring drives to enact so-called right-to-work laws. For instance, they sought passage of such a law four times in 10 years in New Mexico, five times in 10 years in Idaho, four times including two statewide referendums in 5 years in Washington, five recent efforts in Connecticut.

The pattern suggests a deliberate campaign of harassment of organized labor in the evident unwillingness of this group to accept a decision either by a State legislature or by a statewide electorate as final.

As you may be aware, this type of high-pressure campaigning with unlimited funds at their disposal resulted in passage of a right-to-work law in Indiana in 1957. My State has learned that this is bad legislation—legislation that has harmed Indiana's economic advancement—but the same forces that imposed this law on Indiana have bitterly fought efforts by responsible groups of our citizens to repeal the law by legislative action. This same type of drive is now underway in Oklahoma in an all-out effort to upset the Oklahoma Legislature's rejection of this law.

This antilabor committee seems to have unlimited funds at its disposal, all of which makes a financial report such as the one I have here today very interesting.

This report shows that the National Right To Work Committee solicits contributions and memberships from industrial firms and businessmen ostensibly for the purpose of securing enactment of compulsory open-shop laws—those misnamed "right-to-work" laws which have been enacted by some State legislatures.

More important, the report shows that during 1960 the National Right To Work Committee spent 42 cents of every dollar collected on fundraising overhead. In other words, almost half of the donations goes to the promoters. A firm of professional fundraisers received $3,000 a month, plus 33⅓-percent commission on the net income from membership dues and contributions received through their efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I think the industrial firms and businessmen who have been supporting this organization ought to consider two points.

First, should they support a movement which is creating nothing but friction in our industrial life?

And, second, are they getting their money's worth in making non-tax-deductible contributions to an organization that spends 42.2 percent of the money it raises on raising the money?

I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that in a very recent Indiana case the Internal Revenue Service ruled that contributions to a right-to-work committee were political expenditures and not deductible from taxes.

Mr. Speaker, so that employers will have all the facts, the full text of the report of the National Better Business Bureau, Inc., on the National Right To Work Committee, Inc., follows:

NATIONAL BETTER BUSINESS BUREAU, INC.,
REPORT, AUGUST 23, 1961

1. GENERAL

The National Right To Work Committee was organized in January 1955, and incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia on September 7, 1960, as a nonprofit organization.

The committee is national in scope, but it does not have any branch offices or chapters. However, the organization advises that it is loosely affiliated with right-to-work organizations in several States, but has no official connection.

Briefly stated, the purpose of the committee is, "to bring about the elimination of compulsory unionism in the entire Nation." With reference to Federal lobbying, the organization advised National Better Business Bureau as follows: "The committee is not registered at the present time under the Federal Lobbying Act. We are prepared to register and expect to register as soon as active consideration of repeal of section 14(b) of Taft-Hartley begins. In the meantime, we maintain close liaison with Members of Congress, but until 14(b) is actively challenged, we are not engaged in influencing legislation."

Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act permits States to have right-to-work laws.

The organization also states that, "the committee does not, under any circumstances, attempt to directly influence State legislation. Therefore, we are not registered and do not expect to register under State law. Our function at the State level is to assist and advise local leadership in right to work drives."

The committee advises that its principal activities are: production and distribution of education materials; issuance of public statements designed to increase public awareness and understanding of the need for right to work; providing speakers and films for club meetings and conventions; maintenance of close liaison with Congress, preparatory to mobilization of public opinion in opposition to repeal of section 14(b) of Taft-Hartley; counsel, assistance and

guidance to State right-to-work groups and other associations working for passage, protection against repeal and better enforcement of State right-to-work laws; conducting meetings and seminars to educate and stimulate State and local leadership for activity on behalf of right to work at the State level; carrying on an organizational program and information program among rank-and-file union members and other workers to express themselves effectively in favor of the right-to-work cause.

The committee issues a monthly National Right To Work Newsletter, distributed nationwide and bimonthly newsletter—"Straight Talk" for rank and file working people. The committee states that the latter publication has a mailing list of 12,000. The committee has scheduled a National Right To Work seminar for October 25–26, 1961, in Chicago.

GENERAL COMMENT

National Better Business Bureau does not, as a matter of policy, attempt to evaluate the publications, research findings, or programs of organizations seeking funds from business firms and the public. The bureau recommends that prospective donors obtain representative samples of the material of groups soliciting their support, in order that they may ascertain for themselves, in advance of contributing, whether they are in agreement with the underlying principles, objectives and procedures set forth.

4. FUNDRAISING

The committee advises that funds are derived from voluntary contributions from individuals and business firms. Also, funds are obtained through memberships ranging from $1 and up for individuals; $25 to $50 for small business firms; $50 to $100 for average-size concerns; and $100 and up for large companies. The committee reports that there are two general classes of membership: business and professional, with approximately 11,000; worker, with 4,000 members. The committee states that in addition, 15,000 rank and file workers are carried as associate members of the committee, having been enrolled by their employers.

The committee has retained the firm of Wilson E. Hamilton & Associates, Washington, D.C., at a fee of $3,000 per month, plus a commission of 33⅓ percent of the net income on all membership dues and contributions received through their efforts. The commission is based on the amount left after all expenses and the firm's fixed fees are deducted from the gross income.

As reflected in the following financial statement for the year ended December 31, 1960, the committee paid commissions and fees to Wilson E. Hamilton & Associates totaling $74,503.30, or 17.8 percent of dues received amounting to $418,732.50.

The committee also advised National Better Business Bureau that the total fundraising expense for 1960 including fees, commissions, mailings, office space, clerical and secretarial help amounted to 42.2 percent of income, and that the comparable figure for the first 6 months of 1961 was 31.6 percent.

TAX STATUS

The organization advised National Better Business Bureau that contributions to the committee have not been ruled exempt for income tax purposes by the Treasury Department. In this connection, the committee states: "In answer to inquiries, we advise members and contributors that contributions to this organization may be classed as a business expense, but we can give no assurance that this will not be challenged by the Internal Revenue."

5. FINANCIAL STATEMENT

The accounts of the National Right To Work Committee are audited by Rusco H. Crowell, certified public accountant of Washington, D.C. The following is a statement of income and expenses for the year ended December 31, 1960.

INCOME	
Dues and contributions	$418,732.50
Miscellaneous	6,360.44
Building and loan association	163.25
Total receipts	425,256.19
DISBURSEMENTS	
Production and distribution of educational material:	
Printing	128,090.82
Fees and commissions	74,503.30
Postage, supplies and mail, etc	32,988.63
News clippings, books, and subscriptions	1,414.48
Literary and film service and speakers	718.32
Total	237,715.55
Meetings and travel expenses:	
Meetings	6,463.28
Travel	15,946.00
Total	22,409.28
Office rent, furniture and equipment:	
Office rent	12,187.50
Furniture and equipment purchased	2,167.05
Total	14,354.55
Salaries and payroll taxes:	
Salaries and wages	103,136.71
Payroll taxes	3,765.68
Total	106,902.39
Other operating expenses:	
Accounting, legal fees and research	4,676.98
Bank service charges, bad checks, etc	653.60
Insurance, bond premiums and property tax	256.39
Office supplies and operations	5,352.96
Telephone and telegraph	4,141.16
Total	16,081.09
Total disbursements	397,462.86
Excess receipts over disbursements	27,793.33

Pills, Politics, and Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DALE ALFORD

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, on the night of January 31, it was my high honor and great privilege to address the annual meeting of the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc., meeting in the Mayflower Hotel in Washington. This is a very dedicated group of patriots who are working for the good of their country. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of my address entitled "Pills, Politics, and Patriotism":

PILLS, POLITICS, AND PATRIOTISM

(Address of DALE ALFORD, M.D., Member of Congress, Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc.)

"Pills, politics, and patriotism" may seem a bit unusual as a topic for such a distinguished group of patriots; however, when it is broken down into its separate components, I believe you will agree with me that the implications are not quite as sophomorish as a first impression might bring. Or—at the expense of alliteration—I might say pills, politics, and conservatism. The three words of the title indicate a metamorphosis of my own life in the past few years.

Pills has an obvious allusion to the fact that by profession I am a physician and surgeon. For several years I served on the committee on public relations of my State medical society and for 6 years served as chairman of this committee. During the latter period I attended numerous meetings, many local, and some on a national level, dealing with trends in legislation and specifically with Government regulation of my own profession. Through this experience I developed a profound interest in politics and, in addition to being a student of medicine, became a student of political science. Therein lies the reason for the second word in the title of my remarks, "politics." As a physician and businessman I found that I had suffered a true confrontation with a relatively new philosophy of forgetting what you are and want to be and merging yourself with the masses. Get yourself some kind of protective law—irrespective of your talents or capacities or workmanship or diligence—and hide yourself under it, and cover yourself with it. Yes, the trend would seem to be too much the idea that the main thing is to be protected. Be secure. Be certain. Let the Government, let Washington, let the Congress, let the law take care of us. It is my contention that this is not the kind of philosophy that made this country great. Thomas Jefferson said the American Republic was to be a great experiment which would determine for all time whether or not "men may be trusted to govern themselves without a master." He predicted future happiness for Americans "if we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of taking care of them." This country was not built by spineless Socialists. America achieved greatness by the pioneering spirit of rugged individualists who blazed new trails, shaped their own destiny without Government planning—were self-reliant and free.

It has almost come to the point where the race in which we are engaged is not between a slave economy and a free economy, but between a slave economy and a half-free economy. We know that we have already lost many of our freedoms through usurpation and legislative processes. When one is sincere and conscientious and makes a study of the nature of government and its political philosophy, an intelligent and fairminded individual immediately recognizes that our young Nation became the wealthiest, healthiest, and most powerful nation in the world in less than 200 years through a private enterprise economy guaranteed to us under the Constitution. Whether the field is Federal obstruction for the businessman, whether it is telling the physician what he may or may not do with respect to his patients, or whether it is telling the merchant how to run his store, or the farmer what he can plant, or destroying patent rights on American life-saving drugs, or destroying the incentive of business through taxation, the long arm of Government is out of place when it impinges on private enterprise. Government's place is to maintain the outer fences of economy in repair. Government's place is not to step inside the sphere of direction and assume either the authority or responsibility. That

belongs to the people. It belongs to private initiative. And this is what the Government did do under the Constitution for a long time. But alas. When one examines the philosophy of some of our more prominent officials, a student of political science will have to admit that the philosophy falls under the classic definition of "international socialism." It is internationalism on one side and freedom on the other.

The time has come to reinvoke the principles of our Founding Fathers, which brings us to the third word in the title of my remarks, "patriotism."

Each of you here knows that there are forces at work in the United States today, trying to weaken and undermine our people. And it is only when we understand that they are trying to destroy us that we can work together to prevent them from reducing us to a common denominator that would bring about our destruction. If you advocate patriotism today you automatically become a "radical reactionary" to the leftwingers. They'll tell you that you belong to a bygone era, that this is the 20th century and that we "must conform" to our time—in other words, that we must conform to their particular brand of socialism, Keynesian, Fabian, or Marxian—or to the internationalism of the Council on Foreign Relations. They will tell you, in the words of a prominent official, that "the American people have little, if any, need to be alerted to the menace of the cold war." They will advocate negotiation with the Communists "in secret"—and tell us that we face the risk of nuclear destruction if we do not do so; international blackmail. Negotiation, to the Communists, means, of course, that this country and its allies will make concessions. When you ask them if freedom is not better than a straitjacket, they will reply "a straitjacket is more orderly and besides a straitjacket is democratic if everyone wears it." That is what I mean by reducing us to a common denominator. They would lead us into a one-world government—and tell us it is different from communism. Khrushchev apparently thinks differently. In his address to the Russian Communist Party Congress he expressed hope that the present socialism which exists in Russia would soon become total communism and he seemed confident when he stated that "by 1980 the world would be a Communist utopia."

Socialism has been defined as governmental ownership or control of the means of production. And communism, as any political scientist knows, is socialism. Karl Marx labeled himself a socialist. After the Communist revolution, Russia was named the "Union of Soviet Socialist Republics." The invasion of socialism and/or communism into the United States, penetrating every facet of our lives, brings us to the inevitable conclusion that America is in dire need of a new breath of patriotism. We need to reawaken ourselves and all citizens at every level of our economy to the fundamental principles underlying our Nation's greatness, and to the influences that are working to undermine the very foundations of our inherent God-given rights.

I am for economy in Government at every level: city, county, State, and National. I am for fiscal responsibility. I am for a sound dollar.

Fiscal divisions may seriously affect individual rights and freedoms. For example, taxes may cancel the right of the individual to spend part of his money the way he wants to, and the higher the taxes, the less personal discretion for spending.

Although a heavy tax burden is probably inevitable in these times, it is the duty of Congress to insure that the citizen is not deprived of his rights to spend his own money except to the degree essential to meet proper and reasonable Government costs. Since individual liberty is fundamental in American sovereignty, every fiscal and economic division should also be carefully weighed in terms of its effects on individual rights and freedoms.

Our taxes have increased in the last 25 years from $30 per capita in 1935 to $650 per capita in 1961. The Bureau of the Budget has estimated that for every $1,000 paid by you, the average taxpayer, you will pay another $820 in other types of Federal taxes, either directly or indirectly. So when you figure your income tax, add another 82 percent for all the other Federal taxes you have paid through sundry sources, and this would more accurately be your Federal tax burden. All of this is over and above and in addition to the social security tax.

Your elected Representatives and Senators should be your lobby as a taxpayer, but they cannot be successful if there continues to be powerful pressure groups pushing for political projects. There is a proposal now before the Congress to grant the power to our executive branch of Government to raise or lower income taxes at the discretion of the Executive and without the specific consent of Congress. I maintain that this is taxation without representation and that if this is accepted this country will have regressed 200 years to the days when taxpayers in righteous indignation rebelled at the assumption of similar dictatorial power and dramatized their protest with the Boston Tea Party. Individual liberties, the freedom of choice, and the right of private property will continue to disappear unless the taxpayers of this country rise up in protest to this usurpation of power.

Our Federal debt reached a peak of $27 billion at the end of August 1919. On Monday of this week, January 29, 1962, the Treasury Department reported that the national debt had jumped to a record $297 billion. The Treasury can still borrow $542 million before hitting the temporary debt ceiling of $298 billion because not all of the total debt comes under the legal limit. The servicing of a large debt is now a sizable part of the total tax burden. The interest amounts to about $9 billion. And now the Congress is being asked to raise the temporary debt limit by $10 billion—to a new high of $308 billion. This should give us some idea about the size of the budget deficits now to be encountered when the temporary expenses overcome the income tax established in the World War I era as temporary and the corporate income tax levied as temporary in the Korean war and the temporary taxes on telephones and transportation established in World War II. In fact, everything we have today will be purely temporary if the present trend continues.

A large part of these hard-earned dollars is going down the drain in the form of foreign aid. Under the banner of mutual assistance, we are undergirding foreign economies that are operating this very day in open competition with American business. Scrapping our present reciprocal trade policy and exchanging it for the proposed "common market" policy will be simply an economic surrender on the part of American business and American labor to the internationalists. When Americans arrive at the point in our economic life that we cannot survive or defend this private enterprise economy under the Constitution without the permission or consent of foreign powers or international agencies, then Americans will have lost the national sovereignty and independence for which our Forefathers fought so valiantly and so successfully. How, in the name of commonsense, can we continue to increase the national debt, literally pouring billions of dollars into spurious projects around the world, all in the name of or guise of preventing communism when all we need to do is look at Laos, Cuba, Vietnam, and others where our foreign aid was used and we are now hated and these countries have fallen behind the Iron Curtain? We are giving our hard-earned tax dollars to countries whose philosophies are alien to ours and in many instances undergirding governments alien to our economy and American way of life. There are many examples that can be cited. One recent illustration is that of the Prime Minister of British Guiana when he stated on "Meet the Press" October 15, 1961: "In the economic field I do not believe in capitalism. I do not believe that free enterprise which may have been wonderful for, say, the United States of America, will, in present day circumstances, develop either in my country or an underdeveloped country in the world generally." This foreign official who was seeking our tax money in the form of economic aid evaded an answer to the question of whether or not his administration was pro-Communist. I think that we, as patriotic Americans, are entitled to know whether our economic aid to such an administration would receive proper credit to the United States of America in the eyes of his own people. Continuing our study of the global cold war, let us review the statement of President Tshombe of Katanga issued January 7 of this year, bearing in mind that President Tshombe is a Christian leader dedicated to fighting the Communists. Here is a quote from his statement: "With unexpected ferocity, incredible in an international force whose mission is to serve peace, the armies of the United Nations attacked Katanga with astonishing violence. They used the most murderous of weapons. They did not spare the civilian population, which became the great victim of this cataclysm for which the Government of the United States of America should perhaps be held even more responsible than the United Nations Organization. In truth, the Katangan people cannot forget that it was American planes that brought reinforcements of arms and material to the United Nations forces, and made possible the bombardment of Katanga's capital, now partly destroyed and become a city in a stupor."

In my opinion, as American citizens we are entitled to know why American planes carried supplies aiding a pro-Communist movement opposed to a dedicated anti-Communist administration in a sovereign state. Who is responsible for this paradoxical situation? Shall we blame the State Department or shall we blame the real bosses of our foreign policy in both Democratic and Republican administrations; that invisible government known as "the Council on Foreign Relations"? And yet officials on the Washington scene state in such a superior sophisticated manner that "the American people have little, if any, need to be alerted to the menace of the cold war." Are American citizens to be relegated to the position of serfs or peasants bowing in surrendering silence to the feudalistic egotistical whims of the CFR? Are all our rights as a sovereign nation to be destroyed?

The foreign policy of both the Democratic and Republican administrations apparently is dominated by the Council on Foreign Relations and, in my opinion, seems to hinge on a strategy not to destroy communism, but in the words of Dean Manion to preserve communism "as a convenient means for the destruction of American independence": a strategy not to destroy the United Nations but to use it as a convenient world government, using words instead of bullets, to socialize the world; and apparently in the meantime to create regional world government in the form of Fabian socialism and then hand it to the rest of the world as a better substitute for the Russian-type socialism. From the actions of our foreign policy experts this is what we are to know as peaceful coexistence, the existence of two kinds of socialism. In an objective

study of this two-headed socialistic monster one is directed to such a conclusion by just such remarks as one prominent opinion-maker when he was quoted as saying that: "The social objectives and tendencies of communism are, by and large, in the same direction of those of Western liberal industrialism."

Shortly before his visit to the United States, Nikita Khrushchev said: "We cannot expect the Americans to jump from capitalism to communism, but we can assist their elected leaders in giving Americans small doses of socialism, until they suddenly awake to find they have communism."

And now with this background of a confused and tortuous bipartisan foreign policy we are now called upon in Congress to take up one-half or $100 million of a $200 million bond issue by the United Nations in order that the U.N. can bail itself out of an irresponsible policy that resulted in the deficit through aggression against Katanga and questionable policies with respect to Goa and Angola. Why is the United Nations in financial trouble at this time? Simply because Russia refuses to pay anything for police operations. France and some of the Arab States also have balked at paying. Many other nations lag far behind in their obligations to the United Nations. Out of 104 nations, at least 82 are in arrears.

At the same time, the United States paid $22.3 million into the U.N. for the 1961 operating budget. Since its start, the United States already has paid more than $1.5 billion into the United Nations. And this figure does not include the staggering cost of the Korean conflict, which was supported almost entirely by the United States.

How far in the red is the United Nations? Right now the deficit stands at $107 million. Working capital of the Organization is down to zero.

The United Nations was designed to preserve peace in the world, but the follies, foibles, and frauds of the U.N. cause me to conclude that the United Nations is totally ineffective in its world mission of peace and justice and that the U.N. bond issue should be decisively rejected by the Congress of a sovereign people.

It is indeed ironic that our Nation should be preparing for a hot war while appeasing the enemy in the cold war. It is difficult, I am sure, for many Americans who have been called to active duty recently to rationalize that they are at the frontline of defense while we permit Communists to be trained at our own installation in the continental United States of America. More ironic, perhaps, is that our servicemen are ordered to defend the peace of their fellow citizens abroad, but even within our own borders they are not allowed to speak out against the threat of international communism. Such phrases as "the Communist challenge," or "the steady advance of communism," or "on such theories socialism thrives," or "insidious ideology of world communism" have been stricken from proposed speeches by military leaders. What on earth goes on here in the land of the free and the home of the brave when an American is ordered headlong into the cannon's mouth in defense of his country but cannot utter words against the enemy? As a Member of Congress, I sincerely believe it is my patriotic duty to speak out against the pragmatic prating of the political puppets directed to censor such words of our military leaders.

From what we read in the press as to statements being issued relative to patriots and superpatriots it becomes immediately obvious that many persons in high political offices are not properly informed as to the nature of the real enemy.

Despite the economic, political, and psychological battles in which we are engaged, some of our political leaders still contend, either because of their lack of knowledge about international communism, or what is infinitely worse, because they are completely duped by the psychological warfare methods employed by our socialist enemy, that there is no cause for alarm. From the Lenin School of Political Warfare, Georgia Dimitrov stated: "We must always remember that one sympathizer is generally worth more than a dozen militant Communists." So one sympathizer in any American community can effectively do the work of 12 Communists.

What more effective way can we combat international communism than through a properly informed military not afraid to inform other members of the military of the true nature of the enemy.

Our bureaucrats apparently have all kinds of rights of freedom of speech while denying the same right to other branches of Government service. A classic example is the recent statement by a Government official that "a welfare state is our best defense against communism." Now if that is supposed to be positive progressive 20th century liberal philosophy, then I am, indeed, a negative, old-fashioned conservative American patriot.

In spite of the maze of political commentary we read and hear today there are only two distinct sides to the issue when all the frost and foam is blown away. There are those who wish to maintain our liberties and freedoms under the Constitution and there are those who accept or welcome Federal usurpation which aims at overthrowing the Constitution and establishing a centralized international government.

One does not have to be a mental giant to understand that communism is a total threat; that it is a military threat; an economic threat; a political threat; an infiltration threat; and a propaganda threat. Why should we not use every possible means available to us to fight communism when our freedoms are at stake? Why do some leaders speak of a program for survival but never of a program to totally defeat communism? Does their idea of survival mean the surrender of the Stars and Stripes to an international flag? As patriotic Americans we should never entertain the thought that Old Glory must be subservient to the United Nations flag, the NATO flag or any other flag on earth.

We achieved our position of prominence in the world through rigorous attention to our domestic affairs and by preservation of the principles of private enterprise through individual initiative. We did not do it by letting international planners and daydreamers siphon off our freedoms—and we will not now let them take it away from us. But we must again do what our forefathers did. That is, we must release the energies of the people to achieve, to advance, to master, to expand by leaps and bounds.

Not since the days of the Founding Fathers has this country been in such desperate need of patriotism and conservative thinking. The time has come to call a halt to the feeding of the monster that would swallow us up. The time has come to rid ourselves of the internationalists and return to nationalism. It is not too late—and our people are becoming aroused and informed. Your very presence here is strong indication of that. Everywhere alert Americans, like yourselves, are taking action to safeguard the preservation of our traditional way of life. I am persuaded that everywhere there are loyal, patriotic, courageous Americans who are ready to take up this battle and save our great country. With your efforts will come other Americans to meet the challenge.

I have stated repeatedly that we are standing between two great mountain peaks of eternity—on the left we have an atheistic, socialistic, communistic superstate and on the right we have our American Republic held together by the greatest of all legal instruments, the American Constitution, dedicated to the cause of freedom and of Almighty God.

Yes, it may be a cliche, but it is good for us to understand that America is at the crossroads—the crossroads between bigger government and a form of state socialism on one side and a private enterprise system of constitutional government on the other. The burning question today is, "How far down the road into socialism and the welfare state do we go before we lose all our freedoms?" Senator BYRD of Virginia said: "The welfare state—is that state of twilight in which the flow of democratic freedom is fading beyond the horizon, leaving us to be swallowed in the blackness of socialism, or worse."

We, as a people, must not be hoodwinked or duped by the malicious meanderings of a leftist press, leading us into socialism and world government through the hypocritical cry of peace, peace. Peace can only be maintained in a materialistic world by a show of firmness and courage—and most important of all in the eyes of the Communist world—the power to destroy. There is not time for inaction and appeasement. There is no time for retreat and compromise. This is a time that calls for a worldwide offensive on the part of a Christian nation that will stand resolute against the powers of darkness.

Let us make America strong first. I say charity begins at home. Let us not dissipate our resources: let us not disperse our manpower around the world while training Communists within our own interior. Let us leave our children a legacy of patriotism and not be a party to discrediting patriots through an anti-anti-Communist campaign. Let us not forget first of all that everything we have we owe to Almighty God. This is one belief the Communists cannot imitate in their atheistic ideology, for when they do assert this fundamental belief in God, the victory will have been won. No, we cannot win by imitating the atheistic socialists of the world; we cannot win by destroying the sovereignty of our Nation in the name of an international government.

It may be late, but it is not too late to save our Republic.

We can win if the American eagle is free to fly with only loyal Americans on board.

Eighteen Angry Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, last December 7, I climbed down a 150-foot hole in the ground near Great Falls, Mont. The reason was to inspect first hand one of the amazing silos being dug in the vicinity of Malmstrom Air Force Base, Mont., for installation of our Minuteman missiles.

These fantastic launching sites are necessary to deter an enemy from the type of attack that struck us on another December 7, 20 years ago. The men at Malmstrom, headed by Col. Harry Goldsworthy, are racing, and beating, time to complete these silos.

To witness their splendid efforts and results, was an unforgettable experience for me and my assistant, Pat McCarthy.

Now, the story of these men has been told in a Saturday Evening Post article, "Eighteen Angry Men," by Joe Alex Morris, in the January 13, 1962, issue.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I wish to include this article in the Appendix of the RECORD, so that my colleagues who have missed the article can have the opportunity to read it.

The article follows:

EIGHTEEN ANGRY MEN

One chilly day last October a tall, lanky man in the blue uniform of the U.S. Air Force climbed briskly out of a deep hole in the ground in the remote range country of Montana. Glancing anxiously at snow clouds along the horizon, he asked a few questions of workers around the hole, patted a supervisor on the shoulder and gave a couple of concise orders. What Col. Harry E. Goldsworthy was saying, in effect, was, "Dig, boys, dig. And don't let anything stop you."

Despite his steady manner, Goldsworthy is a man under pressure. He is one of 18 colonels—sometimes known as the "18 angry men"—who command what may be the most urgent and the most important Air Force task forces ever created in peacetime. They are called site activation task forces—Sataf for short. And instead of following the service's tradition of trying to fly ever higher and faster, Sataf is spurring an army of 75,000 workers to dig holes in the ground at unprecedented speed for the installation of intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Time is a controlling factor in our $15-billion program to close the so-called missile gap. To be most effective, our missiles must be widely dispersed in well-protected underground sites. It is the job of the 18 colonels, each of whom commands a missile site activation task force, to see that not an hour is wasted in constructing and equipping those sites. Recent indications that the missile gap may be small or nonexistent in no way lessens the urgency of the program.

Goldsworthy, or any of the 17 other SATAF commanders, can pick up a telephone at any hour and call an emergency control center at Inglewood, Calif., to report a problem or any emergency that cannot be resolved on the site and that threatens to delay his activation schedule. Over the phone the Sataf commander dictates a 50-word description of his problem—or "bandit"—which might be anything from a missing shipment of steel to a flaw in silo design.

At the emergency center—known as dynamo—a controller turns to what is called an it index, in which the top experts in every phase of the missile program are listed. He selects from the list the it best qualified to handle the problem at hand and turns it over to him, saying, "You're it, mister. Don't do anything else until this bandit is killed."

On the day I met Colonel Goldsworthy, he wasted no time at his 15,000-square-mile site surrounding Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Mont. Without delay we took off on a helicopter inspection tour of a project everybody has heard about, but which few can visualize, even in this age of astronauts.

Just to start with, a missile hole (technically known as a launch facility, or silo) and its launch-control center have never been seen before on earth. The largest silo, housing a weapon called Atlas F, resembles an air-conditioned 13-story steel and concrete circular skyscraper—50 feet in diameter, turned upside down and driven 185 feet into the earth. In addition to the missile, the silo contains an incredible array of complicated electronic and mechanical equipment. It is sealed on the surface by a 150-ton door. One hole in the ground like this, fully equipped but without a weapon, may cost more than $10 million.

However, the Atlas missile, which is now operational at five bases in Western States, is not Goldsworthy's worry; nor is the somewhat larger Titan missile, for which the first sites are nearing completion. Goldsworthy is digging holes for the newest weapon in the missile arsenal, the Minuteman. There will be many more Minutemen missiles than Atlases or Titans—150 on the Malmstrom site alone—but they are much smaller, and an equipped Minuteman silo costs less than $1 million.

From the helicopter, we glimpsed the first silo under construction. Tucked between two hills, it resembled a gigantic concrete cistern. No effort is made to conceal these sites. They are too big, there are too many of them, and too many people work on them. Furthermore, in the weird philosophy of nuclear warfare, it is axiomatic—missile gap or no missile gap—that even if surprise attack knocks out most of your missiles, you can still fire enough to blow your attacker off the face of the earth.

Ten minutes and ten miles from the first silo we settled gently to earth on a hillside where a chimneylike concrete shaft protruded amid the foundations of a partly constructed building. "The entire Malmstrom project of 150 silos is called a missile wing," Goldsworthy explained. "Other Minuteman wings are to be constructed in North and South Dakota, and a fourth is planned in Missouri. Each wing is divided into 15 smaller groupings known as flights, with 10 missiles and 1 launch control center in each flight." We were then at the launch-control center for flight A. He pointed to the concrete shaft. "We go down there. The elevator isn't working yet."

I started down a seemingly endless steel ladder, wondering how deep you had to be if somebody were shooting a nuclear warhead directly at you. If a 50-megaton bomb makes a 400-foot-deep hole in the earth, as estimated by Nuclear Scientist Dr. Ralph Lapp, what kind of hole does a 1-megaton bomb make? I came to a steel platform and another ladder, which I descended. When I was about 60 feet underground, I found myself in a small room where an eerie glow was cast by the torches of workmen busy over a tangle of pipes, cables, and steel beams.

Ahead of me a small steel and concrete door almost 4 feet thick stood ajar. I stepped through and stood in the brain case of the flight A missile complex. Here, when the brain case has been completely filled with electronic gadgetry, will sit "the man with the golden thumb"—the man who might someday, under certain carefully controlled circumstances, press his thumb on a key and launch the deadly missiles of flight A at a speed of more than 15,000 miles an hour toward targets more than 6,300 miles away. (Actually one man or even two men cannot fire a missile by themselves. At least four men must agree on a receipt of a signal to fire, and must perform certain interrelated actions.)

The capsule-shaped brain case is about the size of a manor house living room. Even before it was constructed, one of Goldsworthy's deputies, Col. C. C. Lutman, was integrating work on the electronic equipment to be crammed into it. A console will show the operational condition of each missile at all times. There will be equipment for instant communication with Strategic Air Command headquarters. A security rack signals any unwarranted presence on any of the 10 missile sites. A decoding apparatus prevents transmission of unauthorized orders and weeds out errors that might launch a missile by mistake. Computers analyze messages, store information and pass on orders in a fraction of a second to missile-guidance systems. These, and thousands of feet of wiring so crowd the brain case that there is barely room left for the two-man crew.

Presumably, the United States would have a warning—say 15 to 30 minutes—of hostile missiles launched against us, and there would be time for orders to be given and for "the man with the golden thumb" to press the retaliation button.

The capsule in which he sits is a quarter-inch-thick steel shell, entirely enclosed in a 42-inch skin of steel-reinforced and specially hardened concrete. Above the capsule are some 40 feet of earthfill and a support building to house machinery and personnel not on duty in the capsule. The entire capsule is floated on a protective 12-inch layer of sand. The interior floors are suspended from the ceiling on hydraulic shock absorbers. Equipment is rested on heavy springs. But most important is a blast valve built into the capsule that automatically seals the entire structure off from the world an instant after any atomic blast.

Thus, under attack, the capsule and its crew become self-sustaining. They have their own filtered air conditioning, power and communications. They have survival equipment. They can fire the 10 missiles in their own flight. If other centers should be disabled, they can use an intricate system of 21,000 miles of underground cables to fire missiles in any of the Malmstrom flights.

Fortunately the blast valve that seals the crew in their capsule does not entomb them. In an upper corner of the control center is a large manhole cover. When and if they decide the atmosphere is safe, the crew could dig its way out.

This sketchy description of just one of the holes the Air Force is digging gives only a vague idea of the overall job of construction. The missile silos, as we shall see later, are bigger and deeper and just as complicated as the launch-control centers, and there are 10 times as many of them. About $3 billion will be spent on their construction and equipment. If you have visualized 1 hole in the ground, multiply that by approximately 800 to get an idea of how workers are, or will be, churning up earth in 18 States to put our missile defenses on full operational basis by 1964.

The story of how the Russians seized the lead in long-range rocketry after World War II, and of how a rebellious U.S. Air Force minority led by Gen. Bernard A. Schriever waged a long struggle to get our ballistic-missile program going belatedly, was told in the October 7, 1961, issue of the Saturday Evening Post. (General of Outer Space, by Don Schanche.) That campaign led to development of the intercontinental Titan and Atlas missiles, which are liquid fueled and can be fired on reasonably short notice. The Minuteman, which is solid fueled and can be fired almost instantly, evolved in 1959.

But the Air Force still had to make up for much lost time. With the support of the country's finest scientific brains, it gambled on building launching silos even before the new missiles had been fully developed and tested. Then it set up an ambitious program for completing 13 Atlas squadrons by 1962; 6 Titan I squadrons, 6 Titan II squadrons and 12 Minuteman squadrons—all before 1965—a total of 834 intercontinental missiles, of which about 60 were operational by the end of 1961.

"In the past, the traditional routine of successive stages—development, design, construction and installation—of a new weapon might normally have required 10 years," explains Lt. Gen. Howell M. Estes, Jr., deputy commander for aerospace systems in the Air Force Systems Command. "But now we had to compress time. We telescoped those stages—before the first one was completed, the second and perhaps the third one was started."

This accordionlike squeeze of operations is known as "the concept of concurrency." According to Maj. Gen. A. C. Weeling of the

Army Engineers, deputy commander for site activation of the ballistics systems division, it presents construction problems comparable to building a pipeline under combat conditions.

As a result, the Air Force needed a miracle almost every day, and there weren't enough miracles to go around. All of the silos for the Titan II, for example, were being built before that missile had ever been test-flown. Even with the best scientific brains, miscalculations were inevitable. When somebody made a mistake, it cost millions.

The experts miscalculated, for example, on the construction of long metal hangars, a number of which went into each Atlas silo. After the first silos had been built, it was found that the heat treatment of the hangars was not adequate. All of them had to be removed, treated, and replaced at great expense. On the Titan I, a miscalculation was made on the deceleration mechanism in the elevator, which lowers the missile into the silo. On a dry run the mechanism lowered a fueled missile too rapidly. It hit bottom and there was an explosion. The lowering control had to be redesigned.

In 1960 the mistakes and the millions began to pile up. Contractors complained about confusion and poor management. Strikes caused delays at various sites. Costs shot up as much as one-third above estimates. Work slipped behind schedule. There were ominous rumblings of congressional investigations into the "sloppy job" the Air Force was doing.

In June of 1960, Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, now Chief of Staff of the Air Force, made a tour of Titan and Atlas sites. He didn't like what he saw. The magnitude of the task had been underestimated. "We just didn't realize," an Air Force officer said later, "how huge the beast was."

But, most troublesome, there was a division of responsibility among various representatives of the Air Force, the Corps of Engineers, and civilian contractors on the sites and at the Inglewood, Calif., missile headquarters. LeMay could not point to any one man on a site or at headquarters and say: "You are responsible. Get this job done."

When LeMay got back to the Pentagon, a number of things began to happen. The most important change—although not the first one—was that, by coincidence during this period, the Air Force was preparing to scrap its outdated Air Research and Development, and Air Materiel Commands, which had divided responsibility over missile sites. To replace them, a new Air Force Systems Command, responsible to the Chief of Staff, was created. In this new setup, General Estes became deputy commander for aerospace systems, including the ballistic systems division. For the first time, all missile personnel—both Air Force and Army Corps of Engineers—were gathered under a single command.

In our tradition-bound armed services, such drastic shifting to a single command causes anguish and wailing. It also takes time. LeMay was in a hurry. In July of 1960, long before the wheels started turning, he summoned to Washington the handsome, 48-year-old commander of the Oklahoma City Air Materiel Area, Maj. Gen. Thomas P. Gerrity, and told him he was being put on the spot. The site construction program was in trouble. One construction company reported it went through as many as a dozen agencies for a year to resolve a problem that should have been settled in 2 weeks. Failure of parts manufactured by different companies to match perfectly when assembled on sites was costing hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Obviously the answer to such confusion was to center responsibility in one man on each site and one man at the Inglewood headquarters. LeMay told Gerrity to go at once to Inglewood (where he later became the first commander of the new ballistic systems division) and take charge. The choice was not random. A veteran of bombing squadrons in the Pacific at the start of World War II, Gerrity had become an expert in the Air Materiel Command, a graduate of the Command and General Staff School, and a graduate of the advanced management course at Harvard University after the war. He had served in the Strategic Air Command and the procurement and production office at the Pentagon. He was known as a "driver" who got things done on schedule.

At almost the same time Gerrity arrived at Inglewood, LeMay wrote a telegram (July 21, 1960) to 18 Air Force colonels whose names he didn't even know—men who would be handpicked over a period of weeks to command the site-activation task forces. The telegram read:

I want it thoroughly understood that I hold each site commander personally responsible for successful activation of his site and its turnover to SAC in an acceptable operational condition at the earliest possible date.

LeMay.

Colonel Goldsworthy did not receive his telegram (dated July 21) until mid-September. He is a soft-spoken man, not easily ruffled; a careful planner, always looking ahead in an effort to prevent problems from reaching the emergency stage. A commander of antisubmarine squadrons in the Caribbean and bombing squadrons in the southwest Pacific during the war, he later was on the staff of the Secretary of Defense as a member of the Weapons Systems Evaluation Group, attended the Army War College, served in North Africa as chief of staff of the 17th Air Force and attended the Industrial College of the Armed Forces before taking over as vice commander of the SAC Refueling Wing at Malmstrom.

The heat generated around Goldsworthy's feet by LeMay's telegram was about average for the 18 SATAF commanders. Goldsworthy may have been under special pressure because he got the first Minuteman site, and Minuteman had been selected as "the present ultimate" in ballistic missile weaponry. It was easier to maintain, less costly than the Atlas and Titan by ratios of about 1 to 8. It could do the same job, if enough were used, and it presented a difficult target if properly dispersed.

Goldsworthy had to start digging long before anyone actually testified the entire Minuteman from a silo. Furthermore, when bids for construction were opened in December of 1960, they were some $20 million above estimates. All the bids were rejected. Changes were made in contract requirements. The job was readvertised, causing a 3-month delay until a contract was negotiated. Even before he could turn a spadeful of dirt, Goldsworthy had lost 90 days that somehow had to be made up.

On the other hand, Goldsworthy had certain advantages. For one thing, Gerrity delegated to him full authority to run the Malmstrom site and backed him up firmly. There also was available to him a vast fund of experience accrued in the building of earlier missile sites.

Goldsworthy had one other unusual advantage. Gerrity, acting on a suggestion by Maj. Earl Bradley, had set up the Inglewood emergency center, Dynamo (dynamic action management operations) where sound management principles were combined with the urgency of wartime aerial combat.

Thus, by cutting redtape, Dynamo is geared to prevent delay in making decisions and to solve unexpected problems at top speed. All "bandits"—or problems—are posted on charts at headquarters, and the person in charge of each bandit must make a daily written report to Gerrity on progress toward a solution. When a bandit is "killed" (solved to the satisfaction of Gerrity and the SATAF commander concerned), a complete report on the problem and its solution goes to each SATAF commander for guidance. The tightening of procedures began to exert a beneficial effect on the entire base construction program by the time work started at Malmstrom in March of 1961. Some lost time was made up. The 3-month delay suffered by Goldsworthy actually turned out to be an advantage, because it gave the staff a chance to organize and avoid mistakes.

About 7,000 contacts had to be made in connection with purchase of sites and rights-of-way. Goldsworthy and his aids made some 150 speeches explaining to about 15,000 persons in even the smallest towns why the work was being done and what it meant to the United States. They built up a lot of good will and forestalled many complaints.

Most landowners cooperated, and some even refused payment for their property. During the winter, Goldsworthy and his deputy, Col. J. H. Dacus, Goldsworthy's engineering-design section, and his administrative staff of about 20 officers, had an opportunity to become thoroughly schooled in missile construction—much to their advantage.

One outstanding reason for loss of time and money on earlier missile sites was faulty "interfaces"—two parts made by different companies, or according to specifications from different agencies of the armed services, that failed to fit together properly when assembled on the site. Goldsworthy's engineers and and company experts had time to make mockups and whole books of special drawings with detailed measurements, signed by inspectors of each agency involved, so that faulty "interfaces" were eliminated.

Design changes were also held to a minimum on the Malmstrom Minuteman site, thanks to lessons learned on earlier construction projects. With the first silos almost ready for installation of equipment last fall, the cost of field changes totaled only about $600,000 at Malmstrom, compared with many millions on earlier sites.

Yet Goldsworthy's job is a formidable one by any standard, even if he did not have to work under the pressure of an urgent time schedule. He will supervise the spending of $61.7 million for construction of 150 silos and 15 launch-control centers, and as much again for equipping them. His engineering staff must excavate approximately 3 million cubic yards of earth, and pour some 120,000 cubic yards of concrete, backed up by 30,500 tons of steel—enough to build 38,000 automobiles. They must bury enough communications wires to reach twice around the world. Cables they lay will cross rivers 34 times.

To supervise this widely dispersed project, Goldsworthy estimates that he and his staff will drive about 12 million miles by automobile before the last silo is operational. But that is only part of the story. He has five helicopters for quick journeys to emergency areas and is testing the use of light planes to move troubleshooters from spot to spot as the need arises. Since it may require a 40-mile trip by road to get from one silo to another that is only 8 miles away by air, helicopters and planes save money and time in moving highly skilled and highly paid personnel.

The greatest timesaver, however, is the project's radio network. Each flight has a radio channel that is in constant two-way communication with 215 mobile radio units in vehicles at sites and elsewhere on the project.

During the actual construction of the Malmstrom site, civilian contractors required a peak force of close to 3,000 men operating a fleet of huge earth-moving machines and concrete mixers. A similar number of men

quickly follow up to equip the silos. The excavation is started by making a cut to a depth of 12 feet. Then a backhoe machine digs a large hole down another 32 feet, after which a clam shell excavates a shaft 15 feet in diameter and 52 feet deep. A concrete footing is poured in the shaft.

A 52-foot liner made of quarter-inch steel is then dropped into the shaft, and the void around it is filled with small stones and a creamy patented cement mixture that attains a special hardness as it dries. A larger, circular underground room at the top of the shaft—the equipment room containing guidance, computer, decoding, and other machinery—is built in much the same way. The silo has its own air-conditioning unit and enough batteries for emergency operation, should outside power lines and an independent generator fail.

Eventually, the excavated areas will be refilled, leaving only the opening of the silos exposed. The Minuteman missiles will be flown to the Malmstrom base. A special 16-wheel transport-erector is being built to carry them to and from the airfield. The vehicle is air-conditioned to prevent heat or cold from affecting the missiles. It is so large that 600 miles of country roads are being improved so it can move over them at 15 miles an hour.

Once a missile is lowered into a silo, and its warhead is in place, the 60-ton concrete door of the silo closes and seals itself. It can be opened by eight bulldozers or with a winch for inspection; but for firing it can only be opened once—by the powerful blast of a gas generator.

The silos are manned entirely by electronic devices—not by humans. When the missile is in readiness, all that will be visible on the surface is a slab of concrete, a small hatchway and a 2-acre plot of grass surrounded by a wire fence. An intricate monitoring system will instantly notify headquarters if anything goes wrong with the missile mechanically, or if any intruder turns so much as a teaspoonful of earth inside the fence.

All this is yet to be completed, of course. So far, Goldsworthy, his staff and his civilian construction teams have made up the 90 days they originally lost, and they are ahead of schedule on the Malmstrom wing where the first silos are scheduled to be operational next summer. Montana winters, however, are hard and long, and Goldsworthy's men are hoping the cold will not halt construction.

Since the drastic reorganization of 1960, the missile base construction program has also made good progress on a nationwide scale—thanks to Goldsworthy's 17 hard-working SATAF colleagues and their men. Instead of being 3 to 6 months behind schedule, it is now within striking distance of its goals.

"We are on schedule," General Estes said after a squadron of Atlas missiles was made combat ready at Forbes Air Force Base, Kans., 3 weeks earlier than expected. "We have the capability to do the job on time."

More Power for the Army in the Field: The Sergeant Missile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the Army Information Digest for January 1962 discusses one of the most important weapons now being placed in the hands of this Nation's combat troops. This is the Sergeant missile, manufactured by the Sperry Utah Co. in Salt Lake City, Utah.

The Sergeant has proved to be a weapon of fantastic accuracy and great flexibility. In the event of open hostility with any enemy in the future it would be an important factor in America's combat strength.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article by Gen. Herbert B. Powell entitled "More Power for the Army in the Field" from page 4 of the January issue of the Army Information Digest.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE POWER FOR THE ARMY IN THE FIELD

(By Gen. Herbert B. Powell)

Fire mission. Coordinates 19snp 37216584, altitude 1760, armored division assembly area, time on target 1200. In less time than it takes to have your lunch, a major threat to a corps commander's scheme of maneuver has been neutralized. Fantastic? Not at all. The Sergeant, the field artillery's newest addition to its family of weapons, has the speed and punch to deliver this decisive blow.

The U.S. Continental Army Command (USCONARC) early recognized that the Corporal put the field artillery in the missile business to stay. However, USCONARC also recognized the necessity for further improvements in reliability, ruggedness, simplicity of operation, accuracy, and range.

These requirements, submitted to Department of the Army, led to development of the Sergeant—an inertially guided solid-propellant missile capable of carrying nuclear warheads and immune to all known countermeasures. (For details of Sergeant development and technical operating features, see following article.—Editor.)

Wtih the development of the Sergeant system, the pioneering Corporal will realize in retirement what so many dream of but seldom achieve. The Corporal will rest on its laurels and let the younger generation take over, confident that the task is in competent hands.

FIELD EMPLOYMENT

Just how will the new Sergeant be employed in the field?

The mission of the Sergeant battalion is to provide field artillery missile fire in support of a field army or corps. In keeping with this mission, the battalion has been organized to furnish the varied firepower requirements of the force it will support. The battalion is composed of a headquarters and headquarters battery, two missile batteries (each with one launcher), and a medical detachment.

Basic fire unit in the Sergeant battalion is the battery. Each missile battery has been provided its own survey, communications, organizational maintenance, and administrative personnel and equipment. Missing from the Sergeant organization is a target acquisition element. The unit must be furnished accurate, three-dimensional target coordinates.

The Sergeant battalion is so organized that each missile battery can perform its tactical mission in locations widely separated from the battalion headquarters, while sustaining itself for much longer periods than were previously practical for other missile systems.

The Sergeant's medium-range missile fire provides the Army or corps commander with a deterrent to the initiation of nuclear warfare by an enemy and with the means of conducting decisive nuclear warfare when his mission requires. Sergeant will be used to attack and destroy large troop concentrations, enemy nuclear delivery systems, communication centers, command and supply installations.

In tactical operations, the force artillery commander prescribes the general location of the firing positions; and the Sergeant battalion commander selects the exact location. Fire support coordination agencies in the supported force headquarters send fire missions to the battalion and provide surveillance of the effects of the fire. The battalion designates the battery to execute the mission.

While the precise times required for emplacement, preparation for action, firing, or displacement will vary with the local situation, the Sergeant can perform any or all of these functions in considerably less time than was required by its first generation parent, the Corporal.

MAINTENANCE METHODS

Echelons of maintenance within the Sergeant system follow the traditional patterns that have been proven effective by the test of time. Within these echelons, however, significant improvements have been made. Scientific progress has introduced automation that eliminates guesswork and simplifies training. Each piece of equipment in the battery has a self-check capability, a built-in automatic system that tells, in simple go-no-go indications, when the equipment is functioning improperly.

Ordnance direct support maintenance for equipment peculiar to the Sergeant system is provided by a mobile detachment, organized on a 1-for-1 basis with each Sergeant battalion. The third-echelon units are equipped to perform piece-part repair on mechanical and hydraulic equipment. Repair of electronic equipment is limited mainly to the isolation and replacement of defective subassemblies. To accomplish this, the detachment is equipped with a field maintenance test station. Faulty assemblies returned by the artillery are plugged into the test equipment. The test equipment then isolates the fault to a subassembly, which is replaced with a like subassembly.

The Ordnance detachment also has a capability of providing contact teams to each missile battery to repair large components that cannot be conveniently evacuated and to provide other technical assistance as required.

Included as a portion of field maintenance is the backup support for the direct support detachment provided by a semimobile ordnance general support unit (Sergeant). The test equipment, organic to this fourth-echelon unit, duplicates that found in the direct support detachment; the general support detachment thus can absorb the workload of any direct support detachments that may be overloaded.

Depot maintenance is standard; it is performed at fixed installations capable of major rebuild.

TRAINING PLAN

To be truly effective, a plan for training unit personnel must insure that each individual in the unit is capable of performing every task required and that, collectively, the individuals can work together as a team. To be efficient, this same plan must consider and coordinate numerous independent actions and responsibilities. With these objectives in mind, the Sergeant training plan was developed.

The plan calls for all Sergeant battalions to be activated and trained initially at the Army Artillery and Missile Center. Both the Army Artillery and Missile School and the First Field Artillery Missile Brigade participate in this program. Instructors for both the school and the missile brigade originally were trained at a contractor school by the Sperry Utah Co.

The training plan for Sergeant units follows the packet system previously proved by USCONARC agencies. Men of the Ser-

geant battalion are grouped into five personnel packets according to the degree and length of training required and the time the packet is to join the battalion.

The administrative and filler packets do not require specialized instruction in the Sergeant system prior to joining the battalion. The remaining three packets, however, receive advance training.

The officers packet and the missile battery packet, for warrant officers and enlisted personnel, are trained by the U.S. Army Artillery and Missile School. The advanced individual training packet consists of selected enlisted personnel who attend 8 weeks of Sergeant training in the First Field Artillery Missile Brigade.

Upon completion of individual training, all five packets are assembled to begin basic and advanced unit training. This is supervised by the missile brigade and culminates in an Army training test which includes live missile firings.

Concurrently with the individual training received by artillery personnel, training is conducted by two of the technical services. The Engineer school trains specialists on the gas turbine generator set and other type generators, to provide an organic third-echelon maintenance capability for the Sergeant battalion's power equipment. The Ordnance guided missile school trains Ordnance direct support detachments. Training schedules assure their arrival at Fort Sill in sufficient time to support a battalion during the unit-training phase.

From the inception of the Sergeant system, USCONARC agencies have played an important role in the development, programing, testing, and training required to employ a new weapon system. A precedent was established when the artillery was brought into the program, at the working level, from the very beginning. For the first time, the user was able to influence the thinking of the contractor and the actual development of the materiel.

The U.S. Army Artillery and Missile School and the U.S. Army Artillery Board, working in conjunction with the U.S. Army Ordnance Missile Command, the Jet Propulsion Laboratory and the Sperry Utah Co. were able to anticipate probable problem areas in the missile and its ground support equipment, in the development of technical manuals, in maintenance concepts, and in training requirements. As new items of equipment come off the production line, the Artillery Board swings into action to wring them out and prove their usability for tactical units.

The end product of this teamwork is Sergeant—a highly mobile, hard-hitting missile system, truly responsive to the needs of the Army in the field. The evolution from Corporal to Sergeant has been an orderly one. It has produced a system with twice the firepower but utilizing the same number of men and about one-half the equipment previously required. This achievement is a tribute to the Army research industry team.

Tax Cut or Political Plaything?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Edmonds (Wash.) Tribune-Review, a weekly newspaper in my congressional district published on January 18, 1962, an editorial concerning the President's tax proposal. This proposal would give him authority to raise or lower income taxes. This proposal, I believe, raises several questions which are pointed out in the Tribune-Review editorial.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this editorial will be of interest to the Members of this body.

The editorial follows:

TAX CUT OR POLITICAL PLAYTHING?

In his state of the Union address to the Congress last week, President Kennedy asked, among other things, for Presidential authority to lower personal income taxes when the President feels such action is necessary to slow down economic decline.

At first blush, this sounded like a fine idea to us. But the more we got to thinking about it, the fishier it sounded.

Not that we don't think income taxes couldn't be reduced, but this doesn't seem to us at all the way to do it. As it stands now, the income tax is a jerry-built hodgepodge with pieces tacked on here and taken away there, until there is considerable feeling among many economists that as it is constituted now, the income tax has quite a bit to do with the lag in economic growth that is one of the favorite views-with-alarm of the Kennedy administration.

We don't think anything that's wrong with the income tax is going to be cured by the President suddenly taking a 15-percent swipe out of it. On the other hand, such action might have just the opposite effect.

Mr. Kennedy is one of the most astute politicians to come down the pike in quite a spell, as his opponents would be quick to agree. In the hands of such a politically keen-minded person, this authority to cut the income tax could be a beautiful plaything indeed, and just about cut the Republicans right off at the pockets.

Come summertime, for example, the President might decide that things are going to hell in a hand basket, and all people who make less than $10,000 a year, say, are going to get a 15-percent cut in their income tax. This would be a most delightful talking point in the hands of Democratic congressional candidates out trying to persuade the 1962 electorate. But maybe the bad old Republicans would pick up more seats in Congress anyhow, and maybe about that same time it would turn out that the President's budget estimates were so optimistic that the Government was going deep in the hole. There probably would be agitation in Congress then to restore the income tax cut, whereupon the President could shrug to the voters: "See? The Democrats giveth and the Republicans taketh away."

Perhaps it might be more realistic for the President to propose a few less spending programs, if he really wants to cut down the bite put on the taxpayer by the Government, then ask for a permanent revision in the whole income tax structure leading to a sensible reduction of the taxpayers' burden.

Our Year of Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, Lexington, Mass., is famed in song and story for its spirited championship of liberty and government. The Women's Republican Club of Lexington is an alert and active group of ladies personifying the best of this tradition. Mrs. R. G. Converse, president of the club, has penned the following poem, which I think is most worthy of sharing with my colleagues:

OUR YEAR OF CHALLENGE

(By Mrs. R. Converse)

We are gathered here together
With a very good intention.
A desire to help our country.
In the next and each election.

We've a great and wondrous country.
And we aim to keep it so,
In a way befitting woman,
In the only way we know.

Putting God and country foremost,
Guarding family from woe,
Living the example,
Our proud heritage did sow.

Alert to danger everywhere,
To body soul and spirit.
Toiling beyond the home,
In order to preserve it.

Our Government has grown now,
Beyond our conception.
And we're hard put to deter,
The corruption and deception.

Our power is in awareness,
And a willingness to work.
To put the men in office,
Whose duty they'll not shirk.

When you look the whole world over,
It makes you mighty proud.
To think God chose we people.
For this great land of ours.

So may we choose the representatives,
Who'll be worthy of this Nation.
Putting principle and honor,
Ahead of their own station.

Freedom came not easy,
In 1775.
Fear was in their hearts,
Just as now with you and I

But they showed their valiant courage,
When they mustered arms to fight,
Bringing home the independence,
That we claim as our birthright.

Now we women aim to honor,
Those souls of '75,
By preserving the freedoms,
For which they fought and died.

We're the envy of the universe
A hope, a dream, a prayer,
We're a way of life that God would have,
For people everywhere.

Iowa Needs These Judges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the February 4, 1962, edition of the Des Moines Sunday Register:

IOWA NEEDS THESE JUDGES

For the information of President Kennedy, we can report growing concern and disgust in Iowa over the inability of the administration to make a decision on the appointment of two Federal judges in Iowa.

We reach this conclusion after reading editorials and letters to the editor in Iowa's

daily and weekly newspapers. Some of the comment is from those backing one of the candidates for U.S. judgships. But most of it is indignation about the politics involved and concern about the delay.

This concern is justified. Legislation approving a third U.S. district court judge for Iowa was approved last May. Judge Henry Graven retired last August. So Iowa has only one judge when it needs three.

Last September, it was reported that the administration had decided to appoint Edward McManus of Keokuk, a Democrat and a former Lieutenant Governor, and J. E. Heiserman of Anamosa, a Republican. Soon after that, the administration apparently decided not to name Heiserman, because he had been too active politically as a Republican.

Last month, the report was that the administration had decided not to name McManus, which provoked a storm of protest from his Democratic friends. This latest report (or was it a trial balloon?) was that the appointments would go to William C. Hanson of Jefferson, a Republican, and Lawrence Mason of Mason City, a Democrat.

The Iowa Democratic patronage committee has made the administration's job difficult. It started out by suggesting a couple of its own members for the judgeships. It has continued since then to be obstructionist.

But the appointments are made by the president, who relies mainly on advice from the attorney general's department, headed by his brother. It is high time that the administration made the appointments, so that the judges can get to work and the politicians turn their attention to other matters than trying to influence the appointment of judges.

Politics Won't Help the Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the Kansas City Star enjoys a well-earned and deserved reputation throughout the Nation for the soundness and constructive, positive tone of its editorial policy. The Star is one of the great metropolitan daily newspapers in the United States. It is in touch with the vital issues of the 1960's, and it works, day by day, with the important problems that confront those of our citizens who live and work in our big cities.

For those reasons, among others, the Kansas City Star is exceptionally well qualified to comment upon the administration's pending proposal to create a Federal Department of Urban Affairs and upon the way the proposal has been handled.

As the Kansas City Star says in its lead editorial of Monday, February 5:

So important a step should be considered without the obfuscation of political and racial issues.

I include the entire editorial:

POLITICS WON'T HELP THE CITIES

We fear that politics and the emotional issue of civil rights have taken over what should have been an important debate on the problems of the urban age. Tempers have already been aroused by the maneuvering around the proposal to create a Department of Urban Affairs. We are not sure that such a Department is either necessary or desirable. But we had hoped that attention would center on the rapid pace of urbanization and the tough problems it has created for the Nation.

Of course, all this political maneuvering won't help the cities, if, in fact, they do need help of the type Mr. Kennedy has proposed. The President must take part of the blame for obscuring the real issue. To be sure, he did not officially announce his choice to head the new Department before the House Rules Committee, by a 9-to-6 vote, rejected the measure. But it was an open secret that Dr. Robert C. Weaver would become Secretary of Urban Affairs and the first Negro Cabinet officer in history.

This stirred southern opposition. It placed the lawmakers who honestly oppose the proposed Department in a bad position. Their opposition was open to interpretation as objection to a Negro in the Cabinet. It is an unfair interpretation. Conscientiously, many people believe that such a Department is wholly unnecessary and that the interests of the cities are already protected in commerce, labor, and elsewhere.

Actually, the turn of events is unfair to Weaver himself. If he is the best man available for the job, he deserves the appointment. But to center attention on him before the Department was even created was a cart-before-the-horse operation. And we can be certain that Weaver, civil rights, and politics will figure in any discussion of the matter in either House. Frankly, we don't expect to hear too much about the problems of the cities.

The big issue has been clouded by irrelevancies, and that is too bad. The President will create the Department unless either House disapproves within 60 days. But so important a step should be considered without the obfuscation of political and racial issues.

Tariff Cut Worsens Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, no President has ever advocated a program as controversial as the proposal of President Kennedy with respect to tariff and the trade policies of our Nation. The President argues in behalf of his program that for this Nation to do less than meet the competition of the European Common Market, it will mean that we will be frozen out of doing business with member nations of that economic bloc. In reply thereto, it has been stated that our market difficulties abroad are a direct result of the fact that American industry has priced itself out of the world market.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I wish to include a timely editorial on this matter which appeared in the Weirton Daily Times on Monday, February 5, 1962, written by Mr. Earle V. Wittpenn, its distinguished editor. This editorial is entitled "Tariff Cut Worsens Situation" and I commend it to the reading of my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

TARIFF CUT WORSENS SITUATION

President Kennedy has made formal request of Congress for the tools with which to implement a new trade policy previously outlined.

Two basic steps are involved.

First, another 5-year extension of the law under which Presidents have been negotiating reciprocal trade agreements for the past quarter of a century. This act, which has been kept alive by a series of extensions, empowers the President to reduce any existing duty by as much as 50 percent in negotiating specific agreements.

Second, special additional authority, in dealing with the European Common Market, to reduce or eliminate altogether duties on products in which the United States and the Common Market between them represent 80 percent or more of world trade.

Last week, at his press conference, the President expressed regret over terms of a labor contract negotiated by the Electrical Workers and New York City contractors calling for a 25-hour workweek.

The two incidents are mentioned here because they have, the Weirton Daily Times feels, a direct and important relationship.

An acknowledged consequence of tariff removal such as the President wants is the substitution of more imports for domestic products on the American market. To ease the economic pain thus inflicted, the President proposes financial and technical aid for companies, farmers, and workers who suffer damage from increased foreign competition.

Help for individual industrial operations would take the form of special tax and depreciation allowances while adjustments to the new situation were being made. Workers whose jobs had been destroyed would get extended unemployment compensation benefits, with coverage up to a year for all and for longer periods for those too old for retraining. Those capable of being retrained would be fitted for other employment and financial help would be given those moving to other areas to take jobs.

The point here is recognition of an economic and employment crisis as one of the immediate fruits of an operation such as the President has in mind. The hope, of course, is that this dislocation would be but temporary. The eventual prospect held out is not merely for restored employment and industrial activity, but of great economic acceleration because of an increased flow of commerce into and out of the country. Our businessmen and farmers, and of course the people they employ, will be given, the President promises, a unique opportunity to compete on a more equal basis in a rich and expanding market abroad which possesses potentially a purchasing power as large and as varied as our own.

How firm is the base on which this opportunity stands? Let's assume, for the sake of argument, that the Common Market goes along with us and knocks down all or more of the trade barriers. Let's assume Mr. Kennedy puts through a number of trade agreements with countries outside the Common Market halving the tariff on a long list of goods. How are we going to sell more competitive wares in these foreign markets at existing and prospective American production costs?

Mr. Kennedy deplores the electrical settlement because he regards it as inflationary. He has exhorted the steel industry and the steel union to avoid an agreement having the same effect. He has taken the position that any wage increase or work reduction should be tailored to conform to productivity improvement. But what it seems timely to inquire, are these exhortations apt to amount to in the light of the record and the realities of the hour?

The electrical workers say a shorter week was needed to make work for idle members.

Transport workers have threatened to strike unless prospective railroad and airline mergers guarantee the preservation of jobs that normally would disappear in any industrial consolidation. The United Steelworkers have made the 6-hour day a major objective. All over the land we hear the story of job displacement by machinery and the necessity of scaling down working time once more as a means of dividing the available labor among more men without any loss of earning power to any. All of this, of course, means higher production costs.

There may be a significant reduction in the working hours of American industry this year, but don't bet on it. One thing you can bet on is that any change in the hour pattern will be down, any change in the wage pattern up. So that, costwise, any alteration of the American-foreign industrial relationship is apt to be in the direction of widening the differential to our disadvantage.

Long before there was any talk of changing our trade policy drastically in the direction of tariff removal it was generally agreed that American industry was losing ground abroad, not because of trade barriers, but because it had priced itself out of the world market. It is realistic, then, to look for accelerated foreign sales to make up for the loss of domestic sales resulting from tariff reduction when everything points to higher rather than lower American production costs?

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Patrick F. O'Dwyer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago in addressing this House I had occasion to comment on the fact that the San Fernando Valley in California is a community of a million people, populated and built almost entirely since the end of World War II. This rapid influx of population and growth has been a challenge to every segment of our community. Today I would like to pay my respects to one of the handful of men who has met the challenge of growth in the need for places of worship and religious education, the Right Reverend Monsignor Patrick F. O'Dwyer.

Monsignor O'Dwyer was born in County Tipperary, Ireland. A graduate of St. Patrick's College in Thurles, Ireland, he was ordained in 1924, and came to California. Shortly after the end of World War II when it became apparent that the San Fernando Valley was to undergo rapid expansion, the then Father O'Dwyer was appointed pastor of St. Elizabeth's parish. At the time, the parish covered the bulk of the heart of the San Fernando Valley. Today, this same geographic area is served by 10 pastors in 10 parishes. With the kindness and wit typical of his national origin, and with a realistic sense of the need for growth, Patrick O'Dwyer set about building a beautiful church and the attendant educational facilities. He was charter chaplain of the Knights of Columbus of West Valley, then the only Knights of Columbus council in the San Fernando Valley. In addition to serving those of his own parish, he made a substantial contribution to the community in his efforts as an original member of the Bethlehem Star Parade Committee. Originated in the late forties, this project has developed into a religious parade participated in by every Christian church in the San Fernando Valley. It is a religious pageant staged during the Christmas season, and is truly an inspiration to the million people who live in the valley, and the millions of others who share it with them on television annually. It is pleasing, though not surprising, to his thousands of friends, both those in his parish and those of us who know him as a kindly friend and a devout fellow Christian, that His Holiness Pope John XXIII, has recently elevated Patrick F. O'Dwyer to the position of Domestic Prelate, as announced recently by James Francis Cardinal McIntyre. It is a privilege and pleasure to join Monsignor O'Dwyer's multitude of friends in extending my sincere best wishes.

On Paying the Policeman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of the present controversy over whether we should purchase $100 million of United Nations bonds, I think it is important to know what some of our newspaper editors are saying:

The following editorial from the Berne Witness, Berne, Ind., reaches the heart of the question, and I am pleased to include it herewith:

ON PAYING THE POLICEMAN

President Kennedy's plea that Congress buy bonds from the United Nations does nothing to make the idea more palatable financially or from a standpoint of politics. In his state of the Union message, the President characterized the U.N. as an international "policeman." He pointed out that no one likes an officer, particularly "when he uses his stick to restore law and order on his beat."

This is an extension of U.N. authority which is accepted by only a small group of professionals within the Secretariat of that international organization. The British do not agree. The French certainly have other ideas. The Russians have never paid any attention to this "policeman." India didn't respect the ethereal stick or nonexistent authority of the U.N.

The President's request is, then, based on an erroneously dangerous concept of what the U.N. is, or rather isn't.

He added that the bonds would be used to finance "special operations for the next 18 months." This is a polite phrase for the U.N. effort to colonize the Congo, including possible military action there. Do most Americans want to spend $100 million for such a questionable cause?

Finally, the President gave the best reason of all for letting other nations share the cost and the burden of the U.N. He argued that the bonds would be repaid with interest within 18 months from regular assessments which other nations have paid. The other nations refuse the special assessments for "special operations."

Supposedly the regular U.N. assessment is a charge against each nation for the normal operation of that body. If this assessment covers normal operations, there will be no surplus left with which to repay bonds or interest. If the assessment is padded to cover the bonds which are used to finance special operations, the same nations which have refused to pay special assessments will simply reduce their regular payments. The Russians and their Communist satellites will see clearly through any such financial maneuver.

If the other nations are able to pay assessments 18 months in the future, they are just as able to make those payments right now. Every member nation should share in supporting the U.N. Congress should insist on this principle by refusing to buy bonds that won't be worth the cost of their printing.

Recreation: Southwestern Nebraska's New Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, a real growth industry flourishes in Nebraska as a happy corollary to the important work of soil reclamation and conservation. This business is recreation. It provides employment and contributes to the State's economic well-being. It is especially welcome in those areas which for many years have relied primarily on agriculture as their economic base.

This relatively new industry of recreation is colorfully described in an article in the current issue of the Reclamation Era, a quarterly publication of the Bureau of Reclamation. The article is by Ralph Bush, agricultural economist, and Dean M. Schachterle, management agronomist, both stationed at the Bureau's offices, in McCook, Nebr.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that their article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECREATION: SOUTHWESTERN NEBRASKA'S NEW INDUSTRY

(By Ralph Bush)

Reclamation lakes in southwest Nebraska, boasting 10,000 surface acres of water, have attracted a multimillion dollar industry—recreation. The impoundments drew over 400,000 visitors last year to enjoy boating, water skiing, swimming, camping and hunting, and the ever popular and predominant sport, fishing.

The phenomenal story we have to tell involves a nine-county area containing 17,500 square miles, populated by nearly 46,000 people. This large expanse, located in the heart of the treeless high plains, is transected by the Republican River and its tributaries, and is bounded on the south by Kansas and the west by Colorado. Within the area, there are numerous small agricultural towns and a few small cities, the largest

being McCook, Nebr., with a population of 8,300.

In the late thirties and early forties, drought and devastating floods seriously crippled the area. Being experienced pioneers in hardship, the people decided to fight back at these problems and began to seek State and Federal help.

In the early planning and construction stages of the large dams being built for flood control and irrigation storage, very little consideration was given to what has proven to be a very important use of the reservoirs—recreation.

If the Federal and State planners and prospective water users could have gazed into a crystal ball, even ahead a few years, they would have seen a vision to quicken the heart of many outdoor enthusiasts—boats by the score plying the waters of these newly created lakes, campers, picnickers, swimmers, water skiers, fishermen and hunters abounding everywhere.

The rapid transformation of the landscape and social habits of the people and the quick change in economic conditions started with construction of the Frenchman-Cambridge Division, Missouri River Basin project, in the late 1940's. Enders Dam and Reservoir, Medicine Creek Dam-Harry Strunk Lake, and Trenton Dam-Swanson Lake were completed and filled in the early 1950's.

A fourth and very promising attraction for recreation seekers, Red Willow Dam-Hugh Butler Lake, is under construction and will be completed in 1962.

During construction of the first of these three big dams and reservoirs, only minimum basic facilities were planned—to take care of the sightseers and an occasional fisherman and to provide protection for reclamation facilities. It was not expected that the reservoirs, located in a lightly populated section of the high plains, would attract many visitors.

Time, however, has proved this viewpoint wrong. In keeping with national trends after World War II, a virtual "recreational explosion" occurred around the new lakes in the Republican Valley. They opened up a whole new world of activity. Now, lines of cars, many trailing boats, head for the lakes on summer weekends and holidays.

It is rather ironic that the city of McCook, which could furnish only one boat (or so it has been reported) for rescue operations during the 1935 flood, now seems to have virtually reached the stage of "a boat in every garage."

The minimum recreation facilities, constructed with the dams and reservoirs, were greatly overtaxed. Fortunately, the Bureau of Reclamation, the National Park Service, and the Nebraska Game, Forestation and Parks Commission worked out a cooperative program which has in a large measure eased the pressure.

The recreation now being administered under the able direction of the latter commission, although timely and highly successful, is too modest to meet the full impact of this newly created industry.

Paul H. Berg, project manager for the Kansas River Basin, in whose area these lakes are located, was convinced that there should be a "new look" at the recreation potential for reclamation projects in the planning stage. To obtain necessary information, he instigated a study to measure the use being made of reclamation lakes in southwest Nebraska. When the study was first being discussed, Mr. Berg remarked, "We need to know how significant are the recreation benefits, and what part they should play in project justification."

Consequently, the Bureau of Reclamation consulted with the National Park Service and it was agreed that a comprehensive and unbiased study should be made by the University of Nebraska. The National Park Service then contracted with the university to collect vital informaton to determine the extent of the economic and sociological impact attributable to recreation on the three southwest Nebraska lake areas. The study was made during 1958 and 1959 under the guidance of the Council for Community Study and was directed by Dr. Edgar Z. Palmer, director of the university's bureau of business research. Dr. Richard Videbeck, of the department of sociology, assisted in the sociological phases of the study.

The university developed an informative report[1] containing numerous sidelights on the extent and variations in the recreational uses of the lakes. Over 3,000 questionnaires were sent to persons living in southwest Nebraska and northwest Kansas, and scores of people were interviewed during the summer recreation season by trained personnel.

The detailed surveys made of business establishments revealed that many new ones had moved into the area to furnish the special services and equipment demanded by outdoor sportsmen. The more noticeable ones are sporting goods stores that sell boats, motors, fishing equipment, guns and ammunition, and all kinds of camping paraphernalia.

The construction industry—both within the towns and cities and along the lakeshores—has also thrived as a result of the lakes. This can best be illustrated by the 22 cabins that have been constructed in the Enders Reservoir seasonal cabin area and the 19 cabins attractively blending into the landscape of Harry Strunk and Swanson Lakes.

To furnish the many necessities that are forgotten at home, or when an emergency arises, concessionaires operate facilities at Swanson and Harry Strunk Lakes. They supply such goods and services as bait and fishing equipment, boat and motor rental, boat repair, parking space and necessary utilities for house trailers, and short-order meals. They also serve as information centers for tourists and new lake visitors.

Why have the many new business ventures been attracted to southwest Nebraska since the lakes were built? Dr. Palmer found that almost $1.4 million is spent annually in the area in connection with recreation at the lakes, plus another $1.2 million spent elsewhere. These expenditures generate another $2 million derivative business associated with the direct recreation spending. He also found that $1.4 million spent in the area is providing work for 50 persons directly, plus another 70 indirectly. This means that about 300 persons in the immediate area, including families of workers, are supported by the recreation business generated by the lakes.

"This is not the only economic benefit from the lakes," says Dr. Palmer. "The presence of recreational facilities is an important factor in making a region attractive, and water is one of the most important types of such facilities in this regard. Prospects for the establishment of industry often inquire concerning the quality of such facilities in deciding whether to locate in a given community."

[1] Recreational Aspects of Three Nebraska Lakes, Community Study No. 3—Edgar Z. Palmer, University of Nebraska.

Altoona, Pa., Hailed as "Gateway to Beauty"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the attention of the lovers of America's great outdoors is called to an article in Sunday's travel section of the February 4, 1962, issue of the Washington Post. Entitled "Altoona: Gateway to Beauty," it suggests an interesting motor tour from Washington through a most beautiful area of our country.

I recommend this route to a weekend of rest and relaxation to my colleagues, as well as to all others whose Mondays through Fridays are spent in the always fast-moving and often hectic conditions of the Nation's Capital. Modern highways bring you into a section of our country that is rich in the history and tradition you will want your family to learn, understand, absorb, and appreciate. Our hospitable people of Pennsylvania welcome you.

We congratulate the writer, Mr. Walter W. Hubbard, for the following timely and inviting article:

YOUR MOTOR TOUR—ALTOONA: GATEWAY TO BEAUTY

(By Walter W. Hubbard)

Altoona and Tyrone serve as a gateway to a magnificently beautiful section of Pennsylvania, to a winter sports area, and to a rewarding country for hunting and fishing.

If you haven't tasted freshly caught Pennsylvania brook trout, you have missed a treat. Cooks, from housewives to hotel chefs in the Quaker State, have almost as many ways of preparing trout as those offered the visitor to Belgium, and they're all good.

Tyrone, at the top of the American Automobile Association map, was settled by immigrants from Northern Ireland well over 110 years ago. It was once the hunting grounds of several tribes of Indians.

Twelve miles southwest of Tyrone lies Altoona, founded in 1849 by the Pennsylvania Railroad. The history of Altoona is a part of the history of the "iron horse." The Juniata shops repaired and rebuilt locomotives and shipped ready-made parts to every civilized country.

This city, lying between King and Tyrone, was named for Altoona, an important Elbe River port in Germany. German, Scottish, and Irish settlers formed the nucleus of this great rail repair center. Today it boasts of the largest locomotive roundhouse in the world.

One hundred years ago Gov. Andrew G. Curtin of Pennsylvania called a hasty conference of governors of the States loyal to the Union to pledge their resources and strength to President Lincoln and to plan for a possible invasion by Confederate forces which had been successful in the field against Northern arms. The meeting was held at Altoona's old Logan House, now torn down.

An old house, built in 1840 in Greek Revival style is one of the sights shown to visitors to Altoona. It is the Baker mansion, in Mansion Park, and is now the headquarters of the Blair County Historical Society. Children will enjoy the exhibit of guns, transportation methods, clothing and household implements of the early Americans.

Nine miles east of Altoona is the site of what was once Fort Roberdeau—a stockaded fortress built in 1778 by Maj. Gen. Daniel Roberdeau near the lead mines "to secure the work so necessary to the public service and give confidence to the frontier inhabitants by affording an asylum for their women and children."

About 5 miles west of Altoona is the famous Pennsylvania Railroad Horseshoe Curve which crosses Kittaning and Glen White Runs. Three reservoirs supplying Altoona and its suburbs are found within the semicircle of track.

The elevation at the east end of the curve is 1,594 feet. And the trains climb to an altitude of 2,480 feet at the west end. Reforestation has added green grandeur to the mountainous scenery, and a road leads to a parking place where motorists may see the entire curve at one time.

Return to Washington by way of King, Bedford and Breezewood.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

TORRINGTON, CONN.,
January 17, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The past 17 years have witnessed the advance of communism on nearly all fronts of the cold war. Moscow's endeavors to permeate the free world have been met by a defensive and sometimes meek United States. The time has come for the United States to reverse its "treadmill" position and actively engage in countermeasures in the diplomatic and propaganda areas.

Your captive nations resolution (H. Res. 211) offers a positive step in combating Moscow's quest for the minds of men. The passage of the captive nations resolution and the full exploitation of its potential is necessary if the United States is to remain the leader of the free world.

I offer my most sincere hope that House Resolution 211 will become a reality in the current congressional session.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL E. GIOBBE II.

ORGANIZATION FOR DEFENSE
OF FOUR FREEDOMS OF UKRAINE, INC.,
Chicago, Ill., January 20, 1962.

Re resolution for a permanent committee of the House for the captive nations.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Despite the fact that this resolution was not passed by the last Congress, we feel that it is in the best interest of this Nation to show these captive people that we in the free world remember them. We strongly feel that this action is the best and real answer to the Soviet-Russian propaganda concerning colonialism. Captive people are looking for moral support to keep their hope for eventual freedom from tyranny of Russian communism.

We are asking you to support the resolution for the creation of such a committee in the opening session of Congress.

Respectfully yours,

ROMAN KOBYLECKY,
Chairman.

WILLIAM HOLOD,
Secretary.

FOR A CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEE

A week or so ago the Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, author of a resolution calling for the creation of a Special Captive Nations Committee in the House of Representatives, made a statement on the floor of the House, announcing that he will again propose the same resolution in the 87th Congress. He said that events of the past year had fully justified the necessity of such a committee.

This committee is long overdue. On Monday, January 22, 1962, a number of U.S. Senators and Congressmen made significant statements in commemoration of the 44th anniversary of Ukrainian independence. Each one made it a point to state that Ukraine is the most important captive nation in the U.S.S.R. and that it constitutes a real problem for Khrushchev and his clique of tyrants who rule Ukraine today. We recall that at the recent 22d Congress of the Communist Party, Khrushchev again attacked the Captive Nations Week resolution as one of the manifestations of U.S. "interference" in the affairs of the Soviet Union.

In the same wise Radyanska Ukraina, which is the organ of the central committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine and the Council of Ministers of the Ukrainian S.S.R., in its January 12, 1962, issue scathingly attacked Prime Minister John G. Diefenbaker, of Canada, for his denunciation of Russian Communist colonialism and imperialism and his statement to the effect that Canada will try to bring the problem of Russian colonialism up for discussion in the United Nations.

Furthermore, Mr. Stevenson's statement regarding the enslavement of Ukraine and other non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R., which he made on November 25, 1961, strongly supports the vital need of such a committee as is being advocated by Congressman FLOOD. Had such a committee been in existence, our State Department would perhaps be more acquainted with the problems of the captive nations than it seems to be now. The unfortunate letter of Mr. Rusk which he wrote to Congressman SMITH on August 22, 1961, is undeniable proof of how badly such a committee is needed in Washington. It is true, that in a subsequent letter, dated December 27, 1961, Mr. Rusk endeavored to convince Congressman SMITH, chairman of the House Rules Committee, that the U.S. Government is in no way reducing its support of the captive nations in the U.S.S.R.

"There is no change in the U.S. Government's long-established policy toward the peoples of the U.S.S.R.," Mr. Rusk wrote. "As in the past, the U.S. Government continues to support the just aspirations of all peoples of the U.S.S.R., without attempting to prejudge the political arrangements which might be preferred by those peoples if they were free to choose them * * *."

This is not entirely satisfactory, for our high officials should never be allowed to blunder in such a vital matter as the captive nations.

It is with this in view that we urge our readers, our Ukrainian-American organizations and societies, our church, women's and youth groups and associations to fully support the Flood resolution for the creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

The best way to do so is by a mass campaign of letterwriting to every Congressman in the House of Representatives, asking them to support the Flood resolution. The State Department, through Mr. Rusk, expressed its opposition to such a committee last summer. Now we believe that even the State Department cannot object to such a measure, as it is essential to the conduct of our foreign policy, especially in the area of the captive nations both within and outside the Soviet Union.

The Ukrainian nation, as well as all other non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R., has never accepted the Communist domination imposed by Communist Russia. The Ukrainians fought against it and are continuing to fight against the despicable Communist rule of Moscow. The recent murders of two Ukrainian nationalist leaders, Dr. Lev R. Rebet and Stepan Bandera, by KGB Agent Stashynsky, is the best evidence that Moscow is afraid of the Ukrainian liberation movement and is trying everything, including murder of individual Ukrainian leaders abroad, to destroy this movement.

There is no doubt that the American people at large are in sympathy with and understand the aspirations of the Ukrainian people to freedom. The solemn observance of the 44th anniversary of Ukraine's independence in the U.S. Congress on January 22, 1962, including the prayers of Ukrainian Catholic and Ukrainian Orthodox clergymen in both its Houses, and the statements of many U.S. Senators and Congressmen in commemoration of this anniversary, is indeed gratifying.

We are sure that sooner or later the Ukrainian people behind the Iron Curtain will learn about these observances. They will be inspired and strengthened in their never-dying attempt and endeavor in search of genuine freedom.

But these manifestations of sympathy with the enslaved Ukrainian nation must be properly supported by concrete deeds as well, such as the creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations as advocated by Congressman FLOOD.

The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America will soon appeal to our community for support of Congressman FLOOD's resolution. There should be no lack of good will and determination on the part of the Ukrainian-American community to do its full share for the quick and proper implementation of the resolution. This will be done when a special committee will be established in the House of Representatives.

We have strong backing among our legislators in Congress, and with proper and determined support such a project will surely be realized, inasmuch as it is in the interest of our own security and the cause of peace as well.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Please fight to publicize and demand free elections in each of Soviet's captive nations. We are always afraid to say anything to disturb the Soviets?

P. A. HOYT.

SANTA ROSA, CALIF.

FLORAL PARK, N.Y., *January 11, 1962.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I have recently read that you are the original sponsor of House Resolution No. 211 to establish a special House Committee on Captive Nations. I feel that passage of this resolution would be a tremendous asset for the United States in the cold war.

Having admired your past work, I would now urge you to do all in your power to have this resolution passed. I would also appreciate any literature you may have on the matter and if there is anything I can do, please let me know. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL V. WILLIAMS.

World Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, recently there appeared in the LaGrange Standard, LaGrange, Ind., an editorial dealing with the world situation which I think expresses the views of many people. Because of its timeliness, I include it herewith:

"SAY NOT THE STRUGGLE NAUGHT AVAILETH"

That is the title, and the first line, of a poem that Arthur Hugh Clough wrote a century and a half ago. It is a strange little poem, for two reasons. For one, it is found in all the anthologies of English poetry and so, by itself, has given an otherwise forgotten writer a place in what Rebecca West has called the continuance of literature—for literature, with history, goes on and on, in a certain pattern, like the links of a chain.

For the other, the body of the poem possesses an amazing symbolism that applies perfectly to the great events of the present day—and of the events and crises and defeats and victories that are to come.

Make no mistake about it—we live in a world dominated by two great and totally inimical powers, the United States and the Soviet Union. If history teaches anything, it teaches that prolonged coexistence under these circumstances is an impossibility. One power—war or no war—will become the primary power. It will lead the other nations of the world in a certain direction.

At present the cold war is being fought on an economic front. There are abundant statistics to prove that in this we, and the other Western Powers, have a superiority of resources. We are able to produce more of virtually everything the nations of the world want and need. But the East—and it must be remembered that Russia is both an Asiatic as well as a European nation—has vast reservoirs of little-tapped resources which she is now developing. So has China, with her incredible population of some 700 million slaves of the state. And the Communist powers can, and will, direct the whole energies of their dictatorships to the purposes of the dictators.

Under these conditions, it can be expected that there will be an economic stalemate—exactly as, it seems, there is a stalemate of weapons in which each side has the capacity to destroy the other. And if this stalemate occurrs, where will the war be fought?

That question is easily answered. It will be fought for minds—for sets of principles which go far beyond any material considerations. The peoples of this torn world will be free to do as they choose, within the limitations. The peoples of this torn world will be free to do as they choose, within the limitations long imposed by the laws of civilization—or they will be driven by their masters. It is a queer and sorry fact that the nation which speaks out most often against colonialism, the Soviet Union, has become the greatest and cruelest colonial power of the modern age. And it is a queer and sorry fact that the new and underdeveloped nations listen to Russia's siren song and, because of ignorance or misunderstanding, so often accept it.

What we stand for—and what the West stands for—must be emphasized with all weight at home—in schools, in the churches, in government, in the labor and business and farm organizations—everywhere. We cannot lead if we do not first understand where we hope and intend to lead to. And we cannot qualify and limit the ideal of individual freedom if we are to remain free, and help others to become free.

The task ahead will not be easy. There will be reverses. But here is where the symbolism of Arthur Hugh Clough's poem fits us now. The last two verses read:

"For while the tired waves, vainly breaking,
Seem here no painful inch to gain,
Far back, through creeks and inlets making,
Comes silent, flooding in, the main.

"And not by eastern windows only,
When daylight comes, comes in the light,
In front, the sun climbs slow, how slowly,
But westward, look, the land is bright."

That is what we must prove—to confused peoples everywhere. Westward, look, the land is bright.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on January 21, 1962, in the common council chambers, city hall, Buffalo, N.Y., the people of Buffalo celebrated the 44th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the program and the excellent address delivered by the Honorable Chester Kowal, mayor of Buffalo:

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Presiding: Dr. Edward M. O'Connor

1. Call to order and presenting the colors.
2. National anthem, Mrs. Halyna Pryshlak.
3. Invocation, Very Rev. John Krestiuk of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, Buffalo, N.Y.
4. Opening address, Dr. Edward M. O'Connor.
5. Hoisting of Ukrainian national flag; a. proclamation of Ukrainian Independence by Ukrainian Central Council, January 22, 1918; b. mayor's proclamation of Ukrainian Independence Day read by Mr. Bohdan Bejger.
6. Mayor's address, Hon. Chester Kowal, mayor of Buffalo.
7. Address by Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI, Member of U.S. Congress.
8. "O, Ukraine," recital by Miss Ola Wilczynsky.
9. Ukrainian response, by Dr. Nestor Procyk, vice chairman UCCA.
10. Closing prayer, Father Bohdan Ostapowych of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, Lackawanna, N.Y.
11. Ukrainian national anthem.

ADDRESS BY HON. CHESTER KOWAL, MAYOR OF BUFFALO, N.Y.

Forty-four years ago today, the Ukrainian nation declared its national independence. This declaration was the answer to the centuries-old aspirations of the people of Ukraine who had, in their long history, experienced the blessings of liberty and self-government. Their liberties and their God-given right to govern themselves had been robbed from them by the scheming Princes of Muscovy.

After a long period of suppression and foreign occupation, the flame of liberty and national independence was rekindled in Ukraine.

There was great rejoicing among the people throughout that land. The Russian Empire of the czars had collapsed under the tidal wave of pressure, generated by the hopes and dreams of long submerged nations.

Historians have come to call that time the golden age of national independence. Nearly a score of nations had thrown off the chains of imperialism to reestablish their national life and culture. Nations such as Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Byelorussia, Georgia, Armenia, Czechia and Slovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria—like Ukraine—were reborne in the dignity of their national life. The empires of Europe were passing into history as this golden age was ushered in. The future prospects of all mankind were bright indeed.

But the golden age of which I speak was all to short lived. It was nipped in its infancy by a new totalitarianism which had taken roots in Petrograd—replacing the tyranny and despotism of the czars with a new and equally oppressive system—communism.

A Red wave of terror, subversion, and armed aggression flowed outward from Russia to engulf many of those newly independent nations which had broken the old chains of Moscow. Before the first crest of the new wave of Russian imperialism was broken, Ukraine and eight other newly independent nations were made captive.

Those tragic events of 4 decades past are fresh in our minds today. Men who love liberty and who have confidence in the ultimate power of freedom will never forget them. But they are more than a memory—greater than a symbol—for all of us gathered here today. We meet here today as a reminder that the freedom and national independence of Ukraine is not forever lost. True, it has been interrupted and delayed. But equally true, its fulfillment cannot long be delayed.

It is the destiny of men to be free and the freedom-loving people of Ukraine will fulfill their destiny as an independent nation.

There are signs, very heartening signs, that the peoples of the world are moving our generation forward to the rebirth of the golden age of national independence. The old empires of south and southeast Asia, the Middle East and most of Africa have been replaced by newly independent nations. Since 1946, no less than 35 new nations have emerged from colonial or dependent status to take their rightful place in the United Nations. More are sure to follow with the rapid changes now taking place on the African Continent. It will not be long be-

fore the terms colonialism and imperialism will apply to but one darkened area of the world, the present-day Russian Communist empire.

The world of our times has been witness to the cold and godless ravages of the new imperialism, the new colonialism. During and since World War II, we have seen the once independent nations of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechia and Slovakia, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Slovenia and Servia, all three within the so-called Yugoslavia, and finally Albania, fall victims to the organized subversion and terror of Red Moscow.

The empire of the commissars exceeds the fondest dreams and hopes of a long line of czars since Peter the Great. This last remaining empire cannot escape the tidal wave of human aspirations, calling out for self-determination and self-government, which sweeps the world in our time. Those who resist this great wave of the future must face the certainty of bloody revolutions.

Mankind's answer to tyranny has always been revolt. The world has always been subject to change but the nature of man is not subject to change. The immortal nature of man demands that he be free.

We Americans who are the legitimate children of the revolutionary age must be prepared to stand fast by our historic traditions. The divine plan for a better world has cast us in the role of leaders. Our goal has always been, and must remain, a peaceful world community of free and independent nations.

We must be prepared to accept the full responsibilities of and to assume the sacrifices required for the winning of that objective. Nothing else will do. Our own future as free people, and that of the world, depends upon the faithful dispatch of that high mission which divine providence has placed in our hands.

On this day I salute the people in captive Ukraine for their unceasing struggles to regain their freedom and national independence. I congratulate all gathered here for your devotion to the cause of a free Ukraine and all the other captive nations.

I pledge to you my solid support for the work that lies ahead. The Citizens Committee to observe Captive Nations Week, under whose auspices we meet here today, must move ahead with the work it has so well planned to keep hopes alive in the darkened nations behind the Iron Curtain. This great work we shall do together.

Thank you.

Historic Opus of Dr. David MacGregor Cheney: A Crucial National Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a most thought-provoking article by Eileen Lardner, staff writer of the New Bedford, Mass., Standard-Times, which recently appeared in that fine publication, with reference to the contributions of a very great scholar, gentleman, and man of letters, Dr. David MacGregor Cheney of Clinton, Mass.

Dr. Cheney, famous author of "Index to Knowledge," is one of the great intellectuals of our times. His brilliant career, superb, indefatigable scholarship and truly breathtaking creative literary work form one of the very brightest chapters in the history of American letters.

Professor Cheney has worked for many years of his life on the "Index to Knowledge," a luminous multivolume reference work that is so huge in scope that some of the publishers and foundations which have surveyed it estimated that it would cost more than $500,000 to prepare the opus for publication.

Notwithstanding the interest of many people, publishers, and foundations in printing this great work in the public interest, and for the purpose of advancing the boundaries of human knowledge, it has not been possible up to this time to secure adequate financing for this challenging task, as projected.

"Index to Knowledge" is a composite dictionary and reference encyclopedia in several volumes.

As we know, various foundations contribute literally billions of tax-exempt funds every year for a variety of purposes, some of them very worthy.

Even a cursory survey of Dr. Cheney's work indicates to the trained mind its tremendous value and the high desirability of making it available as promptly as possible to the American public, especially to scholars, researchers, and students in secondary schools and colleges and universities.

As I recall and consider the many purposes for which the various foundations have made very substantial grants, I am entirely unable to comprehend why some of the wealthier foundations will not undertake to print the amazingly enlightening and useful Cheney work.

In any event, the Standard-Times has done a real service for the country, and particularly for the world of belle lettres and education in bringing additional attention to Dr. Cheney's peerless work, and I hope the day will soon be at hand when it can be published and made available to the world of contemplation, scholarship, and letters as well as the general public. I will continue most vigorously to join with other interested persons and groups in pressing for the publication of this historic work which could so readily revolutionize and facilitate our pathways to knowledge, education, and learning, and those fundamental spiritual truths which nourish and reinvigorate our free way of life.

The article follows:

COLLECTING WORDS, IDEAS, DR. CHENEY'S LIFE WORK

(By Eileen Lardner)

CLINTON, November 18.—When David MacGregor Cheney was a boy, at the turn of the century, his father said to him: "Don't ever let a new word get away from you." Young David Cheney took his father's advice literally. As proof, today he can show you a mountain of words—more than 1 million of them representing over 4 million ideas and weighing more than a ton—that he has spent half a century collecting.

NEW DICTIONARY

They are written in his spidery hand on slips of scrap paper and on small pieces of cardboard. They are typed on long sheets. They are printed in the pamphlet published to retain the copyright on his revolutionary new type of dictionary-encyclopedia to be known as Cheney's "Index to Knowledge."

Dr. Cheney—and his understanding wife—have been living with his "word" collection for 50 years.

"I don't ever throw away scraps of paper," Mrs. Cheney admits, smiling at her husband, "because they might be something important."

So the collection of scraps, the slips of paper, the pieces of cardboard have grown through the years. They are filed neatly in tiers of graham cracker boxes stacked in the bedroom of the Cheney's small book-crammed apartment in a housing unit for the elderly here.

They are hidden in books and in every pocket of his jackets and coats. They are piled in cardboard cartons in a fireproof garage in West Boylston. Samples are in the office of the Boston publisher who hopes to publish the Index.

COLLECTION GROWS

Dr. Cheney is a slight man with an elfin personality. He also is an anachronism in a day when so many people ask, "What can I get out of it?"

Because David MacGregor Cheney, scholar, former newspaperman and former teacher, has devoted his life to pure research simply because he thought it ought to be done.

"I'd much rather have written fiction," he says wistfully. "But I felt that something like the Index was needed."

He talked about his lifetime project sitting in the living room of his apartment, dwarfed by a stack of books on a nearby chair.

CANASTA DEVOTEES

He puffed on his briar pipe as he adjusted his hearing aid and skipped rapidly from "hoochinoo," an alcoholic beverage of Alaskan Indians, to the game of canasta which he and Mrs. Cheney play every afternoon, uttering sharp comments on each.

He pointed out that in actuality there is no such thing as an unabridged dictionary, and then he got to his favorite topic of conversation, the Index.

A professor from Harvard came calling some time ago, he recalled with a chuckle. He had a reputation for being one of the greatest researchers of the century. "Then someone told him about my Index," Dr. Cheney said.

"He arrived at the door, said 'This is utterly ridiculous—no one would do such a monumental job of research in this day and age,' and left without looking at my work."

HE'S DONE IT

It is easy for those who have seen segments of the Index to sympathize with the Harvard professor. No one would do such a painstaking and overwhelming job in this modern age.

But David Cheney has done it.

The Index is unlike any dictionary or encyclopedia in existence. It comprises hundreds of thousands more words than any known reference work and is arranged in a unique fashion.

Normally, one must know a word in order to look it up in a dictionary. In the Index, however, all one has to have is the nub of an idea.

Through a complicated system of cross-indexing and subhead filings, it is possible to find the exact word by looking up something related to it.

"Hoochinoo," for instance, might be filed under Indians, Alaskan, beverage, alcohol, and a variety of other headings. In each case there is given definition, pronunciation, and literary references, if "hoochinoo" has been mentioned in literary works.

IRONY CITED

The imp in David Cheney peeked out from behind the dignified facade of a gentleman of the old school as he discussed the section

on the world's beverages which he has just finished revising.

"Ridiculous that whites passed laws prohibiting the sale of firewater to the Indians when long before the whites ever came to this country the Indians had beverages more powerful than the white brand," he remarked whimsically.

Indian firewater, he explained, came in two potencies, mushkowaugumme, the powerful variety, and nokawgumme, slightly less potent. He didn't have time to get into a comparison of mushkowaugumme and hoochinoo.

Recently, the lively researcher with the unbounded curiosity about everything shipped off his section on anatomy to Dr. Paul Dudley White, the famed heart specialist, a fellow member of the Class of 'Ought Eight at Harvard College.

"He wrote back that the section has more words than any of his medical dictionaries," David Cheney said proudly. And now the researcher is hunting for still more words to add to it.

CURIOSITY PAYS

His curiosity about things is one of Dr. Cheney's most outstanding characteristics. It pays off in a multitude of odd bits of information.

Last Winter, Mrs. Cheney was confined to bed for a time and her husband bought her a plant to brighten her outlook. One day he looked at it carefully and discovered a spring of green pushing up through the dirt.

He began investigating it as it flourished.

"It is a lygodium palmatum, a climbing fern—almost extinct now," the expert announced last week showing off the plant. Probably no one but Dr. Cheney ever asked a florist to check back on plant shipments to see where a particular pot of dirt came from.

Now he knows that certain soil in a certain spot in Connecticut may hold more climbing fern. He plans on investigating it when he has some free time.

David Cheney's friends are not surprised at anything he attempts. He has been doing the unusual for so long they just expect it of him.

It began in high school days when David Cheney sold his first article to St. Nicholas Magazine.

SPECIAL STUDENT

"After that I was impatient with high school English," he recalled. Through the intervention of friends he was admitted to Harvard as a special student.

By the end of his fourth year at Harvard, he was taking more than the required number of credits and was an honor student. Then he met the young woman who was to become Mrs. Cheney.

"I decided I needed a degree," he said, looking at his wife. She smiled back at him.

Despite his impressive record, David Cheney had to take entrance examinations for admission to Harvard as a regular student. He was admitted at the beginning of his fifth year in school.

HONORS DEGREE

Eventually Harvard granted him his degree with honors. Later he picked up a master's degree and then an honorary doctorate. Last year he was elected a fellow of the International Institute of Arts and letters.

Also, he informs everyone proudly, he was honored by Star in the East, A.F. and A.M., of New Bedford last year on the occasion of his 47th Masonic birthday.

David MacGregor Cheney does not merely collect ideas. He also collect things.

They range from a clipping of a cartoon done of him when he was a young reporter on the Evening Standard in New Bedford—"It showed a newspaper growing out of my head"—to an Indian jar that once reposed on the porch of the Monument Beach home of former Gov. William L. Douglas.

DISCOVERY CITED

Now the researcher is carefully investigating what he thinks will be his "greatest archeology discovery" of Indian remains. He is keeping the location secret until he has made arrangements to work the site.

"I have an insatiable curiosity about every branch of knowledge," the Index creator admits. "I wish I had another lifetime to do more."

He bounded up from his chair like a stripling of 17 instead of the 70-odd years he claims. His energy is exhausting to his juniors in years who have less stamina than the "word man."

His energy, unflagging despite his busy schedule, explains in part his accomplishments during his one lifetime.

Dr. Cheney has evolved one of the most—if not the most—comprehensive reference works in the history of mankind. Students and scholars and researchers of years to come will owe a debt of gratitude to his integrity and selflessness.

In a modern age when so many people are in so much of a hurry that slipshod work is the rule rather than the exception, Dr. Cheney is unique.

His painstaking research has erected what might be termed "a factory of ideas."

Not only students will find the Index valuable. Manufacturers and advertising men and "idea men" in innumerable fields will find it a source of ideas for new products and new methods of doing things.

Some details he has discovered in his years of intensive reesarch have never before been published. Others have been elaborated in the Index.

The originator of the new reference system leaned forward in his rocking chair and pointed to the so-called unabridged dictionary resting on a stool in front of him.

He opened a page at random and shook his head. "Some of these definitions are wrong," he said, "and others aren't comprehensive enough."

The pages of the dictionary are blue with notations written in Dr. Cheney's feathery script.

Then he settled back in his chair and puffed again on his pipe.

"I only hope I live long enough to see it published," he said quietly.

The publisher now is trying to raise the $1 million-plus required to get the 26-volume—one for each letter of the alphabet—reference work into print.

And Dr. Cheney is waiting patiently to see it happen.

Hundreds of men in all walks of life have endorsed the index.

But only two have indicated specific interest in helping publish it.

"We have received two definite offers," Vernon E. Kilgour of West Boylston, business agent for the index, said last week.

One offer is from the Boston publisher. The other is from unofficial representatives of the Russian Government.

A world of knowledge is waiting to get into print.

And David MacGregor Cheney—a man of vision for 70-odd years—is waiting, too.

He wants his brainchild to see the light of day.

One of Dr. Cheney's stanchest boosters in this area is his sister, Miss Eleanor R. Cheney, of Fairhaven.

Miss Cheney lives in the family homestead at 101 Green Street.

Educated Gullibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, on October 21, 1961, Calvin Darlington Linton, professor of English literature and dean of Columbian College of Arts and Sciences, the George Washington University, delivered the convocation address on the subject of "Educated Gullibility." I think it is worth a wide reading and am pleased to include it herewith:

EDUCATED GULLIBILITY

(Convocation address delivered October 21, 1961, by Calvin Darlington Linton, Ph. D., professor of English literature and dean of Columbia College of Arts and Sciences, the George Washington University)

There are many definitions of man, some earnest and pious; some learned and complicated; some cynical and wordly wise. Of the last-named sort, one is this: "Man is a creature capable of being deceived."

As unattractive as this definition is, at least it is easy to authenticate. From Eden to Hadacol, man has fallen victim to misleading advertising. From Pandora's box, the Trojan horse, and the double-tongued oracles, all the way to modern Communist doublespeak, man has found his naive little headbone rattled by deception. A modern intellectual has suggested that Lincoln's famous aphorism about fooling the people needs a new punchline: "But almost all of the people can be fooled almost all of the time."

To some thinkers, man's striking capability for being deceived is a good thing. Alexander Pope, for one. And a frustrated romanticist like Jonathan Swift declared that happiness consists in being perpetually well deceived. More moodily yet, Aldous Huxley has suggested that the only solaces in life are dream and drug, for all else is reality, and that is unbearable.

Another line of thought asserts that the possession of a capacity is its own justification for its employment. Man has a capability for gullibility, and the capability is, therefore, to be used. Indeed, to the Existentialist, man's being, the quality of his existence, is essentially anxiety, Angst, in the preservation of which gullibility surely plays a key role.

Most, however, would consider this view an elementary ignoring of the distinction between a positive capability and its mere negative—comparable to a failure to see that health is the positive reality and disease only its undesirable opposite. Man also has the capacity to murder, to turn order into disorder, sanity into insanity, but it is a very perverted philosophy which declares that there is no basis for setting up a critical judgment as to which of these is positive and which negative.

At any rate, it has been the testimony of history that man has constantly exerted his efforts to know, to understand, to avoid being gulled. The two chief tools in his fight have been religion, which seeks the aid of revealed truth to combat falsehood; and learning, which seeks the aid of discovered truth in the same battle. (Naturally, the two need not be, nor perhaps even can be, separated; but it is our fashion these days to speak of "secular" education

as something distinct from "religious" education.)

Every one of you, therefore, has had rather extended contact with an institution of higher learning—this university, and for many of you, other colleges and universities. You have, therefore, presumably received through learning a shield against gullibility, a ward against credulity.

When the Communist says that it was largely owing to the activities of the Red Army that Japan was defeated in World War II, you know, through your learning in history, that he lies. When a quack tries to sell you a nostrum guaranteed simultaneously to cure cancer, dandruff, and bunions, you know, through your learning in science, that it is a lie. When a politician tells you that all you need to do is to support a law that bread prices shall not rise above 5 cents a loaf and all the hungry will be fed, your knowledge of economics shakes its wise head. When a philosopher tells you that chance is the ultimate cause of all order and meaning, your knowledge of logic rebels.

And so you stand, surrounded by nonsense, darts of irrationality being cast at you from every side. But with a quiet smile of assurance, you nimbly wield your shield, repelling all with the skill of a champion Ping-pong player.

It is a nice picture. But you and I know that it is naively unrealistic. It never was on land or sea. No one on this platform, no one in the hall before me is immune to gullibility. If we were, Madison Avenue, among other enterprises, would close up shop.

But my purpose is not to make the ponderously obvious point that intellectual utopia has not yet been established. "The troubles of our proud and angry dust are from eternity, and shall not fail." And one of our chief troubles is credulity, gullibility.

No; my point is this—a point not easy to be listened to: There is good evidence that certain tendencies of modern education are more calculated to increase than to decrease normal human gullibility.

If this is true, it is most upsetting, as upsetting as the predicament of the man who, wishing to avoid pride, becomes proud of his humility. It is sad to be killed not by poison but the antidote.

We think of our age—quite accurately, no doubt—as being the best educated in history. And yet, to name only one piece of evidence at the moment, Martin Gardner, in his book Fads and Fallacies says: "The national level of credulity is almost unbelievably high." He is particularly concerned with the tendency of modern educated man to accept things on authority, not evidence. And yet in college classes, students (and often professors) smile as they note instances, say, of the gullibility of the Middle Ages. How easily they believed the unreasonable, simply because the accepted authority of the day said so. How superior we are to them. I once even had a student who expressed the greatest admiration for William Shakespeare because, long before multiple courses in psychology were available, he was able to depict characters with such astonishing psychological validity.

But 10 minutes later these same sophisticates will buy a certain brand of cigarette because it has been proved to contain less cancer-producing material—less than what is not stated; possibly a bonfire. Or they will swallow without a hiccup some incredible assertion about the nature of the atom—incredible and probably quite true. Or they will stand with well-simulated interest and respect before some art exhibit which looks more like the scene of an accident, with heavy loss of life, than art. Or they will be convinced that the Kinsey report proves something. The catchwords trigger the assent: "latest statistics show"; or "science has proved"; or "uniquely original vision"; or "it is now believed by authorities."

The simple truth is that every age has its own areas of credulity, and because the areas of other ages are not ours, we assume superiority.

But to return to the sobering thought that education itself, the presumed antidote to gullibility, can, instead, produce its own susceptibility to it. Why is this so? What ingredients in modern education are responsible?

From among many possible reasons, I choose three:

1. The invention for almost every learned area of an esoteric, specialized vocabulary which no one but the initiated (and not all of them) can understand: This verbal heresy is the belief that certain sanctified words or sets of words can be set up as primal realities, not merely as tokens for the thoughts behind them. Among primitive tribes, such a point of view is associated with magic. Certain words, uttered without understanding, at certain times, work certain miracles. The local wizard knows the words, but they can be learned only at the cost of lengthy apprenticeship and painful initiation.

Certain modern educational attitudes are disquietingly similar.

2. Specialization and its consequence, fragmentation: It is the age of the specialist, and it takes a lifetime to become one. Writes the great Norbet Wiener, "The present age of specialization has gone an unbelievable distance. Not only are we developing physicists who know no chemistry, physiologists who know no biology, but we are beginning to get the physicist who does not know physics." This goes much farther than the gap between the scientist and the humanist, which Sir Charles Snow has so well publicized.

3. The abdication of what used to be called commonsense as the judge of what is or is not believable: Actually, this has been a forced, not a voluntary, abdication. Commonsense has left its throne under much the same conditions which prevailed when James II of England decided it was wise to depart quietly. He was simply outnumbered and he saw no future where he was.

Commonsense. That ultimate sovereign so praised by the age of reason, so ardently looked to as the unassailable arbiter, so inevitably right once artificial pressures of prejudice and emotion are removed, so hopeful because "common" (that is, universally distributed, common to all), and so comforting in the very sound of the word "sense"—this sovereign has fled murmuring, and with it many rays of light. Psychologists have declared that, to use Huck Finn's term "commonsense" is not a circumstance compared to the subconscious, where the real work goes on. Logicians have pointed out that commonsense must be self-authenticating—it must, so to speak, take itself on faith. And that spoils all the rationalist's fun at the outset. But most of all, worst of all, most ultimately annihilating of all is the abandonment of commonsense by science. This is a controversial statement; so I run for cover to the scientists themselves:

Writes Houston Smith of MIT in a recent issue of a popular magazine:

"The problems which the new physics pose for man's sense of order cannot be resolved by refinements in scale. Instead they appear to point to a radical disjunction between the way things behave and every possible way in which we might try to visualize them. How, for example, are we to picture an electron traveling two or more different routes through space concurrently; or passing from orbit to orbit without traversing the space between them at all? What kind of model can we construct of a space that is finite yet unbounded, or of light which is both wave and particle? It is such enigmas which are causing physicists like P. W. Bridgman of Harvard to suggest that 'the structure of nature may eventually be such that our processes of thought do not correspond to it sufficiently to permit us to think about it at all. * * * The world fades and eludes us. * * * We are confronted with something truly ineffable. We have reached the limit of the vision of great pioneers of science, the vision, namely, that we live in a sympathetic world, in that it is comprehensible by our minds." (The Saturday Evening Post Aug. 26, 1961.)

There are appalling words. Their implications are so vast that we cannot, at the moment of hearing them, begin to grasp their significance. But to some extent we all acknowledge their truth. Who among us would think for a moment of refuting some new discovery of science by arguing that it just does not make sense. The day when we could, with Dr. Johnson, refute Berkeley by kicking the stone is long past. Kick if we wish, but all we will get these days is a sore toe.

For example, you all have recently read of the discovery of yet another subatomic particle, the omega, and we read that some physicists now believe that protons may contain as many subatomic particles as the 90-odd chemical elements that were once thought to be the basic stuff of the universe. The omega may turn out to have complicated structures of it own, and the discoverers of the omega declare that there may never be an end of this process of peeling the onionlike skins from the mystery of matter. So says Prof. Luis W. Alvarez, codiscoverer with Dr. M. L. Stevenson of the omega.

Now would anyone of you dare to say, "It just doesn't make sense"? Our commonsense shield against gullibility is gone. Presumably the discovery of the omega is true, but the layman can neither know its truth nor its falsity. He must take it on faith, faith in the specialist. And thus is the soil of gullibility prepared for either the good seed of truth or the bad seed of falsehood to sprout. The age of propaganda is prepared.

Let me return to the first of the reasons I gave in support of the thesis that certain aspects of education foster gullibility: the deification of the abstruse word at the expense of meaning and understanding. The fullest manifestation of this particular fallacy is seen, I think, in the arts and in the social sciences. Let me read you a few lines of art criticism from a "learned journal":

"He [the artist] pictures the stultified intricacy of tension at the plasmic level; his prototypical zygotes and somnolent somatomes inhabit a primordial lagoon where impulse is an omnidirectional drift and isolation is the consequence of an inexplicable exogamy. This is a parareligious art; in a way it is vitiated by a kind of solipsistic puppetry, a somewhat disingenuous occupation of an emotional existential middle ground between humanistic and theological determinants. This ambiguous focus prevents, finally, the mordant lucidity this kind of art should have. Plastically it assembles several effective but incomplete referrals into a sort of surrealistic abstract-expressionism, which picks up the romanticism from many sources, but not the saving irony or soluble wit" (from Art News, quoted in the New Yorker, Sept. 23, 1961).

Now, I do not for a moment assert that this says nothing; but it says much less than it seems to say. And my point is that none but the specialist knows whether what it says is true or not.

The simple mind is proof against such semantic cancer; the pseudoeducated mind is impressed, because it has fallen under the influence of the defined mystery of the unusual word. Put somewhat crudely, the simple, uneducated mind possesses built-in antibodies of ignorance which destroy the virus of semantic idiocy. It is the learned

who pore over doctoral theses and learned articles which disguise the superficial as profound, and the obvious as original.

Now, I do not mean to speak in praise of ignorance. Ignorance has its own desperate problems, and it is the chief function of this institution to alleviate them. But the fact is that the execessively sophisticated, pseudolearned mind is capable of a degree of utter confusion quite beyond the capacity of the simple.

Another illustration, this time in literature:

Several years ago, two Australian soldiers with time on their hands decided to create a masterpiece of poetry. Choosing completely at random, they picked words from such sources as a science textbook, an advertisement for sleeping pills, a Government pamphlet on how to drain swamps to destroy mosquitoes, and a dozen other varied sources. The product they submitted to one of the magazines specializing in new poetry. It was at once printed and hailed "as a work of genius." Articles were written on the masterly production of intension, the subtletly of its appeal to the affective state, the superb handling of pseudoreference—and, somewhat justifiably, the majestic breadth of the vocabulary. These articles were written by specialists, learned and sophisticated.

Lastly, in music:

In early October, 1960, composer John Cage put on a concert at Venice's International Festival of Contemporary Music. It began with Cage and pianist David Tudor at different pianos, alterantely plunking one note at 20 second intervals. The tempo picked up when Cage began to thump the piano stool with a rock. Tudor slipped under the piano and beat it from beneath with an iron pipe. When a few in the audience (unsophisticated souls) shouted protest, a critic cried back: "Get out of here. Go somewhere else if you want melody. Long live music." By this time, creativity was unlimited, with Cage and Tudor banging notes with feet and elbows, alternating with pipe and rock obligatoes on the instrument's innards. The performance was solemnly written up by the experts. (As a footnote, one customer walked onto the platform and beat Cage's piano with his walking stick, stating: "There. Now I too am a musician." He was dismissed as too uneducated to be bothered about.)

Now perhaps such frauds as these are not to be compared to the magnificent scientific hoax of the Piltdown man, but they are not inconsiderable efforts, and educated gullibility leaped to the bait. As—if I may be permitted a personal reference—I remember leaping to be bait of the Jukes and the Kallikas in a sociology course I had many years ago. My instructor solemnly told us about two such families and the lessons—all depressing—we could learn from them. It was not until years later that I learned that there were no Jukes and no Kallikas, never had been, not even by other names. The whole thing was a hoax.

Now: may I complicate my thesis by pointing out that gullibility can manifest itself in believing too little as well as in believing too much? Indeed, one rather common reaction against successive deceits is for the victim to retreat into himself, like the drawing of a man sitting in a box saying "I hate people." Or perhaps it is the pose of the cynic who rejects all and enjoys nothing. "How learned he must be," satirizes Voltaire of such a one; "he does not like anything."

I speak, of course, of the professional nay-sayers, increasingly numerous in academic circles.

And again I must suggest that the professional nay-sayer is more typical of the highly educated (in the technical sense) than the less well educated. A true education is as much concerned—no, more concerned—with teaching those things which are to be believed than those which are not. One is amused but not convinced by Prof. Irving Edman's witty reply to a student on a celebrated occasion. With his inimitable skill, you recall, Professor Edman was busy in class demolishing certain widespread philosophical beliefs. A student complained that he was destroying everything and building nothing. Replied Professor Edman, "As I remember the ancient story, Hercules was required only to clean out the Augean stables."

This is clever; but one should remember, as a balance to such facile negativism, the parable of the man from whom one demon was expelled only to have seven worse demons move into the empty soul.

Perhaps the most vivid recent advocacy of the "universal no" as a philosophy of life has come from the pen of Leslie Fiedler in his book called "No! In Thunder." In that work he specifies what he calls the "hard no" as the only worthy reply an honest man can make—to anything. The "soft no" is easy to make. One is simply against segregation, or McCarthy, or the current best seller. The hard no is a universal negative. "The 'No! In Thunder,'" writes Fiedler, "is never partisan; it infuriates our side as well as theirs, reveals that all sides are one. * * *" Insofar as anyone is a yea-sayer, in short, he is a liar.

This, obviously, is the philosophy of revolution for the sake of revolution, not for the sake of rebuilding—the philosophy which Albert Camus warned us of in his last writings.

In educational philosophy it is the product, I think, of excessive emphasis on the fact for its own sake, on mere instrumentation of the material, the attribution to material causes of every manifestation of human capacity. We cannot believe in matter; we cannot affirm, say "yes," to matter. Albert Einstein spoke of this view in education as producing the student who is a kind of useful machine. It is essential that he acquire a vivid sense of the beautiful and the morally good. Otherwise, he resembles a well-trained dog. In the words of President Oliver C. Carmichael of the Carnegie Foundation, it is the theory that education is primarily concerned with the communication of knowledge, whereas it is actually a communication of intellectual power. I believe it is safe to say that neither man's capacity to acquire a vivid sense of the beautiful and the morally good, nor his capacity to develop intellectual power, is fostered by saying no, in thunder, to everything.

But enough of the lament, the viewing with alarm. This is always the easy part of any discussion of a contemporary problem.

What is the answer? Do I have the sovereign remedy to human gullibility? Of course not. Nor has any man now living or who has ever lived.

But I can give you a clue—a very ancient one and a very modern one. It is this: trust what you love. Make this principle the central keep of your fortress. Try, of course, to maintain control over other regions within and without the castle of your individual sovereignty. But when all else has fallen victim to the tireless hordes of skepticism, retreat to this central tower, and die rather than emerge from it in surrender.

Now, before you dismiss this as rhetoric, or sentimentality, or a feeble attempt at oratory, consider three things:

First, our ultimate faith must be centered in that area of our being which is, itself, most deeply the core of our reality. (That's why we cannot love or trust matter.) The deepest capacity man has, the most universally distributed, the one without which man becomes less than man, must be believed in or we commit a kind of hideous suicide without the honesty of a corpse. We become walking dead. And that capacity, that universal wellspring of humanness, is man's capacity to love—whether it be beauty, truth, his fellow creatures, or God. Our search for fellowship, for that which satisfies the innermost yearning for order and meaning and purpose and beauty, is motivated by man's capacity for love. Hate, of course, is merely the perverted reverse of this capacity, just as deceiving and being deceived is the perverted reverse of our capacity to understand.

Man is not essentially Angst. It runs counter to every instinct to believe so. He is not mere matter. The only ultimate and basic command man has ever received is short: "Thou shalt love." Any educational theory which does not deal with this imperative is not reaching the deeps.

Second, trust based on love is the most broadly based of all trusts—the kind supported at the greatest number of points. Man's exercise of his capacity to love embraces his intellect, his emotions, his spirit, his body. It is driven by and it is drawn toward the deepest mystery of being, the force of conscious will. Of course, our language is deficient, and we say that we love strawberries or skiing; but the deepest meaning of the word relates only to the region in which there operates conscious will. (Thus the term humanities, those emanations from man clearly produced by the conscious will, not by involuntary response to material stimuli, a Pavlovian jerk.)

Third, only that trust which is produced by love is immune to disaster. It carries its own antidote to deception. No one could maintain that that which we love may not prove untrustworthy. But if our trust has been born of the deepest response we have to goodness, the deception is a disaster only to that which has failed us, not to us. And the ideal which we loved remains untouched by the failure of that in which we thought we had found it.

The man who trusts in the material can find nothing but anguish when matter corrupts. The man who trusts in his hates, as does the Communist, will eat death.

But the man who trusts in that which he loves, in the words of the poet, "even tho' he trip and fall, he shall not blind his soul with clay."

Members of the graduating class, do not become so highly educated that you forget the simple truths.

Senator Andrew F. Schoeppel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, all Members of Congress held Andy Schoeppel in great esteem. Likewise, the residents of Kansas held him in great esteem. The following are some of the many fine tributes to Senator Schoeppel which appeared in newspapers throughout Kansas.

The Clay Center Dispatch:

ANDY SCHOEPPEL

If ever a man looked like and acted like a U.S. Senator, it was Andrew Schoeppel, who died Sunday. A handsome man, who obviously reflected in his size and appearance his football playing days, he also was a fine speaker.

He had become a man who spoke strongly on his convictions and those convictions

seemed to agree with the people of Kansas. To our way of thinking, he was the most potent votegetter in the State.

It was obvious that he had become a respected Member of the Senate. His Republican mates named him campaign chairman a few years ago and he was currently serving on the committee on committees and the Appropriations Committee. Such assignments were notes on the respect which he garnered.

Another note of his success as a Senator was his friendship with other Members of the Senate, regardless of party affiliations. This made him a man to be reckoned with.

It may sound trite to say so, but he truly will be a man missed on the Kansas and Washington scene.

The Kansas City Times:

ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

Andrew F. Schoeppel looked the part of a Senator and knew how to talk the Kansas campaign language. With a sonorous voice, he walked away with elections, first as a two-term Governor of Kansas and as winner in three senatorial campaigns.

Andy Schoeppel was a big, deliberate man with a high sense of public duty. Increasingly, he saw it in conservative terms. As he grew older in politics he naturally gravitated to the right, making it plain that he had no sympathy with liberal, or mildly liberal proposals. He was perfectly sincere; his attitude was innate, not based on prejudice.

In his public career, there can be no question that a central influence was the intelligence of his wife, Mrs. Marie Schoeppel. They were inseparable companions. As he sat in the Senate, his friendship and respect for the late Robert A. Taft shaped his thinking. After Taft's death, Senator Schoeppel sought to carry on Taft's conservative beliefs, although he was more unbending.

As Governor from 1943 through 1946, he was extremely active in promoting the new defense industries for Kansas, helping the factories recruit labor and obtaining materials. Before the years as Governor, he was chairman of the Kansas Corp. Commission.

Andrew Schoeppel was proud of his political rise from a councilman in Ness City to the U.S. Senate. He was an intense party man, which to him meant being the old-fashioned kind of Republican. Generally, he was more interested in the welfare of Kansas than in national affairs. Andy Schoeppel was a kind, considerate man—a natural conservative—who never forgot that the people of his State had sent him to Washington.

The Topeka State Journal:

ANDY SCHOEPPEL'S YEARS OF SERVICE

The death of Senator Andrew F. Schoeppel is a great personal loss, aside from the obvious poltical considerations, to the thousands of Kansans who both admired him as a man of good will and respected him as a statesman of accomplishment.

Although medical reports on condition of the 67-year-old former Governor were more ominous for their lack of information than for their declarations, many suspected the illness which brought Andy Schoeppel down was a serious one. His absence from the Senate on opening day, and the announcement he would be unable to participate in Kansas Day events, both spelled more than passing concern for health of the senior U.S. Senator.

Andy Schoeppel's death in the prime of an honorable career throws the atmosphere of Kansas Republican politics into uncertainty as the party's annual gathering at Topeka approaches. His hearty manner and knowledgeable conversation will be missed at this year's activities.

It frequently was said of Senator Schoeppel that he was a man who "looked" the part of a Congressman. Indeed he was, with a powerful, athletic frame, rugged features, and a voice that emphasized confidence.

Andy Schoeppel served his State well and in a variety of ways, starting with local political office in Ness County, running through chairmanship of the Kansas Corp. Commission, two terms as Governor, and culminating in election to the U.S. Senate.

Many Kansans will recall Senator Schoeppel's statement on leaving the Governor's office in 1947, "My faith in Kansas and in the people of Kansas has been strengthened and deepened, and I marvel at our possibilities—if we but believe in ourselves and work together."

The words summarized a political and personal philosophy that carried Andy Schoeppel a long way in his chosen profession, and an even greater distance in the affection of those who knew him.

The Junction City Daily Union:

"ANDY" SCHOEPPEL

Today Kansans are mourning not U.S. Senator Andrew F. Schoeppel—they are mourning "Andy" Schoeppel, a man who never lost a contest at the polls and rose from a small law office in Ness City to Governor of Kansas and the U.S. Senate.

"Andy" Schoeppel was no stranger to Junction City. As a candidate for office and as an official he visited here often and was on a first-name basis with many individuals. That was typical of "Andy" Schoeppel. He was rough and ready—a farm boy who attended Kansas University, enlisted in the Naval Air Force in World War I, and received his college degree after the war from the University of Nebraska. There he distinguished himself as an end on the powerful Husker football team and won an honorable All-American mention from the late Walter Camp.

As a Senator he was equally forthright, and as a conservative, rock-ribbed Republican headed the important Republican Committee on Committees which decided party assignments to committees. His strength was in organization. As a Senator, he was 1 of the 100 Senators in the world's most powerful legislative body and fully conscious of his responsibilities.

Always we had the feeling that "Andy" Schoeppel was a man of great personal courage. We feel it was most tragic that his last battle was against hopeless odds; that he died in a battle in which he was doomed from the start.

The Manhattan Mercury:

THE INIMITABLE ANDY

The official tributes to the late Senator Andrew F. Schoeppel all will sound pretty much the same. After all when you have referred to his many years of public service—and his was a dedicated service as he saw the issues—there is a little left to say.

It is to those like this writer, however, that the death of Andy Schoeppel is felt most deeply, for he had a way about him that warmed you to Andy and made you enjoy him thoroughly.

To be sure, the feelings of this writer are not unique about Senator Andrew Schoeppel because by virtue of his outgoing nature he was inclined to share his characteristics with many persons.

In short, Andy was Andy, no matter where he was or to whom he talked.

Perhaps this is why we are inclined to attribute his political successes more to his makeup than to his luck, which many commentators have frequently referred to in trying to analyze Schoeppel's enduring success at the polls. Andy was lucky, of course. What politician is not? Circumstances and timing, as a matter of fact and despite what the masterminds say and design, probably contribute as much or more to political success than most persons are willing to say. And again we are sure Andy Schoeppel had his share of that thing called luck. He himself acknowledged it many times.

We are certain however, that the majority of the citizens of Kansas enjoyed Andy Schoeppel and supported him for himself and for his positions. He had the capacity to be positive in his beliefs without being offensive. The fact that he tended to dramatize certain matters was certainly no handicap and he was able to do it in such a way as to make one more interested in what else Schoeppel might be thinking or intending to do on any certain issue. People were inclined to feel that Andy was their champion—and if he could not accept a constituent's position this did not affect the status of friendship.

There are many things for which Kansas owes an indebtedness to Andy Schoeppel. The one issue, however, that stands out above all—and one that most perfectly typifies his personal and political makeup, was his position, on water resources. He excited some animosity over his stand on Tuttle Creek and other projects. But those who were really mad at Andy, even though they disagreed with him, were in the distinct minority. And who can deny that without his foresight and steadfast position that Kansas would be as far advanced in the matter of water resources as it is today?

And it is not merely that Senator Schoeppel championed many things for which Kansans stood. Because of the same characteristics that induced support in Kansas for many years he enjoyed a position of trust and prestige among his colleagues in Congress. It is one thing to be a champion at home and not have the effectiveness necessary to secure action in Washington. Senator Schoeppel could not only think; he could do.

Full of energy; ready to speak at the drop of an invitation. Never content with the status quo; but firmly grounded in the conservative philosophy of government. This was Senator Schoeppel. But more than this he was the big affable Andy, who whether you agreed with him or not, he was always ready to be your friend.

It is wonderful that he was blessed until the last few months with the tireless energy that let him spread his friendship around among so many persons in so many places.

It is this, perhaps more than anything else, that will be missed now that Senator Schoeppel is gone.

To say that he will be sorely missed is to not do him sufficient justice. His shoes will be filled. That is the way things go in the inexorable processes of life. But there will never be another Andy and this is the grief that so many mourners share today with his widow, the beloved Marie Schoeppel.

Survival and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, once again a small segment of our American public is being agitated and aroused by persons allegedly seeking the very desirable goal of universal peace.

Some of this comes from people genuinely concerned. Too much of it, however, comes from those whose motives may very properly be challenged.

There is little doubt that at least some of these persons are interested in making "a fast buck" by the fears they stimulate.

George E. Sokolsky's column "These Days" of February 5, 1962, under the title "Don't Be Tricked By Smart Words" is a splendid piece of work in alerting the American public. His article is as follows:

DON'T BE TRICKED BY SMART WORDS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

I have a circular which asks me to contribute money. It comes from Humanity Guild, Inc. It wants the money to bring about immediate peace, which it cannot, of course, do. Whether we shall have peace or war depends upon many forces and personalities, upon the effects of many errors of judgment in Soviet Russia and the United States, in Great Britain and France, and among the 104 nations that constitute the United Nations.

The circular asking me for money starts thus:

"Will you save my life?

"Since I may not mean anything to you * * *

"Will you save my life?

"Will you save your children's lives?

"Humanity Guild, Inc., provides you with your opportunity to act now to avoid the catastrophe which faces you and your family."

This strikes me as silly talk by someone who writes emotional prose. The fellow wants me to save his life when I do not know that his particular life is in danger. The lives of some of the members of my family may be in danger or soon will be, for they are or will be in the armed service of their country. I do not expect that a few dollars will serve to rescue them from the cowardice that the writer of the frantic circular wishes them to display.

The circular says:

"The only immediate solution for peace on earth now is total disarmament which should include the elimination of all stockpiles of atom bombs at once from all countries which possess its capabilities for destruction of the world and mankind."

Precisely how does its writer plan to achieve total disarmament? The United States has been in negotiation with Soviet Russia on this subject since about 1945 and has got nowhere. In fact, the United Nations was organized to achieve this end. But Soviet Russia has vetoed every measure for peace.

Are we to crawl on our knees before the big bosses in the Kremlin? Are we to lie on our bellies and have their tanks roll over us as they rolled over the Hungarians and the Tibetans?

Presumably there are all sorts of circulars being issued which are designed to weaken our resistance to our enemy. This particular circular is frightening:

"What if a nuclear attack is coupled with a gas or bacteria attack?

"What if the H-bomb jackets are made of cobalt, which would increase fallout immeasurably?

"What if instead of ground bursts the bombs are exploded at high altitude?"

Fritz Kreisler, who died a few days ago, was hit by a truck and became blind and deaf. Shall we therefore abolish trucks? Shall we murder all truckdrivers? I loved Fritz, but I am sure that because a truck brought misery to the last years of his life, I do not want to return to an oxcart or camel or a mule.

Nor do I want to become a slave of the Kremlin. Why do not these lovers of peace go to Moscow and issue their circulars on the Red Square? Why do they not get the miserable peasant, Khrushchev, to agree to a world program of unselfish peace? It would seem that their solution to the problems that face the United States today is to lie down and die while Russians march over our bodies.

No; I shall not contribute a nickel to Humanity Guild, Inc. Instead, I shall pay my taxes for arms to be ready to fight Soviet Russia.

The last line of the circular says: "Humanity Guild, Inc., is a nonprofit organization."

I have grown tired of so-called nonprofit organizations. In fact, when a nonprofit organization hereafter sends me a circular asking for money, I am going to ask for a detailed expense account. It is easier and taxwise smarter to get no salary at all, but to have enormous expense accounts for hotel bills and airplanes and travel hither and yon.

When a money collector comes my way asking for dollars for a nonprofit organization, I shall ask him details of his livelihood. Where does he get the dough to buy his wife's dresses? Or who paid for his automobile?

Let us not be tricked by circulars and smart words. We have a war that this year will run our budget up to $92 billion. As a taxpayer, I want to win that war and end it.

Mr. Speaker, I think that at this time it would be appropriate to again call attention to the earnest and sincere efforts that have long been made by the United States of America to attain worldwide peace.

There is not a doubt in my mind but that President Kennedy, all of his appointees, and every Member of both Houses of Congress have exerted and will continue to exert all their energies to guarantee peace to the world. This is being done in and through the United Nations as well as by every other direct means available to us.

Last year Congress enacted into law, with President Kennedy's approval, a bill which established the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. This is the first time that our Government brought together into one agency, and on a permanent basis, the many and diverse activities of our Government all seeking to bring about disarmament and control of arms.

The Agency is charged with the duty of preparing for and managing our participation in international negotiations in the disarmament and arms control fields. This includes continuing our efforts to discontinue nuclear weapons tests, agreement for the ban on the use of nuclear weapons, complete disarmament and, pending that, control of armaments.

Attention should again be directed to the fact that on September 20, 1961, our Government presented to the Government of Soviet Russia a statement of our position indicating that we were prepared to enter into an agreement of principles on the subject of disarmament provided there could be verification that would "insure that not only agreed limitations or reductions take place but also that retained armed forces and armaments do not exceed agreed levels at any stage."

Unfortunately, the Communist Russian Government immediately responded with this doubletalk, and I quote from their answer:

While being for effective control over disarmament and desiring to facilitate as much as possible the reaching of agreement on such control, the Soviet Union at the same time resolutely opposes establishment of control over armaments.

In the same document the Russian Government charges that such control over armaments "would become an international system of legalized espionage." Obviously this is more doubletalk incorporating the usual Communist pattern of calling names instead of resorting to logic.

Espionage is illegal because it calls for an exposure of military preparations against the will of the country engaged therein. When a country in good faith, however, undertakes, as we are willing to do, to expose our military secrets, no country need employ spies to obtain the information. The same would be true of Russia, if she were willing to act in good faith. By her very agreement to give the world the information necessary to disclose that she is not preparing to engage in any aggressive tactics, the secretiveness of her conduct disappears and espionage is not legalized but is made unnecessary.

I am pleased to note that in the first report of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency our Government indicates that it continues to adhere to the principles of its declaration on disarmament as proposed for consideration by the General Assembly of the United Nations as a guide, and I emphasize as a guide, for the negotiation of a program for general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world. In this declaration we affirm our desire first, to establish an International Disarmament Organization; second, to reduce Armed Forces and armaments; third, to contain and reduce the nuclear threat; fourth, to reduce strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles, also referred to as missiles; fifth, to promote the peaceful use of outer space; sixth, to reduce the risks of war by accident, miscalculation, and surprise attack; and seventh, to keep the peace.

Despite the knowledge that the Communists throughout these negotiations have been acting in bad faith, and in spite of our belief that they have no present intention of changing their tactics, we on our part will do everything possible to control arms and to bring about disarmament in the hope of eventually attaining a total and permanent peace.

Some Tax Theories and Just Theories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy has never run a business in his life. It is therefore logical that he does not know the intricacies and imponderables in conducting a successful business, not only in the United States

but overseas. His administration's attitude on foreign investments is punitive toward American companies doing business abroad, thus increasing employment in the United States and sustaining our good name in foreign lands.

In a very perceptive article in the February 6 edition of the New York Herald Tribune, Donald I. Rogers discusses in detail what this administration wants to do to American business:

TAX THEORY ATTACKED

(By Donald I. Rogers)

The House Ways and Means Committee is confronted with a request from the Treasury Department to increase the tax on U.S. foreign investments on the theory that such investments burden this Nation's balance of payments and send out more dollars than they bring back.

It is not a tax-raising proposal; it is a punitive measure, designed to discourage an increase in foreign expenditures on the part of American corporations. The Treasury has propounded a theory on this which, though it seems convincing, is being seriously challenged by industry to such a degree that it would seem advisable for Congress to move with caution in trying to accommodate the Treasury.

An industry committee representing 19 major U.S. companies, headed by H. J. Heinz 2d, chairman of H. J. Heinz Co., has prepared a convincing report of its own, at least as convincing as the Treasury's, which refutes the premise advanced by Treasury—that direct foreign investment in developed areas is harmful to the U.S. balance of payments.

The Treasury Department's hypothesis is inconsistent with the results of a survey of the experience of the 19 companies in the committee, the report says. The survey showed that the exports generated by the foreign investments of these companies greatly exceeded the flow of dollars into these investments during the years 1957–61.

This is not a new rebuttal. Even larger investment-generated exports were shown in a recent survey of 155 American companies by the Commerce Department, accounting for 80 percent of all U.S. manufacturing investments abroad.

That survey indicated that the total dollar inflow generated or developed by all U.S. foreign subsidiaries was in excess of $2.1 billion in 1959 and more than $2.6 billion in 1960.

The Treasury's position emphasizes investment in the economically advanced countries such as Canada and in Western Europe, where it is contended, the capital outflow to such countries exceeds the returns in dividends, thus burdening the U.S. balance of payments.

To this industry retorts that segregation of the figures for economically advanced and underdeveloped areas for purpose of balance-of-payments statistics is unsound. Viewed as a whole, says industry, direct foreign investments yield direct returns (dividends) which exceed the outflow of capital.

Mr. Heinz emphasized that direct investment abroad frequently consists of investments made in the form of capital equipment made in the United States or dollar deposits in U.S. banks for the purchase of such equipment and components.

Such investments, he said, could hardly be considered a burden on the balance of payments, though in statistics it appears as such.

There is also an area of contention between the Treasury and industry on the matter of invisibles. Companies point out that apart from direct dividends there are royalties, fees, and directly generated exports of capital equipment, components, and other goods.

In its original statement Treasury pointed out that direct foreign investments reduce domestic investments. To this, industry issues a flat denial and a challenge to prove it.

Nor, says the industrial group, do direct foreign investments export U.S. jobs or slow up the U.S. economy.

Most direct foreign investments are made to prevent the loss of foreign markets or to develop new foreign markets. Thus, they don't export U.S. jobs; they have them.

In a statement issued by Mr. Heinz, the companies emphasize that they are not arguing for the evasion of U.S. taxes through the improper use of foreign subsidiaries or by any other means. What they are questioning is a basic change in tax laws which will harm U.S. foreign investment.

Since this appears to be a Treasury recommendation based on unproved hypothesis and incomplete data, the House Ways and Means Committee would not be unreasonable in asking for a more extensive study as the basis for reaching sound conclusions.

There Is No Way To Avoid It, Federal Aid Means Federal Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, for those who continue to insist that we can have Federal aid to schools without Federal controls, I call attention to two editorials from the Wall Street Journal as food for thought:

THE WELL-FOUNDED FEARS

"Let us put to rest the unfounded fears that 'Federal money means Federal control'." With that forthright assertion President Kennedy sent his general aid-to-education message to Congress yesterday.

He went on to note that, from the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 to the present, "Congress has repeatedly recognized its responsibility to strengthen our educational system without weakening local responsibility."

This historical recollection is true as far as it goes, and we would go even farther. That part of our educational system which is public is by definition a responsibility of some level of government; there is no infallible rule we know of which absolutely requires that it be a local rather than a Federal responsibility. Like many other things, the allocation of educational responsibility has evolved partly on a practical basis: What governmental unit is best qualified to undertake it?

Up to now, the decision has been that public education is preponderantly a local responsibility. Local officials, in close cooperation with the parents, are better able to judge their students' needs than a central bureaucracy.

Indeed, with today's instant communications, the argument is more persuasive than ever; a given community can learn immediately what others are doing, can compare notes, can experiment. Just such variety and competition have characterized the tremendous and healthy educational ferment throughout the Nation in recent years.

This ferment has been possible in large part because the communities have been free from external interference. For, President Kennedy to the contrary notwithstanding, the issue of Federal control in aid to education cannot be dismissed with simple assertions that it does not exist.

It must exist, or else the Federal Government is not undertaking a responsibility but taking flight into irresponsibility. Does anyone pretend that the Federal Government makes no attempt to control the Federal highway program or what farmers may do under the Federal farm program?

The right question, it seems to us, is not whether huge Federal aid leads to Federal control, but what kind of Federal control. In pure theory Federal control of education might be beneficial—that is, if the controllers were all wise. In practice, its benefits are doubtful. Let's look at some of the different kinds of aid, adding up to nearly $6 billion in 5 years, that the President proposes.

Aid for classroom construction might seem relatively innocuous, though the request is based on an assumption of future needs many experts consider exaggerated in terms of what localities are doing right now. But even in this area the recipients can find they run smack into control in the form of Federal wage and other standards.

Aid for teachers' salaries obviously opens more direct opportunities for Federal control over what is taught. Still greater opportunities are afforded in the request for funds to improve educational quality.

Now the moment you start talking about quality it is clear that someone must set the standards. Are Federal planners qualified to decree quality? Over the years many of them have been associated with the progressive theory of education, which innumerable schools and communities have now decided was leading to educational retrogression.

But whatever one's opinion on that issue, the point is that there can be no certainty that Federal standards will be the right ones for the Nation. Therefore the Nation is far better off with the infinite variety and experimentation that comes when localities can operate without interference.

An examination of the administration's own proposals suggests that the fears of Federal control cannot be brushed aside as baseless. They are well founded because they are grounded in the nature of tightly centralized government.

THE BLIND COURSE

As President Kennedy was sending Congress his education message, Congress was already acting on one of his education bills—the program for Federal help to colleges.

That suggests one of the troubles with the administration's approach. There are so many of these school-aid bills it is difficult for the citizen to keep them straight. Their impact upon taxpayers, and upon the schools themselves, is blurred.

For a hint of their impact upon schools, what has happened at Harvard University offers a dramatic and sobering example. Harvard is the most heavily endowed school in the United States. And yet President Nathan M. Pusey reports that in the past 2 years the university received more income from the Government than from endowments. "We are now involved," he says, "in 34 categories of programs managed by twoscore Federal agencies." Together they make up about one-fourth of the university's annual budget. This relationship Dr. Pusey regards as "hazardous."

This is not a condition peculiar to Harvard. In greater or lesser measure it involves many other schools throughout the country. Yet ignoring the implications of this Federal liberality, the administration is determined to pour still more funds into the educational system. To continue to do so blindly, without even a glance at the effects of what has been done already, is not only hazardous but inexcusable.

Kick Our Friends—Help Our Enemies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the American Embassy in Jakarta has been stoned, our American flag torn down, and yet we deny our ally, Holland the right to refuel its planes at American airfields.

Robert Ruark, in the Washington Daily News on February 5, tells you what kind of a government the phony Sukarno runs. When will we wake up?

IT IS A NAKED ACT OF AGGRESSION

(By Robert C. Ruark)

LONDON.—The last time I was in Jakarta I did not bother to go ashore. I don't particularly care to be robbed by force, frisked, and hustled on currency by uniformed panderers who are dignified by uniforms sanctioned by President Sukarno of Indonesia.

It was easier to stay on the ship and listen to the complaints of the other unwary passengers who came back battered and generally bereft of any valuables, such as the cameras they took on a sightseeing tour.

You can almost unvaryingly judge a country's general administration by the habits of the small men in uniforms who wear guns and work in the customs and currency controls. Where banditry is open and rampant, the government cannot be far behind.

RIDICULOUS

In Sukarno's Indonesia a few years back there was a ridiculous rate on the rupia which the legal money changers themselves hinted you'd be stupid to accept. There was an almost logical rate which the boys were prepared to offer behind their hands, and if you wanted to really reach the true value of exchange, a proper black market was available to accommodate you.

You were shaken down by unabashed thugs who hinted broadly that it would be nice if you gave them your camera instead of having it taken from you by force. Nice, stupid tourists had their clothes removed, and their persons intimately investigated for the sin of thinking that going ashore in Jakarta might be educational.

SUCH RIGHTS

Indonesia, under the noisy globe-girdler, aid-money spender, Sukarno, has roughly as much right to Dutch New Guinea as he has to Australia on the one side and the Philippines on the other. The black Papuans of New Guinea never heard of Sukarno; they do not share his faith or blood or color.

Perhaps they do not belong to the Dutch, either, but the Dutch have as much right to govern them—and with considerably more skill—than the Indonesians, who have made a miserable joke of their own so-called independence under an absentee warlord, Sukarno, who knows more street names in Tokyo, Moscow, New York, London, and Washington than he does in his own graft-ridden, literally ungoverned, country.

It is a land which has come along well under colonialism and trusteeship, on the Australian half, with the unbelievably primitive people being gentled into such things as roads, bridges, pants, and a kind of old-school propriety which frowns on killing your neighbor for fun.

NO, NO

But not, I should say, under the stewardship of the likes of Sukarno and Indonesia, which is a morass of splinter parties, varying faiths, political immorality, and deep ignorance of basic population.

Sukarno's repeated intentions to annex Dutch New Guinea under the name West Irian is as naked an act of aggression as was ever flourished by the Germans, the Russians, or, more latterly, the Red Chinese in India or the United Nations in Katanga.

Will There Be No Limit to Social Security Boosts?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, as President Kennedy's proposal for an increase in social security taxes to pay for medical care for the elderly comes under the close scrutiny of Congress, perhaps most important in the review of this program is the present trend of the social security tax and how it would be affected by the new plan.

While we consider adding a new tax on all to help pay benefits for the elderly, we should be especially aware of the currently scheduled raises in the tax and how these, coupled with the new program will affect the entire populous.

With these aims in mind, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a penetrating editorial on the subject of social security taxes which appeared January 8, 1962, in the Flint (Mich.) Journal.

The editorial follows:

WILL THERE BE NO LIMIT TO SOCIAL SECURITY BOOSTS?

As most employees already have noticed, the start of 1962 brought an extra bite out of their take-home pay in the form of increased social security taxes.

To help pay for benefit improvements that Congress voted last summer, employees and employers each will pay an extra one-eighth of 1 percent on the first $4,800 of annual earnings. This raises the total tax rate to 6¼ percent and the maximum amount of tax to $300 a year.

The self-employed pay an additional two-tenths of 1 percent. Their new rate is 4.7 percent and the maximum amount of tax is $225.60.

Still further increases are scheduled for the years ahead. In 1963 the employer-employee rate will rise to 7¼ percent, in 1966 to 8¼ percent, in 1969 to 9¼ percent. And these increases are subject to upward revision. If medical care for the aged is included under social security as President Kennedy is urging, a big jump in the rate can be expected.

Should there be a limit to the tax increases that can be imposed on people to finance the social security program? More and more Americans are beginning to think so, including many staunch supporters of social security.

They recall that social security originally was intended to provide a foundation for retirement and survivorship protection, not to meet every possible need or contingency.

Congress, however, sensing that anything that is to be financed through social security seems to be a popular, vote-getting program, continues to find ways of increasing benefits by increasing the tax rate. Before we slip past the point of no return on our way to the complete welfare state, greater recognition ought to be given to the ever increasing savings, investments, hospital insurance, and retirement plans now owned by individuals who are looking to social security as a welcome supplement to their retirement income, not as their sole means of support.

If the ideas persists that social security is going to be the answer to all retirement needs, the financial burden on this country as the life expectancy continues to lengthen and the number of senior citizens increases will be too fantastic to contemplate.

Vice President of the United States Greets Hon. George P. Miller, of California, on His 71st Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased and honored having the privilege of presenting to all the Members of this great legislative body the very significant and gracious letter of commendation by the distinguished Vice President of the United States, Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, under date of January 30, 1962, to my distinguished colleague from California, Hon. GEORGE P. MILLER, chairman of the Science and Astronautics Committee of the House of Representatives.

I am sure we all recognize that by previous training and activities and desire to serve, our distinguished colleague from my native State of California is richly endowed with the qualities necessary to be a most able chairman of this very strategic committee.

The P.S. portion of the letter addressed to our distinguished colleague by the Vice President of the United States is in the handwriting of this distinguished American who took the time and trouble and so graciously sent to Hon. GEORGE P. MILLER this birthday message. I am sure we all join with and cordially concur in the birthday greetings so appropriately conveyed to our California colleague—even though it is belated—on account of his being 71 years young.

The letter follows:

THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington, January 30, 1962.

The Honorable GEORGE P. MILLER,
Chairman, Science and Astronautics Committee, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Before you came to the Congress, you expressed in dynamic and effective action your keen interest in and ability to conserve some of nature's gifts to mankind.

It is not only appropriate, it is wonderful to have you, at 71 years young, on the front line of the New Frontier—outer space. It is reassuring to have you, with your interest in conserving the best of this earth, as a leader in conquering the unknown and in shaping it for man's future best interests.

As an individual and as your colleague, I am deeply appreciative of your unselfish devotion and your dedicated service. And, although belated, I wish you a happy 71st and many, many more.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

P.S.—You have an awesome responsibility as Chairman of Space, but you are a just and good man and you will discharge it well.

Small Business Term Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, David C. Hewitt is senior vice president of the Hartford National Bank & Trust Co., Hartford, Conn. In the November 20, 1961, issue of the New York State Banker Mr. Hewitt discusses his thinking and experience with small business term loans.

This is a valuable contribution coming from one who has been directly involved in making such loans and I commend Mr. Hewitt's article to the attention of our colleagues.

The article follows:

SMALL BUSINESS TERM LOANS

(By David C. Hewitt)

I appreciate the opportunity to discuss with you our thinking and experience to date with small business term loans.

All of us recognize that this area of lending is not a new one—in one form or another most of us have made loans of this type for years. What may be new to many is the concept that the magnitude of the job which should be done by the banks for so-called small business, is so great, that it warrants—and deserves—a well thought-out, special program of its own. There is no need to labor you with statistics to prove this premise. With over 90 percent of the country's businesses qualifying as small, with over 50 percent of our working force finding employment with these firms, they are clearly one of the great backbones of our American business system.

Certainly we banks, as evidenced believers in, and subscribers to, the free enterprise system, have every responsibility under our charters to properly serve this huge segment of our business community.

Let us examine together what has been done as a general pattern in this phase of bank credit, and what could be done with a more realistic approach, including in some detail why we think the plan we have developed is a logical approach to this challenge.

Historically, the self-liquidating 90-day note was the tool used by commercial banks to serve its business customers. We all know how borrowings of this type purchased inventory, processed or stocked it, sold it, and in liquidation of itself produced cash to pay the debt. This worked fine while the great bulk of manufacturing, wholesaling, and retailing businesses were cyclical in their requirements—but two things combined to minimize the true value of this type borrowing to many of our customers.

First, the income tax on business profits made it virtually impossible for the plowback of earnings to keep pace with the need for more worth on which to base additional required credit. Indeed, if we accept the figure of a creeping inflation rate of 3 percent plus per year, then to maintain the same physical volume, without regard for growth, requires an earnings return to worth which in many businesses, after taxes, is hard to meet.

Add to this the successful effort of modern management to level out sales over the year, and no longer does the self-liquidating note furnish the answer. To get full leverage out of capital investment and labor, it is logical and proper to attempt to even out the flow of production and sales over the entire year. The closer to a straight line this curve becomes, the better managed the company.

Faced with these two developments, our small businessman has had a hard row to hoe. To expand his business, the requirement for credit became more a substitute for equity than a true short-term borrowing.

Borrowed money had a way of becoming locked into his balance sheet—and with the pressure of his habit-drugged, unrealistic banker for the annual payout, he found a few equally unrealistic ways of accomplishing this. The obvious answer was riding his trade creditors doubly hard for 30 days, and thus transferring debt from bank to trade. This produced the whitewash payout, and our satisfied banker then went back in for another 11 months. Another solution was a deliberate running off of business, to reduce outstandings and throw off the cash necessary to pay out. In most cases this meant passing up good business, and in these days of excess productive capacity, passing up business is the poorest answer.

In light of this history, it seemed to us that the answer lay in a plan which would give a customer the means to earn a portion of the permanent money needed by his business. The next decision to make was that of maximum term and method of repayment. Our basic policy answer on this was a maximum term of 5 years and level payments on a monthly basis. Needless to say, being a commercial bank, terms are kept at the minimum which can be healthily lived with by the customer, and the rare one with an inbalanced cash flow is given a staggered repayment schedule to fit his requirements. Of interest is the fact that our shortest loan was to the purchaser of a package store, for 1 year.

We put up $4,000 of a total purchase price of $19,000, the balance being produced by $5,000 in cash and a purchase money note for $10,000 to the seller, subordinated to our debt both as to interest and principal. We have, of course, some loans of the maximum maturity of 5 years, and our average maturity is approximately 3 years by number and 3½ years by dollars.

The next step was settling on methods of handling, and rates to be charged. With an excellent time payment loan department's facilities available to us, it was logical to use the accounting and control techniques developed and proven there. As a marketing gimmick we decided on having regular loan officers handle the applications and credit work as against our time payment department interviewers. We do not in print or conversation refer to our small business term loans as time payment loans—and we think this has helped our program. As a matter of fact, we operate an extensive branch system, and 70 percent of our loans in this category originate in the branch system. In these offices, the same man would make and service both commercial loans and time payments.

On rates, our experience with time payment business loans and equipment loans was our greatest source of basic information. Faced with the realities of relatively high risk, equity substitute loans, for long terms, with the attendant costs of handling monthly payments, necessary documentation and follow up systems for protracted periods, we felt justified in a scale of rates ranging from $4 per $100 per year to $6.50 per $100 per year. At no extra cost to the borrower we include life insurance to a maximum of $10,000 on the borrower, in the amount of the balance due at the time of death, under a group life policy. Of real interest is the ability of our carrier, under Connecticut law, to permit us, in the case of a corporation, to cover principals in any proportion we and the borrowers agree on. Such principals must of course be personally liable on the debt—which they are as a matter of policy, and the aggregate must not exceed the $10,000.

Death benefits received under this are of course applied in inverse order of repayment. Where for protection we need insurance in excess of $10,000, we in some instances require the borrower to furnish it at his cost. Average rate on both number and dollar has been just over $5 per $100 per year and loans have ranged in size from $1,500 at $6 per $100 to a young doctor entering practice to $57,000 at $4.50 per $100 to a precision tool shop for the repair of working capital deteriorated by necessary equipment purchases.

We have made, in 7 months, 136 loans totaling $1,920,000. One usage of the plan, if judiciously used and controlled, is the recasting of debt now existing on a conventional discount basis where by past measurements the bank is locked in. Of the total mentioned, approximately 25 percent represents such conversion to a realistic payout schedule.

Let's for a minute examine the tests for such recasting—as this will lead us logically to the credit measures we use on new applications. The primary consideration is the experience and ability of the management. The best evidence of such ability is of course, profitability, and therefore profit and loss figures are as important as balance sheet statistics. After all, if we applied the usual debt to worth, debt to working capital tests to this type borrower, we would in most cases come up with the answer—on a conventional basis—not bankable. Earnings and depreciation furnish the source of cash flow to housekeep the sought-for loan, and evidence and reasonable projections are the No. 1 consideration.

A history of resourcefulness and integrity with the necessary ambition and drive to stick to the job are more important than a frozen worth many times the borrowing. Where the venture is a new company, our policy is, at the outside, to do no more than match dollars with the borrower. In such an event there must be a history of performance in a responsible position in a like business, and evidence that overall managerial abilities are there. In every case we take personal endorsements of affected principals, plus collateral security where available. For instance, with manufacturers we normally take chattels on equipment. There are usually available factors liens on inventory, if thought necessary, or in some cases accounts receivable liens are taken. For instance, we have been able to aid some insurance agency customers of ours with growing pains by taking an assignment of their renewal commissions to secure loans which were paid off by payments sent direct to us by the insurance companies involved.

One positive requirement is all of the borrower's banking business. Company, personal checking accounts—safe deposit boxes—personal loans—we want all connections. This is a typical example of the proper two-way street relationship—if we are taking the risk of joining a customer as a creditor on his business venture, we believe in return we are entitled to all of his banking business. We certainly recognize that very few such customers can keep the conventional 15- to 20-percent balances—but we hope to help him reach that mark. In the meanwhile we want all he does have.

We do not issue coupon books to cover payments on the loans by small business borrowers. We automatically charge checking accounts for payments due—and if the charge is not good when presented—the responsible loan officer is immediately notified. We have been very tough on excuses—believing that training of "due on the date agreed" keeps our relationship on a proper basis.

Because the acquisition and housekeeping of such loans is a combination of commercial lending and time-payment techniques, we drew up a new set of forms to accomplish these objectives with the greatest ease for our personnel and the greatest understanding with our customers. They consist of application, simple loan agreement, checklist, and note. For all other documentation we use standard bank forms—such as corporate borrowing resolutions, subordination agreements, and so forth. Conditions in our agreements are discussed in detail with the customer to minimize the possibility of misunderstandings later.

Because the risk is greater than normal, the completeness of our credit checkings and the resulting credit file are of paramount importance. We insist on the use of a checklist by the loan officer to insure that no detail of policy or procedure is skipped and that every item is given consideration. The degree of control or restriction required varies from customer to customer, and is left to the discretion of the responsible loan officer.

Small business term loans, together with all unsecured loans in our bank, become automatically one of the assets reviewed at least once each year by the loan review section of our credit department and exceptions to policy or lack of followup reported to the head of the loan division. When such loans originate in branch offices, all credit data is retained in that office, and only the note with enough data to enable setting up the liability card is forwarded to the proper time payment department control office for accounting and control.

As evidence of the wide appeal and resulting risk spread of this program, allow me to recite to you the types of customers we have attracted:

Professional: Doctors, lawyers, dentists, architects, engineering firms—electronics.

Service: Beauty parlors, barbers, insurance agencies, printers, dry cleaners, ambulance service, boat transport service.

Retailers: Ready-to-wear, jewelry, furniture, drugs, service stations, restaurant, package store, furrier, lumber and building supplies, florist.

Manufacturers: Metal fabricators, machine shops, tool shops, furniture.

As another criterion, all but 3 of our 23 full service officers have originated business in this category.

We can sum up, I think, the conception and operation of our plan to date by saying:

1. We faced the requirement of small business for an opportunity to earn some of the additional equity he now needs.

2. We have improved the quality of our borrowers by setting terms with which they can comply—and insisting on compliance.

3. We have made this kind of lending attractive by making it profitable. Full consideration may now be given to loan applications which under the conventional unsecured note borrowing pattern would have been routine turn-downs. The belief that a lender is entitled to more than 6 percent simple interest when entering a longer term, risk situation is not unique with banks. For years the private sources of risk capital have used a technique now adopted by the small business investment companies approved and supervised by the Small Business Administration. Here the Federal agency recognizes the need for compensation beyond the conventional interest rate—as a matter of fact, in a measure no one can determine at the inception of a loan. This we all know as the technique of taking convertible debentures as the evidence of debt—and if the borrower does well, the lender coverts and enjoys as additional fruits of his money the resulting additional share in the borrowers equity. I submit that a borrower is better off with lent money on a contractual basis in the absolute, with no access to equity in the event of success. This is the historic role of commercial banks, and if our rates on a dollar-per-hundred basis as a pure creditor would seem high—to supervisory agencies I would say "Give us our fair return for risk, handling, and term, and let the borrower enjoy his equity gain."

4. Our customer service in the plan evolved has met with great community acceptance. As an institution, we have always believed in telling our customers and potential customers what we have to offer. The offering of our plan was preceded by officer and employee training and a well coordinated advertising campaign. As an industry, we chartered banks cannot ignore this dynamic credit area of our service—the benefits will return to us a hundredfold.

It is my hope that with this exposition, the need for such a program and one plan to meet the need have been demonstrated.

In closing, allow me to dwell for a moment on history. If a need develops, by some means it is filled. We were taught in school that nature abhors a vacuum. It seems a corollary that an unfilled economic need is satisfied. Witness, for instance, the fantastic growth of the Federal credit unions and their present share of the installment credit outstandings in this country today. If we banks had seen the need, and had done things we are now trying—too late—this would not have happened to the degree we now see it.

I submit to you that recognizing the need of small business for credit and failing to provide for it will add another chapter to the book our successors will read with regret and sorrow. I offer as my judgment that banks everywhere have it in their power to work out a term lending program suited to the needs of small business and professional men in their respective areas. I say again, this void exists, and if not filled by us as representatives of our free enterprise system, it will be filled by others.

Burns and Duncan: The Pride of the Scots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a very fine article entitled "Scots Honor Robert Burns" by my dear and esteemed friend, Mr. Alexander C. Duncan of Clinton, Mass., which recently appeared in the Clinton Daily Item.

Mr. Duncan is 94 years of age now, but has the outlook and vigor of youth. For many years, he has furnished brilliant leadership for the Scotch people of the community and has been closely and prominently associated with the Scottish clans and other affiliated organizations devoted to preserving the great traditions and customs of the noble Scots.

The birthday of Scotland's great, beloved Bard, "Bobby" Burns, never passes without appropriate recognition by Mr. Duncan. In former years, Mr. Duncan and his fellow Scotsmen staged a huge, lusty "Scotch Ball" on Burns' birthday in the town hall, Clinton, which was one of the most colorful and best attended affairs of the season, featuring Burns' poems, Scottish songs, sword dancers, bagpipes, and everything that goes to make up the lovable Scotch tradition.

Like other affairs of its kind at the time, when music was something more than a raucous din, the Scotch ball started in the early evening with a concert of good music and then a dazzling grand march followed by general dancing, gaiety and merriment, well into the early hours of the morning.

Bobby Burns holds a cherished place, not only in the hearts of Scotsmen, but Americans and people everywhere, and he is widely known and loved throughout the world as the "poet of the poor." It should be observed that he was also the poet of every other class, since his poems were translated into about every language and were frequently read and recited by the people of many lands.

In this age of material progress so-called, and materialistic thinking, what have you, it is very appropriate that in our great Nation, we should pause reverently to pay tribute to the great, immortal figures and artists of the glorious past, who brought joy, gladness, and direction to the world, because their contributions are not only heartwarming, rewarding, and inspiring, but could be truly important blocks with which to build the promised brighter tomorrow, if economic determinists and human folly do not shatter mankind's dreams of peace and plenty.

Bobby Burns has left a great impression on history, and richly deserves the millions of loyal followers he has in the world.

Of these, I am proud to relate that none is more loyal, or more devoted, to the memory of the illustrious Burns that my good and admired friend, Alex Duncan. In fact, he is clearly and indubitably Burns' greatest contemporary enthusiast, and we all laud and enjoy his annual pilgrimage to the cherished shrines of memory that perpetuate Burns' great tradition and keep vibrant and ever-present the gleaming virtues of historic Scotland.

The memory of Robert Burns will live as long as free men and women honor and love the real values of faith, patriotism and human fellowship, and I hope and pray that Alex Duncan will continue for years to come to sing his own strong, sweet song to the blessed recollection of "the Scots wi ha wi Wallace bled."

The article follows:

SCOTS HONOR ROBERT BURNS

To the EDITOR:

Robert Burns' birthday will be celebrated as usual by Scots and friends of Scots alike in all the far corners of the world. The little thatched cottage where the poet was born still stands and has become a shrine for thousands of visitors and tourists each year. He was born in the little Scottish town of Alloway in Ayrshire on January 25, 1759.

The star of Robert Burns never dims, but beams brightly in all its splendor. Why?

Because he loved humanity with rare tenderness, and wrote strongly of freedom and independence.

Burns was born and raised on a farm and was proud to say, "I was bred to the plough and am independent." Abraham Lincoln was an ardent admirer of the "Ploughman Bard" and must have liked those words. Lincoln's early life was one of hard work, often bordering on drudgery, as was Burns'; they were two great homespun characters. Lincoln cherished the ideals of freedom and independence so strongly and beautifully phrased in Burns' "Scots Wha Hae."

Lincoln's love of and for the common people is well known, and he must surely have enjoyed "A Man's a Man for a' That." We know, too, that Lincoln was very sympathetic and tender-hearted, and could appreciate and enjoy Burns' lines "To a Mouse" and, again, "To a Mountain Daisy." Lincoln's shrewd native wit and keen sense of humor were whetted when he read these verses, I am sure.

In his lifetime Lincoln was speaker at two Burns celebrations—one in Springfield, Ill., in 1859; and the other several years later when he was President. On this latter occasion he was asked for a toast on Burns. With pencil and paper he wrote these words: "I cannot frame a toast to Burns, I can say nothing worthy of his generous heart transcending genius. Thinking of what he has said I cannot say anything which seems worth saying."

But Lincoln was not content to read Burns; he enjoyed reciting him to his friends, and did so, of all things, in the pronunciation and accent of the broad Scots dialect. Milton Hay, a law student in Lincoln's office in 1839, stated that his employer had acquired the Scottish accent and could render Burns perfectly, and a good deal of the poetry was quoted from memory, including the whole of "Tam O'Shanter" and a large portion of "The Cotter's Saturday Night."

How sweet and meaningful the following lines, written by the poet upon the loss of an only daughter and darling child:

"Here lies a rose, a budding rose,
Blasted before its bloom;
Whose innocence did sweet disclose
Beyond that flower's perfume.

"To those who for her loss are grieved
This consolation's given—
She's from a world of woe relieved
And blooms a rose in heaven."

ALEXANDER CAMERON DUNCAN,
Past President, St. Andrews Society and Past Chief Scottish Clans, Clinton, Mass.

Let's Make America Wake Up to Brooklyn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, it has been my happy privilege to have spent all the years of my life in the first suburb of the first capital of the United States—Brooklyn, N.Y. I will never cease to wonder why more visitors, more industries, more families have not searched out the tremendous facilities for fine living, working, learning and sheer contentment within the borders of the Nation's greatest borough. I am proud that one of our outstanding business leaders, Mr. Milton T. Vander Veer, has initiated a campaign "Let's Make America Wake Up to Brooklyn" and discussed it in a recent speech before the Brooklyn Real Estate Board. This outstanding organization of Brooklyn realtors is headed by one of our constituents, Robert Loehfelm. I am pleased to insert Mr. Vander Veer's address in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

LET'S MAKE AMERICA WAKE UP TO BROOKLYN

(By Milton T. Vander Veer)

It is most difficult for me adequately to express my appreciation for having been entrusted with the privilege of being your chairman tonight. I have been asking myself, What can I—Vander Veer—possibly tell this distinguished group of the real estate fraternity that would be interesting, would be useful, that would be inspiring? Above all, what can I say that could generate enough drive so that your contribution to Brooklyn's progress—already a large contribution—could be expanded so that our borough could benefit—and each of us, personally, derive a greater reward from our individual efforts? We live in an economic society where personal reward is the prime motivation. This is a good thing. It simply means that by helping our neighbors we help ourselves.

When my ancestors sailed into New York Harbor more than 300 years ago, there was no population explosion here, no congestion, no rent control, no status and no stigma attached to living anywhere in the vicinity. There were as many Indians in one place as another, and they were equally friendly or hostile in one place as any other. So my ancestors had a free choice. They chose to settle in Brooklyn. In my opinion, the passing years have confirmed their good judgment in choosing Brooklyn.

I believe, in the words of our beloved former borough president, John Cashmore, that Brooklyn is the greatest borough, in the greatest city, in the greatest country, in the world. For this we are all grateful and proud.

But all this is well known to you. I know I am addressing the individuals who properly and fully appreciate all the wonderful things that Brooklyn offers the people who live and work here. I also know that you are the folks who have helped to make Brooklyn such a wonderful place. Indeed, it is largely your efforts that have made our borough a haven for the family, for the aspiring businessman, for the industrialist, for the banker, for anybody who wants to better himself and to grow.

WORK FAR FROM COMPLETED

But I think you will also agree that our work is far from completed. There are still many manufacturers who should have plants in Brooklyn, who have never even thought about Brooklyn. There are still many businesses that should have establishments in Brooklyn who are thinking of locating elsewhere. And there are still many fine individuals and families seeking new homes who should cross the bridge to see what we have to offer on the Brooklyn side of the East River.

In our own small way, we in the Lafayette National Bank have been trying to reach these people, these manufacturers, businessmen and private individuals. Most of you are familiar with our campaign in the Wall Street Journal and other leading publications: "Let's Make America Wake Up to Brooklyn."

Just see what happens when we succeed in persuading one company to locate here in Brooklyn. Experts estimate that if a new factory brings in 100 employees, the growth cycle only begins. These 100 employees will cause 112 new households to be established; 296 people would be added to our population rolls; 107 more passenger automobiles would be registered. So far, what would have been accomplished? Well, there would be a need for 112 homes and furnishings and decorating; parking lots and garages would enjoy a nice influx of business. But these new citizens would also support four new retail establishments catering to their needs for an additional annual retail sales volume of over $360,000. I think I can assume you gentlemen would be willing to help these retailers find suitable premises. I need not describe the balance of the business cycle—the insurance, the legal services, the entertainment facilities, the added tax revenue and the other items that would contribute to our city's economic growth. All these—if only 1 factory, employing only 100 new workers—could be induced to come to Brooklyn.

FOURTH LARGEST MARKET

And don't think for a minute that a smart manufacturer shouldn't be giving serious consideration to moving into a community which is the fourth largest consumer market in the Nation. The fourth largest. If the manufacturer has an appetite for more business, he might want to think about Brooklyn't own appetite—we happen to be the Nation's third largest food market.

But, as you might guess, it is not enough to beat the drums away from home when the natives themselves aren't fully awakened. Some Brooklynites don't always believe in Brooklyn. Some folks right here in Brooklyn are only half awake to the opportunities that exist here. So we realized that if we were to sell Brooklyn to the rest of America, we first had to sell Brooklyn to the people right here in Brooklyn.

In addition to spreading our advertising over the country, we also saw to it that we did some missionary work here at home. Brooklyn is a first-class product. And Brooklyn can fill a real need. Good advertising and good salesmanship can always sell a good product that fills a real need.

Unfortunately, no advertisement we can publish can completely describe all of Brooklyn's advantages. We can only begin to mention Brooklyn's enormous importance as a retail market. We can only touch the surface of Brooklyn as a tremendous source of good, conscientious, hardworking skilled and unskilled labor. We can but briefly discuss the advantageous plant sites available here, the unsurpassed distribution facilities that serve our Borough, the waterfront that brings us the world's goods, and lets us send America's goods to the rest of the world.

BEST YET TO COME

I say to you, and I say it conservatively, that we Brooklynites have a new frontier with virtually no boundaries and America is bound to wake up to Brooklyn if we are diligent in our work. And when America does wake up, our past peaks of progress and prosperity will seem like mere ant hills in comparison with what the future will bring us. When you see what has been accomplished by communities not one fraction so well endowed with advantages as we are, it makes you impatient to start selling Brooklyn for all it is worth. When you consider what energetic community salesmanship did for a hot, bug-infested sand bar that became Miami Beach. When you consider what is happening in the enormous smog canyon known as Los Angeles. When you think of the land-locked former cornfields of the Midwest that now are filled with busy, thriving industrial plants. When you think about the mushrooming growth of the impoverished South. You just have to ask yourself: If these places—with all their handicaps—can attract industry, why

shouldn't Brooklyn, with its ideal geographical proximity to the world's biggest markets with its enormous and superb waterfront, be able to set a world's record for business growth in the world market that President Kennedy is now advocating?

And this is not an empty dream. Already, in recent years and months, there has been a dynamic trend toward the realization of this ideal in Brooklyn.

BOROUGH INDUSTRIAL LEADER

I am indebted to the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce for some recent facts that really astounded me. The chamber's special bulletin of January 5 reveals that out of the 16 counties in the New York Metropolitan area, Brooklyn has 30,672 manufacturers, wholesalers and retailers making it second only to Manhattan and the Bronx (which had to combine to be ahead of Brooklyn). Brooklyn has nearly twice as many industries as the next nearest counties, which are Essex County in New Jersey, with 17,182 and Queens with 16,936. Nassau has 14,048. And don't forget, we are on an upswing, while other sections are static. Dun & Bradstreet reports that New York and Illinois are the only two States out of 10 listed, who added more new businesses in 1961 than in 1960.

Don't let anybody outtalk you; and don't neglect to spread the facts at every opportunity: Brooklyn is on the forward march. The Port of New York Authority completed its eighth pier here during 1961, and authorized the construction of a new $5,746,000 pier at the foot of Joralemon Street.

According to the New York World Telegram & Sun the biggest Brooklyn project ever undertaken by the department of marine and aviation is scheduled for completion this year—the $10,600,000 passenger terminal for the Mitsui Line of Japan at the foot of 35th Street.

And Brooklyn is planning not just for business—but for people, too. For example, 6,200 apartments at Fred Trump's Coney Island Trump Village costing $130 million; 1,317 apartments at Marvin Kratter's Ebbets Field houses, costing nearly $23 million; 2,705 apartments at Stanley J. Hart's Lindsay Park houses in Williamsburg, costing $42 million.

So you see, Brooklyn is really hot for growth. In fact, we're smoking. We're smoking more and enjoying it more, too.

CIVIC CENTER OUTSTANDING EXAMPLE

Probably the most dramatic single example of Brooklyn's trend is our new civic center—now nearing completion after an investment of over $250 million. Here's another step—a giant step, I might say—toward assuring a bigger and better Brooklyn.

Downtown Brooklyn is wearing a new look these days—an attractive, sensible, sound new look—with its new arterial highways, educational centers, playgrounds, public and privately built housing developments and government buildings. An outstanding example is the new Brooklyn Union Gas Co. Building. I urge you to see it; no finer structure has been built in all of Greater New York this year. Then we have the new office building nearing completion at 175 Remsen Street, already more than half rented to insurance companies.

But all this is only a beginning, a first step. As step No. 2, I would like to suggest that Abe Stark, our newly elected borough president and first citizen of Brooklyn, be invited to direct a project to redevelop the downtown Brooklyn area just east of the civic center and extending through the Fort Greene and Clinton Hill sections. Here is a project really fit to grip the imaginations of farsighted city builders—a challenge truly worthy of the most dedicated civic enterprise. We view it now and we see its decaying buildings. We see overcrowding and increasingly depressing slum conditions. But that is not all we see. Because here amongst these depressing sights are also some of the borough's most valuable cultural and civic assets.

CULTURAL AND RELIGIOUS CENTER

In this area are located the Community College of New York City; the widely respected Brooklyn Law School and Long Island University, Pratt Institute, Cathedral College, St. Joseph's College for Women, the Brooklyn Academy of Music, the Brooklyn Music School, and a valuable heritage of many houses of worship and fraternal institutions. It also contains Fort Greene Park. This section is already served by the excellent transit systems of New York City and should be a port of entry to Brooklyn which could make us enormously proud.

Our borough president should have the encouragement and total support in this project of all our civic organizations such as our own Brooklyn real estate fraternity, our chamber of commerce, our Downtown Brooklyn Association, the leaders of our valuable business institutions such as our department stores, major manufacturers, and our banks.

And don't let your vision stop with the improvement of the Fort Greene-Clinton Hill area, for in other parts of our borough there are many challenges. These challenges, of necessity, differ in the way they will be handled. I would like to make a prediction to you tonight that within the next 2 or 3 years the builders who went from Brooklyn to the East Side of Manhattan, where land values in the last few years have risen from $20 per square foot to $30, $40, $50, and $60, will be returning to the Brooklyn Heights section to rebuild it with apartment houses equally as beautiful as those they have been erecting on the East Side of Manhattan. Our new zoning law with its reduced area coverage will take care of this, for there is a limit to how much builders can pay per square foot for land and still have a successful operation.

In my judgment, Brooklyn Heights, with its geographical proximity to downtown Manhattan, is bound to come into its own and be rebuilt by private enterprise, for it is only 5 minutes away from Wall Street, either by city transit or automobile. This is prime merchandise, west of Cadman Plaza, and the builders are bound to realize it sooner or later.

Do you see why I speak of a boundless frontier for Brooklyn? Why I am confident, not because of vague, general optimism, but because commonsense convinces me it is good business to be a part of Brooklyn and I know good businessmen are bound to recognize this fact?

AN AREA FOR PEOPLE

In accomplishing these achievements we would not only be helping to create a bigger and better Brooklyn, we would also be helping our neighboring borough across the East River—Manhattan. Anyone watching the plight of Manhattan in recent years must surely experience profound consternation at the unbelievable and illogical situation of saddling a borough already choked by congestion with more and more congestion-producing civic projects. There is an embarrassment of riches across the river which has resulted in mountains of bricks and marble—but no space for people. I say to our Greater New York City planners—if you are planning for human beings give us, give Brooklyn, the next big project like Lincoln Center. Locate it in our borough east of our new civic center, where people can get to it without being strangled by car bumpers and choked by monoxide.

Locate it in Brooklyn, where human beings can reach it with some degree of pleasure. I can actually get from the thirties on the east side of Manhattan to Fort Greene Park in Brooklyn in less time—and with a lot less annoyance—than it takes to travel from the thirties on the east side to Lincoln Center. Anyone who has to travel crosstown in Manhattan knows I speak the truth.

So here is Brooklyn—historic, advantageous, spacious Brooklyn, with lots of room for growth * * * and lots of room for improvement. Here is a Brooklyn that is in a top position for civic betterment, because it is the home of so many fine people who care about it * * * and who love it.

MAN-SIZE FRONTIER

All of us are guilty, from time to time, of moaning and groaning about the things the borough should do. Let us reflect, instead on the things we can do for the borough.

This is a man-size frontier. If we can get on with the march, I can tell you America will really wake up to Brooklyn and all of us will be rewarded many times over for our individual efforts when we really wake up to Brooklyn.

To the extent that I have been permitted to speak on behalf of Brooklyn tonight, I wish to say, "Thank you."

The Forgotten People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, this is the ninth of 10 articles, part of a series which appeared in the New York World-Telegram and Sun in October 1961, on the subject of the migrant worker in the United States. These articles were written by Dale Wright, World-Telegram and Sun staff writer, who, for 6 months, lived and worked as a migrant worker along the Atlantic seaboard from Florida to New York:

THE FORGOTTEN PEOPLE: MIGRANTS EXIST IN DUCK SHEDS

(Today Staff Writer Dale Wright concludes his firsthand reports on the life of migrant laborers, those "forgotten people" who are still underpaid, overworked, cheated and forced to live in degrading conditions. On Monday he will summarize his experiences working and living with them and offer his recommendations for improving their tragic plight.)

(By Dale Wright)

A 30-page, slick paper booklet published earlier this year by the New York State Migrant Labor Committee boasts proudly that the State "marches forward" in long strides in its handling of itinerant farm workers.

Photographs of smiling laborers and their children beam from its pages—at work, at play, in school, and in church. The committee booklet spells out step-by-step the regulations under which more than 25,000 transient crop pickers who come into the State every year live and work.

The publication lists rules for the supervision of crew leaders, growers, packers, processors and labor camp operators. The work of seven State agencies is exhaustively outlined. Impressive statistics tell what has been done to improve the lot of the migrant farm worker in the past 40 years.

It is true that forward steps have been taken. They can be seen in eastern Long Island and other farm areas. Yet here, in perhaps the most enlightened of all of the 50 States, many migrant farm people still face poverty amid plenty. They are neglected, exploited, and left hopeless.

The seamier side of the State migrant labor picture can be examined in all of its shocking clarity in and near Riverhead, Long Island, just 83 miles from Times Square.

I've been there. I've seen and talked with the migrant farmworker at two bottomland squatter communities called Griffing's Path and Tin Top, both within Riverhead city limits. The people I've seen there don't appear in the committee booklet.

MANY ON RELIEF

At a place called Warner's Duck Ranch, about 3 miles from the center of town, some 200 Negroes and a few Puerto Ricans exist in appalling misery and degradation.

In many weeks of traveling, working, and living with migrants I was prepared for anything. But Warner's Duck Ranch bowled me over.

Most of the ranch tenants are migrants. Others are former migrants brought up from Southern States in labor crews, for potato corn, and bean harvests. Because of poor crops—or poor crop prices—and peon wages, they are now stranded with little or no funds.

Many families who live on the ranch are on welfare, swelling the relief burden borne by Riverhead taxpayers.

The ranch, operated by Hollis V. Warner, is run like a pre-Civil War plantation. Mr. Warner was at one time the world's leading duck raiser. He went out of business in 1957.

"The politicians," he told me, angrily waving his hands, "boosted feed prices so high that they ran me right out of business."

Although Mr. Warner got out of duck raising, he did not abandon his ranch. Instead, he converted it into a private housing project and replaced the ducks with people.

HIDDEN BEHIND TREES

He partitioned the long, flimsy, uninsulated wooden sheds, which only 3 or 4 years ago housed ducks, into separate units. Today they house human beings, including many families with small children.

The ranch is, typically, off the main thoroughfare and hidden behind a clump of trees.

Mr. Warner charges $10 to $15 a week rent, tenants said. Each of the converted duck sheds contains two or four rooms. There are almost no indoor toilets. Tenants must use vile outhouses in the rear of each shack.

Because of the lack of a drainage system, it is common for housewives to dump dish and washwater through the front or rear doors into the dirt street.

"This is no place for humans to live," said Louise Davis, a 3-year tenant in one of the converted duck sheds. "Why, even the ducks couldn't make it here. But there's no other place for us to go."

STUCK FOR GOOD

Mother of two small children, Mrs. Davis said she migrated to Riverhead from Florida 3 years ago with a farm labor crew.

"The potatoes were late," she recalled, "and when my babies started coming, my husband left. Now it looks like I'm stuck here for good."

Mrs. Davis said she had been on welfare most of the time she had lived in Riverhead and received $61.50 weekly. Her relief check is boosted to $64.50 during winter months to pay for coal for cooking and heating. She added that many of her neighbors are also on welfare.

Edward Delaney, 62, a bent, toothless man from Durant, Miss., complained: "I can't earn enough to get out of here." He said he paid $15 weekly for a two-room waterless and toiletless shanty.

He arrived in Riverhead with a labor contractor and a crew in July of last year. Like many others, he could not find work enough in the potato fields and grading sheds to earn the fare back home.

It was the old story of overrecruitment of farm laborers so they could be worked for the lowest possible pay.

Mr. Warner, who operates a general store in one of his converted duck sheds, has a different view of his tenants. He was one of the few persons to whom I revealed my identity as a reporter.

I asked him how he could justify charging $40 to $75 monthly rents for such miserable living quarters.

EVERYBODY'S HAPPY

"These people," he said, shaking his fist menacingly, "are all happy here. They're all satisfied. I give them a place to live and something to eat. Nobody else will take them."

Mr. Warner moved closer, and as he spoke I watched over his shoulder as a tiny girl, naked about 3 years old, played with a ragged doll in the dirt. Scratching in the same patch was a flock of dusty, anemic-looking chickens.

The little girl was one of Mr. Warner's "happy" tenants. She lived in one of his duck sheds.

She may die in one of them.

A Seat in the Cabinet for Our "Dimmed" Cities—Editorial by Long Beach (Calif.) Newspaper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to insert to the attention of your own distinguished self and all the other Members of this great legislative body, an editorial which appeared in the Long Beach, Calif., Press-Telegram, a daily newspaper, on Monday, January 15, 1962.

Long Beach, Calif., is now reputedly a metropolitan city of well over 300,000 people.

I note the closing sentence of this pertinent editorial states:

We believe its effort would be more efficient if concentrated under a Department of Urban Affairs.

A SEAT IN THE CABINET FOR OUR "DIMMED" CITIES

"O beautiful for patriot's dream
That sees beyond the years
Where alabaster cities gleam
Undimmed by human tears."
—*America the Beautiful.*

Since World War II, there has been little gleaming alabaster to see in our cities. Even if it were there, it could probably not be spotted through the smog. All too evident in our urban areas, however, are the growing problems of crime, air pollution, water shortages, blighted neighborhoods, overcrowded schools, choked streets and freeways, decrepit public transit, narcotics, and delinquency, to mention only a few.

In the past decade the populations of our major cities, with the exception of Los Angeles, have declined, but their troubles have increased.

In his state of the Union message Thursday, President Kennedy took a quick look at the cities—"America's glory and sometimes America's shame"—and proposed the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs.

"Both equity and commonsense require that our Nation's urban areas—containing three-fourths of our population—sit as equals at the Cabinet table," the President declared.

Business, labor, and agriculture now have seats in the Cabinet. It would seem that the cities, which have problems as big as but distinct from the problems of these three areas of our national life, should also be represented.

There are many Federal agencies now in existence which deal primarily with urban problems. The housing agencies—FHA and Federal Home Loan Bank Board—the Urban Renewal Administration and many other Federal divisions concerned primarily with city dwellers either lead independent existences or are divided among various Cabinet departments.

Grouping these agencies under one Cabinet head would accomplish two goals: (1) It would enable better coordination and liaison among the agencies themselves; (2) it would conveniently group allied functions so that city officials seeking advice and information from Washington would know where to look.

"A strong America depends on its cities," the President declared. He declared that new Federal laws would be necessary to meet urban problems.

"We shall need further anticrime, mass transit, and transportation legislation—and new tools to fight air pollution," he said.

We do not believe the problems of the cities will be solved in Washington. They will be solved primarily by hard work and hard thinking in the cities themselves. Nevertheless, the Federal Government has played a part and will continue to play a part. We believe its effort would be more efficient if concentrated under a Department of Urban Affairs.

Farming and the Common Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to an article appearing in the Russell Daily News, Russell, Kans., on January 11, 1962, entitled "Farming and the Common Market," as follows:

FARMING AND THE COMMON MARKET

Trade ties with Western Europe and Latin America were brought to Kansas wheat and livestock producers last night by statesman Alf M. Landon. Speaking at Great Bend, Landon urged more Presidential authority in trade agreements.

For a dyed-in-the-wool Republican, Landon's sympathetic remarks toward President Kennedy's need to build a successful administration bordered on the heretical fringe. The former Kansas Governor showed a bread-and-butter connection between trade wars and Kansas farmsteads.

Kennedy must come straight to the matter of massive impact of the booming European Economic Community, Landon said. He is ready to endorse the President's expected request to Congress for new, broad, and sweeping delegation of authority on the matter of trade agreements.

Through this means, the United States may take an offense against steady Communist pressure of economic and political subversion. The European Common Market plan is drawing Europe together in a political as well as economic unit. It is a communion of defense. The United States, working with Europe, could serve as a rallying base for the Western World.

A freedom to negotiate with the Common Market means a sharp break with some of the past traditions and thinking. The European market has six countries, 160 million consumers, Britain will swell the number to 220 million. Similar in almost every respect is the Latin America Free Trade Association. This makes three common markets, European, LAFTA, and Communist. The U.S. choice is to join one of the three—or form its own. A step requiring enlarged Presidential freedom to act.

The effect on farmers will vary according to the product, Landon said. For years, the emphasis has been on quantity production instead of quality. Profitable wheat business in Kansas depends on a market for the grain. There is as much difference in wheat as there is in the gravity of oil. High protein hard wheat is needed. Kansas can raise it—the common markets need it. High quality red meat, another Kansas product, is needed throughout the world, Landon said. The Kansas oil producer has excess capacity.

Russians, too, can compete in these same basic fields.

Barriers to trade and finance must be removed for the long-term benefit. The Kansas farmer, the eastern manufacturer and, in fact, every wage earner and investor in the Nation, must have a unity for assurance of peace.

Cooperative trade agreements pave the way, Landon believes.

Concerning Recall of Reservists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 26, 1962

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, in all of the discussion concerning the recent recall of reservists, I have seen no better explanation of the Army's viewpoint than a letter to an unidentified college dean written by Col. James D. Tanner, which I include in the RECORD:

HEADQUARTERS, SECOND U.S. ARMY,
Fort George G. Meade, Md.,
December 22, 1961.

Dr. ———,
Dean, ——— *University*
———, *Ohio*

DEAR ———: This is in reply to your letter of November—concerning the status of Pfc ———, a ready reservist who was called to active duty as a filler replacement for a Reserve unit at Fort ——— on — November 1961.

The commanding general has asked me to convey his appreciation for your helpful and sympathetic approach to the problems inherent in the callup of our reservists.

I would like briefly to outline the chronology of the ——— case:

* * * * *

As may be noted from the above, this case received continuing attention and review, as have approximtely 2,400 similar requests for delay or deferment which have been received by this headquarters during the past 3 months.

The issue here was whether Pfc. ———, as a senior at ——— University needing 35 semester hours for a degree in ——, should be deferred from his Reserve obligation. I would like to point out that delays in reporting for duty may be granted for not to exceed 90 days, and that we have approved several hundred such cases wherein the reservist's problem involved graduation, birth of children, sale of home, turnover of business, illness in family, harvesting crops, and the like. However, any delay over 90 days is only accomplished by transfer from the Ready to the Standby Reserve, and this has the effect of excusing the Reservist from his obligation entirely, short of all-out war.

For the past several years, draftees, volunteers for the draft, volunteers for the 6-months active duty program and others who had an obligation to the Ready Reserve for a varying period of years after their original tour of active duty, were and are required to be ready for immediate callup. As I attempted to explain in my letter of — December to Pfc.———'s mother, this pool is the Army's primary source of trained, filler replacements for Reserve and National Guard units called to active duty. This explains in law if not in equity, why men who have already had prior service, and only such men, are being ordered back to active duty as fillers; the units which we are filling cannot use untrained draftees and must rely upon the Ready Reserve. And the overwhelming majority of this latter group is made up solely of men with prior service.

During the normal administration of the Ready Reserve pool, we continually screen this group so that they are discharged from their overall obligation at the proper time, or transferred to the Standby Reserve if eligible. The guidance which we have for such transfers includes, for example, cases in which a Ready reservist has four or more bona fide dependents, is engaged in a certified critical occupation, is a graduate student in scientific or technical fields, a college or high school teacher in these fields, or otherwise fits the category for "extreme" personal or community hardship. On and after October 1 of this year, such routine screening officially ceased for personnel who had been alerted for active duty, but we are still authorized to grant delays of up to 3 months and, in extreme cases which meet the peacetime criteria, we are happy to make exceptions and still transfer men to the Standby Reserve. For example, if a Ready reservist was the father of three children but did not notify his Reserve Corps headquarters of this fact in spite of the forms which are mailed annually to him, we would still revoke his orders and not require him to serve if he so requested on the grounds of hardship. On the other hand, it is possible that such a reservist might be well off financially, in which case there would be no extreme hardship and he would be required to carry out his legal obligation to serve.

As an educator, I know that you are interested in what appears to be a paradox between the Selective Service and the Reserve Forces Acts. This occurs when student A (who has never served in the Army because he has not yet been drafted), is temporarily immune from call-up as a "1-D registrant" while student B, who has served anywhere from 6 months to 3 years, is subject to recall because of his Ready Reserve obligation. The public as a whole seems not to understand this point, and neither do all Members of the Congress. In one student case we received a telegram from a Congressman saying, in part, that it was "inconceivable" that we would require a reservist to serve again before he finished college. Nevertheless, it is the law.

We attempt to turn away wrath with soft answers, but I am often tempted to ask some reservists what would happen to their wives and families, their homes, cars and savings, their college degrees and their freedoms if the Communists ever took over. As the President aptly stated, "now is the time to ask what you can do for your country," and only yesterday the Acting Secretary of Defense emphasized that the current build-up is being made to prevent a war, not to fight one. Under these circumstances, a temporary separation from families, the interruption of schooling or the disruption of a business or professional career, although certainly hardships, would appear well worth the price if the price prevents war. Also, the rights and benefits of the Soldiers and Sailors Civil Relief Act, free medical attention and many other benefits are available to recalled reservists.

Although we appreciate your observation that the Army is receiving some unfavorable publicity during the current recall program, I think you will agree that most of it stems from a general misunderstanding of the Ready Reserve and its obligation. Short of a shooting war, which is just what the Government is attempting to prevent, we fully recognize the difficulty of defending some individual cases. For example, I have personal knowledge of two Ph. D.'s in our Army area, both of whom have been called up in their Reserve grades of private first class. One of them is a professor of English in a Virginia college, and the press has given considerable publicity to his case. However, in spite of the vital importance of education and a general shortage of teachers, can we conclude that the recall of either of these gentlemen for 12 months or less will, per se, result in extreme personal or community hardship?

The crux of the matter is simply this: if the so-called Ready Reserve consisted of unmarried, unemployed, healthy, debtless, degreeless, and doughty young minutemen, there would be no problem about calling them up. But in the long run, where would we be if our typical Reservist was not married and raising a family, going to school, buying a home, car, TV, and furniture, trying to get ahead in the world, teaching the arts and social sciences, or doing all of the things that we know he is doing? Yet when he is called upon to undergo what in most cases is admittedly a hardship to him, plus a diminution of income and an abrupt sociological change, it is little wonder that he writes to his Congressman, saying, "Let George do it."

We are still trying to find George.

Please excuse my lengthy rambling, but your letters were deserving of full consideration. I only hope that my reply has clarified the situation from our viewpoint to some extent. The problem is nationwide, and while you and I will not solve it, a better understanding will go a long way toward achieving acceptance by the public of the need for a strong defense posture at any price. We need not dwell upon the alternatives.

Sincerely,

JAMES D. TANNER,
Colonel, AGC, Adjutant General.

Pierre Has a Lesson To Learn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, Pierre Salinger is going to Moscow to see how he can win the Moscovites over to capitalism. Mr. Suslov, the other

day, told the world that this is impossible.

The New York Daily News, in its editorial of February 6, in its usual, hard-hitting language, comments on the misunderstanding of communism by this administration. The editorial follows:

SUSLOV LAYS IT ON THE LINE

Mikhail A. Suslov, a big banana in the Kremlin mob, has shot a valuable dash of cold water into the current chatter about peaceful coexistence between communism and capitalism.

A shooting war should be avoided, Suslov told a gathering of Russian educators last Tuesday in a speech made public Sunday. But he added that an ideological struggle between the two systems is unavoidable, and must go on until the last remnants of capitalism are destroyed.

Thus, a leading Communist affirms again, in unmistakable language, the longstanding Red ambition to enslave the entire human race.

Let's hope the Suslov speech was duly noted in all of the world's non-Communist capitals, particularly Washington. The Commies are playing for keeps; you cannot do business with them, any more than you could with Adolf Hitler; and non-Communist statesmen who fail to recognize and act on these truths are gambling with the lives and liberties of their own nations and peoples.

Danger of Far Right Noted by Great Bend Minister

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to an article appearing in the Great Bend Daily Tribune, Great Bend, Kans., on January 16, 1962, entitled "Danger of Far Right Noted by Great Bend Minister" as follows:

DANGER OF FAR RIGHT NOTED BY GREAT BEND MINISTER

The John Birch Society and other rightist groups got a slap from a member of Great Bend's clergy Sunday which accompanied a warning that the groups' philosophies are engendered by leaders who have "a demon phobia that borders on mental illness."

Rev. John Gorsuch, vicar of St. John's Episcopal Church, spoke out against the groups during his regular sermon Sunday.

"Many people today find rightism attractive," Gorsuch noted, "but will have no idea how dangerous it is unless danger signals are raised by responsible community and religious leaders." He also stated the church has a responsibility to speak out against such groups because, "the philosophy of these groups is anti-Christian and antidemocracy." "Also," he added, "many clergymen have been irresponsibly attacked by them."

He continued, "* * * the rightists here are very close to fascism and offer extreme messianic nationalism as the solution to America's problems as Hitler offered it to his countrymen. True, they feed on frustration and discontent as did the Nazis. Nevertheless I doubt that we will swallow the right-wing line. We have always had a right-wing fringe group just as we've had extremists on the left.

"What I wish to stress, then, is that in our preoccupation these past years with the very real threat from the left—from communism—we have been blind to the growing danger from the right. We all agree we must be vigilant against communism. But it is not the only place from which danger comes. Right-wingers who carry the word "America" so heavily upon their tongues are just as likely to subvert the true spirit of America as are the Communists who extol Russia.

"First, the rightists are frustrated folk who appeal to other frustrated folk. They don't like the world we live in * * * the world that has no easy solutions, that demands so much with so little hope of immediate resolution, that saps so much of our patience and piece of mind. From international tension and fear to the tremendous transformations going on at home in such things as the long delayed emancipation of the Negro, America is being pushed and pulled in all directions, not all of them comfortable. The rightists are those who want to stop the clock or to turn its hands back to an earlier, easier time when things seemed to be less confusing and more subject to man's control.

"Second, the rightists have little ability to approach the problems of the world with much understanding of its complexities. For them life seems to be black or white. As Senator THOMAS DODD said when he addressed a huge rally in the Hollywood Bowl, 'The only alternative to total defeat in the struggle with communism is total victory'. This 'either, or' approach leaves out all rational middle courses of action.

"Third, they have a demon phobia. In this case the demon is communism and the demon is found nearly everywhere. It is practically omnipotent as well as omnipresent if you believe what they say. It has permeated the faculties of our colleges and it is in the editorial offices of our important newspapers. It has infiltrated the leadership of the labor unions and has considerable control over the National Council of Churches. Indeed this sermon to them would undoubtedly be Communist inspired. If you're not for them you're against them.

"T. Coleman Andrews, one of the most vehement of the rightists, called the New York Times 'the uptown Daily Worker.' The Justices of the Supreme Court have been called Communist by other rightists for their decision on segregation. Robert Welch, leader of the John Birch Society, has stated that 'Dwight Eisenhower is a dedicated, conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy.' He has also said that 'Communist influences are now in almost complete control of our Federal Government.' These people have a demon phobia that borders on mental illness.

"And fourth, the rightists distrust democracy. As Alan Barth puts it, 'The rightists never regard themselves as gullible or suspectible to Communist subversion; but they appear to be convinced that all their countrymen are outright simpletons ripe for a shift of loyalty at any moment from the Capitol to the Kremlin.' The interesting thing is that these people have actually adopted tactics that border on communism itself in their belief they are combating it. According to Welch, the John Birch Society is to operate under completely authoritative control at all levels. And with the ominous implication he might at some future time be willing to overthrow our Government by force, he asserted that the society of the future can not rely on 'Politicians, political leadership, or even political action.' This is about as antidemocratic as you can get. If it isn't fascism I don't know what is. It is totalitarianism on the right comparable to Soviet totalitarianism.

"Whether rightism is going to become a serious danger is beyond my ability to predict. I think the vast majority of Americans will reject it as the demagoguery it is. No doubt the rightists would like to capture control of the Republican Party. Their darling at the moment is BARRY GOLDWATER but the Senator is soon going to have to choose between their support and the support of the real Republicans who aren't going to forsake their traditions of responsible conservatism for a forlorn sort of fascism. I trust and hope Mr. GOLDWATER and his friends will reject them. I think the Nation as a whole will."

Congress and CIA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, since 1953 I have during each Congress introduced a resolution to create a Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence Matters. All of the arguments which I have advanced in the past retain their validity.

In this morning's New York Times there was printed an editorial entitled "Congress and CIA," which read as follows:

CONGRESS AND CIA

The Central Intelligence Agency, under its new Director, John A. McCone, is opening a fresh chapter. Though without prior experience in the intelligence community, Mr. McCone is an able administrator. He has already made changes in personnel and methods which are hopeful, and others are impending.

But the Central Intelligence Agency cannot live by itself. It is not a policy-formulating agency. It must provide many of the facts upon which policy is built. Its secret operations can influence policy; and it requires, as do all executive agencies, the close supervision of Congress.

For a variety of reasons the CIA has not had that supervision in the past. The system of division of powers upon which our Constitution was founded must not be eliminated, or minimized, in the name of secrecy. And secrecy does not preclude effective congressional control.

Today the CIA is monitored by four subcommittees of the Armed Services and Appropriation Committee of House and Senate. Cuba alone would appear to offer ample evidence that these divided committees do not exercise adequate supervision. What is clearly needed, as we have said many times, is establishment of a Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence, a "watchdog" committee similar to the one on atomic energy. Such a committee, continuously functioning, thoroughly informed, scrupulously discreet, could be the CIA's "conscience," its legislative monitor.

If war is too important in the atomic age to be left to the generals, secret intelligence is certainly too important to be left entirely to its own devices.

Mr. Speaker, over the years the Times has supported this legislation and I am, of course, delighted that they continue to do so. Early last year after a similar editorial appeared, I had occasion to write the following letter to the Times:

APRIL 26, 1961.

Mr. CHARLES MERZ,
The New York Times,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. MERZ: I read with interest the editorial in this morning's New York Times

entitled "Reappraising the CIA." In it, the writer clearly creates the impression that my distinguished colleague, Senator MANSFIELD, was the sponsor and original author of the resolution which would establish a Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence Matters. Humbly I submit the true historical background on this resolution.

Late in 1950, while serving on the committee which was responsible for the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 (Battle Act), I came to realize the tremendous lack of knowledge, on the part of the Congress, of intelligence matters. After 2 years of periodic consultations with Members of the House of Representatives and legal counsel, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 168 in the 83d Congress (July 23, 1953). This resolution provided for the establishment of a Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence Matters. While I endeavored to convince many other Members of the House to cosponsor my resolution, my success was limited to my colleague, Mr. ZABLOCKI (H. Con. Res. 169, 83d Cong.) and Mr. JUDD (H. Con. Res. 170, 83d Cong.).

In 1955, Senator MANSFIELD introduced a similar resolution in the other body (S. Con. Res. 2, 84th Cong.). During the 2d session of the 84th Congress, this resolution was reported in the Senate but did not pass because of certain weaknesses in that version of my resolution.

I endeavored, along with Mr. ZABLOCKI, to have this resolution reported from the House Rules Committee in the 84th, 85th, 86th and 87th Congresses. In March of this year, I appeared before the Committee on Rules and gave testimony in support of my resolution. Members of the House Committee on Armed Services appeared in opposition and testified that a Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services was and had been reviewing CIA activities. The committee did not report my resolution but, recognizing the importance of the matter, did not table the resolution. The matter is still before the committee and considerable sentiment for favorable action has developed. A report of the proceedings before the Committee on Rules by C. P. Trussell appeared in the New York Times on March 5, 1961, at page 56.

Although I have never been a person who seeks excessive publicity, I believe that credit should be given where credit is due. I enclose herewith copies of House Concurrent Resolution 168, 83d Congress; a letter which I addressed to the Speaker of the House on January 20, 1954; Mr. Trussell's article of March 5, 1961; and a copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, 84th Congress.

Sincerely yours,

Honesty Is Still Our Best Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, while attending mass at my community church in Brooklyn, St. Joseph Patron Roman Catholic Church, I learned of an interesting incident which may prove to be a most effective method of promoting good will and better understanding between the people of our country and those of other countries.

The incident is merely a simple act of honesty, but by this act of honesty my fellow parishioner and church usher had won many friends for us in Mexico. His name is Mr. Patty Mangiaracina, whom I have known for many years and who has demonstrated honesty all his life. Briefly, the story is as follows:

Several months ago, the wife of a high Mexican official, the Honorable Hugo B. Margain, Under Secretary of Industry and Commerce, lost a bag in New York during a visit there. She was not sure whether she had lost it at the hotel, at Pennsylvania Station, or in a taxi. She wrote to the hotel management and to station officials, but the bag had not been found. In the meantime, Mr. Mangiaracina had found the bag and turned it over to the New York Police Department. Early in January, Mrs. Margain in Mexico received a letter from the New York Police Department stating that a bag had been turned in which could be hers and would she identify it. The bag was identified and subsequently returned to Mrs. Margain in Mexico.

Last week Mr. Mangiaracina received a letter of thanks from the Mexican Under Secretary of Industry and Commerce in which he expresses "deepest gratitude for your wonderful sense of honesty" and also his appreciation for "all the trouble you and the police department took in order to recover the bag." Mr. Margain forwarded through the New York office of the Banco Nacional de Mexico a Mexican gold coin as a souvenir from his wife to Mrs. Mangiaracina.

Mr. Speaker, courtesies and acts of this kind are very often more meaningful and beneficial than aid programs and similar efforts. I have not only extended my personal best wishes and congratulations to Mr. Mangiaracina, but I am also writing to Police Commissioner Michael J. Murphy, of New York, to congratulate him and the fine men of his police department for a job well done. A little incident like this is worth tons of speeches.

It is of paramount importance for the good will and prestige of our country that we impress upon Americans traveling abroad how urgent it is for them to be on their best behavior. It is similarly important that we extend the best treatment and friendliness to foreigners visiting our country. This could go a long way toward strengthening the ties of the United States with those of other nations in cementing lasting friendship with them and strong support for us in our endeavors to attain security of the free world.

Publisher Exposes Arrogant Violations of the United Nations Charter by the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is unbelievable that we in the United States would contribute to our own distruction and to lend aid and assistance to the destroyers of our Nation. Yet, that is exactly what we are doing by continuing our membership in the United Nations so long as the lofty purposes of that organization have been subverted by the Communists and its deliberations turned into a forum for vicious propaganda designed to defeat the United States in Russia's mad conquest for world domination. How openly the Kremlin operates, how arrogant their disregard of the civlized rules of conduct among nations is exposed in the following article by Alice Widener which appeared in the Tuesday issue of the Washington Daily News.

HIRING YOUR OWN MURDERER

(By Alice Widener)

NEW YORK.—Georgi P. Arkadyev, Under Secretary for Security Council Affairs in the U.N. Secretariat, has violated article 100 of the Charter, and under U.N. staff rules should be summarily dismissed from his U.N. post by Secretary-General U Thant.

The infraction took place at the January 30 meeting of the U.N. Security Council.

Chapter XV, article 1 of the U.N. Charter, states that "the Secretary-General and the staff (the secretariat) * * * shall refrain from any action which might reflect on their position as international officials responsible only to the organization."

Yet on the day mentioned above, Undersecretary Arkadyev discarded impartiality and passed notes guiding procedural parliamentary action to his own countryman, Soviet delegate Valerian A. Zorin.

To understand the gravity of this it is necessary to know the difference between a member of the U.N. Secretariat and a U.N. delegate. All U.N. delegates are diplomats representing only their countries' interests.

But Undersecretary Georgi P. Arkadyev is a Soviet member of the U.N. Secretariat. His salary is paid out of the regular U.N. administrative budget. All member states pay an assessed share of his salary. As a Secretariat employee, Arkadyev is legally bound under the U.N. Charter to work as "an international civil servant neither seeking nor receiving instructions from any government in the performance of his duties."

The record shows that, in actual practice, Communist members of the Secretariat never have fulfilled their obligations as international civil servants. Communists give allegiance only to the Communist Party acting under Soviet direction.

Communist and Soviet officials of the U.N. never have made any serious pretense of doing anything but working on the Soviet Union's behalf. This is why, from time to time, some Soviet members of the U.N. Secretariat are caught red-handed in espionage against the United States.

At the January 30 meeting, however, the Soviet practice of ignoring allegiance to the international organization was overt. Arkadyev's violation of impartiality as an adviser on parliamentary procedure was plain to the delegates. It was also plain to the press, whose reporters saw him pass five notes in Russian to Delegate Valerian A. Zorin.

Thomas J. Hamilton, New York Times correspondent at the U.N., reported that a Western delegate said he was able to make out the number "9" on one of Arkadyev's notes. A few minutes later Zorin invoked rule 9 of the Security Council's procedural rules.

A little later, the Western delegate saw that another of Arkadyev's notes contained the number "30." Shortly thereafter, Zorin invoked rule 30.

Today a member of the U.N. Secretariat told me, "I was there and saw what happened. It was absolutely scandalous. In my opinion it was done deliberately. The

Soviets always have opposed the idea of an international civil service ever since the U.N. Preparatory Commission's sessions in London during 1945–46. Since then, the Communists pretended, if it suited a specific purpose, to abide by the charter provisions concerning the Secretariat. Today, they openly flout them. Furthermore, they influence other staff members from the newly independent nations to do likewise. The Secretariat is becoming a playground for nationalist intrigue. If Arkadyev gets away with his flagrant violation, there will be more such infringements."

Only Secretary-General U Thant has the executive power to dismiss Arkadyev. Should he decide to condone Arkadyev's outrageous conduct, the Secretary-General himself will set the precedent for undermining the legal U.N. parliamentary structure. When it breaks down, there will be anarchy at U.N. meetings.

Times Change, but Fundamental Principles of Liberty Do Not

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the following column written by Dorothy Roe which appeared in the Chicago Herald American deserves the attention of every citizen. I hope that my colleagues in the House of Representatives will read and evaluate the thought which is embraced in it:

WHY MUST WE REGULATE PATRIOTISM?

(By Dorothy Roe)

As an American, I would like our President to define just what degree of patriotism is now considered proper.

When are you a "superpatriot," a "subpatriot," or a traitor? What are the symptoms of "extreme patriotism," which he condemns, and how does one go about being just a fair-to-middling patriot, which seems to be the currently approved attitude?

How can a national hero of the stature of former President Eisenhower soberly warn the country against "super patriots"? What goes on here, anyway?

Being a somewhat old-fashioned type, I was raised in the belief that patriotism is a fine thing, and that it was not only admirable but expected that any citizen should be ready to give his life for his country.

Now it appears from the public pronouncements of our leaders that it's just as bad to be too patriotic as it is to be too treasonable.

If we accept this strange new reasoning, we must conclude that it is all right to be mildly patriotic or mildly traitorous, just so we carry no belief to extremes.

This halfhearted doctrine actually is being preached with a straight face as the new American ideal for our children to follow. If edited by today's pundits, Patrick Henry's famous cry, "Give me liberty or give me death!" would have come out something like this: "Give me liberty if convenient, but please don't think I'm opposed to slavery."

George Washington, following the current line, might have counseled his troops at Valley Forge thus:

"Courage, men, but not too much! Win if you can, but don't offend the enemy."

I must admit that I am bemused, bothered, and bewildered by a national policy which apparently recommends that we be just a little patriotic around the edges, but ready to retreat hurriedly if criticized.

I have been laboring under the belief that America was founded by passionate patriots, and that every great advance in the history of mankind was accomplished only by complete dedication to an ideal.

Just how would a football team fare if the coach said: "Get out there and fight, boys, but don't let anyone know which side you're on!"

Somehow I can't believe that either President Kennedy or ex-President Eisenhower can be serious when they warn Americans not to be too patriotic. Perhaps each was maneuvered into statements he did not really mean. But if such men can be tricked into words that belie the fundamental principles of liberty, who can be expected to stand firm?

Personally, I believe the integrity and common sense of the American people will prove the ultimate bulwark against such muddled policies.

New York Journal-American's Crusade Against Dope Addiction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the New York Journal-American has been carrying on a crusade in recent weeks against dope peddling with the primary purpose of saving our youth from drug addiction. This is a matter of great concern to many of us in New York City, particularly those of us who are parents and fear that our children may fall prey to evil influences.

The New York Journal-American deserves to be congratulated for undertaking this crusade, which should have the support of all citizens. In fact, the public is taking cognizance of this effort to stamp out addiction among our youth. Only a few days ago, the Journal-American reported that a citizens committee of 500 against teenage dope addiction has been organized under the leadership of Kings County Judge Hyman Barshay and Assemblyman Stanley Steingut.

I am today writing to Judge Barshay and to Assemblyman Steingut offering my support and at the same time asking them to support my bill, H.R. 616, to provide grants-in-aid to the States for the treatment of narcotic addicts in closed institutions.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of an editorial from the New York Journal-American of February 5, 1962, entitled "Public Aroused," and also the text of my letter to Judge Barshay and Assemblyman Steingut:

PUBLIC AROUSED

The Journal-American's crusade to save our teenagers from the dangers of narcotics addiction is really getting through to the people.

This was demonstrated again today with the announcement of the formation of a Citizens Committee of 500 Against Teenage Dope Addiction.

Kings County Judge Hyman Barshay and Assemblyman Stanley Steingut head this massive effort to stamp out the dope traffic. They have enlisted an impressive array of public officials, lawyers, medical men, and clergy of all faiths in a drive for a double objective:

A statewide medical program aimed at the cure and rehabilitation of addicts.

Stiffer penalties for dope pushers, especially the evil men who supply narcotics to minors illegally.

It is gratifying indeed to have such distinguished citizens solidly lining up behind a program that parallels the recommendations of our own blueprint for action.

It also is gratifying to have Judge Barshay give the Journal-American's crusade full credit for "providing the impetus for this project." It was to arouse good citizens to the need for action against the dope traffic that we embarked on this crusade a month ago.

We commend Judge Barshay and Assemblyman Steingut for their plan to enlist the aid of the medical societies and legal and civic groups in obtaining a maximum security narcotics hospital for New York City and a program of aftercare for addicts.

We are glad to see that the committee's program for aftercare centers around a key recommendation in our blueprint. This is a system of health camps, where youthful dope users after treatment in a hospital could be quarantined away from the influences that led to their addiction and receive vocational training and guidance.

If you would like to enlist in this crusade, write to Assemblyman Stanley Steingut, State Assembly, Albany 1, N.Y., or Judge Hyman Barshay, Criminal Courts Building, 120 Schermerhorn Street, Brooklyn 1, N.Y.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 7, 1962.

Hon. HYMAN BARSHAY,
County Court Judge,
Brooklyn, N.Y.

DEAR "HY": I want to congratulate you for following up, by concrete action, the graphic exposé of drug addiction and its effects on our society initiated recently by the New York Journal-American. I am very pleased to offer you my assistance in Congress in every way possible.

Dope peddling and drug addiction is as much a Federal problem as it is a New York State and city problem. Were it not for the evil peddlers of dope, many of our young people today would be healthy and productive citizens and New York would not have the dubious honor of having the largest number of addicts in the country.

I have been aware of this situation for a number of years and have done all in my power to try to stamp out this evil. It is for this very reason, and with the support of Commissioner Harry J. Anslinger, Chief of the U.S. Bureau of Narcotics, that I introduced my bill, H.R. 616, to provide grants-in-aid to the States for the treatment of narcotic addicts in closed institutions. This bill is now pending before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

The purpose of my bill is to pay half of the cost per bed patient for the treatment of addicts in institutions maintained by the States. With financial assistance from the Federal Government, States having a difficult narcotic problem will be able to provide for a drug treatment program under which the addict is committed through a State civil action to remain under treatment until released by competent medical authority.

This is compulsory confinement in a drug-free atmosphere, but it is the only logical way to deal with this situation and it is supported by the Bureau of Narcotics and many organizations. We must recognize that the drug addict is a sick person and we must

treat him as such. Under the circumstances, I would, therefore, like to propose three things for your Committee of 500:

1. For as many people as possible to write letters to Chairman OREN HARRIS, Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, House of Representatives, Washington 25, D.C., as well as to all members of that committee, urging that my bill, H.R. 616, be reported out favorably as soon as possible.

2. To have a resolution passed by the New York State Legislature memorializing Congress to take immediate action on my bill.

3. Write a letter to every Member of Congress from New York State requesting that they give their support to the bill.

You may be assured of my personal efforts in all your endeavors.

Sincerely yours,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Member of Congress.

Veterans of Foreign Wars Sponsors Voice of Democracy Contests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the leaders and members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars are to be commended on their laudatory efforts to promote the Nation's democratic ideals through their annual voice of democracy contest.

Yesterday I was a guest of the VFW at their annual dinner honoring Members of Congress who have served in the Armed Forces. At this event the winners of 50 State and District of Columbia voice of America contests were present. The main attraction centered around the address which was delivered by the national winner of the VFW's 15th annual voice of democracy contest, Miss Janice Marie Woelfle, of Lincoln, Nebr.

Miss Woelfle's remarks exhibited keen and sophisticated insight into the essence of our democratic way of life. She received a standing ovation for her able presentation. The 17-year-old Miss Woelfle plans to attend the University of Nebraska next year and pursue her studies in the field of English and drama. There can be no doubt that she and her 50 colleagues, who were present at last night's meeting, will be strong spokesmen for the democratic way of life in their future communities.

It was my privilege and honor to be present at this event. My personal hosts for the evening were dedicated leaders of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of Berks County, Pa. They were Orlando J. Cozzone and Stanley Lecatsas of Lower Alsace Memorial Post, Mr. William A. Moyer, Jr., of Wernersville, Pa., Post, and Mr. William Eisenbise, Greater Reading Post.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, for the privilege of including with my remarks the address delivered by Miss Woelfle at last evening's event:

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

(By Janice Woelfle)

[1] Three Americans were out sightseeing in a Soviet city 2 years ago. One was Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, the second was a U.S. Army officer, and the third a Russian-speaking official of the U.S. Embassy. It was a unique day for them. In their tour of the U.S.S.R., they'd managed for once to shake off their Kremlin-appointed guide.

As they walked down the street, a young man suddenly accosted them. He was about 30 years old, quite well-dressed for a Russian, with the look of a professional person.

"Are you Englishmen?" the young man said in Russian.

The Embassy man replied. "No, we're Americans."

"Americans. That's even better," the young man said excitedly. "I've wanted so long to talk to an American."

"Why?" the Embassy man asked.

"Because you Americans are such lucky people. You can read what you want, hear what you want, say what you want. We can't."

The young man peered nervously over his shoulder to see if anyone were listening. He knew he was risking his life to speak like that. "Always remember," he went on, "they aren't fooling us about you Americans. We want this to be your kind of world." Then he walked away. Fast.

This incident, experienced and related by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, is typical of the effect democracy has on the people of the world; and it is so true. We are lucky.

Because of democracy, we can go to a public library and select any book from the "Iliad" or the "Odyessey," to "Alice in Wonderland." We can listen to the "Classical Hour," the "Top Fifty Tunes," "Back to the Bible Broadcast," or political panels on our radios without fear of being found and punished. We, young and old alike, have the unequaled privilege of casting our vote for class officers, school cheerleaders, or the President of the United States.

I am 17 years old and a senior in high school. Next year, I plan to go on to college and eventually I hope to become a teacher. I have been free to make my vocational and college choice. My family attends church together each Sunday, and we are free to choose our own church. Every year we take a vacation and are free to enjoy the tumbled splendor of the Rockies, the wild coast of Maine, or the warm, sunny beaches of California without having to apply for a passport or ask for permission.

My father is president of his local electrical union where they are free to bargain for higher wages or improved working conditions. I can choose between a movie or a football game; my family can purchase all types of clothes from Bermuda shorts to the most beautiful of formals.

Freedom of press, freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of choice, the right to vote—all freedoms are made possible only through democracy.

Yes, democracy is voting in November, going to the church of our choice, speaking for what we feel is right, and being able to decide what we will read, see, hear, and do. But it is more than this. It is also the shout of a crowd as their team makes the final touchdown; it's the glow in the eyes of a little girl as she sits on Santa's knee; it's the joy on a 3-year-old's face as he pretends that he's a boat in a mud puddle. It is the tender look on a mother's face as she gazes at her new-born child. She knows his future is insured because he was born in a free, democratic country.

Countless times throughout our history we have defended our rights and the rights of other people to be free, but the job is far from done. To further protect and insure the future of every baby, now and yet to come, we must continuously speak for democracy. Yes, we must act for democracy. For only through our democratic processes come the guarantees of rights, liberty, and freedom. Our freedom is a give-and-take process, a mutual agreement among Americans to "pursue happiness" as long as it doesn't infringe on the rights of others.

Yes, our country is a great country and it presents a great hope to the Communist-held world.

"Always remember," the young Russian continued, "they aren't fooling us about you Americans. We want this to be your kind of world."

Freedom is our heritage. Freedom is our opportunity. Freedom is our job.

[1] "The Man in the Street." An experience of Senator JACKSON's as written in the book, "The Day I Was Proudest to be an American" edited by Donald Robinson.

Eau Claire, Wis., Is Milk City, U.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Don Macrae, who is manager of the Hotel Eau Claire in the heart of America's dairyland, is taking positive steps to combat the alarming decline in the consumption of milk in this country. Taking his cue from President Kennedy's instructions that milk be served at every White House meal from now on, Mr. Macrae has adopted a policy of providing free milk with all food served in the Hotel Eau Claire's dining room and coffeeshop. Other plans call for promoting milk breaks instead of coffee breaks and for setting up a portable milk bar for use during the hotel's many conventions.

This drink-more-milk campaign is being launched this weekend with the serving of free milk and the distribution of free butter in the lobby of the Hotel Eau Claire. Appropriately enough, Wisconsin's Alice in Dairyland will be on hand to greet visitors.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD a story from the Eau Claire Leader, Eau Claire, Wis., which details Mr. Macrae's praiseworthy efforts in the interest of better nutrition and in behalf of the dairy industry.

HOTELMAN GIVES FREE MILK WITH FOOD

Free milk with all food served at Eau Claire's main convention headquarters is the policy adopted Saturday by Don Macrae, manager of the Hotel Eau Claire.

"We're going to make Eau Claire 'Milk City, U.S.A.,'" Macrae said as he unfolded his plans to get behind the dairy industry and to do something about the recent decline in the use of milk.

"We in Wisconsin depend upon our dairy industry," Macrae declared. "It's high time we started realizing that and doing something about it.

"People are talking about the decline in the use of milk—well, let's stop talking about it and start doing something."

Macrae's plan is borrowed from President Kennedy. It calls for serving free milk in the hotel and, he has hopes, in other business places in the city.

President Kennedy has directed that milk be served at every White House meal from now on. Macrae has directed that milk be served at every hotel meal from now on.

Macrae, whose Hotel Eau Claire was headquarters for nearly 60 conventions last year, figures the hotel will serve about 350,000 meals in 1962.

"I don't know what it will cost the President to serve milk with every meal in the White House," Macrae said today, "but I've got a pretty good idea what it will cost the hotel.

He declined to name a figure.

After a trial run on free milk with all food, expected to start next week, Macrae said he hopes to set up a portable milk bar which will be available for conventions and meetings.

He also outlined plans to promote milk breaks—instead of coffee breaks—and to promote the free milk program to other business places in the city.

President Kennedy told a national dairy and nutrition conference last week that he regards the recent decline in the use of milk as a very serious matter.

The downturn in consumption is serious not only to agriculture and dairy farmers, but for the country as a whole, the President said, and added:

"It implies poor nutrition."

The President capped his talk by citing health authorities who have made it "abundantly clear" there is no danger in milk, and by drinking a glass of milk before a nationwide television audience.

"If the President can do something, then we ought to be able to do something here in Wisconsin," Macrae said.

"Eau Claire is the heart of America's dairyland and there's no better place to start than right here * * * and now."

Establishing Industrial Development Machinery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following speech by Mr. Howard W. Campen, county executive, Santa Clara County, Calif. Mr. Campen is an able administrator whose success can be measured not only by this presentation, but by the results of his action. Santa Clara County is a growing industrial center. It is an actual example of a plan for progress which has been accomplished most effectively at the local level. The following speech given by Mr. Campen at the midyear meeting of the National Association of County Officials, western regional district, contains many concise suggestions which could be most helpful to those areas throughout the United States desirous of attracting industry.

The speech follows:

ESTABLISHING INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT MACHINERY

(Address by Howard W. Campen, County executive, county of Santa Clara, Calif., before the National Association of County Officials, Phoenix, Ariz., January 26, 1962)

Inducing industry to locate within your community is, in the final analysis, a selling job. Before you can sell, however, there are some basic things you should consider before you hit the road with your briefcase in hand.

I think all of us will agree that a salesman, no matter how frequently he may ring the doorbell, won't make a sale if he doesn't know his product from A to Z.

Our product in this case is our community. How well do we really know it—its many facets, complexities, and interrelationships?

Let us consider for a moment some of the basic things which we should give attention to before we consider the practical aspects of developing industrial machinery. Some of these comments may to you seem repetitious of that which preceding speakers have mentioned, but they are, in my mind, of the utmost importance because without a firm objective evaluation of your own local situation, you cannot bring about sound industrial development in your community. Hence, as phase 1 of this situation, it is my suggestion that you undertake an economic analysis of your county to thoroughly investigate and determine your facilities and potentials, to ascertain what you have, what you need, what you should do in an attempt to adequately provide for the present and future industrial requirements, and particularly to insure desirable industrial diversification and community stability in the prosecution of a continued sound industrial development program.

Any inquiry into a community's economic health logically begins with a look at its people—who they are, how they are making their living, and what they are doing with their resources. Great stores of facts about these matters have been gathered by the Census Bureau and other divisions of the Federal Government, as well as by many State agencies. Many vital facts are obtainable from local sources, along with the thoughtful opinions of leaders of industry, agriculture, labor, and public affairs. It is the business of a survey not only to gather these facts and opinions, but to analyze them and draw conclusions from them—conclusions upon which recommendations for constructive and cooperative action can be based.

The facts about people, their numbers, ages, and rate of increase are of primary importance because population determines the size and skills of the working force, the need for land, for housing, and for all public facilities, the local market for all kinds of goods and services, and the weight of the community's influence in many of the affairs of the State and Nation.

In addition to looking at and studying the population trends, it is most important to analyze the types of employment within your county. What are the people of your county doing? Are they engaged in agriculture, construction, manufacturing, transportation and communication facilities, general trade, services, which might include banking and the professions, or government services? The number of jobs in any one month of any year doesn't tell the whole employment story. It's essential that we know how steady the jobs are. In the various areas of employment, which I have just mentioned, are there general seasonal fluctuations, or is the employment picture one of general stability?

While looking at the employment picture, we must necessarily look at the unemployment picture. If, because of your particular economy, let us say it happens to be agricultural and food processing, you may find a high seasonal employment and, as a result, a large volume of unemployment which is measured by payment of unemployment insurance benefits. Thus, you can correlate your population experience and projections with employment and unemployment experience and projections, and draw some rational conclusions as to population increase to be anticipated and, correspondingly, the number of jobs which must be found as the population increases.

A mere number of jobs in the county does not provide a picture of the county's prosperity, unless we know something about the income those jobs provide—how much is received from investments as well as direct employment. What is the nature of the relationships between labor and management in your community? Have there been numerous work stoppages in recent years? If so, you must immediately interest yourselves in this situation and seek, through your leadership as elected officials, reasonable solutions of a lasting nature. Stable labor conditions indicate sound community values and relationships.

Having noted the principal facts of population, employment, and incomes, the next things to consider are the physical surroundings and public facilities which affect the community's prospects of developing industrial growth.

First of all, is your county's location such that it shares, to a large extent, in a larger areawide economic pattern? Do you look to other more central areas for many types of your services, goods, and facilities, or is your situation such that you might very well be termed an independent or a detached center of economic activity? Do you have a more distinct identity in your whole pattern of living, more freedom of action, and more home-centered interests in attacking your economic and other problems?

Secondly, what are the local geographic facts? What is the extent of occupancy of your land area? How is it occupied? Within the territorial limits of your county, your future development must be worked out. The uses of the land can be changed or intensified.

Again, you should look at the extent of your civic housekeeping. Are you in need of civic improvements? Adequate city and county services, with everything that is implied by the term "good government," are of great importance to the industrialist or merchant considering a new location. Efficient local government rates high on the list of a community's advantages, while unfavorable conditions in public affairs are often decisive in causing plants, stores, and service establishments to locate elsewhere.

Just how adequate are your local services, your water, power, highways, schools, cultural and recreational facilities, hospitals, libraries, churches?

Now that we have completed the inventory of our resources, have made honest, objective analysis of our present situation in light of past trends, let's look to the future and discuss how to implement good industrial growth for our community. What are the possibilities for providing in the future the jobs that will be needed to support your county's growing population? Well, we should begin by looking at our present industrial development before exploring the future possibilities. Three questions should be asked about the present industrial picture in your county:

1. Will the plants now established be likely to grow?

2. Will they be relatively secure against the effects of a depression?

3. Are they as widely diversified as they should be in view of local conditions and opportunities?

There are, in general, about 21 major groups of industrial classifications. How

many of these 21 do you have in your county? If, for example, you have 8 or 10 of the 21 major groups, it doesn't follow that the balance should all be established in your county, or that the ones that are already there are developed as fully as they should be. The major industry groups should be broken down into their several components of approximately 500 more specific categories, and then checked against the basic location factors which industrial leaders consider when reviewing proposed locations for new plants. The choice of a location for a new plant is usually made after a thorough study and evaluation of the specific criteria decided upon by a particular project. In most cases there are two sets of criteria—one, primary; the other, supplementary. These primary location factors are:

(1) New and potential markets; (2) reliable and economical sources of raw material; (3) water; (4) reliable and economical sources of fuel; (5) electric power in adequate quantities at economical rates.

The supplementary set of criteria is equally important and includes:

(1) The type, quantity, and quality of labor available; (2) the health, education, religious, cultural, and recreational facilities of the community; (3) taxes; (4) climatology.

The results obtained from this analysis will be useful to you in the first stages of determining whether the industries of your locality are as diversified as they might be.

When you have completed this step, direct your attention to the remaining major industry groups not yet located in your county, and do a realistic appraisal of them as to their appropriateness in your local community. I am sure you will discover that some of these will not fit your local conditions. Hence, no time should be spent to induce industries in these groups to locate in your county.

Thus you are now to the point of reviewing the major industry groups which have distinct possibilities for location in your community, but obviously the mere compiling of a list does not provide a sufficient basis for a practical program of industrial development. Thought must be given to the sources from which new industries may come, and which of these sources will be most promising to cultivate.

There are three sources of new industry for any area:

(1) New branch plants of national or regional companies; (2) New main plant of companies moving into the area; and (3) new plants of companies originating in the area.

By launching your campaign of industrial expansion you should be able to attract new branch plants if carefully concentrated efforts are expended. Somewhat more difficult is the addition of new main plants by removal from other locations. Surprisingly, the development of new industries originating within your community will not be too difficult once you have started your program. Satellite businesses quickly follow nationally recognized industries when new main plant locations are accomplished.

The continuing growth of the West will cause many manufacturers, particularly those seeking new and potential markets, to pull stakes in other parts of the country and head for the West. To gain one or more of them for your county is a selling job, as it is up to you to make them aware of the advantages of locating in your community.

How is it then possible for you to achieve these goals and by what means? In my opinion, this requires extremely well-coordinated and cooperative action of the citizenry in your community. This is a job that cannot be done singly by civic, political, labor, or industrial leaders alone. This is, and must be, a cooperative effort of all groups and organizations.

We have found in my county that this team action is best done through the auspices of our chambers of commerce, and particularly the Greater San Jose Chamber of Commerce which represents the widest varieties of industries. Our board of supervisors makes available to the chambers of commerce tax funds with which to advertise the industrial resources and potentials of Santa Clara County. Please don't get the impression that tax funds are expended willy-nilly. California State laws set forth the requirements by which a county might make tax funds available to chambers of commerce. In addition to these requirements, our board of supervisors has imposed strict limitations on the expenditure of the public funds. We insist that each chamber of commerce enter into a formal contract with the county by which contract the chamber of commerce agrees to do certain things. The results are reviewed and analyzed prior to new budget allocations.

But the important point here is the fact that the implementation, the actual getting of new industry, is left to the business, labor, and civic leaders who are joined together under the auspices of the chambers of commerce. These people not only know why their firms were attracted to our county in the first instance, but their advice and direction in the implementation of our industrial program is of tremendous value.

May I conclude, however, on a cautionary note: Business, labor, and civic leaders of your area cannot be left to go their own devices, because you, as elected leaders, must give not only direction to their course, but subsequent support when industry does locate within your community. Support in the form of proper and progressive planning, land use zoning, subdivision and building ordinances will be required.

Industrial development within your area will, to be sure, present some problems, but you must anticipate them and be prepared to solve them. To do this requires effective and enlightened community leadership and progressive action.

Increased Annuities for Retired Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the plight of many of our retired Federal civil service employees, who find it difficult to make ends meet on their limited pensions or annuities, are well known to many of us in Congress. These are people who have devoted a lifetime of loyal service for our Government and have subsequently retired with the hope of spending the remainder of their lives in economic security in recognition for their service. The high cost of living has made that hope almost impossible of realization.

Since 1955 these Federal retirees have received only one annuity increase of 10 percent. Legislation is pending now before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee to grant them a further increase so that they can cope with the situation. I want to urge Chairman TOM MURRAY and the members of his committee to hold early hearings and to vote out a bill providing increased annuities for the retirees.

Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a resolution adopted recently by Brooklyn Chapter No. 500 of the National Association of Retired Civil Employees, which numbers over 1,200 members, urging that the committee hold early hearings. I am pleased to insert this resolution in the RECORD and specifically call it to the attention of Chairman MURRAY and all members of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. It reads as follows:

BROOKLYN CHAPTER NO. 500, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RETIRED CIVIL EMPLOYEES, BROOKLYN, N.Y.—RESOLUTION

Whereas the National Association of Retired Civil Employees has a comprehensive program for the 87th Congress involving the good and welfare of Federal retirees and survivor annuitants; and

Whereas certain Federal retirees have received only one annuity increase amounting to 10 percent, since 1955; and

Whereas the cost of living and hospital and medical expenses are continually increasing, making it most difficult for retirees to live on small fixed incomes; and

Whereas, many critical items, particularly international, occupied the attention of our Legislators at the 1st session of the 87th Congress, thus preventing consideration being given to legislation concerning Federal retirees; Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of Brooklyn Chapter No. 500 of the National Association of Retired Civil Employees urgently request the Congressmen from the Brooklyn and Long Island areas to exert their best efforts to pursuade the Honorable TOM MURRAY, chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, to arrange for early hearings on retiree legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution to be sent to Chairman Tom Murray, to the Brooklyn and Long Island Congressmen involved, to Senators Jacob J. Javits and Kenneth B. Keating and to Mr. Glenn R. Simcox, president of NARCE.

New Jersey Milk Sanitation Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include correspondence between officials of the State of New Jersey and of the U.S. Public Health Service concerning New Jersey milk sanitation regulations. My State is justly proud of its high public health standards and the secretary of agriculture, the Honorable Phillip Alampi, and the commissioner of health, Dr. Roscoe P. Kandle, were concerned about certain information contained in the statement of the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, on H.R. 50, National Milk Sanitation Act, presented before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on August 30,

1961. They accordingly wrote the Secretary of Agriculture, pointing out that New Jersey standards are equal in every respect to the U.S. Public Health Service standards. Since that part of the Secretary's testimony was prepared by the U.S. Public Health Service at his request, Dr. Kandle and Secretary Alampi's questions were referred to the Division of Environmental Engineering and Food Protection, U.S. Public Health Service. Their letter and the reply made by Mr. John D. Faulkner, chief of the milk and food program of the Division follow:

DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., December 22, 1961.

ROSCOE P. KANDLE, M.D.
State Commissioner of Health, State Department of Health, 129 East Hanover Street, Trenton, N.J.

DEAR DR. KANDLE: This is with further reference to your letter of November 9, 1961, to the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, concerning information on New Jersey milk sanitation regulations contained in attachment No. 1 to the Secretary's statement on H.R. 50, National Milk Sanitation Act, which he presented before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, on August 30, 1961. As pointed out by Mr. Houser in his letter of acknowledgment of December 4, 1961, since the information contained in the attachment was furnished the U.S. Department of Agriculture, upon request, by the Public Health Service, your letter was referred to this office for reply.

It is noted that you take certain exceptions to the comparison, as set forth in the attachment, of the differences between the New Jersey milk sanitation regulations and the requirements set forth in the Milk Ordinance and Code—1953 Recommendations of the Public Health Service. Specifically you have raised questions concerning some of the information presented under the headings, "Dairy Farm Requirements," "Health of Cows," and "Frequency of Inspections and Laboratory Examinations."

As indicated on the first page of attachment No. 1 to Secretary Freeman's statement, the differences between the requirements contained in the Public Health Service Milk Ordinance and Code and the milk sanitation regulations of certain States were condensed from more detailed comparisons made by the Public Health Service in 1960 at the request of the Subcommittee on Health and Safety, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives. This request was made during testimony on H.R. 3840 (86th Cong.) to obtain information on whether those States which had not adopted the Public Health Service Milk Ordinance and Code had higher standards.

In order to make these comparisons, we requested our regional offices to obtain the latest milk sanitation regulations of the States concerned. For New Jersey, the legal provisions contained in chapter 10 "Dairy Products" of the New Jersey Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Laws (revised Dec. 1958), and in "Official Grades for Raw and Pasteurized Milk and Cream" of the New Jersey Department of Agriculture (revised to July 1, 1951), were used as the basis for the comparison. These were the regulations provided the staff of our New York regional office in 1960 by the New Jersey State Department of Health. Since the request of the Subcommittee on Health and Safety was for a comparison of the milk sanitation regulations of certain States with the recommended requirements contained in the PHS Milk Ordinance and Code, only the requirements set forth in the published regulations furnished us by the States were considered. We had no basis for making such comparison on the manner in which milk sanitation measures were, or might be, applied in certain States through administrative policies, interpretations, and procedures. However, whenever we had firm knowledge that a State was actually enforcing a requirement, even though not specified in their regulations, we attempted to indicate this in the detailed comparisons submitted to the Subcommittee on Health and Safety.

We are pleased to be advised that the State of New Jersey, through interpretations and enforcement procedures, does provide more detailed standards relating to dairy farm requirements, proper protection of farm water supplies, and sampling and inspection frequencies. We shall change our records to indicate that such standards are being applied and would appreciate your providing us with copies of the applicable manuals of interpretations and enforcement procedures.

In comparing the milk sanitation regulations of New Jersey relating to herd health requirements on bovine tuberculosis and brucellosis with those contained in the Public Health Service Milk Ordinance and Code, our staff only directed its attention to item 6, Health of Cows, 24:10–15, Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Laws, New Jersey State Department of Health, which does not contain any reference to these diseases. However, we were quite aware that New Jersey does conduct bovine tuberculosis and brucellosis control programs in accordance with the rules and regulations specified by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, compliance with which is also a requirement of the Public Health Service Milk Ordinance and Code. This fact is stated in the condensed comparison contained in attachment No. 1 to Secretary Freeman's statement and was also noted in the more detailed comparison furnished the Subcommittee on Health and Safety. Our records will be changed to indicate that these cattle disease eradication programs are being carried out under the authority set forth in the Revised Statutes of New Jersey which require all cows to have successfully passed a tuberculin test, and the State sanitary code which requires all dairy animals to be free of brucellosis.

It is hoped that this letter will clarify the basis on which our comparison was made of the New Jersey milk sanitation regulations with those of the Milk Ordinance and Code—1953 recommendations of the Public Health Service. We are glad to learn from your letter that New Jersey, through its requirements and interpretations and enforcement procedures, is operating basically under the same milk sanitation requirements as those contained in the Public Health Service Milk Ordinance and Code.

An identical letter is being sent to Mr. Phillip Alampi, secretary of agriculture, State of New Jersey, who cosigned the November 9 letter to Secretary Freeman. A copy is also being sent to the office of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN D. FAULKNER,
Chief, Milk and Food Program, Division of Environmental Engineering and Food Protection.

NOVEMBER 9, 1961.

Hon. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FREEMAN: Reference is made to your statement on the national milk sanitation bill before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, August 30, 1961, and especially to Attachment No. 1 appended thereto, in which the New Jersey requirements for the production and handling of milk are compared with those of the U.S. Public Health Service Milk Ordinance and Code.

A careful review of our requirements, interpretations, and enforcement procedures would have shown that we are operating basically under the same requirements as the U.S. Public Health Service.

The requirements of the U.S. Public Health Service Code are, in most instances, worded in general terms followed by specific items to determine "satisfactory compliance" with these requirements.

New Jersey's statutory requirements are also stated for the most part in general terms, with specific items in our Manuals of Interpretation being used to determine satisfactory compliance with those requirements.

New Jersey requirements do provide for milking barn lighting, bactericidal treatment of dairy equipment with chemical sanitizers, temperature of cooling, and proper protection of farm water supplies.

The greatest difference between the two sets of requirements is found in the detailed specifications for the construction and design of equipment as set forth in the U.S. Public Health Service Code.

Exception is taken particularly to the statement "New Jersey regulations do not specifically mention tuberculosis and brucellosis control" under health of cows. The revised statutes of New Jesrey require all cows to have successfully passed a tuberculin test, and the State sanitary code requires all dairy animals to be free of brucellosis. Testing in these programs is done by the State department of agriculture whose disease eradication program is recognized as one of the best in the United States.

Frequencies of inspections of dairy farms and milk plants, and of sampling and analyses of milk and milk products, are specifically provided for in our requirements. We have only one bacterial standard of 150,000 per milliliter for farm-produced milk regardless of whether it is shipped in cans or from farm bulk milk tanks. The discontinuance on July 1, 1961, of the New Jersey Department of Agriculture's voluntary grade A milk program has eliminated the dual bacterial standards referred to in the footnote of your review.

This is submitted to you in order that your information in this matter may be complete. It is also being submitted to our congressional delegation so that the foregoing facts and corrections may be read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely,
ROSCOE P. KANDLE, M.D.,
State Commissioner of Health.
PHILLIP ALAMPI,
Secretary of Agriculture.

The Doctors and the AMA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, we will soon be considering the President's proposal for financing health care for the aged through the social security system. This is one of the most forward-looking proposals since the original social security legislation of 1935. It will provide health benefits where they are needed most: among our aged and aging population. Those who contend that these senior citizens do not need such assistance fail to come to grips with the fact that the average annual income of

persons over 65 as individuals is only $1,500 and that for families only $2,500. As we are all aware this is not even a living wage and there is certainly not going to be very much left over for medical care. The AMA, which is fighting this proposal so vehemently, has not, apparently, taken into consideration that every private opinion poll taken shows that approximately 70 percent of the American people are in favor of some proposal that will provide adequate care for Americans over 65 while they retain their dignity. The same percentage was also willing to support such a program with increased taxes.

The Saturday Evening Post of February 3, 1962, contained an editorial on this subject and I commend it to the interest of our colleagues.

The article follows:

THE DOCTORS AND THE AMA

A wholly fictitious doctor named Jones was awakened at 4 a.m. recently by the sound of running water. Investigation showed that a basement pipe had burst; the water was slowly rising on the cellar floor.

"Call the plumber," said Mrs. Jones.

"At 4 a.m.?" the doctor asked.

"Certainly," his wife replied. "He wouldn't hesitate to call you if he had a medical problem."

So Dr. Jones called his plumber and expained the emergency.

"You were quite right to call me," the plumber said. "I'll tell you what to do. Drop two aspirin tablets into the broken pipe ever 2 hours. If the leak hasn't cleared up by 9 o'clock, call me at the office."

The wry humor of that anecdote has enlivened a good many gatherings these past few months. What makes it funny? Like all good jokes, it is reality exaggerated. The kindly family doctor does not give us the around-the-clock service he once did. We resent it—and thinly cloak our resentment in a veil of comedy.

To state the same proposition more bluntly, the American doctor is more widely criticized today than at any other time. There is a rising clamor against the impersonality of medical care, coupled with a mounting indignation over the increased costs of medical services. For the first time in its long and distinguished history, our medical profession is in trouble. It has a public relations problem, and you can prove it by looking at just two sets of figures; the vast increase in the number of suits against doctors for medical malpractice; the sharp decrease in the number and caliber of applicants for medical education.

It is both strange and frightening that this should be so. In this century no profession has contributed quite so much to our national well-being as the doctor's. Even a handful of names—Salk, Menninger, Mayo, Hench, White, Rusk, Ravdin—suggests the magnitude of our debt to medicine. We have a reverence for the "men in white" that is based on their achievements, their solid and devoted service. Why is that reverence now tinged with cynicism?

Some of us are resentful because our doctors aren't on call 168 hours a week—as they are supposed to have been in the good old days—even though most of us feel overworked after an 8-hour day. Some of us resent our doctors' obvious affluence—even while remembering his costly years of preparation and the peon's wages of his internship.

These two beefs are much talked about on the cocktail circuit, but they seem to us to have little or nothing to do with the deterioration in the doctor-patient relationship. That deterioration has come about for one primary reason: The doctor knows how far scientific medicine has come these last 20 years, but he seems incapable of understanding that the patient has come at least an equal distance.

More than 40 percent of last year's high school graduates are in college. Almost every daily newspaper now has a medical column, usually well written and authoritative. Almost every mass-circulation magazine devotes a significant fraction of its space to medical topics. And just try to turn on TV without encountering some new Ben Casey or Dr. Kildare.

The fact is that today's patient, on average, is vastly more sophisticated medically than his counterpart of, say, 20 years ago. He has the brains and the vocabulary to participate in medical decisions. He will not be conned by those practitioners who turn aside reasonable questions with "let me worry about that." He is equipped for at least limited partnership in discussions that involve his own welfare. He can be pardoned, therefore, for resenting the authoritarian doctor—and there are a lot of them—who is appalled that anyone should question his judgment.

The "papa knows best" school of medical practice—so popular in the 1860's—is, in short, wholly out of place today. Not all doctors are guilty of it, of course, but enough strike the I'm the-doctor-you're-a-layman pose to produce great strain in the relationship. The strain gets even greater when the doctor carries this pompous attitude outside his sphere of competence (medicine) and into the political and social arenas.

Traditionally medicine has spoken to the Nation through its chosen instrument, the American Medical Association—although a good many doctors do not belong to or believe in their own organization. Lamentably the AMA has done precious little in our lifetimes to make us patients feel that medicine is on our side. The AMA, for example, opposed hospitalization insurance. Despite that opposition, approximately 130 million Americans now are covered by some kind of prepaid medical insurance; they have clearly expressed their lack of confidence in the AMA in this regard. Similarly, the AMA opposed all kinds of group practice. We now know that some of medicine's finest work has been done in the voluntary clinics. The doctors as a group have in essence been against almost everything that America is for—and usually because the suspicious eye of the medical association espied the bugaboo of socialized medicine lurking beneath every new proposal.

The irony of this is that, so far as we know, there is no serious support anywhere in America for anything resembling socialized medicine. The politicians don't want it; the press doesn't want it; it is not wanted by labor or management, rich or poor, North or South. We can't help wondering if the doctors and their AMA seriously believe that they are fighting the socialized dragon—or whether, perhaps, they use this nonexistent threat to mask a pathological fear of change. It is a strange thing that the profession which has been the most progressive in accepting scientific progress has also been the most reactionary in the face of social reform.

All this has a special significance just now as Congress prepares to consider the President's bill to provide better medical care for the elderly by way of an extension of the social security program. Once again the AMA has sounded the too familiar alarm. If medical care for citizens over 65 is financed through the social security system, says the AMA, we are headed down the broad highway toward socialized medicine. To us this seems the rankest sort of nonsense. Anyhow, the AMA's forecasts of disaster have seldom been right in the past; why should we have confidence in their warning now?

Nevertheless, the AMA does have one solid point in the current debate which, surprisingly, it has consistently underplayed. That point is the fact that Mr. Kennedy's plan for the elderly will be seriously handicapped—even unworkable—unless it has the enthusiastic cooperation of the doctors. Money and buildings can't practice medicine. Only doctors can do that—and even they can't do it very well unless their hearts are in it.

If the AMA people were to voice their objections to the Kennedy proposal in those terms, we might be with them. We certainly would be with them if they came up with a counterproposal acceptable to doctors, that would do the job the President envisages.

As always, though, the AMA seems to us to have confused where we want to go with how we're going to get there. Once again—as in the case of hospitalization insurance—they have allowed themselves to appear to be opposed to humane care when what they actually resist is a method of financing that care. We are not entranced with the administration's plan to finance this bill; we doubt that the administration itself would argue that theirs is the best of all possible solutions. It could be that the American Hospital Association's proposal to extend Blue Cross to all persons over 65 is a better idea. We do feel, however, that the doctors—as responsible citizens of the Republic—have an obligation not merely to say what's wrong but to tell us what's right. No reasonable American can be against providing needed care for the elderly. There has to be a way to get the job done while protecting the doctor from even his imaginary fears.

We call on you members of the AMA for this kind of responsible statesmanship. There are very few Americans who do not have reason to look on your profession with gratitude—even awe. You have literally saved our lives. We want you to be as concerned about us as people as you are about us as patients. We want you on our side, not only in those anguished moments of illness but also when we are facing up to the hard and nervous task of trying to make this a better place for us all.

How about it, doc?

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Remarks of Gov. Otto Kerner, of Illinois, at the Meeting of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks of Gov. Otto Kerner at the meeting of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, February 7, 1962, at Chicago, Ill.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I welcome the opportunity to talk to you today about the importance of export expansion to the well-being of our Illinois cities and farms, our employers, our employees and our farmers. Each and every one of us has a stake in the foreign markets of Illinois.

Too few of our people realize that Illinois is the No. 1 export State in the Union and that though we are in the heartland of America, our frontiers touch every continent. Our prosperity, more than any other State, is inextricably linked to foreign commerce. Its expansion is vital to our growth. As Governor of Illinois, I propose to do everything in my power to promote this expansion.

It seems most appropriate that I am addressing these remarks to a meeting of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry because the association's "Operation Export" preceded the Federal Government's program by months.

Its World Trade Fair is the outstanding event of its kind in the Nation. Chicago's leadership in promoting foreign trade is recognized as the ablest and most farsighted in the United States. This is as it should be, for Chicago is the greatest inland port in the world, tied by air, water, rail and road with every corner of the globe.

The trade expansion you have long advocated has now become a momentous issue of national policy. This policy in my judgment can have major consequences for the State of Illinois, for the Nation and for the whole free world.

The State of Illinois has lost manufacturing jobs since 1953. Despite the great productive power and prosperity of the Chicagoland area, we have felt the consequences of technological change in a stubborn hard core of unemployment and mounting relief rolls. The price of increased productivity in the absence of growth in demand in farm and shop has been a steady decrease in the demand for labor—especially unskilled labor—in two of the most important segments of the labor market.

Shifts in industrial location such as that of the packing industry have radically altered the pattern of labor demand. The effect of this on our economy and on the finances of our State has been painful. Certain important segments of the economy of Illinois are contracting. We must reverse the process.

Here is where export expansion is of vital significance to the State. One of the cures for unemployment is more jobs. Frank Cassell of Inland Steel, chairman of my Committee on Unemployment, informs me that in his judgment one of our most promising avenues to new jobs lies in expanding our foreign trade. Approximtaely 90 percent of all U.S. exports have some components made in Chicagoland.

Half a million workers in Chicagoland owe their jobs to export trade. I could easily multiply statistics to show how vital to Illinois industry, labor, agriculture and commerce is the expansion of our State's position in the markets of the world.

Great as is our present stake in world trade, it could be vastly greater. At present only some 15 percent of Illinois firms are engaged in exporting. If we could increase that number to 25 or 30 percent, we would have made a giant forward step toward providing the jobs and dollars that contribute toward greater economic growth. This would go far to relieve our unemployment, provide new jobs for the swelling number of new entrants to the labor force, and lighten the heavy relief load now burdening the finances of the State.

Some one to one and a half percent of our national production competes with imports. It is obvious that we have far more to gain from the expansion of our trade than from settling for a declining national market sheltered by national tariff walls cut off from the world. We fear too much. We have too little faith in our competitive strength.

Illinois alone is selling some hundreds of million dollars' worth of goods to Japan. International Harvester sells some two-thirds of its production abroad. Our soybeans are sought by all the world. Our agricultural efficiency is the envy and despair of Khrushchev and Mao.

American workers, with the help of modern machinery and up-to-date technology, can produce more units per man-hour than any other workers anywhere. A U.S. coal miner is paid 8 times as much as a Japanese miner, but he produces 14 times as much coal. The result is that the cost per ton of U.S. coal is much smaller than Japanese coal and that the United States sells millions of dollars' worth of coal to Japan every year.

These are facts. We must, however, remember that foreign competition will have its painful side. We must be prepared to pay a price for an expanding share of the markets of the world. Trade is, as you all know, a two-way street. We cannot sell if we are not prepared to buy. Fortunately, for us, much of what we import—bananas, tin, coffee, and the like—we either do not produce or produce only in negligible quantities. In some 68 percent of the goods that move in world trade, our costs are below or competitive with world costs. Still there are areas where our costs are high—where our domestic production will be hurt—where painful adjustments will have to be made.

The leaders of American labor have shown a farsighted, patriotic willingness to lend their support to the cause of export expansion, knowing full well that for some of their members a heavy sacrifice will be entailed. It is up to us in Government and industry to see that what so clearly is in the interest of the overwhelming majority is not allowed to fall with cruel disproportionate weight on the backs of a few. Trade must indeed be a two-way street and we cannot export without importing. However, we must ease the transition for those whose livelihoods are placed in peril.

Thus far I have spoken of export expansion purely in terms of its economic consequences. Important as these are, there are others that are far more important. We are witnessing the success of the major foreign policy initiative of the United States—the Marshall plan.

The unity of free Europe for which we have expended so much in blood and treasure is now a reality through the growth of the Common Market. It seems likely that England and other nations will join the Common Market. When that happens almost 90 percent of the free world's industrial production will be concentrated in two great markets—the United States and the expanded European Economic Community.

We cannot allow a tariff wall to rise between us. Not only would this deprive us of a market that promises to exceed our own, far worse, it could ultimately split the free world. President Kennedy is right. We cannot afford to allow the emerging Atlantic community and its free associates to be driven apart by an economic wedge. Together we are the greatest industrial power on earth, secure from any conceivable Communist challenge—a mighty force for peace and a sure promise of the spread of freedom. Driven apart by the petty jealousies of trade and tariff walls, we can but prosper the dark forces that seek to destroy our common way of life.

There is indeed a tide in the affairs of men, of states and nations. I believe for the United States and the free world, it is now at its peak. Taken with courage, it can lead from the grim present to a bright future for ourselves and our children.

The interest of Illinois, the United States, and the free world are one. It is fitting that Illinois, the greatest export State in the Nation, should take the lead. Our way of life—freemen, free enterprise, free markets—is not a thing of the past but the wave of the future. To paraphrase the master of the man who said he would bury us, there is a specter haunting the crowned heads of communism, the specter of free world unity and free world enterprise.

I am proud as Governor of Illinois to request your support in a cause that is neither Democratic nor Republican—but rather is the cause of the State, the Nation, the free world itself, behind the leadership of President Kennedy.

For in large measure, upon the success of our actions depends the unity of the free world and the future of freedom.

Preserving and Rebuilding America's Lead-Zinc Mining Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask that there may be printed in the Appen-

dix of the RECORD two items of interest to all those Members of the Congress who are hoping to preserve and rebuild the American lead-zinc mining industry.

The first is a statement by Charles Will Wright, former Chief of the Mining Division, U.S. Bureau of Mines, and Chief Foreign Minerals Specialist, attached to the Department of State. The second is an article that appeared in the November issue of American Metal Market.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY WE ARE LOSING OUR TRADITIONAL SOURCES OF METAL SUPPLY

(By Charles W. Wright)

The importance of metals—the basis of industrial power—is not sufficiently realized and not much is being done to win this race, a vital one for our future.

To maintain our position as the world's greatest industrial Nation, we must increase our metal reserves by intensifying exploration and the development of domestic ore deposits.

Thus far, the United States has not experienced shortages in most metals, but with depleting ore reserves at home and abroad and world demand increasing, the time may come when the producing nations would not sell their ores and metals to us. We may then find ourselves in short supply even of the more common metals. Today, however, the free world output of certain metals temporarily is greater than demand and the situation is causing troublesome surpluses, particularly in copper, lead, and zinc. This oversupply may soon change for the better as demands of a growing population increases. It is important to recognize that this is strictly a temporary situation.

That metals in which we are deficient may not be available from foreign sources before the end of this decade is a real possibility. Metal mining operations abroad are being nationalized thus depriving us of such supply sources as Cuba which formerly supplied us with nickel and cobalt, which is now going to the U.S.S.R. Our main source of cobalt and an important source of other minerals is threatened by uprisings in the Congo. Political instability elsewhere could cause trouble in maintaining imports of chromite and manganese ore from South Africa, Ghana, and even Brazil, our largest source of manganese ore at the present time. Russia is now negotiating for the purchase of 300,000 tons of copper from Chile for delivery in 5 years. This is just one Communist move designed to deprive us of metal supply.

Our present position as the world's dominating industrial power is thus being threatened by Khrushchev, the man who intends to destroy us by his 20-year program designed to make the Soviet Union the world's greatest industrial power.

The Communists have over a hundred thousand agents scattered in all parts of the free world countries. These agents are spreading anti-American propaganda, negotiating for the metals now being supplied to us, influencing the local governments to withhold shipments, and fomenting strikes at the mines and ports of export.

By utopian promises and misleading propaganda, the ideology of communism is being accepted by many leaders and the masses, particularly in Latin America. These people, are being urged to expropriate and nationalize privately owned mining industries. By such tactics and threats from without and uprisings from within, Nikita Khrushchev and his associate Fidel Castro believe they can win a worldwide victory for communism. With his megaton bombs, Khrushchev is spreading fear as well as fallout over the world in his attempt to show off his military might, and the Reds are gaining ground.

In his address before the Institute of Cooperation, August 23, 1961, in St. Paul, Minn., Dr. Raymond Miller, author of "Can Capitalism Compete," stated as follows:

"Here in America our economic system—our system of capitalism—has not remained static. We have improved it and developed an entirely new kind of capitalism during the present century—cooperative service capitalism—which combines the basic principles of free enterprise. It is based on man's love for freedom. Despite of all of this, however, service capitalism is not gaining adherents in the world. It is communism that is gaining in many of the newly developing countries of Africa, Asia, and South America."

Survival in the years ahead requires that the United States and the free world reverse the pussyfooting policies that have prevailed in the past and which have fostered success for the Communist's plan of slow death for freedom and democracy. The moral, industrial, and military superiority still enjoyed by the free world must be mobilized for positive action against the Red menace. In this rearmament process, protection of the mineral bases of free world industrial strength is of paramount importance.

WHAT SHOULD BE DONE TO ASSURE AMPLE METAL SUPPLIES FOR THE UNITED STATES?

Experience has demonstrated that the industrial strength of the United States has been the arsenal that brought victory in two major totalitarian assaults on freedom and democracy. Despite the advent of intercontinental missiles, it is logical to assume that the United States will provide the bulwark of strength if the dictators decide to attack again. While our geographic isolation may not be quite as effective as before, it still provides a large measure of security, particularly when viewed in the light of the vulnerable position of the industries of free Europe. Therefore, the assurance of strategic mineral supplies to permit full mobilization of U.S. industrial might in an emergency requires priority in United States and free world defense strategy. Meanwhile the free world must live and prosper in a highly competitive world so that maintenance of adequate mineral supplies for peacetime use is equally essential. Yet U.S. policies are destroying the security we have enjoyed from the productivity of our rich mineral resources. Confiscatory taxation, unrealistic trade policies, fiscal irresponsibility, and an unbridled labor monopoly have all but killed the incentives to development of domestic resources. As a consequence, we are losing our self-sufficiency and, at the same time, permitting the enemy to preempt our traditional foreign sources of supply as noted above.

It is imperative that this destructive trend be reversed. In the past, U.S. mineral policies have been distinguished generally by their absence. At times, the Federal Government has taken opportunistic action to meet an emergency. When the emergency was over sudden policy reversals left mineral producers at home and in friendly allied countries holding the bag. In recent years, Federal actions border on national suicide. All this must be changed drastically.

We need to take a realistic, long-range view of our resource potential and mineral needs and establish firm national policies accordingly. Dominated by the State Department whose actions and motives to date may well be questioned, the executive branch of Government appears to have reached a final conclusion to liquidate domestic strength in minerals in favor of imports from distant and dangerously uncertain foreign sources. In these circumstances it is not surprising that the expert mineral agencies of the Federal Government have been silenced on the crucial factors in national mineral policy.

There is urgent need for detailed study of the Nation's mineral problem by informed and realistic experts—preliminary to determining sound courses for national action. Obviously, there is little hope of reform within existing agencies of Government. Therefore, some organization that commands public respect, is capable of realistic analysis of problems in the light of existing world conditions, and free from the domination of the intrenched mischievous bureaucracy in the regular departments of Government should be drafted to do the job. Congress should move promptly to endow such an organization with authority and funds to conduct the study. The National Academy of Sciences is suggested as an organization that meets the standards enumerated above.

There are some practical actions worthy of consideration in such a study. To maintain our industrial superiority our Government should:

1. Determine the long-range supply and demand situation for each of the metals, evaluating, in cooperation with the mining industry, our present and estimated future ability to provide supplies from domestic sources in order to minimize need for imports.

2. Recognize the three basic situations presently facing the U.S. national resource industries: (a) large known metal resources that presently are uneconomic under world market prices, (b) metals that are being partially supplied from domestic sources with reliance on some imports because of insufficient incentive or other inability to develop adequate U.S. reserves, and (c) metals not available from domestic deposits.

3. With this knowledge provide the necessary incentive to our mining industry through exploration and development programs, tax relief, and adequate import regulation to find new reserves and insure operation within reasonable economic limits.

4. Supplement the insufficiently of domestic supplies with necessary imports through a series of programs that would foster constructive foreign policy and guarantee a sound domestic economy.

(a) Provide a clearinghouse for information on investment opportunities in the less developed countries, and guarantees to American investors against confiscation and other unjust acts by local governments.

(b) Insist that some of the billions of dollars of foreign aid be allocated to mine development projects in friendly nations to help their economy. Such actions should be restricted to ores and metals needed by the United States. The need to provide technical and financial aid to private mine development projects in cooperation with local capital should be recognized.

(c) Improve the supply situation abroad by assigning more mining engineers to our embassies to work with the local mine departments and mining companies in planning the development of new sources of metals in short supply and in keeping the American consumer informed on such sources. The mineral attachés with their background in mining, metallurgy, and metal markets are in a position to advise American investors on investment opportunities and on local conditions. There are only 8 mineral attachés at present and the number should be increased to 30.

5. Acquaint labor leaders and unions with the fact that because of high wages and fringe benefits, our mining companies and manufacturers cannot compete in world markets. Therefore, American business presently is forced to establish plants abroad in low-wage areas, thus weakening our industrial power, our defense position, and causing unemployment at home.

6. Encourage the free world nations to recognize the essentiality of U.S. industry in protecting them from Communist aggression and, hence, the necessity for the mineral security measures adopted by the United States.

If they hope to survive, the Soviets must avoid a direct military encounter with the Western Powers until they have the metals that would insure defeat of their enemies. This is their underlying strategy.

The United States still has superiority in missiles and industrial strength and must keep ahead of our adversaries and not lose in the race for metals. That, and the maintenance of peace, must be our goal.

MINERALS ATTACHÉS ON THE MOVE

(By Ed Taishoff)

The U.S. strategic stockpile is richer by 60,000 flasks of mercury—thanks mainly to one man's alertness.

He found the mercury—and a batch of valuable German patents—in an East German salt mine, where the Nazis had stashed them, during the closing days of World War II. And he quickly had the material moved west—before the Russians moved in to occupy the area.

But this sort of cloak and dagger work was just a wartime sideline for this minerals expert. Just as important was the work he did before the conflict began.

The man—Charles Will Wright—went to Europe as a roving vice consul for the State Department. By 1939, he'd prepared a series of meticulous reports on European mining and mineral activities—reports which proved invaluable in organizing lend lease aid to our Allies, and in waging strategic warfare against the Axis.

Mr. Wright was this country's first minerals diplomat. And his activities point up the importance of the work now being done by his professional heirs. America's little-known band of mineral attachés.

These are the experts who are trying to assess what effect Bolivia's domestic turmoil might have on tin production, what recent Chilean tax legislation might mean to American copper producers there, how the Congo's political strife might affect metals production in Katanga.

But they also stay alert for new developments in the minerals field, new deposits which might be exploited, plans to open or renovate mines which might provide American equipment producers with new markets, the prospects for sale of American minerals or metals in the area where they're stationed.

COMPILE DATA

And they perform the routine—but very important—task of compiling information, and statistics on minerals production and consumption in the nations where they are stationed.

Like all other attachés—military, commercial, labor, agricultural—they are factfinders, experts in their field who also must aid American policymakers and the U.S. industry in understanding what the information they've gathered means.

The minerals attaché also must do the detail work involved in barter agreements. He works closely with local governments and metals industries in obtaining and exchanging information. He studies the effect of local legislation and governmental policies on the minerals industries, assesses what the climate might be for American investment. He advises the chief American diplomats in the area where he is stationed on policy matters which affect minerals. And—of equal importance—he's always on the alert for new prospective markets for U.S.-produced minerals or metals.

The minerals attaché is a professional in the field. Normally, he's a career Bureau of Mines employee, with a background in metallurgy, mining engineering, or geology. He's expected to have an economic outlook, to have a fairly lucid writing style, and, if possible, to be able to speak the language of the country in which he's stationed.

EIGHT POSTS

At the present time, there are eight mineral attaché posts stretching from Sidney, Australia and South America to Monrovia, in the African Republic of Liberia.

The program, however, is expanding. The Bureau of Mines ultimately hopes to establish 25 posts around the world.

The idea of stationing minerals experts in key countries first became a serious project in the 1930's. Mr. Wright—whose wartime adventure already has been mentioned, was the first such specialist sent abroad—although that time he didn't have the title of attaché.

In 1941, six metals experts—all Bureau of Mines personnel—were sent to Latin America. They were stationed in Mexico, Peru, Chile, Argentina, Brazil, and Cuba. Mr. Wright was put in charge of the program and under his direction these minerals diplomats checked on resources in their areas and coordinated supply problems with the various Latin American governments.

A year later the program was absorbed by the State Department and the post of minerals attaché officially came into being.

Mrs. Agnew Wonders How Soon It Will Be Vanished American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, an excellent letter on the so-called battle of Newburgh has just come to my attention. It appeared in the Newburgh, N.Y., Evening News of February 6.

The author of this letter, Mrs. John D. Agnew, is a well-known citizen of Newburgh and a woman who is respected for her intelligence and for her kind heart and generous nature.

MRS. AGNEW WONDERS HOW SOON IT WILL BE VANISHED AMERICAN

To the EDITOR:

I become more amazed and concerned the longer the so-called Newburgh controversy continues. Our problems are not unique; many cities are faced with similar ones.

Is the fact that we are looking at them from a different angle justification for the exposure we were subject to on television on January 28?

Is the fact that we have shown the State government behind the times in not passing a residency law reason for such abuse?

Is it because we feel that Federal Government control is not always the best way—and not the American way to solve problems that have been subject to such misrepresentation?

Is it because we have not been scared into line by the threat of loss of State and Federal aid that we have been rebels? We are, all of us, that same State and Federal aid that is referred to so freely you know.

Is it because out of all this could come a demand for reform in a well-entrenched welfare system that we are called heartless?

Is it because the Federal Government had to take a stand on work relief that Mr. Ribicoff says the NBC White Paper on Newburgh should be shown again, despite the sentiments expressed by our local service clubs, chamber of commerce, businessmen's groups etc.?

Is it becoming so important to break down State rights that the President in his welfare proposal to Congress on February 1 offers a "slight increase" in the dole for the States that will abandon residency laws?

Are we becoming so indoctrinated with social security, unemployment insurance, Government subsidy theories that we will give up our initiative for a number entitling us to our share?

Whether or not you agree with Mr. Mitchell is not really important. However, he has made one point—namely that welfare as administered today is creating a new class of citizen—one who not only accepts welfare willingly, but one who expects it as his due. Out of all this haze of Government help could emerge a new American—one who looks for the easy way out—one who feels that his neighbor must help with his load—one who, as our TV citizen expressed it so eloquently, gets tired of waiting in line at the unemployment office for help—one who wants somebody, city, State or Federal Government, he doesn't care who, to take over his problems. This is what is really frightening.

Our Nation is the youngest world power, but is the American about to join the "vanishing buffalo?" In American folklore is an old saying "you don't get anything for nothing." I doubt if this is expressed often in Washington these days, but I wonder how my children's generation will ever be able to carry the taxload being charged to their generation now?

MRS. JOHN D. AGNEW.

NEWBURGH.

The Less Work-More Jobs Theory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said of late about the reduction of the workweek in order to provide more jobs. The following article appeared in the Wall Street Journal of February 7, and certainly furnishes food for thought on this important question of the day:

THE LESS WORK-MORE JOBS THEORY

The theory that a shorter workweek would create jobs for people who are unemployed has a certain superficial attractiveness, perhaps because it sounds so uncomplicated. It is a theory that appeals especially to labor union leaders who have a stake in seeing that their union members have steady employment.

Walter Reuther, for instance, at an AFL-CIO conference on the theme, "Put America Back To Work," has said that it is the Government's responsibility to provide jobs for anyone able and willing to work if private industry can't provide them. And that if everyone can't be given a chance to work 40 hours per week, then the workweek should be shortened until any person who wants a job can get one.

Now this point of view, shared by a good many other people, contains a number of pretty doubtful assumptions. One is that all employers, in order to make more jobs available, would be willing or able to pay people for, say, 30 hours of work a week at a

40-hour rate. Those who were not would presumably be free to go out of business. That surely would not help to decrease unemployment.

But an even weaker assumption is that it is proper to compare the long-term trend in industry toward shorter hours with arbitrary attempts to deal with unemployment by cutting the workweek. The two should not be confused. A gradual reduction in the workweek has been made possible through increased productivity, which in turn is made possible by substantial investment per employee in plant and equipment. When the workweek is reduced by union coercion alone, as in the case of the 25-hour week recently won by New York electrical workers, only one result is possible: Increased costs.

The responsibility of Government is not, despite the contentions of Mr. Reuther and others, to provide jobs for all. It is not even possible for Government to do that, no matter how many tax-supported make-work projects it undertakes. Rather, its responsibility is to create and maintain an economic climate that encourages development and expansion of private industry, with resulting employment gains in all fields. That is the only way to create more real jobs.

But unfortunately the administration's announced fiscal policies do little to encourage the creation of many more new, productive jobs. And as long as the Government keeps its present impediments in the way of economic progress, it will be helping to foster the fallacious proposition that less work for all somehow is a cure for unemployment.

Obion County Acts on Errant Fathers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, throughout the Nation there have been many conferences, discussions, and news articles about investigations relative to welfare boards. Actions speak louder than words, and I am certainly happy that Judge Dan McKinnis, a very close personal friend of mine and county judge of my home county of Obion in the Eighth Congressional District of Tennessee, is taking the lead in correcting these abuses.

Paul Vanderwood of the Memphis Press-Scimitar, an outstanding newspaper of the Nation, has written an excellent article on the activities of Judge McKinnis and what he is doing in this field.

The article follows:

OBION COUNTY ACTS ON ERRANT FATHERS

(By Paul Vanderwood)

UNION CITY, TENN.—Before they will be considered for public welfare assistance in Obion County, mothers of illegitimate children first must identify the father of those children. She must also swear out a warrant for the man's arrest.

Then county authorities work to locate the father and bring him before County Judge Dan McKinnis, who assesses guilty defendants a child support plan.

The new procedure is designed to save the county large welfare sums by making fathers responsible for the upkeep of their children—even if illegitimate, McKinnis said.

If a man agrees to a plan, then doesn't live up to it, he can be cited for contempt and handled in criminal court.

This has not occurred to date, McKinnis said. Of the nine cases he has handled this way, eight of the men have pleaded guilty to being the father and agreed to provide child support.

There was some doubt that the ninth man really was the father, McKinnis said. His case was dismissed.

Child support is assessed according to the defendant's ability to pay. It averages $5 per week per child, McKinnis said.

If a mother refuses to give the name of the father, or tries to conceal that name, she will not receive welfare, McKinnis said.

Another phase of the plan is aimed at fathers who desert their wife and children. (These are legitimate children.)

In these cases the mother must swear out a warrant for her husband's arrest before being considered for welfare benefits.

This initiates a search for the man. If he is found, he is brought back to Union City for trial on a charge of fraudulent child desertion.

The mother then receives welfare aid—and the man, if found guilty, can be sentenced to 1 to 5 years in prison.

"If, after diligent search, the husband cannot be found, the mother may receive welfare benefits," McKinnis said.

SEVERAL SENTENCED

"Several men are being sentenced each month for convictions on failure to support charges," McKinnis said.

"Our grand jury has not been hesitant to return indictments in these cases, and the judge [E. A. Morris] has been strict in his sentencing," he continued.

Because he is county judge, McKinnis handles the illegitimacy cases, if the father is found in Tennessee. If not, the case goes to criminal court and the county grand jury.

SEARCH GOES ON

"If a father or husband can't be found and welfare is given, this does not end the search," McKinnis said.

"It brings the Federal Government to our assistance, because a percentage of welfare aid is Federal.

"Once the Government is in the picture, we may obtain the man's social security number and other job information which may help us locate him and bring him back to Tennessee."

Most of those found out of State have waived extradition McKinnis said.

ALL OUT

However, if a man fights extradition, the county goes all out to bring him back through legal channels.

"Our program has been a success so far," McKinnis said. "We are saving welfare funds, and getting these fathers to support properly their children. In the long run this campaign will save taxpayers money.

"The plan has not been tested in court—as have other plans which denied welfare benefits in other States," McKinnis said. "If it is, I am confident we will be upheld."

Kansas Senate Concurrent Resolution 13

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, which has been adopted by the Kansas State Legislature recently memorializing the Congress of the United States to establish a modern grain research center on or near the campus of Kansas State University of Agriculture and Applied Science at Manhattan, Kans. I feel that this is indeed a worthwhile project and would serve a valuable contribution in research work in connection with wheat and feed grains. I certainly would like to see such a center become a reality.

The resolution follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 13

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to establish a modern grain research center on or near the campus of Kansas State University of Agriculture and Applied Science at Manhattan, Kans.

Whereas the vast accumulation of stocks of wheat continues to be the most pressing problem in American agriculture; and

Whereas the export market for wheat in the hard currency countries of Europe has been considered frequently as one of the best means of reducing the great surplus of wheat and concomitantly halting the outflow of gold from the United States; and

Whereas the European wheat market is a quality market and this is the crux of the problem; and

Whereas the farmers of this country have made remarkable progress in lowering the cost of production of wheat but this country has made a small and weak effort to improve the efficiency of marketing and transporting and in maintaining, evaluating, and preserving wheat quality as it moves from the farm through the market channel to the export market; and

Whereas to a very large extent agricultural progress in this country has resulted directly from agricultural research; and

Whereas American agricultural research has failed to deal adequately or effectively with the problems arising from the storage, handling, processing, transportation, and quality evaluation of wheat; and

Whereas evidences of lack of attention to quality exists on all sides, such as—the ease with which foreign competitors have taken our quality markets—the complaints of buyers about the quality and condition of the grain they purchased; and these problems stem from the inability of our marketing and inspection agencies to maintain quality control in the distribution channels; and

Whereas the study group of the House Agricultural Committee of the 86th Congress stated on the basis of firsthand observations of U.S. agricultural exports to Western Europe that the first reason for our failure to compete more effectively in the European market was the lack of quality, condition, and dependability of U.S. imports; and

Whereas the efficiency with which grain moves through distribution channels to both domestic and foreign markets needs improvement; and work is needed to guide new developments in grain facility construction; handling grain into, within, and out of such facilities; aeration and drying; transportation and storage; and

Whereas the development of improved marketing methods and practices will enable grain to flow more efficiently from production areas to market; and

Whereas a new impetus should be given to research on the marketing of high quality grains; and

Whereas the first step in such a program would be to develop a modern grain research center; and

Whereas such a grain research center should be located close to an existing milling school which could be utilized in carrying on many of the research projects; and

Whereas the leading milling school in the world is now located at and maintained by Kansas State University of Agriculture and Applied Science at Manhatttan, Kans.; and

Whereas if a modern grain research center was established on or near the campus of Kansas State University of Agriculture and Applied Science work could be done in cooperation with the grain industry and other agencies to improve the quality of grain reaching foreign and domestic markets and to improve the efficiency of such movement; and

Whereas such a grain research center could serve as the research arm for those agencies engaged in the grading of grain, in developing and testing equipment and facilities, in finding more adequate and less costly methods, and in the seeking of new markets, which would guide the industry in adopting improved quality standards and better practices in protecting the quality of grain during drying, storage, and transport and in improving marketing efficiency; and

Whereas an offer has been made to donate to the Federal Government land which is adjacent to Kansas State University of Agriculture and Applied Science which consists of 5 acres with ready access to electricity, water, and sewerage: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Kansas (the House of Representative concurring therein), That we respectfully urge and request the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the establishment and maintenance by the Federal Government of a modern grain research center to be located on or near the campus of Kansas State University of Agriculture and Applied Science at Manhattan, Kans., be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be directed to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, the chairman of the committees on agriculture of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Kansas delegation in the Congress of the United States.

I hereby certify that the above concurrent resolution originated in the senate, and was adopted by that body February 2, 1962.

HAROLD H. CASE,
President of the Senate.
RALPH E. ZARKER,
Secretary of the Senate.

Adopted by the House February 3, 1962.

ALLEN L. MITCHELL,
Speaker of the House.
A. E. ANDERSON,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Greater Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce Confers William Penn Award Upon Mr. William McChesney Martin, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, last December the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Philadelphia conferred its annual William Penn Award upon Mr. William McChesney Martin, Jr., the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

Mr. Martin's address, entitled "The Balance of Achievement," is an intelligent and carefully reasoned presentation of the need for achieving four economic objectives simultaneously—high emlpoyment, rapid economic growth, price stability, and equilibrium in our international balance of payments. He not only argues that none of these objectives should be sacrificed to any other, but he goes on to contend that we cannot be sure of achieving any of them unless we secure them all.

I find myself in complete agreement with Mr. Martin's views and commend them to my colleagues. For that reason, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of his address in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF WILLIAM MCCHESNEY MARTIN, JR., WILLIAM PENN AWARD DINNER, DECEMBER 13, 1961

We are faced with a need for a careful balance of conflicting desires. We have many needs and limited resources to satisfy them. This need for balance seems to pervade our lives. The individual strives for balance between work and leisure, between professional and social contacts. He, himself, through mind and heart, is the balancing mechanism. As a nation, we find it useful also to balance conflicting pressures. The checks provided by co-equal branches of Government help us to do this.

In the economic sphere, the free market may be looked at as a balancing mechanism. The free market works to bring about adjustment in demand and supply of goods and services. It is indeed to the credit of the free market that it performs its functions so well.

No more appropriate example of need for balance in the economic sphere can be found than in our international payments position. Over the past several years we have experienced a serious deficit in our balance of payments. The Federal Government spends abroad for military and foreign aid purposes. Private businessmen invest abroad to take advantage of low costs of production and distribution and profitable markets. Businessmen and consumers purchase abroad to take advantage of low prices and new products. We have not been able to induce foreigners to spend and invest as much here in the United States. And yet it is clear that if the Federal Government, private businessmen, and consumers are to continue satisfying their expressed desires to the extent they have, we must increase spending and investing by foreigners in the United States.

During 1960 the balance-of-payments problem was intensified by an outflow of short-term capital. One cause of this outflow was the difference in short-term interest rates in this country and short-term rates abroad. In payment of part of the deficit, gold flowed out of the country at a rapid rate. A continuing accumulation of foreign claims on American dollars, and the outflow of gold, reached the stage where the stability of the American dollar was being questioned in foreign financial centers. The situation had become critical.

Yet it wasn't possible to concentrate all our policies on this one critical issue. Bringing balance to our international payments is necessary; but we have other desires as well which are closely related and which must, to as large a degree as possible, be satisfied also.

The intensification of our balance-of-payments difficulty in 1960 coincided with a decline in business activity here in the United States. Early in 1960 the Federal Reserve had launched a vigorous program to buttress the economy. The lending capacity of our banking system was expanded by increasing bank reserves and enabling banks to pay off borrowing. With the increased availability of credit, interest rates declined.

The need for recovery at home and equilibrium in our payments internationally confronted the Federal Reserve, as well as the Nation as a whole, with a difficult dilemma. Supplying bank reserves by concentrating on Treasury bills in our open market purchases, as had been our general custom, could drive short-term interest rates so low as to encourage a further outflow of funds.

We had, then, to try some other approach to permit the fulfillment of our international an domestic needs in the monetary area. The System decided to push out its open market purchases beyond bills and other short-term securities to try to provide the reserves necessary to stimulate business without fostering the further outflow of short-term capital.

The cause and effect of economic developments are never easy to disentangle. And we cannot trace definitively the impact of Federal Reserve policy. But for the time at least, speculation against the dollar has diminished; and, at home, recovery has proceeded at a rapid rate since February of this year.

Despite these improvements, we can by no means relax. The basic causes of our balance-of-payments deficits are much broader and deeper than interest rate differentials. Recovery here in the United States has brought with it an increase in imports, a shrinkage of our export surplus and a growth in our payments deficit. Our deficit, after declining below $2 billion on an annual rate basis in the first half of this year, increased again to an annual rate of over $3 billion in the third quarter. A continuation of this kind of deficit is threatening to say the least, and raises the specter of renewed speculation against the dollar.

We have come, then, a long way from the situation of the early postwar years. During those years, you might recall, we gave generous aid to the war-devastated countries of the world. They did the work of reconstruction; we supplied some of the materials and tools.

In the course of time, our aid program bore fruit. The war-torn countries began to prosper; they got their finances in order, expanded their foreign trade and created the means and opportunities for a freer flow of funds across their borders.

All of these developments were properly hailed as necessary and desirable. But they also marked a change in our own role in international affairs—from one whose primary purpose was to help restore and reconstruct to one who must now compete.

We have not yet adapted ourselves to this change in status. Consequently, we have not yet achieved a reasonable balance in our international payments. And, as a result, we must continue to exercise care in our judgment of what to do about it.

Some remedies that are recommended could prove extremely destructive. Restrictive trade and investment policies would wipe out the hard-won gains of years of effort to promote trade. Ultimately, these policies would also compound our international payments difficulties. It must be remembered that free and expanding trade is a benefit to us as well as to the rest of the world.

We must, if we are to solve this problem, clearly recognize the kind of world in which we now live—a relatively small, competitive neighborhood where it takes about 6 hours to transport 125 people to Europe in one of our jet planes and no time at all to transfer $125 million by cable. We must come up in foreign, as well as domestic markets, with the right goods and services, at the right prices. Whatever the controversies

about other undesirable aspects of inflation, the fact remains that we simply cannot afford to be priced out of world markets by price increases at home. Employers here are competing with employers abroad for profits. Employees here are competing with employees abroad for wages. This is the meaning—the problem and the great advantage—of international trade and the convertibility of currencies. Those who believe in the competitive system, and understand its advantages, should be aware of this.

So, too, with the other economic problems we face today. If we are to achieve our goals, we must pursue carefully considered policies. The Federal Reserve has worked to foster recovery from recession in both output and employment. In November, more than 67 million people were at work, a record number for that month. Yet 4 million were still unemployed. On a seasonally adjusted basis, the rate of unemployment dropped considerably in November to 6.1 percent of the civilian labor force from the 6.8 percent that had prevailed over most of the year. That is some progress, but considerable further progress is imperative, and appropriate policies on the part of Government and of labor and management will be needed to achieve it.

When World War II ended, many were concerned about a resumption of the great depression. With the waste and sadness of the 1930's in mind, we adopted as a primary objective the maintenance of high levels of employment. When it became clear that the major problem was not depression but inflation, we found it necessary to turn our heavy artillery in the other direction and restrain excess demands. More recently, much attention has been given to the problem of economic growth. And, as I have already mentioned, our balance of payments today also requires serious attention.

It is sometimes asked whether our multiple objectives are compatible. Can we have high levels of employment and rapid economic growth without inflation and without disequilibrium in our balance of payments?

I think this is not quite the right question to ask. It assumes we can attain one or more of our goals if we forego the others. I doubt that this is true. If we permit prices to rise rapidly, we will not long sustain high levels of employment nor high rates of growth and we will not be able to establish equilibrium in our balance of payments. Conversely, if we permit high levels of unemployment to exist, we also, I think, cannot long sustain rapid growth, or price stability; nor, for that matter, free and expanding world trade. In other words, we must make our objectives compatible by a policy which recognizes our limitations, because if we don't we may find we cannot secure any of them.

What is needed, in my judgment, is a judicious blend of specific actions, well-balanced monetary and fiscal policies by Government, and wage-price policies by labor and management fitting to a vigorously competitive market structure.

In such a setting, the Federal Reserve System would be able to carry out its operations more effectively, and at the same time with greater moderation in respect both to easing and to tightening credit conditions. In consequence swings in interest rates and in bond prices could likewise prove more moderate.

A good volume of savings is, of course, essential to provide investment funds for enlarging our productive capacity. The role of a central bank, in a period of expansion, is the minimize the tendency for bank credit to be used instead of savings for this purpose. If we are to have the growth and the expansion of job opportunities that we all want, we will need to encourage savings.

In all times, it is of course vital that the nature of our difficulties be studied carefully and that policies be based on sound analysis. If we are to achieve the kind of balance necessary, a rational attack on these problems must be made.

Complete 100-percent agreement can never be hoped for. Monetary policy, I decided some time ago, can never be an exact science, for it deals, ultimately, with people, as well as their assets and liabilities. The framers of the Federal Reserve Act were aware, I think, that monetary policy would inevitably require an element of judgment. They took some very well advised measures in mobilizing the efforts of many potential contributors. The hope was that judgments would be impartial, informed, and in the interests of the country as a whole.

Let me just note one or two of these measures in passing. The Federal Reserve System was designed to promote the public interest. The Reserve Board in Washington is clearly a public body. The members of the Board of Governors are appointed by the President of the United States with the consent of Congress. They have primary responsibility for coordinating and directing policy. The 12 regional banks also play an integral role in the formulation and implementation of policy. They are directed by a board composed of nine directors. The member banks in each district select six of the nine, with the other three being selected by the Board of Governors. Once these directors become members of a Reserve bank's board, they take on public responsibilities. For example, they initiate changes in discount rates, which must be approved by the Board of Governors, and they nominate the chief officers of the Reserve banks, who also require approval by the Board. The presidents of the Reserve banks join with the Board in formulating open market policy. When Congress entrusted the power of money management to the Federal Reserve System, it endeavored to provide that this power would not be controlled by private interests on the one hand or be subject to political manipulation on the other.

In adopting that approach, the Congress seems to me to have been very wise. Because it is important to remember that when we deal with the subject of money, we are also dealing with the faith and credit of the United States.

When I was overseas recently, one thing that impressed me, more than ever, was how much people in other countries look on the dollar as a symbol of this country's strength. To them, a decline in the value of the dollar, to say nothing of a formal devaluation, would mean a decline in the faith and credit of the United States. They would regard it as a sign of decline not only in American economic strength but also in moral force.

But money has more than a symbolic value. It serves as a medium of exchange, as a standard for measuring value, and also as a means of storing value. In so doing, it also serves—so long as its own value is maintained—to keep our entire economy functioning efficiently for the maximum benefit of all.

Furthermore, we should never forget that money—if good—is also an instrument of liberty. As we know from history, it was not until payment in labor and produce was supplanted by payment in cash that men were able to break out of the serfdom that had bound the mass of them for life to their native plot of soil and their native status in society.

For these, and for many other reasons, money should never be a political issue. There are numerous, legitimate areas of difference between the parties—foreign policy, the limitations of Federal power, the prevention of monopolies and other matters of both theory and practice on which the voters are divided by their convictions or interests. But in my judgment it is clear that the necessity to maintain the value of our money is accepted by the rank and file of Democrats and Republicans alike, and certainly neither party can benefit by depreciating the dollar.

In carrying out its nonpartisan role, the System is additionally fortunate in having a framework, provided by Congress in the Federal Reserve Act, that was designed to accord recognition to the great diversity of conditions and problems to which our vast continent gives rise. The directors and the personnel of the regional banks—intelligent, experienced, and well-posted men—are strategically located. They provide the System with a distant early warning system—a "dew line"—in the economic sphere.

The individual Reserve banks, in their closeness to developing regional situations, also give the System a flexibility it would otherwise lack. The problems of one region today may be the problem of another region—or all other regions—tomorrow. The analysis, efforts, and experience of a Reserve bank in meeting the problems that it perceives could prove of utmost value for other regions and for the Nation as a whole.

One of the great challenges confronting all of us today is to improve economic understanding. The Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia is about to embark on a new venture to meet this challenge. The president of the Philadelphia bank, Karl Bopp, will tell us more about this later. I think you will see that what the Philadelphia bank is doing is an example of the benefits of a regional system.

The balance of public, private, and regional interests reflected in the framework of the System seems to me in the best American tradition. Democracy is always a balancing of conflicting interests and opinions. We permit and solicit the expression of differences in order to take advantage of the best possible ideas. It was Justice Holmes who pointed out that the competition of freely expressed ideas is not unlike, in its benefits, the competition among goods and services in the marketplace. We organize for free expression, for the adjustment of conflicting opinions and, finally, for cooperation. "The highest and best form of efficiency," Woodrow Wilson believed, "is the spontaneous cooperation of free people." It is the kind of cooperation that only a democracy can generate.

The economic process of building, producing, and consuming is a rational process. Men can master it through reason, and improve it through the discipline of objective study. If we are to achieve a wise and efficient balancing of policies and objectives in the complex world closing in upon us, the widest sort of understanding is necessary.

Consequently, it has been helpful to have discussion and debate, and critical studies of monetary policy. However, I hope, by now, that it is widely understood that economic problems cannot be solved by simple mechanical formulas, any more than monetary policy can be formulated by the wonderful machines that have today become invaluable aids.

The winds that carried the news of new worlds to William Penn and others carried also the scent of opportunity and freedom. We have made much of our freedom and opportunity in the virgin continent uncovered a short four and a half centuries ago. Our rewards have been substantial.

What began as a faith in the ability of men to govern themselves without producing anarchy and to fulfill their own ambitions without economic disaster has been confirmed by our growth and progress. We now understand that man has, and always had, tremendous energies for either constructive

or destructive enterprise. Our free systems, providing opportunities for success, as well as failure, have through a dynamic equilibrium of desires, channeled these energies into constructive achievement.

If we are to continue our advance, the problems of today, more complicated though they be, must be understood and the balance of what we can have—given what we do have and what we want—must be struck. This is no easy task. But with our economic and political heritage no one can doubt our success.

Remarks Made by Senator Douglas, of Illinois, at the Appreciation Dinner Honoring Henry H. Bolz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I made at the appreciation dinner honoring Henry H. Bolz be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I may say that Mr. Bolz is secretary of the Association of Commerce of Decatur, Ill. Not only was he honored by the association, but the unions of Decatur also honored him at a dinner. It is a somewhat unusual occurrence for the unions of a city to honor the secretary of the Association of Commerce. It is an indication of the high esteem in which Mr. Bolz has been held.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAUL H. DOUGLAS, OF ILLINOIS, AT THE APPRECIATION DINNER HONORING HENRY H. BOLZ, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 10, 1962, DECATUR, ILL.

Henry Bolz is a most unusual and valuable citizen—one of the very best that Decatur has ever had. For years he has worked with all his heart, brains, and soul for Decatur. He has tried to bring new industries to Decatur and has been largely successful. He has done this because such growth means increased payrolls and this brings greater prosperity and income to all.

But Henry has worked for many other civic purposes as well. As a reporter years ago, he was one of those who promoted the building of Lake Decatur which not only has saved Decatur economically, but has been a great recreational resource. For years he has been promoting the idea of a second lake to provide sedimentation, water supply, and added recreational features. I know he will continue to work for this and I am doing my best to help you and him.

Henry has also worked for industrial peace and greater understanding among groups in Decatur. Unlike the executive of some chambers of commerce, he has never engaged in any union-busting activities, but has tried to develop mutual cooperation between labor and management. As a result there has been less industrial warfare in Decatur in the last quarter of a century than in most cities.

Henry has also worked for honest, efficient, and humane government and has done so without throwing his weight around.

Henry has done all this because he is a truly good man, broadly tolerant, honorable, and kindly. He has devoted his energies to working with people for people.

God bless you, Henry, and may you keep on to the very end in the path you have hewn out for yourself. We are grateful for what you are and we will all be your friends from the heart, forever.

The Present-Day Doctor of Chiropractic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, director of industrial relations, National Chiropractic Association, Washington, D.C., recently forwarded to me a report on how chiropractic, the second largest healing profession, serves some 35 million Americans. This report was compiled by the Public Information Committee of the National Chiropractic Association and as part of my remarks today, Mr. Speaker, I herewith submit for the RECORD the aforementioned report:

THE TRUTH ABOUT CHIROPRACTIC

The progress of chiropractic was forcefully shown a few years ago when an unbiased fact-finding study was conducted by the Public Affairs Institute of Washington, D.C., a nationally known nonprofit research organization.

Results of this study have been published in a booklet titled "The Present Day Doctor of Chiropractic." The booklet makes known the latest facts of the profession as gathered by expert institute researchers under the direction of Dr. Dewey Anderson (A.B., M.A., Ph. D., Leland Stanford University).

We think that a statement from this scientific study of chiropractic states clearly and accurately its contribution to the general health and welfare of all Americans. This is the statement from "The Present-Day Doctor of Chiropractic":

"In these modern days of our high-speed nerve-exhausting living, chiropractic is fast becoming an indispensable element in helping people maintain good health."

The rapid growth of chiropractic—and its far-reaching effects on our national well-being—is dramatized by Dr. Anderson himself. In one phase of his study of chiropractic, he said:

"From a handful of patients somewhat more than a half a century ago who came to Dr. Daniel David Palmer (chiropractic's discoverer) and got relief, those being cared for by today's chiropractors number many millions. And every year the number swells as chiropractors become more proficient and as their satisfied and healthy patients spread the word. Here is the best and final test of an emerging profession seriously serving the public."

The following impressive facts concerning public acceptance of chiropractic need to be considered:

1. Chiropractic is the second largest healing profession in America. It is classified as one of the four major healing professions, by the Executive Office of the President of the United States, Bureau of the Budget, Washington, D.C.

2. Some 35 million patients from all walks of life visit the offices of North American chiropractors every year.

3. A standard 4-year course of study is required in chiropractic colleges. Up to 2 years of preliminary college education is prescribed by the various States.

4. More than 600 insurance companies recognize claims for services rendered by the chiropractors.

5. All Federal agencies are directed by the U.S. Civil Service Commission to accept sick-leave certificates signed by doctors of chiropractic.

6. The American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the the Disabled American Veterans have passed resolutions at their national conventions requesting the U.S. Veterans' Administration to furnish chiropractic treatment to veterans.

7. The Veterans' Administration authorized and financed chiropractic education for veterans of World Wars I and II and the Korean conflict.

8. Physicians in West Germany (a country noted for thoroughness in research) have been investigating chiropractic and are giving it warm acceptance.

9. Major unions of Federal employees have endorsed legislation to widen the use of chiropractic in Federal compensation work.

10. Scores of employers provide regular chiropractic treatment for their employees.

11. The Railroad Retirement Board accepts statements of sickness signed by chiropractors.

12. The Kerr-Mills Act providing medical assistance to the aged passed by the last U.S. Congress makes provision for payments to doctors of chiropractic.

The remarkable results of chiropractic in health care have won for chiropractic a permanent place in the family of health sciences, and in the hearts and homes of suffering humanity.

The Blind Course

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the February 7 issue of the Wall Street Journal had the following to say about the programs which the Federal Government has assigned to the various universities. I am sure all of the Members will be interested in these comments by Dr. Pusey, president of Harvard:

THE BLIND COURSE

As President Kennedy was sending Congress his education message, Congress was already acting on one of his education bills—the program for Federal help to colleges.

That suggests one of the troubles with the administration's approach. There are so many of these school-aid bills it is difficult for the citizen to keep them straight. Their impact upon taxpayers, and upon the schools themselves, is blurred.

For a hint of their impact upon schools, what has happened at Harvard University offers a dramatic and sobering example. Harvard is the most heavily endowed school in the United States. And yet President Nathan M. Pusey reports that in the past 2 years the university received more income from the Government than from endowments. "We are now involved," he says, "in 34 categories of programs managed by two-score Federal agencies." Together they make up about one-fourth of the university's annual budget. This relationship Dr. Pusey regards as hazardous.

This is not a condition peculiar to Harvard. In greater or lesser measure it involves many other schools throughout the country. Yet

ignoring the implications of this Federal liberality, the administration is determined to pour still more funds into the educational system. To continue to do so blindly, without even a glance at the effects of what has been done already, is not only hazardous but inexcusable.

Annual William Penn Award by Chamber of Commerce of Greater Philadelphia—Address by T. F. Bradshaw

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, at the meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Philadelphia last December, at which the chamber's annual William Penn Award was conferred upon Mr. William McChesney Martin, Jr., the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, two noteworthy speeches were given. One was by Mr. Martin, the other by Mr. T. F. Bradshaw, president of the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Philadelphia.

I do not always find myself in agreement with what is said at meetings of chambers of commerce, either local or national, but on this occasion I heartily endorse the views of Mr. Martin, which I have on another occasion inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, and also those of Mr. Bradshaw.

Only a few lines of Mr. Bradshaw's speech would I disavow—those in which he explains why he cannot speak as a "New Frontiersman," and his phrase "Heaven forbid" when he speaks of national planning. There is nothing in his plea for strengthening free enterprise that is inconsistent with the New Frontier.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of Mr. Bradshaw's remarks printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY T. F. BRADSHAW, PRESIDENT OF THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF GREATER PHILADELPHIA, AT THE WILLIAM PENN AWARD DINNER, DECEMBER 13, 1961

What needs to be done so that the Delaware Valley can realize the enormous potential of its natural resources and its people?

Now if I were speaking for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce or the NAM, the answer to that question would be simple and direct. I would merely say to the Federal Government: "Get off our backs and we—business—will do the job."

I know, and most of the members of the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce know, that this is a hopelessly inadequate answer. We know that this country is a vastly better place to live in than it was 30 years ago. We know that we have a far sounder economy, with more potential than we ever dreamed possible. We know that we have begun to attain certain social goals that we all consider essential. And we know that this has not been accomplished by the untrammeled exercise of 19th-century private enterprise. It has been accomplished by our own brand of advanced capitalism—responsible capitalism—spearheaded by responsible leadership in government, in labor, and in business.

If I cannot speak as a Goldwater conservative I also cannot speak as a New Frontiersman. In its zeal for moving forward, the present administration sometimes appears to lose sight of America's great strengths. The major strength is our own brand of capitalism, which provides all of us with the opportunity to compete, the incentive to excel, and the right to do both in freedom. Another great strength is the capacity of Americans to do for themselves those things which they must do for themselves. Our history is filled with examples of Americans, individually and in communities, who have done what needed to be done in the face of almost impossible odds.

Anything which the National Government does—this or any other administration—which lessens or detracts from our particular brand of private enterprise and our particular kind of self-reliance is a great disservice to the American people. Indeed, it is an affront to the American people.

So in considering what can be done to realize the potential of this Delaware Valley we must give first consideration to what the citizens of this city and this valley can do for themselves, and then, reluctantly, consider those things which must be accomplished in partnership with the National Government.

Of course, there are many things which can only be done by the people of the Delaware Valley joining hands in partnership with the National Government.

As an example, consider this city. Philadelphia and most other cities are undergoing large changes. Once upon a time, the city was both a political and an economic unit. Today the city is still a political unit, but it is only a part of a large economic unit, stretching far beyond its borders. During this transition we need help. We need help in redesigning our city to fit its new role. We need redevelopment help to counteract the blight that this large change has brought about. We need help in developing our transportation facilities. We need help in developing our water resources.

As another example, consider the vast industrial change taking place in the Delaware Valley and elsewhere in the Nation. The large research expenditures made by industry are beginning to bear fruit and the process of change in our industries has been tremendously accelerated. This means that jobs become obsolete. This is the price of progress. But it also means that people become obsolete and this we can never let happen. We need help in relocating workers, in retraining workers, in educating young people who will someday be workers in this new kind of industrial world.

We all recognize these areas in which we must seek the help of the Federal Government—we recognize them more than the Federal Government itself does because we live here; we work here; and the future here will be our future.

The great strength of this Delaware Valley and the great strength of this Nation is the spirit of America's own brand of private enterprise. Our natural resources are no greater than those of the Soviet Union. Our national planners—if their talents were unleashed—heaven forbid—would be no more effective than those of the Soviet. Our great edge is a free people motivated by our enterprise system. Let us not whittle away at this enormous advantage.

I urge that, when the Government considers tax reform, it assesses each proposal against the standard of fair play and what that proposal will do to the spirit of enterprise. I urge that when the Government considers antitrust action, it applies only this yardstick: Does the action increase or decrease the opportunity to compete and thereby to strengthen or weaken the spirit of enterprise? I urge that, when the Government considers further controls on business, it applies the yardstick of whether these controls will further competition and thereby work for the benefit of all of us or whether they will throttle competition and thereby deliver American business into the hands of its foreign competitors.

I have said very little concerning specific programs because I believe the future of this city, this Delaware Valley, and this Nation depends upon principles.

First, the encouragement of the principle of self-reliance; second, the nurturing of America's greatest strength, the private enterprise system; third, an effective partnership with the National Government in appropriate areas.

I would ask the National Government to give us leadership in foreign affairs, where at times it has been sadly lacking. I would ask it to give us leadership in this wretched business of fallout shelters before the moral fiber of America disintegrates. I would ask it to leave to us, the people of the Delaware Valley, the responsibility for the future of the Delaware Valley.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of the 13th Congressional District of Michigan, may I underscore the expressions which have been made by so many of my distinguished colleagues in this Hall with reference to the 44th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukrainian National Republic. All have spoken of the unity and common purpose which we in this land share with the more than 40 million people of the Ukraine who have been shut off since 1920 behind the Iron Curtain of Soviet communism.

As we in America face the gravest crisis of the centuries, as we watch the parallels of the Ukrainian struggle around the world, the monumental impact of what it has cost the Ukrainian people, mentally, physically, and spiritually, to maintain the ideals and maintain the struggle for the dignity of freedom must strike us to the roots.

For 2 fleeting years between 1918 and 1920, surrounded by hostile forces, they struggled to secure and maintain the liberty, the high prize of self-determination and self-government which is an unquenchable striving within man. But the powers against them were too great and in the 40 and more years of enslavement since that time, generations of Ukrainian people have died without knowing the fulfillment of that which they desired. Remembering this, I recall the words of Scripture of the Apostle Paul: "These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them." They died in the faith that others would unceasingly continue the struggle for free-

dom and one day achieve it lastingly, and the evidence is that their faith continues to be justified. We hear of uprisings from time to time, even though we have not details of them and we know that the hope of freedom remains unabated, strongly persistent, and vibrant.

We whose lives are also staked in the tenets of liberty and individual freedom must and do support this struggle of the Ukrainian people. We are grateful for this continuing valiant resistance to the rule and force of Communist tyranny. It is an inseparable part of our fight that men everywhere who wish to be free shall be free and to the hard pursuit of this objective our Nation is pledged.

Mr. Speaker, this is not just a week's observance, this anniversary we share with the people of the Ukraine. We would want Ukrainians everywhere to know our Nation is intensely and urgently aware of their aspirations and these aspirations are before us as we day by day proceed with the task of making secure in the world the right to freedom.

Union Antitrust Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, an editorial was published in the February 5, 1962, edition of the Dallas Morning News entitled "Union Antitrust Laws." This editorial traces the progress of antitrust laws from the 1890 Sherman Antitrust Act to proposed legislation pending in this session before the Congress.

The editorial makes favorable comment on S. 2573, which I, along with some others of my colleagues, introduced during the last session of Congress, which would amend the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, and the LaGuardia Act to prohibit certain activities of labor organizations in the transportation industries in restraint of trade.

I believe this editorial will be of interest to my colleagues and to those who read the proceedings of this body. I am glad to have the support of the Dallas Morning News in furtherance of the proposed legislation. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNION ANTITRUST LAWS

Almost 100 years ago, Americans began to take cognizance of the growing danger of the business monopoly. Standard Oil Co. and other businesses were beginning to seize near-control of entire industries. To prevent this, in 1890 the Sherman antitrust law was passed. Business combinations or contracts which resulted in restraint of trade were outlawed. This law was perhaps one of the most important ever enacted by Congress in the field of economics. The Supreme Court, in one decision, held that the law applied to labor organizations as well as business firms.

During the administration of President Theodore Roosevelt, the Sherman Act was put to vigorous use, and the President made something of a reputation as a "trust-buster." William Howard Taft, who succeeded T.R., made little use of the law, but when he was succeeded in turn by Woodrow Wilson, antitrust action was revived. Congress, in 1914 strengthened the Sherman Act by passing the Clayton antitrust law. Four years later, the Webb-Pomerene Act was passed to exempt export associations from these laws.

Although these laws have never been enforced with even effort (they have been overused as many times, probably, as they have been neglected) and some industries have been able to evade their grasp, the long-term result of antitrust legislation has had an encouraging effect on our Nation's economy. The laws have forced competition. This in turn has held down prices, provided a diversity of products and created employment for many. Without them, it is doubtful that we could be as rich and powerful as we are today.

Greater benefits to the Nation would be possible if labor unions, which were specifically exempted from antitrust action by the Clayton Act of 1914, were included in our laws designed to prevent monopolies. Several of our unions today are more powerful than any of the business trusts ever were, and equally as arrogant. The stranglehold they possess over single and sometimes multiple industries is as great a menace to economic efficiency and progress, if not greater.

Four bills now pending in Congress would end antitrust immunities granted to unions by the Clayton Act. One of them, introduced by Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, would limit the right to strike and to engage in secondary boycotts for transportation unions only. The other three bills cover all industries involved in interstate commerce, and they would outlaw industrywide bargaining, prohibit joint employer bargaining, prevent restrictions on the number of employees allowed to enter a trade and make certain other shady union practices illegal.

Senator JOHN G. TOWER, Republican, of Texas, has also promised to introduce a union antitrust bill which would not apply to labor generally, but only to certain products.

It is probably unrealistic to expect Congress to act on any of these bills this year. Their sponsors tend to consider the proposals as long-term goals or at least countermeasures to offset other congressional attempts to ease existing legal curbs against union power.

Eventually, however, and the sooner, the better, organized labor should be brought back under the antitrust laws, where all other business combines have been placed, and where the Supreme Court once ruled it was and should be.

Money Problems of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Money Alone Cannot Solve the U.N. Problem," written by Arthur Krock, and published in the New York Times of today, February 8, 1962.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONEY ALONE CANNOT SOLVE THE U.N. PROBLEM

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 7.—The administration today presented for the countersignature of Congress a double draft on the Treasury to relieve the financial distress of the United Nations caused by large-scale military operations and fiscally delinquent members.

Testifying before a Senate committee in behalf of the proposed purchase by the United States of 50 percent of a U.N. bond issue of $200 million, Adlai E. Stevenson asserted that the imperative of the objective would justify an outright gift of the money—which many opponents of this plan would welcome as a straightforward, non-precedent-creating substitute. Addressing Congress as a whole, the President asked for a supplemental budget sum of $25.6 million to pay this Nation's share of the cost, so far, of one of the large-scale U.N. military operations—in the Congo, of which the end is not in sight.

But money alone will not solve the problem the U.N. has posed for this people and those of the only effective military allies of the United States. This problem is the product of several developments by which the General Assembly has become the activist force in the big glass house on the East River. Among these developments are: (1) a double standard of international morality, mandatory on the West, unregistered on the Soviet Union and such "unaligned" aggressors as Nehru; (2) the evolution of the Assembly majority, which can be formed of nations that pay 5½ percent of the U.N. costs, into a group which will approve any resolution, no matter how irresponsible or injurious to the pursuit of world peace, if represented as "anti-colonialism."

The tactic of the Kennedy administration, once it made the major decision to base fundamental foreign polices of the United States on positions taken by the U.N. Assembly majority, has been to ignore these problems, or to obscure them for the American people in a cloud of official statements. So candor has been left to British statesmen. How this can be used constructively, with the purpose of preserving the U.N., is demonstrated by the following extracts from Prime Minister Macmillan's speech to the Commons on February 5.

"[The U.N.] is not a sovereign body. It is not even an alliance. * * * It is an association of sovereign states whose sovereignty is especially emphasized in the charter. * * * One of the difficulties about the resolutions [urging "immediate independence" of all peoples, the Katanga military operation, etc.] is that many of them are contrary to the charter * * * are sometimes conflicting and often obscure * * *.

"The whole foundation on which the U.N. was built has been undermined [by the cold war] with 'a number of unalined nations lying outside.' The U.N. can never be made to work unless political conditions can be created in the world which allow the * * * Council to operate, not for perpetual propaganda purposes, not as a body permanently divided, but as a team* * *."

THE BRITISH POLICY VERSUS OURS

The Prime Minister observed that since the British Government thinks "the first purpose of the U.N. ought to be to bring

about peace, not war," it seeks "to prevent the U.N. from being drawn into a position in which it will become a kind of new colonial power, with vast and increasing obligations for administration, finance and military operations far beyond its present capacity." "Honesty," he said, required the British to oppose resolutions [the U.S. delegate voted for], though in "broad sympathy" with their concept, because of language like this—in a resolution "adopted 6 months after the Congo outbreaks and still frequently invoked—'inadequacy of political, economic or educational preparedness should never serve as a pretext for delaying independence.'" This, said Macmillan, "is not the path to freedom, but to chaos."

Macmillan's appraisal that candor is in the interest of the U.N.'s survival, is in sharp contrast with this Government's policy of inducing reform by glossing over and going along. Representative of this thinking were decisions by which the prestige of charter delinquents will be bolstered: the post-Goa visit to India of the First Lady, with Nehru as honored host, and the impending honorific visit of the President's Attorney General and brother to Indonesia and Sukarno.

The Country's Future Needs for Leisure Outdoors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission has completed 3 years of study looking toward this country's future needs for leisure in the outdoors. The report, I believe, represents a map for the wise cooperative efforts of local, State, and Federal Governments, plus private interests. While there may be some questions about the recommendations and conclusions of the Commission, I think most people will find the report extremely useful. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the New York Times of February 2, and a profile of the able Chairman of the Commission, Mr. Laurance Rockefeller, which appeared in the New York Times of February 1, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RECREATION REPORT

The report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission well states the problem posed by America's exploding urban population in its impact on the diminishing open spaces of our country.

With its required emphasis on recreation as such, the Commission did not supply the entire answer to the broader problems of conservation and preservation of the country's natural (including scenic) resources; but its thoughtful program as outlined yesterday could do much to meet the Nation's prospective recreational needs if it is translated into action with determination and speed.

Under the forceful chairmanship of Laurence S. Rockefeller, the Commission has envisioned responsibilities for every level of government: A pivotal role in planning and land acquisition for the States; an equally important share in planning, open space reservation and development for local government; other needs that can be met only, or best, by private enterprise.

Moving with commendable initiative, the Kennedy administration has been at work on specific proposals designed to realize the Federal part of the blueprint. The President will spell these out later this month in a special message to Congress. He is then expected to renew his call for new national parks, national seashores, and wildlife, refuges and, also in line with ORRRC recommendation, propose a system of user fees and possibly new excise taxes to help pay the cost.

A number of the Commission's recommendations are sure to arouse controversy, such as its proposal to create a new Bureau within the Department of the Interior and a Cabinet-level Council to coordinate the now often overlapping, often conflicting, programs of a score of Federal agencies. Here we think the Commission erred on the side of caution; for what is really needed is an entirely new and independent Department of Natural Resources. The proposed land-classification system is interesting and provocative; and, if strengthened could be of great value in preserving open spaces for their best uses.

The country is going to have to face up to the problem of providing outdoor recreational opportunities for 350 million Americans by the year 2000. We cannot enlarge the National and State park systems, protect wilderness, save essential wildlife habitat, clean up polluted streams, manage the national forests and develop public waters and beaches without spending money in the process.

The States and local governments must bear their share of the expense, and the ultimate cost will be less if they also get started at once. The Commission urges early action by the States, pointing to the examples already set by New York, New Jersey, and a few others. Nor is there time to be lost in metropolitan regions where undeveloped areas suitable for parks and playgrounds are being ruined if not devoured in unplanned sprawl.

To advocate inaction or countenance delay is simply to close one's eyes to glaring problems and obvious needs. The present generation is saddled with extra cost for the abatement of water and air pollution and for the replanning and renovation of blighted cities because our fathers failed to look ahead and refused to invest an "ounce of prevention." We should do better for our children.

CITY-BRED OUTDOORSMAN: LAURANCE SPELMAN ROCKEFELLER

Although he majored in philosophy in college, lists himself in "Who's Who" as a business executive, invests heavily in space-age industry and donates vast sums to medical philanthropy, Laurance Spelman Rockefeller takes particular pride in being called a "conservationist."

His abiding concern with the preservation of our natural treasures was eloquently expressed in the program submitted yesterday to the President and Congress on "Outdoor Recreation for America."

The comprehensive program, resulting from a 3-year study by a commission headed by Mr. Rockefeller, looks to the year 2000. It calls for a recognition of the need to assure the American people that the Government wil prevent the destruction and neglect of recreation lands and will expand and improve them over a long-term period.

Mr. Rockfeller has told friends that his interest in conservation was inspired by his late father, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and enlivened by a trip to Jackson Hole, Wyo., when he was 16 years old.

A 33,000-ACRE PURCHASE

Under the guidance of the then superintendent of Yellowstone National Park, Horace M. Albright, the young Rockefeller became acquainted with the vast natural beauty of the region and left with a determination, encouraged by his father, to work for its preservation.

By 1940, the elder Rockefeller had bought 33,000 acres and established the Jackson Hole Preserve, Inc., a nonprofit organization for "protecting and preserving, for the benefit of the public, the primitive grandeur and natural beauties of the landscape in areas notable for picturesque scenery.

Nine years later, Laurance Rockefeller, as president of this group, donated the Jackson Hole property to the U.S. Government. Congress added it to the Grand Teton National Park in 1950.

"The beauty and the wonder of nature are vital human needs to which we all turn for comfort and perspective, happiness and renewed faith. Never to know the beauty of nature is not to have lived in full," Mr. Rockefeller has said.

Through his subsequent efforts primitive areas of the Virgin Islands, waterfront regions of Puerto Rico and parts of the island of Hawaii have been developed and preserved as recreation areas.

In 1957 he was awarded the Horace Marden Albright Award for "distinguished service in the field of scenic conservation and preservation."

This avocation has given wide opportunities for Mr. Rockefeller to indulge his hobbies of cruising, fishing, hunting, hiking, riding, and photography.

Mr. Rockefeller, a tall, rangy man who prefers informal dress and the garb of the outdoors, was born in New York on May 26, 1910. He received a bachelor of arts degree in philosophy at Princeton University in 1932.

ACTIVE IN NAVAL AFFAIRS

For the next 10 years he participated in the myriad business and philanthropic affairs of his family. In 1942 he joined the Navy and was assigned chiefly to the Bureau of Aeronautics, Production Division. He is now a member of the Naval Air Reserve Advisory Council.

"Man has a basic need for the outdoors. He needs it for physical recreation, for contemplation, for stimulation of his senses and sensibilities. It is more than a matter of looking at scenery—though this, too, has its elemental value. It is a matter of assuring, for man, that measure of contact with nature that is vital in developing the whole man," he has said.

In 1934 he married the former Mary French. Their children are Laura, Marion, Lucy, and Laurance. They live at 834 5th Avenue, between 64th and 65th Streets. Mr. Rockefeller serves on a number of park commissions in this area. He is also a trustee and president of the American Conservation Association.

Political Influence in Awarding of Contracts for Defense Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, on January 25, 1962, the chairman of the California congressional delegation sent a

letter to Secretary McNamara, calling attention to the fact that political groups will attempt to influence the U.S. military services in the awarding of contracts for defense purposes. The Secretary of Defense, on February 2, 1962, answered Congressman SHEPPARD's letter and stated unequivocally that "capability of performance, quality, and price are primary factors in our determinations."

We in California are glad to hear this because we believe that these defense contracts should be awarded on the basis of which firm can produce the best product at the lowest price and in the earliest possible time. The State of California which, this year, will become the first State, populationwise, in the United States, with 38 Congressmen, intends to compete for defense business on the merits. We challenge our critics to sharpen their pencils if they want to compete with us and we propose, although we have great political power, to resist politics in the awarding of defense contracts. I assert again that we are willing, in every instance, to compete on the merits with those who claim California gets too much of the defense business of this Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the letter of January 25, 1962, written by Congressman SHEPPARD, and the answer of Secretary of Defense McNamara to which I have already referred.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 25, 1962.

The Honorable ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Once again there is evidence that political groups will attempt to influence the U.S. military services to award contracts based on geographic, distressed area, or other considerations instead of quality and cost. In our opinion, the importance of resisting such pressures cannot be overstated.

Last month, a New York Times article stated the New York congressional delegation's steering committee protested to you about a decline in New York's defense business, and went on to quote that committee as stating such decline "is truly shocking when read in relation to the statistics reflecting the increasingly dominant role of California in such procurements." What would truly be shocking, Mr. Secretary, is if military procurement officials allowed themselves to be swayed by this type of appeal.

We also noticed in Washington newspapers the action of the Governor of Maryland and a committee including Maryland Congressmen seeking defense work in their State because one of their defense companies was laying off some 2,500 workers. (It was interesting to note the same company at the same time had added 3,000 employees at its plant locations in Colorado and Florida.) This action imitates similar actions by other States in the past year or two, and most of the criticism is leveled at the State of California.

Historically, our military services have led the world in their military might and it is obvious that the welfare of our Nation depends on its ability to continue that leadership. During this history of leadership, the services have consistently bought from the private firms producing the best and most advanced articles at the lowest cost. Thus, quality and price have been the two important considerations in the minds of military procurement officials, and this basis for procurement has helped greatly in achieving our Nation's outstanding record of military success.

To buy on any other basis invites second-rate products at excessive costs during a time when neither the world situation nor the economy of our Nation will allow us such a luxury.

The fact that so many of our Nation's top defense manufacturing firms are located in California is due to many good and understandable reasons, including the benefits from the close availability of an experienced and very skilled pool of workers and technicians. For similar reasons, other industries have concentrated in other sections of our country, such as textile firms in the Northeast and South, automotive firms in Michigan, electronic firms in Northeastern and Middle Atlantic States, steel and other metal products in the East and Midwest. But the California congressional delegation never has complained of concentration of Government purchases of such items in those geographic areas. The same principle holds true here: it is to the advantage of our Nation to make Government purchases on the basis of merit—and not on the basis of support for a geographical area.

Our experience with California defense products manufacturers indicates that they are unanimous in their willingness, and eagerness, to compete for Government business on a strictly merit basis—without seeking geographic or any other type of special favor. Indeed, they are concerned that geographic favor for other sections of the Nation may make it difficult or them to compete on merit alone.

The State of California and its congressional delegation, of which I am chairman, shares this concern in behalf of our thousands of skilled workers and our many fine manufacturers in California. We hope you may be able to assure us we have no cause for such concern.

We are sending copies of this letter to your three service Secretaries, and another to Mr. James Webb, as we believe it would be as great a mistake for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration as for the Department of Defense to downgrade their procurement efforts.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter, and we would be very interested to have your comments in reply.

Yours very truly,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
Chairman, California Congressional Delegation.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, February 2, 1962.

DEAR MR. SHEPPARD: I appreciate your letter of January 25, stating your views on the subject of defense procurement policies.

It is, indeed, the policy of this Department to award defense contracts with full recognition to the priorities involving considerations of merit. Capability of performance, quality, and price are primary factors in our determinations. We are currently engaged in intensive efforts to strengthen incentives for outstanding performance.

As I stated before the Armed Services Committee, we recognize that changes in military programs create very difficult problems for the businesses, communities, and individuals affected. Therefore, we have taken such reasonable measures as lie within the capabilities of the Government to alleviate hardships. Within the Defense Department itself we have established a special office to deal with problems stemming from such dislocations. We shall continue these efforts in the future but we cannot compromise the basic principle that the defense programs must be guided primarily by national security requirements.

We appreciate your support for this basic policy of the Department of Defense.

Sincerely,
ROBERT S. MCNAMARA.

The Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very comprehensive article by Mr. Jake Schreiber of the New Paltz, (N.Y.) Independent, outlining the major problems of the eastern farmer. Mr. Schreiber is an avid student of governmental affairs and has the benefit of considerable agricultural experience in his own right. I certainly agree with his views concerning the importance of the family farm and the deplorable results of governmental interference in recent years. His recent article follows:

THE FARM PROBLEM
(By Jake Schreiber)

For 30 years now, the question of helping the farmer through Government subsidy has been kicked around by our lawmakers and it appears that the secret has not yet been found as to how to control both the farmer and his crops.

The idea of the politicians all along has been, that the one-man family farm must be protected by Government grants to stay in business. This has been and is feeding right into the hands of the big operator, especially in the Midwest, who creates the surpluses, because his operating costs are only a fraction of the cost on a small eastern farm to grow a crop. Not only are small farms inefficient on account of the high cost of machinery but taxes eat up a good share of the income.

Really the small farmer has not been helped. In fact, he would be better off today if there had never been any Government interference—either regulations or subsidies—because a small eastern farmer has to pay high prices for feeds he needs to stay in business, which are subsidized by his own taxes he pays to the Government, while surpluses keep building up in Government warehouses.

If the Government stayed out of the farming business, surpluses would fast disappear and farming would adjust itself accordingly. The eastern farmer would be much better off because feed prices would be cheaper and, being near the largest markets in the world for his products, he could control his acreage according to market requirements. The western farmer, that is, the genuine farmer (not the fellow who either has a Government job, or who makes his money in other business, and farms only for pleasure) he would be better off, too, because he would not have to compete with the gentleman farmer for a living. In fact, the gentleman farmer is only in business because of subsidies, otherwise he would quit in a hurry.

Now it begins to look as if the American farmer may lose his export trade, as it appears that at least six European nations are conspiring to keep American imports of farm

produce out through their Common Market bloc they are setting up. So unless our Government bargains for the farmer he may lose the little export trade that is left.

The only big trouble in the United States is that production costs are too high to compete with Europe, may it be in farm or industrial products. With ever-increasing production cost through the ever-increasing cost of labor, it begins to look as if we may have to forget exporting anything, except what we can afford to give away.

The Urban Affairs Political Potato

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the Congress is currently considering President Kennedy's reorganization plan to create a new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. The administration's proposal has been made in spite of the recent action by the House Committee on Rules, which soundly rejected the advisability of creating a new Federal bureaucracy. A recent editorial in the Joplin, Mo., Globe calls attention to the real issues at stake in this administration's proposal, and under leave to extend my remarks the editorial follows:

THE URBAN AFFAIRS POLITICAL POTATO

It may turn out to be all to the good that Washington is making a political football out of the issue of creating a new Cabinet-level Federal bureaucracy of urban affairs. If the people are made to realize that the whole idea is costly political payoff, they may exert pressures to kill it.

It does seem regrettable that President Kennedy has seen fit to inject the racial issue into the matter, even though it is called smart politics. He could have kept this emotional and divisive issue out of it merely by not announcing in advance that he intends to give the Cabinet appointment to a Negro. Ordinarily a President does not announce the intended appointee to any job before the job is even created.

Of course, it is clear the President so acted in this instance to make it appear that all opponents of a Department of Urban Affairs were opposed to a Negro holding a Cabinet post. Actually the basic opposition is on principle—opposition to further costly expansion and centralization of Government power.

The truth is that behind it all is an intended administration payoff to the big cities and their labor-backed political machines for giving the Democrats their victory in 1960. It would mean new multi-billion-dollar sop to the big towns to further entrench political control. And all at taxpayer expense.

The Republicans admitted at their recent national committee meeting in Oklahoma City that it was the big cities that beat them in 1960. So the President now puts these Republicans on the spot if they now vote against his urban affairs setup.

Well, we hope both Democrats and Republicans in Congress who conscientiously oppose the urban affairs grab will display the courage to stand by their convictions favoring State and local home rule, regardless of partisan politics. They thus will be displaying the "profiles in courage" which Mr. Kennedy so eloquently wrote about in a book some years ago, before he became President.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devouted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

JANUARY 25, 1962.

Congressman FLOOD of Pennsylvania,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Good luck on House rule 211. People from Michigan are behind you.

ROBERT DESMOND.

BUFFALO, N.Y.,
January 24, 1962.

Congressman D. J. FLOOD,

DEAR SIR: I am a 20-year-old college student; and I reside in Snyder, N.Y. I am an ardent member of the "twisting generation," a generation considered by many as one of the most unfortunate in the history of the world. We are considered unfortunate because we were born into the world of the atomic bomb.

I can see why some people will say this; but I have never heard any member of my own age group use the term unfortunate in this sense. We may grumble about school, work, and life in general; but we do not feel unfortunate. It is sort of tiresome to hear people refer to us as a "beat generation" that is afraid to face reality. This is not the case.

Our generation is very interested in the world situation. Many of us are sick and tired of being pushed around. We want to do something about it; but we are continually being told that if we push back an atomic war will develop. The United States gives money to countries such as Yugoslavia and what happens? They turn on you at a Belgrade Conference. Cuba, Laos, the Congo, Tibet, and Vietnam are a few areas in which our country has failed. Our only success in these areas has been to keep the Communists within a certain area that does not belong to them in the first place. All over the world we are suffering setbacks at the hands of the Communists and their propaganda. I believe we should do something about this right now.

We should first find out who our real friend are in the world and direct our aid accordingly. We then hit communism in its own backyard. War would be senseless; but we could give the Communists a little of their own medicine. We hit Russia where it will do the most good, in their "Achilles heel" as Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University phrases it.

According to Dr. Dobriansky, Moscow's "Achilles heel" is the group of captive nations enslaved by Russia. Captive nations such as White Ruthenia, Ukraine, Georgia, and Turkestan are strategically more important than countries like Yugoslavia. The people in these areas have extreme patriotic nationalism. This nationalism should be recognized.

House Resolution 211, introduced by you, Congressman FLOOD, will do this. Khrushchev perceives the importance of this resolution; and he has openly attacked it. He knows that a Special House Committee on Captive Nations, if managed properly, would destroy the world's image of Russia as a monolithic state. The world would realize that Russia is not a nation of true Russians; but one of enslaved and exploited people of many races and creeds.

A House Committee on Captive Nations would be a definite blow to the Russians. Therefore I entreat you to advance House Resolution 211. I do not speak for myself alone; but for the majority of the "beat generation." We have never experienced the hardships of a world war; but I doubt that we would not accept the challenge of war. In the next war, however, we would probably not be given the chance to prove ourselves; for the next war would be one of almost complete destruction in a matter of hours. We must defeat the Communists in other ways; and a Special House Committee on Captive Nations would hit at the heart of the matter.

Respectfully yours,

J. BRIAN FERREL.

CAPTIVE NATIONS DETERRENT TO KHRUSHCHEV, EDITOR SAYS

CHICAGO, January 22.—The captive nations behind the Iron Curtain "deter Nikita Khrushchev, the Soviet boss, from pushing his luck too far," an editor declared here.

Walter Dushnyck, editor of the Ukrainian Bulletin and the Ukrainian Quarterly, told more than 2,000 persons at a Ukrainian freedom rally that the captive nations are "the weakest link in the structure of the Soviet Union."

He said that the Ukraine and such nations as Poland, Czechoslovakia, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia will never give up their hopes for freedom and thus Soviet Russia must always be on guard for fear of a revolt.

The freedom rally was held under the sponsorship of the League of Americans of Ukrainian Descent and the Association of Ukrainian American Social Organizations of Illinois.

Dushnyck charged that the U.S. Government is not doing all it could to aid peoples seeking freedom from Soviet Russia.

"Regrettably, the U.S. Government, while supporting all African and Asian peoples in their quest for freedom and independence, is hesitant and even indifferent toward the

plight of such non-Russians in the U.S.S.R. as the Ukrainians, Armenians, Byelorussians, Georgians, Turkestanis, and others who are fighting against Russian imperialism," Dushnyck stated.

He said that 45 million Ukrainians have never submitted to Communist rule and continue to fight underground for freedom.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
January 25, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I recently learned that you are the sponsor of a resolution to form a special committee in the House on the question of the captive nations. I am firmly behind any bill that would draw the attention of the free world to these nations, especially those within the Soviet Union itself.

Judging from the commotion that was caused in the Kremlin by the original captive nations resolution a few years ago, I am sure that a permanent committee on the captive nations in the House would give us another psychological advantage in the cold war. If the Soviets can scream about the "colonial powers" in the West, there is no reason why we should not draw continuing attention to the largest colonial empire in the world. Also, such a committee in Congress would give the imprisoned people in the U.S.S.R. and Europe some hope for eventual freedom.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN P. SHEAHAN.

TWO THOUSAND ATTEND RALLY: UKRAINIANS HEAR RUSK CRITICIZED

U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk was criticized here last night by a Progressive Conservative member of Parliament from Manitoba for having advocated deletion of the name of the Ukraine from the list of enslaved nations.

Addressing a Ukrainian Independence Day rally at Massey Hall, J. N. Mandziuk, member for Marquette, said Mr. Rusk reportedly based his stand on the grounds that the Ukraine is traditionally a part of the Soviet Union.

"Such a policy suits the czars of the Kremlin who, under the guise of protecting Europe against German militarism, can continue to expand their colonial empire," the speaker, who is of Ukrainian descent, declared.

More than 2,000 Ukrainian-Canadians attended the rally which marked the 44th anniversary of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence.

To Ukrainians it has always been most frustrating to see lipservice paid to the liberation of the satellite countries, Mr. Mandziuk stated, while efforts were being made to stifle every step of the Ukrainian liberation movement on the false theory that Russia and the Ukraine are one and indivisible and that Russia must be kept powerful to counterbalance the threat of German militarism.

But the world is finally awakening to the Russian danger, he added, with Canada taking the lead in the awakening.

A recent address to ethnic groups in Toronto by Prime Minister John Diefenbaker and a speech by former Liberal cabinet minister Paul Martin in Windsor are proof that Canadian statesmen and political leaders are not mincing words when it comes to exposing the sinister designs of the Soviets, he said.

Mr. Mandziuk added that since the Second World War a worldwide Ukrainian movement directed toward winning the sympathy and support of the Western democracies for the cause of Ukrainian liberty has been steadily gaining momentum.

The solution of the Ukrainian problem, he observed, is bound up with the collapse of not only the Red regime but in the collapse of Moscow as a great power.

"Upon that event depends the ultimate triumph of liberty and democracy to all nations on the other side of the Iron Curtain," Mr. Mandziuk declared.

Arab Says Israel Has No Job Bias

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I place into the RECORD an article which appeared in the New York Times today, February 8, 1962. The report clearly indicates that Israel is deserving of international commendation for its progress in the field of tolerance and brotherhood:

ARAB SAYS ISRAEL HAS NO JOB BIAS—UNIONIST ON TRIP HERE DENIES DISCRIMINATION BY JEWS

(By Kathleen Teitsch)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., February 7.—Salim Jubran, a Christian Arab, takes great pride in the 30,000 Arab trade union members who work side by side with Jewish workers in Israel's factories and business offices.

They work together peacefully and profitably, receiving equal pay for equal work, he said today with obvious satisfaction.

Mr. Jubran was a pioneer in organizing trade unions for Arab teachers during the 1930's and 1940's when Britain administered Palestine under a League of Nations mandate. He organized the first coeducational secondary school for Arab children.

Two years ago he played a leading part in integrating the separate Arab trade groups into the Histadrut—Israel's largest union. Mr. Jubran came to the United States to meet and talk with labor groups on a visit arranged by the Israeli consulate.

DISCRIMINATION DENIED

He has discovered with some surprise, he said, that there is a popular misconception here that Arab workers are discriminated against and have second-class status.

Mr. Jubran attests to the gains made by Arab workers and the positions attained by the professional groups—the physicians and administrators.

"We have them all, all except capitalists," he says smiling.

Mr. Jubran makes no secret of his view that Arab workers fare far better in Israel than many of those in the neighboring countries.

"The Arabs who remained in Israel are not living in paradise, but they are making a great deal of progress—progress they never dreamed of, and their living standards are higher than those of Arabs in other countries," he said.

He cites the jump in school enrollments—95 percent of the Arab boys have received schooling and 65 percent of the girls.

Arab women in Israel have profited by the progress made by Jewish women, which has enabled them to break down old barriers and enter the labor force. Fourteen years ago, it was common to see Arab women trudging miles to carry water home in jugs. Today every village have its own sanitary water supply and each house its own tap.

Mr. Jubran, who is fluent in both Arabic and Hebrew, speaks frequently of "our Jewish brethren." Like many Middle Easterners, he prefers to express himself by stories and proverbs.

He likens the problem of the Arabs in Israel to a tree. All the branching difficulties come from one root and that is the question: Can the Arab be loyal to Israel?

There is no simply yes or no answer, he says, but one essential is to persuade the Arabs that if they want equal rights they must accept equal obligations to be good citizens.

SOLUTION BELIEVED POSSIBLE

Mr. Jubran expressed the belief that Israel cannot ask Israel Arabs to fight their Arab neighbors, but that "there is such a thing a passive loyalty."

He termed the predicament of the Palestinian Arabs who left Israel during the war in 1948 as a human rather than a political problem, which could be solved.

Communism—A Threat to the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD one of the winning essays in the American Legion contest. The following winning essay was written by Marjorie Dvorak, of Reliance, S. Dak.:

COMMUNISM—A THREAT TO THE CONSTITUTION

America is a dream—a dream of freedom which is sought and desired by people throughout the world who have faith, hope, and love for that ideal. Unless a nation excels us in the way of life as set forth in the American Constitution, America will never be surpassed. Our Constitution insures freedom and security for man's inalienable rights. It is not the vast material wealth of our Nation which makes the United States a great land. That is only a byproduct. Instead, it is the wonderful promise of life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness, freedom of religion, speech, and the press, the treatment of all men as equal, the right to vote and the right to think, act, and work freely.

But even though the dream of America may never be surpassed, it could be defeated—defeated by communism, the spreading force which knows no rules of fairplay or good conduct, a force which cares not about happiness or the rights of men, women, and children.

Communism is like a giant octopus spreading its tentacles, seeking to crush with loud cries of propaganda and threats of physical violence the American way of life. Communism includes not only the Soviet Union, but Communist China and their satellites as well. The glowing promises of Communist propaganda do not fade into grim reality until it is too late. Already nearly a third of the human race has been forced to live under their rule. Khrushchev and his associates are dedicated to the communistic faith—a faith which seems to compel them to spread their system beyond their homes and their land to the rest of the globe—including the entire free world.

How can we fight communism? How can we offer freedom to the millions of people

who deserve it as much as we? Our democracy was inherited from our forefathers. It is our birthright, but it will be ours to keep for only as long as we are willing to keep it. Like an heir to a fortune, Americans must not foolishly spend away their freedom with no thought for the future and, too late, find that their dreams are destroyed.

The Constitution presents our principles of freedom and establishes our rights as citizens. Ours is truly a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people." This is our heritage and communism seeks to destroy it all. We must not let this happen. The preservation of liberty as we know it in America is not up to our officials, our neighbors or our churches. It is up to you and me. We help to compose the government and the churches; we help to write laws and to prevent injustice; we are citizens and citizens form nations. We are a democratic nation.

As citizens of the free world we must meet three requirements. First, we must accept responsibility. This is no small task. Every American is a government man—he is by duty bound to protect himself and his fellow man against all enemies both at home and abroad. We must preserve freedom for ourselves and for others. We must also safeguard the freedom of our Nation and that of other nations. We must help to make America stronger, better, and greater by being not just good citizens, but by being ambassadors of good citizenship. Every man in America must do his duty; every man must accept his responsibility.

The second requirement is self-discipline—training ourselves to speak, think, and act as an American, as one who practices peace and good will toward mankind, and as one who wishes to preserve the fine and honest things in life.

The third requirement of a good citizen is sometimes very difficult. It is the Golden Rule: "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." We do not like to have Communists impose their way of life upon us. In accordance, we would be wise not to force our beliefs upon them. Democracy is for those who want it, those who are ready to accept it, and for those who are willing to sacrifice whatever it may take to make a democratic way of life available to them. Thousands of people have left their homes and families behind them and they have come to America in search of freedom. But that is their choice—neither communism nor democracy should be forced upon anyone. Likewise, even in fighting communism, we must respect the rights of others. Unfair attacks upon those whose views differ from our own have no place in a democratic society.

Every citizen, young or old, can help to preserve the freedom of the land we love—America. We can support institutions of education in their struggle against communism. All of us should uphold the laws of the land and those of us who are of age should make use of our right to vote. We have the right to assert individual opinions and freedom of religion as the very backbone of our country. Support public institutions and take active part in the political party of your choice. Practice good citizenship and resist anything which will corrupt; seek a sound, wholesome way of life. Have faith in American democracy.

Study both communism and democracy, their backgrounds, their beliefs, and their practices. Compare the two and reach your own conclusions. Be constantly alert to the dangers of communism and be prepared to combat them in any way you can. Practice the principles of freedom set forth in our Constitution; cherish and make use of them.

"We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and to our Posterity * * *."

And we shall protect and preserve these blessings as set forth in the Preamble to the Constitution of the United States of America. We shall protect them at any cost.

Soviet Economy Undershoots Goals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Soviet Union—by successive propaganda bomb bursts—continually oversaturates the atmosphere with bragging about communistic accomplishments and goals. Realistically, however, the great bragging of the Reds results not always in "great leaps forward" but, more often rather, in "short hops" or even stagnated, or retarded, progress.

To maintain a balanced picture, then, I believe it is important that we keep up to date, not just on its bragging, but also on realistic evaluations of Red progress.

Recently, the Christian Science Monitor published an informative article entitled "Soviet Economy Undershoots Goals."

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET ECONOMY UNDERSHOOTS GOALS

VIENNA.—Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev's promises in 1961 of more food and consumer goods have been boosted; so has heavy industrial potential. But the common people have less than they had a year ago. For them progress has slowed down. Only their number has increased—by nearly 4 million people.

The Soviet balance sheet for last year is far from encouraging. It bears out reports of internal criticism—criticism which could be inferred from rebuttals of unnamed critics in recent speeches by Mr. Khrushchev, Dimitry S. Polyansky, and Leonid F. Ilyichev.

Outside of the large cities the hope for improvement in the wake of Mr. Khrushchev's reforms has given way to discouragement. The peasants are taking their money out of the bank.

Mr. Khrushchev evidently has become aware that the shortcomings for which he sought radical remedies are deeply rooted in the system, that his marathon speeches before the central committee's agricultural plenum a year ago have been to no avail, that officialdom continues to respond bureaucratically, that there are lickspittles and incompetents everywhere, and that statistical reports still are being faked.

CROP ROTATION HALTED

For the time being Mr. Khrushchev keeps smiling and admonishes his subordinates to treat laggards considerately and not to set off "another hurricane" of dismissals. But faced with the inertia of so many farmers, farm managers, and farm bureaucrats, and with the failings of much of the party personnel, Mr. Khrushchev has done what he repeatedly did in the past: he has engaged in another big gamble.

Crop rotation is to be thrown out. Through continuous cropping Soviet agriculture this year is to be catapulted into prosperity. Yields are to be raised in 1 year by 30, 40, and 50 percent. It is as simple as that.

PARTY OVERHAULED

To carry out this policy the party once again is being overhauled with more than one-third of the membership shunted from one job to another under cascades of indoctrination and control campaigns.

One gamble can lead to another and discovery that the Soviet economy still is capable of quick progress only in pampered sections of industry, which in the last instance represent war potential, may lead Mr. Khrushchev on a dangerous path. His galloping tempo and cavorting denotes uncertainty and strain.

This appraisal is based on findings of experienced visitors to the U.S.S.R. from Western and Asian, as well as from Communist countries. It was corroborated on January 23 by the official plan fulfillment report for 1961 and by the report on an emergency Kremlin conference of party cadre officials in Pravda of January 27.

GROWTH RATE DROPS

Except for strategic industries the Soviet economy last year showed a stark loss of momentum. Production of vital items was lower than in 1960. An absolute decline was admitted not only for meat, fabrics, and timber, but also for metallurgical equipment, tractors, plows and coal.

Output of cotton fabrics was virtually the same as in 1960. The big spurt in mineral fertilizer, upon which the forced introduction of continuous cropping was predicated, did not come off.

The rate of growth has dropped sharply for such consumer goods as shoes and knitwear. Less housing was built than either in 1960 or 1959. House building by farmers and farm officials was at the lowest level in years.

Fewer new enterprises were started than in 1956. It was officially admitted that "about one-half of the capital invested went into projects which have remained incompleted for years."

Farm results were pitiful. Grain acreage increased by nearly 6 percent but the crop was only 2 percent larger than in 1960. It is still more than 10 million tons lower than in 1958 which is the base year of the 7-year plan.

Although the grain crop was only 2 percent larger than last year the Government has collected 11 percent more grain leaving the farms with so much less.

DESPITE BIG WORDS

The potato crop failed. Cotton and flax were far off schedule. Without Cuba the U.S.S.R. would have been short of sugar.

The cattle herd increased, but Mr. Khrushchev disclosed in Minsk on January 12 that in Byelorussia, for instance, half a million head of cattle delivered to the State had an average weight of less than 200 kilograms (440 pounds)—actually calves.

The number of privately owned pigs dropped by more than 1 million. The overall increase was slower than in 1960 although the Premier a year ago had promised to remedy the meat shortage through much faster pig breeding.

Despite use of big words and statistical window dressing, living standards of the mass of the people must have declined. Rural savings deposits last year dropped even more than in 1960.

The number of new savings accounts was less than one-quarter of what it had been in 1960 and less than one-sixth of what it was in 1959. The number of savings accounts owned by the rural population for the first time declined absolutely.

Few developments speak more clearly.

On the positive side, as in Stalin's day, were nearly 5 million tons of new steel capacity, new huge powerplants, and tire factories.

Italian Board of Guardians Honor Congressman Victor L. Anfuso

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on October 29, 1961, I was privileged to be honored by the Italian Board of Guardians at a testimonial dinner at the Hotel Astor in New York on the occasion of the organization's 25th anniversary of its founding. The reason why I was chosen for this signal honor was because I was the founder of the organization.

The Italian Board of Guardians was established for the purpose of combatting juvenile delinquency and helping children from broken homes. In the course of the years it became affiliated with the Catholic Charities of Brooklyn and its record of achievements is widely recognized.

Some 1,500 persons attended the dinner which turned out to be an event of personal tribute and affection for me and my family. Heading the list of distinguished guests were the Vice President and Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, Mayor Robert F. Wagner of New York, and many national, State and New York City leaders in government, religion, civic affairs, industry and labor.

In addition to the real tributes that evening, I was also the recipient of two awards. One, was the Founder's Award in the form of a bronze plaque presented to me by the Italian Board of Guardians "in grateful recognition of 25 years of dedicated service as benefactor of our youth." The other, was an award from the state of Israel in the form of a beautifully embossed Bible, personally inscribed by His Excellency Avraham Harman, the Israel Ambassador to the United States, and presented to me by Ambassador Michael Comay, the Israel representative to the United Nations.

It would be impossible, due to limitations of space, to insert into the RECORD all the addresses and the many congratulatory messages received from dignataries of all walks of life. I shall, therefore, limit it to the following:

The address by Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson; the congratulatory message from President Kennedy; the message from our distinguished Speaker, the Honorable John W. McCormack, then still the majority leader of the House; also from the Honorable John B. Connally, Secretary of the Navy; the Honorable Herbert H. Lehman, our beloved former Governor of New York and former U.S. Senator; and the Honorable Angier Biddle Duke, Chief of Protocol of the United States. My son, Victor L. Anfuso, Jr., presented a bouquet of roses to his mother and paid a very wonderful tribute to her, which I am glad to include here. Then there is the wording of the Founder's Award and the introduction by the toastmaster and my good friend, the Honorable Edward D. Re, Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States.

Others who paid tribute were: Representatives John Rooney, of New York, and Torbert Macdonald, of Massachusetts; Jacob Potofsky, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America; Hon. Joseph T. Sharkey, majority leader of the New York City Council; Hon. Louis J. Lefkowitz, New York State attorney general; Hon. Lawrence E. Gerosa, comptroller of the city of New York; the Right Reverend Robert J. Testagrossa, pastor of St. Joseph's Patron Church; Rev. Anthony F. LoGatto, director of Catholic Charities in Queens; Hon. Joseph F. Carolino, speaker of the State assembly; Hon. Anthony J. Travia, minority leader of the State assembly; Hon. Bart Turecamo, president of the Italian Board of Guardians; Justice Anthony J. DiGiovanna, New York State Supreme Court; Justice Juvenal Marchisio, New York City Domestic Relations Court; Justice Leonard E. Ruisi, New York City Domestic Relations Court; State Senator Frank J. Pino; State Assemblyman Joseph R. Corso; Dr. Mario F. Tagliagambe, chairman of the IBG testimonial dinner committee; Hon. James V. Mangano, administrative director and general clerk, New York State Supreme Court; and the well-known labor leaders, Luigi Antonini, August Bellanca, and Howard Mollisani.

At the conclusion, I responded to all these tributes with an address which I am pleased to insert into the RECORD:

SPEECH BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON AT 25TH ANNIVERSARY DINNER OF THE ITALIAN BOARD OF GUARDIANS, HOTEL ASTOR, OCTOBER 29, 1961, IN HONOR OF ITS FOUNDER, CONGRESSMAN VICTOR L. ANFUSO

My dear friend, "VIC" ANFUSO, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, just to think that you live in a country where a boy born in a foreign land 56 years ago, coming here at the age of 9 years, could sit in the highest councils of the Congress and enjoy the respect and the devotion of the President of the United States, the colleagues with whom he serves and the members of the judiciary who are here this evening, is something that makes us all proud, not only of America, but of Americans.

I have met many members of the judicial branch of the Government this evening. I am aware of the great reverence and respect that the members of the bar have helped to bring about for that separate, independent branch of the Government known as the judiciary.

I have served with great pleasure with the Members of the Congress from the great State of New York and particularly the Members from Brooklyn. Some of them are here this evening. The State of Massachusetts honors us with the presence of Congressman MACDONALD.

I have served with five Presidents of this country during the 30 years that I have spent in Washington. In all those years I have never known a period when our courts, our Congress, and our Chief Executive were confronted with more serious problems or more trying times than face us tonight.

I am privileged to sit in the councils with the great leader of this country—the President of the United States—John F. Kennedy. I see that able judge of men and women spend every daylight hour and many hours in the evening, attempting to resolve the critical questions that come to him for decision and which cannot be passed on to anyone else.

From the experience of the last few months, I have drawn many lessons. One of the most important is this:

One thousand eight hundred million people in the world—almost 2 billion of the 3 billion total—have an income of less than $9 per month. In our part of the world we have an income of more than $8 per day. All 3 billion people are confronted with two philosophies, the Communist philosophy and the philosophy represented by the United States of America—a free country with three separate, independent branches of government, the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. If I could have my wish tonight, I would wish that the Congress in these times and the executive in these times could enjoy the same reverence and the same respect that are accorded to the judiciary.

The enemies of freedom-loving people know that they can never destroy America militarily. They know that they can never destroy America economically. So what would you do if you were looking at it from their viewpoint? You would do exactly what they wish to do and that is to try to destroy us from within. You would rally class against class, race against race, religion against religion, brother against brother, to the point that we would engage in a bitter struggle and weaken our country and believe every claim of Mr. Khrushchev and his minions.

These challenges confront our beloved President tonight. He has been the President for only a few months. He is the only President that this country has and is going to have for the next 4 years. He is the leader of the free world.

We can either help him by closing ranks and forgetting petty differences; by relegating our quarrels to yesterday; by marching forward together in unity; or we can divide, engage in class warfare, and bring our Nation to destruction.

I know what the answer is. I know the people of this country are not going to allow themselves to be so embroiled in bitter internecine warfare that the enemy can take over.

We have the military resources and we intend to use them. We will not be provocative; we will not be aggressors; but we are prepared to stand on our rights and preserve our integrity and our way of life.

It is most inspiring to me to come here this evening to join with honored citizens to honor this great man for his contributions to humanity and for his interest in bettering the role of his fellow men. VIC ANFUSO has proven the theory "Give to the world the best you have and the best will come back to you." As I leave the platform tonight to go across the Nation I feel better in having had the chance to be here and tell you how proud I am to be a citizen of and a resident of a nation that offers opportunity, equal opportunity, to all who reside in our boundaries.

NOVEMBER 1, 1961.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANFUSO: I want to express my congratulations on the silver jubilee anniversary of your founding of the Italian Board of Guardians. I know the Guardians have played a most effective role in coping with juvenile delinquency and helping young people to build constructive and satisfying careers.

I regret that I was not able to attend the dinner held in observance of the founding of the organization but am glad that the Vice

President was able to participate in the anniversary celebration.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

MESSAGE FROM CONGRESSMAN JOHN W. MCCORMACK, OF MASSACHUSETTS, HOUSE MAJORITY LEADER

I regret very much my inability to attend this evening's testimonial dinner to my close and valued friend, Congressman VICTOR ANFUSO on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the founding by Congressman ANFUSO of his splendid organization, the Italian Board of Guardians. Your organization has done outstanding constructive work during the past 25 years in the rehabilitation of character and good life in the cases of countless youth. There is no finer work that any group of men or women, or organization can be dedicated to than this. In honoring Congressman ANFUSO you honor yourself for he is truly one of God's noblemen, as well as a great American and an outstanding legislator in the Halls of Congress. My regard for Congressman ANFUSO is profound. My friendship for him is very deep. I admire him very much. He richly deserves the honor that you and those present are extending to him tonight. I extend to Congressman and Mrs. Anfuso and their loved ones my congratulations and my kindest regards, and to you and all others present my very best wishes.

MESSAGE FROM JOHN B. CONNALLY, SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

A new generation is not born with traits of responsibility, a sense of patriotism, selflessness and dedication to principle is gained by learning from others.

Your fine organization, knowing that youth is the future, has devoted a quarter century to providing guidance which leads to the development of the strong and responsible citizen.

The tragic consequences of juvenile delinquency are manifold not only to the individual, his family, and his faith, but also to our United States which relies so heavily on its most important human resources—the moral fiber of its youth.

To the members of the Italian Board of Guardians, past and present, and all who assist in carrying on your vital work, I extend the Navy's congratulations and best wishes on this 25th anniversary. We express special gratitude to Congressman VICTOR L. ANFUSO whose foresight, inspiration, and dedicated leadership has meant so much to your organization and to the defense and success of our Navy and our country.

MESSAGE FROM GOV. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

DEAR VICTOR: I left New York shortly after primary day and your recent letter reached me only a few days ago. Hence the delay in acknowledging it. I have taken note, however, that you were leaving for Rome shortly after your invitation was sent to me and I assume that you have not returned even now.

I greatly appreciate your very kind invitation to attend and speak at the dinner of the Italian Board of Guardians on October 29 which is honoring you on its 25th anniversary as its founder. As you know, I took a very active part in the primaries and am returning to New York within the next 2 or 3 days to participate in the mayoralty campaign. Unfortunately, I have a number of engagements both during the day and on the evening of October 29, some of very long standing. I have tried to rearrange my schedule so as to make it possible for me to participate in this well deserved tribute to you. Unfortunately, however, I have found it impossible to do so. Were it possible for me to accept your invitation I would consider it a privilege to join with your many other friends in this tribute to you and to the very fine organization for whose creation I understand you are largely responsible.

I am sure that the dinner will be a most impressive and enjoyable affair.

May I send my heartiest congratulations and warmest good wishes to you and wish for the Italian Board of Guardians many years of continued fine service to the community which it has served so long and so faithfully.

With kindest personal regards and warmest good wishes.

Yours very sincerely,

HERBERT H. LEHMAN.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *October 27, 1961.*

MARIO F. TAGLIAGAMBE, M.D.,
Italian Board of Guardians,
Brooklyn, N.Y.:

On the occasion of your dinner on Sunday evening at the Hotel Astor for Congressman VICTOR ANFUSO let me express my regret to you and "VIC" at not being able to attend. I send you my congratulations for recogizing through the medium of your silver jubilee Congressman ANFUSO's leadership and deep personal interest in the glorious cause of youth.

ANGIER BIDDLE DUKE,
Chief of Protocol of the United States.

PRESENTATION OF ROSES TO MRS. VICTOR L. ANFUSO BY VICTOR L. ANFUSO, JR., AT TESTIMONIAL TO VICTOR L. ANFUSO TENDERED BY THE ITALIAN BOARD OF GUARDIANS ON OCTOBER 29, 1961

Mr. Toastmaster, we gather here tonight to celebrate an anniversary, to preserve a spirit of charity, and to honor a man of ideas. But this night belongs also to another person among us.

Your guest of honor was never one to be content with a work a day world, and, from the beginning, he chose instead to climb a steep mountain, complete with crags and crevices, stress, and conflict. But that journey was not made alone. (Nor perhaps is the mountain fully climbed yet.)

And as the guest of honor thinks back, how could he describe the companion of those years. Would he say that she is the mother of his children—Diana, Marianina, Frank, and Joé? Would he describe her as a simple person, who prefers to remain out of the limelight, who would be as content in a farmhouse as in a palace of kings? Would he think of her as an humble person who devotes one-half hour each night to prayer before her head hits the pillow? Would he say that she is a thoughtful person who thinks first of her five children—or as she sometimes likes to say, her six children—before thoughts of herself?

I am sure he would say that she is something more, that she possesses an indefinable power: to bolster confidence with a soft unnoticed word; to put you back on the right path when an instinct tells you to fight back; to comfort in an hour of defeat.

Theirs is a union of two natures, primarily different, which burns the brighter because of the contrast. It is like the effect left on an audience by a great composer who resolves a crescendo of discordant sounds by a balanced pianissimo.

I hold in my hands fresh and blooming roses. My father had a sister named Rose, but the true rose of his life, still freshly blooming, is his wife, Mrs. Frances Anfuso.

TESTIMONIAL BRONZE PLAQUE PRESENTED TO THE HONORABLE VICTOR L. ANFUSO

FOUNDER'S AWARD TO CONGRESSMAN VICTOR L. ANFUSO, K.C.H.S.

Great in the public life of the Nation yet ministering to the poor, the humble, the distressed, in grateful recognition of 25 years of dedicated service to I.B.G. as benefactor of our youth with fervent prayers that God will continue to bless and prosper this noble son of the church.

Presented by the Italian Board of Guardians, October 29, 1961.

REMARKS OF HON. EDWARD D. RE, CHAIRMAN, FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION OF THE UNITED STATES IN INTRODUCTION AND HONOR OF CONGRESSMAN VICTOR L. ANFUSO

Ladies and gentlemen, distinguished guests, members of the Italian Board of Guardians, representatives of the press, and fellow Americans, the function of a toastmaster, at a gathering such as this, is quite as important as it is simple. Essentially, it involves the introduction of the guest of honor to the audience. Responsibility is enhanced when the guest is eminent and the audience distinguished.

Since the introduction is designed to acquaint the audience with the guest and his qualifications, both custom and good sense require that the toastmaster state briefly and accurately the accomplishments and achievements of the one to be honored.

If I were to do this with relation to our guest tonight, I would have to tell you that VICTOR L. ANFUSO was born in 1905, at Gagliano, Castelferrato, Sicily; that his brilliant career began as a student in elementary and commercial high school in Brooklyn; that he attended Columbia University in New York, and graduated from St. Lawrence University Law School (new Brooklyn Law School). I would also have to tell you that he was awarded the LL.B. degree in 1927 and admitted to the New York bar in 1928.

When a person of national prominence, holding truly high office is presented, however, protocol and tradition require that the master of ceremonies simply identify the speaker by the title of his office. The dignity and prestige of the office give a status that does not require a biographical statement of achievements or offices previously held. Accomplishments are properly presumed, and all prior attainments are merged in the high office presently held.

Although Congressman ANFUSO falls within this latter category, ladies and gentlemen, it is my intimate personal friendship of long standing with him that allows me to disregard protocol in order to acquaint all of you with his many outstanding accomplishments that are often minimized by our guest's natural modesty.

And so, I hope that it will not be regarded as presumptuousness on my part to acquaint you with the highlights of our guest's career and his achievements. Rather, permit me to do so as a proud friend.

After his admission to the New York bar in 1928, VICTOR L. ANFUSO engaged in the practice of law in New York City. The humanitarian spirit of our honored guest throughout his extremely active life was early manifest by his great strides as a civic leader and organizer. During and after the great depression, he organized Citizens Welfare Association in Brooklyn. You will recall that this association was instrumental in aiding those who were hardest hit by the depression.

During World War II, VICTOR L. ANFUSO served in the Office of Strategic Services in the Mediterranean theater, another milestone in a long and honorable career dedicated to the service of God and country. For this service he was later awarded the Certificate of Merit by the Regular Veterans Association. In 1946 he was knighted by Pope Pius XII as a Commander of the Knights of the Holy Sepulchre, for his "humanitarian work on behalf of youth."

Upon his return to the United States, he was appointed special assistant to the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization. Congressman ANFUSO played an important role in the extensive surveys and research into the immigration laws as pertaining to southern Europe which were made at this time.

It is a matter of common knowledge that our guest has been a stanch and continuing foe of communism in this country and abroad. In 1948, for instance, he undertook a gigantic task—that of informing hundreds of thousands of Italian citizens abroad to defend themselves against the Communist threat by voting against the leftwing candidates in the Italian elections of 1948. Italian officials admitted that this effort resulted in the victory of the democratic De Gasperi government, and the New York Times described ANFUSO as a "one-man crusader."

He has been the recipient of many awards, among which may be included honors from the Post Office Employees, the American Legion, the Jewish War Veterans, the Liberty Award of the Democratic Nationalities Division, the "Humanity Award" from the Order Brith Abraham, the Polish Migration Committee, Polish-American Youths, the Commander of the Order of Merit from the Italian Government, and many others.

VICTOR L. ANFUSO's continuing struggle and sacrifice on behalf of our American ideals did not long go unrecognized. On November 7, 1950, he was elected by the people of his community to the 82d Congress of the United States. When he first came to Congress, he was assigned to the least desired committee, the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. But Congressman ANFUSO found himself at home on this committee—because it concerned actual people, and no special interest projects. Although still a freshman in Congress, he became one of the most valued members of the committee and the champion of better postal service and better working conditions for postal employees. Congressman ANFUSO began by visiting every post office in the city, coming back to Washington to sponsor immediate legislation. In 1952, he led the fight for the first real pay increase the postal employees had ever enjoyed. It is small wonder, then, that so many postal employees throughout the State and Nation remember him for his services and are represented at this testimonial.

After 2 years in office, he was forced to retire from Congress when his home districts were reapportioned. But this distinguished public servant was far too valuable to the interests of the city and the Nation to be permitted to return to private life. Mayor Robert F. Wagner, whose cause he sponsored in 1953, tendered VICTOR L. ANFUSO the first available judicial appointment upon his taking office in 1954.

Our guest, therefore, continued to serve the public interest on the bench. But the call to a more active life in our country's Congress came again and again from the people he had served so well in the past, and our guest of honor was not one to let the responsibilities of high public office remain unchallenged. With the recommendation of our Democratic county leader, Joseph Sharkey, he ran again, and was overwhelmingly elected to the 84th Congress in 1954. Since then, he has been reelected to the 85th, 86th, and 87th Congresses.

Back in Congress, the administration, cognizant of his previous magnificent record on the Post Office Committee, wanted him to serve as a member of the Agricultural Committee. It is important that no city Member had ever been appointed to this committee before, and people at first wondered what a man devoted to the cause of urban people and issues was doing on a "farm" committee. Once again, however, Congressman ANFUSO realized the opportunity to serve not only the farmers, but the people from the city—as consumers. In one of his oft-quoted speeches, he told the Congress:

"I don't have a farm in Brooklyn. The nearest I can come to being a farmer is that I have a flowerpot on my window sill which gets watered every day. But remember, I represent more people from the cities than those of you from the farm areas. You want better prices for your products. We want better wages, better working conditions, better housing and fair prices for our consumers. Remember also, that this is not a one-way street. Farmers and city people must work together for a more abundant and a stronger America."

Through his own personality, wisdom, and fairness, Congressman ANFUSO won many friends from both sides of the congressional aisle which separated Democrats from Republicans. Soon he became chairman of the Consumer Committee, which he had helped to create; for the first time in congressional history, the consumers of America were assured of adequate representation.

Then dawned the age of space. To meet the many challenges this new era of human history presented to our Nation, a new committee was created by the Congress. Congressman ANFUSO was selected as a ranking member. He serves today as chairman of the Subcommittee on International Cooperation and Security, and as a congressional adviser to the United Nations. In addition, his past record as legislator has virtually assured him a key role on the full Committee on Science and Astronautics.

On this committee, Congressman ANFUSO, following the objectives of President Kennedy in keeping this country the strongest in the world, has been instrumental in the great forward strides this committee has taken since its inception. To inspire our scientists, for instance, Congressman ANFUSO sponsored a law granting, to those making contributions and breakthroughs in science, a Presidential Medal of Honor as well as a cash award. This law passed unanimously. Congressman ANFUSO has also proposed a Science Academy which will rank with our other three great Academies. He has also made the observation that if this Academy is added to our Army, Navy, and Air Academies, we will have created a fourth pillar of defense—the initials of the four spelling SANA—which, in Latin, means sound and strong.

Such constructive ideas are typical of the activity of our guest. At a recent convention in Washington, D.C., of the International Federation of Scientists and Astronauts, for instance, VICTOR L. ANFUSO proposed that, in the forthcoming flight to the moon, we send a Russian, an American, and a neutral. He added, significantly, that:

"Such a team, trained together, welded into a single operating unit and experiencing the glories and hardships of a flight to the moon, would dramatically symbolize the brotherhood of man."

Of VICTOR L. ANFUSO's many other activities and contributions in our Congress I need make no mention. We are all acquainted with his unparalleled accomplishments on our behalf in this branch of the Government; we are familiar with his far-reaching and constructive proposals in other areas—law, culture, and science; we are aware of his place on the front line of the ideological conflict in which we are now engaged. Congressman ANFUSO's record—in all these undertakings—speaks for itself. It is a record of which each and every one of us—as fellow Americans, as constituents, as friends, as New Yorkers—can be justifiably proud.

In retrospect, I find I have omitted a very important item—the exemplary family life which this devoted public servant has led since his marriage in 1930 to the former Frances Stallone of Brooklyn. The Anfusos have been blessed with five children—Victor, Jr. (who is already following in his father's footsteps, recently graduating from St. John's Law School and being admitted to the bar); Diana, Marianina, and twin sons Francis and Joseph.

On this memorable occasion, however, I have saved the most appropriate, and perhaps one of the most important, contributions of Congressman ANFUSO until the last.

It is by the success and permanence of our institutions that we can most properly appreciate the men who founded them. To us gathered here tonight, this silver anniversary testimonial banquet is an event of great significance. It is a tribute, first of all, to the permanence and vitality of a great organization—the Italian Board of Guardians. To those of us present who have witnessed the noble work of the board throughout the years in aiding children from broken homes—this, indeed, is a happy occasion, and one which will be long remembered.

But this wonderful event has an added significance. For in honoring the Italian Board of Guardians, we pay lasting tribute to the man whose wisdom, foresight, and exceptional judgment and sacrifice did much to make its founding possible. It is a tribute to this man and his work that we are assembled here tonight.

It has been said that it is a sacred duty of every American to perpetuate our civil institutions and to avert the dangers which may threaten them. By these standards, VICTOR L. ANFUSO has truly earned our lasting tribute, as well as this testimonial in his honor. Through the board that he founded and nurtured, through all the many activities of a dedicated career, he has helped us all achieve the ideals to which we as a nation are steadfastly committed. In devoted and patriotic service to God, country, and fellow man; in a brilliant, long and honorable career as a public servant, lawyer, judge, and Congressman, no one is more deserving of our highest praise and emulation than our honored guest on this silver anniversary, Congressman VICTOR L. ANFUSO.

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN VICTOR L. ANFUSO

Ladies and gentlemen, I recognize that this is a signal honor—an honor which 25 years ago I did not even foresee. But the child called the Italian Board of Guardians has grown into benign maturity with such wonderful proportions that today it is able to guide the destinies of thousands who otherwise might have strayed into a life of crime. I alone did not bring this child into being. Many who are here contributed to its formation, and most of you have brought it to its present status.

I shall remember and forever cherish the award presented to me this evening by Ambassador Michael Comay, the Israel representative to the United Nations, in behalf of the Government of Israel. This is indeed a token of great esteem and high honor. May I assure the Ambassador—and I shall be pleased if he would convey this to his government—that I am not only fortified in my sincere friendship and esteem for the people of Israel, but that I stand ready at all times to do all in my power and to lend my assistance in every way possible to help bring peace and security to Israel.

As I look back, it was not a pretty picture which I observed 25 years ago, as a practicing attorney of only a few years. The calendars of our criminal courts were filled with Italian names of young men waiting to be tried for crimes of violence, including murder. But what disturbed me the most was our children courts' calendars, replete with names ending in a vowel. Here were our future rapists, thieves and murderers. I was sure that environment alone was not the cause of these children's delinquencies. I had been brought up in the same environment and fought my way through the jungle of poverty and despair. But I had someone to guide me—someone who understood me; who spoke the same language I did. This guidance came from my mother and older brothers and sisters who came with me to this glorious country in 1914. I was only 9 then, but I had already been to school

in Italy and had worked with my father as an apprentice in his business for 3 years until his death. I never stopped working when I came to these shores and continued my education, first during the day and then at night.

Having grown with delinquents in a real tough neighborhood in those days, receiving a broken nose and other forms of injury because I refused to join their gangs, I learned a good deal of the causes of their delinquencies. I also learned to fight with my fists and in time won their respect so that they left me alone. There were times when I would be invited to their homes and learned that children and parents lived in two separate worlds. There was no family spirit at all. There was complete estrangement. The children spoke the English they had learned in school and some of the gutter language they picked up on the streets of New York. The parents spoke no English at all and left the house only to go to work with some paisano. They were hard working, these foreigners from Italy, as were my brothers and sisters and my mother, who took in work at home. The difference between my home and theirs was that we spoke the same language at our home and gathered together for dinner every night, whereas the parents of these other children spoke no English and the children no Italian. Parents and children were never together at dinner and there was absolutely no means of communication between them. They lived in a house without a home. When a child got into trouble and a truant officer or policeman would call at the home, the mother or the father could give no information that would be helpful to restore the child to a useful life. Such little information as they had about the child's doings they would withhold from the court officer with the result that the child was invariably sent to a correction institution for a minor offense. From there he was graduated to bigger institutions and sometimes wound up in the electric chair. He never had a chance. You know it's difficult to be a man. It's difficult to be a woman. Neither a skirt nor a pair of pants makes either one. It takes character. What I regret is that some kids never have a chance to build character.

This was the situation which I and others aimed to correct 25 years ago. How to do it was another thing again. We had no social workers of Italian extraction, no society with a knowledge and ability to solve the problem. We were still newcomers to this great land of many peoples.

I had heard of the Jewish Board of Guardians and how it had solved the problems of delinquency and crime among youths of the Jewish faith. I spoke to its president and my good friend—here tonight—Mr. Philip Heimlick, and I received the most wonderful cooperation enabling me to form a charter based on the model given to me by the Jewish Board of Guardians.

Soon we had our own court officers and truant officers who could understand the Italian language, win the confidence of the parents, and with proper knowledge of the family situation finally win the confidence of the delinquent boy himself. Thus, we were able to present a true picture to the judge or to the school authorities, making it possible for the boy to be placed in our care instead of an institutional home or prison.

The results, as I have said, have been almost miraculous. The calendars of our criminal and children's courts are no longer congested with names ending in a vowel. Indeed, the Italo-Americans have come into their own. The fear of future Costellos or Lucky Lucianos no longer exists.

But more than helping Italo-Americans, the Italian Board of Guardians has contributed to a better America, as did the Irish, the Poles, the Germans and the people of the Jewish faith before them. To unite the country further and to make an invincible America, we must with equal fairness and justice deal with our fellow citizens from Puerto Rico and the Negroes. In furtherance of this, I was happy to lend a copy of the charter of the Italian Board of Guardians to some of my Puerto Rican friends some years ago, and today there is in existence a Puerto Rican Board of Guardians. I predict that in a very short time the Puerto Ricans will make an even more valuable contribution to the welfare of our city, State, and Nation.

The Negro situation looms now foremost on the American horizon. It cannot be handled superficially. We must recognize once and for all that anywhere in these United States they are entitled to the same pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness, and the equal protection of our laws.

I can never forget Richard Wright's book about the colored boy in the slums who, looking up at the airplane in the sky, muttered: "Fly that plane, white box, fly that plane." He knew it was a white boy flying that plane and he knew too that it could never be him, no matter how much he wanted it. That is the trouble today. The Negro feels trapped and feels that he has to fight back—fight everybody.

But I can assure you that they cannot and will not be held down much longer. Negro education and Negro culture have soared. The educated and the cultured are beginning to take care of their own and soon the colored people will assume their proper responsibilities and further enrich the society in which we live.

Nations, just like people, have found it difficult to live together. In the last 2,000 years the world has gained much knowledge, but when we observe the direction in which mankind is headed I am sorry to say that it has gained very little wisdom. Our tremendous progress in the field of science has brought the world to a situation where we are faced with the choice of total destruction or a world of peace and abundance for all.

We cannot lose this struggle if we recognize that the real strength of America lies in its many national and racial strains. These blended together have made the United States, the youngest of Western nations, the strongest country in the world. Further understanding will make it invincible in the future.

Regardless of all the dire prognostications about mankind and its survival in the future, I am optimistic concerning man's ability to extricate himself from the present dilemma in the world and to face a glorious future of peace and abundance for all. We need but to look to our faith in God for encouragement and hope. We can find different messages of hope expressed differently by each of our major faiths or by the prophets of these faiths, but in essence all these messages stem from the One God that is the Creator and Father of all humanity.

In Isaiah (ch. LIV, verse 17), for example, we find this very encouraging prophecy for the future of mankind:

"No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper * * *"

In St. Matthew (ch. XVI, verse 18), we find this prophecy:

"And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

And from a modern-day Protestant religious leader, D. L. Moody, I quote this observation:

"I think it would take the wrinkles out of your brow if you would just look into the future, instead of into the past. There are two kinds of people—some that live on the past, and some that live on the future. You never saw a person living upon the past all the time, and always talking about the past, that did not have a great many wrinkles on his brow."

I am confident that these messages from God and the interpretations of the words of God will someday bring out the best in men and women everywhere and cause peoples all over the world to unite for the betterment and the glory of all mankind, no matter what their religious beliefs. God's message of peace on earth will eventually reach all peoples and will unite this world of ours as it has never been united before.

Thus, united, mankind can conquer space, settle other planets, and eventually bring back to earth presently unimaginable resources to create a world of abundance—making war in the future unthinkable and unnecessary.

My friends, will you please rise with me and together let us toast the future. May we, with the help of God, pass through these days of turmoil, which hold the threat of atomic bombs and missiles over our heads and give us neither peace nor rest. May we be privileged to live and to see some of the wonders that a united world can bring to all mankind.

Good or Bad Government Comes From the Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, one of Nevada's outstanding citizens is Fred Dressler, a rancher from Gardnerville and a member of a pioneer family in my native State. Mr. Dressler, as president of the American National Cattlemen's Association, recently delivered what I consider to be a most thought-provoking address at the organization's 65th annual convention in Tampa, Fla.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Dressler's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT'S ANNUAL ADDRESS, FRED H. DRESSLER, GARDNERVILLE, NEV., FOR 65TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF AMERICAN NATIONAL CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION, TAMPA, FLA., JANUARY 24–27, 1962

Whether we like it or not, we have responsibilities and obligations which supersede all other considerations in our brief spans on earth.

First we have responsibilities as citizens, the pride, the dignity and self-respect of standing on our own two feet and not leaning on the other folks for our existence. Then we have duties as cattlemen, as custodians of the lands and animals only loaned to us by a divine providence and the conscious or unconscious continuance of this privilege by our fellowmen under the laws and government of a yet free people.

As citizens, we show our responsibility for good, just, and practical government by not letting a vacuum be created into which irresponsible persons and ideas move. A dynamic, fluid nation must constantly suffer the impact of new peoples and philosophies. We wouldn't want it any other way, of course. But we must work with and understand them to try and emphasize unwork-

able schemes, to avoid dangerous mistakes before it is too late.

If we default in this responsibility, we leave people with the idea that we don't care or know the difference. Some politicians long have operated on the theory that the citizenry is dumb or blind . . . and, disgracefully—for each of us—they have often been right. Because we as citizens haven't taken the time to learn and understand the position and power we have in this government.

Any evils created in our times are our fault, just as much as though we deliberately set out to create them.

Government, good or bad, comes from the citizen. This, the greatest form of government ever devised, is in our hands. We cannot loosen the grasp, ever.

In recent years it hasn't seemed to matter too much which administration is doing it, but we seem to be in an age when a lot of folks seem eager to solve all the problems of the world with dollar therapy. They aren't concerned about properly distributing the flow of dollars in the furrows of real necessity. They just seem ready to break the dike at any time—and then try to patch up the hole with more money.

We all know about rivers or irrigation canals. Money is like water; it's an aid to growth, a carrier of goods and services and a boon to mankind in the right amounts at the right time. But it is a terrible danger if unleashed unchecked.

One of this Nation's biggest duties in coming years is to dam up the flood of inflation and put our dollars back into a smooth flowing channel to do good year in and year out, without flood and bust or drought and starvation.

In October I called together the Cattle and Beef Industry Committee to consider the tense international situation which could lead to demands for standby economic controls, especially price controls.

We decided then to aggressively carry the industry's views to the administration.

Last week several of us met in Washington with Dr. Walter Heller, Chairman of President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers, and his staff.

Our committee stated its concern over inflationary dangers inherent in the national budget and international pressure on the dollar. We urged that standby price controls and similar powers should not be requested by the Government for the reason that these would, of themselves, be inflationary.

We were gratified to learn from Doctor Heller that the administration has no intention of requesting such control authority from Congress at this time. Also, the Government economic officials now share our feeling that fiscal and monetary policies, coupled with high economic productivity, are the best weapons to use against inflation.

As cattlemen we have a responsibility to the rest of the Nation and the world, whether they know it or not. Just as we must care for our animals with feed and water, protection and comfort, we share a responsibility for feeding and clothing others.

Isn't it wonderful that even as mixed up as our Nation's agriculture has become, that our problems are surpluses and not famine? What an arsenal of freedom, what a mountain of strength, to be envied by the Communists everywhere. Even the best of the schemes in Russia and Red China have not brought forth the food and clothing they need—and their peoples are facing actual famine again this year.

Let's never let us in the United States find ourselves having to have our basic food supply come from outside our borders—so long as we are able to produce it within.

This is our job, our mission in life. We cannot let up on this, no matter how difficult it may become, or how unappreciative the public may seem.

The public has other problems, they cannot be forced into gratitude for our products or our sterling characteristics in making them available. It is our responsibility to see that they do understand what we do, how we do it, and why. And it is our obligation to understand their problems so that our actions may serve them better.

The romance and glamour of the cow business comes from others looking at us and remembering when. But, while enjoying this reflected fame, we have the responsibility to live up to the good points of our heritage—or in setting the record straight.

Before we can do that, however, we must learn about ourselves, our strength and our weaknesses. Beef is raised in many ways in many places. No one can say that one is better than another. The only common denominator is the marketplace—and we're back to the public again.

Our individual desires and needs must be fitted into the overall pattern. Not submerged, but put into the proper perspective.

One section of the country cannot deplore the progress and industry of the cow business in another. To do so indicates that some have not faced up to the responsibility that is competition.

Nor can ranchers complain about feeders or vice versa. Or both try to lay the blame for their troubles on packers, retailers, or the Government. Especially if they have allowed problems to drift and not, as responsible citizens, faced them head on and solved them when they arose.

Most important, we should try to solve our own internal problems between ourselves without hollering for help from the Government or others. Certainly there are many services a government can and should perform for us and the public as a whole. We consider market information and basic, unbiased research in this category, and we do not consider it inconsistent when we ask for "economy in Government" while asking for increased expenditures in these fields—they are services of benefit to everyone in the Nation.

But we do consider many actions of Government, both those which stampede us into more inflation or which tend to thwart the free flo wof commerce, as being bad and the type of thing our industry wishes to avoid at all costs.

I am proud that most of the actions of cattlemen, as individuals and in organizations, have been those of citizens responsible to themselves, their lands and animals, and to the rest of the Nation. Let's look at some of the things we have been doing recently and see if we have not held to our obligations.

On the face of it—and to many nearsighted critics—our request for reasonable, practical tariff or quota protection against the deliberate plans of other nations to invade our market with foreign beef would seem to be selfishness. We think not. We believe that American citizens, as a whole, need the protection that only a government can give against foreign invasion, whether economic or military. There can be no doubts that with the changes taking place in world meat trade, the United States has become the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow—and stockmen all over the world are looking to raid the till at no expense to them, but without a care for the consequences to our domestic economy. The loss of jobs, possible disruption of our food supply, the outflow of dollars—these are all factors demanding a second look at free trade by responsible citizens.

Perhaps some folks would feel that our attitude about grazing on public lands is a special privilege enjoyed only by a small percentage of those producing meat and fiber. What they overlook is that entire communities and economies in many parts of the Nation are built upon this annual harvest of a resource only loaned to us. Without this harvest, beneficial national development would not have come, nor would we be in a position to provide a resource somewhat unappreciated before the days of the missile.

The Nation well may need every animal, every bit of grass coming from these public grazing lands in time of attack. Away from targets as they are, these could be this Nation's food supply. And many responsible citizens, especially outside the livestock industry, are becoming alarmed at unthinking attempts of so-called recreationists and conservationists to eliminate grazing from some of these lands. I'm afraid they are overlooking a need that may come far sooner than those future generations who they say will need play areas.

Recreation should never take precedence over basic necessities. Recreation can best be appreciated and most beneficial on a full stomach.

Don't be misled by the idea that recreation must be the only occupant on public land or any land. As time brings more recreation, we'll just have to mingle it with other numerous activities of our American way of life—or we'll do without much of the basic products from which our citizens create the wealth to allow them to have time for recreation.

As men daily concerned with life and death, we are more worried about the survival of the survivor than we might be about the esthetic desires of a few folks wishing to romp in the forest primeval. We pray not, but life could become mighty primitive indeed, if we do not worry about food to feed those who might crawl from a shelter some withered day.

This is what I mean about responsibility. Although we, too, hope that future generations of Americans will enjoy the wonders of peace and wholesome outdoor life, we are taking a realistic view of the future, hoping that there is a middle course which provides for the one need while anticipating the other.

Within the framework of our industry and organization, we feel that every action has been taken to insure that our procedures and progress are being built upon, not weakened by irresponsible behavior or unthinking disregard for the whole problem. In the matter of beef promotion, for instance, we have faced up to our obligation to look at every phase of it squarely. We could have let it slide on for more months and years without coming to grips with an answer. We could have ignored the whole thing. But you asked us to knock heads together and rattle the bushes—and this we have done. Whether we were right or wrong concerns us less than the fact that as an industry we assumed a distasteful obligation without flinching—just as we have many others in the past—and we have other chores just as difficult in the future.

We had other hard assignments over the past months—grading, marketing, research, public relations, branding, disease control, and so forth. You'll hear more about them during this convention, of course. Some may be solved for the time being, others are just new phases of old continuing problems. But let me assure you that they have been gone over thoroughly by forthright, responsible people, dedicated to their industry, unmindful of whether or not the consequences will hurt them as individuals.

During the past 2 years, serving as your president, I have had numerous opportunities to meet, counsel, and listen to business groups. I have been impressed with the broadspread concern and ever-increasing awareness among these people to our advances down the high road to statism, which is socialism.

These men to whom I refer are united in the view that the salvation of a representative form of government, based on constitutional principles, requires the political activity of all groups dedicated to these principles.

What group of citizens is more solidly grounded, by their record, in standing for individual liberty, than members of our organization?

By encouraging political activity, of individual members working through the parties of their choice, to elect candidates to office who will stand on principle, we arise to a basic citizenship responsibility.

The American National, historically, is a nonpartisan organization. It should remain so, as an organization. But to activate its individual members is but an American obligation of urgency, as I regard the matter.

Certainly we will have differences of views in many instances. I have confidence we will resolve them on the basis of what is best, not alone for our industry but first for our country.

We will continue to view with suspicion those who wish to do us in for economic or political gain, but my suggestion of political activity is the action of people who recognize their duty toward freedom today—and their obligations for tomorrow.

The Blind Course

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial which appeared in the February 7 issue of the Wall Street Journal is worthy of the consideration of everyone:

THE BLIND COURSE

As President Kennedy was sending Congress his education message, Congress was already acting on one of his education bills—the program for Federal help to colleges.

That suggests one of the troubles with the administration's approach. There are so many of these school-aid bills it is difficult for the citizen to keep them straight. Their impact upon taxpayers, and upon the schools themselves, is blurred.

For a hint of their impact upon schools, what has happened at Harvard University offers a dramatic and sobering example. Harvard is the most heavily endowed school in the United States. And yet President Nathan M. Pusey reports that in the past 2 years the university received more income from the Government than from endowments. "We are now involved," he says, "in 34 categories of programs managed by two-score Federal agencies." Together they make up about one-fourth of the university's annual budget. This relationship Dr. Pusey regards as hazardous.

This is not a condition peculiar to Harvard. In greater or lesser measure it involves many other schools throughout the country. Yet ignoring the implications of this Federal liberality, the administration is determined to pour still more funds into the educational system. To continue to do so blindly, without even a glance at the effects of what has been done already, is not only hazardous but inexcusable.

Science and Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Harrison Brown, an eminent educator with the California Institute of Technology, delivered the Sigma Xi-Phi Beta Kappa address to the American Association for the Advancement of Science in Denver, Colo., on December 29, 1961.

Dr. Brown is recognized as one of the outstanding scientists in the world and has made a great contribution to science in his field of geophysics. He was selected by the National Academy of Sciences to chairman its Committee on Oceanography. The Committee on Oceanography made a comprehensive report to the National Academy of Sciences which is the basis of extensive research into this important field by the United States. Dr. Brown has those desirable qualifications that make him the ideal person to act as the catalyst between the scientist and the Government official.

I commend to your serious reading Dr. Brown's address which is made part of this RECORD:

SCIENCE AND GOVERNMENT

(By Harrison Brown)

Several thousand years ago an enormous change took place in the way in which people lived. This change was brought about by the invention of agriculture—a development which made it possible for several hundred persons to be supported on an area of land which formerly could support but one person who gained his livelihood in the traditional manner, by hunting and fishing and by gathering edible foodstuffs from wild plants. As the new technology was exploited and human populations grew, the greater part of humanity very quickly became absolutely dependent upon successful agriculture for its survival. The role of the farmer was well stated by Daniel Webster when he said:

"Let us never forget that the cultivation of the earth is the most important labor of man. When tillage begins, other arts follow. The farmers, therefore, are the founders of civilization."

Indeed, the farmer made possible the emergence of cities, and in turn the emergence of the great civilizations of the Tigres, the Euphrates, and the Nile. The special point can be made that the farmer also made possible the pursuit of science by producing sufficient food so that some persons could engage in occupations other than agricultural ones.

We know that the farmer made it possible for the economy of our own country to develop as rapidly as it did. We have seen in years past the farmer emerge as a major political force in the United States. We are all aware of the strong influence the farmer has had upon the development of both the executive and legislative branches of Government. Even today, at a time when the numbers of agricultural workers are dwindling rapidly, the influence of the so-called farm bloc upon our national policies is still substantial.

I have dwelt upon the role of the farmer at such length because there is a marked parallel between what is happening in the world today as the result of the rapid upsurge of science and technology, and what happened in the past as a result of the upsurge of agriculture. The growth of science and technology, like the growth of agriculture before it, have resulted in dramatic changes in ways of life and in rapid increases in human population. Today, we who live in highly developed technological societies have become enormously dependent upon the continued smooth functioning of science and technology for our survival, just as our ancestors became dependent upon the smooth functioning of agriculture.

As our industrial society becomes increasingly complex, as our supplies of high-grade reserves decrease, as our population increases and as military technological developments accelerate, our dependence upon science and technology will continue to increase. More and more we will find scientific and technological considerations entering into Government decisionmaking processes. Every Government agency will be affected, ranging from State and Defense on the one hand to Commerce, Interior, and Agriculture on the other.

In view of this rapidly growing dependence it is important that we ask ourselves a number of questions. Is there adequate recognition of this problem in the legislative and executive branches of Government and in political circles generally? How can governmental problems involving science and technology be adequately handled within the framework of democratic processes? Is the scientific community at large prepared to accept the increasing governmental responsibilities which will probably be thrust upon it?

Before I attempt to explore possible answers to these questions, I would like to discuss briefly some of the dangers we face as well as some of the penalties should we fail adequately to inject scientific and technological consideration into governmental decisions.

Of course the most immediate danger confronting mankind is that of "allout" nuclear war. This danger results in large measure from the tremendous mobilization of science and technology for military purposes, which has taken place in both the Soviet Union and the United States since World War II. In little more than a decade and a half we have seen the development of atomic bombs, long-range jet bombers, thermonuclear bombs, intermediate-range missiles, polaris submarines capable of carrying many megatons of explosives and now intercontinental missiles capable of accurately delivering explosives in the megaton range halfway around the world. It has been estimated that more than 60,000 megatons of nuclear explosives are now in existence—a destructive power which is at present limited only by the capabilities of the two nations involved to deliver the weapons to targets. The nature of the arms race, in which action breeds reaction, which in turn breeds new action, makes it appear inevitable that unless something new is introduced into the system, we will rapidly approach the time when both the Soviet Union and the United States will have relatively invulnerable weapons systems capable of destroying each other as functioning nations to the point where recovery will be impossible.

I do not believe that under the circumstances either the Soviet Union or the United States would initiate a premeditated "allout" nuclear attack designed to destroy the opponent. I say this in spite of the fire-breathing

statements which are uttered from time to time by some of the more irresponsible elements of our military organization and of our legislative bodies, I regret, by some scientists and by members of recently formed organizations of radical paranoids. I believe that the leaders of both the Soviet Union and the United States are guided more by commonsense than by emotion, and would not knowingly take action which could only lead to the destruction of both nations.

Nevertheless if developments continue in the future as they have during the last 15 years, I believe that an all-out nuclear war involving the Soviet Union and the United States is, in the long run, inevitable. It will be a war which neither nation intends to precipitate. It cannot be stated just how it will come about or when it will come about, but we do know that the kind of situation toward which we are heading is basically unstable—that any major rocking of the boat, whether accidental, by the action of a third power or by escalation, can trigger it. The most we can expect by continued vigorous participation in the arms race is a postponement of the fateful day.

Clearly something new must be introduced into the system if we are to avoid destruction. In the 15 years during which I have thought seriously about these problems I have been unable to conceive of any solution which makes sense from a long-range point of view other than what is now referred to by both Premier Khrushchev and President Kennedy as general and complete disarmament, within the framework of adequate inspections and controls. I have concluded that this is the goal toward which we must push rapidly and for which we must mobilize not only our political genius, but our scientific and technological genius as well.

But clearly, we cannot achieve such a goal overnight. Many difficulties, both political and technical, lie in the path. Many problems must be solved. A series of stages must be devised, designed to stabilize the military situation as disarmament progresses and as inspections and controls are introduced into the system. It is in this area particularly that much scientific and technological thought and much research and development will be needed.

But before disarmament can progress, there must be an agreement, and that agreement must be universal. Before there can be an agreement there must be negotiation and negotiation will take time. In the meantime, what do we do? I fear that we have no choice. We are trapped in the arms race, and until a reasonable agreement is reached aimed at ending it, we must pursue it—attempting the while to avoid rocking the boat unduly, and doing everything we can to introduce stabilizing elements into the system. In doing this, however, we must recognize that at the best it is a stopgap measure—and a distasteful one at that. It is in this area that scientists can play an enormously important role. The task of maintaining military strength and at the same time restraining ourselves from undertaking provocative developments which might trigger military action, is an extraordinarily difficult one.

Before leaving the problems of disarmament, I would like to make one final point. There is a marked tendency in the United States—and an even greater one in the Soviet Union—to talk more about disarmament than to do something substantial about it. Scientists in the United States have done much to remedy this situation, but we still have a great distance to go. In my opinion the political, economic, and technical research and development effort placed upon the problems of achieving a disarmed world, should be fully as great as the effort now being placed upon the solution of problems of a purely military-technical nature. Our current efforts in this direction are woefully inadequate. Insofar as we can tell, the efforts of the Soviet Union are considerably less even than ours.

The second potential area of disaster which involves science and technology is that of the economic development of the vast underdeveloped areas of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The people of these areas have strong desires to improve their lot—to have enough to eat, to have adequate housing, clothing, and transportation and at least some of the luxuries now possessed by people in the economically developed areas of the world. It is clear that if they are to attain this, they must industrialize. Equally important, they must industrialize at a rate which is sufficiently rapid that marked economic improvement is apparent to the average individual during the course of his lifetime.

In the absence of development which proceeds at a sufficiently rapid rate, there is bound to be discontent and upheaval and the pressures will become great to adopt the political techniques which have been used by nations with rapid rates of development—specifically those used by the Soviet Union and by the Peoples Republic of China. In other words I fear that most of these areas may well negotiate their development within the framework of strict totalitarian control and quite possibly within the framework of Marxist-Leninist philosophy. We see this happening today in Cuba. In the future, the free nations of the West may well find themselves an island surrounded by a vast sea of Communist totalitarianism. In our zeal to contain communism by military means, and by thus placing insufficient emphasis upon economic technical and social factors, we may well be expediting its rapid spread.

There are many things, of course, which we as a nation can do about this situation, and many of these things involve the scientific and technical community. Essential aspects, of course, are economic and technical help to these areas on a massive scale. Connected with this help we need major research programs aimed at solving many of the specific developmental problems of these areas. Clearly, were our science and technology mobilized for these ends at a level remotely approaching the level of mobilization for military purposes, a great deal could be accomplished.

There are numerous areas of research and development, directly related to the problems of the underdeveloped areas, in which scientists and engineers can usefully collaborate with other specialists such as economists and sociologists. Many problems must be solved which are peculiar to the individual areas—problems of surveying and evaluating mineral resources, problems of food production, of water, transportation, communication, education, urban growth, and population limitation. It seems quite likely that given concerted effort, new techniques can be developed which can accelerate rates of economic growth and thus help these areas undergo the industrial transition with a minimum of turmoil and agony and within a political framework which can provide for the growth of individual freedom.

On the domestic side, the upward spiral of science and technology will almost certainly give rise to a variety of problems of increasing severity. If these problems are to be solved in time, it is important that they be anticipated.

As a result of a multiplicity of technological advances, both our agricultural and industrial production per man-hour of work have increased steadily during the past several decades. It would appear that productivity will continue to rise in the decades ahead and there is no obvious limit to the outputs per man-hour which can eventually be achieved. Indeed, with proper application of technology the time could well arrive when virtually all of the essentials of life in an industrial society are produced by machines, with but a very small component of human labor being involved.

As we come still closer to such a time, many of the economic problems which already confront us will become greatly accentuated. Will laborers work substantially fewer hours each day or will total production be greatly increased? If total production is greatly increased, will the surplus production be primarily for domestic consumption or for consumption abroad? To what extent will workers gravitate to the services?

Many other questions can be asked involving the interrelationships between our expanding technology and our economy. How large will our population become? It is growing rapidly and already our eastern seaboard has reached a population density equivalent to that which exists in Western Europe today. Were this trend to continue to the point where the entire continental area of the United States attained, on the average, such a level of population density, which is quite possible, the total population would approach 1 billion persons, most of whom would live in cities. Although I sincerely hope that our population does not actually reach this level, it is clear that we have only begun to be affected by the tremendous problems associated with the growth and decay of cities—problems of housing and transportation, schools, urban renewal, sanitation, atmospheric pollution, recreation, and water. Add to this the political and social problems associated with high population densities living in vast urban complexes which are changing rapidly.

Another major category of domestic problems involving science and technology is that of natural resources. Many of the high-grade resources, which contributed so much to our rapid economic growth, are dwindling rapidly. As the grades of available ores decrease, we find it necessary either to import ores or metals from abroad or to learn how to extract the metals from lower grade domestic ores. Often we find ourselves doing both, as in the cases of iron and aluminum. But as the demands for metals and fuels expand in the newly developing nations, importation of raw materials from abroad will become increasingly difficult, and we will have to learn how to "make do" with what we have.

Now, from the purely technological point of view, given enough energy, there is no lower limit to the grade of an ore from which metal can be extracted with a high yield. We know that, with respect to coal and nuclear fuels, our Nation is well endowed. It has been demonstrated that if need be, we could obtain adequate supplies of both minerals and energy from ordinary rock. But as we, of necessity, approach that limit, it will be necessary to introduce steadily increasing amounts of technology into the system. Clearly, our research and development efforts in this area should be substantially increased in the future.

In the category of nonrenewable resource problems, one of the most important is that of waste. We are a wasteful Nation. Governed as we are more by the immediate and short-range economy of the dollar than by the longer-range economy of availability, by fashion and conspicuousness more than by reason, we throw away vast quantities of potentially useful materials in such a way that they are lost forever. As time goes by we should devote increasing energies to the problems of recovering waste materials in forms suitable for reuse.

As our population expands, as our cities become larger and larger, we will be faced by problems of increasing urgency involving our renewable resources. Problems of land use, of wilderness areas, of forests, of water

and agriculture will present ever-greater demands for research and development.

Although the problems of defense and disarmament are the most important problems confronting us from a short-range point of view, largely because they are immediate matters of life and death, the longer-range problems which I have discussed are, in a very real sense, even more important. If we are unable to solve the problems of the developing nations, of resource use, of urban development, and of man in relation to his highly technological society, industrial civilization will perish. And there is serious danger that these long-range problems will be ignored, or given such low priority that the effort placed upon them will be quite incommensurate with the need.

Before leaving the area of social and political problems involving science and technology, I would like to discuss a worry which I have had for several years, and which I find grows each year. This worry involves science and technology in relation to individual human freedom.

Most of us recognize that the pressures placed upon individuals in industrial society to conform are considerable. As our population density increases, as our society becomes more complex, there will be increasing need for rules and regulations to bind men's actions. There will be increasing temptation to make greater use of modern tools of persuasion and even of coercion. As time goes by the effectiveness of these tools will be improved still further and will place unprecedented power in the hands of rulers of industrialized nations.

Modern business machine and computor techniques enable us to keep track of and process information concerning people with marvelous accuracy. Modern interviewing and public opinion surveying techniques enable us to determine what persons who posess specified social and economic characteristics are thinking.

Americans have long prided themselves in the fact that, unlike citizens of many countries, we are not required to carry identity cards. Yet we find driver's licenses necessary and a large fraction of our population now have numbers associated with their names in our social security files. (I need not emphasize the numbers of persons in this room who are described rather completely in the files of the FBI). Certainly few of us object to social security and we appreciate the difficulties of keeping track of so many people. Now we hear that the Internal Revenue Service is installing machinery which will enable it to process income tax returns more rapidly than at present to ferret out incorrect declarations. Certainly few of us can object to steps which would help apprehend unscrupulous persons.

There are pressures from many sources to obtain more extensive data concerning individuals. The medical profession could certainly make good use of better medical records than those which are now available. Businessmen could make good use of better information concerning individual economic behavior.

Could it be that we are approaching a time when complete central records will be kept on all individuals during their lifetimes—when at birth a number and a card is issued and as the individual passes through life all pertinent information is placed upon the card? The information might include biological characteristics, intelligence quotients, the results of aptitude tests, school performance, medical histories, job histories, personal income, spending habits, police history together with other pertinent information.

Such records would certainly be of considerable value from a number of points of view. In themselves they would not be dangerous—provided the information were treated in confidence and with discretion. At the same time, however, such records could also provide the foundation for firm control of the citizenry by an unscrupulous group bent upon oligarchical control.

I cite this possibility as but one small example of the ways in which modern technology could, when improperly used, contribute to a lessening of individual freedom of thought and action. And in this connection we must keep in mind that not only can technology contribute to the loss of freedom, it can provide the means by which once power is gained by the few, it can be held. It seems clear that the road toward totalitarianism has now become a one-way street, and we by no means should rest confident that "it can't happen here". I believe that it can happen—and that equally important, it can happen without our fully realizing that it is happening.

Thus far I have spoken about problems which confront our Government and which involve, in one way or another, matters of science and technology. In some of the examples which I have cited, science and technology can be used constructively to help us arrive at solutions. In other cases, science and technology are themselves creating new problems. I believe that these examples illustrate an important point which has marked bearing upon the ways in which we might choose to handle questions of science and technology in relation to our Government: Clearly the scientific and technological questions are inextricably interwoven with the military, political, economic, and social problems which confront us. One cannot divorce one from the other. Under the circumstances, how should scientific and technological forces best be channeled for the common good?

On the basis of my opening remarks concerning the analogy between the early upsurge of agriculture and the more recent upsurge of science and technology, it might be concluded that I believe that we should form a Department of Science to deal with these questions—much as we formed, many years ago, a Department of Agriculture to deal with agricultural problems. I hope, however, that my later remarks have served to raise serious questions concerning the wisdom of such a solution.

In my opinion we do not need, nor should we want, a monolithic structure of science within our Government. In relation to the kinds of problems I have cited, science and technology are tools or means to help attain ends, and should be utilized in conjunction with other equally important tools—such as those of politics, economics and other of the social sciences.

I believe that most of us would agree that Government agencies which have problems of a scientific and technological nature should carry out their own programs of research and development. Much of this should be carried out in laboratories and institutions which are under the jurisdiction of the individual agencies; much should be farmed out to nongovernmental institutions by contract or grant. Some can be undertaken by other Government agencies, better equipped to handle certain types of problems, on an interagency-cooperative basis. The important point, however, is that individual agencies should bear the major responsibility for the solution of their own problems. I do not believe that this responsibility could be effectively allocated to any centralized scientific authority.

This is, of course, much the way in which we have been operating. And most of us who are familiar with governmental scientific operations recognize that this diffuse approach is fraught with difficult.

One of the more serious difficulties in the past has been that, with few exceptions, department heads have not been research minded, with the result that research and development have been relegated to the lower regions of the priority list. The advice of top scientists in various departments and agencies has, all too often, gone unheeded. The lack of attention given to scientific-technological problems by political appointees has often resulted in the perpetuation of provincialism in a number of the agencies, as well as in the creation of atmospheres which have seriously impeded proper intellectual and physical growth.

Some of these difficulties are now in part being ameliorated by the appointment of qualified technical persons to newly created policymaking or important policy-advisory positions. The creation within the Department of Defense of the position of Assistant Secretary for Research and Development has had considerable effect in helping to integrate scientific and technological considerations into high-level military decisions. The appointment of a Science Adviser to the Secretary of State has helped to emphasize scientific and technical matters in relation to foreign policy. Still more recently the Secretary of the Interior has appointed a Science Adviser, a position which, one might hope, may soon be elevated to the level of Assistant Secretary. The Department of Commerce is anxious to establish the position of Assistant Secretary for Science and Technology—a position which I very much hope Congress will create during its next session. When we couple these considerations with the fact that the National Science Foundation has been headed for some time by a scientist with considerable Government experience, that the Atomic Energy Commission is now headed by a Nobel laureate and that scientists are now in positions of considerable responsibility in other agencies and departments as well, it becomes clear that considerable progress has been made during the 15 years which have elapsed since the last war.

It almost goes without saying that one of the most important of recent developments has been the establishment of the President's science adviser and, associated with him, first the President's Scientific Advisory Committee and second the Federal Council of Science and Technology. I consider the latter of particular importance, for, made up as it is of top-level administrators from all departments and agencies concerned with science, it gives us for the first time direct means for comparing and coordinating research and development endeavors on a governmentwide basis. I believe that the Federal council can contribute substantially to the creation of a more general awareness of some of the major problems which confront us, and to the establishment of coordinated interagency programs which, in turn, can help decrease the provincialism and narrowmindedness which unfortunately still exists in some quarters. Federal council panels have already operated with success in developing coordinated programs in some areas, and it is to be hoped that its activities will be rapidly expanded—particularly into the nonmilitary areas, which have thus far received inadequate attention.

Although a great deal still remains to be done, the evidence indicates that this diffuse approach to the handling of science and technology within the executive branch of Government can be made to work. There are of course enormous difficulties, not the least of which is that of persuading competent persons with technical backgrounds to accept positions of responsibility. Nor is it always easy to persuade administrators who have served their Government for many years that with respect to science and technology they must look beyond the welfare of their own individual agencies. But there is reason to believe that these difficulties can be lessened as time goes by.

We should not leave the question of science in the executive branch of our Government without discussing the role of the National

Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, which as you know is a quasi-governmental organization. It has contributed substantially during the last few years in a variety of ways to the formulation of Government programs. Being outside the Government, it can in principle examine problems in a more detached way than can governmental persons themselves, and I would hope that in the future, the Academy-Research Council might become the major channel for extra-governmental advice to individual agencies concerning specific aspects of their technical programs. This would help eliminate the current practice of some agencies, which will form pet scientific advisory committees and which will make full use of the committee reports if they are favorable, but will often relegate them to the files if they are not.

I would hope, too, that the Academy-Research Council might become the major source of scientific-technical advice to Congress, which increasingly finds itself in need of counsel in scientific areas. In the past, congressional committees have often obtained scientific advice in a rather haphazard way and the persons giving the advice have not always been as competent as one might wish. I would like to see the Academy-Research Council structure strengthened to the point where Government agencies and congressional committees alike, in need of advice, would turn confidently to the organization for recommendations as to how that advice might best be obtained. Congress is going to be concerned more and more during the years ahead with legislation involving scientific and technical matters. The establishment of a strong academy-congressional bond appears to me to make a great deal of sense, provided the Academy-Research Council strengthens itself to the point where it can handle the increased load in a systematic way.

I believe that another approach, which in the long run could be very helpful in seeing that science and technology are adequately taken into account in the formulation of legislation and in political pronouncements, would be for more scientists to become active in partisan party politics. I wish that many scientists would select the political party which comes closest to their beliefs, and then work actively within that party. I personally took this step many years ago and have found it to be a most rewarding experience.

It seems to me that if democracy is to thrive, it is important that our system of political parties be made to function as well as possible. This means that thinking people should become active in the political process, over and above the simple activity of voting. I have seen scientists contribute substantially to political programs by providing information which is helpful in the drafting of campaign positions and speeches. Persons who are candidates for office usually are appreciative of this help, as are the workers around them. Also, a two-way educational process takes place which is healthy: The politician learns something about technology and the scientist learns something about the complexities of the political process.

I would like to cite a specific and personal example of how a group of about 20 scientists were able to function in the political arena, with dignity and effectively. In 1958 a group of scientists, some of whom are at this meeting, agreed to form an Advisory Committee on Science and Technology within the Advisory Council of the Democratic Party. This group undertook a number of studies of problems which intimately involved matters of science and technology and which were also problems well within the political arena. We produced two major documents which were subsequently widely used by candidates and by party workers as background material.

One of our studies involved the problems of disarmament and our group came forward with the specific proposal for the creation of a special agency within the executive branch for the purpose of undertaking the research and development which would be necessary if we were ever to approach negotiations in this area successfully.

This proposal was formally presented to the Advisory Council as a whole in late 1959 and was adopted by the group unanimously. Among those who agreed were Senators Humphrey, Kennedy, and Symington, Governor Stevenson, former Secretary of Air Finletter and former President Truman.

The proposal was subsequently introduced as a plank in the Democratic Party platform in July 1960. The matter was brought up often during the campaign and following President Kennedy's inauguration proposed legislation was introduced into the House and Senate. After considerable debate and some modification, the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was formally created and it is now starting to function.

I would like to stress that had scientists not involved themselves in politics, had this group of men elevated their noses and stated that politics was beneath their dignity—or had they stated simply that they were too busy—we probably would not have a Disarmament Agency today. It is, I believe, a beautiful example of how citizens of good will and knowledge can function effectively and with dignity in the democratic process.

In the area of foreign policy, scientists are making useful contributions, both within the confines of Government and without. Particularly useful have been a series of conferences held between natural and political scientists of both East and West, aimed at clarifying some of the major problems involved with arms control and disarmament, and more recently problems of international cooperation in science between the Communist and non-Communist nations. These conferences, formerly known as the Pugwash Conferences and now known here as the Conferences on Science and World Affairs, have been quite informal and unofficial. The results of the deliberations have been transmitted to our Governments with the hope that they might be useful in approaching the problems of negotiation in these areas. I believe that these discussions have already proven themselves to be useful and I hope there will be many more such gatherings during the coming months and years.

I believe that most persons in this room would agree that science and technology are creating enormous dangers for our Nation and for all humanity. At the same time I believe that most of us would agree that they present us with wonderful opportunities. Science and technology properly used can help create a world free from the scourge of war—a world in which most people are free and in which privation is eliminated. Whether or not this will happen will depend in part upon the way we scientists behave. If we work diligently with our colleagues in the social sciences, if we recognize that the political process is a fact of life within a democracy, if we offer freely of our help, if we are willing, even, to take the initiative—then there is a fighting chance that the free and abundant world may come into existence. However, if we shirk these responsibilities, we will correspondingly decrease the probabilities of success.

Agriculture and the Free Enterprise System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, new agriculture legislation advanced by the administration has not settled well among many of the farmers and groups connected with agriculture in this country no matter how expert our technical advice appears to be.

The concern stems mainly from the proposals for higher price supports and much stricter production and marketing controls aimed at eliminating surpluses. As an alternative, the measure threatens exemption from Federal price supports and stiff penalties for violations.

Although Michigan may not be the most productive agricultural State, many farmers and operators of related businesses in Michigan's Sixth District have been indicating their great concern about some of the provisions of the farm bill. In order to bring some well-taken points to the attention of my colleagues, I would at this time like to enter into the RECORD a letter written to me by a constituent with long and successful experience as a grain merchant.

The letter follows:

FEBRUARY 5, 1962.

Representative CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Listening to Orville Freeman yesterday as he addressed a Farmers' Week audience at Michigan State University made the chills run up and down my spine. At the beginning of his speech he listed the great technological advances in agriculture in this century and gave proper credit to the free enterprise system. Then he proceeded to try to convince us that because of overproduction the farmers are going to have to accept a Government straitjacket if they want to enjoy a satisfactory level of income. There is only one reason why we are troubled with surplus and that is because of unrealistic support prices. You guarantee a producer a good profit and he'll sure set new records every year. With today's low production costs, $2 wheat and $1.20 corn prices are way too high and everybody who is aware of the facts knows it. Just look back a year and you'll recall that $1.80 wheat and $1 corn resulted in huge surpluses being dumped on the taxpayers. Regardless of what you hear from the people who claim to speak for the farmer, production costs per bushel or hundredweight are at all-time lows and the desire to hold prices per unit at or above historical levels is unrealistic. If you continue to offer high price support incentives, the producers will continue to overproduce through more intensive farming practices and by circumventing the restrictions in the many ways they have learned.

The only farm program that can succeed and preserve the free enterprise system which we know in our hearts provides the best way of life for the most people, is a

program of low supports or crop insurance to prevent disaster and let the efficient farmers produce those crops for which there is a market and in volume that will provide a fair profit. That is the way the other segments of our great economy provide the goods and services and profits that we need. If we feel that a strategic reserve of certain basic food and fiber is desirable, then let's have it properly classified as such and stop charging the cost of storing it against the Agriculture Department budget.

You may think this solution to the problem too simple or too ruthless but if you really believe in the system which has made possible our success as a nation and which has been proved again in recent years in West Germany and Japan, then how can you go for Freeman's program of rigid controls on farmers and the high costs to all taxpayers which always result from expanding government programs. Don't listen to the smooth arguments of the highly paid professionals who really speak for only a small minority of our agriculture industry. Take a stand for a return to freedom for our farmers and you will find strong support from the folks back home.

Alaska's Power Needs—No. XI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST GRUENING

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in the 11th article of the timely series written by Paul Lien and published in the Fairbanks News-Miner, the use of mine mouth plants supplied by one of Alaska's several coal mines in the rail belt is discussed. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

USE OF MINE MOUTH PLANTS SEEMS MOST FEASIBLE NOW

(By Paul Lien)

In view of the fact that coal would supply the main source of fuel for interim power, William Waugaman, general manager of Usibelli Coal Mine, Inc., was asked for a comment:

"Coal mining provides a $6 million industry in the Fairbanks area at the present time," said Waugaman.

"Except for the proposed Rampart Dam project, no other hydroplants of any great size would be feasible in this part of Alaska.

"The economy of the rail-belt area is at stake in this matter.

"Assuming we would decide to install an atomic plant at the same price, why should we not use one of our main, natural resources which would not only provide power, but bolster our economy as well?"

EXPERIMENTAL STAGES

"Furthermore atomic plants are still in their experimental stage, and it would be foolhardy for us to use the Fairbanks area for a proving ground for atomic power.

"Atomic fuel is practically given away now in order to create atomic powerplants, but what assurance do we have that the price of fuel will not be raised later?

"Additional power is needed both in Fairbanks and Anchorage in the rail-belt area immediately.

"A study is being made now by the Ralph M. Parsons Co., leading power authorities, on which source of power is most feasible.

"Several utilities companies including those of both Fairbanks and Anchorage have organized the Central Alaska Power Pool for the purpose of making this study.

"Use of mine mouth steamplants in the rail-belt area seems to be the most feasible at the present time, according to the power experts."

CONSUMING MANY YEARS

"Hydroelectric plants, like the proposed Rampart Dam, would no doubt provide cheaper power, but many years are consumed in their construction, and the power companies can't wait.

"The main reason for consideration of mine mouth plants is they can be put into operation in less than 3 years as against 10 or more years for hydroplants.

"This is not expected to affect any existing power units, as they will be kept operational for baseloading and peaking power.

"As producers of coal, we will be glad to make any type of contract the power industry wishes. Coal furnished for say $4 a ton can be by a long-term contract or on a cost-plus basis, whichever serves the best interest of all concerned.

"Use of atomic power in this area is absurd. It does nothing to help the economy. All money spent for the erection and operating of an atomic plant leaves Alaska, except for the comparatively small amount spent during construction and then for maintenance afterward.

"In addition to not being proven and in the experimental stage replacement parts for atomic plants are expensive, and all fuel must be shipped here from the States, at a high cost.

"We now produce 500,000 tons of coal each year, and this amount would be greatly increased with the utilization of mine mouth plants," said Waugaman.

"In making a comparison with a mine mouth plant at Healy and hydroelectric plants at say Devil Canyon and Bradley Lake, I would like to point out that no credit is given to the loss of taxes to the Federal and State Governments, due to the fact that all power will be sold to REA cooperatives and municipal power systems.

"This is true when the alternate source of energy comes from hydroelectric-generated power."

ALTERNATE SOURCE

"When the alternate source of energy is fuelfired, the fuel consumed provides a substantial tax base, both in the form of operating and franchise taxes, as well as income taxes on the profits derived from its production and sale.

"In the case of Alaska, which is bearing an abnormally heavy tax burden of conversion from territorial to statehood status, this tax item is important and should not be overlooked or ignored," added Waugaman.

Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. CANNON

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the subject of medical care for the aged is one which concerns many millions of senior citizens in this country and undoubtedly will be heavily debated here this year. I think there can be no minimizing the importance of this problem and the need for us to give assistance to those who are in real and desperate need.

I received a letter from a constituent in Reno, Nev., Mrs. Alfred E. Schillig, who tells more eloquently than I can what it means to be old and to be confronted by a situation in which the greatest medical need comes at a period in life when our earnings are least able to meet this need.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RENO, NEV., *January 10, 1962.*

The Honorable Mr. CANNON,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Please vote for the medical care for the aged bill. Perhaps my case will help you to decide in its favor.

My husband will be 64 his next birthday. He is highly skilled in his trade but it is seasonal and competitive. For the past 4 years he has had trouble getting work. He is usually the last one to be hired on a job and the first one to be laid off. Sickness, both his and mine, has completely wiped out out savings. He belongs to a union but the insurance does not cover me at all and pays only $5 dollars for each call to the doctor starting with the third call, for him. His last doctor bill was $30 of which the insurance paid $5. Since he has been out of work so much he has had the misfortune of getting sick while unemployed. Then the union insurance pays nothing although he still must pay his monthly dues. Up until 3 years ago I carried extra hospitalization but was unable to keep up the payments when he was out of work for 8 months. I should go to a doctor now but there is just no money for it. Doctors here charge from $10 to $15 a visit and there are always prescriptions to be filled. Our medicine cost now is half as much as our food bill.

I constantly read of doctors objecting to the medical aid bill because it might lead to socialized medicine. This, none of us want, but if it should come it will be the fault of the doctors themselves because of their exorbitant charges and crowded waiting rooms. My last visit to a doctor cost $10 plus $6 for medicine which lasted a week. I had told an office girl (not a R.N.) the main reason I had come. I had an appointment still had to wait an hour and a half in the waiting room. When I was finally shown to my cubby hole a nurse (not a R.N.) took my blood pressure and pulse. No one took my case history and knew absolutely nothing about me except that I was having frequent dizzy spells and bilious attacks. In about 20 minutes the doctor came flying in, make a joke, said he would give me a prescription and that he wanted to see me next week. I thought that he was just too busy to examine me that day but on the way out they asked me for $10. This man is very highly regarded in the community.

I might also say that regular hospitalization plans do not help us. We never have a big sickness with weeks or months in a hospital. Our illnesses are always small but frequent and expensive. It seems to us that this bill is our only bright hope for the future.

Honestly we cannot even afford to die. My insurance would now pay about one-third of burial costs. My husband's would bury him but I would be left penniless and unable to work.

I hope this letter has not taken up too much of your time as I know how busy you must be. I just couldn't seem to say it in fewer words.

Although my husband and I are now living in Reno we have been registered voters in Las Vegas for the past 9 years.

Please accept our grateful thanks.

Very truly yours,

PHYLISS SCHILLIG.
Mrs. Alfred E. Schillig.

Pilot School for Gifted Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in my congressional district there exists an outstanding example of local endeavor and local achievement. The Sands Point Country Day School, under the direction of Mrs. Marie L. Fetsch, has been established as a nonprofit, nonsectarian, coeducational institution, chartered by the board of regents of the New York State Department of Education, for the development of the gifted child. I am tremendously proud of this pilot school, which answers a long-standing need of a course of education adequate for the exceptional child. I believe all the Members of Congress will be interested in the following letter I have received from Mrs. Fetsch, and in two articles which recently appeared in the Long Island Daily Press, on January 21, and in the New York Times, today:

SANDS POINT COUNTRY DAY SCHOOL,
Sands Point, Long Island.

Hon. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DEROUNIAN: The enclosed syndicated article by Dr. Benjamin Fine, which appeared in 100 leading newspapers all over the United States must make you very proud of Sands Point Country Day School which you have assisted in so many ways all these years.

Education, and education for gifted children are of national importance and it must be gratifying to you that a school in your district in which you have been personally interested will serve as a pilot school and is receiving wide recognition.

To further the interest in education and to stress its importance to our country, could you please have this article inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

From letters and calls we received, it would appear that many a Senator or Congressman will be approached by their constituents asking for support in setting up similar schools as Sands Point Country Day School for children of superior intelligence and academic abilities in their home States.

Sands Point Country Day School is a living example of the many contributions you make to projects affecting the welfare of the people in your district.

Kindest regards,

MARIE L. FETSCH,
Sands Point Country Day School.

LONG ISLAND SCHOOL BREAKS LOCKSTEP: A HAVEN FOR GIFTED STUDENTS

(By Dr. Benjamin Fine)

A little wisp of a fellow, 4-year-old James Collorafi, is too young for public kindergarten. He'll have to wait until he is 5 years old.

But he reads at sixth-grade level, rattles off chemistry and physics formulas as though he were a junior Einstein, and knows as much history and geography as many junior high students. He picked up a book about American history and came to the section on the Civil War.

"Four score and seven years ago * * *" he began, and with poise and dramatic flourish he read without stumbling to the end. When asked who gave that famous address he answered:

"Abraham Lincoln, the 16th President of the United States."

"Do you like to read?" this startled reporter asked.

"Oh, yes," he answered happily, "I help my sister read. She's in the first grade. But how silly. Her book says 'See, see, see' and 'Run, Dick, run.' That doesn't make sense."

Our public schools are not ready for Jimmie and the thousands of other gifted children. Jimmie doesn't want to string beads or play in a kindergarten sandbox, or march around the room to the banging of homemade cymbals. He's ready for more.

Fortunately, Jimmie won't have to stifle his creativeness. Last week he entered a special school for the gifted, designed for children with high IQ's. Incidentally, Jimmie's is 164.

For several years the Sands Point Country Day School has operated during the summer months as a haven for the gifted. Now, under charter from the State Board of Regents, it has opened as a full time school for gifted children. The first classes, admitted this month, are on the elementary level. A secondary school, to be known, as the Sands Point Academy, is scheduled to open in September.

The school, under the direction of Mrs. Marie L. Fetsch, will place its major emphasis on the development of courses suitable for the Nation's talented boys and girls. A pioneering program has been introduced to help break the lockstep in education.

Talented, high-IQ children are to be challenged to work to their fullest capacities. The gifted will be permitted to proceed at their own pace. Jimmie is not stringing beads nor playing in the sandpile. When I met him, he showed me his books, on the fifth and sixth grade levels. He had just finished an involved (for a 4-year-old) chemical experiment. He changed water to wine and back to water again.

"School is fun," he said. "I love it here. I'm learning things."

A visit to this school, located on a magnificent 25-acre waterfront estate, suggests that here potential Edisons and Einsteins will be allowed to flower and bloom. Mrs. Fetsch, founder of the school, believes that children should be inspired and challenged. To her, the pursuit of excellence is a worthwhile educational goal.

It is a joy to talk to the bright youngsters. "I was bored with school before I came here," said 6-year-old John Fusi, who had been a first-grader in a Queens public school.

Until coming to Sands Point School, classes had been a dull, uninspiring chore. With an IQ above 150, he could not appreciate the simple, repetitive drilling he received. Take the case of arithmetic.

"I finished the arithmetic book in five afternoons," he told me. "But our teacher said we'll use it until June. I hated school."

Most public or even private schools are not geared for a first grader who can read, write, and figure at fourth grade level. Oh, yes, the teacher tried an enrichment program for talented Johnnie. "She let me take care of the rabbit," he said. "But who wants to be housekeeper to a rabbit?"

Now John is happy. He is in a class of less than 10, and he doesn't have to wait until the others catch up to him. He goes as fast as he wants.

The other talented children are happy, too. "The kids used to poke fun at me for being so smart," said 11-year-old dark-eyed Donna Stark, a bright sixth-grader with an IQ of 150 plus. "I'm not ashamed of it now."

The basic philosophy of the school is easy to understand: Each child is an individual with his own needs, interests and abilities. The teachers, carefully selected, are doing their best to keep up with the challenges that gifted children present.

The Nation is not doing enough to provide the talented with the education they need. Many gifted children never finish high school; thousands never enter college. School does not inspire them, nor meet their needs. Our Nation is the loser as a result.

One small, pilot school in the heart of Long Island is not the final answer. But it can point the way.

LONG ISLAND SCHOOL IN A FORMER MANSION CATERS TO CHILDREN WITH GENIUS; CLASSROOMS CRACKLE WITH INTELLECT, BUT NOT PLAY YARDS

(By Clarence Dean)

SANDS POINT, LONG ISLAND, February 7.—There are no parties at Elm Court any more, but the old Luckenbach mansion is still full of life.

The paneled music hall resounds to Bach and Beethoven, the rathskeller is loud with chatter, and up and down the winding stairs and through the 40 rooms troop some of the liveliest guests the mansion ever saw.

They are all youngsters—less than 13 years old—but extraordinary youngsters.

Their preference is for Bach and Beethoven on the rosewood grand piano. In the upstairs bedrooms overlooking the sound, where the furniture now is portable desks, they talk about Castro, the Kremlin, and Kennedy.

The 29 youngsters nearly all have intelligence quotient ratings of genius or higher. While the so-called normal rating is 100, theirs runs as high as 170.

For the most part, only such youngsters are accepted by the Sands Point Country Day School. The school was conceived by Mrs. Marie L. Fetsch, its director, specifically to help meet what she considers the needed education for the gifted child.

SHOWPLACE REPRODUCED

Mrs. Fetsch and her husband, Joseph F. Fetsch, a retired electronics specialist of the Navy's Bureau of Ships, bought the 25-acre estate in 1948. They spent 6 years restoring the showplace that had been created by Edgar F. Luckenbach, the steamship executive, and began operating it as a summer school in 1954.

Last fall, the operation was extended to a full-year country day school, and this week the second-semester pupils were enrolled.

The children are grouped in three so-called ability classifications, nursery, lower elementary, and upper elementary. Next fall, Mrs. Fetsch hopes to add a senior high school group.

The pupils do not come preponderantly from the immediate, and wealthy, neighborhood. Some come from as far away as Queens. Fourteen are receiving full scholarships from the school. Tuition runs from $500 to $1,200 for the others.

Mrs. Fetsch, a short, motherly woman with rimless glasses, says: "It is terribly, terribly important that we provide schools for the gifted child, schools where he can realize his potential and become a force in our troubled world."

But she adds quickly: "Children are children, and they must be brought up as children. They need guidance and discipline, training in the basic skills. It is dangerous to treat them as prodigies."

At the school the other day, James Collorafi, 5, was calmly reading aloud Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. He turned to a picture book titled "Electronics" and explained to

an adult, who was plainly backward, that turning on the radio while in the bathtub was extremely dangerous.

John Fuisi, 6, demonstrated solar energy with a globe in which a fan rotated when exposed to the sun. "We built this machine," he announced, "but we really haven't decided yet what to call it."

On the playground, it appeared, however, that some of the problems besetting less gifted children were present here, too.

"If you call me an idiot again," an unidentified boy promised gravely, "I will slug you."

Israel's Cooperative Efforts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, with the reasonable attitude described in this fine article by Kathleen Teltsch, which appeared in today's New York Times, there is hope of a solution to the Israel-Arab problem:

ARAB SAYS ISRAEL HAS NO JOB BIAS: UNIONIST ON TRIP HERE DENIES DISCRIMINATION BY JEWS

(By Kathleen Teltsch)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., February 7—Salim Jubran, a Christian Arab, takes great pride in the 30,000 Arab trade union members who work side by side with Jewish workers in Israel's factories and business offices.

They work together peacefully and profitably, receiving equal pay for equal work, he said today with obvious satisfaction.

Mr. Jubran was a pioneer in organizing trade unions for Arab teachers during the 1930's and 1940's when Britain administered Palestine under a League of Nations mandate. He organized the first coeducational secondary school for Arab children.

Two years ago he played a leading part in integrating the separate Arab trade groups into the Histadrut—Israel's largest union. Mr. Jubran came to the United States to meet and talk with labor groups on a visit arranged by the Israeli consulate.

DISCRIMINATION DENIED

He has discovered with some surprise, he said, that there is a popular misconception here that Arab workers are discriminated against and have second class status.

Mr. Jubran attests to the gains made by Arab workers and the positions attained by the professional groups—the physicians and administrators.

"We have them all, all except capitalists," he says smiling.

Mr. Jubran makes no secret of his view that Arab workers fare far better in Israel than many of those in the neighboring countries.

"The Arabs who remained in Israel are not living in paradise, but they are making a great deal of progress—progress they never dreamed of, and their living standards are higher than those of Arabs in other countries," he said.

He cites the jump in school enrollments—95 percent of the Arab boys have received schooling and 65 percent of the girls.

Arab women in Israel have profited by the progress made by Jewish women, which has enabled them to break down old barriers and enter the labor force. Fourteen years ago, it was common to see Arab women trudging miles to carry water home in jugs. Today every village has its own sanitary water supply and each house its own tap.

Mr. Jubran, who is fluent in both Arabic and Hebrew, speaks frequently of "our Jewish brethren." Like many Middle Easterners, he prefers to express himself by stories and proverbs.

He likens the problem of the Arabs in Israel to a tree. All the branching difficulties come from one root and that is the question: Can the Arab be loyal to Israel?

There is no simple yes or no answer, he says, but one essential is to persuade the Arabs that if they want equal rights they must accept equal obligations to be good citizens.

SOLUTION BELIEVED POSSIBLE

Mr. Jubran expressed the belief that Israel cannot ask Israeli Arabs to fight their Arab neighbors, but that "there is such a thing as passive loyalty."

He termed the predicament of the Palestinian Arabs who left Israel during the war in 1948 a human, rather than a political problem, which could be solved.

We Are Asking Too Much

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD (DICK) ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker—

Our first line of defense against inflation is the good sense and public spirit of business and labor—keeping their total increases in wages and profits in step with productivity. There is no single statistical test to guide each company and each union. But I strongly urge them—for their country's interest, and for their own—to apply the test of the public interest to these transactions.

So stated President Kennedy on January 11 in his state of the Union message to the Congress.

In line with the above quotation, I commend the following editorial from the Columbia Daily Tribune, Columbia, Mo., in the interest of our first line of defense, the union of labor and business in our country's interest.

Mr. Jack Waters, Jr., the editor and publisher of the Columbia Daily Tribune, has indeed captured President Kennedy's intent:

WE ARE ASKING TOO MUCH

William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, raised an interesting point regarding national economy in a recent speech before the National Conference on Defense and Taxation in New York last month. Commenting on current concern as to whether the consumer will expand his buying and thus clear the way for more production and more jobs in growing numbers, Martin said:

"Consumers now have more income and considerably more savings than they have ever had. Would it be too old-fashioned to think that the solution may be in trying to offer the consumer more for his money? All we would have to do would be to let the consumer share in the benefits of increasing productivity—an undertaking that could be facilitated if Government, management, and labor would work together to hold costs down all around.

"In our external, as well as our internal economic and financial affairs, much the same questions arise. Does anyone think we'll be better off in our international account, or even as well off as now, if American products become more expensive abroad and the American dollar becomes cheaper, either as a result of the wage-price spiral or of currency inflation, or both? What if, instead, we put our minds and hearts into convincing the whole world, by performance, that the value of American products and American dollars will always equal or better that of other countries' products or currencies?

"In any event it seems to me we have no choice but to make the try or else resign ourselves to eventual decay."

The try is completely within our capability, but we are not making a very good try at increased productivity when some of us are striking for a 20-hour week, as the builders' electricians are now doing in New York, or when we find ourselves unable to match in either quality or cost, the production of many items for sale in either our home markets or in the export field. We are not making a very good try when we let the value of our dollar continue to dwindle or permit foreign faith in the sanctity of our credit and our currency to fade away and our gold reserves to pour out to other nations. As the Federal Reserve Board chief points out, the 1946 American dollar has shrunk to 65 cents, with the resultant higher level of costs making it more difficult to maintain our competitive position in the world or to retain worldwide confidence in our ability and will to maintain the dollar's value henceforth.

The blame is the people's. We insist on spending more than we are willing to pay for—and sometimes on working less than we need to work to produce what we need to produce. We need to check the inflation spiral and to stop living on deficits. Martin put it this way:

"In my view, it would be grossly unfair and wholly unfruitful to blame any one administration for our national debt's growth and our currency's shrinkage. Deficit financing has marked many administrations, and the emergency of war has forced it on many of our presidents, with inflationary consequnces they could not prevent. From its founding the United States has had 34 Presidents and I am certain none of them ever welcomed a deficit or advocated inflation as an instrument of policy. If we the people want a culprit, we had better look for fault in ourselves, as well as in somebody else. And we had better give a collective assist to Presidential commitments to balanced budgets, whenever they're offered. The least thing we can do for our country is to stop asking it to do more for us."

Annuity Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, basic inequities in many laws exist. It is, I feel, the duty of every Member of Congress to attempt to remedy them when such situations are brought to light.

I have recently learned that under the provisions of section 10 of the Civil Service Retirement Act a widow of a Government employee loses all annuity rights upon her remarriage. As a result, should

her second husband die, she is not reentitled to the annuity regardless of her financial circumstances. This, of course, would be true if, by a quirk of fate, the second husband dies 1 day after the marriage.

To remedy this situation I have today introduced H.R. 10172, which would provide the widow with a reentitlement to the annuity should the second husband die. The bill also prevents a widow from receiving more than one annuity in the event she had any entitlement as a result of her second marriage.

I invite and request those of my colleagues who so desire to act as cosponsors of this legislation or to introduce similar bills.

Mr. Walter's Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, everyone knows my feelings toward "TAD" WALTER, a truly great American whom I consider one of my closest friends. Every Member of this House, I am sure, was just as elated as I was with Mr. WALTER's announcement 2 weeks ago that he would seek reelection to this great body. From the daily press have come some of the finest tributes any man could ever dream to have said about him. One of these editorials recently appeared in the Omaha World-Herald. Under unanimous consent, I insert it in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. WALTER'S CHOICE

"A fearsomely able man."

"Ability and hard work make him a hard man to dislodge."

Thus does the Louisville Courier-Journal pay grudging tribute to one of the powerful men in the House of Representatives, a man who aside from J. Edgar Hoover is perhaps the country's most effective battler against subversive activities.

We refer to Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, coauthor of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, a man whose integrity and sense of proportion have kept the HUAC on the track despite the unrelenting enmity of the left and the sometimes embarrassing embrace of crackpot elements.

The immediate news about Mr. WALTER is that, rather than retire, as planned, he will run for a 16th term. We doubt that any other man in public life has taken such unrelenting abuse as has been heaped on Mr. WALTER, or that anyone is more deserving of honorable retirement at 67, which is a relatively early retirement age for a Congressman.

But Mr. WALTER tells of "widespread insistence" that he continue. That insistence reportedly is strong in his Pennsylvania district, where he is believed to be a shoo-in, and certainly all who are concerned about the future of the Un-American Activities Committee will be happy to learn of his decision.

Mr. WALTER personifies the HUAC. The other members—Representatives MOULDER, DOYLE, WILLIS, TUCK, SCHERER, JOHANSEN, BRUCE, and SCHADEBERG—may be estimable Congressmen, but their names do not carry the authority and prestige which FRANCIS WALTER's does. Without him as its chairman, the HUAC would be a much less effective body.

These times call for the knowledge and hardheadedness which Mr. WALTER applies to matters of public policy.

The concern over communism felt by millions of Americans, the bland disregard of the internal Communist menace on the part of some officials, the crackpotism and criminal violence that sometimes flare up, create circumstances which can become explosive.

Under such conditions, the authority and good sense of a FRANCIS WALTER are needed by America. We are pleased by his decision to run again, and we trust that his constituents will send him back to continue his dedicated service to the Nation.

"Caveat Emptor" With or Without Slide Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Ave Maria, national Catholic weekly, issue of February 3, 1962.

"CAVEAT EMPTOR" WITH OR WITHOUT SLIDE RULE

Going shopping? Take along a slide rule.

Or so we're told by a mother of four who never fails to carry a slide rule with her when buying her family's supplies. After some investigation, we came to the conclusion that she is right. Women who do not stop and figure prices on competing brands are losers—and they lose $2 to $3 a week, if they are buying for medium-sized families.

The mother armed with the slide rule calculates fast and easily whether a 1-pound, 14-ounce can of peaches at 30 cents is really a better bargain than two, 1-pound, 2-ounce cans priced at two for 35 cents. (It isn't.)

Deliberate lack of standardization in content weight or measure is but one of the gimmicks employed by American manufacturers and processors to befuddle the hurried and harried shopper, who may be watching several children with one eye as she scans the shelf with the other.

The contents are not listed on some items, disguised on others. So-called sale prices are frequently a coverup for reduced quantity. New beer bottles called shorties or compact cans list bargain prices—and the buyer doesn't realize that he is receiving only 11 ounces instead of the customary 12.

In addition, the packaging industry has achieved miracles in making cartons twice the size of the contents; the label-printing industry has come through with smaller-than-ever type to be used to print the quantity.

Not to be outdone, Madison Avenue does its best to delude, coerce, cower, cajole and caterwaul the public into buying products through tricks and devices—and outright lies and fakery.

Just recently the Federal Trade Commission cracked down on a shaving cream firm for "false, misleading and deceptive" ads. A TV commercial showed the product lathered on sandpaper; this was followed by a swipe of a razor that left the sandpaper's surface clean. Naturally, if you have what is called a "sandpaper beard" you'll want to rush and buy some before tomorrow morning's ordeal.

The hitch: The "sandpaper" was really plexiglass covered with sand. FTC investigators had tried and tried to shave sandpaper with the sponsor's product. All they achieved was a stack of soggy sandpaper.

This single example, adequately publicized in the daily press, reveals a sick part of our society. The mother with the slide rule diagnosed the illness: "Shopping is a battle of wits, with the people who make the products winning consistently. They're out to 'take' you. I visit three chainstores after studying their ads in the newspapers every week. I check the price of every item. I drive my husband slightly batty by oversystematizing this routine. And yet even I get tricked sometimes."

How does the industry feel about the problem? When a bill was proposed in Congress that would create a Consumer Department at Cabinet level to protect the American buyer against the gimmicks of manufacturers, one organ of industry said it was not needed. An editorial in the Industrial News Review claimed: "Mrs. American Housewife is a canny soul. She knows what she wants, and she can tell a good buy from a bad one."

This overbearing complacency in the face of complaints on all sides was pointed up by an editorial in the Portland Oregonian: "With her eyes missing nothing, she moves from shelf to shelf, hefting packages and studying labels and prices. Click, click goes her electronic brain, as she discards the odd-sized package with the flamboyant label and tucks another into her cart. She is efficiency personified. Shopping is her job, and none knows it better."

If these responses typify the attitude of manufacturers and processors in general, they are inviting a governmental look at their tactics, as well as the possibility of some control on the outrageous methods they employ to steal pennies and dimes and, over a year's time, hundreds of dollars from millions of family treasuries.

They are also inviting unfavorable publicity that can hurt longstanding and honorable "images." A major private, nonprofit and noncommercial organization—Consumers Union—is gaining in popularity by its commonsense advice on which brands are better than others.

We would prefer to see the persuasive control of such private groups restore sound ethics to the manufacturing and marketing world; but if the voice of the consumer through organized effort is not enough the Government may have to exercise legal control.

Whatever is done, it is time to stop maligning American women by calling them electronic computers. Industry must accept the responsibility that cannot be divorced from their position of influence as suppliers of the needs of life.

The lady with the slide rule is the rare exception. And if even she gets "taken," what's happening to you?

TERRY F. BROCK.

The Wit and Wisdom of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a copy of

"The Wit and Wisdom of Congress," edited by Edward Boykin.

This is a treasury of anecdotes and epigrams, quips and puns, nuggets of historic debate and gems of eloquence—all handpicked from the annuals of the Congress, from 1789 to the present.

Mr. Boykin, a longtime student of congressional history, has watched the Congress in action for a quarter century.

His research into the records of Congress is probably unsurpassed by that of any other American historian today.

The work of compiling and editing the lively, the humorous, and the eloquent words and activities of the Congress is his unique achievement; no similar treatment of the congressional annals has ever been published.

While I have not yet finished my copy, I have found it thus far to be highly entertaining and informative, and I certainly would offer it as recommended reading for Members of the Congress. And, I might add, our Hon. Vice President JOHNSON, and Senator KENNETH B. KEATING also offer their recommendations of the publication.

Short Explanation of H.R. 10078

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on last Monday, I introduced a bill to provide student loans and require a study and report as to the extent to which our present inadequate and fragmented approach could be replaced and should be supplemented by such a loan program.

This bill is intended to provide loans for better than average students who are unable to attend college without a loan. Under the proposal, repayment of the loan would begin the second year after the student completes full-time study, and the loan would be repaid at the rate of 5 percent of the individual's net taxable income per year.

The bill would allot loan funds to colleges, which in turn would make the loans. The cost to the Federal Government for 200,000 interest-free loans to be repaid from future earnings would be about the same amount as the 40,000 scholarships proposed by the administration and included in the higher education bill as recently passed in the Senate.

This would be a much better approach, for more students would participate, it would not interfere with existing scholarships and would assure continued competition for private scholarships, and it would permit some students below the genius level to develop their talents also.

We do not want a situation where only those who can memorize best go to college—we also want to develop those students who question, think, and analyze, but who tend to get B's rather than A's. Thomas Edison and Albert Einstein were both in this category, and, like them, some students bloom late but with a more solid and better balanced foundation.

It is my belief that the greatest advantage our educational system has had over the Soviet system is that we usually have given students the freedom of choice in what course they will take; however, since shortages have appeared in several professions and skills, the tendency has been to have Federal scholarships in specific areas which will divert students from the courses of study they prefer, and next we find shortages in some area from which students were diverted.

There are some 34 different programs dealing with parts of the problem on a piecemeal basis. I believe the total cost of this increasingly splintering approach is more than the cost of having a broad loan program under which there would be enough graduates taking the courses they choose to fill all the needs. I believe the total cost of an interest-free loan repayable out of future earnings is only about one-fifth as much as the cost of scholarships and thus five times as many students can be given loans with the same cost to the Government.

If we had more going to college who are now looking for unskilled jobs that do not exist, we would not need to try to guide students into courses of study they do not prefer. We are graduating about 800,000 students per year and about 200,000 more of college ability are unable to attend college due to needing an average of $700.

On the average, the young people could secure the balance of the money needed and would gladly repay from future earnings. These young men and women have been adding to the unemployment rolls or replacing unskilled workers at the very time when there is a shortage of some professions and skills, especially in the electronics field.

The bill also provides for a study to determine the extent to which Federal grant and assistance programs designed to induce students into particular courses of study have diverted students from other courses of study which they preferred and for which other Federal grant or assistance programs have been enacted. It will also determine the extent to which the provisions of this act can reasonably replace various other Federal grants or assistance programs designed to overcome the financial barrier to students attending an institution of higher education.

College graduates will not be as efficient and productive if they are in a line of work or a profession that they did not really want anyway. I think freedom of choice should be given greater weight and that it is time we reappraise the direction we have been going and expand the whole base of higher education under a less expensive approach rather than trying to induce students into course of study they do not prefer.

Individual Initiative in Fallout Shelter Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding example of what individual citizens can do in the trying days that lie ahead has been shown by the junior chamber of commerce of Perrine, Fla.

This fine organization has developed plans and received approval for the construction of a 500-person nuclear blast and fallout shelter.

I am proud to point out to my colleagues in the U.S. Congress that the Perrine jaycees intend to raise the entire estimated $230,000 necessary for construction solely through community effort and do not intend to seek any Federal, State, county, or city money for the project.

The Perrine Junior Chamber of Commerce deserves the highest praise for this project, aimed at civil survival. I wish also to mention to my colleagues that this shelter will be named in honor of President John F. Kennedy.

The details of this fine project are set forth in the following article from the Homestead (Fla.) News-Leader of January 11, 1962:

PERRINE JAYCEES GET NUCLEAR SHELTER APPROVAL

A proposed $230,000 nuclear blast and fallout shelter for Perrine—thought to be the first of its kind in the country—got a green light this week.

Location of the 500-person shelter on the grounds of Perrine Elementary School won school board approval with one big stipulation. Permission to begin construction will have to wait until Perrine Junior Chamber of Commerce, sponsor of the shelter, has raised the entire construction cost.

Jaycees, far from being dismayed at the finance reservation, immediately plunged into ambitious plans to earn the $230,000 through a hard-hitting, multiple-facet fund drive slated for kickoff by March 1.

So far, they have slated a million-signature honor roll, contests in which unusual and valuable prizes will be offered, and a dinner and an entertainment meeting for which they hope to arrange television coverage. Menu for the dinner will be, naturally, survival foods similar to those with which the shelter will be stocked.

The shelter, entirely underground, will include all necessary facilities for 500 people for 2 weeks. Covering 10,000 square feet, the structure will have four wings and a 3,500-foot central recreation room. It is to be completely airtight in case of bacteriological warfare of poison gas.

Jaycees' decision to name the shelter in honor of President John Kennedy drew from the President the comment that he is deeply touched by the gesture. "We are dedicating it in his name because he has called attention to the people of the country to the vital need for shelters," said John Standring, chairman of the Jaycees' civil defense committee.

The club does not intend to ask for Federal, State, county, or city money for the project, Standring said. Instead, people and firms in the area will be called on for donations and pledges of service, money, and materials.

"Maybe there's a public spirited rock company that would donate some rock or cement. And construction firms could help us a great deal by providing some type of equipment and perhaps an operator to run it," he explained.

The shelter plans last week won approval of county civil defense officials, Metro Commissioner Walter Weiss, and Dade superintendent of schools, Dr. Joe Hall.

Weiss wrote to the Jaycees: "Civil defense in this nuclear age involves two major phases. One is the matter of survival in the event of a nuclear attack, and the second is that of reorganization of our resources after an attack. Your efforts are significant for they constitute movement in the only direction known to assure some hope of survival. * * * My congratulations for your fine efforts." congratulations for your fine efforts."

Sheriff Tom Kelly, director of civil defense in south Florida and head of the county civil defense organization, also had high praise for the Jaycees' project. "I am hopeful that your worthy undertaking will serve as an example that other civic and fraternal groups may follow," he said.

"The action of the Perrine Junior Chamber of Commerce bears out the old saying, 'If you want something done, do it yourself,' and I compliment the club for its interest in developing a project which will serve the whole community," added Dr. Hall.

The shelter has been designed to be completely self-sufficient, and embodies an isolation ward, a kitchen equipped to serve 500 people, a library with practical books to teach survivors to take up life in a post-fallout world, a communications center with shortwave radio and a periscope system, a sound system with recording of music and stories for entertainment, and a decontamination center where latecomers can shed radioactive clothing and take showers.

The Real Trouble With the U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Madison Avenue boys have been busy on the U.N. bond issue, as has Adlai Stevenson and President Kennedy, but as Arthur Krock points out in his very eloquent article of February 8, in the New York Times, there is more to the problem than money alone. It is time the citizens of the United States were given the true picture:

IN THE NATION: MONEY ALONE CANNOT SOLVE THE U.N. PROBLEM

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 7.—The administration today presented for the countersignature of Congress a double draft on the Treasury to relieve the financial distress of the United Nations caused by large-scale military operations and fiscally delinquent members.

Testifying before a Senate committee in behalf of the proposed purchase by the United States of 50 percent of a U.N. bond issue of $200 million. Adlai E. Stevenson asserted that the imperative of the objective would justify an outright gift of the money—which many opponents of this plan would welcome as a straightforward non-precedent-creating substitute. Addressing Congress as a whole, the President asked for a supplemental budget sum of $25.6 million to pay this Nation's share of the cost, so far, of one of the large-scale U.N. military operations—in the Congo, of which the end is not in sight.

But money alone will not solve the problem the U.N. has posed for this people and those of the only effective military allies of the United States. This problem is the product of several developments by which the General Assembly has become the activist force in the big glass house on the East River. Among these developments are: (1) A double standard of international morality, mandatory on the West, unregistered on the Soviet Union and such "unalined" aggressors as Nehru; (2) the evolution of the Assembly majority, which can be formed of nations that pay 5½ percent of the U.N. costs, into a group which will approve any resolution, no matter how irresponsible or injurious to the pursuit of world peace, if represented as anticolonialism.

The tactic of the Kennedy administration, once it made the major decision to base fundamental foreign policies of the United States on positions taken by the U.N. Assembly majority, has been to ignore these problems, or to obscure them for the American people in a cloud of official statments. So candor has been left to British statesmen. How this can be used constructively, with the purpose of preserving the U.N., is demonstrated by the following extracts from Prime Minister Macmillan's speech to the Commons on February 5:

"The U.N. is not a sovereign body. It is not even an alliance. * * * It is an association of sovereign states whose sovereignty is especially emphasized in the charter. * * * One of the difficulties about the resolutions (urging 'immediate independence' of all peoples, the Kantanga military operation, etc.) is that many of them are contrary to the charter * * * are sometimes conflicting and often obscure * * *.

"The whole foundation on which the U.N. was built has been undermined (by the cold war) with 'a number of unalined nations lying outside.' * * * The U.N. can never be made to work unless political conditions can be created in the world which allow the * * * Council to operate, not for perpetual propaganda purposes, not as a body permanently divided, but as a team * * *."

THE BRITISH POLICY VERSUS OURS

The Prime Minister observed that since the British Government thinks "the first purpose of the U.N. ought to be to bring about peace, not war," it seeks "to prevent the U.N. from being drawn into a position in which it will become a kind of new colonial power, with vast and increasing obligations for administration, finance, and military operations far beyond its present capacity." "Honesty," he said, required the British to oppose resolutions (the U.S. delegate voted for), though in "broad sympathy" with their concept, because of language like this—in a resolution "adopted 6 months after the Congo outbreaks and still frequently invoked—'inadequacy of political, economic, or educational preparedness should never serve as a pretext for delaying independence.'" This, said Macmillan, "is not the path to freedom, but to chaos."

Macmillan's appraisal that candor is in the interest of the U.N.'s survival, is in sharp contrast with this government's policy of inducing reform by glossing over and going along. Representative of this thinking were decisions by which the prestige of charter delinquents will be bolstered: the post-Goa visit to India of the First Lady, with Nehru as honored host, and the impending honorific visit of the President's Attorney General and brother to Indonesia and Sukarno.

The Brooklyn Public Library: We Strive for Excellence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, we in Brooklyn may not know all the answers but we do know where to find them. The 63d Annual Report of the Brooklyn Public Library is a record of growth worthy of a most literate and knowledgeable people, the residents of Brooklyn, the first suburb of the Nation's first Capital.

I commend the chief librarian, Mr. Francis R. St. John, the president of the board of trustees, Mr. Charles J. Mylod, the trustees, and all our librarians whom I have always found to be most courteous, dedicated, and diligent in their continuing efforts on behalf of those who seek after knowledge. I commend to my colleagues certain excerpts from this vital report:

SIXTY-THIRD ANNUAL REPORT, 1960–61: WE STRIVE FOR EXCELLENCE—REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

Hon. Robert F. Wagner, and the Honorable Board of Estimate, it is my pleasure to forward you on behalf of our board of trustees, the 63d Annual Report of the Brooklyn Public Library in which the chief librarian summarizes the achievements of the staff during the period July 31, 1960, to June 30, 1961. On behalf of the trustees and the staff I report with sincere sorrow the death of Henry J. Davenport, president for the past 12 years and a trustee since 1936. The true administration of this library was his life's ambition. We know that he achieved a glorious success.

A review of these past 25 years shows that our Brooklyn Public Library has had a very substantial growth and its services have greatly expanded to meet the demands of our population. This growth is best illustrated by comparing the library budget of several hundred thousand dollars some years ago with our 1961 budget of close to $7 million. Our library has become one of the largest and most respected in the United States. The circulation of books is constantly increasing and, due to our new branches, is near an all-time peak.

In considering this period in the development of this library we refer respectfully to our late friend, Borough President John Cashmore, the library's constant advocate in the board of estimate. Over the years the needs of the library received his careful attention and support.

The growth in library services has required since 1949 the opening of new branches and a program of rehabilitation under the department of public works. Following is a listing of the new branches and the rehabilitation program. Plans to complete the rehabilitation are progressing on a well thought out schedule. We are most anxious at this time to complete the new Brooklyn

Heights branch which is to be a part of the civic center.

Now what of the future? I believe that we may say of our library "The true administration of a free library is the foundation for our democratic government of independence, freedom and liberty". Our free public libraries, surpassed by none and equalled in few countries throughout the world were established for all of our people to have access to the knowledge and writings of the men who established our country as well as to the thought of all ages. Now is the time to take advantage of this knowledge in a rapidly changing world. The year covered by this report shows a restless world in political, social and economic change. New accent is being put on the importance of education to develop special talents in order to advance in scientific and technological discoveries. Since school and libraries are partners in education greater demands will be made on the library. The library is the university of all people as it serves the educational needs of the entire community. It is to our free libraries that our people will turn to review the truths which formed our national character and to rediscover what caused America to be loved and respected throughout the world.

Just how the library measures up to these demands and how it is gearing itself for the pressures of coming years is outlined in the following pages by the chief librarian from reports of the branch and department heads, their theme being "We strive for excellence".

Respectfully submitted.

CHARLES J. MYLOD,
President.

REPORT OF THE CHIEF LIBRARIAN

John W. Gardner, president of the Carnegie Corp., of New York, wrote in the report of the President's Commission on National Goals that, "We must raise standards in every phase of our national life." He urged "an authentic concern for excellence." More recently in his book entitled "Excellence" he stated, "What we must reach for is a conception of perpetual self-discovery, perpetual reshaping to realize one's best self, to be the person one could be."

The goals which Mr. Gardner describes have long been the credo of the staff of the Brooklyn Public Library.

As the president of the board indicated in his report the extension, enlargement and rehabilitation of branch buildings during the last 12 years have provided the shell for the type of quality service which the library staff tries to give. During the coming year we will open six new branches (five of them in areas previously unserved). In addition the new Brooklyn Heights Branch and Business Library will be completed as will an extensive addition to the King's Bay Branch. All of these buildings will permit us to serve these communities with a greater degree "of excellence."

An expansion of the district library—family reading center plan which has proved so successful has helped us to maintain high quality professonal service in the face of continuing shortages of professional librarians.

A basic essential for excellent library service is an adequate book stock. Branch and division heads have uniformly expressed their gratitude in their reports for the increased funds which have helped to fill empty shelves.

Our oral book review sessions held weekly throughout the year have insured a continuing high quality in selection of books for purchase.

Altogether, 429,396 volumes were processed during the year or, 71,574 more than in the previous year. The coordinator of cataloging estimated that if laid side by side these volumes would extend for a distance of 11.6 miles. By comparison the limited space of only a few square feet in which these books are unpacked and processed by a small group of people greatly hampers a dedicated staff.

Mutilations and thefts continue to cut into our book budget. One ironic case, reported by the social science division, and a typical one at that, is the experience of one college lecturer who came to the library to compile a bibliography of recent periodical articles on his subject, "Cheating" only to find that all the articles had been torn out.

Our congratulations go to Mrs. Eleanor T. Smith, coordinator of adult services, winner of this year's Friends of the Brooklyn Public Library Award for her distinguished contribution to the library world for a series of 38 consecutive weekly book reviews on the nationwide Christophers' television program.

Nineteen staff members retired this year and we all wish them long and happy retirements. Of these 14 were librarians and there were 3 from the custodial and 2 from the maintenance staffs.

On December 19, 1960, Mr. Henry J. Davenport, the president of the library board, dies after a brief illness. His imagination, his support, and his devotion to the Brooklyn Public Library made possible the growth of the library during the years since 1948 when he first was elected president. The staff has mourned his death, and as chief librarian I feel compelled to express not only the great professional loss to the library of this valiant champion but a deep personal feeling after 12 years of friendly and enlightened leadership.

Mr. Marino Ruffier who died on May 25, 1961, was another whose death the library has regretted. Mr. Ruffier's intellectual contributions in building the collections of the library have been responsible for much of the present quality of excellence in our reference and research service.

The friends of the library and the Brooklyn Council have continued to give us aid and sustenance during the past year in our efforts to give the best to the people of Brooklyn.

Dallas Editor Warns of Danger to Our Economy in Federal Grab for Power Over Wages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the close affinity of the President with the leaders of big labor increases the chances that the latest scheme of Walter Reuther to tax employers to pay workers for a 40-hour week regardless of the time worked, will be presented to Congress for action. This proposal, of course, follows the pattern of economic thinking opposed to the traditional free enterprise system in favor of socialistic policies. As with all the schemes to give more power to the Federal Government, this one could hurt most those the planners claim they want to help. Once we establish the pattern for payment of wages in private industry by the Government, we have set the stage for the final act in which private industry is abolished altogether and we are all servants of the state. A thoughtful study of the proposal and its implications are contained in the following article by Frank Langston, editorial page editor of the Dallas Times Herald:

TAX-FOR-WAGE PLAN HITS AT U.S. SYSTEM

(By Frank Langston)

Who's going to pay your wages?

Your employer? Uncle Sam? Your neighbors—or yourself?

And what will be the relation of the wages you get to the hours you spend working for them?

These are some questions that are going to be asked in the next few weeks. Some strange answers are being proposed for them.

And these questions will prompt some even more basic ones:

What's the real purpose of the bakery where you work—to bake bread or to provide a job for you? What's the purpose of a shoe store—to sell shoes or to give the shoe salesman a job?

A labor leader with powerful political ties has come forward with this proposal:

Pass a law for a Federal tax on employers to maintain 40 hours pay for a shortened workweek.

The labor leader, Walter Reuther, apparently is serious about the matter and says he has talked with Members of Congress and people inside the administration about it.

He says it would be a sort of "national insurance fund" plan that would work like social security.

HOW THE PLAN WOULD WORK

He would have his plan for a reduced workweek go into effect when unemployment is high. Then the people with jobs would work less but get just as much money as when they were working a full 40-hour week. That would mean more jobs available for the unemployed—also at a reduced-week rate and at 40-hour pay. Everybody would have a steady income and consumer buying would remain at a high level, creating general prosperity.

That's the way the plan would work—in theory.

But there are certain factors that Mr. Reuther ignores.

In setting up an employment insurance system, he plans to tap the employer only to pay the cost.

Nothing is said about having the worker set aside a part of his pay in high-employment periods. The boss would pay the total cost.

FISHING WITH FULL PAY

The worker just couldn't lose under such a system. If business is good, he has a job—and maybe even a little overtime pay. If business is bad he still has a job, getting full-time pay, and also has more time to go fishing.

Under such a system, workers would have an extra incentive for poor business—more leisure time.

Presumably the Federal Government would have to establish the point at which the reduced workweek would go into effect. This would mean more Government interference and more Federal control over private industry.

Once such a scheme were in effect and industry went on a reduced workweek it would be very difficult to return to a normal week. The very act of going back to such a normal week would result in more unemployment—and another order for a reduced week.

Furthermore, we have had conditions many times in which there was a scarcity of labor in certain industries during periods of high employment generally. And the same can be said of certain regions of the country.

EMPLOYER CARRIES THE LOAD

Mr. Reuther's tax—which could become astronomical—is aimed at the employer. He plans to have this one segment of the economy provide for the economic welfare of the entire country without giving it an additional source of profits.

It would make as much sense to levy a consumer tax to assure a market for goods regardless of whether a need for them exists. And it would make as much sense to levy a tax on labor to provide profits for industry during times of recession.

As a matter of fact, any additional tax on employers would have to be passed on to the public in the form of higher prices. This would mean more inflation.

This effort to tax employers to maintain a reduced workweek with normal week pay would hit hard at our system of private initiative. It smacks strongly of the "something for nothing" philosophy.

It would place Government in the role of paymaster for labor with funds wrested from business.

It's contrary to our American system and has no place in our economic picture if we remain a free enterprise nation.

The House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee Will Be Asked To Conduct an Investigation Study of the Adequacy of the Regulation of Nonscheduled Airlines in the Light of the Imperial Airlines Crash at Richmond, Va., November 8, 1961, Killing 74 Army Recruits and 3 Crew Members

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on February 8, I refrained from signing the report of the special Subcommittee of the House Armed Services to investigate the Imperial Airlines plane crash near Richmond, Va., November 8, 1961, at which time 74 Army recruits and 3 crew members lost their lives.

In refraining from signing the subcommittee report the following statement reveals my additional views which I filed with the subcommittee chairman. Following the statement is a copy of the House resolution I intend to introduce on Monday, February 12, 1962, which would authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct an investigation and study of the adequacy of the regulation of nonscheduled airlines in the light of the Imperial Airlines crash near Richmond, Va., November 8, 1961:

H. RES.—

Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct an investigation and study of the adequacy of the regulation of nonscheduled airlines

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study at the earliest practicable time of the adequacy of the regulation of supplemental air carriers (commonly referred to as "nonscheduled airlines"), with particular emphasis upon Imperial Airlines, by the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Aviation Agency insofar as concerns requirements of safe equipment, competent and trained personnel, sufficient inspections and other safety measures, adequate maintenance, adequate records of maintenance and servicing, and compliance with operating standards, instructions, and manuals. Such investigation and study shall be conducted in the light of the crash of an aircraft of the Imperial Airlines on November 8, 1961, at Richmond, Virginia, killing 74 Armed Forces recruits and 3 members of the crew, in order to determine the extent to which this tragedy was the result of inadequate regulations or inadequate enforcement of existing regulations, as well as neglect on the part of management and employees of that airline, with a view to recommending such measures as the Congress may adopt to prevent a recurrence of the factors leading to this tragedy.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

Punta del Este Was Not a Victory for the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in order that the American people understand clearly what we are up against in the Communist invasion of the Western Hemisphere, I call attention to the following article which was written for the Dallas Morning News by a correspondent who was present at the Punta del Este Conference:

PUNTA DEL ESTE TERMED U.S. CATASTROPHE

(By Thayer Waldo)

SANTO DOMINGO, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC.—If the attempted invasion of Cuba last April was a debacle, then what has just taken place at Punta del Este must be rated a catastrophe.

A great deal of murky rationalization about the outcome of that conference is certain to be heard, all over the hemisphere. But the harsh, stubborn fact will remain that the inter-American system fell apart there—which is precisely what Fidel Castro set out to achieve.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk and his colleagues went to that meeting with the avowed intention of securing unanimous agreement, among 19 other members of the Organization of American States (OAS), to apply stiff economic and diplomatic sanctions against the present Cuban Government.

After 10 days of largely fruitless bickering, the U.S. delegates came home with a devious resolution that assesses no such penalties on Castro's pro-Communist regime, but merely calls for eventual—and still hypothetical—disbarment of that regime from the OAS.

More painful still, even that relatively innocuous document is signed by the foreign ministers of only 13 other republics, representing in the aggregate about 30 percent of Latin America's total population.

The three largest nations in the area—Brazil, Mexico, and Argentina—declined to approve that compromise action. They were joined in abstention by representatives of Chile, Bolivia, and Ecuador. Together, these countries have approximately 135 million inhabitants (Cuba itself has 6 million), as against some 60 million persons living in the signatory states.

The prime tendency in the United States is to criticize, reproach or condemn outright those governments which abstained. Demands are already heard, both in and out of the Congress, for a severe reappraisal of foreign aid commitments to the six "uncooperative" nations. Alliance for Progress funds requested by President Kennedy will now probably not be voted without specific restrictions aimed at the defectors.

Such attitudes are to be expected. They are also irrelevant, incompetent and immaterial, as the lawyers say. The disastrous rebuff we received at Punta del Este was exactly what anyone cognizant of the true situation thought we would get.

That Dean Rusk, Chester Bowles, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Richard Goodwin, and the President's other assorted Latin American advisers did not, apparently, anticipate that blow seems little short of incredible. It just about nails down the sorry inference that this administration as the preceding one, has no one in its employ who understands anything whatever about the motivations, prejudices or mental processes of that vast conglomerate often paternalistically referred to as "our southern neighbors."

We wanted this conference. We insisted on holding it—and upon making a cold war issue its raison d'être—even though the six republics which refused to support its minimum findings are the same ones that publicly proclaimed their reluctance to attend such a conclave in the first place.

The only difference between the votes cast in Washington 2 months ago when the meeting was proposed, and those registered at Punta del Este was a single switch—Mexico's—from the negative column to an abstention. Has there ever been any valid reason to believe that a more significant realinement could be effected? If so, it remains invisible.

During the interim between those two sessions, Kennedy conferred at Palm Beach with President Arturo Frondizi, of Argentina. Adlai Stevenson flew to Trinidad for talks with him. In Washington, the corps of bright, busy advisers from the White House and the State Department consulted frequently with diplomats of key Latin American Republics.

Meanwhile, Castro sent personal emissaries—Foreign Minister Raul Roa and the latter's top aid, Carlos Olivares—all around the continent to make direct contact with heads of state or appropriate cabinet ministers in a dozen countries. The travelers had one blunt and simple message to convey: You may not like us, but remember that without Castro to worry Washington, there would be no alliance for progress.

The impact of that message was potent. After 15 years of neglect by the United States, many Latin American leaders were prepared to see a cause-and-effect pattern in the emergence of a hostile Western Hemisphere

regime, openly backed by Moscow, and the massive assistance program offered by Kennedy's administration.

To put it crudely, they just were not sure that we would carry out those pledges if we got everything we wanted in the way of tough measures against Fidel.

There were several other factors which strongly influenced the final lineup at Punta del Este—all of them overlooked or discounted by the "braintrusters" from Washington.

1. No existing article in any inter-American treaty, or in the OAS Charter, specifically provides for expulsion of a member state, based solely on the ideology professed by its government.

2. The Bay of Pigs fiasco 9 months earlier had not only weakened U.S. authority and prestige, but also prompted the suspicion among some that Latin Americans were now being asked to do the job we had failed to accomplish.

3. Inviting such countries as Paraguay, Nicaragua and Haiti to join in a high-minded declaration about "representative democracy" and "respect for human rights"—while suggesting no condemnation of their own dictatorial regimes—put a sour taste in a lot of mouths.

4. All the Republics which abstained are actively engaged in exploring trade possibilities with the Communist bloc, because they desperately need new markets for their raw materials and better terms than they can now get from free world suppliers on essential imports. Inevitably, this circumstance dampens their enthusiasm for becoming more involved in the East-West struggle.

President Kennedy has said that he is satisfied with the results obtained at Punta del Este. Faced with the record, these are brave words. If they are also entirely sincere, the man who holds what has been called "the loneliest job in the world" stands more alone than ever.

Establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1962

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have been much disturbed by the opposition to establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs. Today when 75 percent of our people live in cities, and 63 percent of our population lives on 10 percent of our land, adequate concern should be given to the problems of our cities and their residents. In 1860, 80 percent of our population was rural. Today less than 30 percent is rural farm and nonfarm.

We have a Department of Commerce to assist business, and a Department of Labor to look after the interests of our workers. The Department of Agriculture assists the small fraction of our population which engages in agricultural pursuits. Parenthetically, I might point out that the budget of the Department of Agriculture is $5,836 million. The whole Federal budget devoted to housing and urban problems is $832 million. I do not downgrade nor oppose the need for a Department of Agriculture, on the contrary I have been one of the strongest supporters of programs to assist the farmers. I ask, however, only that consideration be given to the problem of the large percentage of our population which lives, works, and dies in urban areas. Today's urban areas stretch for hundreds of miles almost uninterrupted by any open country. Rapid urbanization has been going on, and it is likely this process will speed up even more with attendant problems mushrooming. Speedy urbanization has given the cities enormous problems in water supply, water and air pollution, sewage disposal, transportation, crime and fire protection and prevention, streets and highways, education, recreation, housing and slum control, planning and zoning, public health and welfare. No city has resources, economic or technical, adequate to cope with these problems which generally flow across city, State, and county lines. Indeed, every American city is plagued with severe financial problems nearing the crisis stage. We must approach these by coordinated governmental action which can be accomplished efficiently only under a Department of Urban Affairs. The problems of cities are now being worked on by the Federal Government in almost every area. Federal programs now deal with air and water pollution, airport construction, educational facilities, disaster relief, civil defense, medical and hospital facilities, water pollution control, highway, public welfare assistance, housing, urban renewal, and a legion of other areas of concern to our city people. Establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs will of itself create no new and vast spending programs. If increased spending follows it will be because the Congress, the elected representatives of the people, have so voted and ordained, and because the plight of our cities demands it. We do seek to have consideration of our problems upgraded to the Cabinet level.

Who will be head of this Department is secondary, the establishment of the Department is of first importance. It is equally important, however, that there should be no discrimination on racial or other grounds in selecting a Cabinet officer to head this Department any more than it should exist in hiring clerks, custodial help, or intermediate executives. Mr. Robert Weaver is the selection of the President of the United States to head this Department. He deserves to be considered on the basis of his qualifications and ability. It is grossly improper to consider him in any other light. It is equally a great wrong to oppose a Department of Urban Affairs simply because Mr. Weaver might head that agency, or because Mr. Weaver happens to be a Negro.

Mr. Weaver has an outstanding record in the field of housing and urban affairs, in which he is a nationally recognized authority. He has given distinguished service as head of the largest Agency in the projected Department of Urban Affairs, where he has compiled a record as an extraordinarily capable administrator, indeed probably being the best one this Agency has had.

I vigorously support the action of President Kennedy in initiating the establishment of this Cabinet level agency under the provisions of the Reorganization Act. I condemn the bigots who have injected the question of race into the establishment of this Department to defeat a measure so clearly in the public interest.

Address by Dr. Charles H. Silver at Dinner Given in Honor of Rabbi William Berkowitz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, on November 28, 1961, a dinner was given in honor of Rabbi William Berkowitz at the Hotel Pierre in New York City, in connection with the drive for the sale of bonds for Israel. Rabbi Berkowitz is one of New York's leading citizens and has made an enormous contribution to the community. A fine speech was given by Charles H. Silver, a leader in the field of education and another sound citizen of the community, and I should like to bring Dr. Silver's speech to the attention of my colleagues:

Although I have never lived in Israel and am still looking forward to a visit that I have thus far been unable to make, it has been the dwelling place of my heart for as long as I can remember. This is true of many of us, I am sure, who through the pressures of time, responsibility, and circumstance must remain only spiritual Zionists.

Yet, it gives me pride to declare that we are not the children of Israel in name only. On many a Sabbath in the synagogue, my eyes have filled with tears as I listened to the beloved rabbi emeritus of B'nai Jeshurun recounting the sights and experiences that were his during one of many trips to Israel, where he and his wife now make their permanent home.

On each occasion, I felt the strong though intangible ties of an ancient heritage that bound me like a bridge of roots across the ocean to the land of our people, newly reborn. And my soul was stirred by the plight of our brothers abroad—and lifted in exaltation at the courage of our pioneering people to conquer adversity, to surmount enmity and despair as they raised the flag of their infant commonwealth and guarded it against foes on every hand.

As the golden voice of Rabbi Goldstein echoed in the chambers of history, we walked with him down the streets of modern cities carved out of the wasteland and across fields made fertile where the desert flowered into an abundant harvest under hands that tilled it with faith, hope, and courage.

We sat and heard him in silence with ears almost unbelieving and hearts torn with pity. Yet we knew that, despite crisis after crisis, Israel would endure, and with her survival would come the end of a nightmare of anguish and wandering for millions of our people.

Our rabbi had been one of the first to view the scars of human tragedy that were stamped on the face of Europe by the bloody heels of the Nazi hordes. He came back to report what he had seen—back from the ghettos of Warsaw where shreds of stained clothing hung from walls as mute evidence

of bare hands struggling against tanks and machineguns.

He told of the burnt-out homes, the barren land, the mass graves, the empty villages, where retreating "supermen" had wreaked a last-ditch vengeance against helpless men, women, and children.

And they seemed to be listening with us in the synagogue—6 million Jewish dead, rising again from the gaping ovens of Buchenwald, the screaming torture racks of the brown house at Munich, the blackened bones of babies still littering the lost places of a civilization gone mad; a hundred concentration camps, a thousand remembered horrors that the world must never forget—that humanity must never witness again.

Listening, we made a sacred vow that the hunted and tormented, the homeless, the oppressed, the refugee would find rest and security at last in Israel.

Yet, even as we made this pledge, and bought our bonds, the blood of yesterday's battles still stained the streets of Zion where she strove to guard her precarious existence, with more borders than territory, with no friends around her, and not a day of peace. Her frontiers still bristle with the fear of tomorrow's attack or betrayal.

There may be some who consider all of this to be Israel's own particular problem; some who deem it the world's; one to be debated and decided at the United Nations. But it is more than this. It is your problem and mine, and I scarcely need to bring this truth to you because I know that the ache is already in your hearts.

The future of that tortured land is the special responsibility of all our people—ours most of all because we are Jews, and despite our allegiance and loyalty to this God-loved land we live in, our blood and heritage is linked to Israel. And it is our problem now, most of all, because we cannot begin to guess what tragedy may be in store if we delay.

We all do our share in many worthwhile charities. This is not a charity. There was a time when we emptied our pockets for Israel, never believing that the bonds we bought would ever mature to pay back what seemed to be an outright gift. We know better now. Israel bonds are a sound, gilt-edged investment—but that isn't why we buy them.

Our duty to Israel is one we inherit from the centuries. It is a debt we owe by our birthright and one we should be proud to pay. The return is substantial, but the greatest interest on our investment cannot be measured in dollars and cents.

This is a time in the destiny of Israel that calls for action rather than words. A nation's future is in our hands, and it is, very plainly, a matter of life or death—perhaps our own or our children's. Time is running out. For Israel, for the world, and for each one of us, this is the hour of decision.

There is little to be said that has not been said before, but there is more to do than we have ever done before.

Israel, defending herself on every hand, needs help desperately and immediately. Much of her resources that should go into the labors of peace must be poured into armed defenses and military equipment to protect her very existence.

Her doors of salvation must be kept open for the desperate and the suffering who still experience the anguish of rejection—homeless and landless—sitting on their pitiful belongings, watching the hungry, anxious faces of their children, practicing the refugees' age-old ritual of patience, of endless waiting.

What are they waiting for there on the clogged roads and huddled into comfortless camps? For whom are they waiting, those sad, silent masses of humanity seeking hope? They are waiting for you—for you and me—and the hope we can give them.

All of us have heeded their plight before. Some have given a great deal.

Others have done as much as they could.

But, in these trying hours, no compassionate person can declare that he has done enough. We must all do more.

I will tell you just one vital reason why we must—though I should first explain that, for what could be termed "cloak and dagger" security considerations, I may not name the nations involved.

But the fact is that, at this very moment, more than a hundred thousand of our people have fled from their homes in Europe, Asia, and Africa in the face of new tides of persecution.

Unfortunately, Israel can find shelter and sustenance for no more than a quarter of them. This could become one of the gravest human tragedies of our times. It is up to us to find the funds to find the space for these helpless fugitives—to find homes for them, food, jobs, and schools for the children. Their fate is in your keeping. Their future is in your hands.

I think you will understand now why I say—and why it is so desperately urgent—that all of us find the means to do more.

Tonight, I am proud and privileged to join with you in honoring one who is doing more with each passing day—to strengthen our ties with Israel. As president of Congregation B'nai Jeshurun, to whose pulpit he has ascended as rabbi, I have come to know William Berkowitz, to respect and to love him. We saw his great promise of power and eloquence during the years he served so ably and eloquently as assistant, and then as associate to Israel Goldstein. Now that he has assumed the full duties of ministry, inheriting a magnificent spiritual estate, he has already, within a few short months, proved that his gifts are a rich endowment to the American Jewish community.

He is making the altar of B'nai Jeshurun a sounding board for the ageless teachings of our faith mingled with electrifying new thoughts to meet the challenge of our changing times. Rabbi Berkowitz is proving himself an inspiration to all who gather within the walls of our cherished house of worship, a friend to all humanity and a guardian of our people's destiny.

As founder of the Institute of Adult Jewish Studies which has flourished for almost a decade, attracting audiences of tens of thousands, he has brought to our congregation and to this city many of the Nation's outstanding authorities on philosophy, religion, literature, government, and the arts. His adroit and incisive interviews with the great intellectual, professional, and political leaders of our day have shaped a new appreciation of Jewish culture and tradition.

Rabbi Berkowitz gives time and energy to a hundred causes. His range of interest goes far beyond the limit of B'nai Jeshurun. His influence is becoming worldwide, and the wonder of it all is that he still devotes the major portion of his time and energies in ministering to his people, sharing our joys and comforting us in our sorrows.

May all of us who have gathered here tonight in your honor, Rabbi, resolve to minister as well to Israel.

We are called upon to do far less than those who gave their lives. For them, we can only deeply mourn. But for this new nation's future, we can rejoice without restraint—and be generous without regret.

Not only will the dollars we invest return to us with added reward, but also to our children and our children's children and to all who inherit the legacy of kinship and love which will, please God, endure forever as the land of Israel.

President's Aid-to-Education Schemes Must Lead to Federal Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Washington Daily News pierces the smokescreen of double-talk in the President's proposals for Federal aid to schools. Stripped of the fuzzy and contradictory phrases, we must reach the inevitable conclusion that Federal controls will follow Federal aid:

BUTTING IN ON THE SCHOOLS

A total of 600,000 public school classrooms must be built during this decade, according to President Kennedy's message on aid to education.

A little more than 2 years ago the Committee for Economic Development surveyed this field. It found classrooms were being built at the rate of 70,000 a year. That would be 700,000 in a decade, and without the Federal aid now declared to be vital.

That, in our view, is fairly characteristic of the message. In part it finds emergencies which do not exist. In part it proposes Federal butting in on affairs now capably handled by the States and local school districts.

"We must find the means of financing a 75-percent increase in the total cost of education," says the message, presumably referring to this decade. Public school expenditures in the last decade increased more than 100 percent, also without Federal aid for buildings or teachers' salaries.

Too many, says the message, leave school before completing high school. True. But the reasons are complex and largely unexplored. In any event, percentages of dropouts have decreased steadily.

Teachers' salaries are too low, says the message. Also true. But that condition steadily is being remedied. Average for the 1948–49 school year was $2,846. Ten years later, for 1958–59 it was $4,935. It has gone up since.

While the CED survey opposed a general subsidy, it found the poorer States need aid. Proposals before Congress include handouts for all, the rich as well as the poor.

In the words of the President, "Americans are still the best educated and best trained in the world." They got that way through an unparalleled devotion to the ideal of public education and a willingness of the people to tax themselves directly to pay the bills There is no evidence this enthusiasm is diminishing.

We consider the President's push in this direction reasonably well-meant but the fundamental demand comes from a busybody element in the bureaucracy which considers nothing run right unless it is run from Washington. Despite effusive reassurances, Federal control is bound to follow Federal financing.

In any event, this proposed subsidy is no gift. It all comes out of taxes which the Federal Government levies on the citizens of the localities. It would aid the States and the local districts with their own money.

We hope, as seems likely, that Congress will reject this scheme, as it applies to primary and secondary schools, again this year.

Medical Schools Need Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most salutary effects of H.R. 4999, a bill to provide matching grants to medical schools for the construction of teaching facilities and scholarship support for medical students, recently passed by the House, is that it seeks to relieve a long-felt need in medical education.

It should be clear even to the casual observer that the Nation must augment its number of trained doctors. In order to achieve this end, it will be necessary to modernize and expand existing programs of medical education and to develop new programs and provide operating support for medical schools and scholarship assistance for medical students.

Obviously, it is most desirable and necesary to continue to expand the present program of research support. To my mind, these measures must be taken promptly and cannot be delayed, if we are to maintain even the existing ratio of doctors to population, not to speak of those required to meet the needs of growth in population.

As many of you know, Massachusetts has some outstanding schools of medicine which are making most significant contributions to medical education, improvement of the public health and research in many fields vital to the well-being of the American people. The cost of a medical education is bounding upward at an alarming rate and lack of adequate capital is seriously checking required extension of educational facilities in this field.

It would be most desirable: First, for medical schools throughout the country to increase their first-year enrollments; second, also increase the number of transfer students they can accept into the third year from the growing number of 2-year medical schools already in operation; third, increase the number of qualified doctors that medical schools can train and send into the service of the people.

It must be recognized by everyone concerned that new medical schools and larger medical schools will require more faculty members. Federal programs have been helpful and fruitful in supporting valuable research in medicine and in medical science. This, in turn, has greatly served to improve the Nation's health and strengthen our medical schools—a long-sought goal.

It should be pointed out that Federal participation in the support of these activities has not brought Federal control. It is believed that this will continue to be true for a program of matching grants for teaching facilities, and grants for scholarship support. The importance to the country of research in medical and biological science has been recognized for many years in and out of the Congress.

It is now appropriate that Congress should recognize that adequate and proper education in medicine underlies both research and patient care.

We should take note of the fact that medical education is a long and costly process both for the student and for the school. Scholarship funds such as the ones provided in the bill would place medical education within the reach of many who cannot now contemplate such a career because of economic circumstances.

The above views are entertained very strongly by high officials of Harvard, Tufts University and Boston University Medical Schools. If scholarship grants are made, Congress will have taken another step in insuring a more adequate supply of talented, well-trained physicians and scholars for the future.

The early implementation of this measure will be a great boon to medical education and I urge expeditious action in this regard.

An Address by the Honorable Eugene R. Black, President, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, October 4, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Eugene R. Black is one of the most distinguished representatives of the American banking community. Last year, on October 4, 1961, Mr. Black addressed the New York group of the Investment Bankers Association of America at the Waldorf-Astoria in New York City.

I commend his excellent address on that occasion to the interest of our colleagues:

A BANKER LOOKS AT FOREIGN AID

I am delighted to be here with you tonight. In a very real sense I feel that I have come home. When I left here almost 15 years ago for Washington, it was your support which was my greatest ally in helping to mold the World Bank into what it is today. And though I have had to travel much and have come to know well many parts of the world, it is always Wall Street to which I am drawn again by will and inclination.

Yet I would certainly not have wanted to miss the privilege that has been mine during these past 15 years of participating in the exciting, frustrating, perplexing—and yet indefinitely hopeful—business of helping to build up the economies of less-developed countries around the world. And it is about this experience, and about some of the lessons concerning foreign aid that I have drawn from it, that I want to speak with you tonight.

For I am convinced that foreign aid is the concern of Wall Street as much as it is the concern of Washington and that there is a great deal that you, as financial and business leaders of America, can and should do about it.

I suspect that I have not selected a very popular subject for my talk. The United States' effort in the underdeveloped countries has left all of us, in greater or less degree, uncomfortable about this foreign aid business—and for good reasons. The foreign aid program has been muddled and confused in its objectives, often mediocre in its administration. Much of the resistance and outright hostility which the executive presentation of the foreign aid budget has encountered year after year, whatever the political persuasion of the congressional majority, is attributable to impatience with the operational weaknesses and administrative failures which have characterized the program in the past. We have been sold foreign aid as an emergency measure to stop communism, as a necessary tool to make friends and influence people in the underdeveloped world, as a must to expand our export trade. Yet none of these so-called objectives has been achieved. Soviet influence remains at high tide; our dispensations of money have won us neither gratitude nor affection, but more often grumbling dissatisfaction; and our balance of payments position has worsened, not improved.

Yet despite what may seem a pretty disheartening record, I want to advance to you, and with conviction, the following propositions:

First, the foreign aid, properly conceived, is a vitally essential element of our national policy—not for the shrill, short-term reasons usually advanced, but for the longer-range objective of building the kind of sound world economy and society which alone will let us fulfill our own national aspirations.

Second, that we can only achieve the real objective of our foreign aid program if emphasis is put, not on the quantity of money provided, but on the quality of the investment made with that money—on the amount of effective development which foreign aid funds buy or induce.

And finally, I want to suggest that the financial and business leaders of this country have a much greater role to play in making our foreign aid program effective than has ever been appreciated in Washington or has yet been generally recognized by you.

Let me start with the basic question of why foreign aid at all—why you and I should support and not oppose it. Foreign aid has been sold—oversold, I believe—largely as a necessary weapon of the cold war.

Indeed, there seems an almost direct relationship between the congressional fortunes of the various aid proposals over recent years and the violence of Soviet threats at the time. That there is a connection between the need for economic growth and the cold war is, of course, true: to the extent that the peoples of the less-developed areas are better housed, better fed, better clothed—to the extent that they can see some prospect of improving their low standards of living—their loyalty to their own institutions will be strengthened and they will be less susceptible to the insidious sales pitch of communism. But we mustn't make the mistake of thinking that by helping to finance their economic growth we can buy the loyalty or friendship of the less-developed countries—or their vote in the United Nations. They are too independent and too proud for that.

Nor must we make the mistake of thinking that foreign aid will buy us popularity. If we are out to be popular—if we aren't thick-skinned enough to hear, without rancor, criticism from those to whom we have extended aid—we had better get out of this business. And we had better get out of it, too, if we are going to consider every temporary advance of communism a defeat for our program.

But if we ever did cut out or cut down on our foreign aid for any such reason, it would be more than the loss of a battle in our struggle with Russia—it would be a defeat for the affirmative objectives of our national policy quite apart from the cold war. Indeed, if the Communist conspiracy should be totally defeated tomorrow, foreign aid to the underdeveloped world would remain, I suggest, an imperative of our time.

There are a number of reasons why this is so. For one thing, there are humanitarian and moral considerations behind our aid. We are moved by a concern for the welfare of others, by an impulse to help those who are engaged in a struggle against poverty, disease and ignorance. We need not and should not be ashamed to recognize and indeed to proclaim this reason for our foreign aid; generosity to less fortunate peoples is an aspect of our national tradition of which we can justifiably be proud.

There are economic considerations behind the program of considerable importance to our own welfare. The only effective way to assure sources of supply for the basic raw materials we need, the only effective way to assure expanding markets for the products of our industries, is to help other countries to achieve and maintain self-sustaining economic growth.

But important and valid as these humanitarian and economic considerations are, I suggest that there are reasons for foreign aid far more compelling, far more basic, than these. We discovered many years ago in our own society that growth based on a prosperous few and an impoverished many was neither healthy nor enduring, that our Nation's system of free enterprise could expand and grow strong over the long pull only by opening opportunities to the people at large and thereby releasing their energies and initiative. This has been reflected in many different ways—in our public education and public health systems, in our fiscal regime, in our slum clearance and urban renewal programs, in our encouragement of agriculture, and so on.

Every consideration of policy which dictated our national program is reproduced on the world scene—and the world today is smaller in many ways than was the United States when these national programs were first started. The industrial countries cannot count on remaining, for long, isolated islands of prosperity. Certainly, as I have already commented, their industries cannot achieve their long-range potentialities except as they build up the markets waiting to be developed in the economically backward countries. And, even more certainly, they cannot count on the political stability they need so long as great parts of the world are smouldering with the discontent born of poverty unrelieved by hope.

The only answer I know to all this is somehow to give the peoples of the underdeveloped world the opportunity, the means—and the incentive—to produce more. That is the simple meaning of all the high-flown talk about economic development. This is the essential objective of foreign aid—to enable the impoverished peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America to improve their own lot by growing more crops, extracting more minerals, manufacturing more industrial products, so that they can enjoy a better standard of living and higher standards of education, thus giving their children greater opportunities than they themselves have known.

I have stated the objective in simple terms, but achieving the vast increases in production that are necessary is an infinitely complicated task. It is not just a matter of building factories—it is first a matter of educating and training people equipped to manage and operate such factories.

It is not just a matter of providing better seed and more fertilizer for the farmers—one must first give the farmers incentive, and put them in a position to use modern tools effectively. This means, among many other things, providing adequate agricultural credit and extension services, and reforming antiquated systems of land tenure.

It is not just a matter of building new roads—it is equally a matter of organizing an efficient highway department to maintain the roads once they are built. It is not just a matter of constructing new powerplants—it is equally a matter of assuring that the power industry will be strong and solvent.

To achieve the necessary production increases, in short, requires changes, and sometimes revolutionary changes, not only across the whole broad front of economic life, but also in many aspects of the social structure.

This is all familiar to us in the United States. Our production has been our strength. The broad diffusion of its rewards among all our people has been the main source of both our economic growth and our political stability. The challenge to us now is to help get the same process going in the backward areas of the world. And foreign aid—financial and technical—is our means for doing this.

That brings me right to my second proposition—that the proper measure of our foreign aid is not the amount of money we make available, but the amount of effective development which our foreign aid funds buy or induce. We should be concerned more with quality than with quantity. Money provided to the underdeveloped countries buys nothing lasting except as it is productively invested either in additional physical facilities or, even more important, in the improvement of human resources. That's why I get so impatient with theoretical global estimates of the amount of external capital needed to bring about development at some given rate. What X millions of dollars will accomplish in countries like India, for example, with well prepared projects, a good level of administrative capacity both in government and in the private sector, and with political and monetary stability, is one thing. What the same amount of money will accomplish in another type of country—of which there are many—with no program, few projects, and a very thin layer of administrative competence, is quite a different thing. Both types of country need help—but help differently fashioned to meet their different needs and in amounts which differ in accordance with their capacity to undertake effective investment.

On this aspect of foreign aid, action is called for by both the recipient and aid-giving countries. The recipient countries need to work out national development programs which reflect a rational determination of investment priorities and, even more important, to translate those programs into specific projects ready for execution. In this task, foreign technical advice can be extremely useful, and is often absolutely necessary.

Equally, the aid-giving countries need to confine their help to sound projects which meet a real developmental need—and not to waste it, either to meet political pressures within the underdeveloped country (as in the case of the Soviet rubles used to pave the streets of Kabul) or else to promote the short-term trade interests of their own exporters. When loans are made for projects that are ill conceived or of low priority simply in order to facilitate the sale of equipment for those projects, the cause of development is retarded, not advanced.

Again, when in response to political pressures, foreign aid is made available to countries which are not effectively mobilizing their own resources—countries, for example, which fail to bring inflationary pressures under control or which fail to tax their citizens effectively—the result is often to enable the recipient government to put off the day for taking the necessary domestic action—again retarding, not advancing the cause of development.

It isn't foreign aid itself, therefore, that is important—it's only the extent to which that foreign aid brings about sound investment. That's why I say to you that we must stress the quality, not just the quantity, of our foreign aid.

And that's where you come in. What I have described as essential in the administration of foreign aid is, after all, nothing more than the standards which you, as investment bankers, are accustomed to apply in the practice of your profession. You know the value of productive investment; you know the importance of assuring the best use of available resources; you know the dangers of lending without considering the technical merits of the project and whether it will result in a marketable product; you know that each client has his own peculiarities and capabilities and that the amount and terms of the financing you provide must take appropriate account of the borrower as well as of the project.

As Americans, you have, I believe, an obligation to support the general concept of foreign aid. But as bankers, you have a special and affirmative obligation to see to it that that concept is translated into a program so framed and so administered that it produces results. It's easy to sit on the sidelines and carp about waste, mismanagement, money down the drain, and the like, but that doesn't help. What the program needs is not more derogatory cliches, but the very kind of informed criticism and discriminating support which you of all groups in the country are in the best position to provide.

There is still a reasonable chance of getting a sound foreign aid program under way. The concepts and principles underlying the new foreign aid legislation are a big step in the right direction; financing in the context of carefully considered development programs, rather than for a series of isolated, unrelated projects; long-term planning and commitment of funds; special concern for countries prepared to mobilize their own resources effectively and to carry out necessary internal reforms; and administrative responsibility entrusted to a single aid agency established at an appropriately high level and as an integral part of Government. The targets of the program will not be easy to achieve and, in actual administration, realistic compromises will sometimes have to be made. But given the understanding support, the friendly but firm criticism of groups such as this, I feel confident that the program can be kept headed in the right direction.

But let me say again in conclusion, as I have said at the start, that your support will be effective only if and to the extent that you emphasize the right issues.

We must stop asking whether foreign aid is really winning us popularity and ask whether it's really buying us development.

We must stop worrying every time the Soviets extend development assistance to one of the underdeveloped countries and concentrate instead on whether our own programs are being effectively carried out. For this development business is our game and our heritage, and not Khrushchev's or that of the Soviets.

It is our heritage which has demonstrated to the peoples of the underdeveloped world that there is an alternative to abject poverty.

It is our heritage which introduced the radical idea of self-determination and national independence.

It is our heritage which has shown the way to mass consumption and to the widest participation in the fruits of economic progress.

It is our heritage which, by giving impetus to this whole revolutionary business of development, has carried a message of hope to human beings the world over.

So let's play the game with good heart and cool head. Let's play it with vigor but without panic. Surely, we need not fear to lose if we only play it well.

Paralyzed Veterans of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a statement presented to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs by representatives of the Paralyzed Veterans of America, a very deserving group of severely disabled veterans. I am sure that Members will find this statement of great interest:

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM OF THE PARALYZED VETERANS OF AMERICA

(Presented before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee by National President Robert Classon, Thursday, February 8, 1962)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Robert Classon. I am the national president of the Paralyzed Veterans of America which maintains headquarters at 1170 Broadway, New York City. I am accompanied by Mr. Dixon Christian, of Richmond, Va., our codirector of legislation, whom I should also like to introduce to the committee, along with others of our members.

It is a great privilege for us to appear before you today to outline briefly the PVA's 1962 legislative program. As a matter of fact, this is an historic occasion; for to my knowledge it marks the first time the Paralyzed Veterans of America have testified before you on a general legislative program. I speak for all our members when I tell you how much we appreciate this opportunity.

Perhaps it would be well to give you first a general outline of how and why PVA is organized.

We are a national organization with 11 chapters and approximately 2,700 members spread across the entire country. This total is close to half of the 6,500 veterans in the country with spinal cord injuries and percentagewise represents probably the most comprehensive representation of any existing veterans group. We are composed exclusively of veterans who have suffered spinal cord injury or disease and who are thus confined to wheelchairs.

Our reason for being is to assist our members in adjusting to the realities of their disability, to help them in their efforts to rehabilitate themselves in the oftentimes discouraging process of finding a useful place in society. It is doubtful if one could find a more difficult and at times more frustrating task.

Above and beyond this immediate goal, PVA has a longer range objective in the fostering of medical research which we confidently believe will someday bring about a means to cure paraplegia.

To this end, the Paralyzed Veterans of America more than 14 years ago founded the National Paraplegia Foundation. To date we have contributed over $100,000 to the foundation for such research.

Additional details about our organization, membership and purposes will be found in the red brochure, "Paraplegia: The Man and the Problem," which has been placed upon your desks with other material about us.

In any comparison with other organizations appearing before your committee, we are a very small group. Yet this fact pleases rather than disturbs us. We wish the number of those veterans eligible for our group were even smaller.

Our numerical size does, however, put us at some practical disadvantage in pressing for legislative objectives. Our membership is too small to afford the luxury of a legislative office here in Washington to maintain closer relations with your committee and with other Members of Congress. And we cannot, of course, make any pretense of mobilizing thousands or millions of votes in our behalf among the Nation's electorate.

These inescapable facts may raise a question in your minds at this point. Why, you may well ask, does PVA struggle to maintain itself as a separate entity at all—especially when it might be possible to combine forces with some broader gage and more politically effective organization as, for example, the Disabled American Veterans?

I suspect at least one member of your committee, the honorable Congressman from Pennsylvania, Mr. FULTON, already knows the answer out of his own experience. For if I am not mistaken he utilizes the service of a paraplegic on his congressional staff. But unless one fully grasps the nature of paraplegia, it may be difficult to understand our determination to exist as an independent group.

Paraplegics are among the most seriously handicapped people on the face of the earth. The problems, both physical and emotional, peculiar to their injury are multitudinous and complex to an unusual degree. I say this not in any bid for sympathy but to emphasize the fact that only fellow paraplegics can fully understand and truly share these problems. And certainly you will agree that full knowledge of a problem is always a prerequisite to its solution.

It is this deep mutual understanding of our own peculiar problems which justifies our organizational existence—and my presence before you today.

Although I realize the question of a congressional charter for PVA is not within your jurisdiction, this same reasoning is one of the basic motivations behind our desire—and our efforts elsewhere in this session—to obtain such recognition. I hope, in our attempts to bring this issue to a vote, we may expect your individual support both off and on the floor.

We also hope that your committee will find our suggestions helpful in setting a legislative course for 1962. And it is to that subject I should like now to address myself.

First, if I may, I should like to discuss the shortcomings of available hospitalization facilities and techniques as they relate to the paraplegic.

This whole question of hospitalization ranks first and foremost in our minds because it is often quite literally a life-and-death question.

Only 20 years ago paraplegia meant almost certain death within 6 months. Today we have been granted a reprieve through the discovery and development of the so-called miracle drugs and through the rapid advance of new medical and surgical skills—and techniques of rehabilitation therapy. Yet it is still only a reprieve. Research of fairly recent date within the Veterans' Administration itself shows all too clearly the mortality rate of the paraplegic is 5 to 10 times greater than the average among the nonparalyzed population in comparable age groups. I have the sources of these figures available, if the committee desires them.

Thus, the life expectancy of the paraplegic is bound closely in a very real sense not only with the competence of his original hospitalization and medical care but also—and this is especially true in chronic type patients—with the availability of out-patient and clinical services integrated to his special needs.

In telling you now there are serious and even deplorable shortcomings in both the quality of VA care and VA facilities for paraplegics we do not mean to lay a blanket indictment on the whole Veterans' Administration hospitalization program. For whether it be in the United States or anywhere else in the world, there are no medical facilities the equal of our VA hospitals. Indeed, this committee can take pride in its own wise and farseeing efforts to maintain the kind of second to none medical care developed in the immediate postwar years.

We are by no means unaware or unappreciative of the billion-dollar VA modernization and repair program started several years ago and continuing mainly as a result of the initiative and tenacity of this committee.

And one need only look at the VA budget to see the enormous dollar stake in the Government's in-patient program for ailing veterans.

The fact remains that from the moment he sustains his injury until he is finally discharged as fully rehabilitated the paraplegic requires constant attendance and integrated service of a specialized variety. And there just are not enough knowledgeable physicians, nurses, aides and attendants for the paraplegic caseload—and among those who are knowledgeable only a few take really great interest in the concerns of chronic-type patients in our category.

We don't pretend to be administrative specialists in this kind of problem. We don't know all the answers. We believe, however, that much of the problem is rooted in the turnover of personnel as doctors, nurses, and aids look elsewhere for better job opportunities.

Perhaps this requires a reexamination of the use of available funds to hire and hold the kind of competence that proper integrated rehabilitation demands. Certainly improved treatment would serve the ends of real economy by materially shortening patients' hospitalization.

I don't wish to trespass on the committee's time but it might be helpful in this connection if I explained that the general VA medical practice of treating only symptoms works effectively in most instances but may—and often does—have disastrous consequences for the paraplegic. For example, a paraplegic receiving treatment for a kidney infection may wind up with a far more serious bedsore complication unless he is turned over periodically. But if bedsores develop, he is moved to let us say a plastic ward for treatment of that condition. More knowledgeable patient care would have prevented the complication in the first place.

Another example: too many paraplegics have been refused weekend admittance to hospitals by medics who know little or nothing about paraplegia. These delays can also be disastrous quite apart from the inconvenience involved. For one of our misfortunes is that while we know we hurt we do not know where. And it is therefore difficult to know how serious our condition may be.

I have mentioned plant deterioration—something this committee has done and is doing something about. Nevertheless, the deterioration of facilities in specific areas is compounding other adverse conditions with respect to paraplegia.

First, the present spinal and injury centers specializing in paraplegia at Boston, Richmond, Memphis, Chicago, and Long Beach do not begin to cover the geographical distribution of the paraplegic veteran population. Consequently, many paraplegics must travel long distances for treatment or else go to nonservice hospitals.

Additional integrated centers are needed in Houston, Miami, New York City, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, and San Juan, P.R.

The need for new or modernized facilities are particularly acute in Puerto Rico and Florida and at the existing center in Richmond. My colleague, Mr. Christian, is better qualified than I to discuss the Richmond situation. As a matter of fact at his own expense, he recently went to Winston-Salem, to survey treatment facilities there, at the suggestion of staff members of this committee. He has a separate report available on his observations which tie in with our resolutions on intermediate care attached to my testimony as an appendix.

I would say in terms of our specific interests pending legislation to increase compensation for service-connected veterans ranks second on our list of legislative objectives.

I believe it is unnecessary for me to advance any additional arguments in support of H.R. 879 which has not only won the endorsement of this committee in the previous session but also was passed in the House with the blessing of the Kennedy administration.

We all know how much the cost-of-living index has risen since the last raise in service-connected compensation.

With respect to this legislation, PVA merely wishes to make one observation: we share this committee's conviction that any legislative blockade of such urgently needed legislation in order to resuscitate an unrelated and controversial GI insurance measure is wrong in principle and cruel in essence. Let the insurance measure stand or fall on its own merits. It has no relation whatsoever to our entitlement to higher compensation which has already been too long delayed. And which is of special concern to us because of its liberalization of aid and attendance benefits.

We come now to the question of how to improve the lot of paralyzed veterans with non-service-connected disability—a question which is subject to wide and critical misunderstanding unless one fully understands the special problems of paraplegia.

We are urging three important liberalizations of the current law which, on superficial examination, may seem like a lot to ask for veterans who were not even in service when their disability was incurred. I sincerely hope we may be able to persuade you to feel otherwise.

First, we ask that pensions for 100 percent non-service-connected disability be raised, or supplemented if you prefer, to a total of $200 a month in the form of grants for aid and attendance. This increment would not be paid during periods of hospitalization although such veterans should be allowed the same 60-day grace period upon checking into the hospital that is envisioned in H.R. 879 for service-connected cases.

Second, we urge that spouses' income be eliminated in computing the earnings of non-service-connected veterans for pension payment purposes.

Third, we urge an increase in the amount that non-service-connected veterans may earn and still qualify for pensions.

Legislators are certainly human and it is understandable that you might feel in this instance that veterans with non-service-connected paralysis are not really to any large degree the responsibility of the Federal Government.

Yet I know from personal experience of many non-service-connected paraplegic veterans idling away their lives in VA hospitals, waiting to die, even wanting to die, because their futures seem so utterly hopeless.

These same men, costing the Government up to $25 a day while they remain in the hospital, could be outside making a positive contribution to society, perhaps even paying taxes, if they were given some basic financial security. The fact is that life in a wheelchair is much costlier than life on legs. The $200 a month figure would just about compensate for the additional expenses involved in such a disability.

The same argument applies with equal justification to the elimination of spouses' income in figuring pensions. For the wife, in many if not most instances, must be the major breadwinner in a paraplegic's home. And her income, while perhaps sufficient to eliminate her husband's pension rights under existing law, is not sufficient to meet the additional costs of aid and attendance. The present law encourages such veterans to remain under hospitalization.

Finally, it is our conviction that present income limitations on the veteran himself actually impede or prevent full rehabilitation of the paralyzed.

Let me illustrate:

Employment opportunities have always been limited for the paralyzed veteran, even when fully qualified, because there is a prejudice against the hiring of the seriously disabled. When a paralyzed veteran starts a new vocational career, usually he must accept a job paying less than the average scale. However, if he makes a few dollars over the present limits, he loses his entire pension. In many cases he chucks the whole thing and does not work at all.

Because being a paraplegic is such an expensive proposition in the world outside of a hospital, many non-service-connected veterans don't dare attempt it under present circumstances. In an age when work is becoming more and more a matter of mind rather than body, we ask that you give these men a chance to use their minds. Allow them to make the effort to become useful members of society by not penalizing their first steps.

These are the three main areas of legislative concern to the Paralyzed Veterans of America at the present time. Attached to my testimony are the rest of our legislative aims for 1962. With the permission of this committee, we would like to enter these in the record without reading them.

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, thank you for giving the Paralyzed Veterans of America the honor and privilege of presenting our legislative goals to you. I hope that our presentation has stimulated some questions.

Money Can't Buy Perfect Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with all the discussions taking place over the country today regarding Federal spending and Federal control of education, an editorial entitled "Money Can't Buy Perfect Schools," appearing in the Wednesday, February 7, edition of the Chicago Tribune is one of the most pertinent and thought provoking I have seen on this subject. Under unanimous consent, I include it in the RECORD at this point.

MONEY CAN'T BUY PERFECT SCHOOLS

In his message to Congress on education, President Kennedy has used the same shotgun approach to the schools' unfinished business that he adopted in his earlier state of the Union address. His promise: Pull the Federal appropriations trigger, and every educational shortcoming in the country will drop dead. He seems to think that every educational problem is soluble in Federal money.

As head of a government loaded with the biggest debt in human history, a government with an ever-rising statutory debt limit and the certain prospect of a series of deficit years, President Kennedy can yet speak of "the greater financial resources available at the national level."

A government that spends $92.5 billion a year obviously commands great resources. Just as obviously, the Government of the United States, without embarking on new channels of spending, already has demands on its resources greater than its income. After provision has been made for all the undertakings it has already assumed, does the Federal Government really have greater resources than those of the States and of local school districts? To ask this question is to answer it.

Trying to brush off what he calls "unfounded fears that Federal money means Federal control," President Kennedy asserts that $5 billion in Federal funds have been piped into higher education "without in any way undermining local administration." On the contrary, every thoughtful student of higher education is concerned by the universities' loss of balance under the impact of Federal money.

The recent spate of taxpayers' money has twisted every first-rate graduate school in the country out of the shape it would otherwise have had. Not only do the humanities and the social sciences suffer in comparison to the heavily subsidized fields, but basic research in the natural sciences suffers also. Even in applied technology, the freedom of university faculties to direct their own studies has been compromised by the temptation to sell projects to Federal bureaucrats with money to allocate.

And, as foreign aid reminds us, when Federal spending occurs without accompanying control, the record has shown conclusively the futility and even the harmfulness of shoveling out money without controls.

Increasing funds for educational research and development can be of little help to an educational profession which solemnly disclaims its ability to recognize good teaching. How can more money from Washington achieve "better curriculums and teaching methods" if that money is spent by doctrinaire anti-intellectuals? Why should the educational deficiencies of teachers be corrected by extra time on the same campuses where the deficiencies were built into them during undergraduate years?

Though the educationists have made some gestures toward placating their critics, the "educational wasteland" described by Arthur Bestor and many others has not been reclaimed, and cannot be reclaimed simply by more money. The unmet need of our schools is more for good sense than for money.

The stampede to infuse Federal money into education began, after sputnik, with the slogan that we "had to catch up with the Russians." Every product of a higher school in Russia is impressed into the service of the Soviet state. If Mr. Kennedy can't corral every American graduate into the political bureaucracy, he aparently thinks he can achieve much the same effect at the source—by bringing all education into the Federal clutch.

Facts on Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, as was well pointed out in the editorial in the Washington Daily News on February 7, the President's message on aid to education does not jibe with the facts. New York State will get less education and spend more money, if the President's massive program ever becomes law.

The editorial follows:

BUTTING IN ON THE SCHOOLS

A total of 600,000 public school classrooms must be built during this decade, according to President Kennedy's message on aid to education.

A little more than 2 years ago the Committee for Economic Development surveyed this field. It found classrooms were being built at the rate of 70,000 a year. That would be 700,000 in a decade, and without the Federal aid now declared to be vital.

That, in our view, is fairly characteristic of the message. In part it finds emergencies which do not exist. In part it proposes Federal butting in on affairs now capably handled by the States and local school districts.

"We must find the means of financing a 75-percent increase in the total cost of education," says the message, presumably referring to this decade. Public school expenditures in the last decade increased more than 100 percent, also without Federal aid for buildings or teachers' salaries.

Too many, says the message, leave school before completing high school. True. But the reasons are complex and largely unexplored. In any event, percentages of dropouts have decreased steadily.

Teachers' salaries are too low, says the message. Also true. But that condition steadily is being remedied. Average for the 1948–49 school year was $2,846. Ten years later, for 1958–59 it was $4,935. It has gone up since.

While the CED survey opposed a general subsidy, it found the poorer States need aid. Proposals before Congress include handouts for all, the rich as well as the poor.

In the words of the President: "Americans are still the best educated and best trained in the world." They got that way through an unparalleled devotion to the ideal of public education and a willingness of the people to tax themselves directly to pay the bills. There is no evidence this enthusiasm is diminishing.

We consider the President's push in this direction reasonably well meant but the fundamental demand comes from a busybody element in the bureaucracy which considers nothing run right unless it is run from Washington. Despite effusive reassurances, Federal control is bound to follow Federal financing.

In any event, this proposed subsidy is no gift. It all comes out of taxes which the Federal Government levies on the citizens of the localities. It would aid the States and the local districts with their own money.

We hope, as seems likely, that Congress will reject this scheme, as it applies to primary and secondary schools, again this year.

Mayor Wagner Supports Reorganization Plan No. 1 for a Department of Urban Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to hear the testimony of the mayor of the city of New York, Robert F. Wagner, before the Committee on Government Operations in support of Reorganization Plan No. 1, to create a Department of Urban Affairs. No man, in my opinion, has greater knowledge of the problems of urban and suburban areas than my most famous constituent and my mayor, Robert F. Wagner. His statement is so comprehensive that I believe that the readers would profit in reading it. Mayor Wagner's statement follows:

I appreciate the opportunity tendered me by this committee to testify on this important bill. I appear here in my capacity as mayor of New York City, but I also appear as a member of the executive committee of the U.S. Conference of Mayors. While I do not mean to show off my medals, I think it is pertinent to recall that I am a past president of the U.S. Conference of Mayors and also a past president of the American Municipal Association.

I also appear here today in my capacity as chairman of the Metropolitan Regional Council.

The metropolitan regional council represents what is usually called Metropolitan New York. It is an attempt to provide a coordinating body to consider the many common problems which affect the people of the area, even though they live in three different States.

I think I am in a position to speak up for, if not on behalf of, the 21 member counties of this council—which include not only the 5 boroughs of New York City, but 6 surrounding counties in New York State, part of Fairfield County in Connecticut, and 9 adjacent counties in New Jersey.

I do not wish to play a numbers game with this committee, but 15½ million people live in these 21 counties. I might point out parenthetically that on this committee, as far as I can ascertain, there are 2 members who each represent 1 of the 21 counties included in metropolitan regional council. And although these two members belong to a party different than my own, I trust and hope that they, among others, are going to support Reorganization Plan No. 1 which is so vitally and critically needed, in my judgment, to advance the interests of the people of those 2 counties, as well as the other 19 counties of Metropolitan New York, and of our country as a whole.

Let me state very simply at this point that I support the pending reorganization plan, and I hope that this committee will favorably recommend it to the House.

As a matter of fact, it is incomprehensible to me that this reorganization plan should have attracted the opposition that has developed. In other words—and perhaps I am being somewhat naive—it does not seem to me that the opposition has made out a very good case.

On the other hand, the need for this new Department is so obvious and so logical that it has been, in fact, recommended by the preceding administration, as well as by this one, and beyond that, by scholars and experts without exception. The first proposal for the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs was made some years ago. I believe, by a Republican Congressman from California.

The fact is that today two-thirds of the population of this Nation lives in urban areas, almost 120 million. The experts predict that by 1980 four-fifths of the entire population of this country will live in cities, and only 20 percent in farm and rural areas.

Just think of it, as of today only one-third of our population lives in rural areas. Yet, the farmers—and I would not begrudge them this—are represented in the Cabinet by the great Department of Agriculture with its vast collection of services and programs. But what department of the Federal Government speaks for the 60 to 70 percent of our people who live in the cities?

But the desirability of a Department of Urban Affairs is not just a question of the number of people living in our cities; it is also, and above all, a question of the number and intensity of problems in our cities.

Let me list just some of the problems of the cities: the problem of racial tension; the problem of crime, especially juvenile delinquency; the problem of housing and the deterioration of vast areas in the cities; the problem of traffic; the problem of open space and recreation; the problem of water supply; the problem of air and water pollution; the problem of public assistance and relief for the weak, the sick, the wayward, the handicapped, the aged; and finally, the problem of education.

As the cities and suburbs have grown, our problems have grown in geometric proportion. Take, for instance, the problem of traffic—how to handle the paralyzing concentration of trucks and passenger cars added to the taxicabs, buses, and common carriers—how to handle them at the cities' entry points—in our case at such narrow necks as the Holland, Lincoln, and Queens tunnels and the various bridges which link Manhattan to the Bronx, to Queens, and to Brooklyn. This, of course, is closely related to the problem of maintaining interurban mass transit services—in our case, the Long Island Railroad and the New Haven Railroad, and the intraurban transit systems as well.

These are among the many problems which call for concentrated, intensive attack on all fronts and with all resources. Failure to solve them threatens the very foundations of city life. The Federal Government must not only recognize the existence of these problems, but must accept its proper responsibility for coordinating, if not leading, the attack upon them.

Primarily, of course, the Department of Urban Affairs will concern itself with housing, urban rehabilitation and urban renewal. This is perhaps the central problem of our cities and of the people who live in them. We in New York City have built 230,000 new housing units in the past 8 years enough to house 2 million people; but we have not, by far, solved our housing problems. We have only begun. We need much more help to achieve our goal of a slumless city—a city in which all can find shelter adequate to their needs at prices they can afford.

I would like to give members of this committee a statistical picture of what Federal aid to housing has meant in the 21 counties covered by the Metropolitan Regional Coun-

cil. In those 21 counties, FHA has insured more than 300,000 single family homes, with a total of almost $3 billion. The FHA has insured 1,500 projects containing more than 200,000 units of rental housing, for a total of almost $2 billion. Including assistance to individual property owners to improve their buildings, FHA programs have benefited more than 2½ million families in the Metropolitan New York area. One and a quarter billion dollars of Federal money has gone into the construction of 215 federally aided public housing projects containing 100,000 units.

These are big numbers, which reflect tremendous undertakings and activities in housing—just in the Metropolitan Area of New York City alone. Certainly a department of Cabinet rank is justified for the handling of undertakings of such magnitude and impact, nationwide. And yet, as I have indicated, what has been done is only a small part of what needs to be achieved in housing and it cannot be achieved simply by increasing the size of present Federal programs. New initiatives are called for, and new approaches. Experimental and pilot programs need to be undertaken. These activities and others related to them, in the housing field, need to be pursued under the sponsorship of a Cabinet rank Federal department.

I have been confining these last remarks just to the field of housing because housing would be the chief operating responsibility of the new Department of Urban Affairs. But this new Department should have many other major responsibilities, one of which would be to help relate the problems of urban and of suburban areas—problems which in many cases cross not only county lines, but frequently State lines as well.

That is why we in the New York area have the Metropolitan Regional Council. That is why we have the New York Port Authority. That is why we have interstate compacts. But all of these devices need to be supplemented and supported by Federal leadership and by the appropriate recognition of Federal responsibility.

We in the cities are facing dynamically exploding demands for essential services. These demands are legitimate; they are largely undeniable. There are, for instance, the demands to meet the manifold problems arising from racial tensions, and the revolution of rising expectations which is occurring among people in the lower economic levels. As far as the racial tensions are concerned, the sins of the fathers are indeed being visited upon the sons in our cities. The measured forward pace of former years is no longer tolerable. We must vastly expand our services to the underprivileged with our housing programs, with our measures for assistance to the aged, and children, our schools and their curriculums must be tailored to meet the changing needs and the rising challenge of technology.

All this we must do. For all this we need the assistance of a Federal Department of Urban Affairs.

As I have already indicated, the proposal to establish a Department of Urban Affairs is not a brand new Democratic invention. In 1942 the eminent historian and political scientist, Charles E. Merriman, called for the creation of such a department; and 8 years ago, the National Housing Conference strongly recommended the same thing. These recommendations, like the one made by President Kennedy last year and again this year, were not based on a desire to expand Government bureaucracy for the sake of bureaucracy—nor to create a Cabinet job for a particular person.

Of course, we in New York are intensely proud of the fact that the first Secretary of the new Department would be a New Yorker and, moreover, a man I was privileged to have in my administration in the city government, and whom I reluctantly released to the Federal Government 13 months ago. It was, of course, very satisfying to me to know that President Kennedy intends to elevate this distinguished New Yorker to Cabinet rank. In response to those eyebrows which have been raised about this announcement, it should be recalled that President Eisenhower—when he contemplated creating the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—announced that he would appoint Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby as Secretary.

I am just as impatient as some of you are with the tendency toward encroachment upon local prerogatives. I believe in the principle of home rule; and often I think how nice it would be to go back to the good old days when all problems were relatively simple and easily manageable. But that is just daydreaming. The reality is that we are confronted with problems of such gravity that jurisdictional questions are almost impertinent.

State governments should and will continue to be encouraged by the Federal Government to contribute to the solution of the many aspects of urban problems. But resolution of these problems cannot wait upon State efforts alone. These problems are so intense and are growing so critical that they must be attacked on all fronts simultaneously, and must enlist the assistance of all agencies that can possibly be mobilized—both State and Federal.

The creation of a Federal Department of Urban Affairs should stimulate rather than detract from State efforts to help resolve urban problems.

The proposed Department of Urban Affairs will be primarily concerned with the problems of people and will strengthen, rather than weaken, the scope of Federal-State relationships by removing the strain and the frequent paralyzing effect of divergent interests as between the State and city governments.

Moreover, in most States the legal status of cities is such that they cannot enter into new and basic relationships with the Federal Government on any major program without the authorization of the State legislature and the approval of the Governor.

In fact, the city government is the creature of the State government and we would be limited in our dealings with the Department of Urban Affairs by what the State government would authorize us to do. Hence, it cannot be said that there would be any loss in the power or authority of the States vis-a-vis the city or the Federal Government.

We in New York City are redoubling and tripling our efforts to meet our problems. We are planning and projecting great new programs to attack those problems. Yet, we also need the stimulation, the guidance, and the services of a Department of Urban Affairs in the Federal Government.

If I may presume to speak for all the people who live in the cities, we are an overwhelming majority of the people of America. May we not have a department of Cabinet rank in the Federal Government to stand guard over our interests?

We are not asking for any special consideration. The people who live in the cities are notoriously underrepresented in the State legislatures of the country. We suffer from this and we necessarily endure it in New York State as much, if not more, than in any other State. And here in Congress, the people who live in the cities are likewise underrepresented.

Give us at least a Cabinet department to speak for us—to advocate our interests and, above all, to stimulate the intensified efforts that must be made—in which all must join—to resolve the problems of urbanization, which really means civilization.

Newburgh: Symbol of Unrest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is tragic that Americans are just becoming aware that there is a problem in this country concerning welfare and assistance to the indigent. Unfortunately the city of Newburgh, N.Y., spotlighted the situation by its retrogressive attitude as expressed in its attempted revision of its public welfare programs. It is unfortunate because of the human beings whose lives are affected by these changes. On the other hand, this spotlighting will—and has—brought new public awareness. The President has sent to us a proposal which would remedy the welfare problem by preventing the continuance on public relief rolls of those who can work, who want to work, and who only need some little assistance. Not a handout, but assistance. Abuses of public welfare programs are minimal, amounting to approximately one-half of 1 percent of the total number of recipients. The overwhelming majority of our citizens who find themselves on relief do not want to be there and will do whatever is necessary to get off.

The administration's bill will help them do just that by providing retraining and relocating assistance and by providing the kind of educational opportunities that will prevent the children of these unfortunate citizens from becoming public charges like their parents.

One of the social agencies which is constantly helping to improve the system in the State of New York is the State Charities Aid Association. In October of 1961 the association issued the following statement on public welfare which I commend to the interest of our colleagues:

NEWBURGH: SYMBOL OF UNREST—STATEMENT ON PUBLIC WELFARE BY THE STATE CHARITIES AID ASSOCIATION

Current public welfare controversies, symbolized by developments in the city of Newburgh, threaten to obscure the plight of the persons most immediately involved: individual human beings in trouble. These are the economically insecure, the very young, the aged, and the physically handicapped.

Our own investigation and an appraisal of the facts seem to us to warrant this public statement.

The Newburgh crusade is not justified by the facts. The public has been misinformed and misled. It is important to set the record straight as a basis for sound planning of productive alterations in our system of public aid to the needy.

Public welfare is the tangible evidence of the conscience and the heart of America. The controversy now raging over its shape and substance is a testing ground of one's willingness to reach out his hand to a needy fellow man.

At the same time, we recognize that the generally favorable public reaction to the Newburgh crusade reflects widespread misgivings about welfare. The readiness of the public to accept a get tough policy reveals a deeply rooted suspicion of public welfare,

involving both those who administer it and those who receive its benefits. And we cannot reasonably maintain that all of these suspicions are unfounded.

We recognize too that Newburgh, like other communities, does have serious social and economic problems of understandable concern to the people of that locality.

In our planning we should not blindly accept the status quo. But we should not accept change based on unfounded allegations, change that looks to the past rather than the future, or change that does a disservice to persons powerless to help themselves.

PRINCIPLES OF PUBLIC WELFARE

Enduring principles—not local or temporary expediency—must be the cornerstone of welfare activities, both public and private. Among these principles are (1) that assistance should be provided solely on the basis of established need; (2) that effective assistance should maintain people in time of need, restore them rapidly to the maximum degree of self-sufficiency, and seek to correct conditions that contribute to dependency; (3) that uniform standards of assistance are necessary to safeguard the needy and to provide a minimum degree of aid in all areas; (4) and that the administration of welfare at all levels should be in the hands of the best trained and experienced persons available.

For more than 30 years these basic concepts have been set forth either explicitly or implicitly in the social welfare law of New York State. For example, subdivision 1 of section 131 states:

"It shall be the duty of public welfare officials, insofar as funds are available for that purpose, to provide adequately for those unable to maintain themselves. They shall, whenever possible, administer such care, treatment, and service as may restore such persons to a condition of self-support, and shall further give such service to those liable to become destitute as may prevent the necessity of their becoming public charges."

The tone and intent of Newburgh's declared welfare program, as set forth in the 13-point code, together with punitive and degrading measures involving local welfare recipients, violate principles embodied in State and Federal law. Whether the Newburgh program actually violates the letter of New York's social welfare law is now being considered in the courts. In view of the pendency of this action, instituted by the New York State Department of Social Welfare, we refrain from taking any position as to whether all or any part of this program conflicts with the law.

WHO ARE THE RECIPIENTS?

In influencing public opinion, the Newburgh program distorts the true picture of those receiving public assistance. It focuses upon alleged abuses in two of the public assistance programs, home relief and aid to dependent children. It does not specifically challenge other programs such as old age assistance, aid to the disabled, assistance to the blind, and medical aid for the aged. Nevertheless, these worthy programs cannot help but be discredited to some degree, and the aged and the handicapped persons involved cannot help but be affected by the psychological pressures engendered by the controversy. As far as costs are concerned, the largest recent increases in the State have occurred in payments to recipients of old age assistance and assistance to the blind, due largely to rising costs of medical care.

The supporters of Newburgh's "get tough" policy have concentrated their fire on frauds, chiselers, and able-bodied loafers. According to the latest information available, the program in Newburgh has failed to produce a single case of fraud, and has yielded only one "employable" relief recipient. It is also noteworthy that in all of 1960 not one case of welfare fraud was prosecuted in Newburgh.

Nevertheless, the all-too-prevalent stereotype of the loafer, drifting through life at public expense has been given new emphasis by the Newburgh campaign.

The fact is that the vast majority—90 percent or more—of persons on relief are not employable: they are too young, too old, or too disabled. (The able-bodied unemployed are covered largely by unemployment insurance.) Another unrecognized truth is that a number of persons on relief already are working full time, but their wages are so low that they need supplementary grants to maintain their families at the subsistence level.

These and other marginal income unskilled workers—the last to be hired, first to be fired—are forced to seek public assistance periodically. Obviously, therefore, a few employable persons are on public assistance from time to time. The announced Newburgh policy is to put them to work for the city. There should be no quarrel with this concept, if by working the recipients can maintain skills and industrious habits, and are not merely being punished for poverty.

WORK RELIEF

But we note with concern the prevailing impression that work relief was invented by the farmers of the Newburgh code. Actually work relief has been part of the New York State welfare pattern, sanctioned by law, for many years. In fact, 50 work relief projects were operating in August in 23 upstate counties, employing 782 public assistance recipients, and the number is expected to rise.

Newburgh itself had a work relief program until May of this year, with weekly caseloads ranging from a high of 25 during a recession period to a low of zero. Currently the potential able-bodied work relief force would appear to be the one man already mentioned—and he was forced to remain at home to care for his children because his wife was hospitalized.

Morever, we take exception to the Newburgh code provision stipulating a full 40-hour week for all relief recipients, regardless of the amount of relief money being granted. Why should a recipient be required to work more than the number of hours needed to equal his relief allotment? At a rate of $1 per hour, a man getting $20 in aid should be expected to work only 20 hours, with the balance of his time available to seek other employment.

AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN

Another target in Newburgh has been that of "welfare-subsidized immorality" under the aid-to-dependent-children program. There is common agreement, in social work circles and elsewhere, that the ADC program poses many thorny problems.

Constructive efforts toward rehabilitation may contribute to the solution. But Newburgh's so-called "solution" of arbitrarily denying assistance to a woman who has another out-of-wedlock child is impractical and destructive. By penalizing the child, it is in itself an immoral action.

The fiction that most ADC mothers neglect their children and deliberately flaunt moral conventions has been given added impetus by publicity on Newburgh. A scientific evaluation of ADC cases in Chicago led to the conclusion that "the mothers gave good care to their children" and that "contrary to general opinion, most of the unwed mothers expressed concern about having given birth out of wedlock, and their guilt, shame and self-derision was expressed in many ways."

In any event, illegitimacy is a social problem rather than a welfare problem. Federal figures indicate that only 13 percent of America's illegitimate children are receiving public assistance. Middle and upper income families confronted with the problem take care of it in private, but public welfare is the last resort for those who have nowhere else to turn.

Throughout the Newburgh furor over home relief and ADC there has run an undercurrent of racial animosity. The Negro population of the area is increasing, and Newburgh now has the second largest proportion of Negroes of any of the State's 62 cities. Yet the fact remains that only a fraction of Newburgh's Negroes are receiving public assistance; the vast majority are productive and self-sustaining citizens.

VOUCHER RELIEF

In the 13-point code, another prime item—wholesale application of voucher relief—is a throwback to the past. This system assumes that relief recipients are incapable of handling money themselves, and must be given chits exchangeable for food, clothing, and rent. Some such cases of irresponsibility exist, and the State law authorizes the use of voucher relief in these cases—although Federal law stipulates "an unrestricted cash grant."

The broad application of voucher relief to all is cumbersome, time-consuming and expensive for a welfare department to administer—compounding the very administrative complexity that critics of public welfare deplore. It also is unsound because it treats unfortunate adults as retarded children. Public welfare policy should seek to encourage self-reliance among relief recipients, permitting a maximum self-management of their own affairs—including financial affairs.

Another shortcoming of voucher relief is that it is subject to abuse by unscrupulous merchants, who may cash the vouchers in return for a discount.

Apart from the code itself, recent Newburgh practices—such as the police station muster of relief recipients and the more recent "mug shots" required of home relief and ADC recipients—humiliate and degrade all the unfortunate as part of a futile search for isolated frauds.

FACTS OF THE CASE

Data used to justify the Newburgh welfare crusade have failed to stand up. It was claimed that undesirable newcomers were flocking to Newburgh to get public assistance. The fact is that in 1960 exactly $205 was spent in home relief on newcomers who had lived in the State less than 1 year—and this sum was repaid in full by the State. What's more, not 1 cent was spent for newcomers on ADC.

Also, it was repeatedly reported in the press that welfare cost the city one-third of its budget. The actual local cost to the city was 13 percent of its net budget. The balance of the cost was met by State and Federal reimbursement. Each of four comparable cities in the State had higher public welfare costs.

In fact, if every man, woman, and child getting home relief and ADC aid had been denied assistance during the entire year of 1960 it would have reduced Newburgh's direct welfare costs by less than $60,000, which is equivalent to some $2 per resident.

As for the financial factor in ADC illegitimacy, the local cost (supplemented by State and Federal reimbursement) is $5.90 per month to care for a child in his mother's home. If the child were removed and placed in a boarding home it would cost Newburgh at least $37.50 per month—and if a boarding home could not be found his placement in an institution would cost the local taxpayer $75 per month. This item of code, then, could cost the city more than 12 times the sum now being spent, in each instance where an ADC child was taken from his mother's home.

HOME RULE

The Newburgh plan is costly, destructive, and retrogressive. In the name of home rule it would abandon much that is sound

in public welfare, and substitute discredited practices.

A basic fallacy is the idea that public welfare measures are of purely local concern. Actually State and Federal Government have a large stake in how all children everywhere are nurtured physically and emotionally. Indeed, the health and well-being of the entire population are a State and National concern.

Lack of minimum uniform standards could only lead to a return to the period of punitive treatment of defenseless people in which each community competes to give the least possible help in order to expel harassed unfortunates from its borders.

RECENT INTERPRETATION OF CODE

In mid-September, court papers filed by Newburgh in answer to a temporary injunction against the 13-point code were detailed in the press. In this so-called interpretation of the code by Newburgh, the most controversial of the items are now set forth in a manner that suggests softening.

Among the city's legal interpretations of the original 13 points, for example, are the following:

Point 3 of the code: All recipients physically capable of and available for private employment who are offered a job but refuse it, regardless of the type of employment involved, are to be denied relief.

Interpretation: "Point 3 has been interpreted in practice to provide that all recipients physically capable of and available for private employment who are offered a job but refuse it are to be denied relief, provided that recipient is physically fitted for the job, that the job is not hazardous and the salary adequate and reasonable in view of all of the facts and circumstances."

Point 4 of the code: All mothers of illegitimate children are to be advised that should they have any more children out of wedlock, they shall be denied relief.

Interpretation: "Point 4 has been determined and interpreted in practice as meaning that all mothers of illegitimate children shall be advised that should they have any more children out of wedlock an investigation and determination shall be made as to the home environment of all such illegitimate children and if such home environment is not deemed satisfactory, judicial proceedings shall be instituted to place all such children in foster care in place of the continuance of welfare aid to the mother for such child or children."

Point 9 of the code: Aid to persons except the aged, blind and disabled shall be limited to 3 months in any 1 year.

Interpretation: "Point 9 has been interpreted to mean * * * that aid to any persons shall only be limited to 3 months unless it is ascertained at the end of such 3 month periods that it is reasonable and necessary under the law that such relief be further continued, and the burden of ascertaining that it not be continued is assumed by the Newburgh welfare department."

The State department of social welfare views these interpretations as indicating that Newburgh has substantially abandoned its drastic code, but in Newburgh itself there is denial that they signify retreat. To the average observer the validity of the State department's interpretation seems obvious.

ITEMS FOR STUDY AND ACTION

In this time of turmoil for welfare there must be constructive analysis, based on enduring principles of humane and effective practices. The goals would be to aid the needy in a more efficient fashion, to minimize the social burden they represent, to lessen administrative complexity, and to prevent dependency—wherever possible—through contributory social insurance systems and broad-scale planning to avert or mitigate threats to the economic health of communities.

Among the opportunities for constructive study and potential action, as emphasized in a State charities aid association memorandum submitted in connection with last year's legislative investigation of public welfare, are:

1. Realinement of local welfare districts within the State to reflect the realities of population groupings, regardless of arbitrary political boundaries.
2. Accelerated social research, under public and private auspices, to learn more about causes of long-term dependency, and to develop more effective techniques of dealing with it.
3. Strengthening and expansion of social insurance systems, especially in the area of medical care.
4. Elimination of the various categories in Federal reimbursement to States and localities, to be replaced by a single category of general assistance.
5. Demonstration programs in physical, social and vocational rehabilitation—and expanded vocational training for youths.
6. Upgrading of public welfare staffs to foster the competence and efficiency that properly trained and experienced personnel can provide.
7. Appointment of qualified local welfare commissioners, replacing the elective system where it still exists.
8. Encouragement of the creation of local citizens' advisory committees, now legally authorized, as part of an expanded program of interpretation and information to the public.
9. More stringent regulations for the protection of migratory workers.
10. Provision of adequate housing, more rigid enforcement of housing codes, and new statutory controls as appropriate.
11. Expanded recruitment of foster homes, particularly for Negro children.
12. Equality of opportunity for employment, through the State commission against discrimination and other means.
13. Establishment of family courts.
14. Provision of day care services for ADC children.

Miami Stupidity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from the Oregon Labor Press which was published prior to the December convention of the AFL-CIO in Miami. I also include several letters regarding this editorial published subsequently in the "Letters to the Editor" column of that paper:

MIAMI STUPIDITY

The opinions and prejudices to be aired in this editorial had better be labeled clearly as those of the editor—and not necessarily those of the unions and labor councils served by this newspaper. (Although we've heard a lot of amens when we've voiced these sentiments in private conversations.)

The AFL-CIO is about to commit an act of monumental stupidity.

It's going to hold its biennial convention in Miami Beach, Fla., in December.

About 5 weeks from now—when most of the country will be blanketed in snow, when unemployment will be approaching its winter peak, when many families will be suffering real privation—the leaders of the American labor movement will gather under the palm fronds and around the swimming pools of Miami's gaudy beachfront hotels.

And there, in solemn convention assembled, they will talk of militancy, and solidarity, and unemployment, and the plight of the workingman.

Bathed by warm tropical breezes, they will saunter each day to the convention hall from their rooms at the Bal Harbour, the Carillon, the Eden Roc, the Biltmore Terrace, the Singapore, the Shamrock Isle, the Balmoral, and the Florida Shores. And there they will adopt policies to guide American unions during the crucial 2 years that lie ahead.

The convention will, of course, receive thorough coverage from the press. And every news story will appear under a Miami Beach dateline.

We wonder how this will impress the unemployed logger in Oregon, the unemployed steelworker in Gary, the migrant farm laborer in California, the man on the picket line in Pennsylvania?

How stupid and insensitive can union leaders get?

In our opinion, it is immoral to hold union conventions in places like Miami Beach. And it seems a very poor policy for the labor federation to convene in a right-to-work State. But let us set these considerations aside. Let us merely discuss the simple, pigheaded stupidity of it all.

Yes, it is true that the hotels in Miami Beach are unionized. It may also be true that the conventioneers' hotel and food bills will be no higher than they'd be in a northern city. This, in our view, doesn't change the picture one iota.

The labor movement spends millions of dollars a year on public service and public relations. The AFL-CIO sponsors the Edward P. Morgan network news program and other excellent radio and television programs. Union members give thousands of hours of their time to worthwhile community activities. Their motive in doing so is a sense of public responsibility and good citizenship—but they reap an extra reward in good public relations for the labor movement.

Then what happens? The leaders of the AFL-CIO, in their arteriosclerotic blindness, call a midwinter convention in Miami Beach. And labor's "public image"—already badly tarnished by McClellan, Beck, Hoffa, Hutcheson and company—gets another black eye.

Someone once said that the labor movement survives in spite of itself. Let us hope it can survive this next adventure into idiocy.

VIEW FROM PICKET LINE

To the EDITOR:

I am in complete agreement with the sentiments expressed in your "Miami Stupidity" editorial.

With the east wind howling down the Columbia Gorge, the fellows on the picket lines at Portland's antiunion newspapers don't take too kindly to their leaders enjoying the Florida sunshine. In fact, I think that any hard-working breadwinner resents his union dues being spent in a right-to-work State.

Moreover, it seems to me that in the interests of economy, national conventions should be held in a more central location to save on travel funds. These savings could be used for the benefit of members.

WILMA MCGLOTHLIN.

CAMAS, WASH.

JOINS IN PROTEST

To the EDITOR:

I have been receiving copies of your paper for some time from friends in the Portland

area. In my opinion, the Oregon Labor Press is one of the finest labor papers I have had an opportunity to read.

Both news coverage and editorial comment are presented in a manner that should interest a wide variety of readers, union and nonunion.

I was particularly interested in your editorial of November 3 in which you drew attention to the fact that the AFL–CIO Convention is to be held in Miami this winter.

I agree wholeheartedly that this is monumental stupidity from any viewpoint, and can do nothing but harm to the public image of organized labor. I add my protest to yours, for what it is worth.

Keep up the good work.

JACK CHAPMAN,
Typographical Local 201, Victoria, British Columbia.

ANTI-MIAMI

To the EDITOR:

I have the November 3 issue of the Oregon Labor Press, which contains your very excellent editorial, "Miami Stupidity," for which you are entitled to the highest praise.

On four occasions I have refused to attend conventions in Miami for the very reasons which you so ably set forth in your editorial.

In the next issue of our local union newspaper, "Voice of the Cooks," I intend to use your editorial on the front page.

WILLIAM KILPATRICK,
Secretary, Cooks Local 44.

SAN FRANCISCO.

THIRTY-DAY CURE

To the LABOR PRESS:

Your editorial, "Miami Stupidity," was a masterpiece. A copy of it should be sent to every delegate to the AFL–CIO convention in Miami.

It just shows how far our leaders are getting away from the real objectives of the labor movement. Decisions like this make the membership wonder if their leaders are only interested in their monthly checks.

It is true that they repeat the same slogans that they did 15 or 30 years ago. But that isn't getting the job done now. They should be telling the labor movement what can be done—not what the law says can't be done.

Here is my suggestion to cure the situation. We should put the tools of the trade in each leader's hands at least once each 5 years for a 30-day period, to let them find out what the score is.

Let them work for the going wage, without the expense account. In other words, just be one of the Indians, forget the chiefs for 30 days.

If they feel that their salaries must be spent, let them give the money to some members out of work or on the picket line.

I believe this system would give some of our leaders the surprise of their lives. There wouldn't be so many recommendations and resolutions that are forgotten before they leave the convention hall. In plain shoptalk, they would get off the membership's back and do the job they are being paid for.

You may publish this letter if it will help the cause. If not, you can use it to wipe off the eggs when they start flying your way.

WALTER C. HALL,
Auto Mechanics 1005.

PORTLAND.

PLUSH RESORTS

To the LABOR PRESS:

Congratulations on your editorial in the November 3 issue entitled "Miami Stupidity."

It is high time that the entire labor movement took a look at the situation and adopted some badly needed reforms in the choosing of a convention city.

In too many instances, the good intentions of the vast labor movement are tarnished by the silly mistake of holding conventions in the plush southern resorts.

Although I am fully aware that it is the convention delegates in many cases who vote to hold the conventions in the plush resort areas, it is, nevertheless, the responsibility of leadership to consider the public reaction and even more to consider the financial strain on the small local unions when conventions are held in such places as Miami Beach.

I concur in your statements and heartily congratulate you for having the courage to say it in print.

JOE WILLIS.

EUGENE.

HURRICANE NEEDED?

To THE LABOR PRESS:

Your "Miami Stupidity" editorial was great.

This attitude of many of our leaders is one cause of much of the weakness in organized labor today. Perhaps when the AFL–CIO convention meets in Miami, a providential hurricane will strike and blow some fresh ideas into those poor, tired old brains.

GEORGE ROE.

PORTLAND.

Our Commitment to the Values That We Honor—Remarks of Hon. Edward D. Re, Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, on the Occasion of the Annual Luncheon of the St. John's Alumni Association, New York State Bar Association Convention, New York City, January 26, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, on January 26, 1962, the annual luncheon of the St. John's Alumni Association in conjunction with the New York State Bar Association convention was held at the Hotel Commodore in New York City. Although I was unable to attend this gathering, many distinguished guests, public officials, and members of the judiciary were present, including Very Rev. Joseph T. Tinnelly, C.M., former dean of the St. John's Law School; Mr. Justice Cone, of the New York State Supreme Court; Dean Harold F. McNiece, of St. John's Law School; Mr. Joseph P. Hoey, U.S. attorney for the eastern district of New York; Justice Carmine Ventiera, of the New York City court; New York State Senator Frank Composto, and Assemblyman John J. Ryan.

The principal speaker on this occasion was the Honorable Edward D. Re, Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, and I am informed that his remarks, entitled "Our Commitment to the Values That We Honor," were exceptionally well received by this large and distinguished audience.

Dr. Re's speech, although beginning in a humorous vein, contains much that is timely and appropriate. Declaring that it is the duty of every American citizen to participate in Government and to accept the burdens of public service, Dr. Re noted that the responsibility of public officials increases geometrically with the extent of their authority. Quoting the Roman Emperor Claudius, Chairman Re noted that public office is not merely an "honor" but a sacred trust to be honorably and faithfully fulfilled.

Dr. Re eloquently stated that everything we do puts to the test our commitment to truth and honesty. Although he makes use of examples from his own agency, to which he was appointed by President Kennedy last year, his remarks concerning honesty and integrity in public service apply to every organ of our Government. And it is with this realization—the general applicability of Dr. Re's observations to all aspects of our Government—that I wish to insert his remarks in the RECORD:

OUR COMMITMENT TO THE VALUES THAT WE HONOR

(Remarks of Hon. Edward D. Re, Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, on the occasion of the annual luncheon of the St. John's Alumni Association—New York State Bar Association Convention, Hotel Commodore, New York City, Jan. 26, 1962)

INTRODUCTION

Very Rev. Father Tinnelly, Mr. Justice Cone, Dean McNiece, Mr. Hoey, Justice Holtzman, Justice Graci, Justice Ventiera, Senator Composto, Assemblyman Ryan, distinguished members of the judiciary and public officials, my colleagues of the faculty, and my fellow alumni:

One would have to be destitute of feeling not to be moved by the friendship and kindness that have been shown to me here today. It has been a wonderful reunion.

Anyone who is asked to talk about his experiences as I have been today, must be regarded as an expert. This at least serves to affirm the accuracy of the definition of an expert that I have been giving in my administrative law class for a number of years that "an expert is a person who comes from afar." I admit that 250 miles is not very far, but since I have not been invited to speak on prior years, the distance, however short, was sufficient to make the difference.

It seemed clear from the reception that preceded this luncheon that regardless of what was intended by the committee, all of you assumed that I was to say a few words about my experiences, impressions or observations about the New Frontier. Since my discipline is that of a lawyer, the first thing that I did was to engage in painstaking research, that is, ascertain what others have said about the New Frontier. In the process of this research I discovered the remarks of another law professor coming from another law school somewhat north of here—the name escapes me for the moment. This law professor not only spoke about his experiences, but he gave hints on how to get along on the New Frontier in Washington. Here are some of the things he said:

1. Get to the office first, leave last, and when you go to bed at home, leave your lights on.

2. Telephone officials you are anxious to impress before they arrive at their office in the morning, or after they've gone home at night. Be sure to leave word that you called.

3. As your own defense against such tactics as these, train your secretary to tell callers

that you have just been summoned to the White House.

Actually, I read these suggestions with great disappointment, because although they might have been new to law professors from that particular school, these were hints that had long ago been improved upon by members of the St. John's faculty. We had been practicing these techniques with the dean for years. But don't sell the dean short—we learned them from him. He had been practicing them with the president of the university. Having found nothing that was either new or useful, I had to do additional research. I believe, however, that I succeeded in finding something that is helpful.

The remarks that I am about to repeat about Washington bureaucrats reveal not only the importance of technical language, but also pertinent operating procedures that are current in Washington. Of course you must know the right jargon, otherwise it is apparent that you are a mere neophyte. And naturally you must know the procedures, otherwise you must personally do the work that ought to be delegated to others. Since perhaps I may now qualify as a "bureaucrat"; let me tell you what bureaucrats do in Washington.

"What do bureaucrats do in their working hours? They implement. Implement is whatever anyone on the Federal payroll is doing when he is handling paper, which is most of the time.

"When two or more Federal employees stop implementing and start talking, they are coordinating. Coordinating requires a big part of the workday. Its purpose is to find out who is implementing what.

"A third consuming duty of the Government worker is formulating. Formulating is producing ideas to be implemented. Usually formulating is a committee operation.

"A fourth important duty of the bureaucrat is to circulate. Circulating is the passing from one office to another of the millions of pieces of paper that hold the Government together.

"A final activity of the Government worker is referring. Referring is usually done on the telephone. When someone telephones the Government worker for information or help, the person receiving the call refers him to another Government office, preferably in another agency. At any moment during the Washington workday, the telephone wires are laden with desperate men being referred from bureaucrat to bureaucrat—because of the bureaucrat's congenital uncertainty about the extent of his own authority. Their business is not deciding, but implementing, coordinating, formulating, and circulating.

"They solve problems by referring, or passing the crisis to someone else." [1]

I do hope that by this time I have shown both the dean and the committee that I have attempted to comply with their exhortations and admonitions. But in all seriousness, would I not be derelict in my duty to you and to St. John's if I were not to leave with you one serious thought concerning the opportunity that has been mine since my appointment as Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States.

THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF PUBLIC SERVICE

Since the political order in a democratic society depends upon the responsible participation of all citizens, no one can shirk the duty of public service. Within this framework, when we speak of public service we are speaking of an important obligation of citizenship. Too often one thinks of the authority and prestige that may be attached to the office rather than its inherent burdens and responsibilities. The responsibility aspects of public office will remind the student of history of the remarks of Claudius, a great Roman emperor who, in appointing public officials, would say: "Do not thank me, for I do you no favor, but call upon you to share with me the burdens of government, and it is I who thank you if you fulfill your duty well." Claudius thereby gave clear expression to the thought, and indeed the ideal, that public office was not merely an honor but a trust to be faithfully discharged.

No one can doubt that as authority increases so does the corresponding responsibility. Experience tends to demonstrate that responsibility increases in geometric progression to the authority.

THE VALUES THAT WE HONOR

Assuming, as we must in our society, that there is a duty to accept public office, the opportunity that it offers is the privilege of emphasizing and putting into effect the values to which one is committed. History has shown that a nation will preserve those virtues and values that it honors. The individual likewise preserves and honors the values to which he is committed. Hence, as one earns the privilege of helping to shape and mold the policy and destiny of the nation to the extent of the authority of his office, he is thereby afforded the privilege of putting into effect his sense of values.

Emerson has said that what we are speaks louder than what we say. This thought has special meaning in public office, for it is true that we leave the imprint of what we are upon everything we do. Although countless examples may be given by those who have had a wide and varied experience in public service, permit me to give only one that pertains specifically to the work of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

The congressional enactments that set forth the jurisdiction of the Commission provide that "the action of the Commission in allowing or denying any claim * * * shall be final and conclusive on all questions of law and fact and not subject to review." The courts have upheld this provision as meaning precisely what it says, that no review can be had of any decision of the Commission.[3] Not being subject to judicial review, the decision is therefore truly "final".

Yet in the administration of this particular statute one's commitment to the standard of due process and fair play, as understood by lawyers trained in the American tradition, would make it absolutely essential for the Commission, prior to the denial of a claim or prior to its final disposition, to afford the claimant every opportunity to submit evidence upon which an award could be made. If the evidence that has been submitted is inadequate, specific findings of fact ought to be made indicating the reasons for its insufficiency. Hence, findings of fact or conclusions of law must illumine the path that the claimant is to follow to qualify for an award.

A commitment to truth and honesty requires that the findings be fair and that the claimant be offered an opportunity to rebut and to introduce new favorable evidence upon which new findings may be made. Honesty also requires that none of this be done in a routine or perfunctory way, simply because thousands of claims are to be processed and decided. Honesty demands that all of the evidence submitted by a claimant be thoroughly examined to ascertain whether it contains the basis for an award or warrants a suggestion for the introduction of additional evidence to justify an award.

How tragic it would be, and indeed dishonest, if the attitude were taken that since the decisions of the Commission are final and no court may review them, therefore it does not matter if the work has been done diligently and thoroughly. Even if this attitude were at first to be assumed with misgivings, in time it would become daily practice. From this would stem the callous disregard of the rights of citizens and the warping of one's sense of justice—all leading to a disrespect for law and the administration of justice.

This, of course, is only one example. Yet it is worthy of mention, for it demonstrates well that "what we are" manifests itself in everything we do.

HONESTY AND INTEGRITY IN PUBLIC SERVICE

Surely this is not the easy path, but for those who truly appreciate how these rights were gained and who respect the real foundations of our Government, no other road is possible. And for this training and awareness we owe a debt of gratitude to our law school. Admittedly it is in the law school that the lawyer, who tomorrow may become a "Government attorney," is imbued with not only a knowledge of due process, but with a love of justice and a sense of fairness which is the lawyer's opportunity to apply the golden rule.

The Government attorney who is unwilling to examine a complicated file because it is burdensome and vexing may be tempted to make the finding "since the claimant has not borne his burden of proof, the claim is hereby denied." However, before succumbing to that temptation he ought to ask himself: "What would I think of a lawyer who would make such a finding if I were the claimant?"

Our law school studies have given us a sense of values that require us to respect the rights of others and to accord to others those rights that we take for granted for ourselves. And we thank our teachers not only for what they taught us, but for their example as well.

These virtues of honesty and integrity have countless ramifications, both in and out of Government service. Government, like all branches of society, will only reflect the society about us. It, too, can only preserve the values and virtues that we honor. Just as the honest businessman can no more justify cheating by saying "but this is business," the honest Government employee, regardless of the scope of his responsibility, cannot deprive the Government of the work for which he receives compensation simply by saying "but this is working for the Government."

Even my limited experience urges me to emphasize that the responsibility of accepting public office is a tremendously important obligation on the part of all Americans. It is a special obligation on the part of lawyers like yourselves who have received an education that highlights personal responsibility, adherence to the strictest standards of truth and honesty, and a code of conduct that does not compromise with integrity.

We, as Americans, have always boasted that ours is a Government of laws and not of men. It is clear, however, that our laws will be no better than the men who will enact and administer them.

---

[1] No speech by a law professor would be complete without at least one footnote. The quote is from Baker, An American in Washington (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961).

The innate humor of Washington correspondence was not, however, new to me. See re, Brief Writing and Oral Argument 21 (2d rev. ed. 1957).

[3] See *Wiener* v. *U.S.*, 357 U.S. 349, 354–55 (1958); *de Vegvar* v. *Gilliland*, 228 F. 2d 640 (D.C. Cir. 1955), cert. denied, 350 U.S. 994 (1956). The Supreme Court has consistently denied certiorari in similar cases concerning the Commission. See also *American and European Agencies, Inc.* v. *Gilliland*, 355 U.S. 884 (1957); *Haas* v. *Humphrey*, 355 U.S. 854 (1957); *Dayton* v. *Gilliland*, 355 U.S. 813 (1957).

Address by Hon. James S. Bush, Director of Export-Import Bank, Before the Minnesota World Trade Association, September 21, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most astute and competent members of the banking community is James S. Bush. I commend to the interest of our colleagues an address delivered by Mr. Bush before the Minnesota World Trade Association on September 21, 1961, entitled "Export-Import Bank of Washington: Its Role in Financing Foreign Trade":

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON: ITS ROLE IN FINANCING FOREIGN TRADE

(Address delivered September 21, 1961, by the Honorable James Smith Bush, Director of Export-Import Bank, before the Minnesota World Trade Association)

It is a great pleasure to return to the Twin Cities, after an absence of 37 years, to have the opportunity to discuss foreign trade with your exporters and bankers.

My brief residence here in 1922 and 1923 was rudely interrupted when my boss advised me that selling flour was not my cup of tea. Following his sage advice, I went into the investment, and later the commercial banking, business where I have been ever since. However, I shall never forget the many happy days that I spent with the Crosby's, the Pillsbury's, the Heffelfinger's, and many other wonderful families, both in Minneapolis and St. Paul.

I would like to tell you something about the Export-Import Bank of Washington, which was created on February 12, 1934, to facilitate trade between the United States and Russia. An immediate and substantial increase in trade between the two nations was expected to follow the U.S. recognition of the Soviet Union in late 1933. Soon after the creation of the Bank, difficulties arose in the discussion of the settlement of debts owing by Russia to the U.S. Government and U.S. citizens. Consideration of the settlement of such debts was one of the subjects of agreement involved in the recognition. In March 1934, the Board of Directors of Eximbank adopted a resolution stating that the Bank would not enter into any transactions with respect to trade between the United States and the Soviet Union prior to the submission by the Russians of an acceptable debt settlement. As evidence of good faith, all of the resources of the Bank were reserved for over a year for the anticipated trade with Russia.

At the same time or shortly thereafter, the U.S. Government was seeking a solution to a request by the Government of Cuba for a loan to finance the purchase of silver and the minting thereof into Cuban pesos. The proposed transaction was considered by the Cuban Government as the only practical means of meeting a serious budgetary deficit that had resulted in the nonpayment of Cuban civil servants, and also as a means of instituting a program of useful public works. Accordingly, on March 12, 1934, the Second Export-Import Bank of Washington, D.C., was organized. The statement of its legal purposes and powers was identical to that of the already existing Export-Import Bank of Washington, but it was announced that the Second Bank would use its facilities to finance trade between the United States and Cuba.

The first business transacted by either Bank was a loan by the Second Bank in favor of the Republic of Cuba in the amount of $4 million to finance the purchase of silver bullion and its coinage at the U.S. Mint in Philadelphia into 10 million pesos. Four more such credits were extended to Cuba between 1934 and 1938.

The Russian debt negotiations failed, and consequently, the original Bank had no business. Finally, in 1935, the two Banks were merged and the original Bank, the Export-Import Bank of Washington, was authorized to extend its activities to finance trade with all countries except Russia. All of the original loans to Cuba to purchase silver bullion and to coin it were rapaid promptly.

It is ironic today to realize that the sole original purposes of Eximbank were to finance foreign trade with Russia and with Cuba.

Since those early days, Eximbank has come a long way. It has authorized over $12 billion in loans, of which some $6 billion are outstanding or committed today. In the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961, Eximbank's business took the following form:

Exporter credits (usually 1–5 years) (439), $143 million.

Project and emergency trade loans (6–20 years) (75), $1.1 billion.

Total loans (514), $1.243 billion.

In addition, we issued 273 guarantee contracts covering U.S. exports of some $170 million.

You might wonder where all of this money went or will go and what purposes it will serve. A brief rundown is as follows:

Brazil: $193 million, of which $25 million was to help finance the purchase of U.S. jet aircraft. The balance will be used to pay U.S. exporters for a multitude of goods and equipment.

Japan: $110 million, of which $60 million will be used to purchase U.S. cotton, and the balance for a wide assortment of U.S. machine tools, machinery, and equipment.

Chile: $120 million to purchase U.S. equipment, machinery, and realted services for iron ore mines, thermal power units, and railways.

Venezuela: $100 million to pay U.S. exporters for a wide assortment of U.S. commodities and machinery and to purchase more U.S. equipment for small- and medium-sized industrial concerns and businesses throughout Venezuela.

India: $81 million to buy papermill machinery and hundreds of other pieces of equipment, including jet aircraft, from U.S. manufacturers.

Philippines: $77 million for steel mill and airport equipment and a host of other U.S. products.

Argentina: $66 million to import highway equipment, steel-mill machinery, machine tools, and other capital goods from the United States to stimulate the Argentine economy, and, incidentally, to stimulate our own economy.

Colombia: $63 million to purchase U.S. aircraft, hospital equipment, agricultural and highway equipment, and many other items of U.S. origin.

Spain: $58 million to help finance the importation of steel-mill, tinning-mill and thermal-power equipment from the United States.

Yugoslavia: $50 million to purchase from U.S. exporters a wide assortment of U.S. goods and machinery.

The foregoing credits, totaling $918 million, represent the major portion of Eximbank's authorizations in the 12 months ended this past June 30.

Please note carefully that these are authorizations, and not actual disbursements. Sometimes it will be 2, 3, or even 5 years from date of authorization before a large loan is finally completely disbursed. This is because it takes a long time to build a new steel mill, dam, iron-ore mine, and the like.

Actually, in fiscal 1961, Eximbank disbursed $526 million on loans and collected $528 million in principal and interest. Thus, we collected $2 million more from foreign borrowers than we disbursed. This is interesting from the standpoint of the U.S. international balance of payments. Our collections of $528 million helped the U.S. balance of payments to this extent. Our disbursements of $526 million were mainly placed to the credit of foreign buyers in the U.S. commercial banks, which, in turn, paid U.S. manufacturers and exporters for the goods and services. Thus, the dollars themselves never left the United States, only the goods and services that were financed. Obviously, our balance of payments is not hurt when the dollars remain in the United States.

I have referred frequently to assistance granted foreign buyers to purchase U.S. aircraft. By far the largest dollar amount was for jets, such as Boeing 707's and 720's, Douglas DC-8's and Convair 860's. However, several smaller airplane manufacturers were also assisted by Eximbank. Small aircraft are purchased for crop dusting, flying clubs which young people join to learn how to fly, and for executive purposes, such as in Argentina, where ranchers have to cover thousands of acres to supervise their agricultural operations.

Some of the least publicized and most important of Eximbank's activities are the lines of credit that are extended to industrial banks in foreign countries or to foreign governments and their agencies, which utilize these funds for the purchase of U.S. equipment for resale to small- and medium-sized industrial and business concerns throughout their economies. Three years ago Eximbank authorized a line to the Government of India of $150 million, and another $50 million a few months ago. To date, some $84 million has been disbursed against the first line and has already resulted in orders being placed with over 500 separate U.S. suppliers. It is important to note that U.S. exporters are paid cash on delivery when they make sales under these lines.

Early in 1961, a line of $25 million was granted to the Industrial Bank of Japan, in consortium with 12 Japanese banks. This credit was used to purchase a wide variety of U.S. equipment, although the largest percentage was for machine tools. Some 60 U.S. suppliers have already received orders under this line.

Similar credits have been made in Spain, Argentina, and Chile. The borrower, such as the Industrial Bank of Japan, or Argentina, is permitted to use his discretion in making small- and medium-sized loans throughout his country to help finance the importation of U.S. goods. However, when the borrower makes a loan of $100,000 or more to a single buyer, the transaction must receive the prior approval of Eximbank. I would say that it is a fair statement that well over 1,000 U.S. concerns have benefited directly from these lines of credit referred to above. These figures do not include subcontractors, who, of course, also benefit. Eximbank has documentation of the fact that over 3,000 U.S. suppliers, including subcontractors, received orders as a result of two loans that it made, one for a copper mine in Peru, and one for an aircraft credit to Brazil. I tell you all of this because few Americans, including the U.S. beneficiaries of these credits, realize to what extent Eximbank has helped the exporters of this country by the extension of these lines of credit.

Eximbank will shortly announce new plans under which American exporters will be afforded insurance and financing facilities at least equal to those offered by any

other free nation in the world. A large group of private casualty insurance companies is proposing to form an association which will issue a single comprehensive insurance policy to cover American exporters on their shipments to all parts of the world. This insurance would cover transactions that are sold on terms from 30 days up to 5 years. Eximbank proposes to join with this association by assuming a portion of the credit or commercial risks involved and assuming practically all of the political risks covered by the policy. The latter risks include inconvertibility, export-import restrictions, war, hostilities, civil war, expropriation, and other causes beyond the control of the exporter or the buyer arising from events occurring outside of the United States. However, it does not, as an ordinary rule, cover devaluation.

These policies will be issued to the exporter near his place of business by his insurance agent or broker, thus making it unnecessary for him to negotiate directly with Eximbank in Washington. I cannot tell you tonight what the premiums will be on these insurance policies. However, it should not be long before the private companies complete a rate schedule and announce it publicly. It is my understanding that rates will vary from one foreign area to another and will be based on figures compiled from studies of credit losses suffered by exporters over recent years.

In addition to these insurance policies to be issued by this association of casualty companies, there will be a new plan under which an exporter can handle many of his transactions through his commercial bank. Under this plan the exporter, the commercial bank, and Eximbank would each carry a portion of the risks involved.

Although Eximbank's expanded facilities to exporters through their commercial banks will not be publicly announced or become official for a week or 10 days, it is hoped that the guarantees under this proposed program will be most attractive to both the exporters and the commercial banks. In a general way, I will say that this plan, when adopted officially, will reach out into the grassroots of the United States and make facilities available to moderate-sized exporters and banks which heretofore have not found it attractive to engage in foreign trade or the financing thereof. It is our hope to make it so attractive to commercial banks that they will not be able to withstand the temptation.

By now, it must be obvious to you that Eximbank's objective is to repose the responsibility of financing foreign trade in private hands to the greatest possible extent, only helping out where the private bankers and insurance people can't do the business. Actually, Eximbank will become more of a guarantor and a reinsurer, with the money coming from private sources. This, of course, will assist the Federal budget and give private capital the opportunity to finance exports of this country, just as private capital does in all other major exporter nations of the free world.

The Board of Directors of Eximbank, I am very glad to say, believes that private businessmen and bankers are fully capable of handling our foreign commerce and we are looking forward to the day when all of the financing and insuring of U.S. exports will be done by private institutions, with the Export-Import Bank acting as a backstop only when necessary.

The backbone of any organization like ours is, of course, the staff, which is divided into four principal divisions; namely, economics, loans, engineering, and legal. Somewhere between 50 and 100 loan or guarantee applications are passed upon by the Board each week. This necessitates considerable study in view of the fact that Eximbank has extended credits in some 69 countries around the world.

Eximbank's lending authority has gradually been increased by Congress over the years and today is $7 billion. This is represented by $1 billion of capital stock held by the U.S. Treasury, and a borrowing authority of $6 billion. At the present time, Eximbank has approximately $1 billion uncommitted lending authority, and it looks as though this figure will diminish rapidly between now and the end of the current fiscal year. This is because exports are increasing, and especially because U.S. exporters are being called upon to extend terms to their foreign customers. The competition from manufacturers and exporters in Western Europe and Japan is increasing rapidly, and these countries have begun to offer attractive terms to their foreign customers. It behooves all of us to watch this trend closely so that we will not let the United States become outmatched by its foreign competition, but, at the same time, keep its terms on a basis that is consistent with sound business principles.

Eximbank is required by statute to have reasonable assurance of repayment before extending a credit or loan, and is also required not to compete with private capital, rather, to assist it. Thus, Eximbank does not want to extend a 3- or 5-year credit on a transaction when the pattern in the private international market has been for 1 year or 2 years. Exporters in Minnesota can be of great assistance to Eximbank in keeping us informed as to financing terms and patterns that may develop in their dealings in various parts of the world.

The United States should be exporting many billion dollars more in goods and services against dollar repayment in order to maintain a healthy balance of international payments. The drain on our gold and dollar reserves of over $10 billion in the past 3 years cannot continue without serious injury to this country's economy. The sound way to correct this imbalance is to sell more goods abroad against dollar payment in cash or in notes repayable quarterly or semiannually in good, sound dollars. The U.S. Department of Commerce has developed a splendid program for export expansion, particularly with respect to opportunities that will exist for sales to foreign markets. The Department has an active field office here in Minneapolis, which can be of great assistance to you. There are field offices in 32 other cities to assist U.S. exporters.

Exporters should bear in mind the increasing activities of the World Bank, the new Inter-American Development Bank, and the new AID agency which will combine the lending functions of the Development Loan Fund, the International Cooperation Administration, and the State Department. The World Bank's and the Inter-American Bank's projects will, of course, be subject to international bidding for the equipment and supplies. However, some portion of the new AID agency's loans will undoubtedly be tied to U.S. purchases and should offer U.S. exporters good opportunities for sales.

The day has long passed when American businessmen and bankers can say, "I'm not interested in foreign trade and want no part of it." The hard facts of life are that you are in it, whether you like it or not, and you may as well take the plunge, if you have not already done so.

Over one-half of the world's population is striving to find the means to become effective customers of the United States. What greater incentive could we have than to develop these markets for the benefit of U.S. business concerns? To put it another way, U.S. businessmen and labor leaders might well contemplate what would happen to the gross national product and employment in this country if Western Europe, Japan, Russia, and Red China captured all or most of our foreign markets. A $550 billion GNP would be a thing of the past and unemployment could become more of a problem than it was in the early 1930's. Thus, it behooves you and all of us to think right now about world problems and world markets in order to save your own skins and those of the hundreds of thousands of American families who are completely dependent upon the decisions you make.

Eximbank will continue to increase its loans and guarantees in support of American exporters, and close contact should be kept with us so that you will know just where we are extending lines of credit or making development loans. After all, each of you, as a taxpayer, is a stockholder in Eximbank and, as such, you have the right to know what we are doing and to benefit from our operations.

In closing, I will report to you, our stockholders, that in fiscal year 1961, Eximbank had a gross income of over $138 million. Our operating expenses were $2.5 million, and our interest paid to the U.S. Treasury on borrowings was roughly $43 million. We charged off one loan of $700,000. This left $92.5 million, from which we paid $30 million in dividends to the U.S. Treasury. The remaining $62.5 million was added to reserves which, as of July 31, 1961, stood at roughly $685 million.

It is our intention to continue to operate on a sound and conservative basis. It is also our intention to leave no stone unturned to carry out President Kennedy's directive that U.S. exporters receive from Eximbank financing and guarantee facilities that will be at least equal to those offered to exporters by any other free nation of the world. My fellow Directors join me in making this solemn pledge to you.

The Boy Scouts' Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, 52 years ago today, one of the great organizations of our time was born. For on February 8, 1910, under the original leadership of a dedicated Chicago publisher, Mr. William D. Boyce, the Boy Scouts of America came into being. Like our very Nation, the Boy Scouts had their roots in English soil, and it was there that Mr. Boyce met and was inspired by Sir Robert Baden Powell, founder of the Scouting movement.

On this occasion of joy and satisfaction to Scouts everywhere, I am delighted to join in the salute to this truly magnificent organization. I know that each of you share my pride in the outstanding work that Scouting does for the youth of America. More than 30 million boys have received the great and lasting benefits that come from belonging to the Scouts since it was founded here in our Nation's Capital this half century ago.

I am sure that none of us is unaware of the great service this organization continues to perform every day. More than 5 million Scouts and leaders are actively building the character and physical fitness of our leaders of tomorrow.

And, as with many other fine organizations who perform dedicated work, they accomplish this without asking or receiving any money from our Federal Treasury.

The Forgotten People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, this is the last of 10 articles, part of a series which appeared in the New York World-Telegram and Sun in October 1961, on the subject of the migrant worker in the United States. These articles were written by Dale Wright, World-Telegram and Sun staff writer, who, for 6 months, lived and worked as a migrant worker along the Atlantic seaboard from Florida to New York. The article follows:

THE FORGOTTEN PEOPLE—STATE COULD REMEDY CONDITIONS FOR MIGRANT LABOR

(By Dale Wright)

I saw it all—the misery and ugliness of the migrant's labor camp and the fields where he worked from Florida to Long Island.

I labored in the same bean and tomato patches with these itinerant crop harvesters. I grubbed in the rich earth with them for potatoes and I chopped cabbage in the same fields.

I shared wretched food with the "stoop" laborer and along with him I was cheated out of my meager wages for work honestly done.

I found that despite legislative efforts and the work of social and religious agencies to improve the lot of the nomadic farmhand and his family, little has been done to better their way of life.

I found that he is forced to exist in degradation without human dignity. I was touched by the hopelessness I saw in a little child's eyes.

I came away angry and sick from the tomato fields just 30 miles south of the glitter and wealth of Miami Beach. I found the same crude exploitation, the same dreadful living conditions, just 30 miles south of New York City.

The question is, What can be done to remedy the plight of the migrant farmworker, whose sweat and toil—yes, and sometimes blood—go into the harvest of this Nation's food crops?

These are the things that must be done:

Guarantee the migrant farmworker a fair wage for his labor, if necessary through Federal minimum wage laws.

Protect the migrant, the man least able to defend himself, from exploitation by his crew leader, the grower, the shipper, the packer or the processor.

Provide him and his children with an education, so they can better themselves and compete for jobs with others who have that advantage.

Treat and cure his many ailments so that he can do an honest day's work.

Give him a decent place to live where he can care for his family in peace and dignity.

There are before Congress today forward steps in this direction. Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, has proposed an 11-point package of legislation designed to bring the migrant out of that clump of trees where he lives and out into the mainstream of American life where he can enjoy his rights and privileges as a citizen.

The migration division of the Puerto Rican Labor Department has set up contractual arrangements under which offshore workers are guaranteed minimum wages and a fixed number of work hours during harvest seasons.

None of these guarantees are available to the vast majority of migrant farm hands—Negroes, West Indians, Mexicans, Cubans, Bermudians and a sprinkling of whites—who come out of the South or from their respective islands to labor their way North. They hope to end the summer with enough money to pay their way home. Instead many remain here as relief burdens.

Enlightened New York State should show the way in improving working and living conditions for migrants. Although seven separate agencies are at work on the job, they have only scratched the surface.

The work of these agencies should be consolidated into one all-encompassing unit with adequate powers to enforce all existing laws and press for new remedial legislation.

New Jersey often points to its pioneer role in handling the itinerant crop picker. It is true, there are some laws. But they are not being adequately enforced. I found many examples of laxity in south and central New Jersey.

The migrant farmworker has been tucked away with his family in that inevitable clump of trees and forgotten for so many years that he is unaware that he has rights and privileges as a citizen.

Can anyone expect the sweating, hard-working, underpaid tomato picker who is cheated at every hand to ask for his rights as an American when he does not know they exist?

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Controversial Department of Urban Affairs and Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy's reorganization plan creating a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing over the bipartisan disapproval of the House Rules Committee seems to have struck an off-key note in many areas.

Because of the necessity for careful study of all proposed programs, especially the creation of an agency of this magnitude, perhaps the motives behind the plan should be examined even more thoroughly than if the legislation which originated in Congress was in question.

Because of widespread public opinion against this Department, which would be the first Cabinet level agency not created by an act of Congress, I would like to make my colleagues aware of thought-provoking editorials from the February 4, 1962, issues of the Lansing (Mich.) State Journal and the Flint (Mich.) Journal which mirror some of the feeling in the Sixth District of Michigan.

The editorials follow:

[From the Lansing (Mich.) State Journal, Feb. 4, 1962]

POOR CHOICE FOR A SHOWDOWN

There have been some admirable proposals among the early recommendations of the Kennedy administration. The proposal for a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing is not one of them.

To begin with, it's unnecessary and unsound. Beyond that, it's purely political.

Expanding on these observations in the order mentioned, this, first off, is a proposal to create a new agency to fill a need which doesn't really exist. The presently constituted Departments of Labor, Commerce, Interior, and Health, Education, and Welfare already are handling, or are adequate to handle, all matters which have been proposed for special attention of this new Federal department.

It is argued that there is a Department of Agriculture to handle rural affairs and that, since the United States has become primarily an urban nation, there is even greater need for a separate department to help the cities and suburban areas.

Agriculture is a single industry, and as such not nearly so diverse as that represented in urban areas. Rural government is less able, both economically and structurally, to take care of the problems which arise.

Even more to the point, an annual expenditure in excess of $6 billion has failed to solve agriculture's problems, and the biggest problem areas involve only those relatively few commodities over which the Federal Government is presently exercising control. This, it would seem, is poor recommendation for creating a new department which would involve infinitely more complex urban areas in a similar web of confusion and red tape.

The Department of Agriculture, despite what presumably have been honest efforts, has fallen far short of ushering in a Utopia for the farmer. There is no more reason to expect that a companion bureaucracy could provide any panacea for urban problems.

Supporters of the proposal contend it merely gives Cabinet status to the Housing and Home Finance Agency and combines with it the Federal Housing Authority. Accepting this statement as fact (and we don't), is there any reason to suspect that this Department, once it had shed fledgling status, would not accumulate personnel, appropriations, and power just as have all other new Federal departments in the past?

Looking at the proposal's political aspects, it becomes apparent that here is a measure aimed at sewing up the big-city vote for Kennedy's next go-around with the voters in 1964. It was this vote that put him in office in 1960, and only by the slimmest of margins.

By submitting this proposal, the Kennedy camp feels it is riding a horse that can't help but win. If the proposal fails, as it should, Kennedy backers can say they tried. If it should pass, so much the better, they feel.

The real giveaway as to the proposal's true purpose came when President Kennedy let it be known that he would appoint a Negro to head this new department if it came into being. Really, now, how transparent can you get? It's all right to play the game of politics, but let's have at least a rudimentary showing of sportsmanship, too. By adding the element of race, the Kennedy administration obviously put the Republicans, who protest the proposal on the grounds of governmental philosophy, in the position of being anti-Negro when they voice their opposition.

Actually, with all of the self-imposed roadblocks set up for this bill, one is almost led to wonder if the administration really wants it for anything except the most demagogic of campaign issues.

This is really the first time since his election that President Kennedy has girded for a head-on fight with Congress. That such a battle would come was inevitable, but it is certainly questionable that this was a respectable issue upon which to base a showdown.

[From the Flint (Mich.) Journal, Feb. 4, 1962]

PRESIDENT SETS GOP TRAP BY TYING WEAVER INTO PLAN

President Kennedy has set what he hopes will prove to be a giant elephant trap. He'd like to ensnare the Republican Members of Congress.

He has baited the trap by tying a civil rights issue onto a controversy on another subject.

The main issue is his proposal to set up a new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing in his Cabinet. But by announcing publicly that he intends to appoint Dr. Robert C. Weaver, Federal Housing Administrator, to the yet-to-be-created Cabinet post, he has thrust a civil rights question into the controversy.

Dr. Weaver, who evidently is doing a highly competent job, would be the first Negro ever to hold a Cabinet rank. Many Republicans and conservative Democrats, who have no bias against Dr. Weaver or the idea of a Negro in the Cabinet, object to the proposed new Cabinet-level operation on the grounds of economy and ever-swelling Federal bureaucracy.

The effect of the President's bringing up Dr. Weaver's name is to put opponents to his plan on the spot. If they stand against creation of the new post Mr. Kennedy will be able to accuse the GOP of being opposed to his appointing a Negro to his Cabinet. Of course, he wouldn't find it necessary to put any blame on the gentlemen from Dixie who travel under the colors of his own party.

Announcing in advance the name of the man he intends to appoint to such a high post even before it exists was highly unusual, to say the least. But its purpose is clear. Mr. Kennedy has dared the Republicans to vote against his plan and risk the loss of the Negro vote.

The feeling is in Washington that while the maneuver will add fuel to the debate, it won't succeed in dispersing the strong opposition to the President's proposal. The issue will be decided, as it should be, on the advisability of creating the new post and not on the capabilities or race of the man who would hold the position if it were created.

Newsprint, Newspapers, and Our National Purpose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, last October Mr. Marvin J. Winship, of Cedar Grove, N.J., delivered an address entitled "Newsprint, Newspapers, and Our National Purpose: A Vital Partnership in the Preservation of Our Way of Life." His remarks were made during National Newspaper Week, and the observations made on the role of newspapers in our society are worthy of notice. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Winship's remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED DURING NATIONAL NEWSPAPER WEEK, OCTOBER 15–21, BEFORE THE KIWANIS CLUB OF WOONSOCKET, R.I., ON OCTOBER 17, 1961: NEWSPRINT, NEWSPAPERS, AND OUR NATIONAL PURPOSE—A PARTNERSHIP IN THE PRESERVATION OF OUR NATIONAL PURPOSE

(By Marvin Jay Winship, president, Kiwanis Club of New York City)

I am delighted to speak to you during National Newspaper Week. I have chosen the subject of newsprint, newspapers, and our national purpose. In these days of grave international crisis, it is well to observe that

"freedom goes where the newspaper goes." No other country in the world has the constitutional guarantee of free speech, free press, and freedom of enterprise. We in the newsprint business feel we have a partnership with the press. Freedom, the newspaper industry, and the newsprint industry literally grew together in this great Nation.

The close connection between the growth of the newspaper and the paper industry is truly remarkable. Let us quickly review the high spots. The first newspaper published in the American Colonies was issued on September 25, 1690, in Boston. The first paper mill in the Colonies was a little handmade one established by William Rittenhouse on the outskirts of Philadelphia in 1690. Both the newspaper industry and the newsprint industry grew rapidly in number during the next 50 years.

In 1861 the curved stereotype plate, essential to high-speed printing, appeared on presses. At about the same time, the first woodpulp paper was produced on a fourdrinier paper machine making high-speed newsprint manufacture possible. From this point on, newspapers grew rapidly with the first successful Linotype machine in use in 1874. A Wisconsin mill got newspaper headlines by making and shipping 10 tons of newsprint in 24 hours. Today there are nearly 1,800 daily newspapers consuming more than 7 million tons of newsprint per year. Presses can turn out 60,000 newspapers per hour. Newsprint machines now can turn out a continuous sheet of paper over 20 feet wide at 2,500 feet per minute—1 mile every 2 minutes.

THE NEWSPAPER'S PLACE AS THE DEFENDER AND GUARANTOR OF OUR FREEDOM

The people of the United States can well be proud of the fact that the United States is one country in the world today which remains completely free of any form of censorship of the news. This freedom of the press has been defended by a long line of conscientious publishers and editors who have been willing to suffer fines, destruction of their printing presses, and even imprisonment in order to defend their right to keep the people fully informed.

One of the earliest defenders was John Peter Zenger, publisher of the New York Weekly Journal, who was arrested and imprisoned in 1734 on charges of having libeled the colonial Governor. With the help of his wife he continued to issue his newspaper from jail. Represented at his trial by Andrew Hamilton, a great Philadelphia lawyer, Zenger was acquitted. His acquittal was acclaimed as the "dawn of liberty," and the people of America thus secured their priceless possession—the right to a free press.

The first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, adopted December 15, 1791, guarantees a free press to the people. "Congress shall make no law * * * abridging the freedom of speech or of the press." The constitutions of each of the 50 States likewise contain provisions for keeping the press free.

Eternal vigilance is the price of freedom. The cyclic rise and fall of the world's great civilizations can be traced in eight distinct stages:

1. Bondage to spiritual faith.
2. Spiritual faith to courage.
3. Courage to liberty.
4. Liberty to abundance.
5. Abundance to selfishness.
6. Selfishness to apathy and complacency.
7. Apathy and complacency to dependency.
8. Dependency to bondage.

What stage are we at?

The common feeling of our first two centuries has been most concisely expressed as "community of will, instead of a community of obedience."

Thomas Jefferson's Declaration of Independence is still the single proclamation of American national purpose which commands the most general understanding in the world. Here is the flat assertion: "All men are created equal * * * endowed with certain inalienable rights * * * among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

These celebrated phrases represent more than a rejection of tyranny and a declaration that mankind has divine rights. The inclusion of a claim to happiness was something different and new. This was the vision that made America. This is what set us apart. For the first time a government was established that was not only subservient to the peoples' will but was also responsible for the peoples' happiness.

The national purpose was then precisely defined in the preamble to our Constitution. Thus the purpose is "to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility (here's happiness again), provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity * * *."

The word "citizen" has a venerable history. It meant, in ancient times, the freemen of a city who share its civic life. I like the definition "share," which, of course, means that citizens share the responsibilities as well as the rights and privileges. Rights and privileges are protected by our Constitution and law-enforcement bodies. There is no law that I know of that forces a citizen to share and discharge civic responsibility. Too many of our citizens leave the discharge of civic responsibility and the control of our Government to political machines made up of men and women whom we would not employ in our business, whom we would not retain as lawyers, for whose knowledge, ability, and experience we have no respect, and in whose character we have no confidence. Too many of our citizens shrug their shoulders and say, "Politics are dirty. I want nothing to do with politics."

Politics are the science of government and will be as efficient, as clean, or dirty as our citizens permit.

We were fortunate in 1787 in having as leaders in our several Colonies a small group of men whose like had not been seen before or since. It was either extraordinary luck or it was providential intervention. Those men fashioned and handed to us a Constitution which Gladstone termed "the greatest document ever stricken off in a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

Following the signing of that Constitution, an elderly lady asked the venerable Benjamin Franklin, "Mr. Franklin, what have you given us?" The wise old man responded with conviction in his voice and doubtless a twinkle in his bright, blue eyes ,"We have given you a Constitution." Then he hesitated and made this pertinent remark, "If you can keep it."

There was doubt in Franklin's mind whether or not our citizens would discharge their civic responsibility and thus preserve their liberty provided by the Constitution.

When the 100th anniversary of the signing of the Constitution of the United States was observed, James Russell Lowell, poet and statesman, was asked, "Mr. Lowell, how long will the American form of government last"? The wise man responded: "Only so long as the spirit and the philosophy of those who made it remains dominant in each succeeding generation."

The practice of good citizenship by each succeeding generation will obviously keep that spirit and that philosophy alive to the end of time.

The men who gave us our way of life provided us with an opportunity to make the most of what we have. Our Founding Fathers worked like Trojans to build America and they roared like lions to preserve liberty, and so must we. They were endowed with strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and willing hands. If we are worthy of our heritage, we will emulate them and thus keep the lamp of liberty casting its ray of hope over the entire universe.

The national purpose objectives are to support the basic principles of our way of life. It is to:

1. Create an understanding of the spirit and philosophy of our Constitution and Bill of Rights.
2. Inspire love of country and respect for freedom.
3. Support the spiritual unity born of the belief that man is a dignified human being created in the image of his Maker.

Our national purpose stimulates individuals and organizations to assume their patriotic obligations, and thus become better citizens. The national purpose demands that people and newspapers speak up for freedom, and thus discharge their responsibilities as good citizens.

Today our liberty is in great peril. World communism is attacking the principles, faith, and freedoms our forefathers won for us. We are sacrificing these principles on the altar of world opinion.

Since the Communist Party was formed in the United States in 1919, our country has been the target of espionage, infiltration, sabotage, and propaganda. The Communist objective is the destruction of our way of life.

Forty years ago Lenin said, "As long as capitalism and socialism exist, we cannot live in peace; in the end, one or the other will triumph."

Last year Khrushchev said, "The children of the present-day America will live in a Communist society," and that communism will "bury America."

To keep their adversaries confused, Communists blow hot and cold on all issues, but their objectives, said J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI, never change.

The Communists tell us that capitalism and communism cannot exist in the same world. They mean it.

Underlying the thinking of Khrushchev and his Communist allies are words of a Chinese militarist, who 500 years before Christ wrote, "To fight and conquer in all battles is not supreme excellence; supreme excellence consists of breaking the enemy's resistance without fighting."

The only power that can destroy our Nation is complacency. As a Nation we have been successful. However, we should keep uppermost in our minds the fact that nothing fails like success—when success leads to complacency. Today we are too complacent. Our newspapers must carry the torch for freedom. An informed citizenry is our greatest weapon.

We would do well to remember this basic historical fact, that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance, and that we will be the land of the free only as long as we are the home of the brave.

Quotas Not the Only Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an editorial from the January 31, 1962, issue of the Northwest Dairy News, published in Bellingham, Wash., in my district. This newspaper has wide circulation in the Northwest

and often expresses the concensus of Pacific Northwest dairymen.

This editorial is another example of the deep concern being expressed, not only in my district, but elsewhere about the administration's approach to the milk problem. I am sure that the Members of Congress also feel deep concern, and that they will soon come to grips with the problem.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 7729, a dairy self-help plan conceived by dairymen, which would take the Government out of the milk business and place it in the hands of the dairy industry. Once again I urge that hearings be held on H.R. 7729 so that this bill can be considered on its merits.

I do not believe more Government regulation and control is the answer to the problem, Mr. Speaker, even though such controls are often suggested under the guise that the industry asks for them.

The editorial follows:

QUOTAS NOT THE ONLY CHOICE

President Kennedy's farm message surprised nobody when it called for production controls for milk. For some time it has been obvious that Secretary Freeman wanted them and was determined to get his way.

Many believe he had this in mind last spring when he appointed the Nourse committee to analyze Federal milk orders. It became apparent, however, that this group was going to take its own sweet time about drafting a final report, and that their report would not be likely to recommend production quotas on a national basis.

That may explain why the 30-man National Dairy Advisory Committee was hurriedly appointed in December "at the request of dairy industry leaders." Some members were notified of their appointment on a Friday and asked to be at the group's first meeting the following Monday.

Freeman got what he wanted out of this committee, which gave almost rubberstamp approval to the supply-management ideas cooked up by USDA. Whether Congress or the Nation's dairy farmers will go for them is another matter.

Do we want national quotas? First, let it be admitted that the surplus situation is bad and will get worse if something is'nt done. While consumption dropped between 2 and 3 billion pounds last year, production soared 2 billion and the Government's loss in the price support program jumped from $300 million to $500 million. The taxpayers, we are warned, won't stand for much more of this.

So Kennedy and Freeman, if Congress approves their plan, are offering dairymen a choice between a rigid national quota system and a drop in the support price from $3.40 to $3.07. This, contrary to what some dairy people have suggested, is not political blackmail. Dairy farmers should not expect the Government to buy their surplus while they go on producing with no regard for market demand.

But this question must be answered: Is the situation bad enough that it can be corrected only by a whole-hog production limit on every U.S. producer, with the Government issuing certificates stating how much milk each man could market without a deduction from his milk check? We are inclined to agree with those who favor approaching the problem through supply control under Federal orders, where much of the surplus is being produced. This should have been done years ago in many markets.

At the same time, the consumption problem must be attacked with more money and more vigor by the industry. If used wisely, we believe that a larger amount spent for research and promotion, even if it had to be collected through a national checkoff, would be a better approach for the industry than simply slamming the door on production with Federal control.

Health Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following as I think it contains a wealth of information that other Members of the Congress might like to examine:

REMARKS BY ROBERT A. FORSYTHE, FORMER ASSISTANT SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, BEFORE THE DULUTH AFL-CIO CONFERENCE ON HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGED HELD AT THE DULUTH LABOR TEMPLE, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 31, 1962

The entire problem of providing health care to the aged in the United States has been the subject of intense discussion and debate for the past 4 or 5 years. Prior to the current discussion it was a major issue in the midthirties and the midforties. It has been explored and reexplored by all interested groups including—local, State, and National government, the hospitals, the doctors, organized labor, welfare officials, the chambers of commerce, the insurance industry, business and perhaps groups too numerous to mention tonight.

Inherent in every discussion and suggestion for the past 30 years has run the thread of the issue as to whether the social security approach or a voluntary approach incorporating the cooperation of several groups would offer the best solution.

Before going any further I would like to recommend that on the basis of the past history, the current facts, and the explosive nature of the problem that certain things be recognized and accomplished:

1. Recognition that the aged citizens of the United States be considered a part of our total society and economy rather than being set apart from the rest of society and the economic problems of our time. We are dealing with and talking about approximately 16 million persons aged 65 and over. To lump them into the category of a group to be set apart from the problems of other aged groups is to fail to recognize the inherent dignity of each individual human being regardless of age. Within this group of 16 million you will find the rich, the poor, the educated, the uneducated, the person from the ranks of labor, the professions, from business, and all other facets of American life. Many of these people are the victims of forced retirement while others are enjoying the status of voluntary retirement. Within this group you will find the healthy and the infirm. It is an injustice, and it is to accept a blind approach, not to recognize this important factor.

2. We must recognize that all who present a solution to the problem of health care to the aged are sincere in their feeling that their solution is the best way to meet the problem. All who are active in this area of activity are concerned with human needs. No one group can be categorized as being filled with the milk of human kindness to the exclusion of others. All are devoting their energies to a common goal—that of solving a problem of our present-day society.

3. We must recognize that everyone engaged in this issue recognizes the need for some kind of action. There are no groups to my knowledge which deny that a need exists. The debate is a legitimate one as to the extent of the need and the program which will best solve the need.

4. I would recommend that the present law known as the Kerr-Mills bill be implemented by the Minnesota Legislature in 1963. Bills were introduced in the 1961 general session, Governor Andersen supported this action, but no action was taken.

5. That recognition be given to the fact that in Minnesota we have one of the most comprehensive programs of providing medical care to the aged who need such care as there is in the United States. This is a fact which is being overlooked in the current controversy.

There are other observations based upon my activity in this area which I believe to be pertinent to this discussion. The entire issue of health care to the aged crosses political lines in both major political parties. To place this issue solely in the light of a political battle without recognizing diverging opinion within both parties is not recognizing reality. If this recognition is not made we will be casting the aged citizens of this country into the category of political pawns where their real needs are secondary to political considerations. This would be an injustice to all. I also believe that we have reached a point where many who advocate the social security approach might be more interested in the system itself as a vehicle for providing medical care rather than arriving at a realistic solution to the problem. It might also be that some of the opponents of the social security approach may lack a certain amount of objectivity.

However, I can tell you that on both sides of the political aisle in Washington there are some real and deep concerns when you discuss the social security system as a vehicle to provide health care.

Some of these are:

1. By using the social security mechanism you do not pinpoint some of the real needs with an adequate solution. It is an admitted fact that somewhere between 2.4 and 3 million persons aged 65 and over would not be covered. Within this number are those who have a real need for assistance. The admission to this weakness was long in coming by the proponents of the social security approach. During the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee in 1960 these advocates admitted the weakness and then supported the Kerr-Mills bill as a method of covering those not covered by social security. It is curious at this point to note that one of the objections to the voluntary Federal-State matching approach to the problem has been the use of an income test. But when dealing with the 2.4 to 3 million the same objection was not used. This has been one of the inconsistencies on the part of those who push for the social security plan.

2. By using the social security system you also blanket in for health care those who do not need assistance in handling this problem. Why should those who can well afford to care for themselves be blanketed under a vast social security plan? No real answer has been given to this and it is a question which concerns members of both political parties.

3. There is also deep concern over the extent to which you can impose a tax such as the one used to finance the social security system. Within a few years the tax is due to go up to over 9 percent of a worker's pay. Add the suggested tax for the King-Anderson bill and it is up to 10 percent by 1969. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Abraham Ribicoff said this week that he considers 10 percent a maximum tax which can be imposed. How then do we increase social

security benefits which are already a part of the system and then add the health program on to it? One answer given is that you raise the wage base upon which the tax is imposed. The proposal is to raise the base from $4,800 to $5,200. This means each worker must calculate the increase to him. Either the tax must be raised or the base must be raised. This leads us to another real concern.

4. That is that traditionally the social security program has been projected on the basis that benefits must be related to wages paid in. For years organized labor held to this premise. Many still do. But if you add medical care to the aged as a benefit you run counter to this traditional position. There are many in Congress who will not accept this break.

5. Another concern is that the tax to finance the program through social security is going to be paid by those in the lower income bracket for a benefit that they may not receive for a long time if at all.

6. Another reason for the Congress' reluctance to adopt the social security approach is that the pressures will be brought to bear to lower the age limit. This has already been done in the case of disability benefits and it will be advocated for medical care within 5 years if the social security plan is adopted. Organized labor says now they are not interested in anything other than coverage for the aged. But how long can the pressures for lowering the age limit be warded off?

There are other reasons why there is legitimate concern for the social security approach. I point these out to demonstrate that those who opposed it are not doing it arbitrarily—rather, their opposition in many cases is based upon very serious and fundamental reasons.

Now I would like to bring to your attention another thing that has troubled me. Whenever we get into discussions on this subject or whenever we read about it in general terms—the impression seems to be given that if the social security approach is used the problem of health-care expense to the elderly will be taken care of. If such an impression exists then it is of the greatest disservice to the aged themselves and to the American public. Nothing could be further from the truth.

In the first place, in order to make the bill more palatable, the authors have eliminated from the benefits the following: First, physicians' calls at home, office, or in the hospital; second, surgery; third, dental care; and fourth, drugs and medicines outside of a hospital or nursing home.

I want to make it plain that these costs will have to be assumed by the aged. In addition the King-Anderson bill also calls for the patient under the plan to pay a deductible fee of $10 per day for the first 9 days of hospital care. This would amount to a total of $90 if the hospital stay was for 9 days or more. In addition there would be a fee of $20 as a deductibe for diagnostic study. So the total could be $110 within the plan itself and then anything else would have to be paid for by the patient if the benefit was not included in the plan. This is a far cry from 1960 when the proponents argued that the aged could not and should not be expected to absorb any first dollar costs. These two items—the benefits not covered—plus the deductibe payments—have not been loudly publicized by the proponents. Yet they are important and the aged should be informed so they are not misled.

In my opinion the problem of health care for the aged can best be handled at this particular time outside the social security system. Consider for the moment the following parts of an overall joint effort to solve this problem.

1. Full implementation of the Kerr-Mills bill which everyone seems to favor today either as a whole or partial solution to the problem.

2. Adoption of a nationwide Blue Shield plan for complete surgical care for the aged at a cost of about $3 per month.

3. Adoption of a nationwide Blue Cross type program for the aged at a minimum cost to the individual plus the possibility of subsidization by the Federal Government.

4. The expansion of the voluntary insurance effort which has now reached a point of health care coverage of 50 percent of the aged and 70 percent of the general population.

5. Improvement of benefits in contracts negotiated between labor and management for worker coverage of health and medical benefits.

6. Continued tax benefits to the aged for medical expenses.

Within the context of such an effort we can arrive at a point of meeting the health care needs of the aged and other age groups in our society. It can be done in a cooperative spirit where government, private insurance, doctors, hospitals, and individuals all play a part in meeting the need. It need not be the compulsory approach of the social security plan. The solution can be pinpointed to the actual need.

In conclusion there is another point which must not be overlooked. As we look ahead in terms of this problem a new dimension will be added. It is estimated that in 1970 there will be approximately 21 million persons who are 65 or over. Sixty percent of these were aged 55–64 in 1960. So we will have 13 million senior citizens who will be reaching retirement age after 15 to 20 years of high level employment with high levels of pay. The vast amount will carry health benefits over into retirement. These benefits will improve as time goes along. So as more and more of the present labor force move into the 65 age bracket they will carry with them the health care benefits which will meet their needs.

It is my judgment that a social security type medical care bill will not pass this session of the Congress. There is too much legitimate opposition from both sides of the political aisle. If this happens—let it not be said that Americans sat idly by and became so wrapped up in a mechanical concept that they did not put their shoulders to the wheel and solve the problem in the alternative approach which has widespread and growing support among the American public.

Address by Senator Kefauver Before League of Women Voters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address by my colleague from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], delivered before a meeting of the League of Women Voters at Nashville, Tenn., January 19, 1962.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS OF SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER, OF TENNESSEE, BEFORE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS, NASHVILLE, TENN., FRIDAY, JANUARY 19, 1962

In the fall, I was privileged to visit Western Europe as chairman of the U.S. delegation to the NATO Parliamentarians Conference in Paris. This was the seventh such Conference to be held and the fifth I have attended as a delegate.

The NATO parliamentarians are a voluntary body of elected lawmakers from the 15 NATO countries. Each year we meet for 1 week to consider new ways to unify, stengthen and expand the free world against the Communist menace. This year I found an electric excitement among European delegates about the future role of the United States in the community of North Atlantic nations.

Although they are still concerned about our steadfastness to the NATO military alliance, they are becoming more interested in our response to the economic revolution which is now sweeping free Europe. The European Common Market may well be the most significant event of this century. Nations which have been bitter enemies for centuries are now discussing a common currency—and the English are even thinking about abandoning their tradition of driving their cars on the left-hand side of the road.

A brief look back over the years since World War II may help explain why our European friends are so anxious about the course of our foreign economic policy—and why we are rapidly approaching a rendezvous with the destiny of the Western World.

When the war ended, the economies of Western Europe were shattered and some of our allies were threatened with economic bankruptcy. By contrast, our economy was secure. We were the only Nation with sufficient international credit to continue to trade. Our friends had nothing to sell and no credit with which to buy our goods. They needed help and we needed them—both as allies in the cold war and as markets for goods produced in our postwar economy.

These nations were turning to currency and exchange restrictions and other artificial devices which might strengthen their domestic economies but which impeded international trade. Our response was the Marshall plan, one of our truly outstanding expressions of responsibility for the needs of fellow freemen. By helping these nations rebuild their economies, we also continued advantages which the United States had enjoyed through the existence in Western Europe of a large market with low-trade barriers.

At the same time, the Soviet Union was repudiating its wartime pledges to the allies and lowering the Iron Curtain between East and West, thereby setting off the international tensions which persist today. The Atlantic community's unified answer to this threat was NATO, the free world's most effective shield against Communist enslavement. It was the military counterpart to the Marshall plan's economic effect.

The cold war years which followed saw vast changes within this Atlantic community. Western European recovery so exceeded expectations that instead of our being Europe's protector, the United States and free Europe are fast becoming competitors, both in their domestic markets and in our markets here at home. The Common Market is the climax of this achievement of economic stability and vigor in Western Europe. It was formed in 1957 by Belgium, France, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and West Germany.

Although they call themselves the European Economic Community, these separate nations are really becoming a sort of United States of Europe for trade and economic purposes. Their ultimate goal is the total elimination of all tariff barriers among the participating countries while maintaining a uniform tariff wall against outsiders. Goods, capital, labor, and tourists will move between these countries as freely as they do among the States of our own Union.

In moving toward these goals, the Common Market has surpassed its own timetables. At the end of 1961, internal tariffs had been cut 30 percent and another cut of 10 percent had been agreed for January

of this year. A still further 10-percent cut is under discussion for early 1962. Originally, it had not been thought that their uniform external tariff could be established until 1966, but it now appears that this wall against outsiders may be thrown up in 1963. Their separate outside tariffs have already been adjusted some to bring them nearer to uniformity.

The results to date of this unprecedented step are astonishing. The Common Market countries have increased their trade with each other by 44 percent and their world trade by 20 percent. They have worked against old national rivalries and suspicions and the influence of colonialists, cartels, and political feudalists. Despite these handicaps, they are creating a consumer-oriented, competitive enterprise, free continental market in the pattern of our own American example.

In 1961 they produced 4 million automobiles, 75 million tons of steel, and 250 billion kilowatt-hours of electric power. Their gross annual product now exceeds $180 billion and accounts for almost one-fourth of world imports.

Perhaps the greatest proof of the Common Market's success came in July of last year when Great Britain abandoned its proud separation from the Continent and applied for membership. With Britain as a partner, the Common Market's population will exceed 220 million people, its gross annual product will rise to $245 billion, and it will account for more than one-third of world imports.

Denmark and Ireland have also applied for membership and Norway has it under consideration. Switzerland, Austria, Sweden, Greece, Turkey, and Israel have begun moves to become a part of this regional economic community. It is estimated that by 1970 the Common Market will become a single economic unit of 300 million people, compared with 215 million in the Soviet Union and 185 million in the United States.

These facts pose implications for us as a nation which cannot be ignored. If we face reality and do not sell short our faith in America and the cause of freedom, the Common Market can become a blessing for us and for all freemen.

In 1952 Joseph Stalin predicted to a Moscow conference that the Communists would win the world peaceably through overwhelming trade agreements. He viewed West Germany and Japan as the keys to this and forecast that the West would greedily hamper their foreign trade and drive them to the Soviet orbit.

Khrushchev has spoken more of recently of burying capitalism and declaring war on us in the field of trade. But Khrushchev's threat did not consider that the Western democracies might unite to confront communism with a joint economic front. His prophesy is becoming a desperate, wishful hope. I think he was trying to coverup the handwriting he could read on the wall.

The course of these great historic events has led the United States to a year of decision in 1962. Many of our people are frustrated and worried as they survey the world fronts of the battle between communism and freedom. Berlin is tense and unsettled. The uncertain Congo divides us at home. Vietnam and Laos are insecure. The United Nations is in a period of crisis.

But I believe all these sore spots can be overshadowed by the opportunities which are opening to us on the greater battlefront of world trade. Here we can seize the intiative. We can build a free world strength and unity which the Communists cannot combat.

A great step forward in trade is more than a chance to deal communism a body blow. It can be the breakthrough which brings greater prosperity to all freemen everywhere.

Freedom of trade and commerce welded our separate States into the greater productive machine the world has seen. The same principle among the nations of the Common Market is now moving their economy ahead at a growth rate twice as great as ours. This principle can be further extended to build economic strength and unity in the free world.

This obviously involves relaxation of tariff barriers. Internal tariffs among our States would have made America as we know it impossible—just as Europe's old internal tariffs were obstacles to the prosperity it is beginning to enjoy. In the same way, tariffs can be barriers to the peace and prosperity of the entire community of free nations.

President Kennedy is urging that the Congress enact a trade program under which the United States can seize the initiative and lead the Western World into a great new era. In this I wholeheartedly support him.

Our present reciprocal trade laws expire in 1962 and must be rewritten by this session of the Congress. At the least we must give the President the tools he needs to negotiate effectively with the Common Market and create a strong trading partnership across the Atlantic. This will require the authority to eliminate or reduce tariffs on broad scales in across-the-board bargaining with the Common Market nations as a unit.

The temptation will be great for our European friends to guard their gains and protect their expanding consumer markets from American competition. They can now offer to their own people the benefits of mass production in a competitive economy. We must set the example and take the lead in offering progress, not retreat, in the face of new challenges and opportunities.

What are the alternatives if we reject this opportunity and revert to economic isolationism?

First of all we may see ourselves cut off from trading with our principal allies. Our exports to the Common Market countries in 1960 amounted to $3.4 billion, an increase of morethan $1 billion since 1958; our imports were much less. If we lose access to these expanding consumer markets, not only will our industries suffer, but some may choose to move plants and capital inside the walls of the Common Market, with the resulting loss of jobs and income here in the United States.

If we fail to keep up our exports, we will cause a renewed squeeze on our balance of payments with threats to our gold reserves and the stability of the dollar. This could in turn require a retreat from some of our vital overseas military and aid commitments.

Of greater concern is the possibility that the Common Market could become our competitor instead of our ally. With mass of industrial and consumer goods, Europe might be drawn into a trade war with America for the markets and raw materials of the world. Europe organized economically without the United States could become a Europe organized against the United States.

Nothing could please Khrushchev more than to see trade barriers crack the historic unity of Western civilization and its united efforts in behalf of freemen and free institutions. By the same token, nothing will dismay the Kremlin more than a united free Europe with strong economic links with the United States.

The success of such a combination would demonstrate conclusively the superiority of democratic capitalism over communism and would lay to rest Karl Marx's prediction that capitalism would destroy itself.

The flexibility of Western capitalism and its capacity to adapt to changed conditions would mock Communist comparisons. The prosperity of an economic community of all the Atlantic nations would be a great magnetic force which could, and I think will, pull satellite nations out of the Soviet orbit.

Protectionism has never made sense in terms of the walfare of the Nation as a whole. Time and again we have allowed protective tariffs to sacrifice the interests of the whole people to the demands of a few. Free competition within our country benefits the consumer by improved technology and lower prices. It can have the same effects in the long run in foreign trade.

A freer trade policy can stimulate a nation's economy by causing it to produce those things which it produces best. Competition from imports may increase productivity and iron out stagnant or inefficient pockets in a nation's economy.

Look at the healthy effect foreign imports had on American tastes in automobiles. And look, too, at the successful transition which our auto manufacturers made to smaller, more economic cars to compete with these foreign imports.

I do not say that building the trade partnership which we must build within the free world will be easy. The transition may be hard. To compete successfully with foreign products we must produce quality and we must sell at prices which may require discipline and restraint in both profits and wages.

Nor do I say that this can be accomplished overnight. It is a complex problem. I appreciate the position of the man who fears he may go out of business, or the worker who fears he may lose his job because of competition with foreign imports. Any program must consider them and treat them fairly.

Any liberalized trade legislation should include trade adjustment features which will aid those businesses, communities, and workers who suffer hardship as a result of import competition. The President's program contains such features and you can be assured that the Congress will look at them closely.

Our new trade offensive will be launched in the national interest—to deal with national problems. Any displacement of plants and jobs and special hardships which it causes should also be treated as a national problem.

Where the change hits hardest—from the point of view of employer and employee alike—there is no question that we must devise adequate means to make the transition fair.

But I do not believe we should let special interests stand in the way of the ultimate accomplishment of something so vital and beneficial to our people as a whole. We must never forget that uniting the economic strength of the free world may well be a question of survival.

The unenlightened protectionist, who is not willing to work with this serious question might unwittingly find himself in the position of making Marx and Stalin prophets and Khrushchev a conqueror. For if sight of the vital goal is lost, then we could find ourselves with nothing left to protect.

If we lose the entire free competitive enterprise system, we lose everything—not only those few protected jobs and companies—but every job and company and our freedoms, too. Restrictive tariff protection could be a tragic Trojan horse which our enemies would be delighted to leave within our gates.

The economic isolationism of the twenties led us to raise tariffs in 1930 on the pretext of helping our jobless. We then saw other countries' tariffs raised in retaliation with disastrous results for all countries. It was the great Cordell Hull who then led the United States and the world to new economic frontiers with our first Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

If he were alive today, I have no doubt that he too would enthusiastically support the President's efforts.

The trade debate of 1962 promises to compare with the historic tariff debates of the early 19th century. It will be difficult and probably bitter, but it deserves the open-minded attention of all of us. I hope business, farm, labor, and civic groups will all give it full consideration and aid the Congress with informed and objective viewpoints.

The League of Women Voters has published some excellent material and is doing a fine job of presenting these issues impartially and educating the public to the issues in foreign trade. I hope other groups will follow your example.

We must again capture the vision of Cordell Hull and move with giant steps as he did. If we do, we will meet the responsibilities of the United States in a free world, we will deal our enemies a death blow, and we will herald a new era of peace and prosperity for all men.

Senator Mundt Salutes Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, on this anniversary observance of the birth of the Great Emancipator—Abraham Lincoln—Republicans are paying tribute to the memory of this man who was the first Republican to be President of the United States. One such tribute is contained in the newsletter of my colleague in the other body, the senior Senator from my home State of South Dakota, Senator KARL MUNDT. I request permission that, on this Lincoln Day, the newsletter "Your Washington and You," of Senator MUNDT be included in the RECORD:

THE LINCOLN HERITAGE

Americans this week are saluting the memory of one of our great Presidents, Abraham Lincoln. He was the first Republican to serve as President. Much of what he said 100 years ago is today the foundation upon which the Republican Party stands. One statement of Lincoln's, perhaps better than any other, provides guidelines which the Republican Party as a whole has accepted as its philosophy of government. It is this:

"The legitimate object of Government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot at all or cannot do so well for themselves in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, the Government ought not to interfere."

This is the dictum followed by most Republicans and by which they gird themselves in the Congress to do battle against the policies designed by the Kennedy administration to further erode the freedoms of the individual while expanding the power of the Central Government. And it is this power the New Frontier policy planners constantly seek as message after message comes forth to the Congress demanding for the President "the power to reduce taxes," "the power to regulate foreign trade," "the power to control city governments through the Cabinet," "the power to spend without limit." The struggle continues, and on this anniversary of Lincoln's birth, we again attempt to give meaning to his expression by achieving that ultimate in public policy that Government ought not to interfere. The cause is not lost, nor the victory won.

FEBRUARY 19: A BIG DAY

When Congress returns to its full-time activities Monday, February 19—following the Lincoln Day observances—two major items of business are on the agenda for your Senator. Our Senate Agriculture Committee will begin hearings on the new farm bill of the Kennedy administration. Later in the day the Senate will take up the President's proposal to establish a Department of Urban Affairs. Both measures are controversial and will be the subject of heated debate, with the decision on Urban Affairs expected to come within a few days. The agriculture bill, of course, has the long road of committee hearings ahead before the measure comes to the floor of the Senate. Testimony has already been received in the House Agriculture Committee from Secretary Freeman in behalf of his program.

SENATE CALENDAR

The Senate has approved a $2.6 billion program for colleges, but whether the figure will stand is questionable since the bill now goes to a House-Senate conference committee which will also consider the House measure calling for $1.5 billion expenditures. The program is for college construction and scholarships. The House bill does not contain the $926 million scholarship feature of the Senate bill. The Senate bill calls only for loans for construction while the House measure would make grants in addition to loans. The differences must be adjusted.

SPRAY FROM THE POTOMAC

The Kennedy administration has added more than 90,000 employees to the Federal payroll. However, not all of them are relatives of the President * * * Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, addressing the Alfalfa Club here, quips that Chester Bowles is to appear on the TV program "What's My Line?" as soon as he finds out what his line is.

Alaska's Power Needs—No. XII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST GRUENING

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in the series on Alaska's power needs published by the Fairbanks News-Miner, the last article deals with the Rampart Canyon Dam as well as with the need for interim power development until such time as that dam begins to generate electricity.

It is gratifying to note that the preliminary report of the Development and Resources Corp., of New York, headed by a most knowledgeable group of experts in the field of power, presents a most favorable outlook for the sale of all the power to be generated by Rampart Dam. In fact, it is the opinion of the Corps of Engineers that not only will the Rampart Dam have to be built if we are to supply Alaska with low-cost power which will develop its economy, but that a development of the whole river basin is desirable and that the power will find a market. For that reason, it is gratifying to record that early in this session, the Committee on Public Works, headed by our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New Mexico, DENNIS CHAVEZ, approved the investigation of the Woodchopper site on the Yukon by the corps.

I ask unanimous consent that the 12th and last article in the Fairbanks News-Miner series, written by Paul Lien, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALASKA'S POWER NEEDS: NO. 12—GRUENING GIVES OPINION IN FINAL CHAPTER ON POWER

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Senator ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska, gives his views on interim power and what is being done in reference to Rampart Dam in this final installment of a series of articles on a predicted power shortage in Fairbanks.)

(By Paul Lien)

Power is needed urgently in the rail-belt area.

Anchorage has already reached the critical stage in a power shortage, and Fairbanks will face a "brown out" in the winter of 1963 if more power is not provided.

Mine mouth plants seem to be the answer for immediate power, at the least possible cost.

Hydroplants, while usually more reasonable power providers, take too long to build to give a quick supply of power.

Atomic plants are still in their experimental stage.

We cannot continue adding small additional power units to our existing plants and ever expect to bring down the price of power to the consumer.

These are points we all must realize say the experts, and almost unanimously have given a thumbs up signal for steam plants established at mine mouth.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska, says that interim power is a must for the rail-belt area.

"Wherever we can utilize a natural resource, such as coal, we should do so," said Senator GRUENING.

"Actually, in the rail-belt area, coal-fired steam plants produce the cheapest power.

Referring to Devil Canyon, the Senator said, "Congress will not give a go ahead signal for a half billion dollars hydroelectric plant that cannot produce power for less than 8 mills."

"Comparing the proposed Rampart Dam with Devil Canyon, we find that Rampart will produce almost 10 times the power at only two and a half times the cost.

"Rampart power will be produced at the bus bar for 2 mills as against 8 mills for Devil Canyon.

"The idea of building mine mouth plants at Healy, Cripple Creek, Jonesville or Sutton is an excellent idea and I will do all in my power to help this venture along.

"Besides producing comparatively cheap power at eight or ten mills at the plant, the whole idea is good for the economy of the country.

"When Rampart is being constructed these coal-fed plants can produce power which will be needed during that period.

"Even when Rampart power is available in Fairbanks for less than three mills, the mine mouth plants will still be used for peaking plants and baseloading."

When asked if he thought there would be any difficulty in obtaining Rural Electric Administration financing, the Senator said, "I have talked with members of the REA regarding this matter, and in my opinion there will be no objection whatever when the proposal is submitted to them.

"The Parsons report meets with my hearty approval, and they have done a fine job in presenting a very informative power study for central Alaska," said GRUENING.

Summarizing the preceding articles in this, the final of the series, we wish to emphasize the following points:

Low cost power is urgently needed in central Alaska in order to further develop the country.

Because of the comparatively small power units now operating at a high cost, we are "dragging our feet" and no progress in this direction is being made.

Integrating our present power systems into one large generation and transmission cooperative, and eliminating duplication of materials and effort, seems to be a step in the right direction.

Use of low cost Rural Electric Administration funds for further expansion along the rail-belt area is less costly by far than use of private capital.

INTERIM POWER

Interim power is needed immediately and the most advantageous source of fuel is coal. The establishing of steam mine mouth plants at Healy and Sutton could be the answer to the problem.

Mining and developing of coal, our main natural resource, will bolster the economy of the entire rail-belt area.

Hydroelectric power, to be generated at Rampart Dam, although much cheaper in the long run, is not foreseen for 10 to 12 years and further development of Alaska must not have to wait for introduction of this lower-cost power.

CHEAPEST POWER

Our main objective is to get the cheapest power to the consumer at the lowest cost as soon as possible.

A second important objective is to attract new industry with low cost power. It is predicted that with reasonable power rates the manufacture of commodities such as cosmetics and plastics may be developed along the rail-belt. This low cost power will make possible electric heating in Fairbanks, and provide an entirely new industry.

Central Alaska is blessed with coal in great abundance, and we should make use of it.

In the meantime we can all sit back and dream of the day we can get power generated from Rampart Dam for two to three mills—and not have to "worry about that ol' light bill."

Farm Facts of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, on February 5, 1962, Howard Henry, a North Dakota member of the National Wheat Advisory Committee, delivered an address over radio and TV media which dealt with the President's farm message. Mr. Henry very ably points up to the farmers the facts of life and the sound reasons for supporting the program. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks of Mr. Henry.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM FACTS OF LIFE

Friends, in the next 15 minutes I am going to try to explain to you the reasons why I believe production controls based on acreage or bushels are essential to the success of the farming industry of North Dakota.

Before I begin, I wish to explain to you what has happened in the last 10 years because we did not have production controls. The farmer is becoming more efficient, he is using more fertilizer, and better management and equipment. We have increased our yields of feed grains and wheat about 40 percent per acre in the last 10 years.

In 1952 the CCC holdings were 236 million bushels of feed grains. By 1960 the CCC holdings had increased to 2,044 million bushels. In 1961 the Government put through the emergency feed grain program, so last year we reduced this surplus to 1,767 million bushels. If it had not been for the feed-grain program in 1961 we would have millions more under storage. Here is what happened in wheat: In 1951 we had a surplus under CCC loan of 154 million bushels. By 1961 this surplus had increased to 1,330 million bushels.

The taxpayers are paying storage on this amount. The surplus increased over 1 billion bushels in wheat in the last 10 years. Feed grain has increased almost 2 billion in the same time. That is Benson's farm record without controls. Can we continue to ask the Federal Government to pay out of the Treasury cash to keep this large surplus of grain on hand, and to continue to build it up? We have 2 years supply of wheat and feed on hand.

The people who in the last 8 years have been recommending low price supports and no control of production can see from these figures just what has happened. We farmers and consumers have to be sensible and face the facts of life. We are becoming a minority group.

How much longer are we going to be able to ask Congress to appropriate money to carry these large stocks of grain at the expense of the taxpayer? I'll admit that I, as an individual farmers, and many of you farmers listening in, have been getting storage on grain, and this has been a great help in adding to our net income.

Our present administration is going to push for more storage on the farm for two reasons: (1) In case of an atomic attack they want the grain reserves stored throughout the country; (2) they feel that this storage income belongs to the farmers.

Farmers cannot be asked to store reserve grain at their own expense. A reserve of food is absolutely necessary for survival in an emergency. We will have to admit that many large corporations are making excessive profits by the storage of this large surplus. Food and feed grains are just as necessary as war material to have stockpiled, up to a reasonable amount.

We have been reading headlines in the last few days about tight Government controls. If you will study this program more fully, you will find that the proposed program is not nearly so bad as the headlines would indicate.

In representing the people of North Dakota in Washington, I can assure you I was always thinking of our special problem. I hope at a future time to be able to give you more of the fine features of the plan that will be of a great benefit to the farmers of North Dakota. I found out that all the States have special problems. The main problem that the farmers are facing today is the fact that we have the lowest income in comparison to our investment of any large business in the Nation. Agriculture is a large business.

One of the biggest jobs that we farmers have to do is to tell our story to the consumer. The false propaganda that has been fed to the consumers in the last 8 years, to the effect that the high cost of living is caused by the high prices that the farmers have been receiving, is not true. The next time you go to the grocery store, check your purchases and see what percentage of them come from the farm. It can be that face powder, a carton of cigarettes, pop, and many other miscellaneous articles there should not be charged to agriculture.

In this proposed program we will have two ways to go. If we do not pass this program we face the possibility of losing our present farm program. Therefore, it is mandatory to you and to me as producers, and is to the interest of the consumers, that we control our production to what we can consume plus what we can export at a profit, and to insure the consumers of at least a year's supply of food and fiber stored on farms to protect them in years of crop failure or an atomic attack. In the proposed program the farmers vote for or against controls.

If more than one-third vote against production controls the program will be lost. Some cattlemen say, "See how successful we are. We have no controls." The broiler producers made this same statement about 2 years ago. Within the last year broilers have been selling as low as 9 cents a pound. If we get cheap feed, cattlemen will be in trouble in 2 years. If we throw productions wide open, the big operators and big farmers can raise wheat cheaper than the small farmer. This will put the small farmer out of business. Do you businessmen in North Dakota want to see this happen?

Do you people in town who are listening in realize that the farmer is at the mercy of the consumer? He brings a load of wheat to town. He asks the elevator man what he will pay for it. The elevator man calls up Minneapolis and finds out what the millers will bid. If the farmer could not store this wheat on his farm, he would have to accept any bid offered. My father at one time under the free market sold wheat at 26 cents a bushel. You and I as farmers can operate on that basis only if the machine companies will operate the same way. Let me bid for a tractor the same as they bid on my wheat and I will be willing to go along on this type of thinking.

Therefore, what are we going to do? If we have a program that does not have any penalties connected with it, the average farmer will sign up and the large operators will ignore the controls and will raise a large volume of wheat or feed grain at the expense of the cooperating farmer. The loan value of wheat establishes the bottom market price for wheat. When I have my wheat in storage on my farm, the millers will have to bid above the loan to get it.

The long-range proposed program will enable the farmer to seed wheat on corn or barley acreage. This wheat can be stored on the farm. He (the farmer) will get storage and if the market price goes up like it did on Durum this year, he will have the grain to sell. A controlled program must include high enough payments for diverted acres and high enough loan payments to give him at least as much income or more than he will get in 1962.

The National Wheat Advisory Committee puts this must in any legislation introduced by the Department. I have faith in this administration, as they are dedicated to the idea that the farmer's net income is too low and will do whatever is necessary to increase it.

I could talk for hours on the many good features of the proposed bill. We hope to be able to seed crops such as flax, safflower, or castor beans on our diverted acres. We hope to get into the bill the right to use the diverted acres for pasture and to put a lot of the poor producing land into other income-producing crops that are not now in surplus.

If we had had in effect the last 8 years the same program we have in 1962 for wheat and

feed grains, coupled with a higher loan rate, which we are now getting, we would not have the large surplus we have today.

We have certain groups in the State who believe in large volume production and low price supports. They say production control will put the small farmers out of business. Under the new proposed program, loan rates and diverted acres payments will be high enough to offset the cut in acres. The important thing to any farmer, large or small, is how much cash does he have left after paying expenses. I honestly believe that if we would double our wheat acreage, which would be done without controls, wheat would again sell for from 50 to 75 cents per bushel. If machine companies would double their output and throw their machines in the market at what they could get, they would be broke in 2 years. And so will you and I without controls.

Did you people read the headlines in the Fargo Forum of February 3? The front page headline was "U.S. Chamber of Commerce Official Brands Farm Plan Blackmail." At this same forum held in Fargo, one of the outstanding champions of a just farm program also spoke. His name is Willard Cochrane. On the inside of this paper was a headline, "Cochrane Defends Kennedy Plan as Meeting the Farm Problem." Now, here is a paper in North Dakota that is directly interested in agriculture. Why didn't they put that headline on the front page and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce headline on the back page?

Walter B. Graver, agricultural manager of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, quote: "The new program gives the farmers the choice of caged animals, 'whether to stomp up and down within the confines permitted them, and whether or not to eat what is put in front of them'." I would like to let you in on a little secret, Mr. Graver. We farmers would rather build our own cage and run our own business than to have the U.S. Chamber of Commerce build the cage for us, and again give us 26 cents a bushel for wheat like you did in the early thirties. I don't think the cage that we would build would smell quite as bad as the cage you would build for us.

Do you businessmen and consumers know that 85 percent of the farmers of the United States voted on a national basis for the 1962 program? When I was appointed on this advisory committee, I publicly asked for advice and suggestions. I asked it from the consumers, the farmers, and from chambers of commerce. I received only one letter from a chamber of commerce of North Dakota offering any suggestions. But now the head of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce is publicly attacking the program.

I did hear through the newspapers of what the machine dealers of North Dakota did last fall. They passed a resolution condemning the sedimentary test for wheat. This test would identify high-quality wheat and add $7 million to our income. We might be able to buy a few new tractors with this money. This new test of high-quality wheat was not a dream child of the Department of Agriculture. This new method of testing high-quality wheat was sponsored by the Great Plains Wheat Corp. The Great Plains membership is composed of the wheat commissions of eight States.

I am trying to impress upon consumers the problem we have in trying to get a fair program for the farmers and the consumers. The groups opposing our program are interested in volume only. They are not interested in the net income of the farmer, and they do not want us to control our production the same as the International Harvester, Ford Motors and others control their production.

I have faith in our farm leaders. I think the leaders of agriculture have just as many brains as the leaders of large industries. The leaders of large industries meet every year before the start of the manufacturing season and decide on how many farm machines to build and they build only enough to supply the demand and for which they can sell at a profit—to which they are entitled. We hope, in a few years, under the proposed program to be able to do just that on all classes of grain. We are doing this on Durum wheat at the present time.

Yes, friends, I feel we can control our production the same as business controls theirs. The only reason we will have to make these large cuts to start with is to get the surplus down. The surplus was built up because our Mr. Benson believed in low loan rates and no controls. You see what we got.

To you farmers that have a below-average wheat acreage in percentage of your cropland, I will say this: I will continue to work to get adjustments made. I have recommended to the Department of Agriculture that farmers with below-normal acreage should not have to take the acreage cut, but the cut be made larger on those with average acreage. I hope the new bill will give the local ASC committee additional power to make these changes. I have also recommended that corn in North Dakota, raised outside of the commercial corn area, be classified as hay when it is used for silage. This silage could be grown on diverted areas the same as grass.

The 1962 program will give the farmers of North Dakota about $30 to $40 million more income than they received in 1960. I hope to give you more figures on this at a later date. This income increase is after a 10-percent acreage cut, but the increase in loan rates and payment on diverted acres makes this additional income.

We farmers are not fools. We are interested in net profit, the same as business is. We are not interested in a large volume to sell at a loss. I am sincere in the belief the new proposed program will help establish a sound economy.

Stop and think. Does it make sense to produce food and fiber in excess, to the point where we cannot sell or give it away? Don't you consumers feel that a program giving us a fair income for our labor, conserving our soil for future generations, keeping a 1 year's supply of food and fiber on the farm, is more sensible than raising all you can and giving it to Europe at a loss or not getting paid for what we do export?

You cannot expect the farmers of America to feed the hungry world at their expense. The "food for peace" program is morally sound, but the farmers should not have to pay its cost by raising large volumes of wheat at a loss. If the taxpayer wants to give food to the hungry, that's fine, but let all the taxpayers share the expense.

We farmers are proud of our production ability. All we are asking is legislation under which we can run our program without overtaxing the U.S. Treasury due to excessive storage costs.

Do you consumers realize that the farmer gets only 2½ cents out of each 28-cent loaf of bread? Think of the additional manufactured products (produced by you) that the farmer will be able to buy because of the additional net profit he will make on his farm. I again repeat, the farmer's biggest job is to bring this message to the consumer group, labor groups, and chambers of commerce. The farmers need you, and you need us. Give us a chance to control our business.

We will guarantee you all the food you can eat. We are getting more efficient every year.

Do you nonagricultural people realize that a three-plow tractor in 1920 cost about $1,250? Now they cost over $4,000. Remember, these tractors have to be paid for out of net profit. They cannot be paid for out of large volume with no profit.

Remember this, every bushel of wheat raised takes plant material out of the soil. Every bushel of wheat raised to give away to Europe at a loss is taking food material from our soil. Our grandchildren will have to restore this by fertilizing. We owe to the future generations the conservation of our soil, water, and minerals. Thank you.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

EAST NORWICH, N.Y.,
January 23, 1962.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Congressman of Pennsylvania, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

HON. CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I am very interested in your resolution to establish a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. I have written to my local Congressman urging him to pass this measure.

Is there anything further I can do to help have this measure passed?

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD C. KELLS.

JANUARY 29, 1962.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DAN: I have just read about your Resolution 211 to establish a Committee

on Captive Nations. I urge Congressmen of both parties to pass this bill, because it will give new hope to the people of captive nations. This new bill will prove to the people of these captive nations, that the United States is effortlessly trying to work out a peaceful solution, which will free these deprived people from their captors. I served with the Armed Forces in Korea, also my wife is from Korea, so I understand how the people of Korea feel about the unification of their country. So, I think this bill is a step in the right direction, and with its passing it will restore new faith in the hearts of these captive people. At this time, I would like to congratulate you on a worthwhile bill, and hope Members of the Congress realize full value of this bill and approve it.

I would like to express my deepest gratitude for the service you rendered me while in the Armed Forces. I was unable to reenlist for an assignment to Japan, due to extenuating circumstances. I am presently employed with the Wilkes-Barre Publishing Co. I passed two civil service examinations, one was for an accounting clerk and the other was for clerk. My future ambition and goal is to obtain a job as an accounting clerk with the U.S. Army in the Far East. While serving with the U.S. Army in Korea, I used to teach English to some young Korean students in my spare time, thus enabling these students to understand the American people much better.

As I close this letter, I want to extend my best wishes for your continued success in the future.

Yours truly,

HARRY R. ECKERT, Jr.

COLUMBUS, OHIO.

MY DEAR MR. FLOOD: I want to commend you on your bill that a Special House Committee on Captive Nations be formed at once.

I've written to the Honorable SAMUEL L. DEVINE to back your bill 100 percent.

Mrs. JOHN B. PARRISH.

[From the Telegram, Toronto, Jan. 22, 1962]

UKRAINIANS CONDEMN RUSK

Canadian Ukrainians yesterday condemned the recently reported action of U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk in asking that the Ukraine be deleted from the House of Representatives list of enslaved nations.

A rally of 2,000 attended a Massey Hall Independence Anniversary celebration, sponsored by the Ukrainian Canadian Committee.

They applauded as Manitoba MP J. N. Mandziuk described Rusk's action as a most glaring example of bowing to the Russian myth there is no separate Ukrainian race.

The MP also objected to the Soviet Ambassador Amasasp Aroutunian's recent ridicule of Prime Minister Diefenbaker's speech to Toronto ethnic groups and his stand on Soviet colonialism.

"We resent his criticism of Mr. Diefenbaker's speech as not quite in accordance with international diplomatic codes of ethics—hardly worthy of the ambassador of a great empire to criticize the head of state to which he is accredited," he said.

GARDEN CITY, N.Y., *January 29, 1962.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HON. CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I am very interested in your resolution to establish a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. I have written to my Congressman urging him to pass this measure.

Is there anything further I can do to have this measure passed?

Sincerely,

THOMAS W. CULLEN.

OMAHA, NEBR., *January 27, 1962.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I would very much appreciate receiving a copy of your bill 211 which I understand proposes a permanent Committee on Captive Nations.

The enclosed material outlines an activity which it is believed would result in definite progress toward accomplishing good for the captive nations to Soviet tyranny. I would be most pleased to place copies in the hands of any persons or groups you may know of who are interested in activity to free the captive nations.

Cordinally and respectfully,

L. E. WHITNEY.

Judge Oscar Dancy, Progressive Leader, Humanitarian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in this country of ours there are a few learned men who, by their own lives, give inspiration to all who count them as friends. Such a man is my friend, Oscar Dancy, the county judge of Cameron County, Tex., for almost 40 years.

The unswerving friendships Judge Dancy has earned in the four decades he has held an office of public trust are beyond counting. Unquestionably, he could have held higher office in Texas if he had sought it. But he preferred to remain in the valley, where the people he loves and who love him are close at hand.

Judge Dancy is a man who fights with unyielding determination for a principle, but in fighting he remembers always that his targets are issues, not personalities. A supporter of mine through all my campaigns, Judge Dancy has also been a strong advocate of passage of the bill to make Padre Island a National Seashore Recreational Area (S. 4). I am grateful for such an ally.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GENTLE AND LEARNED JUDGE

"The old frontiersmen were from the land, usually born in poverty, matured slowly like good mountain whisky, educated in the little colleges and night schools or not at all, and full of commonsense and the rhythms of the Bible."

Thus does James Reston describe Sam Rayburn's political generation, in words that also describe Oscar Dancy.

Dancy is 82 years old, gentle and learned and a fine figure of a man. He looks a little like J. Frank Doble. He speaks with the accents of the country people. He has been county judge of Cameron County for 39 years, and when he finishes his present term he will have been county judge longer than any man in the history of the State.

Several years ago someone, perhaps with Rayburn's shorter sobriquet in mind, dubbed him "Mr. Democrat of South Texas." To Judge Dancy the old-time religion comes first, but the Democratic Party hasn't run a bad second at all.

"He's an old-time politician, in the best sense of the word," a student of the valley says. "Politicians these days, even the best ones, have a kind of impersonal quality. Success moves them up a notch; they worry about their image. But the people know the judge, and the judge knows the people."

The county judgeship is one of the last remnants of freewheeling, personalized politics in Texas. Its duties can be amorphous and sprawling. The man makes the job. Over the course of four decades Dancy has used the position to help and encourage the Latins, to oversee construction of one of the finest road systems in the State, and to stress conservation of natural resources in a region which reached prosperity only after a long and sometimes losing battle with a mean and rugged brush.

PRIMITIVE BAPTIST HOME

Dancy's office in the county courthouse is less an office than a cubbyhole. The shelves are crowded with old lawbooks. On the wall is a photograph of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Almost every morning since 1922 the judge has stopped for "a cup of coffee and a biscuit" at the Texas Cafe, reaching his desk by 5:30 a.m. The routine was interrupted a month ago when he was hit by a milk truck on his way to work. He was in the hospital 3 weeks, and had only been out a few days. He rested, feet propped high, in a green-cushioned easy chair.

He was born in Wilkes County, N.C., in a stanch religious environment, named, as good American irony would have it, after the flamboyant hellion and ardent Democrat, John Wilkes of London. "I first saw the light of heaven in a Primitive Baptist home," Dancy said, "and I was never outside the Blue Ridge Mountains 'til I ran away from home to become a high private No. 8 in the Spanish War. If you've never heard of a high private No. 3, I can tell you it was the lowest in the ranks. My military record wasn't brilliant, but at least it was clean."

When he was 17 he started teaching in "the little schools" of the Blue Ridge backcountry at $20 a month. "I got very little education but McGuffey's Reader and the Blue Back Speller. McGuffey's had some of the best of the oldtime wisdom you ever read—some of the oldtime masterpieces. I don't think they've improved 'em. They should never've discarded 'em. You can get copies of McGuffey's now, but it costs like the devil."

He got his law degree from Southern Normal University in Huntington, Tenn., in 1900. "I came to Texas on January 9, 1909, with my wife and four babies. Another was born after we came.

"I raised three boys and two girls. All the boys are in the grave. Within a period of a little over 3 years I lost my wife and my three boys." One of his daughters lives in Austin, the other in Houston.

"I'm a Democrat," (he pronounces it Demicrat) "because it's the party of the people—it's for a fair deal for the common, everyday man.

"That Homeowners' Loan Corporation, for instance—the Republicans say it cost the country $1 billion. You know, they took loans the banks wouldn't take, they took loans business wouldn't take, and they made $21 million."

The first time he voted for a President was 1904, when he voted for Alton B. Parker against Teddy Roosevelt. The post office where he voted was Transou, N.C., a French Huguenot community.

"Franklin Delano (pronounced Delino) Roosevelt was the greatest American leader of this century, because he did more for the common man and for humanity. He was the greatest humanitarian of his age."

At the merest whim he would interrupt the chain of talk with a chuckle and a mischievous movement of the brows, as with the Primitive Baptists.

"The Primitive Baptists believe in the final perseverance of the saints. They believe what is to be, will be—even if it never happens.

"They wash each other's feet, they pay their debts, and they vote the Democratic ticket—and if you can't get into heaven on that ticket, there just ain't no heaven at all.

"They wash each other's feet, like Christ and the disciples at the Last Supper. If you've never seen it performed you might make fun of it, but I can tell you it's a ceremony of great reverence. Remember, 'they came to scoff, but their remained to pray'?

"They tell me Sam Rayburn was baptised in the Primitive Baptist Church 3 years ago. His father and mother were Primitive Baptists, just like mine.

"You know, I think Sam Rayburn is just about the greatest man in the world. RALPH YARBOROUGH and I shook hands on that the other day. He's a man of unquestioned integrity—and any public man ought to be that.

"But you know, I think that little fellow Kennedy is gonna be a wonder."

YARBOROUGH, on a swing through the valley, had visited him in the hospital only a few days before. "Now, I'm a great admirer of RALPH YARBOROUGH," he said. "I've supported him every time he's run. Me and one other lawyer were the only two people who met him at the train station the first time he campaigned here."

The judge supported LYNDON JOHNSON's nomination for President last year. "When Kennedy got it, I sent LYNDON a telegram. It said: 'Stoop to conquer by accepting second place.'

"If JOHNSON had led the ticket, he'd have been slaughtered. He could've carried the South, but none of the North. With Kennedy and LYNDON it was a perfect setup."

FAIRNESS AND COURTESY

"I guess maybe I got in a rut as county judge and don't want to get out," he said with some whimsy. "But it's an opportunity for constructive work. There's no greater opportunity in the county—working with people, hearin' their problems.

"I took one involuntary vacation, in 1932. Judge A. W. Cunningham from down at Harlingen beat me. He's one of the smartest men I ever knew—and the closest of friends. Folks blamed the depression on Hoover and me. But I won again in 1934.

"You know, this poor devil of a Mexican really needs help, and nobody in the world appreciates fairness and common everyday courtesy more than a Latin. He hasn't had too much of it in the past.

"But my, haven't they gone forward? You go to these high school graduations these days. There's more Latins in the graduatin' classes than Anglos."

What does he consider his greatest accomplishment as county judge?

Without a pause he answered: "Promoting good race relations, and I think you've got the best race relations here as anywhere. I don't claim the credit, but I think I've helped just by treatin' the Latins courteous and fair."

A JUNGLE ALMOST

When he first came to the valley, "it was a jungle almost. It's the greatest country under the flag, as beautiful as those North Carolina mountains are. And as much as I love goin' back to my rel-i-tives, my brothers and nephews in the mountains, I just can't be there 48 hours without misin' it so much.

"And I think the valley's got possibilities that you can hardly imagine. We've just scratched the beginning.

"Fifty years from now Cameron County could—and possibly will—be the leading county in Texas. That sounds like I been smokin' marijuana, but with Padre Island beach, and the river, and the climate, and the border next to Latin America, Texas has the broadest boundary of any State with Latin America, and we're the county that penetrates Latin America like no other county.

"Say—we got a proposition down here, the Falcon Dam. The Federal Government not only put up the money to build it, all we put up down here was the lobbyin'. I believe the two counties put up $10,000 each, and that's all.

"This Texas has an outstanding future. We've got to get tourists. I don't know how it is or why it is, but when you get tourists, everything else seems to follow, especially industry. Take California. It started gettin' those rich midwestern farmers, who came to look and stayed. Flor-i-di is just about leadin' the Nation in industrial development—and in tourists.

"If we get this Padre Island beach, we'll move at a pace down here that'll startle the Nation."

What is politics like in the valley?

"Oh, to a large extent like politics everywhere. It ain't what it oughta be, but I guess it's the best there is. A person that's got a think skin's got no business in politics. In politics they'll charge you with anything under the sun and then they'll succeed in provin' it on you."

If a young man asked for advice on going into politics? "I'd say, Go. It's still the greatest opportunity to help your fellow man, the greatest calling to help your fellow man you could select."

FIVE PEOPLE

Q. "This may be a very foolish question, but if you had the chance to talk with any five people who ever lived, an afternoon each, who would you choose?"

The judge paused a few seconds. "That's not a foolish question at all," he finally replied.

"First would be the Humble Master," he said. "Then I think my second choice would be the Apostle Paul, then Robert E. Lee, then George Washington—and you may laugh at this, but I'd almost say George Washington Carver, that Negro over there.

"Now there was a great man. There wasn't a selfish bone in his body. They offered him $100,000 to be a chemist, and he turned 'em down. And what great things he did for the South. And he found more things in the peanut than what was in the peanut before he started, didn't he?

"You take that fellow Paul, wasn't he a spellbinder? They turned the beasts on him, the snakes bit him all over, he got tossed into the Mediterranean Sea—and he just kept right on goin'.

"Robert E. Lee—do you know he turned down a job as president of a big insurance company to go back to a small college for $125 a month?"

"I sure would like to work Thomas Edison and Benito Juarez in there somewhere.

WRONG CZAR

"I think we should push adult education to the extent there's not a single person in Texas or Latin America who doesn't know the three R's—readin', writin', 'rithmetic. One of the great ways to fight communism is to educate the masses.

"That John Birch Society, ain't that one hell of a society?

"Communism is the greatest menace that's ever been in the world—and I think societies like that help make Communists.

"You know, it's the way these people've been treated that makes communism. Look at the way the czars treated those poor people in Russia. Not so much the last czar as the ones before. I think they killed the wrong czar."

The judge likes to lace his talk with quotes from Burns and Goldsmith and Sam Johnson. But to him Shakespeare was the greatest writer of them all. "Why? Well, he touches—it's just full of human nature, human nature in the raw, full of the truth, that's what it is.

"How could one man know all he did—and he died in his fifties."

EXCELLENT COMPANY

Tom Sutherland drove the car on the way to the judge's home. The judge pointed to the old houses and landmarks of the city, and some of the new ones as well.

He lives in a simple frame house on the outskirts of Brownsville. The shadows of late afternoon were lengthening, and there was the sound of children across the street and down the block.

"We moved into this old house in 1914," he said. "My wife and I raised five children here. Now I'm alone, and I tell you, brother, it's pretty sad."

He opened the screen door and waved goodbye. "Judge," said Sutherland, a lover of the Valley and its people, "you're in excellent company even when you're by yourself."

A Father Looks at Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article which appeared in the Washington (D.C.) Star under date of February 6, 1962, by the distinguished journalist, Mr. Ralph McGill:

A FATHER LOOKS AT EDUCATION—REALIZATION OF ADVANCES BY STUDENTS OF TODAY SCARES YESTERDAY'S GENIUS

A father who graduated with honors from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology has not yet recovered from the Christmas visit of his son, a dean's-list sophomore at MIT.

"I simply could not read his books," said the father, with near panic in his voice. "I was called a young genius. Now I am an illiterate whose son's college books might as well be written in Sanskrit. It is very sad, really, to feel that one so soon has become a bumbling, obsolete man, restricted to a sort of 2-times-2-is-4 existence."

A silence fell. The middle-aged faces about the table were grave. One of the guests reached into a coat pocket and took out a well-worn, folded paper, which he opened.

"A few nights ago," he said, "I saw my senior high school son's mathbook open on his study table. I leaned over and read a paragraph. It overwhelmed me. I borrowed the book and copied the lines which, when I realized they were high school stuff, had made me feel old and ignorant." He read:

"We have defined the function $f: (x,y)$ whose values are given by $y=ax$. Now there is a particular number, a-greater-than-1 of great importance in mathematics. It is an irrational number and approximately equal to 2.71828. It bears the name "e"; thus e is (almost) equal to 2.71828."

"My son," he said, "did not seem perturbed by this and following paragraphs. I sug-

gested that it must be confusing to study about irrational numbers that do not really equal other numbers, but almost do and where a particular, very important number is greater than 1 but not quite 3, and bears the name of "e", which is almost equal to 2.71828. But," he continued, "I was perturbed. I went back to my chair and sat down carefully, knowing that most things break. I felt terribly alone and outside of things."

"I had been reading about the doings at Cape Canaveral," he said, "and I knew that the young scientists there carried in their minds formulas and computations that enabled them to think into space and back again. They could carry in their brains the irrational numbers, the elaborate expressions of equals-to and minus, of related values, of approximate equals and literal equals. They would be able to run these through their crewcut heads and know that an astronaut should fire his retroactive rockets over Africa to land near Miami."

The distraught father who, in another generation, was an honor graduate at MIT, and the humiliated sire of a high school student of today's generation, are more than symbols of the advance in man's knowledge. It is a humbling fact that in all fields of engineering, for example, the experience of a man in his forties and fifties, and beyond, is almost a liability.

It is a sobering truth that whatever wisdom middle and older ages have to offer in our time must be drawn almost solely from the fields of philosophy and experience gained in the testing of intangible values.

Most educators know this. They know, too, there are several millions of American children attending secondary schools that do not even offer enough instruction to enable their graduates to enter an accredited college or university. Still, State legislatures and the Congress refuse to take a good hard look at the facts of life in America today, and millions of parents continue to be disinterested in the quality of education offered in their communities' schools.

Haile Selassie Gets New Yacht

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am wondering just how stupid we can possibly get.

Following is an AP story telling how the United States converted a Navy seaplane tender at the cost of $3 million into a luxury yacht for Haile Selassie. I suppose if we had not done this, he would have gone Communist. When are we going to stop this foolishness and start thinking about the American taxpayer and America?

A friend of mine from Hamill, S. Dak., by the name of Edward Lind said, "If the Communists are going to bury us, we should be stubborn enough not to dig our own grave."

The article follows:

HAILE SELASSIE GETS NEW YACHT

SAN FRANCISCO—A U.S. Navy seaplane tender converted at a cost of $3 million into a state vessel for Ethiopian Emperor Haile Selassie has been turned over to the Ethiopian Navy.

The U.S.S. *Orca*, renamed the H.M.S. *Ethiopia*, was delivered to Prince Alexander Desta, a grandson of the Emperor, at the San Francisco Naval Shipyard Wednesday. Desta, 27, is deputy commander of the imperial Ethiopian Navy.

The ship will be commanded by Norwegian Capt. Rolf Henningsen, who said the H.M.S. *Ethiopia* will sail next month to join six other ships given to the Ethiopian Navy under the U.S. mutual assistance program.

Butting in on the Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the February 8 issue of the Washington Daily News entitled "Butting in on the Schools."

This editorial outlined a valid reason why Federal aid to our educational system is not needed.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUTTING IN ON THE SCHOOLS

A total of 600,000 public school classrooms must be built during this decade, according to President Kennedy's message on aid to education.

A little more than 2 years ago the Committee for Economic Development surveyed this field. It found classrooms were being built at the rate of 70,000 a year. That would be 700,000 in a decade, and without the Federal aid now declared to be vital.

That, in our view, is fairly characteristic of the message. In part it finds emergencies which do not exist. In part it proposes Federal butting in on affairs now capably handled by the States and local school districts.

"We must find the means of financing a 75-percent increase in the total cost of education," says the message, presumably referring to this decade. Public school expenditures in the last decade increased more than 100 percent, also without Federal aid for buildings or teachers' salaries.

Too many, says the message, leave school before completing high school. True. But the reasons are complex and largely unexplored. In any event, percentages of dropouts have decreased steadily.

Teachers' salaries are too low, says the message. Also true. But that condition steadily is being remedied. Average for the 1948–49 school year was $2,846. Ten years later, for 1958–59 it was $4,935. It has gone up since.

While the CED survey opposed a general subsidy, it found the poorer States need aid. Proposals before Congress include handouts for all, the rich as well as the poor.

In the words of the President, "Americans are still the best educated and best trained in the world." They got that way through an unparalleled devotion to the ideal of public education and a willingness of the people to tax themselves directly to pay the bills. There is no evidence this enthusiasm is diminishing.

We consider the President's push in this direction reasonably well meant but the fundamental demand comes from a busybody element in the bureaucracy which considers nothing run right unless it is run from Washington. Despite effusive reassurances, Federal control is bound to follow Federal financing.

In any event, this proposed subsidy is no gift. It all comes out of taxes which the Federal Government levies on the citizens of the localities. It would aid the States and the local districts with their own money.

We hope, as seems likely, that Congress will reject this scheme, as it applies to primary and secondary schools, again this year.

Sonic Booms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, a point is well made in the editorial from the Long Beach Press Telegram reprinted below. The article asks, "Why cannot the military authorities identify a sonic boom when it occurs?" In southern California, where such booms are common they may be heard by 6 to 10 million people, including responsible military people who should be able to identify them as such in order to reassure the public promptly at least as to the probability that that which was heard was a sonic boom rather than some other manifestation. This assurance would not involve any assumption of legal responsibility for damage occasioned by the boom. On several occasions I have contacted both military and civilian agencies respecting a boom occurring days or weeks past. On no occasion have I been notified that specific aircraft were responsible for it. Yet in each case the boom was heard and known to be a boom. It would not prejudice the Government to make known that a boom occurred and would operate to allay public apprehension.

PEOPLE WANT TO KNOW

When people hear a sudden noise resembling a clap of thunder pealing from a clear-blue sky, they quite naturally want to know: "What was it?"

Usually it is safe to conclude that the noise was a sonic boom, caused by a jet airplane traveling at supersonic speeds.

But how is the mere layman to know for sure? What he knows is that he's heard a startling noise, that he's disturbed, that he isn't sure whether he's supposed to be afraid and, if so, what he's supposed to do about it.

He goes to the telephone and calls the police, the fire department, or some other agency, but nobody seems to know the answer. They can tell him it wasn't an earthquake, an explosion, or thunder, but they can't tell him what it was. The standard answer from military authorities is that they don't know what it was, but if it was a jet, it was from some other flying field.

Somebody, of course, knows the story and could, if he would, make an official statement at such times to reassure citizens whose nerves are attuned to the shock waves of the atomic age.

Just once, when we pick up the telephone to question a military official about one of those explosive noises, we'd like to hear him

say something helpful like: "It was obviously a sonic boom; tell the people not to be disturbed."

Instead, the practice is to remain mysteriously silent or evasive, thus keeping people on edge about a happening that affects their nerves and their property. The sonic boom is a disturbance which, if not eliminated, at least deserves to be explained.

Retirement of Mrs. Louise Goff Reece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial in the Johnson City Press-Chronicle of January 17, 1962.

This editorial deals with the announced decision by Mrs. LOUISE GOFF REECE to retire as Representative from the First District of Tennessee upon completion of the present term. As we all know, Mrs. REECE was elected in May 1961, to serve the unexpired portion of the term to which her late husband, the Honorable B. Carroll Reece, had been elected—his 18th term in Congress, incidentally.

The editorial is a fine tribute to a gracious, intelligent lady and, in my opinion, accurately reflects the esteem in which she is held by the people in the First District. I shall miss her charming presence on the Hill.

The significance of Mrs. REECE's retirement from Congress has not been lost on other segments of the Tennessee press. Mr. Barney Ballard of the Associated Press in Nashville, in a story appearing in the Greeneville Sun of January 19, sees it as the end of what he calls the Reece era in Tennessee politics.

I ask unanimous consent that this article, as well as the editorial, appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISTRICT IS GRATEFUL: MRS. REECE HAS ACHIEVED HER PURPOSE

Mrs. LOUISE GOFF REECE's decision not to seek relection to Congress is quite understandable, though it will disappoint some of her friends.

When Mrs. REECE agreed to finish the unexpired term of her late husband, B. Carroll Reece, it was with the thought she could preserve continuity in the office and unity in the Republican Party of the First District. She had no personal ambition for the future. Her's was to be an interim tenure.

Mrs. REECE has achieved what she set out to achieve, and the people of the First District are grateful. She has maintained the high level of service established by her late husband, and she has given the district time to consider what decisions should be made for the years ahead. Clearly she has earned the surcease she now seeks.

People who have had business with her office have found her gracious, friendly, and eager to help. Moreover, they have found her effective in getting done whatever it was they wanted done. That, too, was in the tradition of the late Mr. Reece.

Mrs. REECE still has nearly a year to serve. Though the nominating primaries will be in August, and the election in November, her successor will not take office until January 1963.

From now until then Mrs. REECE will continue to give the district representation in which it can take justifiable pride. Meanwhile, it is as she says, "There are many competent and capable persons in the First District from whom to choose" her successor. The job of the voters is, again as Mrs. REECE says, "to select the best from this number."

LONG REECE ERA IN TENNESSEE POLITICS ENDS

(By Barney Ballard)

NASHVILLE.—The story said Mrs. LOUISE GOFF REECE had decided against seeking reelection to Congress from the First District. Thus ends the long "Reece era" in Tennessee politics.

It began over 40 years ago, when young Carroll Reece—World War hero, just back from Europe—first tried out his sprouting political wings. He ran for Congress.

Reece picked a good one for his opponent. Sam R. Sells, an affluent Johnson City businessman, had gone up from local and State politics to his seat in Congress. He was a strong Republican in a strong Republican area. Sells also was a war veteran—the Spanish-American War—and was seeking his sixth term in the House.

Even boys came out to hear the two opponents deliver campaign speeches—the colorful young war hero in his khaki uniform and the veteran Congressman, a one-armed campaigner who knew nearly everybody in upper east Tennessee.

Reece, onetime farm boy from Butler in Johnson County, was elected. He took his House seat for the first time on March 3, 1921, and with minor exceptions he remained Tennessee's "Mr. Republican" until he died nearly a year ago.

He lost one race for reelection to O. B. Lovett in the early 1930's and took time out in the late 1940's to serve 2 years as Republican national chairman. The rest of the time, Reece spent serving the people of his district, mending political fences, helping other Republicans get elected—or try to get elected—to public office, and looking after his own private investments.

Reece made many friends, some of them Democrats; and he made a few enemies, some of them in his own party. But even his opponents admitted Reece was "the man to see" by any Republican trying to get ahead.

"Old Carroll would do a favor for anybody in his district," one of his Republican opponents says. "He's even done favors for me."

With few exceptions, however, no Republican ever seriously challenged Reece's political authority in Tennessee for the better part of 40 years.

Meantime, numerous young Republicans—older ones, too—waited for the time when Reece would retire, as he frequently said he would, to seek his old House seat. But Reece never retired and the politically ambitious Republicans waited and waited and waited.

When Reece died in March of last year, at least a dozen names were mentioned as possible candidates. All but two or three decided against running, though, when Mrs. REECE agreed to seek the nomination for the remainder of the term.

Mrs. REECE, herself a member of a political family before her marriage, worked closely with her husband during his many years in public office. But her decision to retire means the end of the "Reece era."

Some Republican leaders fear the fight for succession might tear the party apart in a district which never sends a Democrat to Congress. Some Democrats hope such fears are nothing trivial.

But sometime this year a new man will be elected to Congress from the First District and—who knows?—perhaps another new era in Tennessee politics will be born.

The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce Is Being Asked To Conduct an Investigation and Study of the Adequacy of the Regulation of Nonscheduled Airlines in the Light of the Imperial Airlines Crash at Richmond, Va., November 8, 1961, Killing 74 Army Recruits and 3 Crew Members

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, last week under leave to extend my remarks which appeared on page A1001 of the Februray 8, 1962, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, through inadvertence the statement referred to was not included preceding the House resolution which I stated I would introduce February 12, 1962.

The statement referred to, and which is being made a part of my remarks, represents my additional views which were voiced as a member of the subcommittee following my refusal to sign the report of the special Subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services, authorized to investigate the Imperial Airlines plane crash near Richmond, Va., November 8, 1961, at which time 74 Army recruits and 3 crew members lost their lives.

In an effort to restore continuity to my remarks of last week on the subject, following is the statement omitted in the extension of remarks on February 8, 1962, together with a copy of the House resolution which I introduced February 12, 1962:

ADDITIONAL VIEWS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, MEMBER OF A SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO INVESTIGATE CRASH OF IMPERIAL AIRLINES, INC., AIRPLANE AT RICHMOND, VA., NOVEMBER 8, 1961

While I am in accord generally with the views expressed by my colleagues, Mr. HARDY and Mr. BREWSTER, it is my opinion that the committee report and recommendations do not deal adequately with the situation resulting from the air tragedy on November 8, 1961, that took the lives of 74 Army recruits and 3 crew members.

On page 3018 of the special subcommittee hearings, Administrator Alan Boyd, of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, had this to say:

"The nature of the violations were in the economic area: (1) the submission of misleading financial data; (2) ticketing irregularities; (3) tariff violations; (4) filing false statements with the Board."

On page 3073 of the hearings Najeeb Halaby, Federal Aviation Agency Administrator said:

"A special inspection conducted in August, September, and November 1961, indicated the following discrepancies: (1) use of uncertificated airmen on a revenue flight; (2) noncompliance with airplane flight manual; (3) failure to file a flight plan prior to a particular flight; (4) unauthorized appearance on an aircraft flight deck; (5) a failure to list all mechanical discrepancies; (6) ferrying aircraft without ferry flight authorization; (7) absence of fuel records for the month of October 1961."

On page 3077 of the hearings I asked Administrator Halaby the question as to whether or not "there was confusion in the cockpit as the result of a conversation between the pilot and copilot, as to who would pilot the ship. Does this cockpit confusion stem from lack of management?" Administrator Halaby replied:

"I would say it represents both."

In the CAB's accident report released on February 6, 1962, on page 24 the following is stated:

"From a study of all information available to the Board it is concluded that this flight crew was not capable of performing the function or assuming the responsibility for the job they presumed to do. The Board further concludes that the management personnel of Imperial Airlines should have been aware of the manner in which company operations were being accomplished. It is believed that the substandard maintenance practices of Imperial's employees were condoned by management. The manner in which maintenance personnel records were kept by the company confirms this conclusion."

The above statements by the Administrators of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Aviation Agency, as well as the CAB report of February 6, 1962, show evidence of criminal neglect on the part of the management and employees of Imperial Airlines, resulting in the death of 74 Army recruits and 3 crew members.

In view of the allegations which border on criminal negligence, it is my opinion that the U.S. Government has the following responsibility:

1. Insist that the findings of both investigations be referred to the Department of Justice and that the Attorney General proceed immediately to determine the legality of bringing criminal charges against Imperial Airlines.

2. It is my intention to introduce the proper resolution in the House of Representatives authorizing a full-scale congressional investigation of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Aviation Agency in relation to the manner in which they administered laws regarding the supplemental airlines, commonly referred to as nonskeds. This investigation should include the Imperial Airlines tragedy November 8, 1961, to the end that such a tragedy should not happen again.

From the February 7, 1962 issue of the Washington Daily News, I quote the following telling statement:

"The callous neglect, all around, which resulted in the Richmond tragedy is unforgivable."

For the reasons cited above I refused to sign the subcommittee report.

HOUSE RESOLUTION INTRODUCED BY MR. VAN ZANDT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, ON MONDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1962

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study at the earliest practicable time of the adequacy of the regulation of supplemental air carriers (commonly referred to as "nonscheduled airlines"), with particular emphasis upon Imperial Airlines, by the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Aviation Agency insofar as concerns requirements of safe equipment, competent and trained personnel, sufficient inspections and other safety measures, adequate maintenance, adequate records of maintenance and servicing, and compliance with operating standards, instructions, and manuals. Such investigation and study shall be conducted in the light of the crash of an aircraft of the Imperial Airlines on November 8, 1961, at Richmond, Va., killing 74 Armed Forces recruits and 3 members of the crew, in order to determine the extent to which this tragedy was the result of inadequate regulations or inadequate enforcement of existing regulations, as well as neglect on the part of management and employees of that airline, with a view to recommending such measures as the Congress may adopt to prevent a recurrence of the factors leading to this tragedy.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

Kansas Wants Federal Aid to Education Without Federal Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram which I have just received from Mr. C. O. Wright, executive secretary of Kansas State Teachers Association, advising that at a seven State regional conference held at Wichita, Kans., February 8–10, the Kansas State Teachers Association went on record giving approval to my new approach to Federal aid to education without Federal control:

TOPEKA, KANS.,
February 10, 1962.

Hon. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The teachers of Kansas are pleased to learn that a bipartisan movement is underway to promote Federal aid to public schools without Federal control through a measure similar to that proposed by you. The schools of Kansas face a serious financial crisis. The Kansas Legislature, which adjourned last week, gave, in State money, only 1-percent increase to the school budget. This is but a token increase. Kansas schools, with 15,000 more pupils next year face a reduction rather than an increase in the school budgets, for many districts have no legal way to provide more funds. Local property taxes are now confiscatory. We urge your support of the new bipartisan movement.

Classroom teachers of Kansas (771 in attendance at a 7-State regional conference at Wichita, February 8–10, representing 24,000 teachers of the State).

C. O. WRIGHT,
Executive Secretary, Kansas State Teachers Associations.

Government and the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a letter just received from one of my constituent farm families. This couple, with their six children, in my opinion, very aptly express the majority opinion of the grassroots dairy farmers of New York State.

Following many years experience with Federal milk orders, they now find that they are producing a Government inspected and controlled item at 9 cents per quart, which is delivered in New York City at 32 cents to the consumer.

The producers' letter follows:

GREAT BIRCH FARM,
Sharon Springs, N.Y., February 7, 1962.

Hon. J. ERNEST WHARTON,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WHARTON: Our family, my wife and I and our six children, own and operate a family-size dairy farm in Schoharie County. We have a top herd of 25 registered Holsteins on DHIA test and grow the usual associated dairy farm crops.

Both my wife and I are college educated people and believe that we are deep thinkers.

We are deeply distressed by the obvious bungling in Government controlled agricultural programs. Our city friends picture us receiving huge checks from the R.D. mailman every day signed by "Yours truly, Uncle Sam." Naturally you know this a fallacy. We have a tremendous investment in our business and work very hard maintaining our high levels of production so as to provide our family with what we feel is a good standard of living.

We are consistently plagued by mailers from the USDA tempting us to accept cash payments for seed, fertilizer, lime, and machine hire to assist in our normal farm crop operations. On the other hand, we are aware that increased production on our acreage, resulting from this program, will only contribute to an already staggering surplus of dairy products. We never will voluntarily accept any Government payments for raw materials to be used in our farm business because we feel there is no need for this type of charity program.

Agriculture and its effect upon the economy of this Nation is so complex that I am positive there is not one soul on the face of the earth who has a mental capacity to manage a control program of any description, whether it be acreage, production, or etc.

What we feel would benefit both producer and consumer and save the taxpayer of this country an absolute fortune every year, would be for the Government to get out of the farm business. If all support prices were removed gradually over a 5-year period, for instance, the law of supply and demand would take hold of the market and the surpluses would be eliminated simultaneously.

Our country, in a short span of six generations, has stemmed from a minute colony of freedom-loving pilgrims into the foremost Nation in the world by a system of free enterprise. God help us if we destroy this system.

Yours truly,
PAUL S. AND ROSITA M. KLEINBERGER.

Cooperation Between University of Texas and Austin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in a recent article in the Texas Parade, Mr. Jack MaGuire, director of the University of Texas Ex-Students' Association, has written a most informative article on the importance of a strong alliance between a university and the city in which it is located.

Such a partnership exists between Austin, the capital city of Texas, and the University of Texas, fifth largest State-supported institution of higher education in the Nation.

This bond between Austin and the great University of Texas is working to the advantage of the city, the students, and to the entire State. Of particular importance is the emphasis placed by the city of Austin and the University of Texas upon making full use of the high-caliber engineers, chemists, physicists, mathematicians and other scientists within the State of Texas.

Because the article by Mr. MaGuire deals with matters of interest to all university cities, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. It is entitled "University of the First Class," and appeared in the December edition of the Texas Parade.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF THE FIRST CLASS—HIGH CALIBER OF SCIENTIFIC BRAINPOWER FROM UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS IS KEY TO GROWING INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH COMMUNITY IN STATE'S CAPITAL CITY

In a certain industrial city the scientists and researchers of a large company were perfecting a new product that offered great promise to the first manufacturer that could get it on the market. A breakthrough could come any day. But before it did, a breakdown came in the plant. A "bug" developed somewhere in the production line of an old and highly competitive product. So the scientists were pulled out of the laboratory to help salvage the company's position on what was already a low-profit item. They were eminently successful. But while they were doing this another company got the new product on the market first and had already retired research and tooling costs and recovered a handsome profit before the first competition hit the field.

The moral of this story is that the firms who get along better in this space age are those which have their research staffs working so far away from production operations that "fires" in the factory don't interfere with the basic functions of those who man the laboratories.

And herein lies a challenge and an opportunity to the city of Austin and the University of Texas. A similar challenge was met and a like opportunity exploited in bringing corporate research in volume to the campuses and environs of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Princeton, Stanford, and several other leading schools of advanced research in America.

In Austin and at the university this challenge has brought a determination that business and brains can prosper better together than separately.

Here there is a deliberate alliance between town and gown—something new to Texas. Austin is indeed a culturally bent community, sometimes called "the Athens of Texas." Even casual visitors agree it is one of the most beautiful State capital cities in the Nation. The other partner in the alliance, the University of Texas, is the fifth largest State-supported system of higher education in the country. It's fast becoming one of the best.

Although Austin has been home to the university's sprawling campus for 78 years, the attitude of the city and the school toward each other has been, until the past few years, one of mutual toleration rather than cooperation.

By this fall if there remained any holdouts from the town-and-gown arrangement, they saw the error of their ways when Houston, and not Austin, was selected as site for a $60 million project relating to setting up a transportation system between the earth and the moon.

Actually Austin could not have met one of the two major specifications for the site. The moonshot team wanted deepwater transportation near a major university. Austin didn't have the docks and access to the sea, but it does have a major university and is loaded for bear when the next prospect comes around looking for a research site not contingent on sea breezes, channel depths, and wharfage facilities.

The University of Texas, with a faculty and staff of 4,000 and an enrollment of more than 20,000, has always provided Austin's second largest payroll (next to State government) and been one of its best customers. On the other hand, the city's delightful climate, natural beauty—hills, oak trees, winding streams, and lakes—and unlimited recreation has attracted both faculty and students to the university.

In consequence the university has won national recognition for the caliber of engineers, chemists, physicists, mathematicians and other scientists it turns out. But 80 percent of these graduates have been going out of State for jobs. That deeply concerned both the university and the Austin leadership. They united in a move to bring new jobs to Austin to halt the drain on the State's best brainpower.

Thus it was no accident when Dr. J. Neils Thompson, one of the country's best known specialists in structural mechanics, was named chairman of the chamber of commerce industrial committee. Dr. Thompson heads the university's huge Balcones Research Center and is a consultant to industries throughout the United States. A personable, widely traveled man, he was the logical person to tell the Austin story to business. And he had a good story to tell:

The city already is the home of 130 light, diversified industries—the kind both the chamber of commerce and the university are convinced the area can best serve. These include three private research organizations, stone and granite production in the beautiful hill country that rings the city, millwork, printing, furniture, precision instruments, brick, chemicals, fabricated metals and transportation equipment.

Beginning in the heart of downtown Austin and stretching for 60 miles into the hills is a chain of six lakes. Their more than 150 miles of shoreline not only provide some of the finest and least expensive recreation in Texas, but the reservoirs store more than a trillion gallons of fresh water—enough to provide hydroelectric power for a city of more than a million people.

The Austin public school system ranks among the best anywhere and 33 of its 57 buildings are less than 10 years old. In addition, there are 15 private and parochial grade schools and 5 parochial and private high schools.

The city's municipal recreation system has no peer. There are 31 parks and playgrounds, 21 municipal swimming pools (of which all but 4 charge no admission), 4 community centers, 8 athletic fields, 2 municipal golf courses, and a municipal tennis center.

From the standpoint of climate, Austin is ideal. The average winter temperature is from 40 to 60 degrees (the mercury drops to freezing or below only 19 days a year) and from 74 to 94 in summer. Rainfall averages 35 inches annually.

"All of these things, plus our adequate supply of labor, are important to industry," Dr. Thompson says. "Austin's finest asset for business, however, is its concentration of higher education. I don't believe there is a city of comparable size in the South or Southwest that can match the number and quality of the highly trained consultants or the research facilities which we have here."

The University of Texas, the largest in the South, is where the greatest number of technical experts are concentrated. However, Austin also is the home of St. Edward's University, a Jesuit school, and of Concordia College, a Lutheran liberal arts college. It also has two theological seminaries and has more than a score of technical schools and liberal arts colleges within a 200-mile radius.

It is the University of Texas, however, that has both the laboratories and the training facilities for technicians which Dr. Thompson believes will be most appealing to industry. This next June, for example, the university will graduate 475 engineers from a college that now ranks among the best engineering schools in the Nation. In addition, 105 engineers will take master's degrees and 10 others will receive doctorates.

"The 1962 class of engineers alone would staff a half dozen good-sized industries," Dr. B. H. Amstead, associate dean of the engineering college, says.

This spring, the university also will graduate 90 chemists, 65 physicists, and185 mathematicians. Altogether more than 1,500 scientists in various fields will take their degrees and be ready to begin careers in business and industry.

"That is why we would like to see more jobs available for these graduates in Austin and Texas," Dean of Engineering W. W. Hagerty says. "When industry is close by, it puts heavy demands on a university and the university responds. Both benefit because it is a mutual proposition. Industry today doesn't locate where it can't have a continuing supply of technicians. And universities don't achieve first-class status unless industry is there to provide good jobs for first-rate students."

In addition to trained manpower, however, industry requires easily available research facilities and competent consultants. The University of Texas offers both.

The Balcones Research Center, a sprawling 400-acre collection of buildings that looks more like a frontier army post than the scientific wonderland that it is, houses 27 different laboratories. Here university professors, most of them famous names in their specialized fields, conduct experiments that range from space psychology to further study of the atom.

At the $8 million laboratory, isolated from the campus and located in an outlying section of Austin near a new industrial park, scientists work in archeology, economic geology, civil engineering, electrical engineering, and combustion kinetics. One section is devoted to experimental aerodynamics, another to nuclear physics, another to rockets and still another to radio carbon dating.

"No one, not even the president of the university, tells these scientists what to do," Dr. Thompson explains. "All we ask is that they produce."

And produce they do. It was at Balcones that the first monkey to be orbited into space was trained. It was there that the problem of parachuting a loaded jeep through a thousand feet of sky without having it break up on landing was solved. Balcones researchers have developed new grasses for ranchers, conducted research with new drugs on animals and determined the maximum stress on new and old metals.

Across town and near the main campus of the university, the defense research laboratories work almost around the clock. These laboratories also are staffed by university personnel, but much of their work is secret. However, many of the new ideas and materials which these labs have developed first for the Government are later available to business and the staff is available for consultation.

That both industry and Government have begun to recognize the University of Texas as a research center can best be demonstrated by the growth of this activity during the last 10 years. In 1951, there were 37 Government-sponsored research projects at the university. This year, there are 247 such projects. In addition, industry and the university itself will spend another $1 million in 1961–62 on various research projects that will aid business.

Much of this new interest of industry in the university has come about because of the school's rapid advance toward a place alongside the best schools in the country. This is reflected in the quality of students the university is attracting now.

"In 1956, only 14 percent of the incoming freshmen in the college of engineering made the equivalent of 80 or higher on the pre-engineering ability tests," according to Associate Dean Amstead. "This last September, 60 percent of the new freshmen made an equivalent grade of 80 or more. This is a dramatic change that indicates the caliber of the students we are getting today as opposed to the caliber we were getting only 5 years ago."

Everywhere on the campus, the university is busy upgrading its facilities to meet the new demands of business and industry for trained minds and better research. The institution is just now beginning to realize its potential in nuclear physics with the installation this year of a 3-million-electron-volt Van de Graff accelerator. A new reactor is being installed in the college of engineering and new negative-ion injectors and larger tandem generators are on order.

"These facilities, along with the individuals capable of doing research, will move the University of Texas forward to a position of leadership in the field of nuclear physics," Dean Hagerty predicts.

The same is true all over the campus. Only a month ago, the university opened its new half-million-dollar computer center. Here all-transistorized controlled data computers 160 and 1604 will perform intricate calculations in a millionth of a second. These electronic marvels will do everything from translating foreign languages into English to simulating (and helping to solve) the problems faced by a business.

Making—and keeping—the "educational climate" in the State enticing to business and industry is the primary role the university will play in its new partnership with the city of Austin.

"Business needs, and is actively recruiting, the best minds it can find," Dr. Harry Ransome, chancellor of the university system, says. "It wants them trained in economics, government, engineering, and other specialized areas essential to business operation and survival in our complex society. Modern industry also must have the best and newest in research facilities, competent consultants, access to libraries, and the most modern technical aids. For too long now, industry has had to look out of State for these things to find the quality it must have. Now the University of Texas and Austin can offer industry what it wants and we hope that industry will respond."

The dream of both the city's planners and the academicians is to develop around the university in Austin the same kind of industrial complex that already has come to other cities with similar educational facilities. Near the campuses of Harvard and MIT, companies like RCA, Raytheon, Avco, Sylvania, Polaroid, and others have built their plants so their technical personnel could be near these outstanding universities. A similar development has mushroomed around Princeton University in New Jersey, around Stanford University at Palo Alto, Calif., and around a branch of the University of California at San Diego.

In full partnership with the University of Texas, Austin is confident that the next such development will be there.

The Free World's Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, later this week U.S. Astronaut Lt. Col. John Glenn will seek to orbit the earth from Cape Canaveral. The event will evidence a relative relationship between the scientific technologies of the United States and the Soviet Union. It also will evidence the difference between the manner in which an open society, such as the United States, reveals such an event to the knowledge of the world and a closed society, such as the Soviet Union, secrets its doings and withholds information from its own people as well as others. In a broader sense the event also exemplifies the deep divergence between these two societies in their attitudes toward the Almighty.

As related in the following Christmas editorial appearing in the Long Beach Press Telegram, Nikita Khrushchev has made Soviet space events the excuse for an irreverent effort to broadcast communism's antagonism for religion.

In contrast to the Communist leader's atheism, millions of Americans pray to God for Colonel Glenn's safe return. I rather suspect that other millions throughout the world join in those prayers, for this editorial, unusual in that it carried the author's byline, also was sent with a New Year's message by Mrs. Kelly and her husband, Rear Adm. Thomas J. Kelly, U.S. Navy, retired, to friends in many lands. Responses from people of many faiths, including Moslems, Buddhists, and Hindus all indicated they, too, cling to their faith in the Almighty in an era of peril and are moved to know Americans feel the same way.

Forebearers of the editorial's author were pioneers in Tennessee nearly a century and a half ago. She is a product of the so-called Bible Belt of America. But certainly her inspirational words spring neither from her pioneer ancestry nor the chance of her birthplace. Millions of other people in America and millions in the rest of the world have her same faith. It is the power of that faith that eventually will overcome the evil of communism as it has overcome so many other evils down through the centuries.

Although Colonel Glenn may not bring back angel feathers from his trip into space, he will take with him and bring back with him the real power of America and of freemen everywhere—the power so desperately feared by the men of the Kremlin—the power generated by faith in man's divine guidance.

The editorial follows:

"FEAR NOT, BE OF GOOD CHEER," ANGEL MESSAGE

Everyone who cherishes childhood memories of the birthday of Jesus knows that a traditional Christmas tree must have an angel.

This is as it should be, for angels have played dramatic roles, in the Judaic-Christian religions, in announcing God's gracious purposes for man.

When shepherds trembled in the cold, desert air at midnight on bleak hills near Bethlehem, "* * * The angel said unto them, fear not for I bring you tidings of great joy."

The angel of the Lord told Jesus' mother to "fear not," for she had been chosen. The angel of the Lord warned Joseph to take the young Child and His mother into Egypt—and when to return to Israel.

The Old and New Testaments repeatedly attest of angelic messengers who told men three things: to fear only the Lord, to be of good cheer, and to arise.

The final admonition makes it clear that God intends man to help himself by taking action.

Premier Khrushchev cynically said that he sent two men to orbit the earth to look for angels but they did not find a single wing feather.

Those who love God know there are many kinds of angels. There are the radiant earthly angels, loving parents, devoted husbands and wives, adored children, and true friends who bring heaven on earth into the hearts of the truly fortunate. There are also the souls who, with angelic nobility, enrich all of humanity.

There are the divine angels of thought, inspiration, and solace that speak of God's mercy and grace. There are the angels of memory, trust, and faith that transform us all at Christmas into the children who are solely eligible to enter heaven.

With the special Christmas wisdom that angels bring to good children, may we realize anew that nothing in heaven or on earth is more glorious that love which comes from God and which is as close to every person as his heartbeat. As you celebrate the Christ

Child's birthday, may each joyful and loving moment illuminate your life.

In the midst of the perils of 1961 our Christmas wish is that you will remember the words of the beloved 34th Psalm:

"The angel of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear Him and delivereth them."

Unseen Side of the Man They Called Mr. Speaker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Mr. D. B. Hardeman, "Unseen Side of the Man They Called Mr. Speaker":

UNSEEN SIDE OF THE MAN THEY CALLED MR. SPEAKER

(By D. B. Hardeman)

Sam Rayburn was all that has been said of him in the eulogies. He was a man of great honor and high ideals. But he was also a man of earthy humor and plain ideas and this was the man I got to know in my years of close association with him.

His roots were deep in the land of northeast Texas. "I love the dirt," he said. "I like to walk on it. I like to grow things on it. I like to preserve it. Everything comes from the dirt and eventually goes back to the dirt." He shared a mutual respect and understanding for his people—"the real people," he always called them. Soon after he became Speaker of the House—"Mr. Speaker" he was called—he went home to discuss with his neighbors the threat of Adolf Hitler to Bonham, Tex., and the world. "We meet always and in all places as equals," he told them. "Among us we have no classes and no cliques."

His devotion to "the real people" and his enthusiasm for serving them were part of his heritage. From his father he acquired a love of politics. "Pa took his citizenship as a sacred duty," Sam said. From his mother, a woman of stern self-discipline and a keen mind, he learned judgment and patience. From both parents he acquired a deep sense of honor. "Matt" Rayburn lived to be 80 and was a strong, loving influence on Sam throughout her life. Early this year when he was in the middle of the hardest battle of his congressional career over a proposal to enlarge the House Rules Committee, he told me: "What I wouldn't give to be able to sit down and talk over some of these problems with my little old mother right now."

Outside his family, Sam's affections ran strongly toward children and young people. "I've never seen the Speaker around dogs," Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON said, "but I'll bet they love him because children do." They took to him instinctively. They crawled all over his and rubbed their hands over his bald head. I believe the only great disappointment of his life was that he had no children of his own. His brief marriage in 1927 was childless. Once when the Bonham Campfire Girls visited his home he said, "Now what do you girls want to talk about?"

"Were is your wife?" one small girl piped up.

"I don't have a wife," he replied gently.

"Why don't you have one?" She persisted.

"Oh, I'm so cranky that nobody would have me," he said with a laugh.

"I'll marry you," another girl said.

Rayburn roared with delight.

In Washington Mr. Sam enjoyed meeting groups of young people. A high government official might be lucky to get 10 minutes of his time on a busy day but the Speaker would gladly devote an hour or more talking with high school or college students. "I like young men," he said.

"Their minds and bodies are more resilient." LYNDON JOHNSON once confessed: "The Speaker and I have always been very close but if we are not as close as we were once, it is because I'm almost 50. If you notice, he never has old men around him."

The young men—and the old—who got to know Rayburn best in Washington were those who were welcomed in his hideaway on the ground floor of the Capitol. There in the late afternoon the "board of education" met for some light drinking and informal politicking. Away from work Sam's personality was dominated by laughter, cajolery and down-to-earth humor. He rarely told jokes in his speeches ("I tried it once and before I got through I was the joke"). But in private he liked to tell jokes on himself. Soon after William P. Rogers became Attorney General in the Eisenhower administration, the Speaker struck up a conversation with him at a formal dinner although they had not been introduced. Finally Rayburn inquired, "Do you have a position in the Department of Justice?"

"Yes," came the reply. "I am the Attorney General."

To work for Sam Rayburn was to join the large family as another admiring member. He was very sentimental about his employees—at his Washington office, at home in Bonham, at the Rayburn Library. His Negro cook, Bobbie Phillips, was master of the Rayburn kitchen for 24 years until she died. When another employee once complained that his Christmas gift was not as large as hers, Bobbie flared: "Shut your mouth. You just ain't been a Rayburn as long as the rest of us."

Although he could be hard and cold on business matters a basic gentleness always showed through when he was dealing with his helpers or acquaintances on a personal level. I once remarked to him about his extreme politeness to waitresses and bellhops, "I wouldn't be unkind to a little boy or a girl waiting on me for all the gold in Fort Knox," he said. "That little girl might be your sister or mine. What we do in this life is often determined by a mighty small margin. I missed being a tenant farmer by just that much"—he snapped his fingers—"but someone was kind to me in my youth."

Despite his courtesy and patience, Mr. Sam did not believe in taking an insult lying down. When a constituent wired demanding that certain action be taken and implying that the Speaker was not doing his job, Rayburn replied: "I have received your insulting telegram. I think I am perfectly capable of tending to my business and if you would tend to yours, I think it would take most of your free time. The matter has already been taken care of."

One of the big irritations in Rayburn's life was tardiness. We once got a late start on a drive from Bonham to Dallas where he was to address the delegates to the American Medical Association. When he realized we would probably arrive behind schedule he exploded, "I loathe being late. And I loathe people who are late."

Then he began to laugh at himself. "That reminds me of John—who lived out from Bonham," he said. "He was getting married Saturday afternoon at 6 o'clock. He picked cotton till noon, then shaved, got a haircut, took a bath, trimmed his toenails, and was getting dressed.

"One of the groomsmen said, 'If you don't hurry you're going to be late to your wedding.'

" 'Waal," said John, 'they can't do no business till I get there.'

"So I guess," Sam wound up, "that the doctors will just have to wait."

Mr. Sam was also annoyed by inactivity. When he could think of nothing else to do at home in Bonham he would get out all his shoes and polish them. He dreaded holidays and Sundays because visitors were few. One Saturday early this year Rayburn restlessly roamed his Capitol offices. Finally he lay down to take a nap. In a few minutes he emerged, grinning.

"If this keeps up," he said, "I'll be like old Howard, down south of Bonham. Every day he dressed up and stood around on the courthouse square all morning, just talking. One day a fellow asked an old colored man, 'Say, what does that fellow do?' He replied, 'Well, sir, he don't do nothing all morning and he rests all afternoon.' "

Despite his need to keep occupied, Rayburn was a cautious, patient man. He never rushed into a decision. He carefully planned his words and actions. He used to remind us, "One of the smartest things anybody ever said was 'Wait a minute.' " And he adopted for his own a maxim attributed to President Calvin Coolidge: "You never have to explain something you didn't say." He admired brevity and clarity in the House. A freshman Congressman once asked him if he was talking too much on the floor.

"Yes," Rayburn said.

"Well, what should I do about it?"

"Quit it," Rayburn said.

The Speaker was a Democrat by deep conviction. He believed that his party knew best how to run the Government of the United States. Two months after he arrived in Washington in 1913 he wrote his first speech for Congress. In it were the principles—and hopes—that would serve him the rest of his life: "It is now my sole purpose here to help enact such wise and just laws that our common country will by virtue of these laws be a happier and a more prosperous country. I have always dreamed of a country which I believe this should and will be, and that is one in which the citizenship is an educated and patriotic people, not swayed by passion and prejudice, and a country that knows no East, no West, no North, no South, but inhabited by a people liberty-loving, patriotic, happy and prosperous, with its lawmakers having no other purpose than to write such just laws as shall in the years to come be of service to human kind yet unborn."

In political campaigns Sam was a fierce opponent. Yet he was held in affection by most Republicans because, while he fought hard, he never fought unfairly. "The greatest ambition a man can have is to be a just man," he often said.

A newspaperman once asked, "Mr. Speaker, you see probably a hundred people a day. You tell each one 'Yes,' 'No,' or 'Maybe.' You never seem to make notes on what you have told them, but I never heard of your forgetting anything you have promised them. What is your secret?"

Rayburn's hot brown eyes flashed:

"If you tell the truth the first time," he replied, "you don't have to remember."

The Ideal of Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, today, Monday, February 12, is again the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, who was twice elected President of these United States:

To wit, on November 6, 1860, and November 8, 1864.

Most of the present Members of this great legislative body have heard me say on previous birthday occasions of Abraham Lincoln that since early boyhood he has been my ideal of American statesmanship in the best interests of our beloved Nation. I think that it is a fact that as February 12 came around each calendar year of the 15 years I have now served in this body I have taken occasion to say something on the floor of the House, or do something on said birthday which would indicate my continued highest regard for and respect of this former President of the United States who was born in Kentucky on February 12, 1809, and admitted to the practice of the law in the State of Illinois in 1836.

And let us not forget that he was a duly elected Member of the House of Representatives and served in the U.S. Congress as a member of the Committee on Education.

During most of the 30 years I actively and enjoyably practiced law in Los Angeles County, Calif., before I came here more than 15 years ago, I continued my established habit of having a facsimile of Abraham Lincoln on one side of an attractive card about U.S. postal card size with statistical data about him and on the reverse side thereof I had printed the following text:

EXTRACT FROM LINCOLN'S GETTYSBURG ADDRESS DELIVERED NOVEMBER 19, 1863

(Compliments of one who is inspired by Lincoln's life)

Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that Nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field, as a final resting place of those who here gave their lives that that Nation might live.

But in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate—we cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow this ground.

It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

Mr. Speaker, because Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg speech to me has always been one of the most magnificent and appropriate speeches in the English language, in meeting newsboys, Western Union messengers, and other lads from time to time I would present to them one of such cards and say to them that if they would learn the Gettysburg speech within a period of 30 days from the time I delivered them the card, and would look me up and recite it to me, I would present to said lad the sum of $1. So it is, as I consider in retrospect, I believe that there are hundreds of American men who thus learned the text of Abraham Lincoln's speech and earned and received at least $1.

Mr. Speaker, I know you and my colleagues will pardon this personal anecdote but I speak for many other Members of this great legislative body the very satisfactory experience of emphasizing and giving due place to the life of Abraham Lincoln and to the historical value and significance of his Gettysburg speech.

Keep City Hall in Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, more and more restrictions are being placed on the basic freedoms of the American people by the Federal Government that is supposed to protect these liberties under the Constitution.

There is one word, I believe, that summarizes the reason for this encroachment on our freedom. That word is "bureaucracy," meaning government by bureau heads. This often leads to formal administration according to whim.

There are numerous cases to document this trend. Now we have another attempt by the administration to set up a new department which would take the business of running our cities away from city hall and place it in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, the subject of the proposed Department of Urban Affairs has been discussed in an editorial that appeared in the Seattle, Wash., Times on January 26, 1962. I believe it is worth reading and recommend it to all Members of Congress.

The editorial follows:

KEEP CITY HALL IN BUSINESS

A ruling of the U.S. Supreme Court has clearly set our the principle that where the Federal Government subsidizes it has an obligation to regulate.

Congress should keep this in mind in considering President Kennedy's attempt to bypass the House Rules Committee on his proposal to set up a new Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs.

The Rules Committee, in the first significant congressional action of the new session, rejected the President's plan, 9 to 6.

Mr. Kennedy now proposes to set up the Department by the reorganization process, which means his plan could take effect within 60 days unless the House or the Senate rejects it by majority vote.

Before permitting this "end run" by the White House, Congress should take careful note of the probable long-range effect of the administration's proposal upon traditional American principles and practices of local government under local control.

What the administration wants to do is put the Federal Government into virtually every aspect of big-city municipal administration, including police work, transportation, public works, pollution, public welfare, youth training, health and certain types of construction.

Many members of the U.S. Conference of Mayors support the President's program.

Those elected city officials who do so, it seems to us, are attempting to abdicate their responsibilities. They are willing to surrender their own powers of decision in exchange for Federal money in their community programs.

In any program largely supported by Federal funds—no matter how local—the ultimate power of decision rests, not with the local officials, but in Washington, D.C.

The Federal highway program is an excellent example. Local officials have been required to submit every detail of design in the Seattle freeway, for instance, to the Bureau of Public Roads in Washington, D.C.

Another example: The Federal Government recently entered the Washington State dispute over whether pulp mills are polluting Puget Sound waters.

Observers are agreed that this issue can be settled ultimately only in the courts, and that the only practical effect of the Federal intervention has been to postpone for 6 months or a year any chance to bring the dispute to a head.

We are not suggesting that the Federal Government should not have a substantial voice in projects enjoying substantial Federal support.

We are saying that there are local projects, local issues, and local problems in which the Federal Government does not belong.

If everything is ultimately to be decided in Washington, D.C., the day will come when it will be unimportant to elect good administrators to local offices. The necessity, rather, will be for good lobbyists.

A Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs would result, in the first place, in the creation of a vast new bureaucratic beehive, with the new bees set to buzzing in every corner of the country, and the taxpayers supplying the honey.

It is pointed out by advocates of the President's program that rural America has its own Cabinet voice in the form of the Department of Agriculture, and urban America should have the same.

Well, no reasonably informed citizen needs to be told that the Federal farm program for years—under both Democratic and Republican administrations—has been a resounding failure, a prize example of confusion and waste.

Surely the cities don't need that kind of aid.

We hope Congress derails Mr. Kennedy's attempt to detour around the Rules Committee roadblock, and puts his grand scheme for Federal control of the cities permanently on the shelf.

Oil and Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, today as never before the United States must have an adequate supply of domestic reserve producing capacity, and this cannot be done overnight, nor can it be done with the threat of ever-increasing foreign petroleum imports squeezing our oil and gas industry. In light of this, I call to the attention of my colleagues two timely editorials of the Midland Reporter-Telegram, of Midland, Tex.:

WHAT ABOUT ENERGY?

Billions of dollars are being spent by the United States for the defense of this great Nation to assure peace. But, what is going to energize this tremendous program?

Without power or energy, what good are nuclear weapons, bombs, aircraft, ships, submarines, trucks, arms, and other hardware of war? How are they going to be produced or manufactured? From where will the energy come? What will energize the great industries of our Nation?

Certainly, we cannot depend on foreign sources of energy. Bombers, submarines, warships, or atomic weapons can stop quickly the flow of foreign oil. But even without war, we do not have sufficient reserves of energy for the needs of our Nation and its expanding population.

Meanwhile, a great industry—the oil and gas industry—is being allowed to wither. There is no excuse for this. It is time for some serious thinking at the White House and the Defense Department.

The United States, and especially Texas, abound in oil and gas reserves. But these cannot be located quickly and produced by the turn of a few valves. It takes time to drill oil and gas wells. It takes time to make the equipment to drill and produce these wells. It takes time to get oil and gas wells in production, and their products to market.

Is the United States going to wreck an energy industry—the industry which produced the energy for victory in World War II? The big tankers disappeared during World War II. They can disappear again. Some shiek or dictator can stop the flow of foreign oil over oceans to our refineries and industries.

It is time to think of first things first—in peace or war. Our basic problem is energy—fuel for peace or war without dependence on any foreign power.

Probably we are falling into another Red trap.

Many independent oil men are finding it increasingly difficult to stay in business. Reserves are harder to find and costs are rising. These men are not interested in subsidies and neither are the major oil companies. But the major companies and their executives are dedicated to produce the best possible earnings for their stockholders.

The United States must face the fact that its citizens never will return to the standard of living found in foreign nations now flooding the world with oil. But energy must be provided for peace or war.

Meanwhile, our population is increasing. More energy will be required next year, and the next.

We must have sources of energy on which we can depend. Our oil and gas industry certainly has been dependable and must have the right to build up its reserves with fair earnings and without dependence on foreign oil.

ENERGY FOR FREEDOM

Energy to assure the freedom of the United States and its citizens; to keep us from slavery, and to prevent disaster must come from within this Nation. The United States of America cannot depend on foreign powers, dictators, or shieks for its energy.

In 1961, the United States imported about 1,900,000 barrels of crude oil and petroleum products a day. As imports increase, the Nation's petroleum industry must carry more and more reserve capacity in order to remain in a position capable of supplying our needs in the event of a national emergency.

Oil now is the principal weapon of the Communists' economic offensive aimed at undermining free world institutions.

Meanwhile, our great and free Nation is allowing its important oil and gas industry to decline to a precarious position. Russian oil is being offered in the world market on terms which effectively eliminate competition.

Petroleum trade associations are trying to arouse Washington officials to the fact. Perhaps the new Permian Basin Petroleum Association, an organization long needed in this vast area, can help get the White House, Defense Department, and other top Federal officers and bureaus to realize what is happening. No legal barrier exists to prevent Russian oil moving into the United States.

Subsidies are not wanted by the great petroleum industry of our Nation. But no one can expect a drop in the American standard of living, the highest in the world, so our Nation can compete in world markets with foreign oil. We must have sources of energy within our borders on which we can depend in peacetime or war.

William J. Murray, Jr., chairman of the Texas Railroad Commission, last fall told a congressional investigating committee "an adequate supply of domestic reserve producing capacity immediately available in a military emergency is absolutely vital to our national welfare."

"Excessive imports will curtail domestic exploration and development and, therefore, imperil national security."

The energy consumption in the United States is greater than any other nation in the world. Murray explains it is six times the per capita average for the rest of the world.

More than 70 percent of the energy used in the United States comes from petroleum. Scientific experts predict petroleum will constitute the dominant source of energy not only for the Nation but the entire world for the remainder of this century.

Will the United States permit the Communists to control the energy of our Nation?

The time has come for the United States to be realistic about its great oil and gas industry and keep it healthy. Certainly, our Nation and its leaders are not going to invite disaster.

The People Get a Break on Postal Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, in the recent postal rate debate my very able colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia [KEN HECKLER], played an important role and demonstrated great courage and initiative. The Members of the House may be interested in the following editorial from the January 25 Denver Post:

THE PEOPLE GET A BREAK ON POSTAL BILL

The Nation needs more men like Representative KEN HECHLER, Democrat, of West Virginia, in the Congress. Unlike some of his fellow legislators, HECHLER has proved that he does indeed represent the people and not any special interests.

In the House debate Wednesday on postal rate increases, Hechler was brazen enough (and, in our opinion, reasonable and logical enough) to suggest that third-class mail users pay for the entire cost of handling their mail.

The administration-approved bill provided for an increase of $93 million in third-class rates, which would have covered 85 percent of the handling costs. HECHLER introduced an amendment calling for a $171 million increase, which would cover the full cost. The amendment carried by a voice vote.

The bill, as finally approved by the House, provides for a 1-cent increase in first-class and airmail rates. This will bring in about $455 million in new revenue. First-class mail and airmail are now just about paying their way. Under the new rates, first-class would pay 127 percent of its handling costs, and airmail would pay 117 percent of its costs.

Thus, if the House-approved bill is passed intact by the Senate (an unlikely eventuality), third-class mail would be paying its way, and first-class and airmail would be paying more than their way.

What about second-class mail, which includes the publications of the Nation's newspaper and magazine enterprises?

The second-class rates now cover about one-third of the cost handling. Under the House-approved bill, these rates would be raised by $53 million, so that second-class mail would pay for about half of its cost.

To add all these figures up to a meaningful total requires a knowledge of only elementary mathematics and elementary politics.

In short, the first-class and airmail users are being burdened so that the Government can provide a handsome subsidy to the newspaper and magazine publishers.

Why would Congress sit still for this—indeed, encourage it?

The simple answer it because the second-class users—those who through their publications mold public opinion—constitute one of the most powerful special interest groups in the Nation, and the Congressmen do not want to cross the opinionmakers.

We salute Representative HECHLER and lament the fact that there was no representative courageous enough to offer a similar amendment providing that the second-class users pay their way.

The House Should Have Equal Representation With the Senate at the Forthcoming Conference on Amendments to the Pension and Welfare Fund Disclosures Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a letter which I have sent to the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, ADAM C. POWELL. In this letter I have named the two minority conferees for the forthcoming conference on the amendments to the Pension and Welfare Fund Disclosures Act. I have also requested that the chairman of our committee take cognizance of the fact that the Senate has again named nine conferees to this conference and as a result the five House conferees will be badly outnumbered.

As far as I can determine, there is no justifiable reason why the House should not have as many conferees as the Senate. Certainly the bill which we have enacted is as important as the Senate's and should be as stoutly and vigor-

ously defended. It is tragic but true that this cannot be done when the conference membership is so heavily weighted in favor of the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, it almost appears that a pattern is developing. You will recall that at the time of the conference on the proposed amendments to the minimum wage law, the House only had five conferees, while the Senate had nine. At that conference the Senate provisions were almost without exception accepted and the House provisions were stricken from the bill. I cannot believe that the membership of this House wishes to have that procedure duplicated at the forthcoming conference. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I most earnestly recommend, and urge, that this very important matter be given additional consideration and that four additional House conferees be named. I am certain all will agree that the House must have equal representation in a conference or there will be grave danger that its views will be subordinated to those of the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, my letter to the chairman follows:

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your letter dated February 8, 1962, wherein you request that I indicate who will be the two minority conferees for the forthcoming conference on the amendments to the Pension and Welfare Fund Disclosures Act.

Please be advised that Mr. GOODELL and I will be the minority conferees.

On the basis of this request, I assume that there will be only five House conferees for this important conference. As you know, Mr. Chairman, the Senate has named nine conferees, which means that again we will be badly outnumbered and at a serious disadvantage. I believe that this is both unnecessary and unfortunate for we have every right to name as many conferees as the Senate, and I am certain that the membership of the House would like to have us do just that.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I most earnestly recommend that the number of House conferees be increased to nine.

Just as soon as this is done, I will be very happy immediately to designate two additional minority conferees.

Sincerely yours,

CARROLL D. KEARNS,
Member of Congress.

Some Facts To Ponder Before Putting American Education in a Federal Straitjacket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of getting the true facts before the people of this country regarding Federal aid to education, I take pleasure in including as a part of these remarks the following editorial from the Dallas Morning News:

ASSEMBLY-LINE EDUCATION

One of the most powerful and best financed pressure groups in Washington is the education lobby. Out of its offices have poured mountains of skillfully designed propaganda aimed at a single goal: Federal aid to education. A pet project of this lobby has been a program of Federal assistance to higher education, including scholarship grants to college and university students.

To win approval for this program in Washington, and to gain support for it at the grass roots, the eduction lobby has outdone itself in a propaganda battle designed to convince the American people that they are falling behind the Soviet Union and the rest of the world in the field of higher education.

They are constantly citing the European system of education as vastly superior to our own; particularly do they dwell upon advantages of the Soviet scheme for developing brainpower.

This not only is a distortion of the facts but is a gross insult to the intelligence of the American people. If it were not for the extremely effective, one-sided propaganda machine of the educationists, and the support which it has been able to muster among high Government officials, the whole idea would be rejected as the bunk.

Let's look, for a moment, at claims that have been made, then balance them against the other side of the story.

It is said that the Soviet Union now has 2.4 million students at 40 universities and 720 technical institutions—almost three times as many as the number in pursuit of a higher education 20 years ago. This is true.

But the propagandists who point to these figures never reveal comparable statistics for the United States.

Here we have 3.8 million students attending 2,000 colleges and universities—more than three times as many as we had 20 years ago.

With a smaller population, we are educating half again as many students in colleges and universities. It might be mentioned, too, that while the Soviet Union is plagued with an illiteracy rate of at least 10 percent of its population, the United States has almost completely wiped out illiteracy.

Comparison with Britain's educational system is equally absurd. While the British offer higher education with unique advantages to a small number of students at 26 colleges and universities, they neglect the higher education of the great mass of their young people.

The United States has, by far, the best all-around educational system in the world, and it is advancing at least as rapidly as that of any other country.

This system is the product of private, local, and State government efforts.

And yet the Kennedy administration apparently has swallowed all arguments advanced by the educationists.

Last week the President sent to Congress his proposals for Federal education aid, including a program for scholarship assistance.

On Tuesday, the Senate passed a $2.67-billion aid bill which will provide funds for 212,500 student scholarships. The bill now goes to a conference with the House, which last week passed a $1.5-billion aid bill for construction but no scholarship aid.

We hope the House will stick by its guns. It should be remembered that the Soviets have built their educational system around this same, basic idea. Today about 80 percent of its students in colleges and technical institutions are paid a salary.

The salary, of course, goes only to students who agree to study what the Kremlin decides they must study.

The Soviet Minister of Education boasts, "If we plan to have 3,000 law students, we won't have any more. If we figure that 140,000 engineering students are needed, 140,000 we will have." This might be regarded as a handy system, but it leaves out one important element—the right of individual choice.

Do the American people want a similar, assembly line university system which eventually turns out servants of the state? Do parents want to keep control of their educational system, or do they want the Federal Government dictating courses and careers? If Federal aid becomes entrenched, then Federal dictation will follow.

The News repeatedly has warned that, of all forms of Federal aid, that which can be used to control the minds of young people would be the most dangerous. It would be the death of freedom.

John McCone—Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, during the period before John McCone's confirmation as Director of the Central Intelligence Agency many unconscionable things were said about him by individuals who make a living by writing such things for pay. Some decent things were said, too, as illustrated by an editorial appearing in the Los Angeles Times which is reproduced below. Although Mr. McCone and I did not always see eye to eye on matters while he was Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, I gained a healthy respect for his wisdom, courage, ability, and effectiveness. As one American citizen, concerned that the Nation's intelligence activities be in competent hands, I am thankful that the President appointed Mr. McCone to his present post and that the other body, in its wisdom, decisively confirmed the appointment.

JOHN MCCONE, PUBLIC SERVANT

A frequent complaint heard around this Republic is that able men are reluctant to serve the Government, particularly if they had applied their ability at any time in their lives to making money.

John A. McCone's is a case in point, and the case history serves as a general answer to the complaint.

SET HIGH SHIP GOALS

McCone made his own way up the ladder to president of a shipbuilding corporation for which he set production goals nobody believed could be achieved. The result was 467 wartime ships worth a billion dollars. In his pursuit of private fortune McCone found time for public service as a director of Stanford Research Institute, a trustee of Cal-tech, a regent of Loyola University, an organizer of the Los Angeles World Affairs Council.

President Truman drew him into national affairs, although he is a Republican, by appointing him to the Air Policy Commission where he helped Thomas K. Finletter write the famous report, "Survival in the Air Age." He became Air Force Under Secretary under Finletter in 1950, and in that year, significantly, he recommended to President Truman that the embryo guided missile program be conducted by a man with full authority and control of funds to exercise "absolute power over the entire effort."

He gave President Eisenhower the same advice after the first sputnik was orbited.

Although he resigned as Air Force Under Secretary in 1951, he was repeatedly called back to public duty: he inspected the Korean air front for Pinletter and General Vandenberg in 1952; he served on the Wriston Committee organized to recommend improvement of the diplomatic service in 1954. Defense Secretary McElroy called on him for advice, and Chairman Strauss of the Atomic Energy Commission sought him for 4 years as a Commission member. In 1958 he consented to serve, and became AEC Chairman, resigning when President Kennedy came in.

But President Kennedy needed such public servants. The job sought the man: McCone consented last fall to become chief of the Central Intelligence Agency, one of the most difficult places in the Government.

One of his rewards for accepting this onerous post is a current series of attacks on his integrity as a public servant by the widely published columnist, Drew Pearson. The articles have been published on page 6 of this section of the Times. The motive of the Pearson crusade is obscure, but the treatment of McCone is sheerly vindictive. The technique is the smear: the charges are made but the answers are suppressed unless they serve the accuser's purpose.

Pearson based his columns on three congressional hearings, with quotations torn out of the context of several hundred pages of record. The first, in 1946, was an inquiry into shipbuilding profits while McCone was still president of the California Shipbuilding Corp. This was followed shortly by his summons to national service under President Truman. The second, about plane contracts, was held in 1953 while McCone was between public jobs, but he was recalled to service in 1954. The third, held in 1958, rehashed older charges, and it was followed by McCone's unanimous confirmation by the Senate as a member of the AEC.

Three Presidents and the U.S. Senate could find no conflict between McCone's public service and the service he gave his private interests.

NO EFFECT ON SENATE

The Pearson charges will not have any effect on Senate confirmation of McCone to be CIA Chief, as Pearson concedes today while he continues to wield his tar brush.

But the crusade answers the question why many men of ability are reluctant to serve the Government. Some Pearson or group of Pearsons might be lying in wait for them. It takes a man of McCone's sureness and devotion to walk through the mud and keep his eye on the goal, which is to serve his country to the best of his high ability.

TVA Tributary Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial appearing in the Chattanooga Times of January 19, 1962, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

This editorial, first, presents some revealing information about the tremendous sums to be returned to the Treasury from operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority in the coming fiscal year. It also represents a further editorial endorsement of the new major step proposed by the TVA in the field of tributary development.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TVA AND BEECH RIVER

The Federal budget appropriation request for the Tennessee Valley Authority of $35 million is down more than $3 million from last year and is a little more than 8 percent of the total TVA budget. Fifty million dollars would come from the now-authorized bond self-financing program, the rest from current income and reserves.

On the other hand, $48.5 million of the budget would go back to the U.S. Treasury—$38.5 million in return on the appropriations invested in power facilities and $10 million in reduction of the principal of such appropriations.

The proposed funds for 14 small dams on the Beech River in Henderson and Decatur Counties—part of a long-range development program—reflect increased emphasis on tributary work that is encouraging, though it will not satisfy some critics of present tributary policy.

The Beech River Watershed Development Authority would repay about $2 million of the $6 million cost of the program over a 40-year period, in what the TVA Board describes as "a new approach to the water resource portion" of tributary area development.

The $2.5 million appropriation for this project asked by President Kennedy is necessary and important not only for the life-giving progress it itself will bring, but for its implications for the future on the smaller streams of the valley. Tributary development deserves, should and undoubtedly will have even more of the stress now being placed upon it by the Authority.

Ralph Budd: Railroad Builder, Rehabilitator, and Executive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the course of my studies of Panama Canal history, I have been increasingly impressed by the stature attained by distinguished graduates of that great school of construction experience, as illustrated by the brilliant career of the late Ralph Budd, former president of the Great Northern and Burlington railroads.

An early protege of John F. Stevens, known in history as the Basic Architect of the Panama Canal, Stevens and Budd, early in the latter's career, established a relationship that never lost its interest for either as long as they lived. Wherever the master architect and builder went the other eventually followed in some important capacity.

With respect to Budd's most spectacular achievement in constructing the Great Northern tunnel through the Cascade Mountains in Washington, this story has been onlf half told. Mrs. John F. Stevens, Jr., of Brooklyn, N.Y., who, through close association with her distinguished father-in-law, is well acquainted with what went on behind the scenes, has supplied highly interesting information.

This—

Wrote Mrs. Stevens on February 2, 1962—

was the tunnel, outstanding still as a feat unexcelled in engineering history, designed by John F. Stevens with such accuracy and precision that the ends, coming together from opposite sides of the mountain through devious curves and grades, finally converged and came together, meeting with less than an inch between them.

It is also significant to record that when Budd launched the Burlington Zephyr in 1934, he invited his great mentor, John F. Stevens, to accompany him on its first run, which the elder man did with the enthusiasm of a youngster.

In order that the career of Ralph Budd, as told in the obituary news story published in the New York Times of February 3, 1962, may be permanently recorded in the annals of the Congress, I quote it as part of these remarks:

RALPH BUDD DIES, LED TWO RAILROADS—EX-HEAD OF GREAT NORTHERN AND BURLINGTON WAS 82

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF., February 2.—Ralph Budd, who served as president of both the Great Northern and Burlington Railroads and gained an international reputation as a builder and rehabilitator of railroads, died today at his home. He was 82 years old.

Survivors include his widow, Georgiana; two sons, Robert W. of Charlottesville, Va., and John M. of St. Paul, Minn., who is president of the Great Northern; a daughter, Mrs. Victor Hunt of Mexico City; three sisters, Helen and Beulah of Claremont, Calif., and Mrs. George W. Kahl of Oregon City, Oreg., and a brother, John W. of Des Moines.

HAD DRIVE OF LOCOMOTIVE

Mr. Budd, a bulky, exuberant man who spent a half century in railroading, approached his work with the drive of a locomotive churning through a tunnel.

As president of the Burlington, he foresaw the potential of the diesel engine and introduced the country's first diesel-powered streamliner. This was the Burlington Zephyr, a mile-a-minute passenger express with a stainless-steel body. It went into service between Kansas City, Mo., and Lincoln and Omaha, Nebr., in 1934.

When the airplane began to cut into the railroad passenger business after World War II, Mr. Budd made a new breakthrough in 1949 by introducing bubble-domed coaches. These were the Burlington's "Vista Dome" double-deck coaches that were put into service on the San Francisco run.

The Burlington was unable to compete in speed to the west coast with the Union Pacific, which had a shorter route. Instead of trying, Mr. Budd turned to the bubble-domed cars to win passengers on the chance of seeing the "breathtaking scenery" of the Burlington's route through the Colorado Rockies and the Feather River Canyon in California.

PETE INTRODUCED CARS

The coaches' introduction was tied into the 100th anniversary of the Burlington, known to railroaders as the "Q." For the occasion, Mr. Budd donned the stovepipe hat and velvet-collared Prince Albert coat of the old railroad presidents, glued on a black mustache and plunged into a reenactment of the granting of the road's 1849 charter for its first 12 miles of track.

Mr. Budd, a former Iowa farmboy, was trained as a civil engineer and began railroading in 1899 as a rodman on the Chicago Great Western, staking out curves ahead of a steel gang.

The track itself always was one of his major interests. He realined curves, improved the track structure. His ideas about curves, when put to use on the Burlington, enabled the Zephyrs to achieve their unprecedented speeds at the time.

In 1906, John F. Stevens, the Panama Canal builder, brought Mr. Budd to the isthmus to rehabilitate and relocate the old Panama Railroad.

From there he went to the Spokane, Portland, and Seattle Railroad in 1909 with Mr. Stevens as chief engineer. In 1912 he joined the Great Northern Railway as an assistant to James J. Hill, the empirebuilder and originator of the system.

HEADED GREAT NORTHERN

Seven years later at the age of 40, Mr. Budd became president of the Great Northern. His most spectacular achievement there was the construction of a 7.79-mile tunnel through the Cascade Mountains in Washington from 1925 to 1928.

The tunnel was the longest in the Western Hemisphere. It eliminated 9 miles of track, 6 tunnels, 8 miles of snowsheds and curves equivalent to more than 10 complete circles.

In 1930, Mr. Budd went to the Soviet Union to survey the Trans-Siberian and Chinese Eastern Railways and all other rail systems there, an inspection trip that involved 60,000 miles of travel.

During his presidency at the Great Northern, 1,730 miles of track were laid with heavy rail and 25 miles of timber bridges were replaced by steel, concrete, or earthfill.

He also was a firm advocate of the consolidation of railroads, maintaining it would do away with duplication, provide better transportation and lower costs.

Mr. Budd left the Great Northern in 1932 to become president of the Burlington.

ESTABLISHED SPEED RECORD

Just before the Zephyr was put into service it had established a world's speed record on May 26, 1934, by running nonstop from Denver to Chicago, a distance of 1,015 miles at an average speed of 77.6 miles an hour.

The Zephyr was built by the Budd Co. in Philadelphia, a concern run by a family not related to Mr. Budd.

In 1940 President Franklin D. Roosevelt brought Mr. Budd to Washington to take charge of transportation preparedness on the eve of World War II as a member of the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense.

He was in charge of readying trains, trucks, planes, and ships.

Mr. Budd retired as president of the Burlington in 1949 when he reached the age of 70. He, himself, had made retirement at that age mandatory on the Burlington.

However, 3 weeks after his retirement he took over as chairman of the Chicago Transit Authority, retiring in 1955.

Symposium on Antitrust Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, it was my privilege to participate in a symposium on antitrust law held by the New York State Bar Association in New York City on January 25, 1962. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER TO THE ANTITRUST SYMPOSIUM OF THE NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, NEW YORK, N.Y., JANUARY 25, 1962

Antitrust law, like every other body of regulatory law, must constantly be reexamined and amended to insure that it is keeping pace with developments in our complex and dynamic economy. Studies have shown that in many ways, our antitrust laws are presently inadequate.

For example, the Department of Justice has long sought the power to obtain information for civil investigations. S. 167, passed by the Senate and now pending before the House as H.R. 6689, will fulfill this need.

The Federal Trade Commission is presently powerless to stop either a corporate merger or price discrimination, no matter how patently unlawful and harmful to competition, until the termination of long and complicated proceedings. The Justice Department faces a similar problem, especially with respect to scrambled assets in merger cases. I plan to introduce legislation this session which will be designed to remedy this frustration of original congressional intent.

The recent electrical and other price-fixing cases have demonstrated the inadequacy of present sanctions against clearly unlawful conduct. We are presently completing hearings on a series of bills which will not only raise penalties to the level of meaningful deterrence but will also reach top executives who ratify or wrongly fail to halt clearly illegal practices.

Finally, our drug industry hearings have shown the urgent need for introducing some competition into an oligopolistic industry which has used its patent monopolies and irresponsible advertising to keep the prices of indispensable drugs at artificially high levels.

No doubt you are familiar with some or all of these, and my distinguished colleague, Congressman CELLER, will probably discuss many of them in some detail. Today, however, I should like to discuss certain international developments which raise profound and fundamental issues of increasing concern to our policymakers, both in Congress and in the executive.

The successful establishment of the European Common Market may well be the most significant economic and political event of the last decade. A powerful new community is emerging and in order to deal with it we shall need some new thoughts.

Impelled by the vision of a united Europe, the Common Market countries are now engaged in a program of eliminating restrictions on the free flow of goods, services, capital, and labor. So far, they have had remarkable success. The forces of competition so released have made the Common Market a very dynamic economic force, with a faster rate of growth than ours, an enormous internal market with a population roughly equal to ours and a highly efficient export capacity. In these first years, the aggregate trade in and among the member countries has expanded dramatically as has their aggregate gross national product. Imports to the Common Market have also risen. England and many other countries who long stood aloof have been forced either to seek entry and association or be frozen out. It has just been reported that we, too, are negotiating for some form of cooperation with the Common Market; if we fail in these efforts, we risk loss of access to what will probably be the greatest market in the world.

We also risk the loss of something equally significant. The Common Market represents more than simply a great trading area. It can be the foundation for closer political and social ties within the Atlantic community, because, as our national economies become more and more integrated, so will many of our most vital political and social interest, institutions, and policies.

Nor will this integration necessarily be limited to the Atlantic community. The Common Market now has special relationships with some of the new countries in Africa and elsewhere, the so-called associated countries. Other European countries are also seeking some form of association. We must obtain similar benefits for our Latin American friends, and the British will try to do the same for their other commonwealth countries.

We are thus at the threshhold of a community of free nations so rich and powerful as to withstand any threat, a community which can serve as an example to the uncommitted world of how free men can solve the fundamental problems of economic sustenance, a community which, by its aid and assistance to the poorer countries, can bind them to the free world by the ties of common economic and social interests.

What has all this to do with a legislative antitrust program? Simply this: the underlying principle of the Common Market is free competition. The elimination of tariffs, quotas and various forms of discrimination, the removal of restrictions on the free flow of labor and capital—all these reflect a recognition that the bracing wind of competition is the most effective device for stimulating growth.

The Europeans have recognized, moreover, that the removal of publicly imposed restrictions on competition is only part of the task. They have come to realize that private groups must be prevented from replacing the soon to be abolished tariffs and quotas with private restrictions like price fixing, market sharing and other anticompetitive devices. As the Action Committee for a United States of Europe, headed by Jean Monnet, said in July, 1960:

"The firm application of a European antitrust law is essential in order to ensure that all consumers and producers alike enjoy the benefits of the vast single market. The large number of agreements and concentrations envisaged or concluded as part of the producers' reaction to the Common Market underline the risk that it will be dominated and divided by monopolies and cartels."

It can thus no longer be argued that antitrust is a purely American aberration, rejected by public and private interests everywhere else, and a hindrance to American foreign trade. The philosophy underlying our Sherman and Clayton Acts is now reflected to varying extents in every European country and in the supranational bodies. Thus, the Rome Treaty which established the Common Market contains antitrust sections which have just been implemented this past December by supplementary regulations. The Coal and Steel Community Treaty and the Euratom Agreement also contain antitrust provisions. In the last 5 to 10 years, almost every Western country has either adopted or strengthened its national laws against restraints on competition.

These European antitrust laws are, as could be expected, extremely diverse. In the first place, in the Common Market itself, there are overall Common Market treaty provisions as well as national legislation to implement these treaty provisions. Some of these national laws stress prohibitory measures designed to prevent unfair trade practices. Others focus on registration procedures, designed to publicize and control restrictive practices. Few are designed to halt mergers although almost all seek to regulate abusive practices by dominant enterprises. Violations are more severely punished than here, for in the Common Market fines can run to a million dollars, and under the proposed Italian law, it will be possible to suspend officials of guilty companies. Of

great significance is the fact that the Common Market legislation, like all other antitrust laws including our own Webb-Pomerene Act, exempt restraints limited to export trade.

It is still too early to appraise the impact and effectiveness of these new antitrust laws. The English legislation seems to have been remarkably effective in bringing to light and breaking up many price fixing and other restrictive arrangements.

On the other hand, the Coal and Steel Community seems to have run into great difficulty in trying to enforce competition and deconcentration in the coal and steel industry. And it is certainly too early to assess the impact of these laws on the attitudes of European businessmen who, long accustomed to cartels and cooperation, may be slow to change their habits. Indeed, our recent electrical equipment cases show that anticompetitive attitudes still persist in this country despite the passage of some 70 years since enactment of the Sherman Act.

Naturally, these developments also raise problems for American businessmen trading with and investing in Europe. For one thing, the very diversity of the legislation raises a host of potential conflict-of-laws problems. The old controversy about extraterritorial application of American and other antitrust laws is one facet of these problems, for many of the European antitrust statutes apply to agreements made outside their territory which affect the domestic market, or in which one or more of the participants does some business locally. As a matter of fact, it is now quite clear that those who have sought to restrict application of our antitrust laws to acts within the United States were seeking to limit our laws in a way that few nations have done, and without any support in international law. The possibility of jurisdictional conflicts, will, however, require some means for their resolution; the recent GATT resolution calling for consultations between governments affected by restricted practices may point the way.

It is vitally important that we cooperate with and further the effective operation of these new antitrust laws. We must not permit European and world trade to again become cartelized, and thereby lose the many benefits to consumers and producers of freer world trade. For example, it was not until European cars became more freely available that the American consumer was able to force our concentrated automobile industry to produce a small economical car. As a matter of fact, freely available imports may be one of the few effective ways to introduce competition and lower prices into some of our concentrated industries.

Moreover, a cartelized world will lend force to Soviet charges of Western monopoly capitalism, and these charges will find fertile ground among the poorer countries, because it is they who will probably be the prime victims of such cartels.

We must therefore take steps now to study these matters and coordinate our antitrust efforts with those of other free countries to further international competition. For one thing, we and the other countries should reexamine the wisdom of exemptions from our antitrust laws for export trade. Following the example of our Webb-Pomerene Act, the European countries seem to be adopting a narrow mercantilistic attitude that they have no concern with restrictive practices adversely affecting foreign markets. Whereas competition is to be the rule in the home market, cartel practices are permitted insofar as export trade is concerned. This attitude is dangerously out of date, for, as our economies become more and more interdependent, the differences between internal and external trade will diminish. Unless steps are taken to reverse this archaic approach, we may be faced with trade wars and discrimination which will seriously impede the healthy development of our overall economy. Efforts were made during the first postwar decade in the U.N. and elsewhere to obtain an international convention on such international practices. The time may now be ripe for a successful renewal of such efforts, perhaps through GATT, perhaps through the U.N.

Other areas we might reexamine are the wisdom of our own antidumping legislation, first enacted in 1921 and now possibly outmoded in its present form. We should try to coordinate this legislation with the recent European provisions.

We should also reconsider and reject such policies as are reflected in the pirated drug rider tacked on to last year's foreign aid bill, whereby we eliminate any chance of competition where patent monopolies are concerned. Other import and export restrictions also deserve scrutiny in the light of the developments in the last 10 years.

Our subcommittee plans an inquiry this year into the recent antitrust developments in the Common Market in order to obtain some guidance for the furtherance of American public and private interests in the years to come.

We are on the threshold of a great challenge and a great opportunity. We are now in a world economy where foreign trade is a vital element of our political and economic well-being. We must therefore do all in our power to encourage the formation of a great and free community of trading nations which will be free not only of such public impediments as tariffs and quotas but also from private restraints. We cannot afford to do a partial job.

Statement of Francis R. Buono, National Commander of the Disabled American Veterans, to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, February 8, 1962, on Subject "Legislative Program of the Disabled American Veteran"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, today we had a meeting of our great Veterans Committee, with Congressman OLIN TEAGUE, of Texas, presiding, as always. We had a great American, a great man, a good friend, and an outstanding soldier, the Honorable Francis R. Buono, national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, who spoke to our Veterans Committee. Now I hope every Member of this Congress, who represents every human being in America, can read what Francis Buono said.

We had gathered there, with our national commander, hundreds on hundreds of Disabled American Veterans. Mrs. Frank Buono was also there and thrilled too, with us to hear this great man talk to us about your and our disabled American veterans.

Later in the day, I had the joy and the pleasure of giving a luncheon in the speaker's dining room, where we had about 60 outstanding Americans including Alabama's congressional delegation, headed by Senators LISTER HILL and JOHN SPARKMAN.

We also had the great Senator, HERMAN TALMADGE, of Georgia, who along with Senator HILL, and so many others, made a wonderful talk, but nothing any of us said compared to Frank Buono's great speech which I am inserting in the RECORD.

I hope to send thousands on thousands of copies to our disabled veterans and soldiers all over this land and let them know about the national commander, Francis Buono, and all of his great associates that accompanied him to hear him present the Disabled American Veterans' case to our great Veterans' Committee.

I agree thoroughly and wholeheartedly with everything that Francis Buono said and I believe that our entire committee will go along with me on this statement.

God bless Commander Francis Buono, and all of his associates, who are putting up such a fine battle for our Disabled American Veterans:

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM OF THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

(Statement of Francis R. Buono, national commander of the Disabled American Veterans to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, February 8, 1962)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as the national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, I, Francis R. Buono, wish to thank this committee for the opportunity of appearing here today for the purpose of introducing the legislative program of the Disabled American Veterans and to briefly discuss with you some of the thoughts of our organization on veterans' affairs, and to give you some of the expressions I have received from our members in my travels throughout this great Nation of ours when visiting our chapters and departments. However, may I take a moment to introduce our Washington staff; first I would like to introduce our national director of legislation, Mr. Elmer M. Freudenberger, who has appeared before you on numerous occasions in the past. Next, Mr. Irving Peltz, our national service director, and also our assistant national service director of claims, Mr. Frank G. Wood. The next gentleman is Mr. Pasquale Gervace, our assistant national service director of employment. All are members of the Disabled American Veterans assigned to our national service headquarters in Washington and they are available for consultation on problems concerning legislation, claims, and employment matters affecting veterans and their dependents.

This week we are holding our annual conference of department commanders and adjutants here in Washington, as well as the winter meeting of our national executive committee. I would like to ask all of these State and national officers to stand at once rather than taking time for individual introductions.

As the national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, I approach this meeting with a sense of grave responsibility. This feeling comes to me as I reflect upon the visits I have made to the "grassroots membership" of our organization through out the country. This enabled me to gain an insight into the fears and feelings of frustraton in the minds and hearts of so many of our members. My feelings of responsibility are magnified in the knowledge that the more than 209,000 members of our organization actually reflect the problems, feelings, and emotions of more than 2 million disabled veterans in this land. My statement this morning is therefore more than just a personal presentation, but

rather a reflection of what I have heard, what I've seen, and what I've felt as a result of my contacts. Much of what I have heard and what I convey to you this morning is the result of the feelings of so very many of our disabled members in their keen disappointment over the events occurring to our compensation increase bill in the closing days of Congress in 1961.

There is more involved than just the matter of an increase. The 50 cents a month or even $20 per month that might have resulted in the passage of the compensation increase bill has become less important than the feeling that the cause of the disabled veterans in this land of ours is less important in the eyes of some than it was during the days immediately after the war. But the philosophy of compensating veterans is the same today as it was when first set forth by George Washington. There is more involved here than simply giving lipservice to a group of men and women who were unfortunate enough to have been disabled. The whole economy of the Nation is involved. As an economic principle, it is imperative that the largest number of people possible, approach in purchasing power, the normal standard of living set by the economy of a nation.

If a large segment of the population of any society is unable to maintain the standard of living enjoyed by the great majority, this minority will drag down those standards with the result that eventually all of the people will "share the poverty" brought about by an imprudent economy that fails to recognize the needs of all the people. The whole story of compensation should be viewed from the principle that it is wise economy to provide for those who are totally unable to work and to partially provide for those who have lost a portion of the ability to maintain a standard of living they might have achieved were it not for the physical disability acquired by service to the Nation.

It was appalling to the members of our organization to know that while our legislation was not passed, at the same time $4 billion in foreign aid was granted to aid other countries and other peoples, including nations we had defeated in World War II. In retrospect, we wonder if the fates of war had been unkind to us and if we had been the vanquished instead of the victor, if the Axis Powers and the Communist Powers would have given us in the United States billions of dollars in foreign aid? While we in the Disabled American Veterans are fully aware of the need for the foreign aid program, particularly as a measure to fight communism and maintain the peace of the world, we cannot help but inquire if we might not also be entitled to consideration in our fight to provide for our service-connected wartime disabled veterans, a life with dignity and security, free from the fear of poverty, and conducive to a feeling of pride, as well as recognition for services rendered to a grateful American Nation.

We note with considerable dismay the tendency on the part of some to infuse into the structure of compensation, some of the principles of pension and to attempt to base competition more and more upon the "need theory" inherent in the philosophy of pension. The application of the "need theory" to the principles of compensation is, in our opinion, completely repugnant to the whole philosophy and ideal of compensating a person for a disability incurred in the service of the people of this Nation. The "need theory" takes into consideration only the immediate situation, but does not encompass the broader aspect of disability. Disability has three major aspects:

1. There is the immediate effect upon the individual.

2. There is the effect of the condition on securing employment and in job retention, and also in job advancement.

3. There is the effect of the disability upon the vocational longevity of the disabled person.

The first two principles are self-evident and we do not feel it necessary to elaborate on them except to state that they are so elementary to the whole concept of compensation that it should be readily discernible that to modify or dilute these principles is to cause irreparable damage to the entire theory. The third item, however, is one that has never been properly explored and we feel it is timely to consider this problem. We can see this problem in better perspective today because the World War II veteran is now facing the fact that his disabilities are becoming increasingly noticeable to him as he grows older. Thus we see the paraplegic, who used to pose for pictures and even was seen in motion pictures, hopping into his car from his wheelchair and performing many amazing feats with and in spite of his disability, having to decrease his activities and in many cases give up his vocational life.

With the aging process, man's disabilities acquired through his lifetime become more and more prominent in his ability to work and to perform functions which others at the same age are able to perform. The total effect, then, of disability, is that it does sometimes dramatically curtail and shorten the disabled person's vocational life. The "need theory" does not take this into consideration. The income that one receives from compensation from the Veterans' Administration can, to a degree, take up the slack in lost earning power, make up for lost earnings due to disablement, and aid in planning for a premature retirement age brought about from the rigors of disability. Who can tell how long the individual who is disabled is going to be able to work? This cannot be answered precisely in each case, but we do know that the more severe the disability, the more drastic will be the reduction in the number of years employment may be maintained. We therefore denounce the "need theory" as entirely unrealistic, calculated to limit consideration of the disability to the present only, with no thought to the future problems inherent in all disability factors. Economically, the disabled veteran has become adjusted to the role of compensation which we have tried to keep on a par with living conditions to the extent that with what he is able to earn in wages, coupled with his compensation, he is able to be in a position where he has some degree of security for himself and his family and some degree of self-respect mentally, spiritually and economically.

In any provision made for general disability compensation increases, we of the Disabled American Veterans continue to believe that an across-the-board percentage increase, using the figure 15 percent as to all rates, is by far the most equitable and sound solution to this problem.

The range provided by this formula would provide, for example, an increase from the present rate of $19 to $22 monthly for the 10-percent-disabled veteran and from $225 to $259 monthly for the 100-percent-disabled veteran.

Our national legislative committee, composed of Bill H. Fribley, a past national commander from Kansas, as chairman, Bernard O. Killin, of Michigan, and Raymond J. Isley, of Alabama, met in Washington, D.C., with the national commander in November of 1961 and as to the matter of increased compensation it was determined that our legislative program for 1962 would call for a 15-percent-across-the-board increase in compensation rates and including the section from our original bill last year on multiple sclerosis, and the section on aid and attendance hospital adjustment. The committee assigned the highest legislative priority to this measure, which has resulted in the drafting of a new bill introduced by your chariman, and now H.R. 9565. We commend this bill to your early and favorable consideration.

In addition to the compensation increase bill, the National Legislative Committee of the Disabled American Veterans assigned top priority to other DAV bills. As to those coming within the jurisdiction of this committee, I mention the following:

1. The dependency allowances for the lower ratings 10 to 40 percent. The pending bill on this is H.R. 882.

2. The bill to freeze the VA rating schedule. The pending bill on this is H.R. 881.

3. Federal reimbursement to State workmen's compensation funds, etc. The pending bill on this is H.R. 871.

4. The bills on statutory awards embodied in pending bills H.R. 846 and H.R. 873. (Passed by House and now in Senate Finance Committee.)

The Disabled American Veterans has never become reconciled to the inequity of excluding dependency allowance to those disabled veterans rated below 50 percent. The veterans rated 10 to 40 percent need this family allowance also. Attention is called to the fact that most of these ratings have been lowered through the years to below 50 percent after review. We shall have more to say on this matter when hearings are held on the specific bills in the field of compensation benefits.

The bill regarding the freezing of the rating schedule is not a new proposal. If enacted, this bill would bring about a stabilization of the present provisions of the schedule and would require future changes to the schedule to be placed in the hands of Congress. The reasons for our position on this subject are numerous and born from our experiences in the past involving schedular changes working to the detriment of scores of our disabled veterans. The DAV is conducting a survey and study of representative cases and our latest findings will be brought to the attention of this committee prior to further hearings pertinent to the subjects of compensation ratings. I mention this bill to assure this committee that we do regard the measure with great seriousness regardless of how other groups and organizations may feel about it.

The bill regarding Federal reimbursement to State workmen's compensation funds would serve the excellent purpose in encouraging employers to hire disabled veterans knowing that they will not be penalized for their humanity if the disabled employees suffer further injury while on the job. The commendable results achieved through campaigns designed to urge employment to the physically handicapped would be given great impetus through the enactment of H.R. 871, and we strongly recommend that your committee report out this bill.

In the last session of this Congress, your committee did report out and the House passed the two statutory award bills, but the Senate Finance Committee, as on other occasions, tabled these very meritorious bills.

It should be pointed out that the establishment of top priority bills in connection with the DAV legislative program does not in any way lessen the interest we have in or in any way detract from the vigor of our efforts in the matter of other legislation pending from the last session or those measures which have been or will be introduced at this session in behalf of our organization. Many of these matters will be referred to specifically at subsequent meetings and hearings to be scheduled by this committee.

For the reasons stated, I will not delve into the very important subject of hospital, medical, and domiciliary care except to state that the DAV believes that the ceiling on hospital beds should be raised from 125,000 to 150,000. We also believe that comprehen-

sive plans should be expedited to care for the aging veterans of our wars. We are aware that your committee reported out and the House passed House Joint Resolution 73 which is still before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I must not let this occasion pass without expressing the sincere gratitude of our members to this committee for the interest and sympathy you have always shown to the problems of the disabled veterans. To be sure, 1961 was a disappointing year for us in some respects. The increase in compensation rates still remains an unresolved matter. There are other matters which still must be resolved, but I want each and every member of this committee to know that we do look to this committee with great hope, that the tradition established over the long years by the many wonderful people serving on the committee, toward humane and equitable treatment of the problems of the service-connected wartime disabled veteran, will continue and grow with even greater understanding so that all disabled veterans may walk in dignity and security. We pray that favorable action will be taken by this Congress to show the way to the youth of America, and educate them so the cause, efforts, and sacrifices made by our disabled veterans were not in vain but rather to guarantee their freedom in our American way of life.

May I express to you my great pleasure in being permitted to appear before you this morning. I speak for every officer and member when I convey our sincere good wishes to you and thanks to you for your tireless efforts in behalf of all our war disabled and their families.

We hope to see all of you who can possibly be there at our national service headquarters tonight for a social get-together. Thank you.

Tricks of White House Propagandists Exposed in Latest Farm Scheme

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, no administration has so boldly grabbed for power through propaganda as the present one. Daily we are learning of the unabashed demands upon the press, the broadcasting companies, civil servants, and every other group over which the expanding bureaucracy feels it has some leverage, to become propaganda agents for the President personally and for his pet schemes. A case in point is contained in the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune:

PROPAGANDA AND THE FARM PROGRAM

Once again the Kennedy administration's cynical efforts to make political pawns of the farmers have been exposed. Lester Menke, a farmer of Calumet, Iowa, quit his job selling Federal crop insurance after determining that his supervisors wanted him and other insurance agents to become propagandists for the administration's controversial proposed new subsidy and crop control program.

He said, however, that his resignation was not entirely unsolicited. A few days after he had openly stated his opposition to becoming a propagandist at a Des Moines meeting for crop insurance agents, Menke said, his regional supervisor asked him to turn over his files, and he was further pressured into doing so when he was given what he regarded as an impossibly high sales quota for 1962.

"The theme of the meeting was to promote the entire program of the U.S. Department of Agriculture as set up by Secretary Orville Freeman," he asserted in his letter of resignation to Justin C. Dee, newly appointed Federal crop insurance director for Iowa who presided at the meeting. "You made it very clear that if we as agents did not support the Department in all its endeavors through thought, word, and deed, there was no place for us as agents."

Mr. Menke was naive if he thought the job he has held since 1958 was to be confined to selling insurance under the bureaucrats who now control the Agriculture Department. Ever since they got into office they have pressured State and county agricultural stabilization and conservation committeemen, and more recently the agricultural extension service, to get out and sell farmers on the idea that only through Government operated rural welfare programs can they hope to survive economically.

This was pointed out in the House the other day by Representative ARENDS, who charged that Freeman seeks to have the extension service, a nonpartisan educational agency, "enter the political arena to help shape future farm policies and programs." ARENDS also said that Illinois ASC committeemen at a meeting in Springfield were told they were expected to support the administration's program or resign. Under the Eisenhower administration, AEC committeemen were expected to administer, but not promote, price support programs.

Farmers and taxpayers may well ask themselves what kind of program the Kennedy administration espouses if it has to depend for its acceptance on the hard sell techniques of thousands of Federal payrollers. If the program were everything administration propagandists crack it up to be as a solution to the farm problem, its merits should be obvious without the need for a nationwide promotion campaign inspired from Washington and financed by taxpayers.

Pat Casey: A Great Figure in the Motion Picture Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, Patrick J. Casey, one of the great figures of the film industry, died February 7, 1962, in California at the age of 86. With him passed one of the most colorful eras in American life.

Pat Casey, as he was known to all of his friends, actually was responsible for keeping the motion picture industry strike free over a period of 23 years.

All of the motion picture actors and actresses were friends of his, and all of management as well. He was largely responsible for launching Will Rogers on his stage career. Numbered among his close friends were such immortals as William S. Hart, Lionel Barrymore, Marie Dressler, Cecil B. DeMille, W. Irving Thalberg.

Pat Casey went to Hollywood originally at the invitation of Sidney Kent, then head of Fox Films, and of Nicholas Schenk, head of the Loew Co. for many years.

I first met Pat Casey in 1947 when I journeyed to Hollywood as head of the Labor Subcommittee established by Congressman Fred Hartley to investigate jurisdictional disputes in the motion picture industry. Patrick Casey and I quickly became close personal friends and remained close friends to the very last.

I include as part of my remarks a tribute to Patrick J. Casey written by Irving G. McCann, general counsel, Committee on Education and Labor, 80th Congress:

A TRIBUTE TO PATRICK J. CASEY

(By Irving G. McCann, general counsel, Committee on Education and Labor, 80th Congress)

Pat Casey—"the Pat Casey who never struck out" is dead at 86 years of age. He was an Irish nobleman, a Knight of the Holy Sepulchre—an honor he received from Pope Pius XI—and a friend to men and women of every race and religion.

For 14 years Congressman CARROLL D. KEARNS and I were privileged to be numbered among his friends. Only last week in California he said to Tom Kirby, his constant companion for many years, "When we return to New York one of the first things we must do is to go to Washington for a visit with CARROLL KEARNS and Irving McCann." God, in His wisdom, ordained it otherwise; and so we pay this final tribute to one of the truly great men of this generation, our friend, Pat Casey.

We first met Pat Casey in 1947 when Congressman Kearns was designated by Fred Hartley, the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor of the 80th Congress, to investigate jurisdictional disputes in the motion picture industry. I was general counsel of the Committee on Education and Labor, and was assigned by Mr. Hartley to assist Mr. KEARNS in this investigation.

When Pat Casey retired after 23 years of distinguished service as chairman of the Labor Committee of the Motion Picture Producers' Association, Eric Johnston, czar of the "movie" world, paid him this compliment:

"Pat Casey's retirement as MPA labor relations chief will be a great loss to the industry. Casey grew up in the show business. He had friends everywhere.

"All admire and respect him for the warmth of his heart, for his unflagging energy, for his wisdom, his vision, his leadership. Casey leaves behind him 23 years of the most outstanding service in labor relations an industry ever had."

Pat Casey first testified before the Kearns subcommittee on August 12, 1947, and thereafter was in constant attendance throughout the hearings, which continued through September 3, 1947. He was frequently called as a witness to clarify issues which were in dispute.

This was the first major investigation conducted by the Committee on Education and Labor following the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act and was an effort to implement that act through finding a solution for one of the gravest problems of labor; namely, jurisdictional disputes. The knowledge, judgment, and fairness of Pat Casey were of inestimable value to Congressman KEARNS and his counsel throughout the hearings.

Prior to Pat Casey's identification with the motion picture industry he had been active in the development of the theater since he was a boy. At 20 years of age he was chosen as manager of the Parlor Theater in Springfield, Mass., and thereafter was manager of two other theaters in that city. Mary Pickford made her first personal appearance at

the old Gilmore Theater in Springfield, Mass., while Pat Casey was its manager. Another girl who started her career at the Gilmore, as Little Eva, was Elsie Janis.

After 6 years' experience in managing local theaters Pat Casey moved to New York, and in 5 years had developed one of the biggest booking agencies for vaudeville in the country. He was largely responsible for starting Will Rogers on his theatrical career. He gave Marion Davies her first theatrical job. Harry Lauder, Charlie Chaplin, George M. Cohan, Eddie Cantor, Gus Edwards, Sophie Tucker, and Eva Tanguay all became famous through original appearances in vaudeville. Actors and actresses knew that Pat Casey kept an open house for them. He never knew whether he would have 5 or 20 guests for dinner. His charities were as broad as humanity. His friends were numbered among the great and the humble.

And so, Pat, on this day of your funeral, Congressman CARROLL KEARNS and I wish you a speedy journey to the everlasting reward which a good God grants to his faithful servants.

Conserving Salmon Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a letter from Mr. George Johansen, secretary-treasurer of the Alaska Fishermen's Union, concerning the problems caused by foreign nations fishing in international waters for salmon spawned in American streams. This problem affects the livelihood of thousands of persons in my district and the State of Washington. It is a complicated problem, because these foreign nationals have a legal right to fish on the high seas even though they violate the spirit and intent of existing treaties.

Mr. Johansen knows as much about this subject as anyone I know, Mr. Speaker. What he has to say in this letter, I believe, is of vital interest to all who are interested in conserving our salmon resources.

Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include his letter of February 1, 1962:

ALASKA FISHERMEN'S UNION,
Seattle, Wash., February 1, 1962.

WASHINGTON STATE CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: On January 8, 1962, the United States-Japan Trade Council issues a press release which purports to show the volume and the value of goods bought by Japan in the United States. We presume that one of the reasons for the issuance of the report was to influence public sentiment against any policy which would restrict importation of Japanese products on the U.S. market. It is not our intention at this time to dispute the figures in the report. If those are incorrect, they will no doubt be disputed at a later time.

The Alaska Fishermen's Union believes in trade with countries friendly to U.S. interests, and we subscribe to the principle that trade between nations not only fosters good relations but is necessary to the economic well-being of the community of nations. There are certain qualifications, however, which must be taken into consideration. We are not in favor of unrestricted trade, where such may destroy domestic industry, nor do we subscribe to any trade which may be harmful to our efforts of conserving natural resources.

We particularly refer to the fishery resource, which is a living, renewable resource but which is one that can be destroyed by placing intolerable strains upon it.

In the salmon field in North Pacific waters, we are in an unfortunate position in that the United States cannot wholly control the resource because the salmon leaves its birthplace in our rivers and lakes to feed and grow to maturity on the open ocean. Thus, the resource is exposed to fishing by foreign nations in international waters.

We had thought that a solution was found when a treaty was signed between the United States, Canada, and Japan in 1953. In that treaty, Japan recognized our problem of conservation and agreed to abstain from fishing on stocks of salmon of North American origin. Due to lack of information, we could not accurately divide North American and Asiatic stocks, but we did agree upon a division line at 175° W., with a provision that should this line not protect North American stocks, it could be moved, by mutual agreement, to a location where it would furnish adequate protection. While the Japanese may be in technical compliance with treaty provisions, fundamentally they are violating the spirit and intent of the treaty, in that they are not abstaining from fishing on North American stocks.

The Japanese have been taking untold millions of North American salmon over the past several years. Many of these red salmon have been taken between 175° W. and 175° E. The present treaty line should be on 175° E., to provide the protection we need.

No amount of fancy diplomatic language by the Japanese can explain away the fact that they are not concerned about conservation. Their own action of fishing on North American stocks of salmon, after having agreed to abstain, is concrete proof of their lack of understanding of the problems the United States has in perpetuating the resource; nor can we expect the Japanese to act differently in the future because of their refusal to entertain or consider the results of scientific research which have been presented to them and which show conclusively that Japan is reaping a harvest of American salmon at the expense of conservation and the American fishing industry. The last meetings held by the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission in Tokyo in November, 1961, produced no results. Therefore, our only hope of achieving results lies in congressional action.

Bills have been introduced in the Congress which will prohibit sale of salmon on the American market from any country where salmon is caught by methods not allowed American fishermen. The proposed legislation is not a ban on imports—it is designed to conserve a natural resource by denying markets to those nations which refuse to recognize their responsibilities toward good conservation.

We must be tolerant of the right of legitimate groups to protect their own interests. We are not unduly critical of the United States-Japan Trade Council, but we believe they are motivated solely by the profitable trade interests they have and are trying to impress upon the public that no action should be taken to impede the flow of imports from Japan. There is no mention in the report of any aid the Japanese have received from the United States, and which is substantial. The aid has helped Japan to regain economic stability. The United States' policy of rendering aid to friendly nations is commendable and is necessary up to a point. Some of the countries we have helped are now self-sustaining and they, in turn, should recognize they have certain obligations, particularly toward those countries which have helped them in the past.

Perhaps we cannot expect the United States-Japan Trade Council to worry about a natural resource such as salmon and conservation pertaining thereto, but we can and should expect that a responsible government, such as Japan, should not close its eyes to the conservation issue for the sake of profit, and this is particularly true in view of the North Pacific treaty entered into in good faith by all participating nations. The U.S. Government should not tolerate destruction of the salmon resource at the hands of the Japanese, nor should our Government, in its desire for trade, permit whole or partial destruction of domestic industries.

Congress represents the American people, and Congress must find ways and means of bringing about a balance. In this endeavor, their first responsibility is toward U.S. citizens.

In regard to safeguarding a natural resource of such magnitude as our salmon, there can be no compromise. The United States has spent millions of dollars to conduct an extensive research program. Our Government has denied American fishermen the right to fish until sufficient escapement has been achieved, thereby costing our fishermen and operators many more millions because of lack of production. No American fisherman is allowed to fish with nets outside the 3-mile territorial limit. Specific mesh size of nets allows escapement of immature salmon, and there are countless other restrictions placed upon us.

Because of the uncontrolled high seas salmon fishing engaged in by Japan, we cannot rehabilitate the resource. We are, in effect, providing a profitable operation for Japan by furnishing them with a ready supply of fish at the expense of the resource and of the American people. While our conservation program was not designed to benefit the Japanese, the effect of it is working for the exclusive benefit of a foreign country.

Under the circumstances as set forth above and about which we shall have more to say at a later date, we have a right to expect Congress and the administration to take such action as may be necessary to protect not only the economic welfare of the fishing industry but, more important, the resource itself.

We hope that due consideration will be given to our views and that legislation perpetuating the resource will be enacted.

Respectfully submitted.

GEORGE JOHANSEN,
Secretary-Treasurer.

"Off the Bench," "How We Talk to God," by Judge Walter B. Jones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include herewith an article entitled, "Off the Bench," by one of Alabama's most distinguished jurists, Judge Walter B. Jones, of Montgomery.

Judge Jones is a man that all of us in Alabama are proud of, not only for his many years of legal experience, but his untiring efforts on the behalf of the historic associations of Alabama.

Judge Jones is a distinguished American and we are justly proud of him.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include an article entitled "How We Talk to God":

OFF THE BENCH—HOW WE TALK TO GOD

(By Judge Walter B. Jones)

A privilege which I cherish is that of teaching, on the second Sunday of the month, the Adult Bible Class of St. Mark's Protestant Episcopal Church in Prattville. St. Mark's has a wonderful group of kindly and friendly people, a faithful minister, and Prattville is a town that is good to live in. The folks there are generous and hospitable. St. Mark's, now in its 53d year, has for its place of worship a simple and dignified brick building in the Gothic style of architecture.

Last Sunday morning our class used the subject of prayer for the lesson topic. It's difficult to give any fully satisfying definition of prayer, this I prefer: "Prayer is bringing God and the soul together and leaving them alone." It is also said that "prayer is the effort of the human spirit to have conscious companionship with the divine spirit." Prayer is the effort to know God, and private prayer is trying to know God well enough to speak to Him simply and naturally. Lord Tennyson, in his "Idylls of the King," urges us to pray for he tells us truly:

"More things are wrought by prayer
Than this world dreams of. Wherefore, let thy voice
Rise like a fountain for me night and day.
For what are men better than sheep or goats
That nourish a blind life within the brain,
If, knowing God, they lift not hands of prayer
Both for themselves and those who call them friend?
For so the whole round earth is every way
Bound by gold chains about the feet of God."

And Jeremiah tells us of God: "And ye shall seek Me, and find Me when ye shall search for Me with all your heart." And we know the words of the Psalm: "The Lord is nigh unto all that call upon Him, unto all that call upon Him in truth."

A few objections urged against prayer are that the universe is governed by fixed natural laws, that these cannot be broken or changed, and that when we ask God to do anything for us, we are asking Him to violate the laws of nature.

Well, of course, this objection doesn't hold good. Ask the person who is objecting to pick up a book off the table and hand it to you. The law of gravity keeps that book on the table, but when your friend lifts it up, he is bringing into play another and higher law—the law of personality, the law of the human will. This higher law does not violate the law of gravity, but overcomes it; so when we ask God to do something for us, we are not asking Him to violate the laws of nature He has established; but we are asking Him to bring into operation a higher law, the law of His own personality and will.

Then some people say the universe is so great and we are so small that it is foolish to expect God to care for us or to be interested in our welfare. But this confuses "greatness" with "bigness." Which is greater in a mother's eyes—the moon, 2,000 miles in diameter, or the tiny baby in her arms, reaching out for the moon? And so to God, as well as to us, one person counts for infinitely more than any amount of mere matter.

Here are four simple rules for praying: Pray regularly. Henry Drummond said, "Ten minutes every day spent alone with Christ in prayer, with the world shut out, would revolutionize a man's life." Then pray earnestly. Don't be rude to God when you talk to Him without thinking of what you are saying. This is bad manners and is not real prayer. Don't try to make God an errand boy. And, of course, the test of earnestness is being ready to help answer your own prayers. I heard the story once of a wealthy man who prayed that God would take care of the poor, and see that they were fed and clothed. When he finished praying, the man's little girl said: "Daddy, please lend me your pocketbook." "Well, what do you want with my pocketbook?" the father asked. "I just want to help you answer your prayers, Daddy." Then we should pray unselfishly. The best prayer is the one that puts God first, others second, and ourselves last. One of the greatest privileges in Christian prayer is to pray for others. St. Paul asked his friends to pray for him, and the Heavenly Father always prayed for his friends.

These are beautiful lines of poetry:

"Lord, help me to live from day to day
In such a self-forgetful way,
That even when I kneel to pray,
My prayer shall be for—others."

Way back in 1879, Henry-Frederic Amiel wrote in his diary: "Prayer is the spiritual balm, the precious cordial which restores to us peace and courage. It reminds us of pardon and duty. It says to us, 'Thou art loved—love; thou has received—give; thou must die—labor while thou canst; overcome anger by kindness; overcome evil with good.' It was a prayer of Socrates: 'I pray thee, O God, that I may be beautiful within'." And I like this part of one of Elbert Hubbard's prayers: "I wish others to live their lives, too, up to their highest, fullest, and best. To that end I pray that I may never meddle, interfere, dictate, give advice that is not wanted, or assist when my services are not needed. If I can help people, I will do it by giving them a chance to help themselves; and if I can uplift and inspire, let it be by example, inference, and suggestion, rather than by injunction and dictation."

Just the other night, in studying the life of Stonewall Jackson, I found that he was known in the armies as "the man of prayer." He was accustomed in all he did to ask divine blessing and guidance. His old body servant said that "he could always tell when a battle was near at hand, by seeing the general get up many times at night to pray." Many times when Jackson would hold a council of war, he'd ask them to think matters over. Then his officers would say, "Jackson wants time to pray over it."

A friend was once talking with him about the difficulty of obeying the New Testament command, "pray without ceasing." Jackson insisted that we could accustom ourselves to it so that it could be easily obeyed:

"When we take our meals," he said, "There is the grace. When I take a drink of water I always pause, as my palate receives the refreshment, to lift up my heart to God in thanks and prayer for the water of life. Whenever I drop a letter in the mail box, I send a petition along with it for God's blessing upon its mission, and upon the person to whom it is sent. When I break the seal of a letter just received, I stop to pray to God that He might prepare me for its contents, and make it a messenger of good. When I go to my classroom, and wait for the cadets to take their seats, that is my time to intercede with God for them. And so of every other familiar act of the day."

Surely Stonewall Jackson's life of prayer is good to follow.

European Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, during late November and early December 1961, at the direction of Chairman VINSON, of the House Committee on Armed Services, I visited Western Europe and the Near East for the purpose of making an on-the-spot evaluation of U.S. and Allied defense forces and other factors that affect our future peace and security.

NEED FOR INSPECTIONS

Let me say at the outset of this brief report, Mr. Speaker, that this trip has convinced me more than ever that it is of the utmost importance for Members of Congress to go abroad for the purpose of seeing for themselves what is going on, how our money is being spent and which of our programs should be dropped, improved or continued as is. We simply cannot sit here in Washington making decisions for spending huge sums of tax money for defense and foreign aid with information received solely from Government employees or members of our armed services. Some of our friends delight in calling these inspections "junkets"—or even worse. Some take particular pleasure in heaping scorn and ridicule on those Members who travel outside the country to find out what is going on. These same people, however, are always the first to blame Congress for failures in our oversea programs. All Members should be urged to find out firsthand what is going on in the world at every opportunity.

GENERAL

These countries were visited: Great Britain, France, West Germany, East Germany, Italy, Israel, Jordan, and Spain. By using commercial airlines, buses, railroads, subways, taxis, and trolleys almost entirely, it was possible for me to see Europe as the average traveler sees it and also to meet and talk with the man on the street wherever I went. Inspections were made of all NATO and American defense installations in the areas covered. Discussions were held with Allied and American military and civilian personnel of varying levels of command and rank. However, my conversations and observations were by no means limited to the military sphere alone. Many civilians in each country visited helped to give me an all-round, balanced picture of local conditions.

It was my good fortune to have as my military escort, Lt. Col. Harry J. Salsbury, U.S. Army, who proved to be an unusually able and perceptive officer. His excellent planning, guidance, and counsel throughout this tour was invaluable to me.

EUROPE

Mr. Speaker, Berlin, without question, was the most tense place in Europe. My stay there was marked by long talks with Allied and U.S. military and civil officials, as well as with West Germans and even some East Germans, too. At my own request, I inspected the entire length of the wall separating East from West Berlin which was constructed last August by the Communists. The feelings aroused by the wall are impossible to describe. Nothing in modern history quite compares with it. To me, it is a sign of Communist weakness, not strength; of their failure, not success. Somehow it makes one feel that the Communist world must be the largest concentration camp ever known to mankind or there would be no wall or barbed wire. The contrast between free, prosperous, and progressive West Berlin on one side of the wall and drab, dull, and disillusioned East Berlin on the other is the most dramatic tribute to free enterprise and initiative in the world today.

By permitting the East Germans, under Soviet goading, to construct this wall unchallenged, we enabled them to stop for all practical purposes the flow of skilled workers and professional people to the West; to effectively halt the flow of information to us from behind the Iron Curtain; to pull down a shade before the eyes of millions of persons behind the Iron Curtain who had looked enviously at our "showcase of freedom" in West Berlin.

NEAR EAST

The visit to Israel and Jordan, my first to the Near East, was a revelation. Most Israelis are European refugees of varied backgrounds. The spirit and mood of the people closely resemble that here in the United States. The State of Israel, with a population of 2 million, has a land area about the size of New Jersey.

While there, I talked with Gen. Moshe Dayan; Shimon Peres, Deputy Minister of Defense; Nathan Bar-Yaakov, director of the U.S. desk in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; and Israel Meir, his assistant. I also had an opportunity to hear Prime Minister Ben-Gurion eloquently address the Knesset—Parliament. About 25 percent of the people in Israel live in kibbutzes, or communal cooperatives, which are organized usually for agricultural purposes. As Israel improves economically, and personal income rises, these kibbutzes may not be as widely used in the future as they are now, according to local opinion.

It is almost impossible to visualize a nation that has received so few of nature's favors as has Israel. Centuries ago, the land was almost entirely denuded of its forests. There are no real fresh water resources except those shared with unfriendly neighbor nations. That is why the inexpensive desalination of sea water, when available, will have such great future significance. Not only are the nations on all of their borders potential enemies, but a sizable and restless Arab minority lives within Israel.

Financial help from the sale of Israel bonds in the United States, reparations from West Germany, and foreign aid from us have helped immensely in the surprising development of trade, industry, and agriculture.

This small, new nation is a monument to man's determination to live free from persecution and prejudice no matter how great the hardships. Mr. Speaker, the spirit there is very contagious and exhilarating.

The atmosphere in Jordan, on the other hand, I found to be most depressing. Its people are poorly clothed, schools are few, health standards are low and the economy seems to be standing still. Quite a contest to busy Israel.

Here are brief summaries of my findings in the military, economic, and political fields.

MILITARY

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization forces are in excellent condition, admirably trained and well armed. The basic concept of NATO is as sound and valid as ever. The quality of the leadership, contributed by all of the nations, remains very high.

Unfortunately, there is a general misconception in the United States with respect to the relative strength of NATO in comparison with the Soviet bloc in conventional military ground forces. Americans must face the fact that the combined conventional strength of the U.S.S.R. and its satellites considerably exceeds ours on the land mass of Europe.

I found the morale of American forces was high. However, as new U.S. troops arrive, this morale is declining for the simple reason that new arrivals are forbidden to bring their dependents with them, while those servicemen whose families are already there are permitted to keep their families with them for the duration of their tour of duty. Just what caused this order to be issued is unclear. Because it was issued in October, it could not be based on fear of war as a result of the August-built Berlin wall. If it is an economy move, it is a most unwise one. This order does more harm than good and should be rescinded.

No real evidence of imminent conflict could be found in Europe that would justify the abrupt action by the President last October when he called up reserve units and individuals. There was administrative failure to use good judgment in excusing hardship cases. The lack of preparation at many installations for the proper use, equipping and training of the reserves called was inexcusable. This must not happen again.

ECONOMIC

It is in the economic field where the most dramatic changes have occurred in Europe in the last few years. The six-nation European Common Market has without doubt brought great gains to the member nations, and additional nations may soon join. There is virtually full employment in the Common Market area, where the rate of economic growth now exceeds both that of the United States and the Soviet Union. Spain, although modest growth is evident there, lags far behind the Common Market countries economically.

The progress and prosperity of the free enterprise system in Europe is proving to be the greatest stumbling block for the Communists to overcome in their attempts to subvert modern industrial nations. This most likely explains why their efforts are now primarily directed at new and underdeveloped nations.

POLITICAL

It is now evident to all who follow the international scene that there are deepening divisions between men and nations in the whole Communist world. To exploit these divisions, our own policies must be clear and strong.

There is a general disillusionment with the United Nations throughout Western Europe. No longer is the U.N. regarded there as the major instrument for finding solutions to the world's really knotty problems. The U.N.'s tolerance of aggression in the name of anticolonialism, the fiscal irresponsibility of many of its members and the uncertain voting record of some of the new, small, undeveloped, member nations, have made it progressively more ineffective in the eyes of many officials in London, Paris, Bonn, and Rome.

The importance of West Berlin to the free world as a symbolic island of freedom more than a hundred miles inside the Communist empire is greater than ever. West Berliners, as well as U.S. and allied military personnel, are still bewildered by our permitting the unchallenged construction of the wall. Berlin is the world's most conspicuous testing ground for measuring our determination to prevent Russian takeover by the "slice-by-slice of the salami" method.

CONCLUSIONS

First. NATO is still a solid cornerstone for our European policy and the most effective means of checking Communist aggression. The leadership and training of NATO and American forces in Europe is excellent.

Second. Free Berlin must not be bartered away. If necessary it must be defended with all our resources. Failure to do so will encourage the Soviets to take over all of Europe. World confidence in the integrity of the United States would be destroyed for at least a generation.

Third. The regulations forbidding families from joining servicemen now being sent to Europe should be rescinded.

Fourth. The Reserve callup of last fall was unnecessary because no real emergency existed. Those reservists who are serving at great personal and family sacrifice should be relieved from active duty immediately and replaced by volunteers and draftees as needed.

Fifth. The growth, prosperity, and unity of the free world require us to explore every possible avenue of economic cooperation not only with the European Common Market but all other free and friendly nations everywhere.

Sixth. We must carefully reexamine the record of the United Nations to determine how it can be improved or what else we might do to help attain world peace and security.

BRIEFINGS CONDUCTED FOR CONGRESSMAN OSMERS

London, England: Adm. Harold P. Smith, commander in chief, U.S. Navy in Europe,

and commander of the U.S. naval forces, Eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean; Col. C. A. Thompson, deputy chief, MAAG/England; Mr. Frank Wisner, political division, American Embassy; Lt. Comdr. R. P. Sluyter, escort officer.

Paris, France: Gen. Lauris Norstad, SACEUR and commander in chief, EUCOM; Lt. Gen. E. H. Underhill, chief of staff, EUCOM; Mr. J. P. Perez, headquarters EUCOM, escort officer.

Heidelberg, Germany: Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, commander in chief, USAREUR; Maj. Gen. W. H. Nutter, chief of staff, USAREUR; Lt. Col. Lloyd W. Brown, U.S. Army, escort officer.

Frankfurt, Germany: Mr. Hugh T. Cunningham, political division, American Consulate.

Berlin, Germany: Maj. Gen. Albert Watson, U.S. commander, Berlin; Brig. Gen. Frederick O. Hartel, commanding general, Berlin command; Capt. F. J. Fogh, U.S. Army, escort officer.

Verona, Italy: Maj. Gen. Eugene F. Cardwell, commander in chief, SETAF.

Rome, Italy: Capt. R. H. Blair, U.S. Navy, deputy chief, MAAG/Italy; Maj. Madison D. Hartley, U.S. Air Force, escort officer.

Tel Aviv, Israel: Col. Bill J. Tutin, Army attaché; Maj. William H. Norris, assistant Army attaché.

Naples, Italy: Rear Adm. Donald T. Eller, acting chief of staff, AFSOUTH; Cmdr. B. B. Holt, escort officer. (Participating in briefing were officers from the United Kingdom, France, Italy, Greece and Turkey.)

Madrid, Spain: Col. Robert C. Williams, Army attaché; Brig. Gen. Gines Perez, U.S. Air Force, deputy chief, MAAG; Capt. James A. Smith, U.S. Navy, deputy chief, JUSMG; Col. Robert T. Calhoun, commander of Torrejon Air Base; Maj. Thomas F. Hogan, U.S. Air Force, escort officer.

Rota, Spain: Capt. H. T. Hazelton, commander in chief, Rota Naval Station; Capt. G. H. Webber, U.S. Navy; Lt. J. R. F. Bowers, U.S. Navy, escort officer; Comdr. James J. Mayer, U.S. Navy, escort officer.

Gen. Tadeus Kosciusko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, by happy coincidence, the annual celebration of Gen. Tadeus Kosciusko's birthday falls on February 12, the day we honor the memory of America's own great emancipator, Abraham Lincoln. This year is the 216th anniversary. General Kosciusko is known as the leader of Poland's fight for freedom and liberty, and for his service in America as a brigadier general in the American Revolution. Kosciusko is still today a vibrant symbol of the fight for the liberty of the Polish people.

Most American school children remember General Kosciusko as the Adjutant to General Washington, and for his great career as a soldier in the battles of the Revolutionary War at New York, Yorktown, and elsewhere. Kosciusko came to this country as a trained and experienced soldier and engineer, of enormous value to the inexperienced Continental Army, trained at the expense of the Polish Government in England and Germany and France. After the war the Congress expressed its thanks and accorded him the rank of brigadier general, which he carried with him upon his return to the Polish Army. Less well known in the United States is Kosciusko's brilliant career in Europe, where he led the Polish armies in their struggle for freedom in the 1790's. General Kosciusko refused high rank under Napoleon because Napoleon would not pledge himself to a free and unified Poland.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that the anniversary celebrations for Abraham Lincoln and Tadeus Kosciusko fall on the same day. Kosciusko, like Lincoln, was a great American patriot; Congress voted him citizenship in the United States. Both men expressed the ideals and goals and devotion to freedom which characterize the greatest Americans. I am proud to salute Gen. Tadeus Kosciusko for his part in the struggle for freedom in America and the struggle for freedom in Poland.

The Doyle Bill To Outlaw All Communist-Action Organizations, Including the Communist Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, on January 30, 1962, I filed the Doyle bill, H.R. 9944, "to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to provide penalties for becoming or remaining a member of Communist-action organizations, and for other purposes." This bill is designed to have the effect of outlawing the Communist Party in the United States, or any other Communist-action organization whether under the name of communism, or not. It will have this effect of outlawing such, I believe, by making membership, per se, either in the Communist Party or any Communist-action organization a criminal offense. It makes punishable the continuing or subsequent membership in any Communist-action organization after such an organization is found to be a Communist-action organization by final order of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

In connection with the formation of this bill I received, and I very much appreciate, the very great aid of the legal counsel of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and of the Legislative Council of the House of Representatives.

But let me make it clear that this H.R. 9944 is not a bill by or from the House Committee on Un-American Activities, of which committee I have been an active member for about 15 years. The bill has been referred to that committee for further proceeding.

It is my premise that since the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court on June 5, 1962, in the case of the *Communist Party of the United States* v. *The Subversive Activities Control Board*, the provisions of H.R. 9944 will make most trials not only more effective and expeditious but will be comparatively inexpensive, and I believe the bill is deliberately drawn so that all the defendants' constitutional rights and due process under established law will be definitely accorded each and every defendant prosecuted under the bill.

My bill, I believe, will not in any way alter or amend the present existing Smith Act but will, on the contrary, supplement the Smith Act. For instance, whereas the Smith Act, as I understand it, requires, first, proof that the defendant knowingly became, or is, a member of the Communist Party; second that the Communist Party in the United States advocates and teaches the overthrow and destruction of the U.S. Government by force and violence; third, that the individual defendant knew of such purpose of the organization, and, fourth, that the individual defendant actively and purposely participated and took part as a member of the Communist-action organization in such activities. Therefore, under my bill, Mr. Speaker, the only basic fact which must be established in any individual prosecution is that the individual defendant knowingly has continued his or her membership in the Communist Party, or any Communist-action organization, whether the name Communist is attached to it or not, after June 5, 1961, which was the date the Supreme Court of the United States upheld the findings of the Subversive Activities Control Board, which finding was that the Communist Party in the United States is a Communist-action group.

Maximum penalties under my bill would be 5 years' imprisonment, or $10,000 fine, or both.

Mr. Speaker, since the filing of my bill on January 30, 1962, several Members of this great legislative body have spoken to me and asked, approvingly of my bill, whether I would permit them to take the Doyle bill, H.R. 9944, and file the same in their individual name to aid and assist in the premises. I have answered each and every one of them affirmatively and cordially so.

This statement by me is to say to all other Members of this House that any Member who wishes so to do hereby has my hearty approval in doing just that.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of February 10, 1962:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District of Texas, February 10, 1962)

Federal Government size is growing by leaps and bounds: (last year 78,262 Federal employees were added). This week an additional Secretary of Commerce was added, vote 231 for 169 against (ALGER against). The amendments to the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act it is estimated will add 8,550 people to the Department of Labor staff and up costs $45 million, an increase entirely unwarranted according to the facts developed during debate on this bill. These increases cost heavily and with the money and increased personnel goes power and in the same degree freedom is taken from the citizen taxpayer through tax increases and the necessary regulations and Government controls. The danger is, the Government scope and power is greatly accelerating under the Kennedy administration.

"The national debt ceiling must be raised, $2 billion and then $8 billion more" the President informed the Ways and Means Committee. It is interesting to note the distorted logic and statistical misuse of figures presented by the President and his advisers. For example, to show expenditure increases for the military, international and space agencies are lumped together to be contrasted to civilian agencies. Thus, the cost of the Peace Corps, Export-Import Bank, the U.S. Information Agency, foreign aid, aeronautics and space research, are classed as military rather than civilian and in this way the greater increase can be shown as military. The truth, on the contrary, is that the welfare expenditures have gone up 60 percent while military has increased only 40 percent, so the military is not the reason for greater increased spending. Another example is the attempt to show that by increasing our debt we are decreasing our debt. This is done by percentages of the gross national product at earlier periods as contrasted to now and projected in to the future. This is fallacious because (1) Government spending is used to increase the GNP (like a person borrowing at the bank to show he has more money); (2) The same items are covered various times in the GNP total; (3) The President forecasts a $45–$50 billion jump in our GNP next year (this is like borrowing against your own projected next year's credit standing). I shall oppose any increase in the debt limit since I have opposed the increased scope of spending which now necessitates a debt increase.

The Public Welfare Amendments of 1962 is now before the Ways and Means Committee. The changes would include: (1) Increase from 50 to 75 percent the Federal share of Federal-State participation for rehabilitation care; (2) expand child welfare services, including more services to unmarried mothers; (3) more and better trained Federal welfare workers; (4) eliminate State residence requirement for aid receipients and others. The conclusion stated, "We cannot afford our present methods. They are costly to the taxpayer and often shattering to the recipients." With this conclusion I agree. So it is that I fail to see how continuing and expanding existing programs will solve the problems. How strange it is that the President and his spokesman, Secretary Ribicoff, fail to realize that charity begins at home, at the local level, through private and church facilities and activities and that adding thousands more Federal bureaucrats and workers at great expense does not solve welfare problems. My objections include these: (1) Federal coercion of the States using Federal taxes as the bribe and bonus; (2) destroying individual initiative and self-respect (Federal aid does not restore dignity as the Secretary claims); (3) wrong assessment of the situation and the public's needs—deprived of opportunity, bowed down under a bewildering array of new problems, suspect by their fellows, they are devoid of hope in the midst of a society providing abundantly and well for most of us—is not an accurate description of needy Americans today, that Federal aid will correct. Indeed, the old hackneyed, New Deal spend ourselves rich in the name of compassion is not the spirit of America, nor the medicine needed to correct ever-present human problems. Further, the wrong medicine will hurt, not cure the patient. "The new program which has been designed to carry out President Kennedy's recommendations bespeaks a compassionate heart and hard head" statement of Secretary Ribicoff should be rephrased as "bespeaks a lack of understanding of (1) human nature, (2) basic economics, (3) the role of Federal Government in our lives and is designed to be used for political purposes, perhaps by Secretary Ribicoff as a campaign issue in his impending race for the Senate."

The President's message on aid to education requesting a $20 billion per year expansion beyond our present expenditures for education concludes with this fine statement: "The education of our people is a national investment. It yields tangible returns in economic growth, an improved citizenry, and higher standards of living. But even more importantly, free men and women value education as a personal experience and opportunity—as a basic benefit of a free and democratic civilization. It is our responsibility to do whatever needs to be done to make this opportunity available to all and to make it of the highest possible quality." Isn't it a distressing paradox that in seeking such a laudable goal, the President, in the rest of his message completely contradicts and makes impossible the attainment of that goal?

WAYS AND MEANS KEY COMMITTEE

"The fate of a major part of the administration's program will rest this year in the hands of just one committee, the House Ways and Means Committee. Traditionally this has usually been a cautious conservative group, and when they finally act their recommendations nearly always become law."—Representative FRANCES BOLTON, of Ohio.

Department of Army Reorganization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. W. S. Whitehead, a member of a management and trade consultant firm here in Washington, has been communicating with the Armed Services Committee of both House and Senate in an effort to obtain consideration of certain recommendations made by him and a fellow reservist several years ago with regard to reorganization of the Department of the Army.

Mr. Whitehead has now prepared a statement on this subject which he wishes made available to the Members of both House and Senate for their consideration of this problem, and I am pleased to present his statement in full below:

DEPARTMENT OF ARMY REORGANIZATION

Under date of April 16, 1958, in collaboration with Lt. Col. William E. Gamble, an Active Reserve officer, the undersigned submitted to all members of the Senate and House Armed Services Committees, suggested actions for their consideration in connection with the then pending amendments to the National Security Act.

Among those recommendations submitted was one involving the establishment of a single Department of Army Office of Materiel Requirements. Its proposed responsibilities was to establish policy with respect to the procurement, storage, distribution, maintenance, and issue of required supplies and equipment within the Army system.

Unfortunately, the recommendations with respect to the above were not favorably considered by either of the Armed Forces Committees. If favorable action had been taken in this regard at that time, substantial monetary and personnel savings would have been realized over the past 3 years, and the Department of Army logistical functions would have been in a much stronger position today.

In the Army proposed reorganization plan recently sent to the Congress by the administration, it is refreshing to note that the very recommendation Colonel Gamble and the writer proposed with respect to the establishment of a Logistics Command, is contained therein. Since approximately 50 percent of the Army's appropriated dollar is allocated for the procurement of materiel and other things, this proposed change eventually will make more efficient the Army's whole supply management responsibility.

Notwithstanding the foregoing strong and vigorous opposition is hereby registered to the inclusion of the research and development function within the proposed Materiel Development and Logistics Command. A cardinal principle of good management is hereby violated by including within one specialized authority an activity which is not basically nor directly related to that authority. In effect such a proposal will tend for further confusion, overlapping, and unwieldiness.

In the pure sense of the word, development and finalization comes about in close association with performance, and testing on the part of the combat and field forces. Therefore, the logistics experts have very little, if any, participation in the determination of what constitutes improved methods of warfare, or what is necessary or required for a modern and successful defense. After such determinations have been made the supply authorities are then authorized to procure, store, maintain, and issue to the troops, the items required.

In view of the above it is strongly urged, in the interest of assuring efficient military staff performance, that the following revisions in the proposed Department of Army reorganization be favorably considered by both the Senate and House Armed Services Committees: (1) create and establish a materiel and Logistics Command; and (2) create and establish a Materiel Research and Development Command.

Wilson's Typewriter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include the following column by David Lawrence:

THE STORY OF WILSON'S TYPEWRITER—PRESIDENT'S MACHINE VIEWED AS SYMBOL OF DISCIPLINED AND COURAGEOUS MIND

(By David Lawrence)

This is a story about a typewriter that has just come to the White House for exhibition to the public. To understand its significance, one must ask how many persons out of the many millions who use a typewriter every day can do so over the years and almost never make a mistake in typing.

Yet this is the feat which a President of the United States—Woodrow Wilson—performed, and the evidences of it are to be found in the many historic documents that he personally typed and which are on file in the Library of Congress.

President Kennedy received the typewriter at a little ceremony the other day to which he graciously invited this writer, who last autumn had written Mr. Kennedy suggesting that, inasmuch as he was endeavoring to place on exhibition at the White House mementoes of every President, it might be desirable to get the Wilson typewriter from the American Red Cross. Sold as surplus property, the typewriter had come into the possession of the late Adm. Cary T. Grayson, President Wilson's physician, who had loaned it to the Red Cross. It was found stored in an attic, and General Gruenther, president of the Red Cross, made the formal presentation to President Kennedy in a brief ceremony attended also by Admiral Grayson's sons.

Mr. Kennedy displayed some facsimiles of President Wilson's typing, including the original of the message to Congress on the famous 14 points, which were proposed as a basis for ending World War I. Mr. Wilson wrote virtually all his messages and important statements on his own Hammond typewriter—a brand which hasn't been manufactured for many years now.

It was the precision of Mr. Wilson's mind which made extraordinary the many letters and memorandums and statements which he personally typed. He knew exactly what he wanted to say and, though he typed slowly, he was accurate to the point of perfection. The same precision was to be noted in his speechmaking. He almost never prepared a speech in advance, and during his entire campaign of 1912 made only one prepared address, which he delivered on Labor Day and which, he said afterward, he didn't like.

Oddly enough, Mr. Wilson never had to correct his impromptu speeches. The late Charles Swem, an expert stenographer—if not a world champion—took down the speeches in shorthand and gave them to this correspondent and other members of the press almost always without a single correction and usually without even submitting them to anyone for revision. No such handling of a President's speeches has been heard of since.

Mr. Wilson didn't have any ghostwriters though it is probable that some state documents which contained technical material were prepared for him by Cabinet officers. Certainly, after he became ill in 1919, his messages to Congress were prepared by various members of the Cabinet—a practice incidentally, begun by George Washington and continued by many Presidents since. For a President cannot possibly spend his time researching the many points that have to be covered in messages or statements on a great many subjects.

But on the main issues of the day, domestic and international, Mr. Wilson himself wrote all his declarations on his Hammond typewriter. He actually composed on it, in their entirety, most of the important diplomatic communications that were sent to the German Government by the State Department prior to our own entry into the war. He acknowledged daily many a communication from members of the Cabinet in short memos that he personally typed. Unfortunately, he considered most of them to be routine, and didn't make carbon copies. Hence, a lot of these documents have been lost, though a unit known as "The Papers of Woodrow Wilson," headed by Prof. Arthur S. Link, of Princeton University, is researching them at the Library of Congress and is gathering them together for eventual publication, along with other data about President Wilson's two administrations.

Mr. Wilson also was an expert at shorthand, but he used this primarily to jot down notes as he thought out in advance the topics he would cover in a speech. These shorthand notes, however were very brief, and were mainly confined to headings or points to be discussed. For he did not like to prepare the text of speeches in advance. Mr. Wilson was amenable to suggestions from others, but the language was almost always his own. There was a preciseness about his use of words, whether in speaking or writing, which proved him to be a master of expression in the English language.

The placing on exhibition at the White House of facsimiles of historic documents, along with the typewriter on which Mr. Wilson personally typed them, gives to millions of sightseers an opportunity to see on paper, in its original form, the work of a mind disciplined, precise and courageous.

This Nation Can Lose Its Greatness in the Demand for Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include this timely editorial from the Dallas Times Herald which emphasizes a grave danger to free America, the fact that we may be swapping our initiative, our good old American "get up and go" for security. A kept people cannot be a great people nor free. The article follows:

TREND TOWARD GREATER SECURITY SAPS INITIATIVE OF U.S. CITIZENS

Are we Americans swapping off our initiative for security?

There has been a great deal of evidence in recent years to indicate that we are. And if the trend continues it could result in a weakening of the people and the Nation itself.

Leslie B. Worthington, president of United States Steel, believes we have lost some of the boldness and confidence we once had as a nation. Speaking at Pittsburgh Tuesday, he warned: "Too many of our citizens are willing to hide the light of their ability under a bushel that bears the label of security."

What has made America great has been its people with pride in their abilities and confidence in the incentives of profit and personal reward, Mr Worthington said. It has been the incentive gained through freedom of opportunity, freedom to have drawing-board dreams and freedom to push them through to accomplished fact.

But when we look around America today we see the incentives of profit and personal reward being taxed or bargained away. Here are some of the things that contribute to lack of confidence: More and more government control over our lives, penalties in the form of confiscatory taxes and labor demands for fewer hours and more pay.

Mr. Worthington offers this solution to our problem:

1. Keep production costs, tax costs and other costs as low as we can keep them.

2. Create new production and new self-sustaining jobs by investment of savings and by creation of a climate in which government can stimulate rather than retard the growth of investment capital.

3. Regain the incentives, initiative and confidence in our system through participation of each of us in stimulating renewed interest in and understanding of the principles of the American economic system and free, competitive enterprise.

That's Mr. Worthington's recommendation.

It makes a lot of sense.

Urban Renewal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, President John F. Kennedy's reply to a newspaper correspondent as to whom he would appoint as Secretary of Urban Affairs generated heat and anger from Republicans and others. They charged political motives to a proposed appointment when the facts and circumstances lead to only one person as Secretary of Urban Affairs under present circumstances. By reason of his position as Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which would be the nucleus of the Department of Urban Affairs, and by reason of his experience and knowledge of urban problems, Robert Weaver would be preeminently fitted for the position as secretary of the new department. It is important because of the hue and cry to know why a Department of Urban Affairs must be created now.

Since 1949 urban redevelopment has been a program which Congress has said was necessary and essential for a better standard of living and for the improvement of urban conditions. Apart from the improvement in housing, the problems of cities are myriad and intricate. Three-fourths of our national population, or approximately 130 million live in urban areas. Contrast the situation of our rural population where one-fourth of our national population live in rural areas and a Cabinet Department exists to administer the manifold problems of agriculture. The creation of a Department of Agriculture, under a Secretary of Agriculture, was and is a necessity for the progress of our country and the production of food and fiber. The programs which the Secretary of Agriculture administer deal not only with the production of food and fiber, but also with research, with housing, with conservation, with foreign affairs, with electrification, with telephone expansion,

and with food control. It would be unthinkable that such programs should have a hydra-headed administration without central authority.

Likewise the functions of the Federal Government in relation to our cities should be administered by one department head of Cabinet rank coordinating the diversified activities of the Government addressed to those problems. To detail the problems and needs of the cities would be a detailed justification of the creation and the adoption of such an agency as the Department of Urban Affairs. The contribution by metropolitan areas fortify any justification based on need. Metropolitan areas produce most of our wealth, exclusive of food and fiber. They produce enough to enable most communities to build a floor under misery, provide leisure for the workingman and support the institutions that advance our way of life called civilization. The manufacturing of clothing, the production of chemicals, the forging of steel ingots, manufacturing of appliances, the processing of foods and textiles are performed in metropolitan areas. All these require decent shelter, pure water and air, effective mass and private transportation, educational facilities, recreational outlets, such as theater, television, radio, press, parks, and places of worship, such as churches and synagogues. In the furtherance of these objectives, the cliffdwellers require protection at work, on the way home, and at home. They require police, fire, and correctional protection. All these activities must have a sense of direction, and just as the Secretary of Agriculture gives a sense of direction to the farm problems, so there is need of a Secretary of Urban Affairs to give direction to urban and suburban affairs.

Cities today face many difficulties. Financial limitations hamper solutions. Diversified agencies without policy coordination hinder the attainment of desirable goals. Unplanned and sprawling growth require corrective measures of many kinds to promote better living, better housing, and better environmental conditions in our urban areas. Urban renewal requires direction and sense to eliminate the factors which have blighted our cities in the past and are the source of many of our worst social problems. Too many of us do not fully understand the means by which urban renewal functions in our cities.

A law school and college colleague of mine, Arthur J. Gang, who is now Deputy Chief Counsel of the Urban Renewal Administration, served as special editor for the Bar Journal's recent symposium on the subject of urban renewal. Members will be interested in the argument made by Senator CLARK of Pennsylvania concerning the necessity for a new Department of Urban Affairs. There are many other articles that are instructive and informative on the many problems confronted by those who administer the Federal program, their counterparts in the cities, and those who produce the end product—the developers. The contents of the symposium are summarized in a very fine introduction written by Mr. Gang. Since the whole issue comes at an opportune time, and represents a splendid effort to fill the gaps in our understanding of urban renewal, I believe the readers would find the introduction informative and helpful. The introduction by Mr. Gang follows:

INTRODUCTION

(By Arthur J. Gang [1])

This issue was conceived as a means of according recognition to a rapidly expanding program of Federal activity. It directs attention to the variety of legal problems inherent in the Federal urban renewal program, and the opportunities that await members of the profession to contribute to their solution. Urban problems are becoming highly complex; we have it from no lesser authority than the majority whip of the Senate.[2] There is no urban problem of more staggering proportions than the accelerating trend toward blight, and no problem more complex.[3] There are those who believe that the complexity of the problem is more than matched by the complexity of the Federal program devised to resist and reverse that trend. To the extent that this symposium contributes to an understanding of the Federal urban renewal program and its components, it will have achieved its purpose.

II

The Federal urban renewal program is a program of loans and grants to local public agencies for the purpose of providing temporary financing, and the major portion of the permanent financing, of projects for the prevention and elimination of slums and blight. The program has been in existence for a little more than a decade[4] and gives every promise of being with us for a long time to come. Brought into being by title I of the Housing Act of 1949[5] the statute underwent a thorough overhaul in 1954[6] when Congress broadened the scope of the program by authorizing assistance for the purpose of preventing as well as eliminating, slums and blight, and by introducing the concept of renewal, which contemplated the repair and rehabilitation of substandard structures in addition to the acquisition and demolition activities that had theretofore been the exclusive means of dealing with slums and blight.

A second major revision of Federal urban renewal legislation was accomplished by the Housing Act of 1961, which became law on June 30.[7] Without belittling any of the numerous modifications in the FHA section 220 and 221 mortgage insurance programs that are intended to facilitate the provision of housing for moderate income families in urban renewal areas, or the many liberalizing amendments to various features of the title I program, certainty among the more important accomplishments of the 1961 revision are the increase in capital grant contract authorizations from $2 billion to $4 billion[8] and the increase in the Federal contribution to the permanent financing of renewal projects for small municipalities from two-thirds of net project cost to three-fourths.[9] The 1961 act has lent new urgency to the program and will certainly affect its tempo, but it has not significantly altered the course and direction of Federal renewal activities.

There is general recognition and agreement on the elements composing the syndrome of blight—substandard structures, inadequate plumbing, heating, and electrical facilities, overcrowding of people and structures, insufficient open space and recreational facilities, poor street patterns, noxious land uses, high fire losses, and crime ratios, juvenile delinquency in large doses, an inadequate tax base, and poor collections, vermin infestation and other health hazards, social disorganization, hopelessness, despair, and stagnation.[10] There is far less understanding of the tools that are available to arrest and erase blight, and woeful confusion about the manner in which urban renewal contributes to that end. To dissipate some of that confusion, there are presented several discursive articles on various aspects of urban renewal that are of particular interest to members of the bar.

III

Stratton Brown, in what is believed to be the first article appearing in any law journal devoted to the financial aspects of renewal, describes the kinds of financial assistance that are available to a local public agency undertaking a renewal project and leads the reader through the steps involved in financing a typical project. Borrowing working capital or obtaining interim financing in the private investment market is fraught with legal difficulties at every step. A successful transaction demands advance planning, precision of execution, and a sensitive appreciation of the importance of timing. The urban renewal obligations of local public agencies throughout the country are now being marketed in a volume approximating $100 million a month at an interest rate averaging 1½ percent. The excellent market acceptance of these obligations is due in no small measure to the skill of bond counsel in explaining the urban renewal program to their clients and satisfying them on the soundness of the security underlying the obligations that they purchase.

Although Mr. Brown omits all discussion of the definitive loan[11] from his article, presumably because it is not yet in common use, it is more than adequately treated by B. T. Fitzpatrick in his article on the role of the redeveloper.[12] The only issue of definitive loan obligations that has been marketed to date was sold in the private market by the Urban Redevelopment Authority of Pittsburgh, Pa., to finance the lease of project land for the municipal auditorium in that city. However, the Urban Renewal Administration has entered into negotiations with several local public agencies for agreements to make definitive loans on specified terms when required. As the projects to which these agreements relate are completed, the local agencies involved will either sell their definitive loan obligations to the Government or sell them in the private market, using the Government's contract as security for the loan.

B. T. Fitzpatrick's article is more broadly addressed to the troublesome subject of negotiations for the disposition of land to the private developer, many of whom he represents. In view of his extensive experience as an urban renewal practitioner, it comes as no surprise when he pleads for an understanding on the part of the redeveloper of the reasons for the controls sought to be imposed by the local agency and, at the same time, chides the local agency for thwarting unjustifiably the desire of the developer to set up the purchase and construction transaction in the manner that will best serve his business interests.

David L. Krooth is concerned with a different breed of developer. He states the case for the consumer cooperative as a vehicle for reducing rentals in urban renewal areas and opening the way for a return of displacees to their former neighborhoods. He emphasizes the savings involved in purchasing rental units through a cooperative and points to the additional downward pressure on costs that may be anticipated as a consequence of the new FHA below-market interest rate program instituted by the Housing Act of 1961. The wisdom of adequate legal representation to assure sound organization of the cooperative, and successful contract relationships in the purchase of land and construction serv-

Footnotes at end of speech.

ices, is apparent in every paragraph of Mr. Krooth's presentation.

Julian Levi's article is better understood when placed in the historical perspective of the evolution of the Federal legislation. It was only in 1954 that the definition of an urban renewal area was broadened to take into account "a blighted, deteriorated, or deteriorating area" and that "rehabilitation or conservation" became authorized project activities. While there are Federal requirements that must be satisfied before an area is deemd qualified for rehabilitation or conservation treatment, State enabling statutes and State court decisions are generally more restrictive than Federal law on this score [12] and, for all practical purposes, determine the eligibility of the area for the treatment proposed. Hence, the tendency to ignore the Federal statute in discussing issues of qualification or eligibility. Mr. Levi's thesis is simply stated. He questions the feasibility of a rehabilitation program in the absence of penalties for failure to comply that are sufficiently drastic to induce rehabilitation activities by property owners. While he argues well for that point of view, he would probably be the first to agree that we cannot bulldoze our way through all of the slums and blighted areas of the Nation, and that the principal hope for urban renewal lies in developing solutions to the problems of rehabilitation and placing increasing reliance on this less drastic treatment for blighted areas.

S. Leigh Curry, Jr., focuses upon a relatively new tool in the renewal arsenal—the community renewal program. Much of the project activity in the first decade of the urban renewal program has been frankly experimental in nature rather than part of a comprehensive assault upon the problems of blight. Two billion dollars, as Mr. Curry observes, is a vast sum of money to commit to a trial and error approach to the problems of urban blight, and there is a growing demand in many quarters that the renewal dollar be stretched further to make greater inroads on the conditions that produce blight throughout a community. Professor Fitch, for example, reminds us that the Housing Act of 1949 provides the means, but not the policy for urban renewal.[14] He criticizes projects that create luxury apartments as reflecting "class architecture." These "giant towers standing in landscaped deserts" represent intrusions on the urban scene rather than "lively organic parts of complex urban reality." Mr. Curry would agree that there is an absence of coordinated policy in redevelopment. He sees the problem as one of project opportunism, the selection and timing of projects to serve short-run objectives. Recurrent difficulties of that nature must be faced unless a locality commits itself to a communitywide renewal program on the basis of which particular project proposals can be evaluated.[15]

Lewis H. Weinstein, writing as comprehensive a review of urban renewal litigation as has appeared anywhere, stresses a proposition better understood by lawyers than by others when he urges that local public agencies have a profound responsibility to do justice, and to exercise their broad powers with a minimum of hardship to those affected by the renewal process. It is also encouraging to have his judgment that we are moving away from a period of broad spectrum attaches upon the constitutionality of renewal legislation and the findings and actions of local public agencies and their governing bodies, and toward a period of project litigation with challenges to particular actions that do not threaten the validity of the entire undertaking. In support of that judgment is Mr. Weinstein's performance as counsel for the local agency or the municipality in every litigated case in Massachusetts involving slum clearance since 1939.

In his message to the Congress on March 9, 1961,[16] the President urged that we move "with new vigor to conserve and rehabilitate existing residential districts." He recommended new authority for FHA to insure a wide variety of home improvement loans, particularly in urban renewal areas. He also asked for legislation authorizing a locality to acquire existing housing in an urban renewal area and resell it "at a realistic price" for rehabilitation. The President tied the request for the latter authority to his desire to keep rehabilitated housing available to families of moderate income. Richard H. Bryant traces the relationships of the several provisions enacted in the Housing Act of 1961 to implement this feature of the President's message, and in so doing, draws attention once again to the opportunity and the challenge that confront our cities. There are many proponents of the urban renewal program who are convinced that the success or failure of the program will be gaged in large measure by the extent to which we are able to lick the problem of providing housing in renewal areas for a cosmopolitan infusion of families of moderate income.[17]

The philosophical base for the symposium is provided by Senator CLARK and Commissioner Slayton. The Senator, with his customary effective advocacy, states the case for a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, and forecasts accelerated progress in the solution of our urban problems once the Department is organized to provide the necessary leadership and coordination of the many forces striving for the revitalization of our cities.[18] The Commissioner suggests a familiar dilemma—how to reverse the trend toward slums and blight when blight spreads more rapidly than our puny efforts in the areas where efforts are made, can arrest it. The escape from the dilemma, and the justification for the continuing use of urban renewal, is to have Federal aid generate self-help within the framework of a rational and comprehensive developmental program. That can be accomplished only when we are all aware of the importance of a developmental program to guide the growth of the city, when we stress good design in rebuilding the city, and when we remain alert to the human implications of all that we are doing by way of renewal. Commissioner Slayton has no pat answers for breaking the bottlenecks to renewal, but by articulating the problems and by restating so well the important objectives of renewal activity, he plants the seed for further thought and analysis.

IV

By and large, lawyers have probably not been the most creative participants in urban renewal activity. There have been exceptions—indeed, notable exceptions over the years—but to the bulk of our brethren of the bar as to the typical city dweller, urban renewal has been a never-never land in conception and practice. The growing volume of legal literature in recent years addressed to renewal problems attests to a change.[19] With the constitutional underpinnings firmly established, the average practitioner can no longer afford to ignore the renewal field except at the peril of seeing good legal business gravitate in other directions. Moreover, as public officials become increasingly enthusiastic about the potential of urban renewal for their respective communities, there will be a tendency for some to become a bit careless about the rights of the individual tenant or property owner, and considerable legal talent will be required to minimize hardships for those scheduled to be uprooted. The effectiveness of such legal representation will vary directly in proportion to counsel's familiarity with the requirements and procedures of the renewal process as it functions in his community.

Running through the contributions to this issue is a theme of optimism—restrained to be sure, but optimism nonetheless—that the trend toward urban blight can be reversed and that urban renewal is a suitable tool for the purpose. To those who would abandon the fight and flee from urban blight to suburban sprawl, we can do no better than to repeat the advice of the prophet:

"And seek the peace of the city whither I have caused you to be carried away captive, and pray unto the Lord for it; for in the peace thereof shall ye have peace."[20]

---

[1] Deputy Chief Counsel, Urban Renewal Administration; A. B. 1935 College of the City of New York, LL.B. 1938 Columbia Law School; member of the New York Bar, admitted to practice before the U.S. Supreme Court, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, and the U.S. Court of Military Appeals.

[2] Hearings on S. 1633 before the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, 87th Cong., 1st sess., at 14 (1961).

[3] See Whyte, "Exploding Metropolis" (1958).

[4] For an excellent article dealing with the origins and development of the Federal legislation, see Foard & Fefferman, "Federal Urban Renewal Legislation," 25 Law and Contemp. Prob. 635 (1960).

[5] 63 Stat. 413, 414; 42 U.S.C. 1441 and 1450 et seq.

[6] 68 Stat. 590, 622; 42 U.S.C. 1451 et seq.

[7] 75 Stat. 149. See infra, p. 284.

[8] The current demand for funds is such that contract commitments are expected to total $800 million for fiscal year 1962 as opposed to $343 million actually committed during the last fiscal year.

[9] A small municipality is one having a population of 50,000 or less, or 150,000 or less in the case of a municipality in a redevelopment area so designated by the Secretary of Commerce under sec. 5(a) of the Area Redevelopment Act.

[10] Title I defines an urban renewal area only in broad general terms. 42 U.S.C. 1460(a). The urban Renewal Administration will not approve the designation of an urban renewal area for title I assistance, however, unless at least 20 percent of the buildings in the area contain one or more building deficiencies, and the area itself contains two or more environmental deficiencies. HHFA, "Urban Renewal Manual," ch. 3-1. Additional criteria must be satisfied to justify the particular type of treatment proposed for the area. Id., ch. 10-1, sec. 12-1-2.

[11] 42 U.S.C. 1452. The Administrator is authorized by law to make both temporary and definitive loans to local public agencies for the undertaking of urban renewal projects. A definitive loan bears interest at not less than the going Federal rate and must be repaid within 40 years. It is designed to finance the lease of project land by a local public agency, and repayment is secured by and obtained from the rentals of the leased land.

[12] Infra., p. 347.

[13] See, e.g., 67½ Ill. Anno. Stat., sec. 91.10, and see Osgood & Zwerner, "Rehabilitation and Conservation," 25 Law and Contemp. Prop. 711-717 (1960).

[14] Fitch, "In Defense of the City," 27 Acad. Pol. Sci. Proc. 2, 10 (May, 1960).

[15] Mr. Curry's emphasis on a community renewal program as a solution for project opportunism seems to contrast with Professor Fitch's argument for a national policy toward the city as a corrective measure. If the latter is urging that the Federal Government afford additional advice and encouragement to local communities in the planning of projects and the redevelopment of renewal

Footnotes at end of speech.

areas, there can be no quarrel with his proposal. However, if that national policy has more affirmative implications, then it may be inconsistent with a basic premise of the Federal program that projects are locally conceived, locally planned and locally executed with a minimum of control and direction from the Federal Government.

[16] H. Doc. No. 102, 87th Cong., 1st sess. (1961); 107 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 3408 (daily ed., Mar. 9, 1961).

[17] See Testimony of Robert C. Weaver, Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, before a Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, 87th Cong., 1st sess., Housing Legislation of 1961, pp. 245–250 (1961).

[18] Both the House and Senate Committee on Government Operations have reported favorably on the Department bill. The Senate Report on S. 1633 filed on Sept. 9, 1961, was scheduled for debate on that date but was passed over on motion of Senator FONG, Republican of Hawaii. 105 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 17309 (1961). The reasons suggested were that the bill could not be properly considered because of the lack of time before adjournment in this session of Congress and a delay in the submission of the minority views on the bill. It is anticipated that the debate on the Department bill will occur in the next session of the Congress.

[19] Symposium—Land Use Planning," 20 Fordham L. Rev. 635 (1961); "Symposium—Urban Renewal," (pts. 1–2), 25 and 26 Law and Contemp. Prob. 1, 631 (1960–1961); Waite, "Nonresidential Urban Renewal in New York," 10 Buffalo L. Rev. 265 (1961); Levi, "Impact of Urban Renewal on Real Property Law," 41 Chi. B. Rec. 443 (1960); Sporn, "Some Contributions of the Income Tax Law to the Growth and Prevalence of Slums," 59 Col. L. Rev. 1026 (1959); note, "Power of Urban Redevelopment Agencies to Condemn Private Property for Resale to Private Individuals," 35 Tul. L. Rev. 616 (1960); note, "Judicial Review of Urban Redevelopment Agency Determinations," 69 Yale L. J. 321 (1959); note, "Long-Term Leasing in Urban Renewal: an Alternate Method of Municipal Land Disposition," 68 Yale L. J. 1424 (1959); note, "Problems of Eliminating and Preventing Urban Deterioration," 72 Harv. L. Rev. 504 (1959); note, "Urban Renewal—Essentials of the Federal Program," 48 Ky. L. J. 321 (1959). And see address by Richard R. B. Powell on Mar. 4, 1961, "Social Concern With the Contents of the Law of Property," 5 Columbia Law School Alumni Bulletin, No. 3, (Spring 1961) p. 3, 11 (placing urban renewal in the context of major devolopments in the law of real property); address by Adolf A. Berle, Jr., "Reflections on Financing Governmental Functions of the Metropolis," 27 Acad. Pol. Sci. Proc. 66 (May 1960), (urging a system of Federal guarantees as well as direct subsidies for all metropolitan needs). See also, Siegel, "The Law of Open Space," Regional Plan Association, Inc., (1960).

[20] Jeremiah 29: 7.

New Orleans Grain Prosperity Threatened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include the following editorial from the New Orleans States-Item of February 10, 1962, entitled "New Orleans Grain Prosperity Threatens":

NEW ORLEANS GRAIN PROSPERITY THREATENED

If they are not already so doing, local shipping interests ought to devote full attention to portentous implications posed by the European Economic Community.

Currently New Orleans is basking profitably in its impressive successes as the Nation's No. 1 grain port.

Last year 202 million bushels of grain were shipped out. This compared with 165 million in 1960 and continued a meteoric rise that began in 1956 when 83 million bushels were exported.

If Chicago was the world's hog butcher, the New Orleans Port Record was moved to observe last year, then certainly New Orleans had become its breadgiver, providing wheat for French buns, corn for Italian chickens, soybeans for Europe's cattle, barley, and milo for many a distillery across the Atlantic.

But now the sobering prospect arises that the entire European demand for farm products shipped out of New Orleans may soon be snipped off, acocrding to the New York Times.

"In fact," notes the Times, "within a few years it is quite likely that Europe may become an exporter of food rather than an importer."

Principal objective of the European economic community, reminds Times staff writer J. H. Carmical, is unification of West Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg into a single trading entity or common market.

The threat to U.S. agricultural exports comes in the form of the Common Market's newly drafted farm plan, which provides:

"The imposition of tariffs on farm products imported from outside sources at rates equal to the difference between the world price and the Common Market support price."

European support prices at levels currently contemplated, notes the Times, would stimulate full-scale food-producing effort in most sections of the Common Market, thereby making Europe more than self-sufficient agriculturally.

"Eventually," the Times notes, "grain exports from the United States to the Common Market would virtually cease."

In that event what happens to New Orleans' grain bonanza?

That President Kennedy is fully cognizant of the Common Market's threat to U.S. agricultural exports is suggested in his bold new farm program.

The administration is considering drastic restriction of food production over a long period, as well as gradual disposal of some inventories.

With these straws in the wind, long-range vision and preparation, together with full exploration of alternate marketing possibilities, are imperative on the part of local shippers.

Can We Afford the President's Proposals?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, as most Americans enter this period of the year when they are struggling to find ways to meet their Federal tax bill, it may be time for us to ask ourselves if we can afford the costly proposals of President Kennedy and the fuzzy economic ideas of his chief advisers. The following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune is even more to the point:

THE HIGH COST OF KENNEDY

It is difficult almost to the point of impossibility to comprehend a budget such as Mr. Kennedy's for the 1962–63 fiscal year, which calls for $92½ billion in spending. The natural assumption, encouraged by the President, is that this must somehow represent the cost of surviving against the Communist threat.

Mr. Kennedy says that "more than three-quarters of the increase" over the spending of the present fiscal year, ending next June 30, "is accounted for by national security and space activities, and the bulk of the remainder by fixed interest charges."

This increase is $3.4 billion, but for the present fiscal year Mr. Kennedy himself advanced the spending beyond the proposals of the Eisenhower administration by $8.8 billion, so that the best he is offering here is a comparison with his own inflated performance.

Nor, when he writes off so much of the increase to defense and space, is Mr. Kennedy offering a fair statement, for the pertinent comparison is not to the increase, but to the total spending. And here it will be found that defense alone comes, not to three-quarters of total spending, but to 58 percent; while defense, plus space and foreign aid, come to 63 percent of it.

But, subtracting all these activities from the total, and without even questioning their need or validity, we find $35 billion going into things which Mr. Kennedy does not seek to justify by reference to security or space. Of this, $9.4 billion is written off to interest charges, as if that were an inevitability, although this service charge is the price of years of indifference to budget deficits. And the price, through continued indifference, will certainly keep rising.

Having stripped all these costs away from the budget, we still find $25.6 billion going into the domestic operations of Government. Comparing the projected expenditures of the coming fiscal year, item by item, with the actual spending in so recent a year as 1958, we find that every outlay is on a sharply ascending curve.

Health, education, and welfare spent $2,645 million in 1958. It is now down for $5,348 million. In 5 years its spending has doubled.

The Department of the Interior is up from $666 million to $1.03 billion. The State Department has jumped from $206 million to $342 million; District of Columbia from $25 to $85 million; Housing and Home Finance Agency from $199 million to $1,383 million; Department of Agriculture from $4,875 million to $6,709 million; Department of Commerce from $327 to $815 million.

Whereas, in 1958, funds appropriated to the President were $470 million, they are now five times as much, at $2,421 million.

The Council of State Chambers of Commerce remarks that the idea that public services have been "starved" in recent years is a popular contention of liberal professors and others who were influential in drafting the 1960 Democratic platform and are now active in the administration. But, whereas national income increased 26 percent in the period 1955–60, spending by all governments on education increased 53 percent in the same period, to almost $19½ billion in 1960.

In this period spending on housing and community development increased 87 percent; on highways, 47 percent; natural resources, 29 percent; public health and hospitals, 53 percent; public welfare, 39 percent; police and fire protection, 48 percent, and sanitation, 51 percent.

If any sector of the economy is being "starved," it is not the "public sector," but the private, represented by the taxpayers, and the national administration is leading the way.

Legislative Program of the DAV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, on February 8, 1962, I had the distinct honor and privilege of introducing to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs a friend and neighbor, Francis R. Buono, national commander, Disabled American Veterans. Commander Buono made an outstanding presentation of the legislative program of the Disabled American Veterans.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include my introductory statement and the statement of National Commander Buono:

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH P. ADDABBO, INTRODUCING FRANCIS R. BUONO, NATIONAL COMMANDER, DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS, 1961–62, TO THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, FEBRUARY 8, 1962

Francis R. Buono, 46, was elected to a 1-year term as national commander of the Disabled American Veterans at the organization's 40th Annual National Convention in St. Louis, Mo., on August 25, 1961.

He lives with his wife and three children in Bayside, N.Y.

Buono served with the U.S. Infantry in Africa and Italy during World War II, and was wounded three times. His principal military decorations include the Bronze Star, Purple Heart, Soldiers Medal and Combat Infantryman's Badge.

Buono volunteered as a private in 1942 and was discharged with the rank of captain in 1946. He was a platoon sergeant, company commander, and battalion operations officer.

For the past 11 years, Buono has been deputy warden in charge of transportation for New York City's Department of Correction. A civil service employee of that city for 21 years, he has risen through the ranks to a position with executive responsibility for supervision of 275 employees and disposition of an annual agency budget of $9 million.

Buono became active in DAV in New York State in 1946. He became State commander in 1952, after serving terms as State senior vice commander, State junior vice commander, chapter commander, and chapter adjutant.

Buono's other national DAV activities include: national executive committeeman in 1953 and 1954; chairman of the national finance committee in 1955, 1956, and 1957; and national senior vice commander, 1960–61. He also is a member of the DAV Service Foundation's Board of Trustees.

Buono received his military training at the Motors Division of the Cavalry School, Fort Riley, Kans.; Infantry Officers School, Fort Benning, Ga.; and the Command and Staff School, Fort Leavenworth, Kans.

A native of Bayside, N.Y., Buono attended the School of Engineering at Manhattan College and New York University's Graduate School of Administration, Management and Executive Development.

Buono also is active in civic and other organization work. He is chairman of the finance committee, Columbia Association, Department of Correction; past president of the Deputy Warden's Association, Department of Correction; and past president of the Civic Association. He is active in the Community Chest Fund, Boy Scouts of America, and Explorer Scouts. Buono also is a member of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

STATEMENT OF FRANCIS R. BUONO, NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS TO THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FEBRUARY 8, 1962

Subject: Legislative program of the Disabled American Veterans.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee:

As the National Commander of the Disabled American Veterans, I, Francis R. Buono, wish to thank this committee for the opportunity of appearing here today for the purpose of introducing the legislative program of the Disabled American Veterans and to briefly discuss with you some of the thoughts of our organization on veterans' affairs, and to give you some of the expressions I have received from our members in my travels throughout this great Nation of ours when visiting our chapters and departments. However, may I take a moment to introduce our Washington staff. First I would like to introduce our national director of legislation, Mr. Elmer M. Freudenberger, who has appeared before you on numerous occasions in the past. Next, Mr. Irving Peltz, our national service director, and also our assistant national service director of claims, Mr. Frank G. Wood. The next gentleman is Mr. Pasquale Gervace, our assistant national service director of employment. All are members of the Disabled American Veterans assigned to our National Service Headquarters in Washington and they are available for consultation on problems concerning legislation, claims and employment matters affecting veterans and their dependents.

This week we are holding our annual conference of department commanders and adjutants here in Washington, as well as the winter meeting of our national executive committee. I would like to ask all of these State and national officers to stand at once rather than taking time for individual introductions.

As the national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, I approach this meeting with a sense of grave responsibility. This feeling comes to me as I reflect upon the visits I have made to the "grass roots membership" of our organization throughout the country. This enabled me to gain an insight into the fears and feelings of frustration in the minds and hearts of so many of our members. My feelings of responsibility are magnified in the knowledge that the more than 209,000 members of our organization actually reflect the problems, feelings, and emotions of more than 2 million disabled veterans in this land. My statement this morning is therefore more than just a personal presentation, but rather a reflection of what I have heard, what I've seen, and what I've felt as a result of my contacts. Much of what I have heard and what I convey to you this morning is the result of the feelings of so very many of our disabled members in their keen disappointment over the events occurring to our compensation increase bill in the closing days of Congress in 1961.

There is more involved than just the matter of an increase. The 50 cents a month or even $20 per month that might have resulted in the passage of the compensation increase bill has become less important than the feeling that the cause of the disabled veteran in this land of ours is less important in the eyes of some than it was during the days immediately after the war. But the philosophy of compensating veterans is the same today as it was when first set forth by George Washington. There is more involved here than simply giving lip service to a group of men and women who were unfortunate enough to have been disabled. The whole economy of the Nation is involved. As an economic principle, it is imperative that the largest number of people possible, approach in purchasing power, the normal standard of living set by the economy of a nation. If a large segment of the population of any society is unable to maintain the standard of living enjoyed by the great majority, this minority will drag down those standards with the result that eventually all of the people will share the poverty brought about by an imprudent economy that fails to recognize the needs of all the people. The whole theory of compensation should be viewed from the principle that it is wise economy to provide for those who are totally unable to work and to partially provide for those who have lost a portion of the ability to maintain a standard of living they might have achieved were it not for the physical disability acquired by service to the Nation.

It was appalling to the members of our organization to know that while our legislation was not passed, at the same time $4 billion in foreign aid was granted to aid other countries and other peoples, including nations we had defeated in World War II. In retrospect, we wonder if the fates of war had been unkind to us and if we had been the vanquished instead of the victor, if the Axis Powers and the Communist powers would have given us in the United States billions of dollars in foreign aid? While we in the Disabled American Veterans are fully aware of the need for the foreign aid program particularly as a measure to fight communism and maintain the peace of the world, we cannot help but inquire if we might not also be entitled to consideration in our fight to provide for our service-connected wartime disabled veterans, a life with dignity and security, free from the fear of poverty, and conducive to a feeling of pride, as well as recognition or services rendered to a grateful American Nation.

We note with considerable dismay the tendency on the part of some to infuse into the structure of compensation, some of the principles of pension and to attempt to base compensation more and more upon the need theory inherent in the philosophy of pension. The application of the need theory to the principles of compensation is, in our opinion, completely repugnant to the whole philosophy and ideal of compensating a person for a disability incurred in the service of the people of this Nation. The need theory takes into consideration only the immediate situation, but does not encompass the broader aspect of disability. Disability has three major aspects:

1. There is the immediate effect upon the individual; 2 there is the effect of the condition on securing employment and in job retention, and also in job advancement; 3. there is the effect of the disability upon the vocational longevity of the disabled person.

The first two principles are self-evident and we do not feel it necessary to elaborate on them except to state that they are so elementary to the whole concept of compensation that it should be readily discernible that to modify or dilute these principles is to cause irreparable damage to the entire theory. The third item, however, is one that has never been properly explored and we feel it is timely to consider this problem. We can see this problem in better perspective today because the World War II veteran is now facing the fact that his disabilities are becoming increasingly noticeable to him as he grows older. Thus we see the paraplegic, who used to pose for pictures and even was seen in motion pictures, hopping into his

car from his wheelchair and performing many amazing feats with and in spite of his disability, having to decrease his activities and in many cases give up his vocational life. With the aging process, man's disabilities acquired through his lifetime become more and more prominent in his ability to work and to perform functions which others at the same age are able to perform. The total effect, then, of disability, is that it does sometimes dramatically curtail and shorten the disabled person's vocational life. The need theory does not take this into consideration. The income that one receives from compensation from the Veterans' Administration can, to a degree, take up the slack in lost earning power, make up for lost earnings due to disablement, and aid in planning for a premature retirement age brought about from the rigors of disability. Who can tell how long the individual who is disabled is going to be able to work? This cannot be answered precisely in each case, but we do know that the more severe the disability, the more drastic will be the reduction in the number of years employment may be maintained. We therefore denounce the need theory as entirely unrealistic, calculated to limit consideration of the disability to the present only, with no thought to the future problems inherent in all disability factors. Economically, the disabled veteran has become adjusted to the role of compensation which we have tried to keep on a par with living conditions to the extent that with what he is able to earn in wages coupled with his compensation, he is able to be in a position where he has some degree of security for himself and his family and some degree of self-respect mentally, spiritually and economically.

In any provision made for general disability compensation increases, we of the Disabled American Veterans continue to believe that an across-the-board percentage increase, using the figure "15 percent" as to all rates, is by far the most equitable and sound solution to this problem. The range provided by this formula would provide, for example, an increase from the present rate of $19 to $22 monthly for the 10 percent disabled veteran and from $225 to $250 monthly for the 100 percent disabled veteran.

Our national legislative committee, composed of Bill H. Fribley, a past national commander from Kansas as chairman, Bernard O. Killin, of Michigan, and Raymond J. Isley, of Alabama, met in Washington, D.C., with the national commander in November of 1961 and as to the matter of increased compensation it was determined that our legislative program for 1962 would call for a 15-percent across-the-board increase in compensation rates and including the section from our original bill last year on multiple sclerosis, and the section on aid and attendance hospital adjustment. The committee assigned the highest legislative priority to this measure, which has resulted in the drafting of a new bill introduced by your chairman, and now H.R. 9565. We commend this bill to your early and favorable consideration.

In addition to the compensation increase bill, the national legislative committee of the Disabled American Veterans assigned top priority to other DAV bills. As to those coming within the jurisdiction of this committee, I mention the following:

(1) The dependency allowances for the lower ratings 10 to 40 percent. The pending bill on this is H.R. 882; (2) The bill to freeze the VA rating schedule. The pending bill on this is H.R. 881; (3) Federal reimbursement to State workmen's compensation funds, etc. The pending bill on this is H.R. 871; (4) The bills on statutory awards embodied in pending bills H.R. 846 and H.R. 873. (Passed by House and now in Senate Finance Committee.)

The Disabled American Veterans has never become reconciled to the inequity of excluding dependency allowance to those disabled veterans rated below 50 percent. The veterans rated 10 to 40 percent need this family allowance also. Attention is called to the fact that most of these ratings have been lowered through the years to below 50 percent after review. We shall have more to say on this matter when hearings are held on the specific bills in the field of compensation benefits.

The bill regarding the freezing of the rating schedule is not a new proposal. If enacted, this bill would bring about a stabilization of the present provisions of the schedule and would require future changes to the schedule to be placed in the hands of Congress. The reasons for our position on this subject are numerous and born from our experiences in the past involving schedular changes working to the detriment of scores of our disabled veterans. The DAV is conducting a survey and study of representative cases and our latest findings will be brought to the attention of this committee prior to further hearings pertinent to the subjects of compensation ratings. I mention this bill to assure this committee that we do regard the measure with great seriousness regardless of how other groups and organizations may feel about it.

The bill regarding Federal reimbursement to State workmen's compensation funds would serve the excellent purpose of encouraging employers to hire disabled veterans knowing that they will not be penalized for their humanity if the disabled employees suffer further injury while on the job. The commendable results achieved through campaigns designed to urge employment to the physically handicapped would be given great impetus through the enactment of H.R. 871, and we strongly recommend that your committee report out this bill.

In the last session of this Congress, your committee did report out and the House passed the two statutory award bills, but the Senate Finance Committee, as on other occasions, tabled these very meritorious bills.

It should be pointed out the establishment of top priority bills in connection with the DAV legislative program does not in any way lessen the interest we have in or in any way detract from the vigor of our efforts in the matter of other legislation pending from the last session or those measures which have been or will be introduced at this session in behalf of our organization. Many of these matters will be referred to specifically at subsequent meetings and hearings to be scheduled by this committee.

For the reasons stated, I will not delve into the very important subject of hospital, medical, and domiciliary care except to state that the DAV believes that the ceiling on hospital beds should be raised from 125,000 to 150,000. We also believe that comprehensive plans should be expedited to care for the aging veterans of our wars. We are aware that your committee reported out and the House passed House Joint Resolution 73, which is still before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I must not let this occasion pass without expressing the sincere gratitude of our members to this committee for the interest and sympathy you have always shown to the problems of the disabled veterans. To be sure, 1961 was a disappointing year for us in some respects. The increase in compensation rates still remains an unresolved matter. There are other matters which still must be resolved, but I want each and every member of this committee to know that we do look to this committee with great hope, that the tradition established over the long years by the many wonderful people serving on the committee, toward humane and equitable treatment of the problems of the service-connected wartime disabled veteran, will continue and grow with even greater understanding so that all disabled veterans may walk in dignity and security. We pray that favorable action will be taken by this Congress to show the way to the youth of America, and educate them so the cause, efforts, and sacrifices made by our disabled veterans were not in vain but rather to guarantee their freedom in our American way of life.

May I express to you my great pleasure in being permitted to appear before you this morning. I speak for every officer and member when I convey our sincere good wishes to you and thanks to you for your tireless efforts in behalf of all our war disabled and their families.

We hope to see all of you who can possibly be there at our national service headquarters tonight for a social get-together.

Thank you.

Cabinet Status Needed for Urban Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I take this opportunity to insert my statement which I delivered on February 8, 1962, to the Committee on Government Operations which has been holding hearings on Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, to create a Department of Urban Affairs:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN ALFRED E. SANTANGELO IN SUPPORT OF REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1962, TO CREATE A DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

Gentlemen, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you to speak in behalf of the Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 submitted to Congress by the President of the United States. This plan proposes to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, with a Secretary of Urban Affairs.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, subcommittee of Agriculture, I have seen the effectiveness of an agency guided by a Secretary of Agriculture. Without a Secretary of Agriculture, the myriad and intricate problems of agriculture would be unresolved and our Nation of 180 million people could not be fed by a segment of our population which constitutes less than 10 percent working their farms.

The Secretary of Agriculture handles and supervises activities which many would regard as not relating to farming, but on closer analysis, there is a relationship between the farm and the activities to which the Secretary of Agriculture gives sense and direction. The major objective of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Department of Agriculture is the supervision of the production of food and fiber with the management of its supply. The Agriculture Department deals with research, not only in food, but also in the basic sciences which bring about new products, improved quality of the food supply, and variations in the type of food we eat and the clothing we wear. The Department has jurisdiction over the inspection of meat and poultry. It supervises the conservation of soil and the prevention of floods. It manages a special school milk program and a school lunch

program which affects the lives of 13 million of our schoolchildren and aids the pocketbook of families which perhaps could not afford a decent meal for their children. The Department administers a program of housing for the farmer, not only in the improvement of present housing, but in the construction of new shelter. When crops fail, a program of crop insurance is administered by the Agriculture Department. The rural people find available to them, through their cooperatives, electrification of their homes and farms and communication in a REA telephone system. The food supply which the farmers produce in abundance requires the storage of wheat, corn, feed grains and cotton, which the Department supervises and administers. In far-off lands when people are hungry, and, yes, also in our own country, programs to combat famine and to furnish food to those suffering poverty are administered by the Agriculture Department. Without sense and guidance, the farm program in these United States would be chaotic, and could not possibly be administered to feed the people of the country or many of the nations throughout the world.

Just as the Secretary of Agriculture in a Cabinet position has given sense and guidance to the myriad problems of agriculture, so will a Secretary of Urban Affairs give sense and direction to the manifold problems of urban affairs. Since 1949 urban development has been a program which Congress has said was necessary and essential for a better standard of living and for the improvement of urban conditions. Apart from the improvement in housing, the problems of cities are complicated and difficult of solution. Three-fourths of our national population, or approximately 130 million, live in the cities. Over 130 cities have populations of more than 100,000 residents. The experience of other areas and the effectiveness of a Secretary of Cabinet status demonstrate that cities should be represented in the Cabinet with a Secretary of Urban Affairs. A Cabinet position for cities is not only justified by need, but also by its contributions. Metropolitan areas produce most of our wealth, exclusive of food and fiber. They produce enough to enable most communities to build a floor under misery, to provide leisure for the working mind, and to support institutions to advance our way of life called civilization. The manufacturing of clothing, the production of chemicals, the forging of steel ingots, the manufacturing of appliances and farm equipment, the processing of foods and textiles are performed in metropolitan areas. Those who work in cities require decent shelter, pure water and air, effective mass and private transportation, educational facilities, recreational outlets, such as theater, television, radio, press and parks, places of worship, such as churches and synagogues. In the furtherance of the attainment of these requirements, the cliff dwellers need protection at work, on the way home, and at home. These measures consist of housing regulations, factory rules, police supervision and fire protection, correctional institutions, hospital care and preventives of juvenile crime must also be considered. All of these activities must have a sense of direction and guidance. They can find such direction through a Secretary of Urban Affairs, and we, as responsible legislators, must make provision to create a department which will do the job.

Cities today face many difficulties. Financial limitations hamper solutions. Diversified agencies hinder the attainment of goals. Unplanned and sprawling growth require urban renewal and revision to provide better living quarters and functional construction. Proper planning in the form of urban renewal requires direction and commonsense to eliminate the bottlenecks which retard proper growth and which will maximize space for healthy and safe living conditions.

A hue and cry has been raised because our President has suggested the appointment of Robert Weaver as the first Secretary of Urban Affairs. I have known Mr. Weaver for many years, and I am familiar with the work that he has performed in the field of housing which is an important factor in any urban program. Mr. Weaver is preeminently fitted by experience and character to hold the position as secretary of the proposed agency.

In the interest of our country and in the interest of human relations, I urge this committee to recommend the approval of Reorganization Plan No. 1 submitted by the President of the United States.

An Address by the Honorable Robert L. Garner, President, International Finance Corporation, at the 1961 Annual Meeting of the Board of Governors, September 21, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be able to attend the meetings of the International Monetary Fund, the International Finance Corporation, and other financial institutions in Vienna, Austria, last September. One of the highlights of this occasion was the following address by the Honorable Robert L. Garner, retiring President of the International Finance Corporation, at the meeting of that body's Board of Governors on September 21, 1961.

I commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

ADDRESS BY ROBERT L. GARNER, PRESIDENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION, AT THE 1961 ANNUAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS, VIENNA, AUSTRIA, SEPTEMBER 21, 1961

Only a poet could be expected to find fresh words to describe the pleasure of being in this ancient and lovely city and of enjoying the gay and warm hospitality of our Austrian hosts. I shall merely add a simple word of appreciation and join in what has been so frequently expressed by earlier speakers.

The year since our previous meeting has been an important one for IFC. The amount of new investments was somewhat lower than in the previous year, although in the past few months we have made the largest commitments for any similar period.

But I consider more important several new developments. We have made the first sales of entire investments out of portfolio, in line with our basic purpose to help enterprises get started and then sell to private investors—thus revolving our funds. The three sales were on terms providing a satisfactory profit.

We have recently made commitments to provide equity-type capital to two private financial institutions in Colombia. This will enable them to expand their investment activities over a broadening range of local enterprises—chiefly smaller and medium size concerns, which it is impractical for IFC to finance directly.

Another quite different operation is a commitment of $3 million in a $72 million petrochemical complex in Argentina. Organized and largely financed by a group of important U.S. industrial companies and American and European investments, IFC was invited to provide the small balance of funds needed to conclude the transaction.

These variations from the Corporation's usual type of investment add to the flexibility with which it seeks to supply the diverse needs of private business.

We have during recent months completed two studies, in Iran covering the potentials for enterprises in the chemical field and in Venezuela in meatpacking. We shall seek potential sponsors and be prepared to assist in financing if sound projects can be worked out.

Probably the year's most significant event for IFC is the change in its charter permitting investment in equities.

After 4 years of experience, I proposed this change at the annual meeting last year. By September 1 the change was authorized by the required number of member countries, with no adverse votes.

The purpose of this change is to enable the Corporation better to provide various types of investment funds, and in easily understood and simplified form.

Our experience indicates the greatest need of the type of customers with which we deal is for equity capital. It has always been the seed corn for development of private business in the industrialized countries, with borrowed funds as a secondary supplement. Only in recent years and in the developing areas has the practice grown to place main reliance on borrowing. This is largely due to the fact that most public financing agencies supply only loan funds, and at low rates.

Thus businessmen are encouraged to launch enterprises with excessive debt, often of short term and heavily in foreign currencies. This frequently leads to trouble.

My 40 years of financial and business experience make me an advocate of prudent financial structures. I, therefore, see great importance in IFC's new right to provide and stimulate the flow of equity capital.

A number of this audience are well aware of my strong convictions against public ownership of business. However, IFC intends to be merely an interim instrument for holding shares, pending the opportunity to sell them to private investors, which it has the mandate to do. The Corporation will continue to follow the policy of not participating in the management of enterprises in which it invests, and it undertakes to forgo the ordinary voting rights of private shareholders.

One of the most important activities made possible by this charter change will be IFC's ability to assist in spreading share ownership in the developing countries. By underwriting or providing standby commitments it can provide facilities, often lacking, for the growth of capital markets. The ability to draw capital from large numbers of people is a necessary element for sustained growth of modern business. It is the basis of people's capitalism.

All in all, I believe that this year's developments give promise for increasing activity and usefulness for the Corporation.

I shall now take the liberty of speaking in a personal vein. On October 15 I retire as President of IFC. This will end over 14 years as Vice President of the World Bank and in my present post.

Helping build up the Bank was a fascinating and worthwhile task. In those early days it was new and untested; it received more criticism than support. But the foundations were soundly laid and as the years passed it gained recognition as a highly professional, expert organization with a worthy record.

So for me these years have been a great experience, working with the men and

women from so many nations which comprises its organization, from Gene Black down through the ranks. It has enabled me to visit and to know and deal with the leaders of many countries, and to help chart some new paths in international financing.

Some of my friends questioned why I chose to leave this powerful institution to take on the newborn IFC. There was the fact that I had been the most active proponent of the concept of IFC, and there was the appeal of building a new organization from the ground up. However, the main consideration was my interest in private business and my conviction that it can be the most dynamic force to bring widespread material progress to more people. I wished, therefore, to finish my executive career in helping spread good private business in the developing countries. This endeavor, I can say, has likewise been highly interesting.

I turn over the reins of IFC with satisfaction. I am gratified that in assuming the Presidency Gene Black will actively lend to the Corporation his talents and prestige. In Martin Rosen, who as Executive Vice President will be the Operating General Manager, I welcome a longtime associate from the World Bank in whom I have full confidence. So I step out knowing that IFC is in the best of hands.

It is, I believe, accepted pratcice that in turning over command one is entitled to a valedictory. Mine shall be some personal comments on this business of economic development. And now I speak as an individual, not in my role as an official of an international organization. Since I have spent years working in this field, it is not necessary to assert my belief in its importance, nor my sincere interest in the developing countries. I trust, therefore, that you to whom I speak may bear in mind the saying, "Let not him who is my friend speak only in soft words to tell me of pleasant dreams."

We need to keep in mind two significant developments in the postwar world.

First, the spreading realization that no nation can today walk alone;

Second, that for the first time those countries which have achieved a more abundant life have accepted responsibility to assist their poorer neighbors to improve their economic lot.

Thus, the less developed countries have the unique opportunity to draw on the fruits of centuries of experience, organization, and technology in economic progress. They have the goodwill and support of the powerful free nations.

But I am troubled by the extent to which there is growing up the insidious consequences of too great reliance on foreign aid. Everyone repeats the platitudes that each country must be primarily responsible for its future and that others can only supplement its own efforts. Nevertheless, there are too many instances where the obvious attitude is that the chief responsibility of a government is to secure the maximum help from abroad, with lesser responsibility to mobilize its own resources, and to take action so that all resources are most effectively applied, and that internal conditions which hinder development are improved.

Probably the most important economic problem in the world is how the great areas with low productivity and standards of living can move steadily toward the levels achieved in North America and Western Europe.

If, working together, the richer and poorer countries are to make substantial progress to this end, it will require an honest facing of the facts. We certainly need to understand why certain countries have achieved a high degree of economic development and others have not. If we fail to understand the problem, how can we hope to solve it?

Let us briefly examine some of the frequently cited causes of underdevelopment.

It is often claimed that geography and natural resources are determining. They are, of course, important, and extreme conditions may inhibit any worthwhile economic activity, such as in the polar regions or utter deserts. But resources lie inert and have no economic worth except as people bring them into use.

It is easy to attribute the progress of the United States to its wide expanse and abundant physical resources. However, other areas—in Latin America, Africa, Asia—have comparable natural wealth, but most of it is still untouched.

On the other hand, there are countries in Western Europe with limited fertile land and meager mineral deposits, yet they have achieved high levels of economic life.

There appears to be only limited relation between resources and development.

Perhaps most often lack of capital is blamed. Let us take a look at this. In the first place, there is in most developing countries more potential capital than is admitted. But large amounts are kept outside, because of political instability and depreciating currency at home. Or it is invested in often unproductive land, low priority buildings, or otherwise hoarded. From the standpoint of development it is sterile.

The wide acceptance of the assumption that lack of development is primarily due to shortage of capital has led the United States and other richer countries to provide billions in loans and grants. Over the postwar period immense sums have been made available to the developing areas. Some of these funds have been well applied and have produced sound results, others have not. However, to most of the recipient countries the amounts are never sufficient. In my opinion they never can be, because money alone accomplishes nothing. It is only a tool, and what it produces depends not on how much, but on how it is used. If it is applied to uneconomic purposes, or if good projects are poorly planned and executed, the results will be minus, not plus. The effective spending of large funds requires experience, competence, honesty, and organization. Lacking any of these factors, large injections of capital into developing countries can cause more harm than good. The test of how much additional capital is required for development is how much a country can effectively apply within any given period, not how much others are willing to supply.

It is popular in many quarters to charge colonialism with lack of development in territories which have been dependent. This argument seems less persuasive when we observe that a number of countries which have been their own masters for long periods are no further advanced.

I am, therefore, forced to the conclusion that economic development or lack of it is primarily due to differences in people—in their attitudes, customs, traditions, and the consequent differences in their political, social, and religious institutions.

Therefore, if the countries which are lagging are to join in the procession of economic progress their people must change some of their thinking and some of their methods. This is the stubborn core of the problem, the most important factor regulating the pace of growth—how fast will people adapt. A bulldozer can move most things, but not ideas and habits.

It is no service to truth and realism to avoid the fact that much effort and the sacrifice of some of the accustomed ways are the inevitable price of advancement.

Modern machines and the way of life which they demand can produce unlimited goods and services, but only for those who accept the required disciplines. Such disciplines are harshly imposed by the ruling powers in Communist countries. In free societies they must be voluntarily assumed by individuals.

I am sympathetic with those who prefer the old ways and the simpler life. But too many wish for the best of both worlds. It won't work; only frustration and failure can result from seeking the fruits without being willing to pay the price of admission to modern economic society.

Out of my experience I have arrived at a few simple requirements for any country to make its way up the economic ladder. Simple to state, most difficult to achieve.

The first requirement is a reasonable degree of consistent law and order, government which can govern. Each country must work out its own acceptable process by which it governs itself. But without a degree of continuity in political life, consistent economic growth is not possible. Public policies sway with every change in the winds; economic programs do not get off the ground; private investment is frustrated.

Next, I would put the requirements of reasonably honest and effective public administration. There is no denying that in many countries graft and corruption in public office lay a heavy tribute on resources which should go into develeopment. Of course, the less developed countries have no monopoly on public corruption. But its toll is more destructive in poorer countries than in richer societies. This is a problem which is entirely up to the leaders and people of each country.

However, honesty alone is not sufficient. Administration needs to be effective, and more and more individual competence and adequate organization are required as an economy grows and becomes more complex. I have found that in dealing with public officials, the most prevalent obstacle to getting things done is the lack of experience, of training and of ability to make prompt decisions. More attention to training and organization is widely needed.

I can seldom refrain from commenting on the importance of financial stability to steady economic progress. There are many prominent supporters of inflation who claim that it is a necessary adjunct of growth; some assert that it creates development.

But I have taken a close look at inflation in quite a few countries. I have seen it upset government; take the bread out of the mouths of workers, the old, the helpless; undermine the operations of business. So I continue to class it as a dangerous fever, which gives the patient a temporary spurt but quickly saps his strength.

Next, I would emphasize the importance of developing in broad terms a pattern of economic growth, a sensible plan of balance among agriculture, industry, transport, power, communications, with such provision for housing, education and medical services as resources permit. From my experience, this type of basic program, setting out general and related objectives, is more practical than attempts to specify in detail and to direct all spheres of economic activity.

However the plans are made, they will reveal needs so great that there must be a selection of priorities. Of course it is also essential that the country seek to increase its own internal revenues. Many tax systems need overhauling to remove inequities and evasions, and to improve collections. However, if development is to be encouraged and not hampered, it is important to avoid taxation which hinders investment. The best chance for long-term growth in revenues is through increased productivity and national income.

Most countries have in their history experienced some form of feudal society, with wealth and power in the hands of a few. The most advanced countries have moved out of it; in many others it still prevails. This is one of the things which must disappear if there is to be economic progress in the modern sense. It can disappear un-

der the guns of violent revolution, with the lives and property of those who have the most being forfeit. But the mass of people have never found quick prosperity through expropriation; through dividing up an inadequate pie. Grabbing the possessions of a few does not really help the many.

But revolutions are likely to come unless those who have the wealth and power are prepared to cooperate in working out means whereby productivity can be increased and its benefits more widely distributed. If they would look forward they should realize that there is greater opportunity and prosperity for those with superior ability and for capital in a growing economy with widely spread benefits than in a less productive society made up of a few rich and many poor.

So I put high on the list of public policy positive efforts to see that the benefits of growth be spread widely among more and more people—through jobs, ownership, opportunity.

I have some definite ideas as to the means of getting greater productivity, which is the essence of modern economic life, and providing for wide distribution of its benefits, which is both economically and politically imperative in free societies.

Obviously there is need for governments to provide the basic facilities and services. To do this in adequate measure will strain their human and financial resources. It seems sensible, therefore, to give the greatest scope to private initiative and capital in all fields which are not necessarily in the public sector.

There is convincing proof that this is the most assured method of getting development. The most productive economies which have brought the highest standards of living to the most people have been those which have permitted private initiative to control the widest range of activities. This system has worked in the United States, which began as a wilderness; it has worked in Europe and Japan, with the long-established societies.

Over the past 14 years I have visited some 50 countries, most of them in earlier stages of development. The most substantial progress I have observed has come from the private sector, where it has been provided with basic facilities and a political and administrative climate in which it could exercise its talents.

In most instances of public ownership and operation of industry which I have observed, the results have been uneconomic. Too often political considerations determine the type of enterprise, and the size and location of plants. In instances where the facts are available, the publicly owned plants have generally cost more to build and many of them operate at losses, which have to be made up from public funds. At least certain countries, having burned their fingers, are abandoning or selling out to private interests some of these economic liabilities. Others, however, continue to experiment.

It is of course true that the role of government in economic affairs must vary according to the conditions in different countries. Much more is required in the way of planning, stimulation, incentives, and financial participation where industrial development is in an early stage and where there is a scarcity of entrepreneurs, management experience, and organized sources of capital.

Under such conditions, government has two alternatives in dealing with private enterprise. If it sincerely wishes to use its productive potential it can give support and finance on terms which do not repel private investment not stifle private control and management. On the other hand, it can demand such rights and lay such restrictions that enterprise cannot operate on an economic basis. Frequently businessmen cannot get a clear answer to government intentions, often because the government will not adopt a clear-cut policy. So long as the uncertainty exists, it constitutes an obstacle to private investment.

Decisions as to the degree of government ownership and control are not always made on the basis of economics or political theory. Even limited experience in dealing with officials in some countries reveals that they are largely influenced by what will give them the greatest personal power and rewards. The great the control in government hands, the more personally lucrative can be the exercise of such control.

I am convinced that increased productivity can best be assured by a combination of government and private investment and operation, each in its most appropriate sphere. The functions which only government can perform demand its full efforts and human and financial resources. Therefore, if we seek the maximum production and development, private initiative, management and capital should be called upon and given the opportunity to extend their activities most widely.

If productivity can be increased, how then can the benefits best be widely distributed?

We know that the doctrine of socialism says by public ownership of the means of production. Through the instrument of government (which the Socialists will operate) everyone will be allotted his proper and abundant share. It is an idea which has appealed to many, since the days of Thomas More's "Utopia." Up to now it has never worked, because it has never produced the abundance. (It is interesting to note that "Utopia," from the Greek, means no place.)

Then there are the supporters of the ultimate welfare state, who propose that government (which likewise they intend to control) take the maximum amount from all who work and who own property and spread it around as they deem most fitting.

Some wise man has said "there is no such thing as a free lunch." Someone must pay the bill, so the question remains whether people pay their own bills to the maximum extent, or have government take and distribute as much as possible.

I would propose to the developing countries a somewhat different approach in order to spread benefits more widely.

First, I would concentrate on how most effectively to encourage individual initiative and the flow of private capital into productive use. One specific means would be through revision of taxation to give incentives to production and investment and lay heavier taxes on unproductive assets.

I would make it attractive to both local and foreign capital to expand existing enterprises and to start new ones, providing more jobs, more goods, and wider opportunities for ownership of business. I would give incentives to larger companies to sell some of their shares to the general public.

I would work out means by which more farmers could purchase land and get assistance in improving their production and marketing. I would provide credit facilities so that the working man could build or buy a house and pay for it out of his earnings.

This approach would, I believe, begin to build up a middle class of men of property, with opportunities for individuals to progress as far as their abilities warrant.

This is my prescription for building a productive economy and spreading widely its benefits.

I have touched upon some of the things which governments need to do to promote development, including making full use of the productivity of private initiative and capital.

There are, however, equally great responsibilities which private business needs to assume.

The time has come when no longer can businessmen afford to concentrate exclusively on their individual enterprises and to ignore their role in promoting the broad interests of their countries. They should see this as a matter of self-interest, because in the long run the success of all private business rests upon the progress and stability of the community in which it operates.

Furthermore, they should realize that the institution of private enterprise is under deadly attack, not only from avowed communism, but from advocates of all degrees of socialism and state control. Their propaganda is clever, organized, and persistent. Business generally has not effectively taken up the challenge. It has, by default, allowed itself to be put on the defensive. Unless it awakes to the present danger and determines to pay the price and make the fight to preserve and expand its system, its productive contribution may be lost to the world, and bring about total change in our society.

As we have pointed out in our annual report, there are some particular aspects of responsibility for foreign businessmen operating in the developing countries. They need to make special efforts to associate themselves with the local communities, first through maximum use of local resources and people, with positive efforts to provide training and opportunity for advancement to senior positions. It is becoming increasingly apparent that there are mutual advantages in joint ventures with local enterprises, or in sharing ownership with local investors, including, where practical, offering of shares to the public. And on a broader front, foreign business interests are in position to set the example and stimulate their local counterparts in supporting education, technical and business training, and other constructive community activities.

And finally they can demonstrate and make known the benefits which they and all good private business contribute to economic growth.

There is one other major aspect of development to which I wish to refer.

Following World War II the interest of the more advanced countries in giving financial assistance to the less developed areas was evidenced in two directions—first, through bilateral financing, initially by the United States and more recently by Western Europe, as it rebuilt it own economy; and second, through international agencies, starting with the World Bank and the Monetary Fund, to which have been added IFC, IDA, and recently the Inter-American Development Bank. In addition there have been the informal association of the Colombo plan and consortiums for India and Pakistan.

I have observed over these 14 years both types of operation. It might have been said before that my personal interest would naturally prejudice me in favor of the international approach. But now that within a few weeks I shall retire, I have no selfish interest to serve. I now can speak objectively and I shall state my convictions.

The first is that government-to-government financial aid cannot successfully be used to gain and hold political advantages for the country supplying the funds. Rather than making friends, bilateral financing between sovereign countries tends to create antagonisms and distrust. I have observed that within the non-Communist world the nations most friendly to each other are those between which there has been little or no intergovernmental financing. Contrariwise, the more one government has loaned or granted the greater probability of suspicions and antagonisms. I believe the record gives support to my observations.

Also, there are inherent difficulties in arranging and administering developmental financing between governments. Officials and legislative bodies in committing the funds of their citizens have a responsibility that they be used honestly and effectively. Taxpayers are properly critical of abuses and waste. But, however reasonable, recipient

countries are inclined to consider conditions attached to aid as infringements on their sovereignty. And it is no salve to their sensitivity to have large numbers of foreign government representatives stationed in their borders to supervise the use of funds.

Furthermore, it is often impossible to disassociate a government's financial transactions from political motives, so that truly economic objectives may be subordinated.

And finally, there are obstacles to long-range action both in the providing and recipient countries. Commitments on both sides are necessarily subject to political changes and legislative actions. Qualified personnel are difficult to recruit due to uncertain tenure.

In my own country, the annual debates on foreign aid appropriations are familiar to many of you. It is becoming apparent that the American people are more and more questioning and critical, not, I believe, of the mutuality of interests with the developing countries and the objectives of aid, but as to methods and results.

Because of the fundamental difficulties it is doubtful that large government-to-government financing can ever be handled effectively and with mutual satisfaction.

I believe there is a promising alternative in the record of the World Bank.

With substantial capital contributed by all of its 60-odd member countries, each in proportion to its resources, it has been able to approach the job of promoting sound economic development—free of the strains of political pressure and without the suspicion of political domination. It has been able to insist on more stringent economic and technical criteria than are generally proposed by agencies of individual governments. It supervises more carefully the application of its funds. Yet this firm insistence on performance has created a minimum of resentment.

The Bank has established a reputation for competence, objectivity, impartiality, and honesty. It has an international staff. It has gained the respect of its member countries, both the more and less advanced, and of the business and financial communities of the world. Its bonds are prime investments, so that it attracts the funds of prudent private institutions to supplement its Government capital. Few informed people would argue with the statement that the lending of the Bank has produced results superior to most government-to-government transactions.

When it appeared that there was need for an additional type of credit for the more hard-pressed countries, and for a broader range of purposes, the Bank was given the operation of the IDA fund.

Thus the proven instrument exists into which could be concentrated major intergovernmental financing. If the countries which have funds to devote to promoting development of the poorer areas would channel them through the World Bank, rather than in bilateral credits, the result would be more and better development, and better relations between nations.

In proposing the World Bank as the major instrument for development financing of public projects, I also agree that regional institutions, such as the Inter-American Bank, may play a similar role. As they demonstrate that they have established standards of competence, integrity and freedom from political influence, comparable to those of the World Bank, they can likewise perform constructive service in their areas and be equally deserving of support.

It appears obvious that the United Nations, or other associations which are organized on a political rather than economic basis, do not fit the specifications I have outlined.

And in the field of fiscal and financial order, both in individual countries and internationally, I believe that the value of an international organization has likewise been demonstrated. The International Monetary Fund, born at Bretton Woods along with the Bank, has gained recognition as a most useful instrument for financial order and stability. I am sure that the discussions at this meeting will indicate widespread interest in giving the fund even greater resources and responsibilities.

What about finance for private business in the developing areas? What is being done; what should be?

Here again I have some positive convictions.

The first is that private business and private capital are natural twins. The great developments of private enterprise have been nurtured on private, not public funds. In the long run business will not continue to be private if it depends unduly upon public credit. Furthermore, appropriations of public money are limited, and may well at any time be cut off, whereas private capital is an ever growing stream. Private capital is constantly refreshed by that generated within business and by the savings of the people.

In the developed countries this flows constantly into use, into mortgages through savings institutions and insurance companies; into bonds of utilities and industries; and more and more into the shares of these enterprises.

The ownership of business has attained fantastic proportions in the United States. Most of our large corporations have many more shareholders than employees. Mutual and pension funds and other collective investment institutions represent the savings of tens of millions of Americans. Similar expansion of ownership is growing, not only in Europe, but in Latin America and some countries of Asia.

I therefore maintain that an immense reservoir of private capital eixsts throughout the world which can be tapped for expanding production in the less developed areas.

But this capital must be enticed. It appraises the uncertainties and risks and expects ample potential rewards to balance these risks.

However, there are several forces which are damming this potential flow.

There is the threat of confiscation of property and rights. It is probably a conservative estimate that at least 500 million of private capital have been held back from investment in Latin America because of events in Cuba.

There is the nationalism which in varying degree obstructs the import of foreign capital.

There is the jealousy of local businessmen who prefer their monopolies, and resent the appearance of foreigners who may supply the country with better products at lower prices.

And finally, there are the low subsidized rates at which funds of both national and international institutions are loaned to some private business.

A case can be made that in the general interest there is justification for transferring resources of the richer countries to those less fortunate for public purposes without too much regard to the cost of the money. It is more difficult to justify such public funds being made available to private business, at rates far below those prevailing within these countries, thus giving selected businessmen an extra profit.

Soundly operated business in these areas can be highly profitable. It is nonsense to claim that good business cannot start and prosper without cheap foreign credits.

Despite the usual provisions in the laws and regulations of public institutions, that in financing purely private enterprises (without government guarantee) they are not to compete with private investment capital, the fact is that they do. By giving low-cost credits to one business firm they deter other borrowers from seeking funds in the private capital markets.

IFC is the only public institution, either national or international, which actually sets terms which are in line with those of private investment capital. Such terms are attracting private capital to join with us or to buy us out when the project has matured. Now that the amendment of our charter permits investment in equity shares, we can be more effective both in supplying the most needed types of capital to new and expanding business to meet their legitimate needs, and at the same time providing the type of investment which is attractive to local and foreign investors.

I recognize the great economic strides which have taken place in so much of the developing world. At any earlier time this growth would have been accepted as phenomenal. But this is a restless, impatient age, and awakening people are demanding immediate gratification of their desires.

I am fully aware of the immense problems faced by you and the other leaders of the countries, many of them just now attaining responsible statehood, which are moving through the no-man's land between the past and the future. No one can expect perfection in this difficult task. But the stakes are so high you cannot afford basic errors. Your countries do not have a surplus out of which to pay for major mistakes.

I admit to being critical of much which I observe, of desiring improvement. But I believe that the problems can be solved if only people have the wish and the will.

I now come to the end of my final talk to the Governors of our member countries and our guests. Many of you I have known for years. As I retire, I shall continue to follow the fortunes of these institutions and countries with which I have been associated.

To all my friends, and to those many with whom I have crossed swords, best wishes and good luck in the challenging task ahead.

Our Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, liberty and freedom are the precious cornerstones of our heritage. With every generation there are groups that appear on the horizon whose very actions endanger these cornerstones. Fortunately, after appropriate public exposure such organizations fade away.

At the present time, our country is experiencing a rash of superpatriots using demagogic methods to fight the so-called Communist menace. I, for one, am vehemently opposed to both the extreme right and extreme left which are represented in this struggle. When the extremists of the right begin to impugn the patriotism of our Nation's leaders, its Government and our way of life, I become frightened over the consequences.

It would be as dangerous to follow the lead of such extremists as it would to follow the directives of the Communist Party, which seeks to overthrow our Government by any means at its disposal. Both approaches would inevitably destroy the rights and dignity of

man which our country has always protected.

Mr. Abe Kofman, a noted newspaper publisher in my district, has recently written a column on this subject. Under permission to extend my remarks, I am pleased to insert his views in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the San Leandro Morning News, Feb. 7, 1962]

FROM MY NOTEBOOK

(By Abe Kofman)

Three Presidents of the United States—Eisenhower, Truman, and Kennedy—have been moved in recent months to speak out against what looked like a revival of right-wing hysteria, purportedly over the question of anticommunism. In essence, all of these great Americans have said the same thing: America is faced with a profoundly serious challenge by the forces of international communism.

But our Presidents have also warned us that nothing could be more dangerous than to adopt, in the midst of this great struggle, the tactics and techniques of the enemy. As men of vast experience in dealing with this question, they know that nothing could serve the international Communist conspiracy better than a divided, frightened America which, for want of faith in our system and our ideals, seeks to fight with weapons chosen by the enemy.

What is it that has sparked this sudden furor? Obviously there are a great many factors involved. One is that the pathway, particularly in international affairs, is not clear and easy. This is not television. The good guys do not always win. We are playing for real stakes with real people, and we are playing against an opponent who is very formidable indeed. And so sometimes we lose, and naturally when we lose, we are disappointed and there are those among us who would cry "foul"—who think we shouldn't ever lose; and that if we do, it is because someone on our side has played false. Thus you hear these wild and foolish charges about treachery in our schools, in the State Department, on the part of the President himself.

Harry S. Truman once said, "If I'm a traitor, God help America." The same, I believe, could be said for Dwight D. Eisenhower, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Chief Justice Earl Warren. Indeed it is impossible to even discuss this subject in public without feeling somewhat unclean. And as a patriot, I resent those who drag the level of public discussion down to this point.

Another aspect of this problem, it seems to me, is the desire on the part of some of our citizens to return to an older and simpler time (a time which is usually pictured in terms of neat, white frame houses with shady streets—but which in reality was also a time of sweatshops, child labor for the young, and poverty for the old). In all of the literature I have read, and in the speeches that have been reported from these so-called anti-Communist schools and superpatriotic secret societies, the subject sooner or later gets around to the New Deal, F.D.R., they argue, provoked the war with Japan in order to fasten the New Deal on the country and open the floodgates of Europe and Asia to communism.

Dwight Eisenhower stole the GOP nomination, they charge, from its rightful claimant Robert Taft in order to crush Joseph McCarthy. They claim Chief Justice Warren maneuvered the desegregation order through the Supreme Court in order to destroy States rights. And so it goes. What does this come down to? Simply that the entire trend of American history since 1932—growth of social security, unions for the working people, Government guaranteed housing loans, racial equality, widespread free education with teachers enjoying full rights of tenure and academic freedom—all of these things are seen, not as a normal and healthy development of specific solutions to meet real problems of an increasingly industrial and technical society—but as part of a Socialist plot to communize America one step at a time.

Let me simply say that I reject this doctrine totally and completely. I reject its fundamental premise—that the way to fight communism is by impugning one another's patriotism, by organizing emotional rallies allegedly in the name of education; I reject its tendency to encourage those who would bully and frighten our teachers and ministers into silence on the controversial issues of the day. This is a most serious matter. For there is nothing more useless than a frightened schoolteacher who will not speak his convictions. And I reject, of course, the absurd and baseless charges of treachery imputed to high ranking officials of our Government, our schools, our churches, our newspapers, and our radio and television stations. All of whom are—according to some—presumed to be puppets of the Kremlin.

Finally, I have confidence in the people of California. And I invite those who come into our State to lecture us on how to fight communism, to redirect their energies, enjoy our climate and our unparalleled prosperity, admire our well-staffed colleges and prosperous industries—and rest assured that the American people are not fools.

Another Texas Community Wants To Stand on Its Own Feet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, we in Texas take pride in doing things for ourselves. This spirit of independence, this traditional makeup of our people has been the kind of character which has made Texas the greatest State in the Union. Texas citizens and Texas communities are proud of their individual accomplishments which have created a more dynamic society and greater happiness for more people than those areas which consistently rely upon Federal handouts in the false belief that they are getting something for nothing. The Federal Government can give the people wealth because it has no money of its own. It can only return to the people a small portion of the money it takes away from them in the first place. We, in Texas, would rather keep our money and put it all to the uses we believe in our best interest rather than pay freight on money sent to Washington and back and which has been subjected to rough handling by the bureaucrats. The latest Texas city which proudly assumes its own responsibility is Daingerfield. The Daingerfield story of real Americanism is told in the following news article from the Dallas Morning News:

U.S. AID DECLINED BY DAINGERFIELD

(By Fred Pass)

DAINGERFIELD, TEX.—City fathers of Daingerfield have said "No, thanks," to a Federal grant of $700,000.

The grant, plus a loan of almost another half million dollars, was suggested by the area redevelopment administration to finance a new water system for the city.

Instead, the Daingerfield City Council has chosen to let the city's citizens finance their own water system, which they voted to do in a $605,000 bond issue election last August.

The officials figure the local program will actually cost the people less in the long run than the Federal Government's grant plus loan, totaling $1,154,272.

And, besides, the city will continue to control its own system, and be able to set water rates, they say.

Officials were somewhat shy about discussing their action Wednesday. However, Mayor Roy Nail said, "Yes, we have opposed the Federal Government's offer. We plan instead to sell our bonds through the northeast Texas Water District for our water system."

According to Daingerfield citizens, here is what happened:

The city of Daingerfield gets its water from wells, and the supply is limited. But nearby is Lake o' the Pines with a large water supply. So Daingerfield, and six other towns on the lake, established the water district for obtaining water.

Last August the citizens passed a $605,000 bond issue to build a water intake at the lake and install lines for supplying the city and district for obtaining lake water.

But Morris County, of which Daingerfield is the county seat, was 1 of the 47 counties in Texas named by the Federal Government as eligible for redevelopment loans and grants (the so-called distressed area program).

So the water district made application for grants and loans to finance water systems for the towns in the district. Included in the application was a request for a $300,000 grant to Daingerfield.

Then Federal officials came and looked over the situation, and said Daingerfield needed a larger system than had been planned, which would cost over $1 million instead of the $605,000 as originally figured. But they suggested that the Federal grant be raised from $300,000 to $700,000.

There were controls connected. In a recent statement the city officials said: "Should the water district secure the Federal grant, Daingerfield would lose control of the waterline and the benefits accruing from it. We would also lose control of the contract bidding, be forced to accept a lesser amount of water, and have our future industrial needs dictated by the water district.

"The council believes a large line can be installed to provide a surplus of water to the city without Federal aid and its subsequent control. We are opposed to Federal aid for a project where the people have indicated their willingness to assume their obligations as free Americans and have taken this action after a thorough study, acting in the best interest of our citizens and in an effort to keep the control of our water supply within our local governmental rights."

Big Creek Project Has Golden Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, to those who lack faith in private enterprise and its ability to supply America's needs,

while at the same time paying its fair share of the cost of government, I commend the following article from the Long Beach Argus. During 50 years private capital has invested $214 million in this electric power project and has paid $212 million in taxes.

EDISON CO. BIG CREEK PROJECT NOW 50 YEARS OLD

The hardest working water in the world celebrates its 50th birthday this week, December 4–10.

During this week in 1911, a handful of engineers on horseback set out from the foothills of the High Sierras, northwest of Fresno, to seek out a route over which it might be possible to lay a railroad track reaching 56 miles up into the precipitous mountain cliffs and canyons.

The railroad was needed to carry supplies, and this was the start of southern California Edison Co.'s Big Creek hydroelectric project, a vital source of power for southern and central California.

In the succeeding half-century, Big Creek has grown into a $214 million chain of manmade lakes, dams and powerhouses which harness the melting snows from 1,200 square miles of the rugged High Sierras.

It has generated more than 85 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity to help make possible the phenomenal growth rate of southern California; it has helped put an end to disastrous floods which used to ravage the San Joaquin Valley; it has provided vast supplies of water for irrigation; and it has opened up a beautiful new recreation area with fishing, boating, and camping areas for vacationers.

Big Creek water is used and reused to generate power in a total of eight powerhouses during the course of its descent from an elevation of about 7,600 feet to 1,000 feet—earning it the reputation of being the hardest working water in the world. Engineers from all parts of the globe have come to California to inspect this unique engineering achievement.

Big Creek was developed by Edison entirely as a free enterprise project, without Federal aid or subsidy.

"On the contrary, Big Creek has paid into the Federal, State, and local treasuries more than $212 million in taxes since its inception," Harold Quinton, board chairman and chief executive officer, points out.

Motorized construction equipment was unknown when the project was begun 50 years ago, but the 56 miles of railroad were completed by a crew of about 800 men in 157 days—a record for that era. There were 1,100 curves in the route, and the "San Joaquin & Eastern," as it was named, quickly became known as the "Slow, Jerky and Expensive."

At one point, passengers amused themselves by stepping off the moving train, walking across the neck of a long U turn, and boarding again on the other side.

Nevertheless, the S.J. & E. got the job done, moving enormous tonnages of equipment, supplies, and men up the mountain, and it continued to operate until 1933, when it was finally supplanted by trucks and autos.

The railroad hauled not only heavy equipment, but also a never-ending stream of food for the army of construction workers. During the 4½ years of digging on Ward tunnel—a key link in the hydroelectric chain—it took 2 million pounds of fresh meat and almost the same amount of potatoes to feed the tunnel crews, numbering as high as 2,000 men.

Winter months posed the additional problem of getting mail, medicines, and light supplies from Big Creek headquarters—where the rail line ended—up over 9,800-foot Kaiser Pass to the snowbound tunnel crews. This solution: a dog team and driver, imported from Alaska.

Three of the seven dogs died before the tunnel was completed, and they were buried high on Kaiser Pass with an appropriate redwood slab—now a landmark of the area—bearing their names, Whiskey, Babe, and Trim.

A celebration unparalleled in that remote area followed the dramatic moment on February 18, 1925, when the last dynamite blast was fired and two tunnel crews—working from opposite directions—met in the heart of the mountain.

They had completed their job 2 full years ahead of schedule, in one of history's great engineering feats, and they had come within an inch of a perfect alinement when they met. The tunnel was 15 feet in diameter through solid granite. This prodigious effort was justified by its vital function—to connect the Florence Lake drainage area with the rest of the system.

Today, Edison's Big Creek project includes 10 major tunnels, 15 major dams, and 6 manmade lakes—Huntington, Florence, Lake Thomas A. Edison, Shaver, Redinger, and Mammoth Pool. The eight powerhouses have a combined generating capacity of almost 700,000 kilowatts—enough to supply a city of almost a million population.

Boy Scouts 52d Anniversary on February 8, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I call attention to the fact that February 8, 1962, was the 52d anniversary of the founding of the Boy Scouts of America, which organization was chartered by this very Congress of the United States of America.

No doubt every Member of this great legislative body will concur with me that the Congress of the United States did well in chartering the Boy Scouts of America; for this Boy Scouts program has now affected the lives of over 34 million American lads and men since the year 1910; the Boy Scouts of America now has an active enrollment of more than 5,200,000 and more than 70,000 are actively in such program within the Los Angeles area, California, which includes the councils in the suburban areas of Los Angeles, Calif.

The other morning I was pleased and honored and inspired to be called upon by one of the Scout members of the Washington area council who visited me and pinned on the lapel of my coat, the same as similar Scouts did on the lapels of each and every Member of the House, a Boy Scout pin, and he reminded me in his 1-minute speech of presentation that "Boy Scouts program strengthens America and the Boy Scouts program aspires to build a strong America."

Mr. Speaker, many years ago it was my pleasure to be a Boy Scout troop leader and president of the first Boy Scouts Council in the important city of Long Beach, Calif., and for a few years to be a member of the National Council of the Boy Scouts of America. I am sure that very many Members of this legislative body have had similar experiences which continue to inspire and thus carry forward our continued and vigorous interest and support of the Boy Scouts program. I am sure also that you, Mr. Speaker, and each and every Member of this House, join with me in extending to the Boy Scouts organization our compliments and continued best wishes and our daily felicitations and good will.

The Scout program in the great 23d District, California, is one of excellent and dedicated adult leadership and sound, steady numerical growth in the troops of Scouts.

Tadeusz Kosciuszko (1746–1817)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Tadeusz Kosciuszko was one of those rare and brave soldiers of fortune, so abundant in 18th-century Poland, who was willing to go anywhere and serve under any banner for the cause of freedom and liberty. This gifted and gallant son of a well-to-do Polish peasant was destined to be a soldier of great distinction. He was born on February 12, 216 years ago. Even thought at the age of 13 he lost his father, his yearning for education led him to the Royal School at Warsaw in 1765. There he graduated in 1769 with the rank of captain, and earned a scholarship to France where he studied at the famous military school at Mezieres, specializing in artillery and engineering. In 1776 he was in Paris when he heard of the American revolution, which stirred his imagination and his restless soul. He saw his chance for action in a good cause, and with bor owed money he sailed for America, arriving in Philadelphia in August of that same year.

On his arrival he at once applied for military service. First he was employed to draw up plans for the fortifications of the Delaware River. In 3 months the successful completion of these plans earned him a commission as colonel of engineers in the Continental Army. In the spring of 1777 he joined the Northern Army at Ticonderoga, and there he advised on the fortifications of Fort Defiance. During the next 2 years he was placed in charge of the erection of fortifications at West Point. Subsequently, he was in action at Charleston, S.C., and was one of the first Continentals to enter that city after its evacuation by the British.

In recognition of his signal services for the cause of the revolution, Congress made him a brigadier general on October 13, 1783. A year later he returned to Poland, hoping to serve there in her struggle for freedom. Unfortunately, all his efforts to that end were unsuccessful.

In 1789 he was made major general in the Polish Army, and for many years he continued to lead the unfortunate Poles in their hopeless fight against almost insuperable enemy forces. He was sadly disappointed in his gallant attempts, and he ended his stormy career in exile in Switzerland. There he died on October 15, 1817. Today on the 216th anniversary of his birth, Americans of all rank and creed solemnly observe his birthday and do homage to his blessed memory.

Radio Clear Channels: A Defense Resource

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CARLTON LOSER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, Congress has before it bills to preserve existing radio clear channels. I am the author of one. Recently a new defense use of these channels came to light. It adds another compelling reason for approval of the legislation.

Testifying for the Defense Department, February 2, 1962, Maj. Gen. John B. Bestic, Director of Telecommunications for the U.S. Air Force, said:

> With respect to the technical aspects we have been asked to comment on, we favor increased power and clear channel operation to aid in survivable communications.

The threat to clear channels stems from the Federal Communications Commission. It has unfortunately voted to destroy one-half of them. The House Commerce Committee asked the Commission by letter last September to delay the action until the committee could study it. The Commission replied to the letter but refused to heed the request.

A clear channel is one upon which only one radio station operates at night. These channels were allocated originally to make possible round-the-clock radio listening to farflung remote rural regions. They serve the same purpose today. While the Nation has urbanized, nearly 60 percent of the Nation's land area still depends completely and solely upon clear channels as its only source of nighttime radio service. Over 25 million people, plus travelers in that area, get no other acceptable radio signals between sunset and sunrise. Other millions depend on them for a choice of programs. The engineering basis for this is the same today as it was when the channels were originally established.

Currently 25 of the 107 standard broadcast channels are U.S. I-A clear channels. The other 82 channels are used by regional, local, and other stations.

Originally there were 40 such channels. Urban pressures over the years led the FCC to destroy 15 of them. Now it proposes to destroy 13 more, leaving only 12. In fact, it says it may eventually also destroy all clear channels. Thus, it perpetuates its practice of bringing more and better service to urban areas while failing to meet its obligation for more and better service to remote and rural regions. Yet, these are the very people who rely on radio more in their business and daily lives than most others. These are the people who likewise have poorer television service.

These were the facts that led me to introduce H.R. 274. My bill freezes the 25 clear channels as clear channels. I feel, furthermore, that no more stations should be added to the I-B channels. I only wish it were possible to restore several of them to I-A channels.

Now the defense use of these channels enters into the picture.

In appearing before the Subcommittee on Power and Communications of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, General Bestic said:

> USAF war exercises and operational analyses have proved that an enemy using nuclear weapons could cause wide damage to military circuits. Further, data exist which show that nuclear bursts can knock out high frequency communications for several hours. Considering this, we must exploit every means of communicating which may survive.
>
> A resource for communications survivability lies in the radio and television broadcast stations. The feasibility of using the station frequency for communicating at the same time the regular program is on the air was proved by a series of tests directed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The technical ability to operate simultaneously is necessary because it would not be in the public interest to withdraw a broadcast station from its normal function in peacetime.
>
> We are installing a circuit using the above technique. The circuit will be physically separated and completely independent from any other communication system. Initially, we shall test the circuit to determine operating effectiveness and to identify problems. If the circuit confirms our thinking and proves acceptable, we will automate it as rapidly as procurement and engineering procedures will allow.
>
> Although every broadcast station would undoubtedly cooperate, the stations represented by the Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS) are major contributors to our circuit because of the technical advantages they offer. Specifically, their geographic coverage is wider than other stations propagating over the desired paths; their degree of reliability is superior because they broadcast on discrete frequencies and are therefore less susceptible to interference.

Mr. Speaker, in the light of this testimony and a preponderance of other evidence, the FCC's September 1961 decision must be set aside by the Congress. It is the Congress, in the ultimate, that must bear the responsibility for serving and protecting the "public interest, convenience and necessity" in the use of radio channels.

Perhaps the FCC did not know of the full defense potential of clear channels when it made its decision. That is understandable. Several of the channels that it plans to destroy are key links in the Defense Department's system.

The Congress must recognize that the groundwave signals now used and referred to by General Bestic are of an extremely low order and that higher power is needed to extend and increase the reliability of the system. And who is able to predict the future use of these channels in defense and foreign relations?

The use of higher power, such as Mexico and numerous other countries have used for a long time, on clear channels is the only technical way to improve inadequate nighttime radio signals to over 25 million people. Bills now before the Congress also authorize the use of higher power.

The Commission cannot deny that when a I-A clear channel is destroyed by the addition of another station thereto that additional duplications follow inevitably, thus reducing to practically zero the original clear channels' ability to fulfill its intended function.

The reason is simple. At night radio signals that move skyward are reflected back to earth when they hit the ionosphere. This does not happen to a significant degree in the daytime. At night these reflected signals interfere with and distort all signals on the specific channel involved for hundreds and sometimes thousands of miles. There is no way to prevent this.

This is why only one station may operate on a clear channel at night if that station is to serve distant points. It is why local and regional stations find their coverage vastly reduced after sunset. It is why their more distant nighttime signals are garbled as they collide with the reflected skywave signals of other stations operating on their channel.

These reflected or skywave signals furthermore form the basis for the arguments against the daytime stations operating additional hours without creating radio chaos.

Mr. Speaker, it is the engineering basis which makes clear channels necessary if millions of Americans are going to get any acceptable nighttime radio service. The FCC's proposal does violence to this accepted engineering fact. It places in jeopardy the Defense Department's fullest use of these channels. It does practically nothing to improve inadequate nighttime rural radio service. In fact it will bar forever the only known way of improving that service on the channels it plans to destroy, the route of power in excess of 50 kilowatts, an outmoded power ceiling that we have been anchored to by the Commission since the early thirties.

The Commission's answer to better rural radio service after sunset, according to testimony, would bring better radio service to some 250,000 rural Americans out of a total of 25 million in need of improved service. If the addition of stations were an answer to the problem it would have been solved long ago. The Commission has permitted the number of radio stations to operate at night during the past 15 years to double. But the addition of nearly 1,000 of these stations making a total of nearly 2,000 such stations operating today has left over 25 million rural and smalltown Americans without nighttime radio service save for the clear channel signals. Yet, the Commission proposes to solve the problem of inadequate rural radio

service by adding a dozen or so more stations.

It would be desirable, of course, if there was an AM local fulltime radio station every few miles throughout our thousands of thinly populated square miles. Each could supplement local nighttime service to that of the clear channel stations. Unfortunately, this is technically and economically impossible. Most of these areas simply cannot financially support a radio station. I know of no qualified person who takes exception to this.

The matter of the best use of AM radio clear channels was raised for the third time on February 20, 1945, when the FCC upon its own motion set into operation an investigation (docket 6741) as to how, among other things, radio service to remote rural regions could be improved. Only one FCC Commissioner on the Commission today sat through those hearings.

After 16 years the Commission would now resolve the issue by destroying one-half of the clear channels bringing better rural radio service to some 250,000 people while leaving 25 million still without adequate nighttime service and by placing in jeopardy a defense communications system.

By its proposed action furthermore, the Commission would materially handicap the only possible way of bringing better nighttime radio service to rural America, namely, the use of higher power on I-A clear channels.

This is progress in reverse; action that the Congress should not let stand. Congressional action must come quickly also since the Commission's date for starting the I-A clear channel breakdown has passed. Otherwise, vital national resources will have been forever lost.

Tadeusz Kosciuszko (1746–1817)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the success of the American Revolution was assured by the wholehearted efforts and the sacrifices made by the people here struggling for their independence. Other peoples, not native to this country, or related to the people living here, also contributed significantly to the successful culmination of that historic event. Tadeusz Kosciuszko, of Poland, that gallant and gifted soldier of freedom, was one of those whose personal participation in the American Revolution marks him as one of the great heroes of his day.

This gallant son of Poland was born on February 16, 1746, came to America in 1776 and volunteered for military service here. At once he was assigned to the task of fortifying the Delaware River. He performed this task so well that he was made a colonel of engineers in the Continental Army. Subsequently he was in the Northern Army and saw action in Ticonderoga; he also supervised the fortifications at Saratoga. Then he was put in charge of the building of fortifications at West Point. He was one of the first of the Continentals to enter Charleston after that city was evacuated by the British. On October 13, 1783, he was made a brigadier general.

After thus serving the cause of freedom in this country brilliantly and with distinction, he returned to his native Poland in order to fight for her freedom. He did this for 20 years, and breathed his last as an exile in Switzerland. Today, on his 216th birthday, we commemorate his memory as a sign of appreciation of his services to this country.

An Address by the Honorable Joseph J. Williams, Jr., Member, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Before the Savings Association League of New York's State Convention, September 19, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address, "One Year With the Federal Home Loan Bank Board," which was given by the Honorable Joseph J. Williams, Jr., before the State Convention of the Savings Association League of New York at Saranac Lake, N.Y., on September 19, 1961:

ONE YEAR WITH THE FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

(By Joseph J. Williams, Jr.)

I appreciate your kind invitation to visit New York and bring you greetings, not only from my colleagues on the Board, Chairman Joe McMurray, who, as you know, is one of your native sons, and Ira Dixon, but from the entire staff of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board in Washington.

Mr. McMurray is dedicated to the task of making the Federal Home Loan Bank Board one of the best agencies in Government and, needless to say, Mr. Dixon and I join him in this objective.

Exactly 1 year ago today, I resigned as a member of the Legislature of Virginia, a position which I had held for 24 years; gave up my law practice; resigned as general counsel and member of the board of directors of the Franklin Federal Savings and Loan Association of Richmond, which position I had held since its organization in 1933; and accepted appointment as a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. My remarks to you today will, therefore, cover the highlights of what has happened during my 1 year's service with the Board.

First of all, I would like to say that we have in Washington a staff of competent, dedicated people, many of whom have given their lives' work to the savings and loan industry. In spite of insufficient personnel, they have done an outstanding job in keeping abreast of an industry which has quadrupled in the past 10 years and doubled in the last 5.

I have also thoroughly enjoyed working with your excellent president, Dave Ford, with his most personable assistant, Bill Bodine, whom I had previously known when he was with the National League, and with Mike Murphy, the most able president of your New York bank.

During the last year—that is, from September 1, 1960, to September 1, 1961—the number of members of the Federal Home Loan Bank System increased from 4,687 to 4,790. The number of the savings and loan associations insuring their accounts with the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation increased from 4,064 to 4,184, an increase of 3 percent. The number of Federal savings and loan associations increased from 1,868 to 1,896, an increase of 1.5 percent. The total assets of the member institutions of the Federal Home Loan Bank System increased from $67 billion to $76 billion, an increase of 13.4 percent. The assets of the institutions insuring their accounts with the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation increased from $64 billion to $74 billion, an increase of 15.6 percent; and the assets of the Federal savings and loan associations increased from $37 billion to $42 billion, an increase of 13.5 percent. The reserves of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation increased from $358 million to $415 million, an increase of 16 percent: and the assets of the Federal Home Loan banks increased from $3.1 billion to $3.3 billion. The capital stock of the Federal Home Loan banks has increased from $971 million to $1.1 billion, or more than 11 percent.

You will be most interested to know that on September 6 we sold $381 million consolidated notes dated September 15, 1961, and maturing April 16, 1962, which carried a 3.15 percent coupon. This was not only the largest single issue the Board has sold on behalf of the banks but also our largest offering on any one day and, to the best of our knowledge, the largest single public offering of any Government agency security.

I am happy to report that during the year the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation has suffered no losses.

The Board during the past year has adopted, among others, the following regulations:

"RESOLUTION 13873 ADOPTED SEPTEMBER 21, 1960

"Amends Federal regulations by adding a new section to Board rulings (sec. 555.11) interpreting the regulation governing loans for land acquisition and development (sec. 545.6-14). The ruling holds that a loan otherwise eligible under that section, does not become ineligible because the prospective borrower has already acquired title to land.

"RESOLUTION 13915 ADOPTED OCTOBER 6, 1960

"This amendment also relates to Board ruling (sec. 555.8) and dealth with payments on savings accounts received on a fixed date in order to be considered as having been invested on the first day of the month. This ruling held that where the 10th day of the month fell on a nonbusiness date, it would be permissible for the association receiving savings on the first business date next succeeding, to consider such savings as invested on the first of the month.

"RESOLUTION 14187 ADOPTED DECEMBER 23, 1960

"This amendment increased the maximum percentage of value to loan on properties designed primarily for residential purposes for 6 to 12 families, from 66⅔ of the value of the property to 70 percent, and increased the repayment period from 15 years to 20 years.

"RESOLUTION 14260 ADOPTED JANUARY 24, 1961

"A new paragraph (sec. 545.6-4(c)) was added to the Federal regulations prohibiting the sale of participating interests in loans

to noninsured institutions without the prior approval of the Board, except sales to purchasers entitled to an exemption under section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code (e.g., religious, charitable educational corporations, or labor, agricultural or civic organizations).

"FSLIC 1034 ADOPTED JANUARY 24, 1961

"This was a companion amendment to the above resolution No. 14260 making the same provisions applicable to insured institutions. (sec. 569-9-2.)

"FSLIC 1033 ADOPTED JANUARY 24, 1961

"Amended the insurance regulations by permitting the purchase of a participating interest in a loan by an insured institution in which the seller retains a 25-percent interest in such loan. Previously a 50-percent retainage was required. (Sec. 563.9-1(b).)

"RESOLUTION 14477 ADOPTED APRIL 7, 1961

"Amended the Federal regulation dealing with loans for land acquisition and development (sec. 545.6-14) by deleting from the definition of the word 'development' the language 'urban type.' As thus amended, the regulation would be complied with if building sites are so completed that they are ready for construction of buildings thereon.

"RESOLUTION 14541 ADOPTED APRIL 24, 1961

"Amended the scope of the general regulations dealing with hearing procedures to include hearings to determine whether holding companies directly or indirectly exercise a controlling interest over the management of insured institutions, or whether at the time of the approval of an application for insurance, the institution was controlled by a company which also controlled another insured institution or applicant for insurance.

"RESOLUTION 14891 ADOPTED AUGUST 24, 1961

"Prohibits giveaways and advertising giveaways by Federal associations in States where, pursuant to statute, State supervisors may prohibit or restrict giveaways and where such State supervisors have in fact issued such prohibitions or restrictions. No Federal association would, however, be subject to any restriction or imposition to which it would not be subject if such association were a State-chartered association. The effective date stated in this resolution is September 29, 1961."

On February 6, 1961, President Kennedy wrote to Mr. Dixon, Acting Chairman of the Board, as follows:

"As pointed out in the message on economic recovery and growth which I sent to the Congress last week, one of the important factors contributing to the slack in our economy is the current high mortgage interest rate. I have directed the Federal Housing Administration to reduce the maximum permissible interest rate on FHA insured loans, and I have asked the Federal National Mortgage Association to help effect this change in interest rates.

"A most significant role in helping achieve a more realistic yield can be performed by the Nation's savings and loan associations. I hope that the Federal Home Loan Bank Board will cooperate in this effort to secure a level of mortgage interest rates which will stimulate the construction of housing units, thereby aiding in our overall recovery program and in realizing this Nation's full potential for economic growth."

We assured the President of our wholehearted cooperation and have since that time passed the following regulations, some of which are designed to carry this request into effect:

"RESOLUTION 14304 ADOPTED FEBRUARY 10, 1961

"Amended the Federal regulation providing for more liberal loans on one-family homes (sec. 545.6-1(4)), by increasing the ratio of value to loan from 80 to 90 percent and increasing the maximum loan under that section to $22,000.

"RESOLUTION 14305 ADOPTED FEBRUARY 10, 1961

"This amendment liberalized the section governing land acquisition and development loans (sec. 545.6-14) by permitting Federal associations to make loans up to 5 percent of withdrawable accounts in lieu of the earlier limitations of 3 percent, and increased the aggregate amount of loans to any single applicant from 15 to 20 percent of the aggregate of all investments a Federal association could make under this section.

"RESOLUTION 14361 ADOPTED MARCH 2, 1961

"Amended the Federal regulation authorizing loans for land acquisition and development (sec. 545.6-14) by deleting previous requirements that the loan instrument contain a provision that the loan be in default if construction is not commenced within 9 months, and that no more than 85 percent of a loan be disbursed prior to completion of development.

"RESOLUTION 14362 ADOPTED MARCH 2, 1961

"Amended the section of Federal regulations authorizing more liberal loans on single-family homes (sec. 545.6-1 (4)) by increasing from 10 to 15 percent the amount of an association's capital which could be invested in such loans, and also permitting loans under that section for the purpose of making construction loans.

"FSLIC 1084 ADOPTED MARCH 30, 1961

"Amended insurance regulations dealing with participation loans (sec. 569.9-1) by engaging the definition of 'regular lending area' to include the area within which the institution was operating on June 27, 1934.

"RESOLUTION 14491 ADOPTED APRIL 13, 1961

"Amended the Federal regulations by including within the definition of 'other improved real estate' developed building lots and sites ready for construction thereon of one-family homes (sec. 541.12) and added new authority to Federals to make loans to builders to finance the purchase of such lots or sites.

"RESOLUTION 14467 ADOPTED JUNE 2, 1961

"This amendment to the Federal regulation (sec. 554.3) provided for two new bonus plans, one a monthly payment plan calling for regular, equal, monthly payments for a period of not less than 36 months and the other plan, a fixed-balance plan involving savings balances of $1,000 or multiples of $1,000 maintained for periods of not less than 36 months.

"RESOLUTION 14776 ADOPTED JULY 12, 1961

"Amended the Federal regulation authorizing loans for the purchase and acquisition of developed building lots and sites (sec. 545.6-3(c) item 13 above) by deleting the requirement that the loan must be for the purchase of the building site. This was done to permit builders whose capital had been reduced by development costs to obtain a loan on a development site notwithstanding that they already owned the land. As thus amended, loans are authorized on the security of a lien on a developed building lot or site.

"RESOLUTION 14815 ADOPTED JULY 28, 1961

"Amended the section authorizing more liberal loans with respect to one-family homes (sec. 545.6-1(4)) by increasing maximum maturity of the loan from 25 to 30 years, the maximum loan from $25,000 to $26,500, and authorizes loans up to 90 percent of value of the real estate as does not exceed $25,000 plus 80 percent of value as exceeds $25,000."

Due to my experience in the Virginia Legislature, I have been particularly interested in the legislation pending before Congress affecting our system. The board has sponsored and secured the enactment of two bills which, in my opinion, will prove extremely beneficial to our industry. The first is a bill intended to add new strength to the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. Under the provisions of this legislation an insured savings and loans association will be required to make an annual payment to the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation in the nature of a prepayment with respect to its future regular premiums. The annual rate of the regular premium will remain unchanged at one-twelfth of 1 percent of the total amount of all accounts of the institution's insured members plus its creditor obligations. The annual prepayment would be equal to 2 percent of the net increase in such accounts during the next previous calendar year less an amount equal to any requirement, as of the end of that calendar year, for purchase of stock of the Federal Home Loan Bank of which the institution is a member.

The requirements for the purchase of bank stock will be reduced from 2 to 1 percent of the net increase of the member's mortgage portfolio, but the legislation provides that no institution which is a bank member on the date of the enactment of the bill shall be permitted to reduce its stock to less than the amount held by it as of the close of that date, with two minor exceptions.

The corporation is directed to establish a primary reserve, which will be its general reserve, and a secondary reserve, to which the prepayments will be credited. If the primary reserve and any other accounts available for losses should be insufficient to meet all losses of the corporation, the secondary reserve will be available for that purpose. In other words, the prepayments will serve as an additional reserve for losses.

The outstanding balances in the secondary reserve will receive a return at a rate equal to the average rate on the insurance corporation's own investments in Government or Government-guaranteed obligations. This return will not be paid in cash but will be added to the secondary reserve.

When the aggregate of the primary reserve and the secondary reserve reaches 2 percent of the total amount of all accounts of insured members and creditor obligations of all insured institutions (assuming that the primary reserve alone did not reach that percentage), the prepayments will stop and each institution's pro rata share of the secondary reserve will be used, so far as available, to discharge its obligations for its regular annual premiums. If the aggregate of the two reserves later falls below 1.75 percent, the prepayments will be resumed and such use of the secondary reserve will cease. However, if the primary reserve itself reaches 2 percent of this base, the Corporation will pay to each insured institution, in cash, the amount of its pro rata share of the secondary reserve, and the premium prepayments will permanently cease.

The old law made the regular premium payable under the Corporation's reserve fund equal 5 percent of all insured accounts and creditor obligations of all insured institutions, and provided that if, at any time, it fell below that figure the regular premium shall be resumed until it is brought back to that point. The new law, in effect, reduces this ratio to 2 percent but requires that each insured institution pay the regular premium for at least 20 years, in order to assure that newly insured institutions shall make a reasonable contribution toward the building up of the Corporation's reserve.

It is the opinion of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board that the amount of stock of the Federal home loan banks, which now exceeds $1 billion, is sufficient to meet the criterion of adequate capitalization; and that the prepayments of insurance premiums called for in this legislation will greatly increase the reserves of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation and gear the growth

of these reserves to the rapid expansion of its insured institutions.

The second piece of legislation sponsored by the Board simplifies, and makes more workable, the procedure for the nomination and election of directors of the Federal home loan banks. Under this legislation, all elective directors of a bank will be in one group, but will from time to time be allocated by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board among the States of the district in approximate proportion to the required stock of the bank of the district held by the members from the respective States, with a minimum of one such director and a maximum of six such directors for each State. However, each State will be entitled to at least as many elective directors as the number which represented it on December 31, 1960, and the Board is directed to add as many directors as might be necessary for this purpose.

Each directorship allocated to a particular State will be filled by an officer or director of a member located within that State, and the members located within that State will have the function of nominating and electing that directorship. In such election, each member will have the right to cast a number of votes equal to the number of shares of stock of the bank of the district held by such member, except that the bill provides that no added voting strength shall be derived from stockownership in excess of the average required ownership of the members in the particular State.

Early in this session of Congress, there was introduced a bill known as the Curtis-Harrison bill. The Treasury Department, before giving its report to the Ways and Means Committee on this bill, set up an interagency group on the taxation of mutual thrift institutions and reviewed the tax provisions applicable to mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations. I was designated to represent the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and attended all of these hearings, at which not only the representatives of the banks, but the mutual thrift institutions appeared and gave extensive testimony. At these hearings, the mutual thrift institutions were ably represented by the officials of the United States Savings and Loan League, the National League of Insured Savings and Loan Associations and the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks. Toward the end of these hearings, our new chairman, Joe McMurray, took an active part and rendered most valuable assistance in trying to convince the staff of the Treasury Department of the serious impact of these proposed taxes on our industry; we pointed out that the impact upon savings and loan associations of the proposed tax in the Curtis-Harrison bill must fall either upon the annual reserve allocations of our institutions, upon the dividend rate they paid to the savers, or upon some combination of both. We further pointed out that the Federal Home Loan Bank Board could not permit the impact of the tax proposed in the Curtis-Harrison bill to fall upon reserves and that the impact of this tax must of necessity fall upon the dividend rates and materially decrease them, which would in turn materially decrease the amount of money available for home financing and in turn materially decrease housing starts and increase the interest rate. Mr. Robert Weaver, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, gave us valuable assistance and said that "in view of current economic developments and past declines in homebuilding when business expanded, the Housing and Home Finance Agency is seriously concerned with the possibility of a change in the tax treatment of mutual thrift institutions that could lead to a decline in homebuilding."

In spite of this, the staff of the Treasury Department in early July forwarded to the Ways and Means Committee a report on the taxation of mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations, which recommended, with some possible deferments, taxation of mutual thrift institutions in a manner which the Board thought would be very detrimental to the industry.

Mr. MILLS, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, called on the Federal Home Loan Bank for comments on these proposals; and on August 3, 1961 Chairman McMurray sent to him the Board's statement of vigorous opposition. Subsequently thereto, extensive hearings were held before the House Ways and Means Committee in which both leagues, representatives of the mutual savings banks and various representatives of the industry gave excellent testimony against these proposals. Two of your able Representatives from New York, Messrs. KEOGH and MULTER, rendered the industry valuable assistance by their testimony. Your New York league, lead by Mr. Ford, ably represented you; and the testimony of your General Bliss was most appropriate and effective. The overall effect of this work was to have the Congress defer consideration of these tax proposals until next year. These proposals are still with us; and I urge each of you to become thoroughly familiar with them.

Before concluding, I would like to say to you that today the eyes of the administration, the Congress and, indeed, the Nation, are on the savings and loan business. More than 27 million Americans have entrusted more than $70 billion of their savings to our institutions. We are the Nation's largest home lenders. We are, in effect, being challenged to prove that this great thrift system and this great Federal home loan bank system can serve the public interest and help make a better America. How we meet this challenge in the years to come will have a tremendous bearing on our future reputation, prestige, and success. Let's all strive to build a greater record for our industry.

It has been a great pleasure to be with you here in New York and learn firsthand about our industry in this great State.

I Disapprove of What You Say, but I Will Defend to the Death Your Right To Say It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, our democracy will survive only so long as its citizenry is free to speak out. It is in the interest of sound representative government that matters and issues of great concern to our Nation are fully debated—that both sides of a question are heard.

The Congress will soon consider the issue of medical care for the aged. Therefore, I can fully appreciate the deep interest of my constituents in this issue. For a long time thousands of letters have been coming across my desk pointing out the desperate need for such legislation. And I have replied, indicating my support because I am convinced of the urgency of affirmative action in this field. Others have written expressing sincerely their doubts and opposition regarding such a proposal. I appreciate these views and I shall continue to study the question until the debate is finally concluded on this great issue.

One of the writers, my constituent, Dr. Theodore S. Heineken of Glen Ridge, N.J., has requested that I insert on his behalf an editorial from the AMA News in the RECORD. I do not agree with the viewpoint expressed in the editorial; however, in accordance, with the doctor's request, I include the editorial in the RECORD:

BRITAIN'S GHASTLY MESS

"Medicine in Britain is in a mess."

This is the belated opinion of the British Medical Journal, official organ of the British Medical Association, as it joins in the mounting criticism of the National Health Service.

An editorial in the BMJ (December 9, 1961) goes on to quote, and in effect agree with, a member of the House of Lords who found that the medical mess presents "a pretty ghastly, awful picture."

This is what British economists Jewkes, Lees, and Hutton have said about their compulsory health care scheme in recent months. This is also what several British newspapers began saying late in October, the first real public criticism of the NHS since the program was inaugurated in 1948 (The AMA News, December 11, 1961). All have questioned the quality of medical care under a system of centralized and politically oriented decisions, a system which measures costs rather than needs.

It is this messy picture of nationalized medicine that American proponents of social security health care are so anxious to copy. It is ironic that after a 13-year waiting period the British should discover and begin to publicize their mess at a time when pressure for Government medicine is reaching a peak in the United States.

The crux of the matter in Britain is a shortage of physicians, a situation which has resulted from a bureaucratic decision to limit the intake at medical schools and from the emigration of physicians seeking to escape state medicine. If the school intake were raised by 10 percent only 170 more doctors annually would be produced by 1968, but for the past 5 years about 600 British doctors have been emigrating each year.

Much of the credit for awakening the medical profession must go to J. P. Seale, M.D., who has been protesting the declining number of British physicians with well-documented articles in Lancet and the BMJ. It was Dr. Seale's most recent article, following hard upon the criticism of the three economists, that brought from the BMJ its editorial outcry. Said Dr. Seale:

"Young British doctors will remain in the NHS only if conditions of service are reasonably attractive. By their actions, rather than their words, they have shown that they are unattractive. Up till the present the government, and many leaders of the medical profession, have failed to see that this is so."

The BMJ states that "a succession of Ministers of Health and their advisers have been so immersed in the routine of their jobs, or so busy explaining to visitors what a marvelous thing the NHS is, that they * * * have concealed [the medical mess] from each other and the public." And "it is difficult to believe that everyone all the time has been unaware of what was happening."

The BMJ extends its criticism to nationalization in general: "It just shows how in these days everyone can be bemused into acceptance and inaction as a result of the findings of one of these high-powered governmental committees which seem to be

symptomatic of the static society which is Britain today." Exclaims the BMJ:

"What an incredible state of affairs."

We submit that it is not really an incredible state of affairs at all. It is simply a welfare state of affairs. It is not incredible that the English have let themselves be lulled for 13 years in a state of euphoria, because welfarism is a powerful narcotic. Nor is it incredible that the enterprising English have roused themselves at last, for they have been acting out of character with all this lotus eating.

The mounting reaction to adverse conditions in British medicine has been an interesting—indeed, a hopeful—thing to watch. And we have not yet seen the end of it. Dr. Seale writes: "As the failure in the supply of doctors sweeps through the National Health Service and the medical profession like a hurricane, even the sand in which our leaders have buried their heads is being blown away."

It is easy to see, if you have your head up and are looking, that the best way to get out of a mess of this kind is not to get into it in the first place. We suggest that Americans who are advocating nationalized medicine take a good long look at Britain's ghastly, awful picture.

Newburgh on TV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing tendency among the leftwing, radical apostles, who call themselves liberals, to tell only one side—their side—of the great social and economic problems that confront this Nation. Those who know the facts from firsthand observation and study see evidence of this "slanted" journalism almost every day. Those who do not know the facts firsthand are sometimes misled and misinformed by biased and untruthful reporting, be it by newspapers or so-called news commentators on radio and television.

Could it be, Mr. Speaker, that the leftwingers are afraid to let their carefully disguised welfare state programs and cradle-to-grave schemes stand the test of an informed public opinion?

A well-documented example of biased reporting occurred on January 28, 1962, when the National Broadcasting Co. produced a so-called white paper entitled "The Battle of Newburgh." The magazine National Review in its edition of February 20 submitted conclusive evidence that the white paper presented only one side of the controversy over the administration of welfare payments in Newburgh. Evidence upholding the town's position was carefully omitted from the hour long program. The self-explanatory article from National Review follows:

NEWBURGH ON TV

(By M. Stanton Evans)

For the past year, America's liberal community has exhibited an obsessive concern with what seems, at first glance, to be a nonpolitical subject: the accuracy of documentary films.

There is nothing, the left has maintained, quite so contemptible as a documentary on a controversial subject which presents only one side of the issue.

Everyone from the Reporter magazine to the American Civil Liberties Union to the National Council of Churches has delved at length into the moral aspects of zoom shots, film cutting, accuracy of narrative, and use of musical themes—an ethical frenzy the like of which the motion picture industry has seldom seen.

The cause of all this odd philosophizing was a documentary film entitled "Operation Abolition," produced by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. The movie was designed to vindicate the committee, and thus according to the committee's opponents, was distorted, on the face of it.

The residuum of moral commentary from the "Operation Abolition" dispute becomes highly interesting in the wake of another documentary—from a different source, and with a different purpose. On January 28, NBC television produced a so-called white paper, entitled "The Battle of Newburgh." Solemnly narrated by NBC's basset-eyed Chet Huntley, the white paper set about to discredit the welfare policies of the smallish city of Newburgh, N.Y. It surveyed Newburgh's effort to reduce relief costs by policing moochers, and wound up opining that there were no moochers. For the better part of an hour, Huntley skillfully alternated film clips and oral commentary to portray Newburgh as a starving community, writhing beneath the yoke of a tight-fisted municipal tyrant—City Manager Joseph McD. Mitchell. To this end, Huntley quoted brief fragments from Mitchell, then followed up with film or comment designed to refute Mitchell's position (e.g., juxtaposing Mitchell's statement that "no truly needy person has suffered" with a sequence of a husky reliefer reduced to inarticulate blubbering; quoting Mitchell as saying anyone wanting a job could get one, then reading off quotations from the Labor Department to the effect that Newburgh was a surplus labor area).

On the morning following Huntley's one-sided opus, City Manager Mitchell issued a devastating rebuttal, which should tingle the nerve ends of all the sensitive moralists who agonized over "Operation Abolition." "Approximately 60,000 feet of film were taken," Mitchell said, "and 2,000 or less were used. In this clipping process most of the prominent civic leaders who are very articulate on this subject and who were filmed in support of us were cut out."

And: "Those leaders who were used were by and large biased. I refer specifically to a former congressman, a former judge and a pastor, whose wife works in the welfare department. These people were not identified as to their interests and philosophies, and were made to appear as typical citizens."

And: "The budget data used were false. They made it appear that two-thirds of the recipients were old or blind, and that only a very small fraction were in the aid to dependent children category. The facts are that one-quarter was aid to dependent children and a good proportion, approximately 17 percent, was going into administration."

An hour ought to be sufficient time for a full statement of the pros and cons of a dispute such as that which has raged over Newburgh. Yet in that span, Huntley managed to gloss over or omit completely such facts as the following:

Thanks to Mitchell's effort, the caseload of relief work in Newburgh was reduced by more than one-third from February 1961 through October 1961 (a drop from 1,382 to 900), the largest reduction in caseload achieved by any of the five welfare districts in the State of New York.

The aid to dependent children caseload (involving illegitimacies and broken homes) dropped from 160 in February to 20 in August. Home relief was reduced from 100 in February to 20 in August. In October, when costs usually rise, the figure dropped to 19.

The citizens of Newburgh, who had been devoting one-third of their city budget to welfare, achieved a savings of $126,000 in 1961 and a 1962 tax cut, thanks to Mitchell's program. At the height of the controversy, they reelected the city council members who backed Mitchell's program.

Huntley made light of the problem of migration, ignoring the fact that 71 percent of all Newburgh's welfare cases involved migrants.

He also neglected to point out that, before Mitchell's program got under way, there were reliefers in Newburgh drawing down more in welfare payments than some city employees were getting in take-home pay. No less than 17 families were receiving more than $200 a month. One family received $1,000 during the month of September. Others received allotments ranging up to $365 a month. As Mitchell observes: "The film failed to note that many recipients rolled up in Cadillacs, expensive cars of various kinds or taxicabs. It gave the impression that nearly everyone in the line was crippled, disabled, blind and aged, etc."

So runs the other side of the story—a side which NBC viewers, drinking in Chet Huntley's maudlin decoction, could hardly have known existed. Whatever one's overall view of the Newburgh situation, it is certain that Huntley's "white paper" was fraught with bias and distortion. It is less certain whether the ethical film censors of the left will apply to Huntley the same exquisite morals they brought to bear against the House committee.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

C

Appendix

Remarks of Representative Silvio O. Conte at Annual Lincoln Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks of Representative SILVIO O. CONTE before the Middlesex Club on Thursday, February 8, 1962, in Boston, Mass., when he delivered a historical speech on Abraham Lincoln. I think Representative CONTE made an excellent presentation, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN SILVIO O. CONTE BEFORE THE MIDDLESEX CLUB ON THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1962, BOSTON, MASS., AT ANNUAL LINCOLN DAY DINNER

Gen. George Pickett, the fighting Confederate commander, was to remember all the days of his life that fateful day at Gettysburg when he led his long grey lines up Cemetery Ridge in the bloodiest assault of the war. And Mrs. George Pickett was long to remember that afternoon at war's end when she opened the door of her Richmond home in answer to the knock of a tall stranger asking her if George were at home. Replying that George wasn't and wouldn't be for some time yet, she asked the visitor's name. The tall, frock-coated man in the stove pipe hat answered simply, "Just an old friend of George's, Ma'am, just an old friend from before the war." With that he turned, stepped out into the sunlight and walked slowly down that Richmond street, leaving Mrs. Pickett to the startling realization that the President of the United States had come to call.

The President of the United States, Abraham Lincoln was that—of course he was—but really a great deal more too. For this was a man of many parts, all of them human, most of them great.

As a Republican, a Member of Congress, and an American, I am honored and pleased at your invitation to share a few moments with you tonight in commemoration and consideration of this great man.

The appeal of Lincoln to mankind is universal and indefinable. There is something in Lincoln for all men. He was the master politician, who in 30 long, devoted years of service to his party came to realize that politics, like life, is the art of achieving the possible. Scholars tell us that if we are to realistically seek the man who made Lincoln President in 1860, we must look to the activities of Lincoln himself. In the presidency he is recognized as more independent of direct appeals to Congress or the people to achieve his aims than any other strong President. He worked behind the scenes with the organization men of his party. In short, he was a "politician's politician." Yet we hardly think less of him for all this.

Then, too, he was Lincoln the family man and father, whose home was torn by strife and dissension and the tragic death of children. Yet it is not here, nor ever, our task to judge Mary Todd Lincoln. The hearts of these two are best known but to themselves. Suffice it for us to remember that on the night of Good Friday, 1865, in Ford's Theater, Mary Todd and Abraham Lincoln sat holding hands in a darkened box.

President, Commander in Chief, statesman, this too was Abraham Lincoln. Intellectual power, moral strength, a feeling for the spirit and needs of the time, instinctive understanding of the masses, a passion for democracy—all these are the qualities of a statesman. All these Lincoln possessed. Devoted above all to preserving the Union "with the dignity, equality, and rights of the several States unimpaired." This he said, this he did and, in so doing, he brought freedom to the slave.

Lincoln was a martyr, too. And in this capacity history preserves and, yes, even enshrines him forever. A martyr, indeed—to the Union, to peace, and to freedom. Lincoln had a lifelong premonition of death, yet he knew that death was not life at its worst, for to him defeat without trying was true failure, and his ceaseless effort to preserve our Union stands as one of the great successes of all time.

This, then, was Abraham Lincoln—politician, husband, and father, President and Commander in Chief, martyr for all mankind. He was truly a man of such dimensions that he made all others seem small, though he would have been the very last to wish to do so, for he was a man with an attractive sense of humility and humor, rare among his peers.

It is these latter aspects of Lincoln that have special appeal to me, for of all the great lessons of democracy and statesmanship our generation owes Lincoln, we, as Americans in our difficult time, like Lincoln in his, also need humor as our safety valve—our weapon against the harassments of life.

An old friend from Illinois once visited him in Washington. "Mr. Lincoln," he asked, "How do you like being President?" "Well," he answered, "It reminds me of the man in Indiana who was being ridden out of town on a rail." He said, "If it wasn't for the honor of the thing, I think I'd rather walk."

His reputation as a storyteller preceded him to the White House and was well deserved. As a boy in Indiana, as a young man in New Salem, as a lawyer in the dreary taverns of the Eighth Judicial Circuit of Illinois, he was always the center of attraction. With his long legs crossed, leaning slightly forward, his face radiant with anticipation and enjoyment, Lincoln delighted both himself and his audience. His humor, like his compassion, was that of the people he understood and loved so well, with all its, and their, good and bad.

But his stories did more than amuse. They often served to reinforce the point he wanted to make in a way that few could misunderstand. Once, when criticized for allowing General Grant to parole an entire Confederate Army after the surrender at Vicksburg, he replied with the story of Bill Sykes' dog. Some cruel boys had fed Bill's little yellow cur a sausage stuffed with gunpowder and attached a makeshift fuse to it. When Bill heard the explosion, he came outside and said to what was left of the poor animal, "Well, I guess you won't be much use again—as a dog "Gentlemen, I don't think that Army will be much use again—as an Army."

Condemned and maligned more bitterly and personally than any other American President, saddened beyond knowledge by the struggle that was dividing his country, standing almost alone for what he believed to be right against the demands of both conservatives and radicals, he once confided to a friend, "Without humor, I think I should die."

The earthy and the sublime, the magnificent and the humble, the ridiculous and the profound—contrasts in the man are neverending. A mind that could encompass Bill Sykes' dog and the Gettysburg address, stories which could delight a rough frontiersman and his second inaugural address—these are the complexities, the mystery, the greatness of the man whom we commemorate this evening. A man whose appeal so moved Carl Sandburg to say: "Not often in the history of mankind does a man arrive on earth who is both steel and velvet, who is as hard as a rock and soft as drifting fog, who holds in his heart and mind the paradox of terrible storm—and peace unspeakable and perfect."

All of Us Should Drink More

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, many of us have been alarmed for some time at the declining consumption in milk and dairy products brought about, in great measure, by overemphasis in certain media on the problems of nuclear fallout and cholesterol.

It was gratifying that the Department of Agricuture, with the participation of President Kennedy, recently held a National Conference on Milk and Nutrition. I hope that the conference has resulted in a clearing of the air with regard to the fears, real and imagined, which have blighted the reputation of milk as instrumental in adequate nutrition and good bodily health.

I recently received a letter from Mr. Vincent Crowley, of Crowley's Milk Co., Binghamton, N.Y., forcefully outlining the problems which have beset the dairy industry as a result of milk's poor publicity in recent months. I forwarded the letter to Secretary of Agriculture Freeman for his comments, and I here include excerpts from Mr. Crowley's letter, the letter of comment by Secretary Freeman, and a summary of the remarks made by President Kennedy at the recent conference:

CROWLEY'S MILK CO., INC.,
Binghamton, N.Y., December 27, 1961.
Hon. HOWARD W. ROBISON,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HOWARD: I am writing you this rather lengthy letter because of two situations which are causing the milk industry considerable concern; namely, radioactive fallout in milk and milk products, and diet-cholesterol findings. It seems that every time we turn around, we are being clobbered by the press, radio, and television with regard to these two items. Since you are representing a dairy farming area, and this fallout scare certainly affects the farmer * * * your constituents need to be made aware of the facts in order to combat the sensationalist press.

Milk seems to be the press' favorite whipping boy. Why? We think it is because it is a food item produced the year around all over the United States. It is perfect for testing whereas other products used for testing are, at some time of the year and in some parts of the country, not in production, with the result that the milk industry is carrying the full burden of the testing and the publishing of the results. Our plight is partly the result of the sensational headlines which frighten our people and they curtail the use of dairy products which can lead to malnutrition. Unfortunately, the press does not try to make amends when someone does make a find which reverses much of the material they have put in print and circulated. This is not considered sensational, or apt to build their circulation, and consequently they bury such items in the back of the newspaper.

We have been hearing a great deal about strontium 90 in milk. In fact, HOWARD, we have accumulated a considerable file of articles, pamphlets, etc., on this very subject. Recently, the USDA reported the building of an extractor for taking strontium 90 out of milk. It is a very small and costly one, and it is estimated it will cost us 5 cents per quart to use such a machine for this purpose. It is possible to put one in use, however, considering all of the reports submitted here by the National Dairy Council, the Milk Industry Foundation, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the Surgeon General, we can see no justification for putting this machine into use at this time.

From my own conclusions drawn from a recent report which appeared in the U.S. News & World Report (Nov. 27, 1961) by R. Lauriston Taylor, the chairman of the National Committee on Radiation Protection End Measurements, and chief of radiation physics, National Bureau of Standards, I am wondering what all the shouting is about. Mr. Taylor does not seem to be greatly concerned about the problem, at least not to the point the hysterical press is. His approach and outlook seem most sensible and what seems to be needed at this particular time, is a calm look at things, and a commonsense approach to the problem. After all, Mr. Taylor stated among other things, that a man sitting in front of his TV set night after night is getting as much radiation from sitting near the set as he is getting from fallout. (And I'll bet he won't give up his TV viewing just because this is so.)

I think we need to get the experts in this field to come to an agreement on what is and is not dangerous and above all, we need to have some strong assurance with regard to foodstuffs that there is no need for concern and for the changing of dietary patterns which could lead to malnutrition.

Pretty much the same situation exists with regard to cholesterol and the diet. Medical men so far cannot agree on the relationship between high blood cholesterol levels and cardiovascular disease. As a result, many physicians advise against specific fat-containing dairy products for the high cholesterol and cardiovascular disease patients with the result that margarine is substituted for butter, skim milk is on the increase, and in this year more doctors recommended against cheese and cream as butterfat containing products as did in 1959. These items appear in our newspapers, on radio and television as a matter of course, and many perfectly healthy, normal individuals become fearful, and curtail the use of dairy products in the hope of avoiding high cholesterol counts. In many cases, this practice leads to bad health habits and an impairment of bodily wellbeing. * * *

Sincerely,

VINCENT C. CROWLEY.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., February 2, 1962.
Hon. HOWARD W. ROBISON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ROBISON: Thank you for your letter of January 19, enclosing a letter from Mr. Vincent Crowley on the publicity on radioactivity and cholesterol in milk and its effect on milk and dairy product consumption.

The President and I have been concerned about the overemphasis in the press and other communication media of this subject and the implications of this publicity on the Nation's nutrition and physical fitness. The National Conference on Milk and Nutrition was called to discuss this problem. We are concerned also about other ramifications of this problem, including the effects on the welfare of our farm population and on our soil, water, and animal resources.

Enclosed are copies of two of the statements made at this conference including the statement by the President. As you will note, the President had this to say regarding fallout: "* * * It is abundantly clear that for the foreseeable future there is no danger from the present amount of exposure." Regarding cholesterol, he stated: "* * * The Food and Nutrition Board of the National Research Council has concluded after intensive research that the association of milk consumption and coronary disease due to the increase in cholesterol level has not been sufficiently established to justify the abandonment of this nutritious element except where doctors have individually perscribed special diets for those found to be susceptible to special cholesterol or coronary problems." He also pointed out that milk is still one of the best sources of nutrition for children and adults.

These points were brought out more fully at the conference by experts in each field.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S REMARKS AT MILK AND NUTRITION CONFERENCE

Following is a summary of remarks made by President John F. Kennedy before the National Conference on Milk and Nutrition, Interdepartmental Auditorium, Washington, D.C., January 23, 1962, 10:30 a.m.:

"Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Ladies and gentlemen, I want to express my appreciation to all of you for participating in this conference, which I think is most important to our farmers and to our country.

"And I want to say a few words this morning about a very important subject to us all. And that is milk.

"Almost every State produces milk. It provides twice as much of the cash income for our farmers as any other basic crop. It's our most nourishing food.

"And last year we consumed either in the form of milk or in the form of butter, cheese, or ice cream, about 125 billion pounds of dairy products. But in the year before we consumed between 2 billion and 3 billion pounds more. At the same time, our population increased 1.7 percent. And milk production, in an effort to keep pace with population production, increased 1½ percent. And in that same time, milk consumption declined 2½ percent.

"This is a serious matter for us, serious for the dairy industry, for all of our farmers, and for the United States.

"First, it's a matter of concern because it implies poor nutrition and a less balanced diet.

"Secondly, it presents problems in the area of the management of our milk production. It will require adjustment. We cannot continue to accumulate dairy products in still larger inventories. Nor can we embark upon a policy that will jeopardize the economic interest of so large a segment of our farm population. For there is a close relationship between prosperity on the farm and prosperity in the city, between economic health of our farm community and the economic health of our Nation.

"Third, the drop in milk consumption has a serious implication for the best use of those soil, water, and animal resources that are now involved in dairy production. I doubt that anyone can be sure of the reasons of this sudden drop in consumption. We only know that the slow decline in consumption over a period of time became immediate and precipitous last year.

"I have long been convinced that milk is an important aid to good health. This has led me to direct that milk be served at every White House meal from now on. And I expect that all of us will benefit from it.

"If we are to be a vigorous and vital nation as we all desire, then, of course, we must depend on the consumption of a balanced diet. And milk must be a part of it.

"I am aware that there has been a good deal of public discussion about the effect of radioactive fallout upon our food supply. Most of the discussion has unfortunately used milk as an example of food products that might be contaminated. This recognizes the importance of milk in our daily diet, but it has the unfortunate effect of causing an identification in the minds of some between fallout and milk. I should like to correct any misunderstandings that may exist about this.

"The Public Health Service and other agencies have been instructed to keep the problems of fallout in food under constant surveillance. Detailed guidelines to protect the health of the people against radiation have been developed by the Federal Radiation Council. It is abundantly clear that for the foreseeable future there is no danger from the present amount of exposure.

"The milk supply offers no hazards—on the contrary it remains one of the best sources of nutrition for our children and for adults. And I hope that the American people will appreciate this more and more as time goes on. In addition, the Food and Nutrition Board of the National Research Council has concluded after intensive research that the association of milk consumption and coronary disease due to the increase in cholesterol level has not been sufficiently established to justify the abandonment of this nutritious element except where doctors have individually prescribed special diets for those found to be susceptible to special cholesterol or coronary problems.

"In the past 50 years, our children have grown more vigorous and sturdy because of better diets and better health. Our young adults are now about 2 inches taller than they were half a century ago. I should like, and I am sure all of us would like, to see this trend continue.

"A large proportion of our people now attain a physical condition once attained by a very few. But nutritionists tell us that 10 percent of our people still have an inade-

quate diet. The most serious deficiencies, I'm told, are in the very minerals and vitamins such as calcium and vitamin A—most prevalent in milk. I'm sure all of us would like to see this nutritional gap narrowed.

"Those who are familiar with the needs and the problems of our older citizens also tell us that older people need more calcium than they now get. Again milk offers the best and most economical source of this vital mineral.

"There are many schoolchildren today who do not participate in the school milk and school lunch programs because their schools do not and often cannot make them available. Last year we expanded these programs. I hope more and more children will be able to receive school milk and lunches in the days ahead. These find, I think, increasing support, these programs, among the people of other nations. We have encouraged this development and will continue to do so.

"These are some of the areas which I hope this conference will cover. I do not say that it is an easy matter that we are now faced with, but we do want to emphasize that this is a great productive resource of our country. We're rich in a very basic food. We are anxious to have the consumption of it increased as our population mounts and I believe that this conference will help bring attention of the public to what a valuable asset we have and to make sure that we develop it more fully. And therefore I want to express my thanks to all of you for being here today."

The Conscience of a Conservationist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, John Carver, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Public Land Management, has recently delivered, here in Washington, an address entitled "The Conscience of a Conservationist." Secretary Carver is a native Idahoan, and bears a family name and tradition long distinguished for public service in our State. We take special pride in the quality of administrative supervision he has brought to the agencies for which he has immediate responsibility, and even greater pride in the profound sense of moral responsibility which guides his every act and word. In this, he typifies and enhances a standard which is characteristic of the land and people from which he comes.

I ask that the address to which I have referred may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, and I commend it to the attention of Senators.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONSCIENCE OF A CONSERVATIONIST

(Remarks by Assistant Secretary of the Interior John A. Carver, Jr., before the National Consultation on Conservation, sponsored by the General Board of Christian Social Concerns of the Methodist Church at 12 noon, Friday, February 2, 1962)

The Department of the Interior is a land and water managing agency. To you who live in the District of Columbia area, that means the bits and pieces of Federal land making up the National Capital Parks; perhaps weekend trips to Shenandoah National Park's Skyline Drive to see the spring flowers or fall tree foliage; Manassas, Fredericksburg, Gettysburg, Antietam, Harpers Ferry may be familiar interior areas for the history buffs among you; and for more and more Americans our Department participates, so to speak, in the once-in-a-lifetime trip to Yellowstone or Grand Canyon.

In the States west of the 100th meridian, an entirely different image of our Department is evoked in your counterpart groups—the seemingly limitless public domain grazing or forest lands of Oregon, Nevada, Idaho; dams and reservoirs to serve lush irrigated croplands and feed giant power generators on the Columbia and the Colorado and on the torrential streams of the Sierras; the Indian reservations that make up so much of New Mexico and Arizona, and are found in much of the rest of the West, too; the vastness of the Brooks Range and the Arctic coast and the workaday reality of a 470-mile railroad in Alaska.

In Samoa and the trust islands of the South and Western Pacific, the Interior Department means government; in lovely and equable Virgin Islands and Guam, our Department is the channel and conduit to full participation in the American system.

Vast commercial interests look to us as a sort of governmental service department—coal research, commercial fisheries, oil import administration, Bureau of Mines, Geological Survey—these are some of the organization titles which hint at the kaleidoscopic variety of functions with which the Department of the Interior is engaged.

My own interests are broadly denominated as public land management—the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Office of Territories, the Alaska Railroad, are my bureaus as they say in Government.

This covers the spectrum—from government itself in the territories, to the specialized proprietary function of running a railroad.

We are a government of laws, not of men. In a broad, and very real sense, all of us in the Department are administering laws. These laws, hammered out on the anvil of a functioning free Government are based upon ethical concepts. The Congress has intended to "do right" by the land and water and by the people—Indians and dependent groups in the territories.

But the administration of responsibilities so vast and so varied must also bear an ethical burden. Congress' intent to do right must come out that way. The touchstone of much of resource management legislation is the key phrase "In the discretion of the Secretary * * *" or "as the public interest shall require."

So whether we are in "land management," in "water and power," in "minerals," or in "fish and wildlife," all of us in the Department of the Interior look upon ourselves as "conservationists." We think of ourselves as a "department of conservation."

And because we have a Secretary in Stewart Udall who thinks, and reads, and feels strongly this conservationist concept, many of us are inspired by him to seek out and think out our own articulation of what it means to be a "conservationist."

When Mr. Udall and the President brought Robert Frost and Carl Sandburg to Washington, we were refreshed; we were inspired to rummage through our own forgotten books for the eloquence of simplicity, the forcefulness of insight, the wisdom of the poets and philosophers.

Thus it is that I welcome the opportunity to pinch-hit for Secretary Udall before your group today—it gave me an opportunity to think about conservation as an ethical concept, and to talk with you about it.

And, as usual, I found that others have stated it so well that I can do little better than share with you the results of my researches, confessing the while that the research has meant more to me than hearing its results can possibly mean to you.

Listen to Aldo Leopold in his "Sand County Almanac":

"Conservation," he says, "is a state of harmony between men and land."

He develops the ethical sequence. The first ethics dealt with the relation between individuals—the Ten Commandments. Then, as a developing sequence, philosophically the differentiation of social from antisocial conduct of the individual with a society—the Golden Rule is an expression of the ethical relation of an individual to society; the democratic idea is an expression of the ethical relation of a soicety to the individual.

The unrealized sequence, in Leopold's view, is an ethical aspect of man's relation to land. Although individual thinkers since the days of Ezekiel and Isaiah have asserted that the despoliation of land is wrong, society, he thinks, has not affirmed the belief. "There is as yet no ethic dealing with man's relation to land and to the animals and plants which grow upon it. * * * The land relation is still strictly economic, entailing privileges but not obligations * * *."

"The land ethic simply enlarges the boundaries of the community to include soils, waters, plants, and animals, or collectively: the land.

"This sounds simple: do we not already sing our love for and obligation to the land of the free and the home of the brave? Yes, but just what and whom do we love? Certainly not the soil, which we are sending helter-skelter downriver. Certainly not the waters, which we assume have no function except to turn turbines, float barges, and carry off sewage. Certainly not the plants, of which we exterminate whole communities without batting an eye. Certainly not the animals, of which we have already extirpated many of the largest and most beautiful species. A land ethic, of course, cannot prevent the alteration, management, and use of these resources, but it does affirm their right to continued existence, and, at least in spots, their continued existence in a natural state.

"In short, a land ethic changes the role of homo sapiens from conqueror of the land-community to plain member and citizen of it. It implies respect for his fellow members, and also respect for the community as such."

A distinguished anthropologist, Alexander Spoehr, who has studied intensively the areas of the Pacific which my Department administers, has furnished to me the idea that Charles Darwin is the spiritual progenitor of Aldo Leopold. Darwin dwelt with man's place in nature. Michael Faraday, Darwin's contemporary, introduced us to the inanimate forces and their potential to be harnessed for men's needs—the world felt and is still dominated by the excitement attending the accomplishment and application of the physical sciences. Faraday put man in space, and he has seemed to have won the laurel over Darwin—who thinks of man as a part of a "natural" environment when he is spinning about the earth in a capsule environment of his own creation?

The American conservation movement has been described as a minority reaction to the prevailing urban point of view.

Aldo Leopold had a bleak outlook in 1948:

"It is inconceivable to me that an ethical relation to land can exist without love, respect, and admiration for land, and a high regard for its value. By value, I of course mean something far broader than mere economic value; I mean value in the philosophical sense.

"Perhaps the most serious obstacle impeding the evolution of a land ethic is the fact that our educational and economic system is headed away from, rather than toward, an intense consciousness of land. Your true modern is separated from the land by many middlemen, and by innumerable physical gadgets. He has no vital relation to it; to him it is the space between cities on which crops grow. Turn him loose for a day on the land, and if the spot does not happen to be a golf links or a 'scenic' area, he is bored stiff. If crops could be raised by hydroponics instead of farming, it would suit him very well. Synthetic substitutes for wood, leather, wool, and other natural land products suit him better than the originals. In short, land is something he has 'outgrown.'

"The case for a land ethic would appear hopeless but for the minority which is in obvious revolt against these 'modern' trends."

The evidence of the revolt mounts. Consider the words of the ORRRC report, delivered to the President day before yesterday: "When an American looks for the meaning of his past, he seeks it not in ancient ruins, but more likely in mountains and forests, by a river, or at the edge of the sea.

The tale is one of discovery, of encounter, of hard-won settlement. * * *

"Thoreau reaffirmed its [the outdoors] values in words that still compel: industrialization, he believed, could blight us, and he asked: 'Why should we not * * * have our national preserves * * * for inspiration and our own true recreation? Or shall we, like villains, grub them all up, poaching on our own national domains?'

"This mainstream of thought has continued to have its champions through the years. John Muir spoke for the mountains and the wilderness in a voice that moved even the least sympathetic. Theodore Roosevelt talked not so softly about the disappearance and abuse of natural resources and left as heirlooms some of the biggest sticks to enforce conservation policy. Carl Schurz, the German-American Civil War general and Interior Secretary, tried to halt the uncontrolled exploitation of federally owned forests and paved the way for Gifford Pinchot to carve out the national forest system. Stephen T. Mather gave up a prosperous business career to make the national park system a reality. The list is a long one; these are only a few of the men who, with their supporters and disciples, kept alive through the years the warning that the American people cannot wander too far from the great outdoors without losing character and strength and orientation."

In our responsibilities for management of the land, we find satisfaction and are inspired by seeking to harmonize the use of the land by man with a respect and reverence for the land. We have a trust for all the people in the management of the land of the West, whether for recreation, for grazing, for mining, for timber production. Man can be both destructive and constructive, and we want a discipline we usually call sustained-yield management—consumption each year of less raw material taken from earth, sea and air than nature and man together create.

Samuel Ordway put the happiest light possible on our objectives in land management: "Conservation for prosperity appeals to logic also. It is practical as well as creative and constructive. It is cooperative and convivial as well as ubiquitous. It is consonant with the joining instinct and the do-good instinct, and it is respectable. It is educational, social, and political, as well as scientific. It benefits the poor and debases no one. It links respect for the primitive with respect for the sophisticated; love of nature with love of the machine. It would build, not wreck. It would save, not destroy. It lifts man's thought beyond himself. What more can man ask of an ethic?"

But somehow, I feel that Aldo Leopold would not be satisfied by Sam Ordway. I'm not entirely satisfied, either.

Out in the Marshall Islands, where, as I've said, we have a trust responsibility for people, introduce a money economy—development of the copra industry—to a people not conceptually separated from nature. In doing so, we have made a marked change in their attitude toward nature and the land. For this, we bear a responsibility; the limits of this responsibility present a basic ethical question.

For our national defense purposes, we take land of these island peoples—maybe a whole island—if we fail to take into account that in their system land is not sold, and that our concepts of ownership of real property are meaningless to them we are not acting to as high an ethical standard as we might.

The answers aren't easy. There are, perhaps, no answers at all—all problems don't have solutions.

But it helps to think hard—to formulate, if you will, each his own "conscience of a conservationist."

Clean and Responsible Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the many problems involved in financing of Federal election campaigns. Many words have been written and spoken in favor of various reforms in our election laws. Now, the UAW, in a well-reasoned report to the President's Commission on Campaign Costs, has proposed a nine-point program to help reduce the problems arising from disproportionate campaign contributions. The program is designed to increase citizen participation in politics and strengthen our democratic system.

The following news release, based on the UAW's comprehensive report to the President's Commission, explains the program:

The UAW made public a program for "clean and responsible financing of Federal elections," of which the net effect would be completely to eliminate large campaign contributors by setting a $10 limit on contributions by each qualified voter.

The program was submitted by Walter P. Reuther, UAW president, to the President's Commission on Campaign Costs.

The $10 limitation would permit a qualified voter to contribute $10 in a Presidential election year to each of the following: a congressional candidate, a senatorial candidate, a presidential candidate, and either the party of his choice or an independent political committee.

In congressional election years he could contribute $10 each to a congressional candidate, a senatorial candidate and his party or an independent committee. In nonelection years (Federal) he could contribute $10 to his party or an independent committee.

Thus the maximum total contribution of any individual qualified voter would be $40 during a presidential election year, $30 in a congressional election year and $10 in a nonelection year.

In the UAW's nine-point program, the campaign contribution limitation is supplemented by such provisions as tax credit for political contributions, mandatory free radio and TV time for qualified candidates, free mailings for qualified candidates, and a limited Federal subsidy to qualified candidates for Federal office to supplement the small contributions and free services.

The UAW's nine-point program, as submitted to the commission, reads as follows:

"1. Ten dollar limit on contributions: The UAW proposal knocks out the large contributor. Every contribution to a Federal election would be limited to $10 a year for each qualified voter. Our principle is simple: Dollars from many; no more than 10 from any.

"In each year of Senatorial and Congressional campaigns, each contributor could give up to $10 to one congressional campaign and up to $10 to one senatorial campaign.

"In a presidential election year, a contributor could give up to $10 to that campaign. Another $10 would be permitted each year to the voter's political party or to an independent political committee.

"The ceiling would thus amount to $40 in presidential years, $30 in congressional election years and $10 in off years. And there would be no duplications. If the $10 were given directly to a candidate, another $10 could not go to a political committee supporting the candidate.

"The $10 limit is the core of the UAW program. But the other provisions are equally important for they alone can make the $10 limit workable by insuring the participation of the Federal Government and of millions of citizens in financing campaign costs.

"2. Tax credit: To encourage millions of small contributions we propose a 90-percent tax credit up to $10 a year immediately available to the contributor.

"3. TV and radio: A major item in campaign costs would be reduced by making mandatory and broadening the free TV and radio time so successfully accorded the political parties in the last campaign. This would bring American practice abreast of accepted procedure in such countries as England and Canada.

"4. Free mailing: Each candidate would be offered one free mailing to every voter in his constituency.

"5. Federal subsidy: In addition to providing a free mailing and free radio and TV time, we recommend a limited subsidy to candidates for Federal office—to be used for advertising, TV, radio, and other 'visible' expenditures. This would supplement the small contributions and would liberate all candidates from the pressure of commitments to vested interests by assuring them access to at least the minimum essentials in today's high-powered campaigns.

"6. Minority parties: Provision should be made for minority parties to share in these privileges.

"7. Fiscal agent: Every candidate would name a fiscal agent who would have sole authority to solicit and accept contributions. This assurance of centralized responsibility has proved itself over the years in England.

"8. Reporting: Stringent reporting provisions would be mandatory, and contain real enforcement machinery.

"9. Factfinding body: The UAW plan urges creation of a nonpartisan investigating body, factfinding in function, to investigate alleged violations and report them to the Congress and the Department of Justice."

The Federal subsidy for qualified candidates would be limited on the basis of 5 cents per voter in the preceding elections. (The details are spelled out on page 16 of the UAW's proposal to the commission.)

Mr. Reuther noted that "George Gallup has estimated that 17 million American families would be willing to give as much as $85 million in $5 contributions."

"Despite the obvious difficulties inherent in any such mass collection," Mr. Reuther said, "it is not unreasonable to assume that some such figure might be gathered in contributions ranging from $1 to $10 per individual, particularly under the tax-credit arrangement proposed (in the UAW program)."

Mr. Reuther said that the UAW program concentrates on contributions rather than on direct regulation of expenditures.

"Expenditures for the most part would be self-controlling in view of the fact that only small sums from many contributors, together with the amounts to be provided by the Federal Government, would be available to candidates," he said. "None of this money would have a special interest axe to grind and no candidate would feel under obligation for such small contributions. The UAW believes that this program, which combines stringent reporting provisions with assurances that large contributions will be easily noticed, will produce for the first time an enforceable limit on campaign contributions."

The UAW's program was submitted Thursday to the President's Commission on Campaign Costs.

Members of the Commission are: Alexander Heard, dean of the Graduate School, University of North Carolina, chairman; V O. Key, professor of government, Harvard University; Dan Kimball, former Secretary of the Navy, president of Aero-Jet General Corp.; Paul Porter, Washington attorney, former member of the Federal Communications Commission; Neil Staebler, of Ann Arbor, Democratic National Committeeman from Michigan; Malcolm Moos, professor of political science, Johns Hopkins University, formerly an assistant to President Eisenhower; Walter Thayer, president, New York Herald-Tribune, national financial chairman in 1960 for the Nixon-Lodge campaign; John Vorys, Columbus, Ohio, attorney, former U.S. Representative (Republican); James Worthy, Chicago businessman, former Assistant Secretary of Commerce under the Eisenhower administration.

Alaska's First Mutual Savings Bank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the annual meeting in Washington last week of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks welcomed a new member from the 49th State. Two months ago Alaska's first mutual savings bank opened its doors in Anchorage to crown a 3-year effort to make Alaska the 18th savings bank State. Mr. Ron L. Rettig, president of the bank, attended the meeting as Alaska's first representative.

The January 1962 issue of Savings Bank Journal fittingly featured the story of the establishment of the Alaska Mutual Savings Bank from its conception in December of 1958 to its approval in November of last year by the FDIC. The article tells an exciting story of the determination in bringing to the new State an additional source for investment and displays the faith of Alaskans in the State's future. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALASKA MUTUAL SAVINGS BANK

With the snip of a ribbon, a new chapter in the history of mutual savings banking was officially opened on December 14, the inauguration of the Alaska Mutual Savings Bank in Anchorage, first savings bank to be opened in a new State in the past 30 years and the first to be organized under the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in its 28-year existence.

The long-awaited event, culmination of an intensive industry and citizen effort that began in December 1958, became a reality on a cold, snowy Thursday morning last month in the presence of several savings bankers from the "lower States," State and city officials, and a throng of Anchorage citizens. At 10 a.m. that morning, a ribbon-cutting ceremony launched the country's 516th savings bank and made Alaska officially the 18th savings bank State.

From the pledging of funds toward the initial capital of the new bank, through a newly created central industry fund, to the donation of office supplies and equipment, furniture and material, savings banks from all over the country and from as far away as Sweden participated every step of the way in bringing to fruition the opening of the Alaska Mutual Savings Bank.

CHARTER DEPOSITS OVER $127,000

For the Nation's 49th and largest State, for the management of the new mutual, and for the industry at large, it was a gratifying experience, one that grew in dimension as the three opening days drew to a close and the first augury of a bright future took shape in the black ink of the ledger. Some 1,004 new accounts had been opened for a grand total of $127,838 when the Alaska Mutual closed its doors Saturday, December 16, at 4 p.m., it was announced by Ron L. Rettig, president of the bank.

Of these charter depositors, 373 came via mail from the lower States, including 14 savings bank States and Texas, for a total of $50,359. On opening day, 295 Alaskans poured $38,817 into new accounts, followed on the second day by another 128 charter depositors, adding $29,785 to the total. An additional 208 customers followed their thrift impulses across the threshold on Saturday, last of the opening days, and swelled the coffers by $8,645.

Throughout the 3-day period, a steady flow of visitors inspected the modern new building, some of them already familiar with the workings of a savings bank from past associations in other States, many others seeing and hearing of a savings bank for the first time. From the latter came a stream of questions on the purpose, objectives, and benefits of savings banking that kept bank officials and other visiting savings bankers busy with thorough explanations. Two men in constant demand for this and other reasons were NAMSB President Samuel W. Hawley and NAMSB Executive Vice President Grover W. Ensley, who had flown into Anchorage from New York a day earlier. Mr. Ensley is a trustee of the Alaska Mutual.

No less busy were the officers and staff of the new mutual, all of whom were transacting the affairs of a savings bank for the very first time. For Mr. Rettig; George H. Thomson, vice president; Lorraine Tuttle and Audrey Benson, teller-secretaries, the experience was a fast-moving education in the modus operandi of savings banking.

An especially alluring aspect of the new bank was the impressive boardroom which was completely appointed with beautiful, modern furniture and draperies donated by the Swedish Savings Banks Association.

Emerging from the excitement of opening day, most of which was recorded by television and radio, were several highlights, including the presentation to President Rettig by Alaska Commissioner of Commerce A. H. Romick, of charter No. 1, an embossed and framed document that is expected to be the forerunner of other savings banks to come.

KUDOS FROM SENATOR GRUENING

From U.S. Senator ERNEST GRUENING (Democrat, Alaska), an early and ardent supporter of the new mutual, came a letter extolling the arrival of the Alaska Mutual Savings Bank and welcoming it as "an augury of development and progress for our 49th State."

Passbook No. 1, a much sought after prize, was held aside for the first baby born in Anchorage after the opening hour. An 8-pound, 20-inch young man named Gordon Barner, Jr., made his first appearance in this world at 11:49 that morning in Providence Hospital, becoming the first and youngest depositor of the bank as well as the recipient of a $25 deposit donated by the mutual. His parents, Gordon and Donna Barner, are from Idaho and have been in Anchorage for 12 years.

The first over-the-counter depositor was Mrs. Fraeda Priess, an Anchorage resident who came from East Germany in 1945. Mrs. Priess, a cook at the Navy hospital, had waited in line outside the bank for an hour before opening. In an interview with the Journal correspondent, she stated that she had once saved in a savings bank (sparkasse) in her native Germany.

In the middle of the afternoon, Alaska Mutual made its first mortgage loan, a 10-year, $6,200 conventional to Mr. and Mrs. Dennis Branham. The Branhams, Alaskans for the past 20 years, also opened a savings account. Mr. Branham is a guide and lodge owner and flies his own plane.

In such manner did the State's most populous city welcome the new savings bank, a spanking new institution on the corner of Fifth Avenue and F Street in the heart of the financial district. From this same district, however, came the first indication of the competitive climate that lies ahead. On opening day, First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Anchorage announced an interest increase to 4¾ percent for the last half of 1961. Alaska Mutual had announced an anticipated annual interest rate of 4 percent, compounded semiannually.

BANK TO PAY 4¾ PERCENT

(On December 28, 1961, the board of trustees of Alaska Mutual Savings Bank announced a new anticipated annual interest rate of 4¾ percent, putting the mutual on a competitive par with the savings and loan association.)

On analysis, however, the growth of First Federal gives superb testimony to the thrift habits of the Anchorage citizenry, and thereby to the prospects for Alaska Mutual Savings Bank. The savings and loan, which was established in 1955, held assets of over $8 million as of June 30, 1961, with share accounts totaling well over $7 million.

Alaska itself has shown a surging growth in total savings deposits. In 1945, savings stood at $17 million. In 1959, shortly after statehood, this figure had leaped to a total amount of $57 million.

Coupled with such growth has been the rise in population, particularly in the Greater Anchorage area where 1960 census figures show a total population of nearly 83,000. Of these, approximately 25,000 were military personnel or service-connected citizens. Projections for the year 1965 forecast a rise to 102,000; for 1970, to 125,000; and for 1985 to 245,000.

Such potential as this was evident to many Anchorage political, civic and business leaders as well as the savings bank industry some years ago when the idea of establishing a savings bank in the 49th State was first conceived. In the time since, the savings banks of the Nation have displayed a unity of purpose and spirit of cooperation unique in the annals of their own industry. And as a practical course in how to help create a new savings bank in a new area of the country, the opening of the Alaska Mutual Savings Bank is without parallel.

It was 31 years ago, in 1931, that Oregon became the most recent State to permit the establishment of mutual savings banks. In the interim, the benefits of savings banking have been confined to 17 States, where, according to such disinterested studies as the recently published University of Chicago report on Chicago banking, both total savings accumulations and housing growth have been generally ahead of the national average.

With the coming of statehood on June 30, 1958, Alaska experienced the first pangs of a boom. A critical shortage of housing credit and housing accompanied the sudden influx of newcomers. In particular, the need for long-term financing for housing and other building became severely aggravated, despite the existence of 13 commercial banks and 3 federally insured savings and loan associations.

FULL INDUSTRY EFFORT

Against this background did the savings banks of America make their initial move, one of a long series of contributions that extended from assisting in the drafting of enabling legislation to participating in the opening day ceremonies. On December 1, 1958, the question of savings banking in Alaska made its first appearance on the agenda of the NAMSB Committee on Savings Bank Extension, then chairmaned by J. Peter Williams, at that time vice president, Western Saving Fund Society.

In the ensuing months, U.S. Senator GREUNING, of Alaska, offered his enthusiastic support for the idea and supplied the names of interested Alaskans. He was later joined in this regard by U.S. Senator E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT.

The campaign gained further momentum in August 1959, when NAMSB sent Mr. Williams and John deLaittre, then president of the association, to Alaska to confer with business and civic leaders about a way to help ease the critical housing credit shortage, to advise on drafting legislation, and to present the facts about the mutual banking system.

The two emissaries explained how a mutual savings bank, though the promotion and encouragement of personal thrift, would create a flow of savings that would be invested within the very community. They also underscored the prospects of home ownership for more families through the investment of these savings in long-term home mortgage loans, the principal investment outlet of savings banks.

On February 2, 1960, a bill was introduced in the Alaska house of representatives by Majority Leader Peter J. Kalamarides and Speaker of the House Warren A. Taylor. The bill sailed through the house and passed by a vote of 35 to 1. The measure was then introduced in the senate by Senators George B. McNabb and Thomas B. Stewart and was passed 15 to 3.

Gov. William A. Egan affixed his signature to the Mutual Savings Bank Act on April 15, 1960, an action that took but moments but yet more than doubled the area of the United States open to savings banking.

The act stated: "It is the intent of the legislature to make available the benefits of mutual savings banking, thereby encouraging the practice of thrift and promoting the accumulation of funds for investment to develop the economy."

Probably the most critical turning point in the now swiftly moving succession of events came in August 1960. At that time, Mr. deLaittre and Mr. Ensley voyaged to Anchorage and revitalized the interest of the leading citizens who were to assist in the establishment of the savings bank. There had developed a temporary waning of enthusiasm for the project, a trend which Messrs. deLaittre and Ensley quickly offset.

With the legal doors now wide open, the savings banks industry then undertook the most significant and unique program in its history for the extension of the mutual savings bank system. The National Association of Mutual Savings Banks created a central industry fund through which savings banks could participate in the initial surplus that would be required by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to establish a mutual savings bank.

CENTRAL INDUSTRY FUND PROJECT

Announcement of the central industry fund was made by William A. Lyon, chairman of the NAMSB Committee on Relations with Federal supervisory authorities, and president, Dry Dock Savings Bank, New York, at the annual convention of NAMSB in May 1961 at Philadelphia and it was unanimously adopted by the board of directors. Mr. Lyon explained that the first project would be the supplementing of the initial capital raised by corporators in Anchorage for a new savings bank.

Another savings banker added greater incentive to the prospect of a savings bank in Anchorage. Daniel E. Stoddard, president of People's Savings Bank, Providence, R.I., not only served as consultant to the Anchorage group, but his bank also invested $1 million in mortgages in a new residential community in Juneau. Mr. Stoddard was later elected a trustee of Alaska Mutual.

With these many elements merging, the first outlines of an actual bank began taking definite shape. In July 1961, a hearing was held before a special board appointed by Governor Egan to consider the application for State chartering filed in April. On the board were Alaska's secretary of commerce, attorney general, secretary of state, commissioner of internal revenue, and director of division of banking and securities.

Appearing before the board and presenting testimony in support of the petition were Robert Baker, president, Matanuska Valley Bank; Anchorage Mayor George Byer; Carl T. Rentschler, president, C. T. Rentschler Agency, representing the realtors of Anchorage, and the chairman-to-be of the new mutual; Paul Schoffel, president, Modern Homes, Inc., representing the building industry; George Hedla, president of the Anchorage Certified Public Accountants Association; Henry S. Kingman, Jr., assistant vice president, Farmers and Mechanics Savings Bank, Minneapolis, appearing as a representative savings banker; and Ron L. Rettig, Alaskan business leader, who later became president of the bank. NAMSB House Counsel P. James Riordan appeared as special counsel in support of the petition.

Mr. Riordan gave unstintingly of himself in assembling and organizing a huge array of material and witnesses for the hearing, and made an excellent presentation of the petition for a charter.

A particularly interesting development at the hearing was the testimony given by Mr. Kingman, who noted that when his bank, Farmers & Mechanics, of Minneapolis, was founded, the State of Minnesota had approximately the same population as Alaska does now, and that Minneapolis had approximately the same population as Fairbanks today.

One week later, on July 24, Commissioner of Commerce Romick granted approval of the charter.

As the movement toward opening of a bank shifted into high gear, the news from savings-bank-land became tinted with a rosy glow. The infant central industry fund showed signs of an early manhood as scores of mutuals pledged their support to this unique effort toward extension of the savings bank system. Some 239 mutuals had become participating members of the fund.

Leading citizens of Anchorage, meanwhile, had enthusiastically adopted the idea of their own savings bank and pledged their financial support as corporators, thus paving the way toward the final step of procedure, approval, and acceptance by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

In the meantime, other essential moves were taking place. Ground was broken and construction initiated on a brandnew building. A nine-man board of trustees was elected by the board of corporators on August 2. The trustees included: Mr. Rettig, Mr. Rentschler, Mr. Ensley, and Mr. Stoddard, as well as John R. Connolly, an attorney; Robert A. Sheffield, manager, Matanuska Valley Bank; Robert J. Shimek, Shimek's Record and TV Shops; Michael F. Beirne, physician, Alaska Medical Laboratories; and Victor V. Gill, investments and property management, all Anchorage residents.

It was at this time that the new board of trustees elected Mr. Rettig president, and Mr. Rentschler chairman of the board.

FDIC APPROVES MUTUAL

Then, on November 2, the final step was completed with the announcement by the FDIC that membership had been granted to the Alaska Mutual Savings Bank. The initial surplus established by the Federal agency as the minimum requirement for the new mutual was $250,000, plus a credit of $46,000 allowed for equipment and material donated by savings banks from the lower States and the Swedish Savings Banks Association.

Embellishing the growth prospects of the projected savings bank was the action of several lower State savings banks to employ the Alaska Mutual as servicing agent for their mortgage investments in Alaska. This offer, which was typical of the spirit generated throughout the industry, was designed to get the new mutual off to a rousing start as a fresh, new force in easing the housing credit shortage.

Immediately following the FDIC approval, Mr. Rettig announced the opening of the Alaska Mutual on December 14. Then began the final phase of operation as the industry swung into action with intense preparations for the actual opening of the new bank. Kenneth L. Birchby, chairman, NAMSB Committee on Savings Bank Internal Operations, and vice president-auditor, Jamaica Savings Bank, New York, was sent to Anchorage to provide technical advice and assistance in organizing the bank's operations, personnel, promotion and day-to-day functions. Mr. Birchby performed yeoman service in coordinating the sundry aspects of the new bank's operations and was present throughout its first week of existence.

Traditional ceremonies attended the official opening. Full-page advertisements and extensive news and feature stories in the Anchorage newspapers heralded the event as an auspicious occasion in the history of the city. Participating in the opening festivities were such dignitaries as Richard Albers, president of the Anchorage Chamber of Commerce; Richard Gantz, city attorney; William A. Besser, acting mayor; Chet Hostelier, city manager; Ben Boecke, city clerk; as well as Messrs. Rettig, Rentschler, Hawley, Ensley, Stoddard, Birchby, and several other trustees and corporators.

Among Alaskans, meanwhile, a new pride is felt as the Alaska Mutual goes about its business. They have witnessed and participated in the creation of a new force designed to aid in the development of their

prosperity. They have also seen firsthand the concept of mutuality in full action as people from far and near gave of themselves in many ways to bring the new savings bank to birth.

"Muzzling the Military," a Goshen (Ind.) News Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most thoughtful statements I have seen on a subject of current controversy is an editorial which appeared recently in the Goshen News, which is published in the Third District of Indiana. The editorial follows:

WITH DISCRETION, PLEASE

The Senate committee inquiry into alleged muzzling of the U.S. military is producing a tangle of confusing and often conflicting notions which the average citizen may find hard to unscramble.

Beside the question of censorship of speeches by military men, there are involved such matters as the responsibility of our military leaders for indoctrinating our service personnel and the advisability of military spokesmen participating in public forums on communism and other major issues.

In the nature of things, many who testify will not make wholly clear which of these matters they have in mind. Nor will they draw necessary sharp distinctions to aid the citizens' judgment of this problem.

To begin with, it should be made plain that no one, not even Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, favors unrestricted talking of military officers on issues of public policy.

Agreement is general that these men should not inject themselves into partisan politics, nor make statements which run strongly against official Government policy in the foreign field.

The next big thing to remember is that underlying the muzzling charge made by THURMOND and others is the powerful conviction that military men are remarkable and peculiarly equipped to inform not merely U.S. troops but the general public as to the intimate nature and workings of communism.

To have any real validity, therefore, the critics' case must establish more than capricious, careless or foolish censorship of military officers' comments on communism.

The case must show that military men are trying to say things of great fundamental importance on this subject—things of which they have special and intimate knowledge.

If this is not shown, then the argument on censorship moves onto a totally different plane.

We do not need generals and admirals to announce to us that communism is a conspiracy bent on world conquest. Public figures of all kinds tell us that almost daily.

Eliminating such generalities from military speeches may in some circumstances be silly and unwise. But it hardly deprives the American people of information they can get nowhere else.

It should be remembered, too, that military men are not generally political specialists or economists. They have no more than average competence, by and large, in detecting domestic trends that might lead toward communism. More often than not, making such judgments simply involves them in U.S. partisan politics.

The whole subject of military expression deserves full airing. But those concerned owe it to the citizenry to provide such guideposts as are here suggested.

Resolution on Government Patent Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution on Government patent policy adopted by the New England Governors' conference recently held.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON PATENT POLICY—ADOPTED BY THE NEW ENGLAND GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE, STOWE, VT., JANUARY 29, 1962

The New England Governors' conference recognizes that the incentive provided by the American patent system has played a leading role in the inception and growth of New England companies of all sizes and that a substantial part of the employment and tax revenue in New England is derived from the creative genius of its people as protected and developed under this system.

It further recognizes that a substantial portion of this creative genius is being contributed to the defense of the country and the development of its role in the space age through performance of contracts with agencies of the U.S. Government.

It is in the interests of the continued economic health of New England, and in the national interest, to have inventions which are the fruits of this genius put into widespread use for public benefit. This the conference believes may most readily and quickly be done by commercialization of the inventions by the companies originating them.

Existing Department of Defense regulations, leaving ownership of patent rights in the hands of contractors and giving the Government rights of use for governmental purposes, have well served and now serve New England and the Nation.

Proposed revision of existing policies to require inventions developed in the course of public work to become the exclusive property of the Government would, if adopted, jeopardize the interest of New England participants in Government work. They would tend to defeat early widespread production and public benefit from new developments growing out of such activities.

It is, therefore,

Resolved:

A. That the New England Governors' conference supports to the fullest extent the adoption of policies which encourage participation by New England concerns, both large and small, in Government contract work, and particularly in defense activities and procurement;

B. That the New England Governors' conference supports as equitable to both the Government and the contractor the basic principle now practiced by the Department of Defense whereby the U.S. Government takes rights only to those inventions made in doing work under research and development contracts, and limits such rights to royalty-free licenses for governmental purposes, allowing the contractor to retain ownership and commercial rights in such inventions; and

C. That the New England Governors' conference opposes as not being in the interests of the Government or of the people at large any law or regulation which would require, except under extraordinary circumstances which involve the health or safety of the Nation or which created substantial inequity, ownership by the Government of patents growing out of governmental work.

Farm Policy Slogans Hide the Real Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, following is an editorial from the Iowa Farm and Home Register of February 11, 1962. It not only speaks for itself, but it also speaks for and about a lot of people and is especially timely right now:

FARM POLICY SLOGANS HIDE THE REAL ISSUES

The annual political wrangle over farm legislation was launched on the last day of January by President Kennedy with his farm message to Congress. During the next several months we can expect the usual fierce contention between those who feel the Government should take more of a hand in farm management and those who feel it should take less.

In the past, much of this debate has been so theoretical and emotionally extreme that the real issues have been hidden. One might get the impression that the choice facing the Nation was between a happy paradise of high farm income with no Government restriction and a grim police-state agriculture with low income and no future.

From one side, we hear sacred incantations to "the free market," "free enterprise," and "freedom to produce," with castigation heaped on "rigid controls," "Federal bureaucracy," and "socialism." From other groups the chant goes up for "equal bargaining power," "fair prices," and "the family farm." Abuse is poured on those who are alleged to be "driving the farmer off the farm."

These slogans and stereotypes are devices of the mentally lazy who do not want to go to the trouble of thinking for themselves. Instead of thinking, such folks follow the dogma of a cult. They respond to labels, rather than facts. Or they respond to personalities or organization doctrines: So-and-So says this plan is dangerous socialism, therefore bad; or it's free enterprise, therefore good.

The Farm and Home Register suggests that farmers examine the facts for themselves and make up their minds about farm policies on practical considerations, not party or organization labels.

Public policy choices never are between black and white but among different shades of gray. In choosing between a control program with higher prices and no controls with lower prices, you do not face complete regimentation on the one hand nor complete financial disaster on the other. It is a question of how much regulation you will accept in return for how high a price.

Remember, above all, that whatever farm legislation is passed, it can be changed. If it doesn't work or is too burdensome it can be thrown out. A decision this spring will not determine forever the future of American agriculture—despite what the extremists will tell you.

United Nations Handling of the Congo Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Catholic Sentinel, of Portland, Oreg., had in its issue of January 18, 1962, an editorial on American support of the United Nations policy in the Congo.

I think it is a good summary of the situation, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IRONY OF SITUATION IN CONGO TROUBLES

Certain vocal critics of the United Nations have been loud in their denunciation of U.N. handling of the Congo situation. For them it was a clear-cut case of a Red-oriented central government using U.N. troops to crush the noble foe of communism—Moise Tshombe. While we have not endorsed all that has been done in the name of the United Nations in the strife-torn Congo, it seems to us that, by and large, the United Nations is making the best of an extremely complex and difficult situation.

The Congo can survive only if it is united. The economic structure of the country depends on the mineral wealth of Katanga. Therefore, Tshombe must not be allowed to take his Province out of the country.

On the other hand, there is little basis yet for any tight political unity in the sprawling African state. It is a babel of languages and tribal traditions. A loose federation of states would seem to be the most that can be hoped for at the present time.

Developments over the past weekend should have made it clear that the Central Congo Government is not Communist-led or inclined. The question has been asked in the past, "Why should the Leopoldville government wage war against Tshombe, the anti-Communist, and let Antoine Gizenga, who takes his orders from Moscow, go free?" Apparently the answer is that the Central Government felt that one military front at a time is enough. Now that Tshombe has been forced to abandon his secession movement, Gizenga is being dealt with. The irony of the situation is that while American extremists are accusing the U.N. of doing Moscow's dirty work in the Congo, the Communists are denouncing the same U.N. as an instrument of American foreign policy.

We believe that here President Kennedy's words at his second state of the Union address are most appropriate, "But arms alone are not enough to keep the peace—it must be kept by men. Our instrument and our hope is the United Nations—and I see little merit in the impatience of those who would abandon this imperfect world instrument because they dislike our imperfect world. We may not always agree with every detailed action taken by every officer of the United Nations, or with every voting majority. But as an institution, it should have no stronger or more faithful member than the United States of America."

State Pension Plan Can't Be Junked Yet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the following article, "State Pension Plan Can't Be Junked Yet," which appeared in the Denver Post on Monday, February 12, 1962.

The article is as follows:

STATE PENSION PLAN CAN'T BE JUNKED YET

Debate is growing between Denver and Washington over residence requirements in Colorado's old-age pension program.

The problem is this:

Under the present Social Security Act, individual States are permitted to establish residence requirements and still be eligible for Federal matching funds in their assistance programs, including old-age pensions.

The stiffest residence requirement permitted by Congress is the one Colorado presently has: You must have lived in the State 5 out of the last 9 years to be eligible for a pension.

Now, Congress is considering a bill pushed strongly by the Kennedy administration which would overhaul and extend Federal welfare legislation. One proposal calls for reducing the residence requirement to 1 year on several programs, including old-age assistance.

If the law passes, Colorado would have to slash its residence requirements to 1 year or it would be deprived of Federal matching funds.

Colorado's $108-a-month, class A pension, second only to Connecticut's $110 payment, is mostly State money, but partly Federal. The average Federal contribution is $48.78.

There is in this legislation a potential hazard to Colorado's carefully developed pension and medicare program.

Colorado pensioners are in the enviable position of having a much higher pension than surrounding States. Nebraska, for example, has a $48.66 pension and Kansas $68.72.

The medicare program, which spends more than $10 million annually on care to old-age pensioners here, is superior to programs offered in most States.

Thus, it is feared that reduction of residence requirements would lead to an influx of older people, anxious to establish residence requirements and partake of Colorado's better deal.

This, of course, is possible. On the other hand, a good many older people we know of put the considerations of family, friendships, and familiar surroundings first on the list.

Overloading the Colorado program, however, would lead to a dangerous strain, not only on the old-age assistance but on the fine Colorado medicare program as well.

The Colorado Legislature had this in mind when it voted resolutions last week calling for no change in the residence requirement.

Against this consideration is a human one. "Balkanization" of welfare among the various States works a hardship on a U.S. population that in recent years has become highly mobile.

As Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, said last week:

"In our economy, where people move from place to place with unparalleled frequency to find new or better opportunities for work, situations develop in which families are separated or personal distress occurs. These problems are then heightened by the fact that limitations have been set. * * *."

The ideal situation, of course, would be equalization of State assistance programs with all States offering enough welfare payment so that barriers were not needed. This is what Ribicoff is seeking.

For the present, however, we feel that it is extreme to do away with the 5-year limit. Partly, the problem is that national policies on medical care to the aged are also up in the air. If these were resolved then Colorado might know where its present medicare program would be 10 years from now.

It could then plan intelligently.

Perhaps there is some way of compromising the State and Federal positions, to give a small amount of aid under the pension program to those persons still not qualified for the full pension. Or possibly the time requirement itself could be somewhat reduced—but not all the way to 1 year as proposed by Kennedy and Ribicoff.

Should the United States Buy U.N. Bonds?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the strength and future of the United Nations is presently at stake in the $200 million bond issue. It is therefore heartening to see that many outstanding newspapers in the country are taking a strong stand in favor of the bond issue. I have just read an effectively stated editorial on the subject in the February 1 issue of the San Francisco Chronicle. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD THE UNITED STATES BUY U.N. BONDS?

President Kennedy has asked Congress to buy $100 million of a $200 million United Nations bond issue. He says it is vital to the interests of this country that the capacity of the U.N. to act for peace should not be inhibited by a lack of financial resources.

No elaborate argument ought to be required to establish this point, yet a lot of people seem to have missed it. A number of Congressmen resent the refusal of the Soviets to pay their share of the cost of such peace-keeping U.N. operations as those in the Congo and in the Gaza strip; they are so angry about it that they don't want the United States to buy these bonds.

We think such an attitude unrealistic. Financially, the bonds will become a primary obligation of the U.N., and if the Soviets wish to remain as voting members they will have to help shoulder this obligation; they cannot escape contributing out of their

annual dues to the cost of repaying the bondholders. In this way, buying bonds will force the Soviets to cover Congo and Middle East costs that they have so far refused to have anything to do with.

Politically, the bonds will strengthen a Congo operation which has recently begun to show proofs of success. The latest evidence that the U.N. has done the right kind of job came from the vote this week of 20 African nations. Meeting at Lagos, Nigeria, these states decided to oppose a mischief-making Soviet move to invoke Security Council debate on the Congo.

When 20 African leaders show unity in the face of the Soviet pose of friendship and anticolonial sympathy, that ought to convince Congressmen that the United States is on the right track in strengthening, however it can, the U.N.'s authority in the Congo.

Those who say, as the Republican National Committee did in its suppressed policy statement, that the U.N. has failed critical tests of its effectiveness to maintain peace and security, cannot be looking at the same set of facts that we see. The U.N. has indeed prevented large-scale civil war and avoided great-power intervention in the Congo. To keep it effective there merits the investment of $100 million, which would be indeed but a trifling part of this year's total outlay of $50 billion for U.S. security.

A Lesson in Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, the utter absurdity of the Communist idea of taking "from each according to his ability" and giving "to each according to his need" is brought out in a broadside distributed by the Foundation for Economic Education, Inc., Irvington-on-Hudson, N.Y., entitled "Clipping of Note—No. 36." I include the broadside in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CLIPPING OF NOTE—NO. 36—A LESSON IN SOCIALISM

(A letter from Thomas J. Shelly, teacher of economics and history, Yonkers High School, Yonkers, N.Y., January 20, 1951)

As a teacher in the public school, I find that the Socialist-Communist idea of taking "from each according to his ability," and giving "to each according to his need" is now generally accepted without question by most of our pupils. In an effort to explain the fallacy in this theory, I sometimes try this approach with my pupils:

When one of the brighter or harder-working pupils makes a grade of 95 on a test, I suggest that I take away 20 points and give them to a student who has made only 55 points on his test. Thus each would contribute according to his ability and—since both would have a passing mark—each would receive according to his need. After I have juggled the grades of all the other pupils in this fashion, the result is usually a "common ownership" grade of between 75 and 80—the minimum needed for passing, or for survival. Then I speculate with the pupils as to the probable results if I actually used the socialistic theory for grading papers.

First, the highly productive pupils—and they are always a minority in school as well as in life—would soon lose all incentive for producing. Why strive to make a high grade if part of it is taken from you by authority and given to someone else?

Second, the less productive pupils—a majority in school as elsewhere—would, for a time, be relieved of the necessity to study or to produce. This Socialist-Communist system would continue until the high producers had sunk—or had been driven down—to the level of the low producers. At that point, in order for anyone to survive, the "authority" would have no alternative but to begin a system of compulsory labor and punishments against even the low producers. They, of course, would then complain bitterly, but wtihout understanding.

Finally I return the discussion to the ideas of freedom and enterprise—the market economy—where each person has freedom of choice and is responsible for his own decisions and welfare.

Gratifyingly enough, most of my pupils then understand what I mean when I explain that socialism—even in a democracy—will eventually result in a living death for all except the "authorities" and a few of their favorite lackeys.

Changes in Rural America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, as given at the Land and People Conference held in Washington on January 13, 1962, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF CLYDE T. ELLIS, GENERAL MANAGER, NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, LAND AND PEOPLE CONFERENCE, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 15, 1962

Rural America has changed as drastically in the past few years as has urban America.

Today, a new breed of people share the land mass of America. The farmer finds his neighbor on one side runs a store in town; and, on the other side, the neighbor works in the factory in town, the farmer's daughter may still live nearby, but she and her husband teach in the high school; the son has been away to college—or in the armed services, to work at something else for awhile.

A few miles down the road is a new housing development or a shopping center. But before you get there you will pass dark and empty houses with broken windows and tall weeds; houses which a few years ago were homes. Along this road also will be large homes with painted barns and fat cattle grazing behind neat fences. But nearby will be signs of squalor and poverty, and the beginnings of rural slums.

There are people, of course, to fit all these surroundings in the rural America of 1962. They fit no common mold, conform to no classic image, and can be described by no standard cliche.

They have one thing in common: they all live on the land—rural land—and to varying extents their fortunes and aspirations are wedded to the land and its resources.

We in the rural electrification program think we know these diverse people rather intimately. The rural electric cooperatives, in complying with REA's area coverage principles, serve everyone in their area who wants service. Usually the joint ownership of the rural electric cooperative is the only tangible thing in which rural people share a direct interest. The rural electric systems are interested in all programs which affect rural life. We deplore the farm conditions which have forced so many millions of people off the land. The rural electric cooperatives still have lines tied to 450,000 houses that are now empty—and these lines represent an investment of a third of a billion dollars. This is a debt which those who remain must assume and repay.

At the same time, we welcome the trend which is bringing urban people out into the country to live, even though it also creates new problems which we are challenged to solve.

The rural electric systems have been very active in the new rural areas development program. We have long recognized that the deterioration of rural institutions and customs must be checked; that rural people must be able to find economic and social opportunity in their own communities.

I congratulate President Kennedy and Secretary Freeman and his staff upon their recognition that rural problems are not confined to farm production. The rural areas development program is a realistic step forward; so is nonfarm rural housing and nonfarm rural water supply. Other programs in the same vein are urgently needed.

I in no way want to imply, of course, that continued extensive efforts to solve production and marketing problems should not be made.

But the thing I want to emphasize is that the Department of Agriculture must also be concerned with the other pressing problems of rural America. If this Department does not champion the cause of all rural Americans, no one else will. It is now the duty of this Department to marshall the resources so essential to total rural development.

I would remind you, for example, that multiple purpose use of water resources includes the generation of electric power whenever feasible. Thus I feel the Department of Agriculture has a logical interest in cooperating closely with the Department of the Interior, and the Army Corps of Engineers, and TVA, and FPC and the other agencies concerned with resource development. This cooperation requires coordination at a high policy level, but this kind of cooperation and coordination does not exist today.

Our country badly needs (1) a dynamic national resources and conservation policy and (2) a Council of Resource Advisers in the White House to see that it is carried out. These two steps would greatly assist the Department of Agriculture in actively pursuing its obligation to serve all of rural America.

Perhaps all this adds up to a conviction that the sharpening and reshaping of Department of Agriculture policies must be a continuous process.

Perhaps this is not so much the image of a Department of Agriculture as it is of a Department of Rural Affairs.

Maybe it's time to change—or to recognize that change has already occurred.

A Tribute to DAV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to a statement made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a

U.S. Senator, calling the Disabled American Veterans an organization which has "little more than a shirttailful of active members who attend meetings."

I am familiar with the Paterson Chapter of the Disabled American Veterans, and I know that it is an active group composed of men who are dedicated to the protection of the rights of disabled veterans as well as to the welfare of our great Nation. I understand that other posts throughout the country are similarly active.

I do not think that the gentleman who made the statement intended to belittle the organization, but was carried away by the heat of debate. However, I would be remiss if I did not express my own sentiments about this fine organization.

A Baker's Dozen: The Konishi Family of Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, the Platteville Herald, a lively and well-edited weekly newspaper in my State of Colorado, tells a magnificent story of a family in its edition of Friday, February 9. It is the family of Mr. and Mrs. George H. Konishi, who have farmed for many years near Platteville and raised 13 outstanding children.

Recently, I was privileged to name Alban Konishi, one of this "baker's dozen," as one of my competitive nominees for an appointment to the Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs for the class beginning this June.

James and Idella Noel, who publish the Platteville Herald, have put forth a tenderly written account of the Konishi family, its struggles and its remarkable accomplishments.

To my way of thinking, Mr. President, this article tells a great deal about what America is, and what she has meant to millions of immigrants and their families. Among other things, it pays well deserved tribute to a wonderful group of Americans, those of Japanese descent, who practically without exception have made themselves tremendous assets to my State and Nation.

The full story of the Japanese-Americans of Colorado, their hard work and zeal for perfection, their good citizenship and their deep respect for education, should be told more fully at another time. At this time, however, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Platteville Herald of February 9, titled, "Yeast for the Baker's Dozen."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YEAST FOR THE BAKER'S DOZEN

(The baker adds the yeast, kneads his dough, carefully follows his recipe and keeps one guarded eye on the baking. Because he knows and loves his business and constantly is vigilant his rolls rise high and firm. The baker, indeed, has cause for pride when displaying his wares.)

So it can be, so it is, with some parents and their children, specifically the parents of 13 remarkable children, who call this community home. The parents are Mr. and Mrs. George H. Konishi and their 13 children, who have stacked the home shelves full of honors they smilingly refer to as "Konishi's Company."

It was no real surprise to us when the telegram from Senator JOHN CARROLL arrived last week stating that Alban Konishi was being nominated to compete for a vacancy at the Air Force Academy. The Konishis seem born to be leaders; they are leaders, but they've had a lot of inspiration and training along the way. No small part of this has been their parents who farm west of Platteville.

PROUD AS PUNCH

Father George is proud as punch but modestly quiet about Konishi's company. He has to be convinced you're genuinely interested in his family before he'll tell you even a part of their fabulous story.

What is it, what's the driving force that finds these 13 children at the top of their many fields of endeavor? What is it that drives a man, an immigrant with a fourth-grade education, to see to it that these children have all received thorough educations—most college and beyond? We strongly suspect the hard-sell determination with the soft-touch characteristic in the children, has been both inherited from, molded and directed by their father.

There is, in the father, much of the disciplined ambition, pride in leadership yet oriental tenderness, Western minds sometimes find paradoxical. George believes in self-discipline, determination, hard work, respect for elders, tenderness and care for the young. There is also in George a new mellowness; he's about to retire from farming. Although it will be a long day before George sits down and does nothing he's going to take it easier. He's approaching that stage in life which the Japanese have been taught to respect most highly. He wouldn't say it, but he knows he has earned and receives that respect from his family.

HIS EARLY SYSTEM

In the history of the local schools there has been a Konishi enrolled for years. And each class which found itself with a Konishi knew there was real competition ahead—usually the valedictorian or salutatorian type.

George, like most American fathers, admits he was much more strict with his older children than with the younger. It was his aim, he explains, to teach older ones to be responsible for younger ones—and for younger ones to respect their elder brothers and sisters. When the Konishi company set out to meet the school bus on stormy days, George designated an older child to carry the lunch pail and books of a smaller child. The smaller child was to keep close to the elder guardian. The father not only made the rule, he stood by the window to see it was observed.

MELLOWS A LITTLE

George admits too, that this philosophy may have backfired just a little and became a contributing cause to his greater leniency with the younger members of the company. The older youngsters became so protective of their young charges that they persuaded their father that maybe so much discipline wasn't necessary. Still, with the innate respect the younger Konishi's developed for their record-setting elders there has always been that unspoken challenge to keep the company's record bright.

A GOOD EDUCATION

One doesn't speak long with Konishi to realize that he believes one of the most important things in life is a good education. That he was not afforded that opportunity (although you'd never know it if he didn't tell you so himself) has only served to make him more determined that each of his children should have the best education possible.

ARRIVED IN 1910

George came to this country in 1910 from Japan with his parents as a boy of eight. His father came over as a laborer because he believed in America the laborer had the great future of any place in the then world. To the father the most important thing in life was work. George remembers his father was very strict, very saving—a man who constantly stressed to his son the importance of doing a job—any job—well.

Young George had had 2 years of rigorous education in Japan before coming to this country and two more at Fort Lupton after arriving here. His education was slowed by having to break the language barrier and by necessity to work. With only 2½ months of the year available from the fields for him, he gave up formal schooling and concentrated on being the best laborer he could be.

THE WAY UP

Konishi recalls some early years were good; some terrible. In a 3-year period, under his father's careful scrutiny of pennies and devotion to work, the family secured enough funds to go into farming on their own, but that farm was lost in bad times. Following the early death of his father a few years later, George, stone broke, screwed up enough courage to go into tenant farming for himself. The years that followed were also up and down but finally George acquired and held his own land. On February 12 he plans a farm sale and will move his family to Fort Lupton. The farm will be rented.

Whether by choice, or at dad's persuasion, none of the Konishi company boys have become farmers. With only one more boy and a girl at home it isn't very probable there will be another Konishi farmer—not like the one who reared this choice brood of 13 anyway.

THE BAKER'S DOZEN

And the names of Konishi's company:

Lena (Konishi) Mori, of Iliff, the only one of the children who didn't go on to college. "I tried to get her to," says George, "but she looked at all the little ones below her and said she thought she could do much more good staying home to help us."

Martha (Konishi) Nishimoto, of Denver, who studied to be a dietician.

Dr. Ben Konishi, of Alamosa, a veterinarian.

Harry Konishi, with IBM of Douglas Aircraft in California. Harry entered premed school at Boulder following public high school graduation but when World War II broke out he enlisted. He was with the heroic Japanese-Americans in Italy and was highly decorated for his outstanding war record. He, as so many other loyal Japanese-Americans, had to prove his loyalty on European soil. But in so doing, these courageous young men not only did much to help win World War II, but also did much to break down unwarranted prejudices against all their people.

Dr. Frank Konishi, who is on the staff at the University of Illinois.

Gilbert Konishi, who has been teaching at Kobi, Japan, in the Canadian Christian School for about 3 years.

Ruby Konishi, a registered nurse, now at Presbyterian Hospital in Denver.

Charlotte Konishi, a stewardess for Frontier Air Lines.

Catherine (Konishi) Sakorada, who taught in Limon, Nebr., where she now lives, before her marriage.

Robert Konishi, a veterinary student at Colorado State University.

Alban Konishi, Valley High senior, recent nominee to compete for the vacancy at Air Force Academy.

Alvin Konishi, a sophomore, who studies hard to uphold the Konishi company tradition; and finally,

Linda Konishi, 8th grade, who has a terrific record to try to maintain.

QUITE A FEW BIRTHDAYS

There must have been days, even years, the mere clothing and feeding of this remarkable family was a real challenge to the parents Konishi. But if there were such years, George didn't remember them to us. In fact, he registered only one complaint, and that in the affirmative, about the size of his family. He says, "We used to give each child $20 on his birthday, but now the family has grown so much, in-laws joined and about 20 grandchildren arrived that we've had to reduce the gift to $5 each. At that, it costs us about $180 a year for birthdays. I suppose when I retire and the younger children grow up and have families, we may have to go down to $2 each." And he laughed, the kindly laugh of a justly proud father and grandfather—a man with a heart always big enough for one more.

TYPICAL ACHIEVEMENT

The achievements of the Konishi family are typical of the Nisei families in this area. Their record is perhaps more noticeable by virtue of its numbers and consistency. The Japanese-Americans, as a whole, are outstanding students and leaders; they are smart, and not necessarily because they are born with superintelligence. They work, study, apply themselves as few other Americans do. And they are blessed with qualities of patience and desire for perfection.

By this we do not indicate that they are a people apart. Far from it. The Nisei have assimilated in this community as "next door neighbors" with all the happy connotations that term implies.

EAST MEETS WEST

And it is in this blending that the Japanese-Americans have been so successful and become such worthwhile American citizens. It seems to us they've done what Rudyard Kipling said could never be done: caused East and West to meet.

Our Nisei friends, with their Far Eastern ancestry have become a vital, integral, enterprising part of our European-American western culture, yet have retained those qualities of ambition, self-discipline, patience and respect that produce dignified, unpretentious, conscientious leaders of men.

Konishi and company have proved that East and West can meet—and it's a winning combination.

What's better than a dozen rolls?—A baker's dozen.—Especially when they're made with such yeast as this.

Monsignor Wrzeciono

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month the Eighth District of New Jersey and the city of Paterson lost a distinguished resident.

It is with deep regret that I announce to the House of Representatives the death of Rt. Rev. Monsignor James Wrzeciono, prothonotary apostolic, pastor of St. Stephen's Roman Catholic Church.

Monsignor Wrzeciono was born April 30, 1879, in Tarnau county of Oppein, upper Silesia. He pursued his seminary studies in Krakow where he was ordained to the sacred priesthood on June 6, 1903.

The young clergyman migrated to the United States in 1940. After serving as a curate in two New Jersey parishes, he became pastor of St. Ann's Roman Catholic Church, Jersey City, where his pastorate extended until January 1932.

Thirty years ago, Monsignor Wrzeciono came to St. Stephen's. The parish continued to thrive over three decades. Pope Pius XII recognized the dedicated pastor's many accomplishments by elevating him to the rank of domestic prelate with the title of "right reverend monsignor." The Pope further honored Monsignor Wrzeciono by appointing him as a prothonotary apostolic in 1954.

This beloved servant of God was buried in the parish grounds adjoining the church he had served so faithfully.

George Todt's Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the December 11 and 12, 1961, issues of the Los Angeles Herald Express—now the Los Angeles Herald Examiner—two columns by George Todt which I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in Congress. The column of the 11th compares the meanings of conservatism and socialism. Patriotism in advertising is discussed in the column of the 12th.

Under unanimous consent, I include the columns in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ISMS OPPOSING U.S.ISM

"Quit yourselves like men."—I Samuel. 4:9.

"Conservatism is not a dirty word. It derives from the word 'conserve'—meaning to protect from harm, loss, or from being used up. In short, to preserve. Conservatism is not reactionaryism. Indeed, those who would impose communism and socialism upon the world are the real reactionaries. For they would try to make work that which has failed repeatedly from the beginning."

WASHINGTON FOUGHT

This was the thinking of my friend, George Putnam, patriotic KTTV-11 commentator, when I asked him to address the Delta Kappa Epsilon Fraternity Alumni Association at the University Club of Los Angeles recently. His subject was: "Conservatism, the wave of the future." This was a real hit with the Dekes. Here are some highlights:

"There is nothing more powerful than an idea whose time has come. That idea is a rebirth of genuine conservatism—the wave of the future. I submit to you that conservatism is not rightwing extremism. Conservatism is bedrock, middle road Americanism.

"The present controversy over the extremes of the left and right are the work of cheap politicians—and those hoodwinked into using petty catchall phrases in their scramble to win the voters' favor.

AT VALLEY FORGE

"True conservatism is not identified with extremism. It holds that when benefits are handed out without discrimination and Government spends without responsibility, the integrity of our Nation and the liberty of its citizens are restricted.

"The true conservative, in the words of Raymond Moley, "regards the extreme right as a peril to his cause." A grave injustice is done when politicians seize upon extremes to create the impression that all dissent is extreme.

"Heavy government spending involves heavy taxation and heavy debt. This leads to borrowing indefinitely. And thus, one finds his nation following the Marxist line that government borrowing is a good thing—that government debt is not a burden and, in the final analysis, does not have to be paid.

THEN WE GOT

"This is Keynesism, Fabianism, Galbraithism, Stevensonism, Rostowism, Schlesingerism, Bowlesism—yes, and Kennedyism, too.

"And it is also socialism—blood brother of communism.

"But Fabian socialism is a part of our everyday lives whether we realize it or not. The ADA—Americans for Democratic Action—wields a powerful bat in our present administration. There are fewer than 50,000 of them in the Nation, yet this Socialist organization has no less than 37 members in key positions around the President * * *.

"Their initial goal was to capture the Democratic Party and thus effect national socialism in the United States. They are now a potent force in the U.S. Government. They number among their members Chester Bowles and Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT of Arkansas—the man who believes the U.S. Constitution is outdated and needs an overhaul.

LIBERTY, BY GEORGE

"This is ADAism, this is socialism, this is the blood brother of communism. It's a part of your Government.

"Indeed, the ADA, as George Todt suggests, should come out and change its name to ASA—Americans for Socialist Action.

" 'It is time we took the offensive,' concluded George Putnam. I am an American. I am a conservative. I am a Democrat. And in that order. Patriotism and conservatism are kinfolks. Let's back up both of them'."

BILL OF RIGHTS WEEK

"A good constitution is infinitely better than the despot."—Macaulay

This is Bill of Rights Week and a time to pay our respects to the great libertarianism expressed in the first 10 amendments to our Constitution—which has given our Nation more liberty and freedom than any comparable document in the history of this planet. We are a fortunate people. Are we grateful enough?

Virginia was the ninth of the Original Thirteen States to ratify the Bill of Rights, on December 15, 1791—170 years ago—at which time it became officially a part of the Constitution.

SHOULD WE LOSE

In the fair city of Los Angeles, one man in particular has devoted himself in a masterful way to seeing that our citizens here fully appreciate the Bill of Rights and what it does for us all—and he has been performing effectively in this capacity for the past 21 years. This gentleman is Joe Crail, president of Coast Federal Savings located at Ninth and Hill.

This year he has had printed more than a half million copies of the Bill of Rights, which have been distributed throughout the Southland.

Recently I talked with hard-working George Ross, CFS director of civic responsibility who has assisted Crail since 1945 on

his patriotic projects—with outstanding results.

ONLY ONE RIGHT

"We have never had such a great call for copies of the Bill of Rights before," he told me. "In the past we only had requests for about half as many, or 300,000 copies in a single year."

I asked George what this might indicate in practical terms.

"I would take it as an indication of a definite upswing in patriotism and conservative Americanism," he replied quickly. "Our people in the main believe in conservatism and free enterprise. They think we ought to get out and defend it.

"The trouble with us," he continued, "is that conservatives are inclined to sit back—while the Americans for Democratic Action (ADA) gets out and yells for its point of view over a loud speaker."

George Ross and I have long noted the progress of the great conservative counterrevolution now sweeping our country and fully expect to make heavy inroads on the liberal forces in 1962.

Much depends, of course, on getting conservative candidates before the voters where they can compete with the New Frontiersmen and "me, too" Republicans. This vital part is up to Joe Doakes and the grass roots.

But in order to accomplish it, I think something important ought to be done. First things first. We need to put more patriotism in the mass communications media of the Nation. How can it be performed?

WHO COULD CHOOSE

The answer is simple, but an effective one. The businessmen of our country spend fully $12 billion every year on advertising. If we could only persuade them to devote a 10th of it—just 10 percent of the total figure—to patriotic advertising, we might soon have the reactionary forces of subversion on the run.

It only took $12 million in 1952 and again in 1956 to elect Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower into the White House by a landslide vote.

This amount of dollars is only a drop in the bucket compared to one-tenth of the annual advertising budget of the businessmen in the United States. Ten percent would amount to $1.2 billion—and it would quickly roll back the tide of Marxist socialism here and go a long way to smashing it abroad—if intelligently applied.

NOT TO FIGHT?

In addition to Coast Federal Savings in Los Angeles, some other good examples of patriotism in advertising has been produced by Union Oil Co., Richfield Oil Co., Schick Razor Co., Ross Dog Food Co., Knotts Berry Farm, to mention only a few.

Some of the illogical liberals have convinced many sponsors in the mass communications media that only the leftwing approach will appeal to their customers. This is nonsense.

Look at Coast Federal Savings as an example: Only a $50 million outfit 20 years ago when its patriotic program was commenced, it is now 10 times as big today. Really prospered. Americanism is worthwhile.

Lt. Col. Leon G. Turrou Honored by Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States convened recently, February 4-6, the midwinter conference of national officers and department commanders of the VFW, in Washington, D.C. An important part of this conference, which was under the direction of Mr. Robert E. Hansen of Minnesota, national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, was the meetings of the legislative, national security, and civil defense committees.

Approximately 500 officials of the Veterans of Foreign Wars from every major area, both in the United States and abroad, where the VFW has active local posts attended.

Among those who attended this conference was Mr. Leon G. Turrou, the commander of Benjamin Franklin Post No. 605, Paris, France, and a member of the very important VFW National Security Committee. Mr. Turrou, a lieutenant colonel in the U.S. Army Reserve, was the recipient at the February 5 meeting of the full conference, of the VFW commander in chief's silver medal and citation for Colonel Turrou's longstanding and continuing services to the United States and the strengthening of our Nation's relations with our allies in the struggle against Communist aggression.

Colonel Turrou, a prominent special agent of the FBI prior to World War II, is also a distinguished author, whose book, "Where My Shadow Falls," was a bestseller some few years ago. He enlisted as a private in World War II and rose to the rank of lieutenant colonel in a highly important position under General Eisenhower at the end of the war. I would also like to point out that the importance of Colonel Turrou's contributions to strengthening the mutual effort of the United States and our allies against communism is illustrated by the fact that, in addition to his highly valuable service as commander of the VFW post in Paris, he is currently the president of the Interallied Confederation of Reserve Officers, consisting of approximately one-half million reserve officers of the United States and the NATO powers.

It occurred to me that Colonel Turrou's remarks at the VFW conference upon receiving from VFW Commander in Chief Robert E. Hansen, the silver medal and citation, would be of deep interest. In view of Colonel Turrou's extensive travels in Europe, his personal friendship with officials and private citizens representing a wide cross section of European peoples, his observations are particularly pertinent to the international situation today. Under leave to extend my remarks I include Commander in Chief Robert E. Hansen's introduction of Colonel Turrou, and Colonel Turrou's address to the assembled officials of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

PRESENTATION OF COMMANDER IN CHIEF'S SILVER MEDAL TO COL. LEON G. TURROU, CONFERENCE OF NATIONAL OFFICERS AND DEPARTMENT COMMANDERS, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, SHERATON-PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 5, 1962

It is always a pleasure for me to award, on behalf of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, one of our organization's high decorations in recognition of services to our Nation. It is an added pleasure to make such an award to one who is also a distinguished member and leader in the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

The man whom we honor on this occasion has a proud record of service, in war and peace, to our Nation.

The restriction of time does not permit me to relate all of his contributions to the security and betterment of our Nation. However, I would like to set forth, briefly, some of the reasons why this remarkable man is the recipient of this high award today. In the years prior to World War II, Col. Leon G. Turrou was a special agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. During his distinguished service in the FBI, he played a prominent role in bringing to justice some of the most evil of public enemies of that era. He achieved well-deserved national recognition in combating Nazi espionage on the eve of World War II.

A distinguished author, his book, "Where My Shadow Falls," was a bestseller and helped alert our citizens to the insidious danger of Nazi imperialism.

With the outbreak of World War II he entered the U.S. Army, and on his own insistence, as a buck private. Before the war was over he was a lieutenant colonel. In 1946 under General Eisenhower, Colonel Turrou took charge of the Central Registry of War Criminals and Security Suspects with headquarters in Paris. Colonel Turrou was discharged from the Army in 1949 and has since made his residence in Europe. For the past 10 years he has been a special consultant to oilman J. Paul Getty, reputedly the richest man in the world.

I believe that it has been fortunate for our Nation and for the Veterans of Foreign Wars that Colonel Turrou settled in Paris. In Paris he has devoted his efforts to the service of our country and the Veterans of Foreign Wars. He has been repeatedly reelected and is still serving as commander, VFW Benjamin Franklin Post 605, Paris, France. He is a member of our national security committee. Through his efforts the Veterans of Foreign Wars has achieved widespread public and official recognition and respect throughout France and much of Europe.

Colonel Turrou contributed greatly to the meaningful success which attended the presentation, by me, on behalf of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, of the Bernard M. Baruch Gold Medal to Gen. Lauris Norstad, Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, following our 1961 convention. This act by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, coming, as it did, at a critical point during the Berlin crisis, strengthened U.S. influence and symbolized our national determination to remain resolute in Berlin. The unprecedented recognition and cooperation accorded by the French Government and veterans at our recent Veterans of Foreign Wars pilgrimage is in a very large measure attributable to Col. Leon Turrou and, in turn, to his relationship with French officials.

I might also add that his opportunity to serve the cause of freedom is enhanced by the fact that he has been elected president of the Inter-Allied NATO-Convention of Reserve Officers, an organization comprising almost one-half million reserve officers of the United States and the NATO powers.

I think you will be interested in knowing that Colonel Turrou's son, Lt. Col. Edward Turrou, U.S. Army, is also with us on this occasion. Colonel Turrou's other son was killed in action with the Air Force, flying the bombing mission against the Ploesti oilfields in World War II.

It is with a feeling of deep satisfaction that, on behalf of the 1,300,000 members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I now present this citation and commander in chief's sil-

ver medal to a most deserving patriot, Col. Leon Turrou.

REMARKS OF COL. LEON G. TURROU, CONFERENCE OF NATIONAL OFFICERS AND DEPARTMENT COMMANDERS, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, SHERATON-PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 5, 1962

This is indeed a great honor, and I accept this VFW Commander in Chief's Silver Award with a sense of deep humility.

This touches me very deeply, and I shall cherish it always as a symbol of the ideals and goals of our great organization, and of the tremendous service we render to the veterans, to the Armed Forces, and to the American people.

Nothing I have done in my lifetime has pleased me as much as the work I have done for and with the Veterans of Foreign Wars. I have made many friendships and they are friendships that I shall always treasure.

This award, then, will serve as a constant reminder to me of a wonderful period in my life.

In accepting this award, however, I will take advantage of the opportunity to express my deep gratitude and thanks to the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Robert E. Hansen, and to the many other national officers who have extended so much help to me during the past few years. Had it not been for the splendid cooperation and keen understanding of the problems with which I was faced, my efforts to further the cause of the VFW would have amounted to very little.

I have come to this conference as a member of the VFW National Security Committee. However, by virtue of my residing abroad, I have had an unusual opportunity to observe the reactions of our European allies on major issues affecting our foreign policy, particularly as they affect Western Europe.

I feel it appropriate, therefore, to report to you briefly some of these observations of recent months.

First of all, whether we be Democrat or Republican, it is good to know that the prestige of President Kennedy is as high in Europe as recent polls show it to be in the United States, and our NATO allies rely greatly upon his vigorous leadership. They realize that much of the success of the alliance has been due to the leadership and guidance which our country has offered, as well as material support. Most of these countries are very appreciative of our efforts, and continue to respect the judgment of our military and civilian leaders in matters affecting the collective security of the NATO powers.

Next, it is gratifying to report that our Ambassador to France, the Honorable James M. Gavin, has proven himself as the ideal man for the job. I know of no one who has gained the complete confidence and respect of the Head of State, the French Government, and the French people, to the extent that he has. And for good cause.

He is virtually a national hero in France because of his outstanding war record, and particularly for the part he personally played in the liberation of France. He is an able soldier-diplomat-statesman of the highest order, and the VFW should be proud to be able to count him as one of its members. I have found him to be a stanch supporter of VFW programs and objectives. He is a real inspiration to all who have come in contact with him, and it has been a very great pleasure for me to have presented to him, on behalf of our commander in chief, the Commander in Chief's Gold Medal, within the past month.

I would like, also, to mention that President de Gaulle, though having some serious internal problems, is still firmly entrenched in his position as leader of France, and contrary to all rumors, enjoys the confidence of the vast majority of the French people. They recall all too vividly the problems they had experienced under less stable governments, and under the leadership of less determined men. He is dedicated to what he feels is morally right and necessary for the strengthening and security of his nation, and can be counted upon to stand firmly in support of his principles.

I have noted that our Western European allies are keenly aware of the day-to-day development and changes in our foreign policy, and the actions taken by the United States to combat communism.

They are heartened whenever America, or any other free country for that matter, takes a determined stand against communism. They are likewise dismayed whenever such countries take the easy way out and resort to unwarranted appeasement, compromise, or concessions in order to avoid an early showdown.

These NATO countries have seen at firsthand the dangers of appeasement. They have seen that weakness and appeasement invite oppression; whereas, firmness, determination, and strength have presented oppression.

They have seen that whenever we have taken a firm stand against invasion of our treaties or moral rights, the Soviets have backed down. Similarly, whenever we have showed signs of weakness and lack of national backbone, the cause of communism has advanced.

It is important, therefore, that the VFW support the development of a foreign policy which can be identified by a positive program, a determined approach, a vigilance, and a strength of moral purpose which will not leave our allies wondering where they stand, or what to expect from us.

In the opinion of many of our allies in the North Atlantic community of nations, a greater degree of firmness and determination to do what is morally right and necessary will enhance our prestige as leaders of the free world, and will add to the cohesiveness of the NATO alliance.

The VFW is truly a unique organization. All of us have experienced at firsthand the problems and hardships of fighting a war overseas. We have seen shots fired in anger; and when we speak of national toughness, determination, national backbone, and a firm foreign policy that has no room for appeasement and unwarranted compromises and concessions, we do so with knowledge of what the consequences might be. We know the true value of freedom and liberty, and what is necessary to retain it.

It is up to us, therefore, to encourage our military and civilian leaders to stand firmly in support of our treaty and moral rights, and to let the President know that we support such firmness and determination; so that we will not have to apologize to anyone in the world community of freedom-loving nations, for our foreign policy.

Commander in Chief Hansen—it is with this message, and in this humble spirit of service and continued dedication to the principles and goals of the Veterans of Foreign Wars that I accept this prized award which you have so graciously conferred upon me.

Thank you so very much.

Congresswoman Riley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to include an editorial from the State, published in Columbia, S.C., Wednesday, February 14, 1962. This salutes the nomination of Mrs. John J. Riley, to the National House of Representatives from the Second Congressional District of South Carolina. Mrs. Riley is the widow of the late and beloved John J. Riley, who served us so nobly and so well for many years. All of us miss Mr. Riley, but we are most happy that his people have seen fit to honor his great name and good service by nominating his talented wife to this position.

The editorial is as follows:

CONGRESSWOMAN RILEY

The nomination of Mrs. John J. Riley to the National House of Representatives from the Second District means that, if she is elected, there will be a wide-open contest later in the year for the next 2-year term. Mrs. Riley has said she would seek only the unexpired term for which she has now been nominated.

Should she be elected in the May 8 special general election which has been ordered, Mrs. Riley would bring to the office a considerable knowledge of its requirements gained in her close association with it through her late husband.

Also, since she shares the conservative views of her husband, and since this district is largely (not totally) one of that bent, there would be considerable satisfaction from the service of Mrs. Riley, a dedicated South Carolinian and a woman of considerable force and ability.

Likewise, her defeated opponent, Mrs. Martha Thomas Fitzgerald, is an able woman and an experienced person in parliamentary government, gained as a member of the South Carolina House of Representatives. Mrs. Fitzgerald ran grittily on her own, after there had been an announced agreement among State Democratic and Republican leaders that if Mrs. Riley would become a candidate for the unexpired term neither party would bring forward another candidate.

Urban Affairs Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting during this week in which we are observing the birthday of a great American, Abraham Lincoln, that I bring before you for your study a matter involving our present President and his actions on the Urban Affairs Department.

I wonder what Abraham Lincoln would think, could he, who genuinely loved freedom and wanted it for all Americans, regardless of pigmentation or nationalistic background, today witness the recent attempt by our Chief Executive to play on racism in its worst form, as a threat, in an attempt to get urban affairs legislation passed.

I am hopeful that Mr. Kennedy's injection of the racial issue, into what should be a starkly legislative consideration, was the result of too hasty acceptance of ill-proffered advice, and not a measure of his true beliefs. I cannot believe that our President is guilty of personal advocacy of the cynical dema-

goguery which his statements would seem to imply.

Viewed clinically, the urban affairs bill is simply an attempt to create an artificial Cabinet position. It is an attempt to establish a Negro Cabinet member as a symbol of progress, in an effort to derail the necessity of taking positive action for the good of the entire Negro race.

Examples of failure are not difficult to see. It was the President himself who said that by a stroke of the pen he could end racial bias in housing. Yet the pen has laid in its holder, unused. It was the President himself who 2 years ago said that civil rights legislation was even then in preparation and would be put before the Congress in short order. Congress is still waiting.

And where is the FEPC legislation so loudly and broadly demanded in the Democratic platform? Would this symbolic Cabinet member truly compensate for the very real failures in the field of civil rights by the Kennedy administration?

As for the Urban Affairs Department and its functions, it is inevitable that once established it would grow just as have other Government agencies. The scope of functions in the proposed bill which the House Rules Committee killed, is astronomical.

Perhaps we should all take note that this is the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Department of Agriculture. It was formed to bring a few scattered agencies together under one department. In 1862 it had nine employees and a budget of $80,000. In 1962 it has 100,000 employees and a budget of $7 billion. The employees spend much of their time and the Department's money paying farmers not to farm. Every farmer who gets a Government check is under Government control. This is how a "harmless" agency that just brings a few scattered Government functions together can grow until it strangles the purpose for which it was created.

I believe that it is high time that the administration and the Congress stop talking about hyphenated Americans. I do not believe we gain anything for America by discussing the voting power, the likes and dislikes and the political potentials of Negro Americans, Jewish Americans, Polish Americans, Latin Americans. All of these are just plain Americans. On the bloody beachheads of World War II and in the freezing misery of the Korean conflict, no one stopped to ask whether or not our GI's were hyphenated Americans—they were there, they fought, they were wounded, and many died, for the simple purpose of defending what America means—freedom.

The Kennedy administration has chosen to cast its lot on the urban affairs issue with racial discrimination. I propose we consider and vote on American traditions.

As a matter of information to my colleagues, I have compiled a list of congressional districts in the United States with more than 10 percent nonwhite population.

It is obvious that very few congressional districts are affected basically by considerations influenced wholly by the racial nature of their population. Therefore I think the viewpoint expressed by our white and Negro national leaders in both political parties is a sound one: race should not be a factor in congressional voting—on the Urban Affairs Department issue, or on any other.

Many Members of Congress do not realize how very, very few congressional districts in States outside of the traditional South have nonwhite populations of 10 percent or more. For this reason, and because recent statistics on this point are available from the Bureau of the Census, I am submitting the following table which shows clearly the total nonwhite population for each State and for each congressional district with 10 percent or more.

The only States omitted from this table are Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas and Virginia—all States which have a nonwhite population of obviously heavy proportion.

The table also includes a breakdown by race into white, Negro, other races and percentages of nonwhite population. I invite your attention to these figures, which should be of aid in properly assessing the unfortunate course of threats which have been made in the sending of the Executive order for the Urban Affairs Department to Congress for acceptance or rejection.

The table follows:

	Total nonwhite	White	Negro	Other	Percent
Alaska	51,621	174,546	6,771	44,850	22.8
Arizona	132,644				
2d District	96,214	542,437	18,284	77,930	15.1
California	1,261,974				
4th District	42,997	332,374	17,775	25,222	11.5
5th District	92,916	272,029	56,608	36,308	25.5
7th District	92,077	201,440	77,846	14,231	31.4
15th District	126,241	263,512	96,367	29,874	32.4
23d District	122,646	410,133	119,581	3,065	23.0
26th District	164,327	348,349	150,208	14,119	32.1
Delaware	61,965	384,327	60,688	1,277	13.9
Illinois	1,070,906				
1st District	216,504	18,698	214,034	2,470	92.1
2d District	180,180	168,660	177,223	2,957	51.7
3d District	125,602	293,907	124,907	695	29.9
6th District	117,924	227,360	117,110	814	34.2
7th District	120,964	221,937	119,360	1,604	35.3
9th District	32,925	269,733	24,686	8,239	10.9
24th District	60,205	426,993	59,790	415	12.4
Indiana	273,944				
1st District	87,628	425,641	87,109	519	17.1
11th District	100,729	596,838	99,912	817	14.4
Kentucky	218,073				
1st District	33,203	284,233	32,870	333	10.5
2d District	20,206	301,097	20,121	85	6.3
3d District	78,890	532,057	78,350	540	12.9
4th District	21,398	282,033	20,802	596	7.1
5th District	8,902	320,214	8,804	98	2.7
6th District	42,134	369,325	41,822	312	10.2
7th District	4,657	416,159	4,574	83	1.1
8th District	8,683	314,965	8,606	77	2.7
Maryland	526,770				
1st District	56,580	186,990	56,318	262	23.2
2d District	27,376	594,559	26,649	727	4.4
3d District	82,647	176,179	81,386	1,261	31.9
4th District	128,938	154,382	128,069	869	45.5
5th District	94,213	616,832	91,391	2,822	13.2
6th District	22,220	586,446	20,398	1,822	3.7
7th District	114,796	258,531	114,199	597	30.7
Massachusetts	125,434				
12th District	32,322	252,734	31,235	1,087	11.3
Michigan	737,329				
1st District	117,398	165,904	116,873	525	41.4
13th District	134,835	133,205	133,135	1,700	50.3
14th District	66,666	395,526	65,733	933	14.4
15th District	157,100	179,917	155,964	1,136	46.6
Missouri	396,846				
1st District	111,612	456,417	111,030	582	19.6
3d District	112,403	230,066	111,240	1,163	32.8
5th District	66,008	236,805	65,190	818	21.8
10th District	32,134	268,964	32,019	115	10.7
New Jersey	527,779				
2d District	46,497	269,788	45,155	1,342	14.7
4th District	49,932	440,959	47,994	1,938	10.2
11th District	92,092	216,568	91,331	761	29.8
12th District	63,541	299,373	62,857	684	17.5
13th District	35,131	221,846	34,628	503	13.7
New York	1,495,233				
5th District	82,357	309,046	81,177	1,180	21.0
8th District	61,233	295,728	59,518	1,715	17.2
9th District	97,629	293,610	96,524	1,105	25.0
10th District	141,601	212,181	140,000	1,601	40.0
11th District	41,023	370,965	39,620	1,403	10.0
16th District	267,005	34,509	265,401	1,604	88.5
18th District	43,728	225,640	42,195	1,533	16.2
19th District	34,914	266,585	19,124	15,790	11.6
20th District	28,287	251,188	24,036	4,251	10.1
21st District	44,730	241,400	41,054	3,676	15.6
22d District	48,531	278,682	47,588	943	14.8
23d District	85,095	250,071	83,870	1,225	25.4
41st District	62,099	270,677	60,948	1,151	18.7
Ohio	796,699				
1st District	66,076	309,680	65,355	718	17.6
2d District	58,578	429,790	58,082	496	12.0
3d District	73,029	653,127	72,201	828	10.1
12th District	81,601	601,361	80,235	1,366	11.9
21st District	195,744	226,060	194,911	833	46.4
22d District	49,827	308,171	48,802	1,025	13.9
Oklahoma	220,384				
1st District	37,837	483,705	29,753	8,084	7.3
2d District	49,104	319,872	27,132	21,972	13.3
3d District	26,092	201,600	16,939	9,153	11.5
4th District	27,150	225,058	17,327	9,823	10.8
5th District	49,830	503,033	42,396	7,434	9.0
6th District	30,371	374,632	19,537	10,834	7.5
Pennsylvania	865,362				
1st District	67,318	193,449	66,621	697	25.8
2d District	124,663	219,511	123,435	1,228	36.2
3d District	64,566	209,345	62,803	1,763	23.6
4th District	232,476	82,433	231,684	792	73.8
6th District	37,236	310,228	36,506	730	10.7
28th District	82,964	245,200	82,126	838	25.3
South Dakota	27,416				
2d District	19,600	163,245	729	18,871	10.7
West Virginia	90,288				
1st District	7,437	265,670	7,315	122	2.7
2d District	8,061	268,813	7,875	186	2.9
3d District	9,398	258,936	9,302	96	3.5
4th District	6,150	339,058	6,015	135	1.8
5th District	29,771	246,042	29,680	91	10.8
6th District	29,471	391,614	29,191	280	7.0
Wisconsin	92,874				
5th District	63,429	457,245	61,324	2,105	12.2

An inflated myth is being used to persuade, threaten or force Members of Congress to vote for the proposed new Urban Affairs Department and its prospective head, Housing Administrator Robert C. Weaver.

I agree with President Kennedy, Bob Weaver has done a good job as Housing Administrator. Whether or not we should permit the creation of a new Urban Affairs Department is a matter that should be considered on its merits, not on the basis of prejudice for or against the Negro race.

Very few Members of Congress need fear the adverse votes of Negroes on this issue. Outside of 12 Southern States there are very few congressional districts—only 57 out of 437—where Negroes equal 10 percent or more of the total population.

In the 57 Congressional Districts where a Negro population is significant outside the Southern States, the Census records show that there are 8 districts where the Negro population is between 15 and 20 percent; there are 14 districts where it totals between 20 and 30 percent; and there are only 15 districts where the total is over 30 percent of the population.

In light of these figures, it seems clear to me that the current furor about the prospective appointment of Mr. Weaver as a possible Secretary of Urban Affairs is misleading, divisive and simply political propaganda both for Members of Congress and for the general public.

It is clear from the table that no Members of this body outside of the South and the few Congressional Districts listed are elected from population in which the Negro electorate forms a significant factor so as to influence voting. Therefore, I earnestly plead again for all Members to disregard the false arguments now appearing in their mail and in the press. The voting for or against the Urban Affairs Department should be upon the merits of the question.

My own record in the field of race relations is well known. The good people of my congressional district have not been fooled by the hypocrisy surrounding the urban affairs proposals.

As for me, I shall continue to represent my people as citizens of the 14th Congressional District of Ohio.

Susan B. Anthony Day Declared in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Susan B. Anthony passed the greater portion of her life as a resident of the city of Rochester. The inspiration and guidance which she was to give to the women of this country has made her a part of our Nation's history. As a teacher and an advocate of women's rights, she made significant contributions to the State of New York and her country.

From 1869, when she first formed the National Women's Suffrage Association, until her death in March of 1906, she worked untiringly to secure the right to vote for women. While the 19th amendment to the Constitution granting women the right to vote was not adopted until 14 years after her death, it is widely felt that Susan B. Anthony was the driving force that brought this about.

Recognizing Susan B. Anthony's contribution to the State of New York and the Nation as a whole, the Honorable Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, has issued a proclamation declaring today, February 15, 1962, as Susan B. Anthony Day. The Susan B. Anthony Memorial Organization has passed a resolution further recognizing the principles for which this great woman worked.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the proclamation of the Governor of New York and the resolution passed by the Susan B. Anthony Memorial.

There being no objection, the proclamation and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK, EXECUTIVE CHAMBER, ALBANY—PROCLAMATION

"Although Susan B. Anthony was born in Massachusetts we proudly claim her as one of the great New Yorkers who helped to make history. Most of her adult life was passed and her effective work for freedom, justice, and equality was accomplished in the Empire State.

"She was agent of the American Anti-Slavery Society for New York State before she began to devote herself almost exclusively to the agitation for women's rights. Her motto was: 'The true republic—men, their rights and nothing more; women, their rights and nothing less.'

"Her work resulted in adoption of what we know as the Susan B. Anthony Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the 19th amendment, giving women the right to vote.

"It is right that we honor this great and fearless American. Courage of a rare sort was needed to carry her and her associates through the hostility and, above all, the ridicule they encountered.

"Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim February 15, 1962, as Susan B. Anthony Day in New York State."

Given under my hand and the Privy Seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 6th day of February in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-two.

By the Governor:

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.
WILLIAM J. RONAN,
Secretary to the Governor.

NEW YORK STATE RESOLUTION

Whereas Miss Susan B. Anthony believed in "perfect equality of rights for women, civil, legal, and political"; and

Whereas at first women obtained only political; and

Whereas women now are working to secure civil and legal equality: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Susan B. Anthony Memorial, Inc. at the corporation meeting held in the Anthony Home on November 28, 1961, go on record as favoring the civil and legal equality which Miss Anthony in her lifetime approved; and be it further

Resolved, That the Anthony Corp. approves the equal rights amendment which reads: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex"; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Representative JESSICA WEIS and to Representative HAROLD C. OSTERTAG and to the New York State Senators KEATING and JAVITS.

Mrs. Fred Wilkinson,
GLADYS SOULE WILKINSON,
Recording Secretary.

ROCHESTER, N.Y.

Congressman Holifield for Quality and Stabilized Merchandise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday our colleague, CHET HOLIFIELD of California, a retail clothier, delivered the following address, in part, before the National Convention of Retail Clothiers being held here in Washington, D.C.

His remarks and advice, considering his long experience as a retail merchant should be read by all Members of Congress:

CONGRESSMAN HOLIFIELD FOR STABILIZED MERCHANDISING

(Remarks of Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, of California, at the National Association of Retail Clothiers and Furnishers luncheon meeting, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D.C., February 14, 1962)

THE DOMESTIC RETAILER LOOKS AT THE EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET—PART I

Mr. Chairman and fellow clothiers, 35 years ago I became a retail clothier in a small southern California town. Though serving in Congress for the past 20 years, I have maintained my original business and increased its operation with the help of a good manager. Therefore, I have more than a passing acquaintance with the basic problems which you face.

New problems have arisen over the past three decades. Our customers are more sophisticated. They demand a wider selection of style, color, and materials. Expanded use of charge accounts has increased our capital investment. We face a new type of competitive challenge from giant discount houses in many areas. Protecting the normal profit margin of a legitimate business operation is indeed a serious problem.

Along with many of you, I built my retail business on lines of nationally known brand merchandise. If discount houses continue to acquire such brand merchandise and slash normal retail prices, you and I are threatened with the damage or destruction of our traditional way of doing business.

Court decisions have practically nullified the protection of the so-called fair trade laws. It is evident that the independent merchant, to survive and prosper, must reexamine the legislative possibilities.

Congressman MADDEN'S quality stabilization bill seems to offer a carefully considered new approach. It seeks to establish a more complete property right in the brand name so that the manufacturer can (a) specify conditions under which the brand name can be used in the final sale to the consumer, and (b) reclaim merchandise at no actual

loss to the seller, in the event the latter offers the merchandise in violation of the manufacturer's specified conditions of sale to the ultimate consumer.

While I am not a lawyer (I only help to make the laws which confuse lawyers), I have been advised that the legal barriers in the fair trade laws may be overcome by the concept of the quality stabilization bill.

Certainly the manufacturer should have the right to protect his distribution system and his branded merchandise from the cannibalistic practices of the "loss leader" and "price gimmick" operator.

Manufacturer and retailer collectively expend millions of dollars in advertising national brand merchandise. The resulting consumer recognition and acceptance of brand name merchandise is a real tangible business asset to both manufacturer and retailer. This joint asset should not be misused and dissipated by others.

I note that on February 2 of this year, the National Retail Hardware Association, comprising 22,000 independent retailers, endorsed the Madden-Capehart bill. Certainly it deserves serious attention by all independent retail associations.

As a Member of Congress who knows the problems of the retail clothing industry and believes in the fair trade principle, I have cosponsored the Madden-Capehart quality stabilization bill.

Now, may I turn to a matter of great importance to our Nation's destiny, and therefore of great importance to you and to me as businessmen.

Because of our great economic and military strength, the United States has become the leader of the free world.

Since the end of World War II, under a bipartisan national policy decision, we have expended many billions of tax dollars to help rebuild the economic, political and military strength of allied, neutral and former enemy nations. These nations have survived and remained free. They have done more. Great Britain, West Germany, France, Japan and smaller nations have expanded their industrial production far beyond pre-World War II levels. The European part of this great industrial productive capacity is now being melded into a trade and tariff alliance of tremendous potential economic power.

Initially the Common Market consisted of the so-called Inner Six nations on the European Continent. Then in a belated move for self-protection, Great Britain organized the Outer Seven. Now, as you know, there are negotiations for melding the Inner Six and the Outer Seven into a greater Common Market grouping of nations. If this occurs during the next few years there will be a close trade and tariff arrangement among nations containing some 300 million producers and consumers.

Listen carefully—this Common Market trade alliance will increase the economic strength of the participating countries individually and as a whole. The growing economic power of the Inner Six is shown by the rapid strides in output. Over the last year this area increased its gross national product by 6½ percent. Since 1950, its annual growth rate has averaged more than 5 percent compared with our bare 3 percent. In the industrial sector of production its annual rate of increase for the past 10 years has averaged 8 percent, compared with our slightly more than 3 percent.

This is a powerful economic challenge to the United States—make no mistake about it.

The prospects for the Common Market complex then are these:

First, through reducing or eliminating internal tariffs, it will accelerate the interchange of merchandise and labor resources. Therefore, it will become more self-sufficient and less dependent upon imports from the United States.

Second, unified and growing economic strength and industrial capacity will generate greater quantities of goods for export throughout the world.

On the first point, bear in mind that the 13 nations of the European Economic Community were customers last year for $5½ billion worth of American goods. This is an important segment of our total exports of $20.4 billion. It would be very damaging if we should find ourselves excluded by high tariff walls from this market.

On the second point, we must consider the impact of the Common Market on our export trade to other areas, which amounts to $15 billion, or three-fourths of our yearly total of exports. The Common Market nations will be strong competitors in exports because of their growing production capacity, and they will in turn offer the powerful inducement of potential markets among their 300 million people for goods of the other trading nations.

Why should we, as retail clothiers in small or large towns, be concerned with all of these complicated problems of international trade tnd tariffs and the Common Market Alliance?

In the brief time of this luncheon speech—and every luncheon speech should be brief—I cannot do justice to the question and give a full answer. Part II of my speech, which I shall not read, has facts and figures which many of you will find interesting and relevant to your business role in the national economy. The second part amounts to a brief for the proposed new approach to international trade which will be debated in Congress in the coming weeks and months.

The remainder of my remarks today, I hope, will be a stimulus to your examining this problem in depth—a problem which I believe is second only to that of avoiding a nuclear world war.

I could speak to you with great feeling and a wide background of information on the Soviet military challenge. As chairman of the House-Senate Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, my responsibilities are heavy in the field of atomic energy development. The nuclear weapons we need for deterring war range from small tactical weapons to megaton bombs carried by our great SAC bombers, many of which are on constant airborne patrol. Our nuclear submarines armed with Polaris missiles are gliding silently and continuously under the surface of the great oceans, and our great intercontinental ballistic missiles stand guard for freedom.

But these are programs in being. These fantastic weapons and weapon systems are in professional scientific and military hands. They are under the direction of the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces. There is little that we can do individually in this area of national survival—except to pay taxes.

But if we turn our attention to the economic destiny of the United States to those areas of business development and Federal legislation having to do with our stability as a nation, then there is something important and constructive which we can do.

If our Nation is to remain strong militarily, we must take every step necessary to maintain the strength of our economic system. We speak of the American way of life and we speak of competitive free enterprise. Are we mouthing generalities which are familiar enough to sound pleasant, but fuzzy enough to hide the crucial challenges of our times?

Our American way of life is changing. We have moved rapidly from farm to city. Seventy-four percent of our people live in urban areas. Ten million farmers produce more food and fiber than 60 million produced five decades ago. Our great industrial plants, steel, textiles, rubber, automobile, operate on a part-time basis. The workweek dwindles from 60 hours or more when I was a young man to 40 and even 25 for some. Our labor force grows at the rate of 1½ million per year.

We are employing more people but the percentage of permanent unemployed has risen to between 5 and 7 million. Automation takes its toll in industry after industry, and pools of technologically displaced workers grow in stagnant areas of our Nation. I know all the stock answers, but I also know the inadequacy of most of them and so do the unemployed, the displaced miners, automobile workers, railroadmen and others.

Yes, we have problems which are not being solved. They invoke basic factors of change in our American way of life.

Our agricultural production outruns the domestic ability to consume. We use all kinds of controls and subsidies to keep it from collapsing, not under the blessing, but under the curse of abundance.

Our industrial plants, running only part time, produce more steel, autos, refrigerators and soft goods including men's clothing than our domestic market can buy. If you look beneath the surface of general prosperity, you see these cracks in the foundation of our economy.

What can we do to keep those cracks in the economy from spreading? The basic need is a wider distribution and greater consumption of goods. If this can be accomplished our factories can operate more hours. They can utilize more employees which will help to reduce our stagnant reservoir of unemployed and add domestic consuming power.

But how do we get this wider distribution if our domestic market is saturated with goods?

It seems to me we must look to new markets for our goods from factories and fields. This means increased exports.

If the European Common Market threatens our present export market, as I believe it does, then we must meet that challenge promptly.

The President, backed by expert economic advisers from the financial and business world, has asked Congress for more flexible tariff adjustment powers—powers that will allow him to bargain with the Common Market tariff controllers so that we can continue to participate in that great 300 million population market. It will take congressional action to delegate to him this broad general power. If after study you believe it is wise, you can help by making your wishes known to your Senators and Representatives.

But far more is needed than our continued access to the European Common Market consumers.

We need to develop new markets in the underdeveloped areas of the world. Here lies the great challenge and the great opportunity for our part-time production capacity.

If we are to really turn our production capacity loose, if we are really going to utilize our skilled manpower and train our unskilled workers for the production job for which we are capable, then we must become masters of the machine and not the victims of technology.

So, I say to you today, the United States must meet the challenge of greater distribution. It must fight a more efficient competition in existing world markets to maintain our existing exports.

It must vigorously, courageously, and intelligently move into the great underdeveloped markets of the world where millions, yes, hundreds of millions, yearn for the goods we know how to produce.

We must take the plage as the leading international trading nation which Great Britain occupied for so many centuries. She can no longer play the part. She has handed the baton to us.

We will either ignobly fail this task or we will carry the baton to victory.

We can falter in our obligation to meet today's challenges to the American way of life as we have known it, and if we do fail, we will slip into the oblivion which is reserved for all nations or civilizations which grow old and tired and fail to cope with new problems in a new and dangerous age.

I do not believe we will fail. I believe that we have the intelligence to solve the problem of distribution—greater distribution to domestic and foreign consumers through utilizing unused or partly used manpower and machine power. Our Nation of free people has in a period of some 300 years built the greatest production capacity ever known in the history of the world. Starting with a wilderness to conquer and faith in freedom and the democratic way, we have eliminated the scarcity of food, shelter, and goods which has plagued mankind for thousands of years—yes, which still plagues more than two-thirds of the human race.

It would be unthinkable for us to allow this magnificent system of production to choke on its own abundance, while two-thirds of the world starves for food and cries for goods. It would be a tragic ending indeed for the American dream, if we were to falter in the face of the Communist threat, be it military or economic.

We are facing up to the military threat, but do you know that since 1955 the Soviets have completed 206 trade agreements with non-Communist nations? Did you know that from 1954 to 1960 the export trade volume of the Soviet Union jumped from $860 to $2,700 million—more than triple in a 6-year period?

Gentlemen, this is your world. This is your Nation. This is your challenge. It is a challenge which we can and will meet. It is a goal worth winning if we are to have a world of liberty and freedom for ourselves and our children.

Release the Reservists Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK KOWALSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, the recent callup of U.S. Army Reserve and National Guard units and fillers has generated a protest too widespread to casually ignore. The problem is one that is being seriously considered by the House Armed Services Committee under the chairmanship of the Honorable CARL VINSON. It is presently under study by Subcommittee No. 3 chaired by the Honorable F. EDWARD HÉBERT. I have the utmost confidence that these distinguished gentlemen will pursue this problem with diligence and dedication. But, Mr. Speaker, deliberations by these committees necessarily take time. And the longer the time, the more is the magnification of the hardships and inequities that have resulted from this callup.

I have received literally hundreds of letters, telegrams and telephone calls from men who have been recalled, from their families and their friends. The protest is not directed toward the reason for being recalled to active duty, for the greater percentage realize this. Rather the protest is directed toward the necessity of retaining these men on active duty when the need no longer exists.

Men who are not filling critical categories should be released immediately. I see no legitimate reason for further delay.

Recently, I received from Fort Gordon, Ga., a telegram with the names of 155 members of three civil affairs units located there. These men ask to be released immediately from active duty. Mr. Speaker, as a veteran of 33 years in the U.S. Army, 3 of which were spent as a colonel in civil affairs in Japan, I feel I have some knowledge of the utility of such groups. I cannot see any compelling need to keep these men on active duty at this time.

I am aware of the burden that will be placed on the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Staff in having to determine who is to be released. But this burden is not such that justifies no action nor does it brook of delay. The example just cited is certainly one area with which to start the process. I am equally certain that a determination based on actual and compelling need can be made concerning all the men who have been recalled.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to place in the RECORD excerpts from a letter sent to me by a very discerning young reservist who was among those recalled. This gentleman is presently stationed with one of the aforementioned civil affairs units at Fort Gordon. His cogent and persuasive observations relate not only to the callup of the Reserves and National Guard, but also to other problems engendered by our Selective Service System.

The excerpts follow:

JAN. 10, 1962.

The Honorable FRANK KOWALSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KOWALSKI: * * * We have a principle in this country of equal service for all. This is in practice not the policy. Our Selective Service System provides far more men than the services can use; standards are raised so as to reduce the number eligible; yet many of the functions performed by those in service could just as well have been performed by many of those exempted. In order to extend military duty to more people we have a 6-months training program than many in the military itself question the efficacy of. We have administrative, not legislative standards for exemption that result in many individuals' avoiding military service altogether. We have furthermore, I believe, provided inadequate compensation and incentive for those who do make the sacrifices of devoting all or part of their lives to our Military Establishment. Our system of military service is not universal, and we should not pretend that it is. Yet if we say that we have sacrificed universality for effectiveness or efficiency, it is questionable whether we have achieved even that.

We have several general policies in this area and these are derived from basic principles and attitudes that are part of the American tradition. These are reflected in statutes and regulations that are unbelievably numerous. Yet the many and varied programs available for fulfilling one's military obligation have never, to my knowledge, been set forth in one central source. Even when an individual chooses one program he is never sure if he knows the full nature or extent of his obligation; furthermore no method has been devised to inform these individuals of all subsequent changes in the law or regulations that affect their status. An additional difficulty is that with the short-term active duty programs an individual never uses the skills his education has provided him, and the service doesn't gain the benefits of them. Who may a young man go to and say "I am X years old, I want to fulfill my military obligation now; these are my abilities and drawbacks." There is no existing official source that can advise him either competently or objectively.

I can illustrate the above with a description of my graduating class at Yale Law School. There were a few men who found out about the Air National Guard program, were able to join and perform just 11 weeks of active duty. Their choice of program was based clearly on the duration of the AD tour. There were those who joined the Army's 6 months' program. There were some who failed to get into this program because there were no openings at the time they applied and were drafted to spend 2 years in the Army. Others took their chances, and because of the low draft calls, reached the age of 26 without serving at all. Then there were those who married while at school, had a child their last year and never served. This process of selection and distribution of military service is not even rational. The results are neither equitable nor productive of good personnel.

I have no simple solution for this situation. We live in a world that requires us to have a large army, and we must provide the manpower. I am one of those who believes it can be done most fairly and efficiently through a program of universal military training and through a system that provides greater benefits to those who choose the service as a career. I would suggest that whatever the solution, if any exists, it is time for Congress to review in its entirety our manpower policies, and if it finds there should be no basic change, at least the present policies should be made more rational and coherent.

The Reserve mobilization has been the subject of some worthwhile statements and of some publicity that has created more heat than light. I believe that the white paper of the Reserve Officers' Association was a fairly accurate analysis, no matter its motivation. I think that many of the statements from the Pentagon have been misleading, and transparently so. The behavior of the reservists themselves has been on occasion questionable, but in context quite understandable.

The callup may well have served a valuable purpose. But there lingers in the minds of many the question of whether the activation of 150,000 men really represented such a show of strength as to cause the Soviets to hesitate in their aggressive actions. Why were not 500,000 reservists requested of Congress? Why, in fact, were not all of the authorized 250,000 called to active duty? This question, however, is now an academic one.

The men were called up; in many cases units heard of their mobilization through the newspapers or television before they were told by their unit commanders. This was not a good beginning. The fillers were called as they had to be, and despite many inequities it would appear that for the most part this was done efficiently and fairly. The men who had 2 or 3 years of active duty should not have been called as fillers, and indeed in doing so the Army violated the intent of Congress. The Army is now attempting to correct this situation by releasing some of those men who served long tours. This is the correct action, but did they have to wait 4 months? The chief problem is the same one of equal distribution of military service. As I've stated before, the callup

just compounded the inequity of distribution. Though most understand that there could not be a mobilization of Reserves without making some men serve more than others, they ask why they should have to serve a second time when there are so many who have never served at all. I do not want to belabor this point, for I think it has been stated often enough and understood by many; the question of whether there will be future Reserve mobilizations in the absence of a "hot" war must be resolved with this consideration in mind, not only for the sake of the people concerned, but for the effectiveness of the mobilization.

The reservists reacted strongly; the protests were vociferous and numerous. I think it should be noted that the strongest feelings were provoked by two things: the reported extension for a second year, and the statements from the Army and General Van Fleet that morale was high. Not many of the reservists believe that the extension was just a fabrication of the newspapers; they feel it was probably under consideration and was abandoned primarily because of the publicity focussed on it. This was clearly the cause of the first outburst. The statements from Secretary of the Army Stahr and other officials that very few letters had been written, that morale was high and that complaints were unpatriotic angered many and prompted more protest. Many reservists concluded that if the Army could use the press to present its views, so could the men. They particularly resented the Army's intentional misrepresentation of the state of their own morale. Such things as the continuing reduction of draft quotas was indeed demoralizing to these men. All this is really not germane to the question of whether the callup was necessary or how it was handled. It is important, however, as it reflects the attitudes of the many people involved and the effectiveness of the Reserve forces.

One minor point should be mentioned. Many men who had served 3 or 4 years previous to the callup had since performed civilian jobs of varying types and importance. None of this interim experience was, or could be under the present system, reflected in their present assignments in the mobilization. The fact that a man went through the Army Administration Course makes him a clerk-typist, and nothing he does afterwards ever changes this fact. Shouldn't the Army have an MOS classification system that is more flexible, permitting changes while a man is in a Reserve status?

One could discuss at great length the individual cases involving inequity and hardships in this callup; it is sufficient, however, to say that there were many. There can not be and probably should not be any special compensation for these men. I feel, however, that the reservists should be deactivated quickly; there seems little justification for continuing to hold them now. Another few months may not seem to be much time on paper, but to the men involved it is crucial. I can't emphasize this enough. Furthermore, I think that whenever the dates for deactivation are set, the men should be promptly informed. These people are entitled to plan their lives and this information should not be withheld from them. I believe the Army would do the just and compassionate thing by releasing the men as speedily as possible. Also, it is important that the Army determine now for the information of these men exactly what their future Reserve status is. Those that were called up might well have earned a reduction in their total Reserve obligation or possibly a transfer to the Standby Reserve.

The question of what role the Reserves will play in our defense picture and the efficacy of the Reserve program cuts across my three previous points. I understand that these questions will be thoroughly analyzed by both the Department of Defense and the Congress in the near future. I can only hope that the decisions will be based on an honest and forthright appraisal of the Reserves' capability and the strategic necessities, and that the political influence of the Reserve and National Guard organizations will play no part. This may not be very feasible, but the callup should at least provide the impetus for a more objective approach and a more penetrating investigation than has been developed in the past.

I suggest that Congress study the Reserve training programs to determine if they really accomplish their purpose and are worth the time and money devoted to them. I know of no one in the Reserve who considers the weekly meetings worth while. It is an opportunity for some to make extra money, but does it improve the readiness or abilities of the soldiers? Most of the time is spent administering the unit's own existence and in hearing lectures or watching films that were seen or heard while the men were on active duty. Furthermore there is no opportunity during these meetings for men to stay in top physical condition.

There is a tremendous difference between the appearance the Reserve training program gives on paper and the realities. It should be examined closely. I don't mean to say that the time couldn't be used effectively. I am suggesting that in most cases it is not. This may well be the fault, not of the system, but of the people participating in it; admittedly the abuses of a program should not automatically result in the abolition of the program. But if in reality the program is unproductive, then some curtailment or reform is in order.

I am afraid that I have raised more questions than I have answered, and have failed to offer any specific solutions. Unfortunately, the real issues at stake are large and complex; if they have any solution at all they must be based on careful study. I believe that Congress should conduct such a study and that it should be done thoroughly and realistically. I hope that you will do everything possible to bring about an early release of the reservists, but of even more importance is the advocacy of congressional responsibility in this whole area. Congress can do an honest appraisal and insure better manpower policies, and it can and should make it possible for people to speak forthrightly on this subject without having their patriotism placed in question.

Cordially yours,

RICHARD RAVITCH.

Caterpillar To Stress Foreign Sales—They Were 46 Percent of 1961 Total

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, with the upcoming consideration of adjustments in tariffs and our overall foreign trade policy, I believe it very appropriate to include in the RECORD at this point an article appearing in the February 14 issue of the Wall Street Journal concerning the importance of foreign sales to the Caterpillar Tractor Co., the largest industry in my congressional district. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the article be reprinted at this point:

CATERPILLAR TO STRESS FOREIGN SALES—THEY WERE 46 PERCENT OF 1961 TOTAL

(By a Wall Street Journal staff reporter)

NEW YORK.—Caterpillar Tractor Co., Peoria, Ill., is placing a heavier emphasis on foreign operations as a source of increased earnings and sales.

W. H. Franklin, vice president, told the New York Society of Security Analysts the company will be increasing expenditures abroad in the years ahead while holding spending for facilities in this country level.

He listed several reasons for doing this: It is a defense against the inflationary spiral of U.S. wage boosts which may, he said, price domestic goods out of export markets; the growing world need for construction equipment for roads and water resource developments, and the growth of Caterpillar competition in such countries as Italy, West Germany, and Japan.

FOREIGN SALES TO EXCEED DOMESTIC

"In the very near future," he said, "foreign sales will account for over 50 percent of the company's sales and go on up from there." Caterpillar has wholly owned subsidiaries in Great Britain, France, Brazil, and Australia. In foreign sales the company includes products it makes abroad—partly from parts shipped from the United States—as well as its exports. Caterpillar makes tractors, road graders, and diesel engines among other products.

Last year foreign sales accounted for 46 percent of the company's total sales of $734,317,505, which were the second highest in its history. In 1960 the foreign share was 48 percent.

Net income last year was a record $55,822,845, or $2.02 a share after preferred dividends. This year Mr. Franklin anticipates record sales and earnings. Its sales and earnings in January 1962 were at least 10 percent higher than January last year. New orders, however, have slowed a bit recently—largely because of the high volume of orders last October here and abroad placed in anticipation of a strike, Mr. Franklin believes.

The company was struck late last October, but the walkout lasted only 8 days at the main plant in Peoria before a settlement was reached.

NEED FOR WATER, ROADS CITED

Mr. Franklin said the long-term outlook is promising largely because of the growing water shortage in this country and Europe and the need for irrigation projects in other parts of the world. In addition he looks for more roadbuilding abroad, possibly up 10 percent this year.

He listed large dams being built in the United States and overseas. A $1 billion project of dams and irrigation canals in the Indus River Basin in west Pakistan, he said, will start this year and involve moving three times as much earth as did the construction of the Panama Canal.

On other matters, Mr. Franklin said the company will make further headway with its cost control program this year but not nearly as dramatic as from 1960 through 1961. Sales increased almost $20 million from 1960 to 1961 although average employment dropped from 40,600 to 35,800, he said.

This year the company's capital expenditures, mostly for new equipment, will amount to about $30 million, up from $27.8 million in 1961 but a drop from $53 million in 1960.

Mr. Franklin also said: "We see no reason to increase our prices right now. We can't afford to price ourselves out of the export market." He added: "If steel prices rose, we'd have to take a second look."

The Agricultural Conservation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to revise and extend my remarks to include House Concurrent Resolution 22 adopted by the Kansas State Legislature, which has been forwarded to me by the Honorable Paul R. Shanahan, secretary of state, Topeka, Kans., memorializing the Congress of the United States in regard to legislation pertaining to the agricultural conservation program. As conservation is such an important problem, I felt my colleagues would like to have the benefit of the contents of this resolution:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 22

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States in regard to legislation pertaining to the agricultural conservation program

Whereas the ever-increasing demands for effective soil and water conservation impose a major responsibility on Kansas farmers; and

Whereas watershed development in the State of Kansas involves accelerated conservation work; and

Whereas the farmers of Kansas have demonstrated a willingness to spend more of their own time and money for conservation of soil and water in the public interest; and

Whereas, for the past 14 years the Federal appropriation for agricultural conservation work on a cost-sharing basis has remained at $250 million; and

Whereas before the end of the year 1961 more than 60 counties in the State of Kansas were using advance allocations of funds appropriated for the year 1962; and

Whereas in the State of Kansas these funds have consistently been used for fundamental and permanent conservation activities such as terraces, waterways, restoration of native grasses and other projects and practices of enduring value; and

Whereas some States do not use their full allocation of the Federal funds, commonly known as agricultural conservation program money: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives of the State of Kansas, the senate concurring therein, That we respectfully urge and request the Congrses of the United States to maintain the appropriation of agricultural conservation program funds at no less than $250 million per annum; be it further

Resolved, That we respectfully urge and request the Congress of the United States to amend the basic agricultural conservation program law so as to permit unused funds in any State to be reallocated to States which demonstrate a need for additional funds for permanent conservation work; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the vice president of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, the chairmen of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Kansas delegation in the Congress of the United States.

Big Step for Federal Bureaucracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to note that some of our keen political analysts are expressing concern over the ramifications of the President's recommendation for a new Federal Department of Urban Affairs.

Mr. Gould Lincoln, whose column "The Political Mill" appears in the Washington Star, is of the opinion that taxpayers should take a second look at the proposal.

His column on the subject follows:

BIG STEP FOR FEDERAL BUREAUCRACY

The creation of a new Federal Department of Urban Affairs, proposed by President Kennedy, has become a prime issue between the Republican and Democratic Parties. President Kennedy has made it an issue between himself and Governor Rockefeller of New York. But most important, it has become an issue between those citizens who believe in a huge Federal bureaucracy—located in the National Capital and dominated by the President (whoever he happens to be) and the political party to which the President happens to belong—and those citizens who stick to the original concept of the U.S. Government, looking to State and local government. It is not a minor issue, nor should it be a partisan political issue. Nor should such a department be created. While it starts—according to the President's plan—merely as a glorified housing agency, who believes that, once created, the department will not be taking over many of the reponsibilities of metropolitan areas, and smaller areas, throughout the country?

Mayor Wagner of New York, who has become a protege of the Kennedy administration, appeared as witness before the House Government Operations Committee and strongly urged establishment of the department. In reply to a question by Republican Representative MORSE of Massachusetts as to the scope of the department, Mr. Wagner said: "You never get everything you'd like to see. Some day we may have to expand the department's activities. But this is a step in the right direction." Could there be better testimony as to the plans for having city affairs, big and little, taken into the hands of a Federal bureaucracy?

Judging from the many criticisms of Mayor Wagner's first 8 years (particularly the second 4) as chief executive of New York City, Mr. Wagner would like to dump some of his burdens into the lap of the Federal Government. An so would mayors of some other large cities. But that does not mean such a course would in the end be better for the cities or for their citizens.

ROCKEFELLER'S CHARGE

Governor Rockefeller is in his fourth year as chief executive of the Empire State, containing the country's most populous city, as well as many other large municipalities. Speaking in Des Moines February 1, Governor Rockefeller insisted that there was political "fakery" in the President's new Urban Affairs Department proposal, and also rapped the President for announcing that he intended to appoint Robert C. Weaver, a Negro, to head the proposed Urban Affairs Department. This announcement by the President, when replying to a question at a press conference, has been seized upon by the Republicans, including Governor Rockefeller, as presidential politics, designed to make the issue a racial one, put the GOP in a hole, and gain votes. The Governor also jabbed at the Kennedys when he said the President had been able immediately to find a place in his Cabinet for his brother Bob, but not for Bob Weaver.

The President, also at his press conference, accused Governor Rockefeller of having recommended to former President Eisenhower the establishment of an Urban Affairs Department—and of now having turned his back on the proposal, in order to curry favor with the rightwing Republicans. It happens, however, that the Governor went along with the idea of a new city Federal department before he became Governor of New York, and as an executive learned more about the responsibilities of both State and local governments. Further, it is no crime for a government officer to change his mind—as President Kennedy has about strategic stockpiling by the Government. When he was a Senator, his views were favorable to that and even since he became President he has turned a deaf ear to protests made by Representative HALL, Missouri Republican, and others against the size and dollar value of the stockpile.

CHANCES IN CONGRESS

The administration is worried lest the President's order setting up the new Department be vetoed by one or both Houses of Congress. Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democratic leader of the Senate, has announced he will move to bring before the Senate, a resolution dealing with the President's order next Monday. The speedier the action, the less opportunity for rising opposition, and if the order can survive a Senate vote, it may have a better chance than it has been given in the House. The vote in the Senate may be close—but if four or five Republicans go along with the administration on this issue—the chances are the veto will fail in that body. Since such an issue must be voted on within 10 hours after it is taken up, it seems likely that Senator MANSFIELD believes he has the votes.

Obviously, the administration is relying on Senators and Representatives hailing from States and districts with big metropolitan areas to support the Urban Affairs Department program. These are the States and districts which made it possible for President Kennedy to squeak through to a White House victory in 1960. And obviously the Kennedy administration believes it will win again in those States and districts whether the President's present order is defeated or is upheld in the congressional votes. It pays no heed to the warnings of Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD of Virginia, Democrat and chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, that, once established, this new Department will be spending many billions more of the taxpayers' dollar. But the taxpayers in cities as well as in the country, should take a look.

David Ben-Gurion Expresses Views on State of World in 1987

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, there are many points of view being expressed as to our future relationship with the Soviet Union. I think those of

David Ben-Gurion, who is the leader of a key nation both within the United Nations and the free world, are important. Albeit I find myself in some disagreement with him, I believe his views ought to be thoughtfully considered.

Mr. Ben-Gurion expresses his thoughts on what the world will be like in 1987 in a statement which appeared in the January 16, 1962, issue of Look magazine. So that each Member of Congress may have an opportunity to peruse the statement, I ask permission to have it printed in the appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The statement follows:

DAVID BEN-GURION EXPRESSES VIEWS ON STATE OF WORLD IN 1987

David Ben-Gurion (Prime Minister of Israel): "The image of the world in 1987 as traced in my imagination: The cold war will be a thing of the past. Internal pressure of the constantly growing intelligentsia in Russia for more freedom and the pressure of the masses for raising their living standards may lead to a gradual democratization of the Soviet Union. On the other hand, the increasing influence of the workers and farmers, and the rising political importance of men of science, may transform the United States into a welfare state with a planned economy. Western and Eastern Europe will become a federation of autonomous states having a socialist and democratic regime. With the exception of the U.S.S.R. as a federated Eurasian state, all other continents will become united in a world alliance, at whose disposal will be an international police force. All armies will be abolished, and there will be no more wars. In Jerusalem, the United Nations (a truly United Nations) will build a shrine of the prophets to serve the federated union of all continents; this will be the seat of the supreme court of mankind, to settle all controversies among the federated continents, as prophesied by Isaiah. Higher education will be the right of every person in the world. A pill to prevent pregnancy will slow down the explosive natural increase in China and India. And by 1987, the average lifespan of man will reach 100 years."

Fort Morgan Teenagers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, whenever I go to the city of Fort Morgan in my State of Colorado I am impressed with the initiative, imagination, and energy of its young people.

They are a lively, public-spirited group of youngsters; a credit to Colorado and to our country.

In Fort Morgan, the young people organized 15 years ago an organization called the Junior Conservation Club.

Its purpose has been to educate young people in resource management fundamentals.

Today the Junior Conservation Club of Fort Morgan boasts a membership of 200 and its work in conservation is known and heralded all over the State.

Last November a newspaper on the Western Slope of Colorado featured a story on the Fort Morgan Junior Conservation Club, and I ask unanimous consent that this article, from the November 23, 1961, issue of the Western Slope Advertiser in Grand Junction, Colo., entitled "Morgan Junior Conservation Story" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORGAN JUNIOR CONSERVATION STORY

The Fort Morgan (Colo.) Junior Conservation Club has pioneered a relatively new and workable method of educating youth in resource management fundamentals. It was originated in 1946 and has become a working success largely through three vital factors: vigorous adult sponsorship; a student incentive system; and the inexhaustible appeal of outdoor activities.

In the beginning there were only 15 boys in the club, today the membership averages 200 members each year. A regular conservation class is taught each day to all seventh grade boys and girls with full credit received. The class is called natural science.

The club's financial status is rather unique. The major problem concerning money is that of teaching the youngsters to avoid taking money on a gratis basis. The clubs average income is $500 a year. The main sources include membership dues ($1), profit derived from the sale of posting signs, emblems, and decals, sponsorship of shows and the selling of "chamber of commerce type" plaques. In addition they sell subscriptions to Colorado Outdoors, official magazine of the Colorado Game and Fish Department. For each subscription they sell they are permitted to retain 10 cents. To date they have sold some 550 subscriptions. For a number of years the club has collected deer and elk hides, and this year to date they have collected approximately 200 hides.

Two movies, 16 millimeters, in color and sound, are being produced of the Morgan Junior Conservation Club. One is being made by the Colorado Game and Fish Department and the second one by the club itself.

The game and fish department movie is nearing completion and is a story-type show of the club, and will run 15 minutes. The club's movie will be approximately 30 minutes and will show the organization and activities of the Morgan Club.

Herb Hockstrasser, club sponser, reports that a 16-millimeter color film with background music narration is quite expensive to produce. He said "the kids have been raising money for the past 2 years in various ways, to help pay the cost of the production. The National Wildlife Federation provided $1,000 toward the production of the movie. When it is finished the movie will probably be distributed by the Federation." Hockstrasser expressed hope of finishing the movie within the next year.

The club will hold its 11th annual father-son-daughter banquet in the spring. Awards are presented at the banquet to outstanding club members. The Ford and Chevrolet car dealers in Fort Morgan each provide a $100 saving bond for these awards. Last year's main speaker at the banquet was Governor McNichols. Approximately 250 attended the banquet.

The Morgan Junior Conservation Club has received national recognition in magazines and books. It has received six national awards, also several State and local awards. Members have kept a very complete scrapbook of writeups in newspapers, magazines, radio programs, letters received, and pictures of club activities. This gives them a complete history of the club.

Among the numerous activities of the club is the banding of doves in cooperation with the Fish and Wildlife Service, they take two fieldtrips each year, one to Denver and the other to Estes Park, attend various meetings about the State to become better informed on various subjects. For National Wildlife Week the juniors receive all the material for the State of Colorado. They sort and pack the material for mailing to over 150 clubs, newspapers, and radio stations. Also they have the Governor sign a proclamation for the State of Colorado, and their local mayor for Fort Morgan.

At Christmastime for many years the members have picked up all the discarded trees in the town and hauled them to the country. Here they place them in gullies to provide wildlife habitat and also help control erosion. The ranchers in the area like this project so much they have even offered to buy the trees. In the spring the club supplies the manpower to plant from 1,000 to 1,500 trees on some ranch to provide a windbreak or shelter belt. This is done in cooperation with the soil conservation agency and the Colorado Game and Fish Department.

In the junior high school the club has its own room. Actually it is more like a museum, with over 200 mounted animals, birds, fish, and tanned skins they have collected. Among the reading material in the room are many fine books and magazines. The room boasts a very fine Indian relic collection, rock collection, fish aquariums, their own movie and slide projectors, old guns, and leather tooling equipment. One of their skins is a skin of a wolf 7 feet long. This was given to them by the Fish and Wildlife Service in Alaska.

Hockstrasser said the club receives very fine support and in reality has been a guinea pig for the Colorado Game and Fish Department and the National Wildlife Federation. Many conservation agencies provide materials for the club to use. The Morgan Junior Conservation Club is a charter affiliate of the Colorado Wildlife Federation and is also an affiliate of the National Wildlife Federation.

Hockstrasser sums up his enthusiasm for the club this way: "A junior club provides opportunities to teach cooperation, respect, appreciation, and honesty. In our club den we have several thousand dollars worth of equipment and materials and over the years not one item has disappeared. In fact, we keep a money jar on the instructor's desk with anywhere from $5 to $50 in it at all times and the kids make their own change when purchasing items."

He continued, "that a good junior club can be the making of a fine adult club in a community providing the adults will cooperate with the juniors. The juniors can and will carry out most programs better than adults for the obvious reasons of having more time, energy, and interest. Individuals and organizations in a great majority of cases are willing and eager to support a junior group that is striving to carry out a program." He added, "I hope to see many more junior clubs in Colorado in the future and conservation classes being taught in more schools."

Grassroots Support for Proposed Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD,

an article written by Mr. Don Kendall, agricultural expert of the Hutchinson News, regarding the support being expressed by farm groups for the President's farm proposals.

ALPHABET FARM PLAN GETS GRASSROOTS BACKING

(By Don Kendall)

Grassroots support for President Kennedy's A-B-C-D farm program gained momentum here late Monday when the giant Farmers Cooperative Commission Co. expressed general endorsement of the plan. The letters stand for abundance, balance, conservation, and development.

J. H. Dean, Farmers Co-op general manager, said his company is in agreement with the principles of Kennedy's farm program, which was announced last week, as long as it will result in maintenance of present farm income.

Farmers Co-op, which is a grain marketing organization for 50,000 southwest Kansas farmers, joins Kansas Farmers Union, and Kansas Association of Wheat Growers in endorsement of the Kennedy farm program.

"Although we did not have time to study the proposal in detail, especially those details which are involved in wheat marketing and the effect of these on other segments of the wheat industry," Dean said, "we have noted with interest many features which we feel will benefit producers."

The Kennedy plan for what calls for further cuts in acreage allotments plus a bushel control plan for selling wheat produced each year. It is a long-range program which also entails cropland retirement and payments to farmers for taking this land out of production.

The co-op's alinement leaves only the Kansas Farm Bureau among the State's major farm groups, in direct opposition.

Walter Peirce, Reno County farmer and president of KFB, pointed out his organization's policy called for a voluntary land retirement program and removal of all production controls.

"The Farm Bureau, Peirce said, "is in favor of many facets of a farm program backed by other groups, such as expansion of markets, conservation programs, and others.

"But," Peirce said, "Farm Bureau cannot condone a program, which leaves farmers with little choice in deciding what to do.

"We've been unhappy about the program in recent years, and now this is worse," Peirce said.

Farm Bureau is cooncerned that farmers will not be able to maintain their current incomes. "One factor," Peirce pointed out, "is Kennedy's provision for direct payments to farmers for land taken out of production."

Peirce said, "this, of course, will cost money" and he doesn't think urban Congressmen are "ready to approve a measure which will pay farmers for idle land so they can maintain their incomes."

A decade ago Farm Bureau supported get-tough farm legislation designed to head off the current farm problem. "But," Peirce said, "this was impossible to carry out politically." "And," he said, "there is little reason to believe it can be done now.

"The Farm Bureau plan," Peirce said, "would let a farmer grow whatever he wants, and allow voluntary land retirement, take care of extra production in a natural, systematic plan."

The President has referred to his long-range farm program as an "A-B-C-D" plan, a label which critics no doubt will define derogatorially as "Abracadabra," the magic word of stage magicians.

It is hailed as the first long-range, comprehensive piece of farm legislation in a dozen years and encompasses all farm problems, both commodity and humanitarian.

BUSHEL CONTROLS

As far as veteran observers can recall, it is the first suggested by a President which uses bushel controls as a tool in solving the grain surplus problem.

Kennedy's proposal for wheat is tough. It seeks a cut in acreage allotments plus controls on bushels farmers can sell.

It is tied in with other New Frontier programs on feed grains. Cross-compliance, a topic for 20 years, will be a reality if Kennedy's bill is approved.

This means that to qualify for any price supports, a farmer must cooperate in all other Government programs affecting crops he raises. In other words, if a farmer raises milo, he'll have to cooperate in the wheat program, too, if he wants Government supports on his milo—and vice versa.

For years the Nation's wheat allotment was 55 million acres. That was roughly the acreage grown last harvest. Last year Kennedy sliced this total allotment by 10 percent for the 1962 crop.

His new program will cut it another 10 percent. So for the 1963 wheat crop the total U.S. allotment will be 20 percent below that for 1961.

As the Kennedy proposal stands, each year the total requirements of wheat will be determined. For example, in 1963 the United States will need about 1¼ billion bushels of wheat to meet all requirements in the United States and all oversea commitments.

The Government owns a couple of billion bushels of wheat now in storage—this is the "surplus."

Each year the Government will take 150 million bushels or so out of its own stocks to help meet the annual requirement of 1¼ billion bushels. The remaining 1.1 billion bushels will be produced by farmers.

Allowing 25 bushels an acre yield, only 44 million acres of wheat would be needed to produce all that's necessary for 1 year.

This is why Kennedy wants to cut acreage. The old 55-million-acre allotment would be too much.

Farmers would be allowed price supports only on that portion of their wheat crop needed to meet that year's need. Any extra would have to be sold at going market prices or stored for sale during a crop failure.

Putting this down to scoop shovel height is a bit precarious right now, but here's the way it looks for a small wheat farmer:

Suppose Old John has had a 100-acre wheat allotment. Last year he was notified that his 1962 allotment would be about 90 acres—as result of the 10-percent cut in national acreage.

Now, if Kennedy's program is approved. Old John's going to lose some more allotment, probably nearly 10 more acres. So, if he raised 100 acres in 1961, he'll be raising 80 acres for 1963.

For the 20 acres of "diversion"—land taken out of production, sort of a polite way of saying "soil bank"—John will be paid an acreage rate, or rent, by the Government. This would be similar to the "emergency" land-retirement plan in effect right now for both milo and wheat.

MAJOR POINT

This is a major point for farm legislators. If the farmer can be guaranteed enough payment for idle acres, so Old John will have about the same money coming in as he has been getting, they'll look on the Kennedy plan with increasing favor.

There is another provision in the Kennedy plan. There are allotment and marketing controls on feed grains, too. So, if Old John wants, he'll be permitted to plant all his permitted acreage in wheat or milo—as long as he doesn't exceed the total of the two.

Suppose the rain comes down at the right time along in early September and it has the makings of a fine wheat year. Old John could plant his 30-acre milo allotment and his 80-acre wheat allotment all in wheat.

This would give him 110 acres of wheat. But he couldn't plant any milo the next spring. And Old John only could get price supports on his normal yield off his 80-acre wheat allotment.

The "extra" wheat could be sold on the open market (probably at a feed grain price of around $1.40 a bushel), or he could store his excess and market it later if the rains don't continue.

This is hailed as a flexible choice the farmer would have in shifting crops from one program to another.

There's a lot of wheat, chaff, and corn to be shoveled back in Washington before Kennedy's farm program sees more daylight.

Except for the cut in allotments, the program is surprisingly close to what most Kansas farm groups have been advocating for years.

Objection to Creation of New Department of Urban Affairs and Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the tide of battle rages back and forth in an effort to determine whether or not a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing is an ingredient essential to the American society.

Mr. Mitchell Cope, State Representative of the Maine Home Builders Association, offers some poignant views in behalf of his organization, and I commend these to the attention of my colleagues:

OBJECTION TO CREATION OF NEW DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND HOUSING

(A statement by Mitchell Cope)

The Maine Home Builders Association continues to oppose the proposal of the present administration to create by Executive order under the authority of a reorganization plan, a new Department of Government called the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. Here are additional reasons:

1. It usurps rights and responsibilities of local self-government which have been relegated to the various States and municipalities, by-passing State governments altogether and interfering in internal municipal affairs. This embodies a historic change in our entire concept of government, allocating more and more power and control over municipal and State affairs to the Federal Government. It is not in the best interests of the people of this country or of the State of Maine.

2. Already well represented at the Federal level are the populations of cities and their problems through the activities of the Departments of Labor, Commerce, Agriculture, Health, Education and Welfare, and the many independent Federal agencies including the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Creation of the new Department founded to aid people because of their location and not because of their needs is a dangerous and divisive departure from our tradition and governmental history.

3. Lack of coordination will continue despite all claims for the new Department. Obviously the Federal public works, highway and public roads programs, the Federal Home Loan Bank System and veterans housing programs, the Federal airport and airway systems programs, and a good many

others lie completely outside the proposed jurisdiction of the new Department.

4. Confused thinking and lack of clear direction brand the announced plan for the new Department as an ill-conceived, pragmatic, and opportunistic step to be taken at public expense. By contrast the Hoover Commission said that executive departments should have "well-defined, cohesive groupings of activities," and should "provide for greater efficiency and economy in Government." Yet no administration spokesman has stated clearly how the new Department will operate, what the functions of the three Assistant Secretaries will be, how the several agencies and programs involved will be realined or what will be the future scope of the new Department's activities—except that they will be higher.

5. A far better solution would be a Bureau of Urban Affairs, comparable to the Bureau of the Budget and set up as a special function of the President. Such a Bureau would have the ability to coordinate properly all Federal functions and give a stronger "voice" to the programs of importance to cities. It would also have the jurisdiction, which the proposed Department does not have, to carry out fully and realistically an efficient program of urban research and planning.

Blurring a Line at the College Level

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor which raises a very important point concerning the program to assist higher education, currently before the Congress.

This article touches on a very important factor in this program which should be considered by all of the Members before they make their final vote.

BLURRING A LINE AT THE COLLEGE LEVEL

The Kennedy administration apparently has decided after last year's fight that it is not wise to try to force through Congress at this session a comprehensive bill for Federal aid to education.

Yet the bill for financial assistance to colleges which has passed the House of Representatives distinctly raises the question on which last year's general bill foundered—use of taxpayers' money for the benefit of sectarian religious institutions contrary to the rule of separation of church and state.

The bill, if enacted, would permit grants of Federal funds up to one-third of the cost of construction projects for privately controlled as well as public institutions of higher learning. In addition, it would provide low-interest 50-year loans for up to three-fourths of the cost of such buildings.

It may well be that more Protestant church colleges than others would qualify for subsidy under this measure. But the impulsion for including private schools has come from Roman Catholic sources. If Protestant colleges participated it would be in detriment to their own scruples or in self-defense.

The executive director of Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State has accurately declared that use of Federal funds to build facilities at church colleges would be "official aid to religion of a kind that has been prohibited by the U.S. Constitution." This statement is based on clear interpretations by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Members of Congress are under oath to support the Constitution of the United States (which should include the first amendment) the same as members of the judiciary.

Top Red Says Coexistence Impossible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, total domination of the affairs of men is the singular goal of communism. We have been told by a top Communist, Mikhail Suslov, that coexistence with communism either militarily, economically, or philosophically is impossible. Suslov's comments in this regard are reported in an Associated Press dispatch from Moscow which appeared in the February 5, 1962, issue of the Washington Evening Star.

In a speech delivered January 30 last, Suslov asked:

Can we consider that peaceful coexistence exists in the sphere of ideology?

His answer:

Of course not.

He went on to say that remnants of capitalism in Russia are guilty of sponging, stealing, bribery, conducting hooliganism and bureaucratism, and promoting religious ideology.

We all know that capitalists have made mistakes, but capitalism is a far better economic system than that enunciated by the Marxists. Through the years our Nation has rejected Socialist and Communist ideas, and we have no intention of going back to the economic feudalism which these ideas promote.

In light of Suslov's revealing comments, it is imperative that this Congress pass House Joint Resolution 444 by Congressman DONALD BRUCE, which declares that we intend to achieve complete victory over international communism. Passage of this resolution would put Communists on notice that we mean business.

I include the AP dispatch in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Evening Star, Feb. 5, 1962]

COEXISTENCE CALLED IMPOSSIBLE BY TOP RED

MOSCOW, February 5.—Soviet communism has sharpened its battle of ideas with the West.

Pravda published a long speech yesterday by Mikhail Suslov, top party theoretician, declaring that in the realm of ideology peaceful coexistence with the West is impossible.

The speech was made January 30 before directors and professors of social science institutions. It opened a drive to lead the country to more active acceptance of doctrines outlined at last October 22 party congress.

Nikita Khrushchev himself, while a professed advocate of peaceful coexistence on the practical plane, has often pressed the idea that war on the ideological side must continue.

The Suslov speech appeared to be a direct answer to President Kennedy's suggestion in his Izvestia interview last year that trouble in the world is caused by the active preaching and pressure of the advance of communism.

ASSAILS CAPITALISTS

"Can we consider that peaceful coexistence exists in the sphere of ideology?" Mr. Suslov asked. "Of course not. Among some people in the U.S.S.R. still exist remnants of capitalism. They sponge, steal, bribe, conduct hooliganism, bueaucraticism, promote religious ideology.

"Is the peaceful coexistence of our Socialist ideology with such phenomena possible?

"Impossible. Impossible without betrayal of the interests of communism.

"What does the bourgeois ideology consist of?

"It is vicious anticommunism, a propaganda of hatred toward communism, shameless slander of socialism, propaganda of military aggression, ideological defense of a system of hired slavery and colonialist enslavement.

"Is some sort of conciliation possible, at least temporarily, with that ideology?"

CALLED UNTHINKABLE

"It is impossible and unthinkable. This would amount to ideological disarmament for Communists. * * *

"Peaceful coexistence means giving up war, the solution of outstanding questions between states through negotiations. * * * Finally peaceful coexistence is the economic competition of states."

"With bourgeois ideology," Mr. Suslov went on, "we must conduct a resolute struggle."

"Communist scholars," he asserted, "must lay bare the aggressive policy of the imperialist countries and their financial-industrial oligarchies, the activity of military blocs. Of particular importance is the analysis of the home and foreign policy of American imperialism—the main stronghold of international reaction."

In the published portions of his speech—and some were omitted—Mr. Suslov made no mention of Communist China.

Clear the Urban Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, the question of the approval of a Cabinet level Department of Urban Affairs and Housing is one which has recently stirred up considerable heat and will undoubtedly continue to do so until it is passed upon by the Congress. The Congress should render its decision on objective findings and not by the injection of side issues. A very good editorial on this subject appeared in The Morning Call, a newspaper of Allentown, Pa., on February 6, 1962. Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include the said editorial as follows:

URBAN AFFAIRS

Neither the President nor those who oppose his plan to establish a Cabinet level Department of Urban Affairs and Housing find it difficult to marshal arguments to support their respective points of view.

In a relatively few years, this Nation has passed from a rural to an urban way of life.

More than two-thirds of its people now live in the vast metropolitan complexes and this figure is multiplying as the population explosion continues. They pay and will continue to pay by far the highest percentage of taxes imposed by Federal and State governments.

The President contends that those who live and work in these urban centers are entitled to as much voice in the highest councils of the executive echelon of Government as the farmers have in the Department of Agriculture. Within the sprawling megalopolis stretching along the eastern seaboard from Massachusetts to Virginia are countless evidences that not all of their problems are limited by municipal or State boundaries.

Opponents quickly note that although the Department of Agriculture spends $6 billion a year, it is no closer to solving the Nation's farm problems than it was 30 years ago. They question whether the new Department would do any better for the metropolitan areas.

For the present, Mr. Kennedy proposes only to merge existing Federal agencies concerned with housing, urban renewal and other community problems in which the National Government already is active. Admittedly, however, it could quickly lend a hand with such matters as transportation, juvenile delinquency and broad urban planning. The pattern for expanding governmental bureaucracies and increasing their budgets long has been established.

This, say the opponents, is where their greatest fears are centered. In spite of the President's assurances that the rights of States will not be abridged, they see more control of local government centered in Washington. The bait would be handouts to promote more local spending. Those with the greatest political influence in Washington would receive the greatest benefits, but all would share the Federal Government's costs.

The President insists the new Department will help the States assume additional leadership in future dealings with the problems of their urban areas. It would maintain close working and consultative relationships with them. Those who support him argue that municipalities are turning to Washington for help and guidance only because they have been neglected by their own States. This, they are certain, will continue as long as legislatures are dominated by rural representatives who refuse to admit that the urban problem is their problem too.

But, say the opponents, the Government's own record of city administration is none too good. Washington has been under Federal control since its founding. Its own reports show it is plagued with slums, delinquency, crime, poor schools and transportation problems as much as any other metropolitan area.

Both proponents and opponents must agree the needs of the Nation's cities and the densely populated urban areas mushrooming around them cannot be denied. The job to be done has been admitted by both Republicans and Democrats in their platform planks and their campaign oratory.

Municipalities and State governments have admitted it too. Allentown and Bethlehem are among those that have asked for and received substantial Federal help toward solving them. Whenever such help is given strings are bound to be attached.

The present job of Congress is not to determine the specific need or to make a political football of it. The immediate task is to make certain the strings the President proposes will not become ropes to pull every city hall in the Nation to Washington. The Capital is crowded enough as it is.

Big Government at Its Worst

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Mitchell County Press and Osage News, Osage, Iowa, expresses vigorous opposition to the Kennedy administration's proposal to provide medical care for the aged under the social security system. I commend the editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

This seems to be "take off on the administration" week here at the Press-News. Included among the legislation due for debate in Washington is the administration's proposal to finance a Federal health program for the aged through social security.

Just how far are we going to go in this country? Toss out your fears of socialism, of communism, of "veering to the left." These are scare words, naughty labels used by all of those who want no upsetting of the status quo. What we are doing, however, is letting "Big Daddy" get out of hand.

The Government ought to do many things for the citizens and taxpayers of the Nation. Controlling the use of interstate highways, policing the television airwaves, grading meat, delivering the mail, scores and scores of other enterprises come under the heading of "doing for people that which the people cannot do for themselves."

Those who argue that some of the Government's proposals are "stifling the individual's initiative," however, are entirely correct. We see evidence mounting all about us, and we see efforts at promoting a minimum of initiative (such as at Newburgh, N.Y.) greeted by cries of "feudalism," "violation of civil rights," and worse.

It is all very well and good to talk about charity, Christian virtues, helping your fellow man, ad nauseum, but let us start making sure that our fellow man first of all needs that help and, second, that he really deserves it.

Social security taxes are going up to 9 percent within the next few years and if those of us who are in the young or middle-aged category live long enough, we are going to have a nice tidy sum awaiting us someday. If inflation hasn't eaten it all up beforehand.

It is our belief that social security taxes at 6¼ percent have become a burdensome tax. It is our belief that we have gone far enough.

Now the Great White Father is proposing that we add health insurance features to the social security program. The aged need help, there is no denying it. But the King-Anderson bill does not provide this help. It will take care of less than one-fourth of the total average cost of medical bills for persons over 65.

The Government says: those of you who are covered by old-age, survivors and disability insurance and the railroad retirement program are going to be covered by this new program, whether you need it or not and regardless of what program you or your employer may have designed for your later protection.

This is what is so morally wrong with programs of this nature. To tax someone for the future care and welfare of someone else goes against the grain. To tax me against my will to provide care that intelligence and foresight of my own can provide is totally wrong. To say that "you shall have it, whether you need it or not" is big government at its worst.

The emotional and woolly-headed "do-gooders" are saying that a means test is degrading. The heck it is. Do those boys and girls in college on scholarship object to such a test? Do we refuse to aid the Community Chest, the Red Cross, the Cancer Society because much of the work of these organizations is devoted only to those who are eligible?

There is no shame in needing help. When society cannot help, the Government should step in. But the Government should not, and must not, make all of us "wards" of its beneficence. Jack Kennedy and Abraham Ribicoff should know better.

Time May Run Out for Ngo in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Talk of Military Coup—Time May Run Out for Ngo in Vietnam," by Keyes Beech, published in the Washington Post yesterday.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TALK OF MILITARY COUP—TIME MAY RUN OUT FOR NGO IN VIETNAM

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, February 13.—President Ngo Dinh Diem's days as ruler of Communist-threatened South Vietnam may be numbered.

Talk of a Korean-style military coup to oust the 61-year-old Mandarin-born strongman will not die.

What gives this talk credibility is that, despite some marked differences, the situation here bears a strong resemblance to events leading up to the military takeover in Korea last year.

Inevitably, American officials here have been forced to ask themselves the question, "Can we win with President Ngo?" At the same time they are trying to win with Ngo because he is, after all, the Government.

POSITION HAS DETERIORATED

There is little doubt that Ngo's personal power position has deteriorated in the last 3 months.

His own Cabinet ministers criticize him freely behind his back. Dozens have deserted him in the last year. Former defenders and apologists have turned into sharp critics.

One American, formerly close to Ngo, returned to Saigon after an absence of 2 years and was completely disillusioned. He found that of 100 prominent Vietnamese who formerly supported Ngo only 4 still did and 2 of them had doubts.

Standards of government administration, he found, have declined steadily in the last 5 years.

The most telling criticism of Ngo is not that he is undemocratic, which he is, or that all power is centralized in his hands, which it is.

UNSUITED TO EMERGENCY

Rather it is that he simply doesn't get things done down at the grassroots where getting things done counts most.

"President Ngo's whole concept of government is completely unsuited to the emergency this country faces," said another American with long experience here. "Personal loyalty is the only thing that counts with him—not ability."

"He sits and philosophizes for hours instead of getting out and getting things done," complained another critic. "He cannot have it both ways. If he is going to have the power he must use it."

Vietnamese who work for Ngo are startlingly candid in their criticism.

LOSS IN POPULARITY

"There isn't a single American here who really believes down in his heart that you can win with Ngo," said one Vietnamese. "Sure, he has made concessions to the United States under pressure. But those concessions were carefully considered and you will see in the end there has been no fundamental change."

"I can remember when crowds used to carry the President around on their backs when he appeared in public," another Vietnamese said sadly. "Today that would be unthinkable."

Ngo's finest hour was in 1955, 9 months after becoming Premier in the wake of the French collapse in Indochina.

In defiance of the American Embassy and the French, who were still here, Ngo courageously cracked down on the notorious Binh Xuyen gangster sect and its private army. From there he went on to crush two other sects and consolidate his hold on the country.

LACKS DARING NOW

He has never since shown the same daring and imagination in his fight with the Communists, a much more formidable enemy.

An abortive paratroop revolt against the President in November 1960 probably would have succeeded if its leaders had not attempted to bargain with Ngo.

The young officers who engineer the next coup, if it comes, are not likely to make the same mistake.

Some observers fear the Communists might turn a coup attempt to their advantage. Others argue that a military junta replacing Ngo would be equally anti-Communist and a lot more effective.

A Sound Solution to Unemployment Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, how to solve the unemployment problem confronting our Nation is an issue with which Congress must come to grips. This thorny problem is discussed in a column by David Lawrence which appeared in the February 20, 1961, issue of the Washington Evening Star. The conclusion to which Mr. Lawrence comes in his column is that the solution lies in a more intensified system of private enterprise, not in a system of state socialism.

During this election year, we can expect the collectivists among us to promise more and more Government handouts to the unemployed. It seems most appropriate for me to bring Mr. Lawrence's column to the attention of my colleagues in Congress at this time. I ask, therefore, that the column be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

TWO WAYS TO SOLVE JOB SHORTAGE—CLARIFYING OF ANTITRUST AND TAX LAWS URGED TO ENERGIZE PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

There's no harm in talking openly about a recession or a readjustment, but there's a good deal of harm in exaggerations by politicians. They sometimes seek only to blame the opposite party or else to develop an atmosphere that will push a panicky Congress into big spending programs.

What would really be most helpful and constructive would be a discussion that puts the whole economic situation in perspective.

If, for instance, unemployment is to be reduced and held to a 4-percent level, which is considered normal, it will be necessary to have a net growth of about 1,525,000 new jobs every year from now through 1965. This is based on official forecasts by the Department of Labor on the coming of age of new workers and the number retired each year.

In addition to this, even more jobs—possibly another 2,725,000 per year—will have to be created to take care of the persons who will be displaced by automation and increased productivity per man-hour or greater efficiency.

It is easy enough to bandy about figures on what the percentage of growth in national output should be. This is sometimes facetiously referred to as "growthmanship." But the problem of a needed growth to take care of an expanded population and an increase in consumer requirements is not going to be solved by a mere mathematical formula.

It can be solved in only one of two ways—by a regulated economy that eventually can only mean state socialism and bring on an imitation communism, or by an intensified system of private enterprise.

Unfortunately politics has produced a bad atmosphere for the private-enterprise system. The politician may not admit it but almost every solution he comes up with implies more and more Government controls or more and more Government spending. No recession or depression can be cured that way—at least, experience in the last half century points to failure after failure in that process.

What is desirable is a new emphasis on job creation. The profit system needs to be energized. While laws are necessary to curb improper use of economic power by both management and labor, the truth is that existing laws, no matter how well intentioned, contribute largely to confusion and actually retard national growth. Clarification of old laws, rather than enactment of new laws, is really needed.

Much, for instance, is made of the way antitrust laws are violated, but it takes an army of lawyers to advise what is or is not lawful. Many mistakes are made and many law violations are not detected. One businessman said privately the other day that if all the antitrust laws were strictly complied with today many companies would have to suspend operations to find out what to do, and that, since many would be in doubt, business would be injured to an incalculable extent. Expansion would be discouraged and monopoly increased.

The same thing is true with respect to the impact of the tax laws. They often discourage job creation. The problem of depreciation allowances on taxes is still unsolved because it is handled by politicians instead of economists.

America has been passing through a recession that shows some signs now of having reached bottom. Part of its damage was undoubtedly due to the unusually harsh winter weather, which has adversely affected some industries as well as retail sales and transportation. Some significant indicators now are on the optimistic side. But this should not encourage indifference to the solution of the problem of frequent recessions and readjustments in the national economy. It will do little good merely to cry out for more national growth. What is needed is a restudy of job creation.

For while the profit motive does provide an incentive to businessmen and investors, it is by no means the only motive for successful operation of modern business. There is a deep-seated desire to succeed in a given enterprise and to expand. Job creation is a natural consequence. Hence, to discourage job creation, as is done repeatedly by unwise legislation and by inaccurate and partisan interpretations of what has been called the business cycle, is to infect the Nation with a chronic ailment—recurring recessions.

Science has produced technological improvements in material things, but it has yet to come forward with satisfactory analyses of just what causes recessions and what really cures them. The profit system needs a stimulus that could create more jobs. This will come only when the operations and potentialities of the private enterprise system are better understood in Congress and in some academic circles whence comes much of the misguided pressure for a regulated, if not a totalitarian, economy.

Postal Rates on Second-Class Matter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD part of a letter from the general manager of the Rapid City (S. Dak.) Journal, which is the second largest daily newspaper in South Dakota and one that covers the entire western part of the State, and some of the eastern part of Wyoming.

In connection with the postal rate increase bill, there has been considerable talk about how much the taxpayers and the Post Office Department subsidize newspapers. I wish each Member would read part of this letter from Ed Lighter, the general manager, and see just exactly what the Post Office Department is doing, insofar as the Rapid City Journal is concerned. They collected $11,295.61 last year, and just about all they did was to sign a slip twice a day that the weight on the papers was correct. This is Government subsidy in reverse. The proposed bill would give the Department an additional $6,516 for signing their name twice a day.

The letter is as follows:

We have just completed a study for the National Editorial Association on the proposed postal increase of 1 cent per copy surcharge proposed in H.R. 7927, in connec-

tion with proposed second-class postage increases.

We find that our second-class postage cost for 1961 was $11,295.61. The proposed bill would increase it by $6,516 or 58 percent.

If the Postal Department did anything for us we would not mind paying for the service, but we have practically no service that is of any value to us, either time of departure or fast enough to do us any good.

At the Journal we tie and throw in mail sacks our mail subscriptions. We then take them to the post office, put them on the scales, weigh them and a clerk comes over and signs the slip we make out.

Then, we take them all back into our cars and haul them to the various post offices, place the bundles on the rural route tables or the city box tables, and all they do is put them in the boxes or leave them for the route drivers to pick up.

We drive about 750 miles a day 7 days a week to get our Journals to our subscribers when they want them.

Enclosed is copy of our circulation analysis which might give you a better picture of what we have to do to deliver the Journal. Of course, we have throwoff service all along these routes, too, and most of our papers are delivered by carriers in the 49 towns where we have carrier service.

Our percentage of mail is much lower than most papers our size because they do not drive as much as we do, nor do they cover such a large area.

Older Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, in recent years, the tendency has been for industry to refuse to employ older workers and to terminate older workers when a reduction in force becomes necessary. A worker who loses his job after the age of 45 finds it almost impossible to obtain employment with a new firm, even though his training, experience, skill and productive capacity may be at the peak of proficiency. At the age of 45 a worker's financial load is probably higher than ever before. At that age, his children are in the midst of their educational careers, and many promising young students in the scientific and professional fields are compelled to abandon college because their parents have lost their jobs. This is a loss not alone to the worker and his children but to America where the deficit in scientific graduate students is already alarming.

The problem is just as important with reference to workers who are approaching their 60th birthday. They are too young to retire and too old to find a new job. Yet, they may be burdened with mortgages on their homes, heavy hospital and medical expenses and other obligations peculiar to our elder citizens.

This is an acute national problem but one which is not easily solved by government. Congress has no constitutional power to compel employers to hire older workers or to retain older workers in their employ. Even if Congress had the power, a compulsory statute would be offensive to our sense of economic freedom and to the principles of the free enterprise system. Moreover, such a compulsory statute could not be properly policed without greatly expanding the ranks of the Federal bureaucracy.

Accordingly, the only possible solution to the problem is an incentive program to encourage employers voluntarily to employ and retain in employment older workers. I have introduced a bill (H.R. 531) providing for a voluntary tax incentive program. Under that bill, an employer would be allowed to deduct as a business expense not only the gross salary paid to an employee but an additional 2 percent thereof for every employee between the ages of 45 and 50, 3 percent for every employee between the ages of 50 and 55, 4 percent for every employee between the ages of 55 and 60, and 5 percent for every employee over the age of 60.

The passage of this bill would mean an initial loss of revenue, but over the long run there would be a corresponding increase in tax revenue from the salaries and wages paid to these older employees and there would be a corresponding reduction of unemployment benefits consumed and the load on the State and local welfare rolls would be lightened.

It might be argued that a policy encouraging the employment of older people would reduce the job availability of younger workers. Such an argument is at odds with the laws of economics. Economic history proves that the more people we have working, the more we produce; the more we produce, the more we transport and sell; the more we sell, the cheaper the price; the cheaper the price, the more we consume; the more we consume, the greater the demand; the greater the demand, the more we need to produce; the more we need to produce, the more jobs we have available. More jobs for everyone, regardless of age, must be our continuing policy.

We as a nation have, over the years, depended for our growth upon the wisdom, training and acquired skills that come only with age and experience. Some of our most revolutionary inventions and some of the greatest contributions to our economic, cultural and scientific life have come from men and women of advanced years in both humble and exalted positions. This reservoir of wisdom and skills is one of America's greatest assets and one in which we have a great investment. We must by every appropriate means protect that investment and use that asset to advance our national interests.

President Kennedy: A Year in Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Charlotte News, Charlotte, N.C., of January 5, 1962:

PRESIDENT KENNEDY: A YEAR IN OFFICE

After watching the President's inauguration a year ago, we wrote here that: "The Presidency has a power all its own. No one could guess, not even John Kennedy, how the office will shape him."

John Kennedy has gone to school to the Presidency for almost a year. Its demands and cruel choices have changed him in ways disappointing to those who viewed him as a miracle worker, but reassuring indeed to those who thought him a wild-eyed wrecker, a rich man's son who wanted the White House for a game room.

But if the youth, vigor and confidence are now overlaid by the grayer attitudes of caution, restraint and prudence, John Kennedy basically seems pretty much the same. He always was a politician more practical than ideological, and remains so. And he was too learned, as a rereading of his inaugural speech will show, to accept intellectually the aura of invincibility thrown off by his eagerness, his thirst for action, and his earnest hopes for success.

The tone of the inaugural was misleading. The words were correct. They said his administration would be only a phase in the hoped-for making of "a beachhead of cooperation in the jungles of suspicion." There would be no "100-days'" rejuvenation of the country or reordering of the world. The speech made no promises of peace or ease.

How has Mr. Kennedy fared toward the great President he wants to be and the times demand? He obviously has learned much, a chief lesson being where to turn in time of trouble. On Berlin he turned away from counsel urging concession under threat and toward the old hands, Acheson and Clay, for example, who'd been through Berlin flaps before. For key Cabinet positions and sensitive ones elsewhere he called on Republicans of the likes of Dillon, McNamara, and McCone who had reputations for competence, coolness and realism.

If Cuba was an unmitigated disaster and Laos a hand-me-down riddle on which the President overspoke himself, the administration worked effectively to shore up chronically threatened South Vietnam and, seemingly, to save a bad situation in the Dominican Republic. In the Congo his choice between gambles has yet to be played out. The President's demand for a more varied and powerful military force, which he is getting, had meaning extending across the whole range of cold war problems.

Domestically, the President wisely placed the pursuit of national unity above measures that might have made him more the partisan hero. The result is widespread popularity for a man barely elected to the Nation's highest office. The popularity does not guarantee success of New Frontier legislation in Congress. It does assure a hearing even for such bold departures as new, liberalized trade legislation in a period when protectionist sentiment is strong and stubborn. Further, the Kennedy popularity, the belief that he is working at the job earnestly and objectively, also serves as an invaluable buffer against extremist demands that either the world stop turning or that the United States get off.

It has been a hard first year for John Kennedy—a jolting one. But on the whole he has displayed balance and respect for facts, and on Berlin he has proved his mettle. He will need these qualities increasingly in the years ahead. Concepts that have served U.S. foreign policy for years are buckling under the weight of events. The future of the United Nations is heavily clouded. The new nations which the United States seeks to train up on the side of freedom have demonstrated, some of them, not only the expected incompetence in self-government but severe myopia on matters of morality.

John Kennedy will receive more buffetings. He and the country will have losses and victories. But we think they will get along—and get through. There is a world of good stuff in both.

Reform in Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I recently received, as I imagine did my colleagues, a reprint of a statement prepared for one of the White House regional conferences last year by Mr. Milton J. Shapp, chairman of the board of the Jerrold Electronics Corp., of Philadelphia. I want to take this opportunity to call special attention to Mr. Shapp's statement because it advocates a fundamental reform which I have long felt is needed in our Federal Government; namely, the adoption of a system of capital budgeting to distinguish between operating expenditures and investment in long-term assets.

Mr. Shapp's statement puts the case for legislation such as my bill, H.R. 1968, in such clear terms that I want to include in the RECORD the following excerpts from it. I am in full agreement with Mr. Shapp that "eventually we must adopt a sensible businesslike fiscal program for managing Government finances" and that the capital budget approach is "of outstanding importance" to that task.

Excerpts from Mr. Shapp's statement follow:

For years we have talked about the need for introducing modern business techniques into the operation of local, State, and Federal Government. However, we have made but little progress in this direction. Paradoxically, one of the main obstacles has been and still is the violent opposition of many business leaders to changing the fiscal policies and organizational structure of our Government to conform with sound business practices.

We must make these changes if we are to attain the rate of National, State, and local economic growth required to provide opportunities for full employment and higher standards of living for all of our growing population.

Of outstanding importance, we must drop the time-encrusted concept that in preparing Government budgets, in effect, cash is treated as our only asset. Because we keep no businesslike balance sheet for Government fiscal operation, we talk disparagingly about our national debt of $300 billion but ignore the fact that the Government possesses physical assets that perhaps exceed $2,000 billion in value.

A balance sheet of a business firm lists many assets of far greater importance to the potential earning power of the company than its cash on hand. Money is invested in programs of research to develop new products and in capital equipment with which to produce these items. Raw inventory is purchased, labor hired and trained, and goods produced. Marketing programs are developed. The sale of finished inventory creates receivables. These, in turn, convert to cash, and the process repeats itself over and over again. Money is used in business merely as a tool to create and increase wealth.

A business firm normally prepares two separate budgets—one for capital investments and the other for operating expenditures. In addition, as another tool to insure effective fiscal control, most firms compile a cash flowsheet.

The capital budget deals normally with long-term investments needed to insure growth of the company, and often necessitates the borrowing of large sums. In business this is considered good practice if it can be shown that the potential return on investment exceeds its cost. Operating budgets cover current expenses of doing business and must be minimized if the business is to show a profit. The cash flowsheet simply compares cash in with cash out for the period covered. If a company were to consider cash as its only asset, it could never grow; it could never show a real profit. Capital investments made to insure long-term profitable growth would have to be written off each year as ordinary expense rather than depreciated over a period of years in accordance with the usefulness of the capital equipment. To make progress, a business must convert its cash into other assets in order to stimulate the forces of production.

Yet today we ignore this basic principle in handling the fiscal affairs of our Government. Actually, State and Federal Governments and most cities have no budgets in the real sense—only cash flowsheets. If more revenue is collected each year than is paid out, this is called surplus. If more is paid out than collected, this is called a deficit—regardless of whether the money is used for secretarial salaries or invested in new schools, highways, water supply systems, hospitals, airports, or other capital improvements vitally needed to increase the wealth potential of our country. Since budgeting lies at the center of all financial planning, this false concept of measuring only cash input against output in the preparation of Government budgets lies at the very core of our economic illness today. Until we alter this concept, we can make but little progress in resolving our economic problems.

The resolution of our local, State, and National economic problems lies in the application of well-established business principles to the fiscal management of government. Organization should be streamlined for efficiency. Operating expenses should be minimized, but we should never shirk from making needed public sector investments in wealth producing facilities. Schools, highways, airports, hospitals, colleges, water and sewer systems, programs of basic research and programs to develop national resources—these are the facilities and services needed to develop the economic strength of our country and increase the productivity of our citizens.

These are investment programs that must be maximized by the Government and considered as long-term capital investments. Such programs should not be considered as expense items in a cash budget. Nor should such capital investments in needed facilities be considered in the light of public works programs merely to lift the economy in times of recession.

A successful growing business firm does not wait until business is bad before it intensifies attempts to develop new products, to train production, sales, and executive personnel, or to build new plant facilities. While business is good, expansion programs are pushed. The whole concept of utilizing public works programs to lift the economy and to provide employment during a recession ignores the principle that capital investment programs must precede effective economic expansion.

When we finally, as eventually we must, adopt a sensible businesslike fiscal program for managing Government finances, then we shall be on the path to correcting the ills of our economic system. Until we do, we shall continue to wallow, blaming everything from taxes to inflation, from automation to featherbedding, without really coming to grips with our basic problem.

Lithuanian Citizens' Club of Lawrence, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my remarks at the annual installation banquet of the Lithuanian Citizens' Club, Inc., of Lawrence, Mass., on Sunday, February 4, 1962:

The Lithuanian Citizens' Club of Lawrence was organized in 1907—almost 33 years before the Russian Communists invaded Lithuania and deprived that country of its independence.

But I believe that your club will be an active social and civic center for Americans of Lithuanian origin long after the Soviet Union has been replaced by a democratic government that abandons imperialism and liberates its own people as well.

This may sound like wishful thinking.

There are signs, however, of trouble within the Soviet Union.

When Communists start to argue among themselves, that's a good sign for the rest of the world.

And as Russian children grow up to become teachers, doctors, or engineers they expect a more comfortable, more peaceful way of life, free from treachery and terror.

The denunciation of Stalin and his cruelties shows that there are changes going on behind the Iron Curtain.

Khrushchev has publicly denounced Stalin as a criminal and a murderer.

The Lithuanian people will never forget the thousands of their countrymen who were liquidated and the tens of thousands who were forcibly deported to remote areas of the Soviet Union. The younger generation, having heard from their parents' lips of uncles, aunts, and cousins who were the victims of Communist oppression, will remember and will look forward to the day of their country's emancipation.

Khrushchev is caught in a contradiction that must be plain to intelligent Russians. How can he denounce the crimes of Stalin, which include the brutal subjugation of the Lithuanian people and at the same time expect the rest of the world to forget Lithuania's right to be independent again?

Even Stalin—at his worst—could not break the spirit of the Lithuanian people or their religious faith.

Since the beginning of history, oppressive governments have come and gone because they could not crush the fundamental courage and decency that is found in most human beings.

More than 12 million people have escaped from Communist countries since the end of World War II. Add to this number the silent, thinking, and suffering people of Russia and China who resent the closed systems of government that drive them mercilessly—plus the hundreds of millions of people in the free world—and we have the overwhelming majority of mankind either actively or passively opposed to communism.

That's what the Communists fear most.

While they bluster and threaten and conspire against the world in front of them—they secretly worry about the world behind them that they control—on the surface.

In this modern world, no "iron curtain" can succeed in completely isolating one group of people from another. We have means of getting information through to the people of Lithuania and other captive nations, and they have means of communicating with us.

In this way we strengthen our mutual hope and determination to join hands one day in a world without fear united by representative and cooperating governments.

The Lithuanian citizens club of Lawrence, by encouraging the rights and responsibilities of freemen—is doing its share to build a better future for the United States—for Lithuania—and for all nations in the family of mankind.

The Republican Reappraisal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1962

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, Walter Lippmann is acknowledged to be one of the most objective writers on the American political scene. It is a pleasure, therefore, to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD his column of February 15, 1962, dealing with a matter which directly affects the philosophy of our two great political parties and the final judgments of the American people. It is reassuring to have this clear voice indicate that in spite of all the propaganda, especially from extreme rightwing groups, the American Government has not and is not going down the trail of excessive Government expenditures in the public interest. The concept of the duties of government are clearly put into perspective by this article and reflect the need of Americans to attune themselves and their thinking to the needs and realities of the day in which we live.

The article follows:

THE REPUBLICAN REAPPRAISAL

(By Walter Lippmann)

The soul searching which went on among the Republican orators on Lincoln's Birthday did not bring forth that new image which they were all seeking. Somewhere there is a block. It prevents the Republican Party from getting to a position which is both conservative and popular. The block, I venture to suggest, is that the Republican position has been moved so far to the right that the party has conceded to the Kennedy administration not only the left but the whole vast dominant center.

This has left the Republican leaders with no elbowroom, and they are squeezed into a corner where they can only say no. This cannot make for popularity and for votes in a country where the population is growing prodigiously, where the way of life is changing rapidly, where the people, conscious of the huge productive capacity of our economy, are demanding that their crowded life in the cities be made more comfortable and more civilized.

The displacement of the Republican leaders from the center to the right has many causes. One of them, for example, is the control of the party organization by the old codgers, who have safe seats and keep on being reelected. There is another reason which is that in recent years Republican doctrine has been shaped by theorists who are out of touch with the modern world. Indeed it would not be an exaggeration to say that it has been shaped by theorists who do not know what they are talking about.

These theorists have produced a formula which discombobulates Republican thinking. It is that liberalism and progressivism are the highroad to socialism, and that socialism is the highroad to communism. The extremists use the formula to say that the United States started down the road to communism when the income tax was legalized in 1913. But even the moderates, General Eisenhower for example, are deeply suspicious of social security and the welfare state and of aid to education, and above all of the modern conception of the compensatory economy.

The difficulty about making a new image is that the Republican theorists have created such a false image of the Kennedy Democratic Party that there is no effective way they can oppose it. Applied to the Kennedy administration, the formula of the theorists of the right, that progressivism leads to socialism and socialism to communism, is absurd. It is silly. Though Mr. Kennedy is a progressive and a liberal, he is also a profound conservative, and only the befuddled theorists find that strange and hard to understand.

Their central theme, which is also a central illusion, is that this country is "spending" its way out of freedom into socialism and communism. But is it? I have some figures here which come from Prof. F. M. Bator, a leading authority on the problems of government spending.

A big rich country spends more, of course, than a small poor country. The proper basis of comparison, therefore, is the volume of government spending against the size of the economy. Professor Bator's figures show that Government spending in the United States is not out of line with spending in other advanced industrial nations.

The most recent year for which adequate comparative figures are available is 1959. In that year in the United States total public spending (Federal, State, local) was 28.3 percent of the gross national product. As this includes national defense, public education, highways, police, hospitals and whatnot, can it really be said that spending less than 30 percent publicly puts us on the road to, or anywhere near the road to, socialism and communism? Can it really be said when of this 30 percent which is spent publicly over half goes to purchases from private firms producing for profit?

As a matter of fact, in public spending we are behind Belgium (29.3 percent), Canada (30 percent), France (33.5 percent), United Kingdom (34.9 percent), Sweden (35.7 percent). In West Germany the latest figures are for 1957. That was before the big rise of German defense spending and at that time the percentage of public spending was slightly bigger than ours (28.6 percent). Yet West Germany is regarded by many as the shining example of a free capitalistic economy.

But, it will be said, while defense spending is necessary, the real creeping socialism is the money spent for social security, veterans benefits, Government interest, and cash subsidies. For the United States the ratio of such payments to gross national product was 7 percent in 1959. The Canadian ratio was 8.7 percent. The United Kingdom's ratio was 11.2 percent. The West German (in 1957) was 12.1 percent, the Belgian 13.6 percent, the French 16.5 percent. There are other comparative figures which could be cited. All of them point to the conclusion that as compared with the advanced industrial nations of the world the ratio of our public spending is conservative. There is no hard factual basis for the theory that we have turned our back on the free economy and are on the high road to socialism and communism.

The latter-day Republican propaganda does not work for the very simple reason that it is not true.

Anniversaries of Special Significance in Wyoming Valley, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday, February 11, two anniversaries of special significance were observed in my congressional district—the 154th anniversary of Judge Jesse Fell's successful experiment of burning anthracite coal in an open grate, and the 104th anniversary of the founding of the Wyoming Historical & Geological Society, today one of the most important institutions of its kind in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the foremost historical society in northeastern Pennsylvania.

In recognition of these anniversaries, the Wilkes-Barre Record of Saturday, February 10, 1962, made some thoughtful comments in an editorial and as part of my remarks today I include the aforementioned editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Record. Editorial follows:

[From the Wilkes-Barre Record, Feb. 10, 1962]

TWO ANNIVERSARIES WORTHY OF NOTE

Tomorrow, February 11, is a day of special significance in Wyoming Valley. It marks the anniversary of the first use of anthracite coal in an open grate, and the founding of Wyoming Historical & Geological Society.

The story of how Judge Jesse Fell experimented with anthracite, or stone coal, as it was called at the time, is too well known to need retelling. Suffice it to say that after several trials he found a way to burn it in an open grate without an artificial draft and in this way contributed to the multibillion-dollar industry on which this community was built.

The connection between Judge Fell's experiment and founding of the historical society is more than coincidental.

It is told that on February 11, 1858, four men, Stanley Woodward, Henry M. Hoyt, J. Butler Conyngham and James P. Dennis, a grandson of Judge Fell, were riding together in a carriage on a road leading into Wilkes-Barre.

During the trip, it was noted by one of them that the day was the 50th anniversary of Judge Fell's experiment whereupon it was resolved to commemorate the occasion.

A meeting of a number of prominent citizens of the town was arranged for that evening at the old Fell Tavern and, around a fire built in the original fireplace, it was decided to organize a society which was to become Wyoming Historical & Geological Society.

From that rather humble beginning, the historical society has grown into one of the most important institutions of its kind in the State and the foremost historical society in northeastern Pennsylvania.

Much more than a building which keeps the destructive hand of time from the artifacts and relics of the past, it is the repository of the record of achievement of this community and its citizens.

For anthracite, February 11 is the 154th anniversary of Judge Fell's successful experiment. For the historical society, it is the 104th anniversary of its founding. It is fitting that they be observed together.

Board of Supervisors, County of Los Angeles, Calif., Resolve Against Substandard Conditions for Supplemental Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of the unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present to the reading by your own distinguished self and by all the other Members of this great legislative body the text of the resolution by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, in the great 23d Congressional District which I represent. Whereas the resolution is self-explanatory I will not take further of your time, but truly it is a very, very important consideration:

RESOLUTION BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

On motion of Supervisor Bonelli, unanimously carried (Supervisor Dorn being temporarily absent), it is ordered that the following resolution be and it is hereby adopted:

"Whereas present legislation permits independent supplemental airlines to operate under substandard conditions; and

"Whereas the Civil Aeronautics Board has failed to require such airlines to provide evidence of sound financial responsibility and satisfactory safety practices; and

"Whereas Senate bill 1969 and House Resolution 7318, now receiving congressional consideration for final passage, would give permanent legal status to such airlines under the current inadequate fitness requirements: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles does hereby declare its opposition to Senate bill 1969 and House Resolution 7318; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles urges that the proposed legislation be amended to impose greater responsibility on the part of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Aviation Agency in requiring evidence of financial ability and air safety practices from supplemental air carriers."

I, Gordon T. Nesvig, clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of a resolution which was adopted by the board of supervisors of said county on January 23, 1962, and entered in the minutes of said board.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the board of supervisors this 29th day of January 1962.

GORDON T. NESVIG,

Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, State of California.

Deserving Praise for Governor Hughes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, last November the citizens of New Jersey surprised certain political quarters by electing a man considered much less well know than his opponent. That man was Richard J. Hughes, who was elected Governor of New Jersey. In retrospect, everyone seems to agree that it should not have been too much of a surprise, for Dick Hughes was a hard-working, articulate, campaigner; a sincere, dedicated and proven public servant; a native son who had grown up in New Jersey and stayed there, and who knows New Jersey's problems. He was, moreover, a courageous and forceful leader, who was not content to simply coast along with the relative prosperity and good administration that blesses the State. Because he was such a man, he was elected. And already, less than a month after his inauguration, he is facing up to the problems that exist and making a determined effort to solve them.

Among those who have recognized the quality of Governor Hughes' leadership is a newspaper that certainly could not be listed as an ardent pre-election supporter. Last Saturday, the Newark Evening News commented favorably on the Governor's plan for achieving municipal economy, which the Governor describes as "regionalization."

Since the subject of municipal economy is one besetting many urban areas with the same type of close, interrelated local governmental units, I take this opportunity to bring the plan to the attention of my colleagues:

BREAKING THE SPIRAL

Full of theory, but not of practice, some political scientists have long urged consolidation of municipal governments. One of their favorite targets is the New Jersey-New York metropolitan area, where they have counted 1,400 different units of government.

That political consolidation would produce cheaper and more efficient local government is a theory not sustained by the result of the consolidation of five boroughs into the City of New York. That record seems to prove that big government merely creates bigger and more unmanageable problems.

But there is an alternative means of achieving municipal economy. Governor Hughes describes it as "regionalization." Conceding that political consolidation faces insurmountable political hurdles, the Governor says he favors consolidation of services wherever possible. He mentioned intermunicipal boards of health, as an example.

New Jersey municipalities have had successful experience with joint school and sewer districts, and magistrates' courts. Other possibilities to be explored lie in purchasing and street maintenance, construction and operation of parks, playgrounds, hospitals and libraries and joint fire departments. And it has been suggested that more accurate property tax assessments could be obtained if neighboring small towns joined in employing trained, full-time assessors.

Regionalization permits each municipality to preserve its identity and its control of expenditures, while avoiding duplication of services and facilities and inefficient part-time operations. Even if it didn't reduce costs, regionalization could put a brake on the spiral of rising municipal costs.

The Splendid Gadfly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, our good friend, CLARE HOFFMAN, has made a formidable record both in and out of the Congress. If he retires at the conclusion of this session he will be missed by his colleagues and this Chamber will have lost a significant influence.

In an editorial entitled, "The Splendid Gadfly," the editor of the Grand Rapids Press on February 12, 1962, paid tribute to the corrective influences of a CLARE HOFFMAN. This editorial expresses, I am sure, the sentiments of most of us and under leave to extend my remarks I include the editorial:

THE SPLENDID GADFLY

If Representative CLARE E. HOFFMAN, of Allegan, retires from Congress at the end of this year, as he is expected to do, he will have served 28 years. No man, no matter how unobtrusive, can serve in a legislative body that long without having made his presence felt. And CLARE HOFFMAN has been anything but unobtrusive.

In fact he has made a career of intruding on the rosy dreams of many a fellow Member. Spendthrifts have been the special objects of his scorn, but others who, in his opinion, have sought to depart from the basic philosophy of the Republic also have been taking verbal lashings from him. HOFFMAN has feared none; and least of all has he feared speaking his mind.

It may be argued that the times have left HOFFMAN behind, but we should dispute that. The impulsive, in and out of Congress, need the corrective influences of a CLARE HOFFMAN. We have disagreed with him many times, but always have been ready to concede that his

views have supplied the counterweight needed to maintain a reasonable balance in spending and other governmental activities. At times, too, we have felt that HOFFMAN was far more conservative than the Fourth Michigan District he represented. But every 2 years a handsome majority of voters returned him to the House. Part of this support, we suspect, was in the nature of personal loyalty to a man who had the courage to row against the current.

There will be no shortage of good candidates to replace HOFFMAN. Several already have let it be known that they would like to succeed him. But none of them ought to make the race on the assumption that he can win merely by patterning his views after HOFFMAN's; or that if he should win he could pick up where HOFFMAN had left off. CLARE HOFFMAN built his prestige by being his own man. His successor will have to do likewise, if he is to win lasting support.

Horizons Unlimited for Future Farmers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, National Future Farmers of America Week will be observed this year from February 17-24, and it is indeed a pleasure at this time to pay tribute to this fine organization. The members of the Future Farmers of America fully deserve our support, encouragement, and respect. The continued success and growth of American agriculture depends to a great extent on the ability of the farmer of tomorrow to utilize intelligently and scientifically the rich and productive land that is our heritage. The training our young men are today receiving in their FFA work assures us that the future of American agriculture will be in good hands.

In 1928, the national FFA organization was launched at Kansas City, Mo., and on August 30, 1950, the 81st Congress, through passage of Public Law 740, granted a Federal Charter to the Future Farmers of America. If I had been a Member of Congress at that time, I would most certainly have cast the vote of the Second Congressional District of Kentucky for passage of this law.

When we realize that agriculture is America's largest single industry, it is at once obvious that the proper training of our future farmers is of paramount importance. The necessary preparation for a career in agriculture is ably provided by the nationwide program of vocational education in agriculture and its accompanying organization, the Future Farmers of America. Membership in the FFA is open to all boys studying vocational agriculture in a public secondary school.

This country must have a constant supply of new farmers every year to replace those who die, retire, or otherwise leave the farm, and they must be men with experience and training. It is necessary for today's successful farmer to have skill in science, business, mechanics, and other technological advances which the industry has undergone in recent years. Knowing this, the FFA places a great deal of emphasis on training, and each member is required to conduct a profitable farming program at home or on another farm. The success of this program of "Doing to learn," a phrase in the FFA motto and an integral part of the program of the Future Farmers of America, is evidenced by the fact that by the time many FFA members are ready to marry and start a family they are firmly established in a farming program that promises a good future. For those who do not become full-time farmers, many find careers in some phase of agriculture and their experiences in vocational agriculture and the FFA serve well to help them to success. The theme for FFA Week this year is "Honoring Rural Opportunities and Responsibilities" and it is a most appropriate one.

We are fortunate in the Second District of Kentucky in having many chapters of the Future Farmers of America, and we have only to look at the achievements of the individual members of this organization to become aware of the beneficial results this program has on rural communities. I know many members of the FFA and enjoy visiting with these young men and their families when I travel throughout Kentucky. It is always gratifying to see their enthusiasm for farming as a challenging and satisfying way of life.

In closing, I would like to say that I am in complete agreement with the FFA creed which begins with the declaration "I believe in the future of farming." I also believe that the Future Farmers of America are playing a vital part in America's future by training our rural youth to be prosperous and successful farmers, and I wish the members of this outstanding organization and their leaders continued success in all their endeavors.

Tadeusz Kosciuszko, February 12, 1746–October 15, 1817

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Tadeusz Kosciuszko, whose 216th birthday is today, was one of the many gallant Poles who played a very important part in our War of Independence.

This gifted son of a middle-class family was born with the determination to fight for the freedom of his own people. With that purpose in mind he decided to become a soldier and a fighter. When he had completed his military education in Poland, and then in France, he had become a specialist in artillery and military engineering. By 1776 he had had no real chance to liberate his people, but when he heard of our War of Independence, he rushed to Paris, there borrowed money from friends, set sail for America and arrived in Philadelphia in August of that year. There he applied for military service; he was admitted at once and then charged with the drawing up of plans for fortifying the Delaware. His success in this first assignment earned him a colonel's commission. From then on a high place in our Revolutionary War was assured for him. Everything he undertook was performed with distinction, and in October 1783 Congress made him a brigadier-general.

Today in observing the 216th anniversary of his birth we do homage to his memory.

The Pen Is Mightier Than the Sword

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, during the Fourth Annual Washington Mid-Winter Conference held February 7, 1962, under the sponsorship of the Advertising Federation of America, Mr. Avinere Toigo estimated that Communist countries are spending 20 times as much as the United States in trying to win the war for men's minds. Mr. Toigo, who is associated with the New York advertising firm of Lennen & Newell, Inc., is a former resident of Benld, Ill. I am sure my colleagues will find his remarks most interesting:

THE PEN IS MIGHTIER THAN THE SWORD

(By Avinere Toigo)

Today we are engaged in a worldwide war for the minds of men * * * a psychological war between the Communist powers and the freedom-loving nations. Khrushchev says, "We will bury you." He leaves no doubt that the Communists are playing for keeps. Since the stakes are so high, it becomes every citizen's duty to ask our Government a question. Namely: "Are we making the best use of our creative talent in persuading people everywhere that we are a peace and freedom loving Nation?"

People in the advertising business are called persuaders, and no wonder. To sell merchandise and ideas you must persuade. But have we been successful in advertising our American heritage to the minds of men?

Our Nation is living proof that our free enterprise system in a free society makes for a better standard of living than does the regimented society of the communistic nations. We are not getting this message across to the people of the world. We are not making full use of the persuaders' tool—the pen. In the talented hands of persuaders "the pen is mightier than the sword." But to be effective, the pen needs not only skilled hands * * * it also needs ink. And by ink I mean appropriations.

Let us compare the propaganda appropriations of the Communist nations versus the United States. Congress appropriates about $48 billions a year for military hardware. Yet it only appropriated about $140 million

for the last year to the United States Information Agency. This budget figure is $20 million less than a single advertiser spends to sell his products in just this one country. Yet the USIA is given $140 million to sell our way of life to 90 countries around the world. That's spreading our competitive selling effort pretty thin.

On the other hand, it is estimated that the Communists are spending 20 times as much as we do on propaganda. Twenty times $140 million comes to $2,800 million. With these disproportionate budgets it is easy to understand why the Communists are winning the ideological war. Since our very survival is at stake, should this country continue to be curtailed to such a limited budget to educate the peoples of the world to our side of this cause?

The Communists pen, fed with $2,800 million, effectively exploits situations all over the world. Their pen has lots of ink. When trouble explodes in Europe the Communists are busy with pamphlets, books, films, newspaper ads, and radio broadcasts. When trouble explodes in Africa, Latin America, the Near East, or anywhere, the Communists are there with their propaganda. They have more pens telling their story everywhere—and 20 times more money to work with.

In our business, there are two questions that must be answered in the selling of a product: (1) Is the product a good one? and (2) is there an adequate budget to sustain an advertising campaign? With a healthy budget we can secure the cooperation of local media so essential to getting the message to people everywhere.

We have explored the budget. We have learned that the Communists are outspending us 20 to 1. They are ploughing us under with an inferior product by the sheer weight of their propaganda.

The United States is a good product. It is a saleable product. Far better than its communistic competitor. We can tell a good story. The story would include among others:

1. Our American heritage of the four freedoms: (a) freedom of speech, (b) freedom of worship, (c) freedom from want, (d) freedom from fear.

2. Our aid to peace-loving nations all over the world.

3. Our pride in the gradual betterment of all our citizens at home.

Just to take up the last point, the Communists say that our polyglot population is constantly in turmoil. But the facts disprove this. Never in the history of the world has there been such a voluntary inpouring of so many different ethnic groups into one country as have settled in the United States. We take great pride in how well their problems have been solved. We should get credit all over the world for the tremendous strides we have made in establishing harmony among our various people. In our environment of freedom, these people have fared well. Not many years ago an Irish Catholic immigrant arrived in Boston. Everywhere he looked he saw signs that read "No Irish Wanted." Today the grandson of this Irish immigrant is President of the United States. The picture is not perfect, of course, but we are gaining every day.

To those who say that advertising people are not trained to propagandize, let me say that they have the know-how to dramatize ideas and give the message the repetition it needs to be effective.

In closing I want to make a plea to our opinonmakers. I appeal to them to use their influence on Congress to the end that the USIA will be adequately financed to sell our product—the United States—to the world. The advertising profession should be glad to make their know-how in selling available to the Government in the same manner in which our manufacturers have made their manufacturing know-how available to the Government in making defense armament.

Resolution of the Democratic State Central Committee, Lansing, Mich., January 28, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a resolution by the State central committee of the Democratic Party in their meeting at the civic center, Lansing, Mich., January 28, 1962.

That resolution sets forth the position of our Michigan Democratic Party on a number of items of the President's state of the Union message, including increasing job opportunities and training for adults and youth, extending unemployment compensation, a better foreign trade policy, and the President's program for standby authority for public works programs and tax reductions.

The resolution also specifically endorses the administration's medical care program under social security for persons 65 and over.

RESOLUTION OF THE DEMOCRATIC STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE, LANSING, MICH., JANUARY 28, 1962

In one of the most comprehensive messages ever presented to the Congress of the United States, President Kennedy in his state of the Union message on January 10, outlined an extensive legislative program for the advancement of our Nation and the furthering of peace and freedom in the world.

We call at this time special attention to the President's proposals for increasing job opportunities and job training for adults and youth, for extending unemployment compensation, for fair foreign trade policies designed to strengthen this Nation's position in the world economy, and for his request for standby authority for public development programs and tax reductions.

The President's proposal for medical care through social security for those 65 and over is both humane and economically sound. This legislation so sorely needed by millions of the elderly faces bitter and determined opposition from the American Medical Association, the chamber of commerce, and the National Manufacturer's Association: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Democratic Party of Michigan pledge its determined vigorous and enthusiastic support of the President's program in the Congress.

We call upon our party leaders, its members, and friends to bend every effort to make effective operation support, to the end that a maximum vote on behalf of these measures be secured in the Michigan congressional delegation; and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President, Vice President, Speaker of the House of Representatives, the majority leader of the Senate, to Senators McNAMARA and HART, and Democratic members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

Lincoln and Kosciuszko: Exponents of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of Monday, February 12, 1962, carried an excellent editorial on the enormous contributions made to this Nation's freedom by Abraham Lincoln and Thaddeus Kosciuszko. Although editorials are not signed or bylined, I am sure this editorial was penned by the editor himself, Mr. John McSweeney, who, I am delighted to say, received the Polonia Restituta Award some years ago at the time I was presented with the same award.

As part of my remarks today, I include the aforementioned editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader:

[From the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader, Feb. 12, 1962]

EXPONENTS OF FREEDOM: STIRRING EXAMPLES OF LINCOLN AND KOSCIUSZKO IN CURRENT STRUGGLE

Holidays have a way of degenerating. Often we go through the motions of commemorating an occasion, or the birth of a notable man or woman, without troubling to understand or appreciate the reasons for doing so. Such perfunctory remembrance dishonors the person remembered.

So let us not dishonor the memory of Abraham Lincoln, this year, by giving lip-service on this 153d anniversary of his birth. Let us rather, through acts of recollection and imagination, strive to catch the essence of Lincoln's greatness and relate it to our time.

This can be done by remembering the story of his life—his humble birth, struggle for education, rise to strength and influence through the law; his political career that led him to the Presidency; his emergence, through the agony of the Civil War, to giant stature among men. Most of all, it can be done by recalling some of the noble phrases through which the genius and insight of Lincoln were revealed.

When one does this, one soon finds that many of his observations had a universal quality that makes them pertinent in our time as they were a century ago. Lincoln's insistence on the worth and dignity of the individual, his faith in the ultimate wisdom of the people, his profound concern that freedom should be preserved and extended, his trust that if we but proceed "with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right," all will be well—these shine through his words. These are beacons to illuminate America's path now as they did in Lincoln's time.

More than the future of the United States was on trial during the presidency of Abraham Lincoln. The future of the democratic dream—that all men are created equal, that government derives its powers from the consent of the governed—hung in the balance.

Lincoln put it into these deathless words at Gettysburg:

"We are now engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure."

The United States endured. So, too, the idea of democracy. Today, even the Communists find it necessary to pay lip service to

the word, though their usage of it is far removed from its real meaning.

When one thinks of democracy, the names of but a few men come to mind—but first of all Lincoln. What was it about this man that has made him the apotheosis of all that we believe America stands for?

The list of his qualities could be extended indefinitely: His rise from backwoods obscurity by his own initiative; his humility; his dedication to principle; his wisdom; his mercy; his genius with words. But no one of them alone gives us the answer to the greatness of Lincoln.

Neither can it be said that Lincoln was the only man of his time who could have saved the Union. At least 600,000 men who gave their lives or health during the Civil War share with him the glory and tragedy of those days.

No, the measurement of Lincoln eludes us, and will continue to.

Suffice that he did live, and that his greatness came to fruition because of the system under which he lived and which he protected and enlarged.

It is a singular coincidence that Abraham Lincoln should share a birthday with Thaddeus Kosciuszko, the Polish patriot, who fought for American independence and died in lonely exile in Switzerland rather than compromise on the ideals of freedom by returning to his beloved Poland which had been partitioned and enslaved, then as now.

Whereas Lincoln was born in poverty in a log cabin in the backwoods of Kentucky, Kosciuszko was a member of a family of means in Poland. He attended the military academy in Warsaw and later the military school in Paris as the protege of a king. Whereas Lincoln was a statesman, Kosciuszko was a soldier.

But these men of different countries and contrasting backgrounds had much in common. They believed in freedom and in justice and consequently in the dignity of man.

Moreover, they lived in different eras, Lincoln being only 8 years old when Kosciuszko died. Yet, they might have been twin brothers, so far as their ideals and convictions were concerned.

On his own initiative at the age of 30, Kosciuszko crossed the Atlantic like his countryman, Count Pulaski, General Lafayette and Baron DeKalb to strike a blow for liberty. It is ironical that he should have succeeded in his mission here while Poland was unable to throw off the yoke of oppression and, to this day, remains enslaved after a short interval of freedom.

But the important thing is that the spirit of freedom has not perished and Kosciuszko's sacrifices in its name were not in vain. So long as a free America survives, Poland and all lands under tyrannical dictatorships will have cause to live in hope. Our debt to Kosciuszko, Lincoln and the others who, down through the centuries, fought and, in so many instances, died for American independence will never be paid until men and women everywhere enjoy the blessings that have been ours since 1776.

Justified Concern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Camden Chronicle, Camden, S.C., of February 9, 1962:

JUSTIFIED CONCERN

For all its inventive and industrial genius, the United States may soon be operating one of the most outmoded industrial plants of any developed nation in the free world.

That statement is made by a business leader, writing in The Exchange, a magazine which is published by the New York Stock Exchange. And he tells the reason why.

The U.S. tax structure severely impedes capital formation. Some 86 percent of our tax revenues are derived from levies on income and capital—the highest such ratio for any industrial nation. Only 14 percent comes from levies on consumption .

Depreciation allowances, he then points out, are by far the largest source of funds for private reinvestment. Yet, U.S. tax rules on depreciation give no recognition to the effects of inflation and are out of touch with the facts of modern technology. He cites the example of a turret lathe which is company bought in 1928 for $8,140. It had been fully depreciated and brought $675 from resale, so $8,815 was available to buy a replacement. But the cost of the new lathe, with roughly the same capacity, was $46,915. That meant the company had to put an additional $38,100 into the pot. And since the money came from heavily taxed profits, the company had to earn about $80,000 just to break even.

There is more and more concern about our ability to compete in world markets—and with good reason. The development of the European Common Market, and the remarkable industrial resurgence of Europe, shows the way the winds of change are blowing. Certainly, our Government should do everything within reason to give American enterprise and American labor the opportunity to buy and build the tools this competition requires.

Jack Colyer Retires From Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the Lawrence Daily Journal-World, of Lawrence, Kans., carried a story in its February 2, 1962, edition about my good friend and outstanding postal employee, Jack Colyer. Jack Colyer's long years of devoted service, and his splendid attitude toward the postal service and now toward his retirement, service as an example to all. I am glad to be able to bring the Journal-World story to the attention of the Congress, as a special tribute to a really outstanding letter carrier and public servant—Jack Colyer, of Lawrence, Kans.:

LOCAL POSTMAN IS RETIRING AFTER THOUSANDS OF MILES

After 31 years, during which he walked thousands of miles and carried more than 500 tons of mail, John E. Colyer, of 1126 Tennessee Street, has retired from the Lawrence post office.

"My back never bothered me a bit, until someone mentioned how much mail I actually carried during those 31 years," he said.

The longtime mail carrier made most of his deliveries in residential sections. But for the past 6 years he worked the business district on the west side of Massachusetts Street.

"I'll miss carrying mail," Colyer said, "but I figured this was the time to retire and start in on something else." Colyer has no intention of taking to the rocking chair.

He'll fish some and he'll help his wife in her antique shop at the home, but for the most part he will just work at another job.

During his 31 years, Colyer worked for four different postmasters, saw the Department grow into a million-dollar-a-year business, saw it become mechanized and saw the workload of each individual worker increase.

If Colyer had it all to do over again, he'd want it the same way. Despite carrying 150 pounds of mail a day, he found it a good life.

"But I wanted to retire early enough to get interested in another job," he said. "I don't want to just loaf."

Looking Ahead at Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the plight of our railroads is a question which Congress is going to have to consider sooner or later.

Recently, Mr. Crump, chairman and president of the Canadian Pacific Railway, made the following talk at a dinner meeting of the New York Railroad Club. I am sure that those interested in our transportation system will find a great deal of meat in Mr. Crump's address:

LOOKING AHEAD AT TRANSPORTATION

(Address given by Mr. N. R. Crump, chairman and president, Canadian Pacific Railway, before the February 8, 1962, dinner meeting, New York Railroad Club)

The recession behind us, it would now appear that the prophesy of the "soaring sixties" may well be fulfilled in many sectors of the economy. Yet judging by the results to date, the "sorry sixties" would seem to more aptly describe the condition of our railway industry.

It is therefore imperative, I feel, that we take a long, hard look at the transportation industry and our role in it and that we determine where we are and where we should be going. I am not here as a foreigner offering you advice. There is, as you know, a close relationship between the American and Canadian railway systems. Canadian Pacific is intimately connected with the U.S. railway system not only through our many interchanges, but also through an extensive investment in railway facilities in the United States.

In the United States transportation is one of the biggest sectors of the economy. I am informed that, directly and indirectly, transportation in the United States provides jobs for some 7 million workers. It represents a net investment (deducting the privately owned automobile) of approximately $55 billion. It produces gross revenues of almost $50 billion per year. Transportation, gentlemen, is the bloodstream of the Nation's commerce.

Furthermore, transportation as a whole is a growth industry. In the United States, total intercity freight ton-miles grew from 619 billion in 1940 to 1,320 billion in 1960, an increase of over 110 percent in two decades. Intercity passenger travel in the same period increased by approximately 110 percent.

This growth and affluence has not, as you know, been shared by the railway industry. Throughout the postwar period, the railway share of the transportation market has fallen almost continually. The U.S. railways in 1960 represented more than half of total U.S. investment in transportation but obtained less than one-fifth of gross transportation revenues. They had net earnings of only $445 million, of which some $346 million represented income from nonoperating sources. This overall return of 1.6 percent on net investment can only be described as poverty in the midst of plenty.

The financial results in the railway industry do not reflect decline in the use of transportation. Transportation, as a whole, in North America and throughout the world has increased with population and with rising living standards. The railway problem, thus, is not one of size of the total transportation market; it is rather a problem of competition or revenues and costs.

For the railways, the worst financial performance has occurred in the Eastern United States. Yet while the malady may be further advanced in the East, the symptoms, as well as the sickness, are to be found elsewhere.

It is to be sure, easier to diagnose a problem than to solve it. It is also easier to see how a problem might be solved than it is to achieve the solution. But let us not forget, gentlemen, that survival of our industry under private enterprise is at stake. This makes it absolutely imperative that we, in the industry, solve our problems. If we don't, others will seek to solve them for us. Railway nationalization is an admission of defeat.

Is the possibility of railway nationalization farfetched? An editorial published last October by a large Eastern U.S. newspaper had this to say:

"Now 'socialism' is a nasty word. Yet nationalization of the railroads offers as of now the only assured method by which the great rail network so urgently needed in peace, so desperately needed in war, can be preserved as a functioning operation."

This comment, gentlemen, should serve to remind us all of which way the wind of public sentiment is starting to blow. As I said a moment ago, there are those who are willing to try to solve our problems for us if we prove incapable of doing the job ourselves.

Nationalization of railways would, of course, achieve nothing. One need only look at the record. In Great Britain, losses of the state-owned British railways from 1956 to 1960 amounted to 201 million pounds, or some $564 million. In 1960 alone, the deficit was $190 million. In 1960, the French railways, which are also nationalized, lost 250 million NF (new francs) or $53.3 million. The record of state ownership of railways in Canada is, unfortunately, also one of loss.

Railway nationalization does not solve railway problems. It serves only to shove the problems off onto someone else thereby insuring that the basic issues will never be resolved. Nonetheless, gentlemen, railway nationalization is staring us in the face. If recent trends continue, state ownership of railways is a distinct possibility.

What then are the root causes of the railway problem? In order to get to the heart of the matter we must accept one basic fact of life. The railway industry can prosper under competition only if it provides a better service at lower cost than other forms of transportation. Our ability to meet competition is the key to our survival.

Railway problems are the problems of competition, costs, and Government regulation. The three are interrelated. Rate competition cannot be met on a compensatory basis unless the costs of producing railway transportation are below the costs of producing other forms of transportation. Railway costs are frequently higher than they need to be because of Government regulation. Furthermore, you can't meet rate competition if the regulatory authority insists on umbrella rates which protect less efficient forms of transportation.

Our first key to survival under private ownership is selling. Aggressive selling and realistic pricing are an absolute necessity for the survival of our industry. It is unfortunate that railways possessed for so long a monopoly over domestic freight transportation. It is unfortunate because too many of us still think in monopoly terms despite the fact that the monopoly has long since ceased to exist.

We need aggressive selling and realistic pricing as never before. We must find out what our shippers need and we must tailor and give service which will regain traffic. Still more important, we have to price this service on a competitive basis. I cannot emphasize too strongly that monopoly is gone, and with it the types of pricing which once made sense under monopoly circumstances.

Railways have many service and market disadvantages in realtion to their competitors. Yet they also have one tremendous advantage—the low cost of the steel wheel on the steel rail.

There are as many service requirements in freight transportation as there are different types of freight to be transported. But because a railway is a mass production form of transportation, it is not always possible to provide service tailored to the requirements of each and every shipper and consignee, as can be done by the trucking industry.

The backbone of railway freight traffic is and will continue to be bulk commodities which move in volume between private sidings. The only reason why these are captive to the rails is that the rates we charge are significantly less than those under which this traffic could be moved by other forms of transportation. This, notwithstanding, a vast proportion of all freight traffic requires the use of a truck at some stage in transportation or distribution. Even cement is not used where it is unloaded. If it moves by rail, it must virtually always be trucked from railside to the construction site. While it is difficult for the railway industry to provide the type of service required by traffic of this nature, it is in areas such as this that we must successfully wed the over-the-road advantages of the railway with the terminal advantages of the motortruck. The scope for piggyback on this continent is enormous and the potential, so far has scarcely been tapped. Far more needs to be done in the development of improved container systems and in the reduction of the cost of piggyback transportation, both to the railway and to the common carrier trucker. We are in a competitive battle with the trucking industry granted, yet we cannot afford to ignore any ways by which the inherent advantages of rail and truck can be combined.

There is no traffic moving by rail in North America today which could not be moved by highway. The only reason it moves by rail is because our rates are lower than those which truckers can charge. Piggyback will be profitable to the railway industry only so long as the cost of moving traffic over the rails is substantially less than that of moving it over the highway. It follows that we must redouble our efforts to reduce our costs at least as quickly as the trucks reduce theirs. In the differential between rail and truck cost lies the key to our competitive future.

Canadian Pacific has the largest trucking operation in Canada. We are one of the largest piggyback carriers in North America. Our feet thus are firmly planted in both camps because we believe, gentlemen, that no one can ignore the trucking industry today.

The aim of the railway industry must be to provide the same or better service than can be provided by any of its competitors, and at a lower cost. We are not in the railway business; we are in the transportation business. Improved service, of course, would be greatly facilitated by freedom to enter other forms of transportation. Yet even if this cannot be achieved, aggressive salesmanship, intelligent pricing, and improved equipment capable of producing lower cost transportation can win back a good deal of traffic we have lost.

How many railways institute good training programs for their salesmen? How many railway traffic solicitors are judged by the share of the transportation market they are able to capture? How much incentive do we give for successful efforts by our salesmen to win new traffic? How many of us have continuing procedures for measurement of market share on an area and commodity basis? How many of us actively study our markets to assess the equipment, service, and prices which we need to offer in order to compete? Try answering these questions, gentlemen, as they apply to your own property, and you have one of the good reasons for the industry's performance in recent years.

The second key to our survival under private ownership is the level of our costs and our knowledge of them. First, our pricing must reflect the cost advantages of railways over other forms of transportation. Secondly, we must in fact have cost advantages. If the pace of technological progress is greater in trucking than in the railway industry, there will, one day, no longer be any justification for railway transportation.

There is nothing sacred about railway technology; it must change with our need to meet competition. We stand on the threshold of great advances in science and technology. The railway industry cannot compete in the second half of the 20th century on the basis of work rules and a labor mentality appropriate to 1890. In a labor-intensive industry such as ours, the only way in which higher wages can be borne is through greater productivity. Elimination of the firemen from diesel locomotives is only one example of redundancy in the railway labor force.

The notion of stabilized employment and guaranteed wages in the railway industry, a situation with which we are evidently both confronted, can only be called economic nonsense, for one simply cannot have higher wages with no improvement in productivity. I am confident that the research and development presently being carried on both within the industry itself and by its suppliers can achieve important gains in productivity in the years to come. They can be achieved, that is, provided railway labor adopts a realistic attitude toward these new developments. In fact, this is the price of future employment for anyone in railway transportation.

The achievement, through technology and better methods, of subtantial and continuing improvement in productivity is a task to which railway operating management must devote their greatest energy. Mechanical, engineering, and transportation officers must continually strive for higher output at lower cost.

Railways must also ensure that no portion of their plant is allowed to become redundant. Too many railroads with too much track, too many interchanges, to many managements, and too many nonproductive employees, all are a drain on the railways' ability to compete, a drain which can no longer be tolerated. Railway layout, in short, must change to reflect the fundamental changes in railway technology and in railway markets.

It has always seemed to me that one of the great liabilities of the U.S. railway sys-

tem has been an inability of the many different managements to agree on a common policy for the industry as a whole. I am hopeful that, as a result of the merger movement currently underway, the U.S. railway industry will shake down into a few strong carriers. As the chief executive officer of a railway which stretches from the Atlantic to the Pacific, I can only assure you that competition is just as effective when there are 2 railways as when there are 20.

There are many other varied facets of the railway predicament. Many services, which have in the past been performed by railways, can be provided better and more cheaply by the new forms of transportation. Further, if the railway industry had not had to cope, during the postwar period, with the losses incurred in providing passenger transportation, the industry today would be in far better economic health. What is true of passenger transportation is, with slightly greater or lesser emphasis, true of certain branch line and less-than-carload services.

In tackling the railway cost problem, the first requirement is to have realistic cost finding; that is, to know what transportation services cost and to insure that important elements of cost are not forgotten. The second requirement is to take resolute action toward elimination of losses.

I cannot stress too much the importance of realistic cost finding. Abandonment of loss services, restructuring of operations, development of new categories of traffic—all require great skill in the determination and use of costs. Yet the most adroit cost finding is of little avail if management fails to take bold and determined action, once realistic costs have been established.

The third key to our survival under private ownership is realistic public policy toward the railway industry.

The railways must have freedom to price their services in such a way as to reflect the cost advantages of railway transportation. Regulation must recognize that maintenance of railway rates at unrealistically high levels in order to protect inefficient, high-cost forms of transportation can only lead to gross misallocation of transportation resources. Umbrella rates do not protect competition; rather they protect inefficient competitors.

In Canada we have agreed charges. Agreed charges are a contract between railways and shippers for the movement of specific commodities between specific points. Under the contract, the railways grant a particular rate in return for a stated proportion of the shipper's total traffic volume. Agreed charges, we have found, are a highly successful way of meeting competition. In fact, it is safe to say that the problems of the Canadian railways would have been more severe, and attrition in traffic more acute, if agreed charge ratemaking had not been possible in recent years.

In order to offer better service at lower cost, railways must have freedom to abandon loss services. They also need freedom to enter other forms of transportation. Further, if railways are required in the public interest to provide services which incur deficits, then it is only fair that the burden of such services be shouldered by the public which has demanded them. The MacPherson Royal Commission on Transportation in Canada, in volume I of its report, recommended Federal subsidies for the Canadian railways starting at about $97 million per year and declining annually. Purpose of the subsidies is to compensate for the burden imposed upon the railway industry by noncompensatory passenger train operations, by the movement of grain to export positions in Western Canada at rates below the cost of providing the transportation, by other burdens associated with branch-line operations and by other miscellaneous loss services provided in the public interest.

I do not believe that subsidies of this nature, earmarked as they are for specific services, and providing an incentive for the railways to gradually eliminate loss services, can seriously infringe upon private ownership in railway transportation. If the public interest requires that loss services be provided, then the public must judge the cost of these services in relation to the value which they receive. In this respect, such subsidies are not subsidies to the railways; they are subsidies to the users of the loss services. One thing is certain. The burden of these loss services cannot be absorbed through the freight rate structure—competition precludes that.

The MacPherson Royal Commission on Transportation has now released volume II of its major report. The findings of the commission can be of great significance to Canadian transportation.

Royal commissions have no legislative responsibility. A Royal commission, which is roughly the Canadian equivalent of factfinding boards in the United States, is often appointed to make recommendations on contentious issues of public policy. The Government is under no obligation to implement recommendations made, but a Royal commission does provide a forum for careful review by a government appointed body. All interested parties have an opportunity to put forward and defend their positions.

The MacPherson Commission found that, broadly, the forces of competition could be relied upon to achieve an efficient allocation of resources in transportation. It recommended that regulation over railway rates and services be abolished except for a form of minimum and maximum rate control.

The commission recommended that burdens imposed on the railways represented by deficits from services provided in the public interest be removed through subsidies carefully earmarked for that purpose and that regulation be substantially reduced.

Specifically, the commission confirmed the previous practices of the board of transport commissioners in not taking into account earnings and assets of non-rail operations in the setting of railway freight rates. It also recommended that railways continue to be granted complete freedom in entering other forms of transportation. The pioneering recommendation of the commission was that the bulk of regulation of railway rates and services be removed except for minimum rate control, which would prevent the railways from charging noncompensatory rates, and maximum rate control, under which no increases in rates would be authorized which would increase an existing rate on traffic moving entirely by rail in excess of 150 percent over long-term out-of-pocket costs calculated on a load of 30,000 pounds. Between those limits, the Canadian railways would apparently have substantial freedom in ratemaking, subject to the requirement that tariffs be published.

If all of the recommendations of the MacPherson Royal Commission are implemented, the Canadian railways will be able to sink or swim on the basis of the economic factors which determine the success of other firms in the economy. If the privately owned railway industry cannot prosper under a competitive framework, it has little reason for existence.

Another vital public policy prerequisite is that the user charges assessed for use of highways and airports provided at public expense properly reflect the cost of these facilities. Assessing the users anything less is prejudicial and inequitable to railway transportation. All of us in the railway industry must at every opportunity remind government of the need to correct this abuse in the allocation of public funds.

I wish, gentlemen, that I could end my address on a hopeful note. Our problems are many and their roots run deep. Even to attempt to find a solution will require the greatest effort and ingenuity on our part. It will also require understanding and cooperation from government and organized labor. Can we achieve a solution? This, gentlemen, we cannot guarantee. But what we should be able to guarantee, indeed what we must guarantee, is a good, hard fight.

The Gallup Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post on January 10, 1962, appeared the Gallup poll with this headline: "Voters Show Support for Tariff Reduction." In the body of the text appears the following statement:

> As things stand today, the weight of sentiment among those who know something about the tariff fight is that lowering import levies would be to America's advantage in competing in the world market.

Then, the statistics go on to show the following:

> By and large, do you favor higher or lower tariffs than we have at present?
>
> The present results:

	Percent
Higher tariffs	31
Lower tariffs	40
Keep the same	14
No opinion	15

A simple process of addition shows that the headlines and the paragraph in the body of the text, both quoted above, are a complete misrepresentation of the poll itself.

The poll indicates that 40 percent favor lower tariffs.

The poll also indicates that 31 percent favor higher tariffs and 14 percent favor keeping the tariffs the same. As I understand arithmetic, 31 percent plus 14 percent is 45 percent.

Thus, the larger percentage does not favor lowering tariffs—45 percent as against 40 percent.

I should thing that the Washington Post and Dr. Gallup's column should both publish corrections of their interpretation of this poll.

For the benefit of our colleagues, under unanimous consent I insert the entire article:

THE GALLUP POLL—VOTERS SHOW SUPPORT FOR TARIFF REDUCTION

PRINCETON, N.J.—With a hot fight over tariff policies looming during this session of Congress, the question arises as to where the public now stands in the controversy between the "protectionists" and the low-tariff advocates.

What many feel will be a historic debate is just now beginning, and with tariffs admittedly a complicated issue, only a little more than half of the public (52 percent) are as yet familiar with the dispute between the high-tariff and low-tariff schools.

As things stand today, the weight of sentiment among those who know something about the tariff fight is that lowering import levies would be to America's advantage in competing in the world market.

In getting the public's reaction to the tariff issue, the Gallup poll first determined how many voters were familiar with the dispute:

"Some people say that our present tariffs should be increased. Other people say that the United States should establish freer trade with other countries by lowering tariffs. Have you heard or read anything about this?"

Fifty-two percent in the latest survey said that they had heard of the current dispute. This is the same "awareness score" recorded in 1955; in 1959, 37 percent were following the tariff issue.

The second question was put to those who said they had followed the discussion.

"By and large, do you favor higher or lower tariffs than we have at present?"

The present results:

	Percent
Higher tariffs	31
Lower tariffs	40
Keep the same	14
No opinion	15

The vote by party affiliation shows the weight of sentiment among Republicans, Democrats, and Independents on the side of lower tariffs:

[In percent]

	Republicans	Democrats	Independents
Higher	36	28	34
Lower	41	40	37
The same	12	15	14
No opinion	11	17	15

First Slovak Roman Catholic Church in Western Hemisphere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Joseph J. Gavenda, pastor, St. Joseph's Church, Hazleton, Pa., recently transmitted to me a memorandum of historical significance. Monsignor Gavenda points out in his communication that his parish is the first Slovak Roman Catholic Church in the Western Hemisphere and I am delighted to make the monsignor's memorandum a part of my remarks today.

The memorandum follows:

MEMORANDUM OF MONSIGNOR GAUENDA

Relative to the historical fact that St. Joseph Roman Catholic Parish, Hazleton, Pa., is the first Slovak Roman Catholic Church in the Western Hemisphere, I submit the following details:

It is an undisputed fact that the Reverend Ignatius Jaskovich was the first Slovak Catholic priest to come to America.

In a published letter written in 1903, in answer to an inquiry of Mr. J. Szkurka, of Hazleton, Father Jaskovich wrote in part:

"I came to America on the 17th of October, 1882. I was stationed at the German Roman Catholic Church on Second Street in New York until November 2. I came to Hazleton, Pa., where on November 18, I celebrated the first holy mass in St. Gabriel's Church, Luzerne County. The building of St. Joseph's Church was begun on May 18, 1885. The cornerstone was blessed on June 29 of the same year, the feast of SS. Peter and Paul. The first holy mass was offered up in the new church on the feast of St. Nicholas, December 6, 1885."

Another published letter, dated November 11, 1903, in answer to the same Mr. Szkurka, Father Joseph Koesalko, the second Slovak Catholic priest to come to America wrote in part:

"I received your kind letter to which I answer, that Reverend Jaskovic came to America in September of 1882 and I arrived in February, 1884. So Father Jaskovic arrived in America 16½ months before me."

Robert Welch and the John Birch Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I should like to include this statement which I have released to the press.

It may clear up some of the misunderstanding about Robert Welch and the John Birch Society.

The statement follows:

ROBERT WELCH AND THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

There have been many comments recently about Robert Welch, the founder and present leader of the John Birch Society. I have the following observations to make on this subject:

1. I totally disagree with Mr. Welch's position about former President Dwight D. Eisenhower. I made this position very clear in April 1961 at a regular press conference. I have reaffirmed this position publicly on many occasions. The thesis that Mr. Eisenhower was either used by or was (a conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy) was advanced by Mr. Welch in a manuscript known as "The Politician." This has never been part of the John Birch Society. As a matter of fact, the council, made up of 28 fine dedicated citizens, disavowed Mr. Welch's position on this issue very clearly when the John Birch Society was founded in 1958. I personally have had other areas of strong disagreement with Robert Welch and have made this clear not only to the press and my constituents, but also to Mr. Welch himself.

2. Though I have had obvious and pointed disagreements with Mr. Welch in certain areas this does not mean that Robert Welch and/or other members of the John Birch Society cannot unite in several basic purposes.

(a) To encourage the education and responsible understanding among Birch members and all Americans of the threat which the Communist conspiracy poses for our Nation. Attorney General Robert Kennedy confirmed the need for knowledge and alertness when on September 24, 1961, he said: "Communist espionage here in this country is more active now than it has ever been." In the "Blue Book," Mr. Welch has stated: "All we must find and build and use, to win, is sufficient understanding. Let's create that understanding and build that resistance, with everything mortal men can put into the effort—while there still is time" (p. 174).

(b) To give all Americans a full understanding of the insidiousness of the Marxist doctrine to destroy our concept of constitutional freedom in this country.

(c) To regenerate in each citizen a proper appreciation of the protection of individual rights given to us by the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence.

3. Robert Welch and all the members of the John Birch Society are doing their part to contribute not only to the resurgence of the conservative movement within the country, but also positively contributing to the anti-Communist program in this country.

4. There have been recommendations that Mr. Welch be asked to step aside because he is "damaging the cause of anticommunism." I disagree with this thought and wish to make that clear at this time. It seems unrealistic to me to ask any segment of our conservative anti-Communist movement to be removed from the battle line at the time when we are beginning to win and just because we do not agree with every item.

5. Strenuous discussion on all the vital issues is healthy and necessary in order to develop new approaches to solve the problems which face our Nation. Furthermore, the very existence of strenuous disagreement within conservative rank proves the vitality of the conservative anti-Communist movement. Conservatives, contrary to the concept peddled by the collectivist establishment, not only tolerates discussion and disagreement, but encourage it as a means of achieving the desired end of intellectual honesty and academic freedom.

6. Robert Welch is an intense foe of communism and the fact that he is the anti-Communist most often attacked in Pravda as well as other Communist publications throughout the United States and the rest of the world, attests to the validity of this thesis.

7. Finally, claims that the John Birch Society is fascist or dictatorial are preposterous. Mr. Welch has said over and over: "Our members are told specifically and emphatically in our bulletins, about once every 3 months, never to carry out any of our requests or to do anything for the society that is against their individual consciences or even contrary to their best judgment." (Footnote 27, p. xv, 4th printing of the "Blue Book.")

Members of the John Birch Society are fine, dedicated, intelligent Americans who adhere to the motto (less government, more individual responsibility, and a better world). This motto as well as activities of the members, directed to this end, are completely consistent with the heritage on to us by the Founding Fathers of America.

The Building of the American Character

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure and an honor to speak in praise of the Boy Scouts of America. This fine organization is now celebrating its 52d anniversary and it is fitting that we pay tribute here in the House of Representatives to the great service to the Nation made by the Boy Scouts.

In the 52 years since the Scouts organized here in Washington they have contributed to the building of good character in our boys and young men perhaps more than any other secular institution. Not the least important of its many services has been the encouragement and development of physical fitness.

Many millions of American men are grateful for the attitudes of mind and body received through their association

with scouting. The 5 million boys presently in the scouting movement will equally benefit in the same manner from a great organization devoted to America and its youth.

As a longtime supporter of Scouting, I am happy to again take official notice of this fine movement.

Time for Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, the sovereign State of Mississippi has many fine newspapers, one of which is the Clarksdale Press Register. This excellent paper, published and edited by Mr. Joseph F. Ellis, Jr., is situated in Clarksdale, Miss., in the area commonly referred to as the delta. This area has long been known for the graciousness of its people and for its peaceful pursuit of an enjoyable life for all its inhabitants. Of late, however, discord has been introduced into this peaceful region by racial agitators spurred into action by outside persons who make a profession of such agitation. This agitation is the subject of a timely editorial by Mr. Ellis which appeared in the February 6 edition of his paper. Because of its thought-provoking content, I commend its reading to all men of good will.

The editorial follows:

TIME FOR QUESTIONS

In view of the continued efforts of a militant minority of Negro citizens of this area, loosely organized as the Coahoma County Federated Council of Organizations, to provoke the maximum disharmony in the heretofore basically good relations between the races in Clarksdale and Coahoma County, it seems in order at this time to openly raise some questions about the motives of this group.

Since its inception, which was inspired by a falsehood known to its leaders as a falsehood, this group has compiled an impressive record of disservice to the welfare of the community. This disservice it now seeks expand with a continuation of its previous misdirected efforts and the addition of a series of conclaves in local Negro churches tomorrow through Friday, featuring appearances by Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., a man who has left a sorry wake of strife and misunderstanding wherever he has been for the past several years.

While he has a perfect legal right to appear here or anywhere else, the motives of those who promote such unnecessary and purposeless discord are subject to serious question. The time is near for the well-meaning majority of both races to give serious thought to the situation that could be created here.

We have a difficult job in trying to maintain and rebuild the basic and long-lasting regard and friendship between men of good will of both races. It can be done and it will be done, but it will not be accomplished by self-serving local agitators or imported professionals.

It is inconceivable that these few can create further rifts between the majorities of both races, who have lived and worked here together for too long to desire anything but a continuation and improvement of the tranquility and opportunities of each.

The leaders, both local and imported, of these perpetually meeting organizations seem to thrive on agitation. They contribute very little if anything to their community. They use the churches, intended as places of worship and good will, as arenas of discord and politics. They use the ministry as a pulpit of strife. They use the collection plate to finance works which have nothing to do with religion. Who benefits from their efforts?

Certainly not the community upon which all depend for a livelihood and which cannot prosper if it is made a perpetual battleground of conflict. Certainly not the majority of Negro citizens.

Do these activities create jobs? Assist in times of disaster and trouble? Do they help the ill and aged? Do they educate children? Do they really seek to improve in any way the difficulties which afflict all men? They do none of these things.

Just as the white community eventually casts out and ignores those who foment discord and preach hatred, it is time for the Negro community to show its good faith by ignoring those both within and without who grow fat in the flesh or the ego by perpetual agitation.

Up to Soviets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken earlier today on the Kremlin's crime in thus far sabotaging our sincere and long-lasting efforts to achieve a nuclear test ban. Last Friday, the 9th, the Newark Evening News editorialized on the same subject. It is a piece of good writing, and one that should be available to my colleagues and all others who read the RECORD:

UP TO SOVIETS

Experience with Soviet duplicity has made necessary President Kennedy's new requirement that an atomic test ban agreement with Russia include an inspection system to detect preparations for testing as well as the shots themselves.

These preparations are intricate and costly. They take time. Once a nation reaches the triggering stage, it stands a giant step ahead of one that has to start from scratch. And because knowledge from such tests can mushroom, any existing lead or parity suddenly can be upset.

We risked this danger during the gentlemen's moratorium which Russia blew apart with its series of 50 test explosions. To so handicap ourselves again without protective controls would be to court disaster.

The alternative is to proceed firmly on grounds of self-interest, testing if national security demands it. Cooperation of the British now makes it possible to proceed toward testing a nuclear anti-missile-missile warhead or other weapons in an area where fallout dangers can be minimized.

At the same time, the United States and Britain stand ready for one last supreme effort to avert resumption of a contest in this perilous business. The effort extends from technical experts to Foreign Ministers and heads of state, separately or as part of general disarmament.

Thus far, Russia has found reason to renege whenever agreement seemed near. On the basis of this experience, the Western Allies have every reason to make the conditions of agreement realistic.

Our national reluctance to resume atmospheric testing has been amply demonstrated. But should Moscow continue to evade an enforcible treaty, the United States would have no alternative.

Kennedy, the Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chester News, Chester, S.C., of February 7, 1962:

KENNEDY, THE MAN

As the first year of the Kennedy administration ended, newspapers all over the country presented candid views of what, in their opinion, it had accomplished or failed to accomplish. The Associated Press gathered a sizable group of these together, and quoted key paragraphs. They make interesting reading.

Almost all of the papers were critical of the administration policy, or lack of policy, that led or at least substantially contributed to the Cuban fiasco. Policy on Laos also came in for heavy criticism. A number felt that the administration, and the President, had pursued a wavering and indecisive line in foreign policy in general.

At the same time, there were those who felt that Mr. Kennedy had grown in office, and has learned many hard facts of life that he didn't know before. And, of course, there was a universal hope that in the long pull he would be successful.

On domestic issues, the press divided more widely, as is always the case, and kept closer to party ties. For instance, the Dallas Morning News said: "On the domestic front, we feel his administration has pushed the New Frontier too far. Spending has been grossly excessive. No effort is being made to balance the budget or cut down the debt." On the other side of the fence, Editor and Publisher Choate, of the Boston Herald-Traveler wrote: "In a world changing so fast that today's success may be tomorrow's disaster, I am convinced the Kennedy administration has done—on the whole—an outstanding job in 1961. Except for the Castro disaster the President has shown great courage, firmness and resolution." And a yes-and-no view was voiced by the New York Daily News: "We'd say he hasn't done as well as his political and press fawners and flatterers say he has, or as badly as is supposed by his out-and-out political and press enemies."

Now Mr. Kennedy has entered his second year in office, and he must go again to Congress with a series of legislative proposals which, in some cases, are revolutionary in nature. Moving on to the specifics, what is the outlook?

First of all, he will get all, or virtually all, of the military and allied programs he will ask, costly as they may be.

He will again urge medical aid to elderly people under the Social Security setup. But his chances here are considered dim. One reason for that is the widespread acceptance by the states of last year's Kerr-Mills bill

which provides this kind of aid to the needy under a joint Federal-State program, with emphasis on local administration. Another, and very recent reason, is the announcement by the Blue Cross and the American Medical Association of a plan to provide low-income people, 65 and older, with a variety of medical services for about $3 a month, on a voluntary, private basis.

Federal aid to education is up again, as always, and it is administration backed. But here, too, the chance of Congress approving the administration measure seems remote. The cost would be great, and there is doubt as to the need.

A matter of extreme controversy is his antirecession program. This involves several factors. One, an eight percent investment credit for industry, designed to encourage spending for new plants and equipment, has the odds on its side. Extension of the unemployment insurance program—which includes lengthening the time benefits would be paid, and bringing in 3 million more workers—is in the highly problematical category. And his request that Congress authorize him to order income tax reductions up to 5 percent in each bracket, as a spur to purchasing power when he might feel that was needed, would seem to have little future. Congress always resists attempts to limit its control of the national purse strings.

A question of absolutely top importance lies in his request for power to lower tariff duties on foreign imports, to a much greater extent than the present law allows the Executive, and to negotiate with the European Common Market. This will be opposed by some industries and some unions. Yet, due to world conditions, the chances are that he will get what he asks, though, perhaps, in modified form.

It should be added that, clearly, the President will back some of his proposals much more strongly than others. In some cases he will, probably, just go through the motions of suggesting and let it go at that. The tariff and antirecession programs will be given the heaviest White House pressure. Finally, it is worth noting that many qualified observers think that the President has been quietly but steadily moving toward a more conservative position. And it is a fact that some of his severest critics are, currently, the extreme liberals.

The Challenge of Rehabilitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the problem of medical care for the aged is one that concerns all of us in Congress at this time. Fortunately, there are many constructive efforts now being applied toward the solution of this problem.

In San Diego County we have an outstanding institution that has received nationwide attention because of its enlightened treatment of older people. The head of this institution, the Edgemoor Geriatric Hospital, is my good friend, Allan E. Flaven whose dynamic leadership has changed Edgemoor from an old folks home to a respected and dignified institution caring for senior citizens of San Diego County. A recent article has appeared in the magazine Hospital Forum which details the enlightened policies of the Edgemoor Geriatric Hospital.

Under unanimous, I include this article as a portion of my remarks.

The article follows:

GERIATRIC CARE: THE CHALLENGE OF REHABILITATION

(By E. J. Carmody, M.D.)

One of the few remaining frontiers of medicine, that dealing with our aging population, is finally being challenged. Although we are aware that the conquest of this frontier lies somewhere in the future, it is consoling, indeed, to know that we are heading in the right direction. The tremendous importance that is being given to the problems of our older age groups today might be cause for some to think that this condition developed rather suddenly and has caught us unprepared. The fact is, that this problem has been gradually gaining momentum over the years until now it demands its proper consideration and attention.

About 10 years ago, a study was undertaken to determine the trend in our aging population. This was done by comparing the fertility and mortality rates. From this study, it was concluded that in these United States, the decline of fertility and mortality was historically responsible in producing our aging population.

Prior to 1920 and the passage of the restrictive immigration laws, the tendency toward longevity was limited by the large influx of immigrants into this country. Following the 1920's, with the decline in immigration as well as the changes in our birth and death rates, the population of the United States has aged more rapidly than ever before. Death rates in this country have continued to decline for at least as long as there are records available: (1) in 1850 the life expectancy at birth was a little over 38 years; (2) by 1900 the life expectancy rose to 44.3 years, and by 1940 to 63.3 years; (3) by 1948 this figure rose to 65.5 years and today it is close to 70 years.

For a clearer picture of the increasing importance of our aging population, in the years that lie ahead, one should note that the number of persons age 65 and beyond in this country has increased from about 3 million in 1900, to better than 16 million today. The estimated figure for the year 1970 is well over 20 million.

In recent years, two relatively new words—"geriatrics" and "gerontology"—have gained a place of prominence, not only in our literature, but in our everyday vocabulary. Geriatrics was coined about 50 years ago by a New York physician named Ignatz Leo Nascher from the Greek geron" meaning "old man," and he applied the term to that special branch of medicine dealing with the diseases of advanced years. Gerontology, meaning "the study of old age," was derived from the same root. Thus, while geriatrics denotes the medical alleviation of the results of aging, gerontology categorizes the theory of aging.

The common concept today that all people over the age of 65 years are among the "aged," is both inaccurate and unjust. The chronological age of an individual should have only relative importance in comparison to his biological and physiological age. Certainly the calendar on the wall should not be elevated to such a place of prominence where it can limit one's usefulness and potentials.

Our definition of the geriatric patient is: "One who has reached a stage in life (such stage being more commonly and predominantly observed in the older age groups) where his biological and physiological deficiencies have so incapacitated him, either through accidental or natural causes, so as to make him unable to maintain his former independent status in our society."

The chronological age is not the determining factor here, and this is as it should be.

The term 'geriatric" patient denotes, as the word "patient" implies a person who is ill and undergoing treatment for his deficiency. In this sense the definition of patient does not apply to the large number of elderly people who are financially independent, so that in their later years they can remove themselves from the turmoil of competitive society to such beautiful surroundings as are provided by the better retirement homes. One can hardly consider the "guests" of such beautiful facilities to be patients. To us the geriatric patient is sick, debilitated, crippled, and has a variety of both mental and physical deficiencies. Be the cause of his illness natural or accidental, this is the patient whom we attempt to rehabilitate.

If our approach to the problems of this group was to continue as in the past, where the geriatric patient was placed in various institutions, where at best he received an abundance of tender, loving care, was cleaned, fed and kept in bed, with nothing to look forward to but the eventual trip to the mortuary, I do not believe that we could build beds fast enough to accommodate the number of people in need of them. There are still too many of these institutions, archaic in their approach to the problems of the geriatric patient, and they are little more than waystations on the road to the cemetery.

EMPHAIS ON REHABILITATION

Today the trend has changed. The treatment of choice has changed. Today the emphasis is on rehabilitation. The concept of rehabilitation as applied to all areas of medicine is of relatively recent origin. Its potential benefits to mankind gained prominence following World War II when many people became dependent upon such a program for restoration. During this period rehabilitation was focused on the younger age groups. However, with the rapid increase in our older population, with the multitude of potential deficiencies to which the aging process is exposed, it soon became obvious that rehabilitation was a service to provide benefit to the individual and not to any specific age group.

These patients exemplify the frequently forgotten art of medicine requiring consideration and treatment of the whole man, rather than one of his parts. It is not a problem here of treating his heart, or his lungs, his kidneys or his brain alone, and as separate entities, and assuming that the rest of his body is normal. The geriatric patient has a multitude of deficiencies involving many organs of the body, and all must be examined and attended to.

It is true, of course, that we cannot buy new parts to replace those that are in need of repair. All too often the damaged organs are beyond repair. But, in all cases, regardless of the body's condition, the attempt is made to repair and restore the deficient organs to the maximum wherever possible.

Many deficiencies that cannot be restored, can often be prevented from further damage, and the patient can be taught to live in relative comfort with his condition. Our goal at Edgemoor Geriatric Hospital is to restore these patients so that they may once again return to their proper place in our society as independent citizens, where they may live out the remainder of their golden years in comfort and happiness, or as close to that goal as possible.

One of the big problems encountered in promoting the concept of rehabilitation of the geriatric patient is in the field of public education. During recent years there has been a growing awareness by the American people of the needs of those considered less fortunate. This awareness has been particularly evident in the field of health. From this public interest there developed numerous voluntary health agencies, some of which

have become very successful organizations. Why have these agencies become so successful? Obviously, because the interest of the people has been maintained in the works of these organizations, because the majority of the contributing public can and do observe the benefits provided to those in need.

But, why has this awareness become so prominent? Could it be that those so interested in the needs of the less fortunate are willing to contribute so generously so long as they can stand on the sidelines and view the problems of those in need from a purely objective vantage point? It is not difficult for most people to view the works of such agencies objectively because the majority of our adult population will go through life without ever experiencing a disaster necessitating help from one of these agencies and most adults are well aware that their chances of being afflicted with an incurable disease are rather remote.

UNANSWERED PROBLEMS

On the other hand, the disasters and the afflictions to which the aging process is exposed cannot be viewed from an objective viewpoint, but must be faced subjectively. There is no one immune to the potential deficiencies so prevalent in this ever increasing segment of our population. There is no need to fear growing old; rather, one should prepare for that which is inevitable. There are many unanswered problems involving the geriatric patient and only by continuous work and research will these problems be solved. Would it not be more logical and wise to face these problems subjectively with the knowledge that the know-how and the facilities will be available when and if you find yourself in need of them?

Edgemoor Geriatric Hospital has accepted the challenge of rehabilitating the geriatric patient in order to make those added years worth living. Our approach to rehabilitation is a broad one. This approach is necessary because we are dealing with that multitude of complexities with almost unbelievable recuperative powers, which we call the human being. There is no easy method of rehabilitation. There are no pills or gimmicks here that will restore a person to their former selves overnight. What may benefit one patient may do nothing for the next. Each case must be treated on an individual basis. This is as it should be, for if rehabilitation were to demand the forfeiture of individuality, we hardly think that the attempt would be worth the effort involved.

More often the road to rehabilitation is long and hard, where only time will reveal the success or failure. But the knowledge that it can be done—that the geriatric patient can be rehabilitated—and every patient with whom we succeed and is sent back to his proper place in society, more than compensates for those with whom we have failed. One need only to observe, as we have so often at Edgemoor: (1) those patients who walk again after being confined to a bed or chair existence for years; (2) or the patient taking his first teaspoon of food unassisted, after many months of paralysis; (3) or hear the first intelligent words from one who was unable to speak for several months; to fully realize the value of rehabilitation. These observations cannot be evaluated in terms of dollars and cents.

There is no royal road to success in this field of rehabilitation. Many minds and many hands are needed. We are indeed fortunate at Edgemoor in having such a dedicated nursing staff. Their untiring efforts to promote our rehabilitation program under the burden of their heavy workload can only be described as a most noble tribute to their honored profession.

I have frequently mentioned that the problems encountered in the rehabilitation of geriatric patients are numerous. The challenge to these problems has been a continuous uphill struggle. Nevertheless, each step has been in a forward direction.

At Edgemoor we know that the rehabilitation of the geriatric patient can be accomplished. Experience has proven that it should be accomplished. And I know that I speak for the entire personnel of this hospital when I assure you that with the help and confidence of both the public and the professional it will be accomplished for the geriatric patient of tomorrow in every community.

U.N. Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in his article on the President's proposed purchase of United Nations bonds, as it appeared in the Long Island Daily Press on February 9, Edgar Mowrer discusses some interesting factors involved:

ADOULA VISIT TIMED TO U.N. BOND ISSUE

(By Edgar A. Mowrer)

President Kennedy is showing the same skill in making his bid with Congress for $100 million worth of U.N. bonds to finance special executive actions by that body as he showed in his political campaign. His importation—excuse me, successful invitation—of Premier Adoula, of the Congo, was planned to convince reluctant lawmakers that the American policy of using U.N. forces to crush dissident Katanga was correct. It may have that effect.

I still hope that the Congress will refuse to vote any money to purchase any U.N. bonds for any purpose. The United Nations is neither a government nor a corporation. It has no assets. It is a free association of sovereign states. If these states want to finance action of any kind, it is up to them to provide the money as dues—regular assessments according to agreements into which they have freely entered. If they fail to pay, it is the duty of the association to expel them.

It is, in my view, wrong to the point of absurdity that certain U.N. special projects can be undertaken in the name of the organization (I speak of the housekeeping for Arab refugees in the Gaza strip and the attempt to unify the Congo by force) yet paid for only by those member governments that approve the special project in question.

Yet, that is what the U.S. administration is proposing. Moreover, it wants the American people—6 percent of the world's population living on less than 7 percent of the land—to foot half the bill—with no certainty of having it repaid. For whereas at first the administration explained that this coming bond issue (coming if Congress is foolish enough to vote the money) would be a one-shot deal, it now proposes to have all future special "executive actions" financed by borrowing. This would mean that a group of U.N. countries would feel financially free to carry out such other "executive acts" as they chose regardless of the views of the minority—unless that minority included a great power able to use its veto.

Such a situation would be as absurd as it is unjust. It would be absurd because of the present membership of the U.N. That organization, by the charter, is open to all peace-loving nations. Certain of the members have demonstrated that they are not peace loving. The Communist bloc supports wars of liberation and armed suppression of countries like Hungary. India, Indonesia Egypt, several African governments, support any anticolonial war, meaning one that is directed against white people.

Moreover, many of the members—at least 20 or 25—are nations only by courtesy, without any of the prerogatives of real independence. To allow a majority swollen by such governments to take executive decisions, is to make a farce of the ensuing "executive action."

But executive actions by the U.N. are also unjust. They are unjust because they try to impose legality on little countries, while other nations do as they please. A U.N. majority that refrained from executive action against the U.S.S.R. in Hungary, allows Nasser to violate his pledges to keep the Suez Canal open to all countries, permits India to attack Portugal in Goa, closes an eye to the Soviet airlift to the Communist rebels in Laos—such a U.N. is unworthy of confidence. Justice that is not impartially enforced is not justice and the United States should be no party to it.

Peaceful Coexistence and U.S. National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Theodore C. Achilles, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for Political Affairs, is a constituent of our district and recently delivered an address before the Stanford University Foreign Policy Institute. Under leave to insert my own remarks and include extraneous matter, I am including a copy of his address:

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE AND U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY

(Address by the Honorable Theodore C. Achilles)

President Sterling, Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure to be here with you on "the farm." This is the first occasion I have had to express opinions at Stanford since the last time I had to answer questions in class. In those days I used to get a good deal of my sleep in class and if I see anyone dozing tonight I will recognize a kindred spirit and wish him pleasant dreams. It is also comforting to know that if any of the faculty here tonight think I haven't learned much, at least they can't flunk me. My degree is safely hidden away.

You have already heard peaceful coexistence discussed penetratingly and eloquently by four speakers of unusual distinction. It is not easy to follow in their footsteps, but I am glad to have been asked to speak on peaceful coexistence and U.S. national security. That is an aspect of the problem of direct concern not only to us as a Nation but to each of us individually. It might be a matter of life or death for us.

The relationship between peaceful coexistence and our national security depends very largely upon the extent to which it is a firm policy of the Soviet Government or merely a tactic. A lot depends upon the answer to this question, and it is not an easy one to answer. The phrase was coined by the Russians, not by us. Yet the concept that any form of relationship between nations should be peaceful is fundamental to our own for-

eign policy and always has been. Coexistence between nations is in a sense inevitable, unless one of them becomes nonexistent, but the phrase is not a very happy one, particularly in a rapidly changing world. The words "peaceful competition" would better express our idea of relations with the Soviet Union.

The basic Soviet objective, as revealed by its leaders for half a century, remains totally unchanged—worldwide Soviet domination, by peaceful means if possible. The Peiping regime has had a shorter life but its basic objective has never changed—its own worldwide domination, through inevitable conflict.

Certainly their tactics change. A favorite device of the Kremlin is to play alternately upon the world's emotions of fear and hope. Periods of threats of nuclear destruction alternate with periods of apparent reasonableness, with emphasis on "peaceful coexistence" and "relaxation of tensions." The world is learning to be less deceived by these abrupt shifts in the Kremlin's tune and to study its motives more sharply and realistically.

Many books have been written about their strategy, tactics, and methods. One of the best I have seen is "Protracted Conflict," by Strausz-Hupé and others of the Foreign Policy Research Institute. It well describes the Soviet long-range view of the struggle, its all-embracing strategy, its integrated use of force and the threat of force, economic warfare and assistance, negotiation, espionage, conspiracy, subversion, and confusion as methods.

Where does peaceful coexistence fit into this picture? Lenin had advocated coexistence as a tactic in time of weakness but the current intensive export sales of the phrase began only in the late fifties. This was at a time when Moscow sought to appear reasonable, when it believed its policies could be pursued better by soft words than by threats. It was coined in Moscow for export to replace the concept of cold war. "Let us get away from this concept of a cold war," said the Kremlin, "let us all follow policies of peaceful coexistence." They have sought to implant the idea that the two concepts are different. In attacking recent statements by the President and other American leaders, they have charged them with going back to the worst days of the cold war.

Oddly enough, or not so oddly to those who fully understand Soviet tactics and their piracy of democratic concepts, peaceful coexistence comes much closer to our concept of international relations than theirs. Cold war is a much better description of their policy than of ours. We seek peaceful relations, cooperations, and competition; they seek total victory, preferably through other means than total war.

In this sense their use of the phrase "peaceful coexistence" must be considered strictly tactical. It is designed to delude the free world, to keep it off balance, to lull it into complacency, to inhibit the free world while preserving a free hand for the Communist conspiracy. Let us not be deceived. Let us never forget basic Soviet objectives.

Their concept of negotiations is completely different from ours. Ours is to find mutuality of interest as a basis for mutually satisfactory solutions of problems. Theirs is to advance one more step toward their ultimate objective.

To what extent is the concept of peaceful coexistence more than a devious tactic, a weapon or an anesthetic? To what extent can we consider it a policy of the Soviet Government?

Lenin advocated coexistence with capitalist states as a desirable tactic for the U.S.S.R. in time of weakness, a tactic for buying time, time to develop strength. The U.S.S.R. has grown prodigiously in strength since Lenin's time but it still finds coexistence useful as a tactic. Has it become more than that? Have pressures developed within the Soviet Union, within the Kremlin itself, which make at least the peaceful part of the concept something more fundamental, something important to Russian national interests?

Certainly since Lenin's day the hydrogen bomb, the multimegaton bomb, has become a fact of life. It is certainly something which those who determine our military and foreign policy have long since taken carefully into account. Presumably the Kremlin has also given it much thought. The powers that be in the Kremlin, dedicated to advancing Soviet national interests above all things, must have contemplated the effects of nuclear war upon Mother Russia, upon the citadel of Soviet communism, and upon the industrial structure they have exerted such effort to build.

Peiping shows less concern with thermonuclear weapons. China has enormous human resources spread thin over vast areas. The oriental mind thinks in very long-range terms.

Moscow's preoccupation with nuclear war, however, as yet shows no signs of inhibiting its predilection for wars of national liberation, brushfire wars which it can persuade others to fight for it by proxy as in Laos or Vietnam nor for the use of nuclear blackmail to frighten the West from time to time.

There are undoubtedly internal pressures working to some extent, however limited, upon the Kremlin. These are probably contradictory. On the one hand, too great a relaxation of tensions, too great a relief from fear of war, would undermine the Soviet regime and make more difficult the allocation of resources to war production at the expense of consumer goods. On the other, there is no doubt of the strong desire of the Soviet people for peace and a better life. The slight improvements since Stalin's death in relaxation of control and in the standard of living mean so much to the Russian people that they would be hard even for the Kremlin to reverse.

In any event, Moscow is sure to continue vigorously its struggle for the minds of people in the uncommitted, the lesser developed nations. This is basic to its concept of peaceful coexistence as it is to ours of cooperation and peaceful competition.

Nevertheless, there can be no doubt as to the reality of the rift in the Communist camp during the last 2 years. A central element in that growing rift has been this question of peaceful coexistence. Peiping insists that world domination can come only through violent struggle. Moscow insists that the same end can be achieved by other means.

On January 17 an article in Pravda, the Soviet Union's most authoritative newspaper, stated flatly that peaceful coexistence had been made necessary by a "scientific and technical revolution in the military field produced by the creation of thermonuclear weapons which threaten mankind with unprecedented losses and destruction."

The article continued:

"The principle of peaceful coexistence is not a tactical maneuver on the part of the Soviet Government, as the bourgeois politicians try to present it, but a fundamental program point of the socialist states, foreign political activities * * *.

"Peaceful coexistence is a dialectical process in which a most acute class struggle between socialism and capitalism combines organically with the cooperation of the states of the two opposing systems for the sake of preserving peace."

Khrushchev himself has described coexistence as "more than the mere absence of war, more than a temporary and unstable truce between wars; it is a coexistence of two opposing social systems, based on a mutual renunciation of recourse to war as a means of settling international disputes."

While these could, of course, be mere words to delude the West, the vehemence of the dispute within the Communist camp over the issue is unmistakable.

For almost 2 years the quarrel over this issue has been carried on with a virulence that we can be confident has not been staged for our benefit.

We in this country can well understand the compelling consideration that underlies the Soviet concern over the disastrous outcome of a nuclear war. From the free world's point of veiw the struggle for man's future can far better be waged by nonmilitary means than by nuclear war. And we can have some confidence that Moscow's aversion to nuclear war is real.

But one decisive point must be made: Soviet concern over the consequences of a new war is, and will continue to be, directly proportional to our capability and our will to produce the consequences that they fear. Any relaxation—any demonstration of uncertainty or a lack of will on our part—and the Soviets could come to make a different estimation of the likely outcome of one or another gamble.

If we can succeed in keeping the Soviet leadership convinced that war in this day and age is simply unthinkable, will that mean that we can look forward to an era of tranquility? Can we, in other words, hope that Khrushchev's brand of peaceful coexistence—in contrast to Stalin's—gives reason to believe that the menace that the Communist conspiracy has long posed for us in process of disappearing?

The Soviet leaders themselves have given us the answer: Most decidedly not.

I could cite an unending number of Soviet statements that avow in lucid and passionate terms that now, as before, peaceful coexistence, even without war, does not mean "peace" as we understand the term, but relentless struggle against us and our way of life.

Here is how Pravda put it a scant 2 weeks ago:

"Peaceful coexistence does not exclude, but presupposes revolutionary change in society; it does not retard, but speeds up the world revolutionary process; it does not preserve the capitalist regime, but promotes the decomposition and disintegration of capitalism."

And further, "* * * peaceful coexistence of states with different regimes is not the abandonment of the class struggle on the world scene, but the selection of such deployment areas for the struggle as are best suited for the interests of all mankind."

I would have you think on the phrase "selection of the best deployment areas."

What does this mean? The Soviets again have told us:

It means the continued use of all the methods of penetration and subversion that have become so familiar to us. It means that in every part of the world continued relentless efforts are to be made with every means short of actual war to tear down the bastions of a free society.

The Soviets still seek and hope to "bury" the free world.

The challenge is as stark and deadly as ever. How shall we meet it?

Given the secrecy of the Soviet and Red Chinese systems, decisions reached by a handful of men, completely controlled press and exclusion of foreign observers, our judgments concerning Soviet or Red Chinese policy must always be tentative. Given the importance of the answer, we must consider it with extreme care. Our judgment can never depend on what they say, only on what they do, and that over a long enough period of time to form a clear pattern.

To the extent that the Kremlin really believes that peaceful coexistence, the avoidance of war and the waging of the struggle by other means, serves its basic national

interests, we share with it a common interest in the avoidance of war. Obviously this common interest is one of very great importance, one which must be utilized and developed by all practicable means. Let us hope for the best.

Given the nature of Soviet and Red Chinese objectives, policies and tactics, however, we must also be prepared for the worst. Until their objectives, and their power structure, change sufficiently for the instinctive human desires of their peoples for peace and freedom to be reflected in their policies we must maintain our guard.

Until then the free world, and especially the United States must maintain adequate force to deter or, if necessary, to wage general war and to assist other nations to put out the "brushfire" wars which Moscow and Peiping are so fond of fighting by proxy. I do not wish to dwell on the military side but in the past year our defense budget has been increased by 15 percent and our production rate of Polaris submarines and Minuteman missiles increased by 50 percent. We are constantly seeking to strengthen the free world against the "peaceful coexistence" tactic of indirect aggression through subversion.

Until then we must wage the cold war, or peaceful coexistence, at least as vigorously as they do. We must get the cold war out of the trenches. We must understand clearly what we are up against. It is surprising how few Americans really understand Soviet or Chinese objectives, strategy, tactics and methods. No wonder so few people elsewhere do.

Today policies of military containment and negative anticommunism are no longer enough. It is not enough merely to be against something or to react. We must act, we must be positive and dynamic. We must get on with the job of helping to shape the kind of world we would want to see if Marxism-Leninism had never existed.

In a changing world we must know clearly where we want to go, the kind of world we want future generations to live in, the direction we want history to take.

Our basic goal was stated simply by the President in his state of the Union message on January 11: "a peaceful world community of free and independent states—free to choose their own future and their own system, so long as it does not threaten the freedom of others * * * a free community of nations, independent but interdependent."

Our basic purposes as a nation have not changed since they were set down in our Constitution: "to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." What we seek is the kind of international environment which will best assure the achievement of these purposes by us and by all others who share them, an environment in which people with values and purposes such as ours can flourish.

We must be prepared to lead. Someone has said that the United States has been dragged kicking and screaming into a position of world leadership. Whether we like it or not, we are there. Our material strength is unquestionable and we must never cease to keep it growing. We should not underestimate our moral strength. In our nearly two centuries of nationhood we have developed political doctrine and national human and spiritual values of enormous moral force. Let us seek constantly to develop that force and to use it more effectively.

But we cannot be rigid. Nor would we wish to impose our system upon anyone. This is a changing world, and one in which population growth, communications, science, and technology are constantly accelerating the rate of change. We cannot sit still on the status quo, however comfortable it may be. We must recognize and understand the forces of change, the national and human motives behind them, the desire of all men for a decent livelihood, for freedom, for dignity, for opportunity, for a better life for their children than they have had.

We must work with and seek to guide these forces. We must do our utmost to see that inevitable changes, however swift, are constructive and brought about by peaceful means.

We must keep pace with change and seek out new ways of dealing with new situations. In the last 40 years we have seen the world changed by a centrifugal revolution, now almost complete, of the breakup of the old colonial empires into fledgling nations. The admission of 55 new ones in 15 years has vastly changed the United Nations. We must find ways of guiding this new situation, and these new nations, along constructive paths.

In the last 15 years there has been developing a centripetal revolution, a drawing together of national governments to deal more effectively with problems with which none of them can deal adequately alone. Today's economic, military and scientific problems, and many political ones, far transcend national frontiers.

This is an age of experimentation, political as well as technical, and we must keep up, lead if we can. Within little more than a decade the nations of Western Europe, with our strong encouragement and support, have made fantastic strides toward economic and political unity. In NATO, Canada and we have joined our European allies in the most effective defensive unity yet achieved in peacetime. In the last year the Canadians and we have again joined with them and with other European nations in the OECD, the new Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, with a view to harmonizing economic policies and coordinating assistance in the development of other nations.

The new European Economic Community, the so-called Common Market, has combined into one economic unit 170 million people, a population about equal to our own. The Community's gross national product, although substantially less than ours in dollar terms, has been growing twice as fast as ours. Total imports into the European Economic Community in 1960 approached $20 billion, and exports were about the same. Great Britain and other European nations are negotiating participation in this Economic Community. Within another year it may contain some 250 million people.

The development of a common market, a single economic unit; of this size, composed of advanced industrial nations and our best customers is something we obviously cannot ignore, whether we like it or not. We do like it. Over the last 15 years three different Presidents and seven different Congresses with completely bipartisan support, have declared it to be the national policy of the United States to encourage it.

This development presents us with an unprecedented challenge and unprecedented opportunity. If we accept this challenge, this opportunity, by working out a mutually profitable partnership with the Common Market, our factories and farms can increase their sales to our richest, fastest growing market. Our exports will increase and our balance-of-payments position will improve. We will have forged a vital new link in the development of the free world.

If we hang back, if we fail to meet the challenge and seize the opportunity, we will cut ourselves off from our major allies, they will go ahead without us, our exports will suffer, our farm surpluses increase, our balance of payments worsen and Moscow and Peiping take heart from a new source of weakness and friction in the free world.

For these reasons the new trade expansion program which the President submitted to the Congress last Thursday is of paramount importance to our own future and to that of freemen everywhere.

As the President stated in his message of January 25 to the Congress:

"The combined output and purchasing power of the United States and Western Europe—nearly a trillion dollars a year—is more than twice as great as that of the entire Sino-Soviet world. Though we have only half the population, and far less than half the territory, we can pool our resources and resourcefulness in an open trade partnership strong enough to outstrip any challenge, and strong enough to undertake all the many enterprises around the world which the maintenance and progress of freedom require. If we can take this step, Marxist predictions of 'capitalist' empires warring over markets and stifling competition would be shattered for all time—Communist hopes for a trade war between these two great economic giants would be frustrated—and Communist efforts to split the West would be doomed to failure."

At the heart of the kind of world we seek to build, in our own interest and that of all freemen, not merely as the answer to the Communist challenge, lies the Atlantic community. The nations of Western Europe, Canada and ourselves are bound by deep ties of common heritage, tradition, values and interest. All of us are seeking new forms of unity, new methods of dealing together with problems which none of us can solve alone.

Yet this community of free nations we seek must go far beyond the Atlantic. We and other Atlantic nations have close ties with the nations of Latin America, Japan, Australia, New Zealand and other countries. What we are seeking is an expanding community, originally of nations which can deploy substantial resources beyond their borders, expanding in depth of unity and in breadth of association. It must help to expedite the development of less developed nations, to serve as an irresistible magnetic force which pulls them toward it in their own true interests. As this community develops it will have many variations of association in different fields. It must be flexible, free to evolve as experience in this unchartered field shows best. A community secure against Sino-Soviet control must be able to assure progress by its members sufficient to convince them and others that their aspirations can be fulfilled better within its framework than without.

It must and will develop the strength which comes from unity with freedom, the strength of diversity, of freemen working together in their common interest.

In the process we must maintain communications with the Soviets, always ready to negotiate but not counting too much on negotiations except where the strength of the Western position makes it in the Russian national interest to conclude a mutually satisfactory agreement. They respect strength, and as the free world develops it materially and morally through growing unity, they will respect it more.

We must build new faith and vigor into the cult of freedom. We must prove that the wave of the future is freedom and not tyranny. We must demolish the myth the Communists have sought to develop, not without some success, that everything on their side of the Curtain is untouchable and that all controversies between us, win, lose or draw, must be settled within the free world.

As we make our goal clear and as we progress toward it, its appeal will certainly not be limited to the free world. On the contrary, it cannot help but touch responsive

chords in the peoples who have lost their freedom, including those of the Soviet Union and Red China. Hopes for freedom, dignity and opportunity are basic, human, instinctive and universal. In the long run achievement of our basic goal through peaceful competition should help fulfill the aspirations of the people of the Communist world defeating the ambitions of their leaders.

That, ladies and gentlemen, is my view of the relation between peaceful coexistence and U.S. national security. Our basic goal is the American answer, the positive, constructive and dynamic answer, to the Communist challenge. As the President has said: "We will not reach that goal today or tomorrow. We may not reach it in our lifetime. But the quest is the greatest adventure of our century."

Thank you.

All That Needs To Be Done To Become Slaves Is Do Nothing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that if our country is to be saved from its drift toward the Federal Government doing everything for everybody, as long as the money lasts, it is going to be saved by those stout-hearted citizens who are today attempting to jar our citizens out of their slumber.

Many organizations are today sponsoring programs which encourage the citizens to take a sincere interest in national affairs, to learn how their Government functions, and to freely express their views to their elected representatives.

Dr. Tyrone Gillespie, assistant to the president of the Dow Chemical Co., with home offices in the 10th Congressional District of Michigan, which I represent, recently delivered a splendid address along this line at the annual meeting of the Monroe, Mich., Chamber of Commerce. I wish to call it to the attention of my colleagues and others who read the RECORD. I am sure all will agree freedom is a political matter.

The address follows:

ALL THAT NEEDS TO BE DONE TO BECOME SLAVES IS DO NOTHING

Mr. Chairman and friends of the Monroe Chamber of Commerce, I was asked to come tonight and speak to you in an inspirational vein and to give you the yearly shot in the arm that every good chamber of commerce likes to give its members. I don't know how I was asked to do this job, but Mr. McHenry is an energetic manager, and he probably knows a lot more about what I am likely to say than you got out of the introduction, which tells what I have been up to but not what I am going to do. I give you warning that if I had been born a hundred years ago, I would have been a hellfire evangelist, or more likely an Irish rebel like my forefathers.

I'm mad, not at Mr. Roosevelt, or Mr. Kennedy, or Mr. Reuther, but at myself. I've sat around for 30 years and allowed people to rob Peter to pay Paul, without yelling hard enough; and in the last few years I have come to realize who Peter really is. He's my son. He is also your sons and daughters.

Monroe is a famous town. It is famous for several reasons. One, it is the birthplace of General Custer. He was on the Government payroll, but he is not famous for what he took away from America, but for what he gave to it. Monroe is not famous as a town which will give the most welfare, but as a city whose citizens are producing new and better things for our industrialized country, and whose people are willing and anxious that our country and our State grow and prosper by their industry.

Why can't we be famous in the future for what has been our strength in the past?

We have many towns like Monroe, well stocked with serious hard-working, decent, kindhearted people who have kept this country great in the face of terrible war, depression, political stupidity and even subversion.

There is here a deep reservoir of power which could make our State strong again, and as our State regains its vigor, so will our Nation become stronger.

I like to quote the liberals; they say things so well.

Franklin Roosevelt said, while running for office the first time: "We must cut Federal spending or there will be no government. Any government, like any family, can spend more than it earns for a short time. Habit means the poorhouse."

A young Congressman by the name of John F. Kennedy said: "The scarlet thread running through the thoughts and actions of the people is the delegation of great principles to that all-absorbing leviathan—the State. Every time that we try to lift a problem to the Government, to the same extent we are sacrificing the liberties of the people."

I think these quotations will prove that a lot of us sometimes agree with our Presidents.

In saleswork, and I'm sure that there are salesmen in the audience, we are told we must always accentuate the positive.

Try these on for size:

1. Our Nation has a form and philosophy of government that provides the maximum of liberty for our people.
2. Ours is a system which provides investors, producers, and consumers with freedom of choice and freedom of opportunity.
3. Ours is a system in which the productive facilities of the Nation are owned by the people instead of by the Government.
4. Ours is a system which recognizes the dignity of the individual.
5. Our solid religious traditions encourage high moral and ethical standards.
6. Our system gives each individual an incentive to do his best and rewards him according to his production.

THE LEGISLATIVE TEST

These are statements which are positive and verities about our system. If we remember these things about our system, we are prepared to test each piece of legislation and decide whether it is good or bad, and if a legislative act is prejudicial to freedom, it is not progressive regardless of its label.

Let's try an example: Federal aid to education. Well, first, the help will go largely to what we euphoniously call the public sector. This means it will not go to schools which have religion as a part of the curriculum. Secondly, it will carry with it certain standards set by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Will these standards be divorced from the Freudian philosophy of that Department? Thirdly, if we don't like it, how much influence do most of you here have with the Secretary of Health Education, and Welfare—as much as with your school board?

Anyone who opposes Federal aid to education or gets upset if tax money is spent on modernistic daubs to hang in the college lounge is labeled a reactionary and said to be against education.

Well, this isn't so. There is a free enterprise way to handle this problem, and sending money to Washington just isn't that way. One free enterprise solution would be to give tax credit for a part of the tuition and cost of sending our children to school. This would take care of most of the problem, and those left over could be picked up by philanthropic and industrial grants.

Part of our education problem results from a false assumption. We have been propagandized until we believe that everyone, regardless of IQ, desire, or aptitude, must go to college. This is not true. Some should learn a trade after high school. Those who really should go to college could be covered by the methods suggested.

This kind of talk will be scoffed at and statistics thrown all over the place, showing our total birth rates and school population and what a plight we will be in if colleges are not given everything they want by Washington.

You see, the trick of every one of these people who advocate draining our substance is to pick a real need where everyone knows of one or two examples, or can plausibly believe that there is a social problem, and then throw some massive propaganda behind it. Labor leaders tell their people it is needed; liberal Senators and Congressmen make speeches; liberal newspaper columnists write articles and reporters write headlines. Then we believe we have a problem too big for a free enterprise solution and the only acceptable proposition is Federal aid.

Most of the problems of our time are social and belong in the family; some belong in the church; some to the local government; a few in the State, and only a very few to the Federal Government.

THE TAX DOLLAR TRIP IS COSTLY

Government is now spending about 50 percent of its income on national defense, and about 55 percent on other things. If the Federal Government wasn't taking $7 billion of taxes out of Michigan, Michigan could raise our taxes to take care of its needs and we would be better off because our money wouldn't have to make that costly trip to Washington and back.

I was raised on a little farm out in Oregon. We had no money to travel, but we had an unbounded faith and freedom. After graduation from a little high school, I took $20, which I had earned hoeing corn, and hitchhiked 50 miles to Willamette University at Salem, the State capital.

It never occurred to me that one does not enter a university with assets of $20. A kindly registrar, who maybe was making $3,000 a year, took my $20 and reached in his pocket and wrote out his own check for $200 for the balance of the tuition, and I went to school for 7 years. This was in 1932, and there were no ideas prevalent that the government, any government, had responsibility to see that I had a college education. I had freedom, I had faith, I had a burning desire, and a wonderful man saw to it that I had opportunity. I paid him back from money earned washing dishes, selling papers, and tending yards.

Faith, freedom, work, opportunity, family, religion, creativity, courage—these are words which have in times past been the descriptive words portraying the spirit of our Nation. Unfortunately, they are losing their symbolism and are becoming merely words. They are the transcendent concepts of the American heritage. Out of these concepts have been released the energies and creative impulses which have given us the factories, the farms, the churches which have made possible the funds to run the Government.

This story was really to lead up to another point: The campus of the college was directly

across the street from the Oregon State Capitol. The old capitol had burned down and a new one was built which was a gleaming marble edifice, new and awe inspiring to a naive country boy.

One inscription in this building is carved as firmly in my memory as it is carved in the stone there today. This was its text: "In the souls of its citizens will be found the likeness of the State."

Maybe this explains why we have problems in Lansing.

I work for a large corporation. I believe that the corporations of this country are one of its most valuable assets in peace and in war. The men who manage and run my company, I am proud to call my friends. They are honest, honorable, patriotic, industrious, intelligent, and humanitarian. For most of them the workweek is 60 to 80 hours. Michigan is blessed with such corporations, and if each day each of our citizens would thank God that such institutions are here, and mean it, and support them and vote for them, the problems of Michigan would be immeasurably lightened.

The corporation has no civil rights, it has no votes, it can spend no money on elections, yet it must provide the jobs, the production, the payroll, the taxes, and the good things of life we want.

It is the whipping boy of politicians, of labor leaders, of liberals, and it can't fight back except through those who as individuals are a part of the system and believe in it, and they are too few. The very people who are driving business out of Michigan are those who are supported by the profits of business directly or indirectly.

We have our Ford-Canton decisions. We have our line of calumny directed at business incessantly by the Guy Nunns of our State, and we wonder why there isn't a surge of business headed for Michigan. There is nothing wrong with Michigan that a couple of good elections couldn't cure.

Your Congressman is GEORGE MEADER. He is one of the patriots who is trying to fend off some of these social experiments which were tried in Rome between 509 B.C. and A.D. 456, and have had a few test runs since that day, always with the same lethal results. When was the last time you wrote him a letter? For that matter, when did you last write PHILIP HART and PAT MCNAMARA?

Some of our citizens, who suddenly found their lands and homes being summarily taken from them for retrogression to Federal wilderness, have been asking the Senators "Why?"

Have you written to your Senators to ask anything or to tell them what you think about things lately?

IS IT WORTH A LETTER?

There hasn't been too much interest shown that Federal expenditures have increased from $3.4 billion in 1930 to $92.5 billion estimated by President Kennedy in 1962, about a 2,700-percent increase. Total taxes at all levels of government are now taking about 37 percent of our national income. Professor Parkinson, in his book, "The Law and the Profits," states that when a national government absorbs 30 percent of the Nation's income, its national influence will decline. At 35 percent there is a loss of freedom and stability, and at 36 percent there is disaster, though the results may not be immediate.

Is this worth a letter?

Another matter which should interest you is the notion of Senator JOSEPH CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, to establish a Department of Urban Affairs in the Cabinet for financial aid to big cities, which will certainly tie the big cities to the Federal Government and create a new political alinement between the States and Federal Government.

There is a plan—one of Senator KEFAUVER's, Democrat, of Tennessee, dreams—to set up a Cabinet post to coordinate consumers' services, which will consolidate several existing agencies, add some new agencies, and hold national consumers' conferences. The cost is going to be high, and the duties of such a Department will be in part to flay already bedeviled American industry.

Agriculture Secretary Freeman guessed wrong last year, and instead of his program reducing costs on the farm support program, they went up, and he will need another $600 million supplemental appropriation, and so he will urge that he be given more power to directly regulate agriculture, issue directives on packaging and grading farm products, and to further stabilize production and marketing.

Senators KEFAUVER and CARROLL, Democrat, of Colorado, will press their bill to imprison corporate officers and fine them up to $100,000 for antitrust violations and to imprison or fine anyone who might have reasonable cause to believe (whether he knows or not) that his corporation is violating the antitrust laws. It will be safer to be a bank robber than a corporate officer when this passes.

Senator PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, will push his bill to prevent any corporation officer or lawyer involved in any way with an antitrust matter from being employed or paid by the corporation for 1 year after conviction. This sounds like a bill of attainder which our forefathers condemned.

Representative STEED, Democrat, of Oklahoma, and Representative PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, have introduced companion bills to give the Federal Trade Commission power to issue cease-and-desist orders to stop any trade practice deemed objectionable by FTC until a hearing can be held. This violates our basic legal concept that a defendant is innocent till proven guilty, and many practices condemned by FTC have been found proper by the courts after prolonged litigation. Such powers could do immeasurable harm to business.

The drug industry is under attack by Representative DINGELL, Democrat, of Michigan, and Senator KEFAUVER. These bills have such provisions as the limitation of patent rights on drugs to 3 years instead of the normal 17 years; the requirement that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare approve the efficacy of drugs before they are marketed; and the selling of drugs only by generic names instead of brand names. Personally, I believe that our drug industry has done a magnificent job of research, has prolonged the lifespan of our citizens, and has not made exorbitant profits; and such legislation as is proposed is dangerous harassment, not only dangerous to the drug companies and our concepts of fairplay, but actually dangerous to our lives and health. I don't know how you feel, but I would rather trust my life and health to the scientists of Parke Davis and Upjohn than to Secretary Ribicoff or his assistant, Jack Conway, who was Walter Reuther's assistant before he went to Washington.

Senator HART, Democrat, of Michigan, will undoubtedly submit bills to supervise advertising and use of brand names of consumer products.

The patent system, founded by our Constitution and which has been instrumental in the growth and development of our country, is under attack in several bills.

Representative THOMPSON, Democrat, of New Jersey, has a bill legalizing secondary boycotts on construction projects, which would legalize the scandalous situation which occurred at our missile bases last year.

Representative ELMER HOLLAND, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, has a pair of bills, one of which would legalize picketing of entire plants or projects if a dispute occurred in any segment of a construction site, and the bill is drawn to cover a larger base. This could have the effect of closing one of your principal industries if a dispute arises as to the union approval of, say, a plumber doing repair work in the plant. The other of Representative HOLLAND's proposal would set up a several-hundred-million-dollar fund to retrain employees alleging that they have lost their jobs due to automation.

Senator CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, has an even broader bill on the same subject. Senator CLARK, by the way, is the author of a statement which says, "States are no longer efficient instrumentalities for the application of human intelligence and compassion to human problems. Our modern industrial Nation has become economically one community, with whose problems the 50 federated States cannot deal effectively." A translation of this fine language would be, "It's hard to pass socialistic legislation at lower levels because the people can get at the legislators."

Senator HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, has a bill to start a permanent Youth Conservation Corps patterned after the old CCC except that it would be run by the Department of Labor rather than the Army.

Representative CARL PERKINS, Democrat, of Kentucky, would set up funds for the Labor Department to train people who drop out of school to qualify them for the labor force. This would be outside of the education program for which we are paying several billions of dollars.

One of the principal issues will be medical care for the aged under social security. The idea is to provide, in addition to medical care, a system of checkups which would make it almost impossible for you to get to your doctor because of the lineup of older people for checkups; home nursing expense and nursing home expense; dental care; and to have enough Federal inspectors to check up on all the old people to see if their diet is proper, that they are getting enough recreation, and that their religious life is in proper order, and so forth.

Old people are defined for some purposes as those over 40.

The retirement age is to be lowered, which raises the serious question if there are going to be enough workers to do the work of the Nation.

There is legislation now which takes care of needy people who must have medical care, but the liberals' answer to that is that human dignity is lowered if they must ask for help, that the help must be automatic. This eliminates the test of need which this thing was supposed to be all about at the start.

The costs of the proposed programs, added to present social security, will cost every man and woman worker about 10 percent of his or her pay if they are earning under $6,000. It will add about 5 to 10 percent to the payroll costs of businesses, which will break many businesses, for the average profit of many businesses is not that much. It will affix socialized medicine, for there will be "standards" set up for the doctors and hospitals who will take care of these problems. There will be no tax credits for such a program, and the takehome pay and disposable income of a majority of working Americans will be severely reduced. The fakers, the chiselers and profiteers will have a happy hunting ground.

The Federal Government will also take over the unemployment compensation field if an administration-supported bill by Representative KING, Democrat, of California, is passed. It will immediately increase the base and raise the cost by making permanent now so-called temporary increases. It is certain that many businesses will fail and the income of most businesses will be reduced if this bill passes.

In the field of taxation, there will be legislation proposed by the administration to

repeal the 4-percent dividend credit on stock dividends, to commence withholding on interest and dividends, to tax income earned abroad—even on the amounts paid in taxes abroad—and to extend the Korean emergency taxes.

There will be a determined effort to reduce tariffs still further, and open our markets to foreign goods while their markets are closed to us because of the high costs of our production and their tariffs, quotas and embargoes. I have just returned from Pakistan and the Far East, and every businessman that I talked with complained that our goods are too high priced, and they are buying from Japan and Germany. We have priced ourselves out of foreign markets. When you read U.S. figures on foreign trade, examine them carefully to determine how much of the sales abroad are distressed agricultural products sold under Public Law 480 for local currency, which is used to build elaborate U.S. public buildings, rest homes, commissaries, and pay for junkets in the country where the sale is made.

There is more, but I have recited a few samples.

TOO MUCH MEDICINE?

I know that if you as citizens carefully study the foreign and domestic legislation, you will find food for thought, even something to write your Senators about. Every bit of this proposed legislation, like good medicine, has a good and moral purpose stated, but there are side effects, and like taking good medicine, too much of it will kill you. Nature will take care of many of our ills if we have less medicine.

Union workers seem destined to play a leading part in saving or breaking our democracy, and they must somehow be made to understand that their salvation lies not with goosestepping at the call of their union leaders, but with the salvation of their country.

James L. MacDevitt, director of the AFL-CIO committee on political education, has turned to the ancient union enemy, automation, to enforce his will upon his people. He has installed a computer to determine how and whether each union member is registered to vote. He states that if he can win 20 more seats for liberals in the House of Representatives, the AFL-CIO will control the Government.

That, ladies and gentlemen, is the brinksmanship with which we are now playing.

We have no computers and no force but logic to enforce our will on the people of our land, but I believe we have a patriotism, a conscience that will save us from ourselves. The very same policies that have gotten us in trouble at home have gotten us in trouble abroad, and the same system of freedom and energy that made this country great from 1776 can find solutions compatible with freedom to save us at home and abroad.

If we are to have our freedom 10 years from now—even 5 years from now—you must now become a part of the political life of this country. Freedom is a political matter. All that needs to be done to become slaves is to do nothing.

We will probably get whatever kind of Government we deserve.

Which Road for Transportation: Private Management or * * * ?—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I have watched with growing concern the development of numerous problems affecting our Nation's transportation system and, of course, the impact these problems are having on the Nation's overall economy and defense posture. This current session of Congress will very likely be called on to deal with many of these problems, and there is no doubt that the administration will shortly seek specific legislation in this very vital economic problem area.

Traffic World, a weekly transportation news magazine, has published in booklet form a series of enlightening interviews with persons closely concerned for many years with these problems. I commend this series by the magazine's executive editor, Lewis W. Britton—"Which Road for Transportation: Private Management or * * * ?"—to the attention of my colleagues:

INTERVIEW 1

This interview with Gerald W. Collins, manager of the Transportation and Communication Department of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, is the first of a series of interviews conducted by Traffic World since it became obvious in mid-1961 that the much-studied transportation industry was to be subjected to further study. The questions asked of men who are in a position to speak with authority were designed to draw their considered opinions on matters which are fundamental to the decisions which will determine whether the common carrier transportation system in the United States is to continue essentially as private enterprise or is to be subjected to further governmental control. It is a matter of pure coincidence that Richard Wagner, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, made the statement which is reproduced in connection with the interview with Mr. Collins just as Traffic World was preparing to launch this symposium. Mr. Collins in his answers to the questions, voices the policies adopted by the chamber of commerce. Is there any validity to the suggestion that the antitrust laws could take the place of the present regulatory scheme?

The transportation industry is a regulated business primarily because of its importance to the proper functioning of our national economy and because competition has ordinarily been viewed as being less pervasive as a restraining influence in a quasi-monopoly situation such as exists in the common carrier field.

Complete abandonment of these regulatory schemes at this time would not be in the public interest.

While a certain degree of Government regulation of the transportation industry is generally accepted as necessary, we should also realize that changing technology and new conditions demand continual modification of the various regulatory acts if progress is not to be stultified.

In general, the industry will enjoy its maximum efficiency and growth with a minimum amount of government regulation and interference. Therefore, it is necessary to continually work to reduce needless or outdated laws that are not currently in the public interest.

Assuming that the present policy of regulation is to be continued, are there any areas where it could be lessened?

Management should be permitted greater latitude in setting rate levels and regulatory agencies should not substitute their judgment for that of management on such questions as the effect a proposed rate might have on business volume. For example, the airlines are currently experimenting in several ways with various types of incentive rates designed principally to lure people to air travel who are not now using it. The regulatory agency is required to give its approval before such rates can go into effect.

It is in this area of pricing that management should be given its fullest play without hindrance from the regulators. Management is much better able to decide whether a particular rate or fare proposal will prove beneficial. Unless a public interest issue is raised by such a proposal, the regulatory agencies should not become involved.

Is there need, now, to equalize the competitive situation as between the railroads and the air, water and motor carrier industries which operate over Federally supported facilities and, for the future, between the airlines and the motor carriers of property?

Various Government programs are cited as producing benefits for one form of transportation as opposed to another that may be in competition for identical traffic. Reasonable people will agree that Government should not engage in activities that unduly prefer one part of the economy over another unless an important element of national interest is involved. It is also reasonable that if such a program is found necessary, the beneficiaries should bear a fair share of the costs. Otherwise, fundamental property rights and economic relationships are disturbed.

To promote equity in such cases and to discourage needless Government projects, the National Chamber has favored the development of a user-charge program whenever it is practicable to do so.

Would greater freedom of competition achieve the stated purpose of the national transportation policy—a system of transportation adequate to the postal, commercial and defense needs of the country?

The chamber believes that all forms of transportation should be permitted competitive opportunities that will conserve for the public good the advantages of each. The freest possible play of competitive forces that is consistent with the national interest would produce the most efficient use of our transport facilities and therefore would be in the public interest.

It is suggested that one phase of study by the Government would be the part each segment of the transportation industry should play. Would the U.S. Chamber of Commerce favor allocation of traffic by any means other than competition?

The chamber would not favor allocation of traffic by any means other than competition unless overriding national considerations such as national security were involved. Allocation of traffic by government edict is the way this matter would be handled under a dictatorship. This Nation has grown strong through our system of individual initiative and competition. This competition has been the incentive for improvement and should continue to be if we wish to make continued progress. None of us should lose sight of this important difference.

In view of one contract worked out between dock operators and stevedors on the Pacific coast under which part of the savings from automation or improved working rules go to the union in cash payments, should there be a study of the equities to be observed in formulating such agreements?

I am not sure what is necessary here, but in this agreement it appears that most of the benefits of new technology was gobbled up by the labor union. Historically, of course, these improvements have been shared by management and the public has also benefited through lower charges. In our maritime trades today, we are badly outclassed costwise by foreign competitors. We desperately need to cut costs and to close this gap. The future of this industry as well as others may well depend on achieving a better competitive balance. Therefore, when the union grabs the major part of cost savings from automation and takes these bene-

fits in the form of dollar payments to store in their treasury, it insures we will continue to operate as the highest cost operators. This is very shortsighted for the union, the industry and the Nation. Perhaps the labor union leadership is what needs to be investigated.

Does the chamber favor a working relationship between the departments of the Federal Government dealing with labor and regulatory bodies, so that pricing of labor and of service is coordinated?

No. The Federal Government, through either the Department of Labor or the regulatory agencies, should not try to coordinate the pricing of labor and the rates set for services. Wage rates should result from pure collective bargaining between management and labor and rates for services should be set by management, subject only to review by the regulatory agency to determine if they are in the public interest.

What can be done to reverse the loss of traffic by common carriers to exempt carriers?

The exemption provisions in the Interstate Commerce Act should be tightened to make them apply strictly to the movement originally intended by Congress. Continual broadening of these exemptions has been the basic cause of this problem. Energetic enforcement by the States as well as the Federal Government will be necessary. Also the carriers should be allowed greater latitude to price these services with greater imagination so as to counter the need of shippers to resort to private carriage.

What steps can be taken to halt the trend by which regulation, since the Interstate Commerce Act was first enacted, has narrowed the areas of managerial discretion?

It will require continuous hard work by all groups interested in the welfare of the transportation industry. All of us should continually challenge any proposed legislation to be vitally sure it is necessary before it is adopted. We should continually seek out those laws which have outlived their usefulness and secure their repeal. The national chamber for example now is supporting repeal of the antiquated full crew law for railroads and elimination of the locomotive inspection requirement originally designed for outmoded coal burning locomotives.

We should continually recognize that even though this industry is regulated as a public utility, we need the maximum amount of initiative and new thinking which is available in each company's management. Close Government regulation can discourage the development of new ideas and initiative if it is not used judiciously. Maximum managerial freedom is necessary if we are to progress.

Should the Reorganization Act be modified to make plain that the President's plans submitted under that act are to deal with agencies in the executive branch, or with such executive duties as have been placed by Congress in the independent agencies, and to make it perfectly clear that, as arms of Congress, the regulatory agencies are the responsibility of Congress?

It probably would facilitate matters if the act was so clarified. However, the expedient alternative is to oppose any plan that attempts to transfer regulatory functions to the Executive. A case in point is Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1961, relating to maritime functions. This plan would transfer the statutory duties of the Federal Maritime Board relating to the determination of ship construction and operating differential subsidies to the Secretary of Commerce. Thus, it would give to the executive branch functions that are closely allied with the regulatory responsibility and which have traditionally been under the supervision of the Congress.

Report From the Congo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article written by the Reverend and Mrs. Everett Woodcock. Reverend Woodcock's father, Ray C. Woodcock, lives in Cochranton, Pa., and is a constituent of mine. The article was printed in the Meadville Tribune, Meadville, Pa., and it throws a lot of light on the situation in the Congo:

ARMED FORCE DEEPENS CONGO DIVISIONS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Because of the tense situation in the Congo, the following report of the Reverend and Mrs. Everett Woodcock to their friends gives a timely insight into conditions there. The Reverend Mr. Woodcock, a native of Cochranton, and his wife have spent 15 years in African mission fields, 9 of them in the Congo, making them intimately familiar with conditions in that country. Their report comes from Elisabethville, capital of Katanga Province, recent scene of conflict between Katanga troops and United Nations forces.)

(By the Reverend and Mrs. Everett Woodcock)

This time, during the hostilities in Katanga, we are looking in from the outside. We had arranged to spend the school holidays as a family in Rhodesia, for our overdue annual vacation. Our daughters, Mary and Elaine, came with friends to Kitwe, where we met them on December 6. Then we came on to Salisbury, to meet Ray. Part of the time is being spent at a lake near Salisbury, to be followed by some traveling.

We were reluctant to leave Elisabethville just at the time of difficulty, but we knew from experience that it is practically impossible to carry out effective work in the midst of war. The African leaders feel it better for us to not take unnecessary risk. We decided it better to have a vacation and be prepared to do our best if we can return after a month.

PROPAGANDA BROADCAST

We had hoped to the end that the United Nations would not risk the all-out offensive that they threatened. But for the past several months it has been increasingly evident that the Katanga has actually been living under a military occupation. The evidence of actual attack kept mounting. The scattered officers of the U.N. were consolidated around the airport and the headquarters near town. Some of the civilian personnel were evacuated to Leopoldville with the promise that they would be returned in 2 weeks when things would be under control. The helicopters flew overhead and armored cars drove through town. This action has preceded every U.N. disturbance thus far. Malicious propaganda was broadcast over international radios and the statements of the Katanga Government unscrupulously misrepresented.

A group of Irish officers revealed to friends of ours how sadly misinformed they are. They felt that they would soon be called upon to establish order because the Katanga Army was about to disintegrate, that it was corrupted with European technicians and mercenaries, and that the people were losing confidence in the government. The African informants and employees of the U.N. represent a small, radical, minority of the population.

The inaccuracy of the information upon which they act is borne out by the difficulties experienced in carrying out their declared aims.

The alerted Katanga Army took up their strategic defensive positions. Control points were reinforced on all roads around Elisabethville. The fireworks started a half-mile from our house when an armored convoy of the U.N. opened fire on the roadblock leading to town. It is reported that they gave advance notice that they would do so. Both sides were ready.

STRANGE WAR

It seemed like a strange war. The Katanga defenses seemed to be scattered about. They were obviously inexperienced, but determined. The United Nations, for all its display of power and armor, seemed to make little progress. Naturally, soldiers paid to fight on foreign soil are not as ready to risk their life as they would be defending their own country. At one of the airports, several weeks ago, the U.N. soldiers told an American Globemaster crew that they felt they were fighting on the wrong side. On different occasions other U.N. men have told missionaries that they felt they came to help the Congo, not to kill and destroy.

How tragic it is that the decisions to launch death and destruction are made far off across the ocean by men who have not taken the trouble to examine the situation firsthand. Do they conscientiously support the wiping out of families in their homes, bombing of hospitals, destruction of electric power stations, and places of business, or do they not believe it is happening?

UNITED STATES PAYS PRICE

The U.S. Government is paying a tremendous price to betray its stancheat friend in Africa. Some, who admit it, regret that it must be done to unify the Congo.

The terrific amount of men and machines of destruction that is being massed from many nations is a tribute to the stability and courage of little Katanga. It is also solidifying and deepening the divisions, stirring up regional and tribal hatreds that have been held under control for many years. It can hardly be expected that a military victory will prepare the way to force the people to unite.

We can readily understand that the African people would fight and die rather than be again subjected to foreign dominations, especially that evidenced by the United Nations, which has effectively belied its title of "peace organization." It is also understandable that Europeans who have grown up in the Congo should volunteer and be willing to die to save their families from that fate.

Perhaps by the time you receive this, the irrevocable deed will be done. If only the voice of the American people could be heard, appealing that other peoples have the right to have the same freedoms that America is so proud of having.

INHUMANITY PROTESTED

While the U.S. Government supports the U.N. action, we feel it has a moral obligation to take a stand against the inhumane activities of the army it supports and the indiscriminate use of the war materials carried in U.S. planes. This much could be done, even while reaffirming its opposition to the Katanga government.

We are appealing to the American Government and people to realize that military might is deepening divisions in the Congo and destroying the civilizing influence of many years. It is already tragically late, but the United States can still act to oppose

inhumane destruction and urge the United Nations to act constructively for peace by civil operations and technical assistance. In such a way they can help create a peaceful situation in which the African people can reestablish the unity of the Congo.

Musicians' Association President Speaks for the Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSICA McC. WEIS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include at this point in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Joseph T. DeVitt, president of the Rochester Musicians Association Local No. 66, to Representative FRANK THOMPSON, of New Jersey.

Mr. DeVitt, who has served as president of the Rochester Musicians Association for a number of years, is deeply concerned about what he sees as a decline in this country's cultural level. He suggests that the Government subsidize the arts and require young people to take art appreciation courses.

His letter follows:

ROCHESTER MUSICIANS ASSOCIATION,
Rochester, N.Y., November 27, 1961.

Congressman FRANK THOMPSON,
Chairman of Subcommittee on Culture, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: During the past few months, several important events, very vital to our profession, have taken place across the Nation. The Metropolitan Opera, New York Philharmonic, and Philadelphia Symphony Orchestra are all engaged in serious contract negotiations with their respective managements. This is the annual tug-of-war which plagues most symphony orchestras and management and they all stem from the incontrovertible fact that these orchestras cannot support themselves with box-office receipts alone. They need help from other sources and are being hard put to find these sources. In the past they have been helped by local foundations, public subscription, private subsidy, endowment, revenue from "popular" shows sponsored by management. However, with the steadily rising cost of operation, these benefactors are asked each year to increase their contribution and they have all reached the saturation point; hence the reason for annual bickering. The only plausible solution to this nettling problem is Government subsidy. Of course our Government cannot subsidize music without including the other arts, but this is only part of the solution. If Government is going to subsidize the arts, it would be consistent to educate our children to appreciate and enjoy them.

Music is the basic ingredient of all arts; are not the dance, drama, painting, theater, et cetera, all expressions of music of the soul? Would it not be prudent to fully expose our children to the aesthetic beauty of the fine arts? These are the facts and there is a program possible to increase the culture of our people.

The level of a civilization is determined by the cultural level of that particular civilization; our cultural level has been slowly ebbing, it needs help badly. This past session of Congress has shown a willingness to aid education but could not agree on how this aid should be distributed; they also have shown a very mild interest in aiding the arts. Why not combine the two and substantially raise our cultural level?

We have to broaden the base of our culture and the best place to broaden it is at the very foundation; our primary and secondary schools. Most art courses in our schools are selective and the younger children shy away from them. All children attending primary schools should be compelled to take an art appreciation course of 1 or 2 hours per week; they should at least be given a choice of like or dislike. How many adults who learned to love and appreciate the arts in their middle years wish that they knew much sooner that all these beauties of life were unattended. These adults were not even mildly exposed to the arts; had they been, their instinctive love for them would have been awakened much sooner. It is also fair to say that in thousands of these cases their whole lives would have been changed; no doubt for the better. There is nothing that refines a person more than good music and literature and appreciation of art.

If and when Congress passes an aid to education bill, it should incorporate a clause which states that part of the grant must be used to insure that every child from grades 1 to 12 be given at least 1 hour per week in art appreciation—compulsory. I am sure that in 10 years time there will be much less juvenile delinquency, crime, laziness, and more contented parents and teachers. Now if Congress decided to subsidize the arts it would insure that the child of today would be the cultured person of tomorrow, and it would also insure a higher level of civilization.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH T. DEVITT,
President, Rochester Musicians Association, Local 66.

Government by Executive Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, we have traveled a long distance down the road toward executive domination of public affairs and private lives of our citizens in the last year.

The noted columnist, Mr. David Lawrence, has compiled a series of facts which sound an alarm for thinking Americans. We may well ask, "Where are we headed?"

The presentation by Mr. Lawrence follows:

CREATING AN IMAGE OF AUTOCRACY—KENNEDY AIDS BELIEVED ACTING BEYOND CONSTITUTION'S PRINCIPLES

The last thing in the world that President Kennedy probably wants to do is to create the image of an autocracy. Unwittingly, that's the impression conveyed by some of his messages to Congress calling for a concentration of power in the Executive in everything from the fixing of agricultural prices to the raising or lowering of taxes by the White House. Also, without consulting Congress, the President has used the Executive order authority to go beyond the written law. His subordinates have taken a cue from him and have stretched their activities beyond the principles of the Constitution itself. Here are some examples:

1. The Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission speaks out with the President's approval and threatens all radio and television stations with a possible refusal to renew their licenses if they don't furnish programs according to the taste or judgment of the administration. It is denied that this is censorship, but it certainly is a form of coercion.

2. The President's press secretary assembles in a private meeting the secretaries of Members of Congress of the Democratic Party and urges them to get their constituents to write letters to the TV stations, paricularly in the West, which are not carrying Presidential press conferences on the air. When constituents start writing to stations and telling them they have been advised by the offices of their Congressmen or Senators to demand that the President be given more space on television, it begins to look less like an ordinary publicity maneuver and more like a form of coercion, for the TV station may come to feel their licenses will not be renewed in they don't play ball with the administration.

3. The press has published in recent days many dispatches from Washington telling how "censorship" operates inside the Government with respect to public speeches, not merely by military personnel but by civilians. The President has a legal right to withhold information as to the identity of the individual censors, but the fact is that when censorship is applied, the public feels that a kind of "party line" is being handed out.

4. President Kennedy has come out in favor of organizing Federal employees in labor unions and has issued an Executive order requiring formal recognition of such unions. While the document discreetly points out that a Federal employee can refrain from joining if he wishes, and still keep his job—a sort of "right to work" doctrine—it also provides an elaborate machinery to encourage union organization. Surprisingly enough, a task force of administration officials, headed by Secretary of Labor Goldberg, has proposed—and the President has accepted its recommendations—that the checkoff of union dues be instituted. An individual may refrain, of course, from giving permission to deduct his dues from his paycheck, but the main purpose is to make dues collection easier.

5. At present, only 33 percent of the 2.3 million Federal employees are unionized. By making it possible to collect dues from a bigger percentage of Federal employees, not only do the unions get more revenue, but an organization is established through which political pressure can be exerted in behalf of the administration. It could become a powerful political body. These employees, including postal workers, are located in every community in the country.

6. By Executive order of the President and without authority from Congress, a company which bids for any Government contract now must, in effect, give assurances to the executive departments that it will hire an as yet undetermined number of persons from every race or creed or color. This policy was adopted to a limited extent under the preceding administration, but it has been carried even further under the present administration. An official questionnaire has been sent to 38,000 companies, each of which has contracts with the Government in excess of $50,000, asking them to list how many Negroes they employ. Will they next be asked how many of each religion they employ? How many of the 15.5 million workers involved who have earned their place by merit will be deprived of their jobs to make way for the others?

This is obviously a political move in the civil rights controversy, but it is also a form of coercion in which the people's money that should be spent only by the award of Government contracts to the lowest bidder could

conceivably be spent among contractors who are subservient to the Government on political issues, but who charge higher prices.

The whole theory seems to be that the end justifies the means. It's a doctrine which political bossism has always followed, but in these days when America is boasting abroad about the freedom of the individual in our midst, some of these goings on seem more suitable for a police state than a democracy.

"Liberals" Defined

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, because of the loose bantering around of the terms "liberal" and "conservative," I commend for the consideration of the readers of the RECORD a very timely article by Columnist Raymond Moley of Newsweek, which was reprinted with appropriate remarks by Columnist Tom Ethridge of Mississippi's great newspaper, the Clarion Ledger.

The article follows:

"LIBERALS" DEFINED

So-called rightwing conservatives are being smeared and ridiculed these days, so it is interesting to come across a statement that puts "liberalism" under the microscope of critical analysis.

Columnist Raymond Moley of Newsweek was a militant "liberal" in the early days of FDR's New Deal, but his enthusiasm has long since cooled. He is now a sound, consistent advocate of conservative principles in government.

Mr. Moley has come up with this brief but penetrating definition that fits the average "liberal" like the bark on a tree.

"WITLESS, NOT WICKED"

"Liberals are not knaves. They are naive. They are not delinquent. They are deluded. They are not wicked. They are witless. They are not pro-Communist. They merely believe communism can be killed with kindness, money, and appeasement.

"The liberal is really a very sensitive fellow. His antennas vibrate violently with every ill in this broad land. His imagination teems with solutions. In fact, he has more solutions than there are problems.

"Since there are always problems in our society, the liberals join in Congress to pass a law. Then the law creates an agency with a big appropriation to spend. Then the liberals go on to other real or imaginary problems, leaving the practical questions to the new bureaucrats."

ROOSEVELT'S WARNING

As we see it, one of the worst faults of modern liberalism is the tendency to pile up debt through reckless and irresponsible spending as a means of buying votes to stay in power.

Ironically, Franklin D. Roosevelt, daddy of modern liberalism, and patron saint of Kennedyism warned against this practice while running for his first term in 1932, when he solemnly declared:

"If a nation is living within its income, its credit is good. But if, like a spendthrift, it throws discretion to the winds, and is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending; if it extends its taxing power and continues to pile up deficits, it is on the road to bankruptcy. Let us have the courage to stop borrowing to meet continuing deficits. Let us stop the deficits."

TRUE CONSERVATISM

Conservatives are accused of being against but never for anything. This accusation is both false and ridiculous. By its very definition, conservatism is for preserving our "existing institutions and form of government," and opposed to arbitrary, reckless experiments designed to establish a Federal-welfare-state bureaucracy as our supreme master.

The real conservative is for placing the U.S. Constitution above the U.N. Charter; for the preservation of American free enterprise; for an abrupt halt in today's trend toward national socialism and world government. * * *

SOUND PRINCIPLES

True conservative is for the individual's right to choose his own associates and for his right to earn a profit by his own initiative; for limiting the power of government over the lives of its citizens; for more self-reliance and less reliance on government.

The real conservative is for the restoration of a sound, balanced economy; for sane financial policies and liquidation of public debt; for regaining America's former position of dominance and respect in world affairs; for getting Uncle Sam off of his knees and back on his feet—without paying more blackmail or tribute to bandit and beggar nations, or letting them run our Government for us.

The National Student Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, for some time now, I have been very concerned about the actions of the National Student Association. This organization, claiming to represent over 1 million students and 300 colleges and universities, has long been known for its radically liberal political leanings and does not strike me as being fairly representative of the opinions of the majority of American college and university students.

I should like to call to your attention an article which appeared recently in the Crescent of Gamma Phi Beta by Miss Kay Wonderlic. It is one of the most critical appraisals of the National Student Association which I have seen and one which deserves very careful study.

NATIONAL STUDENT ASSOCIATION: THE MOST SERIOUS THREAT TO THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY

The National Student Association is the most detrimental influence on the academic community in one decade. It is not only anti-intellectual, it encourages corrupt and irresponsible leadership and fosters a debased morality.

Two decades ago the menace was Communist infiltration in National Student Association, today it is the weakening of the moral fiber and the teaching of a lack of responsibility for words and deeds which is the more significant threat.

National Student Association is proving a disservice to students, faculty, and administrators. The main disservice rendered the American student is to encourage him to practice deceit and to develop a low regard for basic fair play and civil liberties.

These charges can all be substantiated by examples of National Student Association in action. The anti-intellectualism of National Student Association is best seen in the resolutions its annual congresses adopt. It is the rule rather than the exception that the "Fact" sections of these resolutions contain mere opinion or list unsubstantiated arguments from one side of a controversial topic.

While thorough researching of a subject is basic to a scholarly pursuit, National Student Association material, both resolutions and background papers, demonstrates an obvious lack of researching. A member of the National Student Association executive committee ran up to me during the 1961 congress asking what I knew about migrant workers. He had to write a resolution within the next 45 minutes, he said. He was handed a couple of pamphlets on the topic, and quoting a paragraph or two from each, he wrote his resolution, which was immediately adopted by his committee.

Further evidence for this point comes from a dean of a State university which was the subject of National Student Association condemnation last year. "The two sections of the resolution entitled 'Fact' and 'Declaration' are so riddled with misstatements, half-truths, and unstated facts that it would be impossible to respond to each," he says. He also said, answering an inquiry about National Student Association's reference to a university report, "almost every sentence of the resolution contains either outright error or distortions of the report."

That National Student Association veers from an academic attitude is apparent in the structure of its meetings, also. Time is not provided for a searching analysis of topics it decides to discuss. Over 200 legislative items came from committees which met for a few hours during the summer congress. The 1960 record of 40 resolutions in 14 hours was topped in 1961, though many member schools were pleading for quality rather than quantity.

In deriving these resolutions, the drafters accepted such "factual verifications" as, "Many people agree that * * *. "It is commonly felt * * *," and even "I've heard several people say * * *," "Often the sources 'for facts' are partisan or special interest groups, and the material is rarely attributed to them within the context of the "fact section."

The emphasis is on the participants' status as students rather than as scholars. It becomes a matter of thinking of themselves as a special and significant lobby group which must speak out on every issue. Rather than stimulating its members to thought or motivating them to investigate important issues, National Student Association offers the ego-fulfilling chance to "sound off." That the atmosphere of an NSA congress promotes a feeling of self-importance bordering on impertinence is illustrated by the fact that these ofttimes ill founded and poorly researched items, frequently are sent to the U.S. Congress, and one was even sent to the Russian commandant in Berlin.

The leadership in the National Student Association has proved itself to be frequently irresponsible, disrespectful and deceitful. Although its officers are full-time salaried officials, they are not held responsible for their actions during their term of office when these actions cannot be proved to be directly connected with the activities of the association. The national affairs vice president of the National Student Association demonstrated himself both irresponsible and deceitful this fall when he posed as a reporter for a New York newspaper and became involved in a racial disturbance in the South. Although he was operating in the very field

for which the National Student Association has given him responsibility, his lie and participation in such activity are excused as being unfortunate, but not relating to his National Student Association standing.

Booing and jeering are an accepted part of National Student Association congresses. The assemblage not only shows a lack of respect for its speakers, it demonstrates it toward its own members. Many a speaker at such meetings has had to stop until the boos subsided. Often it has been the very leadership of the association which fosters this climate. The 1960–61 international affairs vice president exemplified the kind of treatment accorded a dissenter when he handed me his report saying, "Complimentary copy, not with my compliments"—this was on the first occasion I had to meet him personally.

The 1960–61 president of the association offers ready examples of deceitfulness in National Student Association leadership. He told at least two member schools he would not entertain a motion to refer all pending legislation to the executive committee, if one should be made at the congress. Such a resolution was made by his international affairs vice president, entertained by him, and adopted. It is possible, of course, that National Student Association had elected a president unfamiliar with parliamentary procedure and not aware that his promise would be difficult to fulfill—and one who neglected to think the situation through before making such a commitment to the groups for which he was responsible (and which were paying his salary).

I present these few examples to show that I can substantiate my charges, and that I am willing to do so. These same individuals to whom I have referred toss aside most criticism, saying it is unfounded. It is time they be made responsible for their words and deeds, as all elected leaders should be.

Another widespread malady among National Student Association leaders is evasiveness. They will not tell their own members where they get contributions to the association. Schools which make up its membership and support National Student Association cannot find out from its officers what the total annual budget is.

Criticism of National Student Association leadership is more than criticism of a few individuals, because the effect can be so great on many would-be student leaders. National Student Association is a training ground for campus executives. As the current president of the association points out, few people leave National Student Association congresses without having undergone some sort of change. All too frequently that change is the new-found realization that it's easier to get what you want from a group if you practice deceit and disrespect, and that it's possible to get away with it if you follow a few simple rules. They are also apt to be convinced that the ends justify the means—a rule which seems to govern the actions of all too many National Student Association leaders.

These student leaders witness legislative sessions where a small group leads the entire assembly in a predetermined direction. They learn how easy it is to pass resolutions and then forget them. I wonder how many of them feel any responsibility for their actions at National Student Association or for their voting record there? Few considered whether their vote accurately represented their schools, and even fewer report back to their schools on how they voted. Probably still fewer ever considered what happened to the resolutions they worked on so feverishly during those summer sessions. The consequence of their actions is a neglected matter.

National Student Association has proved its inability to accomplish its stated goals. Its legislative goal is neither laudable, nor realistic. It passes resolutions about which students are both uninformed and unconcerned. This does not mean students shouldn't be concerned about these matters. But it is setting itself up as the student vanguard, the committee of the elite, to legislate in the name of all American students. Any student of statistics can tell you it is simply not possible for an organization whose membership is less than 20 percent of the colleges in the country to claim to represent even half of the total. Even this elementary math seems beyond Nationl Student Association's power of realization, for it continues to state in its preamble that "We, the students of the United States of America * * * do hereby establish the U.S. National Student Association."

It is up to the students presently in college to make the vast improvements necessary in National Student Association or rid themselves of the organization. But all Americans should be aware of the threat it presents to the academic community and support those presently fighting in this cause.

National Student Association is a symptom—and a serious one—of a killing disease. Perhaps in finding a cure for it we will be contributing to the well-being not only of this college generation, but of our country and our world.

What can be done? I have suggested students work for an educational emphasis in National Student Association, ridding the association of its legislative activities on a national level, and concentrate on learning and stimulating thought through national gatherings for lectures, debates, seminars, and discussions. But this is a partial solution, at best.

The problem we see with National Student Association is a matter of the students' total character and values. The maladies in National Student Association have been allowed to flourish because so many college students have accepted the debased morality which it exemplifies. There is a lack of absolute standards among college students. Few are willing to commit themselves and even fewer are willing to fight for the things in which they believe—especially when those things are of a moral or philosophical nature and difficult to give material values.

Many of us fear the atomic bomb destroying us, but I have an even greater fear that we will destroy ourselves through our lack of absolute standards and dedication to moral principles.

Should a third world war come, it will not only be bombs we must fear. There may be nothing left of us to destroy. Many will have accepted the possibility of total destruction and given in to free love and other forms of debased morality. To so many, such matters are relative to outside situations. They don't have principles which they will uphold in the face of such an extreme threat as nuclear war. Whether nuclear attacks come or not, we will have destroyed ourselves and the institutions basic to our present way of life (i.e., family, church).

There are four steps which I feel students must take, should we survive to be a healthy and happy generation. The first is to think—to think about themselves, to be introspective and concerned about discovering those things which are most important to them. Studying and thinking sometimes prove to be mutually exclusive, and all too often the latter suffers—especially when the probing is into the nebulous problem of "Who Am I?"

The second step is to try to establish a set of absolute standards which they (this can only be done individually) intend to make their guideposts throughout life. This involves the difficult matter of determining right from wrong and leads to the next step, the adoption of a basic philosophy.

Few of us know what we stand for, what we believe in, or have a foundation from which to build a concept of our total self. We may know what we like or dislike, will vote for or against, but few of us know why. We haven't a set of basic principles to guide us or give us a means of measurement. We have been given Ten Commandments, but how many of us have actually thought about these in terms of absolute standards which we can use in determining a set of basic principles?

There must also be commitment. This last and fundamental step involves doing something about the decisions our previous steps have led to. We must live up to the standards we chose to adopt, and we must fight for their preservation when they are endangered. We must not be afraid to be controversial, or to exert leadership in a fight for the things to which we commit ourselves.

We make too many meaningless commitments. Too often our sorority pledges, our National Student Association votes, are just a matter of joining the group, without a commitment. Violations of pledges are not considered serious. Just as we learn short cuts and other bad habits from National Student Association, we are learning to make meaningless vows which we will not be required to fulfill when we sign a sorority pledge.

All of us should be ready to commit ourselves to the things in which we believe, but such commitments should not be taken lightly. We must be ready to live up to them and actually fight for them. Each of us must establish guideposts and goals—must come to know what it is we live for, will try for, and die for.

Providing money, houses, and social opportunities is not enough. The sorority should help its members to find themselves. It should challenge them and interest them in following the steps that lead to this discovery. Sororities will fall short of this if they ask acceptance of meaningless pledges and fail to require commitment and adherence to the standards they set for membership. Sororities are in a position to take a positive step in aiding their membership in the introspective process. National Student Association has been a negative influence. It has loosened the moral fiber of many so-called student leaders and has exemplified anti-intellectualism and irresponsibility. But National Student Association is itself inanimate—it is the student, the individual, with whom we must be concerned. Only through his thoughtfulness and commitment can a problem such as National Student Association be solved.

Public-Spirited Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Gaffney Ledger, Gaffney, S.C., of February 6, 1962.

The editorial follows:

PUBLIC-SPIRITED CITIZEN

Gaffney has no more public-spirited citizen than Brady B. Morgan, retired businessman, who a few days ago made a gift of $8,500 to Cherokee County for the purpose of adding rooms to the Sherard-Allen Nursing Home.

As a result of Mr. Morgan's interest and generosity, the home will be able to accept and care for six more residents after the proposed addition is constructed.

This is only another evidence of Mr. Morgan's interest in helping others. He had previously donated the land for the Church of God's orphanage near Gaffney and for the Girl Scouts camping grounds near Broad River.

Mr. Morgan and his wife both have been liberal contributors for the benefit of local institutions, particularly the Buford Street Methodist Church over the years.

Not many local citizens have matched the record of the Morgans in this respect. Gaffney and Cherokee County would be better off if there were more people here like them.

George Todt's Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, the columns of George Todt which regularly appear in the Los Angeles Herald Examiner are consistently good. They are indeed worthy of national syndication. I believe Members of Congress should have an opportunity to read Mr. Todt's columns of December 13 and 14, 1961.

Under unanimous consent, I include the columns in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

U.N. SLAUGHTER IN CONGO

(By George Todt)

"There is something rotten in the State of Denmark."—Shakespeare ("Hamlet").

There is something decidedly wrong, it seems to this writer, with the military role the United Nations is playing in the Congo. What is it?

The correct answer appears only too obvious: the U.N. is interfering dangerously in the internal affairs of a sovereign nation.

"Meddling" would be a better name for it.

Actually, the august world body maintained it was for this very cogent reason that it could not interject itself into the bloody Hungarian revolution against Russian imperialism in 1957—the Reds claimed it was only an internal matter.

Now when the Communists and their stooges gain the upper hand in an action of this kind, the U.N. is only too ready to maintain a hands-off policy.

REDS STEAL

But it is apparently a horse of a different color when the Soviets commence getting the short end of the stick—as in the case of the secession of Communist-hating Katanga Province in the Congo.

Why not call a spade a spade? The U.N. has been engaged in a nefarious, underhanded operation for many months which is designed for only one overriding purpose: To hand the Congo—and ultimately all of black Africa—to the Soviet Union.

Why are we Americans paying our good taxpayers' money for a self-defeating measure of this kind?

Ask the Department of State that question.

Ask the chief of the Voice of America—Edward R. Murrow—that important question.

AND WE PLAY

Ask the ADA (Americans for Democratic Action) advisers around the President the same question.

What is the answer?

Can we have an honest, intelligent answer to this query without doubletalk and propaganda?

And while we are about it, why are we forced to pay the costs of this U.N. operation while the Russians do not?

We pay for it—and the Reds get the prize.

I am sorry to have to write this—but our leaders have been incredibly stupid and shortsighted in this case.

We may be reminded at this point of the arrogant effrontery of the old Communist windbag—Dimitri Manuilsky, former head of the Security Council of the U.N., now deceased, fortunately—who once told American Quislings this somewhat prophetic claptrap at Lenin University in 1931:

RUSS DOUBLE DEAL

"War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win, we shall need the element of surprise. So, we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard-of concessions. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down we shall smash them with our clenched fist."

Note again Manuilsky's only too-true line: "The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction."

ALL THE WAY

Which is exactly what we are doing now—paying the U.N. costs so that we can "sovietize" the Congo in the end.

In the process, we are attempting to destroy the free enterprise defenders of Katanga, headed by pro-Western Moise Tshombe.

Recently he appealed to the United States to cease its support of forces who were murdering his women, children, and elderly people—and a great lot of the American people think he had the right idea. What are we doing in this highly controversial and questionable U.N. operation?

I think a dangerous precedent is being set here: The U.N. has claimed over the years that it was not authorized to interfere or intervene in the internal affairs of any sovereign nation.

Where will this highhanded usurping of power cease?

Is this a foretaste of "world government" by the U.N.?

SUBVERSIVE ART ATTACKED

(By George Todt)

"Appraisal of art must be restored to writers who possess knowledge and honor and are not Marxist evaluators posing as critics. Art juries should not be loaded with crusading leftists intent on bestowing recognition and awards on their fellow-traveler comrades."—Representative George A. Dondero, of Michigan, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 14, 1956.

My battered hat is off to the American Institute of Fine Arts, an organization formed in the Los Angeles area to support traditional art and resist subversion in the cultural world. More power to AIFA.

This interesting and dedicated group is headed by Col. Don L. Wells (U.S. Army, retired), who is trying to push the membership up from 900 to 1,000 by the end of the year. This is a worthwhile objective and those who wish to assist are encouraged to do so.

Colonel Wells' mailing address is 316 South Lapeer Drive, Beverly Hills; Telephone, OL-5-9528. Inquiries are invited. Membership dues: $5 per year.

Wells is somewhat along in years, but you would never know it from his fighting heart and good, old-fashioned American spunk in the teeth of any odds. He took on a flying buzz-saw, or at least a hive of bees—or maybe just a nest of termites—when he raised up AIFA to do battle with the devotees of the modern art cult.

ART NEEDS YOU

From the way his membership rolls are expanding, it is obvious that he has tapped a well of public understanding and good will.

Those who understand the insidious subversive inroads into American culture by the wily Marxists—and how it fits into their overall plans for Red world domination—will strike a blow for our Republic and its vaunted free enterprise system by giving Wells a helping hand.

I was glad to do so on August 17–18 of this year with a brace of articles in the Herald-Express entitled "Art, Oh Where Art Thou?" and "New Hope for Fine Art." Both attacked "modern art" with a vengeance and ultimately were reprinted in the October 13 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in Washington, D.C. (See Appendix, A8157–A8158.)

Wells tells me this blast at fraudulent art gained AIFA 100 new members and has caused him to receive a flood of sympathetic mail from all parts of the Nation. One came from Wheeler Williams, president of the American Artists Professional League, Inc., 112 East 19th Street, New York, N.Y.

TO STAY FINE

"It is grand to know that we have a new institute deserving of the name 'American' for the arts," wrote Williams. "For myself and the league, I can assure you of our fullest collaboration to the limit of our capacity. Alas, the latter is handicapped by the almost solid paper curtain they have erected in the art press and critical fields—and are fast weaving in our museums.

"It is heartening to know you have someone with the courage and integrity shown by George Todt on the Los Angeles Herald-Express and to find that another Congressman, Mr. JOHN ROUSSELOT, is taking up the cudgels, wielded so ardently and well by George A. Dondero until he retired, to speak on behalf of true art in the Congress."

HELP THE "BLUE"

Those who are uneducated into Communist cunning in gaining the world of art and culture to serve their nefarious and underhanded subversive aims ought to read the report of the 1948 California Senate Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities.

It was shown that a major and subtle feature of Communist infiltration into the arts and cultural fields is the steady, persistent and successful Red program of planting trusted and adept Marxist agents in positions that influence hiring, purchase of material or talent, and the critical and editorial handling of art creations.

Through infiltration into key positions where Communists and fellow-travelers can be advanced, aided and promoted in their careers, Red propaganda experts are enabled to engage in smearing, sabotaging and hampering anti-Communist writers, actors, composers and other creative workers. They are able to conduct an intellectual and psychological reign of terror among conservative workers in the arts.

BEAT THE RED LINE

Communists regard the infiltration, manipulation and control of artistic and cultural media as one of the indispensable phases of their program of revolution. But AIFA in Los Angeles is fighting back.

Wells and his pro-American group are determined that the Reds shall not continue to wield their amazing and unprecedented degree of influence in such a vital portion of our free enterprise system. This intel-

lectual sabotage provides a fundamental weapon in talent and material for Communist propaganda attacks on our institutions—and it provides celebrities and funds for Marxist causes and programs.

Let's help Colonel Wells and AIFA boost that membership to 1,000 by the end of 1961. Give a hand to honest art and culture. Can do?

Alliance in Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the Kennedy administration has at long last acted to cut our trade with Cuba. I have long advocated such action. It is, however, regrettable that the administration has been forced to take this step in a dramatic attempt to divert the attention of the American people from the failure at Punta del Este.

Our so-called alliance for progress is in trouble. In spite of the grandiose pledges of funds to all of Latin America, we lost the support of six of the largest nations when the chips were down. It is obvious that U.S. prestige is at a low ebb in Latin America.

The governments of nations which represent 75 percent of the population and 75 percent of the land area of Latin America refused to go along with us in our efforts to eject Cuba from the Organization of American States. Nations with 149.2 million population comprising 5,948,169 square miles voted against us while nations with 52 million and 1,796,076 square miles voted with us.

Not only that, the Punta del Este Conference came up with no agreement to impose sanctions against Communist Cuba. The Conference issued little more than a slap on the wrist for Castro. Newsmen from South American nations this past weekend said that local people were deriding the Punta del Este meeting and calling it a failure. They say our gains were hardly worth the drastic split in unity among the Americas.

I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point, two clippings from the New York Times by Tad Szulc, which point up the ineffectiveness of the administration's Latin American diplomacy.

Text of the clippings is as follows:

SPLIT ON CUBA IS A BLOW TO UNITED STATES

(By Tad Szulc)

PUNTA DEL ESTE, URUGUAY, January 27.—The shape and spirit, if not the future, of the alliance for progress were at stake this weekend in the exhausting negotiations among the Americas' Foreign Ministers at this luxurious seaside resort, where the problems of Latin America's economic development and of revoluntionary Cuba have reached a conjunction.

The ministers met on Colombia's request and under U.S. pressures to seek ways of facing dangers emanating from Fidel Castro's alliance with the Communist bloc and from the impact of the revolution he has led on the rest of Latin America through subversion and political example.

But in the inevitable way in which seemingly unrelated ideas and actions tend to merge, the alliance for progress—the far-reaching cooperative plan for hemispheric development launched by the Kennedy administration—has become linked with the diplomatic battle over Cuba. The outcome of the battle and the repercussions in the United States and Latin America are certain to affect the march of the alliance.

To be sure the alliance had its genesis in the Cuban revolution in the sense that the revolution alerted the United States to the need of supplying massive help to Latin America to avoid similar upheavals elsewhere in this immensely underprivileged region.

RUSK'S EMPHASIS

Speaking before the conference here, Secretary of State Rusk stressed that the alliance is the great "democratic revolution" that can give Latin America prosperity and ways to happiness without communism, dictatorship, and hatred.

President Osvaldo Dorticós Torrado of Cuba put it another way in his speech when he said that the Castro revolution could be thanked for the alliance for progress.

A number of Latin American Foreign Ministers have made the same point in another dimension, to the effect that the only way to remove the danger of communism and revolutions is through speeding up economic development.

Since President Kennedy spelled out the notion of the alliance last March, and particularly since the fiasco of the U.S.-aided rebel invasion of Cuba a month later, Washington's avowed policy has been to concentrate on setting the development program in motion while isolating Cuba.

Last August, the finance ministers of the Americas came to Punta del Este to hammer out the detailed plans for the alliance. In the months since, the program has begun to take its first hesitant and uncertain steps.

Then this week, in the conference that in the opinion of many Latin American observers was convoked prematurely and without sufficient political preparation, the alliance collided with the Cuban problem.

FRUSTRATIONS

Because U.S. public opinion and the U.S. Congress were insistent that strong action against Cuba be extracted from this ministerial parley and because the administration's optimism of recent weeks had led it to believe that this could be done, the immense difficulties encountered here by Mr. Rusk have already set off the kind of anger against the uncooperative Latin American governments that can cast a pall over the alliance when the time comes to vote appropriations for its programs.

The two Senators and two Representatives who are members of the U.S. delegation have not been concealing their annoyance over the position of countries such as Brazil, which have been advocating a form of coexistence with Cuba.

Two of the delegations went to the extent of staying away from a Brazilian diplomatic reception because of their resentment. Their view was that, if the United States failed to win support for its position here, then Congress was certain to lose much of its enthusiasm for the alliance for progress.

Neither the congressional Members here nor Secretary Rusk think that the alliance would be killed outright on Capitol Hill even if the conference should turn out unfavorably for the United States.

But the very program that was conceived to prevent the repetition of revolutions modeled on that of Fidel Castro and his Marxist-Leninist line, had already suffered considerable damage in the debates here on what to do about the menacing political reality of the Cuban regime as an appendage of the Soviet bloc.

CONSEQUENCES

That Congress and the U.S. public opinion may take a dim view of the role played here by Brazil and a few other countries is fully realized by their delegates. The U.S. negotiators have told them so, not in terms of threats, but in simple declaratory sentences urging the Latin Americans to think of the consequences of their attitudes.

But even if these diplomats understand the problem, as they surely do, this perhaps unavoidable subordination of the alliance to politics cannot fail to set off counterresentments in the affected countries, resentments that the Communists and other anti-U.S. elements, already busy denouncing the alliance's program, are certain to exploit.

Addressing the Conference, Secretary Rusk emphasized that communism will make every effort to destroy the democratic revolution of the alliance. And problems created at Punta del Este may thus provide the Communists with additional ammunition.

Under the best of circumstances, the Punta del Este Conference will make the road of the alliance more difficult. The hemisphere, therefore, may be paying an exacting price for the relatively limited accomplishments that are likely to come from this parley, called with greater optimism than realism and apparently without the benefit of sufficient advance hard thinking in Washington.

Although nobody here disagreed with Mr. Rusk that subversion directed from Cuba complicates the progress of the alliance, the view is that there are even greater obstacles in the hurdles put up by extreme leftists and extreme rightists and by paralyzing inaction in many Latin American parliaments and governments.

RESENTMENTS

In the crisscrossing problems of the alliance and of political action on Cuba, the tactics of the United States here have provided and extra portion of resentment. Colombia and Venezuela, countries visited by President Kennedy last month to show his recognition of their efforts in the field of basic reforms, began to feel this weekend that the U.S. delegation had forsaken them and their desire for strong action in order to court Brazil, Argentina, and other countries representing the "soft line."

To the extent that the latter had warned that forcing them to take strong action would create domestic disturbances, the inevitable weakening of the U.S. position has placed Colombia and Venezuela—which have deep internal troubles of their own—in extremely difficult situations.

The circumstance is likely to encourage the extreme left opponents of the alliance for progress by stressing the political failure here of governments dedicated to the democratic revolution and cooperation with the United States. As the Conference, under the summer sun of Punta del Este, went into its closing stretch, it appeared that both the alliance and the system of inter-American relations might be victimized by this exercise in impatient diplomacy.

INDEPENDENT LATINS—UNITED STATES FACES REALITY OF AN OUTER SEVEN THAT RESISTS A STRONG STAND ON CUBA

(By Tad Szulc)

PUNTA DEL ESTE, URUGUAY, January 27.—One of the new political realities emerging with increasing clarity at the Conference of foreign ministers here is the assertion of independent foreign policies by a number of Latin-American countries. The extent of this independence appears to have been underestimated by the State Department, which had planned with considerable confidence for the adoption of its "hard line" on Cuba by a forceful majority. After 6 days of talks here it has become apparent that the United States faces the dilemma of

edging away from its original line and achieving the best possible face-saving position, or of trying to pry loose one or two votes to force a "hard line" decision on a bare two-thirds majority.

The first alternative is politically and psychologically painful for the United States. The second would accentuate the split in the inter-American system and probably further encourage the tendency toward a grouping of independent Latin states, one of the most important political developments in the region since the Cuban revolution.

NEUTRALIST TINT

An independent bloc, in the opinion of some diplomatic observers, may acquire a somewhat neutralist tint, particularly under the influence of Brazil.

All the independents agree that it was an error to call the conference because the evident disunity here is heartening only for the Cubans.

Some members of the U.S. delegation also question whether enough consideration was given in Washington before the decision to rush into the Conference. One view expressed here is that the United States allowed itself to be stampeded into the Conference without a critical and tactical examination of the positions of the countries opposing action on Cuba.

In exhausting around-the-clock negotiations, Secretary of State Dean Rusk and his aids have become progressively aware this week of the firmness of the positions of the seven nations that are opposing strong measures on Cuba for political as well as juridical reasons. These nations are being called the "outer seven," half in jest.

Brazil is taking the most advanced independent position in the political field and Mexico is the major exponent of cautious action on the juridical ground of nonintervention in the internal affairs of another nation. But all seven have, in fact, become the principal obstacle in the efforts of the United States to lead the hemispheric conference toward strong measures against Cuba.

Argentina has attempted to play the role of a bridge between the hard and soft positions while deploring that the Conference was called in the first place. Chile, Ecuador, and Bolivia, are committed to a soft line. Haiti joined the group for reasons that still are not clear, and her reluctance to favor strong sanctions against Cuba could conceivably vanish before the end of the meeting.

The U.S. delegation has been anxious to stress that this division of opinion should not be viewed as a splitting of the hemisphere into two blocs. In truth, the seven countries have not yet really blended into one, the United States believes.

But the fact that the Conference has produced two opposing schools of thought about what to do with Cuba is a reality that the United States will have to face in the future whenever the question of the Havana regime, or even other matters, comes up again.

Opposition to strong action on Cuba has existed ever since the United States became embroiled in a dispute with Havana. At the last Ministerial Conference in Costa Rica, 8 months ago, Washington could not persuade the Latin Americans even to mention Cuba by name in a declaration urging the hemispheric states not to accept Soviet protection.

But within the last year, as internal problems grew in many of the Republics and as the general idea of independent foreign policies began to take hold in countries such as Brazil, Chile, and Ecuador, something of a common view in opposition to U.S. policies on Cuba began to take shape.

"SOFT BLOC" DEVELOPS

A significant sign that something of a "soft bloc" was developing in the Organization of American States came December 14 when the agency's council in Washington voted to call the Ministerial Conference. Mexico cast a negative vote and Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Bolivia, and Ecuador abstained.

The United States has found itself forced to come increasingly closer to the position of the "outer seven" to avoid an open split in the inter-American system while seeking to salvage enough of a hard line in order not to disappoint public opinion at home.

The U.S. delegation, which a week ago insisted on a collective break in diplomatic relations with Cuba, has now been passing the word that severing such ties might be harmful because of the many persons in asylum at embassies in Havana.

On reading about the pro-Castro riots in Caracas and other Latin American capitals, a U.S. spokesman said that the foreign ministers should not be pressed too hard because they might find their lives in danger when they returned home. The worst that can happen to Mr. Rusk on his return, the spokesman said, is that he will meet some congressional anger.

This process of rationalization in recognition of the existence of increasingly independent policies among the Latin nations may lead to a generally acceptable resolution on Cuba that the United States will join only halfheartedly.

History Is on Our Side

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, on January 14, 1962, the distinguished U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Adlai E. Stevenson, gave an address before the 49th annual meeting of the Anti-Defamation League. Ambassador Stevenson was presented with the ADL's America's Democratic Legacy Award. I would call to the attention of my colleagues a condensation of Ambassador Stevenson's address. So often, in this world in which we live, the soul of man wearies under the strain of everyday tasks and man turns to an enjoyment of nature, the fine arts or simple contemplation to gain perspective and new purpose. I suggest the reading and thoughtful study of this address by Ambassador Stevenson, a speech both idealistic and practical, as a prescription for those who sometimes weary of the difficulties in seeking a world at peace:

HISTORY IS ON OUR SIDE

(By Adlai E. Stevenson)

Theodore Roosevelt once said "The most timid rabbit alive is not afraid of a dead issue."

We are all brave enough to be against George III and Negro slavery. But the issues of our own time are another matter. They could scarcely be dreamt of when this Nation was in its first youth. They are fought out in theaters as wide as the world, and extending even to the space beyond. And they are fought out here at home, in our public policies, our schools and churches and synagogues, at our family breakfast tables and in our secret consciences.

I will not exhaust you with one more attempt to define democracy, or to say what our national goals should be. Democracy itself will always defy definition just because every citizen has a built-in right to formulate definitions of his own.

But today democracy here at home and around the world is being strained and tested as never before. Sometimes we hear the issue between communism and democracy argued as a simple question of efficiency. Communism, the argument runs, has singleness of purpose. It can organize its forces in line with a global strategy. It can mobilize its whole people, send trained agents where it will, divert men and resources secretly into armaments, and terrorize dissenters. It takes full advantage of free debate on our side of the line, but seals off its people from our truth, and feeds them whatever lies it chooses. It hangs up a curtain of secrecy while its agents help themselves to strategic information from our free and open societies.

With all these disadvantages, with all its disorderly debates and cross-purposes, is democracy becoming a luxury we can't afford any more? Is it possibly true, as the Communist leaders love to say, that history really is on their side?

Even if you ask the question in those terms—which are the terms the Communists themselves prefer—I think history since 1945 has already begun to give the answer; and the answer is "No."

Communism has yet to be the popular choice of one single nation anywhere on the face of the globe. In the few places where it has extended its control, whether in Czechoslovakia, North Vietnam, or Cuba, it has been in the same classic role—as the scavenger of war and of ruined revolutions.

And we have seen, too, that the high tide can recede: Yugoslavia ceased to be a satellite; Poland achieved a certain measure of internal autonomy; and in more than one country of Africa and Asia, Communist ambassadors have been requested to go home and take their agents with them.

So even in these Communist terms, of sheer efficiency in the struggle between two supposed world systems, the score isn't so one sided. The promised victory of communism keeps on receding into the future. The juggernaut just doesn't jug. Either democracy is less bumbling than we fear, or communism is less efficient than it claims.

But, of course, this is only one part of the argument. Because beneath this question of efficiency lies a greater and deeper question: Efficiency for what? What is their purpose—and what is ours?

It is small wonder that dictatorships look efficient at waging war, whether hot or cold, because a totalitarian government is in its very essence a kind of war machine. Power is the ultimate justification for all its acts, and the extension of power is the chief article of its foreign policy.

The aims of democracy are altogether different. "As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master" was Lincoln's idea of democracy.

We positively don't want power and domination over others. The greatest triumph of the Marshall plan was not, as Moscow then said, to enslave Europe, but to get it back on its own feet and restore its independence. Our aim in the emerging nations is basically the same. We strive not for power, but for community—at home and among nations. For community, with all the rich variety and mutual tolerance which it implies, is the proper environment of freedom.

Not only aims, but performance, too, must concern us. Let us say that our worldwide aim is a community of nations which, as the United Nations Charter says, will "practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors." Judged by that aim, how is democracy doing? What are the dangers it must overcome?

I think on the basis of our own American experience we can begin by disposing of certain imaginary dangers which we hear about in this country.

There is the fear of racial and cultural difference. It goes back a long way. Even Thomas Jefferson, that most humane and civilized of Americans, was afraid of the melting pots. He predicted that immigrants from European monarchies would import the very political principles from which they had fled, and would even transmit them to their children.

But of course, exactly the opposite happened. This was perceived as early as 1782 by Crevecoeur, who described Americans as a mixture of English, Scotch, Irish, French, Dutch, Germans, and Swedes—to which I think an American of our time might reply, "Monsieur, you ain't seen nothing yet."

And of this "promiscuous breed," as he put it, Crevecoeur wrote: "He is an American who, leaving behind him all ancient prejudices and manners, receives new ones from the new mode of life he has embraced. * * * We know, properly speaking, no strangers; this is every person's country."

Certainly today we need have no fear of cultural or racial pluralism. We have far to go—but our country has already proved beyond any possible doubt, for ourselves and all the world, that there is no barrier of race or worship or culture which the unflinching practice of democratic brotherhood cannot cross.

May the Anti-Defamation League long continue its noble work in that cause.

There are other fears, compounded of fact and fiction, which are too well known and too long exploded to detain us long. From the extreme right we still hear that the income tax is socialism, socialism is communism, and so freedom is already done for. Or we hear that the real threat is not in the truculent power of Moscow or Peiping, but in the freedom of unpopular opinion—or in any authority, be it President or Supreme Court, which refuses to punish error as if it were treason.

Or we hear that the United Nations is a big Communist plot. Some plot—to organize all those votes against yourself.

If you follow that line to the end, you conclude with the discovery that the worst danger of all is democracy itself.

From the radical left, and sometimes from the radical pacifists, we hear other voices of doom. We have great Armed Forces, they say, therefore our freedom is doomed by a garrison state. Or we have big businesses, therefore democracy is being strangled by greedy monopolies. We have "internal contradictions," as the ideologists love to say—labor versus capital, farms versus cities, importers versus exporters—and therefore democracy will soon tear itself to pieces. As if "internal contradictions" were not the very fuel that makes the engine of democracy run.

What a pity it is that the nerves of even one American should be frazzled with these mythical dangers, when there are so many real and deeper dangers for democracy to face in our time.

Whoever reads the newspapers knows what they are:

Abroad, through all the emerging world, there is the danger that the hunger for a better life will be used to bait the hooks of demagogs, to bankrupt economies before they get started—and thus to lead unsuspecting million into communism or some other modern form of tyranny before they have even had a chance to find out what freedom is.

Among the nations of the North Atlantic, which are the economic powerhouse of the free world, there is the danger that this great trading community with its immense creative possibilities, will be frustrated by a vast transatlantic economic duel.

There is the danger that racial prejudice, and the wilder forms of tribal or national chauvinism, will weaken and balkanize the peoples of Afro-Asia—and even of Latin America—and cut them off from the powerful creative economies of the North Atlantic just when this partnership is most vital to their hopes.

There is the danger, so recently illustrated at the United Nations, that the final chapters of the European colonial era will be written in violence and chaos, and the fabric of international peace and law damaged beyond calculation.

All these are dangers for the community of the free—and therefore they are also opportunities for the would-be burial squads of communism. We of the West must act to avert them by every means we have. One means will certainly be to evolve, on a scale never yet attempted, an enduring partnership for economic and social growth between the free industrial economies and the aspiring peoples of the world.

These are the tasks of a generation or even a century. You and I will not live to see them completed. And indeed they will not be completed at all unless we Americans, in whose hands so much of the future rests, can learn certain other lessons in our own society and in our habits of thoughts.

We must remember that handsome is as handsome does. Our country has become so conspicuous that every flaw of economic or racial injustice, every debasement of quality, every blemish of bad taste, bad manners, or shoddy self-indulgence, is likely to be studied in the cruel light of world opinion.

We must learn to avoid the false alternatives which sound so good in argument and mean so little in real life. Why argue about total war and total peace when sheer common sense tells us that the first is unthinkable and the second is unattainable? Why pretend to choose between reliance on armed power and reliance on the friendships and common purposes we can develop in the United Nations—when it is perfectly obvious that our national security demands both?

We must apply ourselves to the long and difficult adventure of converting the fearful and suspicious into friends and neighbors. How easy it is for the rich to turn aside from shocking poverty and to say "But they've always lived that way, and democracy is not really for them."

The brute facts of modern life cry out that all men are neighbors. And our national creed says that democracy is for any man who has the courage to attempt it. We must take it upon ourselves to live by these truths, not just where it is easy and obvious to do so, but where it is difficult and dangerous and the counsels of cynicism are loud.

There is a myth that Americans are impatient, and give up when the going gets hard. Like most myths, it has some truth to it. We are impatient—but we are not dismayed and thrown into despair by unpleasant surprises.

Both our War of Independence and our Civil War seemed at the outset to promise quick victory. But it was 6 years from Lexington to Yorktown, and 4 from Sumter to Appomattox—and there were Americans available to endure it all.

When the Great Plains and the Pacific coast were opened for settlement, the land and the wealth seemed to be there for the asking. But when hunger and death and defeat came, there were pioneers who turned out to be tougher than they themselves had suspected; and the West was settled.

When the Civil War ended and the 15th amendment was passed, 4 million American Negroes emerged from slavery to what they thought would be paradise. But when they met disappointment, and bitter humiliation, they and their descendants, from Booker T. Washington to Martin Luther King, reacted as Americans usually do: by working all the harder to reach the goal.

Sometimes I think that if we Americans had been able to foresee in 1945 what an endless train of disappointments and hard decisions and bitter conflicts we would find in the United Nations, we would never have dared to join it. Perhaps there is something merciful in our lack of foresight.

If our national habit were one of brooding over all the possible pitfalls ahead, there is no telling how often we might have shirked those forbiddingly difficult tasks which a great nation must tackle or perish.

So Americans have tackled many a big and stubborn job and stayed with it to the end. Now history has given us the biggest of all. We are destined to work for the rest of our lives, along with every nation and people who will join us, to build a community of tolerance and peace—a house of freedom which will be big enough, ultimately, for all mankind.

The house will never be finished, for freedom itself is not a static condition but a process and a way of life, utterly unpredictable in the forms which it may evolve. Indeed, the house is already in existence, in a most imperfect and precarious way: and its name is the United Nations.

The United Nations is now in the midst of a lot of criticism, at home and abroad—much of it from people who would like to restrict the benefits of the charter to one class, one race, or one religion. But the United Nations is built for the whole world, and if it tried to satisfy all the sectional views it would end by doing nothing and would soon become an object of contempt.

The United Nations is far from being an object of contempt today. It has never been more vigorous. In the Congo it has supplied the vital force at the vital moment to safeguard the future possibilities of freedom for a united Congolese nation.

Dag Hammarskjold used to say that if you don't like the United Nations, you don't like the world—because the United Nations is first and foremost a reflection of the real world of men and nations, with all their sins and virtues. But it is also something more—something very close to our democratic heritage. It is a standard. It sheds upon the real world the light of moral principles written in the charter. That light may flicker, but will not be extinguished. And as long as we have strength, it is up to us to cope with the stubborn evils which the light reveals.

I would close with one last thought about that mysterious thing, freedom. The true genius of freedom stems, I think, not from an attitude of warlike defiance, but from an altogether different quality called loving kindness.

The very origin of the word "free" bears me out. From the beginning of recorded language, it has been related to words meaning "peace and love." One of these words is "friend." In ancient times you and your family, your clan and tribe—these friends were free, all others in your village were foreign slaves captured in war. The freeman, then, is first of all the beloved, the friend, the man with whom one is at peace.

And now, under our rocket-laden skies, the "family" which must learn to live together in peace and in love, and therefore in freedom, is the family called man—all 3 billion of him.

We should not complain that the attainment of this goal is difficult, or even, in any perfect sense, impossible. Our magnificent gift of freedom was forged in difficulty and suffering, and the impossible was always its guiding light.

Equal Justice for All Our Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, it would be an atrocious paradox if the drive to aid public schools were to succeed to the total exclusion and eventual extinction of private schools in this country under the guise of attaining national excellence in education. Yet that is the prospect we face on the authority of one who has the responsibility for the operation of the largest private school segments in the Nation. Cardinal Spellman has demonstrated a deep interest and dedication to the cause of a finer public school system but he is bound to oppose any measure which works disfavor upon the parents and children who have exercised their constitutional freedom of choice in electing attendance in the independent schools.

The most constructive approach to better educational opportunity is a just bill for all children. I am gratified that in his address to the Archdiocesan Teachers Institute on February 7 Francis Cardinal Spellman saw fit to so describe H.R. 9803 introduced by our distinguished colleague, JAMES DELANEY. After a thorough reading and analysis of Mr. DELANEY's measure, I introduced a similar bill as did one who has always stood for fairness and equality, our eminent colleague, ALFRED SANTANGELO.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues who have an interest in preserving and improving our traditional system of educational equality to study the Delaney bill and I commend to their attention the comments of Cardinal Spellman which go to the heart of this problem:

STATEMENT OF HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL SPELLMAN, DELIVERED AT THE OPENING SESSION OF THE 18TH ANNUAL ARCHDIOCESAN TEACHERS INSTITUTE, HOTEL NEW YORKER, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 10 A.M.

My message this morning is one of gratitude, and I welcome the opportunity of meeting so many of those who teach in our schools and of thanking them in a body, as I would like to individually, for their tremendous contribution to the country and to the church. We have a great heritage, and we have a great challenge. It is true that last year the Congress of the United States did prevent any injustice against the children who attend Catholic schools, but the threat is still there. I have done what I could to bring to the attention of the people of our archdiocese the terrible crime it would be to discriminate against children and their parents and those who help support, and do support, Catholic schools, if they were excluded from the benefits of help from our National Government—if help be given to other children. For all America's children are the concern, and should be the concern, of our National Government. The bishops of the United States have not made any pronouncement about the necessity of Federal aid to schools. They do not wish to enter into that field. But they do claim that, if help be given to children who attend public schools, the same measure of help should be given to children who attend church related schools. It seems incongruous to think that just because the children attend parochial schools they should be excluded from benefits which other children have, or might have.

I am grateful to those in the Senate and in the Congress of the United States who have seen this discrimination and are doing what they can to combat it. I thought that the bill presented by Congressman Delaney was a fair statement and a just bill: that all children through their parents or through the municipality or the county or the State should have equal treatment—if any bill for Federal aid to education should be enacted.

I feel, naturally, very strongly about this because, if the administration bill and the administration's desires should become factual, that means the end of our schools. While we pay our municipal taxes—taxes for education—and while voluntarily we assume the voluntary taxation of supporting, building and maintaining our schools, and while our priests and sisters and brothers give their lives—the most precious endowment that our schools have—nevertheless, if the Federal Government should favor the public school children and put an additional tax on us from which we would receive no benefit, then, my dear friends, it is the eventual end of our parochial schools, because we cannot compete with the Federal Government's support and subsidy of the public schools alone.

If such a bill should be enacted it would be a dagger threatening our very existence. Therefore, we shall continue with every possibility that we have to strive for equal justice for all our children, those in the public schools and those in the private schools, and I know, dear sisters and brothers, that you will continue your dedicated lives of service so that our schools shall be, and must be, the equal of any schools in providing secular education, education in the regular academic studies, and, in addition, provide also the example and the precept of teaching America's children to be loyal to our great country and loyal also to our Holy Mother Church.

The Faiths That Are America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the Exchange of January 1962. It was written by Lester E. Rounds, president of the metropolitan school study council and superintendent of schools, Suffern, N.Y.

Suffern is in my district, where we all have the greatest admiration for Mr. Rounds, and appreciation for his high ideals for our schools and for our country:

THE FAITHS THAT ARE AMERICA

(By Lester E. Rounds)

I am concerned, and this concern has stimulated an attempt to delineate some of the basic faiths that seem to me to undergird the American way of life.

Psychological conditioning by other countries has caused too many defections of Americans from our way of life. Have they learned sufficiently the basic faiths that are America?

I observe some of our own scholars obsessed by the criticism of America as the intellectual thing to do. Are they comprehending sufficiently that certain basic faiths make analyses more meaningful and criticism more productive?

I remember an exchange student from Denmark who came here to observe and analyze public education and to advise his people on our way of life, and I wonder if the new exchange students will be different. Notwithstanding great efforts by many teachers, he did not comprehend why we attempt to educate all children. Did he understand the spirit of America? The faiths that are America?

Recently the Herald Tribune reported some foreign educators' reactions to their tour of American schools. The summary of their comment was, "American schools are not so bad after all—considering our impressions before we came—and certainly not as bad as some American critics would have you believe. One New Zealand administrator commented, "* * * the picture of education you present to the world is misleading."

Do we have faith in good public education as an integral part of an on-going democracy? Do we believe that what we do in the classroom is fundamental to the welfare of America? Do we communicate this to our people and thence to other people?

On June 24 of this year at the high school commencement, the invocation by Cena Goldstein was on the topic, "Faith * * * Makes the Result Come True." Do we have faith that educating all the children of all the people makes democracy work?

In This Week of August 6, "Words to Live By" quoted from above the fireplace of Hind's Head Hotel near London, "Fear knocked at the door. Faith answered. No one was there." As we and our children are beset by the anxieties of our times, do we have the basic faiths to dispel the shadows of fear and to bring the penetrating light of truth?

On August 1, I received a communication from Commissioner James E. Allen stating:

"This amendment (referring to a new statute) serves as a reminder to educators of a generally accepted premise: that we must do whatever we need to do to survive as a free nation. We must institute whatever programs are required in the schools to prepare our young citizens to defend their priceless heritage of individual liberty. We must make them aware of the dangers to that liberty—of the forces that would close in upon and transform our free world into a monolithic kind of world where the individual would exist only to serve the state. The danger is real; the tactics are subtle; the clever presentation of Communist theory is a lure to the idealistic and gullible youth who is impatiently seeking the final answer, the quick solution, the absolute "truth."

"Young people need to learn to recognize totalitarianism in all its guises. Equally, they need to learn to value freedom and individual human dignity so much that no price seems too high to pay for its preservation."

Could it be that emphasis upon "the faiths that are America" is one of the positive procedures needed to immobilize the subtleties of communism? It is my opinion that America can be best comprehended and appreciated by focusing upon her faiths.

FAITH IN GOD

Historically Americans have consistently expressed their "faith in God." We came to this continent to worship our God without dictates; our Declaration of Independence begins with reference to "Nature's God" and ends with, "a firm reliance upon the protection of divine Providence"; our pledge of allegiance now states, "One Nation under God indivisible"; our coins reminds us, "In God We Trust."

America's faith in God is best defined by the concepts of the Hebraic-Christian ethic—the brotherhood of man; the worth and dignity of the individual; the equality of all men; mercy, gentleness, justice, love for all men. We are motivated by the disturbing belief that there are those among us who seem to be last but shall be first. Our political history has proved this ethic else we would not have produced an Abraham Lincoln.

FAITH IN PUBLIC EDUCATION

During our early history, as a new community was developed, homes were built, a church was erected, a school was constructed. We have not only placed faith in God, but faith in public education.

Jefferson very practically advised that all people must be educated if the American ideal of self-government were to work. He said, "I know of no safe depository of the ultimate powers of society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion by education."

Because we believe in the inherent worth of each individual, the public school has kept pace by attempting to create varied curricula so that each individual's talents, interests, and abilities may be improved to a maximum—another way of translating "all men are created equal," all youth must have equal opportunities to reach their potentials.

As our society has become more complex, more responsibility has been placed upon the public school. Four times as much knowledge needs to be transmitted today as compared to 2 generations ago. And, public education of various forms is being extended until it covers about one-third of the life span. Besides the literacy and citizenship fundamentals, the schools have been asked to prepare youth for leisure time, to keep them physically fit, to extend their appreciation of beauty, to deepen their concept of spiritual values, to help them prepare for family life, for vocations, and for consumership.

All this is a large order—but the public schools have and will rise to the challenge because the people have faith in public education.

FAITH IN MAN

America is faith in God and faith in public education, but interrelated with both and yet worthy, I think, of separate consideration is faith in man.

As teachers we are committed ideally to all the children, but realistically are we? Most of us are by nature academically oriented and talented else we probably would not have chosen teaching. Do we understand the boy or girl who does not have the aptitude for reading and writing? Do we have concern and know-how enough to discern his other talents and to lead him temporarily to other curricular pursuits as a way of interesting him in school and bringing him eventually to a modicum of literacy? Do we really believe in the least of these? Are our hearts, as well as our minds, big enongh for all the children of all the people? Does our curriculum and do our procedures of teaching reflect this philosophy? Do we actually believe in the worth of each child?

The Guidance Department of Ramapo No. 1 has just released our "holding power" upon the Class of 1961—88 percent who started school finished. Another way of expressing these data is than 29 boys and girls did not finish high school. This is a realistic measure of our curriculum, our economics, our service to all the children, our concern for the least of these.

If we profess a faith in God as interpreted by the Hebraic-Christian ethic and a faith in public education, it is imperative that each of us have faith in each child—his potential, his future, his contributions to American society. For, this faith characterizes us, I believe, from the other educational systems of the world. Some critics of public education would have us return to some of these other systems; would standardize our curriculum, would educate only the academically talented; would segregate the verbally talented from the mechanically talented, from the physically talented, from the musically talented; would return to the classical tradition for all. It is time, I am convinced, that we assess our heritage and our faiths as independently and with as much courage as in the 1700's we made our stand by the Concord bridge.

FAITH IN AMERICA'S ACHIEVEMENT

We are sometimes characterized abroad as culturally illiterate, as physically unfit, as exaggerating our high standard of living, as having low academic standards; as materialistic. However, non-Americans often do not comprehend the basic faiths that make the difference—our philosophy makes culture, physical education, standard of living, and scholarship something for all of our people.

We are conscious of our underprivileged and are continually attempting to improve their conditions because our basic faiths make this necessary. Materialism, yes, but the sharing of our wealth and our goods with those less fortunate throughout the world is a matter of record during the last two generations. No nation can demonstrate more warmheartedness, more charity than America, because of our basic faiths.

If some of these statements need documentation I suggest reference to Frederick Allen's "The Big Change." Mass production, capitalism, investments have made it possible for millions more Americans to have more, to become more educated, to share more, to live longer, to read more books, to buy more records, and to purchase more radios and televisions (which do bring literary and cultural programs as well as entertainment). From the 1960 World Almanac comes this statement, "The sales of paperbound books continued by the millions, showing that Americans become confirmed book readers when the price is within their reach."

If the cynic, high-school student or teacher, would debunk our achievements not only in material things but in cultural and educational attainments, he is not facing the basic fact that our achievements are by more people for more people. Achievements, based on these criteria, are worthy of our faith.

Last May Dr. Harold Taylor, former president of Sarah Lawrence College, spoke to the Metropolitan School Study Council Superintendents. In a small informal discussion we were attempting to analyze the reasons why such large numbers have applied for the Peace Corps. Could it be that young Americans need a commitment, need a devotion, need a faith? In contrast—young Communists seem to have a dedication, although we know the ideals professed are tarnished, and the ideology is schizophrenic.

Is it possible that we are not utilizing the profound faiths that are America to enlist the loyalties and the devotions of our youth and our people toward positive goals?

Could it be that the teaching profession is not sufficiently aware of these basic faiths, and in turn we as teachers are not capturing the imagination of youth who need, as we all do, to serve a useful cause?

If the teachers of Ramapo No. 1 and of America were completely committed to the faiths that are America, would our students abandon their loyalties when under psychological conditioning; would they debunk America in their intellectual penetrations; would visiting exchange students see us in a new light; would foreign educators have more understanding of our system; would our people have more of their anxieties and fear dispelled? I believe so, for the faiths that are America are sustaining faiths. Faith in God, faith in public education, faith in man, and faith in America's achievements are of the spirit; and America at her finest is a spirtual concept, so to be understood, so to be comprehended, and so to be appreciated.

Speech Delivered by Senator Kerr at Columbia, S.C., February 7, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include a speech delivered by the Honorable ROBERT S. KERR, distinguished Senator from the State of Oklahoma, before a Democratic audience in Columbia, S.C., on February 7.

The speech follows:

I am delighted to be here tonight in this beautiful Capital city with so many fighting, unterrified Democrats from the great Palmetto State—a State which was one of the original 13; a State whose star was sewed upon this Nation's first flag with the threads of bravery, patriotism, and religious reverence. Tonight, that star still brightly shines in the constellation of the 50 States of this mighty Union, which is again moving ahead under the leadership of another great Democratic President.

I am delighted to be in the home State of all of your distinguished congressional delegation, especially my two great colleagues in the Senate, OLIN JOHNSTON and STROM THURMOND. I am glad to be here with your distinguished Governor Hollings and Congressman BOB HEMPHILL. I join with you in mourning the passing of your beloved Congressman, John Riley.

I came here tonight at the request of one of the Senate's most respected and powerful Members—my cherished friend and your senior Senator, OLIN D. JOHNSTON. Meeting and talking with many of you tonight made it easy for me to understand why the good people of your fair State have for 30 years elected OLIN JOHNSTON to serve them in public office. I became acquainted with him when we were both Governors. While I was Governor of Oklahoma I visited him in your Governor's mansion—a house unique in all America, fashioned from what was left of two homes after parts of each had been destroyed during the Civil War. Those of us who have been fortunate to serve as Senators with OLIN JOHNSTON in the Senate respect his knowledge and grasp of all the difficult matters that come before the Senate. And specifically, we look to him for leadership as chairman of the powerful Post Office and Civil Service Committee, as ranking Democrat of the virtually important Agriculture Committee, and as a member of the Judiciary, Appropriations, and other Senate and joint committees. In view of this, it is no wonder that since 1944, when you first sent him to Congress, his seniority in the Senate has grown to the extent that out of 100 Senators, only 10 now outrank him. Yet, in power and influence he is second to none.

I was not surprised when I read not long ago that the Republicans here have listed him as their No. 1 target for defeat in this State. I've got news for them—they will be like the fellow who tied himself to the 3-year-old bull. He said after about three jumps, he saw where he had made a terrible mistake.

A little over a year ago, during the last presidential campaign, both candidates came to this gracious southern capital city and asked for your votes for the highest office in this land.

Nixon stood on the steps of your capitol and told you that the Democratic Party had "forfeited its right to ask you to support it when it adopted its platform in Los Angeles."

Nixon further told you that you had never had it so good as you had during the past 8 years under Eisenhower, and he promised that it would be even better under him.

Kennedy stood on those same steps and sought your vote as the first Democratic nominee for President in the history of South Carolina to come to this State and ask your help. He did not promise you an easy road if you followed him. He said: "I think to be a citizen of the United States in the 1960's is going to be a burdensome and hazardous occupation." He asked for your prayers and your help, and he promised if he were successful he would get this country moving again."

The results of that historic election are known and have been felt in South Carolina and throughout this country. South Carolina joined the majority of the people across this Nation who shouted "no" to Nixon and another 8 years under the Republicans, and "yes" to John F. Kennedy. Thus in the tradition of Jefferson, Jackson, Wilson, Roosevelt, and Truman, we elected our youngest, and one of the greatest Presidents this country has ever known. And with him we elected the wise and able, distinguished, and competent Vice President, LYNDON JOHNSON. We do not claim perfection for either Kennedy or Johnson, but just think how much better off we are under them as our leaders than we would have been with Nixon and Lodge.

Since that election "poor Richard" has been in a state of confusion and semiretirement, and I understand that a fellow named Brown out in California is going to make Nixon's retirement permanent. But the confusion and frustration of the rank and file members of the Republican Party is even worse than Nixon's. No longer can they say "take me to our leader," because they don't know who their leader is. I understand the Republicans have organized a committee to pick a nominee for 1964 who: looks like Rockefeller, talks like GOLDWATER, plays golf like Ike, who is as tricky as Dickie, and who thinks that a Rambler is somebody wheeling toward the White House. However, they wouldn't unite behind such a candidate if he could be found. They would much rather pursue their present course of "feuding, fussing and fighting."

John Kennedy assumed the Presidency during one of the most perilous times in the history of this country, and for that matter, in the history of mankind. After 8 years of Eisenhower there was deep trouble at home, and with the increasing Communist menace, there was more trouble abroad. Now we Democrats aren't like the Republicans who for 20 years have called us the war party. We do not say the Republicans created the cold war. But neither did they meet its challenges. And so when Kennedy assumed the Presidency, he also assumed the problems of a nation needing able and decisive leadership and of a world needing renewed hope and confidence in the United States and in the cause of freedom. And I might add, that not since the early days of Franklin D. Roosevelt's first term has a President moved so quickly and decisively on so many fronts.

In the field of agriculture, Kennedy inherited from Benson and Eisenhower a situation which shocked even the most hardened sensibilities. During the bleak period of the Eisenhower administration the farmer's share of the national income had been reduced from its alltime high to far below what it had been even in the dark days of the Hoover depression. While the farmer's net income had fallen to a 21-year low, the cost of his farm production had risen to an alltime high. But in spite of this sorry record, the cost of running the Department of Agriculture during those 8 years exceeded what it had cost to run that same department in the 100 years "B. B.", that is—"Before Benson." Benson may have gone back to sheep-herding but his name will live in infamy for a hundred years because of his mistreatment of the American farm families and their problems. What he did was like giving them an enema when what they needed was a transfusion. Benson sawed off the supports and cut back the parity on every agricultural commodity except tobacco. And had it not been for your ever-viligant OLIN JOHNSTON, who helped write into law the firm 90 percent parity which could not be tampered with, Benson would have ruined your tobacco industry.

Since Kennedy took office, support prices have been increased, farmers have had $1½ billion rise in net farm income, while the administration was making a real start in reducing the farm surplus. Kennedy promised to restore rural electrification to its former role of preeminence, "enabling that remarkable American institution to get on with its work of providing low-cost electricity and telephones for every American farm family." This was no idle campaign promise. He added $100 million to the Eisenhower budget request last year, and next year he has asked for $100 million more, for a total of $345 million, whereby more loans will be made and even more farm homes lighted. Here in South Carolina alone, nearly $95 million in loans were made to 28 borrowers who serve 143,000 farms and other rural consumers in this State. This year, service will be extended to 25,000 more rural consumers in South Carolina. What a record this is, in view of the fact that when REA was created in 1935, only 2.3 percent of the farms in this State had central electric service. OLIN JOHNSTON, as Governor of this State at that time, had a survey of rural electrical needs made, and then established South Carolina's REA program, a program which now accommodates 97 percent of your farm population with central station electrical service.

These are but a few examples of progress in the farm program since Benson left, but we know that many problems still face us in this area. Let us give thanks, however, that men and women sympathetic to the family-sized farmer and his problems are in the saddle in Washington after 8 long desolate years under Eisenhower, Benson, Nixon. They are building programs which will help restore the faith in their Government of our producers of feed, food, and fiber.

Farmers now have more faith in their Government, and the consumers will have more faith in the farmers. We can be thankful that we now have a Secretary for instead of against agriculture.

Secretary Benson spent his time misrepresenting instead of representing the farmer. Now Secretary Freeman has a double load, not only to provide justice for the farmer, but to undo so many of the wrongs of Benson. Can you imagine Secretary Benson popping up in a supermarket to tell the housewife the farmer's side of the story? Thanks to Secretary Freeman, the consumer will learn that the farmer is his best friend, and that the average farmer does not have two Cadillacs in every field.

Now, for a moment, let us look at what is being done by this administration on other fronts.

A million more people are at work today than last year at this time. How different was Kennedy's attitude to the problems of unemployment than were the cruel words of Eisenhower's Secretary of Defense, when he called the unfortunate unemployed, "kennel dogs who do nothing but sit on their fannies and howl."

In 1 year the Kennedy administration has brought us back from the valley of three recessions to the highroads of recovery and growth. Shortly after taking office, the President increased greatly the distribution of surplus food to the needy, established a pilot food stamp plan for critical areas, reduced FHA and community facility loan interest rates, directed the Veterans' Administration to speed up distribution of $258 million in life insurance dividends, and slowed the outward flow of our gold from Fort Knox and reduced the number of foreign claims against this gold. All of these quick decisive moves put more money into the sluggish economy left over from Eisenhower's recessions. How different were these actions from the cruel policies of the Republican leaders of high interest rates, hard money and tight credit.

President Kennedy also ordered a speedup in Federal procurement and in the building of public works and highway construction. What a pleasant change are these policies from Eisenhower's death knells of no new starts. I have often wondered where I would be if my mother and father had practiced the philosophy of no new starts.

President Kennedy's determined buildup, speedup, and firmup in the related fields of military preparedness, space, and foreign affairs have brought a complete change in the answer to the question "Who's winning the cold war?"

In 1 year, the first year of the Kennedy administration, our overall military strength has almost doubled.

Our Navy is in control of the major seas of the world with close to 900 ships in our 4 fighting fleets containing 17 attack aircraft carriers (of which Russia has none). With the doubling of the acquisition rate of Polaris submarines we shall shortly have 41 of them carrying a total of 700 missiles with ranges of up to 1,800 miles.

In the air we have doubled the number of aircraft on ground alert since Kennedy took office, and at the end of this year, we shall have added to our current number of 1,200 jets capable of carrying nuclear weapons by building up 14 wings of the long-range B-52 bombers. Our bomber fleet is now several times the size of Russia's force, and this favorable gap is increasing daily.

On the ground, we will have by the middle of this year a total of 19 Army and Marine divisions equipped with modern weapons and experienced in guerrilla and other new tactics of warfare. These ground forces are expected to be 45 percent more effective than our forces last year.

The pendulum of the missile gap has now swung in our favor with production doubled on Minuteman missiles, and with the current rate of production on that missile and the Polaris, Titan and Atlas, we will have 1,700 missiles capable of being launched at Russia by 1965.

In the field of space, under President Kennedy, we have stopped strolling in the moonlight and have started racing for the moon.

Our space research has been broader, more methodical and has been conducted on much higher standards. We seek to conquer space not only for our national security but even more so for peaceful purposes. We strive, and will succeed to master the science of weather forecasting. Then will come control of the weather.

In a few short years, we will be operating a worldwide system of communication satellites—telephone, radio, television. What a day it will be when the golden voice of a Billy Graham or a Bishop Sheen can carry the message to a billion people of Jesus Christ, the Saviour and Prince of Peace.

In the overall space effort, we are now ahead of Russia and our lead continues to increase. A major deterrent to the U.S. space program has been the lack of a larger booster rocket. We now have it—the world's largegst known rocket—the eight-engine Saturn which was successfully and dramatically fired from Cape Canaveral on October 27, a total success on its very first firing. It was larger than the Statue of Liberty, the height of a 20-story building, and generated a total thrust of approximately 1,300,000 pounds. This is half a million pounds more than the 800,000 pounds generally estimated for the first stage of the vehicles that put the Soviet Union's astronauts into orbit.

Real facts of the acceleration under President Kennedy and our programs for the future are both illuminating and dramatic.

Last year we launched more than eight times as many earth satellites as did the Russians, scoring a 34–4 victory.

In a few days, we hope, a U.S. astronaut will orbit the earth and later this year astronauts will make day-long journeys of 18 orbits.

In 1963 and 1964 we plan to orbit spaceships carrying two men on week-long orbits around the globe.

In 1964–65 our Apollo mooncrafts will be operational and will make training flights, training crews of threes for trips to the moon.

In 1966 our Saturn rocket will launch Apollos and crews on half-million-mile flights around the moon and back.

And, in 1967, President Kennedy's space program shall reach the spectacular goal of landing Americans on the moon by the use of the powerful Nova rocket.

In the field of foreign affairs Russia has been plagued by failures, while America has begun to regain prestige and respect.

Albania and Communist China have openly defied Russia's control of the Communist world, and other countries such as Rumania and Poland are tugging at the Russian leash. Inside the Kremlin an ideological battle is now dividing the leaders of Russia.

A great new economic force, the Common Market, is rising up on Russia's doorstep, and is becoming a new factor in the world's balance of power.

Since 1948 the only new conquest brought home to Moscow was that of Castro's Cuba. Guinea, once thought to be in the Communist orbit, recently caught and ousted the Russian Ambassador for directing a plot to overthrow the Government.

In this same field of foreign affairs, the United States has outstripped the Russians and we have stopped merely reacting to Communist aggression and started acting and taking decisive steps. Kennedy established a Peace Corps, harnessing our most valuable resource, our young people, as ambassadors of good will at the local level, working side by side with and among the people of 11 countries. Already numerous other countries have saked that a contingent of the Peace Corps be sent to them.

President Kennedy has strengthened NATO, has stood firm in Berlin, and has fought for a neutral government in Laos and for the unity and peace of the Congo. And Cuba has been made to swallow their own Castro oil; last week, Cuba was kicked out of the Organization of American States, thanks to the diplomatic moves by this administration at Puenta del Este. How good and how pleasant has been the change our image from the Ugly American to the image of strength and determination against our enemies, yet one of compassion and help to our friends and to those who need our aid in withstanding Communist aggression.

But all of these facts and figures cannot and do not tell the complete story of why we are wining the cold war under President Kennedy.

I believe the decisive ingredient is what is contained, and what has been rekindled, in the hearts and minds and spirits of 185 million Americans.

It is because of my faith in their faith, my confidence in their confidence, my courage because of the knowledge of their courage, my strength to endure because of their strength to endure, that makes me positive and convinced that America is most certainly winning and will continue to win the cold war.

Is there any wonder that after a year of positive action on all fronts that the Gallup poll shows that 85 percent of the people of this country approve our new President and his leadership.

We know that Kennedy and Johnson were elected because Eisenhower, Nixon and company had been tried and found wanting. After 8 years of being lulled with misstatements, misevaluations, and overdoses of political tranquilizers, the alarm clock has sounded. We have awakened to a world full of peril and pain, but a world offering the greatest opportunities and challenges ever known to mankind. We have accepted the challenges of the cold war, of outer space, and of our duties to our fellow Americans instead of dozing and dreaming with the Rip Van Winkle Republicans. You can feel the quickened pace, the vitality and the new will to compete and win. John Kennedy's election as President has brought about one of the most exciting transitions in evolutionary government that I have ever witnessed.

Let us unite under the banner of Democracy.

Let all Democrats show the way to America and to the world.

Let the battle be joined. Let us not be idle dreamers, but let us dare to dream.

Let us be fully prepared if war is forced upon us, but let us pray for peace.

Let us not act from fear, but not be afraid to act.

Let us gird our loins with patience in the knowledge that communism will not end tomorrow, but that when it does end, it will be a complete victory for democracy and freedom.

Let us bring a new meaning to those words our Founding Fathers penned at the conclusion of the Declaration of Independence, that to insure the successful outcome of this struggle we hereby "dedicate our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

Problems in Developing Apprenticeship in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, full manpower utilization is one of the most pressing and complex domestic problems facing the Nation. It is a concern of this Congress, and will, I should judge, be a concern of many Congresses to come. Central to solution of the problem stands the urgency of providing, through training or retraining, enough skilled workers for our increasingly technical industrial society.

With leave to extend my remarks, I should like at this time to enter into the RECORD a study entitled "Problems in Developing Apprenticeship in the United States." This study, conducted by an ad hoc task force appointed by Labor Secretary Goldberg, resulted directly from investigation last August by the Special Subcommittee on Labor, of which I am chairman, of discrimination in apprenticeship and training programs. While it should be made clear that this study does not represent official Labor Department views, it still dramatically demonstrates the distinct likelihood of an acute skilled manpower shortage within a few years.

For example, at present levels, apprenticeship programs in the construction industry will come nowhere near providing the number of journeymen needed by 1970. Of 14 selected trades, only 1, the electrical trade at 36 percent, reaches a proportion over 22 percent. In carpentry, the largest of the building trades, only 6 percent of needed journeymen will be provided at the present rate of training. Four other trades have proportions under 10 percent. In other parts of the economy, furthermore, the volume of apprenticeship is even less adequate than in the construction industry.

In brief, this study shows that problems in apprenticeship go far beyond the question of discrimination. We need two things and need them soon: First, a vast expansion of apprenticeship and training programs, and, second, removal of all artificial barriers to entry into such programs, so that the best qualified young people may contribute to our future needs.

JANUARY 4, 1962.

The Honorable JAMES ROOSEVELT,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIMMY: The enclosed report was compiled by a special task group who were asked to make a study of apprenticeship and the adequacy of our apprenticeship programs and efforts. While the analysis of the situation seems to be fairly thorough it seems to me that some of their suggestions for corrective legislation are of doubtful value.

The Department of Labor is in the process of preparing proposed legislation on the subject of discrimination in apprenticeship and training that will go substantially beyond the suggestions of the task group report. We should have this ready for your consideration very shortly. I believe it will be much more satisfactory than the suggestions in this report; however, it does not encompass item 1 under "Need for new legislation" and you may wish to give consideration to this.

Please let me know if you need further elaboration.

Sincerely,

JERRY R. HOLLEMAN,
Assistant Secretary of Labor.

PROBLEMS IN DEVELOPING APPRENTICESHIP IN THE UNITED STATES

This paper describes the National Apprenticeship Program promoted by the U.S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training. The extent to which the program is assisting young persons to prepare for careers in industry is discussed.

Barriers to Negro participation and steps that might be taken to provide more apprenticeship opportunities for Negroes are then considered.

I. LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY

The National Apprenticeship Act authorizes and directs the Secretary of Labor to "formulate and promote the furtherance of labor standards necessary to safeguard the welfare of apprentices, to extend the application of such standards by encouraging the inclusion thereof in contracts of apprenticeship, to bring together employers and labor for the formulation of programs of apprenticeship, to cooperate with State agencies engaged in the formulation and promotion of standards of apprenticeship, and to cooperate * * * with the Office of Education * * *."[1]

The Bureau's activities also are authorized by the enabling act that established the Department of Labor, which authorizes the Secretary of Labor to promote the welfare of workers.

II. THE ORGANIZATION OF APPRENTICESHIP IN THE UNITED STATES

The Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training encourages and assists employers and labor organizations to plan programs of apprenticeship that will be in their own long-run interest. The apprenticeship method of training craftsmen provides a systematic approach to mastering all the skills and knowledge involved in a trade. It combines actual work practice and experience with technical instruction in subjects necessary to the craftsman in the performance of his job. Depending on the requirements of a craft, the related instruction may cover mathematics, drawing, blueprint reading, materials, and in some cases, such general subjects as English and report writing. Related instruction is given in a school, usually in a school operated by public educational authorities associated with the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The apprentice is an employed worker who learns the skills of his trade by performing work on the job under the guidance of a craftsman. Necessary theoretical instruction is provided. The apprentice's growth in skill and knowledge is reflected in his paycheck.[2] Moreover, he knows that when his apprenticeship has been completed, he will be recognized by both management and labor as a journeyman.

Participation in apprenticeship is voluntary. Effective training cannot take place without the wholehearted cooperation of the employer, the apprentice, and the craftsmen who supervise and train the apprentice. It is important that each of the parties involved in apprenticeship programs be convinced that he will benefit from the program. Otherwise he will be reluctant to carry out the program.

In working with industry to establish apprenticeship programs, BAT places considerable emphasis on quality. In fact, the entire process of organizing an apprenticeship program could be looked upon as an effort to improve the quality of experience gained on the job. When the improvement in quality has satisfied the criteria included in the fundamentals of apprenticeship, the program may be registered.[3] This emphasis on quality is of distinct advantage to the apprentice. He is given an opportunity to master every aspect of a trade and he can look forward to steady employment when he has completed his apprenticeship. At the same time, however, it should be recognized that there is a limit to the number of young people that can be inducted into an industry in such a favorable manner.

An employer is usually reluctant to train an apprentice if he is not certain that there will be a position available in his organization when the apprenticeship has been completed. Furthermore, sharp fluctuations in manpower requirements in some industries make it difficult for an employer to keep an apprentice steadily employed. To help solve this problem the Bureau has encouraged groups of employers, in cooperation with labor organizations, to set up joint apprenticeship committees composed of equal representation from labor and management. Apprenticeship field representatives and vocational education officials usually participate in an advisory capacity. Apprentices are assigned to different contractors in accordance with the manpower requirements of the contractors and the need of the apprentice to obtain instruction and experience in every aspect of the trade. An increasing number of JAC's are employing coordinators to administer their programs.

III. SELECTION OF APPRENTICES

The selection of apprentices is the responsibility of the sponsor or sponsors of an apprenticeship program. Well operated programs usually have far more applicants for apprenticeship than there are openings. The sponsors usually do not ask the public employment service or the schools to refer apprentice applicants and they do not advertise for apprentices. As a result, Negroes or other minority groups who have no connection with the trade usually do not apply for apprentice jobs.

In selecting apprentices, some preference is usually given to persons who have already had some experience in the industry. Preference may also be given to those who have some knowledge of the trade or who have a close relative in the trade. This sometimes helps to assure that apprentices will know what is involved in the trade and not drop out after a few weeks. Although there is some justification for these practices, they tend to restrict apprenticeship opportunities.

The Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training encourages program sponsors to use objective selection procedures. A chart presentation on selection techniques has been developed for use by BAT field representatives in discussing selection with employers and JAC's. Moreover, program sponsors are encouraged by the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training to make full use of the public employment service. Referral and counseling of applicants are activities assigned by law to the employment service and are not functions of the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training. Moreover, the Bureau does not have the resources to do this work.

IV. THE VOLUME OF APPRENTICESHIP IN THE UNITED STATES

The volume of apprenticeship in the United States is not adequate to meet the needs of the economy. Planned apprenticeship has not been established in many occupations. Even in the trades where apprenticeship has been developed, not enough apprentices are being trained to replace anticipated losses from death and retirement. Although immigration once provided a large number of craftsmen trained in Europe, this is no longer an important source of supply.

Not all workers achieving journeymen status are trained through apprenticeship and it is not expected that all journeymen in the future will have the advantage of formalized apprenticeship. Craftsmen acquire their skills in a variety of ways, including the gradual building up of skills through on-the-job experience, training received in the military service, and training in trade schools.

Although all craftsmen need not be developed through apprenticeship, it is desirable that a high proportion receive this type of training. Automation and other technological changes have increased the skill and knowledge required in many jobs. It is from the apprentice-trained craftsmen that employers usually obtain their foremen and superintendents. The opportunity to "learn while you earn" is also to the definite advantage of the worker.

In considering the need to expand apprenticeship, this paper will first review the situation in the construction industry, where over 60 percent of the registered apprentices are currently employed. The need to develop more apprenticeship in other industries will then be discussed.

Construction industry

Although considerable progress has been made in establishing apprenticeship programs in the construction industry, additional programs are urgently needed. Labor and management groups at the national level have taken steps to promote apprenticeship, but many of the local affiliates of these groups are not conducting adequate apprenticeship programs. For example, a study of masonry construction conducted by BAT in 1960 found that JAC's were being sponsored by only 424 of the 831 local unions of the Bricklayers, Masons and Plasterers International Union. Even in communities in which there is an active program, the number of apprentices employed is often less than the number needed. Furthermore, the national contractors' organizations and the building trades unions are not effectively organized in many small cities and towns. Very little planned apprenticeship has been developed in such communities.

At the current rate of apprentice employment only about 10 percent of the total number of journeymen needed in the building trades throughout the country will be provided through apprenticeship. In carpentry, the largest of the buildings trades, it is estimated that apprenticeship will provide only 6 percent of the needed journeymen. The proportion of journeymen needed by 1970 that will be provided through a planned apprenticeship at the current rate in other selected trades is as follows:

Trades:	*Percent needed*
Brick, stone, and tile	22
Cement mason	12
Electrician	36
Iron Worker	15
Lather	8
Painter and paperhanger	3
Plasterer	15
Plumber and pipefitter	17
Roofer	12
Sheet metal worker	21
Asbestos worker	3
Boilermaker	4
Glazier	21

More detailed data are provided in table 1, which shows for selected occupations the estimated number of additional workers required by 1970 to replace losses resulting from deaths and retirements, and the number needed to meet increased demand. The table compares the number of additional journeymen needed in each trade with those who will be trained through apprenticeship, if training programs continue to operate at current levels. Although measures have already been taken by several trades to expand apprenticeship to some degree, a herculean effort will be required if a high proportion of the journeymen needed by 1970 are to be provided through apprenticeship.

[1] The National Apprenticeship Act (50 Stat. 663; 29 U.S.C. 50) approved, Aug. 16, 1937.

[2] Beginning apprentices usually receive about 50 percent of the wage paid to journeymen. Most programs provide for an increase every 6 months in the percentage of the journeyman wage received by apprentices. During the final 6 months of the program the apprentices usually are paid about 90 percent of the journeyman wage rate.

[3] Registration is voluntary. In 30 of the States, registration is with the State apprenticeship agency. BAT acts as the registration agent in other States.

TABLE 1.—*Estimated number of journeymen needed by 1970 compared with the number that will be provided through apprenticeship*

Trade	Estimated number of journeymen currently employed [1]	Estimated number of additional journeymen needed by 1970				Estimated number of journeymen that will be provided through apprenticeship if programs continue to train the number currently enrolled in apprenticeship.[4]	
		To replace losses		To meet increased demand [1]	Total needed		
		Resulting from deaths and retirements [2]	Resulting from shifts to other occupations [3]			Number	Percent of total needed
Brick, stone, and tile	270,000	59,000	2,000	105,000	166,000	37,080	22
Carpenter	1,200,000	288,000	226,000	440,000	954,000	55,380	6
Cement mason	45,000	11,000	3,000	20,000	34,000	4,030	12
Electrician (construction)	130,000	30,000	2,000	80,000	112,000	39,770	36
Ironworker	90,000	21,000	12,000	50,000	83,000	12,450	15
Lather	35,000	9,000	5,000	5,000	19,000	1,520	8
Painter and paperhanger	425,000	106,000	87,000	90,000	283,000	8,560	3
Plasterer	67,000	16,000	5,000	20,000	41,000	6,180	15
Plumber-pipefitter	315,000	72,000	17,000	135,000	224,000	38,640	17
Roofer	58,000	12,000	8,000	25,000	45,000	5,220	12
Sheet-metal worker	140,000	28,000	8,000	85,000	121,000	25,790	21
Elevator constructor	10,000	2,000	1,000	5,000	8,000	(5)	(5)
Operating engineer [6]	225,000	56,000	30,000	150,000	236,000	1,000	(7) 3
Asbestos worker	20,000	4,000	3,000	10,000	17,000	590	4
Boilermaker	32,000	8,000	4,000	18,000	30,000	1,080	21
Glazier	12,000	2,000	2,000	10,000	14,000	3,000	

[1] Preliminary estimates based on a study being conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, except data shown for boilermaker, elevator constructor, and lather which are estimates made by the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training. For a detailed analysis of employment trends, see the forthcoming publication of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Manpower Needs and Resources in the United States, 1960–75."

[2] Based on "Tables of Working Life for Men," developed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and estimated age distributions.

[3] A rough estimate based on a study of the employment histories of former apprentices.

[4] Assumes continuation of current level of registered apprenticeship and rate of completion. Also includes allowance for apprentices who fail to complete their apprenticeship training but eventually become journeymen in their trade.

[5] Data not available.

[6] Does not include oilers and helpers.

[7] Less than 1 percent.

In considering the above data it should be kept in mind that not all craftsmen are developed through planned apprenticeship. Even if only 50 percent of new craftsmen were provided through planned apprenticeship, management and labor officials in some trades might be reasonably well satisfied. However, the proportion of trade entrants now provided through apprenticeship in many crafts is so small that even minimum goals are not being attained.

Other industries

The volume of apprenticeship is even less adequate in other parts of the economy than in the construction industry. Available data would seem to indicate that only a small fraction of the needed apprentices are being trained. A study of "Manpower in Selected Metal Crafts in New York State," conducted by the New York State Department of Labor revealed that only 17 percent of the firms employing craftsmen were doing any training and that only about one-third of the trainees were registered apprentices.[4] A study of 2,434 contract tool and die firms conducted by BAT in 1959 found that the industry was training only a fraction of the apprentices needed.[5]

[4] These plants were training about 5,600 persons at the same time that they were employing 42,000 already skilled craftsmen. Among trainees in all occupations covered by the survey, the largest proportion (40 percent) are under informal training programs—those that do not define the training period. Approximately a third of the trainees are under formal programs that are not registered with the New York State Apprenticeship Council, while the remaining 26 percent receive their instruction under registered programs. "Manpower in Selected Metal Crafts," New York State, Department of Labor, 1959, p. 2.

[5] "Apprenticeship and Training in the Tool and Die Industry," Bulletin T-150, Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, U.S. Department of Labor, November 1959.

To get a more complete picture of apprenticeship and training activities in various industries, BAT is conducting a nationwide study. A pilot study was conducted in New Jersey in 1959. It was found that only 16 percent of the establishments were sponsoring training of any type. The proportion sponsoring training in various industries is shown below:

INDUSTRY GROUP	Percent
Total all industries	16.2
Transportation, communication, and public utilities	20.4
Manufacturing	25.4
Wholesale trade	21.8
Retail trade	11.0
Finance, insurance, and real estate	25.9
Other	6.8

But even more significant, the study found that less than one-tenth of the trainees reported in New Jersey were apprentices. More trainees were in sales, safety, and other short-term training programs than were in apprenticeship.

Approximately half of the workers apprenticed in the United States do not complete their training. Some of the dropouts eventually obtain jobs as journeymen, but they do not have as good an opportunity to master every aspect of the trade as would be the case if they had completed apprenticeship. The high dropout rate lessens the effectiveness of apprenticeship as a source of craftsmen.

In the light of these data it is clear that a substantial improvement is needed in both the quantity and quality of apprenticeship in the United States even to provide a modest proportion of the additional craftsmen required. Apprenticeship and training become especially important as business activities expand. Training additional craftsmen helps to prevent skill bottlenecks and thus makes it possible for the economy to reach a high level of employment without serious inflation.

V. PROMOTIONAL METHODS EMPLOYED BY BAT

In promoting apprenticeship, BAT relies heavily on direct contacts by field representatives with employers and labor unions. This approach results in approximately 1,200 new apprenticeship program each year. However, this figure is not very large in comparison to the number of employers in the United States. Some indications of the size of the job confronting the Bureau is provided in the table below which shows the number of establishments in various industries, with a breakdown by size of the establishment.

TABLE 2.—*Number of industrial establishments in the United States by industry group and size of employer, 1959*

Industry group	Total reporting unit	Number of reporting units, by employer-size class					
		0 to 7	8 to 19	20 to 49	50 to 99	100 to 499	500 or more
Total [1]	3,206,883	2,455,979	451,718	183,981	61,005	46,221	7,979
Mining	31,801	18,622	6,958	3,844	1,263	935	179
Contract construction	301,604	232,974	43,971	17,007	5,078	2,454	120
Manufacturing	290,902	127,912	65,819	46,484	22,444	23,375	4,868
Transportation and other public utilities	120,169	79,905	20,942	11,086	4,230	3,353	653
Wholesale trade	280,984	186,427	60,559	24,721	6,210	2,897	170
Retail trade	1,674,215	872,014	144,509	42,396	9,757	4,812	727
Other (includes finance, insurance, real estate, and service)	1,107,208	938,125	108,960	38,443	12,023	8,395	1,262

[1] Excludes 23,441 establishments in agricultural services, forestry, and fisheries, and 72,199 nonclassifiable and unclassified establishments. Also excludes establishments in industries not covered by OASI insurance programs such as agriculture, railroads, public schools, and other Government establishments.

Source: Pt. 1, "U.S. Summary, 1st Quarter 1959 County Business Patterns," U.S. Department of Commerce and U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Table 2 shows that there are approximately 55,000 establishments in the United States employing at least 100 workers. In manufacturing alone there are about 28,000 such establishments. The BAT staff of 240 field representatives is able to call on only a small proportion of these establishments in any year.

To supplement the direct contacts of field representatives, the Bureau has encouraged other organizations to engage in promotional activities. BAT has also made use of newspapers, trade journals and other mass media. These indirect approaches to the promotion of apprenticeship will be discussed below.

National industry projects

To capitalize on the interest of labor and management organizations at the national level BAT conducts promotional projects in certain industries, including aircraft manufacturing, tool and die manufacturing, masonry construction, carpentry construction

and printing. During the factfinding phase of these projects information is obtained on the apprenticeship and training programs that are already being conducted and the extent to which additional programs need to be developed. The national organizations sponsoring the project then encourage their local affiliates to take the necessary steps to develop additional apprentceship and training. BAT also encourages the establishment of training funds, which are usually set up by collective bargaining. Training funds are used to employ apprenticeship coordinators, purchase equipment, conduct completion ceremonies, and finance other apprenticeship and training activities.

The Bureau also encourages national level organizations to sponsor apprenticeship contests. The contests give outstanding apprentices an opportunity to demonstrate their skill and knowledge. These competitions stimulate pride in craftsmanship and help acquaint the public with apprenticeship.

The Bureau has had considerable success in promoting apprenticeship through the national industry approach. The national industry projects have been especially effective. However, the expenditure of a considerable amount of staff time is involved in conducting these projects. With its existing resources, the Bureau is able to initiate only about two new industry projects each year.

Community level promotion

In a few communities BAT has been highly successful in working with community organizations in promoting apprenticeship and training. Comprehensive promotional projects have been developed in cooperation with chambers of commerce, Kiwanis clubs, central labor councils, and other community organizations.[6] Community groups can also often be made interested in promoting "pride in craftsmanship" and in sponsoring an "Apprenticeship Week." Furthermore, these organizations are sometimes willing to assume a continuing responsibility for manpower development and training activities. Community training committees are sometimes established to help employers organize training programs. This may make it possible for a small employer, who would otherwise not have any planned training, to participate in a group training program.

In communities that have been designated "Redevelopment Areas" by the Secretary of Commerce, the Bureau works with employers, labor unions, schools, and community organizations in developing training programs under the Area Redevelopment Act. The Bureau is also working with the Office of Emergency Planning in a few communities in developing pilot projects to determine how best to make available the skills of craftsmen and apprentices in time of national emergency.

The success that has been experienced in some communities indicates that it would be feasible for the Bureau to make greater use of the community approach. Carrying out the community approach, however, involves close working relations with civic groups, and this requires a great deal of staff time. The size of the field staff is adequate to carry out this approach in only a few communities each year.

Use of mass media

BAT has from time to time made effective use of newspapers, magazines, radio, and television. Additional resources would enable the Bureau to make greater use of such media. Journals published by international unions and trade associations are usually very receptive to articles on apprenticeship. Movies can also be very effective in the promotion of apprenticeship. BAT has occasionally assisted other organizations prepare films and this year the Bureau has undertaken production of a promotional film. Promotional materials occasionally have been mailed to employers and labor unions. This is another area in which additional resources would enable the Bureau to do a more effective job in its promotional activities.

VI. BARRIERS TO NEGRO EMPLOYMENT

A sizable increase in the volume of apprenticeship in the United States would improve the chances of Negroes to be apprenticed. However, the number of Negroes employed in apprenticeship programs will not be very large until certain barriers are removed.

Apprenticeship openings are given little publicity and Negroes seldom hear of these openings. To help solve this problem, a central clearinghouse for information on apprenticeship opportunities might be established in each community. This approach will be tried in Los Angeles and Fresno, Calif., in 1962. The pilot program will be operated by the California Department of Employment. The California Division of Apprenticeship Standards and the State department of education will help provide necessary information.

Applicants for apprenticeships are sometimes required to have the endorsement of someone already in the trade for which they would like to be apprenticed. As was previously mentioned the fact that few Negroes are now employed in some crafts makes such a requirement a difficult obstacle to overcome. To encourage sponsors of apprenticeship programs to use objective selection procedures, BAT has developed a chart presentation on selection which is given by field representatives to joint apprenticeship committees and other program sponsors. The Bureau also plans to employ four special representatives to promote the employment of minority groups in apprenticeship.

BAT has taken some additional steps to encourage equal opportunities in apprenticeship. Executive Order No. 10925 has been brought to the attention of JACs, employers, and labor organizations sponsoring apprenticeship programs. Since July 31, 1961 the Bureau has required that an equal opportunity clause be included in apprenticeship programs by companies holding Government contracts; furthermore, all new programs submitted to BAT for registration must contain such a clause.[7]

Another obstacle to greater Negro participation in apprenticeship is the fact that not very many Negro youngsters have had the educational background required for apprenticeship. This situation is perpetuated by the reluctance of some school officials to encourage Negroes to prepare for fields in which they fear Negroes have little chance of obtaining employment. There is need for a long-range attack on this problem that will make it possible for members of minority groups to obtain both the required educational qualifications and equal opportunity for entry into apprenticeship. Preapprenticeship programs conducted by secondary schools, in close cooperation with the sponsors of apprenticeship programs, would help to overcome this obstacle.

VII. CONCLUSION

A substantial expansion of apprenticeship opportunities and elimination of discriminatory practices in the employment of apprentices are urgently needed. A variety of measures to accomplish these ends which can be taken within the framework of existing legislation are summarized below. These measures, however, may not be sufficient. New legislation may be necessary. This paper concludes with a discussion of the general direction such legislation might take.

Expansion of apprenticeship opportunities within the framework of existing legislation

1. Greater use of mass media should be made to persuade employers and labor organizations to employ apprentices. Mass media should also be used more effectively to acquaint the public with apprenticeship and the services provided by the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training and State Apprenticeship Agencies.

2. Apprenticeship, or some comparable training arrangements, should be developed in additional occupations, including clerical occupations, selling, retailing, or similar occupations in the distributive field.

3. Greater emphasis should be given to the community approach in developing apprenticeship programs. Greater efforts should be made to stimulate pride in craftsmanship by working with community service organizations, chambers of commerce, local trade associations, labor organizations, and other community groups. Areawide committees should be set up in more occupations to sponsor apprenticeship and training.

4. Sponsors of apprenticeship programs should reexamine apprenticeship standards to find what adjustments might be made to encourage the expansion of apprenticeship. This appraisal should include a review of the apprentices wage scale, content of related instructions, the journeyman-apprentice ratio, and the term of apprenticeship in relation to the age of apprentices.

Promoting equal apprenticeship opportunity within the framework of existing legislation

1. Additional staff members should be assigned to the promotion of equal employment opportunities in apprenticeship. BAT staff members should be selected for such assignments without regard to race. Closer relationship should be established with the NAACP, Urban League, and other organizations interested in intergroup relations.

2. Sponsors of apprenticeship programs should establish closer relations with secondary schools. Sponsors of apprenticeship programs should be encouraged to hire on the basis of merit a considerable proportion of their beginning apprentices from the graduating classes of high schools in the community.

3. Greater emphasis should be given to improving the selection techniques employed by sponsors of apprenticeship programs. Program sponsors should be encouraged to make greater use of the aptitude tests and other services provided by the public employment service. The feasibility of establishing in each community a central clearinghouse for information on apprenticeship opportunities should be explored.

4. More research should be done by BAT in the participation of Negroes in apprenticeship programs. Factors that influence the extent of Negro participation should be highlighted in such studies.

5. Qualified members of minority groups should be encouraged to apply for professional and technical positions in the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training.

Need for new legislation

Although much can be done on the basis of existing legislation to expand apprenticeship and promote equal apprenticeship opportunities, it may be necessary to enact new laws before substantial progress can be made in this field. Some of the directions that new legislation might take are outlined below:

1. Government contracts: Require employers receiving Government contracts to provide apprenticeship and training programs for their employees.

2. Subsidies: Have the Federal Government undertake to pay a portion of the ap-

[6] For a description of a community promotional project in Waterville, Maine, see "The Waterville Story," Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, U.S. Department of Labor, 1957.

[7] BAT Circular No. 65-5, July 31, 1961.

prentices wage, provided that certain criteria were met. It might also be feasible to reimburse employers or provide tax incentives to offset at least some of the expenses involved in conducting an apprenticeship program.

3. Apprentice training centers: Provide training in the skilled crafts at training centers operated by the Federal Government, in cooperation with management and labor.

4. Legislative inquiry: Establish a legislative commission to study problems involved in developing apprenticeship in the United States.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

DECEMBER 28, 1961.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I would like to register my support of your Resolution No. 211 for the establishment of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations.

In my opinion, such a committee could afford an effective means for directing public opinion and legislative pressure toward forcing the State Department into taking positive action against the colonialism and aggressive tyranny of the U.S.S.R. Only through positive means can total cold war victory be achieved; the weak defensive policies of the State Department can, at best, only slow Russia's progress toward world slavery.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE D. SIMONDS, Jr.

DECEMBER 28, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: I have just finished reading the Manion Forum issue of July 16 which prints your remarks on the broadcast No. 355. I am sorry that it did not come to my attention previously.

Let me first congratulate you upon your action in the introduction of House Resolution 211. I regret that I am not informed as to the action of the House upon this bill, for it most certainly should have passed. If, however, this action did not ensue, then I hope that you will reintroduce this bill in the coming session of the Congress.

I am sending a copy of this letter to my own highly esteemed Congressman, the Honorable THOMAS N. DOWNING, of the First District of Virginia, for I feel sure that he would support such a bill.

This country desperately needs to take action that will score a victory over the ungodly forces that wage the cold war against us, and your proposed legislation would aid in our doing so.

Thank you for your action. May it succeed.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD T. WHITNEY,
Captain, U.S. Naval Reserve, Retired.

DECEMBER 14, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I am very much interested in the present and future status of House Resolution 211. Is it planned to have this resolution or a similar resolution introduced come this new session of Congress?

With the evergrowing threat of communism to the people of the free world, it is my conviction that House Resolution 211 creating the Special House Captive Nations Committee and providing an objective, systematic and continuous study of the peoples behind the Iron Curtain would be invaluable in giving the enslaved peoples of the world new hope, and us a more realistic approach to meet the vicious, sinister, and destructive challenges of communism.

I would appreciate very much if I may hear from you relative to House Resolution 211. I am writing Congressman DURWARD G. HALL appealing to him to support the resolution if he has an opportunity to do so.

If you have copies of the resolution available I would appreciate it if you would send me 25 copies.

Very truly yours,

VIRGIL C. PFEIFFER.

DECEMBER 14, 1961.

Hon. DURWARD G. HALL,
Wilhoit Building,
Springfield, Mo.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HALL: As you probably recall, I wrote you August 16, 1961, in support of House Resolution 211. As I understand the Congress adjourned without the Rules Committee of the House making any report on this resolution.

I am still convinced that this resolution has such outstanding merits which would be so valuable in aiding the socially frozen people behind the Iron Curtain, and give us new and additional incentives to stronger dedication to freedom and human dignity and a stronger resolve to seek new realistic ways to meet the challenges of communism.

I hope that come the new session of Congress if you have an opportunity to support House Resolution 211, or a similar resolution and after due consideration that you will find it the proper thing to do.

Very truly yours,

VIRGIL C. PFEIFFER.

NOVEMBER 26, 1961.

HERMAN TOLL,
U.S. Congressman,
Sixth District,
Philadelphia, Pa.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN TOLL: I have recently heard of a measure proposed by Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Luzerne County, Pa., which would seek to establish a Special House Committee on Captive Nations (H. Res. 211). It is my understanding that such a committee would be of great service to the State Department and other executive agencies, and that they would continually inform the public of developments in all the captive nations.

Since I am of the opinion that methodic and continuous studies by such a committee would steadily focus the attention of the free world on Moscow's colonial empire and greatly serve our national interest, I respectfully, but urgently, request that you give this proposal your complete support. Thank you.

Yours very truly,

IAN S. GALE.

JANUARY 30, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your bill to establish a permanent Committee on Captive Nations is a most excellent measure.

If it did no more than help Americans to begin to understand the plight of the captive people in these nations it would be a signal accomplishment.

Will urge our Representative, BARRATT O'HARA, to follow the lead set by Senator DOUGLAS, who assisted in establishing Captive Nations Week, and give support to your Captive Nations Committee.

Could you send be a copy of House Resolution 211?

Sincerely,

J. KESNER KAHN.

JANUARY 30, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: At your convenience, please send me two copies of House Resolution 211, which I understand pertains to creation of a House Committee on Captive Nations to be a continuous effort toward liberation of nations now under control of the greatest colonial empire, i.e., Red Fascist U.S.S.R.

Do you think it will be possible to get Congress to do something in this session re your resolution?

Keep up the good fight. God bless you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. F. J. SHEA.

JANUARY 31, 1962.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: Enclosed find a copy of a letter sent to my Congressman, Mr. WIDNALL, in support of your resolution seeking to establish a Special House Committee on Captive Nations.

May I also take this opportunity to commend you for your sponsorship and support of the resolution, and all your efforts in behalf of these enslaved peoples. Coming from an area where many refugees have settled, I can realize the need for such a committee.

Incidentally, you may make any use of the enclosed letter that you see fit.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH S. CANGIALOSI.

JANUARY 31, 1962.

DEAR MR. WIDNALL: I am sure that, coming from a district which contains many people who have come to this country as refugees from Eastern Europe, you are well aware of the plight of these captive nations. I am also sure that you are aware of the dramatic effect that the captive nations resolution had on the Soviet Premier when it was passed.

In view of these facts, it seems to me that a constructive and concrete step toward aiding these countries would be the establishment of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. Congressman FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, has introduced a resolution in the House to attain this end.

I urge you to give your full support to this resolution. It is time to take the offensive against communism, with proper caution. This resolution seems to be a fine way to do it.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH S. CANGIALOSI.

Dishonest Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the article entitled "Dishonest Financing" by Donald I. Rogers, appearing in the New York Herald Tribune, in the RECORD:

DISHONEST FINANCING

The Investment Bankers Association of America will hold its 1961 convention in Florida starting November 26, and no matter what has been scheduled for consideration, one of the first items of business should be full discussion of the Federal Government's deliberate and dishonest intervention in the private banking industry in the case of some sewer bonds for Charleston, W. Va.

Seven investment bankers submitted competitive bids for $4 million worth of Charleston sewer bonds. The lowest bidder, it turned out, was the First Boston Corp., one of the most respected private investment banking firms in the Nation. Its bid was for 3.945 percent.

While Charleston city officials were opening the seven bids, the process was being observed by an engineer employed by the Community Facilities Administration, a subsidiary of the Housing and Home Finance Administration, headed by Robert Weaver. This engineer, having determined the amount in the lowest competitive bid, then offered to handle the loan for 3⅜ percent, lower than First Boston, and lower, in fact, than the Government can borrow the money to handle the loan.

We will deal, in a minute, with this dishonest procedure, this violation of the ethics of competitive bidding, but before we shed many tears for the investment banking industry, let's consider what this means to you and me, ordinary taxpayers.

It means that you, wherever you live, are paying for Charleston's sewer facilities. You had no choice in the matter.

This Community Facilities Administration, one of the lesser known agencies grouped around the Housing Administration, is empowered to lend up to $650 million for public improvements to communities which can't borrow from private sources at reasonable rates of interest.

First, no one has said Charleston's credit is no good. It's good enough.

Second, no one has said the seven bids submitted for the sewer bonds were not reasonable.

Charleston needs a larger sewer system. In the ordinary course of events it called for bids on $4 million in bonds to finance it. When First Boston's bid of 3.945 percent interest was declared lowest of the seven, the CFA engineer, on the spot, decided this wasn't reasonable and offered to lend Charleston the money at six-tenths of a cent less. The city then threw out all of the bids of the private lenders.

Where does the CFA get this money?

The Government borrows it. The money the Government is borrowing now costs more than 4 percent. This means that the CFA will be carrying this bond issue at a loss of more than $20,000 per year, plus all of those high housekeeping costs they have in the Federal bureaus.

So what the CFA considers a reasonable interest cost is one so low that the lender loses money on it. The lender, friend, is the taxpayer, and that's you. So as things stand, Charleston's new sewage system will be paid for in part by millions of Americans who will never pull the plug in a bathtub in Charleston, W. Va.

I'd like to make arrangements like that for handling the mortgage on my house. Anybody want to help me? No? Then why help the people in Charleston with their sewer?

So, back to the banking industry which is the directly injured party in this little exercise of liberal New Frontierism. Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, Democrat, of Virginia, asked Dr. Weaver, head of the Housing complex, if he wasn't actually saying that a reasonable rate was only the rate the CFA would charge for a loan (which, remember, is a rate handled at a loss.)

No, replied Dr. Weaver, he had determined that "an interest rate is to be determined reasonable if it does not exceed 3⅞ percent and if the loan is repayable over 30 years or more."

Well, now, First Boston's rate of 3.945 percent was based on a repayment term covering 39 years. It was not only reasonable, it was most favorable.

If anybody doubts this, just consider that bonds of the U.S. Government, with a shorter maturity, were priced at the very same time of the First Boston bid, to yield over 4 percent.

Truth is, this is a blatant violation of the principles of competitive bidding and it is a bulldozing attempt to have the Government step into direct competition with private industry. There can be no other interpretation.

New Pressure Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in a very lucid article, William White dispels some of the faulty arguments which are being used by proponents of the President's proposal to establish a Department of Urban Affairs. Here is the article as it appeared in the Long Island Daily Press on February 9:

THE ARGUMENT AGAINST URBAN AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy's plan to create a new Cabinet-rank Department of Urban Affairs ought to be rejected by Congress for the good of the country—and for the President's own good, if it comes to that.

Mr. Kennedy and Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, of New York, who hopes to be Mr. Kennedy's GOP presidential adversary in 1964, have been playing old-fashioned politics on the issue. The prize is the favor of minority groups and big-city people generally.

This is not against the Constitution nor in violation of tradition. All the same, while fun is fun, there is no sound reason to involve the country in this enterprise.

To set up such a department and create in the person of Dr. Robert Weaver an 11th member of the Cabinet, would be short of a national calamity. But it would have obviously harmful results. The innuendo that opposition is based on the fact that Dr. Weaver is a Negro—and a distinguished one—is unfair. It may apply to a handful of Southern extremists. It is not the controlling factor even to most Southerners. Certainly it is not to the Republican opposition—though it is true that the Republicans asked for the situation in a way by happily needling Mr. Kennedy about "not doing enough for the Negro."

To proclaim as solemn Federal policy that city Americans are different from other Americans would be an act of national disunion when national unity was never more needed.

To declare that city people need a special Government Department to have true representation would be to say baselessly that they don't now have fully adequate representation.

To set up such a Department would be to gather up into one immensely powerful new pressure agency dozens of economic, social, religious, and racial groups which, now operating separately, are already quite powerful enough.

The argument is made that because there long has been a Department of Agriculture serving country people, justice is denied until there is a Department serving city people. This is demonstrable nonsense. The Department of Agriculture serves a fundamental all-national interest, production of food, and fiber. The Commerce Department serves an all-national interest, American business. The Labor Department serves yet another all-national interest, American labor.

Obviously Commerce is already more helpful to city than to country people. Obviously, so is Labor. So is Treasury.

Another argument is that the metropolitan centers can no longer solve their own problems. The logical extension of this is that a Federal Urban Department would shortly become the great dumping ground for metropolitan problems. Who in the cities will long suffer the headaches of housing and transportation if these can simply be painlessly handed over to Washington? What happens to municipal responsibility, to local self-government?

Of course, one motive is to reduce the undue power of rural pressure groups in Congress by increasing the power of urban pressure groups in the Cabinet. This is an odd remedy, however, when one considers that the big cities already have at the very heart of the whole thing, the choosing of a President, a wholly disproportionate power both in the nominating and electing processes.

Finally, this reform is, amid our somber world realities, an unnecessarily little thing. What great cold war commander really wants to be remembered as the man who created a Department of Urban Affairs at an hour when national survival is in question? What hot war commander would want to be

remembered as the man who improved the quartermaster's system of counting GI underwear?

We Teach Patriotism in the Elementary Schools, Los Angeles County, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent for me so to do having been heretofore granted, I am pleased to present to your attention, and all the other Members of this great legislative body, the text of a very significant and timely printed folder issued by the Los Angeles city schools, division of instructional services. This folder was furnished to me by Principal Donald G. Runcie, of the 92d Street School, 9211 Grade Street, Los Angeles, Calif., in the great 23d District which I have the honor and responsibility of representing.

A considered observation of the text of this brochure entitled "We Teach Patriotism" in the elementary schools will, I am sure, reveal it is of great and timely value and importance. I am sure that every Member of Congress will join with me in complimenting the superintendent of the Los Angeles school system and the board of education thereof, and all of those who participated in preparing and publishing and distributing this folder to the elementary school children of the great Los Angeles city school system.

The article follows:

WE TEACH PATRIOTISM

Dear parents one of our tasks is to develop in pupils from the earliest grades an appreciation of the gifts that are ours as Americans. As these pupils mature, we undertake to build an understanding of how these gifts were won for us, and the price that was paid.

The teaching of patriotism is based upon a dynamic, vital faith in American ideals. In our schools, we teach about the men, the ideals, and the institutions that have shaped our Nation's heritage. We are dedicated to an uncompromising belief in the worth and dignity of the individual.

Cooperation between the home and school is indispensable in the development of patriotic, loyal, and informed citizens. The sharing of this responsibility develops citizens who are committed to the strengthening and preserving of American ideals.

JACK G. FROWTHER,
Superintendent of Schools.

THE AMERICAN'S CREED

(William Tyler Page)

I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a Republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect Union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

I, therefore, believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws, to respect its flag; and to defend it against all enemies.

THESE THINGS PARENTS CAN DO

As parents, you have a significant role in the development of your child's patriotism and understanding of the principles of the American way of life.

You can help your child grow as a loyal citizen of the United States of America by:

Impressing upon him the worth and dignity of the individual, as exemplified in American society.

Giving him responsibility and guidance in developing the ability to make intelligent decisions.

Helping him to understand and respect people's differences, such as those of race, creed, political beliefs, and occupation.

Imparting the awareness that citizenship in our Nation is an obligation that must be continually strengthened and protected.

You have the opportunity through action and example to develop patriotism in your child by:

Reading to him, or having him read to you, stories and poems about the great men and events of America.

Displaying and honoring the flag on special days and observing the significant patriotic holidays.

Voting in all local and national elections and discussing with him the significant patriotic holidays.

Taking him to visit patriotic exhibits and places of civic and historical significance.

Discussing the Nation's symbols that are displayed on local buildings and landmarks.

Teaching him to show proper respect when the National Anthem is presented at public events.

Visiting museums and other cultural centers to see and discuss the arts and crafts of America.

The home and school, working together, share the responsibility for developing in your child a love for and loyalty to our great Nation.

THESE THINGS WE BELIEVE

We believe that educating children to be patriotic, loyal, and informed U.S. citizens is a major purpose of our schools.

We believe that it is essential to teach children an understanding of our national heritage and a loyalty to our country by providing instruction that develops:

Through understanding and deep appreciation of American ideals and institutions; love of country.

Insight into the purposes, privileges, responsibilities, principles, and processes inherent in the American way of life.

Respect for and loyalty to the American form of government.

Recognition of the significance of the rights of liberty, freedom, and justice.

Realization that a citizen's rights and privileges are balanced by duties and responsibilities.

Knowledge of our historical background and the important historical events that have contributed to the growth of our country.

Appreciation of the qualities and contributions of the men and women who have helped to make our country a great nation.

Personal pride and appreciation of America's patriotic symbols, documents, and events of historical significance.

Awareness of the necessity for preserving the traditions that have contributed to the growth of our great Nation.

THESE THINGS WE DO

We teach patriotism by direct instruction and by maintaining a school environment in which American ideals are stressed.

We encourage the development of sound knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, skills, and actions necessary to further the American way of life. At the appropriate maturity level, children:

Know and understand the pledge of allegiance to the flag.

Participate daily in correct and dignified expressions of respect for the flag (flag etiquette).

Learn and sing with understanding patriotic songs, such as the "Star Spangled Banner," "America," and "America, the Beautiful."

Understand the reasons for observing days of historical significance, such as Washington's Birthday, Lincoln's Birthday, Memorial Day, Independence Day, Constitution Day.

Know and understand the meaning of the great American documents, such as the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the American's Creed.

Understand the significance of historical places, such as Independence Hall, Lexington, Gettysburg, and Washington, D.C.

Develop knowledge, appreciation, and respect for great American leaders, such as George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and Abraham Lincoln.

Understand the organization and functions of our city, State, and National governments.

Understand the free enterprise system of our country.

Compare and contrast the disadvantages of communism and other forms of totalitarianism with the advantages of American democracy.

THESE THINGS WE DO

We provide learning experiences that encourage loyalty, respect, service, and dedication to the American way of life by helping children to develop and practice:

Obedience to the policies and rules of the home and school and to the laws of the community.

Respect for authority, property, and the rights and privileges of others.

Respect for and understanding of the basic freedoms expressed in the Bill of Rights and our other great documents.

Individual initiative and cooperative working relationships with others.

Skill in intelligent citizenship.

Qualities of citizenship and leadership, such as responsibility and integrity.

Democratic processes within the setting of the classroom and school as a whole, such as voting.

Skill in interpreting current events.

We expect children to develop a love of, a respect for, a faith in, and a sincere loyalty to, the American way of life.

John J. Shaughnessy—Mr. "Mark American"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which recently appeared in the New York Journal-American commending the achievement of a long-sought goal by a fearless and indomitable citizen, Mr. John J. Shaughnessey. For over 8 years Mr. Shaughnessey has carried on a lone battle to implement a Congressional Resolution calling for American aid material shipped abroad to be properly identified for the edification of the receipients. I am pleased to note that with the assist-

ance of the present administration a subtsantial improvement has now been attained and Mr. Shaughnessey's quest is not in vain. Unfortunately, to better carry on his personal crusade, Mr. Shaughnessey was forced to separate himself from the civil service system together with all the benefits he had earned for a long period of faithful service. It would be no more than just if some way were found to restore him to a fitting position in the service of his country.

The editorial follows:

A CORRECT LABEL

The announcement of the U.S. Department of Commerce that the "Mark American" campaign is bearing fruit after 16 years is heartening to our side in the cold war.

The Department found that three-fourths of all the goods being shipped from eight major ports now are "properly identified by use of predominant markings to indicate U.S. origin."

This means that the Communists no longer will be able to steal credit from a generous Uncle Sam by changing the lettering on foreign aid supplies from "Made in U.S.A." to "Made in U.S.S.R."

Thus a measure which was passed by Congress in 1953 is finally being implemented after years of being flouted. This is gratifying to this newspaper which has campaigned for enforcement.

But the principal credit goes to John J. Shaughnessy of Brooklyn, a former Government packaging expert, who has waged a one-man crusade to see that all goods shipped abroad are plainly marked "Made in the United States of America."

Gen. Tadeusz Kosciuszko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, this month we celebrate the birthday of Gen. Tadeusz Kosciuszko, a man honored in the history of both the United States and his native Poland. After a desperate battle against despotism in Poland, Kosciuszko came to America during the days of our Revolution and offered the leaders of our infant Nation every aid to win liberty from another tyrant. He, along with hundreds of other Polish heroes, won undying glory in aiding America to win the Revolution.

General Kosciuszko was trained in the art of war and especially in military engineering; and his services were invaluable to the American cause. His advice and counsel were listened to during the dark days of the Revolution and General Washington bestowed upon him every credit for bringing the War of Independence to a more rapid victory. Congress, in deep gratitude, made him a brigadier general.

Upon his return to his native Poland, he fought against the Russian imperialists in 1792 and 1794. The odds were against him and failure was inevitable. The Russians imprisoned him for over 2 years. When he was freed he returned to America where Congress voted him money and lands. A part of this later went to found one of the first Negro schools in the United States. This great general was not content to live quietly on his farm, however, and when there seemed to be a possibility of freeing Poland from its Russian conquerors he returned home once more in 1798. He spent the rest of his life until he died in 1817 in an effort to win victory and establish the freedom and independence of Poland.

Tadeusz Kosciuszko was a freedom fighter who fought for freedom on two continents. The memory of his life and his devotion to freedom are an inspiration to the Polish people today who are not free but who live under a Communist government. But we also honor him here in the Halls of the U.S. Congress because of the debt of gratitude which we owe to this memory and to the memory of all the other brave Polish men who fought in the cause of liberty during the American Revolution.

Resolution of the Miami Chapter of the Lithuanian American Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I call to your attention the following resolution of the Miami Chapter of the Lithuanian American Council, adopted on February 11, 1962:

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL, INC.,
Miami, Fla., February 11, 1962.

Hon. DANTE B. FASCELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FASCELL: Unanimously accepted at a meeting of Americans of Lithuanian descent of the city of Miami and surrounding territory, on February 11, 1962, held at Lithuanian American Citizens Club to commemorate the 44th anniversary of declaration of independence of Lithuania:

"Whereas the Soviet Union in 1940 invaded and occupied and subjugated three independent Baltic States, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia;

"Whereas Soviet occupational forces upon orders from Moscow continues to conduct an elaborate plan of genocide aiming at the destruction of the peoples of these three nations by wholesale arrests, tortures, executions, and mass deportations to remote regions of the Soviet Union;

"Whereas the three former free and independent Baltic States have been turned by brutal terror into colonies of the Red Soviet empire, their properties confiscated and their farmers and workers reduced to the state of serfs; and

"Whereas in October, last year, the head of the present Communist Party, Nikita Khrushchev, after hearing charges against the late head of the party, Joseph Stalin, condemned Stalin as an insane criminal, also condemned most of the acts of his government: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That this gathering of patriotic Americans of Lithuanian descent at this mass meeting ask unanimously that the President of the United States and Secretary of State:

"(a) Recognize the condemnation of Stalin's crimes by the present Government of the Soviet Union and demand that same condemnation be applied to the illegal and criminal and inhuman acts of Stalin's era in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; and

"(b) That the Government of the United States, take steps through the United Nations and other channels to stop the policy of colonialism of Soviet Russia in central and eastern Europe and to force Russia to restore to the three Baltic States their independence."

Yours very truly,

HELEN VERBELA,
President.
JENNIE GOODWILL,
Secretary.
WALTER P. ZEES,
Treasurer.

No Ban on Test-Ban Talks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with the newest Soviet propaganda move in the disarmament debate, it is most practical and necessary that all of us keep in mind the fundamental fact that peace cannot be achieved only with maintaining weapons superiority. By maintaining superiority in military strking power, we hope to reach an agreement with all major world powers for an effective disarmament program. The Chicago Sun-Times, in an editorial on Monday, February 12, penetratingly discusses this basic subject. I ask leave to insert into the RECORD the following editorial entitled "No Ban on Test-Ban Talks":

NO BAN ON TEST-BAN TALKS

The record of Russia hardly warrants the gesture, but the new appeal to the Soviets by the United States and Britain to try again to find a means for halting the nuclear arms race is a wise move, and one that will be hailed around the globe.

The proposal is accompanied by President Kennedy's announcement that he will decide within the next month whether the United States must resume atmospheric nuclear testing, plus the word from Washington and London that the way has been cleared for such tests on British-owned Christmas Island.

This is language Premier Khrushchev understands. This time he may be able to find the reasons for agreeing to a test ban that have eluded him up to now.

Yet, from past experience, the West cannot be overly optimistic about reaching anything like a practical agreement with the Soviet dictator. From March 15, 1960, until Russia broke the voluntary moratorium on testing, September 1 of last year, Great Britain and the United States talked and talked and talked with Soviet representatives seeking agreement on a permanent ban.

All the time, Russia was secretly planning to resume nuclear bomb testing in the atmosphere. It is estimated that Soviet scientists needed at least a year to arrange the 1961 test series of 70-odd explosions in 73 days.

Any future test agreement, the President has made clear, must include inspection not

only of actual trial explosions but also of possible secret preparations for such experiments. In other words, we were fooled once; we do not intend to be again.

Nor is the West—in offering to sit down once again to try to work out an enforcible test-ban treaty—saying it is willing to forgo any future testing it has in mind. In their joint statement on the arrangements for the tests by the West, Prime Minister Macmillan and Mr. Kennedy said Russian explosions brought competition in weapons development to a point which would "justify the West in making such further series of nuclear tests as may be necessary for purely military reasons."

This is the only position the Western leaders can take. The Western Powers are the last and best hope for the safety and security of free peoples everywhere. They must have nuclear power second to none. If Russia should gain such nuclear superiority, she could dominate the earth.

Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, said the United States has new, untested devices that could profitably be exploded in the atmosphere. This being the case, the United States obviously cannot wait interminably for Russia to come around to reasonable agreement. This is especially true since there is nothing to prevent the Soviets from beginning a new series of tests at any time.

At his news conference, the President emphasized the need for the free world to be concerned about its future strength compared with the Soviet Union. It cannot stand idly by while Russia advances periodically by testing while it talks test ban and disarmament.

At the same time, the West recognizes there is need or patience and willingness to try to convince the Soviets that it is to their benefit, too, as well as to the benefit of all mankind, for nations to agree to stop exploding bombs in the atmosphere, and to back up agreement with effective international controls.

So another offer to resume negotiations has been made by the free world. The effort will be for the record, if nothing else, to make it clear to all nations that the United States and Britain exhausted every chance to put an end to the nuclear arms race.

If the conversations among foreign ministers show any signs of progress, Khrushchev can probably have the summit meeting he has repeatedly sought on disarmament. But succeed or fail, Khrushchev is on notice that the West is looking to its atomic strength. This time empty talk will get him nowhere.

Pentagon Censors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, censorship is alien to freedom. Gen. S. L. A. Marshall, in his excellent article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on February 10, discusses the inevitable effects of such action within the military service:

DON'T STIFLE MILITARY INITIATIVE

(By Gen. S. L. A. Marshall)

Anyone who views the Senate inquiry into the muzzling of the U.S. military as a time-wasting performance by several battalions of governmental big hate is invited to take another look.

While it is true that the Senator from South Carolina started with the hope that he would harpoon the "white whale" and thus far has been casting bent pins after minnows, he should not be unhappy wholly about the catch. Several points of great consequence have been established about the murky waters in which he fishes.

First, his investigation has proved beyond a doubt that generals and admirals in the Pentagon would be well advised to discharge their present corps of speechwriters and start afresh. Most of the time they are not saying anything. Most of the phrases which have been curried out of the manuscripts which other hands contrive for them are remarkable only for their triteness and their almost meaningless generalizations.

Second, the so-called censors of the Pentagon are afflicted by overinflated egos and need to be given fatherly advice. The stuff they blue-pencil is not dangerous, but merely badly done, and they do not make it any better by their smalltown editing. They perform as copy handlers, not as guardians of a national policy.

The absence of anything explosive, bold, or particularly enlightening in what was blue penciled is more eloquent of a dubious condition in the Pentagon than all of Senator STROM THURMOND'S bellowing about it. Nothing thus far revealed would even faintly suggest that the top military people are reckless, unworthy of trust by their political superiors, or deserving to be nursemaided like a flock of children. On the contrary, their public utterances are so bland, so innocuous as to indicate that they and their ghostwriters work in fear of running afoul of higher authority.

Is it good? If conformity is the final test of all virtues, well then, yes. Civilian control, if it tries hard enough, can convert all chief military subordinates into an echelon of yes-men, incapable of voicing strong objections even when conscience tells them that taking a stand in opposition for the sake of the Nation is a duty. It is not to the credit of so many of the chiefs that they parade to the witness stand and obediently concur with what is being done. The one notable exception is Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau.

Just what are the others talking about? By their words of approval, they are helping to scuttle almost two centuries of a strong, free national tradition. The American military has never been suppressed in this manner. It was taken for granted that honor and judgment attended high military responsibility. Now the chiefs respond like trained seals who live by the rule that tenure and getting along with the bosses are more important than all other values.

When high commanders accept unprotestingly a curb imposed on freedom of expression in their public relations, they will ultimately become just as pliable, just as neutral in the councils where major questions of strategy, armament and force levels are debated behind closed doors. It is impossible to gag the mouth without dampering the spirit.

There is a larger consideration. The Nation has never been in as great danger as now. To survive, there must be a strengthening of national spirit. And do we expect to work miracles of refrom by stifling the military voice while leaving it to the figures in civilian control to set and maintain higher standards? They come and they go as political opportunity presents itself. Only in the military is there lifetime service to the established national ideals.

To get back to fundamental principles, let us look at a few passages from the combined services' manual on field censorship published in 1954, but written in 1949.

"The United States is served by a free press and its Constitution insures to the people that this freedom will be maintained. It is a basic right, as greatly cherished by the citizens of the Nation as are freedom of speech and freedom of religion. In protecting these rights, the interests and obligations of members of the armed establishment are identical with those of all other citizens.

"Censorship is always a strain on mutual confidence and good will between the armed establishment and the people. When censorship is applied by the military, the people are suspicious that its authority may be misdirected toward the covering up of blunders, waste and general incompetence. This has occasionally happened and in every instance it has been an abuse of power."

Either these words are pious platitudes never meant to be taken seriously or the admirals and generals are wrong in lauding a censorship which is wholly alien to the guiding philosophy.

Rekindling Our National Spirit at the Community Level

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSICA McC. WEIS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include at this point in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Brighton-Pittsford (N.Y.) Post on November 23, 1961.

This article was written by Richard L. Epstein, a young Rochester, N.Y., attorney with a keen sense of civic responsibility who has been active in numerous community endeavors.

Mr. Epstein's article is one which I commend to the attention of every person who is genuinely concerned with the great problems confronting America today:

THE QUEST FOR NATIONAL PURPOSE—A READER STATES HIS VIEWPOINT

(By Richard L. Epstein)

(The author of the following article is an area lawyer associated with the firm of Harris, Beach, Keating, Wilcox, Dale & Linowitz in Rochester. He is active in numerous community organizations.)

The continuing crisis surrounding Berlin is occasion for Americans to bear down on some hard questions. If, honestly, the Berlin matter evolves into a general accommodation of interests, it shall have been, nevertheless, a continuing tragedy if the event shall not have moved Americans to make an examination of their responsibility as individuals in this awesome conflict.

There is in the American people a national resource of strength which has remained untapped for too long.

Our National Government has preyed upon our individual money resources to build and maintain a defense structure since it was agreed that peace can be best maintained by insuring our physical ability to make war.

It seems, however, that we have ignored the importance and effectiveness of building also the spiritual willingness of American citizenry to retaliate.

Development of that state of mind has been too long unattended. It has been discouraged by much of our media. It has been

stified by the effort to innundate the American home with appliances, recipes, and furnishings. It has been put to slumber by the comfort and convenience peddlers.

It appeared for a time that the Kennedy bid for leadership during his campaign for the Presidency portended, if it succeeded, an encouragement of an American attitude which would recall the virtues of strength, initiative, and renewed capacity for indignation and verve.

The promise of an era of this spirit reached its colorful climax in the eloquent inaugural address with its stirring analysis and plea. But the ingredient which gave to the Kennedy campaign an aura of vitality has been lost in the conversion of that campaign to an administration. The promise has not been fulfilled.

It is doubtful that our country's history has seen a similar phenomenon where a source of direction remains so constantly on the brink of great leadership without ever dipping over.

Inspiring pronouncements continue largely as words only. What has been reported to be a sense of confidence and purposefulness as characterizing the President personally is confined to his surroundings and his intimates.

The conglomerate of knowledge, expertise, and sense of historical purpose which is said to occupy the offices of the administration has not seeped down and out across the Nation. It would seem, in short, that the courage of our Government's rhetoric has neither been programed for general guidance nor been infused in the national spirit.

In fact, although the official observation has been made that we must be prepared to abide a long "cold war," the logical consequences of that observation have not yet been articulated. This is a most profound and disheartening example of a national leadership which, if it may not be condemned for standing still, may be condemned for stopping short.

It becomes, then, the sober responsibility of the American people itself, to eliminate the vacuum which our elected representatives at the national level allow and ignore. It is our job as individuals at the community level to assume the assignment of providing the spiritual strength and purpose to participate in the protection of what we have come to call the western way of life.

Stated another way, we must engage upon a vigorous spiritual combat with the Soviet adventure.

To carry out this enterprise I propose that there be assembled in all communities groups of interested persons who agree on this need and who accordingly will nourish actively among their neighbors an attitude of American vitality and emotional strength.

All we as a Nation have done so far is to call to duty a limited number of the Armed Forces Reserves, pay a heavy burden in taxes to build and maintain an arsenal of weapons and munitions, engage in the official governmental protests of enemy activity, and participate in international debate as to what is right and what is not. We have not, however, marshaled an attitude of indignation among ourselves, and there has gone altogether untapped perhaps the mightiest raw material of defense: the American people's capacity for vigorous political action.

It is time that the citizenry be permitted, nay encouraged, to declare total spiritual war upon the enemy; time to recruit and train our minds and tastes to fight our enemy, not through slogans, deceptive Birchers or superficial American loyalists, but rather by arraying across the land a standing army of mentally militant Americans who know their enemy in whatever guise and who will resolve themselves to be armed in mind to protect whatever they shall see as our national purpose.

If until this time, the international peace has been preserved by impressing potential makers of war with our capacity to destroy them in retaliation, then it follows that the willingness to retaliate over and above the ability to, will enhance the strength of that strategy. The majesty of a determined people will add measurably to our defense without increasing the national budget. It will add assurance to a national leadership that does not always seem to be assured.

The current accumulation of groups which at one extreme weeps for peace and bemoans our preparedness and which at the other extreme would fight communism by imposing on our society another kind of police state, makes urgent a thoughtful and determined program at the community level.

If, having asked what we can do for our country, we have received no answer, let us then provide the answer and do it.

Tributes to Andy Schoeppel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the untimely death of the late Senator Andrew F. Schoeppel was, of course, a tragic event in the history of our Nation, and of the State of Kansas. I want to share with my colleagues the editorial comments of three of the distinguished newspapers of my district—all friends of Andy Schoeppel's. The editorials follow, being from the Lawrence Daily Journal-World, of Lawrence, the Kansas City Kansan, of Kansas City, and the Miami Republican, of Paola, Kans.:

[From the Lawrence Daily Journal-World, Jan. 22, 1962]

ANDY SCHOEPPEL

The people liked Andrew Schoeppel and they are going to miss him as a public servant and as a friend. Perhaps no one in the history of Kansas was more popular with the voters, and there have been few in public office who have served with as much pleasure and enthusiasm.

The Nation deserves high-type men in State office and in Congress. Senator Schoeppel met this qualification with his good judgment, genuine patriotism, hard work, and his devotion to the heavy responsibilities of his several public offices. He proved that success and recognition can come to Americans, no matter how humble their beginnings may be.

Death came too early and cut short a career that could have provided additional able leadership for several years to come, but the record will show that Andy Schoeppel used his allotted time and his many talents wisely. He contributed much of benefit to his fellow citizens.

[From the Kansas City Kansan, Jan. 23, 1962]

DEATH OF SENATOR SCHOEPPEL

The death of Senator Andrew F. Schoeppel has shaken the people of Kansas and rocked the political regime of the State. Senator Schoeppel was a person of unusual physical stature and vitality. His constituents can hardly remember when he was disabled by illness. Announcement of his confinement to Bethesda Naval Hospital caused a feeling of anxiety in the State. This changed to apprehension as the nature of his illness became known. Yet his death was unexpected at this time.

Senator Schoeppel was 67 when his long career was precipitately concluded. This is not an advanced age for Members of Congress. Although he did not often appear in debate in the Senate he was active and industrious in direction of affairs elsewhere in the Capitol.

A two-term Governor of Kansas, Andy Schoeppel was an energetic and outspoken figure in that role, quickly winning acclaim and popular appeal. A former Nebraska football player of note, he had a commanding physique and his shock of hair made him quite picturesque. The image of Andy Schoeppel caught on fast, and his elevation to the U.S. Senate was not a difficult feat.

His untimely death predated the annual gatherings of the Republican party in Kansas by 1 week. Usually in attendance, Senator Schoeppel's absence this year and the reason for it will be the cause of earnest talk and speculation hour on hour. Schoeppel won't be on the team, and the shuffling about to find his substitute to finish the game may uncover new talent; open new careers.

As an added note, we can't help thinking about the future of William F. Turrentine, Senator Schoeppel's loyal and competent aid. Bill has worked so long for Andy and has made so many friends around Topeka it would be quite a change to return to his newspaper at Ness City.

[From the Miami Republican, Jan. 25, 1962]

Senator Andrew F. Schoeppel died Sunday at a hospital in Washington, which he entered in October. Kansas and the Nation lost a distinguished statesman. Andy Schoeppel was an outstanding Governor of Kansas during World War II. He was diligent as a Senator, having strong and sound convictions. His was a great public service. Always positive and definite, Schoeppel worked and voted for measures he had studied and found worthy. He was emphatic in his opposition to what he deemed wrong approaches. There never was a question about his position. Andy Schoeppel fulfilled his ambition to give a faithful accounting to the people of our Nation and always led in what would benefit Kansas. It was a privilege of the writer to support Andy Schoeppel in all his primary and election campaigns—twice for Governor and three times for the Senate. A friendship was formed and it lasted.

Behavior of FAA in Mitchel Field Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, there should be a limit to the amount of time that may be spent bandying about the decision on the use to which Mitchel Field will be put. The Federal Aviation Agency has demanded extension after extension of time and I think the point has been reached where Nassau County should be permitted to proceed with its plans. Here is an editorial on the subject which appeared in the Long Island Daily Press on February 7:

MITCHEL FIELD IN NEVER NEVER LAND

In Never Never Land, in all public disputes are settled by a commission whose chief is appointed by the President.

Now this board is no wishy-washy neutral which approaches problems with an impartial attitude. It almost always has a very definite opinion on what is right and what is wrong in all issues.

But in order to satisfy the peasants of this Never Never democracy, the board likes to hold public hearings to find out what the people think.

These public hearings are conducted with widespread publicity so that everyone will know that the commission will be fair—even though the commission has made it quite clear it favors one side as against the other.

After the commission has conducted the hearings and examined all the testimony, it has to make a decision.

But just to show how thorough the commission is, it instructs hundreds of its staff employes to go out and talk to people and find out what they think.

Hey, hold up a minute.

Didn't we just say that the public hearing was supposed to determine that?

If this sounds fantastic, it is almost a precise statement of the behavior of the Federal Aviation Administration in the Mitchel Field dispute. The boss is Commissioner Najeeb Halaby. We don't know yet whether Commissioner Halaby devises these devious processes all by himself.

Cabinet Status Favored by Builders Association of New York for Urban Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, recently a talk by my former associate, Armand Chankalian, now executive director of the United Builders Association of New York, Inc., came to my attention. The organization of which Mr. Chankalian is an executive director is a trade association dedicated to serve the modernization of industry of Greater New York and to promote the construction of buildings which are adequate, functional, and esthetic. The talk demonstrated the magnitude of urban renewal, the potential for growth and the vastness of the problem of building construction, not only in the State of New York, but throughout the country. I believe the readers can benefit from a reading of this speech which follows:

SPEECH BY ARMAND CHANKALIAN

Mr. President, Max Wechsler, architects, realtors, builders, and gentlemen, during my recent visit to Washington, mention was made of a Federal grant to the city of New York to prepare a community renewal program. It now appears that under the new administration in Washington, that the establishing of a new Department of Housing and Urban Development will be a reality. This new Department would enable expanding cities to cope with housing, transportation, and other problems of swift growth cities.

Most of us know, that the program is a colossal one, since it involves community planning, neighborhood redevelopment, and rehabilitation. We have as you know too many of such dilapidated properties which could be rehabilitated under the program of the Urban Renewal administration, a constituent unit of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which may have Cabinet status. President Kennedy is pressing to get the Urban Renewal program going full blast to prevent a further decline in our economy.

As I mentioned before, the renewal program is a big one, much too large for me to attempt to cover adequately. I shall merely try to do two things. First, I want to emphasize that the problems of today are the problems of change. Life is not static, and the realtor, builder, and architect of today is faced with conditions which are fundamentally, disturbingly, and excitingly new. In the second place, I wish to stress the three prime qualities which they will need during these changing times if they are to play the increasingly important role, which is, I believe, his great opportunity and his privileged destiny. The problems of tomorrow are already here, their solution demands of us high courage, imagination, and a new sense of civic responsibility.

The rehabilitation problems of our expanding cities are similar. They include the destruction of slum areas, renewal of special areas, relocation, traffic congestion which threatens to cut off the very blood of our retail business, inadequate health and recreation facilities and other complex problems associated with large-in-scale in migration. While it is recognized that a master plan is necessary for the direction of any rehabilitation project, a review of the findings and recommendations prepared by the New York City Planning Commission in its report on the west side urban renewal study to Mayor Wagner and the board of estimate, on May 9, 1958, clearly summarizes their major conclusions of their study. Naturally this report in no sense constitutes an official renewal plan for New York, it merely explores the practical possibilities of an urban renewal program which would combine clearance and redevelopment, rehabilitation and conservation, and for helping to determine whether a working program of this type should be undertaken. It is my opinion, it should, but it rests with the mayor, board of estimate, and the people of the city to make a final decision after they have had the opportunity to study these findings and adopt the plan as workable.

I would now like to present to you briefly, just a few of the practical projects which I contend can be fully realized when architects, builders, and realtors work closely with building committees, planning boards, each having the diversified responsibility to the community in planning and administrating a renewal plan. A physical inventory of the size, type, and scope of things which are wrong in the other expanding cities might well be undertaken throughout the country. In this way, ideas and techniques developed by the survey could be tested and refined in actual operation.

As an example, let us take the matter of homes and apartments. The importance and necessity for GI housing projects have centered the real estate picture for a number of years, have, in fact, been the principal housing development during the past years. That there is a definite market for the finer type of home is noted in the requests which come from executives and professional men. The modern apartment house can be the answer to many evils in our living conditions and can provide a desirable form of living for different income groups, for multiple living can offer group facilities which those in the lower income could not afford to incorporate into their own homes. Today apartment houses in low income and luxury are designed with overhanging balconies, are placed on building lots with featured rooms in the more favored position, taking advantage of the sun's rays during the winter and summer. Generous lots allow for playground and parks.

Next the hospitals and homes for the aged. One of the prime responsibilities of any community is the care of its sick and aged. Seldom has this country faced so great a problem as shortage of accommodations in these institutions. Hospitals and homes for the aged, for a variety of reasons have been unable to expand or start new buildings fast enough to meet the current and increasing needs. The problems are staggering, but the need must be met. In addition, doctors and dentists should have a building especially designed for them. Today they are scattered about in converted houses, office buildings, store buildings and other places never designed for their needs, and without parking facilities for them or their patients. Because this building must be accessible, it should be outside of the business area and so situated that patients who must spend an hour or so in the building will not be inconvenienced by parking regulations. A drug department should be an integral part of the building. Its assembly hall should be the meeting place of all those interested in the health of the community.

Next the office building.

Office buildings modern in quality, taste, style, and character are needed. Functionalism should be the watchword in their design. Modern machines for proper maintenance, scientific lighting, air conditioning and interoffice communication systems will guard the health and efficiency of the occupants.

Next the theater and cultural center.

Throughout the ages people have turned to theaters for entertainment and culture, yet today many cities have little or no legitimate theater simply because the motion picture industry obtained control of all available theaters and are reluctant to give a portion of a week to legitimate performances and concerts. The tremendous expenses of sending shows or concerts on tours precludes the one night stand. The legitimate theater and concert hall is wanted. Municipally or privately owned, it is a need which should be met.

Utilization of underground areas for underground parking is one of many solutions to the tariff problems in expanding cities. Because parking areas and garages now are few and congested, underground parking must come. Its worth has been proven in the Far West. Around those areas where it is used, new retail business districts have sprung up. How could it be otherwise? Place underneath a city's spacious square, or park, a garage of several levels capable of handling hundreds of cars each 24 hours and you have thousands of people congregating in one area. They demand their shopping area as nearby as possible. Thus business comes to them. It may be of interest to those who fear for the beauty of these open areas to know that the beauty remains unmarred; only entrances and exits suggest the activity beneath them. Let us utilize these areas, keeping them beautiful above and useful beneath.

New churches, rectories, recreation centers, factories, schools with trade school annexes, new and expanded hotels and zoning are also necessary assets in community planning to any expanding city.

It is not my intention, at this time, to discuss the impact of surburban problems and its effects on the city.

It may be that we, the builders, shall be the instruments which shall bring to this country of ours the stimulus and strength to build anew. Our goal is clear, the rehabilitation and rebuilding of America. Let us start wtih our cities, the economic heart of America. Let the heart be placed in a Department of Urban Affairs with Cabinet status for its head.

America Will Miss You, Mr. Sam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include a moving tribute to the late Speaker Rayburn by Msgr. Joseph P. Kiefer from the Steubenville (Ohio) Register:

[From the Steubenville (Ohio) Register, Nov. 23, 1961]

AMERICA WILL MISS YOU, MR. SAM

The Halls of Congress in Washington will never be quite the same without the presence of Sam Rayburn, affectionately known as "Mr. Democrat."

This beloved veteran of legislative and political wars has been around a long time on Capitol Hill—48 years, to be exact. This is the longest period of time ever served by a Member of the House or Senate. Sixteen years of those 48 were spent as Speaker of the House, also a record, surpassing the previous high of Henry Clay (8 years) of a century ago.

Mr. Rayburn's almost five decades as Representative of his district in the congressional Chambers is a testimonial of the affection felt for him by his constituents and their faith in him as a man who was doing a perennially fine job for them and for the country.

"Mr. Sam," as his associates liked to call him, was held in highest respect by all his colleagues, even by those who differed with him on political issues. He was the strong voice of the Democratic Party, the confidant of four Presidents, the man who, more than any other, had the influence to push through legislation when the administration's cause seemed to be lost.

Born in eastern Tennessee in a family of 10 children, he knew firsthand the hard knocks of poverty and sacrifice. Perhaps that is why he was always so sympathetic to the problems of the common man and the underprivileged.

His was a determination that brooked no failure. Already at the age of 10 he had his mind made up that he would someday serve in the House of Representatives and become its Speaker. He was sent to Washington by the voters in his Texas district when he was 30 years old. Ten years later he was elected Speaker of the House. At the age of 79, with cancer ravaging his body, he remained at his post until it was physically impossible for him to continue.

If he backed a candidate for the Presidency, he fought with all his might for that man's nomination and election. When his candidate was unsuccessful, Rayburn worked equally hard for the victor.

This was exemplified last year when Mr. Sam put all his efforts behind the nomination of his fellow Texan, LYNDON JOHNSON. When John F. Kennedy was chosen to carry the party standard, Rayburn worked with equal vigor for the Democratic nominee's election, winning many votes that otherwise might have been lost because of the religious issue.

Since then, any success that the President has had in securing enactment of his legislation must be attributed in great part to the prestige and drive of the Speaker of the House.

Mr. Rayburn was a religious man—a dyed-in-the-wool Baptist—who lived according to the Golden Rule. He firmly believed that prejudice of any kind had no place in the American way of life. Although a Protestant, he fought for the right of Catholics, Jews, pagans, or agnostics to follow their conscience. Although a Democrat through and through, he joined hands with Republicans when his country's welfare was at stake.

When he was a little boy, Sam Rayburn had these words of his father engraved on his mind: "I have no money to give you. I can only give you character." No one will deny that the deceased Speaker of the House inherited that character and bore it nobly throughout a long lifetime.

As Rayburn, at the age of 24, was about to depart for his first trip to the Texas Legislature, his father had only one message of advice: "Be a man."

Mr. Sam was every bit a man in private life, in political combat, in the company of opponents or friends. He never forgot his father's sage advice.

During the two World Wars and the Korean war he was one of the strong men on Capitol Hill guiding the destinies of our Nation. In the cold war of nerves contrived by the Communists he remained steady and calm. During the boom of economic prosperity and during the shaky years of depression, he was always the same stalwart giant while others around him were being tossed in the whirlpools of indecision.

Mr. Sam will be missed. Would that we had many more Americans like him.

Meeting Freedom's Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, last year on October 14, 1961, a richly deserved recognition was awarded to our colleague Representative FRANK C. OSMERS, JR., of the Ninth District of New Jersey. On that date he received the honorary degree of doctor of laws from Fairleigh Dickinson University.

FRANK OSMERS has all his life displayed his ability as a very effective leader. He has unstintingly served his community, his State, and his Nation in many elective and appointive capacities. In addition to his many outstanding contributions to good government, he served with distinction in action during World War II. Many do not know that he left the 77th Congress the day war was declared to enlist as a private in the Army, where he remained on active duty until February 22, 1946. At the time of his release he had achieved the rank of major of infantry.

The honor conferred upon our colleague was well deserved. At the time the honorary degree was bestowed, he delivered a fine address entitled "Meeting Freedom's Challenge." In emphasizing the absolute necessity for our people to rededicate themselves "to that faith and to those ideals that brought freedom and democracy into existence," he called attention to the weakening of America by the pursuit of material things. In his talk he quoted a statement from the letters of Theodore Roosevelt:

The things that will destroy America are prosperity at any price, peace at any price, safety first instead of duty first, and love of soft living and the get-rich-quick theory of life.

The timely message that Representative OSMERS delivered should be read by all. Under leave to extend my remarks, this message is included in the RECORD:

MEETING FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

Mr. President, members of the faculty, students, and distinguished guests, Fairleigh Dickinson University has given me a great honor, indeed. To become an adopted son of this university is for me a great occasion and one I shall cherish throughout my life. I am your grateful debtor for this honor.

I am very proud to be here for, in many ways, Fairleigh Dickinson represents a direct reflection of the growth, vitality and progress of the State of New Jersey and of our beloved country. Within the past decade, the growth and development of this institution have been phenomenal. The rate of progress probably exceeds that of any institution of higher learning in America, the service it renders a great community is second to none, the opportunities it brings are priceless. Such a spectacular growth emphasizes an optimism, a forward look and a faith in the future of America which is encouraging and heartwarming. It augurs well for the future of our democratic institutions and is truly an inspiration to education everywhere.

At the same time, I feel very humble as I receive this high honor from Fairleigh Dickinson and I pledge again, as I have so many times in the past, to give my utmost support to the cause of education and the progress of our educational institutions in this State and in the entire country. It is a cause in which I firmly believe and for which I have always worked. Let us never forget that liberty and learning must lean on each other for their mutual and surest support. If liberty is denied then learning is restricted and narrowed and if learning is denied, then liberty loses the means to defend itself or to increase its scope and promise.

Education in America today has many problems. Our country has many problems. We face a changing world.

We live in a world where the amount and quality of education and understanding may well determine whether democracy will survive or perish.

We must provide for the growth and well-being of an expanding economy, secure and train the necessary manpower for a world of advancing technology. We must insure new avenues of communication and understanding. Much of this responsibility rests to a large degree on our colleges and universities. They will not be found wanting. But make no mistake, meeting freedom's challenge is not just a task for educators. It is a job for every man and woman in this country. You, me, the fellow next door.

It is the challenge to freemen to maintain, protect and enhance the dignity and worth of the individual to increase the concept, the meaning, the understanding and the application of freedom to guard and protect the American way of life and to insure the growth of the spirit of man as he reaches for the stars.

In a material, down-to-earth sense the protection of our freedom is a manpower problem. In a word, we are outnumbered. We simply do not have the manpower that the totalitarian nations have. We cannot compete in numerical strength with the hordes that temporarily swept back the forces of freedom in Korea or overpowered our allies in Indochina, nor can we build our fortifications on the backs of coolie labor, nor would we even wish to do so.

We hear much these days about the increase in population. But the growth of

population does not mean that we will automatically have a labor force that is adequate to all the Nation's needs in the years ahead. In 1940 we were a nation of 132 million. Today we have reached 170 million. By 1980, it is expected that our population will have grown to 250 million. But these figures bear a little study.

The fact is, the population explosion is largely centered in the groups at either end of the age scale—among the young and old. The number of people in the prime working years has remained relatively constant and will for the next 20 years.

Thus, by 1980, when our total population will have risen to the tremendous total of 250 million, we will have fewer people in the most productive bracket (40–50) than we have today.

Not only that, but our younger workers will be living and working in an increasingly complex and technical world. They will be responsible for the future productive balance, for progressively high standards of performance, and much of the leadership that this Nation and the entire free world will so greatly need.

This lack of raw manpower can only be counterbalanced by a determination to train and make available the skilled manpower which is the basic fruit of freedom. The needs of the future demand that every facet of our educational system must provide more rigorous training and demand higher levels of achievement and excellence. Unless we have the fullest possible development of the Nation's fundamental resources in the years ahead, we will indeed be in desperate danger.

Probably an even more important part of the challenge to freemen, is the necessity for rededication to that faith and to those ideals which brought freedom and democracy into existence—those essential character qualities that make a nation strong. Paradoxically the very qualities which have made us great have brought us a living that has weakened those qualities. We are called the affluent nation. We have more money, more prosperity, and more of the good things of life than any nation on earth. In possession of these material things, have we, perhaps, lost some of our respect for hard work, thrift, sacrifice, devotion to duty, and loyalty to common good? These are strengths which we must recapture in order to hold fast our freedom.

Recently I read from the letters of Theodore Roosevelt a statement that ought to be imprinted in the mind of every American today.

He said: "The things that will destroy America are prosperity at any price, peace at any price, safety first instead of duty first, and love of soft living and the get-rich-quick theory of life."

The challenge of freedom has another front—a world front. We seek freedom not only for ourselves but for all men everywhere. But despite all we have attempted to do we have, somehow failed to communicate with them.

The true image of America is being grossly distorted in critical areas around the world. This is more than unfortunate in these crucial times; it is a serious threat. We have seen the resulting damage in the neutral countries, even in friendly nations, and certainly among the undeclared peoples. Our motives are twisted by vicious propaganda and we are made to appear as a rich and grasping nation, concerned only with our own selfish advantage. We see the evil effects of lack of understanding even in the shadow of our own coastline. It would indeed be a cruel turn of events if a generous people should lose because of their failure to adequately communicate the meaning of freedom. It would be a dangerous turn if we should fail to interpret the blessings of democracy and thus lose potential friends to a contrary way of life and find ourselves exposed and alone.

Our failure to enunciate clearly the meaning of democracy is not only a failure in communication but in understanding. Loyalty and love can't be bought. We have learned that lesson the hard way.

New technology has made it possible for us to communicate in many new ways, to inform, unify or divide our world as never before, but wonderful as the new technology tools may be, they are still only tools of transmittal. We must remember that the most marvelous media can communicate no more and no less than a man can feel and express and impart from the mind and the heart and the soul.

Though the transmittal be orbited through space to impinge upon this and other worlds for the rest of time, what still really counts is the substance of the message and its applicability and meaning to those for whom it is intended. And the substance depends upon the real meaning of freedom.

It is the substance that we must communicate to all the world. It is this substance which must be the warp and woof of all our education.

This is freedom's challenge to all of us. How shall we meet it?

1. We can meet it by increasing our education for democratic citizenship and in saying this I give much credit to Fairleigh Dickinson for the programs already in operation on every one of your campuses. The extension work you are carrying on, the evening school programs, the off-campus activities, the reexamination and reorientation of your entrance requirements, the sharpening of your curricula, the adult education programs, and your ability to fit into the communities you serve—all of these heart-warming activities bespeak your interest and understanding.

2. It is important that all our citizens gain new understanding of the meaning of democracy and liberty and freedom. Active participation in public affairs can no longer be left to the few. The right to vote is not only a privilege; it is an obligation. The duty of keeping informed is no longer a duty but a necessity. The study of government can no longer be confined to the pages of a textbook—it is a way of life.

3. We can meet the challenge of freedom with an old-fashioned rededication to the virtues which inspired that freedom.

4. We must educate for more efficient and effective manpower. Our present waste of human resources must be stopped. We must educate for the pursuit of excellence by building an educational program that will discover and encourage the abilities and potentialities of every single individual.

We must educate for greater understanding among all peoples. Education must challenge our own young people with an idealism, a feeling of mission, a better understanding of themselves and the world in which they live, and appreciation of the brotherhood of man and a realization of the power and the glory of a working democracy.

But we must export this education (and import a bit of it, as well) by the exchange of teachers and students with foreign countries, by the establishment of branch universities in other lands, by informational centers, by all the ingenuity at our command.

Such an educational program is now in operation and a number of governmental agencies have the responsibility to speed its progress. But the program cannot be entirely a governmental responsibility. Its success will depend in great measure upon the initiative, the resourcefulness, the ability, and the understanding of the individuals of our great foundations, of religious and social organizations, of educational institutions, of schools and colleges, and faculties and individual teachers. Only thus can success be assured. Only thus can we fully meet the challenge, the obligation, and the responsibility that freemen must meet, if freedom is to prevail.

A Legacy of Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I have just finished reading the radio address which the late Gov. Donald G. Nutter, of Montana, recorded for the Dean Manion Forum just hours before he met his death. I was greatly impressed by the stirring appeal it makes to those of us who are proud of our country and of our Constitution.

Governor Nutter never apologized for his patriotism. He never apologized for his implacable anticommunism. He knew the history of our country and never wished to be "Red rather than dead."

I commend Dean Manion for sponsoring Governor Nutter's "last will and testament to his fellow American citizens," and at this time would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from this fine address:

A LEGACY OF TRUTH

(By the Honorable Donald G. Nutter, Governor of Montana)

Historically, this country down through the years has had two major political parties. Today, there exists within each of the two major parties a difference in political philosophy. We have the so-called conservative Republican and the modern Republican; the conservative Jackson-Jefferson Democrat and the liberal leftwing Democrat.

We use the terms "liberal" and "conservative." The so-called liberals charge the ultraconservatives with being "neofascists." The conservatives equate the ultraliberals with Socialists or Communists. Extremism on one side has bred extremism on the other.

It is time we, the American people, get down to the basic differences in political philosophy. There are those in this country, and I am one of them, who believe in the Constitution of the United States, and in the fundamental concepts of individual freedom and liberty. And—if you please—the free enterprise system in a competitive society.

There are those who believe that our form of constitutional Government is a failure and that it should be supplanted by one completely foreign to those concepts of our Founding Fathers; one which is paternalistic to the end that individual freedom, liberty, free enterprise and competition will be destroyed and be replaced with regulation, control, domination and ultimately, with totalitarianism.

The Constitution of the United States is the greatest document on Government ever promulgated or written by man. The evils which plague this country today are those which have arisen out of a violation of the intent of that document.

We have heard the charge that our Constitution is outmoded; that it is not flexible enough to provide good government in a

changing world. The obvious answer to that charge is that this Nation has been undergoing great changes since its birth.

Provision is made for progress in our basic law by amendment. Our supreme law provides that the people and their elected representatives shall vote changes by amendment. In some instances, in violation of this principle, we have seen our Supreme Court warp the intent and the meaning of the written law. We have seen that Court violate our supreme law by legislating, thus depriving the Congress and the people of a guaranteed right.

To those who are critical of our constitutional form of government, I would say this: Under that Constitution we became the greatest nation on earth. We have the highest standard of living on earth. Our system of education is unequaled by any nation. We enjoy more of the good things of life than any people anywhere.

Our Government is our individual freedom and free enterprise system. Our freedom and our free enterprise system is our Government.

The Constitution is our legal guarantee of freedom to practice free enterprise. Destroy our Constitution and you destroy individual freedom and our free enterprise system. Destroy individual freedom and free enterprise and you destroy our form of government.

This is the greatest nation on earth. We attained this position because of a constitutional form of government which provided for individual liberty and freedom and allowed us to grow and develop under free enterprise and competition.

Do you realize that there are people in foreign lands who would lie down and die if they could just live a portion of their lifetime in these United States of America?

Yet, with all that we have, and all that we are, there are those among us who would have us believe that some other form of government is better; that socialism in its ultimate degree, communism, has something to offer; that the time has come for us to abandon our constitutional government and accept in its place a one-world utopia.

On a recent conference on the problem of feeding the people of the world, those in attendance were told that free enterprise would fail to do the job; that it had not and could not work internationally; that we should have a world food budget, a world money budget for food; that we should shed our nationalism for internationalism.

What did the speaker think would work, communism or socialism? Has he forgotten that farmers and ranchers of this country, under free enterprise, have fed hungry people the world over? Has he forgotten that we fed millions of people in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics? Has he closed his eyes to the perennial famines in Communist Red China?

He belittles the accomplishment of our system, but I would have him know that if he and his ADA friends would remove the shackles from American agriculture, our farmers and our ranchers would meet any challenge.

He spoke of a world money budget for food. He condemns free enterprise, but he would use the product of that system—money—to attain his objective. He believes in a world welfare state and asks us to abandon our nationalism.

With a wave of his hand, he would destroy the gains of American industry and business. He would wipe out the accomplishments of American labor. He would destroy the incentive in American agriculture.

If he thinks so little of free enterprise, how does he explain the rise of West Germany, from a defeated and crushed country—a rubble if you please, to a position of economic strength and wealth? Possibly he does not know that the West Germans turned their backs on the socialistic program recommended by some of the ADA planners and elected to follow the course of individual freedom and competition.

The philosophy of this one-world idealist was, and is, totally lacking in the element of realism. So, also, are those who knowingly or unwittingly sell the Communist line, reluctant to open their eyes to true facts.

If communism is so good, why did the East Germans build a wall of concrete and barbed wire? To keep the West Germans out? Not at all. The wall was built to keep the enslaved East Germans under the yoke of communism.

If communism is such a success, why are unnumbered hundreds of thousands of people on the China mainland living in misery and dying of starvation?

Of those who preach the spineless doctrine of "I'd rather be Red than dead" I would ask: Would the hundreds of East Germans who have crashed the wall in flight to freedom at the risk of their lives rather be Red than dead? Would the Poles, the East Germans, the Hungarians who fought against Red tanks with their bare hands, rather be Red than dead?

What does all this mean to you and me? Just this: Through selfishness, greed, complacency and apathy, we can cancel out all the sacrifices made by us, by our fathers and by our forefathers. Through failure to exercise our constitutional rights and perform our duties to protect this Nation, we can and will drift away from our great heritage.

Khrushchev once said, "We can't expect the American people to jump from capitalism to communism, but we can assist their elected leaders in giving them small doses of socialism until they one day awaken to find they have communism."

You and I must recognize communism for what it really is. A godless ideology which preys upon human misery but offers no cure for it. That communism is a failure is evidenced by human suffering in every Communist country without exception.

That communism is our mortal enemy is evidenced by Lenin who said, "We will take Eastern Europe," which they have done, "then we will organize the hordes of Asia," which they are doing, "and we'll surround the United States. That last bastion of capitalism we won't have to take, it will fall into our outstretched hands like overripe fruit."

What can you and I do? We can elect to public office, not men who would sell their souls to perpetuate themselves in office, but men and women who have faith in this country and in its future under individual freedom, liberty, and free enterprise.

We can take an active interest in good American Government. We can, and must, abandon apathy and complacency. We can, and must, fight for our constitutional way of life.

Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to call to the attention of my colleagues the following statement issued recently by the highly respected State master of the Oregon Grange, Mr. Elmer McClure. Mr. McClure, in his column in the current issue of the Oregon grange's newspaper, indicates the reasons for his support of the Kennedy administration's farm program. It is a thoughtful and thought-provoking analysis and I commend it to those both in and out of Congress:

THE STATE MASTER'S COMMENTS

(By Elmer McClure)

In response to inquiry as to how the Grange, and I personally, feel about the farm program presented to Congress by President Kennedy last Wednesday, I have issued the following statement:

"The administration's farm program as presented to the Congress on Wednesday by President Kennedy, follows very closely the National Grange program and the recommendations to the Agriculture Department by the Advisory Council to the USDA Subcommittee on Feed Grains and Wheat, of which I am a member. We met in Washington twice during the last few months to study this problem.

"I feel strongly that the controls asked by the President are necessary to eliminate the huge surpluses which are presently depressing our market and costing the taxpayers millions of dollars for storage and handling.

"The program as designed, will not cut the economy of the farmer, but it will prevent the noncomplier from exploiting the markets built up by those who participate in the program.

"Under the proposed program, the farmers have the choice, commodity by commodity, of establishing a program. Only if two-thirds of the growers of a given commodity vote to come under a commodity program, will such a program be established. Once it is established, all growers must comply in order to protect the production controls.

"In my opinion, this is the only type of program that will permit the family-type farm to survive."

I have only one further comment; there is so much misunderstanding of the present farm program by the general public and there has been so much misinformation and confusion disseminated concerning the program, that some effective new program will have to be established that will control our surpluses or the public will eventually turn against any farm program at all. This would result in utter chaos in the agricultural industry and when order once more was restored, the family-type farm would be a thing of the past and the vertical integration of agriculture would be completely established.

I think it is probably not an exaggeration to say that the administration proposals are the last best hope of the family-type farm.

Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the Lowell Sun, an outstanding New England newspaper, has dealt with the greatness of Lincoln in a magnificent editorial. Under permission to extend my remarks, I now insert it is the RECORD:

LINCOLN

More than the future of the United States was on trial during the Presidency of Abraham Lincoln. The future of the democratic dream—that all men are created equal, that

government derives its powers from the consent of the governed—hung in the balance.

Lincoln put it into those deathless words at Gettysburg: "We are now engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure."

The United States endured. So, too, the idea of democracy. Today, even the Communists find it necessary to pay lip service to the word, though their usage of it is far removed from its real meaning.

When one thinks of democracy, the names of but a few men come to mind at once—Lincoln, Jefferson, Washington—but first of all Lincoln. What was it about this man that has made him the apotheosis of all that we believe America stands for?

The list of his qualities could be extended indefinitely: His rise from backwoods obscurity by his own initiative; his humility; his dedication to principle; his wisdom, his mercy; his genius with words. But no one of them alone gives us the answer to the greatness of Lincoln.

Neither can it be said that Lincoln was the only man of his time who could have saved the Union. At least 600,000 men who gave their lives, or limbs, or health during the Civil War share with him the glory and tragedy of those days. Yet we cannot imagine what it would have been like without him.

No, the measurement of Lincoln eludes us, and will continue to. Thousands of books have been written about this man, and thousands more yet remain to be written.

Suffice that he did live, and that his greatness came to fruition because of the system under which he lived and which he protected and enlarged.

Unification of Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the resolution I introduced in the House of Representatives on January 31, 1962 (H. Res. 535), to provide for the unification of Ireland through the efforts of the United Nations, I received a very interesting letter from the Reverend Patrick F. Malone, of Ireland.

I think this letter should prove of interest to the Members of this body:

MAYO, IRELAND,
February 8, 1962.

Mr. LEONARD FARBSTEIN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.,
United States of America.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FARBSTEIN: Greetings from the Emerald Isle.

On yesterday we read here in the Irish newspapers that you have introduced legislation in the U.S. Congress to call on the U.N. to hold a plebiscite on the question of the partition of Ireland. Congressman FARBSTEIN, that news to us here is one of the most welcome and wholesome we have heard of in a very long time. You highly deserve the gratitude of the Irish—the world over—for nothing would please them more than to see Ireland united—especially in these days when colonialism is almost as dead as Queen Ann.

Your speech, Congressman, most of which we have, is a masterpiece of commonsense. We rightly challenge the sending of our Irish soldiers to unite the half-savage tribes in the Congo while our own country is yet partitioned and where in that cutoff part, our brothers and sisters are suffering untold hardships—from as you well say—"gerrymandering."

May God grant, Congressman FARBSTEIN, that you will be successful in your fight for this most noble cause. But successful or not, it is an outstanding credit to a foreigner—with a name like yours, to take such an interest in the land of the Kellys, Burkes, and Sheas—and to wield the hammer to try and chisel out the glorious name of Robert Emmet whose tombstone here is yet waiting to be inscribed. On behalf of the 32 counties of Ireland, I thank you.

Yours very sincerely,
Rev. PATRICK F. MALONE.

Air Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, because of the extensive research and the practical applications that have been used in southern California and Los Angeles County in particular, to eliminate smog in the atmosphere, I have been particularly interested in this vital problem for some time.

In that connection, I am submitting herewith a statement presented at the National Association of County Officials Community Development Workshop in Phoenix, Ariz., on January 26, 1962, by Los Angeles County Supervisor Warren M. Dorn on "Air Pollution" which I trust will be interesting to all Members of Congress who have this problem in their communities.

I have introduced and sponsored legislation which would require automobiles traveling interstate to be equipped with exhaust filters in order to reduce smog. I have also urged the cooperation of the U.S. Public Health Service to help Los Angeles and other communities which have a smog problem.

Following is Supervisor Dorn's speech:

AIR POLLUTION CONSIDERATIONS IN PLANNING FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

(By Warren M. Dorn)

Across the Nation the pollution of community air supplies has become a drastic problem. The U.S. Surgeon General estimates that more than 6,000 communities are experiencing air pollution requiring some sort of local action. According to the American Municipal Association, "all of the Nation's 212 metropolitan areas are affected, and in all, three-fourths of our total population is subjected to continuous or intermittent air pollution."

The economic cost of polluted air is staggering, currently totaling about $7.5 billion each year. If such a sum were placed in a trust fund, the interest alone would finance college educations for approximately 38,000 young men and women. It would award homes, free of mortgages, to 500,000 middle-class American families, and would pay the annual food bills for a population equal to that of California or New York.

This a big bill. We pay it, day by day, in the form of higher prices for agricultural commodities, rapid deterioration of the products we buy, lowered worker productivity, lost time from work, increased laundry bills, and in countless other ways. Beyond economic measurement is the nuisance, discomfort, and threat to health which air pollution brings to a community.

In some areas, the problem is little more than a minor nuisance—an occasional odor drifting over town from a nearby rendering plant or petroleum refinery; a new washing, soiled and streaked by the smoke from a passing locomotive; a dirty finger of smoke and grime reaching across a city's skyline from an industrial boiler, steel mill, or burning dump; a pall of smoke hanging over a neighborhood as a result of backyard refuse burning.

In other areas, like Los Angeles, air pollution may result in the total contamination of the air supply for an entire community, bringing acute discomfort and economic loss to millions of people. During extreme atmospheric conditions air pollution can even kill, as it has done in London, in Donora, and in Belgium's Meuse Valley.

The tragedy of this situation is that in most communities the problem is completely unnecessary. Sources of air pollution can be effectively controlled through application of existing technology, through means already proved.

For example, instead of burning our community rubbish, we can bury it in sanitary land-fill sites. This we are doing in Los Angeles today. When the sites are completely filled they will be used as public parks and recreation areas.

In other examples, sulfurous fumes from refinery stacks may be diverted to sulfur recovery plants and profitably reduced to elemental sulfur. The stacks of steel mills and iron foundries can be muzzled with such control equipment as electrical precipitators and baghouses. Odorous emissions from fish canneries, meatpacking and rendering plants can be incinerated.

With proper selection of fuels, good maintenance, and skilled operation, we can prevent smoke emissions from locomotives, home furnaces, diesel trucks, and industrial boilers. Indeed, as Los Angeles County has proved during its 14-year experience in fighting stationary sources of pollution, adequate and technologically acceptable solutions are available for virtually all significant sources.

While virtually all sources can be eliminated or drastically reduced, we cannot neglect the need for simultaneously developing a well-balanced community economy. Our cities and counties must be not only places to live, but places to make a living.

We must be alert to attract those industries and economic enterprises that will provide jobs for our present and future populations. But so also must we assure that the pattern of growth is of a type which will preserve and improve our communities as healthful, safe, and comfortable places in which to live and work.

It is in this respect that proper planning and zoning plays such an important role. In Los Angeles, through means of a permit system, industrial growth has been closely controlled. Prior to construction of any device capable of emitting air contaminants, it is necessary for the builder to secure an "authority to construct" from the air pollution control district's engineers. Following construction, a "permit to operate" must be obtained, and at that time inspections and tests must show that the device will operate without violating district requirements and without giving rise to air pollution problems.

Throughout its life, the equipment is observed and inspected at frequent intervals by the district's enforcement division. On a programed basis, industrial equipment is inspected thoroughly one to three times per

year, and is kept under surveillance by "sector patrols" at all times.

More than 72,000 permits to construct or operate equipment have been screened since the creation of the district. The screening of permits, incidentally, was put on a fee basis in 1957 and during the 4 succeeding years has brought revenue to the county of approximately $450,000. Approval has been gained for the construction and operation of new production equipment valued at $557 million and for new control equipment valued at more than $91 million. Nearly $75 million in new equipment failed to receive the approval of the district, and permit applications for their construction or operation were denied.

But even these figures fail to reveal the total dollar magnitude of the Los Angeles control program. In addition to a capital investment of more than $91 million in control equipment, a substantial annual cost is incurred in equipment maintenance and operation. Refuse collection and disposal costs exceed $24 million per year, and other control costs amount to an additional $8 to $10 million per year.

The program also has been costly to county government itself, because of the pioneering we have had to do in the field of air pollution research, and in the development of source control methodologies. By the end of the last fiscal year, the county of Los Angeles had spent more than $25 million on air pollution control and research. During this same period, the State government had spent less than $6 million and the Federal Government less than $22 million. More importantly, Federal and State expenditures have come only in the last few years, and then only after strong requests for action from the county of Los Angeles.

All of this expense in Los Angelese has produced a dividend for other communities. The work we have done, the research, the controls, the legislation, the methods we have pioneered represent completed activities. They do not have to be repeated in other communities. Also, the development of air pollution research and assistance programs at the Federal level, in response to Los Angeles requests, now provides substantial help to local areas desiring to begin control of air pollution sources. For example, during this current year, the Federal Government will spend nearly $9 million on its program, which is more than it had spent on air pollution from the inception of the Republic to the beginning of the fiscal year 1958-59.

By July 1, 1961, the control program administered by the district was preventing the entry into the atmosphere of approximately 4,600 tons per day of significant air contaminants. From the melting of metal to the painting of finished goods, industrial and commercial operations had been brought within the scope of the air pollution control program. More than 9,000 air pollution control devices had been installed on the county's industrial complex at a capital cost to private industry in excess of $91 million.

Behind this record of progress, and providing the firm stimulation needed for the total program, was the solid force provided by the district's rules and regulations. Based on research and studies performed by the district, and following public hearings by the board of supervisors, emission standards or prohibitions had been enacted to control emissions of hydrocarbons, dust and fumes, smoke and visible plumes, nuisance-causing substances, particulate matter, odors, combustion contaminants, and sulfur oxides from stationary sources. Voluntary programs, instituted on request of the district, also had been pursued by industry to curb losses of carbon monoxide. Banned was the burning of rubbish in open dumps, in inefficient incinerators, and open fires. Specifications had been adopted to control the type of fuels employed by industrial establishments in the county, and a limit had been placed on the quantity of smog-forming olefins permitted in gasolines sold in the county.

However, I emphasize that not 1 ton—not even 1 ounce—of pollutant material was removed from the air by industry without a law, a rule or a regulation either passed or threatened by the county board of supervisors. This is the lesson that 14 years of experience in air pollution has taught us.

The last major remaining uncontrolled source plaguing the people of Los Angeles County is the automobile. In 1960, at the pleading of our county board of supervisors, the legislature approved a law assuming jurisdiction over the control of contaminants from vehicles. With 2½ million vehicles registered today in our county, and with the rate of growth more than 200,000 annually, it is obvious that controls must be instituted by cooperative action of the auto industry, device developers and manufacturers, as well as the State. We have been disappointed in the minimal activity that has taken place since the passage of the law. Were a motor vehicle a stationary source instead of a moving source, it would not be allowed to operate today in even the most heavily industrialized area of Los Angeles.

As a result of the Los Angeles experience in fighting air pollution, several conclusions are indicated.

We have learned that strict laws and strict enforcement are absolutely vital. We have learned that it is necessary to spend money. We have learned that economic pressures must be balanced against demands for clean air, with the health of the community taking precedence over everything.

Even though the air quality of 6,000 American communities has deteriorated to unacceptable levels, in only 342 communities have air pollution control programs been instituted. In spite of the high annual national cost of air pollution, now totaling about $65 per capita, we are spending less than 10 cents per capita to solve the problem. Even then, we are spending this sum in only 342 communities.

Perhaps this, then, is our most important conclusion, that every resource of the community must be thrown into the fight against polluted air; that the situation will worsen unless every plant operator, every businessman, even every motor vehicle operator and every homeowner, joins with public officials in a program of strict administration and enforcement of available regulations. Unless this happens, we will face the consequence of losing our most precious natural resource, the clean, fresh air we breathe.

The 44th Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, in proportion to population few if any of the countries of the world have contributed so importantly to the growth and development and strength of the United States as has the small Baltic nation of Lithuania.

As one who represents a congressional district which includes among its residents a substantial number of people of Lithuanian descent, I speak from personal knowledge that Union County, N.J., is a better place in which to live because of their presence as our neighbors and fellow citizens.

If I may be pardoned a further personal reference, Mr. Speaker, I should like to inform our colleagues in the House that the prayer to be delivered at the opening of today's session in the Senate is scheduled to be offered by a distinguished constituent, the Right Reverend Monsignor Michael G. Kemezis, pastor of SS. Peter and Paul's Lithuanian Roman Catholic Church in Elizabeth, a man and priest greatly loved and honored by all who know him.

By commemorating the 44th anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence, Mr. Speaker, we are honoring not only our fellow Americans of Lithuanian ancestry but all Americans, regardless of their national heritage, who share the love of freedom and liberty which has motivated the determination of Lithuanians everywhere to see their homeland free again.

Freedom is not an accidental quality, to be awarded or withdrawn arbitrarily or capriciously. It belongs, by the very nature with which Almighty God has endowed mankind, to every individual human being. Governments are required by the moral law to respect this freedom and to rule their countries in such a way as to give full scope to the growth and development, in freedom, of the capacities and talents of their people. Governments which deny freedom and which subject their people to the burdens of tyranny violate the law of God and invite the condemnation of the free world.

Freedom has another characteristic. It flourishes only where those who enjoy it take it seriously and strive to protect it and strengthen it and extend its benefits to others. It withers and dies where it is taken for granted, where apathy and disinterest reign, where it is used and exploited only to serve a selfish purpose.

It is important to remind ourselves of these fundamental facts about freedom, Mr. Speaker, and it is particularly appropriate that we do so on the occasion of Lithuanian Independence Day. Tragically, Lithuania lost its freedom or, more properly, was deprived of freedom by the force of arms and by the perpetuation of a foreign-supported tyranny, in gross violation of international law and of the God-given rights of man.

But Lithuanians have not capitulated to tyranny. They have not surrendered. At great sacrifice, they have continued to resist oppression. And in their determination to be free again, to establish once more an independent, truly Lithuanian government, they have the dedicated support of their fellow Lithuanians in America and of all Americans who cherish our Nation's heritage.

We shall not abandon Lithuania, nor forget her sister states of Latvia and Estonia. We, who represent our people in the Congress of the United States, are proud to rededicate ourselves to the noble objective of the independence of the Baltic States and the freedom of people everywhere.

As a part of my remarks on this occasion, Mr. Speaker, I include the text of resolutions adopted on January 28, 1962, by the Lithuanian-Americans of Linden, N.J., gathered under the auspices of the Linden Branch of the Lithuanian American Council, and signed by Vladas Tur-

sa, president, and Stasys Vaiciunas, secretary:

RESOLUTIONS UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED ON JANUARY 28, 1962, BY THE LITHUANIAN AMERICANS OF LINDEN, N.J., GATHERED UNDER AUSPICES OF LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL, LINDEN BRANCH, FOR COMMEMORATION OF THE 44TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

Whereas on February 16, 1918, the freedom-loving people of Lithuania through their representative council at the historic capital of Vilnius, proclaimed to the world the rebirth of a free and independent Lithuania; and

Whereas the years of independent government fully proved and justified the nation's integrity for self-government and completely warranted credence and recognition as a free and independent state, accorded her by the other world nations; and

Whereas the Soviet Union, in pursuance of secret agreements between Joseph Stalin and his government with Hitler and his government, in 1940 invaded, occupied and subjugated the three independent Baltic States—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; and

Whereas Nikita Khrushchev, present head of the Communist Party and of the present Soviet Government, in October of last year at the assembled 22d Congress of the Communist Party made charges against Joseph Stalin, the late head of the Communist Party and Government of the Soviet Union, condemning him as an insane criminal and denouncing most of his acts and those of his government: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American citizens of Lithuanian birth or extraction of Linden, N.J., reaffirming their adherence to the moral and political principles enunciated in the American Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States of America, call upon the Government of the United States to take cognizance of the admission by the present Government of the Soviet Union that the policies and actions of the Soviet Government under Stalin were criminal and that this admission should be made applicable to the Soviet policy in the Baltic states; and be it

Resolved, To request the Government of the United States to take appropriate steps through the United Nations and other channels to stop the policy of colonialism of Soviet Russia in the Baltic states and bring about the reexamination of the Baltic situation with the view of reestablishing freedom and independence to these three nations; and be it

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, His Excellency John F. Kennedy; to the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Rusk; to the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, the Honorable Adlai Stevenson; to the U.S. Senators of New Jersey, the Honorable Clifford P. Case and the Honorable Harrison A. Williams; to the Representative of the 6th Congressional District of New Jersey, the Honorable Florence P. Dwyer; and to the Governor of the State of New Jersey, the Honorable Richard J. Hughes.

Hon. Graham Purcell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Sunday Star of February 4 carried an article written by John McKelway on the Honorable GRAHAM PURCELL, of Texas, the newly elected representative of Texas 13th District. The article dealt with what many people feel is a problem today—our juvenile population.

Because of Mr. Purcell's background on the bench in dealing with juvenile problems, I feel he is well qualified to speak on this subject, and I commend the following article to the Members of this House in the event they may have missed seeing it in the paper:

A NEW CONGRESSMAN FROM TEXAS HAS SOME IDEAS ON JUVENILES

(By John McKelway)

It is generally accepted in most circles that things are just different in Texas.

One of the most recent examples occurred two Saturdays ago when the people of the State's 13th district (which lies below the Oklahoma line) elected to Congress a judge who had picked up a reputation by sentencing juvenile delinquents to the barber's chair.

Such a practice—in most circles at least—would be considered political suicide. But GRAHAM B. PURCELL, Jr., 42, the judge and a Democrat, won by 10,000 votes over a conservative Republican businessman from Wichita Falls, hometown of the even more conservative and the first Republican Senator to arrive from the Confederate States since the Civil War—JOHN TOWER.

The election was held to fill a vacancy, created when former Democratic Representative Frank Ikard, a soft-spoken but highly regarded Congressman, left his native land to take up duties here as executive vice president of the American Petroleum Institute.

Representative PURCELL, sworn in last Monday as a Member of Congress, did not give exactly the impression he was the only law west or east of the Pecos—wherever it might be. He wore a red carnation in his lapel and was quite solemn.

THE FRESHMAN FEELING

By his third day in office he sat in a rather bare office and admitted he was thoroughly confused by the ritual on the floor of the House.

"The last time I felt this way," he said sadly, "was during that first week at college."

The condition is not expected to last too long. He's been living with the Vice President, another Texan and a former teacher.

Mr. PURCELL, a father of four, is slender and tall without boots and he has a fine pair of cold blue eyes. He has that rich, low Texan voice that can be turned to good advantage. He could easily be mistaken for a cattle or oil baron or at least a cowboy who smokes rugged cigarettes.

Actually, the new Congressman grew up on a farm of only 500 acres which in Texas is so small it's considered a "stock farm" and not a ranch. He does not drink and smokes only an occasional cigar—which he goes at with much satisfaction.

HEADLINE VICTIM

In his current bewilderment, Mr. PURCELL seemed relieved to talk of home and his reputation as a judge—and those delinquents he had sent to the chair.

He credits a headline writer on a newspaper in Wichita Falls with getting his name circulated by writing over a 2-inch story on page 1:

"Judge Sentences Youth to Chair."

The story was probably of sufficient length, although it did note a change in the local approach to delinquency problems in Wichita County.

For Judge PURCELL had ordered a youngster, up before him on charges of theft, to have his duck-tailed haircut removed—in a barber's chair if necessary—before he would even conduct a hearing in the case.

"That hair," the former judge recalled the other day, "had been down around those ears for so long there was a white streak running around his head when they cut it off."

To many in the Far East this probably sounded like brutal treatment—for the story was distributed nationally.

But the people of Wichita—if not its youngsters—liked the idea. And the judge, sensing acceptance, improved on the approach as he went along.

"Down home," he said, "the kids were wearing their blue jeans half off. But if they came in my court, I told 'em to get themselves a belt and wear it where God meant it to go. I ruled out those black leather motorcycle jackets and made 'em get a jacket and a tie—if they could afford a tie."

The road to the often frustrating job of dealing with juveniles was a long one for Mr. PURCELL.

After attending public schools in and around Archer City—population, 2,000—he set out for Texas A. & M., picking up a degree just before World War II in animal husbandry.

During the war, he was an infantry officer and fought through Tunisia and up through Italy. He came out a major in 1946.

Back home, he attempted to talk a younger brother into the practice of law. He convinced himself, instead, and was off to Baylor, graduating there in 1949.

A DISTRICT JUDGE

For 2 years he practiced in Big Spring and then moved to Wichita Falls in 1951. By 1955, he had been appointed to the bench as a district judge and in Texas they handle everything from murder to joy riding.

He immediately made his mark in his handling of juvenile cases.

Besides haircuts—he also ruled out boots for those who spent their young lives some distance from the nearest steer—he began trying to instill responsibility.

Not only did the teenagers of this county begin to feel and respect a new toughness but parents found themselves thoroughly involved.

"If I placed a kid on probation," Mr. PURCELL drawled, in a matter-of-fact tone, "he would have to agree he could only go to school or church without his parents. Any place else he went he had to be accompanied by his mother or father.

"I had them sign a statement. And they signed practically in blood and it was a solemn thing," Judge PURCELL said with a flicker of a smile.

The "trial" or hearing was conducted in the somber atmosphere of a very high court. It was never on a chat basis, in the judge's chambers or on the same level in the court.

When some boys were caught at the traditional practice of busting school windows, "I had the boys and their daddies fix the damage," Mr. PURCELL said.

THE AIRMEN'S CASE

After a gang had jumped some airmen at a nearby base and were arrested, he gave the boys 30 minutes to get from school to the court. For weeks, every afternoon, they studied in a room at the courthouse. Their parents had to come and pick them up around 5:30 p.m.

"The first time the boys came down," Mr. PURCELL said, "the whole school followed them down. They stood around outside the court and yelled and the boys hung out the windows. They were heroes.

"Well, I had the bailiff go outside and bring every one of those kids inside the court. We took their names down and I told them if we caught them around the court again they could come in and study. And I told them if they ever went into the service

they were going to be in a strange place someday and maybe they wouldn't like it so much if a gang jumped them. They never came back."

If a youngster was picked up for stealing, the judge ordered him to go to work and pay it all back—and it was the judge who often got the job for the boy.

He had his troubles. He failed to get a bill through the Texas Legislature which would have given him power to waive a juvenile under 17 to adult court, in cases of a serious offense. To get around that, he explained in criticism of Texas law, Texas judges often have to merely wait until a jailed juvenile has a birthday and can then be turned over to the grand jury. He was also unable to get a separate juvenile court for his county.

FAILURE OF BILL

But the community, apparently, accepted his methods—as the vote in his last election indicates.

In nonsupport cases, he demanded cash payments by delinquent fathers.

"A juvenile judge," the Texan said, "has got to be fair and consistent. You can't play favorites and you've got to work like hell. You've got to teach children to respect authority and accept responsibility.

"It's their job to fit into the community and not the community's job to accept them," the Congressman said.

Mr. PURCELL is not about to claim his methods would work elsewhere—in a big city situation where the number of cases are overwhelming. He does feel he accomplished something in Wichita.

Farm Leaders Endorse President Kennedy's Long-Range Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, 127 farm leaders representing 50 organizations in 22 States met January 31 at St. Louis, Mo., in a historic farm leaders conference. Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman was present and very ably outlined President Kennedy's proposed long-range farm program to the group. At the conclusion of the conference, the farm leaders adopted, without a dissenting vote, a statement endorsing this farm program.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include that statement in the RECORD:

STATEMENT ADOPTED AT FARM LEADERS CONFERENCE

We sincerely appreciate the firm and aggressive efforts of the Kennedy administration, and particularly those of the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Orville Freeman, to raise farm income and to improve public understanding of the farmer's problems. These efforts have resulted in materially improved farm income in 1961 and firm prospects for the maintenance thereof in 1962.

We recognize, however, that these improvements have been accomplished primarily through the use of emergency programs and measures. It is essential that a new dynamic, long-range, permanent farm program, dealing with the problems of agriculture, be adopted now, in 1962. We have the blessing of great abundance, but it is essential to the well-being of our agricultural community and is in the public interest that such be a managed abundance. We need a program to meet the problem of low incomes and underemployment in our farm population; to strike at the problem of inadequate diets, both at home and abroad, and to insure proper use of our agricultural resources.

We specifically endorse the positive goals of President Kennedy and Secretary Freeman to achieve proper use of our agricultural abundance; to achieve balance by providing a means of adjustment of production of commodities now in serious oversupply; to encourage conservation and achieve better land uses; and to upgrade the living standards of rural people by the development of new opportunities on the land through rural renewal programs, all of which will be achieved at a reduced cost to Government.

We emphasize the immediate need for these programs and unanimously pledge our full support to the attainment of these goals.

The 100th Anniversary of the Founding of the Sokol Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago, on February 16, 1862, the world-renowned Sokol gymnastic organization of Czechoslovakia was founded in Prague. This event which has long been commemorated by Czechoslovaks, is an appropriate one for commemoration now by the entire Western World. It represented not only the attempt of that well-known Czechoslovak, Dr. Miroslav Tyrs, to educate his countrymen to a high level of physical, spiritual, and moral fitness, it was also a notable advance in the history of the democratic idea. The Sokol organization, which became an integral part and feature of Czechoslovak national life, had as its ideal from the very start democracy and human freedom. The basic principles of democracy and freedom were an integral part of its organizational structure from the very beginning, and its regulations were based on the principles that all officers should be freely elected by all of the members. Membership was open to all regardless of class, creed, or political affiliation.

One has but to review the history of Czechoslovakia over the past 100 years to see the role that this organization has played. At times when the Czechoslovak people have been brutally suppressed the Sokol movement has led them in their heroic efforts to resist and throw off suppression. The organization participated valiantly in the First World War, and after the war helped to make secure the newly created Czechoslovak state in the center of Europe. In the period between the two world wars the organization was one of the strongest elements in Czechoslovak democracy.

It was not surprising, in view of the organization's historic opposition to the evil of totalitarian movements, that very soon after the Nazi occupation of Czechoslovakia in 1939 the organization was declared an enemy of the Third Reich and was disbanded by the Nazi authorities. Although its property was confiscated and some 5,000 of its leading members were put to death, those who survived were notable in the successful resistance against the Nazis during the war.

After the war, under the Czechoslovak Republic, the organization once again came out into the open and carried on its work of training its members in accord with its ancient motto, "Healthy mind in a healthy body."

The subsequent history of this organization, as of all freedom-loving movements in Eastern Europe, is a well-known story. Suffice it to say that wherever individuals are dedicated to freedom, the names of such organizations as the Sokol organization will ring loud and clear. We have a Sokol organization in Milwaukee, Wis., which is continuing its good work in building healthy minds and healthy bodies and a healthy respect for freedom. It is with great pleasure that I salute this organization on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of its founding.

An Address by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Former Ambassador From the Philippines to the United States, Upon the Occasion of Annual Wallow, Military Order of the Carabao, February 3, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, it was a high privilege to be present at the annual wallow of the Military Order of the Carabao on February 3 of this year. The wallow is always marked by the fine caliber of clever entertainment that is put on for the benefit of the members of this military order and their friends.

At this meeting, however, the highlight of the evening was an address by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, recent Ambassador of the Philippines and former President of the United Nations.

I have known the general since we came together in the 79th Congress; he was then Commissioner for the Philippines. He is known as a fine orator and on this occasion was at his best. He spoke feelingly and with emotion and used no notes.

No one man has done more to cement relations between our respective Governments. The blood of our common heroes has mingled together on Corregidor, on Bataan, and numerous other places where men fought and died in the cause of liberty and the Christian-Judaic philosophy of the dignity of man.

I am highly honored to present to my colleagues in the Congress the speech

made by General Romulo on this occasion. I commend it to you and I urge you to read it because here he tells us what we must do to bring together the nations of the world and the fellowship of man.

AN ADDRESS BY GEN. CARLOS P. ROMULO, FORMER AMBASSADOR FROM THE PHILIPPINES TO THE UNITED STATES, UPON THE OCCASION OF ANNUAL WALLOW, MILITARY ORDER OF THE CARABAO, FEBRUARY 3, 1962

Paramount CARABAO. Gentlemen, we are honored to have this evening a distinguished fellow Carabao. His close relationship with the birthplace of our order and the honor he paid us by attending our wallows over the years have endeared him to us all. He will be leaving shortly for his homeland and we wish him Godspeed. He will be sorely missed.

However, I hope he will kindly say a few words to us on this occasion.

Gentlemen, it gives me great pleasure to present to you His Excellency, the former Ambassador of the Philippines, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo.

General ROMULO. Our Paramount Carabao, the members of the Cabiner who are here, the Members of Congress, my fellow Carabaos and friends, during these dangerous, critical days it seems to me quite proper that we should establish certain guideposts, certain guideposts that can give us a gage or a yardstick, that we can use whenever we read in our morning or our evening newspaper an international crisis developing somewhere in the world. Tonight as I am about to take my leave from this beautiful city, it seems that I should share with you what I have considered as my yardstick, and I will discuss this yardstick not seeking your approbation of your agreement, but in the hope that in spite of the "wetness" of this wallow, I can provoke thought and make you think.

When your Government takes a position on an international crisis, what guideposts can you use, what yardstick can you use to judge whether that position is sound or unsound, right or wrong, patriotic, or unpatriotic?

May I submit to you, based purely on logic and reason, free from emotionalism or partisan bias, what I consider can be the yardstick or the gage that you can use to judge the free world's position on any given crisis provoked by Soviet Russia anywhere in the world.

This yardstick is composed of three major premises: The first premise is this: Do we or do we not accept that America is not an imperialistic country? Whatever may have been the international connotations of America's early adventures at the beginning of this century in Cuba, the Philippines, Panama, Mexico, Nicaragua, etc., and whatever may have been the suspicions and resentments aroused by America's so-called dollar diplomacy, after the two World Wars which America helped win decisively, was it imperialism for her not to have annexed a single inch of territory, unlike other conquerors in the past? [Applause.] Was it imperialistic for her to have proved to be the most generous victor in the history of all wars? Witness her treatment of Germany and Japan. Was it imperialistic for her to have shared her abundance with all, friends and foes alike? [Applause.]

Judged by the record of exploitation and tyrannical subjugation of Western and Communist imperialism, certainly no objective observer will refuse to admit that America's enlightened policy is far from being imperialistic. Accepting this premise as we must because it is so, then we must accept the corollary syllogism that wherever Soviet Russia provokes a crisis anywhere in the world today, America's position on such a crisis—and that of the free world—must be in the interest of world peace and security and not dictated by any aggressive designs or imperialistic motives. [Applause.]

The second premise is this: Do we or do we not accept that basic to Communist objective and philosophy is world conquest? Who can deny this announced goal of communism which is to rule the world? Nikita Khrushchev not only does not deny it but reiterates it whenever he can. You remember when he visited your country as your state guest. At the National Press Club in Washington when he was asked to explain why he once said that he would bury you, without a moment's hesitation and with arrogance he replied: "Because I believe in the true historical process—that in the same manner that feudalism made way for capitalism, so in exactly the same manner capitalism must make way for communism," implying of course that communism is the wave of the future, that communism will rule the world.

If we accept this second major premise, as we must because it is so, then we have to accept the corollary syllogism that wherever Soviet Russia provokes a crisis anywhere in the world it must be because it is part and parcel of communism's strategy to conquer the world and therefore it is the duty of all free men to resist it whenever and wherever it happens. [Applause.]

The third premise is this: Do we or do we not accept that America and the free world are today engaged in a life-and-death global struggle against communism, that we are now locked in mortal combat with a godless ideology that is seeking to enslave all of us. Who can deny this? Who can deny that Communist Russia is trying every means to destroy America's prestige all over the world, that Communist propaganda is deliberately building a distorted image of America by presenting the American people as an aggressor, imperialist nation, a money-mad, materialistic country, a racist people, the ugly American, trying to alienate the whole world against you? Why all this effort to engender hatred against America? It is to destroy and subvert the American way of life and thus defeat the United States.

If we accept this third major premise as we must because it is an undeniable fact, then we must accept the corollary syllogism that whenever Soviet Russia provokes a crisis anywhere in the world it is not only because it is its objective to conquer the world but that in order to achieve such an objective it is imperative that Communist Russia must first defeat the United States.

This being so, not only for the sake of world security and peace, but more importantly for every American, for the sake of his safety and the security of his dear ones, for the survival of the American way of life, he must see to it that Communist Russia must be resisted [applause] whenever and wherever communism by subversion or infiltration provokes a crisis anywhere in the world. [Applause.]

These are the three premises, based entirely on logic and reason, I repeat, free from any emotionalism or partisan bias, that I submit to you to provoke your thought and I hope can serve as your guide or your gage by which to judge the free world's position on any given crisis caused or provoked by Communist Russia in Asia, Africa, Latin America, or in Europe. [Applause and cheers.]

These are days where we must view this cold war without complacency, without smugness, without overconfidence. There are certain truths that we must face, and tonight, because I am now going back home, I want to talk to you in the true American fashion, straight from the shoulder, certain truths that need telling that will make you see yourselves as others see you.

Wasn't it a Scottish poet who once wrote "Oh wad some power the giftie gie us, to see oursels as ithers see us." Tonight, you will see yourselves by using the eyes of a friend as your mirror, a friend, of course, who need not protest his friendship for your country and your people, nor his loyalty to the ideals of democracy and freedom.

It has been said that truth makes men free. This is somewhat outworn now but certainly in moments of grave national peril it is good to be reminded that truth helps to make freemen remain free. And I want you to see through me how you are thought of in Asia and Africa, truths that you are entitled to know.

It is realized—outside America—that when Soviet Russia started her course of empire she started at zero. After 16 years Soviet Russia now has under her control—under Communist imperialist subjection, the worst imperialism the world has even known—14 countries with a combined total population of 900 million people. But what is significant to the peoples outside this country is that in these 16 years you have not succeeded to make Soviet Russia recede or retreat one inch from any of her ill-gotten gains. [Applause.]

This is a truth that we must face, that we can not gloss over, because it is known outside the United States. Once upon a time, Rome, Geece, Spain, England were world leaders such as you are today. But they were world leaders—some of them for generations, others for centuries—holding undisputed sway over the world, sovereign, supreme. I repeat, some of them for generations, others for centuries. World leadership came to you, it is true, unexpected and unwanted, but world leadership came to you scarcely 16 years ago and abroad they say it is already seriously contested. Sixteen years, as against generations and centuries of Spain and England. That too is a truth that you must know, that you must face, that should make no room for complacency, or smugness or overconfidence; that this struggle is no children's game.

Four years ago mankind saw the first sputnik orbiting through space, followed by the first manmade planet, followed by the first rocket that reached the Moon, followed by the first pictures of that side of the Moon never visible to a mortal eye, that returned to Earth. Followed by the first astronaut who orbited around the Earth. Five technological achievements, all Russian.

It is immaterial that the United States can cope with these achievements, as I am fully confident America will cope with them and far surpass them. [Applause.] But to the peoples of Asia and Africa and Latin America, these achievements carry a sinister and ominous message, because to them they are symbols of the fact that Soviet Russia, an underprivileged nation, as most of the Asian and African nations are today, 40 years ago, by following a system of economy and a system of government different from that of the West, succeeded in outpacing the West in precisely and particularly and perhaps premeditatedly specifically in that line in which the West has always been considered peerless and unmatched.

That too is a truth that we must not gloss over, that we must face with courage, that should make us pause and ponder. Because these are the intangible factors in this cold war that we can not ignore, and that we must reckon with, because they are in the people's minds and this global struggle in which you are engaged is one the like of which mankind has never seen in recorded history.

This is not a struggle like the struggles of the past for strategic areas, for material resources. No. This is a struggle for men's minds and hearts and souls, and it is global, and we must know what the other peoples are thinking, and that is what I am trying to transmit to you tonight.

Before the Second World War it was an ingrained belief in the Asian, African and Latin American mind that the West in the use of arms was superior, invincible, invulnerable, and perhaps because of that, all these countries were quiescent for centuries—meek, perhaps cowed. But after the Second World War, after Japan, an Asian nation, had you practically on the run for almost two years after Japan, an Asian nation, practically defeated the combined armies and navies of the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Belgium and the Netherlands for almost three years, after the so-called impregnable forces of the West in Singapore, Hong Kong, Batavia, Bataan and Corregidor fell like a pack of cards before the Japanese onslaught, after the pride of the British Navy, the *Repulse* and the *Prince of Wales* were sunk ignominiously in the twinkling of an eye in Singapore Bay by Japanese bombs, after Americans and Britishers and Frenchmen and Dutchmen were captured, imprisoned, tortured, insulted by the Japanese, after the stalemate in Korea, which Peiping radio continually dins into the ears of the peoples of Asia that it was the victory of a handful of Chinese volunteers over what they call the pick of the armies of 17 nations, after the fall of Dien Bien Phu in French Indochina, which Moscow radio daily magnifies and distorts and misrepresents, and dins into the ears of the peoples of the world that it was the victory of a handful of Viet Minh native troops over what they call the flower of the French Army, after the debacle at the Suez Canal, after all that, that once ingrained belief in the Asian and African and Latin American mind of the invulnerability, the superiority, the invincibility of the West in the use of arms is gone. Finished. Forgotten. And much of what is happening in the world today springs from that fact.

That, too, my friends, we must face, and we must know and we should not ignore. I talk to you tonight without inhibitions because I am no longer an Ambassador. And I had the privilege of representing my country here and I have learned to love this country. But more than that, I am selfishly interested in my country's national security, and the Philippines is not one of the neutral nations. [Applause.]

We are not fence-sitters. We are a committed Nation. We do not believe in twilight zones. We believe in freedom, because we know that mankind for 50 centuries has always been offered this choice:

On the one hand, the hard sinews of dignity, integrity and freedom, and on the other, the degradation of slavery and in this day and age, that slavery implicit in a monolithic ideology known as communism, which reduces everything to materialistic dialetics. We have made our choice in the Philippines. We have thrown our lot with you. [Applause.]

So we are in the same boat and because my country's national security is insepaably intertwined with yours, that is why I feel it is my duty to talk to you tonight as I am talking frankly, straight from the shoulder, because we are on the same boat. Your victory will be our glory, but your failure would be our catastrophe. [Applause.]

We in the Philippines are a committed nation. Why? It is not enough for Russia to say that she can send rockets to the moon. It is not enough for Red China to say that she is now the mightiest nation in Asia. The question is, how did they get there? They got there by proscribing, first, religion. They got there by refusing to respect the dignity of the human being. They got there because in their countries the door of freedom has been shut and in their government the secret police rules and the citizen only says aye. That is how they got to where they are.

Those of us who believe in freedom believe in an Almighty. We believe in the dignity of the human soul. We believe in the consent of the governed. We believe in spiritual values and I believe that the American way of life is the spiritual way of life, the spiritual way of life because however Communist propaganda distorts and misrepresents the American image, this is a spiritual country. I say this because I know there are in this country more eleemosynary institutions than in all countries of the world combined, and that to me is the highest form of spirituality. When you take care of what is known in other countries as the human discards, when you take care of your aged, of your infirm, of your invalids, of your blind, of your mentally insane, they are known outside the United States as human discards. You lovingly take care of them here.

That to me is the highest form of spirituality and that is one of the reasons why I believe the American way of life is the spiritual way. [Applause.]

And so therefore, my friends, because the American way of life is the spiritual way, because it respects the dignity of the human individual whatever its pigmentation, when you proclaimed in your Declaration of Independence "All men are created equal," you inflamed the world, and the world took you at your word. And your forefathers who first proclaimed this, proclaimed it in a day and age when in other lands and other continents there were feudal lords and serfs, where the divine right of kings was in its heydey. And yet your forefathers here proclaimed "All men are created equal." And they could have qualified it. They were proclaiming a principle for the first time and they could have written "All men north of the equator are created equal," or they could have written "All men south of the equator are created equal." But they did not.

In their vision, in their courage, in their belief in an Almighty—because they were God-fearing, God-loving, God-worshiping people—they knew that because we are all created in the image of our Lord, each of us has the spark of the divine in him and all we need is the spark of the divine in me to light the spark of the divine in you, for us all to realize that we are brothers under the canopy of Heaven, under the Fatherhood of an Almighty. [Applause.]

And because they believed in that and believed in it fervently and sincerely, they were ready to sacrifice their sacred honor, their possessions and their all for it. They, therefore, proclaimed for all men for all ages without qualifications "All men are created equal."

My American friends, follow that, practice it in your daily lives. If you do, you need have no fear. In this global struggle in which you as a nation are today engaged, because the American way of life is the spiritual way, you can face your future confidently, serenely, unafraid. If you can really make the American way of life the spiritual way and convince the world that you practice it, it is the way of life that is destined to become not only invincible but always supreme.

That, my friends, is my parting message that I come humbly to convey to you tonight. [Applause.]

The Federal Government and Urban Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, as a contribution to the current discussions dealing with the proper role of the Federal Government with regard to our urban areas, I include as a part of my remarks an excerpt from a recent report of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations entitled, "Governmental Structure, Organization, and Planning in Metropolitan Areas." The excerpt sets forth the Commission's recommendation for improved coordination of Federal programs in urban and metropolitan areas.

As a member of the Commision, Mr. Speaker, I endorsed this recommendation wholeheartedly. In my judgment, it represents the most immediately practicable and necessary step which should be taken to assure urban areas the maximum benefits of the various programs enacted by Congress and to minimize the waste, conflict and duplication of effort which so often has deprived urban areas of the help they need.

The excerpt from the Commission's report follows:

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND URBAN AREAS

The Commission recommends that steps be taken within both the executive and legislative branches of the National Government to bring together in better coordination and interrelationship the various Federal programs which impact upon orderly planning and development within the large urban areas.

The fragmented and conflicting impact at the State and local level of disparate Federal programs concerning urban highways, urban renewal, housing, airport and sewage facility construction, and so on, are well known. If improvements in governmental structure and metropolitan area planning are to be made by the State and local level as recommended in the earlier chapters of this report, there must be corresponding improvement at the national level.

Several major proposals have been advanced for increased activity by the Executive Office of the President and by the Congress, including the establishment of a new special assistant to be "Mr. Urban Affairs," the creation, on a basis parallel to that of the Council of Economic Advisers, of a Council on Metropolitan or Urban Affairs, and the establishment of an Interagency Coordinating Committee. These are important proposals, but they involve detailed considerations of the internal organization of the executive branch of the National Government upon which this Commission does not proffer a specific recommendation, since our statutory mandate is confined to relationships among levels of government, in contrast to the administrative reorganization of any particular level. The Commission desires to emphasize, however, that intergovernmental relations with respect to urban

affairs are being unnecessarily impaired because of inadequate coordination of Federal programs and urges prompt and effective steps toward improvement of this situation.

The Federal response to metropolitan problems has not only tended to bypass the States; it has also operated on a single-purpose functional basis, with insufficient attention paid to the need for planning or coordination of the various functions on a comprehensive basis at the Federal level. While large sums of Federal money have been spent on such programs as urban renewal, public housing, highways, airports, hospitals, sewage treatment facilities, river and harbor improvements, etc., little attention has been given to developing a coordinated plan of action at the national level to overcome the conflicts and gaps in their impact upon particular metropolitan areas. Such Federal coordination includes the need for Federal institutional arrangements for properly relating those aspects of the activities of the various Federal departments which are concerned with urban affairs.

1. FORMULATION OF NATIONAL GOALS AND POLICIES

The Federal Government has developed machinery in the Executive Office of the President for the formulation of a national economic policy (the Council of Economic Advisers) but it has not as yet come to grips with the implications of various grant-in-aid and other programs directly affecting the urban areas. In other words, the existing machinery does not meet the need for breaking down each of these programs into its component parts as they affect metropolitan areas and then reconstructing these parts into a new metropolitan area policy which is reconcilable with the national goals.

It is interesting to note, however, that as far back as 1937 the President's Committee on Administrative Management recommended the establishment of a permanent planning agency "to serve as a clearing house of planning interests and concerns in the national effort to prevent waste and to improve our national standard of living;" and "to cooperate with departmental, State, and local agencies and in general to use the Board's good offices to see that planning decisions are not made by one group in ignorance of relevant undertakings or research going on elsewhere." The committee felt that "this cooperation constitutes an important guaranty against overcentralization in governmental planning and against decay of local governmental interest."[1]

During this same time the National Resources Committee (later the National Resources Planning Board) recommended that a unit be set up in an appropriate Federal agency to conduct urban research and perform functions for urban communities comparable to those performed for rural communities by the Department of Agriculture. It went on to urge that the Bureau of the Budget undertake a study of the best methods for bringing about the closer coordination of Federal activities in urban communities and for improving and facilitating collaboration between the cities and the Federal Government. While no action was taken to implement these recommendations, the NRPB itself set up 11 regional offices which were not only largely oriented around State planning agencies and organizations, but also made a real attempt to deal with regional and subregional planning in terms of problem areas rather than solely on a political unit basis. The fact that the NRPB was legislatively "dismissed" in 1943 indicates, among other things, that the real need for Federal coordination in this field was not yet recognized, possibly because the Federal programs impinging on metropolitan areas had not yet reached sizable proportions.

Currently, when the President's program is prepared, the national needs in a given number of fields are considered. The Federal activities scheduled to be carried out in each of these fields tend to be viewed in terms of meeting the requirements of that field alone. While the total of all these activities appears to add up to a national policy, in fact considerable friction develops in the metropolitan areas where many of the component parts of each of the activities come into conflict with the corresponding component parts of other activities. However, our Federal form of Government makes it essential that the policy coordination function be carried out not only in Washington and the Federal field offices, but also in conjunction with State and local agencies. The interaction of all interested parties is essential to effective programs at the level of the metropolitan area.

At the fourth meeting of the ad hoc Interagency Committee on Metropolitan Area Problems, a report to incoming President Kennedy was approved which emphasized that "large-scale urban development programs are a recent phenomenon * * *. The coordination problems created by these programs are only now becoming recognized and understood."[2] Thus, it is not surprising that no truly formal device for coordination has yet been developed at the White House level. The executive branch over the past 2 or 3 years has been feeling its way, with the assignment of relevant duties to a Presidential assistant in the White House and with staff assistance from the Bureau of the Budget and from the former ad hoc Interagency Committee serving an essentially catalytic function.[3]

2. COORDINATION OF OPERATING PROGRAMS

The ad hoc Interagency Committee on Metropolitan Area Problems developed a list of the programs of the Federal Government operating primarily in metropolitan areas which shows how many agencies and what varied activities are now involved in meeting metropolitan area requirements (see appendix K). The Committee report indicates that a number of conflicts between these agencies have arisen and have served to impair the effectiveness of each of the programs involved. The fact that there was not more evidence of lack of coordination was attributed to (1) the existence of gaps as well as overlaps in the activities; (2) the tendency of Federal agencies to draw away from each other in administering their programs rather than duplicate activities; and (3) the lack of a policy framework against which to evaluate the Federal activities.

While the agencies involved in metropolitan activities run the gamut from the Department of Defense to the Veterans' Administration, the Housing and Home Finance Agency has more program involvement with most metropolitan communities than any of the others. The Agency itself consists of two constituent units (the Community Facilities Administration and the Urban Renewal Administration) and three constituent agencies (the Federal Housing Administration, the Public Housing Administration, and the Federal National Mortgage Association), all under varying degrees of oversight by the Office of the Administrator, HHFA.

Interagency problems were dramatized by the differences of approach between HHFA and the Bureau of Public Roads of the Department of Commerce with regard to the relationship between the interstate highway program and urban renewal activities. While it would appear obvious that these two functions should be geared together closely, until recently the planning and actual physical activities involved in each function were proceeding independently. With the highway program making no provision for the relocation of the families forced to move by the construction involved, Mayor Richardson Dilworth of Philadelphia pointed out that "if people are given no help in relocating from the path of highways, this obviously augments the housing problems which the renewal program is trying to solve. And renewal activities must be closely related to the programing of highways if we are to avoid, on the one hand, the creation of new blight along new highways, and, on the other hand, the churning up of a newly renewed area to make way for a new highway."[4] And to carry this possible oversight one step further, the housing mortgage insurance activities often have been developed with little regard for the metropolitan problems created, of a political, economic, and social nature, by new patterns of housing development.

There has been one significant exception to this long history of unilateral functional programing. This exceptional approach was adopted on the assumption that the best way to see that coordination takes place is to require that the community involved develop a "workable program" before being assisted. Thus the Housing Act of 1954 requires that in order to be eligible for certain forms of Federal assistance to urban renewal and public housing, the community must convince the HHFA Administrator that the purposes of that urban renewal will be achieved. The community does this by preparing a workable program that includes among its provisions a comprehensive community plan. If such a plan is in existence, it is expected that the coordination of Federal and other public and private community development activities will be facilitated.

One other device has been used for Federal interdepartmental coordination, but only in the field of housing. Under Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947, a National Housing Council was established under the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The Council consists of representatives from the Veterans' Administration, the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, Commerce, Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and the heads of the three HHFA constituent agencies. The Housing Administrator serves as the Chairman of the Council. The object of the Council is to coordinate the activities of all agencies of the Federal Government concerned directly or indirectly with housing. There is, however, little indication that this Council has made any outstanding strides in the direction of coordinating Federal Government housing and financing activities, but rather it has served primarily an educational purpose.

Within the Office of the HHFA Administator, there is an Office of Program Policy. This Office assists the Administrator in analyzing the type and magnitude of metropolitan developments which exist or are likely to occur, and carries on other duties designed to help the HHFA meet the metropolitan needs that arise. While this Office identifies problems requiring coordination between HHFA and other Federal agencies, and recently helped work out an important program agreement between the agency and the Department of Commerce, it is obviously limited in the powers it has to achieve interagency coordination. In any event, it would have difficulty in objectively evaluating the metropolitan area programs of other Federal agencies and in getting such evaluations accepted.

One of the recent constructive steps forward in interagency coordination has been the agreement negotiated between HHFA and the Department of Commerce in November 1960 to make highway (1½ percent) funds and urban planning funds (sec. 701 funds) available for joint use in comprehensive urban and metropolitan planning. (See appendix L.) Thus, we find one of the basic

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

difficulties we mentioned earlier apparently on the threshold of resolution. The Federal highway legislation referred to authorizes the use of 1½ percent of total program funds for planning and research work in connection with the federally aided highway program.

Under the terms of the agreement a joint steering committee (representing the Bureau of Public Roads and the Urban Renewal Administration) is to be appointed with overall responsibility for encouraging joint planning projects and reviewing and evaluating the success of this joint effort at the metropolitan area level. Regional joint committees from the two agencies will be set up to encourage and assist the States and local governments to undertake this comprehensive planning. Either State or local agencies may initiate a proposal for a jointly financed planning project, but the project must be sponsored jointly by (1) a State, metropolitan, or regional planning agency eligible for urban planning grants, and (2) a State highway department. It was presumably the hope of further developments such as this that led the ad hoc interagency committee to recommend that the internal structure of the HHFA be strengthened to vest full operating and policymaking authority in the Administrator, so that his Office could increase its leadership function among the Federal agencies with respect to metropolitan activities.

With respect to the coordination of Federal field activities, one example may merit consideration for future application. From 1943 to 1952, the Budget Bureau maintained four regional offices located in Dallas, San Francisco, Denver, and Chicago. More were planned but never approved by Congress. Among its functions, the Bureau's field service was assigned responsibility for promoting coordination of Federal field programs, consulting with State and local officials with respect to Federal programs affecting them, and appraising the effect of Federal fiscal policies on State and local governments. The San Francisco office achieved the highest degree of success of the units created, being instrumental in the establishment of the Pacific Coast Board of Intergovernmental Relations, known as PACBIR. This board developed into a striking example of the successful coordination of all three levels of government.

Every major component of government on the Pacific coast participated in this effort at intergovernmental cooperation. Created on a purely voluntary basis, it served the purpose of mutual discussion and cooperation in administrative efforts to solve mutual problems. Membership among levels of government was carefully balanced so that no level would be put at a disadvantage. While it had no power to enforce any decisions, its discussions often led to consensus and resolution of conflict. Among the items on its agenda were many of direct significance to metropolitan areas, including housing, industrial development, administration of Federal grant programs, public works planning and timing, etc.[5] While the factors which led to the discontinuance of PACBIR are many and varied, it is relevant to note that such a device was able to command enthusiastic support from State and local officials alike, even though objections to it were raised at the national level.

3. A DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

The issue of whether or not there should be established within the National Government a Department of Urban Affairs, or a comparable Cabinet-rank agency, is excluded from treatment in this report. The Commission is conducting a separate study relating to this question, and any views or recommendations thereon by the Commission will be issued as a separate document.

---

[1] U.S. President's Committee on Administrative Management, "Administrative Management in the Government of the United States, 1937," pp. 25–26.

[2] Ad hoc Interagency Committee on Metropolitan Area Problems, "Coordination of Federal Metropolitan Area Development Activities," (January 1961) pp. 10–11.

[3] The ad hoc Interagency Committee was abolished by President Kennedy in March 1961 and its functions assigned to one of the special assistants to the President.

[4] Robert H. Connery and Richard H. Leach, "The Federal Government and Metropolitan Areas" (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960), p. 19.

[5] Stanley K. Crook, "The Pacific Coast Board of Intergovernmental Relations," Public Administration Review, vol. 11, No. 2 (spring 1951), and Miriam Roher, "Coast States Try Cooperation," National Municipal Review, vol. 34, No. 10 (November 1945).

Address by Hon. Joseph Kajeckas, Lithuanian Chargé d'Affaires, Ad Interim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, by leave previously granted, I wish to insert in the RECORD an eloquent address delivered by the Honorable Joseph Kajeckas, Lithuanian Chargé d'Affaires, ad interim, at the Cleveland-Sheraton Hotel, Cleveland, on February 9, 1962, on the occasion of the 44th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence:

It is indeed a great privilege and a pleasure to participate in this gathering, as we prepare to commemorate the 44th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence. The act which we will commemorate has great historical siginficance. It was by that act that the Lithuanian people expressed their national will, to be free and independent people under democratic governmental processes established by the Western political tradiiton. At the same time that the act was a people's choice of Western culture and civilization, it was a choice as well of the foundation of Western democratic traditions, and this foundation is the dignity and freedom of the individual person. The value that men attach to freedom is something that cannot be measured by the economic theorists of communism and collectivism; and yet these values will never be supplanted, for man cannot live by bread alone. Patrick Henry graphically demonstrated that value in action when he exclaimed, "Give me liberty, or give me death." Since then, thousands of Lithuanians have given their lives in demonstrating their allegiance to that value.

But what gives an eternal validity to this value that men attach to freedom? The value of freedom is not to be deduced from conflicting self-interest, for there is no real freedom there, but the law of the jungle. Neither is freedom to be deduced from individual preferences for material comforts. Bread alone, I repeat, does not give man freedom, because history teaches us that if bread and material comforts are all that matter, then at the end of the feast lies the circus and the lions' den. Several weeks ago, at the Red Mass celebrated in Washington each year to ask God's blessing on the work of legal men and government officials of all faiths, the answer was succinctly put by Bishop Philip Hannan: "Freedom is under attack in the international order because the traditional, God-centered concept of man is under attack. Materialistic collectivism or communism, denying the dignity of man by denying his creation, denies his personal freedom. . . . Freedom lives only by the virtue of free men, as St. Peter taught. Live as free men, yet not using your freedom as a cloak for malice, but as servants of God." The point is well taken. It is only in the Judao-Christian tradition that man has, not only the privilege of being free, but the concomitant responsibility and sacred obligation to use that freedom in a just and godly manner, to safeguard it for himself and all mankind. If this is the true nature of man as a free moral agent, then the failure to observe the dictates of this nature as created by God is readily discernible in the world today. And it is here that the tragedy of Lithuania and the Baltic States begins its course.

In the wake of Lithuania's declaration of independence, the nations of the Western World recognized Lithuania as a sovereign nation, with Soviet Russia included. But the solemn agreements and treaties that are binding on all other nations are considered by the Soviets as only a means to an end. The Soviets solemnly promised to respect Lithuania's independence forever. Yet forever, in Communist jargon, can mean several years or several days, but it will always mean only what is convenient for the Soviets, and above all, what serves their exclusive self-interests. As a result of this, the Soviet Union, in spite of solemn pledges and agreements binding under international law, forcibly occupied Lithuania in 1940, and the illegal occupation continues to this day. In a word, nation after nation has realized over the years that to deal with the Soviet Union means to deal with a tyrannical state that does not recognize values, because it denies the possibility of their foundation in the free nature of man.

In the face of these facts, a warning was sounded last year by a great friend of Lithuania of long standing, the Honorable Congressman MICHAEL FEIGHAN, of Ohio. Congressman FEIGHAN, speaking from his experience as a member of the distinguished Kersten committee to investigate Communist aggression in the Baltic States, spoke as follows on the floor of the U.S. Congress last year: "There are strange voices in the world today calling for a recognition of the status quo, a deal with the Russians whereby Russia would keep intact its vast empire of slavery in exchange for which we would be spared the Russian hatchet for a few fleeting, humiliating years." And his conclusion hits the nail right on the head: "We know that the best guarantee for our own liberty and safety is a world in which every nation is free and all empires are dissolved."

Ladies and gentlemen, we Lithuanians and friends of Lithuania meet tonight as people bound by brotherhood, history, and present destiny. But we are bound more deeply still in hope and faith. It is only the strong of mind and heart who are able to believe perseveringly in justice—who are able to set aside doubts and fears, and to see truly that mankind's yearning for peace and freedom is rarely rewarded overnight, and even when peace and freedom are achieved, they cannot be maintained without courage and hard work. As Erasmus once said, "God indeed

preserves the ship, but the mariner conducts it into harbour." And it is above all faith in a just cause which enables men to persevere, in spite of obstacles, in the noble quest for a better world. As the distinguished Senator from Ohio, Mr. YOUNG, put it so well on the floor of the Senate last year: "Neither the tyranny of Hitler nor the oppression of the Soviet Union has dimmed the bright hope of freedom nurtured by the Lithuanian people. All tyrants ultimately learn that physical and political suppression of a people cannot accomplish suppression of an idea, cannot erase the faith or hope that freedom someday will return. It has been the history of tyrants that the freedom which they brutally suppress rises again to topple them, for its spirit never dies. This spirit is rooted firmly in the minds and hearts of the Lithuanian people. No Iron Curtain will smother their hopes and prayers for a return to liberty."

The greater the obstacles, the stronger must be this faith. Indeed, the unhappy Lithuanian nation is a witness to the gigantic obstacles to peace that beset the world. The acts of aggression which were first perpetrated on the Baltic States over 20 years ago stand as microcosmic testimony of history to the plight of the world today, when a ruthless tyrant can explode his superbombs in total disregard of outraged world opinion. And yet all acts of animalistic and unrestrained power have the same nature and the same evil face: The atrocities perpetrated directly upon Lithuania are the same in essence as the nuclear flashes from Semipaltinsk and Novaya Zemlya which have beclouded the world with the fear of bondage and the bondage of fear.

In spite of the gigantic quality of brutal inhumanity of which both we and the world are victims, we have good reason for our knowledge that the Kremlin is eventually doomed to failure. For the Soviet empire is a kingdom of lies and treachery. We Lithuanians have long known this; and now the rest of the world has had a chance to observe most clearly the duplicity of Soviet international relations. The Soviets overwhelmed their neighbors, but chant the false song of freedom for newly emergent African nations—nations which the Kremlin would swallow up at the first opportunity. The full picture was strikingly presented by President Kennedy last April 15 in the celebration of African Freedom Day. He cited Benjamin Franklin's remark: "Where freedom is, there is my home"; but he added Thomas Paine's magnificent reply, "Where freedom is not, there is my home."

Indeed, the world cannot be half-slave and half-free—and it is this knowledge, indelibly written on the heart of mankind, that will doom the Kremlin. Already the Russian people themselves are becoming fully aware of the emptiness of Soviet propaganda, as they see a man once worshiped as a fatherly demigod removed by night from honored splendor to an unnoticed grave at the base of the Kremlin wall. The disenchantment of the Russian people is the same as that of their leaders, such as Beria and Molotov. All of them are beginning to realize that, in a reign of terror, there is nothing permanent about human desires and honors. May the day soon come—as come it must—when the cruel and godless tyrants who now oppress Lithuania and the world will altogether pass away. And in that day, the ghost of Stalin will realize, with its successors, that the brave and steadfast longing of mankind for peace with justice buries its own undertakers.

Tonight, I take it upon myself to extend, on behalf of all Lithuanians, the most heartfelt thanks to the distinguished Americans gathered here tonight who have always been such good friends to Lithuania and her cause. Through their efforts, the day of freedom will come sooner rather than later.

Automation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an outstanding article entitled, "Automation," by my distinguished colleague on the House Education and Labor Committee, Congressman ELMER J. HOLLAND, of Pennsylvania, who has been serving as chairman of the Subcommittee on Unemployment and the Impact of Automation.

Few Americans are so well informed on the implications of automation as Congressman HOLLAND. His article contains a valuable summary of the reasons it is essential that Congress this year pass his bill, the Manpower Development and Training Act. I hope very much that the House of Representatives will soon have an opportunity for action on this legislation, which was favorably reported by a bipartisan majority of 24 to 3 in the House Education and Labor Committee.

The text of the article, which was published in the February 2, 1962, issue of the Criterion in Indianapolis, Ind., follows:

AUTOMATION

(By Congressman ELMER J. HOLLAND, of Pennsylvania)

There is little doubt but that automation has become a household word within the last decade in America.

We have pushbutton kitchens, laundries, garages and appliances in our newer homes and our older homes are being renovated and modernized to include these improvements.

The horizon holds almost unbelievable vistas for the individual with all our labor-saving devices.

However, on our way to that horizon we will—and we are—encountering quite a hazardous and rocky road.

As chairman of the special Subcommittee on Unemployment and the Impact of Automation during the first half of the 87th Congress, I listened to representatives of labor, management, government and educational institutions, testifying at our public hearings on this subject and they described the immediate and future problems for which we must find a solution. We all realize that automation is the promise of the future, but we also recognize that it is also a problem of the present.

We do not fear automation nor do we wish to avoid it. We know that we must have it in order to maintain the strength of the American economy and retain our world leadership.

However, we feel that the fruits of automation should be shared by all, not just a few.

We know the housewife welcomes all laborsaving devices in the home and the manager of an industrial plant welcomes labor saving devices in the plant just as readily. The difference, however, is that in the plant, the mill, or factory these laborsaving devices mean the elimination of jobs.

If jobs are not available the housewife will not be in a position to buy these modern appliances nor can she look forward to enjoying the fruits of automation because an unemployed husband cannot supply such benefits for his home.

During our recent hearings it was brought out that—if we continue to automate at the present rate—we will eliminate 1½ million jobs a year. These are jobs in heavy industry and the service industries—production jobs, office jobs, clerical jobs, cleaning jobs, vending jobs, elevator jobs, and many more. These are both blue- and white-collar jobs.

Let me tell you what has happened in the past 10 years—the years of experiment and development in automation. (The official term is R. & D.—research and development.) You can then well imagine what the future holds since they are advertising now machines which make other machines.

In the electrical industry, production jobs decreased 10 percent or 89,000 less jobs, but production (output) increased 21 percent. Production jobs in the appliance field dropped 50 percent and in the production of electrical instruments production jobs dropped 15 percent or 30,000 jobs, but output increased.

Over 20,000 Illinois packinghouse workers have seen their jobs vanish in the meatpacking industry.

In the oil industry there are 10,000 less production workers than before but, here again, production is up. Incidentally, this is one of the most highly automated industries in our Nation.

In the auto industry, it is estimated that over 160,000 auto workers will never be recalled to work because of modernized plants.

In the chemical industry, production rose 80 percent from 1953 to 1960, yet production workers' jobs shrank by 13,000.

In the steel industry, it now takes 12 men to produce the same amount of steel that it formerly took 20 men to produce. In 1960 the same amount of steel was produced as in 1950 but there were 80,000 less steel workers in 1960.

During the postwar period, productivity in the soft coal industry rose 96 percent but employment—jobs for miners—fell by 262,000 jobs.

Railroad productivity rose by 65 percent during these years but employment fell by 540,000 jobs eliminated.

In the offices, it has been estimated, there were 10,000 computer installations during 1961 and each installation affects approximately 140 people. Therefore, it was expected that 1,400,000 workers would be affected last year as a result of these installations. Mr. Howard Coughlin, president of the Office Employes' International Union, testified that within the next 5 years he would not be surprised to see at least 4 million office workers replaced by computers.

It is true, of course, that many of these individuals who have been replaced by machines, computers and the like, have not been thrown out of work immediately. Many of our industries have found other jobs for them. However, in most cases the workers have been downgraded, or forced to work for less money at a lesser job. Upon their retirement or resignation, their job is eliminated and no one is hired to replace them.

This practice is called silent firing and covers—in many cases—the claims made by industry that automation is not responsible for our present unemployment problem. Nevertheless, jobs are not available for the new entrants into our labor market.

During the years between 1960 and 1970, we will have from 1½ to 2½ million yearly enter the labor market. These are high school graduates and, while some will go on to college, it is estimated there will be 26 million seeking jobs. What jobs?

In New York City alone, during the past 10 years, 25,000 elevator operators have been replaced by the automatic elevator. Vending machines have replaced salesmen, clean-

ing machines have replaced charwomen and custodians, dishwashing machines have replaced dishwashers in hotels, hospitals, schools, institutions and similar establishments. These conditions exist in other cities too.

Today there are over 1 million long-term unemployed. These are men and women—unskilled or skilled in only one field—and that field has been automated.

We also have 1.5 million young people between the ages of 17 and 21 who are unemployed, many of whom never have been able to find a job.

Both these groups need additional education and training if they ever hope to secure employment.

This, then, is our immediate problem.

In an effort to assist those who are classified as "long-term unemployed" last August I introduced legislation known as the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1961, H.R. 8399.

At the time of this writing, the Holland bill is in the Rules Committee of the House and is expected to be among the first order of business of that committee when it meets later this month.

There has been much interest in this legislation. The Kennedy administration has endorsed it and is anxious to see it passed. Many of the more liberal leaders of industry are also in favor of its passage. However, I must admit there is opposition to it and that comes from some highly organized groups within industry such as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers.

The Holland bill provides a program for training our long-term unemployed. While attending such classes, the participant will receive an allotment from the Federal Government equal to the unemployment compensation rate paid by the State in which he resides.

This, of course, will not be in addition to unemployment compensation for those who are attending these classes are no longer eligible for unemployment compensation. (At the present time all but 15 States in America prohibit those on unemployment compensation from attending retraining classes as the laws in the 39 States explicitly say that "the recipient of unemployment compensation must be able to go to work immediately if called upon to do so." There is a move on to correct this as it is now recognized that everyone should have the opportunity to secure additional education in order to improve their capability. However, the correction cannot be made under this particular legislation—it must be a separate bill presented by the Ways and Means Committee.)

The courses, under the Holland bill, will be given under vocational school supervision and on-the-job training and will be no longer than 52 weeks in duration.

In order to qualify for such training, the applicant will apply to the State employment offices and there he will be given necessary tests to find out his aptitude and ability. He will then be counseled as to what course he should take.

The courses recommended and taught will be in skills which will be needed in the years ahead.

In order to assure those taking part in this program that they will not be taught needless skills, the Holland bill has provided that authority be given to the Secretary of Labor to conduct a nationwide survey on our manpower needs and our manpower resources.

There is little doubt that many of the long-term unemployed are undereducated for our highly automated industrial world, and unless we help them to secure additional educational opportunities, the remainder of their lives will be spent on public assistance rolls at the full expense of the taxpayer.

The cost of the program, under the Holland bill, has been estimated to be approximately $260 million for 2 years. Those who oppose it state we cannot afford to spend this money now.

I would like to point out that our public relief rolls are continually growing and today we are spending over $2 billion a year—that is State, county, and Federal costs. If we can get a program, such as I have suggested, underway, I am sure the public assistance rolls can be reduced, little by little. I firmly believe we cannot afford not to put this program into effect.

The Department of Labor expects to get at least 200,000 retrained and reemployed under this program, thereby letting these people again support their families, educate their children, live as human beings and contribute to the national economy with their purchasing power.

The Secretary of Labor will find out the plans of our industries and our businesses and their need for specified manpower in the next 5 or 10 years. This will be based on an estimate, of course, for we all know that every successful industry or business enterprise has plans for their future. However, their cooperation is needed if we hope to have full employment and an expanding economy here in the Nation.

When the needs of our industrial society are known, the Secretary of Labor can then specify the courses to be provided and financed by the Federal Government. The individual States will then be notified and through their departments of education such schooling can be offered the unemployed.

We recognize that even with the passage of the Holland bill, all our problems will not be solved. However, many of us feel that without it we will never be able to get many of our long-term unemployed off the relief rolls and enable them to become self-sustaining.

In 1959, a special educational census was conducted and it showed that we had 7.8 million functional illiteracies in our Nation—of these 2.6 million had never attended school. This total consisted of 6.4 percent of the white population over 25 years of age and 23.5 percent of the nonwhite population over 25 years of age. These people will become taxpayers again, and cease to become "taxtakers."

There will be some who say that under the recent Area Redevelopment Act a retraining program was offered and, up to date, it has not proved to be very successful. I would like to call their attention to the fact that the training provided under this act is only for 16 weeks, and in today's world of automation and technical skills, not much can be learned in 16 weeks, especially if any academic training is needed as is the case most of the time. Also, only those residing in certified depressed areas can receive this training.

Those opposing this bill—H.R. 8399—state that individual workers, under the free enterprise system, have the responsibility to secure additional education themselves. They also state that industries and businesses should be required to retrain those whose positions have been eliminated.

In answer to the first suggestion, unemployed workers cannot afford to pay for additional education, even if it is available.

As to having industries and businesses retrain those they dismiss, in the cases of large companies this may be feasible, but here I should like to point out that even Westinghouse Electric has just discontinued its apprentice training course. In the case of small companies—the cost would be too great.

Recently the Wall Street Journal had a feature story—"Job Outlook—Many Firms Will Boost Hiring, but Efficiency Increase Limits Needs." In the story it says: "The Nation's factory workers will find more jobs open in the early months of 1962 but probably not enough more to put back to work everyone furloughed during the recent recession." It further states: "The companies which do not need more workers now say they have no trouble finding unskilled or semi-skilled workers to man production lines, but for skilled workers, including machinists, draftsmen, and especially engineers, the story is often very different." Also the paper reported: "Other concerns are relying largely on greater efficiency rather than more workers to boost output."

In Houston, Tex., just several weeks ago, it was announced that there was in operation a wholly automated steel mill which produced seamless pipe.

In New York City, a wholly automated train was put into operation in the subway between Times Square and Grand Central Station. This was on a trial basis, but the handwriting is on the wall. Similar trains are now being suggested to solve the mass transit systems in many cities.

At Boeing Airplane Co.'s plant in Wichita, Kans., a piece of aluminum is lifted onto a machine bigger than a three-story house. After more than 100 operations, it comes out the wing skin of a B-52 plane. Nowhere in the machining process does a human hand touch the aluminum, nor is there a machinist standing by. A computer does the work.

At Food Machine and Chemical Corp.'s plant in Hoopeston, Ill., 80 holes are drilled and tapped in a piece of steel moving through another giant tool. The steel comes out a finished part for a food-processing machine. No human operator is in sight.

In Washington, D.C., a computer is coming to the rescue of lawyers who must wade through thousands of old cases in search of precedents. The project uses computers to track down information such as law case references and legislative history buried in the mass of legal literature. It is aimed at cutting to a minimum the delays and drudgery connected with research or merger or monopoly cases. At the hearings of my subcommittee last summer, it was reported that such a machine could—in 11 minutes—do the work now done in 7 hours by a law clerk.

These examples are just a few of what is ahead of us, what we can expect, and what we must prepare for.

While the Holland bill deals only with our long-term unemployed, the heads of families, so to speak, we realize the problem of our young people entering the labor market is one that must be faced and solved, also.

Let me point out that our young people must be encouraged to get as much education as possible.

Today, even, a high school diploma is seldom enough to secure a position. Last year one of the mills in Pittsburgh hired only young men with 1 or 2 years' college education for laboring jobs. Their argument was that in the years ahead—in order to grow with the company and the continual increasing use of technology—at least a basic college education was necessary.

Possibly if our high schools upgraded their curriculum and offered some technical training—definitely more mathematics, more languages, more science—our young people would be better fitted to work and live in the highly automated society we will have.

Possibly junior colleges must be opened in our cities and counties, providing additional educational opportunities to our youth thereby preparing them more adequately to earn a living, support and raise a family, and eventually take over the management of this Nation of ours.

We must remember today's youth—tomorrow's leaders.

The future of our Nation depends upon them. We must give them the best if we want America to remain a world leader.

As I stated earlier in this article, the administration is in favor of the Holland Manpower Development and Training Act and President Kennedy, in his state of the Union address stressed the importance of this act and asked for its immediate enactment.

He said that our unemployed "whose only skill has been replaced by a machine, or moved with a mill, or shut down with a mine" must be given the opportunity to secure retraining if we ever hope to have them return to work.

In recognition of the unemployment problem of our inadequately educated and trained youth, the President also asked that the Youth Employment Opportunities Act be passed this session.

The word "automation," that household term, is certainly changing our present way of life. It will be responsible for even greater changes in the years ahead.

Which Road for Transportation: Private Management or * * *?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, this is the second of a series of nine interviews in Traffic World, a transportation news magazine with persons vitally interested in the many and growing problems facing our Nation's transportation system and of course the entire economy and defense posture. The interview follows:

INTERVIEW 2

(James M. Landis, as assistant to President Kennedy, and a longtime student of the Government's role in transportation, is in a particularly significant position to comment on the direction Government may take in its future relationship with transportation.)

Is there any validity in the idea that the present regulatory scheme could be replaced by the antitrust laws?

No.

Should the Reorganization Act be amended to make clear that reorganization plans sent by the President to Congress should deal only with agencies in the executive branch, or with such executive duties as Congress has seen fit to entrust to the regulatory agencies?

I do not see why. The 1950 reorganization plans sent by President Truman to Congress were effective. There is no reason why all the agencies should not be made efficient. Generally speaking, the reorganization plans deal with executive duties, but not always. Take the Federal Maritime Board, which was set up under a reorganization plan. I object, and always do object, to interference by the executive department in the disposition of any particular problem which is before the regulatory agencies. But streamlining those agencies from the procedural standpoint under reorganization plans is all right. I do not see why that cannot be done by the initiative of the President, as well as of anyone else.

A bill introduced in the Senate would allow the President to remove from an independent agency any member who "frustrated" the President's plans. Would this not be an abrogation by Congress of its powers, since policy is made for the agencies by Congress?

I would not support a bill of the type you describe. The concept of an independent agency is simply contrary to the concept of that bill.

Is it not important that the lines of authority granted the President and Congress by the Constitution be kept clear?

It is a little difficult to keep those lines clear. It is the President's duty under the Constitution to see that the laws are faithfully executed and I think that applies to the laws entrusted to the independent agencies, as well as to any other laws. The President has a general responsibility to see that they are doing their job. That does not mean that he has any responsibility with regard to particular decisions they may make in any controversy. That's where the line of independence should be kept clear. But when they bog down with these tremendous backlogs, as they do today, I think the President has a legitimate concern with the problem.

Each of the regulatory acts has been expanded, but the extent is most clearly seen in the Interstate Commerce Act because it is the oldest of them. Is there any principle to be observed so that the ultimate expansion will not completely cover managerial discretion?

Let's consider our subsidy acts. You can't divorce the problem of the grant of subsidy from a concern with management. If management is incompetent and does plainly the wrong things, government has to be concerned with that. Otherwise it will mean outlay without control. You can't neglect to have some supervision over management under conditions of that nature. The general corporate laws provide some supervision over management. The securities acts also call for some kind of supervision to prevent management from doing certain things that it might otherwise do. But I think the design would be to give management as free a choice as possible. I do not think that you can lay down any principle. For example, pricing in various situations cannot be left simply to management—in connection with natural gas, electric power, or something like that, you have potential monopoly situations and you have to limit the discretion of management as to pricing policies. In the natural gas field, you have to restrict management from moving into territory occupied by someone else unless it seems to be in the public interest for competition to exist—which is true in many areas, such as in New York City, where you have three natural gas companies. But I do not think that you can lay down a principle. Public interest manifests itself in many different ways.

Is there any need at the moment to equalize the competitive situation of the railroads and the air, motor, and water carriers who use federally supported facilities; and, for the future, as between the air carriers and motor carriers of property?

There is a need to equalize the competitive situation of the various carriers. The railroads, for instance, bear their own user charges. The airlines, on the other hand, get many services free. So do the water carriers. I am definitely for an attempt to try to suggest that these various facilities bear some portion of the user charges they get free today. You can't immediately cast the full burden on the carriers, but the principle should be recognized and should be developed gradually as the industries themselves acquire the financial strength to bear the burden of these user charges. Right now it is a very difficult thing because most of these industries are not earning the kind of net income that they should be. The trunk airlines in the coming year will have to bear charges running from $20 to $30 million for additional safety equipment; taxes on aviation fuel will add some $30 million to their overall cost. Where are they going to get it from unless, somehow or other, their general status is improved? We all like to have the lowest possible rates for transportation, but we have established rates at a level where there is insufficient net return to the industry. The utility industry—which is, perhaps, one of the industries that are sound financially—is urging a return of some 10 percent on equity investment. Whether that is too high or too low is a matter of opinion, but certainly there must be a return which is compensatory.

You have suggested the possibility of relieving natural gas producers accounting for less than 10 percent of the total production from economic regulation. Could that idea be extended into the field of transportation regulation?

I do not know how that idea could be extended to the transportation industry. In the natural gas industry you have a peculiar situation—a tremendous concentration of big business. I do not think that characterizes the trucking industry, or even the railroad industry. The result of that concentration is that, with the economic power in that concentrated area, the small guys have to go along with the big guys, because, from the standpoint of the impact of their economic power on the price structure of the industry, it is negligible.

There has been criticism that the regulatory agencies administer their acts on a case-by-case basis. What other approach is there?

I think that that criticism is justifiable. There are other approaches. Take the airline field, for example. Instead of dealing with that on a case-by-case basis, which is the normal approach, something in the nature of overall planning of what the route system of this country should be seems to be a much more desirable approach than just taking up the applications of carriers and disposing of them. I had the same opinion with regard to another pressing problem; namely, the merger phase in railroading. I was a little disappointed at the decision of the ICC, when they declined to look at the eastern territory in this country as a whole from a higher standpoint, and saying: "All we are going to look at is the B. & O. and C. & O. merger."

That is what we call a case-by-case approach. What do you want to end up with in the eastern and western portions of the country from the standpoint of an overall rail system which will meet the real transportation needs of those areas? It may take longer; it may be harder work; but I think that is the proper approach. The same thing is true in the television field. What do you want? Generally speaking, our national programing needs change. I do not know the answer, but perhaps there should be some basic guidelines in that connection.

Should there be cooperation between such government groups as emergency boards and the regulatory agencies so that there would be an official determination of the effect of increased wages on the pricing of services, on the one hand, and, on the other, the effect on ability to maintain wages when rate reductions are proposed?

Isn't there some cooperation of that nature? I served on an emergency board in 1937, dealing with a national situation on the railroads. I certainly took into consideration in making my own judgment in that situation of the general status of the industry and the ability of the industry to pay the existing wages. I do not think it is so much the emergency boards which are the problem here. In a sense, it is the problem of labor, too, and still I have all sympathy with labor's general stand. The inability of labor to adjust itself to declines is a real problem. The short declines are not important, but when you get fundamental, overall declines in an industry, such as we obviously have in the railroad field, you have

a problem of operating expenses and reduction in revenue. Everybody has to pitch in.

There have been a number of recent studies of transportation and the Government's role in the field, and others are now underway. This constant reexamination suggests uneasiness as to the present state of things which seems to suggest a doubt that the transportation industry can continue to exist as private enterprise where regulation and promotion by the Government play so large a part. Will we, in short, be able to maintain the area of free enterprise that is now left? How?

I don't know. It really requires a prophet to answer that. I think the objective is to try to maintain private enterprise in these fields as much as possible. But when you realize that the Government is the largest creditor in the transport enterprise, and if it is forced into receivership or something of that nature, the Government may come out of that receivership owning a part of that enterprise. That is only fair, but it doesn't want to. I am not a strong proponent of the concept of nationalization of our transportation system, but I do not see how anybody can predict what the impact of transportation trends on various industries is going to be. You have such examples as interurban business. From a national standpoint that is not important. But I can't see that as true today with regard to our rail system or with regard to conditions of service in metropolitan areas. National interest seeks for the survival of a system of that nature since we do not have any adequate substitute. Highways are not a complete substitute. So we have to maintain those services somehow or other. It may be that considerable expenditures of public funds will be necessary in order to maintain them. I can see the possibility of a sort of creeping nationalization. I do not think many people want it. The general public does not want it. I do not think people in Government of any consequence are looking to its coming.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Trinity River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, early in December 1961 I was privileged to be a principal at the hearing held in Fort Worth, Tex., for the purpose of hastening development of the Trinity River as a major navigation channel linking our great Fort Worth-north Texas commercial complex with the coast.

The hearing was attended by 1,400 enthusiastic supporters of the project, underscoring the growing public consciousness of the tremendous significance this great waterway development will have for the entire area.

A recent issue of the Waterways Journal—January 27, 1962—took editorial notice of the expanding need for us to authorize development of this and other much needed water resources.

The text of this splendid editorial follows:

NEW AUTHORIZATION BILL

The impressive attendance at the recent hearing in Fort Worth, Tex., on the proposal to improve the Trinity River for navigation as far upstream as Fort Worth emphasizes the urgent need for a new authorization bill by Congress in 1962. The development of the Trinity Basin is but one of a number of water resources development projects which should be included in a new authorization bill for rivers and harbors. The fact that an estimated 1,400 persons turned out for the hearing is evidence of the growing public awareness of the need to speed up water resources development.

There was convincing evidence produced at the hearing to justify advancing the timetable on the improvement of the Trinity River. Col. R. P. West, the U.S. district engineer, reported that a survey indicates that if the waterway could be used at this time it would carry about 5,500,000 tons of freight annually, a figure comparable to the Galveston Channel project. The projected capacity of the navigation channel is 20 million tons annually, and the benefit-cost ratio for the $712 million project is well above the standard set for other waterway links. As Congressman JIM WRIGHT, of Texas, pointed out, there are no serious engineering problems involved and he insisted the project is "indispensable to the entire State."

In considering a new authorization bill one of the factors which Congress must keep in mind is the rapid growth of population and industry in areas like the Southwest and Southeast. It is obvious that much of the economic growth of the future will come in these areas which in the past have not been highly industrialized. The direct relationship between industrial growth and the waterways is shown in the tremendous industrial expansion along the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway in south Texas.

There are many other projects which should be authorized now so that efficient and economical construction schedules can be maintained—and more important so the improvements can be put to use. The improvement of the Kaskaskia River in Illinois, which would open the rich coalfields of that State to expanding markets is one example.

The extension of the navigation channel on the Missouri River beyond Sioux City is another. Consideration must be given to needed expansion of links already improved for navigation. In this category, Congress certainly should not delay in authorizing the system of twin locks for the Illinois Waterway. Traffic on this waterway has been increasing rapidly and it is obvious that a serious bottleneck will result if the lock capacity is not expanded by the construction of new locks.

Congress did not pass an authorization bill last year. Enactment of a comprehensive bill approving projects in many parts of the Mississippi Basin, should have high priority on the legislative agenda in 1962.

Arlington Heritage: Vignettes of a Virginia County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by U.S. District Judge Albert V. Bryan in commendation of a very fine book, entitled "Arlington Heritage: Vignettes of a Virginia County," by Eleanor Lee Templeman.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARLINGTON HERITAGE: VIGNETTES OF A VIRGINIA COUNTY

From the time the Necostins—a tribe of Powhatan's Confederacy—abandoned their village until the site was taken over for the present Marriott Motor Hotel, the people, the happenings, and the interests of Arlington County (formerly Alexandria County and earlier a part of Fairfax County), Va., have been intimately related to this Commonwealth and the Nation. Charles I took away the alluring offshore islands of this part of Virginia when he gave the Potomac River in its entirety to the Lord Proprietor of Maryland with the royal grant of that land. The area was embraced in the Constitution's "10 miles square" prescribed by the Founding Fathers for the "seat of the Government of the United States," but upon a plebiscite of the inhabitants, it rejoined Virginia in 1846.

Henry Clay dueled for his honor and, incidentally, his life in a secluded glen there. Meanwhile, for his Custis stepchildren and their children, General Washington had planned their stately homes within the neighborhood. Along the tributaries of the Potomac, these gentry established gristmills for the use of themselves and equally for their neighbors. Robert E. Lee had scarcely left Arlington House for Richmond to accept his commission in the army of his native Virginia, when the Federal troops crossed from Washington to occupy the county.

Fortunately, all of this and a gratifying recognition of the fine old families of the county have been delectably chronicled. With single-subject stories and with early and contemporaneous photographs, including reproductions of treasured portraits, Eleanor Lee Templeman recounts in "Arlington Heritage: Vignettes of a Virginia County," the personages, the homes, the schools, the churches with their glebes, the great commercial canal carried by aqueduct above and over the Potomac, and the other prides of the county. Encampments and activities of the Federal troops of occupation, too, are recalled in authentic camera pictures. The individuals of whom she writes are not those who once slept in Arlington County—they lived in it.

Not an omnium-gatherum, the attractive volume is a tastily selective record. It evinces the hard, factual appraisal of the honest historian, a knowledge of the real values of life and a feeling of what, for all time, is beautiful. So painsworthy a task exacted, and to it was generously devoted, painstaking research. The accuracy—the marrow of history—of the sketches and their condensation—the gem of words—are gently softened by the feathery touch of the author's style.

Northern Virginia—the text runs over into Alexandria and Fairfax County—is especially Mrs. Templeman's obligor. Though born beyond the marches of the Old Dominion, upon reaching the years of discretion she naturally and altogether fitly came back to Virginia. She now resides in the area represented by her great-great-grandfather, Richard Bland Lee, as its first Congressman, where also lived his brother, the renowned "Light Horse Harry" Lee, and where, too, her direct ascendant, John Roberts, was mayor of Alexandria and at times the host of Lafayette. Her book is indeed another of the felicitous events in Arlington County.

The Bay State's Sickest River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Boston Globe on February 12, 1962, concerning the Merrimack River:

THE BAY STATE'S SICKEST RIVER

Since the formation of the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission in 1947 remarkable progress has been made in classifying and cleaning up various

Bay State rivers. The work along the Connecticut River, for example, has been nothing less than spectacular with community after community building or planning sewage treatment plants.

The worst river in the State remains the Merrimack from Lowell to the sea. This is Massachusetts' second largest stream, and long little better in places than an open sewer. Today, however, the opportunity for an abatement program was never better. It deserves response from the legislature and the people of the cities and towns favored by the river.

The first order of business in correcting the condition of the Merrimack River must be a new study of the valley and the stream. None has been done since 1946. That was the year before the formation of the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission. In the intervening years, the departure of much of the textile industry to the South has greatly diminished the discharge of industrial waste into the river.

The years have also brought an increasing demand for use of the river for boating and recreation. Classification of the stream soon to be made by the Department of Public Health, however, will probably put most of it downstream from Lowell in class D, two classes below what is considered suitable for swimming.

The future will probably find more communities turning to the Merrimack for drinking water. Lawrence has long used the water from the river, putting it through a most complicated purifying process. Lowell is considering the use of river water for drinking purposes. The inevitable growth of the other communities as a result of the population expansion in the State will increase the need for bathing areas and the necessity of using the river for drinking water.

It is unlikely that any greater percentage of Federal aid will be made available to the communities along the banks of the river than is now offered. The hope for some special appropriation has led some of them to delay studies and construction. They should delay no longer. The chance to abate the pollution of the Merrimack was never greater. The legislature can start the project rolling.

Turkey Watchers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial written by Mr. Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, which appeared in the February 1962 issue of the Nation's Agriculture, entitled "Turkey Watchers." This editorial outlines the importance of the turkey producers rejecting the effort of the present Department of Agriculture to socialize their industry.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TURKEY WATCHERS

(By Charles B. Shuman)

Bird watching is a pleasant and interesting hobby enjoyed by many amateur naturalists. If the U.S. Department of Agriculture proposal for national turkey marketing orders is approved in a referendum vote by producers, turkey watchers may be added to the already overburdened Federal payroll. The proposed turkey control scheme would establish quotas for hatcheries and attempt to control the marketing of some 100 million birds produced by about 30,000 farmers.

We know about turkey buzzards, turkey roosts, turkey wings, "Turkey in the Straw," the turkey trot, and the turkey gobble—when controls are invoked, black-market turkeys and turkey "leggers" will be added to our vocabulary. They will result in a national turkey watch with Federal agents to count the eggs and police the poults. This Government-directed turkey birth-control project will not be simple or cheap.

As with all political production controls, the small flock owners will be exempt and also ineligible to vote in the referendum. Approximately 90 percent of U.S. flocks are of 400 birds or less. This is another Government control to help the small farmer by denying him a voice in a program designed to keep him small.

Included in the proposed order program is authority for compulsory checkoff deductions to finance research, and surplus disposal, and schemes of all kinds to be administered by a Government-supervised commission. With an army of turkey watchers counting eggs, the rationing of poults by hatcheries, a compulsory checkoff and broad new authorities granted the Secretary of Agriculture, the proposed order is a far cry from a producer-directed self-help plan as it is called by the proponents.

Why the sudden rush to impose national turkey orders? Hearings were hastily scheduled for Thanksgiving week when many growers were so busy they could not participate. Are the controllers and planners afraid that farmers will adjust production and that prices will improve before they can slap on the controls?

One important cause of the excessive 1961 crop of turkeys was the scramble by producers to build up a good base—they were told that controls were coming. Once imposed, the orders would be virtually impossible to repeal. Termination of an order requires a no vote by a majority of all producers—not just a majority of those voting—and this majority must account for more than 50 percent of the total production for market. In the last 5 years there is no record of any farmer referendum with a total vote of as many as 50 percent of those eligible—only 20 percent of the eligible wheat producers voted in 1961.

The national turkey marketing order program is intended to be the first of many such devices to control the producers of all agricultural commodities. It is the entering wedge—the foot in the door that leads to marketing order controls on livestock, dairy, poultry, fruit and vegetable farmers. It will inevitably lead to the replacement of the relatively successful local milk orders with a huge federally directed national milk marketing order with individual producer controls. Yes, all farmers have a tremendous stake in the battle now raging in the turkey industry.

This is one referendum that must not be ignored. The Federal payrollers will be busy getting out the yes votes. As the Ohio State ASC Committee said after the wheat farmers of that State voted against controls—"Your State committee feels that we have our work cut out for us before another referendum is held."

United States Using Dual Envoy System?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, there is little wonder why the European diplomats are confused as to who is enunciating the U.S. foreign policy. Could it be Robert Kennedy, Edward Kennedy, Dean Rusk, Pierre Salinger, or the President? Constantine Brown pinpoints this subject in his column in the Washington Star of February 17. Under leave to insert my own remarks and include extraneous matter, I am including a copy of his column:

UNITED STATES USING DUAL ENVOY SYSTEM?

ROME.—American diplomats, harassed by the complexities of Washington's policies, complain that most of the continental foreign offices are still imbued with the spirit of the frock coat diplomacy of the turn of the century. And puzzlement is expressed privately by France, Germany and the Benelux countries who want to know whether it is the State Department professionals or the White House special amateurs who represent our policies.

There is considerable wonderment in Europe over the role entrusted by President Kennedy to his press secretary, Pierre Salinger, as a go-between with the Kremlin. Few accept the statement that his forthcoming dealings are intended merely to improve communications between America and the Soviet Union. The consensus here is that he will lay the foundation for a Kennedy-Khrushchev meeting.

The press secretary's ability to handle press problems is not questioned. But, say the frock-coat-minded European diplomats, this does not warrant his handling negotiation problems in which he will find himself beyond his depth.

American diplomatic missions abroad give assurances that Mr. Salinger will not intrude in the field of diplomacy when he visits Moscow. But these assurances are accepted skeptically. His talks with the Soviet propaganda chief in Paris last month have been a well-kept secret. So have the long conversations of President Kennedy and Mr. Salinger with Premier Khrushchev's son-in-law, Alexei Adzhubei.

These antics of the unofficial American diplomacy have been partially the reason for a demand for direct negotiations between West Germany and the Soviet Union from a large segment of German public opinion and politicians, including the leader of the Liberal Party, Dr. Mende, on whose support depends the life of Chancellor Adenauer's government.

It took the whole prestige of the veteran Adenauer to induce the German Government to reject the latest Soviet approach for direct negotiations. But there are many in Bonn who ask themselves whether this prestige will be sufficient to thwart another Kremlin effort if the Salinger mission to Moscow does something other than improve communications.

There is even more puzzlement over our attitude toward the Dutch, who have tried to reinforce their weak garrison in New Guinea, than over our stand in the Congo and our lack of reaction when India pushed the Portuguese out of Goa. The situation in West Iran, from the point of view of

the European diplomats, is far more clear than on either of the other occasions.

Indonesia's President Sukarno has announced he will take West Iran by force unless the Dutch abandon it to him. He is backing his word with concentrations of naval, air and ground forces. He has already attempted a small-scale invasion which was frustrated by Dutch destroyers.

The Hague government is on record that it is ready to give the native Papuans self-determination and complete freedom. But as trustees of these primitive people they oppose their conquest by Mr. Sukarno.

In the face of the growing threat from the Indonesians, who have been supported by Moscow with warships, landing craft and bombers, the Dutch want to increase their capabilities to resist aggression, not to keep West Iran for themselves but for the native Papuans. We have refused this NATO ally the use of our landing fields to refuel their planes transporting a few hundred men to bolster New Guinea against Sukarno aggression.

The unofficial explanation given the world informally by no less a person than Attorney General Robert Kennedy was that we were born out of revolution and favor revolutions or actions which put an end to colonialism.

The Western Europeans are more versed in history than the Attorney General, President Kennedy's goodwill ambassador. They point out that the American Revolution was not started by the natives (the Indians) but by the settlers themselves. That is to say, the colonists from Britain, Germany and the European countries who sought freedom on the American continent and rose against the colonialism of the London government. And that is far different from what has happened between Katanga and the rest of the Congo, and especially between the Dutch and the Indonesians.

Our dual diplomacy—that exercised by those authorized to deal with foreign affairs by the Constitution and confirmed by the Senate for such purpose and that of the unofficial representatives of the White House, is an object of unending puzzlement to the Western European foreign offices. Which of these presidential representatives represent actual American policy? This is a question which our ambassadors have some difficulty in answering.

North Dakota Poll on National Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a tabulation showing the results of a poll which I recently conducted in North Dakota. I believe that Members of the Senate will find it as interesting and helpful as I have.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

These are the results of 7,156 questionnaires thus far returned from approximately 30,000 mailed out. With one or two minor exceptions I believe it represents a fairly good cross section of public thinking. It includes all Republican precinct committeemen, but not all Democrat precinct committeemen. (This list not available in time.) About twice as many farmers returned questionnaires as those from other occupations. This percentage of farmers is higher than their actual percentage of the total population. The poll was very interesting and most helpful to me. I was especially pleased with the great number of friendly personal comments. ("F" where used means farmers; "NF" means nonfarmers.)

1. How would you appraise President Kennedy's record during his first year in office?

Good: F, 1858; NF, 613; total, 2471.

Fair: F, 2,112; NF, 1,339; total, 3,451.

Poor: F, 681; NF, 434; total, 1,115.

2. Which do you believe represents the greatest danger to our national economy?

Internal Communist subversion: F, 3,430; NF, 1,865; total, 5,295.

Russia's armed forces: F, 784; NF, 421; total, 1,205.

3. Presently we are providing all the military equipment, technical advice, training and all of the financial support to Vietnam in her war against Communist guerrillas. If it should appear that Vietnam would lose, would you favor sending American troops to help them?

Yes: F, 1,480; NF, 972; total, 2,452.

No: F, 2,463; NF, 1,197; total, 3,660.

4. Do you believe the foreign aid program should be—

Continued: F, 568; NF, 274; total, 842.

Abolished: F, 580; NF, 313; total, 893.

Less and limited to anti-Communist nations: F, 3,311; NF, 1,732; total, 5,043.

5. What importance do you attach to balancing the national budget?

Great importance: F, 2,825; NF, 1,717; total, 4,542.

Some importance: F, 1,464; NF, 579; total, 2,043.

No importance: F, 266; NF, 74; total, 340.

6. Do you favor the administration's proposal for Federal aid to education?

Yes: F, 1,670; NF, 595; total, 2,265.

No: F, 2,823; NF, 1,780; total, 4,603.

7. Do you believe that farm price supports for wheat, corn, barley, rye, flax, oats, soybeans, dairy commodities, wool, etc., should be:

Abolished: F, 542; NF, 352; total, 894.

Gradually discontinued: F, 1,355; NF, 1,298; total, 2,653.

Continued and improved: F, 2,606; NF, 698; total, 3,304.

8. What do you think of the wheat price support program in effect for 1962?

Good: F, 1,257; NF, 333; total 1,590.

Fair: F, 2,224; NF, 1,092; total, 3,316.

Poor: F, 1,007; NF, 700; total, 1,707.

9. What do you think of the feed grain program in effect for 1962?

Good: F, 857; NF, 264; total, 1,121.

Fair: F, 1,691; NF, 784; total, 2,475.

Poor: F, 1,856; NF, 1,054; total, 2,910.

10. Congress is definitely considering the substitution of bushel allotments for acreage allotments in next year's wheat program. If, in determining bushel allotments, the same yields per acre would be used as those for diversion payments, which of the two plans would you prefer:

Bushel allotments: F, 2,725; NF, 1,186; total, 3,911.

Acreage allotments: F, 1,626; NF, 524; total, 2,150.

11. Which do you think is the best plan for providing additional REA power generating facilities for North Dakota?

Lignite electric: F, 3,194; NF, 1,744; total, 4,938.

Basin electric: F, 655; NF, 201; total, 856.

In several respects the returns from this questionnaire would indicate some conservative trend. For example, in a similar poll conducted 2 years ago North Dakotans favored Federal aid to education by a 3-to-2 vote. This poll indicates this thinking is completely reversed. While there is still strong sentiment for price supports among farmers, there is more criticism than previously.

Mobilizing Free World Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in over a decade, the Honorable Alf M. Landon came to Washington for a visit last month. As he said, the visit was to renew old friendships and see old acquaintances. During his visit to Washington, the National Press Club invited Mr. Landon to speak. Mr. Landon accepted and on December 8, 1961, delivered the following address. I am sure that all Members of Congress will find Mr. Landon's remarks of interest:

MOBILIZING FREE WORLD POWER

(By Alf M. Landon)

It is time to wake up. Our dreams for a civilized approach to world problems through the United Nations have been shattered by fast-moving recent events. We can no longer afford to confuse our high hopes for improvement in relationships between governments with the reality of retreats in the face of imperial Communist offensive throughout the world.

In the coming months, many governments will make great decisions in foreign affairs that will shape the destiny of mankind. These governments are basing their decisions on the answer to the question, Who has power and the nerve to wield it? They no longer trust the efficacy of the United Nations. And they cannot be impressed with the mere advertising of the United States as the world's dominant military and economic power when they consider:

1. Imperial communism has, in the year 1961, successfully consolidated a beachhead in North Vietnam with one in Laos. That beachhead places South Vietnam in jeopardy and outflanks Formosa, Japan, and South Korea. It confronts Thailand, Cambodia, the Philippines, Indonesia, and Australia.

2. In 1961 imperial communism has successfully completed a beachhead in Cuba, on our doorstep, and is busily trying to expand it into other great countries in the Western Hemisphere.

3. In 1961—imperial communism has successfully completed a beachhead in Eastern Germany—in the heart of Europe. It has warned Finland once again to watch its steps.

The Soviet has capitalized on this display of power to undercut the United Nations as an agency for peace and the regional collective security organizations as agencies for defense. Communist efforts have led to insecurity and timidity among non-Communist peoples.

Communist imperial strategy has demonstrated that the greater the insecurity resulting from Soviet imperialism, the greater the unwillingness of some people to risk their own hides by opposing it. Like ostriches, they bury their heads in the sand to shut out the present, leaving their sure fate to the future.

This timidity is and can be the only explanation for the failure of the United Nations delegates to respond to our President's reasonable, fair, and logical exposition of the vital concern to small nations of a strong United Nations.

Despite vigorous efforts of the American delegates, the United Nations General Assembly could only meekly resolve to appeal to Khrushchev for a moratorium on nuclear tests.

It was Russia—not the United States—which broke the voluntary moratorium on atomic testing in this crime against humanity. Yet fearful neutrals continue to insist that the United States poses a threat to peace equal to that presented by the Soviet Union and Cuba.

All this indicates that world opinion—by and large—has been intimidated by naked power. At this stage in history, raw power obviously speaks with greater authority than Western humanism—and contempt for the U.N. outweighs our hopes for that organization to maintain peace.

These are the unfortunate facts of life today. These are facts of life that cannot be met by the pretense that a strong and effective United Nations exists. The U.N. repeatedly has failed to maintain order against the Communist bloc—just as the League of Nations would not maintain order against the Fascist bloc.

And let us not delude ourselves that the Soviet is honest in its disarmament negotiations. Lord Home, the British Foreign Minister, said to the House of Lords, speaking of the Geneva disarmament negotiations, "Not only were the negotiators duped, but the Russian people were deceived." It is apparent that Soviet promises are always written on water and that the history of disarmament or reduction of arms or control of arms negotiations with Russia is a completely barren one. That is not the result of an impasse. It is a gigantic hoax by the Soviet to keep us diverted from the real business of organizing what Senator FULBRIGHT has called a concert of free nations.

It is the height of folly, at the present time, to talk blithely of disarmament, world government, a real world court, a rule of law, or world citizenship—or to refer to the United Nations as the "bulwark for peace." If the U.N. is to be saved and to be developed as the bulwark for peace in the future, it will not be as a result of that kind of talk which is so unrealistic under present conditions. When the League of Nations was dying, there was the same willingness to ignore its fundamental weaknesses. It was argued that, if the league could exist long enough, it would prevail in the end. Such contentions only serve to create further confusion. Such wishful thinking only serves to distract attention from the real state of affairs—a state of affairs which proclaims that blind faith in the United Nations—in NATO—in SEATO—in CENTO—as they now exist—as surely means suicide for the non-Communist world as would reliance on unilateral defense to combat Communist imperialism.

We cannot survive—much less win—the causes of peace and freedom unless we recognize the heartbreaking fact that we must subordinate our aspirations for a better life for mankind to the realistic necessity of firmness in meeting the ongoing expansion of the Communist police states. We must pool the strength—the alertness and the resources of the free peoples to meet the threats of that brutal tyranny. We must extend and emphasize the counterthreat of nuclear defense—to give ourselves time to develop new forces more competent to deal with world problems than those now based on irrelevant methods and principles.

The alternative to nuclear war or supine surrender is solidifying the free world into a massive power bloc to meet the threats of imperial communism. That requires the bold adaptation and expansion of existing policies and organizations rather than the establishment of new ones. Despite their weaknesses, these organizations can be developed into an efficient force to meet what our President rightfully calls "the most dangerous time in the history of the human race." Such a development should proceed along the following lines:

1. Coordinate and strengthen our multilateral engagements—global and regional. We should revamp our regional defense systems—NATO—SEATO—CENTO—to merge and pool their military forces in a really cooperative association with unified command to maintain peace in the world and defend equity and justice.

I know that there will be those who will again argue that this involves the surrender of national sovereignty. That contention has little meaning now, for we in effect surrendered national sovereignty by entering into organizations which operated even on the basis of unanimous consent. In fact, our national intentions have been frequently frustrated by the unanimous consent procedure to a greater extent than they would have been under majority rule. Despite our enormous influence among non-Communist countries, America's foreign policies have been frequently nullified and rejected under the unanimous consent rule. Unanimous consent works to promote dissent rather than unity among free peoples. It exaggerates the power of the timid and the gullible. It is the seedbed of negative policies rather than of positive ones.

Last January, our President—in his first TV press interview—virtually issued an ultimatum to imperial communism on Laos. Secretary of State Rusk left immediately to meet with other SEATO representatives. Britain and France vetoed the American policy. Today basic differences exist among Britain, France, and the United States on the Berlin issue.

Under a majority rule, there would be more pressure to carry out decisions on policies and to keep commitments than in a situation where any one nation can exercise a veto. We would stand a better and a fairer chance to implement our policies if we needed to persuade only a majority of the fairness of those policies. In effect, that would strengthen the positive exercise of our national sovereignty in contrast with the system which now more frequently than not prevents the implementation of positive American proposals.

Furthermore, application of the majority procedure would strengthen the chances of developing a single central military command to carry out decisions. Necessity—as well as mutual interest—would operate to bring this about. That necessity—that mutual interest—is the need to unify non-Communist economic and military power to operate effectively against Communist unity. It is the same necessity and interest that brought about the Common Market of Europe. It is the same necessity and interest that forced nations arrayed against Hitler and Mussolini to put their military forces under one supreme commander. It is the necessity and interest that will allow us to unify effectively the exercise of non-Communist power for the defense of peace. But this necessity and interest will be stymied unless we set aside the idea that effective action can result from the debates of associated nations operating as a legislative committee under unanimous consent rules.

2. Military mobilization of free peoples is, however, not enough. It must be supplemented with economic mobilization. The Communist tactics of subversion have never been purely military. They represent an energetic combination of political and economic action—and monumental trickery and butchery.

I urge that we support the expansion of the concept of the Common Market of Europe to include all nations everywhere that are willing to join a cooperative enterprise to create higher standards of living in all countries by freer exchange of goods and services. Already starts in that direction have been made by the great countries to the south of us in the Organization of Central American States in 1951—the alliance for progress program—Organization of American States—and Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—which the United States and Canada have joined. It may be that the urgency of the hour and America's participation in these organizations will provide that necessary coordination to make such international organizations the bulwark that they must be against communism. Although far from being going concerns—they are existing vehicles that are available for developing a regional plan to mesh with European Common Market operations.

The tremendous release of energy—raising wages—improving working conditions—generated by the European Common Market—is a more explosive shock to the economic and political policies of the world—than Russian thermonuclear bomb testing.

The United States of America will not be able to ignore—or to sit on the lid of—that economic development in Europe—by its own tariff and trade policies. Spreading repercussions of common market policies are evident. The obvious pull on Great Britain is from across the English Channel—just as it will be to strengthen West German ties with Europe.

Our national administration's trade discussion and leadership—so far—is confined to congressional legislation renewing and extending President Kennedy's authority in negotiating reciprocal tariff and other agreements.

I believe the issues are much broader and more basic than that. It is the job of our national administration to bring into focus—in conjunction with the leadership of the European Common Market—all the factors involved in the momentous decisions facing us. Legislation of sufficient scope must be enacted to give our President authority to construct a bridge to working relationships between America—the European Common Market and other great nations where we have highly important trade and political relationships.

The problems of living with the European Common Market expanded to include England and the other nations of Europe—are not going to be temporary. The European Common Market will increasingly and fundamentally change world trade conditions. Decisions by its leadership will have a decisive effect in shaping the destiny of the world.

As European prosperity increases and a higher standard of living develops—that economic union may—without the United States and other nations—solidify into a third power bloc that could follow policies of accommodation with Communist countries. That development would split the free world and would have a momentous worldwide impact on peace and freedom. Economic cooperation of all free peoples would prevent that.

It is not going to be easy to persuade the members of the European Common Market to agree to the admission of the United States—even if we want to join up in this great bulwark for peace and democratic processes. After 2 years of discussion over Great Britain—the Common Market nations are still undecided on what the ultimate structure should be and who should be in it.

Time is now running out and the hour for decision approaches for anti-Communist peoples. We must work to see that the right decisions are made. The emerging problems are so enormous—and policies so far reaching—that all Americans everywhere will be affected in one way or another—forever more—even the girl that sells ribbons in a store.

Prime Minister Macmillan said recently, speaking of Great Britain's application for membership, "If Europe does not achieve this degree of unity and common purpose, there is little chance of our rising to meet the

challenge of today." The truth of this statement goes beyond Europe—for it is the anti-Communist world that must recognize what the common purpose is and strive for the unity to accomplish it.

That purpose is to maintain freedom as a vital force in the lives of men. Is there any alternative to meeting the problems posed by the strategic positions and influence of Communist nations in Asia and Europe and in the Western Hemisphere? Is there any alternative to meeting the threat of increasing use of Russian products to create economic chaos in the world?

The peril in which the free peoples now find themselves justifies serious and immediate consideration of drastic political measures. Those peoples who have determined not to live under the tyranny and terror of a Communist police state must act decisively to rise above their present illusions. They must act firmly and realistically to save themselves.

Our leadership must be bold in this matter and the response of our associates prompt. Free peoples simply do not have time to waste while making these momentous decisions. Again, national sovereignty is not the issue; the issue is the building of a bulwark against the constant advances of the Communist bloc.

In the economic sphere, we must recognize that it is no longer acceptable to build a trade policy either on the basis of the theory of tariff protection or the theory of complicated reciprocity agreements and quotas. The former makes for disunity and the latter leads to uncertainty in economic relations. We can afford neither disunity nor uncertainty when confronted by an enemy which feeds on these commodities. American industry, labor, and agriculture should know definitely what trade policies they would face and be able to plan accordingly.

Obviously, we are forced to work out a trade agreement with the European Common Market. The question simply is whether we are willing to take advantage of that to pull together a more powerful bloc for peace than the Communist bloc that intends to bury us either economically or with nuclear bombs.

In other words, I place as much emphasis on using the European Common Market as a national survival policy as I do a trade policy.

There is nothing new in joint economic development plans as a design for peaceful conditions in the world. That has been urged by many for long years.

Common trade ties are a sure way of creating common political ties and common political ties knit unity. Trade situations influence political situations—international as well as domestic. For an illustration, agricultural commodities—like sugar and wheat—are important factors in international relations. Common political policies backed by common military resources and power, and the will to use them for peace, are the surest way of insuring a new birth of freedom and human decency in the world.

Let me say to the leaders of American labor, agriculture, and industry, that it would be the height of folly to be more concerned about attempting to maintain the American wage scale or American profit scale, than girding our loins to meet a more dangerous foreign foe than Hitler and the Nazis. Yet by pursuing Common Market policies, we can have our cake and eat it too. The history of the Common Market of Europe gives evidence that removal of barriers to trade, commerce, and industry all over the world will open a greater market for U.S. products than we have ever known.

Aside from that, it is rapidly coming down to a Hobson's choice, for the gathering momentum of the European Common Market is uniting all of Western Europe—bargaining for the whole—instead of each government for itself.

The Common Market of Europe—while providing free trade for its member nations—can erect tariff walls and quotas against imports from outsiders.

That can hit a heavy blow to American exports to Europe, particularly on agricultural products. With England joining the European Common Market our trade will be further handicapped. Either all-inclusive European Common Market principles must embrace all free nations willing to participate or America must build decisive counterpolicies. If we do nothing or if we attempt to act alone, it is plainly evident that, sooner or later, America is going to face increasing trade isolation.

The position we are in is not unique. Great Britain was confronted with the same problem and made the necessary decision to break with the past, over the objections of other Commonwealth countries—when it applied for membership in the Common Market. The reason for such a fundamental change in English policies is, as Mr. Macmillan recognized, that "the times require such a step to guarantee protection of the free way of life in Western Europe." Can we afford to be less realistic than the British in striving for the protection of the free way of life in the world?

Just about the first requirement for America's admittance to the Common Market will be a balanced budget—a budget balanced to halt the ravages of inflation and to check the present draining of American gold.

Last September, Secretary of the Treasury Dillon was forced by England and France to pledge the balancing of our budget in 1963—before the United States could get credit from the International Monetary Fund. If we are not wondering about overcommitting ourselves financially, our friends and enemies are. Steady weakening of the American dollar by continued inflation and an unfavorable trade balance could lead to climactic cold war victory for the Russians and Chinese. The development of a world trade community should lead to a reduction in the volume of our foreign aid expenditures—the launching of sound enterprises—for the developing members of the community, and through the community's natural operations, could provide new opportunities for the developing nations to achieve decent living standards by their own efforts.

This question is not one that affects just industry—labor and finance. It encompasses agriculture as well.

The European Common Market—a great trade area in the world—has a population of 220 million consumers—with Great Britain—and may soon reach 300 million with other NATO countries.

That huge prosperous area will provide a growing market for increasingly efficient mass-produced farm products. That would mean greater prosperity for the American farmer—freeing him from Government controls and freeing the taxpayer from paying crop support subsidies. Therefore, it would be to the benefit of the United States and other interested nations to participate in Common Market arrangements. It would also benefit the present Common Market nations.

The resultant strength of the merging of these forces will be the greatest the world has ever seen. It would be overwhelming by any index of power, prosperity, and distribution.

I know what I am suggesting in terms of a revamping of free world military and economic organizations has far-reaching political ramifications. I know that our chances of accomplishing these reorganizations quickly are problematical. But it is even more problematical that the free world will survive—much less prosper—on the basis of the methods and principles under which it has been operating. What we must keep in mind is that the improbable—in terms of solutions—is not the impossible. We have an obligation to ourselves and our posterity; we have an obligation to our ideals—to strike out boldly to achieve a massive solidified power bloc. We must remind ourselves of the truth of the old Revolutionary War slogan, "We must all hang together, or assuredly we shall all hang separately."

The time is past for any nation to travel alone in the present kind of world. The time is also past to put our trust in now out-of-date military alliances. The new approach must start with the present member nations of NATO and with the European Common Market. The United States must take the leadership in extending and strengthening these and similar organizations to consolidate and unify the military, economic and political resources of the free peoples. This process must operate to develop the most powerful bloc the world has ever known.

We are in a new type of struggle for the welfare of humanity and it must be fought in new ways—ways that even 6 months ago would have been passed off as fantastic. It is imperative that we take community action—united action by the community of freemen—instead of action by an ill-coordinated collection of nations.

By pooling their resources and activities—freemen could meet successfully the Communist threats in Asia—in Africa—in Europe and in the Western Hemisphere.

The Communist empire—with authority resting on the old imperialistic base of force—would have to change its policies and tactics of subversion, deception, and assassinations against such an alinement of power by free peoples.

Exposed governments—now wavering because of Communist gains—would rally to such a substantial structure because of trade advantages—kindred political principles and security from Russian and Chinese domination and conquest.

The task of building this cooperating structure will be heavy.

The need is perilous. The tremendous advantages of such a pooling of immense and unparalleled resources of the free peoples are obvious.

With the Soviet Union engaged in Berlin, Asia, Africa, and the Western Hemisphere—with Russian nuclear dust over the world—with China in the grip of famine and crop failures in Russia—with a prosperous Europe—and with the sensational posthumous condemnation of Stalin—now is the time for our President and Congress to take the offensive on a bold new program. We can no longer continue to tie our foreign policies to an ineffective United Nations; we can no longer consider undertaking a unilateral action, such as that taken last spring against Cuba.

The merging of the immense and unparalleled economic resources of the free peoples is necessary to meet the Communist combine.

The free world bloc would not have to trade with the Communist bloc. The Communist bloc would have to trade with it. The Communist bloc would be isolated unless and until it changed its ways.

That of itself is the most powerful weapon for peace and stability in the world. It is available to free nations. It is available to free peoples if they have the will to use it. The development—or even the prospect of the most revolutionary development in industrial civilization—would be felt immediately in every corner of the world in both trade and political activity.

The immediate result of such a juncture of awesome power of free peoples would be to put an end to the threat of a nuclear

war and the attempts to establish more Communist colonies in Asia and Africa and the Western Hemisphere by murder and terror and force.

A correlative result of the neutralization of Communist terror by the power of free peoples would be the salvation of the United Nations. The power of the free peoples to checkmate forces of aggression and subversion would give greater force to the decisions of the United Nations. Rather than show contempt for the United Nations, the Soviet Union would need the United Nations as a forum for the honest discussion of problems affecting both the Communist and the free nations. It would attach more—much more—importance to the United Nations decisions than it does now.

English Foreign Secretary Lord Hume, said of the United Nations recently, "When one side advertises its intentions to destroy the way of life of the other, then you cannot have true collective security."

All that would be changed by combining the free peoples' military, economic and political resources—not as a means for aggression—but for the purpose of providing their mutual safety as a deterrent against being overwhelmed and destroyed by Russian and Chinese tyrants.

Clearly the mere material strength of such a fundamental combination far outweighs that of the Communist bloc.

It should be equally clear that the real strength of such a grouping lies not alone in armaments and industry. There are deep spiritual values in an individual-based society. Lived and demonstrated, these values are an invincible tower of strength.

Freedom is man's birthright. The fight for survival of democratic processes is eternal. There are always strong men who cherish it above their lives. Its triumph is inevitable if boldly conducted.

Only as the free nations of the world recognize their progressive role in spreading the dynamics of a free society can the promise implicit in a free world bloc be realized.

Free nations' determination to subordinate shortsighted nationalism to a broader goal is the decisive factor.

Herein is the real test of Western strength—of the determination to live and die as free people—not slaves in a police state.

Our United States of America must pass that test of leadership. We delude ourselves and we flatter our enemies if we think that the only choice before us is peace at any price—or war at any cost.

Proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the current debate over the proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing has taken many strange twists, and the cry of "politics" is often heard. This cry, diverting as it may be to those who wish to miss the real point, is a loud one, but it prevents us from seeing the real issues with any degree of clarity.

An editorial in the February 1 issue of the Record, Hackensack, N.J., reminds us that the real question before us is whether we wish to save the ancient advantages and treasures of our urban centers, or whether we are willing to let our great cities continue to decay and dwindle in the contribution they should make to our society. This is a basic question in our current debate. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS THE CITY WORTH SAVING?

The country appears to be in some danger, which can and should be avoided, of letting its attention be distracted from the subject the President is really discussing when he sends to the Congress his reorganization order to establish, as an eleventh department in his Cabinet, a new Department of Urban Affairs.

The skill with which Mr. Kennedy has played his politics with this issue has been dazzling. He has the Republicans over the barrel; no matter how they vote on this reorganization order, they cannot possibly look good in November to the city and inner-suburb voters on whom their future as a national party has been found by their own research to depend.

But Mr. Kennedy's craftmanship is not the subject.

The subject is the city, and a serious mistake will be made if we let the Congress neglect what ought to be a magnificent opportunity just to say what we mean when we say the word "city."

What do we mean when we speak of the city?

Has the city failed?

Do we believe in cities?

Is the city doomed to decay into slums?

Is the city's role in the future to be a sort of huckster's market and moneychanger's house by day and by night, when the captains and the kings have departed for the suburbs, a slumbering warehouse, or a decompression chamber in which immigrants live miserably for a while to acquire a trade and a new language before they swarm out to overpopulate the countryside?

Or is the city now and hereafter to be, as it has been in the past, the custodian of our culture, the great mystic organism that transforms us from formless sacks of meat into a people, our catalyst, the symbol of us? And if the modern city has become (despite its uncanny attraction for added millions by the year) a thing to be hated rather than venerated and loved as was Pericle's Athens—or Rome, or Alexandria, Florence, Siena, Vienna, Paris, London, Moscow—then what has made it hateful, and what will redeem it, as well as who?

Senator WILLIAMS, Democrat, New Jersey, is right when he warns a New York conference on conservation that too many of us have lost their sense of personal responsibility. We talk about Mr. Kennedy's skill and the Republicans' fumbling, about Mr. Weaver, about the Regional Plan Association studies, about sprawl and blight, as if these things were outside our personal concern and responsibility. Said Mr. WILLIAMS:

"But it seems too big a problem, and we tend to concern ourselves with the immediate neighborhood we live in and to tell ourselves that the experts are handling the rest. But the truth is that the experts cannot and should not be expected to provide solution * * * without active public consensus and support. * * * What we need is a new mood."

The new mood will not be created by transferring Mr. Weaver to the Cabinet or solving the urban and housing agencies' own housing problem by putting them all under one roof. It will not be created by ranting about State rights which in effect mean the right of a State to shunt the cities to Washington for help. The new mood must be created by people who constitute the city, believe in it, understand it, and love it.

Let's talk about the subject.

Northern Cascade National Park at What Cost?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the wilderness bill introduced in this Congress there has been put forth a proposal calling for a study of the North Cascades in Washington State to determine the feasibility of setting aside vast acreages for a national park.

Although I am not opposed to wildernesses and national parks, I question the wisdom of establishing such areas in my congressional district and Washington State beyond those that exist already.

Mr. Ernest Hederick from my hometown of Everett, Wash., and a member of Local 236, International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite & Paper Mill Workers, has written an article that points out the potential losses in dollars and jobs that would come about if such a park were established.

He also points out how multiple use of our forest lands can provide for the recreational, grazing, water and timber needs of the future. I agree with Mr. Hederick, and under leave to extend my remarks include the article, which appeared in the Pulp, Sulphite & Paper Mill Workers' Journal in the RECORD.

The article follows:

MULTIPLE USE OF OUR FOREST LANDS—WHAT DOES IT MEAN TO THOSE WHO WORK IN THE PULP AND PAPER INDUSTRY?

(By Ernest Hederick)

Timber products is one of the Nation's most important industries. We must remember that forests exist to be used. We must have their products to live.

There are some 489 million acres of forest area in commercial use. The Federal Government, the States, and local governments own and harvest commercially 27 percent, about 132 million acres. The remaining 357 million are owned and harvested privately.

These forests support an industry with 1,640,000 employees and a volume of $25 billion a year. Out of these forests come the oldest and newest products. Manufacturers are extracting from wood and wood products such things as yeast, alcohol, adhesives, plastics, textile fibers, perfume, cosmetics, food preservatives, drugs, and vanilla flavoring.

What about A.D. 2000? All the old growth trees of the West will be gone. Dr. Richard E. McCardle, Chief Forester of the United States, as well as all others who rate as authority on the subject, agree that we must increase our wood growth by 50 percent. We rely on 10 percent of our forest needs coming from Canada. How long will Canada permit their timber resources to be exported?

The expansion of cities, dams and reservoirs, military acquisitions, land taken for

flood control, for airports, for city watersheds, for superhighways and recreation will take many, many acres from the national forests during the next 10 years. It is estimated that by A.D. 2000, 73 million acres will be taken out of forest use to grow food for the increased population. This means 26 billion board feet a year of wood production will be wiped out and diverted to food crops.

The small woodlot holders own over half of the forest land of the United States. There are 4,500,000 people. Two-thirds of all of the commercial forest land east of the Rocky Mountains is in this class. This group of small owners are the key to the future of the pulp and paper industry.

Our annual consumption of lumber per capita has remained about the same during the past 20 years. In 1940 it was 225 board feet; in 1959 it was 224. Our annual consumption of paper and paperboard has nearly doubled in the past 20 years. Our consumption of plywood is growing by leaps and bounds, and the use of poles and piling is climbing.

What does the forest industry mean to Oregon and Washington? The reports show that $2¼ billion were brought into these two States in 1959. This means that the forest products industry is still the West's No. 1 employer with 152,000 jobs. Its employees earned more than $810 million. Lumber brought in more than $900 million; pulp and paper, $663 million; and plywood, $578 million. The value of hard, chip, and particle boards exceeds $50 million.

Every informed person realizes that multiple use of our forest lands is the only solution of our forest lands. This means that these lands are managed so that portions that are best suited and adopted for camping grounds, wildlife areas, game, timber, watershed, grazing, recreation, etc., are used for that purpose and through careful planning two or more uses may be found that are capable of existing together. Water, timber production, and other national welfare requirements can be met on a sustained basis which will support the economy of the Nation.

Because of lack of access roads in wilderness areas, there is no insurance that wild, inaccessible forests will not be wiped out by fire, insect, or disease epidemics. In the present wilderness areas millions of board feet of timber are lost to insects and disease each year. A good example is the epidemic of spruce bark beetles which has raged through the wild, overmature spruce forests of Colorado during the last 15 years.

Wilderness at what cost? The Washington State Department of Commerce and Economic Development now have a formula which puts the question on a dollar and cents basis that everyone can understand. According to the formula, 1 million board feet of timber harvested means on the average direct employment for 13.3 persons; direct support for 45 persons; a payroll of $58,750; and forest products valued at $180,000.

If out-of-State conservationists succeed in establishing the proposed Northern Cascade National Park, which would take in a total of 318,788 acres of operable forest land now located within the Mount Baker, Okanogan, Snoqualme, and Wenatchee National Forests, what would be the result? The Forest Service estimates that 12,832 million board feet of timber is located on this acreage. This proposed national park would be added to the 1,279,000 acres of operable forest land already under reserve in our State of Washington. Together, they would total 1,598,000 acres containing, by conservative estimate, 64 billion board feet of timber. Using 120-year rotation basis on the total reserve, it would represent a sustained annual cut of about 12 percent of our total annual cut in the entire State—and still provide recreational opportunities.

What would this mean to the economy of our State, in the way of jobs, payrolls, and manufactured timber products? By applying the Department of Commerce formula, we arrive at these answers:

1. A total of 6,650 persons—equivalent to 10 percent of the total now employed in Washington's forest industries—would have jobs in the woods or industries that use the wood or wood fibers.

2. This would mean a yearly payroll of $29,375,000.

3. The harvest would provide direct support for 22,500 persons.

4. Manufactured timber products would have a total value of $90 million.

5. Figuring a conservative price of $25 per thousand, the yearly stumpage return would amount to $12½ million from the forest industry. Can the laboring people of Washington and the State economy afford this loss? Our economy would be forever denied the great potential of this timber which should rightfully be administered under the Forest Service multiple usage program.

The Untold Story Behind Our Country's Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIBORNE PELL

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, last October, Mr. Lawrence Phelps Tower presented a most thoughtful paper on "The Untold Story Behind Our Country's Flag" to the New York chapter of the Sons of the American Revolution. In reviewing Mr. Tower's remarks, I was interested to note that a close forerunner of our present Stars and Stripes—namely, the red and white striped flag of the Royal Navy—appeared in one of Dudley's copper plates on a front piece in the letter book of Gov. Pelig Sanford of my own State of Rhode Island in 1668.

Mr. President, during these grave times, it is indeed appropriate to review the history of our beloved flag and I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lawrence Phelps Tower's remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNTOLD STORY BEHIND OUR COUNTRY'S FLAG—ORATION GIVEN BEFORE THE NEW YORK CHAPTER, SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION, AT THEIR ANNUAL DINNER, IN THE PARK LANE HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY, ON OCTOBER 27, 1961

(By Lawrence Phelps Tower)

UNDER THREE FLAGS

Few Americans are aware of the fact that the American Revolution was fought under three flags.

They were the Sons of Liberty flag with its 13 horizontal red and white stripes that came into existence around 1765; the great Union flag, which became the Stars and Stripes in 1777; and the Franco-American flag, that had 13 red, white, and blue stripes.

Each of these standards played their separate and important part in winning the American Revolution. Why were these designs chosen and where did they come from?

John Adams and Benjamin Franklin are said to have told the Dutch that America borrowed much from them, including the ideas represented in our flag. This statement is substantiated by the fact that the "Union flag" of Holland consisted of red and white stripes. Also the Dutch Navy in the 17th century flew a flag of 7 red stripes on a white field (13 stripes in all) symbolical of the 7 northern provinces in revolt against the tyranny of Spain during the Reformation.

Both the Dutch and British Navies flew this flag at the Battle of the Armada and it became as well-known in England as in the Netherlands. It was also the flag of the city of Leiden where our Pilgrim Fathers lived for 12 years before coming to Plymouth.

This standard of civil and religious liberty became the flag of the Sons of Liberty in the early days of the American Revolution. In the beginning it had only 9 stripes for the 9 original colonies but later acquired 13 stripes and was known in England as the "Rebellious Stripes."

It has always been surmised, with the Marine Committee's congressional decree of June 14, 1777, establishing the Stars and Stripes as the flag of the U.S. Navy, that all other Revolutionary flags went into oblivion.

This is far from the truth. Pictorial evidence shows the Sons of Liberty's flag 4 months later at Saratoga and at "The Action Off Mud Fort in the Delaware River."

The free library in Philadelphia has two superb colored pictures of General Washington and Charles Lee dated 1779 showing the Sons of Liberty flag with no stars.

John Trumbull a year later painted a full length of Washington with the Sons of Liberty flag in the background.

Peal's portraits of Washington and Green both portray the "Rebellious Stripes" without stars.

Robinson's likeness of Washington 10 years later also displays the Sons of Liberty flag.

The first flag raised by the Army west of the Ohio in 1796 was the Sons of Liberty flag and Gilbert Stuart painted Washington in 1797 with battleships in the background flying only the striped flag with no stars, 20 years after our flag resolution of June 14, 1777.

The last commission signed by Washington, now in Federal Hall, shows the Sons of Liberty flag along with the Stars and Stripes. A print of Perry's victory at Lake Erie in the War of 1812 portrays some ships still flying the "Rebellious Stripes." Just when the U.S. Navy ceased using the Sons of Liberty flag after the War of 1812 is not known.

I am told, however, that as late as 1941, U.S. Naval commissions have two flags on them—one of stripes only and one of stars alone.

The 13-striped Sons of Liberty flag had been incorporated into another Revolutionary flag which brings us up to the next important standard that saw its birth during the early days of the American Revolution—the Great Union flag.

It consisted of 13 red and white stripes, with England's Crosses of St. George and St. Andrew on a blue field next to the staff.

General Washington raised the Great Union flag at Cambridge, Mass., on January 2, 1776, upon taking command of the Continental Army. He stated that it was displayed in compliment to the union of the 13 United Colonies. Washington also stated that it was received by the British in Boston as a token of the deep impression the King's speech, which had just arrived, had made upon us and was a signal of submission. Why did the raising of this flag cause the British, a few miles away in Boston, to think that we were surrendering?

The answer is found in the correspondence of a British agent written 2 days later from Philadelphia, to the Admiralty in London. The commander in chief of the American Navy, Ezek Hopkins, had just sailed out

of Philadelphia harbor flying from his flagship. *The Alfred*, our Great Union flag. British Agent Parker, in his report, described this flag as "English colors but more striped."

It is thoroughly recognized and well known that since the days of the Spanish Armada, the striped red and white ensign of Elizabeth's reign was definitely used by the Royal Navy for certain squadrons during the 16th and 17th centuries.

When the English fleet, under the command of the Duke of Buckingham, went to the aid of the French Huguenots in 1627 at La Rochelle, it was flying the red and white striped flag.

In the "Galleries of the Victories of Louis XIII Trophy Room" at Versailles hangs an oil painting of the siege of La Rochelle. It had formerly hung in Cardinal Richelieu's palace which was destroyed during the French Revolution.

Painted by Nicholas Privot at the command of the Cardinal, it shows several flags flying from the British men-of-war, the most prominent being an ensign of eight red and white stripes, with a pure blue canton. The important fact that this painting reveals to us is that by 1627, the red and white striped flag of the Royal Navy had acquired a pure blue canton. All that remains to make this flag the present standard of the United States is the inclusion of the stars, and a few more stripes.

The Royal Navy flag of stripes with the Cross of St. George in the canton is reproduced in Sir Robert Dudley's "Arcano del Mare" in 1646 and again in a second edition.

This flag was kell-known in New England at this time as is evidenced by the fact that one of Dudley's copper plates, showing this flag, appears as the frontispiece in the letter book of Gov. Pelig Sanford of Rhode Island in 1668.

The striped English flag is also reproduced in many flag books as an English naval flag of rank or of squadron division.

The United Service Museum, Whitehall, London, has in its possession a book written in 1714 which displays this flag as the flag for the Royal Navy of Great Britain in the Western Squadron. The Union Jack appears in the canton, as in our Great Union flag.

"A View of the Town and Castle of St. Augustine (Fla.)" with the Royal Navy at anchor on June 20, 1740, again shows the ships flying this Royal Navy flag.

The next pictorial evidence we have appears on a British man-of-war in the harbor of Philadelphia in 1754. The flag has eight stripes and is identical to the flag that was flying from the ships at the siege of La Rochelle in 1627 except that England's Union Jack is now prominently displayed in the canton.

This is the story of the Royal Navy's red and white striped ensign that was flown by her Western Squadron in American waters during the early days of the Revolution.

Our Great Union flag was so similar that Agent Parker of the British Secret Service reported back to Whitehall that the new American Navy's colors were in fact—"English colors but more striped."

The American Navy flew the Great Union flag from January 4, 1776, to June 14, 1777, when the Marine Committee of the Continental Congress decreed that the "union" in our flag should be 13 white stars on the blue field in place of England's union of the crosses of St. George and St. Andrew.

Rev. Ezra Stiles of Yale recorded the resolution on July 10th, in his diary, stating "The Congress have substituted a new constella of 13 stars (instead of the English Union) in the Continental Colors."

Our great Union flag, America's first official flag, will always stand a symbol of the union of the Colonies with the mother country before the separation.

The third and last flag of the American Revolution consisted of the 13 white stars on the blue field but had a new combination of 13 red, white and blue stripes similar to the tricolors of France.

The tricolors of France are supposed to have been created in the following manner:

Just prior to the French Revolution, when Louis XVI was to be the guest of the city of Paris, it was decided to combine the bourbon white with the blue and red of the city of Paris and thus the tricolors are said by some to have been born.

Nothing could be further from the truth, for in the Bibliotheque National in Paris, among their archives, is to be found the following. I quote: "During the reign of Louis XVI the tricolors of Henry IV (of France) take on a military significance."

This statement is documented by pictorial evidence showing the tricolors flown by the French Army and Navy from 1702 to 1778. These works by different artists appear in the Huntington Library in California, the British Museum, London, the New Brunswick Museum, Canada, as well as in the Bibliotheque National in Paris, where there is a painting showing the French and British fleets engaged in battle in 1778. The French men-of-war are flying the tricolors and the caption states, "Ouessant, a little island off the coast of Brittany near which, on the 28th of July 1778 at the commencement of the War of America there was an indecisive naval battle between the fleets of France and England."

The earliest record of an American armed vessel flying the tricolors is portrayed in a water color in the National Maritime Museum, Greenwich, England. This shows the Brigantine *Lexington*, after her capture by the British sloop *Alert*. She is flying our Great Union flag, but her stripes are red, white and blue.

Soon after the Declaration of Independence, Congress appointed Benjamin Franklin to the Court of France. Franklin arrived in December and received from the French government $400,000 for the purchase of arms and supplies for our Army and Navy.

In June 1777 LaFayette landed in South Carolina to aid the American cause and by 1778 the Franco-American alliance, more effective on sea than on land, was in excellent working order.

The signing of the treaty of alliance between France and the United States officially took place in February of 1778, giving the American Navy the use of French bases.

In April of that year French privateers operating out of Dunkirk were authorized to sail under "Le Pavillon Americain" and the Marquis de La Fayette also wrote at this time that letters of marque could be given to American privateers, sailing with French vessels under French colors.

The earliest written evidence showing that the stars and stripes were merged with the tricolors of our ally, France, appears in a letter from Arthur Lee in Paris to Henry Laurens, President of the Continental Congress in Philadelphia dated September 20, 1778; 15 months after the flag resolution of June 14, 1777, that created our flag of stars and red and white stripes only.

Lee wrote to Laurens as follows: "The ships colors should be white, blue and red stripes alternately to 13 and in the upper angle next to the staff a blue field with 13 white stars."

The next month, in October, John Adams and Benjamin Franklin advised the Ambassador of the King of the Two Sicilies who had asked concerning the American flag as follows: "It is with pleasure that we acquaint your Excellency that the flag of the United States of America consists of 13 stripes, alternate, red, white, and blue; a small square in the upper angle next the flag staff is a blue field with 13 white stars denoting a new constellation."

A drawing made in Texel, Holland, a year later, portrays the ships of John Paul Jones flying the two American flags; one with red and white stripes and the other with red, white, and blue stripes.

Captain Cottineau of the American Navy told Vice Admiral de Reynst of the Dutch Navy at Texel when he showed surprise that the American ships were flying two flags that: "Dr. Franklin in Paris had given permission to use the North American flag. The French flag had been shown only from December 7, 1779."

Trumbull's preliminary oil sketch of the British surrender at Yorktown in 1781 portrays this flag of red, white, and blue stripes with the stars in a circle.

Some flag charts executed in Europe at this time have a fleur de leis in place of a star in this flag.

The seal of Philadelphia in Independence Hall shows a ship flying the tricolored stripes and a painting of Captain Lawrence in the War of 1812, also displays the flag in the background.

It was not until the congressional flag decree of 1818 creating our national flag of 20 stars and 13 red and white stripes, that a semblance of unity and order was brought into the national colors. Even at this late date the Congress failed to stipulate in what manner and design the stars were to be arranged. This seems to have been left entirely to the imagination of the flagmaker.

Our first Revolutionary flag was the Sons of Liberty, which originated in the republic of the Netherlands. It was in Leyden that our forefathers learned the story of civil and religious liberty—later the rock upon which our Republic was founded.

The Great Union flag and Benjamin Franklin's flag have passed into oblivion but the 13 red and white stripes of the Sons of Liberty prevail in our national colors today.

Since the Reformation the red and white stripes have always stood for liberty and, as John Quincy Adams said, the stars in our flag are the symbol of our hope and desire to live in peace and concord with the whole world.

God grant that we all live up to our heritage and defend our liberty under the Stars and Stripes.

Any Gains From Urban Post Highly Doubtful

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial regarding the proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing which appeared in the Ann Arbor (Mich.) News on February 15, 1962:

ANY GAINS FROM URBAN POST HIGHLY DOUBTFUL

Anyone opposed to President Kennedy's plan for an Urban Affairs Department is against cities and Negroes, according to the NAACP and Robert C. Weaver, Director of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

This argument insults the intelligence of many men who have studied problems of Federal-city relations for years. It has no basis in fact.

A minority report just issued by four members of the House Committee on Gov-

ernment Operations—including Representative George Meader—lists many of the factual reasons for opposing Kennedy's Reorganization Order No. 1, under which the Urban Affairs post will be created unless it is vetoed by Congress.

All the order does is elevate the agency Weaver heads to Cabinet level, the report points out. "Proponents concede that no new powers are, or could be, vested in a new department or its secretary by a reorganization plan. They argue that by transfering certain functions to the secretary, they have augmented the powers of the head of the agency over its constituent agencies."

This isn't true. A law passed in 1955 specifically gave the HHFA Administrator "full authority to assign and reassign functions, to reorganize and to make whatever changes, including the reallocation and transfer of administrative expense funds and authority where applicable, necessary to promote economy, efficiency and fidelity in operations of the Housing and Home Finance Agency."

The Cabinet Department Kennedy wants would have legal powers over only about a third of all Federal housing activities, the minority report notes. The Veterans' Administration and Federal Home Loan Bank Board, which conduct about 63 percent of Federal home financing activities, would remain autonomous, unaffected by Reorganization Plan No. 1.

Other Federal activities directly related to urban problems would remain under the jurisdiction of the Commerce Department and the Health, Education, and Welfare Department. In short, Reorganization Plan No. 1 wouldn't accomplish many of the things NAACP leaders have been led to believe it would.

A Cabinet post might lend more prestige to Weaver's job. The minority report points out: "There is no reliable yardstick to measure the value of prestige in the execution of authority. It is difficult to prove that independent agencies such as the General Services Administration, the Atomic Energy Commission, Central Intelligence Agency, or HHFA, have been unable to discharge their important functions simply because the heads of these agencies did not enjoy Cabinet rank."

One other point: "Dollar limits or specific expiration dates are provided in statutes" which created HHFA's constituent agencies, the minority report notes. "An activity of the Federal Government should not be frozen into the governmental structure by making it a department unless it has been established by Congress as a permanent Federal activity."

Finally, it is worth recalling that the News, in gathering material for a November 1, 1960, editorial opposing then-Senator Kennedy's proposal for an Urban Affairs Department, found that New York's Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller was already on record against it. Partisan supporters of the plan insist that opposition Rockefeller expressed in a recent Des Moines, Iowa, speech was a turnabout from his earlier views.

Will those who are playing racial politics with this issue insist on ignoring facts and the views of reasonable men?

How To Read the Federalist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, my good friend and constituent, Holmes Alexander, has authorized a series of essays which are now being published as a book entitled "How To Read the Federalist."

A review of the book by Howard Norton was included in the Baltimore Sun on February 18, 1962. I ask unanimous consent that this review be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALEXANDER ESSAYS

("How To Read the Federalist," by Holmes Alexander, 90 pages, Western Islands, $3.)

In this thin but fascinating volume, a well-known Baltimore author and columnist—with tongue at least partially in cheek—puts the historic Federalist papers up against the problems of the modern world to demonstate that the basic ideas of the founders of this nation are as sound today as they were when the Constitution was written.

In doing so, he also manages to demonstrate that this country has wandered far off the course that was charted for it, and he argues that much of the misfortune that has befallen us can be blamed on this faulty navigation.

The book consists of 11 essays which appeared originally in the magazine American Opinion. Whether you agree with Mr. Alexander's thesis or not, the book is recommended as a vigorous stimulant to the mental processes.

HOWARD NORTH.

Forty-fourth Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that on Thursday, February 15, 1962, an impressive program was held in the House of Representatives on the occasion of the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence and it was my honor and privilege to have served as chairman of that program.

In further recognition of that occasion, the members of the Lithuanian Alliance of America, Lodge 115, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., in my congressional district, have forwarded a resolution adopted by that lodge on February 11, 1962, and as part of my remarks here today, I include the aforementioned resolution:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY MEMBERS OF THE LITHUANIAN ALLIANCE OF AMERICA, LODGE 115, WILKES-BARRE, PA., AT A MEETING HELD FEBRUARY 11, 1962, AT THE POLISH VETERANS HALL, 287 EAST MARKET STREET, WILKES-BARRE, PA.

Whereas on February 16, 1962, the American Lithuanians will commemorate the 44th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania; and

Whereas from the very beginning of the Soviet occupation, the Lithuanian people were opposed to Soviet rule; and

Whereas the Soviets in order to break the resistance of the Lithuanians, deported her peoples to Siberia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we American citizens appeal to the President, to the Secretary of State, and the Congress of the United States, that Soviet Russia, withdraw her troops and political agents from Lithuania and other Baltic States and restore self-government to these countries.

Impact of Rehabilitation Program in the City of Boston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Housing Act of 1961 gave us many improved new tools to offer city officials and others interested in rebuilding deteriorating sections of our urban areas. One of the most promising programs was the neighborhood rehabilitation authorization. Instead of tearing down and then rebuilding, officials can now plan to improve existing neighborhoods. This program has attracted considerable attention. In my home State, for instance, the cities of Trenton and Newark have already offered plans for such projects.

An article in the February 12 issue of the Christian Science Monitor describes the impact of that program in another city, Boston. Mr. Michael Liuzzi has written a good account of the effects of this program. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESCUING A GRAY AREA

(By Michael Liuzzi)

The U.S. Government is about to spend $15,500,000 to help save a residential neighborhood occupying less than one square mile in the so-called "gray area" outside Boston's central business district.

This is Boston's first plunge into federally aided neighborhood rehabilitation.

But the splash should be a resounding one—for the Washington Park project is one of the biggest and most intensive of such projects yet attempted in the Nation.

How will the money be spent? Is such an expenditure justified, or is this "creeping socialism"?

Such questions are scarcely debated in Boston—although this is only the first of many similar projects already on the drawing boards of the Boston Redevelopment Authority. It's the beginning of a citywide program that should provide the first comprehensive test of a relatively new emphasis in urban renewal.

The possibilities are only beginning to be explored. Emphasis is on saving, on rehabilitating—not just a lot of individual buildings—but the neighborhood as a whole.

It still often involves considerable demolition of dilapidated tenements and homes—but as part of a carefully worked-out community plan which is aimed at rescuing and improving everything else in the neighborhood.

One of its features is a financial inducement that the Federal Government uses to stimulate city work on public facilities such as new schools, fire stations, branch libraries, playgrounds, etc.

The traditional formula still applies—the Federal Government paying two-thirds of the total "Government costs" of a project,

and the city putting up the remaining one-third.

But there's a diffrence. In the simple slum clearance project, "Government costs" were mostly limited to buying up and demolishing the old, existing buildings—and the city paid for one-third of this expense. Then the newly cleared land was sold to a private redeveloper.

But in a neighborhood rehabilitation project, total Government costs can be stretched to include whatever new public facilities the city might build to serve residents in the project area. By careful planning, a city can therefore put its entire share of the project costs into construction of needed new schools, playgrounds, streets, etc.

Uncle Sam then pays the whole cost of the remaining project—not just two-thirds of the cost.

In Boston's Washington Park project, the Federal Government's proposed $15,500,000 share would cover the entire costs of buying up slum property, relocating tenants, demolition, planning, administration, property reconditioning, and even some park, playground, and street improvements.

The city of Boston will put up $11,400,000 (its one-third share plus some strictly local extras) to be spent on three new schools, branch library, police station, city field offices, courthouse, swimming pool and skating rink, utilities, parking lots, and a new boulevard.

The remaining land, which will be considerable, will be mostly sold for private low-cost housing development, and a few shopping centers.

This is just the starter. Boston's immediate rehabilitation program covering nearly a dozen large city districts calls for expenditure of at least $90,000,000 in city and Federal funds over the next 5 years.

Is it justified?

Boston officials point to schools still in use that were built before the Civil War, neighborhoods that have been neglected for decades in the matter of streets, playgrounds, and other public facilities—and a vast, growing collection of deteriorating or dilapidated housing.

Complete slum clearance would be quite impractical, and probably not desirable. Neighborhood rehabilitation is the only alternative.

And the fact is that many of the people in these neighborhoods want the program, are ready to support it, and in some cases clamored for it years before the program was finally adopted.

Many owners are able and willing to rehabilitate their individual property—but can't obtain reasonable mortgages because of the "poor neighborhood."

Many tenants are ready to buy and maintain their own homes—but can't do so for the same reason.

The answer: change the neighborhood image, tear out the worst of the buildings, pour in new community facilities, liberalize mortgage terms, encourage private building and rehabilitation—and do it all with a human concern for problems of people in the district, and according to a plan worked out in consultation and with the approval of these people.

Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1918, Lithuania was proclaimed an independent state. This proclamation signaled the end of more than a century of foreign domination and the beginning of a new era for the Lithuanian people. On July 12, 1920, Lithuania's right to freedom was recognized by Russia when that country pledged to renounce all rights of sovereignty over Lithuanian territory. It was recognized as a sovereign and stable member of the world community when, on September 22, 1921, it was admitted to the League of Nations.

The next two decades were marked by the fulfillment of many of the hopes which had sustained Lithuanian nationalism through the long period of czarist rule. A constitution was adopted which accorded freedom of speech, religion, assembly, and communication. A land reform program enlarged the number of farms, and new industries were established. Lithuanian culture, unfettered at last, flourished with new accomplishments in literature and music.

Unfortunately, the location of Lithuania, with Germany to the west and the Soviet Union to the east, rendered it almost impossible for it to survive the aggressions of the Second World War. Although Lithuania attempted to maintain its neutrality, it was occupied first by the Soviets, then by the Germans, then again by the Soviets. On August 3, 1940, Lithuania was declared a constituent republic of the Soviet Union by the Supreme Soviet in Moscow.

The freedom which the Lithuanian people enjoyed between the two world wars stands in sharp contrast to the subjugation which Lithuania has experienced in the past two decades. In place of freedom of speech and communication and other civil liberties are rigid controls and restrictions. In place of mutually beneficial contacts with the West there is the Iron Curtain which keeps at a minimum the number of meetings between Lithuanians and outsiders.

On this 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, it is my hope that these statements in the U.S. Congress will demonstrate to the Lithuanian people that they have not been forgotten. If freedom-loving people throughout the world continue to have faith in their beliefs and to work unceasingly to strengthen liberty, we can be confident that ultimately freedom and democracy must be victorious over totalitarianism and tyranny.

Oregon Broiler Growers Association in Accord With President's Agricultural Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. Burt Searl, president of the Oregon Broiler Growers Association, a nonprofit organization to promote the broiler industry of my State, has forward me a copy of his January 5, 1961, letter addressed to President Kennedy expressing the association's approval of the Kennedy-Freeman farm program. In order that my colleagues may have the benefit of this strong statement of support for the President's farm policy, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Searl's letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON BROILER GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
January 5, 1961.

The Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States, The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The board of directors of the Oregon Broiler Growers Association would like you to know that they are thoroughly in accord with the program in agriculture which is being developed by your Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman. We believe that the Kennedy-Freeman farm program is the best farm program that has been advanced in years. The commodity by commodity approach is a very sensible way of approaching the problems facing agriculture. We definitely favor the method followed with the turkey and broiler industries in which advisory boards of growers were named to examine the problems facing the industry and develop a program.

We would like you to know that we have complete confidence in Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman and his economic adviser, Dr. Willard W. Cochrane. We hope that you will not be troubled by the criticism from some quarters about Government interference in agriculture. The problems facing agriculture are so vast and cover such wide areas, the entire United States in the case of poultry, that help from the Federal Government is needed in order to bring industry leaders together to develop a program and help administer it.

We believe that if the Kennedy-Freeman farm program is fully developed it will result in a prosperous agriculture which, as you know, is the backbone of our Nation.

Respectfully yours,

BURT SEARL,
President, Oregon Broiler Growers Association.

Alaska's Role in National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, in line with Alaska's progress and resource development in its strategic importance as the corridor between Asia and North America—only 50 miles from Russian Siberia across the Bearing Strait, and its vast potential for greater usefulness in the interest of the national defense. An extended speech recently delivered in the Senate by Alaska's senior Senator, E. L. BARTLETT, who is a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, is ably summarized and commented upon by the Daily News-Miner of Fairbanks, Alaska, in a recent editorial. Because of the nationwide importance of the subject matter and the conciseness of the treatment, and as a summary for my colleagues who did not

find the opportunity of reading the Senator's speech, I hereby call to your attention the said editorial, which is as follows:

INTELLIGENT USE OF ALASKA

Since the late 1930's Alaska has been looked upon as being militarily strategic and not just the cold Seward's folly of long age ridicule.

In recent years, with growing tension from across the Bering Sea, Alaska has taken on an ever-increasing importance to world affairs.

This was again brought forth last week by Senator E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT, Alaska's senior Senator.

BARTLETT, a member of the all-important Senate Armed Services Committee, on the floor of the Senate, said in urging intelligent use of Alaska's potentialities:

"As long as we must prepare to defend ourselves and strike back against foreign attacks, Alaska provides an unequalled platform for counterattack weapons."

The Senator urged full exploitation of Alaska as a future base for the weapons which are now located in allied countries.

In stressing this, he pointed out that in the allied countries, however friendly, local political considerations inevitably impair our freedom of action and the money spent to maintain weapons and operating personnel in those countries is a foreign exchange outflow.

In his speech, probably his most significant point was: "U.S. funds spent on defenses in Alaska remain in Alaska; the only political considerations are those which are identified with the best interests of the United States; and if our weapons systems—wherever they are located—become targets for enemy attacks, those atacks, if the weapons are located in Alaska, will not affect major friendly population centers."

He stressed the advantage of Alaska's position by polar projection being thousands of miles closer to Eurasia than any other place in the continental United States. This reduced distance improves accuracy and thereby the effectiveness of missile-borne weapons.

This would give each weapon a wider target selection and thus increase the flexibility of our counter-attack capabilities.

BARTLETT told the Senate that it does not appear reasonable to place ICBM installations on costly real estate in the southwest United States when the same installations might as easily be placed on public lands 2,500 miles closer to the target.

In BARTLETT's plan, the Army also plays a significant role as he pictured the full-scale field maneuvers capable of being held in the State.

In asking for at least one training division in Alaska in the early future, BARTLETT said, "Since the Communist bloc lies largely in regions in which cold weather is a major environmental factor, the Army should emphasize the kind of training which the American soldier receives in Alaska today.

Alaska's role as a base for U.S. Navy operations was not slighted either in the Senator's plea for reevaluation of the 49th State's role in future world affairs.

"From Alaska bases," he said, "the United States can dominate the Pacific Coast of Siberia from which the Soviet Union in time of war might interdict American use of the Pacific Ocean. From Alaska, the United States can dominate equally effectively the Arctic Ocean which today has become an arena for deployment of strategic undersea weapons systems."

What Senator BARTLETT said to his colleagues in Washington was both forthright and timely—and above all, it made sense.

Let's only hope that his advice does not go unheeded.

Tariff on Agricultural Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Louis Olson, president of the Oregon Seed Growers League, has brought to my attention a resolution adopted by that organization at its recent annual meeting.

Because later in the session we shall be debating recommendations respecting tariff proposals and because I feel that the sentiments expressed by the resolution might be helpful to my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Olson's letter and the attached resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON SEED GROWERS LEAGUE,
February 1, 1962.

Subject: Tariff on agricultural commodities.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are enclosing a copy of a resolution passed by the Oregon Seed Growers League at its recent annual meeting.

Certain seed crops, which include creeping red fescue and some bluegrass varieties, are being imported in such large quantities that U.S. producers are being seriously hurt. This heavy importation is extending in many other commodities.

U.S. farmers need some kind of protection if they are to continue as farmers. The Oregon Seed Growers League requests your support of tariff programs that make it possible for U.S. farmers to continue to produce for U.S. markets.

Sincerely,

LOUIS OLSON,
President, Oregon Seed Growers League.

Whereas Oregon Seed Growers League members recognize the need of maintaining a sound and healthy exchange in international trade of agricultural commodities produced in surplus by one country for which there is a demand by another country, it does at the same time recognize the right and necessity for the United States to protect the domestic market of its own agricultural producers against excessive and unduly competitive imports of agricultural commodities and products therefrom which already are being produced domestically in substantial quantities; and

Whereas a growing list of agricultural commodities grown in Oregon are being confronted and threatened with increasing imports in alarming quantities at prices which are ruinous and below the domestic producer's cost of production; and

Whereas Oregon farmers are already in a dilemma with rising costs and lowering returns disproportionate with all other branches of the economy; and

Whereas the loss of market outlet for one agricultural commodity due to cheap foreign competition of imports from low-wage countries throws the burden of surplus upon the remaining commodities when land usage is diverted to production of those commodities: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon Seed Growers League, at its annual meeting, do hereby recommend and urge that Congress give the particular problems of agricultural producers more attention in foreign economic policy by taking action to safeguard U.S. agricultural products against any further tariff reductions, and to retain and strengthen the peril point and escape clause provisions of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, if renewed; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent by the secretary to Oregon's Congressional delegation, the Secretary of Agriculture, USDA, and other interested parties, including the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

Statement of Basil L. Whitener, Member of Congress, 11th District of North Carolina, Before the U.S. Tariff Commission on February 19, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herein a copy of a statement made by me today to the U.S. Tariff Commission:

STATEMENT OF BASIL L. WHITENER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 11TH DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA, BEFORE THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION ON FEBRUARY 19, 1961

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman and members of the Tariff Commission, I express to the Commission my appreciation for the opportunity to appear today in connection with the inquiry now being conducted by the Commission as a result of the request of the President. I think that it is commendable that the President has directed the Commission to determine whether articles or materials, wholly or in part of cotton, are being imported into the United States under such conditions as to materially interfere with the cotton program being operated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture under existing law.

This is a most important matter insofar as thousands of people in the congressional district I represent are concerned. The 11th Congressional District of North Carolina is the largest textile manufacturing district in the United States, and the thousands of people there who earn their livelihoods in the textile plants are greatly concerned about the determination which will be made by the Commission and the President as a result of these hearings since their means of earning a livelihood will be greatly affected by the conclusions reached.

At the outset I would like to commend the U.S. Department of Agriculture for its diligence in presenting the facts with reference to the effect of the importation of foreign-made cotton textiles into the United States. The hundreds of cotton farmers in my congressional district are directly affected by the problem which you are now studying, and I am sure that they have an interest equal to that of our textile workers in the outcome of these hearings. Justification for this interest is, I think, apparent when one reads the statistics set forth in the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture to the President dated November 13, 1961, in which it was recommended that these hearings be conducted. While the hearings are directly related to the effect of imports upon the

cotton program administered by the Department of Agriculture, a favorable decision by the Commission and the President will directly benefit not only our cotton farmers but our textile employees.

While your hearings are related solely to the cotton textile field, I believe that it may be of value to point out some of the statistics with reference to the textile industry generally in recent years. These figures give support to the apprehension which our textile people have for the future of the industry and the people who work in that industry.

The Department of Labor has reported that the number of production workers engaged in textile manufacturing in my home State of North Carolina declined from 210,000 in 1954 to 196,000 in 1958. Bringing these figures down to 1960, we find that a report made by a special subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reveals that between 1947 and 1960 the number of textile jobs involved in liquidations of textile mills in the United States amounted to 229,115. This represents the livelihood of many more persons than those who lost their jobs in the textile industry since the loss of those jobs fell with equal weight upon the members of the families of these job-losing textile workers.

The same report reveals that between 1947 and 1960 there were 838 textile mill liquidations in the United States. The U.S. Department of Labor in its latest report which has come to my attention indicates that in practically every major textile area in the United States there is a substantial labor surplus. Another report which has come to my attention that I think is of significance and relates directly to the hearings now being conducted by this Commission is the Bureau of Census report (FT-410), which states that between 1947 and 1960 there was a 70-percent decrease in U.S. exports of cotton manufactures. This report states that in 1947 our domestic cotton manufacturers exported the equivalent of 2,554 million square yards of cotton textiles; where as in 1960 exports had dropped to 756 million square yards. Further analyzing this report, we find that there was a decrease in our American exports of 80 percent in the yarn and thread division of the industry.

I believe that no one would argue that these figures do not indicate that there exists today a great threat to the thousands of Americans who find the textile industry to be the source of their employment and their opportunities to earn the necessities of life for their families.

Getting to the more specific issue laid down for inquiry by the Tariff Commission, I would point out to the Commission certain data which has been recently brought to my attention by very knowledgeable people in the cotton and textile trade in the United States.

These industry people feel that the principal relief that could be afforded our domestic cotton mills at this time is to permit them to obtain their raw cotton, which is produced in the United States, at the same price as foreign cotton mills can obtain it. Since August 1961 there has been an export subsidy on raw cotton in the amount of $42.50 a bale, or 8½ cents per pound export subsidy on cotton products, including cotton textiles. This $42.50 per bale price disadvantage to American cotton mills is one of the principal reasons that foreign cotton textiles can be imported into the United States under a competitive situation which is grossly unfair to our own textile people. In effect we are under the present state of affairs having our American textile people at all levels taxed to subsidize the foreign textile industry, which industry constitutes an economic Frankenstein which should be destroyed immediately with every available weapon at the hands of the American people and, particularly, Government officials.

I urge the Commission to act favorably upon the request of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the textile industry people throughout the Nation in the present case. I know that I speak for thousands of people in North Carolina and elsewhere when I say to the members of this Commission that we are grateful to you for hearing our pleas and that we will be most appreciative of any action that you can take to help in bringing about a stabilizing of our cotton textile industry in America and assisting us in preserving the opportunities for employment for many thousands of people.

Thank you.

U.S.-International Cultural Exchange—Striped Pants Troupers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, contributing to the many cultural and other benefits which are the result of our cultural exchange agreements are the tours of world-famed American performing artists abroad. These artists perform a great service in bringing good will and an understanding of our culture and entertainment to others.

In this respect I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the contribution to this effort of a great American comedian. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the article on Joey Adams entitled "Striped Pants Troupers Win Raves for United States," which appeared in the New York World-Telegram, January 20.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRIPED PANTS TROUPERS WIN RAVES FOR UNITED STATES

(By Leonard Harris)

Joey Adams can't count how many times he's stood in front of an audience and introduced a purely fictional joke with: "This actually happened."

But, says the comic, who's just returned after heading a 4½-month State Department-sponsored entertainment tour of the Middle and Far East, this actually happened:

"One morning in Saigon—at an orphanage—600 kids got up when our show was over and sang 'God Bless America' in English.

"People in hospitals—what did they have to be happy about?—beamed at us, laughed at us, reached out to us. Everywhere we put out a hand to people, they took it and shook it. There were no 'Yankee, Go Home,' signs, not one."

Joey first suggested the trip to President Kennedy about 8 months ago. The troupe played Afghanistan, India, Nepal, Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, South Vietnam, Hong Kong, Indonesia, Singapore, and Iran.

Joey and his pretty wife, Cindy, and others in the 24-member troupe took turns giving English lessons. But they hurdled the language barrier mainly by emphasizing visual things, broad comedy, music, dancing, magic.

Like any performers on tour, they savor their memories of the things that actually happened.

What they'll remember most in the faces—of the hospital patients in Thailand, the streetful of Red Chinese refugees in Hong Kong, the lepers in a beggars' home in India. Especially the faces of the kids everywhere.

But like all performers, they'll remember the SRO audiences and the raves. Joey was proud to show some of the reviews, particularly the orchids from American officials who noted the effects on the local people. Here are a few:

"Comments from all sources regarding the show have been highly laudatory"—American Embassy in Katmandu, Nepal.

"Wonderful * * * Iranians feel most cordially towards the President and all Americans"—M. Ghaffari, Governor of Abadan.

"Your week's stay here has helped to bring cheer to a hard-pressed people and to give them a real feeling of America's sincerity and warm-hearted support"—Frederick E. Nolting Jr., U.S. Ambassador to South Vietnam.

"Joey Adams' Show Delights"—"90 minutes of sheer delight"—two papers in New Delhi, India.

"A packed house at Annamalai Manram last night roared with laughter witnessing the Joey Adams Variety Show"—the Madras (India) Mail.

Variety, writing under a Washington dateline, said: "State Department officials here point to a pile of reports from embassies and consulates throughout south Asia and proclaim that Uncle Sam's use of vaudeville as a goodwill ambassador is a 'smash success.' The Joey Adams group * * * has drawn raves from American diplomats where they have performed."

Recently a veteran woman gossip columnist called the Adams tour a flop. This was contradicted by Heath Bowman, chief of the State Department's cultural presentations division.

"I must disagree with her," he said. "From reports from all our posts, from officials of the Asian countries, from numbers of people who saw it, we learned the tour was extremely good. It did a great deal for us.

"It played hospitals, orphanages and charities. It played provincial cities. In Thailand, it went into the bushes; it played military camps and entertained wounded soldiers.

"We've never seen anything like this. In Kabul, Afghanistan, it played a fair. The Russians had a group at the fair, too. The Adams company completely eclipsed the Russians. We got a special wire from the ambassador there thanking us."

Joey and Cindy Adams are proud that they worked a "24-hour day," giving shows at hospitals, orphanages, in the streets, in addition to scheduled performances. Mostly they entertained what Cindy called the plain turban tops of Asia.

"Many times we had no water, no electricity," she said. "We tramped through mud in evening gowns to get to our 'stages'; we slept under mosquito netting with the temperature up to 110. We went 5 and 6 days at a time without baths—covered with layers and layers of gummy mosquito repellent. With five layers of that stuff on, we began to repel each other."

The mud and the mosquito repellent washed off, but the anecdotes came home with them—including a few awkward moments.

After a show in New Delhi, India, the troupe released hundreds of red, white and blue "peace and friendship" balloons.

The peace balloons caused a brawl in the second row. An Indian belted the American next to him and shouted: "He took my balloon." Joey took them both backstage and gave each his own balloon.

The performers had been warned it was not good manners to touch royalty unless

the royal person extended his hand first. In Afghanistan, a dancer was introduced to the Crown Prince. "It's a pleasure," said the hoofer. "I hope we get to play your country some day."

"This is his country," whispered Joey.

The dancer was effusively apologetic. He slapped the prince on the back vigorously—and repeatedly. "Aw, Princie boy, I'm sorry," he said. The prince, well, he was a prince about the whole thing.

This actually happened, too:

In Jakarta, Indonesia, the musicians' instruments arrived 4 hours late. Joey drew liberally from his years in show business for a challenge round of jokes which filled the time.

His comic opponent, who also chipped in by singing Negro spirituals, was Indonesian President Sukarno.

The Adams troupe included Buddy Rich and his jazz sextet, the Four Step Brothers, a dance team; fire-eater and clown Chaz Chase, magician Celeste Evans, John Shirley and Bonnie Dale, who make animals out of balloons; and Sylte Sisters, a singing trio, and Jerry Bell, stage manager.

Joey Adams calls them "entertainers in striped pants." He'd like to see many other teams of entertainers follow, and, as president of the American Guild of Variety Artists, he's going to work for it.

The trip might be compared to one of the many industrials that perform in this country. But here the sponsor was the United States, and the commercial, "Let's Be Friends." Joey thinks the customers in Asia went for it in a big way.

Punta del Este: A Plus for Our Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the meeting of Foreign Ministers of the Organization of American States at Punta del Este is now over, Cuba is bounced from the OAS and it is plain to see that the United States certainly made gains through its action and the actions of other Latin American nations at this conference.

Too often our foreign policy weaknesses are talked about and pointed out and too frequently our successes go unheralded.

Mr. William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief of the Hearst newspapers and a knowledgeable observer of foreign affairs, has pointed out in one of his recent columns that the United States and the forces of freedom did indeed make gains at Punta del Este.

Mr. Speaker, I, under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Hearst's article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

PUNTA DEL ESTE: A PLUS FOR OUR NATION

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

The delegates have departed from Punta del Este and the swank Uruguay resort has resumed its status as a playground for the well-to-do, but the debate continues over what or what not was accomplished at the meeting of Foreign Ministers of the Organization of American States.

This is all to the good. If Punta del Este did nothing else, it served to concentrate our attention on our Latin American neighbors—and I have long contended that this hemisphere is the most important area in the world to us.

It helped us realize that our neighbors to the south are highly individualistic, with varying needs, varying internal problems, varying external outlooks. They are not, and never will be, a bloc, unless communism succeeds in its purpose of fusing them into one, and I very much doubt that it will.

They are, in short, American States, as disparate in size as Rhole Island and Texas, as different in political orientation as, let's say, Alabama and Vermont. The important thing is that they are American.

But of course Punta del Este did considerably more than this. As I sum it up, we came out of it with a plus—not as much as we originally hoped for but more than we had any reason to except midway in the conference. Credit Secretary of State Rusk with having done a delicate, patient, and competent job.

And Castro's regime in Cuba came out of it with a permanent black eye. The expulsion of the regime from the OAS is a damaging psychological blow and it could do much, if properly and persuasively utilized, to destroy the Castro myth among the poor, oppressed, and land-hungry people of Latin America, that he is a Caribbean Robin Hood.

In an inverted sense they may have a point. Castro is a hood, all right, and he has succeeded in robbin' the Cuban people of all their freedoms. (This is absolutely the only pun today.)

Thirteen Latin American nations joined with us to give the expulsion vote the minimum essential two-thirds majority. Naturally these nations included those physically closest to Cuba and therefore with greater reason to fear invasion from Castro's Communist-supplied military machine. And naturally I think they voted correctly.

But it would be a mistake to assume that the six nations which abstained on the expulsion vote (although, please note, they did not vote against it) are therefore unaware of the danger of Communist Cuba. They demonstrated their awareness by joining in a unanimous vote of 20 States declaring the Castro regime "incompatible with the inter-American system."

"Incompatible" may have a mild sound (although it is good enough for divorce in some of our States) but what it amounts to is a condemnation of the Castro regime by all other members of the OAS, and that is no weak thing.

Among the abstaining nations on the expulsion vote were four of our most powerful neighbors, Argentina, Brazil, Chile and Mexico. With them were Bolivia and Ecuador. It would be another mistake to think of them as a bloc. Their separate interests happened in this instance to coincide.

Brazil, for example, is economically sick and seething with unrest. Its Government fears a strong move against Castro could set off an explosion that would further the return of Janio Quadros, the President who quit his job, as a Castro-type dictator.

Argentina has its strong remnants of Peronistas as well as Communists and also pressure from a military right.

Mexico has a revolutionary mystique as well as a meticulous regard for the dotted I's and crossed T's of law, and it insists the OAS does not have the legal machinery to expel the Castro regime.

And in all these six nations are great masses of the poor, not Communist but desperately looking for some way out of their poverty, and hence susceptible to the counterfeit appeal of the Castro Robin Hood myth.

It is of course vital (and I use the word in its life or death sense) for these nations to bring about democratic reforms and their willingness to do so ought to be considered in our alliance-for-progress aid. But they cannot do so in a day, and we certainly won't help them do so by denouncing them now.

They have taken one big step in publicly condemning the Castro regime. The next step ought to be easier.

Salt Water Conversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, there is a slowly growing recognition in this Nation that we will have to make major exertions within the next few decades to keep up with steadily growing demands on our water supply.

Within New Jersey we are about to participate in one great project that will make good use of all waste resources within the four-State Delaware River Basin. This is one example of our determination to stop all avoidable waste and to make use of all available assets that we have.

Even with efforts of this kind, however, we must recognize that the conversion of salt water into fresh water offers us opportunities of great magnitude, so great that we may not have given full recognition to the opportunities that exist in this area.

An editorial in the February 2 issue of the Camden (N.J.) Courier-Post gives a good description of some of the opportunities and necessities that now exist. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[The Camden Courier-Post, Feb. 2, 1962]

SALT WATER CONVERSION GAINS MADE

Although we're still at sea on the problem of how to convert large amounts of salt water into fresh water cheaply, the U.S. Government and industry too are gaining more steam and can be expected to make headway, however elusive the solution may be.

Considering the needs of mankind and the benefits to be derived, it's amazing the concerted effort has come so late. About half of the world's nations, including the United States, have serious water problems. Under the impact of tremendous population growth, water shortages in these Nations will put a ceiling on their economic growth unless new sources of water are found.

President Kennedy has said that if we could ever competitively, at a cheap rate, get fresh water from salt water, it would really dwarf any other scientific achievements. The first country that is able to do this will earn far more prestige than we lost by being second in outer space, the President feels.

For some purposes, desalinization processes already are feasible, among them being distillation units on big ships to supply drinking water. The French Line's new $80 million passenger liner *France* has four such units capable of producing about 400,000 gallons of fresh water a day. The nuclear carrier *Enterprise*, the world's largest ship, has units that can supply 280,000 gallons a day.

Industry, of late, has been getting its feet wet and may plunge in full force one day as the water crisis grows. The Office of Saline Water has estimated shortages of fresh water will affect almost every region of the country by 1975.

General Electric Co. has announced that a water purifying device it is developing is unique and shows great promise, and is to be installed in a plant in North Carolina. Others pioneering in the desalting field include Struthers Wells, American Machine & Foundry, Westinghouse Electric, and Dow Chemical Co.

The second of five demonstration plants planned by the Government is in operation now at Webster, S. Dak. The first, at Freeport, Tex., was dedicated in June. It has the capacity to convert a million gallons of sea water into fresh water daily, but the cost, though the lowest achieved to date, still remains far higher than commerically feasible.

Other experimental plants are planned at Roswell, N. Mex.; San Diego, Calif., and Wrightsville Beach, N.C.

Interior Secretary Udall recently visited an experimental pilot plant at Tucson, Ariz., using sunlight to desalt sea water, and called it "the most promising" technique for the purpose he has yet seen.

Ordinarily we think of fresh water primarily in terms of human consumption. But industry actually consumes 45 percent of the total in the United States, agriculture demands another 45 percent and only the remaining 10 percent goes for household use.

The omnious facts are that as a Nation we consume 312 billion gallons of fresh water a day. The available supply comes to 515 billion gallons a day. Already there are shortages in several regions, but little concerted effort to solve the cost problem of conversion was made in this country until prospects of a nationwide shortage loomed after World War II.

The Delaware River Basin, of course, the recent basin compact, under which New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and New York have joined with the Federal Government for the purpose, will develop them further.

But the entire Nation and all of mankind would be blessed if an economical method is achieved to produce desalted water. It certainly would be one of the world's major technical developments.

A Limit on Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in today's New York Times, February 19, 1962. As Congress debates the President's proposals for a new approach to our trade policy, it is well for us to consider the points raised by this timely editorial:

WORLD TEXTILE PLANNING

The 5-year cotton textile agreement reached by 19 nations last week is an important example of free world international economic planning. The agreement formalizes an arrangement under which the expanding low-cost cotton textile industries of such countries as India and Japan will be able to continue increasing their total exports in the years immediately ahead. They will be permitted to raise substantially their sales to Western Europe, while their sales here will be kept down. The Western European countries will ease their restrictions against imports of these low-cost textiles, while we shall make our barriers more solid. The beneficiaries of this plan, if it works, will be the Western European consumers, American cotton textiles manufacturers, and the textile industries of the exporting nations involved.

Political pressure from the American cotton textile industry was clearly the basic force behind the efforts which finally resulted in this agreement. No doubt the individuals concerned in creating this pressure are publicly devoted to free enterprise, the sacred memory of Adam Smith, and the blessings of free competition. But in an effort to prevent the growth of cheap textile imports, they have now subjected the textile industry to formal intergovernmental planning that bears little relation to freedom of competition.

The American consumer is of course the key victim of this pressure and its resultant planning to limit his access to cheap textiles. It may be that the administration had no choice in view of the tremendous political bloc that was formed by the textile industry to secure added protection, a bloc whose appeasement on textiles may perhaps ease the way for passage of the President's proposals for generally freer trade and lower tariffs. But certainly it will be completely intolerable if American consumers are forced to accept also the higher prices which will result if the textile manufacturers win their battle for a compensatory tariff imposed on imported cotton textiles to make up for the export subsidy the Government pays to stimulate raw-cotton exports. Even protectionism for textiles should have limits.

Newark's Metropolitan Medical Center—Newark Industrial Urban Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, New Jersey has been the scene of many new experiments and advances in efforts to rebuild blighted areas within our cities. Only recently in Newark, two such advances were recorded. The plans for a new hospital center there have been helped materially by a new concept in urban renewal. Another new concept was offered recently for a project that has been described as the first and largest industrial urban renewal project in the Eastern United States.

An address made by Irving Feist, president of Feist & Feist, real estate and insurance, in Newark at the time of presentation of the industrial project, gives some details on that project. An article in the November 1961 issue of Newark Commerce by Donald M. Rosenberger, director of United Hospitals of Newark, describes the importance of urban renewal to Newark's Metropolitan Medical Center.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have both articles printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

METROPOLITAN MEDICAL CENTER—URBAN RENEWAL MAKES IT POSSIBLE NOW

(By Donald M. Rosenberger)

The Metropolitan Medical Center plan of the United Hospitals of Newark points up the interrelationship among community leadership, business and industrial enterprise, and government on virtually all levels in the task of urban renewal. Only through the combined effort of these forces can the future need of hospital service in the Newark area and urban renewal for the city be accomplished.

A modern metropolitan medical center is equipped and organized to provide diagnostic, educational and research services to a degree and extent not possible in a general hospital. It attempts to raise the level of community health by bringing the latest advancements of medical practice to the whole community earlier than would otherwise be possible.

Such an institution must be situated at the crossroads of transportation and population in the area it is designed to serve. Newark is recognized as such a crossroads. A recent study describes the area from which the proposed Metropolitan Medical Center will draw patients as having the second highest concentration of people in the United States. The same study also points out that this area has the greatest traffic density of any market in the country.

Under the plans developed by the United Hospitals of Newark, and earlier by the Greater Newark Medical Center Committee, the program to be carried on in the Medical Center will determine the architecture and engineering of the building. It will be partly a community hospital with the usual services common to most large general hospitals. It also will be a referral center housing all the medical and surgical specialties.

For economic reasons, it is necessary that the medical center be sufficiently well-equipped and adequately staffed to serve a large number of patients. It also requires volume of service to do significant research and provides health education to both the patient and the public. In addition, the Metropolitan Medical Center will provide management training for nurses. This is only one of the many professional areas in which the center will serve.

With its overall total of 1,000 beds, modern equipment and facilities, and an adequate medical staff supported by the necessary personnel, the Medical Center will be equal to the future—a future which looks forward to a doubled population of more than 8 million in the center's service area by 1985.

What, then, is the importance of urban renewal to Newark's Metropolitan Medical Center?

Urban renewal, in this instance, through the enlightened cooperation of community leadership, business, industry, and the various units of Government, permits Newark and northern New Jersey to buy a piece of the future.

It would take years to develop a climate of contributor understanding in Newark that would result in financial campaigns sufficiently successful to make possible the size and type of medical center that we can see today will be needed in the future. Urban renewal provides a partnership in the financing of the project between the people of the community and their governments. It is a short cut to the provision of facilities to make possible the practice of modern medicine.

It is a fact that many hospitals, depending solely upon the financial support they can enlist from local citizens, find themselves with a new or expanded building which becomes obsolete before it opens its doors. If Newark is unable to create a medical center—program, organization, and structure—in the near future, it will have to pass up its chance of doing so for another 50 years.

This demonstrates the importance of urban renewal to the Metropolitan Medical center concept in Newark. The extent to which the resources of the hospital can be augmented beyond the cash contributions of the community determines the speed with which we can bring the medical center values to the public and thereby postpone the encroachment of obsolescence. This is true also of other programs in which urban renewal aid will either actually participate or will stimulate action. The clearing of blighted areas, construction of necessary public works facilities, recreational, and cultural improvements, transportation arteries, and the like, fall into this category.

The whole concept of urban renewal is, therefore, in the American tradition of cooperation on all levels of the community, and helps finance through deferred payments, benefits that often would be postponed to the future. The importance of the medical center project to this concept lies in the fact that this particular project opens up new areas of cooperation among the various governments and private citizens.

Government is interested in urban renewal as a tool to aid all of its citizens rather than as an aid to specific existing voluntary agencies. In serving its citizens, its objectives are twofold; the elimination of slums to raise living standards, and economic and cultural revitalization. In this case, these objectives include health facilities of a type normally considered to be largely the responsibility of the community.

Here is an extremely important opportunity for the improvement of medical services and greater economy. Advances of the last 25 years in medical science have made such improvement possible. But this same march of science puts heavy financial responsibility upon the hospital because of greater cost of equipment, facilities, and personnel.

If Newark is to take its place as a leader in providing for its citizens the benefits of these medical advances in patient care, then this combination of private interest and Government assistance can do it. In achieving the reality of a metropolitan medical center, Newark will be pioneering in one aspect of urban renewal for most other metropolitan areas in the Nation.

REMARKS BY IRVING FEIST, PRESIDENT, FEIST & FEIST, PRESENTATION OF NEWARK INDUSTRIAL PARK TO MAYOR, CITY COUNCIL OF NEWARK, N.J.

Mr. Mayor, members of the city council, leaders of the "New Newark," and distinguished guests, I have some very special, and, I might add, personal reasons for feeling a strong sense of pride in what we are accomplishing here today. In an historical context, this project has an even deeper meaning for the Feist organization. In the almost 60 years since our founding, we have watched Newark grow and change—almost block by block—and have played an integral part in this growth.

My father, Abram Feist, who among his other great contributions to Newark, was largely responsible for the development of Halsey Street as well as the early development of South Broad Street. As you can see, our ties with this city run deep, and it is for this reason that we feel a special bond of kinship with this project and the entire "New Newark" concept.

Of all the oft-cited reasons behind the postwar outflow of industry from the central cities, probably none is more obvious than the need for space and amenity. Modern industy has broken its 19th century mold of grim, smoky blots in the core of our largest cities and has fled to the suburbs where it has erected shiny, metal and glass, one-story structures amidst the country atmosphere.

Newark Industrial Park provides a golden opportunity to reverse this trend—to revitalize this city and put it back on the map as a thriving industrial heartland, adjacent to one of the most highly developed transportation and financial complexes in the world.

As we view it, Newark Industrial Park is an insurance policy for the city's continued growth. It will mean that both large and small industries, including those needing additional space and a modern plant, can remain in Newark instead of seeking breathing room elsewhere. It will mean that the siphoning off of our tax dollars through the loss of industrial ratables will be abated.

The creation of 15,000 new jobs will mean more than an alleviation of a chronic problem—it will mean that an estimated $74 million annual payroll will flow in the commerce of our city in the form of goods and services these people would otherwise not enjoy.

According to the national average, four jobs are created for every one that is provided by new employment opportunities. An industrial park with a potential work force of 15,000 will therefore generate 60,000 new jobs in the city. This is a vital factor when viewed against the most recent statistics furnished by the Department of Labor for the Newark labor market. At the close of December, there were 46,100 unemployed here and 14,300 less manufacturing jobs in the city.

Newark Industrial Park will be vitally important from still another point of view: We are all aware of the mounting tax burden on our citizens and its effect upon industry and homeowner alike. The project is a basic building block in the mayor's and city council's program to deal with this debilitating problem and furnish badly needed revenue to a city on the move once again.

The tax ratables that are produced through urban renewal have been well demonstrated. New property values plus large savings in social costs are tangible items to the city's budgetary and fiscal policy. The assessed valuation of the site as it now stands is something less than $13 million. Compare this with a projected valuation of upward of $24 million for the completed project.

Tax revenue—now at approximately $1.3 million—will more than double. In addition it is expected that the city will collect at least another $2 million from personal property taxes, with an accompanying 500 percent increase in tax ratables as a direct result of this magnificent industrial park.

May I also take this opportunity to emphasize two very important factors involved in the timing and staging of our project and contained in our proposal. First, should the location of Route 78 evenutally be changed, we will retract to Hawthorne Avenue or a suitable physical boundary. Second, it is not our intention to displace families from residential units within the area until suitable housing is made available to them. I want to emphasize that our project is planned in a manner whereby it will work hardship on no one.

With the development of the Newark Industrial Park, the city of Newark will be pioneering an important aspect of urban renewal. Prior to the urban redevelopment process, and may I add, the Fox-Lance bill, incity industrial expansion was virtually impossible. But, through the tools of urban renewal, Newark industry can expand and relocate, new companies can be attracted to replace those that have been lost, and this city can once again become the Nation's showcase for urban industrial development.

Our firm is very proud to have played a role in bringing Newark Industrial Park to fruition—and before I close, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to my colleagues in this labor—Financial General, Empire Properties, and John Graham—and to express my sincere gratitude to Mayor Carlin, the Newark Municipal Council, and their forward-looking administration for furnishing the atmosphere in which such a project could be shaped.

Remarks of Secretary of State Dean Rusk in Presenting the 1961 Silver Quill Award of National Business Publications to the Vice President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, February 1, 1962—Sheraton Park—Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on February 1, 1962, the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, appeared in the Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D.C., to present the 1961 Silver Quill Award of the National Business Publications to the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Vice President of the United States.

So eloquent and fitting was the tribute paid to Vice President JOHNSON by Secretary Rusk in presenting the award that I ask that it be made a part of this RECORD. I strongly recommend that it be read by my colleagues.

The address follows:

REMARKS OF SECRETARY OF STATE DEAN RUSK IN PRESENTING THE 1961 SILVER QUILL AWARD OF NATIONAL BUSINESS PUBLICATIONS TO THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, FEBRUARY 1, 1962—SHERATON PARK—WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen—early this morning, I was admiring the southern cross. It is a great privilege to be here this evening to admire the galaxy of stars in this room. Two minutes are just about adequate to honor a great American. But, since that great American also comes from the great State of Texas, I would ask you to give me 3 minutes.

Since we are honoring one of our own, I hope that our friends from the other countries will forgive me a moment of national pride and native presumption—for I believe that America at its best is a great America. And, I believe that the American people at their best are great people. And, I believe that the voice of America at its best is a respected voice. And we honor such a voice tonight.

A voice of tolerance—head of the President's Commission on Equal Opportunity. A voice of free political institutions—partisan when partisanship is required for the health of a vigorous democracy, but nonpartisan when unity is required for the peace and security of our Nation. A voice capable of indignation, where wrong has been committed. A voice capable of grim determination, where the right must be defended.

Economic and social development—a voice that can recall humble beginnings and the transformation of the life of his people by the combination of education, hard work, aspiration, ambition, neighborly cooperation, personal initiative. A voice of a generous spirit which said to a camel driver, "Why don't you all come and see us some time?"

A voice of peace. A voice that recalls that a national with unparalleled power set that

power aside after the greatest war in our history and committed itself to the purposes of the United Nations Charter. A nation holding out its hand to those who would reach for it in good faith and ready to cooperate with all those who would do so for common purpose. A voice which has been carried into almost every continent—into southeast Asia, to give confidence to those who are under pressure and attack; to Berlin, to give reassurance about firm support; to Africa, to extend the hand of brotherhood.

Wherever he goes, an authentic voice of America at its best and a voice given harmony by that of a great lady, a grace springing out of a genuine and simple nobility. Mr. Vice President, I am greatly honored to present to you the Silver Quill Award for distinguished leadership in behalf of the prestige and progress of the United States.

Oregon Grange View of President's Agricultural Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in further support of President Kennedy's farm program are statements such as the one made by Mr. Elmer McClure, president of the Oregon Grange, as published in the Oregon Grange Bulletin of February 5, 1962. Mr. McClure is a highly respected farm statesman in Oregon and I feel sure that his statement carries great weight with many Oregon farmers. In my judgment, this thoughtful statement can be of assistance to many Senators as later this session we consider the specifics of the President's agricultural program. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the statement of Mr. McClure to which I have alluded be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON GRANGE VIEW

(By Elmer McClure)

In response to inquiry as to how the Grange and I personally feel about the farm program presented to Congress by President Kennedy last Wednesday, I have issued the following statement:

"The administration's farm program as presented to the Congress on Wednesday by President Kennedy follows very closely the National Grange program and the recommendations to the Agriculture Department by the Advisory Council to the USDA Subcommittee on Feed Grains and Wheat, of which I am a member. We met in Washington twice during the last few months to study this problem.

"I feel strongly that the controls asked by the President are necessary to eliminate the huge surpluses which are presently depressing our market and costing the taxpayers millions of dollars for storage and handling.

"The program as designed will not cut the economy of the farmer, but it will prevent the noncompliler from exploiting the markets built up by those who participate in the program.

"Under the proposed program, the farmers have the choice, commodity by commodity, of establishing a program. Only if two-thirds of the growers of a given commodity vote to come under a commodity program will such a program be established. Once it is established, all growers must comply in order to protect the production controls.

"In my opinion, this is the only type of program that will permit the family-type farm to survive."

I have only one further comment; there is so much misunderstanding of the present farm program by the general public and there has been so much misinformation and confusion disseminated concerning the program, that some effective new program will have to be established that will control our surpluses or the public will eventually turn against any farm program at all. This would result in utter chaos in the agricultural industry and when order once more was restored, the family-type farm would be a thing of the past and the vertical integration of agriculture would be completely established.

I think it is probably not an exaggeration to say that the administration proposals are the last best hope of the family-type farm.

Lincoln's Birthday Address by John Bashara, Sr., National Commander of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH Q. ALEXANDER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, as everyone is well aware, there is always tremendous interest in Abraham Lincoln and in any part of our history as it relates to him. I was especially impressed by a Lincoln's Birthday address by John Bashara, Sr., national commander, Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., at the Tomb of Abraham Lincoln, in Springfield, Ill., last Monday, February 12, 1962. Under leave to extend my remarks I enclose a copy of Mr. Bashara's address:

LINCOLN'S BIRTHDAY ADDRESS

Mr. Chairman, my fellow buddies of World I, Madam President of the auxiliary, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is indeed a great privilege to be here on this occasion, and I welcome the opportunity to participate in this program on the occasion of the anniversary of Lincoln's birth.

Lincoln's Birthday is a hallowed day in the Nation, and it should be, because Abraham Lincoln was the Nation's benefactor, mankind's benefactor. To the average American visiting your State, he is immediately impressed with the giant signboards advising to such a visitor: "You are now entering Illinois, the land of Lincoln."

In paying homage to that wise and immortal leader, no finer, no greater tribute could be paid to him than for each of us to resolve here and now to vindicate the principles of Lincoln in the eyes and hearts of the American people.

We have come here to spend a brief time together under the guiding influence of his ever-living spirit. We feel that in a very true way he belongs to us and we belong to him. This is true for many reasons, but most of all because he was a man of the people.

Lincoln was great because he exalted the fundamental elements of human life in such a natural way. He let the flow of the irresistible longings of the human soul surge through his being, and thus he reached through to the very heart of humanity itself. Probably the surest mark of Lincoln's greatness was the fact that everybody felt that they had some claim on his thought and affection. He was universal in his mind and character.

Yes, Lincoln lives in our hearts today. No one has ever thought of Lincoln in a tomb, 'neath any coffin lid.

The sublime monument which was erected to his memory on the Potomac River at Washington speaks not of his death, but of his living hold on the affections of his fellow countrymen. Lincoln was a simple soul, and true to his nature he drew the strength of a robust life from the great common people from whom he came. Lincoln was the incarnated soul of the American Republic. He was of the people, by the people, and for the people. He knew no higher human destiny than to express the irresistible human desires of his day. Although he drew his force from the common elements of life, he rose to such dignity of character as to reveal a new beauty in the ordinary circumstances of daily living. Now we feel that the thoughts, words, and deeds which proceeded from his soul possessed an uncommon genius.

The principle of American freedom was on the auction block in Lincoln's day and he purchased it with his life's blood. Today we need a one-pointed universal faith which will galvanize our souls to action.

As commander of the Veterans of World War I, my thoughts go back now to the long ago, here in the great State of Illinois, where Lincoln lived. He was born in modest circumstances, nursed in obscurity, hardened by toil, broadened by suffering, lifted by service, and ennobled by the never-failing love and will of the people.

Moreover, may I remind you, ladies and gentlemen, that Lincoln knew sorrow when he said "to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphans." Haven't we lost the glimpse of him who uttered those words in the long long ago?

But there is more to the story—men have retired from business to go into solitude to study the life of Lincoln. Others have been made famous by reason of having known him. He became the President of the United States, but that affords a small clue to his real distinction. Few people refer to him as "President Lincoln." In the idiom of our people he is Abraham Lincoln. And when called by that name it is the name you gave him in the gloom of the wilderness. And today, from the Atlantic to the Pacific seas and in places under distant skies, children will recite in their schools his words; men will gather about halls to refresh their ideals by hearing anew some phase of this wonderful story. Our Nation could get along without some of its territory, without millions of its people, without masses of its hoarded wealth; but it would be poor indeed were it to wake up on some morning without the memory of Abraham Lincoln.

When I look at the Statue of Lincoln, it is to me all that America is, physically and spiritually. I look at those long arms and long legs, large hands and feet, and I think they represent the physical strength of this new country, its power and its youthful awkwardness. Then I look at the head of Lincoln, and see the qualities which have made the American—the strong chin, the noble brow, those sober and steadfast eyes. They were the eyes of earnest idealism, limited and checked by the possible and the practicable. They were the eyes of a truly and humble spirit, whose ambition was not to live for power, but a desire to be supremely useful. They were the eyes of compassion and mercy and a deep understanding.

And when we ourselves are tempted in the mad complexity of our material civilization to disregard the pristine ideals of the Republic, we see his gaunt figure standing before us and his outstretched arm pointing to the straighter and simple path of righteousness. For he was a liberator of men in bondage; he was a savior of his country.

When we think of leadership, we think of Washington; when we think of statecraft, we think of Jefferson; when we think of heart and soul, we think of Lincoln. It is a pity that few Lincoln Day orators have taken the time, few have the capacity of mind and conscience to understand the true Abraham Lincoln. It is shameful that his essential humanity has been to a large extent lost to the welter and myth we love to build around our national heroes.

Abraham Lincoln was a pretty hard character in the eyes of the propertied class. It seems he had some inkling that the rights of human beings to food and clothing and freedom were greater than the right to acquire and hold wealth in spite of the welfare of one's neighbor.

In the White House, Abraham Lincoln hewed the line, a lonely and abused man, as he had hewed in his youth the fence rails of pastorial Illinois. With conscience intact and vision clear he held to the firm principle of human relationship though the Nation trembled on the brink of collapse. Lincoln believed it were better to have no United States of America than to have a United States through which the word "freedom" rang in hallow mockery.

Lincoln was interested in American institutions as the continuing expression of the ideals of the American people—not as a divinely inspired set of rules and regulations rising up to confound future generations. Americanism, Lincoln believed, was a dynamic principle of action, not a form of ancestor worship. He believed the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence were expressions of the restless idealism of the American people, not empty paragraphs designed to ring hollowly through schoolroom and declamation hall, not a sequence of smug quotations to bolster up the specious argument of constitutional lawyers. There are a lot of folks lately wondering if Lincoln wasn't right after all.

My friends, we have come a long way since the days of Lincoln. There are no veterans of the War Between the States left. Whether they wore the blue or the gray, they will be an honored group. They set an example of devotion to a cause which is often lacking in these times. The community cherishes every one of them and while they have now passed "Over the river to rest in the shade of the trees," may we take courage in these trying days which confront our Nation.

On this, the 12th day of February 1962 we see walls erected between the great cities. The need of the hour is for the stamina that has overthrown every armed enemy of the United States. The situation calls today for no less whit of courage, perseverance, of the will to conquer than our forces have always displayed when they faced the foe. We recall the vicissitudes of the "fathers" and derive inspiration afresh from their fortitude and faith. It was these virtues, as well as valor in battle, that made their cause triumphant.

Having gathered here to pay homage to a great American, let us not forget that the strength of this Nation is not in its accumulated wealth, its vast area, its known and unknown resources. It is in the stable character of its citizens. With the past then, we are not too concerned, save that its lessons so plainly written may aid us in solving the problems of the future, or the lives of its simple great ones serve as illuminated milestones to mark the passage of the ages to a more perfect civilization.

A Youth Program for Our Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the 52d anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America was observed this month, and it was pointed out 34 million Americans have been associated with the Scouting movement since 1910. The contributions made during those years have been many and significant; we in New Jersey are particularly proud that the headquarters for the Boy Scouts is in New Jersey at New Brunswick. An editorial in the February 7 issue of the Camden (N.J.) Courier-Post gives some expression of that pride. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

A YOUTH PROGRAM FOR OUR TIMES

Since 1910, more than 34 million Americans have been identified with the Boy Scouts of America, whose 52d anniversary is observed by Boy Scout Week, beginning today.

There is scarcely an American family that has not felt Scouting's influence. In many families there now have been three generations active in its work.

Even as Scouting strengthens family life in America, this year's Boy Scout Week observance focuses on the contribution families make both to Scouting and the American way of life.

In the younger boy program—Cub Scouting—parents participate with their sons. Mothers serve as den mothers or helpers in other ways and fathers become den dads and Cub Pack Committeemen.

In Boy Scouting and the older boy program of Exploring, parents show their interest by their participation in Scouting functions. It has become tradition in Scouting for mothers to wear miniature pins of their sons' ranks.

Scout leaders feel that because of the active participation of parents in Scouting's programs a profound impression is being made on the home life of millions of Americans. Families brought together by Scouting are said to be stronger families. Certainly stronger families mean a stronger America.

During Boy Scout Week, through unit, district, and council programs typical Scouting families will be recognized.

The slogan for the week, "Strengthen America—Character Counts," found its inspiration in the conclusions of the President's Commission on National Goals.

"The paramount goal of the United States," the Commission said, "is to guard the rights of the indivdual, to insure his development, and to enlarge his opportunity," and that "the way to preserve freedom is to live it."

Chief Scout Executive Joseph A. Brunton, jr., in announcing the new program declares, "Scounting's role in strengthening America was never more important than it is right now. The first line of our Nation's defenses lies in the character of its people and that of the oncoming generation."

Here is what the Boy Scouts of America is dedicating itself to do:

Build a strong America—by building and maintaining a strong movement, capable of leading the largest possible number of boys along the trail to good character, participating citizenship, and physical fitness.

Serve the cause of democracy—by giving boys the opportunity to practice good citizenship through service to their fellow man and by helping them expand their knowledge and love of their country.

Achieve the purposes of Scouting—by helping boys to do things for themselves and others and to instill within their hearts and minds the ideals of Scouting based on a reverence of God.

Here is a youth program for our times, currently bringing "duty to God and country" into the lives of American boys. It's a program we urge all our citizens to support.

We join in saluting Scouting for the role it plays in the families of the 7,970 Cub Scouts, Boy Scouts, and Explorers of Camden County. We congratulate the families selected as outstanding Scouting families in our area. They are the kind of families that are building the kind of character in young people that is America's true strength.

Four Months Each Year for Uncle Sam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, do you, Mr. Taxpayer, realize that is exactly what you are doing? Do you realize further that if the present trend continues you will be working a longer period of time for your Government, which inevitably means you work less for yourself and family?

Reversing the trend is not easy but it can be done. A citizenry aroused to the dangers of so-called Federal handouts—which in reality are not that at all—and more persons in public life at every level who place principle above political expediency, can accomplish such a reversal.

More editorials similar to the one which follows, should at least arouse some thinking:

[From the Farmington (Mich.) Enterprise]

THE TREND TO BIG GOVERNMENT

An article which we read in a trade publication a short while back pointed out that if you are an average American wage earner or businessman you work for yourself and your family from January through August and for the Government the last 4 months of the year.

Economists say a free society is in danger when government takes 20 to 25 percent of a society's wealth. This would mean, then, that we in the United States are already well past the danger point and yet the burden of taxation continues to mount.

Tragically enough, many of us who are most violently opposed to socialism are unwittingly aiding and abetting those whose objective it is to bring just that about in our country. We do it by demanding from various levels of government more and more benefits and services which we can and should provide for ourselves. We do it by asking the Federal Government to do things for us which can be done better and cheaper by local or State government.

A lot of clamoring has been going on of late for Federal aid to education. Vast amounts of Federal money have already been

shelled out for community renewal and redevelopment projects and more and more application are being filed with the Federal Government monthly for similar assistance from communities in all parts of the country. Our social security program which started out as a good thing is gradually developing into a monster and another extra heavy tax burden on each and every business owner and wage earner.

Just a few short weeks back Farmington, Birmingham, Fenton, and Wixom were awarded Federal grants totaling over $61,000 with which to do extensive master planning for community betterment. The grant to the city of Farmington was for $11,250.

Officials in each of the communities receiving these grants are looking upon them as real windfalls. But, let's look at this thing realistically. The money that is being turned over to us now is actually money which we have contributed to the Federal Government in taxes in the first place.

When you stop to consider the vast network of organizations that are necessary to administer just about every Federal aid program that there is, it is quite easy to see that the amount that is coming back to local governmental bodies and individuals is far less than the amounts being contributed.

The question that keeps sticking in our mind is where and when is it going to end. The only thing that is going to stop the trend in this direction is a corps of State and local governmental officials backed by an aroused citizenry that will be willing to start a movement to turn the tide in a new direction.

Let's get our tax money and our programing back to the local level of government again before it becomes too late.

Ravenswood, W. Va., High School Senior, Miss Phyllis J. MacVicar, Honored as Winner of VFW Voice of Democracy Contest in Her State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it was my privilege to have been a guest of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States on the occasion of that patriotic organization's annual dinner honoring Members of Congress who have served in the Armed Forces.

At that significant event, held February 6, 1962, in the Sheraton Park Hotel in the Nation's Capital, State winners of the VFW 1961–62 Voice of Democracy contest were announced and listed in the program.

Miss Phyllis J. MacVicar, 17-year-old daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Cameron MacVicar of Ravenswood, was honored as the contest winner from West Virginia. She is a senior at Ravenswood High School who moved with her family to West Virginia from Spokane, Wash., a year and a half ago. Her father is employed by the Kaiser Aluminum Co.

Miss MacVicar is anticipating college matriculation next year and plans to prepare for a teaching career. She expects to major in English and dramatics.

Among those in the West Virginia delegation at the VFW conference and dinner on February 6 were: Department Commander Richard J. Cooper of Weston; Department Senior Vice Commander James R. Fawcett, of Grafton; Department Junior Vice Commander Leo C. Shuck, of Keyser; Department Adjutant Ralph Stump, of St. Albans; Department Chief of Staff David J. Lawery, of Weirton; Past Department Commander Richard Homan, of Sugar Grove; Department Service Officer Melvin Linton, of Huntington; Sixth District Commander Richard Weidlich, of Roanoke; Eighth District Department Commander John Payne, of Charleston; Leonard DeWitt, of Wellsburg, commander of Post 4496; Ralph Honaker, of Huntington, commander of Post 1064; Claude Hedges, of Martinsburg, commander of Post 896; Department Youth Activities Director George Reilly, of McMechen; Fourth District Commander Lee McDonald, of Martinsburg; C. S. Collier, of Charleston, State director of the department of veterans affairs; and Don S. Maupin, of Moundsville, chairman of the VFW southern conference.

Mr. President, consistent with my annual custom, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the winning essay from among those submitted by West Virginia participants in the VFW Voice of Democracy Contest, Miss Phyllis J. MacVicar's outstanding presentation on the subject, "What Freedom Means to Me."

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

(By Phyllis J. MacVicar)

Freedom is my right to think and choose.

Is it bold of me to speak of freedom as my right? No, because I lay no claim to earning it. It was given to me, it was given to you, and future generations will so be privileged.

However, this is the middle of my story. Let us go back to the beginning and relive the dynamic birth of freedom.

Who fathered freedom? A patriot? A statesman? A brave soldier? No, they couldn't have. They could have given their lives defending it, but they could not have fathered freedom.

Why? Stop and think. Is freedom an arm? or a leg? or something tangible? No. It is a privilege of our capacity to reason. Our Maker so endowed us. He is the Father of freedom.

You have heard the expressions "Our—God-given rights" and "man's unalienable rights." To me freedom is God-given but not like a coat that can be taken off and put on at will. It is in my spirit. I have it, willing or not.

Unbidden, freedom asserted itself in me long before I could name it. Before I was able to hold a spoon, I insisted on choosing the foods I ate. I made quite an issue of selecting my bedtime, and dubiously accepted the proffered hand when crossing the street.

The feeling of freedom is exhilarating. The responsibility sobering. Freedom isn't doing everything we want to do. It is thinking, then choosing. The very small child is alerted to think of the traffic pattern before he crosses the street, to avoid choosing a dangerous time to cross.

I can never escape my God-given power to think and choose. My every thought is a decision, my every choice has a consequence. Freedom rests heavily on my shoulders. It constantly demands expression. My thinking and choosing must keep pace with this demand. When decisions are hard to make and choices unpleasant I'd like to escape to a Shangri-La and leave it all behind. But, I can't. Freedom and I are inseparable. What do I do with it? That choice is also mine. Alarming, isn't it?

Your question to me may well be, "If freedom and the human being are inseparable how do you account for the years of slavery this world has known?" I say to you, the choice was still man's. Evidence? Recall the beasts whose hunger was appeased with innocent blood in the spectaculars of the Roman arena. More recently: recall the words of Patrick Henry, "Is life so dear, or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?"

And today? Eternal vigilance, we are told, is the price of freedom. I like to say personal vigilance, lest honor and justice give way to expedience. It takes courage to maintain honor in the face of ridicule and justice where personal sacrifice is involved. It takes the quiet, everyday, kind of courage, without benefit of drum roll or the magnificent vision of Old Glory majestically soaring to the top.

Personal vigilance is my pledge, lest one day I find a muffled, whimpering, voice within me, crying for the expression denied it, by my poor choices.

Freedom is my right to think and choose.

Speaker Sam Rayburn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 18, 1962

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, little can be said about the late, beloved SAM RAYBURN that would not be mere repetition of the consensus of praise, admiration, and affection expressed by all familiar with the life and work of this outstanding man. His deep sensitivity, coupled with an awareness of the aspirations and rights of people, provided the basis for the pervading reputation of greatness proclaimed by all.

The entire Nation feels indebted for his ceaseless work and devotion to the betterment of the commonweal.

Mr. SAM's realistic appraisals of the circumstances affecting passage of important legislation and his ability to find common denominators among diverse positions has gained him lasting distinction among the great legislative leaders of our history.

The best measure of his contribution is his indelible mark on the vast body of great law enacted under the guidance of his invisible hand.

This plain-living, selfless individual was not an average man. His counsel was respected by all. Like an uncle he offered me sage advice whenever needed or asked. No greater tribute can be uttered than to say that everyone loved and respected this exceptional man.

Fine Arts and the University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the urgent need of help for our cultural institutions is emphasized once again in an address by the distinguished new president of New York University, Dr. James Hester. Although his remarks are directed toward conditions in Brooklyn, N.Y., they are equally applicable as he points out, to the cultural future of other great cities throughout the United States. The same subject is dealt with by Chancellor Clifford C. Furnas of the University of Buffalo, N.Y. The urgency for Federal assistance in this area of our national social welfare is thus made evident once more, and stresses the importance of holding early hearings on the legislation now before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the address by Dr. Hester entitled "The Cultural Future of Brooklyn," which was delivered to the Downtown Brooklyn Association's 23d meeting and luncheon on January 22; and the address entitled "The Fine Arts and the Univercity," delivered by Dr. Furnas on the occasion of the University of Buffalo's convocation for the fine arts on January 20.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CULTURAL FUTURE OF BROOKLYN

(By President James M. Hester)

I wish to invite the attention of this important gathering of Brooklyn leaders to a subject of major concern throughout our country. Our society is becoming increasingly urbanized, or, if you wish, suburbanized. This process has many crosscurrents which are distributing various economic and cultural groups in new locations. In many cases, cities are not growing as rapidly as the suburban areas around them; yet the cities remain the focal points of population growth over increasingly large metropolitan areas. The economic and cultural levels of suburban areas are rising, while the substantial populations that remain or come into the cities tend to be of lower income groups. There are reverse currents in this process, the results of which are evident in those sections of Brooklyn, for example, which are enjoying a renaissance. But these are exceptions to a larger process that began several decades ago. As a result, in Brooklyn, as in many other cities, there are large sections in which the normal stratification of society has broken down. Those who ought to the set the pace for behavior and cultural aspiration are either isolated or no longer present. A population that needs guidance in establishing standards is often left largely to its own limited resources.

The social problems that this has brought about are well known to us all. They are receiving serious attention from responsible leaders here and throughout the country. I am merely adding my voice to many that are asking for greater attention to the needs of those who reside at the centers of our great metropolitan areas.

My argument is this: Whether or not the populations of the cities are growing as rapidly as the populations of the suburban areas, city dwellers are and will remain a substantial part of our total population. Whether or not some businesses and industries are moving to suburban locations, our urban centers will remain vitally important to our total economy and to the livelihood of millions of persons who live both inside and outside the urban centers. I support the view that the cities themselves will continue to be the most important centers of cultural life, not only for those who live within them, but for those who reside in the suburban areas around them. It is doubtful that it is possible to create the quantity of high quality cultural facilities that would be required to give each suburban community the type of activities that can be supported by larger concentrations of resources. Obviously, we cannot abandon our cities as hopeless conglomerations of insoluble problems. Rather, as I am sure you agree, we must discover how to make urban life as healthy and attractive as possible. There are at least two compelling reasons for doing this. First, our cities are right now the homes of millions of our future citizens, whose future is our future and the future of our children. Second, the whole world is becoming urbanized, and our city, New York, is the most urban of all the world population centers. This places on us a responsibility to lead the way in discovering what is required to make modern city life a life worth living. If the leaders of this community cannot deal successfully with this problem, they shall be forsaking not only a great proportion of the youth of this country, but also an opportunity and responsibility to set a standard which urban centers throughout our country and the world can emulate.

It is in this context that I wish to discuss the cultural future of Brooklyn. Admittedly, this is an audacious subject. The cultural future of Brooklyn is a highly complex topic which could only be fully examined on the basis of far more information, wisdom, and clairvoyance than I possess. There are persons here today whose long experience with cultural affairs in Brooklyn equips them far better than I to deal with this question. However, I am keenly interested in it, and I have been given this opportunity to speak.

I came to Brooklyn as a virtual stranger 4½ years ago.. I knew the stereotype of the community presented in novels, plays, and movies. I did not then know of the tremendous cultural wealth that Brooklyn possesses. I did not know, as I do now, that many of Brooklyn's secondary schools, public and private, are among the best in the country, and that they annually produce students who stand at the top in national scholastic competitions. I did not know that Brooklyn has 12 institutions of higher education which enroll more than 60,000 students. Today we are honoring the president of the oldest of these, the Packer Collegiate Institute, whose founding dates back to the establishment of the Brooklyn Female Academy in 1845. I was unaware of the excellent system of public libraries, which extends out from the beautiful main library at Grand Army Plaza to all parts of the borough.

Perhaps the most impressive institution to a newcomer is the Institute of Arts and Science, which administers the Academy of Music, the Brooklyn Museum, the Children's Museum, and the Botanic Garden. No other city in the United States possesses a single organization which provides cultural opportunities of such variety for the whole community.

The Academy of Music conducts an amazing program of concerts, recitals, lectures, and dramas with a total annual attendance of more than 400,000 persons. In recent years the academy has sponsored the establishment of an orchestra, opera company, ballet company, and repertory theater, in Brooklyn and for Brooklyn.

The Brooklyn Museum is world renowned for many of its collections and exhibits. During the past year, 561,000 persons visited the museum.

The Brooklyn Children's Museum is the first and largest of its kind in the world. During the past year it was visited by almost 300,000 children.

Last, but certainly not least, the Institute of Arts and Science administers the Brooklyn Botanic Garden. A million and a half persons visit the botanic garden each year.

I have come to know that there are hundreds of cultural institutions in Brooklyn: churches, temples, lodges, clubs, community centers, and smaller public and private groups of many kinds. A detailed description of Brooklyn's present cultural life would probably amaze the best informed Brooklynite. Brooklyn is unusually fortunate in its inheritance from past generations, whose leaders appreciated the very problems with which we are concerned and who sought to make provisions for their solution then and now. Brooklyn owes a debt of gratitude to those, like Dr. Shafer, who have labored here to sustain and enhance that inheritance.

Although we must feel a deep admiration for Brooklyn's institutions, we must also ask whether the current level of Brooklyn's cultural activities is adequate for the future. In my own opinion, it is not, and I am not alone in this view. Few, if any of the institutions with which I am familiar here are satisfied with either the quantity or quality of the services they can offer in view of the need for them. With few exceptions, Brooklyn's cultural institutions are not adequately financed. For example, during the past 10 years the Brooklyn Museum and the Academy of Music have jointly produced an annual deficit of approximately $70,000, despite increasing city appropriations toward their maintenance and operations. Because of deficits during the past 25 years, the endowed reserves of the Institute of Arts and Science have been reduced by more than a million dollars, resulting in residual reserves of less than a million dollars. When, a few years ago, the institute employed a professional firm to advise on fundraising to correct this problem, the trustees were told that there was not sufficient support for the work of the institute in Brooklyn to warrant a general fundraising campaign. Other cultural institutions in Brooklyn have received the same discouraging counsel. There have been a few shining examples of success, for which several of the men in this room are largely responsible, but I believe it is accurate to say that by and large, awareness, appreciation, and support of Brooklyn's cultural institutions are at a disappointingly low level.

This is not a condition peculiar to Brooklyn. Educational and cultural institutions throughout the country have encountered the same problem. Rising costs, plus the effects of taxation on the large fortunes that once served as sources of endowment, have produced the same results everywhere. In some instances, foundations have filled the gap, but their resources are inadequate for the total task. What must come now, and is building up in many places, is a new pattern of support: annual gifts from a large number of corporations and individuals coupled with a larger number of individual bequests. In other words, one of the effects of increased taxation is the necessity for a broadened base of support to our cultural institutions. The alternatives are the extinc-

tion of many of them or their absorption by agencies of Government, which in turn, means greater taxation.

This state of affairs does have certain stimulating aspects. It is a challenge to civic leaders to help local institutions make their mission, potential, and problems known to those who can support them. It is a challenge to those who administer cultural activities to conduct their programs in a manner that warrants broad-based support.

A question that might be asked is whether Brooklyn has special problems in building support for its own institutions. Every community has special problems; Brooklyn has Manhattan. It is an old story that in becoming part of Greater New York, Brooklyn lost part of its civic identity. Brooklyn has always had strong local communities, but the effect of Manhattan's proximity has been to weaken the cohesion of Brooklyn and to emphasize local community life. Many of Brooklyn's separate communities are full of vitality and prosperity, but none is large enough alone to support the facilities of a great city. Yet Brooklyn is a great city and possesses facilities which require great city support if they are to survive and prosper.

There is a thought which is heartening to anyone who contemplates Brooklyn's history and future. Brooklyn has gone through many phases of development. Repeated waves of newcomers have moved to Brooklyn, have worked and struggled here and many have prospered. Perhaps more than any community in America, Brooklyn has demonstrated resilience, a power of adaptation and redevelopment which must always be remembered in assessing Brooklyn's future. Too often, I believe, this is forgotten. Some observers are too easily disheartened when they limit their thoughts entirely to the worst of present conditions. The easily disheartened can imagine a future Brooklyn as a wilderness of lost souls, existing in a community without structure, without civic pride, and without the cultural standards and opportunities that inspire young people to develop their finest abilities.

Of course it is sad to see what has happened to some parts of Brooklyn, as well as to communities in all of our older cities. It is sad to see beautiful old homes turned into tenements. It is sad to see some new housing developments become the breeding grounds of delinquency. It is sad to see fine old institutions running into debt. It is sad to see struggling young institutions unable to finance healthy growth in a community that needs them. But sadness is no posture for vigorous people in a time of challenge.

The cultural future of Brooklyn is the same as the cultural future of Manhattan, or the Bronx, or Philadelphia, or Chicago, or Detroit. It is as bright as the vision of its leaders—civic, financial, and cultural, and as strong as their willingness to work to achieve that vision. If the natural leaders of the community, the men whose businesses and professions are supported by the community, assume the responsibilities our free society imposes on them, if they will support the institutions which sustain the cultural health of the community, then a bright future is assured. If those who prosper here forsake the community and spend the profits of Brooklyn enterprise primarily on interests outside the city, then the cultural future of Brooklyn is as dark as the future of the suburbs may be bright. But can the suburbs be healthy if the metropolitan area is sick at its core?

I, for one, have been impressed by Brooklyn's cultural wealth in institutions created by community leaders of earlier days for the benefit of their own and succeeding generations. I have been privileged to know some of the present leaders of Brooklyn who are working to sustain and develop those institutions. They labor, however, against tremendous odds, odds that can only be altered by more widespread support for their efforts.

One of the great virtues and justifications of our capitalistic system is that it puts into the hands of those who have succeeded in private enterprise the financial power to support those activities which their communities need. I would argue, therefore, that the cultural future of Brooklyn is a challenge to free enterprise and to those who have benefited from it in Brooklyn.

THE FINE ARTS AND THE UNIVERSITY

(By C. C. Furnas, Chancellor)

When last did you follow a sunrise in the mountains—from the barest suggestion of light to the dodging of the brilliant rays around the jagged peaks? Soon it illuminates the busyness of the people in the broad valley—the farmer, the chemist, the merchant, the engineer, the mother, the teacher—the artist.

Who is the artist? He is the one who, as the shadows lengthened with the evening, sat on the mountainside and contemplated the alpenschein—the afterglow. That is the time of afterthoughts: what did the day mean, not just to me, but to all of us?

He recalled the beauties of the day. As often before he had admired the soaring arch of the dramatic bridge across the river. Did he realize it represented the wedding of the talents of the engineer and the artist?

He had had lunch with a friend of his who happened to be a mathematician, and he was still puzzled by the conversation. His friend had spoken of the beautiful proof of a mathematical theorem. Was he speaking of beauty in the same sense that a musician refers to the beauty of a Beethoven symphony? Is there more basis for common understanding between the artist and the scientist than one might be led to believe at first glance?

Turning to matters closer at hand—I, too, have a mathematician friend. He is an expert in "random numbers." He dabbles with paints and recently showed me a small canvas on which he had daubed spots of many colors without any regard to order. He calls it "Random Blobs" and says it has the significance of unity with his mathematical specialty. I am not sure that this is true, but it is an interesting thought.

A bare 300 yards from here is a strange looking building. Its dominant feature is a stubby, concrete cylinder, stark in outline. It is embellished, however, with three striking sculptural abstractions which perhaps represent elements of Polynesian mystique—no one is really sure, including the artist on our faculty who created them. It is certain, however, that this touch of creativity has converted the building from a drab silo into an exciting structure. Naturally, one of artistic bent who views the effect gloats a bit and says that this is evidence that the creative artist is essential for achieving a proper balance to the work of the crass engineer—and he is entirely correct.

Inside this building there is a reverse phenomenon. The structure houses a nuclear reactor which resulted from the fundamental knowledge acquired by the physicists in the splitting of the atom. When this reactor is in operation, it emits a fantastically beautiful, bluish glow which, until two decades ago, was literally not of this world. Outside of nuclear reactors I have never seen it duplicated elsewhere in nature or on any canvas. Perhaps there is something new here for the visual arts.

Recently the writings of the eminent novelist, C. P. Snow, have caused considerable controversy. Sir Charles, who was first an eminent scientist and government official and later a writer, decries the serious schism in understanding and appreciation between the scientist and the humanist. He feels that this is much more serious than superficial arguments and exhibitions of mutual disdain. He feels that something should be done about it. At least to a degree, he must be correct, and it should be the role of a university to take positive action. Certainly a university should not only imply universality. It should embrace unity—not necessarily complete unity of knowledge, but certainly unity of general understanding, appreciation, and purpose. This is the challenge of modern education: to present to the scientist an appreciation of the arts, and to the humanist, an abiding sense of the values and contributions of science. Be the student a future scientist, engineer, doctor, artist, or musician, true personal reward or fulfillment can come about only through such appreciation of and hunger for, the truth of both art and science, which is the beauty of life and nature.

I anticipate that there will be significant curriculum changes within the next decade which will represent a better balance than there has ever been in basic education, leading to improved understanding and appreciation, among all our people, of the essentials of modern life—science, the humanities, and the arts.

But our obligation does not end here. While some of our young people move on to specialization in the sciences and the professions, others turn toward propagation of the artistic practice—in painting, sculpture, and music—in the academic departments devoted to the majors in these fields. Here the creative impulse is nourished and channeled by an understanding of the past and of the techniques and forces which have enriched and advanced the arts. Thus is the entire educational process devoted to the perfection of the individual and the ultimate perfection of society, which is in itself an art.

The university's role also extends to the nourishment of the cultural hunger which has been awakened in the classroom or the home. In common with other institutions of fine arts we have the obligation to present, both to students and to the public, opportunities for enrichment through concerts, lectures, dramatic offerings, and exhibits. One of these exhibits we wish to call to your attention is here today. This is a collection of rarely displayed, privately owned works of contemporary artists which have been brought together in the exhibition room of this Lockwood Memorial Library, so often the scene of other exhibits of art and literary manuscripts. As our contribution to this glorious day which marks the reopening of the Albright-Knox Art Gallery, we are proud to present this collection of works by Picasso, Chagall, Modigliani, Vass, and Clifford Styll, which has been arranged by Dr. Oscar Silverman, director of libraries.

Up to this point we have spoken primarily of the role of the University of Buffalo in fine arts. This is a role which we are confident will be expanded as the university continues to develop. We would hope one day to achieve a distinction in education in the arts comparable to that which has been brought to our community by the international acclaim which the Albright-Knox Gallery has won as one of the truly outstanding centers of exhibition of modern art in our Nation. To further develop our facilities in this area, we have plans for a visual arts center, which, together with the Baird Music Building and the projected drama building and auditorium, will, in the not too distant future, comprise a complete and integrated center for the fine arts of which the university and all the people of New York State can well be proud.

It is most fitting that we, as a university, should pay honor and tribute, on this happy

day, to the giants of the arts, who have come to us, literally, from all over the world. Their very presence inspires us to dedicate ourselves anew to the work of nourishing the humanities and the arts. May we not look forward to a modern renaissance of interest through education, through example, through an overall increase in cultural activities. None of us here would revert to the notion of classical education of the 1800's but we can foster a keener appreciation among the general population of the traditions which have made our way of life what it is and which are the key to our future advancement.

If we grasp this challenge squarely, we can help to assure the long-range view of the human race glimpsed by the English historian Arnold D. Toynbee, in an article in the New York Times magazine a few years ago. Toynbee would have it that 300 years from now the 20th century will not be remembered for world wars or the automobile, the airplane, antibiotics, or even nuclear energy but rather for "having been the first age since the dawn of civilization some 5,000 or 6,000 years back, in which people dared to think it practicable to make the benefits of civilization available for the whole human race." Equally applicable to the arts and to the sciences, this is the task to which we of the 20th century must devote our energies and talents.

Now in closing let me sound one note of special tribute for the work of our good friend Seymond Knox, for his unfailing devotion to the cause of education and the arts, for his immeasurable contributions to cultural life and educational opportunity here in Buffalo. This round of symposia and commemoration, the magnificent new wing of the Albright-Knox Gallery, the well-deserved recognition for its modern art collection are indeed—as Time magazine somewhat flippantly noted—"Shorty's Triumph."

This is richly deserved acclaim, but I am sure there is more to come. In his duality as president of the Buffalo Fine Arts Academy and also chairman of the Council of the University of Buffalo, Mr. Knox catalyzes the community to the highest levels of accomplishment. As the university rises in stature and treads the path of the arts hand-in-hand with the refurbished and revitalized gallery, there will soon come the day when Time will feel constrained to publish another feature article and it will be entitled "Shorty's Eternal Triumph."

Again, welcome to all of you. It is a rare privilege to have you with us.

Dr. J. Fain Moore, of Coolidge, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a copy of a letter written to President Eisenhower under date of October 25, 1956, by Dr. J. Fain Moore, of Coolidge, Tex.

Dr. Moore has been a longtime constituent of mine and it is always a pleasure to receive mail from him, as the contents are always indicative that he has given much thought to the matters which are before the Congress.

The following letter, although written some 6 years ago, is very much up to date at this time in that it deals with one of the current major problems—reciprocal trade:

DR. MOORE WRITES TO PRESIDENT EISENHOWER—WRITTEN OCTOBER 25, 1956

The PRESIDENT,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I would like to express to you my thoughts concerning the unbalance in our economy concerning agriculture and its relation to all other major industries. To begin with, when our forefathers landed on our shores among savage Indians and a primeval forest where resources and ability to manufacture essential products were so limited as to make competition with the old corporations of England and Europe impossible, our government instituted a tariff to protect our infant manufacturing industries until they were able to meet competition on an equal basis. Today we have the largest and most powerful corporations in the world. We claim to be the most efficient and economic mass producers in the world. We have always preached free open competition to be the life of trade and essential for a good democracy, a proposition which I believe is almost axiomatic. I believe if free trade and competition is good for our 48 States, our Territories, and our 168 million people, it should be good to have free trade and competition among all nations.

It seems quite incongruous for our industries with unmatched efficiency and mass production at this late date to refuse worldwide free competition that would enable the vast majority of humanity, all but destitute in many foreign lands, to accumulate gradually a balance of exchange to buy all the products as surplus the American agriculture could produce on 100 percent of its farmland. If these poor and destitute people were permitted to receive for their goods and services through free worldwide competition an equitable price for their goods and services, their economic growth would soon enable them to have a balance of exchange to buy and consume all surplus agricultural products produced free of acreage control and price supports.

I believe the only way to achieve lasting world peace is to establish a world monetary exchange which would be equitable, fair, and just for all peoples, so their goods and services would bring on a free world competitive basis the same price less competitor's cost of transportation and handling. Every human being has an innate desire for self-expression both physical and mental, to produce those things that his talents, training, skill, and economy permit. I believe if we had a worldwide equitable exchange of goods and services, free of all tariffs, where any products made by any man, anywhere, whether Indian, Burmese, Chinese, or African, would reward him the same world price for his skill and effort, quality considered, that a man in any other nation could produce of like quality there would be an immediate rise in the economic, social, and educational development of the impoverished countries and people constituting more than half of humanity at this late age. Every man would know the reward for his products of his skill, efficiency, thrift, and labor would be the same on the world market for equal quality. These destitute millions' economy would soon rise to where they would have a balance of exchange to buy all the food production, not only ours, but of the world.

In the midst of a world seething with distrust, fear, and insecurity, I believe we should invite a reappraisal of existing world governments with the aim of establishing a world medium of exchange that is just and equitable to all nations and remove all privilege tariff walls. The nations could settle down with a sense of security and lack of distrust and fear, with the knowledge every man and government had an equal world economic opportunity only to be disturbed by some power-mad maniac, whom world humanity and sentiment would crush in its inception.

It seems to me to be most inconsistent to preach free, open competition as the life of a free trade and enterprise, as the farmer has had to do in the world market, and our billion-dollar corporations and others lie behind a tariff wall and refuse to enter or accept free competition. I believe the greatest blessing this world of humanity desires is world peace throughout the lands and where every man could exchange his goods and services on an equal basis throughout the world. This, Mr. President, I believe to be the only basic, fundamental condition, the attainment of which will accomplish a permanent basis for a lasting world peace devoid of fear, doublecrossing, and power blocking by nations to seek either protection or advantage. I believe that if free trade and competition is best for 48 States and territories, it is best and just as applicable between all our family of nations and their people.

In the soul of mankind, there exists a sense of right and equity as related to his fellow man, and when he sees all international cards thrown on the table face up to accomplish the condition I have tried to outline, and stands in the true light of every man's free opportunity to apply his skill and effort for himself and his fellow man on an equitable and just basis, his animosity toward mankind and other nations will fade away.

I have the honor to remain,

Yours faithfully,

J. FAIN MOORE, M.D.

Buy No U.N. Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial in the Dallas Morning News, entitled "Buy No U.N. Bonds," with which I am in full agreement.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUY NO U.N. BONDS

How many Americans would be foolish enough to stand on a street corner passing out $10 bills in exchange for $5's? Not many, we'll wager. That is almost precisely what President Kennedy asked all of us to do when he asked Congress for an appropriation of $100 million from the U.S. Treasury to purchase bonds offered by the United Nations.

These U.N. bonds are to be purchased on a 25-year term at an interest rate of 2 percent. To buy them, the United States must borrow money at the standard rate of nearly 4 percent. This is just plumb foolish. The President should know better. His own family fortune certainly was not amassed by doing business in this way.

This U.N.-bond scheme is little more than a gimmick. Realizing that Americans and their Representatives in Congress have become resentful of having to bail out the U.N. whenever it is in need of funds, U.N. officials decided the best way to get more money out of the U.S. Treasury would be to

make the current bailing out appear more businesslike. But a legitimate bond program involves a guarantee of repayment. This the U.N. cannot give. It may not be around another year, much less 25.

These are only a few of the many objections to this request. As Representative JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR., has pointed out, the United States, in effect, would be making an indirect loan of more than $20 million to the Soviet Union by purchasing the bonds. This is the amount in which the Soviet Union is in default of its special U.N. assessments.

Also, we would in effect be making indirect loans to 82 of the U.N.'s 104 members, for this is the number who have not been paying their share. Some of these nations, of course, have good reason for not "coughing up" the "dough" to support the U.N.'s special projects—like the Congo operation, for instance. What we are doing, in effect, is trying to undercut the financial pressure they have tried to apply by paying their assessments for them.

Purchase of these bonds by the United States will amount to a clearcut endorsement of the Congo operation and similar use of U.N. force in the internal affairs of other countries, because the primary reason for making the fund appeal was to cover the high cost of the U.N.'s war on Katanga.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, has said that we are setting a precedent for a flood of similar bond issues by the U.N. in the future. He has also noted that the President is asking Congress to perform its constitutional obligations in reverse, by increasing the debt of the United States in order to pay off the debts of the U.N.

Many will argue that, though it is an unwise venture, the purchase of U.N. bonds by the United States is essential to save the U.N.—the "last, best hope of mankind," as some have put it. Humbug. If the U.N. must be saved—and we're not entirely convinced at this point that it should—this will not do it. Congress can always appropriate specific grants, in specific amounts, for specific purposes, to keep it going.

More important is that the continued existence and usefulness of the U.N. must depend upon the cooperation and support of all of its members. To date, four-fifths of them are not participating. It is unlikely that they ever will, as long as the United States is willing to pick up the tab.

The Defense of the Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1962

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, an excellent and searching article by M. J. Rossant, financial editor of Business Week, appeared in a recent Reporter magazine, on United States-European relationships due to our respective balance-of-payments positions:

THE DEFENSE OF THE DOLLAR—MR. KENNEDY HEEDS EUROPE'S ADMONITION TO BALANCE OUR BOOKS

(By M. J. Rossant)

Predicting the revenues and expenditures of the Federal Government 18 months in advance is an iffy affair. Yet as early as last September, Mr. Kennedy pledged a balanced budget for the fiscal year ending in June 1963, and while it will be a long time before the results are in, the prediction of a balance was deemed essential by the President and his advisers. The event that dictated the decision was the annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund, whose headquarters are in Washington but which convened last fall in Vienna, bringing together finance ministers and central bankers from all over the non-Communist world.

The major topic on the agenda was a proposal to strengthen the international financial network by enlarging the International Monetary Fund's resources. But much of the discussion centered on the economic policies of the United States. Indeed, delegates from the Western European nations indulged in some thinly veiled criticism in public which was reinforced in much blunter terms in private. What is more, the representatives of the New Frontier, headed by Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon, had to heed the stewards of newly rich Europe, whose sermons on fiscal responsibility and faith in monetary discipline are reflected in the Kennedy administration's economic program, particularly the presentation of a budget in nominal balance and the promise to achieve an equilibrium in the U.S. balance of payments.

The reason the administration had to respond to European pressure was fairly simple: thanks to the huge reserves of dollars they have accumulated, the European central banks, acting with their governments, now have it in their power—should their confidence in the U.S. economy be sufficiently shaken—to bring about a run on gold which in turn could force a devaluation of the dollar.

The harsh discipline of the old gold standard, the so-called rules of the game that called for a country suffering from an outflow of funds to put its domestic economy through the wringer, no longer applies. Governments everywhere give priority to improving domestic conditions, for they cannot afford, politically or economically, the toll exacted by a deflationary policy designed to enhance the competitive position of their industry. But the Kennedy administration has also discovered that it is impossible to concentrate on the domestic economy to the neglect of external financial problems. This new fact of life was bluntly stated by Under Secretary of the Treasury Robert V. Roosa, who recently observed that the United States cannot "be insulated from the consequences, the discipline if you will, of its balance of payments."

Certainly, the persistent deficits that the United States is experiencing in its transactions with the rest of the world have influenced the administration's economic plans. The new discipline involved presenting a balanced Federal budget to convince the international financial community of Washington's determination to gain control over its fiscal responsibilities. With business activity in an expanding phase, a balanced budget could be justified on purely domestic grounds, and the administration has been quick to point out that it no longer has to rely on deficit financing to stimulate the economy because it can now count on a much higher intake of taxes from individuals and corporations to offset its expenditures. Mr. Kennedy and his economic advisers are critical of the Eisenhower regime for restricting the growth of the economy through a radical shift from deficit to surplus in the budget accompanied by an equally extreme move from easy to tight money. They are pursuing a contrasting course, hoping to avoid any sharp change in budget policy by actually increasing Federal outlays to insure that the economic upsurge will be maintained. In essence, this concept of the economic role of government is that it should act as both a stabilizing and an expanding influence. Accordingly, with expansion already underway but with the deficit in the payments balance on the increase, Washington is placing increased emphasis on stabilization.

GOLD RUSH DAYS IN LONDON

By any yardstick the United States is still the world's richest nation. But the American dollar is no longer the one inviolate paper currency, and the U.S. gold stock, which was once so huge as to be considered impregnable, has been eroding at an alarming rate. Between 1958 and 1960, the deficit in the U.S. balance of payments, which is a measure of our total transactions with other countries, amounted to over $11 billion; during this same period, some $5 billion held by foreign central banks was exchanged for gold.

After the Second World War, the United States emerged as the leading international banker, providing both short- and long-term credit to the rest of the world, so that the dollar became the major currency for settling international transactions and a reserve for foreign currencies. The dollar standard thus became an effective substitute for the old gold standard, for the dollar itself has gold backing, and foreign governments and central banks have the right to buy gold for dollars at the fixed price of $35 an ounce. During the early postwar period, Europe was suffering from a severe dollar shortage and in fact preferred dollars to gold. But more recently, the swelling deficit in the U.S. balance of payments has brought a glut of dollars to Europe, and its central banks have taken to exchanging their dollars for gold to build up their reserves.

The causes of the dollar flow were largely our own doing: foreign aid programs, beginning with the massive dollar infusions of the Marshall plan, military purchases in support of our forces in Europe, long-term corporate investment, and the increase in tourism.

For years, Washington found little cause for alarm over the deficit in its balance of payments, taking the view that if a problem existed it was that the United States had too much of the world's reserves. Then, in October 1960, the price of gold on London's free market rose to $40 an ounce on rumors that the dollar would be devalued. There was no solid basis for the story, but concern about the American recession, the long-term erosion of the dollar's purchasing power, and uncertainty ascribable to the election campaign (with Kennedy being viewed as an inflationist) led to a dumping of dollars and a run on gold. The London gold rush finally made Washington aware that things might never be the same again; that gold, which had been something of a barbarous relic, as John Maynard Keynes put it, had been rediscovered, assuming some of its old magic and danger.

Today our gold stock is in the neighborhood of $16.8 billion as compared to $24.6 billion in 1949. But because a 25-percent gold backing is required by law for the domestic money supply, the amount of free gold available to support the dollar abroad is just above $5 billion. Theoretically at least, the United States is vulnerable to a gold run, for with official foreign holdings amounting to about $12 billion, any one of a handful of central banks could start a run overnight by demanding gold in exchange for dollars.

THE HIDDEN HAND

This development has given enormous power and prestige to the men who head the Banque de France, the Deutsche Bundesbank, de Nederlansche Bank, and the Bank of England. The money managers are all public servants responsive to their governments, but they enjoy considerable autonomy in the formulation and execution of policy. They must decide whether to tighten or liberalize credit on the basis of their assessment of prevailing monetary conditions. The nature of

their job tends to make central bankers a peculiarly secretive and conservative breed. As the guardians of their countries' currency, it is understandable that they should have an anti-inflationary bias, but it is often given a moralistic tone, suggesting that tight money and high interest rates are good and that easy money and low interest rates are somehow evil. There is in fact a mystique about central banking, which Walter Bagehot described as "the hidden hand." Though its practitioners are now much more in the public eye than in Victorian days, they maintain something of the attitude of high priests who are prepared to hazard unpopularity in the defense of sound money.

But it would be unfair to regard these men as a sinister cabal who would deliberately create chaos by a run on the dollar. On the contrary, they have been anxious to protect the dollar and see it strengthened. But with so much of their own reserves in dollars, they feel they have a right to insist that the United States maintain a stable currency. Moreover, if they should refrain from buying gold and the dollar were devalued, they would almost certainly be relieved of their posts.

So far, the central bankers have been cooperating with the United States, and they have been exerting an increasing influence on U.S. policy. Their role helps explain the performance of the Kennedy administration. At first, many of Kennedy's economic brain trust were in favor of an emergency tax cut to counter the recession; they also advocated a much bigger outlay in the civilian sector. But Dillon and Roosa at the Treasury and William McChesney Martin, of the Federal Reserve Board, felt that the recession would be short lived, and that a tax cut or a big deficit would be regarded unfavorably in foreign financial circles. Their intervention convinced Kennedy; and as it turned out, the major portion of the increase in the budget deficit during Mr. Kennedy's first year in office was due to the military buildup after the Berlin crisis rather than to the antirecession measures. Moreover, after the Vienna meeting, the President ordered Government spending held down to keep the deficit from going above $7 billion, which was well below the $12.4 billion deficit for fiscal 1959, run up by Eisenhower in countering the 1957–58 recession.

The changed status of the dollar also influenced monetary policy. Traditionally, the remedy for countering a recession calls for the central bank to increase the supply of credit. This has the effect of making funds available at low rates of interest. In the three previous postwar recessions the Federal Reserve Board did just that, and forced the short-term rate down below 1 percent. But last year, the Kennedy administration—and the Federal Reserve Board—recognized that resort to this tactic would lead to an outflow of funds to higher yielding markets abroad, thus swelling the deficit in the balance of payments. So the Federal Reserve Board abandoned its former practice and pumped credit into the economy by trading in Government obligations of various terms of maturity. This served to bolster the short-term rate, which remained above 2 percent throughout the year, while making credit readily available.

These domestic actions were linked with other international moves taken by the administration to erect a defense in depth for the dollar. Until last year, there was a great deal of talk about cooperating to maintain the existing international monetary framework, but very little of a permanent or substantive nature was accomplished. The cooperation that did exist was mainly jerry-built, set up after trouble had actually erupted. For example, it was only after the London gold rush took place that the Treasury began consultations with the Bank of England, which had been unwilling to feed gold into the market on its own account to defend the dollar. After the negotiations, officials refused to confirm or deny that the bank had agreed to supply gold to the market on the understanding that the U.S. Treasury would replenish its stocks. But most private bankers are certain that such an agreement was made and is still in force.

By and large, the administration made considerable progress last year in gaining the cooperation of other governments and their central banks. Mr. Kennedy, it can be said with assurance, does not want to be stigmatized as a devaluator of the dollar. By the same token, no central banker—or Western European government—would relish gaining notoriety for starting a run on gold. But the price of their cooperation has been so high as to make the building of dollar defenses slow and laborious.

Even now, they are far from impregnable. But the administration did succeed in getting foreign central banks to exercise more restraint in their demand for gold. As a result, the United States lost only $900 million in 1961, compared to a withdrawal of $1.7 billion the previous year. Nor are the banks buying gold on the free market. According to Mocatta and Goldsmid, a leading London bullion firm, "It appears that these institutions have a gentlemen's agreement not to purchase gold for the time being." By agreeing to hold most of the new dollar assets they accumulate rather than exchange them for gold, the central banks are hoping to prevent an upsurge in private speculative demand that would entail an indirect drain on the U.S. gold stock. For in the short run the main problem is psychological—to maintain confidence in the dollar and avert an outflow of funds, whether American owned or foreign, which the Council of Economic Advisers admitted in its economic report, can be "large, sudden, erratic, contagious, and self-reinforcing."

The United States has not been content merely with a gentlemen's agreement. After consideration of more radical plans that were strongly opposed by Europe, the administration again put its support behind a proposal offered by Per Jacobsson, head of the International Monetary Fund, to increase the Fund's reserves by obtaining standby credits from the major industrial countries that could be lent to a country whose currency comes under pressure.

The Jacobsson plan won agreement in principle in Vienna, with all issues left to be hammered out by the 10 nations involved—including Britain and 6 European nations, plus Canada, Japan, and the United States—the so-called lenders' club. Last December, after a long series of secret negotiations, the agreement was finally reached. Though it may be a step forward, as the administration claims, more than anything else the formation of the lenders' club is a sign of the shift in the balance of financial power from Washington to Europe.

THE RULES OF THE CLUB

In any event it is a small and hobbled step, for the only effective credit on which the United States can draw will be the $2.5 billion put up by the European members of the club. Moreover, a prospective lender can refuse to advance credit if it feels that the borrowing country represents a bad risk. This provision is a compromise between the original proposal to make commitments automatic and the counterproposal of the French and Dutch—speaking on behalf of the Common Market—for veto power if the borrowing country failed to take corrective measures. To avoid affronting a fellow club member in search of a loan, the rule now allows a country to beg off simply by pleading that it has its own payments problems. Under these conditions, a borrowing member is likely to comply with policies suggested by the prospective lenders.

The real significance of the club is that the United States and Britain, the so-called key currency countries, which have had the most powerful voices in such international institutions as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, are now yielding some of their power to the Common Market countries. Although the club has been set up as part of the International Monetary Fund, its resources are available only to its members, who will consider transactions in private consultations. The Common Market nations are in fact the club, forming a majority that can block any action.

Both central bankers and financial officials are in almost continuous consultation through the newly formed Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, which has been located in Paris. But the Finance Committee of the OECD is made up of the members of the lenders' club, which indicates that its policies will be decided there and then passed on to the IMF in Washington. And another small group, working party 3 of OECD's Economic Policy Committee, has been charged with the task of coordinating policies aimed at narrowing the gap between American and European interest rates, which is an additional buffer against currency runs. Officials of the Kennedy administration have also checked their policies with OECD with the double objective of gaining useful advice while explaining the U.S. position.

Judging from Mr. Kennedy's economic report and the accompanying study by his Council of Economic Advisers, the administration is satisfied with the results to date. But while the payments deficit for 1961 is estimated at $2.5 billion against $3.9 billion in 1960, all the improvement took place in the first half, when business was feeling the effects of the recession and cut its imports at the same time that Europe's boom kept exports at a high level. The overall position deteriorated from quarter to quarter, with the deficit in the last 3 months running at an annual rate of $5 billion, the highest level since the fourth quarter a year ago.

It is difficult to foresee any better showing this year. If business activity is up to the administration's predictions, it will surely mean a substantial increase in demand for imports; and with Europe's rate of growth currently slipping, the prospect for compensation in the form of higher exports is slim. This will narrow the surplus in the U.S. trade account, and it is questionable whether the Government account can be reduced significantly, although Washington cherishes the hope that France will follow Germany's example and offset our dollar expenditures abroad by increased purchases of military equipment in the United States. The most sensitive and volatile areas are in the flow of funds, either for long-term investment or in short-term capital movements. In recent months, both categories have been reacting unfavorably and there is no concrete evidence that the trend will be reversed.

GENTLEMEN AND DOLLARS

The administration, however, feels confident that the business expansion will bring higher interest rates, which would attract short-term funds and make for investment opportunities with appeal for long-term capital. Treasury officials admit that most of the administration's proposals for restoring equilibrium, including its new trade program, are basically long-range measures that would not have much immediate impact even if Congress acted in unexpected haste and approved them. So in the short run, the fate of the dollar depends on the continued cooperation of foreign central bankers who in turn are subject to apprehensions of their own.

It is unquestionably true that in the fall of 1960 large-scale purchases of gold and foreign securities by Americans contributed to the London gold rush. While Congress

has since enacted a law forbidding U.S. citizens to hoard or purchase gold abroad, an American flight from the dollar is still possible and, if it happens, could touch off a crisis. Even if Europe's central bankers—and their governments—are committed to help, they are already uneasy about the present size of their dollar reserves and might act less than gentlemanly if confronted with a fresh flood of dollars from America.

Washington recognizes this danger, and for psychological reasons has decided that it would be unwise to overemphasize the critical nature of the balance-of-payments problems. It is too new and complex a subject to be readily explicable. Unlike the British, who have been frequently faced with the challenge of export or die and are prepared, however grudgingly, to make sacrifices, Americans might react unfavorably. Resistance could lead to a flight of capital, for example, or Congress might slash foreign aid and domestic nondefense expenditures.

Mr. Kennedy is not ducking or sidestepping the problem. On the contrary, his economic program—the new trade proposals, his tax recommendations, the decision to expand Government spending, and even the suggested yardsticks to govern labor-management wage negotiations—is intended to eliminate the payments deficit by stimulating growth and strengthening the competitive position of the American economy. The pledge of a balanced budget when business activity is rising is not inconsistent with his long-term objectives. The need to gain Europe's cooperation may have set limits to the administration's freedom of action, but it has not yet entailed any serious restraints on growth.

If the administration is to be faulted, it should be on other grounds. The notion that the United States must mend its ways and adhere to Europe's example is ludicrous, yet in some ways this seems to be the present trend in Washington. Europe's financial health continues to depend to a large extent on the United States, which has every right to demand, now that the patient has been rehabilitated, that it contribute to the strengthening of the Western alliance. The degree of this trend may be measured by the fact that the administration is much more concerned with restoring confidence by gaining control over its domestic finances than in prodding Europe into a greater show of responsibility for the defense of the dollar.

It is even conceivable that the administration will be forced to take still more conservative steps in order to buttress the dollar. But the breakdown of the gold standard in the 1930's demonstrates that adherence to fiscal and monetary orthodoxy is hardly a guaranteed defense. If the new discipline results in stunting economic growth, the price of cooperation may prove too high.

Cooperation has in fact been comparatively one sided with the Europeans making little more than the most cursory gestures of collective action. They should be persuaded to act with some largess. It should be noted that assets of Americans in foreign countries amount to well over $40 billion, the bulk of it in Europe, which far outweighs short-term liabilities in the hands of foreigners that are posing so obvious a threat. Most of these American investments abroad represent corporate acquisitions—Ford's $374 million purchase of Ford of England in 1960 and Goodyear's recent takeover of Fulda, one of West Germany's largest tiremakers, for some $7 million—and direct expenditures on plants and machinery. As such, they are not liquid but they have placed dollars in the hands of Europeans, who are reluctant to use them for long-term investments and loans of their own. The administration has no plans to prevent Americans from investing abroad, but it can use foreign assets as a stick against the hoarders of Europe. If cooperation is to be effective, it must not be directed only at achieving growth with stability on the domestic front but at a much greater utilization in the interests of the West of the surpluses amassed and frozen abroad—for instance in areas, both military and economic, where the dollar has been carrying the burden.

Father Hesburgh and Notre Dame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most distinguished constituents of my district, the Reverend Theodore Hesburgh, C.S.C., president of the University of Notre Dame, was the subject of a profile cover story in the February 9, 1962, issue of Time magazine.

This story documents the impressive growth in excellence of Notre Dame and Father Hesburgh's contribution to this growth and leadership beyond the university. The story follows:

GOD AND MAN AT NOTRE DAME

"A Catholic university is a contradiction in terms," George Bernard Shaw once said. The Reverend Theodore Martin Hesburgh, C.S.C., president of the University of Notre Dame, can readily see Shaw's point—that religious dogma seems incompatible with the scientific spirit of skeptical, free inquiry. He can just as readily reply to Shaw. "We must cherish both values. We must reflect the 'ancient beauty, ever old and ever new,'" he says. "There is no conflict between science and theology except where there is bad science or bad theology."

By this precept, Father Hesburgh, 44, is guiding the country's best-known Roman Catholic university, and has become the most influential figure in the reshaping of Catholic higher education in the United States. A school once known chiefly for a football team is trying to rise above the undistinguished record of U.S. Catholic colleges in general and reach for the renown of the Catholic universities of the Middle Ages.

A SPECTACULAR FLOWERING

As spring semester opened last week on the campus near South Bend, Notre Dame clearly reflected St. Augustine's "ever old and ever new." In the Sacred Heart Church, young men in blue and gold jackets knelt in prayer as a priest pronounced the ancient greeting Dominus vobiscum. Across the 1,100-acre campus, bulldozers chewed the frozen earth, and riveters set steel beams arattling. Under construction: a geodesic-dome student center, a federally financed radiation laboratory, a $3 million computer center, a 10-story library big enough to seat half the student body (total: 6,467 men).

Notre Dame (pronounced Noter Dayme, according to a university ruling made to help sportcasters) is the proud possession of the Congregation of the Holy Cross,[1] founded in France in 1837. In size (world membership, 3,300) and wealth, the order does not compare with the 422-year-old Jesuits (34,700 members), who control 28 U.S. campuses. C.S.C. has only five: Notre Dame, Oregon's Portland University, Massachusetts' Stonehill College, Pennsylvania King's College, and Texas' St. Edward's College. But in Notre Dame, C.S.C. has what is generally acknowledged as the most rapidly improving Catholic campus in the United States.

"The Notre Dame efflorescence," says Robert M. Hutchins, former chancellor of the University of Chicago, "has been one of the most spectacular developments in higher education in the last 25 years. I suspect that Notre Dame has done more than any other institution in this period, possibly because there was more to do."

THE MISSING SCHOLARS

What had to be done, and what still must be done, is clear from a steady refrain of Catholic self-criticism. "In no western society is the intellectual prestige of Catholicism lower than in the country where, in such respects as wealth, numbers, and strength of organization, it is so powerful," wrote Historian D. W. Brogan. "The general Catholic community in America does not know what scholarship is," said Jesuit Theologian Gustave Weigel, of Maryland's Woodstock College. And the Reverend John J. Cavanaugh, Hesburgh's predecessor at Notre Dame, asked sorrowfully, "Where are the Catholic Salks, Oppenheimers, Einsteins?"

The search for the answer leads into sociology as much as religion. U.S. Catholics came mainly from Europe's humblest classes, and in America were foreigners struggling for security in a hostile society. American priests seemed even more foreign to the dominant Protestant society, in turn saw themselves as protectors of their flock against the moral and intellectual corruption that was all around. Their own hard-won learning was something to be passed along by rote and discipline, not challenged or enlarged by free inquiry. The stifling effects persisted well into the 20th century, even with millions of American Catholics two and three generations away from their immigrant origins and tens of thousands able to afford college. When Americanization might have been expected to set in, it began with the least scholarly practices of secular schools. The result was a blend, in one Catholic critic's words, of "Thomism and the split T."

HUGE EFFORT

Canon Law 1374 says: "Catholic children must not attend non-Catholic, neutral, or mixed schools, that is, those which are also open to non-Catholics." In practice, this is not fully possible in the Protestant United States. Nearly half of the Nation's Catholic grade and high school children and 60 percent of its Catholic collegians attend non-Catholic institutions. With some 10,000 Catholics, for example, New York University (enrollment: 43,000) has been called the largest Catholic university in the country.

Yet the Catholic school effort is huge, the biggest complex of private education in the world. In higher education, it consists of 267 campuses, including 31 universities, enrolling 322,000 students (about 8 percent of all U.S. college enrollment). These colleges are fed by 12,700 grade and high schools enrolling 5,300,000 students—1 out of 8 U.S. schoolchildren.

FEW PHI BETA KEYS

Few secular colleges can match Catholic education at its Latin-and-Greek best: the "pure" B.A. offered at many Jesuit campuses. But overall, Catholic colleges weigh light on the U.S. academic scales. There is no Catholic equivalent of Amherst, Oberlin, Reed, or Swarthmore, let alone Harvard, Yale, or Princeton. Notre Dame itself is not yet among the top schools.

One gage of quality among the Nation's colleges and universities is a Phi Beta Kappa chapter. Whereas 167 secular campuses are empowered to award a Phi Beta Kappa key, only 3 Catholic colleges can (Catholic University, the College of St. Catherine in St. Paul, and—beginning next month—Ford-

[1] In Latin, Congregatio Sanctae Crucis (C.S.C.).

ham). Another gage is Rhodes scholarships for study at Oxford: of the 1,670 awarded in the past 57 years, students at Catholic colleges have won just 15, including 5 at Notre Dame. Catholic colleges do not produce enough doctoral candidates, either clerical or lay, to replenish their own faculties. In Woodrow Wilson fellowships for graduate study by prospective professors, Catholic schools do better: Notre Dame has 78, St. Louis University 36, Fordham 28—against Yale's 132, Harvard's 142, Princeton's 222.

Some of the trouble is money. The average Catholic college has 300 or 400 students, scant cash for science facilities or even faculty pay. This is particularly true of women's colleges, which heavily outnumber those for men.

To Notre Dame's President Hesburgh, all this means that "we have our work to do."

TOTAL TRUTH

What is that work? The text of Catholic education is that of the old Baltimore catechism: "God created man to know Him, to love him and to serve Him in this life, and to be happy with Him forever in the next." In the Catholic view, education is thus committed to total truth—moral, religious, and intellectual. Unlike secularists, Catholics cannot divide reason and revelation into tidy compartments; each informs and reinforces the other. "The hell of secular society unredeemed by Christianity," said St. Augustine, "is not even capable of improvement." Summed up Pope Pius XI: "There can be no true education which is not wholly directed to man's last end."

At the lower school levels, this means strict training in "habitual good acts," the cultivation of faith and morals that constitutes "soul saving," the impressive air of neatness, manners, and discipline that strikes visitors to any parochial school in the land. It means piety: Mass before school, prayer before class, grace at lunch, prayer when school lets out, and an average 2½ hours of religious instruction each week. It means conditioning the will in order to have the power to choose freely what is good in life.

At the university level, Catholic education finds its roots in the great tradition of the Catholic universities in the Middle Ages, when all-inclusive learning was no problem. Universities then organized their faculties around the queen science of theology, which supernaturally interpreted all natural knowledge. It was a time when St. Thomas, the breathtaking synthesizer of Aristotelian reason and Christian faith, could say: "The truth of our faith becomes a matter of ridicule among the infidels if any Catholic, not gifted with the necessary scientific learning, presents as a dogma what scientific scrutiny shows to be false."

Unhappily, lesser theologians forgot this sound advice. When Galileo peered through his telescope 4 centuries later and saw a heliocentric rather than a geocentric universe, the result was conflict between baffled theologians and fascinated scientists. The Roman Inquisition forced Galileo to "abjure, curse, and detest the aforesaid errors," but science was not to be stopped that easily.

The wound did not really heal until this century. Yet as far back as 1852, Britain's John Henry Cardinal Newman wrote "The Idea of a University," a plea for "cultivation of the intellect." Newman held that a university "is not a convent, not a seminary; it is a place to fit men of the world for the world."

BELLIGERENTLY PROTESTANT

While catholicism was in midjourney from the Inquisition to Newman, Jesuits in 1789 founded the first U.S. Catholic university, Washington's Georgetown. Georgetown raised its head in an overwhelmingly (99 percent) and belligerently Protestant new country. A pamphleteer of the time warned of the "calm, shrewd, steady, systematic movement of the Jesuit order * * * to subvert the Reformation, and to crush the spirit of liberty."

In fact, the swelling flock of unlettered immigrants was not much interested in higher learning. Putting first things first, the bishops in 1884 ordered every parish to build a parochial school. Not until 1908, when Pius X converted the U.S. mission church to full status, did the real history of Catholic higher education begin. Various religious orders then began building colleges (all jealously independent) at a fabulous rate: since 1909, Catholic college enrollment has jumped 2,000 percent.

A HOME IN INDIANA

Notre Dame got its start when the French-born Father Stephen Badin, first Catholic priest ordained in the United States, bought several hundred acres around his Indiana log cabin, deeded it to the nearest bishop for a school. In 1842 the C.S.C. in France sent Father Edward Sorin, 28, to build the school. His endowment: an oxcart, seven religious helpers and $541.12½. Bewitched by a fresh November snow, Sorin had a vision of purity that made him call the place Notre Dame (Our Lady).

After 37 hard years, Sorin's proud achievement was a tightly disciplined college, modeled on a French boarding school. Then the place burned to the ground. Sorin concluded that the Mother of God had "to show me that my vision was too narrow." In 4 months flat, Sorin and the faculty raised the huge main building that still stands, topped with the golden dome that is Notre Dame's landmark. The school pushed on with its work for many years under the Reverend William Corby, whose campus statue has long tagged him as "Fair Catch" Corby.

The next major figure in Notre Dame's history was a smash-nosed kid from Chicago, a Norwegian-American Protestant named Knute Rockne. In 1913 obscure little Notre Dame played Army in Yankee Stadium as a filler on West Point's football schedule. Captain Rockne, at left end, and Quarterback Gus Dorais passed Army to death—35 to 13. The stunning upset made Notre Dame famous. From nuns to workingmen, Catholics all over the country began praying on Saturday mornings for Notre Dame victories.

FIGHTING IRISH

With Rockne as coach, Notre Dame became everybody's favorite underdog, then swiftly graduated from underdog ranking. Protestant Sportswriter Grantland Rice supplied the "Four Horsemen"[2] tag; the "Seven Mules" manned the line; the "Fighting Irish," liberally assisted by Poles, Germans, Italians and an occasional Jew, were a national institution. From 1918 until he died (holding a rosary—he had become converted) in an airplane crash in 1931, Rockne's Notre Dame tackled the Nation's best football teams, won 105 games, tied 5, lost 12.

Football fame, scorned as it was by intellectuals, was the key that unlocked the sources of money that now pay for Notre Dame's increasing academic quality. The more scholarly graduates nowadays like to recall that Coach Rockne was also a magna cum laude graduate (1915), a brilliant chemistry sutdent who worked with Father Julius Nieuwland, discoverer of the base for synthetic rubber. In 1952, Notre Dame honored Nieuwland with a first-rate science building that bears his name and the inscription, "All Things God Hath Made Are Good and Each of Them Serves Its Turn."

[2] Rockne's famed 1922–24 backfield: Quarterback Harry Stuhldreher, Halfbacks Don Miller and Jim Crowley, Fullback Elmer Layden.

Withal, Notre Dame has not forgotten football. Like its once-helpful victim, West Point, it believes in the game as a character builder. Moreover, football nets $500,000 a year. But nowadays Notre Dame imposes strict standards on its prime beef, requiring a 77-percent average for varsity players against the 70-percent passing mark. And Hesburgh can permit himself a jibe at Notre Dame's 58,000-seat football stadium as "the civic opera."

I'M GOING TO BE A PRIEST

The priest who dares to kid about football comes from a comfortable, informal home in Syracuse, N.Y., where he was the son of a plate-glass plant manager of German-French descent. "We were middle class, pure and simple," says Hesburgh. He went to parochial schools, served as an altar boy, got to be a Life Scout, built model airplanes, liked to hunt and fish, once played Christ in a passion play, and graduated third in his high school class. What made the quick, dark-eyed boy different was his voracious reading and early ambition. At 12, he was asked by a Holy Cross priest what he wanted to be when he grew up—fireman, policeman, explorer? Snapped Hesburgh: "I'm going to be a priest, Father. Like you."

Duly impressed, Father Thomas Duffy scribbled down Hesburgh's name and attributes ("fine boy, bright"), eventually steered him to Notre Dame. After one year on campus, Hesburgh took his novitiate year at a wilderness camp in Rolling Prairie, Ind. Up at 5 every morning, the novices prayed, read and recited in Latin; prayed, chopped trees, and built a silo. For the voluble Hesburgh, the toughest rule was silence for 22 hours a day. "It was a boot camp," says Hesburgh.

From an original class of 29, Hesburgh and eight others survived to take vows of poverty, chastity and obedience. He was not fleeing the world, he says: "I liked dancing. I liked everything. But I thought there was something more to life. By really belonging to nobody except God, you belong to everybody."

HEBREW IN LATIN

At Rome's Gregorian University, Hesburgh absorbed theology. The classes, including the class in Hebrew, were taught in Latin, and "the dormitory talk was French, the street talk Italian." He also picked up Spanish, and later, Portuguese. Ordered home in wartime 1940, Hesburgh continued his studies at Catholic University. When he was ordained in 1943, Hesburgh begged to be a military chaplain, was ordered instead to work for his S.T.D. (doctorate of sacred theology), which he earned in 1945. Hoping for missionary work, he fetched up teaching a course on moral virtue at Notre Dame.

Again plunging into extra work, Hesburgh became chaplain to Notre Dame's married veterans who swarmed over an area known as Fertile Valley. Hesburgh badgered obstetricians for discount deliveries, baptized babies and babysat in return for sandwiches and beer. He got so adept at marriage counseling that he once reunited a couple after a 3-year split.

A year after becoming head of the religion department, Hesburgh at 32 was made executive vice president of the university. Among his first acts: replacing Clarence Manion, the far-right dean of the law school, with Joseph O'Meara, a Cincinnati lawyer active in the American Civil Liberties Union. Hesburgh also took charge of the university's rapidly expanding building program, got it moving even faster. President John Cavanaugh knew a brilliant successor when he saw one: "You would have had to be blind not to spot his talents." At 35, Hesburgh became Notre Dame's 16th President.

READY FOR TAKE-OFF

What Hesburgh inherited was a university ready for takeoff. Father Cavanaugh, a

onetime Studebaker salesman who dreamed of a grown-up university, had sold the necessity of change not only to his conservative congregation but also to the standpat alumni. Money began to flow, buildings to rise. Though 80 percent of Notre Dame's 30,000 alumni have graduated since 1940, and few are rich, they have chipped in at the rate of $700,000 a year, may hit $1 million this year—a considerable feat considering what they also give to parochial schools.

Under Hesburgh, Notre Dame has put up 12 new buildings worth $12.6 million, started another $13.5 million construction program, increased faculty salaries by 90 percent, tripled endowment to $25 million. The school's operating budget is up threefold, its science spending tenfold. On completion, the new $8 million library will house 2 million books, five times more than the present library. All this is part of a 10-year (deadline: 1968) $66 million "program for excellence."

While raising bricks[3] and mortar, Hesburgh drastically revamped the curriculum, tossed out vocational courses by the score. He held down undergraduate enrollment, let graduate enrollment (now 795) grow. To get better students, he raised admission standards; the average IQ of entering freshmen has gone from 118 to 127. Since 1954, average college board scores have risen 78 points to 536 on the verbal aptitude test, and 77 points to 579 on the math aptitude test (out of 800).

This is well below the 650–750 range on secular prestige campuses, but significantly rising. The Ford Foundation in 1960 gave Notre Dame the honor, as one of five rapidly improving universities (none other Catholic), of receiving $6 million in no-strings grants.

Hesburgh is aware that overobedience and lack of initiative are among the chief criticisms brought against Catholic collegians. For 50 years, Notre Dame cut off lights and even the electricity in student rooms at 11 p.m. Three mornings a week, students had to sign in with prefects outside hall chapels, a way of encouraging attendance. This year Hesburgh dropped both restrictions (chapel attendance has not slipped). Hesburgh also cut 11 pages of student rules to two quick pages that, among other restrictions, prohibit students from having cars, from cheating or from overdrinking. If it took Hesburgh 9 years to make those changes, his hesitation is understandable. On the record, the old tight rein produced remarkably stable men. Not long ago, a visiting Harvard psychiatrist was astounded to find not a single undergraduate suicide in Notre Dame's history.

NATURAL DOUBT

One result of better students is a more intellectual catholicism, an increase in the natural doubt that sometimes hits parochial school graduates in college and even produces some apostates. According to Hesburgh, practically all of his students believe in God. But "you run a hazard working with kids," he says. Real belief comes from experience, perhaps from darkness, not light. With a 19-year-old, "you can't just saw off the top of his head and pour it in. All you can do is give him a basis of order that will prepare him to understand." To assist that process, Notre Dame has 33 chapels, prayers before classes, courses in theology that are required except for the 2 percent who are not Catholics. Eight crosses stand atop the administration building.

Ironically, Notre Dame's theology department, theoretically the core of the school, is regarded by all students and most faculty members as the worst department on campus. Staffed entirely by 24 priests, it offers no major—for fear nobody will seek it. But Notre Dame is working toward improvement: some 25 young C.S.C. priests are studying for their S.T.D.'s at foreign universities, and Hesburgh hopes to snap up 10 or 15 of them. "We've got our Jacques Maritains coming up," he says.

Notre Dame has long given science its due. Its famed Lobund Laboratories were created 30 years ago to develop germ-free animals as a tool for medical research. Its radiation lab claims the Nation's largest radiation chemistry program, and is now being expanded by the AEC to the tune of $2,200,000. Notre Dame also gets good grades in chemistry, English, history, and math. But it still cannot afford sabbaticals for research or a psychology department (launching cost: $220,000). It is notably weak in social sciences.

KNOWING AND BEING

Whether or not the moral dimension enters teaching at Notre Dame is up to the 398 lay teachers (including some 60 Protestants and several Jews) and the 89 priest or brother teachers. In the classes of Historian Aaron Abell, a Catholic, "the Christian ethic is not stressed at all." A political science course, on the other hand, devotes half its reading to Augustine and Aquinas. Papal encyclicals on social justice show up in economics. Biology and the dogma of virgin birth do not conflict because, in Hesburgh's view, "biology does not study miracles." Historian Matthew Fitzsimons hopes that "a Christian view of man makes sense out of sacrifice and suffering."

Perhaps no one else has better conveyed that sense to Notre Dame students than witty, incisive English Professor Frank O'Malley, 28 years on the faculty and the university's most inspiring undergraduate teacher. O'Malley plumbs life's most basic emotions, using Charles Peguy to examine the virtue of hope, Claudel to plumb suffering, Kierkegaard to emphasize the shallowness of religion without love. When he reaches students, O'Malley often changes their lives, teaching them to love learning and learn love. "The totality of life has hit me," said one of his students last week. "The act of knowing and the act of being are becoming one."

PUBLIC SERVICE

Keeping this fine-tuned institution going is a fulltime job for Hesburgh. But he can and does manage another big job; an intensive career of public service. As a member of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission. Hesburgh gives special emphasis to Christian action, last year wrote a notable attack on police brutality against Negroes. As a member of the National Science Board, Hesburgh votes on multimillion-dollar Federal research projects. As a board member of the Rockefeller Foundation, he votes on another $40 million in medical and social welfare projects. As the Vatican's permanent representative to the International Atomic Energy Agency, he goes to Vienna each September for an annual meeting at which he is considered a quietly effective negotiator.

By now Hesburgh has visited almost every country in Africa, Asia, Europe and South America. When he does get time for play, he generally slips off to a favorite Mexican fishing village with a few old friends (one: C. R. Smith, president of American Airlines).

Habitually, Hesburgh works until 3 in the morning, with Brahms and Beethoven humming on his stereo set if he is in his office. "Some people are unwinders," he says of his late hours. "I'm a winder as the night goes on." He sometimes winds right through the night, rising from his desk at dawn to go to church and the first round of his daily 2½ hours of prayers. The type who breakfasts on a vitamin pill and fruit juice. Hesburgh lives a spartan life (salary; nothing), sleeps in a brown iron bed in a bare room, where the furnishings consist of two chairs and an old Royal typewriter.

For all his comings and goings, Hesburgh is abidingly devoted to the glory of the University of Notre Dame. Every conceivable improvement is on his mind, from painting the front door of the main building to launching a new center for the study of man in contemporary society, a project that he hopes will draw theologians into the problems of cities, civil rights and developing nations.

A POSSIBLE RENAISSANCE

By such efforts to join faith and reason, Hesburgh embodies an intellectual maturity that long seemed beyond U.S. Catholic education. At least in theory, such maturity is bound to spread. Socially, politically, and economically, U.S. Catholics are now strong and secure. If money, drive, and ambition can create great universities, Catholics will sooner or later have them. What critics still challenge is whether the peculiarly American heritage of Catholic anti-intellectualism will so hobble scholarship that greatness is out of reach. Mortimer "Great Books" Adler charges, for example, that Catholics still "often appear to think that all the truth worth knowing is already completely known and in their possession."

Hesburgh stands for probing all truth on the ground that there cannot be a conflict in truths. Some Catholics fear that this might push Catholic colleges toward secularism and deprive them of their reason for being. Yet the faith-and-reason approach might flower in the Nation's first significant generation of Catholic intellectuals. Carefully keeping his claims moderate, Hesburgh foresees only a possible renaissance of Catholic education.

"We are men committed to truth," says Hesburgh, "living in a world where most academic endeavor concerns only natural truth, as much separated from supernatural truth, the divine wisdom of thelogy, as sinful man was separated from God before the incarnation. If these extremes are to be united, a work of mediation is needed. We must somehow match secular or State universities in their comprehension of a vast spectrum of natural truths in the arts and sciences, while at the same time we must be in full possession of our own true heritage of theological wisdom."

[3] The yellow Notre Dame brick, made originally from marl in nearby St. Joseph's Lake and now manufactured in New Jersey.

Budgetary Monkey Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD an article written by Ross Valentine, entitled "Budgetary Monkey Business," published in the Richmond Times-Dispatch.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUDGETARY MONKEY BUSINESS

(By ROSS VALENTINE)

Allotment of 1,200,000 Federal tax dollars to finance research into the "affectional relationship of the infant monkey and his mother" (exposed by Senator BYRD) would have delighted Gilbert and Sullivan. With lilting lyric and catchy tune they would have immortalized it, as an example of sacrosanct science dipping into the New Frontier pork barrel.

It is not my intention to deride or belittle the cool abstraction of research. I respect and applaud scientific curiosity for zoological and anthropological fact. But there are two very good reasons why this brash bid for the taxpayers' money should be given the old heave-ho in a hurry.

1. The idea of finding psychological clues to civilized mother-and-infant relationships by research into the behaviorism of monkeys is demonstrably absurd.

2. If the scientists concerned can manage to wangle the needed funds from private persons or foundations, more power to them. But to ask the taxpayers to finance this speculative project is impertinent—at a time when 31 percent of personal income goes to taxes, and the national debt is about to pass the $300 billion mark, with another bulging deficit just around the corner.

Yet this extravagant proposal has its defenders. An RPI associate professor of psychology writes that:

"This particular research is part of Prof. Harry Harlow's [University of Wisconsin] effort to bring the area of mother-child relationships out of the centuries-old literary bog and into the realm of scientific study." (I assume he is referring to the relationship in humans.)

True, monkeys have been used for physiological research, to test polio vaccines, etc. But while monkeys and a few other animals have physiological characteristics closely resembling the human, that is a far cry from psychological parallels.

There is a vast evolutionary gulf between the norm of chimpanzee behaviorism and the infinite diversity of human reactions under the same biological circumstances.

In captivity certain types of monkeys exhibit an often amazing capacity for near-human gestures, grimaces and emotional reaction to certain stimuli, giving anthropology reason to believe that our remotest and "probably arboreal" ancestors were "sports" of the original family tree.

Genealogists tactfully refrain from probing that far back, but we do know from fossil remains in geological strata (by which we measure prehistoric time) that millions of years have elapsed since that hypothetical parting of the ways.

Now, if Congress has been asked to spend $1,200,000 for research on infant-mother relationship in the cannibalistic tribes of Borneo or New Guinea in order to bring the area of civilized mother-child relationships out of the centuries-old literary bog into the realm of scientific study—the proposal would have been laughed out of court.

Yet the maneating savages are millions of evolutionary years closer to us than the chimpanzees. However, what with Enos serving as simian guinea pig to test physiological and nervous reactions under the stress of orbital flight, such projects seem to have acquired an aura of prestige which even the funnymen of the press dare not question, lest they be put down as antiintellectuals.

Actually, there is nothing new about such comparative studies.

As far back as 1831 a research zoologist named Rengger published a report on the behaviorisms of a colony of Paraguayan monkeys he had kept in captivity and under observation for 7 years. (Unfortunately he left no record of his expense account.)

If the subject intrigues you, you may find much of interest in Charles Darwin's "Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals." Much about monkey psychology has been learned since then, and much remains to be learned—but not at the taxpayers' expenses.

Tax dollars, unlike the monkeys' bananas, do not grow on trees. They must first be earned in the sweat of the brow—by working men and women.

A million is still a million—equivalent to $100 extracted from 10,000 pay envelopes. To paraphrase the old folk saying, "if Congress would take care of the millions, the billions would take care of themselves," a motto that, suitably framed, should adorn every Congressmen's desk.

Slaphappy spenders in Congress should be reminded that monkey's don't vote. Pending interpretation of the 15th amendment by Messrs. Myrdal and Warren, the right of franchise is still restricted to human beings.

The Glorification of Indigence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHERINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following speech was delivered on the floor of the New York State Senate by Senator Henry A. Wise, of Watertown, N.Y.

As the speech deals with the problem of welfare, and the daily encroachment on the States and municipalities by Federal welfare programs, it is perhaps well for us to look at the problem from the point of view of a State legislator of considerable knowledge and experience.

Mr. Speaker, after reading the Senator's remarks, I could not help wondering if, in our pursuit of happiness, we may not simply have ended up with "The Glorification of Indigence."

The speech follows:

THE GLORIFICATION OF INDIGENCE

(Transcript of remarks by Senator Henry A. Wise, Watertown, in course of debate in New York State Senate, February 13, 1962, on public assistance)

Mr. President, I arise because of what I have learned about public welfare, or to be specific, the public assistance phase of it, in 10 years as chairman of this Senate's standing committee on public welfare and as chairman of the State Coordination Commission's welfare investigation last year. That commission, headed by Senator Erwin, completed its investigation and made its unanimous report last March 15.

When I started in this I knew it all and was sure that welfare administrators and social workers were a bunch of paperpushing cloud riders. After a dozen years I've learned something of the maze of procedure, of why welfare is in low public esteem and why the people responsible for carrying on its day-to-day operations are helpless, under stultifying rules and regulations, to do much to make responsible citizens out of more of their clients.

Also, I learned that welfare is the dumping ground—the repository—of human problems which are not glamorous or rewarding enough to be taken under the wing of some other State department.

I learned that in New York State over a half million persons are receiving public assistance costing a half billion dollars annually and going up about 30 million a year largely because the myriad procedural details and mountains of paper work now in vogue to obtain uniformity are no substitute for realistic rehabilitation. These roadblocks are the result of bureaucratic policies in Washington, a quid pro quo for Federal aid.

I learned that the present day problems of our metropolitan communities are so vast and complex that even able local commissioners, like James Dumpson of New York City, simply do not have the tools or authority to cope with them adequately under outmoded ground rules and lack of liaison with related municipal functions including housing, schools, health, and transportation.

I do not speak as a partisan because both parties either have been unrealistic or have ducked the tough decisions. Nor do I speak as an up-country legislator oriented to some nostalgic wish for the mythical rural life of years gone by as celebrated in song and story.

I do speak to you as one of the handful of legislators who has seen welfare and what it does to, as well as for, people from observing them in their homes—people unto the second and third generation in rural slums as well as in the solid welfare communities in the heart of our big cities. Caseworkers have taken me to see people, who, when asked what should be done to help them get on their feet, replied, and I quote: "All I want is to live my life on public assistance."

I have read a horrifying and absorbing book in novel form, entitled "The Inhabitants," which portrays the lives, or rather the existences, of able-bodied, chronic, not unusual welfare cases as seen through the eyes of their caseworker. The author, Julius Horwitz, arranged a "conference" for some members of our welfare investigation subcommittee with the "heroine" at her apartment.

DISCRIMINATION VERSUS DISCERNMENT

A complication is one which we all prefer to leave unmentioned. We prate against discrimination based on prejudice while subtly—and not so subtly—using it to gain the bloc votes of ethnic and religious groups. We confuse this with discernment—discernment of the human qualities possessed by an individual, whether man, woman, child, irrespective of the color of his skin or his mode of worship. Discernment is understanding a person's frailities, foibles, and strengths. That is fundamental to rehabilitation.

As our direct and succinct minority leader, Senator Zaretzki, said in an address delivered at a large public gathering only last January 31:

"All men are created equal under the law, but no man is born equal. Every person is born different and is different. Some are crippled. Some have mental defects."

These unpleasant facts have to be weighed if welfare is to be more than a check dispenser, a subsistence program—and it cannot be much more under present time-consuming and burdensome administrative policies in force to protect the State from loss of Federal funds.

HOORAY FOR UNIFORMITY

Public welfare has become over standardized, over formulized and over regulated. It is, however, a person-to-person problem, an individual matter for the soldiers in the field, that is the social workers, to whom must be given the training, discretion and responsibility to act on the basis of their individual judgments, subject to the approval of the case supervisor. No army won a war by deploying on the field carrying bulky volumes of army regulations and consulting them before every move. But uniformity is the watchword thanks to the career brains of the Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Administrations may come and administrations may go but inflexibility in the attitude of a certain breed of bureaucrat goes on forever.

Governor Ribicoff is the first HEW secretary since the Federal public assistance setup has been confusing the welfare pic-

ture to tell the career people of his agency that this is not 1935. However, his proposals of February 1 do not touch good old uniformity and inflexibility much. It is proposed that the Federal Government get deeper into and interfere more with basic State and local functions. HEW apparently just heard about rehabilitation, but one would think they had invented it because now they are going to tell the States how to do it. That means more control. If New York is the most socially advanced of these United States, as it proudly confesses it is, then it doesn't need any guidance from the very people whose policies have thwarted effective rehabilitation for years.

In the words of one State administrator who was in Washington recently to get the WORD on the new Federal proposals: "They are just adding 21 patches to a crazy quilt." The Federal assistance prgorams should be abandoned to the States, or at least overhauled from stem to gudgeon. Anyhow, Mr. Ribicoff has disabused the imprisoned minds of his aids on one other thing: There is no crime in allowing the good ladies supported by Aid to Dependent Children to work—I mean earn money—if they can and will.

THE IDOLATRY OF PAUPERISM

Let's stop kidding ourselves and worrying about what lofty editors and fuzzy-minded bleeding hearts say. Though in the minority, perhaps, there are lots of able-bodied, career welfare recipients. That's because of the nature of men and of welfare as it is. Unfortunately, we have with us, and always will, folks who are so apathetic, indifferent, and downright lazy that a full stomach and a TV set keeps them sitting on their beam ends as a lifetime project. Every caseworker knows it. That's how I know it. Sure they are needy. But how worthy? Will they respond to intensive rehabilitation techniques?

There are plenty of able-bodied and smart-like-a-fox people who could do something useful. Public assistance, we are told, is a right. If so, that is the only right I know of that doesn't carry some minimal responsibility. In smaller cities and the suburbs it is possible to get part-time jobs scrubbing walls, sweeping floors, and so on in business establishments, or doing housework—not just playing house. Yes, these are grubby, hard jobs and would-be employers cannot find reliable takers even at the legal hourly wage. In some places, the more enterprising have contracted out to householders to mow and clean lawns and plow snow. Sometimes the relief check doesn't cover the liquor bill unless such extreme measures are taken. Granted it is much harder to find something useful to keep occupied at in the big cities, but even there the head of the house could put more into making a clean and decent abode.

The chronic deadbeats are good at finding excuses even when work is available and they will keep on finding them as long as the caseworker is refused the discretion to put just a little squeeze on, just enough to get the client moving. The caseworker is pretty helpless unless he can prove with evidence practically beyond a reasonable doubt that relief funds are being misspent. The so-called fair hearing required under Federal procedure is a stacked deck in favor of the recipient of welfare aid. With administrators and caseworkers groaning under piles of paper work there is little time to devise and apply means to make some ADC mothers pay sufficient attention to their children, to raise them decently, discipline them or at least make an effort to keep them from becoming knights of the rumble. Some evidence of social responsibility must be developed in this type of recipient, and it would be, if Washington would give latitude in these details at least to States like New York which had sound social welfare programs before they were ever noticed on the Potomac.

Why these unrealistic and harmful requirements in detail are so tenaciously clung to by HEW is hard to understand. Maybe their jobs depend on filling up their time. Maybe it is because they simply will not realize that public assistance in the sixties is not the emergency subsistence program of the thirties when the money had to be paid out, but fast. Some of the rules that have been promulgated have no congressional authorization whatever. These administrative edicts require interpretations and the interpretations must be interpreted, and it takes a Philadelphia lawyer to get out of the maze at all. This will go on until the States or some of them will marshal their political weight to put a stop to a situation that would be comic if it were not so demoralizing to welfare administrators, workers, and recipients.

We are talking here mainly about the five federally aided categories; i.e., old age, ADC, blind, disabled, and medical aid to the aged. The other public assistance category in this State, home relief, receives no Federal funds and is theoretically solely within State control. I say theoretically because Federal policy dos affect home relief and also child (foster and institutional) care. It would be a practical impossibility to run two administrative systems, one crazy quilt for the Federal categories and another simpler one for home relief, so it's all under the crazy quilt.

LOVE THY NEIGHBOR?

How does the factory worker, the cop, the farmer, the office girl, the saleslady, the junior executive feel about this? How do young and middle-aged people struggling in the $4,000 to $8,000 bracket to support a family react? They think politicians, who don't seem to do much about it except apologize, are ostriches, heads in sand, captivated by pundits and theorists, without concern for the taxpayer, afraid of a sacred cow. Growing exasperation and impatience is a cause of rash action by local authorities such as have occurred in the past year. The public will not accept complacently a system that puts so much emphasis on need and so little on responsibility.

UNCLE AND HIS CHILDREN

History says Uncle Sam is the child of the States, but, by some process nonbiological, the situation in Federal-State welfare relations has been reversed. The growing and difficult role of New York State as the very junior partner in this relationship led Governor Dewey in 1951 to appoint a legislative commission, known as the Kelley Commission, to find an answer. In its reports in 1952, 1953 and 1954, this commission traced very clearly how the Federal Security Agency, predecessor of HEW, had usurped authority that Congress had specifically refused to grant. It showed how States, unless they wanted to forfeit Federal funds, were in a bind with no recourse to determine the legality of this Government agency's requirements. But there was no follow through to amount to anything and there still is no way to get a court decision before the administrative ruling goes into effect.

The 1961 report on public welfare of the Coordination Commission (Leg. Doc. No. 84) contains an analysis of the problem, which is concurred in by the Board of Social Welfare in a detailed statement entitled "Federal-State-Local Relations" dated December, 1961. The Coordination Commission said, and I quote:

"Long and serious thought should be given by leaders of State government to this question. Broadly speaking that question is: Are the people of the State as a whole benefitting from taking Federal dollars under the conditions imposed?" (P. 43, Leg. Doc. 84 of 1961.)

As appealing as the new proposals announced in Washington February 1 may seem at first glance, they will simply extend all these administrative headaches into a broader field as far as New York is concerned. The partnership with the Potomac has seriously impaired New York's once sound welfare program—we sold out for a mess of pottage—and I mean mess. This appraisal of Federal welfare aid is shared by at least one of the three main religious faiths—the Roman Catholic Church. They know the score in this field and the harm Federal policies are doing to the people as well as social workers. In this respect the Roman Catholic dioceses in New York State do a lot more protesting than do we Protestants.

RECENT PROGRESS WITHIN THE NARROW AREA LEFT US

The main problem as seen by the Coordination Commission in its report can be resolved only by Washington. However, the Commission did make significant recommendations in the remaining area. These will take time to show results. Few legislative enactments are required. Some of the sectors where progress already can be seen are set forth below:

1st. Solution of problem or recruiting social welfare workers apparently has been found by the Public Welfare Personnel Classification Commission (L. 1960, C. 834), a temporary body which made its report on January 16, 1962. Former Assemblyman James Fitzpatrick served—and I mean served—as chairman. His recommendations are binding on the Board of Social Welfare and its administrative arm, the Department, without further legislative action.

2. As recommended by the Coordination Commission, the legislature last year enacted a measure establishing a central registration bureau in the department to aid in finding deserting parents. This complex law requires some amendments this year, which already are before us. Under the direction of the very able counsel for the Department of Social Welfare with the help of Senator Barrett's Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation, results may be expected in bringing to time the one-night-stand type of parent. Other States already are eyeing our statute as a model.

3. With permissive legislation last year we encouraged local welfare departments to set up citizens advisory committees. The idea is that, if more citizens become aware of the labyrinthian headaches, the public might be of more help in finding the answers. State Charities Aid Association is particularly interested in this public educational approach.

4. Administrative recommendations made by the Coordination Commission last March included more intensive inservice personnel training, special attention to fraud cases, reduction of office workload particularly by wider use of electronic computers, and recodification and simplification of board and departmental rules and regulations, which now, in an effort to keep up with emanations from the Potomac, fill several large bookshelves. Because the department has statutory power to do all these things, the Coordination Commission did not recommend legislation. However, the perceptive majority leader of this body, Senator Mahoney, saw that the department did not have sufficient specialists to implement those administrative recommendations, so his able staff drafted three bills carrying modest appropriations for these purposes—and with his usual generosity he gave me equal billing, which I, such a modest lad, do not deserve.

ANSWERS TO THE FEDERAL RIDDLE

The best answer would be "render unto Caesar that which is Caesar's and unto God that which is God's," or, Uncle Sam you take your money and leave us States alone. That won't happen because the less affluent States, unlike New York, get from the U.S. Treasury several times what their citizens pay in Federal taxes. Cry as they do about States rights, they don't want to cry loud

enough to lose Uncle Sam's dollars. Another way would be to eliminate categories of assistance, such as old-age, ADC, and so forth. Categories create big administrative headaches. Why not simply treat every one according to his need? That wouldn't work because, with the Government participating, categories are necessary to define the kind and extent of such participation.

A practical and reasonable suggestion was made in the minority report of a committee appointed to advise the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under the preceding national administration. This minority report was developed by counsel to the California Association of Boards of Supervisors and he was supported by an expert from New York State. The recommendation in two parts was that (a) the Federal Government support in full and administer direct the old age assistance category, this being more of a social security type program; and (b) the Federal Government get out of the other three Federal-State assistance categories, that is ADC, AB and AD and leave this to the States. This plan would result in the States getting roughly the same financial benefits from Washington as they did before, without divided responsibility and haggling. Well, the HEW careerists gave that plan the "resquiescat in pace" treatment, but fast. They wanted to make sure their frozen intellects stayed frozen in the old patterns. Empires were never built by giving up something.

The Federal Government has injected itself into a sector which is basically the responsibility of private groups, the local governments and States. As a reason for this they say that States, some States, are not discharging their responsibilities to the people in the field of public assistance. Who is to be the judge of that? If, however, that is the reason and the sole reason for partnership between the National Government and the States in this field, then the former should weigh what each State is doing on its own. If like New York, a State maintains a comprehensive social welfare program, then Washington should recognize that fact and restrict regulation and interference with such a State to a minimum. At the same time, such a State should not be penalized for its enterprise by receiving any less Federal financial aid than it otherwise would.

AMEN

Meantime the monster feeds on itself and about all the public can do to get relief from its frustration is cuss us politicians and enjoy movies, Broadway shows and other media that get big laughs out of spoofing welfare.

The man said that the Declaration of Independence was a promise of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Pursuit. But do you recollect anything that says Uncle Sam should run interference on every play? Did anyone guarantee that happiness would be caught every time a pass is thrown? Your hard working, hard headed fathers and grandfathers who struggled to make this country great never thought so, and neither did King David when he wrote in the 75 psalm, 5th verse:

"I said unto the fools, deal not so madly; and to the ungodly, set not up your horn."

Japanese Affect Fishing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission, as well as others in the fisheries of the North Pacific and Bering Sea, is deeply concerned for the perpetuation, conservation, and wise use of these fisheries.

This concern arises over the expanding trawl fishery by the Japanese in the Bering Sea without evidence that a fishery of this magnitude can be continued without depletion of resident stock, and the lack of evidence of intent on the part of the Japanese to curtail salmon fishing on the high seas in view of an anticipated heavy reduction in the 1962 class of maturing red salmon of American origin.

Mr. Speaker, the case for American fishermen, many who reside in my district, is stated in a resolution adopted by the commission. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this resolution in the RECORD.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE PACIFIC MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

The Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission convened in annual meeting at San Francisco has noted certain developments in Japanese fishing operations in the North Pacific which vitally affect the fishery interests of the member states of the commission. Concern is felt because of the following circumstances:

1. Despite repeated assertions by the Japanese Government of its acceptance of the principles of conservation and of management for sustained yield in Japanese fishing operations there is no evidence of an intent to curtail salmon fishing on the high seas in recognition of an anticipated drastic reduction in the 1962 availability of red salmon of Bristol Bay origin.

2. There is no evidence of any intent to curtail operations or to apply research data to control the newly developed trawl fishery for bottom species in the Bering Sea. It is noted that the Japanese catch by this fishery has attained a volume of approximately 600,000 tons annually, the taking of which is viewed as a disregard of accepted conservation practices.

3. Of utmost concern is an announced decision to expand the Japanese trawl fishery to areas south and east of the Aleutian Islands. This is planned despite an apparent absence of any data as to the ability of the fish stocks to withstand such exploitation without depletion. The United States must be concerned with the likelihood that similar Russian expansion may occur.

4. Such expansion of fishing areas without adequate preliminary research can destroy the established halibut fisheries of Canada and the United States because of lack of any delimitation of the areas to be fished. Under the convention between Canada and the United States, the halibut fishery has been maintained through rigorous joint conservation measures. It is yet to be shown that a trawl fishery can be conducted in areas of halibut abundance without taking halibut, and the present regulations enacted under the convention prohibit the use of trawl gear for taking halibut, for reasons founded in long years of research. This path of expansion can destroy the crab resources of the area thereby eliminating a fishery which makes a very considerable contribution to the economy of Alaska.

In recognition of these circumstances and in the light of well-attested facts concerning the Japanese policy of maximum exploitation of fishery resources of the high seas without regard for the requirements for sustained productivity, it is hereby

Resolved, That the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission does respectfully recommend that the U.S. Government make immediate and direct representations to the Japanese Government, urging

(a) That the Japanese high seas salmon fleets exercise restraint in the areas in which red salmon of Bristol Bay are found to the end that adequate escapement may be secured and that this valuable resource may be preserved.

(b) That proposed expansion of the Japanese trawl fishery to areas southward and eastward of the Bering Sea be postponed until scientific research has been conducted which will reveal the extent and nature of bottom fish resources in such areas and the capacity of such resources for supporting exploitation.

(c) That the Japanese trawl fishery in the Bering Sea be stabilized at present or lower levels until scientific research shall have indicated the safe production levels for sustained yield; be it further

Resolved, That the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission does respectfully urge that the U.S. Government engage immediately upon research and exploratory investigations designed to provide the scientific knowledge referred to above and that the Japanese Government be informed of the readiness of the United States to coordinate such investigations with Japanese studies upon a reciprocal basis; be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted to the Secretary of State of the United States and to Members of Congress representing the States of California, Oregon, Washington, and Alaska.

Executive Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the increasing interest in people-to-people efforts by Peace Corps members and other individuals in our Nation is one of the most encouraging trends of our postwar relationships with other free nations. We have seen many evidences of this interest; towns in far-distant nations have been adopted by other nations; school children are writing to other students in other lands; our exchange students are making friends among people once regarded as strangers.

Another effort is being made by businessmen in a direct effort to share their training and their managerial know-how. Mr. Edward D. deLuca, a New Jersey native now in Pittsburgh, is working with the U.S. International Corporation Administration to help in this effort. His story, as described in the December 24 issue of the Pittsburgh Press, is a very interesting one. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE PEACE CORPS

(By George Thomas)

An executive peace corps that has been fighting communism around the world is largely the brainchild of one of the busiest men in Pittsburgh.

His name is Edward D. deLuca, and the organization he designed and helps run is the Council for International Progress in Management.

Despite its jawbreaking title, CIPM is the "muscle" behind one of the least known but most vital segments of the U.S. foreign-aid program. Its aim: To provide millions

around the world with a better way of life before they blunder into communism.

The reasoning behind this program runs something like this: This Nation's unparalleled prosperity is based on its higher level of industrial development. The main reason American industrial growth has outstripped that in other free nations is highly skilled management.

Specifically, U.S. industry has developed a vast "army" of trained "middle management" people—an army that simply doesn't exist in other nations. By delegating vital responsibilities to these tens of thousands of "professionals," U.S. companies have achieved a growth rate far beyond that ever seen elsewhere.

NARROWING THE GAP

This U.S. industrial system has also helped "spread the wealth," getting rid of any dangerous Commie-breeding gap between the "very rich" and "the very poor."

What the CIPM is doing—under sponsorship of the U.S. International Cooperation Administration—is helping industry in other free nations build these same strengths. For the past 10 year, "flying squadrons" of topflight U.S. executives have been rushed to countries all over the globe—wherever they're requested.

Spending weeks, even months, at a clip, these teams give their oversea counterparts millions of dollars of firsthand advice on management development, employee relations, incentive programs, delegation of responsibility—anything the businessmen of a given country feel they need.

On the theory that anything given away is not so highly prized foreign executives attending these sessions are usually charged several hundred dollars apiece. This also helps keep this one of the lowest cost operations in the entire foreign-aid program.

Of 235 U.S. executives who have taken part in the program to date, more than 100 have been recruited by the man who designed it—Management Consultant deLuca.

A registered engineer and former college business professor, Mr. deLuca operates his own consulting firm—when he has time.

He came to the attention of ICA as author of "Cost and Production Handbook" (Ronald Press) and former national vice president of the Society for the Advancement of Management.

A native of Montclair, N.J., he attended school there and was graduated from Rutgers University. After receiving a master's degree in management, he taught at Rutgers.

Married to the former Annabelle Giorgio of West Orange, N.J., he has two sons, aged 17 and 6.

More than half of the trips have been planned by him, and he has himself taken part in major efforts in 18 nations.

Results of some of his efforts to date: (1) A management training course he developed for French industry has been given to more than 30,000 trainees and executives in that country. (2) The national management association that he designed and helped set up in Chile in 1953 has become the largest outside the United States, with more than 4,000 executives as members.

CONVINCING MAN

Business leaders he has "shipped" from Pittsburgh include: Eugene F. Foubert, vice president, industrial relations, Rockwell Manufacturing Co.; O. E. Guilbert, Jr., president of Guilbert Steel Co.; George Bachman, vice president, Westinghouse Air Brake Co.; Dean James Hayes, of Duquesne University's business school, and Richard Koehler, vice president, LeRoi Division, Westinghouse Air Brake.

Convincing these men and their companies that they should spend 4, 6 or 8 weeks in free "Government service" abroad sometimes takes a little doing.

A. C. Nielsen, Jr., president of A. C. Nielsen Corp., Chicago, told a congressional committee this summer that his partners were almost universally opposed to his chasing off to do this job. "So," he continued, "when the man (deLuca) called back the next morning, I told him I was sorry I couldn't go.

"I will never forget what he said. He said, in effect, 'That is the trouble with you businessmen. You are all too busy making money and leaving to somebody else the job of taking care of the needs of our country.' "

Mr. Nielsen promptly changed his mind.

Because he did so and many others did likewise, "Operation deLuca" has helped dozens of foreign businesses to help not only themselves but also their struggling countries.

Proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a statement made before the Senate Committee on Government Operations, Friday, February 16, 1962, by Mitchell Cope, an associate member of the Planning Board in Portland, Maine.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE MITCHELL COPE, FORMER CHAIRMAN, PORTLAND, MAINE, CITY COUNCIL, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, U.S. SENATE

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today. My name is Mitchell Cope and I am the former chairman of the city council of Portland, Maine, in which position I served as mayor for ceremonial purposes. At this time, I continue to serve Portland as an associate member of its planning board.

I am president of the Minat Corp., which is Maine's largest homebuilding organization. I am an active member of the homebuilding industry but I should note that I appear here today in my personal capacity as a Maine homebuilder and an individual long interested in municipal affairs.

I appear here today in opposition to the proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing as included in Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962.

The administration advocates of this plan stress its need to insure efficiency and economy in Government. On the other hand, the many witnesses appearing on behalf of the American Municipal Association and the U.S. Conference of Mayors have reiterated time and again that the cities need one place for coordinating urban problems and that since this country is rapidly becoming more urbanized, city dwellers should be recognized at the Cabinet table.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that the State of Maine has had a decrease in urban population from 51.7 percent in 1950 to 51.3 percent in 1960. I also wonder what cities are placing the greatest emphasis on this Department because Portland, which is Maine's largest city with a population of approximately 72,000, was not included in the mailing list of 2,400 mayors who were asked by House Democratic Leader CARL ALBERT to unite in support of the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to have inserted in the record an exchange of correspondence I have had with the Mayor of Waterville, Maine, the Honorable Cyril M. Joly, Jr., in opposition to the Department of Urban Affairs. Waterville is the hometown of Senator EDMOND S. MUSKIE who is a distinguished member of this committee.

Certainly, the Maine Municipal Association's Executive Committee is not entirely enthusiastic about this proposal because last July it extensively reviewed the American Municipal Association's request for support and concluded that "* * * it would support the ultimate objective of a Federal department that would coordinate all Federal programs relating to municipal activities but was not particularly desirous of seeing the Housing and Home Finance Agency given Cabinet status alone by the bill" (from p. 8 of "The Maine Townsmen," July 1961).

Mr. Chairman, the constant emphasis on the need for coordination in one Federal agency of the problems relating to urban affairs is unrealistic. In discussions with many municipal officials throughout the State, I have reached the conclusion that the mere title, "Department of Urban Affairs and Housing," is a wishful hope. However, I fail to see how a new Department, created merely from the Housing and Home Finance Agency, could coordinate the highway programs of the Bureau of Public Roads in the Commerce Department, water pollution within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, airport construction within the province of the Federal Aviation Agency, and for this reason, if for no other reason alone, I believe the proponents have deluded themselves into thinking that all the problems now faced by municipal officials could be solved by the creation of a new Department.

Now let me turn to the advocacy of a Cabinet voice for city dwellers. This, too, is a misconception, for with the exception of the Secretary of the Interior, all of the present Cabinet, including the Secretary of Agriculture, are gentlemen with urban backgrounds. The operations of the Defense Department, the Commerce Department in assisting in business and industry, and the Labor Department representing labor which obviously is overwhemingly centered in urban areas, would appear to give more than an average voice for the city dweller at the Cabinet table.

Without belaboring the point, it seems to me that the Secretary of Agriculture is vitally concerned with the urban dweller because the vast production of food and fiber relates to the overall national interest and not to the farmer or to the benefits of agricultural research for pigs, cattle, and chickens. Such research is not for the benefit of chickens but for the city dweller who is the overwhelming user of the chickens.

I am impressed by the February 9 article by William S. White in which he said: "The argument is made that because there long has been a Department of Agriculture 'serving country people' justice is denied until there is a department 'serving city people.' This is demonstrable nonsense." Further, I believe that the problems of cities, particularly the large ones, are already well recognized by the Congress and the administration. An example of this is the Housing Act of 1961 which provided for demonstration grants to find a solution for mass transportation problems, the acquisition of open space, the new middle-income housing program, the increased emphasis on rehabilitation of existing home and neighborhoods in central cities. It is indicative that the Congress and the Government are responsive to the voice of cities of America.

A more honest and meritorious way of meeting the needs of mayors would be a Bureau or Office of Urban Affairs in the Executive Office of the President. The director of such an office could serve as a special staff assistant to the President to coordinate research and activities of the many urban programs now housed throughout the Executive branch of the Government. Further, it could serve as a clearing house for mayors to check in with on their trips to Washington to ascertain which agency had jurisdiction over the problem with which they are concerned. I have often wondered why the mayors through their executive advocates, namely, the American Municipal Association and the U.S. Conference of Mayors could not have a number of their problems answered by checking at the Washington office just as I, as a homebuilder, check with my national association for coordination and assistance on my trips to Washington.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, there already appears an excellent handbook for coordination and referral purposes which was issued in June of 1961 by the Area Redevelopment Administration, entitled, "Handbook of Federal Aids to Communities." This handbook illustrates over 100 Federal programs, gives a description of the program and the address of the Federal agencies with jurisdiction. Some of the programs listed are community facilities, housing, community welfare, and many others.

In conclusion, I strongly urge this committee to reject Reorganization Plan No. 1 for being nothing but a sham and being unrealistic in meeting the needs of coordination for urban problems. I do urge this committee, at some future date, to consider as an alternative, a Bureau or Office of Urban Affairs.

Milwaukee Journal Supports Department of Urban Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the support for President Kennedy's proposal to establish a Department of Urban Affairs is widespread. I am glad that the Milwaukee Journal has added its voice to this rising chorus, and include in the RECORD its editorial of January 14, 1962, on the subject:

URBAN POPULATION AT 70 PERCENT

Opponents of a Federal Cabinet Department of Urban Affairs worry about resulting erosion of the vigor and independence of municipal government. But that does not turn aside the fact of urbanism's overriding dominance in the geography of the Nation today, and its truly national impact.

The private Population Reference Bureau has just drawn the dimensions of urbanism anew. It reminds that the ratio of urban dwellers was still only 40 percent in 1900, had jumped over 50 percent by 1920, is now 70 percent, has a likely prospect of becoming 85 percent by 2000.

Six States (California, Illinois, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island) and the District of Columbia are already more than 80 percent urban. Twelve more are over 70 percent. Eight newly showed up as more than 50 percent urban in the 1960 census. Only 11 now remain predominantly rural in terms of where their people live.

The very fact of jealousy for local government autonomy—in units that ignore true urban limits—is part of the problem in any sizable urban area. Metropolitan complexes today override county and State lines, too. A legitimate national concern for efficient management, planning, and development of these complexes seems inescapable.

President Kennedy has so far hoped to obtain a Cabinet Secretary of Urban Affairs by Congress' initiative, and Senator CLARK of Pennsylvania, prime mover for it, predicts passage this year. In the alternative Kennedy could try to do it by Executive order, effective unless vetoed by either House, which is the way the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare came into being under Eisenhower.

Initially, at least, an Urban Affairs Department would be merely an upgrading of the existing Housing and Home Finance Agency, by way of adding weight to its role, with its half dozen subagencies most notably including urban renewal. How it would grow, how much it would "intrude" upon local government, would depend upon how much or little the cities themselves can and will do to meet the challenge of urbanism.

That seems fair enough, and no less a proper concern of the National Government than it has similarly expressed for such other aspects of the national scene as commerce, labor, and agriculture.

Youth Conservation Corps Endorsed by National Association of County Officials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, those of us who have been both sponsors and strong supporters of Youth Conservation Corps legislation are heartened to know that we have as allies the National Association of County Officials.

This important and widely representative organization, we are informed, is on record as "strongly endorsing the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps." This information is set forth in an article published in the January 1962 issue of the County Officer, publication of the National Association of County Officials.

The article to which I refer was written by Richard Shelton, executive secretary of the West Virginia Association of County Officials, who also wrote:

The bill reported to the Senate by that chamber's Committee on Labor and Public Welfare * * * will have the wholehearted support of the West Virginia Association of County Officials for one basic reason: It represents a two-way assault on one of the major phases of our State's widespread unemployment problem—the great numbers of jobless persons in the ranks of recent high school graduates and the school dropouts.

The program—

Writes Mr. Shelton—

in no way represents a delinquency-control effort as such although it might be a significant means of preventing juvenile delinquency by putting large numbers of the State's idle youth to work and under training, either in conservation camps or in various programs in their home communities.

The title of Mr. Shelton's article in the County Officer is "Youth Conservation Corps and Youth Public Service Program," which also is the title of Senate Report No. 976 made on September 12, 1961, by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The committee favorably reported S. 404 with amendments. The measure, as amended, is a combination of the essential features of two bills; namely, S. 404, introduced by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and 21 cosponsors, including both Senators from West Virginia, and S. 2036, proposed in a message to the Congress by the President, and introduced at the request of the administration by Senator HUMPHREY. S. 404, as introduced January 13, 1961, would establish a Youth Conservation Corps and was identical to S. 812, passed by the Senate in the 1st session of the 86th Congress. S. 2036, the Youth Employment Opportunities Act, contained three titles—the essence of two of which have been incorporated in the bill reported (S. 404) while the third title providing for training was incorporated in S. 1991, passed by the Senate on August 23, 1961.

S. 404 as reported would establish two programs for the employment of youth in useful occupations—a Youth Conservation Corps under title I and a youth public service program under title II. This measure is pending in the Senate as Calendar No. 959. It is my fervent hope—and I join the National and West Virginia Associations of County Officials and many other important organizations in hoping that this vital measure will have early affirmative action by the Senate and that it likewise will be passed by the House and approved by the President before the close of this session of the 87th Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article from the County Officer to which I have made reference and from which I have quoted in part.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS AND YOUTH PUBLIC SERVICE PROGRAMS

(By Richard Shelton)

Youth Conservation Corps and youth public service programs. Remember those designations, because they promise to be very much before local government and other officials during the forthcoming session of the U.S. Congress. The words sum up the contents of a bill reported to the Senate floor by that Chamber's Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The measure, generally a broadened version of a proposal first offered by the Kennedy administration, was reported by a 9- to -5 vote of the committee, urging favorable action on it.

The bill will have the wholehearted support of the West Virginia Association of County Officials for one basic reason. It represents a two-way assault on one of the major phases of our State's widespread unemployment problem—the great numbers of jobless persons in the ranks of recent high school graduates and the school dropouts. The program in no way represents a delinquency control effort as such, although it might be significant means of preventing juvenile delinquency by putting large num-

bers of the State's idle youth at work and under training either in conservation camps or in various programs right in their home communities.

The National Association of County Officials, after careful study and consideration, went on record at the National Association of County Officials Convention in Chicago last August to strongly endorse the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps.

In support of this policy statement, 14 county leaders from California, Maryland, Michigan, New York, Oregon, Utah, and West Virginia recently met with U.S. Labor Secretary Arthur J. Goldberg, in connection with the National Association of County Officials officers and directors meeting in Washington, D.C., to discuss this proposed legislation. Secretary Goldberg and his staff provided a general briefing of the bill's provisions and some off-the-record comment on its probable acceptance by the Congress.

OPPOSITION EXPLAINED

The opposition to the bill from some Members of the Senate committee was explained in two minority reports affixed to the majority report urging its passage. Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, of New Jersey and Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York were in full accord with the aspirations of the programs which this bill would establish.

But they noted that President Kennedy recommended enactment of a 3-year pilot program instead of the large-scale, permanent programs which the committee majority instead sent to the Senate floor. CASE and JAVITS said they would "heartily support" such a pilot approach, but could not go along with the sweeping bill as it emerged from committee.

A minority report signed by Senators BARRY GOLDWATER of Arizona, WINSTON PROUTY, of Vermont, and JOHN G. TOWER, of Texas, was more detailed. It generally said that while there are areas where conservation efforts could be planned to good advantage, it would be more appropriate for such projects to be undertaken by departments of the Federal Government directly concerned; or financed by the States and local communities. The report also said that adjustments which every youth must face in meeting responsibilities of citizenship traditionally have been under guidance and supervision of the home and local communities. And, the report asserted, the Nation "can no longer afford the luxury of the multimillion-dollar pilot programs."

MAJORITY REPORT

The majority report took the position that a Youth Conservation Corps open to young men of good character between the ages of 16 and 21 would provide a labor force for long-neglected forestry, parks and other projects at a cost substantially less to the taxpayer than if the work were performed by additional regular employees of existing conservation agencies. It added that a pilot program proposed along the youth public service line for both young men and women would fill a gap under a sensible matching fund formula in services and facilities for which local funds are scarce.

Both parts of the program—the conservation camps along the lines of the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's and the at-home public service employment—seem to have particular significance for county government. Our national association has expressed serious concern about the growing numbers of high school graduates who can't get jobs, and about the school dropout problem given additional emphasis in recent statistical reports.

It's, of course, impossible here to go into great detail regarding specific provisions of the bill, but a few major points with respect to both of its major objectives deserve particular study. The Youth Conservation Corps would begin with 30,000 enrollees, and would be stepped up by 1965 to 150,000. That would be half of the old Civilian Conservation Corps program strength. Both this program and the public service phase would be under U.S. Labor Department direction, with that agency and affiliated State agencies selecting enrollees and helping to find jobs for them after enrollment. The Youth Conservation Corps would work both on State and local forests and parks, in addition to Federal lands. In fact, the bill reserves one-third of the total Youth Conservation Corps strength for participation by State and local governments. And where enrollees work on State or local lands, State or local governmental units would defray half the cost.

Those enrolled would be paid $60 a month, plus $5 for each enrollment and $10 a month for special skills. Certain hours each week would go for various types of training.

QUOTAS ESTABLISHED

A State-by-State quota would be used for 50 percent of the total Youth Conservation Corps enrollment. For the remaining 50 percent—and here is a feature of particular significance to many States—would come from areas of substantial unemployment.

Under the public service employment program, the U.S. Secretary of Labor would help States and local governmental units, on a 50–50 matching basis, to provide worthwhile job opportunities for young people. Private nonprofit community service agencies also could participate in the program. All in all, public service jobs in or near home communities of the young employees are contemplated. The work would include service in public institutions and other public facilities such as schools, hospitals, libraries, welfare agencies, children's homes, courts, public park and recreation facilities and in such private community service undertakings as settlement houses. Here, the 3-year trial period is envisioned, with the Kennedy administration envisioning employment for 25,000 in the first year and 33,000 in the 2 subsequent years. The Federal share of the cost has been estimated at about $1,000 per enrollee.

Effects of Postal Rate Increases on Foreign Language Newspapers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a copy of "An Open Letter to Members of Congress," from the Amerikan Uutiset, a Finnish language newspaper printed at New York Mills, Minn. Publisher Russell O. Parta has a commendable record of service to the Finnish-speaking people of this country and has worked diligently in keeping these people informed of the events and principles of the United States of America. As Publisher Parta points out, there are many people in our country who are not yet familiar with the language of their new homeland. The people of Finnish extraction he serves are excellent examples. Publisher Parta's remarks on postal rate legislation and the probable effects on the people he serves should be of interest to all. His open letter follows:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE ODIN LANGEN, OF MINNESOTA, BEFORE THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON FEBRUARY 19, 1962. (EFFECTS OF POSTAL RATE INCREASES ON FOREIGN LANGUAGE NEWSPAPERS)

As a publisher of a foreign-language newspaper (Finnish) published in the United States, I read with much apprehension the efforts in Congress to raise postal rates on newspapers, and on foreign-language newspapers in particular.

To begin with, it must be understood that much of the foreign-language press in the United States today is published as a public service to the people reading these papers and to the Government which benefits from having a well-informed citizenry, even if many of these people still are not familiar with the language of their new homeland.

Postal rates affecting newspapers recently were raised several times (minimum rate). This recent raise caused a hardship on newspapers such as our Amerikan Uutiset. The immediate result in our case was that it was necessary to cut our publication from three times a week to twice a week. This, of course, cut our service to our reading public, but it was a necessary step in order to meet the tremendous percentage increase in the cost of mailing newspapers.

Now steps are being taken to raise this already increased rate by another 300 percent (minimum rate).

This large increase is going to seriously handicap the efforts of foreign language newspaper publishers to stay in business. This out-of-proportion cost in the publication of these newspapers will, of course, have to be passed on to the subscribers, because advertising revenues of these papers (the Finnish language press in particular) cannot be increased to cover this increased cost.

Passing this cost on to our consumers will, as has been proven in our experience, cost us a number of subscribers who will not have the necessary means to pay the increased cost of the subscription rate. This will then cut into the total income of the paper and the law of diminishing returns will soon result in no publication.

We are now receiving $7 a year for our eight-page, twice-a-week publication. A $1 increase in subscription rates would not even quite cover the cost of the postal rate increase to say nothing of helping cover additional expenses created by the continued inflationary spiral of costs in the publication field.

We cannot understand how an increase in postal rates amounting to about 1,000 percent in a 6-year period can be justified in the light of what other increased costs have been during this same period. These figures are arrived at by taking the minimum postal rate on newspapers which is the category in which our publication is classified, advertising percentage being comparatively low.

Our readers, elderly Finnish speaking and reading people, some born in Finland and some born in the United States, have little income in this stage of their lives. We know from experience that an increase in subscription rates large enough to cover the additional postal costs will work a hardship upon these people, if they feel able to continue their subscriptions at all.

And when one reads and hears that antagonistic voices raised in derision against minority foreign language groups in the House of Representatives is met with spontaneous applause by colleagues representing the American people, one wonders what is happening to one of the great humanitarian traditions that has made America great—a tradition that many of us think of in our minds and consciences as one of the reasons that justifies our existence as a nation in the sight of God.

We wonder upon what road we are traveling when we are ready to turn our backs upon these people, now elderly, who we once

welcomed to our shores because we needed them to help build our great country.

The postal department is one of the great services provided by our Founding Fathers when they conceived this Nation. The postal department has made it possible for the rapid dissemination of reading material at a reasonable rate so that people might be better informed and thereby be better citizens.

Now we are taking steps to deprive these immigrants and foreign language reading groups from the benefits that this postal service has given them for many years. We are taking steps to raise the cost of distributing these newspapers to a point where it is all out of proportion with the other costs of publishing these low-income foreign language newspapers. We are asking these elderly people, with their shrinking incomes, to help subsidize the cost of the postal service—a service which the foreign language press has helped reimburse the United States with by providing it with thousands of well-informed people who have thus been better able to serve their new homeland. Do we now feel that because these people are older that they no longer have any worth in the sight of our country, that we no longer care whether or not they can be kept informed in a language that they can read and understand? Do we feel that it is better to put the foreign language press out of business, if necessary, in order to help out the Post Office Department? Do we feel that this is a better tradition than the humanitarian one of helping these people, a tradition that has long been one of the guiding beacons in a country rich with the achievements that have come from people who were born overseas, or who are descendants of the foreign born; which, of course, includes us all.

We look forward to a continuing of the altruistic, humanitarian ideals of our country. We see no reason for the adoption of a stern materialistic policy toward the foreign-born minority groups. We feel that we still need these people well informed in order that they may still give their best to this country. We believe that the effort to increase postal rates on publications read by these people will result in their not receiving any publications of this type in the near future and therefore ask that the Members of Congress consider this seriously in their desire to increase postal rates on these publications.

In all sincerity and hopefulness,

RUSSELL O. PARTA,
Publisher, Amerikan Uutiset.

A Logical View of the Proposed Urban Affairs Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the noted syndicated columnist, William S. White, recently commented on the proposed Department of Urban Affairs with what I consider a great amount of insight. The views that he expresses concisely reflect a portion of my feelings on why the proposed Department of Urban Affairs should be disapproved by the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following commentary by William S. White entitled, "The Case Against the Urban Affairs Department":

THE CASE AGAINST URBAN AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT

(By William S. White)

President Kennedy's plan to create a new Cabinet-rank Department of Urban Affairs ought to be rejected by Congress for the good of the country—and for the President's own good, if it comes to that.

Mr. Kennedy and Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York, who hopes to be Mr. Kennedy's GOP presidential adversary in 1964, have been playing old-fashioned politics on the issue. The prize is the favor of minority groups and big city people generally.

This is not against the Constitution nor in violation of tradition. All the same, while fun is fun, there is no sound reason to involve the country in this enterprise.

To set up such a Department and create in the person of Dr. Robert Weaver an 11th member of the Cabinet would be short of a national calamity. But it would have obviously harmful results. The innuendo that opposition is based on the fact that Dr. Weaver is a Negro—and a distinguished one—is unfair. It may apply to a handful of southern extremists. It is not the controlling factor even to most southerners. Certainly it is not to the Republican opposition—though it is true that the Republicans, in a way, asked for the situation by happily needling Mr. Kennedy about "not doing enough for the Negro."

To proclaim as solemn Federal policy that city Americans are different from other Americans would be an act of national disunion when national unity was never more needed.

To declare that city people need a special Government department to have true "representation" would be to say baselessly that they don't now have fully adequate "representation."

To set up such a Department would be to gather up into one immensely powerful new pressure agency dozens of economic, social, religious, and racial groups which, now operating separately, are already quite powerful enough.

The argument is made that because there long has been a Department of Agriculture "serving country people" justice is denied until there is a Department "serving city people." This is demonstrable nonsense. The Department of Agriculture serves a fundamental all-national interest, production of food and fiber. The Commerce Department serves an all-national interest, American business. The Labor Department serves yet another all-national interest, American labor.

Obviously, Commerce is already more helpful to city than to country people. Obviously, so is Labor. So, for that matter, is Treasury.

Another argument is that the metropolitan centers can no longer solve their own problems. The logical extension of this is that a Federal Urban Department would become the great dumping ground for metropolitan problems. Who in the cities will long suffer the headaches of housing and transportation if these can simply be painlessly handed over to Washington? What happens to municipal responsibility, to local self-government?

Of course, one motive is to reduce undue power of rural pressure groups in Congress by increasing power of urban pressure groups in the Cabinet. This is an odd remedy, however, when one considers that the big cities already have, at the very heart of the whole thing—the choosing of a President—a wholly disproportionate power both in the nominating and electing processes.

Finally, this reform is, amid our somber world realities, an unnecessary little thing. What great cold-war commander really wants to be remembered as the man who created a Department of Urban Affairs at an hour when national survival is in question? What hot-war commander would want to be remembered as the man who improved the quartermaster's system of counting GI underwear?

Coast Guard Citation for Lt. Comdr. Alfred Tanner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, on February 15, Lt. Comdr. Alfred Price Tanner was awarded the Coast Guard Silver Life-Saving Medal. I welcome the opportunity to congratulate Commander Tanner on behalf of our Third Ohio Congresional District. Under permission granted, I should like to include in the RECORD the news story by Mr. Gilson Wright in the Hamilton Journal and the official citation by the Coast Guard.

The article follows:

AL TANNER GOES TO WASHINGTON TO RECEIVE LIFESAVING AWARD

OXFORD.—Al Tanner, supervisor of physical education in the Talawanda district, will go to Washington Thursday to pick up a silver medal for being a hero.

He saved a man from drowning in the Ohio River last April, but no one knows who the man is. However, there were at least 30 witnesses to the affair and Tanner, who modestly left the scene without giving his own name, was finally identified and will be officially recognized as the unknown hero.

Lt. Comdr. Alfred Tanner is commanding officer of the Covington, Ky., unit of the Coast Guard Reserves and it is the Reserve Officers Association which will pay him his belated recognition at a banquet Thursday night in the Naval Weapons Depot in Washington. C. Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, is slated to make the award.

BOAT OVERTURNS

Tanner was en route to Oxford from a meeting of the Coast Guard unit at Covington and took a favorite way of getting home, via the Anderson Ferry. While waiting in his car for the ferry to land on the Kentucky side, he saw a boat with three men overturn. One was hauled out by the ferry crew and a second was saved because he was wearing a lifejacket.

"Save my dad," yelled one of the men, both of whom were in their twenties, as the third man was carried downstream by the swift current.

Tanner pulled off his pants and shoes, dived in, and overtook the man downstream. He swam about 150 feet with him to shore. Then he calmly pulled on his pants and shoes, got in the car and proceeded across the river on the ferryboat.

BONA FIDE HERO

While it's unusual to give a medal for saving someone who technically doesn't exist, the Coast Guard made a thorough investigation of the matter and talked with the ferry crew and others and came up with the assurance that it had a hero on its hand.

Tanner, who is a quiet Gary Cooper-type of person, didn't tell anyone in Oxford about his deed until the news broke out of Cincinnati.

The Coast Guard simply couldn't find any of the three men involved in the drama and came up with the conclusion that the men didn't want to reveal their identities and risk possible arrest for what some observers said was reckless operation of their motorboat. Ferry crewmembers said they had warned the men they were courting danger in that area.

A number of Members of Congress will be present at the dinner at which Tanner will be the guest of honor.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY
Washington.

The Secretary of the Treasury takes pleasure in presenting the Silver Lifesaving Medal to Lt. Comdr. Alfred Price Tanner, U.S. Coast Guard Reserve, for service as set forth in the following citation:

"For heroic action on the afternoon of April 23, 1961, when he dived into the Ohio River at Anderson Ferry, Constance, Ky., and rescued a man from drowning. Lieutenant Commander Tanner, returning from weekend drill at ORTUPS O2-565, was waiting in his car in the ferry line on the Kentucky bank when he heard cries for help. He quickly proceeded to the landing where he observed three victims of a capsized motorboat being carried away by the current. One man, wearing a life preserver swam to shore. Another occupant, hanging onto a tree, was rescued by the ferry crew. Perceiving the helplessness of the third victim, Lieutenant Commander Tanner immediately removed his shoes and trousers and, completely disregarding his own personal safety, jumped into the cold waters to help the struggling man who had now gone under and was being carried downstream. He reached the exhausted man about 150 feet from the water's edge and brought him safely to shore. After determining that the victim was breathing normally, he drove his automobile aboard the ferry and continued homeward. Lieutenant commander Tanner's initiative, fortitude, and unwavering devotion to duty were in keeping with the highest traditions of the U.S. Coast Guard."

DOUGLAS DILLON.

Let's Support the Dutch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, on numerous accasions I have risen to voice protests against the neutralism this Nation seems to have embarked upon in the dispute between Indonesia and the Netherlands.

We cannot buy friendship with a few million dollars. We didn't buy the Dutch. Our friendship is built on mutual respect and purpose and is bonded by mutual loss of blood in a bitter war against a common enemy, whom Indonesian President Sukarno supported.

Mr. Speaker, the Djakarta Daily Mail, obviously echoing Sukarno's pronouncements, said in an editorial:

"If Congressman JACK WESTLAND and the other Americans of his kind choose to sit on their money rather than help Indonesia to achieve prosperity for all and real democracy, let them. The caravan rolls on, on, and on, with somebody else's dollars, like for instance, the $450 million from Russia."

I may be an "Innocent American," as the editorial referred to me, but I cannot see why we have to support Indonesia with arms which could be used against our ally.

I've received numerous letters protesting our stand on the West New Guinea problem and have read several editorials that question our approach to this issue. Under leave to extend my remarks I include in the RECORD such an editorial that appeared in the Seattle, Wash., Times, February 6, 1962.

The editorial follows:

TAKING SIDES SHOULD BE EASY

Premier Jan de Quay of the Netherlands says he does not understand the U.S. decision to close American airfields in the Pacific to further flights of Dutch troops to West New Guinea.

We can assure Premier de Quay that a great many Americans also do not understand the decision.

As happens so often, Uncle Sam again has managed to antagonize both sides of a dispute which in no way involves any direct U.S. interest.

Indonesia is furious because one Dutch charter plane, carrying troops to New Guinea, was permitted to touch down on U.S. soil.

The Netherlands is puzzled and disappointed because American airfields have been declared "off limits" to further flights of this nature.

Well, in our view, this is one international dispute in which Uncle Sam shouldn't have any trouble deciding which side is right.

We don't mean the question as to whether the Netherlands should continue to administer West New Guinea. The Dutch have made it quite clear, in fact, that they would be willing to abandon the jungle island under what they consider to be the proper conditions, including measures safeguarding the welfare of the area's primitive native population, which is no more Indonesian than it is Dutch.

Our reference, rather, is to Indonesian President Sukarno's threats of naked aggression. In fact, Sukarno has engaged in more than threats. He attempted one act of aggression, in which the Dutch military gave him a thorough drubbing.

Aggression is still aggression, and imperialism is still imperialism—even when practiced by one of the "anti-imperialist" Asian nations.

Why deny landing privileges on American airfields to an ally—one of America's very best allies—that is refusing to bow to imperialist aggression?

Yesterday the Indonesian Government permitted a student mob to stone the U.S. Embassy in Jakarta, rip down an American flag, and injure an American woman Embassy official.

Indonesian Foreign Minister Subandrio expressed regret for the incident, but added he could "well understand the anger and irritation of the Indonesian people caused by the permission granted to Dutch troop-carrying planes to land on American soil."

Well, Subandrio should be made to feel the anger and irritation of the American people, who are getting pretty fed up with these Embassy stonings.

U.S. aid to Indonesia should be totally suspended until full compensation is made for damage to American personnel and property, and until there is a truly proper statement of apology from the Indonesian authorities.

Prayer of Bishop W. Angie Smith at Highway Dedication, October 29, 1961, by President John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on October 29, 1961, my congressional district had the honor of a visit by our great President, the Honorable John F. Kennedy. The occasion of the President's visit to Oklahoma's Third District was the dedication of a new road which passes through some of the most beautiful country in the southwest. It is an area of imposing forests and majestic mountains, once described as the "Kingdom of Quiet."

In this setting, the Reverend Bishop W. Angie Smith, bishop of the Oklahoma-New Mexico district of the Methodist Church, offered an inspiring invocation. Because of the beauty of his prayer and because of the respect and admiration in which all who know Bishop Smith hold him, I include, under unanimous consent, this prayer in the RECORD:

PRAYER OF BISHOP W. ANGIE SMITH AT HIGHWAY DEDICATION OCTOBER 29, 1961, BY PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Almighty and eternal God, creator of all life, Father of all men, we bow in deepest reverence and humility in Thy presence. Accept our gratitude for Thy leadership in every crisis and our fervent prayer for light, wisdom, and power in the future. Without Thy presence and blessing all wisdom of man will ultimately fail.

We do not all approach Thy throne down the same avenue of creedal expression nor of formal worship but are one family of God. We rejoice that we are citizens of a free and powerful Nation, where each may worship Thee according to the dictates of his own conscience. We thank Thee for our Nation, made free and great, with love and charity for all, by our faith in Thee.

Wilt Thou bless, guide, and inspire every elected and appointed official in Nation, State and local community. May they all understand their responsibility for the protection of our freedom and the continuation of our glorious spiritual heritage.

Our Father, in these crucial and critical days we pray for our great President and his family. No one has been faced with more difficult decisions nor called upon for as large a responsibility for world peace. May Thy loving arms uphold and sustain him in every crisis. Grant unto him wisdom, courage and initiative, all tempered by a divine sense of justice, mercy, and longing for an enduring and righteous peace. May every decision he makes be in keeping with Thy will for all mankind.

If there be divisions among us, heal them; may the temporary be cast aside, so that the world will know we are one people, strong, determined and united. May we strengthen the position of our President in world leadership by a firm foundation of spiritual integrity in our Nation. Grant unto him grace from on high. While facing crises around the world, we rejoice in and profit by developments at home as typified by this

happy occasion which brings us together for this dedication in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Intertie Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the question of whether or not the Federal Government should construct a high-voltage powerline between the Pacific Northwest and southern California continues to be one of the foremost issues among the people of my district.

Recently, the Bellingham Chamber of Commerce in my home State of Washington, invited Bonneville Power Administrator Charles F. Luce and Mr. H. Dewayne Kreager, former State commerce and economic development director, to debate this topic.

We have our differences out in the Pacific Northwest, but we try to look at both sides before we jump to hasty conclusions. This debate, I think, is an example of how we try to settle things back home.

Mr. Speaker, I believe an account of the debate that appeared in the Bellingham, Wash., Herald by Mr. Ken Robertson recently will be of interest and will be helpful to the Members of Congress in understanding this issue.

The article follows:

DEBATERS SEE INTERTIE TO SOUTHWEST CERTAIN

(By Ken Robertson)

"It's not just power we're trying to protect, but low-cost power—that's the key to this thing," Charles F. Luce, Bonneville Power Administrator, told a Bellingham Chamber of Commerce audience Wednesday afternoon.

He spoke in a public debate with H. Dewayne Kreager, former director of the State department of commerce and economic development, over a proposed electrical power intertie with California and the Southwest.

"The availability of firm power is more important than the cost of power," Kreager declared in rebuttal to Luce's argument. "And at this stage of the game, we have not established the mutuality of interest on an equal basis, with California, that is necessary before we go into such an intertie."

SOME INTERTIE CERTAIN

But Luce and Kreager agreed that no matter what anyone thinks a power intertie is going to be established, whether it is done by the Federal Government or by independent California utilities.

Luce reported that two California utilities have already developed plans to build transmission lines with a 230 kilovolt capacity which can, with little difficulty, be changed to handle 500 kilovolts, the same type of line the Bonneville Power Administration has proposed building.

In one of his first public debates on the issue, Luce spoke before about 200 Bellingham citizens at a chamber of commerce luncheon in the Bellingham Hotel.

DUMPED NOW

He said that the Bonneville Power Administration should move now to build transmission lines for the power intertie. The opportunity such a line offers to sell surplus power, which is now being dumped over Pacific Northwest spillways at a loss, is one of the ways Bonneville can gradually erase its deficit condition in order to maintain a power rate in the Pacific Northwest which is competitive with other areas in the United States.

Kreager said now is not the time—there is no assurance with construction of the line that California and Southwest interests could not rob the Pacific Northwest of some of its needed firm power and there is no assurance California would deliver power back to the Pacific Northwest where this area needs it.

"Northwest power in California is worth a great deal more than Northwest power in the Northwest," Kreager said. "Eighty percent of the power market on the coast is in California today and only 20 percent in Washington and Oregon. Industry locates in the center of a market area. This power in California would be an inducement to industries, who might otherwise locate in Washington and Oregon, to locate in California."

Both men pegged their arguments to the attractiveness of power to industry. Luce maintained this area must sell its surplus load to keep rates low and remain competitive with power in the Ohio Valley and the East.

GRAB STRANGLEHOLD

Kreager warned that Bonneville must not allow California to grab a stranglehold on firm power and pull it into the southern area to build up its industrial attraction.

Both men pointed to "preference clauses" in the Bonneville Act, which would allow places that do not have power to have access to it through Federal power sources.

"There is no reason why the city of Los Angeles couldn't build its own lines and demand power from the Federal Government," Luce said, "not only secondary but firm power."

SUPER PREFERENCE

Kreager said there is the "need of a super preference for the Pacific Northwest overriding existing preference before this power moves southward."

Luce mentioned that legislation which is protective enough for the Northwest is now written into a bill before Congress, which he hopes will pass at this session.

"Once this bill is enacted and written into contracts with our customers, Congress couldn't change those contracts without violating the Constitution," he said.

He said Bonneville does not intend to sell firm power to California or the Southwest. It wants to sell only surplus power, $32 million worth of which was dumped over Pacific Northwest spillways last year.

PEAKS ARE DIFFERENT

"Their peak power needs will come in the summer, ours in the winter," Luce said. "We're going to have idle generating time when they need it and they're going to have it when we need it."

By selling the surplus power, Bonneville can begin to erase its deficit, he said. And with the use of electricity from new dams which have cost much more than Bonneville and Grand Coulee, the deficit will have to be erased or the Government will have to raise its power rates.

Kreager said this was fine. He commended Luce on his efforts to get the preference bill written and on his efforts to wipe out the deficit.

FULL, WHITE HEAT

"I think Charlie Luce has done a beautiful job of walking a very difficult line in the full, white heat of public scrutiny, making decisions between what are the interests of the Pacific Northwest and what are the interests of the Nation, as his job demands."

But, said Kreager, he is highly skeptical that California will ever be able to deliver power north when the Northwest needs it, since California demands are growing at a pace the area cannot keep up with.

He said "Politics with a capital P" are, and will be, involved in a transmission line from Bonneville south and he pointed to California's massive power in Congress where future decisions will be made.

NO BENEFIT HERE

"It is an advantage to bring Northwest power into California no matter who happens to be in office. But we have no benefit whatsoever to achieve here in Washington.

"Our altruism could react to our detriment, I hardly think to our benefit."

FINGER IN PIE

Kreager said assurances that the Pacific Northwest would have preference over its own power should be guaranteed in legislation before any power moves out of the area. He declared that the Pacific Northwest will, by 1965, be able to use all its firm power in its own area and no opportunity should be allowed for California to stick its finger into the pie.

"California should solve some of its own problems, through a system of interconnections, which it has not done."

After the debate, the question of the Hanford atomic reactor plant for generating power came up. Both men said it had no bearing whatsoever on the intertie.

Power from the nuclear plant would never go out of the Northwest, Luce said.

PURELY ON ECONOMICS

"The market for power from the Hanford plant is here in the Pacific Northwest," Luce said. Kreager added that the project should "be judged purely on its economic value to the State."

Kreager said he was in favor of the plant.

"I'd like to see it under a combination of public and private management, so both can get the experience of running the operation and working with the benefits of the inexpensive nuclear power production."

THEY SUM UP

The men summed up their argument, Luce declaring:

"With new higher cost projects coming up, unless we can get rid of our deficit through this intertie and other methods, we will be faced with rate increases."

Kreager was still doubtful:

"The fact remains that we must talk about a transmission line of a type and a size, when it's going to be built, by whom and for what purpose. We still do not have any assurance we can hold the line that we're talking about surplus power."

Coast Guard Reserve Comes of Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to take notice in the House today of the fact that today is the 21st birthday of the U.S. Coast Guard Reserve.

In my district, perhaps more than in most districts, the Coast Guard is an important and distinguished force, and its members are everywhere highly regarded.

The Coast Guard Academy at New London trains most of the officers of the Coast Guard, and many of the highest ranking officers of the service today are among its graduates. At Avery Point in Groton, the schools for specialists are in progress all the time. At the Moorings, important operations of the Coast Guard at the entrance to Long Island are conducted.

The Coast Guard Auxiliary, with its power squadrons and leisure time personnel, provides a service to the part of recreation-seeking Connecticut which goes afloat, that is as unique as it is valuable.

The Coast Guard Reserve, however, is a component of our military reserve, and it was created on February 19, 1941, when Congress changed the name of the former Reserve to the Coast Guard Auxiliary, and established the present Reserve on the pattern of the Naval Reserve. One year later, a Women's Reserve was added.

In the 20 years which have passed since the Coast Guard Reserve was established, it has made a day-by-day contribution to help the Coast Guard itself deserve its motto, "Semper Paratus"—Always Prepared.

I take pleasure in congratulating the Commandant and the officers and men of the Coast Guard, and especially of the Coast Guard Reserve, on this anniversary.

Tribute to the Maine Lobsterman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, many Members, if not all, of the U.S. Senate have enjoyed the delicious delicacy of the incomparable Maine lobster. It is the finest food in the world.

But few of us realize what goes behind getting that lobster to the dining table—or to the cook. It involves a great deal of work, discomfort, physical risks, hardships, and heartbreaks. It requires fortitude and patience, vigor and dedication, on the part of the world's heartiest soul—the Maine lobsterman.

I salute him and I ask unanimous consent that an article about him that appeared in the January 11, 1962, issue of the Brunswick, Maine, Record be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD so that the Members of the Senate may read about him and join in my salute to him.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IT'S LIKE TO LOBSTER FOR A LIVING IN WINTER

(By Jean Doughty)

Have you ever thought that the lobster fisherman's life is the life for you? Have you ever thought how nice it would be if you were independent, could work when you pleased, and could have the freedom of the ocean? Before you quit your job and buy a boat and traps, just for the fun of it, let's pretend you are a lobsterman—a year-round lobsterman.

It is late winter and you have been chafing to get out to your traps for a week and a half. First there was a storm, and in its wake a sea that roared and pounded for 3 days. Then the wind veered to the nor'west and blew with 40-mile-per-hour gusts for a few days. After that, the temperature hovered around zero and the vapor rose from the water each day, making the ocean look like a gigantic pan of heating water. Today is a little warmer and although the vapor is rising again, it looks as though you may be able to see your marks.

Money is scarce. Your last haul paid the milk bill and bought a stock of grub. Now the light bill and the oil bill are waiting payment and the stock of grub is gone. The wife builds a couple of sandwiches and a thermos of coffee while you throw a sweater on over your flannel shirt, struggle into your oil clothes, sou'wester and boots. You don't wear mittens because you "couldn't walk down the road wearing mittens without stepping on them." (Your forefathers fished wearing enormous mittens, but you don't see how they did it.) Grabbing your lunch bucket, you kiss your wife, pat the dog, jump in the old, cold, pickup truck and off you go to the wharf.

Someone has used your punt but hasn't cleaned it out, so you put on your cotton gloves, get in the punt, smash up the ice and clean it out. After reaching the boat, you put a pan of water on the gas stove to heat. You can hear the fellows whose engines have fresh-water cooling systems getting their boats underway. After disconnecting the water pump, you start the engine, letting it warm up to create steam which will thaw the water jackets. When the water on the stove has heated, you run part of it over the intake hose. The rest you let trickle over the water pump to thaw it so that you won't shear off a pin or chew up the rubber impeller. You may have to heat another pan of water before everything thaws. Then you connect the belt on the water pump, make sure the pump is operating so that you won't overheat your engine, cast off, and steer for the wharf.

ALWAYS LOW TIDE

There are others ahead of you getting bait, and you wait your turn. At last, you grab your bushel tubs, worm your way up over the ice-coated ramp and pitch the frozen bait into your tubs. It seems to you that every time it is a chance to haul the tide is low. The ramp leading to the raft is on a precipitous slant as you lift your tub onto the slide which is to one side of the ramp. You hang onto the handle of the tub with your right hand, clutch the rail with your left hand and inch your way down the ramp. After four trips your bait is safely aboard and you wait your turn to get gasoline. Finally you join the boats leaving the cove. Your breath blows onto your face and freezes there when you peer out around the side of your house. You get tired of stretching your neck and grabbing a bucket of water you stand on the washboard and throw water on the windows of the house to clean off the snow and ice.

The vapor looking like far reaching fog bank, has been pushed out to sea by the wind which has sprung up. After an hour's running, you reach your first string of traps. You wonder if the wind will continue to air, forcing you to make the long trip back with no work accomplished and gas and bait to pay for. "Might as well start haulin' while I'm waitin' to see what this weather's gonna do," you think. You haul a string out of 40 fathoms of water, bait the traps as you come to them, then throw them on the trap-rack. You didn't see a lobster so you turn on your sounding machine, run until you reach some likely-looking bottom, make sure you are not going to set over someone else's traps, and you set yours.

MUST WATCH ROPE

You push the first trap over, let the rope run out until the second trap-lanyard is ready to go, push the second trap overboard and then let the resistance of those two pull the remaining eight traps over, one at a time. You keep watch of the direction you are headed but you turn around continually to make sure the rope hasn't snarled as it runs out. Seeing a snarl start to make, you reach into the whipping rope, grab the right place and hang on until the rope clears itself. You take a chance everytime you get close to the rope; you know that men have gotten snarled up and have been yanked out of their boats and pulled to the bottom of the sea, but you can't let your traps go down in a heap. Then you head back for your other string, haul it, and bring it down near the string you hauled before so that you won't lose track of their locality. Some fellows fish their strings separately, but they must have better memories than yours. You make a mental note of where you put the traps, and head for your next bunch happy to see that the wind has "flunked out" again.

These next traps are in 15 fathoms, shoal water for this time of year, and you worry about their safety. After grabbing the buoy, you haul by hand to get enough slack, put the rope through the snatchblock, take a few turns around the winchhead and start hauling. All at once the boat comes up on a chop and the rope, which is caught down, parts. Muttering and sputtering to yourself, you coil up the rope already hauled in and put it to one side, then run for the buoy on the opposite end of the string.

TRAPS LOST

The traps come in fine until the seventh one, when you find you have a good, big catch-down. You let out some slack, throw the engine in gear and circle the caught rope, trying to clear it. You alternate between steaming and hauling, to no avail; you try hauling the rope taut and then releasing it so that it jumps back into the water. This sometimes releases the rope from whatever it is caught around, but this time it doesn't work. You pull and haul for three-quarters of an hour, hoping the rope won't part, but eventually it does. Hauling the parted rope in, you find that the seventh trap is there and the parted place is just beyond it. Three traps are still on bottom, caught on some unknown obstacle and there's no way of getting them. There's no sense in sweeping, for the bottom is too catchy and you'd just lose your sweep.

Four lobsters out of the seven traps isn't too tough but you've had enough of losing traps and ruining rope in shoal water so you decide to deepen what's left. The end warps were only 25 fathoms with one floater so you and 25 fathoms more and two more bottles, stack the traps so that you can take on another string, then haul the companion string managing to get them after working out several catch-downs. The end warps on the second string have to be lengthened and bottles added. After you have run for 20 minutes to the southwest, you set the strings, pushing most of the traps overboard. You can't run these out by themselves because they have been stacked one on top of another.

There are no other lobster boats in sight now, you discover as you glance around while munching on a sandwich which you heated by letting it lay on the manifold for a half hour. A tanker did come by when you first got down here and came so close that the pilot came out and waved but now all that can be seen of it is a bit of smoke on the horizon. You are alone—you'e a tiny, insig-

nificant bit of humanity in a little peanut shell of a 30-foot boat alone many miles from shore on the Atlantic Ocean.

You haul a few more strings, get skunked out of some but get as high as seven lobsters out of one string. You start hauling another end warp wondering what the wife is doing on that faraway dot of land you call home. It seems to you that she said she was going to Brunswick to do some shopping. All at once there is a crash and you instinctively turn your head to avoid the flying glass as a bottle smashes to pieces against the snatchblock. "Guess I'd better start payin' attention to what I'm doin'," you think as your thoughts return to your work and you free a riding-turn from the winchhead.

The cold wind aired up an hour ago and the sea is choppy. Your face is stiff from the cold, your oil clothes are stiff and covered with a skim coat of ice, and ice is making everywhere on the boat. While swinging a trap to the after end of the rack, your foot slips on the ice-covered platform and slides up under the stern deck. You find yourself sitting on the platform with a corner of the 60-pound trap jabbing into your chest. After pushing the trap up off you and onto the stern deck, you get your feet back under you and place the trap on the rack.

I guess it's time I put the water to the platforms, you think as you rub the knee you just banged. Now you have it all over the fellows whose engines have freshwater cooling. They may get going quicker in the winter and freshwater may be better for an engine but you derive comfort and safety from saltwater cooling. You drop the outlet hose, allowing the water, which has been warmed by going through the engine, to run along the deck and melt the ice before running out through the scuppers, in the stern. The steam rising from the cockpit now resembles the troublesome vapor of the morning.

COLD, COLD HANDS

The backs of your gloves are frozen and pounding your fingers no longer warms your hands. Even the warmth derived from patting the exhaust pipe is not enough. You hate to start warming your hands with the water from the engine because once you start in, you are uncomfortable unless you keep warming them, but your hands are so numb that they are slowing you down. Gratefully you feel the warmth of the water dissipate the chill which was working from your hands up into your arms.

You thought it was choppy before, but within the past half hour it has become "choppy enough to smash your brains out." The sun is low and it is getting hard to see your marks. You run for the Round Shoals and finally make out Halfway Rock ranging against the southwest end of Haskell's Island and the East Cod Ledge Buoy against Cape Elizabeth. You hunt around and luckily find your traps. Just time to haul two more strings and it will be dark.

TURN TOWARD HOME

With the last two strings out of the way, you turn your boat toward home. You can see the beacon in the top of the lighthouse at Halfway Rock beckoning you toward home and after the beating your body has taken this choppy day, you willingly steer toward it. You're 9 miles out and you know that the folks are wondering where you are; you hope that they won't risk possible disaster by going out in their boats to look for you, but you know how they feel; you have worried and fretted about other fellows when they were still out after dark.

You haven't much to fear until after you pass Halfway Rock for the water is bold from the Round Shoals to the Rock. After you pass there, you will have to steer clear of Drunken Ledge, the Eastern Tail, and Mark Island Breaker. Your engine sounds good and you hope it will continue that way, for it is only 12 above, your tank of bottled gas is nearly empty and you'd hate to take the chance of freezing to death overnight. You light a match and check your oil pressure and ammeter. They're OK. You look in through the companionway and can see the manifold, flange, and exhaust pipe glowing cherry-red. The spray is flying from the bow as you run in, and some of it is landing on the windows, freezing as it hits. Now you are forced to peer out around the house to see ahead, ducking back by spells to warm your face.

WORSE THAN FOG

"It's devlish comin' in after dark," you think, "but it's better than runnin' in a snowstorm like the other day. Of all times for my compass to go haywire. When I finally made land, it looked so different covered with snow plus lookin' through the fallin' snow that I didn't know where I was for a few minutes. A snowstorm's worse than a fog mull."

After musing awhile, you stick your head out around the house again and there are the lights of home showing in the distance. The time drags on until you eventually head up the cove to the lobster car. After you bring your boat alongside the car, you throw your catch in a basket, then hold a flashlight for the buyer while he weighs the lobsters and figures your money. Fifty-five pounds at 80 cents makes $44, less $7 for bait leaves $37. Set aside $6 to pay for gasoline and you are left with $31 for bills and grub. You chat with the buyer a minute then leave the car and hunt for your mooring in the darkness.

WITH DRAGGING FEET

After you pump out the boat, you stop the engine and drain part of the water from the engine and hoses. You check to see that the heat from the elbow of the exhaust pipe hasn't set the wood near it on fire, crawl into your punt and row to the raft. The climb to the truck seems long, your boots seem to weigh a ton and your feet drag. You're cold, hungry and weary.

Once home, you open the door and, 9 chances out of 10, as you ease your old, tired body through the doorway, you are greeted by your wife with information such as, "I just found out we're having company tonight, dear," or "We got a bill from the gas company today." No, like you say, there's nothing like the life of a fisherman.

Resolution Supporting Department of Urban Affairs and Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the RECORD the resolution unanimously adopted by the Common Council of the City of Detroit, on February 13, 1962, endorsing the establishment of a Federal Department of Urban Affairs and Housing:

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND HOUSING

Whereas in the past few decades our Nation has moved from a country of rural dwellers to urban dwellers with fully two-thirds of the people now living in urban communities; and

Whereas this trend not only will continue but will accelerate in the years ahead, requiring intensified and expanded efforts, both public and private, to insure the sound growth and development of our communities; and

Whereas the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing as proposed would provide leadership, coordination, and maximum effectiveness in the execution of greatly needed programs in the area of housing, construction of public facilities, problems of urban mass transportation, comprehensive planning and slum clearance, conservation and rehabilitation, and other matters vital to the future development and progress of the city of Detroit: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Common Council of the City of Detroit strongly supports and endorses the establishment of a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs and Housing in the Federal Government as being in the best interests of our city, our metropolitan area, the State of Michigan, and the United States of America, and that this action be communicated to the President of the United States and to the several Members of the U.S. Congress from the State of Michigan.

Capitol Pages Elect Myrtle Beach Boy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an item from the Charleston News and Courier dated February 13, 1962, regarding the recent election of Roy Davis Howser III, a page from Myrtle Beach, S.C., which is located in my district, as president of the senior class of the Capitol Page School. Mr. Howser has made top grades during the past 3 years that he has been attending the Page School.

Young Howser's father was lost in battle during World War II. We are proud of the wonderful record Howser has made as a page, having been selected by the late Speaker Rayburn as his personal page during 1960 and 1961 and he has been selected by Speaker McCORMACK as his personal page this year.

I know all young Howser's friends in South Carolina will be happy to learn of his success as a page and the honors which have been bestowed upon him since he has been serving as a page here in the Congress of the United States. Young Howser has a wonderful future ahead of him.

The article follows:

CAPITOL PAGES ELECT MYRTLE BEACH BOY

(By Roulhac Hamilton)

WASHINGTON.—For the 4th consecutive year, Capitol Page School classmates of 17-year-old David Howser of Myrtle Beach honored him yesterday by electing him as one of their top leaders.

Howser, who also is holding for the second year the highest honor available to a House of Representatives page, Monday was elected by a 17-to-2 vote as president of the senior class in page school.

Only a few days ago, House Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, designated Howser as the Speaker's page, the top assignment available to a House page. It was old stuff to the Myrtle Beach youngster, however. He served last year as the Speaker's page, by appointment of the late Sam Rayburn, Democrat, of Texas.

Howser, who is in his 4th year as a congressional page, is a son of Mrs. Doreen West Johnson and the late Roy D. Howser of Charlotte, and a grandson of T. V. West. Mr. West, now president of the South Carolina Automobile Dealers Association and a past president of the State chamber of commerce, formerly operated automobile agencies at Georgetown, Myrtle Beach, and Chester.

Howser originally was named to the congressional page corps by Representative JOHN L. MCMILLAN, of Florence. The Myrtle Beach youngster who formerly lived in Georgetown, was secretary-treasurer of his freshman class, president of the sophomore class and student council representative of the junior class before his newest election.

Howser also is editor of the Congressional, the yearbook of the page school, which has a student body limited to pages of the House, Senate, and Supreme Court. He is a member of the National Honor Society and last year won the Harvard Book Award as the outstanding student in the junior class. He expects to attend Duke University after graduation this year, and later study law.

Strength of U.S. Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Stronger Muscles Than Ever," written by Wayne A. Johnston, president of the Illinois Central system, and published in the January–February 1962, issue of Railway Materials and Equipment.

It is both interesting and inspirational to read Mr. Johnston's ringing declaration of faith in the strength of his own rail system, and of the railroad industry, in particular, at a time when, it seems, many persons persist in accenting the negative. As he points out, it is necessary for someone to accentuate the positive strides that are being made by alert rail managements, so that the public will know that, although the railroad industry has many problems, it nevertheless is making vast strides in preparing itself for a growing economy. The future beckons to all of us; and it seems that the railroad industry is preparing for a bright future, in spite of annoying problems today.

I wish to commend Phil Murphy, of Chicago, the editor and publisher of Railway Materials and Equipment, for featuring this important article. He reveals a keen insight into the rail picture in the choice of the material he carries in his publication, which goes to railway executives throughout the Nation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRONGER MUSCLES THAN EVER

(By Wayne A. Johnston)

Everybody knows about the problems of the railroads. At least it would seem everybody should know, because never has so much been said and so much been written about the subject. By and large, this situation is all to the good, because certainly the American public must know the facts about the unfair odds against which railroads contend before the public is moved to do something about the situation. As a result of all this publicity, the railroads have good reason to hope that the Federal Government will take the steps necessary to bring about equal regulation of all forms of transportation.

On the other hand, there has been an unfortunate aspect to all the publicity given the plight of the railroads, necessary as the telling of that story has been. The impression has been left that the railroads have not been trying to help themselves. Indeed, a recent survey reveals that only about one-third of the newspapers that have written on the subject believe the railroads are doing all they should to help themselves. This is a most unfortunate attitude, one that is alarming for the railroads and their friends.

RAILROADS PROGRESSING IN NUMEROUS WAYS

The simple truth is that railroads are pressing forward on a hundred different fronts, modernizing and progressing in numerous ways. In fact, the railroads would have failed by now if they had not been moving so steadily toward higher ground. Strange as it may seem, railroads actually are one of the most progressive industries in the whole economy. This fact is not clearly evident to everyone, because railroads earn a limited amount of income, a condition which limits their ability to invest in improvements. In short, the problems of the railroads fundamentally have not been created by lack of progress on their part. Rather these problems have been created by the inability of railroads to earn a fair return on investment, largely as a result of discriminatory governmental policies.

I hardly know where to start, so numerous are the examples of progress. Critics of the railroads draw a picture of a creaky iron horse, ready to collapse in a pile of rusty metal. Instead, the iron horse is "raring to go," eager to prove that railroading is just as essential to the economic future of this country as it was to its development in the 19th century.

Take an example from my own railroad, the Illinois Central. Last year we took a big step in signaling. For the first time we put an entire operating district under CTC. The location was our main freight line through southern Illinois over what we call our Edgewood Cutoff, 126 miles between the freight yards at Bluford, Ill., across the Ohio River to Fulton, Ky. Here the installation of CTC plus the lengthening of some sidings and an overall project of nearly a million dollars is enabling the Illinois Central efficiently to handle the longer and swifter trains of the diesel era.

The Illinois Central did not stand around waiting for Uncle Sam to make this improvement with tax money. We used the savings of private citizens to make this improvement. And we are not stopping here. Immediately upon completion of the Edgewood Cutoff we moved on to other CTC projects. Currently our signal crews are aiming at an April 1 completion of 35 miles of CTC between Fulton and the Ohio River at Ballard, Ky. A few months ago we started an even larger project to improve the handling of St. Louis traffic between East St. Louis and Du Quoin, Ill., some 66 miles of new signaling. These two projects will represent improvements in signaling alone of about three-quarters of a million dollars, not to mention the improvements in trackwork. We also have studies underway to uncover still additional situations on the Illinois Central where this expensive but highly useful tool can be used to the advantage of the railroad and the shipping public.

Take another Chicago railroad, the North Western. Here is a railroad that has had its financial problems, yet its management had the courage to go ahead with a major improvement to its commuter service. Certainly no American railroad in the commuter business has been given much encouragement to spend hard-earned money on improvements, because almost without exception commuter railroads lose money for their owners. Yet the North Western within the last few years has raised $40 million to buy 200 new doubledeck coaches for its commuter trains, and now more than 75,000 daily pasesngers on the North eWstern enjoy swift, safe service in bright, air-conditioned trains.

Take still another Chicago road, the Milwaukee, which even more recently has invested in stainless steel, bilevel coaches to give its commuters fast service into downtown Chicago and home again. Again the management did not stand around waiting for the Government to hand out tax money for an improvement. Instead the Milwaukee went ahead with an improvement that will help support the tax structure of the community.

Across the land are more than a hundred class I railroads and many more smaller lines, all striving to the best of their ability to use the findings of technical research to improve the quality of American railroading. The account of all the things these railroads are doing could fill the entire issue of this magazine.

Recently S. L. Jewell, vice president of the Peabody Coal Co., was speaking before the Southern Research Institute on the subject of "Coal's New Horizon." Here is another industry that has had its struggles, but one which constantly is seeking to improve its position through the application of science and research. Mr. Jewell in his remarks paid tribute to the railroads of this country for their contribution to the improved transportation of coal. He described how the pattern of coal traffic has been changed by the willingness of railroads to experiment with lower rates on volume movements of coal. As a result of two types of quantity rates—one based on annual volume and the other on volume per train—a large percentage of all coal is moved on such rates. The result has been to hold a great volume of coal to the rails that otherwise might now be carried by other means of transportation.

These new concepts of ratemaking with their emphasis on heavier tonnages per train have encouraged the use of larger coal cars. Railroads, within the limits of their ability to invest in new equipment, steadily have been increasing the size of coal cars. At present, the average coal car has a 57-ton capacity, even though the 50-ton car has been the standard of recent years. The larger average is accounted for by such programs as those of the Illinois Central and the Louisville & Nashville last year, when each built approximately 1,500 cars of 70-ton capacity. The Norfolk & Western, one of the Nation's leading coal car carriers, built more than a thousand 85-ton cars, and the Southern Railway now has some 100-ton cars in use.

A matter closely related to larger cars is the improved lubrication of cars. Railroads in recent years have had a good deal of trouble with hotboxes that have caused delays and wrecks. Through research sponsored by the Association of American Railroads through the Armour Foundation in Chicago and through research in the private laboratories of railway supply companies, a number of lubricating pads have been developed to take the place of the old cotton waste and oil method.

Individual railroads themselves have helped in this research. On the Illinois Central, for example, back in 1955 we started to test these pads on log and pulpwood cars used in the South. These cars often stand in the woods while being loaded, subjected to rain and rust. They come off branch lines and are put into fast freights. At that time the result was a high percentage of hot boxes. Our experimentation with journal lubricating pads brought about a sharp improvement and led directly to our system-wide program. Today practically every car on the Illinois Central has been equipped with pads, well in advance of the final date allowed by the AAR for all interchange cars to be so equipped.

ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT SPEEDS WAYBILL HANDLING

Speaking of the movement of coal, we have a new process on the Illinois Central for streamlining the billing of coal cars. We serve two mains coalfields—west Kentucky and southern Illinois. Our station at Madisonville in the Kentucky fields presently is handling waybills for 19 shippers in the surrounding territory, while our Carbondale station is doing a similar task for 15 coal mines in that area. They are handling the billing more efficiently by the use of custom-designed electronic equipment. Now waybills are coming out at the rate of more than 200 an hour.

As I mentioned above, a major part of all coal moves on volume rates. At Madisonville we handle an average of 500 to 700 waybills a day and at Carbondale only slightly less. Formerly each waybill had to be processed individually at the various stations in the coalfields. Now the information is telephoned from the mine to our billing clerk. Through the use of a synchrotape typewriter and an electronic console, all the constant information that is needed (such as date, shipper, receiver, origin, route, rate, etc.) automatically is reproduced on the required number of waybills. The tape cut by that typewriter is used to send the waybill information via teletype to the distant points where waybills are picked up by the train crews.

The explanation of the method we are using may sound complicated, but the actual operation of that method is simple. As part of our improved process of billing, our operating and traffic men devised a rate and route index system in which more than a third of a million computations were made by our electronic computers. This index system has eliminated the old task of the rate clerk of multiplying the rate times the weight to get the correct freight charges.

RAILROADS HAVE IMAGINATION AND ENTHUSIASM

The things I have been describing may not seem like big changes in railroading, but as the old Chinese proverb puts it: "A journey of a thousand miles begins with but a single step." In the aggregate, the changes we are making on the Illinois Central and that are being made on railroads both large and small all over the United States, add up to an enormous difference. It has been said that any company that hopes to stay in business must do more than invest money; it must also invest imagination and enthusiasm. The railroads are investing imagination and enthusiasm, even though they sometimes find it difficult to invest all the money they would like to invest.

I mentioned the electronic computers. I think it is worthy of mention to briefly describe the unique method of settling interline accounts worked out a few years ago by the Illinois Central and the Southern and the Union Pacific. Because of the great flexibility in routing offered the shipping and traveling public by the American railroads, there is a large amount of paperwork in railroading. Each of the three railroads mentioned has compatible large-scale data-processing machines, which made it possible for us to work out an important shortcut in paperwork. For more than 2 years now we have been settling our interline freight accounts by a simple exchange of magnetic tapes. The improved system has eliminated the large stacks of interline settlement sheets (called abstracts) that formerly were exchanged between our three railroads. I look for this system to grow as the use of electric computers increases on our railroads.

Members of the general public, and indeed many who may be considered thought leaders, simply do not have any idea of how far and how much railroads have improved in recent years. Take the diesel revolution. Virtually without a ripple in the public mind, a tremendous change in power took place in this country. In 1940 American railroads operated some 42,000 steam locomotives, and there were only a few diesel electric engines in use. By 1960, only 200 of the old steam locomotives were left—some for sentimental reasons and some for infrequent use during peak seasonal business. And now, in the place of those 42,000 steam engines, there are 12,500 diesel-electric locomotives, pulling trains with great efficiency. Gone is the soot and smoke that disturbed so many communities. The old iron horse was a glamorous steed, but the new diesel is a far more efficient workhorse. Not only does the diesel permit real economies in fuel consumption, it has the further advantage of being available for service round-the-clock, whereas the steam engine frequently was in the roundhouse for repair.

The American railroads made possible this revolution in power. They did not clamor for the Government to rush to their aid because diesels were better than steam engines. They went ahead and found the means to buy those diesels. They purchased switches and road haul freight locomotives and passenger locomotives. The prices range from about $125,000 up to $250,000, and a little quick arithmetic tells me the American railroads must have spent well over $2 billion in dieselizing their motive power.

This change has taken place from the engine all the way back to the caboose. To the passerby, the freight train may not look too unlike the train of a generation ago, except for the gayer colors of some of the cars; but the exterior similarity is deceptive. Actually, the freight car has undergone a transformation almost as great as that of the locomotive. Here, in particular, the inventive skill and the research findings of the rail supply industry have been combined in rare fashion. It would take a long article to describe the new freight cars—the originality of their design, the greater carrying capacity, the new materials used in their construction, their greater protection against damage, the many special devices in them to save loading and unloading costs, and numerous other improvements.

TODAY'S FREIGHT CARS ARE SPECIALISTS

Today's freight train no longer is merely a string of boxcars, coal cars, tank cars, and flat cars. Instead the train is made up of many kinds of specialized cars, each designed to do one task better than it has ever been done before. Some of the flexibility of the old boxcar, it is true, has been lost in this change, but the new cars are the answer to the new demands in transportation.

We all have seen the development of cars with wide doors to permit shippers to make easy use of lift trucks for loading and unloading materials. We have a wide variety of air slide cars for shipping sugar, flour, and other food products, thereby saving shippers the former great cost of packaging those foods. We have the hard-working covered hopper that has brought important changes in the construction techniques. There are flat cars that permit easy loading of great sheets of plaster board, that excellent, inexpensive item so dear to the heart of the do-it-yourself homeowner. There are cars with mechanical refrigerators that make possible the nationwide movement of frozen foods. There are powerful flat cars with depressed centers to carry giant loads, and there are cars that open on the end instead of the side to accommodate long-length products. And, the old boxcar itself hardly looks like a relative to the new boxcar with its numerous interior fittings for holding ladings snug and safe.

The specialty equipment that has caught the imagination of a nation is the piggyback car and trailer and all the ramifications of that technique that has had a mushroom growth in the last 5 years. Just how much America has taken the piggyback shipping method to its heart was seen last year when Jimmy Hoffa and the trucking industry tried to get laws passed against piggyback. Practically without exception, the press of the Nation rose in editorial protest. Shippers across the land expressed their concern and their opposition to any legislation that would prevent the orderly growth of piggyback.

Readers of this magazine are well acquainted with all the improvements in rail transportation I have been discussing, but it is surprising how large a part of the American public does not realize the progress that railroads have made in new techniques, new machines, transportation concepts. The freight yards, the right-of-way, the communications network—all have been modernized, and still more improvements are coming every day. The rail is heavier, the ballast is deeper, the curves are less sharp, the grades reduced. Any oldtime operating man who has occasion to speak at a retirement dinner is apt to tell with wonder how much the railroad has changed during his working life, and how accelerated that change has been during the last few years.

Now the cynic is apt to ask: "Where has all your progress in equipment and communications and right-of-way brought you?" It is a good question, because it is obvious our earnings have dropped to a dangerous level and our ability to invest in improved technology has been sadly cut. Yet I am an optimist about railroading. I do not close my eyes to the smaller proportion of the transportation market the railroads now serve. I am well acquainted with the glaring discrimination in governmental regulatory policies. I recognize there may be certain forces in governmental circles that want to see the railroads fail, because this would force them into Government control. But none of these facts keep me from holding to the belief that the fortunes of the railroads are going to turn up, not down. Here is what I believe:

First of all, the public through wonderful news coverage by the newspapers and magazines and radio and television, has been made aware of the unfair situation faced by the railroads. In a democracy, public opinion is necessary before there is public action, and the railroads are winning public opinion.

Second, taxing bodies all over the land are beginning to awaken to the fact that railroads are big payers of taxes, whereas Government-owned agencies pay no taxes. We need to keep the railroads alive as tax sources, they are saying.

Third, thought leaders are coming to appreciate that in the current world situation a strong railroad system under private operation is essential, and leaders of the administration are being told this fact.

Fourth, our employees by and large stand firmly behind the managements of our railroads in their fight. For example, more than 1½ million letters poured in to Members of Congress in support of the railroads last summer, most of them written by employees and their families.

Fifth, I am looking to a successful conclusion of the marathon hearings of the Presidential commission on work rules. I am confident the recommendations of the Commission will lead to long-needed changes in our contracts with our unions. These changes will permit the railroads to compete more effectively for new business by reducing costs, and in the long run will make the jobs of our employees more secure.

Sixth, I think Congress will pass laws giving railroad managements more of the freedoms enjoyed by the rest of American business. In other words, the opportunity to diversify into other forms of transportation, to raise and lower rates and fares to compete more directly with other forms of transportation, to change schedules as needed, and so forth.

These beliefs of mine may strike the reader as wishful thinking on my part. It just happens I am an optimist—I have always been an optimist about railroading.

U.S. International Cultural Exchange—Impresario Extraordinary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, some of the greatest long-range benefits to U.S. prestige abroad come from our cultural exchange agreements which have made possible the tours of world-famed American performing artists abroad. American artists have rendered magnificent service in bringing to others the spirit of culture and entertainment representative of our country.

Our effort in this field is relatively very small. We need to have many more of our personalities in the theater, music, and the arts participating in our cultural exchange program so that our country can be adequately represented in all the aspects of our culture and art. I have sponsored legislation for the development of the arts (the U.S. Arts Foundation Act) and have urged that hearings be held by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare at the earliest possible moment so that we can get on with this program.

In this respect the efforts of a great American impresario Sol Hurok would be noted as of general significance to our whole effort in the world. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the article on Sol Hurok, entitled "Impresario Extraordinary," which appeared in Cue magazine, January 20:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPRESARIO EXTRAORDINARY: S. HUROK IS IN THE VANGUARD OF OUR CULTURAL REVOLUTION, IMPORTING TO OUR TOWN TOP ARTISTS FROM MANILA TO MINSK

(By Emory Lewis)

There are more than 1,000 symphony orchestras in the United States, more than 100,000 piano teachers, more than 7,000 classical ballet schools. The box office total for classical music concerts last year was $55 million, $6 million more than Americans paid to watch baseball. All of these statistics are indexes of the amazing change in the Nation's cultural habits. America, it seems, has gone longhair.

One man has done much to bring about this startling revolution in taste. He graces our cover this week, and he is owl-faced septuagenarian Solomon Hurok.

America's No. 1 impresario, this short, gracious, bald man with black, horn-rimmed glasses is also a one-man United Nations. (His own heavily accented, imaginative speech is a kind of U.N. language all its own.) During the year, he has imported hundreds of artists from Europe and Asia, sent many Americans abroad on concert tours. The familiar "S. Hurok Presents" on any program is a hallmark of quality. Hurok has toured the Nation with such diverse attractions as the Kabuki Dancers from Japan, the Vienna Choir Boys, the Roberto Iglesias Spanish Ballet, Uday Shankar from India, the Comedie Francaise, Her Majesty's Scots Guards from Edinburgh, the Moiseyev Dancers, London's Royal Ballet, Moscow's and Leningrad's ballet companies, the Mazowsze folk dancers from Poland. A roster of his concert artists reads like a Who's Who in music: Marian Anderson, Sviatoslav Richter, Artur Rubinstein, Jan Peerce, Igor Oistrakh, Van Cliburn, Gregor Piatigorsky, Nathan Milstein, and so on.

At Carnegie Hall, for example, in the next few weeks, these Hurok artists will appear—guitarist Andres Segovia on January 21 and February 3, violinist Isaac Stern January 22, Soviet mezzo soprano Zora Doloukhanova January 26, pianist Emil Gilels January 31 and February 11. On February 6, Mr. Hurok will launch a 6-week season at City Center of England's celebrated Old Vic Company, with a repertory of Shakespeare's "Macbeth" and "Romeo and Juliet" and Shaw's "Saint Joan."

Who is this cultural czar? Interviewed at his comfortable, spacious Fifth Avenue aerie where every inch of wall space is filled with signed photographs of the great men of art in this century, Mr. Hurok proved a passionate partisan of the arts. Mr. Hurok detractors like to ascribe his success to his shrewd, tough business sense. Of course, he is a good businessman. But his detractors miss an important point. Mr. Hurok has a secret weapon—his pervasive, overwhelming love of music and the other creative arts. It is this as well as his celebrated business sense which has made him the top starmaker in the cultural field for more than half a century. He is a man completely in love with his work.

At the moment, Mr. Hurok's chief concern is subsidy. "It must come," he said heatedly. "It must be on all levels, Federal, State, municipal. Of course, there are those who call it socialism and all that. They said the same thing about social security, minimum wages, unemployment compensation. It will come. It is the duty of our country.

"Subsidy must aid opera, for we desperately need more opera companies with greater outlets for all our singing talents," Mr. Hurok continued. He pointed out that there are some 400 American opera singers in Germany, some 150 in Italy, solely because there are not enough jobs in the United States.

Mr. Hurok is critical of TV, stating that there must be more and more programs of classical music and the other arts. The second-rate agencies, he explained, are pushing the cheaper things onto the sponsors, not understanding the tremendous value and salability of the classics. However, some networks, the impresario conceded, have done magnificent salutes to classical music and dance.

Has any one factor played the key role in the music renaissance? Mr. Hurok answered without hesitation: "The development of the long-playing record."

By this time, the facts of the starmaker's life are fairly well known. He has been the subject of a Hollywood film ("Tonight We Sing," with David Wayne as Hurok). He has written two autobiographical studies (Random House and Hermitage House), which detail his long love affair with Art, from Pavlova to Ulanova. Here are the essentials. Born in a small town in Russia's Ukraine, he came to America in 1905, an awkward, ill-dressed teenager fleeing czarist oppression. He arrived in New York with two battered hampers of clothing, a treasured goosefeather pillow, and 3 rubles ($1.50). He candidly recalled that he slept on the floor of a roominghouse for $4 a month. (Years later, he was to show startled Dame Margot Fonteyn of the Royal Ballet, a cheap slum roominghouse where he once lived.)

First he peddled notions on the streets. Then he landed a steady job in a hardware store at $7 a week. With a burning love of music and an uncanny ability to persuade great names to perform at penny-ante rates, the brash young man decided to present Sunday music concerts at New York's fabled 5,000-seat valudeville house, the Hippodrome (now a garage at 6th Avenue and 43d Street). He managed this feat while maintaining his position at the hardware store. He sold tickets in neighborhood drugstores all over the city. He labeled his popular-priced Sunday concerts "music for the masses." The impresario was on his way.

Within 6 years, he had a stable of stars. He introduced Russian basso Feodor Chaliapin to audiences all over America. He fretted over ballerina Anna Pavlova, when, in Jackson, Miss., she danced in a garage with a leaky roof. The star did not mind; she was, she loftily explained, "bringing culture to the American peasants." He soothed proper Bostonians when Isadora Duncan bared her bosom onstage to "show the Puritans what beauty really was."

In 1962, he is still starstruck. But he also possessed an annual income in six figures and a string of offices all over the world. And he welcomed the hectic day of an impresario: "My day is incomplete without at least one of these—a wire from a violinist in Florida who won't fill a sold-out concert date in Canada because it's snowing there; a call from Omaha that two leading dancers have run away to be married; a scandal in Minneapolis; an attack of nerves in Houston; a train missed in St. Louis because a godlike Far Eastern dancer won't leave without his precious stack of movie fan magazines."

Is the maestro running out of talent? Absolutely not. He is filled with future plans. April 26 at the Metropolitan Opera House, he will introduce to New Yorkers the Ukrainian Dance Company. Also on the Hurok agenda are: the Ballet Folklorico from Mexico City; the Actor's Workshop of San Francisco, a celebrated drama company which specializes in the experimental; the Poznan Singers from Poland; the Foo Hsing Theater of China (from Formosa); Agustin Anievas, the pianist who recently won the Mitropoulos International Competition. Mr. Hurok also plans "A Leonard Bernstein Gala," which will include "Trouble in Tahiti," a wonderfully satiric operetta on love and marriage in the suburbs, the ballet "Fancy Free," and hit tunes from "West Side Story," "On the Town," "Candide," "Wonderful Town," and "Peter Pan." A brandnew chamber music ensemble, the American String Quartet, will be presented by Mr. Hurok. It is the first string quartet that he has undertaken to manage since the Kolisch Quartet more than 20 years ago. Composed of Maurice Wilk and LaMar Alsop, violins; David Schwartz, viola; and David Soyer, cello, the American String Quartet has been in rehearsal for 2 years. And Hurok dreams of importing Russia's celebrated Obraztsov Puppets. Plus, of course, a return visit of the Bolshoi.

Like one of his stars, Artur Rubinstein (also a septuagenarian), Mr. Hurok seems ageless. When he shows you the photographs on his walls, his eyes twinkle, his speech quickens, and he resembles nothing more than a youngster in the middle of his first love affair.

Centralization of Authority: Who's Responsible?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, as we look back upon the first year in office of our present administration and as we anticipate the proposals upon which the House will be asked to pass in the coming weeks, there is no single trend so clearly discernable as the thrust toward centralization of governmental authority in Washington.

The impact of this thrust has not been lost on our people. Concern about this trend forms the underlying theme of nearly all the constituent mail which comes into my office.

Nearly every proposal which has come up from the White House has been designed either to undermine and supplant local and State responsibility or to gather into the executive fold constitutional responsibilities of the Congress.

Although the quest for centralized authority might be the most expedient and rewarding path for the political leader whose primary goal is personal power and tenure in office, it is certainly the most dangerous path for a nation to follow.

Following is an excellent editorial, entitled "Who's Responsible?" which appeared in the February 12 issue of the Wall Street Journal:

WHO'S RESPONSIBLE?

This is the season of Presidential messages, and for a month now they have been coming thick and fast—so much so that it is not always easy to see what the pieces are adding up to. And even the separate pieces, of course, mean different things to different people.

Yet there is one conclusion, it seems to us, that would have to be reached by anyone who has studied the many thousands of words sent to Congress, from the state of the Union and budget messages on down. What emerges is a powerful new thrust toward the centralization of Government in Washington.

The thrust can be seen in terms of money, for one thing. Not merely the broad upward sweep of Federal spending in general, but more specifically in relation to lower levels of Government. Consider this revealing statement in one of the budget's special analyses: "In 10 years, total Federal aid to State and local governments will have more than tripled, rising from $2.9 billion in 1953 to an estimated $9.9 billion in 1963."

The thrust can be seen in the new farm program, which proposes a much tighter regimentation of agricultural life than anything known before. It can be seen in the welfare recommendations which, whatever the merits of some of them, foresee a new expansion of Federal authority. It can be seen in the effort toward central management of cities. It can be seen in the education proposals which, despite official denials, plainly etch the outline of Federal control.

There can be no question at all, then, about the direction. We are perfectly aware that many Americans either welcome or are apathetic about the trend. But many others, conceivably even a majority, are worried about a centralization of power so plainly at variance with constitutional principles and hence so full of foreboding for the future of free institutions.

To such people the trend may seem hopeless to halt, and perhaps it is. But it might at least help clarify matters to ask who is responsible for it.

Certainly the Federal Government is not solely responsible. As President Kennedy somewhat plaintively but truly said the other day, he hears all this talk about big Government, but the minute he suggests that States or localities deal with some problem they come running back to him with it. Therein lies much of the trouble.

Too many pressure groups have found what they think is a good thing in Federal handouts and intervention and control. Too many big-city politicians have found a Federal trough to feed their corruption. Too many businessmen seek Federal favors while extrolling free enterprise.

Too many individuals of all kinds, whether healthy veterans or prosperous farmers or whatever, are content with the subsidy state or vigorously greedy about increasing their "share." Our political system is not as corrupt as most in the world, but it is shot through with this smart-alecky thinking and acting.

Well, it's no use deploring the failings of human nature. If people are going to abandon individual responsibility, they will presumably get the kind of Government they deserve, and they should not be surprised at any disintegration of its constitutional framework.

Yet there remains such a thing as example, or standards set in Washington. And what has the Federal Government been doing in that regard for the better part of 30 years? No single individual or group or segment of society has done more than the Government itself to foster, in word and deed, the delusion that we can and should turn the United States of America into some kind of centrally run handout heaven; such continues to be the unworthy theme of much that lies before Congress now.

That does not absolve any of us from responsibility. But it suggests that the Federal Government, growing steadily more powerful, is falling steadily behind in the exercise of responsible power in a free society.

Congressman Barratt O'Hara, of Illinois, Launched Global Program for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's Chicago's Sunday American editorial by Irving Dilliard set out facts concerning an educational project on democracy that during the last 6 years has resulted in the selling of over a million books on democratic government throughout the world.

This successful program of distributing thousands of inexpensive paperback books exposing Stalin, Lenin, Marx, Mao, and Khrushchev has had international benefits in overcoming Soviet anti-American propaganda. The following editorial by Mr. Dilliard sets out in detail the results of Congressman O'HARA's great educational program:

CARRYING THE WORD TO WORLD

(By Irving Dilliard)

Let something go wrong with our aid program in other nations, and it hits the headlines. That is as it should be, for generally speaking the things that are out of joint fortunately are still rare enough to be news.

But we need to know, too, about the good points in our oversea program. For if the successes are not brought to the front now and then, it will seem that only the Communists are effective in presenting a way of life to the neutral peoples who are yet to be won in the cold war.

One such achievement, far too little known, is the "Classics of Democracy" publishing project of the U.S. Information Agency, which owes its start in large measure to a Chicago constituent of Representative BARRATT O'HARA.

REDS HAD CLEAR FIELD

Nearly 10 years ago, this Chicagoan called O'HARA's attention to an alarming fact. That is, it was alarming once somebody had the perception to point it out. The alarming fact was this: The Communists were sending thousands upon thousands of inexpensive Marx, Lenin, Stalin, and Mao paperbacked books over the world, but there was no counterpart book program whatever on behalf of democracy.

O'HARA promptly looked into the situation. He found that the classic works of the Western World's free democracy were not available in low-cost editions for widespread reading at the grassroots level in other countries. He found, indeed, that many of them, although they had much to do with giving us our system of government, had never been translated from the English language.

CONGRESS STARTS PROJECT

So, in 1954, O'HARA presented these facts to Congress. He asked in effect how we could hope to win the world to democracy when we had not even troubled to make the message, purpose, and form of democracy available to other peoples through cheap books that could be widely disseminated overseas.

Out of O'Hara's interest came a directive to the USIA to assemble, print, and distribute at modest prices in the world's major languages a selection of the basic books which explain the nature, origin, and operation of democracy.

One of the first of these classic works of democracy to be published in other languages was the historic "Federalist Papers," through which James Madison, John Jay, and Alexander Hamilton described the plan and purpose of the new U.S. Government in a series of newspaper essays, 1787–88. Inquiry showed that this bible of our Federal form of government had never been printed in any language on the entire continent of Asia.

MILLION BOOKS SOLD

Since the project began, more than a million copies of approximately 35 books have been issued and sold overseas. One of the most popular of all, "The Autobiography of Benjamin Franklin," has been translated into 20 languages. Thoreau's "Walden" is in 11 languages and "Selected Writings of Thomas Paine" is in 8.

A relatively new book, the collected addresses and papers of the late Judge Learned Hand, published just 10 years ago with the title, "The Spirit of Liberty," has been translated into seven languages, including French, German, Turkish, Greek, Burmese, and Telugu, one of the tongues of India. In this book, readers overseas can get for the first time Judge Hand's classic statement of democracy delivered at the height of World War II, May 21, 1944, to a host of new citizens in Central Park, New York.

The purpose of all these books is to cause liberty to live "in the hearts of men and women," as Judge Hand told his "I am an American day" audience. That the project is accomplishing quiet but solid good for the free way of life is not to be doubted.

Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, today free people throughout the non-Communist world take a few moments from their daily activities to pay tribute to the Lithuanian people. Forty-four years ago today, the freedom-loving Lithuanians reestablished their independence and proclaimed the formation of a Lithuanian Republic founded on the principles of liberty and freedom.

Lithuania was united in 1253 when the many principalities of Lithuania were formed into a single state. Mindaugas, who had been baptized 2 years earlier, was crowned as king by a personal delegate of Pope Innocent IV. This was one of the first expressions of the Christian faith of the Lithuanian people, and Lithuania was officially proclaimed a Christian state in 1387.

It was this same Christian faith that contributed strongly to saving Europe from barbarism in the late 14th century, when the Lithuanians successfully repulsed the Tartar hordes seeking to sweep in upon Europe. During the Middle Ages they also defended their independence against the Germans and the Russians. At that time they were one of the great states of eastern Europe, as Lithuania's boundaries in the 14th century reached into what is now the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Russian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Through marriage ties and parliamentary action Lithuania and Poland were joined legally in the 16th century. In 1795, by the third partition of Poland, Lithuania was annexed by czarist Russia. The Lithuanians struggled in vain to throw off the Russian yoke. The Russians responded by attempting to destroy the Lithuanian language and culture, but they too were unsuccessful, as the Lithuanians tenaciously clung to their historical religion, language, and cultural traditions. Finally the russification policy was abandoned in 1905.

During the First and Second World Wars Lithuania was overrun by both the Germans and the Russians. In these two terrible wars, the innocent Lithuanians, due to an unfortunate accident of geography, stood on the lines and march between the two giants of Europe, and as the military advantage changed from one side to the other, the country became a tragic battlefield, ravaged by gigantic armies.

During the ebb and flow of World War I the Lithuanians capitalized on the conditions favorable for asserting their independence. In 1917 delegates representing the people of Lithuania met to determine the future course of the Nation. Out of this Congress came the announcement of the formation of the Lithuanian State, on February 16, 1918. It is the 44th anniversary of this proclamation that we honor today.

But Lithuanian independence had not yet become a reality, as the Red army invaded the capital and set up a Communist puppet regime in January of 1919. During the following year Lithuanian and Polish fighting forces under Marshal Pilsudski drove out the oppressive Bolsheviks.

In the peace treaty signed with Lithuania on July 12, 1920, Russia pledged to recognize Lithuania as an independent nation and to renounce forever all rights of sovereignty. The language of the agreement reads in part: "Russia recognizes without any reserve the soverignty and independence of the State of Lithuania with all juridical consequences resulting from such recognition, and voluntarily and forever renounces all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory." How false and cynical those words seem today, over 40 years later. Today it has become such a commonplace to speak of Communist duplicity that sometimes we tend to disregard the tragic consequences of that duplicity. The pillaging of a proud and freedom-loving nation is not a matter to be lightly passed over, and I would maintain that if ever we should become apathetic to such outrages, the moral fiber of our country will have been gravely weakened.

When the Russians forced a mutual assistance treaty upon Lithuania in October 1939 they were acting in direct violation of the peace treaty of 1920 and the Soviet-Lithuanian treaty of nonaggression of 1926. Under the terms of this so-called mutual assistance treaty, Lithuanian sovereignty was drastically comprised as the Russians demanded the right to have airbases and Soviet garrisons on the soil of Lithuania. In June 1940 the Russians compounded their tyranny by demanding the formation of a friendly government. Then they ruthlessly occupied the country, and by August 1940 Lithuania had been incorporated into the U.S.S.R. After the Nazi attack on Russia, Lithuania became a German colony for 3 years, until it was recaptured by the Soviets in 1944.

From World War II until 1959 all of Lithuania was closed to Western observers. Since 1959 some Americans have been allowed to enter the city of Vilnius, but the rest of the country remains sealed off. From scattered reports we can put together a pretty clear picture of what has been happening inside Lithuania during the years it has suffered under Communist domination. The picture is not a pretty one. It tells of brutal murders, of deportations, and of slave labor camps. It testifies to a vicious campaign to scatter the Lithuanian people and replace them in their homeland by Russians. And it exposes a brutal plot to destroy the religious faith and love of liberty of the Lithuanian nation. But from this somber story emerges a message and an inspiration for freemen everywhere. The Lithuanian people love God and they love their country deeply. And no Soviet atheist totalitarianism can destroy this precious heritage. The Lithuanian passion for freedom will never die, and communism will not be able to hold in bondage a proud people yearning and determined that one day they shall again be free.

The United States has on many occasions reaffirmed its support of Lithuanian independence. We recognized the independent Lithuanian government in 1922 and have never accepted Soviet domination of the country. Emphasizing our moral commitment to the cause of Lithuanian freedom, we continue to maintain diplomatic relations with a representative of the former independent government, which still has a legation in Washington.

Lithuanians who have come to settle in the United States have made many unique contributions to American civilization. The first known Lithuanian immigrants landed at New Amsterdam in 1688. Today there are an estimated one million Americans of Lithuanian descent. These Lithuanians have been widely praised for their patriotic devotion, their religious piety, their close family ties, and their community spirit.

Today I take great pride in joining with loyal Americans of Lithuanian ancestry in celebrating this anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day.

Proposed Memorial on Wake Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, my introduction of a bill to provide a suitable monument on Wake Island to the small group of Americans who honored us in life and in death by a memorable stand right after Pearl Harbor, has brought enthusiastic response from many who share my feelings.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a letter from the Honorable Jack R. Skaggs of Oklahoma City, a member of the Oklahoma State Legislature, a news story from the Daily Oklahoman, Friday, June 23, 1961, about last year's Wake reunion, and a poem

"Epic to Wake Island" written February 3, 1942, by A. H. La Fleur.

There being no objection, the letter, article, and poem were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
STATE OF OKLAHOMA,
February 13, 1962.

The Honorable MIKE MONRONEY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MIKE: I received the thrill of my life today when I heard by radio about your bill proposing to build a memorial on Wake Island in memory of the servicemen, living and dead, who served there.

This great memorial will make happy the hearts of many loved ones of those who died at Wake, and now seem to have been forgotten. As a former marine, I wish to thank you personally. Last year Oklahoma City was host to the Wake Island reunion at which time some 45 former Wake marines and sailors were present. I have a list of about 75 Wake people, all of whom will hear of your bill within the week; so I know many Senators and House Members will want to be coauthors with you on this fine piece of legislation. As a member of the Oklahoma House of Representatives and one of some 40 marines from Oklahoma who served on Wake during the battle and was later taken a prisoner of war, I would like to serve in any way possible to bring about construction and dedication of this wonderful memorial.

May I again express my deepest gratitude to you on behalf of my many Wake Island friends who served on Wake both in a military and civilian capacity.

Sincerely yours,

JACK R. SKAGGS.

WAKE ISLAND VETERANS TO MEET HERE TODAY

Approximately 40 former marines and their families will spend the weekend in Oklahoma City reliving the early days of World War II.

Here for a reunion at the 89'er Inn will be veterans of the battle for Wake Island. The last get-together for the group was in 1954 at Fort Worth.

Jack R. Skaggs, Oklahoma City member of the house of representatives and a veteran of the Wake engagement, said the group will begin registering at 3 p.m., Friday. The weekend will include a picnic, swimming, and a dance.

"This will mark the first time in almost 20 years that some of the men have seen each other," Skaggs said.

The special telegram has been sent to the group by Rear Adm. Winfield Scott Cunningham, Wake Island commander at the time it fell to the Japanese.

EPIC TO WAKE ISLAND

Far out upon the broad expanse of calm Pacific blue—
There lay a tiny island with its garrison so few,
Alone and yet undaunted; it has earned its share of fame,
A bulwark of our Uncle Sam—Wake Island is its name.

Mid roaring planes and bursting bombs—on guard both day and night,
The Leathernecks, the Olive Drab, the Navy Blue did fight.
Out numbered yet, a thousand times—for 6 and 10 long days,
The dead and yes the living, went through hell a thousand ways.

The morning of the 23d—that sad December day,
The ramparts of the tiny isle, did fall beside the way.
To dreary central China and a place they call Woo Sung—went prisoners—
The men of Wake, before their trek was done.
Now living in a prison camp and proud right to the core—
They wait with chins uplifted for the ending of the war.
Four-hundred-fifty loyal hearts—just waiting for the day,
When they'll be heading homeward to the good old U.S.A.

A. H. LAFLEUR,
Radarman, Third Class.

FEBRUARY 3, 1942.

Oklahomans Honor Albert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, many editorial tributes have been paid to our colleague Congressman CARL ALBERT upon his selection as majority leader. The story of his success and recognition illustrates what is best in the American way of life. Its significance is uniquely captured in an article in the February 1 issue of the Oklahoma Rural News, published by the Oklahoma Association of Electric Cooperatives. Mr. Czar D. Langston, Jr., is general manager of the association, and its publication is edited by Mr. M. Clint Miller:

OKLAHOMANS HONOR ALBERT

Only in America could it ever have happened. A coal miner's son growing up in a rural community, achieving a high school education, a college education, a Rhodes scholarship and finally a top post in the service of his Government.

That's the story of the Hon. CARL ALBERT, once a stubby, drawling redheaded boy who began with a shoestring and on his way up converted it into Democratic whip before going on to greater responsibilities.

Only in America can youth hope for opportunities unlimited, the right to as much education as the youth can absorb. The right to work, to dream, to achieve, to succeed and to prosper. It is truly the American way of life.

The boy from Bug Tussle came home to Oklahoma Sunday to be acclaimed by some 300 Oklahoma newspaper editors and the other members of the Oklahoma congressional delegation.

It would be a happy-ending sort of thing to say that they honored him at the peak of his career: Representative CARL ALBERT, named House majority leader as Congress opened in January. But no one—certainly no one in Oklahoma—is convinced that he has yet reached that peak, high as his new honor is. Most think it only another step upward.

CARL ALBERT was born the son of Mr. and Mrs. E. H. Albert. His father, a coal miner, and his mother were reared around Krebs and McAlester. His great-grandfather, Eli Albert, a Civil War veteran, is buried at Wilburton. His maternal great-grandfather, Stacey R. Scott, who settled in Krebs in 1887, was also a Civil War veteran.

When CARL was 3 his parents bought a farm 7 miles northeast of McAlester in the community of Flowery Mound, commonly called Bug Tussle. There he received his first 8 years of schooling.

As a 14-year-old freshman at McAlester High School he "took a flier" as he expressed it in public speaking, entering and failing in a number of speech contests, but encouraged each time by his father and mother to continue.

It is interesting that his early orations were based on the Constitution of the United States. School elimination contests gave him third and second places, eventually a first in high school, then a district championship in 1926 with the right to appear in a State contest.

Before the justices of the Oklahoma Supreme Court in April of that year, he won the Oklahoma State championship, a prize of $100 and a trip to the Midwest semifinals at Kansas City. There he placed second.

In 1927, he went the same route. He debated, spoke extemporaneously, delivered readings, watched every chance to appear before an audience.

This time he again won the State championship and again a trip to Kansas City. There the short little fellow standing before an audience of 7,000 persons, almost lost on the great stage, a boy with a drawl in his speech and a look of utter innocence on his face, licked the whole Midwest.

CARL ALBERT was no longer a green freshman in his school. He had been transformed into a confident, polished, and inspiring orator ready for national honors. Long hours of reading and research at the library had paid off.

At Kansas City the gigantic audience gave him a resounding ovation. His first-place award made him representative of a million high school students. He was awarded a 3-month summer tour of Europe, a place on the national program in Washington before the President and the Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court who acted as judges of the national contest.

Entering the University of Oklahoma he naturally became a member of the debate team, won a Phi Beta Kappa scholarship; became president of the student body; and now won the national oratorical championship, giving him a $1,500 cash prize and a trip to Honolulu.

But the farm boy was by no means through. Next came a Rhodes scholarship entitling him to study law at Oxford University for 3 years. During that time he traveled through most of the European countries and North Africa.

Entering the armed services with the 3d Armored Division on June 16, 1941, he rose quickly and by the time he was released in February 1946, was a lieutenant colonel with the Far East Air Forces in Japan.

Returning he announced for Congress from the Third District, was elected and began his service in the House in January 1947. He has served continuously since.

In 1955 ALBERT was selected by the late Sam Rayburn to be majority whip. Of him, Representative TOM STEED, of Shawnee, a close personal friend, said, "he is the only Member among the Democratic hierarchy who has the late Speaker's ability to keep the northern and southern factions of Congress in line."

"He enjoys the universal respect of both groups of Democrats in the House," Steed termed his colleague "a Member's member, one who would help get a minor piece of legislation through the House to aid a colleague."

At a dinner last September honoring ALBERT, President Kennedy said, "As one who has benefited on many occasions from his stanch advocacy, I am pleased to express tonight for myself and for members of my congressional relations staff, our appreciation and admiration for the skill and zeal he has displayed during these past months, which have resulted in a record of accomplishment of which we are all justly proud."

Through it all, Representative CARL ALBERT has remained much as his early day friends and acquaintances know him—impressive but unimpressed by his own success.

An old schoolmate back at Bug Tussle remarked, "When Mr. CARL ALBERT is molding the affairs of state, I wonder if he sometimes thinks of the whaling he used to get for sneaking off to the creek in the hot still days of July and August. Especially that one we got when we rolled his father's wagon into 10 feet of murky water, where it stayed for a whole week while his sire hunted all over the countryside." Certainly no one who has known him long will ever accuse him of having forgotten his friends or his humbler beginnings.

Proposed Tax for Farm Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. Robert W. Tanke, president of the North Pacific Grain Growers, Inc., a taxpaying, marketing cooperative serving 22,000 members, has brought to my attention a resolution unanimously adopted by that organization on January 19, 1962.

Because during the present session it is quite possible that the Senate will be engaged in debate upon this question of farm cooperative legislation and because I feel that the position of the North Pacific Grain Growers may be helpful to my colleagues in such a debate, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Tanke and the resolution which accompanied it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTH PACIFIC GRAIN GROWERS, INC.,
Mohler, Wash., January 30, 1962.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: At the request of the membership of North Pacific Grain Growers, Inc., a taxpaying, marketing cooperative, serving 22,000 members, I am inclosing a copy of the resolution unanimously passed at a recent meeting. We hope you will give it your careful consideration.

We would appreciate any effort you can make in encouraging good legislation in behalf of farmers and their cooperatives.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT W. TANKE,
President, North Pacific Grain Growers, Inc.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY DIRECTORS, NORTH PACIFIC GRAIN GROWERS, INC., JANUARY 19, 1962

Whereas in a special meeting of the members and shareholders of North Pacific Grain Growers, Inc., held in Portland, Oreg., on January 17, 1959, a resolution was passed recommending that "Congress (a) establish clear and concise legislation to once and for all establish the single tax principle for farm cooperatives, and (b) establish concise law to provide that any and all patronage refunds be taxed at face value in the farmers' hands at the date of issue or notification"; and

Whereas the resolution adopted at that meeting on January 17, 1959, is consistent with the long established and continuing position of this and other cooperatives; and

Whereas this board of directors believes that the draft proposal relating to taxing of farm cooperatives presently being studied by the House Ways and Means Committee would severely handicap the farmers of this Nation and severely limit the capital needed to carry on their farming activities as well as the capital needed for their cooperatives; and

Whereas this draft proposal is not consistent with the long established and continuing position of this and other cooperatives: It is hereby

Resolved, That we strongly recommend that the aforementioned draft proposal be rejected by the House Ways and Means Committee and that Congress, instead, enact legislation which will implement the intent of the 1951 amendment to the Internal Revenue Code; be it further

Resolved, That the members of this cooperative believe that the House Ways and Means Committee and Congress recognize the very great importance of cooperatives to the farmers of this Nation and therefore requests that legislation will not be enacted which would be detrimental to cooperatives, to farmers and, therefore, the economy as a whole; be it further

Resolved, That the House Ways and Means Committee be informed of the contents of this resolution.

City of Detroit Strongly Opposes Any Plan To Move Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command Headquarters and Detroit Arsenal Property of the U.S. Army from the City of Detroit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, on February 13, 1962, the following resolution was unanimously adopted by the Common Council of the City of Detroit, indicating strong opposition against moving the local Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command installations from Detroit:

Whereas the citizens and government of the city of Detroit would be totally opposed to any proposed departure of the Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command Headquarters and Detroit Arsenal property of the United States Army from the city of Detroit; and

Whereas the city of Detroit holds that there is no more appropriate place in the United States for military vehicle research, primary function of the Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command, than the city of Detroit, automotive research center of the world, and

Whereas in time of emergency the city of Detroit has become the "Arsenal of Democracy" and the Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command installations have become dependent upon the resources at their command in this city; and

Whereas a total of 5,200 persons would suffer unemployment by such an action, adding to the current critical unemployment problems already existing and presenting a challenge for solution; and

Whereas the city of Detroit feels strongly that an outrage will be perpetrated upon the economy of the city and its citizens should such a move be completed; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Honorable Common Council of the City of Detroit hereby register its formal protest against movement from the City of Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command installations now located here; and be it also

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be directed to the U.S. Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and to the U.S. Secretary of Defense, the U.S. Secretary of Labor, and to U.S. Representatives and Senators from the State of Michigan.

Wheeling College 6 Years Old

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following president's report by the Very Reverend William F. Troy, S.J., of Wheeling College, Wheeling, W. Va. I am very proud of the record this private college has made and commend its reading to my colleagues in the House.

THE 6 YEARS OF WHEELING COLLEGE

Rockets facing each other across the Bradenburg Gate and the rush to fallout shelters can make a college president's annual report seem unimportant. But even in time of crisis we cannot immerse ourselves totally in the present. The crises of today evolved from human decisions made in the past. Would our world be different if these decisions had been more intelligent, more farsighted, more courageous, more unselfish? That it would be different and that the future can be different and can be affected profoundly by the education given our young men and women must be the eternal spur for teachers of the young.

Wheeling College, an infant among her 27 Jesuit sister institutions, has just completed her 6th year. Her impact on the world has been slight. There are heartening signs, however, that this influence will grow far more rapidly than her tender years would warrant.

GRADUATES

One night recently I read through the yearbooks for the first three graduating classes, 1959, 1960, and 1961 and made my own study of the alumni. Degrees have been awarded to 184 men and women. Nine of these have already won master's degrees in six institutions. Forty-nine are in graduate or professional school. Twenty-five are teaching, three as fulltime members of college faculties and the rest in high school or elementary school, despite the fact that the college does not as yet have a program in education. Twenty-five are in the Armed Forces with the largest single group, six, serving as naval ensigns. The positions held by others in government, business, and industry are far too varied for cataloging here.

The movement to higher studies after graduating from college is worthy of special comment since it cannot help but be a tribute to the inspiration these students have received from their teachers. In the class of 1961, 21 out of a class of 74 received 46 fellowship, scholarship, and assistantship offers from 30 universities in 14 different fields. Wheeling College is also justifiably proud of the fact that her alumni include two Woodrow Wilson fellows, two national Rhodes Scholarship finalists, two National Defense Education Act scholarship awardees

and 11 graduates and former students who have elected to serve God and their fellow man in the priesthood and the religious life.

THE SELF-STUDY

The most absorbing and important effort on the part of the college during 1960–61 was a self-study undertaken by faculty and administration to assess the progress made since 1955 and to chart a course for the future. A committee of seven teaching members of the faculty under the chairmanship of Father James F. Muldowney, S.J., associate professor of sociology, spent the entire year coordinating the efforts of faculty and administration alike in producing a 160-page volume covering all aspects of the college's life. There are chapters on objectives, curriculum, library, students, faculty, administration, finances, and service to the local community. Since the study was so profitable and resulted in so many notable advances in all areas of the college program, this report will refer to it frequently.

FACULTY

The faculty is now the largest ever with 45 persons of faculty rank engaged in administration or teaching. Of these, 18 are Jesuit priests, 27 are full-time teachers, and 6 hold the position of lecturer, or part-time teacher. Thirty-eight percent of the teaching faculty hold the doctoral degree and an additional 16 percent have completed all course requirements. Degrees are held from an impressive list of 48 universities. The faculty students ratio is 1 to 16.

As a result of the self-study two new administrative positions were filled for the beginning of the 1961–62 academic year. An athletic director was appointed to serve full time in this capacity and that of basketball coach. He will concentrate particularly on building a strong intramural sports program. The second office opened this year has been that of the director of guidance—a lucuna which emerged with great clarity from the self-study. This office has already inaugurated a highly imaginative freshman orientation and testing program and a developmental reading service which will do much to reduce academic casualties among the student body.

STUDENT BODY

The enrollment in 1960–61 was 431 and in fall 1961 it approaches 500. This is still removed from the 850 which the college eventually plans to accommodate, but the next few years will see rapid rises in the number of resident students as new boarding accommodations become available. Residents on the campus in 1960–61 represented 16 States and men currently outnumber women 303 to 177. Total applications for this year's freshman class reached 534. An increase in commuter enrollment is also expected over the next few years as the number of local students applying for college grows, as more students from the Tri-State area are motivated to finance a private college education and as the college itself is successful in soliciting additional funds for scholarship assistance. Greatly deserving of mention again in this year's report is the help given to the college by the Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation in providing financial assistance for worthy students from the State of West Virginia. National Defense Education Act loans have also enabled many young men and women to pay their expenses. The amount that Wheeling College now has loaned to students from this Federal fund totals $77,000.

The college is proud of its student body which invariably makes a striking impression on visitors to the campus. They are alert, friendly, and studious. An interesting trend on the campus noted during the past year has been the amazing growth of out-of-class discussion groups, meeting usually at night and often in considerable numbers, to hear student papers read in the various subject areas and to take part in the discussion afterwards. One sometimes hears students complain of the lack of distraction on a small college campus. If this apartness leads to fiery and articulate extra-curricular philosophical, theological and literary discussion, surely there are priceless advantages to lack of distraction.

A recent survey of alumni indicated that 83 percent of those responding would send their children to Wheeling College. As a foreshadowing of this, there are 22 younger brothers and sisters of graduates and former students in the 1961 freshman class and 18 more in the upper classes.

CAMPUS GROWTH

It would be almost impossible to describe changes that have taken place on the campus during the past year or those that are planned for the next year without the panoramic view reproduced above. In the lower left corner are the tennis courts installed in the spring of 1961. Above them can be seen the foundation outline of the new gymnasium scheduled for completion in the spring of 1962. Moving to the top of the picture one sees McHugh Hall, residence for 158 men opened in 1959 and named for Father Lawrence R. McHugh, S.J., first president of Wheeling College. Preliminary approval has been obtained from the HHFA for a loan to finance an addition to this building housing another 130 men. It will project from the back wall of McHugh Hall and form a cross with the existing building.

In the center of the picture, partially obscured by trees, is the athletic field area with the beginnings of a track, a football field for intramurals and a large baseball diamond. At the far right is Sarah Tracey Hall, the residence for women. This building was first occupied in early 1960 and was originally constructed to accommodate 100 women. A new wing, visible extending from the back of the building, holds 54 more women and was finished in time for initial occupancy this fall.

In the center of the panorama are the three original college buildings completed in 1955 by Archbishop Swint. The topmost is Whelan Hall, the Jesuit residence, now accommodating 18 Jesuit Fathers and Brothers and 25 men resident students. Next is Swint Hall, the administration, library, and student union building. An HHFA loan for a dining hall addition to Swint Hall has also received preliminary approval and plans are in process for a wing extending toward the road and accommodating 350 diners. The largest building on the campus, in the center of the picture, is Donahue Hall, the science and classroom building. It contains 18 laboratories for biology, chemistry, and physics, all the classrooms, faculty offices, and a student chapel, now being enlarged and remodeled, to be named in honor of the late Most Reverend Thomas J. McDonnell, coadjutor bishop of the diocese of Wheeling.

BUILDING PLANS

The gymnasium represents the seventh building contruction job on the Wheeling College campus in seven years. It is probable that during the present academic year two additional buildings, the men's residence and the dining hall, will be started. And even this does not meet the college's needs. The original library, planned for 50,000 valumes is already approaching capacity with over 42,000 books and periodicals on the shelves. Since the college hopes to increase the library to a total far beyond this figure, plans will have to be made for either an addition to the library or a new building. An auditorium will also be urgently needed in the near future. While it is true that the new gymnasium can serve as a site for large convocations, indoor commencements, still its facilities cannot be too often preempted for such purposes or it will fail in its original intention—to provide indoor athletic facilities for the student body. The auditorium the college needs is one for student dramatic productions, debates, lectures, and assemblies. It will be a separate building or conceivably an addition to Donahue Hall. A third men's residence hall is also proposed for the not-too-distant future. The last building operation in this cycle is, of course, a chapel. It is indeed unfortunate that a new college, which so emphasizes religious values, should have to postpone a separate chapel to the end of its building program but the harsh economic fact that other buildings are at least in some measure self-liquidating makes a truly suitable chapel only a dream until the college is able to attract the interest of a memorial benefactor.

Barely visible in the photograph are many small trees and bushes which will one day shade quite hours for reflection. Many of these are a gift of the Wheeling College Charter Guild whose current project is the financing of a color film telling the story of the college and scheduled for shooting this fall.

CURRICULUM

A college can become obsessed with new buildings. Indeed, the needs of the modern college are so great that it is difficult, particularly for a college president, not to yield to this view of a college as a neatly landscaped, rapidly expanding aggregation of well-equipped buildings. We must all remind ourselves constantly that all this is merely subservient to the purpose of the college, the encounter between immature, undisciplined minds and those which have achieved disciplined maturity, the meeting of student and teacher. This encounter may take place in the classroom or laboratory or out of it but unless sparks fly when the meeting occurs the college is a stagnant place unworthy of the name.

The curriculum at Wheeling College is under continuing study by a committee of the faculty. As a result of the self-duty two "majors" or areas of concentration were discontinued this year, those in pre-engineering and in dramatic writing arts. No others have been added. The college intends to concentrate on developing the programs offered rather than on expansion into new areas. The self-study committee did recommend that at some future time programs in modern foreign languages and in education and psychology be considered on the grounds that these would serve the particular interests of the college's clientele.

Recent improvements in the curriculum have included: interdisciplinary courses in which teachers from several departments cooperate in the treatment of definite periods of Western civilization; an upper-division course in African and Chinese history; the addition of a special in speech for sophomores; the equipping of a laboratory with 20 calculators for the use of students in statistics courses; continued study of the freshman program of study to evaluate its challenge for the average freshman student; study of a possible honors program involving independent study for the more talented; the addition of a developmental reading laboratory; installation of a nuclear laboratory for science students; the development of upper-division electives in the modern foreign languages.

SERVICE

In writing its self-study document the college discovered that 13 typed pages were required to outline its services to the Wheeling community, the Wheeling Diocese and the State of West Virginia since its opening in 1955. This is quite surprising in view of the fact that a new college could be expected to devote most of its attention to internal development. During the past year such services have included: The faculty

speakers' bureau, a lecture program available to clubs and organizations greatly used by the community; the Wheeling College Science Workshop, a day-long program conducted monthly by the college for high school science teachers with the aid of the National Science Foundation; the Fourth Annual Tri-State Tax Institute cosponsored by the college with local lawyers and accountants and the Internal Revenue Service; Chemistry for Industry, a series of lectures for professional chemists offered with the sponsorship of five local industries; and numerous other lectures, consultation activities, guidance-testing programs offered by the college or by individual members of the faculty.

FINANCES

Wheeling College is completely without endowment except for that represented by the contributed services of the Wheeling College Jesuits. Like all private colleges striving for quality it cannot hope to amass in tuition income what it actually costs to finance its operations. The college depends and will always depend on annual fundraising to bridge the gap. It must hope to convince the public that it uses funds wisely and that it produces educated men and women of such quality that it deserves enlightened and public-spirited financial support.

For some years we have been saying that we must be judged by our product, the Wheeling College graduate. These young men and women are now taking their place in society, each year in an increasing number as the college grows. Their record is impressive. It is to be fondly hoped that this record will persuade private individuals, foundations, business and industry to judge Wheelding College eminently worthy of a partnership in their programs of giving to higher education.

The expansion campaign of 1958 was moderately successful and surprisingly so when one considers that this was then a new college, as yet to prove its case. The case is now more provable, however, and we hope that this will attract more and more support as the years go on, support that is essential if Wheeling College is to fulfill its high aims.

In the years ahead the college will look in various directions for financial support. Primarily it will always look to the Wheeling area. There is no doubt that the establishment of the college has been an educational and cultural asset: observers comment on this daily. But it has also represented a marked economic asset. During the recent struggle to bring a new arms-manufacturing plant to Wheeling, I could not help but wonder if the area realizes that the college also has the impact of a small industry on the economic life of the community. With its full-time staff of nearly 100 persons and payroll approximating $365,000, the college generates and supports economic factors in the area producing more than $300,000 in retail sales, over $500,000 in personal income and approximately $250,000 in bank deposits. This does not include the massive amount of building construction completed, underway or projected on the campus.

The college will also look to the foundations. I suppose every liberal arts college president agonized over the largess of the Ford Foundation recently in announcing a new gift of $100 million to selected liberal arts colleges during the next 2 years. The colleges already selected have undoubtedly proven their case through a multitude of years and are eminently deserving. But are not new and promising colleges a more challenging, if less predictable, risk for such munificence? Wheeling College must grow rapidly to take its place among those receiving the accolades and demonstrate that it, too, successfully aims at "cultivating the thoughtful leadership and independent opinion essential in a free society."

Alumni will not be a weighty source of support for many years. At the same time their almost total response to annual giving, pledged at the time of their graduation, gives promise for the future and enables the college to use their very informed and critical testimony that it is performing well an essential function in our society.

The great humorist, Stephen Leacock, wrote some lines in the McGill University Annual during the twenties which might well be of interest to all friends of Wheeling College: "Every graduate is, or ought to be, a missionary for his college. He should go out into the world murmuring 'McGill.' At every social gathering he should keep on saying: 'When I was at McGill' * * *. Out of such stuff is the real graduate made. And more than this, he ought to take an oath that if he ever gets rich McGill shall hear from him. He will never get rich—not such a decent man as I have described; he couldn't—but some of his friends may get rich. And it is sweeter and nobler to get one's friends to give than to keep to oneself the whole pleasure of giving."

In the light of its unbelievable progress in 6 short and thrilling years, Wheeling College threatens to become a giant. This is due to the men and women who have believed enough in her high aims to serve unstintingly on her faculty, to her students who have responded to the challenge of being first, to her friends whose perception has inspired their generous support. Now is certainly not the time to settle on a plateau. Only a beginning has been made, granted a hearty one. The faculty must become even more dedicated; the students must gain even greater insight into the opportunities afforded them; the friends must redouble their efforts and multiply themselves. If this is done Wheeling College can achieve her promise and take her place among any others, the alma mater of sons and daughters refined of mind and heart and vowed to spend their lives valuably for man and God.

Federal Aid to Education Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the letters to the editor in the Washington (D.C.) Post under date of February 14, 1962, pointing up the need for Federal aid to education:

EDUCATING OUR YOUTH

The President said, in his message to Congress, that education is "the most profitable investment society can make and the richest reward it can confer." And yet, for some reason, this domestic area has received the big yawn and legislators have not considered the shortage of quality teachers very urgent.

But, I have news for them. If something isn't done to attract our young people into the field of teaching, sooner or later Miss Jones of P.S. No. 56 will be retiring and there won't be anyone who can measure up to take her place.

With our children spending 6 hours a day 9 months out of a year in the classroom, who can measure the influence the teacher has on a child? The first-grade teacher has the most awesome responsibilities and opportunities. If she is creative and talented, she can transmit to them the exhilarating experience of living, the rewards of curiosity and creativity. The seeds she plants will continue to grow, produce, and reproduce throughout the child's lifetime.

In spite of the fact that there are many talented, altruistic teachers working with Johnny from 9 to 3, there are not enough and we are never going to have enough until we are willing to pay them survival salaries. Federal aid to education can only enhance the ability of local boards of education to seek out only the best qualified.

We argue that we can borrow Federal money for home improvement without surrendering our autonomy but cannot borrow Federal money for mind improvement; it is a little difficult to look Johnny in the eye.

GWENDOLYN B. SEEMER.

SPRINGFIELD, VA.

Japan's Experience With Government Health Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, one of the important facets of the debate over the current proposal to place the health care for our senior citizens under social security is the question of the effect of such a basic change in our health care program on the quality level of health care which we enjoy in the United States. Although there are differences to be recognized, it is to the experience of other countries in this area that we must turn to understand the impact of such a program on our health care system. I am placing in the RECORD, as a part of these remarks, a column by Edith Kermit Roosevelt, on the subject of the Japanese health plan. Such reports of foreign experiences in this field must be weighed in with our considerations of proposals to alter our health care program.

The article follows:

SOCIAL MEDICINE IN JAPAN

(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

Japan's system of social health insurance offers an example worth studying as Congress considers whether to follow a similar course by adopting a program of medical care for the aged tied to the social security system.

The expert who helped to make Japan's social security laws was William H. Wandell, chief of the social security and public health and welfare section on Gen. Douglas MacArthur's staff in Tokyo. Partly as a result of the compulsory health insurance schemes promoted by U.S. Federal planners, a physician in Japan today needs all the ingenuity he can command to eke out a living.

Dr. Marjorie Shearon, a scientist and former official of both the Social Security Administration and U.S. Public Health Service, went to Japan recently to study Japanese medical care. Her survey is published in her highly reliable Shearon Legislative Service (8801 Jones Mill Road, Chevy Chase, Md.). Dr. Shearon reports:

If a person covered by Japanese health insurance laws visits a physician's office and requires treatment or a prescription, he pays 100 yen (28 cents) and the Government pays 56 yen for the consultation.

"The patient will not be sent to a drugstore," according to Dr. Shearon, "because one of the chief sources of a physician's income is derived from the drugs he prescribes and furnishes."

Periodically, the Government publishes a book listing the drugs for which it will pay, their cost, and dosage. The spread between the cost of the drug and what the Government pays the doctor represents the physician's profit.

Since the Government will not pay for expensive drugs, doctors who prescribe costly antibiotics to cure patients suffer financially.

If the patient returns for a second visit, the physician could give him a 3-day dose of aspirin. The Government will pay 34 yen or 102 yen for the 3 days. This is the cheapest drug prescribed.

During the same visit if the doctor takes an X-ray, the Government will pay him 907 yen or $2.54. If the X-ray indicates the patient has pneumonia, the doctor might administer 300,000 units of penicillin.

The Government, which in effect makes decisions on medical matters, regards this as an adequate dose and will pay the doctor 89 yen. If the doctor feels a larger dose is needed, he will not be paid for the excess. Thus, by taking an X-ray, giving a shot, and prescribing a drug, the most that the hard-pressed physician can get from the Government during this visit is 1,098 yen or $3.08.

No wonder that doctors tend to rush patients through their offices like cogs on a conveyor belt.

"I spend an average of 3 to 4 minutes with each patient," Tokyo Physician Dr. C. B. Araki told Dr. Shearon.

And woe betide the poor doctor summoned for a home call. He may not charge more than the taxi fare.

The physician also suffers financially in caring for dependents of patients. They are only supposed to pay half the costs.

Japanese doctors are greatly concerned over the future of medical practice. The doctor with great skill receives no more compensation than the most mediocre practitioner. Underpaid doctors, unable to make a living, are tempted to cheat. Unnecessary medication, shots and X-rays are given. The doctor, virtually a hired hand of the state, learns to pad bills so they will look reasonable to Government clerks authorizing payment.

Antibiotics and sleeping pills are sold without prescriptions. The sleeping pill suicide rate is high.

How did this sad state of affairs come about in Japan? It is 40 years since the Japanese passed their health insurance law, the first social insurance law enacted anywhere in Asia. This law covered only a small fraction of the population, the workers in factories employing 10 or more persons or which came under the provisions of the factory or mining law passed earlier.

But due in part to the influence of American officials, dozens of amendments and additional laws were passed until there developed the comprehensive, compulsory health insurance program which now corrupts doctors, destroys the initiative of brilliant medical men and gluts hospitals with patients who don't belong there.

A start in the same direction will be made in this country if our medical profession is stampeded into abandoning its resistance to compulsory social insurance medicine.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, Friday, February 16, the Lithuanian people celebrated the 44th anniversary of their declaration of independence. On this day in 1918, toward the close of World War I, the Lithuanian people, after many years of suffering under czarist rule, established their own government and proclaimed their independence. As soon as the German troops evacuated Vilnius on January 15, 1919, the Red army entered the city and immediately established a Communist government. The battles were extremely bitter but the Lithuanian people emerged triumphant. A Polish army including many Lithuanians drove the Red army out of the city, and not long thereafter Russia recognized the independence of Lithuania. The peace treaty which the Soviet government signed stated that it voluntarily and forever renounces all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and their territory.

The Lithuanians were accepted by the League of Nations, where their spokesmen worked for world peace. In a constitution adopted in 1922, Lithuania promised freedom of speech, assembly, religion and communication to all its citizens. But the freedom of the Lithuanian people was unfortunately short-lived, despite an attempt to remain neutral in the Second World War. Territory was yielded to Germany in March of 1939 and a few months later a mutual assistance treaty was forced on Lithuania by the Soviet Union. Despite an earlier nonaggression treaty with the Soviets the little country was forced to accept Soviet troops and grant air bases to the Russians. A rigged election produced a congress which requested the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union. On August 3, 1940, at this "request," Lithuania was declared a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R.

For over two decades the Lithuanians have suffered under the totalitarian rule of the tyrants in Moscow. Scores of thousands of intellectuals were executed or deported to Siberia. The resistance movement was crushed through the application of unlimited terror. Russian settlers were brought in to help consolidate Soviet control and to supplant the ancient Lithuanian culture and civilization.

In celebrating the independence which they no longer enjoy, the Lithuanian people are expressing their faith that the future will bring the ultimate triumph of good over evil. Americans of Lithuanian descent joint with their brethren in the motherland and throughout the free world. The voice of a brave, freedom-loving people has been stifled for many years but the ideal of human liberty still burns brightly for Lithuania. As the torchbearers of freedom in this world, the American people must never forget the struggle of these people. We must continue to do everything we can to aid the Lithuanians. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with Lithuanians everywhere in honoring the spirit and traditions of Lithuanian independence.

Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian people brought to an end the ruthless rule of czarist Russia, which had lasted 120 years. During the Middle Ages Lithuania had been a powerful and independent state, whose borders extended into the heart of what is now the Soviet Union. The legitimate national aspirations of the Lithuanian people were crushed in 1795, when their country was annexed to Russia as part of the third partition of Poland. Yet the steadfast Lithuanians repeatedly revolted against their Russian overlords and remained loyal to their ancient language, culture and traditions despite continuous Russian efforts to make them forget their independence.

In 1919 and 1920 the Lithuanians established their independence by force of arms, and during the next two decades they made significant contributions to the cause of world peace, both through the efforts of their spokesmen at the League of Nations and by living peacefully with their Polish and Soviet neighbors. The history of this tiny independent state between 1920 and 1939 effectively destroys the Soviet claim that their domination of the captive nations of Eastern Europe is necessary to insure the security of the Soviet Union. Yet the period of independence was not destined to last. Despite the Soviet renunciation in 1920 of "all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory," Lithuania was forcefully incorporated into the U.S.S.R. in 1940. It was one of the first countries to suffer under the brutal occupations of Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union. After the war the Soviets ordered large-scale deportations of Lithuanians to Siberia and many Russians have settled in Lithuania. For a long time the country was completely closed off to foreigners, who are now permitted to visit the capital city of Vilnius. Stalin's attempt to disperse the Baltic peoples has since been abandoned, and in the small towns and farms of rural Lithuania the ancient tradition of national independence has not been forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, Lithuania is no longer a free and independent nation, but the spirit of freedom lives on in the hearts of this sturdy people. As happens so often in the history of Europe, a small nation is in bondage because the military force of a larger neighbor proved more powerful than its legal commitments. We Americans may take some pride in the fact that the United States has never recognized the Soviet incorporation of Lithuania into the Communist empire, has never given its sanction to this lawless act of brute force perpetrated on a small and defenseless nation. We salute the Lithuanian people on the 44th anniversary of their national independence with a sense of deep responsibility and commitment to the ideals of liberty which they share with the entire free world.

Segundo and Las Animas County (Colo.) Fight Unemployment With Retraining Programs, New Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, one of the most serious problems facing America today is that of finding productive jobs for the unemployed living in areas of persistent and severe labor surplus.

Senators have often heard me speak of the problem facing Trinidad and Walsenburg, two coal-mining communities in my own State of Colorado. With the serious and continuing decline in the coal industry, these areas have been faced with a severe economic slump. Many men are unemployed, men with families to feed, men with ties of long standing with their community.

These two areas of Huerfano and Las Animas Counties have now been declared areas of redevelopment under the terms of the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961, a measure which I cosponsored and have long supported. With their certification has come the hope of Federal assistance for their own efforts. It is most important to emphasize that the initiative for such efforts must come from the local community. The Federal and State Government stands ready to help the community to help itself—but the community must take the lead.

A fine and remarkable example of local initiative and self-help is found in the work of Rev. George T. Andrews, S.J., and the citizens of Segundo, Colo., 15 miles west of Trinidad:

Their cooperative, Sangre de Cristo Enterprises, Inc., using money raised locally, has gone into the poultry business. It has also set up the Sangre de Cristo Enterprises Training School which has been in operation since March 1961, instructing miners in new skills and trades, preparing them to become active producing members of the economy.

All this has been done locally with local money and local initiative. It is this type of program which deserves and should have ARA assistance.

I understand that application has been made for such ARA assistance. I have writtn to the Administrator of ARA asking that he give this program his prompt and sympathetic attention. Such local actions must be encouraged to grow and prosper.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article on this project from the Denver Post be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEGUNDO, COLO., IS TRYING TO SAVE ITSELF BY BEING CHICKEN MINDED BUT NOT CHICKEN

The stranger made his way into the building marked "Growing House 2B." There was a sudden flutter of white wings as a flock of young chickens showed momentary alarm. Then the excitement subsided and only the quiet "skirr" of contented chick voices was heard.

"Beg pardon," the stranger said, addressing the pleasant-faced, gray-haired man in the T-shirt. "I'm looking for Father Andrews."

"I'm Father Andrews," said the man, and smiled at the astonishment of the newcomer. "What can I do for you?"

"Well," the stranger said, "I understand you have fresh eggs for sale."

"We do, indeed," said the Reverend George T. Andrews, S.J. "One year from now we hope to be able to say we've sold a million eggs."

Father Andrews did not come to Segundo, Colo., in September 1960 to grow chickens and sell eggs. His principal business was then—and still is—the spiritual welfare of the Catholic men, women, and children of his five mission parishes.

Segundo, formerly a prosperous coal-mining town, is 15 miles west of Trinidad on Colorado Highway 12. A string of productive mines once lay in this valley along the Purgatoire River.

One by one the mines have closed. One of the last, the Frederick mine at Valdez, Colo., was 1 mile east of Segundo, and many Frederick miners lived at Segundo.

In December 1960 the Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp., owner of the Frederick mine, announced the mine would be closed permanent.

Most of the miners are of Spanish-American descent, and are Catholics. When they are in trouble, they tend to turn to their parish priest.

After mass on New Year's Day 1961, Father Andrews was taking off his vestments in the sacristy of St. Ignatius Church, Segundo, when a group of men entered.

They got right to the point. The mine was down, perhaps forever. The miners were out of jobs. They were, they thought, too old to start work in other fields, and they had no hope of finding other mining jobs somewhere else.

"Father," one asked, "what are we going to do? We want to work, but there is no work. What can we do to help ourselves?"

Some of the miners knew Father Andrews had formed cooperatives in St. Louis, Mo., during World War II. They asked what he thought about forming a cooperative in the valley to help establish the miners in new lines of work.

Today Father Andrews will tell you his reaction:

"I thought: another co-op? Do I have the energy? Do I know the people well enough? I've had it as far as co-ops are concerned."

But that day in the sacristy he said:

"All right. We'll form a steering committee and meet Tuesday night."

A list of leaders, both Catholic and non-Catholic, was drawn up, so that the best talent available could be called on.

It didn't happen easily, but after several meetings and much discussion, Sangre de Cristo Enterprises, Inc., was formed. It is a cooperative to introduce new crafts, businesses, and industries in the valley, to finance them, and to help the citizens, regardless of religion, establish themselves in new fields of employment.

Various industries were considered. One man was a skilled taxidermist. It was thought he might teach his skill to others, who then could offer their services to hunters who flock to the region every year. A commercial bakery, leatherwork, and the making of small souvenir and holiday goods were other possible fields.

"I happened to know something about poultry," says Father Andrews, "so my contribution was poultry."

The idea of a chicken cooperative appealed to many. The climate of the valley is a mild one, and the water excellent.

Father Andrews proposed that the cooperative should construct the necessary buildings, equip and maintain them according to good commercial standards, then buy chicks and rear them in batches of 800 until they became laying hens.

The chief crop would be eggs, although meat chickens would eventually be a secondary product. A million eggs a year was the initial goal.

"But this first step," says Father Andrews, "is just a demonstration. We want to show our people what can be done in the poultry industry, and make them confident that an industrious man can make a good living producing eggs.

"Then comes the second step. The cooperative will help individual families to get a Government loan to set up their own poultry farms. The cooperative will help these privately owned poultry farms by supplying them with laying pullets, purchasing their feed for them in wholesale quantities, and marketing their eggs and their culled hens at cost."

Father Andrews consulted the Most Reverend Charles A. Buswell, bishop of Pueblo, and obtained his approval for the use of $5,000 in parish funds to start the work. A parish society advanced another $1,000. Stock was sold to interested persons, and other stock was distributed to members on the basis of one share for each 3 hours worked on cooperative projects.

Many buildings in Segundo had been abandoned. Some of these were bought. Members of the cooperative pitched in with a will and put them in shape to house the chickens. Other buildings were constructed of adobe. A brooder house with a capacity of 3,000 day-old chicks was built.

Today there are three growing houses with a capacity of 2,800 pullets, and soon there will be three henhouses with a capacity of 1,500 laying hens each. The first henhouse with 1,500 pullets recently was producing 750 eggs a day, which is 50 percent productivity after only 1 month of laying.

What becomes of the eggs? They are marketed by cooperative members who serve as routemen and sell the eggs throughout the Las Animas County, in which Segundo is located. But can they sell all the eggs?

Recently Father Andrews reported:

"We've sold 30,000 eggs to date. We keep a 2-day supply on hand, the rest are sold. Yesterday we sold 110 dozen but only produced 88 dozen. You can see we are able to sell the eggs."

Meanwhile the Sangre de Cristo Enterprises Training School began its training in March 1961. Congress has since passed an Area Redevelopment Act intended to help distressed areas, and Las Animas County has been given distressed area classification. The cooperative now hopes for Government help.

Sangre de Cristo Enterprises has submitted a program but as of this writing it had not yet received Area Redevelopment Administration (ARA) approval.

"Sangre de Cristo Enterprises has put $13,000 in cash, 7,000 hours of labor, and a host of gratuities, big and small, behind its determination to found a new industry," says Father Andrews. "We are on the threshold of success, and help from the ARA could put us over the top."

Sangre de Cristo Enterprises is not Father Andrews' first cooperative. In 1944 he was rector of a church in a Negro tenement neighborhood in St. Louis, Mo. He discovered that in many places children were kept in bed on cold days because there was no fuel. Tenants had no place to store coal, and coal in small quantities was expensive.

Father Andrews took a plan to the mayor and aldermen. In a week they had a coal cooperative working on a vacant lot leased from the city at $1 a year. In 4 weeks there were 26 coal stations. The cooperative bought coal in seven carload lots and resold to householders at 15 cents a bushel basket. The previous price had been 45 to 60 cents a bushel.

It was wartime and meat was out of reach of the poor, so Father Andrews organized his first chicken cooperative. Every week it bought 800 to 1,000 day-old chicks. When they got to "skillet stage" they were sold for food at 18 cents a pound, although stores charged 56 cents a pound. During the first spring and summer the cooperative sold more than 25,000 eating fryers.

"The next year," says Father Andrews, "we bought a hatchery, produced 60,000 broilers and continued at this volume for the duration of the war."

Since the Sangre de Cristo Chicken Cooperative was launched, some sharp competition has been announced. The Gates Rubber Co. and the Cyclo Manufacturing Co., both of Denver, have announced that they are going into the egg business. They plan 8 buildings near Brighton, Colo., north of Denver, to house 100,000 laying hens which are expected to lay an average of 80,000 eggs a day.

But Father Andrews is not dismayed.

"We are counting on our training school to teach our men to think, and it takes a lot of thought to raise chickens," he says. "A machine that can think as good as a man would cost a billion dollars. We can train our men much cheaper."

Others might—and did—criticize Father Andrews for devoting so much time and energy to nonreligious efforts.

"My first purpose in life is, of course, to have souls," he says. "But you can't expect people to be much interested in their spiritual well-being if their material well-being is utterly neglected. And besides, a cooperative teaches men to cooperate, to respect one another, to 'do unto others,' and that's a mighty big part of religion."

White House Tour With First Lady

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, February 14, 1962, the television viewers throughout the Nation were indeed treated to an exceptional tour of the White House by the First Lady. The Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of my congressional district carried a highly complimentary editorial on this hour-long program in its edition of Thursday, February 15, and having seen this program I certainly agree with the sentiments expressed by the Times-Leader. As that newspaper pointed out in its editorial, "a great many of us were taught a lesson in history, even though we had studied the subject in school and had visited the White House while in Washington." The aforementioned editorial follows:

[From the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader, Feb. 15, 1962]

WHITE HOUSE TOUR WITH FIRST LADY AS HOSTESS

Television in recent years has featured so much that is mediocre, dull, and, let us be frank, offensive, that the tour of the White House last night with the Nation's First Lady as the guide was refreshing.

Mrs. Kennedy, in the parlance of the theater, stole the show. She was gracious, informed, relaxed—all that America might expect of the President's wife. As she made the rounds, she was an unusually charming hostess with millions of her fellow countrymen as her personal guests.

Moreover, she was thorough and competent in her commentary which shed considerable light on the Executive Mansion and its distinguished occupants. A great many of us were taught a lesson in history, even though we had studied the subject in school and had visited the White House while in Washington.

In expressing our thanks to Mrs. Kennedy for a pleasant and illuminating hour, we should like to add the compliment of nominating her for the top performance on television for the year.

Making the Best Things

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, several days ago, Chicago's American commented editorially on a proposal made in Chicago that American industry and American labor have joined together in trying to improve the quality of American products as one way of meeting foreign competition in international commerce.

I am enclosing in the RECORD today for the attention of my colleagues the editorial which fully supports a proposal made by Mr. Frank Darling, president of Local 1031, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, to a group of employers with whom his union has contracts. As can be noted from this editorial, Mr. Darling has proposed that his union will match any incentive plans which the employers will establish in their plants to help improve the quality of their products.

Earlier in this session, I had proposed a five-point program to deal with the entire subject of mounting competition in America and throughout the world from foreign-made products. One of the points I suggested was to improve the quality of American products. It is a source of considerable pride to me that the president of local 1031 would join in this suggestion, and it is my sincere hope that other union leaders and private industry will join in this cause.

There is no question in my mind that American ingenuity and American craftsmanship can effectively compete for world markets. Improving the quality of American products is one method in which this can be accomplished.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial which appeared in Chicago's American follows:

MAKING THE BEST THINGS

A particular difficulty which American products will encounter in competing for business with the European Common Market lies in the fact that American production costs—wages among them—are higher than they are in Europe. A partial solution to that problem that seems admirable to us has been offered by Mr. Frank Darling, a Chicago labor union president.

"You can't make your products cheaper than some foreign products," he told a group of Chicago makers of television and radio sets, "but you can make them the best products in the world."

Darling's idea of how this should be done is simple and practical: switch the emphasis from making things fast to making them as perfect as they can be made.

To bring this about he thinks employers in manufacturing industries should give cash prizes to workers who most consistently do good work. He says his union, Local 1031, AFL–CIO International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, will match these awards dollar for dollar, and it also will support managements in firing sloppy workers.

This is an exceptionally wholesome proposal. It could start the development of a special demand for American products everywhere on the ground that their quality was superior. And it could give many American workers a heightened interest in their work by stimulating their creativeness and increasing their pride in their work.

Several of the Chicago manufacturing firms have said they will give Darling's plan careful study. We hope they all will.

City of Detroit Supports Federal Department of Urban Affairs and Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution was unanimously adopted by the Common Council of the City of Detroit, on February 13, 1962, endorsing the establishment of a Federal Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND HOUSING

By Councilman Van Antwerp:

Whereas in the past few decades our Nation has moved from a country of rural dwellers to urban dwellers with fully two-thirds of the people now living in urban communities; and

Whereas this trend not only will continue but will accelerate in 2 years ahead, requiring intensified and expanded efforts, both public and private to insure the sound growth and development of our communities; and

Whereas the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing as proposed would provide leadership, coordination and maximum effectiveness in the execution of greatly needed programs in the area of housing, construction of public facilities, problems of urban mass transportation, comprehensive planning and slum clearance, conservation and rehabilitation and other matters vital to the future development and progress of the city of Detroit: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Common Council of the City of Detroit strongly supports and endorses the establishment of a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs and Housing in the Federal Government as being the best interests of our city, our metropolitan area, the State of Michigan and the United States of America and that this action be communicated to the President of the U.S. Congress from the State of Michigan.

Adopted as follows: yeas—Councilmen Beck, Brickley, Connor, Patrick, Ravitz, Rogell, Van Antwerp, Wierzbicki, and President Carey—9.

Nays—none.

A Challenge to All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it has always been my policy to direct to the attention of the Members of the House the opinion of local community newspapers, that I feel reflect grassroots American thinking. The Des Plaines Valley News of Des Planes, Ill., points out the basic facts of life concerning the Communist menace in its editorial entitled "A Challenge to All," which appeared in its Thursday, February 15, edition. I wish to insert this editorial into the RECORD at this time:

A CHALLENGE TO ALL

(By Frank Nagel)

If, after you read the title of this editorial, you should become bored and do not want to continue, then you, along with too many millions of Americans, are the object of it. We are living in, as a new television show calls it, the age of overkill. Americans can no longer neglect their duties as U.S. citizens, a title which promises to its holder a wealth, a security, a freedom known to no other country on earth. Yet in this relative security, Americans have neglected the most important duty, which is to respect, uphold, and defend the backbone of this Nation, her government.

It is time, if it is not too late already, to act in defense of this Government so we may be sure that future generations will have the relative security, enjoyed by preceding ones.

This entails a revitalized interest in (1) voting, only after seriously considering the qualifications of all candidates equally; (2) writing to your individual Congressmen urging them to conscientiously support measures in the public's interest; and, (3) reading books, magazine articles, or newspaper editorials so we may become better informed citizens of a world in which it has become necessary to coexist with those of the Eastern nations.

Take the word "coexist." As a political term this word is a neologism; that is, a new word recently added to the language. Twenty-five years ago the political term "coexist" didn't exist. Only as a result of the cold war and other worldwide crises, has this term come to denote existing, not necessarily living as we know it, in a moratorium or mutual agreement to outlaw war, with a force whose principles and methods are wholly contradictory to everything we know and believe to be right. This force, communism, is a threat to all—all—God-fearing people.

But I ask you, how can you fight something you know nothing about? In many cases, how can you defend something you know nothing about? Believe me, there are some Americans who do not know what America stands for; do not know why they should defend her; do not know why they should fight communism. Let me explain myself. If you are apathetic, which means a "don't care" attitude, and you do not know, nor care to learn anything about why you should defend Americanism, or why you should fight communism, how can you possibly be successful in resisting it?

Khrushchev has said that our grandchildren will grow up under a Communist regime in America. This could very well happen, if Americans continue to shrug off the threats of these maniacs and do nothing to stop them. But it does not have to be so. With work, study, and more work, we of the free world will be able to erect a defense greater than anyone has ever known. That defense will be the stubborn resistance of 180 million well-informed Americans, who will not and cannot be defeated.

This is what we must live and work for. This is what we must pray for. But it can be done; and with our work it will be done.

Solving of Urban Affairs Needs Closer Consideration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the need for closer coordination to solve the problems in urban centers is recognized by all interested and informed citizens who seek a solution for the plight of the cities.

Support for a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing comes not only from big metropolitan cities, but also from smaller cities like Reading, Pa., of approximately 100,000 population. Support has been expressed in many newspaper editorials.

President Kennedy's proposal has much merit because it would make for more efficient Government service and a more effective means for dealing with one of our Nation's most serious problems.

I include with my remarks, Mr. Speaker, an editorial published recently in the Reading (Pa.) Times:

SOLVING OF URBAN AFFAIRS NEEDS CLOSER COORDINATION

One sound reason for promoting the proposed Cabinet level of Department of Urban Affairs is that there is a Department of Agriculture.

The quite valid theory is that the farmer is represented in the Federal Government and the city dweller is not. It is an indication of the growing urban problem. There is a definite need for more coordinated effort to solve the plight of the cities, but mere jealously over rural areas certainly shouldn't be the sole reason for it.

Obviously, cities alone aren't equal to the tasks ahead. Like Reading, they have lost population and tax revenues. And they are losing business and they are not growing physically. In the decade following 1950, just 22 of 130 cities annexed as much as 30 square miles.

There has been an oft-repeated cry that rural areas have dominated State legislatures to the detriment of the cities. And at one time there seemed to be an alliance between suburban and rural areas.

But that picture is slowly changing, because of the ever-growing municipal-type needs of the suburbs. As far as favorable State legislation is concerned, the situation for the cities has never looked brighter.

The main cause of the cities' ills is their very complexity, and likewise the means to solve them will be equally as complex. The sums of money and the energy to be expended are staggering.

But the awful truth that many cities are on the road to decay makes the risks imperative. The Nation's urban regions are rich in people, skills, and resources, all of which need coordination. It is to be hoped that a Department of Urban Affairs will provide that. But we shall have to wait and see.

Gains on Jim Crow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, a most revealing article relating to segregation practices appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on February 4, 1962, written by one of America's most distinguished sports writers, Stanley Woodward. I take this opportunity of placing it in the RECORD:

GAINS ON JIM CROW

(By Stanley Woodward)

Though Ford C. Frick may consider that baseball is treading in the heel prints of "Him who trampled out the vintage where the grapes of wrath are stored," the grapes appear to retain their uval plumpness.

It is pleasant to read in Harold Rosenthal's story of Friday morning that certain ball clubs have made arrangements for Florida training that will minimize the embarrassments and unpleasantnesses accruing to the colored ballplayers they will take South.

This has been done by booking private or semiprivate accommodations. The Yankees have booked a motel wing, private swimming pool and dining room. The Mets will be privately ensconced in a wing of the new Colonial Motel on St. Petersburg Beach. The Whit Sox have bought a hotel of their own (the Sarasota Terrace). The Braves, Cards, and Reds are reported to have private motel arrangements. The Dodgers, in their leased air base at Vero, have the best layout of all but it's a long way from California.

One club joins the scanty western training contingent and, surprising to state, it's the only one with luxuriant home-grown Jim Crow now that St. Louis has seen the light. This is the New Houston Club which will travel to Apache Junction, Ariz., where integration is rife and all men are created free and equal.

STILL SEPARATE BUT EQUAL

The other clubs in Florida will be the Baltimore Orioles, at Miami; the Detroit

Tigers, at Lakeland; the Washington Senators, at Pompano; the Minneapolis Twins, at Orlando; the Philadelphia Phillies, at Clearwater; the Pittsburgh Pirates, at Fort Myers, and the Kansas City Athletics, at West Palm Beach.

Except for the Orioles none of these clubs had done a thing for the Negro players. They still will have to go on taking "separate but equal" accommodations. The movies won't let them in. They can't stop and get a hot dog if they're hungry. If their wives and children want to go swimming (ballplayers generally don't) the broad free Atlantic is denied them.

Miami is an exception for there is a beach for colored people (Virginia Beach on Biscayne Key) halfway out to Crandon Park. Archie Moore who used to do his running there when he was getting ready for one of his fights with Joey Maxim told me it was a pretty nice place.

Baltimore is a little above the other Jim Crow clubs in that it has made arrangements for its Negro players to sleep and eat with the others in the McAllister Hotel, one of the string of stand-and-deliver enterprises on the Miami waterfront. There's nothing they can do otherwise except read or play checkers with each other.

The Miami police won't even let them walk around the streets in a "white area" at night unless they have a note from their boss. It occurs to us that the Oriole property man would do well to stock up with turbans and swami robes for evening use of the colored players.

TOPPING NO RAILSPLITTER

Bill Baggs, editor of the Miami News who is an Atlanta-born integrationist, says he has a Negro friend who has traveled all over the South and crashed any event he felt like crashing with no props except a turban, a small prayer-rug and a few phrases in Arabic. He avoids long sentences, just smiles pleasantly and utters little goodies like:

"It is begged by humble servant that memsahib son-of-a-b will take a dive into the confluence where jelnadars have placed the horse ash."

Baggs claims his friend only had to use the prayer rug once and that was when he met a true blue disciple of Allah at a meeting of the Daughters of the Confederacy. It was the first time he had done any praying but he came away well versed in assuming the knee-chest position.

It occurs to this department that the Florida hotels were much nearer capitulating to the "one-roof" plan last year than they are now. Last year Dan Topping of the Yankees sent the Hotel Soreno, St. Pete, a stiff letter, demanding that it take the entire Yankee party. I called the manager afterward and got the impression that he was about ready to throw in the towel. If he had done it the whole white supremacy mob might have joined in the retreat.

But Topping, with victory in his hands, didn't dare trust it. If the Soreno resisted he had no place to quarter his players. So he backed down and lost his chance to become a junior Abraham Lincoln.

Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, today we pause to celebrate the 44th anniversary of the independence of the Lithuanian nation. In doing so we pay tribute to the gallant people of Lithuania who cannot themselves publicly celebrate this important event which marked a milestone in their struggle for freedom.

Lithuania declared its independence on February 16, 1918, after centuries of subjugation, sometimes German, but mostly Russian. Never during those years of struggle did the Lithuanian people lose sight of their ultimate goal of self-determination. In 1940 Lithuania lost its independence once again when the Soviet Union annexed it and its Baltic neighbors, Latvia and Estonia, and made them republics of the U.S.S.R. This act was in such callous disregard of the sovereign and human rights of the Lithuanian people and in complete violation of international law that it has never been recognized by the United States. Yet despite their many trials the people of Lithuania are neither broken nor discouraged. The passion for liberty and freedom is heightened, not dispelled, by this adversity. Their courage and indomitable will to resist Soviet attempts to inculcate communism and the Soviet way of life, remain strong.

On this day the American people who cherish individual freedom and national liberty as their most priceless possession, join their hopes and aspirations with their fellow men in Lithuania. We renew our devotion to the cause of Lithuanian independence. We hope that the day may not be prolonged when Lithuania will once again regain her rightful position in the family of free nations which she so richly deserves.

For the Farm Mess, an Ax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the February 9 issue of the Life magazine carried a pertinent editorial on the present state of agriculture in the Nation and the alarming direction which the administration is taking in trying to solve some of the farm problems which its spokesmen have led us to believe would be solved.

This editorial throws out a challenge to Congress to be statesmanlike in dealing with this, the many thorny issues inherent in this problem, and I feel that every Member who is sincere in his desire to ease this problem for both the farmers and the taxpayers will benefit from reading this editorial, "For the Farm Mess, an Ax."

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

FOR THE FARM MESS, AN AX

The administration's new farm program has been greeted by the leftish National Farmers Union with hearty cheers. Farmers, says the NFU, are offered "a good choice between adjusting production with price protection, or going on the so-called free market. The noisy apostles of the free market should welcome this challenge, if they are sincere."

As "noisy apostles of the free market," we regretfully but sincerely declare this so-called challenge a fraud. Secretary Freeman offers all feed-grain farmers a choice between the most rigorous system of production controls they have ever faced and a system of no price supports whatever plus this "blackjack": 'If the farmers refuse controls, the Government will immediately bust their market by selling 10 million tons of surplus feed grains (about 12 percent of its long-insulated stocks). If that's a "free market," so is what the Soviets create when they dump oil or tin. If our farmers should really face this Hobson's choice in the voluntary vote by which Freeman hopes to sanctify his program, they will be in much the same position as a Russian whose "Yes" vote sanctifies the official Khrushchev slate.

Though Freeman's option is a political phony, his program has a certain ruthless logic. It offers to "solve" the farm problem by putting grain growers in the same well-padded corral of controls and subsidies that has kept U.S. tobacco farmers quiet these last 20 years. With artificially high prices, diminishing acreage and thorough policing, tobacco farmers make steady money for less and less work. The only trouble is that the U.S. share of world tobacco exports has fallen from half to a third in 10 years. If Freeman extends the tobacco straitjacket to wheat and feed-grain farmers, they will follow the tobacco farmers into comfortable decline at a time when the United States (and the world) needs more farm exports, not less.

No wonder Freeman's plan has aroused congressional and Farm Bureau hostility. Its chances of passage, in anything like his version, are virtually nil. Congress, as so often before, will try to take the bait in it and reject the penalties, leaving the farmers bribed but unfettered to raise still bigger surpluses for Government bins. But the whole of the Freeman plan is so complex, and the farm experts in Congress so adroit, that few laymen will be able to tell what is happening. The farm scandal is hidden beneath so much technical gobbledygook that Congress has even more room for fraudulent behavior than Freeman.

In this dilemma we are grateful for one new idea in Freeman's program. For dairy farmers he proposes a dollar ceiling on what the Government will shell out—$300 million a year. There's a thought anyone can grasp. Let economy-minded Congressmen think in similar terms. Let them set a dollar ceiling on the whole agricultural budget. Let them cut it down to $5 billion this year, to $4 billion next, and so on, until it is under control again. And let the experts worry about how to share out this dwindling gravy.

It isn't as though its present recipients were starving, or even poor. The American farmers who get most of the subsidies are the most efficient (and richest) in the world. Their habituation to subsidies is ridculous. They can no more be permanently insulated from world prices and remain healthy than any other business can. But as long as the administration is exploiting instead of helping Congress incompetence to solve the farm problem, the path back to economic sanity and free markets can only be blazed with an ax: cut, cut, cut, deny, deny.

The President last week coupled his farm message with a proposal for a new Department of Urban Affairs—certainly a logical request, since 70 percent of Americans now live in urban areas. But can we really consider this seriously until the Department of Agriculture has been cut down to size? We taxpayers had better not set up a new and potentially more expensive lobby in the Cabinet until the agricultural larceny has been stopped.

Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, recently it was my privilege to attend a meeting of representatives of all farm groups at Hutchinson, Kans., at which the administration's proposed farm program, particularly as it applies to wheat, was discussed.

The men attending the meeting are actively engaged in wheat farming or in the storage of wheat. They are practical men. They know what will work and what will not work.

They approved the administration's program in principle and made several specific suggestions for improving the program. I am sure that their suggestions will be carefully considered by the House and Senate Agriculture Committees during hearings on the proposed legislation.

I wish to congratulate Mr. Anson Horning of Larned, president of the Kansas Association of Wheat Growers, for the initiative he displayed in calling the meeting. I also want to express my personal appreciation to the men who took time out from a busy schedule to come to this meeting from all over Kansas.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include a letter from Mr. Horning explaining the purposes of the meeting, a copy of the resolutions adopted, and a news release on the meeting.

KANSAS ASSOCIATION OF
WHEAT GROWERS,
Dodge City, Kans., February 15, 1962.

Hon. J. FLOYD BREEDING,
Committee on Agriculture, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BREEDING: The attached material is being sent to you for your information during your consideration of the administration's Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, particularly as it pertains to wheat.

The resolution and news story are the result of an unusual meeting of farm organizations in Kansas, called by the Kansas Association of Wheat Growers. Two of the three major State farm organizations, the wheat organization, two farmer-owned grain cooperative regionals which represent most of the farmers in the State, and an irrigation association representing irrigation farmers (who also are wheat farmers and livestock operators) in 13 southwest Kansas counties, agreed on the resolution. One major State farm organization dissented.

We hope that this material will be of value to you in your consideration of agricultural legislation, and that the resolution will give you information on the attitude of Kansas farmers toward the administration farm bill under consideration at this time.

Respectfully yours,

ANSON HORNING,
President.

RESOLUTION

Whereas representatives of the Kansas Association of Wheat Growers, the Kansas State Grange, the Kansas Farmers Union, the Farmers Cooperative Commission Company, the Farmers Union Jobbing Association, and the Southwest Kansas Irrigation Association: meeting in Hutchinson, Kans., February 14, 1962, represent a wide area affected by the administration farm bill at present being considered in Washington, D.C.: Be it

Resolved, That this group endorse the overall intent of the administration farm bill to:

1. Bring the production of the agricultural plant into balance with disappearance;
2. Support prices for orderly marketing and maintaining farm income; and
3. Recognize the need for soil conservation in land retirement programs.

We believe this bill offers the most satisfactory machinery for bringing these about at this time; be it further

Resolved, That those working with the bill be urged to:

1. Hold the certificate program to a two-price system for reasons of simplicity, workability, and economy;
2. Make the program for recreational facilities under the land retirement program a voluntary program; and
3. See that certain guidelines or limitations be placed in the bill for
   (a) amounts of grain to be drawn from CCC stocks; and
   (b) payments to be made on diverted acres.

The report above was adopted without opposition in a standing vote by those present at the meeting.

KANSAS AG ORGANIZATIONS ENDORSE OVERALL INTENT OF NEW FARM BILL

Farm organizations in Kansas joined forces Wednesday in endorsing the overall intent of the administration's farm bill now under consideration in Congress. The organizations included two general State farm organizations, two farmer-owned regional grain cooperatives which together cover the State, the State wheat association, and a regional irrigation association. One State general farm organization dissented.

The meeting held in Hutchinson at the Baker Hotel is the second such meeting called by the Kansas Association of Wheat Growers for combined action of farm organizations on legislative action. "We think these meetings should demonstrate to the Nation that farmers can get together on what they want," commented Anson Horning of Larned, president of KAWG.

Invited to the meeting were the heads of farm organizations and boards of directors, who took part in the discussion, as well as individual farmers and legislators. Representatives of organizations who served on the resolutions committee were: Anson Horning, Kansas Association of Wheat Growers; Harry C. Colglazier, of Larned, master, Kansas State Grange; Martin J. Byrne, of Topeka, president, Kansas Farmers' Union; J. H. Dean, of Hutchinson, general manager, Farmers' Cooperative Commission Co.; Pat Nash, of Kansas City, general manager, Farmers' Union Jobbing Association; and Lloyd Lambert, of Liberal, president, Southwest Kansas Irrigation Association. Walter Peirce, of Hutchinson, president of the Kansas Farm Bureau, made the one dissenting report for his State organization.

DISCUSS FARM BILL

Provisions of the administration farm bill were discussed by heads of the organizations at the meeting, by Congressman J. Floyd Breeding, Congressman Bob Dole; James B. Dyeas, executive vice president of the National Association of Wheat Growers, Washington, D.C.; and Grover C. Chappell, USDA staff economist, Washington, D.C.

The speakers took up various parts of the bill, with special emphasis on the wheat and feed grain provisions, and the group discussed the bill and asked questions of the speakers before a committee was appointed to draw up the resolution approved by those at the meeting.

The Farm Bureau minority report received 4 votes out of the 106 farmers and farm organization officials present. The resolution of endorsement for the administration farm bill was accepted without opposition.

LIST AIMS OF BILL

The resolution of the group listed as "the overall intent" of the administration farm bill:

To bring the production of the agricultural plant into balance with disappearance;

Support prices for orderly marketing and maintaining farm income; and

Recognize the need for soil conservation in land retirement programs.

"We believe this bill offers the most satisfactory machinery for bringing these about at this time," the resolution stated.

ASK CHANGES

In its resolution, the group urged that the certificate program be held to a two-price system for reasons of simplicity, workability, and economy. The bill provides that the Secretary of Agriculture could set up a third price bracket on wheat.

The group asked that the program for recreational facilities under the land retirement program be made a voluntary one.

In discussion of the bill, and in its resolution, the group asked that limitations be placed in the farm bill on the amounts of grain to be drawn from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks, and that the amount of payment on diverted acres be spelled out.

MINORITY REPORT

In his minority report rejected by the group, Peirce said the Farm Bureau had set its policy on this type of legislation, and that it would be impossible for him to commit it to an endorsement such as the resolution proposed.

Peirce said he could agree to some overall aims such as maintaining farm income, reducing CCC stocks, and land retirement, but that his organization was opposed to the administration bill. "Because of inadequacies—no future—lower income," he said, referring to Farm Bureau opinions on the bill, "we ask that it be kept in committee."

Billions in School Aid Proposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City-Franklin-Clarion (Pa.) Derrick, Tuesday, February 13, 1962:

BILLIONS IN SCHOOL AID PROPOSED

Expenditure of $5.7 billion of the taxpayers' money over the next 5 years is proposed by President Kennedy in asking Congress to approve an aid to education program of the same expansive nature as that which the solons shunted aside last year.

A major portion of the expenditure would go for classroom construction and teacher pay increases which the President holds essential to avoid a crisis he says now threatens America's public school system.

In the light of the tremendous strides made by States and local communities in advancing the education system, it's difficult to find the crisis about which the President speaks.

For instance, he says that a total of 600,000 classrooms must be constructed during this decade to meet the public school needs. Statistics show that at the current rate of classroom construction, States and local communities will have built almost 700,000 classrooms in the decade—more than the number the President says is needed, and without Federal aid.

Again, the President declared that unless States and local communities get assistance for teacher pay increases "we cannot hope to succeed in our efforts to improve the quality of our children's instruction and to meet the need for more teachers."

With respect to this, it's significant to note the reports compiled by various agencies show that since the turn of the century the pupil-teachers ratio has been cut from 35.6 pupils to 24.4 pupils per teacher. In the past 30 years, employment in public education has increased by 140 percent as compared to 45 percent in private industry. And teachers have received salary increases, in constant dollars, of 106 percent in the same period as compared with a 91 percent gain for all other persons receiving wages and salaries.

Moreover, the number of certified teachers is expected to double in the next decade while the school-age population will increase by an estimated 20 percent.

All in all, it would seem States and local communities are doing a good job in meeting the problems of education and preparing for the future. And it is being done without the risk of giving over control of the school to a Washington bureaucracy which would be the inevitable result of Federal subsidies.

Pittston (Pa.) Dispatch Observes 15th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on February 11, 1962, the Pittston Sunday Dispatch carried a highly informative and interesting narrative of its beginning and progress in the 15 years of its existence. It was indeed most gratifying to read of the impressive growth of that exterprising weekly publication, a growth that was realized by an abiding faith in the city of Pittston and the surrounding area.

In order that others may read of the Dispatch's acomplishments over the past decade and a half, I include the aforementioned article of February 11:

DISPATCH HITS 15TH BIRTHDAY

Today's issue of the Sunday Dispatch is the 52d issue of the 15th year that the Dispatch has been in business.

The Sunday Dispatch was born on the second Sunday of February 1947, and grew and prospered through 15 years via hard work and alert effort by a staff of wonderful people—who managed despite many hardships and handicaps to maintain standards set up by the editor.

STARTED SMALL—GREW BIG

The Sunday Dispatch was begun on a small investment. It was a "let's creep, before we walk, and walk before we run" situation. Original plans for the founding of the Dispatch called for the printing of a mail weekly on Thursdays. This editor felt a Thursday paper would serve no useful purpose coming out with stale stuff in competition with Wilkes-Barre and Scranton daily newspapers serving up fresh news. It was decided to start a Sunday newspaper—local in all respects and with a late deadline—early Sunday morning—so Dispatch readers would get the latest news, as well as commentaries and reviews. The plan—build circulation through readership and advertising revenue would follow. It worked out. Today the Dispatch has the largest circulation of any newspaper in Pittston or coming into Pittston. And merchants who want advertising results—make their way to the Dispatch.

HELPED LOCAL AREA FINANCIALLY

But that is neither here nor there—and we don't think of that as the greatest accomplishment.

Let's make a bit of a summation:

Before the Dispatch was born—nobody in the news media paid much attention to Pittston. The Dispatch gave them competition—they had to look toward Pittson.

The Dispatch with a staff of 12 full-time workers and several part-time workers has a year's payroll of more than $60,000. In addition another $25,000 is distributed annually for distribution of the Dispatch through newstands and carrier boys.

Each year the Dispatch brings thousands of outside dollars into the community through State and county advertising, as well as national advertisements, that wouldn't come to this area if the Dispatch had not been born. This money helps to meet the payroll, as well as pay for the thousands of dollars in purchases the Dispatch makes in the local area.

PROVIDED JOBS FOR MANY

And one of the major points—is the employment provided by the Dispatch.

The editor, who took leave from the Times-Leader Evening News, was the only person on the Dispatch staff when it was formulated. Later we added shop help, news help, and advertising personnel.

These people found their first jobs at the Sunday Dispatch, and were trained at the Dispatch. They were all unmarried when they began their employment, but are now married with families, and the Dispatch is their livelihood.

MANY GRADUATES IN GOOD JOBS

In addition, the Sunday Dispatch was the training ground for shopmen who now have fruitful employment in larger newspapers or in other fields. Among these graduates of the Sunday Dispatch basic training who have well-paying jobs in either Wilkes-Barre or Scranton newspapers are: Tom Hoban, of Duryea; Joseph Rock, of Exeter; Bill Luksha, of Exeter; Bill Haddock, of Avoca; John McAndrew, of Dupont; Joseph Howley, of Pittston; Leonard Polinski, of Pittston; and Joseph Bals, now working in Philadelphia. We hope we didn't miss any of them as we are proud that they went higher in the field, as we know they are happy to have had the opportunity for a start on the Sunday Dispatch.

OTHERS WHO HELPED ALONG THE WAY

There have been many others who were employed along the way who did much for the Sunday Dispatch, and now are in other fields of endeavor. Included among these are Eugene Gibbons, now a successful insurance man in Scranton; George Zorgo, proprietor of the Zorgo Printing Service and his patient wife Lucy; Harry Black, of West Pittston, now with the Nestlé's firm as a salesman; Miss Joanne Killian, of Inkerman, who served as secretary and bookkeeper for 10 years; Lois Kane, who has since married and was the first Sunday Dispatch bookkeeper; Erminio Cefalo, secretary of Fox Hill, one of the big helps in the founding days; Flora Forlenza Jordan, now residing in Baltimore; Carlo Saporito, now with a major firm in Philadelphia; Bob McNamara, our first sports writer; and many other who in ways small and large, aided and encouraged through the years.

GOOD FOR AREA—WE'RE FOR IT

But mostly we are happy that Pittston area has its own real newspaper—willing and anxious to help the people of the region—to fight for the protection of the good name of Pittston—to call the shots for Greater Pittston in the so obvious effort of Wilkes-Barre and Scranton to take away from Greater Pittston its rightful individuality. The Dispatch has performed well in its 15 years, and we could list many accomplishments, but space does not permit.

AND OUR GOOD PARTNER, JOHN

And we would be remiss on this 15th anniversary if we did not mention the man who got the idea first in 1946 for a new newspaper, John C. Kehoe, Sr., who arranged for the original investment. John Kehoe was a great friend to have in your corner, as he was so solidly in the corner of this editor. But as for decision on the newspaper, the founding editor, still here, made them all—leaned on no one, but plugged away toward a hoped for goal of 5,000 paid circulation. The goal has been far exceeded—circulation now 9,000. And we are happy for that, and for the fact that the late John Kehoe, Sr., our founding partner, beamed joyously through the years with each succeeding achievement of the Sunday Dispatch.

Our Trillion-Dollar Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, as the House contemplates legislation to increase our incredible national debt by another $2 billion—the first of two increases to be asked this year, we are told—I would commend to the attention of my colleagues the article which appeared in this morning's Washington Post by our former, brilliant Director of the Budget, the Honorable Maurice H. Stans:

UNCLE SAM FACES $1 TRILLION DEBT

(By Maurice H. Stans)

Treasury Secretary C. Douglas Dillon has asked for a $10 billion increase in the ceiling on our national debt. This would bring it to an alltime high of $308 billion.

The Congress has indicated that it will deal with this request in two installments. An increase of $2 billion will undoubtedly be authorized immediately, as an emergency measure, to permit enough new funding to pay current bills. This will bring the debt total to the magic line of $300 billion.

Above this amount, Dillon will have tougher sailing, and the Congress may give him only a part of the additional $8 billion he wants. Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, longtime champion of solvent government, has announced that his Senate Finance Committee will hold hearings on the state of the Government's financial position before voting any further increases. By the time the hearings are concluded, the Senator will have some shocking news to report to the American people.

INTEREST IS $9 BILLION

The annual interest on the national debt is now running above $9 billion, and for the

last several years this carrying cost, without any payment on the debt itself, has been taking 11 cents of every dollar of Federal taxes collected. And the chances that any of this debt will ever be paid off seem less and less as time goes on.

This is quite a contrast with the past. From the beginning of the Nation in 1789 until recent years, a major objective of every President was to pay off the national debt. It was done once—by Andrew Jackson in 1834. But each succeeding war built the debt to a new plateau; intervening efforts accomplished reductions but never eliminated the entire amount.

Even so, at the end of fiscal 1961, the debt was only a little more than a billion dollars. By the end of World War I, it had soared above $25 billion. From this high point it was reduced in 11 consecutive years, cutting it by more than one-third to $16 billion in 1930.

From there it began an upward climb, through wartime and peacetime, with the budget in the red 26 years out of 32. The depression years increased the debt regularly, and it had reached nearly $50 billion before the outbreak of World War II. At the close of the war it was $270 billion. Three subsequent surpluses by Truman and three more by Eisenhower could not match the costs of the Korean War and the intervening peacetime deficits. The current year's spending will push the debt to $300 billion, or more, and the end is not in sight.

CREDIT CARD GOVERNMENT

Up to now I have been referring only to the interest-bearing debt. But this isn't all that we owe as a nation. By a continuing policy of national extravagance, we have been committing the Government's future resources beyond this to an incredible degree. We have adopted in Washington a program of "credit-card government" that is placing a burden of staggering proportions on our children and grandchildren.

As Director of the Budget, I undertook in 1960 to add up all the liabilities of our Government. Here are some of them. We owe $30 billion in unfunded pensions to retired civilian employees of the Government. We owe almost $40 billion in accrued pensions to retired military servicemen. The total of our present commitments to veterans for future pensions and compensation (not counting many other benefits) is in excess of $300 billion. All of this $370 billion is for past services and in the financial statement of a business would be accounted for among liabilities.

Then there are many other present contractual or legislated Government undertakings that will have to be financed in the future. Taking all of them—housing subsidy contracts, shipping subsidies, the Interstate Highway System, unfinished public works projects, unpaid purchases of military supplies, and many others—this group adds up to more than $150 billion in further bills to be met in the coming years.

SOCIAL SECURITY, TOO

Altogether, counting the interest-bearing debt of $300 billion and the other obligations and commitments I have mentioned, we have placed a mortgage of over $800 billion on our national future to be met in taxes. This does not include untold billions of dollars in guarantees by the Government on housing loans and other mortgages, bank deposits, and other savings and so on.

Even this is not the full story. Under our social security system, we have scheduled a series of benefits that far exceed, in actuarial terms, the resources that would be available at present tax rates. This deficiency which can only be made up out of future tax increases already provided in the law, is another $250 or $300 billion.

This makes the total present undertakings of the Government, to be paid from future taxes, in excess of a trillion dollars. And that is beyond the regular annual costs of defense, welfare, and other Government activities.

This is a national debt of more than $22,000 for every family of four in the country. Quite a spending spree we've been on for the last 30 years, isn't it?

The Crash of Falling Straw

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we all understand the fact that it is impossible to separate government from politics, especially in view of the political repercussions that automatically stem from our decisions here in the Congress.

We are naturally interested in the understanding and interpretation that the public places upon the political occurrences of the day. Since we still are blessed with a government of the people, for the people, and by the people, public opinion is important to all of us. It is my opinion that the Wall Street Journal, in its editorial of Thursday, February 15, provided a public service by discussing a facet of the political tempo of the day in a most practical manner. I include, under unanimous consent, the editorial entitled "The Crash of Falling Straw," as follows:

THE CRASH OF FALLING STRAW

We don't know when we've heard so much noise from the left about the right. And so much nonsense.

Almost anywhere you turn nowadays you can hear someone raising the alarm about the "radical right," conjuring up the specter of a country ready to be taken over by the John Birch Society or by other extremists who want to "repudiate the 20th century." Mostly these outcries have come from Democratic politicians, warning the Republicans about this dangerous infection. But of late even some Republicans themselves have caught up the cry.

The other day, for example, Senator JAVITS, of New York, told the Republicans that his party is in mortal danger of succumbing to "ultraconservatism" and in turning to the "far-out right in search of ideas that would be catastrophic to our social order." And Governor Volpe, of Massachusetts, felt called upon to say that the Republican Party is not so the "party of the far right."

To anyone who takes a realistic look at the political world around him, it's certainly a puzzlement. The Republic may be threatened by a good many things but a sweep of public opinion by the John Birch Society, or anything like it, is not one of them. All anyone has to do is look at the votes. If the "far right" is any place at all it is far out in the left field.

Well, then, what is the explanation for this thunder on the right that everybody professes to be hearing?

One possible clue, it seems to us, lies in an old principle of strategy, as applicable to the field of politics as to any other battlefield. The easiest battle to win is against a strawman. And if you want to make it look like a tremendous victory you've really got to make the strawman look like a formidable foe.

In politics it is always difficult to answer men who ask reasonable questions in a reasonable tone of voice. And it is true that a good many people around the country are beginning to ask some reasonable questions about the trend of our political affairs. You may call these people conservatives if you please. Some of them do wear the label proudly, but most of them are just ordinary people who have some doubts about the ever-increasing Government spending, the ever-growing taxes, the ever-widening activities of the National Government.

When these questions are raised by a Senator BYRD in the Democratic Party or a Senator GOLDWATER in the Republican Party, they are not easily parried. Deep in their hearts, a good many citizens think they make sense. And it's pretty hard to make out a BYRD or a GOLDWATER as a danger to the Republic, just as it was impossible to do it in his time with Senator Taft.

That being the case, the best strategy is to divert the public attention from the reasonable men asking reasonable questions to those on the far fringe who are given to making unreasonable statements. Further, the strategy is improved if their numbers and their power can be made to seem greater than they are. Then the heavy guns can be aimed in this direction, the sound of thunder will make a noisy battle and the "enemy" can be obliterated.

This is such a tried-and-true strategy that we are not at all surprised to see it used again by the liberals, if that is what you choose to call them. If they can just create the illusion of enough "thunder on the far right" they can make the noise drown out the reasonable questions of reasonable men.

But just the same, most of the noise you hear is just the sound of crashing straw.

A Secretary for Cities?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, soon Congress will be called upon to approve or disapprove President John F. Kennedy's Reorganization Plan No. 1 creating a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. This matter has received comment across the land. I had the privilege of testifying before the Committee on Government Operations in support of the reorganization plan, and I intend to support this measure when it comes before the House. Just as the rural areas need a Secretary of Agriculture to give sense and direction to the problems of the farmers and problems related to the production of food and fiber and the distribution thereof, so do cities need a Secretary of Urban Affairs and Housing to give sense and direction to the myriad problems which beset the cities of the United States.

The New York Times, one of the outstanding newspapers, poses the question in an editorial of January 24, 1962, "A Secretary for Cities?" The editorial sets forth the problem and the maneuvering which is taking place to scuttle the President's proposal. The editorial follows:

A SECRETARY FOR CITIES?

The conservative coalition in Congress is getting a fast start this year on its alliance for reaction. It is out to scuttle President

Kennedy's proposal for a new Federal Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, and the chances are substantial that it will succeed.

The Republican policy committee in the House has announced its opposition to the administration bill on the ground that it has "neither need nor merit." The sentiment of Southern Democrats is equally cold. Their hostility stems from their expectation that the Department's first Secretary would be Dr. Robert C. Weaver, a man well qualified for the post who would also become the first Negro in the Cabinet.

A test of the bill's ability to survive will come today in the House Rules Committee, traditional graveyard of legislation with any aura of social innovation. The committee is made up of 10 Democrats and 5 Republicans. Speaker McCormack acknowledges that he has no hope of getting the measure cleared for a House vote without some Republican help—which he ought to get unless the Republicans really have decided to write off the urban vote.

There should be nothing controversial about a department to deal with housing, city planning, and the myriad problems spawned by the chaotic growth of our metropolitan areas. As fewer and fewer people are needed on the land to produce our almost too abundant food supply, the influx into the cities keeps growing. We have, indeed, an entirely new kind of city, sprawling over vast acreages, straddling State lines and difficult to plan, administer, and control. Urban affairs demand as much concentrated Government attention is agricultural affairs ever did. They now touch far more of the life of the Nation.

The new Department is needed. It should not be delayed because of the parochial prejudices of overrepresented country districts or the racial prejudices of those who still seek to repress the Negro nearly a century after the Emancipation Proclamation.

The Contributions of the Land-Grant Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, as an alumnus of Cornell University, one of the early land-grant colleges, I have been long interested in the concept that brought about these institutions which have made such an important contribution to the progress of our Nation.

This year marks the centennial of the act of Congress which created the land-grant college plan, and I include a recent tribute to that concept and its results, in the form of an article published in the Christian Science Monitor of February 1, 1962:

THE LAND-GRANT COLLEGES—POWERFUL THRUST OF DEMOCRACY

(By John T. Caldwell)

The land-grant colleges and universities of the United States were born out of a high estimate of education as an instrument of individual and social progress. They were born with a broad concept of the many different kinds of abilities human beings possess and the value of cultivating them all to the utmost. They have been committed from their beginning in 1862 to the wide dissemination and use of knowledge. They were born from faith in the American people and their great destiny.

How magnificent a concept. No wonder newly developing nations of the world and even old nations undergoing self-appraisal now are scrutinizing higher education in the United States for useful hints to themselves.

The centennial year of the land-grant institutions occurs at a moment when the United States is taking a close look, even an anxious look, at the magnitude and urgency of its own educational task.

In 1862 a national population of 32 million boasted 203 colleges and perhaps 25,000 college graduates, three-fourths of 1 percent, such as they were. Today a rapidly increasing population of 180 million is served by more than 2,000 institutions of higher education enrolling 3,891,000 students and counting millions of alumni. One-fifth of the students are in land-grant colleges and universities. These colleges which were "born to grow" are doing it, dramatically.

IMPACT MEASURED

Today—100 years after the act of Congress creating them—there are 68 land-grant universities and colleges. Some are one with the State university (as in Minnesota), some are separate (as in Mississippi), some function as part of a private institution (as Cornell). Although they comprise in number fewer than one-twentieth of all colleges and universities in the United States, their enrollment is one-fifth of the total. They grant 22 percent of all the bachelor's degrees conferred, 25 percent of the master's degrees, and 38 percent of the doctorates. In engineering 40 percent of all degrees at the bachelor's level are granted by the land-grant institutions, 42 percent of all master's, and 53 percent of the Ph. D.'s. In the vitally important fields of mathematics and the physical sciences 35 percent and 42 percent, respectively of the Ph. D.'s are earned in land-grant colleges. As would be expected, the graduates in agriculture are produced heavily by these institutions: 80 percent of the bachelors, 97 percent of the masters, and all of the doctorates. One-fourth of the doctorates in the arts and languages, in business and commerce, and in professional education are conferred by land-grant institutions.

Twenty-one of the 36 living American Nobel Prize winners who studied in this country earned land-grant degrees.

The enormously productive agriculture of the United States rests directly upon the research and educational effectiveness of the land-grant system. Today 1 American farmworker feeds 23 other people, a marvel in the world and a prerequisite to other advancement. The Agricultural Experiment Stations (dating from the 1887 Hatch Act) and the Co-Operative Extension Service in agriculture and home economics (dating from the Smith-Lever Act in 1914) are integral parts of the land-grant enterprise. The county agent is a man of distinction in American higher education and in rural life. He has also become a peacemaker in combining technical ability with skill in human relations to helping other developing economies of our world.

BASIS PUT TO TEST

Even now, however, the land-grant outlook and philosophy are being tested.

Will these institutions have the resources to grow and to maintain quality at the same time? This is a test of the public will and priority of public purpose.

Do they have the ability to use effectively the resources provided by the people and in a manner which will satisfy an intelligent taxpayer? This is mainly a test of management competence.

Can they provide maximum opportunity for the most brilliant minds while at the same time and often on the same campus provide for the student of lesser but solid ability who has much to gain from higher learning which will be returned in enlarged service to his fellow men? This is a test of educational skill.

Can these institutions meet the insistent demands for applied research and yet have time and money for the constant replenishment of our fundamental knowledge of the why and the wherefore of life and energy and behavior? This is a test of both academic character and public understanding.

Can the tremendous achievements of the land-grant colleges in agriculture be duplicated in facing up to the technological and social problems of an urban population? Will the effective skills typical of our extension philosophy be applied to urban living? This is a test of institutional adaptability and determination to face up to new educational needs and to obtain support for meeting them.

The land-grant colleges face the test of internationalism, meeting the manifold requirements of the Government for forging helpful relationships in depth with the people of the world and their problems—now ours. Not just can they but will they see the needs beyond the immediacy of local enterprise within the respective States and apply their skills and resources to a worldwide campus? This indeed is a test of public vision.

CONCEPT PLACED ON SCALES

All these tests are indeed being met—even brilliantly—in places. Another test, however, has not been resolved. It is a test of the whole concept of public higher education. It is a test more of the taxpaying public than of the institutions themselves. The United States is being tested on whether it wants its land grant and other public institutions to continue to serve generously and deliberately the educational needs of all the people for the benefit of society. No student loan program or a student scholarship program yet proposed substitutes for low-cost public higher education.

Sometimes the public colleges are told to raise their charges to students for tuition to meet their budgetary requirements. The issue is complex. But surely it would be a subversion of the history and purposes and enormous achievements of the public institutions to force them now to remold their open character in imitation of the private and church-related institutions, many of whom desperately need to reduce their charges to students. The availability of low-cost, public higher education in the United States indeed is a measure of contemporary democracy, of political responsibility, and of commonsense.

The powerful thrust of democracy in American higher education so evident today is part and parcel with the forces which produced the land-grant movement.

Education in all ages and places has reflected the controlling notions of what the society itself ought to be or become. The older, stratified societies, aristocratically controlled, or colonially governed, built educational systems accordingly, systems which were restricted in outlook both for the nonprivileged individual and for the society's future.

OPPORTUNITY UNFOLDED

Education in this new land was sooner or later destined to reflect its generous concept of the place of the individual and its constantly expanding ambitions for economic and cultural growth, locally and nationally. In retrospect, however, the reflection seems to have been slow in coming. For during the colonial period and the immediately ensuing preoccupation with nation making, the aristocratic and classical character of education inherited from England and the Continent and which had prevailed for 200 years was dominant.

Then followed a combination of forces operating to open up educational opportunity. Jacksonian democracy, a general intellectual awakening, the stepup of science, industry, and invention, agricultural ferment, and even concern over the dissipation of Federal landholdings, combined to produce dissatisfaction with existing education and pressures for improvement. One of the outcomes was the Morrill Act of 1862. Vetoed earlier by President Buchanan, Justin Morrill's bill was signed into law by President Lincoln July 2, 1862.

This Land-Grant College Act brought into possibility, on the pattern of Michigan's new State Agricultural College (1855), a nationwide pattern of colleges, at least one in each State, "where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classic studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts in such manner as the legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life."

The Government granted each State agreeing to the terms 30,000 acres of Federal land for each Senator and Representative in Congress, which acreage was to be sold to provide a capital fund on the investment of which the State would pay in perpetuity 5 percent annually to support the college.

DEMOCRATIC IN CHARACTER

Whether measured in student enrollment, off-campus instruction and technical assistance, or research of fundamental value to human welfare, this group of institutions has made the Morrill Act probably the most significant single piece of social legislation in U.S. history. Their characteristics are clear.

These colleges are democratic in character. No one of them has ever assumed that it should limit the opportunities of its campus to a narrowly conceived aristocracy of position, intellect, or money. They have assumed on the other hand that as the Nation grew, as knowledge expanded, as the range of competencies required by the society was extended, it was their job to serve these expanded needs of the people. This view persists.

These colleges reflect the spirit of Francis Bacon, who had urged three centuries earlier, but with little success, that knowledge should be found and used to improve the lot of mankind.

The land-grant colleges have never been "ivory towers." They have never been far removed from the people they serve and the needs which have nurtured their growth.

The land-grant colleges and universities illustrate dramatically that the people, the public, through their constituted organs of government, hold the major responsibility for the advancement of knowledge and the education of citizens. These colleges are public, tax-supported institutions. Though their resources are supplemented in important respects by private grants and support, the basic responsibility for their support and the basic commitment of the colleges belong to the people exercised through public channels.

EXAMPLES FOR FEDERAL AID

These institutions are living examples that Federal aid to education can serve the national interest with enormously valuable results and without sacrifice of local self-government or institutional integrity. Indeed the United States today would be immeasurably poorer but for this imaginative Federal action one century ago and its continued support in partnership with the States.

They have assumed also the task of developing high standards as a necessary corollary to serving responsibly the special needs of our time. Counseled admissions and placement, honors programs, more demanding curriculums, strengthened faculties, and deepened research commitments characterize the contemporary public university.

Finally, they have not neglected to defend the great principles which universities have always had to defend, such as freedom for the mind. They know now, as intelligent men have always known and as free men always must know, that the risks of freedom to think and write and learn and speak are fewer and less dangerous than the risks of suppression.

The centennial year of the land-grant colleges and universities of the United States finds them living more intimately than ever with the busy world they helped to create. Nuclear reactors, radio telescopes, mass spectrometers, experimental swine shelters, greenhouses, nursery schools, art studies, language laboratories, television stations, theaters, computers, filmed documents—the full range of human knowledge, curiosity, and endeavor, mark the contemporary mission of this educational system.

CONTRIBUTION TO NATION

Without these colleges, which were originally founded especially to teach "agriculture and the mechanic arts," American agriculture would have developed anyway to some extent; industry would have expanded; the Defense Establishment would have trained a fair number of officers for its reserve and active cadres. No doubt some American pure scientists would have teamed with other innovators and inventors to produce some applied results even useful to the farmer. But let us make no bones about it. The United States would not enjoy the culture nor have the productive capacity that it does today—in farm, forest, skyscraper, or factory—without the contributions of research and the wide dissemination of knowledge to which the resources of the land-grant educational system have been devoted.

The land-grant colleges and universities exist to help unfold the glories of man's possibilities and not to settle for less, to make it possible for all men to look out upon a universe better understood, more kind, more just, more abundant than when these colleges entered the scene 100 years ago.

To this end they are rededicated and beg the sustaining company of all the Nation in the journey ahead.

Statement of Administrator John E. Horne of the Small Business Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, John E. Horne has completed 1 year of service as Administrator of the Small Business Administration and during this first year has done much to revitalize the work and service of SBA and to make it more effective in many areas.

Administrator Horne who has had much experience with the problems of small business and with the Small Business Administration, through his work with the Smaller Defense Plants Administration and with the Senate Small Business Committee, used his experience to good advantage in directing the SBA in his first year as its administrator.

An example of his fine service and the effectiveness of the SBA programs is shown by the fact that in 1961 the SBA made 6,836 business loans which totaled $369 million, which was a 90 percent increase in dollar value and a 70-percent increase in number of loans over the past year. In many other areas of service the SBA has done an equally effective job.

Mr. Horne recently prepared a brief summary of the actions and activities of the SBA during the first year of his administration. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the summary in the Appendix of the RECORD. The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY JOHN E. HORNE, ADMINISTRATOR OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

It is now 1 year since I became Administrator of the Small Business Administration. I thought it might be appropriate on this anniversary to review with you what has been going on in the agency this past year, provide you with a general outlook for small business for the year ahead, and summarize for you the various actions and activities of the SBA itself. In that connection I have had mimeographed the attached summaries.

As you can see from these summaries, the past year has been a very active one for all of us in SBA. Virtually all of our programs are now operating at levels well ahead of a year ago. For example:

Business loans: 6,836 loans for $369 million in 1961, a 90-percent increase in dollar value and a 70-percent increase in number over 1960. Effective December 1, SBA set a temporary limit of $200,000 on business loans, except to defense-oriented industries. This was done to conserve our lending funds, thus enabling us to continue serving the maximum number of loan applicants and at the same time support the administration's expressed policy of bringing the 1963 budget into balance.

Disaster loans: 4,682 disaster loans for $29.7 million, more than double those for 1960. These, of course, vary as the number and seriousness of disasters vary.

Local development company loans: 79 loans for nearly $10.3 million compared with 52 loans for $5.8 million in 1960.

Small business investment companies: 273 SBIC's licensed with capital of $270 million, compared with 110 SBIC's licensed with initial capital of $137.5 million in 1960. At the end of 1961, 448 SBIC's had been licensed with a total capital of $432 million for investment in long-term loans or equity capital for small firms.

Small business procurement: 41,000 proposed Government purchases, totaling $2 billion, were cooperatively set aside exclusively for small business bidding in 1961, an increase of 59 percent over 1960. Actual awards to small business under the set-aside program were nearly 46,000 contracts for $1.5 billion in 1961, a 55-percent increase in awards over 1960.

Certificates of competency: 234 certificates, saving the Government $5.7 million in 1961, as against 151 certificates, saving $1.4 million, in 1960.

Administrative management courses: 367 courses, involving 216 educational institutions and attended by 11,000 small businessmen, compared with 261 courses with 149 schools and attended by 8,000 small businessmen in 1960.

This record was made possible partly by overtime and hard work of SBA's employees. Streamlined procedures and increased awareness of our programs also contributed.

I do not in any sense wish to convey the impression that I am satisfied with what we have accomplished. In the year 1962 and the

years ahead SBA must push steadily forward to strengthen further all of our programs and to work in every way we can to help support and maintain the Nation's small businesses.

Some old problems remain unsolved and new problems continually arise. Some such problems relate to (a) obtaining and maintaining a fair share of Government purchases from qualified small businesses. This is especially pertinent because of the recently stepped-up purchases by the Defense Department, (b) the changing pattern of world trade as evidenced by the Common Market, (c) the necessity that the small business investment company program develop into a stable and influential new financial industry, (d) the many businesses that will be displaced by urban renewal, highways and other construction projects that involve Federal participation, (e) what special consideration, if any, will be given to small businesses in economically depressed areas and, (f) how to obtain a larger share of subcontracting for small businesses.

These and other problems demand constant vigilance and effort.

ECONOMIC POSITION OF SMALL BUSINESS

A marked upturn in the Nation's economy during 1961 brought substantial benefits to small business and the outlook is that 1962 will be a much better year than 1961 for many small businesses.

By the fourth quarter of 1961 the gross national product had increased from the 1961 low point of $500.8 billion to $542 billion—an increase of 8 percent and an all-time high.

Equally as important for small business is the favorable outlook for the future that the business recovery will continue during 1962 with the gross national product rising to $570 billion.

As a result of the business upturn several new records were established in the economy during 1961, and I have no doubt that these records will be eclipsed in 1962.

Retail sales (seasonally adjusted) in the second half of 1961 were at an all-time high of $111.1 billion, compared with $109.2 billion during the second half of 1960. This is of particular importance to small business, since small retailers still comprise the largest single group of small businesses, representing 43 percent of the Nation's small firms.

The number of businesses in operation also increased to a new high of 4,770,000 firms. More than 4,500,000 of these are small firms. In the second and third quarter of 1961 the number of firms in operation increased by 15,000 in each quarter, and most of the new businesses were small firms.

The improved business activity brought renewed confidence to small business and encouraged many of them to seek new opportunities, to modernize and expand. This is clearly reflected in SBA's business loan applications which hit a new high of 13,680 for the year, 55 percent greater than in 1960.

The confidence in the future businessmen now feel is also reflected in the rise of business inventories which increased at a seasonally adjusted annual rate of $4.5 billion during the fourth quarter 1961, compared with a decrease of $4 billion in the first quarter. Thus the annual rate of accumulation of business inventories increased $8.5 billion from the first quarter to the fourth quarter. This shift gives further assurance that there is a basis for full recovery and small businesses, along with other groups, will continue to benefit.

The industrial production index (1957=100), seasonally adjusted, increased from a low of 102.1 in February to a new high of 115.2 in December. Manfacturers' new orders for durable goods increased from a low of $12.9 billion in January a year ago to $16.4 billion in December, and the average workweek in manufacturing industries showed a marked increase. Thus manufacturing is in an upward trend, creating new jobs.

Business profits are also up. Corporate profits before taxes increased to $47.2 billion in the third quarter of 1961 compared to $43.2 billion in the same quarter of 1960 and $39.6 billion in the first quarter of 1961.

Data on earnings of smaller manufacturers (those with assets under $1 million) as compared with the larger manufacturers show that the smaller firms were harder hit by the recession than the larger ones. Smaller corporations' earnings after taxes decreased from $534 million in the first three quarters of 1960 to $411 million in the same period of 1961, a decline of 23 percent. For the same period, earnings after taxes of larger corporations decreased from $11,151 million to $10,291 million, a decrease of almost 8 percent.

However, continued expansion of the economy in 1962 should provide a favorable climate for small business growth.

SBA ASSISTANCE TO AREAS OF SUBSTANTIAL UNEMPLOYMENT

During 1961 SBA took the following actions to stimulate business activity and create additional jobs in areas of substantial unemployment:

1. Assigned high priority to requests for Government contracts, loans, and other assistance to small businesses and development companies in these areas.

2. On April 5 interest rates on business and development company loans in these areas were reduced to 4 percent. This move was made to help speed business recovery and stimulate small business expansion and the creation of new jobs in these areas. Since then, through December 31, SBA has approved more than 2,358 loans at 4 percent interest in these areas for a total of $141,417,573. In addition, the Agency approved 29 State and local development company loans, totaling $4,557,199, in these areas at the 4 percent interest rate.

In line with the President's directive to increase foreign trade, and recommendations of the White House Committee on Small Business, SBA has developed a program to help small potential exporters. Under a cooperative agreement with the Department of Commerce, SBA now includes foreign trade in its business opportunity conferences, administrative management courses, publications, and research programs.

SBA, by delegation from the Area Redevelopment Administration, now processes loan applications and also provides redevelopment area agencies with technical information and counsel.

SBA PROGRAM ACHIEVEMENTS AND COMPARATIVE DATA

Business loans

Unprecedented activity in SBA's business loan program during 1961 resulted from adoption of policies and procedures which made financial assistance available to a greater number of small firms and which materially reduced processing time on loan applications.

In September of 1961, SBA adopted a new, streamlined loan plan designed to provide a larger volume and faster handling of loans to small businesses through increased participation with private banks—thus providing needed capital to more small firms with less expenditure of Federal funds. This simplified bank loan participation plan has already met with remarkable success. We seek in every way to obtain even greater bank participation in the future and I am confident that the very fine cooperation we are now receiving from the banks will continue to increase.

As of January 1, 542 loans for $33,159,000 had already been approved under the plan. Applications under this plan are continuing to come in at an increased rate. About one-fourth of all of our business loan applications are now under this plan.

During 1961 SBA approved 6,836 business loans for $369 million, an increase of 70 percent in number and 90 percent in dollar value over the 4,012 loans for $195 million approved in 1960. The 13,680 loan applications received in 1961 were 54.5 percent greater than the 8,853 applications received during 1960.

Disaster loans

The greatest natural disaster during 1961 was Hurricane Carla, which devastated wide areas along the gulf coast last September. To help owners of homes and businesses rebuild after this disaster, SBA opened 10 emergency loan offices in the more heavily damaged areas. As of December 31, SBA had approved 3,323 disaster loans for $13,801,626 to rebuild homes and businesses damaged or destroyed by this hurricane. On an overall basis SBA approved during 1961, 4,682 disaster loans—including drought and excessive rainfall disaster loans—for a total of $29.7 million. In number, this was more than double the 2,137 disaster loans for $17.8 million approved in 1960.

Development company loans

The SBA makes loans to State or local development companies to assist communities in the establishment of new businesses, or help existing small businesses expand. Funds provided by SBA are augmented by funds raised locally, or by the State development company. Since August 1958, when the program started, applicants report that 8,973 new jobs have been created.

During 1961 the SBA set new records both in number of development company loan applications received and loans approved. During the year SBA received 109 applications for loans from local development companies and approved 79 loans for $10,294,364. In 1960 SBA received 65 loan applications and approved 52 loans for $5,857,519. Five applications for loans were received from State development companies in 1961, and four loans were approved for $3,490,000. During 1960 four applications were received from State development companies and four applications were approved for $3,300,000.

Small business investment companies

Nineteen hundred and sixty-one was a most successful year for the establishment of SBA-licensed small business investment companies, which make long-term loans or provide equity capital for small businesses.

During the year SBA issued licenses to 273 companies with capital of $270 million. At year's end 448 SBIC's had been licensed of which 442 were in force and these companies had total capital of $432 million. During 1960 SBA received proposals to form 220 SBIC's and issued licenses to 110 companies with total capital of $137.5 million.

In early September SBA issued a complete recodification of the regulations governing the operations of SBIC's arranged according to purpose and function for easier reference. At the same time additional regulations designed to tighten certain areas of operations were adopted. Among these were restrictions on affiliated transactions; interlocking directorships, officerships, or the ownership of more than 10 percent of the stock in more than one licensee. In addition, a number of refinements were adopted to clarify the scope of the allowable equity investments permitted by the regulations.

The Small Business Investment Company Act was amended in October and subsequently SBA adopted new regulations to complement this legislation. The new regulations set forth how SBIC's may obtain up to $400,000 to be used as part of their paid-in capital and allow SBIC's to undertake financial investments in small businesses with individual investors and lenders as well as with banks.

In addition, these new regulations limit the number of SBIC's that may participate in a financial investment; place new conditions under which SBIC's may borrow from SBA for operating funds; set forth certain standards for showing that the requested funds are not available from private sources on reasonable terms; prohibit investment advisory or management services on a continuing basis with any person or organization which provides the same or similar services to another SBIC; call for more detailed information on officers, directors, or owners of 10 percent or more of the stock of a proposed SBIC, and establish criteria for use in carrying out the $500,000 limitation on investment in any one small business by an SBIC.

The new legislation also authorized SBA to conduct investigations, to suspend licenses, and issue cease and desist orders after administrative hearings. New enforcement regulations were adopted dealing with the investigatory process and rules of practice were adopted governing the adjudicative hearings.

SBA's internal procedures for processing SBIC license applications; applications for funds available under the act; and post-licensing amendments called for by the regulations, were streamlined to permit more rapid processing.

Government contracts assistance

During 1961 SBA set new records for both set-asides for exclusive bidding by small firms on Government contracts and contract awards under the set-aside program.

Prime Government contracts numbering 41,016 were earmarked for exclusive bid by small businesses in 1961 and totaled more than $2 billion. This represents a 59 percent increase over 1960.

As a result of military and civilian proposed purchases cooperatively earmarked for small concerns in 1961, small businesses received 45,856 prime Government contracts valued at $1,475,144,000. This represents an increase of 54.4 percent over a year ago reports, when 25,074 prime contracts valued at $954,899,000 went to small businesses. It should be noted that in spite of the steep rise in set-asides the total dollar value, percentagewise, of all contracts let to small business barely remained constant.

This up-turn in Government contracting opportunities to small business is due to cooperative programs developed by SBA, DOD, GSA, and other Government agencies as a result of the President's order for increased procurement opportunities for the small business segment of the economy.

Certificates of competency

During calendar year 1961 SBA issued 234 certificates of competency to small firms to assist them in obtaining Government contracts on which they were low bidders but were having difficulty obtaining the contracts because their competency to perform was questioned. As a result of the issuance of these COCs the Government saved an estimated $5.7 million. The savings represents the difference in bid price between the low bidder who received the contract with SBA assistance, and the next lowest bidder. During calendar year 1960 SBA issued 151 certificates of competency and the estimated saving to the Government was about $1.4 million.

Small business size standards

The Small Business Administration is responsible for determining which firms within an industry or field of operation are "small businesses" for the purpose of receiving loans, Government contracts, and other assistance from the agency.

During the past 12 months, SBA acted to carry out this responsibility more effectively and to liberalize its standards for concerns in areas of substantial unemployment; to simplify the size standards and perhaps reduce their number; and to modify certain existing standards and develop new ones. Specifically, the agency:

1. Centralized in its office of size standards the authority to determine which businesses are small for the purpose of receiving SBA assistance.

2. Amended its small business size standards regulation to permit a 25-percent size increase for firms doing business in areas of substsantial unemployment.

3. Began a review of the present complex size standards in an effort to make them more understandable and useful to small business, and perhaps ultimately to consolidate them into a few standards for the various small business programs.

4. Held three industry hearings to determine whether existing standards for such industries should be modified or new size standards established and began development of size standards for other industries, for cooperatives, and for small business pools.

No Cuban Imports From Anywhere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the President's recent proclamation banning imports from Cuba came as good news to the Nation. The people of Florida have long supported such an embargo because the importation of Cuban goods supplied Fidel Castro with additional funds to finance his Communist subversion in this hemisphere.

House passage of H.R. 8465, to ban trade with Cuba, was unanimous, and stands as a measure of support for the President's action.

The city of Tampa, Fla., has accepted the Cuban import ban as a cold war measure even though the city's main industry, cigar manufacturing, will be severely affected when present supplies are exhausted.

Yet does the President's embargo apply to Cuban goods manufactured into another form, then shipped into the United States from another nation? For example, could Canada import Cuban tobacco, manufacture the same kind of cigars Tampa does, then ship them into the United States to take advantage of our already established market?

The Tampa Tribune, one of Florida's leading newspapers, has published an editorial which I believe represents a highly reasonable attitude toward the Cuban embargo. Its editors have stated that if Cuban goods come into the United States in any form, the effect of the embargo is lost.

I agree with this position, and include the editorial in the RECORD as a part of my remarks:

NO CUBAN IMPORTS FROM ANYWHERE

In ordering an embargo effective last week against all imports of Cuban products into this country, President Kennedy's stated purpose was to dry up the stream of American dollars which helped sustain communism's base in this hemisphere.

This purpose is sound. Tampa's Havana-cigar industry, which would suffer most from the embargo, accepted it as a necessary measure in the cold war.

But disturbing reports from Washington say the embargo dam has some large holes in it. Under present regulations, apparently, Cuban tobacco can be shipped to other countries, made into cigars and then imported into the United States. The Canadian cigar industry, particularly, is said to be in position to grab for the American market with Cuban tobacco when Tampa factories exhaust their present stocks in a year or so.

To permit Canada or any other country to sell Cuban-tobacco cigars in the United States would be grossly unjust to Tampa (and other American) manufacturers and incredibly foolish from the standpoint of national defense. The strategic purpose of the embargo would be largely nullified, for Castro would continue getting dollars in a roundabout way.

It would seem to us a relatively simple matter for President Kennedy to amend his embargo order to prohibit the importation of any products from anywhere which are made wholly or in part from Cuban materials. Cigar importers could be required to certify that their products contained no Cuban tobacco, on penalty of losing their import license for deception.

If the present legal powers of the President do not permit this extension of the embargo order, then Congress has the duty to provide the necessary authority.

Congressional sentiment, as previously reflected, should accomplish such legislation in quick order. Last year the House overwhelmingly adopted a bill by Congressman PAUL ROGERS, of West Palm Beach, to cut off Cuban trade. Although the Senate did not have an opportunity to act before the session ended, Senator SMATHERS testified at a hearing that he believed 90 percent of the Senators shared his sentiment for a tight embargo.

We would expect Senator SMATHERS and HOLLAND and the entire Florida House delegation to take the lead in urging President Kennedy to tighten the embargo and, if he lacks the authority, to propose immediate legislation to grant it.

Tampa is entirely willing to lose business dollars if the loss helps strengthen freedom and weaken communism; any patriotic community would feel the same. But if Tampa sees its lost dollars going to Canada or West Germany or Spain, thence into Castro's treasury, it will feel defrauded, and rightly so.

Washington may not be much concerned with Tampa's feeling. It should be concerned, however, with the effectiveness of national policy—and it is a well-established fact that a dam full of holes is not very effective.

Editorial Tribute to Bruce Cook, Editor of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, a distinguished New Jersey journalist was recently named "Editor of the Year" by the New Jersey League of Weekly Newspapers. He is Mr. Bruce Cook, editor of the Hudson Dispatch in

Union City, N.J. Mr. Cook has made many contributions to journalism in the Garden State since he began working for a school newspaper during his high school days in Rahway, N.J. A tribute to him, which appeared in the January 19 issue of Jersey Parade, describes his career and his contributions. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO BRUCE COOK

(By M. Martin Turponjian)

I feel signally honored to announce that A. Bruce Cook, editor of the Hudson Dispatch, of Union City, one of New Jersey's most progressive daily newspapers, has been proclaimed "Editor of the year" by the New Jersey League of Weekly Newspapers, Inc., of which Col. Mrs. Arthur Lyons, editor of Spotlight, coast-to-coast picture news weekly is chairman of the board of directors, Dr. Clara K. Aszody, editor of Hungarian Journal, of West Orange, is the chairman of the board of trustees, and M. Martin Turpanjian is the president.

A. Bruce Cook is the "Real McCoy" as the Scotchmen would say. He is honest to the core, sincere in every respect, and possesses a dynamic personality and yet his hat always fits his head.

A. Bruce Cook was born on October 19, 1898, or 63 years ago in Rahway, Union County, N.J. He graduated from Rahway grammar and high schools. It was in high school that he first became interested in reporting and editing, serving as the co-editor of the high school yearbook, and in the same capacity in the publication of the high school newspaper. His actual newspaper career started in February 1917, or 45 years ago when he was a reporter for Richmond Virginian while a student at Richmond College, now known as the University of Richmond, Richmond, Va. Immediately after entering Richmond College, he joined the staff of Richmond Collegian, the weekly newspaper of the college. He was elected editor in 1920 and 1921.

During his college career, Mr. Cook was official football reporter for his college, and contributed sports articles to Richmond newspapers. Upon leaving Richmond College in 1921, he became a police reporter for the Baltimore American. He returned to New Jersey and was employed by Elizabeth Daily Journal, one of the best newspapers in New Jersey in 1922, after which he became editor of Rahway Record, a semiweekly in his hometown.

In 1925 Mr. Cook became advertising and publicity director for a real estate firm in Sarasota, Fla., and became a partner in another weekly newspaper at Bradenton, Fla. He also served as telegraph editor on Tri-City News, of Lanatee, Fla.

A. Bruce Cook is a veteran of World War I, having been a second lieutenant in U.S. Infantry. He is a member of Weehawken Post, American Legion and Lafayette Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons of Rahway. He is married to the former Miss Ida M. Schmidt who was for 11 years private secretary to late William Rubel, publisher of Hudson Dispatch and the present publisher, James J. McMahon. He resides with his wife at 1090 Briar Way, Palisade, N.J.

The name of A. Bruce Cook has been placed in the "Hall of Fame of New Jersey League of Weekly Newspapers, Inc," because of the fact he is honest to the core and a square shooter in all his dealings with the masses and the classes. He has been a member of the editorial staff of Hudson Dispatch for a period of 33 years, having become its assistant city editor in 1928 after having served as telegraph editor in 1927 on Elizabeth Times.

In 1935 Mr. Cook was promoted to city editor of Hudson Dispatch and in September 1941, Mr. Cook was advanced to the position of managing editor. Mr. Cook was promoted to editor in 1960.

Mr. Cook's literary editorial style is arresting in its rare simplicity of expression. He has a natural bent for intellectual brevity. He does not drift into a wilderness of verbosity. He has the power to concentrate on the topic or subject matter with a profound sense of specific concentration of thought. He is dedicated to the factual bases of pure unadulterated objectivity. His editorials always maintain the sober meticulous dignity of a scholar just seeking to present the facts of life and the moral value of our modern social order through the fundamental medium of simple truth. In his personal life he is a natural humanist. He has a powerful personal sense of magnetism. He is an inherent realist. He has strong passionate ideals and he has the courage to express them fearlessly but with a sense of rare tactfulness. He is a veritable genius in saying the right thing at the right time.

Like the Scotchmen would say, Mr. A. Bruce Cook is the "Real McCoy." He embodies in his cameolike noble character sterling credo and honest conviction that glorifies the Hudson Dispatch as being one of the most outstanding daily newspapers in America.

The Internal Threat to the American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to share with my colleagues the thinking of a great American, the Honorable Ezra Taft Benson on a vital subject, "The Internal Threat to the American Way of Life":

THE INTERNAL THREAT TO THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

(By Ezra Taft Benson)

My fellow Americans, we are in the midst of continuing international crisis. The outlook for world peace and security is dark indeed. The gravity of the world situation is increasing almost daily. The United Nations seem unable to settle the troubles of the world. In truth we are faced with the hard fact that the United Nations seems to have largely failed in its purpose. Yes, the days ahead are sobering and challenging.

We live today in an age of peril. It is an age in which we are threatened with the loss not only of wealth and material prosperity, but of something far more precious—our freedom itself. The very thing that distinguishes man from the beasts—his freedom to act, freedom to choose, is threatened as never before by a total and atheistic philosophy of life known as communism.

Never before in the history of our country has there been a greater need for all of our people to take a little time to discover what is happening in the world. Every day decisions are being made affecting the lives of millions of human beings. We now need, as much as during any crisis, the kind of courageous leadership which J. W. Hamilton called for when he said:

"How much now we need a leadership that will tell the truth and talk straight, not about what is expedient or even what is advantageous to American interests, but about what is everlastingly right, and call our people to a crusade for it, and pledge America to the defense of it, so that all nations will be convinced that we mean it. We need men who will ignore the consequences, tell the truth, and take a long chance with God." ("Ride the Wild Horses.")

Such leadership must not be expected merely from those who serve in high offices. This is the kind of leadership we should be cultivating at every level—among parents, teachers, students, judges, the various professions, businessmen, laborers, technicians, ministers—all of us need to join a crusade to develop men and women who talk straight, tell the truth and who are willing to take a course deserving of God's blessings.

A genuine leader tries to stay well informed. He is a person who acts on principle rather than expediency. He tries to learn from all human experience measured against revealed principles of divine wisdom. As a rule, a good leader is not easily deceived.

What has been lacking in our culture that has allowed the Communists to deceive so many of our people so many different times? Perhaps part of it has been ignorance, another part misinformation, and certainly an important part has been apathy-complacency. But whatever the lack has been, this is the kind of school which is designed to do something about it.

Just a short time ago Fidel Castro broadcast to the world his boastful confession that he has been a hard-core Communist all of his adult life. He gloried in the fact that he had been able to confuse and deceive many people simply by saying he was not a Communist. And because there were people in this and other countries who believed his false assertions, he was able to establish a Soviet beachhead only 90 miles from our shores. Americans must face the cold hard fact that Fidel Castro was encouraged and supported in his seizure of Cuba. Why? Simply because many Americans were led to believe the falsehood that he would resist Soviet influence and restore the basic freedom of the Cuban people. A few of us issued early warnings based on unimpeachable evidence. Two U.S. Ambassadors repeatedly warned that Castro was part of the Communist camp and that he was working for the Communist conquest of Cuba. These voices went unheeded.

This is merely a repetition of the same deceitful pattern which was used after World War II to have us tolerate revolutionary Communists in China, to accept them as agrarian reformers and allow them to seize and enslave some 450 million people on the Chinese mainland.

This is the same deceitful pattern which we have been asked to accept in the Congo, in Laos, in British Guiana. In fact, everywhere the Communist conspiratorial machinery is preparing for a seizure of power, we are assured there is no immediate danger from communism. We are told that the high political officials in these countries, who surround themselves with known Communist advisers are merely trying to reconcile the various political factions and make their governments more representative. Later, after each country is taken over by the Fidel Castros, we are then assured that these men betrayed the revolution. Research subsequently reveals that these men had been hard-core Communists for many years. Those who believed them, once more lament, "I wonder how they deceived us?"

To me, the important question is, "Are we going to let them deceive us any longer?"

To the true Communist, nothing is evil if it is expedient. Being without conscience or honor, he feels completely justified in

using whatever means are necessary to achieve his goal: force, trickery, lies, broken promises, mayhem, and individual and mass murder.

Let us have no illusions about them. Their leader has told us bluntly their purpose is not alone to enslave us; they want to bury us.

What we face today is not just a cold war, not just a struggle for the control of land, sea, air, and even outer space, but total competition for the control of men's minds. Unless we meet it and defeat it, we shall almost inevitably one day face the loss of all that we hold dear.

In less than half a century this evil system has gained control over one-third of mankind and it is steadily pursuing its vicious goal of control over all the rest of the world. It is time, and past time, for us to be alarmed.

Latin America does not believe that suppression is the road to freedom.

Less than 15 yars ago communism was not a powerful force in Latin America. Today it is not only strongly present there as an enemy to be reckoned with—it is openly allied with a government located on an island only about 90 miles south of Key West, Fla.

The only political party now functioning in Cuba is the Popular Socialist Party—the Communist Party under another name.

Cuba is being used as a funnel through which Communists are infiltrating other American republics.

True to Communist and dictator tradition, the Cuban Government has deprived its people of the rights of a free press, free elections, and the protection of other fundamental human rights.

How did this situation come about? How has it been possible for this completely warped philosophy in such a short time to reach its present position of influence in the world? How is it possible for communism to be here and now moving into Africa, pressing upon all of Asia, threatening the Middle East and increasingly becoming a danger in the Western Hemisphere?

There are, of course, many reasons. Some nations have failed to provide for the advancement and desperate physical needs of their people. Others have failed to recognize the worth of the individual. But is it not perhaps true, that the biggest reason of all is the failure of Western civilization to live up to its Judaic-Christian ideals?

Is it perhaps true that, as Dr. Charles Malik, the great Lebanese leader and former President of the United Nations General Assembly, has said:

"The deepest crisis of the West is the crisis of faith. Western civilization is doomed until, jolted out of its complacency, self-satisfaction and sense of apartness, it rediscovers and reaffirms what is genuinely human and universal in its own soul."

We must revivify Western ideals and in particular the ideals of our own great Nation. We must call back the spirit of the dauntless leaders of the past. We must meet our present-day challenge not with softness and complacency, but with the depth, wisdom, and daring that characterized America in the days of old.

We have a rich history to guide us. Think back with me a moment to the year 1823. In that year, James Monroe, of Virginia, was President. John Quincy Adams, of Massachusetts, was Secretary of State. These two men formed and announced policy which has profoundly influenced the development of our entire hemisphere.

Here was the situation that called forth this policy, known as the Monroe Doctrine, in 1823.

Several of what are now the Latin American republics had by force of arms newly won their independence from Spain and Portugal. Among them were Colombia, Mexico, Chile, and Brazil.

Meantime a number of the sovereigns of Europe were seeking to enforce the divine right of kings with the express purpose of putting an end to the system of representative government. France, accordingly, had proceeded to restore the rule of Ferdinand VII in Spain. Now these countries proposed to overthrow the new and independent governments in Latin America.

This our Government refused to permit. It said so plainly in the celebrated Monroe Doctrine. The heart of the Monroe Doctrine consisted of these words: "The American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintained, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power."

And the Doctrine went on to spell out clearly just what was meant as follows:

"The political system of the allied powers is essentially different * * * from that of America. We owe it, therefore, to candor, and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers, to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety."

Now there is a statement which might well be engraved in all the capitols of all the countries in this hemisphere today. Every word in it is as applicable today as it was 138 years ago.

Surely if it were true a century and a half ago that European monarchy was essentially different from our American system of representative government, it is even more true today that the Communist system is totally different, totally incompatible, totally inimical to our free way of life.

We are eminently justified in declaring that we should consider any attempt on the part of the Communists to extend their system to any part of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety.

Moreover, the Monroe Doctrine went on: "Nor can anyone believe that our southern brethren if left to themselves, would adopt it (this system) of their own accord." Here again the words of the Monroe Doctrine ring true.

It is almost unthinkable that any people would knowingly and willfully take on themselves the yoke of Communist oppression. No nation, has ever done so yet. If large masses of the Cuban people have done so it is because they have been duped or coerced.

This Monroe Doctrine has been the continuing policy of our Nation for almost a century and a half.

It has been reaffirmed by many American Presidents.

We are on solid, traditional American ground in demanding that the Communists should not attempt to extend their political system to this side of the Atlantic Ocean.

If time permitted I could show that in recent years the principles of the Monroe Doctrine have been strengthened by various joint agreements among the American nations. These should be invoked.

The Communists bring to the nations they infiltrate a message and a philosophy that affects human life in its entirety. Communism seeks to provide what in too many instances a lukewarm Christianity has not provided—a total interpretation of life. Communists are willing to be revolutionary; to take a stand for this and against that. They challenge what they do not believe in—customs, practices, ideas, traditions. They believe heatedly in their philosophy.

But our civilization and our people are seemingly afraid to be revolutionary. We are too broadminded to challenge what we do not believe in. We are afraid of being thought intolerant, uncouth, ungentlemanly. We have become lukewarm in our beliefs. And for that we perhaps merit the bitter condemnation stated in the Book of Revelation 3:16: "So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold or hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth."

This is a sad commentary on a civilization which has given to mankind the greatest achievements and progress ever known. But it is even a sadder commentary on those of us who call ourselves Christians, who thus betray the ideals given to us by the Son of God Himself. Again, I ask, are we going to permit the atheistic Communist masters, fellow travelers and dupes to deceive us any longer?

There is a deception going on in our country this very moment which is just as dangerous to the United States as the false pretensions of Fidel Castro were to Cuba. It is amazing to me that some of our citizens seem to take special delight in ridiculing the warnings of Government investigators and the cry of alarm which comes from Iron Curtain refugees when they see how the United States is being led carefully down the trail of disaster.

Clear back in 1953 the Jenner committee published a report on June 30 of that year which should have sobered the entire country. This report stated:

"1. The Soviet international organization has carried on a successful and important penetration of the U.S. Government and this penetration has not fully been exposed.

"2. This penetration has extended from the lower ranks to top-level policy and operating positions in our Government.

"3. The agents of this penetration have operated in accordance with a distinct design fashioned by their Soviet superiors.

"4. Members of the conspiracy helped to get each other into government, helped each other to rise in government, and protected each other from exposure. (The first Communist cell in government was organized in the U.S. Department of Agriculture in the 1930's.)

"* * * * *

"6. In general, the Communists who infiltrated our Government worked behind the scenes—guiding research and preparing memorandums on which basic American policies were set, writing speeches for Cabinet officers, influencing congressional investigations, drafting laws, manipulating administrative reorganization—always serving the interests of their Soviet superiors.

"* * * * *

"12. Policies and programs laid down by members of this Soviet conspiracy and still in effect within our Government, and constitute a continuing hazard in our national security."

Eight years have passed since that warning was given, but the American people have not yet insisted upon the house-cleaning which is so long overdue. In this year, 1961, that fearless and distinguished American, J. Edgar Hoover, testified before the House Appropriations Committee and said:

"The Soviet intelligence services have reorganized, multiplied their contacts with the American people, and have become aggressively bolder in spearheading their espionage offensive against the United States." (FBI appropriation hearing, March 6, 1961, p. 49.)

Speaking of Communist front organizations, he said:

"They represent transmission belts through which the Communist Party furthers its conspiratorial designs. They have infiltrated every conceivable sphere of activity: youth groups; radio, television, and motion picture industries, church, school, education, and cultural groups; the press, nationality minority groups, and civil and political units." (FBI appropriation hearing, March 6, 1961, p. 49.)

Of course, such groups can have only one purpose and that is deception. The only way to avoid being deceived is to get the facts. Here are people who would try to hide the facts from us and replace the truth with a falsehood. They want us to believe that America is a failure, that her system of capitalistic free enterprise is doomed, that she must remedy her failures by adopting Marxist theories of collectivized control. I recognize these voices. I heard them in 43 nations which I visited in the past few years. I heard them often during my 8 years in Washington. None of them came to me in the name of communism or even socialism, but they came. And while many of us fought them and resisted them on every front, nevertheless, it was alarming to discover how many others were willing to believe and follow. Why do otherwise loyal Americans believe and follow? Because these voices came from masters of deception.

Now supposing a person came along and said, "I am in favor of doing awey with competitive markets and private property, of setting communes in each locality, of taking all the land away from the farmers, of taking over all the steel mills, all the electric power plants, all the automotive industry, the banks, the railroads, the newspapers, the television and radio stations, all the mines, and so forth." I am sure such a proposal would meet with immediate and united resisitance by the vast majority of the American people. But supposing this same person came and said: "It is in the public interest and to the benefit of each citizen if we make industry, the farms, and all means of production and distribution operate for the benefit of all the people and not just for the private profit of a few stockholders." Immediately this line of deception receives a wave of support. It is occurring today here in the United States. It occurred in England, France, and Eastern Europe as well as the Scandinavian countries. It occurred in Russia.

If you ask the individual who made this last statement whether or not he is a Communist or Socialist he will undoubtedly reply with great indignation that he is a loyel American—that he is very anti-Communist. He will generally say he merely wants to see our Nation achieve marvelous new goals which will make our present standard of living appear meager indeed.

When you ask this individual where his plan has been tried and proven successful, he will tell you it is a plan of the future and its virtues are yet to be demonstrated. And if you press him even further by pointing out that his program sounds exactly like the Marxist-socialism of Europe he may become extremely indignant and call you a reactionary who doesn't want to see the country progress.

Now this accusation, of course, is as false as it is unfair. All of us are anxious to see our country progress, but we want to know by what means. The whole American concept of progress, which has outstripped every other nation on earth, is based on certain fundamental principles which these men now ask us to abandon. Certainly we are entitled to challenge such proposals when they are asking us to give up what has worked so well and substitute something which they merely hope will work.

What are these fundamental principles which have allowed the United States to progress so rapidly and yet remain free?

First, a written Constitution clearly defining the limits of government so that government will not become more powerful than the people.

Second, an economic system which is characterized by:

Free enterprise—the right to venture, the right to choose;

Private property—the right to own, develop and enjoy; and

A market economy—the right to exchange and to profit.

Third, building an open society where each individual enjoys the greatest opportunity to improve himself, to travel, to become educated, to invent, to compete, to build, to speak, to worship, and to pursue happiness in whatever way the individual finds most satisfying and worthwhile.

Fourth, assigning government the role of referee rather than competitor—giving it enough power to provide peace, order, and security but not enough power to rob the people of their liberty or take away their property without due process of law.

Of course, it immediately becomes apparent that if certain people wanted to seize control of private property, if they wanted to nationalize the land, if they wanted to have the government take over all the industries, the schools, the transportation complex, and communications network, the way to do it would be by due process of law. Therefore, certain people have set out to do this very thing.

Is this possible? It is indeed, and every American should know it. As the Marxist-Socialists declared over 70 years ago: "Convert the electorate and capture the county councils." ("Fabian Essays on Socialism." Doubleday & Co., New York, 1960, p. 190.) More recently Khrushchev has emphasized the same thing. In 1956 he said:

"In this connection the question arises of whether it is possible to go over to socialism by using parliamentary means * * *. The forces of socialism and democracy have grown immeasurably throughout the world, and capitalism has become much weaker * * *. In these circumstances the working class, by rallying around itself the toiling peasantry, the intelligentsia, all patriotic forces * * * is in a position to defeat the reactionary forces opposed to the popular interest, to capture a stable majority in parliament, and transform the latter from an organ of bourgeois democracy into a genuine instrument of the people's will." (House Committee on Un-American Activities, "Facts on Communism," vol. I, pp. 114–115.)

What Khrushchev is talking about is what he calls peaceful victory of socialism, or seizing the natural and human resources of the earth by due process of law.

He is not alone in this ambition. In this project he is paralleling the position of another branch of Marxism which might be called the Social Democrats since this is the name they took in Russia and most of Europe. Lenin himself helped to organize the Social Democratic Party in Russia but in 1903 he set up his own branch of the party and called them Bolsheviks which became the vanguard of revolutionary violence in the party.

But notice what happened in Russia. It was the Social Democrats, or the ones who wanted to seize power by due process of law who organized the original soviets, who concentrated the power over the industrial workers into a few hands, who overthrew the czar, and who set up conditions in Russia from March to October 1917, which made it possible for the Communists or Bolsheviks to move in with force and violence and take over Russia in November 1917. Notice that the Social Democrats did their organizing in the name of the welfare of the people. After they had provided the basic concentration of power, the forces of Lenin seized control and the people found themselves under the harsh cruelty of a Communist dictatorship.

This is a most important lesson for all of us to learn, namely, that the Communists use the Socialists to pave the way for them wherever possible. This is why Communists and Socialists are often found supporting each other, collaborating together and fighting for the same goals.

The paramount issue today is freedom against creeping socialism. The well-known British writer, John Strachey, who for many years was an openly avowed Communist and who served as Minister of War in the Socialist Government in 1950, made this very plain in his book, "The Theory and Practice of Socialism." He said:

"It is impossible to establish communism as the immediate successor to capitalism. It is, accordingly, proposed to establish socialism as something which we can put in the place of our present decaying capitalism. Hence, Communists work for the establishment of socialism as a necessary transition stage on the road to communism." (John Strachey, "The Theory and Practice of Socialism," Random House, New York, 1936, p. 121.)

Now obviously, the worst thing that can happen to a Socialist is to have himself openly identified with the work of the Communists who are generally feared and despised. The Socialists know they cannot seize property and power by due process of law unless they are politically popular, therefore, they try desperately to avoid the taint of the Communists and present their program so that it appears moral, democratic, peaceful, and so gradual that the people will not resist it.

These are the exact words used by the Social Democrats in England in 1889 ("Fabian Essays on Socialism," Doubleday & Co., New York, 1960, p. 51.) when they were preparing to lay the foundation for the seizure of power which finally took place after World War I and again after World War II. They prepared a book called "Fabian Essays on Socialism." In the preface they said the book was being written by seven members of the executive council of the Fabian Society. They then said, "The writers are all Social Democrats." Nevertheless, they adopted the name of "Fabians" after the Roman general, Fabius, who won his battles by capturing or defeating the enemy a few at a time. This is what the Social Democrats call gradualism. It is their intention to use this method in conquering their enemies which in this case happens to be freemen.

Here is what these Fabians or Social Democrats said they were going to do:

With reference to private property they said: "Private property in land and capital will inevitably go the way of feudalism which it superseded." ("Fabian Essays on Socialism," Doubleday & Co., New York, 1960, p. 82.)

The Social Democrats also said they were going to work for "the ultimate and gradual extinction of the (property-owning) class." ("Fabian Essays on Socialism," Doubleday & Co., New York, 1960, p. 82.)

They said they were going to nationalize or collectivize the land. They described how they would set up collectivized farms. They would organize communes in each locality. They would get cloths from a community store, eat at a community table the food prepared in a community kitchen. They would nationalize the major industries and develop industrial communes for the smaller industries. ("Fabian Essays on Socialism," Doubleday & Co., New York, 1960, especially pp. 184–185, 190–196.)

At this point some of you may wonder whether I am talking about communism in Russia rather than the Social Democrats in England. But I have mentioned these things so that you can see that in their final form the two are identical.

The Fabians even recognize the problem of compulsory labor which might be necessary under their system. In fact, within 1 year after the British Fabians had seized power and socialized the major industries following World War II, they found it necessary to impose controlled or compulsory labor management on the workers. But compul-

sion was nothing new in the thinking of Social Democrats. One of their original founders emphasized this when he said:

"I also made it quite clear that under socialism you would not be allowed to be poor. You would be forcibly fed, clothed, lodged, taught, and employed whether you liked it or not. If it were discovered that you had not character and industry enough to be worth all this trouble, you might possibly be executed in a kindly manner; but whilst you were permitted to live you would have to live well." (George B. Shaw, "Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism," p. 470.)

The Social Democrats even described the serf-like existence of the workers under their program. They pointed out that "the perfect fitting development of each individual is not necessarily the utmost and highest cultivation of his own personality, but the filling, in the best possible way, of his humble function in the great social machine." ("Fabian Essays on Socialism," Doubleday & Co., New York, 1960, p. 79.)

One final observation concerning the socialist plan to seize power by due process of law. During the gradual seizure of land and property there will still be some private industry operating. They describe how they will gradually smother and destroy it. Here is what they say about this stage of their takeover:

"The private capitalist, however, will still be in business, producing and distributing on his own account in competition with the communal organization, which at present will have occupied only part of the industrial field. But these private enterprises will be carried on under circumstances of ever-increasing difficulty."

They then describe how the Government-owned industries, operating with Government credit behind them, will begin to choke off private enterprise. They say, "After a while the private producers will disappear, not because there will be any law against individualist production, but because they will not pay." ("Fabian Essays on Socialism," Doubleday & Co., New York, 1960, p. 195.)

All of this may begin to sound familiar to many American businessmen who have been watching similar influences of creeping socialism gradually using Government regulations or Government ownership to destory the basic framework of economic freedom and private production in our own country.

We must ever keep in mind that collectivized socialism is part of the Communist strategy. Communism is fundamentally socialism. We will never win our fight against communism by making concessions to socialism. Communism and socialism, must be defeated on principle.

When socialism is understood, we will realize that many of the programs advocated, and some of those already adopted in the United States, fall clearly within the category of socialism. What is socialism? It is simply governmental ownership and management of the essential means for the production and distribution of goods.

We must never forget that nations may sow the seeds of their own destruction while enjoying unprecedented prosperity.

The socialistic Communist conspiracy to weaken the United States involves attacks on many fronts. To weaken the American free-enterprise economy which outproduced both its enemies and allies during World War II, is a high priority target of the Communist leaders. Their press and other propaganda media are therefore constantly selling the principles of centralized or federal control of farms, railroads, electric power, schools, steel, maritime shipping, and many other aspects of the economy—but always in the name of public welfare.

For 30 years we have aided the cause of atheistic, socialistic communism by permitting Communists in high places in Government; by giving away vital military secrets; by squandering much of our material resources; by recklessly spending ourselves to near bankruptcy; by weakening our free enterprise system through adoption of socialistic policies; by wasteful bungling of our foreign affairs; by ever increasing confiscatory taxation and by permitting the insidious infiltration of Communist agents and sympathizers into almost every segment of American life.

Many people have wondered if the Marxist concepts of the Fabian Social Democrats have deeply penetrated the United States. In truth they have. British Social Democrats came to the United States in 1888 for a long visit to train Fabian groups in several of the leading universities. Eventually their followers were organized into the Intercollegiate Socialist Society in 1905. By 1916 this organization was becoming increasingly influential and its members were already climbing into the higher echelons of the Government. After World War I the society changed its name to the League for Industrial Democracy and continued to plant its most brilliant personalities in government, education, communications and policymaking bodies. There they remain today, occupying some of the highest offices in the land. Their records will show that they have consistently sponsored the basic ideas of the Social Democrats of Europe. Some of them have been exposed, as not only being sympathetic, and collaborating with their fellow Marxists of the U.S.S.R., but actually joining them.

This, then, brings me to my final point, namely, that the internal threat to the American way of life is in the secret alliance which exists between the more advanced Social Democrats and the hard-core Communist conspiracy. Occasionally this sympathetic alliance breaks out into the open, but most of the time it is maintained in the labyrinths of quiet secrecy. If you should wonder why Socialists in this and other countries have often played into the hands of world communism you might consider these words from the top British Socialist, G. D. H. Cole, who wrote the following words during World War II:

"I have never allowed my dislike of much that Stalin has done to blind me to the fact that the U.S.S.R. remains fundamentally Socialist, or that the Soviet form of revolution and of government may be the only one that is capable of sweeping clean the stables of Eastern and Southern Europe, or of solving the basic economic problems of the unhappy peasants of these impoverished states. I am ready to go further. I would much sooner the Soviet Union, even with its policy unchanged, become dominant over all Europe, including Great Britain, than see an attempt to restore the prewar states to their futile and uncreative independence and their petty economic nationalism under capitalistic domination. Much better be ruled by Stalin than by the restrictive and monopolistic cliques which dominate Western capitalism."

Mr. Cole concludes by saying, "For it would be much better to live within a system, however barbaric in some of its features, that has in it some creative force making for the liberation of mankind from class oppression and primary poverty than to thrust back under the dead hand of decaying capitalism utterly incapable of fresh, creative effort." (G. D. H. Cole," Europe, Russia, and the Future," Macmillan Co., New York, 1942, pp. 8–9.)

It would appear to me that when a mind has been trained to hold such bitterness against capitalism; to believe so blindly in the illusions of communism, it is no wonder that some of this same mentality have used their influence in scientific circles, in embassies, and in governmental positions to betray the interests of their own countries and collaborate with what has turned out to be the most formidable enemy freemen have ever faced.

I believe J. Edgar Hoover and the investigating committees of Congress know whereof they speak when they warn us of a serious internal threat to the American way of life. I hear that some people and more particularly the Communists and the Social Democrats don't want us to examine this internal threat, but I believe we should. I think we should study communism and study socialism so we can recognize the influence of each. We can leave the spies to the FBI, but learning how our enemies are trying to subvert us is everybody's job. I also recognize that it is not popular in some circles to be called an anti-Communist, but I consider communism a godless political and economic disease. I do not believe an American citizen can be patriotic and loyal to his own country, and its God-inspired Constitution, of freedom, without being anti-Communist.

Now I know that Moscow has ordered that all anti-Communists are to be attacked and discredited in every way possible. I know the Communist Party of the United States has issued a similar mandate. This does not disturb me at all. It should be expected. Meanwhile we should pursue a calm and steady course. We should expose to the light of public inquiry those forces which would destroy our country and our way of life. We should pay not attention to the recommendations of men who call the Constitution an 18th century agrarian document—who apologize for capitalism and free enterprise. We should refuse to follow their siren song of concentrating, increasingly, the powers of government in the Chief Executive, of delegating American sovereign authority to non-American institutions in the United Nations, and pretending that it will bring peace to the world by turning our Armed Forces over to a U.N. worldwide police force.

My own political and economic creed is a simple one. I commend it to you:

I am for fredom and against slavery.

I am for social progress and against socialism.

I am for a dynamic economy and against waste.

I am for the private competitive market and against unnecessary Government intervention.

I am for private ownership and against governmental ownership and control of the means of production and distribution.

I am for national security and against appeasement and capitulation to an obvious enemy.

This contest in which we are engaged is as old as man and as young as hope. The issue is over the God-given eternal principle of freedom—free agency, the right of choice. In this struggle it is not enough to be right—we must put strength and action back of that which is right.

In the conflict with socialistic communism we must have patience, courage, and wisdom. We must also have friends. Rusia has hostages—we have friends—millions of them in temporary slavery back of the Iron Curtain, and millions more to be mobilized throughout the free world. In Russia people are unable to challenge the despotic godless dogmas forced on the people. We must take greater risks for freedom. We must dramatize American might and Soviet myth.

Let us awaken to our responsibilities and to our opportunities. Again I quote Dr. Malik.

"The civilization which has been blessed and transformed by Christ, needs only a

mighty hand to shake it out of its slumber. And, once shaken, once really awakened to the world responsibilities which it and it alone can shoulder, there is nothing it cannot dare and do."

I love America. I know you do. God and our children will judge us for what we do with our land and our liberties. As Theodore Roosevelt said over half a century ago, we "hold in our hands the hope of the world, the fate of the coming years, and shame and disgrace will be ours if in our eyes the light of high resolve is dimmed, if we trail in the dust the golden hopes of men."

With God's help the light of high resolve in the eyes of the American people must never be dimmed. Our freedom must and will be preserved.

May God give us the wisdom to recognize the threat to our freedom and the strength to meet this danger courageously.

The Negro Jurist—A Quest for Equality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Anthony G. Ward of the Loyola Law Times, a Loyola Law School publication, recently interviewed my constituent, Mr. Edward B. Toles, president of the Cook County Bar Association, concerning judicial appointments for Negro attorneys. Doubtless my colleagues will find the result most interesting and worth considering:

THE NEGRO JURIST—A QUEST FOR EQUALITY

(By Anthony G. Ward)

Loyola Law School Graduate Edward B. Toles is the president of the Cook County Bar Association, a trustee of his church, member of various civic bodies in his neighborhood, a lifetime member of the NAACP and a Negro who in his own words is realistic about the future of the Negro lawyer in Chicago and in the Nation.

On October 26, 1961, we met in his office and discussed many topics ranging from "man's inhumanity to man" to the way his 8-year-old son reacted to last year's homecoming at the University of Illinois. However, our conversation seemed to focus on the work that Mr. Toles, the Cook County Bar Association, and the National Bar Association have done in seeking judicial appointments for Negro attorneys, on the municipal, State, and National level. Relatively speaking, it seems that they have accomplished a great deal.

On June 29, 1959, Cook County Bar Association Judiciary Committee received permission from the association to publish a complaint against the major political parties of Cook County seeking more nominations of Negro attorneys for election to judicial office in Cook County. The committee was headed by Mr. Toles. In the elections of that year Mr. Fred Slater was elected the first Negro superior court judge of Cook County. Mr. Toles sees that election as a milestone in the fight of the Negro and the Negro attorney to achieve equal opportunity before the law in Cook County.

Subsequently, the midwestern regional conference of the National Bar Association met in Chicago on April 30, 1960, and accepted a report from the committee on judiciary report, headed by Mr. Toles. The report dealt with Negro Federal judges between the years 1863 and 1960 and in short asked for better representation of the Negro attorney on the Federal bench.

The report pointed out that prior to 1960 only three life-term Negro judges had been appointed to the Federal bench. The first was Judge Irwin C. Mollison who was appointed to the U.S. Customs Court by Harry S. Truman in 1945. He was followed by Judge William H. Hastie in 1949, who was appointed by Truman to the U.S. Court of Appeals and Judge Scovil Richardson, who was appointed to the U.S. Customs Court by Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1957.

During this period there were only three term appointments for Negroes outside of the bench of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, these being appointments to district court judgeships in the Virgin Islands.

The report, written by Mr. Toles, stated that although the number of Negro lawyers in the United States exceeded 4,000, a Negro had never been appointed a Federal district court judge although there were more than 235 district court judges in 86 district courts in the 50 States. The members of the National Bar Association, through the able pen of Mr. Toles urged that this situation be remedied.

The National Bar Association didn't discontinue their efforts upon the publishing of the aforementioned committee report but made efforts to take their plea to both men who were in the process of campaigning for the Presidency of the United States. They succeeded in being received by both candidates, by Senator Kennedy in August and by Vice President Nixon in October. Representatives of the association were received by the then Senator Kennedy in Washington on August 31, 1960, who issued a statement to the delegation in which he stated, "I assure you that in a new Democratic administration there will be far better representation, on the basis of merit, of persons of all our racial groups, including particularly those who in the past have been excluded on the basis of prejudice."

Mr. Toles was happy to point out to this reporter that this campaign promise of the President was one that he (the President) has taken seriously, the results being, among others, the first appointment of a Negro (Judge James B. Parsons) as a U.S. district court judge in the history of the United States. Subsequent to that appointment on August 9, 1961, two other Negroes have received appointments to the Federal bench. Wade McCree, who was a circuit court judge in Detroit, Mich., received the second U.S. district court judgeship granted to a Negro and Thurgood Marshall, former legal counsel of the NAACP, received an interim appointment as a U.S. court of appeals judge. Since his election, the President has also appointed two Negroes to the position of U.S. district attorney, one to the northern district of California and one in Cleveland, Ohio.

Mr. Toles agreed that these were signs of improvement in the status of the Negro lawyer but added that these appointments constituted a mere percentage of what the National Bar Association and the Cook County Bar Association considered a rightful share of seats on the bench and other legal and semilegal appointments for the Negro lawyer. Mr. Toles and his associates want more and it doesn't look like they will give up until they get more.

This spokesman for the Negro members of the legal profession in Cook County explained the rationale behind this campaign on the part of the Negro lawyer in this way. He pointed out that in most cases the door to the big corporation and well-known legal firm is closed to the Negro and will be colsed to him for some time. He pointed out that most Negro attorneys have few wealthy clients. Their practice is made up mostly of little cases involving the "little man"—the Negro, and since the Negro belongs to the "lower-lower-middle class, the laboring class," he needs the adivce of counsel only in small cases; i.e., divorce suits, trouble with the law (police) etc. So, in the words of Mr. Toles, the Negro attorney must turn to the public domain for recognition in his chosen profession. It is his view that if the outstanding Negro attorney is going to be recognized for his abilities it will have to be in the form of a seat on the bench or some Government appointment to a position demanding legal background and training.

This reporter asked Mr. Toles what other judicial appointments he and his associates would like to see in the near future. He said that they would like to see a Negro on the Illinois Supreme Court and pointed out that such an appointment would not be without precedent. The first Negro State supreme court justice took a seat on the bench of South Carolina in 1870 and the second was recently appointed in the State of Michigan by Governor Swenson. He noted that there are fewer Negroes in the State of Michigan than there are in Illinois. He also pointed out that there are 40 unfilled appointments to U.S. district court judgeships with vacancies in New York, California, Ohio, and Pennsylvania, all States in which the Negro population would warrant a Negro sitting on the district court. Toles would like to see at least one of these remaining 40 appointments given to a Negro, and maintains that four appointments, one to each of the aforementioned States, would not be asking too much when the Negro population of those States is taken into consideration.

Edward B. Toles is an impressive man, not so much in physical appearance as in quiet courage. Mr. Toles and his associates are courageous in their refusal to be intimidated, to be segregated, in their refusal to accept the status quo of the American Negro. For that they are to be congratulated. For that they ought to be emulated.

In closing the interview, Mr. Toles made this statement, "I believe that this represents the beginning of a new era in the progress of the Negro and the Negro lawyer. The liberal decisions in favor of the Negro by the Supreme Court and the recent appointment of Negroes to the Federal courts and as U.S. attorneys by the President of the United States, gives new significance and meaning to our Constitution and, in the language of President Kennedy, 'For no American should be disqualified for any office because of his race, color, religion or family origin. It is time for us to practice what our Constitution preaches. The Federal service should be a model of Americanism, in which there are no traces of any form of arbitrary discrimination.' "

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of February 17, 1962:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

"We see it, and to us it appears like principle, and the best sort of principle at that—the principle of allowing the people to do as they please with their own business."—Abraham Lincoln.

The Public Welfare Amendments of 1962 provoked some amazing testimony during the hearings concluded this week before the Ways and Means Committee. Representatives of the Protestant and Catholic churches appealed for Federal aid in welfare work. The Protestant, Bradshaw Mintener, chairman of the Department of Social Welfare of the National Council of Churches of Christ, said the church-related agencies were willing to sell their services. Monsignor Gallagher, secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Charities admitted Catholic agencies were already receiving Federal aid. The testimony included the following:

"Mr. MINTENER. There are some 4,000 church-related health and welfare agencies in the United States under Protestant and Eastern Orthodox auspices. A member of these sectarian agencies may be in a position to sell a limited amount of service to their State or county. There is general agreement that church-related agencies may accept per diem payments on a case-by-case basis for services purchased by Government for individuals." Following is a transcript of my questions of Mr. Mintener and his answers:

"Mr. ALGER. I wish to ask a question or two to be sure I understand. Mr. Mintener, you are suggesting then that church-related agencies sell their services to the Government?

"Mr. MINTENER. Make them available to the Government.

"Mr. ALGER. I am quoting you. You used the word 'sell.' I am not haggling over the word. In your statement you say sell their services. Do you not see that when the church-related agencies take money it is to be expected that they will be regulated by the Government? We at the Federal level constitutionally have to lay down the guidelines for Federal spending. At the least, Congress has the responsibility as watchdog of the purse strings to lay down the conditions by which the taxpayers' money is paid out. So you know it is an axiom without question when we distribute money at the Federal level we have to lay down the guidelines in regulations to accompany that money.

"Mr. MINTENER. We would hope that such guidelines or such criteria would be such that these agencies could live under them.

"Mr. ALGER. I am sure we would have the best intentions but I believe it is an axiom without contradiction that Federal money will necessarily be accompanied by a certain degree of Federal control. Do you see no clash whatsoever in your views expressed here today in the separation of church and state, a principle that we all champion?

"Mr. MINTENER. I cannot see all the possibilities. I would certainly hope that this would not result in any clash between church and state. I hope that we can keep that separate.

"Mr. ALGER. Is your hope well founded?

"Mr. MINTENER. I hope we can keep that separate. I am an optimist.

"Mr. ALGER. If you take some money from Uncle Sam, the church, you see no clash at all?

"Mr. MINTENER. All I can say is that we hope this will not occur.

"Mr. ALGER. You know how the church and state thought comes about?

"Mr. MINTENER. Yes, sir.

"Mr. ALGER. I am sure you understand the Bill of Rights as do I. It says, 'Congress shall make no law concerning the establishment of religion' and so forth. It does not say a law which we hope will have no strings attached or a law by which we sell at $50 per case. It says 'no law.' Therefore, I am frankly surprised, and I want to tell you, sir, as far as I am concerned, you do not speak for the church of which I am a member. I am not sure whether we are under your council or not. But so far as what you say today, I tell you I am shocked, I am surprised, and I think your argument is totally without foundation when you express hope that there will not be a clash. I say that you undoubtedly are putting the church under the Government because you will take the Government's money and have to live by the rules which we as responsible legislators will have to lay down. I say this without any bitterness toward you, or rancor. I feel your logic is inaccurate when you say you hope there will not be any confusion of church and state. It seems to me that we will be pretty well taking over your church-related agencies if we use you.

"Mr. MINTENER. I hope not.

"Mr. ALGER. You see no conflict in your logic today in what I am suggesting?

"Mr. MINTENER. Well, we feel that this program can be worked out. I would say that.

"Mr. ALGER. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Monsignor Gallagher said, "We further recommend wherever it is prudent to do so, public welfare administration should purchase service from private agencies and institutions where this service can be effectively rendered by this means. We believe that purchase of service agreements should be on a per diem, per capita, item by item basis."

Again I turn to the transcript of the hearings for my discussion with Monsignor Gallagher:

"Mr. ALGER. Monsignor, are there Catholic Church or related agencies services available for hire as was pointed out by the preceding witness?

"Monsignor GALLAGHER. Yes, Mr. Alger, there has been a long established pattern of cooperation of this sort between public agencies and our institutions and in many cases day-care programs.

"Mr. ALGER. Are they now receiving Federal aid or, rather Federal contracts?

"Monsignor GALLAGHER. They are offering service to State programs where there is a Federal sharing, yes, sir.

"Mr. ALGER. So this would just be an extension of something that is already in practice?

"Monsignor GALLAGHER. That is the way we understand it, Mr. Alger.

"Mr. ALGER. Do you see any danger in the drying up of private money for the support of the church by the expansion of Federal programs?

"Monsignor GALLAGHER. Yes, sir, we do consider it one of the elements in the problem of voluntary effort. A second problem, if I may allude to it and answer both of them together, is our concern for the drying up of interest and activity on the part of people to use their own ingenuity and initiative to help meet their own problems or the problems of a neighbor or others in their general vicinity. For this reason we are anxious to have voluntary effort espoused in whatever legislative way is possible to do so, so that this ingredient of citizenship may never be lost or become inactive in a large number of our people. For this reason, e.g., we share some of the concepts expressed this morning, not entirely, by Mr. Reid to the effect that we don't believe a total amount of the operating budget of an agency should come through the sale of service to a public authority. Now to answer the two of them together, we do recognize that the increase of taxes to support welfare programs does have an effect upon the voluntary contributor and for this reason we would look for some prudent middle-of-the-road path to the increase of service under public welfare administration and those of the fruitful partnership available through voluntary effort.

"Mr. ALGER. Do you have any uncertainty in your mind at all—I have and I am asking for help—Do you feel any uncertainty at all in asking the Government to move into the area which traditionally has been church and private?

"Monsignor GALLAGHER. I think the terms of the relationship as we have had the experience over the years would indicate that it is carefully spelled out so that none of the money obviously is used for the promotion of religious purposes per se. Similarly, that the careful detailing of the budgets supporting the bills that are submitted would indicate that the money is actually spent to fulfill the responsibilities of the public authority. Similarly, the relationship which already exists in the matter of licensing, e.g., by a public authority of our operations indicates that there is a working relationship already established which does not contravene the identity or the integrity either of the individual agency nor of the public authority feeling that his responsibility is not justly being fulfilled. I recognize what you have said earlier as being a very crucial issue in the matter of church and state relationships and the autonomy of religious organizations when they seem to be depending upon a public dollar for their support. But I assure you that it has been worked out seemingly with great satisfaction in several of the States and that there does not seem to be any great reality to the danger of losing one's autonomy on the one hand or of feeling that they are supporting a religion on the other.

"Mr. ALGER. I appreciate the way you have expressed it. You said it far better than I. That is my worry. I don't share your view. Possibly, as I study what you have said and look at the record, I may change my thinking. But I must tell you right now I have a kind of unreal feeling that this is actually happening, I am sitting here listening to the Catholic and Protestant churches indeed selling their services. That is possibly my provincialism. My feelings may change.

"Monsignor GALLAGHER. I shall be happy to meet with you later to discuss this."

Public assistance is a Federal-State program approximately 50–50 percent matching of money, State administered under Federal guidelines. In the current bill (1) A greater Federal part is suggested; (2) State coercion by Federal Government is advocated; (3) 100 percent Federal aid for the training of welfare workers, including graduate studies; (4) exhortation of welfare workers to teach the public about the vast public assistance programs that are available; (5) greater Federal Government leadership in coordinating public and private welfare organizations which include church agencies.

Questions to be answered by my further inquiries of both HEW and churches include: (1) How much aid goes to churches now? (2) Doesn't this violate church-state separation? (3) How can Federal Government dominate (as it always must any joint operation) without destroying the church's autonomy, indeed merging it with government? The role of churches in a spiritually motivated nation is a subject near and dear to the hearts of all Americans and commands our most throughtful and temperate consideration. Further information on this problem will be furnished you in future newsletters as it is developed.

"If destruction be our lot we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of free men we must live through all time or die by suicide."—Abraham Lincoln.

Need for Department of Urban Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as a lifelong resident of one of America's largest cities and the

Representative of a large segment of its downtown population, I am deeply concerned with the formation of a Department of Urban Affairs. I am well aware of the problems which plague modern cities and the difficulties encountered in solving these problems. I would like to commend to your attention a letter from a man who knows and understands better than I the urgent need of American cities for a Department of Urban Affairs. Mayor Barr, of Pittsburgh, expresses cogently and briefly his analysis of the situation. I would also like to include an excellent editorial on this same subject which appeared in the January 24, 1961, issue of the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette and Sun-Telegraph:

CITY OF PITTSBURGH, PA.,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
February 16, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: I am writing to urge your support for President Kennedy's proposed reorganization plan for the establishment of the Department of Urban Affairs.

As mayor of Pittsburgh, I believe the creation of the Department of Urban Affairs as proposed by the administration is absolutely essential to sound progress in the development of our country.

Our cities are the backbone of the Nation's economy. They provide the great bulk of the productive capacity, and purchasing power of our Nation.

Many of the problems of urban areas, mass transit, preservation of open spaces and urban renewal, have outstripped the ability and capacity of local governments. In fact, urban problems today far surpass rural problems in magnitude.

City residents need to be served by a Department of Urban Affairs just as acutely as farmers need a Department of Agriculture.

When I speak of a Department of Urban Affairs, I do not mean a department of big city affairs or small town affairs. This Department would be charged with looking after the programs of vital interest to the big city and the small town.

I would hope that Congress approves the Presidential reorganization plan to coordinate Federal agencies now serving urban needs under the direction of a responsible Cabinet officer, within the framework of a single department.

Most Americans, I believe, support the President's plan to elevate urban affairs to the Cabinet because most Americans live in urban areas. This is evidenced by the declaration of mayors and representatives from some 13,000 cities, towns, and villages throughout the Nation who are supporting the President's proposal for a Department of Urban Affairs.

As a Congressman who represents urban communities both within and beyond the city of Pittsburgh, I strongly urge your support for this measure.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH M. BARR,
Mayor.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette and Sun-Telegraph, Jan. 24, 1962]

THE URBAN BLOCKADE

President Kennedy's renewed request for a Department of Urban Affairs will face a hard test in Congress this week. It is scheduled for a vote in the House Rules Committee, which is dominated by rural and conservative interests. The urban affairs bill has the additional impediment of a racial angle, since the President has indicated that if the new Cabinet post is created, he will nominate Dr. Robert C. Weaver, a Negro, to fill it. Dr. Weaver is now Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which would become a part of the new Department.

To get the support of all eight Democrats on the Rules Committee, the bill will need the votes of two southerners, Congressmen JAMES TRIMBLE, of Arkansas, and HOMER THORNBERRY, of Texas. If these two should defect because of the racial issue, the votes of at least two of the seven Republicans will be needed. Republicans have tended to oppose the new Department.

Beyond the initial obstacle of the Rules Committee, the legislation has to get past the rural bias of Congress resulting from a failure to promptly realine congressional districts in accordance with population shifts. Though 70 percent of Americans are now urban dwellers, Federal programs of direct benefit to farmers still get higher outlays from Congress than those for city residents.

Senator CLARK, of Pennsylvania, the original sponsor of the bill to create an Urban Affairs Department, has offered compelling arguments as to why metropolitan area residents now deserve the kind of special attention from the Federal Government that farmers have been getting since the creation of the Department of Agriculture in 1862. With city populations spilling over into broad suburban developments, municipal governments, Senator CLARK observes, are no longer able to cope adequately with the growing problems of health care, garbage collection, sewage disposal, recreation, zoning, and planning. Often the problems, and consequently the need for remedies, stretch across the State lines, as in the case of the vast metropolis reaching from Boston to Washington, D.C.

Senator CLARK pointed out last year that the Federal debt had risen less than 5 percent in 14 years, while State and local debt had more than quadrupled. Thus he argued that the National Government could more easily take on an enlarged role in urban affairs than could local governments. In the Senator's view, the new Department should have a broad charter to survey the urban scene in its entirety, should be a point of contact in Washington for harassed local officials, should have general responsibility for coordinating all Federal activities affecting the city.

If eventual urban chaos is to be avoided, some sort of coordinated approach to the problems of rising megalopolises will have to be provided.

To Meet Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, several days ago the Chicago Sun-Times endorsed editorially a proposal made by one of Chicago's distinguished labor leaders to improve the quality of American products as one way to meet the mounting tide of foreign competition in the stream of international commerce. I believe the Chicago's American deserves commendation for joining in this effort.

I am very happy to see the Chicago Sun-Times endorse this principle suggested in Chicago to a group of manufacturers by Frank Darling, president, Local 1031, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. At a recent luncheon with more than a hundred employers with whom Mr. Darling's union has contracts, Mr. Darling proposed that his union would match whatever incentive plans the employers initiated in their plants to encourage quality production from their workers.

Earlier in this session, upon my return from an inspection tour of Europe to study the impact of the Common Market on our American economy, I proposed a five-point program to deal with this increasing problem. One of those points included a plea for labor and management to get together in an effective drive to improve the quality of American products. I suggested that employers eliminate speed up techniques, and instead of emphasizing quantity, place a greater stress on quality.

I also suggested that responsible labor leaders join the employers in urging workers to place a greater degree of pride in the quality of their workmanship.

It is a source of great comfort to me to see Mr. Darling endorse this principle, and it is my sincere hope that labor and industry throughout our country will join in this crusade. It is most encouraging to see the Chicago Sun-Times endorse this philosophy.

Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Sun-Times editorial follows:

TO MEET COMPETITION

Frank Darling, president of local 1031, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, would seem to be a labor leader of unusual discernment.

He has asked the management of the 138 Chicago area industrial plants in which 30,000 members of local 1031 are employed to emphasize quality all out, promising, in return, that any disciplinary action they may have to take to assure good work will receive union approval.

Darling's view is refreshing in this era in which some union leaders insist on neither quality nor quantity from their members and object to any effort by management to obtain either. Some unions set production levels which the least able worker can maintain and then pressure better workers to curtail output to that figure. Meanwhile, quality, in such instances, is usually a forgotten practice and efforts by management to obtain it result only in ceaseless grievances, negotiations and arbitrations as the unions seek to protect the unskilled.

Darling said "competition is getting rougher than ever" and noted "drastic inroads into the American electrical manufacturing business" by foreign nations.

"There is every reason to think," he said, "that the growth of the European Common Market will make this problem worse."

West German electrical manufacturers who have gained the most from international trade competition regard quality work as the reason for their success.

Actually, Darling is merely seeking to safeguard the jobs of his union members. That is his function. But he is going about it in an intelligent and farsighted manner, completely at variance with that of those labor leaders whose only concern is so-called job security and wages. There can be neither job security nor wages for anyone in a plant or industry in which workers have little or no concern with quality or quantity.

This is becoming more apparent every day. Competition, whether foreign or domestic, cannot be met by a plant or an industry in which quality, quantity, or both, are of no special concern to employees, organized or unorganized.

The president of local 1031 wants a return to excellent craftsmanship.

"I know my own membership has not had the pride in its work that it used to have," he told employers. "I want a return to those old high standards and healthy pride."

If Darling's views prevail, we predict members of local 1031 will have job security and good wages for many years to come.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

MIAMI, FLA.,
February 1, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I wish to thank you for sending a copy of your Resolution 211 to establish a Committee on Captive Nations.

I believe that a study by a committee such as you propose undoubtedly would provide a great deal of valuable information to the State Department as well as to other branches of the executive department.

We firmly believe that should a Committee on Captive Nations be formed it would go a long way in kindling hope among the many nations now under the domination of communism. Anything we can do to encourage these enslaved people will give them a greater strength to resist.

I am writing my Congressman and the members of the House Rules Committee in support of this bill.

Respectfully yours,

C. R. MILTON.

NEW ROCHELLE, N.Y.,
January 30, 1962.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I understand that you are sponsoring a resolution to establish a special House Committee on Captive Nations. As I understand it, this bill will set up a committee to investigate the proper uses of what seems to me to be one of Khrushchev's greatest nightmares—captive nations.

The United States has frequently supported self-determination for many African and Asian colonies. We, for example, sided with the Soviet Union, against our ally, Poland, in voting for a U.N. inquiry into Angola, traditionally (300 years) a part of the Portuguese Empire. Yet when it comes to freedom for the relatively recently colonized peoples of Poland and Hungary, or even the Ukraine, we seem helpless in exploiting the oppression of the Soviet imperialists.

I would think that such a committee might be helpful in proposing some ways that we might be able to exploit the Soviet Union's Achilles' heel. I support your efforts.

Sincerely,

PETER V. HANDAL.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
January 30, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Old House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: Recently, certain information concerning the situations that exist in the captive nations and your House Resolution 211 were brought to my attention. I, myself, was indifferent to the captive nations, but now I am happy to support those who desire true liberty as much as the Americans cherish it. Rest assured that you have my complete support along with many other Chicagoans in your efforts to establish this committee to study in more detail the circumstances in which the captive nations find themselves.

Enclosed, you will find a copy of my letter to my Congressman, WILLIAM T. MURPHY, of Illinois, in which I urge him to support your resolution.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS C. SHIELDS.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
January 30, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM T. MURPHY,
New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MURPHY: I would like to take this opportunity to call your attention to Congressman DANIEL FLOOD'S House Resolution 211 which provides for the establishment of a separate House committee to study problems concerning the captive nations. I am firmly convinced that the situation that exists in each of these 22 or more countries is one of constant unrest and continued mistrust of the Kremlin. Many claim that the tension that we have seen in such events as the Hungarian revolt and the exodus from East Germany last year is a constant nightmare for Mr. Khrushchev and his lieutenants. This could prove to be an excellent cold war weapon with which to maneuver the Communists into a real bargaining position.

The captive nations present a rather convincing picture of communistic colonialism. As you know, colonialism is certainly a much-debated issue today. Adlai Stevenson wrote a comprehensive memorandum to the General Assembly last year showing this connection between Russia and colonialism. However, it seems that the lawmakers are unable to obtain the real facts concerning the plight of the captive nations. Consequently, no positive actions have been taken.

I am of the opinion that such a House committee would help solve this scarcity of facts. Through this committee, the faulty knowledge and misconceptions that exist today about the situations in these countries would be eliminated. As a result, we would be able to more effectively use this powerful weapon against our cold war opponents.

In closing, I will ask you to give this resolution your careful study and consideration when it comes to the floor of the House. I feel confident that you will see the great benefits that can be gained from the adoption of this resolution.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS C. SHIELDS.

NEWARK, OHIO,
February 3, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I read some of the speeches given in honor of Ukrainian Independence Day. Will these speeches be made into one volume? I have many friends who would be interested in such a volume.

I continue to support the House Resolution 211 calling for the formation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House. I am going to tell other friends about the resolution and ask them to support it.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

Sincerely yours,

ALLEN BINCKLEY.

RACINE, WIS.,
January 31, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: It is with increasing interest that I read of the many references made to your House Resolution 211 and would like to know more about this proposed committee. In particular, I would like to know what its functions would be and how it would specifically help the people of captive nations.

Upon receiving this information, should I view it favorably, I will do my best to urge others to support this resolution and certainly will do so myself.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. RICHARD H. PELKEY.

San Francisco's Sun-Reporter Editorial Opinion: San Francisco Housing Ordinance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention and to that of the House of Representatives the following editorial which appeared in the Sun-Reporter, edited by Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett, urging approval of the proposed San Francisco fair housing ordinance. I would like to take this

opportunity to commend San Francisco for its forward-looking attitude, which the serious consideration of this proposed ordinance demonstrates, toward this important problem of eliminating discrimination against minority groups in the sale and rental of housing.

Housing discrimination has become a serious urban problem in many areas in the United States. The pattern of racial ghettos, which has resulted from the closing of much of the housing market to minority groups, is intensifying the critical problems of our cities. Such ghettos encourage overcrowding and the development of slums and depress the economic climate and tax revenues of urban areas at a time when they are facing a growing need for resources to provide transportation, welfare, educational, police, and other municipal services.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that California has been in the forefront of the States taking official notice of this problem and in 1959 passed a State law prohibiting discrimination in publicly assisted housing, including housing built with FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed loans. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, the attorney general of California has ruled that a real estate broker's office is subject to the State civil rights law pertaining to public accommodations which requires that equal treatment, advantages, and privileges be accorded persons regardless of their race, color, religion, ancestry, or national origin. Mr. Franklin Williams, presently special assistant to the Director, Peace Corps, worked closely with Attorney General Stanley Mosk in issuing this attorney general opinion.

Mr. Speaker, the fair housing ordinance now being considered by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors would greatly implement his policy on the local level. The proposed commission of citizens, patterned on the successful San Francisco Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, by administering the fair housing ordinance with primarily conciliatory and educational procedures will greatly facilitate progress in this field. San Francisco is to be congratulated for its trailblazing activities in this vital struggle to assure all our citizens equal opportunity to become full-fledged members of our democratic society.

The editorial follows:

THE SAN FRANCISCO FAIR HOUSING ORDINANCE

On Monday, January 22, the San Francisco Committee for Fair Housing Practices will introduce to the board of supervisors the San Francisco fair housing ordinance.

This ordinance would declare that discrimination in the sale or rental of housing on the basis of race, religion, or national origin is contrary to the public policy of San Francisco. It would prohibit discrimination in the sale or rental of housing, except for buildings containing less than three units, when one is occupied by the owner (i.e., the individual home or duplex, lived in by the owner, is exempted). It would establish a commission of citizens appointed by the mayor to administer the ordinance, with emphasis on conciliatory and educational procedures. It would follow the successful example of the San Francisco Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity by providing for initial investigation of all complaints, and for confidential negotiations to eliminate any indicated violations.

In the rare instance that such consultation does not succeed, the matter would be brought to public hearing and finally, if necessary, brought to the courts.

Discrimination does exist in housing in San Francisco. This is the one area in which minority groups must break through to continue our slow progress toward full democratic citizenship. Inextricably interwoven with housing discrimination is the problem of discrimination in districting of the public schools.

It is anticipated that the same conservative, even reactionary, forces which opposed the establishment of a San Francisco Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity will drag out the same old cliches and reasons in opposition to fair housing. We believe, however, that the proponents of the ordinance will be able to establish that this is a proper step in dealing wtih a very serious, aggravated problem. We hope that the board of supervisors will show the same courage and understanding that led them to offer leadership to California in the field of fair employment practices through passage of the San Francisco fair employment ordinance.

Support for a law against housing discrimination cuts across social, political, and religious lines. Both the Republican central committee of San Francisco and the State Democratic central committee have supported the enactment of this local ordinance.

Opponents will contend that the problem can best be corrected through education and voluntary means. This argument is a subterfuge. We urge the board of supervisors to provide a broad umbrella of law under which persons interested in democratic housing practices may operate. Moreover, we urge each citizen to let the San Francisco Board of Supervisors know that he supports this proposed ordinance.

Budget Grows With Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, it is a fact often overlooked that the percentage of the gross national product devoted to Federal spending for peacetime purposes has remained about the same for more than 20 years.

Thus a primary factor in the increase in the size of the Federal budget through the years is the growth of our country, its population, its prosperity and its economy.

Mr. Ross Kincade, of Oklahoma City, brought out this point in a letter to the Daily Oklahoman February 4 which was awarded that newspaper's citation for the letter of the week:

To the EDITOR:

The President has presented to Congress his budget for the fiscal year beginning July 1. It is a guess of $92.5 billion. No one can do more than guess because no noe can say that international crisis will not necessitate more expenditure, or that the economy will produce as most economists now believe it will.

Predictably, the political orators sound off along party lines. The newspapers are generally hostile, and other mass media lacking competency to make any analysis are content to speculate and make jokes.

The best present estimate is that all expenditure by Federal, State and local governments will be about $150 billion. This is a sum which most of us cannot comprehend.

It is about 27 percent of our predicted gross national product of $568 billion. Of this, a little more than one half goes for national security. We should understand that except for national security, there has been no appreciable increase in the burden of Government spending in the last 20 years. In 1939, Government spending (minus defense) was 13.4 percent of the gross national product. In 1960, it was 12.3 percent. This is made possible because of the great increase in our gross national product. We are spending more than we used to, but we have more to spend.

We hear a lot about creeping socialism. The facts are, Government purchases its goods from private firms and pays salaries to individuals. In 1960, 53 percent of Government expenditures were goods and services purchased from private firms. The other 47 percent went to employees as salaries. Private enterprise has grown tremendously. It is evident therefore that socialism has not crept very far.

In these last 20 years we have become a nation of 180 million and the world's greatest power; our population has congregated in cities which require more goods and services.

In short, perhaps we have done and are continuing to do a pretty good job and should quit talking and acting as though we are already attending Uncle Sam's wake.

ROSS KINCADE.

OKLAHOMA CITY.

Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, the Nation of Lithuania has been known to history for almost a thousand years. During that time the Lithuanian people have experienced the joys of greatness and independence as well as the tragedies of war and subjugation. Today Lithuania is in one of its darkest periods. On this Lithuanian Independence Day it is fitting that we who are fortunate enough to live in the free world pay tribute to the gallant Lithuanian people and express our hope that the light of liberty will someday shine in their land again.

The first great period of Lithuanian independence was in the Middle Ages. During this period the Lithuanians established a powerful state which was able to check the German drive to the east and protect Europe from the Mongols and the Tartars. They gave their people a degree of freedom which was far higher than in neighboring countries, and through their education and toleration played a significant role in the development of European civilization.

In 1795, however, this bright period of Lithuanian history came to an end and Lithuania was annexed by Russia. The Lithuanians undertook many revolts against czarist oppression, but they met with no success. Following these revolts the Russians launched attempts to wipe

out the Lithuanian language and culture and replace them with Russian ways, but such attempts proved impossible and eventually had to be abandoned.

This long dark period of Russian domination was brought to an end by the First World War. Although the Lithuanians paid a terrible price in that war, in terms of lives and devastation, they emerged as an independent state once again. It was this period of independence, proclaimed on February 16, 1918, that we commemorate today. The Lithuanians thrived in their work of improving the economic and social conditions of their people and building an independent state, and the next two decades marked one of the happiest periods in Lithuanian history.

But just as the First World War had brought freedom to the Lithuanian people, the Second World War deprived them of their liberty. Although Lithuania tried to remain neutral, it was occupied by the Red army and in 1940 was declared a constituent republic of the Soviet Union. Later, in 1941, it was overrun by German forces. Still another reversal took place in 1944 when Lithuania was retaken by the Soviets, and today Lithuania remains under the Soviet domination imposed at that time.

Thus it is that today Lithuania finds itself again in a period of darkness, with an iron curtain draped around its borders to keep out rays of light from the free world. However, it is impossible to prevent all contact with the outside. I feel sure that the statements being made here today, showing that the Lithuanian people and their love of freedom have not been forgotten, will find their way to those who cling to their ideals. It is my hope that in some small way our words will add to their faith that the free world will eventually triumph in the cold war and the Lithuanians and all other peoples denied their political and human rights will be able to hold high the torch of liberty once again.

The St. Louis Story Is One of Cooperation Between Private and Public Groups—Address by Senator Symington at Federal Building Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 5, the new Federal Office Building in St. Louis was dedicated in my congressional district at ceremonies arranged by the Chamber of Commerce of St. Louis. Unfortunately, I was not able to attend the event because of official duties here, the invitation having arrived too late for me to be able to rearrange my schedule.

I am delighted, however, that among those who spoke at the dedication ceremonies was Missouri's senior U.S. Senator, the Honorable STUART SYMINGTON, who used the occasion to emphasize the necessity for close cooperation between the public and private sectors of the community and of the country to achieve real and lasting progress.

Senator SYMINGTON's excellent address was as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR STUART SYMINGTON, AT DEDICATION OF NEW FEDERAL OFFICE BUILDING, ST. LOUIS, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1962

It is a pleasure, and a very great honor, to participate in the dedication of this, the new St. Louis Federal Office Building.

Completion of this modern facility will now afford people of our city, State, and Nation many savings in time, money, and convenience.

It will enable the Government and its people to do a better job of serving you.

This new building is also a major link in the redevelopment of downtown St. Louis. Its location, right here in the plaza area, is symbolic of the cooperative work—private, local and Federal—that has gone into the overall efforts looking toward the renaissance of our town.

It is a tribute to the St. Louis congressional Representatives, especially that gracious and outstanding public servant, Congresswoman LEONOR SULLIVAN, in whose district we, and this building, now stand.

The people of St. Louis know, that, if a city is to move ahead, if it is to rebuild, the real responsibility lies right here at home.

And that is where it should be.

It has been shown that the most effective work is done by local people—and by local funds.

If we citizens had not voted the bond issue of 1935, you would have no Jefferson Memorial today.

Nor would you have the massive slum clearance and downtown redevelopment program without the bond issue of 1955.

The current large Federal investment here would not have had a major effect without the cooperative efforts of the city government—under such men as our outstanding mayor, Raymond Tucker, private business leaders who have made fine investments; and, most of all, the people themselves, who must review and approve what is done.

The defeat of the recent bond proposals—a decision many of us hope will be reversed—showed just how important these local efforts are. It was a defeat against the wishes of a majority of St. Louisians; but in itself it underscored the importance of decision here in our own town.

Whereas the Federal Government is investing less than $20 million in the Jefferson Memorial, private and local investment in this riverfront and stadium area will be well over $100 million.

Some believe that urban renewal is a strictly Federal effort. But experience has shown that for each $1 of Federal grants on renewal projects, about $5 of local expenditures are generated.

And of this local money, about one-half is spent for new housing, one-fourth for commercial and industrial development, and the remaining fourth for a variety of civic improvements.

The Plaza Square apartments right across the street provide an excellent illustration. Total city and Federal expenditures were less than $3 million; total private investment more than $20 million.

The "St. Louis story"—and comparable stories in towns and cities throughout the country—are stories of cooperation, cooperation between private and public groups, joint cooperative efforts of local, State, and Federal Governments.

No one group could possibly have done this part of the overall job which we dedicate today. It represents a joint effort, in the typical American way—and we will have more such dedications in the years to come.

Now we hear much protest these days about the great, and by implication undesirable, increase in Government spending for Federal projects such as this one; and for another Federal project we all want—adequate flood control; and for a Federal project most have wanted—urban redevelopment; and for another Federal project we want—the Jefferson Memorial; and for another Federal project we all want—the interstate highway program.

Very few Missourians have written us opposing any of these projects.

But thousands have written supporting them.

Now let me ask you this simple question.

How can people who write urging these particular projects for the betterment of their city and their State, which, of course, require Federal appropriations, nevertheless vehemently criticize Federal expenditures in general.

Is it not illogical to advocate Federal projects for one's own locality, but at the same time oppose similar Federal projects for other cities and States?

Why should people, who bombard their representatives to obtain improvements for their own area, term comparable appropriations for other areas socialism?

In simple justice, how can they expect to eat their cake and have it too?

How in the name of common sense do they expect our delegation in the Congress to be successful in obtaining desired appropriations for St. Louis and Missouri—but at the same time also be successful in blocking comparable appropriations for other cities and States?

If they are against such expenditures in principle, and want St. Louis and Missouri to stay behind, while other communities move ahead, let them say so frankly. But let's have an end to even the semblance of hypocrisy.

In this connection, you will be most interested in the following figures:

In 1939, Government spending, in the nondefense area, amounted to 13.3 percent of the gross national product; in 1960 it was only 10.9 percent.

Do we in St. Louis want to move backward by standing still—in investment, in employment, in pride of future accomplishment, while other towns and cities and States move forward?

I believe we do not; and I am confident you agree.

Contrary to another inaccurate story being spread around by those who would seem to define as "socialism" any expense which does not directly benefit themselves, recent years have not seen a decline in Government stimulation of the private economy; in fact the reverse is true.

Of all funds spent by the Federal Government in 1960, 53 percent went for goods and services produced by private firms—firms that operate for profit, under the free enterprise system.

In contrast, in 1929 Government purchases from private firms were only 39 percent of the total expenditures; so the history of recent years is one of increasing cooperation, for mutual benefit, between private and public sectors of our economy.

The living standards of the people of America are higher today, after taxes, than any people in the history of the world.

The corporate profits of the last recorded quarter, after taxes, were $27 billion, the greatest in world history.

These are the facts.

This is the truth—and it makes for the "St. Louis story."

I, for one, am mighty proud of what our joint effort has done to create this story.

But that is the past. Let us look to the future. Let us now continue, together, to achieve an ever finer St. Louis and an ever greater Missouri.

Thank you very much.

Textbooks Inadequate on Nazi Horror

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, it is less than a generation since the Hitler holocaust plunged the world into an era of moral darkness, the consequences of which are still apparent, and from which the world will have difficulty emerging within our lifetime, if ever it does. Both passively and by subtle public relation activities, the tragedy of the 20th century is being glossed over.

The Eichmann trial has served in some measure to make aware to the adult world the realities of our recent and shameful history. However, our children here and abroad are slowly but surely being permitted to forget. This is accomplished by deletion of certain facts in textbooks, and by strategic elimination of any reference whatever to 12 years of murder.

A most revealing article on this subject appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of February 18, 1962, written by the distinguished education editor of that paper, Terry Ferrer. I place the article in the RECORD at this time:

TEXTBOOKS INADEQUATE ON NAZI HORROR

(By Terry Ferrer)

It is now more than 16 years since the end of World War II and the collapse of nazism—enough time for a whole new generation to grow up. For these children, and especially those in Germany, the horrors of the Hitler regime must come from textbooks and teachers, from the recitation of dry facts divorced from the emotional impact of the concentration camp, the murder of 6 million Jews, the cold brutality of the Nazi forces.

PETITION FOR REVISION

The only trouble is that German children are not getting the facts at all—or at least not getting them straight.

Neither are American children.

The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith offered proof last year that only 1 of the 48 social studies texts most frequently used in American junior and senior high schools gives a satisfactory account of Nazi persecution of the Jews. And nearly one-third of the texts skip the subject altogether.

The New York City Board of Education has also petitioned 100 textbook publishers to revise their history books because they don't give "adequate knowledge and understanding of Nazi brutalities and mass executions."

Last week, there was fresh evidence that German as well as American children are not getting the facts. A study of East and West German high school history texts—published in the last 3 years—showed that both sides in the cold war are getting a distorted and bitterly anti-American view of German history, Hitlerism and Jewish persecution.

Mark B. Krug, assistant professor of education in history at the University of Chicago's Graduate School of Education, declared that most West German textbooks are biased and reflect neo-Nazi attitudes "that are clearly at variance with the view of Chancellor Adenauer, President Luebke, Mayor Brandt, and many other West German leaders and scholars."

Distortions are especially severe in the "record of the Hitler regime and the appraisal of the policies of the United States vis-a-vis Germany."

In East Germany, Dr. Krug said, history textbooks are "a tool for Communist indoctrination in which the primary aim is to raise dedicated Communists, who would love and admire the Soviet Union and hate West Germany, the Western Powers, and especially the United States."

"Dr. Krug studied eight leading history texts, four from each side of divided Germany. He pointed out that in West Germany choice of texts is left to each state and city authority, while in East Germany texts are rigidly controlled by the Central Ministry of Education. All eight texts are designed for students in grades 8 through 10 of the Oberschule, roughly equivalent to senior high school and junior college in the United States.

DRAWS CONTRASTS

Writing in the new issue of the School Review, a quarterly published by the University of Chicago Press, Dr. Krug notes a number of issues on which the German cold-war adversaries seem at one in their view of the past.

1. Nazi guilt: "The Germans, East and West, have failed to comprehend the magnitude of their collective guilt * * * as far as high-school textbooks are concerned."

Dr. Krug finds it "significant and distressing" that neither the words Coventry nor Lidice are found in the indices of West German texts. (The heart of Coventry, the English city, was destroyed by Luftwaffe bombings, and the entire male population of the Czech village of Lidice was massacred by the Nazis.) "It is strange indeed," he adds, that Free Germany would wish to hide from German youth the two names "which have become worldwide symbols of Nazi crimes and barbarity."

EXPRESS NO SURPRISE

Neither East nor West German texts condemn or express surprise that the whole German people accepted and supported Hitler and Nazism. East German books blamed Nazi barbarity on a band of "Fascists."

But both Eastern and Western texts stress that "the majority of the German people knew nothing or next to nothing about these crimes."

This becomes especially noteworthy in view of the fact that about one-third of the present members of the East German parliament were once card-carrying Nazis—and one-half of those in the West German Parliament.

2. Persecution of Jews: The murder of 6 million Jews is treated in "a detached and restrained manner" in Federal German texts. Two books cut the figure down to "probably only 4.5 million" Jews. All four describe in detail Nazi persecution of Catholics and Protestants, but tend to gloss over Jewish massacres.

EAST GERMAN TEXTS

Curiously, East German texts consistently play down the fact the Nazis sought to exterminate Jews—rather the Jews are called "anti-Fascists" or Poles. One text, which describes such concentration camps as Auschwitz, in southern Poland, declares that the Fascists "increased their bloody terror against the Polish population from year to year."

3. The Nuremberg trials: West German books were highly critical of the trials as illegal because they were without precedent in international law and were conducted on an ex post facto basis.

East German texts praise the death sentences given to 12 Nazi leaders, but feel too many Nazis got away. "Thus the United States and England are attacked by history textbooks of both East Germany and West Germany," Dr. Krug said, "by one side for being too severe and by the other for being too lenient."

4. Anti-Americanism: In West German texts, American Presidents, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, and Dwight D. Eisenhower are pictured as villians and enemies of the German people. Mr. Roosevelt is held personally responsible for the policy of unconditional surrender. All three Presidents are represented as responsible for the loss of German lands east of the Older Neisse line and for the division of Germany.

CONTEMPT AND HATRED

East German books stress contempt and hatred toward America, and reiterate the old charge about Western Powers delaying the second front to weaken Russia. There is no mention of American lend-lease to Russia or of the armed Anglo-American convoys which brought food and military supplies to Russia at great loss of life.

Both East and West Germans agree on the need for, and the certainty of, the reunification of Germany. Texts from each side see this happening as a result of the collapse of the other and its incorporation into one Germany.

REVISION ASKED

Dr. Krug calls for speedy revision, at least in West German texts that have not caught up with the present alliance of the United States wtih the German Federal Republic.

How soon (if ever) these revisions will come is an open question. The Anti-Defamation League said last week that there has been no visible improvement in American texts since its 1961 report. The city board of education is still hoping that the publishers will respond. The American Textbook Publishers Institute stresses that textbooks often require several years to develop or change.

Sixteen years from now, it will be interesting to see if the Berlin wall has made the history books yet.

What Is the "Christian Approach" Toward Russia?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the attached editorial by David Lawrence entitled "What Is the 'Christian Approach' Toward Russia?"

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From U.S. News & World Report, Feb. 26, 1962]

WHAT IS THE "CHRISTIAN APPROACH" TOWARD RUSSIA?

(By David Lawrence)

The above headline appeared on June 9, 1950, on this page. It was the subject of an editorial which called for the expression of our whole-souled desire to remain at peace with the Russian People. The concluding paragraphs of the article were as follows:

"Faith in moral force is at a low ebb in America. Our statesmen appear to have cast it aside despite the lipservice they render now and then to 'the mobilization of spiritual and moral forces.'

"Those words should not be permitted to become empty or hypocritical. They demand acts of faith and acts of sacrifice that will convince the Russian people we are truly

their friends—their brethren in a world of evil—seeking the truth that makes men free, seeking no conquest except of our own souls, and seeking no surrender except of self to the guidance of God."

During the 12 years since those lines were written, churchmen have made various efforts to penetrate the souls of the Russian people by visits to the Soviet Union and to other countries under Communist influence.

It is interesting, therefore, to note the speech of a clergyman, Dr. Dietrich Ritschl, who has just returned from a preaching tour in Russia, Hungary and Czechoslovakia. He is a German-born theologian who has held pastorates in Germany and Scotland and is now professor at the Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Austin, Tex. Here is a striking excerpt from his address at St. Louis on February 13, before the Annual Meeting of the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of Churches:

"After many visits to Eastern European churches, I was invited last fall by the Patriarchate of the Russian Orthodox Church to travel through the Soviet Union and to preach and discuss theological questions with the professors at the theological academies, many of them personal friends.

"The 50 million members of the Orthodox Church in the U.S.S.R. live in conditions totally different from the many million Protestants in the smaller Eastern European countries.

"The Russian Christians have suffered with the other non-Communisists and also with the Communists; they lost twenty million people during the war.

"But in the other countries, communism is only 15 years old; the conditions differ from country to country. But in the whole Communist world, people have learned to respect their government even if they disagree with the party.

"They do not desire an overthrow of the government or a revolution, but they are looking for changes and modification of the ideological system.

"In 1948, the Russian Orthodox Church still criticized the World Council of Churches at Amsterdam, but now she has seen that the way to negotiation with Rome is almost impossible and she has decided to be in solidarity with the Protestant churches in the World Council of Churches.

"This is amazing in the light of the fact that the World Council of Churches is so heavily criticized by the official party propaganda.

"Serious theological work is going on in the Russian Orthodox Church. Millions attend the 4-hour-long worship services. About 50 percent of them are over 50 years of age, but that still leaves 50 percent who are younger. Among them the age group of 10 to 30 is almost absent from the churches.

"There is considerable personal freedom at the moment, in spite of the strong ideological propaganda. Priests and laymen pray openly and make the sign of the cross in restaurants.

"In spite of a shortage of buildings, worship services are held all over the place, including Russian Middle Asia.

"This is also the case in Eastern Europe in general. Eastern Christians do not compare themselves with us in the West, but rather with their conditions in former times. This is a hard lesson for us to learn.

"Protestantism in Eastern Europe is vital and strong. I preached several times to 400 university students in Prague who attended the weekly meeting in their church; I also preached to large groups in Hungary.

"Certainly the Eastern Christian's questions and answers are different from ours, but it is our first lesson here in the West to trust that they are Christians and that they see their own problems much clearer than we.

"They have gone through the sufferings of persecutions and the war, and have no stronger desire than peace. But they, too, live in a world whose political actions are often based on fear. It is good news to hear that we share this with them.

"Our detailed problems are different, but our basic task is the same: to say the liberating word into a world of fear, hatred, and dishonesty."

Temptaton To Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, presently before the House is a proposal by which this body would be increased from its normal permanent membership of 435 to a membership of 438. The pressures to support such a measure are especially great on those who represent the three beneficiary States of Missouri, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania. In the light of these pressures, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, in its lead editorial of this morning, urges the Congress to "Resist the Temptation." This editorial spells out some important considerations in this matter and I would like to take this opportunity to share the admonition of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat with my colleagues:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Feb. 19, 1963]

RESIST THE TEMPTATION

The Congress this week will vote upon a bill which would increase the membership of the House of Representatives by three seats. One of the three would come to Missouri, the other two going to Massachusetts and Pennsylvania.

There is great temptation in this bill for the Missouri delegation to vote for the bill. It would save the seat currently held by Representative MORGAN M. MOULDER, and would continue the Missouri delegation at 11 rather than 10. Massachusetts and Pennsylvania delegations are under similar pressures, and state prestige is considered to be at stake.

This, it seems to us, misses the main issue. The current strength of the House of Representatives is 435, considered by most students of government to be a decidedly unwieldy number. Any increase, however momentarily advantageous to this State, adds to this problem. The current population trend, with Missouri failing to keep pace in population growth, indicates that this would be but a short-lived advantage until the next census in 1970.

In 1910, when the size of the House was fixed at its present number, the argument was persuasively made that the larger the House, the greater its relative disadvantage in prestige to the Executive and the Senate. By a narrow margin, an attempt to fix the House's size at 300 was defeated and 435 was set.

The admission of Alaska and Hawaii automatically subtracted two seats from the earlier 48 states, and now Hawaii has qualified for a second seat. These three seats, combined with failure to keep pace, have cost Missouri, and Illinois as well, a seat each, as well as many other states one or more seats, while fast-growing states like Califorina and Florida have gained many districts.

The overriding question to Missouri Congressmen must not be the temporary advantage of holding for another 8 years a seat to which we are not entitled under current legislation, but rather the question of maintaining the prestige and efficient management of the House of Representatives both actually and relatively to the Senate and the executive branch.

If it is right, as we believe it is, to maintain a House at the smallest feasible number, it is no less right if we happen to be the temporary beneficiaries of enlargement.

For all these reasons, we hope that the Missouri delegation will resist the understandable temptation to widen an already unwieldy organization, and vote to retain the House membership at its present size.

A Letter From Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, ever so often there comes into my office a letter from home which I feel accurately summarizes the feelings of so many of the people whom I am privileged to represent. I feel that such a letter deserves to be read by others besides myself, although I am certain my colleagues receive many letters of a similar nature.

Following is just such a letter from Mrs. Dolores Waterman of Dewitt, N.Y. It is simple and direct, and it expresses the concern which many Americans feel today. Mrs. Waterman asks several rhetorical questions as well as several searching questions to which we would both like to have the answers.

This housewife, who wrongly feels that it might be a bit audacious for her to offer solutions, has some comments that many of our national leaders would do well to digest. This letter further substantiates my belief that public thinking in this country is usually one or two jumps ahead of that which emanates from the high councils here in Washington. And for that we can all offer thanks.

DEAR MR. RIEHLMAN: I am writing this letter in the hope that you might be interested in the thoughts and concerns of one of your constituents back home.

I have become increasingly discouraged and disillusioned about the world situation in recent years, not only by what has been done to the United States and other countries of the free world, but by what we have not been doing in response. It will seem, perhaps, audacious for a simple housewife to think she has some solutions to the problems of the world, but it seems to me that some of them we could find solvable if we could just revert back to the vibrant, energetic, determined Nation that we were a few decades ago.

Why are we constantly cowed by Communist threats all over the world? Why do we constantly back away from communistic challenges? Why do our representatives sit

patiently at conferences in Geneva when everyone knows they are hopeless and useless? Why do we have to accept, willingly, a raise in our taxes in order to finance a rehabilitation program for our neighbors south of the border when the recipients have no intention of cooperating with us in any way. We are a generous people and to a man want to help wherever we can, but our generosity has gotten us nothing but contempt and ridicule throughout the world. Instead of charity, which everyone resents, why can we not be generous and business-like as well? I am not at all happy to think that our hard-earned money is going to people who already have more wealth than they know what to do with, while the hungry will remain hungry. Since sending funds at all to the nations of this hemisphere for their rehabilitation is interfering in their internal affairs, as I see it, why are we so timid about setting down stipulations as to how it is to be distributed? Why not send our economic experts to formulate plans to send this help where it is needed, and not to the few who are already privileged? I hear the word "blackmail" in regard to this very generous offer from the United States and it hurts and appalls me to think that any nation in this hemisphere finds us in such a timorous position as to even entertain the notion of blackmail.

Is there nothing that can be done? Can we not take a stand on anything? It has been said that we are at our best during wartime. Heaven help us if we wait until then to show what we are made of. I feel so certain that a truly firm stand on everything that is important to our welfare just might, at least slow the tide of evil that surrounds us, but the picture of the timid American with hat in hand only whets the appetites of those who would like to destroy us, and fans the fire of ambition for those who have big plans for the United States.

Thanking you for your indulgence, I remain,

Respectfully yours,

DOLORES B. WATERMAN.

Scouting and the Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Progress, February 7, 1962:

SCOUTING AND THE FAMILY

Since 1910, more than 34 million Americans have been identified with the Boy Scouts of America whose 52d anniversary is observed by Boy Scout Week, February 7 to 13.

There is scarcely an American family that has not felt its influence.

In many families there have now been three generations active in its work.

Even as Scouting strengthens family life in America, this year's Boy Scout Week observance focuses on the contribution families make both to scouting and the American way of life.

In the younger boy program—Cub Scouting—parents participate with their sons. Mothers serve as den mothers or helpers in other ways and fathers become den dads and Cub pack committeemen.

In Boy Scouting and the older boy program of exploring, parents show their interest by their participation in scouting functions. It has become tradition in scouting for mothers to wear miniature pins of their sons' ranks.

Scout leaders feel that because of the active participation of parents in scouting's programs that a profound impression is being made on the homelife of millions of Americans. Families brought together by scouting are said to be stronger families. Certainly stronger families mean a stronger America.

During Boy Scout Week, through unit, district, and council programs typical scouting families will be recognized.

We join in saluting scouting for the role it plays in the families of the Cub Scouts, Boy Scouts and Explorers of the Bucktail Council and especially the Clearfield and Moshannon districts. They are the kind of families that are building the kind of character in young people that is America's true strength.

Community Colleges Play Vital Role in American Educational System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased by the increasing interest which is being shown in the community college concept. I have long felt that these institutions have a unique and vital role to play in the American educational system and following my first election to Congress in 1956, I began working on legislation to provide a Federal program of assistance to the States to stimulate the development and expansion of community colleges. I have introduced such legislation in each of the Congresses in which I have served. My bill in the present Congress is H.R. 16.

It is with pleasure, therefore, that I call to my colleagues' special attention two recent articles from the Washington Post, commenting favorably on the development of the community college concept.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 11, 1962]

SPREAD OF JUNIOR COLLEGES IN UNITED STATES BEARS OUT THE PROPHET JORDAN

(By Carole Bowie)

Fifty years ago David Starr Jordan, then president of Stanford University, predicted that the spread of the junior college would be viewed as "the most significant occurence in American education in the present century."

Today, when the junior college movement is being widely described as a 20th century phenomenon and cited as an answer to many critical educational problems, there is little, if any, doubt of the fulfillment of Jordan's prophecy.

The number of junior colleges has more than tripled since 1921 to a total of 667. Located in every State, they enroll one of every four students currently attending an institution of higher learning.

Further, there is widespread conviction among educators that the junior college movement has not yet—indeed, must not have—reached its zenith. California's new master plan for higher education calls for 22 new 2-year institutions.

Plans for expansion of junior college facilities are also underway in other States, including New York, Florida, and Maryland. Legislation to establish a junior college in the District has been approved by the Senate but has been stalled in the House District Committee for a year.

The Senate also, last week, approved a Federal aid program to help colleges build classrooms and laboratories which includes $250 million in matching grants for 2-year colleges. But the junior college aid must survive compromise with a House college aid bill that did not include junior college funds.

Spurring the rise of the junior college is its potential as a way to ease enrollment demands on 4-year colleges and to meet individual and national needs that are now met in no other type of institution.

The diverse curriculum which characterizes the junior college includes:

"Transfer" courses in the liberal arts equivalent to the freshman and sophomore years in a 4-year institution. Some educators hope the bulk of students will take their first 2 years of college in these programs, making room in universities and leaving them free to concentrate on advanced studies.

Terminal programs in semiprofessional vocational and technical skills not offered in most 4-year colleges. These programs, educators think, provide an important source of technical manpower critically needed by the Nation.

Evening programs for adults working for a degree, to improve their cultural backgrounds, or to get a better job. Educators see these programs as a potent force in uplifting the social and economic level of the community.

And in a nation troubled by the fact that less than half its college-age youth seeks higher education, the junior college, located as it is in the community, promises other benefits.

It offers a doorway to higher education for students who do not have enough money to go away from home to school. And it provides a place where students undecided between college and vocational education can make up their minds.

Junior colleges have a place also for "late bloomers" who are capable of college work but cannot get into a 4-year institution because of poor high school grades and for students who want some, but not 4 years, of higher education.

It should be noted, too, that the biggest boom has been among publicly supported junior colleges. They now comprise 59 percent of all 2-year institutions and enroll 90 percent of all junior college students.

If the junior college has been the darling of communities throughout the Nation, it is even more so to the District where, unlike every State, there is no publicly supported institution of higher learning.

District Teachers College, school officials have pointed out, is established solely to train teachers, so offers no general program, and students must sign affidavits declaring their intention to teach to be admitted.

Coupled with the lack of educational opportunity, proponents of a junior college for the city can cite the low economic level of many of the city's students and the very pressing need to provide technical and vocation training for both young people and adults.

What impact a new junior college would have on the low percentage of District high school graduates who continue their education is difficult to predict. There is evidence, however, that junior colleges elsewhere have greatly increased the educational ambitions of youth.

In Jackson County, Fla., for example, only 7 percent of its high school graduates enrolled in college during the year Chipola Junior College was founded. Twelve years later, in 1959, 52 percent of the graduates were beginning college careers—45 percent of them at Chipola.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 19, 1962]

IDEA OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE HAS BIG APPEAL AT LITTLE COST

(By Elsie Carper)

One phase of the Federal-aid-to-higher-education program with big dividends for little cost is the proposal for grants to States to help build community colleges.

The possibilities that the little 2-year colleges offer in taking the pressure of increasing enrollments off big universities has appeal for both exponents of Federal aid and those who have opposed it.

The aid-to-higher-education bill approved by the Senate includes $50 million a year for the next 5 years to be allocated to the States as matching funds to stimulate construction of community or junior colleges.

LITTLE OPPOSITION

Although the Senate debated other sections of the bill—$1.5 billion over the 5 years for loans to colleges for classroom construction and $924 million for scholarships for worthy students—the community college program sailed through without opposition.

Two of the Senate's most conservative Republicans, BARRY GOLDWATER of Arizona, and JOHN G. TOWER of Texas, commented that although they oppose every form of Federal aid to education they recognize the desirability of increasing the number of junior colleges.

"If we were confronted with the necessity of supporting some form of Federal aid for higher education but given a choice as to what form such aid should take, we would unreservedly favor aid exclusively for the building of more junior colleges," the two Republicans said in a statement.

BACKERS GIVEN HOPE

The near endorsement by the two implacable foes of Federal spending has given backers of the community college program hope that this section of the Senate bill earmarking funds will survive a House-Senate conference.

The aid-to-higher-education bill approved by the House provides the $1.5 billion for college classroom construction, 60 percent in the form of grants and 40 percent in loans, but nothing specifically for community colleges.

Major disputes between Senate and House conferees who will be charged with working out a compromise bill is expected to be over the scholarships. House Republicans have so far blocked the conference because of the scholarship provisions in the Senate bill.

There is also a second point of disagreement that must be resolved in the conference. With the exception of matching grants for junior colleges, the Senate bill limits funds for classroom construction to loans.

In practical application this means that some State universities will not be able to participate in the program because of statutes prohibiting borrowing for construction of nonrevenue-producing facilities. While they can borrow to construct dormitories, from which they receive rental income, they cannot borrow for classrooms.

"MAJOR NEW HOPE"

The House bill, on the other hand, authorizes both grants and loans but opens up the religious issue of grants to church schools.

In commenting on the section of the Senate bill authorizing the matching grants for community colleges, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare called the two-year institutions "a major new hpe for the successful accommodation of increasing enrollments."

Senator CLIFFORD CASE (Republican, of New Jersey), who has campaigned for the legislation for 5 years, estimates that if all the States and the District of Columbia take advantage of the grants by appropriating additional funds that about a quarter of a million students will be able to continue their education.

Testifying before the Committee, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Abraham Ribicoff described the community college as "the answer to the floodgate of education in this country."

"I feel with the fantastic cost of education, fantastic cost of buildings, the fantastic cost of room and board, that the answer to the large educational problem will be found in the community," Ribicoff said.

National Lutheran Council Supports the United Nations and Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in resolutions adopted at its 44th annual meeting held in Atlantic City, N.J., the National Lutheran Council went on record supporting participation by the United States in the United Nations and the endorsement of the objectives of the Peace Corps.

The meeting was held January 30 to February 1, 1962. The Lutheran Council is a joint agency for Lutheran church bodies comprising 5,500,000 baptized members. One of its constitutional purposes is "to witness for the Lutheran Church on matters which require an expression of common faith, ideals, and program."

Over 10 years ago the council adopted a resolution supporting participation by the United States in the United Nations. Because of various pressures throughout the country to alter or weaken such support, the council at this annual meeting reaffirmed its earlier statement.

In its resolution concerning the Peace Corps the council gave general endorsement to the objectives of the Peace Corps and encouraged qualified Lutherans to participate in it. At the same time, it expressed the judgment that the council itself, as a church agency, should not enter into any contractual relationships with the Peace Corps.

I include herewith, Mr. Speaker, the resolutions which the council adopted:

UNITED NATIONS

Whereas Christians everywhere in a divided and strife-torn world continue to proclaim the power of love and justice, and seek peace for all men and nations; and

Whereas the United Nations has been under increasing pressures both here in America and abroad from those who have become impatient when its political and diplomatic efforts toward world peace have achieved less than perfect results in an imperfect world; and

Whereas the United Nations has achieved noteworthy results in preserving a degree of peace in a series of military crises, and has established praiseworthy advances in fields that include health, education, labor, trade, relief, rehabilitation, resettlement, and human rights; and

Whereas this organization presents to mankind, under the providence of God, a most hopeful opportunity for sharing the benefits of civilization, and using man's new powers to enhance the dignity and freedom of individuals and nations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Lutheran Council hereby reaffirms its 1951 statement of confidence in the usefulness of the United Nations, and expresses the hope that the Government of the United States, maintaining a place in the family of nations in a way which seeks to cooperate for the good of all rather than to exercise domination for achievement of narrowly self-centered purposes, may continue to contribute leadership and support of this agency of international cooperation; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Secretary General of the United Nations and the Secretary of State of the United States of America.

PEACE CORPS

Whereas the Peace Corps has been established by the U.S. Government to help the people of interested countries and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower as well as to promote a better understanding of the American people on the part of the peoples served and a better understanding of other peoples on the part of the American people; and

Whereas the Peace Corps provides a creative opportunity for citizens of good will and competence to serve human need, and to demonstrate the power of disciplined service given without prospect of pecuniary advantage; and

Whereas the Christian's call into the fellowship of the church is at the same time a call to active participation, under the sign of the cross, in the world recognized as a realm in which God is active in creation, judgment, and redemption: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Lutheran Council:

1. Register its general endorsement of the objectives of the Peace Corps.
2. Commend the President and the Congress for the inauguration of a Peace Corps program which has already given evidence of high standards of performance.
3. Commend the administration of the Peace Corps for its announced policy of not approving churches and religious agencies as sponsors of Peace Corps projects and express the hope that this policy will be maintained.
4. Encourage qualified Lutherans to participate in the Peace Corps program as a significant opportunity for service.

Scholarship To Relieve Physician Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Health and Safety Subcommittee, of which I am a member, of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has recently concluded hearings on H.R. 4999, the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act.

There is much merit in this legislation. Under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith an interesting and

timely letter on this issue which appeared in today's issue of the New York Times. The letter which is written by Dr. Benedict J. Duffy, professor of preventive medicine, Seton Hall Medical School, very aptly sums up the case for the administration's bill:

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

A frequently repeated article of faith is that this country has the best medical care in the world. If this is so, it isn't too obvious when one considers that the United States stands well down the list of Western nations in such measures of better health care as are available.

Reports of the World Health Organization show this country to be 11th on the list in infant mortality. As for dying sooner the United States stands 13th on the list for life expectancy among males, according to the 1960 Demographic Yearbook of the United Nations. Scandinavia and Great Britain have significantly better records in both regards.

In addition to this sobering evidence of the questionable adequacy of this country's present medical achievement there is the more disturbing fact that nonwhite infant mortality in the United States is about twice that of the white population and the situation grows worse rather than better.

The supply of physicians is one critical shortage. The ratio of active physicians to population has declined sharply and will continue to decline unless steps are taken to increase both the number and support of medical schools and their students.

The private sector—individuals, foundations, communities, church groups—has responded with a tremendous outpouring of money. Many States such as New York, have invested heavily in medical education. But there is clearly an end to private endowment and many States have even more urgent needs for their aged and chronically ill citizens.

SUPPORT URGED

Medical education is both a graduate study and a science. It should be supported as such. The overwhelming majority of graduate students in mathematics, physics, and chemistry receive Federal scholarships and generous support by private industry. The medical student from a family of modest means can only expect an increasing load of debts through a much longer period of education and training.

A bill, H.R. 4999, authorizing scholarships of approximately $1,500 to about one-fourth of the students in each eligible medical school is currently before the Congress. Every medical school and organization other than the American Medical Association has endorsed this legislation as minimal, conservative, and urgently necessary.

Not all of the AMA agrees with itself. Commenting on the present situation, which requires that yearly over 750 foreign-trained physicians be imported to maintain our present services, the progressive Council on Medical Education has stated: "This is perhaps the first prosperous, great, and strong nation since the Roman Empire that has ever needed physicians educated outside its own boundaries to provide necessary medical care for its own populace."

If our national medical-care situation is not to become even worse, the American Medical Association leadership and the American people should heed these storm signals and urge congressional approval of the medical-education bill at this session and in its entirety. The health of the American people is at stake.

BENEDICT J. DUFFY, M.D.,
Professor, Department of Preventive Medicine, Seton Hall Medical School.
JERSEY CITY, N.J., *February 8, 1962.*

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Federal Water Resources Planning and Potomac River Basin Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the development, protection and utilization of our Nation's water resources are vitally essential to the welfare and advancement of our civilization. The gravity and magnitude of the problem make it imperative that the Federal Government move as rapidly as possible to take affirmative action in its solution which has ceased to be a matter of exclusive local or State concern.

President Kennedy's water resources planning program as proposed by Senate 2246, now pending in the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, would set up a comprehensive framework for water resources planning within river basins throughout the United States. The enactment of this legislation would afford a proportional means for cooperative participation by Commissions and organizations presently active in this field.

Outstanding in its contribution to this program has been the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin. This Commission is an arm of the Government created by a treaty which was entered into by four States and the District of Columbia and approved by Congress. The Commission consists of 19 members, 3 appointed by each of the 5 signatories to its treaty—the States of Pennsylvania, Virginia, Maryland, and West Virginia, the municipality of the District of Columbia, and 3 Commissioners appointed by the President of the United States.

The Commission's Executive Director, Ellis S. Tisdale, has advised that since 1956, 58 pollution-abatement projects costing $32.3 million have been completed under its program, of which $5.9 million came from Federal grants-in-aid.

Of related significance is an editorial from the Evening Star of February 1, 1962, which reports that Col. Warren E. Johnson of the U.S. Army Engineers has estimated basic development costs for the Potomac River Basin will be approximately $500 million, spread over a 50-year period. He further anticipated that initial construction will be financed by the Federal Government with a large part of the financial burden falling within State and District jurisdiction.

The editorial continues:

As Colonel Johnson suggested, some sort of basinwide authority seems to be by all odds the most logical and sensible means of dealing with the problem.

Certainly one possibility which should be investigated, in our opinion, is that the functions of the existing Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin might be expanded to take over the necessary economic and political chores.

On January 25, 1962, I addressed the winter meeting of the Commission at a luncheon at the Willard Hotel, here in Washington, D.C., on the subject of "Federal Water Resources Planning and River Basin Management." Officials present were: from West Virginia, Commissioners Charles V. Bush, Berkeley Springs, and Samuel R. Pancake, Romney. Our third Commissioner, Dr. N. H. Dyer, Charleston, was represented by J. H. Millar, director, sanitary engineering division, State department of health and also attending was Mr. Kenneth Old, Jr., engineer, Division of Water Resources, West Virginia Department of Natural Resources.

Representing Maryland were: Commission Chairman Hon. H. Winship Wheatley, Jr., Commissioner George F. Hazelwood and Alternate Commissioner Joseph F. Kaylor.

From the District of Columbia were Commissioners David V. Auld and Lee F. Dante. Alternate Commissioner William H. Cary, Jr., represented the third Commissioner, Dr. Daniel L. Finucane.

Others present were: Dr. Charles L. Wilbar, Jr., Commissioner from Pennsylvania and from the U.S. Government were Commissioner Lawrence M. Fisher and Alternate Commissioner Callis H. Atkins.

Included in my address were an outline of the Nation's water needs and a brief summary of the Water Resources Planning Act. This legislation is of timely interest to many of our citizens.

I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

FEDERAL WATER RESOURCES PLANNING AND RIVER BASIN MANAGEMENT

(An address by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, at the winter meeting of the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, Willard Hotel, luncheon 12:15 p.m., Washington, D.C., January 25, 1962)

It is always a pleasure to return and participate in the activities of this commission, activities which enlisted my support almost 25 years ago when we addressed the problem of pollution abatement before the Potomac Valley Joint Conference on River Pollution.

Your interstate commission, which grew out of that conference, has performed yeoman service in bringing coherent and effective pollution abatement practices to the Potomac River Basin, and in setting forth guidelines of action for other areas. Now, however, as the program of this meeting indicates, and as your most able director, Ellis Tisdale, informed me in a recent letter, your commission is prepared to move ahead into the broader field of water resources conservation.

This development is most encouraging. If I might be excused for quoting myself, let us note that the need for expanding your commission's responsibilities and actions was stressed in my remarks to your winter meeting 3 years ago.

I commented that "the most serious pollution problem, and one which indicates the need for expanding the Commission's responsibilities, is that of soil erosion and siltation. This presents a problem which reaches beyond the narrow limits of pollution abatement, a restrictive practice, into the fields of forest management, farming practices, urban and suburban housing developments, and highway construction."

It is my hope that legislation now pending in the 87th Congress will offer Federal leadership and financial assistance in facing not only this problem but the entire gamut of questions encountered in water resources management.

In his letter to the Congress which accompanied his proposed Water Resources Planning Act last year, President Kennedy stated that—

"We have a national obligation to manage our basic water supply so it will be available when and where needed and in acceptable quality and quantity—and we have no time to lose. The planning authorized by this legislation will provide a vital tool for achieving effective water resources management."

The measure of the problem is readily apparent upon even the most cursory examination of our water consumption figures. In 1900 we used 40 billion gallons of fresh water daily. At the present time our consumption is approximately 300 billion gallons a day, and it is estimated that by 1980—less than 20 years ahead—it will reach 650 billion gallons. The current estimate of usable fresh water in lakes, streams and reservoirs is 650 billion gallons daily. Thus, it is evident that we will soon reach our national limit in water supply, a problem which can be surmounted only by a wise management policy and the advancement of technology in the reusage of water.

Nor do these figures reveal the variable conditions of supply and the complexities of furnishing water when and where it is needed. The era of megalopolis, or the supercity, is already with us. Along the Atlantic seaboard, the area from Boston to Norfolk is virtually one unbroken metropolis. In 1900 some 35 percent of the American population lived in towns and cities; by 1950 the population of our urban centers comprised approximately 60 percent of the total. And by the year 2000 it is estimated that 85 percent of our population will be residing in urban complexes.

No person in public life has contributed more to the conservation and development of our national water resources or expended greater effort in the field of water pollution control than my knowledgeable colleague, the Honorable ROBERT S. KERR.

Senator KERR is the ranking member of the Senate Committee on Public Works and is chairman of its Subcommittee on Flood Control, Rivers and Harbors, of which I am privileged to be a member. He was also chairman of the important Select Committee on National Water Resources which was formed in April 1959, under provisions of Senate Resolution 48 of the 86th Congress to make studies of the extent to which water resources activities in the United States are related to the national interest and for other purposes.

The senior Senator from Oklahoma in the foreword of the committee's report, January 30, 1961, clearly and succinctly draws attention to the urgency of moving forward in the field of water conservation and pollution control. He said:

"The nature, the immediacy, and the gravity of the water resources problems faced by the United States vary greatly from region to region, but it is clear that all parts of the country either have or will have problems.

"The committee's studies show the importance of maintaining water quality through pollution abatement in order that increased reuse of water will be possible, and to improve conditions for recreation and for conservation of fish and wildlife to support increased leisure time activities of the people.

"The committee also stresses the importance of research and development in order to promote more efficient use of available water resources and to find economical ways of developing new water supplies through such techniques as desalting ocean water, purifying brackish water, weather modification, etc. The committee asks that Federal research programs in these fields be coordinated, so that the Congress and the public may be better informed."

Significant excerpts from part I of the report emphasize that:

"The task confronting the Nation in the water field is one of meeting the growing demands on water resources in the most efficient manner consistent with accepted public aims. It is important that plans be made to meet demands before they arise so as to avoid any retardation of economic activity in particular localities because of a deficiency in water development. The problem is a dynamic one because the rapid advances of science continually stimulate new demands while at the same time opening up new opportunities for meeting them. Since Government has of necessity assumed major responsibilities in many fields of water development and management, it must equip itself through the adoption of programs and policies to deal with this dynamic situation."

The 1st session of the 87th Congress committed itself to the pollution abatement aspect of the problem by enacting the Federal Water Pollution Control Amendments of 1961. Thus the annual Federal construction grants authorized to assist communities were increased from the existing $50 million to $80 million for fiscal 1962, $90 million for fiscal 1963 and $100 million for each of the fiscal years 1964–67.

The 1961 legislation also increased the annual Federal matching grants for administration of pollution control programs from $3 million to $5 million and extended the program for 7 years. It also authorized $5 million annually for the development of new methods of sewage treatment, and removed the $100,000 annual limitation on research fellowships granted by HEW. These provisions, as well as others not mentioned, have greatly augmented Federal assistance to State and local governments in their efforts to combat water pollution.

Yet, as I indicated, the need for an assured water supply of high quality throughout the United States poses questions which far exceed a pollution abatement program. It is this need to which the President's Water Resources Planning Act of 1961—now pending before the full Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in the Senate—is addressed.

Joint hearings in which I was privileged to participate were conducted last July and August before the Interior and Public Works Committees.

Briefly stated, S. 2246, which embodies the President's proposals would do the following:

In title I, it would establish a Cabinet-level Water Resources Council composed of the Secretaries of the Army, Interior, Agriculture, and HEW and a Chairman of the Council designated by the President. The council would serve as the principal focus within the executive branch for a comprehensive framework for water resources planning within river basins throughout the United States and as a source of overall guidance and standards for planning. The need for some such structure for overall coordination is apparent when one notes that there are at present some 22 Federal agencies from the various departments and independent administrative bodies which are active in the field of water resources conservation, planning, and development.

In title II, S. 2246 would authorize the establishment by the President, at the request of the Governor of one or more of the affected States or of the council, of a river basin, or group of related river basins in the United States.

These commissions, which would be composed of representatives of the States and Federal agencies concerned, would have the responsibility of preparing and keeping current comprehensive and integrated plans for Federal, State and local development of water and related land resources. They would also recommend long-range schedules of priorities for the collection and analysis of basic data and for investigation, planning and construction of projects.

Title III of the act would authorize Federal matching grants to the States of $5 million for each of the years within the 10-year target period, to assist the States in developing comprehensive water resources plans and in participating in the development of the plans authorized in title II. Thus, it provides an element more essential than ever before to the total water resources effort which the future of America demands.

Not only does the President's proposal offer a coherent framework within which such commissions as yours may be accommodated. But even more important, it is national in scope and will enable us to tackle not only comprehensive planning within river basins, but also comprehensive planning in dealing with the total water resources of the country.

It is worthy of mention that the proposal embodies the established policy of the Congress and of the report of the Select Committee on Water Resources in that the river basin planning contemplated by the proposed legislation would require that any river basin plan should take account of domestic, agricultural, recreational, industrial and energy needs as well as those of fish and wildlife and other conservation interests. In this regard, the proposal avails itself of the wisdom and experience of water resources planning achieved in almost three decades of administering the Tennessee Valley Authority, which, in its regional concept, constitutes one of the significant creations of Government in this century. I speak now, of course, not with reference to the issue of public power, but solely in terms of resources planning in the light of the total human and natural ecology of a region or river basin.

The President's Water Resources Planning Act offers a truly major step forward for America and, if enacted, will be the fulfillment of one of his most important campaign commitments. It is my hope, and my belief, that the bill will be reported and favorably acted on by Congress during this session.

A $1 Trillion Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, "Youth Wants To Know" will know about our shocking national debt of over $1 trillion. The National Government can no longer hide these fantastic figures.

The following article was handed to me by a young mother of young children with trembling hands. I commend this article by Maurice H. Stans, former Director of the Budget, to every American.

The article appeared in the Washington Post Monday, February 19:

UNCLE SAM FACES $1 TRILLION DEBT

(By Maurice H. Stans)

Treasury Secretary C. Douglas Dillon has asked for a $10 billion increase in the ceiling on our national debt. This would bring it to an alltime high of $308 billion.

The Congress has indicated that it will deal with this request in two installments. An increase of $2 billion will undoubtedly be authorized immediately, as an emergency measure, to permit enough new funding to pay current bills. This will bring the debt total to the magic line of $300 billion.

Above this amount, Dillon will have tougher sailing, and the Congress may give him only a part of the additional $8 billion he wants. Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, longtime champion of solvent government, has announced that his Senate Finance Committee will hold hearings on the state of the Government's financial position before voting any further increase. By the time the hearings are concluded, the Senator will have some shocking news to report to the American people.

INTEREST IS $9 BILLION

The annual interest on the national debt is now running above $9 billion, and for the last several years this carrying cost, without any payment on the debt itself, has been taking 11 cents of every dollar of Federal taxes collected. And the chances that any of this debt will ever be paid off seem less and less as time goes on.

This is quite a contrast with the past. From the beginning of the Nation in 1789 until recent years, a major objective of every President was to pay off the national debt. It was done once—by Andrew Jackson in 1834. But each succeeding war built the debt to a new plateau; intervening efforts accomplished reductions but never eliminated the entire amount.

Even so, at the end of fiscal 1916, the debt was only a little more than a billion dollars. By the end of World War I, it had soared above $25 billion. From this high point it was reduced in 11 consecutive years, cutting it by more than one-third to $16 billion in 1930.

From there it began an upward climb, through wartime and peacetime, with the budget in the red 26 years out of 32. The depression years increased the debt regularly, and it had reached nearly $50 billion before the outbreak of World War II. At the close of the war it was $270 billion. Three subsequent surpluses by Truman and three more by Eisenhower could not match the costs of the Korean war and the intervening peacetime deficits. The current year's spending will push the debt to $300 billion, or more, and the end is not in sight.

CREDIT CARD GOVERNMENT

Up to now I have been referring only to the interest-bearing debt. But this isn't all that we owe as a nation. By a continuing policy of national extravagance, we have been committing the Government's future resources beyond this to an incredible degree. We have adopted in Washington a program of "credit card government" that is placing a burden of staggering proportions on our children and grandchildren.

As Director of the Budget, I undertook in 1960 to add up all the liabilities of our Government. Here are some of them. We owe $30 billion in unfunded pensions to retired civilian employees of the Government. We owe almost $40 billion in accrued pensions to retired military servicemen. The total of our present commitments to veterans for future pensions and compensation (not counting many other benefits) is in excess of $300 billion. All of this $370 billion is for past services and in the financial statement of a business would be accounted for among liabilities.

Then there are many other present contractual or legislated Government undertakings that will have to be financed in the future. Taking all of them—housing subsidy contracts, shipping subsidies, the Interstate Highway System, unfinished public works projects, unpaid purchases of military supplies and many others—this group adds up to more than $150 billion in further bills to be met in the coming years.

SOCIAL SECURITY, TOO

Altogether, counting the interest-bearing debt of $300 billion and the other obligations and commitments I have mentioned, we have placed a mortgage of over $800 billion on our national future to be met in taxes. This does not include untold billions of dollars in guarantees by the Government on housing loans and other mortgages, bank deposits and other savings and so on.

Even this is not the full story. Under our social security system, we have scheduled a series of benefits that far exceed, in actuarial terms, the resources that would be available at present tax rates. This deficiency, which can only be made up out of future tax increases already provided in the law, is another $250 or $300 billion.

This makes the total present undertakings of the Government, to be paid from future taxes, in excess of a trillion dollars. And that is beyond the regular annual costs of defense, welfare, and other Government activities.

This is a national debt of more than $22,000 for every family of four in the country. Quite a spending spree we've been on for the last 30 years, isn't it?

Meeting of Western Hemisphere Foreign Ministers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I issued on January 23, 1962, on the subject of the meeting of Western Hemisphere foreign ministers at Punta del Este.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY U.S. SENATOR HOMER E. CAPEHART, REPUBLICAN, OF INDIANA

A matter very close to my heart and of vital importance to every man, woman, and child on the face of the earth is the future of Latin America.

It is a matter of pride with me that very long ago I began to urge greater emphasis on and immediate action with respect to the Western Hemispheric solidarity necessary to protect Latin America against the long existent threat of Communist encroachment.

Some, but not enough, of that advice was heeded, else the cancerous Communist beachhead of Cuba which now exists 90 miles off our shores would not be there to spread its destructive fibers throughout Latin America.

It is not necessary here to review the tragic recent history of Cuba. It is sufficient to say we now recognize the mistakes which were made and, in the opinion of many, are continuing. My plea is that we, the people of the United States, now lend the weight of this Nation's stature to the support of Latin American nations seeking to protect themselves, and us, from danger approaching the state of gravity.

I refer, of course, to the position this Nation is to take at the meeting of Western Hemisphere foreign ministers at Punta del Este in Uruguay. The meeting was called for the specific purpose of considering the threat Castro's Communist government poses to all of us.

It is difficult to understand why there should be any doubt at all about our position in the light of President Kennedy's statement last year that "* * * If the nations of this hemisphere should fail to meet their commitments against outside Communist penetration, then I want it clearly understood that this Government will not hesitate in meeting its primary obligations, which are the security of our Nation."

But, there are reasons to believe some persons at or near high diplomatic level in our Government are inclined toward a policy which would amount only to "moral isolation of Castro."

The Wall Street Journal, in its January 17 issue, quotes an unidentified Kennedy aid as saying that all that may be accomplished at Punta del Este is "collective moral isolation of Castro" and as commenting that "even that would improve the atmosphere." Presumably the Kennedy aid is in the White House.

The United Press International quotes Secretary of State Dean Rusk as "avoiding any specific forecast of whether he expects strong action against Castro's Cuba," before he left for Punta del Este.

To quote the United Press International further:

"Rusk said the Conference will reaffirm the principles of the hemisphere security system, it will point to events in Cuba 'in violation of the obligations' and will agree that 'events in Cuba represent an unacceptable penetration of this hemisphere by forces from outside * * *.' He declined to predict, however, whether the Conference will vote any sanctions against Cuba, saying there can be no 'congealing of a consensus' for action until the foreign ministers meet."

Secretary Rusk put his position this way, according to the eminent Associated Press diplomatic writer, John M. Hightower, on the day of the Secretary's departure:

"The ministers will be seeking agreement on measures appropriate to the present situation; that is, one in which Cuba, a member government of the Organization of American States, has made itself an accomplice to the Communist conspiracy dedicated to the overthrow of the representative governments of this hemisphere.

"I am confident that the foreign ministers, recognizing the danger which this situation presents to our free societies and the collective security of the hemisphere, will find within the inter-American system the most effective possible means for the protection and strengthening of the principles upon which this system was founded."

Mr. Murray Marder, of the Washington Post, wrote in the edition of Sunday, January 21, that "there are mixed views inside the Kennedy administration about just how hard the United States can press for drastic anti-Castro action at Punta del Este before * * * the effort becomes 'counterproductive.'"

In the light of statements such as these attributed to the highest diplomatic places in our Government, it is not surprising that representatives of a group of Latin American nations—a good majority of the total number—became so uneasy about the U.S. position that they met in Panama City to arrive at a common approach to the Communist danger in Cuba.

These distinguished citizens, I am told, tried to figure out just what the U.S. position at Punta del Este will be—whether it will be firm enough to fulfill President Kennedy's pledge to our own Nation or whether we will finally accede to a position supporting only "a moral isolation of Castro."

They have heard officially that our firm decision is to insist on sanctions against Castro's Cuba—on quarantining the island as we did the Dominican Republic, and backing up the quarantine with force if needed.

But, I am informed they also have heard that the United States has a second and perhaps a third policy emanating from perhaps unauthorized talks engaged in by administration underlings.

I, for one, do not want this Nation again to be embarrassed by loose talk about coexistence as has been reported from other conferences. It would be a Western Hemispheric catastrophe if our representatives took the position that we would allow Mr. Castro 60 to 90 days to confess his sins, promise to be a good boy, and return to the hemispheric fold as a member in good standing—retaining all the while $100 million worth of offensive weapons which, I suppose he would forge into harmless Marxist-Lenin machetes.

As far as I am concerned, Mr. Castro long ago—even before he admitted he was a devoted Communist and would be the rest of his life—removed himself from coexistence with our system of government.

What will the Cubans do at Punta del Este? As far as I am concerned, it doesn't make much difference, but they're apt to do such things as trying to produce prisoners from the April 17 abortive invasion and attempting to prove that this was solely U.S. intervention and that Punta del Este is merely an extension of that policy.

Whatever Cuba may do, the Organization of American States is perfectly capable of taking concerted action against the Castro Communist dictatorship.

Fourteen nations of the OAS voted to convene the foreign ministers for the purpose of considering the expulsion of Cuba. Two voted against this meeting, including, of course, Cuba. Five abstained.

Some of our diplomatic advisers have been reported to believe that a simple majority of two-thirds is not enough. They are reported to favor serious concessions to gain one or two votes, even at the expense of the sacrifice of principle.

My familiarity with and deep respect (excluding Castroite Cuba) for all Latin American nations, and for our fellow Americans who live there, is well known. Anybody who seeks to cast an aspersion on the basic loyalty to the Western Hemisphere of any one of

them, except for Castroite Cuba, has me to deal with.

Each has its peculiar problems. But each also looks to the United States for leadership. In that leadership we should not fail them at Punta del Este. To them, the voice of any one OAS member is as important as is the voice of any other. Each is basically devoted to the necessity of rejecting Communist dictatorship anywhere in the Western Hemisphere.

Despite the clarity of article 19 of the OAS Charter to the contrary, some contend that sanctions against a Communist dictatorship is, in fact, intervention in the internal affairs of Cuba. But these people do not speak of the intervention in the lives of the Cuban people by a Communist dictator. Cuba is not Castro and Castro will fall of his own weight in the vacuum of ostracism provided for within the legal structure of the OAS. But he will never fall if we, the dominant force in the Western Hemisphere, are so naive as to plead with him to forswear his communism rather than let the majority rule in the OAS.

We are not without important friends within those countries which abstained in the voting to convene the Conference at Punta del Este. The Mexican people are our friends. In Brazil three prominent newspapers have switched sides in Rio de Janeiro alone since Castro's defiant statement that he had always been and always would be a Marxist Leninist.

There is division in Argentina, Chile, and Ecuador. But it is division. Some predict that at least two of the abstainers will switch their votes to condemnation of Castro's communism and dictatorship if they are convinced that the present administration in this country is actually at Punta del Este with one, and only one, position.

We have a duty to perform here and now. First, we must give powerful encouragement to those nations which met in Panama. Second, we must make known to the entire hemisphere and the watching world that we will tolerate no soft stand at Punta del Este.

In a fight to the death with naked Communist dictatorship, let there be no compromise with either right or reality. And let no one representing the U.S. team at Punta del Este arrogate to himself any other position than stern determination to carry out the will of the American people.

Statement by AFL–CIO Executive Council on Department of Urban Affairs and Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement adopted by the AFL–CIO Executive Council in support of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, creating a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing:

STATEMENT BY THE AFL–CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND HOUSING, FEBRUARY 19, 1962, MIAMI BEACH, FLA.

The creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing in the Federal Government has been advocated by responsible municipal and State officers, as well as by the AFL–CIO, for many years. Last year, the goal seemed close to achievement when administration bills to create the Department were reported in both Houses of the Congress.

Unfortunately, legislation was frustrated this year when the House Rules Committee voted to kill the House bill. Immediately, President Kennedy sent to the Congress Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 which, unless vetoed by either House of Congress, will achieve the same end.

Establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing is long past due. Presently nearly 70 percent of all Americans live in urban areas, and both their numbers and their proportion of the total population are rapidly increasing.

This vast population increase has brought myriad problems to the cities and to the States in which they are located. There is an urgent need to coordinate and enhance the multiplying Federal services which are now and will be available to these communities. To Federal aid for housing, urban renewal, community facilities, airports, highways, hospitals, and schools have recently been added Federal aid for rehabilitation of chronically depressed areas, juvenile delinquency control, and health facilities and services. More programs will come as the needs of the communities grow more urgent and their financial plight more acute.

At present, these varied programs are administered by many different agencies in the executive branch. The city or State official who seeks aid under these programs is faced with a bewildering complexity of administrative operations and policies. An important function of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing could be to serve as a clearinghouse for information and services, thus substantially increasing the usefulness, availability, and efficiency of Government functions in these areas.

Perhaps most important of all is that the States and their local communities would at last have a voice in the highest levels of government. There is at present no official representing the views of urban dwellers in the President's Cabinet, and consequently their interest is not adequately represented in the Cabinet or in the various departments and agencies administering the programs listed above.

A Secretary of Urban Affairs and Housing is needed to serve their needs. The Secretary would speak with the prestige and power necessary to assure reasonable consideration of urban needs in the making of policy and the administration of programs.

For these reasons, we believe the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing should be promptly created. We therefore urge the Congress to approve Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962.

Proclamation Honoring American Citizens of Greek Descent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the city of Cambridge, Mass., proudly claims as citizens many people of Greek descent. It is also the home of two of our great universities, which provide students with opportunities to study the modern sciences and the ancient classics.

To the Hellenic forebears who formed the language through which our civilization was founded and given to us, the city of Cambridge recently paid homage with the proclamation of Greek Letters Week.

The proclamation issued by Mayor Edward A. Crane of Cambridge so well expresses our gratitude that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas our citizens of Greek descent, in conjunction with other Americans of Greek descent, will celebrate the week January 25 to February 4, 1962, as Greek Letters Week.

Greece has been the champion of liberty and self-determination, the supporter of everything noble, fine and pure, the defender of man's inalienable rights.

Greece was the cradle of democracy and on Greek soil the beginning of free democratic principles and processes of law came into being. The Greek language became the chief instrument by which humanity was taught the arts and sciences and is promoting man's effort for moral integrity and spiritual enhancement. The Greek language has permitted us to remain strong and adamant in the struggle for the perpetuation of man's lofty ideals: Now, therefore, I, Edward A. Crane, mayor of the city of Cambridge, do hereby proclaim January 25 to February 5, 1962, as Greek Letters Week.

A Personal Plea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD (DICK) ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. ICHORD of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have joined with Congressman ASPINALL in the introduction of the Lead and Zinc Act of 1962, a bill which I believe is a legislative must, especially as it pertains to the Lead Belt area of Missouri. In that respect I wish to share with my colleagues, both in the Ways and Means Committee, as well as in this great body, a letter which I have received from a lead miner in my district. The words of Mr. Marvin L. Poston, of Leadwood, Mo., will present the humane aspect involved in this legislation. The personal plea of Mr. Poston, I believe, will lend cognizance to the urgency of the enactment of the Lead and Zinc Act of 1962. I commend his words depicting conditions in the lead-mining industry of the United States and in Missouri:

LEADWOOD, MO.,
February 9, 1962.

Hon. DICK ICHORD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DICK: I am writing this letter with a head full of worries and near shattered dreams. As you know by now, the price of lead has dropped twice in as many weeks and it is now at a point where I can almost predict that the St. Joseph Lead Co. is preparing to close its mines in the Lead Belt because our Government has failed in its policies to help its domestic mines.

I have read the bill which you introduced in the House. I am in full agreement with your bill; but if it is sidestepped, then we have again failed.

As you well know, the St. Francois County area of fine people are in jeopardy with shattered dreams of the future in a one-industry area. Everyone in the five-county area is dependent upon the mines and they must remain in operation. If they close, then the taxes from a very wealthy county will be cut off; this is very bad business. Then it would not be long until we would be at the mercy of the Government and other tax moneys would have to be used to help us.

I was talking tonight with my close friend, Floyd Becker, county clerk, and he is as worried as I am about this situation. I congratulate you on your proposal before the House and I am hoping something will come from your efforts. Do you really think that something will develop from your proposal? If not, what will be our next move? If I could be of any help to you, please feel free to call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN L. POSTON.

LEADWOOD, MO.

Cost of Federal Farm Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A, B, C, D," which appeared in the February 1, 1962, edition of the South Bend Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A, B, C, D

How ya gonna keep 'em down on the farm?

It's as simple as A (abundance), B (balance), C (conservation), D (development), President Kennedy told Congress yesterday in presenting the administration's much heralded farm program.

But from here, an alternate set of words seem better to fit the letters selected by the President to sum up his plan.

A, it's appalling. B, it's bereft of a real solution. C, it's confusing. D, it's of dubious value.

The new program has been described as tough. It is aimed at whittling down the scandalous cost of Federal farm controls.

The most obvious way of doing this, it would seem, might be to begin easing some of the controls with the intention of gradually scrapping all of them and letting the law of supply and demand dictate the necessary adjustments in agriculture.

Certainly, this could not be done overnight without economic havoc. But if it's ever to be done, a start must be made sometime, however painful the process promises to be.

Mr. Kennedy's plan goes in the opposite direction. It tightens controls.

And the plan makes a certain amount of sense if you accept the thesis that controls provide the right approach to the farm problem. If the administration proposals are adopted, farmers who exceed their production allotments and marketing quotas would lose all price supports.

This is the key to the plan's money-saving features. It is billed as a way to trim some $5 billion off the $12 billion cost of farm programs during the next 4 years.

Saving money, of course, is just fine, but not at the expense of an ultimate solution to the basic problem. Under this plan, the problem would cost less, but it would continue to cost—heavily.

The problem is now in the lap of Congress, where it deserves the closest scrutiny.

If it is passed, our only hope is that it will hasten the day when the farmers themselves finally revolt against more and more Federal regulations which can occasionally ease the problem but, apparently, can never solve it.

The 35th Infantry Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a resolution passed on February 4, by the 35th Division Association in executive meeting, at Topeka, Kans., urging that the 35th Infantry Division be retained in the National Guard. The 35th Infantry Division is truly one of national prominence, and it is my hope that it will not be adversely effected in any proposed reorganization of our military strength:

35TH DIVISION ASSOCIATION,
Leavenworth, Kans., February 9, 1962.

Hon. J. FLOYD BREEDING,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BREEDING: We call to your attention the attached resolution which we feel will be of interest to you in the forthcoming deliberations on the reorganization of the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve.

This resolution represents the thinking of the membership of the 35th Division Association and we respectfully request that you give this matter your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD G. FAULKNER,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION PASSED FEBRUARY 4, 1962, BY THE 35TH DIVISION ASSOCIATION IN EXECUTIVE MEETING AT TOPEKA, KANS.

Whereas the Department of Defense has announced it will ask the Congress of the United States for a major reorganization of the Reserve Forces of the U.S. Army, indicating the elimination of some divisions now in being; and

Whereas the 35th Infantry Division, in which all members of this association have served at one time or another since 1917, is one of the outstanding National Guard divisions among the present 27 in the United States that might be affected by such proposed reorganization; and

Whereas in combat and training the 35th Division has demonstrated gallant and superior performance, presently with one of the highest training indexes of National Guard of the U.S. divisions and with past records of great Federal and State service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this association, with one of its aims perpetuating the 35th Division in military service of the United States, requests the retention of the present 35th Infantry Division in the National Guard and directs copies of the resolution be forwarded to the Secretary, Department of Defense; Members of Congress from both the States of Missouri and Kansas wherein the 35th Division is now assigned.

Tribute to Jimmy Doulos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the United States became a great nation because our ancestors were willing to work to advance themselves and their country.

Massachusetts has a long heritage of hard working people who came from abroad to contribute to our Nation.

One of these is a personal friend of mine, Jimmy Doulos, whose life was described recently in an article by Austen Lake which appeared in the Boston Record American.

Because this story so well outlines the American dream to our friends abroad, I ask unanimous consent that this be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RETURN OF A NATIVE

(By Austen Lake)

If this sounds too saintly it is something I can do nothing about. But there seems to be a gradual breakdown in our moral values until 'taint no sin to sell one's services secretly at a private price, as was done so lately by TV's quislings, the diskjockeys and groups of college basketballers.

Most disturbing thing about these nationwide examples of dishonesty in high places, including top industrialists jailed for price conspiracy, policemen moonlighting as burglars and gambling aides, and bribery among government officials, is the "so wot" attitude of the average U.S. citizen who shrugs off corruption as a modern American life.

Thus it is refreshing to print a true-life portrait of a little Greek immigrant named Demetrius Christodoulos, now widely known as "Jimmy," whose name appears in 6-foot, red electronic script over Boston's largest and best known sea foodery, abaft the Fish Pier.

Jimmy's story comes as a breath of revivifying salt-sea air in these times when the chisel and gouge seem to be our national emblem. So the other day he returned from realizing a lifelong dream—his first visit to his native island of Lesbos, in the Aegean Sea, which he left 42 years ago as a 15-year-old lad, with only a fresh change of laundry and pocketful of nothing. No, that isn't quite correct. He had $13.

Now, at the age of 57, Demetrius, or Jimmy, is a man of stature, although he stands only five-feet-six and weighs 150. He has a hazel-eyed scrutiny, and the compact put-together of an ex-welterweight fighter. But, by the insular standard of Lesbos, he is a fabulous person—a modern version of Jason and the Golden Fleece. He stands pretty tall in Boston, too.

So, when Demetrius-Jimmy went back to Lesbos, last month, he went as an established U.S. citizen, and a paterfamilias, who was met at dockside by the island's high muckel-

orums, including the Governor, the Metropolitan (Bishop), the military gold-cuffs and the entire population of his natal village, Trigona, which means "Three Corners."

Jimmy says it culminated 42 years of "joyful gratitude" to America. Those are his own words and may sound a bit corny to our confirmed cynics. But when he came away, the Governor said, "Perhaps half our population was Communist before you came. But since you have shown them a living example of America's open-door policy, there will be fewer Communist." Jimmy placed his hand on his chest and said, "It made me feel good here." He was happy to perform a helpful mission for his adopted land.

There is an old wheeze that when Greek meets Greek they open a restaurant. So it was natural for Demetrius and his brother Ioanis (John), when they landed in Boston in 1920 to seek work in a Greek cafeteria on Bromfield Street—Jimmy as a dishwasher and John as a busboy.

Jimmy was no clock watcher. He was on the job early and stayed late. So, inevitably he caught the boss' eye. After 3 months he became the cafe's vegetable cook and inside a year the assistant chef. One year later he was the youngest chef de cuisine in all of Boston, at $60 a week. "Eureka," he said which is an ancient Greek word meaning "bingo."

Jimmy was what actors call a "quick study," meaning he learned fast. He also had an aptitude with foodstuffs and an epicure's nose for the right aroma, which to a cook is equivalent to a farmer's "green thumb." But most of all he had real reverence for food and considered cooking next to Godliness. So he never steamed the flavor or nutriments out of his victuals or waterlogged them in their own liquids. He regarded gastronomy as among the great humanist arts and his kitchen as a studio. That's what he says, though not exactly how he says it.

So inside 3 years Jimmy and John pooled their earnings to buy a ramshackle lunchroom near Commonwealth pier. They scrubbed and scoured, polished and refurbished and built a thriving word-of-mouth trade among the town's seafood fanciers, including many of Beacon Hill's top politicos. Then, in 1929 they bought another nearby "grab and gobble" which has since become the site of the present nautical complex of exotic woods, chrome, glass, and polyplastics which overlooks the harbor.

The original 40-foot frontage has expanded to 180 feet now, the handful of helpers to 125 the capital value of the property to a near million, of which Jimmy Demetrius owns controlling interest. And long ago he married an American-born Grecian girl named Irene (Pacific), and has a son, Charles, who recently graduated from Harvard, and a 17-year-old daughter in a New York school.

Jimmy claims no magic as his success formula—just on-the-job tenacity, attention to kitchen detail, and a willingness to dare. "Then be ready for the big opportunity," he advises.

For him the big break came during a 1954 publicized dispute in the U.S. Senate dining room where proponents of Manhattan-style clam chowder argued against the New England type. The former was an unholy concoction of tomatoes and bay leaves commingled with the bivalves to form a pinkish mess that was anathema to the palates of Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL and a younger Congressman named John F. Kennedy.

So the battle was joined and, as former waterfront gourmets, LEV and Jack appointed Jimmy to be their culinary champion and had him bring 30 gallons of his crustaceous chef-d'oeuvre to Washington. Which he did to the editorial huzzahs of Boston's partisan press.

Jimmy personally diced and parboiled Maine potatoes, performed delicate surgery on the necks of Duxbury clams, sauteed New Hampshire onions, and presently there it was—a golden, rich, creamy-delectable northeast clam chowder. That did it. The Manhattan camp deserted en masse and for several days Jimmy made chowder for thousands of congressional sybarites. His triumph was complete.

Operation Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Operation Free Enterprise is a dynamic, positive new program. Operation Free Enterprise was adopted by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce last March as part of a nationwide activity. Due to a lack of funds it has not been promoted nationally. The Junior Chamber of Commerce of South Carolina is seeking cosponsorship—financing—so that when the program is again presented to the national board of directors, it will be assured of national promotion. Operation Free Enterprise will be presented again to the national board meeting March 15 in Tulsa, Okla. This program could become one of the finest activities of the U.S. Jaycees. Operation Free Enterprise was first conceived by the Jaycees in Lancaster, S.C., under the chairmanship of Dr. W. E. Sims, Jr. The South Carolina Junior Chamber of Commerce inaugurated the program and found it highly successful. It is working enthusiastically and effectively in South Carolina with 32 chapters participating.

Mr. Speaker, Operation Free Enterprise could hold the key to a successful advance of our American philosophy in the cold war. I recommend and endorse this magnificient new idea. Now, Mr. Speaker, I urge you, the Congress, and the country to read this splendid explanation of Operation Free Enterprise as compiled by the South Carolina Jaycees:

OPERATION FREE ENTERPRISE

OBJECTIVES

The objective of Operation Free Enterprise is threefold: (1) It is designed primarily as an educational program aimed at the general public to create a better understanding of the many facets of our traditional system of private enterprise; (2) it will provide unlimited opportunities for leadership training among Jaycees; and (3) it can become an effective cold-war weapon against the onslaught of communism and other systems of state control, both in our own Nation and throughout the world.

The program is based on the premise that private enterprise, and the responsibilities it demands and the individual initiative it creates, has been the driving force which has made this Nation strong and wealthy, and has raised us to the highest standard of living enjoyed by any nation in the world.

Before we discard, or even alter too much, the system we now have, let us take note of the fact that the United States of America today has the highest standard of living of any country in the world. Let us also remember the fact that no other country can match ours in the broad diffusion of its living standard to so high a percentage of its people. And let us note further, and more significantly, that our present and past record of outstanding productive achievement—on a scale not even closely approximated anywhere else in the world—was made with an economy that was relatively free of Government planning and domination. All this was attained with a measure of individual economic freedom unmatched by any other country on this globe at any time.

Because our Constitution was created primarily to limit Government, the trend of the past 30-odd years toward bigger, more centralized, more bureaucratic Government is considered to have adversely affected our free enterprise economy. More important, this trend is considered to have caused a change in the economic philosophy of a great many of our citizens, to the extent that paternalism in Government is taken for granted by most people and demanded by a considerable number. These trends can be shown to have a weakening effect upon the morals of our people as the necessity for personal responsibility and individual initiative is gradually removed.

The program is based upon the concepts of (1) limited government at all levels, as envisioned by the Founding Fathers; (2) government by the consent of the majority of the governed with adequate protections for the rights of the minority; (3) government which does not compete with its private citizens in traditionally private enterprises; (4) government which does not compel its citizens to participate in social welfare experiments which are detrimental to the legitimate interests of even a minority group; (5) government which operates on a sound fiscal basis, operating within its income as any business must, and making a respectable effort to repay debt previously incurred; and (6) government capable of administering all regulations necessary for the protection of its citizens in all areas, including the protection of the right to participate freely in our private economy.

These are the principles of government necessary for the proper functioning of a healthy free enterprise economy. While no part of this program is intended as a partisan political implement, it is the responsibility of Jaycees participating in this program to promote these attitudes in government by any reasonable means, including direct communication with elected representatives, and to encourage the general public to do the same.

It is expected that the desire to re-create these attitudes in government, and thereby promote free enterprise, can best be done through a basic economic education program. Every citizen has a responsibility to actively help shape his government; but he cannot be expected to do this unless he understands fully the basic economic principles of our capitalistic, free enterprise system.

The emphasis in this program will be on the future. We, as Jaycees, are concerned about the future of our economy. There is a moral question here, whether we have the right to try to solve our social and economic problems today with money borrowed in the name of the Federal Government, which our generation cannot hope to repay. In this light, we are passing along to future generations a mortgage on everything they will own, including their paychecks. There is a serious question as to how long future generations will be willing to shoulder the burden for our fiscal irresponsibilities before

advocating sweeping changes in our economic system and our Government to relieve them of their dual financial burden. And it must be borne in mind that any such change that would wipe out legitimate financial responsibilities would be in one of two forms: (1) complete collapse of our Government, its monetary system, its power, and its prestige, with resulting chaos and eventual revolution of unknown direction, or (2) complete Government control over all property and exchanges of property, disenfranchisement of the holders of private property and complete regulation of the essential means of production and distribution of all goods and services. In either of these eventualities, collapse and revolution or socialism, we could count ourselves effectively within the Communist sphere and the free world would be doomed.

We expect to evolve our program into a three-phase attack on domestic and worldwide problems in the light of present-day affairs. The first is economic education, the most fundamental necessity for good citizenship in a free society, yet the most neglected aspect of public education. In this phase we will be concerned primarily with young people—Jaycees and students. We must learn, and encourage study in, the elementary aspects of every facet of our economic system—that is, its basic structure and function. Understanding American economics is understanding America and Americans. We must prove that basic, scientific economics is a subject that can be made to appeal to the Jaycee on the local level and one he can work with effectively and enthusiastically.

The second phase should be a study of political theory and practical politics. The effectiveness of economic education within the United States will be measured by our ability to translate this knowledge into political awareness. This will depend upon an understanding of the structure and function of our political system from the precinct up. It will depend upon a knowledge of duties, powers and limitations of elected officials. It will depend upon definition of the citizen's place in this mechanism which forms our government and sets their policies. At this point, the citizen can be an effective spokesman for his views, whatever they are, at the polls, in the precinct meeting, in the political campaign and in communications with elected officials.

The third phase should be comparative economics, or comparative analysis. When we have a workable grasp of our economic and political systems, then we are ready to think in terms of comparing our systems with those of other nations. In the practical sense, this will be comparison of the American competitive enterprise economy with the economy of the Communist-bloc nations. This is the positive approach to the problem of communism as we know it today. It is not enough to believe that our system is better: we need to truly understand why our system is better. If we can do this we will have developed a deeper feeling of dedication to the principles that have made the United States of America the greatest Nation in the history of the world. We will have developed the desire and capability to protect and preserve our freedoms through the proven value of human rights, personal dignity and integrity, individual action and initiative and responsible citizenship. We will surely have developed patriotism in its purest form, and the concept of sacrificing now for a better tomorrow will have taken on new meaning.

To accomplish these things a whole national attitude must be altered. A great deal of public apathy must be overcome, and we cannot exclude ourselves as Jaycees from the attitude of indifference which is our greatest obstacle.

We do not propose an easy program. We do propose a necessary one.

PURPOSE

Operation Free Enterprise is a program designed to create a better understanding of our capitalistic, free enterprise system and the good life which it has made possible for Americans. It is basically an economic education program aimed at Jaycees, students, and the community as a whole. We expect that through this program we can reawaken our own natural loyalties to the American competitive enterprise economy, and that eventually the United States will take the initiative to sell free enterprise to other nations. It is time we took the offensive in the cold war and we are convinced that free enterprise is a product that can be sold to all people who value freedom.

It is, indeed, a sad commentary that such a program is even needed. Why should our own people have to be sold on basic Americanism? The truth is that, while people are sold on our way of life, they do not understand it well enough to know when it is being taken away from them by degrees. They do not realize that more and more government control means more and more taxes and increasing losses of freedom.

Our purpose, then, is to begin a basic, nonpolitical, economic education program which will help to overcome the tragic ignorance of economics so prevalent among our own people. When we understand our own system well enough, comparison of this system with that of communism will be our most effective weapon against the growth of communism.

ORGANIZATION

A local Jaycee organization should first set up a special committee to handle the project. Up to six or eight members interested in free enterprise, government and basic economics should be appointed to the committee.

The committee would first orient itself on its aims and on the basic principles of free enterprise. It would then carry out an educational program within the chapter. This can be done with talks by Jaycees, outside speakers, movies, posters, or other desirable means. After a few sessions with the membership, a speaker's bureau should be set up to carry this message to other opinion leaders and groups within the community. High school and college students should receive special attention. All civic and service organizations, business organizations, church groups, and labor organizations should also be included.

The cost involved would depend upon the scope of the local project. Where contests and awards are part of the program, an expenditure of some $25 should be expected. Other costs will be dependent upon the cost of materials bought or rented, expenses of anticipated guest speakers, mailing costs, etc.

Possibly a month to 6 weeks would be needed after the committee is appointed to get the program organized and into action. It would then be operated as a year-round project with the story of free enterprise being told as often as groups or individuals would listen. There need be no special time or season for these presentations.

There are no present plans for materials other than those provided by State or National offices. However, individual Jaycee chapters may want to use special materials, and can be guided in their selection by the chapter's ability to pay for them.

In 1960–61 two South Carolina chapters conducted successful OFE programs. At this time in 1961–62, 27 South Carolina chapters are actively participating, and it is expected that before the year is out there will be others. It is a class I project of the South Carolina Junior Chamber of Commerce.

There would be no special State services involved other than routine promotion and recognition. State officers and State and National directors would be expected to promote the project actively. The appointment of a State chairman in each State would materially aid in increasing participation.

The how-to-do-it kit is the only item needed and its publication cost would be $1,800 to $2,000. Routine publicity through ads in Future would add slightly to this cost. Corporate cosponsorship will be offered to offset these expenses.

In national administration, the routine services of the national vice president in charge of public affairs, public affairs department of U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce and a national chairman would be responsible for the conduct of the program and supplying any supplementary material thought to be desirable.

SUMMARY

We are concerned for the future of our economy, and for the future of our Nation, because of the trends which have created a great deal of misunderstanding and half-understanding about the role of private enterprise. We want to take better care of our stewardship so that succeeding generations will have equally as good a life. They will have enough problems without ours.

We believe that Jaycees must take more seriously that portion of the Jaycee creed: "We believe that economic justice can best be won by freemen through free enterprise." Our way of life is the best ever perfected. Once lost, it may never be found again.

Operation Free Enterprise can be the project to reawaken and rededicate a complacent America.

We respectfully submit this for approval as a national project.

National Income and the National Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "With Tongue in Cheek, or Don't Bite Hard" which appeared in the Februrary 9, 1962, edition of the St. Joe News, of St. Joe, Ind., of which Mr. T. E. Haberkorn, Jr., is the publisher.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WITH TONGUE IN CHEEK, OR DON'T BITE HARD

This is about something of pre-Christmas vintage. But in view of the discussion about national budget, national income, etc., it seems very appropriate. And I think I should let you in on the great revelation that came to me recently so that you can share in the joy it brought me.

Many of our political leaders and Government economists have in the past espoused more and more spending; I have had the opposite view—we should cut spending. However, during the pre-Christmas activity it suddenly dawned on me what it is they are and have been talking about; suddenly, I became enlightened and can see, happily, what they have been trying to get through

to me and many others for some time. The enlightenment came as I was driving along considering the problem of Christmas giving, Christmas gifts and the money involved. My thoughts centered around the family gathering on the in-law side and the arrangements made for getting dollar or $2 or $2.50 gifts for exchanges of the various age levels. The cost of Christmas when it comes to these exchanges was bothering me, and this led to some thoughts of how ridiculous could we get in this exchange idea if we tried. I thought, "Let's make it a $10 gift for everybody in the family and everybody gets a gift for everybody else." That was just about as ridiculous and impossible as I could get in those thoughts about Christmas gift exchanging when—boom—it hit me. What was so ridiculous about the idea after all? what made me think it was out of the question? The answer was—money. We couldn't afford such an exchange, I thought. But as the thoughts continued to flow, it occurred to me that here, in the Christmas gift exchange with everybody in the family giving everybody else a $10 gift (let's make that a $10 minimum, too), was the means of bringing greater prosperity to the Nation. Here was what those enlightened leaders had been trying to tell me all the time, and I had selfishly been rejecting their suggestions because of money.

I felt mildly ashamed of myself as I continued to drive along, realizing that my past opposition to greater spending had been motivated by personal selfishness—I had been thinking of my own family's welfare, its capacity for earning and fulfilling obligations, more than I had been thinking of the good it could do by participating in a program based on more and more spending. Here I had been foolishly asking, "Can we afford this or that?" when the welfare of the whole country was at stake. "Shame on me," I thought.

Putting it in terms of our own family and Christmas giving, and the effect it could have in the future on the welfare of others, I began figuring. If I buy a $10 gift for my wife and kids and every member of her side of the family, there will be something like $250 put into circulation at Christmas, just from my buying alone. Add to that another $250 which would come from the better half's gift buying, plus another $250 each for the four boys in the family and you can see, as I saw recently, what a terrific boost this would be to our national economy. (And this doesn't include the buying for my side of the family, good for another $240.) At last I understood in plain terms how our Government approaches its budget; it doesn't think in terms of "Can we afford it?" but in the enlightened terms of "think of what it means to others." What a comfort there is when a person finally sees what others have seen and can become one of the enlightened.

Think of it, next year our family can contribute close to $2,000 to the national economy in Christmas gift buying alone. Project our family's possibilities in relation to boosting the national economy into your own family. If this idea catches on, next winter there would be how many millions of dollars happily spent to make others happy, too?

I feel much better now. Now I can see why this spending idea has been considered such a great possibility by so many others in the past several years. There isn't any worry connected to it. We don't worry about whether or not we can afford it; we look deeper and glory in the good that we can do by spending more. We boost the Nation's economy, we put dollars into the pockets of more people as the need for increasing production arises. And when more dollars are circulating, everybody has more of everything.

Oh, the joy of enlightenment.

The Lawyer in Public Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, last week the Student Bar Association of the University of Maryland Law School, had as its guest speaker, Theodore R. McKeldin, former Governor of Maryland. Benjamin I. Michaelson is president of the association, William Cunningham is faculty adviser, and Roger Howell is dean of the law school.

The members of the committee which made the wise choice of speaker are Ronald M. Naditch, John Neubauer, Jr., David H. Clark, J. Frederick Sharer, Robert L. Moran, Paul E. Ellis, and Melvin D. Hill, chairman.

While Mr. McKeldin's remarks were directed to future members of the bar, I think they are applicable to all of us and worthy of our consideration.

His speech follows:

THE LAWYER IN PUBLIC LIFE

(Address by Theodore R. McKeldin)

Any truthful discussion of the lawyer in public life must start with recognition of the fact that, to some extent, he is already there. A lawyer is an officer of the court, which removes him from strictly private life and makes him in a sense a public character.

I am sure, though, that I shall not mislead anybody when I consider a man in public life as one who devotes all, or a large part, of his time and energy to the conduct of public affairs. In that sense a large part of the profession is not in public life and a young man just entering it has a real choice—he may choose public or private service.

Let me say right now that I do not believe that he is under any moral obligation either way. As for me, I have chosen to spend a great deal of my active career in public service, but I do not pretend to be particularly virtuous on that account. Private practice may be just as honorable and useful. It is a matter of temperament, a question of what a man desires to get out of life.

Everyone hopes to achieve success through his profession, no matter what profession it may be. I think, too, that most of us hold, with Sir Francis Bacon, that every man is debtor to his profession; since he hopes to achieve countenance through it, he ought to strive to be a help and ornament thereunto. But as regards the law, certainly, and, I think, as regards the rest of what we call the learned professions, there are widely different measures of success. It is according to what is your measure of success that you ought, or ought not, as a lawyer, to proceed from private practice into public service.

Wealth is one measure of success and in a capitalistic society a perfectly legitimate one. If a man can acquire wealth through the practice of law, he has every legal and moral right to do so on the sole condition that he adhere scrupulously to the ethics of the profession. Social eminence is an equally legitimate aspiration. There is nothing wrong in coveting the respect and good will of one's neighbors, and widespread popularity in the community is a measure of genuine success.

But if that is what a young lawyer wishes to accomplish in the world, public service is not for him. It is not and can never be economically profitable. Nor does it offer a return in social popularity—rather the reverse. Former President Truman's grim remark, "If you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen," put it in a nutshell. The heat of battle is a necessary accompaniment to any effective public service, and the heat of battle withers popularity.

It is not merely that the honest public servant will be denounced by every crook in the land. An honest man, lawyer or any other, ought to welcome the ill will of scoundrells, for it is the best proof of his integrity. What is hard to endure is attack by men of high character who cannot understand either what the public servant is trying to do, or the conditions under which he works. To be blamed for genuine faults is only just. To be blamed for honest error is not unjust, for error brings the same consequences, honest or not. But to be blamed for doing the right thing, perhaps under conditions of great difficulty, is the real trial of the public servant.

Yet it is inevitable in a democracy. Ours is government by the people, which means that every man has a right to his own opinion. We are not compelled to accept the dictum of some overlord as to what is right and wise; and where every man has a right to say his say, there will be great conflict of opinion. Rarely is the distinction between right and wrong so clear that all honest men are on the same side. Almost always when the man in public life makes his decision, he will offend some for whose character he has the highest respect and whose good opinion he values.

Then if public life is not the way for a lawyer to gain wealth, and not the way to gain universal popularity, why should any intelligent man go into it? The answer is that there are some men to whom wealth and popularity are only secondary values. They are values, of course. I never heard of a sane man who was actually opposed to being rich, and who wished to be unpopular; but I have known many who put those values in second place because their ardent desire was for other things.

Fame is one of them, but every wise man knows that fame cannot be won by going after it directly. Notoriety is the most that can be reached by a direct approach. In ancient times the youth who set fire to the temple of Diana at Ephesus in order that he might be remembered achieved his aim; but he is remembered because he is notorious, not famous. True fame comes as an incidental to him whose direct effort is to accomplish something that is of value to the world. Sometimes fame is awarded for such work, sometimes not. A man cannot count on it. His sure reward is the satisfaction of knowing that he has done it; but that reward is very sure and very great.

The satisfaction of having done good work, however, is attainable in private life. It is a fair question to ask if there is any reason to seek it in public service. I cannot answer that for everyone; or perhaps I should say that there are two answers, yes for one type of mind, no for another. In this connection what distinguishes public from private service is the greater durability of public service.

The lawyer who has guided a great corporation through a dangerous and difficult period has done good work, in which he can take pride; and, as a rule, he has also gained a very large fee. The man who has guided a great state safely and wisely through a dangerous and difficult period has also done good work, but as a rule he has gained no fee at all, merely the salary of a public official, which is never extravagant. But the presumption is that the state will outlast many corporations, and the man's children's children will boast of their descent from the man who did that work.

Aside from that, the work of the public servant directly affects the whole lives, not merely the economic interests, of vast numbers of people. To some men—not to all—there is a peculiar attraction about dealing with life directly and not through any intermediate. Sometimes this attraction draws men in private practice. Clarence Darrow was a famous example. But it is felt by all men who go into public life, strongly by a great man, less so by the mediocre, but felt by all.

Of the lawyer-Presidents the greatest, I think all will agree, was Lincoln. The only President who could possibly be regarded as greater was Washington, who was not a lawyer. What, then, do you think influenced Lincoln to enter public life? Cynics may answer, ambition, but that only raises the question, ambition for what? Certainly not for money and, I am firmly convinced, not for fame. Lincoln observed the peril to the Union. He could not, like Solon and Lycurgus, establish political institutions that would endure for centuries, for the institutions were already established; but he could preserve them, an equally important work. He entered public life for one purpose only—in order that "government of the people, for the people, by the people shall not perish from the earth."

He accomplished his purpose. He also won immortal fame, but that was nothing to him. He accomplished his purpose, and the knowledge that he had done so was a reward so great that by comparison all the rest was trival.

If you share any of the spirit of Lincoln, if you, too, think it supremely necessary that this Republic shall endure, not merely as one nation among all the rest, but as a "beacon to mankind," then by all means go into public life. But if you are moved by any lesser ambition, avoid it, for to men who strive for anything less, public life is a delusion and a snare, one long repetition of "hope deferred, that maketh the heart sick."

I don't mean that you should be, or ever dream that you are a Lincoln. There was only one, and there will never be another exactly like him. But although you have neither the mind nor the heart of a Lincoln, you can nevertheless continue Lincoln's work of preserving this country as the last, best hope of earth. And while you may do it in a very small way, it will be a no less honorable way. Nor shall you fail of your reward. It will not be money, and it may not be fame; but it will be the immeasurable satisfaction of knowing that you, while you may not be great, are nevertheless of a great line.

They say that the young Correggio, when he first saw a masterpiece by Raphael, turned away with tears in his eyes, but exclaiming, "And I, too, am a painter." Look at Lincoln, gentlemen, then say to yourselves, "And I, too, am an American." Then act accordingly, and, whether or not you ever touch money or fame, you will be a mighty man.

False Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial on "False Security," written by Mr. Charles Mooshian, the editor of the Carroll County Times, Westminster, Md., issue of February 8, 1962.

Mr. Mooshian is noted not only in his county but throughout the State for his well written editorials. The editorial on "False Security" is a typical example of his writing. I think this particular editorial deserves the attention of all of our people.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Carroll County Times, Westminster, Md., Feb. 8, 1962]

FALSE SECURITY

False security has caused the destruction of nations and individuals since the beginning of time.

Samson, overconfident of never losing his great strength, went to sleep on Delilah's knees. While he slept she called for a man to shave off his locks and his strength went from him.

He thought he was secure.

The Greeks, unable to take the city of Troy after laying seige for 10 years, built a huge wooden horse and hid soldiers inside it. Then the rest of the Greeks took to their ships and pretended to sail away. The curious Trojans dragged the horse inside the walls of the city and proceeded to celebrate. All night they drank wine and reveled in music and women.

They thought they were secure.

Then the Greek soldiers crept out of the horse, opened the city gates and let the rest of the army in. They massacred the Trojans and plundered and burned the city of Troy.

On the night of December 6, 1941, all was secure at the great naval base of Pearl Harbor, Hawaii. Leave was granted to officers and men as usual. Ambassadors of the Japanese Government were in Washington making peace overtures to the Roosevelt administration in regard to American-Japanese relations. The next morning Japanese planes bombed the base and practically demolished the once proud bastion of the Pacific.

They had thought they were secure.

Today our Nation and its people have that same sense of false security. Although things have been bad, they seem to be improving. Think positive; be an optimist; don't think negative.

Alexei Adzhubei, Khrushchev's son-in-law, lunched at the White House last week. Mrs. Adzhubei, Khrushchev's daughter, accompanied by Press Secretary Pierre Salinger and Mrs. Salinger, occupied President Kennedy's box at a concert in Constitution Hall last Tuesday. Afterwards they all went to the Salingers' house for an after-concert supper.

President Kennedy has endorsed expanded contacts with the Soviet Union. "We hope that as communications improve," he said, "problems which cause tension and danger to the world will lessen."

Some observers saw in the President's comments on Laos that he hopes very widely open channels of communication will improve the prospects for reducing tension in that country.

While so many were encouraged by the President's optimistic hopes for peaceful settlement, both in Laos and Berlin, he blasted the U.S. vast stockpile of strategic war materials. He said it had accumulated far beyond the country's needs.

The Chief Executive said he had taken steps to halt further buying except for three critically short items.

These announcements are music to the ears of wishful thinkers. They have forgotten that Khrushchev said: "If anyone thinks that our smiles mean the abandonment of the teachings of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, he is deceiving himself cruelly. The Communists will destroy capitalism, not with nuclear weapons, but through the spread of the ideology. All we have to do is grease our ideology with butter."

Manuilski said: "War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. To win we will need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we will begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record.

"There will be electrifying overtures and unheard-of concessions. The capitalistic countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we will smash them with our clenched fist."

If we believe these two Communists mean what they say, then we may soon expect concessions and overtures in Laos and Berlin. Then if our demands are met, the United States will rejoice, and the clenched fist will bear down.

At the 22d Communist Party Congress held in Moscow last October, Khrushchev said: "The United States * * * has entered a phase of mounting difficulties and crises—the phase of its decline," and "the victory of socialism on a world scale is no longer far off."

This is no time for false security but a time to be alert.

Orville Threatens Rule or Ruin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most amazing statements to ever emanate from the office of any Secretary of Agriculture was that released by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman on February 7, 1962, in testimony before the House Committee on Agriculture. The Secretary was testifying in behalf of the administration's Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, the proposal called by knowledgeable people government by threat.

Secretary Freeman's bill provides that in case farmers have the effrontery to vote down marketing quotas for feed grains and wheat that not only would all price supports be eliminated for these crops, but also the Secretary would be permitted to sell 10 million tons of feed grains and 200 million bushels of wheat with no lower limit on price. This means that the Secretary would sell 16 million tons of grain at whatever price the market would bring for feed.

In his prepared statement he said:

> It is absurd to assume that any such disposal program would be operated for the purpose of depressing the market. On the contrary, utmost care would be taken to prevent that result.

Certainly he should know better than to make such a public statement. Any student of elementary economics knows that the sale of 16 billion tons of grain in an unprotected market can do nothing but depress it. Even the threat of using such power would be bearish on market prices.

Certainly, the Secretary had available to him the many economic technicians in the Department of Agriculture who worked on Senate Document No. 77. The following two paragraphs completely refute the above-quoted statement:

The assumption with respect to liquidation of excessive stocks results in the projected withdrawal of 7 million tons of feed grain stocks annually throughout the projection period. In addition, by 1965, it would be necessary to feed about 9.8 million tons of wheat more than current rates of wheat feeding. This level of wheat feeding plus the projected high level of exports is required to move the projected production of wheat and permit the assumed liquidation of wheat stocks. This total of 16.8 million tons of grain fed at the projected feeding rate of 0.84 ton per grain consuming animal unit would provide the feed for 20 million animal units or 10 percent of the projected number of animal units fed in 1965.

If it were assumed that there were no liquidation of grain, including wheat stocks during the projection period, then there would be a reduction of about 10 percent in the number of grain consuming animal units fed. Consequently, there would be smaller livestock output, increased livestock prices, and a rise of around 10 percent in cash receipts for livestock and livestock products. With a reduction in the amount of grain fed, prices received by farmers for feed grains would be about 25 percent higher. Since production and sales of feed grains would be unchanged, cash receipts from feed grains would also be increased by about 25 percent. Wheat prices are related to feed grains in these projections and there would be an increase of 20 cents or so in prices of wheat. The projected cash receipts figure for 1965 under these conditions would be about $2 billion or 7 percent higher than the $30.6 billion projected under the primary assumptions of this request.

It is to be noted that this study shows that the net effect of the Secretary's rule-or-ruin proposal is to break not only grain prices but also livestock, poultry, and dairy product prices. The net effect of this proposal, according to the USDA's economic technicians—all available to Secretary Freeman—would be to reduce net income by $2 billion.

Let us examine what the greatest agricultural economists in the country said would happen to prices of the major livestock items and crops:

Commodity	Unit	Price under grain dumping assumption	1957–59 average price received
Cattle	Hundredweight	$15.00	$20.60
Hogs	do	11.20	17.30
Milk	do	3.60	4.19
Eggs	Dozen	.29	.354
Broilers	Pound	.15	.178
Corn	Bushel	.80	1.10
Oats	do	.42	.62
Barley	do	.64	.89
Wheat	do	.90	1.84
Grain sorghum	Hundredweight	1.25	1.72

Certainly, one part of the Cochrane-Freeman supply-management team knows better. It should be noted that Willard Cochrane, economic adviser to Secretary Freeman, was a member of the Advisory Committee from land-grant colleges which reviewed the study officially called Senate Document No. 77—"Farm Price and Income Projections 1960–65."

In commenting on the conclusions reached in the report the committee said:

The projected volume of hogs might well depress farm prices by more than the indicated amount. For these reasons, among others, the committee believes that the average level of farm prices in the Department report is somewhat higher than is consistent with the projected volume of total farm marketings in 1965.

Does not Willard talk to Orville? It is regrettable that any Secretary of Agriculture should tell the American farmer that if the wheat and feed grain producers do not vote in favor of his control proposals that he will take out his pique not only on the grain farmer but also on all the livestock, poultry, and dairy producers.

"Rule or Ruin," seems to be the motto.

The President's Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The New Farm Program" which appeared in the February 8, 1962 edition of the Lafayette-Journal Courier.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW FARM PROGRAM

Special messages to Congress by President Kennedy are coming so thick and fast it is difficult to keep up with him—or them. Few if any, however, are any more startling than his farm message last week.

The President was extremely blunt, as perhaps he should be in all cases. But farmers and others may be a long time getting over the shock.

Under the new farm program proposed by the administration, farmers would be given the "choice" between increased Government controls over production of surplus crops, or no Federal price supports. If farmers voted against controls in a referendum, the Government would reserve the right to dump millions of bushels of feed grains on the market, which might be expected to depress prices.

Experience may have proved that if there are to be subsidies, or price supports, there must also be controls. On the other hand, the Government virtually is requesting a weapon to compel approval of supports by the power to dump surpluses. This latter phase has been branded as "naked coercion" by Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau federation. The term appears most apt.

The new program offers a little of something for everyone. Farmers are to see boosts in their incomes, consumers are to have plenty, costs are to be cut for the benefit of taxpayers, the hungry are to have more to eat, and better use is to be made of land and water resources.

It would appear, however, that not everything is as it seems or as it has been made to appear. To begin with there has been the claim that farm income went up $1 billion in 1961, which is represented as an achievement. On the other hand, the budget for the Department of Agriculture went up more than $1.1 billion.

Under the proposed new program, mandatory planting and marketing controls would be imposed for the first time not only on corn, but also on other feed grains and milk, with stricter controls on wheat. Gimmicks and contradictions will not be lost on farmers or taxpayers. Greater Government dictation than ever is proposed and any savings to taxpayers likely would be more than offset by the huge costs of the subsidy programs.

The "maximum freedom and flexibility" for agriculture mentioned in the President's message are not in prospect when the program is analyzed. The proposed use of Government stocks of wheat and feed grains to compel farmers to accept controls makes a mockery of the proposed democratic farmer referenda. Proposals would drastically limit the freedom of farmers to farm and would freeze production patterns by the use of unfair historical base periods.

The President suggested his program is needed to prevent a drift toward "chaotic, inefficient" farm economy. Instead, this drift will be stopped if Congress refuses to go along.

American agriculture is the best on earth. It urgently needs more freedom rather than greater dictatorial power for Secretary of Agriculture Freeman.

The Honorable J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, there has just come to my attention the text of a resolution of tribute to the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, unanimously adopted by delegates to the 68th annual conference of the International Association of Chiefs of Police meeting in Montreal, Canada, October 5, 1961.

The citizens of the United States in all walks of life have abundant reason to recognize and honor the distinguished service of Mr. Hoover during his nearly 38 years as head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and they have given repeated expression to the high esteem in which he is held.

This resolution is a richly merited tribute from an international association and includes a recognition of the important service which the FBI is rendering outside as well as within the United States under the leadership of Mr. Hoover.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I include this resolution:

RESOLUTION TO THE HONORABLE JOHN EDGAR HOOVER

Whereas J. Edgar Hoover has unselfishly served his country with distinction and honor as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation since 1924; and

Whereas through his dedicated leadership in the field of law enforcement, he has aided in creating a professional stature for police

officers and has established a greater understanding of police responsibilities throughout the world; and

Whereas J. Edgar Hoover has instilled in our profession the need for continued advancement in the field of scientific crime detection and has furthered this program through the cooperative services of the FBI Laboratory and Identification Divisions; and

Whereas he has assisted officers in obtaining instruction regarding advanced training techniques and methods of crime detection through FBI-sponsored local and regional police schools and through the training of officers in the FBI National Academy; and

Whereas J. Edgar Hoover has provided the utmost cooperation in assisting authorities not only in the United States but also in foreign countries by providing the services of the FBI Disaster Squad to facilitate the identification of disaster victims; and

Whereas he has made every effort to see that information of interest to law enforcement authorities in every facet of our profession is promptly and accurately disseminated; and

Whereas J. Edgar Hoover has maintained an unmitigated defense of America's law enforcement profession from unwarranted attacks by criminal and subversive elements during his entire career; and

Whereas he has been a stalwart leader to every citizen of the free world in the fight against the menace of communism; and

Whereas J. Edgar Hoover's devoted and unwavering adherence to the principles of justice and fair play has been an inspiration to each and every dedicated officer of our profession: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the International Association of Chiefs of Police at its 68th Annual Conference at Montreal, Canada, on October 5, 1961, does hereby extend its deepest appreciation to J. Edgar Hoover for his numerous, unselfish contributions to the law enforcement profession and hereby pledges its continued support.

The Best Medicine—Sympathy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the New York Times magazine on February 18, carried an extremely interesting story about the problems faced by both physicians and patients in a rapidly changing medical world. The writer, Mr. Lawrence Galton, quotes extensively doctors who are aware and worried about what he calls "the trend toward impersonal medicine" and the fact that the problem is worldwide, "not a matter of national arrangements."

I found the article especially interesting because I have notices that one of the principal arguments voiced against the administration's proposal to finance certain health care benefits for the aged through social security would be that such a system would destroy the valuable relationship between doctor and patient. I have stated many times that this proposal would not damage the ties between physician and patient but might go a long way toward strengthening them. This would come about, I believe, because for many patients the fear of financial burden resulting from illness would be lifted.

Let me quote one paragraph from this article which shows that legislative proposals and Government action is not the problem in the physician-patient relationship:

> The preoccupation of physicians with technology—particularly with prescribing pills to the exclusion of other methods of treatment—apparently is widespread enough so that, at a medical education conference, one medical school dean labeled it a major hazard "threatening the quality of medical care."

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Lawrence Galton of February 18, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BEST MEDICINE—SYMPATHY

(By Lawrence Galton)

A distinguished British physician, Dr. T. F. Fox, editor of the world-renowned medical journal, the Lancet, created something of a stir recently when, addressing a symposium in New York on "Health Care Issues of the Nineteen Sixties," he called attention to the depersonalization of American medicine and made a plea that it become more human.

Did he, he wondered, coming from a country with a nationalized medical service, seem like "a cannibal preaching in New York?" But the trend toward impersonal medicine is worldwide, not a matter of national arrangements, Dr. Fox went on, and "as in so much else, the United States is probably leading the way."

Whether American medicine deserves the dubious distinction of providing such leadership for the rest of the world, it has shucked off enough human aspects and become frigid enough to disturb a goodly proportion of its customers at home. Even half a dozen years ago, a survey of patients in one large city revealed that 64 percent felt that doctors were cold, remote, impersonal, and hasty.

With some eloquence, a young mother remarked: "I am sure my doctor knows medicine. But when we go to his office, I feel like a machine on an assembly line. I'm sure he has to look at the baby's chart, or have his nurse tell him my name, before he knows who we are. If we could feel that we mean something to our doctor, I'd be happier with him."

Often heard today are such complaints as:

"You can't get a doctor to make house calls any more."

"You always have to wait even when you have an appointment."

"The doctor doesn't have the time to talk to you the way doctors used to."

"The doctor never tells you anything."

As a writer on medical and health subjects, I receive many letters from readers, a large number of them complaining of the failure of some doctors to communicate with patients—to discuss their problems with them or even tell them what they are. A woman suffering from vertigo, ear noises and loss of hearing has been told she has Ménière's syndrome and is receiving treatment. But what is it? she asks. What does it mean? And a man with shaking palsy, also under treatment, begs for information on the nature of the problem and the outlook for his future.

The failure of their colleagues to inform patients has alarmed, even angered, some physicians. "The longer I practice medicine," a Michigan practitioner wrote in some heat in a letter to a national medical journal, "the more disgusted I become with the way patients are treated by doctors. Almost daily I am consulted by patients who have had an operation or two, and when I ask what was done or found, they answer: 'I don't know exactly, doctor. I was not told anything.' Why not? This is what they pay for and what they should get. Why are they not told?"

At the same symposium addressed by Dr. Fox, Dr. Cornelius H. Traeger of New York declared: "The patient wants to be allowed to participate. He does not want to be treated as a medical illiterate. The patient is going to other sources (journalistic) for information only because he is not getting it from doctors."

Thoughtful physicians have become increasingly concerned about many other facets of modern medical practice.

In a report called "The Health of the Nation," Dr. Julian P. Price, a member of the American Medical Association board of trustees, took a hard look at the physicians and discerned "certain tendencies—insidious influences—which are creeping in to lower his prestige and to impair his effectiveness. There is the tendency for the physician to think of his patient as a problem to be solved rather than as a person to be helped.

"There is the tendency for the physician to become so engrossed in a particular system or organ of the body that he forgets the patient is an integration of body, mind, and soul. There is the tendency for the physician to think of himself as a man of science and to forget that he is also a man of service."

In its editorial pages, the Journal of the American Medical Association has had occasion to warn that "one of the underlying dissatisfactions that exist in spite of spectacular advances in medical knowledge and skill centers around the lack of personal attention given by the modern physician as compared to that given by the old family doctor. * * * The physician should never lose sight of the fact that, no matter how scientific his treatment or how full his day, his results can be greatly enhanced by an effort to meet those needs of his patients that are not strictly medical."

And the Journal went on to point out: "Every patient who seeks medical aid is frightened, and one of the most important responsibilities of the physicians is to allay the patient's fear. Often without knowing it, the hurried impersonal manner of the physician, far from allaying fear, aggravates it."

The preoccupation of physicians with technology—particularly with prescribing pills to the exclusion of other methods of treatment—apparently is widespread enough so that, at a medical education conference, one medical school dean labeled it a major hazard "threatening the quality of medical care."

Dr. Francis D. Murphy of Marquette University has spelled out the danger in a specific area. "Some physicians have become so drug-conscious that every patient with any degree or type of high blood pressure receives the so-called benefits of hypertensive drugs, but in some instances instead of being beneficial the results are detrimental." And this because doctors have half-forgotten "that there are other methods of dealing with high blood pressure besides drugs."

Dr. Irvine H. Page, a pioneer in blood-pressure research, puts it bluntly: "A pill cannot be substituted for the warmth and understanding of the individual physician. If hypertensive patients were treated with the loving care given severe diabetics in the early days of scarce insulin, the current results would be greatly improved."

Recently, Dr. Seymour J. Rosenberg, a Washington (D.C.) psychiatrist, suggested

that many emotionally disturbed persons could be helped merely by sitting back in a chair and pouring out their troubles to a sympathetic physician. But this form of treatment, he remarked, seems to have gotten lost in the new emphasis on tranquilizing drugs and electroshock.

"My plea is that the family physician should not rush in with medicine and shock treatment without first trying to find out what the trouble is," he said. "Sometimes the doctor can be surprised, and really it requires little effort on his part. Many patients are just dying to tell their stories."

What factors account for the development of cold, impersonal, dehumanized medicine?

For one thing there are not enough doctors. American medical schools are currently graduating some 7,000 a year. This, says Dr. Owen H. Wangensteen, past president of the American College of Surgeons, is 3,000 a year short of training enough to meet the Nation's normal requirements.

Doctors should be able to spend more time with patients, not less. Yet, according to a Public Health Service advisory committee on medical education, whereas the average physician in 1930 saw about 50 patients a week, today's family doctor sees 26 a day—and 36 percent of all doctors see more than 30 a day, while 17 percent see more than 40.

But, shortages aside, there is still the delusion shared by some physicians that medicine has moved into a completely scientific age and that the humanistic side of doctoring has become less important. Their idea is that the best way to serve the patient is to get him well and that this is best done by application of scientific knowledge.

If it sounds like a reasonable approach, it is nevertheless fallacious. It disregards the fact that much of human disease is still not understood, that much of what is called scientific is little better than empirical, and that the number of specific curative remedies are few and far between.

In what may well go down as a classical statement, Dr. Leandro M. Tocantins not only said all this recently to an entering class at Jefferson Medical College in Philadelphia, but went on to point out that many scientific concepts, even when they explain the disease, may still not help the patient. Urging young medical students always to look at a disease with the patient and his personality in mind, he remarked:

"Disease states are well known to affect the reactions of patients and their symptoms. What is equally or perhaps more important is that the patient himself alters the manifestations of a disease. It is only from such an approach that you may wisely decide: (1) that the disease requires no treatment, but the patient does, (2) that the disease, as well as the patient, requires intensive treatment, (3) that neither the disease nor the patient requires treatment and, rarest of all, perhaps (4) that the disease requires treatment but the patient does not."

In a lecture at the University of Chicago, Dr. George L. Engel recently declared that the perceptive physicians' growing worry that "the human aspects of medicine are being submerged in the emphasis on the scientific and technical" is not just concern for "a good press for physicians."

"It could be," Dr. Engel said, "that the doctor's beside manner has vital therapeutic importance, that between physician and patient there transpire certain psychobiological processes which have significance for the capacity of the individual to maintain health or to develop disease."

Recently, psychiatric researchers at the Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, inspired by the fact that some physicians are more successful than others in treating the mentally ill, set out to find a scientific way of determining why. They examined not just patients but also 50 physicians, using personality tests in the process.

The most successful physicians, it turned out, were those who saw their patients' behavior in terms of human interaction. They were "players," the Johns Hopkins researchers noted. The less successful, on the other hand, acted more as clinical observers, diagnosing but unable to see or fill patients' needs for social give and take. They were "spectators."

The emphasis on technology has been responsible, at least in part, for many physicians' tendency to shun house calls. Something of a fuss was kicked up recently when a New Jersey pediatrician published an article in a national medical journal, announcing: "It's time we broke the housecall habit. House calls for the most part are as outdated as the horse and buggy. * * * It's pretty hard to practice good medicine in most homes. * * * I can do a much better job in my office, where I can use my laboratory facilities."

Before publication, the medical journal made a random sampling of physicians and found many in agreement. But there were those who disagreed.

Dr. Julius H. Manes, of Bennington, Vt., said: "If more doctors would learn to use their five senses instead of calling for laboratory tests and consultations, they could do a good job even above the din of the average household. What's more, a doctor can learn a great deal about the patient by observing him in his home. It seems to me that too many physicians are sacrificing the family-physician concept on the altar of so-called greater efficiency."

Another dissenter had a further point. "Let's face it," declared Dr. Frederick M. Walsh, of Long Beach, Calif. "Personal comfort and financial gain are the only things that stop most doctors from making house calls. The excuse that you can't examine a patient properly in the home is a lot of malarkey. It doesn't interfere with the work of rural doctors, and they're the most respected M.D.'s in this country."

Still another factor in the depersonalization of medicine has been the long-term trend toward specialization.

It has been increasing specialization, according to a report to a World Conference on Medical Education, which has "encouraged a false method of dealing with the patient; he became during the past decades, a case of liver, lung, heart or something else and was no longer a human being suffering in his body and soul."

Moreover, specialization has acquired such glamour that it has markedly decreased the number of doctors going into general practice. "At the present time," says Dr. Floyd C. Bratt, president of the American Academy of General Practice, "the country simply has too many specialists. The ratio of family doctors to specialists is approximately 1 to 1. It should be 4 to 1."

It is only fair to add that some responsibility for the depersonalization of medicine may rest with patients. "Seemingly today much more so than in previous decades, patients are impatient with doctors," one physician notes. "They are upset many times and even resentful if the doctor can't pull a miracle out of his medical bag, as the magician does a white rabbit from his top-hat."

With the onrush of medical developments in recent decades, many people have come to expect a panacea for every problem. They don't want sympathy and understanding and quiet help; they just want a magic pill.

Even with such a simple thing as a boil, one physician reports, it is often difficult to give a patient the proper management. "It takes several days, often a week or two, for a boil to come to a head. Except for hot, wet compresses, the medical profession knows little about hastening this process. If the patient goes along with Mother Nature—the boil eventually runs its course and heals quickly without much pain."

But many patients are too impatient to heed such advice. They want an antibiotic. "If you don't give it to them, you lose them. If you do, the result is a biological impasse. Nature tends to ripen the boil to the state of discharging the pus; the antibiotic tends to push the infection backward. The impasse may last for weeks and weeks."

On the other hand, some physicians complain about patients who want interminable explanations. A doctor, they point out, cannot afford the time to satisfy them. And if it might seem logical to charge for such lengthy discussions, the practicality of doing so is another matter; it would be the rare patient who would pay the bill for "talk" or pay it without resentment.

What, then, is the answer to the depersonalization problem? Obviously, there is no single solution.

Currently, efforts are being made to increase the number of medical schools. Some existing schools are being expanded. And some are experimenting with programs to shorten the time between high school graduation and medical practice from the present minimum of 9 years to 7—not merely to increase the number of doctors but also to attract many able students who now cannot afford the lengthy medical training.

Secondly, on what would seem the well-founded assumption that, if a future physician is to treat his patients as human beings rather than numbered cases, he must get the habit of thinking and feeling that way from the first day in medical school, some schools have instituted major changes. At Western Reserve, for example, a student, throughout his 4 years, is assigned to a family. It is his duty to be in the clinic or at the bedside whenever any member of that family needs care.

At other medical schools, there is a pronounced trend toward what medical educators term "integrating the scientific and humanitarian images of the physician." Here social, cultural, and emotional factors related to illness are emphasized.

Of great importance also are efforts to raise the status and quality of the general practitioner, or family doctor. As late as 1948, the GP was so looked down upon that, at a New York Academy of Medicine meeting, he was described as a doctor who could not get—or could not afford—specialty training.

In that year, about 150 family doctors, meeting in Atlantic City, organized the American Academy of General Practice to counteract the swing away from, and raise the standards of, general practice. Today, the academy has more than 23,000 members—and the distinction of being the first medical association to require continuing postgraduate education. Every 3 years each member must complete 150 hours of accredited study or lose membership.

Just before the formation of the academy, only 30 percent of medical school graduates were entering general practice. By 1959, the percentage had risen to 51.

In a parallel development, at least four medical schools have recently begun pilot programs to develop the practice of family medicine itself into a specialty. "I know it sounds paradoxical," says Dr. Ward Darley, of the Association of American Medical Colleges, "but training the general family doctor to take care of patients as individuals in their particular family and social settings represents the ultimate in specialization."

The need for restoring the human touch has come to seem sufficiently urgent to the profession so that the subject comes up at virtually every national medical convention and at a large number of State, county and even local meetings.

"In medicine today, we physicians," said Dr. David B. Allman in his inaugural address as president of the American Medical Association in June, 1957, "are giving renewed emphasis to the fact that it is our responsibility not only to minister to the human body and its ills—but also to human hearts, minds and emotions. The dedicated doctor knows that sympathy and understanding are just as important as scientific knowledge * * * so now, in practice he tries to blend his science with his art."

If Dr. Allman may have been slightly sanguine back then, if the depersonalization of medicine still remains a problem, as many patients and even physicians proclaim, there is at least some hope in the fact that the problem is being thoroughly aired and considered, that some efforts are actually being made to solve it, and that more are likely to follow.

Urban Affairs and Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my remarks before the House Rules Committee on January 24 citing my opposition to the creation of a Department for Urban Affairs and Housing:

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN WALTER S. BARING BEFORE THE HOUSE RULES COMMITTEE, JANUARY 24, 1962

Mr. Chairman and members of the Rules Committee, I am grateful for the chance to appear before you in opposition to H.R. 8429, a bill which would establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

On January 15, I sent a letter to every Member of Congress in both bodies making my position clear that I am a great believer in States rights and that I am firmly convinced that the enactment of the proposed legislation would result in too great a concentration of power within the proposed new Department.

A government that is big enough to give you everything you want is a government big enough to take everything you've got.

The proposed new Department would effectively put an end to home rule and States rights, for there is too great a centralization of power and control. A new Secretary of Urban Affairs would pull strings in all of the cities throughout the United States and the mayors and city officials would be merely puppets directed by the new Department, for power to control city governments would be vested in Washington. The people would lose personal contact with their local governments and this we do not want. This proposed new Department would be extremely powerful and, no doubt, there would be tremendously new large spending programs which would sweep across the country.

I have been worried for several years over an ever-increasing tendency on the part of both Republican and Democratic administrations to centralize power and control in Washington. Big government and centralized power are certainly steps in the direction of national socialism and I feel that the Congress has departed far too far from basic principles set forth in the Constitution of this country. Fear and frustration have ripped the hearts of the American people. Congress has given too many constitutional rights, rights that were delegated to the Congress, to the executive branch.

It matters not which major political party is in control, it is time to stop legislating in this manner and Congress should take back those rights that the framers of the Constitution intended them to have. We should put a stop to this sudden onslaught of liberalism which comes mainly from one group of people in this country, namely the Americans for Democratic Action.

The people of my State are definitely not for this liberalized program and they definitely oppose these actions which are leading us toward one-worldism and the welfare state. The urban renewal program has resulted in absolute chaos in my hometown of Reno. Eminent domain was put into the hands of appointed officials rather than elected officials and has created a very dangerous situation. Hundreds of homes have been condemned for resale and profit.

I believe sincerely that it is the duty of this committee, the Rules Committee, to oppose enactment of this bill which, in my mind, can only lead us further into socialism. May I, with your indulgence, complete my statement today with the quote from Thomas Jefferson, which is applicable to the present consideration of this bill: "I place economy among the first and foremost virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared. To preserve our independence we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. If we run into such debts, we must be taxed in our meat and drink, in our necessities and in our comforts, in our labor and in our amusements. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labor of the people, under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy."

In order to make this country sounder, we have to quit spending. We must reduce the national debt instead of raising the debt ceiling every time a new bureau or a new liberal idea is put into effect. Foreign aid in itself is unconstitutional and should be completely terminated. If this were done, we could reduce the national debt each year by over $5 billion which would be a step in the right direction.

I thank the committee for this opportunity to come before you.

Higher Tax, Lower Revenue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Higher Tax, Lower Revenue" which appeared in the February 8, 1962, edition of the Marion (Ind.) Chronicle.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGHER TAX, LOWER REVENUE

It has long been feared that soaring gasoline taxes would result in lower gas consumption and a reduced tax return to Government. Now the evidence is piling up—and it indicates that this is precisely what is happening.

Pennsylvania provides an outstanding example. The State's gasoline tax rate was recently boosted by a whopping 40 percent. And gasoline sales during the first 9 months of this year were down 41.2 million gallons as compared with the same period of 1960.

There is no real doubt that an excessive tax is the cause. The four neighboring States of New York, Maryland, Delaware, and New Jersey, all showed increased gas consumption, and all have tax rates lower than Pennsylvania's. Conversely, the two adjacent States of Ohio and West Virginia, which have the same gas tax rate as Pennsylvania, also showed gallonage losses.

What it all amounts to is that the individual has some measure of control over any sales or excise tax. In the case of gasoline he can drive less, or he can trade a big car for an economy compact—and great numbers of motorists have been doing just that.

It's an example of the principle of diminishing return. Up goes the tax, down goes consumption and revenue, and all concerned lose. One can only hope that legislators, State and Federal, will heed this obvious lesson and act accordingly.

The Anti-U.N. Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report:

CONGRESSMAN'S REPORT—MUST WE REPEAT OUR MISTAKES?

(By MORRIS K. UDALL)

Forty years ago a small group of sincere and patriotic Americans—who hadn't the slightest thought they might be wrong—prevented the League of Nations from becoming an effective instrument for international peace. Another such group of people are in our land today, doing everything they can to destroy the United Nations. I wish I could be as cocksure as they.

Here in Washington there is great concern over the mounting pressure to "get out of the United Nations" and to refuse the financial support which that organization needs from us to survive. A small but vigorous band of well-intentioned people, having decided they know all the facts and are better able to judge them than anyone in Washington, are proceeding to flood all congressional offices with telegrams (at the new bargain rate for "public opinion messages"), newspaper ads, tracts and even bumper stickers, all in opposition to the United Nations and to our purchase of United Nations bonds.

A Midwest Congressman described the reaction of many of us in both parties when he said, "Politically, there is nothing I would rather do than vote against this proposal, but there is too much at stake." The fact is, the security of our country may hang in the balance.

Distortion of the facts by a vocal segment of the press has helped shape the thinking of many sincere citizens on this issue. The result is that they are now completely convinced that the United Nations is an instrument of communism, that our State Department is overrun with Communists, and that the only hope for our country is to get out of the U.N., pull out of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, end all reciprocal treaties, raise tariffs, and threaten to bomb Moscow if the Russians don't stop whatever it is they're doing at the moment.

"Believe me," one correspondent wrote, "if one woman with a shotgun could do any good in Washington, D.C., I'd be there."

Unfortunately, the people who make the decisions for our country—the President and the Congress—can't afford to engage in such extravagant emotionalism. We are living in a trying period in history; the safe road ahead is not easy to find; but I don't believe the United States can isolate itself from the rest of the world any more than the Russians can ignore the mounting economic strength of the free world. We live on the same planet, we need foreign raw materials and foreign trade, and we need allies.

Now, what are the facts in the United Nations bond issue?

The United Nations is in debt approximately $100 million. Its reserve funds have been exhausted. It cannot continue for long without obtaining funds to pay its bills, past and present.

A major factor in this situation has been the violent Soviet objection to the recent Congo operation. Whereas the Communist bloc wanted chaos, disorder, and anarchy in Africa, the United Nations action has checked the extremists of the left (such as Gizenga) and right (such as Tshombe) and brought some semblance of order in that country, so pitifully unprepared by the Belgians for independence. The U.N. action may still fail, but it has vastly increased our chances of putting the new African nations on the side of the free world.

Because of its objection to the Congo operation the Soviet Union has refused to pay the special assessments arising from it. Other Communist nations also have refused, and many nations have been hard pressed to raise the necessary sums. As a result the United Nations is threatened with bankruptcy.

From the standpoint of the United States, the bond proposal offers a means of reducing our share of the U.N. burden. Here is why: present legal opinion leaves some doubt whether a member can be denied membership for nonpayment of special assessments, but there is no doubt about regular annual assessments. You either pay or you lose your vote.

Since repayment of the bond issue will come entirely from regular annual assessments, this method of financing will require the Soviet Union and its satellites either to pay up or relinquish their votes. Either alternative has something to be said for it.

The United States currently, with its own special assessments, is paying 47½ percent of the United Nations costs; the bond issue, spreading the burden more equally throughout the membership, will reduce our share to 32 percent.

Even so, it would be absurd to say the U.N. bond proposal is a gilt-edged investment. While we can deduct a portion of this each year from our own regular assessments, it is conceivable that we might lose some of this money. In my opinion, the proposal has to be considered, not alone on its financial merits, but on its importance to our Nation's security.

It is time the people who oppose the bond issue did some real, hard thinking about the situation we would face if the United Nations were allowed to expire—to follow the sad road of the League of Nations. Where would the loss of the United Nations leave the free world? Killing the U.N. will not free one satellite, will not destroy one Russian missile or bomber, will not strengthen our military power one ounce. The Communist bloc doesn't need the United Nations (although it can't afford to stay out if the Organization survives), because the Soviet system is welded together as the free nations are not. Without the United Nations it will be easier for the Russian Communists to pick off one free or so-called neutralist nation after another.

Despite its shortcomings the United Nations has been and is an impediment to Communist expansion, and we would be very much worse off without it.

Congress has started hearings on the U.N. bond proposal, and these are expected to go on for some weeks. I intend to listen to all the arguments and take in all the facts. Perhaps there will be a compromise proposal, such as Republican Senator CAPEHART's suggestion that we match the purchases of other nations dollar for dollar. Perhaps some other way will be found to meet the U.N.'s financial crisis. In the end, however, the security of our country—and not the possible loss of one-fifth of 1 percent of our $50 billion military budget—will be the deciding factor in determining my vote.

The cartoonist, Herblock says: "Buy U.N. bonds—the world you save may be your own." There may be some truth in this wry observation.

The Communists are doing everything they can to wreck the United Nations. It is a strange fact that they are joined in this effort by another wrecking bar being wielded by sincere but misguided people in our own country. I do not intend to give either of them any help in this endeavor.

As Liberty-Loving, Sensible, Free-Born Americans, We Can and Must Solve Our Farm Problem Without Compulsion, Fines, and Jail Sentences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, in order to raise the farm income to a proper, stable level, and as soon as possible, a farm bill must be made law to speedily reduce the price-depressing and costly surpluses, which can be done and must be done without compulsion, unnecessary Federal controls, fines, and jail sentences such as are specifically provided and spelled out in the 106-page bill recently sent to Congress by the Secretary of Agriculture, all of which can be avoided as I shall explain later in my remarks.

By making a full, fair study of the administration's farm bill you will find it is nothing more nor less than a patched-up version of old, ineffective and costly farm bills of bygone days, but with added controls and penalties.

Also, you will find that the greatest benefit provided in the bill will accrue to the large landholders who have been most responsible for the piling up of our huge surpluses of grains in CCC bins scattered all over the Grain Belt of the United States of America while the farmers who for many years past have conserved their soil by practicing proper land use and crop rotation will derive little or no benefits from the bill if made law in its present form. I am sure I need not elaborate further on that point, as a cursory reading of the bill will prove the correctness of my statement.

Hence, we see here another step toward the elimination of our family-sized farm, to which I will not be a party, for they are the backbone of our farm economy and, in fact, our national economy, as is farming as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, it would be a sad day for America if ever our farmers cease to be free by placing them in a Federal straitjacket or by the elimination of the small or medium family-sized farms. Look the world over and you will find in every nation where all or most of the land is owned by great and powerful land barons, there you will find without exception discontent, hunger, and revolutions. That must never happen to America, but it will, just as surely as darkness follows the light of day, unless we make an about-face and away from centralized government on many fronts.

Far too few Americans understand the value to every citizen in our land in the maintenance of a prosperous agriculture. To understand that value, one must know that all our new wealth springs year after year from mother earth in the form of all kinds of crops grown on the surface of mother earth, dug or pumped out from under the surface of mother earth or fished out of the waters of mother earth. Therein we find all our raw materials, from which our entire economy is generated for the very simple reason that every employed American is employed in producing, transporting, processing, manufacturing, marketing or using, in one form or another, the raw product or the finished product.

The United States is blessed with a far greater supply of raw products than any other nation on earth, which accounts for the fact that even though we have only 6 percent of the world's population, and because of our competitive free enterprise system of government, we have until recently done over 60 percent of the world's dollar business.

But Mr. Speaker, we now see clearly the danger signals appearing on the horizon, in most every direction, due mainly to our reckless, wasteful spending spree over the past three decades, to the end that our American dollar is losing its popularity all over the world, except of course, as a handouts called foreign aid. As proof, our gold stock at Fort Knox has diminished almost 50 percent during the last 10 years.

The financiers, importers and exporters of every foreign nation know only too well the condition of our U.S. Treasury. Hence, many nations who sell us goods have for years, and are yet demanding gold instead of dollars in payment for their goods. They know as we know that the Federal debt of the United States of America is greater than the debt of all the other nations on earth combined and still climbing. Can you blame them for demanding gold? They know we are traveling full speed ahead to the day when our dollar will be greatly depreciated, just as every school child should know by now.

But fellow Americans, all is not yet lost, if you will demand of your representatives in Congress to stop spending your tax dollars for any and all unnecessary purposes and programs demanded by the President and his party in control of Congress.

Now, back to the farm problem and to explain how billions of dollars can be saved, while at the same time bringing greater income to our farmers, which materially and beneficially effects our entire economy and hence, the welfare of every American.

First, we must consider and know the facts that records and statistics prove conclusively which are, that when our farmer's dollar is worth 100 cents in purchasing power, our farmers buys a fraction over twice as many dollars worth of manufactured goods year after year than do the rest of us on an average. This is understandable since farmers in this day and age must buy costly tractors, trucks, a full line of farm machinery, woven wire, steel and wood posts and building material for not only a dwelling house, but also for barns, hog and chicken houses, granaries, corncribs, machine sheds, and so forth, which means dollars in the pockets of every American in every walk of life from the corner grocer to the factory and mill wage earner.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, I need not elaborate further to prove that the welfare of our entire Nation is greatly dependent on the welfare of our farmers.

Records also prove conclusively that from the end of the Korean war to this day our farmer's dollar has been worth only on an average of 82 cents in purchasing power. Small wonder then that our farmers as a whole have been in a cost-price squeeze almost constantly during these 10 past years, which was triggered to a marked degree in 1951 when Mr. Mike DeSalle, then Director of the Office of Price Control, rolled back cattle prices 10 percent and would have rolled them back aonther 8 percent had not Congress stopped him. The rollback of cattle prices had the effect of rolling back the entire farm income. Look at the records.

That is all water over the dam. Now we must put our shoulders to the important task of properly and effectively reducing the price-depressing farm surpluses, especially the grain and corn surpluses, in order to materially raise our farmer's income, which must be done the American, commonsense, business way, and without coercion and unnecessary Federal controls and penalties.

Mr. Speaker, to even infer that to solve the farm problem our farmers must be subjected to stringent Federal controls, fined and even jailed, in order to solve the farm problem, is a rank insult to our farmers and their families.

Had the Congress during the last session adopted the substitute to the 1961 feed grain bill, which nine Members, including myself, from some of the largest corn and grain producing districts introduced, we would by now be 1 year closer to the solution of the farm problem for farm income as a whole would by now be on a higher level, and over a billion dollars of needless Federal expenses would have been saved.

Here is an analysis of our bill which we will again introduce at the proper time during this session of Congress, and we invite other Members to join us regardless of party and place of residence.

Our bill is short, concise, and to the point. It provides for liberal payments in kind for reducing corn and small grain acres below the average acres of the past 2 previous years. For such reduction the farmer will receive a Government certificate entitling him to take 80 percent of the amount of corn or small grain raised on his reduced acres of the average yield on such acres during the past 2 years, or he can sell his certificate to a neighbor, grain dealer, or to anyone except back to Uncle Sam. In any event, the grain will be taken out of Government surplus storage and gone forever.

The purpose of allowing just 80 percent payment-in-kind is to reduce by the other 20 percent the amount of corn and grain available for feed in order to hold down the available supply of feed so as to increase the market price of such feeds and in turn the price of livestock and poultry. I shall recommend to the cosponsors of our bill that grazing be permitted on the idled acres. I shall also recommend that to be in compliance to be entitled to all the benefits provided in the act, the farmer will be required to put in the program not less than 10 percent nor more than 33⅓ percent of the last 2 years' average acreage in such crops.

Our bill will not in any way affect the regularly established payment for soil conservation practices on any farm. Such farmers will profit proportionately with all farmers from the increased prices of all farm products which the passage of our bill is bound to bring about and soon after the law would go into effect. That, Mr. Speaker, is the most essential provision of our bill in a nutshell.

I have explained our bill to many farmers in the district I have the honor to represent in Congress, and without a single exception, after they fully understand our bill they have voiced their full approval. A farmer can easily figure without pencil and paper that if his average yield of corn, for example, for the past 2 years, was 70 bushels per acre, under the provisions of our bill he would receive 56 bushels in kind—of high feed value, or more bushels of corn of lower feed value—from CCC surpluses for every idled acre which he can take and use himself, or sell the certificate for at least the prevailing market price, which would by that time have increased, by the simple fact that the price-depressing surplus would then be in the process of being materially reduced. That being a fact which is bound to take place and on a voluntary basis, due to the dollar inducement provided in our bill, sufficient compliance will be no problem. Our farmers will remain free and independent to enjoy the fruits of their own labors. The billions of bushels of grain in Government storage belongs to you, Mr. and Mrs. American. It is all paid for with your tax dollars. Who among us dares say it shall not be used to solve most of our farm problem?

Let us also be ever mindful of this old adage which holds just as true today as when the words were first spoken, "If our farmers are ever told when and what they shall plant and reap we shall soon want bread."

And so, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, we must plead, "Speak up Americans for you are still the masters of your own destiny, if you will but use your constitutional inherent powers, reserved to the people."

Approach to Greater Communication Between the United States and Soviet Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Playing Games With Reds" which appeared in the February 6, 1962, edition of the Richmond (Ind.) Palladium-Item.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLAYING GAMES WITH REDS

White House Press Secretary Pierre Salinger is looking for an approach toward greater communication between the United States and Soviet Russia.

Undoubtedly President Kennedy approves the visit of Salinger to Russia.

An exchange of Salinger's children in return for the grandchildren of Khrushchev for a few months appears to be a move to create a homey atmosphere between the White House and the Kremlin.

But that still does not add up to a greater amount of communication. Only the parents of the children of the two families would have more comment to exchange.

The people of Russia want to know more about the people of the United States, says Press Agent Salinger.

Certainly our people are not so naive that they will accept the child approach as a means of breaking down Soviet censorship by Dictator Khrushchev.

If the Red leader of the Soviet wanted his people to receive more information about the people of the United States, he would permit his Russian people to receive and read the newspapers from our country.

It is a well-known fact that the voice of the United States is constantly broadcasting information about us and our way of life.

Russia blocks such information by jamming the broadcasting channels.

The people of the Soviet Union hear only what Khrushchev permits them to hear. They also read only what passes the censorship of the Kremlin.

Is President Kennedy permitting his press secretary to go to Moscow in order that arrangements can be made so that the millions back of the Iron Curtain may know the truth?

We still believe the President has more intelligence than to believe that.

But we do think that the President intends to deal softly with the Red dictator, even as he has for an entire year permitted Cuban Dictator Castro to make solid his ties with the Kremlin to a point where he now does pose a real problem despite the overdue embargo order on trade with Castro announced over the weekend.

Dictators have no respect for a government which is spineless.

Superintendent Mable Moody Gives Impressions of FFA Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRIS FAIRCLOTH BLITCH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, an article in the Georgia Future Farmer has been called to my attention by State Senator W. C. Long, of Nahunta, Ga. Written by Mrs. Mable R. Moody, school superintendent in Brantley County, Ga., the article is a report of her trip to the FFA convention recently in Kansas City. For the consideration of my colleagues in the Congress and for the general public, I am pleased to include in the RECORD Mrs. Moody's report—an interesting tribute to the Future Farmers of America.

MY IMPRESSIONS

(By Mrs. Mable R. Moody)

Kansas City has always awed me. "Kansas City steaks," wide-open spaces, informality; these things are synonymous with Kansas City, United States of America. This city is truly a convention city, situated in the Midwest with plenty of room, plenty of money, and seemingly an abundance of everything it takes to make for a good, wholesome, casual way of living.

It is a warm, friendly city that seems to thrive on large gatherings. This was much in evidence when the 325-pound mayor came to the platform at the opening session of the convention and spent 25 minutes welcoming the 10,000 high school boys who had arrived to attend the 34th Annual National FFA Convention. He was most cordial in offering all the facilities of the city to make the stay pleasant and profitable. "We love you in Kansas City," was his comment, and I believe he meant just that.

Aside from enjoying the glowing Midwest countryside, the FFA national convention is an experience I shall never forget. Every direction one turned there were blue and gold jackets. It was great fun identifying the States and chapters from Puerto Rico to Alaska and from Maine to Hawaii.

One was amazed at the dignity and seriousness of these teenagers in attendance and attentiveness in the convention hall. The poise, appreciativeness, and thoughtfulness of the presiding officers, all Future Farmers, were refreshing. Each guest invited to the platform was accorded every courtesy. There was not a babble in the entire 3-day affair. Frankly, it was carried on in a way to put adult conventions to shame.

The one outstanding feature to me of the gala event was the evidence of training, not only in tilling the soil, but in opportunities of developing leadership abilities and other talents that must have had their beginning in a well-rounded FFA program at the local level. For certainly, without this chapter experience, a national convention of this caliber would not have been possible.

It has long been my feeling that farming is the backbone of a nation. This convention verified the fact. The leading manufacturers and industries of the United States are listed among the FFA donors. They, too, appreciate and realize the importance of farming and what it means to this great Nation of ours, otherwise they would not be giving to the tune of $164,000 per year to the national FFA treasury to support the organization.

I was pleased and impressed during these sessions that at the mention of an enemy to the United States, these seemingly carefree youth gave much evidence of a sudden unity (as one great nation) and they let it be known in no uncertain terms that no effort would be spared to keep the enemy away from this land with its freedom-loving traditions. I had had some concern lately as to whether patriotism was being instilled as it should be, as part of our value system of youth. The convention allayed my fears along this line.

I came away from the convention with the feeling that the America of tomorrow will be in good hands, if what I saw was a fair sampling of youth, and I believe it was. I have nothing but commendation for the FFA program. It is doing a fine job of developing men of the future. Along with this learning to do, doing to learn, earning to live, living to serve, they are having a good time learning to become good Future Farmers of America. There was plenty of whooping it up in Kansas City, and I am sure some such fun and entertainment back home.

My best to each FFA'er in these United States. They make up a fine group for which I have the greatest admiration. Thanks for letting me in on such a great endeavor as a national convention; one that was maneuvered in such a splendid manner. For me, one who has spent most of a lifetime trying to help boys and girls grow into fine men and women, it was a real joy to witness youth doing so well in a man-size job.

But for one young man down in Brantley County, State President Robert Page, who is dear to me, and his vocational agriculture teacher, Jack W. Moore, Jr., I would have missed a wonderful experience in Kansas City. To them, I shall ever be grateful.

My wish for FFA members is that each could attend at least one national FFA convention.

Star and Herald, Panama City, Republic of Panama: Well-Known Isthmian Newspaper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the countries of the Western Hemisphere are fortunate in having at Panama City in the Republic of Panama a well-known Latin American newspaper, the Star and Herald, established in 1849.

It is always illuminating to read its thoughtful editorials and I quote two recent ones:

CRACKING DOWN ON CASTRO

Members of the Organization of American States, at the meeting of inter-American foreign ministers in Punta del Este, Uruguay, on January 22, will have their first and possibly decisive conclave to deal exclusively with the problem of Communist Cuba.

Called by Colombia and Venezuela, the 21-member states will act upon a resolution of condemnation of Cuba. This resolution is still in process of being designed to include the strongest sanctions possible against the Castro dictatorship and still assure a high degree of solidarity among the member states.

Some Latin governments have made known their opposition to any action more stringent than token disapproval of the Communist infiltration of this hemisphere. Others—notably Mexico—have publicly stated their intentions to vote against any resolution of condemnation.

Thus, it appears obvious whatever action is taken in Punta de Este will not be unanimous. That some nations of this hemisphere do not yet comprehend the significance of communism or recognize the threat which is as real to their borders as it is to the island of Cuba is regrettable.

Under the rules of the meeting, a vote by two-thirds of the members for sanctions against Cuba can make them mandatory for all members of the OAS. However, the lasting friction which could be developed by enforcement of this rule has prompted U.S. attempts to find a common ground upon which nearly all members can stand.

Two actions seem assured. The first is either a voluntary or mandatory diplomatic break by OAS members with the Cuban regime (a majority have already taken this action). The second will be more difficult to agree upon—some sort of economic sanctions to prevent the failing economy under Cuban communism from recovering.

There is reason for hope the outcome of the meeting will be a successful closing of ranks in a hemispheric front against the intrusion of communism. The United States has played a minor role in this event, with Latin nations taking the initiative in calling the meeting and composing the agenda.

A favorable response from all attendants will demonstrate conclusively the desire to curtail communism in this half of the world is not an exclusive project of the United States. It should also result in that minority, which has not yet recognized the significance of a waving red flag, reexamining its policies.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN

It is no surprise to learn that the Castro Government has for more than 2 years rejected all attempts of the International Red Cross to assist political prisoners in Cuba.

The Cuban Government, in barring the Red Cross, is indulging in petty malice or revealing a paranoiac fear of strangers. Either reason is a sad commentary on the present state of the republic.

Red Cross aid was requested by the Committee for the Defense of Cuban Political Prisoners, which charges that the prisoners often fail to receive medicine, food and clothing sent them. The committee also charges the prisoners are terrorized by their jailers.

This fits the pattern of totalitarianism which, in all its modern forms, is the plague of the 20th century. The Cuban development is simply the latest variation of man's inhumanity to man.

The President's Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Fewer Controls, Not More, Answer to Farm Problem" which appeared in the

February 1, 1962, edition of the Evansville Press.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JFK APPROACH WRONG: FEWER CONTROLS, NOT MORE, ANSWER TO FARM PROBLEM

The farm program just submitted to Congress by the President is a combination of Government-managed agriculture plus what amounts to a vastly expanded and permanent soil bank.

It would fasten firm controls on such surplus crops as feed grains, wheat, cotton, and dairy products. In return, the farmer would get higher prices, plus subsidies for land removed from production of these crops.

In theory, the farmer could decide by vote whether he wanted the controls but this would be sort of a Hobson's choice. If he turned down the controls, he would forfeit price supports.

American farm life once was the freest, the most ruggedly individual in the world. That such a system of regimentation as now proposed even can be suggested indicates the end result of Government aid to agriculture. As the President notes, this intervention has piled up $9 billion in present loans and inventories. Carrying costs alone exceed $1 billion a year. And these vast expenditures have not resulted in any increased income for the farmer.

The obvious, though extremely difficult, remedy is for the Government gradually to get out of this misguided aid business, eventually restoring a free market and letting the farmer alone. This new program takes the opposite tack—the inevitable trend when once the Government intervenes to help any industry. It would involve the Government deeper than ever, restricting the farmer's freedom of choice to manage his own business—tightly and permanently. In practical fact, he would be working for the Government.

The Kennedy program proposes an elaborate and in some ways constructive program for land taken out of production: parks, wildlife and recreation areas, etc. As our population grows, there is increasing need for this type of land use. Availability is indicated by the President's statement that in spite of a 65 million increase in population by 1980, our farms will be able to produce all we need with 50 million fewer acres than we have in cropland today.

A large percentage of this land never would have been in cropland had not Federal price subsidies furnished incentive for this use.

Removal of that amount of land from crop raising suggests a huge sum in further Government payments. No one has ventured to put a price tag on this.

The best we can say for this sweeping proposal of regimentation is that it dramatizes a couple of generations of farm folly. It puts the question squarely to Congress which recently has tended to turn its back on the whole farm mess, in the apparent hope it will go away. Perhaps now the issue will be tackled in earnest.

Which Road for Transportation: Private Management or ———?—Part No. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in a nine-part series of interviews, Traffic World, a transportation news magazine, has published the views of a number of well-known figures concerned with the growing problems confronting our Nation's transportation companies. In this, the third in the series, Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, expresses his ideas. The interview follows:

INTERVIEW 3

(Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, of Washington, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, has often publicly expressed his concern with many facets of the situation in which transportation, under regulation, finds itself. He has had long experience on the committee and in Congress in dealing with transportation. His answers to the questions posed deserve careful consideration.)

In the last 20 years there have been bills, introduced in Congress which, to one degree or another, would give to the President of the United States authority over the independent agencies created by Congress. What is the explanation for this tendency on the part of Members of Congress to make over their authority to the Executive?

I cannot agree with the premise that Congress is making over authority to the Executive in the administrative agency field. These agencies are arms of the Congress designed to decide matters which require a little more experience and flexibility than the Congress can give to any particular problem. Sometimes laws are introduced that look toward making the agencies more responsive to an overall executive program but there have never fared too well.

Basically, Congress has two controls over the agencies which will never be lessened: (1) There is the jurisdiction to write the substantive laws which are to be applied, and (2) there is legislative oversight which is the power to examine every aspect of the agency's work and change whatever is not satisfactory to the Congress. It is this latter control—legislative oversight—which Woodrow Wilson called Congress most important function.

There has been some experience, as of now, with independent agencies for which the Chairmen have been appointed by the President. Is there any evidence that such appointments have actually made any difference in agency procedure or lessened the criticism of delay or inefficiency?

The Presidential appointment of the Chairman of an agency has been helpful in some cases. The centralization of authority and responsibility in one person is more important in this area of the administrative lag than the fact that the President appoints him. Today we have a situation of greater delay in the agencies than ever before, despite the fact that most Chairmen are appointed. This leads me to the conclusion that the heart of the problem lies in the division of the work within the particular agency and requires a separation of the administrative and housekeeping work from the decisionmaking process.

Coming to the present: A bill in the Senate would give the President power to remove a member of an independent agency who was "frustrating" the President's program. Would not passage of such a bill represent an abandonment by Congress of a vital part of its power to create such agencies and to set the policies they must follow?

Passage of this bill would be like giving the President an item veto, Congress might just as well fold up shop, go home and let the Executive run the country. The present standard for removal of agency members—neglect of duty or malfeasance in office—has rarely been used but is adequate to protect the public.

As the question recognizes, Congress has the duty and the right to create the agency, write its laws, and make certain the laws are carried out as written. If the President's program is being frustrated, he can come to the Congress and ask that the laws be changed. Roosevelt did this when he was in office. And, on occasion, when the Congress was not sympathetic, he went to the people to create a popular demand for certain changes.

Should the Reorganization Act be amended so that it would be clear that reorganization plans submitted to Congress by the President must deal only with agencies in the executive branch or with executive duties which Congress has seen fit to place in the independent agencies?

The Reorganization Act has as its only purpose the granting to the Executive of the right to submit plans recommending structural changes in the agencies and departments. This is a limited area and one that Congress watches carefully so that the particular plan does not go too far. As happened in this Congress, whenever a majority of either House thought the plan reached into an area of congressional prerogative, the plan was defeated.

The advantage of continuing the act as it now stands is that the submission of a particular plan overcomes inertia and gets the pot boiling until needed corrections are made. For example, the FCC (Federal Communications Commission) plan was defeated this year but legislation was introduced and has almost been enacted along the lines of the plan submitted.

Is there any validity in the suggestion that the antitrust laws could be substituted in the field of transportation for the present regulatory scheme?

A few years ago this would have been treated as a wild-eyed suggestion. Now, however, as the inconsistent pattern of our regulation is becoming more and more apparent, the suggestion that we repeal rate regulation and substitute the antitrust laws requires some serious consideration.

Extensive hearings before my committee have revealed that private transportation plus what were thought to be minor exemptions now account for about 70 percent of our total transportation. Regulated common carriage, which is the guts of our national transportation system, is deteriorating at a rapid pace; in a few years it may be nonexistent.

Like the Internal Revenue Code, our Interstate Commerce Act does not spread the burden of regulation equally—there are a lot of holes in the fabric. And the question we are beginning to face is whether everyone or no one should be subject to regulation on an equal basis.

It should be added that substitution of the antitrust laws would have to be supplemented with other provisions. For example, some thought would have to be given to modifying or repealing the Reed-Bulwinkle Act as well as the possibility of applying Robinson-Patman principles to transportation.

Assuming that the present basic regulatory scheme is to be continued, can it be rolled back in any way to give a larger area for the exercise of managerial discretion and still protect the public interest?

Not until two things occur: (1) The burden and benefits of regulation are spread evenly over the whole transportation system, and (2) sufficient information is available to each manager of transportation resources so that his decisions can be based on fact. I have complete confidence in our economic philosophy and the judgment of our men. These have brought us a long way in a few years. For example, ours is the only country that can boast a privately owned system by all modes.

Rational decisions cannot be based on a series of unknowns. Give a man enough information and decisions made for private gain will improve our whole economy. Of course, there will have to be someone to

guard the public against excesses but possibly not to the extent we know the scope of regulation today.

Should some thought be given, now, to adjusting the competitive situation as between the railroads and the water carriers, air carriers, and motor carriers which use federally-supported facilities and, for the future, as between the air carriers and the motor carriers of property?

The question really poses two problems: (1) The almost eternal battle between modes as to who gets the most Government aid and what should be done about it in competitive ratemaking, and (2) as air carriers through advancing technology begin to lower their costs to a point competitive with surface transportation, how is rate competition to be handled? The first problem has been the subject of continuing study and controversy as the need for revenues from our public resources increases. What it boils down to is that no mode really wants to avoid paying fro the use of public facilities, including rights-of-way. But since competition is in a delicate balance between each form, a user charge cannot equitably be imposed unless there is a contemporaneous adjustment in the rate levels throughout the system.

Insofar as air freight competition with surface carriers, the agencies and the industries are just beginning to grapple with the problem. There are certain points of contact between them as in the matter of through routes and joint rates. Since there is a mechanism for a combination of the agencies in section 1003 of the Federal Aviation Act to work out these problems, it should be used. Once a tradition of cooperative settlement of the issues is established, large strides can be made toward a competitive balance.

From the standpoint of service to the entire public, the common carrier represents the mode which has emerged under the free enterprise system, and many in important positions have said that, if free enterprise in the field of transportation is lost, it will be lost in other areas of the economy. What steps, in principle, could be taken to preserve free enterprise in transportation?

America's modified version of free enterprise in transportation will be preserved so long as our transportation resources can serve the broad public interest and at the same time attract private investment. At the heart of our transportation system and philosophy is the common carrier which serves shippers large, small, and wherever located without discrimination or preference. Steps to preserve free enterprise, then, must be steps to preserve the common carrier.

In my answer to an earlier question, I suggested how consideration will have to be given by the Congress to broadening the regulatory fabric so that all public transportation is put on an equal competitive basis in this respect. Added emphasis will have to be given to enforcement of existing laws against the illegal operator. A third and vital step should be a study in depth of transportation with particular attention given to the cost characteristics of each form. Transportation decisions affecting the size of plant, the rate to publish, the mode to use—each has to be the rational result of an analysis of reliable information.

Two other areas of prospective effort are less dramatic but require attention. The first is the heavy load of paperwork imposed on interstate carriage. It is my understanding that industry is collaborating on a variety of fronts with this problem, including a study of electronic data processors.

Finally, State, local, and even some Federal taxes fall more heavily on transportation than on many other business resources. Our transportation industry will continue to pay its way but some reasonable ground rules have to be developed.

A number of bills have been offered which would permit single ownership of multiple modes of transportation as a means of coordinating the various modes. Is the view that the only true coordination would come from common ownership of end-to-end modes a valid one?

Coordinated carriage over different modes will provide the public the most efficient and lowest cost transportation. This is a common goal. But it is my judgment that we should exhaust every possbile avenue for voluntary attainment of this objective with independent modes before resorting to the experiment of single ownership. I have not yet seen convincing evidence which eliminates the possibility of achieving through service by several modes under our present laws.

Difficult problems are presented in scheduling and divisions of rates, but the Commission has not been sufficiently aggressive in this area nor has the industry been cooperative within itself. It is almost axiomatic in our society that the public gets what the public demands. We are getting to the point in the field of transportation coordination where this axiom will apply. Hopefully, this can come with industry cooperation before we incur the well-known social and economic risks of single ownership.

It should be added that the coming of containerized service will facilitate efforts in this field. One of the difficulties has been the cost of handling at a transfer point, particularly with break-bulk freight, but this is now dramatically reduced.

Does the "piggyback" system, with independent motor carriers delivering the container at one end of the rail, water or air haul, and the same or another independent motor carrier making delivery at the completion of the rail, water, or air haul, hold the germ for future sound development of competing systems of transportation?

It's a little too early in its infancy to ascertain and evaluate all the implications of "piggyback." Certainly, at this point of time, the neat situation posed in the question has been expanded by the recent ICC decision upholding plans III and IV rates. Instead of an independent truck or an independent railroad, it could be a freight forwarder using a leased truck on his own flatcar. This much can safely be said now: "Piggyback" as one form of containerization will promote single unit movement over multiple modes due to the ease of transfer. Whether this will lead to systems of transportation or whether we even want such systems is another question.

President's Message on Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Bureaucratic Busybodies Behind School-Aid Push" which appeared in the Evansville Press of February 7, 1962.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUREAUCRATIC BUSYBODIES BEHIND SCHOOL-AID PUSH

A total of 600,000 public school classrooms must be built during this decade, according to President Kennedy's message on aid to education.

A little more than 2 years ago the Committee for Economic Development surveyed this field. It found classrooms were being built at the rate of 70,000 a year. That would be 700,000 in a decade, and without the Federal aid now declared to be vital.

That, in our view, is fairly characteristic of the message. In part, it finds emergencies which do not exist. In part, it proposes Federal butting-in on affairs now capably handled by the States and local school districts.

"We must find the means of financing a 75 percent increase in the total cost of education," says the message, presumably referring to this decade. Public school expenditures in the last decade increased more than 100 percent, also without Federal aid for buildings or teachers' salaries.

Too many, says the message, leave school before completing high school. True. But the reasons are complex and largely unknowable. In any event, percentages of dropouts have decreased steadily.

Teachers' salaries are too low, says the message. Also true. But that condition steadily is being remedied. Average for the 1948–49 school year was $2,846. Ten years later, for 1958–59, it was $4,935. It has gone up since.

While the CED survey opposed a general subsidy, it found the poorer States need aid. Proposals before Congress include handouts for all, the rich as well as the poor.

In the words of the President, "Americans are still the best educated and best trained in the world." They got that way through an unparalleled devotion to the ideal of public education and a willingness of the people to tax themselves directly to pay the bills. There is no evidence that this enthusiasm is diminishing.

We consider the President's push in this direction reasonably well meant, but the fundamental demand comes from a busybody element in the bureaucracy which considers nothing run right unless it is run from Washington. Despite effusive reassurance, Federal control is bound to follow Federal financing.

In any event, this proposed subsidy is no gift. It all comes out of taxes which the Federal Government levies on the citizens of the localities. It would aid the States and the local districts with their own money.

We hope, as seems likely, that Congress will reject this scheme, as it applies to primary and secondary schools, again this year

Urban Affairs Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD editorials from two of New Jersey's most distinguished newspapers, the Trenton Times and the Trentonian. These papers are particularly well qualified to discuss the value of an Urban Affairs and Housing Department, for not only is New Jersey the most urbanized State in the Union, but its capital, Trenton, has recently joined with Federal housing and renewal agencies in a massive program to revitalize that city. If that goal is achieved, and I am sure it will be, we Trentonians will be particularly thank-

ful to both the Federal Government for its vital assistance and to our daily newspapers, who led the way in spurring local interest and initiative in the project. Since the Trenton Times and the Trentonian have thus demonstrated responsibility and concern over urban problems at a city level, I believe it would be both fitting and constructive to include in the RECORD their views on the proposed Urban Affairs and Housing Department.

Mr. Speaker, I fully subscribe to the views expressed in the following editorials:

URBAN DECAY

Governor Hughes' call for a bold attack in the field of urban renewal was almost coincident with President Kennedy's proposal for creating a new Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs. There is a great deal that is heartening in the increasing recognition of one of the most disturbing facts of American life—the steady deterioration of cities that only a few years ago held legitimate claims upon greatness and pride.

"There must be a bold attack in the field of urban renewal with its eradication of slums and the development of new homes and business," the Governor said. "The rebirth of our cities and planned development of our suburbs are inseparable."

This neglect has been one of the major tragedies of our national life. Public officials, preoccupied with far less serious matters, have permitted cities and towns to sink into decay before their eyes, without a word or a move to save them until the damage had been done. The result of this neglect is blighted cities with no appeal to residents, to business, or to industry—cities that demand inspired leadership and heroic efforts if they are to be saved.

President Kennedy and Governor Hughes manifestly share a deep concern for the future of the cities, which have contributed so much to the growth and well-being of the Nation and which still have so much to offer toward its progress.

"We cannot stand by," the Governor said, "while the bright face of New Jersey is disfigured by decay of its cities and a haphazard growth of its suburbs." Although disheartening progress has been made toward both of these disastrous objectives, the trend can be reversed.

The agencies whose establishment President Kennedy and Governor Hughes propose can accomplish this change if they bring to the effort the required spirit of determination and if they receive the support of communities interested in self-improvement.

PRESIDENTIAL ONE-TWO

Trenton is among the many cities that are, or should be, interested in President Kennedy's attempt to set up a Department of Urban Affairs in his Cabinet. There is no telling how much bearing that proposed agency would have upon the future of our city, but when due recognition is accorded the fact that the John Fitch Way project is only a drop in our municipal bucket, and that much more extensive and important redevelopment lies ahead, it can be seen that Trenton is going to be working in partnership with the Federal Government for many years to come.

As is well known, the President ran into a setback when his proposal was voted down by the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives. Now he has had to resort to a Presidential device known as a reorganization plan, under which he can create the Cabinet position if neither the House nor the Senate vetoes it within 60 days.

The proposal has taken on some significant political overtones. Republican members of the Rules Committee lined up solidly against it. This, of course, put their party in the light of being antiurban. But the President further discomfited the GOP by publicly confirming what has been known all along—that he would appoint Dr. Robert C. Weaver as the first Negro Cabinet member to head up the proposed Department. In short order it damned upon discerning Republicans that they had left themselves open for a political one-two to their vote-getting solar plexus, and that the agile Mr. Kennedy had delivered the shots in masterful fashion.

Sometimes the ineptness of GOP leadership is overwhelming. Their opposition to the urban affairs post was based on what can be construed to be sound reasoning; i.e., it isn't necessary because presently constituted agencies can do the job at less cost. But instead of taking that tack forcefully and mounting an offensive, they chose to remain on the defensive and resort to what seems to be the only political strategy they know, teaming up with Southern Democrats (opposed to Dr. Weaver, of course) to gain what may turn out to be a Pyrrhic victory.

Supporting Urban Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the San Antonio Light, February 2, 1962, presented the following editorial for the consideration of the citizens of Bexar County. Inasmuch as many persons have assumed that this issue has not reached the people, that this is not a significant matter, and that the President is not making his point, I present this editorial for the RECORD:

CITIES' NEEDS

Disregarding the politics now boiling around the issue and considering its probable defects, President Kennedy's plan to create a new Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs and Housing should be approved by Congress.

In supporting it we are aware that opponents have valid points—the new Department could turn into just another huge bureaucracy and, at its worst, could develop into paternalistic interference in municipal and State affairs.

These are risks, but the probable advantages outweigh them. The gist of the matter, in the words of the President is this:

"Our cities and the people who live in and near them need and deserve an adequate voice in the highest councils of government."

Ours has become largely an urban country. The U.S. Conference of Mayors and the American Municipal Association which, by the way, endorse the President's plan—estimate that 70 percent of our population live in and around cities. The percentage is increasing.

Mr. Kennedy pointed out that taxpayers in the 10 largest metropolitan districts contribute 35 percent of the total income tax collections.

As the urban areas have grown, so have the multiplicity and complexity of problems—transportation, housing, educational facilities, racial minorities, slums, traffic, downtown blight, and so on.

They are becoming increasingly difficult to solve at local levels; in fact, some of them spill over formal city boundaries and across State lines.

The proposed new Department is not actually a radical innovation. It would coordinate the functions of a number of Government agencies.

The Federal Housing Administration and the Federal National Mortgage Association would be brought into the Department. So would the functions of the Public Housing Administration, the Urban Renewal Administration, and the Community Facilities Administration.

The President's belief that such coordination would increase efficiency is soundly based, and his assertion that his plan "does not connote any bypassing or reduction in the powers and responsibilities of the States" is assuring.

But the most convincing argument in behalf of the plan is this: The tremendous growth of our vast urban complexes makes them and their people deserving of representation in the Federal Government at Cabinet level.

To deny it would be to disregard a dynamic phenomenon of our time.

Farm Program Proposals by Secretary Freeman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Last Frontier," which appeared in the February 8, 1962, edition of the Washington (Ind.) Herald.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LAST FRONTIER

The last frontier is looming on the horizon for agriculture. The last remnant of freedom for agriculture will vanish if the set of proposals advocated by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman is adopted.

To date livestock and poultry have been comparatively free to adjust under the law of supply and demand.

In recent years efficient livestock and poultry producers have done relatively well, and so have consumers who have had an abundance of nutritious products to select from at reasonable prices. Granted, there may be overproduction 1 year and prices may be down, then, the next year as supply adjusts to demand, the price increases. This is commonly known as free enterprise. This was the situation in the turkey industry through 1961, which was one of those years with too many turkeys and a money losing price market.

Here Secretary Freeman enters the picture, ever alert to sell a conglomeration of Federal controls. He has proposed and is actively promoting a set of complicated Federal turkey marketing orders, which would regulate supply and raise prices by limiting the hatch of turkey eggs and the number of turkeys. Some critics have called this a "poult birth control" program.

Regardless of its name it is still Government intervention by Government planners in a field that has served producers and consumers well—a last frontier where producers have made their own decisions

and taken their own risks along with profits and losses.

The proposed turkey marketing orders have been debated at public hearings in regional meetings and may be voted on at a referendum in the near future if the Secretary decides that a referendum would pass and calls for one. At the hearings strong opposition to the orders has developed, along with support for the orders.

A goal of the marketing orders would be to give turkey producers the so-called parity price for turkeys, which would mean a 25- to 30-cent per pound increase, nearly double recent prices.

A lot of men in the industry know that the drastically higher prices would discourage exports, encourage imports, and cause many consumers to substitute other meats for turkey. Producers of substitute meats would increase output to meet demand and the turkey industry would come to a halt.

In addition quotas set under this program would freeze capacity, breeds, egg producers and hatcheries as they are at present. This would curtail growth at all levels, make it difficult for new producers to enter the field, and discriminate against producers in a State like Indiana which imports about 70 percent of the hatching eggs and poults used in its turkey industry.

Tax Equality for Museums

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of February 15, 1962, together with an editorial from the Richmond News Leader of Thursday, February 8, 1962.

TAX EQUALITY FOR MUSEUMS

The Metropolitan Museum of Art, the American Museum of Natural History, and a great many other public museums throughout the country have demonstrated to the satisfaction of almost everybody that they are educational institutions.

But they still haven't convinced government, either Federal or State. Charitable contributions to churches, hospitals, colleges and schools may be credited against taxable income to the extent of 30 percent of adjusted gross income, while similar gifts to museums or libraries fall within the old 20-percent limit.

This is a hardship on the museums and libraries. It is inequitable as well. A gift of money or a painting to the art museum of some obscure college, classed as educational, would get the more liberal tax treatment; but if the same gift went to a great city museum, where it would benefit a far larger public, it would be subject to the more restricted tax deduction. The fact that there have been some abuses in claiming deductions for gifts to art museums—abuses that should be corrected—does not lessen the injustice which present tax law does to museums and libraries by distinguishing them from other kinds of educational institutions.

A bill has been introduced by Representative KEOGH, of Brooklyn, to extend, with logical uniformity, the present tax treatment on gifts to educational institutions also to "a museum of history, art, or science, or a library open to and operated for the benefit of the general public and which normally receives a substantial part of its support from the United States, or any State or political subdivision thereof, or from direct or indirect contributions from the general public." This bill could be broadened to embrace Lincoln Center and other nonprofit institutions that qualify as educational, and not only in the performing arts.

A sampling survey recently indicated that 79 percent of the Nation's nearly 4,000 museums engage in educational work, such as guided tours for schoolchildren and adults, class instruction and lectures, provision of art schools, and college credit courses. Several museums do notable work of this nature in New York, the New York Botanical Garden for one. The museums deserve State aid as educational institutions (and better financial support from the city) and further Federal and State tax relief on contributions as well.

A BILL FOR BUILDING MUSEUMS

Virginia's delegation in the House of Representatives could strike a useful blow for the State's great museum of fine arts, and for other museums and libraries as well, by getting behind a good bill that has been languishing for months in the House Ways and Means Committee.

The bill, sponsored by Congressmen CURTIS of Missouri, and KEOGH of New York, is intended to correct a manifest injustice in a law passed in 1954 relating to a taxpayer's deductions for gifts to various institutions. Prior to 1954, all institutions were treated alike; a taxpayer could deduct up to 20 percent of his gross income in gifts to them. But in an effort to encourage larger contributions to churches, hospitals, and educational institutions, the Congress raised the percentage for these institutions to 30 percent.

Obviously, a museum such as the Virginia museum, or a library such as the State library, is an educational institution, but the language of the 1954 amendment has been narrowly interpreted by the Internal Revenue Service. The Curtis-Keogh bill would place them in the same 30-percent group with churches, hospitals, and educational institutions.

The Treasury would lose little by this, for few taxpayers are able to give 30 percent of their gross income to any object of charity. But these are precisely the taxpayers on whom museums and libraries must rely for the generous gifts that keep them growing. Walter S. Robertson, president of the Virginia museum, has said the Curtis-Keogh bill would be of enormous benefit to the museum. We join him in urging the House to bring this measure out of committee and write it into law.

Where Are We Heading Under J.F.K.?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a recent statement by a leading U.S. Communist which points up the danger of a continued drift toward socialism in our Nation.

On January 26, 1962, Gus Hall, who boasts that he is the leading spokesman for the Communist Party in the United States, told an audience in Berkeley, Calif., that this Nation first will become socialistic, then communistic. He spoke before a group of students at the University of California.

This admitted Red attacked the McCarran Act and the Smith Act, both of which have been used to halt the spread of communism in our Nation. Hall said he and his fellow Communists would not register as required by the Smith Act because "the U.S. Supreme Court has held that communism is a state of mind."

Hall also echoed the Kennedy administration's line that the "extreme right" is spreading panic and hysteria in California and throughout America.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we must seriously consider the words of Gus Hall and where we are heading as a nation. Although they may differ with Gus Hall in many respects, we nevertheless have men around the President today whose views are not entirely dissimilar, whose philosophy of government not exactly unlike that of Hall.

For example, Gus Hall has stated that the trend in this country is toward socialism "not like in other countries, but based on America's background, and still socialism."

Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., special assistant to the President, has stated:

If socialism is to preserve democracy, it must be brought about step by step in a way which will not disrupt the fabric of custom, law, and mutual confidence upon which personal rights depend. That is, the transition must be piecemeal; it must be parliamentary; it must respect civil liberties and due process of law.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point an Associated Press story about the Gus Hall rally which was carried in the San Diego Tribune of January 27, 1962:

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA CROWD HAILS TALK BY U.S. RED

BERKELEY.—Communist spokesman Gus Hall has told University of California students that the United States will become socialistic, then communistic.

He made that declaration yesterday to a capacity audience of 170 in Stiles Hall, the university's off-campus YMCA.

Hall spoke despite opposition of a group of Berkeley businessmen, led by Robert Rinehart, of Berkeley, who had threatened to boycott the Bay Area United Crusade fund drive if Stiles Hall officials allowed Hall to speak. The YMCA receives funds from the crusade each year.

Rinehart and United Crusade officials were not available for comment on whether they would boycott the fund drive, now that Hall has spoken.

All seats in the chamber were filled an hour before the 1:30 p.m. talk by Hall, who calls himself the leading Communist spokesman in the United States. Firemen would allow no standees, and several hundred were turned away.

There were no demonstrations or heckling, but students asked skeptical and antagonistic questions. Hall dodged some and replied humorously to others, apologizing to "those in the audience who expected to see horns or a man who eats fire."

WINS ROUND OF APPLAUSE

He was roundly applauded at the end of his talk, sponsored by the Student Committee for Constitutional Liberties. The committee is composed of students opposed to the Smith and McCarran Acts.

The McCarran Act excludes from the United States any person who seeks to enter to engage in activities against the public

interest or advocate the forcible overthrow of the Government. The Smith Act requires the registration of members of the Communist Party.

U.S. COMMUNISM PREDICTED

Hall called the McCarran Act "impossible and fantastic." He said the trend in the United States is toward socialism—"not like in other countries but based on America's background, and still socialism."

The end product, he said, will be American communism. It will come, he declared, because capitalism has been tried and found wanting, because socialistic systems have caught up and in some cases surpassed capitalism, and because colonialism is at an end.

Of the Smith Act, Hall said Communists won't register with the Government because the U.S. Supreme Court has held that communism is "a state of mind."

DENIES HE'S RED AGENT

Hall, who said he is not a Red agent or a conspirator, made these other points:

First. Northern California is being made a "pilot project" for the extreme right, and its people are "guinea pigs" for an ultra-right blitzkrieg.

"This is no accident," he said. "They've all been here in the last few weeks. They want to see if the American public is ready for panic and hysteria."

Second. Faced with the dilemma of nuclear devices the only solution for capitalism and communism is to live side by side, but they must disarm.

Third. Communism in the United States would not be the same as it is in the Soviet Union. It would be based on America's background, but still socialism.

Editing of Speeches by Military Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Congress Needs To Know" which appeared in the February 8, 1962, edition of the Indianapolis Star.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS NEEDS TO KNOW

The Senate subcommittee investigating muzzling of military leaders is on a familiar merry-go-round with Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara. The subcommittee wants to question individuals who actually performed editing of speeches by military men. McNamara has refused to tell the subcommittee who they are.

The Secretary says that he as the boss must take full responsibility for the actions of his subordinates, and "It is I and not they who should be queried." This is a commendable, manly attitude. But so far it has not helped to get the subcommittee's questions answered.

What it boils down to is the old struggle of Congress to get information from administrative officials who don't want to give it.

President Kennedy made a very pertinent and penetrating remark at his press conference the other day when he brought up the matter of the defense stockpile. He said secrecy about the stockpile at first was intended to conceal shortages, but now it cloaks mismanagement. This is precisely why excessive official secrecy is bad for the country. A certain amount of it is necessary and justifiable for security and diplomatic reasons. When secrecy goes beyond that necessity it merely hides from the people—and their representatives—the true state of affairs.

McNamara's insistence that he is responsible is justifiable only if he is able to give the subcommittee the information it seeks—and does so. Otherwise it frustrates the subcommittee's attempt to reach the sources of information.

As this was written McNamara had not yet claimed "executive privilege in refusing to answer questions, but he had hinted that he might do so if pressed. It can be conceded that administrative officials have a responsibility to keep secrets—even from Congress—when disclosure would damage the national security. But it has not been claimed that disclosure of what the subcommittee wants to know would damage security. In fact, what the subcommittee is trying to learn is whether the Nation's security is being damaged by the operation of military censorship.

If McNamara and his subordinates are concealing information from Congress not because security requires it but only because they do not want to be embarrassed, they are in the wrong. And no amount of explanation of executive privilege can change the fact that they are wrong.

This issue is a very serious one and a solution is badly needed for the whole gamut of relations between the Congress and the executive branch. Congress cannot perform its functions, and discharge its responsibilities to the people, unless it can find out what is going on in the executive branch. Administrative officials, from the President on down, have a responsibility to the people to provide whatever information Congress wants, except where the compelling interests of security and diplomacy clearly require secrecy.

Frederick Cleric Enlists in Anti-Castro Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues an article which recently appeared in the Baltimore Evening Sun on Rev. Father Joseph F. Thorning. Father Thorning is called the padre of the Americas, and the Baltimore Woman's Committee for Cuban Freedom has named him the 20th century's "Flaming Son of Liberty." I believe the text of the article is so sound and the message so important that it should be entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FREEDOM FIGHTERS: FREDERICK CLERIC ENLISTS IN ANTI-CASTRO MOVEMENT

(By John D. Hackett)

A 65-year-old Frederick County churchman has enlisted in the growing army of freedom fighters of the Americas intent on warning lawmakers and average citizens about the subtle and overt Castro-Soviet agents now infiltrating into Latin America from Cuba.

He is the Reverend Dr. Joseph Francis Thorning, pastor of historic St. Joseph's-on-Carrollton Manor Church, in Buckeystown.

Father Thorning, a priest-scholar, has lived, studied, and taught in most Central and South American nations.

He holds six degrees from North and South American universities and has completed graduate studies at England's Oxford University and the Sorbonne in Paris. A former college professor and guest lecturer in Latin American history, he is an associate editor for the Americas and world affairs, national quarterly reviews in history, and literature.

OTHER LEADERS

Other leaders in the freedom-fighter movement include former U.S. District Judge Harold R. Medina, of New York; Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, U.S. Army, retired; Francis Cardinal Spellman, of New York; Senator Thurmond, Democrat of South Carolina, and Senator Dodd, Democrat of Connecticut, and others.

"Fidel Castro last Sunday told the world his kind of revolution would sweep Latin America 'like a march of giants,'" Father Thorning said.

"The Soviet-trained creators of 'spontaneous revolutions' are at work today sowing seeds of discontent where poverty, disease, illiteracy, and injustice exist," the country pastor added.

ASKS STRONG POLICY

Father Thorning, who receives Cuban refugee leaders and mail from all Latin American nations telling of atrocities in Cuba and of Castro agents in the cities and hinterlands, argues that a stronger national policy against Communist growth is needed in Washington.

"The present Castro-Soviet infiltrations, and now the announced policy, present a clear and present danger to the Western Hemisphere and the democratic way of life," Father Thorning said. "We need an army of intellectuals and nonintellectuals to keep this fact alive in everyone's mind."

Cuba today, he said, is the result of "Operation Deception: Objective, Power" which has turned the island into the Soviet captive nation of the Carribean.

What happened in Cuba, Father Thorning explained, should serve as a warning to other Latin American nations. He said they are the target for Soviet expansion. He asserts an indifferent government and people can wake up under a Soviet regime.

CUBA EXPLAINED

Father Thorning, explaining Cuba, said: "The Cuban, as most Latin Americans, is a complex person living among paradoxes.

"Of Spanish hidalgo heritage, aspiring always for the good life, he lives in a quasi-industrial society where most people are poor and uneducated.

"His deep personal faith in God is suppressed by sincere patriotism exhibited with indifference toward church, which once represented the Spanish crown. Tropical warmth and a superabundant soil encourage ennui and sensuality where spartan industriousness is needed to evolve a wealth-producing economy.

"Cubans, in 1958, had been under the harsh yoke of Fulgencio Batista's military dictatorship for 6 years. Life was hard, fear of the Batistas was rampant.

"In Havana, in other cities, in the sugarcane and tobacco fields, suppressed Cubans heard, in whispers, and read, in forbidden leaflets, about a champion of freedom and liberty who dared to attack Batista from hiding places in the Sierra Maestra.

"This was Fidel Castro, the bearded one, now 35, a lawyer and son of an Oriente province sugar grower. He was El Cid, Juarez, Lincoln, Bolivar—the Cubano who

would restore human dignity and the good life.

"He, with 1,200 guerrillas, came out of the mountains when Batista fled and was acclaimed in Havana by the people, rich and poor, learned and unlettered, clergy and businessman.

"This carnival spielman par excellence cajoled the eager populace and played on their prejudices, greed, envies, and jealousies like an accomplished harpist.

"He used the four promises of Lenin, Mao-Tze-tung and the Bolsheviks: land; plentiful bread; freedom from toil; and peace.

"Fidel Castro has falsified every promise. No one in Cuba today owns a house or acre in fee. Farmers work in China-like communes. The unbelievable is seen—people in plentiful Cuba form lines for food.

INSTITUTE OF ROBBERY

"Duped Cubans call the agrarian program the Institute of Highway Robbery. City apartment dwellers, who each month gained a little ownership with their rent, now pay Fidel, the landlord, and have lost their equity.

"Fidel Castro moved slowly with his deceit, the fundamental weapon used to enslave the people. But, within 2 years, this diabolicial man controlled all newspapers, radio, television, magazines and the telephone where operators give the current 'Heil Hitler'-type greeting. Univeristies and schools have been purged of all teachers who were considered hostile.

CLASSES LEVELED

"Fidel destroyed the upper class, imposed heavy sacrifices on the middle class and labor majority in the name of the poverty-stricken who were raised to join the level of ordinary poor.

"There is a spy on every street because a spy eats better. People are jailed or shot every day. People attend meetings and cheer Castro in lieu of going to jail. The fear of Batista has ben replaced by the terror of Fidel Castro.

"This is Cuba today. The Cuba of Communist tanks, MIG jetplanes, armed children, an arrogant leadership supplied by an ever-increasing ferry schedule from behind the Iron Curtain.

ENSLAVES ALL

"This Operation Deceit can enslave the farmer, plumber, nun, mechanic, doctor, minister, merchant, professional, and student in Latin American nations if indifference in leadership continues.

"It cannot happen if people, alerted and knowing the methods, move to establish national policies to prevent it. Alerting the people is the aim of the freedom fighters who are needed to write, make speeches and influence their elected representatives.

"A freedom fighter is any person whose ideals inspire him to seek liberty and life's eternal values, who wants the preservation of representative government and democratic procedures in every American republic, including Cuba," Father Thorning concluded.

The Administration's Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Pretty Strong Medicine" which appeared in the February 15, 1962, edition of the Shelbyville (Ind.) News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRETTY STRONG MEDICINE

Contrary to what may be popular opinion, the administration's new farm program now under development is not "just another farm bill." Far from it, the new program directly concerns city people as well as farmers—from the factories right on down to the local grocery stores.

Confidential reports from Washington State that the plan places the farmer in what amounts to a straitjacket by limiting the amount of certain key things that he could sell, such as wheat, feed grains, milk, basic food crops. It would control supplies of bread, meats, poultry and eggs through grains, and supplies of milk, butter, and cheese through milk allotments.

At the present time farmers are limited as to the acreage they can plant for crops, but the fact remains that they increase production through the use of more fertilizer, new methods, and technology. The proposed new plan would limit the output as sold from the farm, along with stiff fines on those who raise and sell more than the quota. Food companies would be controlled on supplies available to them and by regulations determining how much they could finish up into food, prices would be set generally and indirectly by fixing supply.

This, of course, would launch a planned economy for food and agriculture, with Government acting as the central force, telling farmers how much they could grow, how much they could sell, and dictating the price through support programs.

The aim, which is to cut surpluses, is laudable. But the means appears to be a medicine as objectionable as the illness which we call the farm problem.

Expansion of Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, across the Nation, forestry and forest products industries are making a tremendous contribution to better lives for our people—as well as the economy.

In this industry—as others, however—the key to progress is research.

Over the years, the Forest Products Laboratory, at Madison, Wis., has provided outstanding leadership in research for finding ways in which forest products can better serve the American people.

During this session, Congress will consider the need, not only for carrying forward the operations of this vital Laboratory, but also a much-needed expansion of its facilities, to better serve the needs of the country.

Recently, I was privileged to discuss these needs in a broadcast over Wisconsin radio stations.

Calling special attention of our colleagues on the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies on the need for expansion of research facilities at Madison, I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of my comments printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Traditionally, Wisconsin has been most famous for its production of high-quality dairy foods—valued at $500 million annually.

Forestry and wood products, however, also represent an outstanding industry—not only in Wisconsin, but the Nation.

For 1960, for example, the latest year for which complete figures are available—the forest products industry in Wisconsin ranked high in our economy: (1) It provided over 54,000 jobs; and (2) the total value of all Wisconsin forest products is around $1 billion.

Wisconsin, too, is the Nation's top papermaker in both production and sales. Papermaking—an important aspect of the wood products industry—ranks third in payrolls and fourth in employment. Annually, it sells products worth over $800 million.

Nationally, also, the forest products industry is significant, providing (for the same period) jobs for about 1,136,000 people (a level of employment exceeded only by the machinery, food, transportation, equipment and apparel industries; and the manufacture of wood and paper products contribute about $10 billion to the Nation's income.

OUTLOOK FOR THE FUTURE

The outlook for the forest products industry, however, is problematical. The plywood, papermaking, lumber, fabricating wood products and other parts of this industry complex faces economic difficulties.

"For this reason, Wisconsin—and the Nation—need to undertake realistic efforts to conserve and effectively utilize—as well as replenish—our forest resources. According to experts, the Nation's timber requirements are expected to double in the next 40 years.

In this technological age, research—in forestry, as in other industries—provides a fundamental key to progress.

Fortunately, we, in Wisconsin, benefit from the existence of the Forest Product Research Laboratory at Madison. Although a Federal institution, the Laboratory stands as a good example of governmental-free enterprise cooperation in research for better conservation, utilization and reforestation practices. Serving not only Wisconsin, but also the Nation, the Laboratory participates cooperatively with wood industries in more efficient utilization of wood and wood products for (1) improving wood quality for utilization for commercial and industrial purposes; (2) research on production and protection of solid wood products, including plywood, veneer and lamination—protection against fungi, insects, and fire; and to determine effects of chemicals, et cetera; (3) wood engineering—involving testing the strength and other potentials of wood utilized for building and other engineering purposes; (4) chemistry—including research into processes for changing low-grade products—including sawdust shavings and trimmings—into chemicals.

Overall, the work of the Laboratory—cooperating with private enterprise—is extremely important for the future of the wood products industry. For this reason, I shall (1) support adequate funds, not only to carry forward its present programing—including work in the previously mentioned fields—but also (2) support recommendations for needed expansion of facilities.

For fiscal year 1963, the budget contains about $3,300,000 for operation of the Laboratory. In addition, efforts will be made to obtain approval of additional funds of the needed expansion of the facilities: involving a 3-year, $10 million program, with a

first-year appropriation amounts of $4 million.

Admittedly, this is a substantial amount of money for forest research. Consequently, we must ask the question: Is it justified? In my judgment—yes. Why? For the following reason: According to expert computations, there is about a $70 return for each dollar invested for forest products research. To me, this represents a good investment. For these reasons, then, I am supporting efforts to carry forward—and as necessary to expand—the work of the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis. As this can be done, it will be of tremendous significance to our forest and forest products industries; the thousands of people employed; the business and services dependent upon the buying power of workers in the industry; and the vast number of people, including America's homeowners, as well as many other industries who benefit from the work of the Laboratory.

For the Farm Mess, an Ax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, farmers in the United States are finding that even though they are the most efficient in history, the horn of plenty is only bringing the Federal Government's ax down harder upon their sun burned necks.

Before Congress even considers the tremendous complex of controls and penalties making up the administration's farm program, we should try to foresee the upheaval this will create among the Nation's farmers.

Just as the farmer knows his mule is ready to kick, symptoms of unease have been noted in the farmers as a result of the administration's new plan. Their reactions have given indications that they are ready to "kick" furiously. Who would be a better judge of the future effects of this plan than the farmer, who is closest to it? Maybe our theoretical experts could improve their view of the farm problem with a few turns around the field behind a plow.

Life magazine, in the February 9, 1962, issue has set down some commendable guidelines in an editorial on the farm program. With leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to bring this editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

FOR THE FARM MESS, AN AX

The administration's new farm program has been greeted by the leftish National Farmers Union with hearty cheers. Farmers, says the National Farm Union, are offered "a good choice between adjusting production, with price protection, or going on the so-called free market. The noisy apostles of the free market should welcome this challenge, if they are sincere."

As noisy apostles of the free market, we regretfully but sincerely declare this so-called challenge a fraud. Secretary Freeman offers all feed-grain farmers a choice between the most rigorous system of production controls they have ever faced and a system of no price supports whatever plus this "blackjack": if the farmers refuse controls, the Government will immediately bust their market by selling 10 million tons of surplus feed grains (about 12 percent of its long-insulated stocks). If that's a free market, so is what the Soviets create when they dump oil or tin. If our farmers should really face this Hobson's choice in the "voluntary" vote by which Freeman hopes to sanctify his program, they will be in much the same position as a Russian whose "yes" vote sanctifies the official Khrushchev slate.

Though Freeman's option is a political phony, his program has a certain ruthless logic. It offers to "solve" the farm problem by putting graingrowers in the same well-padded corral of controls and subsidies that has kept U.S. tobacco farmers quiet these last 20 years. With artifically high prices, diminishing acreage and thorough policing, tobacco farmers make steady money for less and less work. The only trouble is that the U.S. share of world tobacco exports has fallen from a half to a third in 10 years. If Freeman extends the tobacco straitjacket to wheat and feed-grain farmers, they will follow the tobacco farmers into comfortable decline at a time when the United States (and the world) needs more farm exports, not less.

No wonder Freeman's plan has aroused congressional and farm bureau hostility. Its chances of passage, in anything like his version, are virtually nil. Congress, as so often before, will try to take the bait in it and reject the penalties, leaving the farmers bribed but unfettered to raise still bigger surpluses for Government bins. But the whole of the Freeman plan is so complex, and the farm experts in Congress so adroit, that few laymen will be able to tell what is happening. The farm scandal is hidden beneath so much technical gobbledygook that Congress has even more room for fraudulent behavior than Freeman.

In this dilemma we are grateful for one new idea in Freeman's program. For dairy farmers he proposes a dollar ceiling on what the Government will shell out—$300 million a year. There's a thought anyone can grasp. Let economy-minded Congressmen think in similar terms. Let them set a dollar ceiling on the whole agricultural budget. Let them cut it down to $5 billion this year, to $4 billion next, and so on, until it is under control again. And let the experts worry about how to share out this dwindling gravy.

It isn't as though its present recipients were starving, or even poor. The American farmers who get most of the subsidies are the most efficient (and richest) in the world. Their habituation to subsidies is ridiculous. They can no more be permanently insulated from world prices and remain healthy than any other business can. But as long as the administration is exploiting instead of helping Congress incompetence to solve the farm problem, the path back to economic sanity and freer markets can only be blazed with an ax: cut, cut, cut, deny, deny.

The President last week coupled his farm message with a proposal for a new Department of Urban Affairs—certainly a logical request, since 70 percent of Americans now live in urban areas. But can we really consider this seriously until the Department of Agriculture has been cut down to size? We taxpayers had better not set up a new and potentially more expensive lobby in the Cabinet until the agriculture larceny has been stopped.

Sugarbeet Research and the Sugar Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, because of the great interest being expressed by many Members of this body in the U.S. sugar program, I would like to call to your attention a recent address on the subject of our sugar program and sugarbeet research delivered by Robert H. Shields, president and general counsel of the U.S. Beet Sugar Association to the biennial meeting of the American Society of Sugarbeet Technologists at Denver, Colo.

The following is a condensation of Mr. Shields' keynote address delivered on February 5, 1962:

SUGARBEET RESEARCH AND THE SUGAR ACT

(Keynote address by Robert H. Shields, president and general counsel, U.S. Beet Sugar Association, Washington, D.C., delivered at biennial meeting of American Society of Sugarbeet Technologists, Denver, Colo., February 5, 1962)

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, * * * we hear and read much about the modern revolution in American agriculture, the sweeping changes that enable a farmer in 1 hour of work today to produce 4 times as much food and fiber as the farmer produced in 1 hour of work 40 years ago. Sometimes overlooked is the basis for this great revolution—research. The keystone of our progress in agriculture, as in other fields, is research, coupled with the practical application of the new scientific discoveries which research develops. * * *

Abraham Lincoln described the stimulation that agricultural research gives * * * so effectively that his words, spoken in Milwaukee on September 30, 1859, we may fittingly use today to set the tone and suggest the breadth of your meeting here.

"I know nothing so pleasant to the mind," Lincoln said, "as the discovery of anything that is at once new and valuable; nothing that so lightens and sweetens toil, as the hopeful pursuit of such discovery. And how vast, and how varied a field is agriculture, for such discovery. * * * Every blade of grass is a study; and to produce two, where there was but one, is both a profit and a pleasure. And not grass alone; but soils, seeds, and seasons * * * the thousand things of which these are specimens—each a world of study within itself."

In thus finding, in Lincoln's words of more than 100 years ago, a theme which is indeed appropriate for your meeting today, we are reminded that your work, to be appropriately evaluated, must be viewed for the long range. The vagaries of wind and rain and heat and cold may cause sharp variations, in some years, from your otherwise steady advancements; there may be occasional disappointments and departures from your long-range rate of progress.

Last year's sugarbeet crop, for example, was a disappointment in a great many parts of the producing area, and the total crop was a disappointment to everyone.

Although acreage planted in 1961 was nearly 15 percent greater than the acreage in 1960, sugar production from the crop will be about the same as the 2,475,000 tons produced in 1960; last summer there were reasonably based estimates as high as 2,800,000 tons of sugar. The yield of beets per acre in 1961 was only 16.5 tons, the lowest yield since 1955. To compound the felony, the sugar content in many areas was low. The average sugar content looks as if it will turn out to be the lowest in 25 years. The combination of low yields and low sugar content was completely contrary to the normal relationship between per-acre yields and sugar content.

The 1961 crop does not mean our technology has failed. The poor crop resulted from a combination of factors that could not be controlled even by you who have unveiled and harnessed the mysteries of genes, male steriles and hybrids—an unusual combination of natural adversities covering much of the beet area the like of which this industry

has seldom experienced, on such a widespread scale, all in a single crop year * * *.

All in all, it was a pretty rough year. But in spite of the natural adversities, an all-time record tonnage of sugarbeets was produced—17,966,000 tons, 9 percent greater than the year before and 35 percent larger than the 10-year, 1950–59 average. With anything like normal sugar content, the industry would have also hit a spectacular new high in sugar production.

We may therefore consider the experience of 1961 as a combination of adverse conditions which is, we hope, wholly unlikely to occur again. That is not to say that we should ignore the experience, for perhaps it does point to some areas in which intensified effort is desirable * * *.

For the long run, however, we must look at averages and trends, not at a single year. And in looking at those long-range averages, anyone can see that you have done a terrific job.

For the basic advancements the industry has made in this century—or the last fifteen, or ten, or five years—have been technological advancements, the results of your research, gains in the field and in the factory that have made the American beet sugar industry the efficient industry that it is today.

Of course I know there are still problems and there always will be. For your work is never done. Your achievements of today are merely the starting points for your work of tomorrow. There is always the challenge of "How can we do it better?" Without meeting this challenge we die.

Let us see how you have been meeting and answering this challenge during the 15 years from 1946 to 1960, the longest recent period for which complete statistics are available.

In 1946, the industry produced 10,863,000 tons of sugarbeets. In 1960, production amounted to 16,530,000 tons—an increase of more than 5½ million tons or 52 percent. This was achieved by an increase of only 17 percent in harvested acres—818,000 acres in 1946 compared with 957,000 harvested acres in 1960.

Obviously, this means you increased the yield of beets per acre, and you did—from 13.28 tons per acre in 1946 to 17.26 tons in 1960, an increase of 30 percent.

Sugar production increased even more than beet production or beet yields—from 1,568,000 tons of beet sugar in 1946 to about 2,475,000 tons of beet sugar in 1960, an increase of 58 percent.

Mind, you, this increase of 58 percent in sugar production took place when there was an increase of only 17 percent in the number of harvested acres.

Obviously again, technological advancement was the reason, this time expressed in yield of sugar per harvested acre. In 1946, an acre yielded 1.92 tons of sugar, while in 1960, the average acre yielded 2.58 tons of sugar, an increase of 34 percent in those 15 years.

Truly, these are remarkable achievements, the concrete results of your combined efforts in agriculture, factory operations, and chemistry. Your achievements have been a primary factor in keeping the industry alive and progressive, in the face of a continuing cost-price squeeze, both in the factory and on the farm.

These achievements also have a direct bearing on sugar legislation—on the kind of law which the industry needs and must have in order to continue its parade of progress—for legislation must reflect and even forecast the achievements of science, or there is trouble ahead.

To put this another way: Unless the quota provisions of the Sugar Act permit a growth in the beet sugar quota which at least keeps pace with the technological advancements of the industry, your progress is nullified and pressures build up which could cause explosions having farflung repercussions.

The truth of this statement is demonstrated by our experience of the past.

You will recall that the Sugar Act of 1948, the first revision to be enacted after World War II, imposed a fixed ceiling on the beet sugar industry and other segments of the domestic sugar producing industry for a temporary period. Those fixed quotas may have seemed generous at the time, but the progress of the industry was such that we were, before long, bumping our heads against the ceiling. When domestic producers again were permitted to share in the growth of our continuously growing sugar market, in the amendments passed in 1956, the beet sugar industry's share in that growth was set at about 22 percent. It was anticipated then that 22 percent would provide sufficient quota to allow for the industry's technological advancements and in addition to permit a modest growth in the industry.

But you have proved to be better than the Congress thought you would be. Your research has developed the new, miraculous, high-yielding hybrid sugarbeet seeds. You have developed the long-sought-for monogerm seed, and by patient plant breeding worked into that seed the desirable characters you earlier had worked into the multigerm seed. You have greatly improved all sugarbeet cultural practices. As a result of your practical research, the technological advancements you have made, the increase in yield per acre has far outstripped the increase in beet sugar quotas provided by the growth formula written in the 1956 law. On the basis of about 150,000 tons average annual increase in U.S. sugar consumption, the 22 percent accruing to the beet-sugar industry amounts to about 33,000 tons. But the technological advancements of the industry result in an average increase in production each year of between 40,000 and 50,000 tons of sugar at a constant acreage figure.

To keep production within the quota levels of the present law, we would have had to reduce sugarbeet acreage sharply in recent years—if misfortunes had not come to the offshore domestic producing areas of Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. A series of catastrophe—hurricanes, droughts and strikes—have plagued those areas, resulting in production well below their quota levels. Substantial amounts of the deficits in those quotas were allocated to the beet sugar area. From 1957 through 1961, the beet area received allocations of nearly 1½ million tons of Hawaiian and Puerto Rican deficits. Without these allocations, the only alternative to reducing acreage would have been to pile up burdensome inventories of beet sugar.

Now we know that dependence on uncertain deficits from other domestic areas—dependence, in short, on someone else's misfortune or inability—is not the best way to maintain a stable climate conducive to a healthy beet sugar industry. So the industry's legislative committee has sought to develop a legislative program for the future which would at least minimize that dependence, and put the beet sugar quota on a sounder basis.

A program has been developed which has the support of all the domestic sugar producing and refining groups—the beet sugar industry, the cane sugar refiners, and the cane industries of Louisiana, Florida, Hawaii and Puerto Rico.

The program would establish a new basic beet sugar quota which would recognize the industry's recent achievements in production and marketing, a quota of 2,665,000 tons at the current level of sugar consumption. For the future, the industry's program would reserve for the beet sugar industry a sufficiently larger share of the normal increase in consumption to accommodate your accomplishments, as fully as we can anticipate their trend, and to permit some expansion of the industry.

The program would include a growth formula which, on the average, would provide for an increase in the beet sugar quota, above the proposed new base, at the rate of about 75,000 tons of sugar a year. We hope that this will achieve the purposes we seek. We hope that this time we have more accurately estimated your ability to increase the per-acre yields of sugar.

Along with increases in the basic beet sugar quota and in the share of future growth for the beet industry, the legislative program also envisions increases in the basic quota and growth percentage allocated to the mainland cane sugar producing industry. These two continental producing areas—the beet sugar area and the mainland cane sugar area—have both demonstrated a willingness and an ability to provide a larger share of sugar for the American market than they have been permitted to supply in the past.

Our experience with Cuba shows how quickly a supposedly reliable and friendly foreign source of sugar for American consumers can become unreliable and unfriendly. Yet our dependence on foreign sugar is still as great as it was before the Cuban supplies were cut off. Not a single ounce of the former Cuban quota has been allocated to domestic producers—it has all been allocated to foreign countries. Under the present law, we still are obliged to depend upon foreign nations for nearly half—over 45 percent—of our annual sugar supplies.

Repeatedly, the Congress has stressed the importance of a domestic sugar-producing industry for national defense and strategic reasons. As recently as June 6, 1960, the House Committee on Agriculture said in a report that a primary purpose of the sugar program is to "make it possible, as a matter of national security, to produce a substantial part of our sugar requirements within continental United States * * *"

Surely in these troubled times it is in the national interest to increase the percentage of sugar we obtain from the sugar industry of the continental United States.

And the Nation will continue to rely upon this industry for a large share of its sugar with the assurance that this is one source of supply that is not and cannot be dominated by the Communist world—that American-produced beet sugar is available here and now, in the continental United States, and is not subject to the uncertainties of unstable foreign governments.

To the extent that you contribute to the dependability of the beet sugar industry—and your contribution on this score is indeed large—you contribute to the stability of America.

Urban Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Bottomless Pit" which appeared in the February 8, 1962, edition of the Rushville Telegram.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOTTOMLESS PIT?

In emphasizing the problems of the cities, the administration's budget contemplates

stepping up spending in that area considerably higher than in the past. Each item carries a suggested appropriation. Total: More than a billion dollars.

The specifics of the message deal with better intracity and commuter transportation, more parks, low-cost apartments for the aged, renovation of rundown housing, training programs for teenagers and workers replaced by machines, more urban renewal and higher welfare payments to the destitute.

There is something to be said for all these urban goals. But there is strong opposition to plunging the Nation into all-out welfarism. Many of these proposed projects are in the area of what people should do for themselves.

The Federal Government could, of course, always cut down somewhere in the process of increasing urban aid. Farm aid, for example, takes 6 cents of every Federal dollar. That the cities could be bottomless chasms for Federal spending is conceded.

If the proposed Department of Urban Affairs were added to the Cabinet, the Government would then either put sharp restraints on the programs it adopted or would speedily build up a budgetary item topping by a wide margin the $7 billion annually now going to the Department of Agriculture.

House Resolution 530

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER H. DOMINICK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker, the announcement has been made that tomorrow we shall take up the resolution (H. Res. 530) disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, relating to the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. As the sponsor of House Resolution 531, an identical resolution to the one being brought before us tomorrow, I should like to state for the record some of the glaring fallacies which have been used by the proponents of the bill which would have established this Cabinet level Department, and are now being repeated by the supporters of the plan to establish this Department through Executive order.

Great stress has been placed by the proponents and by witnesses before our committees on the number of people who today live in cities. Their estimates, percentagewise, range from 70 percent upward, but their estimates are not substantiated by the U.S. Census Bureau whose statistics show that according to the official census of 1960, less than one-third of our population lives in areas which are defined as "urban." The actual number in 1960 was 58,714,587 persons, or 32.9 percent of our total population. Thus it is obvious that the proponents of the creation of this Department either have grossly overstated the statistics, or else they have vastly broadened the definition of an urban area. There is strong evidence to indicate that they have in fact done the latter; however, again the official census statistics show that even by stretching the definition to include all persons living in both urban and suburban areas, the total would reach only 53.2 percent of our entire population—still considerably less than the percentage claimed by the proponents of this reorganization plan. Therefore, in order to reach a level of 70 percent or more, the definition had to be changed to include more people in the urban classification. The language of the bill shows how broad that definition was made: "For the purposes of this act, the terms 'urban areas' and 'urban communities' are intended to include all communities, regardless of size, whether incorporated or unincorporated." This language is all inclusive. With the possible exception of the isolated hermit's cabin or a trapper's lodge, no place of habitation could escape the jurisdiction of this proposed Department so long as one house is in sight of another.

Furthermore, I submit that the contention that the sole purpose in creating this department is to "more efficiently and effectively organize housing and urban functions of the Federal Government" is equally fallacious. If this indeed were the purpose, why were the Veterans' Administration and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board housing programs not included? They total over 70 percent of these Government programs. Finally, we shall be told that our cities are demanding this so-called equal voice in Federal deliberations. Which cities? Certainly not the largest city in my State of Colorado. I have received a telegram from the mayor of our largest city, Denver, which I include in the RECORD:

DENVER, COLO.,
February 19, 1962.

Representative PETER DOMINICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We object to creation of a Department of Urban Affairs as providing the wrong solution to a problem not clearly defined. Its creation would be only an appeasement move to apologize for failure of local people and local leaders to recognize and solve their own problems. It would build another level of bureaucracy between the cities and Federal agencies now assigned responsibility for assisting them. May threaten programs already working well. Department of Urban Affairs would at best be only a temporary palliative. Overall problem definition should come first, then education of population to solve own problems with cooperation that is now available and is being extended effectively by existing agencies.

DICK BATTERTON,
Mayor, City of Denver.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with Dick Batterton that creation of this department is the wrong solution, and that its creation would serve only as a move to apologize for the failure of local people and local leadership to properly define their individual problems and then make use of the existing programs of Federal-State-local cooperation which are working well. We should do well to pay heed to his remarks which are based on experience.

Shall Rise Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IVOR D. FENTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I place in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial "Shall Rise Again," which appeared in the Evening Herald, Shenandoah, Pa., edition of Friday, February 16.

Mr. Speaker, February 16 marked the 44th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania.

Once again when the liberty of free peoples in all parts of the world is threatened, it forcefully brings home to us the freedom which we and free men and women everywhere cherish so much.

The caption "Shall Rise Again" could carry many implications. Today we hear on all sides individuals and groups referred to as extremists of the left, or extremists of the right. One wonders whether in any extreme would it not be better to decide for one's self that which he or she thinks is either right or either wrong.

Our American citizens of Lithuanian descent have been taught even as you and I, that there is either a right or a wrong side. It was on your mother's or father's knee, or at the church of worship, or at the schools which taught the Golden Rule that you must select as an individual what you think is right or what you think is wrong. You are no extremist because you are following the dictates of your own conscience and the principles of God, church, and family.

That is why these men and women of Lithuanian descent know the goal to which they strive, as well as the goal which they hope to see reestablished in their homeland. They have been called upon to determine not what is the extreme left or the extreme right, but what is right or what is wrong.

These sons and daughters of Lithuania know that it is wrong that they are trampled upon and practically impoverished by Communist tyranny. They know that it is right to seek freedom from the Soviet tyranny. They know it is right when they ask you and me to join them in their efforts to have a strong Lithuania once again not only on the threshold but on the accomplishment of peace and tranquility which can only be gained by the right of freedom and the liberties that are essential to freedom.

And so my colleagues, we all join in the spirit of this fine editorial when we say that Lithuania shall rise again, because we know we are on the right side. There is no middle of the road here—we are either right or we are wrong.

God in His infinite wisdom knows that we are right when we join hands and pray that the liberation of Lithuania is

not too far over the rising sun and that the stars of the evening will again brighten the lives of Lithuanians and other free peoples everywhere throughout the world.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert the editorial as follows:

SHALL RISE AGAIN

Today is observed as Independence Day in a European country, dear to the hearts of many Americans who migrated to this great land of ours, but there will be no joy or celebration to mark the occasion.

February 16 has a special significance to American citizens of Lithuanian descent, for this date marks the 44th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania.

Lithuania, with a population of close to 3 million people, is a Baltic State, bounded on the north by Latvia, east by Poland, south by U.S.S.R. territory, and the west by the Baltic Sea.

It has been an independent state since the 13th century, and later a Grand Duchy under the former Russian Empire. Lithuania proclaimed its independence on February 16, 1918. It was recognized by most of the powers. In 1920, Vilna, plus about 10,400 square miles, were occupied by Poland. This city and part of the lost territory were reunited with Lithuania in 1939.

It was in the year of 1940 that Lithuania was occupied by the U.S.S.R. and incorporated into the Soviet Union as the Lithuanian Soviet Socialistic Republic. This action has never been recognized by the United States.

Despite the continued oppression under the yoke of Soviet rule, the people of Lithuania fervently hope and pray for the day when the spirit of truth and freedom, the true pillars of society, will prevail to see their homeland resume its rightful place in the free world.

Recent incidents in Lithuania prove that Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev's talk of freedom of religion is just Red propaganda. The fact is that the situation of all faiths in Communist-dominated Europe is at its lowest ebb.

One must admire the stanch faith of the Lithuanians who remain true to their religious beliefs even in the face of persecution and death at the hands of the Communists.

Soviet trials, a mockery of justice, recently saw Jews put to death on charges involving currency control violations. Another incident resulted in Lithuanian priests being sent to prison for what the Soviet termed charges of embezzlement and currency fraud.

The accused priests had received permission from the Soviet Government to build a church and substantial aid was contributed by friends in the United States. When the church was finished in 1959, the Soviet Government did not allow it to be used for religious purposes and took it over. It remains to this day in the hands of the Communists.

History often repeats and Lithuanians are firm in their belief "That truth crushed to earth shall rise again" as it has in the past. In 1918 when Lithuania declared itself a free Republic, it was after 123 years of Russian rule. Lithuania had previously been a independent nation from 1253 to 1795. Now for more than two decades it has been again under Soviet domination.

Recognition of the plight of Lithuania has been demonstrated by proclamation of various governors, including Governor Lawrence, and in the hallowed halls of Congress it will again be brought to the attention of the public.

While no outward celebrations will take place, thousands of Americans, whose family ties spring from the soil of Lithuania, will join in fervent prayers today for the liberation of their homeland. They will appeal to the Prince of Peace to look kindly on their unfortunate brethren and speed the day when Lithuania will again return to its rightful place—another land of the free and home of the brave.

The Tyranny of the Minority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, one of the more rewarding experiences of this congressional assignment has been had so often in finding confirmation of my own views and opinions in the daily newspapers of my home community. For a long, long time I have been variously annoyed, angered, and troubled by the persistent perversion of constitutional guarantees by a militant minority moving toward the complete exclusion of all references to the Deity from our public schools. In recent days my indignation has been further fueled by an editorial appearing in the Coatesville (Pa.) Record which deals in forthright fashion with the banning of Bible reading in public schools, an editorial which I shall include at the end of these personal observations.

The history of this Nation was written by God-fearing men and our Declaration of Independence, as well as our Constitution, literally breathes those sublime convictions that can come only from a divine source. Certainly those who read into our basic law the injunction for a complete separation of church and state, and a freedom "of" religion, can nowhere justify that ours must be a government freed "from" religion. I yield to no one in insisting that our public schools must remain free from all forms of religious indoctrination. To deny, however, all reference to a Supreme Being, as many would have it, is to deprive the students in our public schools of a great truth that is apparent to anyone who has paused but for a moment to examine God's handiwork all about him.

Normally, I am the most tolerant of persons and I respect fully each man's religion, or his determination to subscribe to none at all. And, by the same tokens, I want to see him and his children protected from being indoctrinated with a philosophy to which he does not confess. On the other hand, my tolerance and my patience became exhausted when a clear minority undertakes to deny the majority the educational, nonsectarian advantages of a daily reading of the greatest Book—and the one in widest circulation since the inception of the printed word.

As our editor has pointed out, there is a subtle threat to all religion inherent in any drive of the godless to prohibit Bible reading in the schools. Perhaps it may be necesasry to rewrite our basic law so that a freedom "of" religion shall not be interpreted to mean freedom "from" religion. In my opinion our freedom-loving majority should move in that direction without delay.

The editorial follows:

TYRANNY OF MINORITY CAN BECOME REAL

Under a Democratic form of government the tyranny of the minority can become a very real thing as is the case of those who have (so far) successfully protested the reading of the Bible in public schools.

Basing their arguments upon the theme of church and state separation, these people have woven a fine legal net from which few of us can escape. In so doing, this minority has worked its will upon the majority.

Contrary to what has been put forth by the minority, Bible reading in public schools is not a violation of the Constitution. Not reading the Bible is a violation of the spiritual theme held foremost in mind by our Founding Fathers who authored the Constitution.

Of spiritual awareness may be found in every passage of the Constitution as originally written. These men did not envision court fights in which decisions would be reached on the basis of what might happen. They spoke of things that couldn't be evaluated except in the light that they were God given. Such things as life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Those who protest Bible reading in public schools interpret the Constitution as permitting freedom from religion. Obviously it permits freedom of religion, and carries with it the express condition that one may believe or that one may be free not to believe.

In this particular instance, those who choose not to believe the Bible should be read in school are having their way. They are in the minority. They should not be permitted to work their will upon the majority who do believe, and who see nothing to get excited about in reading one or two chapters from the Bible each day in school.

It would be well to point out that within that majority are many people who do not share the belief in the Christian faith. These people, strong in their own faith—as they should and have a right to be—have not sought court action to remedy a supposed wrong which they are intelligent enough to know does not exist.

Rather, they seem to have accepted Bible reading in a public place as an affirmation of their particular faith, and also as an assurance that it will continue so long as they remain citizens of a free nation.

The words recorded in the name of every religion are words of love and wisdom. That such words should be denied to any person—particularly one living the formative years—borders on the criminal.

Those who profess a belief in Christianity should alert themselves to this threat. Those who profess a belief in the democratic way of life should stand guard against this thin entering wedge of nonconformity that (if successful) will not confine itself to Bible reading in public schools.

Christians have nothing to fear in speaking out against those in the minority who seek to have their way in this regard. They have much to lose. And, so do non-Christians who do not share the view of the minority. We have a moral right to use public school moments to create an awareness of a Higher Power. We have a responsibility to the younger citizens of this Nation to make this awareness available to them. America did not spring into being because man willed, but because a Higher Power made it possible.

Our forefathers were absolutely certain of this fact, and they sought to insure that certainty for future generations by writing it into the Constitution of the United States.

Christians and non-Christians who do not share the view of the minority cannot—if

they value their freedoms in every area of existence—let the tyranny of the minority stand. If so, they do our forefathers a disservice, they hack away at present freedoms, and they force future generations a step nearer complete tyranny.

Mandatory Compliance With Plan for Reduction of Surplus Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial "Mandatory Compliance" which appeared in the February 8, 1962, edition of the Seymour Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANDATORY COMPLIANCE

In terms that are tougher than any heretofore proposed by a President, Mr. Kennedy has told the vast majority of farmers that they will either go along with a move to reduce food surpluses in this country or face withdrawal of the price supports they have enjoyed in the past.

What the President wants to do is to make mandatory compliance with the Government's call for a reduction in surplus production by way of curtailed planting and added marketing quotas. He is aiming his threat—for the time being—at three segments of the agricultural society: wheat farmers, growers of feed grains, and dairymen, all of whom are producers of commodities now in greatest surplus.

If two-thirds of those farmers comply with the President's proposal—and it still remains with Congress if the program is to be adopted—Mr. Kennedy envisions a balancing of future production with needs, utilizing the current abundance for such things as school lunch programs, free foods to welfare recipients, or, perhaps, as economic aid to underdeveloped nations instead of providing them the cash assistance that the United States has offered in the past.

If the farmers comply they would continue to receive, by way of supports, funds necessary to bring their incomes into line with the national average.

If the farmers refuse to go along after the program is adopted, the President has laid it on the line: the Government will dump up to 200 million bushels of surplus wheat, 350 million bushels of grain, and lower supports currently going to the dairymen.

If that eventuates, it would mean, of course, that prices would be depressed and farmers would receive considerably less for their products than they are getting by way of Government price supports.

The ideal would be to trust farmers to fend for themselves and to compete on a supply-and-demand basis. But if too suddenly undertaken, that would work tremendous individual hardships. It is to be hoped, though, that the time will not be too far off when surpluses of foodstuffs will disappear and farmers can get back to doing business as businessmen and not as pawns of Government.

A Student Views Federal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRIS FAIRCLOTH BLITCH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, Miss Dotty Sessoms, a student at Clinch County High School in Homerville, Ga., recently sent me a copy of a speech that she had written and delivered in a high school debating contest. Her speech concerns Federal aid to education. The periodic debate will no doubt soon reach the Halls of Congres. Before we legislate, let us listen. Let us seriously consider an opinion of a student, since, after all, it will be our young people who are most endangered by a Federal education plan. Under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to submit this affirmative speech:

FEDERAL AID

(By Dotty Sessoms)

Resolve, That the Federal Government should equalize educational opportunities by means of grants to the States for public elementary and secondary education.

Mr. Chairman, judges, fellow debaters, and ladies and gentlemen, this is the most dangerous problem that faces our Nation today because it deals with our American freedom.

Federal aid to education is not new—just as controversy about it is not new. It dates back before the Constitution was ratified. In 1785 the ordinance specified the manner in which western lands should be surveyed. It stipulated that "there shall be reserved the lot No. 16 of every township for the maintenance of public schools within said township." This was closely followed by the ordinance of 1787, which stated that "religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and means of education shall forever be encouraged."

During the administration of Andrew Jackson (1829–37), the Federal Government distributed $47 million to the States for the construction of classrooms.

In 1862 Congress passed the Morrill Land-Grant Act, which granted public land to the States for colleges to teach agriculture, mechanics and liberal arts.

Congress passed the Servicemen's Readjustment Act in 1944. This is popularly know as the GI bill of rights and provides education and vocational training to veterans of World War II.

Other Federal laws, passed in recent years, provide funds for such special purposes as free school lunches and vocational training.

Perhaps the biggest push toward Federal aid to education came in 1955 at the first White House Conference on Education, called by President Eisenhower. At this time a resolution was passed to step in when State and local governments had done all they could but cautioning that any Federal aid should be limited to construction of schools only.

If educational opportunities in elementary and secondary schools were equalized, instructions would be sent out by the Government and each school would be expected to meet required standards. When comparing the school system in Delaware—which is said to have the best in the United States—to that of a Southern State, it is easy to see the differences that exist in educational opportunities. No set of standards fixed by the U.S. Government could be met by every school and if by chance they could, this country would become monotonous.

In recent months an educational television station has begun operation in Waycross. The Federal Government has given aid by providing the necessary equipment but it is good to all of us to know that the Federal Government will not affect any of the programs.

Another example of equalized opportunities is in the lunchroom program. Public school lunchrooms are furnished with surplus commodities provided by the Federal Government. However, this type of Federal aid is not to be compared with Federal aid if given through the teaching facilities, since the food gets only to the body and the education gets to the mind.

Our forefathers settled this country to escape the cruelties administered to them because of their religion. The first amendment to the U.S. Constitution explicitly requires the separation of church and state. This issue is one of the major reasons Federal aid to education usually bogs down in Congress.

Recently eight schools in Redwood City, Calif., put a ban on the singing of Christmas carols in the schools. Pupils could sing "Jingle Bells" or "White Christmas" but those songs do not point to the One who brought into the world the first Christmas gift from God to man. The superintendent said, "The order stemmed from fear that religious carols of Christmas would offend non-Christians at the school." He also said, "The order resulted from a ruling of the district attorney that Christmas songs could violate State laws against the practice of religion in schools." The superintendent stated in addition, "We depend upon the State for 80 percent of our money so this is a serious and difficult problem."

If a State government will put the squeeze on what they do not want, what would the Federal Government do if we get deeper into Federal control of our schools? This should wake us up to do more for ourselves rather than depend upon the Federal Government, for after all they take our money and give back only what they want to give back.

In the decade between 1950 and 1960 it was the liberal Democrats from the North and West who tried to achieve Federal aid but were thwarted by economy-minded Republicans and by some southern Democrats who feared Federal imposition of integrated schools upon the South.

It is apparent that integration is having to be accepted in this section of our country but Federal aid to education would hasten its complete enforcement.

The race issue, the religious issue, and the economy issue have successfully blocked Federal aid for decades.

Probably the biggest issue involved in the entire controversy is—would Federal grants lead to Federal control of U.S. schools?

All State constitutions make education a responsibility of the State legislature. Teachers, in fact, are licensed by the State—not by the Federal Government. Before a teacher is licensed in any State, he must prove he has fulfilled certain minimum requirements set by the State. The State board of education also decides what courses shall be taught in State schools.

We, the opponents of Federal grants to education, say that eventually Federal aid would lead to Federal control of education. Since the Federal Government would be paying the bills it would take over the power to decide what courses would be taught—and who would teach them. Such an occurrence

would lead to Federal thought control and destroy the grassroots freedom our schools have enjoyed since colonial days.

Teachers may momentarily derive an increase in salaries provided Federal legislation called for it and that legislation was upheld in court. However, teachers will benefit by local and State taxation more than they would by a gigantic Federal program. With Federal aid they would lose what, I believe, is the greatest benefit of all and that is the right to teach with freedom.

Georgia has done a large amount to provide equal opportunity. We have the finest school-building program in the Nation and teachers' salaries have been raised greatly. However, we in America have recognized since the Declaration of Independence that we are all free and equal but we also recognize that we are not of equal capacity; therefore when we give equal opportunity to learn it does not mean that we will derive the same benefits. Much has been said about advances made in educational views in Russia but we must remember that Russia is under a dictatorship and what children learn is dictated to them through their education setup which emphasizes above all else the supremacy of Communist totalitarianism. This is contrary in every respect to the people of a democratic republic—the greatest example of which is our own country—the United States of America.

Our future requires that appropriate equal opportunities be freely available to all children and youth no matter what their background, circumstance or place of residence. I believe in Federal aid to education in the sense of equal opportunities but that it be made available by the State.

If we had a bureaucracy in Washington setting a standard for education it would be politically controlled and in controlling the minds of our youth it is easy to see that Federal dictatorship would be the outcome and the loss of our independent freedom would result.

It would be a terrible imposition on teachers. We have teachers who are loyal and believe in the principles of American freedom and they have so taught. If they receive orders from Washington to teach differently and refused, their job would be at stake and they may be fired. We have good public school systems and I, for one, am an ardent believer in it in its present form. I can think of no greater disaster than the invasion of the Federal Government from Washington.

As a student, I do not want to be a slave and as a citizen and a student and a patriotic American, I do not want to see our teachers placed in the undermining role of mere mouthpieces of those who exist in our country for the sole purpose of tempting us with Federal funds for education and thereby taking from us that freedom that so many Americans have lived and died to protect. A freedom that has resulted and the greatest benefits for individuals in the best government ever devised by man with God as his inspiration.

Yankee Imperialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from La Nacion, Costa Rica:

YANKEE IMPERIALISM

(By Dr. Ricardo Castro Beeche)

Yankee imperialism means a country which has gone into two World Wars with enormous sacrifice of lives and money and which hasn't taken a single inch of land from the beaten countries.

It means a nation which devoted hundreds of millions of dollars to the reconstruction of battle-torn countries after World War II through the Marshall plan.

Yankee imperialism has spent millions of dollars in technical assistance and food for years to save many people of the world from hunger and misery. Yankee imperialism says a man has a right to happiness through a worthy life.

Perhaps the Soviets could tell us how this compares with Russian imperialism. The Soviets hold all the countries defeated by them under their yoke without freedom at all.

Senator Carl Hayden

SPEECH

OF

HON. CARL VINSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, because the Committee on Armed Services was holding hearings on our defense posture yesterday afternoon, I was unable to be present here in the House to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the incomparable Senator CARL HAYDEN, the very distinguished senior Senator from Arizona.

For that reason I wish to take this opportunity to extend my congratulations to this very great and very outstanding American upon the occasion of his 50th anniversary as a Member of Congress.

CARL HAYDEN was a Member of the House of Representatives when I first entered the Congress in 1914. Today, Senator HAYDEN and I are the only Members of Congress, still serving, who were Members of the 63d Congress.

Yesterday, Senator HAYDEN achieved a monumental point in history, attaining the heretofore unequalled record of having served continuously as a Member of Congress for 50 years.

CARL HAYDEN has devoted a half a century of his life to the people of the United States and to the greatest legislative organization in the world.

I can well recall Representative HAYDEN as a Member of the House. He was active, energetic, efficient and effective, but always in a quiet, unassuming, and dignified manner. At all times he was humble, and always willing to help his colleagues on every occasion.

I have watched Senator HAYDEN's remarkable career with increasing admiration from year to year. I well recall with sorrow at his leaving, but with pride in his achievement, when he left the House to become a U.S. Senator.

My respect and admiration for this great public servant has increased with each passing year.

I join with his admiring colleagues in the House and Senate, and his hundreds of thousands of devoted friends, in wishing him continued good health and success, and I sincerely hope that he will remain an active Member of the Congress of the United States for many, many years to come.

I hope that he will continue to make available to the American people his remarkable experience, his outstanding ability, and his high sense of integrity.

He is a man whom we could all emulate with honor and pride.

I offer him my sincerest congratulations on this very happy and precedent-shattering achievement.

Urban Affairs Department Would Solve Nothing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I have opposed the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing from the outset on the simple premise that it is not needed, that it would put an additional "bite" on the taxpayer's dollar, and that it would abruptly and permanently sever the lines of communication that run from the States to the counties to local municipalities.

The editor of one of our hometown papers, the Daily Local News of West Chester (Pa.), suggests that such a Department might bring to the cities the same doubtful benefits that our rural areas have enjoyed from he U.S. Department of Agriculture over the past 25 years and points to an expenditure of over $5 billion annually devoted to farm problems, and with a solution to those problems no nearer than it was a quarter of a century ago.

This same article then goes on to point out how unrealistic it would be to expect the U.S. Government—that cannot eliminate crime, delinquency, slums, and so forth, in the District of Columbia, where it has exclusive jurisdiction—to bring order out of urban chaos through the simple method of raising to Cabinet status an existing agency charged with housing and home financing.

The fact is that, while our editor does not mention the political overtones in the pending reorganization plan, the entire proposal reeks with partisanship and is an unsavory display of executive maneuvering for partisan ends.

The editorial in question follows in full:

[Daily Local News, Feb. 17, 1962]

MUST WE HAVE AN URBAN AS WELL AS A FARM PROBLEM?

Gov. David L. Lawrence has returned from Washington where he spoke in favor of the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs.

In the course of his testimony before the Senate Committee on Government Operations, of which Senator John L. McClellan, Arkansas Democrat, is chairman, Pennsyl-

vania's Governor advanced two reasons for favoring the creation of such a department.

First, he said, it would provide fair representation for the interests of our predominately urban population in the executive branch of the Federal Government, and, secondly, it would allow the administration to coordinate more fully, economically, and efficiently the existing Federal activities in urban affairs and housing.

When the Governor spoke of "fair representation" for the Nation's urban population, he was implying that there is another segment of our population which is receiving representation which is lacking in our more densely populated regions. That segment, of course, is the rural areas of America, the vast farmlands, and the breadbasket regions of our country.

Before whooping things up for another giant Federal setup, take a look at one already in existence—the Department of Agriculture which presumably is designed to care for the problems of farmers. This Department is costing the taxpayers some $6 billion a year as it attempts to solve what a lot of Congressmen refer to as the insolvable farm problem.

The record shows that the Federal Government is no nearer to a solution of the problem now that it was 25 years ago. And yet there are those who would create another department whose problems and costs, by comparison, would make the "farm problem" look like a tea party.

Testifying further, Mr. Lawrence said: "We must wage a determined war against slums and ward off creeping blight that has destroyed the heart of so many of our cities. We must plan * * * to promote home ownership and improvement and plan for construction of community facilities."

Take a look at Washington, D.C., which has been under the control of the Federal Government since its founding. In the light of the city's own reports, Washington has trouble aplenty with slums, delinquency, crime, schools, and every other problem to which most metropolitan centers are heir. Shall we trust the same Government to solve for other cities those problems which plague its own doorstep?

And as to "home ownership" and improvements, we are old-fashioned enough to regard those as local matters which should be attended to at the local level. Americans own billions in homes and housing and the problems of upkeep and improvements certainly are not the business of the Federal Government unless, of course, the Government makes them its business through an Urban Affairs Department.

If this happens, there is no telling where Federal intervention will take us. The sky will be the limit.

The Corn Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Big Corn Operator" which appeared in the February 12, 1962, edition of the Indianapolis Star.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BIG CORN OPERATOR

Just suppose there was a really big operator with a lot of money. Suppose he decided he could make a tremendous killing if he "went short" in the Chicago corn market. Just suppose he cornered enough corn to start dumping in order to drive the market down over a long time.

If that sort of thing happened, most Hoosiers would expect their Senators and Representatives to demand an immediate, full investigation. Attorney General Robert Kennedy would probably have moved in long ago. Outraged farmers would have stormed Washington.

This has happened, but few voices have been raised in protest. The big operator is Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture. He announced last year that he was going to drive the price of corn down in order to make a political killing. He has dumped corn in the market at a tremendous rate, and the price of corn has been driven down.

The Commodity Credit Corporation, which acts on direct orders from Freeman has sold 398,194,000 bushels of corn in the market since October 1961. In the same period a year ago, CCC had sold 18,441,000 bushels.

If private individuals or a company had engaged in this kind of manipulation, they would be subject to severe penalties. Isn't it time Congress took a look at the activities of the biggest corn operator of all time?

The Conservation Reserve Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 8, I introduced H.R. 10166, a bill to extend and amend the conservation reserve program.

This program, as you know, was allowed to expire in 1960. When existing contracts expire, this program will come to an end unless we take action to extend it.

During its beginning, there were admittedly some inequities in this act, but many of the abuses that were not foreseen originally were since remedied and the program was working well and making a substantial contribution toward reducing agricultural surpluses toward its end. It met with favorable acceptance by farmers generally.

Obviously, there are usually ways of making any program more workable, more efficient, and less subject to abuses. I am sure there is also room for improvement in the conservation reserve program. For one thing, stronger safeguards could be provided against land speculators receiving any benefit from it, and insuring that it benefits only those legitimately engaged in farming.

The popularity of the conservation reserve among farmers is attested to by the large waiting lists of those who had decided to apply for participation in the program in 1961 and were denied because of the refusal of Congress to extend it.

The administration's farm bill envisages a grandiose land retirement scheme which at this point remains largely cloaked in mystery and vague generalities. It would no doubt involve great outlays of tax funds simply to implement.

Our taxpayers could be spared this added expense by our simply extending a tried and proven program, the conservation reserve, as I propose in H.R. 10166.

The bill I have introduced would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture, during the 5-year period 1962–66, to extend present contracts, other than contracts for the establishment of tree cover, for from 3 to 10 years beyond present termination dates. The bill also provides for a review by the Secretary of the rate of annual payments.

Kansas has 12,637 farms in the conservation reserve progrem, with 1,446,586 acres under contract. Annual payments to participating Kansas farmers totaled $17,220,382 during 1960 for an average payment of $11.90 per acre. Unless the program is extended, some 80,000 Kansas acres will come out of the cropland reserve in 1962, an additional 334,000 acres in 1963 and, by the end of 1969, all present contracts would be terminated.

Most of this land is presently in grass and legume cover. Virtually all of it will probably go back into crops, and with a much higher production potential, unless action is taken now to extend the conservation reserve program.

Farmers and local communities have already made the adjustments involved in the retirement of the acreage now in the CRP. It would be nothing short of ridiculous to encourage the return of these acres to crop production at a time when the administration has under consideration a new, massive, costly land retirement program reported to involve as much as 68 million acres.

Reds Got Better of Swap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Newark (N. J.) Sunday Star-Ledger, Feb. 11, 1962]

PROSECUTOR'S VIEW OF SPY EXCHANGE: REDS GOT BETTER OF SWAP

(By Joseph Carragher)

The Federal prosecutor who put Russian Col. Rudolph Abel behind bars said yesterday the swap of the Red master spy for American U-2 pilot Francis G. Powers is like "trading Mickey Mantle for an average ballplayer."

Looking realistically at the exchange, a former Assistant U.S. Attorney General William F. Tompkins of Maplewood said:

"The Russians are getting back a highly intelligent, specialized cloak and dagger man. We are getting back a pilot."

But Tompkins, who handled the Abel spy case from the Brooklyn trial to the U.S. Supreme Court, emphasized that "human values must not be forgotten."

Tompkins, second-ranking attorney in the Eisenhower administration, said:

"From the human side, the swap is a fine thing. It will be a happy day for all families concerned. I know the Powers family must be happy."

"But it won't change the course of history," Tompkins said.

The former prosecutor said he will always remember Abel because he was "the best spy we ever saw. They are getting back a real pro."

Tompkins described Abel as "a very well-rounded and cultural guy who liked opera and could talk fluently on almost any subject.

"He was extremely capable and had great ability," said Tompkins.

"The Russians will welcome him back with open arms," he said.

Tompkins then predicted Abel would return to work in the Red spying apparatus.

STILL VALUABLE

"I think his information is stale now but he is still a valuable fellow. He'll probably serve in an advisory capacity because he probably knows this country inside and out.

"One thing that you can't forget is that you don't produce an Abel in 1 or 2 years."

Abel, however, probably will not be used as an agent again, said Tompkins because "he's blown."

The term "blown" means Abel is known and would not be any good in fieldwork again.

The scrawny Abel—the first foreign national ever to stand trial for his life on espionage charges in a civilian American courtroom—was well acquainted with New Jersey.

A major point of operations for the convicted spy was Newark.

USED PENN STATION

In 1955 and 1956 Abel used Pennsylvania station's Hudson platform for several clandestine meetings. Even an iron fence rail around the Market Street exit of Track 1 was used by the Abel spy network.

By marking chalk strips on various rungs along the railing, members of the ring were able to pass on signals telling where to look for new messages—one rung signifying a certain theater, another referring to a lamp post, still another pinpoint a letter box.

Newark was also the home of one of Abel's top henchmen, Lt. Col. Reino Hayhanen, who turned against the Reds and testified against Abel.

Hayhanen lived at 806 Bergen Street under the name of Eugene Maki. He testified that Abel had instructed him to set up a photo shop at the Bergen Street location as a front for his spy work.

Hayhanen carried out a number of missions for the ring even though he never opened the photo store in Newark.

A New Jersey Army sergeant also testified at the Abel trial.

M. Sgt. Roy A. Rhodes of 1 Mitchell Drive, Eatontown, confessed he sold secrets to Russia for $3,000 during a series of wild, vodka-drinking parties while on duty at the American Embassy in Moscow.

Rhodes told how he was recruited by the Russians to spy and later was asked to work for a Red spy ring in the United States when he returned home.

A short time after Abel slipped into this country from Canada in 1948, he and Hayhanen went to Atlantic City to look up a resident from Bergen County. They were planning to set up a shortwave transmitter at the resident's home but "a high real estate price squelched the deal."

VISITS ARLINGTON

On "orders from Moscow" Abel visited Arlington and tried to locate an agent by phone. The agent's relative who answered the phone was not cooperative.

Abel left without ever contacting the agent.

Tompkins said Abel should never be forgotten because "he's a cunning, professional out to destroy this country."

The New Agricultural Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Slavery or Suicide" which appeared in the February 8, 1962, edition of the Indianapolis Star.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SLAVERY OR SUICIDE

Another Freeman-Cochrane farm plan has been presented to the Congress, to the American farmer and to the American public. It is even less attractive than the earlier effort by these proponents of Government-controlled agriculture to seize active direction of every acre of farmland in this Nation.

Perhaps there should be a feeling of admiration for the casual brutality built into the so-called new agricultural program. Following the line of reasoning found in that bewhiskered old joke, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman aims to get the attention of the farmer by hitting him between the eyes with a tree limb fashioned from surplus stocks. The plan is extremely simple. The American farmer can vote to accept Freeman's dictation of what he may plant and what he may sell, or he may vote to permit the Government to dump its accumulated stocks of farm products. The choice is economic slavery or economic suicide.

The president of the American Farm Bureau Federation has said that "it is naked coercion to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to dump up to 10 million tons of feed grains and 200 million bushels of wheat to break the market price any time farmers vote against the administration's proposed control programs. Surpluses created by unsound Government programs now are to be used to clobber farmers."

Those two sentences summarize the philosophy which lies behind the Freeman-Cochrane farm plan for 1962. If the farmers of America won't agree, then Freeman proposes to wreck the market. This is rule or ruin on the farm, Washington-style.

Any Hoosier Congressman, whether he sits in the House of Representatives or the Senate, will have some tall explaining to do if he votes to let Indiana farmers choose between agricultural slavery or suicide. Congress found it necessary to toss aside the first Freeman-Cochrane plan before writing the emergency feed grain bill. It appears that this same chore again faces the Nation's representatives.

Presumably, this program is President Kennedy's ABCD for farmers. We prefer to believe that the President, who does not have a farm background by his own admission, has accepted the worst kind of advice. The voice may be that of the President, but the hands are those of Freeman and Cochrane.

Will the Attorney General Censor the Mail?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago the House adopted an amendment to the postal rate increase bill which would have given the Attorney General most unusual and, I think unconstitutional powers to screen mail from abroad to determine which of it is fit to be received by addresses in the United States.

Two of us in the House saw fit to vote against the amendment. I am glad to see that we have been supported from many sources, but one of the best pieces on this subject was written by Raymond Price, Jr., in the New York Herald Tribune. With the permission of the House, I bring the article to the attention of my colleagues:

WILL THE ATTORNEY GENERAL CENSOR THE MAIL?

(By Raymond Price, Jr.)

If the House of Representatives has its way, the Attorney General is going to be charged henceforth with screening mail from abroad to determine which of it is fit to be received by addressees in the United States. This would be accomplished by the so-called Cunningham amendment, which became section 11 of the postal rate rise bill as passed by the House.

This is an extraordinary delegation of discretionary authority, yet it was accepted overwhelmingly by the House. There were, in fact, Congressmen who refused to vote for the rate rise unless section 11 was included. When Representative WILLIAM FITTS RYAN, Democrat, of New York, moved to strike section 11 from the bill he was defeated by 127–2, joined in the vote only by New York Republican JOHN LINDSAY.

With the bill now awaiting Senate action, section 11 merits a closer look.

Its aim is to bar what its proponents describe as a flood of Communist propaganda inundating the U.S. mails, and being delivered at the expense of American taxpayers and stamp buyers. No one knows how much printed matter is received from Communist countries, but it runs into the tens of millions of pieces annually, much of it unsolicited.

Clearly, this unsolicited matter is sent with a propaganda purpose. And it is true that delivery costs from the point of entry to the addressee are borne by the United States. Chief argument of section 11's proponents is that we shouldn't be required to subsidize subversion; as Representative GLENN C. CUNNINGHAM, author of the provision, puts it, "the country is in a dither, it is excited, it is mad about the free delivery of Communist political propaganda."

His solution, in the words of section 11, is to bar delivery of mail matter determined by the Attorney General of the United States

to be Communist political propaganda financed or sponsored directly or indirectly by any Communist-controlled government. It covers all classes of mail.

The free-delivery argument, however, invites closer scrutiny. Both the United States and the Soviet-bloc countries are signatories of the Convention of the Universal Postal Union, which has 112 member nations. The convention provides that surface mail, other than parcels, sent from one member country to another must be delivered by the receiving country to the addressee without payment to it of any part of the postage. It is reciprocal.

Soviet mail is delivered free here only because American mail is delivered free in the Soviet Union, and in all 110 other countries. In fact, the figures suggest the United States may even make a profit on the deal as far as Iron Curtain countries are concerned. During the 12 months ended March 31, 1961, 2,500,000 pounds of letters and printed matter were mailed from the United States to the Iron Curtain countries; only 1,600,000 pounds were received.

Representative CUNNINGHAM claims: "They do not deliver the material that we send over to the Communist countries. We all know that." The Post Office Department, however, says it has no reports of any programs in Soviet-bloc countries which prevent delivery of American mail, whether letters, printed matter or parcels.

For years, delivery of Communist literature was blocked by administrative action. At first the mail was simply seized without even notifying the addressees. One result was that publications needed for scholarly research never arrived. In 1956 the rules were relaxed to allow uninterrupted delivery of periodicals to newspapers, libraries and such. In 1958 they were further eased to the point of at least notifying the addressee that he had mail containing foreign political propaganda. He could get it by signing for it. On March 17, 1961, President Kennedy, acting on the unanimous recommendations of the State, Justice, Post Office, and Treasury Departments, ended the whole seizure operation. It was this move that sparked the pressure for legislative curbs.

In a debate last fall on a rival measure sponsored by himself, House Un-American Activities Committee Chairman FRANCIS WALTER called the Cunningham amendment "so vague and ambiguous as to render it incapable of a meaningful legal construction."

"In addition," Representative WALTER went on to say, "there are substantial doubts as to its constitutionality. The amendment seeks to bar from the United States mail matter determined by the Attorney General to be Communist political propaganda, but it in no way defines, describes, or otherwise creates a standard as to what constitutes Communist political propaganda. We concluded, and (the Un-American Activities Committee's) staff of experts concluded, it would be unconstitutional to designate the Attorney General to screen mail going through a department over which he had no control. I am not afraid of the judgment of the people so long as they are not deceived. Any program such as (this) would create the false impression that the American people are so naive and gullible that they cannot be exposed to Communist propaganda without the danger of their being adversely influenced or corrupted by Communist doctrine. Such a program would also create the impression that the American people are incapable of recognizing and rejecting Communist political propaganda—much of which is false and absurd on its face."

It also raises some interesting subsidiary questions, such as whether, under its sweeping terms, the Post Office could legally deliver Pravda to the State Department.

But this is what the House has voted for, with Messrs. RYAN and LINDSAY the lone dissenters.

Proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Fog-Wrapped Issue" which appeared in the January 30, 1962, edition of the South Bend Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FOG-WRAPPED ISSUE

It may be that there is a genuine need for a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs. It may be that there isn't.

It may be that we'll never know.

Our hopes of finding out about the need rested in Congress. We looked forward to the debate on the legislative proposals to establish the new Department.

The possibility of a revealing debate now seems slim. Instead, we appear to be in for a round of emotional political maneuvering with storng racial overtones.

The first setback to our hopes for enlightenment came from the House Rules Committee, which scuttled the Urban Affairs Department bill last week by a 9 to 6 vote.

The setback turned into a full-fledged rout during a presidential press conference shortly after the committee vote. Mr. Kennedy saw fit (1) to harangue the Republican members of the committee for sinking his proposal, (2) to promise an Executive order creating the new Department, and (3) to assure a questioning reporter that Robert C. Weaver, a Negro, would be named Secretary of the Department.

In blaming the Republicans on the rules committee, Mr. Kennedy overlooked the fact that four southern Democrats also contributed to the demise of the bill. The Republicans, in fact, could not have done it alone.

In doing what he did, the President made certain that the issue became thoroughly political.

In promising a Negro appointment for the Cabinet job, Mr. Kennedy made certain that racism would wrap its blanket of fog around the issue, thoroughly scrapping all hopes for illuminating debate.

With the Executive order, which arrived on the Hill today, Mr. Kennedy is forcing Senators and Representatives who have honest doubts about the Department to vote against it—if they dare risk the inevitable charges that their votes are racially motivated.

Perhaps the President someday will write a second volume of "Profiles in Courage," devoted exclusively to those Congressmen who will have the fortitude to play an honest hand against a stacked deck.

The Sound of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, one of my younger constituents, Miss Bonnie Brixius, a senior at Good Counsel Academy in Mankato, Minn., recently won the 15th annual Voice of Democracy essay contest sponsored by the Mankato Post of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and radio station KYSM.

Because I believe this is such a fine essay and such an ardent expression in behalf of freedom by a young American, I include it, under leave granted, in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

(By Bonnie Brixius)

The ringing bells in America can best express my sentiments concerning our freedom. From Maine to Hawaii, from Florida to Alaska, these bells are broadcasting our American way of life.

On July 8, 1776, the first bell to ring in free America, the Liberty Bell, summoned the people of Philadelphia for the announcement of our independence from England. This bell was heard all around the world. Now, after almost 200 years, the spirit of 1776 is still not dead, for it rings in the heart of every true American. It manifests itself in the eyes of an old Hungarian immigrant as he listens to the strains of "The Star-Spangled Banner" and in the heart of the Cuban refugee as he salutes his new American flag for the first time.

Americans cherish this Liberty Bell in this their democracy because they have fought and died for it. Down through the years we have listened to bells mournfully tolling in memory of the men who died at Lexington, Concord, and Gettysburg. Their names are written in blood on the pages of American history.

Because Americans treasure their freedom, they are eager to preserve it by maintaining a well informed future generation. School bells ringing daily across the country are summoning children of all colors, creeds, and abilities to modern, well equipped schools, built through the initiative of the local citizens. Children are taught to speak, write, and think independently. American young people, as a result, are filled with anticipation and optimistic plans for the future.

However, since the founding of our country, we in America have turned to God for guidance and direction. Thus, America is a religious nation. Our Government not only permits freedom of worship, but also encourages the citizens to exercise this right. Church bells ringing in every town, county, and State, are drawing millions of Americans to churches of every denomination. Our Constitution guarantees freedom of religion, so these bells need never cease to ring.

The Bill of Rights also provides for the freedom to assemble. Before our modern times, the townhall bell would often be rung to summon the townspeople to a meeting to elect an official, settle a community problem, or serve on a jury. Today this same thing is still done on a much larger and more modern scale. Americans are still showing their interest in our country's wel-

fare by serving on a jury, casting their votes for government officials, and taking an active part in community projects. We are an active nation because we are not afraid to express our opinions.

Since Americans are individualists, we recognize the need for free enterprise, which gives us a leading role in a growing America. The happy tinkle of the silver bell which we hear as we enter our neighborhood store expresses the owner's pride at being able to own his own business, no matter how large or small the concern. Free enterprise is the basis of our democracy and it has given America security and initiative for accomplishing great things. Democracy has made America prosperous and prominent.

Physically, bells will crumble and rust through age, but freedom will ring in the heart of every human being for all time. Americans know that it takes more than rich resources, teeming cities and a growing population to make a successful, lasting country, and they have found that secret. Freedom to act, think, and pray as one wishes is America's secret, and with a heart swelling with pride, I speak for it.

REA Loans Reawaken Memories of RFC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I inserted into the Appendix of the RECORD on page A657, January 30, the 1962 Farm Bureau resolution on rural electrification and telephones. This pointed up the concern of 1,600,994 Farm Bureau member families over the Government getting into business via federally subsidized electric cooperatives. I stated that 98 out of every 100 farm families in Illinois are now served by electrical power and commended the REA for their assistance in this project. In fact, they have done such a good job, they are running out of rural customers. Observing REA's reaction to this situation, is the Farm Bureau correct in stating that the REA is now beginning to engage in a new type of unfair competition with American business—moving into the field of industrial development?

Mr. Speaker, Mr. J. A. Baker, Director of Agricultural Credit of the USDA, boasted to the Land and People Conference in Washington on January 15, 1962:

REA, through its section 5 loan provisions recently approved a $30,000 loan to a northern Illinois electric co-op, which in turn lent the money to a ski resort, which opens the area to recreational purposes, providing direct employment for the ski resort people, and indirect employment to the people of the community.

This recreational center, started by two energetic men, was having difficulty getting off to a good start due, principally, to a lack of proper snowmaking equipment which would protect it against the variable weather conditions and insure a steady income from the operation of the ski lift and a restaurant. The short winter days will also be lengthened by outdoor lights which will make the resort a nighttime atrraction, too.

I think the answer to my previous question concerning the fears of the Farm Bureau is obvious. In fact, this is reminiscent of the days when the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was lending funds to promoters of plush cocktail lounges and hotels as evidenced by the USDA release dated January 3 concerning this loan for a snowmaking machine. The release states:

The cooperative plans to relend the funds to the Chestnut Hills Resort, Inc., Hanover, Ill., to help to purchase and install electrically powered snowmaking equipment and outdoor lights. Chestnut Hills Resort, Inc., a member consumer of the cooperative, operates a year-round recreational center on the east bank of the Mississippi River.

Mr. Speaker, if the two men were as energetic as Mr. Baker describes, it is hard to understand why they did not obtain financing from a private lending institution. The use, or rather, abuse, of REA appropriations for these purposes, if continued, can eventually lead to the destruction of the program for the same reason that the RFC met its unsavory end. Using Government low interest cost money for the financial benefit of private individuals was not countenanced by Congress in the case of the RFC and the above-mentioned activities of REA should be similarly distasteful to them.

The article from the Indianapolis Star of February 2, 1962, follows:

REA MAKES LOAN FOR SNOW MAKER

WASHINGTON.—The Rural Electrification Administration has loaned $30,000 for a snow-making machine to extend the ski season at an Illinois resort.

The loan was approved December 28, 1961, to the Jo-Carroll Electric Cooperative at Elizabeth, Ill.

The cooperative obtained the loan under the consumer financing provisions of the REA Act. It was the first such loan to an Illinois borrower under the consumer finance provisions of the Rural Electrification Act as part of the Agriculture Department's new rural area redevelopment program.

The Jo-Carroll Cooperative, in turn, reloaned the money to the Chestnut Hills Resort, Inc., at Hanover, Ill., to help that company buy and install the snow-making equipment and outdoor lights.

The installation of the equipment, the approval announcement set out, would increase the number of skiing days in the season and improve the quality of the ski slope.

The resort is a consumer member of the cooperative.

Lincoln: The Holy Versus the Human

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 11, those in attendance at Ford's Theater in Washington had the privilege of hearing some scholarly remarks on Abraham Lincoln by Dr. James I. Robertson, Jr., the new executive director of the Civil War Centennial Commission.

Because I was in Davenport, Iowa, on that date also speaking on Lincoln, I did not have the opportunity to hear Dr. Robertson, but the many fine comments which have come to me on his address have prompted me to secure a copy of the speech and to read it carefully.

I was impressed by Dr. Robertson's courage and forthrightness in drawing a comparison between what he calls the human and the holy attributes of this great man. I am confident that all Members who enjoy learning more about Lincoln will appreciate the opportunity of reading these remarks themselves.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Dr. Robertson's speech in the Appendix of the RECORD:

LINCOLN: THE HOLY VERSUS THE HUMAN

(By Dr. James I. Robertson, Jr.)

As the last breath ebbed from the body of Abraham Lincoln in the awesome stillness of that April dawn, Edwin M. Stanton bemoaned: "Now he belongs to the ages." The ages have not been unkind to that crude frontier lawyer with polished wit. If, in a famous poem, Nancy Hanks did wonder in death what became of her serious, unpretentious son, thousands today with reaffirm that, as expressed in the Civil War's most famous hymn, Lincoln's soul goes marching on.

That American generations since 1860's have immortalized Abraham Lincoln is irrefutable. It is regarded as almost flagrant hypocrisy to mention Lincoln's name with anything but reverence. His tomb at Springfield is a spiritual Mecca for literally thousands. The Lincoln Memorial here in Washington, originally intended as a monument, has with the passing years become a temple. Here annually tread countless numbers of persons to stand quietly in meditation, or even prayer, before the magnificent statue of our 16th President.

Yet have not we perhaps gone too far in our adoration? True, it is a tendency with us to transform any great American, especially a President, into something unblemished, unrealistic, and almost inhuman. Politicians have a name for it: "The Public Image"—an impression of godliness that can be so nurtured by journalism, literature, and repetition as to distort completely the vivid picture of an extraordinary human being. Particularly in the case of Lincoln have we succumbed to such a procedure; and in our near worship of the man, we have in a sense done him a grave injustice, for if nothing else, Abraham Lincoln was human: uniquely and memorably human. It is the vision of this plain and simple man that endeared him forever to all Americans. If therefore we discount or overlook the image of Lincoln the man, we miss entirely the firm bases for his greatness.

For a few moments let us cast aside the divine apparition. Permit me the heretical liberty of removing from his shoulders the robes of holiness so that we may view Lincoln's human characteristics. Since angels cannot be analyzed, a penetrating look at manly qualities, I firmly believe, will carry us closer to Lincoln and thereby make his contributions more real and meaningful.

Always, and physiologically, Lincoln was a member of the human race. He was born in the Kentucky wilderness in February 1809; 56 years and 2 months later, he died in the chaos of wartime Washington. If we did not know the violent end which Lincoln met, we might be inclined to believe that he lived a normal lifespan for that era. On the other hand, there was little normal about Abraham Lincoln's life. Raised in the turbulent atmosphere of the American frontier, he was self-educated, at a glance rather ugly, un-

couth, crude in manner, honest to a fault, and usually unpredictable in behavior. In short, he personified all the aspects of a growing America. He acquired a deep-seated knowledge of the law and an equally profound respect for the U.S. Constitution in the rough-and-tumble air of Illinois courthouses. In his first ventures into politics, he was unsuccessful. He achieved the Presidency not only through customary political manipulation, but also with an outspoken sincerity that completely stripped his opponents of their weapons.

Lincoln barely squeaked to victory in 1860, and his election promptly occasioned secession and civil war. By background and temperament, he should have failed miserably as the Nation's leader. Yet in 3 short years he established himself among the unforgettables of American history. Then, with success in his hands and a bright future before him for the first time in his life, Lincoln became the first Chief Executive to lose his life at the hands of an assassin.

Lincoln was so complex a person that it is difficult to appraise him either accurately or adequately. A man of many talents and moods, he was able to mature as a statesman because he relied on his assets and overcame most of his liabilities. And whether or not we wish to accept the fact, Lincoln assuredly had definite shortcomings of character. As a human creation, he necessarily had to possess imperfections in his makeup. It is fitting to examine these first.

Most recognizable, and for this, of course, he could not be blamed, Lincoln was amazingly ugly. One of his own Cabinet members contemptuously termed him "a gangling baboon," and many northerners asserted that the sight of Lincoln had frightened the South into secession. Yet ugliness often breeds compassion. "No one could look upon Lincoln's face," one writer has stated, "without feeling sincerity and suffering and kindliness." If Lincoln lacked beauty, he likewise was void of polish. Commensurate with the environment in which he was raised, Lincoln was robust and often raw in his conduct. Much horseplay marked his early years. For example, when his sister died in Indiana, young Abe blamed his brother-in-law for neglecting her. Several years later the brother-in-law and a friend married two sisters in a double ceremony. On the night after the wedding Lincoln proved the leading spirit in maneuvering the two blushing brides into the wrong bedrooms.

A third shortcoming of Lincoln's was his moodiness. He would get so low for days on end as to reduce seriously his effectiveness in office. Many believed him schizophrenic, and Lincoln's faith in the supernatural did little to allay such apprehensions.

As a President he displayed at least three major weaknesses. In 1860 he overestimated Union sentiment in the South. He thought war could and would be prevented. His belittlement of the power of positive thinking among secessionists was a near-fatal blunder. Secondly, was a lack of administrative experience. True, Lincoln learned rapidly; but the process of learning while enmeshed in the adversities of a civil war was for Lincoln a real and a serious handicap. Prior to the Presidency, he had served one unproductive term in the House of Representatives and four terms in the relatively informal Illinois Legislature.. Any other political experience he gained was a byproduct of his readings and his jaunts on the western judicial circuits. These things were hardly attributes to qualify a man for an office previously held by the likes of Washington, Jefferson, Monroe, Adams, and Tyler.

Obviously, many of Lincoln's faults were also the shortcomings of other Presidents, notably Jackson, Zachary Taylor and, to a lesser degree, Theodore Roosevelt. Moreover, when viewed against his virtues, Lincoln's faults do seem minor. What then were his human assets?

They were many, and high on the list was integrity. Above all else, Abraham Lincoln was an honest man, a man of his word, unshakingly faithful to his convictions. Next was an unbreakable humility. Not once in his life did Lincoln ever masquerade as something he was not. He was neither overbearing nor hotheaded; he calmed his enemies with understanding, just as he controlled his anger with patience. That patience which Lincoln possessed was unbelievable. (He himself considered it as his greatest virtue.) No better example of this can be given than in Lincoln's relations with the leading procrastinator of the 19th century, Gen. George B. McClellan. As McClellan delayed and faltered from one critical period to another, Lincoln commented: "I will hold his horse if he will only bring us success." Once during the ill-fated Peninsular Campaign (as a popular story goes), McClellan was advancing on Richmond with all the alacrity of a snail. He sent another in a long series of telegrams to the President: "Have just captured two cows. What shall I do with them?" Lincoln's alleged reply, "Milk 'em, George, milk 'em."

In the White House Lincoln exhibited an amazing capacity for growth. He profited from his mistakes; he learned quickly and he acted adroitly. As Chief Executive he came to develop a deep sense of reality plus a power of concentration so intense that at times he seemed in an almost trancelike state. Moreover, few residents of the White House have possessed Lincoln's tact, his ability to soothe even the most ruffled of feathers. The shining example of this characteristic is, of course, the famous story of Lincoln's visit to the theater.

This is but one illustration of Lincoln's wonderful humor. It was rich, spontaneous, pure, and sometimes biting. When financier Jay Cooke once commented on the contrast between Attorney General Edward Bates' white beard and black hair, Lincoln quickly observed: "Well, it could hardly be otherwise, and the cause is that he uses his jaws more than he does his brains." There may have been a measure of truth in Mrs. Mary Chesnut's bland observation that, given time, Lincoln would laugh South Carolina right out of secession.

So far we have failed to mention the four most enduring of Lincoln's virtues. One was his love of humanity. He apparently hated no man, and disliked only a few. He personally intervened to save a number of condemned soldiers from execution. He wrote as many letters home to distraught mothers as did any commander in the field. He listened attentively to scores of personal requests from privates and officers, poor and rich, afflicted and ambitious. "It is a good thing I was not born a woman," he once said matter-of-factly, "because I could never say no."

Lincoln made a habit of visiting army hospitals and of greeting troops in the front lines. He was known to the men in blue as "Old Abe" and "Father Abraham," and he was never without a kind word for any soldier who greeted him. Small wonder that in April 1863, one infantryman wrote home: "None of us to our dying day can forget that countenance. * * * Concentrated in that one great, strong yet tender face, the agony of the life and death struggle of the hour was revealed as we had never seen it before. With a new understanding, we knew why we were soldiers."

Closely allied to this love of humanity was an unwavering devotion to the Union. Few Americans have or could equal it. Lincoln spent the greater part of his life trying to strengthen and preserve his Nation. He gave his life for doing so. In similar vein, no one can ever charge that Lincoln neglected his job, for he knew nothing about working hours. Many nights, when the outcome of the brothers' war still hung in the balance, Lincoln toiled as late as 3 a.m.—and then might be seen riding through the streets of Washington 3 hours later.

One of Lincoln's strongest virtues is too often ignored by those who make a demigod of him. This is a mistake, for the roots of Abraham Lincoln's greatness lay firmly imbedded in his ability as a masterful politician. Here his achievements were real and human. He had a keen understanding of men; almost at a glance could he discern virtues and vices in individuals. The potential dangers of such ambitious politicians as Salmon P. Chase and William H. Seward Lincoln came quickly to see. Eventually, he moved deftly to counteract their designs. Seward, named Secretary of State, was seemingly left alone to handle many matters of national importance, and I doubt if he ever fully realized how firm a hold Lincoln really had on him. As for the position-conscious Chase, Lincoln soon promoted him from Secretary of the Treasury to the U.S. Supreme Court, thereby giving him increased status but removing him completely from the political arena.

As a skilled politician, Lincoln displayed the wonderful knacks for identifying himself with the masses and of getting along with all types of people. Americans never forgot—because Lincoln would never let them forget—that he was a plain man of simple origins. The masses loved him because he was one of them and because he strove as hard as he could to accomplish a difficult task that would profit them all. True, his profane nature and earthly stories shocked the Victorian element of society; but at the same time these traits won him the warm affection of that class on whom the destiny of this Nation has always rested, namely, the common folk.

The foremost aspect of Lincoln's ability as a masterful politician was his remarkable sense of timing. Relieving incompetent generals from command is one case in point. Not until the people themselves raised loud cries for removal did Lincoln send out dispatches relieving McClellan, Pope, and Hooker. By delaying, Lincoln made it appear as if he were acquiescing to the will of the people. Yet an even more adroit instance of shrewd timing came with the issuance of the Emancipation Proclamation.

Many who would spiritualize Lincoln take great delight in terming him "the great emancipator." This he incontestably was, but Lincoln was not merely a holy abolitionist. Indeed, I question whether he was an active abolitionist at all. Lincoln realized at the outset of the war that defeating Confederate armies was only half the means to the end of a reunited nation. The South's every capacity to fight must be destroyed. Naturally this included the complete dismantlement of slavery, since the South's 3 million Negroes were an integral part of its war machine.

In such a revolutionary setting, Lincoln employed revolutionary tactics. He deferred any action—and on three occasions reproached generals for taking unauthorized initiatives—until political and, more important, diplomatic expedients dictated a move. Then Lincoln had to exceed constitutional powers in issuing a Proclamation of Emancipation. The document said nothing of those Negroes held in various stages of bondage in the North; it expressly referred only to those slave States then in rebellion. As Lincoln so intended, he put the war on a humane level just at the time when England (and quite possibly France as well) were about to grant official recognition and unconcealed aid to the Confederacy.

Simultaneously, Lincoln quieted powerful abolitionists in one section while theoretically confiscating millions of dollars worth of property and a valuable labor supply in another.

Politics, diplomacy, military strategy, psychological warfare, plus a manufactured economic revolution of unprecedented scope—these were factors as important, if not more so, as any humane considerations in the issue of that monumental document. As one Lincoln scholar has aptly stated: "The Emancipation Proclamation was only a half measure, a steppingstone," for "Lincoln knew that righteousness could not be established by Presidential edict." While the proclamation was temporary in appliance and basically a war measure, it nevertheless was an impetus to possible future and more lasting action. Perhaps Lincoln so planned it that way; in any event, it is one of our Nation's permanent tragedies that Lincoln did not live to develop his long-range plan with his wise judgment and wonderful tact.

The final virtue of Lincoln the man was a tremendous articulateness. That Lincoln had the God-given gift to express his views clearly, adequately, and in immortal phrases is borne out in every one of his major addresses.

At Cooper Union in February 1860, Lincoln made his future course of action rather clear with the statement: "Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith, let us, to the end, dare to do our duty as we understand it." As rumblings from the South echoed across the Potomac at Lincoln's first inaugural, he informed dissatisfied countrymen that in their hands lay "the momentous issue of civil war." Yet optimistically and poetically beautiful did he close his address: "The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every * * * patriot grave to every living heart and hearthstone all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature."

And at the midway point of that bloody and tragic war, who else but Lincoln could so richly describe this Government as one "of the people, by the people, and for the people," and could reaffirm that it would not perish from this earth? In like fashion, no one but a man who possessed Lincoln's innate love of humanity, his magnanimous humility, and his solemn devotion to the Union could, on the eve of his second term, look out at those, North and South, who hated the very ground on which he walked and say with a sincerity that reached to the depths of his soul: "With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us continue the work we are in * * * (and) to do all that may achieve and cherish a just, and a lasting peace, among ourselves, and with all nations."

Abraham Lincoln exhibited unbelievably little bitterness in the course of that blood-drenched civil war. It behooves each of us to take cognizance of that fact, especially as we embark on the second year of the war's centennial. The enmities of the Civil War have faded into the oblivion of passing time. Our generations, and generations yet unborn, must concentrate all our efforts to regenerate harmony, restrengthen friendships, and re-cement national unity, among all sections and with all peoples. Only then can the lessons of the war have meaning and value to all Americans.

At the same time, in our actions during this centennial we must keep in mind that we are tampering with human sacrifice. We are treading upon the graves of over 618,000 Americans who died—often with indescribable agonies—for causes each considered just and necessary to the American way of life. If we are to trespass into the ranks of the hallowed dead, we must do so with reverence, dignity, and solemnity. Conscience dictates it; Lincoln would have wished it that way.

For Lincoln, no god but in imagination, was one of those who offered his life for the preservation of these United States. His death was no more glorious or painful than those of thousands of Americans, blue and gray, who sacrificed their futures in that tragic era. Yet Lincoln, a little more so than they, left us all a heritage: in sustaining a Nation, he inspired a world.

With responsibilities as human beings, we cannot forget that.

Coast Guard Reserve Observes 21st Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the 21st anniversary of the founding of the Coast Guard Reserve, a branch of the service of which I am proud to be a member, was marked yesterday. So that this occasion might be appropriately noted and so that the achievements of the Coast Guard Reserve might be recognized, I would like to have this historical sketch and outline of the organization brought to the attention of my colleagues by having it printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

COAST GUARD RESERVE OBSERVES 21ST BIRTHDAY

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The U.S. Coast Guard Reserve today marked its 21st birthday since its founding on February 19, 1941.

Created approximately 10 months before the Japanese bombing of Pearl Harbor, the Coast Guard Reserve was established as an emergency measure during the anxious days immediately preceding U.S. entry into World War II.

Two years earlier, in 1939, there had been established a "nonmilitary, voluntary organization of men and boats" known as the "Coast Guard Reserve." Then on February 19, 1941, Congress changed its name to the "Coast Guard Auxiliary," and established a new military Coast Guard Reserve patterned after the Naval Reserve. A Women's Reserve was added in 1942.

Primary aim of the newly constituted Reserve was to provide the Coast Guard with additional personnel to meet the extraordinary responsibilities imposed on it by war. Under congressional authorization of the Reserve Act, the Coast Guard acquired a fleet of motorboats and yachts from the auxiliary which it employed for patrol duty in ports and inland waters.

Within 2 years after its establishment, the Reserve had added to the regular Coast Guard establishment 6,793 regular Reserve officers, 297 regular Reserve warrant officers, and 135,260 regular Reserve enlisted personnel. In addition, 45,197 temporary members of the Reserve and 22,476 plant guards had been enrolled. These latter groups were utilized mainly in port security work.

As the tempo of war quickened, numerous volunteer port security forces were organized by temporary reservists in all major ports to guard wharves, shipyards, and waterfront property. Serving without pay, they made an important contribution to the war effort.

Carrying out most of the Coast Guard's port security activities during the war, the temporary reservists protected from sabotage navigable waterfront property valued at nearly $5 billion, including 5 million feet of linear wharfage over which 1,200 million tons of cargo had passed in 1939. This tonnage was subsequently increased many times by sharply rising wartime needs. The temporary reservists also assisted in handling approximately 17 million tons of explosives without a major casualty or loss of life. It was indeed an impressive record.

On June 17, 1942, when the submarine menace was at its height along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts, the Navy directed the Coast Guard to acquire the maximum number of civilian craft capable of going to sea in good weather for a period of at least 48 hours at cruising speeds. These ships were quickly acquired as an expansion of the Coast Guard Reserve.

During 1942 the Reserve fleet rose from 314 to 3,148 while miscellaneous motorboats of less than 65 feet in length increased from 174 to 611 and other small craft increased by 240. There were also 121 converted fireboats as well as 102 other cutters of less than 100 feet, mostly yachts.

The fleet became known as the coastal pickets, and each vessel was fitted to carry at least four 300-pound depth charges, a minimum of one machinegun, and a radio set, preferably voice. Groups of vessels were assigned to restricted patrol stations called pickets along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts where the enemy submarines were concentrated. They performed outstanding service both in reconnaissance and in bringing in survivors from the hundreds of tankers and merchant vessels sunk in these coastal waters during 1942 and 1943.

The Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (amended by the Reserve Forces Act of 1955) gave added definition and emphasis to the program by establishing the mission of the Reserve forces, their composition and numbers. It established the categories of Reserve components to include:

Ready Reserve: Members of which are liable for involuntary call to active duty in time of national emergency proclaimed by the President. In a training status this includes members of operational training units and other Reserve unit personnel.

Standby Reserve: Members other than ready or retired who are liable for active duty in time of war or national emergency declared by Congress. From a training viewpoint these are men who have already received basic and specialty training and have met their obligatory military training requirement.

Retired Reserve: Consists of retired Regular and Reserve personnel who may be ordered to active duty if qualified and if the Ready Reserve and Standby Reserve cannot meet the total requirements.

As of January 1, 1962, the Ready Reserve force numbered 3,442 officers and 25,927 enlisted men. Of this total 495 officers and 230 enlisted men are serving on extended active duty. The number who received training during last year reached nearly 1,800 officers and 12,000 enlisted men. In addition, growth had been sufficient to change from primarily a "rate-training" concept to an "operational" (mobilization site and billet) concept. To supplement active duty training, 1,200 officers and 10,000 enlisted men took Navy and Coast Guard correspondence courses.

To handle training for duties that were uniquely Coast Guard, the Reserve Training Center, Yorktown, Va., was established in July of 1959. It is operated on a full-time, year-round basis. In addition to providing summer active duty for training (ACDUTRA)

for Reserve members, it maintains an Officer Candidate School (OCS), a General Service School, and a Merchant Marine Safety School (MMI). This facility, established only 2 years ago, is now our single largest Reserve training site. During five periods, from June 25 to September 1, 1961, over 2,000 officers and enlisted men including 57 Army and 47 regular Coast Guardsmen, received training here.

Reservists also receive basic training at schools in Cape May, N.J., and Alameda, Calif., "getting their feet wet" on ocean cruises aboard the Reserve-operated cutters *Dexter* and *Unimak*. Two-week ACDUTRA is also received at district operational units, Navy and contract schools, and, using the man-for-man buddy system aboard floating units.

In April 1961 responsibility for training Coast Guard Reserve personnel was transferred to the Chief of Staff from the Office of Personnel. Vice Adm. E. J. Roland, as assistant commandant and chief of staff, is the flag officer responsible for Reserve affairs, and Capt. E. S. Kerr, Jr., assistant chief of staff (Reserve), is in charge of administering the program.

Today it can be truly said that on all levels and in all phases the Reserve program has expanded and advanced to fulfill its mission * * * "to provide trained units and qualified personnel available for active duty in time of war or national emergency, and at such other times as the national security requires," to fill the needs for performance of duty by the Coast Guard.

Russian Economic Gains and Progress in Nuclear and Space Sciences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Way To Catch Russia" which appeared in the February 6, 1962, edition of the Gary Post-Tribune.

There being no objection, the editoral was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WAY TO CATCH RUSSIA

There's a way of catching up with Russia. Dean Earl Butz of the Purdue School of Agriculture outlined it the other night in La Porte.

"So we want to catch up with Russia," said the dean. "If we want to catch up then we must decrease three-fifths of our steel production, cut out two-thirds of the world's oil production, decrease 95 percent of our electric machine power output, tear up 75 percent of our roads and highways and eliminate 8 out of every 20 automobiles. That's how we'll catch up."

It's an oversimplification, of course. We must consider the Russian rate of growth, perhaps, more than accomplished works, and we must watch the actual progress the Russians have made in the newer nuclear and space sciences.

But what Butz said to the La Porte Chamber of Commerce does have merit. Certainly we should not be lulled into a false, lazy contentment with what we have. On the other hand, we would be making a mistake if we let worry over the Russian gains scare us into forgetting the strides we have made. Counting our blessings once in a while can be a positive morale factor.

Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, only the marked sadness of this, the 44th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuania's independence as a free nation, mars the conscience of the free people of the world.

The suffierings of its people in the bloody grip of Soviet rule, first under the czarist oppression for 123 years and now under Soviet tyranny and slavery since 1940, have not destroyed the will of its people to be free. This brave race, cultured in the glorious traditions of its heroic leaders dating before the Christian era, facing the many sufferings of her people with tolerance and with prayers to the Almighty, courageously awaits the day of her liberation from Soviet domination.

The 7 mass deportations of her citizens and many lesser ones—2,000 to 3,000 a month—totaling 600,000 souls, has failed to quench this brave nation's thirst for the freedom of those enslaved within and without her borders. One-fourth of her sons have been transported to the interior of Russia, as slaves. Thousands have died in prison camps and in exile. Thus, through mass fear, the inevitable weakening of her patriotic national will lies diluted with despair, questioning if freedom will ever be realized.

The great problem confronting the United States is, Can we really maintain our own institutions of freedom for long—as we view the encroachments made by the Communists upon the free nations of the world—each falling within its aura of godless enslavement?

The United States has already moved with celerity to curb the menace at our own doorstep. This administration, in 1 year, has put the seal of the Monroe Doctrine on the North and South American Continents. Our neighboring nations are alerted to the communistic practices that lead to domination.

We must do more—we must use every force to release the small nations throughout Europe and the Baltic areas. The West must force its preparedness programs to the extreme of our national abilities to pay, in order to give confidence to the new nations of the East and Africa, that no one dare controvert our desires to keep the world of freemen free.

The nations enslaved must be freed, that Christianity prevail. The bodies of men may be enslaved, but the "self," "the spirit," "the soul," can never be lost to tyranny. Lithuania must be saved. Her independence must be restored. The dignity of man must be preserved with free institutions to protect it. America is the one hope that keeps alive the fires of freedom among all men—let us not let them down. We are prepared to march in freedom's name—with God's guidance, we will prevail.

Our American Heritage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent having heretofore been granted me so to do, I am pleased to present to your attention and all the other Members of this great legislative body, the text of "Our American Heritage Project," initiated and being processed by the Downey Unified School District, Los Angeles County, Calif., and located in the great 23d District which I have the honor to represent.

Resulting from my personal observation of this project as it has been applied, I asked consent of the office of the superintendent of the Downey Unified School District to ask unanimous consent to insert the same in the Appendix of this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This I do because I am reasonably sure that as Downey Unified School District has done, so it is worthy of very earnest consideration, and with likelihood of duplication by many other school districts throughout our beloved Nation.

I know that you and all the others join in congratulations to the office of the superintendent and the board of education and all those responsible for the initiation and placed into being of "Our American Heritage Project." Especially do I compliment Mr. Bruce Moore, superintendent of the Downey Unified School District, who presented this text to the board of education on April 27, 1961. Likewise, I compliment the members of the board of education because this project was unanimously approved by said board of education.

OUR AMERICAN HERITAGE PROJECT

(By the Downey Unified School District, September 18, 1961)

This project was proposed by Mr. Bruce Moore, superintendent, to the Downey Unified School District Board of Education on April 27, 1961. The project was unanimously approved by the board.

The project was carried on under the supervision of Dr. Joe Glenn Coss. The committee of teacher writers was chaired by Dr. Tom Gallagher.

Credits are due as follows:

Members of the board of education: Mr. Merritt Yancey, president; Mr. Robert L. Ryan, Mr. Reno H. Sirrine, Mr. Lloyd L. Stromberg, Mr. Harold T. Tredway, Mr. Robert H. Walton, and Mrs. Josephine M. Wiser.

Members of the writing committee: Mr. Arthur E. Adams, Mrs. Serena S. Beck, Mr. Charles H. Bowyer, Mr. James H. Copeland,

Dr. Thomas A. Gallagher, Mrs. Katherine M. Hume, Mrs. Sybil S. Maticich, Mrs. Meryle J. Moravec, Mr. Sherrill L. Moses, Mr. Joseph H. Nylander, Mr Rudy Romischer, and Mrs. Ethel D. Schoen.

Typists for the project: Mrs. Frances B. Bean, Mrs. Pearl A. Benway, Mrs. Louise DL. Coloman, and Miss Cheryl E. Durazzo.

Much credit is also due to many lay citizens who gave excellent assistance to the committee in formulating the list of the basic principles upon which the American way of life is founded.

INTRODUCTION AND BASIC CONCEPTS

Children in the Downey Unified School District are being taught to value their American heritage. Grade level outlines of specific teaching suggestions are followed by teachers in the social studies classes. All children should develop the ability to think and talk clearly about the American heritage. They should further develop strong loyalty to their country and a keen responsibility for good citizenship. They should also learn the responsibilities of the individual citizen as a worthwhile producer and intelligent consumer of goods and services.

In America the terms democracy and republic are often used synonymously. In this project special attention is called to the fact that when either word is used it is intended to mean "the system of government which we have inherited that is (1) Based on rule by the people through a (2) system of elected representatives which are (3) constitutionally bound by a system of checks and balances."

Certain basic principles of government and economics are responsible for making America great. These principles and the institutions based on them are our American heritage. Summary statements of the principles are listed below.

Our representative constitutitonal Republic together with the capitalistic free enterprise system have given and preserved, and will continue to offer, more freedom and more economic prosperity to America's individual citizens than any other form of government or economic system yet devised. This way of life marked by freedom and liberty for the individual, tremendous productivity of the economic system, adaptability to change by a government of law, and creativity in thought has come to be known as American democracy.

1. Religion: Belief in God and in freedom to worship Him as we see fit were and continue to be basic beliefs undergirding American life. Coupled with these beliefs is the sense of obligation to live up to the moral principles of the Judaeo-Christian ethic. This ethic gives purpose to life and explains the right relationship of man to man.

2. Respect for individual worth: American democracy is a way of life which is founded on supreme respect for the value of the individual. This respect finds expression in equality under the law and equality of opportunity. Individual creativity in thought, in the arts and professions are valued.

3. Democratic republic: American democracy has consent of the governed as its main ideal. Government is the servant of the people; people are not the servants of the government.

4. Guaranteed freedoms: American democracy through the Constitution guarantees freedom to the individual. In the Constitution, its amendments, and especially in the Bill of Rights, a number of basic individual freedoms and privileges are guaranteed. Among them are the freedom of speech, religion, press, assembly, and trial by jury. We are insured the rights of petition, secret ballot, and suffrage. We are protected against such things as illegal search and seizure, unreasonable bail, involuntary servitude and cruel punishments.

The citizen has the right to own property (homes, farms, factories, businesses, stocks, etc.) and to control it as he sees fit within the limits of the law.

The citizens have assumed the right to education from such documents as the Ordinance of 1787.

5. Responsibilities as well as rights: The citizens of our country have responsibilities as well as rights. They must inform themselves on public issues and participate actively in government.

6. Majority rule: American democracy is based on majority rule. The minority is protected from the majority. The minority may work to have the minority opinion accepted by the majority.

7. Man's capability: American democracy depends on faith in man's ability to govern himself. Man can solve his problems cooperatively through reason.

8. Dignity of work: There is dignity in all forms of work. Each individual is free to choose his own kind of work. Each citizen, as a producer, is aware of his responsibility to contribute his best in productivity, energy, and initiative. The right to bargain collectively assists those who need it in their chosen work.

9. Source of income: The purpose of ever-increasing productivity is pursued by our free enterprise system. The total income of a society is its total output of goods and services.

10. Enterpriser a key figure: The enterpreneur (enterpriser) is a key figure in the American economic system. He has (1) freedom of initiative coupled with the (2) right to assume the risk of loss with (3) the hope of rewards for his efforts: (a) profit, (b) satisfaction in the value of his contribution to others.

11. Free enterprise: In America the competitive, free enterprise economy is based on the law of supply and demand. Price is the index of supply and demand operating in a free market. The production, distribution, and sale of goods and services depend on the assumption of the validity of contracts.

12. Ever onward and upward: Basic to American democracy is belief in progress. Improvement is expected and worked for in social, economic, and political life. These improvements are achieved by legislation instead of violence.

13. Common defense: Provision is made for common defense against enemies, both foreign and domestic. While war and other violent methods are inimical to the intentions of our democratic government they will be used in the protection of our freedom. The Nation's foreign policy is basically constructive and not destructive. War is basically destructive.

America recognizes her responsibility to work for the good of other people in the world.

14. Schools transmit the heritage: It is the duty of the schools of America to transmit to future generations the heritage of democratic freedom, constitutional republican government and free enterprise under the capitalistic system. Other institutions also promote this cause—the home, the church, and civic organizations, for example.

Letter From Richard Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the most recent issue of Advance magazine, published by a group of exceptional young men at Harvard University, caused considerable comment because of the direct way in which they appraised the Republican Party's future success. Being of the view that honest debate is a healthy thing for any party, I was particularly pleased to read the letter the former Vice President Nixon wrote to Bruce Chapman, publisher of Advance, commenting on the issue. I believe it is worthy of insertion in the RECORD.

JANUARY 26, 1962.

Mr. BRUCE K. CHAPMAN,
Publisher, Advance, Quincy House C-100
Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

DEAR BRUCE: I am very grateful to you, as always, for the copy of Advance, and I want you to know how commendable I regard your special issue on the problems and potentialities of Republican congressional leadership. The vigorous and provocative way in which you tackle this critical subject and your judicious appraisal of our party's future success speaks very will indeed for the generation in whose hands this future rests. My warm congratulations to all of you—editors and contributors.

On the substantive issues involved there is room for disagreement and debate, and I hope you help provoke it. But on the general principle—either the Republican Party presents and "sells" a positive image to the American voter or it becomes a permanent minority, withers, and dies—I think you are absolutely right. We must as a party, in and out of Congress, have no fear of honest controversy but rather welcome it. We must accommodate a diversity of views, within the framework of agreed major principles. And we must not be so protective about exclusive labels and cliques as to cut off the development of widely shared party positions on the overwhelming number of major public policy issues.

I hope all Republicans settle down to this challenge. I intend to do what I can to stimulate the process—and I am certain that your publication will make a significant contribution to sharp but sensible debate.

With every good wish,
Sincerely,

DICK NIXON.

Gilbert H. Myers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. COOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend the residents of the 11th Congressional District of Ohio were shocked, along with myself, to learn of the death of Gilbert H. Myers, of North Kingsville, Ohio.

Gil Myers served his fellow Americans in many ways, as mayor of North Kingsville, as a member of the Ohio State Legislature, and as a member of the Ashtabula County Metropolitan Park Commission, but he was best known probably for his interest in patriotism. He placed his country first at all times. He had a hobby of collecting flags of the United States and of learning about the history of our various flags. In addition, he distributed, usually at his own cost, many flags to schools and patriotic

organizations throughout the 11th Congressional District.

Gilbert Myers set a good example for his fellow men and will be sorely missed by thousands who knew him.

The following is an editorial which appeared in the Ashtabula Star-Beacon of January 25, 1962, commenting on his death:

DEATH OF GILBERT MYERS IS GREAT LOSS TO ALL

The death of Gilbert H. Myers came as a shock to those who knew him, and that includes a high percentage of northeastern Ohioans.

Mr. Myers had been active in public life, particularly after his retirement from the grocery business in North Kingsville and after his final term as North Kingsville mayor.

The former State legislator had remained extremely active, giving his widely acclaimed "flag talk" to all sorts of organizations, keeping up his American Legion activities and working diligently in behalf of the Ashtabula County Metropolitan Park District, of which he was a commissioner.

He was park commission president at the time of his death.

It was typical of Mr. Myers that the park district dedicated a park last summer which legally is not a park at all. Negotiations are still in progress for the lands around the Harpersfield covered bridge. It was Mr. Myers' plan to raise a flagpole at the site and dedicate it anyway, despite almost total lack of funds for such purposes.

Above all else, Mr. Myers was a patriot, a man who placed his county, its history and institutions foremost among his interests. His flag collection is one of the most complete known, and his knowledge of flag lore was perhaps the most extensive of any man living.

There are those who decry the apparent lagging of patriotism in a materialistic age. They point to the crowds during parades, wherein more men fail to remove their hats as the flag goes by than do. Mr. Myers felt this deeply and it disturbed him greatly.

America, and northeastern Ohio, have lost an outstanding patriot, flag authority and public servant with the death of Mr. Myers.

Proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Controlling Our Cities" which appeared in the February 6, 1962, edition of the Indianapolis News:

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTROLLING OUR CITIES

Thwarted by the House Rules Committee in his effort to create a new Department of Urban Affairs, President Kennedy has tried to go another route. He has proposed creation of the new agency as part of his Government reorganization plan, which will become law in 2 months' time unless Congress specifically rejects it.

The President argues that big-city interests should have a voice in the Cabinet because other interest blocs, such as agriculture and labor and businessmen, have special departments to look after their welfare. The cities, it is said, should have equal representation.

The argument is thoroughly illogical. Agriculture and labor and business are types of employment, not localities. Cities are places where employment takes place—and two of the existing Cabinet posts, Labor and Commerce, represent employment categories to be found in the cities. Add in the services the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare purveys to many urban residents and it becomes clear that cities are anything but under-represented on the Cabinet. The President's argument falls apart of its own weight.

The Urban Affairs Department therefore has little or nothing to do with equal representation. It has a great deal to do, in its very conception, with trying to impose Federal controls over the activities of city governments. If the agency performs toward its constituency as the Department of Commerce, Agriculture, and Labor do toward theirs, it obviously is going to establish standards and guidelines for the behavior of city governments. Municipal problems like traffic, blight, and sewage will have to be dealt with by methods imposed by Federal officials. Control over local problems would be taken away from the citizens on the spot, and invested in faraway Federal bureaucrats. (With results, we venture to predict, far worse than those we are getting now.) If there are no such standards and controls, then there will be very little for the new agency to do, and no reason for creating it.

The proposed Urban Affairs Department is not only unnecessary, it is potentially quite dangerous to local control over local affairs. Congress should reject the President's proposal.

The President's Brother

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George E. Sokolsky wrote a very interesting column on Attorney General Robert Kennedy that appeared in the Washington Post on Friday, February 16, 1962, and as part of my remarks today I include the aforementioned column by Mr. Sokolsky. The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 16, 1962]

THE PRESIDENT'S BROTHER

(By George E. Sokolsky)

The President's brother is making a hit on his trip in Asia. Many regard Bobby Kennedy as a tough guy, but if being direct and straightforward and saying what one believes to be true is being tough, then Robert F. Kennedy presents to the American public and to the world the kind of American that we used to know before we began to polish up. The Japanese Communists got a touch of Bobby's way when they were scared away from debating him.

The simplicity of the man and his wife is beyond doubt new to Asiatics and some may think that Bobby is putting on. But they will soon know that this is a well-organized mind, capable of dealing with facts as they develop and that there is no use attempting to put anything over on him.

Americans generally stand in awe of Europeans and Asiatics and tend to bow before the great, regarding the traditional pomp and ceremony of their surroundings as important. They will find that while Bobby Kennedy has all the finesse of his brother, he can, with ease, push it all aside and not only skip rope but make ideas move fast because he does not permit position to interfere with conduct.

He walks about his office in shirt sleeves not as a demonstration of Jeffersonian democracy, but as a matter of choice. He decorates his office with his children's drawings, which he regards as good art and if anyone prefers Picasso, they are free to pursue their taste.

President Kennedy made no mistake in appointing his brother Attorney General. He has turned that into a hard, functioning office based on a program that does not seek sensationalism but produces results.

Undoubtedly the weakest link in the administrative chain of any administration is the State Department. This is no criticism of Dean Rusk. It is a product of accumulation of errors beginning in the Roosevelt administration when President Roosevelt ignored Secretary of State Cordell Hull and operated through a series of Under Secretaries, thus creating an administrative confusion. As a consequence the chain of command became dislodged and gave the irremovable lower echelon an authority in the formation of policy to which it was not entitled.

Robert Kennedy will see the maneuverings of small minds to keep themselves in jobs while great events are permitted to pass them by. He will catch the frauds as they are practiced and he will observe the fraudulent personalities who will substitute theatrical accents and mannerisms for propriety of conduct. We have a way of thinking of many of these personalities as subversive when actually they are only incompetent. They are not subversive; they are often stupid.

The stupid had better not play their folderol on Bobby Kennedy. He will see through them as swiftly as his brother, but his response is likely to be rougher. He has less time to be merciful. His interest in foreign policy is acute, but that does not mean that there is to be a conflict between Bobby Kennedy and Dean Rusk. It simply means that the President's brother is going to have a look around at what is going on.

The first job of diplomacy, whether conducted by the State Department or indirectly by the CIA, is to keep the President informed as to the details of situations. The evidence is likely to show that the President is not informed swiftly or accurately enough.

Sharing in Government Processes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an excellent article written by Mr. William St. Thomas, president, St. Thomas, Inc., Gloversville, N.Y., in regard to the place of businessmen in politics. I strongly recommend that his article be read by all Members of the House of Representatives.

SHARING IN GOVERNMENT PROCESSES

(By William St. Thomas)

As a group, businessmen, for many reasons, have been avoiding participation in

politics, to the detriment of the free enterprise system which they should be the first to nurture and protect. The July issue of the Monitor contained an article written by Lt. Gov. Malcolm Wilson which was the best article on the subject I have read anywhere. In that article he made reference to a businessman who accepted political responsibility. It happens that I am the businessman he used as an example and with the idea that it might help other businessmen modify their reluctance about entering politics, I should like to add my observations to those of Lieutenant Governor Wilson.

In the year 1928 I became a Kiwanian in West Bend, Wis. My first assignment was membership in the public affairs committee. In 1932 I became president of that club, and then chairman of the public affairs committee. A few years later I was offered an opportunity to manage a manufacturing business in Gloversville, N.Y., which I accepted. Upon arrival I transferred my Kiwanian membership and was soon caught up in civic affairs in Gloversville.

Incidentally, one of my jobs was that of song leader. I should like to digress here for a moment to give you a humorous episode that will serve to illustrate my obsession with civic projects. In 1944 the Gloversville Kiwanis Club needed to raise money to finance its many projects, and to raise that money the board of directors decided to put on a home talent musical called Kiwanis Kapers. Kay Hawkins, club pianist, and I were assigned the job of writing the show—and we did. One skit was about local politics and for that I wrote the music and lyrics and acted the part of the mayor. Here are the lyrics of that prophetic song:

"I'M A PUBLIC OFFICIAL

"(Refrain)

"I'm a public official of note.
I'm a wizard at getting the vote.
I flatter the ladies,
I kiss all the babies,
Agree with the men and I'm back in again.

"(Chorus)

"I've been doing the same thing for years.
On occasion I've shed a few tears.
Oh, I've joined all the lodges,
I know all the dodges,
I'm good for at least 30 years.

"(Second chorus)

"Oh, my campaign expenses are small,
I spend practically nothing at all.
From campaigning I shirk.
My friends do all the work.
And I'm hoping they still will next fall."

Acting the part was one thing—actuality was another—so while I was tempted time and again to become an active party worker, I, like most businessmen, was afraid that politics and business didn't mix, and besides, I was deeply in debt, having by that time purchased the majority interest in the manufacturing business I had been managing and in which I saw great possibilities. Building a strong organization in a highly competitive business and paying off the debt I incurred took a few years and such concentrated effort that I had to stick pretty well to my business for quite some time.

Then in 1956, while in New York City on business, I purchased a newspaper at the hotel newsstand, and looking around for more reading matter, I picked up a book with the most unusual title, "You Can Change the World," by Father James Keller. The book looked interesting, so I bought it, intending to read a few paragraphs that night, but once I got started I couldn't lay it down, and ended up reading it through before I turned in. The inspiring message running through the whole book—personal responsibility—freedom is not free—the need of active interest and participation in government by all citizens—was the spark that ignited in me an impelling desire to be, as Father Keller puts it, a "Go-giver as well as a go-getter," to "Light a candle instead of cursing the darkness." I began to see then that I was part of that nebulous "they" that I had been criticising for so many years. That did it. I had to do something.

When I returned to Gloversville I called the county chairman, and much to his surprise, offered my services. He was delighted because he had for years been attempting to sell local businessmen on the need of taking an active part, with only fair success—because they were, as I was, too busy. My first assignment was chairman of Citizens for Eisenhower for the 1956 campaign, which I enjoyed immensely. Nothing much happened for the next 2 years, until one day the chairman of the executive committee asked me to meet with him and the committee. My curiosity was aroused, naturally, for I hadn't the faintest idea of what he had in mind. I was surprised when he told me that Assemblyman Joseph Younglove was resigning as county chairman, after 8 successful years.

It wasn't generally known that Joe was retiring but we could all understand why because it is difficult to be county chairman and represent the assembly district at the same time because there are too many counter pressures.

I could sense that the committee had had several meetings—but I wasn't prepared for what came next. The chairman of the executive committee told me that after they had met several times I was their choice for the job of county chairman. I was astonished—and told them that their offer left me almost in a state of shock—that I would have to think it over for a few days, and further suggested that they might find someone better qualified. I told them frankly that the only political experience I had had was in the 1956 campaign, as they well knew, when I had organized a bipartisan group to work outside the regular party organization; that I had served no other apprenticeship in politics; that my entire career had been spent in business. They persisted, however, and asked me to go home, discuss it with my wife, and meet with the committee again in a few days. My wife and I discussed it at great length and we both decided I should accept the position. At our second meeting I told them that I was willing if they would give me their unqualified assistance and support. They said they would, and with that assurance I put my qualms aside and accepted.

I shall never forget the night the full committee met in the Johnstown Courthouse, which, by the way, is the oldest courthouse in continuous use in New York State. When our retiring chairman, Assemblyman Joseph Younglove, announced the result of the election and I was conducted to the podium, I felt a great sense of misgiving about the whole thing, but the die was cast—there was no turning back. That night I told the committeemen that while their confidence in me was gratifying, I hoped it wasn't misplaced; that I would try to provide the leadership but that they would have to provide the know-how and the fellowship. I went on to tell them that my entire career had been in business, that very little I had ever done fitted me for the job, but that I would give it my best.

Within the next week, with the help of the two previous county chairmen, Joe Younglove and Leon Swears, I set out to organize within the rules of the Fulton County Republican Committee. In Fulton County we have 54 election districts, with 2 committeemen in each district. These committeemen are elected by the people at a general election and are the legal entity of the party. It is their duty to handle the affairs of the party in the district, to screen candidates, to work in the polls or as drivers on election day—in short, they are the party. Within 20 days after their election they must elect a county chairman. He is required within a given time to appoint his executive committee. Within 3 weeks after my election we were organized and I had embarked on a new career. It was then that I learned that as county chairman I would be chairman of the Fulton-Hamilton Assembly District, a member of the 4th Judicial District Committee, comprising 11 counties, that I would participate in screening candidates in the 32d Congressional District and in the 41st Senatorial. Since my election I have, as a delegate to two judicial conventions, participated in the nomination of four State supreme court justices who were later elected, and in 1960 was an alternate candidate to the Republican Convention.

It so happened that I was elected the year Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller was running for office, and by some trick of fate Fulton County was picked as his jumping-off place. It was my first opportunity to plan an important political program with the help of my executive committee. The day was most successful; as a matter of fact, the Governor was busy from the moment we picked him up at the Albany Airport until we delivered him at 7 o'clock that evening in Herkimer.

Since then, every day has brought new political problems. On the whole, however, politics has been an enlightening, stimulating, sobering experience. There have been victories and defeats, elation and disappointment, high humor and heartache. Along the way I have learned a great deal about governmental processes and the people who make our system function. I have met a significant number of earnest, dedicated public officials whom I admire greatly. While I believe that I have had some impact on the political situation and thinking in my county—and that has been a source of satisfaction—I have learned more than I have taught. Another dividend accrued to me that I had not foreseen. I found, to my great delight, that the management team I had worked so long and hard to assemble and direct, was well able to carry on the business in my absence. Our greatest period of growth has occurred during the time that I have been county chairman. My organization has grown in stature and now possesses a greater degree of confidence and self-reliance.

All this is prelude to a few observations I hope you will consider worthwhile.

Can you conceive of a condition within your business that would cost you over 50 percent of your profits without doing something to correct it? You have two silent partners who contribute no capital, who rely upon you to make all the decisions; you have all the heartaches, and the worry, but they step in after your profits are calculated and take well over half of what you have earned. Most of you grumble and complain but that's about as far as you go. If you were as apathetic and fatalistic about a financial drain of such consequence caused by inefficiencies in your operations, you wouldn't be in business long. However, you wouldn't dare to be so nonchalant—you'd do something about it. So why not attack this problem as you would one within your business? Why not get into politics where you might be able to help frame the rules?

Politics is not a dirty business, neither is it a necessary evil. Politics is representative government in dynamic action. Without politics there could be no republic. To say that politics is dirty is to imply that government is dirty, because politics and government are inseparable. Why then this holier-than-thou attitude on the part of re-

spected, responsible people who, when asked to participate, retreat into that old defense, "Politics? Me? Why, I wouldn't dirty my hands by getting into politics." My answer to these people is, "If you refuse to dirty your hands, men with dirty hands will run your local, county, State, and Federal Government." Edmund Burke said, "The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing."

Lt. Gov. Malcolm Wilson said it well in his article, and I quote, "Let me say here and now that I doubt there ever was a time when businessmen could hold themselves aloof from government or politics, and if there ever was, that time is surely long past. The businessman should not worry about whether he is to become a politician—he should be concerned instead if he is not. For, if he does not choose to get into politics and influence the affairs of government, there are others who will be only too willing to do the governing for him, and they will not necessarily give him the best government." You might believe, as many do, that there is some graft and corruption in politics. If you do, that alone should be an impelling reason for you to participate personally because, as Malcolm Wilson said, and I quote again, "No government will rise above the level—moral or intellectual—of those who take the greatest interest in it."

Undoubtedly many of you are already in politics to some extent and for that I congratulate you. Being grateful for your privileges, you have accepted the concurrent responsibilities. You are not like characters I know who cruise around seeking parking meters with unexpired time—you are not parking on the other fellow's nickel.

Business and financial executives comprise the greatest pool of executive talent in America. They are respected for their knowledge and competence—they are the dynamic force that makes our system work. They possess the training, experience, knowledge, and wisdom that is necessary to run a successful enterprise and to keep it solvent. No other group has as much to offer. On the whole, however, they haven't lived up to their responsibilities as citizens by offering to their government the genius and talent that has made them leaders in their respective fields.

James A. Farley, who masterminded the election of Franklin Delano Roosevelt in two campaigns, recently wrote an article in Dun's Review entitled "Businessmen Don't Know Politics." The title is much broader in scope than the article itself. Mr. Farley makes a number of valid observations about businessmen and their attitude toward politics. He says, in short that businessmen do not understand the rules of politics and they have failed to become an effective influence because they usually expect to start at the top. He goes on to say that many businessmen "advocate political measures which, however sincerely inspired, can only lead to political suicide." He accuses businessmen of talking mostly to each other at the country club, conventions, and business functions, and adds that therefore they are poorly equipped to take a hand in politics. He suggests that businessmen start at the bottom. In this regard Mr. Farley says "starting at the bottom might involve running for a local office, learning new relationships with people, as opposed to the hierarchical relationships of business, and a willingness to suffer criticism. Criticism, even insults, are part of politics—one should never be bitter about them." He suggests that businessmen act through their associations, who are better qualified to present briefs to the Congress on pending legislation because they have the know-how and can present a better case. Finally he says "Politics is a year-round affair. Its art, like any other, can be learned only through practice."

It is obvious that Mr. Farley is an expert, but nevertheless I desire here to take issue with his general thesis that businessmen are poorly equipped for politics. In my experience I have found that businessmen as a class are as erudite and wise as their counterparts in politics and it is nonsense to suggest that, having mastered the intricacies of business, they somehow lack the qualities necessary to become successful politicians. Any county chairman who would be approached by a businessman offering his services would be out of his mind if he suggested that the businessman start as a committeeman, making house-to-house calls in his district. There are many other important positions in the party at any level that the businessman can fill with distinction. Raising money is an important part of the job of any political party. Without funds the party cannot operate. Who is better qualified to raise funds by the very nature of his experience than a businessman? The chairman of the finance committee of the Fulton County Republican Committee is a businessman, Leon Swears, who has acted in that capacity for a good many years, having previously been county chairman.

Most businesses require a knowledge of advertising. Who is better qualified to help write the political advertisements than a businessman who has had experience in that field? Who is better qualified to provide the necessary publicity? Most of the businessmen I know are well able to speak in public, and in every county there are a great many public speaking assignments that businessmen could fill. Businessmen are best qualified to organize the office methods in a county, city, or town headquarters. Most businessmen have at their disposal a secretary who can be used to carry on a great deal of the political correspondence that accrues to any political job of consequence. Of necessity a businessman in any position he might accept would come in contact with committeemen, ward workers, checkers, and election inspectors. He would soon get an education that would equip him to take an active part even though he hadn't rung doorbells. In short, it wouldn't take long for a businessman to become initiated into the world of politics if he decided to become actively engaged. After learning enough about politics by working at it, the next step would be to assist in the selection of good candidates or to run for office, and who would be better qualified?

I am not proposing that businessmen get into Government because our elected representatives are not able men in their respective fields. I am suggesting that they become involved because our Government sorely needs the kind of disciplined thinking and executive talent they possess. It has been said many times that politics is not a spectator sport. Businessmen are needed on the playing field—in the arena—where the action takes place. On the whole they have been spectators too long for the good of our country.

It is my belief that business should encourage its executives to participate actively in the party of their choice. It isn't necessary to run for office, although it is desirable. Businessmen should be willing to serve on boards of education; charter commissions, town or city councils; boards of supervisors. In short they should help to formulate the rules by which we work and live. If they are unable to serve, they should contribute generously to the party of their choice, and, last but not least, vote in every election—local, State, and National. Time and again on election day I have known of businessmen who have been away on business or whatever, who didn't take the trouble to get an absentee ballot—a sad commentary on the avoidance of their responsibilities.

From the time you get up in the morning and gargle with a mouthwash that must meet Government standards, wash your face in water controlled by the local water board, drive to work in a car for which you pay a license fee, down roads paid for by local taxes, stop at stop signs set up by the local lawmaking body, you are living within laws, ordinances, and regulations every moment of the day until you lie back at night on a pillow, the filling of which must meet Government standards.

To sum up, businessmen are needed in the most important activity of all—helping to build the framework of laws within which we all live. Government is not a thing apart—it is people working, planning, and governing—why shouldn't we be part of it? There is an old saying, "We fear that which we do not understand." Banish your fears of politics—get to understand what makes your local community tick; get to understand something about your State government; get to know the men who represent you at the national level; make yourself heard, and offer your services where you think they will do the most good.

Public officials are lonely men. They have a great many decisions to make from day to day, any of which might be unpopular with some group of constituents. They need your understanding, consideration, and support because by and large they are very seldom commended, but often criticized. Pressure groups organize their members so that their wishes, mostly in favor of spending or expanding government projects and services, are pounded home relentlessly. They see to it that their representatives are deluged with mail and the very pressure of their organized advocacy looms large in the thinking of their legislators. How often have we businessmen checked the voting records of our representatives—local, State, and National—so that we might commend as well as criticize? How often do we acquaint ourselves with the facts beforehand and write constructive, objective opinions on upcoming legislation?

One case in point is that of Joe Younglove, who represents the Fulton-Hamilton district in the assembly. Joe is living proof that regardless of pressure a great number of our representatives do what they think is right. When it was suggested that New York State adopt the withholding tax, Joe, who is chairman of the Committee on Taxation and Finance, studied the matter diligently, and after making several suggestions which were adopted in the final legislation, he announced that he was in favor of a withholding tax and he voted for it. He received a great deal of critical correspondence, but Joe stuck to his guns because he thought it was right. The Republican county committee backed him and when he stood for reelection he went back to the assembly with an overwhelming majority. One of his distinguished colleagues from a nearby county was defeated because he took the same stand.

Do you believe the President should be given authority to reduce tariffs without establishing quotas? Do you believe that the American foreign policy is operated on the basis of intelligent self-interest? Should being on welfare be considered an honorable career? Do you believe depreciation rates should be revised? Are you satisfied that you are allowed to depreciate new machinery only 40 percent after 5 years whereas the same machinery is depreciated 65.6 percent in England, 90 percent in France, and 100 percent in Sweden in the same length of time? Do you believe something should be done about double taxation of corporate earnings? How do you feel about our participation in the subjection of Katanga? How much government can we afford anyway? Are government services more important than many services we as individuals would prefer to furnish for ourselves? These are just a few of the hundreds of important

questions that should impel you to make your beliefs known where they will do some good—by counseling with your public officials or giving thought to running for public office yourself. When we say that government is often antibusiness, can it be because a large segment of highly educated, purposeful businessmen refuse to take part in the decision process? You have a responsibility to do your share in keeping our Government from straying so far into welfare stateism that we do not all become wards of the Federal Government.

Khrushev once said, and I quote: "A Communist has no right to be a mere onlooker." That applies in infinitely greater degree in a society of freemen. It is tragic that freedom must deal not only with those who would destroy it but with those who would reject it by refusing to give of their hearts, minds, and hands to strengthen and preserve it. Our Republic is a form of government so exalted in its conception, so lofty in its aims, that it needs and deserves the very best we have to give. Calvin Coolidge once said, "No person was ever honored for what he received. Honor has been the reward for what he gave."

In closing, I hope on some future day, when you reflect upon your contributions to the welfare of your country, you will have no regrets; you will not be like the hired man in Robert Frost's great poem, "The Death of the Hired Man," who "had nothing to look back upon with pride, nothing to look forward to with hope."

Participating in politics is not easy. It isn't a lark. It is hard work oftentimes frustrating, and always time consuming, but it is such a small contribution compared to the great sacrifice which made it possible for the founders of our country to hand down to us as a legacy this magnificent edifice, this great Republic. We have a responsibility to see to it that the Republic we pass on to our children and their children is in no wise less free than that which we inherited. Therefore, I hope at some future time you will say, with Robert Frost, as you choose to serve in some capacity—

"The woods are lovely, dark and deep,
But I have promises to keep.
And miles to go before I sleep,
And miles to go before I sleep."

Little-People-to-Little-People Program Spreads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I told you the story of my son's efforts to initiate a program of letter writing among the children of the world. This children's crusade, whose slogan is "Better Brave Than Slave," is aimed at increasing the knowledge and respect of people throughout the world for each other. Such knowledge and respect must come if we are ever to achieve a true and lasting peace.

As I mentioned at that time, Peter's individual work has captured the imagination of many organizations of children and adults. One of the latest to enter the lists in the battle for world education is a group of boys of the Broadway unit of the Newark Boys' Clubs in Newark, N.J., who call themselves the "Bats." Patsy Mandato, head of the club, has asked General Eisenhower for his assistance in writing to boys around the world. Yesterday's Newark Star-Ledger tells the story of Patsy, and I know it will be of interest to my colleagues:

To further the cause of brotherhood, a group of boys from the Broadway unit of the Newark Boys' Clubs are seeking contacts with boys in foreign countries.

The boys, who call themselves the "Bats" and range in age from 10 to 14, have appealed for help in the project to former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, who heads the people-to-people program.

In a letter to Eisenhower, Patsy M. M. Mandato, Jr., 13, of 391 Summer Avenue, head of the club, wrote:

"We would be very happy if you can put us in touch with boys like us who live in foreign countries. Maybe you can even get a boys' club like ours in Russia. We would like to see if we can help such boys and exchange stuff about ourselves.

"We know that if boys in the United States become friendly with boys in other countries, this would help peace."

Senator Keating Cautions Against Loss of Congressional Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSICA McC. WEIS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mrs. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, in a very timely and perceptive speech earlier this month, Senator KENNETH KEATING, my predecessor in the House of Representatives, called attention to one of the most disturbing trends in Government today. I refer to the determined efforts being made by the President and the executive branch of the Government to assume power and authority which traditionally has been vested in the Congress.

Speaking before the 43d Midwinter Trust Conference of the American Bankers Association, held in New York City on February 6, Senator KEATING discussed the President's new trade legislation and outlined his own proposal for retaining a modicum of congressional control over the tariffmaking function.

In a still larger context, the Senator warned of the repeated attempts of the present administration to usurp legislative prerogatives. He suggested that if the procedures and deliberative processes of the Congress are too cumbersome and antiquated to deal effectively with present-day problems, the proper solution lies not in abdicating legislative responsibility in favor of the Executive but rather in reforming and improving the legislative process.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly endorse the Senator's position on this matter and I commend his thoughtful remarks to the attention of every Member of the House and to everyone else who is concerned with the continued vitality of our system of responsible self-government. Under leave granted, I include Senator KEATING's address in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

(Address of the Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING, U.S. Senator, New York, before the 43d midwinter trust conference sponsored by the Trust Division of the American Bankers Association, New York City, Feb. 6, 1962)

"Where Do We Go From Here?" That's quite a title. It limits me a great deal to what I can talk about. It leaves out the past. I hope that this title, which was suggested by Tom Beacom, was not meant to reflect on my past.

You are all trust officers, or most of you are. That's a name that has always intrigued me. I wonder, is there any relationship between a trust officer and a confidence man?

* * * * *

We in the Congress in 1962 will wrestle with several great issues which will have a dramatic effect upon our Nation's future. Trade, health care for the aged, aid for higher education, tax reforms, civil rights, many others are critical. But new trade legislation, I believe, will be in the forefront of our problems.

This is one of those exciting turning points in our history. We are facing a new phenomenon—the growth of mighty constellations of trading power: the Common Market of Europe and the common markets of the future of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Will we move forward or backward? Will we accept this challenge to speed the building of closer economic relationships among the nations of the free world, relationships which depend even more greatly upon the exchange of goods and services among nations?

This is not an issue for conservatives or liberals. It cuts both ways. It is liberal in the sense that it will expand trade. It is conservative in the sense that it will help us to preserve and strengthen the free enterprise system around the world.

We must move ahead: not as Democrats or Republicans, but as Americans.

We must work to build a businesslike understanding among free people, joined in a mutual striving for prosperity and peace—combining, to the fullest extent possible, the talents and energies of every nation that loves freedom and hates the atheistic Communist ideology that is dedicated to its destruction.

How shall we do this? This is the only real question; for do it we must.

The Congress will, I hope, enact a program that will permit an orderly progression toward wider trade contracts. I stress the word "orderly" for it is this concept of an orderly movement to expand trade that we must keep uppermost in mind.

Let me explain what I mean by orderly expansion.

While increasing our trade with the nations of the free world, we must at the same time see to it that our domestic economy is strong and that we permit it to continue to grow and prosper by reserving the condition for it to do so. Here at home, we must avoid having trade policy decisions bring about the unnecessary disruption of men and industries.

The President, as well as the Congress, is not unmindful of the importance of assuring an orderly expansion of trade among nations of the free world. I support the general objectives which the President outlined in his trade message, although I am certain that changes will and should be made in certain parts of the trade bill which he has recommended to the Congress.

Above all, the President left out one big and important point that affects the fundamental workings of our Government.

Since the war, the structure of our Government has changed drastically. The balance

of powers within our Government is very different. It will never be the same again. The Congress, once the nerve center of initiative, has taken a distinct secondary role. For generations, Congress was in the front seat driving carefully at 35 miles an hour. Now, Congress is in the backseat and the President is navigating at thousands of miles per second, just to keep up in this age of space and astronautics.

The field of trade is one of the best examples. The Congress under the Constitution has the responsibility for trade matters. According to the Constitution, this power belongs to Congress and Congress alone. But this too is part of the past—gone the way of buggy whips, outdoor plumbing, and mustache cups.

Today, under the Trade Agreements Act—the so-called reciprocal trade program—the President negotiates trade agreements with foreign governments, which amounts, in fact, to the levying of tariffs. This act expires on June 30, 1962. In requesting an extension in the form of sweeping new tariff-cutting powers, the President did not make as much as a single mention of the role of the Congress in this vital area.

CONGRESSIONAL TRADE VETO

I have advanced a proposal to bring the Congress back into this picture. I recommended granting to the Congress—by a two-thirds vote—veto authority to disapprove major trade agreements negotiated by the executive branch.

Article 1, section 8, of the Constitution clearly assigns the Congress authority to "lay duties, imposts, and excises" and to "regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States." My proposal seeks to restore a portion of this authority to the Congress, recognizing that in the fast-moving world in which we live, the day-to-day implementation of trade policy must be under the control of the President.

This is how my proposal would work: When the President had negotiated a new trade agreement or a modification of an old one, he would send it up to the Congress. It would be referred to the Ways and Means Committee in the House and the Finance Committee in the Senate. The agreement would be before Congress for 60 days, at the end of which time it would go into effect as negotiated by the President unless both bodies of the Congress voted to disapprove it by a two-thirds vote.

If the relevant committee did not report out a resolution of disapproval but a Member of either body wanted to reject a given agreement, after 10 days the Member could move to discharge the committee. Discharging a committee requires a simple majority vote. If a resolution of disapproval passed both bodies, which would only be possible under quite extreme circumstances, the agreement would go back to the White House disapproved.

When you consider that the recent agreement with the Common Market took 16 months to negotiate, giving the Congress 60 days to think it over is not unreasonable.

It is my opinion that granting such a trade veto power to the Congress would have the additional advantage of helping to win the kind of broad congressional support necessary to take the giant step that we must take to strengthen and secure America's trade relations with the Common Market and with all of the nations of the free world.

In this continuing process of breaking down our own trade barriers, we must, of course, make certain that we get our money's worth. We must not trade horses for rabbits.

It is worthwhile to keep in mind that after World War II, when Europe was rebuilding, we went along with certain rather restrictive tariff rates and trade practices which have no justification under present conditions. For example, while we have always admitted large quantities of low-wage goods from countries such as Hong Kong and Japan, we have condoned the virtual exclusion of these goods from European markets. While we poured billions in foreign aid into war-ravaged areas and more recently into underdeveloped countries to bolster their economics and their standards of living, we have received relatively little help in this undertaking from some of our now prosperous allies. These factors are not given much notice in the various Executive messages touting the importance of the President's new trade bill.

Our Nation has long been at the forefront of the battle for expanded trade. In trade negotiations, when circumstances seemed to demand it, we have given miles to get inches. But the tables are turned. Europe is strong and prospering, a fact in which all Americans can take considerable pride. Now, Europe and the Common Market have an obligation to us. They must join in promoting and expanding trade. They must also put their shoulders to the task of rebuilding the less fortunate nations who want and deserve our support.

The growing strength of the Common Market is too often cited as the major and only reason for the President's new trade proposals. There is also good reason for insisting that our prosperous allies pay a fuller share of the aid programs, absorb a larger part of the world's exports, and do away with certain remaining preferential tariffs and quotas.

Reserving a veto power to the Congress appears to me necessary not only to conform to constitutional requirements, but to make sure that American industry and employees get a square deal. I am strongly in favor of breaking down artificial trade barriers. However, I would prefer to see more stress placed on flexibility than on the power of the President to make concessions. Trade is a two-way street. We are not going to get much from our trading partners if they think the only direction we intend to go is down.

POWERS OF THE PRESIDENT AND THE CONGRESS

This is not an isolated example of an area in which the President has attempted to assume powers formerly lodged in the Congress. Back-door spending—a banker's nightmare—is now a routine governmental practice. The President gets funds directly from the Treasury to spend as he wants, circumventing the time-honored, deep-voiced solons of Capitol Hill.

The President's annual budget message and his Economic Report are today major engines of initiative. The President acts. The Congress reacts.

The Reorganization Act, the means by which the President can rearrange the agencies of Government, is another example. The President submits a plan. The Congress can merely approve or disapprove. The iniative is his alone. The President, for instance, has used machinery to set up a new Department of Urban Affairs.

In this complex world in which we live, Executive action is being relied upon more and more. I do not question that there is justification for the Executive being given certain new powers to cope with the complex conditions of the postwar world. But I am concerned about the recurrent insistence on the part of the present administration that more authority be taken from the Congress and given to the President. If this trend is allowed to continue unchecked, I fear that the question, "Where do we go from here," will receive a less favorable reply. We cannot afford to permit our machinery of Government to become too centralized in terms of giving new and broader powers to the President.

The year 1962 has seen a new raft of proposals for more Presidential and less congressional initiative. The President now wants the power to lower taxes and to have a shelf of public-works projects to start when he thinks the economy is on the "bum."

Now you are bankers. Think about this. The President wants the power to lower taxes. Tell me, who in this whole wide country of ours is really against lowering taxes? Let the President send a bill to the Congress telling us how he wants to cut taxes; it would pass quicker than a bill to give lollipops to orphans.

He doesn't want the power to raise taxes. I wonder why?

I have made it clear that I am willing to accept a certain part of this trend away from the Congress and to the President, but I do not for a minute go along on his request for the power unilaterally to lower taxes. Nor can I readily accept his request for wide, new authority over tariffs unless it is coupled with congressional oversight to assure that the President administers our trade laws in the way in which the Congress intended.

Perhaps what we most need to do to govern our Nation effectively in the space age is modernize and strengthen the Congress, rather than to weaken it. We must make the Congress more responsive and more efficient. For example, it has been suggested that we could have longer sessions to meet today's challenges, with only a short summer recess. Similarly, we could set aside a special session for appropriations, obtain more and better staff people to serve our committees, get rid of the filibuster (the greatest evil in the legislative process), and make it easier to bring bills to the floor and act upon them with dispatch. I would endorse such moves. These and similar steps would help redress the growing imbalance between the executive and legislative branches of our Government.

This relationship between the President and the Congress cuts across many issues which are essential to our Nation's future. I hope that we will not make the mistake of permitting the Congress to become a vestigial, honorary branch of government—a parlor for thoughtful seers—a French Parliament or a House of Lords.

THE STRENGTH OF OUR ECONOMY

As bankers, I hope I have given you some insight into my views on economic issues as well as on the present challenge to the structure of our Government which I believe will greatly affect our Nation's future. Trade and taxes, both of which I have discussed, are economic issues of great moment in the Congress.

Let me add to these comments a few of my predictions as to the course of our economy in the months ahead.

Despite the President's insistence, I do not think his fiscal 1963 budget will balance. If it is not balanced, this will, of course, mean a speedup of inflation.

One of the best indicators of the condition of the price level, believe it if you like, is the price of mink pelts. Many observers claim that fur prices are an accurate barometer of overall price movement. This winter, prices on mink pelts are running 7½ to 10 percent ahead of last year. A bad omen.

If any of you gentleman are planning to buy minks for your ladies, you had best reconsider. You can tell them KEN KEATING suggested that out of a patriotic service to our national economy, you should hold off. Fight mink. Fight inflation. This isn't going to make me popular with the ladies or the furriers, but it ought to nail down a great big slice of you gentlemen.

Prices, in recent weeks, have shown signs of deterioration in a number of other key industries. With our economy moving ahead in the thrust of a recovery, I reiterate that I am very much concerned about inflation in 1962.

On the international scene, our balance of pyaments position has gotten much worse.

In the fourth quarter of 1961, we hit a sky-high rate of $5 billion outflow per year. This could become a grave problem, especially with inflation, if it continues into 1962.

These, I believe, are the two most important potential trouble spots. With the exception of inflationary pressures and an acceleration of our imbalance of international payments, I think we are in for good times. Our economy should continue upward, hopefully carrying with it a decline in present high unemployment rates.

So here I am. I have revealed my innermost prognostications. Next year, at your midwinter meeting, you may want to invite me to dinner. I hope I won't have to eat my words. But if I am wrong, you can serve me deflationary stew with a side order of balanced budget; and, for dessert, a small slice of recession pie, topped with a scoop of whipped predictions.

Federal Assistance to Indiana Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I was notified today by the Commissioner of Education that the application of the Pipe Creek Township School District of Miami County, Ind., for assistance under Public Law 874 has been approved for the current operating year. This year's grant is the largest yet received under this program in my district and it is in the amount of $345,087.

With this grant the total Federal funds contributed to the construction and the operation of schools in this single school district pass the $2 million mark. The school district began participation in the program in 1956.

This year, the total operational budget of the school district is $850,000. The Federal contribution, then, amounts to 40.6 percent of the total operating budget of the school district. The Federal contribution to the district under the Public Law 815 program has totaled $1,227,024 for the construction of new facilities.

The reason for Federal contributions to this school district is the heavy concentration of dependent children of personnel assigned to the Bunker Hill Air Force Base. Public Law 824, of course, is a Federal contribution to the school system to pay, in some manner, for the cost of services to dependents and the loss of revenue represented by the Federal installation on which tax is not paid.

I have had occasion to discuss the program with the administrative executives of the district. My main concern was whether or not there was any Federal control over the school district. I was told and told rather emphatically that there had never been any direct or implied control over the local school administration, personnel or curriculum. In other words, this is an example of Federal aid to education which represents more than 40 percent of the total operating budget of the school district that has been proven to be 100-percent control free.

After hearing so much about the inevitable Federal control following Federal financial assistance in previous discussions here in this Chamber, I investigated the program to see what measures had been introduced between the Federal Government and the local school authorities to protect them from the Federal domination. To my surprise, I find that there is no intermediary body. The money actually passes from the Federal Treasury to the local school authorities. This is not like the Federal assistance programs which have been proposed by this administration where the funds would be channeled through the State instruction agencies to place a State barrier between the Federal Treasury and the local school system.

The success of this aid to federally impacted areas certainly proves that Federal aid to education can be a reality without Federal control. The local autonomy is important and the administration of Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 prove without question that this autonomy can be maintained regardless of the source of operating funds. When the question of Federal aid to education is raised again, I hope those who oppose the legislation will use more valid arguments in their opposition. Certainly the old bugaboo of Federal control inevitably following Federal aid to education has long ceased to be a practical point of opposition.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. LeRoy McWilliams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, it has been my happy privilege to have spent all the years of my life in Jersey City, N.J., and to become acquainted with many of the great and distinguished people of our city. Such a man is Msgr. LeRoy McWilliams, priest, prelate, author, civic leader, educator, and chaplain, and beloved pastor of St. Michael's in Jersey City, N.J. The monsignor recently took leave from St. Michael's and is now pastor of Our Lady Queen of Peace in North Arlington, N.J. I received a letter recently from a constituent, Edward F. X. Clennan, in which he paid tribute to Msgr. LeRoy E. McWilliams, and I ask unanimous consent to extend this tribute in the Appendix of the RECORD:

RT. REV. MSGR. LEROY E. MCWILLIAMS

Among those present to bid him fond farewell in an informal manner as he journeyed to his new assignment at Our Lady Queen of Peace, North Arlington, N.J., were his devoted curates, John A. Kelly, Raymond P. Waldron, Hugh Fitzgerald, together with his beloved brother James, the Sisters of Charity, and a host of friends and parishioners, and schoolchildren. The Honorable John V. Kenny, former mayor of Jersey City, flew up from Florida to pay a special visit and tribute to his departing friend.

A long time and a changed civilization has elapsed since the newly ordained priest arrived in Jersey City, December 27, 1918. He traveled from his home in Paterson, N.J. to St. Michael's, along the same route which carried the body of Abraham Lincoln westward and the poems of Joyce Kilmer to the trenches of France—the old Erie Railroad.

The young curate was to learn that St. Michael's was the Antioch of Jersey City. The first American flag to wave in a sanctuary of a shrine in Europe was hung in the Basilica of Our Lady of Lourdes, France as a gift from a parishioner of St. Michael's, Mr. Thomas Hendwood, in 1874. Five great parishes in Jersey City stemmed from the labors of priests who served the downtown church. They are: St. Lucy's, Holy Rosary, All Saints, St. Aloysius, and St. Aedans.

As the monsignor looked over the register of the parish for the last time he thought of the 51 fellow men of God who served the parish. Among them were great churchmen: Most Rev. Thomas L. McLaughlin, bishop of Paterson, Most Rev. William A. Griffin, D.D., Bishop of Trenton, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Januarius DeConcilio, D.D., scholar and author of the Baltimore Catechism, Vicar Gen. John J. Sheppard founder of the New Jersey's Boystown and first priest to be elevated to Domestic Prelate by Saint Pope Pius X, and Rev. Michael P. Corcoran, builder of St. Michael's High School.

The departing prelate noted also that 52 priests and over 100 young women received their religious vocations from St. Michael's. He recalls having read somewhere that "a priest is all things to all men in the sight of God. He may be misquoted, mistaken, and misunderstood, but he'll always forgive. He is a mediator; a peacemaker; a go between heaven and earth."

It seems only yesterday that the first principal of St. Michael's High School shared the same platform with such molders of Catholic thought as: Father James A. Gillis, editor of "The Catholic World," The Most Rev. Bishop Fulton J. Sheen, LL.D, author, Rev. Daniel A. Lord, S.J., and Rev. Edward Lodge Curran, Ph. D. one of the earliest authorities on communionism in America.

The committees he served on as a civic leader and the duties he performed reads like an almanac: OPA Ration Board, Community Chest, Citizens' Advisory Committee, American Red Cross, American Cancer Society, Public Health Nursing Committee, chaplain of Catholic War Veterans, Catholic Daughters of America, Knights of Columbus, Jersey City Fire Department, and the National Catholic Humane Society, which he recently received the blessing of Pope John XXIII for himself and the society upon a recent visit to Rome.

He served also as spiritual director for the St. Rose of Lima Society, the Rosary Society, St. Michael's High School alumni, and was vice moderator of the Mount Carmel Guild, and Hudson County coordinator for the Newark archdiocesan development campaign.

As early as 1938 Monsignor McWilliams declared a no color barrier for students coming into St. Michael's high and grammar schools and St. Francis Hospital School of Nursing. In 1939 he arranged for the first religious Catholic service in the archdiocese of Newark to be broadcast over radio station WAAT from St. Michael's church.

It has been said that the 95-year-old parish is not what it used to be. Yet like the church of Antioch where St. Peter preached, St. Paul was baptized, and the word Christian was used for the first time, Antioch is still a parish.

So too will St. Michael's remain. It remains because the "Parish Priest," Father McWilliams has preserved it for generations to come. He has made it "truly a House of God."

The pure Italian marble, the multiple colored mosaic stained glass windows from Germany, the Way of the Cross retouched with Spanish realism, the shrines to the Mother of God, the Via Martis from Belgium, peeling chimes from Pennsylvania, the simple chant from the great organ, the paintings, murals, hanging Madonnas, and the Sermon on the Mount beckoning from the great vaulted nave, uplift man's spirit to his Maker.

The people of St. Michael's have entrusted to Monsignor McWilliams the ways and means to preserve its radiant beauty. The fifth shepherd of the flock of the archangel has not failed them. He departed with the words of St. Paul lingering in his mind, "a workman need not be ashamed * * * he rightly handled the word of truth."

The Big Swap: Did We Get Short End?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

THE BIG SWAP: DID WE GET SHORT END?

(By Victor Riesel)

It is time that as much of the truth as is possible be told about Col. Rudolf Ivanovich Abel. It is only known to a handful of men—but we exchanged the Soviet's top electronic-missile-outer space rocket spy for an aerial photographer.

This is no reflection on Francis Gary Powers. He is a daring pilot.

But Abel is a skilled engineer a physicist and probably the coordinator of electronic-industrial spy rings still operating across the Western World.

Furthermore, it is absolutely not true that the Russians never claimed him as their own. They did. Sometime after the FBI arrested Abel—code name "Mark"—two members of the Soviet Embassy's secretariat approached the Justice Department. They wanted to see Abel. This was the first and last time the Soviets ever acted in behalf of an apprehended spy.

However, it was the opinion of the then Assistant Attorney General, William F. Tompkins—who brilliantly and successfully prosecuted Abel—that the contact should not be permitted.

The two Russian diplomats then were told to go through channels—the State Department. They returned to the Embassy. They shortwaved for instructions. They never returned.

But I give it to you as fact that the Soviet Central Committee itself wanted Abel back. It began offering Powers in exchange. I reported this as early as July 31, 1961.

There is further evidence that the spies operating out of the Soviet's U.N. Embassy and the one in Washington coordinated their activities through Abel. There is the case of Sergeant R.

I do not give you his full name for he has suffered since he worked in our Embassy in Moscow. The Soviets framed him with a woman. When he was shifted back to Washington the sergeant, unbeknown to our counterintelligence, was being blackmailed into working for the Russians. He was given special instruction on how secretly to contact the Embassy of the U.S.S.R.

His orders were to clip three stories from a certain New York City newspaper. Each story had to be critical of the Embassy, or the Russians, or Communist economy, etc. Then the sergeant was to mark each with a big red crayoned question mark. On the same day of the week, for 3 successive weeks, he was to mail one of the newspaper clips to the Soviet Embassy in Washington, D.C. On the same day of the fourth week, he was to be standing in front of a theater.

Then, one of Mark's men would make the contact and pick up whatever information the sergeant had. Mark, or Abel's interest in the sergeant was a relative who had worked at an atomic energy plant. But the sergeant never did send in those clips. So Abel went after him.

Furthermore, there were other more vital national and international spy rings devoted to the wizardry of modern electronics. There are thousands of U.S. plants to discover and cover. Each has some gadget the Soviets want.

Abel, whose right name not even the CIA knows, nor does it know his rank, busied himself with other dupes and drops. He even outranked U.N. and Washington Soviet Embassy officials.

Without Abel the Soviets had difficulty keeping their electronic-industrial-military spy rings coordinated. One of these rings, for example, is about to be smashed in England. Abel was the inner wheel which kept the rings moving.

For this and one other reason, they wanted him returned.

Many Italo-Americans Have Brought Honor, Glory to United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Anthony Cama, of Lynn, Mass., in my congressional district:

MANY ITALO-AMERICANS HAVE BROUGHT HONOR, GLORY TO UNITED STATES

(By Anthony Cama)

As a struggling writer and poet, I am sensitive to the cultural and esthetic beauties of any great race—the Italian, for one. As a teacher, I know full well the value of constant, patient, incessant repetition upon the mind of one person, a classroom, a great national majority fragment, as a large piece of our own American reading public.

It is, therefore, my obligation, as a teacher, above all, to speak out in defense of the Italian names, of the warmhearted, hardworking, honest Italian men and women who have entered into this great, wonderful land of ours to help to make it a better land of freedom and human dignity, a greater spiritual haven for the millions of hungry, oppressed people who build long ladders from their rungs of faith and hope, strong, proud, enduring ladders which reach for the democratic stars. They have pulsing veins which love every red stripe in that Spangled Banner of ours. They have clean, hard work and dreams, which uplift their eager faces upon each white stripe of a symbolic standard that burns, torchlike and irresistible, everywhere it waves over the nations of suffering and pain.

DUTY

And so it is my duty to speak out against the article by Drew Pearson which appeared in the Item on Friday, February 9, 1962. I am sure that if a list were compiled of all the men and women who went the wrong way in life, we would find more than just Italian, Sicilian, maffia, Mano Nera, and so on. I want to fulfill my sacred duty as a teacher and try to present a few of the Italian names which have brought honor and pride not only to America but to the land of their ancestors.

To you in the America of the adult audience of movies, TV, magazines, and newspapers; to you, reaching, stretching generations of American youth, I want to present these Italian names. If American democratic law and justice have branded some Italian names with the stigma of infamy, if the ears and eyes have heard and seen things which revolted and frightened, let now the very same law and justice and the very same senses of hearing and seeing give due honor and respect to these Italian names. They are Italian in name but irrefutably and irrevocably as American as any other honor able native of this inspiring Nation.

SCIENTIST

Within the pages of the Lynn Sunday Post, where only a few months ago the centennial story of that Unification of Italy was published in honor of Italy and the Italians who contributed to the glory of these United States, this writer is proud to present:

Enrico Fermi, the leading Italian scientist in America, winner of the Nobel prize for physics in 1938. A member of the general advisory committee of scientists for the Atomic Energy Commission. In 1946 he was one of the five top scientists receiving the Medal of Merit, the highest award which the Government can bestow upon a civilian. In 1948 he was made honorary chancellor of Union College in Schenectady, N.Y.

Eugene Carusi, one of the founders of the University of Law in Washington, D.C. Salvatore Cotillo, Supreme Court judge in New York; Justice Capotosto of Providence, R.I.; C. Thomas Schettino, lay judge of New Jersey; Justice Mustmanno of Pennsylvania.

Michael V. DiSalle, erstwhile Director of the Office of Price Stabilization and former mayor of Toledo, Ohio.

John J. Muccio of Providence, R.I., American Ambassador to Korea.

FIRST SENATOR

Head of a State government: JOHN O. PASTORE, Governor of Rhode Island in 1945 and also the first Italian-American to serve as a U.S. Senator.

State cabinet members: Andrew J. Sordoni, secretary of commerce of Pennsylvania; Edward Corsi, commissioner of labor in New York State; John J. DelMonte, commissioner of the Massachusetts department of labor and industries; Frank Annunzio, director of the Ilinois department of labor; Joseph F. DiDomenico, commissioner of the Maryland department of labor and industry; Leo Sarella, commissioner of the Alaska Department of Mines.

The giant of the West and founder of the Bank of Italy in California, which now, under the name Bank of America, has become the largest banking institution in the world is Amedeo P. Giannini. John King of Beretta was the founder of a bank in Laredo, Tex.

Joseph DiGregorio, who owned and developed 40,000 acres of fruitland from California to Florida.

For patriotism, courage, and devotion to their country in World War I, Italian-Americans won 83 Distinguished Service Crosses. Private Valente was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor.

MEDALS OF HONOR

During World War II the first enlisted Marine to receive the Congressional Medal of Honor was Gunnery Sgt. John Basilone of Raritan, N.J. Another was Cpl. Anthony Peter Damato of Shenandoah, Pa.

Medals of Honor in the Army (World War II) were won by 1st Lt. W. C. Bianchi of Minnesota; Maj. Ralph Cheli of Bethlehem, Pa.; Pfc. Frank J. Petrarca of Cleveland, Ohio, S. Sgt. Arthur DeFranzo of Saugus, Pfc. Gino J. Meli of Peckville, Pa.; T. Sgt. Peter J. Dalesandro of Watervliet, N.Y.; Pvt. Mike Colalillo of Duluth, Minn.; Sgt. Vito R. Bertoldi of Decatur, Ill., 2d Lt. Robert M. Viale of Ukiak, Calif.; and Pvt. Joseph Cicchetti of Wanesburg, Ohio.

Recipients of Navy Crosses in World War II were 10 Italian-Americans, of whom the two outstanding are Ensign R. Mazza of Petaluma, Calif., and Lt. Herman J. Rossi, Jr., of Wallace, Idaho, both awarded a gold star in lieu of a second Navy Cross.

Among high-ranking officers, four of Italian ancestry who held the rank of brigadier general are Daniel Noce of Denver, Colo.; Robert V. Ignico of Boston, Ralph Palladino of Winchester, and Joseph T. Michela of Duluth, Minn., who also served as a U.S. military attaché in Russia.

OTHERS

It is impossible in this space to cover the many other illustrious names, but this writer, in all justice, shall not pass on without mentioning Antonio Meucci, credited with the invention of the telephone; Guglielmo Marconi, the wireless; St. Francis Xavier Cabrini, the foundress of the order of the Missionary Sisters of the Sacred Heart and the first American citizen to be elevated to sainthood, by the Catholic Church.

In conclusion, I would like to say to the readers that I would go forth to help and defend any other race of people against scurrilous and defamatory writings. We mortals should remember the great lesson of the Bible, that he who is without sin should cast the first stone.

So, true as it may be that some Italian-Americans, have committed serious offenses and crimes and true as it may be that every name mentioned in Drew Pearson's column is corect, my intention is to show the public how many fine upstanding citizens of Italian blood struggled and sacrificed to help to make our country a land of hope and fulfillment of man's destiny.

OATH

Above all cultural and racial ties, the Italian-American has proved indisputably that he is first and last "American." What could be more appropriate than to quote a part of the oath taken by candidates in joining the Order of the Sons of Italy:

"I believe in the United States of America and promise to obey, uphold, and defend its Constitution and laws. I believe in government by orderly process and do not believe in any doctrines which tend to unlawfully subvert constituted government and authority."

I Am the American Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I recognize it as a privilege and honor to present for your attention and all the other Members of this great legislative body, the text of an essay read on the occasion of the dedication of the new Federal Post Office Building at Compton, Los Angeles County, Calif., by Master James McKeehan of the outstanding Dominguez High School of Compton, Calif.

This magnificently efficient and much neded post office building facility was dedicated on an occasion during the past congressional recess and I had the privilege of being personally present. I heard this outstanding young lad make the statement which follows, entitled "I Am the American Flag." He did it forthrightly, clearly, positively and with great credit to himself and to his teacher and instructor, Mrs. Beverly O. Booth, of the Dominguez High School, Compton, staff. I know you and all the other Members of this great legislative body join with me in contgratulating this outstanding young lad from my native State of California and of the great 23d Congressional District which I represent this my 16th year.

I AM THE AMERICAN FLAG

Since the time of my birth many stories have been told about me. Now I feel it is my duty to tell you what I am and for what I stand.

Born during the Nation's infancy, I have grown with it, my stars increasing in number as the country has grown in size. The domain over which I wave is now expanded until the sun never sets on my bright colors.

I am not only an emblem showing the authority of the United States, indicating supremacy when flying over land, possession when flying over Government buildings, power when displayed by troops—I mean much more than that. I represent the ideals and traditions, the principles and institutions, the hopes and aspirations which constitute what is to mankind the greatest nation in the world, the American Nation.

Stirring are the stories of my stars and stripes. My 13 red and white stripes recall the history of that long, bitter 8-year struggle in which the Thirteen Colonies fought and stood side by side for freedom, exemplifying the principle that "in union there is strength."

Each of my stars tells the story of a great and sovereign State which has entered the Union.

Filled with significance are my colors of red, white, and blue into which have been woven the courage and strength of Americans.

The red in my stripes proclaims the courage that inspires men to face danger and to do what is right. The strength and courage of American manhood from the conquest of the wilderness by the pioneer through the Revolutionary War, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, and in the Korean conflict has done more than anything else to make the Nation over which I fly the greatest and most wonderful in the world.

My white stripes mark me as the emblem of the land of the free, the country in which the oppressed of the world may enjoy the blessings of equality and liberty.

The blue in my field of stars stands for loyalty. It is the true blue. It tells the story of thousands of men and women who have been loyal to their country through suffering and hardships.

I signify the law of the land.

I stand for the Constitution of the United States.

I represent the Declaration of Independence, the birth certificate of the American Nation.

I stand for peace and goodwill among the nations of the world.

I control the strong, protect the weak, relieve suffering, and do all I can for the betterment of mankind.

I stand for tolerance toward men of all creeds and races.

I reflect the wealth and grandeur of this great land of opportunity.

I tell the story of the achievements and progress of the American people in art and science, culture and literature, inventions and commerce, transportation and industry.

I am the badge of the Nation's greatness and the emblem of its destiny.

I am whatever you make me, nothing more. I am your belief in yourself, your dream of what a people may become. I am fear and song, struggle and hope.

I am no more than what you believe me to be, and I am all you hope that I can be. I am the American flag.

Freedom for Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I joined others of my colleagues in paying tribute to the brave nation of Lithuania, which, though impressed into the Red empire, continues in its fight for self-government and independence. On Friday, the 44th anniversary of Lithuania's modern independence, I was honored to join with the Honorable Richard J. Hughes, Governor of New Jersey, and other distinguished citizens in celebrating this anniversary with the Lithuanian Council of New Jersey.

On that same day, Friday the 16th, Council 29 of the Knights of Lithuania, located in Newark, N.J., assembled and adopted a resolution bearing on the internal control and international recognition of Lithuania. The courage and determination of this never-to-be-crushed nation must serve as an inspiration to all throughout the world who would be "better brave than slave." The resolution follows:

FEBRUARY 18, 1962.

Congressman PETER RODINO,
Washington D.C.:

On this 44th anniversary, February 16, 1962, of Lithuanian independence, we assembled at a meeting on February 18, 1962, at St. Georges Hall, Newark, N.J., and the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas the 16th day of February 1962 marked the 44th anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of the Republic of Lithuania proclaimed on February 16, 1918, after 123 years of Russian occupation; and

"Whereas by the Treaty of Moscow of 1920, Soviet Russia recognized the sovereignty and independence of Lithuania and voluntarily and forever renounced all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and its territory; and

"Whereas the guaranteed liberty of Lithuania was forcibly violated and suppressed by Soviet Russia in 1940, notwithstanding the solemn treaties and agreements of nonaggression; and

"Whereas the U.S. Government on July 23, 1940, condemned such aggression and refused to recognize Soviet occupation of Lithuania; and

"Whereas the Republic of Lithuania, a neutral ever advocating freedom for all peoples, made astounding advancements and progress in all fields of human endeavor during the years in which she enjoyed freedom (1258–1795) and more so in 1918–39; and

"Whereas Lithuania continues in her desire to have and enjoy freedom and constantly reminds the free world, 'there is no peace without freedom, there is no security without self-determination': Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Government of the United States continue to remind the free world of the injustice committed upon Lithuania by Soviet Russia by continuing its policy of not recognizing de jure the ruthless seizure of Lithuania by Soviet Russia; and be it

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, Hon. John F. Kennedy, Vice President Lyndon Johnson, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Adlai Stevenson, Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, and to the Senators and Congressmen, and the press."

MRS. EVA M. TRECIOKAS,
Chairlady.

KAZYS SIPAILA,
Secretary.

A Look at the Future of Our Service Bands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation to provide special pay for members of the U.S. Army, Navy, Marine, and Air Force Bands.

These bands of our Armed Forces must have the highest standards of dignity and musical excellence because they represent our Federal Government and all of our people at diplomatic, military, and civil functions here and abroad and they are always compared with military bands in other nations.

At a time when every detail of life in the United States is under the closest scrutiny and is being compared and weighed with life in the Soviet Union and in other nations it is of great importance that the highest type personnel be retained by our great military bands.

If America is to retain and increase its leadership position among the nations of the free world then it must demonstrate its concern with the lasting values of Western culture and civilization.

The Soviet Union is not the cradle of culture which its spokesmen claim; it did not invent culture and it did not invent science.

The Soviet Union is, nevertheless, concentrating on cultural matters at this time and spending vast sums to export its leading artists and art groups overseas for it knows that the arts speak an international language. The impact of the cultural exports of the Soviet Union on people everywhere is very great and must not be underestimated.

The artists and art groups of the Soviet Union have, indeed, been amazingly successful in our own concert halls and theaters, and they are sponsored by leading Americans.

The cultural exchanges between the Soviet Union and the United States is encouraged by the State Department and by the Congress.

I have conducted the Air Force Band in many concerts in Europe and Asia. I can say from first-hand experience that the contribution which our military bands make to psychological warfare is of the highest importance in our relations with other nations and with the peoples of other countries.

Our great military bands make possible a people-to-people diplomacy which is not only greatly superior to that of other groups here and abroad—but it has been demonstrated that it can be provided at very low cost to our Government.

Our service bands represent the oldest continuous musical and cultural tradition of the United States.

The Marine band was established in 1798 by Vice President Thomas Jefferson.

Among the world-famous composers who have written for our military bands is John Philip Sousa—his music will be played as long as military bands exist.

I include as part of my remarks an article from the School Musician of September 1961 entitled "A Look at the Future of Our Service Bands":

A LOOK AT THE FUTURE OF OUR SERVICE BANDS

(By Phil Fuller)

When one looks at the general picture of professional bands in the United States it is difficult to locate permanent units which compare to their counterparts in the orchestral field. With the possible exception of the Long Beach Municipal Band of Long Beach, Calif., most of the units which are national in reputation such as the Goldman Band of New York, and the Leonard Smith Belle Isle Band of Detroit, are seasonal groups. Even more short-termed are the recording bands such as the Symphonic Band of the Air, the Morton Gould Band, the Jimmy Burke Band, et cetera.

This brings us to the point that in this country the only permanent professional bands are the four major service bands located in Washington, D.C., the United States Army, Navy, Marine, and Air Force Bands. The Marine Band was formed after the Revolution (1798) and has been the official band of the President since that time; the Army Band was formed by order of General Pershing after World War I (1922). It came into being because of the impression that the famous bands of Europe made upon the general and the fact that the United States had no counterpart at that time; the Navy Band became the official band of the Navy in 1925, and the Air Force Band was organized during World War II. Each of these bands was organized as a "prestige" unit, employing professional musicians for their personnel.

These four bands have, in the past, represented the ultimate in dignified ceremonial units as well as artistic achievement. They have been the prestige bands not just of the armed services, but of the entire United States. They have not been just another military band unit, but their professional standards have been a reflection of the ultimate ascendancy of the United States as the No. 1 musical nation of the world. Few who have heard these magnificent bands will deny that they are the equal of any of the famous European bands. They are as much a part of the national culture, as much a reflection of the cultural standards of our people and our Government as is our national wealth a reflection of our technological achievements. As the only permanent bands of professional status in this country, they are also the bands to which thousands of high school bands in this country can look to for their standards of the ultimate in artistic achievement. When these units tour our country and perform for the students and people they should be an inspiration for students and teachers alike.

Since the termination of World War II, however, and the advent of the sputnik era of scientific histrionics this approach to these bands on the part of the Government and the Department of Defense seems to have lessened; and it appears that each successive political administration, in their efforts to prove their financial acumen and satisfy their home constituents that they are very economical with the taxpayers' money, have issued orders of economy which have had either direct or indirect results on the financial status of these units. The present administration has reduced the subsistence pay of the enlisted personnel by $44 per month. The basis for doing so was a law which has been in existence for many years so that even though the action was legally sound, the element of precedence raises a question as to whether or not the spirit of the law is being enforced. At the time of the writing of this article no announcement has been made of an attempt to compensate for the loss of income as a result of this legal action. The administration has also made public announcement of a restriction of Federal employees to their Federal income. This would eliminate the possibility of augmenting their salary through private teaching and other musical part-time jobs which they have done in the community. (This does not include any performances which might be in conflict with union personnel. The service musicians have been meticulously conscientious in observing the agreement with the union on this matter.)

It is doubtful that the loss of $44 per month would, in itself, be sufficient to cause the career professional to leave these bands when they have from 10 to 25 years of service behind them, particularly if there were enough higher rates available to these bands to make it possible for the career man to earn an adequate livelihood. It would take more than this to cause the serious depreciation of morale which now exists in these bands, serious to the point that they are threatened with a mass exodus of the career men who have made these bands the superb units they are. It appears that one of the major factors which has contributed to this morale problem is the seeming tendency on the part of the authorities in the Government and the Defense Department to treat these units as if they were in the same status position as the regular fleet and regimental units of the service, with emphasis upon minor military ceremonies, excessive parades, including "dry runs," and engagements for outside organizations which should not be a part of the duties of these major units.

It appears to this writer that the Government and the defense authorities are following a rather short-sighted policy in this regard, and one which should prompt every person who believes that culture is as important as physical force, to notify their Federal representatives that they object to actions which will have the inevitable results of eliminating the career men from these formerly great bands.

Just a few of the facts which the authorities appear to overlook or ignore are:

1. The men who have been in these bands are men who devoted their life to music as a profession. They were professional men before they ever entered the service, and with the exception of specific military functions which are peculiar to these units, it did not cost the Government any money to educate them to a point of usefulness.

There is not evidence that the same consideration for this professional status is given the musician in the way of rates and incentive pay as is given other professional people in the service.

2. Nobody would deny that these groups should perform at important military, Government, and civic functions. But their performances should be restricted to major functions of this nature and they should be basically musical. There are enough fleet and regimental units in the service so that these top professional units could be restricted in their usage.

3. These professional career men are looked upon with respect both as performers and teachers. As musicians they are an important part of the educational services which are offered the neighboring communities. When they function as private teachers they serve not only the nearby education systems but many students who travel long distances to study from these artists. This enhances the prestige not only of the band but the entire service which they represent, and it would be difficult to prove that these activities interfere in any way with the employment of union personnel.

4. It is important to citizens of this country that they be represented by the best, and when these four major bands represent us at diplomatic, military, government and civic functions they should mirror the highest standards of musical and ceremonial artistry and dignity achieveable in this world. This is even more true today than ever before because every minute detail of U.S. activity is now compared to their counterparts in foreign countries—Russia, in particular. This is one phase of American diplomacy which can be superior at a very low cost to the Government.

It is the opinion of this writer that unless something occurs in the near future to alter the present trends, these bands of which we have been so proud will consist of predominantly short-term enlistees—the same as the other fleet and regimental units; the end result of this will be mediocrity. They can be preserved as prestige professional units, however, if our elected representatives and defense authorities can be persuaded to look upon these units as the prestige units which represent the United States nationally and internationally as a part of our cultural growth and development. In order to accomplish this the working, musical and economic conditions must be such as to encourage a fine professional musician to remain in the service for the full 30 years. These conditions do not seem to exist at this time, and appearances are that they are deteriorating.

Unless the taxpaying citizens who are interested will speak up and request the development of more prestige instead of less and for a change in some of the glaring inequities in the working conditions of these men, these bands will be decimated beyond repair by the inevitable exodus of career personnel.

What Freedom Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Department of New Jersey, have again sponsored an "I Speak for Freedom" contest and for the third straight year a graduate of Camden Catholic High School, Camden, N.J., has been the winner.

It is my privilege to express before the Congress my congratulations to the Veterans of Foreign Wars for sponsoring this desirable and patriotic program and to express as a graduate of Camden Catholic High School my personal congratulations to the winner, Miss Alberta Thiel.

I also desire to express my congratulations to Sister Mary Frances, who had a great deal to do with Miss Thiel's success, to Sister Mary Dorothea, the principal of Camden Catholic High School, and to all the faculty of Camden Catholic.

I wish to insert the winning essay paper by Miss Alberta Thiel at this time in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

(By Alberta Theil, Camden Catholic High School)

What is freedom? Being a teenager, I may not be able to express myself so well as you. My choice of words may not be impressive, but the thoughts they convey are sincere. During the transition from childhood to adolescence, freedom mainly meant more privileges; doing what I wanted to do.

High school, though, brought quite a change. At first I didn't know which course to take. Jokingly, I thanked my lucky stars that this wasn't Russia. After all, who wanted to be a scientist? High school brought many problems which I had to solve. Some of my decisions were of no consequence. Nevertheless they were my decisions. I was guided by my teachers, not influenced by them, in making the right choice. I still recall my first class election. I can't explain my feelings the day I cast my first vote. I was proud, happy, and even a little nervous. I wonder how many students or adults, for that matter, on the other side of the world have had this same experience. These elections and everything else my teachers taught me, have been aimed at helping me grow into that type individual who deserves to live in the United States. They taught me to love my country and to serve it as best I could. I was not taught, though, that I was raised solely for the purpose of serving the state. I have learned much, and now as I prepare to leave school, I'm worried but quite anxious.

I'm worried, just as my friends are. No one speaks of their fears, but we all have them. Now as graduating seniors, we are about to go into the world and carve our destinies. Still safe in school, we formulate our opinions on the world situation or the latest bill passed by Congress, but now we must let our voices be heard. We have a shining example to follow in our leaders of the past. They have defended our rights and privileges at all costs. Can we live up to these standards? Will we hand down to our children a legacy as rich as that which we received from our parents? Will our children be free to speak their minds, and hold their own class elections, or will they be afraid to voice their opinions? Will the papers of the future broadcast news of the free election, or will a name simply appear stating that this is to be the new President? Will our children be free to pray to their God when their souls seek that consolation found only in prayer, or will they be forced to live in an atheistic atmosphere? When the time comes for furthering their education, will they be allowed their choice of a career, or will they be placed in a position designed to further the cause? Khrushchev says that our grandchildren will live under communism. Will this be so? These freedoms that are so much a part of our lives; are they to be sacrificed? Can we, the teenagers of today, stand the pressure? I hope to. I love my country, and no matter what the cost is, I'll defend it. If war were to break out tomorrow, I would render every possible service to my fellow countrymen; and if it were to break out in the future, I would gladly give my sons or daughters.

President Kennedy has said that the youth of today is soft. With all due respect to you, Mr. Kennedy, may I say that you are wrong. It's true we're enjoying ourselves, but deep down inside we are aware of what's going on. We are ready to accept responsibility. In a few years, I shall cast another vote, but this time it won't be for a class president. On the day I cast my second "first vote," I will be aware of my privilege and obligation to perpetuate our great American freedoms, freedoms which were purchased with the blood of our ancestors, freedoms which must be preserved by the deliberate choice of every thinking American.

Denver Catholic Register Reports on Communist Propaganda and the Religious Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, a fine article recently appeared in the Denver Catholic Register on the contrast between treatment being accorded the religious press in this country and the treatment being given Communist propaganda.

I commend this thoughtful article by Robert Ramsey to my colleagues. I believe it will be of special interest to all who are concerned about the survival of the religious newspapers of the country.

An ironical situation has developed over the years concerning two forces that are violently opposed to each other. The situation is this:

While the religious press, upolding as it does the most noble traditions of this Nation, was facing a postal rate increase that, if passed, would force many of the smaller publications out of circulation, Communist newspapers and magazines from abroad were, and are, being circulated throughout the United States free of any postal cost whatsoever.

TO DENY POSTAL SERVICE

This unfortunate injustice is in the process of being corrected. The Honorable GLENN C. CUNNINGHAM of Nebraska, a member of the Post Office Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives, introduced H.R. 9004, which would deny the use of the U.S. postal service for the carriage of Communist political propaganda.

The postal bill recently passed by the House included an amendment that was basically the same as the one introduced by Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It needs only the confirmation of the Senate to become a law.

It is interesting to note the extent and purpose of this Communist propaganda in the United States. As reported in the national edition of the Register, July 9, 1961, "The total known Communist material which came to the United States in 1960 from all sources was 14,170,529 packages compared to 5,973,130 packages in 1959." This was an increase of 137 percent.

The purpose the Reds want this material to achieve in the United States was clearly pointed out by a report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. It said: "Propaganda is part of a global program which ranks as one of the Kremlin's most important instruments of conquest."

Mr. CUNNINGHAM declared that "there are, however, some persons who do not recognize this material as Communist propaganda and are, therefore, influenced by it, especially our young people who are the target of much of this material.

PORT OF NEW ORLEANS

"For instance, the port of New Orleans alone counted 300,000 packages of this material destined for colleges and schools in 1 year alone. Each package contained 5 to 15 separate pamphlets. A great volume of this material goes to young people who are the prime targets of the Communist organizers in every country."

For anyone working on a Catholic newspaper, however, the lies found in Communist magazines are easily recognized. For instance, on the day that a few samples of Red propaganda arrived at the Register from Mr. CUNNINGHAM, there was a story received in our offices that said:

"Czechoslovakia's Communist regime has arrested, tortured, and imprisoned 17 religious, it was reported by the Divine Word News Service." The report added that the religious were tortured and brainwashed over a 7-month period in an effort to force them to sign a confession.

Divine Word fathers, the reported noted, have been reduced from 428 to fewer than 100 since the Communists began their campaign against religious orders more than a decade ago.

Compare the above with these sentences found in an article "On Freedom of Religion" in the magazine Czechoslovak Trade Unions of October 1961, which was included in the material sent by the Congressman.

"Religious conviction may not be an obstacle to anyone in Czechoslovakia or deter him from being active in public life, or from holding important public positions. The Constitution not only proclaims religious freedom, but also safeguards its fulfillment."

PROPOSAL

The proposal to ban Communist propaganda from the mails has, in some quarters, come under attack. One local daily newspaper urged that the Senate "knock this amendment in the head." It pointed out that "Foreign mail is distributed in this country through cooperative agreements which insure delivery of American mail abroad."

It would be a comforting thought to know that the Communists are living up to their agreement with the United States for mutual distribution of material from both countries. But we have reason to believe that the Reds are violating this agreement as they have violated so many other agreements in the past.

Writing in This Week magazine January 12, Dr. Mikhail A. Klocho, who fled Russia in 1961, said:

"To enjoy freedom of the mind it was necessary to leave the Soviet Union. Dr. Klocho told how the magazine Amerika, distributed by the U.S. State Department, is available only to senior Russian officials, and copies are passed from hand to hand many times.

"The Russian people are intensely interested in what is going on abroad. The fact that surreptitious means must often be used to get at the truth is what disgusts thinking people. Intellectuals, especially, suffer from a sense of frustration."

When the cultural exchange came to Denver this past summer and Soviet books were displayed in the city's main library, a native of Ukraine wrote a letter of protest to the Denver Post.

In it he told how the Soviet Government even distorts books of its own nation to fit the ends of Communist indoctrination. How much more careful would the Reds be of something that comes to them from the United States and other free nations?

There can be no doubt that this Communist propaganda in the United States is aimed at destroying this Nation and its people. But as matters stand now American taxpayers are paying for the delivery of this material in the United States.

It can only be hoped, therefore, that the Senate of the United States will confirm the action taken by the House and vote to ban this insidious material from the U.S. mails.

Udall Upper Colorado Transmission Lines Proposal Blasted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Interior Secretary Stewart Udall this afternoon announced a grandious scheme to spend $151½ million of the taxpayers money to build a so-called backbone power transmission system for the upper Colorado River project's electric power generating facilities.

He calls for an irresponsible and unconscionable waste of public funds. His statement, made at the very moment this House debates a measure to increase the public debt limit to the astronomic amount of $300 billion is another evidence of callous disregard by Kennedy administration officials for fiscal sanity.

Private power companies stand ready, willing, and able to build every inch of needed transmission lines for this system at no cost whatever to the Federal taxpayers to wheel power at a reasonable cost, on a fair basis and at the same time pay substantial State and local taxes. Not one cent of Federal funds need be spent to accomplish any objective listed by the Secretary as the reason for Federal construction of these lines.

Therefore there must be other reasons for his proposal. The principal reason, in my opinion, being that Fabian-minded reclamation bureaucrats again have propelled Udall into an egghead shaped orbit calculated to end in the transfer of control of the Upper Colorado Basin States from the local people to power hungry civil servants in Washington.

Coupling the demands for a $151½ million raid on the Federal Treasury with a statement that $27 million in private lines will be incorporated into the system is no more than a cynical and deceptive attempt to perfume a stinking socialistic power grab. Udall is trying to make it seem due consideration to non-Federal construction of the lines has been given. In truth and in fact he has spurned private construction and only tosses out this token bone to private enterprise to confuse the issue and smokescreen the fact that this, like his proposed Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest power intertie, is just another link in the public power chain which Fabian zealots for decades have sought to forge in order to control the Nation's power and exert overwhelming politic-economic influence on all American lives.

It is time this Congress and the American people wake up and start pouring some of the DDT of fiscal sanity on these new species of creeping insects plaguing us and threatening, like termites, to undermine the foundations of our national power.

Against an Urban Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by William S. White, which appeared in the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star of Friday, February 9, 1962:

AGAINST AN URBAN DEPARTMENT

(By William S. White)

President Kennedy's plan to create a new Cabinet-rank Department of Urban Affairs ought to be rejected by Congress for the good of the country—and for the President's own good, if it comes to that.

Mr. Kennedy and Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York, who hopes to be Mr. Kennedy's GOP presidential adversary in 1964, have been playing old-fashioned politics on the issue. The prize is the favor of minority groups and big-city people generally.

This is not against the Constitution nor in violation of tradition. All the same, while fun is fun, there is no sound reason to involve the country in this enterprise.

To set up such a Department and create in the person of Dr. Robert Weaver an 11th member of the Cabinet would be short of a national calamity. But it would have obviously harmful results. The innuendo that opposition is based on the fact that Dr. Weaver is a Negro—and a distinguished one—is unfair. It may apply to a handful of southern extremists. It is not the controlling factor, even to most southerners. Certainly, it is not to the Republican opposition—though it is true that the Republicans asked for the situation in a way by happily needling Mr. Kennedy about "not doing enough for the Negro."

To proclaim as solemn Federal policy that city Americans are different from other Americans would be an act of national disunion when national unity was never more needed.

To declare that city people need a special Government Department to have true representation would be to say baselessly that they don't now have fully adequate representation.

To set up such a Department would be to gather up into one immensely powerful new pressure agency dozens of economic, social, religious, and racial groups which, now operating separately, are already quite powerful enough.

The argument is made that because there long has been a Department of Agriculture

serving country people justice is denied until there is a department serving city people. This is demonstrable nonsense. The Department of Agriculture serves a fundamental all-national interest, production of food and fiber. The Commerce Department serves an all-national interest, American business. The Labor Department serves yet another all-national interest, American labor.

Obviously, Commerce is already more helpful to city than to country people. Obviously, so is Labor. So is Treasury.

Another argument is that the metropolitan centers can no longer solve their own problems. The logical extension of this is that a Federal Urban Department would shortly become the great dumping ground for metropolitan problems. Who in the cities will long suffer the headaches of housing and transportation if these can simply be painlessly handed over to Washington? What happens to municipal responsibility, to local self-government?

Of course, one motive is to reduce the undue power of rural pressure groups in Congress by increasing the power of urban pressure groups in the Cabinet. This is an odd remedy, however, when one considers that the big cities already have at the very heart of the whole thing—the choosing of a President—a wholly disproportionate power both in the nominating and electing processes.

Finally, this reform is, amid our somber world realities, an unnecessarily little thing. What great cold war commander really wants to be remembered as the man who created a Department of Urban Affairs at an hour when national survival is in question? What hot war commander would want to be remembered as the man who improved the quartermaster's system of counting GI underwear?

New Jersey: Medicine Chest of the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, any industry that contributes a $90 million payroll annually would be welcomed by any one of our States. But when an industry contributes that amount of money plus a real public service, it becomes much more important than a simple segment of the local economy. The pharmaceutical industry of New Jersey is such an industry. For because of their costly and constant research into the problems of life and disease, New Jersey drug and medicine manufacturers have in large part been responsible for preserving the lives of 5 million Americans.

On Sunday, the 18th, the Newark Star-Ledger featured a story written by my good friend and very able newsman, Dick Shafer, about this industry that is so vital to all of America, and indeed all of the world. Such a story warrants the attention of citizens throughout our Nation, for it is a story that has affected and will continue to affect them.

NEW JERSEY: MEDICINE CHEST OF THE NATION

(By Richard O. Shafer)

Try to visualize a gigantic medicine chest costing a half-billion dollars and you have a mental picture of the pharmaceutical industry in New Jersey.

In fact, because of its size and scope, New Jersey is known far and wide as "The Medicine Chest of the Nation."

Daily, 18,000 workers enter the gates of New Jersey's 19 pharmaceutical firms and 123 drug-making houses.

Their annual payroll is $90 million.

The firms spend $50 million a year in research for new and better drugs—nearly a quarter of the total amount spent throughout the country.

MIRACLE WEAPONS

They make 15 percent of all the medicine in America.

Their sales around the world amount to $400 million a year.

Some of the most important lifesaving discoveries of the last 20 years have been made in the laboratories of the great research and manufacturing firms in New Jersey.

They include penicillin, streptomycin, cortisone, sulfa drugs, tranquilizers, vitamins, cardiovascular agents and new surgical dressings.

They are among the miracle weapons which in a brief few years have helped add two decades to the average American lifespan.

One by one, yesterday's remedies have met sudden death in the research laboratories scattered around the Garden State.

LONGER LIFESPAN

The industry claims that 7 out of 10 of today's prescriptions could not have been written as recently as 1950 because they had not yet been discovered.

Such agents as antibiotics, the sulfas and vaccines enable people to live longer because people no longer succumb to the infections and epidemics which used to strike in the early and middle years.

With population experts predicting that by 1980 there will be twice as many Americans over 65 than there were in 1950, medical research is being concentrated now on the ailments of the aging—such unsolved mysteries as cancer, heart disease, hardening of the arteries, strokes and mental illness.

RESEARCH COSTLY

It is the tremendous cost of research which is responsible for the cost of a bottle of medicine in the corner drugstore, says the industry.

Of 100,000 pharmaceutical compounds tested in 1958, only 63 entered the market as new prescription drugs.

In the early search for antibiotics, 55 scientists in one New Jersey laboratory screened thousands of samples of soil at a cost of $4 million before finding a potent disease-killing mold in a spadeful of Missouri mud.

New Jersey companies have played a key role at every stage of the development of today's wonder drugs.

HOST OF DRUGS

The sulfa drugs appeared in 1937. In the years that followed came synthetic compounds to combat malaria, antibiotics such as penicillin and streptomycin, cortisone which has relieved the agony and restored thousands of arthritic sufferers to useful living, isoniazid and other drugs for tuberculosis.

They were followed by a host of others—tranquilizers, polio vaccines, an oral drug for diabetes, a remedy for migraine headaches, vitamins, a surgical dressing which merely by application stops massive bleeding.

Statistics show that since 1930 deaths per 100,000 have fallen from 402 to 32 in cases of pneumonia and influenza, from 77 to 7 in cases of tuberculosis, and to only one-thirteenth as many maternal deaths in childbirth.

Another way to grasp the research story, says an industry spokesman, is to visualize it in terms of a vast cemetery—a cemetery that never was. Today, there are 5 million fewer tombstones in the United States than there would have been had the death rate held the line against the march of medicine.

Secretary for Urban Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's oldest newspaper of continuous publication is also one of the major metropolitan journals in the country. The Hartford Courant, widely known as a leader of newspaper opinion, has examined President Kennedy's program to combine existing agencies dealing with urban affairs into one Cabinet office and thus increase effectiveness of such programs through greater coordination.

The Courant has stated the case relating to trends by which cities continue to grow. It has also warned that this growth can be viewed as good or bad, depending on the planning that will be undertaken to meet its needs. This is the purpose of the Department of Urban Affairs, and I feel this editorial constitutes a strong argument in its behalf:

SECRETARY FOR URBAN AFFAIRS

There is little doubt that one of the measures to be proposed by President Kennedy will be the establishment of a Cabinet post for urban affairs. The matter was widely discussed at the last session. But the climate at that time was not considered favorable, particularly when the prospect was good that a Negro would receive the appointment. But the pressures have continued to grow as the interrelations of Federal and municipal governments have increased by the day.

This is rapidly becoming an urban nation. But the political power in most States has been disproportionately in the hands of rural areas. This is true to a degree in Connecticut, but it is even more marked in some of the Southern States. To this picture must be added the fact that there is a kind of automatic opposition by rural representatives to anything that is good for the city.

The result has been that, to arrest urban decay and rebuild cities it has been necessary to bypass State legislatures and deal directly with the Federal Government. Thus, in many cities the traditional Federal-State relationship has been replaced by the new Federal-municipal relationship. The process of urbanization continues, and many States traditionally thought of as rural now have an urban majority. These include Alabama, Georgia, Iowa, Montana, Nebraska, Tennessee, and Virginia.

As this process continues and the suburbs radiate from the central cities they are becoming fused into a new socioeconomic entity. For want of better name we call the result megalopolis. We live in the largest of these, the New York-Connecticut-northeastern New Jersey complex in which 14.8 million people live. One unchallengable prediction made recently by Robert C. Cook, president of the Population Reference Bureau: Metropolitan areas will grow even larger. The trek to the city is worldwide. Whether this will be good or bad depends on planning.

One has to think how close interstate transportation in this area is to complete breakdown to realize the community of interest that exists in the components that make up the megalopolis. For reasons mentioned such problems have not always been dealt with promptly or adequately. The familiar law that nature abhors a vacuum is also true in government. Where a need exists but is not met by existing forms of government, new forms will come into being. This is the now ancient story of the New Deal, the beginning of Federal intrusion into local affairs. It now comes to a natural culmination in a department of the Federal Government that deals directly with local communities. And those rural legislators who have built-in antipathy for the cities can truly say: We asked for it.

Junking the U.N. Is Not the Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, occasionally some people advance the argument that the United States should withdraw from the United Nations, and thereby turn this organization over to the Communists, which is precisely what the Communists have wanted. In answering some of these arguments, the Pella (Iowa) Chronicle recently carried an editorial which I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

JUNKING THE U.N. IS NOT THE ANSWER

In a Voice of the Public letter to the editor in this issue a reader voices some question-packed opinions, these concerning a recent editorial on the need for continued support of the United Nations.

We do not choose to categorize these questions and attempt to answer each one in succession simply because we do not possess the power to predict the future, nor are we militarists or diplomats in strategic positions involving world affairs. We have considered both sides of the story, read some facts and figures, considered their source, then express our own opinion.

With the Soviet Union and some other nations unwilling to support the recent Congo operation, the U.N. finds itself in serious financial trouble. Hoping to keep the world organization on its feet, President Kennedy is asking Congress to approve the purchase of one-half of the proposed $200 million bond issue which would rebuild United Nations finances.

U.N. critics now are actively engaged in promoting the collapse of the United Nations organization and present some strong objections. They call U.N. supporters idealistic, maintaining it would be impossible for all decisions made at the world bargaining table to be in the best interest of the United States. This is a human problem in every legislative body the world over. Nations, like special interest groups in towns and cities, regardless of their noble cause, do not always receive decisions in their favor.

We might ask the U.N. critics if they're not just a little idealistic in assuming there might be some type of world or even allied organization where the United States will be able to advance her interests without obstruction.

The United Nations was organized not as a guarantee for world peace, but as a place where nations could work together to achieve peace and understanding through negotiations. This method was considered far better than the use of guns and bombs to attain the same goals.

Another strong argument against the U.S. holding membership in the United Nations is that through the veto power, the Soviet Union has the Security Council under its control. But this does not apply to the Assembly.

Regardless of our position or voting power in the U.N., the United States is recognized for its democratic power and influence throughout the world. Our main effort in the U.N. should be to get all small nations and so-called neutral nations interested and willing to work for human dignity and the common principles of liberty to which mankind everywhere is entitled. Unless the United States is able to show and convince the peoples of the world that our efforts are for the good, there is no hope.

But before we take the critical stand of pulling out and going it alone, we should remember one encouraging thing * * * there are many nations anxious to work with us, and look to us for leadership. Withdrawing ourselves from them is unthinkable.

As we see it the United Nations must be given a chance to prove itself worthy of worldwide confidence. As citizens of a free and democratic nation we should do everything we can to further our interests in peace and freedom, rather than set out to conjure misgivings about the one organization which holds the greatest hope for peace in the world today.

Your Work for Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the Oil City-Franklin-Clarion (Pa.) Derrick, Thursday, February 15, 1962:

YOUR WORK FOR GOVERNMENT

The average American now puts in considerably more than one-fourth of his working time just to meet Federal, State, and local tax bills.

So great has the tax load become that 2 hours and 19 minutes of each 8-hour day are worked exclusively for taxes, according to statistics compiled by Tax Foundation, Inc. It is far and away the biggest drag on the earnings of the average American.

Compared with the time required to meet tax bills in fiscal 1962, Americans work 1 hour and 23 minutes of an 8-hour day to meet the bills for food and tobacco; 1 hour and 24 minutes for housing and household operations; 33 minutes for clothing and accessories; 21 minutes for medical and dental care; 39 minutes for transportation; 19 minutes for recreation; and 1 hour and 2 minutes for all other purposes.

High as the work-tax ratio now is, the end is not in sight. It will go still higher and considerably more of the proceeds of each 8-hour day will be needed to meet tax bills if proposed expenditures for fiscal 1963 are not slashed. On the Federal level alone an increase of several billion dollars is proposed.

Certainly this steadily increasing tax inroad upon the earning capacity of the individual should cause Americans generally to pause and consider the whole fiscal status of government.

Just 25 years ago our national debt was $18 billion; today, it is $298 billion. Just 25 years ago our national budget was $6 billion; today it is $92.5 billion.

The big question is, How much further can we go before the whole financial roof comes crashing down around our heads?

Let's Win the Race in Liquid Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in the December issue of Navy—the magazine of seapower, there appeared a very thought provoking editorial entitled "Let's Win the Race in Liquid Space" and I commend its reading to all those interested and concerned about the future security of the United States.

The editorial follows:

LET'S WIN THE RACE IN LIQUID SPACE

The latest issue of the authoritative Jane's Fighting Ships reported developments in the Soviet Navy which, although predicted, nevertheless portend a defense problem of great magnitude for the United States.

According to the estimates of Jane's editors, the U.S.S.R. has from 6 to 12 nuclear-powered submarines built or building and 18 conventional submarines capable of firing missiles. While some (temporary) solace may be taken from the fact that the potential enemy, as far as we know, has not yet wedded a ballistic missile of the Polaris type to an atomic submarine, it would be highly imprudent to assume that he will not be able to do this within the next few years.

The growing undersea threat is causing deep concern to Navy planners who fear that the antisubmarine warfare link in our continental defense chain has been given too little national attention and too few dollars to strengthen it. They know that, given our present ASW forces and equipment, an enemy Polaris submarine force would be capable of outflanking our latest early warning system and sneaking past the ballistic missile defenses we are hoping to have by 1966.

When the average American hears about the amazing job the ballistic missile early warning system (BMEWS) is going to do—it will give us a 15-minute notice of an enemy ICBM attack launched from 5,000 miles away—he probably feels that continental defense is in pretty good shape. But, is it—really?

Certainly, when completed, BMEWS will be a good system for detecting ICBM's fired from bases in the Soviet empire. Presumably, those bombers we maintain on a 15-minute ground alert would have time to get into the air. Our immobile long-range missiles, buried in concrete silos underground, would, of course, have to "ride out" the attack as best they could.

But BMEWS will be of no help in detecting missiles launched from close-in submarines. Enemy submarines in the Gulf of Mexico, our unguarded cellar door, would be particularly worrisome. Even when the Midas satellite early warning system is perfected to provide immediate detection of missile firings, our defense is hardly like to have

time to react effectively against rockets fired from submarines lying off our shores.

The United States has under development only one antimissile missile system, the Nike-Zeus. If, and when, Zeus becomes operation, we will have a partial defense against enemy ICBM's. But Zeus will be no miracle missile. Submarine-launched rockets, which have to travel a much shorter distance to their targets than ICBM's, are likely to have landed before Zeus can get off the ground.

Clearly, the coming Soviet Polaris-type capability poses a tremendous threat to our continental defense—to our strategic retaliatory bases on land, our cities and industrial complexes. Are we doing enough about it? Some of the men most directly concerned with meeting of the challenge think not.

Vice Adm. John S. (Jimmy) Tach, Pacific Fleet Antisubmarine Warfare Chief, recently warned that the United States has not "faced up" to the enemy atomic submarine problem, which he called one of the major ones of nuclear-age defense. The admiral said that techniques and equipment for combating conventional submarines are simply not good enough to guarantee detection and tracking of those propelled by nuclear energy. He knows firsthand, from wargame experience, how difficult it is to find and close in on a nuclear submarine which wants to evade detection.

There is one school of thought that believes we should keep to our persent substantial, but far from allout ASW program until we get some real breakthroughs in detection methods. There is no denying that significant technological advances will be necessary if we are to be able to blunt fully the nuclear submarine threat.

But there is also a do-more school and it, happily, appears to be winning converts. Its members say we should: Go full speed ahead on our ASW research and development effort and oceanographic studies; assign atomic submarines as integral units of the special ASW task groups we maintain in the Atlantic and Pacific Fleets; hasten the creation of all-nuclear-powered hunter-killer teams (frigates, destroyers, submarines, and carriers); install more and better fixed or passive surveillance systems in key ocean areas in order to detect movements of significant numbers of enemy undersea craft.

The United States and its allies have many advantages in conducting ASW operations as compared with the Soviet Union. We have more favorable geography. We have control of the seas, including those restricted areas through which enemy submarines would have to pass to reach the wide open oceans; we have an ASW force-in-being, long-range and mobile, capable of being expanded and improved whereas the Russian fleet has only an inshore ASW capability at this time.

It remains for us to exploit our advantages and to counter the developing threat with a concerted national drive. The Navy understands the problem, but static percentage budgets from the close of the Korean war until fiscal 1962 did not provide adequate funds for what was considered a defensive, less than highest priority item. The situation can only become more urgent. The Navy, Defense Department, and White House have an obligation to explain it to the man-on-the-street. Until the public understands the problem, the chances are that an adequate solution will be delayed.

We do not have all the answers to the question of defeating enemy nuclear-powered submarines, either as antishipping weapons or missile carriers. But, fortunately, the Russians do not yet have a significant number of such ships. There is, therefore, time to act. One of the Nation's most successful football coaches, Ben Schwartzwalder of Syracuse, has this sign posted in the locker room before his big games:

"When the going gets tough, the tough get going."

It would make more sense for us, as we contemplate the Soviet missile-submarine threat, to "get going" before the "going gets tough."

Urban Affairs Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the metropolitan areas of the Northeastern United States are intensely interested in the President's proposal to create a new Department of Urban Affairs by grouping those agencies now concerned with the tremendous population in our cities.

This proposal has received wide support, from all sectors of the communities I represent. One of the newspapers published in my district is the Bristol Press, and I introduce the editorial printed in this paper to support the proposal. It refers to the programs now under way to benefit that community and the solutions which, I believe, a Department of Urban Affairs can expedite.

I hope that other members will note well the statement of this editorial that there is a dire need for a Department of Urban Affairs in our Government.

The editorial is attached:

URBAN AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT

Mayor Richard C. Lee, of New Haven, has been signally honored by the Democratic State central committee or, if you prefer, State Chairman John B. Bailey, for his graciousness in stepping down as an aspirant for the U.S. senatorial nomination, once the word was passed that Ribicoff is the pick. He has been named chairman of the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner, a fund-raising event to be staged next month at Hartford.

Yet, in spite of the fact that Mayor Lee has been victorious at the polls four times in succession in his quest to be chief executive of Connecticut's second largest city, he will probably be best remembered as the years roll by not as a politician but as a specialist on urban renewal and redevelopment.

Through his efforts the face of New Haven has been so changed that a casual visitor would hardly recognize the City of Elms.

Which brings us to a point. There is no question that another position is needed in the President's Cabinet. From a domestic angle there is a dire need for a Department of Urban Affairs. It is important enough to rate Cabinet status since it is an undeniable fact that the trend of population is to the urban areas and it constitutes a gigantic problem of planning, redevelopment, and renewal, slum clearance, and transportation systems.

There are only 11 States, we are informed by the experts, which can still be properly classified as rural out of the 50 States in the Union. And the population of each of these 11 States is low in comparison with the media. Population statisticians tell us that by the year 2000 A.D. the urban population in the United States will probably rise from its present 70 percent to 85 percent of the total.

Due to our system of State representation in our several legislatures we find that in many States, Connecticut included, the assemblies are controlled by elected representatives from rural areas, who will do as little as possible to ease the plight of the cities. As a result, the municipal leaders have turned to Washington for assistance in ever-increasing numbers.

There is no better example of this than in our own community. Mayor Walter J. Murphy, Jr., has expended a large portion of his time and energies since being elected chief executive, trying to get for his city all of the Federal assistance and moneys possible for the betterment and modernization of our city. His success in getting approval for some $9 million for urban renewal is spectacular to say the least.

Getting back to the national picture, we believe that it is absolutely necessary to have the efforts to modernize our urban areas coordinated under a Federal bureau. The whole idea is so vast that it will be impossible for the States themselves to finance the projects which must be initiated as the flight to the urban centers continues.

Connecticut, for such a comparatively small State, has been signally honored by the Kennedy administration. We have a Cabinet member and the Democratic National Chairman.

It may be too much to ask of President Kennedy, but it certainly seems reasonable that if a Department of Urban Affairs is established and the President persists in his declaration that he will appoint the best men he can find to administrative posts regardless of political affiliation or party contribution, he could not find a better Secretary for his new Department than Mayor Richard C. Lee, of New Haven.

The Committee Fights Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I present the text of an editorial appearing on Monday, January 8, 1962, in the Richmond News Leader, a newspaper published in the beautiful capital of the State of Virginia.

The fullest, accurate available information about this subject matter is, I believe, timely, pertinent, and should be of value to anyone who desires the truth in the premises.

[From Richmond News Leader, Jan. 8, 1962]

THE COMMITTEE FIGHTS BACK

On May 12–14, 1960, the House Un-American Activities Committee attempted to hold hearings in the San Francisco City Hall on Communist activities in the California area. The hearings were completely disrupted by a riotous mob, composed chiefly of college students demanding that the committee be abolished. Some weeks after the incident, the committee had a 45-minute motion picture film prepared from pictures taken at the time by San Francisco television stations. This film, "Operation Abolition," has been shown widely around the United States; it has itself become an issue of intense controversy.

The film is a shocker. Most Americans never knowingly have seen a real, live Com-

munist in action; few Americans ever have witnessed a full-scale riot. Whatever its inconsequential inaccuracies may have been, the film vividly educates its viewers in the techniques of the Communist apparatus put to work in our own country. Here is the ugly, impassioned face of anarchy—an organized and well-planned attempt to overthrow an agency of the U.S. Government by force and violence.

To Communist sympathizers, and to woolly liberals known as anti-anti-Communists, the film has proved entirely too successful. Last year they embarked upon a concerted effort to discredit "Operation Abolition" as a mass of "distortions." The Nation, the Reporter, the Washington Post, and the National Council of Churches have played significant parts in this effort, and it must be said that in many respects their campaign has achieved its purpose. "Operation Abolition" has been withdrawn by the Pentagon from exhibition to troops, and many persons, only vaguely aware of what the controversy is all about, have come to regard the film as suspect.

Last week the House committee released an 80-page report, "The Truth About the Film 'Operation Abolition'." In our view, this report is an impressive and altogether convincing refutation of the charges made against the film. The committee acknowledges that a few shots in the film are out of sequence, but persons who have seen the film will agree that these flaws are wholly immaterial in terms of the film as a whole.

The committee's report is not entirely defensive. It carries an assault against the National Council of Churches for the NCC's 32-page pamphlet, "Operation Abolition: Some Facts and Some Comments." Persons who have tended to support the NCC may well be shocked by the House Committee's blunt charges of unethical and dishonest practices by a body that poses loftily as spokesman for more than 30 million Protestants. The committee report says:

"The slanting of the National Council of Churches' document is obvious from the manner in which it has been put together. It opens with an almost two-page statement adopted by the NCC on February 22, 1961—a statement which, without any justification whatsoever, makes vicious insinuations against the committee. [The booklet continues with 30 pages of statements and editorials about the film, balanced 16–2 against the film and the House Committee; these are intended to present "some facts on which there seems to be no serious disagreement" and also comments by "responsible" publications and writers.] But some of the 'facts' in the National Council of Churches' report are not facts at all. They are falsehoods or misleading half-truths, and there is sharp disagreement concerning them. There would be nothing unfair or wrong in the NCC pamphlet's lineup against the committee and the film if the statements, editorials, columns, etc., quoted in the brochure, were completely truthful. In fact, however, every single one of these items contains either outright falsehoods, distortions of the truth, or subtle, unfounded insinuations against the committee and the film."

It is apparent, says the committee report, that the NCC's booklet "is anything but an objective or scholarly document." On the contrary, "it is obviously prejudiced and compiled to advance a certain view, while disclaiming any such objective."

The NCC booklet at one point quotes J. Edgar Hoover on certain opposition to the House committee that arose in San Francisco in 1959. Says the NCC: "Mr. Hoover does not indicate that there was any subversive influence involved in this opposition in 1959." But the House committee's report shows that the NCC's compilers lifted Hoover's quotation neatly out of context. Hoover was indeed talking about the party. But the NCC left that sentence out.

The national council says its is booklet that the committee and its chairman, Congressman FRANCIS WALTER, have themselves "admitted that the film contains distortions." Says the committee report: "This, of course, is completely untrue. Neither Mr. WALTER nor any member of the committee staff has admitted distortions in the film."

The committee closes its rebuttal report by asserting once more that the San Francisco riots were deliberately planned and instigated by the Communist Party. Then the report adds this, and we leave it to supporters of the NCC and defenders of the cap and gown to think about:

"But was the party alone responsible? Would it have succeeded in fomenting violence without the help of the false, inflammatory statements of the professors and clergymen who had [publicized charges against the committee in letters to newspapers and through other media]? Perhaps it would have, perhaps not. However, there can be no doubt but that these statements, signed primarily by non-Communists, played a major part in what has been described as the most successful Communist coup in the bay area in 25 years. The party owes a debt of gratitude to the professors and clergymen who helped it on this score."

Proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Uncle Sam for Mayor?" which appeared in the February 10, 1961, edition of the Shelbyville (Ind.) News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNCLE SAM FOR MAYOR?

The President has asked that Congress "speak its will" on his demand for a new Cabinet-rank Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. It is, of course, the duty of Congress to do just that—to say whether or not it favors ultimate federalizing of our cities and cutting the umbilical cords that connect them with the sovereign States of which they are now a part.

Since our Congressmen and Senators are perforce residents of our only Federal city, Washington, D.C.—and which has been the charge of Congress since its founding in 1790—they have a unique opportunity to study Federal municipal management at close range.

They are aware, of course, that no city in the world has been blessed with more opulent buildings and monuments, or so many of them, at public expense. They know, too, that Government being the principal industry, the Federal payroll makes the city economically bombproof. Yet in the face of these peculiar advantages, they will see in official reports, a city of expanding slums, relatively poor schools, rising delinquency, flourishing crime as well as the usual metropolitan ills that include an out-of-hand transportation problem.

And likewise our solons are in a good position to weigh the argument that since farmers, who are a minority, have their Department of Agriculture, city people, now in the majority, should have a Cabinet department, too. The lawmakers, aware of Agriculture's $6 billion a year effort to solve the farm problem, and the fact that it remains, after 30 years, as baffling as ever, may properly despair of benefits to the taxpayer from Federal interference at city hall.

But, most of all, our representatives in Washington should recognize—in what appears on the surface to be merely the merging of two existing Federal agencies, the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Federal Housing Authority—a further grab for centralized power.

Department of Urban Affairs and Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1962

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House will be called upon to consider President Kennedy's Reorganization Plan No. 1 whose purpose is to raise to departmental status the functions of the Housing and Home Finance Agency so that Federal functions relating to urban affairs and housing can have a voice in the Cabinet and be given the proper weight and position in the overall administration of the executive branch. The plan would create a new Department in the executive branch and transfer to it the existing functions of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

I am very much in favor of this plan and early in March 1961 introduced legislation to create a Department of Urban Affairs. I appeared before the Committee on Government Operations urging its favorable consideration of the matter.

A Federal Department of Urban Affairs would create a focal point for urban problems; a clearinghouse for research studies on all phases of urban growth and development; and a service organization to assist State and local governments in the delineation of problems and the formation of methods and techniques for handling overall planning and development as well as specific details.

In the New York Times of January 26, 1962, there appeared an editorial supporting the President's reorganization plan which, in my opinion, should be brought to the attention of every Member of this body. I therefore include the editorial with these remarks:

A NEW DAY FOR CITIES

The needs of a nation rapidly becoming urbanized will be served if President Kennedy succeeds in his effort to create by Executive order a new Cabinet Department for cities.

Mr. Kennedy's proposed reorganization plan will not survive, however, unless the President and the leadership of the Democratic majority in both chambers are ready to make a real fight against a floor vote to kill it. The Republicans deserve the castigation the President gave them for lining up solidly in the Rules Committee against a

measure that will contribute to the welfare of areas in which 70 percent of the country's people now live. But the criticism should apply with equal force to the southern Democrats whose hostility stems primarily from Mr. Kennedy's now openly declared intention to make Dr. Robert C. Weaver, a Negro, the Department's first Secretary.

The responsibility of both parties is to enact legislation in the national interest and not to use every session of Congress as a preparatory ground for the next election. Respect for democracy is not enhanced by the spectacle of Democrats and Republicans coming to Washington after each election with their eyes firmly riveted on the next one, rather than on the country's requirements.

Indian Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 26, 1962

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Purl Willis, of El Cajon, Calif., is well known to many of us as a man who has devoted much of his life to the welfare of Indians and particularly to those who compose the membership of the Mission Indian Federation.

Mr. Willis has been deeply concerned recently because of appropriations to the Indian Bureau amounting to several million dollars to administer its programs in California where, he contends, the Bureau has no responsibility for the Indian population.

Under leave granted, I include with my remarks a letter to the editor of the Washington Star prepared by Mr. Willis in rebuttal to a recent article on Indian affairs in that newspaper:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
February 12, 1962.

EDITOR, THE SUNDAY STAR,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have read with deep interest and concern the article in the Editorial section of the Sunday Star, titled "The Vanishing Race," by Lee Lorick Prina.

In the belief that your columns are open for persons qualified to take issue with the views, and apparent build-up commendation of the expanding policy of the new Commissioner of Indian Affairs, I haev prepared this statement. My criticism is not meant to be personal—my statements ared irected at the bureau system, and not the individual.

The Washington Star, to my own personal knowledge across the years, has a strong and loyal reading public, and justly so. Articles in the editorial columns, carry a special appeal to your readers, and especially when the writer covers our treatment of the American Indian. The subject has not been exhausted. The public, in my belief, is deeply interested in the present plight of the Indian—the feeling is that the Indian has not received a square deal—his inherent and simple sacred rights under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, in this arbitrary wardship status, has brought shame on our Nation.

"THE INDIAN BUREAU SHOULD BE ABOLISHED"

This is the position I take in the discussion of the issues your staff writer presents. Being familiar with the expanding policy of the new Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Mr. Nash and his staff, and the contributing task force foundation-supported writers (and these literary array are well known), Mr. Prina had a full library of material from which tod raw in his very extensive article. It should be answered, because it can be by unanswerable official documented evidence, and this evidence, fully justifies the position I defend in the use of the heading above: "The Indian Bureau Should Be Abolished."

I would recommend changing the subhead, "Federal Aid to Indians Still Growing" to "Federal Aid to the Indian Bureau," because in effect that is the real object for the growing budget. That has been the official verdict of every official investigation committee of Congress during the last 20 or more years. This has been the policy of the Indian Bureau through all administrations. The record up to now has been like this: A man on being confirmed as Commissioner of Indian Affairs, or even when being questioned as to his ideas for improving the relationship between the Government and Indians, invariably has been, that "I believe that we can improve the condition of the Indians, and make it possible to turn them all free—I will work myself out of a job."

Yes, that was the first announcement of Commissioner Emmons when he took office in August 1953. His record in office does not show that he worked to that end. One of the last acts of Secretary of the Interior Seaton and Commissioner Emmons, in a special release dated January 7, 1959, arbitrarily extended the trust period on all Indian lands that were then expiring. This drastic directive closed the door of hope for Indians who urged full title to their restricted lands. That order reemphasized the new policy to not release a tribe from Federal wardship, until sometime in the distant future, and then only at the pleasure of the Secretary (Indian Bureau). This action was intended to completely nullify the policy so clearly set forth in House Concurrent Resolution 108, unanimously approved by Congress after extensive hearings. Resolution 108 was approved before Mr. Emmons took office.

The Indian Bureau, those who really make its policy, have carried on an all-out war against House Concurrent Resolution 108, and have brought into its campaign numerous organized pressure groups and individual foundation-supported writers (Indian leaders charge that was the goal of the task force campaign of 1961) to end in a great swoop on Congress to completely "erase House Concurrent Resolution 108," and thus repudiate that simple, sound decision of Congress to extend to the Indian race, a sacred right so ruthlessly denied him across the century. One needs but to read Resolution 108, to know that it was an honest attempt to redeem our national honor. Just what was the goal of those who planned the task force? To get Indians from all sections of the Indian country to get behind the expanding scheme of the Secretary of the Interior and his chief, Assistant Carver, to make permanent the Indian Bureau as a continuing administrative agency. The architects who built this Bureau spaceship, were called to order by Dr. Sol Tax, an archaeologist at the University of Chicago in June 1961, and whose first words of welcome were, "Termination is dead, because Secretary Udall and, his Assistant Carver have said so very clearly."

HIGH-PRESSURE GROUPS SUPPORTING EXPANDING POLICY OF INDIAN BUREAU INTO A PERMANENT AGENCY IDENTIFIED

During the heated campaign of 1960, Candidate Kennedy commended these Bureau supporters, in these words: "* * * If I am elected, my administration will be vitally interested in the suggestions and recommendations of these citizen groups."

Here are those groups and organizations: (a) National Congress of American Indians, (b) Association on American Indian Affairs, (c) American Friends Service Committee, (d) American Civil Liberties Union, (e) Arrow, Inc.

We would not question the right of these organizations to join those who insist on keeping the authority of the old Indian Bureau in perpetual control of Indian life, even under this definite expanding policy, but we do oppose its methods and the final injury to the Indian race its continuance will bring.

We must be constructive in our opposition to the expanding policy of Indian Commissioner Nash, so clearly depicted in the Prina editorial. We refer to the third paragraph of that story:

"In other words, Mr. Nash said, the Federal Government provides all Government services for Indians living on reservations, such as building highways, running schools, and welfare programs. Other citizens, not descendants of the first Americans, receive these from their localities. In addition, the Federal Government also gives to Indians free medical care and acts as manager for Indian estate land."

Speaking for California, and I know intimately Indian problems throughout the State, I say in measured words, the services and the things, to which you credit Commissioner Nash, being done for the Indians living on reservations, is positively not being done in California. None of the California Indians receive Government aid, welfare, public schools, hospitalization or medical care, sanitation, or housing, etc., and there is not one Indian Bureau policeman in the State. All law enforcement in California, among Indians who reside on their (self-owned) restricted lands or those living as individuals throughout the State, is under State law—California Indians legally have all the rights and are meeting all the responsibilities of full American citizenship. You may ask, How did they do this?

We repeat, all California Indians have all the legal rights and responsibilities of other American citizens. These rights were won in the courts, mostly, and not by local, State, or Federal political efforts. The Mission Indian Federation won a sweeping legal victory in a suit brought against San Diego County in 1953, and on appeal by the county, the decision was unanimously affirmed in the high State appellate court. (See 4th Civil, No. 4821–1953.)

The federation employed no attorneys, legal services were free; the only cost to Indians was some $20 for filing fees. At the request of Indians, the then attorney general (now Governor of California) filed proper motions in support of the Indians' claims for full participation in all welfare and other services guaranteed by law to other citizens (but theretofore denied to Indians). In the motion of State Attorney General Brown, it was shown that under the State constitution, upon being admitted into the Union in 1850, the Congress did not insert the usual provisions reserving to the Federal Government the right to have jurisdiction over Indians of the State. An important decision of the Supreme Court (*United States* v. *McBratney*, 104 U.S. 621) in an identical siutation said:

"Whenever, upon the admission of a State into the Union, Congress has intended to except out of it an Indian reservation, or the sole and exclusive jurisdiction over that reservation, it has done so by express words * * *. The State of Colorado, by its admission into the Union by Congress, upon an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever, without any such exception * * * has acquired criminal jurisdiction. The courts of the United States have, therefore, no jurisdiction to try crimes within that reservation."

The motion of State Attorney General Brown carried these words:

"The language of the McBratney case would seem applicable to the case of the

Mission Indians of California. The State was admitted into the Union 'upon an equal footing with the original States an all respects whatever'" (9 U.S. Stat. L., p. 452).

The motion of the California attorney general supported other contentions of the Indians as follows:

"The Mission Indians do not belong to any tribe recognized as such by the United States. It has not been shown that the Mission Indians have or ever had a tribal government of any sort."

The above quotes from the brief filed in behalf of the Indians who sought the benefits of the county welfare laws, must be accepted. Now, the new Bureau policy is to expand its power and control over California Indians. When this writer appeared before the Special House Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations on February 7, I was shocked to learn that for the California area, where none of the usual relief or welfare services are being extended to our Indians by the Bureau, the budget demands are increased by almost $1 million, the total for the next fiscal year is $5,872,230. The grand total urged for the Bureau for its nationwide program is some $262 million.

In his brief filed in behalf of our Indians in the court action above referred to (p. 17, 4th Civil, Cal. 1953) Governor Brown (then attorney general) said this:

"The Indians of San Diego are completely self-supporting and do not receive any assistance from the U.S. Government as to their housing needs or for their daily subsistence."

Congress is responsible, for it alone, under our Constitution, has the authority to set the policy of handling Indian matters, appropriating funds, and directing how such public funds are used. The time to halt this wild, wasteful expanding program of this Federal agency is now.

This brief background history shows how the Bureau grew up.

The original purpose of the Indian Bureau was to fit the Indian into the commonwealth of citizenship, to help him become a responsible citizen. It was intended as a service rater than as an administrative bureau. It had few executive functions, but gradually acquired such functions under a purpose which became dominating.

As soon as it developed into a full-fledged administrative Bureau, it began to set up functional divisions, competing with local, State and Federal authorities, functions, and sanctions: Indian schools were established, then an Indian land division, Indian forestry, Indian irrigation, Indian extension, Indian health and welfare, and Indian inheritance and other divisions, until the Bureau became a miniature Federal organization—it was on its way.

The original plan was to make the Indian a citizen, the present expanding plan appears to keep the Indian an Indian and make him satisfied with all the limitations of a primitive life under the white man's permanent rule.

This Federal Indian Bureau has grown so in political and financial power, that it openly defies the Congress. Its expanding authority is today so complex that it has completely confused and clouded the original purpose of the temporary Federal agency. Committees of Congress have shown in recent years' investigations that they do not believe the Bureau has an active jurisdiction of the some 400,000 to 500,000 enrolled Indians. But that full control has been its goal. Within the last few days some of us have been able to examine the latest official plan issued by Commissioner Nash under date of December 4, 1961. This newest announcement was the result of a meeting of all superintendents held at Denver on October 16 to 18 to consider the new expanding program over Indian life, and their vast land holdings.

One of the most important exposures of Bureau rule was by Utah's famous Senator King, for some 20 years the chairman of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs. The Senator delivered this extraordinary rebuke to the way the Bureau had been operating on February 8, 1933, just before John Collier became Commissioner on March 19. That speech covered 76 pages, under official Document No. 214. A summary of that famous speech, is probably covered in these striking words of "indictment."

From Speech of Senator King, February 8, 1933: "The Indian Bureau is a petrified, crystallized machine, indifferent to criticism, hostile to reforms, ambitious for authority, demanding increased appropriations and a rapidly expanding personnel" (page 3, Pub. Doc. 214).

Not one word can be added to the above paragraph taken from Senator King's speech. However, another, also famous and revealing, public document (Rept. No. 310, June 11, 1943, 78th Cong., 1st sess.), must be in the hands of any American student of Indian affairs.

This Senate Report No. 310, titled, "Survey of Conditions Among Indians of the United States," remains today, undoubtedly, as the most comprehensive and constructive and accurate report on all phases of our relation with the Indians of our Nation. It was occasioned because of the changed attitude of Commissioner Collier in demanding larger budgets, expanding power in continuing control of Indians and their property. We who knew Mr. Collier and his activities and interests, recall that it was he who had been the Indians' defender; he took an active part in every House or Senate investigation of Indian problems. Collier had a substantial budget, numerous legal advisers, and was truly a thorn to the Bureau.

However, John Collier, the Indian Commissioner, within 1 year after assuming the office, it became evident to those who knew him best, that his policy as Commissioner was not in defense of the rights and interests of Indians, but it was clear to all he wanted increased power of control. His proposed first draft of the original Wheeler-Howard bill, laid before Congress early in 1934, revealed the extent he would go in control of all Indian life. After some 5 weeks of continuing Indian testimony—his former supporters, now openly defying his new scheme—in opposition to his proposed bill, when it was cut to pieces and finally reduced to its present size of some 10 to 12 pages (from its first draft of some 50 pages), Mr. Collier had an open clash with Senators Wheeler, Chairman Elmer Thomas, Dennis Chavez and Henrik Shipstead. They questioned his whole new budget.

Senate Report No. 310, was the verdict of the powerful Senate committee. They denounced his budget, his ability, his sincerity and demanded repeal of the Wheeler-Howard Act, and the "abolishment of the Indian Bureau" and then showed in great detail how this could be done step by step—mostly by transferring to States various services assumed and carried on by the expanding Bureau. No other survey has ever approached Report No. 310 for accuracy and constructive attempt to redeem our Nation's mistakes in allowing the Bureau to set up its own policy—a scheme of almost destroying the fine character of the Indian, in crushing his initiative. These rights were and are far more valuable than his vast lands. We can largely repay him for the loss of his acres, will we restore the freedom he so cherished when he and the buffalo ruled the great West? Congress cannot and it must not fail this challenge. America demands it today.

Respectfully,

THE MISSION INDIAN FEDERATION, INC.,
By PUEL WILLIS, *Counselor*.

The National Origins Quota System Needs Revision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, our immigration laws leave much to be desired despite the efforts to liberalize them. More than a hundred thousand Europeans and others have applications pending for admission into the United States. Many of the applicants live in countries whose quotas are mortgaged for years to come. Recently I received a communication from Mr. Edward J. Ennis, an old friend of mine, chairman of the board of directors of the American Immigration and Citizenship Conference, which indicated that 46 organization participants of the conference passed resolutions for consideration by Congress. One deals with the national origins quota system, which has proven antiquated, unrealistic, and discriminatory; and the second, requests authorization by Congress for financial support to aid the U.S. escapee program and the program for assisting Cuban refugees. During the war, Mr. Ennis, as representative of the U.S. Government, was instrumental in eliminating the stigma of "enemy alien" from deserving Europeans who had demonstrated their loyalty to the American cause. Resolution 1 and Resolution 2 and the list of subscribers follows:

FEBRUARY 15, 1962.

To Members of the U.S. Congress:

We urge the Congress of the United States in its present session to act effectively with respect to the primary issue in the field of U.S. immigration policy—the national origins quota system.

We believe that the principle inherent in the national origins quota system, which was developed immediately following World War I, is incongruous with present-day American political and social philosophy. The system itself is inadequate for meeting the complex contemporary situation and serves to undermine our own interest both nationally and internationally.

We believe in the careful selection of prospective immigrants with due regard to our national concerns in such areas as health, morals, and security, but we also believe that such selection should not reflect discrimination against persons because of places of birth.

We, therefore, urge upon Congress that immigration policy should give adequate recognition to human dignity and worth as well as to our country's humanitarian motivations and her concern for fulfilling her responsibilities at home and abroad.

Respectfully submitted.

American Civil Liberties Union.
American Council for Emigres in the Professions.
American Council for Nationalities Service.
American Federation of Musicians.
American Friends Service Committee.
American Fund for Czechoslovak Refugees.
American Jewish Committee.
American Jewish Congress.
Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.
Brethren Service Commission.
Catholic Relief Services, NCWC.

Church World Service, National Council of Churches of Christ.
Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of Allegheny County.
Committee on Resettlement Services, United Presbyterian Church U.S.A.
Community Church of New York, Social Action Committee.
Council for Christian Social Action of the United Church of Christ
Division of Immigration and Americanization, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.
Governor's Commission on Refugees (Massachusetts).
Hias and Council Migration Service of Philadelphia.
International Institute of Philadelphia.
International Institute of Providence.
International Institute of Toledo.
International Social Service, American Branch.
International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, AFL–CIO.
International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft & Agricultural Implement Workers of America—UAW.
Italian Welfare League.
Iuliu Maniu American Romanian Relief Society.
Japanese American Citizens League.
Jewish Community Relations Council of Greater Philadelphia.
Jewish Counseling and Service Agency.
Jewish Labor Committee.
Jewish War Veterans in the U.S.A.
Methodist Committee for Overseas Relief.
Michigan Committee on Immigration.
National Board YWCA.
National Community Relations Advisory Council.
National Conference of Catholic Charities.
National Council of Jewish Women, Greater Miami section.
National Travelers Aid Association.
New York Association for New Americans.
Polish American Immigration and Relief Committee.
Self-help of Emigres from Central Europe.
Tolstoy Foundation.
Union of American Hebrew Congregations.
United Hias Service.
United Lithuanian Relief.
United Steelworkers of America.

FEBRUARY 15, 1962.

To Members of the U.S. Congress:

The undersigned organizations urge the prompt consideration by the Congress of legislation authorizing financial support of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, a general authorization for the U.S. Escapee Program, and for the program for assisting Cuban refugees. All of these matters are of vital signifiance to the United States in its domestic and international roles.

We regret that legislation which the President has requested to implement these programs failed of passage in the last session of the Congress. For many years the activities of UNHCR, ICEM, and USEP have been considered essential to our national policy. Aid to Cuban refugees is an obvious necessity.

Immediate action by the Congress to provide adequate statutory authorization for these programs is urgent.

Respectfully submitted.

American Civil Liberties Union.
American Council for Emigres in the Professions.
American Council for Nationalities Service.
American Federation of Musicians.
American Friends Service Committee.
American Fund for Czechoslovak Refugees.
American Jewish Committee.
American Jewish Congress.
Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.
Catholic Relief Services, NCWC.
Church World Service, National Council of Churches of Christ.
Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of Allegheny County.
Committee on Resettlement Services, United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.
Community Church of New York, Social Action Committee.
Council for Christian Social Action of the United Church of Christ.
Governor's Commission on Refugees (Massachusetts).
Hias and Council Migration Service of Philadelphia.
International Institute of Philadelphia.
International Institute of Providence.
International Institute of Toledo.
International Social Service, American Branch.
International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, AFL–CIO.
International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft & Agricultural Implement Workers of America—UAW.
Italian Welfare League.
Iuliu Maniu American Romanian Relief Society.
Jewish Community Relations Council of Greater Philadelphia.
Jewish Counseling and Service Agency.
Jewish Labor Committee.
Jewish War Veterans in the U.S.A.
Lutheran Immigration Service.
Methodist Committee for Overseas Relief.
Michigan Committee on Immigration.
National Board YWCA.
National Community Relations Advisory Council.
National Conference of Catholic Charities.
National Council of Jewish Women, Greater Miami Section.
New York Association for New Americans.
Polish American Immigration and Relief Committee.
Self-help of Emigres from Central Europe.
Tolstoy Foundation.
Union of American Hebrew Congregations.
United Hias Service.
United Lithuanian Relief.
U.S. Committee for Refugees.
United Steelworkers of America.

Statement by the AFL–CIO Executive Council on "Department of Urban Affairs and Housing"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the Members of the House will consider President Kennedy's Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, creating a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. Such a department, in my opinion, is absolutely necessary to the orderly and proper development of our communities. The sound growth and development of our cities requires leadership, coordination, and direction which can be furnished best under the able direction of a Cabinet officer as proposed by the plan. I would like to commend to your attention a statement of the AFL–CIO Executive Council adopted February 19, 1962, urging approval of the reorganization plan.

STATEMENT BY THE AFL–CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON "DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND HOUSING"

The creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing in the Federal Government has been advocated by responsible municipal and State officers, as well as by the AFL–CIO, for many years. Last year, the goal seemed close to achievement when administration bills to create the Department were reported in both Houses of the Congress.

Unfortunately, legislation was frustrated this year when the House Rules Committee voted to kill the House bill. Immediately, President Kennedy sent to the Congress Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 which, unless vetoed by either House of Congress, will achieve the same end.

Establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing is long past due. Presently nearly 70 percent of all Americans live in urban areas, and both their numbers and their proportion of the total population are rapidly increasing.

This vast population increase has brought myriad problems to the cities and to the States in which they are located. There is an urgent need to coordinate and enhance the multiplying Federal services which are now and will be available to these communities. To Federal aid for housing, urban renewal, community facilities, airports, highways, hospitals, and schools have recently been added Federal aid for rehabilitation of chronically depressed areas, juvenile delinquency control and health facilities and services. More programs will come as the needs of the communities grow more urgent and their financial plight more acute.

At present, these varied programs are administered by many different agencies in the executive branch. The city or State official who seeks aid under these programs is faced with a bewildering complexity of administrative operations and policies. An important function of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing could be to serve as a clearinghouse for information and services, thus substantially increasing the usefulness, availability and efficiency of Government functions in these areas.

Perhaps most important of all is that the States and their local communities would at last have a voice in the highest levels of Government. There is at present no official representing the views of urban dwellers in the President's Cabinet, and consequently their interest is not adequately represented in the Cabinet or in the various Departments and agencies administering the programs listed above.

A Secretary of Urban Affairs and Housing is needed to serve their needs. The Secretary would speak with the prestige and power necessary to assure reasonable consideration of urban needs in the making of policy and the administration of programs.

For these reasons, we believe the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing should be promptly created. We, therefore, urge the Congress to approve Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962.

Minnesota Farmers Protest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am receiving an increasingly large number of protests from farmers and dairymen in my district pointing to their concern

over the strict controls which would be imposed by the enactment of the new administration farm program.

I join them in their concern, Mr. Speaker, because I want no part of putting shackles on the American farmer by making him subject to a program of drastic measures which would in the long run hurt our agricultural economy rather than help it. As an example of correspondence which I am getting in my office I call to your attention a letter signed by a group of farmers and their wives in Brown County which I will insert in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Hon. ANCHER NELSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. NELSEN: We are alarmed at the new farm program, being prepared by the staff of the USDA which shows how this administration will attempt to solve the farm problem.

We are definitely opposed to solving the surplus problem, which exists in only a few commodities, by rigid Government controls over all of agriculture. Such ideology is disapproved of greatly by us.

These new farm plans sound like dictatorship to us. Either the farmer accepts these Government controls or else! Yes, the plans do speak of referendum. Referendum? Nothing but Hobson's choice.

What is happening to our free enterprise system?

A basic problem today is keeping Government under control. Our Government can be and should be a service agency to its citizens.

Mr. Nelsen, We ask you to make every effort to preserve our free enterprise system and to fight vehemently against the ideologies, as set forth in the new farm plans proposed by the staff of the USDA, under which all farmers would be rigidly controlled, sternly policed, and oppressively penalized.

We, the undersigned, do hereby protest such regimentation.

William Simon, Mr. and Mrs. Nick G. Hengel, Mr. and Mrs. Ambrose Pietig, Mr. and Mrs. Henry Braun, Mr. and Mrs. Leo A. Hoffmann, Mr. and Mrs. Harvey N. Paulson, Sleepy Eye; Mr. and Mrs. Harold Knutson, Cobden; Mr. and Mrs. Philip Lang, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Potter, Mr. and Mrs. Lynn Balbach, Mr. and Mrs. Herman H. Rogatzke, Waldo Erickson, Springfield; Edner Holmen, Arnold Holmen, Comfrey; Donald E. Simonsen, Russell E. Christensen, Sleepy Eye; Chris M. Christensen, Lester Frohrip, Morgan; Stanley Schewe, Clarence Wendt, Otto Best, Elmer Hasselmeyer, Cliff Soukup, R. J. Goettig, Sleepy Eye; Lloyd Havemeier, Comfrey; Mrs. Alfred Nelson, Joseph V. Hirsch, Thomas J. Hirsch, Henery M. Birkemeyer, James Schwartz, Frank Schwartz, Edward Grausam, Mr. and Mrs. Mike Grausam, Mr. and Mrs. Everett Guhlke, Mr. and Mrs. Norbert Sellner, Gerald E. Sellner, Sleepy Eye.

What Freedom Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the contestants to appear at the VFW banquet in Washington, D.C., on February 6 to deliver an address in the annual Voice of Democracy contest was a young man from the district I have the privilege of representing in Congress, Robert R. Hayes, 2027 Davie Street, Davenport, Iowa.

All of these speeches were wonderful and no one could come away from such a symposium of patriotic expressions and not have renewed faith in his country and the young people who will someday be its leaders.

I was especially impressed by the remarks of my constituent, and take pride in asking that they appear in the Appendix of the RECORD for others to read and share. This is what democracy means to Robert R. Hayes, of Davenport, Iowa:

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

Freedom to one person may mean one thing, to someone else something different but to me the meaning of freedom is spelled out in the letters which make up the word itself.

First of all freedom means fabrication. The fabrication of this land into a nation stretching from sea to sea, full of power and prestige. Also the fabrication of this Nation into a leader in the fight for freedom in these dangerous times.

Freedom also means rabbi and reverend and signifies the rights the United States have given to all races and creeds, the rights to worship and to live as they please.

To me freedom means the right for each and every person to be in an "elevator of success," if this is what he wants. The Government in giving this one freedom would never stop this climb until he was in the highest echelon he could reach.

Freedom means education to me, also. A substance desired for everyone regardless of his position on the social ladder or the color of his skin.

Freedom signifies a demonstration. A demonstration, given first in 1776, demonstrating what each nation having the desire and drive could accomplish if it was willing to risk life and limb. This demonstration was given freely at that time, but monarchs and dictators have paid highly for it in the past.

Optimism, the outlook which all Americans have possessed from the beginning of the United States and through the dark hours of our history, has assisted our way of life greatly. This outlook has been the most outstanding of all the characteristics of the American people and has lead to the development of their Nation into a leader in the field of freedom. This is yet another meaning of the word "freedom."

Freedom also stands for the men who have lost their lives, fighting to preserve this word and all it means. These men, as Lincoln stated, "did not die in vain" as long as this one word has a nation like the United States of America in which to dwell.

Possibly another meaning should be attached to the word "freedom," that of a stanch stand against all forms of bondage needed in each generation of the American people to keep within all their reaches the true meaning of freedom.

Whatever our opinions regarding any definition of freedom it is obvious that without it life in the United States would be quite different.

As Alfred Austin stated in, "Is Life Worth Living?"

"So long as faith with freedom reigns,
And loyal hope survives.
And men are free to think and act,
Life is worth living still."

With faith in God and loyalty to our Nation, freedom will continue to make "life worth living still." As long as freedom has a nation like the United States of America in which to dwell.

Peace Strikes Help Reds To Weaken Free Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Evening Tribune of January 30, 1962:

PEACE STRIKES HELP REDS TO WEAKEN FREE NATIONS

"War between communism and capitalism is inevitable. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movements on record. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fist."

So said Dmitry Manuilsky in 1930 in a speech before the Lenin School of Political Warfare.

Every one of the so-called peace movements in the last 30 years have been the product of the international Communist conspiracy.

Remember the enslavement of the Poles, the Czechs, the Hungarians, the Latvians, the Estonians, the Armenians, the Ukrainians, the Cubans, the Chinese, the Koreans.

The Communists use peace, just as they do war, to achieve the conquest of nations. They don't care which one they use, so long as the objective is achieved. Peace strikes are Communist weapons of war.

In the United States, which—because of its military power—the Russians cannot seize through war, the Communist conspirators use peace to try to disarm the Nation. Unless we are prepared for war, we cannot win the so-called cold war.

Under a never-ending series of innocent-sounding names, the various peace movements have been promoted by the Communists to snare the unwary into carrying out the Communist plans for the free world's destruction.

Here are some of the organizations which have been identified as Communist fronts in the United States: The American Committee for Protection of the Foreign-Born, the American Peace Crusade, the American League for Peace and Democracy, American Women for Peace, the Peace Information Center, National Labor Conference for Peace, and others.

Now comes an organization called the New York Committee for the General Strike for Peace. It has not been identified as a Communist front. But among its international sponsors is Bertrand Russell, who created the slogan, "Better Red Than Dead."

Weakness and fear serve the purposes of world communism, whether created by Communist fronts or by persons who merely lack courage in the face of threats. As has been said, "We have no fear of fallout, but we should fear sellout."

The organization proposes a general strike once a month in every free world country to stop every effort that is being made to protect the United States and other freedom-loving nations from the menace of attack from any source.

In San Diego, we are advised that the San Diego Chapter of the Fellowship of Reconciliation is trying to raise money, in cooperation with the organization's national office, to support the peace week program.

They proclaim the purpose of the strike is to dramatize a public demand for the elimination of military solutions to economic, social, and political problems.

Patriotic Americans should beware of the snare.

Patriots want more than peace. They want freedom.

Patriots should denounce any insidious and devious maneuver to disarm the Nation so that, in the words of the Communist Manuilsky, the Communists can smash us with their clenched fists.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

What About Energy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. T. RUTHERFORD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, the Midland Reporter-Telegram, of Midland, Tex., in the heart of the Permian Basin oil field in west Texas, is aware of the importance of the petroleum industry to the United States, and is cognizant of its problems. Recently, under the direction of Mr. James N. Allison, its publisher, this newspaper printed two editorials relating to the problem of the energy industry. I feel that every Member of this body should have the opportunity to read these articles, and I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the first of these editorials from the January 3 edition, entitled "What About Energy?":

The editorial follows:

WHAT ABOUT ENERGY?

Billions of dollars are being spent by the United States for the defense of this great Nation to assure peace. But, what is going to energize this tremendous program?

Without power or energy, what good are nuclear weapons, bombs, aircraft, ships, submarines, trucks, arms and other hardware of war? How are they going to be produced or manufactured? From where will the energy come? What will energize the great industries of our Nation?

Certainly, we cannot depend on foreign sources of energy. Bombers, submarines, warships or atomic weapons can stop quickly the flow of foreign oil. But even without war, we do not have sufficient reserves of energy for the needs of our Nation and its expanding population.

Meanwhile, a great industry, the oil and gas industry, is being allowed to wither. There is no excuse for this. It is time for some serious thinking at the White House and the Defense Department.

The United States, and especially Texas, abound in oil and gas reserves. But these cannot be located quickly and produced by the turn of a few valves. It takes time to drill oil and gas wells. It takes time to make the equipment to drill and produce these wells. It takes time to get oil and gas wells on production, and their products to market.

Is the United States going to wreck an energy industry—the industry which produced the energy for victory in World War II? The big tankers disappeared during World War II. They can disappear again. Some shiek or dictator can stop the flow of foreign oil over oceans to our refineries and industries.

It is time to think of first things first, in peace or war. Our basic problem is energy—fuel for peace or war without dependence on any foreign power.

Probably we are falling into another Red trap.

Many independent oil men are finding it increasingly difficult to stay in business. Reserves are harder to find and costs are rising. These men are not interested in subsidies and neither are the major oil companies. But the major companies and their executives are dedicated to produce the best possible earnings for their stockholders.

The United States must face the fact that its citizens never will return to the standard of living found in foreign nations now flooding the world with oil. But energy must be provided for peace or war.

Meanwhile, our population is increasing. More energy will be required next year, and the next.

We must have sources of energy on which we can depend. Our oil and gas industry certainly has been dependable and must have the right to build up its reserves with fair earnings and without dependence on foreign oil.

Don't "Blackjack" Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Deseret News of Salt Lake City dated February 10, 1962, entitled "Don't 'Blackjack' Farmers."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DON'T "BLACKJACK" FARMERS

An inaccurate picture of the administration's new farm program was given this week in Salt Lake City by James T. Ralph, an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. Ralph, here for a conservation meeting, got off on the right foot when he noted that our economic system permits two types of controls—governmental control or self-control. But then he went astray by claiming the proposed new program would allow farmers "the right of self-determination enjoyed by many other professions and industries."

That sounds nice, but unfortunately it just isn't so.

To be sure, under the program farmers would have the choice of either accepting or rejecting marketing quotas. If they accept those quotas they will be accepting governmental controls rated the most strict in U.S. agricultural history. If, however, they choose not to accept the program they will receive no price supports at all. Moreover, huge quantities of Government-held grains—up to 10 million tons of feed grains and 200 million bushels of wheat—could be dumped on the market, thus depressing prices.

How anyone can call this self-determination is something of a mystery. Instead, it amounts to placing the farmer, figuratively speaking, between the frying pan and the fire.

One reason the administration even dares to advance such an unfair plan in the first place is that farmers are rapidly losing their political influence. That's because there are fewer and fewer of them.

If this trend keeps up, sooner or later Congress may become brave enough to solve the farm problem on a realistic, nonregimented basis, without any alleged fear of reprisal from the farm bloc.

Any such fears already are unwarranted since most farmers want the Government to get out of agriculture, but on a gradual basis instead of yanking the rug out from under them all at once.

It's about time we gave the farmers what they want and need instead of alternately trying to bribe them with their own taxes, then threatening to blackjack them with surpluses created by unsound Government programs.

Urbanized Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the citizens of urban America want the U.S. Congress to approve President Kennedy's proposed Department of Urban Affairs. I also feel that these Americans would benefit from the creation of this Department through better coordination and administration of Federal programs for cities. I would therefore like to insert the following editorial from the January 15, 1962 edition of the St. Paul Pioneer Press:

The article follows:

URBANIZED AMERICANS

Establishment of a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs, as recommended by President Kennedy, will be considered by this session of Congress. The proposal is not put forward with any claim that it will solve all the problems arising out of the increased concentration of population in metropolitan regions.

Rather, it would constitute greater Federal recognition of these problems and permit a more coordinated approach to them. In this respect the proposal is comparable to the action taken in President Eisenhower's administration to set up the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, bringing a number of existing Federal programs under a single administration roof.

Commenting on the Urban Affairs Department plan, the Population Reference Bureau, Washington, says the United States is now second only to the British Isles as the most highly urbanized major nation in the world. When the first U.S. census was taken in 1790, only 5 percent of Americans lived in and around the cities, while 95 percent were rural dwellers. Now more than 70 percent are classified as urban residents.

One result has been development of the modern megalopolis or metropolitan area,

spreading out in unplanned growth patterns around central cities. These conglomerations of population are plagued by problems which multitudes of split-up local governments find it difficult to solve by themselves. State legislatures have been slow to come to their aid. Congress has become the main source of help and has established a variety of Federal programs such as urban renewal, public housing, and freeway networks to help out. An Urban Affairs Department would provide a national clearinghouse for urban problems.

Minnesota has not gone as far along the megalopolis road as some other States, but its population is classed as more than 62 percent urbanized, with the Twin Cities as the main focal center. The District of Columbia is 100 percent urbanized, New Jersey 89 percent, and California nearly 87 percent. All over the world the same trend toward population concentration is in evidence.

Whether or not the United States establishes a new Cabinet department, the growing problems of urbanization must be met. What the future will bring remains to be seen. Robert Cook, head of the Population Bureau, and others believe much more planning and regulation in the public interest will be required. "As urban living becomes more congested," Cook predicts, "the individual's traditional freedom of action will be curtailed. * * * The problems are big enough to challenge the best efforts of Government and private agencies."

Foreign Policy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, for many years I have been impressed with the writing ability of Mr. Constantine Brown and also with his dedication and devotion toward preserving our national freedom against the onslaught of Communist aggression and subversion at home and abroad. In writing from Rome, Italy, Mr. Brown has recently had published in the Evening Star of February 15, 17, and 20 three excellent columns which merit the attention of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SOVIET PROGRAM TO DISARM US—CARTHAGE'S FATE AT ROME'S HANDS CITED AS THE UNITED STATES TALKS OF DISARMAMENT

ROME.—If the Dominican Republic were to go the way of Castro's Cuba; if Laos and Vietnam go the way of China; if Turkey goes the way of Nasser; if Iran goes the way of Iraq; if Katanga goes the way of the Congo; if West Germany adopts coexistence; if Portugal goes the way of the old Dominican Republic; if Italy becomes "neutralist"; if Formosa becomes a United Nations trusteeship; if Latin America becomes embroiled in Communist-inspired revolutions—where will the United States be?

To include a further "if—if the administration's proposals for total disarmament are successful and the Soviets give lipservice to them the answer is that our Nation would not even be a "fortress America."

With all of the above possibilities, our Government is seriously working for a disarmament agreement with Soviet Russia as shown in a recent pamphlet issued by the State Department.

History repeats itself, but the lessons of history apparently do not penetrate. More than 100 years before Christ Rome's Cato repeated again and again, "Carthage must be destroyed." Today, and every day since the end of the war the Kremlin has repeated a thousand times in dozens of way, "America must be destroyed." But like the Carthaginians, we don't take such threats seriously.

The Carthaginians, to show their love of peace, agreed to send 300 sons of their noblest families to Rome for study. But the Romans actually had other ideas than peace. Using psychological warfare, they demanded further proof of good will, and so the Carthaginians surrendered their weapons and machines of war, together with armor for 200,000 soldiers.

When later the Romans demanded that Carthage be removed from the sea to at least 10 miles inland from the Mediterranean, this was too much. The Carthaginians decided to resist. In 146 B.C., under the leadership of Scipio Africanus, the Romans delivered the coup de grace. The great city of Carthage disappeared from all but history.

In September 1959, when Nikita Khrushchev stood before the United Nations and proposed total disarmament, he must have had in mind that phase of history. Although disarmament had been a Soviet line since the atomic bombs were dropped in 1945, this was the first big push of the line. The Red dictator not only demanded "general and complete disarmament," but proposed that "military educational establishments would be closed."

Others of his demands were "the discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests for all time," and "the establishment of an international control body comprised of all states. Military bases on foreign territory to be dismantled; the states would retain only strictly limited contingents of police (militia) agreed for each country."

To the general unsuspecting public, all this seemed ridiculous and preposterous in the light of present history. But the Soviets knew what they were doing. The Kremlin published a small document which, after a short preamble, assembled the points made by the Soviet dictator into three stages.

Perhaps by the fall of 1961 the American public had forgotten all about Mr. Khrushchev's rantings about disarmament—and had certainly not seen the three-stage declaration. When at that time President Kennedy addressed the United Nations with an American proposal for total disarmament, the press made no comparison with the previous Khrushchev proposals.

Today the State Department is distributing a small document "For General and Complete Disarmament." Assembled in three stages, the only feature it adds to its Soviet prototype is the proposal for a "U.N. peace force." By the time stage three is arrived at, it claims, the world will be living under international law.

The State Department's document for disarmament takes no consideration of the insincerity of the Soviets. There is some criticism about Mr. Kennedy not ordering a resumption of atmospheric nuclear tests. The truth is that we are not ready for it. During the Geneva moratorium the Russians worked assiduously preparing for such tests. And when they were ready they surprised the world with their explosions. Throughout this time we had observed scrupulously the terms of the moratorium. And now, even if the President wanted to, we must wait until early summer before we are ready.

It could be said that the parallel with Rome and Carthage is not accurate, since the Carthaginians did not demand reciprocity of disarmament from the Romans. But in view of what has happened to the "Geneva moratorium," can we really believe that the Communists will live up to any "solemn" agreement?

PUZZLING FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES—ROOSEVELT'S LOGIC CITED: TAKE STRENGTH WHERE YOU FIND IT AND DEMAND VICTORY

ROME.—The percentage of U.S. expenditure which goes toward deterring Communist aggression is enormous, encompassing everything from a large standing Defense Establishment to foreign aid and the Voice of America. Yet the policies which go along with this vast expenditure are, to some, downright puzzling.

If a country has a political goal directed against an enemy, the aim would logically be its attainment through victory. Our stupendous expenditures are made against communism. Yet we read from testimony taken by the Stennis subcommittee investigating the so-called muzzling of the military that the words "enemy," "victory," etc., have been deleted from speeches made by military men.

One can gather from snatches of information a possible explanation of our policy. In "CIA, the Inside Story," for instance, one comes across an enlightening passage. The author quotes former CIA Director Allen Dulles:

" 'We support our friends,' he always said. 'Do you suggest that we support our enemies?'

"Dulles' critics did not see things as quite so black and white. They complained that it was not enough for a foreign government or leadership to be inimical to the Kremlin; that government also should be an advocate of the necessary social reforms that would buttress its country against Communist infiltration."

This is the clearest explanation of the U.S. foreign policy your reporter has come across. It explains why he has read in his local American newspaper headlines: "United States May Cut Off Spain Aid Grants," and just below it: "J.F.K. To Discuss Increase in Aid With Congo Leader." It explains U.S. hatred of the former Batista government in Cuba, the Trujillo government in the Dominican Republic, the Syngman Rhee government in South Korea and the Salazar government in Portugal, to name a few.

While the logic of the policy is understandable, there is no logic in continuing policy after it has not only been proven on numerous occasions to be wholly unworkable but outright catastrophic to our defense posture.

In World War II President Roosevelt was not at all squeamish that our partner in the war against the Nazis was Soviet Russia, a dictatorship as bad but far more clever than the enemy's. He took an ally where he could find him. Our policy then was victory, and we had complete victory on the battlefields. But since the end of the war all our administrations have discarded the logical policies of President Roosevelt and turned thumbs down on any ally which does not have the social reforms our leaders believe they should have.

No one can sympathize with the methods of Batista in Cuba, but that island was one of the strongest bastions against our common enemy in that area. Not far away on another island we had another dedicated ally against Communist aggression, the Dominican Republic, a country without national debt, with no unemployment and militarily strong. Yet, because these two governments did not have the social reforms we insist on—did not have our pattern of democracy—we encouraged and assisted new revolutionary governments. Until recently, those two governments were strong guard-

posts of the Caribbean. Today that area is in a precarious way.

In Europe, strongly anti-Communist Spain remains an important base for American air and naval forces. Yet it is no secret that the dictatorship of Franco is anathema to a number of our Government policymakers. It is true, as the newspaper dispatch says, that Spain's economy has risen to stability since we aided the Franco government in exchange for American bases on Spanish land. And perhaps the argument that we can no longer afford to give that country foreign aid would have some logic if it were not announced in the same breath that we are considering aid to the Communist-infiltrated government of the Congo's Adoula or to outright Communist governments such as those of Ghana and Guinea.

Not by the widest stretch of imagination could it be said that Tito's government in Yugoslavia practices social reform. It is not against our policy to give aid to that country.

Logic and consistency seem to have no place in the policies emanating from Washington these days. Perhaps some of the Kennedy policy advisers are too young to remember the Roosevelt logic—take strength where you can find it, and demand nothing less than total victory.

UNITED STATES AND THE MONROE DOCTRINE—QUESTION BY OBSERVERS IN EUROPE CALLED SOMETIMES BLURRED IN AMERICA

ROME.—World War II brought recognition of both the physical and political strength of the United States. Wherever Washington led, others capitals followed, not always by choice but often from expediency. American strength was needed to defeat both nazism and communism.

European diplomats are puzzled as to why, in spite of our strength, our policies are becoming more uncertain every day. And because we are a world power our evident wavering in our own bailiwick is of real importance to Europe.

Listening to discussions by observers in this part of the world brings into clear focus what sometimes is blurred in the United States. What, a diplomat recently asked, has become of the Monore Doctrine?

What, indeed? Events off Florida in the last 3 years have been of extreme interest to many world capitals. As critics have said so often, we take the friendship of Latin American countries for granted. And thus the Caribbean has been regarded only as a lush vacation spot. It was not thought of as ever becoming a physical threat—the Monroe Doctrine had assured us against any militant foreign influence.

In the Caribbean area are the islands of Cuba, Dominican Republic-Haiti, Jamaica, Puerto Rico, and Trinidad; and on the continent Venezuela, Colombia, Panama, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Honduras, and Mexico.

The Soviet intrusions in the last 3 years gradually have made the safe Caribbean a dangerously weakened area in our defense posture. With Fidel Castro securely ensconced in Cuba and receiving military assistance from the U.S.S.R., Communist China, and Czechoslovakia, the poison of communism has been spreading to the surrounding areas. While Latin American countries are battling internal subversion, the slogan of independence—the positive side of the anticolonialism coin—has become stronger each day among the various Dutch, French, and British possessions.

Jamaica's recent demand for independence put an end to Britain's aim to form a confederate bloc of the West Indies within jumping distance of Cuba and the Dominican Republic. This was followed closely by suspension of independence plans for British Guiana amid an outbreak of violence.

Anticolonialism has its merit and logic—but not in an era of Soviet aggression and subversion. With the exception of most of the former French colonial possessions in Africa, many recent independents have fallen, or are about to fall, under Soviet influence and domination.

Demand for independence by Jamaica, say some British diplomats, begs the question. It is an island of 4,000 square miles and 1.5 million people only 90 miles from Communist Cuba. To whom will Jamaica look for protection? The cold war battle between Castro's mentor, the Kremlin, and the United States would leave independent Jamaica in a precarious position. The only answer can be that the Jamaicans, appreciating Britain's inability to look after them, no longer believe that the great, good brother to the north can win this battle and in the event of a showdown they would prefer to have no close ties with any free world nation in the hope that this position would permit them to survive. And this logic is becoming contagious.

The Kremlin has announced that 1962 is the year to see the end of all possessions which would include everything from Okinawa to the Canal Zone and Puerto Rico, and, of course, the British and French holdings in the Caribbean.

The Kremlin does not always reach its goal on a specified date. The Berlin issue was to have been decided in 1961, according to its directives. However, whether the goal of liberating all colonial possessions in 1962 is accomplished or not, the emphasis will be on that goal.

The area around the Antilles, linking the Caribbean with Venezuela, does not remain unaffected, either. Now that Venezuela's neighbor, British Guiana which is under a pro-Soviet leader, is having its troubles with violent outbreaks, there is little to defend Trinidad, French Martinique, et cetera.

One cannot expect the countries south of the border to rally to the United States when all can see that their great northern neighbor was unable to prevent Cuba from becoming a Kremlin stronghold just off the Florida coast.

United States and the Monroe Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star in its edition of Tuesday, February 20, 1962, carried a most thoughtful column by Mr. Constantine Brown, from Rome, Italy, on a vital subject, namely, the United States and the Monroe Doctrine. In order that others may have the benefit of Mr. Brown's thinking on this important matter, I include the aforementioned column as part of my remarks today.

The article follows:

UNITED STATES AND THE MONROE DOCTRINE—QUESTION BY OBSERVERS IN EUROPE CALLED SOMETIMES BLURRED IN AMERICA

ROME.—World War II brought world recognition of both the physical and political strength of the United States. Wherever Washington led, other capitals followed, not always by choice but often from expediency. American strength was needed to defeat both nazism and communism.

European diplomats are puzzled as to why, in spite of our strength, our policies are becoming more uncertain every day. And because we are a world power our evident wavering in our own bailiwick is of real importance to Europe.

Listening to discussions by observers in this part of the world brings into clear focus what sometimes is blurred in the United States. What, a diplomat recently asked, has become of the Monroe Doctrine?

What, indeed? Events off Florida in the last 3 years have been of extreme interest to many world capitals. As critics have said so often, we take the friendship of Latin American countries for granted. And thus the Caribbean has been regarded only as a lush vacation spot. It was not thought of as ever becoming a physical threat—the Monroe Doctrine had assured us against any militant foreign influence.

In the Caribbean area are the islands of Cuba, Dominican Republic-Haiti, Jamaica, Puerto Rico, and Trinidad; and on the continent Venezuela, Colombia, Panama, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Honduras, and Mexico.

The Soviet intrusions in the last 3 years gradually have made the safe Caribbean a dangerously weakened area in our defense posture. With Fidel Castro securely ensconced in Cuba and receiving military assistance from the U.S.S.R., Communist China, and Czechoslovakia, the poison of communism has been spreading to the surrounding areas. While Latin American countries are battling internal subversion, the slogan of "independence"—the positive side of the anticolonialism coin—has become stronger each day among the various Dutch, French, and British possessions.

Jamaica's recent demand for independence put an end to Britain's aim to form a confederate bloc of the West Indies within jumping distance of Cuba and the Dominican Republic. This was followed closely by suspension of independence plans for British Guiana amid an outbreak of violence.

Anticolonialism has its merit and logic—but not in an era of Soviet aggression and subversion. With the exception of most of the former French colonial possessions in Africa, many recent independents have fallen, or are about to fall, under Soviet influence and domination.

Demand for independence by Jamaica, say some British diplomats, begs the question. It is an island of 4,000 square miles and 1.5 million people only 90 miles from Communist Cuba. To whom will Jamaica look for protection? The cold war battle between Castro's mentor, the Kremlin, and the United States would leave independent Jamaica in a precarious position. The only answer can be that the Jamaicans, appreciating Britain's inability to look after them, no longer believe that the great, good brother to the north can win this battle and in the event of a showdown they would prefer to have no close ties with any free world nation in the hope that this position would permit them to survive. And this logic is becoming contagious.

The Kremlin has announced that 1962 is the year to see the end of all "possessions" which would include everything from Okinawa to Canal Zone and Puerto Rico, and, of course, the British and French holdings in the Caribbean.

The Kremlin does not always reach its goal on a specified date. The Berlin issue was to have been decided in 1961, according to its directives. However, whether the goal of "liberating" all colonial "possessions" in 1962 is accomplished or not, the emphasis will be on the goal.

The area around the Antilles, linking the Caribbean and Venezuela, does not remain unaffected, either. Now that Venezuela's neighbor, British Guiana which is under a pro-Soviet leader, is having its troubles with violent outbreak, there is little to defend Trinidad, French Martinique, etc.

One cannot expect the countries "south of the border" to rally to the United States

when all can see that their great northern neighbor was unable to prevent Cuba from becoming a Kremlin stronghold just off the Florida coast.

Appraisal of President Kennedy's First Year in Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, one of the few Montana newspapers that supported John F. Kennedy for President of the United States was the Montana Standard-Post of Butte. That newspaper recently appraised President Kennedy's first year in office in an editorial which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENNEDY MORE MODERATE BUT NO LESS PROGRESSIVE

When this newspaper endorsed John F. Kennedy for President in 1960, it pointed out, among other things, its reliance on his commonsense, vigor, strength, and courage. The latter, we thought, would at least have to match that of a Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Kennedy has been in office more than a year, and we are not disappointed. He has demonstrated vigor, intelligence, commonsense, strength, and courage. Furthermore, the youthful brashness which had to be noted not much more than a year ago has been tempered by the acceptance of weighty responsibility. Also, we detect a moderation of the liberalism once attached to some of his ideas and policies.

A year ago, uncertainty and even pessimism were apparent to some extent in his appraisal of conditions. By contrast, in his state of the Union message this month he was confident, and in another message delivered last Monday, he was brightly optimistic.

It cannot be questioned that his popularity has risen during his year in office. Public endorsement, however, is not always reflected in congressional support, nor does legislation follow party lines.

Gradually, in his first year, the President has put forth persistent efforts to cooperate with Congress. Instead of applying pressure to legislators in their home States, he has sought to work with them in Washington.

Unlike Roosevelt, he has carried out the role of leadership without attempting to browbeat either Congress or recalcitrant members of his party.

Perhaps because of his small victory margin, he does not choose to employ dictatorial methods. He has often conferred with leaders of Congress in the shaping of progressive programs. He aims, obviously, at full collaboration of the White House with Capitol Hill.

In this congressional election year, he may reasonably expect a full measure of support from his own party, many of the leaders of which will be making their appeals to their voting constituents next November.

The burden of the Democratic Party at this time is all the greater because of its control of both Houses and the White House. It has assumed obligations and responsibilities upon which it will be keenly judged.

To that extent, its posture is defensive.

Its leader, Kennedy, has given evidence of maturity, a quality which many not so long ago doubted lay within him. In maturity and moderation, it may be he has found his own New Frontier, and the way to get America moving.

If to some he may seem less a dynamic liberal, he is certainly no less progressive.

This newspaper in 1960 saw qualities of greatness in a young man who was running for President. Those qualities are still evident and may develop even more noticeably in the challenges to greatness which 1962 is certain to present.

Boys Town Jerusalem Praised by the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the privilege of being a guest at the 7th annual dinner of Boys Town Jerusalem.

The very name of this institution, modeled as it is after one of the great human experiments carried out so successfully in our own country, indicates how deep the roots of democracy have been implanted in the State of Israel.

Boys Town Jerusalem was established some 10 years ago and was designed to fill a gap in the educational system of a young and still-struggling country. Although the strides made by this infant democracy have evoked the admiration of much of the world, it remains a fact that Israel's present economic level still falls short of permitting free public education on the secondary or high school level. One of the means of solving this problem was the concept that led to the establishment of Boys Town Jerusalem.

The objective was to provide academic and vocational training and a measure of spiritual guidance to boys who were being brought to Israel through emigration. What began as an extremely small operation with a student population of just 18 boys has grown into a school that is now able to give free education and auxiliary support to over 350 boys who have come to Israel from 25 different countries. Approximately half of these youngsters are orphans.

Under the leadership of Mr. Ira Guilden, a distinguished New Yorker, a group of public-spirited Americans have joined together in an American committee to provide urgently needed funds to enable Boys Town Jerusalem to further enlarge the scope of the vital service it is performing. I am happy to note that our own Government has shown a sympathetic interest in this school. We can be proud that an allocation for support of the school's program was made from U.S. counterpart funds in Israel. I know of no better way to secure the roots of democracy in a small country than by ministering to the important human needs of its youth. Boys Town Jerusalem was conceived in the image of our own free institutions and represents the priceless gift of free and open opportunity, that unique hallmark of democracy which has made our American system the envy of the world.

Private American philanthropy has made notable contributions to the school. The American committee for Boys Town Jerusalem is engaged in a campaign to raise $3 million to expand the school's present facilities, the plans calling for a school that will be able to accommodate 1,000 students, half of whom would be boarded on the school site.

The graphic arts industry of New York has made a signal contribution. Ground has been broken at Boys Town Jerusalem for what will be the largest graphic arts center in the Near East. Facilities, costing $200,000 will be provided for the training of 100 teenage youngsters each year in printing and photo-offset trades. Printing presses and related equipment have already been installed and will be moved from temporary buildings where they now operate to new facilities for which contracts have been let.

I know of no better way to describe the human dimensions of the task Boys Town Jerusalem has undertaken than to cite an experience related to me by the president of the American committee for the school, Mr. Ira Guilden. His interest in the program of the school was aroused during a visit he paid to Israel a few years ago. He was particularly interested in the chidlren who were finding their way to Israel from behind the Iron Curtain and the ghettos of Africa and the Middle East. It was while visiting these facilities giving shelters to some of these children that he discovered among them, orphans who had never known their parents and indeed did not know their own names. It was this discovery that impelled him to join with other devoted Americans who see in this school an opportunity to express their deep concern for humanity, one of the treasures of the American way of life.

We live in a time when the old-fashioned virtue of gratitude is becoming increasingly scarce. It was, therefore, deeply gratifying to me to learn of a gesture of appreciation to the Congress of the United States by the youngsters of Boys Town Jerusalem. A group of these boys who had been trained in woodwork and carpentry joined together to hand-make a desk for presentation to the distinguished Speaker of the House, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, in gratitude for congressional approval of the allocation of U.S. counterpart funds for the school.

I note that the desk was presented to the Speaker in brief ceremonies in his office on Friday, February 9. I know of no better way to assess the character and achievement of Boys Town Jerusalem than to quote a brief passage from a letter the Speaker wrote to Mr. Ira Guilden after the presentation of the desk:

Our distinguished Speaker observed:

This great human project is an outstanding illustration of democratic thought and action in operation, and what can be done where a government of laws exists, such as in Israel.

On behalf of Boys Town Jerusalem, I want to thank my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, the Speaker of the House, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, for pointing to the human achievements that are within the grasp of humble people everywhere so long as they enjoy the blessings of freedom.

National Boys Club Week: April 8–15, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, during April 8 to 15, the Nation will observe National Boys Club Week.

Over the years, the Boys Club movement has represented a splendid effort to constructively channel and utilize the vast reservoir of energy, imagination, and talent of America's youth.

The accomplishments of the program deserve—in my judgment—high praise, both for the boys themselves, as well as the adults who provided outstanding leadership. The Nation, and our youth, could, I believe, wonderfully benefit by a further expansion of this fine program.

Recently, I was pleased to receive from Mr. John G. Magistrelli, associate executive director of the Milwaukee Boys Club, a review of its outstanding activities in his community.

I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of this review printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Boys' Clubs of America movement began in 1860 when public-spirited citizens of Hartford, Conn., established facilities and activities to provide boys from lower income families with opportunities for constructive use of leisure time—the time when, these boys were not working in the cotton mills of the city. The movement spread to other communities as the effectiveness of the Boys' Club philosophy and methods became more widely recognized.

In 1906 some 50 existing clubs, including our own Milwaukee Boys' Club, joined together to form the national organization to service the clubs and assist interested communities in establishing new clubs. In 1956, Boys' Clubs of America was chartered by the Congress of the United States—the first youth-serving organization in 40 years to receive such recognition. There are now close to 600 clubs serving more than 600,000 boys between the ages of 6 and 18. A new club is being established every 2 weeks and Boys' Club alumni are estimated at more than 10 million.

The national goal, as set by the board chairman, the Honorable Herbert Hoover, is the establishment of 1,000 Boys' Clubs serving 1 million youngsters.

The Milwaukee Boys' Club was founded in 1887, making it one of the pioneer clubs in the Nation. Currently, plans are underway for a third unit of the Milwaukee Boys' Club to be in operation during 1963. The opening of the Beloit Boys' Club in October 1960 marks the hoped-for start of the establishment of other clubs in Wisconsin. Several other Wisconsin communities have made inquiries for the establishment of clubs.

Your support of the Boys' Club movement is greatly appreciated by all of us, and with your help * * * I am sure that we can give encouragement to the other communities in Wisconsin who are interested in establishing Boys' Clubs.

Faith, Hope, and Foreign Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing and reading a great deal about the need to increase our foreign trade, both on the export and the import side.

Unquestionably there has been much exaggeration of the employment attributable to exports and what expansion of exports would do for us.

There has come to my desk a speech on this subject entitled "Faith, Hope, and Foreign Trade" delivered at the Annual Pacific Northwest Farm Forum in Spokane on February 13 of this year.

The speaker was O. R. Strackbein, chairman of the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy, who is known to many of us as a spokesman for reasonable protection of American industry, agriculture and labor.

I hope that on the eve of the hearings on H.R. 990, the new tariff proposal, which begins in a few weeks, Members read this speech. It contains some thought-provoking observations on the employment-creating capacity of foreign trade that very much need to be taken into account as we study the trade problem.

Under leave to extend my remarks I offer the address of Mr. Strackbein before the Pacific Northwest Farm Forum for inclusion at this point in the RECORD.

The address follows:

FAITH, HOPE, AND FOREIGN TRADE

As our national unemployment problem and the lag in our industrial growth nag us and encroach on our widespread complacence, and as these problems confront us with perplexities, particularly in our struggle against world communism, we cast about for ways out of our dilemma.

The easy way out is usually the most attractive. Indeed, we begin to yearn for some magic solution. We hope that someone will show us the way and we will accept almost anything that sounds good, particularly if it can be described as bold, venturesome or imaginative and so long as it does not hurt us.

Of course, if it might hurt someone else, we can always bear such probable pains in behalf of the national interest.

In these days of unpleasant confrontations of the domestic front, by such persistent realities as the hard core of unemployment, balance-of-payments deficits, gold outflow, fast-rising foreign productivity with its competitive impact, and our growing population with its heavy annual additions to our labor force, we have come to look rather frantically to foreign trade as the piper that will lead us out of the wilderness and into the promised land. If we could only export more, much more, the results would be most remunerative; at least, if we could do so without importing much more; because if we must import much more in order to export much more the negative effects would tend to counterbalance the beneficial effects.

Yes, if only we could export more, much more, several of our perplexing problems would vanish. Forget the rest, the side effects of rising exports, and so forth. We would put more people to work, or so it would seem. Our balance-of-payments deficits would begin to melt, or so it would seem. We could then be of greater help to other countries, especially the underdeveloped ones and could pull them away from the communistic orbit. The uncommitted and neutralist countries would become more tractable. They could see with their own eyes that we are far ahead of the communistic world. Our exports would offer proof of this, no doubt.

Let us therefore beat the drums, thump the tomtoms and send up the smoke signals to proclaim the campaign for more exports. That is what it will be. More exports.

Man all the propaganda outlets. Saturate the air, invade the video circuits and corner the press. Flood the land with the message. Here is a vision, bold, imaginative, venturesome. So, pitch in; fall in line; ask no questions. Above all, ask no questions.

Nevertheless, let us ask a few.

The objective is what, again?

Expand the economy, reduce or even eliminate unemployment, stanch the outflow of gold, befriend the world, stop the spread of communism and establish peace.

These are unquestionably acceptable and desirable goals.

But let us be specific. How will more exports expand the economy?

The answer to that question, it seems, is easy. It will put more people to work, not only on the farms, in the mines and forests, in mills and factories, in railroading and shipping and in boxing and crating, but also in banking, insurance, warehousing, etc. It will buoy the whole economy, replace pessimism with optimism and generally lift morale.

However, some doubts begin to arise. Can we be sure of foreign markets for goods in much greater volume than we now export? It is suggested that we are not now doing our best; and that may be true. Perhaps foreign countries do not now buy from us all that they can profitably dispose of. But will foreign merchants buy more from us simply because we wish to export more? Or do they import from us in order to make money?

If they can buy elsewhere more cheaply, quality for quality, or whatever is equally salable, will they buy from us merely because they like us? Or will they desert us merely because they do not like us, if imports from us are more profitable or if their customers perfer our goods or cannot get a supply elsewhere? How much sentimentality is mixed with trade?

These questions in the practical world answer themselves.

Unquestionably increased exports would increase employment:

1. Unless expansion of our exports would make it necessary to increase competitive imports by a like volume in terms of value.

2. Unless rising productivity resulting from automation or other labor-saving devices required to compete abroad, should offset the higher labor requirements called for

by the increased exports; or if rising productivity on any account in this country should exceed the export rise.

3. Unless further export-expansion could be achieved only through subsidization of such items as farm products, shipbuilding, and merchant marine operation; and other items through foreign aid, and so forth.

These three conditions may be examined in sequence.

1. If exports could be expanded by increasing the imports of noncompetitive products, an unlikely achievement, a net increase in employment would indeed result on two counts, namely in the production and handling of the additional goods exported and in the processing and distribution of the noncompetitive imports.

Should the necessary increase in imports, however, consist of goods that compete with domestic industry, and this would be the surer result, the effects on employment would likely be negative and perhaps even more than merely countervailing.

This is then the crucial question: Will anything be gained by increasing exports if in the process the market outlook must be darkened by booming import competition for other domestic industries to which we must also look for increasing employment or at least for maintenance of existing levels?

The rolls of our unemployed workers consist of at least two elements: (1) Those who were previously employed but who are now out of work while still employable, and (2) those who have not previously been employed but who now are ready and willing to work and are seeking employment.

The negative effects of competitive imports may operate in both sectors: They may actually displace workers, or they may prevent workers who otherwise would be hired, from being employed. It is entirely possible, but beyond positive proof, that of the two effects the latter of the two is the more devastating.

It is usually assumed that in order to increase our exports we must reduce our duties so that other countries may ship more to us and thus gain the dollars with which to buy more from us. Unquestionably that is true in the long run.

However, if we reduce our duties on goods that are also manufactured here and that are sensitive to import competition we will perhaps be destroying jobs and potential employment faster than increased exports will create them, because of lower foreign costs.

Moreover, we have already reduced our tariffs very drastically. In combination with the rise in prices our tariff cuts of the past 28 years have reduced our average protection by 80 percent. Many tariffs have already been cut to the quick. Further tariff cutting, unless very carefully approached, could produce negative and regressive effects on employment. Tariff reductions across the board or even in broad categories as is now proposed cannot be justified.

If a growing domestic industry or a new industry that enjoys high employment potentials is faced with import competition that in turn is on the uptrend and that derives its competitive advantage from lower labor costs per unit of production, such domestic industry will not expand as it otherwise would and therefore will not create the new jobs that it would if it had a higher and brighter ceiling.

The employment trends of the United States clearly show where our increasing employment must come from. They also show where we need not look for unemployment absorption.

A little further analysis will also show that rising productivity per man-hour will not always assure greater employment but will in many cases reduce it or cause it to fall behind population expansion. In other cases it will indeed lead to more employment. All depends on the character of the product and the nature of consumer demand for it. If the demand is inelastic or biologically limited, as by the number of stomachs to be fed or the number of feet to be shod, the employment potentials are limited to population growth, once saturation of the market is achieved. Automation and introduction of labor-saving devices then will guarantee displacement of workers, because lower production costs and lower prices will not appreciably increase consumption.

Perhaps the outstanding example on the American scene showing what greatly increased efficiency can do to employment has been presented by American agriculture in the past 10 years. These results were not foreseen but sprang almost entirely from the fact that the demand for agricultural products, with some exceptions, is notoriously inelastic and limited by human biology rather than psychology.

From 1950 to 1960 the number of farmworkers in this country shrank by 2.8 million. This was a decline of 28 percent and compares with a population increase of 18.4 percent during the decade.

The cause of this shrinkage in the number of farmworkers was of course to be found in the phenomenal increase in yield per acre. This in turn resulted from increased size of farms, advancing mechanization, greater use of fertilizers and pesticides, and improved breeds of plants.

The yield of corn per acre increased 41.7 percent; that of wheat went up 57 percent; that of cotton 66.5 percent; rice, 43 percent; and sorghums for grain a little over 100 percent—all in 10 years' time.

Unfortunately for employment these great increases in productivity did not lead to increased per capita consumption. The consumption of wheat flour per capita has fallen greatly. Fifty years ago it amounted to 214 pounds. By 1940 it was down to 155 pounds, but by 1960 it had dropped to 118 pounds.

The per capita consumption of eggs dropped 16.4 percent from 1950 to 1960. Potato consumption on the same basis declined slightly. Pork consumption has remained quite steady over a period of years as has also the per capita consumption of sugar. Mill consumption of cotton declined from 30.87 pounds per capita in 1950 to 24.45 pounds in 1960. Wool consumption by our mills fell from 4.18 pounds per capita to 2.42 pounds during the same period.

A considerable part of this decline in mill consumption was accounted for by increased imports.

The upshot is that the great rise in productivity in American agriculture, for all its blessings, left us with three perplexing problems: surplus disposal, unemployment, and land use.

The coal industry, fighting for its life against natural gas and petroleum, surpassed even agriculture in the upthrust of efficiency. The amount of coal mined per man per day increased 85 percent from 1950 to 1960. Nevertheless the demand for coal declined; but employment dropped more steeply because of mechanization. The number of workers dropped by 56.5 percent, double the rate of decline registered by farm workers, which was 28 percent. Rapidly rising exports in the 1950's did not stop the downtrend.

Employment in other activities also declined greatly. Transportation was one of them, as were some 30 established industries, such as iron and steel, textiles, automobiles, lumber and wood products, dairying, etc. Thirty manufacturing industries lost 1,169,000 workers. To keep up with the population they should have hired 1,153,000 instead. The lag was therefore 2,322,000. Yet there was growth, as measured by output.

We have to thank half a dozen growth industries and a few stalwart oldtimers for such employment absorption as did take place. Aircraft and parts, certain chemicals such as plastics and synthetics, electrical communications equipment, including television, were among the leading growth industries. In the older field machinery manufacturing, newspaper publishing and printing, more than held their own in employment.

Manufacturing of food and kindred products was one of those that registered an absolute decline in employment.

Yet, our total employment rolls did not shrink as much as these combined declines would indicate. Urbanization led to a vast increase in State and local government employment. This rose during the decade by a little over 50 percent, as did the number of classroom teachers. Employment in banking, real estate, brokerage, insurance, wholesale and retail trade also expanded more than the 18.4 percent population increase.

Yet, with all the absorptive powers of these professional and service trades a lag of 3.7 million occurred in employment, behind population growth. The number absorbed by the services, trades and professions amounted to 6,602,000 but the dropoff in agriculture, mining, transportation, and so forth, was 7,366,000. Considering the population expansion the lag was 3.7 million, as cited above.

Under these circumstances it is not difficult to understand why the idea of exports as a means of stimulating employment should occur to those who are concerned with the state of the national economy.

Unfortunately the equation is not so simple, for reasons that are visible in the employment trends in this country and the nature of the export-import relationship, already mentioned. If this country were on more nearly the same cost level as its competitors the path would be much easier.

To be sure, there is great pressure to export more agricultural products to reduce the surplus on hand. It is even suggested that we reduce or remove our duties on industrial products as an inducement for Common Market reduction of duties on our farm products. It should be clear, however, that this is a false scent if we have in mind reduction of unemployment in this country. It is futile to look to agriculture for increasing employment. Quite the opposite will still take place. Only 10 percent of our work force is left on the farm.

This is not said in derogation of our agriculture. Productionwise it has covered itself with glory and the country with surplusage. It is rather a simple case of facing realities. Agriculture has problems of its own, but in a sense it can be proud of its problem. It has provided too well, not too little.

Our Government has, indeed, gone in full cry after export promotion. This objective has led it to propose precisely those steps that will increase employment difficulties instead of removing or alleviating them.

In support of its program it has thrown its majesty and full-blown power into a campaign to revise the trade agreements program in a manner designed to promote exports by further drastic duty reductions.

In warming up to this campaign it has conjugated the benefits of exports by States and even by congressional districts, for reasons too transparent to need explanation. It has undertaken to show how much of our exports arises from particular areas, including the homes of the Members of Congress.

At the same time it has sought to find great virtues in imports as a source of employment. That some imports have merits goes without saying; great merits, in fact. We use many imported minerals and raw products in our industries. Some of these,

like tin, nickel, and asbestos are not produced here. Some food products, particularly tropical products, supplement and enrich our table fare. Such imports obviously help employment.

Nevertheless, not all imports are of this character. Competitive imports, or over half of the total, whether they be of raw products, food items, or manufactured products, cannot properly be touted as job-creating influences. This is especially true if they come from countries with low wages and rapidly rising productivity.

We may be more efficient in the production of these items than are other countries, but our wages may be several times higher than those prevailing in competing industrial nations. At the same time the rapidly rising productivity abroad, attributable to the vast installation of modern machinery and equipment, has reduced unit cost of production. We have shipped nearly $50 billion of such machinery abroad since 1948.

When our import-sensitive industries consider plant renewal or plant expansion they will think twice. They will ask: What appears more sensible, plant expansion or modernization without expansion? Modernization, which means more up-to-date machinery, will reduce the cost of production; in fact will save labor. This will mean fewer workers with the same output as before, or even a higher output. Thus will it perhaps be possible to meet the import competition and prevent it from capturing the whole market. It will also make us more competitive in export markets. But, what will it do to employment? How far will it go toward absorbing the million new workers each year? Alternately the company may decide that stepping up its foreign investment, rather than expanding here, will pay off better.

There are those who say that our import-sensitive industries are only the small inefficient ones. This view is self-serving of the free-trade advocates, and its acceptance would be fatal to our solution of the unemployment problem. The industries in this country that are import-sensitive are among our leading employers and many of them are in the forefront of our technology. As the years go by yet more of our industries will become exposed to import competition because of the great industrial diversification taking place overseas.

2. It was said at the outset that enlarged exports would increase employment unless, among other things, it led to more mechanization and automation simply as a means of competing; and this would be a likely result. The need to be competitive in foreign markets does not represent a job-creating undertaking; for while it would be expected to lead to lower costs, it would not necessarily lead to higher sales but might simply avoid being driven out. Net unemployment or stationary employment would be the result.

3. If we can export certain products only by subsidizing them, it will help little to increase their exportation because of the cost involved. Certainly we should not hamper and discourage unsubsidized industries by exposing them to more import competition merely with the idea of increasing the exports of subsidized products. Yet that is involved in some of the proposals relating to our association with the Common Market.

Far better to create an investment climate in this country that will bring out and encourage new industries and maintain a high ceiling for existing growth industries than to stifle both by opening them yet more to withering import competition. That way lies industrial stagnation in this country.

It would be better to prohibit the licensing of foreign manufacturers to use our patents than to confront our market developers with import competition before they can create broad consumer demand at home and thus close in on our new industries and new developments and foreshorten their future. We succeed thus in increasing employment abroad rather than here.

We cannot maintain a favorable investment outlook in this country by dismantling more of our tariff; and we must have such an outlook if we are to rehabilitate the best market in the world for American industry; namely, the market in this country. This is where the world's highest purchasing power resides.

There is much to commend the subsidization of agricultural products for export to underdeveloped countries where there are many stomachs and where food is scarce. We know that the American market for food products is quite saturated and if we are to dispose of farm surplus we must go to foreign markets; and we must sell abroad at world prices or even give the products away; but we should not confuse this process with true exports.

This operation should indeed be separated from considerations of the industrial economy where consumer demand in many cases is not limited in the same manner as the demand for farm products. It is the industrial sphere that more employment must be found (outside of the service trades) and if it is found it will in turn provide a better market for some agricultural products. The industrial sphere should not be hindered or retarded for the sake of more exports of farm products. In fact wider industrial uses of farm products at home may offer better outlets for some farm products than do exports.

The notion that foreign trade will help materially in solving our employment problems and therefore some of the other problems represents a wish rather than realism. No country that is based economically as is the United States, surrounded by a world of disparate economic dimensions, standing on different levels, can expect to be helped much by simply increasing its foreign trade. The program represents more of a diversionary tactic than real hope.

Let us suppose that we increased our exports from $20 billion to $25 billion in a few years. This increase would represent less than 1 percent of our gross national product.

Assume that this increase brought with it an increase in imports from just below $15 billion to $20 billion.

The potential economic blight and retardation contained in this $5 billion increase in imports could shrivel many prospective employment-generating enterprises in this country in the seed and would condemn governmental retraining and relocation programs to prefabricated failure.

All in all the hope and faith in foreign trade as offering material help in solving our domestic and international political problems represent an escape from hard realities that we must face.

Colonel Glenn's Orbital Flight

SPEECH

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I join with our great majority leader in extolling the virtues of Colonel Glenn. But as ranking member of the Committee on Education and Labor I would like to say this—I would like to pay tribute, on the floor of the House this afternoon, to all those men who took care of every detail of every meticulous operation that made it possible for Colonel Glenn to be the No. 1 hero of the United States of America today.

The Menace of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Keith Belser, 16-year-old son of the Honorable and Mrs. Irvine F. Belser, Jr., of Columbia, S.C., titled "The Little Black Ants." This article refers to the insidious menace of communism and particularly to the fact that this movement can almost take over a nation before the people realize the conspiracy is underway. The article shows, on the part of the writer, an indication of vision, a great deal of imagination, and a sound philosophy of government. It speaks well of the young people of America and their alertness to the dangers facing mankind in the 20th century.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LITTLE BLACK ANTS

"Mom, I'm home," announced Charles Riner as he slapped his books loudly on the kitchen table.

"Say, Mom, have we got any Cokes? My throat's as dry as a bone."

"Yes, dear," called Mrs. Riner from another part of the house. "The Cokes are in the pantry. How was school today?"

"Awful. Just awful," said Charles emphatically. "Do you know what my history teacher, Mrs. Clarkson, did? I'll tell you what she did. She tortured us. That's what. She made the whole class sit in that stuffy classroom of hers and listen to some dumb speech. I think it was by President Kennedy. Called a state of the Union address or something like that. Talk about a drag. Boy, I've never been so bored in all my young life. He just sat there for 2 solid hours and talked about things like how far behind Russia we are in rockets and missiles and stuff. Why, the way he talked, you'd think we were going to have a war."

"Well, dear, maybe he's right," ventured Mrs. Riner as she walked into the room. "After all," she argued, "he is the President."

"Naw," drawled Charles. "I'm not worried. The United States is so big and powerful that Russia'd be scared to try anything."

"Well," said Mrs. Riner, sounding very bored with the topic of conversation, "all that may well be. But as for you, young man, march yourself right upstairs and begin your lessons. Your father and I weren't very happy over that last report card."

"Aw, Mom," complained the disheartened lad. "I know my grades weren't anything to

shout about, but you shouldn't make me study all day."

"Stop arguing, Charles," snapped his mother. "Go to your room."

With assorted moans and groans of agony, Charles dragged himself upstairs and went into his room. Once inside the dejected lad sat down and began work.

"Let's see," he murmured, "Think I'll do my English first. All we have to do there is read some story in the literature book."

After selecting the proper book and locating the assigned story Charles leaned back in his chair and began reading.

In spite of his indifferent attitude toward studies, Charles soon found himself quite caught up in the thrilling episode he was reading.

Once upon a time, you see, there was an ant colony. This colony was known far and wide for its fine tunnels, huge amounts of stored-up food, and tremendous population. It hadn't always been so grand, mind you.

This colony of little black ants started out just as insignificantly as any other. But something set it apart and make it grow. It was the drive and ambition and sheer vitality of the workers that made it great. They were tireless. Often, in the early days when the colony was small and weak, they were to be seen scurrying madly about at all hours of the night and day. They dug. They built. They gathered food in enormous quantities and stored it up. Finally, they reached their goal. By sheer hard work and endurance, they emerged head and shoulders above any other colony around. They were tops. They had come the distance and were on the summit. Or so they thought.

When the little black ants reached the top of the ant world, they forgot a very important thing. In all their glory and greatness they forgot that hard work, and lots of it, had put them on top in the first place. Soon the colony became idle. It began to backslide. Old tunnels crumbled in and no new ones were built to replace them. Plenty of food was being eaten, but none was being stored up.

"Why should we work?" reasoned the black ants. "We have everything we could possibly need. We've all worked hard. Now we can sit back and relax."

Had the black ants known what was happening just a few paces away, they may not have left so snug and secure.

A new colony was being started. The occupants were red.

As the days passed by, the new ants, red ones, showed the same drive and vitality that the black ones had shown in their early history. Soon the network of red tunnels became vast and the quantity of stored-up, red food became enormous.

The black ants were, of course, aware of the newcomers by this time.

"Well," they thought, "isn't it nice that some of our neighbors have made a success of themselves. All it takes is hard work. It's a good thing they realized that. Now they can sit back and take life easy like we do."

That was where they were wrong. The red ants had achieved success, to be sure, but they weren't about to sit back and take life easy.

The red ants worked on and on. Each new day dawned to find that the red domain had been pushed out just a bit further. Soon the hungry red tunnels completely surrounded the once great, black fortress.

Yet the black ants still didn't worry. They clung religiously to the belief that they were the kings and that nothing could break their power. And still the red noose grew tighter.

Then one day the inevitable happened. The red hordes had waited long enough. They swarmed by the thousands up out of their tunnels and completely engulfed the kings of the world.

Charles was disappointed at the outcome.

"What a silly story," he mused. "Anyone, even a bunch of black ants, would have more sense than to let something like that happen. Certainly," he reasoned, "even an insect can tell when its life is in danger."

With that, Charles rose from his seat, yawned, and reached for his coat.

"That's enough homework for me," he muttered as he left the house and started down Maple Street with a carefree gait. "Think I'll go have a coke at the drugstore."

Charles didn't ever get that coke. He didn't even make it to the drugstore.

At the wail of the sirens, Charles, and all the other people in the impact area, started running. Running and scurrying about. Like so many black ants.

Farley Recalls Unfairness to Franco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, the following is an interesting article by the noted writer, James L. Kilgallen, from an interview with Hon. James A. Farley, which appeared in the New York Journal American on January 21, 1962. It deals with observations made by Mr. Farley, who has been a worldwide traveler for more than a decade.

The article follows:

FARLEY RECALLS UNFAIRNESS TO FRANCO

James A. Farley disclosed yesterday some hitherto unknown facts concerning a difference of opinion in high British and United States circles regarding Spain as a true ally of this country.

In a frank and exclusive interview, Mr. Farley revealed that 14 years ago Sir Winston Churchill told him that "your country and mine had dealt unfairly" with Spain.

Mr. Farley related that upon returning home he talked to then President Truman "in a friendly way" but could not bring him around to his own and Mr. Churchill's viewpoint. Mr. Farley knew that he was on the unpopular side of the Spanish question at the time. But he feels now as he did then.

"There is no country in Europe where a better feeling exists toward the United States than in Spain," he said.

The 73-year-old former National Chairman of the Democratic Party and one-time Postmaster General said it is now "heartening" to note that only last month Secretary of State Dean Rusk conferred with Generalissimo Francisco Franco for 90 minutes.

Dean Rusk was quoted in Madrid dispatches after the meeting as warmly praising Spain as an ally of the United States in the world's defense against communism.

Mr. Farley who, as a top executive for the Coca-Cola Export Corp., does considerable traveling, said that over the years he has met Mr. Franco seven or eight times in Madrid. He added that he saw Franco as a man of integrity, character, and courage.

HIS TALK WITH "WINNIE"

Telling of his interview with Mr. Churchill, he said:

"In 1948, I visited Sir Winston at his country home in Chartwell, outside of London. On that occasion the question of the generalissimo came up, and Mr. Churchill then said his country and mine had dealt unfairly with Spain.

"Mr. Churchill said that whenever allied fliers came down in Spain, the Spanish protected them and turned them over to friendly hands.

"He also said that our invasion of North Agrica in World War II would not have been possible if the Spanish Government had not let us use its territory and the Spanish waters to make the invasion."

ABUSED BY LIBERALS

When he returned to the United States after talking to Mr. Churchill, Mr. Farley was annoyed at the attitude of the American Government and of the liberal elements toward Franco and Spain because he felt Spain was one country in Europe where communism could make no headway.

"I was abused by liberals and liberal writers," he added. "But I was convinced that my attitude on Spain was right.

"I told President Truman and the then Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, what Churchill had said. But they were definitely opposed to Franco and Spain. We had severed relations with Spain. I had a friendly, but strong, argument with Mr. Truman and urged that Spain be recognized.

"I was happy later when our Government finally recognized Spain and resumed diplomatic relations which resulted in the friendly feelings that exist today."

JESTED WITH TRUMAN

After relations had been resumed, Mr. Farley again met Mr. Truman and jokingly remarked: "I'm glad the United States has come around.

"We both laughed about it," Farley said.

Commenting on Dean Rusk's recent visit to Generalissimo Franco, Mr. Farley said:

"It was the proper thing for Dean Rusk to do. We have five joint United States-Spanish missile bases in Spain. Our relations are now extremely friendly. In the event of trouble—which I do not anticipate—we could be assured that Franco, his government, and his people would be sympathetic to us.

"SEES NO WAR NEAR

"The strategic location of Spain, on the tip of the Continent, would mean much to us. An attack on Russia could be made from our missile bases there in the event of war.

"But, in my opinion, there is no immediate danger of war. Another war would be with nuclear weapons and would destroy civilization as we know it. I believe we will be living under a cold war for a long time."

Mr. Farley conceded there will always be criticism of dictators and observed that "we cannot hope to change the governments other people have." He said Spain's good relations with the United States are bound to strengthen our relationship with Spanish-speaking Latin American countries.

Mr. Farley said President Kennedy is to be commended on the way he is handling foreign relations and for his strong support of Gen. Lucius Clay, his special representative in Berlin.

"Mr. Kennedy is destined to become a truly great American President," Mr. Farley concluded.

Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, recently I was given a copy of a wonderful

little article entitled "Peace," by a little girl who lives in Glen Gardner, N.J., Miss Suzy Farren.

It pleases me very much that our young people are giving such serious thought to the great problems of our times, as this article shows, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE

In these times, the times of great weapons, great industries, great competition, it is most important to try to understand this world and its countries. Understanding is our last resort. We have tried all else and failed. Now we have to make a decision. We must live together as a world, or die separately as independent nations. We are all neighbors. We all live here on our world, yet we are divided. And divided we cannot be. Divided we must not be. We must combine our knowledge, combine our strength, combine our nations, to make a world. And until this happens we remain weak. We must combine the nations of the world not to be superior in strength, but to be superior in wisdom. And then and only then, will there be a human race.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on last Sunday, February 18, 1962, the Lithuanian American Council of Lake County, at a mass meeting in the city of East Chicago, Ind., commemorated the 44th anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

This gathering unanimously adopted the following resolution:

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

Whereas the Independent Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia were invaded by Soviet Russia in 1940, in violations of its treaty obligations with those countries and compelled these people to accept communistic rule by force, and

Whereas separate colonies in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia were forcefully established by the Kremlin, then incorporated into the United States of Soviet Russia, depriving these peoples political, civil, and religious rights, destroying national sovereignty, confiscating their properties and reducing their workers and farmers to serfdom, and

Whereas despite untold hardships and brutal occupations, the people of Lithuania and other Baltic Nations have never lost hope of ultimate freedom, and therefore be it,

Resolved, That this meeting urges the United States in their future meetings with the Soviet Union, avoid any agreements about peaceful coexistence, because the basic aims of the Communists to conquer the world did not change, be it further

Resolved, That we urge the Government to use its power and influence to help Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia regain their freedom, sovereign rights, and self determination in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations; and be it finally

Resolved, That this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, and copies thereof sent to the Secretary of State, the Senators and Representatives of the State of Indiana and to the press.

ALBERT G. VINICK,
Chairman.

PETER INDREIKA,
Secretary.

Need for Greater Coordination of Transportation Within the Defense Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Defense Department—pursuant to a recommendation by myself and 11 other Great Lakes Senators, has undertaken a comprehensive study on overall policies relating to shipping of military goods overseas.

The report is expected to be published in the near future.

A preview of this study has revealed that—thanks to a candid, realistic evaluation of existing shipping patterns, there is a real need for greater coordination and correlation of policy.

For this reason, I am urging the establishment of a special Transportation Agency, within the Defense Department.

I ask unanimous consent to have a brief statement outlining these views printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Traditionally, the Defense Department has created, and adhered to, shipping policies that, to a large degree, overlooked the potentials of the Great Lakes Waterway System. The completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway, providing a less expensive route to ports around the world, however, offers in my judgment, a new opportunity to handle such shipping more expeditiously and less expensively. Unfortunately, the Department, as well as other governmental and nongovernmental shippers have not sufficiently reoriented their shipping patterns to take full advantage of the opportunities offered by the seaway.

The purpose of the recommended study was to take a new look at, and as necessary, revise U.S. shipping policies. In response, the Department appointed a special task force to undertake a 90-day study. Expected to be published shortly, a preview of the study reveals that (1) the Defense Department performed a forthright and realistic analysis—commendable, particularly, for its openminded self-criticism of Defense shipping policies, and (2) existing shipping policies suffer from a serious lack of uniform procedure methods, accounting methods, consideration of cost factors, etc.

Because of this situation, I believe that the establishment of a special Transportation Agency within the Defense Department would: (1) create more uniform shipping policies—thus, more equitably serving all areas of the country and all segments of the economy; (2) result in savings of millions of dollars for the taxpayer; and (3) provide a key for more effectively coordinated transportation policy, not only in the Defense Department, but also in other Federal Departments.

Pershing Was Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, now that the air seems to be clearing somewhat on the heated issue of "muzzling the military" a distinguished newspaper editor in my State, Mr. William R. Mathews, of the Arizona Daily Star in Tucson, has written an illuminating summary of the controversy and has drawn some interesting historical parallels. I believe his editorial will be of interest to many of my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

A LONG CAMPAIGN PAYS OFF

President Kennedy did exactly right when, without any hesitation, he forbade Pentagon or State Department witnesses before Congress to reveal the names of those officials whose duty it was to modify or censor speeches and public declarations of admirals, generals, and other top policymaking officials.

He thus came to the prompt support of Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, who refused to comply with the demands of the senatorial investigating committee. In doing so, the President answered a question relating to the exercise of executive authority that has needed answering. In this connection it is worth bearing in mind that this matter of executive privilege is an historic one, that goes back to the days of President Washington.

Imagine what would happen, if those technical subordinates who merely obey instructions of their superiors, would be named publicly and summoned before a congressional committee to testify why they did this or that.

Such reviewing of speeches is positively necessary, if our Nation is to have a cohesive and united foreign policy. Under President Eisenhower, the President or Secretary of State would make a public announcement. Too frequently some talking admirals and generals in the Pentagon would make bellicose speeches contradicting them.

The results were harmful. All that the Russians had to do was to reprint in their newspapers the verbatim quotations of these saber-rattling generals and admirals. What better proof could be had to show the Russian people how belligerent we were, and what our warlike intentions were.

When President Kennedy took office a year ago January 20, he quickly put an end to this nonsense. He did this within weeks after an article of mine appeared in the January 1961 Atlantic Monthly, and later published as an editorial in this column. This article was addressed to the President, and read in part as follows:

"Successful negotiations require a temperate atmosphere. That means that, just as Mr. K must stop his bullying, missile-rattling, and sending of ultimatums, so might you see to it that our talking admirals and generals are silenced.

"Peace cannot be made in an atmosphere where each adversary tries to outboast, outdenounce, and outthreaten the other."

The first to feel this new exercise of authority from the President was Adm. Arleigh Burke, chief of naval operations at that time. His proposed speech was toned down by Pentagon censors, and he did not like it and said so publicly.

Neither did many newspaper editors and columnists, who wailed about the "muzzling" of high military officers and how it was restraining freedom of speech. Senators and Congressmen chimed in with the same singsong. As the rule continued to be applied to Air Force generals, the cries grew louder. The result was that the Senate authorized an investigating committee, which recently began holding hearings on the subject.

The results of the hearings have been notable for the mild way in which Admiral Burke and others have testified. Not a one of the generals or admirals felt he was being denied freedom of speech. Most of them thought reviews and censorship of their public declarations were necessary.

One or two of the Senators finally demanded of Secretary McNamara that he produce the names of the censors. He refused. When he was pressed by the Senators, President Kennedy came forth with his statement. This ought to end the controversy.

The outcome gives me a lot of personal satisfaction, because I began this campaign against our talking admirals and generals back in the days of President Truman. When, in February and March of 1951, Gen. Douglas MacArthur began his public debate with President Truman, here in this column of the Star, I "recalled" the General before President Truman did. My position was that never, never, could our country allow any general, no matter how great and popular he might be, to carry on a public debate with any President of the United States.

Naturally, when President Truman recalled General MacArthur, I thought he did what was right, although the General had been most hospitable to me in Manila in 1945, and Tokyo in 1949 and 1950. That I spent an hour with him in his office that night of June 25, 1950, when the war in Korea started, gives some indication of what he thought of me.

The record shows that I was one of the few editors in the whole country to come to the support of President Truman. After all, Truman acted on the advice of Gen. George C. Marshall.

Down through the two Eisenhower administrations I carried on this same campaign. At times I would quote what the President said one day, and what a talking general or admiral said the next day contradicting him. These editorials had some effect, but not nearly enough. The generals and admirals were aware of Ike's easy-going attitude. He could be contradicted safely.

Subsequently, I wrote that article for the Atlantic, "A Letter to the President." It was written before the results of the election were known. It was addressed as much to Richard M. Nixon as to John F. Kennedy. It offered me a good opportunity to continue this vitally necessary campaign to silence our talking generals and admirals. I feared that their bellicose talks would shout us into war without a good reason.

It naturally is refreshing to see the vigor with which President Kennedy has reacted to an influential Senate committee in supporting his Secretary of Defense.

As Gen. John J. Pershing said one time here in Tucson, "When a man puts on the uniform of the U.S. Army, he gives up his right of free speech."

It is the duty of the military forces of our country to support, not contradict, the diplomatic policy of our country as established by the President and his advisers, who usually work intimately with the Congress.

Negotiation With the Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Mr. Frank van der Linden, a respected and able Washington correspondent for a number of years, has written an excellent article on the subject of our policy in negotiating with the Communists. Mr. Van der Linden has done a good job in analyzing this policy with the idea of sounding the warning that firmness is the only answer in dealing with the Communists and that we should never become so fearful of any type war that we are not willing to stand up to the Communists to resist their aggressive and unreasonable moves in their efforts to gain domination of the world. I commend Mr. Van der Linden's column as printed on February 1 of the Shreveport Journal, February 21, 1962, to the Members of the Senate and ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENNEDY POLICY COULD LEAD TO TRAP BY REDS—FEAR OF WAR MAY BE REAL KEY TO NEGOTIATION MOVES

(By Frank Der Linden)

WASHINGTON.—A nightmare fear of nuclear war may prove to be the real key to President Kennedy's peculiar policy of seeking negotiations with the Russians—despite all their broken promises—and soft-pedaling American military men's speeches which call for victory in the cold war with world communism.

The key may be found in certain significan passages of the President's inaugural address of January 20, 1961, when he said: "Finally, to those nations who would make themselves our adversary we offer not a pledge but a request: that both sides begin anew with a quest for peace, before the dark powers of destruction unleashed by science engulf all humanity in planned or accidental self-destruction."

Speaking, in effect, to the Reds without mentioning them by name, he said: "Let us begin anew—remembering on both sides that civility is not a sign of weakness, and sincerity is always subject to proof. Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate."

Unfortunately, the olive branch held out by the young and inexperienced President was misunderstood by the Communists to be a white flag. They immediately began heating up the areas of conflict, so that hot wars threatened in Laos, the Congo, Berlin, and the Caribbean. Kennedy's off-again, on-again vacillation, which led to the disastrous defeat of the invasion forces seeking to free Cuba from Castro, further encouraged the Communists to believe the United States was too weak to fight in defense of freedom.

Then came the perilous summer when war could have been touched off by an armed clash in Berlin, and the Reds were allowed to build their wall without hindrance.

As Kennedy himself explained his policy at a recent press conference, "the Soviet Union has had de facto control of East Berlin since the late forties" and "the United States has a very limited force surrounded by a great many divisions. You could have had a very violent reaction." The phrase, "a very violent reaction," of course, is a typical Kennedy understatement meaning war.

To convince the Reds that the West would really fight for the freedom of West Berlin, and Vietnam, halfway round the world, the President felt it necessary to call up reservists, call for larger defense expenditures, and otherwise make gestures of determination.

Since that time of crisis, the pressure over Berlin has eased, and for the past several months informal talks have been going on to work out some deal for the relaxation of tensions.

The fallacy in this policy is that the tensions themselves have always been heated up by the Communists; they turn the pressure on and off as it suits their purposes. So there is little solid basis for an agreement on Berlin, on a nuclear test ban, or controlled armament.

Yet the President persists in trying. He invites Khrushchev's son-in-law to lunch at the White House; he prepares to send Press Secretary Pierre Salinger to Moscow; he sends brother Bobby on a good-will world tour and there are reports of an invitation for one Kennedy or the other to visit the Soviet capital. Other reports hint a split between Red China and Red Russia, which might lead Khrushchev to turn to the West to save himself from the big bad Chinese dragon.

If there could be any actual basis for an agreement to avert the threat of war, of course it would be welcomed by a world that yearns for peace. But the danger is that the Communists are merely lulling the West into a surrender. As Representative STEVEN DEROUNIAN, of New York, told the House the other day, the Kennedy administration is guilty of childlike behavior in trying to bat down the Communist empire by being sweet to its rulers.

In his earnest efforts to avoid a war, Kennedy could find himself trapped into a policy that could be denounced as appeasement.

It could lead to another Munich, and a "peace in our time" that would be an equally dangerous illusion.

The Elephant Is Haunted by His Own Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of January 31, 1962. I think the editorial speaks for itself. The GOP platform of 1960 is coming back to haunt the Republican Party at a time when it is attacking President Kennedy's Urban Affairs and Housing Department plan.

The editorial follows:

THE NEW DEPARTMENT

It is difficult to understand why so many Republicans in Congress are so deeply outraged by President Kennedy's intention to set up a new Department of Urban Affairs. The Republican Party's own platform of 1960 recommended:

"A stepped-up program to assist in urban planning, designed to assure far sighted and wise use of land and to coordinate mass transportation and other vital facilities in our metropolitan areas."

To be sure, this Republican plank did not specifically suggest the idea of forming a new department. But the activities it described as needing to be stepped-up are precisely the activities which Mr. Kennedy is now talking about. Certainly the most logical way of stepping-up such activities is to bring them together, under the direction of a responsible Cabinet officer, within the framework of a single Department.

The Federal Government is already deeply involved in urban affairs—think of housing, for example—and it is surely going to be still more deeply involved as time goes by—consider what it will soon be asked to do in the matter of salvaging metropolitan transportation and keeping the commuter lines alive. It is perfectly clear, as the President said in his message to Congress yesterday, that "in a few short decades we have passed from a rural to an urban way of life and in a few short decades more we shall be a nation of vastly expanding population, living in expanded urban areas in housing that does not now exist."

Since a shortsighted and high-handed Rules Committee in the House of Representatives has destroyed the hope of early action on an administration bill to establish the new Urban Affairs Department, we welcome Mr. Kennedy's course in proceeding alternatively under the Reorganization Act, as he has every right to do.

Manned Orbital Space Flights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I joined millions of my fellow Americans in praying silently both for the safety of Col. John H. Glenn and for the success of America's first manned orbital space flight.

In my prayers, I thanked our Divine Maker for the patience and wisdom that He gave to the directors of Project Mercury who so wisely and courageously elected to postpone our manned orbital flight attempt until they had Colonel Glenn's safety and the success of the flight itself assured. Many Americans, as you well know, Mr. Speaker, became somewhat impatient with the vexing postponements in our manned orbital flight attempt. I am sure that all of them now join with me in humble gratitude for the courage of the Project Mercury team. I am sure they now agree that a brief period of delay is eminently to be preferred to the crushing blow that would have been dealt our national prestige if our manned orbital flight attempt had ended in failure.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of our Science and Astronautics Committee, Congressman MILLER of California, recently addressed a meeting of the Hampton Roads Section of the Institute of Aerospace Sciences at NASA Langley Research Center, located in the First Congressional District of Virginia, which I have the privilege to represent. Chairman MILLER called on the IAS to do everything possible to help achieve a broad public understanding of the fact that NASA is attempting to perform a long-term scientific investigation of space.

Manned orbital space flights should never be viewed as "stunts" in our Nation's space program. Our Nation's exploration on the horizons of space will cost the taxpayers something like $50 million over the next 5 years. This expenditure, however successful our space program, will be basically wasted unless we as Americans understand the value that will accrue to our Nation from every aspect of NASA's activities in space.

Colonel Glenn's vastly successful orbital flight is, as one of Project Mercury's directors so aptly phrased it, "the end of the beginning." We are now on the threshold of the unknown. I venture to say that no living American could accurately predict the achievements for our society that will naturally follow Colonel Glenn's epochal flight.

Our Nation's space program is worth the investment, Mr. Speaker. I hope that our most recent space achievement will lead increasing numbers of Americans to active support for our space efforts.

As a Virginian, Mr. Speaker, I am deeply proud that Col. John H. Glenn, whose bravery and ability were so notably made evident yesterday, lives with his lovely wife and teenage children in Virginia. All of us hope that they will elect to make Virginia their permanent home.

And then, too, no one should forget the team of astronauts who originally trained at Langley Field NASA near Hampton, Va., and at Wallops Island, Va. Only one man could make the orbital flight but the entire team was necessary to insure success. And that was what all seven wanted more than anything else. The courage of one was the courage of seven combined into that one.

We should be extremely proud of the directors of Project Mercury. Upon their shoulders rested the responsibility of the whole venture. If the project had failed it would have been their failure. Now that it has succeeded, it is their success.

Also there are the employees of the great Agency, NASA, who have both directly and indirectly contributed so much to the scientific advancement of our aeronautics and space exploration programs. Without them, the accomplishment we celebrate would have been virtually impossible. These dedicated men and women have met and are meeting the almost impossible demands thrust on them.

These and others too, no less dedicated, are the reasons we are joyous. We are grateful for their untiring efforts and limitless abilities.

This achievement, as great as it is, is surely only the beginning, Mr. Speaker. Americans everywhere can be justly proud.

Federal Aid to Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs I am well aware of the plight of our American Indians and what this administration is attempting to do for them. On February 11, 1962, there appeared in the Washington Star an article entitled "The Vanishing Race? Federal Aid to Indians Still Growing." The author, Lee Lorick Prina, points out that the Federal Government will spend a total of $221 million this fiscal year on our Indian programs. These programs include the building of highways, operation of over 300 schools, vocational training, relocation, installation of sewer systems, agricultural projects, and medical assistance. Mention is made of the fact that our Indians are not a "vanishing race" at all, but to the contrary, their population has more than doubled since 1900.

The author discusses some of the steps taken by this administration to assist the Indians. There has been an increase in the revolving loan fund from $10 million to $20 million, and the vocational training appropriation has been increased from $3.5 million to $7.5 million a year. In the article this administration's three long-range goals for our Indian minority are noted as follows:

First. Maximum economic self-sufficiency.

Second. Full participation in American life.

Third. Equal citizenship privileges and responsibilities.

I recommend that all persons interested in our American Indians and what we are doing for them read this article. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE VANISHING RACE? FEDERAL AID TO INDIANS STILL GROWING

(By Lee Lorick Prina)

The Federal Government will spend a total of $221 million this fiscal year on American Indians. The Interior Department's Bureau of Indian Affairs will use more than $160 million for welfare and educational programs. In addition, $61 million will be spent by the Health, Education, and Welfare Department which in 1955 took over from Interior to provide big medicine for the red men.

The present Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Phileo Nash, points out that "the combined appropriations for the Indian Bureau and Health, Education, and Welfare amounts to $700 per capita on Indians receiving Federal funds. But in this $221 million you have focused on one segment of the population all costs of local government—munici-

pal, county, and State plus all Federal nondefense expenditures."

In other words, Mr. Nash said, the Federal Government provides all governmental services for Indians living on reservations such as building highways, running schools, and welfare programs. Other citizens, not descendants of the first Americans, receive these from their localities. In addition, the Federal Government also gives to Indians free medical care and acts as manager for Indian estate land.

The Kennedy administration has brought in a fresh string of players to meet the Indians. A committee, appointed by Secretary of Interior Udall and on which Mr. Nash serves, had recommended three long-range goals for the Indian minority:

1. Maximum economic self-sufficiency.
2. Full participation in American life.
3. Equal citizenship privileges and responsibilities.

To accomplish these aims, the report called for developing both human and natural resources on reservations.

INCREASE IN POPULATION

Far from being vanishing Americans, the Indian population has more than doubled since 1900, increasing from 250,000 to about 535,000. (Reduction of the infant mortality rate was the principal cause of the population jump.) When Columbus discovered America, it is estimated a million Indians lived here.

Considering the amount of Federal output for this minority group, it may sound as if the Indian has at last found his "happy hunting ground." Yet, after 167 years of governmental controls and benefits, the average Indian has a lower standard of living and life expectancy (his average age at death is 41 compared to the national 62) than other Americans. Perhaps half of them are still illiterate.

"One thing that has impressed me above all others is the tremendous complexity and diversity of Indian affairs," former Indian Affairs Commissioner Glen L. Emmons said in 1953. "I am now more convinced than ever that you cannot apply the same yardstick to the more than 200 tribal groups throughout the United States. Each tribe has its own customs and traditions, its own set of problems, its own type of organization, its own idea about its future."

Recently, there have been suggestions that the Indians have exactly the same privileges and responsibilities as other citizens. Questions have been raised about the legality of providing so many Federal benefits to this special segment of the population.

But, once again the Government has had to bow to this fact: Perhaps for another generation, many Indians will continue to live apart on reservations, speaking their own language, clinging to tribal laws and customs, and receiving large amounts of Federal aid.

EFFORTS AT RELOCATION

Indian leaders have seen termination of aid as meaning: Losing their tax-free land; withdrawal of welfare to uneducated and unemployable tribesmen; and tribal breakup due to an exodus from the reservation. They have also been "on the warpath" over Bureau efforts of relocation, finding jobs for the unemployed away from the reservation.

The present Indian Affairs Commissioner believes that someday termination of Federal services will come from the Indians themselves, Mr. Nash feels that the tribes will ask for full responsibility of their own affairs in time. He points out that already a number of tribes with some resources have asked to be freed from Federal jurisdiction.

When the Indians were subjugated and moved West to the reservations, no one was unhappier than these once-free people. Today, it is Indian tribal policy to cling to the reservation, though they are now able to leave it at any time.

A person is legally an Indian if he has one-quarter Indian blood. In the eastern section of the United States, most of these first Americans live like other citizens. But, west of the Mississippi, about 380,000 live on or near more than 250 Federal reservations. These vary in size from the Navahos' 25,000 square miles to a ranch of a few acres.

Besides the basic American freedoms, reservation dwellers have the following privileges: Indian land is tax exempt if held in trust by the Government. Federal funds operate about 300 schools and pay tuition for the other half of Indian children attending State public schools. In addition to the usual social security payments, the Great White Father provides special welfare benefits for the unemployed and needy.

LOANS FOR BUSINESS

About 272 physicians and 94 dentists serve Federal Indian hospitals and clinics. Tribes may obtain Federal loans to start business enterprises. The Government also develops reservation land through roadbuilding, sewer systems, and agricultural projects. Generally State criminal laws do not apply to reservation residents and tribal courts have jurisdiction over most lesser crimes.

The Kennedy administration has prescribed economic remedies to improve life on the reservations. Two laws were passed in the 1st session of the 87th Congress. One doubled the Bureau's revolving loan fund from $10 million to $20 million. The other increased the vocational training program from $3.5 million to $7.5 million a year and liberalized the training requirements.

For fiscal 1963 the Bureau will ask Congress to give it $2,920,000 to establish a Division of Economic Development for Reservations. Second, to solve one of its biggest headaches, the Bureau will seek legislation to solve the heirship problem. It is hoped Congress will authorize tribes to buy small tracts of idle land owned by many heirs and so subdivided that no agreement on its use can be reached.

To make some of the reservation land help pay its way, the Secretary of the Interior now opposes per capita payments when tribes come into money from judgments on land claims. Judgment funds, he says, should go for basic economic development of tribal land, not into individual payments.

Finally, to help more Indians find employment, Washington plans to return to the former policy of using Indian labor on reservation construction projects. Construction contracts will favor use of local residents (i.e., Indians).

HISTORY OF U.S. AID

How did the Government get into the Indian business? When the Constitution was adopted the States ceded to the Federal Government the management of Indian affairs. Originally the administrative agency was the War Department. Fighting the red men, as well as treaty making, was the business of the day. After 1849, when Interior took over, an attempt was made to compensate for a history of governmental neglect of the tribes.

The Indians became wards of the Government in the days of the Old West and the ration system. When the buffalo herds were wiped out and the land settled, hunting was no longer possible. Indians, unable to successfully farm or raise cattle on arid reservations, had to depend on the dole or starve.

Even then one writer predicted that unless some better system could stimulate the Indian to use his own self-reliance, the tribes would become "loafers and outcasts contending with the dogs for kitchen scraps in western villages."

Interior Department policymakers consider education of the present generation of children as the main tool in helping Indians to advance to the point where special services are not needed. As recently as 1950, only 75 percent of Indian children attended classes. Today, except for a thousand or more youngsters in isolated homelands, all can reach schools.

Many Indians today still prefer to live precariously on rents or assets from reservation land, which they actually own but which is held in trust for them by the Federal Government. In 1959, about 52.2 million acres valued at $279 million on paper was trust property.

The Indian tribes base their claim to this land and present Federal benefits on treaties made long ago between tribal heads and Government representatives. Over the years, many treaties were broken and the Indians were defrauded of their land.

In 1946, Congress set up the Indian Claims Commission to settle hundreds of allegations that treaties had been violated and land taken away. As of July 1, 1961, of 852 claims filed, 170 had been settled with judgments totaling more than $72 million in favor of the Indians.

COURT OF CLAIMS

Before the Claims Commission was established, the U.S. Court of Claims heard these land cases. It has awarded more than $100 million in payments to Indians.

To make sure that all tribes had the vote, in 1924 Congress passed a law giving them the franchise. Surveys show that not many Indians get to the polls. The Bureau, however, watches for denial of the vote in Western States, resorting to the courts where necessary.

Virtually unknown as compared to some similar groups, there are four interest groups, with registered lobbyists, presenting Indian views to Washington lawmakers. They are the National Congress of American Indians, Indian Rights Association, Association on American Indian Affairs, and the Friends Committee on National Legislation.

This year, the Bureau will submit to Congress legislation to establish an advisory board on Indian affairs to advise the Secretary of Interior. Composed of Indians and non-Indians, members will serve without pay and meet four times a year.

Today, 12,000 employees, half of whom are of Indian descent, work in Washington and in the field for the Bureau.

Bakers Seeking U.S. Tariff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article which appeared in the Niagara Falls Gazette, Niagara Falls, N.Y., concerning the importation of bread from Canada. The article was brought to my attention by Mr. Joseph E. Malikiewicz, business representative, Bakers' Union Local No. 16, Buffalo, N.Y. The article follows:

BAKERS SEEKING U.S. TARIFF

(By Peter Kohler)

Area bakers, who claim Canadian bread is taking too large a slice of their market, are trying to impose a tariff on it.

But they wonder if Washington, already concerned with tariff-cutting pleas, will go along with the proposal.

Bakers and bakery workers on the Niagara frontier said Canadian bread has captured

20 percent of area market. They want a 15-percent duty placed on it.

In the meantime, Congress is being asked for broad tariff-reducing powers by the Kennedy administration.

President Kennedy has asked Congress for power to slash tariffs so trade can be expanded with the booming European Common Market.

A spokesman for the bakers sees little hope for a duty on Canadian bread, "because the whole tariff picture is up in the air."

But a representative for bakery workers believes the proposal may go through Congress "because this is an election year."

The labor representative is Joseph E. Malikiewicz, business representative for Local 16, Bakery & Confectionery Workers, Buffalo.

He said Saturday that a 15-percent duty on Canadian bread would not be out of line with Government aims for reciprocal tariff arrangements.

Canada, he explained, has a 15-percent tariff on U.S. bread while this country imposes no duty.

He would be satisfied if Canada would drop its tariff because it would put trade on "a competitive basis."

"I definitely have hope for the tariff proposal," he said. A bill has been introduced in the House to that end, he added.

Both the bakers and bakery workers support the tariff proposal. They claim Canadian bread is being "dumped" on this market at the expense of U.S. business and labor.

Charles Schutz, of Buffalo, legislative chairman of the State Manufacturing Retail Bakers' Association, said the imports have had the greatest impact in Niagara Falls.

He traces the influx of Canadian bread to a bakery drivers strike in Buffalo a few years ago. Grocers were then forced to look for other sources of bread. They found them in Canada.

They discovered that Canadian bread could be brought here without duty. And they found the loaves were larger and cheaper.

Within the last 2 years bread imports in this area have increased by about 60 percent. About 160,000 loaves are imported in this area in a month.

In Niagara Falls, Frank DiCamillo, president of the DiCamillo Baking Co. Inc., said: "Since 1954, we have lost more than 50 percent of our bread business."

DiCamillo said his firm sells bread to retail groceries in the city, but has had to cut the number of its routes and delivery trucks.

Canadians are able to produce cheaper bread because of lower flour and labor costs. "Even a 15-percent tariff wouldn't make the difference. I think the tariff should be higher," he added.

Another local baker, John Critelli, owner of the Critelli Bakery, has taken his case to city council.

Critelli told the council that 40 bakery jobs had been lost in the city because of the Canadian bread.

"I had a four-man operation; now there is just one man other than myself.

"Since 1956, I've lost 65 percent of my business," he told the Gazette later.

He said his shop turned out up to 5,000 loaves of bread a week 6 years ago and now it produces about 1,600.

Critelli, Schultz, and DiCamillo charge the Canadian bakers are selling bread below cost in order to use up surplus production that couldn't be sold in Canadian markets.

A baker in Niagara Falls, Ontario, answered this charge as "propaganda."

He is Herbert Petrak, owner of the National Bakery Co., which sells about 30 percent of its bread in western New York.

Petrak said his bread sells for the same price in Canada as it does in the United States about 18 cents a loaf or two for 35 cents.

The 10,000 loaves he produces each week for the U.S. market are not delivered by his firm. "American trucks pick it up," he said.

Petrak said, "I don't care if they put up a tariff. We hate to give up the business, but there is little profit in it anyway.

"The baker gets squeezed between the market and the driver."

He said U.S. chainstores were following cutthroat pricing policies with bread and that his business had been falling off recently.

Area bakers maintain, however, that the import is being dumped. If the tariff proposal doesn't work they hope to bar Canadian bread with the provisions of a Federal antidumping law.

If this tack doesn't work, the bakers and bakery workers have another angle. State law requires that all bakery producers be inspected for sanitation standards. Since State inspectors cannot check Canadian bakeries, it is felt this law could bar imported bread.

Life and Character of Gen. Robert E. Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the first part of a splendid address delivered in the Senate of Texas by State Senator Dorsey B. Hardeman. The address, which follows, was given on January 18, 1962:

LIFE AND CHARACTER OF GEN. ROBERT E. LEE

(Pt. I)

Mr. President and members of the senate, the tedium of the times suggests that we may well pause in the routine of official activities for an address, whether by me or another, on the life and character of the South's most gallant son, on the day preceding the anniversary of his birth 155 years ago, as explained by Senator Moffett, and which will be observed throughout the Southland on the morrow. His name is emblazoned on the hearts of all whose senses of appreciation of honor and loyalty have not been dulled by those who would traduce these basic traits or hold them lightly.

I feel particularly honored by my designation in Senate Resolution 17, sponsored by Senator Moffett, the distinguished senator from Hardeman, to attempt this assignment. I am grateful for this manifestation of your confidence, and I earnestly hope that my sincerity may compensate for my inability to adequately portray the life and character of him whom we pause to honor and and to whom we desire to pay appropriate tribute. I recall no similar program during the three lustrums I have been a member of this body. I commend this observance as a precedent.

Even with this feeble effort we may be able to reflect, briefly, upon some of the things that exalted Gen. Robert E. Lee to the highest pinnacle of personal honor and integrity and set him apart as the supreme example to be emulated in the fulfillment of any noble earthly ambition.

It was Pericles, the eminent Grecian orator who said, in one of his classic orations, while memoralizing those who fell on the field of battle during the Peloponnesian War, that he commended the fitness of honoring their immortals in an appropriate way, but he doubted the wisdom of attempting to embellish their careers with overdrawn speech. He made bold to say that, where men's deeds had been great, they should be honored for their deeds only; and the estimate placed on men, after death, should never depend upon the judgment, good or bad, of any one man. So it shall be as we proceed with this attempt to depict the life and character of him in whose memory this date is observed. Our history, during a century past, has built around him a name and a fame that will light the pathway of generations yet unborn for a thousand years. Patriotism and admiration will not let us forget his mighty stroke for principle and his devotion to duty, even if we would.

Time and circumstances, perhaps, preclude an extended background discussion of conditions preceding the event which was to cast General Lee in his role as America's greatest soldier even though "Fate denied him victory, but fame clothed him with glorious immortality."

He was truly "a gentleman to the manor born," and "no greater encomium can be paid a man than to say 'he is a gentleman.' * * * There is no character so respected and honored as the gentleman. The word 'gentleman' cannot be easily described for * * * it has no synonym and no correlative. It is more than loyalty and chivalry. It combines honor with humility, veracity with meekness and makes purity glow on the heart as a diamond flames on the breast." Of noble parentage, there coursed his veins the blood of Revolutionary heroes and of Virginia's most respected families. He was the illustrious son of a noble sire—"Light Horse Harry" Lee—one of General Washington's most trusted lieutenants and who spoke the immortal, descriptive words about his great, former Commander in Chief as being "first in war, first in peace and first in the hearts of his countrymen." His mother was the gracious, intelligent, and gentle Ann Carter Lee who imbued her son with the strength of character which sustained him in his hours of momentous decisions and which ever characterized his honorable career.

It will serve no purpose to dwell upon the misfortune which befell his distinguished father and which, no doubt, made a lasting impression on the adoring young son, no less than on his mother who taught him the virtues—thrift and self-denial—which his father lacked.

Young Robert grew up just across the Potomac River from Washington, from which point, at the age of 7, he saw the smoke rising from the burning Capitol of his country on that black day in 1814, when the British, under Admiral Ross, landed and burned the White House itself, and from which Dolly Madison rescued the Stuart painting of General Washington, one of our most prized possessions. Circumstances caused him to assume responsibilities far beyond his years, but his heavy and unusual duties during his father's absence and his mother's illness, helped build the character of the man he was to become.

The devotion of his mother, the patriotic record of his courageous father, and the inspiration of General Washington, of whom his father and mother spoke in almost religious reverence, doubtless, contributed to the strong military tradition which was to influence him. Before Robert was out of his teens, the venerable Marquis de Lafayette voyaged from France to visit in the home of the widow of Light Horse Harry Lee and shake the hand of her son.

His great ambition was to become a soldier and wear his country's uniform like his heroic father before him.

Appointed to West Point by John C. Calhoun, then Secretary of War, he entered at the time Cadet Jefferson Davis, whom he would know exceedingly well in later years, was an upperclassman at the Academy. Young Lee's strong body enabled him to

withstand the rigors and hardships of cadet training, during which time he never received a demerit for any fraction of the rules or misbehavior. Upon graduation he stood second in his class of 46, the survivors of 87 hopefuls. In the class was Joseph E. Johnston who was to become one of his most trusted generals in the War Between the States.

While on furlough he discovered Mary Custis, daughter of General Washington's adopted son and the grandson of Martha Washington, whom he married 2 years following his graduation from the Academy.

Assigned to active duty with the Army Engineers, Second Lieutenant Lee was first stationed at Savannah, Ga., and later sent to Fortress Monroe. His first 15 years in the Army were rather dull, but his happy family life at Arlington, his wife's home, compensated therefor. Seven children were born to the Lees. Then came the war with Mexico, by which time Lee had been promoted to captain. He was then ordered to join the American forces stationed at San Antonio, and subsequently, assigned to General Scott's army in Mexico where his brother-officers included many who would win fame in later years, either fighting beside him in the Confederate Army or seeking to destroy him in battle: Joseph E. Johnston, Albert Sidney Johnston, whose portrait adorns this Chamber, Pierre G. T. Beauregard, Stonewall Jackson, George Pickett, A. P. Hill and Jubal Early, all of whom would serve as generals in the Confederate armies; and U. S. Grant, George McClellan, Irvin McDowell and a number of others who would lead Union forces against them.

Captain Lee played a major part in the capture of Veracruz, which was followed by his brilliant strategy at Cerro Gordo, defeating Santa Anna at this mountain pass, in the onward march to Mexico City, whereupon he was promoted to the rank of major. Upon reaching Mexico City, it was Major Lee whom General Scott designated to scout the area for a way to attack the enemy from the rear and in which battle Lee displayed great courage, military genius and physical endurance that almost defy belief. With the assault on Chapultepec, the most formidable of all the forts in Mexico, as planned by Major Lee, during which a bullet gave him a minor wound, Chapultepec fell and the city surrendered the next day. Major Lee had recovered sufficiently to watch the American flag being raised over the Mexican capitol. Again he was promoted, this time to brevet colonel, and again dispatches and reports from the battlefield praised the son of "Light Horse Harry."

Colonel Lee came home to Arlington and to fame. He was appointed Superintendent of West Point and served under the new Secretary of War, Jefferson Davis, with an outstanding and constructive record. It was during his 3 years tenure as Superintendent of West Point that Lee became a member of the Episcopal Church whose influence was never to leave him, nor would his faith in Almighty God, no matter how dark the hour.

Two principal issues were hopelessly dividing the American people: one moral, slavery; and the other political, States rights. The expanding economic and political power of the Southland bestirred jealousies in the North, seized upon by hotheads therein which made it increasingly patent that resort to force of arms would result, as principle after principle was violated for pecuniary preferment. The sons and daughters of Dixie, as hovering warclouds cast their ominous shadows across their land, were compelled to defend their honor and to protect their homes and themselves against further prostitution of constitutional provisions.

Let it not be forgotten that it was northern traders, some of whom founded the great fortunes upon which parasitical subsequent generations have subsisted, who penetrated the unexplored regions of darkest Africa and engaged in murder, robbery, and piracy to capture dark-skinned human beings for work in their mills and factories. When found to be unsuitable as technicians and skilled workers therein, these slaves, and their progeny, were sold in the South where kindlier treatment and more temperate climatic conditions contributed to their well-being, as well as being profitable to the economy of the South, and with it came the increasing political power of which the northern industrialists were so jealous.

Speech Delivered by Gen. A. Somoza D., of Nicaragua, to the West Point Society of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, February 6, 1962, Gen. A. Somoza, of Nicaragua, himself a graduate of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, now Nicaraguan Chief of Staff, addressed the West Point Society of New York, and I include as part of my remarks today the aforementioned address by General Somoza.

Address follows:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY GEN. A. SOMOZA D., TO THE WEST POINT SOCIETY OF NEW YORK, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1962

Mr. President and members of the West Point Society of New York, while to you this may be just another luncheon and meeting, to me it is the rare privilege and pleasure of seeing, and talking to graduates of West Point.

I want to thank you, Mr. President, and fellow members of the long gray line for this opportunity.

While a cadet at the U.S. Military Academy, I was particularly impressed by the words of Gen. Hap Arnold of the U.S. Air Force, who lectured us at West Point in 1946 in relation to world politics.

He stressed that the Western World should expect its future problems on a global scale to come from anywhere north of the 30th parallel. At that time he did not specifically mention the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The world today is struggling to reach a peaceful solution to the many demands that ideoligical and economic roots imposed on it. The ideal world would be one free of hunger, free of ignorance, free of fear, and free of disease.

The battle against these fears has been waged ever since humanity organized into societies of tribes. Mankind today, in its eternal struggle to achieve these goals, is confronted with two possible solutions:

Democracy—with its system of a freely elected Government and just taxation, with governmental programs stimulating trade thereby raising standards of living; and

Communism—which calls for the destruction of private enterprise and the regulation of all social, economic, and cultural activities through the agency of a single powerful authority.

It may be said Latin America today might be faced with the problem of which way to turn. You can feel this hesitation and search for orientation in the divided vote at Punta del Este. Certainly, the current regime in Cuba has given ample reasons to justify collective intervention and yet this action has not been taken because of numerous Castro sympathizers throughout Latin America.

The role of the United States with respect to Latin America is one of great importance to the future of this great nation. Today, isolationism is impossible and interdependence is the current trend in successful international relations.

We in Latin America are not as fortunate as you in the United States. I say this because the historical background of these two continents is different. Your ancestors came to North America seeking a new and better life, our ancestors came to conquer; but later these conquerors were absorbed by the local inhabitants, however, there are few Latin nations in which the natives were exterminated and only Europeans settled. So it is a fallacy to consider that Latin America is a single political entity, with one solution and one problem. Dissimilar climatic, geographic, and racial conditions divide Latin nations into a number of political units each with its own psychology.

The hope that a flow of immigrants to Latin America would develop activities and would provide enough work and opportunities for Latin America did not materialize because as the nations of the Western World have developed their standards of living, people have felt more secure in their respective countries and have not been prone to leave such conditions. Of course, increased immigration from the United States to Latin America would greatly strengthen hemispheric ties. However, this has been limited, for the aforementioned reasons. Therefore, the means to help the people of Latin America must come directly from the Government of the United States to the people of Latin America through their respective governments.

When one stops to think of the millions who have yet to learn to read and write, and of the lack of professional and technical know-how in Latin America, then the responsibility of formulating a program to raise the living standard of these people is one of great consequence, of great necessity and of great decision.

Let us take my country as an example of what may happen when the standard of living in Latin America is raised. In 17 years of army service in Nicaragua, I have visited many towns and villages. At the beginning, in most of the villages that I visited the only request forthcoming was for the establishment of a school. Once the school had been built, the people next wanted more sanitation and public utilities.

When an economic survey showed that the productivity of the villagers was impaired by lack of transportation and modern methods of agriculture, the problem then became one that could not be so easily solved.

Roads were opened, and farm machinery was made available through banking credits. In a few years, the local inhabitants had practically paid for their equipment and showed a small return on their investments.

However, the standards of living did not improve as expected in relation to what had been made available to the inhabitants of the village. Why is the question that now arises—The reason lies in the idiosyncrasies of the fast developing Latin America economy. When the time comes to pay taxes for improvements, such as paving of streets, etc., those whose productivity had been low do not want to pay any direct taxes. They are bitterly opposed because they were accustomed to paying taxes indirectly only on consumer goods. The same mentality in general with respect to taxes applies to those who are classified as wealthy; they, too, are reluctant to pay an income tax. The point

I want to emphasize is that if Latin America is to be free of communism, the philosophy of all the people in these countries must undergo a radical change; the wealthy few must come to the realization that the colonial tradition of exploiting the worker, underpaying and underfeeding him, is no longer valid; instead the privileged classes should be convinced that the everyday laborer must be educated and paid higher wages, thereby raising his standard of living. The mentality of the working class must also change. It must show an interest in increasing its efficiency and productivity in order to justify an increase in remunerating and other benefits.

In addition there must be a change in the attitude of the American businessman in Latin America. He should realize that although some 30-odd years ago because of the squalid economies in many of these countries, their local governments were willing to allow enormous concessions to insure work perhaps only for a few hundred laborers, present circumstances are somewhat different. Today, the knowledge which the people of Latin America have absorbed through radio, television, and moving pictures, has led them to feel that they too have a right to the advantages available in the more developed countries they see and hear about.

On this line of thinking, I have done my utmost to inject these ideas in the officers in the Nicaraguan Armed Forces. I have not done it by just lecturing them but by letting them come into physical contacts with societies and countries in all parts of the Western World. A program of this magnitude could not be carried out on the basis of the meager budget that we have assigned for the security of the country. Considering that 70 percent of all the officer corps has traveled abroad and are back in Nicaragua, this task could only be accomplished by the cooperation of friendly nations.

This cooperation has consisted of military scholarships which these nations have offered to the Nicaraguan Government. The greatest share of this cooperation, I am happy to state, comes from the United States of America. However, we have had cooperation from France, Italy, Spain, Western Germany, and England in the European Continent, and in Latin America from Mexico, Venezuela, Brazil, Argentina, and Peru.

This is the reason why the Nicaraguan Armed Forces are openminded and receptive to any political and social evolution within the framework of democracy. They are convinced that communism is not the solution for our people.

An important step toward the betterment of the Latin American people is the alliance for progress proposed by President Kennedy. This program has given hope to everyone in Latin America from the peon, who believes in this alliance and who sees in it the beginning of a new era that promises better times; to the middle class, the broadening of its social conditions and opportunities; and to the privileged few, the ability to join their local governments and the United States in keeping Latin America free from the Communist grasp and in bringing about in a nonviolent way social and economic justice to the masses.

The problem which will confront us in Latin America is going to be the same problem as that which confronted the aforementioned village. The problem is how Latin America will repay in kind the moneys made available if there are no markets for increased production. This is a thought that I shall leave with you. I would like to quote a phrase, that can be applied to nations as well as societies, from your distinguished President's inaugural address:

"If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich."

Is He Forgotten?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, during the last session of the Congress, I introduced upon the request of the national Veterans of World War I organization, H.R. 3745, which would increase present pensions for veterans of World War I by some 30 percent. The support from many Members of Congress and the various national veterans organizations at the hearings held last summer by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee on this and similar bills was very gratifying. Strong support from the grassroots, if you will, is ably illustrated by an editorial appearing in the "Legion A-I-R," the official publication of the Lawrence Capehart Post No. 35 of the American Legion, in Jeffersonville, Ind. The national leadership of the American Legion did not support the World War I pension legislation at the hearings last year. But, as this editorial points out, there has been strong sentiment among the rank-and-file members of the Legion in my district and all across the country for this badly needed legislation.

Mr. Hermann A. Wenige, the editor of the "Legion A-I-R" has long been active in veterans affairs in my district, and I am pleased to have this opportunity to bring this outstanding editorial to the attention of my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

IS HE FORGOTTEN?

(By Hermann A. Wenige)

I wonder what a hero thinks
When he is old and gray
I wonder if he sometimes blinks
The memory tears away
I wonder if he sometimes hears
The cheering of the throng
And dreams about the early years
When he was young and strong.
Does he remember when the sky
Blazed in a fiery hell
And does he sometimes wonder why
The land he served so well
Deserts him in his time of need
And leaves a debt unpaid
Forgetful of each stirring deed
Or sacrifice he made.
Does he remember, when the wind
Blows gently from the west
That great occasion when they pinned
The medal on his chest
Does he remember that his name
Was once on every tongue
To our everlasting shame
The hero is unsung
Forgotten is the laurel crown
They placed upon his brow
Take the flags and bunting down.
He is forgotten now.

The Legion A-I-R is indebted to "The Gas Attack" publication of Somerville Post No. 19, the American Legion, Somerville, Mass., and this editorial is based on the poem.—Editor.

Not only are the veterans of World War I forgotten by their Government and the general public, but to a large extent by their own comrades in the American Legion.

Let us recall that the American Legion came into being because the veterans of the First World War realized that unless the veterans themselves banded together to look after their wounded and sick comrades and the widows and orphans of those of their comrades who had made the supreme sacrifice and those, who although they came back, would live in a world of pain and helplessness, they would not be looked after.

The outgrowth of the thinking of the men of the AEF was the founding of the American Legion, which from a few score pioneers grew to be the largest organization of veterans in the world.

From 1919 to the outbreak of World War II the members of the American Legion did yeoman work in forming and advocating the passage of laws which would help to ease the burden of their more unfortunate comrades.

That they succeeded is shown by the present Veterans' Administration with its functions of operating veterans hospitals, compensation and pension laws.

Then came World War II and the veterans of World War I, remembering their plight when they were discharged with a gift of $60 to start life anew, determined that those who returned from this second World War would not face the same difficult and thankless job they had faced on their return.

The result was the GI bill of rights, and don't let anyone tell you that other veterans organizations helped to get this greatest piece of benefit legislation for veterans ever passed by Congress, enacted into law. Far from it, they not only opposed it but actively stumped the country to get opposition to the bill organized. Despite this opposition the GI bill was enacted and veterans of World War II and later of the Korean conflict were the beneficiaries. This bill stands as a monument to the American Legion's veterans of World War I.

However, veterans, like all humans, if they live long enough grow old, and now the veterans of World War I average about 68 years of age and many of them are not as affluent as they were when they went to the front, first for their Government and then for their younger comrades.

Now, with fixed incomes such as retirement or part-time jobs, and the increase in cost of living they find themselves in the position of needing the help of their younger comrades to have legislation enacted in a separate bill, which will help them in the twilight of their declining years.

How have their comrades acted on this appeal for help?

Veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict can repay this great debt to World War I veterans by having their posts pass resolutions endorsing separate pension legislation for World War I veterans and insisting that their elected national officers and their appointed committee chairmen carry out the will of the local posts.

In the American Legion of today the younger veterans are now in the majority and it is a sad commentary that of all of the major organizations the American Legion is the only one which has not endorsed separate pension laws for the older veterans.

Why this forgetfulness on the part of those we older veterans did so much to help? Have they, in addition to forgetting the veterans of World War I as human beings, also forgotten the bill which restored them to their jobs when they were discharged; which

gave them up to $300 mustering-out pay; unused leave pay; an opportunity to get training on the job or education; an opportunity to purchase a home without any downpayment so they would not have to live in a hovel for which they had to pay rent; low-cost Government insurance and waiver of premiums in cases where they were unable to pay because of disability?

I am glad to note there are some American Legion posts in which the younger veterans predominate which have adopted resolutions supporting H.R. 3745 introduced by Congressman WINFIELD K. DENTON of our own Eighth District, which would enact separate legislation for World War I veterans and I urge Legionnaires to write Congressman DENTON endorsing his bill.

But, while a poll of younger veterans reveals the rank and file do support separate legislation for the older veterans, the top brass of the American Legion still holds off.

I hope this condition will be remedied at the National Rehabilitation Conference in Washington February 25 to March 3.

Read that poem again and resolve that insofar as you are concerned it does not apply—that you have not forgotten.

The Andrews Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, a veteran Member of our Alabama delegation has earned for himself the unofficial title of "Mr. River Development." That Member is my honored colleague, GEORGE ANDREWS. One of Alabama's leading newspapers, the Dothan Eagle, paid tribute to "Mr. River Development" in an editorial on February 15, 1962. Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE ANDREWS DAM

Several years ago communities along the Chattahoochee River and groups working for the river's development began a movement to name the proposed lock and dam at Columbia the "George W. Andrews lock and dam" in honor of Alabama's Third District Congressman who has toiled in magnificent fashion for the Chattahoochee's development during his 18 years in Congress.

No affirmative action was taken by the proper authorities in Washington on petitions sent to them for this purpose. Now, as the project takes form with completion scheduled for next year, the movement is being revived and is deserving of support not only by the people of the Chattahoochee Valley but by all Alabamians as well. That is because Congressman ANDREWS has worked in behalf of the other river developments and flood control programs in this State with the same devotion and effectiveness as for the Chattahoochee. From his vantage point as a member of the House Appropriations Committee—a key committee if ever there was one since it must approve the necessary appropriations—he has buttonholed, cajoled, persuaded, and otherwise won votes from his committee associates for Alabama's waterway and flood control projects. Likewise, he has worked diligently and effectively for approval by the entire House of Representatives.

This State is in the forefront in the southeast in the development of inland waterways, rivers, dams, etc., and enjoys the distinction in part to the efforts of Congressman ANDREWS. His Alabama colleagues, working for projects of this type in their own districts, have found him helpful, imaginative, and productive and particularly effective on the Appropriations Committee. Although primarily identified with the Chattahoochee's development, inasmuch as the Chattahoochee borders his district, Congressman ANDREWS has directed his influence and efforts to such other Alabama projects as the Tombigbee and Warrior Rivers, the Tallapoosa, Coosa, and Alabama Rivers, and the Tennessee River. Thus, every area of the State has benefited from Congressman ANDREWS' service in this field.

Therefore, we in the third district hope that these areas will join in the revitalized effort to have the lock and dam at Columbia, at the southeastern tip of the district, named the "George W. Andrews lock and dam." It is an honor that Congressman ANDREWS has not sought but one he richly deserves.

The Symbol of Bipartisan Foreign Policy Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Rowland Evans, Jr., which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of February 11, 1962.

Mr. Evans spotlights Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, the senior Senator from Iowa, for his support of this administration's policies at Punta del Este. Senator HICKENLOOPER characterizes an excellent American tradition of bipartisan support for our foreign policy and symbolizes that support among his Republican colleagues.

The article follows:

ANOTHER VANDENBERG

Occasionally words are spoken in the Senate that have a high national significance, far beyond the immediacy of the moment.

Such words as these, spoken in the flat, somewhat brittle accents of Iowa, were heard there the other day when Senator HICKENLOOPER made a brief report on the OAS meeting at Punta del Este.

What he said was important not so much as an endorsement of Secretary of State Rusk, although that in itself is interesting enough. It was important because Senator HICKENLOOPER is unquestionably on his way to becoming the indispensable Republican Senator in the administration's foreign policy designs—the Arthur Vandenberg, if you will, of the Kennedy administration.

Talking about Mr. Rusk, Senator HICKENLOOPER told the Senate that he had "never seen a more able, vigorous, patient, consistent, and statesmanlike approach to the issues involved (at Punta del Este) than that demonstrated by the Secretary of State. Mr. Rusk has a brilliance of mind and a patience which I am frank to say I could not find within myself. I think I would have 'blown my stack' several times a day if I had had to endure the disquieting and irritating things which he endured with tremendous patience and kindness and yet with complete vigor and firmness."

HICKENLOOPER, of course, was there at Punta del Este as part of the small, bipartisan delegation of congressional advisers.

The Democrats were wise to send him there. Senator FULBRIGHT, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, was wise to have suggested to President Kennedy at dinner on February 19 that he invite Senator HICKENLOOPER to the White House for a chat before HICKENLOOPER left the next day for Punta del Este.

HICKENLOOPER is without question the most important Republican on Fulbright's committee. But his importance to President Kennedy goes well beyond his standing as No. 1 Republican on the Foreign Relations Committee. He is also the senior Republican Senator on the Joint Atomic Energy Committee. And finally, he is the chairman of the Senate Republican policy committee. From these three vantage points, the Senator from the onetime bastion of isolationism is in a fair way to making or breaking Republican support for the President in almost any foreign policy enterprise you care to name.

As it happens, Senator HICKENLOOPER has no thought today of obstructing a single one of the President's foreign policies. He disagrees on many details but on no fundamentals. For example, he wants Congress to make clear, when it approves the President's U.N. bond proposal, that the United States intends to be paid back and that countries that fail to pay their dues to the U.N. should be under no illusion that the United States is going to continue to play Santa Claus. But he is committed to the U.N.

He is also committed to foreign aid, but with serious reservations about some parts of the program—the Volta River project in Ghana, for example.

During the whole first year of the Kennedy administration, the serious partisan disputes over foreign policy could be wrapped up together and dropped into a thimble. Debate there has been, of course: debate over atmospheric testing, over doing business with the Soviet Union, over Castro and Cuba, over possible intervention in southeast Asia, over the U.N. military operation in the Congo, and so on. But not one of these including the Congo dispute, has yet become the kind of hot political issue that tears the country apart and forces the parties into real political conflict.

But each of these, and many others still beneath the horizon, contains the seed of partisan war. And for just this reason, the Senator from Iowa becomes a figure of immense potential influence to the country and the administration.

Senator Vandenberg, 15 years ago, was the indispensable Republican to Truman. He and Tom Connally ruled the Senate on major questions of foreign policy. HICKENLOOPER and FULBRIGHT, two politicians who think for themselves and who have often been one step ahead of the pack in the postwar evolution of U.S. foreign policy, are moving toward the same pinnacle.

Plight of the Iron Range of Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the most interesting and fascinating areas of the United States is known as the Iron Range of northeastern Min-

nesota. The center of the iron ore industry of this Nation is located at Hibbing, Minn.

The Iron Range area has been going through some difficult days in the last few years due to the changes in the steel industry, the increase in imports of iron ore from foreign sources, the drop in steel production, and the effects of foreign competition in processed steel. Despite all of these difficulties there is a spirit of optimism and determination which commands the respect and admiration of every one. This great area of the State of Minnesota has a bright future. The people in northeastern Minnesota know that the future is on their side and they are determined to prepare the way for better days and great opportunities.

An excellent article entitled "A Point of View on Minnesota" by Mr. Helmer E. Olson, executive vice president of the Hibbing Chamber of Commerce of Hibbing, Minn., tells the story of northeastern Minnesota—the Iron Range—and Hibbing better than any words I could write or say.

I ask unanimous consent that this splendid article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I hope that each of my colleagues will find the time to read this article and then set aside the time to visit Minnesota and in particular our beautiful northeastern area.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A POINT OF VIEW ON MINNESOTA

(By Helmer E. Olson)

Hibbing, the largest city north of St. Cloud, other than Duluth, is located on the central world famous Mesabi Iron Range. In the heart of the Minnesota arrowhead vacation land, Hibbing is 180 miles straight north of the Twin Cities up town-free State Highways 65 and 73 to the north country and Canada.

Hibbing and Minnesota are suffering the effects of having had a monopoly of supplying the world with iron ore. Iron ore now belongs to the world market for the first time in the history of Minnesota and the United States. The State's transition from a monopoly position alone points up the challenge of the sixties facing every citizen. Taxation is only one of the very many effects of monopoly. Ad valorum, occupation, and royalty taxes levied on iron ore since 1914 have amounted to $1,204,858,690, according to the Minnesota Department of Taxation. In 1957 they totaled $63 million and in 1958, $46 million. In 1959, they declined to $41,524,527. Hibbing is aware of its related problem. From 1950 to 1960 our mineral valuations have declined from over $18 million to $6,010,403. The challenge is great. Other cities and States have grown without mineral valuations. Hibbing already recognizes its fundamental problems. Much is being done—Minnesota will grow.

Perhaps no other city in the United States has had a more important part in the building of this 20th century steel-based economy than Hibbing.

Minnesota's permanent trust funds now exceed $300 million. Much of this money has come from iron ore and is being used to benefit the entire State.

In 1914, A. G. "Bus Andy" Anderson and partner carried passengers between North Hibbing and Alice (now Hibbing). Hibbing is recognized as the birthplace of the Greyhound bus industry.

A sidelight on the iron ore Hibbing's tremendous mining operations have created a world proving ground for heavy earthmoving equipment. Hibbing's new industrial area with over 20 industrial, supply, service, and manufacturing firms, already serves a five-State area and Canada.

Fortunately over 50 years ago the Oliver iron mining division of United States Steel, our farsighted basic industry, began to practice fundamental conservation. By washing low-grade ores of 35 to 50 percent iron content, over 557 million tons of high-grade ore have been shipped by some 80 beneficiation plants operating in the State. Iron-bearing rock with less than 35 percent ore content provides a challenging potential future in taconite. The 1941 State legislature, through the efforts of Dr. E. W. Davis and the junior and senior chambers of commerce of northeastern Minnesota helped secure passage of the taconite law. This encouragement to our basic industry created the new cities of Hoyt Lakes, Babbitt, and Silver Bay. The manufactured product, pellets of 63 percent iron, is already competitive to foreign high-grade ores. Taconite has become a billion dollar investment. With land exchange and a proper business climate, new plants will lend a stability to the area second to none.

The 1959 session of the State legislature enacted a semitaconite law. Purpose was to encourage development of soft taconite and nonmagnetic materials for the central and west Mesabi, as magnetic taconite has done for the east end of the range.

Hibbing is confident of a bright future through scientific progress and understanding the problems of taconite. The M. A. Hanna and Pickands Mather mining companies have been working for years in local research laboratories to concentrate iron particles into more competitive productive form. A $2 million M. A. Hanna experimental semitaconite plant is in operation at Cooley. Another Oliver Iron Mining Division experimental operation is underway at Coleraine. Both are direct results of the 1959 semitaconite law.

Northeastern Minnesota is emerging from the extractive industry stage of growth and development. Tourism is growing out of the "fishing camp" stage. Drawing attention for the area are the historic voyageur story, Minnesota's Paul Bunyan story (now translated into Japanese), the Minnesota Museum of Mining at Chisholm, and Virginia's Lookout Mountain ski area.

Hibbing tourist travel in 1961 increased 67 percent over attendance in 1960 at our mine view points. National advertising and publicity articles have recognized the area. Highway 169 east is being rerouted through an abandoned iron ore mine for further tourist value.

The extractive logging industry era of Minnesota passed in the 1920's to create the greater, stable wood conversion manufacturing industry we have today.

High grade iron ore mining by depletion, which created the new world market, has turned to taconite, direct reduction, peat, lignite and natural gas to convert our extractive iron ore mining industry to stable manufacturing of iron units.

The Minnesota-St. Lawrence Seaway cheap transportation has brought the world to our door. Our 10,000 clear fresh water lakes are a growing asset. Our climate, like Germany, the heartland of Europe, and recreational opportunities provide a healthy, highly productive, low absentee labor force second to none.

The above and the ingenuities of our people concludes that Hibbing and Minnesota can only grow. Capacity for hard work is our priceless heritage.

The Railroad Problem and the Responsibility of the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I include two items of comment which have been of great information to me and which I believe should be brought to the attention of my colleagues. They deal with the pressing and important problem of railroad survival in the United States.

The first is an editorial from the February 1962 issue of Trains magazine; the second, comments of Jervis Langdon, Jr., president of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, as quoted in the Wall Street Journal of February 7, 1962:

HERE'S WHAT WE THINK

(By David P. Morgan)

Sensational journalism is not our bent, so we were obliged to take issue recently with a reader, newly employed by Santa Fe, who felt that we've been painting an unnecessarily black picture of the industry in these columns. Quite naturally impressed by the Atchison's plant and vigor, he felt that it would be proper for us to accent the positive and eliminate the negative. It struck us that a few questions and answers might clarify the railroad scene as we enter 1962. For instance:

Is railroading in trouble or actually on the brink of bankruptcy?

Somewhere in between. Last year the railroads' rate of return on net investment (which has been sliding without respite since 1955) was 1.97 percent—not only their poorest performance since 1938 but only a hair better than the 1931–35 depression years' average of 1.94 percent. No other major industry earns so little on its property.

But doesn't regional performance vary widely?

Yes. But the individual trends remain the same. Also, though there are more than 100 class one railroads with revenues of $4 million a year or more, all are interdependent members through freight-car interchange of an industry doing a 48-State-wide business. It is surely unrealistic to assume that Government would nationalize on a piecemeal basis should the roads in the East collapse, say, even though those in the West retained their solvency. Publicly owned CN and privately owned CP do coexist in Canada but scarcely to the advantage of either. Anyway, the regional rates of return on investment are these:

Year	East	Pocahontas [1]	South	West
1956	3.30	8.68	5.00	3.54
1957	2.40	8.44	4.17	3.18
1958	1.11	6.95	3.68	3.20
1959	1.42	6.89	3.63	2.87
1960	.62	6.51	2.97	2.40
1961 [2]	.98	5.07	2.64	2.34

[1] C. & O. and N. & W.
[2] 1st 8 months only.

Is management largely responsible for the relatively poor showing of the East?

As a rule, no. Indeed, eastern railroads consistently earned more than the industry average until World War II. The eastern decline of our time is attributed to many things.

Eastern roads carry more passengers and, because of the proximity of population centers, maintain more freight yards; both circumstances boost payroll costs which, in the East, account for 52.4 cents out of each revenue dollar versus 49.9 cents for the United States as a whole. Taxes are higher in the East, so high in New Jersey, for example, that not a single road can make money on its intrastate operations there. Again, the East is heavily dependent upon the steel mills which in turn (1) have suffered from foreign competition in recent years, and (2) possess greater access to river, lake, and highway carriers than mills elsewhere. Finally, the East as a region has not experienced the postwar economic growth of other areas such as the Far West, South, and gulf coast.

But didn't a third of U.S. mileage enter bankruptcy during the depression and recover?

Yes—but then the entire Nation, not just the railroads, was in economic trouble. Investors bought the securities of reorganized lines on the assumption that their future earnings would parallel national recovery. Today it's different. No internal financial revamp of New Haven, for example, can possibly alter the external circumstances which forced it into bankruptcy last year.

What price mergers?

They could effect very real savings by elimination of either duplicating or unnecessary plant (e.g., 10 percent of rail route-miles in the United States carry half our ton-miles). Annual pretax savings of the five big mergers which the ICC is hearing or soon will (i.e., NYC+PRR, the Hill Lines, C. & O.+B. & O., Coast Line-Seaboard, and N. & W.-NPK-Wabash) would total at least $225 million. Total railroad net income for all roads last year was only 390 million. Yet it is doubtful if any large merger will receive an ICC permit before the last half of this year—if then. The Commission itself seems favorably inclined but the Justice Department, brotherhoods, and many Congressmen seem dead set against almost any consolidation proposal, and the railroads have not helped themselves by defaulting on a commonsense overall merger blueprint in favor of voluntary marriages that often as not tread on too many toes. Mergers, then, are fine in principle but hard to practice. Also, unless the basic ills of railroading are resolved, merger savings will eventually evaporate into the same inflationary spiral that exhausted diesel savings.

Who can save the industry?

Congress. The legislative branch of the Federal Government could ease or resolve the railroad dilemma this year by tightening up on private transportation and instructing the ICC to regulate all common carriers alike as well as less; imposing user-charges on Government-sponsored transport facilities; and/or allowing the creation of total transportation companies which could operate air, rail, road, and water services. Yet Congress, with little if any instruction from three Chief Executives, has passed only minor remedial legislation since 1945 despite exposure to seven major transportation studies, and at least one of these bills hasn't taken hold. The Transportation Act of 1958 specifically instructed the ICC to allow those rates which reflect a carrier's inherent advantages, and for a while thereafter the Commission so ruled. Yet in recent months the regulatory body has become increasingly restrictive, disallowing several rail rate proposals on grounds that their effect would be to injure or destroy road or water competition. The ability of the railroads to make money with such rates was not questioned. Politically speaking, of course, Congress is under great pressure to preserve the status quo, and as yet the industry has not allocated the necessary money to mount an effective public information program—the AAR's Magna Carta effort notwithstanding.

What about the work-rules issue?

The Presidential Commission has concluded its hearings and will issue its report very soon. Recommendations are binding on neither the carriers nor the unions but should have a profound influence upon opinion at all levels.

How about President Kennedy?

He requested and has received a transport report from Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges. As yet nobody has revealed the contents of the report; less, of course, is known about what reaction the President will have or what action Congress would take on any recommendations he might make.

What are the symptoms of the carriers' illness and its seriousness?

A thousand and one things, not all of them in the headlines. For example, investor disinterest (Wall Street has few, if any, analysts who can afford to work on railroad securities full time); the state of the railroad supply industry (in 1960 carbuilders could have produced "without sweat" 120,000 cars, actually built less than 20,000); congressional apathy over the collapse of New Haven; the frantic merge-or-die nature of such eastern consolidation proceedings as PRR-Lehigh Valley; inadequate research (the industry needs a fully automatic coupler which contains air brake lines, yet has neither a working prototype nor the money to finance a quick changeover); the number of loans, now totaling $153 million, which the railroads could not have secured from private financing without ICC guarantees; the rise of nonregulated carriage (which now accounts for a fourth of intercity freight ton-miles and could hit 40 percent by 1975); aging equipment (average age of freight cars is 19 years, 10,000 diesel units are ripe for upgrading, production of noncommuter passenger equipment virtually ceased years ago); and so forth. However, it may be intelligently argued that abandonment of N.Y.O. & W., much of the passenger service cutback, sale of surplus property, and like activity was inevitable and does not necessarily constitute evidence of disease.

What will happen?

In the East (where almost half of the 40 class 1 roads operated in the red for the first 8 months of 1961) the current chaos implies wholesale bankruptcy in the event of a prolonged recession. Even if the rails aren't allowed to diversify into other modes of transport and equitable user-charges aren't placed on their competition, a regulatory change permitting the industry ratemaking freedom could postpone the danger indefinitely. Failing that, though, and assuming many more New Havens, we must reckon with some kind of Government intervention. Outright public ownership is politically remote. More likely would be some sort of subsidy—say, tax forgiveness, low-interest loans, Government assumption of maintenance of way expenses (which would tend to equate the rails and their competition, who neither build nor maintain their right of way), or outright purchase and lease-back of fixed facilities. Worth remembering, too, is the fact that previous railroad crises have spurred demands for ICC-authored master merger plans. It could happen again.

JERVIS LANGDON, JR., PRESIDENT OF THE BALTIMORE & OHIO RAILROAD, ON RAIL COMPETITION WITH PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES LIKE HIGHWAYS AND WATERWAYS

I disagree with those who believe rail transportation is indispensable. If this country is completely unmindful of expense, it can manage to live without them, even in wartime.

The fact that rail service is still the most economic for most transportation jobs is superfluous and beside the point. Transportation is not an industry where this makes any difference. In our country we do not even try, in this area, to be guided by the principles of economics. We spend billions for transportation facilities without any regard to their true economic worth or the effect on established agencies. With a hoop and a holler the Congress will appropriate enormous sums for public transportation facilities, and the fact that railroads may, as a consequence, be brought to their knees is regarded as completely irrelevant, if indeed the possibility ever occurs to the politicians and special interests who are so free with your money and my money.

If any thought is given to the railroads, it is that public transportation facilities will hold their rates down. This is certainly an expensive form of regulation. Entirely forgotten is that fact that, once the facilities are provided, the first to seek protection from railroad competition are those carriers that use them. In their claim of being the "low cost" form of transportation, these carriers conveniently overlook a return on the billions invested by the taxpayers.

Today, the most important single problem in the railroad industry is to stop the further erosion of traffic to other forms of transportation. If able to do this, the railroad industry still has a chance, by participating in the growth of the country, to hold its own in an inflationary economy. But if unsuccessful and railroad traffic continues to erode, there is no hope, no matter how successful the railroads are in consolidating and coordinating their operations, eliminating duplicating facilities and services, and otherwise putting their houses in order. It would merely be a question of time before the debacle.

Expanding Federal Accident Prevention Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, Representative KENNETH ROBERTS, representing the fourth district in my home State of Alabama, has long been interested in safety measures and accident prevention activities. He has devoted a great deal of time to the subject and recently wrote an excellent article on "Expanding Federal Accident Prevention Activities" which appeared in the February 1962 issue of the Journal of the American Society of Safety Engineers. Representative ROBERTS is currently holding hearings before the House Health and Safety Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on his proposal to establish an Accident Prevention Research Center. I think it most timely that Representative ROBERTS' article be brought to the attention of the Members of this body and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESSMAN ROBERTS REPORTS ON: EXPANDING FEDERAL ACCIDENT PREVENTION ACTIVITIES

The loss of life, limb, and property from avoidable accidents not only is tragic from

the standpoint of human suffering but in this modern age is calamitous from an economic standpoint, especially when we are straining every effort to promote economic development to provide jobs and to meet the obligations we have assumed worldwide to protect our national interests.

There is a growing public awareness of the importance of safety. Along with this increasing interest is a realization that safety is a cooperative effort. Safety engineers working directly in the safety field are largely responsible for this because they have made it their business to find out why accidents happen and what can be done to prevent accidents. Out of this has come more attention to safety on the part of press, radio, and television.

Still, I am sure we can all agree that as a Nation we are not devoting enough energy and effort to a study of the cause of accidents. For this reason I have introduced in Congress a bill to establish a National Accident Prevention Center in the Public Health Service. I do not propose to turn accident prevention over to the Federal Government or even give the Federal Government primary responsibility for research into accident prevention. My bill would set up an agency to coordinate research effort and to promote and encourage wider effort by public and private agencies.

The money appropriated by Congress would be "seed money" to encourage States and local governmental units, as well as individuals, institutions, and foundations to increase their efforts under the guidance of nationally recognized experts.

That has been the history of similar Federal programs. I need only cite the Hospital Construction Act to show how Federal aid has stimulated local efforts and brought about needed hospital facilities.

Federal funds spent on research into cancer, heart disease, mental illness, and other medical problems likewise have stimulated research. Federal approval of a project as worth while is a definite factor in attracting gifts and grants, thus encouraging substantial contributions.

My bill would do more than make Federal funds available It would coordinate research and promote the dissemination of information. Unless research results are made available to those who need the information, we are wasting valuable effort. In brief, the Center which would be established by my bill would—

Conduct, promote, and coordinate research and investigations into the causes and prevention of accidents.

Make research facilities of the Public Health Service available for such purposes.

Authorize grants-in-aid to institutions and other private and public agencies engaged in such research projects.

Establish an information center.

Obtain the advice and assistance of experts in the field of accident prevention.

The bill provides for the establishment in the Public Health Service of an Accident Prevention Advisory Board. The Board would be headed by the Surgeon General, as chairman, or an officer designated by him, and would consist of 12 additional members appointed by the President (none of whom could be a Federal employee) to be selected from among representatives of various State, interstate, and local governmental service agencies, public and private interests concerned with or affected by accident prevention, and individual experts in the field.

In addition to its general function of advising, consulting with, and making recommendations to the Surgeon General with respect to his duties in the operation of the Center, the Board is specifically charged with the duties of reviewing accident prevention research projects and approving those which it deems meritorious. The Board also would collect and make available information on studies of accident causes and prevention, and review applications for grants-in-aid and certify its approval of those projects which show promise of making valuable contributions to human knowledge in the field of accident prevention.

Determining the causes of, and finding the means of preventing accidents, has become a matter of serious concern in this country. This would be expected to follow the growing interest in medical care.

Among the areas of human activity in which accident prevention problems have received special attention are industrial, farm, home, mine, radiation, water carrier, aircraft, railways, and highway hazards. Each of these areas is now in some measure the subject of interest and responsibility of various departments or agencies of the Federal Government especially in the field of aviation, and in railway and highway hazards.

As you know, my principal interest as a legislator has been in the field of highway safety. In that field, those working to cut down the accident toll often need the counsel and advice of experts in such matters as standards of eyesight, hearing, and the effects of organic, nervous and functional diseases on the human body. This is especially important to those concerned with the licensing of drivers for trucks and buses and for passing on the fitness of elderly drivers.

We need information as to the effects of fatigue and drugs on driving ability. We need more information on what can be done about the man behind the wheel who had had a social drink or two or three.

We need to know more about driver training. We need to know more about what makes a good driver so that we can set minimum standards for the issuance of permits.

We need to know more about building safe highways.

But you may ask: Why does the Federal Government have a responsibility in this area?

The responsibility of the Federal Government in the field of interstate commerce is well known. It is also pretty generally known that the Federal Government has assumed full responsibility for making and enforcing safety rules for civil flying, whether by big airliner, or a little one-seater which may never cross a State line.

FEDERAL CENTER JUSTIFIED

In some instances, the Federal Government can provide services which would be impossible or unreasonably burdensome for the 50 States. Research is an example. Research is long and costly. It takes not only money, but manpower and facilities. Manpower is limited. Facilities are expensive. In this situation, the Federal Government can do the job cheaper and quicker than the States and local communities, going it alone. Duplication can be eliminated by a Federal program. Information can be collected and disseminated more rapidly.

That is why the Federal Center is justified. That is how the Federal Center will pay for itself by saving local tax dollars.

The Federal Government's interest in highway safety is greater than generally realized. We all know about the vast modern Interstate Highway System, financed largely with Federal money. With these improved highways we can go further and faster with fewer accidents. But good roads do not eliminate accidents. So modern, scientifically designed highways are not the answer to the accident problem. The real truth of the matter, as we all realize, is that there is no one answer. You cannot solve the problem with slogans or posters or traffic tickets or with any one of a number of other remedies which have been suggested.

But the Federal Government can do a lot more about the problem than financing better roads.

Now, let me say that philosophically I am a States rights man. You will find me generally voting that way. But the States have responsibilities as well as rights. Traditionally, the States have the responsibility of making and enforcing traffic safety laws. The States set safety standards for automobiles, issue permits to drivers, and so on.

But a long time ago we found that State control was inadequate insofar as interstate bus and truck traffic is concerned. So we have the Interstate Commerce Commission responsible for common carrier safety. No one is advocating that this control should be relaxed or abolished. Most would say that it should be strengthened, especially in tightening up on vehicle safety standards and maintenance.

The Federal Government has a responsibility to protect the public in a number of areas where State regulation is impossible or unreasonably cumbersome. I need only cite the pure food and drug laws. Would anyone claim that the Federal Government has no business in this field?

In the field of highway safety the States have been lagging in recent years. The reluctance of the States to adopt the Uniform Motor Vehicle Code which was proposed over 35 years ago is a good example. This refusal to adopt a code which has the approval of such organizations as the American Bar Association, International Association of Chiefs of Police, National Safety Council and many other outstanding organizations is the most glaring example of an "ostrich in the sand" attitude that has come to my attention. No one doubts that the adoption of this code would do a lot for highway safety.

This is the same type of do-nothing attitude which is too much in evidence when safety bills are proposed in the Congress of the United States. If the States cannot agree on a uniform code, should the Federal Government step in with legislation to fill the most important gaps, such as driver licensing, motor vehicle safety standards and motor vehicle inspection?

That is a question which is being asked with more frequency in Congress these days. What the States do in the next 5 or 6 years may determine the answer.

Regardless of the answer to that question, some things can be done by the Federal Government without interfering with the States.

Research is one. The Federal Government is spending a lot of money on various health research projects and rightly so. Not enough is being spent on highway safety, which is a major public health problem.

THE HIGHWAY SAFETY STORY

When I was appointed chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Traffic Safety back in 1956, I set out to review the entire field to see what had been done and what could be done. I might say that the hearings held by the subcommittee in 1956 marked the first effort to "wrap up" in one package the story of highway safety activity in this country.

When we started out, I found that in the early 1950's a nucleus of an accident prevention program had been established with four people in the Public Health Service. This was for all accident prevention—not just highway safety—and in 1956, the budget for this activity was in the neighborhood of $50,000. That is of interest when compared with the 37,000 annual death toll on our highways.

Now, as the 1956 hearings disclosed, there was no lack of interest in highway safety on the part of our doctors and lawyers and other public-spirited groups. The medical profession, in particular, was demanding that

steps be taken to cut down the highway toll. They especially were urging the building of safer automobiles and had made recommendations to the industry which largely were being ignored.

In 1957, the Public Health Service, together with the American Public Health Association and other groups began to take greater interest in accident prevention. This increased interest in safety has been supported in Congress. This year Congress added $1 million to the budget for accident prevention.

The total staff of the Division of Accident Prevention now numbers 122, of which 34 are engaged primarily in traffic accident prevention work. The number of basic research grants in accident prevention rose to a total of 33 in 1961, of which 23 were concerned with research in various aspects of highway accident prevention.

So you can see we are making progress. But a lot remains to be done, especially in the way of research.

The Federal Government can move in other areas without infringing on the jurisdiction of the States. The Federal Govenment could and should establish minimum safety standards for the passenger-carrying motor vehicles it buys. Figures submitted to my subcommittee by the Bureau of Employee's Compensation show that for 1959 we had 3,912 Federal civilian employees injured in motor vehicle accidents, and 50 deaths. These employees lost 421,010 days from work as a result of these accidents, for a total direct cost to the Government of $4,335,307.

I have pending in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, a bill which would do something about this. This bill, H.R. 1341, would establish safety standards for Government-owned passenger carrying motor vehicles. Extensive hearings have been held on this measure and we have accumulated an impressive amount of favorable testimony from doctors, engineers, scientists, and safety experts.

My bill not only would help to reduce the cost of highway accidents to the Government but also would promote the building of safer automobiles for the public. Forced to meet safety standards set by the Government, manufacturers would be encouraged to offer these same features as optional equipment or, perhaps, as standard equipment. Furthermore, Government approval of certain safety features no doubt would lead to widespread public demands for the inclusion of these features on models offered the public.

STIMULATED SEAT-BELT INTEREST

That is what happened in the case of seat belts. When Federal agencies, led by the Public Health Service, began installing and using seat belts, the public began to take interest. The States began to take interest. State legislatures passed laws requiring seat belt attachments on new automobiles. The industry then began offering front seat attachments on 1962 models.

In our hearings on motor vehicle safety, the American Medical Association submitted a list of safety features repeatedly recommended by physicians, researchers, and safety engineers with little success. These included seat belt anchorages, crash padding, improved steering wheel, safety door locks, removal of dangerous knobs, securely anchored seats, the elimination of pointed hood ornaments, and other hazardous exterior design features.

My bill, which passed the House in 1959, has been reintroduced and is now pending before my subcommittee. Hearings have been held but some question has been raised as to which agency should set safety standards and we have not worked out that problem. The bill was bitterly opposed on the floor of the House on the grounds that it would increase the cost of automobiles bought by the Government. Even if it did, I say the increased cost would be justified. But cutting down on deaths and injuries will save money, even if we could measure the worth of human life in dollars.

ECONOMY NOT ENTIRE REASON

Furthermore, many or all of these essential safety features could be paid for by eliminating chrome and frills which serve no useful purpose. But, you will note that some of these recommendations such as eliminating hazardous knobs and gadgets, would cut costs. So economy cannot be the whole reason.

There seems to be pride of authorship factor working here which makes any suggestion from a mere Congressman offensive to a professional designer of automobiles. Be that as it may, the Federal Government has a responsibility to its civilian employees and military personnel to provide them with the safest passenger vehicles possible. There is no question of States rights here. It is just a question of saving human lives and reducing expenses for disability pensions and death benefits. At the same time, by putting safer cars on the market we will be making a real contribution to safety.

Earlier I mentioned the growing demands from the public that the Federal Government do more to promote highway safety. Pressure increases each year for more drastic measures to meet this problem. Now, I am not one who believes that passing a law is the ideal way to solve any or all of our problems. As a nation, we abhor regulations, and rightly so—especially regulation at long range from Washington. We like to see things which must be done accomplished voluntarily. But the fact that we have food and drug laws is proof that things, even essential things, cannot always be done voluntarily. The fact that we have Federal regulation of aviation is proof that business, even big business, cannot always regulate itself.

It is impossible now to predict how far the Federal Government will go in the field of accident prevention, especially in promoting highway safety. It is safe to say that nothing will be done that does not have overwhelming public support. I am sure that the public would rather have the States and local communities make and enforce the rules needed to protect those who use the highways.

But regardless of that, I am sure that a National Accident Prevention Center can be a big help to all of us in preventing all types of accidents. I am convinced that Federal funds spent on such a Center would be a good investment.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following proclamations by Gov. John B. Swainson, of Michigan, and Mayor Jerome P. Cavanagh, of Detroit, as well as a resolution adopted by the Detroit Lithuanian Organizations Center:

PROCLAMATION: LITHUANIAN FREEDOM DAY

In their love for freedom, the people of America and the people of Lithuania have a kindred spirit. This spirit of independence and the love of liberty fills the hearts of the people of these two nations.

The same dedication to freedom and democracy and the dignity of man which brought independence to the United States was present in the hearts of Lithuanians, who, on February 16, 1918, proclaimed their independence. But, Soviet aggression in 1940 robbed the courageous people of Lithuania of their cherished freedom. Because Americans have freedom, they mourn the loss of liberty by the people of Lithuania. Their brave efforts to achieve and their fight to preserve it, although in vain, are an inspiration to all free peoples. Their action holds a valued example for other oppressed peoples.

It is for us, all the free people of the world, on this 44th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, to offer our encouragement and our prayers that the freedom of Lithuania be restored.

Therefore, I, John B. Swainson, Governor of the State of Michigan, do hereby proclaim Friday, February 16, 1962, as Lithuania Freedom Day in Michigan, and urge all our people to continue their support of freedom's cause for these brave people and the eventual restoration of independence to Lithuania and its Baltic neighbors.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Michigan this 13th day of February in the year of our Lord 1962 and of the Commonwealth 126.

By the Governor:

JOHN B. SWAINSON,
Governor.

JAMES M. HARE,
Secretary of State.

PROCLAMATION: REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA DAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1962

"Whereas the Lithuanian Taryba in Vilna on February 16, 1918, proclaimed to the world in the oldest living European language the rebirth of a free and independent Lithuania after 120 years of Russian occupation, and

"Whereas Lithuania, during a score of years of independence, demonstrated her ability to advance, grow, and prosper, and to become an active member of the League of Nations, and

"Whereas the people of Lithuanian origin or descent have helped this country to establish its independence and then contributed their share in the development of its natural resources, industry, and life, and

"Whereas Lithuania with her sister republics of Latvia and Estonia were the first to disappear behind the Iron Curtain and to suffer and expose the aggressive imperialism of Soviet Russia and thus to apprise the world of the aims and technique of communism: Therefore

I, Jerome P. Cavanagh, mayor of Detroit, do hereby proclaim February 16, 1962, as Republic of Lithuania Day in Detroit, and urge the people of this city to join with their fellow citizens of Lithuanian ancestry and descent in the hope and prayer that their mother country may again become independent."

Given under my hand and seal this 31st day of January 1962.

JEROME P. CAVANAGH,
Mayor.

DETROIT LITHUANIAN ORGANIZATIONS CENTER RESOLUTION, DETROIT, MICH., FEBRUARY 16, 1962

"On the occasion of the 44th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Lithuania, February 16, 1962, the Detroit Lithuanian Organizations Center, representing the Lithuanian American organizations of the greater metropolitan area of the city of Detroit, county of Wayne, the State of Michigan, unanimously resolve:

"1. To express sincere gratitude to the administration and Congress of the United

States of America for continued nonrecognition of the incorporation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into the Soviet Union and for the many past considerations of, and sympathy with, the cause of Lithuania's unrelenting battle for independence.

"2. To respectfully urge the U.S. Government to implement a dynamic, forceful program against the conspiracy of international communism.

"3. To respectfully request that the United States of America seek the means to hasten the liberation of Lithuania and the other captive nations.

"4. To ask the U.S. Government to sponsor a resolution in the United Nations based on the findings and conclusions which establish the Soviet Union as a colonial power and aggressor against all nations colonialized and enslaved by communism.

"5. To petition the Government of the United States to condemn the Communist oppression of the Catholic faith in Lithuania and Communist persecution of religion everywhere behind the Iron Curtain."

RALPH J. VALATKA,
President.
JOSEPH GRUZDAS,
Secretary.

Congressman Roberts Discusses His Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech, made by Representative KENNETH A. ROBERTS, of Alabama, on highway safety at a luncheon meeting of the executive committee of the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances, at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D.C., on January 16:

CONGRESSMAN ROBERTS DISCUSSES HIS BILLS

Representative KENNETH A. ROBERTS, of Alabama, expressed his views on highway safety in a talk at a luncheon meeting of the executive committee of the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances, at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D.C., on January 16.

Congressman ROBERTS explained the purposes back of two bills he has introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives which have been widely discussed in AAMVA circles in recent months.

Mr. ROBERTS is chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and Safety of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

One of his bills, H.R. 9433, would require that a person driving a motor vehicle in interstate commerce must hold a permit from a State which has a driver licensing law substantially in accord with chapter 6 of the Uniform Vehicle Code.

"My bill has been denounced as interfering with States rights," the Congressman said. "I do not see it that way. If a State adopts a driver licensing law substantially in agreement with chapter 6 of the Uniform Code, it has no problem," he added.

His other bill, H.R. 1341, would establish safety standards for passenger-carrying vehicles purchased by the Federal Government.

"Forced to meet safety standards set by the Government, manufacturers would be encouraged to offer these same features," Mr. ROBERTS said. "Furthermore, Government approval of certain safety features no doubt would lead to widespread public demands for the inclusion of these features on models offered to the public."

Because of the widespread interest in Mr. ROBERTS' legislative proposals, and in his views as a leader in the field of highway safety, his remarks are quoted below:

CONGRESSMAN ROBERTS' ADDRESS

I appreciate the opportunity to meet with this group which has made a very substantial contribution to the cause of highway safety.

There may be some differences of opinion about what can and should be done to promote highway safety but certainly all of us here today can agree upon the need for uniform traffic laws and ordinances.

In the years I have been working in the highway safety field, I have yet to encounter anyone who does not believe that adoption of the Uniform Vehicle Code would be a substantial contribution to safety.

A great deal of time and effort has been expended drawing up the code and urging its adoption. This has been going on since 1926, when the first code was written. Some progress has been made but still we have a long way to go.

A survey made by my subcommittee a year ago would indicate that in some States the progress is practically nil. In five States an effort is not even being made to check proposed new laws against the code to see if they conform, which would indicate almost a complete lack of interest in the code.

Everyone agrees that the code is important to safety and should be adopted. Mark Twain said people were always talking about the weather but never did anything about it. A lot of people seem to be the same way about the Uniform Code.

The Uniform Code is important but it is not the complete answer to our problem. In fact, as you well know, there is no complete answer. Slogans won't do it. Good intentions are not enough. We need coordinated effort along many fronts.

NEED FOR SAFER CARS

As you know, I have had a lot to say in recent years about the need for safer automobiles. I go along with Dr. T. P. Wright, vice president of research at Cornell University, and others, on the proposition that it is easier to build safer automobiles than to change human nature or traffic regulations.

Thousands of lives could be saved if the industry would follow the recommendations of the American Medical Association in designing certain essential safety features into new cars.

Some progress is being made in the area of seat belts and safety locks but we have a long way to go.

But I will admit other things need to be done. We need to eliminate highway death traps. We need periodic inspections to get a lot of dangerous vehicles off the roads.

DRIVER REGULATIONS

Another thing we can do is to tighten up our driver registration regulations and clamp down on the chronic law violators.

That was forcibly impressed upon me a few months back. I was driving down the highway with my family when we came upon a horrible accident in which some young children were terribly mangled and killed. The accident was blamed on an elderly driver who had no business driving. That horrible scene set me to wondering what I, as an individual could do to help prevent such accidents.

Now, as you know, traditionally the States have the responsibility for licensing drivers. Therefore, of course, the place to get action is at the State level. All of us who have been trying to get the uniform code adopted have been directing our efforts toward action at the State level. You know better than I just how much has been accomplished.

It is sufficient to say that I have not found anyone who thinks the driver licensing laws of all of the 50 States are adequate.

To refresh my memory, I went back and read chapter 6 of the Uniform Code. That, as you know, deals with licenses for operators and chauffeurs.

Chapter 6 is not a drastic document. If every State in the Union adopted chapter 6, a lot of people who have no business driving could still drive. It will take more than chapter 6 to eliminate all of those drivers who are a menace to life and limb every time they get behind the steering wheel of a car.

Chapter 6 would not give us the periodical physical reexamination program which has been adopted in Pennsylvania. We are going to have to have something like that to get at the heart of the problem in the 50 States.

But chapter 6, if adopted and enforced in the 50 States, would be a great step forward. A lot of dangerous drivers would be kept off the streets and highways.

With that in mind, I introduced a bill (H.R. 9433) to require that a person driving a motor vehicle in interstate commerce must hold a permit from a State which has a driver licensing law which agrees substantially with chapter 6.

Up until that time I had not run across anyone who did not agree that we would be a lot better off if all the States had chapter 6. Now I am not so sure.

My bill has brought down a storm of protest. The bill was denounced at a recent meeting of the Committee on Enforcement and Traffic Safety of the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators and members were urged to write their Congressmen and Senators in opposition to the legislation.

My bill has been denounced as interfering with States rights. I don't see it that way. If a State adopts a driver licensing law substantially in agreement with chapter 6 of the Uniform Code, it has no problem.

Now, if we do not approve of chapter 6, that is something else. Maybe chapter 6 should be revised.

If the objection to H.R. 9433 is to the language, that can be worked out. All that H.R. 9433 seeks to accomplish is the adoption of chapter 6 by the various States.

WHOSE RESPONSIBILITY?

It is generally agreed that the States have a responsibility in this matter of licensing drivers and enforcing the licensing laws.

It may be that the Federal Government has more responsibility than anyone has cared to acknowledge. If the Federal Government puts up 90 percent of the cost of the new interstate highway system, does not the Federal Government have some responsibility?

At least, that is the question a lot of people are asking. Many citizens, appalled by the slaughter on the highways, are getting impatient. They are writing their Congressmen asking us what we are going to do about highway safety. To me, that is a good sign. People are waking up to the need for action.

All of us who drive were shocked and horrified by the highway deaths during the recent holidays. True, the killed and injured represent but a fraction of the millions using the highways but that should be no consolation.

We all were horrified, and rightly so, when 77 persons died when a plane loaded with young military recruits crashed and burned near Richmond in November. That accident is the subject of a congressional investigation now underway.

But the slaughter on the highway goes on day and night. How many people have lost their lives on the highways since the Richmond airplane accident, I don't know, but the total is a lot more than 77.

My hometown of Anniston, Ala., had a population of 33,657 in 1960. Suppose we learned

this afternoon that between now and December 31 every person in Anniston would be killed in an accidental explosion or some other manmade disaster.

We would be horrified. We would move heaven and earth to save Anniston. Anyone who refused to contribute whatever he could to saving the lives of these good people would be shunned as an inhuman monster.

But too many people shun their responsibilities when it comes to doing something about the slaughter of 37,000 people on our highways each year. Too many adopt a "let George do it" attitude. Some, I regret to say, seem to be horrified if they are asked to make a small contribution in the way of a tax or a restriction on their freedom of movement. A person who wouldn't think of carrying a cocked and loaded shotgun onto a crowded bus, will get in an old car with inadequate brakes and try to set a new speed record between here and Baltimore.

Yet, a drunk with a loaded shotgun on a crowded bus is not as dangerous as the respectable citizen who gets in the driver's seat of a car after an evening's drinking.

So, I say we are going to have to wake up. Perhaps the Federal Government is going to have to step in to help the States and local communities get the job done.

Now, let me say that philosophically I am a States rights man. You will find me generally voting that way. But the States have responsibilities as well as rights.

Traditionally, the States have the responsibility of making and enforcing traffic safety laws. The States set safety standards for automobiles, issue permits to drivers, and so on.

But a long time ago we found that State control was inadequate insofar as interstate bus and truck traffic is concerned. So we have the Interstate Commerce Commission responsible for common carrier safety.

No one is advocating that this control should be relaxed or abolished. Most would say that it should be strengthened, especially in tightening up on vehicle safety standards and maintenance.

The Federal Government protects the public in a number of areas where State regulation is impossible or unreasonably cumbersome. I need only cite the pure food and drug laws. Would anyone claim that the Federal Government has no business in this field?

MORE RESEARCH NEEDED

Regardless of the answer to the question of whether the Federal Government should legislate on driver licensing or motor vehicle safety standards, some things can be done by the Federal Government without interfering with the States.

Research is one. The Federal Government is spending a lot of money on medical research and rightly so. Not enough is being spent on highway safety, which is a major public health problem.

When I was appointed chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Traffic Safety back in 1956, I set out to review the entire field to see what had been done and what could be done. I might say that the hearings held by the subcommittee in 1956 marked the first effort to "wrap up" in one package the story of highway safety activity in this country.

When we started out, I found that in the early 1950's the Public Health Service had set up an accident prevention program with a staff of four. This was for all accident prevention—not just highway safety. In 1956, the budget for this activity was in the neighborhood of $50,000. That is of interest when you compare it with the 37,000 annual death toll on our highways. In 1957, the Public Health Service, together with the American Public Health Association, and other groups, began to take greater interest in accident prevention.

This increased interest in safety has been supported in Congress. Last session Congress added $1 million to the budget for accident prevention.

When we held our hearings on safety last July the staff of the Division of Accident Prevention numbered 122 with 34 engaged primarily in traffic accident prevention work. So you can see, we are making progress. But a lot remains to be done, especially in the way of research.

SAFETY STANDARDS FOR VEHICLES

The Federal Government can move in other areas without infringing on the jurisdiction of the States.

The Federal Government could and should establish minimum safety standards for the passenger-carrying motor vehicles it buys.

Figures submitted to my subcommittee by the Bureau of Employees' Compensation show that for 1959 we had 3,912 Federal civilian employees injured in motor vehicle accidents, and 50 deaths. These employees lost 421,010 days from work as a result of these accidents, for a total direct cost to the Government of $4,335,207.

I have pending in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce a bill which would do something about this. This bill, H.R. 1341, would establish safety standards for Government-owned passenger-carrying motor vehicles. We have accumulated an impressive amount of testimony from doctors, engineers, scientists, and safety experts in support of this bill.

My bill not only would help to reduce the cost of highway accidents to the Government but also would promote the building of safer automobiles for the public. Forced to meet safety standards set by the Government, manufacturers would be encouraged to offer these same features. Furthermore, Government approval of certain safety features no doubt would lead to widespread public demands for the inclusion of these features on models offered to the public.

My bill passed the House in 1959. The bill was bitterly opposed on the floor on the grounds that it would increase the cost of automobiles bought by the Government. Even if it did, I say the increased cost would be justified. But cutting down on deaths and injuries will save money, even if we could measure the worth of human life in dollars.

Furthermore, many or all of these essential safety features could be paid for by eliminating chrome and frills which serve no useful purpose. But, you will note that some of these recommendations such as eliminating hazardous knobs and gadgets would cut costs. So economy cannot be the whole reason. The Federal Government has a responsibility to its civilian employees and military personnel to provide them with the safest passenger vehicles possible. There is no question of States' rights here. It is just a question of saving human lives and reducing expenses for disability pensions and death benefits. At the same time, by putting safer cars on the market we will be making a real contribution to safety.

THE FEDERAL ROLE

It is impossible now to predict how far the Federal Government will go in the safety field. It is safe to say that nothing will be done that does not have overwhelming public support. I am sure that the public would rather have the States and local communities make and enforce the rules needed to protect those who use the highways.

The Federal Government can make a great contribution in the field of research and in disseminating information. The Federal Government can help by testing and evaluating safety devices for its own vehicles.

My bill is not intended to take away from the States the responsibility for licensing drivers and enforcing the laws to get incompetent and dangerous drivers off the highways. Its purpose is to get the States to accept their responsibility.

If we are going to cut down the highway death toll, teamwork is necessary. The Federal Government must continue to work with the States and local communities. But the States and local communities must realize that this is a national problem in which they have very definite responsibilities.

ROCKEFELLER SUBMITS PROGRAM OF RECOMMENDED LEGISLATION

Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller of New York in his message to the legislature on January 3 said, in part:

"A vital factor in making New York State a better place to live is the impressive progress which has been made in the past 3 years in our approach to the basic factors involved in accident causation—the driver, the vehicle, and the highway.

"We are heartened that our record is the best in the State's history in that motor vehicle deaths have reached a new low in relation to miles traveled.

"However, we must continue our efforts to meet the traffic safety challenge. I urge:

Legislation to subject all school bus drivers to chauffeur licensing requirements.

Legislation to permit convictions of traffic violations in contiguous States as well as forfeitures of bail on traffic offenses to be included within the operation of the point system, and

Consideration of appropriate standards for legislation to permit a broader program of driver reexamination.

GOVERNOR REQUESTS 70 MORE TROOPERS IN WEST VIRGINIA

Addition of 70 men to the State police force in West Virginia was recommended by Gov. W. W. Barron in his address to the legislature on January 10.

The opening of new interstate mileage in the State adds to the need for traffic supervision, the Governor said. Due to the great distance between fuel and repair shops on these modern highways, the State police must render assistance to stranded motorists as a matter of both safety and courtesy, he added.

"Accident prevention itself is a basic police responsibility," the Governor continued. "The presence of State troopers on the highway prevents violations that lead to accidents. It also relieves congestion, and this increases the effectiveness of the State's overall traffic pattern.

"We are going to cut down the killing of our citizens on the highways—we must cut down this killing. This proposed legislation is one way in which we can do it without wasting any more time."

Country Tub Thumping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I take great pleasure by including the following editorial from the Hamburg Reporter, Hamburg, Iowa, by wide-awake, thoughtful American editor, Mr. John Field.

Mr. Field wants no part in setting up a Department of Urban Affairs. Congratulations, John, for this plain-spoken admonition to the people:

COUNTRY TUB THUMPING

(By John Field)

The trend toward tromping rural Americana into the ground, given great attention of late by State Governors the Nation over, has now been taken on as a Federal project.

The New Frontiersmen have apparently decided there are no more mountains to climb, that the West has truly been won, and attention can now be turned to the teeming masses of the hungry, the poor, and the downtrodden in our countless cities.

How's that again? Well, it works like this, Junior. We have promised no raise in taxes, so, more or less, we have to reshape the country with the money at hand, so to speak. With only 92 billion bucks in sight for the next fiscal year, something will have to go if we insert something new.

Now, Junior, guess what will have to go. Right the first time, you rural and small-town American. You are to eventually go. Go where? Why, to join the teeming masses, the downtrodden, the weak and hungry and poor in the cities, of course, you unskilled country lout.

This comes from no less an authority than your friend and protector, the Federal Secretary of Agriculture, name of Freeman. He has been given the honor of leading the attack against we hostile plainsmen out in the great American desert. His orders are to at least thin out the hostiles by 20 percent during the next 10 years.

His orders are, in true frontier style, to take over the land, at least 20 percent, and 40 percent if possible. Not under the nice soil bank plan now in operation, but by taking 80 million acres permanently out of production. That is the goal.

This alone may not kill off us Indians, he is told, so additional steps will accompany the land grab. For example, if the Indians do not obey every treaty down to the last feather, cut off the reservation food. And to lower the cost of this whole process, cut down the food to those who do obey, too.

To start things off, about $300 million less will be spent on this year's farm program. The amount will be cut more from year to year, as the amount of land to be no longer farmed is increased.

Even the boys back in Washington could see rather quickly that with less land to farm, and less money for farming, there would be a few more standing around in the breadlines. What to do with them? Retrain them for city jobs, that's what.

The Agriculture Department estimates that over the next 10 years its policies will make it necessary to retrain more than 1 million farmers who have been squeezed forever off the land.

What is to become of this money saved from the farm programs? Well now, with all these people coming to the city, and with more than 4 million people standing around in the cities already looking for jobs—looks like it will take a whole new bureaucracy, complete with Cabinet post and billion-dollar budget. It will be called the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, and our leader has already told Congress to come up with it, or else.

In words of one syllable, more is to be done in the future for people living in large population centers, and less—much less—is to be done for the rural American.

Nothing is said, however, about retraining the small town businessman whose customers will be moving from the farm to the city. According to the Sunday papers, the exodus has already begun.

The Midwest has a tremendous amount of private Government grain storage. It takes a lot of manpower to move the grain in and out, store it, care for it, and keep track of it. When the Government completes its program of eliminating the stored corn surplus, it will also have eliminated a source of steady employment for thousands of wage earners.

Will the Government retrain them, too?

Only one bright hope remains for us out here in the boondocks. If the Government will only have the sense to re-train all the displaced rural folks as workers in the new Department of Urban Affairs, it ought to just about come out even. The new department will hire hundreds of thousands of ex-farmers to look out after the hundreds of thousands of ex-farmers who have been forced to move to the city.

Don't laugh. By Government estimate, farm income will only be up 3 percent by 1970, but controlled inflation will boost the cost of living 24 percent during the same time. Mind you, this is seriously being planned.

Food costs to the teeming masses in the cities are expected to go up less than 1 percent.

The solution? Abandon all places of less than 100,000 population, everyone move to the city, and we can all live happily for ever after off each other.

The "Trade Winds" of Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the interest of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of February 10, 1962.

The importance of realining our trade policies to conform to the realities of today's economic world cannot be underestimated and it is encouraging to see support for such a realinement from the Saturday Evening Post.

The editorial follows:

THE WINDS OF CHANGE

Realizing full well the revolution that is involved, the Post supports in principle President Kennedy's plan to form a trade partnership with other countries of the free world. The time has come—indeed, it is already beginning to pass—to recognize that the winds of economic change are blowing swiftly over the face of this globe.

To make this trade partnership workable the President should be given the 5-year power he seeks to cut tariffs up to 50 percent in order to sell more American products to other nations which accept a mutual tariff reduction. Some hardships will be thrust upon some industries—including their workers—and some farmers, but the President advocates assistance for those who suffer under the new legislation. Finding a satisfactory formula will not be easy, but the administration and the Congress should be able to come to reasonable terms. The sacrifice involved should be spread as evenly as it was in the last great piece of similar legislation, the Marshall plan, which has cost the American taxpayers $12 billion since it was adopted in 1947. The trouble is that the operation of the proposed trade-tariff act will fall harder on certain areas and certain industries than on others, particularly in its early stages.

In our January 6 issue Christian A. Herter, Secretary of State under President Eisenhower, made an eloquent plea for joining in partnership with other free nations. Beginning on page 17 of this issue one of our editors, Ernest O. Hauser, reports on some aspects of the new affluence in postwar Europe, which depends heavily upon the lowered tariff barriers within the Common Market.

Those 12 billion American dollars kept the Communist wolf from the door of war-torn Western Europe and enabled the Common Market countries to attain their current prosperity. Now the wolf stalks the world at large. Nikita Khrushchev has made it clear that he didn't necessarily mean he would dig us in with nuclear weapons when he said, "We will bury you." He is busily using his enormous economic resources to show the world that communism holds greater promise than capitalism. He is restrained by no rules. He can sell his oil for 10 cents a barrel—at least, for a time—if he foresees an overall profit for communism in the transaction. A trade alliance between the United States and Western Europe and other free countries is our best weapon for undoing Mr. Khrushchev's gravedigging squad.

The Presidential power is the power to persuade, as Harry Truman has well said, and Mr. Truman's successor once removed must do a lot of persuading before Congressmen will sacrifice their districts' individual interests to the common good of the American people. As a veteran of both Houses, Mr. Kennedy knows that a Congressman's main job is to get himself reelected, an axiom which is especially applicable in an election year; the President also knows that a picket carrying a placard emblazoned "Unemployment—Made in Japan" is likely to sway more voters than a well-reasoned argument which points out that we must import more goods if we expect to sell more of our own products to Japan—whose people already buy $180 million worth more from us than we buy from them. The fate of the President's plan may depend on the Alabama Congressman who must decide whether exporting his district's raw cotton is more important than protecting its textile mills against cheap Japanese imports. In spite of fanatical opposition from some Members of Congress, President Kennedy has the best of the argument on his side, and he ought to prevail.

The Constitution gives Congress the power to set duties and imports, but following the disastrous tariff battles of 1922, 1928, and 1930, the Congress in 1934 allocated broad powers over the tariff to the President, where they must remain if foerign trade is to function reasonably.

In the last few years we have acquired an urgent need of foreign trade if we are to remain prosperous. We now send abroad $20 billion worth of our produce each year, while importing $15 billion worth. (The drain on our gold reserves continues because we spend $8 billion on economic and military aid, including our foreign garrisons.) We are moving toward the point Britain attained long ago when her slogan became, "Export—or Die." With our natural resources dwindling, we can justifiably add, "Import, Too." Clearly we aren't going to achieve the exports without the imports.

Attorney Bitker Speaks on the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to place in the RECORD the text of a speech on the United Nations, delivered by Attorney Bruno V. Bitker, of Milwau-

kee, before the Dane County Chapter of the American Association for the United Nations.

Attorney Bitker is an experienced and knowledgeable person, well respected in our community. He is also the chairman of the Governor's Committee on the United Nations. For these reasons, I thought that his remarks would prove of interest to the membership of this body. I wish to commend them to the attention of the House of Representatives:

THE UNITED NATIONS NEED OF PUBLIC SUPPORT

(Address by Bruno V. Bitker, Milwaukee attorney and chairman of the Governor's Committee on the United Nations, presented to the Dane County Chapter of the American Association for the United Nations, Madison, Wis., Nov. 27, 1961)

It is unnecessary for me to review for this audience the accomplishments of the U.N. during the past 16 years. It is true that the U.N. has not fulfilled the great hopes of mankind as a guarantor of peace. But despite the failure to achieve its major objectives, the U.N. has passed from rhetoric to action.

If it has not yet reached maturity, it has grown and developed as such a vital, functioning factor on the international scene so that even Mr. Khrushchev does not dare walk out on the Organization.

The U.N. has maintained armed police in various trouble spots in the world; it has created a new kind of international institution called the U.N. presence; it has assumed responsibility for refugees all the way from Korea to the Gaza strip; it has supervised trusteeships and helped lead new nations toward independence; it has created specialized agencies in the fields of health, food, technical assistance, communications, and others. Although it may not have as yet produced satisfactory solutions to problems in South Africa, in Algeria, in Angola, yes and in Hungary, it has, by airing these conditions through public debate, brought about improvements in some instances and in other instances, at least stirred up public sentiment.

Since the close of World War II a basic principle of our country's foreign policy has been support of the United Nations. President Truman, President Eisenhower, and now President Kennedy have affirmed and reaffirmed the position thereon proclaimed by the almost unanimous vote of the U.S. Senate when, in 1945, it ratified the treaty by which we became a member of the United Nations.

It is true, of course, that the level of our support has not always been at the same high point as it was when the charter originally came into existence. Initially our reaction to the U.N. was one of almost unbelievable idealism. We assumed that the great powers, emerging victorious from the war, would convert their war alliance into an alliance of peace. The expected alliance was the United Nations. This period lasted only briefly. It ended when it became apparent that the Soviet Union was unwilling to wholeheartedly join in any cooperative program to solve the major problems of international affairs through the peaceful procedures under the U.N. Charter.

There then followed a period during which our approach to solving the world's ills was almost wholly unilateral. We did not exactly ignore the U.N. but we did bypass it through the Marshall plan, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the point 4 (technical assistance) program. Although these policies constituted a responsible and generous response to a military, political and economic threat in Western Europe, they did not advance the U.N. as the strong central organization through which the same objectives might have been achieved. To this extent, our reaction to the attitude of the Soviet Union slowed down the development of the U.N. But despite the intransigent positions taken by the Soviet Union on almost every sensitive issue, the U.N. continued to prove itself capable of functioning in a vital manner. No better example from that period comes to mind than its action in Korea. In this action it had not only the official endorsement of our Government, but the support of the American public as well.

Then came the mood in America that almost wrecked the U.N. A small but vocal right wing contingent created a frightening myth of an internal Communist plot which presumably had penetrated all the institutions of American society—the government, the military, the civil service, the schools, the churches, the arts, the entertainment world, the trade unions, yes, even parts of the business world. During this period, while the leadership of this movement was largely rightwing Republican, the loss of confidence in our International Relations spread through both parties.

It is interesting in this connection to be reminded through the recently published quasiofficial biography of Dag Hammarskjold by Joseph Lash, that Hammarskjold's great contribution to the ability of the U.N. to function under its own charter was his success in establishing the independence of the office of Secretary-General. Hammarskjold's first battle to make certain that the Secretary-General was an international civil servant, under the control of no single nation, not even his own, was with none other than Senator Joe McCarthy. Events occur and are forgotten too quickly that there is little wonder that in 1961 we may have forgotten that in 1953, when Hammarskjold first became Secretary-General, Joe McCarthy was demanding the right to pass upon American Nationals who were employed in the international civil service. The requirement of the N.N. Charter that the Secretary must be independent of any member nation was sustained by Hammarskjold. He later referred to this initiation of his as a small nightmare. But if Hammarskjold thought he had firmly established the principle of independence in 1953, he counted not on Mr. Khrushchev in 1960. Unfortunately and tragically, but in the cause for which he had lived, Hammarskjold died before the final stand against the undermining of the independence of the Secretariat through the Troika had been taken by the great majority of members of the U.N.

The bitterness and intense self-distrust of the McCarthy period bred a form of isolationism, even though it did not result in an actual withdrawal from our international commitments. While President Eisenhower continued to champion the U.N.—he declared it to be "the soundest hope for peace in the world"—nevertheless, in fact, our foreign policy was not one of all-out support of the U.N. Rather our attitude turned into a defensive policy, emphasizing military strength and security. It was during this period that we lost touch with our own intellectual resources and moral courage, of which loss the rejection of the egghead was so symptomatic.

Unhappily, too, during this period, we lost touch with the non-Western World outside of the Soviet Union. We failed to sense fully the irreversible revolution taking place in Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America. Today we are aware that the eventual determination of the kind of social system that survives in the West may well depend not on the outcome of the United States-Soviet Union conflict, but on the way in which the rising peoples of Asia, of the Middle East, of Africa, and of Latin America solve their problems. The Western World of a half billion people cannot survive in this technological age as an island of freedom in a totalitarian sea comprising four times as many people.

It is a sobering thought that the preservation of the Western order and culture might be determined by the manner in which these peoples find their way into the 20th century. No single nation can afford the cost of adequately aiding the underdeveloped nations. And even if it could, its purposes and motives would be suspect and its object frustrated, if it attempted to do so unilaterally. This does not mean that all aid must be channeled through the U.N. But it does mean that the instrument through which this can be done objectively and most effectively is the United Nations. The United States must work through and support the U.N. in the process of modernizing these underdeveloped areas.

It was the initial success of the U.N. action in aiding one of these nations, the Congo, in getting on its feet as an independent nation in 1960 that made the Soviet Union turn upon the U.N. and to so vehemently attack Hammarskjold. It was this same proof of its ability to act in Korea at an earlier date that precipitated the bitter attacks of the Soviet Union on Trygve Lie 10 years ago.

It is this very record of achievement that has reawakened American public interest in and support for the U.N. The present attitude of Americans has been demonstrated statistically in the past month. U.N. Day is observed annually on October 24. On the national level, the observance is sponsored and promoted through a quasiofficial agency called the U.S. Committee for the U.N. Ten years ago this agency reported that 291 U.N. Day chairmen had been appointed in local communities throughout the country. This year the number had grown to 2,210. While in the past the greatest number of local ceremonies for U.N. Day reached approximately 10,000, it looks as if this figure this year will exceed 20,000. Every State governor, except Mississippi and South Carolina, appointed State U.N. Day chairmen (four more than the previous record number a year ago). Public support was especially noteworthy in States where the U.N. has been under particularly heavy attack, such as Texas, California, and Florida.

I mention this not because the statistics on observance of U.N. Day are something of special significance per se, but because they are indicative of the mass support of the U.N. by Americans in 1961. The figures for Wisconsin are equally interesting; and perhaps, because of Wisconsin's isolationist reputation, even more stirring. In this State, the Governor's Committee on the United Nations carries on the promotion of local observances. This is done in several ways, but primarily by urging mayors and village presidents to sponsor local programs.

We have asked local authorities, including school superintendents and librarians, to give us a report on their activities. Although the reports continue to trickle in, I can now tell you that the event was observed in over 200 communities in this State. The extent of the ceremonies varied from the issuance of U.N. Day proclamations by village presidents to more formal and publicly attended ceremonies in other communities. For example, more than a thousand citizens participated in the official State observance held at Marquette University with the Irish Ambassador, Frederick H. Boland, President of last year's General Assembly, as the principal speaker. It is evident that U.N. Day was more widely observed in Wisconsin than ever before. Not only did we establish a record for Wisconsin, but we might well have made a national record for the number of local observances. In addition, although not necessarily a U.N. Day function, the related trick-or-treat UNICEF program took place in many communities in behalf of the U.N. Children's Fund.

But the curious thing, and for our country's position in the world, even a disturbing thing, is that at a time when support for the U.N. among Americans is at its strongest and most widespread, that the attacks on the organization should be most vocal and vicious.

Despite what might be considered responsible and respectable auspices under which various of these U.N. Day celebrations were held, the cries of protest were heard and seen from the far right on many of these occasions. Freedom of speech and freedom to protest is in the great American tradition. I would be the last to deny to anyone the right to speak up against anything our Government may be doing, although it is surprising that the kind of picketing carried on by the anti-U.N. groups was a tactic once considered extremely leftist. I do not question their right to object to the fact that the United States is a member of the U.N. or to object to the location of the U.N. headquarters in the United States or to object to our participation in any of the multitude of activities related to the U.N. What I resent is that the dissident voices vent their objections not on the merits of the U.N as an agency for peace, but seek to undermine our national policy by inferring, suggesting, and sometimes even asserting that anyone in or out of the Government, from the eminence of the Presidency itself down to some humanly motivated churchwoman soliciting for the U.N. Children's Fund, is either a fool or a tool if not actually a knowing functionary of the internationalist Communist plot.

It is, of course, easy for objectors to attack the U.N. as an agency organized by and for furthering the designs of Moscow. Thus Robert Welch, of the John Birch Society, characterized Dag Hammarskjold, before his death as, "one of the most comptemptible agents of the Kremlin ever supported by American taxpayers." This type of charge leads to some ridiculous results.

For example, a U.N. Day civic observance in one upper level income suburb was addressed by a distinguished member of the History Department of the University of Wisconsin. Because Time magazine has reviewed an American history book by the professor on the basis that it interpreted some events in our past as having a socialistic slant, a number of "aginers" began a telephone barrage in advance of the meeting to frighten parents into keeping their children from participating. Although the speech was routine as such speeches frequently are, the objectors created sufficient fuss to scare a few of the city fathers into believing that the university professor was some sort of Soviet agent.

These officials have announced that they would not permit the town to sponsor such an event again. In short, the whole of the U.N. was to be abolished or at least ignored because Times magazine carried a critical book review.

Another and almost unbelievable effect is exemplified by the recent pronouncement of the DAR through its committee for our national defense. It warns that the sale of Christmas cards for the benefit of the U.N. Children's Fund is actually a part of the international Communist plot. The DAR said in part:

"This plan to associate the United Nations with Christmas and have it replace the religious aspect of Christmas is believed to be a part of a broader Communist plan to destroy all religious beliefs and customs so that one day we shall awaken to find that December 25 is being celebrated as a one-world peace festival instead of the birthday of Christ."

The reaction of the general population to foreign policy has been described as one of mood. That is to say that foreign policy attitudes among many Americans is not the result of an intellectual pursuit. It is based in large measure on preconceived notions and on prejudices and on sentiment. For example, isolationism has deep roots in this country. Despite our participation in two world wars, despite our realization that we live in one world—and a small one, at that—there is resistance to the acceptance of permanent involvement. There is a nostalgia for a vaguely remembered earlier age of foreign policy innocence.

While approval of the U.N. by the general public has reached a high plateau, the fact is that under normal circumstances the average American tends to be indifferent to questions of foreign policy. This is understandable not only as inherent in the forgotten dream of isolationism, but because such problems seem so remote from everyday interests and activities. It is only when foreign relations disturb the normal conduct of affairs that they break into our normal thinking processes. Then do they share the public consciousness with matters of private and domestic concern.

No better example comes to mind than the effect of the calling up of Wisconsin's 32d Division. This was and is front-page news in Wisconsin. It was not, however, the foreign character of the provocation for the callup that made the headlines, but the intimacy of the impact, foreign policy, save in moments of crisis, has to labor under a hardship. It has to shout loudly to be heard even a little.

Added to this reluctance to accept America's position in world affairs and the natural primary concern of the average individual with his immediate and private affairs, is the understandable hesitancy in allying himself with something which is controversial. To all of this can now be added the threat of the irresponsibles of the 1960's to identify any supporter of the U.N. as a fool or a tool of Moscow.

These people are incredibly bitter toward the U.N. They identify the organization as something sinister. They not only express their loathing about the U.N., but they frequently tie it in with fantastic attacks on our involvement in the wars of the past. Many of them are certain that we could have kept out of World Wars I and II. They seem entirely unconcerned, however, about our avoiding the next war. Perhaps this is why President Kennedy, recently in Los Angeles, and former President Eisenhower, a few days later on a televised program, spoke out so sharply against these bitter people.

It is difficult to relate this current ostrichism with the isolationism of World War I or with the immediate pre-World War II period. There were those then who really believed it was possible to build a wall of steel around the United States of America and let the rest of the world roll by. But in 1961 only the blind fail to see that most foreign countries are one airport removed from our own.

Without doubting their sincerity and giving to their hatred of the U.N. the most charitable diagnosis, they are suffering from one of history's worst cases of frustration. It is the frustration that comes from sensing that America is no longer the dominant nation in the world, a position we held and enjoyed for almost 40 years. To those unwilling to acknowledge that other nations and other peoples with different economic systems and political formulas exist in the world, the cure for this resulting ulcer is to "call out the Marines," "stand up to Khrushchev," "build more potent and more deadly missiles," "smash through the Berlin wall," and above all, "suspect and attack your neighbor if he so much as mentions the word "peace."

In the attitudes and actions of the United States, the President plays the central role. He makes the fundamental decisions that determine the extent of reliance on the U.N. in our national policy. He is the spokesman for the whole population. Through his speeches, his press conferences, and particularly in his appearances before the General Assembly, he exerts vast influence on the attitude of the public.

When President Eisenhower appeared before the General Assembly to deliver his atoms-for-peace speech in December 1953, he lifted us out of what had been a low point in American interest in the U.N. Again in August 1958 when he addressed the General Assembly on proposals for peace in the Middle East, he dramatized most effectively the importance of the U.N. to the United States.

No Presidential speech has been more direct than the remarkable address by President Kennedy on freedom from war before the General Assembly in September 1961. The turbulent events in the Congo, the Soviet scheme to weaken the U.N. through a three-way veto power in its administrative arm, the dramatic death of Hammarskjold, doubt over the ability to agree on his successor, all had produced a mood of pessimism as to the U.N.'s future. It was in this atmosphere that President Kennedy presented his detailed program for general and complete disarmament on the one hand and, on the other hand, a specific and practical program for creating a U.N. peace force to police the peace.

But as remarkable and heartening and encouraging as that speech was, by the nature of our Government, our political leaders cannot take sustained and effective action unless the people accord that action understanding support. Not only must our Government have the support of its own citizens, but the U.N. itself cannot achieve the purpose for which it has been created unless the peoples of the world are fully informed of its aims and activities. It therefore becomes important for Americans to join such citizen's organizations as the AAUN to learn about and give open support to the U.N. as an instrument for peace.

Paying for the U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the United States has been saved by the United Nations from the possibility of being individually injected into dangerous situations that have arisen throughout the world. These situations, in my opinion, very likely will continue to arise so long as we live in a troubled world. A continuance of the United Nations for us as a people is, therefore, very necessary.

I submit a short explanation of the need for the $200 million bond issue written by Mr. Walter Lippmann in the February 20, 1962 issue of the Washington Post which is succinct, clear, and to the point.

The article follows:

PAYING FOR THE U.N.

While Congress is considering the President's request for authority to buy half of the proposed $200 million issue of United Nations bonds, we must ask ourselves what precisely is the crucial question. It is not whether the United Nations is to survive. That is a misleading overdramatization. The critical question is whether the United Nations can and should continue to enforce

peace, as it has been doing since 1956 on the Israeli-Egyptian frontier, since 1960 in the Congo.

The deficit, which the proposed bond issue is to cover, has nothing to do with the regular operations of the United Nations. The deficit arises wholly from these two highly controversial peace-keeping operations.

On the regular assessments for the regular budget the record is very nearly perfect. For the 4 years 1956–59 inclusive, the collections were virtually 100 percent. For the 1960 assessments—those for the year when the great number of new states were admitted—the collections by the end of 1961 were already 94.6 percent. Countries in arrears do not lose their General Assembly vote until the amount owed is equal to the contributions due for the preceding 2 years. On the 1961 assessments, nearly 86 percent has already been collected. Of what has not been collected, China owes over half and the rest is owed chiefly by smaller Latin American countries.

All of this goes to prove that the normal and conventional activities of the U.N. are financially sound and that they have the support of the whole membership—West, East, and neutral.

The deficit is caused by the two special operations. One, known as UNEF, consists of about 5,000 troops under U.N. command, the troops being drawn from 7 countries, none of them a "great power." These troops keep the peace along about 140 miles of the Israeli-United Arab Republic border. This operation costs about $20 million a year.

The other special operation deals with the Congo and is known as ONUC. Its average cost since July 1960 has been about $10 million a month. As of January of this year, 21 countries had contributed to the operation with a total of about 16,000 soldiers. None of the soldiers came from any of the great powers, so that the U.S.S.R., the United States, the United Kingdom, and France have no fighting men in the Congo.

The deficit is not due to the fact that these two operations are very expensive. They have been financed by special assessments, and various countries have refused to pay because they disagree with the purpose or the conduct of the special operations. Because the peace-keeping costs are not part of the regular budget, the nonpaying nations can escape the penalty of losing their U.N. vote.

The Soviet bloc and most of the Arab States have refused to pay either for the Middle East or for the Congo. France, Belgium, Italy, Portugal, Spain, and South Africa have refused to pay for the Congo. There are a few others who have not paid, probably because their Governments are bankrupt. The bulk of the deficit is due to the fact that, for their own reasons, a great many countries dislike the special operations and would like to put an end to them.

We have always supported the special operations in the Middle East and the Congo and we have been paying about 40 to 50 percent of the cost. This sort of thing cannot and should not go on, not because we cannot afford these trifling sums but because the United Nations should not become dependent on any one great power. The true significance of the bond issue is that it opens a way out of this quandary. The central fact of the bond issue is that interest and amortization are to be covered by the regular budget if, as is expected, the International Court of Justice approves the plan. Our share of the peacekeeping costs therefore would decrease to our regular share of the U.N. budget—32 percent. And the penalty for refusing to pay the interest and amortization will be the loss of the right to vote in the General Assembly.

Without insisting that every detail of the plan as presented to Congress is perfect, it is clear that the plan, which we conceived and invented, is good for the U.N. and good for the United States. It saves the U.N. from having to abandon the special operations which are playing such a mighty part in keeping the peace in the Middle East and in the heart of Africa. It brings to an end excessive dependence of the U.N. on the United States, and it brings to an end the unacceptable doctrine that a member can keep its privileges and still refuse to pay its share of operations duly authorized by the constituted authorities of the United Nations.

Seven Ways To Judge How Well Your State Is Really Supporting Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an excellent and informative article by Mr. Donald L. Kruzner, Deputy Superintendent, King County, Washington school system. The article appeared in the November 1961 issue of the Nation's Schools:

WHAT A STATE DOES FOR EDUCATION MAY PUT IT IN THE TOP 10; BUT WHEN WHAT IT'S DOING IS COMPARED WITH WHAT IT CAN DO, RATINGS TUMBLE AND THE FACTS EMERGE

(By Donald L. Kruzner)

A tragedy that faces public education in America today is this: The cream of the teaching profession is being drained off by the relatively wealthy States from the poorer States that are unable to maintain comparable salary schedules.

The level of education maintained in any one State of the Union is an important consideration to all other States. One reason for this is the population migration that constantly is taking place. Through the school district organization, what shall be taught at the local school level has been firmly established. But how it is taught is related to who teaches it, and teachers are bound to be attracted to the States that pay the more inviting salaries.

As long as teachers keep moving, the inability of the taxpayers of any one district to pay their education bill is a matter of national concern. For if equal educational opportunity for all children is to become a reality throughout the United States, spreading the cost of education is a responsibility the American people must accept on a national basis.

This discussion with its tables and charts has been prepared from various official sources. It pinpoints the relative performances of the various States with reference to their ability to support their educational programs.

Salary rating: California and New York rank first and third, respectively, in the amount of money paid in teachers' salaries, but they rank 17th and 39th, respectively, in their relative effort to support public education when income, ratio of adults to public school enrollment, and total school operating costs are considered.

Mississippi and South Dakota rank 50th and 48th, respectively, in the amount paid for teachers' salaries, but they rank 4th and 14th in their relative effort to support public education in terms of income, ratio of adults to school enrollment, and total school operating costs. While New Mexico ranks second in its relative effort to support public education, it is only able to maintain 19th place in the amount it pays its teachers.

These statements may surprise school people who consider the amount spent for education in terms of per capita income alone. The study from which these statistics were taken is a measure of the relative effort that adults, who are considered the principal taxpayers, make to support public school operating costs.

Table 1: The ratio between children in public schools and the total population is an extremely important factor in measuring the relative efforts of adults to provide good public education. This percentage and the relative ranking of States in this regard are shown in table 1. Utah ranks first with 27.4 percent of its total population enrolled in public schools. Rhode Island ranks last with only 15.3 percent of its total population in public schools.

TABLE 1.—*Percent of public school enrollment to total population, 1960–61*

Rank and State	Percent
1. Utah	27.4
2. Mississippi	26.4
3. South Carolina	26.0
4. New Mexico	25.4
5. Wyoming	25.4
6. Arizona	25.3
7. Nevada	25.3
8. Idaho	25.1
9. Alabama	24.6
10. Georgia	24.6
11. North Carolina	24.6
12. West Virginia	24.6
13. Arkansas	23.7
14. Oklahoma	23.2
15. Tennessee	23.1
16. California	22.9
17. Hawaii	22.9
18. Kansas	22.6
19. Washington	22.6
20. Oregon	22.5
21. South Dakota	22.5
22. Texas	22.2
23. Virginia	22.2
24. Kentucky	22.0
25. Florida	21.9
26. Louisiana	21.9
27. Indiana	21.8
28. North Dakota	21.8
29. Colorado	21.7
30. Iowa	21.7
31. Montana	21.5
32. Michigan	21.3
33. Maine	21.1
34. Minnesota	20.5
35. Ohio	20.2
36. Nebraska	20.1
37. Maryland	19.6
38. Missouri	19.5
39. Vermont	19.2
40. Connecticut	18.9
41. Alaska	18.7
42. Delaware	18.4
43. Wisconsin	18.3
44. Massachusetts	17.5
45. Illinois	17.4
46. New Hampshire	17.4
47. New Jersey	17.3
48. New York	17.3
49. Pennsylvania	17.2
50. Rhode Island	15.3

Table 2. Another factor that is sometimes overlooked is the ratio of adults to the total population of an area, particularly since the adults in general form the taxpaying group that pays the education bills. The best single measure of this group, State by State, is the number of people of voting age.

The most recent figures available from the U.S. Department of Commerce were used in

computing this information, shown in table 2. Alaska, with only 36.7 percent of its total population in the income-producing range, is ranked 50th. New York is first with 64.3 percent of its total population in a position to help pay the bill for education.

TABLE 2.—*Percent of population, voting age and over, to total population, 1960*

Rank and State	Percent
1. New York	64.3
2. New Jersey	63.1
3. Pennsylvania	62.7
4. Massachusetts	62.7
5. Connecticut	62.7
6. Florida	62.6
7. Rhode Island	62.0
8. Illinois	61.9
9. Kentucky	61.7
10. Oregon	61.6
11. Missouri	61.4
12. Nevada	61.0
13. Nebraska	60.7
14. New Hampshire	60.5
15. Iowa	60.5
16. Kansas	60.4
17. Ohio	60.1
18. Oklahoma	60.1
19. Wisconsin	60.0
20. Indiana	59.7
21. Washington	59.7
22. Georgia	59.4
23. Maine	59.2
24. Delaware	59.2
25. Vermont	59.0
26. Minnesota	58.7
27. Maryland	58.7
28. California	58.7
29. West Virginia	58.3
30. Tennessee	58.3
31. Michigan	57.8
32. Arkansas	57.6
33. Colorado	57.4
34. Montana	57.4
35. South Dakota	57.0
36. Virginia	56.6
37. Wyoming	56.4
38. Alabama	55.9
39. Idaho	55.8
40. Texas	55.6
41. North Dakota	55.3
42. North Carolina	55.3
43. Louisiana	54.3
44. Mississippi	53.4
45. Utah	52.7
46. Arizona	52.2
47. New Mexico	51.6
48. South Carolina	51.5
49. Hawaii	50.7
50. Alaska	36.7

NOT OFTEN ASKED: WHAT DOES YOUR STATE PAY FOR EDUCATION IN RELATION TO THE NUMBER OF ADULTS IT HAS TO FOOT THE BILL? HERE'S HOW TO TELL

Table 4: Another factor in determining the relative effort of adults to provide adequate funds for good public school education is the average yearly operating expenditure per pupil. This information, for the school year 1960–61, was gathered for each State and reported in a National Education Association research report issued in December 1960. Alaska and New York, tied for first place, spent $585 per year for each child. Alabama, in last place, spent $217 per year for each child. Figures for all States also are reported in table 4.

The cost per pupil per year runs relatively high in the sparsely settled States of the mountain region, which must maintain smaller schools than States with more concentrated populations. It is also significant to note the low cost of education per pupil in many of the Southern States, which have a high ratio of children attending public schools as compared to their total population.

TABLE 4.—*Average yearly operating expenditure per pupil, 1960–61*

1. Alaska	$585.00
2. New York	585.00
3. New Jersey	512.00
4. California	494.42
5. Delaware	460.00
6. Illinois	457.00
7. Wyoming	454.00
8. Oregon	448.00
9. Nevada	435.00
10. Washington	430.00
11. Montana	427.00
12. Michigan	424.00
13. Wisconsin	421.69
14. Pennsylvania	421.06
15. Connecticut	420.00
16. Rhode Island	417.00
17. Maryland	415.00
18. Minnesota	415.00
19. Massachusetts	413.00
20. Colorado	406.78
21. Iowa	400.00
22. Arizona	390.00
23. Ohio	388.00
24. Kansas	384.00
25. Hawaii	378.00
26. Indiana	372.00
27. Louisiana	370.00
28. New Mexico	365.00
29. New Hampshire	363.00
30. Missouri	355.00
31. South Dakota	350.00
32. North Dakota	345.00
33. Utah	340.00
34. Vermont	339.00
35. Texas	330.00
36. Maine	326.00
37. Nebraska	320.00
38. Oklahoma	320.00
39. Florida	310.00
40. Idaho	285.00
41. Kentucky	275.00
42. Virginia	275.00
43. West Virginia	255.00
44. Arkansas	242.48
45. North Carolina	240.00
46. Georgia	236.00
47. Tennessee	228.00
48. Mississippi	225.86
49. South Carolina	223.00
50. Alabama	217.00

Table 5: The next important consideration is the school cost per pupil in relation to the taxpayer. This is referred to as the school cost per adult in table 5. This figure was determined by multiplying the percent of public school enrollment to total population by the average yearly operating expenditure per pupil and dividing the product by the percent of people in the income earning bracket. It is a measure of the cost per pupil in terms of the number of people who pay the tax bills.

Here again the costs are higher in the sparsely populated States and lower in the States in the Eastern and Central Southern sections of the country. Wyoming and California, with costs of $204.46 and $192.88 per year, are ranked second and third, respectively. Tennessee and Alabama, with costs of $90.34 and $95.50 per year, rank 50th and 49th, respectively, on this scale.

TABLE 5.—*Public school cost per adult taxpayer, 1960–61*

1. Alaska	$298.08
2. Wyoming	204.46
3. California	192.88
4. Arizona	189.02
5. Nevada	180.42
6. New Mexico	179.67
7. Utah	176.77
8. Hawaii	170.73
9. Oregon	163.64
10. Washington	162.78
11. Montana	159.94

TABLE 5.—*Public school cost per adult taxpayer, 1960–61*—Continued

12. New York	$157.40
13. Michigan	156.25
14. Colorado	153.78
15. Louisiana	149.23
16. Minnesota	144.93
17. Kansas	143.68
18. Iowa	143.47
19. Delaware	142.97
20. New Jersey	140.37
21. Maryland	138.57
22. South Dakota	138.16
23. Indiana	135.84
24. North Dakota	136.00
25. Texas	131.76
26. Ohio	130.41
27. Wisconsin	128.62
28. Illinois	128.46
29. Idaho	128.20
30. Connecticut	126.60
31. Oklahoma	123.53
32. Maine	116.19
33. Pennsylvania	115.51
34. Massachusetts	115.27
35. Missouri	112.74
36. South Carolina	112.58
37. Mississippi	111.66
38. Vermont	110.32
39. Florida	108.45
40. Virginia	107.86
41. West Virginia	107.60
42. North Carolina	106.76
43. Nebraska	105.96
44. New Hampshire	104.40
45. Rhode Island	102.90
46. Arkansas	99.77
47. Kentucky	98.06
48. Georgia	97.74
49. Alabama	95.50
50. Tennessee	90.34

Table 3: Another factor is the per capita income. This information, taken from the "Survey of Current Business, Office of Business Economics, U.S. Department of Commerce, April 1961, is shown in table 3. Delaware, with $3,094, and Connecticut, with $2,871, top the list of States in per capita income earned. Mississippi, with $1,190, and Arkansas, with $1,369, are 50th and 49th, respectively.

TABLE 3.—*The average per capita personal income earned, 1960*

Rank and State	Income
1. Delaware	$3,094
2. Connecticut	2,871
3. Nevada	2,854
4. New York	2,853
5. California	2,753
6. Alaska	2,724
7. New Jersey	2,687
8. Illinois	2,651
9. Massachusetts	2,548
10. Maryland	2,415
11. Ohio	2,367
12. Michigan	2,355
13. Washington	2,334
14. Colorado	2,301
15. Pennsylvania	2,282
16. Oregon	2,276
17. Wyoming	2,262
18. Rhode Island	2,217
19. Missouri	2,214
20. Indiana	2,198
21. Hawaii	2,192
22. Wisconsin	2,177
23. Nebraska	2,113
24. New Hampshire	2,108
25. Minnesota	2,074
26. Kansas	2,066
27. Montana	1,996
28. Arizona	1,983
29. Iowa	1,982
30. Florida	1,949
31. Texas	1,943
32. Utah	1,936

TABLE 3.—*The average per capita personal income earned, 1960*—Continued

	Income
33. South Dakota	$1,919
34. Maine	1,894
35. Vermont	1,893
36. Virginia	1,868
37. Oklahoma	1,859
38. North Dakota	1,826
39. Idaho	1,824
40. New Mexico	1,789
41. West Virginia	1,692
42. Louisiana	1,630
43. Georgia	1,622
44. North Carolina	1,584
45. Tennessee	1,565
46. Kentucky	1,555
47. Alabama	1,478
48. South Carolina	1,403
49. Arkansas	1,369
50. Mississippi	1,190

WHAT PERCENT OF THE INCOME OF ADULTS IN YOUR STATE REALLY GOES TO PAY FOR EDUCATION? THIS IS A TRUE MEASURE OF YOUR STATE'S EFFORTS

Table 6: Probably the most significant figures in the entire study are shown in table 6. These figures represent the percent of costs per adult in relation to per capita income. These percentages vary from those which relate per capita income to total population. These percentages relate per capita income to the adult population. They were determined by dividing the 1960–61 school costs per adult by the average 1960 per capita income. This is a measure of the effort being made to provide funds for public school education in terms of the ratio of children to adults as related to the average per capita income.

The ranking of States in this effort also is shown in table 6. On this scale, New Mexico and Arizona rank second and third with 10 percent and 9.5 percent of their average per capita income in relation to each adult's cost per child in school. At the other end of the scale, 50th and 49th, respectively, are Connecticut at 4.4 percent and Massachusetts at 4.5 percent.

The sparsely settled States in the mountain regions of the country rank highest in individual taxpayer effort measured in these terms. Likewise, many of the Southern States with small per capita incomes show a greater effort than the majority of States in the higher income brackets. For example, Mississippi, which spent only $225.86 per child in 1960–61 to establish a ranking of 48th, is fourth in its relative effort to support public education. Delaware and Connecticut, with per pupil expenditures of $460 and $420 and first and second highest per capita incomes, rank 48th and 50th, respectively, in their relative effort standings.

TABLE 6.—*Percent of school operating costs per adult in relation to per capita income*

	Percent
1. Alaska	10.9
2. New Mexico	10.0
3. Arizona	9.5
4. Mississippi	9.4
5. Louisiana	9.2
6. Utah	9.1
7. Wyoming	9.0
8. South Carolina	8.0
9. Montana	8.0
10. Hawaii	7.8
11. North Dakota	7.4
12. Arkansas	7.3
13. Iowa	7.2
14. South Dakota	7.2
15. Oregon	7.2
16. Idaho	7.0
17. California	7.0
18. Minnesota	7.0
19. Washington	7.0
20. Kansas	7.0
21. Texas	6.8
22. North Carolina	6.7

TABLE 6.—*Percent of school operating costs per adult in relation to per capita income*—Continued

	Percent
23. Colorado	6.7
24. Oklahoma	6.6
25. Michigan	6.6
26. Alabama	6.5
27. West Virginia	6.4
28. Nevada	6.3
29. Kentucky	6.3
30. Indiana	6.2
31. Maine	6.1
32. Georgia	6.0
33. Wisconsin	5.9
34. Vermont	5.8
35. Virginia	5.8
36. Tennessee	5.8
37. Maryland	5.7
38. Florida	5.6
39. New York	5.5
40. Ohio	5.5
41. New Jersey	5.2
42. Missouri	5.6
43. Pennsylvania	5.1
44. Nebraska	5.0
45. New Hampshire	5.0
46. Illinois	4.8
47. Rhode Island	4.6
48. Delaware	4.6
49. Massachusetts	4.5
50. Connecticut	4.4

Table 7: The amounts paid for teachers' salaries, in terms of statewide average figures for 1960–61, with rankings, are shown in table 7. With few exceptions these rankings parallel the rankings in the per capita income chart. Poorer States are unable to provide salaries comparable to those paid by States with high per capita incomes. While California and New York, with average yearly salaries of $6,900 and $6,400, rank first and third, they rank 17th and 39th, respectively, in their relative effort to support school operating costs. At the other end of the scale are the average yearly teaching salaries of Mississippi, with $3,560, and Arkansas, with $3,600. Mississippi is ranked fourth and Arkansas 12th in their relative effort to support school operating costs.

TABLE 7.—*Average certificated personnel salaries, 1960–61*

1. California	$6,900
2. Alaska	6,700
3. New York	6,400
4. Connecticut	6,150
5. Michigan	6,125
6. New Jersey	6,065
7. Nevada	6,000
8. Illinois	5,950
9. Maryland	5,905
10. Delaware	5,900
11. Arizona	5,830
12. Indiana	5,760
13. Hawaii	5,740
14. Washington	5,735
15. Oregon	5,700
16. Rhode Island	5,700
17. Massachusetts	5,600
18. Ohio	5,570
19. New Mexico	5,500
20. Pennsylvania	5,450
21. Minnesota	5,440
22. Colorado	5,350
23. Louisiana	5,250
24. Wisconsin	5,175
25. Utah	5,120
26. Wyoming	5,100
27. Florida	5,050
28. Oklahoma	4,910
29. Missouri	4,800
30. Montana	4,750
31. Kansas	4,750
32. Texas	4,665
33. Iowa	4,661
34. New Hampshire	4,651
35. Idaho	4,575
36. Vermont	4,525
37. Virginia	4,500
38. Maine	4,300
39. North Carolina	4,250

TABLE 7.—*Average certificated personnel salaries, 1960–61*—Continued

40. Kentucky	$4,231
41. Georgia	4,200
42. Nebraska	4,140
43. Tennessee	4,110
44. West Virginia	4,100
45. North Dakota	4,000
46. Alabama	3,900
47. South Carolina	3,775
48. South Dakota	3,750
49. Arkansas	3,600
50. Mississippi	3,560

In summary: It appears reasonable that there is real justification for thinking in terms of equalizing educational opportunities for children wherever they may live. Certainly such equalization is justified in terms of a formula that would take into consideration the ratio of children to adults, the amount being spent per child, the per capita income, and the relative effort being made by the taxpayer public to provide a good level of education.

Some Hard Facts on Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert L. Garner, former vice president of the World Bank and recently retired president of the International Finance Corp., has had a brilliant career in business and public service, and has recently written a most thoughtful article on the foreign-aid program concerning which he is most knowledgeable.

This article entitled "Some Hard Facts on Foreign Aid," appeared in a recent issue of the Vanderbilt Alumnus—the alumni magazine of my own university as well as Mr. Garner's. Believing that his article will be of considerable interest to my colleagues and others, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Garner's writing be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD. The article follows:

SOME HARD FACTS ON FOREIGN AID

(By Robert L. Garner)

We need to keep in mind two significant developments in the postwar world.

First, the spreading realization that no nation can today walk alone;

Second, that for the first time those countries which have achieved a more abundant life have accepted responsibility to assist their poorer neighbors to improve their economic lot.

Thus the less developed countries have the unique opportunity to draw on the fruits of centuries and experience, organization and technology in economic progress. They have the good will and support of the powerful free nations.

But I am troubled by the extent to which there is growing up the insidious consequences of too great reliance on foreign aid. Everyone repeats the platitudes that each country must be primarily responsible for its future and that others can only supplement its own efforts. Nevertheless, there are too many instances where the obvious attitude is that the chief responsibility of a government is to secure the maximum help from abroad, with lesser responsibility to mobilize its own resources, and to take

action so that all resources are most effectively applied, and that internal conditions which hinder development are improved.

Probably the most important economic problem in the world is how the great areas with low productivity and standards of living can move steadily toward the levels achieved in North America and Western Europe.

If, working together, the richer and poorer countries are to make substantial progress to this end, it will require an honest facing of the facts. We certainly need to understand why certain countries have achieved a high degree of economic development and others have not. If we fail to understand the problem, how can we hope to solve it?

Let us briefly examine some of the frequently cited causes of underdevelopment.

It is often claimed that geography and natural resources are determining. They are, of course, important, and extreme conditions may inhibit any worthwhile economic activity—such as in the polar regions or utter deserts. But resources lie insert and have no economic worth except as people bring them into use.

It is easy to attribute the progress of the United States to its wide expanse and abundant physical resources. However, other areas—in Latin America, Africa, Asia—have comparable wealth, but most of it is still untouched.

On the other hand, there are countries in Western Europe with limited fertile land and meager mineral deposits, yet they have achieved high levels of economic life.

There appears to be only limited relation between resources and development.

Perhaps most often lack of capital is blamed. Let us take a look at this. In the first place, there is in most developing countries more potential than is admitted. But large amounts are kept outside, because of political instability and depreciating currency at home. Or it is invested in often unproductive land, low-priority buildings, or otherwise hoarded. From the standpoint of development it is sterile.

The wide acceptance of the assumption that lack of development is primarily due to shortage of capital has led the United States and other richer countries to provide billions in loans and grants. Over the postwar period immense sums have been made available to the developing areas. Some of these funds have been well applied and have produced sound results, others have not. However, to most of the recipient countries the amounts are never sufficient. In my opinion they never can be, because money alone accomplishes nothing. It is only a tool, and what it produces depends not on how much, but on how it is used. If it is applied to uneconomic purposes, or if good projects are poorly planned and executed, the results will be minus, not plus. The effective spending of large funds requires experience, competence, honesty, and organization. Lacking any of these factors, large injections of capital into developing countries can cause more harm than good. The test of how much additional capital is required for development is how much a country can effectively apply within any given period, not how much others are willing to supply.

It is popular in many quarters to charge colonialism with lack of development in territories which have been dependent. This argument seems less persuasive when we observe that a number of countries which have been their own masters for long periods are no further advanced.

I am, therefore, forced to the conclusion that economic development or lack of it is primarily due to differences in people—in their attitudes, customs, traditions, and the consequent differences in their political, social, and religious institutions.

Therefore, if the countries which are lagging are to join in the procession of economic progress their people must change some of their thinking and some of their methods. This is the stubborn core of the problem, the most important factor regulating the pace of growth—how fast will people adapt. A bulldozer can move most things, but not ideas and habits.

It is no service to truth and realism to avoid the fact that much effort and the sacrifice of some of the accustomed ways are the inevitable price of advancement.

Modern machines and the way of life which they demand can produce unlimited goods and services, but only for those who accept the required disciplines. Such disciplines are harshly imposed by the ruling powers in Communist countries. In free societies they must be voluntarily assumed by individuals.

I am sympathetic with those who prefer the old ways and the simpler life. But too many wish for the best of both worlds. It won't work—only frustration and failure can result from seeking the fruits without being willing to pay the price of admission to modern economic society.

Out of my experience I have arrived at a few simple requirements for any country to make its way up the economic ladder. Simple to state, most difficult to achieve.

The first requirement is a reasonable degree of consistent law and order—government which can govern. Each country must work out its own acceptable process by which it governs itself. But without a degree of continuity in political life, consistent economic growth is not possible. Public policies sway with every change in the winds; economic programs do not get off the ground; private investment is frustrated.

Next, I would put the requirement of reasonably honest and effective public administration. There is no denying that in many countries graft and corruption in public office lay a heavy tribute on resources which should go into development. Of course, the less developed countries have no monopoly on public corruption, but its toll is more destructive in poorer countries than in richer societies. This is a problem which is entirely up to the leaders and people of each country.

However, honesty alone is not sufficient. Administration needs to be effective, and more and more individual competence and adequate organization are required as an economy grows and becomes more complex. I have found that in dealing with public officials, the most prevalent obstacle to getting things done is the lack of experience, of training, and of ability to make prompt decisions. More attention to training and organization is widely needed.

I can seldom refrain from commenting on the importance of financial stability to steady economic progress. There are many prominent supporters of inflation who claim that it is a necessary adjunct of growth; some assert that it creates development.

But I have taken a close look at inflation in quite a few countries. I have seen it upset governments; take the bread out of the mouths of workers, the old, the helpless; undermine the operations of business. So I continue to class it as a dangerous fever, which gives the patient a temporary spurt but quickly saps his strength.

Next, I would emphasize the importance of developing in broad terms a pattern of economic growth, a sensible plan of balance among agriculture, industry, transport, power, communications, with such provision for housing, education, and medical services as resources permit. From my experience, this type of basic program, setting out general and related objectives, is more practical than attempts to specify in detail and to direct all spheres of economic activity.

However, the plans are made, they will reveal needs so great that there must be a selection of priorities. Of course, it is also essential that the country seek to increase its own internal revenues. Many tax systems need overhauling to remove inequities and evasions, and to improve collections. However, if development is to be encouraged and not hampered, it is important to avoid taxation which hinders investment. The best chance for long-term growth in revenues is through increased productivity and national income.

Most countries have in their history experienced some form of feudal society, with wealth and power in the hands of a few. The most advanced countries have moved out of it; in many others it still prevails. This is one fo the things which must disappear if there is to be economic progress in the modern sense. It can disappear under the guns of violent revolution, with the lives and property of those who have the most being forfeit. But the mass of people have never found quick prosperity through expropriation—through dividing up an inadequate pie. Grabbing the possessions of a few does not really help the many.

But revolutions are likely to come unless those who have the wealth and power are prepared to cooperate in working out means whereby productivity can be increased and its benefits more widely distributed. If they would look forward they should realize that there is greater opportunity and prosperity for those with superior ability and for capital in a growing economy with widely spread benefits than in a less productive society made up of a few rich and many poor.

So I put high on the list of public policy positive efforts to see that the benefits of growth be spread widely among more and more people—through jobs, ownership, opportunity.

I have some definite ideas as to the means of getting greater productivity, which is the essence of modern economic life, and providing for wide distribution of its benefits, which is both economically and politically imperative in free societies.

Obviously there is need for governments to provide the basic facilities and services. To do this in adequate measure will strain their human and financial resources. It seems sensible, therefore, to give the greatest scope to private initiative and capital in all fields which are not necessarily in the public sector.

There is convincing proof that this is the most assured method of getting development. The most productive economies which have brought the highest standards of living to the most people have been those which have permitted private initiative to control the widest range of activities. This system has worked in the United States, which began as a wilderness; it has worked in Europe and Japan, with the long established societies.

Over the past 14 years I have visited some 50 countries, most of them in earlier stages of development. The most substantial progress I have observed has come from the private sector, where it has been provided with basic facilities and a political and administrative climate in which it could exercise its talents.

In most instances of public ownership and operation of industry which I have observed, the results have been uneconomic. Too often political considerations determine the type of enterprise, and the size and location of plants. In instances where the facts are available, the publicly owned plants have generally cost more to build and many of them operate at losses, which have to be made up from public funds. At least certain countries, having burned their fingers, are abandoning or selling out to private interests some of these economic liabilities. Others, however, continue to experiment.

It is, of course, true that the role of government in economic affairs must vary according to the conditions in different countries. Much more is required in the way of planning, stimulation, incentives, and financial participation where industrial development is in an early stage and where there is a scarcity of entrepreneurs, management experience, and organized sources of capital.

Under such conditions, government has two alternatives in dealing with private enterprise. If it sincerely wishes to use its productive potential it can give support and finance on terms which do not repel private investment nor stifle private control and management. On the other hand, it can demand such rights and lay such restrictions that enterprise cannot operate on an economic basis. Frequently businessmen cannot get a clear answer to Government intentions, often because the Government will not adopt a clear-cut policy. So long as the uncertainty exists, it constitutes an obstacle to private investment.

Decisions as to the degree of Government ownership and control are not always made on the basis of economics or political theory. Even limited experience in dealing with officials in some countries reveals that they are largely influenced by what will give them the greatest personal power and rewards. The greater the control in Government hands, the more personally lucrative can be the exercise of such control.

I am convinced that increased productivity can best be assured by a combination of Government and private investment and operation, each in its most appropriate sphere. The functions which only Government can perform demand its full efforts and human and financial resources. Therefore, if we seek the maximum production and development, private initiative, management and capital should be called upon and given the opportunity to extend their activities most widely.

If productivity can be increased, how then can the benefits best be widely distributed?

We know that the doctrine of socialism says by public ownership of the means of production. Through the instrument of government (which the Socialists will operate) everyone will be allotted his proper and abundant share. It is an idea which has appealed to many, since the days of Thomas More's "Utopia." Up to now it has never worked, because it has never produced the abundance. (It is interesting to note that utopia—from the Greek—means "no place.")

Then there are the supporters of the ultimate welfare state, who propose that government (which likewise they intend to control) take the maximum amount from all who work and who own property and spread it around as they deem most fitting.

Some wise man has said "there is no such thing as a free lunch." Someone must pay the bill, so the question remains whether people pay their own bills to the maximum extent, or have Government take and distribute as much as possible.

I would propose to the developing countries a somewhat different approach in order to spread benefits more widely.

First, I would concentrate on how most effectively to encourage individual initiative and the flow of private capital into productive use. One specific means would be through revision of taxation to give incentives to production and investment and lay heavier taxes on unproductive assets.

I would make it attractive to both local and foreign capital to expand existing enterprises and to start new ones, providing more jobs, more goods, and wider opportunities for ownership of business. I would give incentives to larger companies to sell some of their shares to the general public.

I would work out means by which more farmers could purchase land and get assistance in improving their production and marketing. I would provide credit facilities so that the working man could build or buy a house and pay for it out of his earnings.

This approach would, I believe, begin to build up a middle class of men of property, with opportunities for individuals to progress as far as their abilities warrant.

This is my prescription for building a productive economy and spreading widely its benefits.

I have touched upon some of the things which governments need to do to promote development, including making full use of the productivity of private initiative and capital.

There are, however, equally great responsibilities which private business needs to assume.

The time has come when no longer can businessmen afford to concentrate exclusively on their individual enterprises and to ignore their role in promoting the broad interests of their countries. They should see this as a matter of self-interest, because in the long run the success of all private business rests upon the progress and stability of the community in which it operates.

Private enterprise is under deadly attack, not only from avowed communism, but from advocates of all degrees of socialism and state control. Their propaganda is clever, organized and persistent. Business generally has not effectively taken up the challenge. It has, by default, allowed itself to be put on the defensive. Unless it awakes to the present danger and determines to pay the price and make the fight to preserve and expand its system, its productive contribution may be lost to the world, and bring about total change in our society.

As we have pointed out in our annual report, there are some particular aspects of responsibility for foreign businessmen operating in the developing countries. They need to make special efforts to associate themselves with the local communities, first through maximum use of local resources and people, with positive efforts to provide training and opportunity for advancement to senior positions. It is becoming increasingly apparent that there are mutual advantages in joint ventures with local enterprises, or in sharing ownership with local investors, including, where practical, offering of shares to the public. And on a broader front, foreign business interests are in position to set the example and stimulate their local counterparts in supporting education, technical and business training, and other constructive community activities.

And finally, they can demonstrate and make known the benefits which they and all good private business contribute to economic growth.

Uncle Sam Faces $1 Trillion Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, some rather startling and unsettling facts have been presented in a recent article by Maurice H. Stans, former Director of the Bureau of the Budget, concerning our national debt. I want to bring this article to the attention of my colleagues in the hope that sometime, somehow, we can put an end to this frightening spiral.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 19, 1962]

OUR CHANGING ECONOMY: UNCLE SAM FACES $1 TRILLION DEBT

(By Maurice H. Stans)

Treasury Secretary C. Douglas Dillon has asked for a $10 billion increase in the ceiling on our national debt. This would bring it to an alltime high of $308 billion.

The Congress has indicated that it will deal with this request in two installments. An increase of $2 billion will undoubtedly be authorized immediately, as an emergency measure, to permit enough new funding to pay current bills. This will bring the debt total to the magic line of $300 billion.

Above this amount, Dillon will have tougher sailing, and the Congress may give him only a part of the additional $8 billion he wants. Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, longtime champion of solvent government, has announced that his Senate Finance Committee will hold hearings on the state of the Government's financial position before voting any further increases. By the time the hearings are concluded, the Senator will have some shocking news to report to the American people.

INTEREST IS $9 BILLION

The annual interest on the national debt is now running above $9 billion, and for the last several years this carrying cost, without any payment on the debt itself, has been taking 11 cents of every dollar of Federal taxes collected. And the chances that any of this debt will ever be paid off seem less and less as time goes on.

This is quite a contrast with the past. From the beginning of the Nation in 1789 until recent years, a major objective of every President was to pay off the national debt. It was done once—by Andrew Jackson in 1834. But each succeeding war built the debt to a new plateau; intervening efforts accomplished reductions but never eliminated the entire amount.

Even so, at the end of fiscal 1916, the debt was only a little more than a billion dollars. By the end of World War I, it had soared above $25 billion. From this high point it was reduced in 11 consecutive years, cutting it by more than one-third to $16 billion in 1930.

From there it began an upward climb, through wartime and peacetime, with the budget in the red 26 years out of 32. The depression years increased the debt regularly, and it had reached nearly $50 billion before the outbreak of World War II. At the close of the war it was $270 billion. Three subsequent surpluses by Truman and three more by Eisenhower could not match the costs of the Korean war and the intervening peacetime deficits. The current year's spending will push the debt to $300 billion, or more, and the end is not in sight.

CREDIT CARD GOVERNMENT

Up to now I have been referring only to the interest-bearing debt. But this isn't all that we owe as a nation. By a continuing policy of national extravagance, we have been committing the Government's future resources beyond this to an incredible degree. We have adopted in Washington a program of credit-card government that is placing a burden of staggering proportions on our children and grandchildren.

As Director of the Budget, I undertook in 1960 to add up all the liabilities of our Government. Here are some of them. We owe $30 billion in unfunded pensions to retired civilian employees of the Government. We owe almost $40 billion in accrued pensions to retired military servicemen. The total of our present commitments to veterans for future pensions and compensation (not counting many other benefits) is in excess of $300 billion. All of this $370 billion is for past services and in the financial state-

ment of a business would be accounted for among liabilities.

Then there are many other present contractural or legislated Government undertakings that will have to be financed in the future. Taking all of them—housing subsidy contracts, shipping subsidies, the Interstate Highway System, unfinished public works projects, unpaid purchases of military supplies, and many others—this group adds up to more than $150 billion in further bills to be met in the coming years.

SOCIAL SECURITY, TOO

Altogether, counting the interest-bearing debt of $300 billion and the other obligations and commitments I have mentioned, we have placed a mortgage of over $800 billion on our national future to be met in taxes. This does not include untold billions of dollars in guarantees by the Government on housing loans and other mortgages, bank deposits and other savings, and so on.

Even this is not the full story. Under our social security system, we have scheduled a series of benefits that far exceed, in actuarial terms, the resources that would be available at present tax rates. This deficiency, which can only be made up out of future tax increases already provided in the law, is another $250 or $300 billion.

This makes the total present undertakings of the Government, to be paid from future taxes, in excess of a trillion dollars. And that is beyond the regular annual costs of defense, welfare, and other Government activities.

This is a national debt of more than $22,000 for every family of four in the country. Quite a spending spree we've been on for the last 30 years, isn't it?

Federal Abuse of Social Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the abuse which is typical of many programs which include participation by the Federal Government is discussed in the February 19 issue of the New York Daily News, in its editorial on the problems of social welfare:

HANDS OFF RELIEF, UNCLE

Speaking of Uncle Sam, State Senator Henry A. Wise, Republican, of Watertown, made a remarkable speech in the senate a few days ago on relief and the reasons why it is so widely and increasingly abused.

Senator Wise has studied the subject for at least 10 years. His conclusion is that the chief villain in the relief-abuse drama is the Federal Government.

FEDERAL MONEY—FEDERAL CONTROL

The Government puts up billions a year to help the States pay their relief costs. Since Federal aid always means more or less Federal control, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare insists on pretty much dictating the ways in which the States shall spend relief funds.

Result: Myriad procedural details and mountains of paperwork keep local welfare workers, no matter how able, from handling each case as they know it should be handled. Uniformity is enforced from Washington, on pain of the State's losing its share of the Federal relief funds.

What can the ordinary taxpayer do about all this? He can at least (1) pressure his State legislators to fight Washington's continual butting in on State management of relief, and (2) pressure his Senators and Representatives to fight the HEW's endless grabbing for more power, more money, and more people on its already swollen payrolls.

Ordinary taxpayers in million lots had better do those things, persistently, if they want these relief abuses ever to stop, even in part.

Originator of National Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Hazleton (Pa.) Standard-Speaker in its edition of Monday, February 19, 1962, carried a story of historical importance. From this article I was delighted to learn that National Brotherhood Week, annually observed during the week of Washington's Birthday, was conceived and founded by a native of my congressional district, the late Right Reverend Monsignor Hugh L. McMenamin, rector of Immaculate Conception Cathedral, Denver, Colo., until his death in July of 1947. Monsignor McMenamin was born in Freeland, Pa., which is located in the southeastern part of my congressional district of Luzerne County. It gives me pleasure to include the aforementioned article from the Hazleton Standard-Speaker as part of my remarks today.

The article follows:

FREELAND NATIVE WAS ORIGINATOR OF NATIONAL BROTHERHOOD WEEK

National Brotherhood Week, observed annually during the week of Washington's Birthday in about 10,000 communities, was conceived by a native of Freeland, it was learned Saturday.

The founder of the nationwide observance of a concerted effort toward racial and religious tolerance was Rt. Rev. Msgr. Hugh L. McMenamin, rector of Immaculate Conception Cathedral, Denver, Colo., from July 26, 1908 until his death July 27, 1947.

With a firm conviction of equality of all races and creeds, Father McMenamin a generation ago conceived the idea of Brotherhood Day, adopted in 1934 by the National Conference of Christians and Jews. Years later, the observance spread across the Nation to become Brotherhood Week.

HONORED POSTHUMOUSLY

At a Brotherhood banquet in Denver last fall in which a Protestant, a Jew and a Catholic received citations from the Colorado region of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, Monsignor McMenamin was awarded posthumously for his courageous, tolerant and unselfish leadership in religious and civic affairs.

The award was received by Rt. Rev. Msgr. John B. Cavanaugh, editor of the Denver Catholic Register, on behalf of Monsignor McMenamin.

ONE OF 15 CHILDREN

Born in Freeland September 11, 1871, Monsignor McMenamin was the third of 15 children of Hugh and Ann O'Donnell McMenamin, Schwabe Street.

The only surviving member of the family is a sister, Mrs. Cell Gilmore, Philadelphia. Other relatives include a nephew and niece, Hugh and Belle McMenamin, this city.

A brother, the late John J. McMenamin, was Jeddo breaker boss for the G. B. Markle Coal Co.; and a first cousin, John, was owner of a Freeland shoestore and participated in North Side sports activities.

According to records of his parish, the then Reverend McMenamin, after serving as an assistant for 3 years, was appointed rector July 26, 1908, at a time when the future of the cathedral was uncertain—preliminary construction of a new parish was curtailed by recurring financial problems.

Father McMenamin is described by church historians as a "young man of talent, energy and courage" and "the man of the hour."

Under his direction, new plans for financing the cathedral were devised, subscriptions solicited and construction finally was completed. The church was dedicated in 1912.

The Punitive Effects Upon Multistate Manufacturing Corporations of State and Local Taxes, on, or Measured by, Net Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to me, I am inserting in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement delivered personally recently on the subject of State taxation of interstate commerce by Mrs. Pauline B. Dunckel, of Washington, the capable and efficient executive secretary of the Institute of Appliance Manufacturers, before the Special Subcommittee on State Taxation of Interstate Commerce of the Committee on the Judiciary of this House.

The principal reason I want to underscore this presentation is that it serves to show poignantly, in my judgment, the punitive effects of a multiplicity of taxes, in virtually all of the 50 States, in terms of personnel expense to the small manufacturers who are striving to gain and to hold a toehold in our marketing picture. Many times, we in Congress state that we are for small business and for giving it a chance to survive, but sometimes through neglecting auxiliary or supplementary laws which have nothing to do with lending money to such enterprises or helping them with marketing information and so forth, we fail to do our best to make the right climate possible for small business to survive.

While it is premature to decide whether or not new legislation is needed to protect small business against the many State taxes which have been enacted into law in another period, but now apply with full force under entirely different circumstances, I nevertheless personally want to keep abreast of the

problem and I want to urge my colleagues to do so. As our Nation grows, it is essential that we not let a few giants in each field dominate our manufacturing picture, but that opportunities be kept alive for new investment to gain a share of the market. I congratulate Mrs. Dunckel for this penetrating statement. I am not inserting her examples, which are specific and to the point, but urge Members who are interested to read the transcript of the hearing, when this becomes available in some weeks.

The statement by Mrs. Dunckel is as follows:

THE PUNITIVE EFFECTS UPON MULTISTATE MANUFACTURING OF STATE AND LOCAL TAXES ON, OR MEASURED BY, NET INCOME

(Statement before the Special Subcommittee on State Taxation of Interstate Commerce of the House Committee on the Judiciary on behalf of Institute of Appliance Manufacturers)

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am Pauline B. Dunckel, executive secretary of the Institute of Appliance Manufacturers, a trade association made up of producers of many types of major appliances and household equipment, also their principal component suppliers.

The industry for which I speak is made up of a few large companies and a great many small and medium-sized concerns. Everyone agrees that clarification is needed of the areas in which the States can tax the operations of out-of-State companies engaged in interstate commerce.

The smaller units do not have the benefit of full-time legal counsel on tax matters. Their accounting departments are necessarily small and the task of handling the multitudinous reports required by local, State, and Federal taxing authorities is becoming more and more burdensome each year.

In 1959 the Institute of Appliance Manufacturers strongly advocated the passage of Public Law 86-272. We knew it to be an imperfect tool for meeting all the problems in the field of interstate taxation but were gratified by the two major steps which were taken in that measure:

First. Demarcation of a line beyond which the States cannot go in imposing a tax on the net income of out-of-State corporations.

Second. Provision for investigations like this one and others which may be held before the Senate Finance Committee. The purpose of these investigations, as we understand it, is to determine the effects of the existing law and the need for further limitations on that large gray area in which the commerce clause of the Constitution and the natural desire of the States to find new sources of tax revenue may come into conflict.

In my statement today, I should like to point to three areas in which improvement in Public Law 86-272 is called for:

1. The limitations against taxes on net incomes of out-of-State corporations should be extended into other fields such as franchise, excise, personal property, sales, or use taxes, where the business being taxed is truly interstate.

2. A rewording of the law so that in effect it says that no company involved in interstate commerce shall be taxed by a State unless it maintains a permanent establishment within the taxing State.

3. A specific definition of permanent establishment be set forth including the fact that the mere use of a public, bonded warehouse does not in itself make an out-of-State company subject to taxation by the State.

These points will be developed both in my paper and in that which follows by Robert G. Appleby, assistant treasurer of the Tappan Co. in Mansfield, Ohio, who will speak on the basis of his company's own experience.

We shall not touch on the constitutional questions nor on the dangers involved in the often-referred-to "Balkanizing" of the American economy. These broad subjects can best be left to the discretion of the members of your committee and the Senate Finance Committee who very well know the mandate of Congress to maintain a free flow of commerce among the States.

Because it is impossible to cover in a short period of time any large number of case histories, we have selected five appliance manufacturing concerns, one large, three medium-sized, and one small. These cases are set forth in exhibits to this brief and were chosen because the companies are typical of the appliance industry as a whole.

At the start of this discussion, let me be specific in the fact that the organization I represent does not challenge the right of the States to tax any company which maintains a permanent establishment within the taxing State so that the State may be compensated for its police and fire protection, roadbuilding, and other State, municipal, and county services. We do, however, think it is extremely important that the nexus between an out-of-State company's operations and the State be more directly and specifically defined than has so far been done either by the courts or by Public Law 86-272.

There is fairly general agreement, I believe, that the law enacted in 1959 relieved some of the pressures on business, principally in the fields of claims for retroactive taxes. A number of the States which were encouraged by the results in the Northwestern Portland Cement and Stockham Valve decisions of the Supreme Court tried to compel manufacturers to file tax returns and pay taxes retroactively for a long period of years. To a considerable degree Public Law 86-272 stopped this.

On the other hand, the law may have brought new kinds of taxes on out-of-State concerns. These may have been imposed because a tax on net incomes was no longer possible. These new taxes have as high nuisance value in terms of the cost of compiling records and filing returns as the tax on net incomes. A case in point is the Florida tax recently imposed on the value of advertising materials shipped into that State. Florida requires quarterly returns on this tax. One of our member companies said that it took a tremendous amount of time and effort for his accountants to convince the State authorities in Florida that one return a year would accomplish the State's objectives without burdening the manufacturer unnecessarily. Florida, at the present time, has no income tax on corporations.

Now to be as specific as I can in view of your request that witnesses stick to specifics and not generalize in their testimony:

Imagine, if you can, a medium-sized company with sales of $20 million a year with its seven interstate subsidiaries currently filing more than 1,000 tax returns annually with States, counties, and municipalities. Bear in mind this figure does not include Federal income, excise, and payroll tax returns. These 1,000 returns fall into such categories as:

State payroll taxes, disability taxes, city, county and State franchise taxes, use taxes, State income taxes, highway taxes, personal property taxes, ad valorem taxes (a variation of personal property taxes), gross receipts taxes, occupational license taxes.

For example, the cities of Birmingham and New Orleans each impose a minimum tax of $150 in this occupational license tax bracket. There are said to be at least 18 other cities with similar tax regulations.

The total amount of taxes paid by this company on 1,000 State, county and municipal returns was $214,432 in 1960. That figure does not include any type of tax which is recoverable from customers.

That figure, plus the cost of filing the returns, is considerably more than the company's net earnings for 1960—this is an extremely significant point.

This company has made a diligent effort by engaging expert tax accountants, attorneys, and by subscribing to three major tax services to keep abreast of all State regulations affecting its national business. Nevertheless, it was compelled to pay penalties in at least two States in 1960 for failing to file returns on taxes of which it had no knowledge whatever.

This company reported to us that the State of Texas recently passed a new law affecting out-of-State corporations. Enactment was in early July and the law became effective on September 1, 1961. Our member complained to its leading tax service that up to last week, no report had been given to subscribers on the Texas law. Just a few days ago he received a reply to his complaint in which the tax service, which shall remain unnamed here, said in part:

"We regret that we have been unable to keep up with the hundreds of legislative and administrative changes that have been made in State and local taxes in the past 6 months. We hope to have our reports on a current basis shortly after the first of the year."

Before enlarging on our specific recommendations as to constructive steps which may be taken to improve this situation, may I mention only one extreme case to point up the seriousness of this problem of tax reporting and tax auditing:

"The State of New York has a mileage tax on out-of-State trucks using its highways. Manufacturers are required to record mileage figures and prepare tax returns. The State requires its own auditors to check the manufacturers records at least once every 2 years. The taxpayer is required to pay the New York's auditor's traveling expenses and subsistence expenses during the period of the audit. The auditor checks only 2 months' records and then multiplies his result by either 6 or 12 depending on the length of time since the last audit was made. The selection of the 2 months which are audited could substantially affect the amount of the tax due."

Can you imagine the turmoil which would build up if the States followed this system of auditing all types of taxes on out-of-State corporations?

RECOMMENDATIONS

We heartily endorse the recommendation of the Controllers Institute of America that an amendment to Public Law 86-272 be enacted which would read about as follows:

"No state, or political subdivision thereof, shall have the power to impose, or require the collection of any tax (including but not limited to a franchise, excise, income, sales, or use tax) on or by any foreign corporation (a corporation created by the laws of any other state or country, or the laws of the United States) unless said corporation has in the taxing jurisdiction a permanent establishment, such as a branch, factory, warehouse, or other fixed place of business, but a foreign corporation shall not be considered to have a permanent establishment in the taxing jurisdiction for the purposes of this definition, by reason of carrying on in such state any one or more of the following activities: maintaining an inventory of goods, or merchandise, on consignment or in a public warehouse located within the state."

It should not be difficult for Congress to set up a clear definition of a permanent establishment for this purpose. Numerous tax treaties have been negotiated with foreign countries on this specific point. The one with the United Kingdom is very closely in line with our recommendations.

It is obvious that in trading with a foreign country, an American manufacturer would have to make some sort of a warehouse arrangement with a local warehouse to store his goods until they could be picked up

by common carrier and delivered to their destination. The same sort of an exemption for use of a public warehouse in a state should be included in amendments to Public Law 86-272. This would enable a manufacturer who has a salesman in a state to solicit orders, have them sent back to the factory for approval, have shipment made from the factory either direct to the customer or to a public warehouse for later delivery to the customer. This is a matter of convenience both for the customer and for the factory especially for the purpose of avoiding less than carload shipments and high freight costs.

There is another very major reason why a clarification of the status of out-of-State corporations is badly needed. At present compliance with State laws is very lax. Enforcement machinery is breaking down because most State tax commission offices are not sufficiently well-staffed to follow through on all companies which do business, or are alleged to do business, within the taxing State's borders. This results in unequal enforcement and discrimination among the companies trading in any State.

We have been told by several companies in our industry that their tax attorneys and accountants have advised them to wait until they are approached by the States for payment of taxes which may be due. If they follow this procedure, they may be building up long-term tax liabilities and penalties which could prove very serious. Adoption of the permanent establishment principle should make it much easier for the States to enfore their tax statutes and at the same time clarify the taxpayer's responsibilities.

Before turning over the remainder of our time to Mr. Robert G. Appleby of the Tappan Co., who will give you specific examples of the applications of this problem of State taxation of interstate commerce, I should merely like to take a moment to repeat the three things which I tried to stress in this brief statement:

First, that we approve of the steps which have been taken so far under Public Law 86-272.

Second, that we should like to see the law clarified and strengthened to cover other types of taxes besides taxes on net income, for example, franchise, personal property, use, sales, and excise taxes.

Third, that through a definition of permanent establishment it be made clear that an out-of-State corporation has the right to store its own products in a public bonded warehouse without being subjected to State taxes. The State is already collecting taxes on the warehousing operation located within its own borders.

On behalf of the Institute of Appliance Manufacturers and its members may I express my appreciation for this privilege of presenting our views to your committee? We consider this problem vital to the continuing growth of commerce and trade among the States and commend it to your favorable consideration.

Respectfully submitted.

PAULINE B. DUNCKEL,
Executive Secretary.

Stultifying Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in the Committee on Ways and Means we are working on a tax proposal of the President's which will not do very much to encourage our participation in world commerce or foreign investment by American companies. According to the editorial in the New York Daily News, on February 19, President Kennedy's next proposal will discourage investment in domestic industries. What incentive will there be for growth of private enterprise?

The editorial follows:

LET'S HAVE REAL TAX REFORM

In an interview at Dallas, Tex., the other day, Internal Revenue Commissioner Mortimer M. Caplin made some vague and disquieting remarks about various tax reforms which he said President Kennedy will propose to Congress next year.

Mr. Caplin predicted that the President will want the base rate on personal incomes dropped from 20 percent to 15 percent, and the top rate from 91 percent to 65 percent.

That sounds good. But Caplin went on to say that, to make up for revenue lost by these reductions, the President will want to "treat all income alike"—meaning to scrap the capital gains tax and various exemptions aimed at stimulating people to look for needed mineral products such as petroleum.

These latter proposals, if the President makes them, can be counted on to start a lot of Americans looking around for investments in other countries. Abolish the capital gains tax and the oil depletion allowances, and we'll only take away two more incentives for trying to make big money in the United States.

Opposed to Department of Urban Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I know that every Member of this House has received voluminous correspondence regarding the proposal by the administration to create a Department of Urban Affairs. Most of the mail which I have received since this proposal was made to the Congress has been in opposition to the establishment of a new department. The opinions which have come to me are from private citizens, organizations, and even local governments.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter which I received today from the governing body of the city of McPherson, Kans.:

FEBRUARY 19, 1962.

Hon. GARNER E. SHRIVER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SHRIVER: As the governing body of the city of McPherson, Kans., we desire hereby to express ourselves as being opposed in every way to the proposed Federal proposal for a Federal Department of Urban Affairs. It is our opinion that our cities are capable of taking care of themselves and we are opposed to any Federal law which would centralize control of all of the cities of our land in one department. Certainly our President has enough problems without suggesting that our Federal Government get into more phases of operation, and certainly our Federal Government with its tremendous Federal debt needs not look for further means of adding additional debt which is not necessary. Is more and more Federal intervention in local affairs something which will strengthen our country? Is this the economical method? We do not feel thus.

We feel that if you get the feelings of the grassroots you will find much opposition to the President's proposal. We propose and advocate your voting against the proposal.

Very truly yours,

G. G. DIXON,
Mayor.
LESTER PREMER,
Commissioner of Finance and Revenue.
WALTER H. MCREA,
Commissioner of Streets and Utilities.

1600 Peppermint Lounge?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Roll Call:

1600 PEPPERMINT LOUNGE?

The White House is the official residence of the President of the United States and his family.

The pages of history show that when the Founding Fathers were conceiving the Presidential residence, they exhibited great caution to insure simplicity, wholesomeness, and dignity as the characteristics most desirable in a national home for the democratic leader of the Nation.

Despite the studied caution to avoid establishing "an official palace," the fact is that the White House has become more than a mere dwelling place for the Presidential family.

It has become a national shrine, a symbol to the world of the power and glory and simple dignity of America.

It's an accepted fact that the man in public life has traditionally been a favorite whipping boy of the American people. Congressmen have long been recipients of unmerciful press and public wordlashings.

No President has ever escaped the verbal attacks which have become a sort of national pastime.

Golfing, fishing, poker playing, bourbon drinking, extended vacations, yachting, and a hundred and one other activities enjoyed by Presidents have come under the fire of political critics.

Much of the criticism is partisan sniping, much of it good-humored joshing, a great deal of it the American predilection to let off steam.

Deep in the collective heart of the American, however, is the knowledge that relaxation and recreation are prime requisites for maintaining the health and well-being of our Chief Executives, and no one really harbors bitterness or ill will toward the man who seeks respite from the onerous burden of the Presidency.

President Truman liked to play poker with political cronies. Roosevelt swapped yarns with his favorite newsmen, and Ike played bridge with his golfing cohorts.

In the years that followed World War II it became apparent that American standards were dipping dangerously.

Juvenile delinquency, a general decline in morals, college cheating, rigged TV shows, basketball fixes, rigged prizefights, and myriad other instances of moral decline filled the Nation's newspapers.

Young Presidential Candidate John F. Kennedy captured the imagination of the American people when he boldly called for a rededication to the principles upon which the Nation was founded and grew strong. He roundly criticized the Eisenhower administration for failure to lead the way toward reimbuing the Nation with a sense of purpose, failure to rekindle the desire to take seriously its national obligations, to build the moral and physical strength of the Nation's youth.

It was, indeed, a pleasant relief to witness President Kennedy's interest in the arts. Intellects rejoiced when aging Poet Laureate Robert Frost braved the icy winds which cut through the inaugural scene to profess the new administration's dedication to the greatness of America.

Despite an administration affinity with a theatrical band known as the "Rat Pack," the tenor of White House entertainment rose in tone and taste. Pablo Casals and Shakespeare replaced Fred Waring and Zippity Doo Da at White House musicals.

Mrs. Kennedy's interest in reigniting the historical significance of the White House was widely acclaimed. Presidential interest in the arts and music so publicly manifested seemed to be setting the stage for a high moral leadership from the stately house on 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

The power and prestige of the White House, it appeared, was being harnessed toward motivating a higher moral plane for America.

But now comes news to crush our illusions and shatter our pride.

They're doing the twist at the White House, the papers say.

Are the impressive halls where courtly gentlemen and velvet-garbed ladies once danced the stately minuet now reverberating to the raucous cacophony accompanying the gyrations of the new American neurosis known as the Twist?

God forfend. Say it isn't so. Mr. President. Tell us you are not turning the White House into the Peppermint Lounge. Tell us you know that a pleasure-bent administration can hardly call the turns on the complex international situation.

Gosh, Mr. President, until this twist writhes off our mortal coil, we would even settle for bringing back Fred Waring.

The Farmers Almanac

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I imagine it sometimes appears to the general public that the so-called farm problem is something new. Something that has developed recently, because of some recent change in circumstances affecting the agricultural economy of the United States. The omnibus farm bill now before Congress is being justified by its proponents as being a means of meeting an emergency situation which has developed because of unforseen circumstances.

The farm economic problem is as old as history. For some reason, farmers always seem at the lower level of income, as compared to those engaged in some other economic endeavor. Various means of extending needed facilities to farmers to enable them to secure a better income have been authorized by Congress over a long period of time. Some of the most familiar are the land-grant colleges, the Extension Service, the Farm Credit Administration, and the Rural Electrification Administration.

An editorial in the National Observer of February 18 contains some observations on the continuing farm problem from both the economic point of view and the political atmosphere that has characterized the attempts of Congress to improve the lot of farmers during the past 30 years.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this editorial to the attention of the Members of the House and wish to have it be included, with my remarks, in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE FARMER'S ALMANAC

There are not many along the New Frontier old enough to remember, but the farm program which President Kennedy has submitted to the present Congress had its origin more than 30 years ago. Same problem, same cure. And it would be an optimistic farmer, we suspect, who would count on its having anything but the same result.

The year was 1929, a date that has a curious way of marking the before and after of so many things. Herbert Hoover was President, and the Nation's farmers were troubled with the twin problems of overproduction and prices, which according to their spokesmen did not give them "parity" with the prices of industrial goods. Two leading Republican legislators—Senator McNary, of Oregon, and Representative Haugen, of Iowa—led the political fight for the Government to do something.

What the Government did was to pass the Agriculture Marketing Act of 1929, which for the first time adopted the idea that the Government should intervene in the marketplace to support farm prices.. From that day to this there has been a clear line—the first AAA of the New Deal, which plowed under the cotton and slaughtered the pigs; the soil-conservation program, which was going to cut production by cutting acreage; the ever-normal granary of Henry Wallace; the food-stamp plan; 90 percent of parity; the Brannan plan of the Truman era; flexible parity; a series of oversea surplus disposal plans; and finally the soil bank plan of the Eisenhower administration.

None succeeded. And so now Congress comes to the Freeman plan of the Kennedy administration.

In the broad sense the Freeman-Kennedy plan is just more of the same. It aims, on the one hand, to reduce the amount of acreage planted to the major crops and hence, hopefully, the overproduction that still plagues agriculture after all these 30 years. And, just like its predecessors, the plan would arrange to support the prices in the marketplace and to pay the farmers direct subsidies for not growing things.

But it differs in three major respects. In the first place, its aim is not merely to cut production back to the estimated level of market demand but to slash it below the estimated needs for several years to come. In short, radical surgery. The farmer's production would not be just trimmed back; it would be ruthlessly cut away in the manner of a surgeon attacking a cancer that has spread beyond hope of any moderate cure.

In the second place it introduces marketing quotas as well as acreage quotas in some areas. For example, currently there are no limits on the amount of wheat a farmer can market so long as the wheat is produced within his acreage allotment. The new plan would clamp fixed limits on the wheat the farmer could market for food and export irrespective of the number of acres on which the wheat is grown.

Finally, it puts sharp teeth in the penalties farmers would have to pay if they reject the Government's program. Should the farmers reject the controls on wheat and feed grains, for instance, they would lose not just a portion of the price-support level but all price supports entirely and all direct Government payments. The penalties on individual farmers who overplant their allotted acreage are also increased to a prohibitive level.

And if all this is not enough to whip the farmers into compliance, the Freeman-Kennedy program has yet another weapon. If in their referendum on the control program (this is all very democratic, you understand) the farmers should happen to vote down the controls, then the Government would have the right to dump, at once and unceremoniously, some 10 million tons of feed grains and 200 million bushels of wheat on the open market. This, of course, would break the market wide open.

In short, the choice in the Freeman plan is loss of the last vestiges of the farmer's freedom to farm his land as he will or the ending of all Government aid altogether.

One thing this program has is inexorable logic. Every other administration, from Hoover to Eisenhower, has shied away from recognizing that the Government could not on the one hand intervene in the market to raise farm prices above their market level and at the same time leave the farmer any freedom to control his own produciton.

In earlier programs it was thought this alternative could be disguised by an acreage allotment system. That is, farmers could be partially controlled by limiting their acreage planted to major crops while they retained some freedom in what else they did with their acreage.

But the consequences of this was itself inevitable. Land taken out of one crop was used to create new surpluses in other crops; payments to let land lie fallow were used to cultivate more intensely the remaining acres. As one intervention failed another new one was tacked on, and its failure brought another.

The history of these failures is too well known to be labored here. Except for the few years of World War II when this country supplied not only itself but half the world, the surplus has mounted steadily, year by year. The problem of 1929 was a molehill compared to the surplus problem of today.

Whether this logic will appeal to the Congress—or to the farmers—is another matter. Many of the farm organizations oppose it, and some of them have swung 180 degrees in their thinking; they are now groping for some way to undo the disastrous interventions of the past generation and return farming to the freedom of the marketplace.

But logic suggests that this would not be easy. The Nation's agriculture has for long so subsisted on the narcotic of Government aid that almost every part of it now is so distorted from any relation with the reality of the marketplace that the withdrawal pains would be intense. There is, to be honest about it, no easy way any longer out of the farm problem.

Ironically, this is just what President Coolidge predicted when he vetoed an earlier McNary-Haugen bill, although there are few around the New Frontier who would remember. Said that man of sparse words: "Government price-fixing, once started, has alike no justice and no end."

And there are a few other sad little ironies. It was the Republicans who started it all. It was the Democrats who, in 1928, said "the solution to this problem should avoid Government subsidies, to which the Democratic Party has always been opposed."

The question today is whether President Kennedy—or the farmers—can now appreciate the humor.

Which Road for Transportation: Private Management or———?—Part No. 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues the following, the fourth in a series of nine interviews by Traffic World Magazine of men prominent in transportation and concerned with the growing problems facing this vital industry. The interview—with Sam H. Flint, general traffic manager of the Quaker Oats Co., follows:

INTERVIEW 4

(Mr. Sam H. Flint, general traffic manager of the Quaker Oats Co., is chairman of a special advisory committee on Interstate Commerce Commission practices and procedure established by the ICC. He is also chairman of the special administrative procedure and legal services committee of the National Industrial Traffic League, and a member of the League's legislative committee. He speaks, therefore, as one having special interest and competency in the field of transport regulation.)

A bill has been introduced in Congress which would permit the President to remove a member of an independent agency if the member "frustrated" the President's program. Would not passage of this bill amount to abandonment by Congress of its authority over agencies which have traditionally been considered arms of Congress and whose policies are determined by Congress?

I am unable to become greatly disturbed at the provisions of S. 1842 which would permit the President to remove one member of an administrative agency. The purpose of this authority is to enable the President to establish an agency membership majority of his own party affiliation. It does not, as the question suggests, empower the President to remove any member whose policies or actions are not pleasing; it confines the removal to the member (of the wrong party affiliation) having the least time remaining of his appointed term.

I don't thing this is a necessary provision, and I am inclined to disfavor it simply because it implies there should be at least a partial turnover of agency personnel with each change of administration. I think we get better regulation with a greater continuity of membership. On the other hand, it must be appreciated that in all the acts creating the regulatory agencies there are so-called bipartisan provisions, which for all practical purposes assume that the party in power will establish at the earliest opportunity a majority of membership on these commissions. S. 1842 would simply advance the opportunity to do this.

My personal feeling is that so long as we have a two-party government the bipartisan provisions of the regulatory acts should be fully observed. During the Eisenhower administration these provisions were frequently frustrated by appointment of nominal Democrats who however had overtly supported the Republican candidates. I suspect some wounds were opened which are going to be a long time healing, and it is entirely possible that as a result there will be a greater turnover than would otherwise be expected.

Do you believe that the Reorganization Act should be amended so that it would be clear that reorganization plans sent by the President to Congress must deal only with agencies in the executive branch or with executive duties which Congress has entrusted to independent agencies?

No, I do not believe this is necessary. The Reorganization Act has been on the books most of the time over a period of about 13 years in substantially its present form. It is difficult, if not impossible, to draw such a fine line between what the President may submit and what he may not submit. I think we are perfectly safe in relying on the Congress to call a halt if the President seeks to trespass too much on the prerogatives of the legislative branch.

One criticism which has been levied at administrative agency procedure is that the agencies proceed on a case-by-case basis. Is there any other method the independent agencies could follow in applying the policies expressed in their acts to the asserted rights of either carriers or shippers?

Yes, I very definitely think there is, and there is evidence progress in this direction will be forthcoming shortly.

There are all sorts of disadvantages in the ad hoc or case-by-case approach to regulation. It obviously produces inconsistencies. It spawns additional litigaiton and thereby results in delays. It frequently deprives the public of the benefits of the expertise of the agency. In other words, when the regulatory body confines itself to deciding narrow issues and fails to enunciate broad policies it doesn't give carriers and users alike a proper idea of where they stand or a proper guide for future conduct.

There are at least two ways in which policymaking or affirmative regulation may be undertaken. First, the commissions could anticipate the formulation of issues which inevitably would result in litigation and could institute investigations or rulemaking proceedings bringing before them at one time all the related issues and all the interested parties.

A second method would apply to those cases where litigation has already begun. When it becomes apparent the same or similar issues are coming before the agency in several different proceedings the Commission could well consolidate these cases into a single proceeding and perhaps at the same time institute an investigation of its own to increase flexibility of handling.

Of course there is nothing new about these ideas. The Interstate Commerce Commission has used both approaches to a limited extent in the past. I just think much more of this should be done.

The important thing is that the proper vehicle must be provided for policymaking. It is dangerous for a commission to decide individual cases and then invoke the doctrine of stare decisis in all future cases involving similar issues. I am a great believer in policymaking where there is a sufficiently broad basis, and I think it must come if the commissions are going to cope with an ever-expanding caseload.

Does any real advantage in the public interest accrue in the cases of those independent agencies for which the President has the right to appoint Chairmen?

This is a difficult question. From the standpoint of logic there are obvious benefits from Presidential appointment of Commission Chairmen. In the first place, the bulk of the Chairmen's responsibilities are administrative in nature; for efficient performance a real executive is required, whereas such executive ability is certainly not a requirement for a Commission member confined to decisional responsibility. There is, too, the obvious advantage of continuity in administrative programs. And one would expect better coordination between Federal agencies if the President had "his man" at the head of each.

Despite all the logic, I am afraid of it, and I hope the ICC does not get infected. It just doesn't make sense that Presidential appointment of the Chairman does not carry with it an opportunity for executive department control of, or influence on, an agency's handling of cases.

The record of agencies having Presidentially appointed Chairman for the past several years does not particularly recommend it as a cure-all.

Perhaps the sensible alternative would be election by the agency of a chairman for a 3-year period or even longer. In any event, the automatic rotation plan should be discarded.

Should there be consideration given now to adjustment of the competitive situation between the railroad industry and the motor carrier, water carrier, and air carrier industries which use federally supported facilities and, for the future, as between the air carriers and the motor carriers of property?

Of course consideration is being given to this problem and it has been given for a long time. The trouble is, nothing has been done about it.

Water/rail competition is currently the most serious matter. There has never been any question in my mind water carriers—or for that matter anyone else using Government-provided facilities—should pay a reasonable charge and I mean a charge which not only would pay for the maintenance of the facility but should amortize its cost over a reasonable period of time and pay for the cost of the public's capital while it is tied up in the facility. These user charges would necessarily be reflected in the rate structure of the for-hire carriers and in the operating costs of the private carriers. The railroads' competitive disadvantages would obviously be lessened, but there would also be an important result which I rarely hear mentioned. You see, actually there are only a limited number of big companies which derive any real benefit from these Government-provided waterways, so while we are always talking about unfair competition between the carriers, I think the important thing from the standpoint of fairness is that these noncarrier industry people ought to start repaying the Government for some of the special benefits they have been enjoying so long.

It is much more difficult to determine to what extent motor carriers are not paying a fair portion of the cost of facilities provided by the Government to them, but as we look into the future, I think we certainly can foresee a peculiar position for the motor carrier in this argument. There is little doubt the motor carrier will be confronted with intense subsidized competition from the air freight carriers.

Is there any validity to the view which has been advanced, that the antitrust laws could take the place of the present regulatory scheme in the field of transportation?

I have the utmost sympathy for restricting or reducing the amount of regulation for the transportation industry. I also have the utmost respect for the gentlemen who have been the principal advocates of substituting antitrust laws for the Interstate Commerce Act. However, for a number of reasons, I cannot agree.

In the first place, I have often wondered if people in the transportation industry realize just how much other industry is regulated. When transportation people say, "Let the transportation industry operate the way the rest of the industries do," do they mean that transportation wants to be subjected to the provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act? Does transportation wish to be regulated by the Federal Trade Commission, by the Securities and Exchange Commission, by the Food and Drug Administration and any number of other agencies which operate under statutes in many respects more restrictive than those which apply to the transportation industry?

As a matter of fact, transportation has specifically sought to avoid regulation under antitrust statutes and by other governmental agencies. Section 5a (the so-called Bulwinkle Act) is there to relieve the carriers from the operation of the antitrust laws with respect to ratemaking agreements. Section 20a of the Interstate Commerce Act is there at least partially to relieve the carriers of regulation by the Securities Exchange Commission as well as various State agencies.

I concede there is validity to the complaint transportation suffers more from initial interference than does other industry, not only because of the Commission's power to suspend rates, but also because carriers must obtain Commission authority before proceeding with mergers and various other transactions. Certainly we need to find some workable way to give the carriers more freedom to act, and to accelerate the handling of cases which must be decided by the Commission before the carrier can act. But even here there are two sides to the coin. Although the carrier may be delayed for many months in establishing a price, at least it can proceed confidently thereafter, whereas other industry sometimes finds only many months after a price change or a merger that its action cannot be sanctioned and it may be confronted either with substantial penalties or with a requirement for divestiture.

In view of the studies underway in the regulatory field, what steps might be taken to preserve the area of free enterprise now remaining or to enlarge that area by some curtailment of regulation?

It seems to me it is not so much a question of preserving free enterprise as it is a question of preserving our for-hire transportation system. While I would favor by reflex action the curtailment of regulation, mature thought takes me in the opposite direction.

I agree with many who believe the most effective steps we could take to preserve our free enterprise for-hire transportation system would be to withdraw the exemptions from regulation which have mushroomed far beyond what was originally contemplated. I mean, of course, the part II agricultural exemptions and part III bulk commodity exemptions.

Of course, there are also some opportunities to pull in our regulatory horns and they should be explored. I would like very much to see a more liberal rule of ratemaking, but I am frank to say I cannot suggest anything which might not cause confusion, uncertainty and delay, which are among the horrible results we could expect from enactment of S. 1197. Maybe we would be better off to let the ratemaking rule stay as it is for another few years.

But I do think there are a number of little harassing requirements which ought to be taken off the books. An outstanding example is the fourth section. Repeal of section 4 would do nothing to the substantive regulatory law, but it would just get rid of a completely unjustified impediment to ratemaking.

There are some other silly things, like the commodities clause, which we should eliminate, and then there are a number of requirements which should be loosened up in the light of our expanded economy. I have in mind broadening the exemptions for transfers of motor carrier operating authority, for issuance of securities, et cetera.

In other words, while I agree we should have no more regulation than is necessary, I also feel we should have no less than is necessary to produce and preserve a good for-hire transportation system.

It's Time for a New Look at Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, our able Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable Abraham Ribicoff, has frequently discussed the misconceptions and misunderstandings in America about the problems of our citizens who are on what is called relief. Recently Secretary Ribicoff wrote an explanatory article on this most important subject which appeared in This Week magazine, February 11, 1962.

To help dispel some of the false impressions of the welfare programs, I commend the Secretary's article to the attention of our colleagues:

IT'S TIME FOR A NEW LOOK AT RELIEF

(By Abraham Ribicoff, U.S. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare)

How much does welfare cost? Who pays? Who gets the money? The man in charge of it gives you a hard look at our 30-year-old U.S. relief system—and forecasts some important changes.

You have read and heard many disturbing things about public welfare recently. You have been told that your money is being wasted on chislers, immoral women and those too shiftless to work. You are worried, and rightly so, about abuses in relief.

I would like to tell you the truth about welfare. Yes, there is some foundation for some of the charges that have been made. Grafters and chiselers do exist on relief, as elsewhere. A few seriously distressed families do stay on relief down through the second and third generation. Welfare today does cost more in dollars than it did 10 years ago—like nearly everything else.

However, this is not only a part of the picture—and a very small part at that. The fact that it exists at all is one reason why we are taking a new look at public assistance. The whole picture is very different from the partial one so often held up to us. It shows, I believe, that we must do two things:

We must meet the few cases of real abuses with practical solutions instead of angry, nickel-saving schemes that cost more dollars in the long run.

We must pursue a new and constructive approach to the entire welfare problem—aiming to get people off relief and back into the self-respecting lives almost every one of them wants.

In this article, I would like to first present a clear picture of welfare in the United States today, and then tell you what I feel we need in the way of a new approach, and how I feel we must go about putting a new approach into effect.

1. Who is on relief?

The following shows in concise form the breakdown of present welfare cases in the United States. The total is 7.2 million people, 4 percent of the population, divided as follows:

Two million six hundred thousand children get $1 billion.

Children make up more than one-third of the total. Some are the children of disabled fathers. Other boys and girls are fatherless by reason of death, divorce, separation or desertion. Some children of unemployed fathers are also included. Despite wild accusations, more than 80 percent of these children are legitimate. Most receive aid to dependent children (ADC) support for less than 2 years.

We can be proud that through ADC many millions of young people in the last 25 years have been able to remain in their own homes with their own mothers, despite tragedy and deprivation. My files bulge with records of such youngsters who have gone on to earn fine scholastic records, get decent jobs, marry, and raise families—and very often support their own parents in the bargain.

Eight hundred thousand mothers get $300 million.

Mothers of ADC children who also receive aid number about 800,000. The point of this program is to enable a woman who has lost her husband to keep her family together. If you seriously believe that large numbers of women are bearing illegitimate children to increase their relief allotments, consider simple arithmetic. The average payment for all the expenses of each child is exactly $1 a day—hardly an inducement to take on the costs and problems of raising another child.

Two million three hundred thousand aged get $2 billion.

Aged men and women compose close to another one-third of our relief total. Surely this group of needy old people can not be condemned as grafters.

Four hundred thousand disabled get $300 million; 100,000 blind get $100 million.

Disabled and blind people account for half a million welfare receipients. Nobody will quarrel with their right to assistance.

One million general get $300 million.

General assistance recipients (home relief) include 1 million people—a surprisingly low figure when you think that our unemployed number about 4 million. Many are in economic disaster areas; others are victims of automation. The Federal Government does not contribute toward general assistance. The program is in the hands of the States and localities.

To correct other false ideas that are widely held, you should also know that it is far from easy to get on relief. Nor is it possible to live in luxury on relief. The average welfare family squeezes by on one-fourth the income of the average non-welfare family. Imagine that in terms of your rent, food and milk. You may read of one family getting over $200 a month. Have you read of 99 other families who get less than $85 a month?

Studies have shown that fraud and outright chiseling amount to less than 2 percent.

Relief costs have not spiraled out of hand. While dollar costs are up the percentage of our gross national product devoted to public assistance has declined by about 11 percent since 1950.

That is the true picture of relief today. Close to 90 percent of welfare recipients are too old, too young, too disabled to work or are caring for young children. Of the remaining 10 percent, many would work eagerly if they could find jobs.

2. A new aim in welfare: save them from relief.

But we are far from satisfied with the current state of relief. Although our economy and our problems have become more complex and our knowledge of human behavior has deepened, we still go about public assistance the same way we did 30 years ago—passing out relief checks without correcting the causes that keep people on relief.

We must change. Public welfare must have a positive goal. The goal should be to move people off relief by renewing their spirit and creating economic and social opportunities for them. We must save them from relief.

Before I took office a year ago, I promised the Senate Finance Committee I would reappraise the country's welfare program. Months before Newburgh broke into the news, I called together outstanding social-welfare leaders and asked them to study the public-assistance picture and make recommendations. From these proposals I have announced certain changes in our welfare programs. Today I am happy to discuss our new program for the first time in a publication.

Major objective: prevention. Through our Federal welfare laws we want to help prevent delinquency, illegitimacy, chronic dependency, and family breakdown. We all know a stitch in time saves nine. Yet we hesitate to take that stitch. Among the children on ADC many are vulnerable to the forces that produce delinquency.

If we know that a particular child is fatherless, deprived financially, living in poor housing in a bad neighborhood, with a mother overwhelmed by worries, doesn't it make sense to act early rather than wait until that child commits some serious misdeed? Of course it does.

Another area for prevention is the rise of illegitimacy at all income levels. Of special concern is the woman who bears repeated children out of wedlock. Neither starvation nor a simple relief check offers a meaningful solution to her tangled problems. But careful studies show that preventive measures do work.

At a home for unwed mothers in New York, girls were given professional casework services at the time of their pregnancy. Eighty-five percent, over a 10-year period, had no more illegitimate children. The other side of the coin is seen in a Maryland study. Out of 100 girls who did have more than 1 illegitimate child, only 2 received casework services at the time of their first pregnancy.

Major objective: rehabilitation. Through welfare we must seek to restore thousands of individuals and families to self-respect and self-sufficiency. Most people want to work to earn an honest living. Most families want to handle their own affairs.

A job is a key step. But many workers are jobless today because their skills are no longer needed when factories automate or move away. Their best hope may lie in retraining.

The New York City Department of Welfare has set a fine example in training relief recipients in new trades and better work habits. In Huntington, W. Va., the whole country is watching as 325 long-term unemployed persons are being retrained under a new Federal program. One in ten workers in that area is out of a job because of chronic depression in the soft coal mines. But jobs for appliance repairmen, route salesmen, automobile mechanics are going begging.

Another approach to reemployment is through work opportunity programs. I think we are ready now for the Federal Government to participate in these programs, broadening them from mere make work to teaching new skills and eventually returning workers to payrolls in business and industry.

Still another road to rehabilitation is through treatment of the family as a whole. This can work. In Chicago, an experimental family restoration unit of 5 top-ranking caseworkers eliminated 163 families from relief rolls in 7 months. The team made it possible to cut grants in 29 cases and kept 8 families from going on relief. The saving was $182,000 a year.

In Indiana, accelerated counseling with 125 chronically dependent families resulted in savings of $16,500 in 1 year and $22,500 the next. We mean to step up efforts to bring such services to relief recipients.

3. What we need to achieve our new welfare goals.

Incentives: We must offer both States and individuals incentives to help themselves. We are working with the States to seek solutions to people's problems rather than to keep paying them relief. We have also issued a new policy encouraging teenagers receiving ADC assistance to work and save for their education and so train for future employment. In fact, we are examining all of our laws and policies to make sure none thwart self-reliance in even the smallest way.

Training: More and better trained social workers are essential. One untrained worker, in charge of 300 cases, becomes a mere conduit for a flow of money. We have already taken steps to begin a more effective training program in every State.

Money: Yes, it will cost a great deal to restore millions to independence and productivity. But it costs even more not to, as the chain of dependency lengthens and crushing burdens fall on schools, neighborhoods, courts, and all other institutions.

Legislation: When citizens and legislators understand what we are trying to accomplish, I feel sure they will support our legislative program.

To reach the point where relief billions may someday be released for other purposes, we must breathe a new spirit into our welfare laws. Indeed the word "spirit" might well sum up our approach. The letters of the word spell out the ingredients of our new program: Services, prevention, incentives, rehabilitation, independence, training.

To realize the uniquely American promise in our Constitution: "To promote the general welfare," let us start now to devise a great living program of human renewal in our land.

Col. John Glenn

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, words cannot fully describe the feeling that today is in the hearts and minds of people throughout the United States of America because of the space achievement of Col. John Glenn.

Suffice it to say it is a feeling of deep pride and quiet jubilation.

Through the achievement of Colonel Glenn the United States has arrived foursquare on the space scene. He deserves each and every accolade that has been paid him and which will be bestowed upon him in the days to come.

His was a feat of dedication, courage, fortitude, brilliance and determination. We, as a nation, owe him an everlasting debt.

And, as a nation, we also owe undying gratitude and thanks to the thousands upon thousands of people who helped make this achievement possible and thoroughly successful. It was a demonstration of a nation's skill and teamwork as the astronaut, the mechanic, the laborer, the scientist, the sailor, the soldier, the airman, the marine and the white-collar worker all pulled together in a common cause.

On behalf of the people of the 12th Congressional District of New Jersey, I offer my thanks and congratulations to Colonel Glenn and his many teammates.

The Glorification of Indigence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, herewith is an excellent statement by Senator Henry A. Wise, who for years has been chairman of the Welfare Committee of the Senate in the State of New York.

He knows this subject thoroughly and is a real authority, has worked hard on it and I know that the Members of the House and the country at large will be interested in his views, with which I completely agree.

The statement follows:

THE GLORIFICATION OF INDIGENCE

Mr. President, I arise because of what I have learned about public welfare, or to be specific, the public assistance phase of it, in 10 years as chairman of this Senate's standing committee on public welfare and as chairman of the State Coordination Commission's welfare investigation last year. That Commission, headed by Senator ERWIN, completed its investigation and made its unanimous report last March 15.

When I started in this I knew it all and was sure that welfare administrators and social workers were a bunch of paper-pushing cloud riders. After a dozen years I've learned something of the maze of procedure, of why welfare is in low public esteem and why the people responsible for carrying on its day to day operation are helpless, under stultifying rules and regulations, to do much to make responsible citizens out of more of their "clients".

Also, I learned that welfare is the dumping ground—the repository—of human problems which are not glamorous or rewarding enough to be taken under the wing of some other State department.

I learned that in New York State over a half million persons are receiving public assistance costing a half billion dollars annually and going up about 30 millions a year largely because the myrid procedural details and mountains of paper work now in vogue to obtain uniformity are no substitute for realistic rehabilitation. These roadblocks are the result of bureaucratic policies in Washington, a quid pro quo for Federal aid.

I learned that the present-day problems of our metropolitan communities are so vast and complex that even able local commissioners, like James Dumpson of New York City, simply do not have the tools or authority to cope with them adequately under outmoded ground rules and lack of liaison with related municipal functions including housing, schools, health, and transportation.

I do not speak as a partisan because both parties either have been unrealistic or have ducked the tough decisions. Nor do I speak as an up-country legislator oriented to some nostalgic wish for the mythical rural life of years gone by as celebrated in song and story.

I do speak to you as one of the handful of legislators who has seen welfare and what it does to, as well as for, people from observing them in their homes—people unto the second and third generation in rural slums as well as in the solid welfare communities in the heart of our big cities. Caseworkers have taken me to see people, who, when asked what should be done to help them get on their feet, replied, and I quote: "All I

want is to live my life on public assistance." Unquote.

I have read a horrifying and absorbing book in novel form, entitled "The Inhabitants," which portrays the lives, or rather the existences, of able-bodied, chronic, not unusual welfare cases as seen through the eyes of their caseworker. The author, Julius Horwitz, arranged a conference for some members of our welfare investigation subcommittee with the heroine at her apartment.

DISCRIMINATION VS. DISCERNMENT

A complication is one which we all prefer to leave unmentioned. We prate against discrimination based on prejudice while subtly—and not so subtly—using it to gain the bloc votes of ethnic and religious groups. We confuse this with discernment—discernment of the human qualities possessed by an individual, whether man, woman, child irrespective of the color of his skin or his mode of worship. Discernment is understanding a person's frailties, foibles and strengths. That is fundamental to rehabilitation.

As our direct and succinct minority leader, Senator Zaretzki, said in an address delivered at a large public gathering only last January 31:

"All men are created equal under the law, but no man is born equal. Every person is born different and is different. Some are crippled. Some have mental defects."

These unpleasant facts have to be weighed if welfare is to be more than a check dispenser, a subsistence program—and it cannot be much more under present time-consuming and burdensome administrative policies in force to protect the State from loss of Federal funds.

HOORAY FOR UNIFORMITY

Public welfare has become overstandardized, overformulized, and overregulated. It is, however, a person-to-person problem, an individual matter for the soldiers in the field, that is the social workers, to whom must be given the training, discretion, and responsibility to act on the basis of their individual judgments, subject to the approval of the case supervisor. No army won a war by deploying on the field carrying bulky volumes of army regulations and consulting them before every move. But uniformity is the watchword thanks to the career brains of the Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Administrations may come and administrations may go but inflexibility in the attitude of a certain breed of bureaucrat goes on forever.

Governor Ribicoff is the first HEW Secretary, since the Federal public assistance setup has been confusing the welfare picture, to tell the career people of his agency that this is not 1935. However, his proposals of February 1 do not touch good old uniformity and inflexibility much. It is proposed that the Federal Government get deeper into and interfere more with basic State and local functions. HEW apparently just heard about rehabilitation, but one would think they had invented it because now they are going to tell the States how to do it. That means more control. If New York is the most socially advanced of these United States, as it proudly confesses it is, then it doesn't need any guidance from the very people whose policies have thwarted effective rehabilitation for years.

In the words of one State administrator who was in Washington recently to get the word on the new Federal proposals: "They are just adding 21 patches to a crazy quilt." The Federal assistance programs should be abandoned to the States, or at least overhauled from stem to gudgeon. Anyhow, Mr. Ribicoff has disabused the imprisoned minds of his aids on one other thing—there is no crime in allowing the good ladies supported by aid to dependent children to work, I mean earn money, if they can and will.

THE IDOLATRY OF PAUPERISM

Let's stop kidding ourselves and worrying about what lofty editors and fuzzy-minded bleeding hearts say. Though in the minority, perhaps, there are lots of able-bodied, career welfare recipients. That's because of the nature of men and of welfare as it is. Unfortunately, we have with us, and always will, folks who are so apathetic, indifferent, and downright lazy that a full stomach and a TV set keeps them sitting on their beam ends as a lifetime project. Every caseworker knows it. That's how I know it. Sure they are needy. But how worthy? Will they respond to intensive rehabilitation techniques?

There are plenty of able-bodied and smart-like-a-fox people who could do something useful. Public assistance, we are told, is a right. If so, that is the only right I know of that doesn't carry some minimal responsibility. In smaller cities and the suburbs it is possible to get part-time jobs scrubbing walls, sweeping floors, and so on in business establishments, or doing housework—not just playing house. Yes, these are grubby, hard jobs and wouldbe employers cannot find reliable takers even at the legal hourly wage. In some places, the more enterprising have contracted out to householders to mow and clean lawns and plow snow. Sometimes the relief check doesn't cover the liquor bill unless such extreme measures are taken. Granted it is much harder to find something useful to keep occupied at in the big cities, but even there the head of the house could put more into making a clean and decent abode.

The chronic deadbeats are good at finding excuses even when work is available and they will keep on finding them as long as the caseworker is refused the discretion to put just a little squeeze on, just enough to get the client moving. The caseworker is pretty helpless unless he can prove with evidence practically beyond a reasonable doubt that relief funds are being misspent. The so-called "fair hearing" required under Federal procedure is a stacked deck in favor of the recipient of welfare aid. With administrators and caseworkers groaning under piles of paper work there is little time to devise and apply means to make some ADC mothers pay sufficient attention to their children, to raise them decently, discipline them or at least make an effort to keep them from becoming "knights of the rumble." Some evidence of social responsibility must be developed in this type of recipient, and it would be, if Washington would give latitude in these details at least to States like New York which had sound social welfare programs before they were ever noticed on the Potomac.

Why these unrealistic and harmful requirements in detail are so tenaciously clung to by HEW is hard to understand. Maybe their jobs depend on filling up their time. Maybe it is because they simply will not realize that public assistance in the sixties is not the emergency subsistence program of the thirties when the money had to be paid out, but fast. Some of the rules that have been promulgated have no congressional authorization whatever. These administrative edicts require interpretations and the interpretations must be interpreted, and it takes a Philadelphia lawyer to get out of the maze at all. This will go on until the States or some of them will marshal their political weight to put a stop to a situation that would be comic if it were not so demoralizing to welfare administrators, workers, and recipients.

We are talking here mainly about the five federally aided categories, i.e., old age, ADC, blind, disabled, and medical aid to the aged. The other public assistance category in this State, home relief, receives no Federal funds and is theoretically solely within State control. I say theoretically because Federal policy does affect home relief and also child (foster and institutional) care. It would be a practical impossibility to run two administrative systems, one crazy quilt for the Federal categories and another simpler one for home relief, so it's all under the crazy quilt.

LOVE THY NEIGHBOR?

How does the factory worker, the cop, the farmer, the office girl, the saleslady, the junior executive feel about this? How do young and middle-aged people struggling in the $4,000 to $8,000 bracket to support a family react? They thing politicians, who don't seem to do much about it except apologize, are ostriches, heads in sand, captivated by pundits and theorists, without concern for the taxpayer, afraid of a sacred cow. Growing exasperation and impatience is a cause of rash action by local authorities such has have occurred in the past year. The public will not accept complacently a system that puts so much emphasis on need and so little on responsibility.

UNCLE AND HIS CHILDREN

History says Uncle Sam is the child of the States, but, by some process nonbiological, the situation in Federal-State welfare relations has been reversed. The growing and difficult role of New York State as the very junior partner in this relationship led Governor Dewey in 1951 to appoint a legislative commission, known as the Kelley Commission, to find an answer. In its reports in 1952, 1953, and 1954, this commission traced very clearly how the Federal Security Agency, predecessor of HEW, had usurped authority that Congress had specifically refused to grant. It showed how States, unless they wanted to forfeit Federal funds, were in a bind with no recourse to determine the legality of this Government Agency's requirements. But there was no followthrough to amount to anything and there still is no way to get a court decision before the administrative ruling goes into effect.

The 1961 report on public welfare of the Coordination Commission (Leg. Doc. No. 84) contains an analysis of the problem, which is concurred in by the Board of Social Welfare in a detailed statement entitled "Federal-State-Local Relations" dated December 1961. The Coordination Commission said, and I quote:

"Long and serious thought should be given by leaders of State government to this question. Broadly speaking that question is: Are the people of the State as a whole benefiting from taking Federal dollars under the conditions imposed?" (p. 43, Leg. Doc. 84 of 1961).

As appealing as the new proposals announced in Washington February 1 may seem at first glance, they will simply extend all these administrative headaches into a broader field as far as New York is concerned. The partnership with the Potomac has seriously impaired New York's once sound welfare program—we sold out for a mess of pottage—and I mean mess. This appraisal of Federal welfare aid is shared by at least one of the three main religious faiths—the Roman Catholic Church. They know the score in this field and the harm Federal policies are doing to the people as well as social workers. In this respect the Roman Catholic dioceses in New York State do a lot more protesting than do we Protestants.

RECENT PROGRESS WITHIN THE NARROW AREA LEFT US

The main problem as seen by the coordination commission in its report can be resolved only by Washington. However, the commission did make significant recommendations in the remaining area. These will take time to show results. Few legislative enactments are required. Some of the sectors where progress already can be seen are set forth below:

1. Solution of problem of recruiting social welfare workers apparently has been found by the public welfare personnel classification commission (L. 1960, C. 834), a temporary body which made its report on January 16, 1962. Former Assemblyman James Fitzpatrick served—and I mean served—as chairman. His recommendations are binding on the board of social welfare and its administrative arm, the department, without further legislative action.

2. As recommended by the Coordination Commission, the legislature last year enacted a measure establishing a central registration bureau in the Department to aid in finding deserting parents. This complex law requires some amendments this year, which already are before us. Under the direction of the very able counsel for the Department of Social Welfare with the help of Senator BARRETT's Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation, results may be expected in bringing to time the one-night-stand type of parent. Other States already are eyeing our statute as a model.

3. With permissive legislation last year we encouraged local welfare departments to set up citizens advisory committees. The idea is that, if more citizens become aware of the labyrinthian headaches, the public might be of more help in finding the answers. State Charities Aid Association is particularly interested in this public educational approach.

4. Administrative recommendations made by the Coordination Commission last March included more intensive inservice personnel training, special attention to fraud cases, reduction of office workload particularly by wider use of electronic computors, and recodification and simplification of Board and Departmental rules and regulations, which now, in an effort to keep up with emanations from the Potomac, fill several large book shelves. Because the Department has statutory power to do all these things, the Coordination Commission did not recommend legislation. However, the perceptive Majority Leader of this body, Senator MAHONEY, saw that the Department did not have sufficient specialists to implement those administrative recommendations, so his able staff drafted three bills carrying modest appropriations for these purposes—and with his usual generosity he gave me equal billing, which I (such a modest lad) do not deserve.

ANSWERS TO THE FEDERAL RIDDLE

The best answer would be "Render unto Caesar that which is Caesar's and unto God that which is God's," or, Uncle Sam you take your money and leave us States alone. That won't happen because the less affluent States, unlike New York, get from the U.S. Treasury several times what their citizens pay in Federal taxes. Cry as they do about States' rights, they don't want to cry loud enough to lose Uncle Sam's dollars. Another way would be to eliminate categories of assistance, such as old age, ADC, and so forth. Categories create big administrative headaches. Why not simply treat everyone according to his need? That wouldn't work because, with the Government participating, categories are necessary to define the kind and extent of such participation.

A practical and reasonable suggestion was made in the minority report of a committee appointed to advise the Secretary of HEW under the preceding national administration. This minority report was developed by counsel to the California Association of Boards of Supervisors and he was supported by an expert from New York State. The recommendation in two parts was that (a) the Federal Government support in full and administer direct the old-age assistance category, this being more of a social security type program; and (b) the Federal Government get out of the other three Federal-State assistance categories, i.e., ADC, AB and AD and leave this to the States. This plan would result in the States getting roughly the same financial benefits from Washington as they did before, without divided responsibility and haggling. Well, the HEW careerists gave that plan the "Resquiescat in Pace" treatment, but fast. They wanted to make sure their frozen intellects stayed frozen in the old patterns. Empires were never built by giving up something.

The Federal Government has injected itself into a sector which is basically the responsibility of private groups, the local governments and States. As a reason for this they say that States, some States, are not discharging their responsibilities to the people in the field of public assistance. Who is to be the judge of that? If, however, that is the reason and the sole reason for partnership between the National Government and the States in this field, then the former should weigh what each State is doing on its own. If like New York, a State maintains a comprehensive social welfare program, then Washington should recognize that fact and restrict regulation and interference with such a State to a minimum. At the same time, such a State should not be penalized for its enterprise by receiving any less Federal financial aid than it otherwise would.

AMEN

Meantime the monster feeds on itself and about all the public can do to get relief from its frustration is cuss us politicians and enjoy movies, Broadway shows and other media that get big laughs out of spoofing welfare.

The man said that the Declaration of Independence was a promise of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Pursuit. But do you recollect anything that says Uncle Sam should run interference on every play? Did anyone guarantee that happiness would be caught every time a pass is thrown? Your hard working, hard headed fathers and grandfathers who struggled to make this country great never thought so, and neither did King David when he wrote in the 75th psalm, 5th verse: "I said unto the fools, deal not so madly; and to the ungodly, set not up your horn."

Encouraging Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, we have pending in Congress tax reform which is far superior to the proposal Internal Revenue Commissioner Mortimer Caplin indicates President Kennedy will recommend next year. The Herlong-Baker bill, which was defeated by the Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means, not only offers relief to the individual taxpayer, but encourages growth of private enterprise. The editorial which appeared in the New York Daily News on February 19 discusses the superiority of the Herlong-Baker proposal:

THE HERLONG-BAKER BILL—OR SOMETHING MUCH LIKE IT

Introduced by Representatives A. S. HERLONG, JR., Democrat, of Florida, and H. H. BAKER, Republican, of Tennessee, this measure calls for some tax law revisions which seem clearly sound and constructive.

Instead of doing a hasty one-shot job, Herlong-Baker would spread these changes out over a period of 5 years:

GRADUAL REFORM, AND REAL REFORM

1. Cut personal income tax rates from 20 to 15 percent in the lowest bracket, and from 91 to 47 percent in the highest.
2. Reduce corporation taxes by 1 percentage point a year from their present top of 52 percent.
3. Speed up depreciation writeoff rates.
4. Reduce estate and gift taxes.
5. Defer capital gains taxes until the taxpayer unloads the property on which the gain has been made.

Messrs. HERLONG and BAKER admit that their bill would mean somewhat lower revenue for Uncle Sam in the first 2 or 3 years following enactment. But they insist that thereafter revenues would soar, because the Government would be letting people keep more money than they can keep now for investment in productive and taxable new enterprises or expansion of existing ones.

The current Congress would be wise, we believe, to adopt some such genuine tax reforms, rather than take a chance on President Kennedy's socialistic financial advisers' selling the next Congress a bale of goods which will hobble investment and discourage enterprise even more effectively than the present tax laws do.

The United Nations Bond Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD the text of a most thoughtful letter concerning the United Nations and the President's proposal for a U.N. bond issue.

The author of the letter is the Reverend Philip S. Moore, C.S.C., academic assistant to the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., president of the University of Notre Dame.

The letter follows:

UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME,
Notre Dame, Ind., February 14, 1962.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: Like most Americans who are interested in the vital problems of the day, I have recently done some soul searching in regard to the U.N., its policies, its support by the United States, its greatly changed composition with the admittance of many newly independent countries, etc. Frankly, I am not entirely happy about everything, but I am still fully convinced that the U.N. is our best hope for the avoidance of world war III, and in comparison to that all else becomes secondary.

On the other hand, I am convinced that the U.S.S.R. and its satellites are trying to destroy the U.N. Their efforts have been revealed in their attacks on the late Dag Hammarskjold, their attempt to introduce "troika" into the Secretariat, their refusal to pay the extraordinary assessments for peace and security operations in the Congo and the Middle East, etc. We cannot afford to let the U.S.S.R. succeed in the destruction of the U.N. which would throw us back entirely into naked power politics—no substitute for the U.N., despite its shortcom-

ings, for the avoidance of war and the maintenance of peace.

The financial deficits of U.N. resulting from the refusal of the U.S.S.R. and its satellites to pay their special assessments can destroy the U.N. and achieve these countries' objective. The $200 million bond issue seems the most practical present way of thwarting this. Some will object that the United States purchasing 50 percent of these bonds is an unfair proportion. But the real issue is the survival of the U.N. and to assure its survival $100 million, even granting that the United States will not be repaid, or at least not in whole, over the next 25 years, is a small price to pay.

Hence, I strongly support the bond issue and the United States purchasing 50 percent of the bonds and I ask you to support the recommendations submitted to the Congress by President Kennedy on January 29.

With best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP S. MOORE, C.S.C.,
Academic Assistant to the President.

The Religious Nature of our People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion in recent years relating to the recitation of prayer or reading from the Bible in our public schools. A friend of mine, a very fine attorney by the name of Daniel G. Buckley, prepared a legal brief to be presented to the State Commissioner of Education on this subject.

I am inserting herewith an essay, summarizing the very lengthy brief that Mr. Buckley prepared, on "The Religious Nature of Our People." I am certain that everyone reading it must realize that our country was and is founded on religious principles and a firm belief in Almighty God.

THE RELIGIOUS NATURE OF OUR PEOPLE

(By Daniel G. Buckley)

From the discovery of America to the present hour, tradition, custom and law have recognized our national dependence on God, and the religious nature of our people.

Starting with Christopher Columbus' Commission for Discovery to current decisions of the highest courts of the land, this recognition has survived and it has been strengthened.

In 1620, 41 Pilgrims gathered on the deck of the Mayflower, signed the Mayflower Compact which opened with these words, "In the name of God, Amen." The compact stated that the long and difficult journey to the New World had been "undertaken for the glory of God." The Pilgrims signed it "solemnly and mutually in the presence of God."

There is inscribed on the Liberty Bell, cast in 1751, the words, "Proclaim liberty throughout the land unto all the inhabitants thereof" (Leviticus 25: 10).

The American Seal, approved by Congress in 1782, contains the words, "Annuit Coeptis" which mean, "He [God] has favored our undertaking."

The Northwest Ordinance, approved by Congress in 1787, acknowledged that "Religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

IN GOD WE TRUST

Our national anthem, composed by Francis Scott Key during the bombardment of Fort McHenry on the night of September 12, 1814, closes with this reference to God:

"Praise the Power that hath made and preserved us as a nation
Then conquer we must, when our cause it is just
And this is our motto—'In God is our Trust!' "

"In God we Trust" has been inscribed on our coins since 1863.

Our national monuments exemplify our dependence on God and the religious nature of our people.

The Tomb of the Unknown Soldier contains the inscription, "Here lies in honored glory, an American soldier, known but to God."

"Suffer the little children to come unto me and forbid them not, for such is the kingdom of heaven," appears on the Washington Monument. The words "* * * that this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth" are inscribed on the Lincoln Memorial. "God who gave us life gave us liberty. Can the liberties of a nation be secure when we have removed the conviction that these liberties are the gift of God?" words, uttered by Thomas Jefferson, are chiseled into the Jefferson Memorial.

Every President of the United States, from George Washington to John F. Kennedy, has placed our Nation under the protection of God.

In his first official act as President, George Washington called for the assistance of "* * * that Almighty Being who rules over the universe * * *." Thomas Jefferson, after "* * * acknowledging and adoring an over ruling Providence * * *" then asked "* * * that Infinite Power [to] lead our councils to what is best * * *." At the close of his state of the Union address in January 1962, John F. Kennedy said "* * * may God watch over the United States of America."

Our dependence on God is acknowledged in the constitutions of all 50 States; an invocation to God is provided in the constitutions of 34 States, and God's blessing is asked in the Constitution of the United States and in the constitutions of 21 States.

BOARD OF REGENTS RECOMMENDATION

Recognizing our dependence on God and the religious nature of our people, the Board of Regents of the State of New York, a public body composed of members of many religious persuasions, on November 30, 1951, unanimously recommended that there be a voluntary recitation in the public schools at the opening of each class day of the following prayer, commonly referred to as the "Regents' Prayer":

"Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers, and our country."

This recommendation signaled an atheistic and secularistic attack which had and continues to have one aim: the establishment of a public educational system which is godless in all respects. Those who direct the attack on the regents' prayer attempt by deception and fraud to read into the law that which is not there.

In *Engel v. Vitale*, the famous Herricks case involving the recitation of the regents' prayer, the board of regents filed a brief amicus curiae. Among other things, the brief said:

"The board (of regents) * * * is also aware of the dire need, in these days of concentrated attacks by an atheistic way of life upon our world and in these times of rising juvenile delinquency, of crime increasing both numerically and in gravity of offense, with an ever-swelling number of criminals being counted in the younger age groups, of finding ways to pass on America's moral and spiritual heritage to our youth through the public school system.

* * * * *

"It is obvious that the child at a very early age is bound to come in contact with the word and concept 'God' and their connection with our life, history, and national heritage. This contact and knowledge cannot and should not be eliminated from any child's life."

RELIGION AND THE STATE

The courts of our Nation have consistently upheld two propositions. First, that there should be an accommodation between religion and the state. Second, that our Founding Fathers never intended that there should be hostility between religion and the state.

In the historic case of matter of *Lewis v. Allen*, Mr. Justice Bookstein found no violation of the Constitution in public school recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance which contained the words "under God."

Mr. Justice Bookstein said:

"If I properly apprehend the intent, design and purposes of the first amendment, it was conceived to prevent and prohibit the establishment of a state religion; it was not intended to prevent or prohibit the growth and development of a religious state.

* * * * *

"If petitioners' contentions be sound, it may be wondered whether the public school curriculum might properly include the Declaration of Independence and the Gettysburg Address. Could 'America' ('protect us by Thy might, great God, our King.') be sung in a public school without offending the first amendment? And might not the presidential oath of office have questionable constitutional status?

* * * * *

"Petitioners' right to disbelieve is guaranteed by the first amendment and neither they nor their children can be compelled to recite the words 'under God' in the Pledge of Allegiance. But the first amendment affords them no preference over those who do believe in God and who, in pledging their allegiance, choose to express that belief. (Emphasis by the court.)

In another celebrated case, *Zorach v. Clauson*, involving New York's released time program, Judge Desmond wrote:

"If petitioners are right, then there is a violation [of the first amendment] every time a chaplain opens a congressional session with prayer, or any Army bugler sounds 'church call.' If petitioners are right, then the Pilgrims were wrong, as was every President who officially urged our people to train themselves in, and practice, religion. Our own State constitution, on petitioners' theory, offends against American constitutionalism at the point in its preamble where it expresses gratitude 'to Almighty God' for our freedom. Petitioners would have this court now deny the declarations of the Supreme Court in the *Church of Holy Trinity v. United States* and of Chief Justice Kent in *People v. Ruggles*, that ours is a religious nation. I stand on Chief Justice Kent's declaration * * * that the Constitution 'never meant to withdraw religion in general and with it the best sanctions of moral and social obligation, from all considerations and notice of the law.' "

THE BEST OF OUR TRADITION

When *Zorach v. Clauson* reached the Supreme Court of the United States, Mr. Justice Douglas wrote:

"There is much talk of the separation of church and state in the history of the Bill of Rights and in the decisions clustering around the first amendments. * * * The first amendment * * * does not say that in every and all respects there shall be a separation of church and state. Rather it studiously defines the manner, the specific ways, in which there shall be no concert or union or dependency one on the other. Otherwise the state and religion would be aliens to each other, hostile, suspicious, and even unfriendly. * * * Municipalities would not be permitted to render police or fire protection to religious groups. Policemen who help parishioners into their place of worship would violate the Constitution. Prayers in our legislative halls; the appeal to the Almighty in the messages of the Chief Executive; the proclamation making Thanksgiving Day a holiday; 'so help me God' in our courtroom oaths—these and all other references to the Almighty that run through our laws, or public rituals, our ceremonies would be flouting, the first amendment. A fastidious atheist or agnostic could even object to the supplication with which the Court opens each session; 'God save the United States and this honorable Court.'

* * * * *

"When the State encourages religious instruction or cooperates with religious authorities by adjusting schedules of public events to sectarian needs, it follows the best of our tradition. For it then respects the religious nature of our people and accommodates the public service to their spiritual needs. To hold that it may not would be to find in the Constitution a requirement that the Government show a callous indifference to religious groups. That would be preferring those who believe in no religion over those who do believe * * * we find no constitutional requirement which makes it necessary for Government to be hostile to religion and to throw its weight against efforts to widen the effective scope of religious influence."

In *Doremus* v. *Board of Education*, the New Jersey Bible reading case, Mr. Justice Case, in a particularly learned opinion for a unanimous court, wrote:

"The fact is that the first amendment does not say * * * that God shall not be acknowledged by our Government as God. Our view is that a prohibition which is not in the language of the amendment and which is contrary to the intention of those who framed and adopted the instrument should not be read into it. We consider that the Old Testament and the Lord's Prayer, pronounced without comment, are not sectarian, and that the short exercise provided by the statute does not constitute sectarian instruction or sectarian worship, but is a simple recognition of the Supreme Ruler of the Universe and a deference to His majesty. * * *

"It is not necessary that the state be stripped of religious sentiment. It may be a tragic experience for this country and for its conception of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness if our people lose their religious feeling and are left to live their lives without faith. Who can say that the attributes which Thomas Jefferson in his notable document called 'inalienable rights' endowed by the Creator may survive a loss of belief in the Creator. The American people are and always have been theistic. The influence which that force contributed to our origins and the direction which it has given to our progress are beyond calculation. It may be of the highest importance to the Nation that the people remain theistic, not that one or another sect or denomination may survive, but that belief in God shall abide. It was, we are led to believe, to that end that the statute was enacted; so that at the beginning of the day the children should pause to hear a few words from the wisdom and the ages and to bow the head in humility before the Supreme Being. No rites, no ceremony, no doctrinal teaching, just a brief moment with eternity. Great results follow from elements which to human preception are small. * * * Our way of life is on challenge. Organized atheistic society is making a determined drive for supremacy by conquest as well as by infiltration. Recent history has demonstrated that when such a totalitarian power comes into control it exercises a ruthless supremacy over men and ideas, and over such remnants of religious worship as it permits to exist. We are at a crucial hour in which it may behoove our people to conserve all of the elements which have made our land what it is.

DO NOT FORGET GOD

Chief Justice Neal of Tennessee recently ruled in *Carden* v. *Bland*, a case involving prayer and Bible reading in the public schools, that:

"Much is said in argument of able counsel about the wisdom of separation of church and state. * * * But the counsel * * * confuses an hour, or a short period of reverence, or a simple act of spiritual devotion as being a form of worship that is being sponsored and approved by an agency of the state. * * * We find it more or less difficult to conceive that these simple ceremonies amount to 'establishment of a religion,' or any attempt to do so; nor is it an interference with any student's secular beliefs contrary to law.

* * * * *

"In order to wipe out any and all right of the state to control their own system of public education great stress is laid upon the need for maintaining the doctrine of 'separation of church and state.' We concede that this is important. But it should not be tortured into a meaning that was never intended by the Founders of this Republic, with the result that the public school system of the several States is to be made a Godless institution as a matter of law.

* * * * *

"The highest duty of those who are charged with the responsibility of training the young people of this State in the public schools is in teaching both by precept and example that in the conflicts of life they should not forget God. And this in substance is about all that our statute requires. For this court to hold that the statute herein assailed contemplated the establishment of religion * * * would be a spectacular exhibition of judicial sophistry."

We who believe in the moral and spiritual foundation upon which our country rests should prepare to challenge the narrow bigotry expounded by atheists and secularists. The law of the land is on our side. So are tradition and custom. We should leave no stone unturned to make certain that they remain on our side.

Divisive atheistic and secularistic pressure groups should not be permitted to detremine and to undermine the educational policy of our school districts, which districts are rightfully governed by trustees elected by the qualified voters who reside within them.

RESIST GODLESS STATE

We have a vast stake in the future of our country, and in the future of our civilization. We must resist those who are working to make the United States and the world a godless state and a godless world.

The position of those who attack the Regents' Prayer is similar to that taken by those described in *Lewis* v. *Board of Education*, which case upheld Bible reading in New York City public schools. In that case the Court said:

"Undisguised, the plaintiff's attack is on a belief and trust in God and in any system or policy or teaching which enhances or fosters or countenances or even recognizes that belief and trust. Such belief and trust, however, regardless of one's own belief, has received recognition in state and judicial documents from the earliest days of our republic."

The Court reminded the atheists and secularists that, "Freedom is negated if it does not comprehend freedom for those who believe as well as those who disbelieve. Freedom for nonbelievers in God but denial to believers in a Diety, would be a mock liberty."

Do We Need a Department of Urban Affairs?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to offer for the perusal of my colleagues in the House an article written by Dr. Richard H. Leach and Dr. Robert H. Connery, who are both political scientists and members of the faculty of Duke University, which is located in my congressional district.

This article, which appeared in the Western Political Quarterly in March, 1960, is entitled "Do We Need a Department of Urban Affairs?" and is a very cogent and thought-provoking exploration of the problem which is shortly to confront the House. The article reflects a great deal of time, research, and professional knowledge which the authors brought to its composition. In order to indicate the professional standing of Dr. Leach and Dr. Connery, I include very brief biographies of their careers:

Professor Leach is a graduate of the Colorado College and a recipient of the Ph. D. degree from Princeton University, where he was one of the early Woodrow Wilson fellows. He taught at the Georgia Institute of Technology before coming to Duke in 1955. He has had considerable practical experience in government as a member of the staff of the Southern Regional Education Board and of the Army Security Agency. He is the author or coauthor of numerous articles in the field of State and local government and of "In Quest of Freedom: American Political Thought and Practice" (1959), and "The Administration of Interstate Compacts" (1959), as well as "The Federal Government and Metropolitan Areas."

Professor Connery is a graduate of the University of Minnesota and a recipient of the Ph. D. degree from Columbia University. Over the past 25 years he has served as consultant to numerous Federal, State, and local governments and officials, including among others the National Resources Planning Board, the President's Committee on Administrative Management, the New York State Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Defense, the Hoover Commission, and the city administrator of New York. He has been a fellow as well as a senior staff member of the Brookings Institution.

He is the author of several books, including "The Navy and the Industrial Mobilization in World War II" (1950), "Governmental Problems in Wildlife Conservation" (1936), and, with Richard H. Leach, "The Federal Government and Metropolitan Areas" (1960).

I am sure my colleagues will conclude, and rightly, that these gentlemen are specialists in their common field of government and political science. As scholars and investigators, they use the technique of presenting thoroughly and fairly both sides of the question as to whether or not a Department of Urban Affairs is needed, and the arguments in the affirmative are present in the first half of the study, so that a cursory reading of that portion might indicate that the authors favor such a plan. The latter half of the study, however, sets forth the negative side of the question, and the conclusion presents what is to me more than ample proof that a Cabinet-level organization to administer urban affairs is unnecessary at this time. Since the article was written and published, in 1960, several circumstances have changed, but I do not feel that the fundamental principle has in any way been affected by this fact or the conclusions drawn invalidated, nor do I understand that the authors' views have changed at the present time.

I have found this article very helpful to me in my extensive study and careful consideration of Reorganization Plan No. 1, since it is a completely objective approach to the problem, and I hope that it will be illuminating, also, to the other Members of the House.

The article follows:

DO WE NEED A DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS?

In both the last two Congresses, bills were introduced to establish a new executive department specifically charged with meeting the needs of cities and metropolitan areas. Already bills have been introduced into the 86th Congress to accomplish the same purpose.[1] As a result of the passage of any such bill, another department, perhaps a department of urban affairs, directed generally at urban and metropolitan problems and combining research, service, and educational functions on the one hand with prgram operation functions on the other would be added to the structure of the Federal Government.

The idea of a Department of Urban Affairs is not new. As far back as 1912, Philip Kates urged the creation of a national department of municipalities.[2] Kates' suggestion interested Woodrow Wilson "very much, indeed," and he hoped "to have an opportunity to discuss it very seriously * * * with those interested."[3] The opportunity evidently did not materialize, and the proposal was lost in the pursuit of the new freedom and in the preparation of the United States for World War I which immediately followed it. It was revived in 1919 in a slightly altered form by Harlean James, who thought that a department of civic economy in the National Government, "rightly conceived and vigorously carried out," would be invaluable in assisting cities and towns to meet the challenge of the postwar period.[4] Miss James' idea did not bear fruit, either, but in 1934, Charles E. Merriam, then with the National Resources Board, remarked that it was important that "the voice of our cities be heard in the capital, [and] it is equally important that the U.S. Government have some responsible administrative representation in the cities * * * there is no urban U.S. representative corresponding to the county agent in the rural districts." Although Merriam confessed he did not know "just what form this new development may take or whether a number of Federal agencies may not jointly share Federal responsibility," he was certain that "the whole question of the relation of Federal Administration * * * to city government * * * looms up larger every day."[5] By 1942, Merriam had become convinced that a separate administrative unit in Washington was necessary "in view of the proportion of our people who dwell in cities and the importance generally of cities in our political and economic system," and he recommended that there be set up "a bureau or department of urbanism" in the Federal Government.[6] Since the end of the war, the idea has been advanced quite frequently, and it has won a number of outspoken proponents, particularly among hard-pressed mayors and local officials. The idea has even become a popular subject for the press and for editorials across the country, even in some of the small newspapers,[7] and it has twice been incorporated into the annual policy declarations of the American Municipal Association.[8] A number of other national organizations also have accepted the idea of a department, among them the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, the National Housing Conference, and the American Society of Planning Officials; and the mayors of a good many of the Nation's largest cities have pledged their efforts to its establishment.[9]

The idea warrants analysis and discussion because it is the first concrete proposal to be laid before Congress for tackling the metropolitan area problem, and because it has won the endorsement of the leading organizations representing urban interests in the United States. One must recognize, of course, that proposals to create new executive Departments are made quite frequently, and some of them have received a great deal of support, both in Congress and outside, without having been accepted. In the last decade, proposals for Departments of Civil Defense, Transportation, Water Resources, and Public Works have all been advanced without success. A Department of Urban Affairs, however, suggests an easy solution to a complex problem, which in many ways is broader in scope and more immediate in its need for action than any of the other problems. Moreover, a discussion of such a concrete proposal can do much to clarify the proper way to deal with a problem of this magnitude administratively. And since an executive Department will doubtless be offered repeatedly in the future as the solution to the problem, it is time that the merits of the idea be thought through.

All the bills presented to Congress have had certain similar features. All called for the creation of a new executive Department, variously entitled the "Department of Urban Affairs," the "Department of Housing and Urban Affairs," and the "Department of Urbiculture." All proposed the same type of administrative organization, at least in broad terms. A Secretary, an Under Secretary and a varying number of Assistant Secretaries heading major departmental divisions were provided for in each bill. Likewise, all the bills set forth the same general goal for the Department, though as one might expect, they differed considerably in their exact wording. H.R. 1019, to create a Department of Urbiculture, had the most limited scope. It declared that "Congress finds that many of the most pressing problems facing the people of the United States grow out of the lack of knowledge and understanding of proper techniques in utilization of urban land, and that there is a corresponding national interest in the development of the science of urbiculture." Therefore:

"Recognizing the invaluable contribution made by the Department of Agriculture in promoting increasingly efficient use of farmlands, the Congress enacts this act in order to provide a corresponding executive department to develop methods of dealing with pressing social, economic and civic problems growing out of inadequate knowledge of the principles of using and developing urban lands, and to make these methods available to the people of the United States through suitable educational programs.[10]"

H.R. 3383, to establish a Department of Urban Affairs, noted "that the pressing needs of cities and metropolitan areas are such that Federal action should be taken to assist in meeting these needs through education, research, technical services, and such other programs as the Congress may later prescribe." The Senate bill (S. 2159), for the creation of a Department of Housing and Urban Affairs, was very similar to H.R. 3383.

Supporters of the new Department build their case on a number of grounds. Perhaps the most frequently offered justification is the fact that, with the Nation becoming increasingly urban, the Federal Government cannot be indifferent to the fate of nearly two-thirds of the Nation's population. After all, as Mayor Richard J. Daley of Chicago pointed out recently, the problems in metropolitan areas concern the Federal Government "because they concern people. The Federal Government is concerned with people," and the bulk of those people "are in cities all over America."[11] The effective government of so much of the country's population and the solution of the problems which face them are necessarily matters of prime importance to Washington. Indifference to the problem as a whole, or the extension of mere sympathy and encouragement to the States in solving it, or even a continuation of the existing hit-and-miss program will no longer do. It has been obvious for some time not only that the "people and the governments of the metropolitan areas cannot solve their problems with the governmental and private devices now available,"[12] but also that the States, acting by themselves, can supply only part of the deficiency.

The most important metropolitan areas in the United States are outside the jurisdiction of any single State. These areas cross State boundary lines and thus a single area may be under the jurisdiction of 2 or 3 States. In 1950, according to the census, 23 standard metropolitan areas extended across State boundary lines, and the 6 largest of these—New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, St. Louis, Washington, and Cincinnati—accounted for over one-sixth of the population of the United States. Speculating upon the implications of this, Daniel R. Grant concluded that "with the bulk of our population increase presently taking place in the suburban fringes of metropolitan areas, there may well be more people living in interstate metropolitan areas than in intrastate cities of all sizes within the next generation or so."[13]

Moreover, a number of important metropolitan communities lie athwart international boundaries. The Detroit-Windsor and the Buffalo areas on the Canadian border are already well-developed metropolitan areas, as is El Paso on the Mexican border. The entire Rio Grande Valley, the San Diego area, and the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence region, however, give promise of rapid urban development, which will result in an increase in metropolitan problems. Already, sewage disposal, water supply, smoke abatement, water levels for navigation, and restrictions on truck transportation have become problems demanding attention and solution. By their very nature, it is obvious that problems

Footnotes at end of speech.

such as these cannot be handled either by the communities themselves or fully by the States. And the mechanisms created by the Federal Government so long ago to settle disputes in boundary areas are limited in scope and operate as adjuncts to its conduct of foreign affairs. Neither the State Department nor the international commissions were intended to deal with the complex problems that metropolitan areas present.

More than anything else, however, runs the argument, Federal action with regard to government in metropolitan areas is demanded by the kind of problems those areas face today. Far from being matters of local or even statewide concern, the most vital metropolitan area problems are at the same time problems of utmost concern to our national defense, to the conservation of natural resources, and to the maintenance of national health and welfare. They are problems of national dimensions, affecting the lives of all Americans, no matter where they live. So closely knit is our economic and industrial system today that what strikes at the metropolitan nerve centers of the Nation is felt throughout the country. It was demand for aid in solving these problems on the part of individual cities that first brought the Federal Government into the picture, and it is the fact that many of them have become aggravated with the passage of time which now makes an integrated Federal program imperative. Even if the theory of federalism would seem to allot the solution of some of the problems to the States, because of their very nature the Federal Government cannot avoid responsibility for aiding in their solution.

The need is not for the Federal Government to take over the solution of these problems lock, stock, and barrel. Democracy must of necessity resist the temptation to concentrate all powers of the State in one organ. The need is rather for the Federal Government to recognize and accept its responsibility on the one hand and to devise a coherent and comprehensive policy within the framework of cooperative federalism, to guide it in its actions on the other. To date Washington has done neither.

In the lights of all this, supporters of a department declare that special recognition of urban affairs is a necessity. Thus Senator JOSEPH CLARK, in a statement explaining the purpose of S. 2159 to the 85th Congress, argued that "metropolitan growth is posing one of the greatest challenges of the second half of the 20th century. We cannot meet this challenge with Government machinery designed for the 19th century."[14] As a matter of necessity, the Federal Government must adapt its administrative organization to enable it to meet more effectively the problems of today's urban and metropolitan areas.[15]

Creating of a department and the designation of a Cabinet representative for urban affairs, the argument continues, would provide stronger leadership for and better representation of urban interests in national policymaking. At present, there is no focal point for urban affairs in the executive branch of the Federal Government. A great many agency and bureau heads represent one aspect of the urban and metropolitan problems, but their efforts are often contradictory and are in no sense all inclusive. The result is that national policy in this important field can only be formed on the basis of incomplete or inaccurate data about cities and their problems and needs. "It does seem to me," Representative WILLIAM L. DAWSON noted, "that it is indicated that the problems of cities be given a departmental status, and it so seems to me from my experience as a Congressman here in Washington, and observing the various departments make their needs known to the Congress."[16] Farmers have the Department of Agriculture to point out their needs to Congress and to protect their interests and promote their welfare; "however, the problems of the cities are not voiced here as such. Because of the great impact of those problems upon not only the cities but upon the country as a whole, I think that there is a crying need to the extent that the country should begin to think about a department to handle this."[17]

This reasoning would seem to be supported by general studies in the field of public administration. Arthur MacMahon and John Millett, for example, declare that the "head of a department * * * has an individual consultative relationship to the President, to the administration as a whole, and to Congress," a relationship of such importance that the secretary of a department becomes "the administration's natural consultant" in regard to the problems in his area.[18] To date, there has been no such consultant available specifically for urban affairs. Schuyler Wallace finds that since the President's Cabinet frequently serves not merely as "an administrative but also an advisory agency on broad questions of public policy * * * representation [thereon is] highly desirable."[19] Both by being available as a consultant on urban affairs to other officials in the Federal Government and by contributing the urban point of view to the determination of national policy, a secretary of urban affairs would fill a need which has already been met in all other important policy areas. In a Nation so predominantly urban, proponents of a department insist, to deny Cabinet representation to urban affairs is no longer tenable.

Aside from the need to have urban interests represented in national policymaking, those who advocate a department point out that by now the Federal Government has many programs which affect urban areas and and that together they are important enough in the total picture of the Government's activities to warrant elevation to departmental status. The Federal Government's housing programs alone, to say nothing of its civil defense program and others with distinctly urban aspects, certainly have become important enough and involve large enough expenditures of personnel and money to be raised to departmental status. They should, proponents of a department argue, be recognized as permanent interests of the Government by being given regular Cabinet status, by being, in short, combined into a separate and distinct executive department. Thus William C. Wheaton of the National Housing Conference maintains that "the relative size of the Housing and Home Finance Agency as compared with other executive departments," entitles it to departmental status. "If we look at the expenditures, we find that the gross expenditures of the Housing and Home Finance Agency exceed that of five other Cabinet departments * * * [it] has more employees than one department. * * *"[20] Certainly, then, the HHFA ought to be converted to departmental rank, especially when its total financial commitments were compared with those of the other civilian departments. Those commitments, Dr. Wheaton thought, "probably exceeded all of the other [civilian] departments saving only the Treasury * * * and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare * * *."[21]

Nor do Dr. Wheaton or other proponents of urban affairs have to look far for support of their contention. The first Hoover Commission used the same type of argument to support its claim for the creation of a Department of Social Security and Education. Having recommended the creation of a United Medical Administration to take care of the Federal Government's health programs, the Commission went on to say, "there remain, however, certain most important bureaus [and] agencies relating to education which must be organized into a workable department." And as the reasons for that conclusion, it noted: "The size of these agencies * * * is * * * indicated by the fact that they embrace about 20,000 employees. The administration expenditures [of the several agencies combined] would be roughly $50 million. The grants-in-aid to be distributed would approximate $800 million".[22] When operations of separate agencies reached such proportions, the Commission seemed to say, they naturally should be combined into one Department. More recently, a proposal has been advanced to centralize the Federal Government's science activities in a Department of Science and transfer to the new Department the functions of the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Science Foundation, the Bureau of Standards, and the Patent Office, among others. The proponents of this measure, like those of a Department of Urban Affairs, justify the action on the grounds that in terms of money and manpower involved the time has come to recognize the importance of the Government's scientific interests.

For departmentalization, they assert, is the only really efficient way of handling related program operations of such magnitude in the Federal Government. Scattering of functions among a number of different units means that it is not possible anywhere to get a view of the problem to be solved as a whole. Senator CLARK built much of his case on the advantages that a Department of Urban Affairs would bring in coordinating existing programs concerned with urban affairs and in simplifying the governmental structure by reducing the number of independent agencies reporting directly to the President.[23] The American Municipal Association in its 1956 policy statement likewise stressed the "greater * * * efficiency" in one "unified administrative organization at the Federal level."[24] And no study which has been made of the executive branch fails to emphasize the evils attending the great proliferation of independent executive agencies which has occurred in recent years and the advantages to be gained by a reduction in their number and a coordination of their efforts. Indeed, the first finding of the Hoover Commission was precisely along this line: "Federal programs * * * must be grouped by related function and divided among a small number of principal assistants who are the heads of departments. * * * Until dispersed units are pulled together, and authority is placed in department heads as chief assistants to the President, there will be conflict, waste, and indecisiveness in administration."[25] To bring even the housing activities together under one Department, if not also those relating to civil defense and possibly others, would thus seem to be in direct accord with the principles of efficient Government administration.

The creation of a Department would have the added advantage, the argument proceeds, of making it easier and quicker to conduct the great amount of research that needs to be done before actual solution of urban problems is possible. Such research could be much more effective if brought together in one coordinated program, administered by an agency which would have the facilities to attract the services of the Nation's outstanding experts in urban problems. That kind of program would have the double advantage of avoiding duplication and repetition and, at the same time, of covering all the important questions facing cities and metropolitan areas today. Today such studies are made in bits and pieces—or not at all—and not only are they thus uneconomical, their results are not often widely publicized. A Federal Department would not

Footnotes at end of speech.

only develop data but would have channels available both to distribute it and to assist city and county officials in applying it. The Department might thus become, its proponents argue, an urban planning assistance agency for the Nation.

A further justification offered for a Department of Urbain Affairs is that it would provide a central point in the Federal Government where cities could come for help and information. The American Municipal Association originally based its support of a Department largely on these grounds: "The Congress should authorize a new Federal Cabinet post for urban affairs. Unlike other segments of our political economy, such as industry, labor and agriculture, local governments have no place to turn to in their many dealings with the Federal Government."[36] Instead of one place, there are many. A mayor must often make six or eight visits to get a complete picture and, to make it even worse, the information he gets at one point is apt to be contradicted at the next. The mayor of Seattle, Allan Pomeroy, expressed the feelings of many of his fellows when he pointed out that "above all, such a Department would provide a central clearinghouse for all the specialized problems having to do with intergovernmental relations as they affect central cities and their metropolitan areas."[37] And Carl Feiss, former Urban Renewal Administrator, noted the great advantages of effecting through the creation of a single Department "a simplification in the lines of communication between the Federal, State, local agencies—so that local public officials would have a real opportunity of finding the right person at the right time for the right purposes and the right programs in order to simplify and expedite the very complicated problems that the localities are facing * * * in this tremendous urbanization that is taking place."[38]

Although not advanced as openly as the foregoing arguments on behalf of a department of urban affairs, another argument has been as influential. This is the argument of practical politics. Gerrymandered as most State legislatures are in favor of rural areas, they have not listened with sympathetic ears to the pleas of urban citizens. In some cases, the dominant upstate (rural) areas are of one political persuasion, the downstate (urban) areas of the other, and this has further complicated the relationship between the legislatures and the cities. In disgust and desperation, therefore, city officials have increasingly turned toward Washington for help and guidance. In national politics, although the cards are still stacked against urban voters, at least they are not stacked as high. City officials and urban citizens are convinced that with their own department, and even more, their own secretary, who will serve as their advocate, at last they may begin to get the sympathy and assistance they have long asked for.

However appealing the case for a department of urban affairs may be, the other side of the coin ought to be considered carefully before a decision is made. Indeed, it could be argued that such a department would be politically unwise, administratively unsound, and functionally unnecessary. The creation of a department of urban affairs—or urbiculture (a department by that too clever name seems unlikely in any event)[39]—seems unwise on the ground of semantics alone. Semantics can be overemphasized, of course, but the words so far suggested for the department's title constitute a real handicap for its adoption. "Urban affairs" is naturally contrasted with "rural affairs," and all the old stereotypes about rural and urban would be aroused by its establishment. "Urban" means cities, and cities are still pictured as sinful and unhealthy when opposed to farm and country living, which are equated with clean living, hard work, and thrift. Cities are thought to be dominated by bosses, and political machines, in contrast with the democratic, independent way of life on the farm. It is not enough to say that this is an incorrect, distorted picture, both of urban and rural living, nor is it sufficient to point out that cities down through the ages have been centers of freedom, that even today they are more progressive than the rural areas, which are traditionally conservative. Whatever the truth of these characterizations, the important fact is that the rural and small-town population in the United States traditionally view cities with suspicion, and these are the groups that dominate Congress as well as legislative bodies in the States.

Added to this is the fact that urban also will be contrasted with suburban, and the suburbanite is even more antibig city than his country cousin. At least he is antidowntown big city. One of the principal reasons for the existence of metropolitan areas has been the movement of population to the suburbs made possible with the development of the automobile. To the suburbanite, "the city," means where he works in the daytime. It means crowds, noise, subways, and social groups he does not like. He feels differently about the suburbs. Politically, the suburbanite is becoming increasingly important. His numbers alone make him a political factor to be counted. In alliance with rural voters, he is a formidable power. Representatives from strictly rural areas may be declining in strength as population moves away from the farms, but the small towns and especially the suburban areas are steadily gaining in population, political power, and importance. All three would be against a Department of Urban Affairs. Why, they would argue, should the whole Nation underwrite a segment of the population which is quite able to take care of itself? Cities are rich; they do not need help from the Federal Government. An executive department devoted to their interests would simply be a means by which big cities would get increased Federal aid, perhaps to their detriment. While opponents of a Department might admit that urbanism is a national problem, they argue that ours is a Federal s system of Government, with certain well-defined areas of power given to the Federal Government and others reserved to the States. Problems of local government, they assert, whether in large or small urban centers, are primarily a concern of the States and the local communities themselves. The Federal Government has no responsibility for cities as such, and therefore, there is no need for a Department. These may not be sound arguments, but they have lots of emotional appeal. They have been used in State legislatures for years with great success. They are and will continue to be just as effective in Congress where smart city slickers are feared almost as much as they are in State legislatures.

Not only would these emotional factors make the creation of a department of urban affairs politically difficult, but they would subject the operation of the Department to continual friction with Congress. Whether it could ever be really effective under these circumstances is an open question. The very speed with which the idea has been developed and pushed also works against its adoption. Not only does Congress not like innovation, it is not apt to act on so radical a proposal without having before it conclusive evidence that the cities have done all they can to help themselves solve their own problems. To date, such evidence is not forthcoming. Congress likes even less to alter the administrative structure of the Federal Government until it is sure of the soundness of the proposal. In the past, periods of 30 to 40 years have elapsed between the creation of new executive departments. Agencies, bureaus, and commissions are not quite such an affront to congressional sensibilities, but the creation of a department, affecting, as it would, the very core of the executive branch, is another matter altogether. Any proposal for a new department, however sound, traditionally has rough going in Congress. As one of the witnesses before the Dawson subcommittee testifying in connection with H.R. 1864 pointed out, "A major stumbling block for H.R. 1864 is that the creation of a department of urbiculture would elevate consideration of urban problems so high and so fast from present levels of consideration that the sudden jump would be unacceptable to some people."[40] Chiefly, it would be unacceptable to Congress, at least in its present state of mind and membership.

A department of urban affairs is politically unlikely, in the third place, because the proposal did not originate with the President or the White House and has not been included in an administration program. Thus the idea has never had the support of the executive branch. Nor for that matter has there been any degree of popular pressure from the voters for its adoption. Congressmen move largely when the politics of the situation seem to make motion advisable; to date, there has been no force exerted by the people or through political channels to produce any congressional action on any one of the bills. Even as Representative DAWSON acknowledged in the 1955 hearings on H.R. 1864, "You appreciate that there must be a public interest and demand for this legislation. * * * There must be created within this country a desire to have established a department which is concerned with the problems of the urban dweller * * * sentiment for the idea * * * is necessary in this form of government to make it become a law."[41] Until such sentiment is built up, to talk about its adoption is futile.

Moreover, a secretary of urban affairs, actively looking to the interests of cities in Washington, would add greatly to the centralization of governmental power in Federal hands. As Governor Nelson Rockefeller of New York, who called the proposal for a Department of Urban Affairs "appalling," went on to point out, there is need for coordination of Federal programs involving urban and metropolitan areas, but to vest that power in a new department would be to create an "all-powerful coordinator * * * in Washington." "On reflection," Rockefeller concluded, "it is self-evident that a Federal department with as much power as this would require, would be a Frankenstein." If such a department were ever established, "home rule would become a memory."[42]

Finally, its creation is politically unlikely because of recent actions regarding the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Federal Civil Defense Administration, the functions of which were to be transferred to a Department of Urban Affairs. During its debates on recent housing bills, Congress has given every indication that it contemplates the continued existence of HHFA as the administrative unit for housing programs. And by Executive order, the Federal Civil Defense Administration has recently been merged with the Office of Defense Mobilization, to form the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. The probability that the functions of either agency might be shifted to a new department in the near future is remote.

Not only are there strong political arguments against the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs, but there is a strong case against it on grounds of administrative soundness. Creation of a department has come to be regarded as a panacea for all administrative ills. Yet a study of the service departments over the years, and of the Department of Defense in particular, since its creation in 1947, produces considerable evidence that departmentalization is not a guaranteed cure for administrative difficul-

Footnotes at end of speech.

ties. Establishment of a department, indeed, may only delay the cure of force it to take place in different surroundings. Back of the proposal is the idea that a simple organizational change will provide the answer for urban and metropolitan problems. This is a false belief. The mere creation of a new administrative unit is not the answer to a problem as complex as that presented by the phenomenon of metropolitanization. Creation of a department would beg the most important question of all, what is the Federal Government's proper role in urban areas? The answer is not merely to assign urban affairs to a single organizational unit. It is a matter of principle and philosophy, not of method. To create a method without first having established a philosophy to base it on is to put the proverbial cart before the horse. Coming as they do at this time, when the Federal Government's thoughts about the basic issues involved are still inchoate, such a proposal is clearly premature.

Moreover, a Department of Urban Affairs as proposed would be based on a geographical concept rather than on a functional one. To admit it would be to introduce a maverick into the administrative corral. The work of such a department, if all the programs carried on by the Federal Government affecting cities were placed under its jurisdiction, would necessarily cut across the functions of a great many existing agencies and departments. Indeed, once the Pandora's box is opened, how is it to be closed? What programs do not have an urban interest, save those pertaining strictly to agriculture? If housing and related activities and civil defense are the first to be included, how can arguments for the inclusion of a host of others be denied? Thus in the hearings on H.R. 1864, the representative of the American Municipal Association declared that in his opinion the new department "should include such items as highways and urban transit, airports and airport administration, public health matters * * * water and air pollution, and juvenile delinquency" in addition to housing and urban development and renewal and civil defense.[33] What would be the effect at least on the Departments of Commerce, Interior, and Health, Education and Welfare of the creation of a department of urban affairs? It would certainly conflict with their organization and ongoing programs, to say nothing of the complexities it would introduce into the programs of many independent regulatory agencies. To insert an executive department based on a geographical pattern into a system primarily organized functionally would make for more, rather than less, confusion in the administrative structure.

It is argued that the new department would simply parallel the existing Department of Agriculture and serve city dwellers in the same way that Agriculture serves the farmers. But even if it be admitted that Agriculture is principally concerned with farmers, yet its organizational base is strictly functional. A comparable situation would be created if the new department were made simply the department of housing. This title, however, would not give it cognizance over the broad area of urban problems which sponsors of the new department desire. What would be done with activities like airports, highways, and water pollution? Is it suggested that these functions, too, be divided along geographic lines and that urban highways be placed in the new department but rural highways left where they are now? Would highway matters thus be divided between two departments? Would the same duplication be repeated for water and air pollution, airport construction and maintenance, water supply, hospital construction, and all the manifold other urban programs of the Federal Government? Indeed, with what department and agency of the Federal establishment would a department conceived upon geographic lines not conflict? To ask the question is to supply the answer. To create such a department would be to create an organizational misfit.

Moreover, it cannot be conclusively demonstrated that merely because certain activities of the Federal Government reach a particular magnitude they should automatically be brought together under a single executive department. The Veterans' Administration would seem to be a case in point. In terms of the number of employees, size of budget, and amounts of money distributed, it would long ago seem to have deserved elevation to departmental status. Yet it has functioned with benefit to the group it serves through the years without Cabinet status. What advantages would have accrued to have converted it into an executive department? Proponents of the Department of Urban Affairs claim that one advantage would be better representation in the administrative structure. The heads of HHFA and OCDM now sit with the President's Cabinet when matters pertaining to them are discussed. What would be gained by giving them secretarial status?

But it is argued that instead of occasional participation in the Cabinet the Urban Affairs Secretary would be a full-time member. This argument is based on the assumption that the Cabinet is in fact a policy-forming body. Actually the President makes policy, and the Cabinet may or may not be consulted. Confusing the British system with its theory of Cabinet responsibility and the American system where it is sometimes said the Cabinet members are the natural enemies of the President is responsible for this. Under the American system access to only one man, the President, is important, because he bears the chief burden for policymaking. Entree at the White House is much more important than Cabinet status. Harry Hopkins, during World War II, was a good example of a man who did not have Cabinet status but who was much more powerful than any Cabinet officer because of his entree to the President. Indeed, entree to the King was what gave Cabinet officers in England their position of power in the first place. One of the principal prerogatives of an English Secretary of State was "the privilege of the closet," which meant the right of entree to the King and the right of consulting with him alone.

Close ties with congressional committees and well organized pressure groups also account for the success of an administrative agency. Certainly the Veterans' Administration owes much of its prolonged success to these factors. A seat in the Cabinet for the Veterans' Administrator would not have been nearly as important in making it possible for him to carry out his agency's program. On the same basis, it cannot be maintained that departmental status and Cabinet representation alone would produce the effective "representation" of urban interests that proponents of the idea claim it would. Good entree at the White House, good working relations with Congress, and effective group pressure produces better results in many cases than a seat in the Cabinet.

Nor can it be demonstrated that the research and educational programs which are so urgently needed with regard to metropolitan problems can be carried out best by a single department. How much research of a general nature is worth while? In regard to mass transportation, for example, must not a solution be fitted to the needs of each individual metropolitan area? Indeed, is there a need for the Federal Government to conduct such research at all? Today there is a host of agencies, public and private, carrying on research on these problems.

Finally, a Department of Urban Affairs is unnecessary now. Attention to metropolitan problems is not guaranteed merely by the creation of an executive department. It can be secured as well under the existing arrangement of agencies, once they all recognize "that our metropolitan communities provide the environment within which the greatest number of people live and the largest part of the Nation's business is carried out."[34]

Given the need for focusing the attention of the Federal Government on metropolitan area problems, creation of a Department of Urban Affairs or its equivalent is not the way to accomplish the objective. The proposal does not make political sense, it is not in accord with the administrative concepts on which the rest of the executive branch is based, and functionally it would add to the difficulties of effective administration.

What is needed more than an organizational reshuffling is a policy to guide the Federal Government in its urban and metropolitan activities. This is properly a staff, not a line, function. There should be an agency in the Federal Government concerned with urban areas and their problems, but it should be a staff agency, whose concern it would be to gather the facts on which the President and his department and agency chiefs can form an appropriate policy, not a line department to administer urban programs. What is needed is a focal point in the White House where all the multiform data about metropolitan areas are collected and analyzed and from which the facts about metropolitan problems will flow into the planning stream on the top staff level. A permanent staff agency, a council on metropolitan areas, to give concentrated attention to metropolitan problems, should be established in the Executive Office of the President. Working closely with the other agencies in the Executive Office and with the White House staff, such a council would provide a point of contact with metropolitan research and governmental units across the country and would be a means by which the conclusions of all sound thinking about metropolitan problems could be woven into the planning to solve them.

As Federal activities in urban areas continue to grow, as inevitably they will, an executive department may one day be established. But the immediate need is for staff attention to the problem, not line action. A council on metropolitan areas would serve to bring the Federal role in urban areas into focus and enable the Federal Government to provide the kind of leadership the problem requires. Formulation of a philosophy and evolution of a firm policy based thereon should be the first steps. A staff agency in the President's office, not a department of urban affairs, is the proper unit to take them.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] Three such bills were introduced in the 84th Cong.: H.R. 1804, by Representative J. Arthur Younger, Republican, of the Ninth District (San Maeto County) of California; H.R. 10295, by Representative Irwin D. Davidson, Republican, of the 20th District (New York City) of New York; and S. 3159 by 9 Senators, some of them from the Nation's most urban areas—Herbert Lehman, Democrat, of New York (New York City), Hubert Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota (Minneapolis), Paul Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois (Chicago), Wayne Morse, Democrat, and Richard Neuberger, Democrat, of Oregon (Eugene and Portland), Warren Magnuson, Democrat, of Washington (Seattle), Thomas C. Hennings, Democrat, of Missouri (St. Louis), Pat McNamara, Democrat, of Michigan (Detroit), and James E. Murray, Democrat, of Montana. Virtually the same bills were submitted to the 85th Cong. (H.R. 1019, H.R. 3383; S. 2159) and to the 86th Cong. (H.R. 781 and H.R. 984).

[2] Philip Kates, "A National Department of Municipalities," the American City, January 1912. pp. 405–7.

[3] Woodrow Wilson to the editor of the American City, Aug. 22, 1912, quoted in the American City, October 1954, p. 19.

[4] Harlean James, "Service—The Keynote of a New Cabinet Department," Review of Reviews, February 1919, p. 190.

[5] Charles E. Merriam, "Cities in a Changing World," City Problems of 1934, the Annual Proceedings of the U.S. Conference of Mayors (Chicago, 1935), pp. 73–74.

[6] Charles E. Merriam in Guy Greer (ed.), "The Problems of Cities and Towns," report of the Conference on Urbanism, Harvard University, Mar. 5–6, 1942 (Cambridge, 1942), p. 29.

[7] See, for example, "Urban Secretary Remains a Possibility," editorial, Durham Sun (Durham, N.C.), Aug. 8, 1958.

[8] See "The National Municipal Policy" of the American Municipal Association, 1956 and 1958.

[9] Representative YOUNGER was kind enough to allow the authors to read the letters he received in response to the bill he sponsored; a score or more mayors offered him their support and assistance in getting such a department created.

[10] H.R. 1019, sec. 2.

[11] Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, U.S. House of Representatives, Federal-State-Local Relations, 85th Cong., 1st sess., pt. 2, p. 397.

[12] An Advisory Committee Report on Local Government, submitted to the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, 1955, p. 26.

[13] Daniel R. Grant, "The Government of Interstate Metropolitan Areas," Western Political Quarterly, VIII (March 1955), 90.

[14] Mimeographed press release from Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK's office, May 26, 1957, p. 1.

[15] S. 2159, sec. 1 (3).

[16] Committee on Government Operations, U.S. House of Representatives, "Hearings on Creation of a Department of Urbiculture," 84th Cong., 1st sess., 23 (July 26, 1955).

[17] Ibid.

[18] Arthur Macmahon and John D. Millett, "Federal Administrators" (New York: Columbia University Press, 1939), p. 4. Of course, Macmahon and Millett were not speaking specifically about a Department of Urban Affairs.

[19] Schuyler C. Wallace, "Federal Departmentalization" (New York: Columbia University Press, 1941), p. 67. Wallace was not addressing his remarks specifically to a Department of Urban Affairs.

[20] Hearings, supra note 16, p. 34.

[21] Ibid., p. 35.

[22] Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (First Hoover Commission, "Report on Social Security" (Washington, 1949), p. 5.

[23] Mimeographed press release from Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK's office, May 26, 1957.

[24] American Municipal Association, "The National Municipal Policy," 33d Annual American Municipal Congress, Nov. 28, 1956 (Washington, 1956), IV, 4.

[25] Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (First Hoover Commission), "General Management of the Executive Branch" (Washington, 1949), p. 3.

[26] "The National Municipal Policy" (1956), op. cit.

[27] H. Rept. 575, 85th Cong., 1st sess., p. 428.

[28] Committee on Government Operations, U.S. House of Representatives, "Hearings on H.R. 1864," 84th Cong., 1st sess., 42 (July 26, 1955).

[29] See W. Brooke Graves, "The Coming Challenge in Federal-State Relations," A report for the Chamber of Commerce of the United States (Washington 1957).

[30] "Hearings," supra note 28, p. 49.

[31] Ibid., pp. 45–46.

[32] New York Times, September 24, 1957.

[33] "Hearings," supra note, 28, p. 45.

[34] Harvey S. Perloff, "Responsibilities of Local, State, and Federal Governments," a paper prepared for the Conference on the Challenge of Metropolitan Government, American University, Washington, D.C., June 21, 1958, p. 5.

They Twisted at the White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include this article so that we may all know the extent of entertainment of our young administration, and surmise the cost to the taxpayers.

With two Missourians present, I am surprised the "peppermint twist," was the order of the night, in lieu of a healthy square dance or stately cotillion in accordance with local custom, or the late advertised emphasis on culture. However, the imported guests probably demanded it; and as a physician I recommend recreation, as apparently the writer does not. Could it be the age differential?

By the same token, as a physician I am concerned for weak backs, over 40, overexercising, and such late hours; whether it be recreational, cultural, or pure diversion.

The article follows:

THEY TWISTED AT THE WHITE HOUSE

(By Drew Pearson)

The big story social Washington has been buzzing about has not been U–2 Pilot Powers, or Astronaut Colonel Glenn, or the proposed summit meeting, but rather who leaked the news about the big White House twist party when even the Secretary of Defense, to the amazement of his generals, twisted and when the President himself danced until 4:30 a.m.

Details of these White House parties are supposed to be more carefully censored than the speeches of the admirals. No information is given out, and attractive Pamela Turnure, Mrs. Kennedy's press secretary, tilts her pretty nose and gets very hoity-toity with anyone who asks for the guest list to Jackie's intimate parties for her sister, Princess Radziwill, or her sister-in-law, Eunice Smith.

Guests are even cautioned not to divulge the names of other guests.

In this case, however, news that the President twisted until 4:30 a.m. and that even the Secretary of Defense joined in this hot dance, imported from New York's Peppermint Lounge, was too much to keep. It made the society columns next day.

Four newspapermen were at the party and some of them have been blamed for the leak. However, Charlie Bartlett of the Chattanooga Times would be the last one to talk about his friends, the Kennedys; nor would Rolley Evans of the New York Herald Tribune.

The leaks actually came from the horde of about 50 guests imported from New York, who next day were itching to spill everything about the glamor night at the White House.

Among the guests were not only such Kennedy favorites as Prince Oleg Cassini, brother of Cholly Knickerbocker and dress designer for Jackie Kennedy, but Tom Watson, head of International Business Machines; also Chiquita Astor, who is married to the youngest son of Lady Astor and loves an excuse to pop across the Atlantic; also Fifi Fell and Patsy Pulitzer Preston, the former Vogue model.

Then there was Magda Moyano, the Argentine beauty, her raven locks piled regally on top of her head. She is usually squired by Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS of South Bend, Ind., but on this night JOHN was left at home. To make up for the lack of Washington bachelors, the First Lady imported an assortment of debonair New Yorkers—Michael Forrestal, son of the late Secretary of Defense; Peter Duchin, son of the orchestra leader; Clayton Fritchey, assistant to Adlai Stevenson; George Plimpton, son of Ambassador Francis T. P. Plimpton—most of them very young.

Despite these importations, the party was still so short of men that some of the most glamorous dolls ever seen in Washington had to sit demurely around the wall waiting to do the twist.

One guest looking at the dazzling array of pink and cream colored beauty, remarked: "It makes you think of having too much ice cream."

With the President himself on the dance floor, his Cabinet members more or less had to get into the act. Bob McNamara proved to be the most agile of the Cabinet twisters. Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon complained later that he was exhausted.

Senator CLAIBORNE PELL, the young diplomat from Rhode Island whose wife is an heiress to the A. & P. grocery chain, looked immaculate, as did his handsome colleague from Missouri, STUART SYMINGTON, and his slow-speaking fellow Senator from Kentucky, JOHN SHERMAN COOPER.

Bernard Lanvin, whose perfumes are famous in Paris and on Fifth Avenue, admired the Texas yellow gown of Lady Bird Johnson. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., who hasn't attended as young a party since his daddy was in the White House, put on a skit illustrating the difference between Prince Oleg Cassini, who is descended from the czarist nobility, and Prince Radziwill, who is descended from Polish nobility.

It being Friday, fish was served—but what fish—poached in a creamy sauce of white wine. The chef that Jackie Kennedy wanted to steal from the French Embassy couldn't have done better, and Ambassador Alphand himself testified to that—especially when the dessert of souffle macaroon was served.

Meanwhile three musical teams—the Air Force singers, Lester Lanin's strollers, and a U.S. Marine combo—kept everyone entertained and dancing. They didn't stop playing until 4:30 a.m.

It was a great evening. And everyone is hoping that Congressman H. R. GROSS, the mean old Republican economizer from Waterloo, Iowa, won't get too mean. He has a habit of getting up on the House floor and reminding people that they, the taxpayers, put up the money to pay the bills at the White House.

Post Office Appointments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, probably more misinformation is generated in re-

gard to Post Office appointments than any other nominations. I am sure this has been so regardless of which party happened to be in power.

Recently in my State of Maine certain erroneous allegations were made concerning the handling of a rural carrier nomination in 1959 by Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine, a former distinguished Member of this House.

In a letter to one of Maine's largest daily newspapers, a Mrs. Barbara Hoyt Rainey asserted that Senator SMITH engaged in party politics in making a rural carrier appointment that resulted in the death of her then husband. For the sake of accuracy and fairness I would like to make these facts a part of the record:

This case involves a Mr. Lawrence E. Hoyt who took a civil service examination and failed with a score of 65. Since he did not make a rating of 70, no points for veterans' preference were added to his rating.

In a letter dated December 21, 1959, to R. L. Hulick, Acting Director of the Bureau of Operations of the Post Office Department, Senator SMITH notified the Post Office Department that she was declining to make any recommendation on the appointment. The end result was that the Postmaster General made the selection without any recommendation from Senator SMITH. It may be of interest to note that the Postmaster General selected an individual for this appointment making the highest grade on the civil service examination—a grade of 88.

Inasmuch as Senator SMITH did not make this appointment and even refused to make a recommendation, it is clear that any allegations to the contrary are an injustice to Maine's senior U.S. Senator.

Balance-of-Payments Deficits in Fourth Period of 1961 Topped Gold Crisis Quarter in 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. SCRANTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker, the problem of trade and tariffs does not stand alone. It is tied closely to the financial status of the U.S. Government. The balance of payments situation, the gold crisis, unbalanced budgets, all bear directly on this problem.

The figures on the balance-of-payments deficit in the fourth period of 1961 have finally been published. They are not encouraging.

We are told that this period was rather exceptional primarily because of very short-term capital outflows. Whether this is a transitory phase, as the administration contends, or not, it does require substantial improvement, as the administration admits.

Further, the Commerce Department is hardly reassuring with its report that "it would be entirely unrealistic to expect major changes in the balance of payments within a short time."

Because of the tremendous importance of this problem to all Americans, I bring to the attention of the House a Wall Street Journal article dated Tuesday, September 20, describing the critical balance-of-payments situation.

BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS DEFICIT IN FOURTH PERIOD OF 1961 TOPPED GOLD-CRISIS QUARTER IN 1960

WASHINGTON.—The Government said the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit in the closing months of last year turned even worse than in the gold-crisis period of 1960. But officials are confident the current quarter's deficit is swinging back to a lower figure.

The Commerce Department officially reported 1961's balance-of-payments deficit at $2.4 billion, down from $3.9 billion in 1960. These figures on the adverse margin between U.S. payment abroad and its smaller revenues from oversea sources had been foreshadowed by administration officials in speeches and congressional testimony.

What was not known for certain was the extent to which the deficit widened in the fourth quarter. Officials knew the figures would look bad, partly because of what they considered to be freak yearend flows of short-term capital, but a precise deficit figure was not available until yesterday.

The Commerce Department placed the final quarter deficit at $1,450 million after seasonal adjustments, up from a $859 million deficit in the third quarter and a $1,434 million deficit in the fourth quarter of 1960. It was in the 1960 quarter that huge amounts of gold were leaving the United States and international traders were speculating on a possible devaluation of the dollar.

The balance-of-payments deficit increases the dollar holdings of foreign governments. This money can be used to purchase gold from the U.S. Treasury. Fears of dollar devaluation stepped up hedge buying of gold in the closing months of 1960, but such speculation dwindled sharply after President Kennedy pledged early last year that the dollar would not be devalued.

The United States earns more money from its exports than it pays out for imports of foreign goods. But this favorable balance is more than offset by such foreign expenses as military costs, investments, foreign aid, and movements of short-term capital.

The overall 1961 reduction in the balance of payments deficit to $2.4 billion from $3.9 billion in 1960 was concentrated early in the year, as the margin of exports over imports ran unusually high. The payments balance in the second quarter showed a surplus, due to $700 million in early repayments of foreign aid loans by Germany and other countries. The balance turned from a $248 million surplus in the second quarter to an $859 million deficit in the third quarter due to the absence of this temporary income and because imports began rising swiftly while exports held about steady.

The $1,450 million final quarter deficit was blamed heavily on what the Commerce Department called "rather exceptional" outflows of capital. For this reason, officials were reluctant to convert the fourth quarter figure to an "annual rate"—an often-used statistical device that shows what would happen in a full year if the deficit continued at a particular quarter's level. At an annual rate, the fourth quarter deficit works out to $5.8 billion, a figure that Federal analysts regard as unrealistically alarming. This compares with an annual rate of more than $5.7 billion in the fourth quarter of 1960, a $1.4 billion rate in the first quarter of 1961, a rate equal to a surplus of $992 million rate in the second quarter and a $3.4 million deficit rate in the third quarter.

PERIOD CALLED EXCEPTIONAL

Officials suggested that the "rather exceptional" fourth quarter capital movements accounted for more than $500 million of the actual $1.450 million deficit. These movements included U.S. contributions to international organizations, heavy private purchases of foreign stocks, bank loans to Japan and the Philippines and about $100 million of "very short-term capital outflows." These were described as temporary jugglings of deposits by U.S. and foreign banks to improve their yearend bookkeeping positions.

The report said these movements "may have already been reversed in January." The first formal estimate of the first quarter deficit won't be available until spring, but officials are sure it will be less than the fourth quarter level. "It is possible," the Department said, "that the deterioration in the overall balance at the end of last year represents a transitory phase."

The report continued: "But even allowing for that possibility, the U.S. position continues to require substantial improvement." The administration eventually wants to end the payments deficit altogether, and President Kennedy has called for a "reasonable equilibrium" in the Nation's international payments within the next 2 years.

The Commerce Department report reviewed measures taken to reduce military outlays abroad and to make U.S. goods more competitive on world markets, but it added: "It would be entirely unrealistic, however, to expect major changes in the balance of payments within a short time."

Address by Hon. Joseph Kajeckas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I insert in the RECORD excerpts from an address delivered in Lithuanian by Hon. Joseph Kajeckas, Lithuanian Chargé d'Affaires ad interim, in Cleveland on February 11, 1962, on the occasion of the 44th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence:

It is a very great privilege and pleasure for me to be with you on this occasion, which commemorates the 44th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence. Coming from Washington, I feel that I have gone from one capital to another, because the city of Cleveland has always played such an important part in the progress of Lithuanian history and the aspirations of our Nation.

Cleveland is truly a city of Lithuanian numbers, deeds, and tombs. The resting place of many Lithuanians bears mute testimony to the numbers of great and dedicated people who have done so much for Lithuania.

Among the noted graves of famous Lithuanians here in Cleveland is that of Antanas Smetona, a signer of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence and the last President of free Lithuania. As Cleveland's loyal Lithuanians sheltered him here in his exile, may you continue to do so until his remains may one day be removed to the soil of the capital city of his beloved Lithuania, where his remains may rest in honored glory in a free homeland. In honoring his remains today during this visit, I honored also the memory

of all his compatriots who joined him in signing Lithuania's Declaration of Independence, and who have now come to their eternal rest after lives of devotion and dedication to their country. At the same time, I paid tribute to the bravery and dedication of the surviving signers of that act, with a particular regard for those whose unflinching love of freedom now preserves their courage while they endure enslavement behind the Iron Curtain. The noted graves in Cleveland include also such figures as Gen. V. Nagevicius and Col. K. Zukas.

While the night of Soviet oppression fell on Lithuania, it was in Cleveland that there appeared the book written by Owen Norem, the last minister of the United States to free Lithuania. Only last year, also in Cleveland, there first appeared the deservedly famous recollections of Mrs. Barbara Armonas, "Leave Your Tears in Moscow." Cleveland is also the headquarters of the Ciurlionis Ensemble, a choral group dear to all Lithuanians, whose songs have brought warmth and cheer to all the hearts choked by memories of Lithuania in better times.

All of the various other works of Lithuanians in this city—cultural programs, publications, patriotic projects—serve to indicate in passing what a great pleasure it is for me to commemorate Lithuania's independence in this city which is so dear and meaningful to all my countrymen. On this, my first visit to Cleveland, I venture to say that all the Lithuanians behind the Iron Curtain know of all your efforts, and are heartily grateful for them.

The act which we commemorate today has great historical significance. It was by that act that the Lithuanian people expressed their national will, to be free and independent people under democratic governmental processes established by the Christian political tradition in the Western World. At the same time that the act was a people's choice of Western culture and civilization, it was a choice as well of the foundation of Western democratic traditions, and this foundation is the dignity and freedom of the individual person. The value that men attach to freedom is something that cannot be measured by the economic theorists of communism and collectivism, and yet these values will never be supplanted, for man cannot live by bread alone. Patrick Henry graphically demonstrated that value in action when he exclaimed, "Give me liberty, or give me death."

Since then, thousands of Lithuanians have given their lives in demonstrating the efficacy of that value.

In the wake of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence, the nations of the Western World recognized Lithuania as a sovereign nation, with Soviet Russia included. And it is at this point that the modern-day tragedy of Lithuania and the other Baltic states begins. For the solemn agreements and treaties that are binding on all other nations are considered by the Soviets as only a means to an end. The Soviets solemnly promised to respect Lithuanian independence forever. Yet "forever," in Communist jargon, can mean several years or several days, but it will always mean only what is convenient for the Soviets. As Attorney General Robert Kennedy said several years ago of the Kremlin leaders, their practice "has been in the past to make promises and treaties to serve their purpose and to break them when it has been to their advantage." As a result of this, the Soviet Union, in spite of solemn pledges and agreements binding under international law, forcibly occupied Lithuania and the other Baltic states in 1940, and the illegal occupation continues to this day.

Since then, the question of the self-determination of nations has been often raised at the United Nations, and in the discussions that have ensued, the true face of the Soviet Union has been revealed, in its hypocrisy, imperialism and its practical neocolonialism in regard to captive nations. In this connection, we may mention the excellent speeches of President Kennedy, Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, and the Canadian Prime Minister, Rt. Hon. John J. Diefenbaker. They have raised such questions as self-determination of nations, the mass deportations employed by the Soviet Union to subjugate captive nations, and the vote that millions of people from the captive nations have cast against the Soviet regime by fleeing it for freedom in the West. As President Kennedy said before the United Nations, "There is no ignoring the fact that the tide of self-determination has not yet reached the Communist empire where a population far larger than that officially termed "dependent" lives under government installed by foreign troops instead of free institutions—under a system which knows only one party and one belief—which suppresses free debate, free elections, free newspapers, books, and trade unions—and which builds a wall to keep truth a stranger and its own citizens prisoners." President Kennedy's proposal of "free plebiscites in every part of the globe" is, of course, unacceptable to the Kremlin, for the Kremlin does not conceive of morality apart from advantage, from principle apart from self-interest. Amid all these facts, certain observations emerge very clearly. One of them is that the Soviet Union employs every kind of subterfuge to mask its continuing genocide in regard to countries such as Lithuania, and yet the Kremlin dares, with the boldest imaginable hypocrisy, to espouse "freedom" for newly emergent Asian and African nations. A point to remember, on the basis of practical experience, is that any nation close on the borders of the Soviet Union is bound to experience a very different kind of "freedom" than we experience in these United States. The type of "freedom" that the Soviets espouse for their neighbors consists of mass murder, deportation in cattle cars to Siberia, rigged elections, and the type of regime by terror that is so obviously present in today's East Berlin.

When the questions of colonialism and self-determination were debated in the United Nations, the diplomatic representatives of the Baltic States presented a lengthy memorandum to the member nations, outlining the process of enslavement that the Soviet Union imposed on our homelands. Well might the free world take a lesson from the Baltic States, for our continuing fight to regain freedom and independence for Lithuania is at the same time a fight for the basic rights and freedoms of people throughout the world. Because of this, it is little wonder that we have many friends in our cause.

The greatest of these friends has been the United States and its people. It is almost 22 years since the U.S. Government first condemned and denounced the forcible occupation of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union, and it continues to support the just aspirations of our people to a free and independent existence in the family of nations. I can assure you that within a few days, on February 16, Lithuanian Independence Day, the U.S. Department of State will issue yet another statement espousing these just aspirations; as a matter of fact, President Kennedy will also receive a delegation of Lithuanian officials on that day. On this occasion, I would like to take the opportunity to thank the American government and the American people, in your behalf and that of all Lithuanians, for the warmly-valued sympathy and support that has been and continues to be extended to Lithuania and her enslaved people.

We are steadfast in our hope for regained Lithuanian freedom, and we are steadfast for good reason. It is clear that history teaches us that the thrones of tyrants and oppressors always crumble in the end, and that inhuman rulers always end up the victims of their own inhumanity.

We know that the Soviets are riddled with unrest. The date of Lithuania's undertaker, Molotov, comes in the wake of Stalin's ultimate demise to the shadows of the Kremlin wall. And the wall in Berlin is the most striking testimony to the precariousness of the Kremlin's stand against the desires and aspirations of freedom-loving peoples. Speaking of the doom that Kremlin always threatens for the west, well did President Kennedy say, in his state of the Union message, that "We in the free world are moving steadily toward unity and cooperation, in the teeth of that old Bolshevic prophecy, and at the very time when extraordinary rumbles of discord can be heard across the Iron Curtain. It is not free societies which bear within them the seeds of inevitable disunity."

Tomorrow is the birthday of the man who knew that no nation or community of nations could ever exist "half slave and half free." Abraham Lincoln also knew that the principles upon which America's Declaration of Independence was founded were principles that would always give hope to all freedom-loving peoples throughout the world, for all time. And so it is with the Lithuanian people of today, who have known bad times and good, and who are now undergoing a long and arduous battle for their national existence. In the cold war such as that in which the whole world is engaged, victory is not to the strong alone, but to the brave. After so many years of hope and disappointment, the courage of the Lithuanian people remains undaunted, and they look to a brighter tomorrow, when the efforts and sacrifices of moral men everywhere will have regained a world in which justice and peace with honor may become a firm foundation for cooperation and trust between men and nations.

Urban Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I herewith present the text of a telegram just received by me from the honorable mayor of the city of Los Angeles, Calif., the text of which telegram will be self-explanatory. Since some portion of the great 23d Congressional District, which I have the honor and responsibility of representing, is within the corporate city limits of this great metropolitan geographical area in my native State of California, designated as the "City of Angels," I presume the honorable mayor of that city sent me this telegram which I present for the RECORD during this debate:

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

President Kennedy's proposed Urban Affairs Department of Cabinet status would be of tremendous benefit to the city of Los Angeles as well as the other urban areas of our country. I consider it imperative that this new Cabinet post be created so that cities can receive maximum Federal help and guidance to combat their growing problems. Your support of the President's proposal will be greatly appreciated by the people of Los Angeles.

SAMUEL YORTY,
Mayor.

Life and Character of Gen. Robert E. Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the second part of an address delivered on January 18, 1962, in the Texas Senate by State Senator Dorsey B. Hardeman. The second portion of the address follows:

LIFE AND CHARACTER OF GEN. ROBERT E. LEE: PART II

Mr. President and members of the senate, it was not because of the South's cruelty to the Negro or because of her treachery to them or because she bound them in chains, as was falsely charged by the rabblerousers, that battle was done to deliver the Negro from these alleged perilous conditions. Nor was it the North's love and affection toward these pitiful creatures; rather, it was the greed and desire she had for economic advantage and political control.

Never can it be successfully charged and maintained that the Southland had no love for the Union for which her treasures were generously expended and her finest blood so freely shed to promote its interests and defend its honor. Not a single demand made by the South, amid the bitter passions and flaming prejudices of the stormy days preceding the crisis of 1861, may be pointed to as unwarranted by the Constitution or which was not upheld by the Nation's highest judicial tribunal.

On the other hand, Northern States flagrantly violated the fundamental law of the land as provided in the Constitution or decreed by the Supreme Court and the land of Dixie was not accorded the rights to which every civilized nation is entitled under the law of nations—after every object for which "a more perfect union" was formed and had failed. Almost a century later, free Americans were to witness a disgraceful parallel of this state of affairs as the callousness and irresponsibility of the Eisenhower administration, through the chicanery of that conniving triumvirate of Brownell, Rogers, and Nixon, engineered the unwarranted, unjustified and illegal military invasion and violation of the sovereignty and integrity of the commonwealth of Arkansas when bayoneted Federal troops, under the command of Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker, overwhelmingly defeated teenagers and bobbysoxers armed with booksatchels, lunchboxes and slates. When all hope of redress had vanished, there was no other course with honor left to pursue, save that taken by the Southern States. The devotion to the principles of the Constitution of Philadelphia is evidenced by the fact that the Constitution of the Confederacy was almost identical, save for amplification of ambiguous phrases therein.

Thereupon, the terrible notes of war were sounded and the true sons of our beloved Southland answered the call to arms. From the time the Stars and Bars were borne to victory over the bloody fields of Bull Run until the worn and depleted forces of Lee surrendered to Grant, at Appomattox, no homes ever had more stanch and able defenders; no country more brave and loyal soldiers. From the Old Dominion to sunny Florida, from the palmettoes of the Carolinas to the sparse settlements of the Rio Grande, mothers, daughters, wives, and sweethearts toiled and sacrificed in silence and their prayers were wafted on every breeze for loved ones "For whom no more the blazing hearth would burn."

And during these terrible and devastating days there were none more faithful to the southern women, in their time of travail, than the oldtime servants on the plantations. Even though emancipated, they set a pattern of loyalty and fidelity that may well be emulated today, by white and black alike, and which, with intelligence and understanding, honor and honesty, would resolve most of today's interracial problems which are being fanned and exploited for pecuniary and political purposes by agitators, sit inners, and freedom riders today.

It was in this conflagration that General Lee was to become the major military figure and which would bring to him everlasting renown in every phase of life.

Hostilities erupted while Colonel Lee was still in Texas, following a brief command at Fort Mason—about 125 miles from here. He was greatly disturbed and troubled over his course of action, with the withdrawal of Virginia from the Union which he loved deeply. General Scott ordered him to report to Washington, which brought to an end his military services in Texas, during which sojourn, as always, his command—both officers and enlisted men—took great pride in their Colonel Lee as personifying the finest qualities of American soldiery.

His high principles, selfless devotion to duty, and the sense of justice which Lee exemplified were criteria for leadership.

He arrived at Arlington on March 1, 1861, and thereupon entered a new period of his life. He was permitted to know only a few short weeks of the affection and comfort of family and home before he was swept into the vortex of war. Lee's old comrade of Mexican War days, P. G. T. Beauregard, now with the Confederate Army, ordered his men to fire on Fort Sumter on April 12, which surrendered 2 days later.

It was then Mr. Lincoln tendered Colonel Lee the command of the U.S. Army, which offer was declined. Lee hastened to General Scott to inform him of his decision, which came as no great surprise to Scott, and to resign his commission. With the invasion of Virginia imminent, the occasion which he hoped would never arise was upon him with terrible swiftness, and, the die cast, he heeded the call of Governor Lechter to come to Richmond to accept a command in the service of his native State. This ultimately brought him to the command of the southern forces.

Until his men made their last march, under their hallowed flags, General Lee remained near them. Aware of the futility of further resistance, he returned to Richmond with weary and heavy heart. There he was met by his wife and daughters. His eyes were not closed to the wretched plight of the South. He realized it was not a time to nurture hate and bitterness, but conscious of duty performed, General Lee courageously accepted the fortunes of war. During the ensuing weeks, until midsummer of 1865, he sought rest and reflections as he rode Traveler about the quiet of the countryside, which tended to raise his spirits.

Then, came August with a visit from Judge Brockenbrough, rector of Washington College, Lexington, whom he had never met, to announce that the trustees, on August 4, unanimously had elected General Lee president of the institution and urging his acceptance. After conferring with his friend, Dr. Wilmer, former chaplain at the University of Virginia, the general, on August 24, wrote the committee of his willingness to assume the duties if it was thought his services would "be advantageous to the college and country"; otherwise, he would have to decline.

The trustees proudly published the announcement of General Lee's acceptance, with the comment that "In dedicating his future life to the holy work of educating the youth of his country, General Lee presents a new and interesting phase of his grand and heroic character."

Upon his arrival, he found the college barely alive. The confidence in General Lee inspired the school with a vigor it had never before experienced. His success in the direction of the college was phenomenal. The enrollment steadily increased, financial support became available, and academic instruction broadened. General Lee avoided politics and continued to shun all discussion of the war. He kept advocating, in his quiet manner, his creed for southern recovery—work, economy, patience, self-denial, and faith.

Shortly after the opening of the session of 1869–70, the general suffered a heart attack from which he, apparently, soon recovered, but he began to experience some difficulty in breathing which became so serious by March 1870 that the faculty united in a request that he take a vacation which he spent in Florida. His condition improved slightly, but the opening of the next session of the college—the sixth under his presidency—saw him rapidly failing in body, and by September 28 of 1870 he was forced to his bed.

All Lexington, all Virginia, the entire South was moved with deep anxiety. A week passed and it was whispered that his picture had dropped from the wall, which the superstitious said was an omen. Then followed another night when the sky flashed and shivered with an aurora borealis which recall to mind a passage in Aytoun's "Edinburg After Flodden":

"All night long the northern streamers
Shot across the trembling sky;
Fearful lights that never beckon
Save when kings or heroes die."

General Lee, it is reported, was the least concerned of all. The 11th of October found him wandering in mind, but once he spoke in tones as clear as battlefield orders to say, "Tell Hill he must come up." As the day waned, his condition worsened and, on her insistence, Mrs. Lee was wheeled into the room where she kept vigil, hour after hour, as she sat there with his moist hand in hers until the hour of 9:30 when came the end.

His military successes and reverses—and it was in this latter role that the true grandeur of his character shone forth more resplendently than in times of victory—are such as to warrant fuller discussion than is now propitious, although I do pause to inject that history presents no soldier with a prouder record of battles won over obstacles, apparently unsurmountable, and no citizen with a character more lordly, but let me adopt the descriptive words of the orator of another day, Senator Benjamin Hill of Georgia, who said:

"When the future historian shall come to survey the character of Lee, he will find it rising like a huge mountain above the undulating plain of humanity, and he must lift his eyes high toward heaven to catch its summit.

"He possessed every virtue of other great commanders without their vices. He was a foe without hate; a friend without treachery; a soldier without cruelty; a victor without oppression; and a victim without murmuring.

"He was a public officer without vices; a private citizen without wrong; a neighbor without reproach; a Christian without hypocrisy; and a man without guile.

"He was Caesar, without his ambition; Frederick, without his tyranny; Napoleon, without his selfishness; and Washington, without his reward. He was obedient to authority as a servant, and royal in authority as a true king.

"He was gentle as a woman in life; modest and pure as a virgin in thought; watchful as a Roman vestal in duty; submissive to law as Socrates; and grand in battle as Achilles."

Checkoffs for Agriculture Trade Promotion and Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of my congressional district, in common with their associates in agriculture everywhere, have always been allergic to controls and the whole idea of the checkoff smacks so much of the regimentation under which labor presently suffers as to make that part of the pending Food and Agriculture Act somewhat suspect.

Section 2 of title III of H.R. 10010 would amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to authorize farmer contributions, by means of checkoffs from the returns on marketing farm products, for "marketing research and development projects designed to assist, improve, or promote the marketing, distribution, and consumption" of the product covered by a marketing order.

The bill does not say so specifically, but it seems to me that the broad language quoted would have to be interpreted as authorizing the compulsory collection of funds from farmers for industry advertising programs.

This, to my mind, raises some substantial policy questions.

So long as funds for trade promotion of particular farm products are raised by voluntary contribution, there is reason to suppose that the amount collected will not be excessive and that the funds collected will be spent judiciously to accomplish the desired purpose.

But when the collection of funds for such purpose is compulsory, the discipline of voluntary participation is eliminated, and the door is open for abuses.

No point is served in lengthy review of possible abuses. But let us look at a few likely possibilities.

One of the possibilities is that an excessive percentage of all funds collected is used to propagandize farmers for continuation of the program. Vested interests in the continuation of a program are created. It is to be expected that such interest will affect the views and actions of program administration.

Another possibility is that the funds will be used for purposes other than those intended. One of the likely possibilities here is to use farmers' money, collected for trade promotion, for legislative purposes.

Those with a vested interest in the program are likely to regard expenditures to continue legislative authorization for the program as perfectly legitimate, as well as expenditures for other legislative objectives. Nor is it unlikely to suppose that farmers' money will be used in election campaigns, either directly or indirectly, of congressmen who have supported the program.

This compulsory association for legislative and political purposes is immoral and contrary to basic political concepts of the Constitution.

The idea that Government power should be used to compel the collection of funds for trade promotion purposes for farm products is one that seems to be growing in acceptance. Yet it seems to me that some seriously adverse factors should be given greater consideration than they have in the past.

For example, at what point does it become unethical or immoral for the majority to compel the minority to contribute money for a program the minority may be opposed to.

The minority may, for example, be convinced that a proposed advertising and trade promotion program is likely to be a net cost rather than a net benefit to them.

The minority may be right. Yet irrespective of whether they are right or wrong, are they to be compelled by the majority to contribute to the program?

Let us recall that the basic concept of our form of government is not that the majority rules, but rather that each individual has certain inalienable rights which should not be taken away from him by the majority.

This basic principle is to my mind violated when we use the police power of government to compel individuals to make contributions to causes which such individuals believe are either wrong or unwise.

There is another aspect of this approach to the farm problem that should be considered.

I think it is very unlikely that the consumers total expenditure for food can be increased by commodity advertising programs. The most that can be accomplished by a commodity advertising program is to shift consumption in some small degree to the product advertised.

Therefore, even if we make the assumption that such a shift can be made, the net effect of such commodity advertising program is to induce the consumer to eat a little more of some products, a little less of others.

I can see little benefit to farmers from this. In fact, if all farm products, or even a substantial percentage of them were all advertised, the net result would be that the advertising costs would be a substantial burden on farmers, with no benefits to them at all.

Some persons seem to take it for granted that public policy should promote commodity advertising programs. Have we thought this through? If commodity advertising programs are good for farmers, are they equally good for nonfarm products?

Should law compel every manufacturer of shoes to pay money to an industry fund to convince consumers they should buy more shoes?

Would any worthwhile public purpose be served if all manufacturers of motor boats were required to support an industry program to get more people to buy boats?

The Congress has never reached any conclusion that such legislation would be desirable, either in the public interest or in the interest of the industry involved.

It seems to me we are jumping to an unwarranted and unsupported conclusion if we assume that compulsory advertising programs for farm products are in the public interest or in the interest of farmers.

This provision of the new farm bill is one that has not been thought through, that has apparently been swept up in an endeavor to roll into one package virtually everything that has ever been proposed as contributions to solving the farm problem.

It seems to be becoming clearer that perhaps the single, most important factor standing in the way of improving the farm situation is the periodic warming up of every proposal considered and discarded in the past 20 years.

Farmers have a lot of problems. Most of them are in Washington. And the pending omnibus agricultural proposal emphasizes these facts.

Better Air Safety—With Saving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 22, 1962

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it is easy for people in a community to applaud Federal economies which do not affect their community. However, the real test of a desire for Federal economy comes when that economy strikes near home.

Recently, the Federal Aviation Agency has announced plans to remove the Air Route Traffic Control Center from Phoenix, and consolidate it with a similar function at Albuquerque, N. Mex. This announcement resulted in absolutely no mail of protest arriving in my office, and also resulted in the following editorial which appeared in the Phoenix Gazette of January 29, 1962. I am convinced that this editorial reflects the thinking of the vast majority of the people who reside in the First District of Arizona.

BETTER AIR SAFETY—WITH SAVING

The Federal Aviation Agency's announcement that it will close the Air Route Traffic Control Center at Sky Harbor almost certainly will be met by loud complaints, accompanied by attempts to pressure the FAA into reversing its decision.

Some of these complaints will come, rather hypocritically, from persons who frequently complain about Federal spending, but don't like it when even minor economies are effected in Arizona.

The center here is being closed and its function—the control of instrument flights over Arizona—is being transferred to a similar center at Albuquerque, N. Mex., because advances in communications and radar have made such a move possible.

More important, however, is that the move is also highly desirable. With high speed jet aircraft coming into wider use, it is far better to have fewer but larger control areas. This simplifies control procedures and eliminates the danger factor that exists when control of an aircraft is transferred from one center to another.

True enough, Phoenix will lose a $1.25 million annual payroll and the airport will lose a $50,000 a year tenant from one of its buildings. But the booming economy here will scarcely feel the payroll loss and airport officials won't have much trouble renting vacant space at crowded Sky Harbor.

Probably the most unfortunate thing about the transfer is that some of the 135 employees who call Phoenix home will have to move to other cities. We wish them well and hope some day that they will return.

The closing of the center here, along with similar closings in St. Louis and Detroit, will save the Federal Government $3.5 million per year.

And economy, like charity, must sometimes begin at home.

United States-Mexican Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, recently I received an excellent letter from one of my constituents, Miss Luz Castanos, on the subject of Mexico and United States-Mexican relations. Miss Castanos not only took the trouble to write at length, but came to see me in the local congressional office of the 17th District in the city of New York.

I not only was appreciative of her personal visit, but I think it was a mark of good citizenship that she came to me expressing concern about the extremely important subject of United States-Mexican relations. Miss Castanos' letter is a demonstration of that concern.

It is a very healthy thing when a U.S. citizen who cares about her country will call upon her Congressman to discuss her concern for the future and to make suggestions about how international relations can be improved.

I forwarded Miss Castanos' letter to the Department of State, and I received a very good and very fair reply from Assistant Secretary of State Frederick G. Dutton.

Certainly steps should be taken by our Government to see to it that relatively small errors, which are relatively easy to correct, as pointed out by Miss Castanos, are avoided. I would hope, therefore, that the Department of State would have these pertinent comments very much in mind.

With the permission of the House I am inserting Miss Castanos' letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, along with Mr. Dutton's comments:

NEW YORK, N.Y., *January 11, 1962.*

Congressman JOHN V. LINDSAY,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: I have recently returned from a 3-month stay in Mexico, during which I was made painfully aware of the great antipathy our neighbors have toward us. It is not the usual dislike of the little fellow for the big fellow, it goes much further than that. This is not my first trip to Mexico although it is the longest that I have every stayed there. For the past 9 years, I have been a yearly visitor, staying with relations. I am of Spanish descent and speak the language fluently.

During this extended stay I found myself repeatedly defending the United States and its way of life. To further my concern my antagonists were my friends, who insisted that I was not really from the United States and therefore I was an exception to the usual American. These young people are all professionals or graduate students between the ages of 25 and 35 and I feel represented the people who will be ruling Mexico. They have definitely been influenced by Communist propaganda, but this alone does not make them dislike us. I feel that we have somehow failed to make them understand that we are not as cruel, cold, and calculating, as they now believe.

I have tried to find reasons for the Mexican antipathy and strongly feel that in many instances some American tourists and some American residents are responsible for it. American tourists have a great reputation for going completely haywire while in Mexico. We are a free country and of course would resent anyone telling us how to behave, but could we not make a few suggestions? The passport office issues a booklet, together with your passport indicating that every tourist is an Ambassador. There is no passport required to enter Mexico and few if any tourists visiting ever receive this booklet. Is there any way that this booklet could be given to all tourists, at the same time that they are issued their Mexican tourist card? I am sure that the Mexican Government as well as their authorized agents, for the issuance of tourist cards, would be happy to cooperate. I would divide American residents in Mexico into two categories:

1. Those who live in Mexico because they like it and who want to.

2. Those who live in Mexico because they have to or because it is profitable.

I think the first category does not present a problem to either the United States or Mexico, but I do think the second one does. American businessmen in Mexico are noted for keeping to themselves. They go to the American Club, their children go to the American schools, they live in mostly American neighborhoods and only deal with Mexicans in line with their work. I am sure there are exceptions to this rule, but not too many. As far as the American schools are concerned, this past year the attempt was made to change the school year to coincide with the school year in the United States, that is summer vacation instead of winter vacation as is the rule in Mexico. There was opposition and the attempt failed, but not before it had added to the ill will. It seems to me that if we live in a foreign country, for whatever the reason, we should attempt to adjust to their way of life and not expect them to adjust to ours. It occurs to me that a monthly newsletter from the Embassy or State Department could remind our citizens of their responsibility, as good will ambassadors, to the United States as well as Mexico or whatever foreign country they reside in.

I have called the citizens of the United States, Americans, something which I and all other Americans call ourselves. To us it may seem a small point, but Mexicans are also Americans as are citizens of all the other Latin American Republics. I know it will be almost impossible for me to start calling myself a United Statestian and I do not expect other U.S. citizens to stop calling themselves Americans but could we not put a reminder in the booklet to tourists or the newsletter so that we will be aware that other Americans do exist?

I know that we alone are not at fault for the Mexican attitude, propaganda has played a great part. I discussed this with one of my American friends who is married to a Mexican and resides in Mexico City. She, too, has been upset by the growing anti-Americanism and felt that our propaganda machine had definitely let us down. She advised me that in the past 2 years there had been several groups of singers and dancers, sent by the U.S.S.R., that had been warmly received by the Mexican public. These groups played at both Bellas Artes, at high admission, and at the National Auditorium, at popular prices. The last group, the Soviet Army chorus, appeared in September and their final performance, at the auditorium was cheered with many shouts of Cuba Si, Yankees No. This same sentiment is clearly evident on many fences and walls in Mexico City.

We too have sent groups to Mexico. Louis Armstrong was there in November and played the National Auditorium, I do not know if he was sponsored by the State Department or not. The Helen Hayes group appeared in October, only at Bellas Artes, they also visited two other Mexican cities. Since they presented legitimate plays they of course could not appear in the vast auditorium at popular prices. The admission at Bellas Artes is much higher than most Mexicans afford and on the evening that I attended I would judge that the audience consisted mostly of Americans. It is very flattering to Mexico, to send a star of Miss Hayes' category; her "Glass Menagerie" was a great hit. I feel, however, that one of our musical comedies such as "South Pacific" or "Oklahoma" would have reached more Mexicans and could have played the National Auditorium. In a musical comedy the language problem is not as unsurmountable as in a play.

I had been in Mexico 5 weeks when together with my American I called on our Ambassador, Mr. T. Mann. We wanted to suggest that the United States send more entertainment that would appeal to a greater number of the people and not just a few. Looking back on our interview I realize that sending entertainment is not the only answer, although it is effective propaganda and should be used to further advantage than it has been.

I would judge the focal point of anti-U.S. sentiment is at the university and predominantly in the schools of law and economics. The average American, like myself, cannot answer technical questions dealing with our law and our economic system. No matter how willing we are to defend our system we do have limitations.

However, we do have excellent professors in our schools, who could explain our system. Could the United States not send guest lecturers or exchange professors, specifically in the field of economics and law, to the University of Mexico and the Politécnico? Perhaps it could be handled directly by our universities with the universities in Mexico. I do not mean to send propagandists, but legitimate experts and recognized authorities who could answer the questions from the gallery.

I am very upset by the turn of affairs in Mexico. It is a country I am very fond of and due to my close ties I almost consider it a second home. I would not like to see a second Cuba in Mexico. I know our foreign policy has improved tremendously but money and the Peace Corps alone are not the answer. The Peace Corps helps the underdog but the young intellectuals are the rulers to be. These are the people we must reach and must prove to that our system would be best for all. I still feel the greatest influence could be our U.S. citizens in Mexico, but till now they seem to have failed, perhaps even been a detriment.

I hope the few suggestions I have made may be of some use and that you will be able to bring this matter to the attention of the correct people. Both my friend in Mex-

ico, and myself are willing to give any assistance or further information that you may require.

I feel it is high time the people of the United States were made aware of our great responsibilities to our neighbors.

Very truly yours,

LUZ CASTAÑOS.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 5, 1962.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LINDSAY: I appreciated receiving your letter of January 22 making available to us comments and suggestions of Miss Luz Castaños. I was pleased to note that she had discussed her views with Ambassador Mann.

I would certainly agree with the observation that money is not the whole answer to the problem of relations with Mexico or any other country. I would also want to add that the ability of the U.S. Government to influence the situation in foreign countries is limited. As Miss Castaños aptly points out, much depends on such things as the conduct of American tourists and even more so on Americans resident in the country. Implicit in her remarks, of course, is the fact that the state of relations also depends on the attitude of the other government and its people. It is true that we have great responsibilities in the hemisphere and we have recognized that fact in the alliance for progress, but it is equally true that the other countries in the hemisphere also have responsibilities to their own people and to each other including the United States.

With specific reference to Mexico, events in Cuba have had repercussions there as they have in the United States. There is a small but very active minority in Mexico composed almost entirely of Communists and their sympathizers which supports the Castro regime. This is, however, a small factor in the attitude of Mexico toward the United States. The Mexican attitude is determined more by the long history of relations between the United States and Mexico and Mexico's own revolution which kept that country in turmoil from 1910 until the late 1920's. The current concern in the hemisphere with the unhappy events in Cuba and the public debate of them in Mexico has inevitably resulted in a discussion of United States-Mexican relations. Some Mexicans mistakenly view the Cuban revolution as a repetition of their own historical experience and therefore are favorably predisposed toward efforts to stir up anti-American sentiment in Mexico. These efforts have had some success, but we are confident that Mexico's firm attachment to the fundamental principles of democracy and its strong ties with the United States will assert themselves. Certainly, as most thoughtful Mexicans believe, the Castro revolution has nothing to offer Mexico and, as the Mexican Foreign Minister stated at the foreign ministers' meeting in Uruguay, the Marxist-Leninist philosophy of the Castro regime is incompatible with the inter-American system.

With these more general observations, I would like to comment on the specific points in the very thoughtful and constructive letter from Miss Castaños.

I find that tourist booklets are not provided by the U.S. Government but are made available for distribution to passport applicants by the people-to-people program. The Department of State does not have funds available for the procurement of this booklet. There are some 600,000 American tourists who visit Mexico each year. Carrying out the suggestion that a copy be made available to each tourist would involve considerable expense.

It is true that the information and cultural activities of the U.S. Government in Mexico are not as extensive as those of the Soviet Union and its satellites. The U.S. Information Agency has available about $800,000 this fiscal year for a program in Mexico, whereas we estimate that the Soviet Union and its friends are spending in excess of $7 million. This comparison of expenditures should be qualified, of course, by pointing out that there are substantial private activities which support our general beliefs and objectives, but the amount of funds available has meant that we have an extremely limited program in the performing arts. We do have a program with Mexico involving the exchange of both students and professors. We hope that this can be expanded modestly this year, especially in the field of economics.

I trust that the foregoing will provide information with which you will be able to reply to your constituent. I hope that you will not hesitate to write me again if I may be of further assistance.

Respectfully,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Address by Lloyd Godley to Osceola Rotary Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, there has come to my attention a very fine speech delivered to the Osceola, Ark., Rotary Club by Mr. Lloyd Godley, in December of last year. Mr. Godley is a well-known figure in agriculture in my State and a highly respected citizen of northeast Arkansas. His speech is a cogent statement of several propositions which are very basic to our democracy, and I commend it to my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Godley's speech as it appeared in the Osceola Times be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GODLEY SPEAKS ON GOVERNMENT TO ROTARY

(By Lloyd Godley)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following talk was given by Lloyd Godley, manager of the Planter's Production Credit Association, at a meeting of the Osceola Rotary Club a week ago. To insure clarity the article is being printed in full.)

Government is an institution peculiar to the human specie. Without government, life for us would be one of existence only as lower animals live.

The Government of the United States of America, conceived and developed in the spirit of the Judaeo-Christian religion, is the modern wonder of the world. It has the imperfections that the masses of our people have, because it is subject to the will of the people.

It has all the character of the leaders we select because it is they who enact our laws, pass judgment upon our conduct, and administer the affairs of State.

It is true that our Government and our form of government has now, and has always had, enemies within and without.

One hundred years ago the same alarm was sounded against our Government that we so often hear today; yet it still stands like the Rock of Gibraltar.

It is the envy of all the world and the hope of millions throughout the world. Not perfect, but a Government that has all the virtues, and some of the vices, of us all but the virtues constantly subdue the vices because restrained freedom is the mother of virtue, and restrained freedom is the foundation of this great democracy.

We have now, and we have always had, extremists in this country; sometimes misguided, sometimes subversive. Fortunately when an evil becomes rampant it has always been defeated or subdued, either through the efforts of an outraged citizenship or by well-meaning people who supported the evil becoming aware that the evil exists.

Many of us here remember the antics of the Klu Klux Klan shortly after World War I operating under the guise of Americanism its attempt to take the law into its own hands.

Many good men joined without the knowledge that their action was contributing not to Americanism but to a philosophy that had the potential of destroying America's freedom and justice.

We saw the spectacle of the thousand men under the fiery cross being inducted into the KKK on the Dallas fairground.

When the many thousands of good, honest citizens learned the evil nature of the klan, they withdrew their membership and the evil vanished like a June frost and without being forced by major legal action.

We recall the so-called roaring twenties when the bootleggors, kidnapers, and other gangsters almost had control of this great Nation of ours. Finally an enraged citizenship rose up and demanded that the evil be brought under control—and it was.

When Hitler was in his glory, we had his prototype Fritz Kuhn, an American dupe, and the likeness of the Nazi Party in the German American Bund. Since the rise of communism in Russia, we have had a small but extremely subversive Communist Party in this country.

Except in time of war, we have never prevented by law our people joining and participating in the activities of any of these un-American parties or organizations just so long as they do not commit some act of treason.

Despite this freedom of choice, a very small minority of our population has ever joined the extreme left or the extreme right.

You will recall that Hitler called his government a socialist democratic republic. It was not socialistic, it was not democratic, and it was not a republic—it was a vile dictatorship.

The Russian leaders call their Government a federation of socialist democratic states. It is not socialistic, it is not democratic, by the greatest stretch of the imagination, and it is not a federation of states. It is the most evil dictatorship the world has witnessed.

We will recall that Hitler and Stalin, pretending to hate each other's system of government with a passion, joined together in a nonaggression pact, then in true gangster style went to war because each wanted to subvert and exploit Poland.

Names have changed but world conditions have not. Evil still must be held in check and subdued by good.

It may be that it is the destiny of the United States of America, with its religious heritage of freedom and democracy, to keep the torch of liberty burning in the world.

We still have the extreme radical fringe on the right and the extreme subversive fringe on the left. The left is much more dangerous because it is backed by a worldwide conspiracy of communism. But let us remember that Hitler and Stalin joined hands when they thought it to their mutual advantage—so the right and left in this Nation could join if they felt it to their mutual advantage.

Let me say here that we in our zeal to destroy godless communism must not embrace other ideologies that would just as surely destroy our heritage of freedom and democracy.

I recall that some few years ago one of our colleges here in Arkansas, that is rather noted in some quarters as a militant fighter of communism, conducted what it called a Freedom Forum. As the headlined lecturer on that forum they employed one Louie Budenz, an ex-Communist courier and past editor of the Communist Daily Worker—a man who had spent most of his adult life attempting to destroy the freedom of America, and the world. They announced that Hamilton Moses was also a speaker on the same forum.

When I read the announcement of Budenz as a lecturer on this program, I thought, "My God, what are we coming to?" I thought of the contempt we all held in our childhood of Benedict Arnold, the traitor, and here an arch traitor was being invited to lecture our college students on freedom.

This thought came to me: "Judas may have been forgiven for betraying Christ, but most certainly he could never have been classed with Peter or Paul as a crusader for Christianity. Likewise, Louie Budenz should, if he has actually repented, be forgiven for his betrayal of the land that has given him freedom, but he should never be classed along with men like Hamilton Moses as a crusader for freedom, nor should he and his kind be placed in honor before our college youth to lecture on freedom or any other subject. Forgive him yes, but as an example to others who might be tempted to travel his way, let him earn his bread by the sweat of his brow for as long as he may live."

In the guise of protecting freedom, let us not destroy it.

There is a southern editor and publisher, educated in one of our greatest southern universities—at least he went to college there—we doubt if he is educated—who is the darling of certain extreme groups. On a nationwide radio speech he said, "Government is the greatest enemy of mankind." In my opinion, government is one of mankind's greatest blessings. Any government is better than no government.

Those of us who are fortunate enough to live under the Government of the United States of America are blessed perhaps far beyond what we deserve. This includes the above-mentioned gentleman who rants in the press and from the platform as though all men in high places in our Government are traitors and he, alone, has the truth.

It is good for him that he lives in this land of unprecedented freedom. In much of the world he would be in jail or before the firing squad. I do not believe anything that he says, but I would fight for his right to say it, just so long as he does not advocate violent overthrow of our government. Many of us have read with disgust the statement recently made to the President of the United States by a newspaper editor from Dallas. He is a man who had been extended the courtesy of the White House and a conference with the President, a privilege which most of us cannot hope to enjoy.

Here is a man who classes himself a militant advocate of traditionally free America, yet he shows utter contempt for the high office of President which is the very keystone of our great democratic system.

He proved that he is not a gentleman by insulting his host.

He proved that he has little respect for the traditions of this great Nation by his contempt for the high office of President.

He proved his lack of common decency by taking advantage of our freedom of speech to personally insult the President.

How can a man like this through his great newspaper hope to lead public opinion in the right direction when he himself belittles the very fountainhead of our free institutions?

Constructive criticism, yes, but personally insulting the President is not good Americanism.

It is right and proper that we fight communism or any other ism that would destroy our freedom, but it is not right and proper nor is it effective when we in one breath condemn godless communism, and in the next breath condemn without restraint our government and its freely elected officials. How can our children understand what we are fighting against if our free democratic system is not presented to them as something worth fighting and dying for?

They should be taught in the home, the school, and in the church the evils of all dictators, but they should be taught more.

They should be taught that it will become their sacred duty and God-given privilege to freely participate in the election of the President of the United States and all other officials.

They should be taught that under communism the individual is a slave of the state, but that in this free democracy the state exists only to serve the people.

They should be taught that under communism the individual can not freely express his point of view, but that in our democracy, one is free to advocate anything short of forceful overthrow of our Government.

They should be taught that under communism one is not free to advocate his religious belief or to freely worship his God, but that religious freedom is one of the great cornerstones of our democratic system.

They should be taught that no people has ever freely adopted communism and that it has always been imposed and maintained by force.

They should be taught that democracy is always established by the free will of the people and that it is never maintained by force.

They should be taught that the standard of living under communism has never approached, nor perhaps will ever approach, that of our democracy with its free enterprise system.

They should be taught that there is only one political party in a Communist state and that party is the exclusive property of the dictator in power, while here in America we draw our greatest political strength from the vitality of our two great political parties.

Our children should be taught to respect the high office of President, governor and all other public offices.

They should be taught that corrupt officials are the exception, not the rule, and that there is a little or less corruption in ours as there is in any government on earth.

If we fail to install in our children love and respect for their Government, how can we expect to fill our offices both high and low with individuals of superior character and intellect?

A few days ago two great men demonstrated the strength of this country with its two-party system. President Kennedy and General Eisenhower went into New Jersey and New York, each to speak on behalf of the candidate of his political party. A few days later, President Kennedy appointed General Eisenhower to a position of gerat honor and responsibility.

There is something deeply reassuring in this spectacle.

They quietly established before the people this enormous fact, that though this is not an ancient land as ancient lands go, its method of free government is one of the oldest and most powerful successes known to mankind.

The great masses of our people, all of us here, are in the center, neither to the extreme right or to the extreme left.

We have our feet solid on the ground.

We differ to be sure—our great strength is that we are not forced to conform. We criticize when criticism is due, and we applaud when applause is deserved. Changes in our government are orderly, restrained, and are brought about only by the will of the majority.

If we who are living today do our job well, our children, grandchildren, and their children's children, will live in peace and prosperity. If we do our job well, this country with proud continuity of national life will survive, one way or another, no matter how dreadfully dangerous and menacing the outer world may seem.

In this great Nation strong leadership seems to rise when our way of life is most threatened.

No man can be elected President of these United States unless he has within him the spark of greatness, and the awesome burden and responsibilities of that office often fan that spark into a flame of greatness.

Thus we are blessed with great men in the highest office of this land. England in its most trying bomb-wracked period had a slogan—"There will always be an England."

We might paraphrase this and adopt as our national slogan—"There will always be a land of freedom—the United States of America."

Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I received a friendly and candid letter from Robert Sargent Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps, concerning the alleged secrecy of this organization.

Because Mr. Shriver so clearly corrects the misinterpretations of the press, I wish to insert his letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

PEACE CORPS,
Washington, D.C., February 9, 1962.

Hon. FRANCES P. BOLTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. BOLTON: You may have seen the attached editorial which ran in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of January 29. Since the editorial was written without benefit of consultation with anyone at the Peace Corps, I want to take this opportunity to correct the inaccuracies and misinterpretations in it.

In the first place, it is not the purpose or the policy of the Peace Corps to hide reports and records. Quite to the contrary, I doubt there is any other agency of the Government whose record is more open than ours. Anyone who reads the newspapers knows that any mistake we make gets full publicity.

Second, we do not even use top secret or secret—except in response to material so classified which we receive from another department or agency. For example, the Secretary of State or the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation may send material so classified, and in response to it we, of course, honor their intentions. The Peace Corps, however, has never originated secret or top-secret documents or letters. Nor is it our policy to do so.

As for the necessity of classifying certain material "classified" or "for official use only," I am sure you will understand that this is sometimes necessary in the interest of some countries which with the Peace Corps is negotiating a project. During the course of negotiations we respect the desire of those countries to carry on negotiations without public discussion. Once the negotiations have been concluded, however, the agreement is a matter of public record.

The implication in the editorial that Peace Corps volunteers themselves classify material is, of course, absurd. Nor do the Peace Corps volunteers conduct sensitive diplomatic negotiations. We would have been happy to point out these facts to any newsman with the initiative to call.

Our policy has been and continues to be one of freedom of information.

Sincerely,

ROBERT SARGENT SHRIVER, Jr.,
Director.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Jan. 29, 1962]

WHAT'S THE SECRET?

Representative JOHN E. MOSS, Democrat, of California, as chairman of the House Government Operations Committee, has been insisting that the Federal Government should tell the people what's going on. As a foe of the coverup, he uncovered a peach of a case of stupidity recently when he found out the Peace Corps was entitled to classify its documents.

This means the Peace Corps has a Presidential order allowing it to hide reports and records on the ground they are top secret. R. Sargent Shriver, Corps Chief and brother-in-law of the President, had the gall to claim this order was necessary because the corps conducts negotiations with foreign governments.

Nonsense. The Peace Corps is an idealistic organization, mostly of young collegians who aren't quite missionaries, nor are they point 4 engineers. They have volunteered to help underdeveloped countries catch up with the 20th century and the top secret billing is absurd. More power to Representative Moss as he battles to clear away the unnecessary iron curtains in Washington which separate the people from their own Government.

Legislation Introduced for Two Additional Juvenile Court Judges in the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation today that will provide two additional judges for the juvenile court in the District of Columbia. The bill which I have introduced is similar to the proposal which was approved by the Senate last year.

The House is scheduled to consider the measures dealing with the problems facing the juvenile court on Monday, February 26. I hope that at that time the House will approve the legislation which I have introduced today.

I have introduced this measure to add two judges to the juvenile court after a complete discussion with metropolitan area community leaders and a complete study of the various proposals to remedy the problems caused by the huge backlog of juvenile cases. I believe that the

best method of solving this problem is to strengthen the present court rather than transfer its functions to another court.

The current backlog of over 2,000 cases now pending in the juvenile court has provided the District of Columbia with one of its most serious social problems. The approval of this bill would reduce the time between apprehension and trial from 15 weeks to 5 days. The present delay in hearing juvenile cases is one cause of delinquency that can be remeied immediately by the Congress.

The plan which I have introduced is supported by the Judicial Conference of the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Bar Association and the Washington Bar Association as well as many other civic leaders.

Houston Loses Outstanding Civic Leader in Death of Ben C. Belt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the distinguished citizens of our Nation, Mr. Ben C. Belt, of Houston, Tex., has passed from among us. Mr. Belt was one of the Nation's pioneer oilmen. He was an outstanding leader in the business world, and he was highly respected for his willingness to volunteer this leadership ability in behalf of his fellow man. Mr. Belt was a tireless and dedicated worker for such projects as the United Fund, and he was the only man who ever served four terms as president of the Houston Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Belt was chairman of the board of trustees of Saint Thomas University, a member of the lay advisory council of St. Joseph's Hospital, and had served as head of a $5 million building fund campaign for St. Joseph's Hospital.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the following newspaper stories and editorials concerning Mr. Belt:

"Civil Leader Ben C. Belt Dies at 72," from the Houston Press, January 15, 1962; "Ben C. Belt," editorial from the Houston Press, January 16, 1962; "Ben Belt, Civic Leader, 72, Dies," from the Houston Chronicle, January 15, 1962; "Ben Belt, Four Times Chamber of Commerce President, Is Dead at 72," from the Houston Post, January 16, 1962; and "Ben C. Belt Worked for Better City," editorial from the Houston Post, January 16, 1962.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Houston Press, Jan. 15, 1962]

CIVIC LEADER BEN C. BELT DIES AT 72

Ben Carlton Belt, one of the Southwest's greatest pioneer oilmen and a top Houston civic leader for more than a quarter of a century, died of a heart attack in his sleep early today. He was 72.

Mr. Belt, who never had been seriously ill before in his life, apparently had been in excellent health.

He entertained guests until 10:30 last night and went to bed in good spirits.

He was found dead in his bed at 3 a.m. today.

FOUR-TIME CHAMBER OF COMMERCE PRESIDENT

Mr. Belt, a serious, dynamic, hard-working man until the end, made a deep impression on the Houston scene through his many business, scientific, cultural, and social interests.

He was the only man to serve four terms as president of the Houston Chamber of Commerce.

As president of the Houston Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Belt was deeply concerned with Houston's industrial water problems, and it was his leadership that kept legislation from prohibiting Houston to negotiate with the Trinity River Authority for its share of Trinity water.

Houston was able to negotiate with the Trinity River Authority, and last year Houston was awarded a permit and the city and county now are working on plans for a dam.

OTHER INTERESTS

His main interests were air transportation, industrial development, and highway improvement.

Marvin Hurley, executive vice president of the Chamber of Commerce, said of Mr. Belt:

"He was an outstanding citizen in every respect. He devoted himself unselfishly to his church, community, State, and to his industry.

"The Chamber of Commerce, the United Fund, and Texas Research are more effective because of his leadership.

"He was a man of deep conviction, mature judgment, broad vision, and determined application."

NOTED GEOLOGIST

He was known as the father of the great Permian Basin, the bed if immense mineral wealth—oil and potash—that stretches through west Texas and New Mexico.

He knew more about the geology of the Permian Basin than any other man and it was he who outlined the exploration that produced the riches of the west Texas and New Mexico fields.

It was he who brought Gulf Oil Co. into the Permian Basin.

Mr. Belt worked with Underwood Nazro, regarded by many as the greatest oilman who ever lived, when Mr. Nazro was in charge of all oil production for Gulf.

Mr. Belt succeeded Mr. Nazro as head of production for Gulf, retiring in 1954 to go in business for himself. He searched for oil and found it in Mexico, Australia, and much of the southern part of the United States.

UNITED FUND FOUNDER

The 6-foot-2 bushy gray-haired giant was one of the founders of the United Fund and was a volunteer worker in all of its 11 campaigns.

He was a chairman of the board of trustees of the United Fund for two consecutive terms in 1954–55, and was made an honorary lifetime member of the board several years ago.

C. C. Ridge, manager of the United Fund, said:

"I feel that Mr. Belt has made as fine a contribution of service to the community as any other man. He set an example of volunteer leadership that will be hard to replace."

Mr. Belt was president of the Houston Chamber of Commerce from 1955 through 1958—the only man ever to be honored with more than 2 terms in that important post.

PRAISED BY GOVERNOR

A lay leader in the Catholic Church, Mr. Belt was honored in 1958 at a brotherhood banquet of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

Gov. Price Daniel at that dinner said of Mr. Belt:

"In this day when so many minds are centered on science and the secrets of outer space, it encourages me to meet with people who are still concerned with improving our human relationships on this earth."

The son of a farm family near Norman, Okla., Mr. Belt was reared on a farm and attended the University of Oklahoma, where he earned a degree in geology in 1910—one of the first geologists to get his degree from that school.

Highly regarded by A. W. Mellon and all of the Mellon family, Mr. Belt came to Houston with Gulf in 1929. He was vice president of Gulf Oil at the time of his retirement, remained with Gulf as consultant.

He was honored by the Houston Junior Chamber of Commerce at a Ben Belt Day luncheon in 1956, another occasion on which Governor Daniel was a guest to pay tribute to the Houston leader.

That same year Mr. Belt received the Texas Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association's distinguished service award.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE HONORED

During Mr Belt's presidency, the Houston Chamber of Commerce was cited by the United States Chamber of Commerce as having the best program of any city in the United States with a population of more than 200,000.

Mr. Belt raised much money for the support of St. Thomas University and St. Joseph's Hospital. He was chairman of the board of trustees of the school and a member of the advisory council of the hospital.

A GREAT LOSS

His unexpected death shocked many of Houston's top civic leaders, among them P. H. (Perk) Robinson, president of the chamber of commerce and a lifelong friend, who said:

"Ben Belt was one of our truly great civic leaders. He was right in behind everything that was good for Houston, and he always did a tremendous job. His death is a great loss to the community."

The first geologist to put a major oil company in the Permian Basin, Mr. Belt was honored last fall by fellow oilmen at a banquet in Midland.

He was much interested in the Houston Museum of Natural Science, of which he was a board member, and in which he was extremely active.

His interests extended to agriculture and he had a large farm near Athens.

He was a member of the Houston Club, the River Oaks Country Club, the Petroleum Club, the Serra Club, the Houston Geological Society, the American Petroleum Institute, and the American Association of Petroleum Geologists.

He is survived by his widow, Mrs. Ruth Watson Belt; a granddaughter, Cathy Belt Jacob, of Houston; one sister, Mrs. Arthur Snead, of Oklahoma; and one brother, Gregory Belt, also of Oklahoma.

FUNERAL SERVICES

Funeral plans include a parish rosary at 8 p.m. Tuesday, Serra Club rosary at 7 p.m. Tuesday, both at Earthman Chapel; funeral services at 9:30 a.m. Wednesday at Earthman Funeral Home and burial at Calvary Cemetery.

The family has requested that, in lieu of the usual remembrances, contributions be made to the Hodgkin's Disease Memorial Research Center or the Houston Heart Fund.

[From the Houston Press, Jan. 16, 1962]

BEN C. BELT

Ben C. Belt was a do-it-himself-too man of rarest know-how and highest purpose.

People working with him either in private or in public affairs soon learned Ben Belt could do, and would do, anything and everything he was asking them to do, and more. And no big talk about it.

This, in our opinion, was one of the reasons for Mr. Belt's outstanding success in his profession of geology, as a high executive in the oil industry, and in his long and great service to his church, his adopted city and State and his Nation.

It was Ben Belt's trademark to say little of himself, to try his hardest on the task at hand, to get it done in a hurry, and then to give as much credit as possible to his associates.

His sort of unselfish willingness and the automatic challenge to others it carries is the most effective type of leadership.

Like a real good second baseman, he had the knack of making the tough ones look easy. Only Ben Belt and those closet to him knew how much hard work and keen thought went into preparation for those easy jobs.

Born on a farm near Norman, Okla., Mr. Belt was one of the first to take a geological degree from the University of Oklahoma. He roamed the early-day oilfields and prospects of the world—Mexico, Cuba, Australia, and all over the southern United States. When he came to Houston in 1929, he already was a top hand in his profession and industry.

Many high honors were paid him by his industry—before and after his retirement as vice president of Gulf Oil Corp.

The one the oil men of Midland gave him only last year probably meant the most to Ben Belt. They hailed him for his leadership in helping make possible the tremendous development of the huge Permian Basin of west Texas and New Mexico.

Every geologist knew the basin was there. It took the Ben Belt mixture of unremitting work, determination and faith to make it pay off in a big way.

Houston has been blessed with many great civic workers and leaders, most of whom at one time or another served as president of this city's remarkably effective chamber of commerce.

Only Ben Belt ever was elected chamber president 4 consecutively yearly terms.

Only in Ben Belt's tenure did our chamber astonish the business community of the Nation by being twice in those 4 years cited as having the best program of work of any city in the Nation of 200,000 population or more by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

For the records, that alone attests to our city's great loss when Mr. Belt died Monday at 72 years of age, apparently without ever before having had a serious illness. Houston lost much more, though.

It lost a big, breezy and friendly man of incalculable optimism and good cheer.

It lost a hard-driving man who drove himself just as hard for his community as he did for his own business—a man who was a leader even among leaders.

It lost a top-bracket businessman who helped found and sustain our great united fund because of his personal interest in and desire to help the less fortunate.

It lost a plain, devout man who showed his belief in good works in his everyday life.

That kind of man we can only mourn. He cannot be replaced.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Jan. 15, 1962]

BEN BELT, CIVIC LEADER, 72, DIES

Ben C. Belt, 72, who worked so dynamically for Houston's progress that a grateful chamber of commerce elected him president an unprecedented four consecutive terms, died in his sleep early Monday.

Death came from a heart attack at his home, 2414 Rosamond.

He was regarded as one of the Nation's top geologists, but his life included more than his contributions to oil.

MAJOR FORCE

He had been a major force in civic enterprise since he came here in 1929.

He was retired vice president of Gulf Oil Corp., and at his death was a consulting geologist and head of several business firms.

He worked unceasingly for Houston's growth. He was chamber president from 1955 to 1958. No other man had ever served more than two terms.

NOTICED ELSEWHERE

Belt's achievements here did not go unnoticed by other groups either.

On July 16, 1956, the Houston Junior Chamber of Commerce held a Ben Belt Day luncheon. Those paying homage included Gov. Price Daniel, then a U.S. Senator.

In 1958, Belt, a Catholic, was honored at the brotherhood awards banquet of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

HUMAN RELATIONS

In presenting the awards to Belt and the two other recipients, Governor Daniel said: "In this day when so many minds are centered on science and the secrets of outer space, it encourages me to meet with people who are still concerned with improving our human relationships on this earth."

Belt received the Texas Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association's distinguished service awards here in 1956.

In 1955 and 1957, under Belt's guidance, the Houston chamber was cited by the United States Chamber of Commerce as having the best program of work in the Nation among cities of 200,000 population and above.

Belt received a citation from the Lane Bryant Annual Awards in recognition of outstanding community service for 1957.

CHAMBER WORK

Born in Marshall, Mo., Belt graduated from the University of Oklahoma in 1910, searched for oil in many lands: Mexico, Cuba, Australia, and the Southern United States.

FOUND THE OIL

As a geologist, he found oil, plenty of it.

When he retired from Gulf in 1954, after 38 years' service, he opened his own office. Gulf immediately hired him as a consultant in oil exploration. So did the Western Natural Gas Co.

Belt served two terms as chairman of the board of trustees of the United Fund and Community Council of Houston and Harris County.

He was chairman of the board of trustees of St. Thomas University, and was on the lay advisory council of St. Joseph's Hospital. He was a one-time chairman of the Texas Research League.

Belt also headed the $5-million St. Joseph's Hospital building fund campaign, the $500,000 Cenacle Retreat House building campaign, and served as area chairman of the crusade for freedom.

A CLUB MEMBER

He was a member of the Petroleum Club, River Oaks Country Club, Houston Club, Houston Geological Society, American Petroleum Institute, and American Association of Petroleum Geologists.

Funeral services will be held at 9:30 a.m. Wednesday at Earthman Funeral Chapel, 2420 Fannin and at 10 a.m. at St. Anne's Catholic Church, 2140 Westheimer. A Serra Club rosary will be recited at the Earthman Chapel at 7 p.m. Tuesday and the parish rosary at 8 p.m. Tuesday.

Survivors include his wife, Mrs. Ruth Watson Belt; a granddaughter, Miss Cathy Belt Jacob, Houston; a sister, Mrs. Arthur Shead, and a brother, Gregory Belt, both of Oklahoma.

[From the Houston Post, Jan. 16, 1962]

BEN BELT, FOUR TIMES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE PRESIDENT, IS DEAD AT 72

Ben C. Belt, a consulting geologist and four times president of the Houston Chamber of Commerce after he retired as vice president of the Gulf Oil Corp., in 1955, died early Monday in his sleep at his home.

The funeral will be at 10 a.m. Wednesday in St. Anne's Catholic Church, 2140 Westheimer Road. Burial will be in the Garden of Gethsemani.

Belt was 72. He was born in Marshall, Mo., took a degree in geology at the University of Oklahoma in 1910, and worked for several oil companies and as an independent geologist before joining Gulf for the second time in 1925. That was in Fort Worth. He was transferred to Houston in 1929.

His home here is at 2414 Roseamond Street.

The survivors are Mrs. Belt; a granddaughter, Miss Cathy Belt Jacob, of Houston; a brother, Gregory Belt of Norman, Okla., and a sister, Mrs. Arthur Shead of Norman.

Besides serving the unprecedented four terms as president of the chamber of commerce, Belt had been chairman of the Texas Research League, chairman of the board of directors of the United Fund, chairman of the board of advisers of St. Joseph's Hospital and a trustee of the Houston Museum of Natural Science.

He was a member of the American Petroleum Institute, the Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, the American Association of Petroleum Geologists, and the Houston Geological Society. He was chosen by the distinguished service award committee to receive one of the two 1956 awards for outstanding service to the oil industry.

He was a member of the board of directors of the University of St. Thomas and chairman of the advisory council of the southwest executive development program of the University of Houston. He served on the board of directors of the Petroleum Club. He was also a member of the Serra Club, the River Oaks Country Club, and the Houston Club. He was a director of the Texas Gulf Sulphur Co. and the Texas Western Gas Co.

While with Gulf, Belt had a large part in the development of such oil fields as Thompsons, the huge east Texas field, Yates, Goldsmith, and McElroy in west Texas and Grand Bay, Quarantine Bay, and West Bay in Louisiana. He supervised Gulf's early explorations in the waters of the Continental Shelf offshore from Texas and Louisiana.

Before joining Gulf for the second time in 1925, he had worked for the Mexican Eagle Oil Co. as chief geologist for Mexico and Cuba, as manager of the Pantepec Oil Co. in Tampico, as an exploratory geologist for the Vacuum Oil Co. in Australia and New Zealand, then briefly in Houston for Vacuum.

Belt saw some rough times in Mexico when he was working there during the revolutionary years between 1910 and 1914 and again during the boom days at Cushing, Okla., and Ranger, Tex. Friends said he seldom got upset.

There will be two rosaries for Belt at the Earthman Funeral Home Tuesday, by the Serra Club at 7 p.m. and by St. Anne's parish at 8 p.m.

[From the Houston Post, Jan. 16, 1962]

BEN C. BELT WORKED FOR BETTER CITY

The death of Ben C. Belt takes from the scene a man who worked long and tirelessly for the betterment of Houston. His many activities included 4 years' service as president of the Houston Chamber of Commerce.

He was born April 9, 1889, at Marshall, Mo., grew up in Oklahoma, and came here to live in 1929. He was a geologist by profession, and he spent many years hunting for oil in Oklahoma, Louisiana, Texas, Mexico, and Australia. Most of his career was spent with the Gulf Oil Corp. At the time of his retirement in 1955 he was vice president for the corporation's Houston division.

He served as president of the chamber of commerce for the years 1955 through 1958. He also served as a director of the United Fund.

Belt was a longtime advocate of an adequate surface water supply for Houston's

future and had his hope realized in 1958 when the Trinity River program was developed. In 1956 he had strongly urged that the city acquire rights to the Trinity River source. He argued that Houston was in danger of losing industrial potential if it did not find a good supply of water to make industrial expansion possible.

During the years he was associated with Gulf, Belt actively participated in the development of such well-known oilfields as Thompson's and Stowell in the Gulf coast area, the great East Texas field, the Yates, Goldsmith, and McElroy fields in west Texas, and the Grand Bay, Quarantine Bay, and West Bay fields of Louisiana. About the only place where his search for oil was fruitless was Australia.

For his many services to the community, the people of Houston owe a debt of gratitude. His death will be mourned by the many who knew and loved him.

Homeowners Deserve a Much Better Plan Than the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, our homeowners deserve a much better plan than the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing sponsored by President Kennedy.

I am intensely interested in legislation which will help cities combat blight and enable the Federal Government to gain more tax revenue thereby over the long run.

The spreading blight of urban decay and obsolenscence is far outrunning the ability of cities and the Federal Government to deal effectively with the problems involved.

I am not in favor of the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing because it would simply increase the huge sums now devoted to grandiose city-beautiful schemes involving yacht basins, luxury apartments starting at $325 a month, parking lots at public expense disguised as slum-clearance programs, and downtown renewal schemes costing hundreds of millions of dollars.

Three - hundred-and-twenty-five-dollar-a-month luxury apartments are being provided in the Southwest urban renewal project, in Washington, D.C., in which the Federal Government has an investment of more than $70 million.

Parking lots requiring the destruction of houses which would cost up to $50,000 to $75,000 each to replace are planned in the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project area. If there is one shred of evidence that 16th Street, Columbia Road, Lanier Place, and the Kalorama Triangle are slum areas—as claimed by the National Capital Planning Commission, and the Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia—then it should be brought forward for the entire Nation to examine.

Urban renewal schemes for the renovation of the Georgetown area of Washington, D.C., have been in the news for months. Georgetown is one of the most expensive areas in the entire country to live in. If it is a slum then this is news to its inhabitants.

These are the kind of plans which have gotten the administration's plans for a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing into trouble.

There are much better plans available.

President Eisenhower's Urban Renewal Commissioner, David M. Walker, once said that he firmly believed that tax considerations can stimulate a new industry of home improvements and repair, and that the Treasury, over the long run, would gain more revenue than it would lose.

Mr. Walker considered decay and obsolesence of American cities one of our Nation's most serious domestic problems.

Among other things, Mr. Walker recommended that first, homeowners be allower to deduct repair and maintenance expenses in the same way landlords can at the present time, and, second, individuals who are property owners be allowed to depreciate the cost of home improvements more rapidly as an incentive to home restoration and remodeling.

I have today introduced legislation which would provide individuals with an itemized income tax deduction for depreciation of their residences. Present law only permits a deduction for depreciation of property used in a trade or business or held for the production of income. These present deductions, which both individuals and corporations can take, are not changed by my new bill.

The National Association of Home Builders supports the depreciation approach embodied in my bill. In fact, the statement of policy for 1962 of the National Association of Home Builders, item IX, reads:

> The annual depreciation in a home, through use, should be recognized by annual income tax deduction. We urge that homeowners be allowed to deduct annually an allowance for depreciation.

Ours is a representative form of government. The Congress has shown that there is little support for President Kennedy's plan to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

If the President really believes in representative government then he should look into proposals such as the one I am introducing today. Certainly it is a plan which would be highly popular with all Americans.

More than 60 percent of American householders now own the homes they live in. My bill would greatly encourage homeownership.

There is nothing which would better demonstrate to the world the desirability of the American system over the Communist system than the proof that all of its citizens are homeowners.

The need for some recognition in the tax law of the wear and tear and obsolescence of a family dwelling has been obvious for some time. When a home is sold at a profit, taxable capital gain is realized; a loss is not recognized. A half-way step to alleviate the tax problem of the homeowner was taken in 1951 when a provision was added to the law postponing the tax on the gain produced by sale of a residence if a new residence is purchased or constructed by the homeowner within a specified period of time and if the new residence costs as much as the sales price of the old one. However, the tax on the gain was only postponed by the 1951 provision; it will be taxed if the homeowner sells his residence without buying or building a new one of equal or greater value, and the provisions of this bill would not affect either the postponement or the ultimate taxability. As a matter of fact, since the depreciation deduction would reduce the tax basis, the ultimate capital gain subject to tax could only be increased.

Each homeowner would be permitted to deduct an amount each year computed by taking into account the cost—or other basis of the property—the useful life, and the salvage value of the property. If the residence were acquired by gift or by bequest, then the cost to the donor or decedent would be the basis of the property for depreciation. The useful life and the salvage value shall be matters subject to proof by the taxpayer, but the Internal Revenue Service will publish regulations to provide minimum reasonable allowance.

If in any year a homeowner declined to take the itemized deduction for depreciation, electing rather the standard deduction, then the basis of the property would still be reduced by the amount allowable to him. Likewise, the cost basis of a residence for the first year when a deduction is allowable, 1962, will be adjusted downward to take into account actual wear and tear sustained by the homeowner prior to that year.

A person has to be a homeowner to qualify for this deduction; a person renting his home will not receive the benefits quite correctly, since he has no capital investment in the property and loses nothing through wear and tear or obsolescence. A person holding the property for life, however, would be entitled to the deduction. Of course, equitable ownership, though the property is subject to a mortgage or deed of trust, will qualify for the deduction.

The text of my new bill, which carries out the policy of the National Association of Home Builders, follows:

H.R. —

Bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a depreciation deduction for the wear and tear of real property used as the taxpayer's principal residence

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to additional itemized deductions for individuals) is amended by redesignating section 217 as section 218 and by inserting after section 216 the following new section:

"SEC. 217. DEPRECIATION OF RESIDENCE.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—There shall be allowed as a depreciation deduction in the case of a taxpayer who is an individual a reasonable allowance for the exhaustion, wear and tear (including a reasonable allowance for obsolescence) of property owned by him and used as his principal residence.

"(b) PROPER METHOD.—The term 'reasonable allowance' as used in subsection (a)

shall include (but shall not be limited to) an allowance computed in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, under the straight line method.

"(c) BASIS FOR DEPRECIATION.—The basis on which exhaustion, wear and tear, and obsolescence are to be allowed shall be the adjusted basis provided in section 1011 for the purpose of determining the gain on the sale or other disposition of such property, except that (1) the basis of a residence or any part thereof acquired from a decedent within the meaning of section 1014(b), or acquired by gift, shall be the same as it would be in the hands of the decedent or the donor, as the case may be, or the last owner by whom it was not acquired from a decedent or by gift, and (2) the basis, however determined, shall be reduced by an adjustment for exhaustion, wear and tear, and obsolescence to the extent sustained prior to January 1, 1962, either by the taxpayer or any decedent or donor with respect to whose basis the taxpayer's basis is determined.

"(d) OWNERSHIP.—For the purpose of applying subsection (a), a principal residence shall be deemed owned by the taxpayer if legal or beneficial ownership of the property is in the taxpayer. In the case of property held by one individual for life with remainder to another individual, the deduction shall be computed as if the life tenant were the absolute owner of the property and shall be allowed to the life tenant. In the case of property held in trust or in an estate, the depreciation deduction under this section shall be allowed to the individual who by the terms of the trust instrument, will, or law of succession is permitted to occupy the property and who, in fact, uses the property as his principal residence."

(b) The table of sections for such part VII is amended by striking out

"SEC. 217. CROSS REFERENCES."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"SEC. 217. DEPRECIATION OF RESIDENCE.
"SEC. 218. CROSS REFERENCES."

(c) The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Estonian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the year 1918 saw the end of the bloodiest and costliest war the world had known until that time. Belligerents and neutrals alike were glad to see that human carnage stop and they all welcomed the return of peace. To some people 1918 ushered in a new era; it brought them a prize for which they had been fighting for generations and even for centuries. In that year they regained their national independence and freedom. Estonians were among these people.

The Estonian people had settled in their historic land long before our era. There in a northerly outpost of Europe they led a quiet and contented, but strenuous and hardy life. They constituted one of the smallest and most homogenous ethnic groups in Europe, seldom numbering more than 1 million souls. But they succeeded in maintaining their national identity, their distinct national traits and characteristics, and their love for freedom. In the year 1710 their country was overrun by the Russians and they were forced to accept the autocratic regime imposed upon them. For more than 200 years they lived under Russian oppression and they never liked it. Their chief desire during all that time was to be free, but they were unable to attain their freedom without help from others. Events in the course of the First World War worked in their favor. When the czarist regime in Russia was overthrown, that Government's rule over other nationalities was shattered. Then Estonians felt free, and on February 24 of 1918 they proclaimed their independence.

That was exactly 44 years ago, and unfortunately the new and independent Estonia born on that day ceased to exist very early in the last war. Since then unhappy Estonians are suffering under Communist totalitarianism, but their hope for freedom and their desire for independence is not diminished. These ideals still live in their hearts and minds; and they still cling to them as steadfastly as did their forefathers while suffering under czarist oppression. Their friends join them in the celebration of the 44th anniversary of their independence day and hope that they will again attain their cherished goal, freedom and independence.

Urban Cabinet Post Faces Fight in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial from the Modesto, Calif., Bee in support of the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs.

Although the Congress yesterday saw fit to defeat this reorganization, the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing is so important that I feel confident it will be established in the not too distant future.

Following is the text of the editorial:

URBAN CABINET POST FACES FIGHT IN CONGRESS

President John F. Kennedy in his state of the Union message to Congress renewed his request for a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing to prevent further deterioration of the cities which he termed America's glory but sometimes America's shame.

Notwithstanding the President's strong case for such a Department to coordinate programs for urban renewal, improved housing, better mass transit, aid to airports, hospitals and transportation, and attacks on crime, delinquency, and slums, the proposal faces a bitter fight in Congress.

Opposition to the Department is coming from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers and the National Association of Real Estate Boards, as well as from many Republican and southern Congressmen.

Some of the points of the opposition must be assayed by the public as to whether they are excuses or valid reasons. Southern dissent is based at least in part on the reports that Robert C. Weaver, a Negro, would be the first Secretary of Urban Affairs, although some of this has been undercut by more recent speculation that Weaver would succeed Abraham Ribicoff as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare if the latter should retire to run for the Senate.

Also the fear has been raised that under a Department of Urban Affairs the Government's home financing programs might be reduced—or subjected to antidiscrimination regulations. On these the President needs to spell out his policies unequivocally.

It also will be necessary to overcome the indifference or open antagonism of Congressmen from predominantly rural districts and this could be done partially by pointing out that 203 of the 483 localities now sharing in the urban renewal program have fewer than 50,000 population.

The overweening point is that if the Government is to be representative of the people it must give recognition to the urban areas which have 7 out of every 10 Americans and may have the Nation's biggest and most pressing problems.

The Resurgence of Anti-Semitism in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, in recent articles appearing in the New York Times and in the New York Herald Tribune I have read with keen interest and a deep sense of personal distaste of the resurgence of anti-Semitism in Russia. This anti-Semitism is a milder form than that which existed in the days of the pogroms. Jews are not being executed or shipped off to Siberia, but nonetheless anti-Semitism in a more subtle but vicious form is prevalent in many parts of the Soviet Union today.

Nine years ago on the floor of this House I spoke out against the brutal Soviet policy of anti-Semitism which then existed in Russia and I do so again today. I believe it is my duty to speak out here on behalf of these oppressed people to once again ask that action be taken to place this country on record as opposing this evil.

I think the remarks that I made 9 years ago are just as pertinent today. At that time I said:

I am gravely concerned and deeply shocked at the wave of anti-Semitism in Russia. The General Assembly of the United Nations has convened again. As a Member of Congress, I strongly urge that the United States, through its delegates to the United Nations, take speedy action to bring these Communist outrages against the Jews before the United Nations to help stop these inhuman acts which are so patently a violation of fundamental human rights.

We must immediately denounce growing anti-Semitism in the Communist world and see that the free governments

and the United Nations vigorously protests against it. The persecution and killing of Jewish people behind the Iron Curtain are part of the planned Communist campaign to enslave the entire free world. The Soviet Union must not be permitted to carry out their horrible practices as Hitler did. The free world must never forget the merciless slaughter of 6 million Jews by Hitler and his Nazi henchmen.

The Kremlin's assault and persecution of the Jewish people make it quite clear that the Moscow terror has for its real target the eradication of religion itself. As an American and of Catholic faith, I have always fought against and condemned race hatred and intolerance against minorities. I have always maintained that whenever one religious group suffers persecution, no other religious group is assured of immunity therefrom. When Jewish rights and liberties are trammeled upon, likewise Catholic and Protestant rights and liberties are gravely endangered.

The arrests of Catholic priests and the brutalities inflicted upon them and the grave harm and injustices done to the Catholic Church behind the Iron Curtain are a pattern now extended to the Jewish people. The atrocities committed by Russia against such outstanding prelates of the Catholic Church as Cardinal Mindszenty and Archbishop Stepinac and others have already aroused the conscience of the free world and clearly show that Russia wants to enslave freemen everywhere. The closing of the borders by the Kremlin prevent the Jewish victims from leaving the Iron Curtain to seek shelter and refuge in the democratic State of Israel and elsewhere, and heaps cruelty upon cruelty.

The United States has always been the torchbearer of freedom and democracy. We have been and must continue to be the beacon light in the free world. The moral weight of the United States must be brought to bear against this anti-Semitism by Russia. I firmly believe that the United States and our representatives in the United Nations should strongly condemn the anti-Jewish policy of the Kremlin. I urge that appropriate action be taken forthwith. I am submitting herewith a resolution to the House of Representatives and ask that my distinguished colleagues unanimously join with me in adopting same. The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas the entire free world is deeply concerned over the growing anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the campaign of hate and persecution now being conducted against the Jewish people behind the Iron Curtain is abhorrent to all free peoples and increase the threat to the religious freedom of all free peoples; and

Whereas the people of the United States, true to their tradition and heritage, vigorously condemn bigotry and race hatred and strongly believe in freedom of religion and in all the fundamental rights of man; and

Whereas it is appropriate that the House of Representatives place itself on record by denouncing and opposing the growing anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives hereby expresses its profound sense of indignation and shock at the growing anti-Semitism and the campaign of hate and persecution being conducted against the Jewish people in the Soviet Union.

SEC. 2. (a) The President is requested to convey to the Soviet Union an expression of the grave concern of the people of the United States over this growing anti-Semitism, and to seek assurances that prompt and appropriate action will be taken to stop all forms of bigotry and race hatred against the Jewish people now living in the Soviet Union.

(b) The President is further requested to urge the Soviet Union to allow all Jewish persons within their borders who desire to do so to emigrate and to seek refuge and salvation in Israel and other free lands.

SEC. 3. The President is requested to take all possible immediate steps, through the United States delegation to the United Nations, to bring before the United Nations and before the bar of world opinion the facts about the cruel mistreatment of Jewish people living within the Soviet Union, to the end that such mistreatment shall cease.

Amendment of Juvenile Court Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CARLTON LOSER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia that considered and reported favorably H.R. 6747, amending the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia, I heartily join with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Honorable JAMES C. DAVIS of Georgia, in support of the Juvenile Court Act for the District.

The crimes of violence that have been committed over a period of years by juveniles under the age of 18 is startling. As a matter of fact, between July 1, 1959, and April 1, 1960, there were more crimes committed by juveniles of the ages of 16 and 17 than there were between the ages of 18 and 20.

Mr. Speaker, it is my considered opinion that the District of Columbia Committee has done an outstanding job in reporting H.R. 6747 to the House for its consideration. My experience in the prosecution of criminal cases in Tennessee covers a period of more than a quarter of a century, and as a result of this experience in dealing with crime I have come to a definite conclusion as to the method that should be used in combatting crime. I do not believe there is a greater deterrent to antisocial conduct more effective than the certainty of apprehension, together with a speedy trial and adequate punishment.

Mr. Speaker, I was astounded to learn when I sat in on these hearings that juveniles charged with the crimes of rape and murder under the age of 18 could be tried in a juvenile court. In my State of Tennessee, our juvenile courts have no jurisdiction whatsoever in rape and murder cases, regardless of the age of the accused. Our statute in Tennessee creating the juvenile court specifically provides that persons charged with these serious offenses are to be tried in a court enjoying general jurisdiction in criminal cases.

Mr. Speaker, Judge DAVIS, the subcommittee chairman, has been most diligent in these hearings and I believe that, should H.R. 6747 become the law here in the District, it will operate as a great deterrent.

It is shameful that in the Capital City of the Nation so many crimes of violence have been committed by juveniles that the police department had to issue a set of instructions to Washingtonians who traverse the streets here after dark. The police department even suggested that persons in an automobile who were approached by a suspicious looking person, immediately move off rapidly even if it means running a red light. I was shocked to learn that five women were ravished in 4 days in the middle of 1961 and that four of the rapes were committed within 13 hours. It is a matter of common knowledge that rapes and assaults have been committed in the daytime and at night on the streets and in homes and, upon occasion, even in business establishments.

I believe it would be manifestly in the public interest that the jurisdiction of the juvenile court, in handling youth offenders, should be reduced from 18 to 16 years.

The Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia has an unusually effective leader in Chief Robert V. Murray, and his Department has been doing a splendid job under adverse circumstances. Here in the District we have nearly 3,000 policemen, and 50 police dogs have been secured and trained and are now assisting in patrolling this area.

Mr. Speaker, I am not greatly concerned whether the court hearing juvenile cases is called a juvenile court, or whether it is a branch within the municipal court. What this District needs is an additional judge to promptly hear and determine cases within his jurisdiction. I believe that H.R. 6747, if given a trial, will effectively meet the needs of this community at the present time. If it should develop that additional judges, other than the two provided for in the bill, are needed, the Congress can act promptly on the matter.

Mr. Speaker, suffice it to say that I heartily support the measure, as reported by the District Committee, and hope that it will receive favorable action by the House.

Colonel Glenn's Epochal Flight

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, the heroic flight of Lt. Col. John Glenn on last Tuesday was a monumental achievement

of which America can be justly proud. We can also be proud of the fact that all phases of the project were done openly and with complete publicity. The flight was a triumph not only to Colonel Glenn but also to the scientists, engineers, and technicians who worked on the project.

Colonel Glenn has the admiration of all of us, not only because of his patience and steady nerves in the face of many postponements, but also because of his complete mastery of his vehicle in space and his splendid demeanor after the successful conclusion of his flight.

We give thanks for Colonel Glenn's safe return, and we are also tremendously grateful for the very definite knowledge that his epochal flight gave to us as this Nation moves ever further into the conquest of outer space.

There is little more that I can add to what has already been said in praise of this wonderful American. As long as we have men like him in this great country of ours, we need never fear for its future.

Fort Worth Lions and Lions International Build Bridge of Good Will With Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, through broad press coverage, our national efforts to improve and expand good relations with other countries are generally known to the public. Often, the results are weighed against the cost in the formation of public opinion concerning these efforts at international good will.

However, the Fort Worth Lions Club, in the finest tradition of Lions International, has demonstrated how private citizens acting under wise leadership can accomplish great things in the way of international good will and fellowship.

Recently, the Fort Worth Lions Club arranged to be host to 20 Monterrey, Nuevo Leon, Mexico Lions and their wives, and assisted the visiting citizens of Mexico in arranging a tour of many other Texas cities. Other Lions organizations participated in a grand Texas welcome to the visitors.

Bill Turner, now president-elect of the Fort Worth Lions Club, was one of those acepting a major responsibility in arranging a highly efficient and effective reception for the visitors to Texas. His work exemplifies what a private citizen can do in extending a friendly hand across a national boundary.

Previously, the Fort Worth Lions Club members had visited Monterrey and the visit of the citizens of Mexico to Texas was a return of friendship and hospitality.

No amount of national diplomacy can have the impact for good that stems from these exchanges of good fellowship between friendly, informed people with a common bond like that provided by Lions International.

To illustrate the effectiveness of such good will programs, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD today, an article, entitled "Brothers of the Border," from the February 1962 edition of The Lion:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROTHERS OF THE BORDER

From the moment the 20 Monterrey, Nuevo Leon, Mexico Lions and their wives crossed the border into the United States, the welcome for them was warm, continuous, and sometimes bewildering.

As Prof. Manuel Flores Varela, immediate past president of the Monterrey club and Lieutenant Governor of the Mexican State of Nuevo Leon, put it: "We feel a little embarrassed to have so many fine attentions * * *" Half the Lions couldn't speak English, but enthusiastic greetings bridged the language gap, and friendship solved the border differences.

Such open-armed reception was understandable. The delegation from Monterrey represented the world's largest Lions Club (830 members). It was repaying a visit made to Monterrey by Fort Worth club members a year ago, and the Texan inclination for bigness has international renown.

A full month's planning had gone into making sure that the Mexican Lions' whirlwind weekend bus tour of Texas cities would run smoothly. Bill Turner, vice president of the Fort Worth Club, sent a raft of letters and made numerous phone calls to untangle procedural paperwork. City officials and police departments in Texas were contacted so that the Monterrey bus would not be hindered in any way. A detailed itinerary for the visiting Mexican Lions had to be worked out, then checked with Monterrey President Roberto G. Cantu. U.S. Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON, and Texas Gov. Price Daniel sent their blessings on the project.

So as soon as the delegation stepped across the border at Laredo, Tex., late one Thursday morning, there was a welcoming party of Fort Worth Mayor John Justin, Jr., Bill Turner, and R. H. Coquat, past president of the Encinal, Tex., Lions Club. Mayor Justin presented President Cantu with a glass-framed proclamation designating the following day, a Friday, as Monterrey Day, the first time that Fort Worth has bestowed such an honor on a foreign city.

With the opening ceremonies over, the Monterrey Lions boarded their chartered bus for the 400-mile trip to Fort Worth, led out of Loredo by a siren-sounding police escort. At each major city along the route—San Antonio, Austin, Waco, and Hillsboro—other police waited to make way for the Mexican visitors through teeming metropolitan traffic. (Only at West, Tex., just south of Fort Worth, did the careful planning hit a snag: A siren sounded, this time by a highway patrolman who stopped the bus to give the driver a ticket—later canceled—for speeding.)

Once in Fort Worth, the big doings really started. Late that night there was a reception given for the Monterrey Lions by the host club to renew acquaintances. Early next morning, they boarded their bus for a tour of the city (zoo, aircraft plant, art museum) with Fort Worth Lion Sam Silva as guide and interpreter.

Lunch that day was in the old western U.S. tradition with a special Texas touch—a barbecue on the 30th floor of a newly completed office building.

Coming down into their hotel lobby that evening, the Mexican Lions got a booming welcome from the 45-piece Lions Club Band of Greater Fort Worth. Then there was a reception in the home of Fort Worth past President Raymond Nichols, who had led the Texas visit to Monterrey. At a dinner dance that night in a fashionable country club, Lion Tommy Thompson, a city councilman, capped off the long Fort Worth greeting by presenting Monterrey President Cantu with an honorary citizenship plaque.

Early the next day, Saturday, the Fort Worth Lions made their goodbyes to the Monterrey Lions and turned them over to their next hosts, the Dallas and Dallas (Central) clubs. Dallas Mayor Earle Cabell was on hand for the official welcome that started the festivity-filled tour of that city. There were more receptions, a tour of Southern Methodist University, and a visit to an amusement park.

By the time the Monterrey Lions were homeward bound on Sunday, they had enjoyed more than a weekend's worth of happy activity. But more important than the activities themselves was the exchange of good feeling which the visit made possible. As the Dallas Lions saw it: "In times like these when international relations elsewhere in the world are tense, it is a distinct pleasure to extend again the hand of friendship to our long-time friends across the border."

Answered Mexican Consul Samuel M. Pereyra in a letter to Fort Worth President Grady H. Helm: "What your Lions Club did for these fellow citizens of mine is the greatest thing that I have ever witnessed. * * * I cannot find the words to tell you how much we of the Mexican Government appreciate this effort on your part except to say 'Thanks.'"

You Fear the Least What You Know the Most About

SPEECH

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, millions upon millions of Americans and friends of this country are rejoicing in the superb achievement of an American test pilot. The mass media have been describing to us both the fantastic details of Colonel Glenn's 81,000-mile trip and the tremendous wave of worldwide approbation which has followed that flight. We rejoice in his safety and have united to honor the steadfast courage and skill which enabled him to achieve for us and for the free world this signal advance.

We would find it difficult to express our pride in John Glenn and the NASA, however, without observing that it is due as well to the thousands of other skilled hands and minds which made the flight possible. For example, approximately 15,000 scientists, technicians, engineers, administrators, and factory workers, labored for as much as 4 years in the development and manufacture of the Mercury space capsule alone in a program directed by the McDonnell Aircraft Corp., and involving 4,000 subcontractors and suppliers throughout the country. Without the educated brainpower which this program represents, Tuesday's achievement could never have been. Nor would it have been attempted

without such other necessary systems as the complex global tracking network created by the NASA through the Western Electric Co. and four other private corporations with help from the Lincoln Laboratory of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

In short, then, what Colonel Glenn's flight represents is a mutual effort of the several branches of American life in a pooling of scientific know-how. It is beyond question a tribute of the highest order to American educational achievement.

It is not a final tribute, however; more remains to be done. We remember that the Soviets have launched and recovered a manned spacecraft weighing more than twice as much as the *Friendship 7*, remaining in orbit for a considerably greater length of time, and effecting a return on land. As President Kennedy observed on Tuesday, we have a long way to go in this space race. We started late.

In this and in so many areas, however, we shall move forward confidently, at a rate largely dependent upon the earnestness with which we support and further American education.

Important decisions determining our support of that education will rest with this body. I am deeply hopeful that we shall not evade our most serious responsibilities. In a letter from a hero whose birthday we celebrate today, the first President of this Nation, we find a timely reminder:

> If there cannot be money found to answer the common purposes of education it is evident that there is something amiss in the ruling political power.

If there is another hero of the day—and there is indeed—it is Col. John Glenn. It seems appropriate in several ways to quote him too. This recent observation, offered in the context of his courageous undertaking, is no less profound a comment on the goals of American education: "You fear the least what you know the most about."

There is much to know in this day of scientific revolution; and sometimes we may think that there is much to fear. On Tuesday millions of Americans stopped work to listen to news of the magnificent flight. Among them were millions of school children, into whose classrooms the radio coverage was broadcast. To them especially was this triumph of enormous significance. It is in those classrooms and the classrooms to come that such children will be offered—or not offered—worthy introduction to the mysteries of the many broadening fields of knowledge, including space science, into which they will be called. It is there that such education, if we offer it will afford them the thorough knowledge that dispels fear and makes possible the kind of magnificent and courageous achievements which we have seen exemplified this week.

Colonel Glenn has moved us forward at the same time that he has called us back to ourselves, reminding us of what can be accomplished through the American brand of education. I join my colleagues and countless others in offering him and his fellow discoverers my sincere admiration and gratitude.

Difference Between a Republic and a Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George Todt discusses the difference between a republic and a democracy in his column which appeared in the February 13, 1962, issue of the Los Angeles Herald Examiner. Believing that my colleagues in Congress will benefit from reading Mr. Todt's column, I ask that it be printed in the appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

WHAT IS A REPUBLIC?

(By George Todt)

"It is of great importance in a republic not only to guard against the oppression of its rulers, but to guard one part of society against the injustice of the other part."—Alexander Hamilton, the Federalist.

Are some of us confused about the difference between a republic and a democracy? What is it, then? Who knows the correct answer? Let's analyze some facts without emotion today.

In order to furnish my readers with light instead of heat, I went back a bit in historical times—just 33 years ago to be exact—and came up with some excerpts from a book officially compiled and issued by the U.S. War Department.

It set forth exact and truthful definitions of a democracy and of a republic, explaining the difference between both.

Under the heading "Citizenship," let's see what TM-2000-25 (published by U.S. War Department, Washington, November 30, 1928) had to say about this by now controversial matter:

"Democracy: (118-120).

"A government of masses.

"Authority derived through mass meeting or any other form of 'direct' expression.

"Results in mobocracy.

NEGATES PROPERTY

"Attitude toward property is communistic—negating property rights.

"Attitude toward law is that will of the majority shall regulate, whether it be based upon deliberation or governed by passion, prejudice, and impulse, without restraint or regard to consequences.

"Results in demagogism, license, agitation, discontent, anarchy.

"Republic: (120-121).

"Authority is derived through the election by the people of public officials best fitted to represent them.

"Attitude toward property is respect for laws and individual rights and a sensible economic procedure.

"Attitude toward law is the administration of justice in accord with fixed principles and established evidence, with a strict regard to consequences.

AVOIDS EXTREMES

"A greater number of citizens and extent of territory may be brought within its compass.

"Avoids the dangerous extreme of either tyranny or mobocracy.

"Results in statesmanship, liberty, reason, justice, contentment, and progress.

"Is the standard form of government throughout the world.

("A republic is a form of government under a constitution which provides for the election of (1) an executive and (2) a legislative body, who working together in a representative capacity, have all the power of appointment, all power of legislation, all power to raise revenue and appropriate expenditures, and are required to create (3) a judiciary to pass upon the justice and legality of their governmental acts and to reorganize (4) certain inherent individual rights.

"Take away any one or more of those four elements and you are drifting into autocracy. Add one or more to those four elements and you are drifting into democracy.")

—(Atwood.)

"121. Superior to all others:

"Autocracy declares the divine right of kings; its authority cannot be questioned; its powers are arbitrarily or unjustly administered.

"Democracy is the direct rule of the people and has been repeatedly tried without success.

"Our constitutional fathers, familiar with the strength and weakness of both autocracy and democracy, with fixed principles definitely in mind, defined a representative republican form of government. They 'made a very marked distinction between a republic and a democracy . . . and said repeatedly and emphatically that they had founded a republic.'"

The quotes above in parentheses inside TM (Training Manual) 2000-25 are from "The Constitution of the United States" by Harry Atwood.

There has been a steady attempt over the past three decades to erode our concept of what a constitutional republic really means to us.

Let's consider the matter factually, not in the light of partisan politics. This has nothing to do with the Democrat or Republican party as such.

Every good American should be for our constitutional Republic.

Democrats as much as Republicans, too.

Telegram Sent to Colonel Glenn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, as an American, as well as chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, I join my fellow countrymen in being filled with exhilaration and pride at the accomplishment of American science in developing the know-how to achieve greatness in the exploration of outer space.

As an engineer by profession, I am desirous of pointing out to my colleagues that America's great triumph in space technology came during National Engineers' Week.

In view of this fact, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a telegram sent by Mr. Murray Wilson, president of the National Society of Professional Engineers, to Lt. Col. John H. Glenn congratulating our astronaut on his momentous flight:

FEBRUARY 20, 1962.

Lt. Col. JOHN GLENN,
Project Mercury Headquarters,
Cape Canaveral, Fla.:

Your historic orbital flight will be recorded as a milestone in American engineering and technology. It was a splendid personal achievement, and an outstanding example of teamwork involving industry, Government

agencies, the military services, and research and development in many diverse fields. We of the engineering profession feel that it is indeed fitting that the Nation's first orbital flight should be accomplished during National Engineers' Week, an annual tribute to U.S. engineering knowledge and skill.

MURRAY WILSON,
President, National Society of Professional Engineers.
WASHINGTON, D.C.

A Tribute to William Holsinger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with a real feeling of privilege that I speak today on behalf of the Ohio Republican delegation of the 87th Congress, to pay tribute to one of the unusually consecrated and loyal citizens of our free America, Col. H. William Holsinger. I am particularly happy to do this today because February 22, is the birthday of Bill Holsinger. Meeting together, the Republican men of Ohio asked me to speak for them, as I do for myself in extending birthday greetings and saying "thanks for a job well done."

On December 20, 1961, H. William Holsinger retired as manager of the Cleveland, Ohio, Regional Office of the Veterans' Administration. Col. Bill Holsinger has "stacked arms" and is now beginning to enjoy the luxury of a life without schedules or deadlines. His stern Pennsylvania-Dutch heritage would not consider such a light hearted way of life until all parts were neatly cleaned up and stored away in their proper niche. Now that is done—and with the same zeal he applied to his life of service—he is embarking on his leisure years.

William Holsinger, born on February 22, 1900, is a lineal descendant of a family with their roots deep in the soil of America. Early immigrants to William Penn's colony along the eastern seaboard and then service in the Colonial Army during the Revolutionary War is typical of the heritage bestowed on him by his forebears. Each conflict found a member of the Holsinger family enrolled in the ranks and several battlefield crosses exemplify their ultimate sacrifice. Late in World War I, young Bill Holsinger, true to his lineage, volunteered for service. An early cessation of hostilities terminated his active service in that conflict but it did not quench the inner fire of service to his country.

In the early twenties, after moving to Ohio, he joined the Ohio National Guard and shortly after became the bugler for Gen. (then colonel) Ludwig Connelly of the 145th Infantry.

This recognition of his musical ability was no coincidence. The innate love of the silver-tipped notes of the cornet had appealed to Bill very early—and with his usual perseverance—he became the master of this musical instrument at an early age. To this day—hundreds of miles are but minutes away if there is a military band concert to be heard upon arrival. If he is more attentive to the trumpet section—and nods approvingly after the spirited passages of Sousa's "Stars and Stripes Forever"—it is truly the accolade of one of the finest—for Bill did play cornet under the March King, John Philip Sousa.

A graduate of the University of Akron in 1924 and Cleveland Law School in 1927, Bill Holsinger taught and coached athletes for several years before entering the practice of law.

In the early thirties he became one of the young trial attorneys in the U.S. District Attorney's Office for Northern District of Ohio. Following this he went to other positions of trust in public service, in the city of Cleveland, and the State of Ohio. During these important early years of his career—he still gave unstintingly of himself to community and charity work.

Following Pearl Harbor, Lt. William Holsinger, Infantry, ORC, again volunteered to serve his country in an emergency. He was called to active duty and immediately put in counter-espionage duty in the highly industrialized Ohio River Valley. His ability was soon recognized and when the Army organized their first CIC School in Chicago in 1942, Lieutenant Holsinger was on the faculty and soon became the Assistant Commandant of that school.

While a good soldier and willing to perform his assignment, Bill wanted to get to a combat zone. Soon he was en route to the Philippines with the 80th (Wildcat) Infantry Division where he shortly entered into combat. His early training as a young Infantry officer was soon to exact its toll when the repeated firings of the heavy 80-mm. mortar in combat began to affect his hearing. Shortly thereafter he joined the 11th Airborne Division for its occupation duty in northern Japan but this was not to last long.

With the Allied decision to prosecute those guilty of war crimes, Major Holsinger was summoned for duty as executive officer of the Judge Advocate's Section of Gen. Douglas MacArthur's Supreme Allied Command Headquarters in the Far East. Because of his earlier training in the U.S. district attorney's office, and his capacity for thoroughly building his cases, he established an enviable reputation in this position and upon his departure was awarded the Army Commendation Medal.

With World War II and the war crimes trials behind him, Bill decided that he and his lovely wife Maude, whom he married on August 30, 1930, would travel a bit before he resumed his practice of law. His intentions were of the best but his ancestry was not to be denied. Soon he was deeply engrossed in his practice and a greater demand for his services in the community caused the cancellation of these well-laid travel and vacation plans. A short trip to Europe was realized but a return to Japan had to be deferred.

On October 4, 1954, William Holsinger was sworn in as the third manager in the history of the Veterans' Administration regional office at Cleveland, Ohio. He then became responsible for the veterans benefits program for over 750,000 veterans of northern Ohio.

That he was acutely aware of the magnitude of this task was evident 2 days later when he appeared before the Disabled Americans Veterans and pledged himself to serve the veterans and their families of his area 24 hours a day and 365 days a year if necessary to get the job done. He declared an "open door" policy for his office and invited public inspection of any and all parts of the regional office.

Every veterans' organization and their auxiliaries in Ohio soon had the opportunity of hearing this pledge of service repeated at their meetings. Incredulous at first, everyone soon found this dedicated individual meant exactly what he said from their platforms. He was in his office to hear their stories; he took their telephone calls even late at night; he responded to their letters and he appeared at their meetings. He personally set an example of service that very soon infiltrated every work level of the VA regional office.

His vigorous support of the national service officers stationed in the Cleveland regional office brought about a high degree of cooperation with these skilled representatives that made this relationship extremely unusual in VA history. Testimonials of the high regard and esteem which Bill Holsinger engendered from these worthly critics of veteran service were the plaques and honors from every service organization represented in the area of the Cleveland regional office. These were the tributes accorded the man in their midst whom they had adjudged as serving them best.

During Bill Holsinger's tenure as manager of the Cleveland regional office he met with the many changes required of his office, additional responsibilities, revised procedures, mechanization, and, finally, conversion to the automatic data-processing system being introduced into the Veterans' Administration.

As one of the pioneer automatic data processing stations, Cleveland met the problem, met the deadlines and brought distinction to the northern Ohio regional office by mastering this tremendous conversion without one single word of criticism from service organizations, press or radio. Areas of possible trouble had been anticipated and a way to correct the trouble had been devised. A delayed widow's check received important attention and if the delay were unusual—Bill Holsinger's name was on the request to get financial relief to that widow at once. His personal interest in service to our veterans included midwinter inspections of GI home construction; his visits to the campus of Ohio schools and colleges and to night schools; his inspections of the Ohio Soldiers and Sailors Home; his many conferences with probate judges; his attendance at service officer schools, and many other unsung personal efforts which attest to the true dedication of Bill Holsinger in his leadership of the

Cleveland regional office from October 4, 1954, to December 20, 1961.

Now, this kind and understanding citizen, this civilian-soldier, this dedicated American has stacked his weapon, laid aside his pen and with his lifelong helpmate at his side is going to travel and rest, revisit old scenes and renew old acquaintances. It is a well earned and certainly a deserved respite from his busy life of service to his country and his fellow man.

Many of our veterans carry their chins a little higher; many of their families are better cared for; many are better housed and are more responsible citizens because of his personal interest, his unwavering devotion and abiding loyalty to his credo of "Service to those who served."

So to Col. William Holsinger as he enters into his retirement we say: May all your sunsets be glowing red to set you merrily on your way and all of your tomorrows be filled with the joys and pleasures of life which you so diligently earned and so richly deserve. Godspeed and good health.

Rotary's 57th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call attention to the following editorial which appeared today in the Millburn and Short Hills Item, a fine weekly newspaper published in my congressional district.

The editorial salutes the more than 11,000 Rotary Clubs of the world, and their members, on the 57th anniversary of the organization's founding. In placing this tribute to Rotarians before my coleagues, I wish to join the editor of the Item, Mr. Charles E. Paulson, in offering my congratulations to them for the excellent work they have done at the community level throughout the years.

ROTARY'S 57TH ANNIVERSARY

Fifty-seven years ago, when the motorcar still brought cries of "Get a horse" and the airplane could fly for no more than a few minutes, a new kind of club for businessmen was born. It was the Rotary Club and today, in countries around the world, the 57th anniversary of the founding of that club is being celebrated by more than 11,000 Rotary Clubs that have descended from it.

It was in Chicago, on February 23, 1905, that a young lawyer, Paul P. Harris, Rotary's founder, gathered with three business associates and formed the nucleus of the organization which now numbers in its global ranks more than a half million business and professional men—doctors, lawyers, retailers, educators, and hundreds of other representatives of different vocations.

In Millburn, the Rotary Club has 53 members, each selected not only on the basis of his vocation, but also for his interest in serving this community, in raising its standards of business and profesional practices, and in accepting his personal responsibilities for the betterment of human understanding as a means of insuring world peace.

With Rotarians everywhere dedicated to the attainment of these goals, Rotary is conveying its message of service to millions of people and is exerting a tremendous force for the good of all.

For their devotion to the ideal of being throughtful of and helpful to others, we salute Rotarians of the world, and wish them still greater success in their prorgam of service.

The Orlove Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, only Art Buchwald would have the reportorial know-how, plus the good sense and good humor, to uncover the Orlove plan. He even beat J. Edgar Hoover. The article follows:

THE ORLOV PLAN

(By Art Buchwald)

PARIS.—The way for a newspaperman to get reams of mail these days is to write a piece attacking the John Birch Society, General Walker, and any of the extreme rightwing groups which seem to be having a renaissance in the United States.

A recent article suggesting that General Walker look under his bed every night if he wanted to find Communists, brought in the best batch of mail we've had since we wrote that James Whistler was an orphan and painted somebody else's mother.

The letters in their denunciation seemed to follow a pattern and we were quite puzzled by it until by accident we found ourselves in Maxim's sitting next to a Russian named Serge Orlov, who was eating large portions of caviar and drinking vodka.

We got to be friendly and pretty soon, after several vodkas, we asked him what he did.

"I used to be in charge of all Communist subversive activity in the United States," he said.

"You were?" we asked in amazement.

"Yes. Perhaps you have heard of the Orlov plan?"

We admitted we hadn't, though we explained it was because we hadn't kept up much on subversive activities in the United States recently.

"The Orlov plan," he said, swigging down anothed vodka, "was the most masterful subversive plan ever devised in the cold war. I received the Fourth Order of the Lenin Cross for it."

"What was it?" we asked.

"I was in charge of all internal subversion in the United States from 1950 to just a few months ago. For years we had been trying to infiltrate the unions and the liberal groups but we made little headway. We were wasting our time and money. The United States was stronger than ever, its policy toward the Soviets had toughened and little damage was being done to American morale.

"I realized something had to be done. Then I hit upon it. The Orlov plan. The only people willing to wreck the U.S. Government were the extreme rightwing groups. They were being ignored and yet they were the key to all internal subversion. I laid out a plan. I would have my agents organize a program working through the extreme rightwing which would stand the United States on its head:

"First I would get the right wing to accuse Eisenhower of being a Communist. Then I would get them to call their own high Government officials traitors.

"Then I would see that the right wing attacked American United Nations representatives. I also would convince the right wing that Russia didn't have atomic weapons.

"Then I would encourage rumors that every one in the State Department was either a Communist or a homosexual. I gave orders to wreak havoc in the armed services by turning military officers against civilians. I even proposed they impeach Chief Justice Warren, and I laid out different attacks against anyone who advocated better education or health facilities in the United States. And the topper was that anyone who disagreed with this would be accused of being a card-holding Communist.

"When I proposed the plan in Moscow the Kremlin thought I was crazy. But they figured they had nothing to lose. Well, you can see the results for yourself. The seeds of doubt about America are being planted by their own people and we've been making more progress in wrecking the U.S. Constitution in the last few years than my predecessors have been able to do since the revolution."

"Then you mean all these extreme rightwing groups are really Communist dupes?" we asked in surprise.

"Exactly, they're doing the Lord's work for the Soviet Union, and most of them don't even know it."

"But why are you in Paris and why are you telling me all this?" we asked him.

He finished off the bottle of vodka. "Because," he said, "I defected."

"Defected?"

"Yes," he said smiling. "You see, when I proposed the plan to the Kremlin they asked me how much it would cost. I said for a start about a million dollars, which they turned over to me to dispense. Well, what happened was when I got the extreme rightwing groups to help me, I discovered they insisted on putting up their own money. It didn't cost me a dime. And those people are loaded. So I just took the million dollars and deposited it in Switzerland. The Soviets heard about it and I decided I'd better defect. Anyhow, they still call it the Orlov plan. If I hadn't swiped the money, I might have been sleeping next to Lenin one of these days."

Little People to Little People Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, there are many young lads who are anxious to impress the youths of other lands, as to the advantages of American life for teenagers. This situation was brought to the fore, recently, in a program initiated by Master Peter Rodino, son of our illustrious colleague from New Jersey, called little people to little people—a letter-writing crusade for peace through the exchange of correspondence between teenagers of other nations and the children of the United States.

Youth, in its natural simplicity of understanding, is basically dedicated to the simple ideologies of American life. The flourish of empty words, descriptive of

nothing, are strange to their style of writing. Youth sees freedom through every experience. Youth has a sense of ascertaining the real truths of existence.

In most instances where youth has failed to meet the challenges of life, lack of straight adult thinking has been the cause of youth's failures.

We congratulate young Peter Rodino and, of course, he has made his dad very proud. The old adage seems to be the proof in this case, "Like sire, like son."

Medical Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a story by Eve Edstrom, of the Washington Post, regarding a Health, Education, and Welfare progress report on the operation of the Kerr-Mills medical assistance for the aged—MAA—program.

I think this is another indication that the MAA program is not providing effective assistance either in terms of numbers or quality and quantity of service. The article follows:

MEDICAL ASSISTANCE

(By Eve Edstrom)

Ninety-two cents of every $1 being spent on the Kerr-Mills medical assistance for the aged (MAA) program goes to pay the bills of recipients in three Northern States.

The MAA programs, according to the American Medical Association, is the answer to the health-care needs of the aged who cannot afford to pay for their hospital and doctors' bills.

But the unevenness of the program, as implemented by the States, is apparent from an analysis of the latest MAA statistical summary compiled by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

That summary shows that $13.9 million in Federal-local funds was spent for aged beneficiaries in December. Of that amount, more than $8 million was spent in New York, $3.4 million in Massachusetts and $1.1 million in Michigan.

Of the Nation's almost 17 million aged, only 72,159 were MAA beneficiaries and 51,549 lived in the three States spending the largest amounts.

SEVENTEEN STATES PAYING

While the American Medical Association says that 27 States have taken advantage of the MAA program enacted by Congress in the fall of 1960, the HEW summary shows that only 17 States and the Virgin Islands were making payments under the program in December.

In some States the legislation is on the books but there is no appropriation for the program. Furthermore, there are only a handful of recipients in some of the 17 States. For example, Louisiana lists 8 beneficiaries; New Hampshire, 25 and Utah, 27.

There also is a wide disparity in the average payments for recipients. In Kentucky the average payment was $15.60 and in Maryland it was $16.63. But in South Carolina it was $285.71 and in New York it was $285.43.

Michigan, with 4,253 recipients, aided fewer people than Maryland, which had 6,814 recipients, but Michigan's expenditures were 10 times that of Maryland.

KERR'S AND MILLS' STATES

A negligible amount of MAA money is being spent in the home States of the program's authors, Representative WILBUR D. MILLS, Democrat of Arkansas, and Senator ROBERT S. KERR, Democrat of Oklahoma.

Arkansas expenditures amounted to two-tenths percent of the total while Oklahoma's expenditures were four-tenths percent.

Critics of the MAA program have said that a person's right to health-care benefits should depend on health-care needs and not on the State in which a patient may reside.

But under the MAA program, eligibility qualifications and health-care benefits are set by the States and are dependent upon the amount of money State treasuries appropriate to match open-end Federal grants.

Birmingham: Heart of the Deep South and the Land With a Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Forbes McKay, of Birmingham, has written a fine article about Birmingham and its potential for growth in the January 1962 issue of Birmingham magazine. The magazine is published by the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce and is one of the finest publications of its kind. The South is just now coming into its own and the last half of the 20th century belongs to the South. Daily the people of the South are working out sound solutions to problems that have hindered the progress and development of the area for many years. At the heart of the Deep South is Alabama and in the center of Alabama is Birmingham, which will become the industrial and commercial hub of the Southeastern States. I think that many Members of the House will be interested in the progress we are making in Birmingham and our hopes for the future as detailed in this fine article.

BIRMINGHAM: CENTER OF THE LAND WITH A FUTURE

(By Forbes McKay)

Twenty years ago South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana were regarded as the Nation's "economic problem No. 1." Today this region, once the poorest in the United States, is "on its way to becoming a productive giant in agriculture and industry," said U.S. News & World Report in an article entitled "The Deep South—Land With a Future" in its issue of November 6, 1961.

These five States, generally referred to as the "Deep South" had an economy based on the old plantation system with cotton as the main source of income. Cheap hand labor had for generations planted, cultivated, and harvested the fiber which brought great wealth to the plantation owners.

But when mechanical cultivation and harvesting in the Southwest and Far West made it impossible for the Deep South to produce cotton in competition with mechanized farming in other areas it became necessary to turn to other sources of farm income.

In 1939 the income per farm in Alabama was only $492 per year and the purchasing power of the predominantly rural population did not justify very much activity in the manufacturing or marketing of consumer items and there were practically no conveniences, and cartainly no luxuries, on the average Alabama farm.

It must be remembered that the State of Alabama is in the exact center of the Deep South and the State is commonly referred to as the "Heart of Dixie." The startling recovery of its economy since 1939 is almost unbelievable and is worth careful study by those who are looking for a region where business and industrial profits are almost unlimited now and will be for a long time to come.

In 1939, 46 percent of the farm income in Alabama came from cotton and 31 percent from livestock; today only 25 percent comes from cotton and the income from livestock is 57 percent of the total. The net result is that as of today the average farm income is $4,720, an increase of 859 percent over what the poverty-stricken Alabama farmer received in 1939.

It was this fantastic increase in farm income that first sparked the great industrial and business development of the State, with its increase in payrolls of wage earners who at first were primarily engaged in satisfying the wants of agricultural communities. In time the workers in business and industrial activities added to the wealth and buying power of the total population. Banks in Alabama are now overflowing with money. In 1940 Alabama bank assets were $425,538,000. In 1960 assets were $2,350,272,000, a 20-year increase of 452 percent. In the same period manufacturing has increased from $246 million to $1,771 million, an increase of 621 percent. The increase in factory payrolls and income per farm has raised the State's per capita income from a miserable $282 in 1940 to a comfortable $1,462 in 1960. This represents a 418-percent increase in the last 20 years.

The revolution in Alabama farming came when farmers turned from cotton to cattle, hogs, and poultry, and mechanized the production of field crops. Aberdeen Angus, whiteface Herefords, purebred hogs, and fine dairy breeds graze in rich pastures which are the natural result of the abundant rainfall in the State. Today Alabama is also one of the leading broiler producers in the Nation. Peanuts and pecans are crops which are shipped to every State in the Nation. Candies, including both of these fine nuts, are produced in large quantities. Tomatoes, beans, and other vegetables are canned and fruits are frozen to satisfy the appetites of the region and beyond. Shrimp, crabs, oysters, and fish are also a source of important income to the State. The U.S. News & World Report says, "Today the Deep South is becoming a reserve breadbasket of the Nation second only to the Middle West.

But it is industrialization which is bringing the greatest changes in the economy of Alabama and the other States of the Deep South.

Industry is taking advantage of the many plus factors found in the Southeast. In addition to the vastly increased buying power of Alabama families, people are attracted to the State because there is a moderate and pleasant climate, unsurpassed recreational facilities, lakes and rivers teeming with fish and providing water sports as well as unlimited water for industrial use. Industry, too, because intelligent workers are available. There is a great abundance of resources including timber, iron ore, limestone, coal, natural gas, oil, and hydroelectric power, not to mention farm-produced raw materials

which are manufactured into useful consumer products.

Two of the major tire manufacturers have heavy production facilities in Alabama. Textiles, television tubes, vinyl floor covering, pulp and paper products, building materials, steel, aluminum, fabricated metal products, synthetic fibers, plastics, and chemicals are only a few of the many hundreds of items produced in Alabama. Huntsville, Ala. has become a key center of missile production and space flight engines. In 10 years it has grown from 16,000 to 72,000 population. The Hayes Corp. in Birmingham is one of the leading contractors in the Nation for the production of items for the National Aeronautics and Space Agency in 1961.

Water transportation on the Warrior and Tennessee Rivers is playing a vital part in the industrial development of Alabama. The Coosa River Valley is the center of this unparalleled economic growth.

In the "heart of the Deep South" is Birmingham, Ala. People are pouring into Birmingham at the rate of 10,000 to 12,000 per year. They come to take advantage of the magnificent opportunities incident to the fantastic economic growth of the area.

Residential developments extend for miles along the main highways leading into the city. The new residents come from all over the United States. They find here an opportunity to make a good living and to live a good life.

People in Birmingham live well if family income is any measure of good living. Birmingham families (both white and Negro) have a higher family income than in other cities in the Deep South.

This higher purchasing power creates more opportunity for the manufacturers and distributors of consumer goods.

Another reason why Birmingham is a preferred location for manufacturers of consumer items is that in addition to purchasing power, the new wealth of the entire Southeast is ready to be spent for consumer items.

Birmingham is in the exact center of a region that can be reached easily and economically. Facilities for the transportation of manufactured goods are unequaled. Eight railroads and four airlines serve the city and many companies have private fleets of trucks, either owned or leased. The highway systems of the Southeast serve Birmingham admirably. Birmingham has been called the hub of the trucking industry of the South.

Birmingham is one of the finest places in America in which to live as well as to make a living. The people are friendly. The climate is moderate and pleasant. There is year-round enjoyment of recreational facilities of every kind. Cultural, religious, and educational institutions are the finest.

It's nice to be in Birmingham.

Washington's Farewell Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I have listened today with great interest to the gentleman from Indiana read Washington's Farewell Address. We who are regarded as conservatives have enjoyed a great speech. I only hope a part of it rubs off on our liberal brethren and the administration.

Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Agriculture's recent speech in Harrisburg left no doubt as to the administration's desires for authority to move large groups of America's populace from one section to another without regard to the preference or sensitivity of those involved.

Spokesmen for the administration's foreign trade program have summarily decided that American workers displaced in chosen occupations by the impact of import competition should be shifted to regions where production is unaffected and employment more plentiful. My colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] told a meeting in Washington last week of the obvious consequences of the program which the entire Cabinet and an army of its underlings are huckstering. Glassworkers whose roots are in western Pennsylvania and who aspire only to remain in this residency of their nativity would perforce be driven into population centers entirely strange to them for the express purpose of permitting products of another nation to displace the labor of those citizens of the United States.

Now that the Secretary of Agriculture has released his plan, the small farmer who seeks to earn his livelihood in the verdant hills and valleys of Pennsylvania and other fertile regions might have no other choice but to join his displaced industrial neighbor in a manufacturing plant in the Middle West, the Far West, or—if the ultimate plans of our international leaders prevail—perhaps even in Tokyo, West Berlin, or Brussels. Oh, I have heard this proposition advanced many times in the argument for free trade, Mr. Speaker.

The doctrinaires occupying the expensive new quarters of the State Department see nothing at all wrong about shifting work opportunities from our native land into the workshops and sweatshops of Europe or Asia.

Under the proposed farm program, the small farmer likewise may find no place else to go, for the mass production factories which presumably would prosper under the original demands of the one-world trade plan are also in trouble. The typewriter manufacturer, machine tool company, and electric equipment maker have found that they cannot compete with the wages of foreign labor. Many have set up shop in countries where workers can be obtained at wages that have not been popular in this country since the early part of the century.

Mr. Freeman would apply strict production controls on small farmers, thus cutting down their already low income and in many cases making it impossible for them to continue in business. A farmer who is at least getting by under present conditions would be forced to give up and, falling into the pattern proposed by the Department of Agriculture, would necessarily have to move on to unfamiliar fields.

Two editorials in the Johnstown (Pa.) Tribune-Democrat analyze the Freeman scheme. I ask unanimous consent to insert these editorials in the RECORD and commend them to your attention:

DON'T PLOW UNDER OUR STATE'S FARMS

In the course of Pennsylvania's—and the Nation's—history a gradual shift occurred in the use of land. The urban areas grew and expanded, taking in much of what was once farmland. They did this in ways which could not have been anticipated. Some cities, like New York, grew straight up; some, like Los Angeles, spread out over mile after mile of countryside. That is natural and inevitable and contributed to the marvelous diversity of the Nation.

Pennsylvania, generally regarded as an industrial State, is also a large producer of agricultural commodities. This affords balance to the economy of the State. But apparently the Federal administration has other plans for Pennsylvania—and the Nation. The statisticians have concluded that in 1980, with 240 million people, the United States will need 50 million fewer acres of farmland. So these acres are to be put to a "more useful purpose."

Primarily Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, an attorney and politician from Wisconsin, wants to retire this land from production to get rid of the farm surpluses that are steadily accumulating. The proposal to put the land to new uses is subordinate to the purpose of getting it out of production. Just what these uses will be is, as the Secretary made clear in Harrisburg last week, pretty vague as yet—but the Government will provide matching funds for whatever it can think up later.

But what about the people who want to farm? There is marvelously fertile land in the State—for example, in the Lancaster-York regions—and some of the finest farms in the Nation. Mr. Freeman is not interested in their quality. His plan does not contemplate using up just the marginal land. It will take in the good farmland, too.

It may be assumed, of course, that Mr. Freeman does not intend to stop the spending of billions of dollars to irrigate the arid farmlands of the West, while he is putting out of production the rich and well-watered farmlands of the East. That would interfere with political gratuities to a number of States, which more than one administration has found useful.

Nor, of course, does Mr. Freeman intend to stop the main cause of our overflowing granaries—the high price supports which encourage the wheat farmers of the Midwest, particularly, to load their land with fertilizers and make it produce as much as possible; not for the market, but for the Government to buy and store. That, also is much too valuable a political issue to be discontinued.

If Mr. Freeman will just be patient, the land problem will take care of itself as the population grows. Land that is more profitable for recreation will go to that purpose; land that can be farmed profitably will remain in cultivation. This has been going on for a long time. If the Government would just quit aggravating the farm problem it would be solved ultimately by the commonsense of the farmers, for which we have considerable respect.

WHO'S WIPING OUT FAMILY FARMS NOW?

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman told a meeting of Pennsylvania agricultural leaders in Harrisburg this weekend that half of the State's farmers had inadequate resources to compete in the market and should

convert the land to recreational use and look for other work. His department, he said, would help them to do this.

Mr. Freeman referred not only to "marginal" farmland, but to highly productive land as well. He came to Harrisburg to explain President Kennedy's farm program, presented to Congress last week.

This is a fairly sharp reversal from the customary Democratic complaint that the Republican Party was bent upon destroying the family farms of the Nation. The trend away from the farm and to the cities has been fairly constant since the early days of the country, when 95 percent of its people were engaged in agricultural pursuits. And it has been increased since the "agricultural explosion" of recent years that greatly increased the productivity of the Nation's farms.

In the normal course of events, the combination of small farms into larger ones, the greater capitalization of farms in the form of costly machinery, and the drift from the farms to the cities will no doubt continue for awhile. But it does not seem to occur to Mr. Freeman that there is unemployment in the cities, too; and that this is hardly the time to send half of the State's farmers out looking for industrial jobs by a Federal speedup. Even a marginal living on the farm is better than unemployment and relief.

Or is this just another example of the Federal Government's right hand knowing not what the left is doing?

Lincoln and the War With Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Lincoln and the War With Mexico," which appeared in the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal on February 20, 1962:

LINCOLN AND THE WAR WITH MEXICO

The comment by touring U.S. Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy in Jakarta that the United States was not justified in making war on Mexico in the 1840's, stirred immediate and critical reaction in Texas where the Alamo still is remembered.

The Robert Kennedy comment, made in answer to an Indonesian student's charge that the United States was guilty of aggressive expansion in the 19th century, has more than ordinary news interest here in Illinois.

Although Illinois sent a proper quota of volunteers to fight in Mexico, there was controversy in the State in regard to the necessity for war, or justification for military invasion of Mexico.

It was during the Mexican War that Abraham Lincoln campaigned successfully for a seat in the House of Representatives in Washington. Although he may have had some inner doubt of the necessity and justification for the war, Candidate Lincoln urged united action against the enemy.

Shortly after he took his seat in Congress the new Representative from the Springfield district joined with other Whigs in rejecting a resolution introduced in behalf of the Polk administration calling the war just and necessary. Later Congressman Lincoln introduced a series of resolutions calculated to embarrass the President by compelling him to admit that Mexico, and not the United States, had jurisdiction over the spot where the first blood was shed.

The Lincoln resolutions failed, and his speech on the subject was ignored. But his political enemies, in Washington and in Illinois, called him "Spotty" Lincoln. The man who later was to be the Civil War President, served but one term in Congress. He was violently denounced by the political opposition in his home State for failure to support the war in Mexico in which Illinois counted heavy casualties.

The 1960 reaction to Robert F. Kennedy's Mexican War comment may have further interest in Illinois now that the State superintendent of public instruction has been asked to provide guidelines for the teaching of patriotism in the public schools.

To the professional practicing patriot who would compel the teaching of a course in patriotism in the public schools, all our country's wars were and are just.

History, political science, and civics are proper courses for study in the public schools. Students who have solid, objective instruction in those courses can be trusted to write their own definition of patriotism. They should know not only the names of the generals who won glorious military victories, but also know what were the issues leading up to the war, and the arguments, however unpopular they may have been at the time, on the other side.

Birth of an Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith a timely and interesting article which appeared in today's issue of the Washington Post. This editorial merits the serious consideration of every Member:

BIRTH OF AN ISSUE

Congress has killed a proposal and given birth to an issue. Surely no one believes that the vote in the House Wednesday and that in the Senate Tuesday will put an end to the President's proposal to gather together into a single department agencies having to do with functions and problems of towns and cities.

It is unfortunate that the merit of this proposal got beclouded by racial bias and political prejudice. It is equally unfortunate that the discussion of the proposal seemed to rest in part upon the theory that urban is a synonym for antirural. There are enough irrelevant class and race distinctions in the land without trying to pump up antipathy between town and country. What is involved in the solution of urban problems is not just the interest of urban dwellers. Cities great and small provide many services to the suburban, smalltown and rural areas that lie about them. Those who dwell in these communities, scattered about large urban centers, have a stake in the city not much less than that of the citizen who lives and works in the city. The 7 million farm people are served by 6 million workers in the farm supply business, and by 10 million workers engaged in transporting, processing, and distributing farm products, and by uncounted other millions who supply the necessities and amenities of life to farm people.

There is a community of interest that is now, less than ever before, fixed by the accident of geographic boundaries. Better cities mean better farms and better farms mean better cities. This broad realization ought to destroy the parochialism and provincialism that cause urban Congressmen and Senators to talk about the "farm problem" as though it were a disease; and it ought to diminish the parochialism and provincialism that impel legislators from rural areas to speak of urban problems as though farmers should be indifferent to them.

When the Congress has recovered from whatever fit of pique and politics misguided it this past week, its rural and its urban members one day will unite to set up a department of Government for the purpose of dealing with the problem of urban areas. This proposal will remain an issue until it becomes a department.

Radio Address by Alphonse Lucas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herewith a radio address made by my former administrative assistant, Mr. Alphonse Lucas, who retired December 31, 1961, after 45 years of faithful service:

RADIO ADDRESS BY ALPHONSE LUCAS

Ladies and gentlemen, the purpose of this talk is to give you briefly some of the highlights of your Congressman's career in the Congress of the United States since you first sent him there in 1935.

As you will recall, he was elected to fill the unexpired term of Hon. John McDuffie, who was appointed to the Federal bench in Mobile. Congressman BOYKIN did not take the the oath of office until August 12, 1935, just 2 weeks before that session of Congres adjourned. During that 2 weeks about 22 percent of all major legislation passed during the entire term was enacted into law. He was the only Alabama Member who remained in Washington after adjournment and our office became headquarters for State, county, and city officials from all over Alabama, who were seeking approval of variour WPA and PWA projects, and your Congressman, while new on the job, went to bat for each and every one of them. With his congenial personality and ability to make friends, he soon knew most of the keymen in the various Government departments well enough to get them to do things for him, and in this way scores of projects such as community houses, armories, airports, community activity buildings, courthouse renovation projects, road paving projects, etc., were expedited and approved.

The entire three-way paving program for the State of Alabama was rejected by the Comptroller General, a Republican named McCarl, who maintained that WPA funds could not be expended on a Federal aid highway. Governor Graves had returned to Alabama, having given up the fight, but FRANK BOYKIN practically camped on McCarl's doorstep for about a week, and frankly, folks, I have always believed that he devised a method of handling this problem simply to get FRANK off his neck. Then FRANK took another week at the Bureau of Public Roads to secure their approval, and Governor Graves gave your Congressman public recognition for accomplishing this seemingly impossible task. This approval enabled Alabama to pave hundreds of miles of highways throughout the State.

Another "they said it couldn't be done" task was accomplished by FRANK for Hon. J. A. Keller, Alabama State Superintendent of Education in connection with the entire PWA school building program in Alabama. Included in this program were some of the finest high schools in our district.

Your Congressman played a large part in securing approval of the $880,000 quickfreeze plant at the State docks in Mobile, and of the $4,300,000 Bankhead tunnel which has been a real boon to industrial Mobile.

When FRANK went to Congress, he stated he was not going there to be a statesman, as such, but to try to help better the lot of every man, woman, and child in his district. While money was being expended by the Federal Government to provide employment during the lean years, he insisted that this money be spent on permanent worthwhile improvements.

FRANK BOYKIN is known in Washington as the hardest working Congressman on Capitol Hill. On many mornings, before breakfast, he dictates on the dictaphone a day's work for one typist. The man fairly radiates energy and enthusiasm.

Back in 1924, 11 years before FRANK BOYKIN went to Congress, he met Andy Mellon, president of the Aluminum Co. of America, in the lobby of a New York hotel. Both had the habit of arising early and FRANK had an excellent opportunity at breakfast that morning, to tell Mr. Mellon of the splendid location of the port of Mobile for an aluminum ore plant. Mr. Mellon promised FRANK he would have his technical advisers investigate Mobile's possibilities, and that planted the seed which was to blossom into the largest aluminum ore plant in the world, now located in Mobile.

He worked practically a year, to interest Hollingsworth & Whitney in locating their huge plant in Mobile. Mobile competed with many other cities, some of which offered free sites and other inducements to this company. Today this plant gives employment to hundreds of our people, both directly in the plant and in our forests.

The Southeast Air Depot, now known as Brookley Field, was authorized by an act of Congress years before World War II, and Tampa had been tentatively selected as the site, not only for the airbase, but also for the depot. In view of Mobile's strategic location your Congressman urged its selection for the depot, which began as a $7 million or $8 million investment, and now represents about $32 million. This Army installation now has the largest payroll in the city of Mobile.

Mobile was well on the way to her industrial place in the sun before the war boom started and was a bright spot on the business map. We have all the natural God-given advantages in this port and in this district, but nothing much had been done about them. As FRANK has often said, "our section of the country is a place where God has done so much and man so little." He has devoted a great deal of time to interesting capital in developing the natural resources in our district and State.

With the imminence of war came huge shipbuilding contracts (and these contracts came to Mobile and the rest of the gulf coast over the protests of Admiral Vickery of the Maritime Commission who maintained that we on the gulf did not have the brains, energy, or ability to build ships, and that we would get ship contracts over his dead body. FRANK told him he did not intend going over his dead body, but that if any other part of the country got ship contracts, we would get our part of them). Mobile's shipyards made an outstanding record during the war and FRANK has not failed to hammer this fact into the officials of the Maritime Commission. Admiral Vickery later became the Congressman's close friend.

With the terrific influx of workers to the shipyards and Brookley Field, our housing problems, sewer and water problems, and school problems, become acute. With an initial project of 500 housing units near Brookley for which FRANK had to fight tooth and nail, the Mobile area, both in public housing and FHA-financed housing, secured over 30,000 units.

I could talk for an hour about FRANK's efforts in behalf of Mobile's school system, which would surely have collapsed but for the generous contributions made through FRANK's committee, Public Buildings and Grounds. These grants enabled us to give our teachers a much-needed and well-deserved increase in salary. Through this same committee we were able to get authorizations for funds to construct the Craighead and Vigor Schools and other smaller school units.

As chairman of the House Patents Committee, FRANK sponsored some much-needed patent and trademark legislation, which was enacted into law, and as a result he received acclaim throughout the Nation from inventors, attorneys, and manufacturers. The community tax provision of the current tax law was sponsored by your Congressman and will mean the saving of hundreds of thousands of dollars in taxes to hundreds of husbands and wives in this State alone. He introduced the bill providing for freeing the toll bridges in this State. Included among these bridges was the Cochrane Bridge and the bridge across the Tombigbee River at Jackson. He led the fight to confirm the title to tidelands in the State. The bill passed the House with only 11 votes against it. While it was vetoed it has been reintroduced and has an excellent chance of passage at this session, and represents another fight for the preservation of States rights.

Your Congressman's committee assignments have been most important to our district. The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee handles all maritime legislation. The most important bill was the $17 billion ship sales bill which was fought over in committee for nearly a year and a half. As chairman of a subcommittee investigating the shortage of steel he succeeded in having extensive research and experiment made into the possible utilization of low-grade iron ores.

His membership on the Rivers and Harbors Committee was particularly helpful to our port and our State, as all port channel improvements and all waterway developments in this State had to be authorized by this committee. His work on the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee was outstanding and the beneficial results can be seen all over the district in housing, schools, public buildings, access roads (such as the paving of Michigan Avenue and the overpass into Brookley Field), community facilities, such as the $2 million water system at Mobile, and so-called Lanham Act funds which kept our schools and our teachers going during the war and postwar period. He was also a member of the House Accounts Committee, Invalid Pensions Committee, and Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, all of which were very active.

In the reorganization of Congress which was effective during the 80th Congress, each Member could be on but one committee, and your Congressman is now in Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which it was felt was most important to the port of Mobile and surrounding area.

I believe all of you are familiar with FRANK's victorious fight to secure passage of the bill authorizing the construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Canal. He received a tremendous ovation from his colleagues when he made his speech on the House floor in behalf of this project. Also included in this authorization bill are the Demopolis Lock and Dam, Coosa-Alabama waterway project, Bayou La Batre, Coden, and Dauphin Bay projects, all of which have had or will shortly have appropriations for initial operations. The improvement of Mobile's harbor has had a great deal of FRANK's attention, and Uncle Sam has been rather liberal in funds for this purpose.

The $400,000 extension of the new Federal building at Mobile, and the new post office building at Monroeville were among the projects on which he worked. Also the new post office at Camden, for which the site was purchased, and construction halted by the war. Also halted by the war was a $2 million improvement and expansion of the Mobile Post Office Building, which is so badly needed. When the post office building program is resumed, not only Camden, but Linden, Jackson, and several other communities where postal receipts justify it will be allocated new post office buildings, and the Mobile Post Office Building will be enlarged and improved. During the war, our work became even heavier, and we devoted much time to the boys in the services, their parents, and other members of their families. One of the Congressman's saddest tasks was notifying a parent or wife that their loved one had made the supreme sacrifice for his country.

The Congressman has helped hundreds of veterans of World Wars I and II and the Spanish-American War not only in pension and compensation matters, but in housing, education, allotments, mustering out pay, hospitalization, and many other matters. Having had brothers and sons in both World Wars, he knows the problems of these veterans, and has left no stone unturned to help them, not only in legislative matters, but also in personal problems.

Many thousands of farm bulletins, agriculture yearbooks, cookbooks, infant care books, and other free Government material have practically blanketed our district since FRANK has been in Congress. Having a farm and livestock business of his own, he knows what our farmers need, and has helped bring millions of dollars of Government benefits to the farmers of his district and State.

On account of the increased cost of living he has voted for all increases in pay given to all types of Government workers. He has also voted for the so-called Crosser amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act, which will benefit many railroad workers. His championship of rural electrification to light up every farm home in his district is well known.

Since the war, your Congressman has been successful in preventing the dismantling of a plant at the State docks, and securing this plant for the Ideal Cement Co., which is now operating it and employing many local workers. He also went to bat to secure from the Federal Government the site for the new Arkell & Smith plant at Chickasaw. This fine plant is providing employment for more of our workers.

FRANK has always maintained that the greatest friend that labor can have is a man who will go out and get industries which will provide our men and women with permanent employment at good wages, and to do this, we must interest capital. Capital will have to be sold on our people, our location, resources, and possibilities. FRANK did this long before he went to Congress and I can assure you he will continue to do it.

The job of trying to keep up with FRANK, with his boundless energy and never-say-die spirit, is a difficult one; but, as he says, his staff do not work for him, they work with him, and all of us in his organization share with him the satisfaction of a job well done.

I have attempted as briefly as possible to give you some of the highlights of FRANK BOYKIN's career—it would take a large-sized book to enumerate all the things he has done for his district—in fact I doubt that there is a man, woman, or child in his district who has not shared directly or indirectly in the fruits of his labors.

I thank you.

George Washington: The Image and the Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, a fortnight ago Charles Cecil Wall, who has served us all so very well as resident director of the work being carried on by the Mount Vernon Ladies Association of the Union, at the home of the man whose birthday we celebrate today, spoke at a meeting of the Optimist Club in Arlington. His subject was "George Washington: The Image and the Man."

In simple language he gives us a rare picture of our first President. I wish to extend my remarks to include this portrait:

GEORGE WASHINGTON: THE IMAGE AND THE MAN

When we look into the mirror of history with a clear and healthy eye, what manner of man do we discover George Washington to have been? He was not an easy man to know, as Dr. Freeman, the author of his definitive biography, discovered. He was an Englishman, with the reticence and gift for understatement which characterizes that breed of men. He drew a sharp distinction between his public and his private life. In the former he assumed the dignity which he thought proper to the office he held; hence, in his most conspicuous and best recorded roles he has left an impression of formidableness, of a man without a sense of humor. In his private life he commanded what the word denotes, privacy, to a much greater degree than is possible today. His personal letters reveal more of the writer's true self, his tastes, and his philosophy, than do his official papers, but they partake of the general literary style of the period—formal, oftentimes to the point of seeming stilted by present-day standards. Unfortunately, his portraits also follow the prevailing mode; they portray the official personage, stern of visage.

It was one of his few intimates, Henry Lee—Lighthorse Harry Lee of Revolutionary fame—who characterized Washington as "First in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen." This, you will note, is not a full sentence. Let me quote it for you in full: "First in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen, he was second to none in the humble and endearing scenes of private life." The three "firsts" were so apt and so captured the public imagination as to eclipse what Lee here intended to emphasize and what he was so well qualified to affirm—"he was second to none in the humble and endearing scenes of private life." This private George Washington is the man we should know if we are to derive personal inspiration from his life.

Washington's career evolved outward and upward from the local setting in which he was second to none. Although not a father, he was a devoted stepfather to Mrs. Washington's two children and his position with his numerous nephews and nieces was patriarchal. In his parish he was a vestryman. He represented his community in the House of Burgesses, and there, by 1774, without eloquence or effort to aggrandize himself, he stood among the highest in the esteem of his colleagues. He would have been characterized by his friends as "disinterested," a man of integrity, devoid of ambition for position, power, or fame. He had no desire other than to be numbered among those who "live genteelly and hospitably on clear estates," as he expressed it in a letter to his neighbor, George Mason.

If we could probe deeper into the mind and motivations of this colonial Englishman, what would we find? An occasional note of belligerence appears in his writings as he comments on the encroachments of King and Parliament. He was jealous of his liberties. There is no inkling of the Rubicon which he was so soon to cross, no evidence that he would think himself equal to the crossing. Yet, as we read his correspondence on the eve of the Revolution we encounter a prophetic passage in a letter to a dying neighbor who had asked him to be his executor and the guardian of his only son. In reply, Washington wrote of time-consuming services to others which denied him any leisure. He declined the executorship, but offered to become the boy's guardian. In this letter there is a single sentence more significant in the context of events, more revealing of the writer's deepest motives, than can be found elsewhere in all the volumes of his writings. The sentence reads * * *. "I never deny, or even hesitate in granting any request that is made to me (especially by persons I esteem, and in matters of moment) without feeling inexpressable uneasiness." Five months later, to avoid a feeling of "inexpressable uneasiness" he did not deny the request of the Continental Congress that he assume command of its army. On his own testimony and that of his close friends, it can be affirmed that he did not want this command, that he felt himself unequal to it. He had never held a military command above the regimental level. At that level his reputation was established. He could return to Virginia, assured of top command there and lead men he knew, over familiar terrain, with a fair prospect of enhancing his reputation. The request of Congress, he knew, was prompted by political considerations, not by any opinion of his military abilities higher than his own. His decision is foretold in his letter to a dying neighbor 5 months earlier. This time it was "a matter of moment." He may have hesitated, but he did not deny. Though "domestic ease," as he termed it, must be put aside, and reputation and life itself be hazarded, he turned northward to lead a motley militia against the most potent military power in the world, his mother country.

Is there inspiration for us in George Washington's decision? We have no expectation of facing a similar personal dilemma in such an exalted historical setting. Our opportunities and our obligations are more likely to confront us within our own more local communities. But I submit most earnestly that the health and the survival of an open society such as ours depends on our willingness to emulate the man whose inner compulsion would allow him to deny neither his neighbor nor his fellow men at large.

We may premise that our opportunities are likely to be more local and less demanding, but George Washington's career suggests that this need not be so. Dr. Freeman emphasizes that his life, from youth to old age, is a remarkable example of developing abilities which were equal to the ever greater challenges he faced. It is permissible to reflect that in less trying times Washington might have lived out his life in obscurity, his potentialities unrealized but, happily for us, the man and the crisis coincided. While I do not suggest that we are all potential George Washingtons, I do insist that the times are no less perilous than they were in 1775 and that our potential surpasses our performance. We hesitate and deny when the times call for sacrifice of present ease. The institutions created by our Founding Fathers were never more gravely threatened, from the left and the right, from within and without. The ideals which inspired these men have lost nothing of their dynamic content. They were never more relevant. They are our finest heritage. The free world looks anxiously to us for leadership. "Let us raise a standard to which the wise and the honest can repair," George Washington said. Will we fatalistically accept a state of "inexpressable uneasiness" or will we rise to the challenge? Our answers might be decisive—for ourselves, our society, and our posterity. If the mirror of history can inspire us and guide us to correct decisions and timely actions, we may look with confidence to a faithful image of the man whose birthday we will observe next week.

The Proper Observance of American History Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. FORRESTER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, the Leader-Tribune, a splendid weekly newspaper published at Fort Valley, Ga., February 15 issue, carried an outstanding editorial written by the published, Hon. Dan Grahl, relative to American History Month and our observance thereof, that is so sound and so American in content that everyone should have the privilege of reading it.

The article reads as follows:

THIS IS AMERICAN HISTORY MONTH—LET'S ALL TAKE A LOOK AT OUR OBSERVANCE

February, for a number of years, has been set aside by the national society, Daughters of the American Revolution, as American History Month, and all of its units have been urged to emphasize the study of American history during this month.

Mrs. Sally H. (Albert) Evans, regent of the Governor Treutlen chapter of the DAR, asked us to write a word or two about American history and its study.

She couldn't have asked at a more opportune time. We are just boiling over with things we feel we must say about America—and patriotism. Stay with us.

Before we begin, however, we wonder if our readers are aware of the fact that two of our great Presidents were born in the month of February. And we do mean two of the very greatest. The two we are talking about are George Washington and Abraham Lincoln.

According to Mrs. Evans, and we agree, the facts of written history refute the theory that indifference and ignorance can replace patriotism.

We have felt for some time that patriotism has become an outmoded state of being. To be patriotic one has to be considered "corny." And that is the very last thing that parents our age, and younger and older, want to be considered.

So, we don't normally observe the Fourth of July, November 11, etc., as patriotic observances of noteworthy events. We just sort of lakadaisically put out a flag or two and let it go at that. We got to "stay hep," man. (If that is the right expression.)

The papers of today (we must say the dailies) are filled with ridicule of the "super patriots," and few if any raise their voice in protest. We do not profess to be one or the other, but we do know that a "super patriot," however perverted his opinion may be, is in favor of the United States, and is definitely not in favor of the opposition. Our hat's off to him, or her, as the case may be.

It is our firm belief that one of the facts of history which produced more turncoats to America during the Korean police action than at any other time in the history of our country was the basic and simple fact that the boys who participated, and turned to the other direction, never had the training and schooling in love of their country that their predecessors had.

We think it is time our children and adults alike rededicate themselves to America with a love so strong that such things as communism will have no chance to get a real foothold among our people.

We are not by any means advocating a return to the economic and social conditions of our fathers. We believe in progress and realize that to grow and prosper we must look to the present and the future. But that doesn't mean that we shouldn't love, remember and observe the past of our great country.

In fact, we are sure that many profitable lessons may be learned by many people in a study of the history our Nation.

We add our agreement with the DAR in their efforts to keep alive the history of our country and a strong, wholesome patriotism.

We Must Lead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, these words from Washington's Farewell Address come ringing down through the years, holding important counsel for us in 1962. Today we celebrate the birthday of George Washington, whose armies loosened us from the bonds of foreign domination and—as our first President—launched us on the mighty course of a sovereign state. Here are his words:

> Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence * * * the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the baneful foes of republican government.

During our development as the strongest and most progressive Nation in history, Americans have had to adjust to a changing world, a world so outwardly different from Washington's that to even compare them is to mock time itself. Even so, the unchangeable principles upon which our Republic was founded remain to guide us today when we are inextricably entwined in a larger, more complex world.

Washington's warning about the dangers of foreign influence is a guideline for present U.S. foreign policy. We must participate in the world; our history and our destiny demand that we lead as well. Washington's words that foreign influence must not divert U.S. policy—a policy which reflects the position of the United States—is as important in this age as it was in our first President's era.

A republican form of government is as sturdy as the maintenance of the sovereignty upon which it was built. Our hallmark is freedom and our challenge lies in the exertion of leadership as free men. It is for this reason that the United States has not only inherited—but earned—its position as leader against the forces of tyranny and oppression.

All too often we have allowed ourselves to become submerged in a puddle of international wishy-washiness. A clear U.S. foreign policy, anchored by its force as the free world's leader, has subsequently become diluted. It is essential that today, recalling Washington's apt reflection, we secure our proper and vital role in assuming the leadership of free men everywhere.

Judge Ketcham's Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the juvenile court of the District of Columbia is currently overburdened and understaffed to a point it is not fulfilling properly the role that has been assigned it by the Congress. This situation has persisted for years. The District government, civil and community groups, and the daily local newspapers have rallied to a workable piece of legislation that has overwhelming community support. But the measure, passed by the Senate, has been bottled up in the House District Committee. This unfortunate state of affairs has persisted for session after session of Congress. On February 1, in an appearance before the Woman's National Democratic Club, District Juvenile Court Judge Orman W. Ketcham, the only judge of the court, gave a speech in which he graphically describes conditions under which he is now operating. Judge Ketcham also sets down cogently the reasons for his opposition to another approach to the problem that originated in the House District Committee.

Judge Ketcham's speech follows:

SPEECH DELIVERED TO THE WOMAN'S NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC CLUB BY JUDGE ORMAN W. KETCHAM AT LUNCHEON ON FEBRUARY 1, 1962

Mrs. Mann, Mrs. Bible, Mr. Pusey, club members and guests, thank you for inviting my wife and me to be with you today.

It is a pleasure to address a group such as this which has a threefold interest in the work and problems of the juvenile court. As women interested in the elective political system and the administration of our National Government, your concern for the administration of justice and the operation of the courts is commendable. As women and mothers, your interest in children, in their welfare and rehabilitation, is natural. And, as residents in our Nation's Capital, your appreciation of the difficulty we face in trying to get remedial legislation through the U.S. Congress is most gratifying.

My topic is "The National Significance of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia." You may think this is a presumptuous title. But accept, for a moment, my assurance that juvenile delinquency is not only a national, but also an international problem. Consequently, our court, located in the Capital City of these United States, is under constant scrutiny by observers from other nations and from all our American States. It should be an outstanding example of how we, as a nation, deal with our children. The State Department, the Department of Justice, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Labor, and numerous private organizations send great numbers of foreign visitors to our court to observe our procedures and emulate our techniques. Last year we had over 250 distinguished foreign visitors from 38 nations. Just yesterday, for example, the judge of the family court of Tokyo spent the day in my court. Groups from all over this country look to the juvenile court in Washington as an example of what the Federal Government is doing for the children under its jurisdiction. And what do all these visitors find? An organization—the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia—so overburdened and understaffed, so hampered by the inability of Congress to agree upon court improvements and the lack of representative government, so frustrated by its own lack of time for judicial deliberation and by the eroding effects of delay upon the children concerned, as to be in serious danger of foundering.

Our problem can be stated simply: We have a large jurisdiction which encompasses all delinquency and dependency, plus determination of paternity, support of children born out of wedlock, criminal actions to punish husbands or wives who desert or refuse to support their minor children, and criminal actions against adults for contributing to the delinquency or dependency of a juvenile, and violations of the child labor and compulsory eduaction laws. To cope with this workload, which requires approximately 7,500 judicial dispositions each year, the court has but one judge. We need at least two more. As the only juvenile court judge, I have exclusive judicial responsibility over nearly one-third of this city's population. In contrast, there are in our District court and our municipal court a total of 31 able judges available to deal with adult judicial problems.

This need for additional judges has long been recognized in the community—in fact the first legislation to create new judgeships was introduced in Congress in 1949—not 1959, but 1949. During the past decade, three extensive studies of the juvenile court have been made by citizens' groups, and by the District and Federal Governments. All three investigations revealed the same basic deficiency—lack of adequate judgepower. Since the passage of the 1938 Juvenile Court Act, through the administrations of three different judges, the business of the court has steadily increased. In my opinion, this upward trend can be attributed to a substantial increase in population (especially during the post World War II period), to an increase in delinquency among juveniles (which has been a nationwide trend), to greater numbers of dependent and neglected children in the central city area of Washington, to an increased number of illegitimate births, and to other breakdowns in parental responsibility and the stability of home life in this city.

The consequences of this increased caseload, coupled with insufficient staffing of the juvenile court bench can, I believe, be best illustrated by the long delay between the filing of a complaint and the disposition of juvenile and adult cases. In new juvenile cases we give highest priority to cases in which the child must be detained in the receiving home pending adjudication. In these cases there is today a time lapse of 6 to 8 weeks between the filing of the petition and the initial appearance of the child before the judge. If the child is not detained and remains in the community in the custody of his parents or guardian, there is a time lapse of 7 to 10 months between the filing of a new petition and initial hearing before the judge. While many of the new cases awaiting judicial action involve no contest we do have several trials each month.

Even the uncontested cases require from 10 to 30 patient minutes to work out a suitable plan for treatment. Even the best rehabilitation plans frequently do not work out as expected, requiring review and adjustment as time passes. Hence, the constant need for additional judicial hearings in active juvenile cases.

I do not believe that anyone who has not observed a juvenile court in operation can fully understand the complexity of the individual situations to which a judge must tailor his judicial decisions and dispositions.

Turning to our adult cases, we estimate that there is a time lapse of about 1 year between the filing of an information and the arraignment. This time is steadily growing. If the adult admits paternity or pleads guilty to the criminal charge, disposition is usually made the same day; however, where there is a denial, a trial by the court or jury must be scheduled. Where a jury trial is scheduled (over 100 adult cases are awaiting jury trial), the time lapse is about 2 years. Since orders for support in paternity cases cannot be made retroactive, this means that—some fathers are able to avoid supporting their children for as much as 3 years.

In my opinion the most basic need of the juvenile court is to be staffed with at least three judges. I see no other satisfactory solution to the problem. The Capital of this Nation and its children deserve to have such important matters as delinquency, dependency, illegitimacy and criminal nonsupport cases handled by duly appointed judicial officers in a just, compassionate and unhurried manner.

This request is not unreasonable when one compares Washington with the juvenile court benches in other major cities in the Nation. A recent survey of the Nation's 12 largest cities revealed that, of courts with both juvenile and adult jurisdiction, only Washington had a single judge and no referees. Cleveland, for example, is staffed with four judges and five referees in their juvenile court. Philadelphia has 14 judges in its court of comparable jurisdiction. San Francisco, with a population slightly smaller than Washington, has only juvenile jurisdiction which is handled by one judge and two judicial referees. The survey points to Washington, not as a shining example of how this Government provides individualized justice for children, but as one of the most deprived juvenile courts in America today.

Since our problem is so well known and has been so long recognized, you may ask why after all these years, has Congress failed to provide our juvenile court with additional judges? The answer is relatively uncomplicated. Despite community pressures (resolutions in our support have been passed, for example, by the parent-teachers' associations, by all three bar associations, by the Council on Law Enforcement, by the Federation of Citizens Associations and by the Federation of Civic Associations, by the ADA and by the DAR), despite the support of the Washington Post and the Evening Star and local radio and television stations, and despite enthusiastic and continuous efforts by the League of Women Voters, by our own advisory committee and by the Commissioners' Youth Council, the Senate-passed legislation has consistently died in the House Committee on the District of Columbia.

This year, in September, before adjournment, the Senate unanimously passed a bill which would add two judges to the juvenile court bench. It is known as the Bible bill, S. 486. Three similar bills introduced by Representative GREEN of Oregon, Representative MORRISON, of Louisiana, and Representative MULTER, of New York, were referred to the House District of Columbia Committee, but no action has yet been taken on any of them. This is the legislation that the court and the community almost unanimously support.

Instead, there has been introduced a bill to transfer many functions of the present juvenile court to adult courts. We are most emphatically opposed to this.

Let me give you a few reasons for our firm stand against such an approach. The first of its proposals provides for a reduction of the court's jurisdictional age limit to 16 years. It is now 18 years. I am unalterably opposed to such a change. The Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act of 1938 provides for an 18-year-age maximum for juvenile offenders. On a nationwide basis, 34 States, and the District of Columbia have an 18-year-age limitation. Nine States have a 17-year-age limit. Only seven States have a 16-year-age limit and in some of those jurisdictions, such as New York City and Baltimore, there is provision for an intermediate youth court with specialized juvenile jurisdiction between the ages of 16 and 21. The National Council of Juvenile Court Judges and the Children's Bureau of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have consistently taken the position that the upper age limit for courts handling juveniles should be 18 years. The new Standard Juvenile Court Act published by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency just last year provides for an 18-year-age limitation.

My experience on the bench during the past 4 years has convinced me that the majority of juveniles referred to the court between 16 and 18 years of age are not beyond salvage. Many of them are first offenders, lack sophistication, are not violent, and can benefit materially from the rehabilitation services available within a juvenile court setting. I do not want to be a party to any arbitrary stigmatization of every youth over 16 years of age who violates the law. The deserving ones who can be helped through our processes can and should be afforded educational, vocational, and employment opportunities such as a juvenile court can provide, not branded with a criminal record in an adult court and sentenced to prison solely on the basis of his chronological age.

In practice, I have found that the waiver provision in our present statute, which allows the court to transfer to the U.S. district court the older and more aggressive juveniles charged with felony-type violations, provides adequate flexibility. Under current waiver policy and procedures, which were developed after conferences with the chief judge of the U.S. district court and the U.S. attorney, every waivable complaint filed with the court is carefully reviewed by the court's probation staff. Ultimately, I make the determination of whether or not the alleged offender should be transferred to the adult court for prosecution. In fiscal year 1960, I transferred a total of 105 such cases in the U.S. district court, and in the past fiscal year 1961, I waived jurisdiction on a total of 138 cases. Many of those who are transferred to U.S. district court are sentenced under the Federal Youth Corrections Act, others are committed to Federal prisons or are placed on adult-type probation.

The bill I opposed also recommends that the juvenile court's authority to waive jurisdiction to the adult court should commence at age 15. I take the view that, except for capital offenses for which the present law provides no age limitation, a child under the age of 16 can and should always be treated as a juvenile. This is what the present statute provides and therefore, I do not support the proposal to reduce the waiver age to 15.

I am also opposed, for reasons which I'm sure are obvious to you, to the provision in the bill which would permit public trials and disclosure of the social files of children over 14. If our rehabilitative work is to be effective, we must win and maintain the confidence of the children and their families. Public exposure is certainly not in keeping with this goal. Our present procedures for private hearings which exclude the general public, but which permit observation by interested parties, including the press, are a suitable balance, I believe.

A large number of the provisions of the bill are concerned with the abolition of the autonomy of the juvenile court and the establishment within the municipal court of a juvenile court branch. Several community and national organizations have announced that such a merger would be inconsistent with the basic purposes and principles of a specialized and independent children's court. Still other community groups who support the juvenile court principle believe that our court should, instead, be expanded into a full family court. There is, in my opinion, no logical reason for submerging the presently independent juvenile court in a court of limited criminal jurisdiction. This proposal, however, concerns a matter which is of vital concern to the entire bench and bar of the District of Columbia as well as to its citizens, since it deals with the basic administration of the city's judicial system.

The U.S. Department of Justice voiced its opposition to such a plan in a letter to the House District Committee last May. Byron White, the Deputy Attorney General, in commenting on the disruption such a shift in jurisdiction would entail, said in a letter to the House District of Columbia Committee:

"As a consequence of section 4 of the [Davis] bill, all juveniles 16 or more, involved in a felony offense would fall within the criminal jurisdiction of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. In fiscal 1960, 105 juvenile cases were waived to the U.S. district court by the judge of the juvenile court. Section 4 of the bill would raise this figure approximately 575 cases per year. Chief Judge Pine advised that this transfer of criminal jurisdiction would require two additional district judges. It would also require an increase of at least two attorneys on the staff of the office of the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia, whose office has the prospective jurisdiction in that court. In addition, section 4 of the bill would shift approximately 400 cases per year to the municipal court, with an attendant increase in the need for judges and prosecutors there. The Department is concerned that such a wholesale change of method and treatment of juvenile offenders is not in the best interests of the administration of justice or of successfully combating juvenile delinquency, and that a preferable course would be to increase the existing court by two additional judges and to permit the discretion of that court to govern the waiver of jurisdiction over any offender under 18 of age, on a case-by-case basis."

Secretary Ribicoff of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, who addressed this club last Monday, in a letter to Representative COHELAN, of California, characterized the bill in these unequivocal terms:

"Not only would these changes, if enacted, turn back the clock in this important field in the District of Columbia but, because they would be an act of Congress, they might have an influence on action throughout the country altogether disproportionate to its character as local legislation."

And finally, Senator THOMAS DODD, of Connecticut, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, declared:

"Reducing from 18 to 16 the age limit of juveniles coming before the new youth branch would subvert the original purpose of the juvenile court and put us right back where we started 60 years ago."

National organizations working in the field of juvenile delinquency have voiced their strong opposition as well. Last May, for example, at a meeting of the Advisory Coun-

cil of Judges to the National Council on Crime and Delinquency in Oklahoma City, that organization stated: "The juvenile court of the District of Columbia is the only Federal juvenile court in the United States and serves not only the children and citizens of Washington, D.C., but is a symbol of the American juvenile court system to foreign and American visitors in the Nation's Capital and throughout the American judiciary." The council, in a resolution specifically denouncing the bill, "decried present efforts to dissect, debase, and substantially to destroy the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, and urged the Members of Congress to reject such destructive and retrogressive legislation."

In June of 1960, the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges, at its annual conference in Detroit, Mich., linked the reputation of the juvenile court of the Nation's Capital with that of the entire juvenile court system and observed that the Washington court's value to this community and to the entire country is "disgracefully impaired because the volume of business creates an impossible hearing load for its present sole judge." In June 1961, this same Council called upon the President and the Congress of the United States to establish in the District of Columbia a model juvenile court and to adopt legislation to provide this court with all facilities, including additional judicial personnel, probation staff, clinic and detention home necessary for it to become an outstanding example of this Nation's judicial concern for its children.

With these views in mind, I trust you will agree with me that there is, indeed, a great deal of national significance to the operations of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia.

Ideally, the Congress should establish in the only Federal juvenile court—the juvenile court of the District of Columbia—a model for the emulation of State and local courts (both in this country and in foreign lands), and a laboratory for training and development in the newest procedures for delinquency control and rehabilitation. At the very least, Congress is obligated to provide for this city's delinquent and dependent children a juvenile court in which they will receive prompt adjudication and disposition of their cases. This year, once again, we await congressional action to give us the required judges.

Because we in the District lack the power to legislate for ourselves, our problems are the problems of the entire Nation. I deal, every day, with parents who neglect their responsibilities, and with their children who must become wards of the State. In a very real sense, the District of Columbia is a ward of the Nation. Powerless to help itself, it looks to the National Legislature (the Congress) for its every need. It is fitting that the United States, the richest and most resourceful of all parents, regard and remedy the difficulties of the District of Columbia's 225,000 children. And it is urgent that this action be taken soon—during this session of Congress—if the juvenile court is to be a symbol of the best that the American judicial system can provide. In keeping with President Kennedy's message to Congress today on the administration's welfare program and goals, I sincerely hope that the New Frontier, which has shown itself so concerned with the aspirations, opportunities, and potentialities of America's youth, will accept its responsibility for the children of the District of Columbia and will soon legislate to provide its overburdened juvenile court with the judges which are so desperately needed.

Miami Plays Host to Peru Teenagers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to the further patriotic efforts of my good friend Mr. Louis P. Farina, former president of the Young Democrats of the State of Illinois, to acquaint the youths of other nations about the United States. Recently a program sponsored by the Miami Herald published by John S. Knight, conducted "an operation amigo" at Miami attended by young American leaders who held conferences with 48 teenagers from high schools in Lima, Peru. This program received such widespread approval that another group of Peruvian students will be invited in the near future. The Miami Herald and its publisher, John S. Knight, is to be congratulated in sponsoring such a worthwhile program.

For 3 years Mr. Louis P. Farina has advanced the idea of bringing together young political leaders of foreign lands together with young American political leaders. As early as December 4, 1959, he corresponded with former President Eisenhower regarding an exchange of young political leaders of the United States and those of the Latin American countries as a forerunner of the Peace Corps for cementing understanding, and friendliness between other nations and the United States. The growth of this relationship under the Miami Herald program Operation Amigo establishes a common ground of understanding in all facets of American life. The school class attendance of these teenagers together contributes much to the understanding of the fundamental ideas of the American system of education.

Under the persistent leadership of Mr. Louis P. Farina his plan of exchanging young political leaders has been approved by the State Department and the administration. He is to be congratulated for successfully advancing through great effort during the last 3 years his plan of Operation Friendship.

The Chicago Daily Tribune has covered each of these programs in its recent issues, as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Feb. 17, 1962]

POLITICAL LOOKOUT

(By George Tagge)

Louis P. Farina, head of the city bureau of parking, has a political vehicle that keeps rolling despite a lack of public recognition. It is Operation Friendship, a program to exchange young political leaders of the United States with some from South America.

Farina said that his plan will be put into effect next month after 3 years of corresponding with the State Department and the White House.

He said he is elated over the prospective beachhead of friendship and political understanding with our Latin American neighbors. In the President Eisenhower administration, Farina was a member of a team of 10 young Democrats and 10 young Republicans which attended a NATO conference in Paris.

He is former president of the Illinois Young Democrats and former chairman of the Cook County Young Democrats organization.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Jan. 25, 1962]

MIAMI PLAYS HOST TO PERU TEENAGERS

MIAMI, January 24.—Forty-eight Peruvian teenagers from high schools in Lima are here having a wonderful time—and learning about the United States from American youngsters their own age—under a unique Operation Amigo sponsored by the Miami Herald.

The program has won such instantaneous and widespread approval, both in Florida and South America, that Herald officials expect to bring another group of Peruvian students here within a month.

"But there won't be enough such visitors to handle the demand, we're sure," said Pat Murphy, a Herald promotion man. "We've had requests from people all over the Greater Miami area to participate in the program, which was started as sort of a pilot experiment. Tampa, Fort Lauderdale, and St. Petersburg officials have sent us feelers about getting in on it, too."

APPEAL IS SIMPLICITY

The Miami Herald is one of the newspapers published by John S. Knight.

The program's appeal is in its simplicity and heartwarming lack of stuffiness. Here is its history, and how it works.

In December, a Lima lawyer named Dr. Raul Beraun visited Herald officials with a story, and the makings of an idea. Beraun said he was tired of hearing fellow Peruvians telling things about America he knew were not true. More important, he said, Peruvian boys and girls were getting bad information about the United States, from leftist sources and elsewhere. What could be done about it?

Herald Managing Editor George Beebe and others conferred with Beraun, and Operation Amigo was born. Beraun and fellow Peruvians would select top Lima high school students, and send them to Miami for a 2-week visit during which they would stay in the homes of American high school youngsters, go to school with them, and take part in their activities.

OFFERS $200 TICKETS

Peruvian Airlines offered a round-trip price of $200 each for the youngsters. About half of them had their fares paid by their families. Sponsoring organizations and individuals here and in Lima—Lima newspapers took part—paid part or all of the fares for poorer children.

Meanwhile, with the blessings of school authorities, Herald officials had gone before the student council of Miami's big Edison Senior High School with a request—would Edison students and their families take part? The answer was a roaring affirmative.

On January 12, the 48 Lima teenagers landed at Miami International Airport. The Herald's Juanita Greene, a veteran reporter, will never forget it.

"We had expected just the Edison student council to be on hand, but the school band was there, and at least 100 other students, and Miami Mayor Robert King High, and scores of other people," she said.

"The airport was turned into a big pep rally."

"The Edison band had spent the previous day and most of the night learning the Peruvian national anthem, and blared it out as the Peruvians came down the ramp. The Edison youngsters had formed a receiving line, and started out by shaking hands with their guests, but pretty soon everybody was

embracing everybody else in real South American style."

The Peruvian and American students were first taken to lunch at a swank hotel, then to Edison High.

"It looked like the whole student body had waited, even though school was over," said Miss Greene. "The visitors were mobbed by excited kids with questions—what was life like in Peru, did Lima kids like rock and roll, and a million others. Not all of the Peruvians could speak English, but it didn't seem to matter."

Parents who were to play host were there, too, and the visitors were soon on their way, matched as nearly as possible with American youngsters of their own age. Since then, they have lived like adopted children, going to classes at Edison, going swimming and to home parties, and joining in special events arranged for them. They also have visited law courts and seen city officials in action.

Yesterday they were flown to Tallahassee where they spent the day as guests of Gov. Farris Bryant, touring the capitol and ending up at a cake and dance session in the gubernatorial mansion, where Bryant's 15-year-old daughter, Celia, made a big hit. Today, the visitors are relaxing in the sun as swimming pool guests of a Miami Beach hotel.

FLY HOME MONDAY

They fly home Monday, but more will be coming. Murphy said some of the Peruvians have liked it so much they wanted to finish the semester here, and added: "More than that, some of the parents with whom they are staying have called school officials begging that they be allowed to."

Public Law 87-362: A Fitting Tribute to George Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, today we pay homage to the soldier statesman who, because of his great and heroic efforts in behalf of this Nation rightly earned the designation, "Father of Our Country."

On this commemoration of the birthday of George Washington, the 87th Congress may take pardonable pride in its recent efforts to further protect the Nation's most beloved shrine of Mount Vernon. Last year, Mount Vernon was about to experience a serious onslaught of commercial urbanization. The shores opposite Mount Vernon have been maintained to date, much as they were in the time of George Washington. Not only has this been of significant historical consequence, but it has been an inseparable part of the character and setting of Mount Vernon, and this view from the veranda of the mansion has thrilled and inspired the citizenry of our country and foreign dignitaries alike. When the threat to establish a sewage treatment plant on the Maryland shores of the Potomac, directly across from Mount Vernon, was apparent, the Congress of the United States acted swiftly and decisively. The Congress enacted Public Law 87-362, which authorized the Federal Government to acquire the land opposite Mount Vernon for preservation in keeping with its original open and wooded character.

The overwhelming support of this measure by the Congress offers proof, beyond the words of praise, of the feeling the citizens of this country, and their elected representatives, have for the memory of George Washington.

This body has been extremely fortunate over the years to have the very capable counsel and leadership in the area of natural resources of the chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. WAYNE ASPINALL. In learning of this threat, he introduced legislation to protect properly the environs of Mount Vernon. He was joined in this leadership by the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks, Mr. RUTHERFORD. These men were acutely aware of the need for fast action, if Mount Vernon was to receive adequate protection. During the committee's deliberation it became apparent that the preservation of this area heretofore had been achieved through planning and sacrifice by individual citizens. Private covenants were established to maintain the character of the area. Local government cooperation was asked, and plans were effected to establish zoning to the end of preservation. In addition, regional organizations, charged with the overall planning and coordination of the other areas of Metropolitan Washington, cooperated in urging that the area be kept in an open or park status. The State of Maryland had initiated standards to achieve the preservation of these lands. These activities have continued for over 15 years—activities that were manifested in good government by private citizens and local authorities. Unfortunately, the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission had wide powers of condemnation and eminent domain granted to it by the State, and the groups, both private and governmental, that labored so long were unable to restrain the sanitary commission from their plans of establishing a sewage treatment plant opposite George Washington's front porch. The Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission held hearings over a year ago, on January 13, 1961, in which the majority of the affected landowners, in addition to national conservation and historic societies vigorously objected to these plans and procedures. On August 17, 1961, the Subcommittee on National Parks, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Congressman from Texas, held hearings on the measures introduced to afford Federal protection to these areas. In the course of these hearings, it became apparent that there were other locations that could better serve the area than the one chosen by the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission. A great deal of testimony was given to the committee as to the advisability of locating a much larger sewage treatment plant at the Mattowoman Creek site, and in an area already industrialized. This would be a plant more in keeping with the future needs of the area, would be a joint venture between Prince Georges and Charles Counties, in the State of Maryland, and a design and type much recommended by the Federal Anti-Pollution Control Act. Additional testimony was given that existing facilities could indeed handle the existing sewage treatment problem. No opposition witnesses appeared before the subcommittee. As a result, the proponents of the sewage plant could not be questioned. Yet despite their failure to appear, those urging the construction of such a plant continued to urge the need for speeding up this construction.

None of the supporters of the measure to protect Mount Vernon desired precipitous action. None desired to work serious hardship on the local residents. All were somewhat baffled at the insistence of the great urgency to construct this sewage treatment plant. On further investigation, it was revealed that the developers of a subdivision across the Piscataway Bay, and some distance from the area in question, had plans to create a high density development. In order to achieve this objective, proper sewage disposal was necessary. They applied for a permit to erect a sewage treatment plant on their own area of development. They then proceeded to abandon the plans for such a plant, and indicated plans to build a marina in the area that was to have served them for proper sewage disposal. At this point, they then urged the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission to construct a sewage plant at Mockley Point, which had the effect of taking the sewage from a high density development and dumping it onto an area of low density development. With this knowledge and information, the committee acted to authorize the Federal Government to acquire these areas. The measure was drafted in order to avail the Federal Government of the generosity of the private foundations who offered to give their land to the Federal Government for the purposes of preservation. Our own colleague, the distinguished Congresswoman from Ohio, Mrs. FRANCES BOLTON, who is also the vice regent of the Mount Vernon Ladies Association provided from her private resources, funds to enable the Accokeek Foundation to acquire considerable acreage in order to prevent commercialization. These foundations now stood ready to donate almost 50 percent of the entire land that would be acquired under Public Law 87-362. The House, upon hearing the able presentation of the chairman of the National Parks Subcommittee, Mr. RUTHERFORD, acted without a dissenting vote to authorize this legislation.

The Senate was no less mindful of this threat to Mount Vernon, and under the capable leadership of the distinguished chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Mr. ANDERSON, who was joined in this effort by the distinguished Senator from Nevada, chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Lands, Mr. BIBLE, introduced legislation to provide for the Federal protection of Mount Vernon. Since a number of inquiries had not been answered by those seeking to erect a sewage treatment plant, Senator ANDERSON wrote the chairman of the Washington Suburban

Sanitary Commission, Mr. Blair Smith, indicating that the first session of the 87th Congress was about to end, and that the Senate might better appraise the situation if it were allowed the time to do so. Senator ANDERSON then asked if any plans for construction could be held in abeyance until the Senate returned, thus affording a more ample opportunity to investigate the matter. The chairman of the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission replied that they would be happy to have the advice of the Senate, but made no commitment as to holding plans in abeyance until the Senate returned. As a result of this correspondence, hearings were scheduled quickly before the Subcommittee on Public Lands, under the able chairmanship of Senator BIBLE. Witnesses opposing the measure were members of the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, the real estate developers and two landowners. The overwhelming majority of witnesses however, were in strong support of the Anderson bill. The indecisive actions of the opposing witnesses appeared no match for the volume of evidence in support of the measure, and this no doubt hastened the committee, and subsequent Senate action, as the measure passed without dissent. Few measures have come before the Congress with such wide and vigorous support, and it appears that the Congress, in its swift resolve of the matter, has worked the will of the people. I should like to include, Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks, a partial list of the many organizations that have supported this legislation.

Beginning with the hearings in the Senate, the tact of the real estate developers and the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission underwent a subtle change. They renounced their earlier position of placing a sewage treatment plant at Mockley Point and assured the Senate that the area could accommodate a park and a sewage treatment plant. There were further assurances that such a plant would not be seen from Mount Vernon, or intrude in any way upon the scenic area, or be disadvantageous to the proposed park itself. This, of course, would have required a reduction in the proposed park area. Later arguments of this same group indicate not only would the plant not be visible, but it would be appropriately landscaped and blended with the area surrounding it. Evidence to this fact, they contend, is the sewage treatment plant contiguous to the Washington-Baltimore Parkway, which is so well concealed that few people know of its existence.

The proponents of the legislation to protect Mount Vernon have sought to decide these issues on the merits of the relative cases. It should be stated candidly however, that the proponents of the sewage treatment plant are either incompetent, or they are not coming clean in their discussion of these issues. They use the analogy of the sewage treatment plant near the Baltimore Parkway. Is it their contention that their proposed sewage treatment plant on the Piscataway Bay shore of Maryland is to be of the same size, using essentially the same techniques of sewage disposal? Why do they continue to be vague as to the new location of the sewage treatment plant. Precisely where is it to be? Are we to take their word that while they will need part of the park area, it still will not be seen from Mount Vernon? Mr. Speaker, these arguments are spurious and fall by their own weight. If the plant is to be so small, why do not the developers put it on their own land? But then can it be so small, if the main reason for locating it in the Piscataway area is to serve a large area? As to the exact location, the framers of the legislation were completely aware of possible alternatives and drew the boundaries for Federal acquisition and protection of Mount Vernon with precisely this in mind. The argument that a little sewage treatment plant tucked in the corner of the proposed park would not be intrusive, will not wash.

That the developers are anxious to place their sewage in this low density area, or into the park, is without question. I ask unanimous consent Mr. Speaker, to include in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, a letter from the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission to Mr. Douglas L. Hatch, president of the Prince Georges Utilities Co., an organization controlled by one of the real estate developers, confirming that these real estate developers, through the Prince Georges Utilities Co., had offered a contribution of $500,000 to the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, if they would build this plant in the Piscataway Bay area. Perhaps it is good business for the developers to enhance the value of their own property by paying to have their sewage dumped on someone else, but it is a serious question as to whether it is good business for the American people. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that it takes quite a degree of callousness to infer that the legislation authorizing Federal acquisition is too greedy, and too asking in terms of the need it seeks to meet, when the people making these charges are the same ones who would have public agencies bail them out of their own financial dilemma at a considerable cost to the American public in terms of a most serious intrusion upon one of the most majestic, most historic, most revered scenes of the Nation.

The concern of this country has been manifest again and again at the disappearance of open space. The encroachments upon national shrines and monuments, and the need for concerted action to preserve and protect these beneficences of nature that are irreplaceable. This is not a matter of partisan politics, but rather of deep national concern that touches all regardless of political persuasion. Those who have been active in the effort to further protect Mount Vernon represent every walk of life. The leadership in this great body to which I referred to earlier has been forthright and basic, and practiced by Chairman ASPINALL and the members of his committee. The same statement can be made of the distinguished chairman, Mr. ANDERSON, who has a like role in the Senate. The backgrounds of these men indicate the knowledgability and wisdom that they consistently bring to these matters.

Certainly, the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association is to be congratulated for their long time efforts in the early restoration and preservation of Mount Vernon, inclusive of all its grounds and buildings. The State of Virginia has aided and abetted the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association over the years in order to present to the American people and the world, the home of America's first President in a proper and reverent setting, and their efforts should be honored and appreciated.

Aid and invaluable assistance in this vigilance, was received by the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, under the leadership of Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, often referred to by his colleagues and Government leaders alike as "Mr. Conservation." Their concern for the dignity and preservation of monuments so cherished by this country has been long evidenced by the activities of this fine group and their judgments respected.

Of great significance, has been the appreciation and gracious demeanor of our first family for the shrine of Mount Vernon, perhaps evidenced by Mrs. Kennedy's description as the "Nation's most revered house." This is a charge to all Americans to keep it that way.

WASHINGTON SUBURBAN
SANITARY COMMISSION.

Mr. DOUGLAS L. HATCH,
President, Prince George's Utilities, Inc., Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HATCH: Please refer to the commission's letter of August 26, 1960, wherein you were advised that the commission had approved the project consisting of a sewage treatment plant and the necessary sewers and pumping stations to serve the Piscataway drainage basin, subject to a contribution of $500,000. As you know, since that time considerable opposition has been voiced toward the construction of a sewage treatment plant in the Piscataway Bay area, both by letters and in person at the hearing held by the commission on January 13, 1961, at the courthouse at Upper Marlboro regarding this project.

At the hearing the commission was strongly urged to undertake a joint project with Charles County and construct a sewage treatment plant in the vicinity of Mattawoman Creek. Preliminary investigations have been made and the matter discussed with the officials of Charles County and the indications are that Charles County would not be in a position to proceed promptly with such a project. Before making any final decision on the location of a sewage treatment plant, however, the commission would like the engineering department to complete its study regarding this possibility and pursue the matter further with officials of Charles County.

One of the major objections to the construction of a sewerage system in the Piscataway drainage basin at this time is that a large part of the area is outside of the regional district of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission and not subject to zoning controls. The Park and Planning Commission has included in its proposed legislation that this area be added to the regional district at this session of the General Assembly of the State of Maryland. If such legislation is passed it would normally be effective June 1, 1961.

At the hearing the commission presented a letter from Mrs. Wolman and Geyer, consultants to the Washington Metropolitan Regional Sanitary Board, indicating that the construction of a plant on Piscataway Bay would not be inconsistent with the regional sewerage system for the metropolitan area.

The commission has been advised that the final report being prepared by those consultants is exepcted to be completed in June. The commission desires, if possible, that its sewerage program be consistent with the regional sewer plan for the metropolitan area.

In view of the above, the commission has decided that it is not in a position to proceed at this time with the proposed project for Piscataway Bay which it indicated it would undertake subject to a contribution of $500,000. Before definitely deciding to proceed with this project, the commission desires to have available to it the results of further discussion with Charles County, the decision as to whether the area is added to the regional district and the report of the Washington Metropolitan Regional Sanitary Board. It appears that all of this information should be available by July of this year, at which time a decision can be made as to the method of handling the sewage of the Piscataway Basin. The commission realizes that this will delay your program, but it is believed to be in the best public interest to follow such a procedure.

Very truly yours,

JOHN BONIFANT, *Secretary.*

Cooley Supports President's Action on Barter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post of February 12 there was a news story quoting a Member of Congress, one of my distinguished colleagues, as charging the President with inconsistency for permitting barter transactions under Public Law 480 while at the same time calling for a review and possible reduction of the Nation's strategic stockpile. With all deference to the gentleman, may I say that I believe he is confused about the basic purposes of the Nation's stockpiling programs and should familiarize himself with the laws enacted by Congress before commenting on the President's action.

The President's reference in his recent press conference was to the so-called strategic or national stockpile which is established under the authority of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act. Its purpose is to acquire and stockpile materials which will be needed by this country in the event of war. The requirements of that stockpile have been changed from time to time as our military strategists have modified and modernized their conception of the type of war in which the United States might be forced to engage.

The other stockpile is the supplemental stockpile which was established by the Agricultural Act of 1956 to hold for future use materials which are acquired under the barter program authorized and directed in Public Law 480, which was enacted in 1954. The basic purpose of this program is to obtain something of permanent value to the United States in exchange for surplus agricultural commodities which cannot be sold abroad for cash—and thus protecting the investment of the taxpayers of the United States in materials which are acquired under our agricultural price support program.

I do not know the full details of the particular transaction referred to by my colleague, but I do know that neither the President of the United States nor anyone else has made a mistake in taking such materials in exchange for our surplus agricultural commodities and I believe that the transactions to which the gentleman referred complied in all respects with the policies laid down by the Congress for such exchanges.

The Congress, by its enactment of Public Law 480, established various methods to reduce our agricultural surpluses and at the same assure our country of receiving as much return as possible from these surpluses to offset the cost of our farm program. The Congress recognized that it was impossible for us to reduce our surpluses solely through the sale of commodities for dollars and therefore directed in Public Law 480 that in addition to selling for dollars or for short-term dollar credit, these commodities be sold for soft currencies, that they be donated outright in certain cases, that they be exchanged for strategic or other materials, and that they be sold on a long-term dollar credit basis.

Subsequently, the Congress specifically established priorities for these various types of disposals. We have told the executive branch that they should give preference first, to the sales for dollars; second, to short-term credit; third, the exchange of our commodities for materials of which the United States does not produce its requirements, which are not perishable, and which are cheaper to store; fourth, long-term dollar credit; and last, sales for soft currencies.

I particularly call the language of the law to the attention of my colleague because the barter transactions for lead and zinc to which he referred clearly fall within the law and the directives given by Congress to the executive branch.

First, I am informed that the United States produces only about 70 percent of the quantity of lead and zinc which is consumed annually in the United States and that our known lead and zinc deposits are gradually being used up. As to the second requirement, perishability, I am informed that lead and zinc can be stored in the open on military reservations and other Government property for generations with no deterioration whatever. In contrast, the wheat and corn which were exchanged for the lead will stay in condition only a few years even under the best possible enclosed storage conditions, and soon lose their value completely.

Third, with respect to the cost of storage, Government figures show that it costs about 12 cents a year to store a ton of lead, whereas it costs approximately $4.50 a year to store a ton of wheat or $4.82 a year to store a ton of corn in approved commercial storage. To put it another way, a ton of lead could be stored for approximately 2,000 years before the storage charges would equal the value of the material. On the other hand, studies by the Department of Agriculture show that the value of a ton of grain will be eaten up by storage, handling, and carrying charges in less than 5 years, so that within this period the value of the bushel of grain, or a ton of grain, is reduced to zero. Each year the savings in storage and deterioration losses on the counterpart wheat or corn given in exchange for the lead the gentlemen referred to will provide sufficient revenue to store the lead for a period of more than 250 years.

An even more interesting example, Mr. Speaker, is in the case of industrial diamonds. This is one of the materials for which the President has authorized the exchange of our agricultural surpluses. The United States produces virtually no industrial diamonds but we use approximately 80 percent of the world's output. The volume of this need for industrial diamonds in our highly industrialized economy is increasing yearly and we must depend upon foreign sources for virtually all our requirements. I am informed that industrial diamonds valued at $100 million can be stored and insured for less than $1,500 per year. When we exchange perishable wheat or corn for imperishable industrial diamonds, 1 year's savings in the storage and deterioration loss on the wheat and corn will provide sufficient revenue to store industrial diamonds for more than 10,000 years before we have exhausted the savings.

To me, Mr. Speaker, no part of our agricultural export program makes more sense than this program of exchanging perishable and costly to store agricultural surpluses for nonperishable materials which we do not produce in sufficient quantity in the United States to meet our requirements and which can be stored at very little cost.

I must admit that I do not understand the reasoning of those who claim that we can have too much of any of these materials. How can we possibly have too much of a nonrenewable natural resource which is absolutely indispensable to our industrial economy? Does anyone contend that we have too much oil? That we have too much iron ore? That we have too much natural gas? How then, can it be assumed that we have too much of any other nonrenewable natural resource, particularly those which are indispensable to our economy and which are not even produced in the United States?

How can we possibly have in storage in this country too many industrial diamonds, too much chromite, too much manganese, too much palladium— materials which we must have for our national survival and for which we must depend for our supplies upon nations which may or may not always be friendly to the United States and willing to sell these materials to us? Suppose it is 300 years before we need the lead which we acquired by bartering corn and wheat last summer. When we need it the lead will be there, and the cost of storing it for that period of time will be infinitesimal compared to the cost of storing the agricultural commodities we have ex-

changed for it, or compared to the benefits to be derived to the United States from the mere fact that we have it available for use when we need it.

To put it succinctly, Mr. Speaker, under this program we are exchanging national liabilities for national assets.

The mere existence of these metals and other materials in the United States is a national asset and there is no reason whatever to assume that the Government, which owns these materials, cannot manage them to the best interest of private industry and the Nation as a whole. Much of our indigenous natural resources, many oil and gas reserves, many of our mineral reserves are the property of the Government—and I have seldom heard any complaint that these resources are not being managed by the Government in the best interests of the United States. There is no more reason to assume that reserves which we stockpile in exchange for perishable agricultural commodities will not be managed, likewise, in the best interests of all of the people of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has repeatedly examined into the reasons why the previous administration practically eliminated the barter program in early 1957. Prior to that time, the program was functioning smoothly and we had received virtually no complaints about its operation. We had moved more than a billion dollars worth of surplus agricultural commodities into the markets of the free world and had received in exchange materials which not only met the criteria established by the law, but which according to the information supplied by the Department of Agriculture had actually appreciated in value since their acquisition. Materials for which we exchanged approximately $1 billion worth of surplus agricultural commodities under barter transactions were worth approximately $1,100 million in 1959 when the Committee on Agriculture conducted its most extensive examination of this program.

Obviously, the Congress knew what it was doing when it passed the so-called barter law to which our colleague takes exception. However, he might be pleased to know that he is joined in this view by some individuals in the State Department who do not believe that we should get value returned for our surplus agricultural commodities but that we should use them only for give-away purposes in an international welfare program.

The position of those who have opposed the barter program directed by Congress is that such exchanges have interferred with cash sales of our agricultural commodities. It is rather clear, however, to those of us who have followed this program carefully that the real basis of opposition is that this program has made U.S. agricultural commodities competitive in markets where they would not otherwise be able to compete. They have not interferred with our cash sales but with the sales of other countries, many of which are conducted on precisely the same barter and bilateral basis to which they find objection in our own exports. Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary for me to repeat here the many arguments that have been advanced and the reports rendered on both sides of the Congress in support of the barter program. I do state categorically that based on our committee investigations and the actions taken by the Congress we believe that disposals through the barter program have actually helped sales for dollars because of the linking of certain aspects of the commercial transactions and because they have actually made our commodities competitive on a world market. It must be remembered that both the surplus commodities and the incoming materials flow through normal trade channels and regardless of the use of the world "barter" they are handled as any other commercial transactions.

The testimony of Government witnesses before our committee has been crystal clear that prices paid by exporters for the agricultural commodities is exactly the same as if they had been purchased for cash and the prices paid for the materials which are received in exchange are at or below the prevailing market prices. Further, statistics given us by Department of Agriculture witnesses showed that as barter increased so did our sales for cash and when barter was curtailed our cash sales dropped off even more.

I, for one, my committee, and the Congress have clearly stated time and again that it is much better to receive hard diamonds or manganese in exchange for our surplus agricultural commodities than soft currencies, most of which we immediately donate back to the recipient country in the form of grants or soft loans which will probably never be repaid. As the Members of Congress individually may or may not know, it is now the current procedure of the executive branch to make sales for foreign currencies on a basis which returns approximately 75 percent of the foreign currency received to the country of destination in the form of long-term loans which will probably never be repaid. When it is remembered that on these transactions the United States pays in dollars not only the cost of the agricultural commodities but also the ocean shipping charges, it has been calculated by those who are familiar with this subject that we are receiving a return of approximately 6 percent to the American taxpayer on these commodities which are sold for foreign currencies. On commodities which are bartered for materials we will need in the future, we are receiving a return of approximately 100 percent and the ocean transportation is paid by the contractor who provides the materials.

Mr. Speaker, I think the record is clear that the Committee on Agriculture and the Congress have never refused to give the administration any authority it requested to donate our surplus agricultural commodities without compensation to other nations of the world in order to facilitate our foreign relations program. We have made available without compensation all of the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation which the administration has told us could effectively be used in promoting our foreign relations. The only request we have made is that before we give these commodities away we do our best to obtain for American taxpayers and for this country as much actual return in value as we are able to do. This is the only request which we make now. It is the reason for the barter program. It is one way in which we can get something of value for the United States and for the American taxpayer in return for our agricultural surpluses.

So far as I am personally concerned Mr. Speaker, and although I can speak only for myself, I believe that I reflect the sentiment of the whole Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, I intend to insist that every effort be made to obtain something of value for the United States for our agricultural surpluses before they are given away. As far as I am concerned I do not intend to vote for one single additional bit of authority for foreign donation of our agricultural surpluses as long as arbitrary roadblocks are being put in the way of exchanging our commodities or selling them for something of real value to the United States. When I am convinced that every effort is being made to obtain for the American taxpayer as great a return as is possible for our surplus agricultural commodities, then I will be willing to go along with proposals to donate abroad as much of the rest of the surplus as can be used effectively to relieve hunger and hardship.

I have been greatly encouraged by the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture has carefully studied this problem and is currently planning to issue new directives designed to assure a greater use of this disposal method. I am further encouraged to believe that this position is supported by our Chief Executive.

On the other hand, we are disturbed by stories that notwithstanding the wording of the law and its clear intent, there still remains some residual opposition from the same staff levels that sponsored opposition to the barter program in the past administration. The Congress is convinced that this is a sound program of which we should make maximum utilization. The law on this point is clear. We agree that the program needs to be most carefully administered in the future as it has been in the past to avoid either overstimulating foreign production or creating artificial shortages in world supply. I have heard no criticism of the failure of the Department of Agriculture to do this in the past.

My distinguished colleague seemed to feel that the barter transaction to which he referred was adversely affecting domestic producers of lead in his district. I am certain that he did not know, or if he did, he failed to recognize the import of the fact, that not only was this particular transaction in strict accordance with the law and the intent of the Congress but was used as a tool to get an agreement from the foreign suppliers of this particular lead to cut back their production by 10 percent. Furthermore, it reduced surpluses of lead hanging over the market which were equally depressing world and domestic prices.

Nature has seen fit to give us the soil and the climate, which, when coupled with our technical and production methods, make us the greatest producer of agricultural commodities in the world. In order to keep our farm industry we have properly established farm programs which in part have created our commodity surpluses. On the other hand, we are a have-not nation for many of the metals and minerals without which our industry cannot function.

If we can take our agricultural surpluses and through normal trade channels secure national resources which every study made indicates we will need in our future economy and at the same time reduce our storage costs and losses by deterioration, I feel that we have a national program which is good by the standards of any reasonable man.

If this is not a good program, if there is anything evil about taking something of value in return for our perishable surplus agricultural commodities, then, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the time has come to repeal the law in its entirety. All evidence points to the desirability of the program. But the law should either be carried out or repealed, and I am confident that the President will see that the law is carried out.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the House that I have requested Congressman JONES, one of our most able and outstanding committee members, through his Subcommittee on Departmental Oversight and Consumer Relations, to make a study as to the present status of the barter program. I have directed him to make a particular effort to analyze and make public the sources of opposition to the program and the bases for this opposition. I believe that this study will prove to be illuminating and helpful, and if, as I understand to be true, we have had in the meantime an announcement as to a revised program to make greater use of the barter method of disposing of surpluses, the subcommittee can judge the effectiveness of the changed program. Certainly we need to accurately determine the value that our country is receiving from the surplus commodities disposed of through this method to reassure ourselves that this value supports our present faith in the program.

The Case Against U.S. Trading With Communist Bloc Countries—Speech by Hon. Thomas M. Pelly, of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD a speech by Representative THOMAS M. PELLY, which he delivered before the Yale University Political Union on February 19, 1962.

The speech was on a most timely topic entitled "The Case Against U.S. Trading With Communist Bloc Countries."

As a member of the House Select Committee on Export Control which over a number of months has been holding hearings and conducting studies in regard to trade with the Soviet bloc and U.S. trade control policies, I believe it is vital that the nature of the problems confronting us in this area are known by the citizens of the Nation.

It is important in my opinion for the citizens to know the significance of trade with the bloc which helps toward building up Soviet economic and military capabilities.

I was therefore happy to see that this subject was discussed by Representative PELLY on that occasion.

THE CASE AGAINST U.S. TRADING WITH COMMUNIST BLOC COUNTRIES

(Text of speech of Representative THOMAS M. PELLY, First District, Washington, State, delivered before Yale University Political Union, Monday, February 19, 1962)

Friends and members of the Yale Political Union, as a preface to our discussion on the subject of trade with Communist bloc nations, it would seem to be orderly procedure to start with a summary of U.S. policies under which our trade is conducted.

Difficult as it is to do it, the U.S. policy attempts to draw a distinction between strategic and nonstrategic goods and materials.

Yet one may fairly wonder if there are any such items as "nonstrategic" goods as far as Soviet needs are concerned. The war of two ideologies is being waged on two fronts: On the one hand it is a contest of armaments, missiles, and military strength and on the other it is one of economic competition in which the Communist leaders, I would suppose, expect to outdo us. On this latter score, it is difficult to identify products that lack significant strategic value.

Tonight I have thought to comment in a general way on sales to the Communists of commercial goods and then after that to discuss trade which more directly bears on our national security.

The policy of the United States under the Export Control Act of 1949 is to use export controls to the extent necessary (a) to protect the domestic economy from a drain on strategic materials (and with a huge oversupply of stockpiled materials at the present time, this provision can be ignored this evening) and (b) the policy is to use export controls to further the foreign policy of the United States, and (c) also the policy is to exercise the necessary vigilance over exports from the standpoint of national security.

Under the law, our policies of security export controls include embargoes to Communist China, North Korea, North Vietnam, and, as of 10 days ago, Cuba (embargoes to those four areas); and restrictive controls of exports to the U.S.S.R. and other Soviet bloc countries, limiting direct shipments of U.S. products for these latter destinations to nonstrategic exports. Controls over our shipments to the free world countries cover only a highly selected list of goods to prevent, if possible, their unauthorized diversion to the Soviet bloc.

All commercial exports from the United States, its territories, and possessions are prohibited unless the Department of Commerce has either issued a validated license or established a general license permitting such shipments.

It should be noted, perhaps, that following congressional adjournment last fall, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee had under study the operations and effectiveness of our export controls on shipments of strategic goods to the Sino-Soviet bloc; and more recently, a select committee of the House of Representatives has concluded hearings in connection with a study of the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Export Control Act. This act expires June 30, 1962, and its reenactment will come up for consideration shortly, so our discussion tonight is timely.

These House and Senate studies were the result of public concern as to the Government's wisdom in allowing shipments of certain commodities, machines, and manufactured products to the Sino-Soviet bloc.

Also, as much as anything, a sale of $365 million worth of grain by Canada to Red China and public disclosure of various transactions, such as U.S. sale of jet planes to Yugoslavia were the cause of indignant protests by the American people over existing policies. Certain Members of Congress have criticized the administration and in my case I introduced legislation to ban all exports to all nations with Communist governments. Indeed, I have wanted to go further and restrict economic assistance of any kind to nations which sell so-called semistrategic materials such as grain to the Communists.

Here I must point up that the distinction between strategic and nonstrategic materials has posed a difficult problem and raised a strong difference of views in our Government. In administering the Export Act, the Secretary of Commerce consults with the Departments of State and Defense and other agencies of Government. Of course, the decision for or against trade with the Communists ultimately will be decided by the people. The force of overall public opinion, under our system of Government, eventually sets policy. Momentarily, however, the distress of many Members of Congress, it appears that the administration's desire to increase industrial output and to increase foreign trade, even with the Soviet bloc, has resulted in the lifting of restrictions on strategic commodities; either this, or we seem to have gone along submissively with our allies.

Data as to the nature and amount of trade with the Soviet bloc is very limited. This is because (1) the Communists do not publish complete and continuous information concerning their economic activities, and (2) all prices within the Soviet bloc are administered prices with frequent changes. For example, in East Germany the price of an automobile is approximately 16,000 marks, whereas the identical car can be bought in West Germany for about 7,000 marks.

Another case I have seen cited is of a tractor selling for the equivalent of 21,500 Swiss francs inside the bloc, as against 13,600 Swiss francs outside the bloc, and other similar examples have been quoted in wheat and coal sales.

Exports from the Soviet bloc are based on political considerations, while as for Soviet purchases Khrushchev has been quoted as saying: "We want to buy products in which we really are interested." He has made it clear that the Soviets do not intend to open themselves as a market for goods just because the free world is seeking a consumer outlet for its surplus production.

One of the arguments against U.S. trade with the Soviet bloc is the business risk involved which is greater than in trading with other areas. Bloc trade involves another difficulty, in the lack of commercial skills on the part of the Communists and always the dangers of unilateral breach of contract by Soviet bloc countries hangs like the sword of Damocles over East-West business transactions. Invariably, claims for damages due to breach of contract have been decided by a panel of Soviet arbitrators in Russia's favor

and legal redress through Communist courts is of doubtful value.

Especially the United States stands to lose in East-West trade because of the abuse of any patent protection. The Communists have become masters of product copying, bypassing time-consuming research and development expense; and also thereby eliminating the need for further trade. There is no effective protection against patent piracy by the Soviets because there are no patent conventions.

Some American economists take the position that with the exception of munitions and arms, our official policy should be one of free trade between the Communists and non-Communists. Support for this position may be prejudiced, owning to the fact that trade with Communist countries is often quite profitable to free world traders. Price is arbitrary in the bloc countries, which often brings lucrative short-term benefits.

On the other hand many, including myself, take the position that the Soviet bloc would not purchase anything from us unless it was to their economic and political advantage to do so.

In short, without any military considerations, a good case can be made against trading with the Soviet bloc countries as far as U.S. national interests are concerned, especially since our trade with the Communists is insignificant in the aggregate and I believe that in the balance the United States is better off without it. So much for commercial trade.

Now, let us consider the sale of so-called strategic goods—items of military significance.

The Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951—known as the Battle Act—supplements the Export Control Act. The Battle Act declares it to be the policy of the United States to embargo shipments of arms, ammunition and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation and other materials of strategic value to nations threatening U.S. security, including the U.S.S.R. and nations under its domination.

This act, moreover, makes it mandatory to stop any kind of assistance to any nation which knowingly allows sale of arms to the Soviet bloc. Sale of strategic materials used in war production to Communist bloc countries calls for termination of U.S. aid, unless the President decides cessation of aid would be detrimental to our security.

Unfortunately, in my opinion, the provision calling for discontinuance of aid to a nation selling materials of strategic value to Soviet bloc countries has not been used. There is not one case of the Battle Act provision having been invoked. On the other hand, there have been 19 Presidential determinations to continue U.S. assistance in spite of other nations having sold strategic materials to the Soviet bloc. These were the following countries: Belgium, Denmark, West Germany, France, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Turkey, and the United Kingdom. Fourteen determinations affecting eight countries have been classified, under Executive privilege so there is no information available on these latter cases.

As to the free world system of controls, the United States consults with 14 other free world countries, Belgium, France, Norway, Denmark, United Kingdom, Netherlands, Luxembourg, West Germany, Portugal, Italy, France, Turkey, Japan, and Canada—a voluntary association of representatives of these nations known as Cocom (for Coordinating Committee) has been formed.

Cocom countries have one list of commodities under complete embargo on export to the Soviet bloc. This group of nations has as its basic purpose the denial to the Communists of materials, equipment and technical data involving technical services which would aid the military-industrial mobilization base of unfriendly countries. Or at least that was its objective at the start.

Over the years since 1950 when Cocom was organized, through its members' eagerness to increase their foreign trade, many items on the international list of embargoed commodities have been removed, even though of obvious strategic importance.

In addition to the Cocom list, in the United States the Department of Commerce has a list known as the positive list. These are called presumption-for-denial items against export to the Communists. Validated licenses must be obtained for export of these commodities to all destinations except Canada.

The chairman of the House Committee on Export Policy, Congressman PAUL KITCHIN, of South Carolina—a former FBI agent—stated the other day that evidence establishes that the Cocom list, the Battle Act list, and the positive list have all been eroded, meaning that bit by bit their effectiveness has been lessened by deletions and yet it takes unanimous decision of all member nations to remove an item from the Cocom list. The excuse is that willingness on our part for the removal of items from the list was to prevent a breakdown in the whole setup, but I am far from sure those administering our controls themselves genuinely believed in the control program. U.S. decisions, we are told, in allowing licenses to be issued on export commodities of strategic goods to the Soviet bloc follow a policy of granting permission on the basis that if some other country will supply an item we will approve it, too. As an example, the Department of Defense strenuously objected to approval of an application for the issuance of a license to export to the U.S.S.R. certain machines capable of producing 360,000 V-8 engine motor blocks each year.

Due to diplomatic considerations, a restudy was requested. Secretary of Defense McNamara reversed the position of all the Department experts. The reason given was that similar machines could be obtained from alternative sources abroad. These machines had been internationally embargoed by the 14 Cocom countries—but for reasons unknown had been deleted from the list.

The application, however, is still pending because the Congress is interested. Someone is fearful of public reaction to this sale which would increase greatly the Soviet production of military trucks and tanks.

At the present time, also, in the Department of Commerce there are pending export applications for many millions of dollars worth of similar commodities, classified as strategic, to the Soviet bloc countries. Since Congress has been studying export policy, there has been a marked slowdown in such approvals.

However, that does not alter the situation that prior to this study vast quantities of scrap copper, steel, and iron scrap, borates, and hundreds of other strategic commodities were allowed to go to Communist Yugoslavia. Have we so soon forgotten the tragic lessons of history—Bataan, Pearl Harbor, Midway, Guadalacanal, to name only a few—when we were on the receiving end of our own scrap iron from Japan? And, by the way, before World War II, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, a younger man then, and perhaps wiser, picketed the loading of that scrap iron for Japan at San Francisco.

Speaking of Yugoslavia, the United States has had a less restrictive policy on exports to Poland and Yugoslavia than to the Soviet Union.

Our policy has been to encourage the development of free world economic ties with Yugoslavia. For example, under that policy, through various programs we have supplied her Government with 683 planes. We have equipped and maintained her air force. With regard to Poland, we have permitted more liberal export policies so as to evidence our sympathy and support to the Polish people.

Public Law 87-195 of September 4, 1961 (so-called foreign aid), section 620(B) states: "No assistance shall be furnished under this act to the government of any country unless the President determines that such country is not dominated or controlled by the international Communist movement."

My mail tells me many of my constituents disagree with the President's determination in these two instances of Yugoslavia and Poland. I think you will agree and history will support the view of my constituents. You who have studied the Marxian philosophy—now, ask yourselves in all seriousness—on whose side do you think these nations will be in any final showdown?

The United States in recent years has exported billions of dollars worth of food and military aid to Yugoslavia, including jet airplanes, and trained their pilots under the policy that such assistance is in the interest of national defense. Tito's expressed pro-Soviet attitude at the Belgrade Conference of so-called neutrals has caused great indignation and unhappiness among the American people. Yugoslavia's votes in the United Nations—and particularly the one in favor of admitting Red China—added to the public fury. But Secretary of State Rusk takes the position our aid and trade is not designed to win friends. So he testified—I had thought otherwise.

Some of us believe communism is the same in the U.S.S.R., Poland, Yugoslavia, Cuba, or even in this country. The purpose of the Communists in some 80 of the world's countries is revolution and an international conspiracy frankly intent on destroying free governments and, as Khrushchev put it, "to bury us." Poland's position on international issues is rarely distinguished from that of the Soviet bloc. She is formally bound to the U.S.S.R. by treaties and such instrumentalities as the Warsaw Pact and her troops maneuver in East Germany. I cannot understand a policy that says she is not controlled by the international Communist movement. I cannot agree that technical assistance by Yugoslavia and Poland to Cuba, North Korea, and North Vietnam is normal and natural, as viewed by Secretary Rusk.

The President of the United States through the advice of the National Security Council determines export policy within the framework of law. In this connection, it has appeared that after his inauguration, President Kennedy embarked on a course of seeking to win Soviet good will through a change in trade policies.

One such generous impulse was an announcement in March 1961, as I recall, whereby the ban was lifted on shipment to the Soviet bloc of surplus subsidized grain. Here, the idea of allowing Russians to buy food at considerably lower prices than American housewives can buy it resulted in many indignant American consumers. And then there arose the question: is not food a strategic commodity? Does not an army still march on its stomach? Certainly our military experts believe this is true.

Secretary Rusk argues that because of Soviet difficulties in their agricultural program, the Communists are forced to strain themselves to buy foodstuffs rather than use their foreign exchange for supporting subversion and revolution abroad. The Secretary takes the point of view it is safer for us if they use foreign exchange to acquire food rather than for purchase of other goods. This has logic.

Yet, let us look at the other side of the argument. Agriculture is one of the really serious problems of the Communists, a problem wherein they suffered their most serious failure. Why not keep as many workers as possible in the fields meeting Soviet food needs rather than in factories producing implements of war? Remember, the Soviet

Union is capable of feeding its own people, provided it concentrates on production of food instead of building up its military potential.

The issue of selling grain for food is especially important in connection with Red China. Many Americans, of course, are softhearted and cannot support a policy of refusing food to people who are hungry. Other people were sharply critical of Canada when it negotiated the $365 million sale of surplus wheat to Red China. That was when the United States relented and approved of the United States supplying pumps to unload the grain in Red China. In my judgment, this issue is recognition that actually we are at war, cold though it be.

I hold the view that after 3 bad crop years—and little prospect of being able to feed her exploding population—agriculture under Red China's Communist system has failed miserably. The food shortage is the one way of proving to the skeptical mainland Chinese that their system cannot compete with free enterprise. Signs have appeared in China: "We want food—not machines."

So, when Canada, Australia, and more recently, France, provide food, it seems to me they are helping assure that communism in China will succeed.

Suppose we sold the 500,000 tons of wheat to Russia, an order for which Secretary Hodges, of Commerce, had under consideration—and still does, I believe—there would be no way to prevent her transshipping it on to Red China for propaganda purposes.

I feel in the long run we could do our free way of life more good by going on paying storage costs, onerous as that is. Anything, rather than help communism succeed. America cannot win a cold war without sacrifice. We cannot do business as usual, practicing the Golden Rule, unless all parties use the same set of rules. A cold war cannot be won by kindness.

Of course, the administration of our export control program is under a chairman of the Committee on Export Policy, Dr. Jack Behrman, a learned professor and author and a long-time free trade exponent, who, I am told, favors letting all bars down on trade with the Communists except on actual military weapons and the like. His argument is that Russia will make herself self-sufficient if we restrict goods she needs. I disagree. I think restrictions will hamper Soviet progress and throw the Communist economy off balance. But my point is that an administrator should believe in the policy set by Congress. His decisions otherwise could be contrary to the spirit of the law. Don't get me wrong. I am not inferring anyone is soft on the Soviets, I want to make that clear. I say some persons are soft of heart and other persons are soft in the head. We can't afford either.

Actually, when I review the commodities which have gone under export license behind the Iron Curtain and especially the industrial materials to Poland and Yugoslavia, I reach the conclusion that the United States is going a long way toward helping Khrushchev bury us. It seems sometimes that we are doing the digging, while Mr. Khrushchev looks on with a not entirely inscrutable smile.

After reading much testimony and reviewing many records, I have come to the firm conviction that a total embargo would be better in the interests of national security. Is there any doubt as to whether Tito or Gomulka hold us in any honest affection? I think not and I believe our policy of practically open trade with a so-called friendly Communist country is hurting us and helping it. No real consideration seems to have been given, in issuing export licenses, to the overall effect of building up the Communist economy and thereby we have been contributing to the success of our enemy in his economic offensive.

If the term "peaceful coexistence" had any meaning, such a policy might make sense, but the "peaceful coexistence" of Mr. Khrushchev to my mind is one of enslavement as we understand the term.

We blow hot and we blow cold. Our policy has been to use export controls on a sort of day-to-day basis of negotiation.

Congress, I hope, supported by public opinion, will be tightening the program of controls. I believe agricultural commodities such as grain and the like should be declared to be strategic.

Lenin has been quoted as saying: "As soon as they (i.e., the Western nations) start trading with us, they will prepare their own ruin." Many of his prophecies have come true. Do we want to help his batting average?

I have looked over lists of commodities for which licenses have been issued. How some of these items were deemed nonstrategic, I will never know, but when the House Committee on Export Controls sought to evaluate these lists, the Commerce Department flatly refused permission for the committe or its staff to review its pertinent files, claiming Executive privilege. The committee's efforts were thwarted but I am sure that when the final congressional report is issued it will conclude that the Government has followed a soft policy and used poor judgment in issuing export permits. For example, I asked Secretary Rusk what would happen to the output of the steel mill we helped finance in Poland. He readily admitted its production would be strategic and that the output might well go to the Soviet Union.

And how about the Polish loan to Cuba—the proceeds of which were to be used to build a shipyard and battery repair facility? Who believes such is not to provide a base for Soviet submarines? Under the provisions of the Battle Act, I cannot understand how the President can determine that continued aid to Poland is essential to our national security. But that is the only legal basis of continued aid to Poland.

Some of our allies persist in selling planes, electronic equipment, and other items to those who are our adversaries. Such an example is the 6 Vickers Viscounts the British sold to Red China a short time ago. Where will the Chinese Reds use these planes—in peaceful pursuits? Not on your life. They will use them in transporting military equipment and men to Laos and South Vietnam, and other brush-fire areas of their making.

To me this is no matter for a pained expression of regret to our British cousins. I think we could use some firmness and brinkmanship with our own friends.

Could we persuade our allies to go along on a tough policy? I don't know. But if we passed a law to cut out all aid of every nature to noncooperating nations we might be surprised. That is, of course, if we set them an example. We cannot sell jet fighter planes to Yugoslavia and expect England to refrain.

As to why we have not been tougher, there are reports that a preinaugural Presidential task force, headed by the present Under Secretady of State, George W. Ball, recommended a virtual scrapping of the existing embargo on exports of strategic materials to Communist bloc nations. Secretary Ball has declined to inform the House committee studying exports about the report, but he is the State Department official in charge of economic affairs and that aspect of the cold war.

President Kennedy a year ago called on each citizen to ask what he could do for his Government.

One of my constituents decided what he could do. He sacrificed profit and refused to sell an electronic lumber sorter to be included in a new modern lumber mill a Canadian firm was planning to sell to Russia. Patriotism and sacrifice such as that are what this Nation needs. This man's conscience told him the sale was wrong—although the State Department had approved the transaction. That lumber mill would set the Soviet system of lumber production ahead 20 years. Such trade steps up her military-industrial potential.

I cannot feel this is any time to scrap export controls. On the contrary, we should bring all the influence and leadership at our command to persuade the free world to join us and make these controls more effective. Strangely enough, it is the NATO countries who are joined with the United States in a Treaty of Mutual Protection, yet these very nations have contributed substantially toward the strength, technological progress and military capability of their potential aggressor. Soviet bloc imports in 1960 totaled $4.5 billion; $2.8 billion of this was from Western Europe. Only about $200 million was from us.

As Senator WILEY said in the Senate the other day, the Soviet Union is now scouring Western Europe in attempts to buy packaged complete plants for industry. Why? This is necessary, largely because the Soviet economy is oriented, to such a large degree, toward the output of military equipment that it lacks the capability for adequate creative technological advancement.

By attempting to buy up complete plants from the West, the Soviet Union, then, accomplishes the following purposes: First, the Red economy may continue to concentrate upon production of scientific-industrial equipment of military value; second, the Reds are saved the great, and sometimes long, trial-and-error experimental periods for developing technological advancements; and, third, the attainment of complete production plants enables them to move forward faster than otherwise could be done under the Soviet economy.

The Senator said there are no signs on the horizon of abdication of Red goals of world conquest and burying non-Communist ideologies and systems.

Consequently, he said, it is absolutely essential that the United States encourage its allies to take a new, careful, cautious look at offers from the Communist countries and to cut off materials which would strengthen the ability of the Soviet Union to commit aggression, and I agree.

Finally, consider the sadly absurd situation of Cuba on which we have just imposed an embargo. Yet Punta del Este failed to include trade curbs and Cuba is not treated as a Communist bloc country by Cocom. The United States has announced a campaign to discourage strategic trade with Cuba, but our allies may expect an increase in their commercial exports resulting from our embargo. Canada, as a matter of fact, has announced she will continue this trade.

On the heels of all U.S. foreign aid from the Marshall plan down to the present the United States seems to be a victim of policy such as described by a onetime British statesman when he said: "There can be no permanent friends—only permanent interests." Somehow, one gets the idea that nations make profits and prosperity—rather than national security—their permanent interests and overlook friendship entirely.

Finally, as to the case of trading with the Communist bloc, I myself conclude that any trade is aid—aid toward the economic or military undoing of the free world.

I cannot see why the Kennedy administration has not finally discovered that the lifting of bans on food shipments and other commodities and following a general policy of being kind to Khrushchev is not a mistake. As Theodore C. Achilles, Special Assistant to the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, said in a recent speech to the Stanford University Foreign Policy Institute:

"Today," he said, "policies of military containment and negative anticommunism are no longer enough. It is not enough merely

to be against something or to react. We must act * * *." I agree—but his boss does not seem to agree. We don't act.

To me, the way to ultimate victory is a positive program to persuade our allies to ban all strategic trade with the Sino-Soviet bloc, including Yugoslavia, Poland, and Cuba. As for ourselves, I would harden our export policy and likewise let it be firmly known to neutrals and friendly nations alike that all aid to them will stop unless and until these nations firm up their policies in harmony with ours.

The Select Committee on Export Controls of the House of Representatives will shortly be submitting a complete report to the Congress.

Meanwhile, its chairman, Mr. KITCHIN, made a statement giving his opinion as follows:

"First. The economic phase of this prolonged, tense cold war is becoming more important each day. As our military posture and that of the Soviet bloc approach a stalemate, due to the absolute destructive power of each to annihilate civilization in a nuclear military conflict, the economic phase attains the status of a prime and strategic operation.

"Second. Continued emphasis must be placed on the vital area of trade with the Sino-Soviet bloc. The cooperation of our Western allies is of paramount importance.

"Third. There must be a readjustment of our thinking as regards our present status quo attitude. It is imperative that we acquire a realistic appreciation that while we are maintaining the peace we may be losing the cold war.

"Fourth. A strong and affirmative policy on foods and fibers to the bloc must encompass a philosophy of peace for food as well as food for peace."

George Washington once expressed confidence the American people would always do the right thing if they had the facts.

Our export policy is not favorable to an informed opinion.

The Government has shrouded much of the export control policy in secrecy.

The people are unaware to a great extent of the functioning of the Cocom program and only occasionally when word leaks out of transactions such as the sale by England to Red China of planes, do they learn of its ineffectiveness.

Some matters involving security, of course, cannot be published, but secrecy is greatly overdone. The privilege is often used to cover up mistakes and to try and avoid embarrassment over error and weak decisions of both ourselves and our allies.

This attitude prevents mobilization of public opinion against continuing policy failure and ineffective administration.

What we need, it seems to me, is full and frank disclosure of the facts. The people should have the truth. If they had it, I am sure there would be a stiffening of policy and a demand for stern measures by the entire free world.

Let the peoples under the yoke of communism earn anew their freedom by hunger, hardship, and harsh sacrifice. Let the peoples under the threat of communism do the same.

On the later score, it was gratifying to read (in Saturday's New York Times) that some Americans are willing to sacrifice. A 500-member union local—Lodge 893, International Association of Machinists-Stratos Division of Fairchild Engine & Airplane Co.—invited their own loss of jobs by protesting the production of a strategic item for the Communists. Their leaders said they were shocked and dismayed to discover in their trip to Washington, D.C., that this administration has no set policy governing the export of equipment. How true.

Unless the United States sets an overriding goal and actually comes to grips with communism, unless the United States reverses its policies of compassion, appeasement, compromise, and slow retreat, I predict we will never achieve ultimate victory; and one day America will wake up and discover the free world and our allies and our economy are no longer free. Then it will be too late.

Cuban Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, pastor of St. Joseph's Church on Carrollton Manor, Buckeystown, Md., has long been known as the Padre of the Americas. The Baltimore Women's Committee for Cuban Freedom recently named Father Thorning the 20th century's Flaming Son of Liberty. Father Thorning is now delivering a series of lectures to the faculty and students of the Visitation Academy, Frederick, Md. The fourth lecture of the series was directed to recent developments in U.S. policy toward Cuba. For the benefit of the Members of the Congress, I append in the RECORD an account of this lecture as it appeared in the Frederick News:

FATHER THORNING DELIVERS LECTURE

Delivering the fourth lecture in a series for the faculty and students of the Visitation Academy here, Rev. Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, pastor of St. Joseph's Church, Carrollton Manor, and author of the recent U.S. Senate-sponsored monograph, "Cuban Aftermath: Red's Seeds Blow South," declared that the resolutions of the Punta del Este Conference of Foreign Ministers "constituted a limited victory for freedom and decency over the Castro brothers, Fidel and Rául, provided swift, decisive actions implement the declaration that the Soviet Sauleiters of Cuba no longer enjoy the protection of the law."

The Maryland author, educator, and diplomat added:

"There is now moral, ethical, and juridical basis for the apprehension and arrest of the Marxist-Leninist, criminal conspirators who, by an adroit admixture of deceit and violence, seized power over a good neighbor Republic. Cuba has been characterized as a captive nation. The Cuban people have the same right to be liberated as the people of Tito's Yugoslavia. Gomulka's Poland, or collectivized Czechoslovakia. The Castro brothers, in the eyes of the law, are worse than the unlamented, Cuban military dictator, Gen. Fulgencio Batista. The latter, although a tyrant, never merited the outlaw status that has been established with regard to Fidel Castro. The bearded prophet can masquerade no longer as the Robin Hood of Latin America. He has been indicted, tried, and convicted by his peers. Only the penalties need to be spelled out and applied.

"Apparently, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, whose skill and patience were submitted to a severe test in Uruguay, has determined that a complete program of action must be scheduled. The preliminary steps, substantially cutting down dollar revenues for Castro, are an indication of a new soul in the State Department. The views of Ambassador deLesseps ("Chep") Morrison, U.S. representative on the council of the Organization of American States, seem sound enough to prevail in the deliberations of his colleagues. The congressional leaders, who, 3 years ago, were assured by Mr. Roy Richard Rubottom, Jr., then Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, that Fidel Castro, if given enough rope, would hang himself, have seen the folly of such advice. They now know that Castro, instead of cutting his own throat, simply dug in, armed his militia, men, and women, to the teeth, consolidated his dictatorship and started the construction of airfields and missile launching pads. The nearby island is an enemy headquarters.

"A victory for genuine liberal forces in Fidel Castro's Cuba can turn the red tide throughout the globe. Freedom for the largest and most popular island in the Caribbean can inspire anew the freedom fighters of Eastern Europe, southeast Asia, Africa, and Latin America. On the other hand, any hesitation, or failure to carry through, about Castro would encourage his fanatical followers in Mexico, Brazil, and Ecuador. A clue to the Western Hemisphere situation can be noted in the presence of Francisco Juliao, Soviet Gauleiter of Northeast Brazil, in the Fidel Castro stronghold in Havana. But Gen. Lázaro Cárdenas, ex-President of Mexico, apparently intimidated by the revelations about his role in the files of the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, lost his nerve at the last moment and did not carry out his design to show up side by side with his fellow-conspirators in Cuba. This shows the road to victory; truth-telling about the agents of Messrs. Mao Tse-tung and Nikita Khrushchev in all the American Republics."

Rev. Mother Mary de Chantal Keanny, Visitation Superior, and Sister Claire Joseph O'Neill, directress of studies, presided at the meeting here.

House Resolution 543 To Authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce To Conduct an Investigation and Study of the Adequacy of the Regulation of Nonscheduled Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, when I introduced House Resolution 543 on February 12, 1962, I stated its purpose is to direct the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make an intensive review of the manner in which the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Aviation Agency have regulated the nonsked airline industry. It is my belief, based on the evidence before our special subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services, as well as my own investigations, that the Imperial Airlines accident is attributable to the loose regulation of these carriers by the CAB and the FAA, as well as the poor management of the carrier.

In view of the magnitude of our scheduled air carrier industry, I am not persuaded that there was a demonstrated need for these nonscheduled certificates, and in holding them illegal, the court of appeals disagreed with the CAB, too, in

many respects. However, I realize that the present Board inherited this problem from its predecessors. In fairness to all concerned, I should point out that throughout the history of the nonsked problem, present CAB member Chan Gurney and his former associate, Col. Harmar Denny, of my own State of Pennsylvania, consistently urged caution in the issuance of the nonsked certificates and voted for enforcement penalties and sanctions against those who violated regulations. The CAB has leaned over backward to resolve all doubts about certifications, certificate renewal, hidden control, and inadequate financial responsibility, and managerial ability in favor of the nonskeds instead of in favor of the public. Following the Board's ill-advised actions in issuing these certificates and in failing to revoke them when knowledge of their inadequate financial responsibility or questionable managerial fitness came to its attention, the problem then shifted to the FAA.

Here again I realize the present Administrator inherited a problem in trying to keep up with the fitness of these marginal carriers.

It is quite obvious that an undue number of hours have been required on the part of FAA personnel to determine the fitness of the equipment, personnel and operations of these nonscheduled carriers. I agree with the majority's conclusion that the Imperial Airlines accident could have been prevented. I agree with the majority's conclusion that there has been inadequate attention given to the managerial capacity and financial responsibility of these carriers. I agree with the majority's conclusion that any doubt concerning legal authority of CAB and FAA should have been resolved in favor of the public interest rather than the industry, particularly where economic factors affecting safety are concerned.

But I would go further. My question is why this situation has been allowed to continue. Why the CAB and the FAA have not used all of the legal authority that they presently have to eliminate the incompetent or unfit operators, and if they do not have adequate authority to accomplish this, why have they not asked the Congress for such additional authority as they may need to deal with this situation.

I cannot help wondering how many potential Imperials there may be in the supplemental industry in view of: (a) Administrator Halaby's testimony in reference to supplemental carriers that "there are good ones and not so good ones"; (b) the admitted failure of either CAB or FAA to evaluate adequately the management and financial resources of supplemental airlines; and (c) testimony of MATS that they have found a substantial number of carriers not qualified for military traffic. I certainly feel the general public is as entitled to safe air transportation as is the military. There is too much evidence that this is not always the case today.

Both the CAB and FAA told the subcommittee they were conducting extensive investigations of these carriers. What have been the results of the investigations? What changes should be made in the legislation now pending before the Congress to bring this industry under proper control? We should insist before final action is taken on this legislation that it eliminate all possibility of incompetent, poorly financed or poorly run operators. In this connection, it is my opinion that the interim certificate authority may not be adequate to accomplish this. Why should the Congress direct the Board to give interim certificates to carriers which the Board's own findings might show are unfit, unsafe, or otherwise incompetent? Let us give the CAB and FAA authority to cut off the carriers that have filed false reports, that have operated in defiance or violation of Federal law and regulation, whose control may have come into the hands of persons whom the Board presently considers unfit. And for the future, if the Congress contemplates setting up a permanent class of supplemental carriers, let us make sure that the initial certificate standards are high, and that doubts as to the public need for fitness or ability of these applicants is resolved in favor of the public and not in the private interest.

With that in mind, I sincerely hope that my resolution, House Resolution No. 543, will receive favorable consideration and thereby direct the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to review the CAB and FAA to determine the adequacy of the regulation of nonscheduled airlines.

The Perils of Secrecy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, for more than 6 years the work of the House Government Information Subcommittee has been guided by the conviction that unnecessary restrictions on the availability of information about our Government are dangerous and repugnant to our free society. In a series of reports approved by the Government Operations Committee there have appeared documented instances of attempts to suppress information because it might be considered embarrassing or of partisan use, or simply because some bureaucrat did not want to answer questions.

During the summer of 1960 the operations research office of Johns Hopkins University completed an unclassified research project that recommended, among other things, that the conelrad system be abandoned as useless in this missile era. Almost immediately the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization sought to suppress the report because of the embarrassment it might cause political appointees in the Government. Thorough subcommittee investigation produced proof of the suppression and forced release of the report. This week it was announced that the conelrad system is being abandoned and will be replaced by an up-to-date system that reflects the technological facts of our times.

While we have no evidence that disclosure of the conelrad report speeded the decision on a new system for civil defense warning, we can assume that the disclosure could not possibly have hindered or delayed reaching a decision. And we can be sure that continued suppression of the report would have slowed down the process by which outdated systems are reviewed and replaced by modern security devices.

So that the Members of Congress might have the details of this case of unnecessary secrecy, I ask leave to insert in the RECORD a series of newspaper articles dealing with the subject:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Oct. 25, 1960]

SUPPRESSION OF CRITICISM LAID TO CIVIL DEFENSE—REPORT DECLARED AIR RAID ALERT OBSOLETE

WASHINGTON, October 24.—House investigators today accused the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization of trying to suppress a still-secret Army report criticizing the Nation's air raid alert system.

Representative JOHN E. MOSS, Democrat, of California, chairman of the House Government Information Subcommittee, leveled the charge in a letter to Army Secretary Wilber M. Brucker. He said he had been informed that OCDM Director Leo A. Hoegh wrote the Army's research chief "requesting him and urging him to withhold publication of the report."

OUT OF DATE

The study, prepared by the operations research office of Johns Hopkins University, said both the Conelrad radio system and the nationwide network of air raid sirens were badly out of date in the ballistic missile age.

Representative Moss wrote Mr. Brucker that the letter requesting the Army to suppress the air raid warning report was sent in August to Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Army Chief of Research.

Representative Moss said the report was not secret, but had been withheld from the press. He asked Mr. Brucker to cite "specific statutory authority for withholding it from the public."

SIRENS IGNORED

The study, stamped "For official use only," said a large proportion of the Nation's air raid sirens were not loud enough to alert the civilian population. It urged development of a low-cost alarm system which could be installed in every house and building in the United States.

It also concluded that the average American citizen—even when he hears a siren—usually ignores its warning because of the large number of practice alerts and siren tests.

Concerning Conelrad, the report noted that the radio system's original purpose of preventing enemy aircraft from using radio beacons for navigation was designed to defend against manned bombers and would be meaningless in the age of missiles.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Nov. 23, 1960]

PROBERS SAY CIVIL DEFENSE REPORT WAS STIFLED—SEES PENTAGON FEAR OF EMBARRASSMENT

WASHINGTON, November 22.—House investigators charged today that administration officials tried to suppress a report criticizing the Nation's air-raid warning system because

they feared its publication might prove embarrassing.

Representative JOHN E. MOSS, Democrat, of California, Chairman of the House Government Information Subcommittee, cited a letter from Leo A. Hoegh, Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, in support of his charge.

Mr. Hoegh's letter, addressed to Lt. Gen. A. G. Trudeau, head of Army research, said "it would be most unfortunate" if a presentation of the report resulted "in embarrassment to the Army, to the Department of Defense, or the OCDM."

SEES "FACESAVING"

Representative Moss said in a statement that "political facesaving has been claimed by an administration bureaucrat as justification for suppressing the ugly fact that during the last 8 years little or nothing has been done to put into effect a meaningful air-raid warning system."

"These are dangerous games for politicians to be playing," Representative Moss said. "To suppress public information because someone might be embarrassed is a threat to the fabric of democratic self-government."

Earlier this month Mr. Hoegh denied that he had tried to suppress the still-secret report, prepared under contract for the Army by the Operation Research Office of Johns Hopkins University. Army officials have said the report will not be made public until they have had an opportunity to review it.

CALLS SYSTEM OBSOLETE

The study, written under the direction of Theodore J. Wang, asserts that the present air-raid warning system does not provide protection in the age of intercontinental ballistic missiles. It says the Conelrad radio system, mainly designed to prevent enemy planes from navigating on commercial radio beacons, is obsolete in the era of pilotless missiles.

It also says present-day sirens are incapable of warning large segments of the U.S. population and recommends a buzzer system be established in all homes and public buildings.

Representative Moss said subcommittee investigators had discovered that the author of the report was invited to present his findings at a national conference of the U.S. Civil Defense Council in September. He said Mr. Hoegh, learning about the proposed presentation, called on the Army to consider the propriety of the study.

"But before the Army had a chance to act," Mr. Moss said, "Hoegh moved on his own to make certain the scientist's findings would be suppressed."

Representative Moss said the author of the report was told after a meeting between Mr. Hoegh and the conference officials that he would not be on the program.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 26, 1960]

ARMY RELEASES REPORT ATTACKING AIR-WARNING SETUP AS INADEQUATE

The Army—under pressure from congressional investigators—yesterday removed the wraps from an unclassified report which said the Nation's air raid warning system is inadequate in the missile age.

The report, prepared under contract with the Operations Research Office of Johns Hopkins University, called on the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization to set up a national buzzer alarm system in private homes and public buildings.

Earlier this week, Chairman JOHN E. MOSS, Democrat, of California, of the House Government Information Subcommittee accused OCDM Director Leo A. Hoegh of pressuring the Army into withholding the report from the public.

Prepared by the researchers from public testimony before a congressional committee, the Army last week refused a reporter's request for the study. A spokesman said then that the unclassified document would not be made public until it had been evaluated.

The study, written under the direction of Theodore J. Warg, said present air raid sirens are incapable of giving warning to large segments of the U.S. population, and OCDM has scheduled so many alerts that persons who do hear the sirens tend to ignore them.

The report also found that the conelrad radio system, mainly established to prevent enemy planes from navigating on commercial radio beacons, is obsolete in an era of the intercontinental ballistic missile.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 18, 1962]

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT TO SCRAP CONELRAD FOR NEW SETUP

(By John M. Goshko)

The Defense Department is preparing to scrap the existing conelrad system for broadcasting information to the American public by radio in the event of nuclear war.

In its place, the Department plans to establish a greatly modified system designed to overcome acknowledged weaknesses in the present setup and to allow local authorities greater control over broadcasting of public information.

Officials of the Department's Office of Civil Defense have refused to comment on the impending changes. However, it is known that OCD has won the approval of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Federal Communications Commission for a drastic overhaul of the system.

REASONS FOR SECRECY

Reliable sources say the secrecy surrounding the project is due to the fact that details have not been fully worked out. In addition, these sources report, Pentagon officials are reluctant to discuss the matter because the Canadian Government has not yet approved changing the system. Conelrad is a joint United States-Canadian venture.

Official announcement of the new system, it is said, will not be made until these two problems are resolved.

The present setup, established in the early 1950's, represented an attempt to reconcile certain conflicts between military and civil defense officials.

The Government recognized that it had to have a means of getting information to the public before, during, and after an enemy attack. But the Air Force, concerned at that time with defense against manned bombers, insisted that any broadcasting system contain safeguards to prevent enemy planes from picking up a radio signal and using it as a guide to their target.

The result was a plan under which the FCC set aside two airwave frequencies for exclusive civil defense use on a nationwide basis. These frequencies, 640 and 1240, have since been widely publicized as the conelrad stations to which the public should turn for emergency information.

The Government then selected a number of radio stations (theoretically there is one in every American municipality or county) that could change over from their regular frequencies to one of the two conelrad frequencies during an emergency.

These stations were then assigned to two conelrad nets, a national net embracing every participating station in the country and a regional net including all participating stations within a specified area.

The nets were to work this way:

The national net has a secret control center in direct contact with the North American Air Defense Command and the White House. From it, mesages of national importance can be sent out simultaneously through every conelrad station in the country.

REGIONAL NETS

Similarly each regional net has its own control center to originate messages of a local or regional nature for transmission over stations within the net.

For example, the District is part of a regional net that also includes Virginia, Maryland, and parts of West Virginia, Delaware, and Pennsylvania.

Thus District officials wishing to relay information to District residents would have to submit the message to the control center for transmission. The message when sent would be heard not only on conelrad stations in the Washington area but also on those in Baltimore, Richmond, and every other station in the net.

The system contains three safeguards to prevent enemy planes from using an intercepted signal to "home in" on a target:

The conelrad frequencies are on a low-power transmission system that gives off a weak signal. This signal, which carries for about 50 miles from the outlet station, is considered sufficient to reach everyone within a specific locality but not strong enough to be intercepted by enemy planes from a great distance.

The fact that a multiplicity of stations would be broadcasting simultaneously on the same two frequencies would hamper enemy navigators in their attempts to follow the signal to a specific source.

No city, State, or other political jurisdiction can be mentioned by name over conelrad. This is to prevent enemy planes from identifying a signal with a specific locality.

These elaborate safeguards have been a continual source of frustration from the outset to State and local civil defense authorities. Among their specific complaints:

The necessity of originating local messages from a control center that might be several hundred miles away from the community for which the message is intended represents a roundabout and time-consuming process.

Competition with national messages that take priority and with the other political jurisdictions in the regional net for time on the air would also delay urgent messages, perhaps keeping them from being delivered in time.

The individual trying to get local information over his radio would be confused by messages intended for other jurisdictions within the regional net.

This last complaint is perhaps the most serious against the system, since communities cannot be identified by name in conelrad messages.

Thus a message intended for District residents could be identified only as coming from "Commissioner Tobriner" (Walter Tobriner, Chairman of the District Commissioners). Such a system is highly dangerous, civil defense officials contend, because large segments of the public cannot be depended upon to know the name of their local and State authorities.

Acknowledgment of these weaknesses by the Defense Department has finally led to the decision to overhaul the system. In this, the Department has been aided by a recent relaxing of the Air Force's formerly inflexible insistence on retaining the system's safeguards.

This change of heart has been prompted by the Air Force's feeling that the main threat of attack will soon come from guided missiles, which cannot make use of radio signals, rather than manned aircraft.

Just 74 Boys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the tragic Imperial Airlines crash November 8, 1961, near Richmond, Va., that claimed the lives of 74 Army recruits has resulted in nationwide indignation over the apparent laxity in the enforce-

ment of maintenance and safety regulations. From coast to coast the wave of public resentment is mounting daily while the demand increases that congressional approval be given House Resolution 543 which I introduced February 12, 1962, and which provides that a full and complete investigation be made of the adequacy of regulations affecting the nonscheduled airlines in the light of the tragic Imperial Airlines crash last November.

For over 3 months the daily and weekly newspapers of the Nation have published thousands of communications from readers in their "Letter to the Editor" column. These letters reflect bitter denunciation over the callous disregard for human life as unfolded through the recent investigations of the Richmond air tragedy. It is due to the brevity of the investigations that I have requested congressional activity in obtaining two-pronged action by the Department of Justice and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce as an aftermath of the Imperial Airlines crash.

Among the thousands of letters to American newspaper editors is one from the pen of Raye O. Lawson of the World-Wide Detective Service, Inc., Richmond, Va., which appeared in newspapers in the State of Virginia. The brief, yet thought-provoking title, "Just 74 Boys" is followed by a penetrating and poignant description of the crash of the Imperial Airlines cargo plane which is attributed to the frenzied desire of the Federal Government to spend money for every conceivable type of program; yet when it comes to safeguarding human lives they are sacrificed on the altar of mammon on the flimsy pretext—"the Government has to save money."

The letter written by Raye O. Lawson follows:

JUST 74 BOYS

To the EDITOR:

They are expendable.

Seventy-four young men, mere boys, many fresh from high school graduation, full of hope, with their boyish ambitions and young interests, several of them an only child, perish like trapped rats in the flames of a burning air boxcar. To the parents, the moms and dads who had reared and loved these kids they were their all, their life. To the Army they were expendable.

The Government has to save money, the Army with all its planes, with good airlines, with regularly scheduled routes, and experienced pilots, the Army contracts with shoestring contract haulers. Money to go to the moon, money for flying VIP's in the best of planes, money for junkets for "two bedroom Charlies," but for these kids the Army had to economize. They were just 74 future soldiers.

In the old days it was 40 homme or 8 chevaux. Today it is 74 boys or 500 sacks of potatoes. Hauling for contract. A little known (except for bad record) contract hauler with third-handed planes is entrusted with the lives of our children we give to the Army.

This cargo plane that took 74 boys to a horrible death, who owned it, how old was it, what is the record of the company? Let's look at the known record. In 1953, operating as the Regina Airlines this same outfit crashed and killed 19 soldiers en route to McChord Air Force Base. This same outfit, in January 1949 at Aberdeen, N. Dak., and in 1955 at Charleston, S.C., had two accidents due to faulty landing gear. Luckily there were no fatalities. In November 1959 the company was ordered to pay a $1,000 fine by the FAA for operating a plane that was not airworthy. Two of the line's pilots have been suspended in the past by the FAA for violations of civil air regulations.

The Army has to save money. Boys are expendable.

RAYE O. LAWSON.

Birmingham's Festival of Arts—An American Renaissance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to call to the attention of the House the festival of arts program that is going on in Birmingham right now. Our famous festival of arts has been and is being widely imitated in other cities throughout the country and we in Birmingham are glad to share our experience with others. For those that are not familiar with the festival of arts, I should explain that it lasts for nearly all of the month of February and it is a period crowded with artistic and cultural events.

The citizens of Birmingham and all of Alabama are proud of the wonderful traditions of the festivals of arts that have been built over the years. It is, I believe, getting better each year and although Birmingham is the youngest of the world's great cities we have built a fine reputation for encouraging and promoting the arts. We have art shows presenting only our local artists that fill our fine museum, during the festival. Our local musicians are kept busy trying to keep up with the demand for their talents. There is a variety of competitions that are widely participated in by people from all over Alabama. I could go on for a long time about our great festival but I just want to commend the following article to the attention of the Members. The article appeared in the Birmingham magazine for January and gives a good account of the success of the festival of arts:

AN AMERICAN RENAISSANCE: BIRMINGHAM'S FESTIVAL OF ARTS

This is the story of Birmingham's world-renown festival of arts.

More, it is the story of an entire metropolis that puts aside its concentration on manufacture and trade and its citizens become cultural explorers for new artistic talent.

It's the story of an entire community kindled by the reverberation of arts for the people.

It is no empty saying.

For 3 weeks in February, the muses, never quiet in magic town, join hands and walk through the mountain-rimmed city, assuming many guises in many places.

"Culture bypasses no one here," one Birmian asserts. "Art goes up in store windows, schools, theaters, churches, hospital corridors, depots and cocktail lounge."

"Housewives give up cooking for culture. Businessmen bypass prospects for art films, lectures and flowers. Children quote Shakespeare and hum arias. It's a bit startling to newcomers."

The Birmingham Festival is a 21-day period packed with cultural offerings.

The best in amateur, near-professional and professional performances, today's stars and tomorrow's hopefuls give enjoyable performances to enthusiastic audiences here.

For instance, Birmingham's civic opera and full symphony orchestra will perform together in the difficult Puccini Triptych, "Gianni Schicchi," "Il Tabarro," and "Suor Angelica." Four of Birmingham's five theater groups will present O'Neill's "Beyond the Horizon," "Troilus and Cressida," the religious drama "Everyman," and Wilder's "Our Town."

The community's three ballet companies will be presented in performances. A special flamenco exhibition has been arranged by the Birmingham Classical Guitar Society. A string trio will present the festival's award-winning chamber music composition.

The festival calendar also includes the world's largest camellia show, antique and coin collections, young artists concerts, cultural lectures and films, exhibits and tours of Birmingham churches and artists' studios.

Eighty chairmen head the many events that are part of the festival.

These chairmen and their committees include public officials, civic and business leaders, artisans, professional men, spiritual leaders, laborers, students, homemakers, club members, and others.

Nearly 500 persons are involved in the steering organization of the festival. Festival events have an attendance of more than 75,000. It is estimated that 10,000 more are engaged in the many details incidental to an event of such broad scope. Thus nearly 100,000 people from all walks of life in Birmingham have a part as spectator or participant in a festival that makes culture an exciting, enjoyable experience for increasing numbers.

The recently established festival of arts office at city hall encourages continuation of long range planning for the festival each year. Mayor Arthur J. Hanes, whose office adjoins the festival office, is cochairman of the 1962 festival. He probably would not have considered himself a candidate for cultural leader in the late thirties when he was a star college gridder.

But Birmingham's advancement in the arts has made Hanes, as it has other leaders and citizens, acutely aware of the value of culture to a community.

Mayor Hanes observes, "When industry considers expansion, it looks for cities with a good educational system and active cultural opportunities as well as a suitable business climate."

Interest of civic and business leaders in the festival is indicated by the fact that the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce helped organize the festival in its all-embracing form. The chamber gives awards to Birmians for outstanding contributions in the fields of music, drama, art, and original creative event. (Award recipients must be truly outstanding.)

Interest of youth in the festival is aroused by such events as a performance by the 65-piece Birmingham Youth Symphony Orchestra, an art education program to prepare scouts for participation in a nationwide project, and additional youth-slanted activities including an opera matinee.

Birmingham is a mecca of cultural participation for both county and State. Faculty and advanced students from colleges all over Alabama are taking part in the 1962 festival as committee chairmen, lecturers, and soloists. College presidents are serving or have arranged for faculty members to serve on advisory groups to further organize cultural presentations.

Each year one college of national renown is asked to present during the festival a

program on the arts. Tulane University will give the program this year. This stimulates an exchange of cultural ideas throughout the Nation.

Alabama artists send their paintings and sculpture to Birmingham's famed museum of art for exhibition during this period.

Statewide competitions in art, chamber music and literature are being held. And artists throughout Alabama have been submitting sketches in a competition which will decide a permanent festival symbol to be used in promoting nationally the 3-week cultural event.

Two of the festival's competitions are open on a nationwide basis. They are the radio and television script writing and play writing contests. Countywide, statewide, and nationwide, the tide of interest in this unusual festival is constantly rising.

Some of the national figures scheduled for February events include violinist Ruggiero Ricci, the Julliard String Quartet with Madame Rosina Lhevinne,) Broadway cast for "The Best Man," and classical guitarist Charles Byrd.

Other visitors will include Mary C. Takahashi, nationally noted flower arranger, authors Louis Niza, Arthur Hailey, Frank G. Slaughter, Ann Hebson, MIT's Albert Bush Brown who will present an award for the best architectural design; five of New York's leading decorators, panelists for an interior design forum, Michigan organist Marilyn Mason, and Washington's Catholic University Players who will present "Richard III."

The exhibit of the Birmingham Museum of Art for the month of February will feature the work of the best contemporary American artists. Among the hundreds of pictures will be paintings by Franz Kline, Hans Hoffman, Max Ernst, Walter Meigs, and Willem de Kooning.

Widely known and copied, the Birmingham festival has served as a model for similar art events.

It predated Paris' Congress of Cultural Freedom and Boston's Arts Festival. It provided the pattern for similar programs in Sarasota, Fla., Winston-Salem, N.C., and Montgomery, Ala. Last year, New Orleans, La., sought information on how to form a festival similar to Birmingham's.

Birmingham Festival Association president, William R. Lathrop, Jr., believes that Birmingham has won such acclaim for its arts program that it has become a spontaneous communitywide participation in ideals of culture and beauty.

Mrs. John H. Jacobson, chairman of the 1962 February 2–24 salute to "the arts around us," sees Birmingham's spontaneous participation in the arts as the answer to the challenge that every area should provide good entertainment for all ages, develop future audiences with knowledge and appreciation of the fine arts, and nurture its own talent for both local footlights and those of the Great White Way.

Birmingham is indeed answering the challenge.

Dr. Daut Dispenses Good Will Pills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Dr. R. V. Daut, of Davenport, Iowa, fulfilled a longtime dream this past summer when he spent 2 months as a urological surgeon on the SS *Hope*, the hospital ship dispensing medical care and good will to peoples of the Far East.

Dr. Daut prepared an account of his experiences for the January–February issue of Blue Cross, Blue Shield Currents, the publication of Hospital Service, Inc., of Iowa.

Out of this experience comes some guidelines which Congress should recognize in planning programs which seek to improve our relations with other countries. It is for that reason that I feel Dr. Daut's account of these experiences should be brought to the attention of the Members.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this account in the Appendix of the RECORD:

DR. DAUT DISPENSES GOOD WILL PILLS

The American public's interest in health seems to be overpowering. Pick up any magazine from Reader's Digest through Holiday and you'll find an article on some phase of health problems.

Many of these articles, especially in Look, et al., are slanted against the free enterprise of medicine and voluntary health insurance. It was a pleasure, as a representative of our free enterprise system of medicine, to be able to volunteer for service as a rotating consultant on the SS *Hope*.

This had nothing to do with the U.S. Government. The Hope project is well known on both coasts of the United States. It has not had good coverage in the Midwest, but gradually the people's attention is being drawn to the spectacle of a non-Government-sponsored health ship. The SS *Hope* is the first peacetime hospital ship sponsored by labor, business, Republicans, Democrats, doctors, drug concerns, nurses, and the little people like you and me. This is entirely voluntary and it is not wasting our tax dollars.

In an article in Life magazine in December 1960, there was a four- or five-page spread on the *Hope* ship as it then cruised in Indonesia. Shortly thereafter, I was in communication with my old medical school roommate, Dr. Mark Kuhn, formerly of Waterloo, now located in Fort Lauderdale. He discussed the situation and the ideas behind Hope and said that he had volunteered for service.

While in medical school we discussed the rewards of the practice of medicine in distant lands and what an opportunity it would be to bring the newer techniques of medicine and surgery to the newly developed countries of the world. Neither of us were missionaries in the usual sense of the word, but I think that every doctor and every nurse has a bit of the missionary spirit in them.

After discussing the situation with my wife and children, the application was forwarded. I was fortunate enough to be selected, partially because of the intercession of my friend and partially, I'm sure, because they wanted a representative from Iowa and Illinois on the ship to make this completely U.S.-wide in composition.

While flying with the U.S. Air Force in 1953–55 overseas, I was able to get a good comprehension of the problems facing the United States and the world, from both an economic and a health standpoint. This, therefore, was an opportunity to widen my knowledge and perhaps, through an interchange of information, widen the horizons of people outside the United States. Incidentally, it was a pleasure, through the International College of Surgeons, to see many of our members throughout the world, both going and coming. I also had an opportunity to speak at numerous other places, including Hong Kong, Bangkok, and Athens.

Preparations for the trip started July 21, 1961, and were, to say the least, frantic. Being a solo private practitioner in urologic surgery, it was necessary to cut off the surgical procedures at some distance before the trip, to take care of the many problems arising from a protracted absence. I packed, unpacked, repacked, weighed the articles, discarded them. There are myriads of problems that go with air travel and its very narrow margin of error regarding the weight in an oversea flight. Since this was my own money, I can assure you that I did not go first class.

Then there was the problem of the technical instruments necessary. Each urologist has his own pet system of instruments. The areas in which *Hope* traveled certainly could not furnish anything in the way of complicated instruments, fulgurating units and so forth. It was, therefore, necessary for me to carry over 20 pounds of instruments with me, which with the weight allowance of 44 pounds left very little room for latitude regarding shoes, underwear, and the various necessities of life in traveling. This again carried with it a frantic reappraisal of how many pairs of socks are absolutely necessary if I washed out a pair each night.

Finally the big day came. The children were in a mountain camp in Colorado. My wife was deposited safely in California with her family and I was on the big jet winging westward.

After stopping in Hawaii, Hong Kong, and Tokyo, I was met by one of the "hopie's," as the rotators were called, in Saigon, South Vietnam. The *Hope* ship had berthed 50 miles up the Saigon River, just a grenade's throw from the Hotel Majestic at the dock.

After being briefed by the men that I replaced, the responsibilities for the urologic service were turned over to me. I found that work went on unceasingly. During the 2 months period that the ship was in Saigon with nine surgeons, we did 700 major operations. This ships' doctors, totaling 18, saw 18,000 people during this time. There was a backlog of 20,000 that we were unable to see.

About a third of the surgery was done on the ship. Therefore, two-thirds were done in the larger hospitals in Saigon and Cholon, which is the twin city of Saigon. The hospitals there were horribly decrepit. In the maternity hospital, for instance, 2,000 beds—6,000 patients. Three patients to each bed. This was a common thing in South Vietnam.

The surgical suites were rather rudimentary. Due to the shortage of physicians, the average doctor saw 150 patients a day, 7 days a week. There was 1 doctor for each 40,000 people in Vietnam. Actually, they were lucky. *Hope* berthed at one place in Indonesia in which 1 doctor took care of 800,000 people. When we contrast that to New York City, where we find 1 doctor for each 470 and Iowa, where 1 doctor aids 1,200 people, we see that our situation is, indeed, rosy.

Inoculations were instituted. The French Indochina Peninsula had never known of mass inoculations previously. We started the blood bank in South Vietnam. The doctors, themselves, were quite capable in many spheres of medicine, but badly needed help in others.

No thoracic surgery had ever been done in the area. Therefore, everything that our thoracic surgeon did was a first. No maxillofacial surgery had been done. Therefore, the cleft palate, harelip type numbered into the hundreds and hundreds. I can't describe to you the horrible lesions that we saw as a routine thing. Any one of hundreds might be exhibited as a medical curiosity in a textbook or periodical, here.

The major problem initially was one of communication. However, most of us spoke a smattering of French or of German and the native doctors studied in both French

and English so we were able to communicate. Within a month we were able to converse in rudimentary Vietnamese. When I tell you that there are 35 different accent marks and that each word is monosyllabic with a phonetic translation from the original Chinese, you can realize how difficult this was Even so, a smile and a probing finger and a medical interpreter seemed to get us through the tough spots.

I am sure that we will be asked if this program has any lasting benefits. If I can teach 5 men a technical procedure and each of these men in turn can teach 5 and then again 5, in 3 generations we have taught 75 doctors a procedure that was not being done previously.

Textbooks are wonderful, but this does not help in more complicated surgical procedures. I would do a surgical procedure with my intern and resident and perhaps one of the attending physicians. Then after two or three of these, the surgical procedure would then be done by one of the previous assistants. This teaching by supervised doing was a wonderful method and it allowed the doctors to save face, to be able to stand on their own two feet and you can be assured that they knew where this help was coming from.

It was with great dismay that I learned that much of our aid to the area is not having proper publicity. The U.S.-made tractors as they came off the ships were stenciled U.S.S.R. The United States was shipping Metrecal by the gross to a people who weighed 70 pounds average. Very few of the Embassy personnel spoke any Vietnamese.

The factories that we sent to southeast Asia did not have any identification of United States of America. In fact, one of our highly placed, controversial political figures, while interviewing one of the little girls working on one of the shuttles at a textile mill that we supplied, was blithely informed that the Russians had given it to the South Vietnamese.

Notwithstanding my bitter commentary on our lack of progress in other spheres of aid, I was highly enthusiastic about the feeling of the common people toward Hope and therefore, America. Each person as he comes on ship is handed a brochure, not just about Hope, but pointing out to each native what the American people do. There is no mention of violence and crime as on TV, but rather how we work in America to make our living, what our attitudes are toward helping people, and how we conduct our various enterprises under a free system.

These people respond eagerly to these brochures. They want to know more and more. We had people who walked over a hundred miles, carrying their children in their arms. You can't turn these people down, even though you are understaffed and overcrowded.

Every intelligent native has read "The Ugly American" in translation or has discussed it with another native who can read well and understand what he reads. One man actually said to me that the *Hope* ship gave him a different conception of the United States. He felt that we previously had exported only machines and bullets and that this was something new, the exporting of health.

In these short paragraphs I can't give you a conception of the mess that our foreign aid program is in. By the time this article goes to press, I will have spoken to approximately 12,000 people regarding the *Hope* ship and our problems in southeast Asia and in fact the world over. The most common recurring question is, "All right, what can we do about this?"

This, of course, is the toughest question of all. I am no expert in the field of foreign affairs and foreign aid even though I have been an amateur student of these problems ever since high school. However, using a rather trite statement, "You do not have to be a hen to know that an egg is rotten."

In the past our approach to foreign affairs has been extremely naive. Perhaps we are being naive in feeling that projects like the *Hope* ship can change anything. However, this is an entirely positive way of approaching the problem. The most important thing that I can say is that these people understand service which is selfless and in which we do not expect anything in return.

The important thing is to have contact with the people on a plane that they can understand. Our method of dishing out our hard earned but easily extracted tax dollars to the rulers of the country, so that they can dribble small amounts of change down to the peasants has been a notorious failure. I would refer you to "A Nation of Sheep" by Lederer if you want further discussion of this and if you want to stay up at night chewing your fingernails about the present state of the world.

What can we do about it: Write your Congressman concerning our giveaway program. Support this type of Hope program, not just with money, which is another form of "letting George do it." We can't buy these people's loyalty nor good will; we must earn it.

I have no halo, but I happen to think that tax dollars are not enough out of our pockets. Service from each of us is the answer, and each of us has to decide how he or she can serve. "He also serves who only stands and waits."

Which Road for Transportation: Private Management or ——?—Part No. V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be one of nine men interviewed by Traffic World magazine in a series dealing with our views on the future course of our troubled transportation system. As reprinted by Traffic World in booklet form, my comments are as follows:

INTERVIEW V

(JAMES VAN ZANDT is the Republican Member of Congress for the 20th District of Pennsylvania. He was elected to Congress in November 1938. Since then, except for a period of 3½ years with the Armed Forces in World War II, he has served continuously as a Member of the House of Representatives. Mr. VAN ZANDT has always shown a quick interest in transportation, perhaps because he began a railroad career in 1916 as a molder apprentice in the Pennsylvania Railroad's shops at Altoona. He was district passenger agent for the road when he was granted a furlough to seek a career in public office.)

In the last 20 years there have been bills introduced in Congress which, to one degree or another, would give to the President of the United States authority over the independent agencies created by Congress. What is the explanation for this tendency on the part of Members of Congress to "make over" their authority to the Executive?

I have observed no tendency in Congress as a whole to "make over" to the President the authority which Congress exercises over the independent agencies. While it is true that bills to this effect have been introduced, and may be again, it is, of course, one thing to introduce a bill and quite another to get it enacted into law. The Congress will not lightly renounce its authority or shirk responsibility in this field.

There has been some experience, as of now, with independent agencies for which the chairmen have been appointed by the President. Is there any evidence that such appointments have actually made any difference in agency procedures or lessened the criticism of delay or inefficiency?

If there is any evidence that independent agencies with chairmen appointed by the President have fared better than those without, I have yet to learn of it. On the contrary, the Interstate Commerce Commission, which does not have a politically appointed Chairman, is the oldest and probably the most respected of all the independent agencies. Each of these agencies, it should be remembered, is responsible for a vital segment of the Nation's economy. The individuals selected to staff them must have not only the highest possible qualifications but must also be free to exercise their best judgment without fear of political repercussion. I cannot foresee any public benefit in making a political football of the agencies responsible for the regulation of public utilities—transportation, communications, power, etc.

Coming to the present: A bill in the Senate would give the President power to remove a member of an independent agency who was "frustrating" the President's program. Would not passage of such a bill represent an abandonment by Congress of a vital part of its power to create such agencies and to set the policies they must follow?

Emphatically, yes. I recall that one President tried to infringe upon the rights of the judicial branch by attempting to pack the Supreme Court, but Congress blocked it. We must be constantly on the alert to prevent Executive power from intruding further into the legislative and judicial branches.

Should the Reorganization Act be amended so that it would be clear that reorganization plans submitted to Congress by the President must deal only with agencies in the executive branch or with executive duties which Congress has seen fit to place in the independent agencies?

Under the Reorganization Act the executive branch and other interested parties are encouraged to express their views on the independent agencies. But I believe the responsibility for modifying these agencies must remain the responsibility of Congress. At the same time, I feel that Congress should consider promptly any agency reorganization proposal which comes from the agency itself. No one is more familiar with an agency's problems than the agency.

Is there any validity in the suggestion that the antitrust laws could be substituted in the field of transportation for the present regulatory scheme?

The field of transportation presents a unique regulatory problem in the business world. For instance in transportation an exception is necessary to the usual application of the antitrust laws in order to provide a stable rate structure upon which shippers can depend in determining transportation costs. Congress, in recognizing the unique problems presented by regulation of transportation, established the ICC to act in the public interest in this regard.

But there are things we can do right now to help solve the transportation problem. We can relax the archaic and unnecessary regulations, most of which were written 75 years or so ago, so that they are brought into line with our modern economy. To me, the key word in your question here is "scheme." That's exactly what we have now—a transportation scheme instead of a transportation plan or system. We have a hodgepodge of conflicting rules and regulations which

work tremendous hardship on such parts of the transportation industry as the railroads, which need all the help they can get now—not all the hindrance.

Assuming that the present basic regulatory scheme is to be continued, can it be rolled back in any way to give a larger area for the exercise of managerial discretion and still protect the public interest?

Yes, certainly the public can be protected while giving management a greater voice in running its own business. The railroads are a classic example of this. They are regulated today as if they were a monopoly when in fact they are fighting for their lives in one of the most competitive of all businesses. For example, railroads are sometimes denied the right to pass along to shippers, in the form of reduced rates, the benefits of their inherent low-cost advantage, all the while competing with carriers subject to no rate regulation at all. And instead of correcting this obviously inequitable situation, we saw a Senate committee this year hold hearings on S. 1197, a bill to further seriously restrict the railroads' ability to lower rates.

Should some thought be given, now, to adjusting the competitive situation as between the railroads and the water carriers, air carriers, and motor carriers which use federally supported facilities and, for the future, as between the air carriers and the motor carriers of property?

I certainly believe that such adjustments should be made, and I favor the user charge principle as a means of achieving such adjustments. As you may know I introduced in the House this year a bill providing for the establishment of user charges on inland waterways to help cover Federal expenditures on those waterways.

Every President back to and including Hoover has supported the user charge principle. Last winter President Kennedy instructed his Budget Director to formulate general principles for the application of user charges for all types of Federal projects. Numerous study groups have recommended charges for the users of airways, waterways, and highways—charges in which the user pays his fair share. This matter of user charges—or rather the lack of them—works especially hard against the railroads which must acquire, maintain and pay taxes on their rights-of-way while their competitors benefit tremendously from publicly built or operated rights-of-way on which they pay no property taxes and usually inadequate user charges. This of course places the railroads in an almost hopeless competitive position.

From the standpoint of service to the entire public, the common carrier represents the mode which has emerged under the free enterprise system, and many in important positions have said that, if free enterprise in the field of transportation is lost, it will be lost in other areas of the economy. What steps, in principle, could be taken to preserve free enterprise in transportation?

I believe the key factor in preserving the free enterprise system in the transportation industry is simply the will to do so. We know the way to do it, as borne out in seven studies of the transportation industry since World War II—modernize the rules and regulations which govern the industry, stamp out the inequities, establish a transportation system instead of a transportation jumble. But do we have the will to permit free enterprise work in this case? Sometimes I wonder.

A number of bills have been offered which would permit single ownership of multiple modes of transportation as a means of coordinating the various modes. Is the view that the only true coordination would come from common ownership of end-to-end modes a valid one?

As I see it, the various modes of transportation are simply tools which should be used by transportation companies or systems in carrying out as efficiently as possible their jobs of providing the best and cheapest transportation service. A transportation company should no more be denied the use of any of these tools than a carpenter should be denied the use of his hammer or his saw in building a house. In a recent speech, A. G. Anderson, general traffic manager of the Socony Mobil Oil Co., said it was wishful thinking to believe that coordination of transportation media can be secured by voluntary cooperation. "No carrier will voluntarily give to another mode a movement that it can haul itself," he said. "Only integrated transportation companies can furnish complete service to shippers. If such integration were to be given legislative sanction, the shipper would be able to purchase from one carrier that combination of transportation facilities best suited to his needs."

Does the piggyback system, with independent motor carriers delivering the container at one end of the rail, water, or air haul, and the same or another independent motor carrier making the delivery at the completion of the rail, water, or air haul, hold the germ for future sound development of competing systems of transportation?

In transportation, as in science and technology in general, great strides are being made in improved techniques. No roadblocks should be placed in the way of putting these improvements into practice. Piggybacking is but one of many innovations in transportation, and it is important because it is a means of combining more than one form of transportation. But it is under no circumstances to be considered an alternative to providing transportation by any and all means and in any combination under competing transportation systems.

Besides piggybacking, major steps forward in the transport of freight by rail include the trilevel racks for hauling new automobiles on freight cars; hauling grain at reduced rates, in multiple-car lots, by employing new high capacity cars, and the fivefold expansion since World War II of centralized traffic control (CTC) which increases the capacity of a single-track line by 75 to 80 percent. Also entire freight trains can be reassembled now in just a few minutes in electronic freight yards.

But too often roadblocks are placed in the way of passing the benefits of these improvements on to the shipper and the public. For instance, the Tennessee Valley Authority has protested the proposed reduction of rail rates on grain and related commodities between the Ohio River and points in the Southeast. The lower rates were proposed as a result of lower costs, made possible by larger cars moving in multiple-car lots, to meet the competition of water carriers. TVA protested the rates because it said it had spent more than $200 million in Federal funds to make the Tennessee River navigable to haul grain by water from the Midwest to the Southeast, and that the proposed rail rates were designed to eliminate the barge movement of grain. I think this is a shocking situation, when a branch of the Federal Government opposes passing on to the public the benefit of lowered rail costs.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Tribute to George Washington on the 230th Anniversary of His Birth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on February 22, 1962, it was my privilege to deliver the following address at the annual Washington Day banquet of Somerset Lodge No. 358, Free and Accepted Masons:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, WASHINGTON DAY, AT SOMERSET LODGE NO. 358, OF THE FREE AND ACCEPTED MASONS, SOMERSET, PA., ON FEBRUARY 22, 1962

It is a genuine pleasure to be here with you tonight for this annual George Washington Day observance of Somerset Lodge No. 358.

I want you to know that I am speaking to you as a member of our fraternity.

I am a member of Hiram Lodge No. 616, of Altoona, of the Scottish rite bodies of the valley of Williamsport, and of Jaffa Shrine at Altoona.

Somerset has a proud history.

It was appropriately founded in 1787, the same year the Constitution of the United States was signed.

It was then known as Brunerstown.

The history of your city represents a long and honorable record.

On this date it is especially appropriate that we honor our first President—George Washington—who was born 230 years ago today.

There is always a certain solemnity about an occasion honoring George Washington.

There is a feeling of warm satisfaction, too, as in a large family gathering, met to pay reverent and affectionate tribute to an honored past.

Wherever George Washington's countrymen are assembled together there is a sense of brotherhood and common kinship that binds us together with the Father of our Country.

It is seldom in the history of the human race that a man is so obviously born to command.

Yes; one so perfectly equipped—by every quality of mind and heart—to lead a bewildered and distracted people into ways of safety; ways that proved to be sure and certain.

Every American is aware of the unmatched leadership of George Washington.

It is regrettable that very often Americans do not fully appreciate his true greatness.

He towers above the rest.

He appeared on the pages of our history at a most crucial time.

For him and his associates there could be no second guessing.

They gambled not only with their property but with their lives.

They won a victory which was good for the world.

As we briefly review the biographical facts pertinent to George Washington we recall that he was born in 1732 in Westmoreland County, Va.

He had little formal education but was gifted with much commonsense and the ability to lead.

He loved the out of doors and early in life became a guide.

An early significant public event in his life was his service as messenger from the Virginian to the French Governor in 1753–54.

In 1754 a battle at Great Meadows—fought by the small force he commanded—ushered in the long French and Indian War.

Washington was obliged to surrender Fort Necessity and so he resigned, but the next year he served on Braddock's staff at the defeat of the Monongahela.

Here he had a miraculous escape.

He continued in the army until 1759 and had a part in the taking of Fort Duquesne in 1758.

Washington married Martha Custis in 1759. He was a most devoted husband.

That same year he entered the Virginia House of Burgesses.

For several years he led the life of a Virginia planter at his beloved Mount Vernon.

He was a delegate to the First and Second Continental Congresses.

As the energies of the American Revolution exploded, he was chosen to head the Colonial forces.

He led those meager forces through 5 devastating years of war.

It was his task to put into the form of an organized force the raw and ill-equipped soldiers.

His first enterprise succeeded.

Boston was evacuated by the British March 17, 1776, and the Army was transferred to New York.

After the Declaration of Independence a disheartening series of reverses marked the next half year.

These included the Battle of Brooklyn, the withdrawal from New York, White Plains, the fall of Fort Washington, and the melancholy retreat of the diminishing Army across New Jersey.

But the morale of the troops and of the entire country was suddenly raised by Washing's brilliant surprise of Trenton and victory of Princeton.

In the autumn of 1777 Washington's army—though defeated at Brandywine and Germantown—kept a large British force occupied, and so contributed to the victory at Saratoga.

Then came the gloomy winter at Valley Forge.

The battle of Monmouth was won in the summer.

The treason of Benedict Arnold in 1780 was a severe blow.

The following summer Washington showed the qualities of a great general by his secret and rapid march from the Hudson River to Chesapeake Bay—a march which eventually resulted in the fall of Yorktown.

There continued widespread confidence in his thorough devotion to the cause of independence and the basic establishment of the new Nation.

Washington presided over the Federal Convention of 1787.

He was the unanimous choice for President.

Washington's Inauguration was in New York on April 30, 1789.

He was elected for a second term and he served until 1797.

Consider for a moment the long, long years of strain and drain during the agonizing struggle for independence—demanding day after day, for 8 weary years, the last ounce of physical, mental, and moral self-control.

Consider, too, that once independence was achieved the greatest, most daring experiment in human government was about to be launched.

The immense weight of responsibility then descended upon the weary shoulders of a man no longer young.

A man whose only wish was to remain for the rest of his life at his beloved Mount Vernon.

In Washington's own words, written in the summer of 1788, he said: "* * * the great searcher of human hearts is my witness that I have no wish which aspires beyond the humble and happy lot, of living and dying a private citizen on my own farm."

After a year of the Presidency, George Washington could still write wistfully of his Virginia home:

"I can truly say I had rather be at Mount Vernon with a friend or two about me than to be attended at the seat of government by the officers of state and the representatives of every power in Europe."

Two hundred and ten years ago on the 4th of November in 1752, the Masonic Lodge at Fredericksburg, Va., initiated George Washington as a member.

He brought honor, fame, and distinction to the great fraternity of Free Masons.

He was initiated an entered apprentice and in testimony of his esteem for this lodge and the cardinal principles of Freemasonry he retained his membership from the date of his initiation until the time of his death.

At the founding of the Grand Lodge of Virginia in 1785, George Washington, because of the esteem in which he was held by his brethren, was tendered the office of grand master.

Twice after this date he was proposed as Grand Master of the United States by other grand lodges.

Both of these honors were refused for reasons known best to himself.

When the Alexandria, Va., Lodge surrendered its charter—held from the Grand Lodge of Pennsylvania—and received its Virginia charter in the year 1788, George Washington was named its charter master by Most Worshipful Edmund Randolph, then Grand Master of Masons in Virginia.

The lodge has since changed its name to honor its illustrious charter master and is now known as Alexandria-Washington Lodge No. 22.

In 1951, in a volume published in the George Washington Masonic Bicentennial Year, under the authority of the Grand Lodge of Virginia, Grand Master Rudolph R. Cooke, wrote the following:

"George Washington lived in a period when new forces and new ideas and ideals were being born in the world.

"His life and his every action displayed his unwavering devotion to the great principles for which Freemasonry stands.

"The great concepts of brotherly love and freedom were given national birth because of his untiring efforts.

"His life—and the great principles for which he stood— are a part of the glorious heritage of every citizen of the United States of America.

"It is fitting and proper that we should honor his memory, praise his steadfast devotion to the principles of Freemasonry, and observe the anniversary of his Masonic birth with fitting solemnities."

Americans have—and almost seem to have by birth—an inordinate interest in "firsts."

Who was first to go up in a balloon?

Who was first to go over Niagara Falls in a barrel?

Who made the first automobile?

Washington—our first President—goes down in history as being the "first" in the hearts of his countrymen.

Two very learned men have in recent years published books on American "firsts," and it is interesting and enlightening to note how often Freemasonry has had a part in them.

To Washington's lot fell many many "firsts."

He was the first American Commander in Chief; the first President. In Freemasonry he was the first choice for grand master by Virginia, the first independent American grand lodge. The first choice by those who worked to have a national grand master. The first master of Alexandria lodge under its Virginia charter.

The sentimental values attached to Washington relics in the Masonic order reveal the depth of esteem in which he is held in the fraternity.

It has been said that Washington made sacred the things that he touched or that have been associated with him.

Thus cherished above rubies is a gavel made from an oak in the grounds of Mount Vernon. The Washington Bible. A tiny lock of his hair in a golden urn which was the handwork of Paul Revere. And many, many other relics.

It has been suggested that one of the underlying reasons for Washington's personal and persistent interest in Masonic lodges was his own conviction that the hope of success in the Revolution rested with the officers.

Washington always was pleased to see his officers become Masons because the lodge was a school of honor.

Something of the bitterness which Washington tasted in Benedict Arnold's treachery was the man's coldblooded violation of all his Masonic ties and confidences.

If these things are true—and certainly they are reasonable—they lend an added interest to George Washington—the Mason.

We can find much consolation in the decisions reached by George Washington in his troubled times—and in the philosophy of government—that is often hidden under the surface of Washington's more glamorous exploits.

There is no deep and lasting benefit from a mere recital of biographical facts concerning the life of a great man.

Rather, we must look into the past and dig from it nuggets of wisdom that we can apply to the problems of our time.

If George Washington could revisit this earth—one of his greatest surprises—aside from the mechanical changes in our lives—might be the diplomatic and personal relationships we in the United States have with half the world.

The names of the countries in our newspaper headlines would not be familiar to Washington.

Far less familiar to our first President would be the concepts of mutual security, technical cooperation, and permanent alliances for mutual defense.

He would undoubtedly be baffled by the United Nations, the Organization of American States, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the obligations assumed by us under their respective charters.

Yet Washington was not only a great and good man, but also a practical one.

No doubt if he were President today he would be starting on his way to Latin America and planning European and other visits around the globe to further the peace of the world.

We must recall that the end of the American War for Independence brought freedom from outside rule, but it also brought uncertainty and upheaval.

The States became insecure in their relationships with each other.

There were those in Connecticut who feared the expansionist aims of Massachusetts and vice versa.

New York and New Jersey—with a common harbor—became involved in a tariff wrangle.

Despite all these internal problems George Washington had succeeded in turning back the British—largely because he was able to keep the military coalition of the States from breaking off into fragments.

He had the stature and the singleness of purpose that gave the States confidence, the rallying power, and the tenacity needed for victory.

He was a man of good will and absolute integrity, in whom all Americans could believe regardless of party.

Washington did exactly what was expected of him.

He stayed outside the range of frequently bitter debate, using his authority sparingly so that he could apply his full prestige before the people of all the States in the biggest job of all—which was to get the Constitution ratified.

It has been said that "this ability to stand symbolically before the Nation with arms fully outstretched—in order to appeal to and embrace all groups and parties caused many people to regard him as a National Father."

When it became necessary to elect the first President under the U.S. Constitution, the choice of the electors was automatic.

Washington carried with him into the Presidency the belief that he could be above the give-and-take of party strife.

Our Constitution—which reflects Washington's leadership in so many ways—slows up the final governmental decisions.

It subjects them to the checks and balances of repeated examination and the maturity of delayed judgment before becoming final.

Those who speak glibly of our Republic at the level of our Federal Government would do well to weigh these facts which have been responsible for making this a most stable government and our Republic the greatest guarantor of individual liberty in the world today.

Unfortunately some historians have attempted to downgrade Washington.

It has been said that Washington was a dreadful fellow who belonged to the gentry.

He owned property, he was an aristocrat, he was against the common people, and he was a reactionary.

This, however, is the same man who served his country without cost to the Nation and so helped win freedom for all people.

This is the same man who presided over our Constitutional Convention and helped provide the basis for the protection of private property with more people enjoying the blessings of ownership on a more equitable basis than in any other nation in the world.

This is the man who fought to destroy the right to inherit rank and title, and helped establish a government where titles of nobility are constitutionally forbidden.

This is the man who stands head and shoulders above his countrymen, and led the most Revolutionary movement, which resulted in the establishment of more freedoms than has been known to any nation in our world.

In his circular to the States—under date of June 8, 1763, written from his headquarters at Newburgh, N.Y., after the close of the war—Washington wrote a solemn admonition in what he supposed was a final public farewell to his countrymen.

In fatherly words he earnestly exhorted the Thirteen States whose independence he had so lately won and who had already fallen into quarrelling and bickering among themselves:

"There are four things," wrote Washington, "which I humbly conceive are essential to the well being—I may even venture to say to the existence of the United States as an independent power:

"First, an indissoluble union of the States under one Federal head.

"Second, a sacred regard to public justice.

"Third, the adoption of a proper peace establishment; and

"Fourth, the prevalence of that pacific and friendly disposition among the people of the United States which will induce them to forget their local prejudices and policies to make those mutual concessions which are requisite to the general prosperity, and, in some instances, to sacrifice their individual advantages to the interest of the community.

"These are the pillars on which the glorious fabric of our independency and national character must be supported."

In paying tribute to George Washington—as Americans and as Masons—we can do no less than remember his desires for his beloved country by giving recognition to his demands for outstanding leadership.

A type of leadership that is so eloquently described in the following well-known prayer:

"God give us Men.
A time like this demands—strong minds, stout hearts, true faith, and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who express opinions and a will;
Men of honor;
Men who will not lie."

Eugene Black and the World Bank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I know nothing about reports that Gene Black is thinking of retiring, but I hope they are not true. As head of the World Bank, he has created a stable and successful operation that is of tremendous importance to the United States and the world. His support and encouragement of the International Monetary Fund have been important as well.

If and when Mr. Black feels that he must retire for reasons of health, I quite agree with James Reston of the New York Times that his great, large shoes of worldwide fiscal stability will be almost impossible to fill. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Mr. Reston's column on the subject.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 18, 1962]

WASHINGTON—ANOTHER "GEORGIA PEACH" SLIDES FOR HOME

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 16.—Gene Black, the greatest natural wizard to come out of Georgia since Ty Cobb, is thinking of retiring soon.

He is head of the World Bank and one of that remarkable breed of international civil servants who have done so much for the reconstruction of the old world and the development of the new nations since the last war.

When the history of this first postwar era comes to be written, it's a good bet that the political figures in the cold war will seem less important than they do now, and that a few creative pragmatists in the international community will loom much larger.

Among these are the late Dag Hammarskjold, Secretary General of the U.N.; Jean Monnet of France, whose quiet and persistent wisdom guided the unification of Europe; Per Jacobsson of Sweden, head of the International Monetary Fund; Sir Oliver Frank of Britain, who helped persuade the United States to launch the Marshall plan, and Gene Black, whose political genius, charm, and cool competence have guided the World Bank through a remarkable period.

THE ORTHODOX INNOVATOR

Gene Black—out of the University of Georgia at 18, Phi Beta Kappa, the seasickest ensign in the U.S. Navy in the First World War, investment banker in Atlanta for the New York investment firm of Forbes & Co., vice president of the Chase National Bank in 1937, student of Shakespeare and connoisseur of the four B's—baseball, bridge, bourbon, and Balzac—came to the World Bank first as executive director for the United States and then as president in 1949.

His story since then illustrates the flexibility of the American mind and the development of these new international institutions as instruments of peace.

First, he concluded that it was important to develop what the London Observer has called "an international social conscience—a feeling that extreme differences of wealth and poverty were as intolerable among nations as, during the last 100 years, they had come to be regarded among individuals within the same nation."

Second, he concluded that the development of the new nations of Africa and Asia meant nothing less than "exporting the industrial revolution, with all its political and social implications."

Third, as Black himself said, "the most necessary requisite for development may be reform * * * and since resources will at best be limited, careful planning is necessary * * *.

Thus the orthodox conservative American banker out of Atlantic via the Chase National became a kind of international social reformer and managed to do it, not with grants but with sound self-liquidating loans.

In the process he has not only won the confidence of the lenders of the world but of the borrowers as well and gradually, as a result of this confidence, he has been forced into the role of mediator between governments in international disputes such as those between Britain and Egypt over the Suez Canal, and India and Pakistan over the waters of the Indus River.

THE WEAKNESS OF GREATNESS

The weakness of greatness, however, is that it tends to be irreplaceable. Replacing such a man will, because of the financial power of the United States, start with President Kennedy, but it is an international responsibility which cannot be met in accordance with the normal process of American politics.

Mr. Black will not reach the Bank's retirement age of 65 until May 1, 1963, but he has not been well recently, and on his urging, the search for a competent successor has already started very quietly.

Those being mentioned are William McChesney Martin, head of the Federal Reserve Board in Washington; Secretary of the Treasury C. Douglas Dillon, Thomas Gates, former Secretary of Defense under President Eisenhower, and Under Secretary of State George Ball.

Meanwhile, Gene Black has bought himself a house on Brooklyn Heights, from where he can watch the skyline of downtown Manhattan and carry on his duties as chairman of the finance committee of the Ford Foundation and read Shakespeare.

He won't leave until he is satisfied with the transition, but when he goes it will be a sad day in the Capital. For this breed of international civil servants—the Monnets, the Hammarskjolds, the Franks and the Blacks—were not only great servants of the world, but they were among the most articulate and charming men of their time.

A Secure America: The Challenge to Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, last fall a young man from Pompano Beach, Fla., addressed the convention of the Southern Association of Student Councils while he was serving as president of that organization. The subject of that talk was "A Secure America: The Challenge to Youth."

This young man, Richard W. Hughes, is to be commended not only for his stirring remarks, but the fine work he is doing in student affairs. He is demonstrating leadership qualities which this country so desperately needs, and is further proof that we have good reason to feel that our future will be in good hands.

Because this talk is as timely today as when it was delivered, and its subject matter should be of interest to all Members, I include it in the RECORD:

A SECURE AMERICA: THE CHALLENGE TO YOUTH

In the past decade we have been told again and again of the danger we face in the form of that autocratic doctrine of the East, communism. We have been warned of it, reprimanded for our ignorance of it, and taught to fear it, as the greatest threat to our well-being today. But is it the greatest threat? Is communism the one factor which can destroy America? No. America can only be destroyed by herself. If this land of ours crumbles in the face of danger, she will crumble, as so many great nations of the past have done, from within. Her foundations, the principles on which she was built, will weaken, and finally break. The walls which have guarded her from tyranny—free elections, and our governmental system of checks and balances, these will rot away from disuse and neglect; and with these, the roof which has kept our Nation protected from the storms of injustice will come tumbling down. With it, all equality and civil liberty—those freedoms which we for so long have taken for granted—will be lost in the dust of the earth. The history books will not record the loss, because from that time on, history will be rewritten to suit those who rule. After a generation goes by America will be spoken of only as a "warmongering, capitalistic society, whose existence endangered world peace, and so had to be destroyed in the interests of the peace-loving nations of the earth."

Do we want our Nation to come to this end?

This could happen. It very well may happen. Our foundations are weakening this minute. Whether they give way is entirely up to us. Men and their ideals made the country, gave it truth, justice, and honor. Now, I ask you: Has the world been so altered by new men and new ideas that these have changed? No. There is still truth, and there is still a just way of dealing with our fellow man. There are still certain standards of character and integrity for which honest men can strive. Human good will and loving kindness, decency of thought and manner, all those essentials of honor which make nations great; these will never change—and it is up to us to see that their meanings are made clear to the world, and that their significance in the history of the world is not forgotten. Men and their ideals gave us these fundamental precepts, and the duty of keeping them alive. Thomas Woodrow Wilson set forth this duty in a speech to Congress on April 2, 1917, when he said, "Our object now * * * is to vindicate the principles of peace and justice in the life of the world, and to set up among the really free and self-governed peoples of the world such a concert of purpose and of action as will henceforth insure the observance of those principles." If we can fulfill this one obligation, our battle for survival is half won.

A strengthening of these principles can save us, but it is a task that cannot be accomplished by a few. Every American citizen must engage in the struggle for national security and world peace. And since we who are young will be at the helm of our country during what may prove to be its most desperate years, it is fitting and proper that we should begin now, to take the lead in this war for survival. President Kennedy emphasized this idea recently when he said, "If the youth of America face up to our responsibilities, undeterred by fanatics or frenzy, at home or abroad * * * we shall be neither Red nor dead, but alive and free."

We have before us three great battlefields on which this war must be fought. The first consists of our homes, schools, and communities. Here is found the lifeblood of our Nation. Here, the people meet, discuss and resolve their problems, and live their lives day by day. It is here that the people must be made aware of the situation which faces them, and of how they can combat it. Let us look at our homes:

Through the years the American home has been a basic unit of our society. In the home must be taught a strong devotion for each family member and a strong devotion to God. Here should be learned the love, discipline, and respect which plays such an important part throughout our lives. Here also, must be learned and practiced the basic methods of democracy. The home, as the primary environment of young Americans, must be made to serve America by teaching her youth the ideals which have made America great, and by instilling in them deep faith and love for these ideals and for God. Unfortunately, in recent times, too often this strong unit has deteriorated into a loose companionship, lacking in love, discipline, and respect. A home lacking in these virtues is a birthplace for crime and mental disease which will weaken a nation. We must

strengthen the family and restore binding ties between its members. As future parents we must assume the responsibility for making the American home of tomorrow a steadfast strong institution that maintains its rightful place in our society.

The school represents the second sector of this battlefield. It has been said, and quite accurately, I believe, that the central purpose of American schools is to improve the individual. On the whole, our schools live up to this. They offer us a comprehensive study of the past, an up-to-date knowledge of the world today, and adequate preparation for our future in tomorrow's world.

Without the education which our schools provide, democracy can never succeed. Our schools must foster constructive new ideas, thinking, creativity of the mind and body. Since it is here that our ideas of right and wrong are formed, youth must be taught with care and not be led astray by radical ideas. I am reminded of an incident which occurred in one of our universities at the beginning of the fall term this year. A social science professor announced to his class of almost 100 young people that he was a Socialist, and that the class would be taught along lines of socialism. The class listened for a few minutes, then stood, and went directly to the office of the dean to report the incident. The professor is now under suspension and will most likely be dismissed from the faculty. We can be proud of those young people, for they realized that people such as that professor are a real menace to our country's stability.

To impress our youth with the urgency of keeping our democracy safe from tyranny and corruption, youth must be taught the good and the bad, the right and the wrong, in order that they might distinguish between the two. Above all, the students must never be denied the truth, or the right to learn and to explore further. Someday, every student will be either an asset or a liability to his country. The school must strive to make each student an individual, with ambition and ability. Our schools must help him in his choice.

In order that the youth be fully prepared for adult life, the education must include outside activities which provide companionship with others and a chance to give special attention to extracurricular fields of interest and ability. In this, our schools do not fail us, for each year they present a more varied program of supplementary activities. Outstanding among these is the student council, which employs skilled guidance to develop future leaders, and gives its members an early chance to develop and display their abilities. The students are given responsibilities, and an opportunity to demonstrate their capacity for work and imagination. They meet other student leaders from all over the United States, and this association with others enables them to broaden their scope of knowledge and ideas. Finally, the student council serves the all-important role of acquainting the students with and actually putting into practice the governmental system which has become the backbone of our Nation. Strong objections to student council have been raised over the point that it takes too much time from class but I firmly believe that no other element of our educational system can so effectively provide the experience of participating in a democracy at work as can the student council.

The third and largest sector of this battlefield is the community. In the community, where the people live, work, play, meet, and cast their votes, we find the first level of true democratic government. Because of this, the community may well be considered the most vital part of our Nation. Basic democracy must be kept alive and working here at all costs. The people must be impressed with the need for exercising their voting privilege, and, incidentally, I cannot think of a more worthwhile project than a get out the vote crusade.

Once the officials are elected, the citizens should support them, but the people must not allow unscrupulous officeholders to try to usurp their rights. For this reason, the citizenry must keep an alert and interested eye turned toward community government affairs, and not be afraid to speak out if he sees something being done in an unjust or incorrect way. We are given the right to speak out against bad government and we must use that right.

But the support of the government is not the only thing necessary to put our communities on an even keel. In far too many cities and towns across our Nation, there exists today a complacent, lethargic attitude toward crime and immorality. Recently, an article about one of our cities told the shameful story of how, for 40 years, the city had been run by one of the best-organized local vice mobs in the country. Gambling, prostitution, sale of narcotics, and utter defiance of the liquor laws had become commonplace there. Although the public was aware of this situation, it was over 40 years before some positive action was taken by a few citizens who decided to fulfill their responsibilities. True, the important thing is that something was done, but in so many other cities and towns throughout the country, virtually nothing is being done, although similar conditions exist.

We must wake up to the fact that circumstances such as these certainly can cause our Nation to collapse. As young citizens of America, we must begin now to keep a watchful eye on our own community affairs. Whether it be organized crime or petty thievery, it must be sought out and stopped.

The community serves the country in the important role of the meeting place of people of various religious beliefs. In America, no person is prohibited from worshipping as he pleases. We must make use of this freedom. It is important that we stress our religious ties, and keep a deep, abiding faith in God. It matters not what church we attend, just as long as we go, and show the Lord that we appreciate our world.

And so, this is the first battlefield. Home, school, community—these are the fundamental units of America.

The great war for life under liberty must be fought on a second battlefield—that of government and diplomacy. In the field of government there is a set of dual responsibilities and obligations; those which we owe our governmental officials, and those which our officials owe us. Both are equally necessary to a secure nation.

Perhaps it is the people who have the greater duty. We are responsible for the officials that we elect and we are therefore obliged to elect the best qualified men and women by exercising our sacred right to vote. We have an obligation to support our Nation by abiding by the laws set forth by Congress and to respect the courts in their decisions.

We, the citizens, have another huge responsibility, which unfortunately, we have failed to fulfill for many years. This is the duty of taking an active interest in our Government, how it works, and what it is doing. The utter indifference expressed by many Americans concerning national affairs is not only shameful, but is increasingly becoming a dangerous threat to the well-being of our country. We must realize now, that complacency and apathy toward the Government can destroy a nation faster than any bomb our foes may produce. Every citizen must become a watchdog for the Nation; he must express his feelings toward the administration of its affairs, and must let the elected representatives know that he is aware of what is going on; that he agrees or disagrees with their decisions. "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," said Thomas Jefferson, but it is a small price to pay for the blessings of freedom. If we relax our vigilance, corruption and bad government set in and freedom will not last.

On the national level, we have entrusted to about 600 people the welfare of over 180 million and we demand certain things of them. We expect these few to manage our country honestly and fairly. We depend on them for a stable economy, for just laws, properly enforced, and a fair trial for all accused. We demand that they examine all new ideas openmindedly, and be progressive in their thinking.

These officials are responsible to us for maintaining the Nation's military security, and its diplomatic prominence and leadership. In all of their dealings, they have the chief obligation of standing firm on the principles of freedom and justice to all.

"For," as President Kennedy said in a speech in 1959, "if we should ever abandon the basic American traditions in the name of fighting communism, what would it profit us to win the whole world, when we had lost our soul?" We expect our leaders to stand their ground in international affairs, not to give up an important issue for the sake of compromise. Too many times we have compromised and have lost ground, while our Eastern foes have gained.

If the Government and the people can be made to fulfill their obligations, the fight on this field is won.

There is a third field of battle. It is the most complex, and yet, the most limited. It is the smallest, and yet, the greatest. This third battlefield is the individual.

Our country was not made great because it is of such magnitude, or because it contains such unlimited natural resources. It was put into the position of eminence it now holds by men and women who made the most of what they had, applied their simple ideals of justice and liberty, and molded a fine new civilization. By the same token, America will not remain a great nation because of its immense population, or because of its large cities and factories, or because of its high standard of living. No; it can only be the people—the individuals—who will sustain our country's greatness, and every American citizen must decide now, before it is too late, whether he prefers a future of peace and prosperity, or a future of oblivion. If we will choose now to maintain our freedom, and will actively assist in the task of revitalizing our country, the peace of this generation and many generations hereafter will be preserved. As the former Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Charles Evans Hughes, once said "Forms of government, however well contrived, cannot insure their own permanence. * * * If today we find ground for confidence that our institutions which have made for liberty and strength will be maintained, it will not be due to abundance of physical resources, or to productive capacity, but because these are at the command of a people who still cherish the principles which underlie our system, and because of the general appreciation of what is essentially sound in our governmental structure."

The Chief Justice certainly knew what makes a nation strong, and the truth of his words has not diminished since 1939. It is up to us to create within ourselves a strong desire to succeed in our bids for world peace, an alert enthusiasm in national affairs, and a basic awareness of the fundamentals of our democracy. If the individual fails in this, our country's voice as a world leader must be relinquished.

Thus, we have the three realms of battle: the first, consisting of the home, the school, and the community; the second, the Government; third, the individual. A victory on all fields is essential. The contest is raging now and as we move to the front lines,

we must take stock of ourselves, our beliefs, and our ideals.

Most important, we must formulate and put into effect now a plan of decisive actions to accomplish the goals previously set forth. Begin now to put new life into your homes, and to take new interest in your family. Attend church regularly, and be thankful to God that you can grow up in a land such as ours. Take stock of what you are getting from school, or rather, what you are putting into it. Find ways to build your own character through your school. Look objectively at your student council, as well as the other clubs to which you belong. Do they measure up to the ideals upon which they were based? Wake up to the happenings in your city or town, and find ways in which you and your council can aid in its development. Acquire a keen interest in national affairs, and don't be afraid to write your Congressman on matters of vital interest. Finally, look at yourself critically. Are you really performing to the best of your ability in all that you do? Do you have certain ideals to live up to, and have you set a goal?

Strength in our Nation will not be achieved by noble thoughts alone; we must act.

The challenge is placed before us, and with world events moving so rapidly toward a threatening climax, it is probable that our generation will lead America, either to total collapse, or to worldwide triumph in the fight for freedom.

Take your pick: Will we be the ones to commit suicide by taking a deadly dose of complacency, or will we meet the challenge with unyielding decisions and actions, guided by faith in our principles and in Almighty God?

What will you do? If you will choose to take renewed trust in your country and what it stands for, if you will make yourself mindful of the dangers we face from within, and what can be done to alleviate them—our advancement under liberty will be as limitless as the horizon.

Do you believes in your country? Will you stake your life on its future? Will you dedicate yourself, yes, yourself, your mind, and body, to its well-being? Will you meet the challenge of your generation with knowledge, with vigor and firmness, and with faith in America's doctrine of liberty and equity?

Young Americans, ours is the richest heritage, the greatest potential, and the most promising destiny of any on this earth. As a fellow citizen of our great country, as a brother in the eyes of God, I ask you to meet the challenge to preserve these. It will not be a wasted step, nor a vain fight. A secure America can be ours. The world awaits our answer.

RICHARD HUGHES,
President, Southern Association of Student Councils.

Resumption of Atmospheric Nuclear Tests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, a statement which I recently wrote was published in the Seattle Times, February 15, 1962, under the title "United States Has No Alternative But To Resume Tests in Air."

Because of the vital importance of the issue discussed in this article, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES HAS NO ALTERNATIVE BUT TO RESUME TESTS IN AIR

(By Senator HENRY M. JACKSON)

WASHINGTON.—Moscow has made it inevitable that the United States must resume atmospheric nuclear tests.

Last fall, after months of secret preparations, the Soviet Union callously broke the nuclear test moratorium and exploded between 40 and 50 nuclear weapons in the atmosphere.

For 39 months we sat through more than 350 negotiating sessions patiently trying to get an effective test-ban treaty. And more than 350 times the Russians said, "Nyet."

Khrushchev has forced the issue.

A President, on taking office, swears to "preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States." His most solemn responsibility is to provide for the common defense.

By itself, a strong military posture is not an answer to the future problems of national security. But without such a posture there will be no future.

Today, America's atomic strength and strike capability, in the aggregate, is still the most powerful in the world. These capabilities are deployed so as to survive surprise attack and to devastate any aggressor which starts a nuclear war.

But the key question relates not to the present. It concerns the future. And that question is this: Will our atomic arsenal be strong enough 3 or 4 years from now to deter attacks on us and our friends and allies?

The Soviets use testing to terrorize the weak and sap the determination of the strong. But their tests are not mere bluff and blackmail. They also give Soviet leaders and scientists the chance to develop and improve their nuclear arms, for example, in the area of an antimissile missile. Nuclear weaponry is not a static art, any more than any other technology.

The Russians took big steps forward in their last series of tests. Moscow is now ahead of us in certain areas of nuclear-weapons development. In view of this, and to maintain this country's effective deterrent power, we must continue the improvement of our nuclear arms and delivery capabilities.

We have no alternative but to undertake some tests in the atmosphere. Testing is an indispensable part of any laboratory process—the only means by which we can move from scientific theory to proved weapons. And atmospheric testing is required because we cannot learn all we need to know simply through underground testing.

We will not conduct nuclear tests in the atmosphere for psychological or propaganda reasons—as Moscow has done. We will undertake such tests only to serve a rational military purpose. We should test only to the degree that the essential development of critical weapons cannot proceed without such tests—and with maximum precautions to restrict fallout to a minimum.

The course before us is clear:

1. The world is not safe in a nuclear-arms race.

Therefore, we must keep trying to achieve a secure arrangement for the reduction and control of armaments. We must continue to seek agreement on a nuclear-test-ban treaty based on an effective system of international inspection and control, which, among other things, could protect us against the repetition of lengthy secret preparations for surprise testing.

2. The world is not safe if the Soviet Union gains superiority in nuclear striking power.

Therefore, we must push the development of critical new weapons essential to the defense of the free world. Insofar as atmospheric testing is necessary to assure this development, we must go forward.

Observance of Metropolitan Slipy Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 18, 1962, a solidarity celebration was organized by the Citizens' Committee for the Observance of Metropolitan Joseph Slipy Day, under the auspices of St. Michael's Catholic Ukrainian Church and the Maryland branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., at St. Michael's Hall, Lombard and Wolfe Streets, Baltimore, Md.

Several hundred Americans of Ukrainian descent of Baltimore, with their pastor, the Reverend Petro Melnyczuk, presiding, joined in a prayer crusade commemorating the 70th anniversary of the birth of Archbishop Slipy to invite the attention of freedom-loving peoples the world over to the suffering and persecution this Ukrainian prelate has endured during the past 17 years in Soviet prisons and concentration camps.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the program as well as my message to those assembled on this occasion:

PROGRAM

(His Excellency the Most Reverend Archbishop Ambrose Senyshyn, metropolitan of Philadelphia, initiated the celebration of the 17th anniversary of the birth of the Metropolitan Joseph Slipij, who has been imprisoned by the Communists. He is metropolitan of Halych and archbishop of Lviw. St. Michael's Catholic Ukrainian Church, Baltimore, Md., with the cooperation of all local organizations sponsors this academy in honor of this occasion.)

1. "Star-Spangled Banner," piano solo, by O. Maciurak.
2. Opening address: Rev. Petro Mlenyczuk.
3. Active participation in prayer: "Mighty God," girl students of parish school.
4. Lecture in English: Mr. W. Sushko; lecture in Ukrainian: Mr. J. Shawiak.
5. Movochatsky, "Our Father," sung by church choir; soloist, S. Poliszczuk.
6. Bohdán Lepky, "In the Cathedral of St. George," recitation by Andrew Tatchyn.
7. Bach, "Solfeggietto," piano solo; Florence A. Goodrich; "Caprice in C," by O. Kohut.
8. Charles Gounod: "Ava Maria," solo; Cherubini, "Mama," solo sung by L. Korobijowska.
9. Bortniansky, "Wsi Jazytzy," sung by church choir; Jaroslavenko, "Blakytno Zowty Stiah," sung by choir of OCHUSU.
10. Church song, "My Choir of Parochial School Children"; Ukrainian hymn, combined choirs and guests.

Choir director: Mr. I. Seniuta.
Piano accompanist: Mrs. L. Shawiak.
Costume preparation: Mrs. W. Wojtowych.

COMMEMORATION OF THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF METROPOLITAN SLIPY, FEBRUARY 18, 1962

It is good for us to be here. That is so because we assemble for a noble purpose—

to put our voices in unison and offer a fervent prayer to Almighty God that Metropolitan Joseph Slipy, the head of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in the Ukraine, heroic sufferer for his church and nation in a Communist-ruled Russian prison, will be given the physical strength, and, yes, the moral courage and fortitude to withstand the persecution to which he has and still is being subjected. And beyond that, please God, we hope the day will soon come when Archbishop Slipy will be free to shepherd his flock without molestation.

What untold agony this brave man of God and truly modern-day martyr for his church and his people must have undergone during these past 16 years of imprisonment. On this, the occasion of the 70th birthday of Metropolitan Slipy, we welcome the opportunity to join the prayer crusade initiated by the Most Reverend Archbishop Ambrose Senyshyn, metropolitan of Ukrainian Catholics in the United States.

You Americans of Ukrainian descent, and those of us who are privileged to be with you on this occasion, are justifiably proud to demonstrate to the entire world that we will not stand idly by while those who represent the forces of tyranny and oppression deny to their fellow man the basic freedoms of liberty and justice. Freedom to worship God should not and must not be denied any man. Not only Metropolitan Slipy, but all members of the Ukrainian Catholic Church presently under communistic Russian domination, are included and remembered in our prayerful petition this day.

Less than a month ago—on January 22—we observed the 44th anniversary of the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic. Some may ask why we commemorate the anniversary of Ukrainian independence. We, of course, realize that the freedom-loving and God-fearing people are under the yoke of oppression. To those who would ask why, I say: We salute and admire these gallant people for their principled determination to be free, sympathize with them in their incredible suffering, and sustain and give them reassurance that their courageous struggle to achieve liberty again and glorious independence will not be in vain. We echo over and over to them that the free nations of the world stand by and beside the people of the Ukraine.

The city of Baltimore, the State of Maryland, and the United States of America are proud of the Americans of Ukrainian descent in our midst. We recognize that these patriotic citizens are holding on high the torch of truth, liberty, and justice for their loved ones and brethren across the sea.

With hearts and minds lifted in prayer, with a steadfast faith in the future, and secure in the knowledge that our cause is just and honorable, we beseech Almighty God to bless this Nation, our President, freedom-loving peoples everywhere and today we plead especially: Long live Metropolitan Slipy, long live the Ukrainian National Republic.

Thank you.

Policing Organized Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a very interesting and informative article entitled "Policing Organized Labor," written by Erwin Ross, appeared in the February 5 edition of the New Leader.

It comments favorably on the effect the Landrum-Griffin Act has had in the protection of union members against abuse of power committed by some union officials. The writer of the article cites specific examples of cases in which this law has been employed to correct fraudulent election practices or to prevent embezzlement and other misuse of union funds by some union officials, or other improper activities. I am indeed gratified to read these comments concerning the effectiveness of this law, which is aimed at removing some of the blight uncovered during hearings by the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field.

I believe those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will appreciate having the information this article contains. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLICING ORGANIZED LABOR

In June 1960, Local 1617 of the United Steelworkers of America held an election in Youngstown, Ohio. The incumbents won handily. But soon afterward three of the losers charged that the election had been rigged. From July through September, they sought a new election and were successively turned down by the local, by the international executive board and by the union's biennial convention.

Before September 1959, the defeated candidates would have had no further recourse. In that month, however, the Labor Department set up a court of last resort for aggrieved union members—the Bureau of Labor-Management Reports (BLMR)—to enforce the recently enacted Landrum-Griffin Act.

And so it was that the sorely tried Youngstown steelworkers formally appealed to the BLMR to void the June election. The Bureau began an exhaustive investigation which soon turned up some disquieting facts: There was evidence that only 1,178 members had actually voted in the election, whereas 1,432 votes had been counted. Before the count, the ballot boxes had been left unattended while the tellers went out to dinner; when they returned, the boxes had been moved.

The investigators also interviewed a number of union members who, the records showed, had voted. Fifty-one of them, however, insisted that they had not voted. Several had been out of town—one in military training, another attending a wedding in Pennsylvania, still another fishing 44 miles away. Over 800 ballots were sent to the FBI laboratory for examination; the FBI reported suspicions indentations of X's on many ballots, which suggested that they might have been marked in stacks before being stuffed into the ballot boxes.

Before going to court to invalidate the election, the BLMR laid the facts before the international union. The latter moved quickly. First it tried to persuade the local officers to hold a new election. When they refused, the union sent in an administrator to run the local and oversee a new poll. In March 1961, a second election was held. With one exception, all the previously defeated candidates won. The new president was elected by more than 600 votes; in the first election, he had lost by nearly 200.

The deplorable electoral system in Local No. 1617 was only one of hundreds of messy situations which the BLMR has set aright in its 2½ years of operation. The Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act, popularly known as the Landrum-Griffin Act, was passed by Congress largely in response to the startling disclosures before the McClellan commitee of financial malpractice, conflicts of interest, phony elections and other undemocratic procedures in certain labor unions. The culprits were a small minority of the labor movement, but they often succeeded, as in the case of the Teamsters Union, in victimizing hundreds of thousands of members.

Basically, the Landrum-Griffin Act seeks to protect union members against abuse of power by their officials. It endows individual members with certain civil liberties enforcible in court (such as free speech at union meetings); it sets up standards for fair elections and trusteeships; it requires that union financial officials be bonded for faithful discharge of their duties; it requires full disclosuse of union finances, payrolls, and expense accounts, as well as employer payments to labor consultants.

At first the act was viewed with horror by a good many labor leaders. "It subjects every union to harassment, litigation, factionalism, and the legalized infiltration of employer spies and stooges," President Al Hayes proclaimed to a convention of the International Association of Machinists. This prediction has not been borne out. The labor movement has neither been crippled nor harassed nor overrun by spies. Arthur J. Goldberg, who became Secretary of Labor after a career as a union lawyer, says, "I think the law has had a great prophylactic impact. The fact that it is on the books has made people more careful—both in handling union funds and in running elections."

Indeed, those aspects of the law which the AFL–CIO favored back in 1959—financial disclosure, fair election standards, and Government scrutiny of trusteeships—are considered by many trade unionists to have worked a positive boon for the labor movement. The sections of Landrum-Griffin that aroused the AFL–CIO's ire were the Taft-Hartley amendments in title VII, which do not bear on the act's main purpose of safeguarding the rights of individual union members; title VII is administered by the National Labor Relations Board.

The files of the BLMR are full of expressions of approval on the part of rank-and-file members and local union officials. A union officer in Arkansas told a BLMR representative, "After hearing your speech; I don't believe you're the monster I had envisioned." From a Minnesota union leader came the comment: "We were afraid of this law, and now we find that in some respects it has helped us a whole lot."

James P. Mitchell, Secretary of Labor when the act was passed, staffed the BLMR with men who were both knowledgeable about the labor movement and sympathetic to its aspirations. As commissioner he appointed John L. Holcombe, a judicious, affable career civil servant who had been a labor expert early in his Government service and in recent years had held high-ranking posts in the Defense Department. A number of Holcombe's subordinates have had trade-union experience. The Bureau has over 500 employees and maintains 5 regional and 24 area offices, operating on an annual budget of $5.7 million.

Holcombe and his staff have a lot of muscle to enforce compliance with the law. They can go to court to set aside rigged elections or overturn trusteeships illegally imposed by an international union over a dissident local. They can invoke penalties of a year in jail and a $10,000 fine against willfully false reporting by a union, an employer, or a labor relations consultant. The Bureau prefers, however, to hold its penalties in reserve and

secure voluntary compliance wherever possible.

It has been astonishingly successful in settling cases out of court. Up to November 3, 1961, it determined that 2,632 violations of the act had occurred. In 2,591 instances, voluntary compliance was secured. Only 41 cases required court action.

Many of the 2,632 cases involved minor and unintentional violations, such as erroneous arithmetic in a financial report, and could be cleared up after an exchange of correspondence or a visit by a compliance officer. Other infractions, such as election irregularities, involved the rights of a good many union members. By early November, the BLMR uncovered 103 election violations. In 85 instances, it was able to persuade the union to right matters voluntarily. In only 18 cases did it have to file a complaint in court—and in 7 of these the union agreed to a new poll, under BLMB supervision, before the matter came to trial.

Almost any election case is dramatic testimony to the effectiveness of the law. In the Banana Handlers Local of the International Longshoremen's Association in New Orleans, everything indicated that the incumbents had long kept themselves in power through autocratic rule. Certain features of the constitution—such as fining members for using cusswords or smoking at meetings—were scrupulously observed. The members' rights to self-government were as consistently flouted.

In March 1960, the local held a meeting to nominate officers for an election to be held in April. The president gratefully accepted his own renomination and that of his slate. He allowed no other names to be placed in nomination. At one point, he announced, "I have always been president and will always remain president." With no opposition, he triumphed handsomely at the polls.

His opponents vainly sought relief through their union and then approached the BLMR, which ultimately filed a complaint in Federal court. This action prompted the union to agree to a new election, at which 86 percent of the 753 eligible members voted. Most of the members who lined up at the polls were equipped with buttons, arm bands and banners proclaiming their allegiance to the incumbent slate. When the votes were in, however, every one of the 17 former officers had been defeated.

Fraudulent elections are only one way by which union members are victimized. The McClellan hearings revealed many instances in which international unions arbitrarily denied self-government to local unions, deposing their officers and sending in trustees to run their affairs. To correct such abuses, the Landrum-Griffin Act provided that trusteeships could only be established for certain legitimate purposes—such as eliminating corruption, reestablishing democratic procedures, or assuring adherence to collective bargaining contracts.

Within 30 days after a trusteeship is imposed, an international must file a report justifying its action. Additional reports, explaining why the trusteeship has been continued, have to be filed every 6 months. The BLMR is obliged to investigate every complaint of an illegal trusteeship and is empowered to bring a civil suit to set it aside.

Sharp scrutiny of trusteeships has unquestionably decreased their number. A total of 506 were in effect when the Landrum-Griffin Act was signed; 419 were dissolved by November 14, 1961. In that same period, 236 new trusteeships were set up, but 98 of them were thereafter terminated.

In many cases, the BLMR sustains the parent body. One of its most interesting cases involved a trusteeship which the United Automobile Workers (UAW) imposed in January 1960 on local 988 of Memphis, Tenn. After receiving several complaints, the Bureau launched an investigation.

The trusteeship, it developed, had been established after UAW headquarters had made repeated and vain efforts to persuade the Memphis leadership not to discriminate against the 500 Negroes in the 1,800-member local. Negroes were systematically excluded from union committees and were forced to use segregated washrooms and drinking fountains—all of which the international found incompatible with its constitutional goal of uniting all workers in its jurisdicton regardless of race, creed or color. After examining the facts and the UAW constitution, the BLMR held the trusteeship to be valid.

One of the major contributions of the Landrum-Griffin Act is that for the first time it has made embezzlement of union funds a Federal crime. Embezzlement, of course, has always been a State crime, but local authorities have often lacked the interest or facilities to police unions. Up to last December 31, there were 21 embezzlement convictions under the act, involving unions in 13 States and Puerto Rico. Ten other cases are pending prosecution.

By agreement between the Labor and Justice Departments, most such investigations are conducted by the FBI, with the BLMR often providing the initial leads. The most notorious hoodlum brought to book was Stoy Decker, president of Local 86 of the Teamsters in Louisville, Ky. In April 1961, he received a 9-year sentence and a $10,000 fine after being convicted on 10 counts of embezzling union funds.

The law has had a salutary effect on the internal life of unions even in the absence of a major "case." Typical was the experience of two bakery workers who informed the Philadelphia office of the BLMR that they were unable to get copies of the constitution and by-laws of their local. The compliance officer told them of their legal rights, and they subsequently raised such a stir that documents were made available to the group.

Another union member wrote to Washington that his local had refused the membership information about its finances. The BLMR checked its files, found that the union had not furnished the financial report required by the law. A compliance officer approached the union and 2 weeks later the report was mailed in. The complainant also got his information.

The Bureau undertook an investigation of financial chicanery in a large east coast local headed by a man who had many brushes with the law. During the investigation, a transformation occurred in the local: business agents were suddenly responsive to members' grievances, shop stewards began to make their rounds diligently, the membership took a more active interest in the local's affairs.

Thanks to the law, many rank-and-file members for the first time can scrutinize the financial affairs of their unions. Every report filed with the BLMR is subject to public inspection; there are over 52,000 union financial reports alone. Copies of any report can be obtained for 25 cents a page. Last year, 2,000 people visited the BLMR's document rooms in Washington and some 1,300 inquiries came by mail. In the near future, it is planning to decentralize its document files, so that a copy of each report will be available in the area in which it originates.

At the end of BLMR's second year of operations, Secretary of Labor Goldberg hailed the fair and cooperative attitude of unions in complying with the law. The BLMR, however, is not taking anything on faith; a third of its 152 compliance officers are organized into task forces to ferret out the most covert and resistant pockets of corruption in the labor movement.

Investigators also routinely audit union books and records, even in the absence of specific complaints, to verify the accuracy of the annual financial reports. Some unionists object to these searching audits—calling them fishing expeditions—but Goldberg regards them as at least as valid as those of the Internal Revenue Service.

Disclosure, public scrutiny and relentless investigation have already noticeably improved the atmosphere in many unions. The job is by no means over, but as BLMR Commissioner John Holcombe has put it, "The worst abuses revealed by the McClellan committee have to a large extent been ended. Most of the waterholes are no long being visited, and the tracks are old."

Let Co-ops Pay, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include a very fine article written by Donald I. Rogers which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune last January 16 entitled "Let Co-Ops Pay, Too."

To me, this is a burning question with us. I have had bills before the House over a long period of years on this subject and it is the one place where the Treasury can gain additional money while at the same time put these businesses which are growing so rapidly on a sound competitive basis with those in a similar line of business who are required to pay taxes.

The article follows:

LET CO-OPS PAY, TOO

Now that President Kennedy has asked Congress to consider the tax laws with a view toward closing the numerous loopholes, it might be a good time to review the unfair advantage which farmer cooperatives enjoy in this country.

Co-ops enjoy great privileges when compared with the private or proprietary business enterprises in the land, far greater, even, than in Sweden or Denmark, countries which are frankly Socialist and where the co-op movement has been established for years. Sweden taxes its co-ops at substantially the same rate as other businesses. Denmark taxes its consumer co-ops at slightly less than half this rate. Both countries, however, make the co-op and patron liable for taxes on income from co-op earnings.

In America, the cooperatives pay little or no tax. There is no tax on income derived from them so long as it goes into expansion of the co-op.

The House Ways and Means Committee proposes to increase the tax somewhat on farm co-ops, a darn decent thing to do, since in the same omnibus bill is the proposal to withhold 20 percent of the dividends due holders of common stock of private businesses plus proposals for higher taxes on oversea business operations and a broad attack on business expense deductions.

The theory seems to be that if those who invest in the free enterprise system are going to get belted even harder, then it's possible to take the curse off it by nudging the co-ops a little bit.

The President recognizes that farmer cooperatives enjoy a most unusual tax loophole. It is estimated that it costs the country as much as $332 million a year in lost taxes—a sort of monetary monument to

the past, when co-ops were in swaddling clothes.

Farmer marketing cooperatives today do over $15 billion worth of business a year. Their tax exemption has made it possible for them to force many taxpaying companies right out of business, either by buying them out with tax-free earnings, or forcing them out with tax-free dollars.

Patron farmers in these enterprises—and that's really what they are, despite the term co-op—would like to forget, and Congressmen frequently do forget, that the private businesses of America provide 25 percent of the Treasury's revenue through a corporate income tax rate of up to 52 percent of the gross.

The first farmer cooperative in this country was organized in 1810. Recurring farm depressions spurred their growth, and they received public encouragement—rightly so—and were accorded certain privileges including broad exemption from corporation income taxes and slightly limited exemption from prosecution under antitrust laws.

Recent statistics show clearly the trend toward bigness in farmer co-ops. While memberships in co-ops grew by 72,095 in 1958–59, despite a declining farm population, the total number of co-ops decreased by 77. The Farmer Cooperative Service attributes much of the decrease to "mergers, consolidations, or acquisitions of facilities and membership of other cooperatives." It might have added that there were many taxpaying businesses included among the victims, too.

According to the Commerce Department, 215 farm and food product wholesaling firms failed in the first 8 months of 1961.

Let's note also that during that same period 112 privately owned food processing companies went under.

If this had happened in a manufacturing industry the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department would have so many investigations going it would be hard to report on them all.

Of the 6,042 marketing co-ops reporting to the FCS, those handling grain and soybeans comprise the largest commodity group—one-third. Located in the Midwest grain States are three-fifths of the total number of marketing co-ops and over half the farm supply co-ops. Of the 7,000 country elevators there, 30 percent are co-op owned and these enjoy the largest share of business.

Do they succeed? In a period of 13 months, one large co-op acquired a big soybean processing plant for $6 million, a string of 37 country elevators for $1,500,000 and a linseed oil processing plant for an undisclosed amount, but for which replacement cost was estimated at $6 million. The Government lost an estimated $2 million annually in taxes from this deal.

This is simply to suggest that the friends of the farmer in Congress have persuaded the Ways and Means Committee to go about the loophole-closing business backwards.

Before withholding dividends on investments and interest on savings, the committee should consider closing this mightiest of all loopholes, the unfair exemption granted the farm cooperatives.

Those Yellowstone Elk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the question of the wisdom of the slaughter of so-called excess elk in the Yellowstone National Park is one that has disturbed many sportsmen and conservationists. Many of us take the position that this is an inexcusable practice as presently conducted. This matter has been called to the attention of the Honorable Stewart Udall, Secretary of the Department of Interior, and to other officials in that agency, time and time again but nothing happens. The March 1962 issue of Guns magazine carries a timely statement, which I submit for reprinting in the RECORD:

THOSE YELLOWSTONE ELK

Residents of the areas surrounding Yellowstone National Park, as well as hunters and sportsmen's organizations everywhere, are deeply concerned over the slaughter by park rangers of 5,000 excess elk in the park. Forage within the park is said to be insufficient to maintain the herd at present size.

Shooting is very strictly prohibited in the park, for reasons that are commendable under ordinary circumstances. But when shooting has to be done, why not let sportsmen do it? Licenses for out-of-State hunters to bag an elk in areas immediately outside park limits cost $100. At that price, 5,000 Yellowstone elk add up to half a million dollars—to say nothing of the sport involved.

Residents around the park say that much of the excess consists of elk driven in by hunting pressure during the season. They insist that many of these elk will drift back outside the park when the season is over, if they are not slaughtered first.

Surely, if elk need to be killed, an in-park season for selected hunters could be arranged and supervised at license fees well below those of the out-of-State licenses in effect, but still high enough to produce a worthwhile profit for park betterment, without park damage. Or, if the park no-shooting rule must be maintained in spite of hell and high water, why not cowboy the excess elk out of the park—and mend the fences? Elk will travel plenty far once they're convinced that an area is unfriendly; and, once well scattered, there should be no forage problem. Last time this writer hunted there, that was real big country.

Lithuanian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, Lithuania has had a stormy history. For 22 years, following the war of 1914–18, it was an independent state. In the era of its greatest power it stretched from the Baltic to the Black Sea. After it was converted to Christianity in 1385, it was dominated by Polish influence for more than 400 years. It was annexed by imperial Russia in 1795 but at the time of the Communist revolution it broke away from the Soviet Union and proclaimed its independence.

But the lights of freedom were soon put out by the sharp winds of World War II. In June, 1940 Lithuania was occupied by Soviet troops, and soon after was blackmailed into becoming the 14th Soviet republic. Thousands of Lithuanians were deported to the east as the Soviet warlords sought to communize the country. The United States refused to recognize the Communist conquest.

The whiptides of war loosed the Soviet hold on Lithuania and the German Nazis occupied the country from 1941 to 1944. But with the German defeat Lithuania was again annexed to the Soviet Union. It remains a captive nation, tied to its eastern overlords in unhappy bondage.

Lithuania looks to the West, not to the East. It has a Christian heritage. Like all people, the Lithuanian people would like to be free to decide their own destiny. And some day they will be.

For if there is one thing that we can be sure of, it is that the wave of the future is on the side of human liberty, and that the various totalitarianisms, whether they be Communist or Fascist, will eventually die away. This is the hope which those of Lithuanian descent in this country can always hold out to their kinsmen behind the Curtain.

A Tribute to Frank Ahlgren, by Jack Carley, Memphis, Tenn., November 7, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, February 20, the Midsouth suffered a profound loss in the death of the chief editorial writer of the Commercial Appeal, Jack Carley, who was recognized by his colleagues and respected by a host of people throughout the Nation. He was truly a conservationist and knew the Mississippi River and other rivers with thoroughness. Every Chief of Army Engineers for 30 years or more respected his judgment.

Equally interested in law enforcement, he had the confidence of local, State, and National enforcement officers. For years he spoke annually at the commencement of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's school. Mr. Carley was able to use the choicest language when he approached any area or any field of the material or the humanities. He possessed the rare ability to speak eloquently from the platform as he was so abundantly endowed with the ability of perfection in writing.

Last November, his editor Hon. Frank Ahlgren celebrated his 25th anniversary as the editor of the Memphis Commercial Appeal, a paper so widely known and so highly regarded. Mr. Ahlgren is truly an outstanding editor of a great newspaper. His friends at the testimonial dinner whose attendance represented the Governor of the State, representatives of all levels of Government including the Congress, and professional, business, labor, manufacturing, banking, and for that matter all facets of our life, heard but

one tribute to him. The committee wisely selected the late Jack Carley, who had been associated with him during the full quarter of a century of his editorship and who had been a personal friend of still longer standing.

Mr. Carley's tribute to his editor was moving, sincere, and challenging. It did not border upon the emotional, nor was it overdrawn in the practical. So many have desired to possess a copy of this speech that I have asked permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include it. I know the friends of both these men will consider its reading as a tribute not only to a man who has gone to a just reward but as a continuing challenge to the man about whom he spoke so sincerely and to the rest of us who can see in the lives of both the highest measure of ability, integrity, and character.

The speech follows:

A TRIBUTE TO FRANK AHLGREN, BY JACK CARLEY, MEMPHIS COUNTRY CLUB, MEMPHIS, TENN., NOVEMBER 7, 1961

To pay tribute adequately to Frank Ahlgren is a futile undertaking. He has been my editor and coworker for 25 years. He has been my loyal, understanding friend for 35 years.

In a period of a relatively few minutes I am required to encompass the quarter century of his editorship of the Commercial Appeal. I beg his and your indulgence for my own limitations in filling this extraordinary and, for me, most happy assignment.

He assumed his post at a time of developing international crisis soon to culminate in global war and a struggle for our own national survival.

There has been no surcease from crisis since he first assumed his journalistic leadership post. The continuing struggle for survival in freedom is now accentuated by the potential of nuclear destruction.

During this same quarter century there have been tremendous political and economic changes, sectionally and locally. Some have historic significance.

A newspaper has many responsibilities and obligations to those it serves in a free republic. Chiefly, it must inform, it must inspire, it must guide. Under Frank Ahlgren's editorial leadership the Commercial Appeal has well met those responsibilities and fulfilled its obigations.

No man here would be foolish enough to claim infallibility. Least of all would this man for whose labors we are expressing gratitude and appreciation by our presence. It is to the net of 25 years of editorship to which we bow, a net of great good done. It is the net of fine achievement which we applaud.

In considering the many facets of this achievement I have found myself returning repeatedly to that tablet in Saint Paul's Cathedral which bids those seeking a monument to Sir Christopher Wren to "Look Around You."

It is not an extravagant analogy to tell those seeking monuments to Frank Ahlgren's quarter century of stewardship of the Commercial Appeal to look around.

By all recognized journalistic standards that newspaper today is a much better medium in every way than it was 25 years ago. It is a better newspaper today than it has ever been. A striving for constant improvement is one of the chief endeavors of this editor of many passions.

But where else are these monumnts, these elements of the net accomplishment, to be found? Some are physical and structural. Come are intangibles represented by contributions to national defense, internal security and to State and local health, public order, and safety.

As the well-rounded editor should be, Frank Ahlgren is a man of diverse interests and activities and how wide, indeed, has been their range in this quarter century we mark tonight.

He is essentially an architect of progress. He is an educator. He is the promoter of sound agricultural practices from which this area and Nation benefit greatly.

He is the insistent advocate of integrity in public office.

He is the tireless pleader for elimination of waste in public spending and for efficiency in governmental operation.

He is the implacable foe of criminality.

He is, I insist, a man of many passions but none burns with greater intensity than his passion that freedom survive and justice prevail. This is not strange because Frank Ahlgren is a lover of freedom and a most fair man.

Indeed, are his monuments all around us—the great complex of medical colleges of the University of Tennessee in Memphis—an institution of which he has long been a trustee; the splendid new mental health facility soon to be dedicated in Memphis; the E. H. Crump Hospital for Negroes—a teaching unit in the city's John Gaston group; the Collins Chapel Hospital for Negroes; the agricultural diversifications programs of plant-to-prosper and live-at-home—two of the most unselfish undertakings ever sponsored by any newspaper anywhere.

His experiences and observations during the terribly destructive 1927 flood and the subsequent 1937 record flood are being translated by him into unremitting support of adequate flood control projects and those for sound conservation and development of water resources.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation, which has the principal internal security responsibility, knows him as one of its most consistent and vigorous champions.

The Defense Department knows him for his equally vigorous championship of a strong military posture and of forces—in being sufficient to meet any attack. It has appropriately recognized his many services to it during World War II and subsequently when he assisted in the reestablishment of a free German press.

Monuments to Frank Ahlgren's zeal and activities over a quarter century are almost innumerable and their forms many. They range from baskets of food for the hungry to great public projects. Because I was his instrument and emissary I can say with utmost authority that without his support the Tennessee Chute Harbor project might still be in the design state.

I would serve him ill, however, were I to try to create an impression that the monuments cited are entirely of his creation. Many minds, hearts, and hands shared in the fashioning of most. It is his inspiration, guidance, and leadership which I have attempted to place in perspective.

A newspaper is many things but above all is it a living entity—a thing of flesh and blood, brains and striving, sacrifice and plain hard work by the living and by the dead who have given so much of themselves to the whole, imperishable fabric. This being especially so with the Commercial Appeal, we must, too, view Frank Ahlgren in the role of keeper of an unparalleled and priceless journalistic heritage which has survived almost fantastic vicissitudes including those of civil war, wandering, and scourges.

In no area of his editorship has Frank Ahlgren excelled more than in jealous guardianship of that heritage. And I would be most remiss if, at this point, I failed to pay deserved tribute to Scripps-Howard's full regard for that heritage and the support and approval those owners have given to Frank Ahlgren's guardianship.

The title editor becomes Frank Ahlgren, and he becomes the title, but strip that away, and with all the honors and awards which have rightfully come to him, and there is revealed the true man—Frank Ahlgren the honest, courageous, inquisitive reporter, the factfinder and truth seeker, the man of insatiable curiosity, the crusader for decent causes, the friend of the man or woman who may have no other friend.

I could give him no higher praise than this. By being here to honor him as a really good reporter we honor ourselves.

All of his rules for brevity have been violated by me tonight. I have made great intrusion on his modesty and outraged his inherent sensitivity. Even so, Frank Ahlgren, I have adhered scrupulously to the basic rule of reportorial accuracy in this all too brief accounting of your quarter century of editing.

So far as it was possible I have avoided personal feeling engendered by 35 years of friendship. There are some things not spoken publicly even among friends. I will say this much, that were I to start out on a dark and rugged road with you beside me, I know that you would be with me at the end, however long the road, however rough the going. You are that breed of man and that sort of friend.

God spare you for another quarter century of service to this city, to the Midsouth, and to the Nation.

In that spirit and on behalf of your coworkers on the Commercial Appeal and your friends, it is my very great privilege to present you with a tangible memento of this occasion and on their behalf also, to ask you to present to Mrs. Ahlgren a reminder of our friendship and esteem.

Your County and the U.S. Forest Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 31, 1962

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an informative speech by the Assistant Chief of the Forest Service, Mr. Edward C. Crafts, which was delivered before a workshop representing the western county officials on January 25 at Phoenix, Ariz.

As Mr. Crafts points out the national forests lie in 740 of the 3,000 counties in the United States. While it is a fact that the national forests can be found in 460 counties west of the Mississippi River and this is where 85 percent of the national forests lie—they also can be found in 280 eastern counties.

I served as Secretary of Agriculture and I believed then, as I do now, that these lands are truly national in location, and national in character and benefit. The counties where these 186 million acres of dedicated resource lands lie have a wonderful opportunity to work with their National Government cooperatively and constructively. The Secretary of Agriculture seeks to cooperate with local governments and I am confident that he will do so with intensified vigor.

For this reason, Mr. Crafts' concise and complete outline of national forest benefits, tangible and intangible, his

discussion of policy and program, his delineation of major policy issues on such subjects as revenue sharing, roads, wilderness and the creation of parks, is of more than passing interest not only to county government, but to all who have an interest in national forest policy.

Mr. President, the Government Printing Office has advised me that this speech will require approximately three pages for printing in the RECORD, at a cost of about $243. I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the cost the speech may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR COUNTY AND THE U.S. FOREST SERVICE

(By Edward C. Crafts)

It is indeed a pleasure to be here at this luncheon meeting today. This is more like a homecoming to me than a business engagement. Arizona was my home State for a goodly number of years, and 28 years ago this month I spent part of my honeymoon in this same hotel.

The Forest Service is glad of this opportunity to speak at the policy level to your associations of county officials. We are especially pleased to see the National Association of County Officials come alive, so to speak, in the last few years and to exert vigorous leadership in public affairs.

We hope that the future will bring closer working relationships and increased cooperation between county officials and the Forest Service. This does not mean that we shall always agree. It does mean that we should be able always to talk things out. Possibly at some future meeting key Forest Service officials may meet with you concerning areas of mutual interest somewhat as the Bureau of Land Management is doing today, and to discuss matters in more detail.

May I also say a word of greeting to my friends in the BLM. I am flattered to be on a BLM program, but since it came about through the auspices of the county associations, I feel somewhat like the poor relation who came in through the back door. Karl Landstrom, Harold Hockmuth, and Jerry O'Callaghan are three of my good personal friends. There is little doubt that the BLM and the Forest Service are working closer together and in better harmony today than they have for many years. Many of you know, I am sure, of the discussions of mutual problems between the top officials of both bureaus that occur periodically in Washington.

As county officials, elected or appointed, you serve the public just as fully as do State or Federal officials. True, the public to be served varies widely, depending upon whether the official is functioning at the county, State, or National level. But on one thing I think we can agree. Although we may serve different publics, no public body should ever become the front for individual pressure groups. Once a captive we are lost.

Since most of you are westerners as well as being public officials, you are reasonably familiar with the national forests and the national grasslands. Some of you are intimately acquainted with national forest matters through years of experience and contact.

The Forest Service has managerial responsibility for 186 million acres of Federal forest and rangelands and high-mountain watersheds. These are divided into 155 national forests and 18 national grasslands located in 41 States and Puerto Rico. There are one or more national forests or grasslands in each of the 16 Western States, except for Hawaii.

Some 750 Forest Service offices are found in these 16 States; and except for the vast expanse of interior Alaska, about 1 acre out of every 5 in the West is a national forest acre.

The national forests are a vast domain with invaluable resources of recreation, timber, water, forage, minerals, and wildlife, intended to be administered for the benefit of all people—local, State, and National.

The Forest Service also has extensive responsibilities in two other major lines of work. One is the administration of cooperative forestry programs through the States for the benefit of both State and private forest landowners. The second is a research network of forest and range experiment stations that is nationwide.

This noon, however, I want to confine my remarks solely to the national forests and grasslands. In preparing for this talk today we researched some statistics of county-national forest relationships that were new to me; and I think may be of interest to you.

Of the 3,000 counties in the United States, about 740 contain 1,000 acres or more of national forest land. Of these, about 460 counties are west of the Mississippi River, with the remainder, or 280, east of the river.

Sixteen counties, all in the West, have more than 1½ million acres each of national forest land. Idaho County, Idaho, has nearly 4½ million acres, and Coconino County here in Arizona has 3⅓ million.

These figures mean that the national forests are truly national in extent, and are by no means confined to the West. Nevertheless the majority of the counties having national forest land as well as the large concentrations of land per county occur in the West.

I know that a great many people think there is too much Federal land in the Western States. I, personally, don't feel that way with respect to the national forests, particularly inasmuch as very little of the western national forest system was ever in private or State ownership. Further, I see no point in concealing figures of this sort.

Some 60 counties in the United States have more than half of their total area in national forest ownership. Fifty of these are in the West. Dropping to a lower percentage, about 200 counties in the country (146 in the West) have a fourth or more of their area in national forest ownership, and 3 counties have 85 percent or more. They are Valley in Idaho, Alpine in California, and Mineral in Colorado.

NATIONAL FOREST BENEFITS

If you are a typical county official and have been listening to some of the preceding figures, you are wondering along about now: What does a county get out of having so much national forest land within the county and not on the tax rolls?

Answer: The counties get intangible values, secondary benefits, and direct financial revenues.

Most of the truly intangible values of the national forests are experienced by the millions of people who use these lands for reasons other than commercial utilization of resources. There is no measure of value to express the true worth of the relaxation, pleasure, rest, spiritual satisfaction, and improvement in health derived from the national forests.

No realistic dollar value can be placed on water from the national forests. But let us remember that water is already the most precious commodity in the West and over half of all streamflow in the West originates on the national forests.

Nor can there be any complete assessment in dollars of the lives saved, damage prevented, and resources preserved by improved accessibility, suppression of pests and fires, and reduction or prevention of floods. All of these are benefits of national forest management.

Secondary benefits include such things as the numbers of people directly employed in the management and utilization of national forest resources, and the value added to those basic resources through processing, distribution, and marketing.

The Forest Service employs at peak seasons about 35,000 workers.

Let us also remember that for every dollar of national forest timber sold, the end product will be worth about $20 by the time it reaches the consumer. Employment associated with the utilization of timber harvested from the national forests in 1962 will amount to about 600,000 man-years.

Similarly, the value of meat, hides, wool, and other livestock products increases with reprocessing and handling, as do the numbers of dependent people.

Recreational use of the national forest system is currently about 100 million visits a year. These recreationists put into trade channels three-quarters of a billion dollars a year for sporting equipment, transportation, licenses, lodging, and so on.

The capital value of the timber, forage, and lands of the national forests is estimated at well over $7 billion.

Dollars are supposed to speak louder than words, so let's for a moment talk about direct dollar payments to the counties from national forest revenues.

Current annual revenues from the sale of timber, grazing fees, special-use permits, and other sources of income now run over $100 million. One-fourth of this is distributed through the States to the counties in which the national forests are located to be used for public schools and roads. This means that payments to the counties last year were somewhat over $25 million. Although less than the previous year, this was three times the payments of a decade ago.

Since the national forests were created more than 50 years ago, a third of a billion dollars has been paid to the counties by the Federal Government under the 25-percent formula, and without any cost to the counties for collection, or administration or management of the properties. Nor do the counties have any fear of delinquency in payments from national forest revenues.

During the last 5 years, 55 western counties each received on the average $100,000 or more annually from national forest revenues. Nine counties received a half a million or more dollars from this source. Two counties, Douglas in Oregon and Skamania in Washington, each averaged more than a million dollars annually; and one county, Lane in Oregon, averaged $2⅓ million annually.

Are these revenues important to the counties involved? Obviously, yes. Skamania County received over 70 percent of its total revenue in 1957 from the national forests. Five counties, 3 in Oregon and 2 in Washington, received one-half or more of their total revenues from national forest receipts, and 17 western counties look to the national forests for 25 percent or more of their dollar income.

There is one other source of direct financial payments to counties resulting from the occurrence of national forest land within county boundaries. These are the payments made under Public Law 874 of the 81st Congress dealing with the school-aid program. Last fiscal year the Federal Government assumed partial fiscal responsibility for 368 school districts in 30 States due to the occurrence of national forest land within these counties, or other circumstances associated therewith. Some $2 to $3 million were made available to these school districts on account of national forest lands and activities.

The question always arises as to how these direct payments to the counties from national forest receipts compare with what the

lands would yield if they were privately owned and subject to property taxation. There is no finite answer to this; and the most recent studies were made back in 1952.

At the time of that study, 135 counties were examined, which together included 40 percent of the national forest acreage. National forest 25 percent fund payments averaged 11 cents per acre in those counties as against an estimated tax income for the same lands of 19 cents per acre. Of course revenues from the national forests have greatly increased since then; but by the same token taxes likewise have doubtless gone up.

In addition to direct payments from the 25 percent receipts formula, an additional contribution accrues to the counties owing to Federal expenditures for fire prevention and suppression and for roads and trails. An amount estimated to be what the counties would have spent if the lands had been in private ownership was termed a "contribution in kind." This was only a portion of total Federal expenditures for these purposes but it averaged 24 cents per acre. If recognized as a legitimate item (as I think it should be), the Federal dollar contribution rose to 35 cents per acre. This was substantially more than the estimated taxes that would have been paid if the lands had been in private ownership.

NATIONAL FOREST PROGRAM AND BASIC POLICY

The Forest Service has known what it wanted to do with the national forests for a long time. Through numerous Chiefs of the Forest Service and numerous Secretaries of Agriculture the basic policy has gradually evolved and been refined over the years. Continuous use and development for the benefit of all citizens of the variety of renewable resources found in the national forests has been the basic approach. It still is.

Fortunately, in recent years overall policies and objectives have been spelled out and are available in two documents. One is the "Development Program for the National Forests" recommended to the Congress last September by the President, and the second is the Multiple-Use-Sustained Yield Act of June 12, 1960.

The development program includes all of the renewable resources of the National Forest System—water, timber, recreation, forage, and wildlife habitat. It includes long-range objectives to the year 2000 and a large variety of specific action proposals for the next 10 years designed to greatly intensify management.

Among the major recommendations are upward adjustments in recreation and timber resource management; an increased multiple-purpose road program; and a long-range purchase program to acquire key tracts of private lands inside the national forests, particularly those having significant recreation value.

The Multiple-Use-Sustained Yield Act was a major enunciation of policy with respect to the national forests by the Congress of the United States. It is occasionally said that the Multiple-Use-Sutained Yield Act did no more than endorse what the Forest Service was already doing. This is far from the truth. Let me give you a few illustrations.

1. The act directed that the national forests be administered for multiple use and sustained yield of its renewable resources. This is now a congressional order. Previously, this was being done as a matter of administrative choice.

2. The act enumerated all of the renewable resources as purposes for which the national forests are established and shall be administered. This is new.

3. The act made it clear that equal consideration shall be given to each of the renewable resources in the management of the national forests. It gave no single resource priority over any other. This, likewise, was new.

4. The act defined by statute the terms "multiple use" and "sustained yield of the several products and services." These terms had not heretofore been defined by the Congress.

5. The act applied sustained yield not only to timber, but also to the other renewable resources of the national forests. This, too, was a first

6. The act for the first time gave statutory recognition and endorsement to wilderness.

My reasons for mentioning the national forest program and the Multiple-Use-Sustained Yield Act today are to emphasize that in these two brief documents one can find spelled out the long-range objectives, a short-term development program, and the basic policies for administration and management of the national forests. These are the fundamental guides, the overall controls.

POLICY ISSUES

Now I want to say a few words about four policy questions which currently, and in some ways continuously, confront the Forest Service. There are numerous others but I pick these four because I think they may be of special interest to you as county officials. These are questions about counties sharing in national forest revenues, national forest roads, wilderness areas, and national forests and national parks. Each of these are complex questions and merit a thorough discussion. About all I can do here today is mention a few highlights.

SHARED REVENUES

I have already given you some dollar figures showing how much the counties share in national forest revenues. Twenty-five million dollars annually is a substantial amount.

However, three questions more or less perennially arise with respect to sharing national forest revenues with local governments. These involve: (a) the use to which the counties may put the funds received; (b) proposals to adopt a different formula than the prevailing one of 25 percent of gross receipts; and (c) proposals to calculate the 25 percent against a different total base.

National forest revenues now received by the counties must be used for public schools or roads. This requirement reduces the flexibility available to counties in apportioning these funds and in their overall budgeting.

From time to time proposals are introduced in the Congress to allow counties to use national forest revenues for any of the appropriate expenses of county governments. In general, the Forest Service has favored these proposals, but they almost invariably run into difficulty with educators who fear that the net result may be a reduction of funds for the county school system.

Proposals also arise rather frequently either to adjust the percentage of national forest receipts to be received by counties, or to switch from a percentage of receipts to a percentage of fair appraised value of national forest real estate.

Payments to counties based on a percentage of appraised value of the lands is in practice with respect to a portion of the Superior National Forest in Minnesota; but this is the only case where such a special statute has been enacted. The reason in this instance is that the Boundary Waters Canoe area to which this act applies does not return appreciable dollar revenues. Thus the use of this other formula assures the counties of moneys on account of national forest lands.

The President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations—the so-called Kestnbaum Commission—in 1955 made a comprehensive study of the question of Federal revenue-sharing arrangements with States and counties. The Commission concluded:

"By and large, the present revenue-sharing arrangements on national forests are operating to general satisfaction. Neither practical nor theoretical considerations require replacement of this revenue-sharing arrangement with some other Federal payment procedure. The 25-percent share of receipts payable by the Federal Government appears generally fair and reasonable and should not be disturbed."

The Forest Service over the years has consistently agreed with this position. The Department of Agriculture has recently reiterated this view in opposing legislation that would change the revenue-sharing arrangements for national forest in Michigan to three-fourths of one percent of appraised value.

Now we turn to a third proposal which would enlarge the base against which the 25-percent payment is calculated, and thus increase the amounts going to the counties. Naturally, most counties think this would be a good idea.

In evaluating this, we should first remember that most national forest receipts are derived from the sale of timber. Under various laws the Forest Service is authorized to require a timber purchaser to make deposits of money in addition to his payments for timber, such deposits to be used for betterment of the timber-sale area or for disposal of logging slash. Further, certain road maintenance and erosion-prevention work may be required and a timber purchaser has the choice of either doing this himself or depositing money with the Government for the latter to do it. These deposits are not interpreted legally as payments for timber. Instead they are more in the nature of business expenses associated with harvesting national forest stumpage. Under the law the 25-percent fund must be calculated only against the price for timber, not against the payment for timber plus associated deposits. Since these deposits may be, and often are, substantial, and since payments for timber would be greater if deposits were not required or made, the issue often becomes consequential to counties in terms of dollars foregone.

The Forest Service view generally is that the present system is proper and equitable. Through forgoing a percentage of these deposits, counties in effect are sharing in the investments in the land necessary to assure continuous and future timber crops. This means employment, payrolls, and future income when the next crop is harvested. It would seem equitable that the counties participate in this investment.

NATIONAL FOREST ROADS

It takes a Philadelphia lawyer to understand fully the different kinds of roads that exist on the national forests, who builds them, who maintains them, the various cooperative arrangements that are worked out between parties at interest, and the sources of money for both construction and maintenance.

It is not so difficult, however, to understand that there are Federal, State, county, and private roads in the national forests, and that for the most part these are classified into two general systems—a forest highway system and a forest development road system. The former are mostly highways carrying traffic from one destination to another. The latter are all the other roads that are needed and used primarily for the development, utilization, and management of national forest resources.

There are now about 25,000 miles of forest highways and eventually there will need to be about 70,000 miles.

The forest development road system is much larger. There are now about 160,000 miles of such roads and eventually there will need to be over half a million miles.

One basic policy question with respect to forest development roads is what pro-

portion of them should be constructed with federally appropriated funds and what proportion should be built by timber purchasers in connection with timber sales. In either case the public pays because even if the timber purchaser builds the roads, an adjustment is made in the price of the timber. This means a foregoing of gross receipts to the Treasury, and this in turn means that the counties pay 25 percent of the cost of timber-purchaser built roads.

Historically, the Forest Service would like to have larger authorizations and larger appropriations for direct Federal financing of roads. The proportion in recent years has been about 60 percent of the roads built by timber purchasers and 40 percent by Federal appropriations. We believe as a matter of policy that these percentages should be approximately reversed.

Forest Service policy is that the roads necessary for primary access to the general area of a timber sale should be financed by Federal appropriations, whereas roads necessary to operate and harvest the timber in particular sales should be built by the successful bidders for those sales. Practice of this policy would insure a certain level of competition for sales, help solve the problem of road standards, and help to assure multiple-purpose roads as needed.

In general, the Forest Service has no basic disagreement with the policy statement on forest access roads adopted by the National Association of County Officials last August.

WILDERNESS AREAS

In the national forests there are 83 designated wilderness-type areas covering 14 million acres, or 7 percent of total national forest acreage. The three States with the most national forest acreage dedicated to wilderness are Idaho, Wyoming, and Montana.

I suspect you have mixed feelings about these wilderness areas. Some of you are wilderness lovers and like to use them. Others feel that they are good for business because they attract tourism and sportsmen. Others of you, who may not personally use wilderness areas very much, simply believe that some of the wilderness heritage of America should be preserved. Still others, and this may be a rather substantial segment, think there may be too much wilderness because commercial-timber harvesting is precluded and Federal and county revenues from national forests are correspondingly less.

The Forest Service pioneered the wilderness preservation concept in establishing the first such area, the Gila in New Mexico in 1924. In the last 20 years there has been little net change in either the acreage or number of designated areas.

The Forest Service is proud of its wilderness policies, believes these policies have been right, and is gradually studying existing primitive areas to determine their suitability for more permanent wilderness designation.

Wilderness areas and pending wilderness legislation have been in the forefront of public discussion in recent years. The Forest Service is the only Federal agency that has consistently supported wilderness legislation ever since a wilderness bill was introduced in 1957. We did not at that time favor the specific bill but recommended substitute legislation. We still favor wilderness legislation, and the Department of Agriculture is on record in support of Senator ANDERSON's bill, S. 174, as introduced about a year ago. No position has yet been taken on the amendments to that bill added by the Senate.

Looking to the future, we expect to continue a portion of the national forests in wilderness condition. We do not envision a major change in the percentage of national forest land so designated. We fully realize as you do that the great majority of recreational users will continue to desire that areas be readily accessible by road where they may go in their family car to camp, picnic, fish, hunt, or enjoy the scenery. Nevertheless, there is definitely a place for wilderness.

May I say just a word, too, about national forest shorelines. There are 13,000 lakes, 81,000 miles of rivers and streams, and if the southeastern peninsula of Alaska is included, some 11,000 miles of ocean coastline within the national forest system. The recreational potential of these shorelines needs to be developed. We favor Senator ANDERSON's bill, S. 543, that would direct the Secretary of Agriculture to study the borders of these waters in order to determine those which are most appropriate to preserve and develop as shoreline recreation areas.

NATIONAL FORESTS AND NATIONAL PARKS

A lot has been said on this subject recently. I think most of you know that a considerable number of national forest areas, especially in the West, are being advocated by one group or another for transfer to the national park system. Several million acres would be involved in these proposals.

Perhaps 40 to 45 such proposals have been advanced in the last year or two; but relatively few of these have been officially endorsed by either the National Park Service or the Secretary of the Interior.

As I stated early in this talk, under the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act recreation is one of the purposes for which the national forests are established and shall be administered. Congress also has directed that all renewable resources be given equal consideration in national forest management.

In contrast, lands in the National Park Service are administered for more limited purposes. The two management objectives of lands in the national park system are preservation and recreation.

Since recreation is one of the management objectives of both the national forests and the national parks, the general view of the Department of Agriculture is that lands in the national forest system should remain so. We feel that the burden of proof should rest on those who advocate that substantial areas of national forests and grasslands be transferred to the National Park Service. In general, the Department of Agriculture would oppose such transfers unless there is overwhelming evidence that the lands in question are not suitable for multipleuse management and that they are primarily of recreation value of a character and quality in keeping with traditional national park standards.

It is possible that some national forest lands meet those qualifications and in time may be transferred to the National Park Service. It is equally possible that some lands in the national park system are better suited to multiple-use management and should be made parts of the national forest system.

As a matter of perspective, it is well to recognize that land transfers between the two Departments have been going on regularly for many years. For instance, in the last year or two Agriculture has agreed to small land transfers of national forest land to the Lassen National Park in California, and to the Colorado National Monument. It has not objected to transfer of parcels of national forest land to the Gila Cliffdwellers National Monument and to trade acreage between the Cedar Breaks National Monument and the Dixie National Forest.

Over 2 million acres of former Bankhead-Jones land, largely in Montana, were transferred in 1959 from the Forest Service to the Bureau of Land Management and transfers of substantial acreages involving the Bureau of Land Management, the States, and the national forests are under way in Michigan and in New Mexico.

Insofar as major areas under public discussion and proposed for transfer from national forest to national park status are concerned, the Department of Agriculture within the past few years has agreed to transfer four different areas to the national park system. These are an addition to the Grand Canyon National Park here in Arizona, the creation of a Great Basin National Park in Nevada, and the transfer of several thousand acres each to a proposed Ozark Rivers National Monument in Missouri and a Pictured Rocks National Recreation Area in Michigan.

It is a healthy sign that discussions continue periodically between the Departments of Agriculture and Interior as to whether efficiency in land management and the public interest would be better served by the transfers of certain lands now under the jurisdiction of each Department to the other.

I fear I have talked too long, but there are some things that I wanted to say to this group today. I hope some of them proved of interest to you.

If this can be the beginning of a new period of close working together between county officials and the Forest Service in the many matters wherein we have mutual aims, and if this can also be the beginning of better understanding of each other's problems and points of view, your time and mine will both have been well spent.

The 44th Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, February 17, 1962, under the sponsorship of the Council of Lithuanian Societies of Baltimore, the 44th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania was observed at a banquet and appropriate ceremonies held at Lithuanian Hall, Hollins and Parkin Streets, Baltimore, Md. The honored guest and principal speaker was Dr. Stays Bockis, the newly appointed counselor to the Lithuanian legation. Prior to his assignment to Washington, he was the Lithuanian Minister in Paris, France. An interesting part of the Lithuanian Day program was the performance of three national dances by the Lithuanian National Dance Group of Baltimore. This group has won many prizes in the All Nations Day contests held at Gwynn Oak Park in recent years.

Mr. Thomas G. Gray, president of the Council of Lithuanian Societies of Baltimore, read a resolution which was unanimously adopted. Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include the resolution for reprinting as well as the remarks I was privileged to address to those assembled on this occasion:

RESOLUTION, COUNCIL OF LITHUANIAN SOCIETIES OF BALTIMORE

We Lithuanian-Americans of the Free State of Maryland, having gathered this 17th day of February 1962, at the Lithuanian Hall Auditorium, in Baltimore City, under the sponsorship of the Council of Lithuanian Societies of Baltimore, after due deliberation regarding the present international situation, adopt the following resolution:

"Whereas freedom and democracy are being challenged by communism all over the world;

"Whereas February 16, 1962, is the 44th anniversary of the independence of the Democratic Republic of Lithuania;

"Whereas ever since the 13th century, the Lithuanian nation has shown her right to independence by an unending struggle against tyrannical invaders;

"Whereas the Lithuanians have repeatedly displayed their determination for freedom by their resistance against Russian imperialism in the years 1831, 1863, 1904, 1918, and 1941;

"Whereas even at this very hour the Lithuanian people are engaged in a ceaseless resistance to the ruthless persecution of their religion, culture, and economy by Soviet Russia: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we free and loyal American citizens appeal to the United Nations, in the name of our suffering kinsmen, to free Lithuania and the other captive nations from Russian colonialism; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we appeal to the Government of the United States of America to support all efforts to free people from the bonds of communism; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we express our profound appreciation to the Government of the United States of America for continuing the fearless recognition of Lithuania as an independent nation; and be it finally

"*Resolved*, That we express our deep appreciation for the increasing coverage by American newspapers of Soviet persecutions behind the Iron Curtain."

THOMAS G. GRAY,
President.
LUCY LASKOUSKAS,
Secretary.

THE 44TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY, LITHUANIAN HALL, 851 HOLLINS STREET, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1962

First, I should like to explain that I have just left the annual banquet of the Advertising Club of Baltimore in order to join with all of you as you assemble to observe the 44th anniversary of the Republic of Lithuania. I asked to be excused prior to the completion of that function so that I would have the opportunity to participate in this outstanding event in the history of the Lithuanian colony of Baltimore. Those of you who have been attending this anniversary banquet for a number of years know that I have always made it a point to be with you, regardless of other commitments I may have had.

It is good for us to be here tonight. That is so because we assume for a noble purpose—to mark the anniversary of independence of the Lithuanian Republic. Some may ask why we commemorate the anniversary of independence each year, when the freedom-loving and God-fearing people of Lithuania are under the yoke of oppression. To those who would ask why, I say: We meet to salute and admire these gallant people for their principled determination to be free; we sympathize with them in their incredible sufferings, and give them reassurance that their courageous struggle to achieve liberty and glorious independence again will not be in vain. We echo over and over to them that the free nations of the world stand beside the people of Lithuania constantly.

We know that despite every effort to suppress it, the yearning for liberty is unquenchable among brave and heroic Lithuanians and that tyranny has only served to stimulate it rather than stifle it. The city of Baltimore, the State of Maryland, and the United States of America are proud of the Americans of Lithuanian descent in our midst. We recognize that these patriotic citizens are holding on high the torch of truth, liberty and justice for their loved ones and brethren across the sea.

Tonight, as in past years, we take courage in the fact that these brave people are spiritually and physically endowed with the necessary strength and fortitude to continue to withstand the yoke to which they are still subjected.

As your Representative in the Congress of the United States, and as your fellow American, let me assure you that this beloved country of ours will never abandon its interest in the needs and welfare of the oppressed peoples everywhere.

With hearts and minds lifted in prayer, with a steadfast faith in the future, and secure in the knowledge that our cause is just and honorable, we beseech Almighty God to bless this Nation, our President, freedom-loving peoples everywhere, particularly those of Lithuania. Tonight our voices cry out: "Long live the United States of America; long live the Republic of Lithuania."

Thank you.

Paperboy Praised as Unsung Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, as a tribute to that unsung hero—the paperboy—I offer for the Appendix of the RECORD some thoughts that originally appeared in the San Antonio, Tex., Express, were reprinted in the Jackson, Miss., Clarion-Ledger, and wound up in the Maryville-Alcoa Times of Tennessee on February 5, 1962.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAPERBOY PRAISED AS UNSUNG HERO

One of the unsung heroes of the world today, who seldom gets any notice from anybody, is the boy who delivers the morning or afternoon newspaper. If he is the deliverer of the morning paper you never see him or even hear him. If he delivers the afternoon paper, he rides by so fast and throws the paper so quietly that you don't recognize him. So says the Rev. W. Earl Waldrip, writing in the San Antonio (Tex.) Express and his quoteworthy tribute to this unsung hero applies equally in Mississippi:

"The paperboy is one of the youngest businessmen of our age and one of the most aggressive. He gets up at 3 o'clock in the morning to deliver your morning paper, or home from school and works until dark to deliver your afternoon paper. Most of the time he has to work overtime once each month to collect your money * * * He is the future executive of America. Most of the boys make good when they reach maturity. They have been schooled in the art of good business.

"When does your paperboy hear from you? Do you ever show him your appreciation for bringing you the news of the day? Do you ever give him a cookie or say thanks when he comes to collect? Most of the time the paperboy hears from us only when he threw the paper on the roof, or hid it in the hedge, or when it rained after he threw the paper and got it all wet, generally because we overslept that day; or when the neighbor's dog stole our paper and we think the boy didn't deliver our paper.

"And sometimes the paperboy misses us, just skips our house. When he is late coming, or at any of the other times mentioned above, he hears from us pronto. We pick up the telephone and call his home and get the household out of bed, and demand of anyone who answers the phone: 'Where is my paper?' Or we call the news office and demand that a new boy be put on our route because the one we have is not satisfactory. All this because one time he was late, or the paper got wet, or it was in the hedge all the time.

"I want to go on record here of saying thanks to the paperboys of America. They do a fine job. We could not do without them. Well, now that I have written my article for the day, I think I'll go out and get the morning paper. Darn that paperboy he missed me again. No he didn't, there is the paper tucked gently in the drain gutter. Like I said, bless the paperboy."

Import Competition and Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, in these days when we are all concerned with the problem of employment facing this country, and particularly with that of finding employment for the 1 million or more new workers who come on the scene each year, we are on the lookout for anything that will throw light on the problem.

I am aware, Mr. Speaker, that the Departments of Commerce and Labor are making surveys of the employment that is generated by our exports. They will give this out with great fanfare. They will try to show by some questionable hocus-pocus just how many people are employed in each congressional district.

Later they will try to show that import competition is quite harmless in causing job displacement. They will undertake to show how beneficial certain imports are, such as coffee, bananas, tea, tin, crude rubber, copper, ore, and so forth, but they will not tell you that these products are on the free list and pay no duty at all.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that we looked at the job-generating effects of exports and the job-shrinking effects of imports in their true light.

About a fourth of our exports of $20 billion result from subsidies of one kind or another. Sixty percent of our agricultural exports move as a result of governmental assistance, including subsidies, sale for foreign currencies, outright gifts, and so forth.

The exports that arise through subsidies cost the Treasury several billion dollars and that is a rather expensive way of buying employment.

In all this debate about employment, growth, productivity, and so forth, as related to exports and imports, some of the most important aspects do not usually get the emphasis that they should. For example, the actual displacement of jobs by imports is not the most harmful part of low-wage import competition.

The most telling injury from competitive imports is to be found in the discouragement of growth and expansion in this country. Much as we need growth we must be aware that we will not get it from industries that are confronted with import competition that steadily gains in the domestic market on domestic industries.

How can we expect the kind of growth and expansion that we need when imports are already taking up most of the increasing market that results from population increase? If the market outlook is gloomy because of low-cost imports, who will build another plant or invest in plant expansion?

Is it not more likely that such a company, if it does anything, will modernize its present facilities in order to compete? It will install modern machinery, possibly imported from abroad, rather than expanding. The result will be lower costs at the expense of employment. The same output or even more will be achieved with fewer workers.

This route is not the route to greater employment. It leads in the opposite direction. Faced with encroaching import competition more and more of our industries will go abroad while increasing their efficiency at home. This is an inexorable trend and no amount of surveys of employment in export industries will overcome it.

Yet, it clearly spells a growing hard core of unemployment rather than the opposite.

Mr. Speaker, there has come to my desk a study of this very subject. This study is an analysis of employment trends during the decade from 1950 to 1960. It shows the decline in employment in many of our leading manufacturing industries, in mining, in agriculture, and so forth. It also shows where employment expanded. This study was prepared by Mr. O. R. Strackbein, who as most of you know, is chairman of the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy.

I urge my colleagues to read this analysis. I think you will find it an eye opener. It will be well worth your time.

Under leave to extend my remarks I offer Mr. Strackbein's study:

IMPORT COMPETITION AND EMPLOYMENT

(By O. R. Strackbein)

The net effect of imports and exports on domestic employment cannot be determined either by argumentation or by official pronouncements that come from sources that are wedded to a tariff-cutting program.

Many such pronouncements have attributed to exports employment-swelling powers that find little support in statistics of the past decade. At the same time these official and semiofficial expressions have quite uniformly minimized the employment-shrinking powers of import competition.

It would perhaps better serve an objective inquiry if the earlier estimates, opinions and pronouncements, official and private, in both fields were forgotten. One of the most widely quoted of the estimates[1] would have been acceptable as a good guess if the several assumptions upon which it rested had clung to it instead of being lost on the way. The authoritative character of the estimate could not then have flourished as it did, far beyond the modest claims of its author. That this particular estimate has been so widely repeated, with no allusion to the assumptions that hedged it carefully against too serious entertainment, may be ascribed to the fact that it found little employment-displacing threat even in the abolition of tariffs and import quotas. This was enough to assure it of investiture with the aura of authority in free-trade quarters.

To be sure, there is no accurate way of measuring either the job-displacing effect of imports or the employment-creative powers of exports. In a complicated economy it is not possible to separate different factors that may produce similar effects. For example, loss of jobs may be caused by mechanization and automation at the same time that imports are rising. On the other hand, employment may rise in an export industry because of a favorable change in consumer demand, rather than being exclusively the result of increasing exports.

At the same time, mutually offsetting factors may be at work in both the import and export field. More jobs might have been lost to imports in some instances but for some fortuitous development that occurred independently of imports. The freezing of fish, for example, opened a much wider market in this country. This development counteracted some of the job-displacing effects that rapidly rising imports would otherwise have produced. On the export side, more jobs might in some cases be created than in fact result from greater foreign sales because introduction of laborsaving devices has in the same period pulled in the opposite direction.

Sometimes, then, imports are absolved of their job-killing potential by other favorable developments, including population growth; and exports do not get full credit because they too sometimes are moving upstream, statistically speaking, i.e., against the current of automation. Their job-generating effects may then be canceled by countervailing forces.

Statistics in the gross may therefore be very misleading. However, if enough is known of the component elements of the statistics relating to particular industries, certain influences may be traceable precisely because they do impress themselves on the aggregate. This would indicate a persistency that could not easily be ignored. Some common causative factor might then be located.

Employment statistics that reflect a whole industry's job movement, if they are accurate, necessarily incorporate all the factors and influences at work. Some of these may be offsetting and therefore concealing; some, cumulative and therefore exaggerative with respect to any single factor.

Any attempt in any individual industry to extricate a decline in employment that might be attributed to import competition from the unemployment attributable to rising productivity would require specific knowledge of the trend of mechanization in the industry, together with the consumption trend. If there was no technological advancement and if consumption remained steady a decline in employment might then with greater confidence be attributed to import competition.

In like manner if employment rose while domestic consumption and productivity remained constant, any appreciable increase in exports might be credited, at least tentatively, with expansion of employment.

A study of employment statistics covering the 10-year period, from 1950 to 1960, classified by industries, such as the Bureau of the Census presents us, will reveal the extent of declines or increases in the number of workers employed.

From such a classification it is possible to determine how many workers any given industry should have added during the decade had its expansion in employment kept pace exactly with the increase in population. This was 18.4 percent.

There might be, as already indicated, a variety of reasons why a given industry had failed to expand its work force by 18.4 percent from 1950 to 1960. For somewhat different reasons the work force of another industry or service trade might have expanded by a margin greater than 18.4 percent. Only by accident would an industry keep in precise step with the population increase. If employment as a whole failed to keep pace with the rise in population this fact might indicate that a rather widespread influence was at work.

If we examine the employment statistics for all manufacturing industries (i.e., nonagricultural and nonmining) we will encounter an actual decline in the number of production workers employed from 1950 to 1960. The total was 12,317,000 in 1950 and had shrunk to 12,265,000 in 1960. This was a loss of 52,000 factory jobs during the decade immediately past.

Since population had increased 18.4 percent, the number of production workers should have increased by 2,266,328. Instead the number fell by 52,000. In other words, the number employed as production workers fell short by 2,318,328 of keeping apace with population increase.

If, instead of confining ourselves to production workers in industry we give our attention to all employees in the manufacturing industries (excluding agriculture and mining) we encounter something less startling but nevertheless indicative of powerful negative influences at work.

WORKERS IN MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES

All manufacturing employees stood at 14,967,000 in 1950 and rose to 16,337,000 in 1960. This was an increase of 1,370,000 employees, compared with a decline of 52,000 in production workers. In other words, office workers, salesmen, etc., increased by 1,412,000 during the decade while production workers lost 0.42 percent or 52,000.

Yet the expansion of total manufacturing employment fell far short of the level needed to keep pace with the 18.4 percent in population increase. To keep this pace would have called for an increase of 2,753,928 in employment. The actual increase, to repeat, was only 1,370,000, leaving a deficiency of 1,383,928. This meant that only 50 percent of the expansion needed to keep in step with the population increase was realized.

The upshot is that manufacturing industry failed to absorb its share of the additional employees who came forward looking for jobs during the 1950–60 decade.

For the moment, before inquiring into the causes of this lag, it will be desirable to examine the trend in other types of employment.

Besides manufacturing industries the census report lists separately all mining operations, contract construction; transportation, communication, and public utilities; wholesale and retail trade; finance, insurance, and real estate; service and miscellaneous; government, classroom teachers, farm employment, and armed services.

MINING

Mining registered a sharp decline in total employment, attributable in great part to the shrinkage in the number of workers in bituminous coal production. All mining employment dropped from 889,000 in 1950 to 664,000 in 1960. This was a drop of 225,000. The decline in bituminous coal itself was 209,000; in anthracite the decline was 62,000, ending with only 13,000 in 1960; while crude petroleum and gas production gained 34,000 workers in the same period. Instead of losing 225,000 workers the mining industry as a whole should have added 163,000 if it was to

[1] See Howard Piquet, "Aid, Trade, and the Tariff"; Crowell, 1953.

keep pace with the population. Since it lost 225,000 its total deficiency was 388,000.

Metal mining, though not remotely shrinking to the degree experienced by bituminous coal mining, nevertheless slipped from 97,000 to 92,000. Instead of losing 5,000 it should have added 18.4 percent of 17,848 in order to keep pace.

While employment in nonmetallic mining and quarrying gained 18,000 workers in this period, rising to 113,000, this gain plus that registered in crude petroleum and gas production fell far short of balancing the other employment shrinkage.

FURTHER EMPLOYMENT SHRINKAGE

Among the manufacturing industries that registered appreciable losses and thus failed to meet their share of the employment burden were the following, shown with decline in employment from 1950 to 1960:

Industry	Number employed		Loss in number of employees
	1950	1960	
Broad woven fabric mills	588,000	389,000	199,000
Sawmills and planing mills	463,000	309,000	154,000
Yarn and thread mills	162,000	104,000	58,000
Motor vehicles and equipment	825,000	781,000	44,000
Blast furnaces, steelworks, and rolling mills	611,000	569,000	42,000
Women's outerwear	369,000	337,000	32,000
Dairy products	125,000	95,000	30,000
Knitting mills	249,000	219,000	30,000
Men's and boys' suits and coats	143,000	114,000	29,000
Cutlery, handtools, and hardware	158,000	133,000	25,000
Carpets, rugs, etc	65,000	45,000	20,000
Pottery and related products	60,000	48,000	12,000
Leather footwear	252,000	244,000	8,000
Watches and clocks	33,000	28,000	5,000
Costume jewelry	64,000	60,000	4,000
Petroleum refining	185,000	182,000	3,000
Rubber footwear	24,000	22,000	2,000
Iron and steel foundries	224,000	222,000	2,000
Total	4,600,000	3,901,000	699,000

Had these industries kept pace with population their employment should have increased by 839,040 workers. Instead employment fell by 699,000. The deficiency or lag was therefore 1,538,040. Combined with mining the lag was 1,926,040.

With respect to the above examples it should be kept in mind that the total employment lag is much greater than the decline in employment. In the case of broadwoven fabric mills, for example, the loss of 199,000 in employees must be added to the number that would have been added to the 1950 total of 588,000 if employment had grown in keeping with the population trend. This addition would have been 108,192, thus bringing the total deficiency to 307,192.

To the loss of 154,000 in sawmill and planing mill employment must be added 85,192 for a total deficiency of 239,192.

In order to maintain employment at a level high enough in the country to absorb the net addition to the employable work force, some other industries or some service or profession would be called upon to take up the slack. Should they fail to do so the country's unemployment rolls would swell by that much.

The primary metal industries, consisting of iron and steel, copper, lead and zinc and other nonferrous metals, instead of gaining employment during the decade, lost several thousand, falling from 1,200,000 in 1950 to 1,186,000 in 1960. At first blush it might be remarked that this vast sprawl of industry, including our huge steel works, rolling mills and foundries, nearly held their own. They lost only 14,000 workers; but if the country's population growth is taken into account a vastly different conclusion is reached.

These primary metal industries, to carry their share of employment, should have added 220,800 workers. Instead they lost 14,000, thus bringing their deficiency to 238,800 employees. To repeat if these were to be employed they must find work elsewhere, i.e., in growing industries or in trades, services or professions.

There were some industries of this character. We shall look at a few of them now.

GROWING INDUSTRIES

The five principal growing industries in the manufacturing group were aircraft and parts, electrical communications equipment, machinery (except electrical), chemical and allied products, and printing, publishing and allied industries. They are shown below:

Industry	Number employed		Number of employees added
	1950	1960	
Aircraft and parts	282,000	653,000	371,000
Electrical communications equipment	351,000	674,000	323,000
Machinery except electrical	1,354,000	1,637,000	283,000
Chemical and allied products	682,000	875,000	193,000
Printing, publishing, and allied industries	738,000	894,000	156,000
Total	3,407,000	4,733,000	1,326,000

Here were some appreciable gains, but they will also shrink appreciably when they are read alongside of the growth factor attributable to population expansion. We then find that the 371,000 increase in aircraft and parts employment shrinks to 319,112. This is still a respectable increase. True, it is not enough to overcome the shrinkage in employment in interstate railroads. This was 497,000.

The gain of 323,000 in the electrical communications equipment manufacturing industry shrinks to 258,416, which is also still a respectable increase. The contribution of the machinery industry, i.e., the gain of 283,000, however, overruns the population growth factor by only 33,864. This group includes machine tools, agricultural machinery and tractors, construction and mining machinery, engines and turbines, office and store machines, etc.

The 193,000 added by the chemical and allied products industry is reduced to a net gain of 67,510. The 156,000 addition to the printing and publishing and allied industries falls to a net gain of 20,208.

Between these 5 large industries 699,112 workers were absorbed over and beyond the level of population growth. This was equal to the employment lost by the class I railroads plus nearly all those lost by the broadwoven fabric industry; but it did not make up their deficiencies, which between them amounted to a lag of 531,857, based on the 18.4 percent population increase.

AGRICULTURE

The shrinkage in agricultural employment has been sharper than in any other field. In 1950 it stood at 9,926,000 in terms of total workers. In 1960 it had fallen to 7,118,000, representing a drop of 2,808,000. Had farm employment kept pace with the population increase it would have risen by 1,826,144. The lag was therefore 4,634,144.

TRANSPORTATION

While employment in interstate railroads declined sharply, dropping from 1,391,000 in 1950 to 894,000 in 1960, for a loss of 497,000, trucking and warehousing rose from 619,000 to 884,000, for a gain of 265,000. Other transportation and services rose from 610,000 to 690,000, for a further gain of 80,000.

However, since all transportation declined in employment from 2,765,000 to 2,558,000, there was a net loss of 207,000; and this represented a lag behind population growth of 715,760, since transportation as a whole should have risen by 508,760 in keeping with the growth in population.

CONTRACT CONSTRUCTION

Employment in contract construction increased from 2,333,000 in 1950 to 2,772,000 in 1960. This was an increase of 439,000, or 9,728 more than the increase called for by the population expansion.

TELEPHONE, TELEGRAPH, GAS AND ELECTRIC UTILITIES, INCLUDING LOCAL UTILITIES

Telephone and telegraph employment rose from 664,000 to 742,000 or a total of 78,000. This gain, however, fell short by 44,176 of the pace set by the population increase.

Gas and electric, including local utilities, registered an employment increase of 53,000, rising from 549,000 to 602,000. This represented a lag of 48,016 in relation to population expansion.

Summary of employment lags

Industry or service	Actual loss 1950–60	Total lag in relation to population growth
Mining	225,000	388,000
18 lagging industries (listed previously)	699,000	1,538,040
Agriculture	2,808,000	4,634,144
Transportation	207,000	715,760
Utilities (gas and electric, telephone and telegraph)	[1] 131,000	92,192
Total	3,808,000	7,368,136

[1] Gain.

Employee-absorbent services, trades, and professions

Industry or service	Number employed		Number of employees added
	1950	1960	
Wholesale trade	2,571,000	3,135,000	564,000
Retail trade	7,074,000	8,507,000	1,433,000
Federal Government	1,928,000	2,237,000	309,000
State and local government	4,098,000	6,221,000	2,123,000
Classroom teachers	914,000	1,410,000	496,000
Finance, insurance, and real estate	1,824,000	2,485,000	661,000
Military personnel, active duty	1,460,000	2,476,000	1,016,000
Total	19,869,000	26,471,000	6,602,000

From this table it is readily visible what activities have absorbed employees from industrial, agricultural and those of the service and trade pursuits that registered a lag.

State and local governments have been the principal havens of those who have been squeezed out of other pursuits or who were newcomers. From 1950 to 1960 they added 2,123,000 employees. This represented a growth of slightly over 50 percent, compared with the population growth of 18.4 percent. To keep abreast of population growth State and local government need have absorbed only 754,032 employees. Instead they added 1,368,968 in excess of that number.

The next highest absorbent activity rose from 7,074,000 to 8,507,000, representing an increase of 1,433,000. This was virtually a 20 percent increase and exceeded the population growth (18.4 percent) only slightly. In proportion to population growth the retailing services would have added 1,301,616. The actual increase was 131,384 in excess of that number.

Employment in the wholesale trade was slightly more expansive, or about 22 percent. The expansion of 564,000 above the 1950 employment of 2,517,000 was 90,936 in excess of the population growth factor.

The employment expansion of the Federal Government was slightly in excess of 15 percent and was therefore a little below the 18.4 percent growth of the population. Three hundred and nine thousand employees were added to the 1,928,000 on the payroll in 1950, and this was 45,752 less than population growth would have called for.

Classroom teachers registered a greater proportional expansion even than State and local government. The number grew from 914,000 to 1,410,000, and this was an increase of 496,000 or 54 percent and added 327,552 beyond the population growth factor.

Finance (comprising banks, trust companies, security dealers and exchanges), insurance, other finance agencies and real estate showed a growth of 36 percent. This was about double the population growth factor. Employment rose from 1,824,000 to 2,485,000 representing an increase of 661,000. That was 325,000 in excess of the number called for by the population growth.

Military personnel on active duty expanded by a little over a million from 1,460,000. This was a 69-percent expansion and went 748,000 beyond the population expansion factor.

SUMMARY

The table shows an expansion in the entire group of services, trades, and professions listed, from 19,869,000 in 1950 to 26,471,000 in 1960, an increase of 6,602,000, or 33 percent. The expansion called for by the population growth factor would have been 3,655,896. The actual employment exceeded this by 2,946,104.

Unfortunately, the lag exhibited by receding industries, mining, agriculture, transportation, etc., reached 7,366,096 employees.

However, a few industries produced employment rolls in excess of the 18.4 percent increase in population. The significant and leading ones were listed above. Among them they absorbed 699,112 workers beyond the population growth factor. If these are added to the 2,946,104 workers absorbed by the services, trades, and professions, a total of 3,645,216 is reached.

If this number is placed alongside of the lag of 7,366,096 set forth above, we are left with a residual lag of 3,710,880.

If the increase in the Armed Forces is deducted from the employed, the lag rises to 4,726,880.

COMMENTARY

Perhaps the most startling shifts in employment aside from the precipitate decline in the number of agricultural workers has been the sharp uniant in State and local government employment. Considering the relatively mild upward movement of Federal Government employment, this explosion in the State and local field leaves efforts at explanation somewhat at a loss. Unquestionably the very decimation of the rural population and the growth of many towns into cities and the swelling of urban and suburban population accounts for much of the swelling employment in State and local government. Most of the increase came in local government, which rose from 3,228,000 in 1950 to 4,795,000 in 1960. However, the ratio of growth was virtually the same as in the State governments.

However, with all the swelling of employment levels in the trades, services and professions, the shrinkage of employment in agriculture, manufacturing, mining and transportation was not overcome. The deficiency (calculated in relation to the population increase) of 3,710,880 during the decade of 1950 to 1960 (exclusive of military personnel) was slightly over 6 percent.

The failure of the productive enterprises to uphold their part in the increasing employment, measured by the population, is of course attributable in good part to rising productivity per man-hour, the onward march of mechanization and automation.

The rapid rise in the yield per acre among our leading crops, together with greater mechanization of farming operations, from plowing, through cultivation, to harvesting, unquestionably has caused the great shrinkage in farm employment during the past decade. This shrinkage was close to 40 percent or 2,808,000 workers.

AGRICULTURAL CROPS—YIELD PER ACRE

A few examples will illustrate the increase in yield per acre:

Crop	Acreage harvested (millions)		Production (billions)		Yield per acre		Increase
	1950	1960	1950	1960	1950	1960	
							Percent
Corn ..... bushels	81.817	82.117	3.057803	4.352668	37.4	53.0	41.7
Wheat ..... do	61.610	52.643	1.019389	1.363443	16.5	25.9	57.0
Oats ..... do	40.733	27.091	1.410464	1.161512	33.2	42.9	29.2
Cotton ..... bales	17.842	15.316	.010012	.014309	[1] 269	[1] 448	66.5
Weighted average							46.0

[1] Pounds.

The increases in yield per acre between 1950 and 1960 ranged from 29.2 percent with respect to oats to 66.5 percent in the case of cotton. Next to cotton was wheat with an increase of 57 percent. Our largest single crop in point of acreage is corn. The yield per acre increased 41.7 percent. The weighted average of the four crops is 46 percent.

Naturally, these results are approximations because of crop variations from year to year; but they are supported by the trend in other crops. Rice production rose from 2,389 pounds in 1950 per acre to 3,411 pounds in 1960. This was an increase of 43 percent. Tobacco yield rose from 1,270 pounds per acre to 1,713 pounds or 35 percent. The yield of sorghums for grain rose from 18.9 bushels to 41.3 or a little over 100 percent.

These upward jumps in yield per acre in our agriculture are sufficient to account for the decline of 40 percent in farm employment.

It is obvious that in agricultural production the increasing yield per acre provided the basis for a healthy growth and expansion. Unfortunately the consumption of many agricultural commodities is quite inelastic. The upward trend in yield per acre was much sharper than the population expansion. Thus it was possible to reduce acreage and still produce a surplus. In some instances, indeed, our per capita consumption of certain foods has declined greatly.

Since 1950, for example, per capita consumption of wheat flour in this country has declined from 135 to 118 pounds in 1960. In the past 50 years the decline has been quite steady. In 1910 the consumption stood at 214 pounds per person.

Consumption of potatoes has suffered a similar decline. In 1950 the per capita use was 106 pounds; in 1960 it had fallen only to 103 pounds, but 50 years ago the consumption was 198 pounds. Cornmeal has suffered an even sharper reduction, going from 11.8 pounds in 1950 to 7.4 pounds in 1960. This is a far fall from 51.1 pounds in 1910.

The most notable increase in per capita consumption has been experienced with beef. In 1950 the per capita consumption was 63.4 pounds whereas in 1960 it stood at 85.8 pounds. However, the increase since 1910 has not been phenomenal, coming up only from 70.4 pounds. Meantime it had dropped to 48.9 pounds in 1930. Pork consumption has remained remarkably steady, ranging between 60 and 70 pounds per capita since 1910, except 1940 when it rose to 73.5 pounds. In 1960 it was 64.6 pounds.

Our agricultural operations, while creating burdensome surpluses, have done so with fewer and fewer workers. The vast increase in productivity, arising from extensive mechanization, the application of fertilizer and the use of pesticides, has indeed answered the quest for growth and expansion; but it has not increased employment; indeed, quite the contrary.

Efforts to dispose of our agricultural surplus abroad have led to extensive governmental subsidization, wheat and raw cotton being the outstanding examples. In 1960 upward of $550 million in costs were incurred by the Federal Treasury for subsidies to move these two crops abroad. Other methods, principally shipments under Public Law 480, were also used. This included outright gifts to foreign countries, sales for foreign currencis, etc. In 1960 our exports of agricultural products responded sufficiently to achieve a record at $4.8 billion. The previous high was in 1957 when we moved $4.7 billion such products into exports.

We have experienced an embarrassment of farm productivity and have been left with two unwelcome results: displacement of workers and accumulation of surpluses.

Meantime we continue to import competing agricultural products. It is true that about half of our agricultural imports of $3.8 billion in 1960 were noncompetitive, the biggest item being coffee. Crude rubber, cocoa, tea, spices, bananas, and raw silk were other leading items in this category.

However, we imported edible meats (including lamb, mutton, and beef) and animals to the extent of nearly $400 million; also vegetables, fruits, and nuts in a volume slightly more than $300 million. Nearly $200 million was imported in the form of unmanufactured wool and mohair. Sugar and related products reached $555 million in imports in the same year. These with some exceptions competed with our own producers.

Imports of raw cotton, wheat, and wheat flour, while directly competitive, were small because of highly restrictive import quotas established under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. Dairy products and eggs were also maintained on a restricted basis of imports but reached $33 million.

Whatever may be the virtue of these competitive imports they aggravate our agricultural surplus, disposal and unemployment problems. In 1960 the Commodity Credit Corporation owned an inventory of $7.2 billion in farm commodities, including over a billion bushels each of wheat and corn and 5 million bales of cotton.

There is no hope therefore that agriculture will add workers to the payroll; or that agriculture will help in the absorption of the new additions to the work force each year. This must come from elsewhere.

MANUFACTURED PRODUCTS

Employment in the manufacturing field has not suffered nearly as grievously as in agriculture. Yet, with some exceptions the record provides little consolation.

Our foreign economic policy is at odds with the order of developments that we must have at home if the employment prob-

lem is to be met or at least reduced to manageable proportions. This includes growth and expansion of our industries, not their stagnation or shrinkage.

We have become increasingly exposed to import competition as a result of drastic tariff reductions since 1934, but particularly since 1947 when the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) was signed.

We have become increasingly exposed also because of the great increase in productivity in foreign industrialized countries while foreign wages have not bridged the gap.

Several troublesome results have supervened:

1. Import competition has dampened domestic industrial expansion.

2. It has stimulated the drive toward automation as a means of competing.

3. Import competition within this country has led or forced many industries to import component parts for assembly here rather than purchasing from American manufacturers.

4. It has driven some investments that otherwise would have been made here to foreign countries, thus substituting employment-expansive investments abroad for domestic ones. Henry Ford's investment of some $365 million in England rather than here offers the most dramatic example.

5. Rising foreign productivity and lagging wages (relative to the wage-productivity equation in this country) have held down our exports and made them progressively more dependent upon subsidization, including ocean-shipping costs. This has extended beyond agricultural products and reached into industrial products, such as those that are exported under our foreign-aid program.

6. Lower foreign costs of production and foreign barriers against our exports have led many American companies to establish production facilities overseas in order to supply foreign markets from within and to export from there to third countries rather than directly from this country. In some instances these companies have engaged in shipping to the United States itself from abroad.

7. Efforts to hold foreign markets have created additional pressure for automation and other labor-saving steps. In statement after statement made by industrialists, editors of trade journals that analyze the problem of foreign competition, and writers who investigate this problem, the conclusion is reached that in order to meet foreign competition at home and to hold our own in foreign markets, we must become more efficient, reduce our costs, sell harder, etc. There is only one means by which costs can be reduced drastically, and that is through installation of labor-saving equipment in the factory and, secondarily, in the offices. Another avenue lies in developing new products that incorporate economies of labor; but for these there must be a fair marketing outlook. The remainder produce relatively little effect.

If we examine the lag in employment visible in nearly all but the new manufacturing industries, such as aircraft and electrical communication, in the light of import competition and the struggle for foreign markets we begin to appreciate the stubbornness of our unemployment and underemployment problem.

After each recession during the postwar period we have at the peak of our recovery faced a larger hard core of unemployment than before, even as our gross national product has reached successively new heights in dollars.

How avoid the conclusion that most of our manufacturing industries are not employing as many workers as they might if they faced a different outlook? The exceptions are the growing and expanding industries, such as aircraft, electronics, synthetics, aluminum, and some others. We must look to them to help absorb the new employees that come on the labor market at the rate of more than a million a year. This they will not do if we visit upon them the blight of a withering import competition. Times have changed. Today, unlike the expectancy in the past, a new industry in this country is soon beset by competition from abroad because we no longer have a technological insulation. Patents offer insufficient safeguards.

Should the domestic market be made to look better to many of these industries as well as the more stabilized ones, would they not be inclined to expand more freely and build new plants in this country rather than trekking outward beyond the domestic horizon and leaving behind them unemployed workers whom they might otherwise have put to work?

Would not this expansion employ many of the unemployed and, these being employed, would they not add to the market demand for more goods and would not this brisker trade lift the ceiling for further investment? And would not this additional investment in turn create more jobs? Altogether we would be realizing the growth we need in order to provide employment as well as a broader tax base upon which much else depends. Instead of a downward spiral that moves toward a progressively more gloomy future, would not the outlook for a better market at home prime the pump for greater industrial activity?

In the other direction, i.e., if we seek industrial salvation by expanding exports and leaving our industries at the mercy of what is often quite unfair import competition, we face increasing discouragement. We will then need to subsidize more and more, both as a means of exporting farm products and rehabilitating import-injured industries; meanwhile moving yet further out on the limb. We will also then face the need of more relentless automation as a means of reducing costs in order to become or remain competitive. Here we would face a paradox, for if we succeed in becoming more competitive we would simply drive other exporting countries, some of which are very much more dependent on foreign markets than we, back against themselves with unfortunate economic and political consequences at home.

Also, we should reflect that if we automate feverishly and do all that we can do to reduce costs and thus meet import competition at home successfully we would restrict imports as surely as we would if we raised the tariff or imposed import quotas. What then would become of the much-touted program for increasing imports to the end that we could export more? With respect to the underdeveloped countries we would be working at cross-purposes more surely than if we followed the expansionist principles at home. We would be able competitively to gain and hold foreign markets and either keep the lesser developed countries out or restrict their penetration at will. Otherwise why improve our efficiency as a competitive weapon? Should we follow the domestic expanionist principle we would be in a better position to absorb a maximum of foreign goods on a fair competitive basis, just as a healthy, well-fertilized crop is more disease resistant than an impoverished one.

Realistically speaking, increasing exports by the route of feverish automation would not offer the best prospect. We should not forget that other countries too are able to pursue automation; and at the same time should keep in mind that extensive mechanization and automation abroad would benefit the other countries competitively more than it would us, because the other countries are still moving upward from a lower base. We are by way of making available, and have already made available to other countries the fruits of research and development in industrial equipment and machinery that would perhaps have taken 20 to 30 years for them to achieve on their own. As it is they can move forward rapidly with amazing gains in productivity. This door with perhaps an exception here and there is not open to us.

The net result then would be a species of industrial-mechanization race between us and our foreign competitors that would put us at best on a competitive treadmill while labor was being displaced without much hope of absorption. The expansion of employment usually expected after automation would be retarded or would vanish because of import competition. Is automation then a goal in and of itself, if it would not help in the competitive field? It may conceivably do more harm than good, under some circumstances, as when it proceeds too rapidly for absorption or when its benefits are nullified by other factors, such as import competition that skims the cream off the market, and in some cases badly depresses it.

Already many of our industries have seen a higher and higher share of the domestic market go to imports. In some instances our industries have nevertheless moved forward; but at a rate behind population growth. In other instances they have held their own productionwise but have done so at the expense of employment; i.e., they have increased productivity, either without adding employees or actually dropping some workers. In yet other cases they have not only not kept pace but at the same time have witnessed an outright shrinkage in their work force. The exceptions are not numerous; and, to repeat, these have not been sufficient to overcome the lag found in other manufacturing industries. They should obviously all be encouraged rather than discouraged by relentless exposure to a type of competition that is not constructive.

The net result from 1950 to 1960 was an increase of 1,370,000 in total employment in manufacturing. This included the expansive industries. It also included the office workers, staff employees, engineers, salesmen, etc., in manufacturing plants. However, needed to keep up with the population were 2,753,928 additional jobs. This left a gap, to repeat, of 1,383,928 workers.

This result came about in the face of all else that happened, including an increase in exports from $10.142 billion in 1950 to $20.3 billion in 1960 or a 100-percent rise.

Imports rose from $8.743 billion to $14.652 billion, an increase of 67 percent.

In weighing these trade statistics we should keep before us the fact that the import values are foreign values, i.e., the sales price to our importers, exclusive of duty, ocean freight, marine insurance, etc. This fact tends to shrink the impact of imports in terms of man-hours required to produce them. For example, in 1960 our imports of shirts were valued at $14 million.

What did this mean? What are $14 million worth of shirts? How many shirts?

In this country it would mean 7 to 9 million shirts at factory prices. How many employees would be needed to make that many shirts?

But wait. The imports were not 7 million or 9 million shirts, but 24 million. At our values they would have represented $36 to $48 million.

Innumerable other examples could be given.

In terms of man-hours required to produce the 1960 imports of $14.6 billion, exports of perhaps double that dollar value would be required to balance the account.

Whereas the trend in our imports has been strongly toward finished manufactures our exports have been moving slowly in the opposite direction. From the decade high

of 69.5 percent finished manufactures among our total exports, the low point was struck in 1960 when finished goods had fallen to 56.3 percent of total exports. On the import side finished goods have moved from 17.5 percent in 1951 steadily to 35.8 percent of our total imports in 1960. Manufactured foodstuffs have remained close to an additional 10 percent.

Claims are made that exports, dollar for dollar or in the aggregate, give rise to more employment than imports displace. This appears most unlikely on the face of it; not only because it is contradicted by those trade statistics in which both quantity and value are recorded, as in the case of shirts, but because our imports are concentrated in labor-saturated products while our exports fall largely in categories of goods that are made by labor-light industries, wherein automation has already done most of its work.

The obvious pressure so far as the import-vulnerable industries are concerned, is to mechanize and automate as quickly as possible, never mind what happens to the displaced workers. They can always find work elsewhere.

But where? In electronics and aircraft plants? Unfortunately there have not, on the record, been enough of these to absorb the automation casualties during the past decade. Can we believe that the next decade will be any better, when other countries are hot on the trail of mechanization and automation and will be able to undersell us all the better?

Very well, the Federal Government will launch a program to relocate industries, retrain their workers and make low-interest loans to the industries that are badly crippled by imports.

Where will this come out?

Will such a program improve the outlook of the remaining industries so that the ferment of expansion will seize them and lead them to employ the unemployed? Or will they, one by one, as imports strike them, fall into the line of supplicants for aid?

Or shall we send the residual unemployed to the State and local governments, to the wholesalers and retailers, the insurance writers and real estate operatives for absorption?

Shall we become a nation of trades people, service caterers, and professionals living off each other? That has been the trend of the recent thundering destiny as exemplified by our outmoded foreign trade policy.

It is true that while we have opened our market to naked competition from abroad, we have sought and continue to seek the upbuilding of the lesser developed countries for several reasons. One of these is to create greater markets abroad. As countries industrialize and as their standard of living rises they consume more products. Since no countries are self-sufficient they will buy more abroad. When this happy day comes we will export more. So runs the reasoning. Unfortunately the present trend in world trade might indicate that other countries, rather than this country, would supply these newly enriched markets.

We could then settle down to retraining workers and relocating industry as a steady operation in this country while our capital could continue to emigrate in search of a more hospitable investment climate abroad, and to escape sterile regimentation at home.

Certainly this outlook is bleak for American labor, small industry, and suppliers of materials and parts to large manufacturers. It is also bleak for agriculture since American labor, small industry, and the suppliers of materials and parts to large industries form the principal market for farm products—far, far more than do export markets. Lastly it is also bleak for the growing industries since the tone of the domestic market also determines their horizon.

From the foregoing recitation of employment shifts and failures to reemploy the unemployed and to absorb the newly arriving millions of new workers, it becomes clear that our present foreign trade policy has worked itself out of gear. It cannot cope with the employment problem; in fact gravitates against its solution.

It creates insurmountable pressures for economic steps, such as defensive capital emigration as distinguished from investment of surplus capital abroad, importation of parts and components as a defensive competitive measure, conversion from manufacturing to importation, unhealthy automation as a means of reducing costs, curtailment of domestic expansion because of a gloomy competitive outlook and final collapse upon the mercy of the Federal Government for rehabilitation, relocation, etc.—all of them steps that are at once negative and astringent of growth and expansion while turning down the wick on new jobs that otherwise would open.

Until our manufacturing industries, mining enterprises, and agriculture are given effective assurance and not merely a defaulting promissory assurance, that they will have a real defense against withering import competition they will not provide the growth and expansion that we need. The specter of a chronic and stubborn unemployment will persist and, worse, it will spread.

Kremlin Appointees Now Rule China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, "Latin American News Notes," written by Mrs. John Perry, Jr., for the Palm Beach Post-Times, has done a commendable job of calling our attention to happenings in Castro's Cuba and other danger areas in Latin America.

In a recent column "Kremlin Appointees Now Rule Cuba," Mrs. Perry describes the role of Communist leaders in Cuba today. Because of her many contacts with democratic Cubans in Florida and elsewhere, Mrs. Perry's views are particularly enlightening.

Knowing of the interest of all Members in this important matter, I include Mrs. Perry's remarks in the RECORD:

LATIN AMERICAN NEWS NOTES: KREMLIN APPOINTEES NOW RULE CUBA

(By Jeanne S. Perry)

One of the questions that we often hear asked regarding Cuba is, who really wields the power on that island today? Here is the lineup as authorized by the Kremlin.

Although Fidel Castro is still doing all the talking, he acts strictly on orders from the Russians. For some time now Castro has been fearful that he might be disposed of by the Reds. Many people feel that this may account for the real reason behind his statement of undying adherence to communism.

Che Guevara has also fallen from prominence, but is still active because of his considerable knowledge of guerrilla warfare. The Russians have Che in charge of creating uprisings in other Latin countries along with Spanish-born and self-designated General Bayo. It must be a bitter pill for Guevara to swallow, as the man who now gives Che his orders is Carlos Rafael Rodriguez. It was not too long ago that Che was ordering Rodriguez around.

Raul Castro still holds the title of Minister of the Armed Forces, but his baliwick is now confined solely to Oriente Province. Raul's moves are dictated by Ladislao Gonzalez Carvajal, who appears way down on the list of Cuban Party hierarchy which follows:

The No. 1 man is Fabio Grobart. He holds the title of Secretary of Discipline for the Reds in Cuba. He is also the editor of Cuba Socialista, required reading in Cuba today. This crafty Communist has never been photographed. Grobart not only heads the Communist apparatus in Cuba, but is in charge of the entire Carribean area as well.

Grobart first appeared in Cuba in 1928. His mission at that time was to organize the Communist ranks. When things began to get too hot for the Communists in Cuba, Fabio Grobart departed and spent most of his time traveling between Venezuela, Columbia and the Dominican Republic. He did manage occasionally to sneak in and out of Cuba using a passport under the name of Marcos Diaz. At other times he has assumed the name of Otto Modley, claiming Poland as his birthplace. Presently he holds a Cuban diplomatic passport under his own name.

In 1952 when Batista's coup d'etat brought him control of Cuba, Fabio Grobart left the island and stayed away for some time. His whereabouts in the next 5 years are unknown until he reappeared in 1957 in the Russian city of Kiev.

No. 2 man is Blas Roca, Secretary General of the Cuban Communist Party. It was Grobart who found and consequently educated Blas Roca in the Communist discipline. The 54-year-old Roca (nee Francisco Caldeiro), was born in Oriente Province. Despite a limited education, he became a country schoolteacher at 16, then a bill collector and carpenter.

When Lenin Communists set up a cell in Blas Roca's hometown of Manzanillo, he joined the group and adopted his present name.

In the early thirties, Blas Roca was imprisoned several times for stirring up agitations. Roca moved on to Havana in 1933 and became one of the three ruling secretaries of the Communist Party. Six years later he was promoted to Secretary General, and attended the Seventh Party Congress in Russia, staying on afterwards for several months. He was then assigned to move about Latin America doing organizational work for the party, but still retaining his position with the Communist Party in Cuba until 1952. The following year he was arrested in Santiago de Cuba during Castro's attack on the Moncada barracks. Roca went to trial but was absolved of any implication in the affair.

During Batista's 7 years in power, Roca claimed that he had cancer of the liver, kept out of the limelight, and was left alone.

Once Castro was in charge, Blas Roca openly started operating again. In November of last year, Roca returned to Moscow to attend the anniversary of the Red counterrevolution. As a reward for his faithful party service, Khrushchev turned over complete control of Cuba to Blas Roca.

In order of their importance, the next 14 ruling members of the Cuban Communist Party are: (3) Anibal Escalante, secretary of organization; (4) Joaquin Ordoqui, military affairs; Severo Aguirre, agrarian affairs; (6) Carlos Rafael Rodriguez, economic and industrial affairs (direct supervisor to Che Guevara); (7) Lazaro Pena, labor affairs (head of Cuban Confederation of Labor—CTC); (8) Assistant to Aguirre; (9) Manuel Luzardo, assistant secretary of organization; (10) Fabio Bravo, assistant to Blas Roca; (11) Edith Garcia Buchaca, cultural affairs; (12) Leonel Soto, educational affairs; (13)

Cesar Escalante. All propaganda; (14) Ladislao Gonzales Carvajal, delegate in Oriente Province (direct supervisor to Raul Castro); (15) Salvador Garcia Aguero, racial affairs; (16) Juan Marinello, intellectual matters—(Marinello is nearly blind).

Arizona's Economic Growth Through Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HAYDEN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Commissioner of Reclamation Floyd E. Dominy before the central chapter of the Arizona Society of Professional Engineers, at Phoenix, Ariz., on February 23, 1962.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARIZONA'S ECONOMIC GROWTH THROUGH RECLAMATION

(Address by Commissioner of Reclamation Floyd E. Dominy before central chapter of the Arizona Society of Professional Engineers, Phoenix, Ariz., February 23, 1962)

I feel a deep sense of pride every time I visit Arizona—and particularly your Valley of the Sun where Reclamation's multipurpose concept was born on the Salt River project.

Here is where Reclamation met and won its first major engineering challenge more than a half century ago.

Here is where Reclamation is today meeting an engineering challenge of great magnitude in Glen Canyon in northern Arizona.

And here is where Reclamation faces even greater challenges in the further development of the Nation's water resources.

I am keenly enthusiastic over this opportunity to talk with you Arizona professional engineers about Reclamation's engineering challenges—both old and new—and Reclamation's vital contribution to Arizona's economic growth.

I realize that the Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Arizona's native son, was invited to be your speaker for this occasion. I am honored to appear on any occasion to substitute for him and to support his constructive leadership in the field of natural resource development. I know you are interested in what I have to say because you and Reclamation have much in common. Many of you have been—or will be—directly or indirectly connected with Reclamation planning and construction in Arizona. And what Reclamation and the State can cooperatively accomplish in the future may well determine how well the economic potential of the State may be further realized.

We are proud of the professional engineers who have designed and built Reclamation's projects. We treasure the fact that these engineers follow their profession's tradition of high integrity and skill—upholding the public's trust. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that every dam planned and constucted by our engineers is doing its job day in and day out without regard to calendar limitations placed on its benefits.

Reclamation is meeting its challenge through you—the professional engineer. Great projects have already been built in Arizona—more are yet to be built. The lower basin of the Colorado stands on the threshold of a further water resources development program that will exceed, dollarwise, anything heretofore attempted.

A year ago I joined you and other citizens of Arizona in celebrating the Golden Jubilee of Theodore Roosevelt Dam. President Kennedy, in his message to those assembled for that celebration said:

"It is fitting that the great rubble-masonry dam on the Salt River, which is the key structure of the Salt River project, bears the name of President Theodore Roosevelt. He truly appreciated the importance of resource conservation and development, and it was with his energetic and farsighted support that the Federal reclamation program was initiated."

We have farsighted and energetic leadership in high places today to support and carry on this work.

Just 2 weeks ago Arizona celebrated its 50th anniversary of statehood. Arizona and reclamation have literally grown up together. And the dean of the U.S. Senate—the Honorable CARL HAYDEN—has been out in front all the way. His vision, foresight, and dogged perseverance to get the job done continues to be an inspiration to reclamationists everywhere.

I recall the time some 16 years ago shortly after I had first joined the Bureau of Reclamation, when I looked down upon your Valley of the Sun from an aircraft. Checkerboard fields of green and golden grain, fruits and winter vegetables, and livestock grazing on lush, irrigated pastures stretched between the mountains on all sides. As I flew into Phoenix yesterday, I again saw this beautiful agricultural scene. But I saw other things which did not exist 16 years ago. Your metropolitan area has pushed out across the valley, absorbing more and more of the agricultural lands. You have had a tremendous economic and population growth. As a matter of fact, most current growth indices show that Arizona leads the Nation.

Since the turn of the century, Arizona has had a 959 percent gain in population, rising from 122,931 in 1900 to 1.3 million in 1960. The estimated 1961 population is 1.4 million and by 1980 you may have a whopping total of about 3 million. Arizona also tops the Nation in income growth showing a gain of 296 percent from a 1946 figure of $669 million to a 1960 total of $2,650 million.

Federal investments in irrigation developments such as the Salt River, Yuma and Gila projects, have been repaid manyfold in tangible and intangible benefits. The farmer, the merchant, the manufacturer, the recreationist, people in all walks of life, here and throughout the Nation are reaping the benefits of Arizona's multipurpose reclamation developments.

Maricopa County is one of the many reclamation looking glasses through which the world views the benefits of reclamation multipurpose development. The Federal Government originally invested $10 million in the Salt River project, which, by 1955, was repaid in full by the Salt River Valley Water Users' Association. The Salt River project at present is modernizing its irrigation works under a rehabilitation and betterment program. The project has already expended about $10 million—equal to the original cost of the project—under an overall $16 million loan program. The project also is repaying this money to the U.S. Treasury.

The project is an excellent example of the fallacy of restricting benefit measurement to 50 years as many authorities have advocated. It is already more than half a century old and is piling up greater economic benefits for the area and the Nation today than it ever did before.

Largely as a result of its wealth created by the Salt River project development, the Maricopa County area has returned to the Federal Treasury more than $300 million in excise and income taxes between 1940 and 1961. This is a fifteenfold return to the Nation on the original Federal investments. The Yuma and Gila projects also have excellent tax and wealth-producing records.

These figures substantiate the Salt River project's slogan, "Arizona grows where water flows." In the literal sense of this slogan, approximately one-third million acres of land in Arizona irrigated by reclamation works in 1960 produced crops valued at $11 million. Meanwhile nearly a billion kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric energy from reclamation dams on the lower Colorado River were delivered to Phoenix and other load centers throughout the State.

The clear desert sunshine with which you are blessed produces a year-round growing season and likewise a 12-month recreation season. The tremendous recreational benefits and their economic worth as created by reclamation reservoirs were at one time looked upon as a rather inconsequential byproduct of reclamation development. But now everyone has more time to play and the trek of visitors to reclamation reservoirs and river stretches controlled and desilted by reclamation dams has increased rapidly. Now, we must and have accepted recreation as a major benefit of reclamation development. Furthermore, we are including recreation needs and potential in the planning of our future projects.

Reclamation dams on Arizona's rivers have added greatly to recreation and tourism, which are among the State's major industries. Hoover and companion dams on the Colorado River—Theodore Roosevelt and other dams on the Salt River and other central Arizona rivers—have created some of the Nation's finest bodies of water for the recreationist. Also, these lakes provide flood control, water storage for irrigation and domestic uses, hydroelectric power generation, fish and wildlife, and other benefits.

Glen Canyon Dam, 370 miles upstream from Hoover Dam, has taken its place with other reclamation dams as a tourist attraction of prime importance. Right now, construction is the attraction and a big one it is. But soon Glen Canyon Dam will start backing up the river to create Lake Powell—and thus open up a spectacular recreation area for Arizona, Utah, and the Nation.

The Lake Mead National Recreation Area, surrounding Hoover and Davis Dams and their reservoirs, alone attracts some 3 million visitors annually. Many of these visit the Arizona shoreline or reservoirs. Additional millions trek to other reservoirs and clear river stretches along the lower Colorado River, the upper Salt and Gila Rivers.

Tourism in Arizona—much of which is the result of reclamation development—is big business, ranking fourth in total value behind manufacturing, agriculture, and mining. The State's income from visitors last year is estimated to be well over $300 million. The Salt River Valley accounted for about half of this amount.

From the standpoint of reclamation engineering, Arizona offers a virtually complete case history of progress. Here, you find the oldest as well as the newest water resources development projects which have put the West's rivers to work. The Salt River project's Theodore Roosevelt Dam was the Hoover Dam or the Glen Canyon Dam of its day. Completed in 1911, Theodore Roosevelt Dam set a precedent for other great dams built wholly or partly on Arizona soil.

Hoover Dam, anchored on the east in Arizona and on the west in Nevada, was completed in 1935 to bring the unruly Colorado River to heel for the first time. The river's first structure, Laguna Dam, 13 miles north of Yuma, had been completed in 1909 to divert Colorado River water to the Yuma project in southwestern Arizona and southeastern California. This dam, however, did not provide the storage and river control so vitally needed to control floods

and regulate the river in a year-round flow to prevent droughts in the lower basin. Later, Hoover Dam provided this river control and regulation to assure successful agricultural and industrial development in Arizona, Nevada, and California.

Other reclamation structures on the Colorado River, partially in Arizona, followed Hoover Dam's construction. These included Imperial Dam and desilting works, Parker Dam, the world's "deepest"; Headgate Rock Dam, built by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Davis Dam, and Palo Verde Diversion Dam. And today, as I mentioned earlier, the Bureau of Reclamation is building Glen Canyon Dam. Begun in 1956, construction of Glen Canyon Dam has passed the halfway mark. Each of these dams presented its own particular challenge to the engineers. But the engineers who investigated and constructed Theodore Roosevelt Dam perhaps met the greatest challenge of all. The job of building Theodore Roosevelt Dam must have seemed formidable to reclamation engineer Louis C. Hill when he arrived here in October 1903. He was to take charge of the planning and construction of what was to be that day's world's highest dam, creating the world's largest manmade lake.

And it was probably equally formidable and challenging to the general contractor, John M. O'Rourke & Co. of Galveston, Tex. New machinery and new construction techniques were developed for this job, just as for every new dam job since. These methods seem antiquated now but they got the job done. Theodore Roosevelt Dam stands today as a good example of planning, design, and construction. The huge pieces of native stone, quarried from the surrounding mountains and canyons, and laboriously hoisted into place by men and crude machinery, are here to stay. Theodore Roosevelt Dam is still the highest all-masonry dam in the world.

Hoover Dam was the next major challenge to the professional engineer. Here, again, new machinery and techniques had to be developed. Many laymen—and a few engineers—advised against the construction of Hoover Dam. Some who were faint of heart, said there were too many unknown factors in such a trailblazing construction venture. But, the engineering profession was not to be discouraged. Hoover Dam stands today as this hemisphere's highest and a monument to all those dreamers and visionaries who fought through its authorization and those construction stiffs who translated it into reality. It was the pioneer structure of its type for the whole world and has been the pattern for worldwide development of water resources.

Construction of Glen Canyon Dam likewise was and still is a big undertaking. Planning and construction of this development required great imagination and skill. The logistics of isolation created a particular problem but your profession is meeting this challenge successfully. A river barrier is slowly rising which is larger in concrete volume than Hoover but some 16 feet lower. Rising 710 feet above foundation bedrock, Glen Canyon Dam will store about 28 million acre-feet of water—only about 3 million acre-feet less than Lake Mead is capable of holding.

And the day of challenge to the professional engineer is far from over. Along the Colorado River in northern Arizona between Hoover and Glen Canyon Dams, and throughout Arizona, great reclamation projects await construction. Some of these, like the proposed Marble Canyon and Bridge Canyon Dams and other proposed work, will surely test your professional skill.

These and other projects, now under investigation, will cost billions of dollars. However, their wealth-producing benefits to future generations will exceed their cost manyfold. These developments would further enrich the Pacific Southwest as well as the entire Nation. Doubters should be referred to the Salt River project. In its day, its was probably just as revolutionary and farsighted as are some of the proposals under investigation today.

Authorization and construction of the remaining projects on the Colorado River depend on two factors.

First, because of the tremendous silt load carried by the Colorado River, dams in Marble and Bridge Canyons had to await construction of Glen Canyon Dam. Without Glen Canyon storage, which will trap some 75 percent of the river's sediment load, reservoirs in Marble and Bridge would have comparatively short lives.

Second, projects which would divert water from the river must await the Supreme Court's decision in the *Arizona* v. *California* suit over allocation of Colorado River water. The Court heard final arguments last month and is expected to render its decision this year.

At the request of the State of Arizona, which also financed the work, the Bureau of Reclamation recently completed an appraisal report on the proposed central Arizona project which would be one of the world's largest multipurpose water resources developments. Since the Bureau's original central Arizona project report was issued in 1947 and published in House Document No. 136, 81st Congress, 1st session, the project area has approximately doubled in population and now totals 1 million people. The project area's population is expected to double again in the next 10 to 15 years.

Arizona's water supply problems and needs have become more critical as a result of the State's tremendous growth since the close of World War II. Consequently, Arizona officials felt it essential to reexamine and update costs for the project prior to the Supreme Court's decree so that current information on the project would be available to the Congress at the earliest possible time following a Supreme Court decision on the law of the river.

The Arizona legislature provided $150,000 to the Bureau to appraise the project plan in light of present conditions. An additional $30,000 was subsequently contributed by the New Mexico Interstate Stream Commission to finance the New Mexico portion of project investigations and for other studies of the Gila River drainage system in New Mexico.

The Bureau performed this work under contract with the Arizona Interstate Stream Commission and the New Mexico Interstate Stream Commission and the results were recently announced. The States and the Bureau recognize that the quantity of water available to Arizona will not be known until the Supreme Court issues its decree. The appraisal report is based on the assumption that 1,200,000 acre-feet of water annually could be diverted to the project from the Colorado River. This amount of water was also assumed in the original report. We do not know as yet whether this amount actually will be available. But we are sure of one factor, regardless of the quantity of water to be diverted, the demand will far exceed the supply.

Water which could be diverted by the central Arizona project would not irrigate any new lands. Rather, it would deliver supplemental water to lands now irrigated and furnish sorely needed municipal and industrial water to Phoenix, Tucson, and other urban areas. The appraisal report focuses attention on the fact that the area to be served by the central Arizona project area is now being supplied by an overdraft of the groundwater basin.

Without additional water, much of the developed lands ultimately will be forced out of production and growth, and further development of the area rendered virtually impossible. The central Arizona project plan would give only partial relief. For this reason, long-range conservation and development steps must also be taken.

The central Arizona project is only a part of a more comprehensive basinwide plan of water conservation and development required to sustain the existing economy and permit future growth of the entire Lower Colorado River Basin. We in Reclamation are convinced that financial assistance from hydroelectric projects now in operation and those yet to be built will be required to accomplish such long-range objectives as lining the All-American and Coachella Canals, salvaging water along the Colorado and Gila Rivers through channelization and clearing of phreatophytes, and possible importation of additional needed quantities of water from other watersheds or by other means of the future.

Upstream from Bridge Canyon—in the stretch of river between Grand Canyon and Glen Canyon—the Bureau of Reclamation has conducted extensive field investigations of Marble Canyon Dam and powerplant, construction of which will be possible when upstream river control is established by Glen Canyon Dam. We have completed field surveys of the Marble Canyon Mile 32.8 site and the alternate Mile 39.5 site. Sufficient drilling of foundations and abutments has been performed on both sites to prove their structural feasibility. Our studies indicate the Marble Canyon project to be a feasible development, although our investigations are not yet complete.

The Federal Power Commission was advised on November 1 that it was the Department of Interior's view that a license should not be granted for development of the Marble Canyon at this time. The Department urged that the Commission's decision await the Supreme Court's decision as to the amount of water available to Arizona. It is the Department's view that the Congress should have the opportunity to consider the needs of the central Arizona project in the light of the Supreme Court's decision and the Bureau of Reclamation's investigation. This stretch of the Colorado River is the last readily available "water hole" in the southwest. All major development thus far on the Colorado River has been by the Federal Government in cooperation with the States or their lesser agencies. It has thus far proven to be one of the most successfully coordinated multipurpose river operations of record. Additional development by whatever agency must necessarily be closely correlated with existing structures to be fully effective and achieve maximum benefits.

Completion of Glen Canyon Dam and construction of Marble Canyon and Bridge Canyon Dams would go a long way toward complete utilization of the hydroelectric power potential of the Colorado River from northern Arizona to the Mexican border.

These, and other works yet to be constructed on the Colorado River and its tributaries, will bring this great river system under complete control and utilization, if they are planned, constructed and operated under a unified river development plan. They will assure that not a drop of the precious river water will reach the sea without having paid its full toll in multipurpose benefits.

Elsewhere in Arizona, we can look to future construction of the potential middle Gila River project. The Bureau has completed feasibility investigations of a multipurpose dam and reservoir at the Buttes site on the Gila River. This dam would provide flood control and supplemental irrigation water for lands on the San Carlos project, which includes more than 100,000 acres, about half of which are Indian lands. Sediment control, fish and wildlife and recreational benefits also would accrue.

The Corps of Engineers would be responsible for flood control and channel improvements, including Camelsback Dam and channel clearing along the Gila River from Camelsback Dam to the San Carlos Reservoir and from the mouth of the San Pedro River to the Buttes Reservoir site.

The Bureau of Reclamation has completed 31.5 miles of channelized river on the Colorado River in the Needles vicinity. Similar channelization of the badly aggraded river below the Palo Verde Diversion Dam in the Cibola Valley is also planned. This work awaits final determination of the Arizona-California boundary in the Cibola and Yuma areas and the appropriation of funds.

This channelization project, eradication of phreatophytes and other conservation measures on the lower Colorado River could make available at least 300,000 acre-feet of water annually to water users.

Construction of drainage works in the Yuma area has resulted in much improvement in protecting lands from high water tables. Wells are now pumping drainage water from the water logged lands of the Wellton-Mohawk Valley on the Gila project into a recently completed 71-mile-long concrete-lined conveyance channel. Construction of two outlet channels and wells designed to lower the water table in the south Gila Valley has been completed.

The Bureau recently awarded a contract for construction of 4½ miles of levee along the Colorado River near Yuma to protect the south Gila Valley from possible flooding.

We are currently negotiating a repayment contract for construction of a distribution and drainage system for the south Gila Valley. With the final unit of the Gila project yet to be constructed, the distribution system will deliver Colorado River water from the Gila Gravity Main Canal to over 8,000 acres of land in the south Gila Valley now served by wells.

This is something of a look into the future of water resource development in the Lower Colorado River Basin and particularly as it relates to Arizona. It offers an exciting challenge to the engineering fraternity. But more than that, it opens vistas of opportunity for future growth and prosperity in your State. The very climatic and geographic circumstances which make this such an attractive State in which to live also pose critical water problems which must be solved.

The close partnership between the Bureau of Reclamation and your people started even before statehood and has borne goodly fruit. I join with you in looking to the future. This is no time to rest on our laurels.

The "Houn' Dawg Song"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose herewith from the Sunday News and Leader, a daily newspaper from the district I represent, dated February 11, 1962, the weekly story as recreated by Lucille Morris "Celia" Upton as written to her aunt, 50 years ago today.

You will note that it pertains to the "Houn' Dawg Song," which, along with mules and the show-me attitude, has made Missouri famous. Inasmuch as the old 203d Coast Guard Artillery Regiment of the 35th Division, famous in two wars, is from this particular area and used the song quoted at the last of the editorial as a marching song at one time, I feel it is appropriate that this be recorded and made available at this time, and in the future, to members of oncoming generations:

THE GOOD OLD DAYS

I haven't said much about the Houn' Dawg Song for a week or two so I'd better make sure you don't think we have forgotten it.

J. W. Foland, writing in the Leader this week, says that "Out of the Ozark hills has come a folk ballad that may yet become the State song that Missouri has been searching for. It was not written. It just grew. * * *

"Up and down the White River, on the banks of the old Twelve Points and over the hills that lie around about Mulligan Gap and the Hickory Barrens, they have been singing this song ever since the war.

"In it is the spirit of that real Missouri that lies afar from the smoky cities and noisy haunts of men. They are singing it now along Mack's Creek and in Mansfield, Springfield, Willow Springs, and Mountain Grove. It has invaded St. Louis and its wailing minor strains are becoming familiar to the belated St. Louisan.

"The halls of Missouri's capitol have rung with the story of the wailing and persecuted hound. Senators Thomas F. Lane, of Cape Girardeau, Francis M. Wilson, of Platte City, and McDavid, of Springfield, introduced this wailing ballad to the legislators during the 45th general assembly. This started the spread over the State.

" 'It was the favorite song of the Missouri Senate during its last session,' says Senator Lane. * * *

"It is said the song originated in the Forsyth country back in the 1950's. Zeke, otherwise nameless, came to town with his hound dog trotting at his heels. The town boys persecuted the hound. Zeke's half-crying, half-defiant complaints are the basis of the song. As they say in the Ozarks 'they made a song about it.' * * *

"Missourians love the dog, but above all others do they love the hound dog. He was the playmate of their boyhood, the companion of their youth, and the solemn-eyed, silently philosophizing friend of their manhood. They have heard his ringing trail-cry on those frostly nights when the moon was up and the autumn was upon the hills.

"If it should be adopted informally by Missourians at home and abroad it would be the most remarkable of all the existing State hymns. It gets nearer the soil than any of the ballads that have been adopted by other States. It goes back to the first rude strains of song that burst from the lips of the coonskin-capped pioneer with his long, brown rifle and deerskin hunting shirt.

"A thousand fiddles have sung this song of the hills. It is just such an air as the rural youth and the maiden love when the cabin floor is rocking to the swing of flying feet. It is homely, pathetic, pleading, defiant and somewhat warlike. It is a growth in the backwoods, the high hills and the lonesome places."

The writer gives some verses of the song that are different from most versions published thus far:

"Every time I come to town
The boys keep a-kickin' my dog aroun'
Makes no difference if he is a houn'
They gotta-quit kickin' my dawg aroun'.

"Sambo, lay that banjo down,
You good fur nothin' trifin' houn'
Makes no difference if he is a houn'
You got a-quit kickin' my dawg aroun.'

"Every time I go to school
The teacher lams me with a rule,
Makes no difference if I am a fool,
She's got a-quit lammin' me with a rule.

"Sift the meal and save the bran,
You can't grow taters in sandy lan'
Makes no difference if he is a houn'
You got to quit kickin' my dawg aroun'.

"My dawg Drum is a good ol' houn'
Trails the possum on the dryest groun'
Makes no difference if he is a houn'
You got a-quit kickin' my dawg aroun.'

Your loving niece.

CELIA.

Views on Department of Urban Affairs and Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a statement which expressed my views regarding Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 which was rejected overwhelmingly by the House of Representatives last week:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN GARNER E. SHRIVER REGARDING PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND HOUSING

The past few days much has been said and written about the overwhelming defeat in the Congress of the administration's proposal to create a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. The vote in the U.S. House of Representatives was 264 to 150 in opposition to the creation of this new Department. As with so many controversial issues, there are, of course, seemingly valid arguments for and against.

As I observed the debate and all I could find to read on the subject, the main argument for the creation of this new Department was that with a large percentage of the people residing in the cities, a Cabinet officer with a department should primarily be concerned with the problems of cities.

In opposition to the creation of such a department were such reasons as:

1. The resolution before the Congress to create this Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would have included only about one-third of the Federal Government's present housing activities. It would not have embraced the veterans' housing programs nor the Federal Home Loan Bank. These housing agencies account for approximately 63 percent of the housing financing activities of the Federal Government.

2. A multitude of Federal functions useful to metropolitan areas in meeting many of their problems would have remained where they are now even if this new department had not been authorized. For example, the Federal highway program affecting access to municipalities and expressways through cities as well as city streets would remain in the Department of Commerce.

Technical assistance and other programs for "depressed areas" now afforded under the Area Redevelopment Act also would remain in Commerce.

Water pollution and sewage disposal programs remain under the jurisdiction of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare where they are now.

Vocational education funds, social security activities welfare programs, Hill-Burton

funds for hospitals, assistance to schools in federally impacted areas such has Wichita, activities designed to promote public health, all these would remain right where they are now.

Another reason for lack of congressional support was stated by a member of the party of the administration when he said:

"In a few years time, this Department would cost the Government $165 billion dollars. It would give the Secretary of Urban Affairs and Housing more powers than has been held by an individual since the beginning our Government."

In other words, the creation of this new Department would bypass the States and centralize further power in the bureaucracy of Washington, with more and more Federal employees and more and more cost to the taxpayers.

These were some of the considerations which went into my decision to vote with the majority in opposing the present creation of this Department.

Finally, I would like to express my regret and in fact, resentment of the deliberate injection of the racial issue into consideration of this request. The matter of who would be appointed to the chief position in the new Department had no place in a decision on the merits of the legislation.

My 10 years as chairman of our Kansas Legislature's Committee on Municipalities made me fully aware of the complex problems faced by metropolitan areas. I am convinced that the American public should not be led to believe that the creation of a new Department in Washington would solve all of these pressing metropolitan problems.

There must be a strengthening of relationships between local and State governments in meeting many of our urban problems. In Kansas, our larger cities, such as Wichita, have been given home rule authority to help them work out solutions for their special problems. Urban areas deserve more consideration from their respective State government, including appropriate representation according to population in their State legislatures. Fortunately, most of our States are now working toward these goals.

Send the Space Capsule Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, this is a most appropriate day for me to call attention of the House to the fact that we in St. Louis are extremely anxious to have the space capsule in which Colonel Glenn made astronautical history returned to St. Louis, where it originated.

I have read in the papers that Colonel Glenn's space capsule may be placed in the Smithsonian Institution. Apparently it would be placed next to the one used by Commander Shepard. We had asked for that one too. We would be glad to have either one. It would be placed in the Transportation Museum in St. Louis which is to become part of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial.

We in St. Louis do not begrudge the Smithsonian Institution its right to these great trophies. After all, one of the most spectacular and treasured exhibits of the Smithsonian is the *Spirit of St. Louis*. But we do not think that the Smithsonian needs to have a whole series of historymaking space capsules. I would think one would be enough for the Smithsonian. We would like to have the other in St. Louis where it was built.

Bulgarian Liberation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the Bulgarian people are a proud people, people that review each year on March 3—their national liberation day—the feats of a glorious past. Throughout their long history they have had the unhappy distinction of living astride the path that has been trod by a succession of ruthless dictators and they have had the added inconvenience of living cheek and jowl with aggressive neighbors.

Forced to take the side of Nazi Germany in World War II, the Western allies took cognizance of the compulsion under which this great people were forced to suffer and our ultimate declaration of war against Bulgaria was a routine matter and did not conceal our reluctance to engage in conflict with a nation that even then had furnished so many stalwart volunteers for our own Armed Forces.

The irony of the situation is revealed by the fact that throughout the conflict Russia did not even bother to declare war on Bulgaria. As soon, however, as the hostilities with Germany were concluded, Russia promptly declared war on the Bulgarians and aided by subversives from within took over the prostrate nation and placed their puppets in control. There then followed a brief sequence of events of which we—the Western allies—can never be proud; namely, President Roosevelt gave a free hand to Churchill in the Balkan countries and Churchill in turn gave Stalin a free hand in Bulgaria. And from that moment to this very hour those great, liberty-loving people have had to submit to the cruelest type of dictatorial domination.

All Americans today are keenly alive to the great and ever increasing contributions that are being made by the Bulgarians in our midst who have found in these United States a haven for the oppressed. At the same time there must be an increasing awareness that our disservice to Bulgaria at the time of the Russian takeover can only be remedied by our support of their national aspirations from hereon. We applaud the laudable ambitions of the Bulgarian National Front of America and we shall support, all the way, their determination that their beloved homeland shall once more be free.

Where Are We Going?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, recently there appeared in the Rankin County (Miss.) News a reprint of thought-provoking article written by Dr. Robert Morris, president of the University of Dallas. Dr. Morris article, in my opinion, is such a timely dissertation on our current policies in dealing with the Congo situation that I am including it herewith as part of my remarks:

WHERE ARE WE GOING?

(By Dr. Robert Morris)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Dr. Robert Morris, president of the University of Dallas, was formerly chief counsel of the Senate's Subcommittee on Internal Security.)

Adlai Stevenson, who has the title of U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, recently said, "Then the United Nations will need its own United Nations peace force, capable of deterring or subduing the strongest combinations which might be raised against it." In the same talk he also said, "Events in the Congo have shown how vital it is that the United Nations retain and develop further the capacity to act for peace, to deploy military forces with speed and precision. * * *"

At about the same time (August, 1961) he wrote, "I believe with him (Einstein) that we must be prepared in the West for the restraints on self-interest which a worldwide system of law and policing implies."

I submit that this man cannot represent the United States when he says these things. He really qualifies as the U.N. Ambassador to the United States because he is clearly advocating the supremacy of the U.N. over his own country.

When the United States submitted to the U.N. Charter it received specific assurances, from Secretary of State Stettinius and others against what Adlai Stevenson is now recommending.

One may say that these utterances are mere expressions of idealism, remote from reality. Lest you take assurance from this thought, however, look at what is happening in Katanga. And in looking at Katanga we should remember that the U.N. Charter itself assures repeatedly against intervention in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state.

When Patrice Lumumba, a notorious Communist, was installed as head of the Congo in the late spring of 1960, Moise Tshombe, the leader of Katanga, understandably refused to subordinate himself and his people to Lumumba's Central Congolese Government. Despite Lumumba's political coloration, he had the strong support of Christian Herter, our Secretary of State, who brought him to Washington and gave him a prestige bath. Immediately we, the U.N. and news media generally dubbed Tshombe a "secessionist," even though he had never submitted to any unification.

I heard President Kennedy state recently that we are committed to a policy of self-determination for all peoples. Katanga, of all African political entities deserves self-determination the most. Its industry, orderly government and self-dependence are well known. It wants to be free, particularly free of Communist rule.

For these impious motives, and these alone, Tshombe is a "threat to the peace

of the world" and the U.N. uses this pretext to scuttle all its commitments against intervention in the domestic affairs of any nation.

Looking to the future, will Adlai Stevenson's U.N. "peace force" be employed to crush the aspirations of other peoples to be free of Communist rule? If the U.N. police force will be the strongest force in the world, what of our own aspirations to remain free?

All the State Department says, in the face of these grave developments, is that Adoula is as anti-Communist as Tshombe. That does not justify the intervention. It only turns it into a disclaimer that the illegal intervention is not on behalf of Soviet hegemony.

But, even on that score, I remember its assurances that Castro was not a Communist, promulgated as late as 10 months after he was in power. I remember Secretary Herter's embrace of Lumumba.

And if Adoula is anti-Communist why did he appoint Bocheley-Davidson, a strident Communist, to be administrator over Katanga? Why is his first deputy, Gizenga himself? Why are his Minister of Interior and Minister of Justice Communists?

The world that aspires to be free should long remember the contribution of Moise Tshombe. He has given us 18 months in Africa. But he has also put into focus the motives of men who seem bent on crushing everything he and we stand for.

The 50th Anniversary in Congress for Senator Carl Hayden, of Arizona

SPEECH

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, this week I will celebrate my 50th birthday. When I consider how old I sometimes feel, it is a refreshing thought to remember that Senator CARL HAYDEN began his legislative life in 1912 during the same week that I was born.

It is therefore with a certain amount of awe at this man's energy, strength and endurance, that I take the floor today to saluate him on the occasion of the completion of 50 years of distinguished service to his State and to the Nation.

The story of CARL HAYDEN is the story of the development of modern-day America. He first entered public service at the turn of the century at a time when most of the scientific advancements which we now take for granted had not yet been achieved. During his career in Congress the automobile, the telephone, the airplane, have all taken their place among the commonplace. And just this week the Nation which used horse and buggy when he was born has sent a man three times around the world at 17,000 miles per hour.

The increasing power which has come with America's increased material wealth has brought increased responsibility both at home and abroad. Senator CARL HAYDEN throughout his career has met these responsibilities with energy and imagination. His reputation as a legislator's legislator is well deserved. He has attained it and maintained it over a span of years which has seen many lesser men come and go. Many of those who have served in the Congress with CARL HAYDEN have received more publicity and more notoriety at any one particular moment in their political career. But in the long-term history of America his name will have a place above theirs. For while they made headlines he made progress.

What I am saying, in essence, is that while we celebrate today a quantitative record which CARL HAYDEN has established in the annals of American political history, what we should really celebrate are the many qualitative records which he has established during his long tenure. The example of service which he has set during the last 50 years is one to which we must all strive as we do our legislative jobs in the troublesome years ahead. I hope that we will have his leadership with us for many years to come.

Prefers Democrats on Bench

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial regarding the selection of judges which appeared in the Adrain (Mich.) Daily Telegram of February 8, 1962:

PREFERS DEMOCRATS ON BENCH

The American Judicature Society has compiled a summary of President Kennedy's appointments to the Federal bench. There have been 62 appointments to date of these, 59 are Democrats, 3 Republicans. One of the three Republican appointments did not get through the Senate.

This lopsided partisan balance is surprising only because Mr. Kennedy, before election, indicated that something other than partisan bias would enter into his selection of Federal judges. In August 1960, almost 3 months before the election, he wrote the president of the American Bar Association: "I would hope that the paramount consideration in the appointment of a judge would not be his political party, but his qualifications for the office. Please be assured of my cooperation in the effort to achieve your objectives in this regard."

Obviously, partisan considerations enter into the selection of judges. But they should not be the only consideration. It is difficult to believe that in considering appointments to the Federal bench that Mr. Kennedy has found such qualities as learning in the law, patience, dignity and fairness a monopoly of persons associated with the Democratic Party. But the record shows out of 62 appointments, only 3 Republicans appear to have met the administration's requirements.

The result, of course, is that the Federal judiciary is being loaded with Democrats. President Kennedy still has authority to appoint 73 new judges and to fill 22 vacancies. When he took office, Democrats held 52 percent of the Federal judgeships. It would seem that this percentage is bound to increase greatly in the near future.

Lionel H. DeRemer, Pioneer Flier, Dies on Eve of National Recognition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lionel H. DeRemer, pioneer aviator who held U.S. pilot's license No. 115, died in Bay City, Mich., last week on his birthday, February 13, only a few days before the Bay City Chamber of Commerce planned to honor him on the 50th anniversary of the award of his flier's license following a flight at the Nassau Boulevard Field, Long Island, on April 13, 1911. He was also to have received a bronze plaque at the Smithsonian Institution within a few weeks as a pioneer aviator.

When he died last Wednesday the Bay City Times published the following account of his career:

Lionel H. (Nello) DeRemer, 73-year-old pioneer Bay City flier, who held the 115th aviator's license issued in the United States, died on his birthday yesterday at 7:15 p.m. in General Hospital.

Mr. DeRemer had been not only a stunt flier but a musician and a jack-of-all-trades around radio station WBCM for 30 years before he retired to help his wife, Annette, with her dancing school.

He was to have been honored with a special "Lionel DeRemer Day" at Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, in April on the 50th anniversary of winning his pilot's license.

A trip to the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C., was also scheduled to present him with a bronze plaque for his pioneering in aviation.

After becoming the 115th licensed pilot in America, he immediately went into stunting and barnstorming at State fairs around the country.

Airplanes were pretty shaky in those days, and once, while flying over New York City, he was forced to land in Central Park. His clippings (he loved scrapbooks) show that he was arrested for investigation in this caper.

He was born in Harrison February 21, 1889. He came to Bay City with his family when he was a year old.

The early-day stunt flyer, who loved to recall aviation hazards, had friends in all strata of society.

As a child, Mr. DeRemer joined his father and brother, who were professional musicians, as a member of the DeRemer orchestra and band, playing for dances and occasional funerals. Later he played with pit orchestras in theaters in Bay City, Saginaw, and Flint.

In early 1910 Mr. DeRemer and George MacBride, his partner in wireless telegraphy experiments, built a single-surface, Curtiss-type biplane which they had purchased in knockdown from a company in St. Louis, Mo. It was powered by a two-cycle Pierce-Budd motor, built at the time in Bay City.

With no previous flying training, Mr. DeRemer took the ship up. It lifted only 20 feet and crashed, in high wind. After attending flying schools in St. Louis and New York, he was granted his pilot's license, No. 115, from the Aero Club of America on April 19, 1912.

Meanwhile, his father had organized a stock company to purchase a secondhand plane for exhibition flying. Mr. DeRemer began flying this model B, Wright biplane at the State fair in Detroit in the fall of 1912.

his most important engagements a flight at the State fair in Detroit in the fall of 1912. He knew the Wright brothers, Orville and Wilbur, who invented the airplane, took lessons from them and flew with them in Dayton, Ohio.

He based his model B plane at a field owned by the North American Chemical Co., then operating here. The field is now known as James Clements Memorial Airport.

In late 1912, Mr. DeRemer went to Corpus Christi, Tex., to become chief instructor for the Mills School of Aviation. He fitted out his plane with pontoons and made the first flight from water takeoff in Texas before a large and curious crowd.

Later he opened an aviation school at Wenona Beach. On the afternoon of August 2, 1914, he was flying his plane from the beach to Bay City when it caught fire over Belinda Street Bridge. He brought the plane down in the Saginaw River safely, but was unable to put out the fire and had to swim to shore. The plane was a complete wreck and never salvaged. The flight was DeRemer's last as a pilot.

After his flying days, Mr. DeRemer went back to music, playing in the pits of Butterfield theaters in Bay City, Saginaw, and Flint.

But in the early 1930's, talking movies put an end to the pit musician.

That's when he went into radio as a musical director. He joined WBCM here in 1928, retiring in August 1958. He was not only a musical director, he also announced programs, reported news, and swept out the studio.

Mr. DeRemer, during his theater days, met many of the great stars of the theater when they came to the Saginaw Valley on tour. He played for the three Barrymores, Ethel, John, and Lionel. He remembers the Shakespearean actors, David Warfield and George Arliss.

Among other lustrous stars he met when they appeared at the Washington Theater here were Chauncey Olcott, Eva Tanguay, Maude Adams and Billie Burke, whom he liked best of them all. She remembered him each time she returned for a Bay City appearance.

Between 1905 and 1917 Mr. DeRemer played in Herbert Milliken's orchestra here: the trumpet for musical comedies, the piano for dramatic shows.

While helping direct the dancing school in recent years, he also played with local musicians at civic functions.

Only several months ago he noted interest in studying "more about electronics, if I only were younger." He said "the space age has caught my imagination."

Mr. DeRemer was a member of the musician's union in Bay City and Saginaw and leaves besides his widow, who lives at 238 North Madison Avenue, a son, Kenneth, of Florida, and a grandchild.

Questionnaire Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, coinciding with the beginning of this session of the Congress, I sent a questionnaire into 89,923 homes in the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Washington to obtain the views of my constituency on various issues before us. By last week, 19,471, or nearly 22 percent, had been completed and returned to me.

I am proud that so many residents of my district are actively participating in governmental affairs in this way, and that thousands of those who replied to the questionnaire also enclosed helpful comments in explanation of their views.

Today I sent a copy of the tabulation to President Kennedy for his information and consideration, and I include the tabulation at this point in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues:

[In percent]

4th Congressional District (12 counties)	Yes	No	No opinion
1. If Red China is seated in the United Nations, should the United States consider withdrawing from the U.N.	40	52	8
2. Should the United States stop shipping strategic goods to Communist countries	90	5	5
3. Do you believe the United States should conduct nuclear tests in the atmosphere	62	23	15
4. In view of increased costs of our expanding military defense, would you support Congress in deferring action on increased expenditures for present or new domestic programs	61	28	11
5. Do you favor the administration's proposed $20,000,000,000 civil defense program to construct community fallout shelters	19	71	10
6. Which method would you favor to solve our post office deficit:			
(a) Increase postal rates for the purpose of maintaining the postal service on a self-supporting basis	68		
(b) Meet increased costs through annual appropriations by the Congress	16		16
7. In regard to Federal aid to education proposals, do you favor—			
(a) Federal funds for teachers' salaries	15	66	19
(b) Federal funds for school construction	35	47	18
(c) An income tax deduction for parents to help meet expenses in sending dependents to college	58	30	12
8. Do you favor compulsory medical care for the aged, tied to the social security fund	37	56	7
9. Do you support the wilderness bill	36	25	39
10. Do you think the Government should build a nationwide federalized power grid	17	60	23
11. Are you in favor of a power intertie between the States of Washington and California	33	45	22
12. In Government farm programs, do you favor:			
(a) Continuation of the present wheat program (10 percent acreage cut, price support at 83½ percent of parity)	8	55	37
(b) Enactment of a wheat marketing program featuring bushel control rather than acreage controls	37	27	36
(c) Expansion of Government control programs to additional farm commodities	5	66	29
(d) Reduction of Government control over agriculture	75	8	17

Give Gas Pipeline the Green Light

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, the Colorado Interstate Gas Co., with headquarters in Colorado Springs, Colo., has proposed an expansion program of great importance to natural gas consumers in my district, as well as other areas. This project was filed in November 1958, and it is still pending before the Federal Power Commission. I wish to include in my remarks an editorial from the Denver Post commenting on the unreasonable delay in approving the plans for this expansion program and expressing the hope that this project will receive early approval.

The editorial follows:

GIVE GAS PIPELINE THE GREEN LIGHT

Three years and 3 months ago Colorado Interstate Gas Co. and El Paso Natural Gas Co. asked the Federal Power Commission to approve plans for a $151-million pipeline expansion program to provide more gas for consumers in eastern Colorado, Cheyenne and southern California.

Today, believe it or not, the application is still awaiting a decision. Hearings on the proposal before an FPC examiner in Washington have not been concluded. Testimony in the case now exceeds 13,000 pages and, as one member of the FPC has ruefully remarked, "the end is nowhere in sight."

Meanwhile, the gas supply situation in this area is very tight and a serious shortage of gas may develop next winter if the project is not approved and built by that time.

Recently some householders in northern Colorado were asked to turn down the thermostats on their gas furnaces to stretch fuel supplies. So far this winter the Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp. has lost 5 days of work at its Pueblo plant. The reason: No gas.

Utilities are supposed to be regulated by the Government in the interest of consumers but in this case the regulatory machinery is moving so slowly that the public could be seriously hurt.

Fortunately, members of the FPC themselves are growing concerned over the snail's pace of the hearings and the stalling tactics being used by a rival company of El Paso Natural Gas. The tactics include efforts to introduce extraneous issues into the testimony.

A few days ago the FPC spoke sharply regarding the need for an early end to the hearings. Whether the hearing examiner will heed this warning remains to be seen.

The $151-million project was approved once by an FPC examiner. It was approved once by the FPC itself. It has been approved by the utilities commission of California.

It is being supported by the utilities commissions of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Utah, Nevada, and Wyoming. It has the approval of the Public Service Co. of Colorado, the largest customer of Colorado Interstate.

Only standouts against the project are the Tennessee Gas Transmission Co., which wants to become a seller of gas in the lucrative California market; the city of Denver and the Colorado Public Utilities Commission.

Denver and the Colorado PUC are no longer actively opposing the project. In 3 years and 3 months they have been unable to show it would not be in the public interest to have it built.

But they have not come out in favor of the project. Their support would simplify the issues before the FPC and, in all probability, would contribute to an early decision on whether to permit construction to start.

It is the position of Denver and the PUC that they would be willing to trade their support of the project for a promise by Colorado Interstate Gas Co. not to seek a gas rate increase before January 1, 1965.

There is nothing wrong with trying to drive that kind of bargain except that it obviously cannot succeed and the longer the city and the PUC hold out in their effort to obtain unattainable terms, the longer the controversy will last.

Colorado Interstate has already promised it will not seek a rate increase before January 1, 1965, because of the new investment it would have in proposed new pipelines. It is unwilling to promise it might not seek a rate increase for some other reason, now unforeseen, such as an increase in wages or taxes.

In 3 years and 3 months the proposed $151 million project has been examined and reexamined by hosts of experts and no valid objection to it has been found.

We believe it should be given a green light by the FPC and that the city of Denver and the Colorado PUC should join in urging its early approval.

Thank You, Mr. and Mrs. Ribicoff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, a great amount of talk has been directed at the control feature of the King-Anderson medical care bill. It is maintained that there is free choice of doctors now but with a foot in the door who can say what will happen? The past is prolog and it points to the fact that once established these programs grow and grow, the restrictions become greater and greater, and the area of individual freedom of choice becomes less and less.

Dr. L. C. Roettig, member of the editorial advisory board of the Academy of Medicine of Columbus, Ohio, and Franklin County, wrote the following interesting letter which appeared in the January 1962 issue of the organization's magazine, Bulletin.

The letter follows:

THANK YOU, MR. AND MRS. RIBICOFF

Columbus was recently treated to one of the finest examples of the split bureaucratic personality that has ever occurred. When we say "split bureaucratic personality" we mean split as far as his attitude toward medicine is concerned. The Columbus papers duly reported on their front pages the trip made by Mrs. Ribicoff, the wife of the Director of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to University Hospital for a nose operation. They gave due recognition to Dr. Saunders for developing the type of operation which she came to have performed. Later they also reported on the front page that her husband, Mr. Abraham Ribicoff, had returned to Columbus for a complete physical checkup, having been favorably impressed by our health center at the time when he visited his wife while she was a patient here.

The point that the newspapers, however, did not make and did not call to the attention of the public was that here was a perfect example of a highly placed Government bureaucrat who avowedly would like to shackle the American public with a gradually increasing form of socialized medicine, doing exactly the thing that would be impossible if his system of medicine were eventually fastened upon the American public. Mr. and Mrs. Ribicoff used to the fullest extent the right of freedom of choice of physicians, coming to Columbus to the doctor whom they felt was best qualified to take care of their physical disabilities. If Mr. Ribicoff's proposed Government control of medicine should ever come about, this free choice of physician would be eventually denied to everyone except perhaps the bureaucrats controlling the program.

The Ribicoff's visit to Columbus is comparable to the example which Mr. Walter Reuther set when he had his last hospitalization. Mr. Reuther, as is well known, chose to go to Henry Ford Hospital in Detroit to receive his care instead of the Metropolitan Hospital where his union members have to go in order to take advantage of the UAW's prepaid medical care plan.

Both examples should be given more widespread public display and we should, indeed, thank Mr. and Mrs. Ribicoff for demonstrating so beautifully one of the strongest points of our American system of medicine—free choice of physicians.

L.C.R.

National Brotherhood Week and the Volunteer Hospital Worker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, last week as we observed National Brotherhood Week, I was reminded of the following lines:

Of a truth, men are mystically united: A mysterious bond of brotherhood makes all men one.—Thomas Carlyle, "Essays: Goethe's Works."

Anyone wtih a passing acquaintance with history or a nodding familiarity with the national and international events of his own lifetime would tend to doubt that mankind has achieved a mystical unity or a mysterious bond of brotherhood that makes all men one. We are facing in our own time the most malevolent threat yet concocted by the mind of man: nuclear war. It is the purpose of National Brotherhood Week to remind us that the idea of brotherhood is not an impractical dream or a visionary's fantasy. In proportion as the strains, and, indeed, the terrors, of living increase, so faith in mankind and the desire for peaceful community become more urgent. Brotherhood suggests the way in which an individual can unite these two ideals; through faith in man peaceful community can be achieved.

True faith in man, however, is not blind optimism.

No one can be perfectly free—

Spencer remarked—

till all are free; no one can be perfectly moral till all are moral; no one can be perfectly happy till all are happy.

That man can achieve freedom, morality, and happiness is our humanitarian faith.

Brotherhood Week serves to remind each of us that we have an obligation to each other. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested to hear how one of my constituents, Arthur Murray Aibinder, is serving his fellow men. Mr. Aibinder recently wrote to me about his service as a volunteer hospital worker. I should like my colleagues to read some of his thoughts. Mr. Aibinder writes:

During visiting hours the ward might be crowded with parents, friends, and relatives. However, little Johnny has no one at his bedside. It is not being overly dramatic to say that little Johnny is crying for he frequently does at such times. A volunteer approaches John's bedside, talks to him, and engages him in a game of checkers. In a short time Johnny is smiling and delighted to have won the game.

A patient who has just been admitted can be comforted by a visit from the volunteer prior to and following visits from the professional staff.

Engaging a ward of youngsters in a game of Twenty Questions, or playing a game of Monopoly or Sorry with a smaller group is very entertaining. Above all, the hospital volunteer must have a natural feeling of compassion for his fellow human beings which is conveyed to the patient.

Recently while visiting an adult service to learn if there are any other teenage patients, I was asked to visit an adult. We discussed "things in general" for over an hour, and our conversations have lasted just as long during following visits to the hospital.

Patients—young and old—need a friend, people who really care.

Financially, the volunteer receives nothing, spiritually, he becomes a millionaire.

There are many other aspects of volunteer work. Helping the nurses to distribute refreshments, translating patient-staff conversations, clinic clerical work, and reception to name a few.

I have only discussed in detail the aspects of volunteer work in which I actively participate.

It should be brought to light that whether a volunteer is putting pills in boxes or in actual conversation with the patients on the ward he is contributing a valuable service.

Mr. Speaker, the volunteer hospital worker exemplifies the spirit of Brotherhood Week.

Promise of the New Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article which appeared in the Monroe (Mich.) Evening News, February 14, 1962:

PROMISE OF THE NEW FRONTIER

Pointing to such close economic and social advisers as Arthur Schlesinger, Walter Heller, W. W. Rostow and Chester Bowles, there are some who are prone to suggest that many of the Kennedy administration policies are characteristic of a premeditated trend in economics something akin to that practiced in Sweden. Such a socialistic economic system has been called controlled capitalism or capitalism-socialism. In such a situation, industry is held in private hands while such matters as national economic planning are subject to manipulation by the government through such devices as wage, price and profit controls.

A recent issue of U.S. News & World Report contemplates the possibility of such a trend in the United States under the Kennedy administration. According to the article, a planned economy in the United States would come about by giving the President many powers he does not now possess. Supervision over wages, prices and costs would be widened. The article also noted that one of the Kennedy planners has said that if the Central Government should be given more power over the economy, our gross national production could be increased by $100 billion.

It may be that the farm program that has been proposed is an advance prospectus. Similar to the gaundy junk mail we all get, the program contains a picture of brilliant colors of what is offered, higher prices for farmers, a cut of $5 billion in the cost of the present farm program reducing the load on taxpayers, a heavier cut in croplands, with some farms near cities converted into recreation areas for townfolks.

But like the junk mail offering, the price is carefully concealed until the last. It is the turning over to Government of greater control over the farmer and his operation. In reality it looks as if it would give the farmer two choices: Accept growing Government control or face ruinous prices with subsidies suddenly knocked out to be further aggravated by the Government's dumping of surpluses on the market.

Faced with two such alternatives, there is little doubt which way most farmers would go. How far the administration plans to go in the same direction in other parts of the economic field, we will have to wait and see.

Man's Finest Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, today Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., received the formal tribute our Nation and the Congress pays its greatest heroes.

His victory in space marks a milestone of progress by the United States and joins Colonel Glenn with our heroes of the past who have dedicated their lives to achievements which have perpetuated this country.

It is impossible at this time to realize the historical impact of this success that will only become fully evident as the generations pass.

As Americans, we can be truly proud of the forthright manner in which we have gone about this mission into space and the emphasis which has been placed on the importance of the individual under our form of government.

An excellent editorial by Mr. David Lawrence, entitled "Man's Finest Hour" in the March 5, 1962, issue of U.S. News & World Report, I am sure mirrors the thought of the Nation and should be preserved in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in recognition of this momentous event.

The editorial follows:

MAN'S FINEST HOUR

(By David Lawrence)

Millions of people throughout the United States and millions overseas joined in spontaneous prayer as they awaited for the fateful word that Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., had descended safely after circling the earth three times on Tuesday, February 20, 1962.

The event was historic, not merely because of the conquest of space by an American astronaut, but because of the worldwide manifestation of an impulse that came from the hearts of millions of human beings everywhere. It was probably the most universal expression of the spiritual feeling of mankind that we have witnessed in our time.

Both television and radio brought the word to Americans, but overseas—where they had only radio contact—there was equal excitement. When in history have so many persons been united in fascinated wonder and, indeed, in such common anxiety, lest a single human being lose his life?

Any one of the multiple gadgets in the mechanism could have failed. The man, tightly positioned in the capsule—from which it would have been impossible for him to have emerged through his own efforts—spoke often over the radio as he traveled around the earth three times in 5 hours. Somehow, there was a feeling that this part of the journey would probably come out all right, because unmanned vehicles had often accomplished it. But what of the descent?

As the people listened for word from the astronaut, they became apprehensive. They waited in grim silence. Neither the television cameras nor the recording instruments could as yet tell the world what it most wanted to know. For 45 minutes there was suspense. People asked each other: How long a time must elapse during the descent, and, after the capsule touched the water, how long before it could be recovered?

Wherever people were watching or listening—in public places, railroad stations, stores, factories, business offices, and schools, as well as in countless homes—tens of millions of men and women began at that time their spontaneous prayers. They prayed that this selfless man might be spared. They prayed that the service he had endeavored to render to his country would not end in tragedy. They listened hopefully and fearfully. They gave thanks when word finally came that the capsule had been taken aboard a standby vessel of the U.S. Navy and that Colonel Glenn had actually emerged safe and sound.

In those few minutes, more people prayed together for the same objective than at any time in history. Humanity gave vent to its most noble instinct—its common sympathy and its deep faith in that divine power which the finite mind cannot see but can truly feel.

What a lesson this episode teaches! What a message it relays to us in this age of atomic weapons and fallout shelters!

Even Nikita Khrushchev—archfoe of democracy and the man who symbolizes atheism itself—caught some of the meaning of this strange and unprecedented occurrence. For, while the Soviets claim that two of their astronauts circled the earth last year, neither our Government officials nor the scientists of the free world have received to this day all of the scientific information so necessary to establish the proof of those claims. President Kennedy, at his press conference a few days ago, noted the continuance of this secrecy—in contrast to our open society.

But the head of the Soviet Government realized as soon as Colonel Glenn's mission was successful that there was an opportunity to bring Russia into the orbit of worldwide publicity, too. He proposed that America join with the Soviet Government to explore outer space by cooperative endeavors. Whether his suggestion will ever come to fruition is uncertain. For the Moscow regime has made pious recommendations like this before in disarmament conferences and in the United Nations General Assembly, but the Soviets have wiggled out of their promises when the end seemed to justify the means.

President Kennedy, however, rightly took at face value the Soviet Premier's statement and promptly urged that conferences be begun to put it into effect. It was reasoned that nothing would be lost and something might be gained by the further exchange of views on how outer space can be utilized in the cause of world peace, and not just to seek advantages in the cold war.

Will another miracle happen? Could the spiritual emotion that swept the world as Colonel Glenn was descending to the earth be extended to reach the hearts and minds of the millions of persons behind the Iron Curtain? For by their concerted will they can transform a world beset with fears of self-destruction into a brotherhood of peace.

Miracles do happen when the world shows its humility in prayer. The voices that besought Almighty God to save the life of Colonel Glenn can speak again, as even more of us petition Him to save humanity from nuclear war. For those prolonged minutes of prayer on Tuesday, February 20, constituted man's finest hour.

Committee Staffs Are One-Sided

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, because of its general interest to the Members I should like to include with my remarks an article in today's Washington Post by Roscoe Drummond, entitled "Committee Staffs Are One-Sided":

COMMITTEE STAFFS ARE ONE-SIDED

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Bear in mind that during the next few months the Congress of the United States will:

1. Make a series of crucial decisions affecting the fate and future of the Nation, including a trade policy which will shape our economy for many years.

2. Conduct at least 35 congressional investigations into such matters as tax reform and evidence of graft in the Federal highway program.

And still the Republican Members of Congress are being denied—partly by their own default and connivance and partly by the bald powerplay of the Democratic majority—the one instrument needed to do their job.

I refer to the woefully inadequate, enfeebled, and puny minority party representation on the professional staff of the policymaking and investigative committees of the House and the Senate.

True, it is the Members of Congress who appear to make the decisions, and who in a sense do make the decisions. But it is the professional committee staffs—the experts, the technicians, the research scholars, and the investigators—who constitute a power of initiative behind the committees. They shape the reports which shape the decisions and, when properly balanced between the two parties, help produce alternative courses of policy.

What has happened?

An official Republican policy committee document shows there is not a single staff expert responsible to the minority party on 10 critical House committees.

On many of the others the minority representation is either so sparse or so incompetent that they are overwhelmed by the sheer numbers of the Demorcatic appointees.

In the House the Demorcatic Party has a 3 to 2 majority. The professional staffs of the House committees are 14 to 1 Democratic.

It wasn't this way during the first 2 years of the Eisenhower administration when the Republicans had control of the House and Senate.

The present imbalance in committee staffing began in 1955 and has been getting more lopsided ever since.

Why has it happened?

Because the leadership of the Republican Party in Congress has not stood up and fought for its rights.

Because the rank-and-file members of the Republican Party in Congress have not stood up and insisted that the party leadership fight for their rights.

Because some highly placed Republican members of the committees have preferred accepting a few personal prerequisites from the majority chairmen to making a determined, even unpleasant, demand for reform.

Republican National Committee Chairman Representative WILLIAM MILLER of New York, knows what needs to be done and wants to do it. But he has thrown up his hands hopelessly in the futile effort to enject enough gumption into his party to do something.

Recently two respected Senators, CARL CURTIS, of Nebraska, and KENNETH KEATING, of New York, offered an amendment to a bill which would have made a miniscule beginning toward reform—1 Republican staff expert to 10 Democratic staff experts. The Democrats instantly rallied to defeat it on a straight party vote.

This is a scandal of national proportions. It goes to the very vitals of our two-party system of government. If the Republicans don't do whatever is necessary to win this battle (by rallying to the Curtis initiative and fighting for reform in their own committees) they deserve to continue to lose elections—and will.

ADA Recommendations for Republican Party in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party in California has been given a five point program by Mr. Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., vice chairman of Americans for Democratic Action and Democratic national committeeman from the District of Columbia. Evidently, he has done this in an attempt to portray the ADA as nonpartisan.

I totally disagree with Mr. Rauh's program. As a man who has dedicated himself to the collectivist cause, he hardly qualifies as an authority on Republican Party affairs. However, I think Members of Congress should be familiar with his program, since it manifests the ADA goal of persuading the Republican Party to embrace the collectivist ideology.

Mr. Rauh outlined his program in an interview which he gave to the Los Angeles Times on January 26, 1962. The following day the interview was reported in the Times. I include, under unanimous consent, the report in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CONSERVATIVES URGED TO REPUDIATE RADICAL RIGHT

(By Richard Bergholz)

A leader of liberalism has some advice for conservatives: "Repudiate the destructive right, just as liberals repudiated the Communists long ago."

Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., of Washington, D.C., former national chairman and now vice chairman of Americans for Democratic Actions, came here Friday to help initiate a drive to form a California State council of the organization.

At a Biltmore news conference, Rauh said:

1. Republican leadership should "disassociate itself utterly and irrevocably from the radical right."

2. Richard Nixon, former Vice President and now a candidate for Governor, should "stop slapping the John Birch Society on the wrist and repudiate it once and for all."

RECANT COMPLIMENTS

3. Former Senator William Knowland, now an Oakland newspaper publisher, should "recant his compliments to Dr. Fred Schwarz (organizer of the Christian Anti-Communist Crusade)."

4. Representative ROBERT WILSON of Chula Vista, chairman of the national Republican Congressional Campaign Committee, should "cease his courtship of the radical right."

5. California Republican voters should "ride out of the party such Birchite spokesmen as Lloyd Wright, Joe Shell, Representatives John Rousselot and Edgar Hiestand." Wright is running for U.S. Senator, Shell for Governor, and the two Congressmen for reelection.

Rauh, who said his organization has about 45,000 members nationally, argued that "the time has come for conservatives to realize that they have no more business with the radical right than liberals have with the Communists."

The ADA leader, a Washington attorney, said he thinks California needs the proposed expansion of the ADA movement because "seldom, if ever, has this State more needed a platform from which the issues of survival and freedom can be discussed with hard reality."

It isn't getting that kind of discussion now, he added. What it's getting is "ghoulish nonsense, from one end of the State to the other."

The ADA, which already has a 1,000-member chapter in northern California headed by Edward Eichler, of Atherton, will not recruit or endorse political candidates, Rauh said.

RESULTS COMPARISON

Nor will it necessarily compete with the California Democratic Council, a statewide organization of party volunteers and which he said was part of the official party organization.

Rauh said: "I reject and resent the comparison that ADA is to the Democrats what the John Birch Society is to the Republicans."

ADA believes in democratic processes and operates openly, whereas the John Birch Society "doesn't believe in democracy and operates secretly," he said.

Eichler said his organization plans a foreign policy conference here April 4–6 as the first public event in the organizing effort.

Prepare for Citizenship, Michigan Teenager Urges Companions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, although not old enough to vote under the laws of their respective States, there is growing interest in government on the part of our teenage citizens. This is a very encouraging sign, particularly in view of the alarmingly small number of today's citizens going to the polls on election day in comparison with the number of eligible voters.

Miss Denise Brooks, one of the junior citizens of my District, recently made a speech at Government Day ceremonies at the Osceola County Courthouse in Reed City, Mich., in which she called upon other teenagers to prepare now to accept their responsibilities as citizens.

The speech by Miss Brooks, who is a student at the Evart, Mich., High School, was given special recognition and this included its printing in full in the Michigan Courthouse Review and other newspapers.

I believe Miss Brooks is to be congratulated on her presentation and if admonition is heeded by this generation of teenagers, our country's future will be in good hands.

Miss Brooks' speech follows:

DUTIES OF THE NONVOTERS IN TODAY'S GOVERNMENT

Government is one of the major factors in our lives today. From the cradle to the grave, we will come in contact with it, directly or indirectly. Soon, we will all become leaders of one kind or another, whether it be in the State, community or in the family. Whatever, we must be special leaders, extremely efficient in stimulating others and calling forth desired responses from them. Whatever our faults now, we must develop into tough, energetic, inventive and resourceful people. Certainly you will agree with me in thinking that soft-muscled descendants of those who tamed and settled this great Nation could never appreciate the sweat that lubricated the process. We must start now to prepare ourselves for this great responsibility. Here are some of the problems we may likely have to face:

Apathetic Americans who need to be awakened to the hand they have in democracy. They must not continue to let it wither in their hands through disuse. The outrageous stay at home vote, for instance, runs to 50 percent and higher in many of our national elections. This compares very unfavorably with the records of certain other democratic countries. We often find our own families being guilty of this misuse of freedom's precious rights. Americans do not take their politics seriously enough. We

are much more apt to give our time to talents, hobbies or social life rather than reading about important issues or persons or events of our time.

It is so easy to say, especially at election time, "Gee, just think, in 2 or 3 years, I'll be voting. This year's issues aren't important to me now, I can't vote anyway. I'll just wait 'til I can and catch up on them then." True, it sounds logical that if you can't have a say in something, why waste the time studying up on it? Here is one reason. We must be critical thinkers. In voting, especially, it is very easy to accept, without logically thinking through, a lot of the so-called bait that is handed out by some of our national leaders. Therefore, is it not also logical that the earlier we start exercising our critical thinking in such phases as this, the more expert we will be in 2 or 3 years? Think about it.

We have another duty. That is to begin now and do everything we can to wipe out some of the many plagues of democracy. By this I mean, racial prejudice, penetrating propaganda, juvenile delinquency and crime. We must destroy such words as "wop," "Red," "Jap," "Chink," and "nigger." Each time one of these ugly words is used, it is as though a knife is being thrust into the side of a fellow American, and a new hatred to the American way of life is being established.

Now, you will ask me, "Just how shall we go about reforming these twisted attitudes and actions that are growing stronger each day?" And I will answer. "There is no one way to do it. No pattern to follow. No one solution." That is what makes our part as the youth of America so important. No two people are alike and no two communities are alike. Therefore, our job is to get together. Nobody can do a job like this alone. Find the plague in your community or town, arrange your plan or pattern of action and by using any suitable method you can, do not let up until you have done all you can to destroy it. It is your responsibility.

In conclusion, I would say that we as teenagers, have all the strength and character that is necessary to do a job well worthy of praise. We need now only to realize the greatness of our country and everything it stands for. Once this is done, there will be a patriotism instilled within everyone of us that will be great enough to drive us forward to do whatever is expected of us.

The Ham Humbug

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Daily News editorial column on February 13, carried this review of the "imitation" ham controversy. It points up the capricious manner in which Secretary Freeman attempted to interfere in ham marketing:

COURT NAILS THE HAM HUMBUG

Some weeks ago we called attention to a bit of arrant demagoguery on the part of Agriculture Secretary Freeman. He had issued an order requiring meatpackers to label as "imitation hams" any weighing more when marketed than they did before curing.

We are pleased to note that the U.S. Court of Appeals in Washington agrees with our reasoning. In deciding an appeal brought by Armour & Co. the court called Secretary Freeman's order "capricious and arbitrary on its face." "The regulation," said the court, "would have required packers, by this distortion, to violate the statute which forbids misbranding by labeling a genuine ham as an 'imitation.' ".

This case will be no help to the effort of the Kennedy administration to erase the conviction, so strong in many quarters, that it is antibusiness. The order on "watered hams" ran counter to the position of career experts in the Agriculture Department, and was in fact a political pandering to the commotion created by a consumer's magazine which alleged that the packers were selling water at ham prices.

The facts are that modern methods of curing employ a process of pickling in a water solution, instead of smoking and salting. Some fluid remains in the ham, but retailers testified that this has been reflected in lower prices per pound.

Packers not in interstate commerce were not affected by Secretary Freeman's order. They could continue to sell "watered hams" without misbranding them "imitation." This is the sort of strong competition that is the best insurance that the public will not be overcharged.

Quite a lot of Secretary Freeman's behavior indicates that he does not have much confidence in the operation of this free enterprise system. It goes far beyond his effort to tell housewives that the moist hams they have come to prefer were not really hams. He was influential in the creation of the program which President Kennedy sent to Congress providing for tighter controls over production to qualify for price supports.

In one case, at least, the courts have stopped the "arbitrary and capricious" use of power. The farmers themselves will have to refuse Treasury checks offered them at the price of accepting a halter.

Johnson City Is Proud of Commander Exum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUISE G. REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mrs. REECE. Mr. Speaker, the First District of Tennessee as a whole, and my hometown of Johnson City, is particularly proud that to one of its local boys and my late husband, Carroll Reece's midshipman, Lt. Comdr. John D. Exum, of the U.S.S. *Noa*, should have gone the honor of retrieving the space capsule ridden by Lt. Col. John H. Glenn.

Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Johnson City Press concerning this most happy occasion:

JOHNSON CITY IS PROUD OF COMMANDER EXUM

Nearly every news story is local, including one of such worldwide significance as the orbital flight of Col. John Glenn.

Here in Johnson City, we are swelling with pride because a hometown boy, John D. Exum, was in command of the destroyer *Noa* which pulled Colonel Glenn from the sea.

Our cartoonist, Jim Counts, polarized popular sentiment with his drawing of Commander Exum reaching over the side of the *Noa* with a net and fishing Colonel Glenn's capsule abroad. It didn't happen just that way, of course, but no matter.

Johnson Citians feel that they have had a very direct and personal connection with a great event in history—as indeed they have.

As for Commander Exum, he was merely doing a job and wouldn't want any fuss made over him. He is like his mother, Mrs. T. F. Exum, who was helping a customer in a downtown store where she works, when the radio described her son's role in the unfolding drama. Modestly, Mrs. Exum drew back from the spotlight and declined to pose for a newspaper photo.

But many of the rest of us have shown no such reluctance. We have been busy recalling that we went to school with Commander John, played basketball with him, or knew him when he was a mere stripling back in grammar school.

And why not? It's good for us, and it's good for Johnson City. We would be a sorry lot if we were not proud when one of our own turns out to be at the right place at the right time—especially at a place and time like last Tuesday.

So the Press-Chronicle offers this additional salute to Commander Exum, whom the late Representative B. Carroll Reece appointed to the U.S. Naval Academy in the 1940's because he seemed the right sort and had dreamed of a naval career since high school days. He has fulfilled all expectations in a most admirable way. We extend to him and to his wife, the former Mildred Lee, and their two children, best wishes for the future.

Should the United Nations Survive?—Address of Hon. James F. Byrnes, of South Carolina, in Jackson, Miss., February 6, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, no one in America today is better qualified to appraise the effectiveness of the United Nations in attempting to preserve peace than Hon. James F. Byrnes, of South Carolina.

On February 6, 1962, in an address before the Jackson, Miss., Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Byrnes brought to light many of the shortcomings of the United Nations, and raises some very serious questions about its recent actions.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the text of Mr. Byrnes' speech.

SHOULD THE UNITED NATIONS SURVIVE?

(Address by James F. Byrnes, at Jackson, Miss., February 6, 1962)

Since last December many Americans have asked the question, "Can the United Nations survive?" In recent days an increasing number are asking, "Should the United Nations survive?"

To understand the reasons for the questions one must revert to the situation existing in the closing days of World War II. Many people, weary of war with its sufferings and sorrow, prayed for a cease-fire, and also wanted to establish an organization for the peaceful settlement of future international disputes.

No one of the world leaders was more devoted to this ideal than President Roosevelt. Wisely, he urged even before the outcome of the war was clearly established, that work

should be started upon the establishment of such a peace organization. He believed that as the casualty lists were daily published in all the countries participating in that conflict, there would be greater support for such an organization.

As early as February 1945, at Yalta, the President urged the adoption of a resolution providing for a peace conference to be held at San Francisco in the spring of that year.

I was then Director of War Mobilization and accompanied the President to the Yalta Conference. I found that he was more interested in the establishment of the United Nations than in any other item on the agenda. He had the support of Churchill. No enthusiasm was shown by Stalin for the project, though he expressed no opposition. Dedicated as the Soviets were to controlling the world, he simply was not interested in a peace organization. As further evidence of his indifference, when the Conference finally was scheduled to meet in San Francisco, he advised the President that his foreign minister, Mr. Molotov, would be unable to attend as he was greatly overworked.

President Roosevelt promptly sent a message pleading with him to reverse his decision. He told Stalin that if a great power like the Soviet Republic should fail to send its foreign minister to the meeting, it would create the impression that the Soviets lacked interest in the organization. Stalin persisted in his refusal.

A few days later in April 1945, President Roosevelt died. Only then did Stalin send a message to President Truman that in view of the unfortunate situation throughout the world created by the sudden death of Mr. Roosevelt, he would reverse his decision and send Molotov to San Francisco.

I recall also that at Yalta when the U.N. resolution originally was considered, Stalin asked that the Ukraine and Byelorussia be invited to become members of the organization. They were not independent states and it simply meant giving Russia three votes, but neither Churchill nor President Roosevelt raised an objection to the request. That evening, after the session, when I expressed to the President the opinion that giving Russia three votes in the Assembly, when we had but one, was a mistake, he told me that he feared if he objected, it might endanger the adoption of the resolution by the Soviets. His theory, too, was that the Security Council would dominate the organization and it would do no great harm if the Soviets did have three votes in the Assembly, which he visualized merely as a forum for debate.

When I continued to protest, the President suggested that I take the matter up with both Churchill and Stalin. When I talked with Churchill, he said as the Soviets would have three votes, he was heartily in favor of the United States having three. I had to return to Washington the following day and the President said he would talk to Stalin about it. A few days later the President sent me a message that Stalin promptly agreed that we should have an equal number of votes in the Assembly.

A few weeks later President Roosevelt died and I left the Government service. At San Francisco our delegates and the representatives of the State Department, for some reason which I never knew, decided not to ask for the three votes.

In urging that we have three votes, I did not anticipate the situation now existing in the Assembly where the free world is outnumbered, but I simply was opposed to the Soviets having three votes to our one.

Under the charter, a member of the Security Council can veto any important action of that body. The Soviets have used the veto 100 times and greatly lessened the influence of the Security Council. Representatives of the free world were forced to make the General Assembly the effective agency of the U.N.

In 1950 Dean Acheson, then Secretary of State, succeeded in having adopted a resolution incorporating the principle that whenever there was a breach of the peace, the Assembly by a two-thirds vote could override a veto of a member of the Security Council. Under this authority, the U.N. has performed a very useful service on several occasions.

The United Nations of today is not the organization we sponsored in 1945. Originally, it was composed of states that had declared war against the Axis Powers. At the time of creation there were only 50 member states. Gradually the number has been increased until today it is more than doubled.

Of the 104 members, 34 are Afro-Asian States. Most of these were established within the last few years, and few of them have had any preparation for patricipation in the solemn decisions of world affairs. Each new African State, regardless of how small its population, has a vote in the Assembly equal to that of the United States.

The United Nations is changed not only in its membership, but in its purposes. The charter, in the first chapter, declares, "The purpose of the organization is to maintain international peace and security."

Because this is its primary purpose, thoughtful people of the world were shocked last December when Prime Minister Nehru, of India, who for years has posed as the apostle of peace, caused his government to invade Portugal's Goa, and by force of arms conquered this little province. By his action he earned an award for superlative hypocrisy.

It is despicable that while preaching peace, Nehru was planning, in violation of India's solemn obligation to the United Nations, to take by force from Portugal territory which had been hers for more than 450 years.

If there was any plausible excuse for his statement that he was merely liberating territory taken from India only a few years after Columbus discovered America, then with equal plausibility, we could expect the American Indians to claim possession of the United States taken from them 400 years ago.

It must be said that Nehru's representative was frank in his defiant statement to the Council, that India would have her way, "charter or no charter, Council or no Council."

When it was sought to have the U.N. condemn this outrageous aggression by the hypocritical Nehru, the Soviets vetoed the resolution of condemnation in the Security Council. When our Ambassador, Mr. Stevenson, considered submitting the question to the General Assembly to override the veto, he found he could obtain only about 35 votes when he would need twice that number.

The action of the United Nations in failing to even condemn this aggression by India now provokes the question in the minds of Americans: "Has the organization become useless?"

If the U.S. Ambassador could not find encouragement even to submit to the Assembly a request to carry out the primary purpose of the organization, "to maintain international peace and security," then what excuse is there for the U.N.?

The primary purpose of the United Nations is ignored by the Afro-Asian governments now dominating the U.N. They think its primary purpose is to secure the independence of colonials. They accept as gospel the language of a resolution adopted by the General Assembly last December, declaring that "inadequacy of political, economic, social, or educational preparedness should never serve as a pretext for delaying independence."

The independence of an African tribe incapable of maintaining a stable government, ordinarily would not have serious consequences to other governments, but where such a group of people establishing a state, are admitted to the United Nations and its vote offsets the vote of responsible governments, it does affect other peoples.

And we cannot be proud of the role played by the United States under the new conditions. Last year a resolution was introduced in the U.N. by Liberia calling for an inquiry into conditions in Angola. The resolution charged that innocent, helpless Negroes were being exploited by cruel whites. Of course, the Soviets voted for it because Portugal is anti-Communist. But why did the United States vote for it?

Portugal is a member of NATO. It supported the allies in World War II and has furnished us with airbases. There was no reliable evidence of crimes committed by the white people in Angola. Much of the alleged disorder is attributed to terrorists of the nearby Congo, inspired by Communists.

However, the United States has continued to support the Soviet Union and the Afro-Asian states against our ally, Portugal. Arthur Krock, able columnist of the New York Times, is quoted as calling the resolution supported by us a form of lynch law. It does seem that in this and some other cases we have recently deserted our friends for our foes.

There is also a very dangerous trend in the policy of the organization. The charter specifically provides in article II of chapter I, paragraph 7, "Nothing contained in the present charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the members to submit such matters to settlement under the present charter * * *."

At the time the United States ratified the charter, there were in the U.S. Congress many men who favored it because of this language, but now the new coalition of the Afro-Asians and Soviets seems determined to intervene in the domestic affairs of the governments of the free world.

In South Africa where the white inhabitants have been consistently anti-Communist and pro-American, the government's position as to segregation aroused the antagonism of the Afro-Asian bloc and they sponsored a resolution which was adopted, denouncing the Government of South Africa for its attitude on the race question. It was supported by the United States.

If the group now in control of the United Nations causes the organization to intervene in the internal affairs of South Africa, what is there to prevent the same group from causing the United Nations to denounce the State of Mississippi for arresting the freedom riders?

The United Nations has another problem—it faces bankruptcy. Since its establishment, the United States has paid approximately 40 percent of all its expenses. The deficit of approximately $160 million is due to money spent for the purpose of making war in the Congo and the Gaza strip, and assessments for these expenditures have not been paid by many members. Of this deficit, the Soviets and their satellites owe approximately $50 million.

To pay this deficit and continue the war against Katanga, the United Nations has issued $200 million of bonds and asks that the United States buy one-half of them.

These bonds will pay 2 percent interest. Today the United States is paying 4 percent for money it borrows. President Kennedy recommends the investment and says, "It is sound for the United Nations and its members." It may be sound for the United Nations, but it is not sound for the United States.

France refused to put one cent in the bonds. Britain refused at first but was persuaded by us to make a token purchase. It promised to buy $12 million by the end of the year. No other government will buy these bonds. Britain's postponement until the end of the year probably means the United States will pay the entire cost of the war in the Congo.

The President, after telling the Congress this was a sound plan said: "These bonds will be repaid with interest at the rate of approximately $10 million a year, as part of the regular assessment. Every nation—including the Soviet Union—will thus be required to pay its fair share or lose its vote."

The President was misinformed in this. Article 19 of the charter provides—

"A member of the United Nations which is in arrears in its payment of its financial contribution to the Organization shall have no vote in the General Assembly if the amount of its arrears equals or exceeds the amount of the contributions due from it for the preceding 2 full years. The General Assembly may, nevertheless, permit such a member to vote if it is satisfied that the failure to pay is due to conditions beyond the control of the member."

That does not say that a special assessment to conduct a war shall be included in the normal budget.

In December the U.N. submitted to the International Court this question as to whether expenses such as those incurred in the Gaza strip affair and in the Congo war could be charged to the normal budget. That question has not been answered. It is clear that if the special assessment cannot be charged to the normal budget, no state will lose its vote by failure to pay.

Even if the International Court decides that these war expenditures can be charged to the normal budget, the Soviet Union and other governments having refused to contribute to the war in the Congo will refuse to pay any assessment for that war. The Afro-Asian bloc having no money and being entirely willing to let the United States pay all expenses of the U.N., will not buy any bonds. Practically all states having refused to pay, they certainly will not vote to deny the Soviet Union the right to vote because of nonpayment.

I hope the people will ask the Senator and Congressman who favor purchasing the bonds, whether he would purchase a thousand dollar bond with his personal money. If he would not, certainly he should not vote to spend the tax money of the people to make such an investment.

If Congress should vote against purchasing the bonds, the U.N. officials can then offer the bonds for sale to investment bankers of the world. I doubt they can sell them, but at least an opportunity to purchase will be given to those who favor making war against Katanga, instead of forcing our taxpayers to finance something to which they are opposed.

The problems now confronting the U.N. make it wise for us to take stock of our position. The United Nations is not what it was or what it was intended to be. The increase of membership from 50 to 104 has made it possible for the Afro-Asian bloc, plus the Soviet bloc, to dominate it. From experience, we know that the Soviet bloc is not interested in the maintenance of international peace. It is the greatest threat to peace. Peace is not the primary purpose of the Afro-Asian states. They are inspired by their hatred of the so-called colonial powers, like Britain, France, Portugal, Belgium, and the Netherlands, who are our friends. If to win the support of the various African tribes, now established as states, we constantly antagonize our proven friends, we cannot expect their continued friendship.

We cannot expect all of our allies to conduct their internal affairs as we think they should. The difficulties we experience in successfully handling our own domestic problems should cause us to realize we cannot solve all the problems of all the peoples of the world.

We must realize that the United Nations cannot prevent a war between major powers; that its chief contribution to the cause of peace is as a forum of debate which may clarify international issues.

If the organization is to die, or if we are to withdraw from it, the world will not come to an end. If it is to survive and we are to continue our membership, we must emphasize the provision of the charter that prohibits the United Nations from interferring in domestic affairs of a state.

We must place less reliance upon the United Nations and more reliance upon NATO and other regional organizations of our allies pledged to the preservation of the independence of free peoples.

We must put first things first. As long as there exists the threat of the Soviets to dominate the world, we must postpone expenditures for projects that may be desirable but are not urgent, and devote our money, our time and our talents to increasing our military strength so as to insure our freedom.

The Gallup Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include three articles by Mr. George Todt, columnist for the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner which has a million circulation. These articles deal with the Gallup poll.

I have long been of the opinion that Dr. George Gallup attempts to be an opinionmaker rather than an opinion finder. His polls dealing with an election are always objective, and he takes every precaution to be accurate for the very simple reason that an election following these polls will indicate his accuracy. Having then proved the accuracy of his polls, he has a valuable service to sell to anyone wanting to use his polls to prove an ideological point, knowing of course that there is no following election to show how wrong he is.

As an example, if I wanted statistics to prove that the general public disapproved of foreign aid by 10 to 1, I would send my pollsters into certain areas of my district and could come up with the answers I wanted. The same is true of any economic or ideological question. I could ask some apparently innocent questions to determine the thinking of the individual whom I intend to interview. Having determined that he is generally favorable to my desired result, I would poll him. If not, I would skip him over. This is not objective poll taking.

The psychological effect of a poll taken by Dr. Gallup is quite impressive with the reading public as no one wants to be an odd ball but prefers to be numbered among the majority. The question of right or wrong seldom enters into his thinking. His conclusion is generally wrong because either the major or minor premise of the theorem is wrong.

The articles follow:

HAS THE U.N. FAILED?

(By George Todt)

"It is not every question that deserves an answer."—SYRUS.

"The Gallup poll is neither an idol nor a sacred cow insofar as I am concerned," Congressman JAMES B. UTT, of neighboring Santa Ana, told me recently.

"When it purports to show that 89 percent of the American people think the United Nations Organization has done a wonderful job—well, Mr. Gallup must not have sent any of his 1,648 questionnaires to people in my district."

The fiery little Congressman is one who has a bill presently in Congress to take the United Nations out of the United States—and the United States out of the United Nations.

U.N. CONTROLS US

Before aficionados of the U.N. cry out in mortal hurt, permit me to point out that this bill—considering the ideological makeup and complexion of both Congress and the administration—is going exactly nowhere in this session of Congress.

But it does point up, regardless of Mr. Gallup's bland assertions to the contrary, that the U.N. does not have the complete confidence of a large segment of the American people.

Let's stop kidding ourselves.

The operating personnel of the U.N. is 40-percent Communist and votes Red en masse. Some of the neutral nations play ball in the same camp, despite our bribes known as foreign aid.

The U.N. handling of war in Korea, Congo, and India has done much to raise doubts and alarm Americans in both parties.

The overzealousness of certain U.N. adherents to take us into world government—which is bound to be Marxist Socialist under present conditions—does not increase U.N. popularity here.

The list could be added to, but why bother?

Reasonable persons, both pro and con, must realize by this time that U.N. popularity and respect for it has waned.

The answer does not lie in vicious diatribes against those who point out our problems and mistakes. Let's have a solution.

Actually, I do not see how the U.N. can long continue to pretend to speak for a world which is half slave and half free.

It seems to me a form of global schizophrenia.

The alternative to breakup of the U.N. today is not the strawman of war or "isolation"—and anyone who takes such an absurd position is an extremist. What is another avenue which we might take now?

LION AND LAMB

I think that going back to regional alliances of nations based on mutual, sympathetic aims—military, economic, cultural, and respect for religious practices—is more practical than trying to make the lion and the lamb lie down together.

This course is only practical when a new lamb is the main course for the lion on succeeding mornings.

Suppose we and the Communists were in opposing blocs of nations in routine alliances, instead of the present U.N. arrangement; would this mean no contact between the groups?

Not at all—at least not necessarily, unless so desired.

But the important thing is that our side could accomplish vital matters without being subject to an irresponsible and selfish Soviet veto.

Presently nothing is being accomplished in the U.N. for us because the Reds invariably veto major matters that conflict with their interests. They muddy the waters and confuse issues. Why take it?

I believe we need good allies and should not become isolationists—but we ought to be choosy about who we allow to become our allies.

MORE WITH FEWER

We could get far more done by working with fewer but more qualified allies than a conglomerate of enemies, neutrals, and friends.

Congressman UTT said he is of the considered opinion that the U.N. has control of our national sovereignty at this time, if it might choose to exercise it.

This seems hard to believe. The American people can always say nix to the celebrated world body by the simple expedient of withholding crucial funds.

The Utt resolution will not pass Congress this time—but it is an indication that the Gallup poll is not the only criterion.

GALLUP POLL QUESTIONED

(By George Todt)

"Put your trust in God, my boys, and keep your powder dry."—Col. VALENTINE BLACKER.

Dr. George Gallup has done it again.

His latest poll on the purported acceptance of Gov. Nelson Rockefeller by Republican rank-and-file voters over Senator BARRY GOLDWATER—by a 5.8 ratio, yet—is as completely unrealistic and unbelievable as the majority of his liberal "ideological" forays into the wild blue yonder.

Make no mistake about it, I think Dr. Gallup is a smart fellow. Real smart. But I would think twice before accepting his guesstimates—particularly whenever a so-called liberal issue might be at stake—as though the Delphic Oracle had spoken.

Let's hang onto our hats here.

MAKING A GUESS

Actually, I think the Gallup poll is a liberal propaganda device on the American domestic scene. Let me explain why I believe this to be the case. Then let your conscience be your guide.

It is my personal opinion that the liberals who run the Gallup poll do not take fair samplings of the public. The ones to whom are addressed the approximately 2,000 questionnaires on any particular question may be heavily loaded to the liberal left.

Here is why I think so. Several years ago I was lecturing to the Republican Women's Club of Merced, Calif., whose president and program chairman was Mrs. Carl Swanson, presently residing in the San Fernando Valley of Los Angeles.

I asked the ladies present, during the course of my speech, if they had ever run into anybdy who had been questioned by the Gallup poll. One of them raised her hand. It was the first time I had received an affirmative answer in 3 years of trying.

Afterward the lady came to the speaker's rostrum and told me her father had been employed at one time to ask people questions for the controversial poll.

She said she thought there was a gimmick to it.

According to this daughter of a Gallup poll taker, there were "preliminary questions" asked before the main question was popped. She seemed to believe that at least one of the seemingly harmless preliminary questions was designed to indicate to the poll taker whether his quarry was "liberal" or "conservative" in his outlook and philosophy.

IT'S JUST AS TRUE

The lady also confided that everybody who was asked the routine preliminary questions was not necessarily asked the final, important one. What might this indicate to us, then?

Why, quite simply, that the Gallup poll may be heavily weighted toward those who are fellow liberals in ideological bent and character.

If Dr. George Gallup gets answers from 1900 "liberals" and 100 "conservatives", his final answer is bound to be liberal in flavor.

Now, isn't it?

Conversely, let me ask 1900 conservatives and 100 liberals the same question, and I could come up with just as overwhelming a conservative answer. This could be tailor-made to specifications.

MORE OR LESS

There is one area where Dr. Gallup does not fool around, however. That is in his political prognostications—for it is here that he can be checked out by the public, where his reputation is made.

In this region, I am sure he gets only the most reasonable, impartial public opinion samples. They are understandably most correct and designed to come as close to the target as is humanly possible to do so. Here Gallup is judged.

So that when, later on, his highly controversial "ideological" results show up in other matters—like the present Goldwater-Rockefeller travesty on commonsense—he can point with pride to the fact he was so unerring on his previous outright political election polls.

AS POLLSTERS DO

This is clever, but is it factual—is it truthful?

I will bet Dr. Gallup a month's pay that if he and I come on to any 1000 Republicans taken at random across the country—not in the Rockefeller Center in New York City, for example—that no 51 percent would be for Rocky over Goldwater. He's a charming fellow, but 15 percent would be a much closer figure for the New York Governor at this point.

The eminent Gallup hedges his incredible, well-nigh impossible findings with the succint observation that the GOP party organization is undoubtedly for Goldwater over Rockefeller and might hand him the nomination anyway because they tend to be conservative. It's just the "old pros" versus people.

My, my. And to think that it's people who elect these old pros.

ARE POLLS ACCURATE?

(By George Todt)

"There lives more faith in honest doubt, Believe me, than in half the creeds."—TENNYSON "In Memoriam."

Dear Senator GOLDWATER: In these trying times, all of us are worried about many different things—and I am no different from anybody else. One of my chief worries today is the Gallup poll. Let me explain why. And I hope you will give the matter your attention. The Nation ought to be given the facts.

There is no objection by this writer as to the liberals winning a fair share of the controversial issues at stake. But it is impossible for me and many other thoughtful citizens to assume they deserve to come out on top 100 percent of the time.

Except when the Gallup poll and similar organizations count the votes of their private questionnaires, it is difficult to find the American people giving warrant to any such biased conclusions. How can we check?

BOTH CONSERVATIVE

Frankly, the public—Democrats and Republicans—is basically conservative despite propaganda to the contrary.

The majority of our people, perhaps up to 80 percent, are still thinking of Americanism in terms of free enterprise and the way of life which stemmed from the Founding Fathers at Philadelphia.

It is a sad commentary on our times that half of this 80-percent figure downplay or do not reveal outwardly their conservative sentiments on the grounds that it might be considered unpopular to do so. Many have been fooled by liberal opinionmakers in this regard. They have been taken in.

I do not admire deception of any kind where the public is concerned.

We can make up our own minds without being told what we ought to think in advance.

Today there are many people, often in the most responsible positions, who are guided in their thinking by what the Gallup poll suggests—no matter how incredible the results may seem to be.

Worst of all, they insist that others ought to buy their specious reasoning because the Gallup poll says so. It is their god.

WHAT GIVES

Well, Senator GOLDWATER, as you may surmise by now—it is not my god. Nor is it any holy-of-holies to the tens of thousands of people I have had letters from since commencing to write for this newspaper.

In the case of the Gallup poll, we want to know what gives?

Since a large portion of the liberal establishment relies on the poll to back up its conclusions in the ideological realm, I think we are entitled to some kind of open investigation in Congress as to just how it operates—and by whom?

Just how many questionnaires does the poll send out to establish what the American people are supposed to be thinking?

I have heard the number is only 2,000 and, if this is true, it seems doubtful that this might reflect the thinking of 180 million citizens. There is too much margin for error. Or hit and miss.

Most important, just how are the questionnaires "farmed out" to the recipients who answer the questions?

Are they ever screened by preliminary questions to first determine whether they might be liberal in outlook?

Are they sent to blocks in areas known to be overwhelmingly liberal in population, for example, so that the majority of questionnaires will be filled out mainly by liberals?

WHO ARE THEY?

And just what is the ideological complexion of the force Dr. Gallup utilizes to assist him? I believe Dr. Robert Oppenheimer is, or has been connected with the Institute of Public Opinion, but few others are known. Who are they? Are there any conservative thinkers in the group? Is it a balanced organization?

I do not accuse Dr. Gallup of any wrongdoing nor do I question his integrity, but I do want to know about his methods.

Since his poll is playing such a large part in making up the Nation's mind in advance, then the Nation is entitled to know the score about this important operation. What is the answer?

Let's approach this matter in a spirit of impartial inquiry now.

Kennedy Was Unaware of Venezuela Snub

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, during his visit in Venezuela last December,

President Kennedy was treated to a series of snubs cooked up by the Romulo Betancourt-led coterie of pro-Communists now in control of the government of that key Latin American nation.

The discourteous reception accorded our President is discussed in an article by Robert Jones entitled "Kennedy Was Unaware of Venezuela Snub" which appeared in the January 8, 1962, issue of the Indianapolis Star. The article supports statements I make in a speech I call "Tito Betancourt Demands a Billion" which I have given today the special order. I think Members of Congress will want to read Mr. Jones' article and I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD for this day:

KENNEDY WAS UNAWARE OF VENEZUELA "SNUB"

(By Robert Jones)

President Kennedy wasn't aware of it, but during his good-will trip to Venezuela last month he was the victim of what was probably the most studied discourtesy ever accorded an American Chief Executive visiting another hemispheric country.

This apparently was not realized by Americans accompanying the President. Latin Americans present, however, grasped the significance of a series of curious incidents which took place. They add up to a calculated insult by the Venezuelan Government.

LAMENTABLE RECEPTION

One pro-United States newspaper called it "the most lamentable reception that any chief of state has ever been given in Venezuela."

The street crowds greeting Kennedy were friendly enough. What was totally unexpected was that official hospitality would be in such frigid contrast to the warm welcome given by the Venezuelan people. The reverse had been expected.

That was the ostensible reason for whisking away the Kennedys shortly after they landed at the Caracas airport. The official motorcade sped nonstop through town, then out to an airport. The Kennedys were flown to a minor agricultural project miles from the Venezuelan capital.

The real reason for getting President Kennedy out of Caracas later became apparent. It wasn't for reasons of security. Kennedy's own official hosts had previously put the capital off limits to him.

The President was to be given no opportunity to visit the National Congress. It had pointedly adjourned just before his arrival and Kennedy was not invited to address a special session.

The Caracas city government had refused to receive him. Not only did the Municipal Council extend no civic hospitality, but in effect had declared the U.S. President persona non grata.

REFUSED DEGREE

The Venezuelan national university at Caracas had refused to award Kennedy an honorary degree—even though a previous visitor, Fidel Castro, had been loaded with academic degrees and citations from the university.

The last snub was possibly the most significant. Intellectual recognition of the President by the university would have been a major breakthrough in a political area where the United States has been lagging behind the Communists. Universities and students are deeply respected in Latin America. A visit by the Kennedys might have had far-reaching favorable impact.

Instead, the President wasn't even allowed to visit the campus. The university is government-supported and Venezuelan President Romulo Betancourt could have insisted that basic courtesy be shown his country's distinguished visitor. But he didn't.

That these were not merely the acts of freewheeling bureaucrats was made plain by President Betancourt. In his two public speeches during the visit, Betancourt made it clear that official rudeness was his government's policy.

He accused the United States of "ignorance and incomprehension." This country was obliquely charged with having supported right-wing dictatorships. Even Betancourt's stilted praise of Kennedy personally contained subtley barbed shafts. For he favorably contrasted the President of the United States with the United States itself.

By Latin American standards. Betancourt's speeches constituted slaps in Kennedy's face.

DID NOT REGISTER

It was smoothly done, however, and apparently did not register with the President. He sat beaming throughout. But Latin Americans present caught the pointed phrasing.

It was also noted that Betancourt pledged no solidarity with the United States in the struggle against communism. He omitted the usual expressions of friendship for his visitor's country. But Betancourt did make it clear that he expects for Venezuela a big chunk of the 20 billion American dollars to be spent on aid to Latin America.

Comdr. Charles Brendler, U.S. Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, today Comdr. Charles Brendler, the great leader of the U.S. Navy Band, turned over his command to Lt. Anthony A. Mitchell. I have been closely associated with Commander Brendler since first I was guest conductor of the Navy Band 20 years ago when he was solo clarinet player. The influence of this great leader will never cease to be felt by Navy bandsmen throughout this country and abroad.

I include the following résumé on Commander Brendler:

COMDR. CHARLES BRENDLER, U.S. NAVY

Comdr. Charles Brendler, leader of the world famous U.S. Navy Band, is most certainly the dean of the military band conductors—going into his 48th year of active duty with the Navy. In fact, he has the most active service of anyone in the Navy today except Fleet Adm. Chester Nimitz, and is still going strong.

Commander Brendler has marched in every inaugural parade since 1921 and this year's parade for President John F. Kennedy marked his 11th such appearance down Pennsylvania Avenue to honor a new President.

The commander remembers best the parade of January 20, 1937, for President Roosevelt. "We stood in position for 2 hours before the parade even started, and it was pouring rain. We were all soaked to the skin. We were glad this year's parade was under better conditions even though the snow caused some marching problems for everyone in the parade."

Charles Brendler was a youth of 15 when he began his naval career. He went aboard the U.S.S. *Florida* with clarinet under his arm as a "Landsman for Musician" which allowed him the princely pay of $17.16 a month. Four years of the sea and service discipline didn't discourage the clarinet playing lad; there, at the ripe old age of 19, he decided that Navy life was for him.

Through application, ability, showmanship and true devotion to this job, he has reached the top musically speaking—a higher top than ever achieved by any other musician in the regular Navy.

The "Sail Loft," Naval Weapons Plant, Washington 25, D.C. (known as the Navy Yard), has been home base for Commander Brendler since 1917 when he came to the Washington Navy Yard Band to fill a clarinet vacancy. He was a member of this band when on inauguration day, March 4, 1925, President Coolidge signed a special act of Congress designating the Washington Navy Yard Band as the official U.S. Navy Band. In 1938, he was advanced to assistant leader and 5 years later, in 1941, he was appointed to the coveted position of leader. The story of his rise to leadership is synonymous with the history of the renowed U.S. Navy Band itself. The two grew up together.

He has achieved notable distinction throughout the world of music. He is a proud possessor of an honorary doctor of music degree and is the one and only honorary member of the exclusive White House Correspondent's Club. He is an active member of the American Bandmasters Association and served with distinction as vice president from 1953 to 1954, and president 1954 to 1955. He holds a life membership in the Modern Music Society and Kappa Kappa Pi, as well as membership in Phi Beta Mu. He recently was awarded the National Guard of Honor Gold Medal by the American Legion for his accomplishments in the fields of music.

In the fall ow 1925, the U.S. Navy Band left Washington on its first annual concert tour which was authorized by Congress and approved by the President. In the years that followed, under President Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy, the band has played for millions of listeners throughout 49 States, as well as Canada, Puerto Rico, Panama, Cuba, Jamaica, Haiti, South America, and the Virgin Islands.

Comdr. Charles Brendler, USN, conducts all concert presentations without the use of a written score—he is a complete master of his art.

On September 26, 1913, at the age of 15, Charles Brendler enlisted in the U.S. Navy in the rating of landsman for musician. He served aboard the U.S.S. *Florida* from 1913 to 1917. He was transferred to Washington, D.C., as solo clarinetist of the new Washington Navy Yard Band, which, by an act of Congress, approved March 4, 1925, became the U.S. Navy Band. Meanwhile, he progressed through the enlisted ratings to that of chief musician in 1924. In 1938, he was appointed assistant leader, and, in December of 1941, acting leader.

February 17, 1942: Appointed leader, U.S. Navy Band; by act of Congress, granted pay and allowances of lieutenant, U.S. Navy.

April 8, 1943: Appointed for temporary service as lieutenant.

February 1, 1945: Reappointed lieutenant, temporary service.

February 12, 1947: Appointed lieutenant commander, temporary service.

July 19, 1953: Permanent commander, U.S. Navy act of Congress (Public Law 135).

Present grade of commander is highest grade ever held in Navy music program.

He holds a commendation from Secretary of the Navy for meritorious service to Treasury Department, Office of War Information; Silver Medal Award from the Treasury Department.

Past president of the American Bandmaster's Association.

Holds honorary degree of doctor of music; holds honorary rank of admiral in the navies

of Texas and Nebraska; honorary Colonel and aide-de-camp on the staff of the Governor of New Mexico. Listed in Who's Who in America.

The National Commission of Fine Arts Has Rejected the Proposed F.D.R. Memorial Because It Does Not Conform to the Law—Congress Should Now Move Decisively To Protect the Washington Monument and the Jefferson and Lincoln Memorials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the huge memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt has been unanimously rejected by the Commission of Fine Arts because it "does not conform to the requirements of the law setting up the competition."

Dr. David E. Finley, Chairman of the National Commission of Fine Arts explained that the law provided that:

The competition * * * shall be carried out so as to insure that it—the F.D.R. Memorial—will be harmonious as to location, design, and land use, with the Washington Monument, the Jefferson Memorial and the Lincoln Memorial.

Dr. Finley added that, in the matter of location:

The design, by its great size and height, competes with, rather than supplements the three memorials with which it is required to be harmonious.

The Washington (D.C.) Evening Star has declared editorially that:

It is too soon for sighs of relief. Now the Roosevelt Memorial Commission must submit a recommendation to Capitol Hill, where the final decision presumably will be made. One would think in view of the forceful action of the Fine Arts Commission, however, that the memorial group will want to review its earlier approval of the slab design with the utmost care.

I include as part of my remarks, articles from the Morning News of Wilmington, Del., and the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star.

The articles follow:

McDOWELL HIT "STONEHENGE" FOR F.D.R.

(By Sam Hanna)

WASHINGTON.—Delaware's Representative HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR., has won the first round in his fight for a Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial which he considers suitable, but there's no telling what comes next.

McDOWELL was among the first to denounce the plans for an F.D.R. Memorial on Washington's tidal basin selected by a special commission headed by former Attorney General Francis Biddle.

The plan was picked from among 574 proposals submitted by nationally famous architects. McDOWELL took a look at the drawings and started a stream of caustic press releases rolling out.

The design consisted of a plan for several giant slabs of concrete in assorted sizes that would loom above the Japanese cherry trees near the Jefferson Memorial, dwarfing everything in sight. The slabs—dubbed a "free-form stonehenge" by critics—would be inscribed with notable quotations from the speeches of F.D.R.

This week, after a year of weighing esthetic consideration of art experts in and out of Congress, the Fine Arts Commission overruled the F.D.R. Memorial Commission and decided the design was inappropriate. Somewhat belatedly, it discovered the design did not fit the congressional resolution authorizing the memorial.

So far, the taxpayers are $100,000 poorer as a result of the Memorial Commission's activities. The Commission awarded $50,000 for the winning design and $10,000 each to the five runners-up.

The next step requires the Fine Arts Commission to report to Congress, recommending some kind of memorial for the President who once said he preferred something simple in his memory. The fine arts group could theoretically endorse one of the also-ran designs or propose something new.

Still pending in the House Interior Committee is McDOWELL's bill that would settle the whole memorial problem by eliminating any massive structure and authorizing a memorial garden in the same tidal basin area. Interior Secretary Stewart Udall has been asked for his opinion of the garden plan, but has delayed pending the findings of the Fine Arts Commission.

OUT OF TUNE

The refusal by the Fine Arts Commission to indorse the proposed giant-slab memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt has dealt a major setback to this weird design. We hope the relapse proves fatal.

As the Fine Arts group noted, it is not that the arrangement of huge monolithic tablets, one of which would rise to a height of 167 feet, is objectionable in itself as an exercise in contemporary design. Perhaps amid different surroundings (in the vast expanses of the Great Plains, for example), it might be quite striking.

But Congress has specified that the design must be "harmonious" with the setting of West Potomac Park, and particularly with such landmarks as the Washington Monument and the Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials. It is on this test that the recommended design was found wanting. Rather than consonance, the Fine Arts Commission quite logically saw only discord, a lack in architectural terms, of "repose," a conglomeration of concrete which "by its great size and height, competes with, rather than supplements, the three memorials with which it is required to be "harmonious.'"

It is too soon for sighs of relief. Now the Roosevelt Memorial Commission must submit a recommendation to Capitol Hill, where the final decision presumably will be made. One would think in view of the forceful action of the Fine Arts Commission, however, that the memorial group will want to review its earlier approval of the "slab" design with the utmost care.

ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL TABLETS ARE REJECTED

(By Robert J. Lewis)

The Fine Arts Commission today rejected the contemporary design for a huge memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

The seven-member group decided that the proposal for eight giant tablets arranged around an open court in West Potomac Park "does not conform to the requirements of the law setting up the competition."

Chairman David E. Finley said the action was unanimous, though a reliable source said members of the commission previously had been divided on the question.

The next step will be for the Arts Commission to transmit a report to Congress and to the President, in compliance with the law setting up the design competition for the memorial.

The decision withholding approval was announced in the presence of Francis Biddle, former Attorney General and chairman of the Roosevelt Memorial Commission, which was set up in 1955 to conduct a nationwide competition. Also present was William F. Pedersen of the architectural firm of Pedersen & Tilney of New York, winner among 574 entrants in the competition.

In an obviously emotional voice, Mr. Biddle said he was "sorry" the arts group did not approve the design.

"I can hardly think that this action of the Commission of Fine Arts is calculated to encourage the Government hereafter to rely on the best architects they can obtain to plan and build public buildings," Mr. Biddle said.

The competition cost the Government more than $100,000, including a $50,000 award to the winning designers, and $10,000 each to five runners-up.

Mr. Biddle said the memorial commission also would make reports to the Speaker of the House, the Vice President, and the President.

He said he could not indicate the tenor of this report prior to a meeting of memorial commission members, or a poll of them.

NO PREJUDICE TO DESIGN

In announcing the negative action, Mr. Finley said it was taken without prejudice.

This he explained to mean that the design was not objectionable as such, but only that it did not conform to requirements of the law.

A spokesman said the commission previously has approved designs that are contemporary in character, and that the Pederdsen and Tilney design was not turned down for that reason.

In explaining the basis for rejection, Mr. Finley said the law provided that "the competition * * * shall be carried out so as to insure that it will be harmonious as to location, design and land use, with the Washington Monument, the Jefferson Memorial and the Lincoln Memorial."

ONE TABLET 167 FEET HIGH

He said that, in the matter of location, "the design, by its great size and height, competes with, rather than supplements, the three memorials with which it is required to be 'harmonious.'"

As created by the winning designer, the memorial's 8 giant tablets, one of which would rise 167 feet, would be arranged around an open court in West Potomac Park. The site would cover 26½ acres.

Of the design itself, the commission's statement said: "It is lacking in repose, an essential element in memorial art, and the qualities of monumental permanence that are the essence of the three memorials with which it must, by law, conform."

The Commission also objected to the use of concrete in construction of the giant tablets, on the basis of durability.

"The Commission is aware of positive qualities in the proposed design," Mr. Finley said. He mentioned such qualities as "those of great dramatic force and impact, of imaginative and stirring effects of light and shade, and the expression of much that is characteristic of our times." Notwithstanding this, and after "careful consideration of the design chosen by the jury," Mr. Finley said, the commission reached a unanimous agreement to withhold approval.

At a presentation last month, three architects appealed for a favorable vote—Pietro Belluschi, dean of the School of Architecture at Massachusetts Institute of Technology and chairman of the jury which selected the winner; Philip C. Johnson, a well-known contemporary architect, and Douglas Haskell, editor of Architectural Forum magazine.

In his brief comment today Mr. Biddle said the winner was chosen by a 9-to-1 vote of the memorial Commission and emphasized that the jury was composed of outstanding experts.

Members of the jury, besides Mr. Belluschi, included Thomas D. Church, San Francisco landscape architect; Bartlett Hayes, Jr., director of the Addison Gallery of American Art, Phillips Academy; Joseph Hudnut, professor of architecture emeritus, Harvard University, and Paul M. Rudolph, chairman of the department of architecture, Yale University.

CITIES AND PEOPLE—DICTATOR OF ART?

(By Robert J. Lewis)

If the Fine Arts Commission were as powerful as many people think it is, the precedent-setting memorial for Franklin D. Roosevelt would be disgraced, finished, and done with.

Last Wednesday, after a great buildup of suspense, the Commission acted in the full panoply of its powers. It "withheld its approval." That's all.

One might think this action served to raise a huge club, then bring it down with smashing force upon the design, breaking it into smithereens, and destroying it forever.

Instead, the Commission's decision, unless it has public support, has hardly more force than a tap on the wrist.

Strangely to some, the Commission cannot command. It can only persuade. Its function is only advisory. It wants it that way, for therein lies its strength.

Any censor—and the Fine Arts Commission must inevitably play that role—is in a difficult position in a democracy.

An all-powerful censor would be in an intolerable position.

That's the reason the Fine Arts Commission would lock itself in mortal combat with anyone who wanted to make it a dictator of art.

In its own words, the Commission was set up to serve a twofold purpose:

"First, to give advice concerning esthetic question and matters of design involved in the orderly development of the city of Washington; and, second, to furnish expert advice on questions of art to the President, the Congress and its committees and Members, and the heads of Government departments."

For more than 50 years, the Commission has adhered closely to this conception of its duties.

If its advice is heeded, well and good. If its advice is ignored, then the consequences, good or bad, are the other fellow's responsibility.

Some years ago, it was proposed the Commission be turned into a sort of Ministry of Fine Arts, to administer Federal subsidies and provide a central guidance for Government-supported cultural activity.

In a characteristically mild reply, the Commission said it didn't want to be mixed up in any "concentration of authority such as has not existed in this field in the United States."

Because of its clear understanding of the perils of censorship in a system under which the people rule, the Fine Arts Commission is satisfied with only the power to express an opinion from a lofty place. In this self-limited ambition, it stands almost unique among Government agencies.

There is, of course, the question of whether anyone can be an expert in matters of art, rather than merely the repository of an accumulation of prejudices and predilections.

The available records do not reveal whether the Commission has ever faced up to this philosophical question. But certain facts do tend to uphold, at least, the democratic nature of the Commission's expertise. Not least of these is that its membership changes, from time to time, and is not static.

Paradoxically enough, Pietro Belluschi and Joseph Hudnut are former members.

Since those two well-qualified gentlemen were members of the jury which enthusiastically chose Pedersen & Tilney's giant tablets as the winner among 574 submissions in the Roosevelt Memorial competition, an academic question arises.

How would they have voted last Wednesday had they still been Commission members, instead of jurors?

Not that the answer would make a great deal of difference as to whether the memorial will eventually be built in West Potomac Park.

The only dictator in that matter is the American people. Being prudently democratic, the Fine Arts Commission wants to keep it that way. So it will be up to Congress to make the final decision.

Two Giant Steps Toward Victory in the Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the Honorable CRAIG HOSMER, of California, made such an appealing and penetrating statement on the Dean Manion Forum that, under unanimous consent, I include it in the RECORD, that all Members may read it:

TWO GIANT STEPS TOWARD VICTORY IN THE COLD WAR

Thank you, Dean Manion. For many years you have warned that the persistent and continuing goal of the international Communist conspiracy is world domination. You and your guests on the Manion Forum again and again have disclosed the many insidious and brutal ways in which Communists aggress against the free world. It has properly been pointed out that any mischief, from dropping pamphlets to dropping thermonuclear bombs, will be used by Communists whenever, wherever, and however it will help carry out Khrushchev's threat to bury us.

In this manner, they are fighting us over a spectrum of conflict which includes both cold war and hot war, and which can range from the least violent to the most violent actions in which man can engage. Communist dogma tells Communist leaders to use the greatest amount of violence they can get away with, without risking their own home base of aggressive strength.

For instance, the only reason Communists are not dropping atomic bombs on the United States today, quickly to remove us as the chief obstacle to their goal of world domination, is that they know we can and will retaliate with all our nuclear weapons and destroy them.

Because they are deterred, temporarily at least, from using hot war against us, they are using all the many weapons in their cold war arsenal in a massive attack on many fronts to defeat us by nonmilitary warfare. The situation is simply that unless or until they safely can burn us to death in a hot war, they intend to try freezing us to death in cold war.

Because of your efforts, Dean Manion, and the efforts of other patriots, the American people have become awakened to this great danger and are demanding that our Government take effective action in cold war just as it would in hot war should that ever be necessary. Even though our Government does not, the American people do recognize that on the decisive battlegrounds of the cold, nonmilitary war our defenses are shamefully weak, our generalship is appallingly bad, and our effort is woefully inadequate.

It would be madness to attempt fighting a hot war without declaring it, without national strategy, without top-level command, without war plans, without mobilizing, and without appealing to the patriotism of the people for the blood, sweat, toil, and tears needed to win it.

Yet, without any of these things, we are engaged in a new, strange, and deadly kind of a war—a cold, nonmilitary war, in which the stakes are freedom and survival, and which we are not winning. It is clear we will not start winning until the irrevocable determination developed by individual Americans to do so is declared to be the official policy of the Government of the United States.

RECOGNITION OF ENEMY NECESSARY FOR VICTORY

For this precise purpose, I have introduced House Joint Resolution 517. It is patterned after our declaration of war following the Japanese sneak attack on Pearl Harbor. However, House Joint Resolution 517 declares conflict rather than war and identifies our enemy as the international Communist conspiracy. This resolution directs the President to employ the entire power of the United States to carry on the cold war and pledges all the resources of the country to bring it to a successful conclusion.

This resolution will serve to start the official chain of events which must be started by the U.S. Government, if we are to stop losing and start winning. Only by openly declaring the conflict which the international Communist conspiracy wages against us, can we organize and mobilize to fight it as a major enterprise on the scale necessary for victory. The passage of House Joint Resolution 517 will not only mobilize America for cold war but will enlist the support of all men everywhere who cherish freedom in this great contest for its survival.

We Americans are not unique in our desire for freedom—only in our vast national power which causes people throughout the free world to look to the United States for leadership in the struggle to preserve it. Other people, too, want to fight effectively in the common cause. They, too, have their doubts, their worries, and their fears that the time of freedom is running short. But until the United States declares the conflict, begins to move against communism and move decisively, as a world leader should, others cannot be expected to go it alone.

Based on the formal congressional declaration of the conflict, many of the actions which must follow to win it can be put into effect without delay. The organization of our Government to fight cold war effectively is one of the most critical of these necessary actions.

The cold war sweeps across many otherwise unrelated functions of Government. It goes far beyond the jurisdiction of any of the specialized committees of Congress now in existence. And, in the executive branch, it goes far beyond the State Department or any other single department of Government—far beyond the formal Government even—it sweeps across our whole society.

The President alone has the broad power and control over the wide range of functions which must be organized, carried on, timed, coordinated, and pushed to overall success to meet the enemy and to overcome him. At the top, there must be a national nerve center and command post for cold, nonmilitary war. Call it the Strategic and Tactical Office of the President—STOP. And, at COMSTOP, in the White House itself, stopping communism must be a 24-hour-a-day operation for as long as it takes to do the job.

Likewise, the Congress should have a committee which views our cold war efforts as a unified whole. It has occurred to me that one of the existing committees of Congress, such as the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, already accustomed to dealing with complex and highly classified information, might be the logical committee to which Congress should assign cold war responsibilities.

Once we properly declare the conflict with international communism, express our irrevocable determation to win it and organize ourselves to do so, we can begin to fight intelligently and effectively on the cold war's many battlefronts. We can tie together and coordinate national cold war strategy, intelligence activities, scientific propaganda, economic and diplomatic moves, psychological warfare, and all the other many activities short of actual military operations that winning cold war involves.

All these operations must be run by managers who are themselves knowledgeable in the political, strategic, and psychological nuances of nonmilitary warfare. We must quickly train, in our universities and elsewhere, the knowledgeable Americans needed to officer and man this new force of our national defense, the cold war fighting force.

CARRY COLD WAR FIGHT BEHIND IRON CURTAIN

From the overall strategic standpoint, it must be emphasized that fighting cold war effectively not only means defending against the aggressive action the Communists mount against us in our own territory, but, if we are ever to win, it means carrying the fight deep behind the Iron Curtain into communism's own home territory.

In urging former President Eisenhower to wage cold war and turn Moscow's own cold war weapons against it. Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff argued that our potential fifth column is greater by millions than the enemy's. Within the Communist empire are countless areas of weakness and possible internal strife. Our cold war strategy must be geared to go on the offensive and seize and exploit the opportunities they present us to carry our cause forward.

Turning from cold war strategy to cold war tactics, we find almost limitless opportunities for turning the tide of world events to our favor and away from the Communists. Immediately following our declaration of conflict against the international Communist conspiracy, the Congress should declare contraband all Communist arms and munitions in the Western Hemisphere. I need not dwell on the presence of MIG fighters, Soviet tanks, and 400,000 Red armed soldiers in Cuba, almost within sight of our own shores, to underscore the necessity for this move.

I have introduced another resolution, House Joint Resolution 524, which formally declares that Communist arms and munitions are contraband in the Western Hemisphere and requires the President to enforce this contraband by appropriate use of U.S. airpower and seapower.

This is the way it would work: International law recognizes a right to enforce contraband. It is a peaceful procedure. A U.S. patrol aircraft spotting a Communist bloc ship headed toward Cuba or elsewhere in the Americas would signal a U.S. destroyer to intercept and search it. If Communist arms or munitions are found, the ship is warned to turn around. If its captain refuses or tries again to proceed toward his destination, our Navy can reboard the merchantman and jettison its contraband cargo and bring it to a U.S. port to have confiscation adjudged.

The advantages of this unique approach, based on modernization of longstanding principles of international law are many. Only a few U.S. aircraft and ships would be required. These would operate on the high seas, and there would be no interference with the integrity of any nation's territorial waters or domestic soil.

U.S. forces would be acting in a strong area of American sea and air power, almost 5,000 miles from the Soviet Union's nearest base. The Monroe Doctrine which protected the Western Hemisphere for so long from the grasping hands of European despots would once again be made meaningful and would once again be used courageously and effectively to preserve freedom in all the Americas.

My friends, House Joint Resolution 517, the declaration of conflict, and House Joint Resolution 524, the declaration of contraband, are vitally needed and should be enacted swiftly, but they are stalled in the House Foreign Affairs Committee and need your active support.

Thank you, Dean Manion, for this opportunity to urge from the Manion Forum that Americans demand that their Congressmen, their Senators, and their President move swiftly to do these things, and the many more necessary to make America strong and keep her free.

Setting the Industrial Program in Motion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of our board of supervisors of San Mateo County, Mr. T. Louis Chess, gave an address on "Setting the Industrial Program in Motion," which talk was delivered before the Community Development Workshop sponsored by the National Association of County Officials and State Associations of County Officials in Phoenix, Ariz.

Since we are all interested in providing employment and maintaining our existing industries, I am sure this talk by Mr. Chess is of interest to all Members of Congress.

The address follows:

SETTING THE INDUSTRIAL PROGRAM IN MOTION

Before we discuss the placing of the industrial program of a community into motion we must assume that someone has carefully designed the program, considered the needs of the community, recognized the fact that industry, in its broadest term, can often change the face, alter the complexion and in many instances change the entire character of a community.

Taking this into consideration we can then proceed to ponder over a definition once given of an industrial development program. It stated that a well organized industrial development program mobilizes the mental attitudes and the physical and financial resources of a community for the attraction of industry in order to bring about the optimum of residential, commercial and industrial activities desired for sound, steady community growth.

We will now assume that this program that is to be set into motion has advanced to the point that the people in the community recognize the value of industry. This could take care of the "mental attitude" part of our definition.

We will also assume that planning has been accomplished setting aside the physical amenities necessary. This could take care of the "physical" phase of our definition.

Now getting down to the financial resources, we have to ask ourselves: Who's going to pay for the necessary promotional and organizational activities necessary to compete in this national—yes—even international competitive race of trying to influence that new business into settling in our area.

And speaking of definitions, one other given at a recent meeting stated that a sound industrial development program is the solicitation of nuisance-free, fast-growing industries, recessionproof and strikeproof, with heavy assessed valuations and large year-round employment at high wages, willing to take immediate advantage of the ideal location factors every community offers.

Through these definitions we now have two basic principles fairly well outlined:

1. That the need for industry is real and accepted by the people of the community, and

2. That through intelligent planning, certain areas have been designated for the location of industry.

And it is at this point, many of us in our communities, in spite of the sophistication of our electorate, the know-how of our public officials, and in many instances, the considered educated opinions of successful local business leaders, we look at one another and say:

Where do we go from here? How do we get some action? And you can be rest assured there is no pat answer. There is no secret formula. There is no great panacea that can guarantee results, and most important, the end result is not measured and usually not attained by dollars spent on three-colored brochures—inflated promotion gimicks—or half-informed, inadequately equipped trade association or chamber of commerce officials, unable to even remotely set themselves into motion, let alone a sound industrial program.

I am certain that you will understand my reference to the San Francisco Peninsula area in my remarks, particularly when I say we are most humble when talking about our growth in the last few years, but we were faced with a problem in the early fifties, and we had to ask ourselves exactly two questions: Where do we go from here? and, How do we get some action?

Probably the first thing that we discovered—and thank goodness that we discovered this early—and in our estimation, this was a key point, that the most important industry to any community is the industry that the community already has.

Let me repeat, the most important business to any community is the business that is already there.

When you think of this and you think of what can develop from this one point, you can readily recognize the futility of attempting to lure other business and other industry to your community, if that which is already there is unhappy.

At the outset we now see that if an action program is to be developed it should logically stem from that successful business leader that is already in your community and is happy about it, or that business leader that is not enjoying the success that he understandably feels he should be having in your community, and wants to do something about it.

It is at this point that you start mobilizing the attitudes, the thing that we talked of earlier.

In San Mateo County, Calif., this problem of "where do we go from here?" was put bluntly and firmly to those business leaders in our area. After due consideration, through their coordinated action, a first step was taken. There was no thought that this step would completely solve our immediate or future problems, but there was a determination that it would get us on the road.

I am referring to the study that was made by a panel of the Industrial Council of the

Urban Land Institute made in San Mateo County in 1953. This action not only "got us on the road" but well "over the hump" and can seriously be looked upon as one of the turning points in the industrial career of our area.

We cannot, of course, say that this basic step was responsible, in total, for let us say, the 1,072 new plants and expansions that we have enjoyed from 1957 through 1961 but we can forthrightly say that this study, made in 1953, assisted us in coordinating and clarifying our position at that time, which allowed us to experience a more orderly growth in our industrial activities which followed.

And, the most important factor in this action, in this motion, if you please, was that it was stimulated and financed by local business and industrial leaders. And don't you think for a minute that these same business and industrial leaders have not enjoyed the profits that usually accompany the results of an industrial development program.

Thoroughly unorganized when the urban land group came into our county, these leaders formally incorporated in 1955, and, again with the utmost of humility, we must admit that the San Mateo County Development Association is recognized nationally as one of the outstanding industrial development groups in the business today.

Though the recipient of some county funds for advertising and promotion purposes, this association is basically privately financed and at no time since its inception has the public tax dollar been greater than the private dollar invested, and we think this important.

We think it important because we in the county realize that with the investment of their dollars, our businessmen are performing for themselves the sound concepts referred to earlier; they are mobilizing their mental attitudes and their physical and financial resources.

Of course, many of you will say that this is easy to "yak" about but does it really work?

I can tell you that it works, because there are many people working to make it work.

This motion didn't come without problems however. We had the usual complainants; we had the usual negatives; and we had then, and we all will always have, the usual "seven steppers."

These are the firm adherents in the community to the "seven steps to stagnation"—evident when most anything for the good of the community is up for consideration. The "seven steppers" hue and cry includes:

Step 1. We tried that once before.
Step 2. It costs too much.
Step 3. We're not ready for that.
Step 4. We've never done it that way.
Step 5. We're doing all right without it.
Step 6. That's not our responsibility.
Step 7. It just won't work.

After we learned to conquer these attitudes, the first important internal function of our industrial development program surrounded the coordination of those agencies, both public and private, that had direct interest in the overall economy of the community. The association pulled together the chambers of commerce, the labor organizations, the other trade associations, in order that there could be some clearly defined policies as to its scope of activity in the community. It was important to see that there would be no duplication of interest or effort. This probably was the most productive of its earlier activities.

They then went beyond the imaginery polotical boundaries of our community, into our neighboring counties, into the entire bay area, into Northern California, to examine its position in relationship to like organizations in other sections of the State.

It soon found the source of facts and figures necessary to adequately service not only the industrial or business prospect, but to supply existing business and industry statistical material helpful to them in their marketing analysis work as well as planning for future expansion within the area.

Again the emphasis was placed not totally on the new prospect but on existing business.

Probably the most important factor emerging from this first phase of the association's activity was the realization of the interdependence of communities within an area—within a State—within a group of States—in the industrial development field. The need for full understanding of just which business and industry can operate efficiently and profitably in your community is important, but equally important is to know just which business and industry could operate more efficiently and more profitably somewhere else, and knowing where that somewhere else is, and being frank enough to admit it to the prospect.

Following this motion our industrial development group was introduced to the then—this was in 1956–57—not thoroughly understood term—"business climate."

In order that they could better understand just what a good business climate might be in comparison to a poor business climate, they launched into some thoughtful studies. Many of you will remember that from these studies came the first business climate survey taken on a county level in the United States. And this paid huge dividends. It was during this period that it became evident that we had problem areas and it was during this survey we found out, direct from the basic industries participating in this survey, why they chose San Mateo County, what they liked about our county, and what they didn't like about the county.

This survey had a remarkable effect on the community. We found that some of the growth problems of our area were being better understood by our business community and we were getting better action and better participation in our cities and within our county government from qualified business and labor leaders. It appeared that through this media they more thoroughly recognized their responsibilities as citizens of the community.

Probably foremost in setting a program into motion is an important factor that I briefly mentioned earlier—it can probably best be described by two questions that a prospect asked in our area not too long ago: "What are the facts?" and "Who's running the show?"

It was the last question that concerned him. Who are the group of men behind our industrial development program, what kind of leadership does it have and do we have capable staff people, sufficiently equipped to intelligently, confidentially and forthrightly answer questions, answer inquiries, meet prospects and coordinate the existing business fraternity?

None of us can expect results by asking a boy to do a man's job. And we cannot expect results if the community is not willing to accept the financial responsibility of equipping an office or organization with a good leader, capable of accepting responsibility and of keeping up with the rapidly changing aspects of industrial development factors today.

The day of the retired, remittance man, willing to serve in a half-voluntary capacity is past. Good old Joe, who can fill a desk and answer a phone, and do a swell job in collecting tickets at the weekly or monthly luncheon is soon going to have to look elsewhere. There is no place for him in a vibrant, forward program.

There are today well over 16,000 development organizations throughout the United States. This is a competitive business and it is the survival of the fittest, and your community better be fit if it is to survive.

Tomorrow is upon us. The future is going to demand that such community and industrial development organizations render more service, to more people, more quickly and more efficiently. Your ability to succed might rest solely on your ability to select a well trained professional to do the work.

At the same time, the industrial development man—the professional in the community—is powerless and helpless to do the kind of a community development job alone that needs doing. He has to have the mobilized forces of the entire community behind him and have them understand what he is doing.

So we go back to our original concept—the mobilization of the mental attitudes and the physical and financial resources of our community—and when we consider them in the light of future growth we soon recognize that with the proper perspective of our local business and community leaders, results will come if a militant citizenry is really serious in attracting industry, and our program will not only be in motion, but rolling in high gear.

And in turn a prospective business and/or industry will soon recognize that ours is one community with a sound industrial development program that is taking care of, rather than trying to catch up with, the needs of our community.

A Triumph and a Tonic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, when word went out that Colonel Glenn was safely aboard a recovery vessel, a great sigh of relief went up across the land.

In the February 21 issue of the Bangor Daily News appeared two articles treating of this magnificent space achievement, one an editorial and the other a reference to the sending of a congratulatory wire to Colonel Glenn by the village of Friendship, Maine.

For the interest of my colleagues, I submit the articles concerned to the RECORD:

[From the Bangor (Maine) Daily News, Feb. 21, 1962]

A TRIUMPH AND A TONIC

The rocket lift that put Astronaut John H. Glenn, Jr., into orbit from Cape Canaveral yesterday was tremendous—but nothing compared with the lift that his successful flight gave the Nation.

The historic space trip showed the United States at its best, and a very good best it was. There was Glenn himself, a quiet, unassuming man who handled his task calmly and competently.

But this was a team job. Fellow astronauts had a hand in it. So did a large staff of scientists and crews of technicians. A Navy force handled the rescue and recovery assignment. Radar units at farflung points tracked the flights of the *Friendship 7*. Radio stations maintained contact with Glenn.

In the background were the manufacturing firms and researchers who developed the thousands of components required to fling a human being three times around the earth and bring him back alive. This was an achievement of which every American can be proud.

It is true that Glenn's flight came 10 months after the pioneer space journey of

the Soviet Union's Maj. Yuri Gagarin. But Gagarin's flight was shrouded in secrecy until it was over. Glenn's mission was performed before the eyes of the world, preannounced beginning with the first tentative scheduling back in December.

Each postponement and reason was reported to the world. And the payoff came yesterday when all the world could hear and much of it saw the magnificent American performance.

Yesterday demonstrated that the United States has an excellent space program which is being pushed ahead with confidence and skill. We'd say the United States rapidly catching up with the Soviet Union in the space race and is getting in position to pull ahead in a competition that is only in its infancy.

FRIENDSHIP, MAINE, SENDS TELEGRAM

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Col. John H. Glenn, Jr.'s space capsule was named *Friendship 7*. We don't know if it was coincidence or what, but a check of the postal guide showed seven towns named Friendship in the United States. This is the story of one such Friendship on John Glenn's day.)

(By Spence Gregory)

FRIENDSHIP.—This picturesque coastal village quietly joined the nationwide celebration Tuesday of Col. John H. Glenn, Jr's., successful three-orbit rocket flight around the world.

The flight had special significance here. Glenn's space capsule was named *Friendship 7*.

GET OFF A TELEGRAM

When word of Glenn's safe recovery flashed into businesses and living rooms here, Friendship residents immediately got off a congratulatory telegram to the pioneering astronaut.

The telegram's sponsor was an organization dedicted to the revival of a much older and somewhat slower form of transportation that had its birth right here—the *Friendship* sloop.

The telegram, signed by Mrs. Betty Roberts, secretary of the Friendship Sloop Society, read as follows:

"Congratulations from the people of Friendship, Maine, to John Glenn. When you named your craft *Friendship 7* you had our especial interest. We are thrilled with your accomplishment today."

The telegram was sent to National Aeronautics and Space Administration headquarters at Cape Canaveral.

BUSINESS STOPS

Glenn's flight virtually halted business and other activity here Tuesday as most of the village's 800 residents stayed close to their television sets and radios.

Many people climbed sleepily out of bed to watch early telecasts of preparations for the flight. Some watched the entire proceedings through to Glenn's rescue in the afternoon.

Others stole minutes from their jobs to witness bits of the flight and keep posted on Glenn's progress.

"I watched every minute of it," said Mrs. Francis S. Dow. "If he had been my son I don't know if I could have stood it."

GLUED TO TV

"Just about everyone was glued to the television," Mrs. Roberts, Friendship Sloop Society secretary, said. "Even the usually busy telephones have been quiet."

The Rev. Frederick Mills and Mrs. Woodrow Verge, members of the Friendship ambulance crew, were torn away from their TV sets by an ambulance call late in the morning.

Both had been among those who had watched the flight from its beginning, and both returned to watch its conclusion after transporting a patient from Knox County General Hospital in Rockland to a Waldoboro nursing home.

Mr. Mills said he thought he attached more significance to the name given the capsule than some other Friendship resident.

"When the name Friendship is mentioned here, we're more likely to think of sloops than space travel," he said. "I'm more of a newcomer and the name of the capsule seemed rather important and appropriate."

Mr. and Mrs. Archie Wallace took turns tending their general store so each could observe part of the flight on their television set at home.

SAT ALL DAY LONG

Their son David, 14, sat at the set all day and didn't venture outside the house until after Glenn had been picked up and had climbed safely out of the capsule.

Lewis Benner, a clerk at the S. E. Prior hardware store, said he and the proprietor, Prior, had a TV set at the store and watched the flight.

Both Benner and Mrs. Wallace said very few customers ventured into their stores during the flight.

FEW CUSTOMERS

"The lack of customers has been noticeable," Benner said.

Only one person contacted by the News said he had not given special attention to the flight. Claude E. Patch said he had only listened to a few brief radio reports on the project and watched TV coverage a short time. He sad he had been too busy.

He said, however, that several of his acquaintances had arisen early to watch the blastoff preparations.

Lewis Benner gave voice to the thought that may have passed through the minds of many residents of this historical shipbuilding village as they watched Glenn's rocket boosters hurl him into the sky.

"Sure we've thought about the name of the capsule," he said with a note of quiet pride. "This is Friendship the first. That's *Friendship 7*."

Tax That Means Hardship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. SCRANTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker, with the "tax reform" bill about to come to the floor of the House, I hasten to bring to the attention of the Members the following editorial from the Scranton Times on the withholding tax proposal, one of the most important provisions of that bill:

TAX THAT MEANS HARDSHIP

Included in a series of suggested revisions of the income tax law now under consideration by the House Ways and Means Committee is a proposal calling for a Federal withholding tax on interest and dividends. If adopted—and it is reported to stand a good chance of approval—it would mean an automatic deduction of 16⅔ percent on all interest and dividends, including interest on savings accounts, U.S. savings bonds, and other bonds and securities, and on all stock dividends.

Here is a nuisance tax if ever there was one. It will work a special hardship on elderly people, children, and others least able to bear it. It provides for withholding from nonprofit and charitable corporations as well as from those not making enough money to be subject to income taxes. The only way that minors and elderly people with small incomes can escape the proposed withholding tax now proposed is to file a special statement of exemption for each account, institution, or stock.

This is a system that is certain to cause hardship. There are millions of Americans who will neglect to file exemption statements or applications for refunds because of unfamiliarty with the required procedure. Others just won't take the trouble. Minor children, the aged and sick people will have to get someone to assist them in wrestling with the Government redtape.

The mounds of paperwork which this law would impose on banks, trust companies, security houses, and ordinary taxpayers are incalculable. Compound interest schedules would be upset since funds could be tied up as long as 15 months instead of drawing compound interest during that period. As the new bill now stands there is no provision for notifying any savings depositors or owners of stocks and bonds how much of their interest and dividends is being withheld for the Government.

While we believe in the principle of every taxpayer meeting a fair share of the cost of operating the Federal Government, we think that the proposed withholding tax on interest and dividends will do more harm than good and should be defeated. The best way to bring about the defeat of this bill is for taxpayers to register their individual protest with Members of Congress.

Two-Party System Is Being Sabotaged by One-Sided Committee Makeup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Members to a timely column written by Roscoe Drummond in this morning's Washington Post. Mr. Drummond points out the danger to our political system in the current acceptance of denying the minority party in Congress proper representation in staff appointments to House committee:

COMMITTEE STAFFS ARE ONE-SIDED

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Bear in mind that during the next few months the Congress of the United States will:

1. Make a series of crucial decisions affecting the fate and future of the Nation, including a trade policy which will shape our economy for many years.

2. Conduct at least 35 congressional investigations into such matters as tax reform and evidence of graft in the Federal highway program.

And still the Republican Members of Congress are being denied—party by their own default and connivance and partly by the bald power-play of the Democratic majority—the one instrument needed to do their job.

I refer to the woefully inadequate, enfeebled, and puny minority party representation on the professional staff of the policymaking and investigative committees of the House and the Senate.

True, it is the Members of Congress who appear to make the decisions, and who in a sense do make the decisions. But it is the

professional committee staffs—the experts, the technicians, the research scholars, and the investigators—who constitute a power of initiative behind the committees. They shape the reports which shape the decisions and, when properly balanced between the two parties, help produce alternative courses of policy.

What has happened?

An official Republican policy committee document shows there is not a single staff expert responsible to the minority party on 10 critical House committees.

On many of the others the minority representation is either so sparse or so incompent that they are overwhelmed by the sheer numbers of the Democratic appointees.

In the House the Democratic Party has a 3-to-2 majority. The profesional staffs of the House committees are 14-to-1 Democratic.

It wasn't this way during the first 2 years of the Eisenhower administration when the Republicans had control of the House and Senate.

The present imbalance in committee staffing began in 1955 and has been getting more lopsided ever since.

Why has it happened?

Because the leadership of the Republican Party in Congress has not stood up and fought for its rights.

Because the rank-and-file members of the Republican Party in Congress have not stood up and insisted that the party leadership fight for their rights.

Because some highly placed Republican members of the committees have preferred accepting a few personal perquisites from the majority chairman to making a determined, even unpleasant, demand for reform.

Republican National Committee Chairman, Representative WILLIAM MILLER, of New York, knows what needs to be done and wants to do it. But he has thrown up his hands hopelessly in the futile effort to inject enough gumption into his party to do something.

Recently two respected Senators, CARL CURTIS, of Nebraska, and KENNETH KEATING, of New York, offered an amendment to a bill which would have made a miniscule beginning toward reform—1 Republican staff expert to 10 Democratic staff experts. The Democrats instantly rallied to defeat it on a straight party vote.

This is a scandal of national proportions. It goes to the very vitals of our two-party system of government. If the Republicans don't do whatever is necessary to win this battle (by rallying to the Curtis initiative and fighting for reform in their own committees) they deserve to continue to lose elections—and will.

American Legion Commendation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK KOWALSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently there has come to my attention, through publicity in Connecticut newspapers, the action of the executive committee of Corporal Coyle Post No. 1, the American Legion, Waterbury, Conn., in the adoption of a resolution expressing enthusiastic and sincere appreciation to our colleague and my fellow Connecticut Representative, the Honorable JOHN S. MONAGAN, for his work in behalf of the veterans of the Fifth Congressional District.

The resolution adopted by these veterans, in commendation of Congressman MONAGAN, has been widely publicized and copies have been sent to the national legislative director of the American Legion, Washington, D.C., and to Chairman John Bailey of the Democratic National Committee.

In making known the action of the American Legion executive committee, the past department commander, Edward H. Lynch, Jr., said it was an indication of the genuine appreciation of the members of our post for the work which has been done by Congressman MONAGAN. He made it clear that the American Legion post will not forget how closely Congressman MONAGAN worked with their special committee in trying to retain the Veterans' Administration office in Waterbury, Conn., and the many other times that he "went to bat for us."

I believe that all of us are aware of the splendid achievements of our hard-working colleague, not only in the representation of the Fifth Congressional District but, also, in his service to the Congress and to the Foreign Affairs Committee, and the Committee on Government Operations.

With permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include at this point the resolution adopted by Corporal Coyle Post No. 1.

Whereas U.S. Representative JOHN S. MONAGAN has consistently proven his interest and concern for the welfare of veterans; and

Whereas he has diligently worked on their behalf in his position as U.S. Representative, Fifth Congressional District of Connecticut; and

Whereas he has once again demonstrated his interest in the welfare of veterans, by his support of the Veterans Preference Act: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the executive committee of Corporal Coyle Post No. 1, the American Legion, Waterbury Conn., does commend him most enthusiastically, and expresses to him their sincere appreciation for his support of the Veterans' Preference Act, and for the work he has done in behalf of the veterans of the Fifth Congressional District.

Vote for Solvency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News:

VOTE FOR SOLVENCY

(By Henry J. Taylor)

The only way to eat an elephant is to cut it up in pieces and get a lot of people chewing on it. The thing we need to chew on is our taxes and what makes them so high.

Nobody objects to taxes for what we need, but anybody with an ounce of gumption resents levies for things he should not pay for.

The first thing we should not pay for is pork-barrel spending to get votes. And the New Frontier professors are now reducing this to a science. Next is the attitude of general extravagance. It shows up all over the place like the old-time whoopla in the Roman forum or the pearls on the nose of Cleopatra's camel.

This Government is being run by the Kennedy brothers. Obviously, they have a blind spot about taxes. This is of itself an important psychological problem. They have never had to worry where the money was coming from. It was always there. They have never had to earn the taxes. In fact, the President's approach to our difficulty is so emotional and unknowing as to be impervious to argument or, indeed, to the facts.

The President hardly lets a day go by without announcing some new spending program, or buying some bauble like the $2 million yacht he gave the Lion of Judah, Emperor of Ethopia, or the $5 million new jet that is to move into the White House stable—the most costly plane per seat ever built in the history of aviation. Why, on February 8 he even asked for additional money beyond the incredible $92.5 billion budget, including $2.5 million to build an educational television station in the Samoa Islands. Does our hard-earned money mean nothing?

These are poor uses for our taxes and a bad example by a leader who called for sacrifices from the rest of us a year ago last month. I hope not, but at this rate it looks as if Mr. Kennedy is going to be a problem President.

Every penny, every dime, every dollar anybody in the Government spends must be earned by you or me or somebody and handed over out of our worry and sweat. Taxes are, in fact, the largest item in our cost of living. And whoever does not yell out loud when he sees them wasted simply does not understand the American democracy or his duty as a citizen of the United States.

Our forefathers, the colonists, knew better than that in Boston Harbor. A flicker of revolt right now might cause these spenders to pause for a second thought. And, fortunately, there's a way to make them think. Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, has called for "a full scale investigation of the financial condition of the country" by his committee. He is a stalwart, he is immensely informed, and he has the courage to lead the fight. For he is beholden to nobody and nothing frightens this gallant son of our Jamestown pioneers.

This is important because the public vote is important on Congress as well as the President. Much of the spending is Congress' own idea. Congress will sober up only if it hears from home and discovers it is politically popular to stop the star-spangled giveaways. The President could perform a profound service by pounding home the needed call for thrift and prudence, loud into the national ear. He should ask the people's help in seeing that it was transmitted to Congress. Instead, the President seizes the leadership himself in irresponsible spending. As a result, the duty falls to others.

Seeing this, millions who are heartsick and worried ask, "What can I do?" What they can do is to call on everyone, inside and outside the Government, to support Senator BYRD and his committee and make this investigation a roaring vote for the solvency and security of the United States. For our solvency and security are indivisible. And until we turn back from this road to financial disaster our long-term security against the Soviet Union cannot be guaranteed. All our public needs is the stark, naked truth.

End of the Prolog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, as Lt. Col. John H. Glenn himself said before the joint session of Congress today, space exploration is still in its infancy. But we cannot minimize the tremendous accomplishments of Colonel Glenn and all those associated with the space program.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y., on February 21, 1962:

END OF THE PROLOG

In the long perspective of history, Colonel Glenn's epochal earth orbit may take its place as merely one of successive steps to the outer reaches of speace. But to a world that watched and waited—and prayed for his safe recovery—Tuesday's event marked the end of the beginning for U.S. space endeavor, a prolog written by men in an open society undaunted by delays and doubts and unafraid to bare their trials as well as triumphs to the world.

This is a day of unrestrained rejoicing and marveling: Rejoicing that it was "all go" for a modest young American who demonstrated inspiring self-confidence quite as much as patience, pluck, and pioneering. And for marveling at the whole "goldfish" bowl openness with which the saga—from its beginning on the Florida dunes to the recovery 4 hours later in the Atlantic—was unfolded before the world.

The forthright candor with which each detail of the trip was told gave every American a sense of personal participation. And it is this sense of intimate identification with Colonel Glenn and sharing in the tension and suspense of his launching that captures the imagination in a way that neither of the secrecy-cloaked Russian man-in-space project preparations could or did.

His countrymen whose hopes rode with Colonel Glenn will be excused a surge of national pride in an accomplishment that was both human and scientific. That the first successful launching and safe return of an American from sustained orbits occurred 10 months after Yuri Gagarin's flight—and that it does not match the endurance test of Titov's 17 orbits—will not be remembered as much as the vivid contrast between the furtive and open society. The latter gave witness to its meticulous concern for the safety of an astronaut's life. And that society gained for the way it let all the world witness the orderly, sure-footed preparations of its space technology—unhurried, deliberate, supercautious but self-confident.

Assuredly, the hero of this space chapter is Colonel Glenn. No amount of steeling for the tests of physical and psychological endurance can equal the sheer dimensions of the human challenge—an odyssey in a hostile environment that to earthbound minds all but defies comprehension. Most of us cannot grasp the realities of gravity, weightlessness, and a hundred uncertainties faced by America's first orbitifig space voyager. For these—as for the spirit of adventure he symbolizes—Colonel Glenn warrants the Nation's heartiest "well done." This was his day of triumph.

Yet as Colonel Glenn will be the first to insist, it belongs also to scores of others—to his astronaut colleagues, to the technicians who spared no effort for safety's sake, and to the long parade of scientists whose pooled knowledge has now paid off brilliantly. While rejoicing in the human drama of fortitude and teamwork, we can marvel at the creative human mind that welded machine and man in the conquest of new knowledge, auguring discoveries beyond imagining.

The President's Plan To Take All Freedom From the Farmers Must Be Defeated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, if America is to remain free from total Federal bureaucracy which, in the end, must bring about socialism, Congress must stand and fight to retain the freedom of American farmers. The President's farm proposal would completely wipe out a free agriculture in the United States. If we adopt his plan everything a farmer plants, grows, and sells will be determined by the Federal Government. How his farm is operated, what he must do to stay on the farm will be in the hands of desk-chained bureaucrats in the Department of Agriculture. Our entire free farm population will be living under a dictatorship and it stands to reason that when over 5 million farm families are no longer free, the other segments of our national life will soon be in the same boat. As a part of these remarks I would like to include some thoughts on the subject of Washington-planned farming contained in the following editorial from the Dallas Times Herald.

FREE ENTERPRISE AGRICULTURE OR WASHINGTON PLAN FARMING?

The farm program which the administration has asked Congress to approve purportedly is designed to raise farm income, cut costs to taxpayers and reduce farm surpluses.

These goals sound good. The proposed farm program might or might not accomplish them.

But it would do one other thing: It would place every farmer in the country under an agricultural dictatorship in Washington. In effect it would remove agriculture from the free enterprise system in the United States.

For the first time this program would place all major crops not only under production controls but under marketing controls as well.

Once this plan were enacted into law, the Government would be in a position to offer farmers a proposition—like it or else.

Coercion of farmers would be provided in the form of authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to dump up to 10 million tons of feed grains and 200 bushels of wheat to break the market price any time farmers vote against the administration's proposed control programs.

Surpluses created by unsound Government programs in the past could be used as a club over the heads of farmers who oppose further socialization of agriculture. Farm referendums, under such conditions, would become a farce.

Elsewhere there might be some attractive features to the proposal. Reducing farm program costs to taxpayers would be a major selling point. This would be accomplished through selling off surpluses and through expanded food giveaways. Presumably individual farm family income would rise somewhat, with net income of all U.S. farmers remaining at about present levels and with fewer families dividing the total. Consumers might get lower taxes, only slightly higher food prices and—for some—more free groceries.

The program envisions more cropland turned to recreational uses.

There are many contradictions in the administration proposal: For one thing, it calls for a program that would restrict the expansion of American farmers' markets at a time when the President is urging expanded world trade.

It envisions an expensive feed-grain program and a complicated three-price wheat plan at the same time it calls for imposing controls and penalties on dairy farmers in the name of economy.

The plan is said to be designed for maximum freedom and flexibility in individual farm operations. But the proposal itself would limit the farmer's freedom to farm. Its use of historical base periods would freeze production into fixed patterns.

In short, the program would move farm operations from the free enterprise system to a centrally planned and controlled economy.

Is this the sort of thing we want for American agriculture?

Hans A. Bethe at Cornell University—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, Prof. Hans A. Bethe spoke on January 5, 1962, at Cornell University. Though his speech was widely reported, I believe that his remarks are of such importance that they deserve the attention of the House. Below is the first half of the lecture at Cornell. It deals with some of the dangers inherent in the arms race as it now progresses. The second half of the lecture, which I will include in the Appendix of the RECORD tomorrow, deals with first-step solutions to the arms race problem.

HANS A. BETHE AT CORNELL UNIVERSITY—I

1. RUSSIAN TESTS

The world was shocked by the 60-megaton test on October 30. The U.S. analysis has shown this device used a lead jacket around the fusion materials, and gave only a few megatons fission. Thus the Russians reduced the fallout, especially that which might have fallen on their own country. If lead were replaced by uranium, the Russian device would give 100 megatons or slightly more.

One hundred megatons is a formidable weapon. Exploded at 30 miles' altitude it will set fire to almost anything within a 30-mile radius. Firestorm may result, some fires to twice the distance; blast destruction to at least 20 miles. Each of our big population centers can be wiped out with one, all of them with perhaps 10 such weapons. Civil defense is very difficult. If used at high altitude the weapon will not cause fallout.

A 100-megaton weapon probably cannot be carried by the existing Russian ICBM but could be carried by their large bomber planes. Their 25-megaton weapon probably can be

carried by their ICBM. We also have a 25-megaton weapon in stockpile which is based on our 1958 tests, and which can be carried by our B-52's or B-47's. We could build 100-megaton weapons if we wanted to, but fortunately we have not wanted to. The difference is that we never advertised our 25-megaton weapons; the Russians did in a naked show of power.

There is not much difference between 100 and 10 megatons from the military point of view. Ten megatons is enough to destroy nearly any big city. A simple rule is 10 megatons, 10 miles destructive radius. Placed at the south end of Central Park this will cover nearly all of New York City. We have had 10-megaton since 1954, they since 1958. We have 500 B-52's to deliver these, 1,000 B-47's. The Russians have smaller numbers but still enough to destroy us many times over. Nothing has been fundamentally changed by the Russian tests, except that it has become somewhat easier for them; nothing fundamental is likely to be changed by any amount of future nuclear testing.

A good effect of the Russian testing is that it has made the world aware of the mortal peril in which we live. Scientists in 1950 tried to do this before H-bombs were developed, nobody listened.

2. BALANCE OF TERROR

What military consideration prevents Soviets from attacking us? Our capability to retaliate, to inflict horrible damage on them. This is known as the strategy of deterrent. This balance of terror is most uncomfortable but is a necessary part of life in the H-bomb-missile age. The big weapons exist only in order to insure that the other side does not use them—strategic stalemate.

The idea of deterrent and retaliation is as old as war. In the nuclear age, Dulles in about 1954 formulated his doctrine of "massive retaliation." Under impression of the Korean war, Dulles said we would not react in a similar way to any future attack by the Communists on the periphery of the free world but that we would directly attack Russia and presumably China with atomic weapons. I have always regarded this as a most pernicious doctrine because it means deliberate escalation of a small war into a big one. It was also a shortsighted doctrine because it was already clear in 1954 that Russia would soon get H-bombs as well.

The massive retaliation doctrine has now been turned back on us by Khrushchev, first in his threat of rocket retaliation on any country serving as a base for U-2 flights over the Soviet Union, then by describing the 100-megaton bomb as a sword of Damocles hanging over the Western Powers.

We see there are two entirely different concepts of retaliation and deterrent. One is retaliation against an enemy attack by H-bombs. Our capacity to retaliate in such a case is vital to us; it is the only thing which prevents a potential enemy from making an attack. The other is massive retaliation against minor wars. This concept must be removed from our military doctrine, both for practical and for moral reasons.

3. COUNTERFORCE AND INSTABILITY

With H-bombs in possession of both sides, it is clearly tempting to destroy the enemy's warmaking capability at the outset of war. In the midfifties when planes were the only vehicles capable of delivering large bombs the destruction of the enemy planes was obviously a great prize. This appeared easy because many planes are on one airfield, one bomb of 1 megaton will get them all. This is known as counterforce strategy. Of course, if one succeeds in destroying the other side's planes on the ground, by a surprise attack, then the deterrent no longer works. The country which strikes first, i.e., usually the aggressor, has won the war.

Each side builds up its defenses against such a calamity. This can be done in two ways. One is air defense, i.e., the attempt to shoot invading enemy bombers down by fighter planes and antiaircraft rockets. These were developed by both sides; the Russians spent a larger fraction of their military budget on them than we. It is not clear to what extent their defenses, or ours, can be penetrated by bomber planes.

The second measure against surprise attack is to put one's strategic bombers on alert. We constructed a radar warning system, the DEW line in northern Canada, which would give about 2 hours' warning of any possible Soviet attack by planes. In case of a warning, our strategic bomber force takes off and flies toward the north, with bomb loads. However, they may not proceed beyond a certain line except if they get a specific command from the President to do so. In this way, defense against a surprise attack by planes is gradually winning.

This situation was changed again, in favor of the aggressor, by the advent of the ICBM. It should be remembered that the Russians were ahead of us in this field; they tested their first ICBM in the summer of 1957. Many Americans did not believe this until sputnik in October 1957. However, sputnik was in the end a very good influence, accelerating our military research and development and leading to great improvement of the organization of science in government.

The advent of the ICBM has made surprise attack much easier. We have a radar warning system against missiles, BMEWS, but this gives only about 15 minutes' warning. A large part of our strategic air force has therefore been put on a 15-minute ground alert. Our own first missiles as well as those of the Russians are above ground, soft, could also be destroyed by a surprise attack. Therefore a nation which expects an enemy attack may be tempted to launch its missiles on the basis of radar warning, which may be a false alarm. This is far more dangerous than getting planes off the ground because missiles cannot be recalled. All this makes for a very jittery attitude.

This whole situation puts a great premium on first strike. This clearly makes war more probable, both sides more nervous, accidental war more likely. Also because only part of the force of the defending party is expected to survive, force needs to be many times that actually needed in war. Assuming that each B-47 carries 10 megatons and each B-52 carries 20 megatons gives a U.S. striking power of 20,000 megatons in planes alone, a truly formidable destructive power—the arms race in full swing.

The counterforce strategy of destroying the enemy's warmaking capability does not work between two powers of comparable strength but only puts a premium on the aggressor.

4. STABLE DETERRENT

To improve the capacity of the retaliatory force to survive, the United States is planning to put most of its missiles, especially Minuteman, into hardened underground silos which can survive blast pressure of 100 pounds per square inch. A bomb explosion of 10 megatons causes a pressure of 100 pounds per square inch at a distance of 1.3 miles. Therefore, if the hardened missiles are placed at least 3 miles apart then an enemy attack can never destroy two missiles simultaneously, no matter how accurately the enemy missiles are aimed. Since the Minuteman carries much less than 10 megatons it would be foolish of the Soviets to attempt to attack a single Minuteman launch site with a 10-megaton warhead. Thus the hardening to 100 pounds per square inch makes our launch sites essentially invulnerable to a national attack by a potential enemy.

It is clear that 100 missiles of 1 megaton each are a far stronger force than 1 missile of 100 megatons. To make our Minuteman even more useful as a deterrent to war it is propelled by solid fuel which is instantly ready in case of enemy attack. I think it is fair to say that in spite of our late start we now have or are building a highly useful missile force. According to reports in the papers we also have at least as many missiles as the Russians.

Even more invulnerable than the Minuteman is the Polaris, also a missile propelled by solid fuel and carried by a submarine. Already several such submarines are operational, carrying about 100 missiles. It would be essentially impossible to ascertain the location of all Polaris submarines prior to launching a surprise attack agaist the United States. By Polaris and hardened Minuteman the premium on the first strike is essentially removed and, therefore, the danger of surprise attack is greatly reduced. It will no longer be necessary for the United States to launch a counterattack in response to mere indications on a radar screen for fear that our retaliatory capability could be greatly reduced by a Russian first strike. Polaris and hardened Minuteman are therefore called a secure second strike force. They will greatly contribute to the security of the United States, to a less nervous attitude on the part of the U.S. military forces, and thus to stability of the military situation.

The recent Russian test series included many tests in the range from 1 to 5 megatons. This is just the range which might be suitable for a Russian solid-fuel missile similar to our Minuteman which could be placed in hardened sites. I hope this is the right interpretation, and that the Russians will aim for a secure second strike force. This also will contribute to stability and will remove any incentive for the Russians to strike first. This major part of their test series, therefore, may well have reduced rather than increased the danger of war.

The fact that striking force can be made secure against surprise attack should make it possible to greatly reduce its size. The large size of our present strategic force is justified mainly by the expectation that only a fraction of the force would survive surprise attack by an enemy. There is at least a chance now to slow down the arms race; but, of course, if one side resumes the race the other side will follow. Unilateral restraint coupled with careful observations of the actions of the other side could be very useful here in the absence of a formal arms-control agreement.

Another desirable consequence of invulnerable missile sites is that secrecy loses its value. If the sites cannot be destroyed anyway it will no longer be useful for the enemy to know where they are. This may make it possible for the Russians to open their country.

However, with all the great advantages of an invulnerable deterrent there is coupled one disadvantage. Since most of the important military targets are invulnerable, the main targets which remain are cities. I believe therefore that if the deterrent would fail and war should come, most of the enemy weapons would be directed against cities.

This is important to keep in mind in relation to the shelter problem. Fortunately, the Defense Department has just published a very good and well-balanced pamphlet on shelters. In contrast to the strongly biased discussions in newspapers and magazines in the last 6 months—biased in both directions—the Government publication says correctly that no shelter program can prevent the death of millions of people in case of thermonuclear war and that therefore the important thing is, by policy and by the correct military preparations, to prevent such a war. But, says the pamphlet, if war comes in spite of this, other millions can be saved by shelters.

Some military experts have stated that the stable deterrent is likely to remain stable unless one side or the other finds an effective civil defense or an antimissile missile, an AICBM. I think it is clear that any really effective civil defense is impossible, and I believe the same is true for AICBM.

It is not very difficult to design a defensive missile which will come close enough to an ICBM to destroy it by means of an atomic explosion. There is also no problem about providing atomic warheads for antimissiles. But the offense can send decoys along with its missiles which are almost impossible to distinguish from the missiles, and they can send many missiles simultaneously which saturate the radars of the defense. Thus, I think AICBM is virtually hopeless, and the deterrent can remain stable for a long time.

Of course the stable deterrent is never static. We need to know the changing threat from the Soviet Union and to adjust the structure of our strategic forces to it. For instance the recent Soviet tests will require certain modifications in our military planning in weapons systems. It will require a lot of additional work, an increased number of competent scientists working on armaments, not necessarily on nuclear weapons, more expenditures for armaments and perhaps—though I hope not—a further increase in the level of armaments.

United States Rejoices in Glenn Orbit Flight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, not only the United States but the entire free world rejoices in the successful orbit of Lt. Col. John H. Glenn.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial that appeared in the Buffalo Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., on February 21, 1962:

UNITED STATES REJOICES IN GLENN ORBIT FLIGHT

Three years of intensive training and weeks of frustrating postponements finally culminated in the successful emergence of Marine Lt. Col. John H. Glenn as the first American to go into orbit around the world in a space capsule.

He thus exceeds the previous feats of Astronauts Alan B. Shepard, Jr., and Virgil I. Grissom, who made space flights but not in orbit, and puts him virtually on even terms with the Soviet orbital cosmonauts, Gherman Titov and Yuri Gagarin.

The scientific importance of the Glenn flight is pointed up by the statement of Kenneth W. Garland, vice president of the British Interplanetary Society, that the undertaking "has given a great stimulus to the development of space flight and is a complete vindication of the Mercury program." He added: "It is evident that America is now getting into its stride to challenge the Soviet Union in the attempt to land a man on the moon."

Particularly gratifying to the American people is the fact that from blastoff to recovery there was complete coverage of Colonel Glenn's space voyage by all forms of information media. People around the world were able to follow his progress at all times. Even the controlled Russian press and radio reported the event. Like the preceding American space tests, it was there for all to witness, succeed or fail.

Colonel Glenn's triumph is a spectacular tribute to his own superb conditioning for the ordeal and to the thousand and one manifestations of scientific skill and all-around cooperative effort which went into the whole complex project.

The world long has awaited this American bid to get back into the space race with the Russians. It is a matter of pride to the American people that the challenge has been convincingly met and a matter of the heartiest congratulations to Colonel Glenn as the man who did it. All honor to his name.

Breaking Out of Frustration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Pasadena Star-News, February 7, 1962:

BREAKING OUT OF FRUSTRATION

(By Lee Merriman)

This is the story of the Cold War Council, which in less than a year is assuming national stature, with its slogan, "Let's Start Winning" (the propaganda war).

I am told this story appears here for the first time in any newspaper. Henry Mayers, Los Angeles advertising executive and a reserve advisor to the U.S. Information Agency, counseling the President and Congress on propaganda in the cold war, has just left this office. His friendship was one I made at Art Coons' American assembly sessions on higher education. It was Mrs. Mayers about whose person-to-person magazine project I did a piece last week.

As a man whose career demonstrates his knowledge of how the mass mind works and how, if you will, to manipulate it; and whose travels throughout the underdeveloped yet awakening world have permitted him personally to observe the effectiveness of Russian propaganda versus American efforts to win friends and influence the peoples of Asia, Africa, and South America—he decided to turn to a few topflight professional friends in his determination to create a cold-war council capable ultimately of influencing Washington to the degree that we may launch a winning, long-range counteroffensive against Russian propaganda which he's convinced is shellacking us almost everywhere.

He's equally convinced this dismal situation can be reversed, heartened by two facts. Informally, before groups of citizens, extreme conservatives, and then extreme liberals, he's explained the Cold War Council and the part every citizen may play in making it successful, always to be greeted by enthusiasm. This he found true also in Italy and France, where all extremes also unite when given a real chance to strike at communism.

Second, response from within his own profession was such that the Cold War Council almost immediately became a solid national fact. The Nation's top experts began donating everything needed to get it going.

Emotionalism plays no part in this project. Findings of the University of Pennsylvania's foreign policy research institute set guidelines for the council.

Henry is not critical of the men who direct and operate the U.S. Information Agency, not unduly critical of the State Department's relationship to this Agency (although often the left hand doesn't know what the right hand is doing) but he is critical of Congress.

The U.S. Information Agency's hands, in many ways, are tied by the law creating it, passed by Congress in 1948—before China was overrun by Reds—and which restricts it primarily to publicizing America. Congress has never taken another look at this law. All these cold war years, we've been publicizing this Nation while Russia's realistic cold war propaganda plays skillfully on the hopes and passions of awakening peoples, reaching their minds and hearts with seductive assertions that communism will convert their problems into their "better tomorrow."

In this phase of the cold war, the Communist effort, also better directed, outstrips ours 20 to 1.

The Cold War Council's fed up with this.

How did Henry Mayers start out to make his protest effective? For Advertising Age, a bible of his profession, he wrote an unemotional, realistic, constructive analysis of this absurdity, submitted a program to correct this, and invited reactions. This article made a profound impact on the professionals who know the mass mind best, and upon manufacturers, industrialists, and public relations men who best know the power of effective presentations.

Result?

The editor of Advertising Age, after filling 3,000 requests for reprints, asked the Cold War Council, which almost overnight had come into being, with an office also in New York, to take over handling additional requests.

I wish everyone could read that first Advertising Age article, as I have just done. When I started this column, I felt I could wrap up Henry Mayers' project in one piece. I realize now that this requires two or more.

Tomorrow you'll find here quotes from that article which will ring true to you. Then, later, will come the well worked part every citizen can play in making the Cold War Council's voice heard in Washington, and throughout the free world.

You'll be interested.

A Department of Urban Affairs: Pro and Con

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the resolution (H. Res. 530) disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, last Wednesday, February 21, this body rejected Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, which would have created a Department of Urban Affairs. During the floor debate on this subject I stated my opposition to the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs. At that time I stated that I was very much aware of the problems facing the urban areas. It is my conviction that the solution to these problems is not to be found in devising a new organizational chart. As I pointed

out Wednesday, any real solution to this problem is going to be found in the development of a policy or philosophy and in the coordination of activities.

This can best be achieved through the creation of a small organization which might be called the Council of Urban Advisers. Such a council would be a staff agency set up on a continuing basis and composed of experts. It could conduct research, seek a coordination and integration of related activities, and make recommendations. Perhaps most important of all, it could think about and work toward the formulation of a basic policy which we do not now have.

This approach, which has much to commend it, is considered favorably by Robert H. Connery and Richard H. Leach in their excellent and objective examination of the question of an Urban Affairs Department in their book. "The Federal Government and Metropolitan Areas."

Profs. Robert H. Connery and Richard H. Leach are distinguished scholars of the subject area of Federal Government and metropolitan areas.

Robert H. Connery holds degrees from the University of Minnesota and Columbia University, receiving his Ph. D. from the latter. He has taught at Columbia, Catholic University, Stanford, the University of Illinois, and Duke University.

Over the past 25 years he has served as consultant to numerous Federal, State, and local governments and officials including among others the National Resources Planning Board, the President's Committee on Administrative Management, the New York State Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Defense, the Hoover Commission, and the City Administrator of New York. He has been a Fellow as well as a senior staff member of the Brookings Institution.

During the Second World War he served for 5 years in the Navy as a commissioned officer. In that capacity he was assigned to Secretary Forrestal's office to write an administrative history which later was published as "The Navy and the Industrial Mobilization in World War II, 1950." He is also author of "Governmental Problems in Wild Life Conservation, 1936," "Administration of an NRA Code, 1936," and other Government reports and articles.

Richard H. Leach is joint author of "The Administration of Interstate Compacts, 1959," of "In Quest of Freedom: American Political Thought and Practice, 1959," and of numerous articles. He was graduated from Colorado College in 1944 and received a Ph. D. from Princeton in 1951. He taught at Georgia Institute of Technology before joining the Duke faculty. He has had considerable practical experience in government as a member of the staff of the Southern Regional Education Board from 1953 to 1956, and of the Army Security Agency.

Both men are now members of the Department of Political Science at Duke University, Durham, N.C.

Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert chapter 5 of "The Federal Government and Metropolitan Areas"—"A Department of Urban Affairs: Pro and Con," into the RECORD. The authors have given me permission to quote this chapter. I commend it to all for thoughtful consideration.

A DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS: PRO AND CON

The idea of an executive agency devoted entirely to urban affairs is not a new one. A variety of possibilities have been suggested in recent years, ranging from an interagency committee all the way to a department of urban affairs at the Cabinet level. Some of the proposals have been for a temporary organization, some for a permanent one; none of them have agreed on what form the organization should take.

The simplest suggestion advanced has been for an interagency committee, to be made up of representatives from the several Government agencies whose programs bear upon urban and metropolitan areas. This proposal has been discussed informally but has never been activated. Endless variations have been suggested as to what agencies should be included and as to what its exact terms of reference should be. The proposal ran into the problem encountered so frequently in dealing with Federal programs, that no one knows precisely which agencies and what programs actually do have an impact on metropolitan government. In addition, the proposal ran afoul of the inbuilt weaknesses of all interagency committees. With no permanent secretariat, no provision for regular meetings, no delegation of precise authority, an interagency committee is at best a feeble administrative device for dealing with a problem as explosive as that of metropolitan areas today.

A Cabinet committee has also been suggested as a device to focus attention on the problem. In 1956, for example, President Eisenhower asked seven members of the Cabinet to serve as a Committee on Small Business, and in 1958 he requested five members to constitute a Council on Youth Fitness. He might do the same for metropolitan areas. If he used such a committee, however, a full-time secretariat should be provided, for Cabinet members are fully occupied in their own departments. The President might wish instead to bring in an individual for a short while to study the problem and report to him, as he did recently when he appointed Edward P. Curtis to study aviation facilities planning (1957), and Clarence B. Randall to study international trade (1958).

Another means of focusing public attention on the problem would be to make use of a special Presidential commission to study it. Thus, in 1954 the President appointed a five-man advisory committee for a national highway program, headed by Gen. Lucius Clay, on whose report the Highway Act of 1956 came to be based; and in 1956 he directed a 34-member Committee on Education beyond the high school to examine problems in that area, and on the basis of its findings to develop proposals for action. Congress provided funds for that committee's work, a series of studies and conferences was launched, and a final set of recommendations was drawn up. In other areas, President Eisenhower has appointed a Committee on Government Contracts, an Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space, a Committee on Government Employment Policy, and a Science Advisory Committee. Such committees of prominent citizens, properly staffed and financed, can do an excellent job of analysis and recommendation.

None of these temporary and short-range devices, however, should be regarded as a good alternative to the creation of a Council on Metropolitan Areas. They are useful in educating the public and the President, but they cannot supply the President with the continuing staff assistance the metropolitan problem demands. Though any of these devices can be very helpful to the President in preparing legislation, what is needed for metropolitan areas is not the passage of a single act, but an agency which will provide the President with a continuous flow of information upon which he can base policy.

Even though the newly created Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations is to be permanent, it is not a satisfactory answer for metropolitan areas either. Growing out of the work of the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the House Committee on Government Operations, the Commission is visualized as a body which will bring together Federal, State and local officials on a continuing basis for discussion of the problems which concern all levels of government.

The bipartisan commission will consist of 26 members: 3 from the executive branch of the Federal Government, 3 Senators, 3 Representatives, 4 Governors, 3 State legislators, 4 mayors, 3 county officials, and 3 private citizens. It is clear from its sponsors' statements that the commission will be mainly concerned with allocation of functions among levels of Government and with Federal grant-in-aid programs. As a means of gathering information the commission has some attraction, but it will have so broad a membership base and be so indirectly involved in metropolitan problems that it will have limited usefulness, so far as the Nation's great urban communities are concerned. The establishment of a commission of this nature, indeed, may lead people to conclude that an agency which will devote its primary attention to the metropolitan area problems has been established, when in fact it has not.

PROPOSALS FOR A DEPARTMENT

The most widely supported idea for an executive agency in the area of urban and metropolitan problems is to create a Cabinet department devoted exclusively to them. The idea dates at least from 1912, when Philip Kates suggested the creation of a National Department of Municipalities. The Kates proposal would have created a research and service department which as its first task would conduct "a comprehensive and authoritative study of the municipal problem in its basic principle * * * an industrial survey of national scope, with * * * attendant investigations into causes of congestion of population, and the remedies by improved communication and transportation and other means; into sanitary conditions * * * into housing, disposal of municipal waste * * * industrial working conditions * * * the working of other municipal systems than ours, and of other theories and methods of legislation (applicable to the American problem)." The information thus collected, fully and quickly transmitted to the proper local officials, Kates thought, would give municipalities all the information which was "essential to the proper solution of (their) problems." Kates' idea interested Woodrow Wilson very much indeed, and he hoped to have an opportunity to discuss it very seriously with those interested.

The opportunity evidently did not materialize, however, and the proposal was lost in the pursuit of the new freedom and in the preparation of the United States for World War I which immediately followed it. It was revived in 1919 in a slightly altered form by Harlean James, who thought that a department of civic economy in the National Government, rightly conceived and vigorously carried out, would be invaluable in helping cities and towns to meet the challenge of the postwar period. Miss James conceived of her department of civic economy as performing primarily an educational service. Such a department, she wrote, "should conduct research studies and make experiments on a scale possible only for the Federal Government" and should make its findings available to the sleepy crossroads corner

in the remote county as well as to the noisy traffic-ridden city.

Miss James' idea did not bear fruit either, and for another decade or so no new proposals toward this end seem to have been made. In 1934, however, Charles E. Merriam, then with the national resources board, remarked that it was important that "the voice of our cities be heard in the capital, [and] it is equally important that the U.S. Government have some responsible administrative representation in the cities. * * * there is no urban U.S. representative corresponding to the county agent in the rural districts." Although Merriam went on to profess that he did not know just what form this new development may take or whether a number of Federal agencies may not jointly share Federal responsibility, he was certain that the whole question of the relation of Federal Administration * * * to city government * * * looms up larger every day. By 1942, Merriam had become convinced that a separate administrative unit in Washington was necessary in view of the proportion of our people who dwell in cities and the importance generally of cities in our political and economic system, and he recommended that there be set up in the National Government a bureau or department of urbanism.

Since the end of the war, the idea has been advanced quite frequently. Just recently, Nathaniel S. Keith, a former Federal housing official, proposed the creation of a Department of Community Development. Commenting on his idea, Keith declared that "the realities call for the establishment of a Federal department as a focus for the necessary Federal attention and assistance" to community development. The establishment of a Federal Department of Community Development would give needed stature to the Federal interest in this field and would provide Cabinet-level policy coordination for all Federal activities with an impact on community developmental problems. The following operating functions, Keith thought, ought to be consolidated in the new department; research in housing and community development problems; assistance to regional, metropolitan, and urban planning; assistance to housing; assistance to urban renewal; assistance to the planning and financing of local public works; assistance to highway development and metropolitan area transportation. "The administrative consolidation of these functions in a single Federal department," he concluded, "would provide the necessary fulcrum for consistent application of these programs in the field."

In one form or another, the idea of a department has won a number of outspoken proponents. Representative J. ARTHUR YOUNGER gave impetus to the idea in an article about it in a Sunday supplement. Since then, it has become a popular subject for newspaper editorials across the country, even in some of the small newspapers, and it has been incorporated into the last three annual policy recommendations of the American Municipal Association. A number of other organizations have accepted the idea, including the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, the National Housing Conference, and the American Society of Planning Officials, and the hard-pressed mayors and local officials of a good many of the Nation's largest cities have pledged their efforts to its establishment.

The idea has also caught the attention of a number of Members of Congress, and several of them have introduced bills into Congress to create such a department. Three such bills were introduced in the 84th Congress, one by Representative J. Arthur Younger, Republican, of the Ninth District of California, one by Representative Irwin D. Davidson, Republican, of the 20th District of New York, and one by nine Senators, some of them from the Nation's most urban areas: Herbert Lehman, Democrat, of New York; Hubert Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota; Paul Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois; Wayne Morse, Democrat, and Richard Neuberger, Democrat, of Oregon; Warren Magnuson, Democrat, of Washington; Thomas C. Hennings, Democrat, of Missouri; Pat McNamara, Democrat, of Michigan; and James E. Murray, Democrat, of Montana. Each of the three bills was referred to the Committee on Government Operations of the appropriate Chamber. Only the Younger bill received a hearing, however, and no further action was taken before the end of that session. No action at all was taken on the other two bills, so that all of them died at the end of the 84th Congress.

Virtually the same bills were submitted to the 85th Congress. In the House, Representative YOUNGER reintroduced his bill, and Representative MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, Democrat, of the 17th District of Michigan offered another. The Senate version was offered by some of the same Senators, but this time under the leadership of Senator JOSEPH CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, a former mayor of Philadelphia. Senators Jacob Javits, Republican, of New York, Russell Long, Democrat, of Louisiana, and Clifford Case, Republican, of New Jersey joined Senators Humphrey, Morse, Neuberger, Magnuson, and Representative Murray in sponsoring the bill. All three bills were referred to committee, but no hearings were held, and, as before, all of them died at the end of the session.

In the 86th Congress, four bills were introduced in the House, one by Representative ALBERT RAINS, an influential member from Alabama, another by Representative HUGH ADDONIZIO of New Jersey, and the same bills as before by Representatives GRIFFITHS and YOUNGER. In the upper house, however, Senator CLARK and the other Senators had shifted their support to the metropolitan study commission idea and did not submit again the departmental bill of the preceding Congress. Senator KENNETH B. KEATING of New York introduced a companion bill to Representative YOUNGER'S.

The proposal for a department warrants analysis and discussion if for no other reason than the fact that it has won so much endorsement. One must recognize, of course, that proposals to create new executive departments are made frequently, and some of them have received a great deal of support, both in Congress and outside, without being accepted. In the past decade, proposals for Departments of Civil Defense, Transportation, Water Resources, Public Works, and Science and Technology have all been advanced without success. A Department of Urban Affairs, however, suggests an easy solution to a complex problem, which in many ways is broader in scope and more immediate in its need for action than any of the other problems. Moreover, a discussion of such a concrete proposal can do much to clarify the proper way to deal administratively with a problem of this magnitude. Since proposals for an executive department will doubtless continue to be offered in the future as the solution to the problem, it is time that the merits of the idea be thought through.

ORGANIZATION AND POWERS OF THE DEPARTMENT

All the bills so far presented to Congress have had certain similar features. All call for the creation of a new executive department, variously entitled the Department of Urban Affairs, the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs, and the Department of Urbiculture. All propose the same type of administrative organization, at least in broad terms. A Secretary, an Undersecretary, and a varying number of assistant secretaries heading major departmental divisions are provided for in each bill. Likewise, all the bills set forth the same general goal for the Department, though, as one might expect, they differ considerably in their exact wording. The Younger bills have the most limited scope. As H.R. 1019 (85th Cong.) put it, "Many of the most pressing problems facing the people of the United States grow out of the lack of knowledge and understanding of proper techniques in utilization of urban land [thus] there is a corresponding national interest in the development of the science of urbiculture. Therefore:

"Recognizing the invaluable contribution made by the Department of Agriculture in promoting increasingly efficient use of farmlands, the Congress enacts this Act in order to proved a corresponding executive department to develop methods of dealing with pressing social, economic, and civic problems growing out of inadequate knowledge of the principles of using and developing urban lands, and to make these methods available to the people of the United States through suitable educational programs."

Representative GRIFFITHS' bills note "that the pressing needs of cities and metropolitan areas are such that Federal action should be taken to assist in meeting these needs through education, research technical services, and such other programs as the Congress may later prescribe." Moreover:

"The Congress finds also that a number of important Federal programs * * * have a vital impact on local communities and metropolitan areas; and that there is need for a central place in the Federal Administrative structure to assess the overall results of these programs, to help coordinate these activities, and to represent the needs of urban areas at the national level."

The Senate bill (S. 2159) for the creation of a Department of Housing and Urban Affairs was very similar. It declared:

"(1) That a large majority of the American people now live in urban and metropolitan areas, and that almost all population growth in the last two decades has occurred in these areas; and (2) that the number of Federal programs which have a vital impact on urban and metropolitan areas are numerous and varied; and (3) that the general welfare and security of the Nation and the living standards of its people require that the Federal Government * * * [assist] * * * the States and local governments in meeting the problems caused by the continuing growth and concentration of population; and (4) that for these reasons there should be a Federal department * * * to deal with those urban and metropolitan problems in which the Federal Government has a direct or cooperating interest."

Three of the bills would have abolished and transferred the functions of certain existing agencies to the new Department: Representatives GRIFFITHS and YOUNGER, those of the constituent agencies of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and S. 2159, those of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Federal Civil Defense Administration. All three bills also contained a section which would have permitted the President to "exercise his authority under the Reorganization Act of 1949 with a view to further consolidating within the Department such functions and agencies of the Government as will further the purposes" of the act creating the Department. The Rains and Addonizio bills would leave the transfer of functions, including housing, entirely to the President.

The Younger bill also provided that the Secretary should "establish research and educational programs to accomplish the purposes set forth" in the act, and the Senate bill instructed the Secretary of the Department to "conduct a continuing study of problems peculiar to urban and metropolitan areas, including problems of coordinating Federal-State programs in such areas," to

"provide technical assistance to State and local governmental bodies in developing solutions to such problems," and to "make such recommendations to the Congress, as a result of the studies to be undertaken * * * and after consultation with appropriate representatives of State and local governments, as he shall determine to be appropriate."

As a result of the passage of any one of the bills, or of a mixture of them, another executive department, directed generally at urban and metropolitan problems, and combining research, service, and educational functions on the one hand with coordination and program operation functions on the other, would be added to the structure of the Federal Government. Initially, at least, no new functions would be added, but those which are now scattered throughout the Federal Government would be centralized in a single administrative unit.

ARGUMENTS FOR A DEPARTMENT

Supporters of the new Department build their case on a number of grounds. Perhaps the most frequently offered justification is the fact that in a nation which is becoming increasingly urban, special recognition of urban affairs at the Cabinet level is a necessity. Senator CLARK, in a statement explaining the purpose of S. 2159 to the 85th Congress, remarked that "metropolitan growth is posing one of the greatest challenges of the second half of the 20th century. We cannot meet this challenge with government machinery designed for the 19th century." As a matter of necessity, the Federal Government must "adapt its administrative organization" to enable it to meet more effectively the problems of today's urban and metropolitan areas. Just as a Department of Agriculture was created as a farmers' agency in recognition of the primary importance of agriculture in 1889, and a frankly pro-labor Department of Labor was established when increased industrialization made it seem important to "foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States," so is the development of a Department of Urban Affairs important and necessary today. Representative YOUNGER, testifying before the Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization of the House Committee on Government Operations in 1955 in behalf of his first bill, remarked that "very much the same argument that was advanced for the establishment of the Department of Agriculture" could be advanced for a Department of Urbiculture.

"In 1862, when the [Office] of Agriculture was established, approximately 80 percent of our population lived on farms or in rural areas, and only 20 percent in urban territory. Now, in 1955, that situation has entirely changed. * * * In 1862 the problems which came to the Federal Government for solution arose from the rural areas because 80 percent of the population lived in rural areas. With 85 percent of the population concentrated in the urban areas, naturally the problems which come to the Federal Government for solution arise from those areas. * * * I think that * * * we should concentrate * * * Federal concern over the problems that originate in the city areas into a Department that [has] a head with a Cabinet status. In simple terms that is what this bill was designed to do."

Representative WILLIAM L. DAWSON, of Illinois, the chairman of the subcommittee, remarked upon hearing his colleague's testimony: "Here in the Congress I have noticed that the farmers are well represented. They have the Department of Agriculture as well as the legislative committee set up here. They are taken care of and, as you say, the people are no longer on the farms. I think the Congress and our Government should revamp itself to meet the situation because government is for the people.

REPRESENTATION OF URBAN INTERESTS

Creation of a Department and the designation of a Cabinet representative for urban affairs, the argument continues, would provide stronger leadership for and better representation of urban interests in national policymaking. At present, there is no focal point for urban affairs in the executive branch of the Federal Government. A great many agency and bureau heads represent one aspect or another of the urban and metropolitan problem, but their efforts are often contradictory and are in no sense all-inclusive. The result is that national policy in this important field can be formed only on the basis of incomplete or inaccurate data about cities and their problems and needs. "It does seem to me," Representative DAWSON noted, "that it is indicated that the problems of cities be given a departmental status, and it so seems to me from my experience as a Congressman here in Washington, and observing the various departments make their needs known to the Congress." Maintaining that farmers have the Department of Agriculture to point out their needs to Congress and to protect their interests and promote their welfare, he argued, "the problems of the cities are not voiced here as such. Because of the great impact of those problems upon not only the cities but upon the country as a whole, I think that there is a crying need to the extent that the country should begin to think about a department to handle this."

This reasoning would seem to be supported by studies in the field of public administration. Arthur Macmahon and John Millett, for example, declare that the "head of a department * * * has an individual consultative relationship to the President, to the administration as a whole, and to Congress," a relationship of such importance that the Secretary of a department becomes "the administration's natural consultant" in regard to the problems of his area. To date, there has been no such consultant available specifically for urban affairs. Schuyler Wallace finds that since the President's Cabinet frequently serves not merely as "an administrative but also an advisory agency on broad questions of public policy * * * representation [thereon is] highly desirable." Both by being available as a consultant on urban affairs to other officials in the Federal Government and by contributing the urban point of view to the determination of national policy, a Secretary of Urban Affairs would fill a need which has already been met in all other important policy areas. In a nation so predominantly urban, proponents of a department insist to deny representation to urban affairs is no longer tenable.

SIZE OF URBAN PROGRAMS WARRANTS DEPARTMENTAL STATUS

Aside from the need to have urban interests represented in national policymaking, those who advocate a department point out that by now the Federal Government has many programs which affect urban areas and that together they are important enough in the total picture of the Federal Government's activities to warrant elevation to departmental status. The Federal Government's housing programs alone, to say nothing of its civil defense program and others with distinctly urban aspects, certainly have become important enough and involve large enough expenditures of personnel and money to be raised to departmental status. They should, proponents of a department argue, be recognized as permanent interests of the Government by being given regular Cabinet status—by being, in short, combined into a separate and distinct executive department. Thus Walter B. Mills, Jr., president of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, in a letter to Representative DAWSON in connection with H.R. 1864, declared that his organization was "strongly of the opinion that the Federal Government's activities in the field of housing, slum clearance, and urban redevelopment of urban centers have reached proportions warranting the creation of a department * * * having full Cabinet status." In the same vein, William L. Wheaton of the National Housing Conference maintained before the Dawson subcommittee that the "relative size of the Housing and Home Finance Agency as compared with other executive departments" entitled it to departmental status. "If we look at the expenditures, we find that the gross expenditures of the Housing and Home Finance Agency exceed that of five other Cabinet departments * * * [it] has more employees than one department." Certainly, Dr. Wheaton argued, the HHFA ought to be converted to departmental rank, especially when its total financial commitments are compared with those of the other civilian departments. Those commitments, Dr. Wheaton thought, "probably exceeded all of the other departments saving only the Treasury * * * and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare."

Nor did Dr. Wheaton or other proponents of a department have to look far for support of their contention. The first Hoover Commission used the same type of argument to support its proposal for the creation of a Department of Social Security and Education. Having recommended the creation of a United Medical Administration to take care of the Federal Government's health programs the Commission went on to say, there remain, however, certain most important bureaus [and] agencies relating to education which must be organized into a workable department. And as the reasons for that conclusion, it noted: "The size of these agencies * * * is * * * indicated by the fact that they embrace about 20,000 employees. The administration expenditures [of the several agencies combined] would be roughly $50 million. The grants-in-aid to be distributed would approximate $800 million." When operations of separate agencies reach such proportions, the Commission seemed to say, they naturally should be combined into one department. More recently, a proposal has been advanced to centralize the Federal Government's science activities in a Department of Science and to transfer to the new Department the functions of the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Science Foundation, the Bureau of Standards, and the Patent Office, among others. The proponents of this measure, like those of a Department of Urban Affairs, justify the action on the ground that in terms of money and manpower involved the time has come to recognize the importance of the Government's scientific interests.

For departmentalization, they assert, is the only really efficient way of handling related program operations of such magnitude in the Federal Government. Scattering of functions among a number of different units means that it is not possible anywhere to get a view of the problem to be solved as a whole. Senator CLARK built much of his case on the advantages that a Department of Urban Affairs would bring in coordinating existing programs concerned with urban affairs and in simplifying the governmental structure by reducing the number of independent agencies reporting directly to the President. The American Municipal Association in its 1956 policy statement likewise stressed the "greater * * * efficiency" which would result from centralizing the various activities affecting cities in one "unified administrative organization at the Federal level." No study which has been made of the executive branch fails to emphasize the evils attending the great proliferation of independent executive agencies that has occurred in recent years and the advantages to be gained by a reduction in their number

and a coordination of their efforts. Indeed, the first finding of the Hoover Commission was precisely along this line: "Federal programs * * * must be grouped by related function and divided among a small number of principal assistants who are the heads of departments. * * * Until dispersed units are pulled together, and authority is placed in department heads as chief assistants to the President, there will be conflict, waste, and indecisiveness in administration." To bring even the housing activities together under one department, if not also those relating to civil defense and possibly others, would thus seem to be in direct accord with the principles of efficient Government administration.

FACILITATION OF RESEARCH

The creation of a department would have the added advantage, the argument proceeds, of making it possible more easily and quickly to conduct the great amount of research that needs to be done before actual solution of urban problems is possible. Research needs to be undertaken, for example, on the problems posed for urban mass transportation facilities by the rapid expansion of metropolitan areas in the past quarter century and on the problems growing out of "the lack of knowledge and understanding of proper techniques in utilization of urban land." Other questions, such as "parking, traffic * * * central business district, port development * * * [and] metropolitan governmental problems * * * including problems of annexation and metropolitan urban services distribution" offer equally great possibilities for study. All such problems could be much more effectively studied if brought together under an agency which would have the facilities to attract the services of the Nation's outstanding experts on urban problems. Such a program would have the douable advantage of avoiding duplication and repetition and at the same time covering all the important questions now facing cities and metropolitan areas. Today such studies are made in bits and pieces, if made at all, and not only are they therefore uneconomical, but their results are not often widely publicized. A Federal department not only would develop information but would have channels available both to distribute it and to assist city and county officials in applying it. The Department might thus become, its proponents argue, an urban planning assistance agency for the Nation.

INFORMATIONAL CENTER

A further justification offered for a Department of Urban Affairs is that it would provide a central point in the Federal Government where cities could come for help and information. The American Municipal Association originally based its support of a department largely on these grounds: "The Congress should authorize a new Federal Cabinet post for urban affairs. Unlike other segments of our political economy, such as industry, labor, and agriculture, local governments have no place to turn to in their many dealings with the Federal Government." Instead of one place, there are many. A mayor must often make 6 or 8 visits to get a complete picture, and, to make it even worse, the information he gets at one point is likely to be contradicted at the next. The mayor of Seattle, Allan Pomeroy, expressed the feelings of many of his fellows when he pointed out that "above all, such a department would provide a central clearinghouse for all the specialized problems having to do with intergovernmental relations as they affect central cities and their metropolitan areas." And Carl Feiss, former Urban Renewal Administrator, noted the great advantages of effecting through the creation of a single department "a simplification in the lines of communication between the Federal, State, [and] local agencies so that local public officials would have a real opportunity of finding the right person at the right time for the right purposes and the right programs in order to simplify and expedite the very complicated problems that the localities are facing * * * in this tremendous urbanization that is taking place."

PRACTICAL POLITICAL ARGUMENT

Although not advanced so openly as the foregoing arguments on behalf of a Department of Urban Affairs, another argument has been as influential. This is the argument of practical politics. Gerrymandered as most State legislatures are in favor of rural areas, they have not listened with sympathetic ears to the pleas of urban citizens. In some cases, the dominant upstate (rural) areas are of one political persuasion, the downstate (urban) areas of the other, and this has further complicated the relation between the legislatures and the cities. In disgust and desperation, therefore, city officials have increasingly turned toward Washington for help and guidance. In national politics, although the cards are still stacked against urban voters, at least they are not stacked so high. City officials and urban citizens are convinced that with their own department, and even more their own Secretary, who would serve as their advocate, at last they might begin to get the sympathy and assistance they have long asked for. As Representative YOUNGER has put it, "Agencies and commissions are temporary and, what's more, they're also the stepchildren of government. The chairman of a commission * * * is many, many rungs down the ladder from the Secretary of a department who has daily access to the President's ear. The only favorite sons in Washington are the heads of the executive departments." It follows, therefore, that "only a full-time, full-ranked Secretary * * * can effectively serve the cities of this Nation."

Those who favor a new department declare, furthermore, that there is considerable evidence in other fields to demonstrate that the Secretary of a department does in fact serve as a special advocate for his "constituents." To some degree at least, every Secretary of Agriculture, Labor, or Commerce takes care of the interests of his special clientele and tries to present a good record of performance for the party's sake—and for his own—at the next election. He builds such a record by aggressive leadership in programs in the area of his responsibility. Urban matters, however, have not been carried to the political level by such an advocate. The Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Administration simply is not the political figure that a member—any member—of the traditional Cabinet is. Urban officials see the advantages to be gained in exploiting the political possibilities of a Cabinet post, and though the other justificaitons they offer are offered seriously and honestly, the political aspects of the situation have obviously been considered.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST A DEPARTMENT

However appealing the case for a Department of Urban Affairs may be, the other side of the coin ought to be considered carefully before a decision is made. Indeed, those opposed to a Department have the stronger case. They argue that such a Department would be politically unwise, administratively unsound, and functionally unnecessary. The creation of a Department of Urban Affairs, or Urbiculture (a Department by that too clever name seems unlikely in any event), is unwise on the ground of semantics alone. Semantics can be overemphasized, of course, but the words so far suggested for the Department's title constitute a real handicap to its adoption. "Urban Affairs" is naturally contrasted with "rural affairs," and all the old stereotypes about "rural" and "urban" would be aroused by its establishment. "Urban" means cities, and cities are still pictured as sinful and unhealthy as opposed to the farm and the country, which are equated with clean living, hard work, and thrift. Cities are thought to be dominated by bosses and political machines, in contrast with the democratic, independent way of life on the farm. It is not enough to say that this is an incorrect, distorted picture, both of urban and of rural living, nor is it sufficient to point out that cities down through the ages have been centers of freedom, that even today they are more progressive than the rural areas, which are traditionally conservative. Whatever the truth of these characterizations, the important fact is that the rural and small-town population in the United States traditionally views cities with suspicion, and these are the groups that dominate legislative bodies in the States as well as in Congress.

Added to this is the fact that urban also will be contrasted with suburban, and the suburbanite is even more anti big city than his country cousin. At least he is anti downtown big city. One of the principal reasons for the existence of metropolitan areas has been the movement of population to the suburbs made possible with the development of the automobile. To the suburbanite, the city means where he works in the daytime. It means crowds, noise, subways, and social groups he does not like. He feels differently about the suburbs. Politically, the suburbanite is becoming increasingly important. His numbers alone make him a political factor to be counted. In alliance with rural voters, he is a formidable power. Representatives from strictly rural areas may be declining in strength as population moves away from the farms, but the small towns and especially the suburban areas are steadily gaining in population, political power, and importance. All three would be against a Department of Urban Affairs. Why, they would argue, should the whole Nation underwrite a segment of the population who are quite able to take care of themselves? Cities are rich; they do not need help from the Federal Government. An executive department devoted to their interests would simply be a means by which big cities would get increased Federal aid, perhaps to their detriment.

Though opponents of a department might admit that urbanism is a national problem, they argue that ours is a Federal system of government, with certain well-defined areas of power given to the Federal Government and others reserved to the States. Problems of local government, they assert, whether in large or in small urban centers, are primarily a concern of the States and the local communities themselves. The Federal Government has no responsibility for cities as such, and therefore there is no need for a department. These may not be sound arguments, but they have lots of emotional appeal. They have been used in State legislatures for years with great success. They are and will continue to be just as effective in Congress, where smart city slickers are feared almost as much as they are in State legislatures.

POLITICAL DIFFICULTIES

Not only would these emotional factors make the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs politically difficult, but they would subject the operation of the Department to continual friction with Congress. Every time the Department's budget was scrutinized by Congress, every time a hearing was held on its legislative proposals, the tension between them would be aggravated. Could the Secretary of Urban Affairs deal successfully with Congress under these circumstances?

The very speed with which the idea has been developed and pushed also works against its adoption. Not only does Congress not like innovation, it is not apt to act on so radical a proposal without having before

it conclusive evidence that the cities have done all they can to help themselves solve their own problems. To date, such evidence is not forthcoming. Congress likes even less to alter the administrtaive structure of the Federal Government until it is sure of the soundness of the proposal. In the past, periods of 30 to 40 years have elapsed between the creation of one new executive department and the next. Agencies, bureaus, and commissions are not a great affront to congressional sensibilities; but the creation of a department, affecting as it would the very core of the executive branch, is another matter altogether. Any proposal for a new department, however sound, traditionally has rough going in Congress. As one of the witnesses before the Dawson subcommittee in connection with H.R. 1864 pointed out, "A major stumbling block for H.R. 1864 is that the creation of a department of urbiculture would elevate consideration of urban problems so high and so fast from present levels of consideration that the sudden jump would be unacceptable to some people." Chiefly, it would be unacceptable to Congress, at least in its present state of mind and membership.

As a matter of practical politics, to propose a Department of Urban Affairs is futile at present because the idea has not built up the kind of political support which would make it possible. President Eisenhower and his top administrative officials have shown no interest in it whatsoever. On the contrary, there is some evidence that they would be strongly opposed to such a department. Nor, for that matter, has there been any grassroots support for it, notwithstanding the formal resolutions of a number of national civic organizations. Even as Representative DAWSON acknowledged in the 1955 hearings: "You appreciate that there must be a public interest and demand for this legislation. * * * There must be created within this country a desire to have established a department which is concerned with the problems of the urban dwellers. * * * Sentiment for the idea * * * is necessary in this form of government to make it become a law." Until such sentiment is built up, to talk about its adoption is futile.

A Secretary of Urban Affairs, actively looking to the interests of cities in Washington, would, moreover, add greatly to the centralization of governmental power in Federal hands. As Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, of New York, who called the proposal for a Department of Urban Affairs "appalling," went on to point out, there is need for coordination of Federal programs involving urban and metropolitan areas, but to vest that power in a new department would be to create an "all-powerful coordinator * * * in Washington." "On reflection," Rockefeller concluded, "it is self-evident that a Federal department with as much power as this would require would be a Frankenstein." If such a department were ever established, "home rule would become a memory."

Finally, the creation of such a department is politically unlikely because of recent actions regarding the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Federal Civil Defense Administation, the functions of which were to be transferred to the Department of Urban Affairs. During its debates on recent housing bills, Congress has given every indication that it contemplates the continued existence of HHFA as the administrative unit for housing programs. By Executive order, the Federal Civil Defense Administration has recently been merged with the Office of Defense Mobilization, to form the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. The probability that the functions of either agency might be shifted to a new department in the near future is remote.

ADMINISTRATIVE CONFLICTS

Not only are there strong political arguments against the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs, but there is a strong case against it on grounds of administrative soundness. Creation of a department has come to be regarded as a panacea for all administrative ills. Yet a study of the service departments over the years, and of the Department of Defense in particular, since its creation in 1947, produces considerable evidence that departmentalization is not a guaranteed cure for administrative difficulties. Establishment of a department, indeed, may only delay the cure or force it to take place in different surroundings. Back of the proposal is the idea that a simple organizational change will provide the answer for urban and metropolitan problems. This is a false belief. The mere creation of a new administrative unit is not the answer to a problem as complex as that presented by the phenomenon of metropolitanization. Creation of a department would beg the most important question of all, What is the Federal Government's proper role in urban areas? The answer is not merely to assign urban affairs to a single organizational unit. It is a matter of principle and philosophy, not of method. To create a method without first having established a philosophy to base it on is to put the proverbial cart before the horse. Coming as it does at this time, when the basic issues of intergovernmental relations in metropolitan areas are still unresolved, such a proposal is clearly premature.

Moreover, a Department of Urban Affairs as proposed would be based on a geographical concept rather than on a functional one. To admit it would be to introduce a maverick into the administrative corral. The work of such a department, if all the programs carried on by the Federal Government affecting cities were placed under its jurisdiction, would necessarily cut across the functions of a great many existing agencies and departments. Indeed, once the Pandora's box is opened, how is it to be closed? What programs do not have an urban interest, save those pertaining strictly to agriculture? If housing and related activities and civil defense are the first to be included, how can arguments for the inclusion of a host of others be denied? Thus, in the hearings on the first Younger bill, the representative of the Amercan Municipal Association declared that in his opinion the new Department "should include such items as highway and urban transit, airports and airport administration, public health matters * * * water and air pollution, and juvenile delinquency" in addition to housing and urban development and renewal and civil defense. What would be the effect at least on the Departments of Commerce, Interior, and Health, Education, and Welfare of the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs? It would certainly conflict with their organization and ongoing programs, to say nothing of the complexities it would introduce into the programs of many independent regulatory agencies. To insert an executive department based on a geographical pattern into a system primarily organized functionally would make for more, rather than less, confusion in the administrative structure.

It is argued that the new department would simply parallel the existing Department of Agriculture and serve city dwellers in the same way that Agriculture serves the farmers. But even if it be admitted that Agriculture is principally concerned with farmers, yet its organizational base is strictly functional. A comparable situation would be created if the new department were made simply the Department of Housing. This title, however, would not give it cognizance over the broad area of urban problems which its sponsors desire. What would be done with activities like airports, highways, and water pollution? Is it suggested that these functions too be divided along geographic lines and that urban highways be placed in the new Department but rural highways left where they are now? Would highway matters be divided between two departments? Would the same duplication be repeated for water and air pollution, airport construction and maintenance, water supply, hospital construction, and all the manifold other urban programs of the Federal Government? Indeed, with what department and agency of the Federal establishment would a department conceived upon geographic lines not conflict? To ask the question is to supply the answer. To create such a department would be to creat an organizational misfit.

Moreover, it cannot be conclusively demonstrated that merely because certain activities of the Federal Government reach a particular magnitude they should automatically be brought together under a single executive department. The Veterans Administration would seem to be a case in point. In terms of the number of employees, size of budget, and amounts of money distributed, it would long ago seem to have deserved elevation to departmental status. Yet it has functioned with benefit to the group it serves through the years without Cabinet status. What advantages would have accrued from converting it into an executive department? Proponents of a Department of Urban Affairs claim that one advantage would be better representation in the administrative structure. The heads of HHFA and OCDM now sit with the President's Cabinet when matters pertaining to them are discussed. What would be gained by giving them secretarial status?

But it is argued that instead of occasional participation in the Cabinet, the Urban Affairs Secretary would be a full-time member. This argument is based on the assumption that the Cabinet is in fact a policy-forming body. Actually the President makes policy, and the Cabinet may or may not be consulted. Confusing the British system, with its theory of Cabinet responsibility, and the American system, where it is sometimes said the Cabinet members are the natural enemies of the President, is responsible for this misapprehension. Under the American system access to only one man, the President, is important, because he bears the chief burden for policymaking. Entree at the White House is much more important than Cabinet status. Harry Hopkins, during World War II, was a good example of a man who did not have Cabinet status but who was much more powerful than any Cabinet officer because of his entree to the President. Indeed, entree to the King was what gave Cabinet officers in England their position of power in the first place. One of the principal prerogatives of an English Secretary of State was "the privilege of the closet," which meant the right of entree to the King and the right of consulting with him alone.

Close ties with congressional committees and well-organized pressure groups also account for the success of an administrative agency. Certainly the Veterans' Administration owes much of its prolonged success to these factors. A seat in the Cabinet for the Veterans' Administrator would not have been nearly so important in making it possible for him to carry out his agency's program. On the same basis, it cannot be maintained that departmental status and Cabinet representation alone would produce the effective "representation" of urban interests that proponents of the idea claim it would. Good entree at the White House, good working relations with Congress, and effective group pressure produce better results in many cases than a seat in the Cabinet.

BETTER MEANS AVAILABLE

Finally, the opponents of a Department of Urban Affairs argue that it is unnecessary now. Attention to metropolitan problems, they say, is not guaranteed merely by the creation of an executive department. It can be secured as well under the existing ar-

rangement of agencies, once they all recognize "that our metropolitan communities provide the environment within which the greatest number of people live and the largest part of the Nation's business is carried out." What is needed more than an organizational reshuffling is a policy within the entire executive branch to guide all Federal agencies in their urban and metropolitan activities. If such a policy existed, "then the * * * Council of Economic Advisers would be devoting a large share of its attention to the economic problems of urban communities within the framework of the national economy. The * * * Bureau of Public Roads would have a finely articulated program for relating the construction of the interstate highway system to the needs and requirements of the group of cities within each of the regions of the United States. The agencies concerned with water resources would be at least as much concerned with the river basins within our metropolitan communities as they are with the problems of irrigation in the West."

Establishment of a department would not necessarily be of any assistance in achieving coordination. Coordination in the executive branch results from common understanding and a will to cooperate among the personnel concerned; these can be achieved among diverse agencies as well as in a single department. Such simple devices as the exchange of personnel between one agency and another and the institution of periodic consultation between program officers would go far toward bringing about coordination. Indeed, a department as big as the proposed Department of Urban Affairs would have its own coordination problems which would have to be settled in some way. One important objection to adopting the proposal is based on past experience within the Federal Government. Over the years, it is notorious that the housing and civil defense officials have vociferously disagreed with each other. Would bringing them toegther eliminate their differences? How would they be reconciled? Which interest would dominate? A solution which would ignore longstanding conflicts of personnel and philosophy is not a solution at all.

Nor can it be demonstrated that the research and educational programs which are so urgently needed with regard to metropolitan problems can be carried out best by a single department. How much research of a general nature is worth while? In regard to mass transportation, for example, must not a solution be fitted to the needs of each individual metropolitan area? Indeed, opponents of a department argue: Is there a need for the Federal Government to conduct such research at all? Today there is a host of agencies, public and private, carrying on research on these problems. Commenting on Representative YOUNGER's first bill to establish a department, the editors of the American City said:

"In the opinion of the American City, the need for an overall * * * Department * * * is much less than was the case four decades ago. This is owing, in part, * * * to the spread of the council-manager form of municipal government and the establishment of local planning and zoning boards * * * to the excellent aids to municipal efficiency rendered by such national organizations as the '1313' group with headquarters in Chicago and such citizens' associations as the National Municipal League and the Government Research Association and * * * to the effective work of the various foundations, educational institutions, State leagues of municipalities, and other agencies working for municipal improvements and civic advance. In other words, much * * * research and guidance * * * is now available for municipalities from sources other than the Federal Government, and municipal efficiency can thus be achieved with much less reliance on Uncle Sam than seemed to be essential four decades ago.

Others are willing to admit that research on metropolitan area problems is needed, but argue that this is a staff function and would best be handled by a staff agency. They say that there should be an agency in the Federal Government concerned with urban and metropolitan areas and their problems, but that it should be a staff agency whose concern it would be to develop the facts about metropolitan area problems, which the President and his department and agency chiefs would take into account in framing policy. It is worth noting that the American Municipal Association, which advocated a line Department of Urban Affairs at its 1956 congress, had cooled off considerably toward the proposal by 1957. The declaration of policy adopted by the 1957 congress recommended instead creation of a staff agency, a Council of Urban Advisers, to study metropolitan problems and recommend solutions on the one hand, and to suggest a policy for the coordination of all Federal programs affecting urban areas on the other. Sober second thought seems to have led AMA to the conclusion that although there is truth in the argument that research on urban problems is necessary, this does not require the creation of a new executive department.

Finally, say the opponents of the department, the greatest danger of all lies in the possibility that the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs would be accepted by Government officials and others as settling the whole problem, when in reality it would provide only an organizational detail. Certainly city officials, the lobbyists they employ, and their organizations might welcome an executive department to use as a waste basket into which they could dump all the metropolitan problems referred to them and thus discharge their responsibilities.

A DEPARTMENT REJECTED

One cannot but conclude that the opponents of a department have the better case. Formulation of a philosophy and evolution of a firm policy based thereon should precede designation of the agency to carry it out. Who executes policy is much less important than what the policy is. What is needed is not merely moving chessmen around on the board, but adopting rules for the game. Given the need for focusing the attention of the Federal Government on metropolitan area problems, creation of a Department of Urban Affairs or its equivalent is not the way to accomplish the objective. The proposal does not make political sense, it is not in accord with the administrative concepts on which the rest of the executive branch is based, and functionally it would add to the difficulties of effective administration.

Perhaps the most that can be said for a Department of Urban Affairs is that discussion of the idea keeps the need for action with regard to urban problems before the public. But such a department is not feasible at the present time. It is not beyond the realm of possibility, however, that, as Federal activities in metropolitan areas continue to grow, as inevitably they will, an executive department may one day be established. If it is, past experience would indicate that it will result from a gradual evolutionary process over a period of years as was the case with the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In the meantime, there is much greater need for a Presidential staff agency than for a new line department.

There Will Always Be a Way if We Have the Ingenuity To Uncover It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker—

One thing we can do to gain a better fate than eventual extinction is to keep on solving individual problems as they appear by recourse to that same characteristic which brought us out of the jungle. There will always be a way if we have the ingenuity to uncover it and the wisdom to follow it.

With these reassuring but admonitory words, my friend and Pomfret, Conn., neighbor, Adm. Luis de Florez, concludes a most inspiring article in the February 1962 issue of the magazine, the Nation's Business.

The editors of the magazine asked Admiral de Florez, an inventor, engineer and aviator, to write about "Ingenuity," and that is the title of his article, which expresses the theme of a series summarized by the editors this way:

Our heritage has given us the strengths to defy tyranny, conquer a continent, build a nation. In these qualities we find the power to win the cold war—or the hot.

My friend gives stimulating examples to make his point that ingenuity is not necessarily a gift we are born with, and that most of us can develop this characteristic to a greater or lesser degree through necessity.

He makes a most practical suggestion, it seems to me, which the National Inventors Council, of which he is a member, has sought for several years to have adopted by the U.S. Government, and which would foster the useful stimulation of ingenuity in a great variety of ways, through an adequate system of rewards as an incentive to spur inventiveness and original work. It is like the "suggestion box" that many companies maintain, for ideas to be submitted by employees, but on a nationwide scale.

These awards, as contemplated by the National Inventors Council, would be in addition to and not a substitute for patents.

They would, in a sense, compare with the Distinguished Service Awards which our Nation makes for military valor, for the prizes which are bestowed by various private organizations for distinguished achievement in literature, the arts, the theater and many other fields of endeavor.

They would emphasize that ingenuity by any individual can be not only rewarding in many ways, but most of all, that its exercise even in ways that sometimes appear to have a small relationship if any to the destiny of our Nation, can be of great patriotic significance.

Admiral de Florez himself holds more than 50 patents on processes and equipment widely used in the oil industry. He has been awarded the Collier Trophy for the greatest achievement in aeronautical safety and efficiency. He is one of the founders of the Office of Naval Research. He is a director of several enterprises. He has been a flyer for 50 years, and has checked out in more than 200 kinds of aircraft.

His background of experience, therefore, speaks for itself. His marshalling of facts and stimulating ideas to emphasize the qualities of victory are of interest, I sincerely believe, to all Americans. I therefore include Admiral de Florez's article on "Ingenuity" in the Nation's Business in full at this point:

IGENUITY

(By Luis de Florez)

The ingenious man, the ingenious organization and the ingenious nation—other thing being equal—have the best prospect for survival and success in the world today.

The founders of our country needed more than labor and courage to open virgin territory, create tools, process raw materials, harness natural resources and establish communications. They required ingenuity. And this quality is a continuing requisite in the competitive world in which we live. We must never fail to foster and stimulate ingenuity in America if we are to meet the challenges ahead.

Ingenuity is not easy to define. But we recognize it or its lack on every hand. It appears to be an extraordinary combination of imagination and nonconformity which produces a way to attain an objective, usually despite inadequate means or adverse circumstances. Inventiveness, resourcefulness and the ability to improvise, to meet the unforeseen are characteristics of ingenuity.

How can we come by this great quality of ingenuity. Is it inherited? Can it be developed? The answer is that some people are born with more natural ingenuity than others. Most of us can develop this characteristic to a greater or lesser degree through necessity.

I have seen men under stress come up with ideas that would never have occurred to them under ordinary circumstances. Certainly necessity is a spur to ingenuity whether inherited or developed. It is not always possible to identify the ingredients of motivation, but certainly some motivation is needed to make us scheme, plan and struggle to achieve our objective.

Being primarily an engineer I find difficulty in describing the mental workings that produce success through ingenuity for a lawyer, doctor, poet, politician, or business manager. But for what it may be worth, I can describe the working of my mind in arriving at a mechanical invention which I treasure, for, in its time, it saved many lives and much equipment.

For many years I specialized in the design, construction and operation of refinery equipment, particularly in cracking units in which petroleum was treated at temperatures on the order of 1,000 degrees Fahrenheit and under 600 to 800 pounds pressure per square inch.

I had just put into operation a battery of such stills for the Gulf Refining Company in Port Arthur, Texas, when a new oil field was discovered in West Texas. The oil from this field was far more corrosive than anything previously processed, and we began to have trouble with what became known as "spotty corrosion."

This type of corrosion took place irregularly inside the piping. Some parts were virtually unaffected while others pitted dangerously. The danger lay in the inability to find all such weakened spots by inspection. This raised the growing specter of a major failure and consequent explosion.

One night one one of many periodic visits to the plant, I had just spent several hours with the night shift and subsequently had gone to bed. Suddenly, I was awakened by a dull roar. Through my window I saw the dreaded glow of fire in the location of my battery. I stumbled into my clothes and rushed to the scene.

When I arrived, I was told that a vapor line had let go, doubtless due to spotty corrosion, and hot vapors under high pressure had poured out, blanketing the battery. The stillmen, my friends, without thought for themselves, had rushed to the fireboxes to shut off the burners to avoid ignition instead of running away for their lives. It was of no avail. The vapor fired in the hot furnaces and the men had been burned at their posts.

To this day I remember the shock and pain at losing the men I had worked with for months and the surge of anger at our helplessness in solving this elusive corrosion problem that had caused the explosion.

HOW ANSWER WAS FOUND

As I left the battery in the early light of dawn, I passed by a water pump which had been rigged to protect other equipment and saw against the brightened sky a thin spray of water squirting through a pinhole flaw in a cast iron fitting. At once the answer came to me and stopped me in my tracks.

If I drilled a minute pinhole at regular intervals in our piping part way through the wall of the pipes, any spot of corrosion which occurred nearby would eat through to such holes and a minor leak of vapors would occur and be noticed immediately.

The still could then be shut down while the piping retained an adequate factor of safety.

After that, all our piping was drilled. Other companies followed suit. This became known as safety drilling and spotty corrosion lost its terror. Nothing I've ever done has given me more satisfaction. My only regret was that I did not think of it sooner. On the other hand, I might never have thought of the solution to the problem had it not been for a great emotional shock and that flaw in the cast-iron fitting.

Ingenuity tends to be associated primarily with science and technology. Certainly we have seen an ever-increasing and dramatic progression of scientific marvels to harness nature's energy and make for better living. Actually, it is a major ingredient of success in every human activity.

We recognize ingenuity in business, in medicine, the law, politics, the arts, music, mathematics, in international relations, in wars, and peacetime diplomacy.

Obviously, the opportunity to apply ingenuity is almost infinite, but if it is to be applied constructively, it must be directed by the requisite spiritual qualities which guide our normal lives and pursuits. The pioneers who developed our country required the type of resourcefulness that brought primitive man from his cave to what we now term civilization.

There is little wonder why we became a great nation in so short a time.

Ingenuity fostered by dire necessity and freedom of opportunity, backed by indomitable courage and will to survive, produced an amazing progression of accomplishments; the product of original thinking to fit a new world.

We have today a priceless heritage bequeathed us by those who struggled ingeniously as well as laboriously to conquer the wilderness and create our way of life.

This heritage, great as it may be, is not indestructible. If we do not maintain it with the same quality of ingenuity, courage and spiritual guidance, it will be lost to us and to the world. The very posterity with which we are blessed as a result of the application of constructive ingenuity seems to be changing our point of view and motivation. There appears to be a tendency to resort to ingenuity to avoid work rather than to accomplish more, to scheme to give less for a dollar rather than find ways to give more for it.

The struggle for the mirage of security rather than adventure, for working fewer hours rather than making greater progress, the tendency to stifle private enterprise, to penalize the successful as part of the goal for unearned equality are all manifestations of corrosive forces threatening our future survival.

We see a tendency in our scientific schools to cram students with facts, rather than to teach them how to solve problems by an ingenious application of knowledge.

This situation has been induced by tremendous growth of technology and the attempt to telescope more and more knowlege in a four or five year technical course. This is no easy problem to solve. Regardless of the difficulty, somehow students must be given the realization that the objective of a scientific course is not merely a diploma, but rather to acquire the ability to apply knowledge gained in a useful and original manner.

With this in view, I began an experiment some years ago at my old school, MIT, setting up prizes for original design in the Mechanical Engineering Department.

The instructors found this so useful in stimulating ingenious solutions to problems that I set up a regular yearly cash award for "the most ingenous student" in the department. The winner was selected by a committee on awards drawn from the faculty which reviewed not only the student's scholastic record but his extracurricular activities as well.

This stimulated the interest of the students in using their newly acquired knowledge in ingenous combinations, and the interest of the faculty itself in uncovering talents in the students which were not apparent from routine classification. In any event, it has demonstrated the necessity for ingenuity as well as knowledge to those who would face the world as engineers.

None of the students who received awards was at the top of his class scholastically. But these young men accomplished more, because they had absorbed knowledge and applied it effectively when motivated. It is my belief they will be among our most successful alumni.

MOST IMPORTANT INCENTIVE

The patent system was created to reward and stimulate ingenuity and inventiveness. Classifying a novel idea as the inventor's property which could be reserved for exclusive use or sold or leased for a royalty permits the idea to be used openly without fear of competition for 17 years and with due recourse to law if infringed.

These rights and benefits have produced a powerful incentive for people to exercise their ingenuity and devote their efforts to finding new, improved ways to do things and new tools with which to do them. There is no doubt that the existence of the patent and patent rights has had a profound influence on the rapid industrial growth of our country and served to bring native ingenuity to the fore.

In recent years, however, there has been a tendency on the part of the Government to appropriate patent rights of individuals which will reduce and tend to kill the incentive they were originally designed to produce. Take, for instance, the policy of a good many Government agencies toward their employees—among them the Atomic Energy Commission, the Bureau of Standards, Department of Agriculture, and others. In general, they require that their employees assign to the Government all their rights,

including commercial rights, on any idea patented by them.

If the employees were specifically paid to invent, or adequately remunerated, this might be fair; but in most cases they are not. Under such circumstances the patentee should be allowed to retain the commercial rights as an incentive.

Fortunately, this policy is not held by the Armed Forces, which so far have been able to maintain a more liberal policy of allowing inventors to retain commercial rights wherever possible. Such a policy is not only fairer to the inventor, it has paid off in the form of greater progress.

Some years ago, a survey was made of the number of applications for patents in the Bureau of Standards and in the Naval Research Laboratory which were roughly comparable in personnel. It showed that in that year the Naval Research Laboratory personnel had filed more than twice as many inventions as personnel of the Bureau of Standards. This single instance may not prove the point but, coupled with others, it indicates the value of an incentive policy whereby the inventor can reserve at least part of his patent rights which the Government has no means of using properly. Today, many companies shun Government developmental contracts because they cannot retain any rights to their work after completion. Here again is a case where incentive is curtailed at the expense of progress. It tends to deprive the Nation of the skilled efforts and the use of the facilities of some of the most competent organizations in the country.

Realizing the situation, the Department of Defense has historically accepted only licenses for use by the Government, leaving title with the inventing contractor as an incentive. This stimulates the highest quality in work and encourages faster completion of the job.

Unfortunately, our Government in some policies seems to be leaning toward an increasingly socialistic point of view, which will weaken the driving force behind constructive applications of ingenuity. For instance, some bills pending before Congress currently would shorten the lives of drug patents and give the Federal Government title to certain inventions. What then would stimulate new researchers?

Socialistic thinking does not seem to comprehend that people as a whole receive greater benefits from progress than from rules to force equality.

History tells us that socialism, despite its well meaning ideals, just doesn't work in the competitive world in which man has evolved. Man's natural tendency is to try to outdo his fellow man. If his efforts are not rewarded or are frustrated by rules, he will drift aimlessly.

This does not make for progress or assure survival individually or nationally.

In the sciences there are amazing examples of ingenuity today. In the relatively new field of nuclear physics the means developed by which we can measure the mass, energy, and velocity of infinitely small and unseen units, and harness forces and energy beggar imagination.

In mathematics we have found means of arriving at comprehensible answers to incredibly complex problems by means of expressing general relationships mathematically which would be impossible by means of words.

In chemistry new substances are being produced through the study of molecular structure by means of the electron microscope and rearranging the molecules to produce new products with the desired characteristics.

In astronautics we have the satellite which derives its power for operation by absorption of solar energy to inform us of conditions existing in outer space and even send us pictures of what it sees.

All this and more has come about through the ingenuity of man, and in particular the genius and dedication of our many unheralded scientists who often receive relatively little reward other than the esteem of their fellow scientists and their own self-satisfaction for their accomplishments.

For years, the National Inventors Council, of which I am a member, has sought with little success to have the U.S. Government institute an adequate system of awards as an incentive to spur inventiveness and original work.

These awards would be in addition to and not a substitute for patents, as some have proposed. It makes no sense for the Government to take patent rights because it has no means to exploit them and they thus become valueless. No company is likely to spend the funds necessary to develop an invention to the point of use, or to produce it, if every competitor has an equal right to it through a Government-held patent.

The patent system must be retained as the primary incentive for ingenuity. But awards can add even more to this incentive as a just reward for valuable ideas which are not necessarily patentable.

In Britain, for instance, Sir Frank Whittle received a grant of 100,000 pounds sterling tax free for his invention of the turbojet engine. In the United States and award was made to Dr. W. B. MacLean who developed one of the most valuable guided missiles of our time. Simpler, cheaper, more effective than anything previously developed, it served as a powerful deterrent to Red Chinese aggression aimed at Formosa. But it required an act of Congress to award him $25,000, taxable as income.

Fortunately, under Navy policy he was able to retain commercial rights, which are far more valuable.

The availability of large and prompt awards through a widely known established system would have a tremendous effect in stimulating new thought and effort in this country with corresponding effect on industrial progress.

Ingenuity has been more than a major factor in man's evolution. It has been a key factor in his survival. The more enterprising members of the species that were man's ancestors began to arm themselves with stones and clubs against the stronger wild beasts. Thus, they used their own initiative rather than waiting for natural evolution to provide them with physiological means of protection.

This is in contrast to other more powerful contemporary species which ceased to exist because they did not have the mental characteristics to cope with changed living conditions by artificial means.

Consequently, it is apparent that from the earliest days, ingenuity has been an ingrained quality of man.

In the world today we face a new and vital problem. Man has increased his physical power at a rate far faster than he has developed his wisdom to use it. The flint ax of the Stone Age has become a deadly thunderbolt with which man is capable of destroying himself and his world as well as his personal enemy.

What then lies ahead? None of us can tell. Certainly one thing we can do to gain a better fate than eventual extinction is to keep on solving individual problems as they appear by recourse to that same characteristic which brought us out of the jungle.

There will always be a way if we have the ingenuity to uncover it and the wisdom to follow it.

A New Approach to American Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., was one of 59 people who participated in a shared time conference in New York City. Because this new principle may result in the meeting of the minds and finally bring about additional Federal aid for education, I consider the article "Shared Time: A New Approach in American Education," to be of great national interest. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include Dr. Reuter's article.

SHARED TIME: A NEW APPROACH IN AMERICAN EDUCATION

(By Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr.)

INTRODUCTION

The Committee on Religion and Public Education and the Committee on Weekday Religious Education, in a joint meeting in October 1961 met in the Interchurch Center in New York City. Fifty-nine public educators, religious leaders, and private educators met to discuss a new approach in American education. Each came as an individual, the meeting was held without news releases, and each returned to tell the story as fully as he desired. The group included the superintendent of schools of three large cities, a former U.S. Commissioner of Education, a leader in the Roman Catholic Church, similar leaders in the Lutheran and Methodist Churches, a well-known Jewish lawyer and writer, an editor of a major educational publication, a major administrator of a large university, and a major general. All came for one reason: to consider a new approach. This approach is shared time.

THE NEED

During 1961, the American citizens were divided concerning the desirability of additional Federal aid for education. The polls indicated that the great majority favored additional funds for the public schools, but aid for private schools created much heat. Aid for private schools became a factor in the defeat of the program favored by President Kennedy. There is thus a need to resolve the controversy.

In calling the meeting, one major educator said: "You are aware of the controversies on religion and public education. It is urgent that ways be found for resolving the problems arising from such controversies. One possible way seems to be that of shared-time schools. In behalf of several persons who have been engaged in informal conversations on problems of public and religious education, I write to invite you to join a group which is assembling without official sponsorship to discuss off the record this matter."

SHARED TIME DIFFERENT FROM DISMISSED AND RELEASED TIME

The Dictionary of Education defines two of these terms only. First, dismissed time: "Official dismissal of students for a part or the whole of a schoolday, usually at the elementary or secondary school level, so as to facilitate staff meetings, special events, etc." Second, released time: "Time granted by public schools to their pupils for the express purpose of attending religious classes

conducted under the auspices of their respective denominations or faiths."

These definitions have been altered in recent years to mean that both relate to religious instruction. It is often termed "dismissed time" when the public school permits its students to leave the grounds of the school to attend religious instruction on church property. "Released time" is used to mean when the public school permits its students to receive religious instruction on school property. There are examples when the two words are given the same definition.

One of the public school educators described an example of shared time and how it would function in a typical community. This description reveals the difference of shared time from dismissed and released time. He noted: "If our concept of shared time could work in this community each of the 1,000 Roman Catholic children would be enrolled in the public school for part of his schooling, thereby reducing the overall burden on the parochial school plant so that class sizes could be reduced to sizes comparable to those of the public school, and the financial burden of the parishioners would be reduced to the simple cost of providing that portion of the child's schooling which the church itself would determine to be of religious import. Ideally and theoretically this would relieve the feeling of Roman Catholics that they are doing the state's job. It is quite conceivable that the present late afternoon Hebrew schools would be conducted under a scheduling arrangement which would use a larger portion of what would be looked upon as the normal schoolday, so that the children of these schools would be free to participate more freely in the scheduled extracurricular and recreational activities of the school and community."

SOME INDIVIDUAL EXPRESSIONS

One religious leader present said: "The present moment would seem to offer the best opportunity in many years, if not in our entire history, to take a fresh look in a forum comprising the whole community at the roles of public and parochial schools and the possibility of lessening competition, and increasing cooperation between them in those communities where an impasse has been reached."

A public school leader present said: "The hope for this plan, in theory at least, is that there would be more common ground in the educative process on which the separate elements of our pluralism could meet. For example, it is quite easy to visualize a common physical education program conducted by the public school. Perhaps there would be a single high school football team * * * with more junior varsities competing with other towns. Industrial arts shops, home economics classrooms, science laboratories could become the meeting ground for the common learning of all the children of all the people."

A professor in a private nondenominational university noted: "Hamilton, Ohio, had one of the earliest sets of relationships which could be described as cooperative. Up to 1949, Hamilton public schools made a number of services and facilities available to the Catholic parochial school and to parochial school students * * *. Walter Crewson, the superintendent of schools of Hamilton, felt that this arrangement was well received in the community and that, indeed, many of these services represented not gifts but actual rights that parochial school children had."

A public school leader stated: "It is not to be presumed that the services of the public school will be lessened, either in time or in variety of comprehensive service * * *. The public school must become increasingly a service institution, standing ready to insure that a complete and adequate schooling is available for every child of every parent * * *."

I do not formulate policy for the American Federation of Teachers. During the past year, I edited "Historical Justification for Federal Aid to Education," expressing AFT's policy in favor of additional Federal aid for public schools, and "Some Constitutional Prohibitions Against Financial Aid to Private Schools," expressing AFT's policy against extending Federal aid to private schools. My opinions have not changed concerning these principles.

It is my opinion that shared time will become a major principle in American education and that it has the following possibilities:

1. It will reduce competition and increase cooperation between public and parochial schools.
2. It will reduce class size in parochial schools.
3. It will reduce financial obligations of parochial schools and thus reduce their interest in Federal aid.
4. It will increase financial obligations of public schools and thus increase their opportunities for additional Federal aid.
5. It will be a step toward curriculum improvement.
6. It will improve the social environment of children and parents in American society.

Editorial Exposes Another Move To Sell a Gold Brick to Uncle Sucker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, for those who are urging that we buy United Nations bonds in order to keep that organization solvent even though the Soviet Union and its satellites are nearly $2 billion in arrears in their payments, I call attention to the following editorial from the Dallas Times Herald:

HOW WILL U.N. PAY OFF BONDS? WITH U.S. TAXPAYERS' MONEY

U.S. savings bonds are a good investment. The United Nations bonds are not.

But if the U.S. Government persists in investing the money it borrows from its citizens in such unsound schemes as purchase of U.N. bonds, our own savings bonds will lose some of their charm for Americans who have to earn their money before they invest it.

Many of us have an old-fashioned idea that a bond should be a sound business investment; that it should be worth at least the purchase price. The borrower should be willing and able to redeem it, and should have a sound plan for doing so.

The United Nations is virtually bankrupt. It got that way because many member countries pursued an irresponsible policy of democracy by force in the Congo without regard to cost.

The U.N. is in the red because many nations—each with one vote, the same number as the United States—backed this policy but failed to put up even $1 to carry it out.

Now the United Nations, with no physical or financial assets to speak of, is planning a $200 million bond issue. The bonds would be backed only by the reputation of the member nations, whose default brought about the deficit in the first place.

The United States, which has put up its share of cash all along, is asked to buy half of the bonds. Our Government says it is a good deal.

But from here it looks like a pretty sorry investment.

If some nations—big nations like the Soviet Union, for instance—refused to pay their share of the Congo operation costs, can we expect them to do so now?

Unquestionably the bonds would be paid off, however. They would be paid off when the United States, and possibly a few other nations, pick up the check for the whole thing.

Then the United Nations could redeem with U.S. cash the bonds sold to this country.

Support of any such scheme as this looks downright dishonest. If it were individuals or corporations involved, the plan would be branded immoral.

The United States has no business buying these United Nations bonds.

We always stand ready with millions for charity. But we should offer nothing for the purpose of being a sucker.

The United Nations Bond Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following testimony given by the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on February 7, 1962.

Ambassador Stevenson makes an excellent case for our participation in the bond program and I urge our colleagues to consider his arguments with care in deciding this issue.

The statement follows:

THE U.N. BOND ISSUE

The occasion for these bearings is the President's request for a U.S. subscription to the United Nations bond issue. This raises a number of questions of fact and of policy. Underlying these financial questions is the more basic question of the purposes which these expenditures are intended to serve, and the effectiveness of the United Nations in promoting those purposes.

It hardly needs saying that if the continuation of the United Nations is contrary to the true interests of the United States, $1 would be too much for us to spend on it. On the other hand, a vigorous and effective United Nations is an important ingredient in the prescription for peace and security, and, therefore, the freedom of the American people. If the United Nations, even in its present imperfect form, were ever subtracted from the arsenal of our diplomacy, I think many times its cost in dollars would then have to be added to our defense arsenal. Nor do I care to contemplate the possible loss of life in avoidable conflict.

So I support the purchase of U.N. bonds which the President has recommended. The financial situation of the United Nations convinces me that prompt steps are necessary to assure the financial soundness and continued vigor of the organization. I believe this bond issue, proposed by Secretary General U Thant and approved by the General Assembly, is the best means yet proposed for this purpose; and that the share

of the bonds which the United States proposes to buy is realistic.

If members of the Committee wish to direct questions about the financial details I will do my best to answer them. But Ambassador Klutznick from the U.S. mission to the United Nations, who has followed this matter closely for the United States from the outset and who has negotiated very ably in our behalf, will be available to the Committee to discuss the bond issue in all its aspects. I understand he will be accompanied by Assistant Secretary Cleveland who is also well informed on the financial details.

I shall confine myself to one observation on the matter of cost. Comparing the amount which we are asked to lend the United Nations with its value to this country, I believe that even if we had to give the $100 million, instead of lending it, in order to help keep the organization alive and vigorous, it would be worth the cost many times over, for $100 million is an investment of only about one-tenth of 1 percent of our Federal budget in the peace-keeping capacity of the United Nations. And I am sure you have often heard that on a per capita basis each American spent only $1.06 on the United Nations in 1961 contrasted with about $300 on defense.

With that preliminary I should like to supplement the able statement of the Secretary of State with some views of my own as to the value of the United Nations to the United States. For that is the underlying question.

We are all aware of the part which the Senate played in the creation of the United Nations, going back to the Fulbright resolution and the Connally resolution in the fall of 1943. At the charter conference in 1945 I was privileged to be present as an adviser to the Secretary of State, and I remember vividly the important work of Senator Connally and Senator Vandenberg and of Congressman Bloom and Dr. Eaton as members of our United States delegation and in the ratification debate the following summer.

Later I served as chairman of the U.S. delegation to the Preparatory Commission in London, which worked out the detailed structure and procedures of the organization. Then in 1946 and 1947 it was my privilege to be a delegate to the first two sessions of the General Assembly. After that I thought politics would be less of a strain and now after a year back at the United Nations I still think so.

In 1948 came the second great Senate debate on the United Nations. This produced the Vandenberg resolution, reaffirming our country's support of the United Nations and setting forth several policy objectives to advance the United Nations purposes.

The question then was whether the United Nations could be effective without great power agreement. At least two dozen Soviet vetos in the Security Council had caused great dismay about the United Nations. Some thought they would end its usefulness. It was widely suggested that we should shift to other means, such as military aid and regional arrangements, to gain the ends of peace and freedom for which we had originally looked so hopefully to the United Nations.

The great wisdom of the Vandenberg resolution (S. Res. 239, 80th Cong.) flowed from the realization of its authors that these different courses of actions were not alternatives; that we did not have to choose between them. In fact it was equally vital to pursue them all. So the resolution helped to lay the basis not only for NATO and other regional arrangements—which as Senator Vandenberg said were "within the charter but outside the veto"—but also for renewed efforts to make the United Nations Organization itself a more effective instrument of its declared purposes.

In this historical framework the United Nations in terms of our foreign policy, is, to begin with, a standard—a statement of the basic aims which the United States holds in common with most of the nations of the world—however much we may differ with some of these nations on other questions.

Not only our actions in the United Nations, but all our actions on the world stage, must be aimed at the fulfillment of those basic charter aims—or must at all events be consistent with them.

Secondly, the United Nations is itself one means for carrying those aims into effect. It is not the sole means. Indeed, the charter itself is full of references to others. Article 33 calls for bilateral negotiation, arbitration, judicial settlement, and so forth, as the first obligations of nations involved in a dispute. Article 51 safeguards the inherent right of nations to individual and collective self-defense. Articles 52 to 54 deal with regional arrangements. Similarly the articles dealing with economic and social matters, and with the administration of non-self-governing territories, constitute among other things pledges by the members themselves, simply as individual signatories of the charter, to follow certain standards of conduct and to promote certain aims.

But the United Nations organization is the instrument specifically created to work full-time for the achievement of the charter's purposes. The general assembly, the security council, the economic and social council, the trusteeship council, the secretariat, and the international court of justice—these six basic organs and their various subsidiary bodies are designed for those purposes and no other. Whatever the imperfections which this United Nations organization displays, the light of the charter usually shines a little brighter upon its proceedings than it does upon many of the actions in the world outside.

Furthermore, the veto problem which concerned the authors of the Vandenberg resolution has been overcome to a degree that was barely visible 14 years ago.

The world doesn't stand still. There have been very many events of importance since the United Nations was founded, which were not clearly foreseen. It is therefore fair to ask whether the United Nations is able to cope with the new forces which we find in the world, and whether it can do so in a manner consistent with the purposes of the United States.

My belief is that the United Nations is an asset of incalculable value in coping with those new forces. It is doing so, and gives promise of continuing to do so, in a way which is manifestly consonant with the fundamental interests of the United States. This does not blind one to imperfections and mistakes which are inevitable in so complex an enterprise.

Let me recall briefly, then, some of the main forces which have been shaping world events in the past 10 years, and which provide the environment in which the United Nations has functioned. And let us see how the U.N. has responded.

Of all the new developments of the past decade, the one which has exerted the greatest impact on the United Nations has been the independence movement. It has added greatly to the membership. It has affected the agenda and the decisions of the organization. To appraise it properly it is best to consider first the other major forces with which the independence movement has interacted.

First I would place the continued strength and influence on the United States. We have remained not only a great military and economic power, but also more fundamentally, a nation committed to certain universal moral ideals. What is still more important is our enduring determination to work toward an ever greater realization of those ideals, both at home and abroad. This is surely the deepest source of our national strength. If the United States had ceased to exert its share of moral and ethical leadership during the past decade, the world today would be a very tragic place.

In all the work of the United Nations the United States continues to carry its portion of responsibility. We do not control the United Nations. We never have. We have never aspired to. The very idea of one-power control would defeat the purpose of the organization.

But our position in the United Nations is preeminent. We are the host country to its headquarters. In accordance with our national product, we are the largest single contributor to its regular budget. Almost nothing happens in which the United States is not interested, and on virtually all vital questions we and the majority of members find common ground.

Indeed, in all the history of the United Nations I know of not one case in which the United Nations has injured the vital interests of the United States.

Second, since the death of Stalin and the end of the war in Korea, the leaders of the Soviet Union have not sponsored any new large-scale military aggression. And they have opened a few chinks in their closed society, through which the Russian people may begin to get rid of some of their poisonous suspicions of the world outside. These latter developments, however limited, must be counted a substantial gain for the whole world.

The United Nations has had something to do with this. It has been a factor in inducing the Soviet Union to shift away, in great part, from overt Korea-style aggression. There is the memory of the support which the United Nations gave to the defense of the Republic of Korea. What is more, bomb rattling has never been popular in the United Nations. Whenever the Soviets have shown this ugly face in the United Nations debates they have been least effective in getting votes and political support.

There is intense interest in disarmament at the United Nations. Every year this subject is debated at great length. And one can predict that this issue will soon replace colonialism as the major preoccupation.

But disarmament is a hard subject to debate anywhere, especially between a free society like ours and a closed society such as the Soviet Union. It is also a highly technical subject, and many people around the world who yearn for peace do not understand the technical difficulties. This leaves a wide field for demagogy, and Moscow has done its best to exploit that field in the United Nations.

In view of all this, we have made out fairly well in the disarmament debates. The thorny issue has always been inspection and verification. Last fall the General Assembly once again supported our view on this issue in several key votes. In two instances it did not, and we voted against the resolutions.

After long and patient negotiation we have finally reached agreement on the principles of disarmament, and this winter we also agreed on the composition of a new Disarmament Commission so that negotiations will be resumed in mid-March after almost 2 years.

More public education is necessary all over the world. But if our position is sound and if we continue to advocate it patiently the world will accept it. We should not be too provoked by occasional disappointing votes which do not and cannot control our policy.

Through the United Nations the Soviet Union has also participated in a number of peaceful activities. It is a member of the International Atomic Energy Agency, which resulted from President Eisenhower's proposal in the General Assembly of 1953. The

Soviets have joined to some extent in the work of several of the specialized agencies, and they contribute every year to the U.N. technical assistance program. Their contribution is smaller than it should be but it marks a reversal from their earlier opposition.

Also, we have finally got a basis on which the Soviet Union will join in the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space.

Thus far the very gradual opening of the closed Soviet society has aroused little interest at the United Nations. Sooner or later this development should receive increasing attention as members grasp the significance for world peace of nearly total control over information—and misinformation—by a power which also possesses great armed forces and nuclear weapons.

Third among the important forces of this past decade have been certain stirrings among the satellite nations of Eastern Europe. Despite the tragedy of Hungary, these stirrings reflect a very durable aspiration which is expressing itself in minor but meaningful ways even now.

Resolutions every year since 1956 have placed the United Nations squarely on record against the repression of the Hungarian people and the suppression of their national independence. These debates and resolutions and reports on Hungary have caused the Soviet Union to pay a much higher price in public esteem than it would otherwise have paid.

The voices which call for justice have not been stilled at the United Nations, even when the perpetrator of injustice is a great power.

Fourth, Communist China has emerged as an oppressive and disruptive influence in its own sphere and around the world. Despite extraordinary pressures to have the Peiping regime accepted as a respectable nation, it remains a maverick in international affairs. It has been kept out of the councils of the United Nations and remains largely beyond the reach of U.N. influence. The General Assembly censured it in 1950 for its aggression in Korea, and again annually since 1958 for its brutality in Tibet—albeit without visible result.

The General Assembly has repeatedly rejected the Peiping regime's claim to take over the U.N. seat of the Republic of China. Last December the vote was 48 to 37, which was a wider margin than the year before.

The United States has continued to take the lead on this issue. Perhaps the vigor with which we have pleaded our case has had something to do with the result. But the main author of the exclusion of Communist China from the United Nations has been Communist China itself, with its continued addiction to violence at home and abroad. The leaders in Peiping have damaged their own case even more by explicitly demanding that the U.N. acknowledge their so-called "right" to conquer the 11 million people on Formosa by armed force. A substantial majority of the Assembly seems in no mood to bow to such an arrogant demand.

There is reason to hope that if the Chinese Communists really want to sit in the United Nations, and if the majority of U.N. members persevere in their judgment, this will influence the Chinese Communists in the right direction. But, as this committee knows, quite a number of friendly countries who have proved their hostility to communism openly differ with us on this question and there are always present all of the elements of crisis over this issue.

Fifth, during the past decade creative economic forces have been working in nearly all parts of the non-Communist world. Two trends stand out: in free Europe the great movement for economic unity culminating in the Common Market, and in the less developed countries the potent revolution of rising expectations.

Nearly a billion people of the emerging nations have been marching out of the shadows on to the stage of history—people who no longer accept the proposition that hunger, disease and poverty are the immutable destiny of man. They are demanding economic progress and social reform. This demand must be met in ways which promote the future prospects of freedom and political maturity. Our conscience and our security both require us to respond to this challenge.

An increasing source of investment and technical knowledge for the emerging nations will be free Europe, itself invigorated by growing economic unity and linked together in the OECD. But another important channel, into which the United States and Europe and other countries can profitably channel an increasing share of their development aid, is the United Nations.

The United Nations technical assistance program, its special fund for preinvestment surveys and for research and training programs, and the work of the family of specialized agencies—all these provide at small cost an arsenal of skills, drawn from many countries, to meet the needs of the emerging nations. These skills are put to work where they are needed, under international auspices which are beyond any suspicion of political strings.

This aspect of United Nations work is largely unheralded in this country. It is less dramatic than political controversy, but it may mean more in the long run in our search for world peace and justice.

Last September President Kennedy recognized this when he proposed to the General Assembly a United Nations decade of development, which was unanimously agreed to by the Assembly.

Now I come back to the most dramatic of the forces of the past decade and the one which has exerted by far the greatest impact at the United Nations: the independence movement, which has descended like an avalanche on the old empires of Africa and Asia. It has been largely peaceful but there have been some tragic episodes of violence, and the danger of further violence will be with us for years to come.

The independence movement has increasingly occupied the center of the stage at the United Nations, and has greatly added to its membership.

A few simple figures suggest the magnitude of this transformation.

In 1946, when the General Assembly first met, only 4 of the 51 founding members had gained their independence since the start of the Second World War in 1939.

Today, out of 104 members, 39 have become independent since 1939. That is more than one-third of the membership.

This process is not yet complete. In the coming decade there may be as many as 20 or more new nations seeking membership in the United Nations.

The American people have rejoiced to see the people of the old colonial empires attain their independence. This movement is in our tradition. It fulfills on a grand scale that prophetic phrase in our Declaration of Independence that all men—not just Americans, but all men—are created equal and have unalienable rights.

The United Nations has been midwife at the birth of many of the new nations and has striven with some success to ease the birth pains. This aid is desperately needed, because there are many perils in this swift transition.

One such peril exists in the apparent strategy of the Soviet Union, one of whose chief preoccupations is driving wedges between the nations of Africa, the Middle East and Asia on the one hand, and those of the West on the other. They fan distrust and racial hatred among the emerging countries, and hope to move into the vacuum created by the departing rulers. The defeat of that strategy in Africa, particularly in the Congo, is a great contemporary drama of the United Nations.

There are other dangers as well, not all of them made in Moscow. There are dangers of extremism and war; of the Balkanization of Africa into units too weak to stand alone; of adamant resistance to the winds of change in Southern Africa; and of efforts by some parties to whip these same winds of change into hurricanes. From all these dangers flows the further danger that these aspiring peoples could be cut off by war and hatred and fear from the friendship and aid of the free world.

There is still another supposed danger which is more imaginary than real. That is the specter of the alleged Afro-Asian neutralist bloc in the United Nations, ganging up with the Soviet bloc to outvote the West.

Nearly half of the 104 members of the United Nations today are from Africa, the Middle East, and Asia. The assertion that all these countries vote together against the United States has no basis in fact.

Nations do not vote according to their size or, in any automatic or mechanical way, according to their geographic region. Generally each of them votes on the issues, and in its own interest as it sees those interests. Our posture in the United Nations is based on the belief, so amply justified year after year, that the interests which we hold in common with the great majority of nations—regardless of size, power, population, race, or region—are so much stronger than the interests which divide us that we generally find common ground with them on the vital issues. To find that common ground, consistent with U.S. interests in and out of the United Nations, is the real burden of our diplomacy.

Therefore I do not feel any great anxiety about the principle, however vexing, of "one nation, one vote" in the General Assembly. Our adherence to this principle was foreshadowed as early as 1943 in the Connally resolution of the Senate, which called for a general international organization to keep the peace and to be based on the sovereign equality of all members, large and small. Our experience indicates that even with the much enhanced influence and responsibility of the General Assembly of today, this highly democratic principle is workable and not inconsistent with the interests of the United States. Moreover, no one has found a suitable alternative.

Actually there is a great power which is regularly outvoted in the Assembly, but it is not the United States. It is the Soviet Union, whose aims and actions so often inspire widespread distrust. That has been true in the most recent sessions of the Assembly. But I am not going to belabor you with cases in point unless you so desire.

The underlying reason for the basic identity of interest between the United States and the majority at the United Nations is not far to seek. Unlike the Soviet Union, our purpose is not conquest but community—a community in which the small and weak need not fear the big and powerful.

The whole history of the United Nations could be told as a series of attempts, more or less successful, to uphold the independence of small and vulnerable nations. Iran, Greece, Indonesia, Israel, Korea, Egypt, Lebanon, Laos, and finally the Congo—all these are nations whose independence was threatened in one way or another from the outside, and which got some measure of help from the United Nations in their hour of trouble.

The one case which has presented the organization with its greatest challenge has been the Congo. If the United Nations had not been available to answer the appeal of the new Congolese Government in 1960, it

seems certain that there would have been a direct confrontation there between the great powers. The Soviet Union had smuggled aircraft and trucks and technicians into the Congo, against the resolutions of the United Nations, in an attempt to turn the Lumumba government to its purposes. It was the United Nations, acting as the instrument of the world community on the request of the legitimate government, that prevented this attempt from succeeding.

The U.N. acted also to prevent secessions which would have carved the Congo into little spheres of influence, whether under Russian or European sponsorship. It has struggled to preserve for that tortured nation one of the greatest gifts it inherited from its former Belgian ruler: its unity. It begins to look as if the Congolese Government, in partnership with the U.N., can begin to repair some of the ravages of the past 2 years and turn its attention to the great task of building a viable independent nation.

This United Nations action in the Congo is something quite new in history. The vacuum of power which was left by the sudden departure of the former colonial ruler has been filled, not by a new imperial master far worse than the old, but by the community of nations, acting to help a new fellow member to cross the dangerous gulf to independence.

The capacity of the United Nations to take such effective action has been developed not by revision of the charter, but by adapting the present charter to the urgent requirements that arose.

For example, the authority of the General Assembly, and its ability to use that authority effectively on urgent matters of war and peace when the Security Council is tied up with the veto, is one such adaptation.

A second is of equal importance: the growth of significance of the office of the Secretary General. Contrary to the Soviet contention Mr. Hammarskjold was never a usurper. But more and more over the years the General Assembly and the Security Council made decisions which required large-scale executive action. He showed that he could meet that need as well as serve a uniquely valuable diplomatic function. His successor, U Thant, of Burma, a man of admirable qualities, has shown that he too is a man of action and a faithful and able servant of the community.

It would be foolish to contend that the United Nations has been doing a flawless job or that it cannot be improved. There have been mistakes in the Congo. There have been some recent votes in the General Assembly which we consider unwise and ill-considered. There is an unwillingness in some cases to see the tragic implications of the use of armed force, as in the recent case of the Indian seizure by force of Goa on which I was moved to speak forcefully in the Security Council.

But it scarcely serves a useful end to judge the United Nations solely by the points at which it has failed. I often wonder whether those who judge it in this way would be happier if the United Nations had stood aside completely from the real, tough events of the world where failure is always a possibility.

Underlying all the questions at issue in the United Nations is the more basic question: what is the unifying purpose behind those efforts? What is the game we are playing?

As far as the United States is concerned, I believe the game at the United Nations is exactly our national style. It is a game in which it is not necessary to defeat and crush an opponent in order to score a point. In fact, the highest points are scored when a great action is taken with the greatest unanimity.

The United Nations is dedicated by its charter "to be a center for harmonizing the actions of nations" in pursuit of certain common aims. The goals are clearly set forth—the promotion of international peace and security; the prevention of war; collective action against aggression; peaceful settlement of disputes; cooperation for economic and social progress in larger freedom; observance of international law and justice; and the advancement of dependent territories toward self-government and self-determination.

Taken together these aims constitute an enormous harmony of interest—a framework of standards of conduct within which a great deal of disagreement and friction can be contained, and an immense wealth of talent and resources combined for the common good.

We in the United States have, and I hope we always will have, that spirit of liberty which, as Judge Learned Hand said, "is the spirit that is not too sure that it is right." But in the United Nations there are others who are much too sure that they are right. It is that quality in the Soviet Union, and in the other totalitarian powers, and unfortunately to a certain extent, in some of the nations of the non-Communist world, that quality of superrightness, and of intolerance and unwillingness to listen and learn, which is to a great extent at the root of the world's troubles, because it gives rise to impatience and anger and to violent solutions.

Seen in that light, the United Nations possesses an incalculable civilizing value for the nations of the world. It teaches tolerance. It teaches free and frank exchange in open debate. It teaches accommodation. And the exhausting process of trying to muster the necessary two-thirds majority for a resolution, in a parliamentary body of over 100 sovereign nations, is a most civilizing experience.

It requires the kind of skill in which our country, with its great internal variety and nearly two centuries of representative government, is extraordinarily rich. By contrast the delegates of the Soviet Union, which has no democratic tradition at home, have had to try to acquire it at the United Nations by painful hard knocks.

I don't think the Soviets can ever really succeed at the United Nations until they have outgrown the notion that success consists in crushing somebody else. Among the non-Communist nations, both old and new, we sometimes find either a too stubborn resistance to inevitable change and growth, or at the other extreme an insistence on forcing the pace in an atmosphere of violence and hatred. But both these tendencies would be far greater than they are if it were not for the effect of United Nations diplomacy in wearing down the sharp corners of national policies.

This basic character of the United Nations would be congenial to the United States in any era. But in the present era we face dangers which make it a vital necessity.

If we were to neglect our own responsibilities in the United Nations, or if it degenerated because of financial failure or for any other reason into what Dag Hammarskjold called a mere "static conference machinery" then it would fail of its real purposes and might even be perverted to serve the purposes of its enemies. I do not think that is going to happen. I do not think the faithful members, including this country, will let it happen. Rather I expect that the United Nations will continue to adapt to changing requirements; and that it will prove far more creative and enduring in the drama of our time than the seemingly efficient but actually very primitive institutions of communism.

And as an American I believe that, whatever the storms we may face in the years ahead, the United Nations will remain one of the chief elements in our country's security. For through its processes we can make the most of those common aims which bind us to the vast majority of mankind.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletters of February 24, 1962:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

"As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear."—George Washington's Farewell Address.

National Indignation Convention members visited Congress and Congressmen this week. Numerous members, including myself, introduced concurrent resolutions stating "that no funds will be appropriated for the purpose of training military personnel from any Communist country or any country dominated by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 421

"Resolution to prohibit training enemy military personnel or aiding Communist nations

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)* That no funds will be appropriated for the purpose of training military personnel from any Communist country or any country dominated by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

"All Communists and other representatives of enemy countries now being trained in the United States as pilots, technicians, and other military personnel shall be returned to their own lands at the earliest possible moment.

"The transfer to Communist and other enemy nations of all planes and other weapons of war, and materials that may be converted to weapons of war, shall be terminated at once.

"Any such material in process of transfer shall be stopped in transit and returned to the United States; and any and all agreements relative thereto shall be canceled immediately.

"Any persons in Government found guilty of violating the provisions of this resolution shall be removed from office."

The good sense of this resolution is self-evident. The logic of why we have aided the enemy and continue to do so escapes me. I applaud those citizens who have indignantly petitioned their government to change this, as well as other government errors. People must protest loud and clear to all elected officials. (1) Educate, (2) lobby, (3) elect is the threefold course of action needed today to make "government of, by and for the people" succeed.

The Attorney General Robert Kennedy's remark discrediting Texas still remains unanswered as to what he really meant. It should be the expectation of all Texans, surely that this answer be forthcoming soon. Brave Americans who fought and died for this country in any war deserve a special place in the hearts and minds of those who follow and who must protect their honor.

The expropriation of American property, an $8 million company of International Telephone & Telegraph Co., by Brazil is another act in the chain of humiliation of the great United States. Once again the Untied States does nothing. No marines or warships offshore and tough diplomatic talk to remind Brazil that the U.S. lives and property are inviolate. Instead we listen to Mr. Goulart, President of Brazil, claim he is not responsible for and cannot control the action of his brother-in-law, Governor Leonel Brizola, in the seizure. An offer of $400,000 in exchange is more than outrageous. How can we encourage Americans to invest in foreign lands without protection? At the same time the administration has promised $20 billion in aid to the alliance for progress. What kind of progress is expropriation? Now, no doubt, the President will authorize millions in aid to Brazil. What's more, this criticism I herein level is the kind the liberals who control Congress call "extremist, reactionary, old fashioned." To me, the protection of U.S. lives and property is "patriotic, constitutional, commonsense." The healthiest action possible, and most needed in the world is timely, strong-armed toughness of the United States acting fast and sure to protect U.S. rights when and wherever they are jeopardized.

The debt ceiling was raised $2 billion. For the second year, I protested in debate and committee report, any increase. While it is true that the United States must pay bills when already contracted for and payment is due, it is equally true that denying money to the President would force some reshuffling of expenditures resulting in less spending. In 1954 Congress denied a $15 billion increase and the Government got along all right. Specifically, I criticized (1) the "temporary" tag. There's nothing temporary about government spending; it's permanent; (2) Increased military spending is not the reason for more needed money since nondefense spending under Kennedy has been 60 to 75 percent of the increase, contrary to what is being told the public; (3) The debt ceiling is a false limitation and should be done away with: There is no limit to the Government's power to tax, spend and borrow. (Hence the need for my constitutional amendment (H.J. Res. 11) to force a balanced budget on Congress.) As usual, some members demagogically spoke about the need for debt reduction, the same members who have voted most, if not all the spending which occasioned the need for a debt ceiling increase. Nor is this all, the Ways and Means Committee is forewarned that the President will ask soon for $8 billion more increase of the debt. Welfare spending in every area is soaring. This year the President will require us to raise $14 billion more in taxes than last year just to break even, if there are no further increases by the President. I wonder when the people will really awaken and restrain the President and his equally radical ADA advisers in this mad race to financial ruin. I was proud this week to put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the story of Daingerfield, Tex. Daingerfield, like Dallas, is determined to stand on its own feet, develop the community through the efforts of its own people instead of waiting for the Federal Government to do it.

The creation of a new Government Department of Urban Affairs and Housing and a new Cabinet officer occasioned the week's biggest controversy. A yes vote meant a no to permitting the President a go-ahead on Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962. The President was soundly rebuffed by a vote of 264 to 150. All but 13 Republicans were against the new Department. Of 248 Democrats voting, 111 joined the Republicans, leaving 137 Democrats favoring the new Department. Argument for: (1) Urban growth is great, (2) Federal housing and urban programs have grown greatly, (3) improved management and operation of Federal programs. Arguments against: (1) Vast increase of Federal employees and expense, (2) weakening of State and local jurisdiction, increase Federal centralization of power, (3) not necessary to accomplish Federal programs, (4) discourage initiative and further dry up local taxes as Federal Government collects taxes and returns some to the communities. Probably the biggest factors were not on the surface of the debate: (1) The President was trying to force Congress to accept his proposal, (2) the President injected politics by criticizing the Republicans in the Rules Committee who earlier voted against such a Department (all 5 Republicans of the Committee were joined by 4 of the 10 Democrats) and secondly he announced Robert Weaver, a Negro, who would head the new Department as a Cabinet officer, a callous injection of the race issue. Subsequent developments include the President's announcement that the Department would still be set up. This time, I predict, the "benevolent dictatorship" will fail in its objective. Certainly, new pressures will be brought to bear against vulnerable Members of Congress by the President. How refreshing it would be if Congress would really reassert its constitutional role as it did this once.

The tax bill before Ways and Means has gone through so many revisions and "about-faces" I shall withhold overall comment until the final draft is complete. I can report with disappointment that several very sensible proposals were defeated. Eleven Republicans and one Democrat joined (but were defeated by 14 of 15 Democrats) in proposing a tax cut for individuals, corporations, and a liberalized depreciation allowance at a tax loss of $1.4 billion less than the President is demanding in the "giveaway" investment credit being granted to some industries and costing $1.8 billion. At a time of great spending it is recognizable that tax cuts are inconsistent. Now the President asks that $1.8 billion be cut as grants to certain taxpayers as the administration specifies. This is tremendous political power in the hands of the Treasury Department. As I see it, any tax cut should be a true tax cut, to everyone as the Alger-Baker-Herlong provision provides, which would liberalize depreciation and cut every bracket of individual and corporation taxes, the only real stimulus to our economy. Of course, the really necessary action to accompany tax cuts is reduced Federal spending. This is a lesson never learned by the Democrats now leading the administration and Congress.

This is a week which will be remembered for all time for the heroic achievement of Col. John Glenn in his inspiring race around the earth in space. On Monday the entire Congress will hold a joint session to pay tribute to the man and to his achievement. Every American heart thrilled at this latest success for our science, our technology, and the pioneering spirit which has always been an intrinsic part of American character.

"It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another."—George Washington's Farewell Address.

Aviation Industry Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the highest possible standards in the contract aviation services industry are vital to provide our military with a good product.

Mr. Beverly E. (Bevo) Howard, president of Hawthorne Aviation in Charleston, S.C., recently emphasized this in remarks at the National Aeronautical Services Association's fourth annual Army aviation contract services symposium.

Mr. Howard explained the contractor's role in providing the Army with excellent service and stretching the dollar in many ways for the military's benefit.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I insert his comments for the information of the Congress and the American public:

REMARKS OF BEVERLY E. (BEVO) HOWARD PRESIDENT, HAWTHORNE AVIATION, CHARLESTON, S.C.

The contract aviation services industry desires to have the highest possible standards, both technical and ethical, to provide the Army with the best product at all times. Contractors can provide the Army a broader base which is important, not only in wartime, but also in peacetime. As contractors "we believe that we not only need the Army, but the Army also needs us. We believe that the contractor should put Army aviation's desires ahead of his own desires and selfish interests the same as he would do in the case of any other valued customer. * * * We believe that contractors should not buy business, as has been done in the cases of a few companies, because we believe this invites trouble and works against the competitive enterprise system. We believe in the free enterprise system. And we believe also that the contract system strengthens the free enterprise system. The reason that we have such an abiding belief in the free enterprise systems weakens our Nation. And if we ever country the greatest and strongest country. Anything that weakens the free enterprise systems weakens our nation. And if we ever become a second class nation, then we are going to end up with a second-class Army, and that, as you know, will be the beginning of the end for us. * * * We believe that the Army should be just as concerned with its contractors making a fair profit as we ourselves. As you know, if the Army does not get a qualified contractor, and one that is making a reasonable profit, that situation invites trouble and in the end costs our Government and the taxpayers more money—to say nothing of the inefficiencies that come along with that. That profit system is not an evil system. Anyone who feels that the profit system is an evil system really doesn't believe in the free enterprise system. * * * We don't want to be kept in business as a contractor unless we are needed. It is extremely important that you understand our feeling on this point. If we approach you or if you feel we are approaching you on the basis that we want you to provide us with

some business just to keep us in business, you are not getting your money's worth and neither are we contributing what we should contribute. * * * We believe very strongly that there are many areas where you can use the contract concept. Contractors can help you stretch the Army's dollar in many, many more ways."

U.S Concern for Glenn's Safety Is Reason for Pride

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, we are justly proud of the orbital flight of Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., last Tuesday because it was a victory not only for the Project Mercury man-in-space program, but also for America and for our way of life.

The day, February 20, 1962, will be remembered through history not just for its scientific significance but because the space flight made by Colonel Glenn was broadcast to the world, in contrast to the secrecy shrouding the manned orbital flights claimed to have been made by Soviet Russia's cosmonauts.

As Colonel Glenn himself pointed out in his speech before the joint session of Congress, his flight is but a "building block" for what is to come in the area of space travel. He outlined our plans for future space activity, culminating in a lunar landing.

But as we move forward to greater achievements which now are almost incomprehensible, as was Colonel Glenn's flight to us only a few years ago, we can look back with honor upon this day.

The spirit of our Nation regarding the success of this space project has been brought out admirably by our free press. A penetrating and commendable editorial pointing out the humanitarian method with which we dealt with our astronaut appeared February 21, 1962, in the Flint, Mich., Journal.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am asking that this editorial be printed in the RECORD in order that it may further reflect our national pride on this great day.

The editorial follows:

U.S. CONCERN FOR GLENN'S SAFETY IS REASON FOR PRIDE

Tuesday millions of Americans figuratively held their breath.

Today they are holding their heads high. They have reason to be proud.

The man responsible both for the Nation's anxiety and exultation was Astronaut John H. Glenn, Jr.

For more than 5 hours, from the time Glenn was shot into space in his *Friendship 7* capsule until word was received that he had been safely lifted from the sea, most normal activity ceased throughout this country. Some people went through the motions of normalcy. Others made no such pretense. But any interest anyone had in anything else going on between 9:47 a.m. and 3:05 p.m. was purely feigned.

As Glenn's voice was being received and his very heartbeat graphically recorded for the world to hear and see, most Americans mentally were whirling around the earth with him as they unashamedly prayed for his safety.

It was Glenn himself who said he thought too much emphasis was being placed on the human factor involved. More emphasis should be concentrated on the scientific significance of the flight, he insisted.

Well, we hope that the first American to orbit the earth will excuse his country's heartfelt concern for his life first and hope for the project's scientific success second. We are certain he understood. For this is an American trait for which we all should be grateful. In fact it has had much to do with shaping this country's man-in-space program. It is this concern for human life that permitted the Soviet Union to forge ahead in the space race. But it is a distinguishing part of our program about which Americans can be rightfully proud.

Compassion, concern for the welfare of others, placing a high premium on human life—these are characteristic traits of Americans. Communists point to them as indications of weakness. But this merely underlines their misunderstanding of the moral, spiritual fiber of the American people. They are signs of a fundamental strength that has helped to weld this Nation into an unconquerable force whenever it has been seriously challenged.

Today we can point to the tremendous achievement that Tuesday's orbital flight actually represented. But at least for 5 hours Tuesday, America's attention was focused on the astronaut guiding his spacecraft through outer space. His safety was uppermost in everyone's mind. And no one would want it any other way.

Tuesday's shot has been described as only another step in man's attempt to conquer space. Someone called it just the end of the beginning. And unquestionably we someday will look back on Glenn's trip as a crude, unimaginative stab at space travel. But February 20, 1962, will go down as an important date in U.S. history.

Not only did Tuesday's orbital shot stamp Project Mercury's 3-year program a success, but it represented a monumental propaganda victory for the United States in the cold war struggle for prestige.

The Soviets have made claims of two manned-orbital flights. But they have been conducted in secrecy. Even the Russian people were kept in the dark about the shots. The world has only the word of the Soviet Government that Gherman Titov and Yuri Gagarin circled the earth.

But the first U.S. manned-orbital attempt was made in the open with representatives of the foreign press among the witnesses. And every detail was broadcast and telecast before the eyes and ears of the world.

We did it. We proved it. We demonstrated not only the skill and prowess of our scientists and engineers, but also the wondrous success and advantage of freemen living in an open society.

We have challenged the Soviet Union to live up to its boasts of supremacy. Let it try to duplicate our feat while the world looks on.

It can't possibly accept such a challenge. It can't afford to gamble on failure.

The United States gambled and won.

Americans have good cause today to look the rest of the world in the eye and be proud—proud not only of a scientific victory, but proud of Americans like Glenn and members of the Mercury team responsible for the almost incredible exactness of Tuesday's world-circling flight.

H.R. 9986: A Bill To Prohibit the Application of Unreasonable Literary Requirement Regarding the Right To Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, 20 States in this great democracy still have some form of literacy test as a prerequisite for the exercise of the individual franchise to vote. On January 31, 1962, I introduced H.R. 9986, a bill to prohibit the application of unreasonable literacy requirements regarding the right to vote. Section 1 of my bill sets forth four findings of the Congress. It states, first, that Congress finds that the right to vote is fundamental to free, democratic government, and that it is the continuing responsibility of the Federal Government to secure and protect this right against all unreasonable and arbitrary restrictions.

The bill states, in the second place, that Congress finds that the right to vote of many persons has been subjected to arbitrary and unreasonable restrictions on account of race or color; that literacy tests have been extensively used to deny the suffrage to otherwise qualified persons because of their race or color; and that existing laws are not adequate to guarantee the enjoyment of this basic right without discrimination.

The bill further states, third, that Congress finds that illiteracy is rapidly disappearing in the United States, that the quality of elementary education furnished by the Nation's schools is of high caliber, that persons completing six grades of education in a State-accredited school can reasonably be expected to be literate; and that any literacy test that denies the right to vote to any person who has completed six grades is arbitrary and unreasonable.

The bill states finally, that Congress finds and declares that its enactment is necessary to make effective the guarantees of the Constitution, especially those contained in the 14th and 15th amendments, by eliminating or preventing arbitrary and unreasonable restrictions on the franchise which occur through the denial of the right to vote to persons with at least six grades of education.

Section 2 of the bill amends the Revised Statutes so as to provide that all citizens of the United States who are otherwise qualified to vote at any election by the people shall be entitled and allowed to vote at all elections without distinction of race, color, or previous condition of servitude and without being subjected to any literacy test beyond the completion of the sixth primary grade in a school accredited by any State or by the District of Columbia.

It is legislation of this character that will raise the level of true democracy in the United States, not to mention the effect it will have upon devastating Soviet propaganda in this area.

This bill will make effective the guarantees of the Constitution to many minority groups, members of which have been subjected to arbitrary and unreasonable restrictions on account of race or color.

I urge my colleagues to give serious and favorable consideration to the legislation I proposed and incorporated in H.R. 9986.

Small Business an Important Part of Free Enterprise System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the strength of the free enterprise system lies in the fact that it is built of many components including individual initiative and enterprise, small business, and big business. An important factor is that under our system of free competition opportunity is not limited by government decree, but only by the effort, the know-how, the willingness to risk and work by the individual. In all this complex society small business has always played an important part. The following article from this morning's Washington Post by Maurice R. Stans is well worth reading for a better understanding of our American economy and how it works:

BRIGHT FUTURE SEEN FOR SMALL BUSINESS

(By Maurice H. Stans)

Joe Young graduated from college in Iowa last year. He is now home in a suburb of Omaha running a new taxi service. His fraternity roommate, Bill Eden, has gone back to Minnesota and become the owner of a flower shop and nursery. Both are doing well.

In our American economic structure, small business has always played an important role. It has been, in fact, the symbol of free enterprise. Hundreds of thousands of new entrepreneurs set out to accept the invitation of our system to demonstrate personal ambition and initiative each year.

Millions of small businesses have been successful. Some have grown and become big business. Others have merged or been sold to larger outfits. Some, with inadequate capital, poor management or misplaced confidence, have gone under. The important thing is that our American society offers an open opportunity to everyone with an idea, a willingness to work and a little money to try for the big time. If we are to avoid socialism, it is vital that we preserve the room and the climate for small business in this country.

The erroneous impression frequently arises that small businesses are slowly disappearing. Part of this belief includes the false notion that big business is pushing the "little fellow" into oblivion.

The truth is that small business is doing much better than is usually assumed. It is not only holding its own but is on the rise.

GROWTH NOT STIFLED

A report prepared for the Federal Reserve Board a short time ago concluded that neither large business nor big automation "have reduced small business to insignificance, or even stifled its growth in most of the major sectors of the economy."

According to the Department of Commerce, there were a record 4.7 million business firms in operation at the end of 1960. Of this figure, about 4.5 million were small businesses, as defined by the Small Business Administration, and these accounted for 96 percent of the total. (For comparison, at the end of 1957 there were 4.25 million small business units in operation.) These small business enterprises represented more than 40 percent of the Nation's total business activity and employed nearly 30 million people.

The future outlook continues favorable. The small business population is projected to exceed 5 million by the end of the 1960's. This increase of more than 500,000 new organizations clearly indicates that opportunities for small business are just as favorable as ever.

LARGE NEED THE SMALL

Paradoxically, an important reason for this bright picture for small business is the contribution of large corporations to the economy. Large business enterprises need small firms to help in the manufacture, distribution, and servicing of their products. The emergence of large automobile producers created hundreds of thousands of opportunities in the distribution and repairing of cars, as well as sales of gas and oil. Our important defense industries rely heavily on small business firms to supply unique materials and special services. The large defense firms, with Government encouragement, make special efforts to subcontract substantial parts of their contracts to smaller enterprise. A long as small business can supply the needed parts or services at competitive prices, size is not important. In fact, these smaller firms are often better organized to do specialized work than large companies.

Small business today is assured of adequate financing, both short-term and long-term commercial banks have long given special attention to the short-term credit needs of small businesses. The Small Business Investment Act, passed in 1958, provides new ways of bringing long-term and equity capital to small ventures.

So the future holds enticing promise for small business. The 1960's should be the greatest period of expansion in our history. A population rise of 30 million people along with a 50-percent gain in the gross national product should provide widespread opportunities. As our family demands move more and more from goods to services, new openings for small business are created in large numbers.

TECHNOLOGY HELPS

While bigness will be a necessity in certain fields, in many it will not be important. The development of new industries based on new technology will broaden the prospects for small enterprises. The emphasis on brainpower rather than size will open new vistas. Higher levels of education should widen the demand for new products and services and further encourage formation of new enterprises. For those who have imagination and ability, and who are willing to work hard and take risks, there is as much inducement as ever in many new and expanding fields.

There are two conclusions we ought to reach from all this. America is still a land of opportunity. And the future of small business does not depend upon attacking or destroying big business. Both have a place in our free society.

Of Moon and Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, rarely have I been so moved in this House as I was today when Astronaut John Glenn came before the Congress to tell us of his epochal flight. He left an indelible mark on history, a mark he etched last week a hundred miles above the earth. And he also left an indelible mark on those of us who were fortunate enough to be present when he addressed the Congress in joint session.

Among those who have been impressed beyond the obvious giant scientific stride is James "Scotty" Reston, of the New York Times. The day before Colonel Glenn appeared here, Reporter Reston, as is his way, touched on a deeper significance, one of which we have all been somewhat aware but one which Mr. Reston committed to the printed page, in his concise and thoughtful style.

Consequently, I include this article in the RECORD:

CAPE CANAVERAL: IS THE MOON REALLY WORTH JOHN GLENN?

(By James Reston)

CAPE CANAVERAL, FLA., February 24.—The examples placed before a nation are vital. What we constantly observe, we tend to copy. What we admire and reward, we perpetuate. This is why John Glenn himself is almost as important as his flight into outer space, for he dramatized before the eyes of the whole Nation the noblest qualities of the human spirit.

Outside of the morality play of our cowboy movies, where the hero always gets the girl and the villain always gets slugged behind the saloons, courage, modesty, quiet patriotism, love of family and religious faith are not exactly the predominant themes of our novels, plays, TV shows, movies, or newspapers these days. Yet Glenn dramatized them all coast to coast and around the world.

This was no insensitive robot who landed here from the heavens yesterday morning, but a warm and thoughtful human being, natural, orderly, considerate and, at times, quietly amusing and even eloquent.

ALL THIS AND ANNIE TOO

His departure from Cape Canaveral in a blaze of orange fire was a technical triumph, but his return was a human triumph. When he came back and saw his lovely wife, Annie, he put his head on her shoulder and cried. Thereafter nothing ruffled him, not the President, or the clamorous press, or the whirring cameras, or the eager shouting crowds.

This memorable performance, of course, may not stamp out juvenile delinquency overnight, but the models of the Nation—not the uncovered cover girls of today but the larger models of human character—are probably more important than this age believes.

When Walter Bagehot, the English editor and scientist, made his famous study 100 years ago of why some nations progressed, he concluded that what a nation admired and despised was almost as important as its military power.

"Slighter causes than is commonly thought," he said, "may change a nation from the stationary to the progressive state

of civilization, and from the stationary to the degrading."

It all depended, he insisted, on the model of character emulated or eliminated. If the enduring qualities of nobility, intelligence, perseverance, and courage were uppermost, then he felt all was well.

For then, he asserted, "a new model in character is created for the Nation; those characters which resemble it are encouraged and multiplied; those contrasted with it are persecuted and made fewer.

"In a generation or two, the look of the Nation becomes quite different; the characteristic men who stand out are different; the men imitated are different; the result of the imitation is different. A lazy nation may be changed into an industrious, a rich into a poor, a religious into a profane, as if by magic, if any single cause, no slight, or any combination of causes, however subtle, is strong enough to change the favorite and detested types of character."

If this was true in the middle of the 19th century it has even more validity in this age of instantaneous communication. Only a few hundred people heard Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. New models and styles are now set by television every day, but most of them are models of cars and styles of dresses and hairdos.

What transcontinental television did for the Nation on the Glenn story illustrates the wider application of the idea. It almost made up for what it does to us the rest of the time, but not quite.

THE EARTH'S NEED

Meanwhile, the question remains, How many more John Glenns and Al Shepards are hiding in this country?

Outer space is a long way to go to discover a new generation of leaders of men, but if we have to recuit them there, why not? Human weightlessness is almost our major problem in Washington, and since these astronauts know more about it than anybody else, maybe a couple of them should be transferred to thin hot air of the Capitol.

After all, Glenn is 40, and even if he looks like the freshman football coach at Muskingurn College he can't go off spinning around the earth without his Annie forever. Once Christopher Columbus had discovered America, Ferdinand and Isabella didn't insist that he go back every Tuesday.

Besides, is the moon worth John Glenn when we need him so badly on earth?

A Project Worthy of Congressional Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Roscoe Drummond which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of February 9, 1962.

It is an excellent endorsement of an excellent program—the Peace Corps—and I join Mr. Drummond in its support.

The article follows:

PEACE CORPS WINS PRAISE—SHRIVER'S VOLUNTEERS SEEN DESERVING HILL'S ACCEPTANCE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—If you thought that the Peace Corps was going to be a political boondoggle, a joyride for the volunteers and likely to alienate foreign friends—the facts are proving to be quite different.

I certainly had my own reservations at the beginning. I thought the Peace Corps was a good idea likely to go wrong in operation. It has gone right.

When its 1962–63 budget comes before Congress for approval, the Peace Corps will find that it has won many new supporters in both parties.

On the basis of its efficient management and first-year achievements, the Peace Corps clearly deserves the increasing—even enthusiastic—acceptance it is getting on Capitol Hill.

Director Sargent Shriver, Jr., is giving the Peace Corps a drive and dedication which are reflected throughout its operation.

Thus far there are 802 Peace Corps volunteers working in 14 countries in Africa, the Near East and South Asia, the Far East and Latin America.

These young, well-motivated and college-trained volunteers are working about 18 hours a day teaching students and teaching teachers, mapping roads, improving health and sanitation, improving methods of farming. The Peace Corpsmen received tourist travel and living expenses (some of it paid by the host countries) and $75 a month deposited to their credit in the United States.

The only practical basis for judging the Peace Corps at this time is whether the countries in which it is serving are satisfied. On this point the facts are these:

Everyone of the 14 countries want the work continued.

But this might just be a wish not to offend. It is more than that because every one of these governments—from Ghana to Thailand, from Tanganyika to Chile—is asking for more Peace Corps help.

Furthermore, 13 other countries are asking the Peace Corps for volunteers. How have the Peace Corps volunteers themselves shown up under stressful conditions? Out of 802 volunteers working in remote parts of relatively underdeveloped countries, only one has quit and another ordered home.

At headquarters Mr. Shriver has attracted—and the Peace Corps ideal itself attracted—outstanding able people from business, from academic life and from other government agencies. The Peace Corps is a spartan operation in the field and it is being spartanly but firmly managed in Washington.

What is life and work like for the Peace Corps? Here is a typical report from a volunteer in Ghana:

"Real privations have been at a minimum. My house, a 2-mile walk from the school, is without electricity, refrigeration, and transportation; but it is compensatingly located on the beautiful, grassy, warm, windswept plains of Winneba, and faces the distant and lovely Mount Mankoadze.

"In order to reach school for the morning service and the first class at 7, I rise each day at 5:30. Classes are completed at 2, at which time I return home for lunch except when I remain on duty until 9 or for student meetings which last the afternoon. My teaching, 28 hours a week of English language, French language, English literature, and British history, demands many extra hours of preparation.

"I usually cannot retire before 10 or 10:30. Extra activities include additional classes for the upper forms in English and history (often for students not officially in my classes), and being a form master, the entertainments master, and the debating union master. When we move to our new location, I hope to do some coaching of wrestling, tennis, and basketball.

"It has been interesting to give a few Saturday night lectures to the school. * * * I was pleased to discover how much an objective, unbiased American point of view—on Berlin—can be appreciated by an uninformed but eagerly curious group of students."

The Peace Corps hopes to expand its volunteers working abroad from 800 to about 6,700 in the next 18 months.

Here is a New Frontier enterprise which is really creating a new frontier for practical American idealism in action.

Functional Illiteracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I made before the General Subcommittee on Labor under date of February 19, 1962, in which I spoke in behalf of H.R. 10191, which is labeled as "Functional Illiteracy." In addition, I would like to include the statement made by the late Senator from West Virginia, the Honorable Harley M. Kilgore, in the publication "School Life" in March of 1952, entitled, "Literacy and the National Welfare."

The statements follows:

FUNCTIONAL ILLITERACY

Mr. Chairman, I appear in favor of H.R. 10191. The purpose of this bill, to provide an emergency program to eradicate undereducation among many adults, is of vital importance.

This problem is labeled "functional illiteracy". By that we refer to those adults whose education is so limited that they cannot be fully utilized in a complicated and mechanized and automated society. Furthermore, they have an adverse effect upon their children.

"It cannot be denied that children tend to be cast in the image of their parents. They learn their manners, their morals, their attitudes, their values, and much more, from their parents and families. They also learn how to make a living from them. A child whose father is an unskilled worker is also likely to become an unskilled worker.

"The home environment may handicap a child in school and in life, or it may be a source of special advantages. It may provide unusual opportunities, or it may close all doors and shut out opportunity." So says Patricia Sexton, assistant professor of educational sociology at New York University, in her recently published book "Education and Income."

In a study of the relationship between ability to read and family background, it was found that youngsters who scored high on reading tests were more likely to have been read to by their parents * * * usually owned several or many books. Lower income students are very often poor readers because they have never been introduced to public libraries by their parents, are not exposed to newspapers, magazines, and books in their homes.

IQ test scores have revealed that children of higher income families have higher IQ's. "But there is not a shred of proof that any of these IQ tests are valid measures of native intelligence, and in fact there is much proof that they are not," says Patricia Seaton.

Yale Prof. August B. Hollingshead says: "The [lowest class] adolescent has been subjected to a family and class culture in which

failure, worry, and frustration are common. He has not been trained at home to do his best in school. His parents have not ingrained in him the idea that he must make good grades if he is to be a success in life. Moreover, the class system as it functions in school does not help him to overcome the poor training he has received at home and in the neighborhood."

Surveys made on school dropouts also point up the importance of the child's family influence. Studies made in Austin, Tex., and Tucson, Ariz., showed that a majority of the dropouts came from low-income families who lived in substandard housing and belonged to a racial minority. This kind of family, according to the NEA research division in its report on the study, tends to look upon education with hostility or indifference, and children from this background find it hard to feel that they belong in most schools or that what they learn there will ever be of any use to them.

So clear cut are these findings, it has been said that if you know a child's family income and level of education, you can pretty well predict his success or failure in school.

The implications for the families of America's 10.7 million functional illiterates are clear. Through no fault of his own, not because of his own lack of native intelligence or ability to learn, but because of his parents' low level of education, the child of functionally illiterate parents is usually doomed to failure in school, in competing for jobs, in making a happy adjustment to modern life. Chances are he will become a juvenile delinquent, a school dropout, one of society's parasites as his name appears again and again on unemployment lists, welfare rolls, criminal court dockets. The social problems of America's illiterates are thus self-perpetuating, unless an all-out drive is made to educate them.

Ralph Young, director of Carver House settlement in St. Louis, Mo., said recently, "An illiterate family has a hard time turning our literate children. Even if they are eager to have their children attend school, they seldom can give the children the necessary intellectual motivation. The child is too likely to say, 'Why should I go to school? You didn't.' Or you get a parent who feels 'I made a living without schooling. Why should you have it?'

"Without a special effort to educate the illiterate adults, you will have the same vicious cycle of poverty, ignorance, and crime repeating itself generation after generation."

This program would complement title III of a bill, H.R. 10180, a general Federal aid to elementary and secondary education bill. Title III of my bill authorizes grants to the States to help eradicate special urban area educational problems, one of which is the dropout problem.

It will also complement a pilot project authorized a few weeks ago by our West Virginia State Legislature.

This bill would also help West Virginia speed its own efforts to curb adult functional illiteracy.

According to the 1950 census, West Virginia had a total population of 1,039,555, age 25 years and over. Of this number 142,500, or 13.7 percent, had less than 5 years of schooling and therefore were considered functionally illiterate. Of the 142,500 persons who were functionally illiterate 25,630, or 2.5 percent of the total of 1,039,555 adults, had not completed any years of schooling. Of the 142,500 functionally illiterates, 35,305 or 8.7 percent were urban, 72,190 or 16.9 were rural nonfarm, 35,005 or 17.3 percent were rural farm. Of the 1,039,555 adults 978,525 were white and 61,030 were nonwhite. Of the 142,500 functionally illiterates 126,145 were white and 16,355 were nonwhite.

In 1960 the situation in West Virginia had not made any significant gains or losses either in the number of adults 25 years and older or in the reduction of the number of functionally illiterates. For example, the adult population 25 years and over was 999,731 or 39,844 less than the adult population in 1950. In 1960, 110,000 or 11 percent of the adults had less than 5 years schooling completed. In 1950 West Virginia ranked 41st among the 48 States. In 1960 West Virginia ranked 29th among the 50 States.

Under the proposed legislation to provide assistance to States in the reduction of illiteracy, West Virginia would receive in grant-in-aid approximately $64,594 the first year, and approximately $129,188 for each of the succeeding 4 years of the program, or $580,000 over the 5-year period. This grant-in-aid assistance should be positive and stimulative in West Virginia in strengthening the foundation of education in the several communities. And it is upon a strong basic education that all training and retraining must rest.

Finally, as a West Virginian, I am pleased to suggest that the administration and you, Mr. Chairman, are traveling along a road pioneered by our late Senator Harley Kilgore.

LITERACY AND THE NATIONAL WELFARE

I am pleased to have the opportunity to express my views on the problem of illiteracy to the Nation through the columns of School Life. My interest in the problem is of long standing. It goes back to the days when I, just out of the University of West Virginia, taught public school in my native State. Later, as judge of the criminal court of Raleigh County, W. Va., I saw at first hand many of the tragic results of illiteracy.

It will be remembered that in 1948, I introduced a bill in the second session of the 80th Congress to assist the States in the removal of the blot from our Nation. I again introduced a similar bill in 1949 in the first session of the 81st Congress. And it is my intention to continue to do everything in my power to solve this problem until the Nation is aroused to its importance and the Congress assumes its responsibility in the matter. The reasons for my interest are fundamental, and may be stated very simply and directly.

ILLITERACY SLOWS NATIONAL DEFENSE

Adult illiteracy is a serious problem to our Defense authorities. The loss in manpower because of illiteracy during the last war is well known. The number of men rejected by the Selective Service System would have made 40 Army divisions. Even today, with our limited mobilization, the military could do a much more effective and speedy job of preparation if they did not have to contend with the illiterates. It is estimated that approximately 75,000 male youths who are functionally illiterate (had completed fewer than 5 years of schooling) reach registration age each year, and that the corresponding number of females is approximately 50,000. Unless means are provided to lift this mass of undereducated youth to a level of functional literacy, and if we face all-out mobilization, the Defense Establishment will find itself saddled with the burden of training as was the case during the last war. To the extent to which this is necessary, it will, of course, divert the time and energies of the military from their primary task of defense.

ILLITERACY RETARDS ECONOMIC GROWTH

Our economic strength is an important link in our defense program. The industrial and agricultural activities which are at the foundation of our economic strength are becoming highly mechanized, requiring an ever increasing amount of literacy. Lack of ability to read makes the illiterate a menace to himself and his fellows in industry and prevents the agricultural worker from benefiting fully from the services of Government bulletins, county agents, and other sources of helpfulness. The products of industry and farm are second only to manpower in our defense efforts. Anything, therefore, which impedes their flow, as does illiteracy, is an enemy within our ranks. It retards economic growth and development and should be stopped without delay.

Normally, when our economic establishment should be geared to the scientific and technological progress of our times, illiteracy is as much of a deterrent as in times of emergency. It is well known that industrial wages and farm income of individuals, communities and States rise in proportion to the rise in literacy. Retail sales also are closely related to literacy. The flow of interstate commerce, the interdependence of individuals and groups, and the elimination of geographical boundaries by modern transportation and communication facilities are more and more becoming matters of national concern. And anything which affects them, as does illiteracy, becomes a national responsibility.

LITERACY PROMOTES SOCIAL PROGRESS

Social progress is dependent upon individual progress. One of the most important ingredients of this progress is the ability to use effectively the tools of modern communication. The ability to function effectively as a worker, as a citizen, and as a member of a family is a powerful contributor to the general welfare of society. And the extent to which an individual can communicate with his fellows and understand the printed page, to that extent will he contribute to social advancement. In order to do these things, a command of the skills of communication is necessary. This includes not merely the ability to read and write, but also the ability to speak and listen with discrimination. The complexity and tempo of our civilization make these abilities mandatory. Employers do not want illiterates because they cannot meet the exacting requirements of the average job. The duties of a citizen in a modern community today call for competencies which illiterates do not possess. The relationships among the different members of the family today call for knowledge, skills, appreciations, and attitudes which are almost impossible for the illiterate to acquire. If, therefore, the Nation's progress and welfare depend on the efficiency of its workers, the competencies of its citizens, and the wholesomeness of the relationship of its families, it follows that anything that will contribute to the achievement of these goals—as does literacy—becomes an urgent responsibility of the Nation.

ILLITERACY ENDANGERS DEMOCRACY

Democracy, more than any other form of government, calls for a literate population. Our founding fathers recognized this, however, they did not specifically provide for its achievement in the organic law. Nevertheless, the principle has been so generally accepted that we have established the most comprehensive system of free universal compulsory education found anywhere in the world.

Despite this fact, we still have millions of adult citizens who are illiterate, whose lack of education is a handicap to themselves, and causes them to become a drag on society and a potential menace to our democratic way of life.

In order to function effectively in a democracy, citizens must possess facts about many things and people. If they are to exercise the kind of independent judgment which our representative form of government requires and are not to be unduly swayed by the rabble-rousers, and the bombardment of mass media, they must think clearly and discriminatingly about those things and people. They cannot think clearly and independently unless they can participate effectively in the arts and skills of communication which is functional literacy.

The extent to which the individual is the cornerstone of our democracy to that extent is it necessary that there be a high rate of literacy among all groups of our population, because, as I have often said, "talk

about 'democracy' and 'our way of life' is largely unintelligible to illiterates."

The 1950 census data on illiteracy are not yet available. But according to the 1940 data, and the estimates of the Census Bureau in 1947, the problem is extensive and widespread. As I pointed out in my speech in the Senate on June 3, 1948, "the men and women in the United States who are now in the darkness of functional illiteracy are not all foreigners or Negroes, or members of other underprivileged groups. * * * Educators have long known that a grim percentage of our native-born white citizens have had little or no schooling." I also emphasized in that speech a fact which is not generally known; namely, that illiteracy exists throughout the Nation.

LITERACY IS A NATIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

A national program of action is needed for several reasons: (1) It is needed to equalize the burden of education, because many States are not able to support an adequate program of education; (2) since each State must contribute its share to the security of the Nation, it is the responsibility of the Nation to assure the effectiveness of that contribution; and (3) the magnitude and complexity of the problem require a concerted, coordinated, and frontal attack.

A national program of action such as I have been advocating will not only serve our own national needs, but will also contribute directly and indirectly to the strengthening of our international relations.

In the speech referred to earlier, I called attention to our contributions to the UNESCO program. Since that time we have contributed huge sums through ECA and point 4. A national program to eradicate illiteracy in the United States could help furnish the know-how in attacking the problem throughout the world. It is conceivable that such a program would also enable us to supply the many requests that come to us from other lands for teachers and leaders. The significance of this possibility is realized when it is recalled that practically one-half of the population of the world is illiterate, and that communism is making a strong bid for leadership of those masses. If we could thus give a needed emphasis on the human and social aspects of our aid to the world, in addition to our present emphasis on economic and military assistance, I am confident that it would pay handsome dividends; namely, greater faith in our humanitarian and democratic motives.

Clonel Says GI Servants To Stay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK KOWALSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, with unanimous consent I would like to read an article from the February issue of the Elks' magazine.

It is bitterly ironic that the commanding officer at Fort McNair should make such a statement at a time when our Government has recalled thousands of its citizen-soldiers from their families and their jobs to secure our national defense:

GI's as servants will stay on the job at Fort McNair in Washington regardless of complaints from Congress. Some 25 enlisted men mow the lawns, make beds, cook, and even shake martinis for officers. Col. H. E. Townsend, commanding officer, said "We've been doing this since 1809, and I doubt if we are going to change now."

A Lesson in History for the Attorney General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following article which was reprinted in the Dallas Times Herald from the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune. Perhaps the President's little brother, Bobby, will see it and help him to better understand American history on which he seems to be somewhat confused.

The article follows:

TEXANS ARE RIGHT: THE MEXICAN WAR—WHY IT WAS FOUGHT

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

Attorney General Bob Kennedy, in his good-will trip around the world, has apologized for America's role in the Mexican War. This "confession of error" may have been designed to disarm Indonesian students who gathered around him to shout Communist slogans. But it has caused 10 million Texans to reach for their six-guns—and the Texans are right.

Let's look at a little history:

James K. Polk, one of our most underrated Presidents, was in the White House when the Mexican War exploded in 1846. The Whigs, anxious to embarrass the President, called it "Polk's war" and insisted that it was an unprovoked attack upon a peaceful neighbor. The abolitionists, sure that the annexation of Texas was merely a device to add slave territory, echoed the charge. The legend has stubbornly persisted until now practically all the "liberal" historians dismiss the Mexican War as unalloyed Yankee imperialism. No doubt this is what Bobby Kennedy was taught at Harvard.

The fact is that at the time when Mexico declared its independence from Spain there were only three tiny settlements in the whole territory that is now Texas. They were Bexar (San Antonio), La Bahai (now Goliad), and Nacogdoches. The new Mexican Government wanted some people in the territory but its own citizens were uninterested. So a contract was entered into in 1821 with a Missouri promoter by the name of Moses Austin to bring in American settlers with guarantees of land. Austin promptly died, but his son, Stephen, came forward to honor the contract and he led his American colonists to Texas.

AMERICANS IRKED

After a few years both parties began to regret this arrangement. The Americans were irked that Texas was administered as part of the far-off state of Coahuila. They wanted Texas to be a separate Mexican province and they wanted more representation for themselves in its government. The Mexican Government, on the other hand, feared that too many American settlers were coming in. It sought to stem the flow and hurriedly gave huge land grants to favored Mexican politicians who had never even visited Texas. Some of these grants encroached on land previously reserved for the American colonists.

Gen. Antonio Lopez de Santa Anna, a former royalist officer who had an in-and-out career stretching over 30 years as a periodic Mexican dictator, began to treat the Texas-Americans as revolutionaries. The Americans reacted with a declaration of Texas independence.

It turned out to be a rough little war. All of the 183 defenders of the Alamo were killed, and when the Mexicans captured General Fannin's little force of 371 men they shot 351 in cold blood. But Sam Houston finally routed Santa Anna at San Jacinto and the Texas Republic was born.

There followed an uneasy peace. The Texans claimed that the boundary should be on the Rio Grande and the Mexicans said it was the Nueces which flows into the sea at Corpus Christi. The Nueces is a poor natural boundary since it disappears in the hills a few hundred miles inland, which the Rio Grande is, with the exception of the Colorado, the Southwest's longest and most imposing river. But the claim that subsequent troubles with Mexico sprang from the empty expanse of mesquite that existed between these two rivers is ridiculous.

WAR AGITATION GROWS

Actually, the Mexican governments in the 10 years between 1836 and 1846, officially refused to recognize Texas independence at all. They kept claiming that Mexico's true boundary was the Sabine River, which, of course, is the Texas-Louisiana boundary. A war agitation grew in the Mexican Army to take Texas back.

In the meantime, the Texans were finding that independence was no bed of roses. There were vast distances to overcome, no near markets, no developed natural resources, no industry, nothing. The Texas dollar soon skidded to a 2-cent value. So Texans began to demand that the United States annex them, and they threatened to petition for admission to the British Empire as a colony if the Americans didn't come through.

Yet the Americans hesitated for 10 long years. We already had more territory than we knew what to do with, and there was the growing fight over which of the new States would be slave States. The whole American North wanted no part of Texas.

But Polk, in his quiet way, finally engineered Texas statehood. He was working on an agreement with the British to end threats over the boundary of the Oregon territory and Canada, and he offered to negotiate with Mexico on similar disputes. But the Herrera government declared that if the United States annexed Texas it would be equivalent to an act of war against Mexico. In March of 1845 the Mexican Minister was withdrawn from Washington, and when President Polk sent John Slidell to Mexico City to seek some settlement he was not received. At the same time the Mexican Government raised a war chest to retake Texas.

EIGHT THOUSAND MEN EMBARKED

Thus it was that Gen. Zachary Taylor was ordered to embark 8,000 men (half of the whole U.S. Army) at New Orleans and proceed to Corpus Christi.

Eventually, the Mexican Army under General Ampudia moved up to Matamoros and General Taylor marched his troops south to north bank of the Rio Grande in the vicinity of what is now Brownsville. The Mexican leader sent Taylor a note warning him to break his camp and retire to the Nueces "or suffer the consequences." Taylor stayed put and the next day Ampudia crossed the Rio Grande and attacked.

The results were fast and catastrophic for Mexico. Throughout the entire war the Americans hardly lost a skirmish.

You must judge a war against the background of its time. All nations are the products of wars of conquest. Mexico, itself, is the story of the conquest of the Mayans by the Toltecs, of the Toltecs by the Aztecs, and of the Aztecs by the Spaniards. If we are going to start apologizing for such wars in the past we must admit that people of north European origin have no business in North America, and people of Latin origin no business in Latin America.

The Mexican War was one of the gentlest conquests in history. What other country would have walked out of Mexico after scattering its armies and seizing its capital?

The crowning irony was to see Bobby Kennedy apologizing for the Mexican War to an audience of Indonesians who are currently hell-bent for the conquest of Dutch Guinea. Just who are we trying to appease?

Our Imposed Problems and Their Solution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. William A. Patterson, president of United Air Lines, recently addressed the New York City Wings Club on the subject "Our Imposed Problems and Their Solution."

There is no question but what Members of Congress are deeply interested in the plight of our trunk airlines and the tremendous losses which they have suffered during the past 2 years. They are not now on subsidy, but may well have to return to subsidy unless correction can be made in their financial status.

Mr. Patterson's address follows:

OUR IMPOSED PROBLEMS AND THEIR SOLUTION

(By William A. Patterson)

Last year, for the first time since 1948, the combined trunkline operations resulted in a net loss, estimated as high as $30 million. This is approximately 6 times the industry loss in 1948 and it has aroused about 10 times as much advice on what is wrong and how it should be corrected.

Doctors have gathered around the patient to diagnose and prescribe treatment. Some say, adopt a Spartan regime in cabin service, penalize no-shows, and pool your ground equipment. Others say, sell harder, invade the automobile travel market, tap the mass market. This one says, your trouble is overcapacity, and that one says, you're suffering from jet age growing pains.

I'm sure you're familiar with the various contentions on the cause and cure of airline problems. The advice is generally well meant and it reflects some fraction of the truth, but the question is—who decides when the doctors disagree?

Disagreement—diversity of opinion—is no novelty in the air transport industry. More often than not, it is a dominant characteristic of the industry. Conflict of thought and freedom of expression are necessary to arrive at the truth.

I have had honest disagreement with the philosophy of the Civil Aeronautics Board at various times in the past. And it would be strange, indeed, if I had been in continuous agreement with every person who has ever served as a Board member. I have known many of them as capable, intelligent gentlemen, and I have never doubted that their motives are every bit as sincere as mine. But a problem exists and it will not be solved by the sincerity with which we hold opposing views.

The airline problem, actually, is related to a larger problem which is sometimes overlooked in concentrating on our own immediate cares. The larger problem is that common carrier passenger transportation has been fairly even for many years. In 1950, for example, the railroads, buses, and airlines operated almost 62.7 billion passenger miles. In 1960 the total was an even 62 billion.

The static pattern of common carrier passenger business has not been of pressing concern to the airlines in the past because of extremely vigorous growth. Industry traffic volume in the decade of the fifties just about tripled. But a large part of the growth represents diversion from surface carriers, particularly the railroads. And the harsh fact is that the airlines have been getting a larger and larger share of a total volume that is not growing.

The villain, so to speak, is the private automobile. While common carrier passenger miles have not increased since 1950, intercity automobile passenger miles have increased 65 percent. This trend has been stimulated by the construction of toll roads, superhighways, and cars designed for greater speed and driving comfort.

The failure of common carrier business to increase has not gone unnoticed by the CAB. Its researchers and economists also have observed that some 90 million people have never taken a trip on an airplane. The airlines, accordingly, have been urged to siphon off automobile travel and to develop a market among those 90 million. This advice is well intended but I maintain it is more of a pious hope, rather than a realistic goal to be profitably achieved by human effort.

It's a mistake to assume that those 90 million constitute a market merely because they exist and have never been airline customers. A potential market of any worth must meet other criteria. Now elaborate studies can be made to determine the size, depth, and shape of a market but I have a simple rule of thumb which is generally reliable. It consists of three questions: First, is the desire there? Second, is the need there? And, third, does this particular market have the means?

Business travel, as you know, is the backbone of our operations. More than two-thirds of our volume is derived from that source. If you apply the rule of desire, need and means, it is clear that the business traveler meets the test squarely on all counts.

In considering the 90 million who have never flown on airlines, great numbers obviously can be ruled out on any one of the main counts. Some haven't the desire to fly and no amount of advertising can awaken the desire. Others haven't the need—the pattern of their lives is such that they just don't have to go anywhere.

Many of the 90 million have jobs that keep them in shops, offices and factories. They may have the desire to travel but, unlike the business traveler, there is no connection between their everyday work and the necessity to travel. The only time their desire to travel can be reasonably exercised is during vacation periods, assuming they have the means.

What about the means?

It has been suggested that the airlines should make special efforts to develop a market among those with modest annual incomes—on the order of $5,000. In support of this view, some economists have said that as much as 10 percent of that $5,000 is budgeted for travel. Now, $500 is a sum worth going after, but I have no proof it is there, waiting to be claimed by the airlines.

The person with a $5,000 income must pay out a substantial portion for food, clothing and other necessities. Housing alone—the servicing of mortgages, rental payments—claims about 25 percent of the average income. And there are other costs that grow in relation to family size, such as education and medical care.

But let's assume that 10 percent remains for travel. And having accepted that assumption, I'd like to offer one of my own: I am convinced that the 10 percent, 8 percent—whatever it happens to be is irretrievably earmarked for the family car. It pays the monthly installment. It buys gas, oil and tires. And when vacation time comes along, the man with a $5,000 income is going to use what he already has for travel—the automobile. And he'll take the kind of vacation on which he can be accompanied by his wife, children, and vacation equipment, if he wants it.

The further control costs, he's going to bypass the luxury hotels and the fashionable resorts. Chances are, he'll seek some out-of-the-way place, remote from cities and airline service. Now, he could get from an airport by renting a drive-yourself car but this is not inexpensive and he has a limited budget.

A CAB spokesman has expressed the opinion that airline fare reductions would woo motorists from the highways. Ostensibly with this in view, one of the trunklines several months ago proposed a jet fare reduction of 25 percent. We protested. Other airlines joined us and the fare was rejected by majority vote of the Board members.

Such experiments—in the absence of proof they can succeed—are perilous at a time when the economic health of the industry is impaired. They have a ring of hasty improvising about them—as though created in a spirit of let's try it and see if it works.

I haven't a closed mind on experimentation but I am reluctant to risk the interests of our stockholders by participating in untested schemes. Surely no one in his right senses is averse to tapping a vast new profitable market—if the market is there. Now, some people think the market is there and some are sure it's not there. I have a proposal on how to settle this difference of opinion.

The Federal Government and private industry invest billions each year in research to develop new techniques, procedures and products. No reasonable person questions the value of this effort. Things are tested in the laboratory and by consumer panels to determine their potential worth before heavy investments are made. I suggest adoption of similar methods by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

It should not be too difficult to arrange actual field tests and learn, for example, if low fares can attract a large volume of motorists and result in airline profits. Routes could be carefully isolated for control purposes, with costs, traffic levels and other factors under thorough study for a suitable period. And just as laboratory research is underwritten, the carriers taking part in the experiment could be subsidized for any losses.

So, very seriously and constructively, I recommend field studies and pretesting of various theories which some CAB officials hold. The airlines cannot reasonably be expected to experiment at their own expense, especially when a profit cushion is lacking. And the airlines should not stand accused of being opposed to low fares that—in some unexplained and so far unproved way—might restore their economic health.

The facts available to us show that past low-fare experiments have failed to generate the high volume required to offset the revenue reduction and the costs of providing the service. I'll give you cases—omitting, of course, the recent youth fare which, as with our own youthful years, passed very soon.

As many of you know, some time back we reduced Hawaiian fares by 25 percent and we promoted this bargain for 4 years. Now, in order to replace revenues lost through a 25-percent reduction in fares, it is necessary to generate a 33⅓-percent increase in traffic. Travel increased 24 percent—and that's a considerable increase—but it was still 9 percent less than the volume required to break even on the discount.

Let's also remember that, apart from fares, the growth occurred in a period when public interest in Hawaii began to quicken and expand.

Some years ago we established coach fares, offering a 25-percent differential between coach and first-class service. Coach travel has grown, yes, but not as a result of tapping a new market. Its growth has been accompanied by a steady decline in first-class travel. One expands while the other contracts. We know that hundreds of corporations have instructed their representatives to travel by coach. For every four who shift to coach, we have to get one new passenger to break even.

Last year the trunklines gained about 1 percent over 1960 by flying 29½ billion passenger-miles. Fifty-seven percent of the total was coach travel. In 1960 it was 49 percent and just 6 years ago it was 35 percent. The reduction in revenue due to this kind of inward growth has contributed to the industry's present financial condition.

When did the trouble begin? Well, the date is fairly well fixed in a recent CAB document which points out that a declining rate of earnings has been experienced over the last 6 years.

What happened approximately 6 years ago? Let me refresh your memory. In the period from July 1955 to December 1956 the CAB decided 15 proceedings that changed the operating authority of every domestic airline. These decisions piled more than 21,000 miles of extra competition on the industry and the stage was set for a large part of our present problems.

The New York-Chicago case, the Denver Service case and the Southwest-Northeast case were all decided in the fall of 1955. And there are others continuing down to recent times. I mention these specifically and by date to illuminate a further point.

The year 1955, you may recall, was a year of decision in still another way. Beginning in the early 1950's British progress with the Comet was watched with great interest and there was growing speculation on when the U.S. airlines would commit themselves on jet aircraft.

Some of our critics implied we were dragging our feet—allowing British technology to pass us by while we wrung every last penny out of the piston-engine plane. Actually, as you know, the major airlines were conducting an intensive evaluation of jet aircraft. In our case, thousands of manhours were spent in economic studies, consulting with manufacturers and working up specifications.

We ended the jet speculation in October 1955, by ordering the DC-8 and shortly thereafter the other trunklines began making their commitments. Because of the lead-time required to manufacture jet aircraft and place them in service—about 4 years for the DC-8—our order was based on what studies and forecasts indicated the market would be in the sixties.

Our analysis of the future market was well drawn in terms of foreseeable conditions, and I'm sure that our competitors made theirs with equal care. But, no matter how well drawn—all the research and planning was disrupted by route award piled on route award. To give a few examples—three airlines flew the New York-Chicago route, now there are four; three airlines flew the New York-Washington route, now there are eight; one airline flew between Denver and the west coast, now there are four.

I could continue this rollcall with city-pairs across the Nation, but let's consider for a moment the economic effects.

Three years ago the nonstop market between San Francisco and New York was served by United and TWA. We were operating with a 54-percent load factor, which indicated there was ample room for growth. Aircraft were on order to accommodate that growth. These facts failed to carry, however, and American Airlines was authorized to fly the San Francisco-New York nonstop. The award diverted $13 million from United and TWA.

Any jubilation this may have occasioned at American was brief. Within several months three airlines were authorized to fly the southern transcontinental route which American had been serving without competition. These awards diverted approximately $16 million from American.

Aside from obviously creating excessive competition, multiple route awards produce various inefficiencies that help build up airline costs. As an example, airlines receiving new routes sometimes purchase additional planes to compete against the carrier or carriers already serving the route with an adequate fleet. Or again, a carrier faced with added competition is well advised to reduce flight frequencies at the stations concerned. Fixed costs remain the same but the ability to spread the handling costs per passenger over a greater number of flights is severely limited. In other words, the operation is less efficient.

One of the standard replies to protests about route awards and excessive competition is that the CAB has merely awarded what the airlines have requested. That is true, but I must point out that regulatory power includes the power to hold individual interests in check. If overly ambitious, disruptive demands are not brought into shape and balance by the CAB, then who will do it? Under the Civil Aeronautics Act, it is an express duty of the Board to foster sound economic conditions and maintain competition to the extent necessary to assure sound development.

I don't wish to seem presumptous in mentioning this responsibility, nor would I have my remarks interpreted as critical of any Board member. My usage of the word "Board" itself is in an impersonal sense, referring to an accumulation of policies and decisions, rather than to a group of officials. The gentlemen who presently constitute the Board have inherited problems of great magnitude and my sympathies are with them.

I was encouraged several months ago when airline representatives were invited to discuss the situation with CAB officials in Washington. I hoped that the main cause of the industry's affliction would be laid open and skillfully treated. Instead, what I regard as mere surface symptoms were marked off for treatment.

Now, I regard small economies as part and parcel of ordinary, everyday, good business housekeeping. It's important to keep operations tidy by detecting petty waste and inefficiency. But it's more important to detect opportunities for major savings that can achieved through research and the use of new machines and techniques. This type of economy advances and improves air transportation.

Understanding this, you will understand my disappointment when the Washington sessions resulted in discussions of meal service, pooling ground equipment, no-show penalties and the like. Such matters are worth consideration but why not plunge into the main areas for improvement and economy? The idea of discussing types of meal service at a time when industry losses were nearing $30 million struck me as incongruous. It seemed we were invited to concern ourselves with trivia.

It would be far more rewarding, for example, to explore ways in which traffic control can be smoothed out to reduce holding periods and terminal delays that cost the airlines many millions annually. Surely science—electronics, engineering—can produce a better system with enduring benefits that would far outweigh any amount of menu juggling.

I'll cite one more:

As captive tenants of airports, the airlines are subject to fiscal policies that are increasingly burdensome. Neither controls nor uniformity exist in determining costs. United's bill for landing fees and terminal expenses was about $1,800,000 in 1952. For the current year, it will amount to $16,500,000, exclusive of $7,250,000 for hangar rents. Our airport costs for 1963–64 will border on $20 million—an increase of 1,000 percent over 1952. Surely, this is an area worth looking into.

But the problem of excessive competition overshadows all other problems, and I have yet to hear of any program to remedy the situation. Lately, there's been much discursive and hopeful talk about mergers. To hear some tell it, a merger is a mystical union that melts away problems and the two merged companies live happily ever after. We've been given to understand that the CAB is kindly disposed toward mergers. But, so far as I know, a rationale has not been worked out. No criteria have been established as to what kind of merger is desirable. Wil any old merger do? Obviously not.

A merger between two weak airlines will merely spread the weakness. By the same token, a merger between two strong, aggressive airlines can produce such strength that weaker carriers will be forced into bankruptcy or back to subsidy, if they can get it. I doubt that any policy designed to reduce competition by forced or planned bankruptcy would meet with congressional acceptance.

Now what is a good merger? Well, I would place the United-Capital merger in that category. Capital was spared bankruptcy and no competing carrier has been brought to the brink of financial disaster as a result of the merger. Greater efficiency has been achieved. Outmoded aircraft have been withdrawn and jets are continuing to be placed in service on Capital's former system. And the result is clearly in the public interest.

I believe that the Civil Aeronautics Board should assert leadership at this time by determining what kind of mergers are best for the public, the industry and the stockholders of the companies involved. Guidelines must be set up and objectives clearly defined to prevent blunders and senseless combinations that could aggravate an already sorry situation.

I would be remiss if I left you today with gloom hanging in the air. I've talked frankly of our problems. I've not minimized my concern, nor have I skirted the issue of regulatory responsibility, as I see it.

But this industry has great vitality, as shown by its past development and the confidence with which the challenge of jet conversion was accepted. It retains that vitality in spite of burdens, reverses and imposed problems. We need sound judgment now, patience and the good sense to avoid hasty cure-all remedies.

In a recent speech in Connecticut, Mr. Boyd, the CAB chairman, was frank and accurate in discussing excessive competition. Judging from his comments, we are in agreement on the fundamental problem. The question, what can be done to correct it? Excessive competition is solidly imbedded in the industry's structure and there is no fast or easy way to root it out. The CAB is entitled to every constructive idea we can offer.

I have devoted many hours of thought to possible solutions, but I come full circle when I reflect on the tedious procedures that must be followed. For example, I visualize the Board holding public hearings that would stretch out day after day, week after week, while the parties gave detailed testimony. And I know of no way to dispense with such

hearings, if the final decision is to be honest and just.

Then, after the decision is announced, I visualize a series of court actions. I don't think we could criticize the delay that would occur. Due process must be observed, and anyone involved would have the right to be heard. Management, understandably, would make every effort to protect the interests of stockholders.

A more direct alternative method would be to conduct a thorough study of excessive competition and clarify what should be stripped away to produce balanced competition and economic health. The next step would be to achieve airline agreement on a withdrawal policy, so that those who were last to begin service on a route would be the first removed. Perhaps the subtractions could be offset by gains in other areas and, of course, such possibilities would be analyzed in the basic study.

This alternative method also would take considerable time and in that period the position of the airlines would deteriorate further. Consequently, only one realistic course is open in the interim—and that is to provide temporary fare increases as a measure of relief while legal analysis and fact-finding are in progress.

Most of you know that United filed for an increase in November, amounting to about 7 percent. This would have yielded less than what we need to consider ourselves a financial success. It was a moderate request but it was suspended. However, the CAB approved a 3-percent increase, which is acceptable, but we plan to refile for the 7 percent. And, in connection with that refiling, we look forward to a full public hearing.

The hearing should include facts already on the record and also cover those points in business philosophy, service and costs which have been subject to a clash of opinion. It is my fervent hope that the proceedings will reconcile the opposing points of view and bring about an understanding that will enable the industry to advance and prosper. Conflict of thought has constructive uses, as I mentioned earlier, but when continued aimlessly year after year it is damaging and disruptive.

I have great regard and affection for this industry I've been talking about today. In the 1920's I worked in a bank and the prospects were good, but I left the bank to join the Boeing Airplane Co. I was optimistic about air transportation when many looked upon it as doubtful enterprise with a vague, uncertain future.

I was optimistic in the 1920's, and in January 1962 I continue optimistic.

Adherence to the American Way Is Best Antidote for Recession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Dallas Times Herald is a strong appeal to Congress to refuse to abrogate any more of its constitutional authority to the executive branch. Recessions will not be cured by extending Federal controls or by losing our freedom. The best antidote for economic ills is to give our free enterprise system an opportunity to work:

J.F.K.'S BID FOR RECESSION TOOL POLITICAL AS WELL AS ECONOMIC

The administration wants standby authority to launch $2 billion worth of public works projects at the first real signs of a business slump.

The request is certain to stir a controversy in Congress. Here are the reasons why:

1. Many Congressmen consider it an invasion of congressional authority.

2. There are other and, many think, better ways of fighting recession.

3. Such power could lend itself to political as well as economic use.

The administration appears to be unduly peroccupied with the threat of recession. The platform on which Mr. Kennedy ran for President called for strong Government action to fight recession. And upon taking office the President urged such measures. Amazingly, though, the Nation's economy reversed its downtrend not only before the pump-priming effects could be felt but actually before most of the measures were undertaken.

Congress usually has jealously guarded its authority to approve or disapprove spending and has insisted upon the last word on the timing of spending projects.

Many persons, in private life as well as in Congress, feel that a good business climate would do more to discourage recession than all the standby spending projects that could be devised.

They point out further that Government spending has risen to a new peacetime high under the budget proposed for fiscal 1962 and that, contrary to Government predictions, a sizable deficit is probable. Reduction of spending rather than the prospect of an increase in it would be welcome to taxpayers.

There is always the possibility that in the event of a lagging economy before election time, public funds could be poured into areas where they could be calculated to bring about political as well as economic results.

Congress should seriously consider the possibility of recession, of course, even though the possibility of increased inflation appears to be much greater. But it should reserve for itself the decision of when—or whether—to spend public funds to combat it.

Strong Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, as in many other areas of our country, the administration's new farm program has been the subject of much speculation and comment in Michigan's Sixth District.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial appearing in the February 22, 1962, issue of the Ingham County News of Mason, Mich., a central Michigan farming community.

The editorial follows:

STRONG MEDICINE

Unless farm groups can wake up other segments of society to the widespread dangers hidden in President Kennedy's latest farm bill, the country may be in for another giant stride toward socialism.

Though the avowed purpose of the proposed legislation is a good one—cutting surpluses and farm subsidies—Kennedy's medicine for the disease may be worse than the disease itself.

Basically, the bill calls for a straightjacket on farmers by limiting the amount of certain key products a farmer could sell—wheat, feed grains, milk—generally most basic food crops. By setting such limitations and establishing fines and punishment for farmers who exceed the Government controls, a restriction upon agrarian supplies would have their effect on related industries.

Farmers now are limited as to acreage they can plant for crops, but they increase the yield by fertilizer, new methods and technology. The proposed plan would limit the output sold from the farm. Restrictions would not be based on acres, but spelled out in bushels, gallons or pounds.

For consumers, it would mean higher food prices.

The proposed plan is aimed at raising farm income and reducing the farm subsidy. It shifts the cost of government farm supports directly onto the consumer. Food companies would have to charge more, for instance, if they paid more for their supplies.

The President deserves the credit for daring to take a measure to correct a situation that even farmers are becoming disgusted with. Perhaps the only solution is the acid treatment as outlined in the new farm bill.

But before the bill becomes law, it should be explored by all segments of the population to discover what inherent dangers are contained within the proposal.

Dr. Kennedy's prescription for a case of flu might be strong enough to kill the patient.

Boston University Symposium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, 11 members of the Boston University staff, board of trustees and faculty, headed by Dr. Harold C. Case, president of the university, and Dr. Shields Warren, chairman of the board of trustees, have contributed individual short essays, some generalized and others from specialized points of view, on the theme of "What Is the Future of Private Higher Education in America?"

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include the answers given to this question by Harold S. Case, president of the university; by Shields Warren, chairman of the board of trustees of the university; and by Lewis H. Rohrbaugh, vice president for academic affairs at Boston University. Following each of the answers, I should also like to include a short biographical sketch of the author.

The articles follow:

ANSWER BY HAROLD C. CASE, PRESIDENT OF BOSTON UNIVERSITY

Our American Founding Fathers exhibited unusual insight when they established the plan for our individual and corporate life. They reserved major areas of thought and action to private citizens. They defined limits for government influence.

Education moved westward with the trek of pioneers. Colleges were established to guarantee adequate religious leadership and preparation for the teaching, legal and medical professions. Many survived, grew, and set high standards for education in this Nation. Some lost step with the times and ceased to function.

A growing population and the mounting need for technical, scientific, agricultural and other specializations, gave rise to the legal authorization, appropriations for, and establishment of tax-supported universities. They have grown beyond all early predictions and have extended higher education in varied aspects to millions of people.

Today, as the population explosion of the 1940's expresses itself in college enrollments in the 1960's, the tax-supported institutions will carry an increasing percentage of American students.

Some predictions doom independent higher education. Without agreeing, all thoughtful educators recognize that there is a significant struggle ahead for the independent institutions.

Costs are mounting. Competition for able faculty members is increasing. Government support—municipal, State, and Federal—is increasing among all private educational institutions. Private support from alumni, business, industry, and foundations is being sought and secured by the public institutions.

Will these and other mutual efforts erase the differences and eventually eliminate the independent university, or emasculate it so that it looks and acts like a public institution? I think not.

The independent institution is needed today. It cherishes a tradition rooted in individual enterprise, founded on religious idealism, committed to classical learning, and designed to motivate students as well as to inform them.

Amid crucial social changes, the independent institution provides a necessary independence of thought, freedom from political partisanship, and dedicated scholarship. It confronts extremists without fear or favor, sets standards for academic achievements and social progress and, because of its independence, strengthens the public institution.

Although it now seeks government aid for facilities, research and training, it opposes all government interference in program, philosophy or content. It provides the balance essential to the best expression of "the American way of life."

In an hour when the desire for security combats the urge to adventure, the independent institution of higher learning stands, first of all, for the sanctity of the individual, for the freedom to inquire, to communicate, and to decide; hence, for the practices without which the rigorous self-discipline essential to a healthy democracy cannot be perpetuated.

Every lover of freedom will support our dual system of public and private education. This dualism, far from being wasteful or obsolete, is our most powerful tool for national strength with wisdom.

Harold C. Case, president of Boston University, received his B.A. from Baker University, S.T.B. from Boston University, and has done graduate study at Harvard University, Garrett Biblical Institute and Northwestern University. He has received many honorary doctorates, from such institutions as Northeastern University, West Virginia Wesleyan College, Temple University, Tufts University, and Pratt Institute. A teacher at Southwestern College in 1927, he has since served as pastor in Glencoe, Ill., Topeka, Kans.; Scranton, Pa., and Pasadena, Calif., before coming to Boston University in 1951. He has been an active member of various committees and conferences for the Commission on World Peace, the Methodist Church, the National Council of Churches, and the World Christian Youth Conference. Most recently, he served as a member of the board of education and the University Senate, Methodist church; member, President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School; and as president of the National Association of Schools of the Methodist Church. He is a trustee of New England Deaconess Hospital, Dillard University, and the Church Peace Union; member of the board of directors, Morgan Memorial, Inc., and the executive committee, Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews; chairman, Massachusetts State Advisory Committee to Commission on Civil Rights, and member, Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce, Massachusetts Higher Education Assistance Corp., and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

ANSWER BY SHIELDS WARREN, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES AT BOSTON UNIVERSITY

Private higher education in America must play an important part in the future of all education since a tax-supported university, no matter how good, is subject to proprietary interest by citizens as a whole and by legislators. Hence it tends toward rigidity and conformity with popular opinion. The budget of a tax-supported university rises and falls with the record of the football team as often as with the record of academic accomplishments. The private university, therefore, is needed to set educational standards, to permit academic innovations, to provide a haven for attitudes of thought or lines of research temporarily neglected or unpopular. If the private university is to survive and beyond survival provide effective educational leadership, it must continue to develop and demonstrate a sound philosophy of education to motivate faculty, students, and the public at large.

The private university stands midway between industry, where top management makes decisions, and government, where public opinion, often distorted by a vocal minority, makes decisions. University policy, if it is to achieve desirable results, must be evolved by consultation, education and persuasion.

The faculty are the essence of the private university and should properly consider themselves as self-employed experts, adjusting their ideas somewhat to the needs and attitudes of the community and their colleages. Enthusiastic participation in maintenance of the common enterprise of the university is essential.

While the universities cannot live by bread alone, they cannot live without bread. A basic problem for them is how they shall be supported in the near future when the leveling effect of the graduated income tax and inheritance taxes has largely obliterated individual resource, the traditional support of universities in the past. This means that industry and indeed, Government, must contribute by appropriate means to avoid control to the support of the private university lest the student body become a wealthy elite The private university on the whole provides a better education for less than does the public university, because of its primary emphasis on scholarship, its greater efficiency and flexibility of operation and its freedom from the changing currents of public opinion.

Shields Warren of Newton, Mass., chairman of the board of trustees at Boston University is also a leading cancer and atomic research authority. Among his current affiliations are: U.S. Representative on the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation; Consultant to the U.S. Government on atomic energy and related matters; committee activities for the National Research Council; Director-at-large, American Cancer Society, Inc.; and is a member of the National Committee on Radiation Protection and Measurements. A professor of pathology at Harvard Medical School and Pathologist, New England Deaconess and Baptist Hospitals, Dr. Warren received an A.B. degree from Boston University and an M.D. from Harvard Medical School. He has been awarded honorary degrees by Boston University, Western Reserve University, Tulane University, Case Institute of Technology and Northwestern University.

ANSWER BY LEWIS H. ROHRBAUGH, VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS AT BOSTON UNIVERSITY

The prospect ahead for the "privately supported" institutions of higher learning in America, without radical change of direction, is a gloomy one. In fact, every college and university, public and private, will soon be confronted with a gap of monumental proportions between its present and foreseeable resources, and the need society expects it to meet.

We address ourselves here primarily to the plight of higher education's private realm.

Year by year, many private colleges have defied the fiscal law of gravity. The day of reckoning is at hand. In my personal judgment, Boston University and like institutions must now turn for substantial aid to city, State, and Federal Governments, as well as to traditional private sources, if higher education's major role in meeting the crisis of Western civilization is to be realized.

First on the priority list is the Federal Government. There is urgent need for massive, intelligent Federal aid to higher education, privately supported included, on the simple but fundamental ground that higher education is in the national interest, our main medium for survival. The variety of forms of assistance are many, but I am particularly hopeful that the Congress in 1962, remembering that privately supported colleges and universities enroll 45 percent of the students, will enact programs of grants and long-term, low-interest loans for the construction or renovation of academic facilities, and the extension and supplementation, with operating grants to the institutions, of Federal scholarship programs.

Nothing less should be tolerated by the American public. That much more could be undertaken is manifest when we realize that a meager 1 percent of the gross national product is now spent on higher education—mute testimony that we have been using pennies where dollars are in order.

More substantial aid can and should come from outside the Government. We must reinforce and redouble our efforts to make clear the case for vigorous alumni support. We have a right to expect that business and industrial support to all higher education will rise far above the 1 percent of income before taxes that it now approximates, especially when broad tax concessions are in the offing. It is also my hope that the tax-exempt foundations, whose grants to universities have meant so much, will swing gradually to a rhythm of general institutional support, to be expanded in ways judged best by the institutions, and away for grants for projects which the foundations prefer to have explored and implemented.

What else? Much.

For one thing, the colleges and universities must get their own houses in order for that, in the final analysis, may be the only insurance policy for all.

Looking outside again and without frightening our own city fathers, it must be stated that there are many logical and compelling reasons why the city of Boston should contribute to the universities within its scope.

These reasons range all the way from the fundamental assertion of the interests of society, and the internal commerce created, to the multitude of services such as Boston University annually renders to the community. To list one: the vast medical service program provided in the city's south end by the home care program of our school of medicine.

The Massachusetts General Court should, in this emergency era, also begin to provide annual operating appropriations for this university and others of like nature, allocations made on the basis of a formula of points weighted for such factors as percentage of income from tuition, enrollment, percentage of income spent on salaries, percentage of students from Massachusetts, and so on.

Capital plant appropriations should also be made by the State legislature, and State provision for expanded student aid on an award-to-the-student basis should be initiated. Legislation for a State subsidy of from $2,400 to $3,000 for each student enrolled in the Commonwealth's three medical schools, without regard to place of residence, is also a logical step.

It, of course, behooves sister institutions in this and other areas to develop cooperative arrangements to pool efforts where appropriate, to "take" courses to the students, to share faculty and overhead, to issue common transcripts in some instances, to do more basic factfinding and identification of the percentage and number of high school students who do not go on to college and act to correct this group, and to avoid the development of competitive programs where the demand will not support them.

Certainly, I'm opening a potential Pandora's box by these recommendations. The times elicit this. I recognize that some feel there are implicit dangers from an overdose of the influence of Federal bureaucracy and control over our school systems, lower and higher, though the historic pattern of Federal aid to our land-grant institutions definitely has not resulted in tyranny from Washington.

It would be appropriate and singularly wise for the major private foundations, suddenly, to put strong emphasis on the buttressing of privately supported higher education if only because of a fear that lack of such support will eventually make the 'citadels of democracy' all public. Need I underscore how the democratic system itself, forgetting the pressures of the cold war, would be endangered in the latter eventuality?

The hour is late for our Nation, particularly in the backyard affairs of our privately supported colleges and universities. The time for action is now.

Lewis H. Rohrbaugh of Rockport, Me., is vice president for academic affairs at Boston University. Before coming to the university, he served as vice president and provost at the University of Arkansas from 1954 to 1959. His former posts also include Director, U.S. Technical Cooperation Mission to Iraq, U.S. Department of State; Director, Graduate School, U.S. Department of Agriculture; Director of Personnel, Balkans Mission, Cairo, Egypt, and Deputy Chief of Mission for Finance and Administration, Greece Mission, Athens, Greece, for UNRRA; as well as other governmental and public education positions. He has served as a consultant to many organizations varying from colleges and universities to the World Bank. He received his Ph. B. from Dickinson College, did his graduate work at Cornell and at the University of Pennsylvania, where he received the Ph. D. He received a D. Sc. (honorary) from Dickinson College.

Speaker Sam Rayburn—Philosopher King

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, about a year ago, over a nationwide television program, I listened to the very interesting and well-considered views of our late and beloved and most esteemed Speaker Sam Rayburn, as they were presented in response to a series of questions on the panel "Washington Conversation."

I was so deeply impressed with the views of our beloved Speaker at the time that I immediately wrote him a brief letter commenting on the excellence of his presentation and the splendid manner in which he had commented on many burning public issues.

I thought no more of the matter until about 2 weeks afterward, when our dear friend, the then Speaker, came to me on the floor of the House and thanked me very warmly for the letter I had sent him.

He said it was "one of the finest letters he had ever received," and he thought so well of it that he was arranging to have it placed in the Rayburn Library at his beautiful hometown, Bonham, Tex.

The letter had been written from New York, where by mere chance I had seen the excellent program, and I had no copy of it. Most desirous of seeing its contents, I made appropriate inquiries at the Speaker's Office and have just received a copy of the letter from Bonham. It reads as follows:

HOTEL ASTOR,
New York, N.Y., Saturday.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Your talk on "Washington Conversation" which I have just heard over TV was one of the finest ever. It ended too soon.

But it was replete with accurate, sound commentary on many political figures and matters, past and contemporary, and infused with noble philosophy. The country will be very deeply impressed, and I wish it could be carried into every hamlet, not only to inform and inspire, but to clarify many popular misconceptions.

It reminded me so much of Plato, his image of the democratic city, state and the philosopher king. You are indeed cast in that mold—great in ability, in experience, and in justice, rich in all those things and attributes that make for lofty service to the people. Do it again soon.

Warm and admiring congratulations.

God love and keep you.

Proudly,

PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

Mr. Speaker, as I reread the letter, I was very happy indeed to realize that I had written to our beloved and great former Speaker while he was with us some of the very things that were said of him after he had passed from the scene and left an irreplaceable void in our midst.

In this sense, I felt no inconsiderable satisfaction that I had conveyed to him in person, even if but very briefly, some of the thoughts that were in my mind and heart concerning his memorable service and everlasting inspiration.

Appreciation of Our Gallant Men in Uniform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure and a privilege under leave to extend my remarks to insert into the RECORD a copy of a letter from our Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara, addressed to the relatives of our men in the Reserve Forces who have been called back to active duty. I also present a copy of a press release from Secretary of the Air Force, Eugene M. Zuckert, as well as one from Gen. Curtis LeMay. All are thoughtful expressions of appreciation from their superiors to our gallant men in uniform.

The letter and press releases follow:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., January 8, 1962.

DEAR FELLOW AMERICAN: During the last several months more than 150,000 men in the Reserve forces of the United States have been called back to active duty. This has been brought home to you in a very personal way, I know, because a relative of yours is among the reservists now in uniform, and it is for that reason I am writing you.

Every reservist called back to active duty is making a special contribution to his country's security, but I recognize—and the President recognizes—that this has meant difficulty, inconvenience and the disruption of civilian pursuits for thousands upon thousands of Americans, including the families who were left behind when the reservists reported for duty. The necessity for such sacrifice is not always understood. That's why your service has been using its internal information program to explain the callup and to answer many of the questions which I know have been raised.

As we enter a new year the United States continues to face a strong and determined adversary who is pushing and probing at freedom in many parts of the world. The United States is the chief defender of freedom in this world, and we can fill this role and maintain the peace only so long as we ourselves are strong and determined. The 150,000 recalled reservists have helped to keep us strong, and their recall has surely evidenced our determination.

We are taking other steps, of course, to convince the Soviet bloc we mean business, and as we build our strength in these other ways it will become possible to release the reservists from active duty. But in the meantime their country owes them a very great debt, and you who are sharing in the

sacrifices they have made are equally entitled to the thanks of a grateful nation.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. MCNAMARA.

PRESS RELEASE No. 1

Secretary of the Air Force Eugene M. Zuckert dispatched congratulatory messages today to the Commander of the Tactical Air Command, Gen. Walter C. Sweeney, Jr., and to the commanders of the former Air National Guard units now in Europe. The messages are as follows:

"To Commander TAC:

"My congratulations to TAC on the professional manner in which you conducted the operational deployment of units from the Air National Guard. The success of the deployment reflects the cooperation between our active duty and Reserve forces and underscores the high degree of proficiency of both. Please extend my congratulations to all TAC units and personnel participating in this successful operation."

"To Commander USAFE for Individual Unit Commanders:

"My warmest salute to the men of your command on their highly successful deployment to Europe. The manner in which the deployment was conducted so soon after recall could only be the result of sustained superior performance. It is my desire that every man in your organization knows of the pride the whole Air Force feels in this accomplishment, which reflects the high standards set and maintained in Air National Guard training."

PRESS RELEASE No. 2

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay has congratulated the Tactical Air Command and the Air National Guard on "the outstanding manner" in which the recent movement of more than 200 jet fighters to Europe was accomplished.

The Air Force Chief of Staff, who has just returned from a visit to Europe to inspect the recalled units of the Air National Guard, sent the following message to Gen. Walter C. Sweeney, Commander of the Tactical Air Command, and Maj. Gen. Winston P. Wilson, Assistant Chief of the National Guard Bureau for Air:

"The movement of the newly federalized ANG units to Europe was executed in an orderely, efficient, and professional way.

This required the utmost leadership, planning, and cooperation on the part of all units and personnel involved. All obstacles were overcome by ingenuity and determination in spite of the extremely short preparation time available. The end result of the safe and expeditious arrival of the fighters should be a source of great pride to all who had a part in the operation. I wish to offer my congratulations for the outstanding manner in which this difficult and vitally important task was successfully accomplished. Please pass the above on to your people who were responsible for this."

Tactical fighter units included in the deployment to Europe were elements of the 122 Tactical Fighter Wing, Fort Wayne, Ind.; the 131 Tactical Fighter Wing, St. Louis, Mo.; the 121 Tactical Fighter Wing, Columbus, Ohio; the 102 Tactical Fighter Wing, Boston, Mass.; the 108 Tactical Fighter Wing, McGuire Air Force Base, N.J.; and the 117 Tactical Reconnaissance Wing, Birmingham, Ala. They are equipped with F-84F, RF-84F and F-86H aircraft.

Organizations which assisted in the deployment included the Military Air Transport Service, the Strategic Air Command, the Air Force Logistics Command, the United States Air Forces in Europe, the Air Defense Command, the Navy, and the Coast Guard.

The American People Facing Their Finest Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, no moment in history has offered a greater challenge than that faced in this day by the American people. How we stand the test of this moment may determine the freedom of all mankind for all time to come. From that distant day when the stirring words of the Declaration of Independence were heard the first time, the United States of America, with its dream of individual liberty, has been the inspiration for all people who would ascend the heights of human dignity based firmly on the principle that man does have certain God-given freedoms which are superior to and greater than any privileges granted by the State.

Today we stand at the brink of losing this glorious heritage for ourselves and, if we do lose it, we deprive all mankind of hope for freedom. The challenge we face as a people and as a nation is clearly defined in this editorial from the Dallas Morning News which I am proud to include as a part of my remarks:

THIS HOUR, PLACE, PEOPLE

"This is the hour, this is the place and we are the people to use the opportunity for leadership for peace and profit."

That challenge to all Americans was issued on the eve of George Washington's 230th birthday by Dr. Jesse Hobson, a research leader, in addressing the Dallas Council on World Affairs. While he emphasized education and research in Dallas and the Southwest, his message was far broader. It was a call to our national leadership, our business leadership, and to all Americans to see and grasp the opportunity before us.

This hour is when, in Washington, Congress plainly expresses the mood of the American people by rejecting the administration's plea for more bureaus to run urban affairs, more controls to manage farmers, more spending and power for centralized government.

In Valley Forge, where the Fathers of this Republic bled for freedom, at this hour the Freedom Foundation honors Americans of today who fight for those basic principles. Among them is Dick West, editorial editor of the News, who wrote: "This country does want peace, but no peace that compromises with evil * * * no peace that distorts the American dream."

All over the world, at this hour, freemen honor American achievement in outer space, and look to America as never before for leadership.

This place, the United States of America, is where freedom has lived longer, created more, used more wisely the abundance of God-given natural resources and human talents than ever before, anywhere in history.

This place is where there are the wealth, the trained minds, the experience in free enterprise and free government to give the world guidance, inspiration and courage.

We are the people who can—who must—seize this opportunity for leadership for peace and profit.

We must lead by practicing the frugality of our Founding Fathers to eliminate nonessentials in government, business and our personal lives in order to devote all our resources to the fundamentals of freedom which must be preserved at any cost.

We must lead by shining in the eyes of others that lamp of freedom which has guided Americans since 1776.

For our own peace, and for that of the world, for our own profit, and for that of all mankind, we are the people who must forever devote our hearts, our hands, our minds to the cause of freedom everywhere.

Resolution Commemorating Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of addressing a group of First District of Wisconsin citizens of Lithuanian descent gathered together to commemorate the 44th anniversary of the restoration of independence to the Lithuanian nation.

One cannot meet with and speak to these people without being humbled by their sense of dedication to the cause of freedom and all for which America stands. While it is with regret and sorrow that Lithuania has become a victim of the Russian policy of colonialism and are captive within their own land, yet the light of hope for ultimate freedom for their families, relatives and friends burns brightly in their hearts.

That my colleagues may know of this hope and concern and faith in ultimate victory, I include a copy of the resolution adopted by the Racine, Wis., Lithuanian Americans:

RESOLUTION COMMEMORATING ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDECE

Whereas the independence bravely won by the Lithuanian people 44 years ago was erased after two short decades by illegal colonization of Soviet Russia; and

Whereas their desire for freedom has been expressed by those who escaped by hundreds of thousands from Communist ruled part of Germany through the city of Berlin before that route was blocked by the wall; and

Whereas the United States and its allies offer the only hope for restoration of freedom to all persons living in captive nations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we strongly support adoption of House Resolution 211 which would create a Congressional Committee on Captive Nations; and be it further

Resolved, That we also endorse the Kuchel-Lipscomb resolution of similar legislation authorizing the U.S. Government to request a United Nations investigation into the forceful overthrow of the Baltic countries by Soviet Russia, and its policies of colonialism and extermination of national traditions of the helpless nations; and be it further

Resolved, That the United States extend its support to all nations under just governments which, when seeking to maintain their sovereignty and freedom, are making strenuous efforts to improve living standards of

their people. On the other hand, the United States should let it be known it does not intend to apply economic or technical assistance to these nations which are sitting on the fence of imaginary neutrality; and be it further

Resolved, That we are grateful for the efforts being made by the Government of the United States in fighting back international communism, which is the gravest threat ever existed to our great Nation; and be it finally

Resolved, That we express our deepest thanks to the Government of the United States for nonrecognition of the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union.

Teachers Tell Why They Fled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 26, 1962

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I was happy to receive from my good friend, Dr. Walter Becher, Secretary General of the Sudetan German Council, a copy of the bulletin of the Press and Information Office of the Germany Federal Government, containing an article on the number of teachers who have fled from behind the Iron Curtain. I include the article with my remarks:

TEACHERS TELL WHY THEY FLED

Since the partitioning of Germany, some 75,000 teachers have fled from the Soviet Zone of Germany. They report as the chief reasons for their flight:

That they found it unbearable to have to teach in contradiction to the truth and their own convictions;

That they rebelled against the order to spy on the student body; and

That they felt unable to submit to the enforced participation in Communist-line political events that is prescribed for teachers and students.

These are the findings of a four-man commission recently sent to Berlin by the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession (WCOTP) to study the situation of the schools in the Soviet Zone of Germany at firsthand. The confederation comprises 120 professional organizations in 73 countries, with a total of more than 4 million teachers.

The commission sent to Berlin consisted of members from four continents: Mr. Carr from the United States, Mr. Kioni from Kenya, Mr. Lum from Malaya, and Mr. Baude from France. Their purpose was to inform themselves "as objectively and thoroughly as possible on how children, students, and teachers at all levels have been affected by events since the 13th of August, 1961, in the Soviet Zone and in divided Berlin."

In the effort to achieve the greatest possible objectivity, and to hear both sides, the commission invited the teachers' organization of the Soviet Zone to join in the investigation. But they received no answer from the Communist organization. They nevertheless visited East Berlin several times, endeavoring to get information through personal conversations.

In West Berlin, 200 private letters from refugee teachers and students were made available to the commission; they heard 100 witnesses of events in the Soviet Zone school system; and they consulted with representatives of West Berlin schools and universities. Incidentally, their investigations also turned up new human facets of the story of divided Berlin: for instance, the fact that 80 percent of the boys and girls at two West Berlin schools have close relatives in East Berlin whom they have not been able to visit since the erection of the wall.

REFUGEE SCHOLARS SINCE 1958

During 1961, more than 500 members of university staffs and research institutes in East Berlin and the Soviet Zone of Germany fled to the free part of Germany. Since 1958—when the Communist regime of the zone started its socialistic remodeling of the universities and institutes—1,606 such scholars have chosen to flee to the West. Well over half of these were occupied with medicine or the natural sciences.

The following is a list of the chief institutions at which the refugee scholars had been working, and the number of staff members each of these institutions lost:

University of East Berlin	275
University of Greifswald	62
University of Halle	147
University of Jena	98
University of Leipzig	199
University of Rostock	75
Dresden School of Technology	89
Freiberg Mining Academy	81
The research institutes of the Academy of Sciences in East Berlin	255

Michigan Legislature Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Senate Concurrent Resolution 3 offered by Senator Philip Rahoi, of the Senate of the State of Michigan entitled "A Concurrent Resolution Memorializing the U.S. Congress Concerning the Gogebic Iron Range and the Menominee and Marquette Iron Ranges."

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 3

A concurrent resolution memorializing the U.S. Congress concerning the Gogebic Iron Range and the Menominee and Marquette Iron Ranges.

Whereas the majority of the deep-shaft iron mines on the Gogebic Iron Range and the Menominee and Marquette Iron Ranges have ceased operations, thereby creating a serious economic hardship on the peoples and the communities involved, and the future of the remaining mines is extremely doubtful, indicating possibility of more extensive unemployment and acute suffering; and

Whereas the potentials are not only local, they are of vital interest to the Nation; and

Whereas proof exists that there are tremendous reserves of iron ore in the Gogebic Iron Range and the Menominee and Marquette Iron Ranges and the ore can be beneficiated and pelletized, thereby creating a product which is in demand by the steel companies; and

Whereas these processes of beneficiation and pelletizing demand large quantities of natural gas, which is not now available in the immediate area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully urged to establish an investigatory committee to probe the facts herein reviewed and related problems in the Gogebic Iron Range and the Menominee and Marquette Iron Ranges, to restore economic recovery and stability in the area, and to preserve for the Nation the use of these valuable iron ore deposits; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Governors of Michigan and Wisconsin, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Michigan and Wisconsin delegate to the Congress of the United States, and the Assembly and Senate of the State of Wisconsin.

Adopted by the house February 1, 1962.

NORMAN E. PHILLES,
Clerk of the House of Representatives

Adopted by the senate January 16, 1962.

BERYL I. KENYON,
Secretary of the Senate.

Dr. William M. Hudson Celebrates 90th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, today is the 90th anniversary of the birth of Dr. William Mestrezat Hudson, president emeritus and still-active board member of Blackburn College in my hometown of Carlinville, Ill.

For 55 years Dr. Hudson has proudly served this college with his time, energy, intellect, and faith. Through his efforts Blackburn has retained its unique program of self-help education for students who otherwise may not have been able to afford college. Dr. Hudson has placed Blackburn on a sound financial basis, and increased the services of a higher education for the enrollments of 35 students in 1912 to over 300 students in 1945, the year of his retirement from the presidency.

William Mestrezat Hudson was born February 26, 1872, near Waynesburg, Greene County, Pa. He and his mother and two brothers and a sister moved to Waynesburg when he was 10, following the death of his father.

He was graduated from Waynesburg College in 1892, first in a class of 16. He entered Princeton University that fall and was graduated cum laude in 1893. In 1896 he was graduated from Princeton Theological Seminary and was ordained to the ministry of the Presbyterian Church that fall. He immediately took the pastorate of the New Providence Presbyterian Church at Carmichaels, Pa.

In 1900 he spent 7 months abroad, including a month in Egypt and Palestine.

From Carmichaels he moved to the pastorate of First Presbyterian Church at Clarksburg, W. Va.

In 1905 he married Miss Florence Ronald Barclay of Louisville, Ky. They have three daughters: Miss Harriet Hudson, Ph. D., academic dean of Randolph-Macon Woman's College, Lynchburg, Va.; Mrs. Leslie Meyer, Upper Montclair,

N.J.; and Mrs. Florence Callaway, Laguna Beach, Calif.

Dr. Hudson served as president of Waynesboro College, Pennsylvania, from 1907 to 1911. He assumed the presidency of Blackburn College, Carlinville, Ill., in 1912 and held that post until his retirement in 1945. He is still an active member of the board of trustees of Blackburn College and is the president emeritus of Blackburn.

He holds a doctor of philosophy degree from Waynesburg College and has received honorary degrees from Princeton University; Henry Kendall College, Tulsa, Okla.; Illinois College, Jacksonville, Ill.; Waynesburg College, and Blackburn College.

He was named a "Pennsylvania ambassador" by the Commonwealth's chamber of commerce in 1950. The citation read, in part:

For outstanding achievements in the best traditions of the Commonwealth, this citation is awarded to William M. Hudson, a former resident of Greene County, Pa., who has won distinction as a college president and devoted friend of financially needy students.

He was the first individual from Greene County to be so feted.

Upon assuming the presidency of Blackburn College he found the institution nearly destitute with a endowment that had been depleated to only $100,000. There were only 35 students and the graduating class numbered 2. Under these circumstances he established the now internationally famous "work program" at the college. The program, essentially the same today, requires all students to work 15 hours per week at oncampus "institutional housekeeping" tasks, in partial payment for their education. He had made it possible for students from low-income families to secure a college education.

Dr. Hudson erected new buildings on the campus, added to the faculty and increased the endowment funds so that at his retirement the institution was financially sound, noted for its academic excellence and enrolling more than 300 students. His work plan at Blackburn has been followed, in part, by several institutions in foreign countries. The unique program has been featured in such national and international publications as the Reader's Digest, the Saturday Evening Post, Redbook, and Collier's. The story has also been told overseas recently by the U.S. Information Agency and by Reuters, Ltd., international news syndicate.

Wrote Mr. W. L. Schmitt, publisher of the Macoupin County Enquirer:

Few residents of Carlinville and Macoupin County have had a more satisfying career than William Mestrezat Hudson, president-emeritus of Blackburn College, distinguished educator, religious leader and all-American citizen. Liberal in his educational philosophy, conscientious and capable in his devotion to the public good, strong and alert in mind and body, temperate in all things, a man of unusual strength in intellect and character Dr. William M. Hudson looms today among the great citizens of the community.

Thousands of college students have felt the impact of his work at Blackburn College. Without him this Nation would have had to neglect the many able young men and women he has helped educate.

With him for 55 years has been his wife, Florence, affectionately called "Mother Hudson" by the students of the college for more than a third of a century. Behind a great man one usually finds a great lady.

Still active in civic and church affairs, the Hudsons spend their winters in Lakeland, Fla. They return to their home in Carlinville, Ill., each spring.

Today his experiment with the work program at Blackburn College is an integral part of the Blackburn Plan of Education. By Dr. Hudson's example, and under the guidance of the now president of Blackburn College, Dr. Robert P. Ludlum, the institution now serves 400 students on its modern campus. It is a fully accredited, 4-year, degree-granting institution of higher education. It is best known for its work program, instituted by Dr. Hudson in 1913. Dr. Hudson's wisdom and foresight have contributed greatly to the establishment of the college on such a high academic plane.

The high esteem in which Dr. Hudson is held by his fellow townsmen is reflected in the following editorial from the February 22 issue of the Macoupin County Enquirer, of Carlinville, Ill.:

DR. HUDSON NEARS THE AGE OF 90

If the Enquirer were asked to name Carlinville's leading citizen, the most distinguished man in our community, we don't know of anyone more qualified for that honor than Dr. William M. Hudson, president-emeritus of Blackburn College, consecrated churchman, ideal citizen, and longtime community leader.

And the occasion of his coming 90th birthday next Monday would be an ideal time for the people of this area to pay him the honor which is his due. Dr. Hudson has spent the fruitful years of his life guiding young people and building up Carlinville's own unique institution of learning—Blackburn College.

To enumerate the countless accomplishments of this venerable gentleman would require a good-sized volume, but possibly foremost of these would be his inauguration of the now world-famous study-work plan which has enabled thousands of worthy young men and women to acquire an education while paying part of their way with the labor of their hands.

And while of course she is a long way from being as old as her husband, the gracious and warmhearted "Mother" Hudson also deserves honor and credit for the more than 50 years she has worked with, guided, counseled and put up with the eccentricities of her illustrious husband.

Citizens of Carlinville and throughout this area will not be able to personally greet Dr. Hudson on the occasion of his reaching the estate of a nonagenarian, since they are spending the winter months in Florida, but we imagine hundreds will send him greetings by mail, telephone and telegraph.

And we suggest, when the Hudsons return home in early April that the community join in giving a banquet in honor of our distinguished first citizen.

Tribute to Air Reserve Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point a wonderful letter which arrived in my office this morning from the Honorable Joe Foss, president of the Air Force Association. It is a splendid and well-deserved tribute to our Air Reserve Forces and it is a pleasure for me to commend it to the attention of all of my colleagues here in the U.S. House of Representatives:

AIR FORCE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., February 12, 1962.

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: In the midst of the controversy and complaints over the callup of Reserves as a result of the Berlin crisis, it appears that the public is largely unaware of the magnificent job done by the Air Reserve Forces during this period.

The Air Reserve units are and should be made up entirely of volunteers. We ask your assistance in making it clear to the men and their families that their sacrifices have been for a vital purpose, and that the Nation appreciates their continued willingness to serve. Few will want to serve in an organization that may be under a cloud of doubt and suspicion.

The Air Force Association has undertaken a project to set the record straight for all Americans. In the belief that the callup record of the Air Reserve Forces might merit coverage in your newsletter, I call your attention to the following:

First, the Air Force record shows convincingly that the Reserve Forces are a valuable component of our defense structure.

Second, the patriotic response of the members of the Air Reserve Forces and the sacrifices borne willingly by their families merit the Nation's gratitude.

Third, appropriate recognition of the reservists will help assure the continued strength and usefulness of the Air Reserve Forces when they are released from active duty.

Specifically, I call your attention to four examples in this record of accomplishment:

1. Air Guardsmen flew 218 single-engine jet planes over the Atlantic within a month after being recalled, providing much-needed conventional fighter strength for Air Force combat units in Europe. In a recent letter to President Kennedy, Chancellor Adenauer of Germany wrote that, in his opinion, the buildup to which these units contributed was the prime factor influencing Khrushchev to back down on Berlin.

2. The number of complaints from Air Force recallees was nearly zero—no greater under the circumstances than would have been experienced with career personnel.

3. Five Air Force Reserve and Six Air National Guard squadrons entered on duty with four-engine transport aircraft, the first to be assigned to their respective components. In 3 months of active duty, their crews flew almost 4 million miles on troop carrier and cargo missions.

4. The remaining 13 Air Guard tactical fighter and reconnaissance squadrons on ac-

tive duty in the United States are combat-ready, poised for immediate deployment wherever national security may be threatened.

The Secretaries of Defense and Air Force and the Air Force Chief of Staff have publicly expressed their high regard for the mission capability of reserve forces personnel and appreciation for the spirit in which reservists' wives and families have accepted the recall. Their pertinent statements are attached.

We hope you agree that the record of Air Reserve Forces on active duty deserves the attention of your constituents and all Americans. We hope you will help make the record clear.

Sincerely,

JOE FOSS.

The Relationship Between Profits and Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 5, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, may I call to the attention of the social planners and those who would exchange our free enterprise system for a federally controlled economy I would like to call attention to the following basic economic truths in an article written by Dick West, able editor of the Dallas Morning News:

MORE ON PROFITS

(By Dick West)

The other day we had a piece in this space on economics—specifically, the value of the proper attitude toward business. More specifically, the necessity of public understanding that profits are the life blood of business.

Unless a business makes a profit—and keeps a certain percentage of it for a rainy day—jobs are in jeopardy. That business can't expand. It can't hire. It can't provide security for its employees.

The depression of the 1930's, and its bitter experience, were blamed on business. The word "corporation" became an ugly term. Profits were considered in the same breath with poisonous snakes.

Each year in this country more than 2 million young people are absorbed directly into the Nation's work force. The great majority have not gone beyond high school, and only 5 out of every 100 have had as much as one semester in economics.

"It is small wonder," the National Association of Manufacturers says, "that so many of our prospective employees, as well as those presently at work, go along with the 'merchants of fancy' since they have little or no understanding of the basic economic principles under which the free competitive business system operates, and in which most of them will spend their working lives."

What do these high school graduates think about our business system? Well, you'd be surprised. The opinions of a majority of these young people, who don't know any better, sound like anti-American propaganda from Moscow.

Studies by Opinion Research Corp. reveal the folowing about these students: 82 percent think that monopolies rule the roost in many of America's major industries; 60 percent think that owners get too much of a company's profit; 62 percent think that a worker should not produce all that he can; 76 percent think that most of the gains from new machinery go to the owners; and 53 percent favor Government ownership (socialism) of one or more industries—banks, railroads, electric power, steel, oil, automobile.

The truth about business and our economic system is far different from these attitudes.

During a 28-year (1929–56) period, all corporations made an average of 3.8 percent profit on their sales; 96.2 percent went for other costs, such as labor and taxes.

Of all money in a corporation going to workers and owners, the workers get 87 percent, the owners 13.

Of the total national income, workers receive 66 percent. Owner-stockholders get only 6 cents of each dollar, and of that 6 nearly half is set aside for expansion to create more jobs.

The have-nots can't liquidate the haves and help themselves. Many workers have an idea they can make more by taking it from the rich. Truth is, after income taxes less than 2 percent of the national income goes to people with incomes over $20,000 a year.

Postal Rates and Newspapers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the February 2, 1962, issue of the Illinoian-Star daily newspaper published in Beardstown, Ill., contained this excellent editorial on postal rate increases and how they affect country newspapers. As we deliberate on the postal rate increase I urge my colleagues to give attention to this comment:

PROPOSED POSTAL RATE BOOST AFFECTS YOU

A bill raising $701 million additional in postal revenue annually is now before the U.S. Senate, having passed the House earlier in the week without difficulty. If it should become law July 1, it would affect you in these ways:

Letter mail would be increased to 5 cents and air mail to 8 cents.

If you subscribe to an out-of-town newspaper delivered by mail or take a magazine, the post office would add a charge of 1 cent per copy of each delivery made to you.

If you take a daily newspaper, the charge for mail delivery would be increased $3.12 per year. This applies whether the paper is an 8-page Illinoian-Star delivered to Frederick, or a 30-page New York Times mailed across the continent.

The across-the-board increase of 1 cent per copy would apply equally to a slim issue of a farm publication or a bulky copy of Fortune magazine.

The public is practical. If higher taxes are needed, we'll tighten our belts and pay them. If higher postal rates are needed, we'll pay them.

Most newspapers, including the Illinoian-Star, have cut down the work of the postal system by presorting and sacking newspapers. The Illinoian-Star has delivered papers to Bluff Springs and Frederick post offices since passenger trains were removed at both places.

The unfairness of a 1-cent-per-copy increase is most glaring when attention is focused on Illinoian-Star delivery to Frederick. Persons there were accustomed to getting newspapers with their mail on a Burlington passenger train about 4:40 p.m. When the train was removed, the post office did not duplicate the mail schedule. The mail now doesn't leave here for Frederick until the next day. So we make special delivery by auto to the Frederick Post Office daily, but pay the same postal rates as if the delivery were made by the post office.

The post office now would increase those rates exactly the same amount as for the Fairbanks News-Miner sent here from Alaska.

The House acted in haste. The Senate will proceed more cautiously, allowing objectors to testify at scheduled hearings. It's unlikely they'll accept H.R. 7929 without considerable revision, especially since it would doom many small weekly publications. Farm magazines, parent and children's magazines have also indicated they'd have to close shop.

The Illinoian-Star would pass the increased cost on to subscribers, the same as we've given them the benefit of low postal rates in the past.

The Attorney General's Trip

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, George Sokolsky has written an excellent answer to the current carping about Attorney General Kennedy's trip.

Mr. Sokolsky's column, which appeared in the Washington Post of February 19, 1962, follows:

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S TRIP

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Henry J. Taylor, against whom I bear no malice and with whom oft on a Tuesday I chitchat over a viand in good company; regards himself as an authority on international relations, having been Ambassador to Switzerland; a lesser country engaged mostly in producing milk chocolate and providing tax havens. Harry apparently does not appreciate Bobby Kennedy traveling over Asia and Europe and having a look-see at the doings of diplomats, politicians, merchants, and others who live outside the United States.

Bobby Kennedy, apart from being the President's brother and despite such a relationship, is an experienced investigator, having served on the McCarthy committee and the McClellan committee of the U.S. Senate and having written an important book, "The Enemy Within." He has gone through the labor unions of the country, leaving nothing to be discovered that is corrupt and he is now teaching American business that the law must be obeyed, no matter how big the company.

Were he not the President's brother, it would be found satisfactory to send him on a mission of investigation underwritten by a foundation or some other enterprise. Because he is the President's brother political enemies raise the cry of nepotism which gives the impression that only one member of a family is genetically endowed with ability, capacity, and imagination. Of the Kennedy brothers, Bobby is to my liking because he fights for many causes that I believe important.

One of the misfortunes of our country is the mismanagement of the State Department and the CIA. The President has to do something about it. President Eisenhower should have done something about it. Therefore a prime investigator, who happens

to be Attorney General of the United States, is moving about the world looking at why this country is so badly represented abroad. Nearly all the Kennedys are on this job and when they come home the President will have firsthand knowledge of what goes.

My good friend, Harry, the erstwhile Ambassador, calls it a junket. Bobby Kennedy and his wife take the cheers and jeers that nowadays come to American celebrities. Harry Taylor worries about the cost of this trip. He says:

"The Government's spending is colossal. We foot the bill for every penny. Anything that smacks of an idea that a few millions here or there makes little difference is a terrible injustice. It is a symptom of a malaise at the top."

We are throwing away billions of dollars on futile activities. If a prime investigator, which Robert Kennedy is, can discover what is done with this money and why it is being spent, we might not only get a dollar's worth of return for our money but we might even save huge amounts. At any rate, someone is on the job who could discover what Hoffa was up to and who can discover what all the little devils who sit around eating cream puffs and denouncing their own country, are up to.

This does not mean that there is a quarrel between the President and Secretary of State, Dean Rusk. It does not mean that the President plans to make his brother Secretary of State. It does mean that the President knows that he was misinformed concerning Cuba; that Secretary of State John Foster Dulles was misinformed concerning Cuba and that that must not happen again to a President of the United States and a Secretary of State.

Estonian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, Estonians were among the numerous European nationality groups which regained their independence toward the end of the First World War. Their country on the northeastern shores of the Baltic had become part of the Russian empire early in the 18th century, and they endured the oppressive czarist yoke for two centuries. In 1917 when the czarist autocracy was overthrown by the Russian revolution, all national groups once subjected to the czarist regime were freed, regained their liberty and proclaimed their national independence. The Estonians did this on February 24, 1918, and founded the Estonian Republic.

In the newly established democratic Republic its stouthearted, patriotic and thrifty inhabitants, numbering a bare million, did wonders in the course of their free existence during the next two decades. Besides rebuilding their devastated and ruined country, they advanced in every phase of their national activity. And they were quite content with their lot in their beloved homeland. But their independent life did not last long. When the Second World War began, Estonia's independence was threatened. In 1940 the country, after being occupied by the Red Army, was made part of the Soviet Union. Thus ended the freedom of the Estonian people, and since then they have been living and suffering under totalitarian dictatorship. For two decades they have endured the oppressive yoke of their captors, and under such unenviable circumstances they pray for their deliverance from Communist tyranny. On this 44th anniversary of their independence day we wish them fortitude and courage in their struggle for their freedom and independence.

The Future Is Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in the September 1961 issue of the Carnegie Alumnus, John C. Warner, president of the Carnegie Institute of Technology, has written a most excellent article which is based on an address before the Engineering Educators Forum at the Ford Motor Co. last June. It contains, in my opinion, a refreshing look at modern education.

I highly commend this excellent presentation to the Members of this House who annually struggle with the very important questions facing American education:

THE FUTURE IS NOW

(By John C. Warner)

I say the future is now, because the future will be determined largely by what we do now; by the goals we set for our society; by the extent to which we are realistic about the domestic environment and the world environment; by the extent to which we have the courage to make social, economic, and political decisions which, considering the realities, are compatible with our goals; by the extent to which we adapt our educational system to provide us with the skills, competencies, and leadership we must have.

I believe that if we do now that which will make a good future for our grandchildren and great grandchildren, the distant future will have a first-rate chance of being a good future, too.

I take it that in this future we want a reasonably free society, not a dictatorship; that we want to preserve individual liberty, human dignity, the freedoms of the Bill of Rights; that we want the individual to have the opportunity to develop his capacities and to win rewards for unusual competence, creativeness, and the application of his abilities to worthy tasks; that we do not want all industry, business, and commerce nationalized; that we do not wish benevolent planners in Government to tell us whether we may have zero, one, two, or three automobiles, or where we must live, or in what trade or profession we must be engaged. Indeed, unless the goal in our future continues to be the free society, there is no good purpose to be served by this expression of my ideas or, indeed, by this magazine.

How about the realities of the situation internationally and domestically?

Everyone knows that the most important fact of life in the world today is the scientific-technological-economic-ideological race in which we and our allies are competing with Soviet Russia, Red China, and their satellites. We know that the aim of communism is to destroy all other systems of government; we know that the Communists proclaim their belief that the universal triumph of communism is inevitable; but we know that communism cannot triumph unless we lose the race.

Many of the neutral or uncommitted nations outside the Communist bloc are underdeveloped, with great masses of people living in poverty and ignorance. From humane motives we want to help these depressed populations to improve their lot through technical aid, education, capital investment, and gifts. From political motives many want to improve the lot of these unfortunate people in the hope that it will win their minds. In any event this is another fact of life on the itnernational scene with which we must reckon.

On the domestic front, the following realities must be recognized, and their compatibility with a free society in the future estimated:

(a) It is politically unacceptable to tolerate more than minimal unemployment. How much? Some say 3 or 4 percent—some say 5 or 6 percent.

(b) Political expediency rather than the long-range insurance of a free and prosperous society seems the guide to legislative and executive decision making in government.

(c) Largely because of the previous condition, I believe, there has been a growing advocacy of equalitarianism—not equality in the eyes of the Lord, not equality of opportunity, but equality here and now in sharing in the privileges and rewards made possible in the most productive society the world has ever developed. This has led to a distortion in the distribution of the national income and in the distribution of rewards and privileges. We tax—we might say loot—the competent, creative, ambitious people to give to the incompetent and lazy on a basis of need. We are supposed to assume that all are born endowed with equal potential powers and that all could make an equal contribution to society if they but had equal educational and economic opportunities. To the advocates of this doctrine of equalitarianism higher education becomes a right, not a privilege to be enjoyed by those who have the ability to profit by it.

Will we have the courage to make social, political, and economic decisions—considering the realities—which are compatible with our wish that a free society shall survive and prosper? It means we would need to do what it takes to maximize our effectiveness in the use of our human and material resources to stay ahead in the race with the Communists and to insure an expanding economy in a free society here at home.

It means the continued maintenance of a powerful deterrent force and an adequate defense and retaliation force to be used if necessary.

I guess it means a competitive position in space exploration.

It means a much more intelligent and effective approach to any aid we give to underdeveloped countries. If there's a grain of truth to Lederer's "A Nation of Sheep" we need to clean house (ideas and people) and start over.

It means such a rate of economic growth as will sustain reasonably full employment.

It means operation under fiscal policies which preserve a reasonably stable price level—this means tax revenue adequate to meet expenses; wage and salary increases consistent with increased productivity; and production costs reasonably competitive with those in other countries.

It means backing away from the doctrine of equalitarianism so that people win honors and rewards in proportion to their contribution to our economy and our society.

It means curbing excessive power whether it resides in monopoly unions, monopoly business, the veterans, the farmers, or in any other special or vested interest group.

I believe it means that we must do a better job than we are doing on the allocation of funds and on the allocation of our most competent and creative manpower to scientific research and technological development. The emphasis should be on our security, on the scientific-technological activities which contribute to economic growth, and on the education of oncoming generations of creative scholars.

Politics being what it is, I presume we may expect that in many ways things will get worse before they get better—I expect, for example, that we shall have another whirl at stimulating the economy by following inflationary fiscal policies; and that we shall continue for some time to yield to pressure groups and perpetuate inequities in the distribution of the national income.

In the long run, however, I believe we want the free society badly enough that we will do what it takes to preserve it. We know that economic growth steadily stimulated by inflationary policies leads to economic chaos. With chaos, people look for a messiah and give him absolute power. Thus ends the free society.

I am confident that we shall do what we need to do if our educational system is truly adapted to the needs of society and if those who enjoy its opportunities will meet their obligations as citizens. Thus much of that future that is now depends upon our educational institutions—primary and secondary schools, junior colleges, community colleges, technical institutes, regular 4-year colleges, professional schools and graduate schools.

That future we have focused upon is roughly the beginning of the 21st century. Chances are that the major responsibilities in leadership and decisionmaking at that future time will be borne by men who already have been born—indeed some are already in school or college. How important then for that future is the quality and efficacy of formal education today?

I would like to say a bit about proper goals for the schools, pass quickly to post high school education in general, and then deal more fully with higher professional education, especially education in science and engineering.

The principal and almost only purpose of our primary and secondary schools should be the intellectual development, not the social adjustment, of our children. This should consist chiefly of solid subjects studied in sufficient depth to challenge the abilities of the students. It should provide a knowledge of our heritage, our institutions, and the natural sciences and mathematics. It should make the student acquainted with some of the great masterpieces of thought and expression and it should develop the art of reading, the arts of oral and written communication, and the art of self-discipline.

All students should follow the course of study in solid subjects as long as their intellectual ability is adequate to the task. When a limit is reached below that required as preparation for higher education, the student should be directed into those vocational studies for which he has greatest aptitude so that he will attain the skills needed for useful employment. In between these and those clearly headed for higher education there will be a segment who are capable of profiting by solid subjects throughout secondary school, but then should be prepared for a vocation in a post-high school, 1- or 2-year terminal program provided by a junior or community college or a technical institute. Vocational education must play an increasingly important role in our society because of the steady decline in the opportunities for the employment of unskilled workers. Vocational training of the above sort must also be increasingly provided for the retraining of workers whose skills have become obsolete. Certainly vocational training and retraining, and means for increasing the mobility of labor must be important elements in any scheme to promote full employment.

To assure the survival and prosperity of our free society in our future, it is mighty important that all those who in secondary school have demonstrated that they have the capacity and the will to profit by higher education should have the opportunity to do so. What fraction of our college-age population are likely to be in this group? In 1955–56 a little over a third of our college-age population of 8,500,000 were in institutions for higher education—actually 35.1 percent, or approximately 3 million. By 1970 our college-age population will have increased to about 14,500,000 and the planners in the U.S. Office of Education predict that 44.4 percent or about 6,400,000 will be in institutions of higher education. The latter figure might be reasonably reliable for 1970 if it included students in post-high school vocational education as well as students working toward bacculaureate or higher degrees. I doubt that the percentage actually in higher education should be much higher than at present, around 36–37 percent. It's true that an appreciable number of students of good ability do not go to college, but I have a hunch that just about as many are in college that should not be there as are not in college that should be there.

It seems to me that we should tighten up on admission standards so that we do not waste educational resources on the unfit, and that we should do everything we can to see that the able student is motivated to take advantage of higher education and that there is no economic barrier in his path. (I might say that in my experience the lack of motivation barrier has been more important than the economic barrier when students of adequate ability have not gone on to college. Although there are many cases in which the economic barrier is a real deterrent, I am convinced that the great majority of able, highly motivated young men and women can find a way to go to college—and that this is not much more difficult now than it was when I went to college on my own in 1915.)

Higher education also should have as its principal aim the intellectual development of students. Every program should have a dual objective: provide the student a solid core of liberal studies and give him an understanding of a scholarly or professional field so that he is competent to do socially useful work in the field. In this rapidly changing world it is of extraordinary importance that all programs be designed so that formal education is most useful as a base for a lifetime of education—mostly self-education. To accomplish these fundamental purposes it is becoming more necessary in most scholarly and professional fields to educate the most able and most highly motivated who are going to be our leaders to high levels of competence in graduate school.

I have painted here with a pretty broad brush and long strokes to give my overall ideas about good higher education. Education for the various scientific and engineering professions fits into the overall broad picture, but I'm sure this audience will be interested in exploring in somewhat more detail ideas which seem rapidly to be coming in focus among our leading educators in science and engineering.

First of all, I can say that everyone stands by the decisions made back in the 1930's that scientific and engineering education needed to be liberalized by providing curriculum time for a solid, effective core of studies in the humanities and social sciences. Today, if we argued for change in this aspect we would argue for more time or greater effectiveness for this part of the curriculum for two reasons:

It is urgent that the natural scientists and the engineers establish better rapport with the humanists and social scientists. The importance of this to our social order is argued in a most eloquent manner by many people—e.g., C. P. Snow in "The Two Cultures," J. Bronowski in "Science and Human Values," and Bentley Glass in "Science in Liberal Education."

It steadily is more clearly recognized that our scientific and technological problems almost invariably contain social, economic, political, or moral elements. And we can not give complete or best solutions without considering these elements and human behavior. This is best illustrated by problems in what may best be called the area of systems and communications, science, and technology.

On the scientific-technological side, engineering education has undergone steady change during the past quarter century. A most significant step was taken in the 1930's by focusing this part of engineering education on the long pull—our future—instead of on the "here and now." Much "know-how" and descriptive material was discarded and a new emphasis was placed on giving the student a thorough understanding of basic science, skill in the use of science in the solution of engineering problems new to the student, and the habit of trying to learn something from each experience. I believe our Carnegie plan is an outstanding example of these vital curricular changes.

Since that time there has been an increased emphasis on the engineering sciences underlying all branches of engineering and a further decrease in the time spent on specialized engineering applications and subjects. All this has led to more common subjects in engineering curiculums and consequently less sharply defined departmental lines. Right now there is a lot of soul-searching going on in an effort to design formal higher education in engineering to best serve our future. Considering the rapid rate of change in science and technology; the rapid change in our domestic and world environment; the new tools steadily being made available to us; and the growing complexity of our most pressing problems, we are led to the following general conclusions:

1. No lasting benefit can be derived any longer from giving curriculum time to the study of present "know-how."

2. Every emphasis must be placed on preparing the student for a lifetime of education, mainly self-education.

3. No curriculum time should be used to train engineers to do what computers can do for them, but curriculum time must be given to learning what computers can do.

4. During formal education it would be well to deemphasize loyalty to an individual professional field and encourage an attitude favorable to crossing the standard departmental lines in an interdisciplinary attack on complicated problems.

There is ample evidence from the observation of the careers of engineers we know, that engineers who do not continue their education, whether they be in industry or the colleges, become obsolete. This is borne out by the Engineers' Joint Council salary studies: In general, curves showing median salaries as a function of years out of college reach a maximum at about 25 years out and then either stay about constant or decline. Salary curves for those in the lower quartile and lower decile in general reach a maximum earlier and are more likely to decline than the median. Salary curves for the upper quartile usually continue to rise somewhat even after 35 years out of college, and for the upper decile the curves continue to rise

very substantially. It seems safe to assume that the upper quartile and decile are the smart engineers who have continued their education throughout their professional careers.

Dr. Thomas E. Stelson, head of our civil engineering department, has said some rather startling but very important things on this subject and I would like to conclude by quoting a few paragraphs from his paper "Education for Oblivion?" which appeared in the Alumnus last spring.

"The decline in value or obsolescence of engineering personnel may likely become an increasingly serious problem in modern technology unless professional societies, employers and schools recognize its importance and develop suitable remedies. The problem may be viewed as a combination effect of growth and change. New knowledge is continually being developed. A practicing engineer must continually grow in new knowledge or he will decline in his relative position with respect to the frontier of knowledge. An example of this process will be illustrated by changes in the civil engineering curriculum at Carnegie Institute of Technology.

"Even though Carnegie Tech had a newly developed and progressive curriculum in civil engineering 10 years ago, about 25 percent of that 4-year curriculum has since been completely abandoned and has been replaced by more advanced course work in science, mathematics, and engineering. * * * Thus, a B.S. graduate today has essentially reached a level of advanced training that an M.S. graduate attained 10 years ago.

"The impact of this change on education and engineering practice is significant. Unless a graduate of 10 years ago has systematically spent about 10 percent of his time extending his knowledge beyond the level of development achieved in his collegiate training, he will not have value in excess of that of a new graduate. This analysis, furthermore, assumes that he retains all of his previous training, which is probably far from realistic. If an estimate of decay from neglect or disuse is also 10 percent per year, an engineer is then faced with the task of growing in new knowledge at the rate of about 20 percent per year to remain of equal value to his employer and society. To increase in value at a significant rate he should probably devote about one-third of his productive hours to self-education and improvement. Such growth is a prodigious task. It magnitude is seldom realized and all too infrequently attained. * * *

"Another example of the rapid obsolescence of engineering personnel because of replacement of their abilities by high-speed computers is taken from mechanical engineering practice. In one large industry a number of engineers were primarily engaged in the development of optimum designs for gear trains. Such problems require skill and ingenuity, and frequently take about one-half day for solution. After this problem had been programed for computer solution, the computer also determined the time charge and billed the appropriate department. These particular problems only justified the minimum charge—42 cents. Thus, highly trained and competent engineers are replaced for 84 cents a day. What industry wants to, or should, resist the pressure to replace a $40-a-day engineer with an 84-cent computer bill?

"The high-speed computer is a wonderful tool that has opened a new horizon for the extension of engineering knowledge and application, but only for those engineers who use computers and not for those who compete with them. Too many schools are still teaching engineering curriculums whose graduates are trained to compete with computers rather than use them. Unless such graduates are capable of quick growth in other directions, they will soon be sadly disillusioned about their prospects for development in the engineering profession. Engineering educators must be ever alert to avoid training 84-cent-a-day engineers. It is obvious that the only good engineering education is one which concentrates on lasting basic knowledge with a minimum of concern with applicational methods and operational techniques. * * *

"Thus, above everything else, it's important to educate engineers so that they may continue to grow throughout their professional life. The engineers of the 21st century have already enrolled in school." Their future is being made now.

Mayor Daley and Governor Kerner Proclaim February 25 WGN Radio and Television Day in Illinois and Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Governor Kerner and Mayor Daley proclaimed yesterday, February 25, as WGN Radio and Television Day in Illinois and Chicago, respectively.

That is the day on which WGN, Inc., was awarded the second annual Mike Award by the Broadcast Pioneers in New York City at a ceremony in the Latin Quarter restaurant.

The award was given to the Chicago Tribune's stations "for distinguished contribution to the art of broadcasting, pioneering in the art, and service to the public."

Governor Kerner in his proclamation, urged all citizens to take cognizance of the great honor being accorded to our State's radio and television stations.

He cited WGN's role as a 50,000-watt station on a clear channel, saying it has been "continually serving the interest of the sovereign State of Illinois, the Midwest, and the Nation for almost four decades."

Referring to WGN-TV, Kerner said:

It also is a pioneer in the industry as one of the first television stations to add color to its services to viewers with the finest in programing.

The two stations, Kerner added, have achieved national prominence for their adherence to quality, integrity, responsibility in programing and management, and a position of leadership in the broadcast industry.

Mayor Daley's proclamation emphasized the "indispensable role of radio and television in National, State, and local economy" and praised the pioneering of WGN, Inc.

It is with great pleasure that I today call to the attention of my colleagues the honor which has been bestowed on radio and television station WGN. At the conclusion of my own remarks, I shall include the two formal proclamations and other related material which describes so vividly the very significant contribution that both WGN's radio and television stations have made toward the cultural, industrial, scientific, and educational progress, not only in Chicago and Illinois, but throughout the areas of our entire Nation which these two stations serve through the media of radio and television.

It is indeed fitting that the broadcasting pioneers have singled out WGN for the second annual Mike Award this year when this fine broadcasting facility is observing its 37th year of service to the public.

Radio and television have become so much a part of every American's life that too often we fail to recognize the full significance of its impact in our daily existence. Throughout its 37 years, WGN, both as a pioneer in radio broadcasting and in later years as a pioneer in television, has brought the world and its complex structure within the reach of millions of Americans.

We in Chicago are very proud of WGN because it was among the first radio stations in the country to develop facilities in bringing on-the-spot news developments directly to the people. In 1925, it was WGN which brought the American people live coverage of the celebrated Scopes trial in the tiny hamlet of Dayton, Tenn.

Since those early days, WGN has set the pace for the highest standards of radio and television coverage of world events.

In looking over the tremendous accomplishments of radio station WGN, we see at once the wisdom demonstrated by the Federal Government when it allocated clear channel frequencies to stations like WGN. To this day WGN operates as one of only 25 clear channel stations in America and, as a result, the high standards of musical entertainment and the outstanding dedication to public service and coverage of the news have been brought to millions of American people throughout our country who otherwise, for lack of radio facilities, would be denied these sources.

It would appear to me that those who would today suggest the removal of clear channel privileges to stations like WGN, would do well to study the long record of illustrious public service by WGN which found expression yesterday in connection with the honor being paid WGN, Inc.

At the impressive ceremony held in New York Sunday night, leaders of the broadcasting industry were on hand to pay tribute to the Chicago Tribune's broadcasting subsidiary company. These included J. Howard Wood, president of the Tribune Co. and publisher of the Tribune, who is also president of WGN, Inc. Ward L. Quaal, executive vice president and general manager of radio and television station WGN accepted the second annual Mike Award. I am sure that all of the people who come in daily contact with these two broadcasting facilities shared the same thrill in seeing WGN honored, as that experienced by Mr. Quaal in receiving the award.

Mr. Speaker, the supplemental material which I discussed earlier follows:

PROCLAMATION ISSUED BY RICHARD J. DALEY, MAYOR OF CHICAGO

Whereas the business of radio and television fulfills an indispensable role in our National, State, and local economy; and

Whereas WGN, a pioneer station has played an important part in the growth of the communications industry; and

Whereas WGN radio, as well as WGN television, is being honored with the second annual Mike Award by the Broadcast Pioneers on Sunday, February 25, 1962, for "Distinguished contributions to the art of broadcasting, and in recognition of pioneering in the art, the science, and in service to the public"; and

Whereas these two Chicago stations have gained national prominence for dedicated service to the vast mid-America area and the Nation, and adherence to quality, integrity, responsibility in programing and management, and position of leadership in the broadcast industry: Now, therefore,

I, Richard J. Daley, mayor of the city of Chicago, do hereby proclaim Sunday, February 25, 1962, to be WGN Radio and Television Day in Chicago, and urge all citizens to take cognizance of the great honor being accorded to our city's own radio and television station.

Dated this 19th day of January 1962.

RICHARD J. DALEY,
Mayor.

PROCLAMATION ISSUED BY OTTO KERNER, GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

Whereas the radio and television industry fulfills such an indispensable role in contributing to the governmental, business, educational, cultural, artistic, news gathering, sports presentations, and entertainment fields in our State and its communities; and

Whereas WGN, a pioneer station which has served as a 50,000-watt clear channel radio station continually serving the interest of the sovereign State of Illinois, the Midwest, as well as the Nation for almost four decades; and

Whereas WGN Television, also a pioneer in its industry and one of the first television stations in the Nation to add color to its services to viewers, has also served said viewers with the finest in programing; and

Whereas the dedicated services of these two Chicago stations have gained such national prominence for their adherence to quality, integrity, responsibility in programing and management, and position of leadership in the broadcast industry; and

Whereas WGN Radio, as well as WGN Television, is being honored with the Second Annual Mike Award by the Broadcast Pioneers on Sunday, February 25, 1962, for "distinguished contribution to the art of broadcasting and in recognition of pioneering in the art, the science and in service to the public";

Now, therefore, I Otto Kerner, Governor of the sovereign State of Illinois, do hereby proclaim Sunday, February 25, 1962, to be WGN Radio and Television Day in Illinois, and urge all citizens to take cognizance of the great honor being accorded to our State's radio and television stations.

Dated this 20th day of February 1962.

OTTO KERNER,
Governor.

[From Chicago's American Leisure Magazine, Feb. 25, 1962]

HOW TO WIN A GOLD-PLATED MICROPHONE

(By Joan Lynn)

The Broadcast Pioneers have good reason to honor WGN in New York City this evening. It's the only radio station that can claim it goes back to the origin of man.

The claim may be disputed by disciples of Charles Darwin, but the fact remains that in 1925 WGN took its microphones to the tiny Tennessee hamlet of Dayton to cover the trial of John Thomas Scopes, a high school teacher charged with expounding evolutionary theory in his classes.

This in itself was as startling a thing to do in radio then as the evolutionary theories Scopes was teaching in the classroom, but for a station that was blazing all sorts of trails in broadcasting, to coin a familiar phrase, it was all in a day's work for the pioneering WGN.

So, when Phil Edwards, president of the New York chapter of Broadcast Pioneers, presents the second annual Mike Award, a gold-plated actual ribbon microphone of pioneer radio days, it will be in recognition of a score or more such broadcasting achievements by WGN over the last 38 years.

A distinguished group of guests will be on hand for the presentation ceremonies in New York's Latin Quarter.

WGN will be represented by J. Howard Wood, president of the Tribune Co. and publisher of the Chicago Tribune, in his capacity as president of WGN, Inc., and by Ward L. Quaal, executive vice president and general manager of WGN.

The Mike Award will be something of a birthday present, coming just before the station's 38th anniversary.

The award ceremonies also will open a floodgate of nostalgia as some of WGN's historic radio achievements are recalled, dating back almost to its first day on the air, March 24, 1924. [Actually, the Tribune had been associated prior to this with the broadcast activities of Chicago stations WDAP and WJAZ.]

The station's first big pioneering effort was the 7-hour broadcast of the 1924 Memorial Day 500-mile race at Indianapolis.

The station added another first in May, 1925, with a broadcast of the Kentucky Derby, the first of many such radio reports of the famed classic. The broadcast was elaborately staged featuring a corps of eight radio observers, the Pullman Porter's Quartet, and the singing team of Charles Correll and Freeman Gosden, later to become Sam 'n' Henry, and still later Amos 'n' Andy.

On May 31 that year WGN returned to Indianapolis to do its second Speedway broadcast, and in July it packed its microphones for the trip down to Dayton, Tenn., to report the Scopes "monkey" trial which pitted William Jennings Bryan against Clarence Darrow, noted defense attorney.

In September 1925, WGN racked up another first with its broadcast of the World Series between the Pittsburgh Pirates and the Washington Senators.

All in all, those were colorful pioneer years for one of the Nation's earliest stations.

As we said at the beginning, WGN can claim it goes back to the origin of man via the Scopes "monkey" trial. No other station can make that claim.

WGN WINS THE GOLDEN MIKE—A 37-YEAR LISTENER'S VERDICT: "THEY DESERVE IT"

The Broadcast Pioneers will present their second annual Golden Mike Award to WGN, Inc., Chicago, "for distinguished contribution of pioneering in the art, the science, and in service to the public" Sunday night in New York City.

(Leaders of the broadcast industry will be on hand to pay tribute to the Tribune's broadcasting subsidiary company. J. Howard Wood, president of the Tribune company and publisher of the Tribune, is president of WGN, Inc. Ward L. Quaal, its executive vice president and general manager, will accept the award. The ceremony will be broadcast by WBN.)

(By Larry Wolters)

When WGN receives the second annual Mike award of the Broadcast Pioneers in New York Sunday night I expect to be there cheering. For 37 years I have been a WGN listener. My first contact with the Tribune's station was made through a crystal set in Pittsburgh where I was working in 1925.

WGN had a fine clear channel frequency then as now and occasionally we could pull it in clearly at night. First show I heard from WGN was the Coon-Sanders Nighthawks, whooping it up at the Blackhawk restaurant.

We also laughed with Sam and Henry (Charles Correll and Freeman Gosden), later to become famous as Amos 'n' Andy. In those days it seems a miracle to hear voices from 450 miles away. Now they tell me they've talked to the moon and had the words bounce back.

It was an even bigger thrill to hear WGN reporting the Scopes [monkey] trial from Dayton, Tenn., in the summer of 1925. Despite the stentorian voice of William Jennings Bryan and his opponent, Clarence Darrow, this drama came through feebly because daytime reception was poor.

I came to Chicago in 1926 and became radio editor of the Tribune in 1929. I remember WGN in those days for its music. But the smooth flow of Jean Goldkette's melodies was interrupted frequently at night by the police sergeant's staccato voice ordering "Car 54 (or was it 254?) go to 2500 Wabash. A stabbing reported."

The Untouchables seem pretty tame compared to the screaming sirens of our own police rushing to the scene of violence. Through these tests WGN proved the value of radio in crime detection and the police radio system grew out of it.

WGN was blazing new electronic trails during the early 1930's. It was experimenting, trying new things every week. Out of WGN came the serial story, still so popular in television. The first ones were adaptations of Tribune cartoons—Harold Teen and Orphan Annie.

WGN created the very first "soap opera" in Painted Dreams. In its cast I first met a youngster, Toni Gilman, whom I still know today as a panelist on WGN-TV's Down You Go. The story of Painted Dreams was inspired by her mother and the Gilman family.

Among the teams and personalities to become extremely popular were Ed East and Ralph Dumke, known as "Sisters of the Skillet"; Clara, Lu 'n' Em, a trio of housewife gossips, Irene Wicker, the Singing Lady.

Through the radio heyday—the 1930's and early 1040's—I wrote countless stories about station programs and personalities, but only one that was unique. Col. Robert R. McCormick, editor and publisher of the Tribune, assigned me to a story explaining how radio works.

"Write it so anyone can understand it," he suggested. I sought out Carl J. Meyers, then as now, director of engineering. He was laid up with pneumonia at his home in Elgin. He had a high temperature but he explained radio and its workings anyway. I don't believe that my story was a complete and accurate report on radio transmission. What it said basically was: "The music goes round and round and comes out here." It was profusely illustrated.

After WGN built its new transmitter on Rohlwing Road, Carl explained the whole operation once more to me. I still do not understand it. But radio and TV transmission are sheer magic to me.

WGN's greatest success was its "Chicago Theater of the Air," featuring operas and operettas, with Marion Claire singing most of the feminine leads and most of the great male singers of the day—James Melton, Robert Merrill, and Richard Tucker among them, while Henry Weber conducted the orchestra. Colonel McCormick spoke on many subjects.

Through the years WGN was noted for its great dance band broadcasts. On these remotes I first came to know Wayne King, Guy Lombardo, Perry Como, then a singer with Ted Weems; the late Hal Kemp, Kay Kyser, who started his "Kollege of Musical Knowledge" while at WGN; Lawrence Welk, Horace Heidt, and many others. Also Ralph Ginsburgh and his concert ensemble, heard for many years.

After the war WGN laid plans for a television station. It opened in March 1948, and has followed WGN radio in pioneering many program concepts and ideas. Its hour-long live dramatic series, "They Stand Accused," was the first of the many courtroom drama series on TV. It was not long before Perry Mason was conceived as a TV feature.

Popular as baseball had been on WGN radio, it took TV to make the public really appreciate the great American sport. Through the years the home games of the Cubs and White Sox have proved the most durable and popular feature of WGN–TV. Jack Brickhouse and the channel 9 crew are unquestionably the best baseball telecasters in the Nation.

As an independent station WGN–TV has done much to serve the community with public service and special programs. There is no room here to list these. Let us cite just two things WGN–TV has done that have brought it national recognition.

"The Blue Fairy," its wonderful children's program, brought it a Peabody Award, and Brigid Bazlen, its 14-year-old star, an open door to motion pictures where she is already successful.

"Great Music From Chicago" is just what the title indicates; the finest in classical music, featuring the Chicago Symphony Orchestra. It won WGN–TV another Peabody Award.

In its new Mid-America Broadcasting Center in Bradley Place, WGN, Inc., is still leading the way to new accomplishments. Currently it is occupied with popularizing color television.

It has been my good fortune to have been so long associated with WGN and its gifted people. I'm happy about the recognition they are to receive tomorrow. I think they deserve it.

Also, I want to thank WGN for sparing me, all these years, from the scourge of rock 'n' roll. They have barred their mikes to this raucous nonmusic.

BROADCAST PIONEERS, NEW YORK CHAPTER, SECOND ANNUAL MIKE AWARD TO WGN

For distinguished contribution to the art of broadcasting and in recognition of: Dedicated adherence to quality, integrity and responsibility in programing and management

From the first day of operation—March 24, 1924—to the present, the WGN call letters have been respected for history-making, pioneering efforts and dedicated service to the vast Mid-American area and the Nation.

The early, colorful years of WGN produced such historical accomplishments as the Scopes trial remotes, live coverage of major sports events, including the Kentucky Derby, Indianapolis Speedway races and World Series baseball games. The radio station first presented the Sam 'n' Henry comedy team (later the enduring Amos 'n' Andy), and pioneered the development of the first police radio system. Under the WGN banner some of the first network shows were produced and broadcast in Chicago, with WGN serving as outlet and originating point for NBC and CBS and later, for many years, as a key station of the Mutual Broadcasting System.

WGN has always been closely identified with the vast Midwest community it serves, for over 4 decades producing programs in cooperation with such great institutions of the Midwest as Northwestern University, University of Chicago, Notre Dame, University of Illinois and many others.

As a 1-A clear channel station, WGN has assumed with serious enthusiasm the responsibility to serve listeners not only in the immediate Chicago area, but throughout Mid-America, providing the only radio service possible to countless remote communities in surrounding States. For this widespread audience, WGN programs with a complete consciousness of its needs, offering full service programing as proof positive of dedicated adherence to quality, integrity, responsibility, in programing and management.

PIONEERING IN THE ART, THE SCIENCE AND IN SERVICE TO THE PUBLIC

With television and national program syndication added to radio, WGN in the sixties continues to advance the frontiers of broadcasting as an art, a science and a business dedicated to serving mankind. Typical of WGN activities in these vital areas have been the company's pioneering and aggressive support of color television and the key role it has and is playing in the development and conduct of a new national defense alert system. WGN programing today, in television as well as radio, has news, entertainment, sports, public affairs, special events and cultural offerings as the backbone of a full service schedule. The best products in the areas are being shared nationally via syndication.

The WGN Mid-America Broadcast Center, dedicated in mid-1961, stands as an appropriate symbol of the company's outstanding achievements in broadcasting.

Staffed by newsmen, announcers and performers of national renown, WGN stresses creativity and innovations, renewed emphasis on quality program performance, integrity in operation and inspiring management leadership.

Deserved recognition for outstanding performance has come from the highest quarters, as testified to in part by two recent unprecedented George Foster Peabody Awards for Television Production and the three-time bestowal of the Alfred P. Sloan Award to WGN radio.

INSPIRING INDUSTRY LEADERSHIP

By pioneering with unreserved concern for heightened standards of operation and responsible programing, WGN, Inc., has provided leadership and made major contributions to the professional stature, technical excellence, and record of service achieved by the broadcast industry.

Made this 25th day of February 1962.

THE MIKE AWARD

Broadcast Pioneers, New York chapter, February 26, 1961, inaugurated the Annual Mike Award to honor pioneer radio and television stations which have contributed to the fine traditions of the broadcast industry. The first recipient of the symbolic emblem, the Microphone, was WLW, Cincinnati. This year the Annual Mike Award is being awarded to WGN, Chicago, in acknowledgment of dedicated adherence to quality, integrity, and responsibility in programing and management, pioneering in the arts, the sciences, and in service to the public.

BROADCASTERS' FOUNDATION, INC.

Broadcasters' Foundation, Inc., has been established because of the concern of members of Broadcast Pioneers for the welfare of fellow broadcasters who might be in financial need because of illness, emergency, or some other unusual circumstance.

Its purpose is to foster and promote the welfare of persons in need of assistance who have been employed in or engaged in working in the field of radio broadcasting for 20 years or more, or in television broadcasting 10 years or more, whether or not they are members of Broadcast Pioneers.

It has developed a fund to carry out the purpose of Broadcasters' Foundation, Inc., through individual and corporate gifts, with proceeds from the Annual Mike Award banquets and in other ways yet to be developed.

The president and executive committee of Broadcast Pioneers cordially invite the members of the organization as well as all those who are associated with the broadcasting industry to share the rich rewards which can be realized as active participants in this project.

Broadcasters' Foundation, Inc., strives to preserve individual human dignity, to foster the spirit of brotherhood, and to attend to the practical welfare of the members of the broadcasting industry who have contributed to its greatness today.

Great Moment for a Man and His Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, in the past it has been rather infrequent that we have asked leave to cause editorials from newspapers to be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. However, once in a while, along comes one that because of its excellent content so completely scores a point that I believe it becomes worthwhile to spread the good word beyond its own circulation.

One of America's great newspapers is the Kansas City Star, and its morning edition goes under the name of the Kansas City Times. In its Sunday edition of February 18 there appeared an entire section devoted to the space era. The content of the section pointed out the paper had named three of its veteran editorial writers to make intensive studies of our Nation's activity in the burgeoning field of space. It listed Alvin S. McCoy, a Pultizer Prize winner and a member of the Star staff for 31 years and for years its State of Kansas editor as one of its principal space writers, and named another editorial writer, W. W. Baker, who is extremely well versed in the subject of space and has found astronautics to be a fascinating hobby. Additionally, Kenneth L. Fox, for many years the Star's military commentator, has been assigned to make a thorough study of missiles and the military aspects of space. These three working together produced the special space section entitled, "The U.S. Goal in Space: The Moon and More."

It is a privilege to serve as a member of the House Space Committee, and we believe this service carries with it a duty and an obligation to better inform all of our people on the subject of space. The Kansas City Star is to be congratulated for the production of this special section of about a week ago, which is not only most interesting but brings a wealth of information on space to the reader of the Greater Kansas City area.

We call attention also to the following editorial which appeared in the Kansas City Times, on Wednesday morning, February 21. We think it is most fitting it be entered in the same issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which appears Colonel Glenn's remarks before the joint session of Congress:

GREAT MOMENT FOR A MAN AND HIS NATION

John H. Glenn, Jr., rode three times around the good earth yesterday, and into the pages of history. As he did so, a little part of each American must have ridden

with him. It was a magnificent flight, another step on the way to the moon. All of us, today, can take pride in the magnificent achievement of spaceman No. 5.

The voice of this solitary human being from space, reporting that all was well, somehow symbolized the hopes and aspirations of the Nation in this great, new adventure. To be sure, we are far from the full drama of a lunar landing. We are, it must be admitted, still "behind the Russians." But for all the delays and frustrations, the United States has succeeded in sending a human being into orbit. It was an essential stride, if a small one. John Glenn, Jr., is a courageous pioneer who merits the respect and admiration of every citizen.

Later this year, perhaps early in 1963, another brave man will follow Glenn's path through 18 orbits. Then the Mercury program will have reached its full climax. By then, too, its successor, Gemini, will be well on its way. Certainly the prospects of a moon landing before the decade is over are brighter at this moment than they have ever been.

Yet much remains to be done. If the life-support system of the Mercury capsule can sustain a man for 3 orbits, 18 orbits are something else. With the 18-orbit flight, science will know much more about the reaction of the human mechanism to the weightlessness of orbit. Unfortunately the Russians have been less than generous in sharing the data on the flight of Cosmonaut Titov.

So in the space of slightly more than 4 hours, we moved a great distance and yet we moved only a step. There will be future delays and future frustrations. But there should be, above all else, a new confidence in the ability of American science. We can remind ourselves of the depression that followed the first sputnik, of the disappointment when Gagarin and Titov made the first orbital journeys. Yet we can also see how far and how fast we have come from that dramatic day of October 4, 1957, when the space age dawned.

We salute a brave man and the thousands across the Nation and around the globe who made his achievement possible. There can be no question today: We are on our way to the moon and to the stars beyond. As a nation we are accepting and meeting the challenge of the space age.

Helicopter Prospects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have long been concerned with the mass transportation problems which face the Los Angeles area and other metropolitan areas across the Nation. Los Angeles' problems have been magnified daily, as the city has grown into the Nation's second largest metropolitan area. Billions of dollars' worth of freeways have not been able to keep pace with the 3.8 million cars owned and operated by the 6½ million inhabitants.

To partly overcome the time-consuming ground transportation to the city's major airport, there has been increasing reliance on the helicopter.

Up to the initiation of a new helicopter, the S-61, helicopter service had not lived up to earlier expectations. Not long ago, the CAB cut helicopter subsidies, because of the high rate per passenger. Now, the Los Angeles Airways has put into service for the first time this new whirlybird, four times roomier and twice as fast as presently used helicopters.

Consequently, by being able to compete with congested freeways, the S-61 has a promising future. The new 28 passenger, turbine-powered craft has bright prospects not only for cutting down time between departure point and airport—oftimes the longest part of any trip—but for profitable or near-profitable operations.

Mr. President, this advance in solving the transportation problems of urban and interurban areas deserves our attention. I ask unanimous consent to have in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from Business Week entitled: "Lift for Ailing Copter Lines."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIFT FOR FAILING COPTER LINES

The Nation's scheduled, passenger helicopter airlines next week will reach a milepost that the regular airlines passed in 1936, when the DC-3 went into service.

On January 24, Los Angeles Airways, Inc., 1 of 3 subsidized helicopter lines, will send passengers aloft for the first time in a new, 28-seat, turbine-powered helicopter 4 times roomier and 50 percent faster than present equipment.

Like the DC-3, the new whirlybird—the S-61—is the first of its type whose operating costs are low enough and whose passenger capacity is high enough to permit subsidy-free operations—someday.

Subsidy cut

The craft is arriving in the nick of time. Congress is becoming thoroughly disenchanted with the mounting subsidy bill that three helicopter airlines companies have run up.

Since 1954, the three operators—the other two being Chicago Helicopter Airways and New York Airways—have received more than $31 million in outright subsidy, plus additional Federal money for hauling mail. And during that 8-year span the annual subsidy total has approximately doubled.

Congress cut this year's subsidy allotment to $6 million from the $6.9 million that the Civil Aeronautics Board had requested. As a result, New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles operators have had to trim their operations and their hopes for expansion.

Grounded plans

The companies' original plans for acquiring turbine-powered helicopters and for expanding their routes would have pushed the subsidy bill to $8.5 million. Los Angeles and Chicago had intended to purchase four each of the new helicopters from Sikorsky Aircraft Division of United Aircraft Corp. New York had planned to buy five slightly faster models from Vertol Division of Boeing Co.

Now Chicago Airways has told CAB it is deferring its order for its S-61's for at least 6 months, in part because its traffic has declined with the decreasing amount of regular airline flights at Chicago's Midway Airport—which it connects with the busier O'Hare. And New York Airways has had to cut its order from five helicopters to four. The New York company's annual subsidy, which last year totaled $2,623,000, has been trimmed to $1,950,000. Previously, New York had been receiving the largest share of the Government payout—some 48 percent. Now all three will share equally.

I. TESTING GROUND

Of the three lines, Los Angeles has perhaps the brightest future—due, in part, to conditions on the ground.

Clarence M. Belinn, president of LAA, expects his company to prove two theories about air transportation of the future. The first is that the helicopter is essential for distributing passengers from jet age terminals to cities within a 150-mile radius. The other is that the helicopter will form an essential cog in the transportation machinery for the coming "megapolis," the term used to describe a continuous metropolitan area of several hundred miles.

The operating preserve of Los Angeles Airways is an ideal testing ground for both theories. LAA already provides interurban transportation for four counties—Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino.

These 4 counties contain 7 million people and 300 cities and communities spread out over 5,000 square miles. Public transportation in the area is inadequate.

New assets

The key to acceptance of the helicopter for interurban service lies in the new equipment. Service with the old S-55 never had a fair trial. The S-55's were noisy, sometimes smoky, they cruised at 85 miles per hour, they carried only 7 to 9 passengers, and they vibrated. Aside from shaking up the passengers, this vibration shook the engine in such a way that frequent inspections were necessary.

The new S-61's cruise smoothly at 120 miles per hour to 125 miles per hour, and a Navy version has reached a top speed of 199 miles per hour. The S-55 in Los Angeles Airways' operations has a direct cost of 17.9 cents to fly one seat 1 mile; the S-61 has a seat-mile cost of 9.25 cents. The breakthrough figure often quoted by helicopter men for profitable operations is 10 cents a seat mile.

By comparison with these costs, a good average seat-mile cost for a DC-8 is 1.5 cents.

The present speed of the S-61 will permit helicopters to compete with Los Angeles' freeways on time, and in some cases with local service airlines. Both of them, however, beat the helicopter costs. Fares, while not competitive with all forms of interurban transportation, are nonetheless attractive. The basic fare is likely to be $4 plus $1 for each 10 miles, Belinn says.

Airport to suburb

For passengers traveling to a Los Angeles suburb by helicopter and who began their journey on a scheduled airline, LAA has worked out all-inclusive fares with the airlines so that it costs only $2 more for the helicopter ride.

As an example, an all-inclusive fare from Washington to San Bernardino would cost only $2 more than the regular ticket from Washington to Los Angeles. The regular helicopter fare from Los Angeles to San Bernardino would cost $8 for the 58-mile run.

The airport-to-suburb traffic makes up 94 percent of LAA's business, and Belinn feels this segment will build up rapidly with the new equipment. In the past, LAA has had insufficient seats to guarantee space. When flights were overloaded on the small helicopters, LAA dispatched passengers by limosine and bus.

Intercity traffic

Belinn's hope for the future, however, is to build up the intercity traffic. LAA is banking on the future of the megapolis concept, the development in Southern California of a city 300 miles long and 75 miles wide. And it is promoting the concept of painting the motto "Servicing the Los Angeles Megapolis" on the sides of the helicopters.

Present projections by Robert R. Dockson, consulting economist for Union Bank, are that Los Angeles County alone will have 12 million people by 1980, with millions

more in the remainder of southern California, producing the biggest collection of suburbs in the world. The key to free movement within the area will be the helicopter, Belinn believes.

Expansion

LAA will put the first two jet helicopters in operation next week, and the third and fourth will follow along shortly. LAA gradually will add new segments. Service to Catalina Island and Newport Beach are scheduled for the first half of this year, Oxnard in Ventura County and Canoga Park in the west end of the San Fernando Valley for the second half. A downtown Los Angeles terminal will be added in 1963, then a route to San Diego by way of downtown Los Angeles, Pasadena, and Pomona.

Both the S-61 and the S-55 are designed for fast conversion to all cargo, or part cargo, part passenger. This helps to cover costs, since a flight can go out in the morning jammed with mail and cargo and return with passengers.

Cost-conscious

Los Angeles Airways was founded in 1944 and was certificated by the Civil Aeronautics Board in 1947, becoming the world's first scheduled helicopter airline. Airmail service was begun on October 1, 1947, and later LAA began carrying air express by helicopter. Passenger service began November 22, 1954. The line pioneered a network system of copter service—to 20 heliports in a 65-mile radius.

II. TEST CASE

Congress cut the subsidy of LAA and other helicopter airlines because it was concerned over the large amount of subsidy paid for hauling only a limited number of passengers, and in New York and Chicago, on only a few high-density runs. CAB has limited the number to three deliberately because it looks upon the scheduled airport-to-city helicopter operations as experimental.

A case is pending, however, that gives CAB a chance to take a new look at the question of expanding services. In the examiner's hearing stage are eight applications to provide service in the Washington-Baltimore area. This would be airport-to-downtown service linking the two cities with surrounding airports—Friendship Airport (serving both Washington and Baltimore), National Airport (near downtown Washington), and the new Dulles International Airport southwest of Washington.

Assessment

In this case, CAB is assessing prospects that future helicopter operations can be self-supporting. It is considering the performance and economics of existing, new, and future 'copters.

If the new turbine-powered craft is considered to offer good prospects of profitable or near-profitable operations, the Board may not only authorize a Washington-Baltimore service, but also begin acting on some 80 other applications pending for service in other cities.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Young Americans Learn, Live, and Serve Through 4-H

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, National 4-H Club Week will be celebrated this year from March 3-10, and it is most appropriate that a period is set aside each year to commend the members of this outstanding youth organization. Nearly 2⅓ million young Americans belong to 4-H Clubs, and they are fully deserving of our encouragement, respect, and support. These youngsters through their 4-H Club activities are preparing themselves to be the type of citizen America must have if we are to maintain our place of leadership in the world.

From a rather humble beginning around the turn of the century, the extensive system of 4-H Clubs is now worldwide and more than 50 countries have adopted all or part of the 4-H plan. Three major groups are largely responsible for this phenomenal growth—The Cooperative Extension Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and State land-grant colleges and universites, the National 4-H Club Foundation, and the National 4-H Service Committee. These groups have joined together in their common desire to assist 4-H members to utilize their talents and abilities to the fullest possible extent, to teach them to make use of science in farming and homemaking, and to encourage them to efficiently serve their community, State, and Nation.

Instruction and guidance are provided at the local level by county agents, home demonstration agents, 4-H leaders, parents, businessmen, teachers, and older 4-H'ers who give unstintingly of their time and effort to make this program a success. In the Second Congressional District of Kentucky, which I have the honor to represent, we are fortunate in having a great many men and women who devote themselves to 4-H Club work and the success of their efforts is apparent in the many awards won by Kentucky 4-H members. These leaders certainly deserve our wholehearted gratitude for the contribution they are making to a stronger America through the youth of our Nation. The 4-H Club program is one of the finest methods I know of for achieving an informed, courageous and public-spirited citizenry.

Shortly after World War II, a national committee of extension workers spent 2 years considering various 4-H postwar programs. One of the guideposts for developing future 4-H programs which came out of this study was "Serving as Citizens in Maintaining World Peace." From this idea the International Farm Youth Exchange program was started, since the young people and their leaders reasoned that an exchange of rural youth between the United States and other countries would help to clear up misconceptions between peoples, and promote understanding of each others' aims and problems. Participants in the IFYE program actually live and work on farms and in rural communities in this country and other countries for about 6 months. The U.S. delegates who go abroad and the exchangees who come here are thus able to acquire a closer acquaintance with their hosts and their host country. When these young men and women return home they carry on an extensive reporting program to share their experiences with others. These 4-H'ers are truly grassroots ambassadors, and are contributing in a very effective manner to better world understanding.

The continuing theme of National 4-H Club Week is "Learn, Live, Serve Through 4-H," and, in my opinion, it clearly expressed the high ideals and purposes to which these young people have dedicated themselves. 4-H Club members learn numerous skills which will assist them in later life, they strive to live each day in a manner which will reflect credit upon themselves, their families, and their organization, and it is through service that these young people put into practice the training they have received in their 4-H Club projects.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to extend my very best wishes to the members of the 4-H Clubs and their leaders, and to wish them continued success in all their endeavors.

Go, America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very appropriate editorial written by one of the most outstanding publishers in the southwest, the Honorable Carl Estes, publisher of the Longview Daily News:

GO, AMERICA

(By Carl L. Estes)

That which is truly great is accomplished only with patience and perseverance. In putting a man into orbit and bringing him safely back to earth, the United States has proved to itself and to the world that it has the will and the purpose which are prerequisite to patience and perseverance, and that these qualities of character and performance bring rewards.

The hero of the man-in-space show is Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., the first American to orbit the earth. No one can deny him the glory that rightly is his, for he risked all in the line of duty and performed admirably under experimental and truly pioneering circumstances. President Kennedy saluted him as the kind of man of whom the Nation could be proud.

Astronaut Glenn, at the very apex of his glory, credited his success to teamwork—thereby acknowledging that it was the work of a great team that put him into triple orbit and safely returned him to earth. How truly American in spirit is his attitude. He has proved, in deed and word, his worthiness to undertake this great trailblazing mission.

That America was not the first Nation to orbit a man is beside the point. That which has been done earlier in secret has been and still is of no value to man's progress. The American effort, full details of which have been known to the world at all stages, has become the world's pace setter for space exploration. The peoples of the world must look to the United States for leadership and knowledge in this new sea because there is no other source of such knowledge available to freemen.

The United States has moved slowly in the field of space technology, by some comparisons, but there is evidence for all the world to see that we have moved deliberately. Ten times, we could have launched the spaceship from its pad at Canaveral. But patience prevailed, and the perseverance of a Marine pilot and the industrial, engineering, scientific, and managerial experts who worked as a team on this project delivered a successful performance.

Old Glory waves proudly today. Another spaceship is at Canaveral and is being fitted for a second orbital flight. Others are in preparation. Astronauts in teams will follow in 1963. The United States never lacked confidence, but today the world has seen our confidence confirmed in achievement. We cannot look ahead through the eyes and mind of a Robert Fulton, or the Wright brothers, or a Charles Lindbergh, but we have the faith to believe that Colonel Glenn and company see out there in the new sea of space great new opportunities for man's progress and welfare.

In this faith, we say: Go, America.

Peter Rodino III's Little-People-to-Little-People Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. Speaker, I was very much impressed by the remarks of my colleague, the Honorable PETER

RODINO, which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 15 concerning the little-people-to-little-people program.

I would like, first of all, to express my congratulations to Congressman RODINO's 10-year-old son, Peter, for giving expression to this idea and, of course, to Congressman RODINO for recognizing its potential and for giving encouragement for its application.

The children and youth of our country, surprisingly, are not deaf nor blind to the problems confronting the world today. Though their grasp and understanding of the complexities of these problems are at times incomplete and even sometimes naive, still we cannot help but recognize the basicity of their concern over such things as peace and war. After all, it is their future that is at stake and they have every right to take an interest in our efforts.

I, too, have received many letters from the children of Hawaii expressing their concern over world events. Their plea for world peace is an inspiration—a guide to the trees in this forest of congressional activities.

The people-to-people program has been preempted exclusively for adult participation and promotion. It serves a useful and valuable purpose, and I am happy to say that the State of Hawaii has risen to the challenges of this program as evidenced by its sister city affiliations and student and businessmen exchange programs. The little-people-to-little-people program would be an appropriate corollary to the adult program. It has great merit and is certainly deserving of all encouragement.

Hands Off Relief, Uncle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I attach herewith an editorial from the New York Daily News regarding a speech by New York State Senator Henry A. Wise who is from my district. He is chairman of the welfare committee of the New York Senate, knows his subject thoroughly and is a recognized authority on the many abuses that have grown up in welfare. I hope the Members of the House will read this brief editorial:

HANDS OFF RELIEF, UNCLE

Speaking of Uncle Sam, State Senator Henry A. Wise, Republican, Watertown, made a remarkable speech in the senate a few days ago on relief and the reasons why it is so widely and increasingly abused.

Senator Wise has studied the subject for at least 10 years. His conclusion is that the chief villain in the relief-abuse drama is the Federal Government.

The Government puts up billions a year to help the States pay their relief costs. Since Federal aid always means more or less Federal control, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare insists on pretty much dictating the ways in which the States shall spend relief funds.

Result: "Myriad procedural details and mountains of paperwork" keep local welfare workers, no matter how able, from handling each case as they know it should be handled. Uniformity is enforced from Washington, on pain of the State's losing its share of the Federal relief funds.

What can the ordinary taxpayer do about all this? He can at least (1) pressure his State legislators to fight Washington's continual butting-in on State management of relief, and (2) pressure his Senators and Representatives to fight the HEW's endless grabbing for more power, more money and more people on its already swollen payrolls.

Ordinary taxpayers in million lots had better do those things, persistently, if they want these relief abuses ever to stop, even in part.

The House Is Big Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram of February 21, 1962:

THE HOUSE IS BIG ENOUGH

The House Judiciary Committee has just approved a bill to increase the size of the House and thereby save the seats of some Members who face the peril of redistricting. It is a familiar device. And attempts to use it are made every time the Federal census shows the need to redistrict because of population changes in the States.

The House now has 437 Members, including 2 added to give seats to Hawaii and Alaska. But under present laws the number is to revert to 435. Meanwhile the census count shows that 16 States must lose seats and 9 gain. Michigan is entitled to one new seat. Massachusetts is scheduled to lose two seats; Pennsylvania three; Missouri, Illinois and some others one each.

A number of bills were introduced last year to increase the size of the House and thereby save seats for the States threatened with loss. One would have increased the House to 469 Members and spared any State from loss. This measure and others aroused so much ridicule that they were shelved.

The bill just approved by the Judiciary Committee calls for much less expansion in the size of the House than last year's measures. It has the backing of Speaker MCCORMACK. That is not at all surprising since it would save one seat for Massachusetts, his home State. It is supoprted by Representative FRANCIS WALTER and Representative WILLIAM GREEN, both Pennsylvania Democrats. Under it Pennsylvania would lose two seats instead of the scheduled three. Representative MORGAN MOULDER, Democrat, of Missouri, also likes the bill. It would save a seat for Missouri.

A year ago the late Speaker of the House, Sam Rayburn, refused to support any of the schemes to enlarge the House membership. He said the House was already too big. Increasing it to save the seats of certain Members would only dilute the voting power of other State delegations. Morever, increasing the size of the House is only a dodge to avoid the effects of population shifts.

We hope the Michigan delegation will stand fast against this attempt to dilute its voting power.

A Farmer's Answer to the Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IVOR D. FENTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. FENTON, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the highlights of a speech made last evening by Mr. Fred Bohn at the annual congressional banquet sponsored by the Pennsylvania Farmers' Association, which this year was held at the Annapolis Hotel in Washington.

A very fine program was presented and all present had the opportunity of learning firsthand what the farmers are thinking today not only about the economy of the Nation but the farm programs in force, and proposed legislation which would not only affect the farmers but practically every citizen in our country.

One hears many pros and cons concerning the effect of Federal controls over the farmers, and it was a distinct pleasure to attend this fine meeting and learn firsthand from the farmers themselves what they are thinking and what they intend to do about it.

It is hardly necessary to point out that the soil and those who develop it are not only the most vital part of our economy, but that of practically every other nation in the world. It has often been pointed out that coal and steel are the sinews of war, but without the products and foodstuffs from the soil our men and our women would not have the physical requirements to meet any emergency, not alone the vital requirements of everyday life.

The Pennsylvania Farmers' Association is one of the finest of its kind in the United States. Its membership is composed of citizens who are not only interested in the farm and its problems, but who in many instances have an active and important part in the economy, business, industrial, and civic life of the area in which they live.

One might say facetiously that these farmers "have their feet on the ground," but the fact of the matter is that they actually do have their feet on the ground most of the time and they know where they are going and what they want.

As real Americans, these farmers know and exemplify the principle that regardless of their own personal and community feelings the welfare of their country is paramount.

Mr. G. A. Biggs is president of the Pennsylvania Farmers' Association, which has its headquarters at Camp Hill, Pa. Its vice president is Mr. Paul R. Anthony, and Mr. Hollis A. Hatfield is the secretary-treasurer.

I might mention, Mr. Speaker, that among the many dignitaries present last evening was my good friend, the Honorable Miles Horst, former Pennsylvania secretary of agriculture, and more recently before his retirement a special assistant to one of the Secretaries of Agriculture in Washington.

While there were many excellent speeches and presentations at last night's congressional dinner sponsored by the Pennsylvania Farmers' Association, at this time I would like to insert in the RECORD the highlights of the speech made by Mr. Fred Bohn. Mr. Bohn is one of the prominent dairy farmers in Berks County, Pa., a county which is known throughout the United States as one of the finest agricultural areas in our country.

Highlights of Mr. Bohn's address are as follows:

A FARMER ANSWERS TO THE FARM PROBLEM

Chairman, Senators, Representatives, farm members, ladies and gentlemen, as a member of the Pennsylvania Farmers Association, which is affiliated with the American Farm Bureau Federation—the Nation's largest farm organization—I am going to try in my humble way to give to you the highlights of the Farm Bureau cropland retirement program for a free and prosperous agriculture; also, the highlights of the present administration's farm bill.

CHART 1

Our objective is for a high net farm income. We farmers have been used as a cushion for other segments of business, including some of our own finished products. For instance, when a product goes up in price, our share is small and in some cases nil; and on the other hand, when prices drop, we absorb the greatest share of the drop and a lot of times 100 percent—labor and industry help to absorb the increase but neglect to take their share of the drop in price. The usual reason given for this is surplus; forgetting that we also have, at the same time, a surplus of labor that would work for less if it were not for organized labor. Maybe we should call our surpluses unused commodities to correspond to the unemployed. (Labor is subsidized by welfare.)

Our Congressmen, PAUL DAGUE and FRANK CLARK, have introduced our program. Some of the highlights are as follows:

CHART 2

1. Opportunity for renewal of conservation reserve.

2. Authorized new long-term contracts for cropland retirement on a voluntary basis. If this cannot be accomplished, establish the additional acreage, to be retired under annual contracts, to meet the overall retirement goal.

3. Eliminate wheat allotments.

Due to the 15-acre exemption and a guaranteed higher price, many farmers who never grew wheat, or whose allotment was less than 15 acres, planted the 15 acres.

4. Put price support on corn at 90 percent of the previous 3-year market price or 65 percent of parity, whichever is higher.

5. Price support for wheat, soybeans, and other feed grains to be based on support level of corn for economical reasons—for instance during the 20 years (1930–49) when wheat was fed in greater volume, average wheat prices exceeded average corn prices by 23 cents, or 26 percent. Over the last 5 years, during which little wheat was fed, wheat prices averaged 76 cents or 72 percent above corn prices. During 1961, wheat prices averaged 80 cents or 80 percent above corn prices. History suggests, that if wheat and other grain prices are permitted to return to normal relationships, wheat will again be fed.

6. Prohibit CCC from selling products for domestic use at less than 115 percent of current support price, plus carrying charges, unless they are replaced, by comparable open market purchases. I feel this grain was bought to support the then current price and not to be used later to depress or make an artificial price for cooperators as well as noncooperators.

7. Relate dairy support prices to average market prices during the immediate preceding 3 years. This affords protection as well as a base. We will seek constructive changes in the dairy price support program, and vigorously oppose legislative or administrative controls to restrict the volume of production or marketing of any farm product or commodity not now under contracts.

8. Strengthening bargaining power of all farmers.

According to our Secretary of Agriculture we had this privilege in the thirties but failed to take advantage of the opportunity, mainly because we were not organized sufficiently and of our financial condition at the time, and that the Government program looked like an easy and quick way out of the depression.

We feel at present that we are organized sufficiently, through our cooperatives and our associations and the like, to handle our commodities on a marketing and bargaining system. This may take time and some Government help, but I assure you it will not cost the taxpayers near as much as the present proposed program.

Much of the trouble in agriculture is due to extreme fluctuation in price. Yet, the nutritional value to consumers does not change with price fluctuations, and the retail price often does not change a corresponding amount.

Prices of many agriculture commodities can be established in advance of production, if contracts between producers and processors are in effect. Also, producer can negotiate for delivery terms, payment terms, methods of grading, payment differentials for grades, and so forth.

CHART 3—HIGHLIGHTS OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S FARM PROGRAM

1. Land retirement—mandatory.

2. Establishes a national dairy program.

3. Authorizes quotas on producers of turkeys, and turkey hatching eggs and milk.

4. Establish minimum allotments and quotas for individual producers, including those in milk deficit areas and in Federal milk marketing order areas, based on any 12-month period that the Secretary of Agriculture sees fit.

5. Penalties for overproduction of milk—up to $2.75 hundredweight and for violation of recordkeeping (1 year and/or $2,000).

6. Set price support between 0 and 90 percent of parity. The proposed level of support remains the same for 1962 as 1961. Present floor of 75 percent of parity would go out, and a new 0 to 90 percent would be used at the Secretary of Agriculture's discretion.

7. Authorizes compulsory checkoff for market research and promotion for milk.

We are doing this now through our American Dairy Association. Most dairy farmers cooperate 1 month out of the year but feel that every month is too much. I guess we will have to threaten them like our Secretary of Agriculture proposed to do if we don't accept his program.

8. Farmers choice—in case of milk. Ninety percent of parity with quotas, or 0–90 percent. In case of feed grains and wheat, the administrations program or no program, with the Secretary of Agriculture to sell 10,000 tons of feed grains and 200 million bushels of wheat on the market.

This is not the answer.

CHART 4—A YARDSTICK FOR MEASURING FARM PROGRAMS

Government programs for agriculture should:

1. Increase economic opportunity for farm people.

2. Promote efficiency in farming.

3. Adhere to the competitive principle.

4. Be consistent with the law of supply and demand.

5. Strengthen the free market system.

6. Stimulate market expansion.

7. Encourage soil, water conservation.

8. Insure our ability to feed and cloth an increasing population.

Government programs should not:

1. Open the way to price fixing.

2. Stimulate excessive production.

3. Permit development of monopolies.

4. Erode individual freedom.

5. Freeze historical production patterns.

6. Encourage use of substitutes.

7. Shift adjustment burdens from one producer group to another.

8. Increase farm production cost.

9. Make farmers dependent on Government payments.

Our program to increase farmers bargaining power will be explained and illustrated further by a set of slides. At present, we are in the process of bargaining for the processing of apples and tomatoes.

SUMMARY

When President Kennedy outlined the administration's new farm commodity program in his message to Congress he noted that they "could become effective only after they are approved democratically by a two-thirds majority in a producer referendum."

But the fact is that these farmer referendums would by no means be free, in the sense that a citizen going to the polls to vote on an issue is under no outside pressure to vote either way. That is because the Government has served notice on farmers that if they reject the new farm program, it will throw on the market 10 million tons of surplus feed grains and 200 million bushels of wheat from the vast Federal surplus stock.

The American Farm Bureau Federation has applied, and properly so, some strong language to this choice offered the farmer. "The use of Government stock of grain," it says, "* * * to compel farmers to accept proposed control programs" amounts to "naked coercion" and "makes a mockery of * * * democratic farm referendums."

Now there are plenty of us farmers who would be willing, without hesitation, to vote down the still more regimented system of agriculture the administration is proposing, and to start from scratch with no Federal planning and crop controls at all—if they had a free choice.

But there, staring us in the face, are those surplus millions of tons of grain. They are there, they exist, and it cannot be ignored that in some manner they are going to have to be liquidated. They exist, however, as the accumulations of years of Federal farm policy mismanagement and, because that is so, it is natural of the Government to say, now, that if the farmers turn down the new farm program these grains will suddenly be dumped on the market.

The Farm Bureau program was developed by farmers and for farmers. The administration's program was developed by the Government and for the Government. Our program is for a free and prosperous agriculture, not an agriculture controlled by the Government. Our program is positive. We are moving ahead in the area of increasing the farmers bargaining power. This is a program that is developed, financed, controlled, and operated by farmers and for farmers and for the Government, not by the Government. This is the answer for a free and prosperous agriculture for tomorrow.

Finally, to you Congressmen, help give us enabling legislation so that we can enjoy a high net farm income along with lower taxes for the consumer. Be our servants, and don't let the Government make servants, or rather slaves, out of us farmers.

TV for Rural Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill, concerning certain amendments to the Communications Act of 1934. I believe these amendments are necessary to protect the interest of all Americans and to insure that their wide area VHF television service is maintained and not weakened or destroyed. My action is prompted by the grave danger that millions of people—a great many of them farmers and ranchers—face the imminent possibility of losing all television service or ending up with a degraded technical quality of television service.

I am greatly concerned about the recent proposals of the Federal Communications Commission which could result in all television, nationwide, being switched from VHF channels to UHF channels. My concern is shared by other Members who have expressed themselves on this threat and have also introduced bills and resolutions on this very matter. Our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. ROBERTS, has introduced a bill, H.R. 9267, and my bill is a companion measure. I endorse the remarks that Congressman ROBERTS made in the RECORD on September 19, 1961, on this matter, for I believe that what is at stake here is a matter of important public policy with complex issues that will have far-reaching effects on the future of television service in our country.

The threat facing the American television system is contained in FCC docket No. 14229. The stated objective of this proposal is to expand television service by encouraging the use of UHF—ultra high frequency—channels. I will support meaningful efforts to increase television service to the American people, but I must oppose any plan which would take consistently good television service away from millions of families who now receive it. I am convinced that the FCC's plan as stated will do just that—provide less service and a technically inferior service. Therefore, I must add my strenuous opposition to that which has already been expressed and oppose FCC docket No. 14229.

In docket No. 14229 the FCC is proposing to switch VHF stations to UHF channels through a process known as "deintermixture" to all-UHF. This means that VHF stations—which have been serving their communities for many years—will be forced to broadcast on a UHF channel regardless of whether they want to do so and despite the fact that this new UHF channel will be unable to provide service over the same wide rural areas that the existing VHF channel reaches.

The FCC plans initially to start a dangerous chain reaction to an all-UHF nationwide television system by switching VHF stations to UHF channels in eight communities. These eight areas are Montgomery, Ala.; Madison, Wis.; Rockford, Ill.; Champaign, Ill.; Hartford, Conn.; Erie, Pa.; Binghampton, N.Y., and Columbia, S.C.

The FCC has stated that it will propose later that other communities lose their VHF stations and go all-UHF. Regions of the country would be switched to all-UHF and ultimately the entire country.

Like a chain reaction the progressive switch of VHF stations to UHF channels would leave a trail of television service destroyed or deteriorated. Millions will lose their sole source of TV service, millions more will lose their choice of service, and those who will be able to receive the new UHF channel will have less reliable reception than present VHF service.

Within the vast areas of television blackout live the farmers and ranchers who make up much of the economy of my State. It is these people who are extremely dependent on wide area VHF television service for weather news, feed and crop reports, market information and other important reports essential to the intelligent conduct of their business. It is in the public interest that this service is now available via the wide area VHF television service and yet the FCC proposes to take away the only opportunity many of these farmers and ranchers have to receive this service because the UHF channels just will not reach out far enough with a signal to provide these programs. The FCC apparently believes that increased competition would result, with a larger number of stations in small communities. But the history of television broadcasting thus far hardly warrants such a conclusion. My concern, therefore, is very great that the public interest of those people who will lose service or receive a degraded service is being completely ignored by the FCC. However, I cannot ignore the serious implications of the Commission's all-UHF drive.

It seems to me that neither the VHF channels nor the UHF channels alone can provide adequately for television's future without compromising the existing technical standards and in so doing destroy or deteriorate existing consistently good television service. I have been told, however, that VHF and UHF—all 82 channels—are necessary to protect existing service and still allow room for television's growth. It would seem then that the intelligent approach would be to use the 12 VHF channels and the 70 UHF channels together, side by side in the same communities and areas.

To successfully effectuate a VHF-UHF side-by-side approach, the FCC should have authority to require that all telesion sets shipped in interstate commerce be capable of receiving all channels—the present 70 UHF and the present 12 VHF. This would help to eliminate the "root problem" of receiver incompatability and insure the final success of the side-by-side method of television allocations.

My bill provides for amendments to the Communications Act of 1934, which would protect existing wide area VHF television service, serving vast rural areas, allow for expansion of television via the UHF channels and insure their successful operation side by side with the VHF channels in the same communities through all-channel receivers. This would truly serve the public interest now and guarantee the protection of the public interest in the foreseeable future.

Representative Loser Acts To Assure for Glenn, Congressional Medal of Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CARLTON LOSER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Members of Congress were pleased to honor a national hero, Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, the first American to achieve orbital flight. Today I am introducing in the House of Representatives a bill to further honor this great American with the Congressional Medal of Honor. I think it is only fitting and proper that we do this. This great American performed a service for his country far beyond his call of duty. His every moment of orbital flight was fraught with unknown dangers, but he was calm, alert, and courageous throughout. He has opened an uncharted sea for his country.

The Nashville Banner, on Saturday, February 24, 1962, published an excellent editorial on this subject. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including this fine editorial. It follows:

REPRESENTATIVE LOSER ACTS TO ASSURE FOR GLENN, CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR

Due recognition will have honored heroism in a particularly appropriate way when, as now appears certain, the Congressional Medal of Honor is bestowed on Lt. Col. John H. Glenn—whose achievement in space America and the world still are celebrating. And Middle Tennessee is gratified that the legislation to that end will be introduced by Fifth District Representative J. CARLTON LOSER.

No less in keeping with the magnitude of the national triumph warranting this acclaim is the further resolution, likewise suggested by the Banner, Wednesday, to designate February 20 as John H. Glenn Day for perpetual reminder of an extent which in point of scientific achievement, and its pattern in the best of the human spirit, is unsurpassed in the national annals.

There is no question as to the propriety of this dual recognition. Correcting the impression—a misconception—that the Congressional Medal of Honor is bestowed only for wartime feats of heroism in combat, Representative LOSER has reminded that it was awarded Admiral Richard E. Byrd in 1926 for his Polar exploration.

That bestowal was in order, expressing admiration and gratitude for extraordinary service—an achievement in human courage, indeed, and advancing American progress in the realm of science. It was exploration of the earth. With unexceeded dedication, in service beyond the call of duty, Colonel Glenn was exploring the uncharted areas of time and space.

It was an extraordinary—yea, phenomenal—accomplishment, incorporating in it all the human heart can know of intrepid challenge, and unconquerable faith. It warrants, indeed, the formal acknowledgement which should be reserved, ideally, for that caliber of men.

In urging that, Representative LOSER speaks beyond question the sentiment of his district, his State, and his Nation.

Rewarding Political Expediency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Monroe (Mich.) Evening News of February 23, 1962:

REWARDING POLITICAL EXPEDIENCY

Ever since 1912, the membership of the Federal House of Representatives has stood at 435. During his tenure, the late House Speaker Rayburn stubbornly fought off repeated attempts to increase the membership. Every time there is a decennial census some States lose Representatives and some gain—depending upon the proportionate gains and losses of population. The reasoning behind the rule at fixing the membership was that if there were too many Members the body would become unwieldy.

Because of the fixed membership, States have been given the legal duty of redistricting when their representation changes. As a stimulant to see that congressional districts within a State were representative, the law added that if a State which lost Representatives didn't redraw its congressional districts in accordance with some plan, the entire congressional delegation would have to run at large, a very difficult and expensive procedure for candidates.

Now there is a proposal to add three additional seats to the body, and if it weren't for the powerful position that Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, holds, the measure probably would be buried. Fifteen of the 16 States which lost strength as a result of the 1960 census have completed their redistricting. Massachusetts, because of a deadlock in the State legislature, has not. This has raised the specter that all Congressmen in the State—including Speaker MCCORMACK—would have to run at large this fall. In all probability, this would give one party or the other a clean sweep in the election—a risk neither is willing to take.

So, to bail out the Massachusetts politicians who have been unable to come to a consensus as 15 other States have done, the bill would cut Massachusetts' loss of two seats in Congress to one. In addition, Missouri and Pennsylvania, who are unhappy about the redistricting done in their States, would add two more seats. Thus, House membership would be increased to 438. This, no doubt, will hardly be a popular move with the 13 States which have reapportioned in good faith.

Certainly this is a sterling example of rewarding civic irresponsibility. It is to be wondered what State in 1970 will want to redistrict in order not to lose a congressional seat?

Governor Rockefeller Proposes Federal Union of Free Peoples

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the February 10 issue of the Washington Post carried an editorial commenting on the forward-looking and hopeful attitude of Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, of New York, regarding a Federal union of free peoples. The newspaper states quite accurately that Mr. Rockefeller's proposal "reaches far beyond what is customarily heard from candidates for political office."

This is a moment in which uncommon courage in political candidates is urgently needed.

The editorial follows:

GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER PROPOSES FEDERAL UNION OF FREE PEOPLES

Governor Rockefeller has committed himself to work for extension of the American concept of federalism to the free world. His proposal, as expounded at Harvard University, is that the Federal idea has given the people of this country the freedom, diversity and creativity essential to progress in the modern world, and that this means of attaining a balance between liberty and security is as applicable to the free world as it was to the 13 American Colonies in 1787 * * * that the tested and proved principles of federalism offer a key to a new world order.

The Federal idea, by Mr. Rockefeller's definition, is a "concept of government by which a sovereign people—for their greater progress and protection—yield a portion of their sovereignty to a political system that has more than one center of sovereign power, energy, and creativity." It leaves broad scope for "the free play of individual initiative, private enterprise, social institutions, political organizations, and voluntary associations—all operating within the framework of law and principles affirming the dignity and freedom of man."

The federalism for which he speaks "fosters diversity within unity." It "encourages creativity, imagination, and innovation in meeting the needs of the people." It avoids excesses by dividing power between central and local governments and between executive, legislative, and judicial authorities. In some degrees it fosters competition among governments in meeting the needs of the people.

Looking beyond the American experience, Mr. Rockefeller sees a harassed world in which all free peoples are confronted by some very hard choices: (1) No nation today can defend its freedom or fulfill the aspirations of its people through its own resources alone; (2) the old patterns of the international order have been shattered; (3) the U.N. has not been able to shape a new world order; (4) communism is making a powerful bid to fill the vacuum that has been left by the passing of the old order and the failure of the free world to put anything in its place.

Governor Rockefeller is very positive in his belief that the answer to this perilous situation can be found in "the Federal idea." While recognizing the hopeful progress made through the European Common Market and the growth of regional organization, he challenges the free world to a faster pace in order to meet the common danger.

What he urges at this time is a "common commitment to some basic principles and purposes." These would include assurance of freedom for the individual, removal of the barriers to commerce, unity in defense, movement toward some form of common taxation, and the gradual development of "authentically political forms of unity." The United States is the natural leader of such a movement, he contends, because "our dominant commitment from our very birth as a nation has been to everlasting concern for the individual, his freedom and his dignity."

This is a powerful appeal to the American people as well as to our friends abroad. Presumably Mr. Rockefeller is staking his political future on a "grand design" that reaches far beyond what is customarily heard from candidates for political office. Apart from any partisan overtones in these speeches, he has eloquently challenged free peoples everywhere to arise to a new concept of their destiny.

Farm Economist Takes Note of Feed Grain Program Slippages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, despite my repeated appeals for better administration, the "phantom acres" will again be paid for under the 1962 feed grain program.

Those who still question that such "phantom acres" existed in the 1961 program should take note of a statement by G. E. Brandow, of Pennsylvania State University, president-elect of the American Farm Economics Association. In an article published in a December 1961 issue of the Journal of Farm Economics, Mr. Brandow summarizes the 1961 feed grain program.

In it he makes reference to slippages—another term for "phantom acres"—which were inconsistent with the Feed Grain Act and might have been reduced by appropriate administrative procedures. Here is the quotation from Mr. Brandow's article:

Programs of this kind can be expected to be subject to certain slippages that cause the reduction in crop output to be less than the number of payment acres would imply. Some of the slippages in the 1961 program might have been avoided if more time had been available to put it into effect. Unfortunately, such slippages, once permitted, probably must be lived with in later years.

The first slippage was assigning to producers acreage bases that were higher than actual plantings in the base period 1959–60. The overrun was about 3.4 million acres for corn and 5.3 million acres for grain sorghums. The second slippage apparently was permitting land to be cropped that would have been idle, fallow, or pastured on the participating farms in the absence of a program. Both slippages were inconsistent with the Feed Grain Act and might have been reduced by appropriate administrative procedures.

Tariff Bill Aims at Gradual Cuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 1962

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD an analysis of President Kennedy's trade expansion program that was published in February 25, 1962, editions of the New York Times. I suggest it is instructive to those who seem to be bracing for some precipitous, unthinking reduction of tariffs.

The article follows:

TARIFF BILL AIMS AT GRADUAL CUTS—ACTION WOULD NOT BE FAST, DESPITE PLAN'S URGENCY

(By Brendan M. Jones)

Emphasis on the boldness and urgency of President Kennedy's liberal trade program has created some impression that it will bring a precipitate reduction of tariffs.

But a study of the bill (H.R. 9900) embodying the President's trade policy shows, however, that most proposed tariff cutting would be gradual. Under terms of the bill, much of this tariff cutting, even at the top rate of 50 percent, would extend over a 5-year period.

In short, the reduction of tariff walls by as much as one-half would be a paring down, or erosive, process, rather than a knockdown, demolition operation.

The new measure, which in effect would replace the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act expiring on June 30, would become effective on July 1. It is before the House Ways and Means Committee, which has scheduled hearings to start on March 5. Under provisions of the bill, it would take at least 6 months to prepare for a round of reciprocal tariff negotiations with other countries.

Such negotiations, it has been indicated, would be primarily with the European Common Market consisting at present of France, West Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg. In line with the President's aim of a general lowering of world trade barriers, the negotiations would extend to other major trading nations such as Canada and Japan.

Latin American, African, and Asian nations, which the President's program particularly seeks to benefit, also would be likely participants.

Negotiations on a scale that would result in a substantial freeing of trade throughout world markets would cover in addition the greater part of United States and other countries' tariff rates. Even if the negotiations dealt with broad categories or groups of products, bargaining would involve more than 100 classifications on each of which the interests of a dozen or more countries would have to be considered.

Since bargaining probably would last at least a year, it might be early 1964 before rate reductions under basic new agreements could be promulgated.

REDUCTIONS IN STAGES

Then, in accordance with the bill's formula, the reductions would be made in stages, or installments, over 5 years. Taking the average range of tariff rates that might be cut by the maximum one-half as 20 to 30 percent, the average reduction would be 2 to 3 percentage points a year.

The bill provides that such a reduction of tariffs need not be in equal amounts for each of the 5 years. The amounts of reduction in the first 2 or 3 years could be less than the average for the entire 5-year period as long as the total reduction was in effect at the end of that time.

The first stages of reduction on items more sensitive than others to increased import competition could be made even more gradual than under the general formula.

Whatever the procedure employed, the full effects of new tariff cuts under the earliest application of the proposed new law would not be felt until 1968 or early 1969.

The overall purpose of this gradual reduction of tariffs would be to allow similarly gradual adjustments to more competitive conditions by domestic producers. President Kennedy and other administration officials have noted that the amount of adjustment required would not be much different from what industry encounters from technological changes over a 5- to 7-year period.

Although descriptions of the President's trade policies as an urgent and bold new program have tended to obscure the gradualness of proposed tariff reductions, they are essentially accurate. In terms of a large nation's actions to meet broad economic and trade conditions in world markets, preparations requiring 5 years or more to complete may still be relatively urgent.

The President's program is bold in the sense that it entails relatively drastic and extensive changes to meet a world economic trend that has been building up for nearly 10 years.

Consequently, the President's program calls for a larger measure of real trade liberalization than in the past at a time when protective tariff sentiment has been gaining strength.

In this relation, it is both bold and new. But, at the same time, it incorporates the principle of gradual tariff reduction for sound practical reasons. By contrast, a precipitate move for rapid tariff reduction could defeat the eventual goal, which is the development of a freer world trading system.

Other measures for tariff reduction in addition to the general 50 percent maximum are provided in the bill. These include special provisions for negotiation with the European Common Market and for furthering vital trade of Latin American countries that the United States is seeking to help economically.

TARIFF ELIMINATION

These measures would allow elimination of certain tariffs, notably those of 5 percent or less, if bargaining produced desirable concessions from the Common Market.

The bill provides also for negotiation that would remove or reduce import restrictions other than tariffs. These other import restrictions, according to the definition in the bill, would include a limitation, prohibition or charge other than duty as well as the rate or form of an import classification.

The principle of gradualness in tariff or other trade-barrier reduction, which is an essential part of the new trade program, is in harmony with the approach to freer trade within the Common Market. The European group's internal elimination of trade barriers, as well as its external tariff and agricultural integration, also has been scheduled on a gradual basis.

The period provided for accomplishment of these various Common Market measures, although one-third completed for some objectives, will not end until about 1970.

What the European Common Market Means to Kansans in General and Farmers in Particular

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, on January 9, 1962, at the annual chamber of commerce dinner in Great Brend, Kans., the Honorable Alf M. London delivered the following speech entitled "What the European Common Market Means to Kansans in General and Farmers in Particular." I am sure that Governor Landon's remarks and ideas will be of interest to Members of Congress.

The speech follows:

WHAT THE EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET MEANS TO KANSANS IN GENERAL AND FARMERS IN PARTICULAR

The Democratic national chairman, building votes for the next campaign, is reported in the press as picking "medical care for the elderly as the party's most attractive issue in this year's election."

Congressional leaders of both parties stress the most vital legislation is that delegating to our President broader responsibility in negotiating practical and reasonable trade relations with the European Economic Community, called the Common Market, that is remaking Western Europe and the British Commonwealth.

There is no doubt about the vital importance to every American of the decisions the administration and the Congress will make on that tariff legislation.

That will be a historic turning point in not only trade, but political relations that can, and probably will, mean the difference between peace and a nuclear war.

The momentous problems involved in a sweeping and drastic change in our tariff policies is right smack dab in our President's hands.

No President has ever been able to drive successfully a three-horse administrative legislative program through tough, hard opposition. If one bogs down, the whole is affected.

Facing strong opposition, any President must center on one major piece of legislation and say to his party leaders: Here is where we stand and fight to the finish.

The time is here for plain speaking and bold, vigorous leadership by our President.

It is his job to come straight to the matter of the massive impact the booming European Economic Community will have on world markets and political relations among all governments—friendly and unfriendly alike.

If a program of mutual cooperation can be developed, that will be a factor of immense importance in steadily strengthening the bonds between peoples determined to be free from imperial Communist domination.

Therefore, I am ready to support our President's expected request to Congress for new broad and sweeping delegation of authority on the matter of trade agreements.

After my National Press Club talk last month, the question was raised whether I am a Democrat or a Republican. The times are so perilous that I spoke then, as I do now, not as a Republican—of course not as a Democrat—simply as an American more con-

cerned about the crucial world position in which we are involved than personal or party advantage.

Mr. Kennedy is going to be President of the United States until January 1965. Until then—as Chief Executive—he represents all of us. He is going to set the pattern of what is to follow by his decisions. When I think he is wrong, I will say so. When I think he is right, I will say so.

Like General Eisenhower, former Secretary of State Herter, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, I believe our President must have broader authority and responsibility in negotiating tariff agreements.

That means taking the offensive against steady Communist pressure of economic and political subversion, rather than letting them have the ball all the time.

First let us take a brief look at our situation in the world today. The dimensions of the Soviet empire are in plain sight.

Platitudes and generalities that the smoke will go up the chimney just the same cannot conceal the fact that there is a serious breach in basic policies between Great Britain, France, and our United States.

While we have already surrendered independence of action—in effect, surrendered national sovereignty—in the United Nations, in SEATO and NATO—they have not lived up to expectations.

Those organizations are not as effective as they would be, buttressed by deep foundation of economic understanding between major powers of the free world.

Opposing views have prevented a united front against the common enemy—imperial Soviet—in critical areas like Suez, Laos, Berlin, and the Congo.

As a result of that lack of consistent unity on basic polices, imperial Soviet occupies a base for military operations in the heart of Europe, next door in the Western Hemisphere, in key countries of southeast Asia, is equipping Nasser's army and navy, and the United Nations is bankrupt, financially and spiritless. It is tragic to watch its moral stamina eroding in recent months, by inaction, when imperial Soviet frowns.

Only 15 of the 103 member nations have paid their 1961 assessments in full. That displays a lack of faith, almost amounting to contempt for the United Nations, that speaks loud and clear. Simply lending money to the United Nations, as our President proposes, will not correct that. When did lending money to fearful incompetents ever help any organization? That is not the way to save the United Nations for a useful purpose.

I mention those pivotal areas, not for the purpose of assessing the blame for their loss to imperialist aggressors. I mention them because our national existence depends on cold steel acceptance of a true perspective and recognition that we are confronted with a continuing and consistent massive attack on our national existence.

In a nutshell, I believe we have been ensnared into a losing game—the way we have fought the battle of ideology. All through the Truman containment policy and the late Secretary of States Dulles' self-styled Brinkmanship, where we talked of the battle for the minds of men, a world court, and a rule of law, we constantly lived on a high cloud and tried to build the roof before the foundation.

The imperial Communist empire hides behind ideology, on the one hand, and a rule of terror, slave camps, and military power, on the other, to accomplish great strides toward its ruthless ends of conquering the world.

Despite all Communist palaver about the oppression of capitalism, one brutal fact stands out in their system and in their promises and play upon emotions. That is the nakedness of the individual.

The whole world is shocked by Nehru's military invasion of Goa. It has destroyed his universal appeal for justice based on nonviolent measures and peaceful negotiations and rule of equity. Of even greater importance Nehru's seizure of Goa by force raises the question whether he has come to the conclusion that the United Nations has run its course. His success encourages other similar aggressors.

The obvious world drift back to brute force calls for fundamental changes in tactics if we are to continue to enjoy life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

One is understanding the pratcical function and possibilities inherent in the European Common Market.

What is this Common Market and how does it affect our national security?

One sure important consequence of the European Common Market will be to draw Europe together in a political as well as economic unity. The Kansas City Star's European reporter recently wrote, "The necessity for military protection against one another has been giving way to a communion of defense."

In a nutshell the combining of Europe and England that Louis XIV, of France, Phillip II, of Spain, Napoleon Bonaparte, and Hitler, savagely attempted by war is well on the way to peaceful accomplishment for the common good by tradesmen, assisted by practical politicians with foresight and imagination.

That is: Creating a third world power that will be strong enough to protect Europe against Communist economic and military aggression. That can be a decisive bulwark in preserving and upholding peoples governments in the area of freedom and spiritual values, or it can be neutral and aloof.

If we work with them and they work with us that would serve as a rallying base for the nations of the Western World. The trend would logically be in that direction as world conditions become more chaotic and the futility of the United Nations becomes more apparent.

Our trade policies must gradually be adjusted to enable us to negotiate freely with the Common Market. That needs to be done both as a protection to our own export interests and to facilitate the closer political relations that we must cutlivate for our own security.

All of that will mean a sharp break with some of our past traditions and thinking. It will be stoutly opposed by special interest groups, both in industry and in labor—and by those who think in terms of slogans.

The first effects might be adverse, but I believe the pressure of events will compel us to make these moves.

Instead of constant retreat we take the offensive. Instead of conceding the inevitability of a holocaust of a thermonuclear war, or ghastly life in a police state, we refuse either of these concepts by gearing the economic resources and drive of the free world.

What was only 15 years ago the dream of classical economists and a few realistic politicians has become a stupendous success in stimulating prosperity and raising the standards of living of the six member nations.

The European Common Market consists of six countries: France Belgium, Holland, West Germany, Italy, and Luxembourg. Those countries add up to 160 million consumers. With the addition of Great Britain, there will be 220 million consumers.

The proof of the impact of the European Common Market, present and future, is found in Great Britain being forced, after 2 years of reluctance, to abandon hereditary and traditional trade policies by applying for membership in that organization still somewhat unsettled on structure and trade policies.

Other European countries are already knocking at the door. It is plain that sooner or later they will have to join either this European Common Market or the imperial Communist common bloc.

Therefore, the incipient total of the European Common Market is 300 million consumers with the second highest standard of living in the world today.

Furthermore, there is LAFTA—Latin American Free Trade Association—that will have in time an important impact on Common Market and unity of the Western Hemisphere.

The pattern of that organization is the same as European Common Market, insofar as lowering trade barriers, improving transportation between member nations, and acting as a unit in tariff policies and quotas against outsiders are concerned.

That makes three common markets: Communist, European, and LAFTA.

That is the league we are either going to have to play in or try to organize one of our own. That would further split the free peoples defense setups such as NATO and SEATO.

On the other hand, cooperation in the concept of the common market will strengthen the unity and the forces of those defense organizations.

Policies of trade and commerce have always begat political policies, and political policies have always begat military policies.

Therefore, the tariff and trade issue is divided into two arenas. The first, and to me the preponderate one, is to unite, and thereby strengthen, defenses of free peoples against the perfidious Soviet and the implacable Chinese whose self-proclaimed plans are to crush the existence of free peoples.

The more free peoples get together in trade and exchange of services upgrading our free world economy, building greater prosperity for all, a greater structure of purpose and basic outlook that will hang together is bound to develop.

Now that there is a clear intention of the European Common Market and of Great Britain to surmount obstacles in the way of English membership, a dramatic force has come into being, the power of a total European community of both economic and political character.

Its merged economic and political strength and potentiality is far greater than the Communist bloc. No wonder Khrushchev, by recent moves, betrays his fears at the growing strength through growing trade unity of Europe and Great Britain.

As separate entities, the European democracies did not have the value and stupendous force in this titanic struggle for survival that results from the unification of their highly developed economies, their vast skilled manpower, and essential mutuality of political thinking.

The second area is economics. Just as modern weapons, modern science, have broken down all geographical lines so is modern trade communications and interchange breaking down old barriers.

In the great countries to the south of us, there are millions of people that have never actually worn shoes, ignorant of a better life until radio, television, and tourists came along. As they watched them on rare visits to town, their simple desires were stimulated not only for manufactured articles, but a roof over their heads, in place of a primitive thatched one, and food for their shrunken bellies. Over 50 percent of the 180 million persons of Latin America are suffering from malnutrition.

They are easy prey for the Communist agitators and organizers promising all that, and more too.

Therefore, the free world's huge problems involve other factors than simply tariff legislation or intricate trade barriers.

Side by side with the Common Market must come the development of local agriculture and industry, especially in those underdeveloped countries.

The alliance for progress, if rightly and efficiently administered, has great promise. Its base for success is a firm position by the United States that any and every country involved must put its own house in order so that the American taxpayers' money is used in the way and for the purpose intended.

In order for both to work, the Congress must repeal legislation blocking the channels of finance.

Because of national legislation, an American company doing business in a foreign land is handicapped. An American doing business in a foreign country pays that country's tax. So do his competitors.

However, all of them—English, French, German—the whole kit and kaboodle—can take their net profits home, after local taxes, mind you, with more tax advantages than Americans.

On top of that, two punitive measures are also being proposed.

One is not to allow any credit on American businesses' tax at home for taxes paid in foreign countries.

The other is to tax Americans' profits abroad whether they are brought home or not.

All that kind of punitive legislation forces the export of American plants and capital abroad by subterfuge in one way or another.

That does not help our American labor or balance of payments. Capital is fluid; labor is not.

Unlocking the channels of trade by tariff and quota adjustments needs to be supplemented by removing such threats and penalties on Americans doing business abroad.

That is a highly complicated question that cannot be dealt with in a couple of paragraphs. Legislation is needed to clarify the position of legitmate Amercan enterprises abroad; also to plug the loopholes in our present tax structure favoring cheaters evading their taxes.

The advantage to America in people-to-people relations through American business activities abroad must be weighed in our taxing policies.

We were once known as a nation of Yankee traders. Even then, our standard of living was above our competitors. Why should we now fear competition in the world markets?

There is one other factor I must mention. That is balancing the budget to stop the drain on our gold reserve.

One great advantage of a Common Market is sound currency. That currency cannot be based on the quicksand of the planned inflation of the Keynes school.

No other country in the world has fallen for that theory except America, under the New Deal, the Fair Deal.

It remains to be seen what the New Frontier does.

Whatever our adjustment to the Common Market—we will first have to stabilize our money.

And whether we try to adjust our economy to the Common Market by authorizing our President to negotiate tariff and quota cuts by broad-scale negotiations, or attempt to ignore it, an unbalanced budget and an unstable dollar block the channels of commerce and trade as bad as high protective tariff.

Both are outmoded. Therefore, the first requirement of any benefit from a fundamental change in our tariff policy is to stop debasing the value of the American dollar by deficit financing.

The English, the French, and the Dutch know their history. They know the disastrous consequences of the permanent policy of deficit financing we have actually followed for 30 years.

At this point I must also mention that there will be great immeditae disadvantages and a multitude of problems for a high standard of living country, with efficient farm mass-production, with a complex industrial economy, adjusting itself to lower standard of living countries. It is further complicated by our present unemployment, caused in part by automation, by obsolescent plant equipment, where the cost of production can be met only in peak demand markets.

However, the advantages will come in the long pull by closing the gap by raising lower standards of living, increasing total market demands, plus increased national security.

It must be realized that the disadvantages of staying aloof are even greater and certainly more disasterous. There is the same confusion among agricultural leaders that there is in the NAM and the AFL–CIO on the effect of the European Common Market. The Farm Bureau's National Convention and Martin Byrne, president of the Kansas Farmers Union, are supporting the proposed change in tariff legislation.

The immediate effect on farmers, as on industry, will vary according to product. A banker who describes himself as a free trade, standpat Republican, said to me, "The man who thinks the Common Market will not have any effect on the wheat farmer of Thomas County is crazy."

Under Federal farm-control programs based on acreage the tendency has been to produce quantity. In Kansas, we have got to plan for the export quality wheat market if we are going to raise wheat profitably.

The way the wheat market adds up today, Kansas is the bread wheat and the export wheat. Southeast United States is cakemix and pastry wheat. Northwest Pacific wheat is especially prepared for the Japanese market to blend with rice. The northern Great Plains wheat is absorbed in the domestic bread flour market.

The German Government guarantees its wheat farmers $3 a bushel for their wheat. Yet they do not raise enough wheat to fill the domestic demands.

The French Government guarantees its wheat farmers $2.20 a bushel for their wheat. They raise a surplus that is stored with the accompanying waste inherent in that program.

Our American Government guarantees American wheat farmers an average of $2 a bushel for their wheat. Like the French, our farmers raise a surplus and that part that cannot find its way into a market is stored with waste.

The basic error in international movement of wheat is the failure to recognize quality.

Too many countries are supporting wheat at a high price that is not adequate in strength and quality to modern baking processes. They think wheat is wheat. There is as much difference in wheat as there is in the gravity of oil.

All over the world wheat is going into commercial production in mechanically operated bake shops. That requires a reasonable amount of high protein hard wheat.

Essentially, all wheat produced in the Common Market countries is lacking in protein and strength to be adequate for commercial baking.

Regardless of the breaking down of barriers between the Common Market countries that will enable wheat to move more freely, the point is that a steadily increasing standard of living, plus modern baking processes, increase the demand for the kind of high protein wheat Kansas produces.

The rising standard of living of European consumers will not only increase demand for bread of high protein quality, but also increase demand for good red meat. Because of American efficient livestock production, we can turn out quality red meat as well as wheat. Therefore, the wheat and livestock producers of Kansas are going to be vitally concerned about negotiations with the European Common Market.

The rising standard of living of the European Common Market and of countries to the south of us, where white bread is a luxury to the masses, means a steadily increasing market for high quality protein wheat and will promote meat consumption.

It is well known that the Soviet is selling its oil below cost as a political and military weapon.

The American oil producer, like the American farmer, has excess capacity.

Working with the Common Market he would have a mutuality of interests to offset the Soviets' price that will be more beneficial in the long run than higher quotas or tariffs.

Our President spoke early in December to the National Association of Manufacturers convention. According to the press, he got a cool reception. But he is gathering their support.

The next day at AFL–CIO in Florida, Mr. Kennedy got a warm enthusiastic reception. He got their cheers but no support in their resolutions for his tariff policies.

One and all we must not be hypnotized by short-term interests. We must recognize that the call is to seize the counteroffensive on the economic front with soundly constructed national security and economic policies.

One thing for sure. If the AFL–CIO and the NAM convention position, plus other pressure groups and tariff protection, prevail, the shock will be far greater on our economy. Succeeding temporarily, we lose in the end. We become sitting ducks. All will be eventually engulfed by the force of onrushing economic tide from either the Communist bloc or the European Common Market, plus the potential one in the Western Hemisphere.

First the Congress must delegate to our President broad powers on tariff and quotas. Then it depends on how skillfully and effectively Mr. Kennedy handles his authority to remove barriers to trade and finance.

That involves many factors of readjustment both at home and abroad, including removing the obstacle of uncertainty as to our fiscal and taxing policies. New markets abroad can be developed for American products by vigorous cooperation between our Government and American industry. Either way we go the problems are enormous. They will affect every one of us, in the present and in the future.

The best hope for the continued existence of western democracies is to adjust our differences and unite economically and militarily without delay to defeat imperial Communist economic and military attacks in Europe, in Africa, in Asia, and their toe in the door in the Western Hemisphere. When there is unity on policies as well as purpose in NATO and SEATO the assurance of peace is increased. Cooperative trade agreements pave the way for that.

Facing the reality of imperial Communist penetration in those great areas the call for united action is clear and imperative. Policies of free peoples, economic and political, must be based on cooperative and sound political and business principles—thereby building close and enduring relationships.

Union of the free is vital to freedom triumphant.

It was never more true in critical times of the past than today, "United we stand. Divided we fall."

We seek to coerce no people into our philosophy of government.

Neither will we surrender our philosophy of government for peace at any price.

Steuben Society of America Supports House Joint Resolution 447

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, the Steuben Society of America, founded in May 1919, has long been a stanch supporter of the constitutional principles which have made this country great. The society, composed of American citizens of German extraction, is named after Gen. Frederick William von Steuben—1730–94—who came from Germany to fight in the American Revolution.

The February 1962, edition of the Steuben News carried an article expressing the Steuben Society's support of House Joint Resolution 447, a "declaration of war against the international Communist conspiracy."

House Joint Resolution 447 is directed against the 98 Communist Parties of the world who are acting in unison to destroy all of the free world and its free institutions. These 98 Communist Parties comprise the international Communist conspiracy and take their direction from, and owe allegiance to, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Nikita Khrushchev, as First Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, is in fact commander in chief not only of the political and economic structure of the Soviet Union, but also commander in chief of the political global war being waged by the international Communist conspiracy.

I was pleased indeed, to learn of the Steuben Society's decision to support House Joint Resolution 447.

The article from the Steuben News follows:

PILLION PROPOSAL SUPPORTED WITH ONE RESERVATION

NEW YORK, N.Y.—House Joint Resolution 447 introduced by Representative JOHN R. PILLION, Republican, of New York, was presented to the Public Affairs Committee of the Steuben Society of America at its January 1962 meeting, for consideration.

The resolution, calling for militant counteraction to the worldwide Communist conspiracy indicts the 98 national Communist Parties and their 36 million agents for the crime of war against all free peoples, severally and jointly.

INTENT SUPPORTED

Robert F. Holoch, chairman of the committee, announced that the intent of the resolution found enthusiastic support, though a reservation was entered on the wording of the last paragraph of the preamble, and a substitute was offered as follows:

"The United States formally and solemnly declares that it hereby pledges all its resources, and that it will take all steps and actions necessary to prevent these Communist conspirators from succeeding in their joint and several campaigns of economic, cold and hot wars against the United States and all free peoples of the world; which Communist Parties of the world jointly and severally include the following:"

(The Pillion resolution then lists the 98 national Communist Parties of the world.)

It was felt that the original wording provided a propaganda weapon for those against whom the resolution was directed.

David J. Dallin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, word of the passing of Dr. David J. Dallin on February 21, 1962, was received with great sorrow by those of us in the Halls of Congress privileged to have had first-hand knowledge of the character and work of this eminent scholar.

America was Dr. Dallin's refuge from persecution by both the Communists and the Nazis, and over the course of more than 20 years' residence, he made an outstanding contribution to the country of his adoption. Dr. Dallin will continue to be with us and succeeding generations through his many, many scholarly books. His writings, which deal primarily with Soviet affairs, are widely known and respected both here and abroad. The Committee on Un-American Activities was fortunate in obtaining the services of Dr. Dallin in recent years for the preparation of a documented history of the Communist regime in Russia. The study was completed in December 1960, and published by the committee under the title "Facts on Communism, Volume II: The Soviet Union, From Lenin to Khrushchev."

In his works, Dr. Dallin combined painstaking research, scrupulous concern for facts and literary talent. He was always guided by the conviction that, and I quote his own words, "there exists no stronger weapon against communism than the simple truth." Those who knew him personally were unfailingly impressed by his wisdom and humanity.

I would like to enter into the RECORD an article from the New York Times of February 22, 1962, which provides more detail on the life and accomplishments of Dr. David J. Dallin.

DAVID J. DALLIN, AUTHOR, 72, DEAD—SOVIET AFFAIRS EXPERT WAS RUSSIAN ANTI-COMMUNIST

David J. Dallin, an authority on Soviet affairs and an anti-Communist leader in Russia after the Bolshevik revolution, died at his home, 310 West 106th Street, yesterday after a long illness. He was 72 years old .

Since coming to the United States in 1940, Mr. Dallin had written 10 books on the Soviet Union. He was coauthor of another, "Forced Labor in Soviet Russia," with Boris I. Nicolaevsky, which precipitated Soviet denunciation in the United Nations General Assembly.

His book "Soviet Espionage," published in 1955 after 5 years of study here and abroad, was described by Igor Gouzenko as "undoubtedly the major work on Soviet spy activities." Mr. Gouzenko is a former Soviet cipher clerk who exposed a spy ring in Canada.

Mr. Dallin's works were often "monumentally documented," as former Assistant Secretary of State Adolf A. Berle, Jr., once wrote. Aside from available open sources, he had built up files on material that had to remain confidential to protect officials and other persons still living.

PAPERS TO GO TO LIBRARIES

He had provided that such so-called D papers used in his book on espionage—a filing drawer full—should be deposited with the library of Yale University in 1970. Another file of D papers, used in his book "Soviet Policy After Stalin" is to be deposited with the New York Police Library in 1976. The book was published last year.

However, Mr. Dallin also stipulated that "anyone who can prove his honest intentions and legitimate interest" could utilize those papers before then.

Mr. Dallin was born in Rogachev, now part of Byelorussia, on May 24, 1889. He was the son of a merchant. In 1909, while studying law at the University of St. Petersburg, he was arrested for underground activities against the czarist regime. He was imprisoned for 2 years and then went into exile in Germany.

He earned a doctorate of economics at the University of Heidelberg in 1913. Ten days after the overthrow of the czarist regime in March 1917, he returned home. He was elected a member of the central committee of the Menshevik Social Democratic Party, opposing the Bolshevik Communists.

SERVED IN MOSCOW SOVIET

After the Bolsheviks took power, Mr. Dallin served as an elected opposition deputy in the Moscow city soviet from 1918 to 1921. He was arrested briefly by the Soviet rulers in 1920. Two years later, facing new arrest, he left again for Germany.

He wrote two books on economics in Berlin and lectured and traveled in Western Europe until he was expelled from Nazi Germany in 1935. He went to Poland, and, after the outbreak of World War II, made his way to the United States.

For nearly 20 years, Mr. Dallin was a contributing editor and columnist for the anti-Communist weekly, the New Leader, writing in Russian in the earlier years. His first books here, "Soviet Russia's Foreign Policy, 1939–42" and "The Real Soviet Russia" were translated, respectively, by Leon Dennen and the late Joseph Shaplen.

In his 1947 story of forced labor, Mr. Dallin concluded that there were then 8 million to 12 million men, at least 16 percent of all adult Soviet males, in Soviet prison and labor camps.

Among his other books are "Russia and Postwar Europe," "The Big Three: the United States, Britain and Russia," "Soviet Russia and the Far East," "The Rise of Russia in Asia," "The New Soviet Empire" and "The Changing World of Soviet Russia."

ATTACKED CURB ON MAIL

In 1952, Mr. Dallin brought into the open that the U.S. Post Office Department had begun seizing and destroying Soviet bloc publications addressed to persons and registered as foreign agents. The Department contended that they were illegal political propaganda.

His and other protests caused the agency to permit copies to reach persons it recognized as scholars, including himself. Mr. Dallin contended the policy was depriving many Americans of an "important source of knowledge and weapon in the 'cold war'," and it was later halted.

In recent years Mr. Dallin was a visiting professor of political science at the University of Pennsylvania.

Surviving are his widow, Lilie; a son, Alexander Dallin, professor of international relations at the Russian Institute at Colum-

bia University, and his brother, Simon Wolin. His first wife, Eugenia, from whom he had been divorced, also lives in New York.

U.S. Economic Battle of the Century

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER, Mr. Speaker, there seems to be no question but what most of the economists advising the President at the present time are devotees of the Keynesian theory and I am delighted to learn that a conservative Democrat, a former member of the State Department and a member of the Harvard Law School faculty has taken issue with this theory.

He is Mr. Simon Kuznets. His survey on capital formation in the American economy is very interesting and I am glad to insert an article from the World dated February 28 entitled "U.S. Economic Battle of the Century is Joined":

U.S. ECONOMIC BATTLE OF THE CENTURY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—For months there has been scarcely a top-level economic discussion that has not included some debate on a book which may well be the most provocative economic study of our time: "Capital in the American Economy, Its Formation and Financing," by Simon Kuznets, Princton University Press. Its major impact: a frontal, factual assault on the "consumption" bias of the American economy, a bias largely introduced by followers of the theories of the British economist John Maynard Keynes. For all its well-discussed significance for professional economists, business leaders and government officials, this collision of theories has had little general public exposition. World presents just such an exposition. The author is a distinguished economist and attorney, now practicing in Washington. Formerly a foreign economic policy official of the State Department and a member of the Harvard Law School faculty, he describes himself as a conservative Democrat who, prior to the Second World War, began to question, on his own, the Keynesian theories which have generally shaped U.S. policy and which are now seriously challenged by Professor Kuznets' base-prodding counterattack.)

(By Mathew J. Kust)

President Kennedy's economic report to Congress again expresses concern over the inadequate economic growth of the United States which has averaged hardly 3 percent per year during the past decade, at a time when most of the countries of Europe, including Russia, Japan and others, have maintained growth rates two and three times as great. It would appear appropriate, therefore, to inquire whether the economic policies the country is pursuing are sound. Following are the theories propounded by Simon Kuznets, as opposed to traditional (for several administrations) Keynesian theories.

KUZNETS

Late last year, Simon Kuznets of Harvard published a study on capital formation in the American economy which provides an unorthodox answer for our inadequate economic growth. He simply concludes that there is too much consumption and too little savings in the American economy. This leaves not enough for investment in buildings, machinery, equipment, tools and other capital goods to increase the productive capacity of the economy. Kuznets' thesis can be illustrated graphically by likening the American economy to a man who habitually spends all or most of his income. Such a man will accumulate little or no capital. So it is with a national economy that devotes too much of its production to consumption and too little to savings and investment.

Kuznets brings out another important factor affecting American capital formation. The rate of capital consumption rose appreciably from about 10 to 15 percent, as a percentage of gross national product (GNP), since World War I. Two factors appear to be chiefly responsible for this rapid rise. First, fast advances in modern technology create greater obsolescence of productive machinery and equipment. Second, the proportion of such capital in total capital is greater today, rising from 20.6 percent to 50.5 percent during the 85-year period covered by the study. Thus, at a time when more investment is required to replace obsolete machinery and equipment, the American economy devotes less of its production to savings. The result is a striking decline in capital accumulation.

The study refutes the contention often made that it is lack of investment opportunities, not savings, that impede capital investment. In fact, the author intimates that the American people are being denied the benefits of scientific discoveries and technological innovations of our laboratories because of lack of capital to translate them into commercial production.

DECREASED SAVINGS

The study covers the period 1869–1955, during which time net capital formation declined from 14.6 percent to 7 percent. Most of the decline is attributable to the rapid increase in capital consumption, which doubled over the period. Although this decline should properly have been offset by an increase in savings in order to maintain faster economic growth, the American economy assumed instead a greater consumption bias.

Whereas the American people saved about 12 percent of their disposable incomes prior to 1900, this declined to only about 7 percent since the end of the war in spite of the fact that per capita incomes rose around 17 percent per decade.

In other words, nearly all of the increase in incomes during the past few decades went into increased consumption instead of increased savings at a time when economic growth required more capital to offset the rising rate of capital consumption due to fast advances in technology.

It is the consumption bias of the individual which causes the inadequate rate of savings in the economy as personal savings account for 70 percent of net savings in the economy.

But Kuznets does not overlook the fact that huge Government expenditures during the past few decades have contributed significantly to the consumption bias of the economy. Much of the budget is for military and welfare purposes, which results in consumption or destruction of the national product. Only a very small portion of the huge military expenditures result in productive investment. Taxation and borrowing by Government for these purposes no doubt retards the propensity of the individual and corporation to save and invest. In final analysis, then, it is the individual bias toward consumption and the governmental bias toward greater expenditures which prevents a higher savings ratio in the economy.

NO FORCED SAVINGS

Kuznets also doubts that savings can be forced through the use of credit. Recent statistics on private credit would seem to support him. During the past decade private debt, excluding consumer's credit, increased $266 billion. Yet there was no increase in the savings ratio, and economic growth declined throughout the period.

Kuznets, moreover, does not think this consumption bias of the American economy is likely to change in the future without some basic changes in the socioeconomic structure and of individual attitudes. He feels that all present-day pressures are toward greater consumption. There is, for example, the rapid urbanization of the country which stimulates desires for more goods and services. There is the constantly broadening availability of goods and services. And he might well have added the existence of a well-entrenched advertising fraternity with its highly developed kit of hidden and not-so-hidden persuaders to induce individuals to consume more of their incomes. Furthermore, he points out that the Government will probably spend more with increasing defense and international commitments in the cold war. The study refrains, however, from making any suggestions for socioeconamic reforms which would counteract this consumption basis and promote more savings for investment.

KEYNES

The Keynesian school of economic thinking which dominates in the universities, government and even business, is at variance with the Kuznets thesis. It holds the view that capital formation is retarded by lack of investment opportunities which can be rectified only by stimulation of consumption. The current report of the Council of Economic Advisers states categorically that:

"Faster economic growth in the United States requires, above all, an expansion of demand, to take up existing slack and to match future increases in capacity."

Keynesian thinking fears that too much savings in the economy decreases demand which alone can create investment opportunities. Given the requisite demand, however, it feels that the necessary savings and investment will somehow be forthcoming. In this respect, great faith and reliance is placed upon the credit facilities in the economy. Unlike Kuznets, the Keynesians believe savings can be forced largely through credit.

This conflict in views can be ascribed partly to the short and long run views of the problem. Kuznets does not conclude that investment opportunities (i.e., expansion of demand) are unimportant and, at the moment, with much idle capacity the council's conclusion that there must be an expansion of demand to take up existing slack in capacity cannot be gainsaid.

At the same time taking up existing slack is only part of our problem. It is generally conceded for the long run that our industrial plant and equipment needs modernization for increased productivity. In fact, this is the heart of Kuznet's thesis—that the savings ratio is declining at a time when it should be increasing to offset the rising rate of capital consumption due to fast advances in technology. Moreover, it appears that the obsolescence of our productive facilities is one of the important factors in our worsening competitive position vis-a-vis Europe and Japan which reconstructed their wartorn industries with more modern plant and equipment. Yet the Council's report touches this problem only lightly and dwells hardly at all on Kuznets' central finding of the rapidly increasing rate of capital consumption for which he concludes the national savings are inadequate.

The Council, however, gives oblique recognition to the importance of savings when it states in its conclusion that:

"Granted continued prosperity, we can have slower growth or faster growth. Just as an individual can increase his consumption possibilities in the future by present

saving, so can a whole society provide more fully for its future by using present resources for acts of investment."

The variance between the Kuznets and Keynesian theses is a difference of emphasis on consumption and savings in the economy. But that difference in emphasis may well contain the explanation for a slower or faster rate of growth. Kuznets recognizes there can be no definite proof whether slower growth is due to lack of investment opportunities or lack of savings, but he leaves no doubt that he believes it is lack of savings which is retarding capital formation in the American economy. Equally firm in their belief that inadequate demands is retarding our economic growth are the Keynesian economists. Since the latter are in positions of power, it will be necessary to give the Keynesian thinking a few more years to prove its worth.

It is hoped that Congress will grant the President the two powers, viz., standby power for temporary tax reductions and a standby program of public improvements, he requests so that the thesis of maximizing consumption can be given the acid test of demonstrating a faster rate of economic growth. If a few years of full employment fail to attain the desired 4 to 5 percent rate of growth the country would then be well advised to seek a new economic philosophy by which to live.

At any rate, the economic dialectic of our times may well form around these two variant theses. And if Kuznets is right, it may call for some fundamental changes in our national policies on taxation, consumers' credit, Government expenditures, and similar matters.

KUZNETS STUDY FINDINGS

The Kuznet study contains the following important findings. The ratio of gross capital formation to GNP, reckoned in constant 1929 prices, declined from 22.6 percent during the period 1869–88 to 21.7 percent during 1909–28 to 17.5 percent during 1946–55. The ratio of net capital formation to net national product for like periods declined from 14.6 percent to 11.2 percent to 7 percent. In current 1955 prices, the respective figures for the first series were found to be 20.2 percent, 20.9 percent, 21.3 percent and, for the latter, 13 percent, 11 percent, 8.7 percent.

The ratio of capital consumption to gross capital formation rose from 0.4 in 1869–88 to 0.65 in 1946–55. About $3 of gross capital formation is required to create $1 of net capital formation today, whereas during the earlier period, it took only $1.7 to do so.

A Little-People-to-Little-People Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, this past week our colleague, Congressman RODINO, presented a very meritorious proposal—one that every American parent should encourage. I refer to the little-people-to-little-people program instituted by our colleague's 10-year-old son, Peter.

I wholeheartedly endorse this movement. National leaders from all over the world daily are trying to solve the everyday problems that have been created mainly because of jealousy and ignorance.

Therefore, it becomes a natural thing for the children of this great Nation to educate other children of the world on the true meaning of Americanism.

The various veterans groups—the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars—and parent-teacher groups, all have thrown their support behind the young people-young people campaign.

These groups see in such a program, if properly handled, a unique opportunity for our children to lead the fight of freemen everywhere against the Red menace.

We can be sure that the Communist nations of the world will try to use this means to further their own cleverly contrived propaganda campaigns. It is not unreasonable for us to believe that many of the letters that will originate from behind the Iron Curtain will be the handiwork of trained Communists trying to indoctrinate our own youngsters in the ways of communism.

However, I think it is worth the chance. The pen pal idea has proven profitable down through the years in developing everlasting friendships.

American youngsters, I feel, will join this children's crusade and effectively bring to the attention of the world the true meaning of democracy in America.

Kennedy Voted for It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Illinois State Journal, Springfield, Ill., in an editorial published Friday, February 16, commented on the stockpiling scandal. It very properly assigns to President Kennedy a share of the blame.

The editorial follows:

KENNEDY VOTED FOR IT—STOCKPILING EXORBITANT

Just about everyone in Washington agrees that Government stockpiles of materials supposedly hoarded to carry the Nation through a war are fantastically exorbitant.

Even President Kennedy said he was "astonished" to learn that some $7.7 billion was tied up in such stores. Senator HARRY BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, was probably more accurate when he estimated the figure at $14.2 billion.

At least three different investigations already are proposed to determine how and why the stockpiles have swollen to more than double possible wartime needs. Incongruously, Mr. Kennedy's planners already are getting ready to make new estimates of materials needed to rebuild the Nation after an atomic attack. They insist new items must be added, stocks of other materials must be increased, and some raw materials must be processed into semifinished form. No one, naturally, has any idea how many more millions, or billions, all of this is going to cost.

The President proposes to get rid of billions of dollars' worth of commodities that would not be needed either during or after a war. Many experts believe he has set up impossible conditions for dumping such materials. As one of them said: "I don't know how you can sell these things without doing what he says he won't do—disturb market prices, offend allies, and all that."

Mr. Kennedy suggested that an investigation of the problem might reveal that corporations involved in the stockpiling had received "excessive and unconscionable profits." Mr. Kennedy may prove right in this instance. But it is interesting to look at his own record as a Senator in connection with stockpiling.

During that time he answered nine rollcall votes on proposals to curtail stockpiles. He voted against eight of them. Had Mr. Kennedy in those days evidenced as much concern on Government hoarding of supplies as he seems to now, he might have not been confronted with the problem.

By innuendo, the administration implies that the overabundance was created when General Eisenhower was in office. If Mr. Kennedy will search the records he will find that the stockpiles began growing like topsy during the Truman administration. President Eisenhower's efforts to reduce them went for naught because of the opposition of then Senator Kennedy and his free-spending legislative associates.

It will be interesting, perhaps distressing, to see how Mr. Kennedy tries to solve a problem he helped create.

Which Road for Transportation: Private Management or ———?—Part VI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, to get suggestions for solutions to the difficult problems confronting our Nation's transportation lines, Traffic World magazine has sought the counsel of nine men vitally concerned. Now reprinted in booklet form are these illuminating interviews, one of which follows:

INTERVIEW SIX

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Burton K. Wheeler speaks from a long service in the Senate of the United States (1923 through 1946) and as a member of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce through that entire period. He was chairman of that committee from 1935 to 1946. Inevitably there is a reflection of the history of the development of the Interstate Commerce Act in the replies which Senator Wheeler gives to the questions addressed to him and, most significantly, the alteration which he says took place in his thinking about the nationalization of the railroads as a result of his experience with Government in Washington.)

It is said that the Interstate Commerce Act was originally intended to protect the public interest but that, as now administered, its provisions are used to protect the carriers from competition. What validity is there to either of these assertions?

The original act to regulate railroad transportation was passed in 1887 for the purpose of correcting abuses by the railroads. The railroads at that time had a complete mo-

nopoly on surface transportation. In more recent times competing forms of transportation have developed with such rapidity that no one would suggest that such a monopoly exists today. With the advent of motor transportation it was not taken seriously by the railroad industry. In several attempts prior to 1935 Congress had attempted to pass legislation regulating trucks and buses. In 1935 Congress passed an act regulating trucks and buses and the 1940 act provided for the regulation of water carriers and it expressly provided that the Interstate Commerce Commission should exercise fair and impartial regulation of all forms of transportation and that it should so be administered as to recognize and preserve the inherent advantages of each. The Senate committee in their report in 1958 reiterated and reemphasized the law as it appeared in the 1940 act by saying it was the policy of Congress that every form of transportation should have the opportunity to make rates reflecting the inherent advantage each has to offer so that the public may exercise its choice of cost and service. It would seem clear that it is the duty of the Commission to promote rather than stifle competition.

The scope of regulation has steadily increased since the Interstate Commerce Act was first placed on the statute books. What, in your opinion, has been the reason for this—merely the growth of transportation and its importance to the economy, or failure of transportation management to measure up to its responsibility?

Regulation of the transportation industry has increased since the passage of the original act for several reasons. One has been the growth of the transportation industry which created many new problems. Second, the lack of foresight on the part of management and their financial backers who to a large extent controlled the railroads in not foreseeing the growth and importance of the bus and truck industry. Again, there were new abuses which were brought to light during the investigation of railroad finances by the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee.

The trucking industry was in a chaotic condition and unregulated until 1935. The law today should be strengthened to prevent trip leasing by the trucking industry. The agricultural commodities exemption in the 1940 act should be rewritten to make clear the intent of Congress. It has been interpreted by the courts in such a way as to virtually emasculate the provision as it was originally intended by Congress and has permitted commercial carriers to engage in carrying all kinds of products with little or no regulation. The farmers only asked when the bill was under consideration before the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee to be exempted so that they could take their own and their neighbor's products to market and bring back a few products in exchange. As one who handled the 1940 act I can say that this was the only exemption intended at that time. In 1958 Congress did make some changes in this provision, but in my opinion they should have tightened it much more.

With some railroads "in the red," with the air carriers said (by a Federal official) to be operating on a "razor-thin" profit margin, and with the motor carrier industry registering unsatisfactory financial returns, can any part of this record be ascribed to "over-regulation" or inept administration of the regulatory acts?

I doubt that the serious financial condition of the railroads or the trucking industry can be attributed to over-regulation. There have been many changes in the transportation industry since the 1940 act was passed. There is a plethora of transportation facilities and management faces serious problems endeavoring to keep the railroads from bankruptcy and consequently they should be given a freer hand wherever it is possible to do so. The trouble with the railroads is that the people are not riding on the trains, are using their own private cars, and many large shippers are using their own trucks. As a result, it is necessary for railroads to abandon some of their lines, and other facilities. If the railroads and some truckers are to survive there will have to be some consolidations and the elimination of duplicate trackage and other facilities which should mean cutting overhead costs and better service to the public. Many of the States today have outmoded regulations, some opposed to the railroads doing away with extremely unprofitable branch lines regardless of how little they may be used. While I was always friendly to the railroad brotherhoods, the work rules of the unions because of changed conditions are outmoded and should be changed in some particulars. Serious consideration should be given to the elimination of the excise tax on the transportation of passengers, which would result in the lowering of cost to the traveling public.

The area of managerial discretion has been narrowed by regulation. How can we stop that process and, perhaps, "roll back" regulation to some degree?

The area of managerial discretion should be enlarged by the Interstate Commerce Commission wherever it is possible. If legislation is needed the industry should present the matter to Congress and the Interstate Commerce Commission should make such recommendations as they feel would be consistent with public policy. I believe Congress would be sympathetic with any reasonable changes along this line.

Could the system of self-policing used by steamship conferences (the appointment of a "neutral body" to determine whether exclusive contracts have been breached by shippers) be applied by domestic transport modes to settle disputes and so reduce formal complaints filed with regulatory agencies?

The answer is "No." In my judgment the self-policing system used by the steamship conferences could not possibly work satisfactorily in the railroad industry. The two situations, in my judgment, are not comparable. I am sure any attempt to pass legislation of this kind would not meet with the approval of Congress.

Is there any validity to the suggestion that the antitrust laws could replace the regulatory scheme?

The antitrust laws could not replace the regulatory system of the transportation industry. To attempt to do so would mean chaos. While management frequently complains about the rulings of the Interstate Commerce Commission, I doubt that there is any intelligent manager of railroad, trucking or even the shipping industry who would want to repeal the Interstate Commerce Act in toto. The Interstate Commerce Commission is made up of human beings and they sometimes make mistakes. When they were attacked on the floor of the Senate I repeatedly defended them and said that while I didn't always agree with them I felt that they were the best of the Government regulatory bodies. There are many dedicated men and women in that agency seeking to be fair to industry and at the same time to protect the public interest.

Since private carriage cannot constitutionally be prohibited, can you suggest any measures either Government or regulated carriers could take to lessen the loss of for-hire traffic to private carriage?

I believe that there are abuses by some shippers who use their trucks to transport their products to a certain destination but on the return trip use their trucks for carriage of goods for which they charge rates. This subject was discussed in the report of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee on S. 3778 in 1958. The committee attempted to correct the abuses in that act and felt they went as far as they could go under the Constitution.

Since pricing of a service is the basic privilege of the free enterprise system, would denial to the regulatory agencies of the right to prescribe specific rates, leaving only the power to prescribe maximum and minimum reasonable rates, permit regulated carriers greater freedom to bid for traffic now lost to private carriage?

I seriously doubt that the denial to the regulatory agencies of the right to fix specific rates would affect the earnings of the railroads one iota. The agency very seldom and, in fact, I know of no case where they have fixed specific rates. They fix class rates, maximum and minimum, which must be reasonable.

Again in the hearings on S. 3778 in 1958 the railroads urged enactment of legislation that would restrict the Commission in ratemaking. There was much opposition and the committee refused to approve of the suggestion. They did, however, say that they felt the Commission had not been consistent in interpreting the law as it now stands.

Highways and airways have been created with Federal aid. Would adequate and economical systems of highways and airways have been created by private enterprise, with the aid of the individual States?

Highways would never have been built in this day and age sufficient to take care of the transportation needs of the shipper or the traveling public without Federal aid and I would doubt very much that the terminals for airways would have been adequate or possible without Government aid. Neither the automobile or airplane industry would have developed to anything like it is today without the Government aid in building roads and air terminals.

There will be further recommendations for regulatory legislation as the result of studies to be made. If the constant broadening of the area of transport regulation continues, is there any way of avoiding domination of transportation by Government, or nationalization?

I cannot believe that the studies that are being made will result in any further regulatory legislation to hamper the railroads or that the Congress would adopt such recommendations if they were made. Because of the financial conditions of many of the railroads, the lack of freight and passenger traffic, it is going to be necessary to have consolidation of many railroads to abandon unprofitable branches and duplicating facilities, otherwise you will have to have huge Government subsidies for some of the railroads, or nationalization. During the depression in the thirties when many railroads were in bankruptcy, the president of the Association of American Railroads, accompanied by one or two presidents of railroads and a committee of the railroad brotherhoods, came to my office in the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee room and said that they felt the solution of the problem was for the Government to loan the railroads something like $2 billion. I told them at that time that I did not agree with them and asked them if they wanted Government ownership of the railroads. If the Government subsidizes the railroads they will sooner or later dominate them completely and it will mean nationalization of the railroads. When I first came to Washington I was naive enough to believe that the nationalization of the railroads would be a good thing, but when I learned of the waste, extravagance and inefficiency in Government I felt that notwithstanding that there are abuses by the railroads they could be solved by enlightened management and I preferred to see private operation of them.

We are spending many billions of dollars for defense purposes today, but sometimes we forget that the railroads are not only essential in peacetime but they are an absolute necessary in war time. There is today no other form of transportation which could handle the transportation of troops and war materials in time of war excepting the railroads. It has been demonstrated time and time again that it doesn't do any good to manufacture war materials unless you can get them to the ports, and the American people should bear in mind that their money isn't being wasted when the railroads are being privately operated.

Should the reorganization act be amended to make it clear that the President, in transmitting reorganization plans to Congress, is to deal only with agencies in the executive branch and not with the independent agencies created as "arms of Congress?"

The Interstate Commerce Commission and the other independent regulatory agencies were created as an arm of the Congress and any reorganization act should not in any way change their status in this respect. President Roosevelt on one occasion told me he thought of placing the Interstate Commerce Commission under the Department of Commerce. I was opposed to it, as I felt that if it were transferred to the Department of Commerce it would be completely dominated by the executive branch of the Government and would no longer be independent but subject to political pressure in many important cases.

There is a bill in Congress which would permit the President, after a certain time in office, to remove a member of an independent agency who, presumably, might not see eye-to-eye with him. Would not this be an abrogation of the rights of Congress over these independent agencies?

The Congress should never permit the President of the United States to remove any member of an independent agency because of the fact that that member did not see eye-to-eye with him, any more than a President should be permitted to pack the Supreme Court because it did not decide cases in favor of the Government. I am afraid that some members of these independent agencies in the past have followed the executive department's views rather than making up their own independent judgment. This is because of the fact that they have to look to the President for reappointment. These agencies should be completely independent and make up their opinions absolutely free from any domination either by the Congress or the executive department. If they put a wrong interpretation upon a law passed by Congress, Congress can correct it.

Earl J. McGrath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following position taken by the former Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable Earl J. McGrath, under date of February 21 at the 94th annual meeting, the American Association of School Administrators, held in Atlantic City, N.J. Mr. McGrath presently is executive officer, Institute of Higher Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

ADDRESS BY EARL J. MCGRATH

The able executive secretary of the American Association of School Administrators in extending the invitation to speak on this program stated, "We are not interested in anyone winning a debate." It was easy to accept his implied admonition to be constructive. Anyone who takes the view that there should not be a national board of education, has a professional and a moral responsibility to make an alternative proposal for strengthening the position of education in the Federal structure and in the country at large.

Accordingly, my remarks will be divided into two parts, the first setting forth my objections to a National Board of Education; the second, proposing a different educational structure within the executive branch of the Government which, in my judgment, would better serve the interests of the whole enterprise of American education. The latter objective, namely, the improvement and strengthening of our educational system animates every though I have to express on this subject. I am unconcerned about the status or the prestige, as such, of local, State, or National educational authorities or agencies. Nor do I place any value on traditional theories or practices unless their worth can be demonstrated in terms of the educational and social needs of our time.

My approach to the matter under discussion can be clarified, and the merits of my argument validated, by an exposition at the very outset of four assumptions. Time does not permit a full presentation of the facts needed to justify these premises, but fortunately they have been elaborately set forth in the professional literature.

My first assumption is that to a very large degree, local as well as State control of education should continue, indeed be improved. I say to a degree because it is obvious that the States have increasingly assumed control over local educational policy and practice. This centralization of authority will unquestionably be extended with real advantages to our educational system. Moreover, national accrediting agencies and voluntary professional associations are increasingly determining State and local educational practice. Their influence may not be so direct and binding as a State law, or a regulation of the State department of education, but the end result is essentially the same. When the AASA establishes a national policy which excludes from membership all who do not possess certain educational qualifications, this action eventually has the coercive effect of law on those who aspire to local administrative posts. I am confident, too, that the results of curricular studies and recommendations made at the national level, either by voluntary associations or by the U.S. Office of Education, regardless of their intentions, will have a forceful influence on State and local practice, as indeed they already have had. In the main, however, State authorities will continue to be the dominant agency in establishing policy and practice in the public school system.

My second premise is that the educational enterprise of the United States is woefully inadequate. I do not wish to associate myself with the ill-informed critics both within and outside the profession whose statements confuse our people about, and sometimes undermine their faith in, American education. Recognizing existing inadequacies from the kindergarten through the graduate school, I wish, nevertheless, to affirm my conviction that for a free, democratic society of the type we treasure, ours is the best educational system in the world. Unlike some of our countrymen who do not seem fully to recognize that education both reflects and shapes a culture, I do not wish to emulate or be governed by Russian educational standards and practices.

But in terms of our own national purpose and needs today and tomorrow, our public schools and institutions of higher education are not what they should be. Anyone who has heard or read the testimony of representatives of the National Education Association, the American Council on Education, and other national bodies before committees of the Congress, recognizes the disturbing truth of this statement. We have too few teachers, many at all levels are inadequately prepared, there is a continuing shortage of classrooms and other physical facilities, antiquated courses of study and textbooks are not uncommon, and the Nation suffers from a dangerous shortage of engineers, mathematicians, nurses, accountants, technicians, and other professional and semiprofessional workers.

My third premise is that the Federal Government is now and long has been deeply involved in the whole national educational effort. Though this involvement reaches back to the early days of the Republic, in recent years it has undergone unprecedented expansion. Yet, no one knows the full extent of Federal educational activity. It is heartening to note the establishment of a committee under Congresswoman EDITH GREEN, of Oregon, to make a detailed and comprehensive review of educational activities in all branches of the Government. It is pertinent to the present discussion to observe that if education had been given a stronger position in the executive branch with broad responsibility for giving general oversight to the educational operations of the Government, the facts Mrs. GREEN's committee will now assemble would routinely have been available to the Congress and the public at large. In spite of the fact that the information is not current some notion of the magnitude of the Government's operations in education can be obtained from a report of a House committee headed by the Honorable Graham Barden a few years ago. Using the full influence of his office, Congressman Barden finally extracted from the various governmental departments reports on expenditures for various types of educational activities. The total in 1953 amounted to over $3½ billion. The relatively weak position of the U.S. Office of Education in this large and complicated enterprise can be inferred from the fact that of this large sum, the funds expended through the Office amounted to only $225 million, and its own operating budget was about $3 million. The argument as to whether the Federal Government should actively participate in and support education is obviously anachronistic and delusive. But how these activities have been, are now, and how they should be administered are reasonable and unavoidable questions to which I wish to return.

The fourth and last premise can be quickly and simply stated. The large educational activities of the Federal Government, already referred to, will, and should, be greatly expanded in the immediate future. Whether we like it or not the Federal Government will be establishing new programs and policies affecting all branches and levels of American education.

Within the framework of these four assumptions, I wish now to examine the soundness of the proposal for a National Board of Education. Though I recognize that the establishment of such a body might lead to some improvements in our educational system, far better results would, in my judgment, be accomplished more quickly by the enhancement and strengthening of the present educational arm of the Federal

Government within our bipartisan political structure.

I wish to make three points in opposition to the National Board. The first stems from experiences of more than 4 years as U.S. Commissioner of Education. As my association with politicians of both major political parties increased, with notable exceptions, my respect for the elected representatives of the people both in the legislative and the executive branches of the government grew. Though my own personal views on education, and I may add on politics, often differed basically from some of theirs, I felt that as a group they tried to reconcile the diverse and often conflicting interests of their constituencies in terms of the national welfare as they in good conscience saw it. Especially in respect to education I found them generally high minded and free from any desire or willingness to interfere with our traditions of State and local control, or with the internal management of the Office of Education. I wish I could say that all individuals and groups within the profession had observed a similar hands-off policy with respect to the administration of the office as did the elected and appointed officers of government, but I could not honestly make such a statement.

In regard to immunity from partisan political interference, anyone familiar with the history and current status of State and local boards knows that many have been the unwilling victims of, or the voluntary participants in, political domination of educational policies and practices. I would, therefore, be fearful that a board composed of a few citizens would be no less susceptible to the influence of powerful professional or political groups than the hundreds of officers of government broadly representative of and directly responsible to the whole people. Unless our entire complex of free political institutions, with its built-in balance of powers disintegrates, I have no fear that politicians will want to try or could succeed in prostituting the work of the U.S. Office of Education to political purposes, in controlling American education, or in dominating the thinking of our people through Federal usurpation of State and local educational responsibility.

Secondly, I object to the Board because its establishment would rest on a false and inherently dangerous analogy. The mere success of State and local educational authorities as effective instruments of public policy does not prove the desirability of a similar structure at the national level. The analogy is basically defective. The legal control of education within the States and local communities is placed in boards of education who delegate administrative jurisdiction to their apponted officers. To advocate a comparable national agency is logically tantamount to proposing similar powers and responsbilities for such a body created by the Federal Government. State or local boards of education properly exercise control over a great variety of matters which determine the character and the quality of American education, a type of control our people properly do not want at the Federal level. These boards set and enforce standards for the preparation of teachers, they usually finally approve the selection of the textbooks used, often they determine the amount of money to be spent for the schools, they decide the purposes for which these funds are to be usd, they determine the type of curriculum to be offered, the types of school buildings to be erected, and a host of other matters which directly or indirectly shape American education.

The Federal Government, except in its own programs such as those in the Military Establishment, does not, and should not have such responsibilities. In the effort to protect State and local autonomy, the sponsors of virtually every piece of national educational legislation include language which specifically prohibits any officer of the Government from interfering in the functions of State and local authorities. In principle they reject the idea that a national body should control and administer local schools with all that it implies. The National Board, therefore, conflicts with our basic educational and political traditions.

Moreover, the position of the Commissoner of Education is not analogous to that of the State and local superintendent of schools. His functions and the office he administers are different and should remain so. He is not and should not be, the executive officer of a national board which operates a public school system, a board which selects textbooks, appoints teachers, establishes basic educational policy in the geographical area it represents, as is the case with State and local boards. To establish a National Board to do these things and to have that Board appoint a Commissioner of Education, would be to overturn our most deep-seated practices. I can understand how a citizen interested in imposing countrywide educational standards and practices might espouse a National Board having the necessary powers to do so, but I cannot see how members of the profession who openly oppose any such form of Federal control can advocate such a plan.

I can, however, see the need for an advisory body, representative of educational and lay groups in all sections of the Nation, to take long-range views of America's needs for various types of education and to advise the Government as well as our people generally concerning the steps which ought to be taken to meet these needs. This body ought not legislate educational policies, nor ought it impose its views on the officers of Government, except as public opinion would support its recommendations. It ought to deliberate periodically on large educational issues and problems and recommend well-considered courses of action within the Federal Government, in the States, and among private agencies. One device to achieve these goals might be a National Educational Assembly convoked every 5 years by the President of the United States. Each State Governor could be asked to name one educator and one layman to this conference. The President might also name a small number of additional persons from the country at large. The chairman of the Assembly should be the U.S. Commissioner of Education who, with the assistance of his staff and State educational authorities ought to make up the agenda, have working papers prepared, and publish the proceedings. Such a quinquennial conference would focus the attention of Americans on the condition of their total educational enterprise. It would also enlist public support for the future development of educational policies in the Federal Government. It would presumably set forth educational goals toward which the whole Nation could move during the 5-year periods between meetings of the Assembly. Without establishing policies either in the Federal Government or in the States or private educational institutions, this body would nevertheless provide a powerful cooperative mechanism to advance the interests of American education within the framework of our educational and political philosophy.

Thirdly and lastly, there are almost insuperable practical difficulties inherent in the plan for a National Board. Such a group of prominent citizens scattered throughout the country would be able to meet only for a few days, three or four times a year. Hence, even if theoretically desirable the plan would be practically unsatisfactory. For a long time Government educational policy will be in a constant state of vigorous discussion and formulation. The issues will be complex, the forces at work diversified and strong, the financial involvement substantial. Hence, the necessary educational decisions in the years ahead will be concerned with large and significant policies. In the main they will not be the type of administrative decisions a Commissioner of Education could legally make under the general supervision of a National Board. They will inevitably involve complicated and almost daily communications at the Presidential, Cabinet, or congressional levels. These activities can only be carried on effectively by an officer of the Government who occupies the highest possible rank and who can independently exercise his professional judgment within the political realities of the times. He could not possibly anticipate the complex questions which will arise and thus obtain the advance approval of a board in official session; nor could he canvass opinions in time to make them useful.

No President of whatever party will or should be willing to delegate these responsibilities with which the fate of the Nation is so intimately associated to a board of men and women, or its executive officer, however nonpartisan these persons might be in their views. The executive branch has general responsibility for the management and supervision of all governmental activities. It must report to the people on its trusteeship. It cannot fairly be held accountable for policies over which, as in the case of a National Board of Education, or its Commissioner of Education, it would have little or no control.

The advocates of the National Board properly insist that the Commissioner of Education must be a person who exhibits the highest professional standards in the discharge of his duties. But to operate at this high professional level, it is argued that he must be protected from political influences through appointment by a National Board. I have know personally and professionally every Commissioner of Education from the days of Claxton who took office more than 50 years ago. I believe the record shows that in terms of personal integrity, professional competence, public dedication, and independence from political influence they rank very high, certainly as high in these qualities of mind and character as their contemporaries appointed by boards of education. There is little merit to the argument, therefore, that a Commissioner need be appointed by a Board rather than by the President of the United States to guarantee either professional competence, personal integrity, or resistance to improper political influence.

In appraising the effectiveness of a National Board the experiences of other such bodies in Washington ought to be considered. When they have been outside the central structure and executive lines of authority of the Government they have usually been weak and powerless in achieving their purposes. Such bodies have difficulty in attracting the political support which in the last analysis, through the mechanism of the budget, determines their very existence and the effectiveness of their programs. The National Science Foundation illustrates the point. It was not until forces from outside, namely the scientific successes of Russia, increased its prominence on the national scene that this agency was able to get the type of financial support it had sought for so many years. But more importantly it should be observed that when the critical situation arose in regard to the scientific activities of the Government, the President appointed a scientist to advise the executive branch and the Congress.

One of the most serious handicaps under which the U.S. Office of Education has labored through the years has been its low standing in the family of Government departments. To remove it still further from direct contact with the President and his

Cabinet by making the U.S. Commissioner of Education responsible to a Board rather than to the Executive would only lower its status and reduce its already limited influence.

I now turn to what I consider to be realistically constructive proposals for enhancing and strengthening the position of education in the Federal Government, and for preparing our Nation to meet the sobering educational problems of the future. I make the assumption that the traditional information gathering and dispensing functions of the U.S. Office of Education, however useful they may continue to be, represent a limited, outmoded, and unimaginative conception of the work of this agency totally inadequate to our needs. The Nation requires an educational branch suitably staffed, equipped, and financed to take greater responsibility in dealing with the enormous complex of current American educational problems. In cooperation with State and local educational authorities and the voluntary national associations, the Office of Education ought to be enabled to assume leadership, in identifying, considering, and proposing solutions for the problems which have to be treated on a national scale if we are to remain domestically prosperous and internationally strong. Some of these problems relate to the condition of education within the several States and communities, but others involve matters which extend far beyond their borders or jurisdiction.

The full educational implications, for example, of recent scientific developments on the international or even interorbital stage have not yet been seen. But it is already obvious that the emerging national problems can only be treated on a national scale and with the involvement of the Federal Government where the pertinent and often classified information exists. Likewise the worldwide educational developments under the Agency for International Development and other internationally operative agencies require national consideration and Federal action. In these international areas, actions are of necessity already being taken, often, however, with little overall planing which involves the U.S. Office of Education, to say nothing of the thousands of school systems and institutions of higher education. There are equally urgent and important domestic educational problems which, because of the position of education in the Federal structure, are not approached and handled in accordance with well-considered national plans and policies. No National Board of Education, however well appointed and supported could possibly deal promptly and effectively with these urgent matters which will be followed in quick succession by others no less demanding.

My main argument, therefore, is that instead of the proposed National Board with almost complete autonomy outside of the normal political chanels of responsible government, we need a well organized, staffed, and supported educational branch at the highest possible level within the Government. I strongly urge a closer relationship at the top between our officials responsible for educational planning and operations, the other ranking officers in the several departments, and the political representatives of our people. Without such a strengthened position education will go on being a stepchild in Government, disregarded, ill-fed, and hence so underdeveloped that it cannot possibly assume the responsibilities the times require.

To a degree, the present condition of American education is the result of the inconspicuous and uninfluential position of education in the Federal structure. One has only to examine the Federal budget to gain an assessment of the place of education among our governmental concerns. Observe, for example, that expenditures for military activities in the proposed budget to become effective in July 1962 amount to $55 billion. The total recommended appropriation for the entire Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is $5.3 billion. For education alone it is this year about $550 million. If the monotonous history of recent years is repeated the appropriations for education in fiscal 1963 will fall below the recommended sums. To a degree, these arresting budgetary contrasts represent fiscal policies determined by international and military events in the world over which we have no control. Nevertheless, in a nation with a gross national product of more than half a trillion dollars the proportionate allocation of our expenditures for social services, including education, reveal the concern of the Federal Government for various phases of our national life.

Education patently deserves a more prominent place in the whole texture of American life. The very welfare of the Nation demands a more, not a less, influential position for education in the Federal structure, as indeed do all the other Government functions related to the strengthening, the improvement, and the betterment of the lives of our people. These activities are largely concentrated in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

If it were a politically realistic proposal, I would recommend that the head of the educational branch of the Government be made an independent officer with direct access to the President through Cabinet rank. Since I do not consider this goal realizable at present, I suggest a structure comparable to the Department of Defense with a top Secretary, and under him a Secretary of Education, a Secretary of Health, and a Secretary of Welfare. All three of the present constituent branches of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would thus be placed in a relative position more in keeping with the human values which ought to dominate American life. Education especially would thus be raised to a place of greater dignity and more prestige, but, most importantly, of greater capacity to assume leadership cooperatively with the several States and the other branches of Government in the improvement of all American education. I have great respect for, and I count among my closest friends, many who advocate a separate lay board of education to reach these goals with which our destiny as a people are indissolubly connected. In all sincerity, however, I believe their proposal to be theoretically unsound, politically unrealistic, practically inoperable, and nationally inadequate.

I hope that this necessarily limited development of this subject will, nevertheless, be convincing to members of the profession and laymen alike. I trust I have been able to demonstrate that the position of education ought to be strengthened within the central structure of the Government and not moved outside to fend for itself with the sole support of nine citizens, however distinguished, competent, and self-effacing in the discharge of their duties. American society and American education have come of age. Our present national educational planning and operation do not reflect this fact. If as a people we are to realize our full potential at home and in the larger society of nations we will need an invigorated educational system with a clearer sense of direction. A national board will, in my judgment, not be able to meet the educational challenges of our time. A secretaryship of education, capable of leading in national planning and in advising on legislation, and with sufficient status and influence to gain public support for educational development consistent with the responsibilities of the hour, will better serve our national needs than a lay board of education.

How Far Can Government Go in Managing Free Enterprise?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, there is a real need today for emphasizing the importance of individual initiative, creativity and just plain get-up-and-go. This is only too clear when we contemplate the pellmell advance of collectivism in our Nation.

Government bureaucracy must not be allowed to destroy the individual freedom which is so very vital to the survival of our free enterprise economy. We must begin now to reduce the amount of control our Federal Government has over private businesses.

What I am saying is clearly stated in a Kohler of Kohler advertisement entitled "Snow Shovelers: The Last Vestiges of Free Enterprise," which appeared in the February 27, 1962, edition of National Review. I ask that the advertisement be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press]

SNOW SHOVELERS: THE LAST VESTIGES OF FREE ENTERPRISE?

High time it is for the Federal Government to take measures to regulate the shoveling of snow. Just last week, when snow blanketed the city there were hundreds of young boys going from home to home seeking to remove snow from sidewalks. These youngsters are the last vestiges of free enterprise in the United States and steps should be taken to remove this blot from the American scene. These boys, ranging from little fellows of 6 and 7 to teenagers, apparently do not know that they are the victims of exploitation.

During that recent snow, it was easily seen there was an overabundance of youths willing to shovel the downfall from the walks. Procedures should be established to eliminate such situations. A benevolent Federal Government should take steps to see that there is sufficient snow for all boys to shovel. (More than that, the Government, if it really wants to woo tomorrow's voters, should provide free shovels for these snow shovelers.)

In case there was a general heavy snowfall throughout the entire Nation, the Federal Government (this would probably be a Cabinet post with some benevolent soul in charge of snow jobs) could provide for the storage of surplus snow at strategic points. During years when snowfall was at a minimum, this vast surplus of snow could be shipped to various areas of the country, where snow was not available, so it could be shoveled by young boys.

A system of penalties would be devised which would require youths shoveling snow in excess of their allotment to forfeit part of the pay they received for their work.

In this day and age it is not fair to permit boys who are ambitious to shovel snow and be paid for it while other youths remain home and watch television and are not paid for it. It is strange that in this field the New Frontier has not yet taken steps to set up at least a snow corps. Unless this free enterprise idea demonstrated by unregulated snow shovelers is stamped out, the United

States is liable to wake up one day and find that someone will be advocating the encouragement of free enterprise by our National Government.

Hans A. Bethe at Cornell University—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, below is the second half of a lecture presented by Prof. Hans A. Bethe at Cornell University on January 5, 1962. It presents an idea for the first steps one might reasonably take which lead away from the self-defeating dangers of the arms race. Those interested in the first half of this widely reported speech will find it reproduced in the Appendix of yesterday's RECORD:

HANS A. BETHE AT CORNELL UNIVERSITY—II

5. RESTRAINT AND ARMS LIMITATION

I have told you about many of the strategic concepts of our Government, and I suppose you knew much of this before. But it is important to see the complete picture, and to see how it fits together. By looking at one aspect only, be it the Russian tests or the AICBM, we may be completely misled. As a whole, the picture appears to me one of increasing strength and security, but with ever-present danger.

The probability of war is greatly reduced once the stable deterrent is established. Then restraint can be used in responding to an accidental attack by one enemy missile. Restraint can also be used in the number of missiles deployed on each side. Most important, even during the war, restraint can be used in the number of missiles which are actually fired, because the remainder will still be secure.

Such restraint is absolutely essential. Physically each side is capable of destroying the other virtually completely, inflicting 50 percent casualties, or 80 or 90. Only self-imposed restraint can limit the destruction. The warmaking capability would be the hardest to destroy. We must learn again not to use our full strength. This is frustrating as was shown by the Korea example. But it is the only way to avoid complete catastrophe. We must learn to be satisfied, in case of a war as well as in peace, with partial success. This was the rule in wars in the Middle Ages and to the end of the 18th century. Only in the last 150 years have wars been fought to unconditional surrender. The power situation no longer permits such a goal and we must psychologically get used to this situation.

It is impossible to have everything at the same time. If there are two enemy camps of approximately equal strength, you cannot at the same time have security against a surprise attack, and a counterforce strategy. We are building a safe retaliatory force, we hope the Russians will do the same so that they become less nervous. This means necessarily that the idea of a counterforce will have to be abandoned.

Likewise, the doctrine of massive retaliation is dead. Strategic forces are extremely important and must be strong enough to deter strategic attack by the other side. But they can only serve this purpose. They cannot and should not serve to deter small wars, nor to compensate for a weakness in capability to fight small wars.

I have said that it is necessary to use restraint at all stages. It is of course unknown whether the other side will also use restraint. It is even more difficult to guarantee that either side would continue to use restraint in case of war. It is much better to impose restraint in peacetime by concluding a treaty on strict limitation of armaments, enforced by inspection. Then if war should come in spite of the deterrent it would not be so completely disastrous.

6. THE TEST BAN

The breakdown of the test ban negotiations is not a good omen for disarmament. After 3 years of negotiations no treaty was concluded. However, we should not accuse the Russians of breaking an agreement by their resumption of tests. No agreement has been concluded; in fact the United States insisted repeatedly that the moratorium was temporary and could be terminated any day.

Nevertheless the Russian procedure showed bad faith. Their test series was so elaborate that it must have been prepared for many months, perhaps longer. It is likely that they had started preparations by March when the test ban conference reconvened in Geneva; thus they negotiated for 6 months in bad faith. They did so at the time when we were showing most clearly by our attitude and proposals at Geneva that we were sincerely interested in a test ban and willing to meet the Russian political demands on the control of a test ban more than halfway.

There has not been any evidence that the Russians cheated by testing during the moratorium. However, they have shown by the manner of their resumption that they will act in any manner which suits their purpose, at least as long as there are no definite legal agreements to the contrary. If we conclude an agreement with them it is important to devise it in such a way that it will be an advantage to them as well as to us to keep the agreement.

A great mistake during the test ban negotiations was that we were trying to put the entire burden on technical devices to detect violations. There was no broad consideration of the advantage of concluding the test ban agreement and there was hardly any consideration of the political implications. One of the best results of the negotiations was that we recognized our own deficiencies and that we set up the U.S. Disarmament Agency to deal in a coherent fashion with all political, military, and technical problems of disarmament.

The test ban as such is in my opinion no longer a desirable goal to pursue. I had two main intentions in advocating the ban, namely (1) to stabilize the technical advantage which the United States still possessed in 1958 in nuclear weapons, and (2) to obtain an inspection system which could be a precedent and an example for the inspection of future disarmament treaties. Neither of these aims can any longer be realized.

On the other hand the value of tests has been grossly exaggerated. We already know so much about atomic weapons that there is very little more to learn. We have weapons of all sizes, for all reasonable military purposes. Only relatively minor improvements can be made in the yield of weapons for a given weight. After the extensive Russian test series in which they attempted to catch up to our technology it is reasonable that we also should test those designs which we have developed in the laboratory and which fit into our strategic plans, especially warheads for Minuteman and Polaris. There are a few other tests that make sense for us, but I do not believe that nuclear testing is the endless frontier that some people seem to see in it.

7. ELIMINATION OF NUCLEAR STOCKPILES

If the test ban is no longer a desirable field of disarmament, what is? One area which has been discussed is a cut-off production of fissible material and a reduction of nuclear weapons stockpiles. I do not believe that these are effective measures. The United States and the U.S.S.R. have enough fissile material to supply a huge strategic force and more. Nuclear weapons are rather small, can be stored almost anywhere, and are hard to find even if one has complete access to a country. Control of fissile material would have been possible in 1946 when we proposed the Baruch plan which would have put all production of such material in the hands of an international authority. Even now, some schemes could be devised to control fissile materials but they will only be effective together with other steps of disarmament.

8. ARMS CONTROL

To my mind the most promising and the most important area to start disarmament is in strategic delivery vehicles, i.e., large bomber planes and long-range missiles. These are the greatest threat, and because of their large size they are easy to find once you have access to a country. As I have explained earlier, in the era of an invulnerable deterrent it is no longer necessary to have large numbers of such vehicles. At the present time we have about 500 B-52's, nearly 1,000 B-47's, and we are likely to have about 1,000 long-range missiles in a few years. It seems to me entirely safe to reduce the force to a few hundred invulnerable missiles, each carrying about 1 megaton, in contrast to the 10 megaton or more which can be carried by large planes. This would be an enormous reduction of the threat to civilization posed by nuclear weapons.

Drastic reduction of the number of missiles and planes is possible if we can be sure that the other side has made a similar reduction. This brings us to the all-important problem of inspection. In September, in a very important document, Mr. McCloy of the United States and Mr. Zorin of the U.S.S.R. agreed on principles of disarmament. These principles included that of inspection. However, the two sides did not agree on the kind of inspection needed. The Russians have offered to let us witness the destruction of any item of armament which they eliminate, according to a disarmament treaty. We, on the other hand, insist that we must know the amount of armaments remaining, not the amount destroyed. This is very essential because we do not know actually the number of weapons the Russians now possess, and with their type of inspection we could not guard against new weapons production.

The Russians also have good reason for their point of view. As long as most of their delivery vehicles are soft, i.e., planes or missiles above ground, we could destroy these by a surprise attack if we knew their exact location. This indeed is the meaning of the counterforce strategy which I have discussed and which was long espoused publicly by the U.S. Air Force. While it is now gradually becoming less popular, the Russians cannot feel sure that we have given it up. In this situation they naturally wish to preserve one of their greatest military assets, the secrecy of the location of most of their striking force.

The best way out of this impasse has been suggested by Professor Sohn of the Harvard Law School. According to this plan, each of the two major countries, Russia and the United States, divides its territory into a number of zones—let us say 20—of approximately equal military importance, and gives a map of the zones to the other country. Then each country declares the number of strategic weapons in each zone but not their

exact location. Then the other country picks one of the zones, and has the right to inspect this one zone in all detail. In this way the initial declaration can be verified, and at the same time 95 percent of each country is still secret. After some time, let us say half a year, a new declaration must be made, and another zone will be opened. The total number of weapons in all zones would be reduced according to an agreed schedule. After a while, other countries would participate in this scheme, and other armaments than strategic delivery vehicles would be included.

An important question is whether a plan of this kind would be acceptable to the U.S.S.R. Private conversations with a few Russian scientists and social scientists seem encouraging, although such conversations may not mean very much in the light of power politics.

Drastic reduction of strategic forces by treaty, and with inspection of the Sohn type, seems to me our best hope of stopping the arms race. To start on this road both sides have to change their attitude considerably.

The United States will need to renounce the policy of massive retaliation, i.e., of applying a strategic threat against peripheral war. To make this possible without yielding to the Communists it will be necessary to build up our conventional forces. President Kennedy has said we must have an alternative to nuclear holocaust or surrender. A buildup of conventional military forces is an essential part of disarmament in the nuclear area. This must be realized and our young men as well as those of Western Europe must be willing to serve in the army, with the understanding that this decreases the risk of all-out thermonuclear war. Perhaps we shall need tactical nuclear weapons for small wars, at least for some time, but with the idea of eliminating them ultimately. The ground forces will probably have higher morale once the strategic threat is diminished, which would make them a more important part of our Military Establishment.

The Russians will have to open their country to inspection by the Disarmament Authority. They will have to relinquish high-sounding phrases about complete disarmament in favor of meaningful limited steps. They will also need to give up hopes of ultimate military superiority which, though far in the future, they might achieve in a continued arms race.

Unfortunately we must learn from the Russian conduct during the test ban negotiations to be careful during future negotiations on arms limitation. Until the negotiations are successfully concluded, and the treaty including inspection has begun to operate, we must keep up our strategic forces and other military capability. It is important for the people to understand the logic in this paradox, namely that we must keep fully armed while at the same time working hard for controlled, bilateral, and substantial reductions in armaments.

9. GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT

The U.S.S.R. has coined this phrase. It has been accepted as an ultimate goal by both sides in the McCloy-Zorin agreement. While I agree to this as an idea it seems to me that many prerequisites must be fulfilled before we can reach complete disarmament. Most important, we need means to settle disputes other than by war. For this purpose we must strengthen world law and make it a habit to submit all disputes to the International Court at the Hague. The United States does not have a good record; it is urgent that the Senate repeal the Connolly amendment which provides that the United States will not be bound by decisions of the Hague Court unless we choose to. Naturally the U.S.S.R. would also have to recognize the Court.

The recognition of world law would clearly weaken national sovereignty, and such weakening runs counter to cherished beliefs of the U.S.S.R. There will have to be an international police force, stronger than the armed forces of any particular country or any likely combination of countries. The important question is who controls this international force? It might be very dangerous to have this force be a power on its own.

These are just a few of the many problems which must be solved before we can have complete disarmament. I do not profess to know the solutions to these. It is clear that it will be very difficult to get agreement between the United States and the U.S.S.R. on these problems, and on the organization of a completely disarmed world. We cannot wait until all these matters are agreed upon before we begin to stop the arms race but methods for making such a beginning can be devised. In the meantime we must remember that the most important competition between us and the Russians is not in armaments but in the peaceful development of underdeveloped countries.

Investigation of Banking Practices of Nonscheduled Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, on February 26, 1962, I introduced House Resolution 551, the purpose of which is to provide for a congressional investigation of the banking practices of supplemental or nonscheduled airlines. It is my hope that the resolution will be assigned to the House Banking and Currency Committee.

Under unanimous consent, I include the resolution in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Whereas there has recently occurred in the supplemental airline industry, three tragic airplane crashes, namely:

1. Arctic Pacific Air Lines on October 29, 1960, at Toledo, Ohio, killing twenty passengers and a crew of two and injuring and maiming another twenty-five passengers. Sixteen of the deceased and twenty-two of the injured were young college football players from the California Polytechnic State College, San Luis Obispo, California.

2. President Airlines, Incorporated, on September 10, 1961, at Shannon, Ireland, killing seventy-seven passengers and six crewmembers. The deceased were sixty-five Germans, eight Austrians, two Dutch, and two Swiss representatives of those countries traveling to the United States to study our agricultural methods.

3. Imperial Airlines, Incorporated, on November 8, 1961, at Richmond, Virginia, killing seventy-four passengers and three crewmembers. The deceased passengers were young United States Army recruits on their way to be trained for service in our Armed Forces; and

Whereas investigations following these crashes reveal practices and conditions of maintenance, training, and operations of these airlines that are deplorable and intolerable; and

Whereas these deplorable and intolerable practices and conditions germinate in the financial environment of said airlines and their owners; and

Whereas report numbered 41, Eighty-seventh Congress, second session, of the House Armed Services Special Subcommittee investigating the Imperial crash states on page 3101 that little if any attention was given by the Civil Aeronautics Board or the Federal Aviation Agency to the economic capacity of the carrier to sustain operations; and

Whereas the records of the Civil Aeronautics Board disclose that of twenty certificated supplemental airlines, six are bankrupt and fourteen others show large deficits of operating capital and net worth—the House Armed Services Special Subcommittee Report Numbered 41, Eighty-seventh Congress, second session, pages 2887 to 2889, states in part:

1. Airline Transport Carriers, Incorporated, doing business as California Hawaiian Airlines:

Earned surplus (deficit)	$167,000
Net worth (deficit)	99,800

2. American Flyers Airline Corporation:

Current liabilities	$252,500
Current assets	107,500
Working capital (deficit)	145,000
Earned surplus (deficit)	49,700
Net worth (deficit)	44,700

3. Associated Air Transport, Incorporated:

Current liabilities	$354,000
Current assets	152,000
Working capital (deficit)	202,000
Earned surplus (deficit)	162,500
Capital surplus (deficit)	12,400
Net worth (deficit)	174,000

4. Coastal Air Lines:

Current liabilities	$29,700
Current assets	11,200
Working capital (deficit)	18,500
Earned surplus (deficit)	64,400
Net worth (deficit)	55,900

5. Modern Air Transport, Incorporated:

Current liabilities	$349,600
Current assets	152,500
Working capital (deficit)	197,100
Earned surplus (deficit)	38,300
Net worth (deficit)	37,300

6. Overseas National Airways:

Current liabilities	$2,848,000
Current assets	1,223,000
Working capital (deficit)	1,625,000
Earned surplus (deficit)	987,400
Net worth (deficit)	887,400

7. President Airlines, Incorporated (testimony of Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania):

"This is the company which stranded the Chicago charter group at Shannon Airport, Ireland, and the Los Angeles charter group in London last fall. As I recall, the press reported the stranding at Shannon as due to refusal of the airport authorities to release the plane until payment of delinquent landing fees and fuel and oil bills.

"On September 10, 1961, a President plane crashed on takeoff at Shannon, killing eighty-three persons.

"To the best of my knowledge, the Civil Aeronautics Board has not revoked the certificate of this carrier."

8. Saturn Airways, Incorporated:

Current liabilities	$720,900
Current assets	69,000
Working capital (deficit)	605,200

9. Sourdough:

Current liabilities	$12,000
Current assets	6,900
Working capital (deficit)	5,100

10. Standard Airways, Incorporated:

Current liabilities	$387,000
Current assets	251,000
Working capital (deficit)	136,500
Earned surplus (deficit)	23,500

11. Stewart Air Service (testimony of Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania):

"Current assets reported by the carrier as minus $2,170 with 'cash on hand' of minus $3,251. I have never heard of having an asset that is a minus dollar amount. Current liabilities are $70,594, for a working capital deficit of, I gather, $72,764."

12. United States Overseas Airlines, Incorporated:

Current liabilities	$3,422,500
Current assets	1,526,000
Working capital (deficit)	1,896,000
Earned surplus (deficit)	1,714,000
Net worth (deficit)	1,421,700

13. Vance Roberts (testimony of Honorable Francis E. Walter, Democrat, Pennsylvania):

"This appears to be a carrier of size comparable to Sourdough. Current assets are only $2,942, with total assets only $41,838."

14. World Wide Airlines, Incorporated:

Current liabilities	$110,700
Current assets	48,200
Working capital (deficit)	62,500
Earned surplus (deficit)	238,700
Net worth (deficit)	49,400

Whereas the House Armed Services Subcommittee report numbered 41, Eighty-seventh Congress, second session, states on page 3107 that Imperial Airlines' violations of Civil Aeronautics Board regulations were in the economic area by the use of misleading financial statements and by the filing of false statements with the Board according to the testimony under oath of the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, Alan S. Boyd; and

Whereas these companies could not exist for long if the above deficit balance sheets and financial status reported to the Civil Aeronautics Board were true; and

Whereas in light of the House Armed Services Special Subcommittee Report Numbered 41, Eighty-seventh Congress, second session, which states on page 3089 that the Federal Aviation Agency testified: "Our observations of the company's thirteen years of operations, and our intensive inspections following the recent accident indicate that the company tended to operate at all times with the very minimum of facilities and personnel for operations, training, and maintenance necessary to meet our safety standards" it is quite obvious that some undisclosed financial arrangements keep these airlines operating at dangerously low standards of safety and performance for the purpose of greater profits; and

Whereas there is evidence at hand that an investigation of the financial structure and banking practices of supplemental airlines will reveal the existence of a banking system which operates in defiance of the banking laws and extracts hundreds of thousands of dollars of cash and credit from banks for the operation of supplemental airlines by illegal arrangements of bank officials with airlines owners; and

Whereas this same illegal system has been worked by the officials of two different banks with the owners of two different airlines, it is evident that there is a system of illegal banking transactions among supplemental airlines which must be investigated for the purpose of making laws to prevent such practices; and

Whereas the House Armed Services Special Subcommittee Report Numbered 41, Eighty-seventh Congress, second session, on page 3101 emphasizes the "importance of having an industry that has integrity, not in a minimum degree but in a maximum degree" and the committee asks, "What can the Congress do to bring about this necessary degree of integrity in the supplemental air carrier industry?"; and

Whereas Congress on July 14, 1960, acting in good faith to save the airlines but under deadline conditions resulting from the decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in the case of United Air Lines, and others, against Civil Aeronautics Board (108 U.S. Ct. of Appeals, D.C.), continued the operation of these supplemental airlines for twenty months; and

Whereas four months thereafter a plane of the defunct Artic Pacific Air Lines crashed at Toledo, Ohio, killing and maiming members of the California Polytechnic College football team; and

Whereas there is pending in the Congress, S. 1969, a bill which, among other things, grants grandfather operating rights to the supplemental airlines listed above: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Banking and Currency Committee of the House forthwith conduct an investigation into the financial conditions and banking practices of banks making loans to and/or containing the bank accounts of the supplemental airlines; and be it further

Resolved, That the House defer and suspend action on any legislation permitting or authorizing the operation of supplemental airlines until the termination of such investigation.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution, the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records correspondence, memorandums, papers and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

Europe Is the Rising Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the second session of this Congress is moving along rapidly. Some legislation already has passed the House of Representatives, but the Congress has yet to face the real problems that affect our Nation.

In my opinion, one of the overriding issues is whether or not Congress will pass a real balanced budget. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, our Government must put its fiscal house in order if America is to keep its leadership in world affairs.

Recently, I read an article that appeared in the London Sunday Times under the byline of its city editor. I believe it represents an opinion that is growing among those who are familiar with international trade and finance. I believe the Members of Congress will find it informative and provocative.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article in the RECORD.

The article follows:

EUROPE IS NOW THE RISING POWER

I was left with two abiding impressions of my visit to Vienna last fall: One was the extent to which the real power of nations depends upon their economic strength; the other was the complete absence of Communist sympathy in the one part of Eastern Europe which the Russians occupied and then relinquished. Both facts seem to me to have a close bearing on the present world crisis.

First one should look at the implications of the change in economic bargaining power. At every previous International Monetary Fund meeting the dominant power has been the United States. This was not merely because of American voting power, or because the Fund, with its Washington headquarters, is a strongly American-oriented institution. It was because the United States was the great source of money, either for the World Bank, or the IMF itself. For this simple reason the American view almost invariably prevailed.

This year, for the first time, it was the United States which wanted money, and the European powers who had to decide whether to give it. The proposed enlargement of the IMF includes an increase in the supply of dollars, but the IMF already has more dollars than it needs. The new funds which matter, the currencies which will be drawn out first, are the deutschemark, the lira and the French franc.

As a result, the balance of power in the IMF visibly shifted: it was not the Americans but the Europeans who dominated the conference, and of the Europeans the most important were in fact the French. The question that has to be asked is whether this is a temporary, marginal change, or whether it is the first overt sign of a fundamentally new relationship.

The Americans themselves seem to think that it is temporary. They believe that the immense reserve strength of their economy in effect secures their predominance, that when they really need to put the pressure on, Europe will still respond, and that a marginal balance-of-payments deficit—itself much reduced—is a purely temporary phenomenon of secondary significance. They certainly underrate the extent to which the European Economic Community is consciously designed to free Europe from American predominance.

The other view seems much more plausible. Even between 1955 and 1960 the gap in economic power between Europe and the United States has been rapidly reduced. The Common Market is somewhat weaker than the United States in raw materials and somewhat smaller in population, though it will have a population larger than the United States or Russia if Britain enters it. Yet Europe has the advantage of a lower cost basis (including a lower standard of

living) and a well-established pattern of rapid growth.

In economic affairs, therefore, it seems probable that the West is moving from having one great power to having two. Europe will still be the poorer of the two powers, and certainly it will have lower defense expenditure and lower defense potential. Nevertheless, by 1965–70, it is probable that Europe will have reestablished something approaching parity of world influence, and predominant influence in its own area.

The second point that one saw clearly in Vienna is the degree of Russia's failure in Eastern Europe. The Austrians, whose neighbors live under Communist regimes, are, of course, alarmed by the Russian threat—where Londoners are afraid of the H-bomb, the Viennese are afraid of the army. But none of them believes that communism offers a tolerable alternative way of life.

East Germany is the most striking proof of this. The statistics show that East Germany has enjoyed a growth rate broadly comparable to that of West Germany (a reflection which casts some doubt on the simple comparison of rates of economic growth). Yet the Berlin wall in itself shows that the economy of East Germany has failed where that of West Germany has succeeded. Even Ulbricht would not need a wall to keep the rich out of a land of poverty. The failure of communism is not that it cannot produce, but that it does not allow people to consume.

These, therefore, are the economic elements of the present European crisis. The astonishing economic success of Western Europe is removing Europe from the sphere of dependence on the United States: Some part of this dependence still remains for reasons of defense, but the economic dependence has largely disappeared already. At the same time the relative failure to build Eastern Europe into a prosperous economy creates an almost intolerable tension in the Russian satellite empire.

This does, of course, have a very direct bearing on the Berlin crisis. Berlin is still an area in which the Russians can negotiate direct with the United States, in which the old two-power, H-bomb, cold-war balance can determine what bargain will be struck. Even so, the United States has much difficulty in making any concessions which Germany will accept.

This is very probably the last year in which anyone except Europe will be able to negotiate for Europe. Certainly in 2 or 3 years' time Berlin would have to be negotiated between Russia and Europe, and necessarily that means between Russia and Germany. The Russians are pressing on Berlin at least partly because they must negotiate a settlement of Germany, if they can, before the balance of economic power swings any further against them.

In fact, however, economic forces, as Marx himself taught, cannot indefinitely be resisted. Both Russian and American power in Europe is already well past its peak, and each has been in gradual decline for at least 10 years. Another decade of progress in Western Europe will, if peace is maintained, inevitably produce a third world power capable of negotiating on level terms with the other two (whether China will by then be a true world power is somewhat more doubtful).

Eastern Europe, cut off from the mainstream, will almost certainly show many symptoms of political decay, as it did under the Turks. Russia herself will in Europe be an intensely conservative power, as she is already becoming, clinging to a status quo which will look less and less possible to preserve, like the czars before the revolution.

Vienna and Berlin have both this year been prefiguring the future. It is the revival of Europe, for 2,000 years the most powerful of the continents, which is now putting under strain the political system of the world. From the point of view of Russia it is Europe which is the revolutionary force, a revolutionary force created by economic expansion. From the point of view of America it is Europe which is reclaiming an economic equality which had seemed forever lost.

Still the Master

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on this glorious and historic day when we have welcomed and acclaimed a true and humble hero, let us pause and think a moment on one of Colonel Glenn's remarks:

Now we can get rid of some of that automatic equipment and let man take over.

Our committees have already studied the problem of automation. They will study it more. We shall individually have to make legislative decisions about its effect on labor. Certainly, it is a problem; and closing our eyes to it will not make it go away. But last week we were given dramatic proof that the machine is not yet able to replace man in all areas.

In an editorial of last Saturday, the Newark Star-Ledger comments on the colonel's statement in a manner that I think will be of interest to my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

One of the great problems of our time, we are told, is the replacement of man by the machine.

Machines have been dislodging human labor for more than a century, and now, with computers and automation, the process is picking up speed.

Some grim predictions have been made by researchers and theorists, who warn of a future in which social upheaval and mass unemployment will plague the world. And even the present is being called into question by observations such as President Kennedy's recent remark that we must create 25,000 new jobs a week to meet the various existing problems of our Nation's economy.

All in all, it seems likely that the public is beginning to get the message, and that Americans in great numbers are awakening to the threats posed by modern technology.

It is really a very simple idea and, with the proper publicity campaign, it probably could be reduced to an easily grasped slogan about how machines replace men.

But now the picture has been clouded a bit, by none other than Lt. Col. John Glenn and his space capsule.

The most significant technical result of Glenn's flight into orbit, he says, is that the value of human pilots has been shown.

He talks of it in terms of men, machines and replacement, too. And here is how he puts it:

"Now we can get rid of some of that automatic equipment and let man take over."

There are some jobs in a space capsule that are better done by men than by machines, Glenn feels. And the experts in his project agree.

So we might conclude that, although change and dislodgment seem inevitable as science and technology continue to develop new devices, it's far from a simple matter to know who will replace whom. Influential as machines are, it's just possible that man will continue to be the master.

There's a Better Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

During the coming weeks, the House will be studying and debating the administration farm proposals. As we do this I think that it is essential to keep constantly in mind the thinking of that segment of the Nation's economy which this legislation is supposed to help—the farming industry. Because of this I want all of us to have the opportunity to read the following article which appeared in the Farm Journal, a leading and respected farm publication.

The article follows:

THERE'S A BETTER WAY

The chief impression one gets from the Kennedy-Freeman farm program is that it was designed more for consumers and taxpayers than for farmers. It makes pretty good reading in cities. Toward farmers it is amazingly tough: "Take this or else."

Agriculture is in chaos and inefficient says the President, which will be news to most farmers. Two million of them often possess too little skill and managerial ability. Agriculture is costing taxpayers an unconscionable amount, and this can't go on. Voluntary farm programs have been failures. Too many farmers don't participate, and those who do somehow always outwit the Government. Enough of this. Now, by golly, we'll put the feed grain and dairy farmers under compulsory controls, along with the farmers already there. The Government will give them a ticket, as it were, allowing them entry into the farm arena, then it will tell them how much they can farm.

The Secretary of Agriculture will pay them something for the land they retire. He will set their support prices. He will take over from Congress the determination of how many acres of certain crops we'd have, and each farmer would get his historic share. The only way a producer could grow would be to buy another farm, with quota or allotment attached. A young man trying to get started would have one more thing to buy—a quota.

Feed grain acreage would be cut back 20 percent to 25 percent below 1959–60 levels and wheat 20 percent below 1961, the Secretary says, although he could set different figures later.

There's to be a 2-price plan for cotton and a 3-price plan for wheat (one for domestic food, one for export, one for feed). Cotton, rice and tobacco acreage would likely expand.

So goes the administration's thinking. All of this goes into effect if two-thirds of the farmers who vote favor such plans. If more than one-third don't approve:

Wheat and feed grains would get no supports at all. That's right, none. Never before has there been a threat to abolish supports on these crops. Dairymen would probably get supports but sharply cut. Nor is this all. The Secretary would be empowered to dump on the market, at any rate he chose, 10 million tons of CCC feed grains and 200 million bushels of wheat a year.

That's what the administration calls "choices." The President says the program would give farmers "maximum freedom," a claim we'll let farmers judge for themselves. He says it will "increase income." Yet USDA's own estimate is that under such program farm income would go up by only $425 per family, and that not until 1965. Do you think it's worth it? We've done better than that over the last 4 years.

Farm Journal agrees that painful adjustments have to come in feed grains and wheat. But we don't concede that compulsion is the only way, or the best way, to accomplish them. Dairy products are overproduced only 5 percent—we certainly don't need to put dairymen under Government controls to cure that. If the Secretary had not increased supports a year ago we would not have even this much problem. The administration proposes retiring 50 million acres of land, and that's good provided we let farmers do it voluntarily, rather than take the land by decree. Let's retire another 25 to 50 million acres of cropland and we'd have no problem. Farmers could then decide how to farm the rest. Our only failure with this approach has been in not going far enough.

This might cost a half billion dollars a year more than the administration's program, by the time we got done paying the large costs of administering and enforcing the latter. We favor it. We believe Congress would agree that the difference would be worth paying to avoid putting farmers under Government controls no urban citizens are being asked to accept—or would accept. That's not too much to pay to leave farming in farmers' hands.

Plan To Prevent Abuses in Area of Financial Public Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, for several years I have been a member of the Public Relations Society of America. Always I have been proud of the efforts of the society to establish sound, ethical programs in the field of public relations. The society has vigorously moved to prevent bad practices.

As a whole, members of the public relations profession have worked diligently to insure moral practices within their profession.

Mrs. Denny Griswold, the publisher and editor of Public Relations News, the only weekly public relations publication for executives, recommends in the February 12, 1962, issue of this publication a positive program for public relations people to follow in the field of investments. Her program is designed to prevent further abuses in the area of financial public relations.

I include her comments in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under unanimous consent heretofore granted:

Despite the fact that such an informed member of the financial community as Keith Funston, president of the New York Stock Exchange, tells us that he believes instances of stock manipulation by persons identified as public relations professionals will prove to have been few, the situation cannot be ignored. What can be done? We believe:

1. Every public relations executive should take immediate steps to determine that the public relations consulting firm employed by his organization to assist with financial public relations has personnel of extensive experience in the investment field and not simply in the area of general publicity and public relations.

2. Public Relations Society of America should appoint a small committee of experts in the area of financial public relations. They should be men of outstanding reputation. Both financial public relations consultants and financial public relations officers of important companies should be included. The committee's purposes should be to establish a code of fair practices and to intervene, if necessary, in SEC proceedings which tend unjustly to condemn the profession as a whole. And, if such a committee is not permitted to testify at hearings, it should be prepared to counter—and do so energetically—any unfair criticism in statements issued by the Commission.

3. If any member of PRSA is accused by the SEC of having engaged in illegal practices, he should not be judged until after he has been brought to trial and found guilty. If convicted on the basis of anything but a trivial technicality, he should be suspended or expelled, according to the seriousness of his misconduct.

4. If any PRSA member is accused by the SEC of having engaged in unethical but not illegal practices, his case should be carefully reviewed by PRSA. If they SEC charge is found to have been just, the member involved should be severely disciplined. If, on the other hand, the charge is believed unwarranted, PRSA should give the member vigorous and full public endorsement and support.

Col. John Glenn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, at about 1 p.m. today it was my great pleasure and honor to shake the hand of that great American, Col. John Glenn, who challenged the elements of outer space and returned safely back to earth. Unlike his historymaking tour all alone, he visited our National Capital yesterday with his wonderful family, a brave little wife who he introduced to the cheering joint session of Congress, as the rock of the family.

The multitude which gathered along the parade route, who defied wind and rain to do honor to the man, was indeed living testimony to prove once again that, all America can stand united under God in heartfelt thanksgiving. As a member of the subcommittee of appropriation for deficiency requests, I am now more satisfied than ever that I did right in supporting the request for additional funds for the space administration during the last session of Congress, a part of which was spent to finish the construction and preparations for the Glenn flight.

Do Schools Need Federal Aid?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, several proposals have been introduced in the 87th Congress to provide Federal aid to secondary schools, including aid for classroom construction, loans and grants to private schools and assistance for teachers' salaries. This is an important issue in which the people of my district have a vital interest.

Most of the letters I have received oppose Federal aid. The results of my annual questionnaire during the past several years shows a growing opposition. This opposition is indicated in an editorial written for publication in the Everett (Wash.) Daily Herald, on February 5, 1962.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this editorial:

DO SCHOOLS OF THE NATION NEED FEDERAL ASSISTANCE?

Those who desire a strong Central Government to control just about every phase of our lives have in recent months put out so much propaganda in favor of Federal aid to schools that many people are now believing that such assistance is desirable and essential.

Again we ask the question: Do the schools really need Federal aid?

These supporters of Federal intervention are downgrading the achievements of American teachers, school boards, and communities in building the finest education system the world has ever known.

This is not to suggest that the school system should not be constantly improved.

We have just scanned a report showing that there are more classrooms, more teachers, a lower pupil-teacher ratio, and a higher level of education in this country than ever before in history.

The report shows that in the last 10 years the number of public school pupils increased 48 percent. The number of classrooms jumped by 60 percent. Teachers' salaries rose 72 percent, to an average $5,389 a year. Money spent per pupil increased from $224 a year to $390 a year.

American communities approved the highest volume of school bond issues in history during 1960, the summary states. Even so, less than 1 percent of America's school districts have reached their maximum bond limitations.

All this has been done without Federal intervention, Federal dictation, or the Federal control that surely would follow Federal subsidy.

All this has been done with the local taxpayers' money, men and women who are interested in seeing the schools in their communities improve and expand. This good work must go on and, we know, from what is going on all around us, is continuing. Maybe we need to move a bit faster. Maybe we can if we do not have to listen to political oratory on the subject.

Congratulations to Postal Workers on Merger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the Alabama branch of the National Postal Transport Association has long been considered to be a guiding fixture on the scene of postal employee organizations in Birmingham, throughout Alabama and the Memphis postal region. I have just been informed that the Alabama branch has voted by referendum ballot to merge with Local 303 of the United Federation of Postal Clerks.

The United Federation of Postal Clerks is a relatively new postal employee organization on the national scene, being recently formed by the merger of the National Postal Transport Association, the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, the United National Association of Post Office Craftsmen, and the United Postal Workers. However, within the framework of the national merger, it was stated that any merger on a lower level would be the result of local option. I am happy to notify the Speaker and my colleagues that this local option was exercised as a result of a unanimous vote of local 303 and a more than 20-to-1 vote of the Alabama branch. I certainly wish to congratulate the leaders of these two progressive organizations and especially Mr. John Waldrop, president of the Alabama branch and Mr. J. D. Park, president of local 303.

As a Member of Congress, I have been very close to the postal employee organizations in Alabama and even before coming to Congress I have been closely associated with many of the leaders of these organizations and personally aware of their problems. Just a few weeks ago, I had the pleasure of introducing a bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees which was assigned the number H.R. 9949 and was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. And while I shall certainly do all within my power to see this bill, or its companion bill, through the legislative processes of Congress, I am aware that not all the problems of the postal employees of Alabama concern salary increases.

I may have been the first Member of Congress to ride in a railway post office car. Certainly I was the first in the sense that the ride, which was arranged for me by Mr. A. W. McCrary, Mr. J. L. Conway, Jr., and Mr. Joe D. Newton, of the Alabama branch, was accomplished even before I came to Congress in 1955. Under the guidance of these gentlemen, I learned the specialties of railway mail clerks, the things they need to know and the importance of the service they perform. Today, 8 years after that ride on the railway post office car, I realize that no one, either within or outside the Post Office Department, has yet developed a method of mail handling which will equal the idea of en route distribution as a benefit to the postal service and to postal patrons as well.

Partly because of the education I received on the trip, partly because of personal inspection of many of the post offices within the State of Alabama and partly because of my study of the supporting material furnished me by the postal employee organizations and their auxiliaries, I have on many occasions interceded with the Post Office Department on behalf of many postal employees in an effort to right the wrongs which sometimes occur. On many other occasions, I have introduced and supported legislation in this body designed to accomplish the same end; whether it be salary legislation where a discharge petition has sometimes been necessary or other types of legislation designed to prohibit "speed-ups" or "airlift" of first-class mails without payment of premium postage.

Thus, being quite familiar with the problems of our postal employees, the stalwart efforts of the employee organizations, and our entire postal setup in general, I think I am in a position to evaluate the significance of the merger of these two outstanding local postal employee unions. My judgment is that the merger will shortly prove to be one of the best things ever to happen for our career postal employees. One of the ways it is going to be beneficial is in being able to present to those of us in Congress a comprehensive view of new situations which arise from time to time affecting all postal employees and all postal patrons.

I am sure that members of the Alabama branch of the National Postal Transport Association feel a little sadness at the demise of their old organization. This organization served its members well. But I believe that the merged organization will promptly come to have the full loyalty and appreciation of those who made the decision to launch out on this new and promising venture.

Incidentally, I myself guard a certain fondness for the old Alabama branch of the NPTS. For example, I am proud to have hanging on the wall of my office the first "citation of loyalty" presented by the Alabama branch and which is signed by Mr. Joe D. Newton, then branch president and now an associate national vice president of the United Federation of Postal Clerks. I have a later award in my Birmingham office which is signed by Mr. John Waldrop, current president of the Alabama branch. I am also proud that a former member of my congressional staff, J. Thomas King, has received this award.

Mr. Speaker, it is my earnest desire to be present at the first meeting of the merged union to be held in Birmingham, Ala., on March 3 of this year and I shall make every effort to be there if at all possible. It has been my pleasure to attend many meetings of various postal employee unions and my pleasure to communicate with many postal employees throughout the State of Alabama. Again, I am certain that this great step forward will benefit both the employees and Members of Congress, and will contribute to a postal system for our Nation that is unsurpassable.

Dallas Educator Evaluates State Department Pamphlet, Freedom From War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, what will be in store for the people of the United States if certain State Department planners have their way in subjugating the sovereignty of the United States to the will of the United Nations is set forth in the following article by Dr. Robert Morris in the Free Citizen, a publication of the Freedom Education program:

AROUND THE WORLD

(By Robert Morris)

The State Department has issued an official bulletin entitled "Freedom From War." It outlines the steps for the liquidation of the United States of America as we know it. It makes this liquidation the official policy of our Government today.

This bulletin says, "The United States has introduced at the 16th General Assembly of the United Nations a program for general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world." The program reads:

"During the third stage of the program, the states of the world, building on the experience and confidence gained in successfully implementing the measures of the first two stages, would take final steps toward the goal of a world in which:

"States (such as the United States) would retain only those forces, nonnuclear armaments, and establishments required for the purpose of maintaining internal order; they would also support and provide agreed manpower for a U.N. Peace Force.

"The U.N. Peace Force, equipped with agreed types and quantities of armaments, would be fully functioning.

"The manufacture of armaments would be prohibited except for those of agreed types and quantities to be used by the U.N. Peace Force and those required to maintain internal order. All other armaments would be destroyed or converted to peaceful purposes.

"The peace-keeping capabilities of the United Nations would be sufficiently strong and the obligations of all states under such arrangements sufficiently far reaching as to assure peace and the just settlement of differences in a disarmed world."

This incontrovertibly means that the combination of forces which has been running the invasion of Katanga, killing innocent women and children, would be supreme and

we here in the United States would be subject to them. This is surrender of our Constitution, our Bill of Rights, our religions and spiritual heritage and of our freedom.

There is no denying that Soviet power in the United Nations is growing stronger every day. Perhaps it has not yet directly taken over but by its infiltration of non-Communist governments, its ruthless diplomacy and its own inflexibility added to its own strength, it is the dominant force driving the U.N. to do its bidding. And this trend is continuing. By the time the State Department enacts its program, the admission of Red China and further Soviet takeovers in Africa, Latin America, and Asia will give them a clear preponderance.

Certainly the prevailing force in the U.N. is godless. It has no background in common law, in spirital heritage, even in basic justice. Yet our State Department wants this force to be supreme over us and our way of life.

The UNESCO program enacted in Paris last December fits into this grand design of surrender. That provides for a monolithic worldwide system of education that professes to tolerate independent education, but only if it conforms to the master plan and "promotes the U.N."

The State Department is pushing this program even though there is not the slightest disposition on Khrushchev's part to yield in his stated goal of world domination. Khrushchev has said:

"Even if all countries of the world adopted a decision which did not accord with the interests of the Soviet Union and threatened its security, the Soviet Union would not recognize such a decision, but would uphold its rights, relying on force."

I often wonder if the desire to enact this program is one of the reasons behind the present concerted drive against "anti-Communists" and those who dissent from what our planners are doing in Washington.

This program is so fantastic in its advocacy of surrender and dismantling the power of the United States that you may find it hard to believe me as I write these things If so, write to the U.S. Government Printing Office, ask for Department of State Publication 7277, "Freedom From War." It costs 15 cents.

Voice of Project Mercury Deserves Commendation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSICA McC. WEIS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Congress, the people of Washington and, indeed, the entire Nation paid tribute to Lt. Col. John Glenn, and his six fellow astronauts who are pioneering America's efforts to explore space.

I want to say just a word today about still another member of the Project Mercury team who, in my opinion, is richly deserving of high praise. I refer to Lt. Col. John A. "Shorty" Powers, the man whose voice kept the entire world informed, step-by-step, of America's first successful manned orbital flight.

It was Colonel Powers, calm and unemotional throughout the entire tension-packed day, who, from the Mercury Control Center, relayed up-to-the-minute reports on the progress of the space flight. His was the responsibility of keeping the world posted at all times on how the flight was going, and he did a superb job. His voice, as it went out over the airwaves to all parts of the globe, demonstrated conclusively to the world how a free country operates its space programs, openly and honestly. As we honor the Project Mercury team, I want to say a special "thank you" to Lt. Col. John A. Powers, the official voice of Project Mercury.

Lincoln Day Address, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, during the observance of the Lincoln Day period it was my pleasure to deliver a series of addresses throughout the State of Pennsylvania and in West Virginia.

Among the various Lincoln Day dinners I attended in Pennsylvania was one sponsored by the Young Republican Club of Wyoming County which was held at Tunkhannock, Pa., February 14, 1962, and at which I delivered the following address:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS AT TUNKHANNOCK, PA., FEBRUARY 14, 1962

Across the country this month Americans are pausing to commemorate the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, the martyred President who saved our Nation and emancipated a race.

His era in history was one of trouble and tribulation and his life has been a symbol to all mankind of the hope, opportunity, and freedom that is America.

Today, as we honor the man who was our first Republican President, his words come thundering down across the years as forcefully vital and true as when he first uttered them more than a century ago.

He brought to us a message of hope, of faith in ourselves, and in the wisdom of the Nation's Founders.

Lincoln was a great politician—in the highest sense of the term.

He loved people.

But he made it clear that he did not consider them infallible, for he said:

"It is true that you may fool all the people some of the time; you can even fool some of the people all the time; but you can't fool all of the people all the time."

I believe that is the message of hope which Lincoln brings to our party today.

For, in my opinion, the high-sounding oratory and rosy promises which marked John F. Kennedy's campaign in 1960, and his administration since then, are beginning to sound empty.

The indecision and weakness which sent an abortive band of Cuban rebels against Fidel Castro without U.S. air or naval support, the failure to honor our commitments in Laos, the vacillation which allowed the Communists to erect a wall sealing off East Berlin from the West, all are somehow inconsistent with the picture of strength and determination which brought Mr. Kennedy his victory at the polls in 1960.

The American people, who for more than a year have witnessed the lack of decisive action by the self-styled "New Frontier," now are beginning to ask some rather searching questions.

Why, they wonder, has the State Department used foreign aid and its diplomatic power to force the Lao to accept a government chosen for it by Nikita Khrushchev?

Why did the administration cancel out the air support for the Cuban invasion after it was underway, thus dooming more than 1,200 freedom fighters to imprisonment or death before Castro's firing squads?

Why were the Communists permitted to erect in Berlin, in absolute violation of five separate treaties and agreements signed since World War II, a wall which now locks in hundreds of thousands of East Germans and denies the previously guaranteed right of free access within the city?

Why were repeated pleas by the U.S. commander in that blockaded city asking for permission to tear down the wall not answered by Washington?

Why has this administration so consistently sided with neutralists and Communist nations against the Western Powers and thus strained relations with such longtime, dependable allies as Britain, France, Belgium, Portugal, and the Netherlands?

Why did we express simple regrets at the naked Indian aggression in Goa and then calmly announce that the incident would not influence whatsoever our multimillion dollar program of assistance to Nehru?

Why, when we supposedly are dedicated to the principle of self-determination for all peoples, are we openly siding with the pro-Communist Indonesian Government in its attempt to take over as a colony Dutch New Guinea?

Despite Mr. Kennedy's campaign promise to the contrary, why has this administration refused to protect its nuclear superiority through the resumption of atmospheric testing, even though the Russians broke the moratorium on experiments by setting off more than 30 such blasts, one of them a 50-megaton monster bomb?

Why did this administration approve a $133 million contribution to the pro-Communist Government of Ghana for construction of a dam on the Volta River?

Why did our economic growth, which averaged 3.1 percent annually during the Eisenhower administration and which Mr. Kennedy claimed was too slow, slip to 1.8 percent during his first year in office?

Why did average unemployment rise to a 20-year high last year with little prospect for improvement?

Why did a pledged farm income of 90 percent of parity drop to the 1939 depression low of 79 last year?

Why did a farm program that Mr. Kennedy told the people would cost a billion and a half—possibly $2 billion less than the Eisenhower program—actually cost a billion and a half dollars more?

Why have depressed area funds—earmarked for the rehabilitation of hard-hit urban communities, been dumped into such places as Gassvile, Ark., which has a population of 233, to establish a shirt factory for low wage nonunion labor?

Why did Government payrolls increase by about 90,000 persons last year, despite Mr. Kennedy's campaign pledge to curtail Government spending and payroll padding?

Why, when he pledged that Civil Rights legislation would be among the first orders of business if he were elected, did President Kennedy refuse to endorse the bill he had called for?

Why was our prestige lowered around the world by irresponsible campaign talk about "Missile Gaps" which was later disproved, but which conveyed to other Nations at the time that we were a second-rate power and they had better turn to Russia for safety's sake?

Why were 150,000 reservists recalled to duty in what one high administrative official later admitted was a "mistake"?

"The people will want to know why a presidential candidate who denounced family favoritism as "dangerous to our national morality" later put more of his relatives on the public payroll than perhaps any other President in history.

The people will also wonder why President Kennedy insists on surrounding himself with advisors and special assistants whose views are alien to our American philosophy, including, for example, one who openly has suggested the replacement of our form of Government with a welfare state as "the best answer to communism."

There will be other questions, too.

Explanations will be demanded for the $3.9 billion deficit compiled in fiscal 1961 after the Eisenhower administration had willed to the New Frontier a program which would have resulted in an $800 million surplus.

There is also the question of the Eisenhower budget which would have produced a $1.5 billion surplus in the current fiscal year, but instead is resulting in a $6.9 to $10 billion deficit.

But if the performance of the New Frontier during its first year in office is any indication, the people will receive, instead of answers, a fuzzy assortment of evasions and old-fashioned double talk.

You can take my word for it that when such conduct happens—the ordinarily slow-to-arouse American people will understand the mistake they themselves made in November 1960 when they elected to office an administration made up of political confidence men.

The result will be a voter's rebellion, which will sweep a Republican Congress into office in 1962 and a Republican administration into the White House in 1964.

When this happens, we will be able to return to the solid principles laid down more than a century ago by Lincoln when he said:

"I insist that if there is anything which it is the duty of the whole people never to entrust in any hands but their own, that thing is the preservation and perpetuity of their own liberties and institutions."

As stewards of the Republican Party, we must pledge anew our courage and our determination to keep sacred these principles and to oppose with all our vigor those programs which we believe will violate them.

Lincoln's philosophy of government was simple.

He summed it up in these words:

"We see it, and to us it appears like principle, and the best sort of principle at that, the principle of allowing the people to do as they please, with their own business."

He described this philosophy of government as true republicanism and was confident and content to allow the people of the Nation to judge his administration accordingly.

And the people did judge accordingly.

Following Lincoln's tragic visit to Ford's Theater on the night of April 14, 1865, a grief-stricken and shocked American public dedicated itself to a perpetuation of the beliefs and principles he had given his life to strengthen.

Although his two greatest legacies to his country were the preservation of its unity and emancipation of the Negro, he also gave us our first veterans' benefit system, established the Department of Agriculture, opened Federal land to homesteaders and inaugurated our national banking system.

Because of his leadership and the goals of Republican government he set, Lincoln's successors brought our Nation the majority of the benefits it has received since.

Under Republican Presidents, the 14th and 15th amendments were added to our Constitution, extending to Negroes the right to vote and other privileges; the Departments of Justice, Commerce, and Labor were created; we acquired Alaska, Midway, Hawaii, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines; the first conservation program was started, establishing fisheries, national parks and forest services, the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines; the Civil Service Commission was established; Pan American Organization became a reality and immigration laws were enacted.

We stimulated development of our industries and agriculture through tariff acts and a reciprocity policy; monopolistic trusts were outlawed with the Sherman Antitrust Act; we inaugurated the Government's reclamation and irrigation program and built the Panama Canal.

A Republican Congress gave our women the right to vote.

We achieved the first voluntary arms limitation agreement with foreign powers, established the executive budget system, and promoted cooperative marketing in agriculture.

All this was done by Abraham Lincoln and by his Republican successors, prior to the advent of Franklin Roosevelt.

And despite the onslaughts of the New and Fair Deals on constitutional and Lincolnian principles during the 20 years that followed, Republicans in Congress successfully defeated many legislative attempts which would have led to even more government and less individual freedom.

With the election of Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1952, the Republican Party began the task of reestablishing the rights and privileges which had been weakened by the New and Fair Deals and reasserting the objectives of our party.

The record of the 8 Eisenhower years is indisputable evidence that this was done, and done during 6 of those years over the opposition of Democrats who controlled Congress.

We brought an end to the costly Korean war which a Democratic administration had forbidden us to win; we rebuilt our depleted armed services and brought a neglected missile and space program to a point where it was superior to all others in the world.

We put atomic energy to peaceful uses, raised employment to its highest peak in history, and checked the devaluation of our dollar.

Under the Eisenhower administration we also gave Americans the highest standard of living the world had ever known and increased our gross national product by one-fourth; raised wages and family income to new highs; extended social security protection to 12 million additional workers; and created the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

We halted the trend toward centralization of government in Washington, strengthened State and local authority, expanded farm markets, broadened conservation; and resources programs and gave the Nation four balanced budgets in 8 years, as compared with three in 20 Democratic years.

We created the Small Business Administration and brought Alaska and Hawaii into the Union as States.

We brought these and thousands of other benefits to the American people, because our party always has been, and will continue to be, dedicated to the principles of free enterprise and individual initiative spelled out in our Federal Constitution and championed to the degree of martydom by Abraham Lincoln.

In 1859 Lincoln made this pledge:

"I have enlisted for the permanent success of the Republican cause."

We can do no less today.

Let us, each of us, on this occasion, pledge anew our determination to work for victory, because the welfare and success of our party means the welfare and success of our country.

Meanings of the U.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, amid the great bulk of reading material of all descriptions that daily comes into our offices, there are many articles of genuine interest, some of which provide us with new insights into problems under consideration by our committees and by ourselves individually.

Occasionally, we receive a publication whose every article is important, whose every word has real meaning. The March issue of the Rotarian, the magazine of Rotary International, is just such a publication.

The issue is entitled "Meanings of the U.S.A." Its purpose is to give a perspective to our Nation, in the editors' words, as a traveler sees his native land upon returning to it from a long stay abroad; as a visitor sees that land for the first time; as specialists view it through their varied lenses—all seeing with fresh eyes, noting its unique qualities." Believe me, it has indeed fulfilled its purpose magnificently.

You will remember that on the 15th I spoke about the little-people-to-little-people program started by my son, Peter III. I sought your help in organizing this children's crusade. I pointed out the common ignorance—even among our own citizens—about America, what our country and way of life stand for, do and are. I called for support to an allout effort by our children to bring the facts of American life to the children of the world.

In this one magazine are 10 fine articles written by experts in their fields that will go far toward explaining America's precious quality to people everywhere. Because of their timeliness and uniform excellence, I intend to ask permission to insert them in the RECORD, so that the greatest possible circulation can be obtained among our citizens who may not be Rotarians.

Today, I would like only to quote the official object of this outstanding international organization which does so much each year for local communities:

The object of Rotary is to encourage and foster the ideal of service as a basis of worthy enterprise and, in particular, to encourage and foster: First. The development of acquaintance as an opportunity for service; Second. High ethical standards in business and professions, the recognition of the worthiness of all useful occupations, and the dignifying by each Rotarian of his occupation as an opportunity to serve society; Third. The application of the ideal of service by every Rotarian to his personal, business, and community life; Fourth. The advancement of international understanding, goodwill, and peace through a world fellowship of business and professional men united in the ideal of service.

Here is truly a people-to-people program in action.

State Department Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in this Republic of ours we the people ought to be exposed to both sides of a difficult problem. It is therefore disturbing that our State Department has refused a visa to Moise Tshombe, the true anti-Communist leader of the Congo.

The following editorial of the February 24 edition of the Tablet and the further editorials in the four other New York dailies accent the point that the censorship demonstrated extends also to Africa:

MORE "LIBERAL" CENSORSHIP

The State Department has refused a visa to Moise Tshombe, popular Katanga leader, friend of the United States and ardent anti-Communist, to visit our country. The reason given for setting up the bar against him was first that he had not "properly applied," his application was "incomplete," etc. After procrastination and a demand from many that the Katanga leader be admitted, the State Department publicly rejected his visit as undesirable at this time and in the "current" circumstances, that his visit "would interrupt and jeopardize the progress" being made for a united Congo.

The "progress" to which the State Department referred was, as noted Washington Correspondent Arthur Krock said, "the forced product of United Nations punitive military measures in Katanga that were made possible only by the military and financial backing of the United States."

The real reason for barring Tshombe, of course, is that the State Department feared the truth, objected to free speech, could not permit Americans to hear what the Katanga leader had to say in his own defense. Tshombe's appearance in the United States would have been embarrassing not only to State Department but to the U.N. Secretariat and Assembly majority. According to the Katangan Information Services in New York, some of the invitations Tshombe had accepted before the State Department supplanted evasions with an adverse decision were:

In Washington, a "Meet the Press" program, a luncheon speech to the National Press Club and a meeting with a group of Members of Congress; speeches at the University of Virginia, the Overseas Press Club in New York City, the Boston Law College Forum, the World Affairs Council in Los Angeles and a rally in New York City of "Young Americans for Freedom." The schedule opened the prospect that influential groups throughout the country would hear the other side of the administration's Congo policy from its principal target.

The barring of Tshombe is a typical example of what passes for liberalism—freedom to express one group's ideas but barring of any opposition. Thus, from Khrushchev to Lumumba to Castro, we had a series of Communists receiving visas and official welcomes, but Tshombe, the anti-Communist, is denied admittance to the country. It is not without significance that the press asserts G. Mennen Williams and his liberal group won the day in barring Tshombe. And to close the deal, as Arthur Krock said on Tuesday, "Usually in these circumstances the same protests would be loudly registered by self-classified liberals and the civil liberties groups. But not a peep from any of them so far."

THE TSHOMBE VISA

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun]

The cold shoulder turned on Moise Tshombe by our State Department is beneath the dignity of the United States. It reveals a disturbing brand of timidity which cringes from free speech.

We have managed to survive the visits—and the oratory—of a varied international crew which has included even Castro and the bull Communist himself, who propagandized from coast to coast.

But, according to a State Department spokesman, a visit right now by the President of Katanga Province would "interrupt and jeopardize" unification of the Congo.

In all deference to Dean Rusk, our Secretary of State, refusal to let Tshombe state his case to an American audience could jeopardize something a great deal more important—instinctive confidence that our Government is fairminded and trusts the judgment of the American people.

TSHOMBE RULED OUT

[From the New York Daily News]

Moise Tshombe, anti-Communist chief of the Congo State of Katanga, was to have visited the United States for speaking engagements in Virginia and Texas, and to receive an award from Young Americans for Freedom at a March 7 rally in Madison Square Garden.

Now the State Department announces that Tshombe will not be permitted to come here. Excuse: such a visit would "interrupt and jeopardize the progress" toward unifying the Congo.

This, after the White House rolled out the red carpet for Congo Premier Cyrille Adoula—who then said he is soon going to Moscow.

Apparently the Kennedy administration fears to have both sides of the Katanga story told in this country, and hopes to discredit the YAF, a vigorous young conservative organization.

We'd call it a shoddy performance—and one which should greatly benefit the YAF with a lot of choice free advertising, courtesy of the White House.

[From the Daily Mirror]

WHAT'S THE GAME?

Is there a funny game going on here? The State Department bars Katanga President Moise Tshombe from this country. Tshombe, an anti-Communist, has been a special whippingboy of United States-United Nations diplomacy.

From Lumumba to Nkrumah, Red African leaders have been welcomed—even feted—here. But the rope is up against Tshombe because, says the State Department, a visit by him might jeopardize progress toward a Congo settlement.

In other words, the U.N. can put the screws and muzzles on Tshombe in the Congo, but would have a hard time gagging him here. What a puzzlement.

[From the Journal-American]

BLUNDER

After days of shilly-shallying doubletalk, the State Department has slammed the door on a visit by Moise Tshombe, President of Congo's Katanga Province.

It is a bad goof.

The rebuff to Tshombe is far more likely to damage progress than asking him in and letting him speak his piece. And the reference to Premier Adoula's Central Government suggests it has been permitted too much influence in shaping the decision.

Granting Tshombe is temperamental, granting he is not the shining champion his avid supporters in this country make out, the fact remains that he is the militantly anti-Communist leader of the Congo's richest province. Without Katanga (and Tshombe), Adoula cannot put the pieces of the Congo together into a stable country.

The Hearst newspapers have supported Adoula in his efforts to bring about stability and keep the Communists out.

But we do not support him in pressing the State Department to deny Tshombe a visa—which may or may not have been motivated by personal animosity.

And we think that State is guilty of diplomatic stupidity.

Reservists and Guardsmen Show Well in Current Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the contributions of the Nation's reservists and guardsmen have never shown more brightly than in the current period of crisis. This service, with particular reference to the Air Reserve Forces, is brilliantly set forth by the Honorable Joe Foss, president of the Air Force Association, in a letter to Members of Congress. I submit the letter and accompanying appropriate statements from national leaders for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The letters and statements follow:

FEBRUARY 12, 1962.

Hon. ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: In the midst of the controversy and complaints over the callup of Reserves as a result of the Berlin crisis, it appears that the public is largely unaware of the magnificent job done by the Air Reserve Forces during this period.

The Air Reserve units are and should be made up entirely of volunteers. We ask your assistance in making it clear to the men and their families that their sacrifices have been for a vital purpose, and that the Nation appreciates their continued willingness to serve. Few will want to serve in an organization that may be under a cloud of doubt and suspicion.

The Air Force Association has undertaken a project to set the record straight for all American. In the belief that the callup record of the Air Reserve Forces might merit coverage in your newsletter, I call your attention to the following:

First, the Air Force record shows convincingly that the Reserve Forces are a valuable component of our defense structure.

Second, the patriotic response of the members of the Air Reserve Forces and the sacrifices borne willingly by their families merit the Nation's gratitude.

Third, appropriate recognition of the reservists will help assure the continued strength and usefulness of the Air Reserve Forces when they are released from active duty.

Specifically, I call your attention to four examples in this record accomplishment:

1. Air Guardsmen flew 218 single-engine jetplanes over the Atlantic within a month

after being recalled, providing much-needed conventional fighter strength for Air Force combat units in Europe. In a recent letter to President Kennedy, Chancellor Adenauer of Germany wrote that, in his opinion, the buildup to which these units contributed was the prime factor influencing Khrushchev to back down on Berlin.

2. The number of complaints from Air Force recallees was nearly zero—no greater under the circumstances than would have been experienced with career personnel.

3. Five Air Force Reserve and six Air National Guard squadrons entered on duty with four-engine transport aircraft, the first to be assigned to their respective components. In 3 months of active duty, their crews flew almost 4,000,000 miles on troop carrier and cargo missions.

4. The remaining 13 Air Guard tactical fighter and reconnaissance squadrons on active duty in the United States are combat ready, poised for immediate deployment wherever national security may be threatened.

The Secretaries of Defense and Air Force and the Air Force Chief of Staff have publicly expressed their high regard for the mission capability of Reserve Forces personnel and appreciation for the spirit in which reservists' wives and families have accepted the recall. Their pertinent statements are attached.

We hope you agree that the record of Air Reserve Forces on active duty deserves the attention of your constituents and all Americans. We hope you will help make the record clear.

Sincerely,

JOE FOSS.

P.S.—We would appreciate receiving copies of material emanating from your office on this subject, so we may give it proper recognition.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., January 8, 1962.

DEAR FELLOW AMERICAN: During the last several months more than 150,000 men in the Reserve Forces of the United States have been called back to active duty. This has been brought home to you in a very personal way, I know, because a relative of yours is among the reservists now in uniform, and it is for that reason I am writing you.

Every reservist called back to active duty is making a special contribution to his country's security, but I recognize—and the President recognizes—that this has meant difficulty, inconvenience, and the disruption of civilian pursuits for thousands upon thousands of Americans, including the families who were left behind when the reservists reported for duty. The necessity for such sacrifice is not always understood. That's why your service has been using its internal information program to explain the callup and to answer many of the questions which I know have been raised.

As we enter a new year the United States continues to face a strong and determined adversary who is pushing and probing at freedom in many parts of the world. The United States is the chief defender of freedom in this world, and we can fill this role and maintain the peace only so long as we ourselves are strong and determined. The 150,000 recalled reservists have helped to keep us strong, and their recall has surely evidenced our determination.

We are taking other steps, of course, to convince the Soviet bloc we mean business, and as we build our strength in these other ways it will become possible to release the reservists from active duty. But in the meantime their country owes them a very great debt, and you who are sharing in the sacrifices they have made are equally entitled to the thanks of a grateful Nation.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. MCNAMARA.

NOVEMBER 14, 1961.

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay has congratulated the Tactical Air Command and the Air National Guard on "the outstanding manner" in which the recent movement of more than 200 jet fighters to Europe was accomplished.

The Air Force Chief of Staff, who has just returned from a visit to Europe to inspect the recalled units of the Air National Guard, sent the following message to Gen. Walter C. Sweeney, commander of the Tactical Air Command, and Maj. Gen. Winston P. Wilson, Assistant Chief of the National Guard Bureau for Air:

"The movement of the newly federalized ANG units to Europe was executed in an orderly, efficient, and professional way. This required the utmost in leadership, planning, and cooperation on the part of all units and personnel involved. All obstacles were overcome by ingenuity and determination in spite of the extremely short preparation time available. The end result of the safe and expeditious arrival of the fighters should be a source of great pride to all who had a part in the operation. I wish to offer my congratulations for the outstanding manner in which this difficult and vitally important task was successfully accomplished. Please pass the above on to your people who were responsible for this."

Tactical fighter units included in the deployment to Europe were elements of the 122d Tactical Fighter Wing, Fort Wayne, Ind.; the 131st Tactical Fighter Wing, St. Louis, Mo.; the 121st Tactical Fighter Wing, Columbus, Ohio; the 102d Tactical Fighter Wing, Boston, Mass.; the 108th Tactical Fighter Wing, McGuire Air Force Base, N.J.; and the 117th Tactical Reconnaissance Wing, Birmingham, Ala. They are equipped with F-84F, RF-84F, and F-86H aircraft.

Organizations which assisted in the deployment included the Military Air Transport Service, the Strategic Air Command, the Air Force Logistics Command, the U.S. Air Forces in Europe, the Air Defense Command, the Navy, and the Coast Guard.

NOVEMBER 7, 1961.

Secretary of the Air Force Eugene M. Zuckert dispatched congratulatory messages today to the commander of the Tactical Air Command, Gen. Walter C. Sweeney, Jr., and to the commanders of the former Air National Guard units now in Europe. The messages are as follows:

TO COMMANDER, TAC

"My congratulations to TAC on the professional manner in which you conducted the operational deployment of units from the Air National Guard. The success of the deployment reflects the cooperation between our active duty and Reserve forces and underscores the high degree of proficiency of both. Please extend my congratulations to all TAC units and personnel participating in this successful operation."

TO COMMANDER USAFE FOR INDIVIDUAL UNIT COMMANDERS

"My warmest salute to the men of your command on their highly successful deployment to Europe. The manner in which the deployment was conducted so soon after recall could only be the result of sustained superior performance. It is my desire that every man in your organization knows of the pride the whole Air Force feels in this accomplishment, which reflects the high standards set and maintained in Air National Guard training."

The Rights of an American Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, last week I was privileged to participate in a seminar conducted during the national convention of the American Association of School Administrators. The moderator for this panel was the distinguished educator, Dr. David A. Lockmiller, executive director of the National Home Study Council. Dr. Lockmiller presented a most thoughtful review of the problems facing us from an educational point of view, and I insert his remarks in the RECORD for the information and edification of my colleagues:

THE RIGHTS OF AN AMERICAN CITIZEN

Our subject—"to preserve and develop a governmental structure at the local, State, and Federal level which protects the rights of the individual"—is broad, general, timely, and of vital importance. It is an outgrowth of the report of President Eisenhower's Commission on National Goals, a program of action for American citizens in the 1960's.

The nonpartisan Commission was composed of 11 eminent leaders under the chairmanship of Dr. Henry M. Wriston. It was assisted by some 100 authorities in various fields. The work was privately financed by eight foundations, and administered by the American Assembly of Columbia University, an educational agency favorably known for its wide and nonpartisan consideration of public issues.

President Eisenhower charged the Commission to "develop a broad outline of coordinated national policies and programs" and to "set up a series of goals in various areas of national activity." The members labored diligently and reached a consensus on 15 goals beginning with the individual and including the United Nations. It was not expected that the recommendations would receive unanimous acceptance, but rather that they would evoke discussion which under our democratic processes would lead to a stronger and greater America.

Our concern this morning is with the individual and the impact of government at various levels to protect, enlarge, and advance his rights. This paramount goal was set forth by Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence and adopted by the Continental Congress on July 4, 1776:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

It was a mighty vision; it pledged the young Republic to the principles that every human being is of infinite worth. It did not include slaves, but in time the ideal led the Nation through the Civil War and out of the morass of human bondage. It led us to fight in distant lands in two World Wars and it inspires us still in the struggle at home and around the world for freedom and justice under law.

Following independence from England, a framework of self-government was estab-

lished in the several States and nationally. It rested on the election of representatives from the body politic and the limitation of the authority of those placed in office. State constitutions as well as the Federal Constitution contained bills of rights, all designed to make government the servant and not the master of the individual. This was a revolutionary concept and it is still challenged in many quarters today.

Before discussing in some detail the problems resulting from the transformation of this country from rural to urban, from agricultural to industrial, and from one of isolation to worldwide commitments in a space age, let us summarize the goals of the Commission on the individual, equality, and the democratic process.

1. The individual: The status of the individual must remain our primary concern. All our institutions—political, social, and economic—must further enhance the dignity of the citizen, promote the maximum development of his capabilities, stimulate their responsible exercise, and widen the range and effectiveness of opportunities for individual choice.

2. Equality: Vestiges of religious prejudice, handicaps to women, and, most important, discrimination on the basis of race must be recognized as morally wrong, economically wasteful, and in many respects dangerous. In this decade we must sharply lower these stubborn barriers.

Respect for the individual means respect for every individual. Every man and woman must have equal rights before the law, and an equal opportunity to vote and hold office, to be educated, to get a job and to be promoted when qualified, to buy a home, to participate fully in community affairs. These goals, which are at the core of our system, must be achieved by action at all levels.

3. The democratic process: The degree of effective liberty available to its people should be the ultimate test for any nation. Democracy is the only means so far devised by which a nation can meet this test. To preserve and perfect the democratic process in the United States is therefore a primary goal in this as in every decade.

Although this panel is not primarily concerned with government and education, we know that sound learning is vital to citizens in a democracy. The Commission recognized and emphasized this when it stated:

"The development of the individual and the Nation demand that education at every level and in every discipline be strengthened and its effectiveness enhanced. New teaching techniques must continue to be developed. The increase in population and the growing complexity of the world add urgency."

During the colonial period, the education of individuals was of little public concern. The monarchs of Europe claimed to be vice regents of God. When their former subjects became free citizens of a republic, these citizens were justly apprehensive of strong government. There was to be no privileged aristocracy, and the possibility of arbitrary authority was to be checked. The Federal Constitution was not adopted until assurances were given of a bill of rights, the first 10 amendments, and the purpose of the Founding Fathers was engraved on the reverse of the Great Seal of the United States—novo ordo seclorum (a new order for the ages).

The Federal Bill of Rights restricts Federal authority as interpreted by the Supreme Court, and this body is often and properly the subject of debate. Following the Civil War suffrage was broadened, U.S. citizenship became paramount, and amendments restricting the States were adopted. In 1920, suffrage was extended to women. All the while and today, and we tend to forget this, the rights of citizens as affected by State and local governments were and are determined by State constitutions with their bills of rights. In fact, the 14th amendment to the Federal Constitution has received so much attention, that there are those who say the Supreme Court has forgotten that the States came first, that the powers of the Federal Government are delegated powers, and that the 10th amendment to the Federal Constitution, never repealed, is ignored in the interest of the general welfare, continuing national emergencies, and the pressures of special interests.

All of this raises questions only partially answered by the Commission on National Goals. Briefly stated, are present forms of government obsolete, do they treat citizens equally and equitably, and do they adequately protect and advance the rights of all in present-day America? If the machinery of Government is creaking in places today and legislators and judges, not to mention executives and bureaucrats, are strained to accomplish desired ends within dual and overlapping laws, how will American citizens and their rights fare in the future?

Do you ever have occasion to wonder whether government is your servant or master? And what has happened to the "right to be let alone" mentioned by the late Mr. Justice Brandeis, as "the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized men." Can it be said that the urban age of the mass man was not foreseen by those who gave us our historic charters, and that while the ideals are valid, the forms of government no longer fit? If this is true, I would recall another but almost forgotten passage of the Declaration of Independence which reads as follows:

"Whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

In this age of international entanglements, big government, big business, big labor, and big education, how fares John Q. Citizen? He has a wonderfully rich inheritance, great ideals, and a high degree of material prosperity, but he suffers from curtailed rights, limited opportunities, increasing crime, high taxes, and the subtle and pervasive threat of atomic warfare. He is bolstered by the moral stature of the United States as the home of the brave and the land of the free, but he is often frustrated and impatient for action. He is a product of the past, unable to escape history, but greatly influenced by the environment of a troubled present and increasingly concerned about his future.

In a human society, concern augurs well as opposed to complacency. But let us spell out more specifically areas of concern. War and the aftermath of war affect everything from compulsory military service, free communication, economic growth and stability, to high taxes and cultural exchanges. On the home front, the rights of minority groups, particularly Negro citizens, are justly on our mind and conscience. Government can help or hinder, but the prime responsibility rests with individuals. America injures herself and fails to measure up so long as any citizen is denied his equal rights and privileges. This is particularly true, North and South, in the basic areas of suffrage, education, health, and employment. Attitudes and conditions are changing, and these and their implementation are being watched at home and abroad. Picket lines in Washington and sit-in demonstrations in Chicago and Montgomery raise anew questions of individual rights, legal and cultural lags, and civil disobedience. Even a minority group, in its anxiety to achieve its due, cannot accomplish its purpose at the expense of the rights of others.

The fantastic urbanization of the Nation is creating many domestic problems. Yet State legislatures which gerymander congressional districts tend to be dominated by rural areas. The result is that country citizens are overrepresented and farmers can get more help than the users of commuter railroads. You will hear echoes of this in the debates on the President's proposal for a Cabinet post of Urban Affairs. Students of government await with keen interest the decision of the Supreme Court in the Tennessee reapportionment suit, and observe with equal interest the efforts of the Federal Government through the Attorney General to set aside voting requirements in some of our States.

While these matters are pending, President Kennedy, probably for political reasons, has reversed earlier stands and failed to sign an Executive order abolishing racial discrimination in Federal Housing. Vice President JOHNSON, as Chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity is having considerable success in enlisting employers to give Negroes more and better work opportunities. Granted that progress is slow and uneven, the ferment emphasizes the importance of the goals we are here to consider.

The rights of citizens as well as the welfare of the country are involved in labor legislation and the activities of unions; money and banking, tariffs and common markets, monopoly and industrial mergers, patents and copyrights, law enforcement, education, conservation, atomic energy, Indian Affairs, the District of Columbia, veterans' affairs, health, social security, civil service, communication, and many, many other activities. Furthermore, it must be remembered that government, particularly the Federal Government, is no longer just a defender and umpire, it is world promoter and banker, builder and operator of great public works, research scientist, explorer of outer space, and the employer of several million of our fellow citizens.

All of this apparently is not enough. Each year additional demands are made of our several governments, and without debating recent collectivist trends there are those, economists and leaders in major political parties, who question a tax structure which tends to check individual initiative and makes citizens increasingly dependent upon government. The growth and cost of government have been phenomenal. The 13 Colonies are now 50 States with more than 3,000 counties and parishes. There are more than 17,000 cities and villages, another 17,000 towns and townships, 50,000 school districts, and some 14,000 special districts. These many units give the United States strength, but also occasion problems which trouble and challenge us at this hour. They make the location of sovereignty difficult, they compete for tax dollars, they engage in jurisdictional disputes, they impede interstate commerce, and at the same time they collaborate and share power effectively in many domestic concerns. To many students of government, dispersed and shared power is the key to effective democratic government in the years ahead.

To service government in its various forms we employ some 11 million people—approximately 15 percent of the Nation's total employment. About 2½ million of these are in the military services, another 2½ million are civilian employees of the Federal Government, and 6 million work for the various State and local governments. It is these public servants, increasing at a rate several times that of the population growth, who advance or retard our freedoms and condition the vitality of our citizenship. They give us a government of men as well as a government of laws, and they make taxes high as well as certain.

At the present time, expenditures by Federal, State, and local governments total $155 billion each year. Of this sum $99 billion represents the purchase of goods and services as opposed to social security and other transfer payments. These sums are 27 and 19 percent, respectively, of the total gross national product, and pending proposed budgets indicate even larger expenditures.

The Commission on National Goals stated that "economies can and must be made," but admitted that "savings cannot be counted on to offset rising expenses." In considering taxes and an annual economic growth rate of 3.4, the Commission stated:

"We must face squarely the issue: if attaining the goals (education, health and welfare, national defense, foreign aid, etc.) outlined in this report should require a somewhat higher level of taxation, can we bear this level without consequences which themselves make the goals more difficult to reach?"

The Commission urges tax reform and new sources of taxes. There is disagreement concerning the annual rate of economic growth. It concedes that increasing public expenditures would retard the increase of the average citizen's standard of living but concludes that "a moderate increase in taxes need not, if its necessity were understood, materially impair the incentive or the morale of the American people, nor alter the primary reliance of the economy on private choice."

It has often been said that the power to tax is the power to destroy. The same might be claimed for regulations. Certainly in a crowded and shrunken world one can expect the individual to be required to do more and more for the general welfare as well as for himself. The acid test is the degree of effective liberty these things make available to the individual citizen. According to the Commission, that criterion establishes an order of values with self-fulfillment at the summit. Even "personal security and comfort must have less consideration." Our basic problem then is one of the individual versus society or the age-old reconciliation of liberty with authority for the common good. This can be a very personal matter for women, generally discriminated against throughout most of history, minority groups such as the displaced Japanese during World War II, religious sects, and those who cannot or do not desire to join unions. On the other hand, it sometimes seems that the great inarticulate majority is ignored at the behest of vocal minorities. On balance, it appears that society and government, perhaps of necessity and with the benevolence of good governments of past eras, are winning at the expense of individuals. The latter, however, all too often fail themselves, their country, and posterity, in measuring up to their rights, privileges, and responsibilities as the activities of their political parties, their civic service, and personal voting records indicate.

Because of the conflicts, pressures, and apathy confronting us, it is basic in a democracy that education must be and forever remain free to instruct all citizens to make free and informed decisions. If religion, morality, and knowledge" were necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind at the time of the Northwest Ordinance in 1787, they and a superabundance of self-discipline are doubly needed today.

Democracy, which has proved to be adaptable in times past, must continue to develop and adjust if the individual citizen is to retain his unalienable rights of liberty and the pursuit of happiness. In the words of Lowell we should remember that:

"New occasions teach new duties;
Time makes ancient good uncouth;
They must upward still and onward,
Who would keep abreast of truth."

The Census Bureau reports that we have 185,000,000 citizens in the United States, more in several urban centers than were in all of the States when the Federal Constitution was adopted.[1] What happens to these citizens and their rights is important at home and to the standing and role of the United States as a leader among free nations. As citizens primarily concerned with education, our opportunities and obligations are great indeed.

Democracy is a sort of game which never ends and the stakes increase from age to age. The time is ripe for a new series of Federalist Papers to explain the proposals of the Hoover and other commissions on needed reforms in government. With our freedom as citizens we can look to the past, muddle through the present, or plan realistically for the future. And all the while our cherished rights in action may err as well as succeed. We cannot be insured from our own ignorance, wrongdoing, or folly as we evolve our destiny. Furthermore, even if we attain individual and general welfare at home, we cannot underwrite or guarantee it in international or cosmic relations.

The mounting urgency of national and world events compels us to restudy accustomed ways of thinking and doing things, of separating means from ends, of assigning priorities, and of defining anew the rights and duties of citizens in a democratic society with a republican form of government. Being human, we hear far more about rights and privileges than we do about duties and responsibilities, but in a country such as ours they must go hand in hand. Furthermore, the climate must be kept free for heresy as distinguished from subversion, and our education, information, maturity, and commonsense must protect us from extermists be they on the far right or left.

Finally, our Nation was founded and advanced by people with deep moral, religious, and spiritual values. There is quite a difference between freedom of conscience and freedom from conscience. Here it should be noted that the U.S. Supreme Court recently ruled unanimously in the Torcasco case that Maryland's "religious test for public office unconstitutionally invades * * * freedom of belief and religion." Neither the size nor the form of our Government, however, should lessen our understanding of and adherence to moral and spiritual values and our continued dependence as individuals and a nation upon divine providence. If we think, discuss, and act on these things as free and conscientious citizens to the best of our ability, then we can sing as individuals and in unison the well-known prayer:

"Long may our Land be bright
With freedom's holy light,
Protect us by Thy might,
Great God our King."

[1] This number will increase by 50 million in 15 years—giving us a total population of about 235 million by 1977.

Estonian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, during most of their modern history Estonians have been subjected to foreign rule. Founded by King Valdemar II of Denmark in 1219, they lived for centuries under Scandanavian governments. Finally, they fell under the yoke of the oppressive Russian czarist regime. When the Russian Imperial Government was overthrown by the 1917 revolution, Estonians burst their bonds and declared their freedom on February 24, 1918. Their long, hard struggle was ended, their national goal was realized.

For the next 22 years Estonians lived in peace and worked happily to build themselves a responsible republic and a progressive, healthy economy. But the evil forces of destruction and death were again let loose on the eve of World War II, and the unfortunate Estonians witnessed the doom of their independence as a nation and the loss of their freedom. In July 1940, the proud little nation was overrun by the Red army, and the country was annexed to the Soviet Union.

America has never recognized this brutal annexation. Estonians have never ceased to be Estonians. They have suffered these 22 years; they have borne the brunt of alien philosophies imposed upon them by godless Communists. They know, as we, that at the moment the indescribable suffering will go on, not look bright. But these brave and sturdy fighters for freedom, long schooled in adversity, cling tenaciously to their ideals and never entertain any doubt about the ultimate victory of their righteous cause of freedom and independence.

On Saturday, the 24th, the million citizens of that brave nation observed in private ways the 44th anniversary of their independence. There could be none of the joyous and public display that we in America give on our 4th of July. But in their hearts and minds, their prayers and determination were renewed. In America, the thousands of citizens that have sprung from this noble stock added their prayers. We were not in this Chamber on that day; but I know all of us assembled now joined in with them. Here and publicly let us now proclaim to the world the justness of their cause. Let us lift up our hearts in prayer that the same cherished freedom we enjoy will soon spread east of the Baltic, and that Estonia will again take her place in the councils as well as the hearts of the community of free nations.

Urban Affairs Proposal Unworthy of Support

SPEECH

OF

HON. JESSICA McC. WEIS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the resolution (H. Res. 530) disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962.

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the administration has made a sound case for the reorganization plan under consideration today and I support its rejection.

Contrary to the hopes of many sincere people, including those who have written asking me to support this proposal, I do not think it begins to accomplish the things its sponsors claim for it.

After considerable study I have reached the conclusion that this proposal would be of little real value to the people of my congressional district, or to urban dwellers anywhere, and I am convinced that the arguments of those who support it will not stand up under close scrutiny. I should like to examine some of these arguments briefly here today.

On what grounds do the supporters of Reorganization Plan No. 1 seek its approval? They tell us that unlike the farmer, who has the Department of Agriculture, the urban dweller has no voice in the Federal Government and that this plan will give him one. They say it will bring about greater economy and efficiency in Government. They claim that the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency does not have sufficient status to represent and promote adequately the great programs under his direction.

Let us look a little more closely at some of these allegations. We are told that the urban dweller has no voice in Washington and is being neglected. I cannot accept this claim, for the Federal Government is literally filled with articulate spokesmen for our cities, both in Congress and in the executive branch. Would the proponents of this reorganization plan argue that the President is not willing and able to speak effectively for urban dwellers? Do they contend that the President's appointees—as, for example, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Goldberg, or Mr. Weaver—are incapable of speaking forcefully on behalf of those who live in the cities? Are they arguing that the great committees of Congress which deal with urban affairs, such as the House Banking and Currency Committee or the House Education and Labor Committee, are not doing a good job for city dwellers? I do not think the proponents of this plan mean any of these things when they charge that there is no voice for the cities in Washington. In fact, it is difficult to attach any meaning at all to this charge, which has emotional appeal but precious little substance.

But, say the supporters of this proposal, we must have someone in the very highest councils of Government to speak out on the needs of the urban masses. The farmer, they say, has the Secretary of Agriculture; the city dweller must have a Secretary of Urban Affairs and Housing.

Putting aside the issue of how much good the Secretary of Agriculture is doing our farmers, let us examine this argument for a moment. Would this proposed Secretary of Urban Affairs and Housing be the man who could speak out on problems of unemployment, juvenile delinquency, worker retraining, welfare or civil rights, all problems of great concern to the city dweller? Would he be the man who could speak out on such problems as air and water pollution? On the location of highways, expressways, airports, health centers, or hospitals in our cities?

Under the terms of this reorganization plan, the answer in every case is no, he could not, because the sponsors of the plan have done nothing to give the proposed new Secretary of Urban Affairs any authority over any of these problem areas which are so vitally important to urban living. By the admission of its own backers, this proposal does nothing to enlarge the responsibilities of the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. It adds no new functions. It gives him no authority he does not already have. Yet, somehow, it is supposed to be an unprecedented boon to our cities and the people who live in them.

Another major argument used by the supporters of this proposal is that it will solve the great need to coordinate the various Federal programs bearing on urban problems. In 1957, the Bureau of the Budget listed 21 Federal programs affecting urban areas. More have been added since then, and I definitely agree that there is a serious need for better coordination of these programs. But this proposal offers absolutely nothing in the way of improved coordination.

As I have already pointed out, this plan gives the HHFA Administrator no new responsibilities and no new programs to administer. He would have nothing more to coordinate as a Secretary of Urban Affairs than he now has to coordinate as Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Furthermore, the proposal sets up no new mechanism for coordinating in any way the various programs in other Government departments and agencies which deal with urban problems. In short, the contention that this reorganization plan would result in better coordination is false.

As a matter of fact, however, the Administrator of HHFA already has ample authority to reorganize his Agency in the interests of economy and better coordination whenever he wishes to do so. In the 1955 Independent Offices Appropriation Act, the Congress gave the HHFA Administrator, and I quote from the act, "full authority to assign and reassign functions and to reorganize his Agency to promote economy, efficiency, and fidelity in the operation of the Housing and Home Finance Agency."

Furthermore, although this proposed reorganization plan does nothing to promote better coordination, there already exists within the executive branch a coordinating council which at least partially meets this need, the National Housing Council. The Administrator of HHFA serves as permanent Chairman of this Council, which includes the heads, of their designees, of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Veterans' Administration, and the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, Defense, and Health, Education, and Welfare, along with other key HHFA officials. I submit that the council holds greater promise for adequate coordination than anything contained in this reorganization plan and that, imaginatively used, it might well fill the void which now exists with regard to coordination. At least this prospect bears further examination.

Still another argument which we hear is that the Administrator of HHFA does not have sufficient stature or prestige in the Government to obtain a fair hearing for the programs under his direction. I know this is not true as far as the Congress is concerned. I hope it is not true that the President is unwilling to listen to the HHFA Administrator now or that he would pay more attention to him and give his programs higher priority if only the Administrator were a Cabinet officer.

The fact is that there is nothing magical about Cabinet status, nothing about it which suddenly makes a man more able or more successful in presenting his programs and proposals. It is a further fact that the present HHFA Administrator is a man of great energy, experience and ability and his stature, both among Members of Congress and within the executive branch, is extremely high. I am certain that his recommendations are given the full attention they deserve.

Furthermore, I am convinced that this would be true of any HHFA Administrator of the same caliber. The records of such agencies as the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Veterans' Administration, the Atomic Energy Commission or, for that matter, HHFA itself, disprove completely the contention that agencies without Cabinet status have a hard time holding their own in Washington. On the contrary, it is common knowledge that each of these agencies holds a highly respected place within the bureaucratic hierarchy and none has experienced difficulty in securing either public acceptance or financial support for its programs—$13.5 billion, or one-third of the total nondefense budget, is budgeted this year for these four agencies alone.

Finally, it is said that local communities have difficulty knowing where to go or how to get help from the Federal Government and that they are shunted from agency to agency in their efforts to secure assistance. It is implied that the Department of Urban Affairs contemplated by this proposal will, in effect, provide one-stop service for these communities.

I have already pointed out that this proposal does nothing either to consolidate or to coordinate the dozens of programs in various departments and agencies which bear on urban problems. But there is another point which I want to make and it is this: Any community which has a sound and constructive program or proposal and is willing to bear the substantial amount of responsibility necessary to put that program into effect will neither have trouble finding nor obtaining the various forms of financial assistance available from the Federal Government. This has been true of my own home area of Rochester and Monroe County, N.Y., and it is true of other progressive communities. The trouble comes when a community, or a State, wants Washington to do all its thinking, planning and financing for it. This, I

am afraid, is what some city and State officials have in mind when they become so enthusiastic about a proposal like the one we are considering today.

Before closing, Mr. Chairman, I want to make just one comment about the manner in which the administration has presented this proposal to the Congress and the country. Realizing, apparently, that on its merits alone this reorganization plan was extremely weak, the administration has attempted to avoid consideration on the merits by clouding the facts and by interjecting both racism and partisan politics into the issue.

They have attempted to label those who oppose their proposal as either against the urban dweller or against the Negro race, or both. They refuse to admit that this plan can be opposed in good faith by a person who appreciates the problems of our growing urban communities or by a person who is sincerely interested in the progress of all Americans, regardless of the color of their skin. Mr. Chairman, this is demagogry at its worst. I personally resent it and it ought to be repudiated by the House today. On its merits alone, this proposal should be rejected. Neither the reorganization plan itself nor the tactics which have accompanied its presentation are worthy of the support of the Congress.

United States Must Withdraw From United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a speech by Mr. Homer Tomlinson, of Fort Worth, given in 1954 together with an opening and closing statement by Mr. Halsey McGovern, of 607 Pershing Drive, Silver Spring, Md.:

LETTER No. 22

Dear friends of our beloved America: Once against we are with you, again emphasizing the fact that more and more Americans of conscience are raising their voices in condemnation of that migraine mirage, that cute little Hiss boy's pet project—that thing called U.N.

This time it is a fine and forthright American, Mr. Homer Tomlinson, whose recent speech indicting this so-called United Nations is so magnificent, is so well reasoned, and is so well stated that I wish every citizen of this Republic could read it. The speech is printed in the May 1954 issue of the Southern Conservative (Flatiron Building, Fort Worth, Tex.), with the following editorial comment and explanation:

"Homer Tomlinson is a Fort Worth publisher and is one of the increasing number of the Nation's business executives who are taking time out from their private interests to study the state of the Nation and to contribute their bit toward efforts to improve it. We regard the arguments in this address, delivered recently to a large Fort Worth audience, as among the soundest, most forceful, and unanswerable so far offered concerning the danger to our national sovereignty by continued participation in the United Nations."

Here is the speech, and read it, please, every word of it:

UNITED STATES MUST WITHDRAW FROM UNITED NATIONS

(By Homer Tomlinson)

"Whoever for any cause,
Seeketh to take or give
Power above and beyond our laws
Suffer it not to live.

"Holy State or Holy King
Or Holy people's will,
Have no truck with the senseless thing
Call out the guns and kill."

These immortal lines of Kipling depict more forcefully than any prose of mine the real issue facing the people of the United States.

There is a "thing"—a senseless thing, to again borrow the words of Kipling—that has now been let loose which "seeks to take and to give power above and beyond our laws," our municipal laws, our State laws, our Federal laws and even our Constitution—that instrument that William Gladstone, British statesman and prime minister, once called the "most remarkable political document ever produced by the human intellect."

"I shall exert every faculty I possess in aiding to prevent the Constitution from being nullified, destroyed or impaired and if I should see it fall, I would still, with a voice feeble perhaps, but earnest as ever issued from human lips, call on the people to come to its rescue."

Those are the words of Daniel Webster. They are also my sentiments and, I hope, of every true, loyal citizen of the United States. For make no mistake, that is the issue in the question as to whether or not we should remain in, or withdraw from, the United Nations. The issue is not do we want war or do we not want war. Korea proved that. The issue is do we want to live under the United Nations Charter or do we want to live under the Constitution of the United States. We cannot live under both.

I have watched the progress of the United Nations from its prenatal beginning at Dumbarton Oaks. I think that in those early days there was not a person in America who looked with more longing eyes and a more eager heart to the "Star of Hope" we were assured was rising over the troubled horizon. I served in World War I. I had two sons in World War II, one in the Battle of the Bulge in the Air Corps, another in the Navy at Subic Bay in the South Pacific. My daughter's fiance—now her husband—was in the battle of France. I had two nephews in that conflict, one of whom was killed in a bombing mission over the Skagerrak near Denmark, not to mention various other near and dear relatives and close friends.

Surely, I thought, there must be some answer other than war as a solution to mankind's problems.

"The United Nations is the solution" said those who were our leaders then. And eagerly in this darkest spiritual hour, I grasped their "Star of Hope." Each and every trip to New York following the actual signing at San Francisco I never failed to set aside at least one day to sit in on the United Nations sessions. I went to Flushing. I went to Lake Success—several times—I watched almost from the day of groundbreaking the construction of the present magnificent United Nations building in the heart of down town New York—on the very site of the old New York slaughter houses. I was there when they first began to explain to visitors from a little miniature model erected in the main lobby. I have bought copiously of their books in their book store. I have listened to their lectures. And I have through the years, painstakingly and with an open mind and eager heart, studied its various ramifications.

I cannot now recall the exact moment when I first began to have misgivings. I think it was when I stood in line at the cafeteria at Lake Success. I watched while the paid Secretariat ate lunch and took their noon hour. Never in all my life have I seen so many eyes with so many gleams. Were those eyes and the souls behind them drawn there to carry on the creation of a new world of peace? Somewhere in the back of my mind a bell of danger began to ring, and an uneasy feeling crept in. Why I cannot exactly explain. All I can say for sure is that it did. It was not until much later that I learned that this staff—these people who actually did the work of the United Nations—was Communist controlled.

On another occasion when I visited the United Nations, literally carloads of books and pamphlets were stacked out in the halls addressed and waiting shipment to all the four corners of the earth. I'm in the newspaper and advertising business. I have been all my life. I know something about printed matter, if I know anything about anything. Well, I examined these pamphlets, or at least the titles, and so forth, as much as I could in the time at my disposal. I'm not too smart—I know that—but as I say this is my field, and I give my word that if there was a single thing in any of these truckloads of pamphlets that could be remotely calculated to "prevent war and keep the peace" I was too dumb to catch it. Certainly the incident tended to add to the misgivings that had now begun to arise.

These misgivings were heightened later when I first stood before the beautiful model of the United Nations set up in the uncompleted headquarters building. There a very intelligent young lady undertook to explain the things to be found in the buildings. She told us much, but two things stick in my mind to this day. First, almost every other room—or so it seemed from what she said—was to be a cocktail room. Now don't misunderstand me—some form of stimulant may be necessary to relieve the tension of prolonged sessions—but I confess that I did begin to wonder if the cause of peace was going to be furthered to any appreciable degree, or the threat of war abated by minds addled and twisted by round after round of cocktails. And second, she left my wife and me both with the very definite impression that "all ye who enter here must leave your nationality outside."

That was quite a jolt. I love the United States—my country—I wasn't then—and I am not now, about to give it up for anybody's.

Well, along came Korea—with its more than 150,000 American casualties—the third most costly war in lives and treasure ever endured by the American people. And the only one, incidentally, that we ever failed to win. That, I confess, decidedly shook my faith in the United Nations as an instrument of peace.

But I still clung to my faith—my hope. Surely we needed something. Maybe the U.N. wouldn't prevent war as they told us it would. But at least it showed to the good God in heaven that we were trying—trying to make the old world a world of peace. Maybe even if it wasn't doing any good, maybe it wasn't doing any harm. Oh, it was costing us a pretty penny in various ways, but what did that matter, sorely taxed as we now are, if there was even a glimmer of hope in it—a hope for peace.

And so on that basis I stood firm. I still felt that we had best string along with the U.N., and strive to improve it.

Then came this "new concept of law", as Frank E. Holman, past president of the American Bar Association, so ably and aptly describes it. A concept which takes advantage of what Senator Bricker describes as a

"loophole in our Constitution." There is a provision in our Constitution, article VI—a provision which says that "treaties are the supreme law of the land." Under that heretofore little-used clause, treaties by the hundreds, yes thousands, are being ground out—treaties and so-called executive agreements. These treaties and executive agreements are not subject to our constitutional legislative processes. They are not subject to review by the courts. They do not have to be passed by the Senate and the House and then signed by the President: Oh, no. In the case of treaties the courts and the House are bypassed entirely. And in the Senate only a two-thirds vote of the Senators present and voting—get that—present and voting—and the signature of the President are necessary. The record shows that several treaties have been passed with only one or two Senators on the floor. The very important treaties with Turkey and Greece were passed with only three Senators present and voting.

In the case of executive agreements we don't even have that little protection. The President writes a letter—or as a matter of practice, one of his various aids writes a letter—the President signs it—and bingo, you have another law. A law that supersedes all of our Fort Worth laws, all of our Austin laws, all of our Texas laws, all of our other State laws, and our Federal laws—the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Oh, they can talk all they want, and they can hem and haw about what I've just said (and the lawyers of the State Department and the U.N. do talk and hem and haw)—but as Senator Bricker has said: "If they—these State Department and United Nations lawyers are right, then 90 percent of the rest of the lawyers of the United States are wrong."

I must confess that at this point I began to shy clear away from the United Nations. But hope springs eternal. I say to myself that it's just an oversight. That nobody, not even the most devout lovers of the U.N., would want our own laws set aside in favor of anybody's laws. They don't want overriding laws that can be passed by the whim of any one man—dictatorlike—regardless of who that man might be. And certainly the American people do not want to eliminate the House of Representatives—the body that is after all closest to the people and most amenable to their wishes. But did they? Did they pass the Bricker amendment? Did they listen to Senator George? Did they do anything—anything at all—to allay the nightmarish fears that have come to dwell in the minds and hearts of all of us who love America? You know the answer as well as I. They did not. At that moment I realized what had happened—and I now confess it. I had been duped: They had sold me a bill of goods: From that instant I have known that there was but one thing left, one course of action open to those of us who love our country and who appreciate the priceless heritage bequeathed to us by the sacrifices at Concord, and Lexington, and Valley Forge. The only thing left for us was to withdraw from the United Nations. To withdraw definitely, finally, and unequivocally.

I therefore want to present a bill of particulars on which I base my stand:

It is my firm conviction that we should get out of the United Nations now—before it is too late, first, because:

All available evidence indicates that the charter was, for all practical purposes conceived in Moscow, and that its chief architect was the convicted perjurer and oft accused Communist, Alger Hiss. Alger Hiss was at Dumbarton Oaks where the charter was incubated. He was the man who consulted about it in Moscow before it was written. He was secretary general of the meeting at San Francisco at which the charter was adopted.

Alger Hiss has publicly claimed it as his handiwork, and it was he, Alger Hiss, as its custodian-father who flew it from San Francisco to its home in Washington. Of course the charter was the work of many minds, but the words themselves are largely the words of Alger Hiss. Any document with a parentage like that is unsafe for the American people to use as the supreme arbiter of their destinies. For, as many believe the hidden meaning of many words, surreptitiously inserted by Alger Hiss, have not even yet come fully to light.

We should get out of the United Nations now because: Except in its brief World Court chapter, the late Senator Arthur Vandenberg tells us that "The Dumbarton Oaks formula from which the United Nations sprang does not once mention justice as a guiding objective or as a rule of conduct." Any instrument that thus ignores justice is not a safe instrument under which the American people should be forced to live.

We should get out of the United Nations because: The United Nations is essentially a "war baby." It was conceived in war, and born in war. At a time when men's minds were not normal. At a time when they were not capable of thinking and reasoning sanely and dispassionately. I have all of the speeches of the various delegates and dignitaries before, at, and after the sessions at San Francisco. A careful reading of these speeches proves this conclusively. A document born under the psychosis of war is not a safe instrument under which we can afford to trust our lives.

We should get out of the United Nations because: It is not clear. The American Bar Association, officials of the U.N., U.S. Senators, Members of the House, Presidents, and Eleanor Roosevelt have been engaging in constant argument as to its meaning since the earliest days of Dumbarton Oaks and these arguments have continued ever since the charter itself was signed in San Francisco. After all this time they are certainly no nearer to agreement as to actually what the words in the United Nations charter say, much less what they mean. I'm in the advertising and newspaper business, I deal in words. We have a saying to this effect: "Never write so that what you write can be understood—always write so that it cannot be misunderstood." I sat for one whole afternoon at Lake Success and heard the delegates of the various countries argue as to the meaning of "should," "would," and "will." To me those are simple enough English words. But the delegates never could agree as to what the words meant. I submit that there is something radically and fundamentally wrong with an organization functioning under an assortment of words that even the experts cannot understand. Where does it leave common folks like you and me? We'd better get out now while there is yet time, and if need be start all over again, and this time let the words be written by patriotic Americans and not by an Alger Hiss and his associates.

We should get out of the United Nations because: It places an imminent and ever-pressing threat to our basic rights guaranteed to us under the so-called Bill of Rights. In our own Constitution the right of trial by jury is unequivocally guaranteed. Under the proposed covenant of human rights—well, let Dr. Phillip Jessup, former representative to the U.N. and professor of international law at Columbia, tell it as he does in his book "A Modern Law of Nations."

In this book he discusses what he calls an unavoidable collision between a universal bill of rights and article 10 of the draft covenant of the U.N., which permits denial of right of trial by jury, and article 36 of the proposed U.N. treaty, which provides, and I quote: "Trials shall be without jury." That's what's potentially ahead of us on the right of trial by jury, a right won in 1215 by our Anglo-Saxon forebears from old King John on that low lying plain just outside London called Runnymede.

On freedom of the press—another fundamental basic right, always heretofore enjoyed in America since the days of Peter Zenger—listen to article 14, paragraph 3 of one of the human rights covenant drafts. It says:

"If necessary for the protection of national security, public order, safety, health or morals, or of the rights of others, they (i.e., the rights to freedom of press) may be withdrawn."

As a publisher I assure you that no would-be dictator could ask for a more effective club over the newspapers of his country.

But here's the real joker: Article 2 says, and I quote:

"Many of the rights ostensibly guaranteed in the covenant including freedom of the press, may be withdrawn during an emergency officially proclaimed by the authorities."

In heaven's name how much protection is that? Surely it is in time of "emergency officially proclaimed" that the people most urgently need the protection that freedom of the press gives them.

On freedom of religion—and to us in the United States at least, that is the most vital right of all—for in God we still trust. On this point our Constitution says: "Congress shall make no laws respecting the establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

What does the U.N. Covenant say: Well it does not say "shall not." It says:

"Freedom to manifest one's religion shall be subject only to such limitations as are necessary to protect public safety, order, health, morals, or the fundamental rights and freedoms of others."

And who pray is to judge as to whether or not my religion and the way I want to worship is going to endanger somebody's "health or morals"?

We should get out of the United Nations because: The ILO—International Labor Organization—through its conventions which threaten to act as universal law—ties the laboring man in the United States and his high standard of living to that of the peon laborers of the world whose low production and correspondingly low standard of living would be devastating to the lives of all who work in these United States.

We should get out of the United Nations because: It destroys our U.S. sovereignty, and sets up in its stead a socialistic welfare world state. The major cost of this part of the program—some 70 percent of it to be exact—is scheduled to fall upon the already sorely pressed American taxpayer. But to even this we would not too seriously object if in fact a socialistic welfare state ever had, in the entire course of history, shown any signs of permanently or appreciably raising the level of man's well-being. Such a socialistic program would indeed ultimately bankrupt the United States, and a bankrupt United States would be the greatest possible tragedy, not only for ourselves, but for the entire world.

To sum up: The United States should get out of the United Nations now—now before it is too late, now before the United Nations Charter is revised by one-worlders, now before man in this socialized world-welfare state is made, in truth and in fact, a creature of state instead of a creature of God.

This then is my bill of particulars:

We therefore, as representative citizens of the United States of America here assembled and apealing to the Supreme Judge of the universe for the rectitude of our intentions, do hereby solemnly publish and declare that these United States are, and of right ought to be, again free and independent: that we are henceforth absolved from all allegiance to the United Nations as now constituted, and that all political connec-

tion between us and the so-called United Nations is, and of right ought to be, totally dissolved, and that once again, as a free and independent sovereign nation, we should again have full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, control our own internal domestic affairs, acknowledge the existence and divinity of a Creator-God, and to do all other acts and things which we, as an independent nation may, of right do, under the terms of our own Constitution.

And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, a protection ignored in the United Nations Charter—we do mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor.

"For of what avail the plow or sail
Or land or life if freedom fail."

There, stated with almost inspired clarity, you have not only the views and convictions of the vast majority of present-day Americans but a splendid reaffirmation of the principles of our Founding Fathers, a rededicated Declaration of Independence, and a bill of divorcement from that thing called U.N.

I would add further that divorcement from U.N. seems clearly enforcible because all that is needed to accomplish that much-to-be-desired result is for patriotic Americans to put a stop to the illegitimate use of their money in support of U.N. No more American money, no more U.N. And the stoppage would have support in conscience and in the Constitution for the United States of America, because neither conscience nor the Constitution sanctions the enforced exaction of money from American citizens for any purposes other than "to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States." Most certainly you are not obligated to supply the means for the subversion and destruction of your own beloved America.

Think it over, won't you please, and discuss it with the lawyers who are in the patriotic, civic, or fraternal organizations to which you belong.

Sincerely yours, for an America without a U.N.

HALSEY MCGOVERN.

Money Grows on Trees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, Tax Foundation, Inc., in its January 1962 issue, states the President's budget for fiscal year 1963 to be the highest in peacetime history. Allocation of the tax burden for this spending will run from $193.14 per resident of the State of Mississippi to $1,055.90 per resident of the State of Delaware. New York State's share per resident will be $739.28. It is apparent that the Kennedy administration, from the President on down, has no appreciation of the value of money or how it is earned. The following articles by Robert C. Ruark and Henry J. Taylor, in the February 16 edition of the New York World-Telegram and Sun, dramatizes the plight of the taxpayer and the businessman:

AFTER ALL, IT'S ONLY MONEY

(By Robert C. Ruark)

I forget what the formal figure was this time last year, when Mr. Kennedy was going to do away with the expense-account boondoggle entirely, and Mr. Douglas Dillon of the Treasury was loudly agreeing that any businessman could make it bravely on an allowance of $25 or $30 a day. I think I pointed out at the time that neither Mr. Kennedy nor Mr. Dillon had ever been unduly hampered by an acute case of what the gamblers call the "shorts."

This is to say that they are millionaires, and have always been millionaires, and millionaires, believe it or not, do not bleed as thee and me. You just call up Papa, and he sends the money on his own plane.

Mr. Kennedy, in an outburst of boyish enthusiasm which generally comes from running for public office after you've been elected, was going to kill off expense-account deductions from the liable list, and pick up some $250 million extra in the process of eliminating what he referred to as widespread abuses. I would not like to stick that back in his teeth in terms of what it cost old Joe to elect our President, but you cauld surely call it something in the way of widespread abuse and personal patrimony for a trip not really necessary.

It seems to me we reminded Mr. Kennedy at the time that if he off-knocked expense deductions to any marked degree he would also off-knock the hotel business, the entertainment business, the automotive industry, the airlines dodge, the booze trusts, etc.

This assassination of deductible expenditure would indeed do strange things to the national economy, which would quite possibly make it necessary to raise taxes some more to pay off unemployed saloon keepers, workless hotel magnates, airline employees, waiters, bus boys, ticket scalpers, and professional dancers.

The national brow would indeed be grievously smitten, since if our unemployment soars at home there will be less money to spend on the undeserving poor in Laos and Ghana; less money to finance the United Nations in the Congo; less money for radio commercials to hustle new employees for the Peace Corps * * * terrible.

I truly, sincerely wish the President would quit kidding us with the business entertainment nonsense, which seems to be rather a foolish fixation with him. He knows it's not going anywhere.

It is a big country, and our leader keeps talking about burgeoning the national product until we fair ooze with milk and honey. Certainly he tilts the ante on the giveaways to the undeserving many as time goes by. It would seem to me that the increase of the national product, and the upped charity to the clamoring multitudes must depend on one thing—the health of business and the American businessman.

The American businessman, with his pitiful little deductible wastage, is a spender second only to the congregation he hustles to buy his goods so that he may pay his taxes to keep the government fed, stabled, and watered.

It seems to me that any government which practices loose-limbed, big-time spending might allow a little leeway to the man who makes the Saturday nights possible—the American businessman with his tiny little license to steal just a teensy little before taxes.

Sometimes it seems to me we continually couple the cart before the steed. If you are hustling bonds in a busted flush like the United Nations; and if you are feeding our billions to everybody everywhere, what is so wrong with letting the harassed man who provides the dough steal a little on the side with some reasonably justifiable business expense? I mean to say, who knows when the theater tickets and the cute chick might not provide the impetus to the deal that makes the money to pay the Treasury so they can give it to Kwame Nkrumah or pay the village police force in Laos?

KENNEDY SPENDING IS EVERY MAN'S BURDEN

(By Henry J. Taylor)

The only way to eat an elephant is to cut it up in pieces and get a lot of people chewing on it. The thing we need to chew on is our taxes and what makes them so high.

Nobody objects to taxes for what we need, but anybody with an ounce of gumption resents levies for things he should not pay for.

The first thing we should not pay for is pork-barrel spending to get votes. And the New Frontier professors are now reducing this to a science. Next is the attitude of general extravagance. It shows up all over the place like the oldtime whoopla in the Roman Forum or the pearls in the nose of Cleopatra's camel.

This Government is being run by the Kennedy brothers. Obviously, they have a blind spot about taxes. This is of itself an important psychological problem. They have never had to worry where the money was coming from. It was always there. They have never had to earn the taxes. In fact, the President's approach to our difficulty is so emotional and unknowing as to be impervious to argument or, indeed, to the facts.

The President hardly lets a day go by without announcing some new spending program, or buying some bauble like the $2 million yacht he gave the Lion of Judah, Emperior of Ethiopia, or the $5 million new jet that is to move into the White House stable—the most costly plane per seat inside ever built. Why, on February 8 he even asked for additional money beyond the incredible $92.5 billion budget, including $2.5 million to build an educational television station in the Samoa Islands. Does our hard-earned money mean nothing?

These are poor uses for our taxes and a bad example by a leader who called for sacrifices from the rest of us a year ago last month. I hope not, but at this rate it looks as if Mr. Kennedy is going to be a problem President.

Every penny, every dime, every dollar anybody in the Government spends must be earned by you or me or somebody and handed over out of our worry and sweat. Taxes are, in fact, the largest item in our cost of living. And whoever does not yell out loud when he sees them wasted simply does not understand the American democracy or his duty as a citizen of the United States.

Our forefathers, the Colonists, knew better than that in Boston Harbor. A flicker of revolt right now might cause these spenders to pause for a second thought. And, fortunately, there's a way to make them think. Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, has called for "a full-scale investigation of the financial condition of the country" by his committee. He is a stalwart; he is immensely informed, and has the courage to lead the fight. For he is beholden to nobody and nothing frightens this gallant son of our Jamestown pioneers.

This is important because the public vote is important on Congress as well as the President. Much of the spending is Congress' own idea. Congress will sober up only if it hears from home and discovers it is politically popular to stop the star-spangled giveaways. The President could perform a profound service by pounding home the needed call for thrift and prudence loud into the national ear. He should ask the people's help in seeing that it was transmitted to Congress. Instead, the President seizes the leadership himself in irresponsible spending. As a result, the duty falls to others.

Seeing this, millions who are heartsick and worried ask, "What can I do?" What they can do is to call on everyone, inside and outside the Government, to support Senator BYRD and his committee and make this investigation a roaring vote for the solvency and security of the United States. For our solvency and security are indivisible. And until we turn back from this road to financial disaster our long-term security against the Soviet Union cannot be guaranteed. All our public needs is the stark, naked truth.

This further editorial appeared in the Washington Daily News on February 22:

WE'LL OWE FOREVER

With some reluctance, the House has voted to raise the so-called ceiling on the national debt to $300 billion—for the fiscal year ending June 30. The Senate shortly will follow suit.

This is solemnly called an emergency or temporary measure. The so-called permanent ceiling is $285 billion—but Congress almost every year tacks on a temporary addition, each time bigger.

President Kennedy wants to raise this $300 billion temporary ceiling to $308 billion for fiscal 1963—temporarily, of course.

Treasury Secretary Dillon told Congress it might as well raise the ceiling because, if it didn't, the administration would have to get the money somewhere else anyway, at a higher cost. It would borrow the money indirectly, instead of directly, and not count it as part of the official Federal debt.

It has been doing this right along.

Maurice Stans, who was Budget Director in the Eisenhower administration, once estimated that the Government has amassed obligations for the future which eventually will have to be paid out of taxes to the tune of $1 trillion. That's $1,000 billion.

This is money the Government has committed itself to spend in later years—pensions, veterans' benefits, unfinished public works, subsidies, highways. These are built-in programs already underway, and snowballing each year. They amount to a mortgage on the future income of the Government.

They have nothing to do with such annual expenses of the Government as defense, space, payroll, welfare, and all the other yearly costs.

The recognized Federal debt is only a fraction of the story.

This gives real point to the proposed Senate Finance Committee investigation of the Government's actual financial predicament. If this inquiry can dramatize the true indebtedness of the Government, ceiling and otherwise, we guarantee it will be illuminating—in a shocking way—to all taxpayers.

Aid to Education: Private Schools Lessen the Taxpayer's Burden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, a short while ago, the Wisconsin State Legislature approved a bill—admittedly inadequate—to provide at least partial schoolbus transportation to children attending nonpublic schools. The Governor signed the bill into law. This event marked a milestone in the prolonged effort of many Wisconsin parents to secure equal treatment under our Constitution for children attending nonpublic schools.

I have repeatedly maintained that on a local, State, or Federal level, we should not discriminate against children who, as a matter of conscience or free choice, are attending nonpublic schools. These schools are supported by the parents of these children. They are not financed by public funds derived from the taxpayers. As a matter of fact, their existence lessens the taxpayers' burden to a considerable extent.

The extent of this relief is clearly portrayed in an article by a distinguished Wisconsin journalist, Mr. William A. Norris, which appeared in the February 21, 1961, edition of the Milwaukee Sentinel. Under leave to extend my remarks, I want to place this article, entitled "State's Private Schools Ease Tax Burden," in the RECORD. I commend it heartily to the attend of the membership of this body.

STATE'S PRIVATE SCHOOLS EASE TAX BURDEN

(By William A. Norris)

The highly controversial schoolbus bill is not yet before the State supreme court, but it very definitely is before the bar of public opinion.

The question is whether public money should be used to transport schoolchildren to parochial or other private schools—in other words, to schools not supported by public funds derived from the taxpayers.

This is the apparent, or superficial question. Underlying it is the deeper, more fundamental question whether public money should in any way be used to further the education of children in Catholic—and to a lesser extent in Lutheran—schools. Back of this question are generations and centuries of religious conflict.

Your columnist has always thought that the question of assisting nonpublic school children in getting an education in the schools supported by their own people was fairly well settled when we started spending public money for police officers and others to safeguard Catholic and Lutheran children on their way to school, and when we put up stop-and-go lights and other warnings near nonpublic schools.

I can see little difference, except perhaps in degree, between these protective measures for parochial school children and the protection of such children by giving them the same transportation between home and school that we give to nonparochial school children in order to protect them from the hazards of traffic and weather.

However, the rest of this column concerns itself with less lofty considerations—with considerations that are positively mercenary.

In most Wisconsin communities, the rising tax rates are due chiefly to skyrocketing school costs. In most communities, part of the school costs are borne, not by the general taxpayers, but by the parochial school systems. If there were no such parochial systems, the cost to the general taxpayers would be much higher in most communities.

How much higher, and in what communities?

The 1960 census tells us how many elementary school children are enrolled in each county, and how many of them are in public schools. The rest are attending parochial and private schools, not supported by the general taxpaying public. My slide rule and I have worked out the percentage of parochial and private school elementary pupils for each county. Within rough limitations, the percentage of nonpublic school enrollment shows the percentage of potential school costs saved for the general taxpayers by the existence of the parochial schools.

[Percentage of elementary pupils not in public schools]

County:	
Calumet	69
Manitowoc	58
Brown	55
Pepin	51
Outagamie	50
Ozaukee	47
Washington	47
Wood	47
Portage	46
Marathon	42
Dodge	41
Kewaunee	41
Fond du Lac	40
Milwaukee	38
Green Lake	35
La Crosse	35
Sheboygan	35
Ashland	34
Grant	34
Jefferson	34
Chippewa	33
Langlade	33
State average	32
Kenosha	31
Racine	31
Winnebago	31
Clark	28
Lincoln	28
Sauk	28
Shawano	27
Waukesha	27
Door	25
Oneida	25
Marinette	24
Iron	23
St. Croix	22
Buffalo	21
Price	21
Waupaca	21
Dane	20
Douglas	20
Eau Claire	19
Monroe	19
Lafayette	18
Oconto	18
Crawford	17
Iowa	17
Pierce	17
Juneau	16
Taylor	16
Richland	15
Rock	14
Columbia	13
Marquette	13
Rusk	13
Trempealeau	13
Vilas	13
Bayfield	12
Walworth	12
Dunn	11
Barron	9
Green	7
Waushara	7
Washburn	5
Sawyer	4
Jackson	3
Vernon	3
Florence	1
Forest	1
Polk	0
Adams	0
Burnett	0

In the above table I have figured to the nearest percentage point in order to keep it simple. The table gives some idea of what the taxpayers of each county save through the existence of parochial (private) schools.

Let me add that I am neither a Catholic nor a Lutheran.

But I am a taxpayer.

Remarks by Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson at Luncheon in Honor of Lt. Col John H. Glenn, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, all America glows with pride over the accomplishments of Lt. Col. John H. Glenn and our American astronauts, as well as the achievements of American scientific ingenuity.

Yesterday, Congress and official Washington paid a fitting tribute to Lt. Col. John Glenn. Following the very outstanding presentation by Colonel Glenn on the floor of the House before the joint meeting of Congress, a luncheon was held in the Colonel's honor. The remarks made by the Vice President on the occasion of this luncheon are most appropriate in stating the basis for America's space explorations and recognizing a few of those who have been in the forefront of the development of the space frontier.

I am proud and pleased to insert in the RECORD these brilliant statements of Vice President JOHNSON.

The statements follow:

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON AT LUNCHEON IN HONOR OF LT. COL. JOHN H. GLENN, JR., FEBRUARY 26, 1962

My friends and fellow Americans, this day belongs to Lt. Col. John H. Glenn and his fellow astronauts, the space pioneers of the new frontier.

Our people are rejoicing. Rains may dampen the streets of Washington but they cannot dampen the mood of exhilaration that is deep within all of us.

There is a reason for this that goes beyond the magnitude of the achievement itself. It can be found in the character of the men who are blazing trails in the heavens.

We have held to the belief that in a democracy men who are adequate will arise to any situation, no matter how perilous. And we have proved that belief in men like John H. Glenn, Alan Shepard and Gus Grissom.

These are the men of absolute competence, complete devotion, sure courage and high purpose who are leading us to the stars. And behind them, we have millions of the same breed.

I can list only a few but some that I cannot name will be as important as those that I do.

The greatest administrator, Jim Webb.

Mr. Wisdom of Science, Hugh Dryden.

Mr. Gilruth, who did as much as any living man to make the Glenn flight a success.

Senator LAUSCHE, the senior Senator from Colonel Glenn's native State.

Walter Williams, whom we had trouble locating this morning.

Senator BOB KERR, the able and imaginative head of the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee.

GEORGE MILLER, the wise leader of the House committee.

The beloved former Speaker, JOE MARTIN, and the fair and nonpartisan Senator, ALEX WILEY.

Congressmen ALBERT THOMAS, FRANK BOW, MIKE KIRWAN, all of whom helped finance this great effort and Colonel Glenn's own Congressman, TOM MOOREHEAD, as well as my own associate, Ed Welsh.

Like the astronauts themselves, our space program has been neither provocative nor timid. We have not rattled atomic bombs among the stars; nor have we shrunk from the full consequences of what we are doing.

We have proceeded with confidence, with sureness, with boldness tempered by prudence—and we have proceeded in the full light of day. We have not treated outer space as a vast collection of secrets which we hope to lock up in a steel safe, away from humanity.

Colonel Glenn, you and your fellow astronauts have done much more than advance human knowledge. You have also advanced the confidence that men should have in themselves and the Nation and the cause of freedom will always be grateful to you.

Praise for Internal Revenue Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 1, I inserted an editorial that had appeared that day in the Nutley (N.J.) Sun which was critical of the longstanding Federal practice of continuing certain important officials in "acting" capacities. The situation at the Newark, N.J., Internal Revenue Service district office was the immediate concern of that editorial because the man in charge of it had remained in an "acting" status for a long period.

In the February 15 edition of the same newspaper, there appears a followup editorial complimenting the Internal Revenue Service for making changes at the Newark district office and elsewhere which have removed the cause of the original criticism.

In fairness to all concerned, I ask unanimous consent to place the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

NATIONAL RECOGNITION

In the February 1 issue of the Sun there appeared an editorial entitled "The Turtle-like Speed of Federal Government," which chided the Government in Washington for taking so long to fill important offices and for keeping capable officials dangling in the limbo of uncertainty by continuing them in "acting" status for indefinite periods. The case in point was the then Acting Director of the Newark District of the Internal Revenue Service, Kenneth O. Hook. He has since been replaced by Chris Gross, formerly of Camden, and Mr. Hook has been promoted to Philadelphia, one of the largest IRS districts in the country.

Speaking in the House of Representatives the day the editorial was printed, Congressman FRANK C. OSMERS, JR., of Tenafly, who represents the Ninth Congressional District (parts of Bergen and Hudson Counties) in the House, read the comments of the Sun into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Hook promotion is appropriate recognition of the good work of a dedicated, career, public employee.

In Chris Gross, the Newark IRS district gets a worthy replacement for Kenneth Hook. Gross is also a career Treasury employee. Coming up through the ranks, in 1955 Gross caught the eye of the then U.S. Deputy Internal Revenue Commissioner, O. Gordon Delk, who personally selected Gross for the difficult assignment of reshaping a rundown district office.

Delk's faith in Gross paid off well for Uncle Sam, for the Camden District Internal Revenue office today is among the most efficient in the system.

To Kenneth Hook go our best wishes in the bigger task which awaits him in Philadelphia.

For Mr. Gross the north Jersey "welcome mat" is rolled out once again to a deserving career employee. He inherits an office which has gained national acclaim under the direction of the late Joseph F. J. Mayer.

Both Hook and Gross were given IRS executive opportunities only after former U.S. Deputy Internal Revenue Commissioner O. Gordon Delk (himself a career Federal employee) removed the Internal Revenue Service from the influence zone of the politically important.

From the beginning of Delk's tenure to the end of the Eisenhower years the merit system became a fact of everyday life in the U.S. Internal Revenue Service.

It is refreshing to note the present Democrat administration intends to carry on—and expand upon—the fine policies and programs initiated by Delk in 1953. Such a policy can only benefit our taxpayers, IRS employees, and the Kennedy administration.

Urban Affairs Backfire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the smart boys around the President thought they were being real slick when they had the President inject racism into a matter that should be decided clearly on its merits. The fact that the President degraded his Office by indulging in such cheap, tawdry political blackmail is something else again.

Newsday, the largest daily circulated in my district has been most forceful in its disenchantment of the President, on this subject. When one considers that the editor and publisher supported candidate Kennedy, the attitude of this newspaper is all the more revealing.

I submit here editorials which appeared in Newsday on February 20 and 23:

DIRTY POOL

The proposed Federal Department of Urban Affairs should from the beginning have been considered on its merits. It should never have been tied to a distasteful corollary that raises and intensifies the whole issue of race. By insisting that the head of this Cabinet-level Department be Robert C. Weaver, a highly qualified Negro, President Kennedy opened the door to some dirty pool. Weaver himself has now added to the unpleasantness of the argument. Appearing on a State TV and radio network Sunday, he was asked by Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, whether he thought that Congressmen who voted against the new Department would be labeled "anti-Negro." "There is a large segment of the population which will interpret a vote against this Department as a vote against the concept of having a Negro in the Cabinet," Weaver replied.

This is political blackmail with a vengeance, for—outside the southern Democrats—there are few Congressmen who cannot be tarred with theanti-Negro brush, however unfair the accusation may be. The whole controversy raises some questions. Why, if the President wanted a Negro in the Cabinet, did he not appoint Weaver or some other able Negro when he was making his list of selections in December 1961? Why did he not permit the urban affairs issue to be debated on its merits, even knowing that it probably would be defeated?

The regretful answer must be that the desirability of a Negro Cabinet member did not dawn on the President until long after he took office, and then only when a much-desired piece of legislation was in jeopardy. He should have recognized from the first that no minority group should be barred from Cabinet representation, and that equal or superior ability should be used as the measuring stick. He could, and should, have obliterated the race issue by appointing Weaver to some other post—say, Commerce, or perhaps Health, Education, and Welfare.

The answer to the second question has to be that the President, either on his own initiative or as the result of some extremely bad advice, sought to pull off a slick political trick, to box his opponents into a corner, and to label the Republican Party as anti-Negro—which, historically, is the exact opposite of the truth. The result is rancor. Name calling is bound to follow. And, in the end, a capable man will have been used out of the wrong motives and will, very probably, never reach the Cabinet. It is bad business all around.

DESERVED LUMPS FOR KENNEDY

President Kennedy has suffered the defeat he deserved in his plans to establish a new Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

There is no denying the need for such a department, with the problems of the cities being what they are. Had Kennedy tried to sell his new department on the basis of need alone, he surely would have at least come closer to achieving it.

But Kennedy chose to obfuscate the issue by declaring, in advance, that his Cabinet member of this new department, when formed, would be Robert C. Weaver, a very capable administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and, not incidentally, a Negro.

To forewarn a racially divided Congress that a Negro would join the Cabinet for the first time in American history via this new department was legislative suicide, and a gross attempt by Kennedy to inject the racial issue into a subject which needed no additional barrier to its passage by Congress. Kennedy's attempts to label those Congressmen voting against the measure as anti-Negro fortunately didn't cow Congress into voting out of fear.

A Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would be a natural, modern-day extension of the Cabinet and one which should be established, just on its own merit. Kennedy, when he came into office, had 10 opportunities to name a Negro to his Cabinet but chose not to do so. It is at the expense of a vitally needed new Cabinet department that he selected this time to inject the totally unrelated racial issue. In this case, he may have won the battle, but he unquestionably lost the war.

The New York Herald Tribune, in a February 23 editorial, lays bare for all to see the duplicity of President Kennedy and his advisers:

TOO CLEVER BY HALF

The administration's manipulation of the urban affairs issue has received an unexpectedly—but not undeservedly—severe rebuke at the hands of Congress.

Perhaps too many of the Senators and Representatives were irked at the way in which Mr. Kennedy had tried to make a vote against the new department seem like a vote for racial bias; obviously, the Senate was annoyed at the parliamentary device the administration leaders tried to use to force a quick vote on the matter. Whatever the motives behind the votes, the results in both Senate and House were a slap at the White House and at those commentators who were so full of admiration for the President's cleverness that they failed to see the danger of being too clever too openly.

The Senate vote was procedural and not conclusive. The House vote, however, saw nearly half the Democrats bolt the reservation—and it may be some time before the administration can round them up again.

The President implied that the adverse vote was due to rural votes, and warned of the danger of farmers voting against city folk and vice versa. But that is hardly the issue; farm State representatives have voted for urban renewal projects as city representatives have voted for rural electrification and the like.

Administration tactics, quite as much as or even more than Presidential goals, are in question here.

There is still talk that the President's stand will win votes for the Democrats in November. This might indicate that, to paraphrase an old saw, the President does not care who makes the laws of the Nation provided he can get the votes.

But garnering votes is only the beginning; the real job of governing a country comes in translating a popular mandate into effective action.

To split a party wide open, not over a matter of principle but by being too Machiavellian, is hardly statesmanship.

David Lawrence examines in depth why the Department of Urban Affairs was defeated. His analysis of the problem appeared in the February 23 edition of the New York Herald Tribune:

BEHIND URBAN DEPARTMENT VOTES ANTI-CENTRALIZATION REVOLT

WASHINGTON.—Despite the fact that the House of Representatives overwhelmingly defeated the administration's latest reorganization plan, President Kennedy predicts that the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs, which he unsuccessfully advocated, is an inevitable development.

But the President, unhappily, has not analyzed the real reason for the setback. It wasn't personal. It wasn't based, as he suggests, on opposition from rural areas to giving aid to cities. It wasn't motivated by the ill-advised interjection of a racial issue in the announcement that Robert C. Weaver, a Negro, would be appointed to head the new Department. The refusal of Congress to go along was due primarily to a deep-seated revolt against the concept of a centralized Government which could conceivably convert the White House into the most powerful political machine this country has ever known.

For if a Department of Urban Affairs is needed to work with municipal governments, it is just as logical to ask for the creation of two other departments—one covering all relations between the Federal Government and State governments, and another to embrace all relations with county governments. Likewise, it can be argued that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has too broad a scope, and that it should be separated into two departments, so that one can specialize in education.

But the basic mistake is in the concept that new departments are needed for urban affairs, just because city problems have increased. Fundamentally—if the Federal Government is to maintain the constitutional principle of State, city and county systems, as separated from the Federal system—what is desirable is not several new departments, but one department that specializes in the disbursement of Federal funds and the making of contracts with the States, counties and cities.

Also, if the argument that the Federal Government does not intend to control the educational process of the States—when Federal funds are furnished to them—is accepted as sincere, then all that is needed is a good business organization to see that Federal funds are matched by the States, and that the money is spent for the purposes set forth in the law.

While Robert Weaver might be a good man for a Cabinet post some day, it would have been much better if the President had turned to the business or financial world and had selected another Robert McNamara to head up the very Department of Urban Affairs which he espoused. For it is not a knowledge of city politics that is so much needed as a familiarity with large business and financial transactions.

Billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money are involved in all these plans for new departments. Thus, the billions that are spent by the Federal Government in cooperation with the States for highways are in the hands of the Bureau of Public Roads inside the U.S. Department of Commerce. It could logically be argued that a U.S. Department of Relations With the States would more properly supervise the work done by the Bureau of Public Roads and other agencies of the Federal Government that deal with the States.

COUNTIES NEGLECTED

Counties have too long been neglected. Federal funds are being furnished to distressed areas through the Area Redevelopment Administration, which is in the U.S. Department of Commerce. This Department today delegates some of the activities of the Area Redevelopment Administration to at least five other departments or agencies of the Federal Government.

The fallacy in the approach heretofore to the problems of administrative reform and reorganization is that broad subjects—agriculture, labor, and commerce—have been confused with simple tasks which are designed to make sure that Federal funds are spent for the objectives stipulated in the appropriation laws passed by Congress.

The Federal Government is growing as population grows. And while the fundamental structure of the Government here can be improved and modernized, the basic principles laid down in the Constitution are still valid—namely, that self-rule must be maintained, as well as a reliance on the States and cities and counties to exercise full responsibility for their own systems of Government.

What is needed in Government today is decentralization instead of more centralization. The States and cities are not all equal in financial capacity, and some Federal aid becomes essential. The doctrine, however, that the Federal Government shall extract from taxpayers in New York State, for example, money to pay for the projects of the State of Illinois, which has the resources to finance its own needs, cannot be persuasively defended. The President the other day in his press conference said that 80 percent of the American people now live in cities, and offered this as a justification for supervision of urban affairs by a department of the Federal Government. But this might readily lead to an abandonment of self-rule and a concentration of political power in the executive branch of the Federal Government—a formula that could make

the White House in the future a bigger source of political power and boss rule than a dozen Tammany Halls combined.

It is interesting to note that in the Department of Commerce statistics, in breaking down the congressional districts, 300 districts are listed as "urban" and 137 districts listed as "rural." This reveals the propaganda the administration has been dishing out to the effect that the rural areas voted against the President. What nonsense.

The following further editorial on the subject appeared in the Washington Daily News on February 22:

NEW CABINET POST REFUSED

The urban affairs incident reveals a streak of bitter-end stubbornness in our President. Or a fondness for involved political maneuver. Perhaps it is a little of each.

Certainly the proposal to create a new Cabinet post concerned with city problems never had a chance to be considered on its merits. From a cynical point of view it might be ventured that this never was intended.

It was not the first time in our history that a President, while asking enlargement of the Cabinet, had named the person he intended to appoint. But when President Kennedy named his obvious appointee, he aggravated the race question, possibly with deliberate purpose.

His proposed appointee, Robert C. Weaver, present Housing Administrator, would have been the first Negro in an American Cabinet.

Tempers were further aroused, and chances for eventual approval lessened, by the futile maneuver in the Senate Tuesday, which offended against the traditional committee system and without doubt alienated some votes.

Yesterday's House vote, which killed the plan, 264 to 150, resulted from a mixture of sentiment which included fundamental prejudice, honest opposition and resentment at an attempt to shove the reorganization down the throat of Congress.

Whatever benefit may accrue to the administration will be in form of big city votes in the fall congressional elections, prompted by belief that this defeat either was race prejudice or lack of concern for city dwellers. If this actually was the motive for the pressure applied, we doubt it will work. It is a divisive pitch as likely as not to be resented even by the Negro citizens at whom, presumably, it is aimed.

Let's Not Knuckle Under to Khrushchev's Attempts at Summit Blackmail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Dallas Times Herald points out the danger in meeting the Soviet Union at any summit conference under the pressure of blackmail tactics by the Kremlin boss:

SUMMIT OR ELSE? NEVER, MR. K.

When communism holds out the olive branch, it extends it in an iron fist.

That briefly sums up the relationship of the two messages that Premier Khrushchev sent to the U.S. Government last week.

In one, recognizing the successful orbital flight of Lt. Col. John Glenn, he suggested that the United States and the Soviet Union undertake a joint project for the exploration of space.

In the second—20 pages long and loaded with propaganda—he insisted that President Kennedy agree to a summit meeting in March.

The Russian boss obviously has set out to torpedo the Geneva conference, just as he torpedoed the Paris summit conference. At that time, of course, he used the U-2 incident as an excuse to break up the meeting and to withdraw his invitation to President Eisenhower to visit the Soviet Union. He apparently was afraid of the effect of the personal popularity of President Eisenhower on the Russian people.

This time he apparently is intent on using the Geneva conference to prevent President Kennedy from ordering a new series of atmospheric nuclear tests.

The language of the newest message is reported to be sharp and insistent, as compared with one earlier this month in which Khrushchev proposed a summit conference.

The implication is this:

"Summit or else—."

President Kennedy is responsible for his actions to 180 million persons. Khrushchev is not among them.

The American people resent any attempt at coercion. They resent any kind of threat.

Any agreement on Mr. Kennedy's part to participate in a summit talk now would be in the nature of a concession before the talks begin.

The answer has to be "No."

Personal diplomacy isn't well suited to the cause of freedom in any case. It certainly isn't appropriate when it is dictated by the demands of the Kremlin.

American Heritage Observance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, February 24, 1962, members of Court Eugene A. Garvey No. 652, Altoona, Catholic Daughters of America, sponsored a benefit luncheon, fashion show, and card party to buy books for the library of the new Bishop Guilfoyle High School at Altoona.

Some 400 persons attended this event held at the school. The theme of the observance was based on George Washington and it stressed his honesty as well as his burning desire and tireless efforts for liberty and freedom. It was my privilege to attend this event and to deliver the following address:

OUR AMERICAN HERITAGE

I am indeed honored to address the Catholic Daughters of America.

It is a pleasure to appear before your membership and to assimilate with you the atmosphere of patriotic endeavor, good fellowship, and constructive effort which exists on this occasion.

Your organization is a great force for good.

You believe in the propagation and preservation of your religious faith in promoting the spiritual and temporal welfare of the women of the Catholic Church.

The Catholic Daughters of America exemplifies the traditions of our country and is living testimony to the spirit of liberty in America.

Our country was born in the spirit of humble prayer, undaunted courage, and self-sacrifice.

We have a continuing obligation to restate and reinterpret our American heritage in the light of new political, economic, and social conditions of our time.

Too often our American heritage—our American traditions—are misrepresented and misinterpreted by people who have axes to grind—political or otherwise.

Words and phrases like "democracy," "liberty," "the pioneer spirit," "equality of opportunity," "self-reliance," "local self-rule," and "constitutional government" mean different things to different people.

New problems, new economic and social conditions, demand that we separate the essential American traditions from the nonessential and the outdated, so as to form a belief presented simply and freshly, and explicitly.

The hope of liberty drew our Founding Fathers across the sea to America.

In the pursuit of liberty they braved the dangers of the wilderness, pushing forward over the Appalachians and the Great Plains and through the Rocky Mountains to the shores of the Pacific.

Liberty still beckons to the descendants of the pioneers—to all who have now inherited America.

But liberty beckons in the 1960's along strange trails that the Founding Fathers neither knew or dreamed of.

What is liberty in a country of jet air travel and shining automobiles, supermarkets, large corporations, and labor unions?

Can we hope to continue to find liberty among the struggles of our time?

I firmly believe the reply of "Yes."

But, my friends, liberty has to be founded on security.

It was Daniel Webster who said:

"God grants liberty only to those who live it and are always ready to guard and defend it."

Since 1776 the meaning of "liberty" has changed with changing circumstances.

Our Pilgrim Fathers thought first of the freedom to worship God in their own way.

Today—three centuries later—complete freedom of worship has existed for so long that it is too often taken for granted.

Americans notice with uneasiness, however, that in nations where liberty disappears religious liberty disappears with other freedoms.

This week the United States celebrated the birth date of George Washington.

He was born in 1732—230 years ago.

Despite the vast span of time since his wisdom helped to guide the peoples of the 13 colonies, first through the Revolution, and then through two terms as our first President, George Washington's words are still timely reminders of religious toleration and religious liberty.

Let us never forget it was a people of strong character who built this Nation—and only a strong people can be trusted with our great powers, privileges, and responsibilities.

One has only to read the history of early New England, Virginia, the Atlantic coast settlements, and our own Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, to be impressed by this fact.

Our Founding Fathers were a sturdy lot with strong sense of righteousness, justice, and personal integrity.

This Nation was founded upon the fundamental doctrines of reverence, industry, frugality, sobriety, and honesty.

It was a stern philosophy—but it was Christian—it was not weak.

The earlier settlers—the English, Scotch, Irish, and Scotch Irish, were succeeded by freedom-seeking French, by Germans fleeing from Prussian militarism, by Italians, by Scandinavians, Russians, and others who saw the vision of a land of liberty and opportunity.

They were refugees from political and religious oppression, but they were not fugitives from high moral concepts and disciplined religious living.

There was something noble and great in them which we in our day need if we are to emerge as a people worthy of survival.

We need to be reminded of the greatness of our Founding Fathers.

Their faith in God and country is a platform on which Republicans and Democrats, and others can write in behalf of truth.

It is the direct opposite of Kremlin ideology.

Communism is atheistic.

Our Founding Fathers believed in God.

The cornerstone of a church is an important part of the building's foundation.

So the cornerstone of our democracy is an important part of our Government's beginnings.

But at once someone asks: "What do you mean by democracy?"

President Lincoln answered that question when he spoke of "Government of the people, by the people, for the people."

What Lincoln meant was the right of the people to govern themselves; that is, to govern themselves directly in a local town meeting or indirectly through elected representatives in city, State, or national affairs.

The American way of life has been referred to as the idea of "giving everybody a chance to share in making the rules."

Like a person every nation has an individuality.

If it is to survive that individuality must be preserved.

The social order and the way of life prevalent in a nation are expressions of certain fundamental principles of morality and of government which mark it as distinct from every other nation.

The symbols of our American heritage—the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, the Gettysburg Address, are the foundations of our republic.

They are the expressions of our national faith—the legacy of America.

Men who would rule by enslavement—always have hated any form of human society based on the principle of freedom of the individual.

Such hatred and fear of a free society caused Benito Mussolini to refer to us as the "stinking corpse of democracy."

Today the same fear of freedom causes other dictators to inspire hatred of democratic principles and institutions which threaten their power over enslaved peoples.

The Iron Curtain with its censorship is an unconscious tribute to the vitality of the idea of human freedom—in our concept of American citizenship.

For today human liberty remains a challenge to dictators and an obstacle in their path.

When danger threatens it is natural to consider means for warding off that danger.

So we are forging a strong shield against the danger—a shield beyond which the free world may live in peace.

For our own national security we must build our strength, our political, economic, moral, and military strength, and the strength of all the other peaceful nations of the world into a force for the discouragement of aggression.

Granted this is only relative security, but there is no such thing as absolute security in the world today.

For so long as there is danger of aggression—only an economically unacceptable amount of military power can guarantee freedom from it.

We could—if we wished to curtail many of our basic inherent freedoms—become an armed camp fully mobilized.

However, we realize that even this would not be total security.

Meantime our job today is to so discourage any potential aggressor by our timely preparation that he will not accept the risk of an attack.

The price of peace in the world of today is continual preparedness.

It took a terrible war to teach us this.

But we also learned that our most powerful weapon was—and is—our moral fiber as a people.

This moral fiber grows—not from a disregard of our American heritage—but grows from the kind of discipline which our Founding Fathers developed.

It is the kind of discipline that makes good citizens cheerfully obey the rules and regulations.

It is the kind of discipline that allows us "the pursuit of happiness"—without a headlong rush into chaos.

We do know that a well-disciplined citizenry stands a better chance of national salvation when the moment of decision arrives—than a citizenry unaccustomed to orderly respect of its foundation stones.

We need to bring our American traditions out in the open.

They still stand for the principles that will not perish.

Attorney General—Secretary of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, apparently we have two Cabinet officers in one, in this administration. He is none other than Robert Kennedy, who has been making high policy speeches and probably also making commitments for which neither the people of the United States nor the Congress has given him authority, while neglecting his constitutional duty as Attorney General.

It is strange that the Vice President of the United States, who was elected by the vote of the people, is relegated to less important tasks when he should be the one making these trips for the President.

Secretary of State Rusk should either act as Secretary or he should resign, or be fired. The time has come when diplomacy-by-brother must come to an end.

The following article by David Lawrence, in yesterday's Washington Evening Star, discusses the pitfalls and bad taste displayed:

THE KENNEDY CONFLICT OF INTEREST—TRAVELS OF PRESIDENT'S BROTHERS RAISE AN UNPRECEDENTED QUESTION

(By David Lawrence)

A curious kind of conflict of interest arises in the cases of Bobby and Ted Kennedy as they tour the world with aura of their brother's Presidency surrounding them wherever they go. Two questions are being asked: Are they trading on the position and prestige of a distinguished relative? Should they be disqualified from doing what comes naturally in their respective careers just because they happen to have a brother who is President of the United States?

There is only one instance in which a close relative of a President has later become the Chief Executive. John Adams, the second President, had been out of office 24 years and was 89 years old when his son, John Quincy Adams, was elected the sixth President. But this doesn't mean that relatives of several other Presidents haven't tried for the Presidency—as, for instance, the sons of Theodore Roosevelt, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and William Howard Taft.

It was not until 30 years after Mr. Taft became President that his son, Robert A. Taft, was elected U.S. Senator and began his unsuccessful drive for the Republican presidential nomination.

The controversy over the Kennedys differs somewhat from any similar question raised heretofore. No President has ever given his brother a post in the cabinet and then sent him abroad in the role of unofficial envoy or good will ambassador.

Milton Eisenhower, brother of President Eisenhower, was designated as a special envoy to Latin America, an area about which he had exceptional knowledge, but he volunteered his services without compensation and served his government without relation to any political career. He never was in the cabinet.

When President-elect Kennedy was reported in December 1960, to be considering his brother for the post of Attorney General, this writer said at the time that Robert Kennedy was "an able young man and ought not to be penalized just because he is the brother of the President-elect," and that the real question was whether he was the best-qualified man in the country to direct the Justice Department.

The same yardstick applies today. Was it in the best interest of the United States in the operation of its foreign policy to send Attorney General Kennedy around the world making contacts with high officials of foreign governments which are involved in major controversies of the day?

Naturally, the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, and the Under Secretary of State, George W. Ball, have risen to defend the President's action in authorizing his brother to deal with foreign governments. What else could these two officials do even if they felt it was an error? A member of the team defends what the captain of the team does, or resigns.

It can be argued that it was a mistake for President Kennedy to take his brother away from his post as head of the Justice Department, for which duties he is being paid a salary by the taxpayers, and to send him abroad for several weeks. It wasn't a mistake for Bobby Kennedy, on the other hand, to take advantage of the opportunity to get worldwide notice and prestige for use in advancing his own political career.

When the Attorney General wanted to go on the trip, how could his brother turn him down? After all, Bobby Kennedy has performed a remarkable job as a political mentor and political manager in the 4 years before J.F.K. was elected President. He knew how to line up delegations for the convention. He mastermined the strategy of the whole presidential election campaign. The President himself happens to have been raised in the school of practical politics where a service like this doesn't go unrewarded.

A related question is: What is a President's brother to do if he has political ambitions? Shall he take himself completely out of the Democratic administration that is in power and wait a few years till after his brother is out of the White House before embarking on a political career on his own?

The question answers itself. Bobby Kennedy is right from his own standpoint to take advantage of every opportunity to become nationally and internationally known.

But the President himself hasn't such an easy out. He must face the judgment of the American people someday as to whether it was right to pick as an unofficial envoy at a critical time in history a younger brother who had no previous experience or special qualifications for the ambassador's role he now adopts.

It is being asked on Capitol Hill why the Vice President of the United States, LYNDON JOHNSON, wasn't given the assignment, since the country had already witnessed his successful missions abroad in the 13 months that the present administration has been in office.

Was it in the public interest not to take advantage of an opportunity to train a Vice President for possible emergencies, or was it more important to reward his brother's political service and aid him in his ambition for higher office? That's the conflict of interest which President Kennedy faced in this unprecedented case.

Columnist Questions Integrity of Taxpayer Sponsored Trips by President's Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to call attention to the timely article written by David Lawrence in the Washington Evening Star. It seems to me the American people should seriously question the propriety of sending members of the President's family abroad to handle delicate relationships with the heads of foreign states and as a consequence build up their personal prestige.

THE KENNEDY CONFLICT OF INTEREST—TRAVELS OF PRESIDENT'S BROTHERS RAISE AN UNPRECEDENTED QUESTION

(By David Lawrence)

A curious kind of conflict of interest arises in the cases of Bobby and Ted Kennedy as they tour the world with the aura of their brother's presidency surrounding them wherever they go. Two questions are being asked: Are they trading on the position and prestige of a distinguished relative? Should they be disqualified from doing what comes naturally in their respective careers just because they happen to have a brother who is President of the United States?

There is only one instance in which a close relative of a President has later become the Chief Executive. John Adams, the second President, had been out of office 24 years and was 89 years old when his son, John Quincy Adams, was elected the sixth President. But this doesn't mean that relatives of several other Presidents haven't tried for the presidency—as, for instance, the sons of Theodore Roosevelt, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and William Howard Taft.

It was not until 30 years after Mr. Taft became President that his son, Robert A. Taft, was elected U.S. Senator and began his unsuccessful drive for the Republican presidential nomination.

The controversy over the Kennedys differs somewhat from any similar question raised heretofore. No President has ever given his brother a post in the Cabinet and then sent him abroad in the role of unofficial envoy or good-will ambassador.

Milton Eisenhower, brother of President Eisenhower, was designated as a special envoy to Latin America, an area about which he had exceptional knowledge, but he volunteered his services without compensation and served his Government without relation to any political career. He never was in the Cabinet.

When President-elect Kennedy was reported in December 1960, to be considering his brother for the post of Attorney General, this writer said at the time that Robert Kennedy was "an able young man and ought not to be penalized just because he is the brother of the President-elect," and that the real question was whether he was the best-qualified man in the country to direct the Justice Department.

The same yardstick applies today. Was it in the best interest of the United States in the operation of its foreign policy to send Attorney General Kennedy around the world making contacts with high officials of foreign governments which are involved in major controversies of the day?

Naturally, the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, and the Under Secretary of State, George W. Ball, have risen to defend the President's action in authorizing his brother to deal with foreign governments. What else could these two officials do even if they felt it was an error? A member of the team defends what the captain of the team does, or resigns.

It can be argued that it was a mistake for President Kennedy to take his brother away from his post as head of the Justice Department, for which duties he is being paid a salary by the taxpayers, and to send him abroad for several weeks. It wasn't a mistake for Bobby Kennedy, on the other hand, to take advantage of the opportunity to get worldwide notice and prestige for use in advancing his own political career.

When the Attorney General wanted to go on the trip, how could his brother turn him down? After all, Bobby Kennedy had performed a remarkable job as a political mentor and political manager in the 4 years before J.F.K. was elected President. He knew how to line up delegations for the convention. He mastermined the strategy of the whole presidential election campaign. The President himself happens to have been raised in the school of practical politics where a service like this doesn't go unrewarded.

A related question is: What is a President's brother to do if he has political ambitions? Shall he take himself completely out of the Democratic administration that is in power and wait a few years until after his brother is out of the White House before embarking on a political career on his own?

The question answers itself. Bobby Kennedy is right from his own standpoint to take advantage of every opportunity to become nationally and internationally known.

But the President himself hasn't such an easy out. He must face the judgment of the American people someday as to whether it was right to pick as an unofficial envoy at a critical time in history a younger brother who had no previous experience or special qualifications for the ambassador's role he now adopts.

It is being asked on Capitol Hill why the Vice President of the United States, LYNDON JOHNSON, wasn't given the assignment, since the country had already witnessed his successful missions abroad in the 13 months that the present administration has been in office.

Was it in the public interest not to take advantage of an opportunity to train a Vice President for possible emergencies, or was it more important to reward his brother's political service and aid him in his ambition for higher office? That's the conflict of interest which President Kennedy faced in this unprecedented case.

Madison Avenue on Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the propagandists for complete domination by the Federal Government in public school education have been dishing out the fiction that the people really want Federal aid. The New York State School Boards Association, at a recent meeting in Albany, voted 431 to 80 against a broader Federal aid program.

The following story in the New York Herald Tribune on February 23 and the editorial in the New York Daily News reveal the true feeling of the people:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Feb. 23, 1962]

NEW YORK SCHOOL BOARDS VOTE NO ON FEDERAL AID

(By James J. Morisseau)

New York State's school boards are overwhelmingly against general Federal aid to public schools, the State school boards association reported yesterday in Albany. The association's president said he thought most school board members feared Federal aid would bring Federal control.

An association poll, in which the boards voted 431 to 80 against a broader Federal aid program (New York City voted "yes"), did not ask for the reasons behind a "yes" or "no" vote.

But Hugh Davies, association president and president of the Yorktown Heights Board of Education in Westchester, said he thought most of the opposition grew out of a fear of Federal control.

Mr. Davies, who said he favors Federal aid, interpreted the vote as an indication that the majority of school board members in the State believe the taxpayers in their districts will adequately support educational programs.

The results did not come as a surprise. School board members in the State, and for that matter throughout the Nation, are generally regarded as conservative, particularly in their attitude toward the role of the Federal Government.

What was surprising was that a special breakdown, done for the Nassau-Suffolk School Boards Association, showed Long Island school districts voting 2 to 1 against Federal school aid.

Even the New York City Board of Education, which voted for Federal aid, did not do so by a unanimous vote of its nine members. Max J. Rubin, board president, could not recall the vote breakdown, and with school headquarters closed for Washington's Birthday the records were unavailable.

Mr. Davies said the Long Island result probably meant that school boards in less populated areas in Suffolk County had outvoted the booming suburban districts in Nassau and western Suffolk.

He added that the latter type of district, where exploding school enrollments have touched off financial crises and taxpayer revolts over mushrooming school budgets, tends to favor Federal aid.

The school boards' stand was in direct contrast to the action Wednesday of the American Association of School Administrators at their annual convention in Atlantic City. The administrators' association, which has about 1,100 members in the State, asked

for a massive $8 billion a year general Federal aid program to provide $200 per pupil to the public schools and like grants for 2-year college students.

Mr. Davies noted that the vote amounted to a crucial action, since it may well affect any stand taken on Federal aid by the National School Boards Association at its April convention in St. Louis.

The vote represented only about 56 percent of the State's 900 operating school districts, of which 811 are members of the school boards association. "Thirty-one districts," Mr. Davies said, "took no position, either because they could not get a majority vote either way or because they desired to express their opinion on specific proposed legislation rather than on the board question. Others did not reply."

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION: 80 YES, 431 NO

The State school boards association reports that 80 school boards around New York State have gone on record as favoring more Federal aid to public schools, while 431 have registered firm opposition to it.

Reason for the opposition is believed to be fear that Federal money would mean Federal control, inevitably, of public education. We'd suggest that Congress take serious note of this overwhelming adverse vote. It's in the nature of top-grade expert testimony.

President's Proposal for Underwriting Cost of Vaccines for Immunization of All Children Under 5 Years of Age Recalls Approach of 1955 Sullivan Bill on Polio Immunization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, we have all been impressed, I believe, by the comprehensive message just presented to us today by President Kennedy on proposals to meet the health needs of the American people. This is a great challenge, and one I believe the Congress should and can meet in this session.

Mr. Speaker, while I endorse the general principles in the President's message and am delighted with the forthright manner in which he has again presented his views on this important issue, I am particularly pleased by his proposal for Federal underwriting of the cost of providing vaccines for the immunization of all children under 5 years of age in this country against polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus. His approach to this problem recalls the proposal I made here on June 27, 1955, at the height of the confusion and chaos over the then brand new Salk vaccine, when I suggested that the Federal Government buy the entire limited output and make it available for immunization of all children on a priority basis, without regard to economic circumstances of the families of the children involved.

My bill, H.R. 7026 of the 84th Congress, would have solved all of the priority headaches by turning the full supply of available vaccine over to the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis for mass inoculation of children under priorities to be determined by that organization.

NOT A "DEAD HORSE"—WE SHOULD LEARN FROM PAST MISTAKES

This may now sound something like ancient history, Mr. Speaker, to hark back to events of 7 years ago, but it is not a case of "beating a dead horse." We made serious mistakes in 1955 in the handling of the polio vaccine opportunity, and it took several years before the panic and the hysteria over the immunization of children against this dread disease could be resolved in some orderly fashion.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1955 was so fearful of charges of "socialism" in the handling of the polio problem that it was willing to do little more than provide Federal funds for purchase of vaccine for the indigent. Many parents, meanwhile, paid exhorbitant "black market" prices for Salk vaccine for their children, and the priorities often favored those willing to pay the highest fees. This should never have happened. I believe that the bill I introduced 7 years ago would have prevented much of the heartbreak and panic.

The problem today is much different. There are no real scarcities of vaccines. The problem is to assure that every child obtains the immunization we can provide. The best way to assure this, I believe, is through the approach the President now proposes of having the Federal Government provide the funds for the immunization of all children under 5, to get the program started on a comprehensive basis. Then the problem will be to make sure children born later are immunized, and that older children and adults are also immunized—but this can then be accomplished through educational activities with a minimum of Federal cost. There is a tremendous job, however, to begin the elimination of all four diseases cited by the President for which effective vaccines now exist, and I hope we can carry through on this.

The mistakes of 1955 in connection with the polio vaccine are therefore worth citing and remembering at this time, so that we can learn from—profit from—previous errors.

APPROACH OF THE SULLIVAN BILL OF 1955

Mr. Speaker, I submit as part of my remarks the speech I made in the House on June 27, 1955, in connection with the introduction of H.R. 7026, as follows:

SALK ANTIPOLIO VACCINE

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to have the Federal Government purchase sufficient quantities of the Salk antipolio vaccine to provide for the inoculation of all of the children in the United States under the age of 20.

The vaccine so purchased would be turned over to the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis for allocation and distribution by the foundation, but under the general supervision of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. But it would be up to the national foundation—and, of course, that is the logical organization to have that authority and responsibility—to see to it that all of the children get this vaccine in the most equitable and efficient manner, deciding where it is needed most geographically and which age groups should have it first, and so on. The inoculations would be free. This is an idea on which I have been working since May 13 when Dr. Scheele appeared before us in the Banking and Currency Committee. I think it is the best approach.

FURTHER MATERIAL SUBMITTED BY MRS. SULLIVAN ON JUNE 27, 1955

Mr. Speaker, I also include at this point the additional material I submitted to the House on June 27, 1955, on the bill I introduced that day on the polio vaccine issue, including a press release on the bill and the text of the bill itself, as follows:

VESTING IN THE NATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR INFANTILE PARALYSIS SUFFICIENT QUANTITIES OF SALK VACCINE TO INOCULATE FREE ALL CHILDREN IN THE UNITED STATES UNDER THE AGE OF 20

(Extension of remarks of Hon. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, of Missouri, in the House of Representatives, Monday, June 27, 1955)

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, as I announced to the House today, I have introduced a bill which has been in preparation for more than a month which would authorize the purchase by the United States of sufficient quantities of antipoliomyelitis vaccine to inoculate every child in the country, without charge. The actual allocation and distribution of the vaccine under my bill would be in the hands of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis.

I suggested this approach on May 13, when Dr. Leonard Scheele, the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, was testifying before the House Banking and Currency Committee. While he voiced no official policy on that suggestion, he said he personally could see no objection to turning the whole thing over to the polio foundation. I then attempted to obtain the views of the foundation itself, but was unable to do so until just recently, when Mr. Basil O'Connor testified before the Senate Labor Committee. His testimony—in answer to persistent questioning—finally gave me the information I felt I needed before I introduced any legislation on the subject. In other words, we now have the word of the foundation that it can do this job; we also have the information from them as to how they would perfer to handle it in case it was thrust upon them.

I think they should have the responsibility. They do not ask for it. But they can handle it. And no other organization in the country, including no Goverment agency, could handle it as well, in my opinion.

Mr. Speaker, I have issued a press release which gives the full details on my bill, and I include it, and also a copy of my bill, as follows:

"CONGRESSWOMAN SULLIVAN TO INTRODUCE BILL TO TURN OVER TO NATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR INFANTILE PARALYSIS ENOUGH SALK VACCINE TO INOCULATE FREE ALL CHILDREN UNDER 20 YEARS OF AGE

"Congresswoman LEONORE K. SULLIVAN, Democrat, of Missouri, plans tomorrow (Monday) to introduce a bill which would have the Government purchase and turn over to the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis sufficient supplies of the Salk antipoliomyelitis vaccine to immunize all children in the United States under the age of 20. The inoculations would be free.

"Mrs. SULLIVAN first broached this idea on May 13 during a hearing of the House Committee on Banking and Currency while she was questioning Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service. Dr. Scheele said that, speak-

ing personally, he could see no objection to turning such a mass immunization program over to the National Foundation.

"The Congresswoman, 3 days later, on May 16, wired Basil O'Connor, president of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, asking if he thought her proposal 'would be a practical approach and if the foundation would be willing to undertake the burden of the work. I can think of no better way of assuring fair distribution of the vaccine. Would you give me your views?' She said she would introduce such a bill if the foundation agreed.

"Mrs. SULLIVAN received no direct answer from the foundation. Mr. O'Connor asked for time to think over her suggestion. Failing in a subsequent effort to get a definite statement of views on this matter from Mr. O'Connor, Mrs. SULLIVAN waited until the foundation head testified before the Senate Committee on Labor and Education when, under persistent questioning, he finally, reluctantly, acknowledged that the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis had the competency to inoculate all children in the country if the vaccine were supplied.

"The National Foundation, which financed Dr. Salk's research leading to the development of the vaccine, and also the field tests involving nearly a million children in 1953 and 1954, is now in the process of providing free inoculations for all first- and second-grade children.

"In his testimony before the Senate committee, Mr. O'Connor said the foundation would be reluctant to take Government money in carrying out a mass inoculation program. 'We would follow the policies that the Red Cross has always followed of not accepting Government funds. If that was officially presented to us, we would prefer that the Government buy the vaccine and give us the vaccine and vest it in us as we did in foreign civilian relief in the Red Cross.'

"After reading this testimony, Mrs. SULLIVAN decided to go ahead with the idea she had put forward on May 13 of having the Federal Government, through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, purchase the vaccine from the manufacturers, and then turn over the entire program of allocation and distribution of the vaccine for all children under 20 to the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, without regard to the ability of individual families to pay for the inoculations.

"The Congresswoman declared:

" 'The confusion which arose because of the Government's original failure to have any practical program for allocation or distribution of the vaccine, or to assure that every child in the country would receive the vaccine regardless of ability to pay started this whole thing off on the wrong foot. The administration fumbled the thing terribly. Its present proposal for the free inoculation of indigent children puts too much of a charity connotation on this program. It is not charity. All the people of the United States have paid for the development of this vaccine through their dimes and dollars to the National Foundation.

" 'The Foundation pioneered the vaccine. It has paid for its development. It has pledged $9 million it does not even have to carry out the school inoculation program for first and second graders. It has been engaged in this work for 20 years. It knows the priorities and the needs, both by age groups, geographically, and so on. You would have no question of blackmarketing or of anything of that nature, for no one, no matter how much money he had, could possibly corrupt the Foundation or argue with its decisions on who should get the vaccine and in what order.

" 'My bill provides for the inoculation of all children under 20 by the end of 1956 with vaccine supplied by the Federal Government. I understand it will take until about then to make sure we have the 160 million separate shots of the vaccine needed to immunize the 59 million children under 20, giving 3 shots to each, including a third shot for the children who have already been covered.

" 'Once this mass inoculation program is complete, then of course the antipolio immunization program could be carried on in routine fashion through normal channels as any other vaccination program is regularly handled. But there is nothing normal about the demand for this vaccine, and the problem it creates in assuring fair treatment for all, particularly in such an emotional area as this where the health of children is involved.'

"Mrs. SULLIVAN said her bill differs from the one introduced by all seven Democratic members of the Senate Labor Committee, which also provides for free inoculation of all children under 20 in that S. 2147, the Senate bill, provides for grants of money to the States to purchase and distribute the vaccine, whereas her bill has the Federal Government buying the vaccine directly, but authorizing the National Foundation, under the general supervision of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to have complete control of allocation, distribution, and regulation of the use of the vaccine.

"The Sullivan bill is attached, as follows:

" 'H.R. 7026

" 'A bill to provide for the purchase by the United States, and the distribution by the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, of a sufficient supply of poliomyelitis vaccine to immunize all children in the United Sttaes under 20 years of age against paralytic poliomyelitis

" '*Be it enacted, etc.*, That in order to promote the general welfare, raise the standard of health for all children of the United States, and institute the most effective and equitable plan for the eventual elimination of the scourge of paralytic poliomyelitis among the American people through mass immunization of all children under 20 years of age on a priority basis, without regard to their ability to pay for the vaccine, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall purchase a supply of poliomyelitis vaccine sufficient to carry out such an immunization program as provided in section 2 of this act.

" 'SEC. 2. The National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, under the general supervision of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, is hereby authorized to—

" '(1) develop a program for the allocation and distribution of all poliomyelitis vaccine purchased by such Secretary.

" '(2) establish priorities by age group and geographical location for the allocation and distribution of such vaccine in such a manner as to make the vaccine available to all children in the United States under 20 years of age, and

" '(3) regulate the use of such vaccine, under the provisions of this act, in such a manner that will assure its most effective and equitable use in combating the spread of paralytic poliomyelitis in the United States.

" 'SEC. 3. For the purposes of this act the term "United States" includes Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Canal Zone, and the District of Columbia.

" 'SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

" 'SEC. 5. This act shall terminate not later than December 31, 1956.' "

Don't Get Stung Twice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy has indicated that he would like to cooperate with Khrushchev in space.

President Kennedy should cooperate with Khrushchev as he would with a serpent. The following editorials of the February 22 issue of Newsday and the February 22 issue of the New York Journal American offer good advice for the President:

KHRUSHCHEV'S SPACE GAMBIT

It is difficult to assess Premier Khrushchev's latest "cooperation in space" gambit as anything but another in Russia's series of propaganda ploys.

Khrushchev, in his congratulatory note to President Kennedy on Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr.'s space orbitations, suggested a pooling of scientific, technical, and material knowledge for the exploration of outer space. The idea explicit is, of course, exemplary. Mankind today no longer stands on the threshold of space. Mankind has crossed that threshold and has beheld all the wondrous and agonizing aspects the world beyond has shown us thus far. What mankind has to determine now is how that new world can be developed to the benefit of all, whether the "all" in this case be the free world, Red world, white man, colored man, religious man, or atheist.

From past performances, Khrushchev doesn't care much about mankind. He is dedicated to the Communist conquest of the world and he is prepared to use any and all weapons at his command to achieve that end. And now that he sees the United States rising to par value with the U.S.S.R. in space matters he would like to pool resources toward the ultimate conquest of space.

He would pool these resources not for you and not for me but for the overall good that would accrue to the Communist world. He has the big rockets which can carry the heavier payloads into space, but we have the instrumentation which can better tell us what space can do both to and for us.

The exploration of space has more than scientific bearing; the military aspects in space are frightening. So, before we rush in to grasp the outstretched hand of friendship Khrushchev offers us in space we must determine what it is that we would gain from such cooperation, and what demands he would make in retaliation.

Any cooperation between the United States and Russia with regard to space must be carried on in the true spirit of peace. Khrushchev has shown a total disregard for that spirit and this latest gambit of his does little to alter the picture he has drawn of himself throughout the years. Happily, Kennedy has evidenced caution in his reply to the Khrushchev gambit and has told the Red chief that the United States would "prepare new and concrete proposals for immediate projects of common action."

Those proposals should be as concrete as is absolutely possible and they should have every safeguard imaginable tagged onto them that any pooling of resources will be made only in the interests of peace. And any pooling of resources with the Soviet Union must be confined to pooling which is in

strict and complete compliance with the old and revered tradition of tit for tat.

A FEW YEARS LATE

One thing is certain and another seems evident in Khrushchev's proposal that the United States and Russia cooperate in exploring space.

It is certain that Khrushchev is nearly 4 years late.

The proposal for international cooperation in space exploration was first made by the United States in 1958 and has been repeated since then by both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy.

In fact, one of President Eisenhower's finest speeches was his address September 22, 1960, to the United Nations Assembly calling for a four-point program to assure that "outer space be preserved for peaceful use and developed for the benefit of mankind."

These are words that Khrushchev is parroting in February 1962, without any program to implement them.

Hence it seems evident that Khrushchev has seized on Col. John Glenn's space triumph to grab himself a propaganda ride. It is a trick he has used before.

His record discredits sincerity. The Soviet Union has refused, for example, to cooperate in reaching any workable agreement for banning nuclear weapons tests.

What assurance would we have that Khrushchev would cooperate all the way in revealing Soviet space progress, particularly since space vehicles have military significance?

It is far more likely he wants us to reveal our superior scientific and technical achievements.

The opportunity was available up to 4 years ago for Russia to cooperate in space exploration. It declined, obviously because it had a solid lead.

Khrushchev's present proposal must, therefore, be tacit acknowledgment that we are catching up far too fast for his comfort—and that is the one heartening thing we get out of it.

President Kennedy, at his press conference Wednesday, pointed out that cooperation is a 2-way street, and that so far the Russians have wanted it to be all 1-way—theirs.

As for willingness to talk about it with the Russians in the UN or elsewhere, why not, so long as we don't get pinned down into inactivity as we permitted ourselves to be in the test ban talks.

The Myth of Our $5 Billion Export Trade Surplus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, this is a cynical city. Often either by deliberation or by lack of knowledge, astronomical figures are thrown around to prove a political point. Often such figures are in fact highly misleading.

A current example is the figure of $5 billion which is attributed to our "export surplus." This figure has appeared in editorials all over the country and has been used by various high public officials in statements which are purported to be authoritative. Yet this $5 billion export surplus figure is a phony.

In this respect, I would like to quote one of our most distinguished colleagues, the senior Senator from Virginia, who says: "I think it is very deceitful to do this, to publish figures on a dollar basis when we don't receive any dollars."

Certainly the export figures should be revised so as not to include items which are sold for nonconvertible currencies. In our lifetimes, most of these currencies will remain nonconvertible. Nor should these figures include heavily subsidized exports; nor should they include charitable contributions; nor should they include equipment given away abroad under the foreign aid program; nor should they include equipment purchased here by American companies for use in their plants and subsidiaries abroad.

No one knows the exact amount of this equipment which is purchased by American companies for use in their foreign subsidiaries. The Department of Commerce made an estimate that the figure in 1957 for this was in the neighborhood of $1 billion.

And this is not all. Vast sums are spent in the purchase of American equipment here with funds which are made available through the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Export-Import Bank, Development Loan Fund, Inter-American Development Bank, International Finance Corporation, and even the U.N. Many of these purchases are financed by long-term loans which may never be repaid. In fact, the healthy looking balance sheets of some of these organizations are almost entirely caused by the long-term nature of the loans. The document which I am submitting for the RECORD shows that the actual balance in favor of exports is only slightly more than one-tenth of the mythical $5 billion or $587 million. However, when one considers the lending and other operations which I have just cited, there probably is no balance at all, or a negative one.

I, therefore, include under unanimous consent, the following analysis in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that our colleagues may have an opportunity to study it.

THE MYTH OF OUR $5 BILLION EXPORT TRADE SURPLUS

The Congress and the American public are being asked to believe that the United States sells approximately $5 billion more in exports than it pays for imports. The mildest characterization of this claim is to call it a myth.

By endless repetition of Government officials and propagandists, the alleged $5 billion export trade surplus is being urged as one of the principal bases for the delegation by the Congress to the President of power to eliminate entirely duties on some commodities and to reduce duties on some other commodities up to 50 percent. If true, the claimed favorable export trade balance would not justify the proposition. The purpose of this paper is, however, merely to establish the misstatements of fact on which the proposition rests.

There can be no validity in a conclusion based on misstatement of fact. When errors of fact are revealed, the proposition which rests on them must be rejected.

The representations concerning the claimed $5 billion export trade surplus have been made in innumerable news stories, articles, pamphlets, radio and TV broadcasts and otherwise, and stem principally from such representations as the following:

The President in his speech to the AFL-CIO December 7, 1961, said:

"We sell abroad now nearly $5 billion more than we import, but unfortunately that $5 billion goes abroad in order to maintain the national security requirements of the United States."

Secretary of State Dean Rusk in a speech to the United Church Women on October 11, 1961, said:

"Last year we sold to other countries almost $20 billion worth of American goods" while "our purchases from abroad were in the order of $15 billion."

The Department of State Publication 7321, Commercial Policy Series 183, released in January 1962, states:

"In 1960, the United States sold about $20 billion worth of commodities abroad * * *."

Note the emphasis on what "we sell," the comparison in Dean Rusk's statement between what "we sold" and "our purchases," and the State Department's claim that our "sales" abroad amounted to $20 billion.

The fact is that we do not sell exports amounting to $5 billion more than what we pay for imports. We do not receive $20 billion for the American goods we export, although we undoubtedly pay $15 billion for the foreign goods we import.

These figures, which are used to support the argument for unprecedented grant of power to reduce duties even at the expense of injury to some domestic industries and communities, are made up by stating the dollar value of all goods which we export as if we received dollars in payment for all such goods.

We export the goods—we just don't get the dollars.

The Congress and the public are being misled to believe that the figures cited by Government propagandists relate to commercial transactions in international trade.

The total of $5 billion of export sales over import purchases is attained only by the fantastic, fictitious, and deceitful method of counting gifts as "sales."

The claimed dollar surplus of exports over imports (stated by the Treasury Department in June, 1961, as amounting to $4.7 billion) has been described by Senator ROBERT S. KERR, of Oklahoma, as "a fictitious figure." In response to a question propounded by Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, at a hearing of the Committee on Finance of the U.S. Senate,[1] "You mean you included value of all the wheat and everything we send abroad, for which we get nothing?" Assistant Secretary of the Treasury A. Gilmore Flues answered, "That is included, sir."

Senator Byrd characterized the Government's method of including in the dollar value of exports the value of merchandise for which the United States does not receive dollars in the following statement: "I think it is very deceitful to do this, to publish figures on a dollar basis when we don't receive any dollars."

Although Government statistical reports on exports, imports, foreign aid, subsidized sales and other pertinent factors are not specifically designed to reveal the facts which rebut the myth of the $5 billion export trade surplus, the true facts can be gleaned from such statistics and the result is so startling that, even allowing for a margin of error, the basic fact remains; namely, that in the terms of international trade, in com-

[1] Hearings on H.R. 6611, Senate Finance Committee, June 22-23, 1961, p. 34, 35.

mercial transactions, we have not approached a $5 billion export trade surplus.

The following simple table on exports and imports for 1960 shows the facts:

	Billions of dollars
We exported merchandise valued at	19.409
We paid for imports from abroad	14.722
Thus, we shipped abroad merchandise which, in value, exceeds our payments for imports by	4.687
No dollars were received for the following exports:	
Nonagricultural products valued at (shipped on U.S. grants or foreign aid credits, U.S. suppliers being paid from U.S. Government funds)	.5
Agricultural products valued at[1] (U.S. Government paid U.S. suppliers. Foreign nations gave credits in their currencies to be used as grants or loans for projects in the foreign nation)	1.2
Agricultural products given for famine and emergency relief valued at (U.S. Government paid domestic suppliers)	.2
The total value of merchandise exported for which the United States received no hard cash	1.9
Of the merchandise which we shipped abroad exceeding in value our payments for imports, the amount for which the United States received dollars was	2.787
Some exports for which the United States received dollars were not strictly commercial transactions such as the sale of cotton at prices below cost and $42.50 per bale below the price to domestic mills. Some other sales were on credit, "loans" or, in effect, Government subsidy. These "sales" are estimated at	1.4
Thus, on commercial transactions in international trade, the favorable export trade balance was only slightly less than 30 percent of the mythical $5 billion export trade surplus	1.387

[1] The good bartered by the United States for strategic raw materials have been excluded from the exports for which no dollars were received. These exports are valued at $118 million.

Sources: Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1961, p. 865; U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, Rept. No. 84, June 1961; Survey of Current Business, Dec. 1961, p. 16.

The effect of our so-called sales for credits in foreign currency may be illustrated with the following example, which demonstrates the administration's error in using the word "sell" when the right word is "give."

Upon agreement between our Government and Yugoslavia, 500,000 metric tons of American wheat are to be shipped to Yugoslavia. This wheat is valued at approximately $25 million and will so appear in Government figures showing the dollar value of our exports. The American suppliers of this wheat will be paid in dollars by the U.S. Government. The Yugoslavia Government will make payment in dinars (Yugoslavia currency of uncertain value), by crediting the purchase price to the United States with permission to the United States to apply 10 percent to the expenses of our Government in Yugoslavia. The other 90 percent will be given back to Yugoslavia as a gift or as a loan which may or may not be repaid and on terms which practically amount to a gift.

These funds are called counterpart funds, that is, funds in foreign currency derived from the sale of U.S. exports, in this case agricultural products, to be expended only in the foreign nation. Press accounts indicate that the United States has offered to approve the expenditure of some counterpart funds derived from the sale of agricultural products for research projects to advance common knowledge in the social welfare and maternal-child welfare fields, including the study of methods of treating children, ways of improving health services, medical care for the aged, juvenile delinquency, credit cooperatives, etc., in Yugoslavia, Poland, and elsewhere, with possible inclusion of India.

It is obvious that in dealing with Yugoslavia, India, Poland, and other foreign nations, the United States does not need to reduce duties on imports in order to induce these nations to continue to accept gifts of exports from the United States.

This country does not have a problem on its favorable balance of trade (considering trade in its usual sense as applying to commercial transactions). This country does have an unfavorable balance of payments. The United States simply pays out by gifts, etc., more than it receives in international dealings. The only practical correction of the problem of unfavorable balance of payments is available to the United States at any time. The correction is to reduce our payments, not our duties.

The foregoing solution is, however, too simple, practical and immediate to appeal to the advisers, the economists and others, particularly in the State Department, who have been guiding and will continue to guide our international trade negotiations. It cannot be expected that the President in the exercise of the vast powers conferred upon his office, including the additional powers sought by impending legislation, can examine into the details of the merits of every proposed transfer of goods from the dutiable list to the free list or drastic reductions in the rates of duty. It must be expected that, if the proposed power over tariffs is delegated by the Congress to the President, he will have to depend upon economists and other advisers, the same ones or their colleagues who have created the myth of our $5 billion surplus in international trade.

Resolution for Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, the Worcester, Mass., area Lithuanian-Americans celebrated the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence on Sunday, February 18, 1962, with a cultural festival held in St. Casimir's Parish hall in Worcester.

Among those attending the festival were Rev. John J. Bakanas, administrator of St. Casimir's Church and honorary cochairman of the festival; Vytautas S. Macys, general chairman; Attorney Anthony J. Miller, and Rev. John C. Jutt, pastor of St. Francis Church, Athol, and guest speaker at the festival. Also speaking was Vytautas Strazinskas, of Providence, R.I., who came to this country from Lithuania 4 months ago. Strazinskas spoke on "Lithuania Today."

It was my privilege, also, to speak to the assemblage on this eventful occasion.

The festival concluded with the adoption of a resolution asking President Kennedy to aid Lithuania in its present struggle for freedom, and I am pleased to include the resolution, as follows:

At a mass meeting held by Lithuanians of Worcester, Mass., representing 36 Lithuanian organizations in said Worcester, on February 18, 1962, at St. Casimir's Hall in commemoration of the 44th year of the declaration of the Lithuanian independence, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

"Whereas the Soviet Union in persuance of secret agreements between Joseph Stalin and his Government with Hitler and his Government in 1940 invaded, occupied and subjugated three independent Baltic States: Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; and

"Whereas Soviet occupational forces, Red army and secret police, upon orders from Moscow have conducted and continue to conduct an elaborate plan of genocide, aiming at destruction of the peoples of these three nations by wholesale incarceratic tortures, executions, and mass deportation to remote regions of the Soviet Union; and

"Whereas the three former free and independent Baltic States have been turned by brutal economic exploitation, coercion, and terror into colonies of the Red Soviet Empire, their properties confiscated, and their farmers and workers reduced to the state of serfs; and

"Whereas the 22d Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, assembled in Moscow in October of last year, after hearing charges made by the present head of the Communist Party and of the present Soviet Government, Nikita Khrushchev, against Joseph Stalin, the late head of the Communist Party and the Government of the Soviet Union, has condemned Stalin as an insane criminal and condemned most of the acts perpetrated by Stalin and his Government; and

"Whereas the Soviet Union through her representatives in the United Nations and at other international forums has been posing as the protector of all subjugated peoples and has started a noisy campaign of all the remaining colonies in Asia and Africa: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Lithuanian-Americans of said Worcester do hereby express their thanks and gratitude to the Government of the United States of America for its support of the Lithuanian cause for freedom and for its refusal to recognize the illegal, by force of arms, annexation of the Baltic States, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by Soviet Russia;

"*Resolved*, That this mass meeting of Lithuanian-Americans ask unanimously the Government of the United States:

"(a) To take cognizance of the condemnation of Stalin crimes by the present Government of the Soviet Union and to demand that same condemnation be applied to the illegal, criminal, and inhuman acts of the Stalin era in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and

"(b) To take appropriate steps through the United Nations and other channels to stop the policy of colonialism of Soviet Russia in central and Eastern Europe and to force Russia to restore the three Baltic States their independence; and

"*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the

United States, the Secretary of State, the Representative of the United States to the United Nations, the Senators LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, BENJAMIN A. SMITH, and the Congressmen PHILIP J. PHILBIN and HAROLD D. DONOHUE, and the press."

VITAUTAS S. MACYS,
Chairman.
JULES SVIKLAS,
Secretary.

Boston University Symposium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, as I previously mentioned, 11 members of the Boston University staff, board of directors, and faculty have contributed individual short essays, some generalized and others from specialized points of view on the theme of "What Is the Future of Private Higher Education in America?"

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include the answers given to this question by Horatio M. LaFauci, Francis S. Doody, Everett E. Hicks, and Stuart Grout.

Following each of the answers is a short biographical sketch of the author:

BOSTON UNIVERSITY SYMPOSIUM

(Answer by Horatio M. LaFauci, A.B., A.M., Ed.D., of Arlington, Mass., executive assistant to the president of Boston University, dean of the college of basic studies, and professor of education)

There is a crisis ahead for private higher education in America. It derives from the conflict of opposing philosophies which presently impinge on our private educational system. One of these philosophies urges expansion and further extension of educational opportunities, acceleration of the rate of intellectual, technological, and spiritual growth, and a strengthened and ever-broadening base of academic excellence. This is countered in part by a second educational philosophy, equally intense, less cultural, and more economic in orientation, which calls for refinement and even contraction of our national effort and proposes to prescribe rigidly the level and scope of excellence which is attainable. It is the impending dominance of these latter views which precipitates a crisis that American private higher education now faces.

Need for increased financial support to maintain vital growth and to sustain a concurrent dynamism is omnipresent. The extent to which private institutions can continue to turn toward tuition income for further sustenance is at best limited. Endowment and gifts cannot keep pace with need. In the absence of new support mathematical reality requires that existing funds be redirected and reallocated to serve the optimum purpose. Each institution of private education, if it is to function with maximum effectiveness, must seek ways to protect primary values while restricting expenditures. To accomplish this, each institution must establish for itself a hierarchy of values which will permit it to carry out its designated responsibilities. In this process, academic values must be examined vis-a-vis academic values, student services must be compared with student services, and academic values with related services. There is no general solution. There is no single standard except within the context of the particular institution. Each institution will find it necessary to surrender what it determines to be the lesser values to protect those greater values that identify best with the primary functions of the institution and through which its excellence is maintained. To do otherwise is to court disaster.

While this period is one of imminent crisis, it is also one of opportunity. It is time to reassess the broad range of responsibilities to which institutions of higher education have fallen heir. It is time to review the demands of special interests to which some institutions have bowed. It is time for new concepts, new values, new approaches to emerge and be carefully examined. In short, there is opportunity for the private institution of higher education to reverse the trend toward constant proliferation of its functions and to reexamine and redefine its role in order that it may continue and increase its own particular contribution to our society.

Yet, if there is a limit to the extent to which the private institution can rely on new and existing sources of income, there is also a limit to which it can cut back its services without reducing irreparably the effectiveness of its educational processes and still meet the fundamental demands of our society. It is at this juncture that an answer to this seeming dilemma must be provided and the aforementioned crisis will be reached.

If the demands of society are to be met and if the obligations of a democratic society are to be fulfilled and the danger to our society averted, we must accept the strengthening of our total system as a common task. The system of American education is an organic whole; it is a blend of the private and public, the secular and sectarian, and the independent and affiliated. Private institutions of higher education serve to provide vital elements in this total system and cannot be left wanting without impairment of the whole.

An answer to our dilemma is Government support, free from controls, permitting the independence of these institutions, while allowing expansion and a concomitant push forward toward redefinition of academic excellence. Such support will permit extension of educational opportunities and realization of the American ideal of individual fulfillment for all who are qualified, unrestricted by intellectual snobbishness and untrammeled by economic or sociological biases. It will help avert the crisis for private higher education and for the Nation.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Horatio M. LaFauci, of Arlington, Mass., is dean of the Boston University College of Basic Studies and executive assistant to the president of the university. He previously served as budget director of the university. Before coming to Boston University, he held posts as head of the accounting department at Becker Junior College in Worcester, Mass.; head of the history department and director of athletics at East Greenwich Academy in East Greenwich, R.I.; and was a teacher at Mount Pleasant High School in Providence, R.I. He received his B.A. and M.A. from Brown University and his Ed.D. from Harvard University.

(Answer by Francis S. Doody, A.B., A.M., Ph. D., of Pembroke, Mass., director of the Bureau of Business Research and professor of business administration at the Boston University College of Business Administration)

The future of private higher education appears to me to be a bright one because of the likelihood that the Federal Government will not long overlook the present financial problems of higher education. It is not impossible, and I think quite desirable, that the program that eventually emerges might resemble the following:

1. The present program of Federal, low-interest loans for the construction of self-liquidating dormitory and dining facilities should be extended to aid other types of construction. Instructional, library, and laboratory facilities often present more pressing areas of need than do dormitories, although they do not carry the self-liquidating aspects of dormitories. The needed new construction can be supported by grants, perhaps on a matching basis, as well as by loans.

2. Federal aid should be offered in support of instructional programs, perhaps to whole curriculums, but more reasonably to individual departments and in varying degree. Grants to individual subject matter fields may be one way out of the present controversy over Government aid to institutions with religious identification. Reasonably objective criteria should be developed as a basis for making department grants and evaluating their success.

3. A third type of program would offer direct aid to individual students. Competitive scholarships, with minimum grants for merit and larger amounts in proportion to need, will ease the financial burden of education upon the family and help reduce the incidence of wasted talent. Within limits of their grants student recipients would be free to select the college of their choice. Scholarship grants should go hand in hand with a system of federally guaranteed loans to the student, to be paid later from the increased earnings of the graduate.

4. Federal purchase of research services from colleges and universities will continue and probably grow. At present this program represents in only a limited sense aid to higher education and may even siphon off resources from the educational mission. The present Federal research programs tend to create a concentration of research power in a small number of large institutions. Grants should be made on a more diffused basis than at present and efforts should be made to develop a system of research subcontracting.

The foregoing represents a multipronged approach for Federal aid to higher education within which a variety of adjustments are possible to suit a variety of conditions.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Francis S. Doody of Pembroke, Mass., is professor of business administration and director of the bureau of business research at the Boston University College of Business Administration. He has taught at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and served as visiting lecturer at Wellesley College. At Boston University since 1946, he is the coauthor of "The Schumpeterian System" and editor of "Readings in Labor Economics" and is a former editor of the "Boston University Business Review." He received his A.B. degree from Tufts University and his A.M. and Ph. D. from Harvard University.

(Answer by Everett E. Hicks, B.S. in B.A., of Needham, Mass., director of financial aid to students at Boston University)

The place private higher education will assume in America during the next 20 years will be determined to a great degree by the effectiveness of financial aid programs developed during the next few years. College enrollment is rising faster than the number of scholarships awarded by colleges, even though the average scholarship tends to increase about as fast as tuition. With fewer scholarships available for the larger number of students requiring aid to attend private colleges, fewer children from the middle and lower income families will be able to afford the high cost of private higher education. If no significant remedy is found to correct this trend, private education will

gradually decrease in importance as fewer and fewer students find the means to attend these institutions.

More of the Nation's qualified young people must be educated to serve the expanding needs of the Nation, industry, and the professions, for trained personnel. If the financial bars to private colleges are too high, State-supported colleges and universities will expand rapidly to fill the vacuum. It will not be any less expensive to educate students at State colleges. The burden will merely be shifted from parents and colleges to all those who pay taxes. If the tax base is to be used eventually to help the masses of qualified youth of the country get an education, would it not be more expedient to devise an equitable plan whereby these needy students could get State- and Federal-sponsored financial aid to attend existing institutions of higher education rather than to build up monolithic State college complexes? A comparison of the costs would certainly favor the financial aid program as being the most realistic way of handling the problem for all concerned. If the State and Federal Governments would initiate legislation on a cooperative basis to provide the necessary financial assistance to the needy average student who desires to further his education at a private institution of higher education, colleges, industry, and private donors would continue in the traditional way to assist the needy above average student with his educational expenses.

With the Government joining in this cooperative effort, our qualified youth will continue to enjoy the benefit of educational facilities unequaled anywhere on earth.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Everett E. Hicks, of Needham, Mass., director of financial aid to students, received his B.S. degree from Boston University, College of Business Administration, and a certificate after a year's study at Fordham University Graduate School. Following 3 years' service in Europe with the U.S. Army, he joined the staff of the First National Bank of Boston and served for 3 years in their Buenos Aires branch.

(Answer by Stuart Grout, B.A., M.A., Ph. D., of Winchester, Mass., director of institutional studies, office of academic affairs at Boston University)

What is the future of private higher education in America? If the question is put before 10 college and university presidents representing a random sample of private higher institutions, chances are that 10 quite different answers would emerge. Why? Because the simple truth is that American private higher institutions as a group have very little in common, except that they are not principally tax supported, and are always in need of additional endowment funds. Even these common denominators are deceptive because there are few higher institutions today which are well endowed and which do not receive some sort of governmental tax support. It may be in the form of low interest rate loans for construction of student housing or the advantage of status as a tax-exempt enterprise.

Suppose, for example, our sample of 10 presidents represented such diverse institutions as M.I.T., Birmingham Southern, Minnesota Bible College, Swarthmore, New York University, New England Conservatory of Music, Notre Dame, Princeton, Ohio College of Chiropody, and Our Lady of Cincinnati College. Our presidents' answers would undoubtedly be as diverse as are the institutions they represent. Yet, all represent private higher education in America today. The fact is that American private higher education is an extremely complex phenomenon. To draw meaningful generalizations about any complex phenomenon is extremely difficult, if not almost impossible. And to predict the future of such a complex social phenomenon is even more difficult. Yet the question is before us and will continuously be asked. It will be answered in many ways by many individuals and groups, not the least of which will be the panel of 10 presidents.

At this point the reader may be completely confused or ready to conclude that one so brash as to predict the future of American private higher education is indeed either an egotist or a dullard. This well may be, but fortunately it is not always the case.

The answer to our question is surprisingly simple. The future of American private higher education will be what our American social order wishes to be. One may with some justification protest that this is no answer. But before such a snap judgment is made, one must remember that the weight of history proves this to be the only logical answer. History shows that education at any given time or place is a product of the social order of which it is a part. At the same instant, the forces of education are paramount in reshaping the social order. This broadly conceived game of give and take has, over the long haul, in large part determined both the nature of education and the social order.

Thus, the future of American higher education will be, on the one hand, what the American social order wills it to be, and on the other hand, how it in turn acts as an important force in shaping the future of the social order of which it is a part.

We still have not indicated what the future holds for American private higher education. We have, however, introduced the essential tools for finding our answer.

Let us apply our game of mental gymnastics to a few specific examples. Fifty years ago, few indeed among our 10 imaginary college presidents would have even considered introducing courses in such diverse areas as nuclear physics, television studio skills, and advanced computer programing. Yet we find these and other similar courses listed in many of our college catalogs. But our contemporary American social order demands their inclusion in the curriculums of our colleges and universities, public as well as private. At the same time, it is well to point out that without the efforts of scholars in these same higher institutions, many of our greatest scientific, technological, and social advances would not have been possible.

When the question about the future of American higher education is raised, it would be well to determine which private college or university is in question. Only then is it feasible to arrive at an answer. Next, those familiar with the institution must be considered: the trustees, the administrators, the faculty, and the students. The nature of its undertakings must be considered. If it is 50 years behind the contemporary American social order, one can conclude that the institution has a bleak future. One might even venture a prediction that within a decade or more, it will most surely close its doors. If, on the other hand, the institution is 50 or even 20 years ahead of contemporary society, the future will be bright indeed. But whether the future is bright or dim, there is little doubt that in the years to come their common denominator will be the need for more endowment funds.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Stuart Grout, of Winchester, Mass., is director of institutional studies and assistant to the vice president for academic affairs at Boston University. A native of Croswell, Mich., he began his career as a teacher of mathematics at Lakeview High School in Battle Creek, Mich. He has since served as staff assistant at the Midwest Administration Center of the University of Chicago, assistant professor and assistant to the director of laboratory school experiences at Illinois State Normal University, and was assistant to the vice president and provost and later assistant to the president at the University of Arkansas. He received his undergraduate degree from Western Michigan University, his master's degree from the University of Michigan, and his doctorate from the University of Chicago.

States View of Welfare: State Senator Henry A. Wise, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in this great Federal Union in which we operate, it is important that those of us in the National Legislature give heed to the words and feelings of our legislative counterparts on the State level. I recently had the opportunity of reading a speech by the Honorable Henry A. Wise, senator from the 43d Senate District of the State of New York and chairman of the New York State Senate Committee on the Public Relief and Welfare. Senator Wise forwarded me a copy of his speech with the following comment:

I enclose copy of part of the debate on public assistance in the New York State Senate today. This may interest you as it attempts to point out how the Ribicoff proposals will merely complicate the problem, not solve anything. I am sorry that the Ways and Means hearings were held so soon and so fast.

I should like to share this speech with my colleagues in the National Legislature for I believe it gives a sound view of Federal welfare programs from the point of view of those who must live with them in the States. I commend Senator Wise for bringing this matter so clearly and forcefully into focus:

THE GLORIFICATION OF INDIGENCE

(Transcript of remarks by Senator Henry A. Wise, Watertown, in course of debate in New York State Senate, February 13, 1962, on public assistance)

Mr. President, I arise because of what I have learned about public welfare, or to be specific, the public assistance phase of it, in 10 years as chairman of this senate's standing committee on public welfare and as chairman of the State coordination commission's welfare investigation last year. That commission, headed by Senator Erwin, completed its investigation and made its unanimous report last March 15.

When I started in this I knew it all and was sure that welfare administrators and social workers were a bunch of paper-pushing cloud riders. After a dozen years I've learned something of the maze of procedure, of why welfare is in low public esteem and why the people responsible for carrying on its day-to-day operation are helpless, under stultifying rules and regulations, to do much to make responsible citizens out of more of their clients.

Also, I learned that welfare is the dumping ground—the repository—of human problems which are not glamorous or rewarding enough to be taken under the wing of some other State department.

I learned that in New York State over a half million persons are receiving public assistance costing a half billion dollars annually and going up about 30 million a year largely because the myriad procedural details and mountains of paperwork now in vogue to obtain uniformity are no substitute for realistic rehabilitation. These roadblocks are the result of bureaucratic policies in Washington, a quid pro quo for Federal aid.

I learned that the present-day problems of our metropolitan communities are so vast and complex that even able local commissioners, like James Dumpson, of New York City, simply do not have the tools or authority to cope with them adequately under outmoded ground rules and lack of liaison with related municipal functions including housing, schools, health, and transportation.

I do not speak as a partisan because both parties either have been unrealistic or have ducked the tough decisions. Nor did I speak as an upcountry legislator oriented to some nostalgic wish for the mythical rural life of years gone by as celebrated in song and story.

I do speak to you as one of the handful of legislators who has seen welfare and what it does to, as well as for, people from observing them in their homes—people unto the second and third generation in rural slums as well as in the solid welfare communities in the heart of our big cities. Caseworkers have taken me to see people, who, when asked what should be done to help them get on their feet, replied, and I quote: "All I want is to live my life on public assistance."

I have read a horrifying and absorbing book in novel form, entitled "The Inhabitants," which portrays the lives, or rather the existences, of able-bodied, chronic, not unusual welfare cases as seen through the eyes of their caseworker. The author, Julius Horwitz, arranged a "conference" for some members of our welfare investigation subcommittee with the "heroine" at her apartment.

DISCRIMINATION VERSUS DISCERNMENT

A complication is one which we all prefer to leave unmentioned. We prate against discrimination based on prejudice while subtly—and not so subtly—using it to gain the bloc votes of ethnic and religious groups. We confuse this with discernment—discernment of the human qualities possessed by an individual, whether man, woman, child, irrespective of the color of his skin or his mode of worship. Discernment is understanding a person's frailties, foibles, and strengths. That is fundamental to rehabilitation.

As our direct and succinct minority leader, Senator Zaretzki, said in an address delivered at a large public gathering only last January 31:

"All men are created equal under the law, but no man is born equal. Every person is born different and is different. Some are crippled. Some have mental defects."

These unpleasant facts have to be weighed if welfare is to be more than a check dispenser, a subsistence program—and it cannot be much more under present time consuming and burdensome administrative policies in force to protect the State from loss of Federal funds.

HOORAY FOR UNIFORMITY

Public welfare has become overstandardized, overformularized and overregulated. It is, however, a person-to-person problem, an individual matter for the soldiers in the field, that is the social workers, to whom must be given the training, discretion, and responsibility to act on the basis of their individual judgments, subject to the approval of the case supervisor. No army won a war by deploying on the field carrying bulky volumes of army regulations and consulting them before every move. But uniformity is the watchword thanks to the career brains of the Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Administrations may come and administrations may go but inflexibility in the attitude of a certain breed of bureaucrat goes on forever.

Governor Ribicoff is the first HEW Secretary since the Federal public assistance setup has been confusing the welfare picture to tell the career people of his agency that this is not 1935. However, his proposals of February 1 do not touch good old uniformity and inflexibility much. It is proposed that the Federal Government get deeper into and interfere more with basic State and local functions. HEW apparently just heard about rehabilitation, but one would think they had invented it because now they are going to tell the States how to do it. That means more control. If New York is the most socially advanced of these United States, as it proudly confesses it is, then it doesn't need any guidance from the very people whose policies have thwarted effective rehabilitation for years.

In the words of one State administrator who was in Washington recently to get the word on the new Federal proposals: "They are just adding 21 patches to a crazy quilt." The Federal assistance program should be abandoned to the States, or at least overhauled from stem to gudgeon. Anyhow, Mr. Ribicoff has disabused the imprisoned minds of his aids on one other thing—there is no crime in allowing the good ladies supported by aid to dependent children to work—I mean earn money—if they can and will.

THE IDOLATRY OF PAUPERISM

Let's stop kidding ourselves and worrying about what lofty editors and fuzzy-minded bleeding hearts say. Though in the minority, perhaps, there are lots of able-bodied, career welfare recipients. That's because of the nature of men and of welfare as it is. Unfortunately, we have with us—and always will—folks who are so apathetic, indifferent and downright lazy that a full stomach and a TV set keeps them sitting on their beam ends as a lifetime project. Every caseworker knows it. That's how I know it. Sure they are needy. But how worthy? Will they respond to intensive rehabilitation techniques?

There are plenty of able-bodied and smart-like-a-fox people who could do something useful. Public assistance, we are told, is a right. If so, that is the only right I know of that doesn't carry some minimal responsibility. In smaller cities and the suburbs it is possible to get part-time jobs scrubbing walls, sweeping floors, and so on in business establishments, or doing housework—not just playing house. Yes, these are grubby, hard jobs and would-be employers cannot find reliable takers even at the legal hourly wage. In some places, the more enterprising have contracted out to householders to mow and clean lawns and plow snow. Sometimes the relief check doesn't cover the liquor bill unless such extreme measures are taken. Granted it is much harder to find something useful to keep occupied at in the big cities, but even there the head of the house could put more into making a clean and decent abode.

The chronic deadbeats are good at finding excuses even when work is available and they will keep on finding them as long as the caseworker is refused the discretion to put just a little squeeze on—just enough to get the "client" moving. The caseworker is pretty helpless unless he can prove with evidence practically beyond a reasonable doubt that relief funds are being misspent. The so-called fair hearing required under Federal procedure is a stacked deck in favor of the recipient of welfare aid. With administrators and caseworkers groaning under piles of paperwork there is little time to devise and apply means to make some aid-to-dependent-children mothers pay sufficient attention to their children, to raise them decently, discipline them, or at least make an effort to keep them from becoming Knights of the Rumble. Some evidence of social responsibility must be developed in this type of recipient—and it would be, if Washington would give latitude in these details at least to States like New York which had sound social welfare programs before they were ever noticed on the Potomac.

Why these unrealistic and harmful requirements in detail are so tenaciously clung to by HEW is hard to understand. Maybe their jobs depend on filling up their time. Maybe it is because they simply will not realize that public assistance in the sixties is not the emergency subsistence program of the thirties when the money had to be paid out, but fast. Some of the rules that have been promulgated have no congressional authorization whatever. These administrative edicts require interpretations and the interpretations must be interpreted—and it takes a Philadelphia lawyer to get out of the maze at all. This will go on until the States or some of them will marshal their political weight to put a stop to a situation that would be comic if it were not so demoralizing to welfare administrators, workers, and recipients.

We are talking here mainly about the five federally aided categories, i.e. old age, aid to dependent children, blind, disabled, and medical aid to the aged. The other public assistance category in this State, home relief, receives no Federal funds and is theoretically solely within State control. I say theoretically because Federal policy does affect home relief and also child (foster and institutional) care. It would be a practical impossibility to run two administrative systems, one crazy quilt for the Federal categories and another simpler one for home relief, so it's all under the crazy quilt.

LOVE THY NEIGHBOR?

How does the factory worker, the cop, the farmer, the office girl, the saleslady, the junior executive feel about this? How do young and middle-aged people struggling in the four to eight thousand bracket to support a family react? They think politicians, who don't seem to do much about it except apologize, are ostriches, heads in sand, captivated by pundits and theorists, without concern for the taxpayer, afraid of a sacred cow. Growing exasperation and impatience is a cause of rash action by local authorities such as have occurred in the past year. The public will not accept complacently a system that puts so much emphasis on need and so little on responsibility.

UNCLE AND HIS CHILDREN

History says Uncle Sam is the child of the States but, by some process, nonbiological, the situation in Federal-State welfare relations has been reversed. The growing and difficult role of New York State as the very junior partner in this relationship led Governor Dewey in 1951 to appoint a legislative commission, known as the Kelley Commission, to find an answer. In its reports in 1952, 1953, and 1954, this commission traced very clearly how the Federal Security Agency, predecessor of HEW, had usurped authority that Congress had specifically refused to grant. It showed how States, unless they wanted to forfeit Federal funds, were in a bind with no recourse to determine the legality of this Government agency's requirements. But there was no followthrough to amount to anything and there still is no way to get a court decision before the administrative ruling goes into effect.

The 1961 report on public welfare of the Coordination Commission (Leg. Doc. No. 84) contains an analysis of the problem, which is concurred in by the board of social welfare in a detailed statement entitled "Federal-State-Local Relations" dated December, 1961. The Coordination Commission said:

"Long and serious thought should be given by leaders of State government to this question. Broadly speaking that question is: Are the people of the State as a whole benefitting from taking Federal dollars under the conditions imposed?" (p. 43, Leg. Doc. 84 of 1961).

As appealing as the new proposals announced in Washington February 1 may seem at first glance, they will simply extend all these administrative headaches into a broader field as far as New York is concerned. The "partnership" with the Potomac has seriously impaired New York's once sound welfare program—we sold out for a mess of pottage—and I mean mess. This appraisal of Federal welfare aid is shared by at least one of the three main religious faiths—the Roman Catholic Church. They know the score in this field and the harm Federal policies are doing to the people as well as social workers. In this respect the Roman Catholic dioceses in New York State do a lot more protesting than do we Protestants.

RECENT PROGRESS WITHIN THE NARROW AREA LEFT US

The main problem as seen by the coordination commission in its report can be resolved only by Washington. However, the commission did make significant recommendations in the remaining area. These will take time to show results. Few legislative enactments are required. Some of the sectors where progress already can be seen are set forth below.

1. Solution of problem of recruiting social welfare workers apparently has been found by the public welfare personnel classification commission (L. 1960, C. 834), a temporary body which made its report on January 16, 1962. Former Assemblyman James Fitzpatrick served—and I mean served—as chairman. His recommendations are binding on the board of social welfare and its administrative arm, the department, without further legislative action.

2. As recommended by the coordination commission, the legislature last year enacted a measure establishing a central registration bureau in the department to aid in finding deserting parents. This complex law requires some amendments this year, which already are before us. Under the direction of the very able counsel for the department of social welfare with the help of Senator Barrett's joint legislative committee on interstate cooperation, results may be expected in bringing to time the one-night-stand type of parent. Other States already are eyeing our statute as a model.

3. With permissive legislation last year we encouraged local welfare departments to set up citizens advisory committees. The idea is that, if more citizens become aware of the labyrinthian headaches, the public might be of more help in finding the answers. State Charities Aid Association is particularly interested in this public educational approach.

4. Administrative recommendations made by the coordination commission last March included: More intensive in-service personnel training, special attention to fraud cases, reduction of office workload particularly by wider use of electronic computors, and recodification and simplification of board and departmental rules and regulations, which now, in an effort to keep up with emanations from the Potomac fill several large book shelves. Because the Department has statutory power to do all these things, the coordination commission did not recommend legislation. However, the perceptive majority leader of this body, Senator Mahoney, saw that the Department did not have sufficient specialists to implement those administrative recommendations, so his able staff drafted three bills carrying modest appropriations for these purposes—and with his usual generosity he gave me equal billing, which I (such a modest lad) do not deserve.

ANSWERS TO THE FEDERAL RIDDLES

The best answer would be "Render unto Caesar that which is Caesar's and unto God that which is God's," or, Uncle Sam you take your money and leave us States alone. That won't happen because the less affluent states, unlike New York, get from the U.S. Treasury several times what their citizens pay in Federal taxes. Cry as they do about States rights, they don't want to cry loud enough to lose Uncle Sam's dollars. Another way would be to eliminate categories of assistance, such as old age, aid to dependent children, etc. Categories create big administrative headaches. Why not simply treat everyone according to his need? That wouldn't work because, with the Government participating, categories are necessary to define the kind and extent of such participation.

A practical and reasonable suggestion was made in the minority report of a committee appointed to advise the Secretary of HEW under the preceding national administration. This minority report was developed by counsel to the California Association of Boards of Supervisors and he was supported by an expert from New York State. The recommendation in two parts was that (a) the Federal Government support in full and administer direct the old age assistance category, this being more of a social security type program; and (b) the Federal Government get out of the other three Federal-State assistance categories; i.e., aid to dependent children, aid to blind and aid to disabled, and leave this to the States. This plan would result in the States getting roughly the same financial benefits from Washington as they did before, without divided responsibility and haggling. Well, the HEW careerists gave that plan the "Resquiescat in Peace" treatment, but fast. They wanted to make sure their frozen intellects stayed frozen in the old patterns. Empires were never built by giving up something.

The Federal Government has injected itself into a sector which is basically the responsibility of private groups, the local governments and States. As a reason for this they say that States, some States, are not discharging their responsibilities to the people in the field of public assistance. Who is to be the judge of that? If, however, that is the reason and the sole reason for "partnership" between the National Government and the States in this field, then the former should weigh what each State is doing on its own. If, like New York, a State maintains a comprehensive social welfare program, then Washington should recognize that fact and restrict regulation and interference with such a State to a minimum. At the same time, such a State should not be penalized for its enterprise by receiving any less Federal financial aid than it otherwise would.

AMEN

Meantime the monster feeds on itself and about all the public can do to get relief from its frustration is cuss us politicians and enjoy movies, Broadway shows, and other media that get big laughs out of spoofing welfare.

The man said that the Declaration of Independence was a promise of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. But do you recollect anything that says Uncle Sam should run interference on every play? Did anyone guarantee that happiness would be caught every time a pass is thrown? Your hardworking, hardheaded fathers and grandfathers who struggled to make this country great never thought so, and neither did King David when he wrote in the 75th Psalm, 5th verse:

"I said unto the fools, deal not so madly;
And to the ungodly, set not up your horn."

The Farm Income Picture in Focus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from State Representative, Roy Schulz, of Mankato, Minn., enclosing an article which appeared in the Independent Bankers magazine entitled "The Farm Income Picture in Focus." Representative Schulz, who has had long years of experience in our Minnesota State Legislature, stated in connection with this article:

Whenever one segment of the economy does not get a fair return on their investment, or a fair return for their labor, the other segments of our economy will be in trouble.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring this farm income article to the attention of my colleagues and I include excerpts from it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE FARM INCOME PICTURE IN FOCUS

(By V. E. Rossiter, Sr.)

The monetary wealth that farm people take with them when they leave our rural communities is the source of money supply for the communities, the source of deposits for the local banks and the source of liquidity in the banker's note portfolio.

Now let's review the balance sheet of agriculture, 1961, as reported in the August, 1961, issue of the Federal Reserve Bulletin.

Nearly 260,000 fewer farmers had checking accounts early in 1961 than a year earlier, the Federal Reserve estimate of farmer-owned deposits indicates. And the bank deposits, currency and U.S. savings bonds owned by farmers declined during 1960 for the second consecutive year.

New basis estimates place the total of these assets at $13.3 billion on January 1, 1961, a decrease of $500 million from a year earlier. About $300 million of the decrease in liquid financial assets in 1960 was in farmers' checking accounts.

The situation is one which is very apt to get worse before it gets better.

For this reason, the Independent Bankers Association has appointed a committee of three midwestern bankers to engage in a study of the farm income situation and its effect on the rural economy, particularly the effect on rural banks.

It is not the committee's intention or purpose to solve the farm problem, but only to throw light on it. It is presumed, however, that if the IBA membership becomes sufficiently concerned, as a consequence of the frank discussion which the committee intends to engage in, subsequent action by the IBA as an association may evolve. This would be within the tradition which has motivated the IBA since its inception, subject, of course, to the wishes of a majority of the membership.

If you live in an area where agricultural production and income is even substantial, although it be less than half of the income earned in your communities, you are stuck with the consequences of a gross farm income which has failed to rise materially, and a net farm income which has declined on the average every year since 1951.

We will use the years 1947–49 as a base for comparison of the relative rise of the various segments of our economy, because, (1) This is the base generally used by our Government statisticians, so much of the work is done for us here, and (2) This is one of the three periods in our economic history since the turn of the century in which we had the very desirable combination of approximately full employment, approximate complete utilization of our raw material production (no bothersome surpluses), and relative prosperity in all of the six major segments of our economy, including agriculture.

Theoretically, if we can successfully restore the various segments of the economy to approximately the same ratios of national income that prevailed in 1947–49, we can again attain the desirable levels of employment, production, and consumption which has made our Nation prosperous on previous occasions. Failing to do this has historically caused an eventual depression, and each successive depression has been worse than the previous depression. Theoretically the next major depression will be five times worse than the depression of the 1930's because we have five times more money involved, and about a third more people, than we had in the period just prior to the depression of the 1930's.

National income, as computed by the U.S. Department of Commerce, is the sum of all of the profits, the net income, earned by the six major segments of our economy. In other words it is the profit earned from the operation of all the business enterprises in the United States. Among these profit items is the net income (including inventory adjustments) earned by the agricultural industry.

The difference between net farm income and gross farm income, $26.3 billion in 1960, is the production cost of agriculture, the money that farmers must spend to plant and harvest an annual crop, and produce livestock, poultry, dairy products, etc., leaving them a net, in 1960, of $12 billion.

This relatively small net farm income must be used to provide the family living, repay all capital debts, purchase all of the farm equipment such as tractors, farm machinery, automobiles, trucks, household goods, and other capital goods, and after all of these things are taken care of, the remainder can be saved for expansion, college educations for the children, old age and retirement, or just be placed in a bank someplace to add to the capital structure of the community and provide a basis for rural development.

It is obvious that net farm income, the primary and basic profit earned in any given rural community, has been declining while all other segments of the economy have been rising. To fully understand this situation, one must recognize that the rising profits in the other segments of the economy reflect in the cost of things that farmers have to buy in their highly mechanized operations, which tends to put the farmer in a veritable vise, which is commonly called the cost-price squeeze. As his ability to earn money, with which to buy things, has diminished, the cost of the things he must buy in order to live and to operate have increased.

To well-established farmers, with two or three generations of land and resources at their disposal, this bind hasn't been too noticeable. Farm net income not only includes the farmer's wages, but it also includes the return on his investment.

Also hidden in the farm production costs in 1960 is an item of more than $4 billion of depreciation allowance. A farmer with substantial investment, presumably earning a return on this investment computed at 4¾ percent interest plus a $1,000 or more depreciation allowance, can easily be misled to believe that he is doing all right because he will show some appreciation in net worth, from year to year, everything else being equal.

But the chances are that he has received little or nothing in his net return, as wages, or as payment for management if he employs additional labor, and that he is calling the interest on his investment and the depreciation allowance income, and is living it up from year to year on the assumption that it is wages.

In the meantime, however, he will have lost the wages for himself and his family labor, and for the hired labor he may have used, and this loss can never be recovered because he has sold the production of those prior years at too low a price level, and does not have it to sell again.

Then there is the younger farmer who may have returned to the farm as a tenant operator following World War II. He may have even put together enough savings through the late forties and the early fifties to make the downpayment on a farm.

If he has done this, he will have done it with some difficulty, because he also had to pay the costs of a growing family—a new baby every year or so. We will also have spent considerable money in first obtaining used farm equipment, most probably, and then in replacing this original purchase with new and more expensive machinery as the original used machinery wore out, and additional equipment became necessary.

This man, be he a tenant or an equity land owner, doesn't have two or three generations of capital assets in the form of land and equipment on which to draw an interest income on investment, nor has he accumulated enough machinery so that his depreciation allowance is very substantial. He is paying interest on the investment in his land, whether he owns it or not. If he rents, his share rental represents the equivalent of interest or even more. If he owns his land, the interest that he will pay to his loan company may equal and even exceed the return on the land, at the recent estimated rate of return on farm real estate at and below 3 percent for the past several years.

He is also very probably borrowing heavily toward his operating expenses, and for the purchase of machinery and equipment, at interest rates varying from 6 percent to 9 percent on which he is presumed to be earning 4¾ percent.

This man can't live on the interest on his investment, nor will his annual depreciation allowance enhance his meager wages sufficiently to cover his family living costs and cost of production, plus the acquisition costs of land and machinery and the interest charge on his operation.

He is destined to be pushed out of agriculture sooner or later, not because he doesn't have the knowhow, and not because he is inefficient and lacks good management, but because he is engaged in agriculture at a time when the net return is not sufficient. It is because his industry is not earning a sufficient profit to provide relatively young or beginning farmers with both the cost of production, interest on their investment, and reasonable hourly wages for the operator's labor, the family labor, or wages paid to hired help.

He will very likely not be available as a replacement farm producer a year or so hence in an industry in which the average age of all farm producers is now 50.5 years. It is evident that had agriculture enjoyed the same average rise in net income, as the market would have justified in 1960, his gross earnings would have doubled and his net would have been almost triple at $33.1 billion more than he did receive (i.e., $12 billion).

The simple truth remains that wages and salaries, the largest single segment of national income and sources of demand, has increased 215 percent from 1947 to 1949, and there is no reason to believe that people who earn wages and salaries cannot afford a corresponding increase in the cost of their grocery bill, just as well as they can afford similar or greater increases in the cost of other goods and services.

It is self-evident that the increases resulting in other segments of the economy, because of the greater volume of business that would be generated by the increased farm income flowing through the economy, would make it possible for every segment to absorb comparable increases in groceries and other items produced from farm raw materials.

But the farmer is unorganized, in a highly organized economy, and has failed to find the means of enforcing the price level that he must have, and that others can afford to pay, so he remains the scapegoat. And we people who are determined to provide goods and services to him so that he can live and produce find our economy gradually tightening up, gradually reaching a state of atrophy which is now barely discernible, but which will one day be glaringly obvious. On that day the possibility of correction and a change of direction may very well have passed us by.

It is now becoming quite widely known, and is a matter of quiet concern to knowledgeable people, that the commercial banking system has repeated the mistakes of the twenties and is now, and has been for some time, loaned up to historically high levels in ratio to available deposits. Perhaps it is confusing to larger banks and their officers, but a rural banker shouldn't have any trouble putting his finger on the source of money in his community, and the source of deposits in his bank, and the source of liquidity in his note portfolio.

It is farm raw material income. It is the number of units of raw material produced in his trade territory, multiplied by the price level placed on that raw material production. The production itself is worthless to the producer and the community unless the unit price provides the producer with the cost of production, plus a reasonable profit, because the cost of production flows out of the rural communities into the metropolitan industrial and manufacturing centers. Only the profit remains in the local community.

If the unit price level is relatively low, then the profit will be relatively low, and the producers will have fewer dollars to put into the bank, and will very likely in many cases come to the bank for borrowed funds, with which to balance their living and operating budgets.

If the unit price level is relatively high, bank deposits will grow and expand, and the loan level will be apt to decline because prosperous people do not have to borrow money to balance their living and operating budgets.

But let us hasten to add that it does not necessarily follow that bank loans will be nonexistent one day. In a fully operating economy there will always be ample demand at profitable levels for commercial bank loans. The ultimate of the economic circumstances which have prevailed for the past several years, with the units of farm raw material production priced at a break-even level and below the cost of production and living, is for bank deposits to decline, because people who still have money will have to withdraw it to balance costs with submarginal income. Others will not have

the usual additions of income which would normally recline in banks until used subsequently. And still others will come to the bank to increase their already heavy indebtedness or to incur new indebtedness if they have been so fortunate as to have sufficient fat to tide them over until now.

The end result of declining deposits in the face of increased demand for loans is an incredible situation which brought about the collapse of more than 10,000 banks, mostly rural, from 1931 to 1934.

The Alexander Hamilton Institute, in a publication dated June 26, 1961, summarizes the situation in banking quite succinctly when it points out that one of its oldest charts of business activity indicates that the "supply of loanable funds dropped in May 1961 to the lowest level since February 1934."

From this indicator, it is an easy step to discover that in 1934 our gross national product was $65 billion, while in 1960 it is currently running at an estimated $516 billion, 794 percent higher than in 1934.

Can you imagine trying to finance an economy which is nearly 8 times more demanding in terms of income and credit than the 1934 economy, with only one-eighth of the apparent requirement for credit available? Are you unaware of the fact that the financial system of the United States has added massive doses of credit to the total economy in the last 10 years to provide a market for the expanded production, a total of $460 billion, and an average of $46 billion a year, and that apparently we are approaching the end of our rope; that we can no longer pick up our end of the credit tab and that as a consequence there will one day be no market for an important portion of our total output of goods and services?

Rural bankers know all of these things, but we haven't been thinking about them enough lately. Memories are short and often unresponsive because the benchmarks have been changed. The most difficult thing that we do is to try to look backward and to try to look forward.

Looking back to the depression of the thirties is meaningless unless it can be related to the present or the future. To those who experienced the depression, it is something to forget, rather than to remember. Looking forward, in this day of the hydrogen bomb, is anything but pleasant.

Nevertheless, after looking in both directions, the committee has concluded that it is more important today for the United States to be economically strong and solvent than ever before. As a nation we must not only pay the way for our own country, but we must of necessity assume a large share of the cost and of the responsibility for protecting the peace of the whole world. And, failing in this, we must be strong enough and prepared to fight another devastating and costly world war.

It has long been recognized that Russia plans to win the United States by default, and not by doing armed battle. Russia has anticipated economic collapse in the United States every year since 1948, and with economic collapse Russia presumes that the people of the United States will welcome the direction of totalitarianism, because it will seem evident that democracy and free enterprise have failed.

There is more at stake than just money in maintaining a properly balanced U.S. economy and a prosperous and solvent people. And there are times in our history when partisans must put aside petty differences and work for the common good. It is our view that this is one of these times.

The selfish interests should now be submerged by the necessity of statesmanlike solutions to chronic problems which have been created by the selfish motives of the selfish interests.

There is no logical reason to presume that farmers are not just as entitled to a return on their investment comparable with that enjoyed by industry, nor is there any logical reason to presume that a farmer and his family workers are worth less than the average wage paid to other highly skilled employees, and management, in business and industry.

Experience and the Dreamer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following quote from the New York Daily News of February 23 is self-explanatory.

The contrast is perhaps the reason why we are not doing so well at the U.N. these days.

THE MEN VERSUS THE BOYS

Ex-Connecticut Gov. John Davis Lodge, in a Washington's Birthday speech, warns that Khrushchev is not going soft; says let's "adopt an order of priority to dissipate the Communist threat, whose targets include the Western Alliance, the U.N., and the collective security of the Western World. Peaceful coexistence is surrender on an installment plan."

U.S. U.N. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson says in a Washington's Birthday speech: "There is a tendency to say that because the other guy hates us and expects to bury us, or at least to officiate at our funeral, we must therefore make it our business to hate him and bury him * * * Righteous indignation is not sufficient in such cases."

Dallas Constituent Urges Action To Reduce National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, last week the House once again acquiesed in the President's request to increase the debt limit. I voted against the proposal because I believe the time has come to call a halt in Federal spending. The only way this can be done is to force the administration, and the Congress, to live within its income. The following letter written to the editor of the Dallas Times Herald suggests where we are heading in continuing to pile up the national debt.

AMERICAN NATIONAL DEBT WORLD'S EIGHTH WONDER

To the Times Herald: The U.S. national debt has been increased by our mammoth foreign aid program, by the maintenance of a huge and ever-hungry bureaucracy, and by necessity of financing our national defense against a vicious enemy implemented by us, endowed by us, lifted by us from weakness to power, all of which argues our simple-mindedness as a nation, does it not?

Just see what we've got in return for this idiotic behavior: A national debt the biggest in world history; a national debt for megalomaniacs to brag about; a national debt which surpasses all seven wonders of the world.

For it is more massive than the pyramids of Egypt, more proliferant than the Hanging Gardens of Babylon, more impressive than the Temple of Diana at Ephesus, more majestic than the Statue of Zeus by Phidias, more plaintively mournful than the mausoleum, more fixed and rigid than the Colossus of Rhodes and more far-reaching than beams from the famed lighthouse at Alexandria.

Isn't it about time for U.S. taxpayers to insist on a complete audit, revision, and straightening out of the economic burden they have to carry?

ELIZABETH STAPLES.

DALLAS.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

Army's New Reserve Proposals Prove Disturbing to Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, recent proposals by the Secretary of Defense for the curtailment of the Reserve training programs, and for substantial reorganization of the Army Reserve, have been widely discussed.

While the details of this new program have not yet been announced, now presented to the Congress, they have caused some comment among Reservists. It is my understanding that they were considered at recent meetings of the Reserve Forces Policy Board, in the Department of Defense, and in the Army by the General Staff Committee on Reserve Policy.

An article in the current issue of the Officer magazine, the official publication of the Reserve Officers Association, deals with this subject. It was written especially for the Officer by John G. Norris, who is well known as an experienced observer and analyst of the military. Mr. Norris' article should prove of interest to all Members of this body, and is recommended for your consideration.

The article follows:

ARMY'S NEW RESERVE PROPOSALS PROVE DISTURBING TO LEADERS

(By John G. Norris)

As this was written, only the broad outlines of the Defense Department's new Army Reserve program were known, but they were enough to disturb Reserve leaders and many Members of Congress.

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara personally briefed the Army Section V Committee on his still secret plan January 26 and other Pentagon officials explained to the Reserve Forces Policy Board, February 1 and 2. Whatever hopes he had of quick endorsement by the two groups were quickly dashed, however.

Congressional leaders have warned the Defense Department that unless he gets the backing of both advisory bodies for the reorganization they'll be in for a real firefight on Capitol Hill. Just what went on behind the closed doors of the meetings has not been officially revealed, but it is reliably reported that strong opposition immediately was voiced by members of the 22-man section V committee over the way the reorganization program was handled and that judgment was reserved about the plan itself.

By law the General Staff Committees on National Guard and Reserve Policy (the sec. V group) "are responsible for formulating and/or reviewing all policies affecting the National Guard and the Army Reserve; for submitting recommendations thereon to the Secretary of the Army, through the Chief of Staff; and for reviewing regulations designed to carry such policies into effect."

It is reported that some of the 14 Reserve component members objected that instead of being asked to formulate new policy, they were asked to endorse a fait accompli. The program outlined, it was said, had been drafted within the Office of the Secretary of Defense, after Army recommendations in the matter largely had been scrapped. Few, if any, of the Guard and Reserve generals present, other Reserve leaders gathered, liked what was presented.

At any rate, it is known that the committee deferred action, and appointed a subcommittee to study the Pentagon plan and report back at a subject meeting in early March. Subcommittee members are: Maj. Gen. Louis D. Burkhalter, U.S.A.R., commander of the 103d Infantry Division (Iowa); Maj. Gen. Maxwell E. Rich, adjutant general of the Utah National Guard; and Brig. Gen. Carl Darnell, Jr., U.S.A., assistant Army chief of staff for Reserve components.

RFPB Chairman John Slezak, it is reported, also postponed action on the Pentagon plan after finding there was opposition—or at least reservations—by Army Reserve component members.

There is much to commend in that part of the Pentagon plan that has been announced to date. McNamara proposes to maintain six Reserve component divisions and other units in a much higher state of readiness by giving them much greater manning, training and equipment levels. This creation of a true priority Reserve seems overdue, in light of the success of the Navy's selected Reserve and the ready Air Guard and Reserve programs.

There would be 465,000 officers and men in this priority Reserve, composed of 155,000 men in units needed to reinforce the Regular Army, 203,000 in the 6 divisions and supporting units, 32,000 in 9 separate brigades, 68,000 for training and base units and about 7,400 to man the on-the-site air defense battalions. A "ready ready" pool of obligated reservists would be created within the Ready Reserve reinforcement pool to avoid repetition of last fall's troubles with "fillers" in a future cold or limited war emergency.

The drill pay strength of the Army National Guard and Army Reserve would be cut from 700,000 to 670,000. Only 445,000 men would take 48 drills; of the remainder, 138,000 would get only 24 paid drills and 87,000 would be taking 6 months active duty.

McNamara's public announcement withheld information on many important aspects of the plan, including a breakdown of forces between the guard and Reserve and what happens to the other 31 existing Reserve component divisions. The Secretary did say that "military plans do not require 37 Reserve divisions" and that the Nation needs a "large but not necessarily highly ready" Reserve Establishment to "provide a base for a large-scale mobilization in the event of general war."

There are persistent reports that all or most of the 31 divisions not given priority status may be dropped, although for the time being at any rate all except eight of the divisions—four USAR and four NG—would be retained at skeleton strength.

If these fears materialize, there is sure to be strong opposition in Congress to so weakening the mobilization base for a general war. It is quite true that the greatest possible catastrophe facing the Nation is all-out nuclear war. And also that small limited war—which also may not require large Army forces—seems the most likely type of conflict. But many in Congress remember—even though some of the New Frontiersmen may be too young—that the general opinion between World Wars I and II was that the day of "mass armies" was past. And that only the existence of 18 Guard divisions and 150,000 Reserve officers in 1940 to back up the three understrength regular divisions enabled the United States Army to expand rapidly with allies holding the line. Even then it was necessary to create some 60 other divisions by the weakening "cadre" process. Wars have a way of confounding many prophets.

Another phase of the McNamara program has aroused some concern. That is the still not fully explained proposal to cut many units from 48 to 24 paid drills. Experience taught the Army Reserve that the money-saving scheme to provide 24-drill class B and 12-drill class C units was disruptive of morale and it was dropped. No one likes to be in a "second class" unit.

This change can be done without revision of law, but the appropriate congressional committees are expected to take a good, long look at this and other parts of the McNamara program when it finally emerges.

Metric System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the following column published in the Democrat-Message newspaper, Mount Sterling, Ill., was prepared by Mrs. Sidney Landfield, wife of the editor. It points up in clever prose the confusion throughout the world in weights and measures, and the desirability of uniformity.

The column follows:

METRIC SYSTEM

Gentlemen of the Congress of the United States, 3 barleycorns and King Henry I of England and 16 left shoes are bugging your constituents. We ask relief.

While you are whipping into shape our credentials for trade with the Common Market, please work in to the law a target date for changing our weights and measures to the metric system, so that we can get in step with the rest of the world.

It was clever of the ancient Egyptian to carry his cubit with him always in the guise of a forearm, elbow to fingertip. It probably did no harm for English architects of the early 1100's to plan cathedrals on the basis of the distance from Henry's nose to the end of his thumb, the original yardstick. Or for preindustrial man to cull an inch from 3 barleycorns and a rod from 16 left shoes.

But honestly, men, aren't we being more than a little silly to hold onto these quaint customs so long? After all, should the ruler be lost, how many secretaries keep barleycorns in the emergency drawer?

A year ago I was shocked to learn that my son's arithmetic textbook carried the multiplication tables only through 10. What; go through life crippled as to inches, feet and yards, as well as ounces and pounds or ounces, cups, pints, quarts, and gallons.

At that time I suggested in a column that we change to the metric system as a means of easing the then current unemployment crisis. I pictured thousands of unemployed scurrying from sign to sign along the highways converting miles to kilometers, other thousands going door to door selling metersticks to fill a universal demand, and factories hiring extra help to produce converters for their previously sold products.

Dear gentlemen, have you ever had to buy ingredients for a recipe expressed in thirds of cups, when the store product is labeled as to ounces or half pints? Have you ever engineered window draperies, adding the requirements for pleats, headings, and hems to the window's half size and then multiply by the number of half-windows, and then had to convert the whole mess to yards before ordering fabric?

Have you ever tried to figure, on the spot, whether the "economy" 10½-ounce package is more economical than the "giant" 6-ounce package, as expressed in terms of decimalized money? I once did. Once. I was only on the second sheet of figures when the store manager hinted it was closing time. Forced to gamble, I chose the economy size and checked out. That night I sacrificed CBS Reports and half of Jack Paar to finish the paper work, only to learn that the economy size was seventy-nine hundredths of a cent per ounce more expensive than the smaller size.

England (bless her) has given up fahrenheit for centigrade and is now planning to decimalize her money and catch up with some of her erstwhile colonies. Surely she will do the same with weights and measures.

In the meantime, we in the United States suffer an indefensible double standard. Our scientists, for all their superb education, need only shift a period to change terms of reference, while the poor soul who barely made it through grade school must struggle over pages of figuring. Even the corner druggist breezes along with kilograms while his customer fights it out with ounces. Many of our products are decimalized for export, yet still barleycorned for us.

Last summer you muffed a chance to vote on a study of the changeover. Now we are heading into a market system which demands that we speak the same language in weights and measures as Western Europe. If you care nothing for the convenience of your constituents, this time consider the national economy.

P.S.—Sure, it costs money, but so does scratch paper.

St. David's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday evening Mrs. Flood and I had the distinct pleasure of attending the annual banquet of the St. David's Society of Wyoming Valley, the society's 83d annual affair, held at the Irem Temple in Wilkes-Barre.

In recognition of that occasion, the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader in its edition of Friday, February 23, 1962, published an editorial and as part of my remarks today I quote the aforementioned editorial:

[From the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader, Feb. 23, 1962]

ST. DAVID'S DAY BANQUET IN CITY SATURDAY NIGHT

Tomorrow night, members of the St. David's Society of Wyoming Valley and their guests will gather at Irem Temple for the 83d annual St. David's Day banquet, an occasion which individuals of varied backgrounds share with the sponsors whose roots are deep in the soil of Wales.

To be sure, February 24 is not St. David's Day, but that is a mere technicality. While the actual anniversary of the death of the Welsh patron, the day that is noted as St. David's Day, is March 1, in recent years the celebration has been extending over a week for the convenience of those who do not restrict their celebrating to one affair.

So tomorrow night's dinner at the North Franklin Street mosque and civic center will serve to usher in a week of festivities that may even stretch out to 10 days, to which no objection will be raised in view of the mounting interest in St. David's Day, locally, nationally and internationally.

The banquet of the St. David's Society of Wyoming Valley is always one of the highlights of the observance in this area and tomorrow night's assemblage will be no exception to the rule. With former Gov. Arthur H. James and Judge Thomas M. Lewis as honorary chairman and cochairman respectively, H. Merritt Hughes and John Griffith as general chairman and cochairman, Milton Richards, the president, has entrusted the details to seasoned hands.

The Welsh are known the world over for their golden voices and silver tongues and these assets find their finest expression at a St. David's Day fete when sentiment, fellowship and pride enhance the occasion and inspire the participants.

Commemorating Bulgarian Liberation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, this coming March 3, 1962, represents the 84th anniversary of the commemoration of Bulgarian Liberation Day. This date first came into being to honor the brave Bulgarian people on March 3, 1878, and has been observed ever since by all freedom-loving peoples.

Bulgaria is one of the smaller nations in the Balkan Peninsula but its impact on that immediate area throughout its long, troubled history has been an important one. The Bulgarian people over the centuries have been consistently in the forefront in the fight for freedom and the rights of mankind. This struggle goes back to the Middle Ages and the 14th century when the Bulgarians were subjugated by the Turks and forced to live under this rule almost 500 years. In 1878 peace came to the people of Bulgaria and in commemoration of that freedom the date of March 3 is celebrated annually as a Bulgarian holiday. This day has been properly set aside to honor those people of Bulgaria who have sacrificed their lives to keep aloft the true spirit of independence and to protect the sovereign rights of men. Once again Bulgarians lie suppressed under the heel of a new tyranny—communism. But like other tyrannies, communism will one day vanish and the people of Bulgaria will once again control their own lives and their own destinies.

I am privileged to salute the brave Bulgarian people on this their great Liberation Day and I wish them most fervently an early end to the dictatorship they now suffer under and the right that belongs to all men—the right to live freely and in a manner of their own choosing.

The Little-People-to-Little-People Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I was very interested to read in the RECORD of February 15 the remarks of our good friend and distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] relating to his son's little-people to little-people program.

I think that Peter Rodino the younger should be complimented on his zeal and desire to help the statesmen of our day to solve the most perplexing problem our Nation has ever faced: the problem of achieving security, and peace with justice, in a world poised on the brink of a nuclear holocaust.

Although he is quite young, Peter's and other young people's preoccupation with this grave problem is certainly legitimate. The solution of this problem will determine what kind of a world they are going to live in. God willing, they have many years ahead of them, and they should be able to look forward to living them in a world which is not constantly threatened with global disaster.

I think it is important for our young people to become aware of world problems, to strive to understand them, and to determine to solve them.

One important task in this field involves understanding our own heritage, and the nature of the Communist force which threatens it.

I think that our schools could do better work in this area. I understand that there are many schools below the college level which do not provide any type of instruction about communism. Theirs is a shortsighted policy. I hope that it will be corrected before long.

Young people are anxious to know, and to understand. It is our job to help them, to guide them, to bring them to

the truth. We need not, and should not, use Communist methods of indoctrination. True to the principles of our free society, our schools should stop at the point at which our people—young and old alike—can arrive at the truth. And it is in truth that our strength lies.

I hope that we can bring more facts about communism to our youth. This is important. And I commend efforts directed to this end.

The Farm Problem of Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, the farm problem is a perennial one which has been with us for a long time, and will, undoubtedly, be with us for many years in the future.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include an editorial appearing on February 26, 1962, in the Levittown Times, a newspaper of lower Bucks County, Pa., which is very apropos to this problem of the future. The said editorial is as follows:

THE MENU FOR TOMORROW

Government and other farm economists disagree on when we may reasonably expect our rising population to soak up persistent food and fiber surpluses which dog us these days. But the agricultural engineers plunge ahead as if we already were suffering from shortages.

They don't worry about the immediate future. Government experts say if we just use to the full the technical knowledge we now have it would be the equivalent of adding 160 million acres of fertile land to our present 500 million acres.

Another 25 million acres of new cropland may be available by 1975 through irrigation, drainage, and clearance. And farm engineers at Stanford Research Institute say that in the same span the equivalent of 23 million more acres could be made available through altogether new advances in technology.

After that, they foresee a series of truly radical changes which finally will transform farming into a kind of factory chemical operation totally divorced from the land. They even see us scanning the oceans to scoop up millions of tons of rich plankton, a kind of small floating animal and plant life.

Along the way, say the Stanford men, we will learn how to apply missing minerals to vast "trace element" deserts; areas deficient in tiny amounts of iron, copper, magnesium, zinc and other materials. With desalted sea water we will irrigate more acres, if we can find the cheap energy to pump it over mountains.

On existing farmlands, we will simplify, systematize and mechanize as never before. Tractors may be governed by automatic pilots, with operators riding in soundproof, air-conditioned cabs. New kinds of compact electric power units are looked for.

Electronic sensing devices planted under the skin of livestock will record animal health, growth rate and weight. Transmitted to computers, this data will tell how to feed the animals, and when to breed and slaughter.

Similar mechanisms stuck in the soil will allow a computer to advise when to water, fertilize and otherwise treat crops.

As time goes on, electronic equipment will manage the whole business, from seeding through harvesting and packaging.

When soaring population one day makes farming on the land insufficient, crop output will be moved indoors, ultimately to be governed wholly by synthetic chemical processes. Then, say the busy engineers, the oceans may be the only outdoor farms.

It all sounds rather dramatic but quite unappetizing. We can take some comfort from the likelihood that factory crops and ocean harvests may still be at least half a century off.

Meantime, would anyone care to sample a plankton steak, compressed from the waves of the future?

Weekend Hospital for Emotional Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Roderick G. St. Pierre, director of the Topeka, Kans., Veterans' Administration hospital, has developed an effective and dynamic new concept to help the veteran with emotional problems. Because of my interest in veterans' affairs through my membership and work on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and because of my interest in emotional and mental problems through my knowledge of the tremendous work being done in Kansas by Dr. St. Pierre, by our State hospitals, and by the Menninger Foundation—for all these reasons, I am particularly pleased to bring to the attention of the Congress the following feature news story from the Topeka (Kans.) Capital-Journal, of Sunday, February 18, 1962.

WEEKEND HOSPITAL TO TACKLE EMOTIONAL PROBLEMS

(By Stannie Anderson)

The need of the veteran who walks a fine line between emotional problems and mental illness long has been a cause for concern at Topeka VA hospital.

The twisting indecision of the veteran is understandable. He doesn't think he is mentally ill—although he does acknowledge he has serious problems.

"How could I afford to be admitted to a mental hospital?" he wonders. "I'd lose my job—my boss wouldn't hold it open for me. He might not like it anyway if one of his employees were admitted to a mental hospital for treatment.

"And there's my family—how would my wife and four kids live if I were hospitalized? My friends and neighbors would find out I was a patient and would think I'm mentally ill. I do think I have some emotional problems—but how can I admit that to my friends?"

Yet if the veteran puts off seeing a doctor, he may become sicker.

In an attempt to reach out into the community with help for these veterans before they become chronically ill, Topeka VA Hospital will launch a weekend hospital, believed to be the first of its type in existence.

Heading the project as psychiatrist will be Dr. Roderick G. St. Pierre, hospital director. Other staff members will be Dr. Francis Vernallis, psychologist, and Elmo Camp, therapy assistant.

The veteran will keep his job and live with his family during the week. Then at 8 a.m. on Saturday mornings he will report to the hospital where he will remain until 8 a.m. Monday. He must agree to spend 12 such successive weekends.

The veteran will receive, at no cost except his weekend leisure hours, the same intensified kind of treatment given any other patient over a period of 1 year.

"This means that instead of playing golf or going fishing, cutting the lawn, playing with the kids or buying groceries, the veteran will come to the hospital for the weekend," Dr. St. Pierre said. "He'll have to find time during the week for these other activities. Probably he'll work harder here than on his job or at home. But if he really wants help, he can get it this way without disrupting his relationships with his family and his employer."

"The weekend hospital is not a cure-all but rather another approach to the same old problem." Dr. St. Pierre said. It will make facilities of the hospital more available on the veteran's time rather than on the hospital's time.

"There will be no unscheduled time during the weekends," the hospital director said. "The group will have all activities together. Every minute will be planned from 8 a.m. until 10 p.m. with patient-planned activities given precedence. Staff members will live and eat with the group and sleep in the same area of the hospital."

Veterans will spend most of their time in the ward. They will eat their meals in the main messhall as a group. They will make coffee in the ward, wash their own dishes and make their beds, since no housekeeping services will be supplied.

They will have intensified group therapy and go together to the gym, the swimming pool, to movies, and to church services of their choice. Those who do not wish to attend church services will spend the scheduled time at the hospital library.

"The weekend hospital is not for mentally ill persons but for those with emotional problems," Dr. St. Pierre emphasized. "If a patient should become physically or mentally ill, he will be transferred to a medical, surgical or psychiatric unit. No drug therapy will be given to patients on the ward. If a veteran needs drugs, he doesn't belong on this ward."

Before admission each veteran will undergo extensive physical and psychological evaluation.

Ward F—for facilitas, meaning easiness of access and freedom from difficulty—will be located in building No. 3 in the last unassigned space in the VA hospital.

It will contain beds for 10 patients, a table and chairs, a couch, and kitchen facilities for snacks. Across the hall will be lockers, showers, and bathroom facilities of the compact unit.

The "weekend hospital" program was conceived by Dr. St. Pierre as another approach to a more flexible use of existing hospital facilities.

"Most hospitals—whether private or community—actually are 5½-day hospitals rather than 7-day hospitals. The Topeka VA hospital is geared to the 5½-day week, with emergencies being admitted from Saturday from Saturday noon until Monday morning," Dr. St. Pierre said.

"Many of our veteran patients go home for the weekend. This leaves a number of empty beds and provision for meals that are not prepared. The weekend hospital will permit the utilization of the entire hospital facilities at a time when the patient population is reduced. And this service will be made available to veterans who could not

otherwise take advantage of such an opportunity," he said.

The Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health, in its final report in 1961, recommended demonstration programs and more flexible use of mental hospital facilities. It also recommended that there should be movement toward admission to a psychiatric hospital without formality—and in the locale determined to be best for the patients.

It is hoped the weekend hospital will serve as a bridge back to normal living for the veteran who otherwise might cross that fine line between emotional problems and mental illness.

Congressman Holifield Sees Delay in Atmospheric Testing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, since the possible resumption of nuclear weapons testing in the atmosphere by our country has been causing so much controversy, I believe the Members of the Congress will be interested in the views expressed by our very able and well-informed colleague, CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to insert an article from this morning's Baltimore Sun, which contains his remarks on the subject.

DELAY SEEN IF UNITED STATES SETS TESTS IN AIR

(By James MacNees)

WASHINGTON, February 27.—Representative HOLIFIELD, Democrat, of California, said tonight that if even with a Presidential go-ahead it will take "a number of months" before the United States could resume atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons in the South Pacific.

HOLIFIELD, chairman of the congressional Atomic Energy Committee, said this is so because during the 34 months of negotiation at Geneva we allowed our facilities in the South Pacific to deteriorate.

Our buildings and our equipment stood still. Much of our work even in laboratories did not go forward as aggressively as it should have gone forward.

NUMBER OF MONTHS

The task force which usually takes several thousand men would have to be put together. The facilities would have to be renovated. Scientific equipment would have to be installed.

And I would say that if we're talking about large tests in the South Pacific, it will take a number of months.

President Kennedy told his news conference on February 14 that analysis of the lengthy series of atmospheric tests conducted by Russia late last year would be concluded by the end of the month.

He indicated his decision on whether to resume nuclear testing would be forthcoming shortly thereafter.

Earlier this month President Kennedy and British Prime Minister Macmillan exchanged test sites—the British will test in Nevada and the United States will utilize Britain's Christmas Island in the South Pacific if Mr. Kennedy's decision is affirmative.

The British, in fact, are expected to detonate a low-yield weapon underground test at the Nevada site later this week.

The Nevada test would be Britain's first in 4 years and her first underground.

HOLIFIELD, interviewed on the Westinghouse radio program "Washington Viewpoint," said the United States could test a small nuclear weapon tomorrow, by dropping it from an airplane or placing it on a tower in the atmosphere.

LONG DRAWN-OUT AFFAIR

He said a Presidential decision to resume nuclear testing might have a temporary dampening effect upon the disarmament negotiations now scheduled to begin in Geneva March 14, but said he did not see that it could cause any permanent damage to the talks.

"Any kind of a successful disarmament conference must go into complicated matters of national and international relations, prejudices of different nations, their security convictions, and so forth, that I think every realist realizes that disarmament is going to be a long drawn out affair."

For this reason he said he felt each nation would proceed with programs to protect its own national security while the talks were going on.

PROBABLY TRUE

In answer to a specific question the chairman said he thought it probably true that on the basis of military considerations this country has passed the stage where it must weigh world opinion in the decision to resume testing.

President Kennedy said 2 weeks ago that "whichever way the decision would go, there would be no testing on Christmas Islands" before the Geneva talks beign.

HOLIFIELD said that if analysis of the Russian tests shows the United States to be behind the Communists that must be the controlling factor in the President's decision.

The chairman said some student groups which have demonstrated against the resumption of nuclear testing are uttering cliches culled from pacifist organizations and even Communist front organizations, and they are unrealistic. Last week he said one group was "full of baloney."

TANTAMOUNT TO SURRENDER

"In the face of Communist ideology, any nation that lays down its arms can expect immediate occupation," HOLIFIELD declared. "I think it would be tantamount to surrender to the domination of communism."

On other points HOLIFIELD said this Nation is trying mightily to improve its ability to detect underground tests, but as yet has been unable to differentiate between volcanic type explosions and nuclear explosions.

As to whether Russia has perfected an antimissile missle, he said he "would speculate that they have not."

Asked whether the public would respond to the civil defense fallout shelter program set forth by President Kennedy, HOLIFIELD said he did not want to prejudge it, but he did not thik the $700 million program proposed would próvide the number of shelter spaces "we need as quickly as I think we need them."

The Hopi Pottery and Navajo Rug Gap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, much as Socrates was a critic to the ancient Greeks, one Tom Bahti, an Indian art and crafts trader, and sometime philosopher, is a critic to the Arizona congressional delegation. I have recently received another of his provocative communications, and I feel I would be depriving my colleagues of needed counsel if I did not share with them Bahti's unselfish advice.

The communication follows:

LETTER FROM TOM BAHTI, TUCSON, ARIZ.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Recently I have been reading of the fictitious "bomber gap" and "missile gap" created to spur Government spending in these fields of endeavor.

Before you jump to the conclusion that I oppose such shenanigans for the sake of business I want to assure you that I do not.

No sir, I want to be a rugged individualist and a patriotic American interested only in keeping America strong. I also, of course, wouldn't mind making a little money while pursuing these more noble goals.

It has come to my attention that Russia may begin a crash program to outproduce the United (more or less) States in Hopi pottery and Navajo rugs, two important fields in which we have always maintained a consistent superiority.

I am therefore asking that you draw up appropriate legislative bills which will provide vast sums of money to spur these long-neglected portions of our national economy.

If we let those godless Russians close the Hopi pottery and Navajo rug gap, our national posture is bound to suffer.

Sincerely,

TOM BAHTI.

Support for Allegheny Parkway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. PAT JENNINGS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, legislation is pending in the House and Senate to authorize the construction of the Allegheny Parkway, a scenic drive atop the Allegheny Mountains that would have no parallel east of the Mississippi River. It is hoped that hearings can soon be conducted on this proposal.

The Virginia General Assembly, which is now in session, recently adopted a resolution in support of the Allegheny Parkway bills. A copy of this resolution has been sent to me.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the resolution passed by the general assembly and invite my colleagues' attention to it.

The resolution follows:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 46

Joint resolution concerning the Allegheny Parkway

Whereas the Allegheny Mountains, extending through Virginia, West Virginia, Tennessee, and Kentucky, contain some of the most beautiful scenery anywhere in the world and these beauties of nature should be made easily accessible to the motoring public, proposals have been made and these would become so available if the Allegheny Parkway were constructed through this scenic area; and

Whereas the Allegheny Parkway would pass through or near the beautiful Breaks of the Cumberland, which is an attraction of national interest and is sometimes referred to as the Grand Canyon of the South; and

Whereas the Breaks Interstate Park is near the site of the proposed parkway which parkway would also run near the Cumberland Gap National Historical Park in Cumberland Gap, thereby treating the public to further beautiful vistas and majestic splendors; and

Whereas the Allegheny Parkway would be the highest scenic highway east of the Mississippi River, it would attract multitudes of tourists who have never been able to visit that area before, and the construction of the parkway would improve employment throughout the area in which it would run, thereby helping the economy of an area which has been classed as a distressed area; and

Whereas the Allegheny Parkway would also run near the following flood control dams: The Fish Trap Dam in Kentucky and the Flannagan Dam and the North Fork of the Pound River Dam in Virginia, thereby making additional recreational facilities available to many visitors in these States; and

Whereas a proposal is pending in the Congress of the United States for the construction of the Allegheny Parkway and it is proper that Virginia express its suport of this undertaking: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of delegates (the senate concurring), That this body hereby expresses the hope that the Allegheny Parkway will be constructed as soon as may be in order to assist the areas in which it is located and to make the wonders of nature available to the American motoring public; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the house of delegates is instructed to send a copy of this resolution to each member of the Virginia delegation in the Congress of the United State and such members are respectfully urged to support such undertaking.

GEORGE R. RICH,
Clerk of the House of Delegates.
BEN D. LACY,
Clerk of the Senate.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

DALLAS, TEX., *February 14, 1962.*

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: We, the undersigned, support your House Resolution 211, entitled "Special Committee on Captive Nations" which would create a special committee to study continuously and objectively all of the captive nations in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

It is high time that some action be taken to put the spotlight on Moscow's colonial system. Millions of enslaved people throughout the world were inspired with new hopes for freedom by the captive nation's resolution a few years ago, but nothing has been done thus far to justify their hopes.

We are today writing our Congressman and Senators to support your resolution for a continuous committee to the end that some action will be taken to free the enslaved peoples. Would appreciate one copy of your resolution.

Respectfully,

RUTH A. HANSON.
MILDRED V. LAKOS.
DAVIS O. BARRAND.
HOWARD J. BARRAND.
DONALD M. LANON.
JOSEPH J. LAKOS.

FEBRUARY 17, 1962.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: May I voice my support of your House Resolution 211, Committee on Captive Nations. What a wonderful way to demonstrate to patriotic Poles, Hungarians, Ukrainians, and Chinese that our free world has not forgotten them, that Americans still reaffirm our own Declaration of Independence where it states, "Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." Should we not actually set the tangible goal of free elections for enslaved nations as a permanent part of the work of such a committee? Such a goal would, it is true, probably not mean much to the uncivilized peoples of Africa who have no knowledge of what this entails, but it would be a spark of hope for gallant peoples who know even better than we do what loss of liberty entails.

Obviously, such a positive program would not meet with favor in the United Nations. This should not deter action on House Resolution 211, however, because most of the nations represented do not hold ideals of human rights compatible with ours, anyway. It appears about time that we untwisted ourselves from the false idols, the never-ending compromises with our moral conscience, that has become more and more an accepted part of our participation in the U.N. councils. It appears about time we demonstrated the courage to promote those ideals we do believe in and not accept further those compromises which appear expedient before the majority of the U.N. members.

Currently, we are discussing the purchase of $100 million of U.N. bonds. It is not about time to invest further money in our own ideals? The American dream once fired the world; how far have we compromised it as we look around us today? Possibly we should take a good look at the security image with no strings or obligations attached that is now so popular as compared with what America offered in 1776.

If individuals here wish to subscribe to U.N. bonds, let them, whether or not the SEC approves. I believe it is time, however, for the United States to stop pinning its faith on a morally bankrupt organization where all talk justice, but power rules. Let's get out of the U.N. while we still can. Risks, yes, but how do they compare to risks taken willingly by our ancestors in 1776? Have we lost the faith under God in what we and they believe in? Let's restate our beliefs in House Resolution 211, not only for ourselves but for all peoples. Let's give men a tangible alternate to slavery and show by positive action that we are ready to back it up in the face of totalitarian expansionism. We or they must ultimately triumph. Coexistence on their terms means defeat for us. The sooner we get out of the U.N. and spread our own tenets, the better. Let's start by funding House Resolution 211 with the $100 million which apparently some in our Government would give to the U.N.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. FISH.

LOUISVILLE, KY.

MCLEAN, VA., *January 30, 1962.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: We have just finished reading the Manion Forum's copy of "Captive Nations—Moscow's Achilles' Heel," November 12, 1961, and want to compliment you for supporting the worthy proposal of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations.

Today, more than ever before, the United States must take positive steps to protect and aid those countries who want to remain or to become free. As leader of the free world, America has a responsibility to espouse the cause of freedom in the face of growing Communist aggression. Ingorance and lack of courage are no excuse to shun this responsibility we have toward our fellow man.

We sincerely hope, sir, that you will continue to support and urge the acceptance of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. This proposed committee could prove to be the backbreaking force of communism. Certainly, it would become a most powerful asset to the United States in the cold war. Thank you.

Sincerely,

FRANK E. BARTOS, JR.
JAMES R. BARTOS.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *February 7, 1962.*

Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I'm enclosing copy of a column which I write for several Catholic diocesan weekly newspapers which mention your bill for a Committee on Captive Nations.

I thought it was a swell idea, and picked it up for my column. I'm afraid it isn't used by any Catholic weeklies in your district or State, but maybe it will help the cause elsewhere.

Cordially,

JOHN COSTELLO,
Editorial Writer.

WHAT COLONIALISM?

(By John Costello)

Seldom have we been faced with such an example of brutal colonialism," the speaker cried, with a great show of indignation. He had the floor in the plush, domed hall of the General Assembly of the United Nations in New York City.

And of whom was he speaking?

Of the builders of the ugly wall that cuts in half the once great city of Berlin?

Or of the tank commanders who crushed the revolt of the Hungarian patriots, many of them boys and girls in their teens, in the streets of Budapest.

The speaker was Bohdan Lewandowski of Red Poland. He is one of the new generation of quislings who serve Communist masters, instead of Nazis.

Lewandowski was not speaking of Berlin or Budapest—or Warsaw.

He was discussing Angola, an oversea province of Portugal.

It is one of the areas of Africa that has never been given its independence. And the 104 members of the U.N. General Assembly had come back to New York, after a long Christmas recess, almost solely to browbeat Portugal into "freeing" Angola.

What the United Nations should have been discussing, if colonialism was on the agenda, was Communist colonialism.

In Lewandowski's country, for example, the Soviets keep 28 million Poles under their thumb only by the bayonets of the Red army.

And the subjugated Poles have plenty of company.

Last year, the Assembly of Captive European Nations, issued a booklet on the new Red colonialism. Since 1939, it pointed out, 41 nations that were once western colonies have gained their freedom.

More than 800 million people live in those newly independent lands.

In the same period, however, the U.S.S.R. and Red Chinese have assembled a vast empire that embraces almost as many people as the West has freed.

The list includes:

	Population
Albania	1,421,000
Bulgaria	7,667,000
Czechoslovakia	13,353,000
East Germany	18,000,000
Hungary	9,812,000
Romania	17,829,000
Poland	28,535,000
North Korea	9,150,000
North Vietnam	13,000,000
Outer Mongolia	740,000
Tibet	1,000,000

Since ACEN compiled this list, Cuba has been added to the Communist bag. In addition, the U.S.S.R. has annexed East Poland, and its 12,775,000 people.

Chinese Communists, by force of arms not ballots, took over mainland China and Manchuria. Thus, some 6 million to 800 million more were added to the inmates of the vast Red prison camp.

Many Americans do not realize that at least half the people in the U.S.S.R. are not "Russians," at all. The Soviet Union has swallowed up nearly a dozen nations and nationalities—some with a history that goes back more than 1,000 years.

Moscow did not snuff out Ukrainian independence until 1920, long after the October revolution. Georgia held out until 1921.

And Turkestan, in Central Asia, fought off the U.S.S.R. and the Red army until 1924.

Moscow is very touchy about these captive peoples inside her own borders. Why? Because many of them still hate the Russians.

They are a potential fifth column capable of inflicting great damage to the U.S.S.R.

Once, in the U.N., Canadian Prime Minister John Diefenbaker rubbed this raw spot when he criticized the U.S.S.R. for demanding an immediate end to "colonial regimes". He quoted Soviet Premier Khrushchev's remark:

"It will always be the Soviet stand * * * that countries should establish systems * * * of their own free will and choosing."

"What of Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia," Liefenbaker asked. "What of freedom-loving Ukrainians and other Eastern European peoples. I ask Mr. Khrushchev to give these nations under his domination the right of free elections."

His statement was blacked out in the Soviet press.

But Radio Liberty in Munich repeated it for several days in broadcasts aimed at the Ukraine. Apparently the word got through.

The reaction was volcanic.

Communist Ukrainian newspapers unleashed a savage attack on the Canadian. Radio Kiev made the air blue with its abuse of him. So did 10 other provincial radio stations.

Protest rallies were organized. Prominent Ukrainian authors and artists were dragged out to throw rocks at him, but their words were often suspiciously wide of the mark.

The U.S.S.R.'s restless satellites and captive people are its Achilles' heel, some believe. But does the West exploit this weakness?

No, it doesn't. Until recently, Voice of America beamed only one 15-minute program a day to Soviet Central Asia. It was in Uzbek.

Nothing in their own tongue was broadcast to the Kazakhs, Turkmenians, Kirghiz, or Taezhiks.

BBC was also silent.

Only Radio Liberation broadcast to them in all five main languages. But its signal is weak, and often jammed by the Soviets.

Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, Pennsylvania Democrat, has one suggestion. He wants to establish a special House Committee on Captive Nations to keep the spotlight on the new Communist colonialism.

He introduced a bill for it March 8, 1961. So far, it has gone nowhere.

JACKSONVILLE, FLA., *February 15, 1962*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: My organization is behind you 100 percent in support of H.R. 211. This is indeed a needed committee. I only wish the Kennedy administration would formulate a strong "win" policy against the spread of godless international communism so as to make your proposal even more effective. The grassroot conservative movement now sweeping this country wants to see some positive action toward freeing the enslaved nations. We are tired of words. We are tired of our leaders talking about repealing the Connally amendment. We are tired of seeing Communist sympathizers like William Arthur Wieland and Ralph Bunch appointed to positions in our Government, much less positions that could spell disaster for the security of our Nation.

Again I commit myself to full support of H.R. 211.

Please place my name on your mailing list.

I am sincerely,

GARY C. HARRIS.

An American Triumph

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, we are all tremendously proud of Lt. Col. John Glenn. His epochal flight of last week ranks with the greatest feats of American history. Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include an editorial which appeared in the Morning Call of February 21, a newspaper published in Allentown, Pa. The said editorial reflects the feelings of all of us about this great American and his accomplishment. The editorial is as follows:

In all this Nation's history there have been few days like yesterday.

Never have as many Americans prayed so fervently and at the same time for one thing: The safety of the first of their countrymen to be hurled into space for an orbital ride that took him 160 miles above the earth and three times around the world in 4 hours and 56 minutes.

Only when a cruel enemy has been conquered have there been as many simultaneous cheers and hushed words of thanks as there were when word was flashed into almost every home and office and factory that Lt. Col. John Glenn was safely back and on the deck of an American destroyer, a hale and hearty astronaut.

Every bit of the way, from the earliest laboratory experiments until the space ship was picked up from the sea, the journey was an American triumph, a proud one in which many shared.

Not for a moment from the time he entered the capsule was Colonel Glenn alone. Many millions were with him on every inch of his 81,000-mile flight through a chartless new sea. The way he and his countrymen elected to make the journey permitted the world to share the fireball ride.

There never was a trip quite like this one. Others credited with traveling substantially the same route went alone and in secret. They reported their travels when they returned.

America's astronaut, now deservedly its newest hero, took the world with him. He crowded even the most timid into his tiny capsule and piloted them on a 5-mile-a-second magic carpet odyssey that passed from dawn to dark and from winter to summer three times in little more than half a normal working day.

He took time out from the controls and gauges to describe what he saw as an 1,800 mile vista flashed by in a glimpse. He told them that in an all-encompassing view the State of Florida looks just as it does on a map. He even remembered to thank the Australians who turned on the millions of lights of Perth as a gesture of good will and good luck.

This was as brave and as remarkable an adventure of man as history ever has authenticated. Every step of it is clearly and indelibly written in infinite detail to provide background for others that will be even more daring. Many of the doubts, the riddles and the mysteries of space have been answered. Many more still are to be resolved.

Colonel Glenn has convincingly demonstrated that many can survive travel through outer space. For any who may have doubted, this Nation has proved it has the knowledge and the skills to provide him with the necessary vehicles. What's more, it also has the courage, the patience, the heart and the spirit.

Which Road for Transportation: Private Management or——?—Part VII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following interview with Dr. Dewey Anderson, executive director of the Public Affairs Institute in Washington, D.C., is one in a series of nine published first in Traffic World magazine and now reprinted in a booklet. I commend this, and the other eight, to the attention of my colleagues:

INTERVIEW SEVEN

(NOTE.—Dr. Dewey Anderson is executive director of the Public Affairs Institute, of Washington, D.C., an independent nonprofit research organization which draws its support from a number of individuals representing a cross-section of business, education and government, and labor organizations, including the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. Against a background of 15 years of interest in and study of public affairs, Dr. Anderson's brief statement of his views is of interest. Dr. Anderson first offers a general statement on the situation of the railroads.)

Too often those interested in solving the financial management and operational problems confronting our railroads forget its fundamental character and importance to the Nation. Railroads are a service industry. They use their own and public property. They operate under Government franchises by which they are given certain exclusive privileges and for which they make certain concessions and abide by certain regulations imposed upon them.

Railroads are common carriers. They cannot refuse business, nor discontinue services or abandon trackage and facilities without express permission of the Government. They are subject to Government control and even to Government operation in case of national emergency. For railroads are regarded as essential to the very life of the Nation both in peace and war.

Yet railroads are private business. They are owned by stockholders who properly expect management to produce net rvenue above operating expenses. They are dependent on the banks and capital markets for the means of conducting daily business and developing new operations just as are other corporations.

With these fundamentals in mind, I address myself to the questions asked.

A number of studies of the Federal Government's policy and role in the transportation field are underway, suggesting that there is a conviction that the time is ripe for answers to some basic questions. First. Is there any validity to the suggestion which has been made that the antitrust laws could replace the present scheme of Federal regulation?

From long experience with antitrust operations through my service as executive director of the Temporary National Economic Committee (TNEC) I am convinced that despite delays, confusions, and sometimes baffling experiences with ICC regulation, railroad management and labor, and assuredly the public, are better served by the regulation of an independent public agency than they would be by actions of an Attorney General through the prosecuting arm of the Administration. The problem is not one of prosecution, but of achieving workable cooperation through consultation in which the public interest is safeguarded by law and ICC administration of it.

Assuming that the present policy of regulation is to be continued, are there any areas where it could be lessened?

The setup and operation of the ICC stand in need of fundamental improvement. First, because the problems and workload have multiplied since the agency was formed, and neither its organization, personnel, nor budget is sufficient to meet them. More important is the need to streamline the work within the ICC. It is easy to criticize from the outside, of course, but from close observation and some direct contact with the agency and its officers I am certain that an efficiency study would materially reduce timelags, cut out overlapping functions, shore up weak aspects of the work, and improve regulation. The human factor will still remain, and criticisms of the past are still altogether too true that salaries are not comparable with those in the industry itself, and such material considerations, coupled with the political aspect of appointment making, have not always given us the quality of leadership needed. I do not favor drastic changes in regulatory procedures or regulatory powers before this streamlining has occurred.

Does the Public Affairs Institute favor government ownership of transportation?

While the Public Affairs Institute has no official way to express a single view of its sponsors and staff, I feel confident that none among us seeks government ownership of the railroads.

If we accept the idea of a transportation system partly free enterprise and partly regulated, what steps can be taken to halt the further expansion of regulation?

There is such an abundance of information resulting from recent investigations by Congress and the Government, and still more to come from studies now being made, that no quick answer should be given to the question of how we may put the brakes on efforts to further regulate and straightjacket the railroads. The ICC is making some progress as it is, in such redefinition of the intent of the 1958 Transportation Act by its recent rulings on plans III and IV on TOFC.

Is there need, now, to equalize the competitive situation as between the railroads and the air, water and motor carrier industries which operate over federally supported facilities and, for the future, between the airlines and the motor carriers of property?

This leads into the next question of how to bring about greater equalization between the various forms of transportation, rail, air, water and road. Strictly in economic terms, each form of transportation should start on the same scratch line and be subjected to the same rules as to safety, public convenience and use of public facilities, so that their inherent advantages and sound operations would alone express their relative value. But we are not dealing in any such terms anymore, if we ever did. Subsidy has crept in all along the line so that today we cannot judge precisely its role in favor or against any one form of transportation. The ICC has begun to understand this and in the rulings just referred to is saying in effect that each form of transportation should be allowed to make proper use of its technological and managerial peculiarities or advantages. Any new ruling on this fundamental question may have to await action of the Congress. But under the 1958 act, the ICC should seek such equalization as will enable each kind of transportaion to render its service at reasonable profit and with full efficiency.

Will greater freedom of competition achieve the stated purpose of the national transportation policy—a system adequate to the postal, commercial and defense needs of the country?

I believe in real competition as the way to conduct our transportation business. For in it will be found the greatest savings to the consumer, the most efficient use of equipment, the largest volume of traffic movement, the best chance for labor to share in maximum productivity, and the best service to the public. If artificial restraints that serve no real social purpose are removed, competition by itself will go a long way to provide the transport system we need both for defense and peacetime uses.

It is suggested that one phase of study by the Government should be the part each segment of the transportation industry should play. Would the institute favor allocation of traffic by any means other than competition?

No artificial or arbitrary allocation of traffic between the various forms of transportation could ever work without friction and a burden of uneconomic costs being saddled on the public.

In view of one contract worked out between dock operators and stevedores on the Pacific coast under which part of the savings from automation or improved working rules goes to the union in cash payments, should there be a study of the equities to be observed in formulating such agreements?

There is a very real and unsolved problem in transportation respecting the introduction and use of laborsaving devices and systems which are promoting automation. While labor is on record as encouraging such improvements, for only as they come are the railroads able to gain a bigger share of traffic, the impact of these innovations has not been well cushioned. Many workers have lost their jobs entirely, or their work has been degraded with resultant lowered earnings as a result. What is needed is a system for the utmost transferability from one road to another and between divisions on the same road. For those who lose their jobs, adequate severance pay is a must, and in addition the Government should be encouraged to develop a retraining and reemployment system in which transportation management and workers participate. Such a move as that of the Pacific coast longshoremen and shippers to divide technological gains is in the right direction.

Does the Institute favor a working relationship between the departments of the Federal Government dealing with labor and the regulatory agencies, so that pricing of labor and of service is coordinated?

But the wages of workers in transportation and the rules under which they do their work are best left to collective bargaining between management and labor, with present machinery of government available to protect the public. Any artificial or arbitrary pricing of labor by an outside agency would introduce a foreign element that can only complicate the situation.

Should the Reorganization Act be amended to make it clear that reorganization plans sent by the President to Congress should deal only with agencies in the executive branch

or with executive agencies entrusted by Congress to the independent agencies?

As to the final question whether the Reorganization Act should be amended to limit its automatic effects to agencies in the executive branch, my answer is affirmative. The independent agencies set up by the Congress under special legislation are in somewhat different relationship than the creations of the executive branch. They have developed a history of experience and an accumulation of administrative orders which have become ingrained in agency life. They are in need of overhauling all right. But the Congress has a direct stake in their reorganization and the President's suggestions should require congressional review and action before becoming effective.

New York Times Comments on Federal Union Idea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times beginning January 8, published a series of three editorials on the Atlantic Convention which explored the possibility of a permanent union of free peoples. This is a significant and hopeful proposal, and I invite my colleagues to read excerpts from these editorials:

A MORE PERFECT UNION?

Will this convention be merely another talk session, full of good words and friendly gestures but ineffective? It need not be. To that doughty crusader for Atlantic union, Clarence K. Streit, this meeting bears some resemblance to a gathering in Philadelphia in 1787, which was also without formal power but which produced the American Constitution and the Union of these States. The proposed Atlantic union has now reached a stage where it is wrestling with the same problems—namely, trade and commerce, reliable currencies, and contractual relationship—that threatened the 13 Colonies in 1787. NATO is a military response to today's crisis just as the Common Market is an economic response. Under the NATO treaty 15 nations are pledged to "encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them."

The Paris deliberations will last in their first phase until January 20, and will be resumed, if all goes well, a few weeks later, possibly in the United States—and perhaps in Philadelphia. They cannot be expected to produce anything resembling the U.S. Constitution, nor would such a document now be acceptable to the 15 member countries, our own included.

But it is worth while to talk things over in this context and it is particularly worth while for private citizens, not bound by governmental decisions but still representative of public opinion, to talk them over. In essentials we move toward greater unity. The gay and poignant distinctions of culture will, we hope, last for endless generations. But it is time to begin consolidating the Atlantic community in every way we can—and article 2 of the North Atlantic Treaty points to important ways that have not yet been sufficiently used: the promotion of economic (as distinct from strictly military) interconnection between all the members of NATO, by mutually "strengthening their free institutions" and "by promoting conditions of stability" among them.

ATLANTIC UNION ON THE MARCH

The vision of an Atlantic union that began to take shape with the revolution in American foreign policy that created the North Atlantic alliance is gaining increased momentum and more concrete outline at the Atlantic Convention in Paris. There the semiofficial delegates have agreed on the urgent need for further steps toward the political, economic, and military integration of the alliance's 15 member nations.

Among the most outspoken advocates of such steps is former Secretary of State Christian A. Herter, cochairman of the American delegation. Mr. Herter warns against waiting for "some great catastrophe to produce the necessary compression of national sovereignties" and urges a "courageous act of faith" to propel the vision toward reality. But the most concrete proposals along that line are submitted by former Belgian Premier Paul van Zeeland, who calls for a "true Atlantic organization" based on an Atlantic Economic Community or Common Market and a renewed, rejuvenated, and reinforced North Atlantic alliance with both a cabinet and a parliament wielding real powers. Others advance similar proposals, including in particular the transformation of the European Common Market into an Atlantic Common Market embracing the United States.

But the difficulties encountered by the European economic community in reaching a common agricultural policy, in agreeing even on the principles of political integration and in dealing with Britain's application for membership warn that a full-fledged Atlantic union would face even greater obstacles. That is why Mr. Herter himself holds that any steps that are taken must not outrun the ability of western peoples to accept the implications of integration—a factor that handicapped the first suggestions for an Atlantic federal union. Sound Atlantic unity, he cautions, must be built on a firm economic and military basis; and while we must also push for political ties, such ties must mark not the beginning but the crowning achievement of union.

This is, in effect, the same functional approach toward union which Europe has adopted after more ambitious plans had failed. It is all the more necessary because any suggestion of even a partial surrender of American sovereignty still meets the most determined opposition. Even President Kennedy's liberalized trade program, which includes neither our joining the European Common Market nor altering our concepts of political sovereignty, faces a hard uphill battle in Congress. So does the conversion of NATO into a fourth atomic power.

But, as again shown in Paris, the idea of Atlantic union is on the march. It has already produced not only the North Atlantic alliance itself but also such vital institutions as the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, the International Monetary Fund, which has just formed a primarily Atlantic $6 billion pool to stabilize currencies, and various unofficial organizations dedicated to like ends. Years of work and study will be required before the goal is reached; but the goal is no longer utopian and begins to look like a historic inevitability.

BLUEPRINT FOR ATLANTIC UNION

After 2 weeks of deliberation the Atlantic Convention, consisting of about a hundred semiofficial delegates from the 15 North Atlantic allies, has now drafted the first internationally agreed proposal for converting the vision of an Atlantic Union into practical reality. This blueprint is laid down in a unanimously adopted "declaration of Paris" which calls on the Allies to create within the next decade a "true Atlantic community" with joint executive, parliamentary and judicial institutions.

The declaration goes far beyond President Kennedy's projected trade partnership with the European Economic Community and contemplates joint action not only in trade but in all political, economic, military and cultural affairs. However, the delegates agreed with their chairman, former Secretary of State Herter, that the convention should not get too far ahead of public opinion at home. For that reason they sought to build as far as possible on existing institutions and to follow a functional approach to union without neglecting the ultimate goal.

The declaration of Paris is a starting point on which to build the reality of a NATO extended far beyond its present military emphasis to include still closer economic and political collaboration throughout the Atlantic community. Atlantic union, though still far off, can no longer be dismissed as an idle dream.

The Indiana Dunes and Harbor in Lake County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands are holding hearings on Senator PAUL DOUGLAS' save-the-dunes bill.

The following is a statement which I made before this committee on Monday of this week:

THE INDIANA DUNES AND HARBOR IN LAKE COUNTY

(Statement of Hon. RAY J. MADDEN, a Representative in Congress from the First Congressional District of Indiana, before the Subcommittee on Public Lands, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the Senate)

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I represent the largest industrial congresional district in the United States. There are three major steel mills in the Calumet region of Indiana, the Inland, Youngstown, Carnegie Illinois, and a number of other steel fabricating mills. We have the refineries of all of the major oil companies and several hundred more industries, large and small.

Lake County, by the way, comprises the First Congressional District of Indiana—as Representative of that area I am very much alarmed from the standpoint of unemployment.

In 1946, and that was the first year after World War II, the manufacture of steel was at its height. At that time, the mills only occasionally would operate 100 percent.

In the last few years, the steel mills in my area have on occasion been down to 46 percent. Automation coming in, during the last 7 or 8 years has thrown thousands not only out of work but also on part time, 3 days a week, 2 days a week, 4 days a week. A man, at the head of the family, when he is working part time is out of the purchasing market because his purchasing is confined to food, clothing, rent, and the bare necessities of life. I was interested in the telegram read by Senator DOUGLAS from Joseph Germano, director of the Chicago Northern

Indiana Steelworkers Union opposing the proposed harbor at Burns Ditch.

Now, I am very much in favor of a harbor for northern Indiana, but I am interested in seeing that the harbor is located in a place where it can serve industry that is already operating.

I have already gotten a favorable report on my resolution from the Public Works Committee of the House authorizing an Army Engineers study and survey for a harbor located in the area of Whitting, and East Chicago, and Hammond in the northeast corner of Lake County.

Senator BIBLE. That would be Lake County and that would be west of Porter County. Is that correct?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes. Right up near the Illinois line, where the port would be in close proximity there for shipping down through the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers to the Gulf of Mexico.

Senator BIBLE. What is the position of that particular legislation now, Congressman MADDEN?

You say you have made a request to the——

Mr. MADDEN. The Public Works Committee of the House has already favorably acted on the request for an engineers' survey and it is a matter now as to when the Appropriations Committee will authorize money for the survey.

I appeared in Indianapolis last August, when the Army Engineers hearings were held down there. I mentioned then, and I am going to repeat to this Committee, there seems to be something rather mysterious about the report that the Army Engineers issued in October 1960 on this proposed harbor at Burns Ditch. For some reason or other that report was withdrawn. I do not know what pressures were brought to bear for the Army Engineers to recall and nullify that report. According to that report, the figures revealed from the Army Engineers are as follows, and, they are not RAY MADDEN'S figures.

I will read: According to the Army Engineers report 97.3 percent of the future benefits coming from this proposed harbor at Burns Ditch will go to two steel companies; namely, Midwest, a wholly owned subsidiary of National Steel and the adjacent proposed construction of Bethlehem Steel Co.

On page 19, paragraph 57 of the report—now, listen to this—it states that the estimated total average annual benefit will be $8,157,000. Of this amount cargo or shipping, exclusive of the steel mill operation, will account for only $217,000.

Now, that is the Army Engineers report of October 1960. The shipping that would come from all of central Indiana and southern Indiana, would amount to $217,000 as compared with $8,157,000. The latter figure would be the shipping of the two proposed steel mills.

I fail to see, Mr. Chairman, the justification for the expenditure of millions of dollars of public money to provide a harbor and a port for the exclusive benefit of two wealthy and powerful steel mills.

Now, in Lake County—the Carnegie Illinois Steel, Inland, and Youngstown have their harbors and did not ask the Government or State of Indiana to finance them. Of course, I do not want to cast an aspersion but there seems to be some kind of powerful interest behind this situation.

In Congress, working along with other colleagues for several terms for the St. Lawrence Waterway project we had difficulty in getting results. Then in 1953, a very distinguished industrialist by the name of George Humphrey became the Secretary of the Treasury and it did not take long for favorable action to start on the St. Lawrence Waterway. Maybe Mr. Humphrey of the National Steel Co. might have something to do with this terrific publicity and organization behind the Burns Ditch Port project to provide a harbor to accommodate his and the proposed adjacent steel mills.

Mr. Chairman, I think there is good evidence to indicate that because of the character of the lake itself, this proposed port down at Burns Ditch might be a white elephant from the standpoint of sandfill and sand drift at the southern tip of Lake Michigan.

U.S. Senator Daniel Webster made a special trip from Washington in July 1836, to Michigan City to attend a big celebration on opening the original shipping harbor at this southern tip of Lake Michigan—the Congress had spent considerable money on way back 130 years ago for a port at Michigan City. For a period of 50 years thereafter Congress from time to time appropriated money to clean out the sandfill and drift at the Michigan City port.

Army engineers report of October 1960 revealed there is a north-to-south windsweep down that lake of about 500 miles. Mariners or sailors on that lake will testify that there is no body of water where there are higher waves and more sand drift than into the south tip of Lake Michigan.

It would be a terrific expense to keep a port of that type operating at that particular location.

Now, somebody here stated this morning that there were trainloads of sand hauled from the dunes in to make beaches in Chicago. Yes. Why?

Right in that area, because of the terrific sand deposits caused by storms with a 500-mile sweep is the reason we have the sand dunes at the southern tip of Lake Michigan.

That is what made the dunes.

That is why there is not a spot in the world like the Indiana Dunes.

And it has been brought out in our hearing, in the Army Engineers report of 1960, that there would be a shifting back and forth, east and west, of the sand silt there. Imagine what that will do to the park that we have there now, Indiana Dunes State Park.

Steel mill waste and pollution would spoil the water and beaches for miles surrounding the Indiana State Park.

I happen to have experience, as far as parks on the south shore of Lake Michigan are concerned. Back in 1935 and 1936, I was city comptroller at Gary, and we had a public beach there, and still have it.

The citizens of Gary can hardly enjoy it because of the influx of people coming from Chicago. We are right in the shadow of six million people in the Chicago area. And I do think that the time has come when we had better start paying a little attention to future generations and people coming from some other place for recreation.

Now, they say that there are many miles of sand around that Lake Michigan shores; but the port that I am interested in, and the chamber of commerce at Hammond, and the chamber of commerce at East Chicago, and Whiting, and the mayor of Hammond, Gary, East Chicago, and Whiting—they are very much interested in the port right there where there is plenty of industrial business and shipping right now.

Why, we have a township relief loaf in Lake County of people working only part time and unemployed in our steel mills today. With automation, what is going to happen if two great mills start operating 12 miles east of us?

Workers will flock in from all areas of the country to work in those mills. We are going to increase our relief roll problem.

I have received thousands of letters on this matter of the sand dunes. I received these letters not only from my area, but from Indiana and also from the Chicago district. They all ask that something be done in order to preserve the Indiana Dunes for future generations.

Before I terminate my remarks I think it might be well to read an editorial from James DeLaurier, publisher of the Hammond Times, in regard to what the Inland Steel had to say about the harbor at Burns Ditch. I will read part of this editorial.

And it says that one of the more significant voices opposing a port in Indiana at the Burns Ditch area of Porter County was unheard, although on the record—at the Army Engineers hearing in Indianapolis last August was the Inland Steel Co.

It opposes the site in Porter County, that is, Burns Ditch, and it was set forth in a written statement, submitted in behalf of the company for the hearing record, by Delmar W. Johnson, vice president of researching and planning.

It placed in the record, although not read at the hearing, and it said, to begin with, Johnson makes clear that Inland has a valid interest in the Porter County area.

Now, they own land there, where it is proposed to locate the port. Since 1919 Inland has owned more than 800 acres of land, including the mill shoreland from the Lake Porter County line, east toward Ogden. This property has been held and has continued to be held for the purpose of building a steel plant with harbor connections, Johnson points out.

Actual maps locating the proposed port's future extension to the southwest show the harbor line touching the southeast corner of the Inland Steel property of U.S. 12. Inland's statement declares that the October 1960—that is the Army Engineers report—that, for some mysterious reason was recalled, Inland states, and Inland's statement declares that the October 1960, interim report, submitted by the Army Engineers, estimates that oversea general cargo would amount to only 160,000 tons a year by the 10th year after the harbor is built. That is after the proposed Burns Ditch Port is completed. And only 370,000 tons a year by the end of 50 years. Now, that comes from the Army Engineers report of 1960, as far as the future shipping down into central Indiana from a port at that particular is concerned.

In contrast, the annual water borne tonnage for the steel mills, proposed to be built at the site, would run into 10 million tons per year. This, Inland says, would mean that the State and Federal Government together would be investing $74 million mainly for the benefit of two private steel companies, but even this tonnage, Inland says, will be negligible until blast furnaces and steel furnaces are installed. Inland says that they appear to be some distance away.

Inland states it takes note that Hammond, Whiting, and East Chicago, have urged Congressman RAY MADDEN to petition the Army Engineers for a study of what came to be known as the Tri-City Port, which would extend along the shores of the three cities and would be created of a long breakwater between existing breakwaters in south Chicago and the Indiana harbor.

That is the port I am talking about, which is now before the House of Representatives.

Furthermore, Inland points out the Monon Railroad is going ahead with plans to improve the harbor at Michigan City at its own expense, which would provide a port for handling bulk and general cargo.

That comes from the Inland Steel. Inland asked the Army Engineers to disapprove the Burns Ditch site until a study can be made of the Tri-City area. Somebody told me that there is an Army Engineers report coming out here in the next few days, pending this hearing.

Senator BIBLE. They will testify in full when——

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to have the Army Engineers defer until they make a study of the Tri-City Harbor where there is industry already established and where it could op-

erate once we build a good harbor there with plenty of business right from industry that is operating in this locality already.

"This is the first time that Inland or any other major steel company in Lake County has taken a position on the recent proposal for building a port of Indiana at Burns Ditch. There is some feeling that Lake County steel mills have refrained from speaking out on the Burns Ditch site question in the past for fear it might seem they were taking a dog-in-the-manager attitude." End of quote from Hammond Times.

Well, the telegrams that were read here this morning from the leaders of the mill workers in the Calumet region, that they are against it because thousands of families are having a hard time making a living on 3 days a week and the three steel mills operating in Lake County today, all of this should be taken into account.

As I have said, I have received thousands of letters regarding this matter, and I am going to read one very briefly to you and then terminate.

This letter comes from Chicago and is dated February 21. I received it Saturday.

"To Congressman RAY J. MADDEN, House of Representatives:

"SIR: This is perhaps the last opportunity to save or lose one of nature's jewels, God's gifts to the American people, the Indiana Sand Dunes.

"Knowing how precious is your time, Sir, I shall put my appeal to you as short as possible.

"1. I am pledging for conservation of the area along Michigan Lake eastern shore, Indiana Sand Dunes, not for my personal interests, having none and being too old to have any, just for the health, fresh air, benefit, and happiness of the future generations of millions of Americans in the Midwest.

"2. In my long life I have found only two such spots of natural beauty:

"One is the Kurish Neringa (Nehrung) or Little Sahara on the eastern shores of the Baltic Sea in Lithuania, alas now cut off from the free world by the Soviet Iron Curtain. The other one is the Indiana Sand Dunes, and the only one left for the free world. There is no other spot in this hemisphere like Michigan Lake shores. A large part of the dunes is spoiled and destroyed forever already by industry. Sand Dunes is the last piece of a jewel left intact, and being already destroyed in two vital places: at the Burns Ditch and in the Dunes Acres region.

"3. It took nature centuries to build one sand dune, yet it takes one day only for a bulldozer to destroy it, and dozens of bulldozers are at work there already. What the interested-in-destruction people say, is just bunk. Workers in Porter County would rather go by car, bus, or electric train a few miles farther and work in steel mills and come back to Porter County homes with fresh air and healthy happy families.

"4. Lots of people from other lands complain that Americans do not appreciate real beauty and are bent on destruction of nature. The ugly industrial sections of cities and towns tend to testify to it and the insistency of these interested in building their mills and factories exactly in the rest of unspoiled area, confirms it. However, the energetic resistance of people of the Midwest, the heroic struggle of the Save the Dunes Committee, and the sympathetic attitude of many Senators and Congressmen witness to it that Americans are not the nation of sheep as some author called them.

"5. Sir, it is so easy to spoil nature and spread blight and find arguments for such inglorious acts. Yet, I may assure you, the posterity will build monuments of gratitude not to those who have built factories and slums with accompanying foul air and diseases, only will build to those who cared for health and happiness of theirs and their children. Your CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS have stated that only one-half of one-third of an inch of sea and lake shores are left for every citizen of the United States, and, remember, population is growing fast, and sources for fresh air and recreation are rapidly diminishing.

"Let my weak voice be one in a choir of many thousands. Save the dunes."

Mr. MADDEN. I want to thank the committee for your attention.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you very much, Congressman MADDEN. I understand your position.

I have no questions.

Senator DWORSHAK?

Senator DWORSHAK. No questions.

Senator BIBLE. Senator LONG?

Senator LONG. No questions.

Senator BIBLE. Thank you very much, Congressman MADDEN. Let's withhold our applause until the hearing is completed.

The Many Thousands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM V. MOOREHEAD

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that some among us, who should know better, would downgrade our country, I commend to readers everywhere an editorial appearing in the Wall Street Journal, today.

The last paragraph thereof should be read and reread by those who sometimes, for one reason or another, choose to accentuate the negative.

The editorial is as follows:

THE MANY THOUSANDS

Part of the appeal of Lieutenant Colonel Glenn's remarks before the joint session of Congress lay in their simplicity and naturalness. But part of it, too, lay in the unabashed way in which he stated an obvious truth so easily lost in more learned orations.

In the flight of *Friendship 7*, he remarked, "many thousands of people were involved. Civilian contractors and subcontractors in many different fields, many elements, civilians, Civil Service and military all blending their efforts. * * * It has involved a cross-cut of American endeavor with many different disciplines cooperating toward a common objective."

This is perception as well as modesty. And it would do none of us any harm to reflect on who these many thousands are.

Some of them, of course, were plainly seen on television that famous Tuesday; we were all made aware of the vast organization that contributed to the day's success. But that which was seen was only a tiny fraction of the whole, and the unseen was no less important.

Take the reference to the military. There have been times when the public impression of the Pentagon was that of a battlefield for disastrous service rivalries. The obtuseness of the "military mind" is now almost a literary cliche. Yet this successful venture not only demanded cooperation among the services, in the best sense of that word, but it would have been impossible if the military mind did not also embrace men of intelligence, educated skill, and vision.

Or take the allusion to "contractors and subcontractors." It takes nothing away from the space agency's achievement in coordinating the whole effort to recognize the role played by private enterprise. Not only was most of the equipment made by private companies, large and small, but the solution to many of the important technical problems came out of private research laboratories.

Here, indeed, "many different disciplines" of knowledge contributed. If there is one area where we do surpass the Russians it is in the field of instrumentation and communications; this was made possible by the work of our telephone and radio companies in advancing the whole state of the knowledge. Other examples abound; new problems of valves and pumps were overcome by drawing on the experience of all American industry. Many were the technical contributions made by men who did not even know they were contributing.

It ought not to be necessary to labor the point. Every American is at least dimly aware of it, which is why *Friendship 7* gave such an enormous uplift to everyone. We all knew, as we watched, that behind Mr. Glenn's courage and the skill of the men in Mercury control lay the unseen work of a whole country.

All very obvious, we suppose. But the next time someone tells us that our military minds are incompetent, that our political system is inferior in efficiency to that of the monolithic state, that our private enterprise system is outmoded in the modern world, we'll recall the perceptive remarks of Mr. Glenn. And remember that without the diversity of labors of the many thousands of which he spoke, there would have been no such occasion for him to speak at all.

Plight of the Migratory Farmworker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of the Congress an excellent statement on the plight of the migratory farmworker in the United States by ATID, the college-age organization of the United Synagogue of America. The United Synagogue is a branch of the conservative movement in Judaism, representing some 1½ million Americans.

ATID, which was formed 2 years ago, has chapters on many campuses throughout the country. It is primarily a religious organization which concerns itself also with social action. The national president, Michael P. Lerner, is a sophomore at Columbia University. He is the son of my good friends and constituents, Judge and Mrs. Joseph H. Lerner, of South Orange, N.J. Sharon Gaidemak of Newark, N.J., a student at the University of Michigan, is the social action chairman.

It is heartening that our college students in ATID and other organizations are taking such a lively, informed interest in national issues. I commend ATID for its belief, as expressed in the statement, that "we must actively identify with and work for action which has its end in the realization and preservation of human dignity for all men, consonant with that flame of the Divine implanted in all of us." The statement, entitled "ATID Speaks Out," follows in full:

ATID SPEAKS OUT

As citizens of the United States and future voters, and as part of the world community, members of ATID, the college-age organization of the United Synagogue of America, are actively interested in the issues which face our Nation and the world. As members of the human race, we should, must, and do concern ourselves with the sufferings of our fellow human beings. As a religious organization, we see this not simply as a responsibility but as a sacred commandment. The Bible instructs: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" (Leviticus 19: 18).

Judaism has always acknowledged the sanctity of all life and the right of all men to human dignity. But we in ATID believe that we must do more than acknowledge; we must actively identify with and work for action which has its end in the realization and preservation of human dignity for all men, consonant with that flame of the Divine implanted in all of us.

The migratory farmworker in America does not live in dignity and self-respect. He cannot because poverty, filth, hunger, and illiteracy bring desperation and humiliation. One cannot hold his head up under such a burden. The domestic migratory workers and their dependents number approximately 2 million American citizens. Also there are from 350,000 to 500,000 foreign nationals who come to this country every year to work on American farms. These migratory workers, both domestic and foreign, live such a wretched existence that it is almost impossible for us in the prosperous and comfortable United States of the 20th century to believe or comprehend. They are exploited by their crew leaders, the people who recruit them for the farms. They are housed in shacks, unsanitary, uncomfortable, and unfit for human beings. They receive the lowest average wage of any industry in the United States. There are no child labor laws to protect their children outside of school hours; yet agriculture has the third highest accident rate of all the industries in the United States. Because they are transient, and because they often have to work during school hours, the children fall behind in their education. And when they do attend schools the teachers have neither the time nor the facilities to help them. There are no health facilities for these people whose infant mortality rate is twice as high as the normal death rate and who are potential carriers of many diseases as they move across our country. These are only some of the problems.

Clearly something must be done to help these people. The bills proposed by the Senate Subcommittee on Migrant Labor and passed by the Senate constitute one excellent approach to this problem, a problem which should be of concern to all Americans. We, who believe in democracy and the right of the individual to freedom, in equal opportunity, and the pursuit of happiness, must fight for these rights for the migrant. The responsibility is upon all Americans to help alleviate this situation which is totally incompatible with every aspect of the American democratic ideal.

Pancake Day Proclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, 12 years ago the housewives of Liberal, Kans., issued a challenge to the housewives of Olney, England, to a pancake race. The challenge was accepted and since then Shrove Tuesday has marked the date for the International Pancake Day race.

I request the Pancake Day proclamation by Gov. John Anderson, Jr., of Kansas, for Tuesday, March 6, 1962, be inserted in the RECORD.

The proclamation follows:

PANCAKE DAY PROCLAMATION

To the People of Kansas, Greetings.

Whereas the Liberal Junior Chamber of Commerce, Liberal, Kans., has sponsored and fostered the International Pancake Day Race between the housewives of Liberal, Kans., and Olney, England, for 13 years and such relationship between the United States and England has brought about better international relationship and promoted good will and a better understanding toward each nation; and

Whereas Pancake Day is traditionally on Shrove Tuesday—the same being the first Tuesday before the lenten season—and that Shrove Tuesday falls on March 6, 1962; and

Whereas the good people of Liberal, Kans., and of the State of Kansas observe Shrove Tuesday by eating the traditional meal of pancakes and the ingredients of pancakes are made from our good Kansas wheat and grown by our great Kansas wheat producers: Now, therefore

I, John Anderson, Governor of the State of Kansas, do hereby proclaim March 6, 1962, as Pancake Day for the State of Kansas and urge all of the good people of Kansas to attend the festivities in the pancake hub of the universe, Liberal, Kans., on March 6, 1962.

By the Governor:

JOHN ANDERSON,
PAUL R. SHANAHAN,
Secretary of State.
LEONE M. POWERS,
Assistant Secretary of State.

Committee Staffs Are One Sided

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 26, 1962, I included in the RECORD a column by Roscoe Drummond in which he stated the case for increases in the minority staffs of congressional committees. The article was clipped from the Washington Post. Later in the day I read the same article in the New York Herald Tribune. To my amazement I found that the Post apparently had censored certain portions of the article.

I am asking that the entire "unabridged" article be printed again, and I offer apologies to Mr. Drummond. My apologies to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], who was cut entirely from the Post version by the censors. He deserves full credit for all he has done to call attention to this problem.

In order to indicate the censored portions of Mr. Drummond's article, I am asking that the sections deleted by the Post be enclosed in black brackets.

The article follows:

COMMITTEE STAFFS ARE ONE SIDED

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Bear in mind that during the next few months the Congress of the United States will:

1. Make a series of crucial decisions affecting the fate and future of the Nation, including a trade policy which will shape our economy for many years.

2. Conduct at least 35 congressional investigations into such matters as tax reform and evidence of graft in the Federal highway program.

[3. Attempt to hold in check a massive and complex $91 billion budget.]

And still the Republican Members of Congress are being denied—partly by their own default and connivance and partly by the bald powerplay of the Democratic majority—the one instrument needed to do their job.

I refer to the woefully inadequate, enfeebled, and puny minority party representation on the professional staff of the policy-making and investigative committees of the House and the Senate.

True, it is the Members of Congress who appear to make the decisions, and who in a sense do make the decisions. But it is the professional committee staffs—the experts, the technicians, the research scholars, and the investigators—who constitute a power of initiative behind the committees. They shape the reports which shape the decisions and, when properly balanced between the two parties, help produce alternative courses of policy.

What has happened?

An official Republican policy committee document shows there is not a single staff expert responsible to the minority party on 10 critical House committees.

On many of the others the minority representation is either so sparse or so incompetent that they are overwhelmed by the sheer numbers of the Democratic appointees.

In the House the Democratic Party has a 3-to-2 majority. The professional staffs of the House committees are 14 to 1 Democratic.

It wasn't this way during the first 2 years of the Eisenhower administration when the Republicans had control of the House and Senate.

The present imbalance in committee staffing began in 1955 and has been getting more lopsided ever since.

Why has it happened?

Because the leadership of the Republican Party in Congress has not stood up and fought for its rights.

Because the rank-and-file members of the Republican Party in Congress have not stood up and insisted that the party leadership fight for their rights.

Because some highly placed Republican members of the committees have preferred accepting a few personal prerequisites from the majority chairman to making a determined, even unpleasant, demand for reform.

[Because the Democrats have pressed their unfair advantage to the full.]

Republican National Committee Chairman Representative WILLIAM MILLER, of New York, knows what needs to be done and wants to do it. But he has thrown up his hands hopelessly in the futile effort to inject enough gumption into his party to do something.

[A few Republicans, like Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, of St. Louis, have led a lonely fight among colleagues in the House and so far have been getting either limp indifference or the back of the wrist.]

Recently two respected Senators, CARL CURTIS, of Nebraska, and KENNETH KEATING, of New York, offered an amendment to a bill which would have made a miniscule beginning toward reform—1 Republican staff expert to 10 Democratic staff experts. The

Democrats instantly rallied to defeat it on a straight party vote.

[They knew what they were doing. They know how to keep the Republican voices enfeebled.]

This is a scandal of national proportions. It goes to the very vitals of our two-party system of government. If the Republicans don't do whatever is necessary to win this battle (by rallying to the Curtis initiative and fighting for reform in their own committees) they deserve to continue to lose elections—and will.

A Showcase for New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post on February 24, 1962. This article entitled "New York's Colossal Coliseum" indicates the tremendous benefit the coliseum has brought not only to New York but to the Nation. Since the coliseum was opened 5 years ago, 16 million people have visited the various exhibitions and trade fairs held at the coliseum. In addition, the coliseum has contributed to greater understanding among nations by having exhibits and fairs from many foreign nations including the Soviet Union:

NEW YORK'S COLOSSAL COLISEUM

(By Stanley Frank)

Few people would undertake to move the furniture and personal effects of 500 batty families into one building at the same time and put each apartment into impeccable condition to receive guests within 72 hours. Yet a comparable job is faced practically every 2 weeks by the operators of the huge, handsome New York Coliseum, the leading exposition center in the United States. Its 9 acres of floorspace house an average of 40 big shows every year, including the World Trade Fair each May, to which 60 countries sent exhibits in 1961. Since the coliseum was opened 5 years ago, more than 16 million visitors have passed through its turnstiles to gape at anything from flowers and scouting equipment to the latest in rockets or automated kitchens.

Space in the coliseum is booked solidly a year in advance, usually for 2-week cycles that begin on a Wednesday with the arrival of exhibits for a Saturday opening. A show runs 9 days until the following Sunday, 2 days are allowed for dismantling, and then the process begins all over again. The rent for all four floors is $61,000 for the 2 weeks, but separate floors can be leased at rates ranging from $10,000 to $23,000. The coliseum can accommodate four shows at once, each with its own marquee, lobby, elevators and catering service.

Watching the installation of 3 million pounds of paraphernalia in the coliseum is a fascinating study of controlled chaos. Early Wednesday morning huge trailer trucks begin lining up on West 58th Street from Columbus Circle to the Hudson River three-quarters of a mile away. At 8 a.m. the trucks lumber into the building in a sequence determined by Ernest Moorehouse, superintendent of operations. Two ramps and a brute of an elevator—that can handle a 49-foot vehicle carrying 38 tons—take the trucks from the street directly to their destinations on the floors.

Emergencies pop faster than toy balloons in a hailstorm when displays are assembled. People with perishable food and flowers scream for refrigeration. Orders are yelled in a babel of languages to technicians hooking up water, steam, electric, gas, and telephone connections to outlets that honeycomb the floors. Alterations have to be made in displays to satisfy fire department inspectors. Missing crates are still sitting on docks in Hamburg, Genoa, Bangkok, and Caracas.

By Friday afternoon 4,000 workmen are wading through knee-deep debris around the booths. Howard G. Sloane, the coliseum's managing director, surveys the confusion calmly. "An awful mess, isn't it?" he observes airily. "I'll bet a hundred guys are moaning we'll never open on time tomorrow. We haven't missed yet, but there were a lot of close calls. Two hours before the kickoff of a flower show, a landscaper was stuck with 3 extra tons of topsoil. The aisles were too jammed to get a truck through, so the dirt was carried off in wheelbarrows and cartons. We scraped up the last specks just as the crowd came in."

Because the coliseum can become an arena of international complications second only to the U.N., the State Department and the building's operators have to be on the alert during shows attracting foreign countries, especially newly created states quick to resent real or imagined affronts to their national pride.

South Korea's delegation to the World Trade Fair set a new record for high dudgeon in May when its flag was flown upside down at the coliseum. The previous year Tunisia's consul general noticed that his country's flag followed Turkey's although alphabetical order was supposed to govern the display. He stalked to the gallery 60 feet above the floor and pointedly corrected the mistake.

Despite the sticky situations, the coliseum has promoted a significant increase in commercial and cultural relations, particularly with Iron Curtain countries, since it was completed in 1956. Previously the Russians had declined to discuss a reciprocal program with us, because exhibition facilities in New York were wholly inadequate for the big publicity impact they wanted. After the coliseum was available, the Soviet Union entered into negotiations for an exposition in New York and an American fair in Moscow that ran concurrently during the summer of 1959.

That breakthrough opened the doors to Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and Bulgaria. Political propaganda is barred from the shows, but displays of American products point up the sparse fruits of communism, of course. Our annual fair in Poland, sponsored by the Department of Commerce, is such a hit that a permanent pavilion has been built at Poznan, the scene of wild riots against the pro-Russian regime in 1956.

The most important function served by the Coliseum was to jolt American industry out of its patronizing attitude toward foreign competitors. Many companies assumed that their superior enterprise could run stodgy rivals out of oversea markets whenever they elected to turn on the heat. Once the Coliseum began attracting exhibitors from all over the globe, our people discovered they were bush leaguers in staging presentations at trade fairs, a blend of showmanship and merchandising.

"We have a lot to learn from European and Asian experts," say Charles Snitow, president of the World Trade Fair and the only American accredited to the Union of International Fairs, which establishes regulations and assigns dates for events. A 54-year-old lawyer, Snitow is recognized as the top American specialist in the business.

Until the Coliseum was built, says Snitow, "there wasn't one modern plant in the country suitable for the elaborate fairs that are the backbone of business in Europe.

"Milan has a beautiful setup holding 14,000 booths on one floor, and a dozen other cities maintain swell installations designed exclusively for fairs. We have good facilities now such as McCormick Hall in Chicago and Cobo Hall in Detroit, but we haven't overcome a blind spot that's the biggest handicap to boosting our export volume. Manufacturers here don't realize foreign firms get the bulk of their orders at trade fairs, an extension of the ancient marketplace. The tradition of going to one central source of goods has a strong psychological appeal for buyers overseas."

Snitow's criticism of our failure to cultivate foreign markets has been echoed repeatedly by the Department of Commerce since 1954, when slumping exports began to cut alarmingly into the Nation's gold reserves. President Eisenhower, drawing on emergency funds, created the Office of International Trade Fairs to put on exhibits and trigger more aggressive action by manufacturers. The agency has presented 105 shows on every continent.

Many big outfits still are reluctant to cooperate with the Trade Fair office, because of the tremendous expense of designing, installing, and staffing displays. American firms, accustomed to shooting the works in soliciting domestic business, are floored by the cost of making even a modest splash in the big-league international marketplace.

Still, the concentration of purchasing agents in New York and the huge cosmopolitan population which buys the $1.50 tickets that defray operating expenses, continue to attract events like the British exhibition in June of 1960, the most elaborate pageant ever staged by one country. Transporting products and national treasures valued at $200 million, then decorating the coliseum for the 17-day show ran up a bill of $12 million—considerably more than the combined cost of all the theatrical productions on Broadway in a year. The displays included Winston Churchill's personal mementos, a replica of an Elizabethan tavern open to customers, a Scotch whisky distillery (no samples) and a priceless collection of antique gold and silver. The British got off the hook handsomely with 320,000 admissions—at $1.50 a head—and "astounding" orders from 27,000 trade buyers.

Rolling out the red carpet for visitors is not an idle phrase when Snitow puts on the International Auto Show. He annually spends $60,000 for 82,517 square feet of wall-to-wall carpeting on the main floor of the coliseum, an area equivalent to a football field and five basketball courts. "I've been called a chump for blowing a lot of money on a luxurious touch most people don't notice," he remarks. "It's essential for creating an atmosphere that induces them to spend $28,000 for a Rolls-Royce. Maybe the carpet doesn't clinch a sale, but it cushions the shock of fancy price tags."

It does indeed. During a 9-day period in April, cars with a total value of $90 million were bought at the coliseum. The KX-E Jaguar, costing about $6,000, was introduced at the show and rang up $30 million in sales. The three most expensive Rolls-Royces went for $81,000.

In any building with as many as 60,000 transients a day, security measures are an expensive proposition. "It's a predictable cinch we'll get a sprinkling of cranks, nuts, shoplifters, insurance gyps, publicity hounds and knuckleheads every time we open the doors to the public," says managing director Sloane. "On big days we have a force of 55 uniformed guards and plainclothesmen

trained to spot troublemakers and oddballs such as a fat old dame called Aunt Mathilda. She has a yen for sneaking onto the dais at openings and stealing the scissors used in tape-cutting ceremonies. Once, at an outdoor show, the place was in an uproar when a guy who had escaped from a mental institution was nabbed as he was about to throw a child into the pool.

"Any disturbance in a large crowd is dangerous, because it may touch off a panic. We've never had one, but we never know when all hell will break loose."

Five years of experience have taught the staff to anticipate special problems posed by different types of crowds. "The most disreputable bums turn up at the National Photographic Show," says Walter Hammond, head of the security force. "They come to steal high-priced cameras. The usual method is to walk in with five or six old cameras slung around their necks and to leave with anything they pick up. But the beatup clothes the thieves wear give them away."

Curiously enough, the annual invasion of sweet old ladies at the flower show gives a severe attack of the jitters to the staff. It is kept hopping reviving elderly women who exhaust themselves trying to see too much in a few hours. Attendants recognizing the symptoms of imminent seizures gently urge the women to rest for a while. The ladies frequently keel over in a dead faint while protesting that they feel perfectly fine.

One precaution rigidly enforced is the exclusion of anyone under 18 years of age from the International Radio and Electronics Show. On display is such a welter of complex and dangerous equipment that the insurance company refuses to provide coverage for accidents suffered by prying youngsters.

After a show is over, uniformed guards are everywhere as trucks roar around the floor to collect crates. "The guards watch for scavengers," says Sloane. "Truckers and even some exhibitors will steal anything that isn't nailed down in the hassle of dismantling a show."

"Any serious losses?"

"Just one. A bar of columbium, a rare metal, worth $5,000 was swiped at a chemical show. We had a helluva scare another time. A painting by Matisse, valued at $75,000 disappeared after a home-furnishings show. It turned up in a crate that had been shipped to the wrong address. Every show produces headaches, but they all seem trivial after the Russian exhibition 2 years ago."

Small wonder. The political climate superimposed so many complications on routine problems that the coliseum negotiated with the State Department and the Soviet Union for fully a year, working out expedient solutions. Although Arthur Smadbeck, president of the coliseum, and Sloane, his son-in-law, dealt with the Russians as private citizens, they were handicapped by one overriding consideration: Under a reciprocal agreement the American National Exposition, sponsored jointly by the Government and industry, would open in Moscow a few weeks after the 42-day Soviet show got underway at the coliseum. If the Russians were antagonized or impeded in New York, they were sure to retaliate in Moscow.

All arrangements with the Russians touched on such sensitive areas of diplomacy and security that plans had to be cleared with the State and Treasury Departments, the CIA, the FBI, and the New York police. Sloane met with leaders of 17 labor unions employed in the coliseum and warned them their members had to lay off disputes with the Russians. (There was only one flare-up. A Lithuanian-born mechanic who had been hitting the bottle began to blast the Communists' suppression of his country. He was hustled off the floor before the Russians knew what was happening.)

"The Russians' willingness to take advice surprised me," Sloane confides. "They intended to run the show themselves, but they hired Charley Snitow and a publicity firm at top fees when the advantages were explained to them. They also dropped the idea of a free show, as the American Fair was in Moscow. We told them they'd get bigger and better types of crowds by charging admission. They compromised by knocking a half dollar off the usual coliseum price of one-fifty.

"The Russians were suspicious of everyone at first and put the same questions to a lot of people to check the answers. Once they were convinced we were leveling with them, they went out of their way to behave correctly."

The Russians had gripes, of course. They protested anti-Communists who picketed the building, and the Moscow radio denounced "the coarse, critical, and abusive remarks" inscribed in visitors' books. Many entries were pretty rough, ranging from profanity ("You're a bunch of lying s.o.b.'s") to Latin ("Corruptio optima pessima"—the corruption of the best is the worst.).

On the whole, however, the Russians were delighted by their reception in New York. They should have been. They pulled 1,100,000 paid admissions—an average of 26,000 a day for 6 weeks—and there were remarkably few demonstrations of open hostility.

The Russians' satisfaction with conditions at the coliseum was reflected in the treatment of our people at the fair in Moscow. Reciprocity was observed down the line. Two Russian cameras were stolen in New York. Exactly two American cameras were stolen in Moscow the next day. The hosts in Moscow threw their weight around only a few times. They demanded the removal of 100 books on foreign affairs, and Khrushchev needled Vice President Nixon in the famous "kitchen debate" at the opening. A defective concrete floor raised choking clouds of dust, but old Moscow hands assured our exhibitors it was a normal, not a contrived bungle.

We were happy to be topped by the Russians in one record. There had been rumors that the Communist Party, which controlled tickets to the Moscow Fair, would keep a tight rein on them to forestall any funny ideas our displays might give the faithful. Tickets were distributed so generously, though, that the attendance hit 2,700,000.

Ever since the coliseum was built in 1956, at a cost of $22 million, its profits have been an embarrassment to New York's city fathers. Businessmen who had been screaming that obsolete facilities for trade shows were costing the town $100 million a year were told by hand-wringing officials that the city was strapped for money to construct a modern plant. Civic groups wailed that the prohibitive cost of acquiring property in a good location ruled out the investment of private capital. This irritated Robert Moses, the prime mover behind most of the major public projects that get off the ground in New York.

Moses, chairman of the city's Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority, pushed through the State legislature a bill approving an exposition center under his administration. He obtained Federal and State slum-clearance grants to build the coliseum and 590 apartments on 2 blocks of a blighted area in midtown Manhattan. Disregarding the yelps of real estate interests, Moses tacked on a 20-story office building, raising the total cost of the complex to $45 million.

As the coliseum neared completion, the engineers of the bridge and tunnel authority nervously wondered what to do with the enormous place designed for an enterprise at which they had no experience. They jumped at a proposal made by Arthur Smadbeck, a veteran trade showman who ran the Grand Central Palace, an outmoded exposition hall. To operate the coliseum, Smadbeck offered to pay the authority a base rental of $300,000 a year and a share of the profits on an ascending scale up to 85 percent. It was the best deal the city ever made.

Last year the coliseum's return of $1,122,000, plus $42,000 in lieu of taxes on the former property, was insignificant in the overall picture. Another drop in the bucket was some $3 million realized in sales taxes on expenditures by out-of-town visitors and buyers. The New York Convention and Visitors Bureau estimates the new business generated by shows in the coliseum adds up to $500 million a year.

Such eye-opening results have not gone unnoticed in Washington. The Vice President formally opens the World Trade Fair each year to underscore the mounting importance of exports to our economy. LYNDON JOHNSON officiated at the fair's opening last May in the coliseum. It was a stiffer workout than he, an old pro, had anticipated. He greeted so many exhibitors he automatically shook the hand of a dummy at Thailand's booth. By the time JOHNSON reached the West German pavilion, he was so tired he made a beeline for a contour chair on display. Ottmar Schneider, the display director, suddenly remembered a bolt was missing from the chair and rushed to brace it with his knee as JOHNSON settled down for a breather.

"The chair is collapsible," Schneider said apologetically.

JOHNSON misunderstood him. "Why, that's a mighty nice feature," he answered. "I'd like to buy one for my ranch in Texas."

"It is not meant to fold," Schneider explained desperately as his knee began to buckle. JOHNSON got the idea and hastily lurched to his feet.

Despite such contretemps, the coliseum has made important contributions to hands-across-the-sea amity. During the Soviet exposition, the 250 Russians exiled to work at the exhibition and endure the unspeakable decadence of capitalistic society had a ball. They really went for our cosmetics, lingerie, steaks, bourbon and TV westerns. They also developed a crush on Brigitte Bardot. Pictures of the Sex Kitten, who was shedding her husband, filled the papers, and the Russians even clipped shots of her wearing clothes. A coliseum electrician made a remark that could serve as the cornerstone of international brotherhood. "Guys who go for that kind of French fluff can't be all bad," he said pensively.

Job Training for the Unemployed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, in my annual legislative questionnaire mailed to citizens of western Illinois, I asked this question, among others: "Should the Federal Government pay for job training for the unemployed?"

Returns to date show this response: yes, 492; no 2,685.

The folks back home seem to have clearer vision than some of us in Washington.

The proposed training program would mark the beginning of a new Federal activity. Eighteen States are already

carrying out job training programs for unemployed, and the others have the opportunity to do so. In view of the fact that the Federal Government is already spending a million dollars an hour more than it takes in, a brandnew activity of questionable constitutionality seems doubly unwise.

No one seriously suggests that this program would last only 2 years. No one seriously doubts that it will grow in size year after year, and have much the same dangers and shortcomings ascribed to proposals for Federal aid to meet ongoing expenses in public education.

Shall It Be Law or Tyranny?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, the following article by J. Edgar Hoover which appeared in the February 1962 issue of the American Bar Association Journal should be of interest to all involved in the struggle to preserve our freedoms. I commend it to lawyer and layman alike.

The article follows:

SHALL IT BE LAW OR TYRANNY?

Not long ago, Nikita Khrushchev, the world's No. 1 Communist, toured an American exhibition in Moscow. While there, he observed some voting machines, the type used in many of our polling places. His comment was short and to the point: "I have no interest in them."

In these words, Mr. Khrushchev expressed a basic tenet of communism—its detestation for our democratic concepts, for our system of free government based on the will of the people. The Communists have nothing but contempt for our courts, our legal profession, our principles of jurisprudence. To them, the Communist Party is the highest law, the tribunal of ultimate appeal. Law is defined and executed by the discipline of the party.

Mr. Khrushchev's remarks, in fact, are a measure of the giant ideological struggle which engulfs the world today. Nothing less is at issue than our whole Judaic-Christian concept of government and law. The majesty of the law is the very essence of our democratic way of life. This is the grandeur, the nobility, the lifeblood of our Republic. This is why men fought at Valley Forge, at Verdun, at the Battle of the Bulge. We are a government of law, not men. William Pitt, the great commoner, thundered the answer years ago in the English House of Lords when he shouted, "Where law ends, tyranny begins."

MEN OF THE LAW STAND ON THE FRONT LINES OF BATTLES

You, as men of the law, very literally today stand on the front lines of battle. Both as Americans and as attorneys, you have a deep and abiding responsibility to help defeat this evil assault. The battle, most truly, is one of law versus tyranny, individual liberty versus mass repression, the dignity of the human personality versus man as a slave of the state. To a large extent, America's answer must rest with the lawyers of the Nation.

The Communists have long recognized the irreconcilability of law and their ultimate aims of violent revolution—hence their constant efforts to defame, subvert and tear down the orderly processes of law and order.

This hostility to law is reflected in the "Communist Manifesto," a basic document of international communism. "Your jurisprudence," say Marx and Engels, "is but the will of your class made into a law for all, a will, whose essential character and direction are determined by the economic conditions of existence of your class."

The Communists look upon democratic or bourgeois law as an instrument of class coercion, an instrumentality whereby one class maintains dominance over another. Law represents the codification which the dominant class finds necessary to maintain control. "State and law," says Andrei Y. Vyshinsky, former Foreign Minister of Russia and a leading exponent of Soviet law, "emerge from the material form of life of people and have only the form of the dominant will. In other words, they represent an expression of that will. Marx * * * unmasks the specific illusion of jurists and politicians who imagine, on the contrary, that legislation depends on the whim of people."

Vyshinsky in another passage states:

"Marxism-Leninism gives a clear definition (the only scientific definition) of the essence of law. It teaches that legal relationships (and, consequently, law itself) are rooted in the material conditions of life, and that law is merely the will of the dominant class, elevated into a statute. It starts from the proposition that political, legal, philosophical, religious, and literary development is defined by—and is a superstructure over—economics. Law is one of the superstructures above the totality of production relationships forming society's economic structure."

The very recent authoritative party manual, "Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism," prepared by a group of Moscow scholars, maintains that "the obsolete ruling class * * * controls the state, a powerful apparatus of coercion.* * * The dominant position of the old production relations rests on the whole apparatus of the economic, political, and spiritual domination of the class in power. That is why the replacement of these relations by new ones demands not evolution but revolution * * *."

Hence, since communism is determined to destroy the existing society, law (as one of its coercive manifestations) must also be destroyed. This Communist position is vividly illustrated by a recent writer in the Soviet magazine, Communist. "The Soviet regime," he says, "has smashed and destroyed the old court system which was an instrument for the enslavement and oppression of the masses. In its place was created a new, people's court." [1]

LAW IN A COMMUNIST SOCIETY

Law in a Communist society is not based on any belief in a Divine Creator, on a body of accepted rules distilled from the experience of men, on norms of fairplay, tolerance and free speech. Law as the embodiment of the values of love, justice, and truth, as a sinew of understanding among rational men, is unknown. Under communism, law becomes the coercive tool of the Communist state. The objective is not impartial justice, the protection of individual liberties or the just settlement of grievances among disputants.

Under communism, the law (usually termed "Socialist legality") is utilized (1) to eliminate the enemies of the Communist regime and (2) to build the Communist state. "Marxism teaches the necessities of using law as one of the means of the struggle for socialism—of recasting human society on Socialist bases." "Soviet laws * * * serve the great goal of the building of a Communist society." "The Soviet court system organizes all its work with a view to strengthening Socialist legality. * * *"

Note the emphasis on the role of the "legal system" (especially the courts) as a coercive instrument for the promotion of communism. The stress is on "building" communism, strengthening "Socialist legality," "promoting" the Communist state, not on personal liberties, the impartial adjudication of cases, the protection of the individual. The ultimate law in Soviet society is the party. Under Mr. Khrushchev, the legal system of the Soviet Union has reflected a number of changes, but there has been no deviation from the basic objective and underlying motive of that system as it prevailed under Lenin and Stalin. The Communist legal system still exists primarily for the benefit of the state, rather than for the rights of the individual. Any Communist talk about protecting individual liberties (which the Communists claim they do) is mere window dressing. Communism and individual rights cannot coexist.

Hence, the Communists cannot tolerate the existence of an independent judiciary, independent-thinking lawyers, free bar associations, or law enforcement agencies dedicated to gathering the truth. William Z. Foster, former chairman emeritus of the Communist Party, U.S.A., who recently died in Moscow, made quite clear the Communist opinion toward lawyers. In a Communist society, Mr. Foster wrote, "The pest of lawyers will be abolished." Why have lawyers, when there are no rights to defend? [2]

THE COMMUNISTS' MARK OF A GOOD LAWYER

The mark of a good lawyer or a good judge then becomes a matter of being a good Marxist. M. I. Kalinin, former President of the Soviet Union, is quoted very approvingly by an author in "Mr. Khrushchev's Russia" as saying:

"If a judge is a good Marxist, an experienced practical worker, a cultured and sufficiently educated person, we may say with confidence that 99 percent of his verdicts and decisions will have political significance, and will be one of the best forms of propaganda of the Soviet laws and of the directives of the party.

"A judge who is a poor Marxist, unfamiliar with party resolutions, unable to fight for party decisions with sufficient vigor * * * such a judge is unfit."

Hence, members of the judicial system become political hacks, decisions are motivated by the partisan interests of the state and justice as we know it is completely perverted. Yet the Communists have the audacity to proclaim that "Socialist legality" is more meaningful than democratic or bourgeois justice.

One Communist writer states:

"Presumption of innocence has likewise been proclaimed in the 'Declaration of Rights of Man and Citizen,' in 1789, after the victory of the bourgeois revolution in France. In its time it has played a positive role in bourgeois legal procedure. This presumption is acknowledged still in theoretical research works of some bourgeois authors and even sometimes is formulated in the laws, but often is in a glaring contradiction with the bourgeois legal practice."

Now listen to this:

"In the U.S.S.R., presumption of innocence is not a fiction, but an expression of legality in criminal legal procedure and a guarantee of objective and thorough examination of the case."

The Communists utilize the freedoms guaranteed by our form of government as a cloak to mask their assaults on democratic concepts of law and order. They feign the

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

highest solicitude for civil liberties, the dignity of the law, constitutional rights. They pose as martyrs[1] in the "battle" to "maintain" the inviolability of personal liberties—liberties which they would not permit if they were in state power.

The assault against the FBI and law enforcement agencies, for example, has been particularly brutal. We have been accused of virtually everything imaginable—violating civil liberties, brutality, thought control, forgery, FBI's tactics * * * cheap, vulgar, intimidating, blackmailing * * *, FBI is * * * an international police conspiracy. * * *." The Communist attack against the FBI never ends.

PURPOSES OF COMMUNISTS' FALSE DIATRIBES

These false and slanderous diatribes are designed (1) to weaken public confidence in our democratic system, (2) to create fear and hatred on the part of party members against the FBI and American legal institutions and (3) to pursue the class struggle for the promotion of communism.

A major aim of the Communists, in their assaults on law and order, is to convince non-Communists that the entire farbic of our constitutional government is rapidly deteriorating. The Communists, as part of their tactics, proclaim that laws directed against the party are also aimed at non-Communist groups, "* * * the attack against Communists is but the prelude to destroying the liberty and freedom of all." At the present time the Communist Party is openly defying the decision of the Supreme Court on the Internal Security Act of 1950. The party's national committee has proclaimed very falsely: "It is not for ourselves alone that we speak * * * in nation after nation the destruction of the democratic rights of all began with the attack only on the Communists. * * * The bell tolls not for the Communists alone but for the hard-won rights of all Americans."

The idea here is to convince non-Communists that American liberties are being garrotted—and they should do something about it (that is, actively support the Communists in their attack on law and order). "All must act together to save American constitutional liberties. Speak up. Speak up today as an individual or through your organization." What happens? Communist-sponsored resolutions, letterwriting campaigns, mass rallies, pamphlets and books, demonstrations, front groups. The point here is how the party, through propaganda and agitation, is frequently able to secure the support of non-Communists in its campaign of vilification of our judicial processes. Never do the Communists admit that they have enjoyed all the privileges of our legal system (which are available to all) or that their true aim is the total smashing of the very laws they so hypocritically profess to uphold. Sow seeds of doubt concerning the validity of our democratic institutions—that is part of their tactics.

Denunciation of American legal institutions, moreover, helps inculcate a fear, hatred, and contempt of our Government among party members. These individuals are taught that the FBI, local and State police, and other agencies of bourgeois society (including private lawyers and bar associations) are "enemies." "FBI agents," one party document stated, "should be viewed with * * * hatred and contempt. * * * People should refuse to have anything to do with the FBI or in any way to cooperate with it. They should refuse to talk to them, to answer their questions, to voluntarily admit them to their homes or to enter their cars or go to their headquarters." Such instructions help create the type of revolutionary Lenin had in mind when he said: "When we have companies of specially trained worker revolutionaries who have passed through a long course of schooling * * * no police in the world will be able to cope with them. * * *." To the party, the inculcation of hatred toward "bourgeois institutions" among their members is absolutely essential.

PROGRAM CALLS FOR ATTACKS ON OUR JUDICIAL PROCESSES

Then the Communist assault against our judicial processes enables the party to pursue the class struggle, that is, to create conditions favorable for future revolutionary action. The party, time after time, actively seeks cases involving arrests, trials and convictions for the specific purpose of creating agitation situations, designed to promote the party's special interests. The party falsely charges illegal arrests, trumped-up evidence, phony justice—not that the party is legitimately interested in the welfare of the person concerned, but because these cases might possess elements which can be exploited for the party's benefit. These emergencies are exploited to recruit new members, create fronts, further party discipline, make contacts with non-Communists. Notice how the party always screams in these situations for money (a defense fund), for more money (a publicity fund), for still more money (an emergency fund). To the Communists, attack against our judicial institutions is an essential ingredient in the party's day-to-day program of revolutionary class struggle.

The Communist Party has every right to legitimate legal counsel. It has every right to all the legal processes available to men and women in our free society. However, this does not mean a Communist abuse of our legal institutions. It does not mean allowing Communists the freedom to rip asunder the integrity of our courts, to turn legal trials into demonstrations, to make the law inoperable in cases in which they have a partisan interest. In the past some lawyers have gone beyond their oaths of office as officers of the court, resorting in cases involving Communists to disruptive courtroom tactics, vilification of the judge and contempt for the orderly processes of judicial behavior. The courts must enforce respect from its officers.

Actually the Communist Party has been able to recruit only a very few attorneys. Support of the aims of communism and faithfulness to the law of our land are irreconcilable. A few lawyers are assisting the party through front groups—which, though allegedly espousing legitimate aims, actually are transmission belts of communism to the masses. These groups are not interested in legitimate social reforms, but advancing the party's line. Particularly reprehensible is advice from attorneys which would enable the party to impugn the integrity of the laws of the land. As long as a few members of the legal profession, wittingly or unwittingly, serve these ends, the Communists will be the gainers.

HOW TO COPE WITH COMMUNIST TACTICS

An analysis of Communist tactics in undetermining the laws of our land should give us an insight into how to cope with this danger. The answer must be an increased reliance on law, a renewed faith in the democratic processes of government. Just because the Communists have no respect for law and order does not mean that we should retaliate in kind. Cries for legal shortcuts, vigilante methods and less reliance on legal processes, though based on the most patriotic of motives, are most shortsighted. These would undermine our cause. May I quote from a most distinguished American jurist, a gentleman who has had first-hand experience with Communists in his courtroom. Speaking in November 1956, before the graduating class of the FBI National Academy in Washington, D.C., Judge Harold R. Medina said:

"* * * I would have you always conscious of the fact that your first duty, above all others, is to maintain the integrity of our laws and our freedoms. No convictions based upon some violation of these laws or constitutional rights can possibly benefit our Nation in the long run."

Judge Medina then continued:

"What I wish to leave with you today is that all these and others are rights of an accused which come to us because men fought and struggled for freedom. Once lost, these precious freedoms are most difficult to regain; once whittled away or disregarded and neglected, they cease to be realities and vanish into thin air. You men stand at the first line of defense; and I would have you be constantly mindful of your trust."

Our fight against communism must be a sane, rational understanding of the facts. Emotional outbursts, extravagant name calling, gross exaggerations hinder our efforts. We must remember that many non-Communists may legitimately, on their own, oppose the same laws or take positions on issues of the day which are also held by the Communists. Their opinions, though temporarily coinciding with the party line, do not make them Communists. Not at all. We must be very careful with our facts and not brand as a Communist any individual whose opinion may be different from our own. Freedom of dissent is a great heritage of America which we must treasure.

Today far too many self-styled experts on communism are plying the highways of America giving erroneous and distorted information. This causes hysteria, false alarms, misplaced apprehension by many of our citizens. We need enlightenment about communism—but this information must be factual, accurate, and not tailored to echo personal idiosyncrasies. To quote an old aphorism, we need more light and less heat.

I should like to congratulate the American Bar Association for its excellent work in this field. Many years ago the American Bar Association recognized the seriousness of the Communist danger. Your special committee on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives is doing a magnificent job. This committee's plan, already being implemented, of fostering high-level, dignified, objective seminars on communism through the cooperation of local bar associations throughout the country is excellent. This committee, moreover, is encouraging a study of the contrasts between communism and free government in our secondary and college-level schools. I feel that the American Bar Association is rendering a distinct public service and should receive the commendation of grateful citizens all over the country.

The majesty of the law, in today's world, is not just a figure of speech or a rhetorical flourish. It is the diadem of American freedom, the reality which distinguishes us from tyranny. It is our heritage, our refuge, our glory.

"Let the ruling classes tremble at the prospect of a Communist revolution," proclaimed the "Communist Manifesto." We tremble not. The ideas of Marx and Engels, though tipped with deceit and chicanery, shall not dislodge the goddess of justice—that eternal lady who rules our destiny as a nation under God.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] Engels wrote: "The law is of course sacred in the eyes of the bourgeoisie, for it was concocted by the buorgeoise, was passed with the approval of the bourgeoisie, and exists for the benefit and the safeguarding of the bourgeois social order. The bourgeoisie knows full well that, even if one specific law should be injurious to the individual bourgeois, the code as a whole protects the

interests of the bourgeois class as a whole. * * * To the English bourgeois the law is sacred, for he sees in it his own image and likeness, just as he sees his own image and likeness in God. That is why the policeman's truncheon (which is really his own truncheon) has so comforting an effect on his mind. But the worker fails to see this sacredness. Experience has taught him only too implacably that the law is a scourge of cords, which the bourgeoisie has plaited for him. Consequently, unless circumstances compel, the worker never appeals to the law * * *".

[2] Very interestingly, according to a December 1961, news dispatch, lawyers in Poland are being told to forget about defending clients and instead promote communism. This dispatch indicates that the President of the Polish Supreme Court had recommended that private law practice in the country be abolished. Lawyers should be "collectivized" and made subject to severe disciplinary controls. The purpose of these "reforms"? "To fit the Polish bar for work in a socialist state." "A Polish lawyer", the dispatch stated, "should be an active coauthor of state justice in Poland, and * * * the state should have considerable influence over the bar association, including the right of a ministerial veto in bar elections." Very encouragingly, the news item added that an influential section of the Polish bar opposes the "reforms".

[3] The Communist Party even goes so far as to represent itself as a legitimate American institution whose roots go back to the days of the Civil War. In "An Open Letter to the American People" issued by the National Committee of the Communist Party, U.S.A. (1961) this statement is made: "The Communist Party will defend its right to a legal existence under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights as a legitimate current in American political life, a movement that can trace its existence back a full century into our history, from the Communists who supported Lincoln and the Union through the old Socialist Party."

Barter, Stockpile, and the Administration's Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, on February 22, 1962, my distinguished colleague from North Carolina, the longtime chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, submitted a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD taking exception to statements which I made concerning the administration's position on the barter program insofar as it affects the stockpiling of lead. He apparently was championing the position of the Department of Agriculture in so doing.

I had previously questioned the consistency of the administration's expression of astonishment over the size of our stockpiling program in view of its failure to heed my request of July 13, 1961, to the President urging opposition to a proposed barter agreement. This barter agreement ultimately resulted in the acquisition of 100,000 tons of lead from Australia and Canada to be added to our already excessive stockpile.

I have carefully read my colleague's statement and noted particularly his comment that "he is not aware of the full details of the particular barter transaction criticized by Mr. Hall."

I regret that the chairman of the committee on Agriculture did not avail himself of the opportunity to become familiar with this particular transaction and study the correspondence which I had with the White House.

Had he done so, I am sure he would not have spoken so hastily as to my confusion, and with so little basis in fact. I refer in particular to the following statements which he made:

> Under this program our farm surpluses are exchanged for scarce metals and other storable materials produced in other countries.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I am well aware of the need to maintain an adequate reserve of strategic materials such as beryllium, titanium, nickel, and so forth, which this country has trouble producing in sufficient quantities to meet national security needs. However, lead certainly is not a scarce mineral, a fact to which the thousands of unemployed miners throughout the Nation, and particularly in Missouri, will attest. The tragic plight of the mining industry is not due to any scarcity of lead, but rather to the depressed price conditions which prevail in the industry, a direct result of excessive importations from other countries, and possibly production costs.

Within the past few weeks, the price of lead has sunk to 9½ cents, the lowest level since price controls were removed after World War II. The lead obtained through the barter program has no market, but goes directly into the stockpile, thus creating a greater surplus and downward pressures on price. This situation continues in spite of the lead-zinc subsidy bill enacted in the last session which thus far has failed to solve any problems.

> The President did not refer to the supplemental stockpile.

The President's announcement made no distinction between the strategic and supplemental stockpile, and the dollar value of the stockpile which he quoted included both items. The President himself has expressed shock at the size of the stockpile, an observation which the gentleman from North Carolina apparently has overlooked in his zeal for bartering. It makes no sense to separate stockpiles obtained through barter from those obtained by other methods. The end result is the same no matter which "pile" we ignore:

> No part of our agricultural export program makes more sense than this program of exchanging perishable surpluses for nonperishable materials which we do not produce in sufficient quantity in the United States to meet our requirements.

In my opinion nothing makes less sense than to substitute one surplus for another whose economic results are as devastating to the lead-zinc industry as our grain surpluses have been to the farmer. In 1960 only 23 percent of our domestic lead was produced in the United States while imports accounted for 33 percent of consumption with the remainder coming from secondary sources reclaimed lead. This does not reflect any lack of domestic lead, but rather indicates the extent to which Government policies are dissipating the domestic industry in favor of foreign ores. According to the Emergency Lead Zinc Committee there were 1,346 lead and zinc mines in the United States in 1948 and this had dwindled to only 292 mines by 1960. Production of lead in the United States is down from 390,476 tons in 1948 to 246,667 tons in 1960. These figures do not reflect any lack of domestic lead resources. They reflect the drastic effect of excessive imports on our market. The amount of lead which the United States agreed to import from Canada and Australia under last year's barter agreement is more than one-third of the total U.S. production. Meanwhile our own mines stand idle, and workers remain unemployed. It is important to maintain know-how, pumps, cribbing and avoid the deleterious effect of ionized salts of water and acid in our fields and mines for conservation alone.

The Emergency Lead Zinc Committee further states:

> It is imperative for the economy of mining States * * * and for the national economy and defense that we maintain a domestic lead-zinc mining industry that can continue to explore, and develop our mineral reserves and to mine a substantial part of our own lead-zinc needs.
>
> There must be import controls to equalize present levels of low world mining costs compared to those under the higher living standards of the United States, particularly since our own Government has helped subsidize foreign production through barter purchases for our stockpile, and has provided development loans for foreign mineral exploration and plant expansion.

I am sure that if there were idle lead mines in North Carolina instead of tobacco and cotton, the gentleman from North Carolina would be more concerned over the administration's and Cabinet's actions. My real thesis in the first place was that in view of the President's admission of my being partially right—the left hand—Department of Agriculture—knoweth not what the right hand doeth—administration, Department of State, and the Department of the Interior.

> I am further encouraged to believe that this position—barter—is supported by our Chief Executive.

This is contradictory to the letter which I received on July 19, 1961 from Presidential Assistant Lawrence F. O'Brien, in answer to my protest to the barter agreement. Speaking for the President, he said:

> Certainly the domestic barter program suffers from some of the disadvantages to which you refer. * * *

Probably the most vulnerable statement made by the gentleman from North Carolina was his comment:

> This [barter] agreement reduced surpluses of lead hanging over the market which were equally depressing world and domestic prices.

The lead-zinc industry is unanimous in its contention that the barter program has been an absolute and utter failure

insofar as it was intended to reduce surpluses and improve prices. As stated previously, the present price on lead is 9½ cents, the lowest since 1946, and overall world production shows no signs of any marked decline, the barter program notwithstanding.

The huge quantities of lead in our stockpile continue to depress the market and the administration has indicated that lead from the stockpile may be moved into world markets, in an effort to decrease the size of the stockpile.

If further evidence is needed, I quote from the brief filed this month with the U.S. Tariff Commission by six companies engaged in the lead and zinc industry in the United States:

We join in submitting this statement * * * to emphasize the fact that the existing U.S. Government policy toward lead and zinc has failed. It has not significantly helped the domestic mines which it was designed to protect. * * * It has created conditions and sacrifice to foreign competition and markets of certain of the industries principal customers, the fabricators of lead and zinc.

It will be seen that for 14 years lead production has been in excess of lead consumption. This long continued imbalance has been possible only because the greater part of the material produced, represented by the gap between production and consumption, has been taken off the market, primarily by the U.S. Government for stockpiling or through barter transactions. For years, the acquisition of surplus stocks for stockpile has permitted world producers to operate without regard for the economic axiom that production cannot indefinitely exceed consumption.

While I am glad that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture has appointed my colleague from Missouri to look into this question, I can assure him that there is little need for an investigation to determine the sources of opposition to the barter program. It comes from thousands of unemployed miners throughout the Nation whose ability to earn a living has been taken away from them by Government policy.

In order to further enlighten my colleague and so that in his well secured position he won't have to "shoot from the hip," without warning at a "confused" freshman Member, I ask unanimous consent to insert the following correspondence on this subject:

Letter from Hall to President, July 13, 1961.

Letter from O'Brien to Hall, July 18, 1961.

Letter from John P. Duncan, Jr., October 3, 1961.

Letter from John H. Kelly, August 7, 1961.

The letters follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 13, 1961.

The Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am disturbed by the recommendations of your administration within the past few weeks affecting policy toward the lead-zinc industry. I wish to call several matters to your attention, and to the attention of your advisers in the Department of Interior and the Department of State.

One cannot help but draw the conclusion that the Department of State and the Department of Interior are recommending a course of action which will be utterly disastrous for our domestic lead-zinc industry, and for the thousands of persons employed in that industry.

Specifically, I refer to the administration's recommendation for a system of barter and stockpile as the solution to the lead-zinc problem. More "solutions" like this and we will no longer have a lead-zinc problem—or a lead-zinc industry.

As a Representative of the Seventh District of Missouri, with a concentration of lead-zinc mines, I call attention to these recent developments:

1. Negotiations are nearing completion for barter of 100,000 tons of lead from Australian and Canadian mining companies. This metal will be added to the U.S. supplemental stockpile in spite of the unanimous objection of the domestic lead-zinc industry.

In essence, we are thus using our agricultural surpluses in a barter arrangement which will add to our lead-zinc surpluses and will tend to further depress the lead-zinc market.

2. The administration has recommended a new policy that would consist of a barter program to purchase $60 million worth of surplus domestic lead-zinc stocks now held by U.S. producers, to be added to the supplemental stockpile.

A review of our policy over the past 10 years will disclose that the major effect of stockpiling and barter has been to encourage more foreign production of lead and zinc. Foreign producers, many of them subsidized through our foreign aid program, have never failed to take advantage of opportunities to feed their production into the United States. The present quotas are so high that they offer virtually no restriction on these imports. Any temporary benefit from this proposal would not reach the miners who are the ones who need help, but would go to two or three large producers whose excess stocks, in many cases, has been refined from foreign ores, and who have large oversea investments.

The major cause of instability of price and stocks during the past 10 years has been and still is the import of excessive foreign supplies of these metals, largely the result of higher production costs here and economic assistance to oversea producers.

It might be added that other domestic programs implemented by the administration affecting wage costs, tax demands, and so forth, are hardly calculated to lower our own production costs.

It is an irrefutable fact that the State Department has been the major obstacle in efforts to grant relief to our lead-zinc industry through adjustments in tariffs and quotas—this in spite of the fact that several Tariff Commission determinations of injury with recommendations for greater tariff protection have fallen—and continue to fall—on deaf ears.

I contend that the State Department has virtual sole jurisdiction in an area affecting thousands of domestic jobs in the lead-zinc industry, and that responsible persons in that Department are resigned to the demise of this industry—this in spite of the fact that lead and zinc are strategic materials, the domestic production of which is absolutely vital to our defense needs in times of emergency.

I submit that the domestic minor should have at least a minimum of 50 percent of our U.S. market needs of lead and zinc ores and that it is time for this administration to begin paying more heed to the advice of industry spokesmen and less heed to officials in the State Department who seem to be wholly preoccupied with the creation of jobs overseas at the expense of domestic workers. Surely, we must realize that we cannot and should not curry favor or influence foreign loyalty with self-degrading and one-way trade agreements.

I believe that H.R. 3416 involving judicial use of tariffs and import quotas with less influence on subsidies, is at least a step in the right direction and is urgently needed if the lead-zinc industry in southwest Missouri is to survive. Do you recall your campaign promises in Joplin, Mo., while wearing a miner's hard hat?

I also urge the administration to reconsider its support of section 609 of the foreign aid bill which would permit the AID administrator to dispose of lead-zinc from our supplemental stockpile unless the Congress specifically disapproves the plan within a 60-day period. Such "vest-pocket approval" techniques have no place in a statesmanlike legislative program.

Aside from the constitutional question of whether Congress should abandon its authority in this area, it makes little sense for the administration to be seeking authority to unload our lead-zinc stockpile on the world market at the same time that it is negotiating an agreement with Canada and Australia to obtain their lead-zinc for inclusion in that same stockpile.

Nor do I believe that the administration should take such authority out of the hands of a domestic agency, OCDM, and place it in the hands of an agency primarily concerned with foreign affairs and having little regard for the affect of its actions on our domestic economy.

At the meeting with mining State congressional group on June 23 you indicated your intent to assign a task force to devote further study to the lead-zinc problem.

The last thing we need is a task force study to tell us what our problems are in the lead-zinc industry. We know what those problems are; we know what initial steps should be taken; and we certainly know that the situation will become steadily worse as long as policy is being dictated by the Department of State.

I hope you will see fit to reverse the administration's policy so that a sick industry will be given a chance for survival, and our internal economy may flourish again on principles which have made our Nation great.

Respectfuly submitted.

DURWARD G. HALL,
Member of Congress.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., July 18, 1961.

Hon. DURWARD G. HALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: For the President, I would like to acknowledge and thank you for your letter of July 13 commenting on a policy for the domestic lead-zinc industry. Certainly, the domestic barter program suffers from some of the disadvantages to which you refer, and I am bringing your comments to the attention of the Department of the Interior and the Department of State for consideration.

We expect that within a few days, the Department of Interior will be prepared to express its views on the pending legislation dealing with the lead and zinc industry. We appreciate your letting us have the benefit of your thinking.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN,
Special Assistant to the President.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. DURWARD G. HALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HALL: Your letter of July 13 addressed to the President has been referred to this Department for further reply.

The proposed barter program is not being pursued actively at the present time. It is undoubtedly true that the Government's acquisition of lead and zinc, both by purchase for the strategic stockpile and by barter, over a period of several years did serve to perpetuate an overproduction of these metals. It was for this reason that in 1958 this Department requested the Department of Agriculture to remove lead and zinc from the list of materials eligible for barter. We did not suggest merely a resumption of the earlier program. We specifically proposed that it be limited to the acquisition of surplus stocks in the United States, and we had expected to obtain some kind of agreement with producers holding these stocks not to rebuild them. This proposal was never thought of as the solution to the entire lead-zinc problem. In fact, we believe that any single solution to such a complex problem is likely to create as many difficulties as it solves.

I am enclosing a copy of the statement which I presented to the Senate Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials and Fuels on July 25 concerning lead-zinc legislation. You will not that our reference to task forces is not a further study of the lead-zinc problem but a basic analysis of depressed community problems and a beginning of a program of basic improvement of the economic opportunities in these areas.

We welcome your interest and appreciate your continued cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN M. KELLY,
Assistant Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., October 3, 1961.

Hon. DURWARD G. HALL,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HALL: This is in reply to your letter of September 5, 1961, with respect to barter transactions involving lead and zinc.

The Department has not entered into any contracts for the exchange of zinc during the past 2 years. On August 23, 1961, the Department entered into contracts for the exchange of CCC-owned agricultural commodities for 100,000 short tons of lead from Canada and Australia, while the principal commodities are tobacco and feed grains, some wheat may be exported. The lead will be placed in the stockpile and will not enter commercial markets until such time as it is released. These contracts were entered into on the understanding that the producers of lead in Canada and Australia have taken steps to reduce their production.

This arrangement was designed to reduce supplies of lead which were depressing the market and it followed a recommendation made by the International Lead and Zinc Study Group at its 3d session held in Mexico City, March 20–24, 1961. A copy of a press release reporting on this meeting is enclosed.

The Department does not regard the barter program as a complete solution to the wheat and feed grain problem. We are administering the program in accordance with the laws passed by the Congress and regard it as one of the ways we can promote the export of agricultural commodities.

If you have any further questions about the barter program, I shall be glad to try to answer them.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN P. DUNCAN, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary.

Confidential Files in Jeopardy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, about 2 weeks ago I called the House's attention to the fact that the assurances of confidentialness contained in the 1954 Census Bureau Act means little or nothing. This is borne out by an editorial appearing in a recent issue of the Business which I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

CONFIDENTIAL FILES IN JEOPARDY

NEW YORK.—Shocking news for the industrial world was a ruling of the Supreme Court by a 6 to 3 vote that the heretofore sacrosanct company records in the hands of the Census Bureau can be seized by the Federal Trade Commission.

It was a ruling against St. Regis Paper Co., which refused to turn over copies of its confidential reports to the Census Bureau to the FTC. But this has much broader implications for all pulp and paper companies which have been making annual reports on their production and shipments, etc., to the Census Bureau on the understanding that they were not to be revealed to anyone, but used only in putting together national, regional, and statewide statistics.

"Can't we trust Uncle Sam any more?" was a wry comment of one paper industry executive (not a St. Regis man) and he was not exactly joking.

The whole structure of Census Bureau statistical work may be threatened and it certainly has suffered a damaging blow.

Justice Clark, former Attorney General for President Truman, wrote the majority opinion which forced St. Regis to give up on the records, even though an Illinois court previously had ruled they were confidential.

A new way to get records from many other companies is now apparently opened up for the Federal Trade Commission and it will probably make a lot of companies hesitant to cooperate with the Census Bureau. Even in doing so, many of these census figures are merely rough guesses and the question is raised as to the right of FTC to use guesses as facts. Will future guesses be on the low side?

Justice Black, in a minority report for the Supreme Court, declared it was wrong for the FTC to fine St. Regis $100 a day from the date when it refused to give up the records to the date when the Supreme Court decided to consider the case. Though the Supreme Court seldom grants a rehearing on such matters, St. Regis is asking for a rehearing on the penalty.

Justice Clark in his opinion had made the interesting observation that a company should not keep carbons of its records for the census.

Much more is expected to be heard of this case. The Census Bureau, for many years, has had excellent and timely statistics on paper, paperboard, woodpulp, waste paper, rags, and pulpwood, produced and used in this industry. What will this ruling do to these statistical reports? There are certain to be objections which were never raised before.

Some other industries, according to informants in Washington, have never been as cooperative and as prompt as the pulp and paper industry in giving the Census Bureau what it wishes.

FTC Chairman Paul Rand Dixon has been making a name for himself thinking up new techniques of investigating companies. He was Senator KEFAUVER's general counsel in his investigations of business.

The FTC was reported planning "an investigative hearing" to look into the impact of mergers which St. Regis has carried out. Subpenas were issued for six St. Regis officials but the company pleaded that no more than two officials be called at one time, in order not to disrupt its business. This was turned down by the FTC.

Its moves against St. Regis and future plans are shrouded in what is apparently deliberate secrecy.

These developments are interpreted widely in the industry as a sign of the hostility of the Kennedy administration toward business.

State Views of Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Wheeling, W. Va., Intelligencer on February 3 made editorial comment on the experimental provision of giving aid to dependent children based upon the unemployment of the father. This editorial indicates the difficulties which have been experienced by the State in administering this program which, it is now suggested, be made a permanent feature of the Federal welfare programs. I should like to place this editorial in the RECORD with the hope that it will aid in the consideration of the President's proposals on welfare.

The editorial follows:

FOULED UP—CHARLESTON, WASHINGTON GET WIRES CROSSED ON VIRTUE OF AID TO UNEMPLOYED FATHERS

Last year the Kennedy administration initiated a relief experiment known as Aid to the Dependent Children of Unemployed Fathers. It was geared for a 1-year trial run in 14 States, including West Virginia, making available up to $165 a month in Federal and State funds to the unemployed heads of families. During the past year, according to Charleston records $15 million in Federal money and slightly under $5 million in State funds were distributed.

Under the West Virginia plan of operation, said to be unique among the 14 States distributing this form of relief, beneficiaries were required either to work on public projects at $1 an hour or take vocational retraining. Approximately 11,000 fathers are participating at present.

But the project has not proven satisfactory to West Virginia officials, who apparently assumed that it was in disfavor in Washington, as well. No provision was made in the new budget now before the legislature for continuation of the program beyond June 30. The officials directly responsible for its administration—Welfare Commissioner W. Bernard Smith, Road Commissioner Burl A. Sawyers, and Natural Resources Commissioner Warden M. Lane—say it is unwieldy and difficult to administer. They have expressed the opinion that it should be permitted to lapse, and Smith recommended the same thing to Federal officials, on the ground that it constitutes no long-term answer to the economic problem it is concerned with.

It appears, however, that Washington's economic planners were not impressed with West Virginia's experience or with Mr. Smith's recommendations. Not only does the new welfare program unveiled for Congress the other day by President Kennedy provide for continuation of ADCU, but recommends that it be put on a permanent basis. So Charleston, with time running out for this legislative session, faces the necessity, in contemplation of congressional approval of the President's plan, of improvising a financing arrangement to keep in step with the New Frontier or sacrifice what looks like a lot of soft Federal money.

Such are the glories of public relief in these days of social enlightenment.

Amending Juvenile Court Act for the District of Columbia

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6747) to amend the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to go on record in favor of the substitute amendment to H.R. 6747. From the evidence that I have seen, and from the debate on the floor, there is no doubt that the amendment is clearly preferable to the bill itself on the major provisions.

In the first place, we find that H.R. 6747 would destroy the independent juvenile court in the District of Columbia, and establish instead an additional branch of the municipal court. However, the common experience of the separate States has led the majority of them to adopt the independent juvenile court approach, and testimony given on this bill has consistently shown the need for strengthening, not weakening, the juvenile court in the District.

The backlog of cases in the juvenile court has been and is a scandal. Even under normal conditions, the necessary safeguards and formalities of the law require a sufficiently long waiting period. Among the catalog of infirmities which man must endure on this earth, the law's delay is one for which no adequate remedy has yet been found. But to compound the law's delay with man's delay as has been done in the District is surely unnecessary and should not be allowed to continue. The addition of two additional judges, not inclusion in the municipal court, is what is needed. The substitute amendment would provide them.

The other provision of H.R. 6747 which I cannot support is the one which would lower the age for municipal court jurisdiction from 18 to 16. On this point, two sound arguments have been put forward by proponents of the substitute—namely the minor nature of most offenses committed by those in this age group and the experience which various States have had. One in seven cases handled in the juvenile court in fiscal year 1961 were major crimes. All others were of a lesser nature. To permanently classify persons 16 and 17 years old with a criminal record for the committing of a variety of minor crimes is unnecessary and unwise. Second, we find that 34 of the 50 States set the age limit at 18, presumably because their experience has shown this to be preferable to a lower limit. I believe that 18 years is the proper figure.

Finally, we find that an overwhelming number of organizations, agencies, and groups who are concerned and involved with the problem are in favor of the substitute. Almost everyone, from the District Commissioners and the judges of the municipal court to the Federal Departments of Justice and Health, Education, and Welfare are in agreement that the foregoing provisions of H.R. 6747 are not in the best interests of the District. The substitute amendment deserves support.

Cooperative Power Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. BLAINE PETERSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, last September I made a statement regarding my decision to support H.R. 9076, which among other things carried a controversial provision of funds for Federal planning and construction of some 2,000 miles of lines to transmit power which will be available from the Colorado River storage project beginning in 1963.

At that time I stated:

Both private and public power interests have submitted voluminous material relating to this complex and technical matter. I have been unable to reconcile the differences between them, but I am of the firm opinion that in the end it will be necessary for both groups to work together for the full utilization of the power generated. I had hoped they could resolve their differences before now.

Agreements for construction of these lines by private utilities were negotiated and announced last week by the Secretary of the Interior. I compliment both the Government and private power interests on this compromise solution to this very complex problem. It recognizes the free enterprise system by allowing the lines to be constructed and maintained by private power interests on a contract basis and it guarantees to the consumer a fair and equitable rate. It also assures that the schedule of payment for the entire project will be fully met.

On Tuesday of this week editorial comment in the Washington Post pointed up the commendable achievement of this compromise agreement. Because of the importance of the resolution of this controversial issue in the public interest, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be reprinted in the RECORD at this point:

COOPERATIVE POWER POLICY

Two facts stand out from the agreements which the Bureau of Reclamation has negotiated with the private power companies for the transmission of power to be generated by the immense Colorado River projects. First, the achievement of a reasonable working relationship became possible only after Congress had appropriated funds to begin the construction of an all-Federal system for the movement of this power. The previous offers of the private companies had been rejected as being exorbitant. But after it became apparent that the Government was ready to build a complete transmission system of its own, new offers were forthcoming. It is said that the present agreements will ultimately put into the Upper Colorado Basin fund about $400 million more than the companies' previous offers would have done.

The second fact that stands out from the agreement is that this cooperative arrangement will cost taxpayers much less than it would have done to build a wholly new system of transmission lines. While the agreements with the various private utilities in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming differ in details, the general policy is to make full use of the existing private facilities and then for the companies and the Government to alternate in the construction of new lines as they are needed for joint use. In the case of the Utah Power & Light Co., however, only company lines will be used because the service charges agreed upon are less than would be the cost of constructing and operating new Government lines. The company will build a new line to the dam under construction at Glen Canyon, Ariz.

The saving in Utah alone is estimated to be more than $700,000 a year. It may be assumed that the private companies will obtain benefits from these cooperative arrangements; otherwise they would not have negotiated the agreements. Even more obvious is the advantage to the Government in terms of reduced outlays and the creation of a cooperative power system.

Whether this type of agreement is called "partnership" or a "cooperative approach," as Secretary of the Interior Udall prefers, is of no significance. The important point is that private utilities and the Government have decided to work together in what appears to be a mutually advantageous endeavor. That is good public policy, and it ought to serve as a useful precedent when the extremists are locked in battle over the relative merits of private power and public power.

I intend to carefully check the final draft of the contract to make sure that the rights of both the Government and private power, and of preferential users, are fully met and protected.

The Federal Woman's Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE D. NORRELL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mrs. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, last evening official recognition and commendation brought into the spotlight of

public acclaim the achievements of six women employees of the Federal Government whose services have been outstanding.

Each of the six women was the recipient of the second annual Federal Woman's Award at a dinner given in their honor by the board of trustees. Two members of the board are our colleagues in the Congress: The Honorable KATHRYN GRANAHAN and the Honorable MAURINE NEUBERGER.

Earlier in the day President Kennedy had received the ladies at the White House, when his remarks to them reaffirmed his belief in the essential role of women as full partners in our democracy. This belief had been exemplified last December when he established the President's Commission on the Status of Women. At that time he expressed the hope that the prejudices and outmoded customs which act as barriers to such a full partnership will soon be overcome.

The objective of the Federal Woman's Award is to provide special recognition to women who have made oustanding contributions to the efficiency and quality of the career service of the Federal Government, and to dramatize and make more widely known to the public the wide variety and challenging careers for women in the Federal Government.

The career women selected as award winners represent high achievement in the fields of astronomy, chemistry, foreign service, law, pathology, and personnel administration. Each recipient was nominated by the head of her department or agency, and was selected by a panel of 5 judges from among 65 nominees.

With understandable pride in their achievements and their invaluable contributions to our Government, I ask my colleagues in the House to join with me in extending congratulations and appreciation to these six women:

Mrs. Katherine W. Bracken, Director, Office of Central American and Panamanian Affairs, Bureau of Inter-American Affairs, Department of State. Mrs. Bracken was presented for the award by the Honorable George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State.

Miss Margaret H. Brass, Chief, General Litigation Section, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice. Miss Brass was presented by the Honorable Byron W. White, Deputy Attorney General.

Dr. Thelma B. Dunn, Head of Cancer Induction and Pathogenesis Section, National Cancer Institute, National Institutes of Health, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Dr. Dunn was presented by the Honorable James M. Quigley, Assistant Secretary of the Department.

Miss Evelyn Harrison, Deputy Director, Bureau of Programs and Standards, U.S. Civil Service Commission. Miss Harrison was presented by the Honorable John W. Macy, Chairman of the Commission.

Dr. Allene R. Jeanes, Chemist, Chemical Reactions and Structure Investigations, Cereal Properties Laboratory, Northern Utilization Research and Development Division, Agricultural Research Service, Department of Agriculture. Dr. Jeanes was presented by the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture.

Dr. Nancy Grace Roman, Chief of Astronomy and Solar Physics, Geophysics and Astronomy Programs, Office of Space Sciences, National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Dr. Roman was presented by the Honorable Hugh L. Dryden, Deputy Administrator of NASA.

The individual citations and biographical sketches of the award winners are most interesting and will serve to give encouragement to other women throughout the country who may be well started in their careers or who may be preparing themselves for career service in the Federal Government.

The citations and biographical sketches follow:

THE FEDERAL WOMAN'S AWARD

Mrs. Katherine W. Bracken, for "her exceptional success as a Foreign Service Officer in person-to-person relationships with citizens of the countries in which she serves." Mrs. Bracken began her career in the Foreign Service of the Department of State in 1943 as a clerk-stenographer, assigned to Guatemala. She passed the Foreign Service examinations and was appointed a Foreign Service Officer in 1946, serving successively as vice consul at various cities in Greece and Turkey, and as consul at cities in Turkey, Iran, and Pakistan. In order to promote friendship and understanding with peoples of all classes she has mastered the language of every country to which she has been assigned, and her acceptance as a U.S. official in areas where women do not participate in public life has been without parallel. In 1953 she was assigned to Turkish-Persian area training at the Foreign Service Institute at Princeton University; in 1958 she was selected to attend the senior officers' seminar in foreign policy; and the following year she was appointed chief of the Mideast aegean division. In 1960 she was advanced to her present position, where she is one of the six highest ranking women in the Foreign Service of the United States and the only woman office director in the five regional bureaus. She is a native of Lavonia, Ga.

Miss Margaret H. Brass, for "her deep dedication to the philosophy of free enterprise embodied in the antitrust laws, and her singular contributions to the development of legal principles to carry out those laws." Miss Brass holds the degrees of bachelor of laws and master of laws from the Columbus University of Washington, D.C., now known as Columbus School of Law of Catholic University. Born in Connellsville, Pa., she has spent her entire legal career in Washington, D.C. She is a member of the bar of the District of Columbia and of the Supreme Court of the United States. She entered the Department of Justice as a stenographer in 1936, and since 1939 has been a career attorney in the specialized field of antitrust law. She has actively participated in the trial of most of the nationally known Federal antitrust cases in the past 20 years, and as a chief trial attorney has had outstanding success in the development and advancement of antitrust doctrines. In 1957 she was given a departmental sustained superior performance award in the maximum amount of $500. With her appointment to the position of chief of the general litigation section in 1961 she became the first woman ever to be chief of a section in the Antitrust Division.

Dr. Thelma B. Dunn, for "her distinguished career in experimental cancer research, and particularly her highly significant studies of the origins of cancer in animals." Dr. Dunn received her B.A. degree from Cornell University and her M.D. from the University of Virginia School of Medicine. She joined the National Cancer Institute in 1942, after several years as a pathologist on the medical faculties of the University of Virginia and George Washington University. She is known as the world authority on the pathology of the laboratory mouse, the animal most commonly used as a tool for the study of human cancer, and has published a large number of research papers. As assistant chief of the laboratory of pathology she plans and evaluates staff research in the induction and pathogenesis of cancer. She has been president of the Washington Society of Pathologists, represented the National Institutes of Health on a delegation of distinguished American women physicians visiting the Soviet Union in 1958, and was chosen "Medical Woman of the Year" in 1959 by the American Medical Women's Association. In 1961 she became the first women to be elected president of the American Association for Cancer Research. She was born in Renan, Va., is married to a physican, and has three children.

Miss Evelyn Harrison, for "her outstanding competence demonstrated by her role in the formulation and development of Government-wide personnel policies." Miss Harrison holds the distinction of being the first woman to graduate from the Engineering College of the University of Maryland, having received the B.S. degree in civil engineering in 1932. She has done graduate work at George Washington University and American University in psychology, psychometrics, and public administration. A native of the District of Columbia, she began her Government career in 1934 as a draftsman with the Geological Survey. She came to the Civil Service Commission in 1938 as an examiner in engineering and allied fields, and became assistant to the Chief of the Examining Division in 1945. She was appointed Assistant Director of the Bureau of Programs and Standards in 1953 and served as Acting Director until the appointment of the present Director in 1955. She has played a central leadership role in the formulation of progressive personnel legislation and in the complete overhaul, within its statutory framework, of the personnel system under which the Federal work force of over 2 million persons is employed. She is known to high officials throughout the Government for her ability in resolving interagency problems of personnel policy and practice under the Federal merit system.

Dr. Allene R. Jeanes, for "her pioneering chemical research on the starches and sugars obtained from cereal grains." Dr. Jeanes received her B.A. degree from Baylor University in Waco, Tex., where she was born, her M.A. from the University of California at Berkeley, and her Ph.D. in organic chemistry from the University of Illinois. She became a research associate at the National Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce, in 1940. In 1941 she was appointed to the Department of Agriculture's Northern Utilization Research and Development Division in Peoria, Ill., where she has held progressively responsible positions in a complex program of organic and biochemical research. She has made notable contributions to fundamental carbohydrate chemistry through pioneering research on dextrans, including the practical development of dextran as a blood volume extended (a replacement for blood plasma) to fill the critical needs of the armed services and civilian defense. Five patents have been issued to her and three more are pending. She has published numerous research papers. Honors she has received include the Distinguished Service Award, highest award of the Department of Agriculture, and the Garvan Medal, presented by the American Chemical Society to the outstanding woman chemist for distinguished service to chemistry.

Dr. Nancy Grace Roman, for "her high ability and strong leadership in developing a progressive national space program in astronomy and astrophysics." Dr. Roman received her B.A. degree in astronomy from Swarthmore College and her Ph.D. from the University of Chicago. She began her Government career in 1955 in the Radio Astronomy Branch of the U.S. Naval Research Laboratory. She joined the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in 1959 as head of the observational astronomy program. In this capacity she was responsible for coordination of national effort in the development of instrumentatiton and techniques for astronomical observation from sounding rockets, satellites, and space probes. In 1960 she was made Chief of Astronomy and Astrophysics Programs, and has directed the development of scientific experiments to be flown in satellites. These satellites include a gamma ray astronomy satellite, flown in 1961, an orbiting solar observatory to be flown in 1962, and an orbiting astronomical observatory planned for 1963. She has also established a broad program of research and development in preparation for other satellite flights in the more distant future. She has participated in international conferences in Dublin, Stockholm, and London. Born in Nashville, Tenn., in 1925, she is the youngest recipient of the Federal Woman's Award.

Washington Post Edits Out Column Paragraphs Favorable to Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday I inserted in the RECORD a column written by Roscoe Drummond which appeared in the Washington Post. I was unaware at that time of a Post policy of editing its columnists to leave out parts of their columns which would strengthen the Republican position. This particular column dealt with the makeup of congressional committees and warned of the dangers of the imbalance which has been allowed on the professional staffs of committees as between the majority and minority parties. The efforts of my esteemed colleague, THOMAS B. CURTIS, and two Members from the other body were mentioned in the column by Mr. Drummond, but left out of the article as it appeared in the Post. Because of the importance of this issue, not only to the orderly functioning of Congress but in the implications for the establishment of a one-party system, I think it is necessary that the Members have the full text as written by Mr. Drummond and I, therefore, include the complete column as it appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times to replace the incomplete article which appeared in Monday's RECORD:

GOP IN DEFAULT ON STAFF DUTIES

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Bear in mind that during the next few months the Congress of the United States will—

1. Make a series of crucial decisions affecting the fate and future of the Nation, including a trade policy which will shape our economy for many years.

2. Conduct at least 35 congressional investigations into such matters as tax reform and evidence of graft in the Federal highway program.

And still the Republican members of Congress are being denied—partly by their own default and connivance and partly by the bald power play of the Democratic majority—the one instrument needed to do their job.

I refer to the woefully inadequate, enfeebled and puny minority party representation on the professional staffs of the policymaking and investigative committees of the House and the Senate.

True, the Members of Congress appear to make the decisions, and in a sense do make the decisions. But the professional committee staffs—the experts, the technicians, the research scholars and the investigators—constitute the power of initiative behind the committees. They shape the reports which shape the decisions and, when properly balanced between the two parties, help produce alternative courses of policy.

What has happened? An official Republican Policy Committee document shows there is not a single staff expert responsible to the minority party on 10 critical House committees.

On many of the others, the minority representation is either so sparse or so incompetent that they are overwhelmed by the sheer numbers of the Democratic appointees.

In the House, the Democratic Party has a 3-to-2 majority. The professional staffs of the House committees are 14 to 1 Democratic.

It wasn't this way during the first 2 years of the Eisenhower administration when the Republicans had control of the House and Senate.

The present imbalance in committee staffing began in 1955 and has been getting more lopsided ever since.

Why has it happened? Because the leadership of the Republican Party in Congress has not stood up and fought for its rights.

Because the rank-and-file members of the Republican Party in Congress have not stood up and insisted that the party leadership fight for their rights.

Because some highly placed Republican members of the committees have preferred accepting a few personal perquisites from the majority chairmen to making a determined, even unpleasant, demand for reform.

Because the Democrats have pressed their unfair advantage to the full.

Representative WILLIAM E. MILLER of New York, chairman of the Republican National Committee, knows what needs to be done and wants to do it. But he has thrown up his hands hopelessly in the futile effort to inject enough gumption into his party to do something.

A few Republicans, like Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS of Missouri, have led a lonely fight among colleagues in the House and so far have been getting either limp indifference—or the back of the wrist.

Recently two respected Senators, CARL T. CURTIS, of Nebraska, and KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York, offered an amendment to a bill which would have made a miniscule beginning toward reform—1 Republican staff expert to 10 Democratic staff experts. The Democrats instantly rallied to defeat it on a straight party vote. They knew what they were doing. They know how to keep the Republican voices enfeebled.

This is a scandal of national proportions. It goes to the very vitals of our two-party system of government. If the Republicans don't do whatever is necessary to win this battle (by rallying to the CURTIS initiative and fighting for reform in their own committees) they deserve to continue to lose elections—and will.

Labor-Management Cooperation: A Dramatic Example

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, what would happen if labor and management put the public interest first in their negotiations?

It sounds like some kind of idealistic dream, impractical for a hotly competitive industry and a strong union. But 4 years ago, in Long Island's sheet metal industry, which employs a goodly number of my constituents, a unique experiment was begun along these lines.

This was the idea: With the warm air heating industry fairly new, sheet metal contractors found themselves cutting corners in order to compete with the other forms of heating homes and factories. The result was slipshod work, and the new method of heating was getting a black eye.

The local sheet metal workers union, taking a long-range view, realized that if the public interest were served, there would be fewer work opportunities in the future for their membership. They demanded and received a 10-cent-an-hour increase from their contractors—but, to everyone's amazement, put that raise into a joint labor-management industry fund instead of into their pay envelopes.

This labor-management group, called the Climate Control Council, established a code of standards for warm air heating installations—and made it stick throughout their area. They set up a free advisory service for homeowners whose homes were heated by warm air, and any complaint about a member-contractor's installation was promptly serviced. And an apprenticeship program was started to improve the quality of work performed by new union members. The council sought to inform the public about the virtues of clean, modern warm air heat.

All this brought a big laugh from a lot of skeptics. Some other labor people thought the local union was crazy to forego their increase, and other contractors said the whole thing was a pie-in-the-sky promotion by a bunch of do-gooders.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of this House part of an annual report showing the results of the Climate Control Council's efforts. The skeptics are quietly staring at three facts:

First. Work opportunities have grown over 40 percent in the past 4 years in this field, far faster than in other areas; the union membership is highly pleased.

Second. With the industry booming, the local contractors are doing more business now than ever before—they are happy.

Third. The public is getting a quality product at a fair price. And the public responds by wanting more.

What is more, this labor-management cooperation has not undermined arm's-length negotiations—the union may be farsighted, but it also presently demands and gets one of the highest pay scales for its type of work in the United States.

This experiment in New York State deserves some careful study by other labor and management groups across the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, as evidence of the success of this dramatic experiment I would like to submit for the RECORD "A Letter From Labor and Management," part of the 1961 annual report distributed by the Climate Control Council, and an editorial commenting on the program in the Akron (Ohio) Beacon-Journal:

A LETTER FROM LABOR AND MANAGEMENT

If labor and management were to sit down at the bargaining table with the best interests of the consumer in mind, what would the result be?

This unique experiment was undertaken 3 years ago in the warm air heating and air conditioning industry on Long Island, by the 700 members of Local No. 55 of the Sheet Metal Workers International Association, and a group of the largest sheetmetal contractors in this area.

The result of this pioneering effort has been startling, pointing to a new path for labor-management relations throughout the Nation.

For the consumer, the result has been far higher standards of performance of heating systems in homes, schools and industry, backed by a solid guarantee on the part of the industry, insuring the highest quality workmanship at an equitable price.

For the workingman, the result has been a 40-percent increase in job opportunities, as public confidence in our warm air systems, compatible with air conditioning, has greatly increased the use of this modern method of climate control. In addition, the scholarship and apprentice programs begun under the labor-management industry fund makes possible greater opportunity for more skilled work.

For the employer, the result has been a substantially increased volume of business, with the future growth implicit in satisfied customers.

All these results have been achieved by the climate control council, set up 3 years ago by the industry fund, which maintains these public services:

1. Monitoring by the sheet metal industry of its code of standards which has been reviewed and approved by civic officials, and is subject to updating revision to include the most advanced improvements. The detailed code, whose preamble is reprinted in this annual report, permits only quality workmanship in the design and construction of efficient, clean, warm air heating and air-conditioning systems in homes, schools, businesses and industrial plants.

2. A free diagnostic and advisory clinic conducting upon request inspections of warm air heating and air conditioning systems in Nassau and Suffolk Counties. (During the past year and a half, these requested inspections have been made in scores of homes, and expert aid and advice given to the homeowners.)

3. A free expert information service on warm air heating and air conditioning for architects, builders, school boards, town councils, city planners, banks, and like groups, to give technical advice.

4. A research and development program to test materials and methods in the interest of Long Island private, commercial and public building.

5. A public education program to provide information on the warm air heating and air-conditioning industry, and the council-established safeguards and improvements. This has included articles and advertisements in Long Island and industry publications, participation in the Long Island Fair, scholarship and training programs, and the publishing of warm air heating facts in the game programs of the widely attended industry-sponsored big league softball team.

Many years ago, when asked what he wanted for the labor movement, Samuel Gompers replied with a single word: "More."

Today the pioneering program of the climate control council is proving that both labor and management profit most when the consumer gets "more".

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH FREDERICK, *Chairman.*
EDWARD KLEIN, *Cochairman.*

[From the Akron (Ohio) Beacon Journal, Jan. 15, 1962]

A UNION THAT CARES

Local 55 of the Sheet Metal Workers Union, located on Long Island, New York, has set an example that other trades unions might well follow.

In cooperation with the sheet metal contractors for whom its members work, the local has engaged in a constructive effort to raise standards and promote more business for warm air heating and air-conditioning industry.

Through a so-called climate control council, a code of standards for the industry has been adopted and is being enforced. The result; a 40-percent increase in business in the last 3 years. This means, of course, more jobs and more hours of work for the union members as well as more profits for the employers.

The astounding fact about all this is that the initiative and the financing came principally from the union—at least that's what the local's public relations counsel says.

Yes, public relations counsel—and hired by the union.

It would be a fine idea if local 55 were to send missionaries around the country to tell of the accomplishments on Long Island.

The traditional approach of too many unions in the building industry has been to let the employers do all the worrying about getting new business—and to make things as tough for the employers as possible by instituting restrictive practices and demanding higher and higher wages.

More cooperation between employers and the unions, featuring a friendly, constructive effort to win and hold new customers, could be a boon to all concerned.

Not Typical Americans Are Our Space Heroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Post-Gazette]

NOT TYPICAL AMERICANS ARE OUR SPACE HEROES

(By Andrew Bernhard)

Not since Lindbergh's epochal one-man flight across the Atlantic has the attention of the American people, and, for that matter, most of the world, been so centered on one individual as on John Glenn last week.

There is something infinitely attractive to us in a one-man attempt to conquer the elements, and time and space. It is hard for us to identify ourselves with, say, a ship's company, but one man alone we can understand. We can sympathize with him for we, each of us, puts himself in the lone man's place.

Few of us, I am sure, actually wish to be in his place. What we do is to feel, vicariously, the fear we would surely experience if we were alone in the plane that took Lindbergh to Paris, or the capsule that took Glenn three times around the earth.

We are greatly pleased, too, that Glenn is one of us, one of us Americans, even though we know there are few of us who would dare compare ourselves with him. Since he is an American we all can feel a share in his experience, even though we ourselves lead humdrum, unimaginative lives.

Curiously, the Glenn adventure was infinitely more appealing to us than the shorter flights of Alan B. Shepard, Jr., and Virgil I. Grissom. Yet it in no way detracts from all the honors due Glenn to point out that Grissom and Shepard, too, dared greatly and had the iron nerve to undergo the hazards of takeoff and landing. But Grissom and Shepard made only short flights. Glenn went around the world thrice.

It is to the credit of all three brave men that each handled himself well in the ordeal of meeting press and public after their returns. Each has emphasized the undoubted fact that no space flight would be possible but for the combined efforts of hundreds, even thousands, of other men. And each of the three astronauts has been careful to say a good word for the others.

The parallel with the case of Lindbergh is inevitable. He, too, had been preceded across the Atlantic by other men. Yet it was the young man who hopped off from Long Island to dare the ocean crossing alone that attracted the world's sympathy and adulation.

So with Glenn. He was our third man in space, to say nothing of the two Russians who orbited the earth. But he was the first American to circle the globe and the first man of any nationality to do so in the glare of worldwide attention.

I must admit I have been one of those who sometimes wished our space attempts were not so well advertised in advance, for I remembered the let-down that came to all of us when our first attempt to emulate sputnik fizzled out.

Yet, now that we have done what we set out to do I am glad it was done for all the world to see. The whole United States was involved in what was a gamble. The Russians, with their closed society, took no such chances. It hardly is likely that they did not have failures in their early attempts to launch a rocket into space. But the world knows nothing of them. Not a peep came out of Russia about the flights of Gagarin and Titov till they had safely returned to earth and even then the reports lacked greatly the details we know of the exploits of Shepard, Grissom, and Glenn.

Glenn, Shepard, and Grissom. Three heroes. And I hope no one makes the mistake of calling them "typical Americans." They are not typical, any more than Lindbergh was the typical young American he was called in 1927.

They are not typical. Few of us have their cool nerve, their steadfastness. Lindbergh was not typical of the young America of his day. He was above the typical as our latest heroes are above the typical.

The typical American would not have dared the Atlantic crossing in a frail, one-engine monoplane in 1927. By the same token the typical American would have had

no desire to take a seat in a rocket headed for space.

They are not typical, such men. We can be thankful they are far above the rest of us, who are typical. And a nation owes its thanks to them.

Statement by Charles L. Bacon, National Commander, the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a statement by a great and good American, Charles L. Bacon, national commander of the American Legion. This statement was made this morning, February 27, before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, in the caucus room, and this room was filled to overflowing, with every chair and all standing room taken, and all members of this great committee were there, including our great chairman, "TIGER" TEAGUE.

Mr. Speaker, so many great things have been happening the past few days here in the Capitol of the United States, that we are almost overwhelmed and are thankful for so many good things that have been bestowed upon us. Yesterday there on the floor of the House in the Congress of the United States, we heard you introduce one of the earth's greatest men, a great leader and a great hero, Col. John Glenn. Sitting there in the Chamber were the entire Senate, the House, the Supreme Court, the diplomats from every country on earth, and the men sitting there as Members of Congress represented every human being in this great Nation, and I believe sitting with us were the great ambassadors from every nation, making practically the entire world represented, and one man told me that more than 1 billion people were represented there by the men who came to honor this great man, his wonderful mother, his fabulous father, his lovely wife and children. What a day. It reminded me of the day we had that great Gen. Douglas MacArthur, who addressed the House, and again of the day when the great Winston Churchill addressed the House. Speaker McCORMICK, you were here then, and you are here now, and you introduced this great hero, this great American, this great scientist and this great marine, who made a record that will last forever. How I wished all of our loved ones everywhere could have been here, but in this great age and time, most of our loved ones will see or hear the speech by Colonel Glenn, which was so simple, so fine and so wonderful in every way. I saw tears in many men's and women's eyes, great generals, admirals and many men and women from every walk of life. What a great prayer Reverend Braskamp said this morning when we opened the Congress. Is it not great and is it not good that this is one country that can open its meetings with prayer and asking God's blessings. This, Mr. Speaker, we had all the way today, and all the way when Colonel Glenn was flying at the rate of 5 miles per second and made this unusual achievement of orbiting around the earth three times.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are having another great day and have just had another great speech by the national commander of the American Legion, Cmdr. Charles L. Bacon, and as he spoke to us, I could see tears in the eyes of his beautiful wife, and he did make a profound impression on everyone of us who sat there almost until noon listening to this great man tell us what he and the men in the great American Legion were doing now and their plans for the future. There sat my lifelong friend, Brad Taylor, vice chairman of the National Legislative Committee of the American Legion and all of the officials. When I looked down from my seat on the committee rostrum, there sat a wonderful woman from Alabama, Mrs. W. W. "Lillian" Andrews of Jackson, Ala., who is always here to help in the American Legion, and in any other services to our great servicemen who saved this Nation and all the world. I am so glad that so many people will get to read Charlie Bacon's great speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which goes to every library in the Nation and most other nations. It has been a joy and a pleasure for me to serve on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, where it gives me an opportunity to help not only our great American Legion, but all the men who have served in the Armed Forces, of our great Nation. God bless you, Charlie Bacon, and keep you, and give you strength to carry on the great work that you have done and are doing and will continue to do.

STATEMENT BY CHARLES L. BACON, NATIONAL COMMANDER, THE AMERICAN LEGION, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FEBRUARY 27, 1962

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee: This occasion has always meant much to the American Legion. In a personal way, it has added significance by virtue of the fact that I have been presented to this committee by my friend and fellow Missourian, Congressman RANDALL.

At the outset, may I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee for your consideration in receiving all of us this morning. We are grateful for this opportunity to present the American Legion's rehabilitation legislative program for the year.

We are extremely conscious of the fact that service on this committee constitutes one of the most difficult yet one of the most rewarding of congressional assignments. It is also a thrilling experience for a citizen to appear before legislative bodies, for it is in this arena that life and meaning are given the democratic processes.

The Legionnaires who have joined me today are representatives of every State in the Nation. They are in Washington attending our annual commander's conference. This is an important series of meetings and, in addition to the 39th Annual Rehabilitation Conference, includes the convening of seven of the major commissions of the American Legion. The keynote of our conference is our conviction that the more effective we make the programs of the American Legion today, the stronger and better will be the America of tomorrow. This keynote calls attention to the reason for the very existence of the American Legion: a stronger and better America.

The American Legion is indebted to the Veterans' Affairs Committee for its significant efforts to improve and perfect legislation controlling veterans' benefits. We know this committee is conscientious, is hard working is sympathetic and is cooperative. If I were to epitomize the actions and results of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I would say that both strongly indicate that its members recognize and accept a compassionate responsibility for those who offered their lives in defense of this Nation. We have much to thank this committee for, not the least of which is the fact that it invariably receives our proposals, and those who present them, with understanding and grace.

Mr. Chairman, your committee staff has been most helpful to us. Mr. Meadows, Mr. Patterson, and all the others seem to consider us interested parties engaged in a mutual undertaking. We thank them for their willingness to receive and consider our suggestions and to keep us informed of the special studies in which they engage.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, we have a substantial number of legislative proposals which we will urge for your consideration this session. To us of the American Legion, all are important and we will work diligently toward their enactment. Although we appear and participate here today as advocates and not as the judge and jury, we desire that our participation be responsible, and may I assure you that we are aware of the fact that there can be a unity of purpose without a strict conformity of thought. Some of our proposals are more far reaching than others, affect a greater number of beneficiaries, or have a greater impact upon the veterans' benefits program. I intend, this morning, to discuss in rather general terms several which, in my judgment, fall into this latter category, and to submit, as an appendix to my statement, a complete list of all of our resolutions in the rehabilitation legislative field.

DISABILITY AND DEATH COMPENSATION

It has been the well-established position of the American Legion that the service disabled and the survivors of those who die of service-connected causes, are the first concern of our organization and of the Congress. Their welfare and their best interests are always uppermost in our minds. Our complete dedication to the service disabled does not mean, however, that we will endorse every compensation bill presented. Last session, this committee did not approve the Legion's proposal to adjust the service-connected compensation law; that fact certainly does not justify the allegation by anyone that the committee is not for the service disabled. There are some compensation increase bills which in our judgment fail to meet basic and fundamental needs. It is most important to note here that I do not speak only of the question of how much of an increase should be granted. In addition to that important point are two other considerations about which we feel strongly. The American Legion is convinced that balance should be restored to the rate structure and that additional allowances, on a pro rata basis, should be provided for veterans rated 10 through 40 percent disabled. As to balance, we cannot escape the logic of the argument that contends that a man who is rated 90 percent disabled by the Veterans' Administration should receive a monthly sum equal to 90 percent of the amount payable for total disability. He did until 1952, when the rate structure was thrown out of balance. At present, he receives an amount equal to 79 percent of the amount payable for total disability. The imbalance

continues down through the remaining percentage evaluations. If he is not truly 90 percent disabled, he should not be so rated, or the rating schedule, which specifies the evaluation to be assigned, should be modified. Nor can we in the Legion see the rationale in the law which provides additional allowances for the family of a man rated 50 percent disabled but not for the family of the man rated 40 percent. The inequity is particularly striking when we consider the case of a man with several children who is reduced, because of a changed physical condition, from 50 to 40 percent. He loses not only the 10 percent compensation, but also all allowances for his family—as though they had suddenly ceased to exist. It is the conviction of the American Legion that a compensation bill which does not restore balance and provide the additional allowances described is basically and fundamentally deficient. We urge your consideration of our proposal in this field.

DISABILITY AND DEATH PENSION

Public Law 211, passed in the 86th Congress, instituted a number of substantial changes in existing pension legislation. These amendments were intended to perfect the controlling law and to especially benefit the most needy. Our experience was 86-211 impels us to the conslusion that certain revisions are in order. The resolution which our last national convention approved will, we believe, put the law in a form that will fulfill the purposes for which it was originally passed.

NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE

Notwithstanding the value of national service life insurance, millions of veterans were unable to retain their insurance after discharge. The demands of education, growing families, economic adjustments, and so forth, were too great. We feel that had the Congress established a prospective termination date for the life insurance program, which had been in effect since the close of World War I, giving veterans a last but reasonable period in which to apply, many would have made the sacrifices necessary to secure the insurance. We urge that the privilege of securing national service life insurance now be reopened for a limited time, under specific conditions and with due regard for those who are now uninsurable as a result of service-connected disabilities.

AGING VETERANS

The aging and chronically ill veteran has been a source of great concern to us for some time. We have devoted much time and study to his problems. We have a joint economic-rehabilitation subcommittee whose sole function it is to consider this matter. The American Legion has urged that special medical facilities be provided for the veteran, usually advanced in age, who is afflicted with a long-term illness. I single out this subject because of its growing importance and because I know you share our interest in the subject.

ADMINISTRATION OF VETERANS' BENEFITS

We are aware of proposals to vest in agencies other than the VA the administration of certain veterans' benefits. We oppose such a move. Tradition and reason, in our judgment, require that the agency experienced and trained in these matters continue to control them. We fear, too, that one such loss would be followed by another, leading ultimately to the completely unsatisfactory condition that existed when veterans' matters were administered according to subject matter by various Federal agencies. Experience led the Congress to establish a single agency, charged with the responsibility for veterans' affairs. That same experience, now fortified by time and achievement, dictates that the single agency concept must be retained.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the legislative proposals which we present to you today constitute one part of the whole effort to which the American Legion devotes itself. Were we an organization that only asked, I might be hesitant in coming before you today—even though that which we seek is for others. But our record of giving is a source of pride and satisfaction—giving, not only in the field of rehabilitation, where the Legion annually spends $2 million and where thousands of service officers, almost all unpaid, give countless thousands of hours of service; but giving, also, in our other programs, such as child welfare, boys State and junior baseball, in Americanism, and national security.

We are keenly aware that some of our proposals cost substantial amounts of money. I can assure you that the delegates to our conventions bear in mind constantly their responsibility to the public as well as to veterans. We believe that what we seek is right and reasonable. We are convinced that it will always be within the power of this Nation to do that which is right and reasonable.

Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time, our staff will present to your committee the details of all of our specific legislative proposals. We will try, as always, to establish and document their validity and their desirability.

Thank you again for your kindness and for your attention.

OUTLINE OF THE 1962 REHABILITATION LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

(Based on resolutions adopted by the 43d annual national convention, the 42d annual national convention, and by the National Executive Committee at its meetings of November 17-18, 1960, and May 3-4, 1961.)

HOSPITALIZATION AND MEDICAL CARE PROGRAM

Provide sufficient VA hospital facilities—

For all eligible veterans (National Executive Committee Resolution 24, spring 1961): Provide sufficient VA hospital facilities for the care of eligible war veterans, including those suffering from long-term mental and physical disabilities.

For aging and chronically ill veterans (1961 convention Resolution 427): Provide VA with sufficient funds and necessary authority to expand its special hospital and medical care facilities for aging and chronically ill veterans.

For veterans in Alaska (1961 convention Resolution 37): Restore VA's authority (lost by effect of statehood) to provide medical services to eligible war veterans in Alaska through private contract facilities.

Oppose closing of needed VA hospitals—through direct appeal to Congress (1961 convention Resolution 261).

Oppose closing of needed VA hospitals or the diminishing of medical service for eligible war veterans, through continued direct appeal to the Congress.

Provide VA with sufficient funds for operation of medical facilities (1961 convention Resolution 141):

Provide sufficient funds to permit the orderly and continuous operation of VA medical facilities at maximum capacity; and, to carry out the pre- and post-hospital care program.

Maintain adequate salaries in VA hospital system—

For professional personnel (1960 convention Resolution 107): Provide adequate salary structure for VA Department of Medicine and Surgery to the end that the agency will be enabled to attract and maintain professional personnel of the highest quality.

For food service workers (1960 convention Resolution 176): Provide VA with greater latitude in determining the pay scale of food service workers in VA hospitals so that the agency might consider, in addition to the prevailing wages in the community, other relevant factors such as the salaries of other workers in the same hospitals.

Extend eligibility for medical care—

To certain veterans residing outside the United States (National Executive Committee resolution 36, spring 1961): Authorize VA to provide medical care to veterans with service-connected disabilities while they are residing abroad, providing they retain U.S. citizenship.

For certain non-service-connected disabilities on outpatient basis (1961 convention resolution 32): Authorize outpatient treatment, within the limits of VA clinics, of veterans entitled to receive disability pension and in need of such treatment for non-service-connected disabilities.

Expand and modernize State veterans' homes through Federal grants-in-aid program (1960 convention resolution 406): Provide for a grants-in-aid program to assist the States in the construction, expansion, and modernization of veterans' homes (for domiciliary care of war veterans).

Honor the memory of Congresswoman Edith Nourse Rogers by naming the VA hospital, Bedford, Mass., for her (1960 convention resolution 605): Provide that the VA hospital at Bedford, Mass., be officially named the "Edith Nourse Rogers Memorial Hospital."

COMPENSATION PROGRAM FOR SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY OR DEATH

Oppose the requirement of a needs test for entitlement to disability compensation (1960 convention resolution 18): Defeat all attempts, legislative or otherwise, to inject the element of need into the service-connected compensation program.

Grant cost-of-living increases in rates of disability and death compensation; and restore balance and equity to the disability compensation program (1961 convention resolution 373, reaffirming 1960 convention resolutions 29 and 365): Provide cost-of-living increases in the rates of disability and death compensation; and, provide that the amount of compensation payable for each degree of disability less than total shall bear the same relationship to the amount payable for total disability as the rating bears to 100 percent; and, that additional compensation for dependents shall be payable to veterans rated less than 50 percent disabled on the same basis as for veterans rated at 50 percent and above.

Pay a statutory award for each anatomical loss or loss of use plus disability compensation, with limitations (national executive committee resolution 31, spring 1961): Authorize payment of a statutory award for each anatomical loss or loss of use of a creative organ, a foot, a hand, both buttocks, or for blindness of one eye (light perception only), in addition to the basic rates of compensation; provided, that for such purpose the loss or loss of use of more than one creative organ shall be treated as a single anatomical loss or loss of use; and, that the total amount payable shall not exceed the rate payable to a veteran who has suffered the anatomical loss or loss of use of both hands, or both feet, or of one hand and one foot, or who has 5/200 or less visual acuity in both eyes.

Award a total disability rating for certain veterans who are blind if blindness of one eye is due to service (national executive committee resolution 16, fall 1960): Authorize the VA to assign a total rating for compensation purposes to a veteran who is service connected for blindness in one eye, and who subsequent to service incurs blindness in the other eye.

Restore the total rating for total deafness by statute or by revision of the rating schedule (national executive committee resolu-

tion 28, spring 1961): Restore the 100 percent rating for deafness, bilateral, either by a change to the VA schedule for rating disabilities or, if necessary, by legislation.

Increase rates of DIC for widows with children (1961 convention resolution 343): Provide that the monthly rate of dependency and indemnity compensation (DIC) payable to a widow with children shall be increased by $25 for each child.

Liberalize annual income determinations for certain dependent parents by excluding costs incident to death of a spouse (national executive committee resolution 38, spring 1961): Provide that a surviving dependent parent may exclude amounts equal to amounts paid for a deceased spouse's just debts, and expenses of last illness and burial, when computing annual income for purposes of entitlement to DIC.

Permit earlier effective date of awards of increased compensation (or pension) (national executive committee resolution 27, spring 1961): Provide that the effective date of an increased award of compensation or pension shall be fixed in accordance with the facts found (if otherwise in order), rather than from "date of receipt of the evidence showing entitlement thereto."

Of compensation newly authorized by law (national executive committee Resolution 7, fall 1960): Provide that the VA shall award compensation payments, not previously authorized by law, from the effective date of the act authorizing the additional or increased benefit, if the entitling evidence was of record on such date and a claim therefor is received by the VA within 1 year thereafter.

Repeal bar to payment of compensation to a veteran who has received readjustment pay (national executive committee Resolution 8, fall 1960): Amend the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (sec. 265) so as to remove the bar to payment of disability compensation by the VA to a veteran by reason of his having received a readjustment payment when involuntarily released from service.

Extend the presumptive period for establishing service-connection of a psychosis, from 1 to 3 years (1961 convention Resolution 29): Provide that a chronic functional psychosis becoming manifest to a compensable degree within 3 years after wartime service shall be deemed to have been incurred during such service.

Of multiple sclerosis, from 3 to 7 years: (1961 convention Resolution 69): Increase from 3 to 7 years the presumptive period for purposes of establishing service-connection of multiple sclerosis initially manifested after separation from wartime service.

Restore certain remarried widows to rolls if a voidable marriage is legally dissolved (national executive committee Resolution 9, fall 1960): Restore VA's authority to replace a widow on the compensation or pension rolls if her purported remarriage has been properly discontinued because it was voidable (as well as void) on a ground going to the essence of the remarriage.

PENSION PROGRAM FOR NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY OR DEATH

Amend and liberalize the new pension law as proposed in the Legion bill, H.R. 886 (1961 convention Resolution 471, reaffirming 1960 convention Resolution 320): Amend the pension provisions of title 38, United States Code, as amended by Public Law 86-211, by—

(a) revising the tables of disability and death pension rates and the corresponding annual income limitations (see comparison chart on p. 9);

(b) repealing the requirement that certain veterans must count a portion of their spouse's income as their own;

(c) permitting veterans to exclude from the computation of their annual income an amount equal to amounts paid for the expenses of last illness and burial of their spouse or child;

(d) Repealing the $30 limit on the pension that may be paid a veteran while in a VA hospital or domiciliary beyond 2 months, and restoring the former provisions whereby one-half the pension of a veteran without dependents was withheld after the six month of care in a VA hospital or domiciliary, but was paid to him in a lump sum upon discharge.

Liberalize the disability requirement for veterans who have reached age 65 (1960 convention Resolution 59): Provide that a veteran age 65 or over shall be deemed to be permanently and totally disabled for purposes of entitlement to disability pension.

For certain veterans with tuberculosis (1961 convention Resolution 38): Provide that active pulmonary tuberculosis requiring hospital treatment shall be deemed to be permanently (as well as totally) disabling for purposes of entitlement to disability pension.

Permit payment of death pension plus certain social security payments (national executive committee Resolution 30, spring 1961): Amend the Social Security Act so as to remove the bar in section 217(b) thereof to payment of a social security benefit to a dependent of a veteran (on the basis of his death within 3 years after World War II service) if the VA has determined that death pension is payable to such dependent.

In certain inservice-death cases (national executive committee Resolution 13, fall 1960): Provide that the widow or child of a person who died in active service under circumstances precluding payment of a service-connected death award, shall be eligible to receive a nonservice-connected death pension as if the death had occurred after separation from service.

INSURANCE PROGRAM

Reopen the NSLI program for a limited period for certain veterans and under certain conditions (1961 convention Resolution 4, reaffirming 1960 convention Resolution 12): Provide that the VA may issue national service life insurance up to a total of $10,000, upon application received within 1 year from date of approval of authorizing legislation (or from a date to be specified in such act), to insurable and service-disabled veterans of service between inclusive dates of December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, and of June 27, 1950, and July 27, 1953, under policies which provide for a premium charge sufficient to cover the administrative costs.

Forgive failure to timely file for waiver of NSLI premiums in certain exceptional cases (national executive committee Resolution 12, fall 1960): Provide that the VA may grant a waiver of NSLI premiums based upon total disability where such disability commenced before the lapse of a policy and has been continuous thereafter, and there was an official record of such total disability in the VA or a service department within 1 year of the date of lapse; the VA to place a lien with interest against the policy to cover any premiums so waived (and not otherwise waivable under existing law).

Extend NSLI total disability income protection to age 65—subject to certain conditions (national executive committee Resolution 33, spring 1961): Provide for extension of the disability income provisions of NSLI so as to cover total disability commencing prior to an insured's 65th birthday, upon application by the insured before age 60, proof of good health, and payment of such extra premium as the VA Administrator shall prescribe.

Permit certain veterans to increase their NSLI disability income protection without regard to their service-incurred disabilities (1961 convention Resolution 23): Provide that service-incurred disabilities may be waived for the purpose of meeting "good health requirements" in order to permit certain veterans to exchange their $5 per $1,000 NSLI disability income riders, authorized under the Insurance Act of 1946, for the $10 per $1,000 riders authorized by Public Law 85-678.

Establish a "modified life plan" of NSLI to encourage conversion from term insurance (1961 convention Resolution 58): Provide for a modified life plan of NSLI issuable to present policyholders, with level premium rates calculated on the 1958 Commissioners Standard Ordinary Table of Mortality and interest at 3 percent; the face value of such insurance to be reduced by one-half at age 65 (with the insured permitted to replace the amount reduced by payment of necessary premium).

Exempt the proceeds of VA-administered insurance from imposition of the Federal estate tax (national executive committee Resolution 25, spring 1961): Provide that the proceeds of USGLI and NSLI shall not be included for purposes of Federal estate tax determinations.

RETIREMENT AND DISCHARGE REVIEWS; CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

Remove time limits for applications for military reviews and record corrections (national executive committee Resolution 5, fall 1960): Eliminate the time limitations imposed for applying for (1) review of discharges and dismissals, (2) review of decisions of retiring boards, and (3) correction of military or naval records, so as to assure every discharged person a full opportunity to obtain redress which may be accorded by such reviews.

Establish a Civilian Separation Review Board responsible only to the President (1960 convention Resolution 539): Create a Board consisting solely of civilians, to be appointed by the President, whose duty it will be to review all discharges from military, naval or air service except honorable discharges, with full authority to exercise powers of clemency and pardon and to replace any other than an honorable discharge, no matter under what circumstances issued, with any type of discharge it may, in the exercise of its discretion, deem to be just and proper, such Board to be responsible only to the President and not to be connected with any existing governmental department or agency.

LIMITATIONS ON COLLECTIONS; WAIVERS OF OVERPAYMENTS

Limit time for collections, and authorize waiver of recovery of certain erroneous payments by armed services (national executive committee Resolution 15, fall 1960): Establish a statutory limitation of 6 years, from date of any erroneous payment by an armed service to a serviceman or dependent, for institution of collection procedures on behalf of the Federal Government; and, authorize the Comptroller General of the United States to waive recovery of any erroneous payments made under laws administered by the armed services, from any person who, in his judgment, is without fault and where such recovery would be against equity and good conscience or cause undue hardship.

BURIAL AND FUNERAL EXPENSES

Extend time limit for reimbursement claims in certain cases of delayed entitlement (national executive committee Resolution 10, fall 1960): Provide that a claim for reimbursement for burial and funeral expenses shall be deemed to be timely filed, notwithstanding any other applicable time limitation, when a claim is filed with the VA within 2 years subsequent to the date the nature of discharge requirement is met by a change, correction or modification of a discharge by competent authority.

Pay cost of transporting body of veteran from a State home on same basis as for veteran dying in VA facility (1960 convention Resolution 405): Provide that the VA shall pay the expense of transportation of the body

of a veteran who dies in a State home, to a place of burial in the United States, on the same basis as applies for veterans who die in a VA facility.

DETERMINATIONS OF SERVICE CONNECTION

Insist that no agency except the VA determine service connection for entitlement to disability compensation (national executive committee Resolution 14, fall 1960): Oppose legislation that would permit a Federal agency other than the VA to make determinations of service connection for purposes of entitlement to disability compensation.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION FOR PEACETIME VETERANS

Oppose giving programs administered by VA to another agency including a proposed program for peacetime veterans (1961 convention Resolution 540): Oppose any proposal to assign to any agency other than the VA the administration of the proposed vocational rehabilitation program for peacetime veterans, or any veterans' program traditionally within the jurisdiction of the VA.

(NOTE.—Under national executive committee Resolution 28, fall 1959, benefits for peacetime veterans are held generally to be nongermane to the program of the American Legion; and, therefore, are neither supported nor opposed. Resolution 540, above, is to the effect that such benefits do become germane to the Legion's program if their administration substantially affects the operation and existence of the VA).

Rates of disability and death pension under Public Law 86-211 compared with Resolution 320, 1960 convention, reaffirmed by Resolution 471, 1961 convention

VETERAN, NO DEPENDENT

Public Law 86-211		Resolution 320 (and H.R. 886)	
Income range	Monthly rate	Income range	Monthly rate
0 to $600	$85	0 to $1,200	$100.
$600 to $1,200	70	$1,200 to $1,800	$80.
$1,200 to $1,800	40	(Add $70 to above rates for aid and attendance cases.)	
(Add $70 to above rates for aid and attendance cases.)			

VETERAN WITH DEPENDENT SPOUSE OR CHILD

	Number of dependents				
	1	2	3 or more		
0 to $1,000	$90	$95	$100	0 to $2,000	$100 plus $5 each additional dependent.
$1,000 to $2,000	75	75	75	$2,000 to $3,000	$80 plus $5 each additional dependent.
$2,000 to $3,000	45	45	45		

WIDOW, NO CHILD

0 to $600	$60	0 to $1,200	$65.
$600 to $1,200	45	$1,200 to $1,800	$55.
$1,200 to $1,800	25		

WIDOW, 1 CHILD

0 to $1,000	$75	0 to $2,000	$75.
$1,000 to $2,000	60	$2,000 to $3,000	$65.
$2,000 to $3,000	40		
(Above plus $15 each additional child.)		(Above plus $15 each additional child.)	

Congressman Paul Rogers Is Commended for Stand Against Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have spent considerable time and effort over the past 2 years striving to obtain strong action against Castro's Cuba by the Organization of American States and by the U.S. Government. It has been my privilege to have as my stanch ally in this cause the distinguished gentleman from Florida, Representative PAUL ROGERS.

The gentleman from Florida, Congressman ROGERS, diligently pursued his efforts to get the United States to cut off all imports from Cuba and thus stop furnishing Castro with American dollars. He introduced and worked relentlessly for passage of a bill to ban imports from Cuba. The gentleman from Florida's bill was passed without a dissenting vote in the House of Representatives last year. This action, together with the overwhelmingly favorable vote by the House on my resolution calling for OAS action against Castro's government, constituted strong fortification for the four of us who represented the U.S. Congress at the recent Foreign Ministers' Conference in Punta del Este, Uruguay. At that Conference, the representatives of the American Republics arrived at a historymaking decision to expel Castro's Cuba from the OAS and to take appropriate diplomatic and economic sanctions against that Communist regime. Shortly thereafter, on February 3, President Kennedy announced that the United States was banning all imports from Cuba. Three developments were indeed a source of gratification for those of us who had urged for some time that such decisive steps be taken to meet the threat of international communism in the Western Hemisphere.

Through their letters and newspaper comments, the constituents of the gentleman from Florida have voiced their approval of the measures taken against Cuba and have justifiably given their Congressman the credit due him for his viligant fight against communism. The following editorials are indicative of their appreciation of their Representative, Congressman ROGERS, and I feel they should be called to the attention of the Members of the House.

[From the Fort Lauderdale News, Feb. 8, 1962]

CUBAN TRADE EMBARGO PROVES TO BE POSITIVE APPROACH TO DEALING WITH CASTRO

(By Jack W. Gore)

While one of this State's major industries is almost certain to be badly hurt by the almost complete embargo on Cuban trade which took effect yesterday, the vast majority of Florida citizens will roundly cheer President Kennedy's belated decision to take this action.

Months ago Congressman PAUL G. ROGERS of this district started what was at the time almost a one-man campaign to get all trade with Cuba banned. He pointed out that millions of hard American dollars were being poured into Fidel Castro's hungry hands through his trade with this country, and that much of this money was being used to foster the spread of communism through the rest of the hemisphere.

Representative ROGERS was particularly incensed at the manner in which Cuban produce was being permitted to come into this country to compete in the open market with Florida-grown produce, and time after time he took issue with State Department officials and others in the Kennedy administration who didn't want to cut our trade ties with Communist Cuba.

Now, however, what Representative ROGERS was urging fairly early in 1961 is being done at the direct order of President Kennedy, who has finally awakened to the fact that this Cuban trade was not the picayunish little thing some of his advisers made it out to be, and that it actually was helping Fidel Castro spread his vicious propaganda throughout Latin America and build up his armed forces to the point where they could be a threat to our own safety and security.

It is regrettable, of course, that in applying this trade embargo the Tampa cigar industry might be badly hurt. This industry employs a great many people in the Tampa area and many of these people are apt to lose their jobs in the next 6 months if an adequate substitute cannot be found for the Cuban tobacco which goes into the making of almost all Tampa cigars.

Research, however, is already being conducted into growing elsewhere in Latin America the same type of tobacco that is produced in Cuba, and we have even heard rumors about test plots being planted in the Everglades that are producing tobacco leaves of comparable taste and quality to the Cuban variety.

Be that as it may, the important thing about this trade embargo is that, at long last, it represents a positive rather than a negative approach to the Cuban situation, and it is about time we got a little positive in our reaction to what's been going on practically on our doorstep within the past year.

As Congressman ROGERS declared this week, the Cuban trade ban is the kind of

unilateral action which has long been needed to bolster our position against communism and to demonstrate our leadership to the free world.

"The theory of multilateral action in international affairs has been the growing and dominant philosophy in our State Department since World War II," Congressman ROGERS told his fellow House Members this week.

"This concept has reached such proportions that those in the State Department who held the minority view of unilateral action by this Nation have been smothered, their voices muted in the conduct of our affairs. This condition is particularly true in our Latin American policy and painfully so in our handling of Communist Cuba," Representative ROGERS went on to say.

"To have multilateral action, however, there must be leadership and for leadership there must be a leader—and for the leader, unilateral action is at times the moving force," ROGERS declared.

The solid truth of this statement can hardly be denied. The United States has been losing its position of leadership in Latin America, and throughout the rest of the world for that matter, simply because it has refused to lead. We have talked but done nothing, and this policy of waiting until we can get other nations to join us before we take action against a common enemy has been one of the most fruitless policies this nation has ever adopted.

The Berlin wall is a solid example of this point. Reports have it that just as soon as the East Germans started building this wall, American forces were ready and waiting to tear it down as there was little question about its being an infraction of the occupation treaty. But the order to tear the wall down never was issued from Washington, apparently from fear that any unilateral action on our part in this case might antagonize our allies and start something we weren't prepared to finish.

Perhaps the Russians and the East Germans would have reacted violently to any attempt on our part to tear down their wall. But past experience has clearly proved that every time we have taken firm and decisive action against a Communist threat it has been they, and not we, who have ultimately backed away.

In days gone by American presidents and American diplomats never bothered to get the permission of other nations to do something that definitely fell within the realm of protecting our own interests. But with all the international gobbledygook that prevails today, it seems we can no longer do anything without first consulting with the U.N., the OAS, the NATO countries and anybody else who wants to stick a finger in the pie.

We sincerely hope President Kennedy's action in slapping a trade embargo on Cuba this week marks something of a change in policy. To be a leader, a country must act like a leader and it seems to us that one of the big troubles with our Nation today is that we have too many people in too many high places who are content to follow along with the crowd instead of stepping out in front and saying this is what must be done and this is what we are going to do whether anybody else likes it or not.

[From the Hollywood (Fla.) Sun-Tattler, Feb. 12, 1962]

ROGERS MERITS RECOGNITION

Our Congressman from the Sixth District, Representative PAUL G. ROGERS, deserves a substantial measure of recognition for the part he played in the ban on imports from Communist Cuba.

The ban, which was announced on February 3 by President Kennedy, went into effect last Wednesday.

Representative ROGERS had urged the action for a long time. In fact, he urged it at a time when he was virtually alone in taking such a stand. Finally, he was able in the last session of Congress to introduce legislation to ban the Cuban trade, and the legislation was reported unanimously from the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

It then passed the House without a single dissenting vote.

Without a doubt, passage of this legislation strengthened the hand of the congressional delegation at the Punta del Este Conference and cleared the way for the President's action of February 3.

Also, Representative ROGERS has followed up on this action with a speech in the House last Monday in which he pointed up the need for more unilateral action by the United States in its hemispheric dealings and urged that Members of Congress continue to be included in our international conference delegations. Through congressional participation he believes the will of the American people will be better interpreted in our foreign relations.

Representative ROGERS deserves commendation for his accomplishments thus far, and it is to be hoped his actions along these lines will meet with continued success.

[From the Palm Beach (Fla.) Times, Feb. 9, 1962]

IT MIGHT HAVE BEEN THE SOFT SEVEN

When the Organization of American States met at Punta del Este last month to consider ways and means of dealing with the Communist beachhead in Cuba, a bloc of Latin American nations opposed to firm action against the Castro regime won for themselves the nickname of "the Soft Six."

It might have been "the Soft Seven"—including the United States—if some of our State Department softies had had their way.

Florida's Representative PAUL G. ROGERS brought out in a House speech the other day that the advance guard of U.S. diplomats at the OAS meeting almost torpedoed Secretary of State Dean Rusk's eventual success by creating the impression among Latin delegates that the United States had no definite policy to pursue.

"As a result," said Representative ROGERS, "the stage was set for compromise before the drama had begun."

Probably there's no connection whatever, but a few days earlier Senator OLIN JOHNSTON, of South Carolina, after an Internal Security Subcommittee hearing, declared his conviction that William A. Wieland, former Director of the State Department's Office of Caribbean-Mexican Affairs, was hoodwinked into believing that Castro was not a Communist.

Wieland had been questioned by the Senate subcommittee for more than 3 hours. Although he is a career Foreign Service officer, the State Department says it does not consider Wieland's present job sensitive.

Possibly not, but someone in a sensitive position in the State Department, obviously, is still opposed to effective action against Communist Cuba; and, apparently, to any action aimed at victory over communism.

The same soft philosophy is reflected in Pentagon censorship of speeches by our military leaders. And they, like the authors of U.S. blunders in Cuban affairs, seem to have a passion for anonymity.

A corollary of this soft philosophy is the theory of multilateral action in international affairs, which Representative ROGERS told the House "has been the growing and dominant philosophy in our State Department since World War II."

"This concept," he said, "has reached such proportions that those in the State Department who hold the minority view of unilateral action by this Nation have been smothered, their voices muted in the conduct of our affairs. This condition is particularly true in our Latin American policy, and painfully so in our handling of Communist Cuba."

In plain English, it has been decided by our foreign policy brains that we must play the role of the "cowardly lion"—either in fear of adverse world opinion, or of actual retaliation against us by Communist Russia.

Representative ROGERS does not discount the value of multilateral action, but he points out that it requires leadership, and for the leader, unilateral action is at times the moving force. He urged further unilateral action by the United States, such as the Cuban trade ban, to bolster our position against communism and to set an example for the free world.

It is comforting to have a man of Representative ROGERS' forthrightness and vigilance representing us in Washington. We commend his zeal in pushing for an unrelenting fight against communism in our backyard, and we hope he will continue to use the "needle" on slackers whenever and wherever he finds them.

Medicare Polls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, from time to time there have appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the results of polls taken by various Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the subject of financing health care for the aged. This issue, being of importance at the present time, generally has a high place on the list in any questionaire circulated by Members of the Congress.

A compilation has been made of the results of the polls on this matter which have been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The science of taking polls is, at best, in the exploratory stage. Nevertheless, some emphasis has been placed upon preference polls by those who support the social security approach to financing the health care of the aged and it would be interesting and quite helpful if more Congressman who circulate questonnaires would place the results of these inquiries in the RECORD. At present, the polls which have appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD show, as well as can be found in bringing them together, that only about 40 percent of those responding favored the social security approach. This is significantly below the support claimed by its backers. I urge that other Representatives and Senators who have polled their constituencies on this matter place the results of their polls in the RECORD to help us achieve a better understanding of this matter and the support which is given the varying approaches to the important question of financing the health care of our aged.

The compilation follows:

POLLS PRINTED IN CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Representative THOR C. TOLLEFSON, Republican, of Washington, April 24, 1961: Should medical and hospital care for the

elderly be provided through the Social Security Act under a plan calling for an increase in the payroll tax? Yes, 64 percent; no, 33 percent; no opinion, 3 percent.

Senator J. GLENN BEALL, Republican, of Maryland, June 12, 1961: Are you in favor of federally financed medical benefits under the social security system? Yes, 25 percent; no, 65 percent; no answer, 10 percent.

Representative JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Republican, of Ohio, June 12, 1961: Which more adequately reflects your position on medical care: (a) I support a compulsory Federal program of medical care for the aged under social security with the cost of program paid for by increased taxes on employees and employers, 16 percent; (b) I support a voluntary program of medical care for the aged with costs shared by Federal and State Governments out of general tax revenues, 29 percent; (c) I do not believe in Government participation in this field, 48 percent; and no opinion, 7 percent.

Representative DELBERT L. LATTA, Republican, of Ohio, June 20, 1961:

Do you favor a compulsory Federal medical-care hospitalization program for those receiving social security to be financed by increasing social security taxes? Yes, 21 percent; no, 79 percent.

If your answer to (2) is no, would you favor such a proposal if it also included those not on social security but past 65? Yes, 26 percent; no, 74 percent.

Would you prefer that the Federal Government not enter the medical-care hospitalization field? Yes, 70 percent; no, 30 percent.

Representative SILVIO O. CONTE, Republican, of Massachusetts, June 19, 1961: Do you favor:

Compulsory plan, administered by Federal Government and financed by employer-employee increases in social security taxes? Yes, 796; no, 1,292; no opinion, 212.

Voluntary, State-administered plan, financed by State, Federal, and individual contributions? Yes, 1,192; no, 816; no opinion, 292.

Representative GORDON L. MCDONOUGH, Republican, of California, June 7, 1961:

Do you favor a compulsory medical aid plan under social security? Yes, 26.4 percent; no, 73.6 percent.

Do you favor medical aid for the elderly under a plan which would permit all elderly people to benefit, regardless of social security coverage? Yes, 54.1 percent; no, 45.9 percent.

Representative HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI, Republican, of Pennsylvania, June 6, 1961: Do you favor Federal aid (a) to the aged by matching funds to the States (Kerr-Mills)? Yes, 31 percent; no, 39 percent; undecided, 30 percent. (b) To the aged by the social security method? Yes, 59 percent; no, 27 percent; undecided, 24 percent.

Representative PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR. Republican, of New Jersey, May 24, 1961: Do you favor medical care for the aged tied to social security? Yes, 53 percent; no, 39 percent; no opinion, 8 percent.

Representative E. Y. BERRY, Republican, of South Dakota, May 3, 1961: Do you favor medical care for the aged under the social security program not based on need, pushing the payroll tax to 10 percent by 1969, applicable only to those covered by social security? This program has been proposed rather than the State-administered program covering any needy person enacted by Congress last year. Yes, 19 percent; no, 70 percent; not certain, 11 percent.

Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON, Republican, of Ohio, March 22, 1961: Do you favor a health insurance program tied in to the social security system? Yes, 58 percent; no, 35 percent; no opinion, 7 percent.

Representative E. C. GATHINGS, Democrat, of Arkansas, May 8, 1961: Do you favor medical and health care for social security beneficiaries financed by increased social security taxes? Yes, 32 percent; no, 64 percent; no opinion, 4 percent.

Representative BURR P. HARRISON, Democrat, of Virginia, May 17, 1961: Do you favor legislation which would provide health protection for people over 65 years of age? Yes, 1,160; no, 176; uncommitted, 35. If so, should it be under social security ssytem? Yes, 859; no, 260; uncommitted, 254.

Representative TOM V. MOOREHEAD, Republican, of Ohio, May 22, 1961: Which one of the following do you support:

(a) A compulsory Federal program of medical care for the aged under social security with costs borne by increased taxes on employees and employers? Yes, 27.51 percent; no (blank); no opinion, 6.20 percent.

(b) A voluntary program of medical care for the aged with costs shared by the Federal Government from general tax revenues and the individual beneficiary? Yes, 39.84 percent; no (blank); no opinion (blank).

(c) No medical care for the aged involving Federal Government participation? Yes, 24.65 percent; no (blank); no opinion (blank).

Representative PAUL G. ROGERS, Democrat, of Florida, May 17, 1961: Do you favor the proposal to make a compulsory medical care plan for the aged part of the social security program? Yes, 55 percent; no, 45 percent.

Representative ALFRED E. SANTANGELO, Democrat, of New York, May 4, 1961: Do you favor legislation granting annually 60 days of hospitalization, nursing care and surgical expenses for retired pensioners under social security system in lieu of present law which provides that Federal Government will match State expenditures for programs for retired pensioners earning less than $2,500 annually or who are welfare recipients? Percentage results in entire district: Yes, 74 percent; no, 26 percent. Percentage results above 96th Street at East Harlem section: Yes, 87 percent; no, 13 percent.

Representative HAROLD R. COLLIER, Republican, of Illinois, May 29, 1961: Do you favor—

Assistance limited to social security recipients by increasing social security tax rates? Yes, 30 percent; no, 59 percent; no opinion, 11 percent.

Assistance to all citizens over 65, based upon criteria of need, with Federal Government and States sharing the cost? Yes, 55 percent; no, 35 percent; no opinion, 10 percent.

Representative MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH, Republican, of Illinois, June 26, 1961: Do you favor a Federal medical care program for the aged? Yes, 40.8 percent; no, 32 percent; no opinion, 27.2 percent. If so, do you prefer—

(a) Extension to all over 65, based on need, with Federal Government and States sharing the cost (present law)? Yes, 50.1 percent; no, 21.3 percent; no opinion, 28.6 percent.

(b) Increased social security taxes on employees and employers to cover social security beneficiaries only? Yes, 19.1 percent; no, 38 percent; no opinion, 42.9 percent.

Representative ROBERT J. CORBETT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, July 17, 1961: Should medical care for the aged be financed through social security (Forand plan) rather than some other way? Yes, 55 percent; no, 45 percent.

Representative GARNER E. SHRIVER, Republican, of Kansas, August 1, 1961. Do you favor medical care to the aged financed through: Social security—yes, 30.5 percent; no, 64.5 percent; uncertain, 5 percent. Federal grants to States—yes, 38.5 percent; no, 49.9 percent; uncertain, 11.6 percent. No Federal program in this area—yes, 4.9 percent; no, 45.3 percent; uncertain, 13.8 percent.

Representative SAMUEL S. STRATTON, Democrat, of New York, July 20, 1961. Do you favor hospitalization insurance for retired persons as part of an expanded social security system? Yes, 70.7 percent; no, 22.7 percent; undecided, 6.6 percent.

Representative DAVE MARTIN, Republican, of Nebraska, July 5, 1961. Should we increase social security taxes to provide free medical care for pensioners, despite the fact that many are not covered by social security? Yes, 11.2 percent; no, 81 percent; not sure, 7 percent.

Representative WILLIAM G. BRAY, Republican, of Indiana, August 28, 1961. Do you favor increase in social security taxes to provide a compulsory Government program for medical care of persons over 65? Yes, 30 percent; no, 67 percent; no opinion, 3 percent.

Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, of New Jersey, August 23, 1961. Do you favor a Federal program of medical aid for the elderly? Yes, 72.5 percent; no, 21.25 percent; no opinion, 6.25 percent. Through Federal aid to States, each State to administer the program on the basis of need? Yes, 50.5 percent; no, 49.5 percent; no opinion ——. Through social security? Yes, 62.5 percent; no, 37.5 percent.

Representative CLARK MACGREGOR, Republican, of Minnesota, January 10, 1962. Do you favor medical care for the aged under social security? Yes, 33.7 percent; no, 50.6 percent; no response, 15.7 percent.

Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, January 23, 1962. Do you favor providing medical and hospital care to recipients of social security benefits and paying the cost by increasing payroll taxes? Yes, 33.3 percent; no, 66.7 percent.

Senator Hayden

SPEECH

OF

HON. OMAR BURLESON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I join with Senator HAYDEN's many other friends and colleagues in warmest and heartiest congratulations on his 50th anniversary in the Congress of the United States.

It has been my privilege to have a rather close association with the Senator during the last several years as his vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing. I have greatly benefited from that association.

Never have I had anyone be more kind and considerate, both personally and officially, than Senator HAYDEN. In deepest sincerity, I say that Senator HAYDEN is one of the most lovable characters I have ever known, and I wish for him many more years of devoted service to our country and to the great responsibilities which he carries in the Senate of the United States. It is an inspiration to know a man of such great stature and influence but who is also humble and modest. Senator HAYDEN is an example of one who, having great power and authority, uses it sparingly, carefully and responsibly. To me, this is the principal attribute of greatness.

I extend warmest congratulations to Senator HAYDEN and to the State of Arizona and our entire Nation for the opportunity of his wisdom and his services.

Action Needed in Chronic Unemployment Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1962

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the most puzzling phenomena is taking place in America today. In almost every corner of this country, there are distressed areas, bankrupt companies, and chronic unemployment.

All this can be traced directly to the effects of our trade policies. A massive offensive has been maneuvered by our own Government officials, aided and abetted by registered foreign agents, foreign country publications, conflicting and contradictory statistics, pamphlets, speeches, and news releases, to further demoralize the economy of this country, with a so-called expanded free trade program.

Mr. Speaker, for the RECORD, I would like to present the case of two production facilities—one in your home State of Massachusetts, and one in my home State of Pennsylvania. I would like to present two resolutions for the record. One passed the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, which follows:

TEXT OF RESOLUTION BY MASSACHUSETTS LEGISLATURE CALLING FOR ACTION BY CONGRESS AND ADMINISTRATION ON THE PERMANENT CLOSING OF THE EAST BOSTON LAMP WORKS BY THE GENERAL ELECTRIC CO.

Whereas the General Electric Co. has recently announced the permanent closing of their East Boston Lamp Works, and the transfer to the South of the work now done here; and

Whereas General Electric's excuse for moving is that they can manufacture cheaper in the South and be better able to compete against Japanese imports; and

Whereas a majority of the 450 affected employees have more than 15 years' service, and some as much as 40 years' service, in specialized jobs; and

Whereas many shopkeepers, tradesmen, professional people and the community itself will also be adversely affected; and

Whereas this is only the latest of a long series of similar moves by General Electric and other corporations; and

Whereas the continued prosperity and well-being of the Commonwealth is contingent upon the elimination of the unfair practices and conditions used to solicit the runaway shop; and

Whereas the problem of the runaway shop, which constitutes a threat to the Massachusetts economy, cannot be solved as a Massachusetts problem alone but requires a broader national solution: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts takes note of the existing general attitude of helplessness which now permits these runaways with the resultant losses to employees and communities; and

Respectfully urges the House of Representatives of Massachusetts to petition the Federal administration and the Massachusetts congressional delegation to take whatever steps are necessary to convince General Electric to rescind its order to move this work out of Massachusetts; and

Respectfully urges the Federal administration and the Massachusetts delegation to take the necessary measures, by tariff, quota, negotiation or other appropriate means, to prevent the complete domination of the domestic lamp market by imports; and

Respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to prevent the runaway of companies to backward areas by establishing standards of responsibility, by setting up national standards of basic conditions and preventing the giveaways now being used to solicit business; and

That the secretary of the Commonwealth forward copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Presiding Officers of both branches of the Congress, and members of the Massachusetts delegation.

The second is resolution pertaining to a Pennsylvania plant recently affected by a closedown order:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF UE LOCAL 125 IN SCRANTON, PA., TO KEEP 500 JOBS IN PENNSYLVANIA

Five hundred workers in the Scranton area are faced with the loss of their jobs. This catastrophe developed when on February 2 this year, the General Electric Co. announced that they were going to close their tube plant in that city. UE Local 125 represents the 300 production workers involved and there are also 200 salaried workers employed there. This latest irresponsible action by GE is totally uncalled for. It is a flagrant disregard for the economic well-being of the people of Pennsylvania.

The facts are that the GE Scranton tube plant is a profitmaking installation. Seventy percent of the work done there is on Government defense orders. The Scranton area is classified by the U.S. Department of Labor as a "major area of substantial and persistent unemployment" with a rating that places it among the worst economic areas in the country. The Scranton area is the most distressed area in which any of the GE tube plants are located.

Under these circumstances it appears that the General Electric Co., one of the country's major corporations and one of the three or four top companies in defense production, to withdraw some 500 jobs from Scranton would run counter to Federal area development policies and endanger State efforts toward rehabilitation of the area.

General Electric Co. can not be allowed to get away with this irresponsible action: Therefore be it

Resolved, That UE District Council No. 6 and all local unions do everything possible to prevent this loss of jobs to our brothers and sisters in Scranton. That we call upon all our Congressmen to join with Representative Scranton, Senator Clark, and Governor Lawrence as well as all State legislators to use their authority and influence to stop this move by GE; and be it further

Resolved, That we demand that our National Government exercise a strong policy in regard to the issuing of defense orders so as to insure against the loss of jobs in situations as persists in Scranton today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what do we find in just these two cases. We find that even before the passage of the new trade plan we have workers who need the relief promised in the new Trade Adjustment Act.

Is it not just as true that as far back as 1957, Senator Kennedy, from Massachusetts, now President Kennedy, proposed his first Trade Adjustment Act?

The Trade Adjustment Act of 1957, introduced on August 30 as S. 2907 by Senator Kennedy, of Massachusetts, is specifically related to the destructive impact of the trade agreements legislation. In Senator Kennedy's own words:

The assistance which it proposes is made necessary by the trade policy of the United States. The sudden economic reversal which these industries suffer is the result of governmental action in lowering tariffs. It is therefore the responsibility of the Government to at least lighten the blow.

This first serious warning of the destructive effects of our trade policy was followed by an amendment offered by the same Member of the Senate (and others), to the distressed area bill, giving first priority for relief to communities "affected adversely by the reciprocal trades agreements."

Knowing this, and recognizing the damage already inflicted upon our job economy and being told bluntly by the proponents of the new trade bill that further inquiry will be the result of the passage of this act, how can any Member of Congress—knowing this—vote for this proposal and still be representing the best interests of his constituents and the workers of our Nation?

By what twist of the imagination can a Member justify a vote that takes one man's livelihood away from him, with a promise to retrain him for a job yet to be created or discovered for him?

Is it not true that the twin purposes of trade are first, profits, and second, jobs for a community's workers? The most astonishing thing that seems to be part of the program of the proponents of this new trade policy is the utter lack of consistency, or even an attempt to follow their own avowed purposes of creating a free trade world.

Let us look at two protectionist developments that are being pushed by the same people who claim that protectionism is dangerous, contrary to our welfare and an assist to the Communist bloc.

First. The President has asked the Tariff Commission to establish a base for increased tariffs on cotton textile imports to protect American textile mills against unfair competition because of higher costs of raw materials to U.S. producers. At the same time, this Nation is leading a fight to establish protectionist quotas by agreements with 18 other nations on textile exports.

Second. The President's new sugar law program would eliminate the subsidized premium priced sugar quota system and in lieu, institute a flexible tariff to protect high cost American sugar producers. The following article is here included:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 27, 1962]

SUGAR LAW PROSPECTS FADE AS THE ADMINISTRATION AND CONGRESS DISAGREE

Differences delay the bill Kennedy has promised to submit to adjust the U.S. market to loss of Cuban supplies. He wants to replace the premium price U.S. importers pay for sugar with a variable import fee to protect high-cost domestic producers, and to quit parceling out shares of the U.S. market to individual foreign lands. He would let them compete freely instead.

One wonders whether the Congress of our Nation is ignorant of these facts or is just so confused by the mixture of diplomacy and economics, contradictory statistics and political considerations that facts no longer count.

Enough news does get out about what other nations are doing in the matter of trade policies to give any Member who wants to analyze this issue sufficient reason to pause before committing this

Nation to a policy that will continue the nonreciprocity of the Reciprocal Trades Agreements.

Just yesterday's Wall Street Journal carries a story on Mexico substantiating my public statement made in early January. At that time I called attention to Mexican plans to force American auto manufacturers to produce in Mexico or be faced with an embargo.

I quote from the Wall Street Journal:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 27, 1962]

YANKS IN MEXICO—U.S. FIRMS OFFERED BIGGER MARKET SHARE IF THEY BUILD PLANTS—GOVERNMENT BANS IMPORTING OF MANY AUTO PARTS; FORD MULLS $25 MILLION FACILITY—CARBIDE FINDS CAPITAL SHORT

(By Donald A. Moffitt)

MEXICO CITY.—Near this busy capital, a white brick assembly plant where Studebaker-Packard de Mexico, S.A., was producing cars and trucks a few weeks ago now sits idle, its steel gate padlocked.

Studebaker-Packard Corp., of South Bend, Ind., owner of the Mexican firm, is offering the plant for sale. Its 850 former employees are looking for other jobs. Production of West German Volkwagens and Swedish Volvos, assembled under contract at the plant, also is cut off. The reason for the shutdown: Mexico has canceled Studebaker-Packard's license to import vehicle parts.

Similar bans have been imposed against 12 other auto makes, including General Motors Corp.'s Vauxhall and Pontiac.

STRICTER MEXICAN TERMS

Systematic efforts of this type are making it increasingly evident to American businessmen here that their future participation in Mexico's economic development will be on stricter Mexican terms. President Adolfo Lopez Mateos, under pressure from the left but also with the support of Mexican businessmen, is goading his country toward "the most rapid economic development compatible with the national interest and well-being of the population."

If Mexico can persuade foreign firms to build components in Mexico it can not only provide more jobs for Mexicans but also reduce fiscal problems that are partly a result of high imports.

Mr. Speaker, I find it hard to believe that a group of duly elected Representatives of the people can allow this type of foreign noncooperation by removing Congress completely from the trade-and-tariffs policies of the United States.

Sooner or later we must readjust our trade acts.

Caribbean Cruise Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend section 613 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to require Government-subsidized U.S. passenger vessels, which have been given permission to operate Caribbean cruises, to stop at the ports of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands on each cruise.

Since the Merchant Marine Act already authorizes the payment of operating-differential subsidy for these cruises, it is only fair to require U.S. ships cruising the Caribbean to make stops at these U.S. pòrts. It would be indeed unfortunate if these beautiful parts of the United States were not seen by our cruising citizenry.

Needless to say, these islands have much to offer the tourist. In turn, our dollars would not be dissipated in foreign markets, but rather the American dollar would aid in the economic development of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, a responsibility which is largely ours to share.

This legislation is especially needed at a time when our Government is concerned with the flow of the American dollar and its effect upon the U.S. gold reserve, and has the personal support of both Governor Muñoz-Marin of Puerto Rico and Governor Paiewonsky of the Virgin Islands.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation and earnestly request that it be given early and favorable consideration by Congress.

Glenn's Fighting Spirit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles from the Pittsburgh, Pa., Press concerning Colonel Glenn's courage on his astronautical feat last week.

The articles follow:

COURAGE—GLENN'S FLIGHT INSPIRING

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Oldtime auto racing driver Barney Oldfield was an extraordinarily bad driver in city traffic. One day in Los Angeles he hit an immense street-paving steamroller that was standing still.

To friends, he explained he just couldn't think clearly under 100 miles an hour.

Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., is much different. He seems always to think clearly. What a man.

When we see courage, competence, modesty, and patience tested as the whole performance tested this American, the spiritual uplift given all of us is of itself a great reward.

For there is too much emphasis in our country on personal rights and not enough on personal responsibility. Colonel Glenn reversed this.

All the centuries from Moses to Faraday and from Faraday to this cosmic age, and all the zones from the man-cradle of Turkey to some new Texas county rode in that capsule.

The industry, science, art, geography, mathematics, physics, and mind of the whole human race were accumulated in this interlacing of the tens of thousands of threads which necessity wove into *Friendship 7's* production, the flight, and the recovery.

THE GIANT SUN

The age of world exploration began with the Portuguese captains in 1418. And when the efforts of several centuries brushed aside the curtain which concealed the system of the worlds, we discovered that the sun possesses 333,000 times the material the earth has.

There were in Glenn's sight other suns in space that are a million times bigger than our sun.

Colonel Glenn is aloft. The ephemeral perceives the eternal. The heaven was high and clear, he said. There was a great glory in this sky.

The stars, appearing in a fragile, shining mass with the vast tapestry of celestial needlepoint behind them, were radiant as a weave of silver, thrown with gusto and great assurance from one horizon to the other.

And against all this the greater stars stood out so clearly, suspended, each alone and each alive, each in its place like a jewel in a velvet box, yet each traveling through the heavens at a speed beyond comprehension.

How constantly we overstate what we know and understate what we do not know. And how magnificently surprised we can be when we reach even the end of this decade. Imagine what wonders we will, no living person could possibly guess today one-tenth of the future's truth.

MORE ORBITS SLATED

The first help will come from more orbits around the earth. Then Project Gemini in 1963 or 1964, with two astronauts in the same vehicle. Then Project Rendezvous, the hoisting of small loads for celestial assembly into a space observation station.

Once assembled there in outer space, these observation vehicles will circle the moon. Then the moon shot itself, about 1967, but surely in this decade.

The geography class of the future will be a class in astronomy. Our intellectual lives will begin with the going down of the sun and the gradual appearance of those mighty neighbors in space that will interest the most thoughtful men and women of tomorrow in the universe.

GLENN'S ORBIT FLIGHT PLEASES READERS

Thank you, John Glenn.
It's great to be an American.
Mr. and Mrs. CHARLES DOUGLAS.

WORLD CAN BELIEVE STORY OF JOHN GLENN

On Tuesday the world stood still, not just one country, because we showed the world the feat of our astronaut, Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, and his flights around the world.

This the world can believe. They were all watching.

NICHOLAS MARINI.

Dangers in Dairy Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, as you all know, I come from one of the important dairy producing areas in the Midwest. We have a vital interest in the dairy problem and the dairy legislation that might be enacted by this Congress. The President has submitted his proposal for a dairy program.

In connection with the President's dairy program one of the best editorial comments that I have seen on this subject was published in the Dairy Record on February 7, 1962. The Dairy Record is one of the outstanding dairy trade papers in this country published in St.

Paul, Minn. It is widely read within the dairy industry, and its point of view is highly regarded by leaders in the industry.

I would like to submit at this time this particular editorial entitled "Courageous but Dangerous."

COURAGEOUS BUT DANGEROUS

In many respects, the recommendations made by President John F. Kennedy to Congress on the urgent problem of milk surpluses was a courageous one. The milk surplus is like a cancerous growth that keeps enlarging and enlarging, and, unless drastic steps are taken, the problem becomes almost impossible of solution.

There is little in it that comes as a surprise, for practically all of his recommendations have been enumerated in Dairy Record prior to the time that he addressed his message to Congress.

We state that it is a courageous act on the part of President Kennedy, for it is an election year and quotas to most milk producers are extremely distasteful. They would prefer to go along as they have been. The Government has been a very good customer for dairy products, the price has not been bad, and, furthermore, no matter how much each individual producer increased his output of milk, he knew that the Government stood ready to buy everything that he produced.

Generally speaking, the farmers whose principal business is to produce milk have been fully aware that the situation as it has been for years could not continue indefinitely. They have become increasingly aware of it since the Kennedy Administration took over, and numerous farmers went to great pains during 1961 to step up their production on the assumption that some control plan was not too far in the future.

The administration itself has done a rather skillful job of conditioning milk producers to the idea, and the program as outlined by the President is going to be a powerful club to use on every milk producer to force him to vote affirmatively in a referendum, providing, of course, that Congress approves the administration bill. Producers will have almost no other recourse than to approve the program, in view of the threat to reduce the support price to 75 percent or lower. In effect, the plan lays down an ultimatum to the producers that they either accept the program or the Government will make dairying so unprofitable for producers that economics will force a voluntary reduction in production.

No mention is made in the Presidential message whether the control plan would be all inclusive and extend to every farmer owning one or more cows or whether there would be an exemption for those milking only a few cows. Unquestionably, this will be clarified in the farm bill as presented to Congress and it is highly important that it should. There should be no exemptions, for it is those farmers who are milking cows as a sideline who are in no small part responsible for the existing milk surplus.

That, of course, brings up the matter of administration which, at best, is going to be so tremendous and involved that it staggers the imagination. Dr. Harlow Halvorson, of the University of Wisconsin, who favors controls, has stated that a tentative estimate is that it will cost a cent a hundredweight, or roughly $12½ million. We would challenge that figure. It is going to mean that handlers are going to be burdened with a mountain of bookwork which will require additional employees and of course it will mean the employment of hundreds of Government supervisors, accountants, administrators, and those in other capacities to keep check on every producer and handler, as well as many others who will have to unsnarl the snafus which inevitably will develop.

There is nothing mentioned in the Presidential message concerning the importation of dairy products. Are these to be supported as they have been and is the price for their supports to come out of the $300 million fund to be set up by the Government and the penalty payments which are to be put into the monetary pool? There needs to be elaboration on that point, and we also would like to have the President or Secretary Freeman elucidate what the policy is going to be on the nonquota importation on Colby cheese, which is coming into the country at the rate of 20 million pounds or more annually.

President Kennedy speaks glibly of getting dairy prices up to about 90 percent of parity under the base-allotment plan, in order to compensate for reduced production. That is attractive bait to dangle before producers, but what about the consumer reaction? Consumer resistance to butter prices have been directly responsible for increased usage of margarine and we are very certain that oleo manufacturers will be delighted if butter prices are raised still more.

The proposal to set the base on 1 year, 1961, is not sound or even fair. As mentioned previously, many farmers, and especially has this been true in some of the Federal order markets, increased their production to an inordinate extent last year, going on the assumption that some control plan possibly would be put into effect and they wished to have a high quota. On the other hand, a producer's output conceivably could have been cut sharply in 1961 because of disease, drought or many other factors. Setting a base period of 1 year is unrealistic and certainly there should be no valid argument or good reason against using an average of the last 3 years' production.

The history of production controls has not been outstandingly successful. We do not feel that President Kennedy's milk control plan holds much promise. It could, turn out to be a tremendous fiasco.

This particular editorial makes several points about the administration's proposed dairy program better than I can. You will note that in about the fifth paragraph this editorial points out that the administration has done a rather skillful job of developing a program that will be used to force dairy farmers to vote affirmatively for their production control program. I am vigorously opposed to the alternatives provided in the administration's dairy legislation. I hope that the House Agriculture Committee will work out alternatives that can be presented to dairy producers whereby they will not be forced to have a production control program if they do not wish one, but yet have reasonable price support protection.

The second point made in this editorial has to do with the exemptions. The editorial points out that it is highly important that the question of what type of exemptions should be clarified by the Congress. Would a farmer with 1, 2 or 10 cows be exempt? This is an important question and should not be left up to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The question of the kind of exemption has an important relationship to the cost of administering this proposed dairy control program. The editorial points out that one of the outstanding dairy economists has indicated that the administrative cost for carrying on this type of program would be a cent a hundredweight or roughly $12½ million. This in itself is a tremendous amount of money. Added to the amount that the Government would have to pay is the amount the milk producers, handlers and processors would have to pay to keep the necessary records. Will the dairy industry get this much greater income as a result of the control program?

The third point raised in the editorial which I think must be considered in connection with the dairy program has to do with the importation of dairy products. The bill makes no mention of how the importation of dairy products would be handled. There is no question that the higher price support level proposed by the administration would serve as a magnet to draw additional dairy products to this country. Is this approach consistent with the administration's request for expanded international trade?

The fourth point in this editorial, which is a very important one, deals with the suggestion that dairy prices under the program would be set at about 90 percent of parity. As the editorial points out, this is an attractive figure to dangle in front of dairy producers; but what about consumers? Is it fair to assume that they will continue to purchase the same amount of milk and dairy products if this program results in higher retail prices? I think this is a question that cannot be ignored by the dairy industry as they discuss this particular proposal. They have had enough experience to know that consumers can and will substitute other foods for milk and dairy products.

This editorial closes on what I consider a very significant statement. It says:

> The history of production controls has not been outstandingly successful. I would not feel that President Kennedy's milk control program holds much promise. It could turn out to be a tremendous fiasco.

I think this statement states better than I my point of view as to the administration's dairy program. I hope that it will be rejected.

An Address by Hon. James S. Bush, Director, Export-Import Bank of Washington, December 13, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address by the Honorable James S. Bush, a Director of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, at a luncheon sponsored by the Bankers Association of Monrovia, Liberia, on December 13, 1961, at the Ducor Palace Hotel in Monrovia, Liberia.

Mr. Bush's excellent address follows:

ADDRESS BY JAMES S. BUSH, DELIVERED AT A LUNCHEON SPONSORED BY THE BANKERS ASSOCIATION OF MONROVIA, LIBERIA, DECEMBER 13, 1961

Mr. Chairman, your excellencies and distinguished guests, first, may I pay tribute to

the eloquent and, indeed, very moving address delivered last evening by our good friend, Charles Sherman. He made it abundantly clear that freedom and liberty carry heavy obligations as well as precious privileges. I feel that my whole trip to Africa, pleasant as it has been, was made worthwhile by listening to Secretary Sherman's words of wisdom.

The world is progressing at a furious pace and countries around the globe are bursting with activity, most of them bent on developing their own resources to the fullest possible extent to the end that their peoples may improve their way of life and the governments increase their incomes at home and abroad. The accomplishment of these worthy objectives would, of course, result in the balancing of the domestic budgets and improving the foreign exchange positions of the countries involved. These international balance of payments can, as you know, be helped in two ways: first, by exporting more against payment in hard currencies, and second by creating new industries and activities which will manufacture or assemble products which were formerly imported. Thus, foreign exchange is either created by increased sales abroad or savings are effected by utilizing domestic resources, both in products and in personnel, to the fullest possible extent.

The Export-Import Bank of Washington was originally created by the U.S. Congress in February 1934. Its sole purpose was to finance foreign trade between the United States and Russia. However, a clause in the legislation required that World War I debts owing to the United States be settled satisfactorily before any credits could be authorized. This did not materialize and consequently the original Export-Import Bank did not extend a single loan. Later in 1934 a second Export-Import Bank was created for the sole purpose of financing U.S. trade with Cuba. Several loans were made to Cuba to enable that country to purchase silver in the United States and have it coined into pesos at the U.S. mint in Philadelphia. All of these loans were fully repaid on schedule. Finally, the First and Second Export-Import Banks were combined and the new Bank was authorized to finance U.S. foreign trade with all friendly countries around the world.

Since then, Eximbank, as it is known in common parlance, has extended credits of $12 billion in 70 separate countries. Our largest loan to one private enterprise was $115 million to enable four U.S. copper companies to develop a huge mine in the high mountains of southern Peru. The smallest private loan was for $500 to enable a small U.S. manufacturer to sell a plowshare to a customer in Brazil. In number of transactions, the small and medium sized loans are preponderant. We process some 50 credits and guarantees each week and, on the average, 48 or 49 out of the 50 are of small and medium proportions.

In the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961, Eximbank disbursed $526 million in 43 countries and collected repayments of principal and interest of $528 million from borrowers abroad. Eximbank has $1 billion capital, all owned by the U.S. Government, and, in addition, is authorized to borrow $6 billion from the U.S. Treasury at going rates of interest. After paying several hundred million dollars in dividends, we have retained $675 million as earned surplus and as a reserve against catastrophic losses, which, we pray, will never materialize.

Our activities fall into four main categories: First, the issuance of guarantees to U.S. commercial banks and exporters to insure them against losses due to war, expropriation, inconvertibility and other events beyond the control of either the exporter or his customer. This cover is also extended to credit and commercial losses due to protracted default or bankruptcy. The U.S. exporters and banks, of course, pay fees for this protection and in all cases the exporter retains 15 percent of the credit for his own account and risk. This follows the pattern of other exporting nations which insure their exporters, such as England, Canada, West Germany, France, Belgium, Italy, the Union of South Africa, and others.

Second. Eximbank has, historically, extended credits to U.S. exporters, either directly or more recently in participation with U.S. commercial banks. We shall continue to make financing available to our exporters and banks, but we hope that the private financial institutions in the United States will provide most of the funds, with Eximbank providing adequate guarantees. The Congress has directed us to "aid and facilitate the foreign trade of the United States" and it is our intention to carry out this mandate to the fullest possible extent.

Third. The third category, and by far the largest in dollar amount, is actual lending of money to assist foreign countries, both in the public and private sectors, to establish thermal and hydro electric plants, steel mills, chemical plants, papermills, port facilities, glass manufacturing, hotels, agriculture, roads and highways, mining of all sorts, railways, and many other types of installations which develop the economies of the borrowing countries. Eximbank's loans pay for the U.S. dollar costs involved in these projects. Thus, the dollars do not leave the United States, only the goods and services that are exported.

These loans run from 5 to 20 years, always repayable in semiannual installments or even quarterly, and bear interest at going rates which, at present is 5¾ percent—this rate being the same to borrowers in Africa, Europe, Asia, South America, or elsewhere. We now have $71 million either committed or actually on loan to Liberia, mainly for iron ore mines, electric powerplants, highway equipment and water and sewage facilities. Our relations with this great Republic have been splendid and we are looking forward to many more years of business together that will be profitable to Liberia and to us.

The fourth category that has been interesting to us in recent years has been the extention of lines of credit to development banks in such countries as Argentina, Chile, Venezuela, Japan and Spain.

These lines of credit are especially designed to make it possible for small- and medium-sized business concerns in foreign countries to purchase U.S. equipment on a sound credit basis and at reasonable interest rates. The businessman borrows from the development bank which, in turn, is reimbursed by Eximbank. Upon receipt of documentation showing the U.S. purchases, Eximbank will credit the development bank's account in New York, Chicago, or any other American city. These transactions are automatic, except when the development bank might wish to make an unusually large loan. In this case, the details of the projected loan must be sent to Eximbank in Washington which, in turn, will study them and, if everything is in order, give its approval. However, as previously stated, the normal transactions are automatic with no previous review by the Directors and staff at Eximbank.

Eximbank will continue to expand its facilities around the world, Africa included. The President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, has taken a keen interest in Eximbank's activities and has provided us with stimulating leadership. We must remember, however, that Eximbank, with a lending authority of $7 billion, is devoted primarily to financing the export of U.S. goods and services, included ocean freight. Our borrowers, whether public or private, provide their own funds for local costs, working capital, et cetera.

We, at Eximbank, do not feel that we are giving anything to anyone and, contrariwise, we don't believe that we are being given anything. The very largest percentage of our loans is based on the proverb "The Lord helps him who helps himself" and I am glad to say that our best friends abroad have been those who have repaid punctually.

No businessman wants charity, but rather the opportunity to earn a good living for himself and his family—he wants a place in the sun to progress, an equal chance with others to compete. He is entitled to this, and such a man or such a country will always find a receptive ear at the Export-Import Bank of Washington which will continue to be dedicated to sound business, to sound loans and to assisting sincere hard-working peoples who are our friends and who want to progress and enjoy the same opportunities to which all free men and women are entitled.

I am honored at being accorded the privilege of addressing this distinguished group which is dedicated to the development of the great continent of Africa and I wish you Godspeed in your efforts.

Editorial in Roosevelt Junior High School Magazine, Compton, Los Angeles County, Calif., by Student Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted, I am pleased to present to the attention of your own distinguished self and every Member of this 87th Congress, and any others who may read it, the text of an editorial written by the student editor of the very distinguished Roosevelt Junior High School, Compton, Los Angeles County, Calif., weekly magazine, which is named Lionews.

I am sure you and every other Member of this legislative body will join with me in complimenting this junior high school student editor for this informative and pertinent editorial appearing in their magazine for all of the students and faculty of this very important junior high school located in the great 23d District of California, which I have the honor and responsibility of representing in this my 16th year, to read.

I respectfully submit that there is no doubt in my mind, but that the daily living and example of this principal and his faculty associates in a vigilant, patriotic, proud manner as American citizens, has had a definite beneficial influence for these students under their daily guidance to pattern by.

The editorial follows:

WHETHER GOOD OR BAD, DESTINY IS OUR HERITAGE

Our American heritage is many things. It is our famous written documents, as the Bill of Rights, the Constitution, and the Declaration of Independence. Or our heritage may be thought of as our vast country, natural resources, natural beauty, highways, free enterprise, libraries, public parks and recrea-

tion areas, our high standard of living, and free public education.

Most of us though, never think to realize that our heritage is not all as good as the things just mentioned. There are also things that we have and will inherit that we wish we had not, such as the cold war, our national debt, and religious and racial prejudice. Most of us didn't have anything to do with starting matters like this, yet these things are our heritage and someday our problems.

We are now in the midst of a cold war. A war of words against the enemy. Words that try to convince and break down the strength of our Nation. Words that tell of evil plans. Words that lie. In the time of a cold war no one really feels secure. We know that any moment we could be destroyed and vanish from the face of this earth.

America has an extremely large national debt. The cause of this is war, mainly. Our debt has been rising since the Revolutionary War until at present it is approximately $11 billion. If there is a World War III, our national debt would increase so much that it would never be completely rid of. Briefly, this is another problem the future generation will inherit.

Maybe one reason why some people consider our Nation weak is because, in a way, we are not one people working for the benefit of our Nation. Why? Because of religious and racial prejudice. Some people just don't seem to be able to live in the same world as those with a different colored skin or strange religion. For some reason these people feel inferior to the others. This is very wrong, and until all of the American people can get along together and work together in this free land of ours, we will not be considered as one nation. This can be accounted as a third problem that, someday, we will inherit.

Our American heritage is all of these things, good or bad. These are the things we have inherited and our children will have as their American heritage.

An Address by the Honorable James J. Saxon, Comptroller of the Currency, February 9, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, James Saxon is one of the most competent Americans presently serving his country in the Federal Government. His knowledge and understanding of the American banking community is extensive and finds few equals.

On February 9, 1962, Mr. Saxon delivered the following address before the Bond Club of Toledo at Toledo, Ohio, in which he discussed the role of the Office of the Comptroller in the American economy:

REMARKS OF JAMES J. SAXON, COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY, BEFORE THE BOND CLUB OF TOLEDO, TOLEDO, OHIO, 7:30 P.M. FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1962

Over the nearly a century of its existence the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, which is the oldest regulatory agency in the Federal Government, has been concerned principally with the basic function of maintaining the solvency and liquidity of our great national banks throughout the country. Time has brought pervasive changes, however, in the tasks which our national banks must perform, and these changes have altered significantly the responsibilities of the Comptroller's Office. If our national banks are to play the role they must in the growth and development of our economy, their operations must be attuned more sensitively to the requirements of today and of the future. The need for a reappraisal of the functioning of our banking system is urgent, and we have made it the first order of business of this Office to reexamine the laws, procedures, policies, and practices which affect these operations.

A week ago we began the first full-scale investigation of our national banking system which the Office has ever undertaken. Every significant aspect of the operations of our national banks will come under close scrutiny in the course of this study. We are drawing on the experience of the heads of all the national banks, and on their thoughts and reflections concerning the problems they have faced, and we anticipate that we shall assemble from these sources the most comprehensive factual evidence that has ever been available concerning the actual functioning of our national banking system. I have appointed a distinguished group of bankers and lawyers as an advisory committee to assist me in appraising this evidence, and in devising measures to meet the problems which are disclosed.

This, however, is only the first step in the adaptation of our national banking system to the modern economy. This initial study shall be concerned principally with the powers and functioning of commercial banks. Significant as these surely are, there lie beyond these matters at least two further and vital aspects of our commercial banking system which require the most intensive reexamination.

The first, on which I shall shortly announce an inquiry, concerns the proper role of competition in the field of banking. The banking industry presents unique problems of public policy because, while it is competitive, it is not—nor may it properly be—fully competitive. Banking stands midway between industries such as the public utilities, and those industries in which we rely principally upon the maintenance of essentially unregulated private competition to serve the public interest. It contains elements of both these basically divergent philosophies.

Like the public utilities, entry into banking is controlled by public authority. And there is intimate public supervision of bank lending and investment policies. Unlike the public utilities, however, only certain maximum rates are publicly set for banking services, and the provision of these services is not mandatory. There is thus, within these limits, scope for the exercise of private initiative in the field of banking. This mixture of public regulation and private competition in banking is today a source of uncertainty and dispute.

The issue, put simply, is this: What role should the competitive factors play in the regulated industry of banking? The criteria of the antitrust statutes do not seem appropriate for the publicly regulated industries. The antitrust statutes are designed to maintain private rivalry free of explicit public control, where the public depends upon such private competition to serve its needs. Where reliance is placed upon private initiative to make the basic choices concerning investment, output, and prices—as is true in the nonregulated industries—the public authorities stand outside the decisionmaking process and act merely to sustain rivalry. To achieve this purpose, it is indispensable that full freedom of entry for new competition should be preserved.

In sharp contrast are the objectives and policies which characterize the public control of banking. The effective functioning of any economy which has advanced beyond the stage where individuals produce solely for their own consumption, requires a reliable monetary medium, and a confidently accepted means of storing and investing savings. To achieve these aims, above any other consideration bank solvency and liquidity must imperatively be assured, and the supply of money and credit must be made responsive to the monetary and fiscal policies of the Government. These have always been, and inevitably must be, public functions—and they inescapably entail public control over the entry of new competition in the field of banking. How can the performance of these tasks, which require that the basic decisions be made by the public authorities, be reconciled with the fundamental reliance upon private decisions which is embodied in the philosophy of our antitrust statutes?

In the current merger cases this basic issue may not specifically be before the courts. These suits rest solely on antitrust grounds, and the courts thus have no occasion to review the other considerations which the banking agencies must take into account in merger cases. Unfortunately, therefore, the broader public-interest criteria which necessarily guide banking policy are not being faced explicitly by the courts. Judicial review which meets all of the issues cannot be achieved unless means are found to place these broader criteria specifically before the courts.

There are many subordinate problems which grow out of this fundamental issue, and which must be examined. As examples, I would cite these questions: How is the size of banks related to their efficiency; at what point are the cost advantages of size counterbalanced by the limitations over rivalry which result from a reduction in the number of bank competitors; how important a role does the preemption of desirable locations play in the opportunities for new competition to develop in the field of banking; do our present Federal and State banking laws inhibit the achievement of the most efficient pattern of banking facilities; what are the proper areas of competition to be considered, and do these vary with the types of banking services offered; what account should be taken of the competition of financial institutions outside the field of commercial banking; should bank holding companies be treated according to the same principles as bank mergers?

Of special concern are the limitations of choice which now hamper the bank supervisory agencies in carrying out their responsibilities to insure that the convenience and needs of the public for banking services are met. Many State laws now limit or prohibit the privileges of branching and of bank holding companies. These State standards seriously impair the discretionary power of the Federal banking authorities. As a result, undue reliance has often had to be placed upon new bank charters, mergers, or holding companies, depending upon the facts in the individual case. Strong pressures are now being mounted to accede to the unnatural use of these devices, without regard to their suitability to the needs of the individual community or area. This course would serve only to fortify these discriminatory inhibitions of the present State and Federal statutory structure, and thus obscure its evident and serious weaknesses contrary to the public interest.

The broader the range of choices which are open to the bank supervisory agencies, the more likely it is that the public's needs will be served to best advantage. These needs will vary with the circumstances in indi-

vidual cases, and the public authorities should have at hand the full complement of tools which may be required. This point cannot be stressed too emphatically. The need was never more urgent to assure the free flow of capital to its best uses throughout the country. Such mobility is indispensable if our economy is to grow and prosper to its full capacity.

The second additional area which I propose to examine intensively is the international role of our commercial banking system. Today, only five of our commercial banks perform a major function in our international trade and commerce, and these are confined to three large metropolitan areas. In most sections of the country, too little attention has been paid to this essential and growing function. All of the evidence points clearly to the fact that in the years ahead we shall have to devote increasing efforts to this field of banking operations.

It is interesting to note that the two most significant developments which have taken place with respect to the international operations of our commercial banks over the past half-century have been the results of postwar developments. After the First World War, we sought to fill the gap in our export trade which had been financed to a significant extent by our governmental aid programs, through the passage of the Edge Act which was designed to broaden the scope of private financing of this trade. Neither the Edge Act, nor the related agreement corporations, ever flourished. The outlets for financing facilities within our own domestic economy were so great during the intervening years that, by comparison, foreign opportunities rarely seemed sufficiently attractive.

The reduction in our governmental economic aid programs within recent years has once again brought resort to new measures to stimulate our export trade. Early this week a new plan to deal with this problem was placed in operation. The approach this time is to encourage commercial banks throughout the country to participate more actively in financing our export trade, under the protection of a system of export credit insurance which spreads the risks of such transactions and sets specific costs for meeting these risks. The condition of our international balance of payments has brought this development in our public policy, and our commercial banks must be prepared to adapt their operations to this new task.

The challenge to our imagination and ingenuity, and to our dispassionate concern for the public interest, as we undertake the task of reappraising our national banking system, is undeniably great. The hope that, with the help of all who know its problems, it may yet achieve its full potential for the national well-being, is worthy of that challenge.

CSA Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues have received copies of the CSA Voting Index and I suppose that this index has been disseminated around the country. It was very difficult for me to understand the rationale behind the votes selected as key votes in this index and it certainly was difficult to understand the conclusions drawn from the compilation of these votes. Hon. BRUCE ALGER has written a letter to Mr. Kent Courtney, national chairman, the Conservative Society of America, New Orleans, La., making pertinent comments in regard to this voting index. Mr. ALGER, of course, was in a position to write this critical letter inasmuch as he had a 100 percent record according to their standards.

The letter is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 19, 1962.

Mr. KENT COURTNEY,
National Chairman, the Conservative Society of America, New Orleans, La.

DEAR MR. COURTNEY: Thank you for sending me a copy of the CSA Voting Index. I think you have done a fine job of compiling the voting records of Members of Congress on the most vital issues affecting our Nation and the freedom of the people.

I would be derelict in my duty to you, as a friend, if I did not point out that your conclusions in which you attempt to prove there is no difference between the parties contradicts the excellent job you did in the compilation. I am sure you are much too sincere in your efforts to protect our free enterprise system than to allow faulty reasoning to detract from your efforts. It is in this spirit and as a friend that I feel I must point out to you the fallacies proved by your own figures.

YOUR CONCLUSION

In your foreword you repeatedly attack the Republican Party for "trying to outdo the Democratic Party, in appeasing the Communists and outbid it in spending the taxpayers' dollar—a pale copy of the Socialist, Communist-appeasing Democratic Party." On page 14 you state, "It was members of the Republican Party which gave Kennedy his margin of victory on five key bills in the 1961 session of Congress."

THE ISSUES

Now, Mr. Courtney, let us take your own figures on the very next page on these five key issues. On area development 17 percent of those for were Republican and 83 percent were Democratic; feed grains bill only 2 percent of the Republicans voted for the bill; raise minimum wage, 30 percent of the vote was Republican and 70 percent was Democratic; cultural exchange, 40 percent Republican, 60 percent Democratic; foreign aid, 28 percent Republican, 72 percent Democratic. With those lopsided percentages, how can you possibly justify the claim the parties are the same or that the Republicans gave Kennedy his margin of victory?

THE CONGRESSMEN

On page 55 of your book you show 38 Members of the House voting from 70 to 100 percent conservative and only 3 of the 38 you list are Democrats. How can you then substantiate your claim that there is no difference between the parties, using your own figures?

On page 59 you list 47 Congressmen from big cities who vote 90 to 100 percent pro-Socialist and only 1 of these is Republican. On page 80 you name 81 Congressmen with a 100 percent pro-Socialist voting record and on page 62 there are 36 Congressmen with a 90 to 99 percent pro-Socialist record and not a single Republican among them. Take these three pages and your own figures show that out of 163 Congressmen with a 100 percent of nearly 100 percent pro-Socialist voting records there are 162 Democrats and 1 Republican and then you claim there is no difference between the parties.

THE COMMITTEES

Let's take your figures on the committees. In this area your findings are completely erroneous as a result of striking an average of the entire committee membership. By this method you prove nothing in comparing the attitude of the parties. The only way you can show a party comparison is to take the average of Democratic committee members as opposed to the average of Republican members. Comparing the averages of Democratic members and Republican members we find, as examples, Appropriations, Democrats, 25 percent conservative, Republicans, 53 percent; Banking and Currency, Democrats, 7.5 percent, Republicans, 46 percent; Labor and Public Welfare, Democrats, 2.4 percent, Republicans, 40 percent. These are Senate committees. Figures on the House side are equally lopsided.

If you carry out the party averages in your table on page 68 we find in the House the Democrats come up with an overall average for all committees of 14 percent conservative against a Republican average of 50 percent and in the Senate, Democrats 16 percent against Republicans 57 percent. Granted that 50 percent and 57 percent are far from perfect (and how happy all of us would be if we could attain perfection, but we know it is not possible) the difference between 14 percent and 50 percent and 16 percent and 57 percent certainly is enough to prove that the parties are not the same to any degree.

I could go on and on through your compilation. In every table you prove conclusively that the Republican Party is far more conservative than the Democrats, but you ignore your own findings in summing up. This is no brief for those Republicans who consistently vote the liberal way, but it is a plea to you not to jeopardize the great work you are doing by being blind to the facts. In the foreseeable future there is little chance that a third party movement would be successful. That means the conservatives have their best hope within the Republican Party. Your efforts to becloud the relative positions of the parties can only lead to confusion in the minds of the voters and result in the reelection of those who support the radically led Democratic Party.

I want to remain your friend and have you for mine because I believe we are both fighting for the same cause—the future of this great land of ours. We weaken this cause when we allow ourselves to become vulnerable as a result of juggling figures to prove some special point in which we feel we have a particularly personal interest.

With kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

BRUCE ALGER.

Recovery Doesn't Produce Those Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious of the many domestic challenges confronting our Nation today is the problem of maintaining full employment in the face of an expanding labor force and the continued displacement of workers by automation.

This week as we consider the important bill relating to manpower development and training I would like to call my colleagues' attention to a very thoughtful article by Bernard Nossiter which appeared in the Washington Post on February 25.

Mr. Nossiter has examined several critical facets of the problem of how

we insure adequate employment and wages for our country's workers, and I urge my colleagues to give this article their careful attention and consideration:

"RECOVERY" DOESN'T PRODUCE THOSE JOBS

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

In blunt language, President Kennedy has singled out the task of finding jobs in an automation era as the gravest domestic challenge of the 1960's.

His press conference words 10 days ago probably startled citizens enjoying the fruits of the affluent society. "Hasn't everything been going up but prices?" they might have asked. We've had recovery for a year now. What's all the fuss about?

The President's words, moreover, seemed out of joint with his own Economic Report. That document held out the prospect of a rising wave of output shrinking unemployment to 4 percent by the middle of next year.

One clue to Mr. Kennedy's concern may lie in some dull-looking figures compiled by the Labor Department a few days before the President spoke out. These statistics showed that the current recovery in production has yielded the fewest additional jobs of any in the postwar period. Moreover, they showed that each of the four recoveries has had increasingly less power to expand jobs.

For each of the four postwar business cycles, the Labor Department counted the gain in wage and salary jobs outside of farming 11 months after recovery had gotten underway. In other words, the last slump hit bottom in February 1961 and the Department counted the number of nonfarm payroll jobs that had been added by January 1962; the the previous slump hit bottom in April 1958, and the Department counted the jobs in March 1959, and so on.

Here's what the comparison revealed:

INCREASE IN NONFARM JOBS 11 MONTHS AFTER CYCLE TROUGH

1948–50	3,462,000
1953–55	2,170,000
1957–59	1,942,000
1960–62	49,000

The weakness of the latest recovery shows up more graphically if this comparison is made:

INCREASE IN NONFARM JOBS 11 MONTHS AFTER 11TH MONTHS AFTER CYCLE TROUGH

1948–50	2,405,000
1953–55	1,427,000
1957–59	1,306,000
1960–62	99,000

Was this because the latest recovery just wasn't as strong generally as the other three? No, that's not the answer. Output of goods and services has risen about as rapidly in the 1961–62 recovery as it did in the three earlier advances.

What all this indicates is that it takes many fewer persons to turn out the same amount of goods, that productivity rose at a staggering pace, that machines are now doing much more of man's work. (The soft word "indicates" is used advisedly because the period involved here—11 months—is so short that economists are reluctant to draw hard conclusions about productivity from it.)

In other words, it looks as if the old link between rising output and rising jobs has been wrenched severely. One trouble with this conclusion is that it flies in the face of the best economic analysis.

Studies by the Joint Economic Committee and Mr. Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers agree that automation has not made any new contribution to the unemployment dilemma. The President himself reflected this view at his press conference and in his economic report when he said that rising output by itself would solve much of the unemployment problem.

In line with this view, he has proposed relatively small scale programs to train a few hundred thousand youths and retrain about the same number of older unemployed workers.

Virtually every business spokesman has scouted the notion that automation has caused or will cause an employment problem. Management insists that the new industries and new demands created by advancing technology will, over time, supply all the new jobs that are needed.

However, the suggestive evidence of the Labor Department's figures and similar studies elsewhere are raising some disquieting doubts about the belief that a conventional rise in output will call forth the historic number of additional jobs.

There is in all this, too, another source of concern: if the administration's theory is correct, where will the demand come from to call forth the extra output that will yield the needed jobs? The administration's answer is clear: from the private economy, particularly from business investment.

For the year starting July 1, the Government plans to run a surplus that, measured in terms of economic impact, will take out $4.4 billion more from the spending stream than it will put in. Private citizens in general and the business community in particular are counted upon to counteract the drain.

This optimism has caused considerable anguish among some of Mr. Kennedy's strongest supporters in the academic world. A recent symposium conducted by Prof. Seymour Harris of Harvard uncovered opposition to the balanced budget from such Kennedy stalwarts as Prof. Paul Samuelson of MIT and Alvin Hansen, formerly of Harvard.

But even if the private sector performs as buoyantly as the administration expects, some doubt persists that it will yield enough of an increase in jobs. On top of the deficiency caused by any spurt in technological advance, the Nation will soon be confronted with an enormous increase in the number of youths looking for their first job.

Thanks to the birth explosion of the 1940's, the number of new job seekers in this decade—after subtracting those who will retire—is expected to average 1,350,000 a year. That is 50 percent more than the 900,000 who came in annually during the 1950's.

Naturally enough, the trade unions have been making the loudest cries about the shortage of jobs. In negotiations with management, however, they have gotten virtually nowhere in coping with this problem.

The unions' solution of spreading the work through shorter hours has run into an unyielding wall of employer opposition in every industry where jobs and not labor is scarce. The administration's opposition also has been so strong that the hard-pressed United Steelworkers, for one, have virtually taken the shorter workweek demand off their bargaining table in Pittsburgh.

An AFL-CIO economist, Nathaniel Goldfinger, said a few days ago: "Collective bargaining procedures between unions and employers can provide cushions for the workers who are displaced. But collective bargaining itself cannot solve this problem."

And if the suggestive statistics are really pointing to a new era of explosive technological advance, a whole new order of problems is at hand. One of the more thoughtful union leaders, President Ralph Helstein of the Packinghouse Workers, has explored some of them.

"Will we not have to change our ideas, because of the new technology, as to what constitutes work, and how income is provided?" he asks. "Over the centuries, income for most of humanity has depended on work. Is there a necessary relationship between income and work? That is, without work can there be income?

"There are thousands of Americans whose current income is unrelated to work. There are other thousands whose current income reflects work done at some previous point in time, either by themselves or their forebears. This suggests that income and work are not tied together by inexorable laws but rather by the traditional operations of our economic system. The problem is: How do we assure income for workers if work is not available?"

Glenn a Symbol of Renewed Confidence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, many wonderful articles and editorials have been written about our national hero Lt. Col. John Glenn. Among them is an excellent and timely article written by Mr. Ross Cunningham which appeared in a recent edition of the Seattle (Wash.) Post Intelligencer. The article follows:

GLENN A SYMBOL OF RENEWED CONFIDENCE

(By Ross Cunningham)

Not since V–J Day signaled the final victory in the Second World War have the American people enjoyed such exhilaration as came from the success of Astronaut John H. Glenn's triple circuit of the earth.

In Seattle, as everywhere in our country and many parts of the free world, Glenn's orbiting was followed with admiration for the scientific feat, and a kindred feeling of almost breathless hope that he would complete his mission in safety. Perhaps many of Glenn's ground followers were more anxious than the cool-nerved astronaut himself.

And the rejoicing afterward was as tremendous as it was spontaneous.

One may assume that the feat made a lasting impression on the people of America—and also that it left distinct impressions abroad in lands where doubts have been growing about the resourcefulness and abilities of the United States.

In out own country, one may at least hope that there were imprinted lasting impressions of renewed confidence in our own free form of government, our institutions, our political system, ingenuity in the fields of science and technology and the dedication and abilities of our armed services—with a marine, in this instance, being our symbol that America is not a decadent democracy.

It has seemed to this writer over the past couple of decades that Americans have engaged in so much self-criticism—which has been mimicked by friends and foes abroad—that we have been endangered of self-defeatism.

This negative attitude, it might be interpolated, has been encouraged by domestic Communists in our midst with the active if not willful assistance of too many fuzzy thinkers who have held that if the country isn't run precisely the way they think it ought to be run, we are on the rough skids.

Certainly we have enough things wrong in this country, but not as many as exist in many countries abroad where fingers are pointed toward us because we engage in so much self-criticism in our efforts to make things better here—and to help them.

We have in fact become a nation which has attached too much importance to se-

curity, when in fact there is no such thing as security in the troubled world; we have largely forgotten, or ignored, that America was built by men, women, and children who placed store in opportunity. How long has it been since anyone heard about the great opportunities in America? They are greater in the United States than ever before—and much greater than anywhere else.

What middle-aged or elderly person of substantial wealth or affluence in our midst who is a straight thinker would not trade his position, if he could, with one of the youngsters of school age today who has the world and its opportunities before him?

Yes, we live in a world of hazards, but what age didn't have some kind of hazards? The opportunities of today—if more time were spent on contemplating them than seeking elusive security—are greater in America than ever before for the person who will take advantage of them.

It was not very many years ago that John Glenn was a freckle-faced boy in a small town, as there are millions of such boys—and girls—today. His prospects of getting somewhere were about average for the course. He took advantage of opportunities afforded to him, which are available to the average youngster today, and through application, courage, and about the same avearge of breaks that are available to the average youngster, he became America's first globe-circling astronaut.

Glenn has made his place in history, and it is an enviable one. All youngsters cannot become astronauts, although many of them may live to travel in outer space. But the opportunities for really great feats and self-satisfying accomplishments are ready and waiting for the takers who are willing to spend less time in search of security which cannot be found—and reach for the opportunities which abound on every hand.

If Astronaut Glenn's feat dispels even a part of the self-defeatism which is America's geratest hazard, it can be as inspiring as the scientific and technological strides by this Nation's free-enterprise system which permitted millions of persons everywhere to thrill to his voice from outer space.

Americans, You Are Not Easy To Understand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week I called attention to the current issue of the monthly magazine of the International Rotary Clubs. The entire issue is devoted to projection—a magnificent projection, I might add—of the American image. At this time, I would like to quote an article by Father R. L. Bruckberger, the French Dominican priest, author of the widely and properly acclaimed book "Image of America," which was published by Viking in 1959. Father Bruckberger is a man who has lived in the world, with collateral duties that would tax even a man who does not have his primary obligations to the religious aspects of life. He was a World War II commando and chaplain of the French resistance, movie producer, editor of an anti-Communist magazine, chaplain of the French Foreign Legion in North Africa, and a writer of books. He came to live in the United States, and during his 8 years here desired to "look, to listen, and to learn America, as if I had never even heard of it."

The article in the Rotarian is an adaptation of his book, and after reading this short piece, I am sure many will want to read or reread his longer commentary.

May I point out particularly in the article Father Bruckberger's remarks in the third paragraph:

The greatest fault you have—seems to be not so much a fault as the inability—to make yourselves known for what you are. Americans, you are not easy to understand, and perhaps for that very reason you are hard to love. But from the moment one begins to understand you, one realizes with a shock that the portrait of America and Americans accepted throughout the rest of the world is not a likeness but a caricature.

Erasure of this caricature and projection of the true image of America and Americans are among the objectives of the current campaigns of Rotarians and the little-people-to-little-people program. They are objectives worthy of our full support.

The above-mentioned article follows:

Americans I have come to love America. The Europeans who visit your country do so for a variety of reasons—sometimes out of curiosity, sometimes out of necessity, and sometimes merely in order to be able to say, "I know America, I have lived there."

In my case, I arrived in your country in May 1950, just before the outbreak of war in Korea, and I stayed 8 years. I have traveled from coast to coast, and in some ways I probably know the country better than most of you do yourselves. Like other foreigners, I too could write satirically about it, and earn the applause of all those in Europe and elsewhere who make a career of their contempt for America. Indeed, a book of that kind might even bring me a certain success in America itself. But my experience has not been conducive to satire. Now, after the 8 years I have spent in your country, I can say that I feel about it what I feel about a friend, that it has brought new meaning to my life, that the mere knowledge of its existence makes me happy and proud to belong to the human race and to the same civilization. America has given me a hope for man's future that I did not have before.

This does not mean, of course, that I am unaware of your faults. If one were to love only the faultless, one could love no one but God; but quite apart from this fact, even your faults do not lessen my respect for you, and in friendship this is what counts. Indeed, most of your faults I rather like. The greatest fault you have, as a matter of fact, seems to be not so much a fault as the inability—an inability of which you may even be proud—to make yourselves known for what you are. Americans, you are not easy to understand, and perhaps for that very reason you are hard to love. But from the moment one begins to understand you, one realizes with a shock that the portrait of America and Americans accepted throughout the rest of the world is not a likeness but a caricature.

You have a keen sense of privacy which, translated into terms of international relations, means isolationism. You love your country; you are always happiest when you are at home and among compatriots, and this is quite natural. Your country is vast enough, rich enough, roomy enough to put you all at your ease. You go on the principle that "God helps those who stay at home," and you sincerely believe that this is the key to peace. At the same time you deploy your troops, your planes, and your battleships all over the world, and now and then you use them. You accept this as temporarily unavoidable and blame it on those tiresome Russians who refuse to behave. Deep in your hearts, you look back with nostalgia to the day when America had no world responsibilities. Since you are not imperialists, having all you need at home, you long for the return of a day which for you was so peaceful. But you may as well make up your minds that that day will never come again.

The foundations for unifying our planet have already been laid. They are not of a political or religious nature. The most solid of them is the technological progress that has already changed part of the world and tomorrow will change the rest of it. The spirit in which modern industrial enterprise is undertaken may vary from country to country, but its structure remains substantially the same in America as in Russia, in Western Europe as in China. Industrial enterprise separates ownership from responsibility for what is owned; it collectivizes not only capital but the means of production and labor itself; and it concentrates all authority in the hands of management. It profoundly alters and reshapes traditional social relationships within the community and the family, as it does those between nations. Modern industrial enterprise has raised the standard of living, multiplied the conveniences, and advanced social progress. Thanks to modern industrial enterprise, America has eliminated the proletariat. Western Europe is on the way to attaining the same goal; so too is Russia; and China, through mass production and mass distribution, will also no doubt attain it tomorrow.

Walter Lippmann makes clear the precise point at which Communist propaganda becomes identified with the hopes of the overpopulated and underprivileged nations. For these nations, the example of America and Western Europe carries no weight. They cannot see a future for themselves in a process as slow as the industrial growth of America and Western Europe has been. By contrast, the industrial growth of Russia and China is taking place with such lightning rapidity that every last nation, no matter how backward, no matter how overpopulated, now sees the possibility of conquering poverty in the span of a single generation.

The imposture of Communist propaganda lies in the fact that Marxism has had nothing whatever to do with technical and industrial progress. A hundred years ago the Communist Manifesto foretold that the old system of production would be destroyed. And the old system of production is indeed in the process of being liquidated all over the world. But it is not Marxism that has brought this about. It is not because of Marxism that Russia and China are increasing their industrial power so rapidly and raising their standard of living; it is because they have adopted the industrial methods invented and perfected in the West. Their present pace of industrialization is possible only because the West explored a virgin territory and blazed the trail.

In 1912, at the time Henry Ford was launching his assembly line and demonstrating the phenomenal efficiency of his industrial methods, America and America alone embodied, for the poor on every continent, the hitherto inconceivable hope of throwing off the harsh yoke of poverty and achieving a decent standard of living, dignity for the individual, and political independence all at the same time. Today that hope is divided. Although the underprivileged peoples still want their independence, they are now ready to sacrifice individual freedom to national or racial dignity, even when independence turns out to be illusory. But what they

want first and foremost is to escape from the servitude of poverty and achieve a decent way of life. Through a tragic misunderstanding which in 1912 could not possibly have been foreseen, it is no longer the Americans who hold out that hope today; it is the Russians and the Chinese. You Americans neglected the noble role you could have played, and now you have been robbed of it. You alone had that opportunity at the start of the century; it is up to you to recapture it, not only for the security of the West, but for its honor.

Americans, you know how to defend yourselves in war. Why are you so inept in peace? You win wars, yet you lose revolutions. In this modern era, however, revolution conquers more surely than war. War can win territory. But revolution, when it wins territory, wins hearts as well. Russia has mastered the art of revolution. It has succeeded, on the one hand, in identifying communism in the minds of the poor and underprivileged with an industrial progress available to the most backward peoples and with immediate victory over poverty, while, on the other hand, it has succeeded in identifying America with capitalism and all its past but unforgotten and heinous crimes, with war, with imperialism, with the systematic exploitation of the poor by the rich.

You are right to resent the horrible caricature of America and Americans that Communist propaganda has drawn. But alas, resentment leads nowhere; it never solves a problem.

Walter Lippmann is quite right in saying that it is not enough to answer propaganda with propaganda, that there must be some grandiose, spectacular, and immediate action, and he suggests that America dedicate itself to making India a modern industrial power.

I wholly agree with Mr. Lippmann, but allow me to say that the situation also requires an effort of the intellect and a reappraisal of words. I hold it very much against you that you insist upon using the word "capitalism" to define your economic and industrial structure. You who are the greatest traveler in the world should ask yourselves what people outside America think of the word "capitalism." To them, capitalism stands for imperialism, for the exploitation of the poor by the rich, for colonialism. It is a dishonored word, and one that breeds terror. You may well pay a visit to the moon, but you will never rehabilitate the word "capitalism" in the eyes of the world. Why, then, do you persist in clinging to a word which makes it so easy for Communist propaganda to impale you on the horns of that absurd dilemma; either capitalism and poverty, or socialism and the liberation of the poor?

Americans, it is your misfortune, as it is the misfortune of the entire West, that you were the first, and until now the only, nation to drop the atom bomb on open cities. It is an added misfortune for you and for the West that you used the atom bomb against another race. It does no good to tell us that you were compelled to drop it, and that this terrible act, by shortening the war, saved more lives than it destroyed. The rest of the world remains unconvinced that you were compelled to drop the bomb. But the entire world is absolutely convinced that, even if you were compelled to drop it, you should have gone about it differently. The entire world is absolutely convinced that you should have given some warning, a limited demonstration, and that this act of destruction, the most frightening act ever to have been decided upon in the history of man, was decided in too great haste.

I will concede that not all its results were disastrous. It may well be that the memory of Hiroshima restrained the Russians at a time when, with your armies demobilized and Western Europe defenseless, there was nothing to keep them from advancing to the Atlantic coast. But even if true, this still proves that the use of the atom bomb served only the interests of the West. It only confirms the underdeveloped peoples in the belief, implanted in their minds by the Communists, that the West is prepared to go to any murderous extreme to preserve its material supremacy.

Americans, I do not touch upon this sensitive point—a point, by the way, to which you yourselves seldom refer—merely for the pleasure of setting your teeth on edge. I am deeply convinced that you will never be able to overcome and defeat Communist propaganda unless you fully understand its roots. If you choose to ignore the world's grievances against you, your country is indeed imperiled, and with your country the whole of the West.

Americans, when one loves America, when one is certain beyond the shadow of a doubt that it embodies the best hope on earth for the West and indeed for mankind, and when one sees how stubbornly you refuse to face the realities of your situation, one is seized with despair. For I am deeply convinced that if America does not do what it is up to America to do, and do it quickly, the world is very close to being lost. By the world, I mean this world, man's world with his individual and concrete liberties, his life on earth, a human life worthy of being lived.

It is not yet clear how to solve the problem of disarmament and still preserve our security, but there can be no doubt that this is the problem at the heart of man's anxiety.

Another aspect of the world situation, an aspect which would be less dangerous for the West if the unification of the world were not taking place so rapidly, is the imbalance between the relatively prosperous peoples of North America and Western Europe and the underfed millions of Asia and Africa who spend their lives on the verge of famine. The industrialized nations, primarily the Western nations, which comprise only 14 percent of the world's population, enjoy 55 percent of the world's income. This disparity is constantly becoming greater as a result of the prodigious increase in population in the underdeveloped countries.

First Russia and now China have shown us that the most backward peoples can achieve industrialization very rapidly indeed. This means that all those other nations that still hunger today have only to make the effort and they too will become powerful. Does anyone imagine that, once powerful, they will remain hungry and resigned? This planet of ours is like a nightmare ocean liner. In the first class, a few well-fed passengers live luxuriously in spacious quarters, while on the decks and in the holds all the rest of the passengers are herded together in hunger and misery. Who can fail to see the dynamite in this situation?

The West is close to having solved the social problem. To all intents and purposes, you Americans have solved it. You no longer have that bitter, obdurate antagonism between rich and poor which for so long has characterized it. It still exists, however, but now it is on a world scale, and this makes it all the more serious and urgent. If we are to save the world, and specifically the West, the antagonism between poor and relatively rich nations must at all costs be prevented from becoming more virulent; the gap that separates them must at all costs be closed. It is in this light that Walter Lippmann's proposal with regard to India assumes its true significance. Nor is it any less important, any less urgent, to prevent this worldwide social problem from being further envenomed by racial hatred. That is why I believe it to be of burning import for America to reach an honorable solution of its racial problem and for France to succeed in its effort to construct a European-African community.

I am aware that, by tradition as well as by temperament, you Americans like to take your time, advance prudently, make sure at each step that you are on solid ground. But time is running out. With the very real possibility that within 10 years the industrialization of China could bring us to the brink of a war that would set the colored races and the backward nations against the white race and the West, there is not a moment to be lost. If we want to save not only the West but the world, a world in which we are at least free to breathe, we can no longer tolerate anything whatever that might tend to create an irreconcilable rift between the proletarian and the capitalist nations, between the colored races and the white.

Remember, Americans, the time has now run out. Those delays, those cautious measures, those formulas for compromise at which your politicians so excel, are not only contemptible but dangerous and grotesque. It is a disgrace that a negligible white minority should be able to prevent the full implementation of your Declaration of Independence and deprive your Negro citizens of their right to frank and fraternal acceptance in the community, and it is just as much of a disgrace that the great majority of your people, believing as they do in integration, should nevertheless continue to allow, year after year, a handful or racists to nullify the law of your Republic.

Americans, it is time to recognize that the Declaration of Independence is not yours alone. That solemn Declaration was made not just for you, but for everyone; not just for the men of one time, the 18th century, and one place, America—but for the whole world and for all the generations of mankind.

Your task is to extend the Declaration of Independence to the whole world, to all nations and all races. If you are to remain worthy of your heritage, you must now help solve the social problem between proletarian and capitalist nations, and the racial problem between white and colored peoples. The West would be doomed, and you eternally shamed, if today you proved incapable not only of fulfilling the splendid hope of the Declaration of Independence in your own country, but also of bringing that hope to the rest of the world. It will mean your everlasting glory and salvation for mankind if, as I believe and hope, you can find it in you to proclaim and defend once again the right of all men to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and determine to consecrate your utmost strength, labor, and generosity to the task of making it possible for all men, in America and throughout the world, to enjoy these rights to the full.

Bulgarian Liberation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, Americans of Bulgarian descent observe Bulgarian Liberation Day on March 3 of every year. The independence of Bulgaria dates back to March 3, 1878, when that nation's freedom was reestablished after centuries of oppression under the old Ottoman Empire. Bulgaria's independence came to an abrupt end when first Nazi Germany and later Soviet

Russia established their domination over the country. To this day, Bulgaria remains a subjugated country under the yoke of the Kremlin and its people are a captive nation.

In connection with the observance of Bulgarian Liberation Day, I recently sent a letter of greeting to the Bulgarian National Front of America for their annual commemoration of the event, which is being observed on Saturday, March 3, at the New Yorker Hotel in New York City. I am pleased to insert into the Appendix of the RECORD the text of my message, which reads as follows:

FEBRUARY 12, 1962.

Dr. KALIN KOICHEFF,
Secretary-General, Bulgarian National Front of America, New York, N.Y.

DEAR DR. KOICHEFF: Please convey the following message to your organization on March 3 at the Hotel New Yorker:

"On this day, when you meet to commemorate the Bulgarian Liberation Day, I am happy to join with you in hope and prayer for liberty and independence of your ancestral homeland.

"It is extremely important that we in this country and freedom-loving people in other countries should continue to focus the spotlight of the world on the subjugated status of the captive nations of Europe struggling under the yoke of tyrannical communism. We must do so in order to gain the offensive in the cold war. We must utilize every means to put Communist imperialism on the defensive and subject Russia to worldwide criticism.

"Carry on your good work and your untiring efforts so that Bulgaria may soon be liberated again. Your cause is close to the hearts of the American people, who support you and wish you an early victory."

Sincerely yours,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO.

The Age of Miracles Will Never Pass Out of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, on January 30, 1962, the Lexington Dispatch, Lexington, N.C., printed an article by Dick West entitled "The Age of Miracles Will Never Pass Out of Congress." I think my colleagues will be interested in reading it.

The article follows:

THE AGE OF MIRACLES WILL NEVER PASS OUT OF CONGRESS

(By Dick West)

WASHINGTON.—Anyone who thinks that the age of miracles has passed would do well to spend some time contemplating the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Seldom a day goes by that this tax-supported publication doesn't work a miracle or two, and not just the common garden variety of miracles.

Its miraculous powers make it possible for Members of Congress to be two places at the same time.

For example, a Congressman can, through courtesy of the RECORD, deliver a speech on the floor of the House of Representatives at the same time that he is patronizing the $2 window at Bowie race course.

I am not suggesting, of course, that some of our lawgivers like to bet the horses. This is only a theoretical case.

It would serve just as well to say that the hypothetical Congressman was catnapping in his office, or pacifying a constituent, or off somewhere on a junket.

HOUSE RULES

The trick of being two places at once is accomplished by means of a House rule which permits Members to "revise and extend" in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks they make, or don't make, on the House floor.

In other words, written statements and speeches are printed in the RECORD side-by-side with those uttered orally on the House floor. In cold type, it's hard to tell which are which.

This system provides two major benefits: (1) A speechmaker is spared the task of speaking his speech, and (2) others are spared the task of hearing it.

Some House Members, however, look upon the custom of ghost speaking as being somewhat deceptive. Two of them, Representatives THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri, and JOHN V. LINDSAY, Republican, of New York, have proposed a change in the rules that would preclude double images.

DIFFERENT TYPE FACE

Under their proposal, spoken speeches would be printed in the RECORD in a different type face from written speeches that are merely handed to the clerk for publication.

LINDSAY explained that this would provide readers of the RECORD with a more accurate reflection of what actually takes place on the House floor.

Furthermore, he said, it could have a collateral effect of cutting down absenteeism among House Members.

Such indeed might be the case, but there also would undoubtedly be a corresponding increase in the oratorical output in the Chamber.

The question the House must decide, then, is whether a little more honesty would be worth all the extra time.

Boston University Symposium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, recently a number of members of the Boston University staff, board of trustees and faculty, contributed individual, short essays—some generalized and other from specialized viewpoints—on the theme of "What Is the Future of Private Higher Education in America?"

This consideration of the pressing needs of our private colleges and universities constitutes reflections on a critical part of the overall problems of contemporary American education. Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include answers to the above question written by Irwin T. Sanders, Horace G. Thacker, Kurt M. Hertzfeld, and Richard S. Bear, all associated with the university. Following each of the articles is a brief biographical sketch of its author:

BOSTON UNIVERSITY SYMPOSIUM

ANSWER BY IRWIN T. SANDERS, A.B., PH.D., OF WELLESLEY HILLS, MASS., CHAIRMAN OF THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY AT THE BOSTON UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS AND THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

Higher education, like American society in general, has been experiencing accelerating differentiation and specialization. This in tiself is nothing new but the tempo at which it is happening is introducing a total impact that will profoundly affect the American university in 1970. The differentiation between the public and private university, which has been with us for a long time, is not nearly as significant as some of the other trends which are drawing the public and private university much closer together. We might describe the public-private dichotomy as a vertical division, whereas the other examples of differentiation pervading all institutions of higher education are horizontal. The following diagram illustrates this:

Traditional emphasis	*Contemporary emphasis*
Faculty	Administration.
Teaching	Research.
Academic	Services.
Liberal arts	Professions.
Curricular	Extracurricular.

The trends in each of the above are moving to the right, whether conceived in terms of power and influence within the university or in terms of expectations by those outside the university. Indeed, the chart speaks for itself.

The day is long since gone in the United States when the faculty pretended to have any influence over very much of the total university enterprise. University administrators are not elected by the faculty as the European faculties elect the university rector. Nor should one today expect this to be the case in the face of the need for fundraising by university presidents, whether from the general public and a few wealthy donors or from the State legislature. The administrative and the faculty roles are irrevocably differentiated, so much so that a college dean no longer can be a full-fledged member of the American Association of University Professors, in which he may have been a loyal worker before assuming the deanship.

A second trend is seen in the growing importance of research, both as a means of prestige and as financial support for the institution. Classroom teachers do not win a Nobel prize but laboratory researchers do. The differentiation of roles is also recognized with the appointment of research professors in contrast to "regular" academic professors. Many faculty members struggle bravely to combine both roles into their 12-hour day, but admit that something has to give—which usually is teaching.

Within the university community a further trend is underway: namely, the increase in services to the students (and staff) and to the community. In the competition for funds and space between those in charge of services and those in strictly academic pursuits, the services usually win out. An administrative official, to cite one example, can keep under lock and key for more than 2 years an unused room next to an overcrowded academic department on the grounds that someday plans call for its use for student services. Those in service roles can present cases which seem more closely in touch with the real life needs of people than can those who teach literature, anthropology, or Western civilization. Those who receive the general public in their offices also are thought to need more spacious quarters than the professors who supposedly only receive each other and their students. The concept of community service is also widely developed, with some universities interpreting the community as a metropolitan area which surrounds them, or a whole State,

or the world. To note the multiplication and differentiation of roles devoted to service aspects, one has only to look at the staff list of any university. If it took a score of men to support each front line soldier in World War II, it would be of interest to note how large a body is needed to support each classroom teacher in the battle for men's minds. Or, maybe the front has shifted from the classroom to some other area of the university—service or extracurricular.

A fifth trend toward professionalization might well be questioned. After all, the medieval university trained lawyers, doctors, clergymen. So was it not professional? No, for the definition of a professional has changed with increasing occupational differentiation and the demands of modern society. More and more, the value of liberal arts is being weighed in utilitarian, income-producing terms rather than in terms of the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake, which may or may not have been true in the past. Outside accrediting agencies dictate just what a university has to do if it is to prepare people for professional standing, board exams, and many of the professional jobs which are sometimes in very short supply.

Finally, the trend from curricular to extracurricular emphasis is not just the problem of the public university, but it characterizes the private university as well. When a senior asks, "If I do not take senior seminar will I fail to graduate?" and the answer is "Yes" he gives a great sigh of relief and exclaims, "Oh, I won't take it and then I'll have another year of athletic eligibility left." Specific extracurricular activities may have their fashions, much as women's clothes, but there is an increasing recognition of their importance.

It seems certain that there will be no reversal of these trends. Some areas of a university or even some university may try to halt the tide, but that can be done only if the institution also isolates itself from the world about it. The implications are clear: the liberal arts core of the university will decline in importance; the faculty role will diminish in influence in university affairs despite token efforts to give the faculty some participation on a few committees; the auxiliary staff of the university will proliferate even more and new types of nonacademic needs—many supportive of academic success—will be provided; professional schools will increasingly set the tone of the university and extracurricular activities will compete even more effectively with the academically oriented activities.

Or, put in other terms, the traditional image of the university as the guardian of learning will more and more give way to the reality of the university as the training ground for every kind of occupation, dealing with students at every level of their existence, and serving the public in a variety of ways so numerous that the faculty never hears about most of them. Furthermore, as both the private and public universities make even wider use of the grants from the Federal Government and industry, the private university will no longer remain private nor the public university public.

If present trends continue and at their current rate, the university by 1980 may have ceased to be an educational institution in the traditional sense of the word. Therefore, those within the university community, administrators as well as faculty members, who are interested in preserving liberal arts education for our civilization should begin thinking about the strengthening of or the creation of a new type of institution—outside the contemporary American university pattern—in which the academic pursuits again have preeminence and love of learning for its own sake is accepted as the primary value.

Biographical sketch

Irwin T. Sanders, of Wellesley Hills, Mass., is chairman of the department of sociology and anthropology at the Boston University College of Liberal Arts and Graduate School. He is also a member of the Harvard School of Public Health faculty and former research director of Associates for International Research, Inc. A former dean of the American College in Sofia, Bulgaria, he has also served as director, bureau of community service and chairman, department of sociology at the University of Kentucky; agricultural attaché, U.S. Embassy, Belgrade, Yugoslavia; and has done extensive work for the Federal Government. He is a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Washington and Lee University and received his Ph. D. degree from Cornell University in rural social organization.

ANSWER BY HORACE G. THACKER, B.B.A., M.B.A., OF NEEDHAM, MASS., DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF SCHOOL AND COLLEGE RELATIONS AND HEAD OF THE GUIDANCE DEPARTMENT AT THE COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Private higher education in this country is now running scared—and that is a good sign for the future.

There is no longer any question that the continued existence of the institution is threatened. Daily it becomes apparent that survival is at stake. The eloquence of those who have been shouting doom have succeeded in hoisting the danger signals across the land. The issue is now one of national concern—complacency is gone. The stout-hearted have not yet really begun to fight—but they will. The pessimists will lose.

The whole history of our people exhibits a tardiness in the recognition of and a reluctance to face up to the dangers affecting our way of life and to the established institutions that have made it. But when those dangers have become clear a concentration of effort has developed to meet them. New vigor has been found to overcome them.

Private higher education is one of those institutions. The backbone of our civilization is said to be centered in the education of our people. The great strength of our higher education is its diversity. This diversity exists not only in the dichotomy of the tax supported versus the privately supported, but in the great diversity of type, curriculum and quality within each of them. Within the veritable network of private colleges, there are the large, the small and the in-between, the aristocratic and the plebian, the rurally located and the urban, the academically strong and the not-so-strong, the nationally known and the purely local, the sectarian and nonsectarian, the church related and not related, the all male, all female, the coeducational and the coordinate, those that are well endowed and those operating primarily on student charges—to name the best known types.

The institution of private higher education will not disappear. However units within it may well do so. Adjustments in role and in financing are inevitable, and those who revel in the serenity of the status quo are in for a rude awakening.

As long as our form of democracy survives, as long as education itself remains the cornerstone of our civilization, the future of private higher education is secure. There will be an army of fighters both in and out of the Government to make it so.

Biographical sketch

Horace G. Thacker of Needham, Mass., is director of the office of school and college relations and former professor of guidance and head of the guidance department at the college of business administration. A member of the faculty since 1921, he received his B.B.A. in 1920 and his M.B.A. in 1923 from the university's college of business administration. He is the author of several articles including "Hire New Englanders" published in Industry. He is a member of both the National and Massachusetts Association of Secondary School Principals.

ANSWER BY KURT M. HERTZFELD, A.B., M.B.A., OF WEST NEWTON, MASS., VICE PRESIDENT FOR ADMINISTRATIVE AFFAIRS AT BOSTON UNIVERSITY

Institutions of higher education are major and integral elements in the total economy of this Nation. Like other organized enterprises, they are individually and collectively subject to the same underlying forces which shape the national economy as a whole.

Trends in the national salary level have perhaps their greatest impact on the operational costs of the individual college or university, since the cost of personal services represents by far the largest group of expenses, generally ranging from 65 to 80 percent of the total budget. If the rate of improvement in efficiency of the national economy exceeds that realized by the educational institution, it will inevitably result in depressed institutional salaries, or a tuition level that rises inordinately and at a rate not commensurate with that of the national price level, or increased budget deficits and concomitant competition for the outside support dollar even more intensive than heretofore.

Faculty salaries must not be permitted to fall behind. Competition for qualified teachers on the college and university level will increase. By 1970 when public institutions can be expected to accommodate more than 70 perecnt of a vastly increased student body, private institutions of higher education will need to pay comparatively higher salaries if they are to succeed in obtaining and holding faculty which will attract students able and willing to pay tuition rates substantially higher than those charged in public institutions.

Annual outside support has been accepted as an important "budget balancer." Such support comes from many sources including alumni, friends, industry and commerce, and public grants. These funds are vital to the survival of the private institution. Three factors, however, condition this support. First, there are practical limitations to the availability of these funds. Second, certain support funds, especially many public grants, tend to be restricted as to use, or at the very least "directive" in nature. They tend to encourage activities in certain areas simply because support is available. Third, prudent financial stewardship limits the proportion of the annual education budget which is supported by these annual gifts and grants, since there is no certainty of their continuance.

Realistic answers to the problem of survival of private institutions of higher education can probably be found in a reexamination of objectives of the educational program, the level of tuition required, and the degree of efficiency maintained.

Private education must be of a quality that will justify the tuition differential which students will be required to pay. This means that the specific objectives and purposes of the institution must be consonant with its academic and financial capability. Tendencies toward proliferation which often reduce the effectiveness with which an institution meets its obligations must be curbed.

Tuition must be expected to carry an increasing share of the total costs of a student's education. This will require a radical change in our present attitudes and concepts relating to the financing of a college education. Private education must necessarily be conceived as a major investment that is to be amortized over a substantial portion of its useful life, i.e., the economically productive life of the recipient. Tuition levels of $8,000 to $10,000 for a 4-year undergraduate education are feasible when

the cost can be financed over a period of 20 years.

Finally, college administrators have a responsibility to make education as efficient as possible. This implies a willingness to experiment with new methodology and, above all to review such traditional concepts as class size, academic calendar, faculty load, athletic programs, building and service requirements, etc. If this Nation is to commit an ever-increasing share of its resources to higher education, it will expect higher education to strive for the highest standards of efficiency and effectiveness consistent with quality education.

Biographical sketch

Kurt M. Hertzfeld, of West Newton, Mass., is vice president for administrative affairs at Boston University. Born in Austria in 1918, he is a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Harvard College and received an M.B.A. from the Harvard Business School. Before coming to Boston University, Mr. Hertzfeld served for 7 years as business manager at the University of Rochester. He is also a director and former vice president of the Federation of College and University Business Officers Associations and secretary-treasurer of the Eastern Association of College and University Business Officers.

ANSWER BY RICHARD S. BEAR, S.B., PH. D., OF BOSTON, DEAN OF THE BOSTON UNIVERSITY GRADUATE SCHOOL

About a hundred years ago in this country, when Western States were building their public institutions of higher learning, it was possible to discern significant differences between the educational aims of the tax-supported colleges and the private organized ones dominant in the East. By and large the former were intent upon bringing a pragmatic education to all young men and women who could assimilate it, while the latter continued the traditional emphasis on cultural values for the few.

While remnants of these differences are still discernible, today the aims of all higher education in this country have pretty much drawn together through paths designed to provide, for as many capable young people as facilities permit, an education that has both practical and cultural significance.

Another development of the recent past, begun with the rise of graduate schools in universities late in the 19th century, has been the growing recognition that few are prepared for full career capacity by the traditional 4 years of undergraduate study. The increasing technological demands of our civilization require even larger numbers of professionally trained experts, including ones fully able to cope intellectually with the complexities of the modern scene.

The broadening bases of student numbers and of educational goals have recently and will continue in the foreseeable future to increase the tasks of the universities explosively. Private colleges and universities feel this explosion most distressingly because their resources are not pegged to the rising public tax bases.

The public sees the problems of higher education most directly as ones of offering opportunity to all capable students through scholarship and fellowship aid, and of utilizing the resources of the universities for strengthening our society in a technological age by means of emphasis on research in the natural sciences in the name of defense. Acceptable as these forms of support may be, they tend to put the cart before the horse by failing to recognize that before students can be taught or research carried out there must be capable professors and buildings, the two ingredients now most grievously in short supply on all campuses. Emphasis on the sciences and engineering tends to develop an imbalance in the total educational programs.

Private colleges and universities have made enviable records in the past. They provide the individuality of approach needed in an age which tends toward regimentation. Their financial problems in these magnified times are such, however, that they will necessarily rely upon some form of public support. The Federal Government has developed techniques which support education and research without controlling it in policy ways. With broadened and expanded use of these procedures, the private colleges and universities will be able to make ample return to the country in terms of their recognized distinctive contributions.

Biographical sketches

Richard S. Bear of Boston, Mass., is dean of the Boston University Graduate School. Before coming to Boston University in July 1961, he served as dean of the college of science and humanities and director of the industrial science research institute at Iowa State University. He has also been a fellow of the national research council at Princeton; research associate in zoology, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.; assistant professor of plant chemistry at Iowa State University; and associate professor and professor of biophysics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Once named 1 of the 10 most outstanding starch chemists by the Chicago section of the American Chemical Society, he is the author of numerous articles on biophysics, especially involving X-ray diffraction investigations of the molecular structure of natural polymers and tissues. He graduated with highest honors from Princeton University in 1930 and 3 years later was awarded his Ph. D. in chemistry from the University of California at Berkeley.

The Not-So-Ugly Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the first recorded American program of foreign aid occured 340 years ago. At that time, Squanto, an Indian, granted technical assistance to the starving Pilgrims at Plymouth, teaching them how to farm the new land, how to fish its streams and waters. Since that time, Americans have made a practice of extending a helping hand to the less fortunate among themselves and others. Philanthropy is today one of the largest businesses in America, and assistance to people throughout the world is our national policy.

Cynics in our own and other lands have termed our efforts "do-goodism." But a man who remembers well one of America's many humanitarian projects has written an article that appears in the magazine I have referred to previously today and on Monday: the March issue of the Rotarian. The author is Dr. Pitrim A. Sorokin, founder-director of the research center in creative altruism at Harvard University. A world-renowned sociologist, Dr. Sorokin was born in Russia, where he was a determined foe of the czarist and Red regimes alike. After the overthrow of the imperial government in 1917, he was secretary to Premier Kerensky during the brief days of democracy between the revolution and the accession to power of the Bolsheviks under Lenin. In 1922, Dr. Sorokin escaped from the Red firing squads, worked in Europe, and came to America, where for many years he has been on the faculty, principally as a professor of sociology, at Harvard University.

Dr. Sorokin's analysis and comment on this so often misunderstood phenomenon of American culture and belief should be read by Americans and everyone who has been helped at our hands. Ever since our history began, we have had our people-to-people programs.

The article is as follows:

As any nation, the United States throughout its history has committed a multitude of noble as well as ignoble deeds. Lately the face of "the ugly Americans" has been particularly stressed, while the noble aspect of the American image has been downgraded or even passed by in silence. This distorted image needs to be corrected and replaced by the true portrait of this Nation. In this true portrait its noble soul and beautiful visage fully deserve to be emphasized as much as or even more than its ugly face and dark soul. After all, in the total balance of all the noble and all the ignoble deeds committed by the American Nation the weight of its good accomplishments certainly outweighs that of its misdoings.

In my personal experience I observed the beautiful soul of America at its noblest and best in 1921–22, in Russia. Devastated by the First World War and the terrible Civil War of the Revolution, the Russian nation was then enfeebled vitally, ruined economically, and disorganized morally. The great famine of 1921–22 catastrophically aggravated this tragic situation. Utmost starvation and ensuing epidemics began to depopulate vast regions of Russia. In many Provinces mortality reached an unprecedented rate of 500 per 1,000 population. Despair and fear took possession of millions of Russian souls.

And suddenly the darkness of this abomination of desolution was pierced by the beacon of light, life, and hope. This beacon was the American Relief Administration initiated and organized by Herbert Hoover. Without any strings attached it brought food and other necessities and began to feed, revive, and sustain not only the life of the famishing millions but also brought hope and courage in their souls. In my notes jotted down at that time I summed up the results of this rescue mission as follows:

"The S O S (of the starving millions of Russia) was heard. It crossed the ocean and beat on the hearts of the great American Nation and brought a relief that saved from cruel death at least 10 million men, women, and children. God will forever remember that deed. God will forever bless that generous people" (P. Sorokin, "Leaves from a Russian Diary," p. 288).

Since that time I learned that this noble act was not something rare and exceptional in the history of the American Nation, but was, in fact, a sort of routine activity regularly performed by this Nation. For whenever and wherever a great calamity strikes a multitude of human beings, the generous helping hand of the American Nation is usually found there. Whether the misfortune be an earthquake or famine or flood or tornado or pestilence or war or anarchy or other calamity, whether it occurs in the Americas or Europe or Asia, the Americans almost always appear amidst the stricken people, feeding the hungry, curing the sick, teaching

the ignorant, consoling the disconsolate, encouraging the downhearted, and in other ways relieving suffering humanity. And all these services they do, in most cases, without any selfish motives, but just for the sake of an unselfish love, compassion, and sympathy for their fellow human beings. Hardly any other nation can compete with the United States of America in frequency, large scale, and generosity of these good deeds.

What perhaps is still more significant, these noble accomplishments are not confined to this sort of charitable works. No less important are the creative-ameliorative services that regularly supplement the philanthropic activities of the American people. These services consist in building schools, laboratories, hospitals, churches, libraries, recreation halls, and other cultural establishments; in introducing and instructing new agricultural, industrial, medical, educational, and other techniques; in establishment of democratic local and international organizations such as Rotary, Lions, and Kiwanis clubs, the YMCA, the Boy Scouts, and Girl Scouts, and ending with the League of Nations and the United Nations; finally in propagation of the lofty values of brotherhood, human dignity, and the Bill of Rights' freedoms, not to mention the noble values of science, religion, law, and fine arts.

Again in this ameliorative mission the American Nation is hardly rivaled by any other nation, especially during recent decades. The missionary zeal of the American people is so intense and generous that it extends its grace not only over the friendly and neutral peoples, but frequently enough even over the recent enemies. The last case is well illustrated by the gigantic help rendered by the United States to Japan, Germany, and other inimical countries immediately after the armistice. There is no need to mention the Dawes, the Young, the Marshall plans which rebuilt and vitalized the ruined economies of America's allies as well as its former enemies.

A prophecy of all this, perhaps, came in 1771, at a time when the United States was not yet born. Benjamin Franklin said, "A voyage is now proposed to visit a distant people on the other side of the globe: not to cheat them, not to rob them * * * but merely to do them good, and make them, as far as in our power lies, to live as comfortably as ourselves."

Soon America, which only a short time before had been the beneficiary of missionaries from the Continent, began to send missionaries from its own shores. Today more than 33,000 missionaries from the United States are at work in 146 lands, teaching trades, building hospitals, educating doctors and nurses, training native leaders in administrative work, developing social-welfare programs, and showing farmers how to increase their crop yields. Their years of experience have proved valuable to the organizers and participants in the Government-sponsored point 4 program and more recently, the heralded Peace Corps.

During recent decades this ameliorative mission of the American people has grown so fast and has now reached such a vast scale that it is certainly not rivaled by any other nation. A few statistics give an idea of that scale. For the period of 1946–61 the U.S. economic aid to foreign nations amounted to $28,375,400,000 (not counting addditional military aid amounting to $25,167,100,000). For comparison purposes the economic aid of the Communist bloc of nations for the period of 1954–60 amounted only to $4,800 million. From 1954 through 1959 about 6,500 shiploads of surplus farm products moved abroad from America under what is known as the food-for-peace program. This food and fiber, which had a market value in excess of $7 billion, was a gift to hungry nations. More important in the long run has been the export of U.S. agricultural techology. Technicians from the International Cooperation Administration, for example, are responsible for such improvements as a dipping tank for lice-ridden camels in Libya, a modern fruit-packing plant in Greece, and a 40-percent boost in corn yields in El Salvador.

Similarly, there is no other nation whose private citizens gave more than $8 billion in 1 year (1960) to charitable, religious, educational, public health, and cultural causes. And the rate of growth of this American private philanthropy has been prodigious. For instance, in 1870 total private gifts to education in the United States amounted to $8,593,740; in 1950, despite an enormous growth of public schools and public funds for education, these private gifts grew to $300 million. No less significant is the fact that some 75 percent of these gifts came from private individuals (corporations contributing only about 5 percent, foundations about 3 percent, and various bequests and accrued interest from investments filling the remaining total).

No wonder, therefore, that without any advertising and propaganda this ameliorative philanthropy has spontaneously earned this Nation the unrivaled prestige of the most generous good neighbor and the foremost moral and cultural leader.

This prestige would have been still higher if these altruistic activities had not at times been contaminated by, and mixed with, power politics and selfish economics. Some aid allegedly undertaken for the benefit of helpless nations, or for protection of freedom, democracy, religion, dignity of man, and so on are, in fact, motivated by selfish interests of American economic blocs, influential cliques, and irresponsible politicians. Despite the beautifying rouge and powder of these aids, their ugly face is easily recognized and correctly evaluated by the benefited peoples as well as by the world at large. One of the regretful effects of such activities is that they arouse suspicions even in regard to the genuine unselfish work of this Nation. Herein lies the source of the resentment and seeming ingratitude of the helped peoples with which now and then they react toward their American benefactor.

The practical conclusions from this is, first, that these two different kinds of activities should be kept apart: power politics and selfish economics should not be mixed up with the noble work of gracious giving and unselfish help on a gigantic scale carried on by this Nation; second, that a durable moral prestige of the United States as of any other nation can be based upon, and maintained through, only the real good works. While the moral effects of their imitations invariably turn out to be temporary and ephemeral, the effects of the genuine good works survive and often become immortal.

Hon. Ralph Gwinn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the great privileges I have enjoyed as a Member of Congress was the opportunity to serve with Ralph Gwinn and to enjoy a personal friendship with him which carried beyond our service together in the House. We shared a common philosophy of government, a philosophy to which he was completely dedicated. He believed, with all his heart, in the God-given freedom of the individual as set forth in the founding documents of this Nation. So dedicated was he to this principle that he gave up his seat in Congress because he felt he could render greater service to the people if he worked outside the limits set by congressional rules and procedure.

The Nation has lost one of its fine leaders, many of us have lost a valued friend, but the Nation, the people and his friends are better because Ralph passed this way.

Don't Get Rigged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, "the cradle to the grave" philosophy of President Kennedy is now apparent to all who take the bother to inquire. The following editorial in today's Wall Street Journal leaves no doubt as to the direction this administration has taken Once freedom has been sacrificed, it is too late to do anything about it.

The editorial follows:

RIGGING THE GAME

Secretary of State Rusk, in urging adoption of the administration's tariff program, made these remarks a few days ago:

"Either we believe in capitalism, in the freedom of individual enterprise, or we do not. And we do not if we hold with massive Government intervention to distort and freeze the market. If we look to Government to rig the game, we may as well look to it to play the hands."

That's all very true. And it applies not only to tariffs but to many other types of Government activity. Individuals, organizations, cities or States may seek only Government money or some other form of Government help. But sooner or later, invited or not, the Government is likely to shed its role as helpful bystander and become an active participant.

Take aid to farmers, for example. This program got its real start during the 1930's, when the Government agreed to support prices for farmers who limited their acreage. But improved methods of cultivation soon were getting more output from each acre, and the Government has wound up with an immense hoard of farm products. The Federal outlay merely for warehousing all of the surplus corn, wheat, cotton, and other goods now is running a staggering $1 billion a year.

The next step seems almost inevitable. The administration is proposing an even more massive intervention in farm marketing. Production would be cut below consumption and the Government, as an active trader, then would unload its big holdings.

Or consider labor. In the early 20th century, labor unions generally were small and poorly organized. In a strike the local police usually sided with management. So it seemed perfectly natural for the unions to appeal to the Federal Government for help. In the 1930's, the Government began moving into an increasing number of labor disputes. Before long, it was inextricably involved in negotiations in steel, autos, rail-

roads, and a wide range of other industries, both large and small.

Furthermore, the Government began moving into bargaining at earlier and earlier stages. And it's expanding its role in negotiations, too. As Labor Secretary Goldberg put it the other day, the Government from now on will have the courage to draw economic guidelines to protect the public interest.

The list could go on and on. Once the Government shoulders anyone's problems, it soon begins to pick up an increasing share of the load. In part, this is the fault of the person with the problem. When he starts to rely on the Government, his own initiative and enterprise are weakened and it's easy to give up more and more of his burden. But the process also is partly the usual result of bureaucracy at work, gradually extending its sphere of operation and influence.

There's no reason to think that things will be any different in the future. To help the Nation's elementary and secondary schools build new facilities and pay their teachers, the administration is proposing $2.1 billion of Federal grants over a 3-year period. But the administration's interest goes beyond mere financial aid. It's also urging "rapid improvement" in the "quality" of education, through supplementary training of teachers and use of new teaching media, techniques, and curriculums.

In another area, medical care for the aged, the administration talks only of providing financial help through the social security program. But it's easy to forecast that the Government before long would be deeply interested in the quality, cost and other characteristics of the medical services being provided.

At some point, the beneficiaries of all this bureaucratic attention may have wistful second thoughts about the freedom they have sacrificed. But by the time matters have reached that point it's often too late. As Mr. Rusk says, those who allow the Government to rig the game shouldn't be surprised if it plays the hands. And once you've given the Government the cards, it's hard to cut the Government out of the game.

U.S. Loyalty to Allies Tested

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer entitled "Kashmir Debate in U.N. Will Test U.S. Loyalty to Allies," as released by the McClure newspaper syndicate.

The article follows:

KASHMIR DEBATE IN U.N. WILL TEST U.S. LOYALTY TO ALLIES

It seems to me that the American administration would do well to shift its attention from its semiutopian preoccupation with ending nuclear tests, arms control, general and total disarmament, relaxing tensions over Berlin and latest cooperation in space exploration with the U.S.S.R. It could then concentrate for a while on the intensely practical matter of restoring our allies' confidence in the United States.

For our recent refusal to take sides between allies and indifferent, even hostile, neutrals is undermining that global defense chain upon which our own security is built.

The latest country to express serious doubts about the value of the American alliance is Pakistan and the immediate cause is the current American attitude to India's armed threat against Pakistan over Kashmir. Kashmir has been an issue between those two countries ever since the partition of British India in 1947. Since then, India has been in occupation of the richer southeast, Pakistan of the bleaker and mountainous west and north.

Each country claims the entire territory and, of the two, Pakistan's claim is by far the stronger. The chief evidence for this is, without going into the details, that Pakistan has repeatedly offered to submit the questions of ownership and demilitarization to arbitration and a free plebiscite and India has steadily refused. India has, in fact, quite illegally annexed its portion of Kashmir to India, thus defying the United Nations as positively as it did passively (there was no vote) in the matter of its seizure of Portuguese Goa.

Pakistan has never accepted the current division as final. For a time, it looked as though India did. Recently however, India's Defense Minister Krishna Menon, his head swollen by his giant country's military "victory" over tiny Goa, has been massing military forces against Pakistan. Furthermore, several Indians have been talking of "settling the Kashmir affair by force."

India's Prime Minister, the saintly Nehru, has revealed that his Gandhian nonviolence is strictly for other countries and does not apply to India. Therefore, Pakistan has insisted that the U.N. Security Council which has been seized of the Kashmir issue since January 1948 on complaints from both sides, immediately take up India's military threat against Pakistan.

President Ayub of Pakistan, for the first time, believes that India may risk some sort of sneak blitz attack against Pakistani Kashmir, counting on new weapons to overcome the Pakistanis' superior military spirit. India has somewhat more than four times as many people as Pakistan and its military forces are three or four times as great.

The coming debate in the Security Council may well put the United States on a hot spot. India has steadily defied the U.N. over Kashmir, and now is threatening a tried ally of the United States. Moreover, some years ago, U.S. Ambassador Chester Bowles promised India U.S. military assistance in case of an attack by Pakistan.

Now that India is building superior weapons, the Sidewinder and the Redeye, which Pakistan has not yet received from the United States, the shoe is on the other foot. The American administration has so far given no similar pledge of immediate American assistance to Pakistan in case of attack by India. Instead, American officials, obviously embarrassed by being asked to take sides, have told the Pakistanis to "work it out with India." Once more they have refused to side with an ally against a threatening neutral—just as they are doing in the Dutch-Indonesian dispute over New Guinea.

This sweet impartiality between a partner and an outsider may seem smart to weak-kneed U.S. diplomats and amateur New Frontiersmen, but it is death to the security of the United States. For sooner or later—and rather sooner than later—a refusal to take sides will deprive the United States of all its allies, including Pakistan.

It is high time that our President recognized that a country at war—even a cold war—like the United States can only keep friends by taking their side and treating them as partners. The coming Kashmir debate at the U.N. Security Council will be a real test of the political understanding of the Kennedy administration.

Cain and John Glenn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, among the almost endless stream of tributes which the press and people of America have paid to Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., since his triple orbit of the earth on February 20, one of the very finest I have read was published as an editorial in the February 23 issue of the Monitor, the weekly newspaper of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of San Francisco. Its author is the newspaper's distinguished editor, John A. O'Connor.

The Monitor places Colonel Glenn's exploit in a broad perspective and draws from it some fundamental implications. The spirit of the editorial is, I think, very much in harmony with the words of Colonel Glenn himself which, in his address before a joint meeting of Congress yesterday, moved us so deeply.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the Monitor's editorial:

CAIN AND JOHN GLENN

Move over Columbus. Move over Eric the Red, St. Brendan, Drake, Da Gama, Byrd, Lindbergh, and all the explorers and courageous adventurers who have ever probed the unknown. Move over for John Glenn.

Our proximity to the event might dull it for us. The great, almost suffocating, blanket of communications coverage has filled us with information of the brave marine's successful orbit in space. But time will surely give the flight its proper stature, as it will add its patina of heroic legend to the name of John Glenn.

Who was with him on his trip? The schoolboy, up before his usual protesting hour, still in his pajamas watching. The young mothers stalling breakfast preparations as the television becomes the center of attention. The grandparents who wake early, waking even earlier, and getting the countdown coffee on. The workers on the highways tuned in to their car radios.

The prayers and hopes and cheers of men everywhere—lying in hospital beds, manning tracking stations, sitting in smoky clubrooms: Everywhere everyone seeking the best for John Glenn.

We imagine even Comrades Titov and Gagarin, Soviet cosmonauts, joined in wishing success to the U.S. test pilot.

The triumph of the *Friendship 7* points up the stunning pace at which we are now propelled. Men, pursuing truth through science, have accomplished marvels. More will come, not only in the area of space exploration, but in communications, transportation, medicine, food, industrial production, and the myriad occupations of man.

Undoubtedly the most startling progress will be made within the areas of science and technology. John Glenn's triple tour of the globe from an orbital height will give added impetus to the scientific penetration of nature's mysteries.

The big question might be put this way: Can man's capacity for love and understanding and patience with his fellow man keep pace with his jet-propelled ride into the future?

Or, as scientists continue to open further treasure boxes in nature, will men continue to squander these treasures?

A great portion of the world lives in subhuman poverty.

A great portion of the world is poorly fed.

A great portion of the world is frighteningly unschooled.

The great vocations call for workers to join the harvest: The priesthood and ministry; teaching, medicine, and all others at the service of humanity.

Mental illness wreaks its gnawing tortures.

Alcoholism erodes the foundations of personality.

Race hatred pits whole nations against others.

Embers of old bigotries get an occasional poke from the envious and fearful.

Yet—see how much is done when men work together. When scientists and technicians pool their brains and their sweat to push an explorer into the uncharted spatial oceans upon which we must sail.

So much can be done by coming together, and Christians especially should be sensitive to the appeal of the Holy Father to unite for action.

Pope John said this week that all men, without exception, are brothers under God.

The whole world seems to shrink, and men come closer together. But are they ready to live closer together?

The unity of human brotherhood was graphically dramatized by the Glenn flight: With common eyes we followed his path, with common ears we heard his voice, with common heart we cheered him on.

Yet, knowing we are creatures of a common Father, we still ask, with Cain, "Am I my brother's keeper?"

Somehow, each person whose heart was with John Glenn, knew the answer.

The Little-People-to-Little-People Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, the little-people-to-little people program which was initiated late last year by 10-year-old Peter Rodino III, son of my colleague, the Honorable PETER W. RODINO, JR., of New Jersey, is a symbol of youth's determination to take part in molding the destiny of the world they will inherit. This new children's crusade is most encouraging and should receive wide support here and abroad.

Young Peter Rodino is demonstrating the same love of country, and the same desire to protect and advance its causes, as his distinguished father has done throughout his career. On February 24, there appeared in the Passaic, N.J., Herald-News an excellent commentary on this unique and inspiring program by Edward J. Reardon, its Washington correspondent. I ask unanimous consent to insert this article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

BETTER-BRAVE-THAN-SLAVE DRIVE UNDERWAY—CHILDREN'S CRUSADE FOR WORLD EDUCATION STARTED BY JERSEY BOYS

WASHINGTON.—Patsy Mandato, Jr., 13, of Newark, wrote to former President Eisenhower the other day.

General Eisenhower is head of this country's people-to-people program, a worldwide project. Patsy is head of a unit of the Newark Boys' Clubs.

"We would be very happy," Patsy wrote the general, "if you can put us in touch with boys like us who live in foreign countries. Maybe you can even get a boys' club like ours in Russia.

"We know that if boys in the United States become friendly with boys in other countries, this would help peace."

Patsy's letter was evidence that still another path is being opened by the little people-to-little people campaign begun last October by Peter Rodino III, the 10-year-old son of Representative PETER W. RODINO, JR., New Jersey's 10th District Congressman.

It was young Peter, who lives with his parents at 105 Grafton Avenue, Newark, who started the children's crusade for world peace when he wrote to Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev, asking him to stop the nuclear bomb testing in the interest of the health and safety of people all over the world.

The inspiration came to the youngster one evening while he was at dinner with his parents.

"Maybe Mr. Khrushchev does not believe the ordinary people in America and other countries really want him to stop the bombing," Peter said. "Maybe if a lot of children wrote him, he would believe it. If he gets a fallout of letters, he might stop the fallout of bombs."

So that very evening he wrote Khrushchev. And next day he started his campaign to get other children to write. The letters have been going to the Soviet leader ever since. But now, they are sent by children from all over the United States.

Khrushchev hasn't answered. What can you say to a youngster who hits you between the eyes with the truth?

But young Peter's letter writing campaign promises to have far-reaching effects.

With parent teachers associations, Boy Scout groups and veterans organizations encouraging still more children to write, it is taking shape as a real children's crusade. General Eisenhower, named by President Kennedy to head a people-to-people campaign, has called Peter's little people-to-little people program a natural corollary.

Representative RODINO, who is backing his son's campaign wholeheartedly, thinks the letterwriting program Peter inaugurated could be effective in discrediting and destroying the myth of communism in the minds of men throughout the world.

"The Communists start the political training of their citizens at an early age," the Congressman points out, "enlisting their youth in the young pioneer movement, preparing them for more sophisticated political training. I think we must conclude this has been an effective system for the Communists. It can be even more effective for freemen. For we shall write on the white pages of freedom, not on the red pages of tyranny."

Representative RODINO thinks the Reds' example can be used to initiate a movement that will give the children of the world some facts about today's world.

"We know from various polls," he says, "that at the moment our own youth, and many among our adult population, believe communism is bad. But they do not know for sure because they do not really know what communism stands for, and does and is.

"We know, also, from the experience of our men captured during the Korean episode, that there is a concomitant ignorance about America, what our country and way of life stands for, do and are."

RODINO thinks that the Communist crusade for world domination can be answered with an American children's crusade for world education.

But before this can be really effective, he thinks, Americans must have a working knowledge of the two systems so they will be able properly to inform the rest of the world on the differences between the two. And the place to begin this education program is in the elementary schools of this country.

So the next step in the campaign started by 10-year-old Peter Rodino III could be to have such a program of comparison instituted in America's elementary schools. There is no need to fear exposing our youngsters to such a program, says RODINO, because the advantages of freedom over slavery have been valued by the people of all the world back through the centuries since they became civilized enough to think for themselves.

The Congressman is now thinking of a plan to have one or more of the various foundations—Ford, Rockefeller or similar institutions—assign one of their professors to prepare such a text book for elementary school use.

Give them this equipment to intelligently battle the forces of communism for the minds of men, Representative RODINO believes, and you will add substance to the clarion call for freedom:

"Better brave than slave."

Labor's Court of Last Resort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my colleagues who served in the 85th and 86th Congresses well remember the debates in this Chamber in connection with labor reform legislation. Most members felt that something should be done to correct the abuses that were spotlighted by Senator McClellan's Committee to Investigate Improper Activities in Labor-Management Relations and the Landrum-Griffin Act finally was enacted to meet this need. Many of us wondered how this bill would work, whether or not it would do the job, and about the reaction of the various segments of our economy that would be affected by it.

The passage of time has now answered most of these questions. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to call to the attention of the House an article which appeared in the March 1962 edition of the Reader's Digest.

The article, written by Irwin Ross, points out that the Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, popularly known as the Landrum-Griffin Act, has earned the respect of rank-and-file members and local union officials.

While I feel this article will be of interest to most Members of Congress, I believe it will be particularly significant to the working men and women of our highly industrialized State of Michigan, and that our workers will be glad to know what has been accomplished by this remedial legislation.

As you know, Congressman ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, cosponsor of this act, is one of my colleagues in the Michigan delegation. I think it might be well to review at this point some of the background of his successful fight for more effective labor-management legislation.

Congressman GRIFFIN in 1959 was the ranking minority member of the Joint Subcommittee on Labor-Management Reform Legislation, an unusual distinction for a second-term Member of Congress. After participating in lengthy hearings held by this subcommittee, he joined with our able colleague, Congressman PHIL M. LANDRUM, Democrat of Georgia, in formulating and introducing a bipartisan labor-management reform bill.

The Landrum-Griffin bill quickly attracted widespread national attention and was endorsed by Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, Democrat of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Select Committee investigating labor racketeering. You will recall that in a historic radio-television address to the Nation, President Eisenhower called for passage of the Landrum-Griffin bill.

Congressman GRIFFIN played a leading role during prolonged debate in the House which resulted in the passage of the bill 303–125. He was then appointed as one of seven conferees to represent the House of Representatives in a joint Senate-House Conference to resolve differences between the Landrum-Griffin bill and the Kennedy-Ervin bill passed earlier by the Senate.

Legislation finally agreed upon in Conference embodied most of the provisions and all of the principles of the Landrum-Griffin bill. It was overwhelmingly approved by both Houses during the closing days of the first session of the 86th Congress and became the first major law enacted in more than 12 years dealing with labor-management relations.

With these few paragraphs of background, I insert in the RECORD the following article:

LABOR'S COURT OF LAST RESORT

In June 1960, Local 1617 of the United Steelworkers of America held an election of officers in Youngstown, Ohio. The incumbents won handily; three of the losers charged that the election had been rigged. From July through September they sought a new election and were successively turned down by the local, by the international executive board and by the union's biennial convention.

Frustrated, the steelworkers appealed to the Labor Department's court of last resort—the Bureau of Labor-Management Reports, set up to enforce the Landrum-Griffin Act.

Investigating, the Bureau soon turned up some disquieting evidence about the election. A total of 1,432 votes had been counted, but only 1,178 members had actually voted. Before the count, the ballot boxes had been left unattended while the tellers went out to dinner; when they returned, they found that the boxes had been moved. The investigators also interviewed 51 union members who insisted that they had not voted, although the record showed they had. Several of these members had been out of town—one in military training, another attending a wedding in Pennsylvania, still another fishing miles away. Many ballots bore suspicious indentations of X's, which suggested that they might have been marked in stacks before being stuffed into the ballot boxes.

The Bureau of Labor-Management Reports laid the facts before the international union. The latter moved quickly. First it tried to persuade the local officers to hold a new election. When they refused, the union sent in an administrator to run the local and oversee a new poll. In March 1961 a second election was held. With one exception, all the previously defeated candidates won. The new president was elected by more than 600 votes; in the first election he had lost by nearly 200.

The electoral system of local No. 1617 is only one of hundreds of deplorable situations which the Bureau of Labor-Management Reports has set aright in its two and a half years of operation.

The Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act, popularly known as the Landrum-Griffin Act, was passed by Congress largely in response to the McClellan rackets committee's startling disclosures of financial malpractice, conflicts of interest and phony elections in certain unions. The culprits were a small minority of the labor movement, but they often succeeded in victimizing thousands of members.

Basically, the Landrum-Griffin Act seeks to protect union members against abuse of power by their officials. It endows individual members with certain civil liberties enforcible in court (such as free speech at union meetings); it sets up standards for fair elections and trusteeships; it requires that union financial officials be bonded for "faithful discharge" of their duties; it requires full disclosure of union finances, payrolls, expense accounts, as well as employer payments to labor consultants.

At first the act was viewed with horror by many labor leaders. "It subjects every union to harassment, litigation, factionalism, and legalized infiltration of employer spies and stooges," proclaimed President Al Hayes to a convention of the International Association of Machinists.

This prediction has not been borne out. Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg says, "I think the law has had a great prophylactic impact. The fact that it is on the books has made people more careful—both in handling union funds and in running elections."

The Bureau of Labor-Management Reports files are full of expressions of approval from rank-and-file members and local union officials. From a Minnesota union leader came the typical comment: "We were afraid of this law, and now we find that in some respects it has helped us a lot."

James P. Mitchell, Secretary of Labor when the act was passed, staffed the Bureau of Labor-Management Reports with men who were both knowledgeable about the labor movement and sympathetic to its aspirations. He appointed as commissioner John L. Holcombe, a career civil servant who had been a labor expert early in his Government service and in recent years had held high-ranking posts in the Department of Defense. The Bureau has over 500 employees and maintains 5 regional and 24 area offices. offices.

Holcombe and his staff have a lot of muscle to enforce compliance wtih the law. They can go to court to set aside rigged elections or overturn trusteeships illegally imposed, and to invoke penalties of a year in jail and a $10,000 fine against willful false reporting by a union, an employer, or a labor-relations consultant. The Bureau prefers, however, to secure voluntary compliance wherever possible. In this it has been astonishingly successful. Up to November 3, 1961, it determined that 2,632 violations of the act had occurred. In 2,591 instances voluntary compliance was secured. Only 41 cases required court action.

Almost any election case is dramatic testimony to the effectiveness of the law. In the Banana Handlers Local of the International Longshoremen's Association in New Orleans, the incumbents had long kept themselves in power through autocratic rule. When the local met to nominate officers for an election to be held in April 1960, the president, who was in the chair, refused to allow any other names to be placed in nomination against his slate. He announced, "I have always been president and will always remain president."

His opponents vainly sought relief through their union and then approached the Bureau of Labor-Management Reports, which ultimately field a complaint in court. This action prompted the union to agree to a new election, at which 86 percent of the 753 eligible members voted. Most of the members who lined up at the polls were equipped with buttons, arm bands, and banners proclaiming their allegiance to the incumbent slate. When the votes were in, however, every one of the 17 former officers had been defeated.

Fraudulent elections are only one way by which union members are victimized. The McClellan hearings revealed many instances in which international unions arbitrarily denied self-government to local unions, deposing their officers and sending in trustees to run their affairs.

To correct such abuses, the Landrum-Griffin Act provided that trusteeships could be established only for certain legitimate purposes—such as eliminating corruption, reestablishing democratic procedures or assuring adherence to collective-bargaining contracts. Now, after a trusteeship has been imposed, an international union must file periodic reports justifying its action.

The Bureau of Labor-Management Reports is obliged to investigate every complaint of an illegal trusteeship and is empowered to bring a civil suit to set it aside. Sharp scrutiny of trusteeships has unquestionably decreased their number. A total of 506 were in effect when the Landrum-Griffin Act was signed. By November 24, 1961, there were only 215.

In many cases, however, the Bureau of Labor-Management Reports sustains the trusteeship. The United Automobile Workers imposed a trusteeship on local No. 988, in Memphis, in January 1960. After receiving complaints, the Bureau launched an investigation. The trusteeship, it found, had been established after UAW headquarters had made repeated and vain efforts to stop the Memphis leadership from discriminating against the 500 Negroes in the 1,800-member local. Negroes were systematically excluded from union committees and were forced to use segregated washrooms and drinking fountains—all of which the international found incompatible with its constitution. After examining the facts, the Bureau of Labor-Management held the trusteeship to be valid.

One of the major contributions of the Landrum-Griffin Act is that for the first time it has made embezzlement of union funds a Federal crime. By last December 31 there had been 21 embezzlement convictions under the act, involving unions in 13 States and Puerto Rico. Ten other cases are pending prosecution. By agreement between the Labor and Justice Departments, most such investigations are conducted by the FBI, with the Bureau of Labor-Management Reports often providing the initial leads. The most notorious hoodlum brought to book was Stoy Decker, president of Local 86 of the Teamsters in Louisville. In April 1961, he received a 9-year sentence and a $10,000 fine after being convicted on ten counts of embezzling union funds.

The law has had a salutary effect on the internal life of unions even in the absence of a major "case." Typical was the experience of a union member who wrote to Wash-

ington that his local had refused the membership information about its finances. The Bureau of Labor-Management Reports checked its files, found that the union had not furnished the financial report required by the law. A compliance officer approached the union, and 2 weeks later the report was mailed in. The complainant also got the information he requested.

Thanks to the law, many rank-and-file members can for the first time scrutinize the financial affairs of their unions. Every report filed with the Bureau is subject to public inspection; there are more than 52,000 union financial reports alone. Copies of any report can be obtained for 25 cents a page; last year 2,000 people visited the bureau's document rooms in Washington, and some 1,300 inquiries came by mail.

Disclosure, public scrutiny and relentless investigation have already noticeably improved the atmosphere in many unions. The job is by no means over, but as Bureau of Labor-Management Reports Commissioner John Holcombe has put it, "The worst abuses revealed by the McClellan committee have to a large extent been ended. Most of the waterholes are no longer being visited, and the tracks are old."

Politics First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, it has often been said that anything can happen under the New Frontier, but I did not think there would be any representative in the Democratic Party so crass and arrogant as Democratic Chairman Bailey when he tried to tell the country that President Kennedy was responsible for Astronaut Glenn's spectacular and heroic feat.

In his speech before the Congress, on Monday, Astronaut Glenn, himself, stated that the astronaut program started "3 years ago." I might remind Politician Bailey that during the Truman administration more money was spent for peanut subsidies than for missile research; this despite the fact that then Chief of Staff Eisenhower had recommended $75 million for such research. The Republican Congress had apropriated this sum, but President Truman had impounded it.

As great a judge of the situation as Dr. von Braun also verified the fact of no interest in missile research under President Truman when he stated in a syndicated article that Russia had had a 6-year head start on us and that these 6 years could never be regained.

To show how ridiculous it is to put politics above our country's progress, Gould Lincoln's article in yesterday's Washington Evening Star, and the Star's own editorial clinched the argument of Democratic Chairman's Bailey's credit claim as pure bunk.

The article and editorial follow:

GLENN FEAT THRUST INTO POLITICS

To many Americans the attempt by Democratic National Chairman John M. Bailey to play partisan party politics with the earth-orbiting flight of Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., claiming all the credit for the Kennedy administration, came with a sickening thud. It came at a time when the whole Nation, Republicans and Democrats alike, were rejoicing in the success of this remarkable achievement and in the fact that the United States had demonstrated once again the courage of its citizens and the worth of its scientists. Chairman Bailey was delivering a pep talk to Democrats in Hartford, Conn., in his own home State. And he seemed to be trying to use the Glenn space flight to cover up his disappointment over the knockout blow last week to President Kennedy's Urban Affairs Department proposal in the Congress.

The language used by Mr. Bailey was far different from that of Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON, who as Democratic leader of the Senate and as Chairman of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, said in January 1958: "Why do we now stand in a posture of relative weakness? (Soviet Russians had demonstrated their capacity to launch a half-ton satellite into space.) When such a question is asked, as it should be asked, there is an ever-present danger that we shall frame our answers in terms of credit and blame. To do this now could well be fatal. There is little question that wrong decisions have been made. These errors are not divided along any partisan lines. As Prime Minister Churchill told the House of Commons on June 18, 1940: 'If we open a quarrel between the past and the present, we shall find that we have lost the future.'"

SPEAKS AS AMERICAN

Mr. JOHNSON was speaking, not as a Democrat but as an American, at a time this Nation was faced with a major problem—that of regaining lost ground in the field of missile and space development. The record shows that Mr. JOHNSON has been a leader for years in the drive to promote the development of space science and of missiles capable of putting men into space.

It is of interest to recall that Vice President JOHNSON, as long ago as January 1958, was urging that "we make provision for inviting together the scientists of other nations to work in concert on projects to extend the frontiers of man and to find solutions of the troubles of this earth." This is similar to the recent proposal made by Premier Khrushchev in his letter to President Kennedy congratulating Colonel Glenn on his orbital flight. And in November of 1958 it was Senator Johnson who was chosen to present to the United Nations a resolution calling for a committee to explore the possibilities of joint United Nations actions on outer space.

It has been Vice President JOHNSON's deep belief that outer space could be a pathway to world peace. In his opinion, the United States now has a rare opportunity to seize the initiative. President Kennedy has already replied to Mr. Khrushchev that he welcomed the idea of cooperation in the development of space science and travel in the cause of peace.

For many reasons, therefore, it was very fitting that the Vice President should have been selected to ride with Colonel Glenn on his trip to the Capitol from the White House yesterday. And it was with fitting pride in Colonel Glenn and his accomplishments that the Vice President presided jointly with Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK over the meeting of Congress which listened to the astronaut tell of his experiences in space, and honored him. Colonel Glenn's fervent wish that man may go forward into more and more knowledge of outer space and that such knowledge may aid toward a peaceful world runs parallel to that expressed 4 years ago by Mr. JOHNSON.

BAILEY REMARK

Mr. Bailey's effort to make political capital out of the Glenn flight was couched in these words: "This week our country celebrated an inspiring achievement, the three orbits around the earth of Astronaut John Glenn. This magnificent flight symbolized what can be done by an administration (the Kennedy administration) with the imagination, energy, and know-how to set big goals and to reach them. It showed what America can do when urgency and determination replace apathy and indecision in the executive branch (presided over by former President Eisenhower) of our Government."

Senator HICKENLOOPER of Iowa, Chairman of the Republican Policy Committee of the Senate, countered with a statement that the Kennedy administration simply carried out the program of the Eisenhower administration—the Mercury program started 3 years ago. Senator HICKENLOOPER said that, "no responsible" Democrat will seek to make political capital out of the result. He commented further that during the Truman administration less than $4 million was spent on intermediate range and intercontinental ballistic missiles; that starting in 1953 the Eisenhower administration built the program for development of heavy thrust missiles, and from 1953 through 1961, the Eisenhower administration planned, spent, and appropriated $14 billion for the intercontinental and intermediate-range missiles alone. This program, he said, makes possible the heroic feat of Colonel Glenn.

POLITICS AND THE INFINITE

Measured against the stars and the incomprehensible magnitudes of infinity, a man like Democratic National Chairman John M. Bailey seems to be quite absurdly small, to put it mildly. This holds true for all of us earthlings, of course, but he stands out at the moment as a particularly glaring example of how ridiculous a human biped can make himself look when he says silly things about the high heavens around us and our terra firma politics.

What silly things? Well, Mr. Bailey has hailed Astronaut Glenn's triple orbital flight as a triumph that must be credited to the Democratic Party and "the imagination, energy, and knowhow" of the Kennedy administration. This is a real blooper and a strangely stupid one in view of Mr. Bailey's reputation for being sensible, and in view also of the fact that Project Mercury was set up by the Republican Eisenhower administration.

Colonel Glenn, in any case, has set a nonpolitical standard, way up there above our little earth, around which all men of good will, intelligence, common sense and genuine patriotism can rally. In short, he has achieved something so grand that politicians like Mr. Bailey make themselves look foolish when they try to capitalize on it for votes.

A Tribute to REA Pioneers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the fine record of the rural electrification program in the United States has been accomplished by the untiring efforts and dedicated service of many people across the Nation. As the

program which brought lights and power to rural America enters its 27th year, a number of the men and women who pioneered this movement are no longer with us. Their accomplishments are typified by the accomplishments of Raymond L. Cleaves, who helped organize Chippewa Valley Electric Co-op in my home district in Wisconsin, and who ably served as this cooperative's manager until his death on November 25, 1961.

When Chippewa Valley members held their 25th anniversary meeting February 2 of this year, Herman Rahn, of Dairyland Power Co-op, gave a moving tribute to Mr. Cleaves. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include this eulogy in the RECORD.

The eulogy follows:

RAYMOND L. CLEAVES: A EULOGY

President Grape, honored guests, members of Chippewa Valley Electric Cooperative, ladies, and gentlemen, we meet here today to celebrate the 25th anniversary of your cooperative—to reflect upon the past, to review your progress and growth during the last quarter century. Although you experienced opposition in the organization of your cooperative rural electrification program, and although there were some disappointments, and perhaps a few failures, yet yours has been a record of constant growth—of truly "growing together," as your anniversary program indicates. An anniversary with the type of accomplishment that you have experienced here is a time for rejoicing, because of the splendid progress which your membership has shared together.

Nevertheless, a note of grief and sadness sometimes has a way of creeping into our anniversary celebrations, and so, today, we pause to honor the man who served as your first and only manager, Raymond L. Cleaves. Last October 17, he celebrated his 79th birthday, but passed away suddenly on the morning of November 25.

It was my privilege to know Ray Cleaves only since 1949, but I cherished his association. Those of you who knew him through the years have an added advantage. I will miss him, and I know that you will too. Ray Cleaves was always doing and thinking for the benefit of the people in his area. The mainspring of his life, to which he devoted his major energies, was in the field of promoting and building cooperative rural electrification. He was one among many of you who was truly a pioneer in rural electrification. Ray Cleaves was always young in spirit and young in ideas. His influence was statewide and nationwide. We will miss his kindly helpfulness.

Ray, as he was known to all, once told me that when Chippewa Valley Electric was being organized, he decided to help out for a few months. He had had a wide experience in business matters and financial transactions. He though he could be helpful, and, at the very start was particularly interested that the Holcombe area, where he lived, would be included in the area to be served by the new organization.

Ray said to me further, "You know, everyone was so interested and worked so hard, that I caught the bug. I became enthusiastic about the idea of bringing electricity to all the rural people in the area. Pretty soon I found I was spending just about all my time on the thing. A little later they asked if I'd take over the job of manager, and I told them I'd try it for a while."

All of you know the results. He came to help for a few months. He stayed for 25 years and assisted in lightening the burden of rural peoples here and far beyond.

I doubt if even Ray and his associates fully realized at the time the far-reaching implications of their decision to build the Chippewa Falls diesel station in late spring of 1937. As a member of the executive committee of the board of directors of Wisconsin Power Cooperative, he was one of a small group of 5 men who decided that farmers needed their own generating station. He was one of the signers of the telegram which was sent to REA Administrator John Carmody which said, "We are going ahead with Wisconsin Power Cooperative as planned. We have the backing of 12,000 farm families."

This station, going on the line in March of 1938, broke the frustrating bottleneck here and throughout the Midwest which had stymied the efforts of farmers to get wholesale electric power at reasonable rates. It provided the spark which ignited the enthusiasm of farm people with the idea that they were capable of setting up cooperative organizations controlled and operated by themselves which would supply their electric power needs.

As the years went by, other generating stations were built larger and more efficient and the Chippewa Falls Station was placed on standby, being called upon now and again to assist its giant brothers. This in no way, however, detracts from its fundamental and far-reaching importance. It is a symbol of a firm foundation. It stands as a mark of progress. It exemplifies your slogan of "Growing Together". It indicates the vision of your late manager, Ray Cleaves.

It took equal vision and much determination to form Dairyland Power Cooperative in December 1941 when Wisconsin Power Cooperative and Tri-State Power Cooperative to the south, blended their organizations into one. Ray was a director on the first Dairyland Board, the only manager to ever so serve.

Throughout the years which followed, Ray did not rest on his laurels. He worked tirelessly for sound growth and progress. On March 17, 1938, 125 of your members first received electricity. This service is now enjoyed by 3,300 in abundant quantity, and by 102,000 through the entire Dairyland system. I can hear Ray say at Dairyland managers' meetings, "Let the farmers use all the power they want when they want it."

Your president, in his message to you in your silver anniversary report, sums up Ray's service as follows:

"To our late manager, Chippewa Valley Electric Cooperative was his pride and joy. No one person gave so much of their time, energy or effort to make the Cooperative a success. Hours of work, miles of travel, or personal sacrifice meant nothing when problems needed to be solved during any of the 25 years. He took a great pride in the fact we never had a bad year. We should all enjoy this pride, for all of you helped to establish this fine record."

I should like to conclude this eulogy of Ray by relating two personal incidents. The first occurred last October. After the Dairyland board of directors meeting was over, which he attended as many managers do, he came into my office and, with justifiable pride, showed me the tentative layout or format of your silver anniversary report. I told him that I thought his proposal was excellent and that I hoped he would find time to work out all the details. His passing on November 25 precluded this, of course, and it had to be finished by members of your board and staff.

As he was about to leave my office, I said something like this: "Ray, about 4 years ago when you and Mrs. Cleaves were celebrating your golden wedding anniversary, you sort of promised that when you got close to 80, you'd begin to seriously consider the idea of retirement. Any comment on the consideration, Ray?"

"Yes," he said, "but of course, I'm not 80 yet—but I'll say this. You know how important I think our annual meetings are. It gets our members, old and young, together. It keeps our cooperative on the beam. Our next one will be our 25th and I want it to be a good one. If the good Lord, and my people, and my board can put up with me until then, or maybe until spring, then I think I'll be ready to turn over the reins to someone else."

In his voice there was humility, understanding, gentleness, sincerity, and thankfulness.

The second incident occurred about the middle of last November. A committee of managers and Dairyland board members were discussing whether Dairyland's 20th anniversary, which would occur on December 16, should be a large or a small celebration. I was asked to sit in and take minutes. Because of the press of so many important projects that Dairyland management was working on, the group decided upon the small celebration, but all agreed that Dairyland's 25th anniversary would definitely be a large one.

After the decision was reached, Ray Cleaves sat reflecting a moment and then said to William Garbisch, vice president of Dairyland, who was sitting beside him, and who is a truly healthy and vigorous man who carries his 75 years lightly, "You know, Bill, it could be that some of us won't be here if we have to wait that 5 years."

"I know how you feel", replied Mr. Garbisch, "but I guess you and I and some others can be satisfied with the thought that if we have done our chores properly, others will remember our efforts and will carry on the work which we started."

There was a silence and then we all heard Ray's voice—"You know something, Bill, you're absolutely right; absolutely right."

Democracy in Action Produces a Center for Social Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, last November I was privileged to attend and participate in the 46th biennial General Assembly of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. I had the honor to serve as chairman of that group's resolutions committee and take pride in the assembly's vote to establish in Washington the Emily R. and Kivie Kaplan Center for Religious Action, a physical expression of the program of the Commission on Social Action of Reform Judaism.

The December 11, 1961, issue of the Congress Weekly, a publication of the American Jewish Congress, contained the following article by Ben Firestone relating the assembly events leading up to the adoption of the resolution creating the Center for Religious Action and I commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

DECISION ON SOCIAL ACTION

(By Ben Firestone)

It was 2 p.m., Tuesday, November 14. The large ballroom of the Sheraton Park Hotel in Washington, D.C., was almost full. Harried ushers scrutinized the credentials

of each person who sought entry to the roped-off section reserved for delegates. More than one notable, having forgotten his badge, had to hurry back to his room to retrieve it. Visitors, some coming from New York City just for this particular session, streamed into the balcony to watch the drama.

Approximately 1,300 official delegates, representing Reform synagogues throughout the United States and Canada, had registered for the convention which had begun 2 days earlier. All were in their seats that Tuesday afternoon, voting cards and resolutions in their hands. The vast hall was charged with suspense. Waiting expectantly for the gavel, the delegates sensed that a stormy 2-year struggle was about to reach its dramatic climax.

Judge Emil Baar, permanent chairman of the convention, standing under a banner setting forth the convention theme of "Judaism and Democracy: Our Common Mission," strode to the podium and gavelled to order the session of the 46th General Assembly of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. The long-awaited debate was about to begin.

Many of the Reform Jewish leaders in the room had also been in attendance in Miami Beach at the 1959 biennial assembly of the UAHC where the controversy, now to be resolved, had really begun. In Miami Beach, the delegates had voted overwhelmingly to accept a gift of Mr. and Mrs. Kivie Kaplan of Boston for the establishment of a center for religious action in Washington, D.C., as part of the program of the Commission on Social Action of Reform Judaism. Thereafter, a building had been purchased in the Nation's Capital but implementation of the center had been postponed as a result of a determined opposition to the center on the part of several of the reform synagogues which make up the UAHC. Led by Temple Emanu El of New York City and Washington Hebrew congregation, the opposition had waged a zealous campaign for reconsideration of the entire matter at the next convention. Because of the importance of the issue, the UAHC leadership agreed to place the question once again, for full debate and action, before the 1961 general assembly.

In the months preceding the convention in Washington, the air had been purple with charges and countercharges. It was clear that the opposition combined a variety of forces and views. Some were vehemently opposed to social action altogether, holding that the application of Jewish ethics to social issues and daily life was the duty of the individual and not of the synagogue or of the Reform Jewish movement. Some were strongly opposed to the idea of a social action center in Washington, fearing it would smack of "lobbying" and would involve Reform synagogues in "controversial" issues. Some southerners objected because of UAHC positions on desegregation. The American Council for Judaism loosed a wild charge that the center was part of some dark trend toward "monolithic" institutions. One or two others, unconcerned with social action one way or the other, saw in the issue an opportunity to challenge the leadership and basic direction of the UAHC.

The debate opened after Congressman ABRAHAM MULTER, chairman of the resolutions committee, offered a resolution which had been approved by the UAHC board of trustees (by a vote of 130 to 3) and by the convention resolutions committee (by a vote of 40 to 2). The resolution strongly reaffirmed support for the Washington Center and set forth the procedures and safeguards under which the center would be conducted. It stressed that the center would be supervised by the national Commission on Social Action, that it would operate according to resolutions adopted by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and the Central Conference of American Rabbis. Further, it recommended the establishment in Washington of a 6-man advisory committee which would counsel and advise the director of the Washington Center.

Each side was then given 50 minutes to present its case. It became immediately evident that the opposition had begun to retreat from its original position. Instead of directly opposing the center or social action (let me emphasize that we are all for social action), it concentrated on a demand for additional "safeguards" in the center's operation. Specifically, it pressed for an amendment demanding a "watchdog" advisory committee, to be made up of laymen who were not members of the Commission on Social Action. The issue then became: Would such a "watchdog" committee stifle or emasculate the social action program? Supporters of the center contended it would; opposition speakers insisted it would give the congregations additional necessary protection.

Distinguished members of Reform Judaism were to be found on both sides of the controversy. Among those speaking for the resolution—and against the amendments—were Mr. Irving Fain, chairman of the Commission on Social Action; Rabbi Solomon Freehof, president of the World Union for Progressive Judaism; Mrs. Henry Monsky, president of the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods; Rabbi Albert Minda, president of the Central Conference of American Rabbis; Rabbi Roland Gittelsohn; and Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath, president of the UAHC.

Speakers for the opposition included Mr. Myron Sulzberger, Rabbi Nathan Perilman, and Rabbi Julius Mark of Temple Emanu El, New York; Mr. David Bress, Washington Hebrew Congregation; Mrs. Bernard Brooks of San Antonio, Tex., Rabbi William Rosenblum of Temple Israel, New York.

An enthusiastic message of support for the center from Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg was read to the delegates. An interesting aspect of the controversy is that Mr. Goldberg, several years earlier, had been among the first to propose the establishment of a social action center under Reform Jewish religious auspices which would work side by side with the many Protestant and Catholic social action agencies already functioning in Washington.

Even in the early stages of the debate it became evident where the sentiments of the delegates lay. The opposition to the center was singularly unpersuasive. The vote was overwhelming—approximately 1,200 to 100. A triumphant roar of gratification echoed through the hall, almost drowning out the chairman's announcement that the amendments were defeated and the main resolution carried.

It was a dramatic moment, the climax of a memorable convention. After the smoke of battle cleared, it was manifest that all the sound and fury of the past months had been generated by a small minority. The Union of American Hebrew Congregations, in keeping with a tradition going back to its inception in 1873, had resolved to keep faith with its commitment to social justice.

The Emily R. and Kivie Kaplan Center for Religious Action will be formally dedicated in 1962.

Court Packing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the pious platitudes of President Kennedy on how he would insist on qualified persons for his appointments have been flagrantly disregarded.

As a result, deserving Democrats only are being considered in naming Federal judges. The article by David Lawrence, in yesterday's New York Herald Tribune shows how unjudicial a President can be in appointing members of the judiciary:

NEW COURT PACKING SEEN IN NAMING ALL DEMOCRATS

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy has asked the American people to believe that, in nominating 82 new Federal judges, he couldn't find in the entire United States a single Republican lawyer who, in his judgment, was qualified to be on the list. By reason of legislation last year creating 73 additional judgeships and because of some existing vacancies, Mr. Kennedy will soon have filled nearly one-third of the entire Federal bench—more appointments than any President heretofore has had an opportunity to make in a single term.

The display of partisanship was the result of a recommendation by the President's brother, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, who managed the last presidential campaign and who, it now is being charged, awarded the judgeships on the basis of polical considerations.

Another Democratic Party leader, the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, sought in 1937 to have the Supreme Court enlarged from 9 to 15 Justices because, as he told the American people, some of the Justices on the Court at that time held views that didn't go along with his. He wanted a majority that would outvote those with whom he disagreed. The scheme became known as court packing, and was defeated in Congress.

Court packing now, however, is back in vogue on a large scale. It is embarrassing for some Senators to oppose a partisan list of judges, because many of the nominations are made to curry favor with Senators who want friends or political associates named to the bench. Seventy Kennedy appointees have been confirmed already by the Senate, and probably the others will be accepted as a matter of routine. The fact that the Republicans have done this in the past does not justify it. Two wrongs do not make a right.

REPORT MADE PUBLIC

It is significant that Bernard G. Segal, chairman of the Federal Judiciary Committee of the American Bar Association, has just made public a report filed with the Attorney General condemning the process by which 82 Democrats were selected for the Federal bench. Adding to these the 3 recess appointments of the preceding administration, the qualifications of a total of 85 nominees were analyzed. The American Bar Association committee designated seven as "not qualified." Only 14 were designated as "exceptionally well qualified," and 41 were listed as "well qualified," while 23 were referred to as "qualified." The distinction between these classifications is one that is difficult to define, but apparently even mediocre nominees are frequently called qualified.

Certainly the country is not getting the best qualified men or women to serve as Federal judges.

The big question is whether politically chosen judges will feel obligated to construe the law in ways that will carry out the policies of the Democratic administration. In these days of "Government by Executive order," the politically minded appointee can play politics on the bench. He may have been a good lawyer in private practice, but does this necessarily mean he will make an impartial judge?

In answer to criticism, Department of Justice officials are saying that they are merely doing what the Republican administrations did in the past—appointing more

judges from their own party. But Republicans declare that the Federal judiciary was unbalanced, politically speaking, during the Democratic Party's occupancy of the White House from 1933 to 1953, and that President Eisenhower, by his appointments, was able to bring about for the first time in many years an equal division on the bench between the two political parties. In other words, as Mr. Eisenhower filled vacancies with Republicans, he overcame the Democratic Party advantage. Since an equal number of Republicans and Democrats was finally obtained in 1960, the argument is being made by Republican leaders that President Kennedy should have preserved the equal status instead of disturbing the balance once more.

TWO REPUBLICANS NAMED

Besides the 82 Democrats nominated for the Federal bench and mentioned in the report of the American Bar Association, Mr. Kennedy named 7 additional Democrats and 1 Liberal Party member. Two Republicans already serving on the bench under recess appointments given them by the preceding administration were reappointed. So to date only 2 out of the total of 92 appointments are Repulicans. By way of consolation, Department of Justice officials are saying that there will be some Republicans named in the next batch of 43 appointments. But nobody is saying how much is some.

Why should any judge ever be appointed by the political process of recommendation by party brethren in Congress and by local politicians? Does this make for a judicial system of the highest integrity? Mr. Segal, of the American Bar Association committee, says wistfuly in his report:

"We continue to strive and we continue to hope intermediately for bipartisanship, eventually for the ideal of nonpartisanship."

One wonders why in these days, when the errors and unmoral behavior of businesses or of some corporations or of private citizens become the subject of congressional investigation, there is no uproar at all about the unmorality that envelops the scandalous method of selecting Federal judges in America.

Washington Light Infantry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Maj. Gen. D. W. McGowan, chief of the National Guard Bureau, addressed the Washington Light Infantry at its annual banquet in Charleston, S.C., February 22.

General McGowan told of the bold courage needed in the founding of our great Nation. His remarks speak for themselves, but I think they are of such importance in these days of national peril they should be made available for the information of the Congress and for all patriotic Americans to read.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert his speech in the Appendix of the RECORD:

REMARKS BY MAJ. GEN. D. W. MCGOWAN, CHIEF, NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU, BEFORE THE WASHINGTON LIGHT INFANTRY, CHARLESTON, S.C.

It is a pleasure for me to be here tonight among brothers-in-arms of the South Carolina National Guard. My pleasure is twofold, since I feel a sense of real kinship with the Washington Light Infantry. Your unit represents the State of South Carolina in the Centennial Legion, just as my old unit—Troop B of the 102d Cavalry (the Essex Troop)—is the New Jersey member of that organization composed of the ancient military units of the Thirteen Original Colonies. Together they perpetuate the military traditions of organizations which have fought to protect our Nation since earliest colonial days, just as the Essex Troop and the Washington Light Infantry trained together for World War II combat at Fort Jackson. It is a kinship we all greatly value.

In meeting here on this particular date, we do honor to not one Washington, but to two: The man whose birth date it is, the father of our country, and his distant cousin, Col. William Washington, the godfather of your organization.

In a larger sense, we honor here today the spirit of American liberty which was born of our great Revolution, for just as both Washingtons embodied that spirit which gave birth to our liberty, so our National Guard units have fought in every war to preserve it.

The role of the Southern Colonies in our Revolution is one which is not well enough known nor appreciated, in my opinion, but it was one of vast significance to the eventual outcome at Yorktown. The British plan to divide the Colonies by gaining firm control of the South, and then to concentrate their efforts against the North, had not reckoned on the unconquerable spirit of South Carolinians. There were royalists to contend with in these parts, to be sure, but there were also the frontier riflemen and the free yeomanry, crack shots, who didn't mind taking on the Redcoats, whatever the circumstances.

The British, in their attack on the South in June of 1776 by an army of 3,000 well-trained troops and a fleet of 11 men-of-war confidently expected to capture Charleston by assault.

It was during the cannonade of Fort Moultrie that the memory of Sergeant Jasper became forever enshrined in the hearts of loyal Carolinians. You will recall that it was at a crucial moment in the 10-hour battle when the flagstaff was shot away and fell outside of the fort; whereupon Sergeant Jasper jumped outside the ramparts, tore the palmetto flag of South Carolina from the broken staff and, surviving a storm of shot and shell, planted it on the palmetto log walls of the fort attached to a rammer staff.

So shaken were the British by their defeat that day, that it was nearly 3 years before they again turned their attention to the South.

With the capture of Charleston in 1780, however, the British believed they could at long last secure a stranglehold on the South, and their cavalry under the hated Tarleton ravished the countryside. But they soon found themselves faced with a new kind of warfare—guerrilla cavalry tactics.

The Southern Irregular Cavalry lacked a central organization, but their hit-and-run raids hurt the enemy badly.

Led by the immortal Pickens, Sumter, and Marion, rebel raiders drifted out of their hideouts in the swamps to strike isolated outposts, gobble up supply trains, and wreck British formations, sapping and neutralizing superior enemy strength by pinning down hundreds of their regular troops.

And one by one, patriot forces snapped up the series of British posts which Cornwallis had so carefully established to maintain his hold on the Carolinas and Georgia.

Slowly the tide of the war began to turn. At King's Mountain the Tories suffered a humiliating defeat at the hands of an inferior force of backwoods riflemen under Sevier and Shelby with the total loss of their troops by death or capture.

Although Gen. Nathaniel Greene, who took command late in 1780, never got the credit he deserved, it was he, through his strategic marches and his skillful use of continentals and militiamen, who kept the war going here in the South and prevented the British from cutting the country in two.

At the Cowpens, Morgan so skillfully deployed his continental regulars and militia, and so maneuvered them in the fight, that he nearly wiped out Tarleton's entire force. It was during this battle that Col. William Washington engaged Tarleton in fierce personal combat, and nearly annihilated his defeated force in its headlong rout. The subsequent strategic withdrawal of Greene north over the Dan River into Virginia was an epic.

Even Greene's later defeat at Guilford Courthouse in March forced the British under Cornwallis to withdraw to Wilmington, and subsequently into Virginia.

The final blow to the British came at the Battle of Eutaw Springs. Though not a clear-cut patriot victory, the British forces were so weakened by their losses that they never again engaged in a major battle. For all practical purposes, the war in the South was won.

When the Washington Light Infantry was organized in 1807, it determined to carry forward the tradition of the War of Independence and the exploits of these South Carolina militiamen, and specifically by honoring the memory of that great soldier hero of the victory at Cowpens—Col. William Washington.

In 1824, the company with other historic units in the States took part in a great patriotic celebration which was to have a very special significance for all guardsmen. Designated for the occasion as the "Fusilier Francaise," the Washington Light Infantry acted as a special guard of honor to escort the aging Marquis de Lafayette into Charleston on that French nobleman's triumphant and nostalgic return to the United States. It was in New York City that the famous 7th Regiment also served as a guard of honor to Lafayette, and for the occasion renamed itself "National Guard" in honor of Lafayette's "Garde Nationale," which he had commanded in France. From this triumphal tour, and from this adoption of the name, we of the States' armed forces today bear the name National Guard.

In the Mexican War of 1847, the Washington Light Infantry formed the nucleus of company A, of the Charleston Volunteers, and took part in General Scott's brilliant campaign from Veracruz through Contrearas, Churubusco, Chapultepec, and the Garita de Belen leading to the fall of Mexico City.

During the Civil War, the unit provided three companies; one serving under the immortal Wade Hampton, the other two as part of the 25th (Eutaw) Regiment, South Carolina Infantry. Of the original 414 officers and men from the original company, more than a fourth were killed in the great battles of that war.

Serving on the Mexican border in 1916 as Company B, 2d South Carolina Infantry in 1916, the unit became company B, 118th Infantry in World War I, part of the 30th Division. It was this division with the 27th of New York that cracked the Hindenburg line in Flanders signalling the beginning of the end of World War I.

Entering World War II, Company B, 118th Infantry took part with the 30th Division in the climactic battle to halt Von Runstedt's armored drive on Mortain where he hoped to cut off Patton's armored columns fighting their way south from the Normandy beachhead into Brittany.

In subsequent combat, this National Guard division, Old Hickory, was to become known as "The Workhorse of the Western

Front." Thus, it is a proud heritage that the Washington Light Infantry carries forward—a tradition born at Lexington and Concord and, more specifically, here in South Carolina at the Cowpens, at Kings Mountain, at Camden, at Guilford Courthouse, and at Eutaw Springs.

And now to conclude by returning to our first President, whose birthday we celebrate, commander in his day of the Virginia regiment.

Character was that quality which distinguished George Washington—probably not a military genius, he was, indeed, a great military leader, and a great President.

It was the force of his high character and the strength of his personality that held together the tattered remnants of his Continental Army through the unspeakable hardships of the winters at Morristown and Valley Forge. He knew defeat first at Long Island, again at Harlem Heights and at White Plains. Retreating with his dwindling forces across the Jerseys, Washington took refuge behind the Delaware River, opposite Trenton. For the decisive attack on the Hessians in Trenton—his own daring idea—three separate columns were detailed to cross the ice-filled Delaware. Only two columns made it—one of them accomplished nothing. Only the column which he personally led was to claim the victory—a victory that marked the turning point of the Revolution. Surely there is exemplified the imponderables of great military leadership.

The following story concerning our great President, I recounted at Savannah, Ga., just 2 years ago today to the Exchange Club:

Washington's insistence that the civil government be ever paramount, and that indeed he himself was but the servant of the Continental Congress, is supported by two incidents at the close of the war, which I will briefly describe.

The last wartime winter of 1782–83 was an unusually severe one. The fighting had long ceased. Although Washington thought the Army generally "was better organized, disciplined, and clothed" than ever before, serious trouble threatened in the resentment against its continued neglect by the Continental Congress. Washington warned a delegate at Philadelphia, "The temper of the Army is much soured and has become more irritable than at any period since the commencement of the war."

An anonymous address attacked the "coldness and severity" of the Congress toward the officers' financial distress and urged them, should the Congress ignore a "last remonstrance," to desert the country during the war, or in event of peace, to refuse to lay down arms until redressed.

Upon reading the anonymous circular, Washington instantly ordered a meeting of officers for the 15th of May 1783 and decided that he, himself, must attend and address the meeting.

Maj. Samuel Shaw of the artillery was among the officers present at the meeting, and gives an account of it in these words:

"Washington opened the meeting by apologizing for his appearance there, but said that the diligence used in circulating the anonymous pieces rendered it necessary that he should give the sentiments to the Army on the nature and tendency of them."

The anonymous addresses, said Washington, were directed more to "the feelings and passions than to the reason and judgment of the Army," and he bitterly denounced the courses proposed by the papers to the officers.

After speaking of his own and of the officers' responsibilities for the Government, he then read a letter from Joseph Jones, the Virginia delegate to Congress, which acted as testimony of the good disposition in Congress toward the Army.

Major Shaw further writes:

"One circumstance in reading this letter must not be omitted. Washington, after reading the first paragraph, made a short pause, took out his spectacles, and begged the indulgence of his audience, while he put them on, observing at the same time that he had grown gray in their service and now found himself growing blind. This appeal forced its way into the heart and moistened every eye. The general, having finished, took leave of the assembly."

Washington received a vote of thanks, and the officers expressed their confidence in Congress, repudiating the proposal of the anonymous addresses and quietly adjourned.

Instead of open revolt, by his unaffected and natural appeal, Washington had thus brought about formal expression by the officers corps of its confidence in the Continental Congress, the elected representatives of the people.

The second incident involves Washington's last official act as Commander in Chief of the Continental Forces.

The war was over. It was December of that same year, 1783. Savannah had been evacuated in July of the previous year. Washington had decided to return to civil life, with as little fanfare as possible, not only because this was the nature of that great man, but also because he felt that the enormous esteem in which he was held was potentially dangerous for the Nation. But the public would not have it so.

Congress was meeting at the same time in the State House at Annapolis, and Washington determined to deliver his resignation to that body in person. And so, after bidding his officers a moving farewell on December 4, at Fraunces' Tavern in New York, he set out on his long journey south. In the three cities through which he passed—Philadelphia, Wilmington, and Baltimore—he was joyously received with townwide celebrations. It was the same when he arrived in Annapolis. At his journey's end, he was an even greater hero than before.

In contrast, the Continental Congress was virtually without prestige. Added to a total indifference on the part of most citizens was the fact that many States had even neglected to send any delegation. The people had virtually forgotten that a national body existed.

But for Washington—hero though he was—this was the Congress and he was its servant. Why else had he fought?

On December 20, in Annapolis, Washington sent a letter to Congress, asking permission to resign and requesting the manner of doing so. The committee informed him that the Congress wished him to deliver the resignation in person at noon of the 23d. The reply went on to set forth the following specifications:

1. He was to be accompanied by his two aides, but, while Washington was to be shown a seat, his aides were to remain standing.

2. The President of the Congress would tell him when he might speak.

3. At the close of his address he should return his commission to the President and hear the President's reply.

4. That the Members of the Congress would remain seated and would keep their hats on. They were not to rise nor to uncover to General Washington. When, however, General Washington had become Mr. Washington, then the Congressmen were to rise and lift their hats.

5. After the ceremony, Washington was to bow to the Congress, but the Members were not to bow in return. They were to maintain their superiority to Washington, whether he were soldier or citizen.

And so it was. He arrived at noon on the 23d accompanied by his two aides, and took the seat assigned to him. After receiving the President's permission to speak, he read his brief address. At its end he "drew out from his bosom" his commission and placed the document in the President's hands. At every point, he conformed to the rules of the Congress. When the ceremony was ended, Congress rose and uncovered as a sign of respect to him.

And then Washington performed his first act as a private citizen. He returned Congress mark of respect with a greater one.

He bowed, as Congress had specified he should.

This was his greatest hour.

The horses were at the door. Fifty miles lay ahead—the ferry across the clear Potomac—the last swift gallop along the lane to Mount Vernon—where Martha awaited him. George Washington, private citizen—home for Christmas.

French Professor Brilliantly Demolishes the Pompous Pretenses of the Recently Issued Draft Program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Problems of the Peoples of the U.S.S.R. No. 12, 1961:

REPLY TO A TASS QUESTIONNAIRE

(By Raymond Aron)

(NOTE.—Raymond Aron, professor of sociology at the Sorbonne, is internationally known as a distinguished commentator on world affairs. How he came to be answering a Tass questionnaire, he explains himself. For permission to reprint M. Aron's remarks, we are deeply indebted to the editors of Figaro in Paris.)

I was one of the recipients of a questionnaire sent to 31 Frenchmen by a Paris representative of Tass, the Soviet news agency. The list of addressees includes nine "old reliables"—that is, men devoted body and soul to the Soviet cause, whether that involves deifying Stalin or liquidating the personality cult, and about half-a-dozen fellow-travelers. Since the Tass correspondent's letter did not indicate where or how the replies would be published, and merely expressed the intention of making known to Soviet and foreign readers the point of view of the Frenchmen questioned, I thought there would be nothing wrong in making my point of view known to the readers of Figaro, while still sending my reply directly to Tass.

I. WHAT GENERAL IMPRESSION DO YOU GET FROM READING THE DRAFT PROGRAM OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION?

An impression of dullness. I have made two trips to the other side of the Iron Curtain, and found that a socialist regime is even more thorough and efficient in organizing boredom than in organizing enthusiasm or terror. To require a Westerner to read the 127 pages of the draft program is to ask for an extremely strenuous effort, whose magnitude the Soviets are incapable of grasping after more than 40 years of ideological satu-

ration. On page after page one reads sentences like this: "The enormous extent of large-scale building projects requires the rapid development of the building industry, the perfection of its techniques, a considerable growth in the volume of production of building materials, whose quality must be improved and production cost lowered." In the West even our Government officials do not subject us to such massive doses of soporific verbiage.

As for the program itself, my main impression is that we have heard all this before. The ability to insist upon the realities of things as they should be, but aren't—an ability which the world has long admired in the Soviet Union—obviously remains unimpaired. On page 83, the Soviet economy is called powerful and harmoniously developed. As my high-school teacher would have remarked on hearing the expression harmoniously developed, "this is a felicitous find." When you consider the disproportion between heavy and consumer industry in Russia, you wonder whether the word "harmony" means the same thing on both sides of the Iron Curtain. "Under a socialist regime nations blossom and their sovereignty consolidates itself." The sovereignty of the Hungarian people was probably consolidated in November 1956, like that of the 3 million Germans who have left East Germany in the last 15 years.

As for the rest, I leave it to specialists in ideological exegesis to determine whether the mixture of "peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems" and "the relentless struggle against bourgeois and reformist ideology" is supposed to satisfy Mao Tse-tung or Marshal Tito, Lenin's shade or Stalin's ghost.

II. WHAT PERSPECTIVES DOES THE PROGRAM OPEN UP FOR THE SOVIET PEOPLE?

I must apologize for a reply which will be no less disappointing than the one above. The Soviet people can expect to see the continuation of a process familiar to them for several years already: the rapid growth of the power of the Soviet Union, and a slower rise in its standard of living.

I know well enough that the draft program provides exact figures which cannot fail to impress gullible readers, or even a few economists. But does this prove anything? The program says that by raising the overall industrial production of the Soviet Union two-and-a-half times it will surpass the present industrial production of the United States. I must therefore conclude that Soviet production is now 40 percent of that of the United States. (Mr. Khrushchev recently said 50 percent, but in these matters the ambiguity of the figures leaves considerable room for the imagination.) The program declares that in the next 20 years industrial production will be multiplied at least six times over. I have my doubts on this point since this goal would have to be attained by multiplying work productivity in industry by 4 or 4.5. Now, from the first 5-year-plan onward, the targets of heavy industry have almost always been reached, and the targets of light industry almost never. The results have been regularly attained by a greater increase in manpower, and by a lower increase in productivity than had been foreseen. My skepticism is all the greater regarding the 2½ times increase, in 10 years, of the overall volume of agricultural production, going up to three-and-a-half times in 20 years.

As for agriculture, it is enough to compare the promises made during the last 40 years with the actual harvests, as reported in the official statistics, to be able to conclude with reasonable assurance: Mr. Khrushchev proposes, and the Russian peasant—helped or frustrated by the whims of the weather and bureaucrats—disposes.

Moreover, we are not exactly terrified by the prospect of these promises being carried out. Quite the contrary. We Westerners are convinced that the Russian people, like other peoples, wants to live in peace and that it learns by experience. It is Moscow that has provided the following definition of the Soviet Union: The country where one knows exactly when the cosmonaut will be back from the moon, but not when the housewife will be back with the meat from the corner butcher. Personally, I have a weakness for a country which accepts (reluctantly, I admit) a delay in the conquest of space, but which is not so quick to sacrifice the well-being of ordinary people down here on earth.

But if 20 years from now Soviet cosmonauts push on and on, and Soviet housewives are more satisfied, this can only please us. Why shouldn't the Russian people finally see the day when their sacrifices will be rewarded by more than pride in their collective strength and the glory of exploring space? And, if you will pardon our vulgar Marxism, we have not lost all hope that prosperity might sweeten the intransigence of your faith and make you less insensitive to what is for us the greater prize: freedom.

So don't believe it when you are told that the anti-Communist peoples are afraid that the building of socialism will succeed. There is room for all peoples and all systems of government on this earth of ours. We shall not be converted to your gospel by statistics of the rate of economic growth—unless, as a result of your achievements, you give back to the proletariat you have "liberated" by subjection to party discipline, the freedom to question this discipline and to judge for themselves whether the West really resembles the caricature which your propaganda machine never stops churning out. However, if your "liberated" proletariat were free to argue, discuss and travel, there would no longer be any quarrel between us.

III. WHAT INFLUENCE IS THIS PROGRAM LIKELY TO EXERT ON THE POLITICAL, ECONOMIC, AND SOCIAL FACTORS OF THE MODERN WORLD?

In itself this program will exert no particular influence, since it is only another advertisement hoarding. In 20, or even 10 years from now the Agit-Prop technicians will think up another one. It goes without saying that the promise to achieve communism in our time will disturb people in the uncommitted world as well as Europe who are afraid of not setting their armchairs in the direction in which history is going, and who won't even take the trouble (for their own good reasons) to read the program. However, reading the program would teach them that the society of the future will not be so very different from that of the present: the program declares that one-half of a worker's salary will be paid indirectly, that is, that one-half will finance the social services, so that everyone will receive in cash, to spend as he wishes, only one-half of what he earns (p. 90). Will Soviet workers consider that progress?

While the program as such is unlikely to exert any marked influence in one direction or another, the Soviet Union itself, by its acts, by its leaders' statements, by its undertakings, will, to a considerable extent, determine the course of history in the next 20 years. Do not think that I am unaware of the position of the Soviet Union as a great superpower. In my youth I used to spend a good deal of time reading the works of a certain Koenigsberg philosopher, a philosopher whom you call bourgeois, but who retains his position as a teacher and master for people with certain kindred minds. It is he who taught me that power can command obedience, but not respect.

I doff my hat when that is the social custom, but I reserve my moral respect for those who are personally worthy of it. If I act this way toward the powerful men of my own country, why shouldn't I act similarly toward yours, even though, in terms of ballistic missiles, your country is so much more powerful than mine?

We are, of course, deeply obliged to the Prime Minister of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union for the noteworthy information he has provided regarding the number of hydrogen bombs required in order to devastate France or Great Britain (Hitler used the word "ausradieren").

First of all, we believe that our American allies have just as many available for your convenience, and that the Soviet leaders will not fall into the error they call "adventurism." Furthermore, we can hardly believe that the high priest of a religion calling itself humanitarian could casually envisage the prospect of atomizing millions of people. Finally, and most important, human beings do not like to admit to themselves that they are afraid. As Alain (another bourgeois thinker) said, they rush towards danger to conquer their fear.

I have recently been reading about experiments carried out on mice. It seems that in the animal world, success reinforces, while failure weakens, aggressiveness. A thrice-victorious mouse will pounce on its fourth victim. A thrice-trounced mouse either lies low or flees the aggressor. Man, however, who also has a certain tendency to react like a mouse, is a strange animal, since he has a conscience and is his own judge he refuses to submit and goes on fighting despite all object lessons. In 1941 the Russian Armies received severe blows, but it was they, finally, who marched into Berlin, and not Hitler's troops into Moscow. If the Soviet Union, through its possession of missiles and hydrogen bombs, wants to rule the world by terror, it will provoke a war which will leave socialism just as devastated as capitalism.

I know what your reply will be: the West's policy toward the Soviet bloc raises this point just as relevantly, even though the West does not perhaps see it in the same way. In the long run peaceful coexistence can only be maintained on two conditions: that neither of the great powers tries to impose its will on the other by brandishing its missiles when the vital interests of its alter ego are at stake; and that neither of the two camps, under the pretext of ideological struggle, denies the other the right to exist. Competition has to work itself out in freedom, and all hopes are permitted.

What do I mean by competition and freedom? Let a Moscow professor come to Paris to teach Marxist sociology, and let me be allowed to teach non-Marxist sociology in Moscow. Yes, I know you will say to me: "Here we don't tolerate the propaganda of 'monopolists,' 'revanchists,' or 'warmongers.'" I shall not even take the trouble to say that I am none of these. I shall simply object that in your world it is the government which decrees who is a friend and who is an enemy of socialism (sometimes the decree works retroactively). In our world we let our citizens—and especially our students—decide for themselves. They certainly make mistakes sometimes, but your leaders make mistakes sometimes too, and their errors are far more costly (as the personality cult bears witness).

I therefore hope that even before you achieve communism you will allow your students to judge for themselves the truth or falsity of the ideological teaching given them. When that day comes, coexistence will at last be peaceful.

Appendix

Community Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HAYDEN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, last January, with county officials from 16 Western States in attendance, a midyear workshop meeting of the National Association of County Officials was held in Phoenix, the county seat of Maricopa County, Ariz. On January 26, 1962, two outstanding addresses were delivered at the Westward Ho Hotel which, as a former county treasurer and sheriff of that county, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LONG-RANGE PHYSICAL PLANNING FOR COMMUNITIES

(By Donald W. Hutton, director, Maricopa County Planning and Zoning Department)

It is a pleasure to participate in this conference. Specifically, my subject, "Long-Range Physical Planning for Communities," will touch upon the problem of integrating planning in larger communities with particular reference to planning activities in this county.

During the past 20 years, I have participated in the preparation of plans for various cities including comprehensive plans for St. Petersburg, Fla.; Oklahoma City, New Orleans, and Louisville, Ky. Since January 1958, I have been director of the Maricopa County Planning and Zoning Department.

In the time available, I will comment upon growth trends in Maricopa County, major planning problems, and our approach to planning.

GROWTH TRENDS

A great deal has been published on growth trends in the United States and particularly in the Western States. For instance, according to the October 16, 1960, issue of U.S. News & World Report, the total combined population of the 16 States, including Alaska and Hawaii, represented in the western regional district, is expected to increase from 30,698,000 persons in 1960 to 39,823,000 in 1970; this amounts to an increase of 29.7 percent compared to an estimated future gain of 16.8 percent for the Nation as a whole during the same period. Arizona is expected to increase from 1,292,000 persons in 1960 to 1,898,000, or 46.9 percent, by 1970.

Maricopa County increased from 186,193 persons in 1940 to 663,510 in 1960. This is an increase of 477,317 persons or more than 250 percent over a span of 20 years. In a study prepared for the city of Phoenix and Maricopa County by western management consultants, it has been estimated that the population of Maricopa County will probably reach 1,400,000 persons between 1975 and 1980 if both national and local conditions continue favorable to the county's growth. This may prove to be a conservative estimate as it is based upon employment prospects as projected. Projections based upon net migration to the county and of local birth and death rates produced estimates ranging from 1,500,000 persons to 2,400,000 persons.

In 1950, approximately 72 percent of the population of Maricopa County was located in urban areas as compared to an estimate of more than 90 percent today.

The magnitude of total growth and urbanization trends emphasizes the necessity for careful urban planning in order to anticipate the amount and location of future growth and the various physical facilities that will be needed such as major streets and highways, schools, parks, and the like.

PURPOSE, AUTHORITY, AND SCOPE OF PLANNING

The purpose of physical planning is to provide a general guide for the orderly and economical growth of a community. A plan provides a framework within which all private and public construction materializes. Authority for planning is derived from State enabling legislation and local ordinances and resolutions thereunder. The scope of planning generally includes all or most of the following subjects: studies relating to the economic potential, population, land use, major streets and highways, schools, parks and recreation areas, transit and transportation, public buildings, housing, zoning, subdivision rules and regulations, capital expenditure programs, utilities such as water and sewers, and administration of the plan.

The benefits to be obtained from a plan are of course dependent upon the adequacy of State enabling legislation, adequacy and scope of the plan, public understanding and support, and administrative understanding and support. If any of these elements are missing or deficient, planning suffers accordingly. Since time does not permit full exploration of these various matters, I will pass quickly into a discussion of problems of integrating planning in larger communities.

PROBLEMS OF INTEGRATING PLANNING IN A METROPOLITAN COMPLEX

The ideal unit for physically planning would be an area that is a single economic unit under a single governmental jurisdiction. However, in metropolitan complexes the economic unit embraces numerous governmental jurisdictions. Also, problems of government transcend corporate limit lines. This has given rise to various methods of approach such as consolidation of city and county functions, annexation, extraterritorial control, creation of separate authorities for particular functions of government on an areawide basis, and various cooperative arrangements between local governments.

THE PLANNING APPROACH USED IN MARICOPA COUNTY

Insofar as physical planning is concerned, we believe that cooperation between local governments is a logical, practical, and effective approach in Maricopa County. Unified planning is possible while at the same time local autonomy is preserved.

In July 1958, the Phoenix City Council and the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors, upon the recommendation of their respective planning commissions, provided for the establishment of an advance planning task force. This task force had as its mission the preparation of certain physical plans for the Phoenix urban area. Separate office facilities were established for the advance planning group and it comprised staff members assigned by the two planning departments. Subsequently, the advance planning task force cooperated very closely with western management consultants, who were employed to prepare an economic analysis for Phoenix and Maricopa County, and with Wilbur Smith & Associates, who were employed by the State, city, and county to plan a system of major streets and highways designed to serve the Phoenix urban area and Maricopa County.

The advance planning task force prepared separate reports upon population and land use respectively, which reports have been given widespread distribution. Among other purposes, these reports served as a basis for the proposed major street and highway system, which has subsequently been adopted by the county and various cities and towns in the county.

COUNTY PLANNING UNDERTAKEN FOR VARIOUS SMALLER INCORPORATED COMMUNITIES

In addition to the joint advance planning work with the city of Phoenix, the services of the Maricopa County planning department were offered to incorporated communities in the county on a matching fund basis under contractual arrangement whereby the county defrayed 50 percent of the cost of the work, and the community concerned defrayed 50 percent of the cost. Under this program, the county entered into planning contracts with various communities including Buckeye, Scottsdale, Mesa, Chandler, and Gilbert. In addition, we have undertaken planning work for the Salt River and Gila River Indian Reservations, the unincorporated area of Gila Bend, and the relatively new towns of Surprise, Youngtown, and Paradise Valley.

Of interest is the fact that certain planning proposals suggested for the little community of Gilbert, Ariz., for westernization of its central business district have been carried out. Consequently, their business district now has a new appearance that is of considerable civic pride to the community. Buckeye, Youngtown, Surprise, and Paradise Valley adopted zoning regulations that we prepared for them, and Youngtown and Paradise Valley adopted subdivision regulations we prepared. New zoning regulations prepared for Chandler and Scottsdale are currently under advisement by those communities. At present we have 16 incorporated cities and towns, and we have been or are presently preparing comprehensive physical plans or parts thereof for 8 of these in addition to 2 Indian reservations and various unincorporated communities.

SUMMARY

In summary, I have touched upon population growth trends and their significance to planning; the purpose, authority, and general scope of physical planning; problems of integrating planning in metropolitan complexes; the planning approach used in Maricopa County; and a brief summary of county planning undertaken for various communities in the county.

The Maricopa County board of supervisors and county manager have long recognized the need for sound planning and

are supporting county planning work by providing necessary budget appropriations and by helping in every possible way. The county highway department, health department, parks and recreation department work very closely with us in both day-to-day and long-range planning matters. Other departments, agencies, and officials assist in every way possible. We have a very active county planning commission and maximum credit is due the commission for the leadership and guidance that it provides.

In closing, it has been a pleasure to participate in this conference.

MARICOPA COUNTY'S DEVELOPMENT OF ITS OUTDOOR RECREATION NEEDS—A CASE HISTORY

(By Kenneth J. Smithee, director, Maricopa County Parks and Recreation Department, Phoenix, Ariz.)

In 1957 the Community Council of Phoenix, Ariz., a nonprofit, nonpolitical and community supported service agency, met with officials of Maricopa County and the city of Phoenix to discuss the need for a countywide park and recreation survey in order that recreation lands, facilities, and programs could be evaluated in terms of existing and projected needs. Since Maricopa County's population is among the fastest growing in the United States, the need for such a survey was apparent, particularly after the Bureau of Census released Maricopa County's population for 1960 as 663,510. A year later, January 1962, more than 667,000 residents participated in the county's Sabin Polio immunization program. As a result of these discussions, the National Recreation Association was selected by the community council to conduct the survey on a contractual basis, with the cost of $14,000, excluding the expenses to the community council, being defrayed by Maricopa County and the city of Phoenix.

Subsequently, a survey team from NRA, composed of G. Leslie Lynch, recreation planner; John J. Collier, Pacific-Southwest district representative; and Marian Preece, program specialist; in cooperation with the community council, established the administrative plan for implementing the survey which involved over 500 people serving on various committees and subcommittees in areas concerned with programing, financing, planning, and so forth. As a result of the intense and diligent work put forth by these committees, several major objectives were outlined in the survey.

The land sites committee recommended that top priority immediately be given to the acquisition of urban and nonurban park lands, especially those lands which could be acquired by lease from the Federal and State Governments. The committee recommended also that the full-time position of land acquisition agent be established by the county, so that the land acquisition program could be coordinated under one person.

When the survey was completed in February 1958, the Maricopa County Parks & Recreation Commission unanimously recommended that the board of supervisors immediately file applications on four regional park sites, composed of desert and mountainous terrain, surrounding the projected urban area and totaling some 68,000 acres. Subsequently, within the year, two additional large regional park sites were recommended to be acquired. Again the board of supervisors, being aware of the acute need for preserving these large sites, immediately filed the necessary applications. Five of the six sites applied for were located within a 28-mile radius of downtown Phoenix.

The previous policy of the Bureau of Land Management required governmental agencies to pay a leasing fee based on the appraised value of the land. The leases on the county regional park applications, if issued on the former basis, would have resulted in a prohibitive leasing fee. The county contacted Bureau of Land Management officials, both personally and through written correspondence, urging that action be taken which would permit the leasing of Federal lands for public park and recreational purposes at a reasonable fee, and which would allow governmental agencies to expend lease rental savings on needed recreational improvements.

Subsequently, when Stewart L. Udall became Secretary of the Interior, one of the first actions he effected was to issue an administrative order which now allows governmental agencies to purchase Federal lands for park and recreational purposes for $2.50 an acre, or to lease lands at 25 cents per acre per year. Very shortly after this order was issued, the county received leases from the Arizona office of the Bureau of Land Management on the McDowell Mountain regional park site, a 17,648-acre site, located 15 miles northeast of Scottsdale, and on the 28,194-acre White Tank Mountain regional park, located 15 miles due west of Peoria. Soon thereafter, additional leases were issued on the Estrella Mountain regional park, an 18,574-acre site located 20 miles southwest of Phoenix, and on the Usery Mountain regional park, a 3,048-acre site, located 15 miles northeast of Mesa; also 1,326 acres of Federal land were leased to the county for the expansion of Lake Pleasant regional park.

In addition, during 1961, the county acquired by lease assignment a 340-acre urban park site in rapidly expanding Paradise Valley on lands held by the State of Arizona, and also a 1,320-acre shooting range and recreation area, subleased from the Arizona Game and Fish Department. The aforementioned acreage, coupled with 442 acres of county-owned lands, totals 83,524 acres of park lands currently comprising the Maricopa County regional park system.

Because the county has taken advantage of the Federal Government's policy of making such lands available for recreational purposes, the present and future citizens of Maricopa County are assured of one of the finest regional park systems in the country. The board of supervisors, in cooperation with the Bureau of Land Management, as a matter of policy has continued hunting and fishing, grazing, and other compatible supervised uses to the benefit of all concerned.

As might be expected, Maricopa County is purchasing a section of Federal land each year with the intention of eventually acquiring all the present leased lands in this manner. Under present regulations, a fee of $1 per acre per year is charged to all governmental agencies leasing State lands for public purposes. Purchase of State lands by governmental agencies is prohibitive since, under present rules, the lands are sold at public auction to the highest bidder. At present Maricopa County expends $14,137 per year for leasing State lands, and $16,931 on Federal lands, making a total of $31,068 spent annually on leasing fees. With Maricopa County's current population of 700,000 expected to reach 2 million by 1980, the importance of acquiring park land now is obvious.

In reviewing various actions taken in the past 5 years which have resulted in Maricopa County obtaining recreation leases on these regional park sites, it should be noted that close cooperation with various agencies was of prime importance. The Maricopa County Parks and Recreation Department has a close liaison with the Maricopa County Planning and Zoning Department and Commission, and thus is able to obtain projected population figures, growth patterns, highway systems and other pertinent information which have a very important bearing on the location of park areas.

Every subdivision plat which is filed with the county planning and zoning commission is sent to the Parks and Recreation Department's land acquisition agent for his study, evaluation and recommendation of needed park sites. Four years ago, at the completion of the parks and recreation survey, legislation was sought and successfully passed which allows counties of the State to expend funds for recreational facilities on U.S. Forest Service lands. Because of the dynamic growth in Maricopa County and the increased use of these Forest Service recreation areas, the parks and recreation commission and the board of supervisors, believing that the county should help in solving this locally created problem, have budgeted nearly $50,000 during the past 3 years for the construction of recreation facilities at the confluence of the Salt and Verde Rivers and at Saguaro Lake.

The parks and recreation commission, since its inception, has encouraged the development of recreation facilities on park lands by community groups. For example, nearly $100,000 worth of improvements have been made on the Estrella Mountain 18-hole golf course site during the past year and one-half, through the voluntary participation of citizens, civic clubs, and service organizations from the Avondale, Goodyear, Litchfield Park, Tolleson and Buckeye communities.

Also presently, various affiliated clubs of the Arizona State Rifle and Pistol Association are voluntarily contributing time, money and materials to help complete the construction of the newly acquired Black Canyon Shooting Range and Recreation Area. When development of the range is completed, over 50 percent of the improvements will have been made in this manner.

In summary, six ingredients have been necessary which have allowed the county to acquire the regional park system it has today:

1. The preparation of a sound, comprehensive, long-range plan by a qualified agency such as the National Recreation Association.

2. The participation of lay citizens and community leaders in the actual preparation of the plan.

3. A dedicated interest by the county parks and recreation commission in actively soliciting support for implementing the final survey recommendations.

4. The establishment of a close liaison with the county planning and zoning department and commission, which has insured sound, logical, long-range planning.

5. An awareness by the county board of supervisors of the need for taking prompt action in filing applications on the recommended Federal and State sites for regional and urban parks.

6. Participation of Bureau of Land Management officials in an advisory capacity in the survey's preparation, resulting in their understanding of the plan's objectives, and thus, how they could assist the local community in implementing the survey recommendations.

Why is outdoor recreation becoming such a problem? According to Marion Clauson, former Director the U.S. Bureau of Land Management and presently Director of Studies in Land Use and Management for Resources for the Future, there are four major reasons:

1. The population of the United States is growing at a rapid rate and projections show that there will be twice as many people in the United States in the year 2000 as there were in 1950. It is reasonable, according to Mr. Clauson, to predict a national population of 310 million by the year 2000. The vast majority of the future population will be concentrated in the urban population centers and these citizens will have to seek the use of specialized areas for their outdoor recreation.

2. The buying power of the average U.S. citizen will be perhaps twice as much per person in the year 2000 as it was in 1950. Income, after taxes, averaged about $1,600 per person in 1956, but it is estimated that the same comparable individual income for the year 2000 will be in the neighborhood of $3,600.

3. Citizens will have more time for outdoor recreation. The average number of hours worked per week has been dropping steadily from around 70 hours in 1850 to nearly 40 hours in 1950. The future is pointed to longer, more widespread paid vacations. A reasonable estimate for the year 2000 may well be an average workweek of around 28 hours, due to the growing influence of automation on business and industry.

4. The last major reason cited by Mr. Clauson is that people will travel more. In 1900 the average traveler covered about 500 miles a year; today, with the airplane, the family automobile, the yearly average has risen to nearly 5,000 miles. A reasonable estimate for the year 2000 is an average of 9,000 miles a year for each traveler. Opportunity for outdoor recreation will increasingly be an inducement for moving and for travel.

As you can see, with the increasing demand for outdoor recreation facilities and the decreasing amount of land available, governmental agencies must act now, especially where Federal lands can be acquired, if our succeeding generations are to retain and enjoy recreation in the great out of doors.

Why Liberal Policies Gain and Conservatives Lose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, Rogers C. Dunn, of the Dunn Survey, McLean, Va., has prepared a pamphlet with the above title that contains an introduction so packed full of truth and commonsense that I want to provide it for all Republican voters to read and ponder over.

I am in full accord with Mr. Dunn's thinking as expressed in his pamphlet. Therefore I include the introduction as a part of these remarks and recommend your examination of the supporting facts contained in the pamphlet "Why Liberal Policies Gain and Conservatives Lose":

Under the gilded banners of "liberal," "me-too," and "modern," the American people have been led far into a welfare-Socialist state.

No national party has championed the traditional constitutional concept of American Government for over 20 years.

On election day, the people choose between a "liberal" and a "modern" party, both of which have embraced virtually all welfare-Socialist policies adopted between 1936 and 1960.

The people have been deprived of the opportunity to choose between the welfare-Socialist concept and the traditional constitutional concept of government.

Those who seek to reestablish the traditional constitutional concept have failed because they have failed to concentrate on providing the people with the opportunity to choose between the two concepts on election day.

While failure to recognize this decisive reality continues, opposition to "liberal" policies will continue to do no more than influence the speed of the movement. The recurrent rays of hopes of conservatives will continue to be always over the next hill.

THE BIPARTY OPERATION

For 20 years every Republican setback in a national election has been attributed to Democratic candidates winning welfare and bloc votes—union labor, farm, colored, and now Catholic. These votes have been credited with providing the marginal vote which gives victory.

This has resulted in the belief that Democrats must hold the vote of such special interest minorities or lose an election; and that to win an election Republicans must break into the vote of one or more of these groups.

This has set in motion the chain competition of two parties bidding for the support of leaders of large minority groups. The two parties bid for this support with the money and policies of the United States.

Thus, such leaders are given a power greater than that of any elected official except perhaps the President of the United States. When their wishes are satisfied by one or both parties, new demands are made to further their objectives. Why not?

The two parties will seek to hold, or gain, the marginal vote called essential to win an election. Republican appearances of appeasement, known as "me too," are bids for support and permit or force the Democratic Party to raise its offers.

Conservative Democrats and conservative Republicans with nowhere else to go, probably millions of them, reluctantly accept their own party's bids for votes with "liberal" policies as something necessary to win. They condone this as the lesser of two evils.

Consequently, if these group votes exist in fact as claimed, there is no practical means to halt the biparty movement into a welfare-socialist state.

On this all-important question of election fact, which has been used to excuse and justify the biparty operation, the Dunn survey takes issue.

The Scourge of Giantism in Business and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on February 12, I addressed the National Association of Retail Clothiers & Furnishers at their national convention here in Washington. Subsequently, I received a letter from Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, endorsing certain of the views I had expressed.

Believing the exchange may be of interest to independent businessmen generally, I ask unanimous consent that the relevant portion of my address, together with those parts of Mr. Burger's letter pertinent to it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SCOURGE OF GIANTISM IN BUSINESS AND POLITICS

(An address by Senator FRANK CHURCH, Democrat, of Idaho, before the Retail Clothiers & Furnishers convention, Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D.C., Feb. 12, 1962)

Thank you for inviting me to be your speaker. You may regard yourselves as retail clothiers and furnishers, but I regard you as radical reformers, clothing over old-fashioned class distinctions.

Every country has had its method for making class distinctions. An Englishman is classified by the way he speaks. Remember that delightful bit from "My Fair Lady":

"Why can't the English teach
their children how to speak,
This verbal class distinction
by now should be antique."

Well, our own snobbery in bygone days used to be expressed, not by how one spoke, but by how one dressed.

What a change you clothiers have worked. Why, you have draped us all in cloth of such quality and style that it's hard to tell the difference, anymore, between a plutocrat and a plumber. In fact, here in Washington nowadays, the only way left to distinguish a Democrat from a Republican is to check on whether he's wearing a two- or a three-button coat.

All of this leads me to wonder where we are headed. It reminds me of the story Ambassador Carlos Romulo of the Philippines used to tell last year, at the time we were so agitated over the hijacking of those airliners. He said he flew out of San Francisco on a scheduled nonstop flight for New York City. About 2 hours later, as the speedy jet approached the Great Lakes, the loudspeaker suddenly blurted out: "This is your captain. Within 5 minutes we shall be passing over Chicago; in another hour we will be landing at Idlewild—that is, we will be if this bearded fellow sitting beside me turns out to be a Jewish rabbi."

Where is the independent merchant, the small storekeeper, headed? This is the first question I would raise with you this evening. In your own line, you know how the storm clouds are gathering. Last year there were 1,107 business failures in the retail apparel trade. This was an increase of 14 percent from the 1960 rate. And these were not shoestring operators, because they left liabilities averaging nearly $36,000 apiece. This appalling casualty list reflects the serious difficulties that small businessmen are experiencing, not only in the retail clothing trade, but in every part of our economy. I would like to spend a few minutes discussing what I think are the main reasons for these difficulties, and what might be done about them.

When a typical independent retail business, such as yours, is forced to the wall, where have the customers gone? I think the answer is obvious. They have usually gone—whether for shoes, shirts, or suits—to a chain outlet, or a discount house. It is the twin lure of giantism and discountism that is undermining the independent retail merchant.

I cannot believe this trend is good for the country. The independent retail merchant, after all, has a special stake in a viable, free enterprise system quite unlike that of the chainstore executive. When he is displaced by a remote corporate hierarchy, a local organization man, and a crew of impersonally recruited hired help, the community suffers. Moreover, corporate giantism leads to monopoly. The bigs have ways of rendering competition painless to each other. The ultimate object of chain merchandising and monopoly is to increase profits by driving out independent competition, and when this

happens, the consumer suffers, whether he knows it or not.

So it has been a long-professed objective of our Government to pursue policies calculated to preserve an economic environment in which the independent business venture can be started—can grow, prosper, and achieve a stable place in the community.

Many approaches have been tried. Some of them have helped. But no single one, nor any combination yet tried, has solved the problem. We have laws against practices which are in restraint of trade, or tend toward monopoly, or constitute unfair competition. I think they have had some efficacy, but they are difficult to enforce, and they have not arrested the trend toward extinction of independent business. We have a Federal agency, the Small Business Administration, whose chief function is to provide credit for hard-pressed local businesses. But experience has shown that credit alone is not the answer.

What is needed is a means of assisting the small but well-managed business to overcome the inherent competitive advantage of sheer bigness. I think the rational answer lies in a proper adjustment of tax policy, frankly designed to serve the public interest by giving preferred treatment to small business.

We do this already, to a limited extent, by means of the graduated personal income tax. But more and more the advantages of continuity of identity, limited liability, and readier access to capital, make the corporation the most chosen vehicle for doing business. And taxes on corporation profits are not graduated, except for the single step, from the normal tax of 30 percent to the surtax of an additional 22 percent, which comes when net profits reach $25,000.

While revision may be needed in the present surtax schedule on personal incomes, I think it is widely recognized that progressive taxation is fair, in principle, and that it has contributed significantly to the development of our democratic and equalitarian society. The same principle could be applied, it seems to me, to the taxation of corporate incomes, with equally beneficial results.

The Senate Select Committee on Small Business now has a measure of this kind under study. The proposal calls for a graduated tax rate, beginning at 5 percent instead of the present 30 percent, and yielding substantial reductions for corporations with net taxable incomes up to $250,000. For example, the tax on a net income of $5,000, under this new schedule, would be $250 instead of the present $1,500, a reduction of over 83 percent. On corporate incomes of $25,000, the tax would be reduced from $7,500 to $4,500, a saving of 40 percent. At $100,000 of net income, the tax would be reduced by more than 17 percent, and the saving would still be above 6 percent when corporate income reaches a quarter of a million dollars. Beyond that point, rates would remain substantially the same as at present, with no incerases at any level.

There have been recent intimations that prudent tax cuts may be possible next year, if present business trends continue. If that happens, the time may be opportune to press for a graduated scaledown of corporate taxes as the key to strengthening the competitive position of small business in our economy. Smaller corporations would be able to use the tax differential to accumulate reserves. Moreover, recent changes in the Internal Revenue Code, giving individual and partnership enterprises the option of being taxed, and of reinvesting out of earnings, as if they were corporations, make the suggested new rate schedule even more attractive to small businesses.

I am by nature skeptical of panaceas, and I don't suggest that this new tax schedule, if adopted, will solve all your problems. However, I commend it to your attention. Additional information can be obtained from the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, and I know that your inquiries and support will be most welcome.

NATIONAL FEDERATION
OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
San Mateo, Calif., February 14, 1962.

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CHURCH: I noted in the New York Times in the financial section, of your address before the National Association of Retail Clothiers & Furnishers at the Shoreham Hotel.

It is my opinion, Senator, that you hit the nail on the head when you blamed the growth of chains and discount houses for many of the difficulties faced by small retailers. "The twin lure of giantism and discountism," you said, "is undermining the independent retail merchant."

You spoke the views which I personally have maintained and which probably would be concurred in by the nationwide membership of the National Federation of Independent Business, which membership totals approximately 175,000, all independent business and professional men, and a goodly number in your own State of Idaho.

Bear in mind, Senator, the views I express come from my own personal experience in heretofore owning and operating an independent establishment for better than a quarter of a century. In those days we did have discount houses but not to the degree they exist in our overall economy today, and if it continues it will eventually destroy the business life of efficient independent business throughout the entire Nation, and producers should realize this before it goes a long way to reduce many producers.

When the Robinson-Patman Act was enacted by the Congress in the summer of 1936 we in small business, and particularly in the retail field, believed that our "Magna Carta" had arrived—that unjustified price discrimination was outlawed.

We have urged the Small Business Committees to make the principal item on their agenda, as a benefit to small business and the free enterprise system, that they check into the operation of the Robinson-Patman Act through its enforcing agency to find out if the law is really foolproof. If so—then vigorous enforcement. If the law is weak or deficient the agency should advise Congress as to the needed amendments to protect the free enterprise system, and more important, independent business throughout the Nation.

Again, Senator CHURCH, it is our opinion you made one of the most constructive addresses before a business group rendered in many years, and it might be of interest to you and your colleagues to make this letter a part of the Appendix of the RECORD. You would be doing a great service to small business not alone in the State of Idaho, but throughout the entire Nation.

With very high regards, and again our heartiest congratulations.

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

Dr. Bruce E. Whitaker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, for more than 110 years Chowan College has been a powerful factor in the raising of the cultural, social, economic, and educational level of the Roanoke-Chowan and southeastern Virginia area in general, and of Hertford County, and the town of Murfreesboro in particular. And yet, perhaps the period of Chowan's greatest influence has been since the spring of 1957 when Dr. Bruce E. Whitaker assumed the presidency of the institution.

When this forward-looking young Christian minister-educator came to Murfreesboro, Chowan College had only 235 students enrolled. The present enrollment exceeds 700. Three magnificent new buildings have been added to the lovely old campus as a result of his energetic leadership.

But Bruce Whitaker has not been concerned only about numbers of students or of buildings. During his tenure as administrative head of Chowan College he has had academic excellence as his constant goal. The well-prepared and dedicated faculty he has assembled, his continuing devotion to accreditation standards, the zealous emphasis he places on curriculum development—all of these are evidences of his educational genius and success. Murfreesboro is fortunate indeed to have Chowan College within its borders, and especially so with a man of Dr. Whitaker's caliber and acumen at its helm.

His contributions to community life, however, are not confined to those which are byproducts of his leadership of the college. Dr. Whitaker is actively involved in the total religious, civic, and social life of both his town and county. An ordained Baptist minister, he is a faithful supporter of his church and its program, and of other religious groups. He holds membership in the Murfreesboro Rotary Club and has more than a casual interest and influence in local and county affairs. Along with Mrs. Whitaker and their two sons, Barry and Garry, he also finds time for recreational activities with their many friends.

Moreover, Dr. Bruce Whitaker is a tremendous asset in terms of the prestige brings to this community and area through his professional honors. For example, he is a director of the Roanoke Island Historical Association, the North Carolina Council for Social Service, and the North Carolina Foundation of Church-Related Colleges. He is listed in "Who's Who in American Education," in "Who's Who in the South and Southwest," and in "Who's Who in America." He is also chaplain of the Eastern North Carolina Press Association, an officer in the American Association of Junior Colleges, and a frequent contributor of articles for both religious and professional journals.

The Exchange Club of Murfreesboro, N.C., salutes Dr. Bruce E. Whitaker, and, by entering his name in the "Book of Golden Deeds" for 1961, hereby expresses sincere appreciation for his manifold contributions to his community, his area, his State, and his country.

Under unanimous consent I submit the following article from the Raleigh, N.C., News and Observer of February 18, 1962, extolling Dr. Whitaker as "Tar Heel of the Week."

The article follows:

TAR HEEL OF THE WEEK: BRUCE E. WHITAKER—LEADERSHIP FROM THE CAMPUS FOR THE CHOWAN

(By Roy Parker, Jr.)

The visitor to Chowan College in Murfreesboro is struck by the mixture of ancient and modern. Giant pine trees lines the circular drive. "The Columns," Chowan's massive 110-year-old main building, is something out of ante bellum Southland.

But "the Columns" has a swimming pool in its basement, and surrounding it are mushrooming examples of 20th century campus architecture, sleek and low slung and glass curtained.

For Dr. Bruce E. Whitaker, Chowan's 40-year-old president, the mixture has a meaning—for the Baptist junior college and for the northeastern area of North Carolina of which it has been a part for 113 years.

"We are working on a history of the college," Whitaker says, "and I am struck by the fact that there have been many Chowans. The Chowan of today is a new Chowan."

Although he is careful to pay deference to his predecessors, the fact is that the new Chowan's great leap forward into its modern role began in earnest at the time when Whitaker became president in 1957.

HIGHER GOALS FOR GREATER SERVICE

The bare statistics indicate the new Chowan. Coeducational enrollment now total about 700, more than double the enrollment in 1957. New buildings, a boy's dorm, a girl's dorm, cafeteria, and gymnasium, have gone up. Accreditation has been achieved. Faculty pay has gone up by 73 percent. A fundraising campaign is now on to raise $900,000. The money will build a new administration classroom building and a new library.

Whitaker brought a personal new look to Chowan. Throughout its history, the roll call of Chowan leadership was sprinkled heaviest with men whose basic training and motivation was in the ministry. Whitaker has a background in the higher education, and although he is ordained as a Baptist minister and is active in the politics of the denomination, he says "my main orientation and work has been in higher education, and I intend to spend the rest of my life in it."

Whitaker has the new look approach to the work of a college president. While the approach isn't short on prayer, the main emphasis is based on a belief that public relations will move people to action at least as fast as waiting for the spirit to move them.

MAKE THE GOOD NEWS KNOWN

"I believe in public relations. If you have something to offer, the only way to make it useful is to make it known," Whitaker says.

For that reason, one of his first actions as president was to add a full-time public relations man to the administration. His choice, John Gill, was a longtime friend, and they have worked closely together in bringing the new look to Chowan's image to the public.

The new status of Chowan as an educational unit, as opposed to a religious training ground, is indicated, too, in Whitaker's own involvement in educational affairs.

He is active in the American Association of Junior Colleges, delivering a paper at the association's most recent convention. He is on the association's committee on student personnel and he is chairman of the Southern Association of Junior Colleges' committee on that subject.

His basic goal for Chowan is a drive for excellence. "We're not in public relations for the sake of growth. We are after quality in teaching, in study. The private college has a place in higher education because it can strive for excellence without having to become large. I want Chowan to grow to about 1,000 or 1,200 students, and that is far enough."

In this striving for excellence, Whitaker has the view that his main job as president is to "bring people to the college staff and faculty."

Beyond that, he says, the quickest way to get and keep good faculty is to frankly understand that financial rewards are as appreciated by the academician as they are by the insurance salesman.

"We have a fine spirit, good morale," not because Chowan's faculty people feel they are doing and dying for dear old ivy-covered walls, but "because we have upped pay, provided retirement and hospitalization."

Whitaker knows, too, that Chowan and all of private education must make new and bold efforts to win financial resources. He sees a marriage of education and business as a major means to this end.

At the same time, Whitaker frankly admits and concurs in the fact that publicly supported institutions are filling a larger and larger place in the higher educational scheme. He feels sure the present 50–50 ratio of student enrollment between private and publicly-supported units will widen in favor of the public institutions.

"However, I think we must continue to strive for a balance somewhere in the 60–40 or 70–30 range," he says.

EVERY COLLEGE HAS A PLACE

The place of the church-related college Whitaker sees as of growing importance in the age of bigness and the organization man.

"The belief in the worth of church-related higher education is what motivates my life," he says.

"The church-related college is interested in quality education, and in values. In a college the size of Chowan there is time for the student. This is a major strength of the medium-sized institution in these days of bigness. Ideally, the educational institution must be free. There has been a tension between faith and education. Some say the two are incompatible, that a college is a place for inquiry and seeking, the church is a place for faith and affirmation.

"I agree that the church has a difficulty, and honestly so, in allowing church-related institutions to be seekers. However, the church is best served by its institutions when this seeking is taking place. Progress is being made in all religious groups to the extent this is accomplished," he says.

Whitaker is a product of the church-related college system. Born in Shelby in 1921, he won his bachelor's degree from Wake Forest in 1944 and his doctorate at Southern Baptist Seminary.

He has been a teacher and professor of sociology, philosophy, and religion at the University of Indiana, Cumberland University, and Shorter College. He spent a single year as religious education director at Atlanta's big Druid Hills Baptist Church. He came to Chowan from the post of secretary of the student department of the Baptist State convention.

His wife, the former Esther Adams, of Conover, also has a background in education. She holds three degrees and, while keeping up with two young sons, also has time to be a part-time professor in Chowan's School of Religion.

Kiwanis Theme for 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, for progress and security, the Nation today depends upon full, effective utilization of our human and natural resources.

The mobilization—in will, spirit, and action—of all such resources is absolutely essential—at an historical time when our free system is challenged by communism.

All too often, the telling of the "story of freedom" is limited to largely governmental activities.

A great unsung story—a key to success and progress in our system, however, involves the splendid way in which our citizens—voluntarily cooperating individually and through organizations—work together to build a better, stronger country.

Today, I want to pay tribute to one such splendid organization, the Kiwanis International. As a past Governor of Wisconsin, upper Michigan district, I am particularly familiar with its splendid objectives and programs. Along with other service—veterans, civic, patriotic, and similar organizations—Kiwanis plays a vital role in contributing, not only to national programs, but to better international relations. Recently, I was privileged to receive from Mr. O. E. Peterson, secretary of Kiwanis International, a résumé of the Programs of Service and Administrative Theme for 1962 reflecting its high goals of Kiwanis for this year.

I ask unanimous consent to have the résumé printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PROGRAMS OF SERVICE AND ADMINISTRATIVE THEME FOR 1962

Recognize God's will in all Kiwanis activity. Exemplify His principles in our daily living and uphold human and spiritual values.

Develop in our youth—by precept and example—integrity, patriotism, self-reliance, a strong sense of right and wrong, and a desire to achieve excellence.

Create leadership through service activities in Key Clubs and Circle K Clubs, giving these clubs constant adult association, counsel, and guidance.

Maintain and strengthen Canada-United States relations as a pattern of friendship and peace.

Insist on a realistic farm program. Improve rural-urban understanding and work for the conservation of our natural resources.

Promote individual responsibility in all areas of citizenship service through the CQ program. Exemplify the Kiwanis code of ethics in all public and business affairs.

Rededicate ourselves to the principles of a free competitive system as an indispensable

part of the life and strength of our countries and educate youth concerning free enterprise. Champion individual rights and the removal of government encroachment on business.

Stimulate a public awareness of the dangers to our freedom. Understand communism and its techniques of infiltration and compare the values of our way of life against the claims of communism and socialism.

Retain our members through personal sponsorship, effective club activity, good programs and music, fun and fellowship.

Reaffirm our belief in providing opportunities for quality education for all ages.

Foster respect for law, encourage effective enforcement, and promote highway safety.

Tariff Argument Obscures the Real Economic Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, one of the most pressing problems confronting the Congress and the people of this country is our trade policy.

There recently appeared in the Johnstown Tribune-Democrat a profound editorial worthy of consideration by all persons, regardless of the position they take on the trade issue, and I commend it to your reading.

The editorial follows:

TARIFF ARGUMENT OBSCURES THE REAL ECONOMIC PROBLEM

A study prepared by the Libby-Owens-Ford Glass Co., in connection with pending legislation on tariff reduction, asserts on the basis of statistical evidence that U.S. commodities with "high labor content" are falling behind in international competition.

Offering comparisons of foreign trade in 1951 and 1960, the study appears to show that while the United States still has approximately the same margin of exports over imports as it had in the earlier year, the character of our exports has changed.

We have, this study aims to prove, registered large gains in the export of raw materials such as pig iron, scrap iron, aluminum and other nonferrous ores, synthetic rubber, raw cotton, etc., but large losses in our share of the export market in manufactured steel, leather, grain, rubber, and food products, all kinds of machinery except agricultural, all kinds of vehicles except aircraft, scientific apparatus, etc.

This country, the study asserts, cannot live by exporting raw materials, or look for growth to provide new employment. It says that two choices are open to labor: Either to accept lower wages so that foreign workers cannot take their jobs, or to insist upon import duties which neutralize the labor-cost advantages of foreign competitors.

Assuming that the statistics offered by the Libby-Owens-Ford study are reasonably accurate—and other statistics seem to support their general tenor—this conclusion misses one point: The distinction between real wages, measured in what the paycheck will buy, and nominal wages measured in the number of dollars with shrinking value in the marketplace.

When rising productivity, through machines which enable workers to produce more efficiently, is accompanied by reduction of prices, the purchasing power of labor as well as all other segments of the economy increases even though earnings may remain the same. Thus the real wage goes up, even when the nominal wage does not. And that is the point this economic study ignores.

No one proposes a drastic cutback of wages, which would be both politically and economically unacceptable. But it is possible to stop annual increases in wages and fringe benefits that have slight relationship to productivity gains, and to start devoting a great deal more of the benefits of efficient production to reducing prices. And unless that is done soon, this country's already impaired ability to compete with lower wage foreign industry will be completely lost.

Government, too, for political reasons has contributed to this impairment of competitive ability. High taxes on corporations will either be reflected in higher prices, or so reduce the earnings of capital as to eliminate the incentive to invest in new and more efficient plant and equipment. Federal deficit spending spurs inflation, and erodes capital. And inadequate depreciation allowances for tax purposes prevent replacement of outworn or obsolete and inefficient machinery.

Multitudes of people in this country have been persuaded by demagogs that Government can spend and spend, and cure all their economic complaints; that a large national debt is a good thing for the country; that taxes on the wealthy or on corporations are merely economic justice; and that a steady inflation is unavoidable in the interest of national progress.

These are fallacies which have been exposed over and over again in the course of history, but they are perennially appealing. Now it is said in some quarters that if we merely stop imports from coming into the United States, our problems will be solved.

But that will not stop foreign producers from becoming more and more efficient, while this country's producers gradually grow less so under the soothing influence of protection. And the ultimate result will be the complete outpricing of American industry in foreign markets, while a captive market in the United States is compelled to pay a steadily rising price for the domestic goods it buys.

However, the reduction of tariffs without a concurrent attack on undue rises in wages and inept and inflationary tax policies will be just as fatal to the Nation's economy. For that will bring in more imports without substantially adding to the Nation's exports of manufactured—that is, high labor content—goods.

The sole policy that offers a prospect of restoring American economic health is that of gradually reducing production costs, and thereby prices; and cutting back unnecessary Government expenditures which are inevitably added to the prices of goods.

That will be a painful cure for what ails the Nation, but it is the only cure that will work. Whether the voters and the politicians and the labor unions and the management of business and industry can be persuaded to take it is extremely doubtful. But if they don't, neither tariff reduction nor tariff walls will save the country, because in either case it will be unable to compete with lower cost producers in other lands.

Outer Space: The New Arena for World Communications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was privileged, on the 14th of February last, while in Milwaukee, Wis., to speak to a fine group of telephone company officers and personnel. The occasion was a company meeting held at the Schroeder Hotel in Milwaukee. I ask that a copy of my remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUTER SPACE: THE NEW ARENA FOR WORLD COMMUNICATIONS—"LET'S BRING THE PICTURE OF AMERICA INTO EVERY LIVING ROOM IN THE WORLD"

THE TELEPHONE—AN AMERICAN SYMBOL

It is a pleasure being with you, the telephone people, here in Milwaukee this morning. Yours is an industry which has become a symbol of the American way of life. Indeed, if I would have had to select the three outstanding scientific and mechanical devices which have made America what it is today, I would choose the automobile, electricity, and the telephone.

Without these three we would lack the unity that we now have. Without them the several States would have never been meshed into the immense economic giant that we now are. Without them the individual farmhouse would have remained far in the country, distant and remote, rather than having fully joined in the national life.

The telephone has become an American symbol, a tool that we take so much for granted that we hardly appreciate it any longer. Yet, in other places the telephone is something to strive for, something to hope for. In Asia, in Africa, and even in Russia, a telephone is a status symbol. Telephones there are in short supply.

In Russia being able to afford a telephone, and being able to obtain one from the Government telephone monopoly, is a major accomplishment. Let me remind you that in the United States with a population of 185 million, we have 74¼ million telephones. The Soviet Union, with a population of some 210 million, has only 4½ million telephones—or some 5 percent of the American total.

Now that we have this widespread net of telephones all over the surface of the United States, where do we go next? As a nation we have never been willing to accept a mere state of inaction. As a people we have always been searching for new challenges, for new outlets, for new horizons. Indeed, you members of the telecommunications industry have always taken a place of leadership in our constant search for improvements, change, growth and discovery.

Today I want to discuss before you what I consider a new rich field for American ingenuity. This indeed is a field in which you, in particular, should have a special interest. The field is space. And what I want to discuss with you specifically is the utilization of space and of space satellites for the development of worldwide communications.

President Kennedy, in the state of the Union message delivered about a month ago, had much to say about the trouble spots of the world, about the balance of payments, and about our military strength. Yet, note that despite the immediate threats that face this Nation and the world, the President took a few minutes to describe the future utilization of space. In the words of President Kennedy: "With the approval of Congress, we have undertaken in the past year a great new effort in outer space. Our aim is not simply to be first on the moon. Space is a vast new frontier of science, of commerce and of worldwide cooperation, and this Nation belongs among the first to exploit it."

SPACE—THE NEW FRONTIER

Let us examine these words. Only a few years ago space was a total mystery. Then came sputnik and space has remained constantly in the news. I have served as a

member of the Senate Space Committee for over 3 years now, and I must admit that I have not become an expert in high military strategy or in the complexities of space enginering. But I do know the value of space to our national interest. Indeed, what we are interested in is not only a competition with Russia for prestige. We are as much interested in space utilization for weather prediction, and eventually weather control. We are interested in the use of space for a new type of wireless communication. Indeed, one of the most exciting projects for space is a global system of communication satellites linking the whole world in telegraph and telephone, in radio and television.

Today was set by NASA as the day for Astronaut John H. Glenn's orbital flight. This project, Project Mercury, has been in preparation for a long time. I am delighted to learn of the success of this great project.

In his bell-shaped craft, standing only 9½ feet high and measuring only 6 feet across the base, Glenn's assignment is to make from one to three orbits around this globe of ours. This one important project will cost this Nation some $400 million. This is a tremendously big investment, when we remember that the total yearly defense budget before the First World War was around $348 million, and that the total military budget in 1938, only shortly before the Second World War, was about three times the size of this project's cost.

Yet, we are willingly undertaking these explorations of space because we believe that in space there is the key to this Nation's and the world's future wealth and growth.

We all realize that, as yet, we do not fully know and cannot fully predict what space exploration may mean in years to come. In future years, it may well be said of our space pioneers what was once said of Columbus:

"When he started out he didn't know where he was going, when he got there he didn't know where he was, when he got back, he didn't know where he had been, and he did it all on borrowed money."

SHOWING THE TRUTH TO THE WORLD

Today, I want to discuss with you in particular the role of space in your field, the communications field. Colonel Glenn's space flight is not only an important technical success for the astronaut and his associates at Cape Canaveral, but it will also be a profound propaganda success for the United States. Films of this exploit, to be shown all over the world, will have a tremendous effect, similar to the effect of Commander Shepard's previous space flight. People who have only read about the Russian enterprises in space are able to see actual pictures of our American astronauts in flight. Not only American audiences but oversea audiences are exposed to the thrills of space exploration. And there is a lesson for us in the response of the world audiences.

The lesson is that showing the truth to people will work for our benefit, if we get the picture to the people who need to see it. And space indeed affords us an unparalleled opportunity to show the truth to the people of the world.

In the past we have used many means in order to convey the picture of America to the people of the world; we have used radio, books, and exchange programs. These have had some effect, but the effect of television programs showing to the world the great events and the ordinary life of citizens in a democracy would be definitely more powerful. And in space there has now appeared a new means for beaming television directly from the United States to oversea ground receiving stations through electronic relays borne by satellites.

Last week the President sent to Congress a program for the financing and operation of a multibillion International Communications Satellite System. This proposal will come before the Space Committee, of which I am a member. At this time there is still uncertainty as to the exact means for financing this satellite system. Some feel that the Government should take a direct part in it. Some believe that industry should manage it. And some believe that this important enterprise should combine both industry and Government. Whatever the final solution to this question, there is little doubt that our communication satellites will be in operation within the near future.

Within a year the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) will put into orbit an experimental satellite built by the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. This 175-pound sphere will contain a relay station that will provide for transmission of television, telephone calls, and other types of communications between the United States and Europe. Signals beamed from transmitters in the United States will be picked up by the satellite's antennas. These signals will be amplified within the satellite, then relayed to waiting ground stations in "Free Europe." This satellite will carry any picture from America across the Atlantic.

Naturally, a complete system of communications satellites operating 24 hours a day will be an expensive undertaking. But many communications experts believe that in the years ahead such a system may more than pay for itself in increased revenues from oversea transmission of telephone calls, business data, and TV programs.

But such a communications satellite system will have not only a commercial value. It can have a great impact on our propaganda competition with the Soviet Union.

Today, I would like to propose here that we dedicate this new communications system to the struggle for freedom, to the struggle for world opinion. Through such communications system we will be able to relay a true picture of our American way of life to broadcasting stations which in turn might transmit into the homes of the Africans, the Asians, the Russians, and the Chinese Communists.

There are 120 million television sets in use in the world. Of these almost 50 million are overseas and some 9 million are within the Communist bloc. Last year the number of oversea sets increased by 1 million each month. In many countries these sets are in public places and reach an ever-increasing number of people.

Through a communications satellite system we will be able to send programs through space into every country of the world. This is a great challenge to all of us.

This I therefore propose for today, let us set up a worldwide communications satellite system for the spread of truth and freedom.

Such a new international television network will comprise hundreds of millions of viewers. People on the far side of the world will see thriving American cities and the rewards of life lived in freedom. They will see the American workingman, his freedoms, his material blessings. One British authority has stated that such television satellites can decide whether Russian or English is to become the language of the future. More effective communications may well determine who will win the cold war.

The television battle is on even now. East Germany transmits anti-American programs, dramatizing unemployment and racial tensions to West Germany. But East German refugees say Western programs penetrate much deeper into East German territory and reach almost 2 million people.

CONCLUSION

We know Russia spends 10 times what we do in manpower and resources to make her propaganda appeal to the world. We must multiply our efforts. We must reach behind the Iron Curtain and into Russia itself. I envision that, as an extension of this proposed worldwide TV network, more Russian viewers will pick up our broadcasts from powerful free world antennas in Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, and Norway. The picture of truth will spread.

It has been said that whether we like it or not we are engaged in a worldwide space race with the Soviets. Our competitor in the space race is tough and determined. He is willing to deprive his people of consumer goods in order to channel more resources into space research. Can we afford to be second best? Should we not channel our riches to exploration and improvements rather than luxury?

The proposed international communications satellite system will be a wonderful tool for cooperation between the free nations. This country is in an economic and political position to marshal the scientific resources of the free world for such peaceful uses of outer space. Surely, the other nations and the other people will be enthusiastic and loyal partners when they are invited to share in this great human adventure, and the push into space, into the wonders and mysteries of the origin of matter and of life, can offer an unbounded challenge.

Address by Stafford King, Grand Master of the Masonic Lodge, Washington, D.C., February 20, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD the speech delivered by Stafford King, grand master of the Masonic Lodge, at the grand master's banquet February 20 in Washington:

Mr. Chairman and brethren, I do not propose to recite the antiquities of Masonry, nor glorify the contributions it has made to the progress of mankind. Neither do I propose to present a philosophical dissertation upon its moral teachings, nor expound the beauty, significance and perfection of its rituals.

We, who are gathered here this morning, know full well that Masonry is old and that it has made substantial contribution to both men and nations. We know it teaches through symbolism the relationships between God and man and between man and man. We know it builds character, promotes charity, teaches harmony, and that it provides a proper vehicle in which the average man, aided by reason and logic, can progress toward that perfection so much desired and so seldom achieved.

Known in the beginning, also, that I feel no especial competence to perform the task assigned me here. I was asked to speak and, recognizing the invitation as both privilege and honor, I accepted.

I believe that it is the responsibility of the Mason to speak his mind, especially upon request and in the presence of his brethren where he has the full assurance of their patience and forbearance.

Even as I speak of danger to our way of life in the United States, because I know its background best, I contend my argument applies to free peoples everywhere.

I submit that one of the greatest and most common errors which we as Masons make is in our failure to speak out. We make no consistent effort to put into prac-

tice outside the lodge the basic truths which we are taught within the lodge.

We are met today as Grand Masters of Masons of North America. We represent a membership of some 5 million men, and all of us are plagued by the problem of inattendance, by lack of activity within our subordinate lodges, by incomplete communication, and by the growing social philosophy of conformity which strikes at the very heart of the Masonic contention of freedom of thought and of action. It is well, perhaps, to remind ourselves that the position we hold in our respective jurisdictions is one of great distinction and of high honor. It has come to us in part as recognition of merit—mostly, however, it has come through the charity, the tolerance, and the patience of our brethren.

With it has come our greatest responsibility—to lead, to direct, to instruct—and to justify, maintain, and expand the logic of Masonic teachings, to the spiritual and material welfare of our brothers and of the country in which we live.

We, as freemen and Freemasons, predicate our freedom upon the basis that we are entitled of right to life and to liberty. As Masons, we can constantly reiterate our belief in God, our faith in country, our love of home. The rights so to believe and to have faith and to hold love are natural rights—rights inherent in the infant babe at birth and ceasing not before death takes his toll. These are the rights that make us free. Their exercise is freedom. Older than civilization, they were established in Nature's law even as the hand of God struck light from darkness in the earth, and first gave to man a mind with which to think and reason, and a heart with which to progress himself above the beasts of the field. These are the rights which have gifted the tongue of man to speak, skilled his hands to labor, and raised his eyes above the soil to envision a life eternal beyond the shadow of the grave.

It is indeed significant that it remained for the embattled forefathers of the United States to first set down these principles upon the parchments of any nation so conceived in liberty. From the facile pen of Jefferson there flowed the principle, "That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights amongst which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." No other man had written them—no other nation in them had her birth. We, the people of the United States of America, were the first so to declare.

In the Declaration of Independence were set down the reasons which impelled our forefathers to seek their freedom from an all powerful central government—and in the Constitution or our United States were set forth the laws whereby they were to maintain their freedom and ours. This freedom, so declared and so maintained, was neither unlimited nor unrestricted—nor was it license for each in his own way to return to savagery. Rather it was a wise and just determination of balanced powers and responsibilities between the citizens and their government. Freedom for us was agreed to be individual liberty—to live, to speak, to pray, to work, to own property, to educate our children, to bear arms, to be tried by a jury of our peers, to assemble together, to do as we please, except only that we do not jeopardize the rights, the welfare or the safety of our fellows.

God-given as are these rights—they are set down one by one in that great covenant of faith and law which is our Federal Constitution and in its first 10 amendments, the Bill of Rights. As the Holy Bible is the great light of masonic though and practice, so is the constitution the great light of your liberty and mine as freemen and freemasons. Under its protection and within its limitations, our Nation has progressed farther in a shorter time than most others. Our people have developed a higher scale of living than most others, and the intrinsic value of our natural resources has multiplied a thousandfold.

Herein lies the danger. For today, the lack of a sense of individual responsibility on the part of many of our citizens, the inherent selfishness of others and the deliberately taught and constantly fomented ideologies of statism, in all its many forms, threatens the very life of our Republic, the individual liberties of our people and the free heritage of our children. As it threatens us, so it threatens our brethren everywhere.

Individual freedom cannot live without expression. True, is is no tender flower which droops and falls before each shifting breeze, nor yet does it lose its life in the winter of dissent and criticism. It is much sturdier than that, for its roots are deep in the instinct of man and in the recesses of the human mind. But neither can it exist beneath the trampling hoards of revolution or war, nor can it maintain itself, even in the days of peace, within itself alone and undefended.

Freedom, my brothers, demand use—deserves protection—inspires sacrifice—and is forever lost through negligence and disservice.

Whatever we are, whatever we have, whatever we hope to be, we, as citizens, owe to the accident of birth, or to the direction of immigration into a free nation, under God, of freemen.

We need not, if we be wise and just, fear revolution. We need not, if we be brave and strong, fear invasion—but statism, with all its communistic connotations, is not yet so bold as to attempt either. Instead it lulls us into inaction with soft words and vast promises, and then creeps insidiously into our homes and schools and churches to seduce our thinking until, in fact, it is the strong right arm of freedom which welds in error the chains of our own enslavement.

"Ill fares the land to hastening ills a prey, when wealth accumulates and men decay."

The honeyed phrases "human rights above property rights," "planned economy," "security for all"—are as nooses around the necks of freemen to lead them toward an autocratic state governed by men rather than by law. In such a state, restrictions forever accumulate and liberty inevitably will decay.

Certainly government should accept the responsibilities granted by the Constitution. Certainly, however, government should not do, nor attempt to do for the people, that which they can, and of right, should do for themselves. Nor should Central Government trespass upon the constitutional rights and prerogatives of the states nor upon the individual liberties and free enterprise of the people. As authority is centered in government, either by the application of the belief in the divine right of kings or in the theory of man's inability to support and govern himself, freedom dies. Such is the proof of history from ancient Rome to modern Cuba.

That "human rights are above property rights" is an adaptation of the proposition of Karl Marx, father of communism, in his Communist manifesto, where he declares against private ownership of property. Our Constitution set forth the principle of private ownership and provided that no citizen could lose either property or life without due process of law.

"Planned economy" is a modern procedure which places the freedom and independence of every citizen under the directive control of the "planners," whoever they may be. It is typically communistic in concept because it aggrandizes the state—makes it all powerful—and subjugates the person of the citizen to its will and pleasure.

The use of the word "security" is perhaps the most insidious and most dangerous of the current political dogmas. Every man is desirous of security for himself and his family. He wants to be free from the fear of old age and poverty, and instinctively he welcomes the half-truth and futile hope of government security. Nor is he inclined to compute his freedoms lost. But security as planned by the active Communists and the political demagog is as false to the basic principles of freedom as serfdom is contrary to the American Constitution.

It is the age old and repeated temptation of evil designed to break down truth. It is as enticing today as when Satan tempted the Master upon the mountain top. In that day it was "Worship me, and I will give you power over all the world." In this day, it is "Give government the authority to think and to plan for you, give it the earnings of your toil, let it say when to plant and what to reap, let it regulate your life and and educate your children, and it will give you security."

By whatever name, "socialism," "statism," "paternalism," it is the working of atheistic communism to create and maintain the autocracy of centralized authority above the natural rights and God-given liberties of the people. It denies the independence of the individual and glorifies the power of the state. It stifles ambition and puts a premium upon indolence. It uses the taxes of the worker and producer to buy the subservience of the people. So Essau sold his birthright for a mess of pottage.

The slave who labored on the plantations of the South had exactly the security now planned and promised for free America. He had food and drink and shelter and clothing, he had medical care, he had education, he had safety, all as his masters planned and granted him; and in sufficient amounts to maintain him as an active worker in the production line of slavery. But in no way was he free.

The American Indian, his lands forfeit to the Federal Government became, by the force of military conquest, a ward of Government, and the Government promised him security. Through the years it has doled out to him and to his sons and daughters Federal aid for food and shelter and clothing, for health and welfare and education. His movements from reservation to reservation have been restricted, his rights of participation in government denied, his ambition and initiative weakened and destroyed until today the genius of Sitting Bull, and the wisdom of Seneca are gone, never to be restored in the developed indolence of their descendants. The wisdom and strength of a once powerful, capable, and independent race has been destroyed by the paternalism of autocratic bureaucracy. What centralized authority has done to the Indian yesterday and the day before will be done to all Americans today and tomorrow if we be unalert to the danger and negligence in defense of our free institutions.

It can happen to us. It has happened to the Russians, to the Serbs, to the Montenegrins, to the Latvians, to more than half of the Germans, to most of the Austrians, to the Poles, to the Croatians, to the Manchurians, to almost all of China—and to our neighbor 90 miles away in Cuba—all under the rule that might makes right, and under the ironshod heels of the Red Star's marching men.

In your lifetime and mine we have seen it. Its progress and procedure is blueprinted on every page of current history: Soften the people by grants and aids; lull them by promise of more to come; assume control in times of need and of emergency; raise taxes in the unholy name of conformity, and teach a generation of youth that government can, and of right, should do all things for all men.

Then once established, it is forever maintained by force and fear.

You and I, my brothers, have seen it happen so often in the past few years that now we scarcely remark about it. Comfortable and contented in our own homes, we are smugly unalert to the poet's question: "How can such things be and overcome us like a summer's cloud without our special wonder?"

Both history and experience teach us the immutable rule, that regardless of emergency or the desirability of achievement, central control kills independence. When freemen permit other men to regulate their lives, they are no longer free.

We are freemen, and we proudly bear the designation of "Freemasons." With us, there can be no appeasement nor compromise—no weakness of intent or purpose in our fight to maintain our land as the last great bulwark of freedom. When we surrender, we die. Better far to die on our feet as freemen than to live on our knees as boundsmen.

It is for us as freemen and Freemasons to accept the rule of law and of human association, that for every right there is a corresponding duty and obligation. The acceptance of the right of freedom carries the obligation of its support and its defense.

Wherever communism gains a foothold—wherever dictatorship rules—wherever people for any reason are dependent upon government, liberty is destroyed, property is confiscated, and taxes rise to perpetuate paternalism.

Centralized authority cannot and should not exist where freemen demand that liberty be maintained, and when they have the courage and the wisdom to enforce their demands.

America stands almost alone as the last great citadel of liberty. It is the oldest constitutional Republic in the world. It has grown greater in 10 generations than any other nation in a hundred. Not because our natural wealth was greater—not that Americans were stronger mentally or physically than were the peoples from whence they sprang—not that we were more ambitious or industrious than our ancestors—but solely because under our form of constitutional Government, Americans have been free to use all their energy, free to accept the inspiration of their own ambition, free to work and sacrifice for their own advancement, and free to profit by their own mistakes.

But now that same energy is becoming confined and contained, limited and restricted.

Today, no private enterprise nor public activity appears exempt from the influence of those who would destroy our way of life.

We did not seek it—we do not want it—we hoped it might pass us by—but this is war—ruthless, vicious, uncompromising, to the death—and we are in it—in self-defense—"for the ashes of our fathers and the altars of our gods." And Khrushchev says our children will be Communists. That he "will bury us."

If freedom be preserved, we need harken once again to the voice of Washington as he warned against alien influence and foreign entanglements. We must recognize the wisdom of Marshall who declared "The power to tax is the power to destroy." We must recall the declaration of Jefferson "That government is best which governs least." We must find the conscience of Franklin who asked in prayer the guidance of Almighty God in his contention to be free. And we must have no less courage and character than Patrick Henry who asked "Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?"

It is for us, my brothers, to recognize that communism, as such, cannot make good citizens—nor accept free ones. No godless ideology can produce a nation of freemen. "When people forget God, tyrants forge their chains."

We must get back to God. We must regain our lost concept of freedom. We must be reinvested with the spirit of the ancient principles from which our Nation was born. We must be alerted to the price we know must be paid for liberty. We must, as men and Masons, in no way shirk the full responsibilities of our citizenship. God-given freedom must not be lost through apathy or fear, nor jeopardized by expediency, nor compromised by unbalanced thinking.

It is a crime unspeakable to send our sons and daughters into recurrent wars to die for the ideal of freedom, only to destroy that same ideal, because we have not the stamina to protect and defend it, in time of peace.

Five million men with one ideal of freedom, with one voice to proclaim it, without fear in the holy cause they serve, can leaven the thought and strengthen the character of the whole Nation, of the whole world.

This is the hour, the sand runs low in the glass, we have little time. Let it be not wasted in useless bickering about religious sects, nor political extremists, nor social distinctions. Harmony is still the strength and support of all society. United we can prevail. We know the way. We must speak out.

And if for a moment we see no danger, let us turn our eyes to the east whence comes the light, and to the south, the better to observe the time. There stands the spirit of Cuba, chained and shackled, with weeping eyes and upturned hands, crying out in misery, "Oh, Lord, my God, is there no help, is there no hope?"

Idaho Falls Naval Reserve Research Company 13–6

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, Idaho is very proud of its military Reserve units and many of them have been accorded special honors. This month Naval Reserve Research Company 13–6 in Idaho Falls was presented a general excellence award, the first such in the Nation.

The Post-Register of Idaho Falls carried an excellent account of the award in a recent issue, and I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Idaho Falls (Idaho) Post-Register, Feb. 11, 1962]

LOCAL NAVAL UNIT WINS TOP NATIONAL AWARD

Idaho Falls Naval Reserve Research Company 13–6 was the first recipient of a general excellence award Friday night.

Presenting the award was U.S. Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research and Development, James H. Wakelin, Jr., Washington, D.C.

This is the first such plaque to be awarded in the country, according to Capt. T. J. Wadsworth, company commander. A giant replica of the plaque is being constructed in Washington, D.C., and Idaho Falls Naval Reserve unit will be listed first on it. This is the first year the award has been presented.

The unit received telegrams of congratulations from Gov. Robert E. Smylie; Congressman Ralph R. Harding, Democrat, of Idaho; Dick Everett, president of the Western Montana Council Navy League; Mayor E. A. Lindquist, Blackfoot; and other State and National leaders, Wadsworth said.

READS AWARD

After the program, Wakelin read what the award stands for, which follows: "Neptune, mythological god of oceans," was shown posed with his trident, the symbol of his power, with which he could shatter rocks, call forth or subdue storms and shake the shores. Similarly, the U.S. Naval Reserve research companies penetrate scientific secrets, and direct and subdue natural forces, sometimes with earth-shaking effect."

The Idaho Falls company won top honors in competition with 114 other research Reserve units throughout the Nation.

The unit also received a first-place permanent plaque for being the outstanding nonpay Reserve unit among the 39 nonpay units in the 13th Naval District. Rear Adm. George C. Towner, commandant of the 13th Naval District, Seattle, presented the award.

BE ON DISPLAY

The awards will be displayed next week, Wadsworth said. Location has not yet been determined.

Wakelin took a picture of President John Kennedy with him, painted by Paul Todd, Idaho Falls, Saturday morning, and will deliver it to Senator Frank Church, Democrat, of Idaho, and Congressman Harding, both of whom will present it to the President.

IN PARTY

Included in the Secretary's party were Capt. W. D. Morgan, USN aide; Comdr. P. L. Havenstein, U.S.N. staff assistant; Maj. H. E. Ronand, Jr., USMC Marine aide; and Milton Shaw, special assistant (formerly special assistant to Vice Admiral Rickover).

Guest speaker were Lt. Comdr. John E. Van Hoomissen, Idaho Falls, who is associated with General Electric Co.'s Idaho Testing Station; and Lt. Wallace S. Manning, mathematics teacher at Idaho Falls High School.

Nuclear Testing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on February 21 I took the floor of this House criticizing the President for his failure to order imediately resumption of atmospheric nuclear testing. On Wednesday, February 28, James Reston of the New York Times had a very timely article on the same subject which I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

WASHINGTON: HOW PROPAGANDA INTERFERES WITH POLICY

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 27.—The administration has decided against turning its astronauts into oversea propagandists. There was some pressure on President Kennedy to do so but in the end he said "No."

This was undoubtedly the right decision. The most effective propaganda is what the astronauts do rather than what they say and, anyway, policy decisions for propaganda purposes have seldom proved to be either

good policy or good propaganda in the long run.

The President is already in an increasingly embarrassing position because he has allowed propaganda to influence the question of reopening nuclear testing.

Once the Soviet Union had broken the nuclear test suspension with over 50 major explosions in the atmosphere, the way was clear for the President to announce then and there that the United States would resume testing in self-defense.

Nobody could have objected to that, and the blame for breaking the ban would clearly have lain with the U.S.S.R. In fact, there was never much doubt that the President would go ahead with atmospheric tests after the Soviet tests, but for propaganda reasons no announcement of a U.S. decision to test was made.

SHORT-RANGE THINKING

The reason for this is now clear enough. Washington wanted to dramatize the Soviet tests, to let the world see who had broken the test ban, and meanwhile to appear to be standing aside itself and not testing.

As part of this propaganda campaign the administration put out almost daily statements about the possible contamination of the world's milk supply as a result of the radioactive fallout from the Soviet tests, and encouraged State governments in this country to do the same.

This produced two results: first, the Russians got the tangible advantage of the tests and we got the intangible advantage of the propaganda; and, second, the announcements about the possible contamination of the milk supply here merely added substantially to the Government's milk surplus and probably cost millions of dollars to buy up the unsold milk.

SHIFT OF ATTENTION

Months have passed since then with the result that announcing the reopening of U.S. tests in the atmosphere now is harder to make than it would have been when Moscow broke the ban. For, with the passage of time, attention has shifted in many parts of the world from the Soviet tests to the new disarmament conference coming up in Geneva in a couple of weeks and from test explosions to Khrushchev's efforts to call another big splashy summit conference.

Having waited this long, the United States will now undoubtedly be blamed for poisoning, not only the atmosphere but the Geneva Conference. Yet the lesson of this incident is not to allow propaganda to dominate policy again, but to go ahead and announce the tests which the administration feels are essential to maintain the balance in the arms race.

This might not be justified if there were the slightest evidence that the Soviet Union is really ready for serious negotiations on an inspected disarmament system, but there is no evidence to support this and Khrushchev has even had the impertinence to declare that renewed U.S. tests now would be an aggressive act.

RESERVES AND SHELTERS

No doubt there are times when decisions have to be made or not made for propaganda purposes, but more often than not the propaganda-directed decision leads to trouble.

President Kennedy's callup of the Army Reserves and his appeal for family fallout shelters last summer illustrate the point. These acts were taken, not because anybody here believed the Reserves or the shelters would deal effectively with any war situation over Berlin, but primarily as propaganda devices to indicate that the United States was determined to defend its rights over Berlin.

The result was that the Reserve callup and the shelter program annoyed and confused the American people more than they frightened the Soviets. In fact, these two decisions were handled about as badly as anything done here since the Cuban affair, and the administration has not dealt with the consequences even yet.

Maybe by the end of the coming summer, the Reserves will quietly be released, but the shelter program is still a mess, and so many people have been scared by the original propaganda shelter announcements that nobody in the administration and few in the Congress are willing to come out flatly against what is likely to be an extremely costly blunder.

Fortunately, in the case of the astronauts the President has put policy before propaganda. His decision is to get on with the job and let John Glenn's space shot speak for itself. Under the circumstances, this is not a bad idea for nuclear testing either. It would have been easier to announce the thing months ago, but since the administration still feels that the Soviet tests have to be matched, the sooner the announcement is made before the Geneva conference the better.

Exploding the "Law of the Land" Myth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the fallacy of the self-serving myth promoted by certain radical pressure groups that decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court constitute the "law of the land" is effectively refuted by Editor Charles J. Bloch in the February 1962 issue of the Georgia Bar Journal. In a lead article entitled, "The Law of the Land," Mr. Bloch cites the rewards which have come to the very men who are responsible for this myth as the result of their flaunting of it. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"THE LAW OF THE LAND"

We lawyers of the South so often hear that such and such a case is the "law of the land," and should be respected as such. Some newspaper editors are especially critical of us—lawyers, officers of court—who, they say, should not flaunt and defy the "law of the land."

This criticism has prompted us to reveal the reward which has come to some lawyers who didn't happen to agree that a certain decision of the Supreme Court of the United States constituted "the law of the land." It is true they weren't southern lawyers, but that ought not to make any difference.

On April 1, 1935 (April Fools Day), the Supreme Court of the United States, then composed of Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes of New York, and Associate Justices Van Devanter of Wyoming, McReynolds of Tennessee, Brandeis of Massachusetts, Sutherland of Utah, Butler of Minnesota, Stone of New York, Roberts of Pennsylvania, and Cardozo of New York, unanimously held that the exclusion of a negro (no capital N either) from a primary election under a resolution of the Texas State Democratic Convention limiting membership in the party to white citizens was not violative of the Federal Constitution.[1]

Although there were some right distinguished jurists on that Court, a Negro citizen of Harris County, Tex., didn't think much of that decision as a declaration of the "law of the land." So on July 27, 1940, he demanded the right to vote in a primary election for the nomination of Democratic candidates for the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives and Governor and other State officers. The election judges relying on the decision of the Supreme Court of a few years before, refused to permit him to cast a ballot. (That was the year in which President Franklin Roosevelt was a candidate for election for a third term.) The Negro, Lonnie E. Smith, then filed a suit against the election managers for damages. Federal District Judge Kennerly thought the 1935 decision of the Supreme Court was controlling. So, he dismissed Smith's petition.

From the judgment dismissing Smith's petition, he appealed to the Circuit Court of Appeals of the Fifth Circuit. And who do you suppose turned up representing Smith in that court? None other than Thurgood Marshall, of New York City. On November 30, 1942, that court, composed of Judges Sibley, Hutcheson, and Holmes, affirmed Judge Kennerly.[2] They thought, too, that the 1935 decision was still valid.

Thurgood Marshall, however, hadn't learned about Supreme Court decisions being the "law of the land," to be respected as such by lawyers and everybody. So, he and some other lawyers filed a petition in the Supreme Court of the United States praying that the Court review this case—although the "law of the land" had been settled some 8 years before. The Texas statutes hadn't been amended. Neither had the applicable provisions of the Constitution of the United States. The personnel of the Court had changed, though. All who were there in 1935 were gone save Stone and Roberts. Stone had become Chief Justice. Among the lawyers aiding Thurgood Marshall was Arthur Garfield Hays, representing the American Civil Liberties Union. They hadn't then discovered the theory about the "law of the land." They were plowing new ground, because Hughes and Brandeis and Cardozo and four of the other Justices were gone. Then, too, the election year 1944 was approaching. On June 7, 1943, the Court granted the petition.[3] And a few months later, the American Civil Liberties Union and National Lawyers Guild were granted leave to file briefs.[4] On December 6, 1943, the case was restored to the docket and assigned for reargument on January 10, 1944.[5] It had been argued in November of 1943. The reargument was held on January 12, 1944. Thurgood Marshall was joined in the argument for "Lonnie Smith" by another lawyer, William H. Hastie. And a brief, urging reversal of the "law of the land" was filed by Mr. Whitney North Seymour, on behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union.[6]

Oh, well. On April 3, 1944, just a few months before the election at which President Roosevelt was elected for a fourth term, the Court, with only Justice Roberts dissenting, "overruled" the 1935 decision and made some new "law of the land" which forbade the exclusion of Negroes (capital N now) from voting in a Democratic primary to select nominees for a general election.[7]

Were Thurgood Marshall and William H. Hastie catigated for thus flaunting the "law of the land"? Was Whitney North Seymour criticized for aiding in the flaunting? The answer to each question is, "No." Mr. Seymour was in 1959 elected president of the American Bar Association. William Henry Hastie was in 1946 appointed Governor of

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

the Virgin Islands, and on December 1, 1949, appointed by President Truman as a judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, comprising the States of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware. (That was after President Truman had been elected in 1948.)

Thurgood Marshall was in October of 1961, given a recess appointment by President Kennedy as a judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, which circuit comprises the States of New York, Connecticut, and Vermont. He has not yet been confirmed by the Senate.

So—disobeying the "law of the land" sometimes has its rewards.

---

[1] *Grovey* v. *Townsend*, 295 U.S. 45.
[2] 131 F. 2d 593.
[3] 319 U.S. 738.
[4] 320 U.S. 612; 64 S.Ct. 155.
[5] 64 S.Ct. 257.
[6] 64 S.Ct. 155; 321 U.S. 650.
[7] 321 U.S. 649; 64 S.Ct. 757.

The Businesslike Approach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Journal Star, February 21, 1962:

THE BUSINESSLIKE APPROACH

(By C. L. Dancey)

If the American people's intimacy with Col. John Glenn during this 17,500-mile-per-hour ride thrice around the world, weightless in space, teaches us a basic truth about man's capacity and man's potential, our first man-in-orbit would have a more decisive effect on human history than on the space program.

A dozen TV and radio announcers were more excited than Colonel Glenn.

All of the weeks, hours, and minutes of soap opera sentimentality and speculation: "How does John Glenn really feel?" "How does Mrs. Glenn feel?" "What's it like to lie there and wait?"

Oh, and the Russians gladly volunteered their share with Gagarin piously saying he never went through anything like that, and "it must be terrible," etc., etc., etc.

A bunch of psychological experts who had no connection with Glenn or his preparations expressed their concern for his tender nerves before the flight.

Then came the liftoff.

Cutting cleanly through all the baloney then came the clear, triumphant voice of Colonel Glenn speaking even as he was buffeted by the massive G-forces of takeoff.

Then, as he whizzed through space, there came that clear, strong, businesslike voice reporting so calmly on conditions, routine checks, and what he could see as the whole world passed under him.

He was calmer than a guide in the National Museum of Art.

There's a great lesson to be learned from all of this, but we probably won't learn it. Instead, we will insist that Glenn is some sort of superman. We'll give him all the admiration he deserves—and in the process miss the great lesson he could be teaching us, and would, we are sure, most like to succeed in teaching us.

That lesson is that man's greatest enemy is ignorant speculation iced with imaginative sentimentality.

Those of us who approach this fantastic feat as something strange and unimaginable are the ones who conjured up the most exotic feelings and fears about it.

Colonel Glenn, Col. John Powers, and the rest of the astronauts and workers on the project had become close to the reality of this problem and this exploit.

They were gripping it with their bare hands. They were dealing with it at point-blank range.

To them this whole business was as real as it has been unreal to many of us.

And when mankind faces things at point-blank range, with a sense of reality, there is almost literally nothing of which we are not capable.

Man is a fantastically rugged creature. This body and mind and nervous system can adjust to wildly different conditions, as it has through the ages in all parts of the earth, and on the sea and under the sea and in the air and now in space.

We specialize in fear of the unknown—which vanishes when it becomes known.

We tremble at change at every new thing that isn't well understood—from atomic bombs to automation, but drive on streets that could be lined with the crosses of fatal accidents with apathy. We're used to that. And cuss the cops for trying to slow us down.

If we can pick up a touch of Col. John Glenn's businesslike approach to the problem, shed all this cultivated emotionalism, and recognize that the way to approach a problem is to get the facts, first, without emotion, make it a known and understood situation, and then calmly and confidently make the best of it how much better off we'll be in terms of everything from public safety officers and annexation to the cold war.

As an example to us all, Glenn's service to the people of the United States has only begun.

Georgia Youth Speaks Up for Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, every so often there comes to my desk a letter that renews my faith in the future of the human race in general and the United States in particular. Such a letter was received last week. It came from a 19-year-old constituent, a young man named Charles Everett Gilpin, of Augusta, Ga.

The purpose of Mr. Gilpin's letter was to express his indignation over demonstrations of certain segments of misguided American youth in support of disarmament and the expressions of criticism of American freedoms and institutions by such groups. His patriotic eloquence was an inspiration to me as I believe it will be to all Senators and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of his letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUSTA, GA.

Senator HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have just finished reading an article in the newspaper of a demonstration for disarmament held by high school and college students in front of the White House.

It seems that in the past few weeks I have read of many such unwarranted actions by young people of my own age. I happen to be 19. The instance that provoked me to red-hot anger was about a northern high school newspaper. The student editor of this newspaper stated that democracy is blind and stupid.

I would like for you to bring to light in Congress the fact that the youth of Georgia would gladly die so that blind and stupid democracy might live on and on and on.

Sincerely,

CHARLES EVERETT GILPIN.

The Forgotten Man?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Journal Star, February 27, 1962:

THE FORGOTTEN MAN?

In all the sharing of the triumph of the space shot, one empty spot keeps coming to mind, over and over, and as yet we have not seen it show itself in all the celebrations.

This program goes a long way back to the selections of astronauts, the launching of space medicine research, of astronaut training, the program for the development of a life-sustaining capsule that could reenter the atmosphere, the proving of a reliable and reasonably safe booster, development of recovery techniques, and so forth.

In its early conception and planning when all these programs were launched it was calculated that they would all become married in 1962 when an Atlas would loft a Mercury capsule containing one of the original astronauts into orbit.

At long last that came to pass, and the triumph was first shared at Cape Canaveral by the launch crew, John Glenn, Mr. McNabb, long the keyman in Atlas launchings, the head of NASA, the commander of Cape Canaveral, the heads of space committees of the Congress, and the President of the United States.

It was a great day for all of them—followed by another great day in the city of Washington.

Everybody got into the act that ever had anything significant to do with this program, soon or late—everybody except one man.

That old man now living on a farm had his share of frustrations in setting it up and getting it started, and his share of criticism and even ridicule—and when the day of triumph came, as it did, on the original schedule with the same team he had organized, we guess he watched it on TV like the rest of us, and watched the others glowing, smiling and witty, basking in the cheers, and sharing the triumph while he remained far away in the mountains on his farm—at Gettysburg, Pa.

C. L. DANCEY.

Tribute to Widow of Late President Woodrow Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in his column "Off the Bench" in the Montgomery Advertiser of February 19, 1962, Judge Walter B. Jones, distinguished presiding judge of the Montgomery, Ala., circuit court, paid a beautiful and richly deserved tribute to the late Edith Bolling Wilson, the widow of our late President Woodrow Wilson. I ask unanimous consent that the tribute may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PASSING OF A GREAT LADY

(By Judge Walter B. Jones)

In our Nation's Capital December 28 last, in her stately townhouse, a great lady died as she approached her 90th year. She was Edith Bolling Wilson, the widow of the 28th President of the United States. Mrs. Wilson was one of sweetest and noblest women who have ever lived in the White House. It was her pleasure to make it a home. She was a retiring woman, seldom appearing in public. She came of distinguished ancestry, the Bollings of Virginia, traced her heritage through Col. Robert Bolling (1646–1709), back to the Indian princess, Pocahontas.

Mrs. Wilson, born in Virginia in 1872, was one of 11 children. Her first husband, who died in 1908, was Norman Galt, the owner of a famous Washington jewelry company.

Woodrow Wilson became President in 1913, and served until March 4, 1921. Mrs. Galt happened to be in Philadelphia in 1909. Someone told her the president of Princeton University was addressing the Princeton alumni, so she looked through the door and that was her first glimpse of Woodrow Wilson. She saw him again when he addressed the two Houses of Congress in a joint session in 1914. She remembers "looking down on the tall, slender figure of Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States."

Mrs. Galt did not see Mr. Wilson again until she was visiting the White House in March 1915 with Helen Bones, the President's cousin. Mrs. Galt seemed to know that she had met her fate. On December 18, 1915, she and President Wilson had a very quiet wedding in her own home with only the two families present. Someone suggested to her, "Oh, you should be married in the White House. It would be so historic." Mrs. Galt promptly told them she preferred the simplicity of her own home to historic background and that she would be married in her own home, and nowhere else.

Edith Bolling Wilson was an ideal wife and helpmate. Dignity and gentleness walked with her. She was devotedly attached to her husband, comforted and supported him under misfortune, was interested in everything he did, and saw to it that while the White House was officially the residence of President Wilson, it was also the private home of Mr. and Mrs. Woodrow Wilson.

As the wife of the President, she was most careful to preserve his health and she conducted herself with great dignity and lovingly gave her beautiful life and all her great talents to her husband. Mr. Wilson, in selecting her for his life companion, remembered the saying of Euripides, that "Man's best possession is a sympathetic wife." And in the person of Mrs. Wilson, love, sweetness, and goodness shone. She was truly a fellow-farer true through life, and Mr. Wilson followed the wise saying, "for a wife take the daughter of a good mother."

Mrs. Wilson never thought that she had been elected as a sort of assistant President. She never rushed into print. She never conducted any newspaper and magazine columns, nor press conferences. She never lectured Senators and Congressmen how the United States should be run. The White House was not commercialized. None of her family sold insurance to high Government officials. She remained always by the side of the President, and made the homelife of the White House something which won the heart of the American people and endeared her to them.

President Wilson suffered a nervous collapse on September 25, 1919, while campaigning for the League of Nations. They hurried him back to the White House and there on October 1–2, 1919, he suffered a stroke which disabled him physically for the rest of his life. Mrs. Wilson never left the bedside of her sick husband. During the many, many months that President Wilson was ill, and was out of direct touch with his associates, the good wife sifted the matters to be brought to him, summarized them, and carried his decisions to the Cabinet.

Some critics went so far as to characterize her as the "first woman President of the United States." Well, she would have been a better President than some I have known. After she left the White House, Mrs. Wilson wrote frankly in her book, "My Memoir," that "Woodrow Wilson was first my beloved husband, whose life I was trying to save, fighting with my back to the wall; after that he was President of the United States."

During the President's critical illness, all sorts of rumors got out, one of them said the President was insane, another story was that the stroke had impaired his mind, and Senator Moses of New Hampshire cooked up the story that the President had suffered a brain lesion. This brought the prompt reply from Dr. Grayson that Woodrow Wilson's mind was "clear as a bell." His enemies in the Senate got up a scheme by which a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was named ostensibly to confer with the President on the Mexican situation. The real object was, of course, to see if Mr. Wilson was mentally capable of administering the office. Senator Albert B. Fall, who later went to the penitentiary for crooked deals as a Cabinet officer, headed the committee. They were greatly disappointed when they found that Mr. Wilson's mind was in perfect condition, stronger than the minds of the senatorial snoopers.

The Wilsons left the White House March 4, 1921, retiring to private life in a small mansion at 2340 South Street NW., now a national shrine. The love and appreciation of the American people went with them. There they lived and Mrs. Wilson continued the loving care of her husband until death claimed him, February 3, 1924. After that, she continued to live in the home, always conducting herself as a great lady.

On Monday, January 2, 1962, the body of Mrs. Wilson was borne tenderly into Washington Cathedral for the time-honored burial service of the Protestant Episcopal Church. She was laid to rest in one of the stone vaults which lie below the nave and west of the St. Joseph Chapel. This is just beneath the tomb of President Wilson. One of the burial vaults was opened so that Mrs. Wilson might lie as closely as possible to the President. The vault was sealed with a heavy stone on which is carved the simple inscription: "Edith Bolling Galt Wilson, 1872–1961. And, so today, in this stately and hallowed cathedral, a flower in stone, Woodrow Wilson and Edith Bolling Wilson, united in death, sleep forever their last sleep."

America will treasure through the centuries the goodness of Woodrow Wilson. It will ever honor the memory of the good and loyal wife who was always at his side.

Robert Joseloff: Humanitarian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday my hometown of Norwalk lost one of its leading citizens, Robert Joseloff. I had known and respected Mr. Joseloff and his family for many years. I consider it a high privilege to be able to offer this tribute to him in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to insert the following editorial from the Norwalk Hour. His life enriched all those who knew him. His benevolence will be felt in the community for many years to come. I know I speak for the entire community in mourning his passing.

The editorial follows:

ROBERT JOSELOFF: HUMANITARIAN

Robert Joseloff, a resident of Norwalk for nearly 75 years, who was recognized as the dean of Norwalk Jewry, passed away Sunday morning at his home in 41 Seaview Avenue at the age of 93 years.

His business career was a real-life Horatio Alger success story. He was a native of Poland who came to America in 1886. Four other brothers followed him here within a few years. Mr. Joseloff worked in two other Connecticut cities before settling in Norwalk in 1888, opening a small grocery store on Wood Street. A few years later he purchased a grocery store at 21 First Street, which he sold in 1913 to Henry Harris. He, himself, went into the wholesale grocery business with his brothers, Samuel, Manuel and Morris, and they built up a grocery empire of 500 stores which merged in 1929 with First National Stores.

Mr. Joseloff, developing an interest in real estate here and in Westport, formed the Connecticut Mutual Realty Co., which later purchased and merged with T. H. Canty Co. He was president of the Canty Co. from 1940 to 1955 when he became chairman of the board.

Mr. Joseloff was the last of the surviving founders of the Congregational Beth Israel, first Norwalk synagogue, at South Main and Concord Streets. He was a founder of Temple Beth El on East Avenue. He was a founder of the Independent Hebrew Association which established a cemetery in West Norwalk. He was active in the formation of the Young Men's Hebrew Association of Norwalk, the predecessor of the Norwalk Jewish Community Center, and he served as president of the Young Men's Hebrew Association and, later, of the Jewish Center.

Outside of his business interests, Mr. Joseloff was long active in civic, religious and fraternal affairs. He was a charitable man, contributing generously to community activities. In 1921, Mr. Joseloff established a trust fund for the United Fund, designating the United Fund as the permanent recipient of a yearly income from the trust—a trust

which will serve as a model for many years to come.

Mr. Joseloff was honored many times by the community during his long career. In 1929 he was presented with a gold watch by the Young Men's Hebrew Association at a testimonial dinner. In 1959, he was the honored guest (although unable to attend because of illness) at a testimonial at the Norwalk Jewish Center at which the speaker was the Honorable Robert Briscoe, the Jewish mayor of Dublin, Ireland. Mr. Joseloff was the oldest member of Norwalk's Kiwanis Club and was elected a life member in 1924.

The loss of Robert Joseloff will be long felt by the community.

Arthur J. Behl: War Hero, Jet Pilot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of my fellow Texans, Mr. Arthur J. Behl, lost his life on December 7, 1961, when an F-89 he was flying crashed in the Sacramento Mountains in New Mexico. His job was launching of the jet propelled targets across McGregor Range for the Nike crews on the ground to fire on.

On the day he lost his life he had just launched his second target when a malfunction occurred resulting in the plane going into a steep dive from 30,000 feet and crashing into a mountainside in Monument Canyon, in the Sacramento Mountains.

Mr. Behl, who had a distinguished record of service to his country both as a Navy Pilot in World War II and a courageous pilot in civilian life, was a highly respected member of his community, in El Paso, El Paso County. He was sincere in his beliefs and worked hard for the things in which he believed.

He was a devout Christian and gave much of his time and himself to the organization and expansion of St. Luke Methodist Church in El Paso. He is sadly missed by his family, his coworkers and all who knew him.

His life was such that my State and Nation may be justly proud of him.

I ask unanimous consent to have two articles from the El Paso Times printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, one entitled "Wing Tips" and the other "Arthur Behl Services Set Sunday."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WINGTIPS

(By Bill Thompson)

The community and the aviation fraternity lost a fine man and a great pilot when Art Behl of Norair, crashed in the Sacramento Mountains, December 7.

Art was 44 and a Navy pilot in World War II. He was aboard the U.S.S. *Lexington* at sea in the Pacific when the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor. He was a member of the Navy Reserve at the time of his death.

Following the war, he was a pilot for Pan American Airlines for about 3 years, flying the Pacific Ocean routes.

He started to work for Norair in 1951 as a pilot and had resided in El Paso for about 2 years, flying F-89's in the RP-76 target program.

Behl and another Norair pilot, John Januleski, ferried two F-89's across the Pacific to Korea several months ago and were among the first pilots to fly this distance in that particular type aircraft.

He was highly skilled in the profession, and the sky was an element as familiar to him as the earth.

He was a quiet, gentle man who made friends easily.

He will be sadly missed by his family, his coworkers, and the circle of people who were fortunate enough to have known him.

ARTHUR BEHL SERVICES SET SUNDAY

Memorial services will be held at 2 p.m., Sunday in Grace Methodist Church, 400 North Carolina Drive, for Aurthur J. Behl, 44, 9905 Suez Drive, who was killed in a plane crash in the Sacramento Mountains, Thursday, December 7.

The Rev. Rodney Roberts of St. Luke's Methodist Church will officiate.

Mr. Behl was born December 11, 1916, in Cassville, Wis. He was a graduate of Cornell College of Iowa and was a lieutenant commander in the Navy.

He is survived by his widow, Mrs. Ruth B. Behl; four daughters, Diana, Jackie, Sandra, and Janet; one son, Edward; his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Arthur E. Behl of Monroe Center, Ill.; three sisters, Mrs. Gilbert Krajnik of Swanton, Nebr.; Mrs. Barbara Morris of Wilbur, Nebr.; and Mrs. J. W. Ing of St. Charles, Ill.

Testimonials for Dirksen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert an editorial from the Peoria Journal Star of February 27 calling attention to President Kennedy's tribute to the Republican Senate leader, my distinguished colleague from Illinois, Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN.

TESTIMONIALS FOR DIRKSEN

President John Kennedy paid good-humored tribute to the political genius of Senator Everett M. Dirksen on the night of John Glenn's orbital ride.

The administration forces had tried a bit of tricky maneuvering in the procedures of the Senate to bring the President's bid for a Department of Urban Affairs to a showdown vote there before the House action already scheduled (which House action they justly feared).

They thought they had the situation locked to jump into the Senate but Minority Leader DIRKSEN outmaneuvered them and "headed them off at the pass" leaving the President's urban affairs program "high and dry."

President Kennedy used a different term. He told guests (including Senator DIRKSEN) that DIRKSEN's maneuvers of the day had "put me in orbit." Implying that no landing was arranged, either.

The remark was typical of the good humor which is characteristic of the political wars in Washington, and the distinction the President, himself, places on issues which are largely political and those which are of vital bipartisan concern. He has learned to expect DIRKSEN's expert opposition on one, and support on the other.

The remark also underlines the fact that behind the facade of his oratory, DIRKSEN is recognized as a very skilled and deadly opponent in the arts of politics as practiced in the U.S. Senate.

He now has the testimony of the President of the United States on that. Indeed, he now has the testimony of the last two Presidents—one respecting him for his able assistance, the other paying respect to him for the skill of his opposition.

Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. MURPHY, JR.

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed, in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial, appearing in the February 19 issue of the Claremont, N.H., Daily Eagle, entitled "Brotherhood Week."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROTHERHOOD WEEK

What can I do for my country?

This is probably the most frequently asked question in America today. There is a feeling of inadequacy and an inability to transfer into action the desire on the part of Americans to do something concrete in response to President Kennedy's ringing challenge: "* * * and so, my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

This is Brotherhood Week sponsored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews. This organization is dedicated to the aim of breaking down the barriers of religious, racial and ethnic prejudice which threaten our democracy and distort our business, social, and political relations.

Three hundred and sixty-five days out of every year NCCJ conducts hundreds of educational programs for brotherhood throughout the country in the fields of education, religion, labor-management, and community life.

During Brotherhood Week National Conference of Christians and Jews calls to the attention of every American the imperative need for a rededication to the concepts of democracy and our Judeo-Christian principles. It stresses the urgency for human understanding in today's rapidly changing world. It calls all Americans to help eradicate bigotry, fear and prejudice among men, not only during this week of brotherhood but throughout the year.

To accomplish this change of human attitudes and emotions is a herculean task requiring the strength, will, and support of every American. No American can escape his responsibility.

You can do something for your country. You can reexamine yourself and your own attitudes. You can fight the prejudice within yourself and then help others to understand the meaning of true freedom and equality for all by example.

Together, we can all make democracy work through brotherhood.

Some people smirk at the idea of Brotherhood Week and not without some justification. It is impossible to achieve any objective in 1 short week. The very thought

of overcoming prejudice, fear, and bigotry among men in 1 week is ridiculous if not preposterous.

The goal of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God is a lifelong practice—in fact it has been waged through all of history.

Today, as never before, in the face of world challenge, we must all rededicate ourselves to the principles of brotherhood during this week and work for brotherhood throughout the year. We must tear out the cancerous growth of bigotry and selfishness that divides us as a country.

Every minute of every hour of every day of every year is the time for brotherhood.

Regionalism Held Waning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the San Diego Union, on Sunday, February 25, 1962.

REGIONAL DIVISIONS WANING, POLL SHOWS

People in Illinois and California feel almost the same about issues of war and peace and domestic and international communism, separate polls taken by Copley Newspapers in both areas show. The polls indicate that "regionalism" is dying, or dead, as a factor affecting American foreign policy—a development of great political significance to the country.

The polls were taken by the Copley Newspapers in cities of California and Illinois, for the information of both editors and readers. The results of the intensive San Diego County survey, conducted by the San Diego Union and Evening Tribune, are presented in full in the Today's World section of this newspaper.

Responses to such questions as the likelihood of war, or what the United States should do about the United Nations, show only narrow differences between the results for San Diego and those from key cities in Illinois. The Illinois cities surveyed were Springfield, the State capital, and Aurora, Elgin, and Joliet, commercial and industrial cities in farming areas which give a good cross section of Illinois population.

The great likeness in opinion between San Diego and an area at the heart of what was once labeled the "isolationist" Midwest is shown in one key question, "Do you favor a firm stand, even risking war, in Berlin?" To this question, 88 percent in San Diego answered yes; 86 percent in Illinois answered yes.

Answers to some of the key poll questions follow. Included in the "overall response" column are the San Diego and Illinois answers, plus poll results from seven other California areas served by Copley newspapers—Alhambra, Burbank, Culver City, Glendale, Monrovia, Redondo Beach, and San Pedro. Answers do not add up to 100 percent because some of those questioned did not give opinions on all points.

The table below summarizes the attitudes of Illinois and San Diego residents on foreign policy questions which were asked in a poll conducted by Copley newspapers:

[In percent]

	Illinois		San Diego		Overall response	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Do you believe nuclear war likely within 3 years?	6	88	7	85	8	85
Do you believe limited war without A-weapons possible?	65	30	71	24	63	32
If possible, would you build a fallout shelter?	26	66	30	62	26	66
Do you favor a firm stand, even risking war, in Berlin?	86	9	88	8	86	9
Do you favor a firm stand, even risking war, in southeast Asia?	70	20	77	15	72	18
Do you favor a firm stand, even risking war, in Formosa?	69	20	71	19	70	2
Should the United States continue to support the U.N. if:						
A. Communist China gains admission?	50	22	42	27	42	28
B. The Secretary General loses his effectiveness?	44	43	39	46	39	47
C. Neutralists shift support to Russia, outvote United States?	41	45	39	51	38	49
Do you consider communism a serious internal threat?	75	22	78	21	79	18
If "Yes" should Communist party be outlawed?	78	19	80	16	80	16

Do you think foreign aid should be:

Illinois: Expanded, 12 percent; reduced, 44 percent; eliminated, 7 percent; continued as is, 23 percent.

San Diego: Expanded, 13 percent; reduced, 46 percent; eliminated, 11 percent; continued as is, 23 percent.

Overall response: Expanded, 12 percent; reduced, 46 percent; eliminated, 10 percent; continued as is, 26 percent.

First President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on February 22, 1962, the Washington Daily News carried an editorial entitled, "First President." There has been a good deal of misunderstanding as to who deserves the honor of having been the First President of the United States—John Hanson or George Washington.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled, "First President," which clarifies this dispute be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST PRESIDENT

Our correspondent, Charles Havlena, here in Washington, is disturbed, and rightly so, at recurring implications that George Washington, whose birthday is celebrated on this date, was not the first President of the United States of America.

To settle any doubts, he has gone to the ultimate authority, the National Archives and Records Service, whose Director, Albert H. Leisinger, reports as follows:

"John Hanson has often been referred to as the 'first President' because of the position he held under the Articles of Confederation. His office was that of President of the United States in Congress assembled and not the Office of President of the United States of America.

"By article V of the Articles of Confederation the Delegates were to meet in Congress on the first Monday of November in every year and article IX states 'the United States in Congress assembled shall have authority * * * to appoint one of their numbers to preside: Provided, That no person be allowed to serve in the office of President more than 1 year in any term of 3 years.'

"Thus, under the Articles of Confederation, John Hanson, on November 5, 1771, was appointed to preside and held the Office of President of the United States in Congress assembled.

"The Commission granting Washington full power and authority to arrange an exchange of prisoners of war with the British, which as you know is the earliest known use of the seal of the United States, is witnessed by 'John Hanson, President of the United States in Congress assembled * * *.'

"The Office of President of the United States of America was created by the express words of the Constitution (art. 11, sec. 1), which says 'the Executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America.' "

That should settle it. John Hanson was President of the United States in Congress assembled. George Washington was the first President of the United States of America. Let the record so show.

Farmer Caught in Crossfire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, no single section of our population is caught in as many crossfires as are those engaged in farming. In addition to problems which originated in the depression years, the dairy farmer in particular has been subjected to a new type of psychological warfare, resulting from misleading information regarding the dangers of fallout. Recently I urged the U.S. Public Health Service to revise its present system of reporting fallout to include a marketbasket approach rather than singling out milk. Some of these problems are clearly highlighted in a recent editorial which appeared in the Springfield, Mo., Leader and Press. Under leave to extend my remarks, the editorial follows:

PITY THE POOR FARMER

Ever since the end of World War I, American agriculture has been having its problems, few of them ever solved and with new ones cropping up periodically.

Agriculture was the only segment of industry not to recover from the depression of 1920, and boom until the market crash of late 1929.

Life in the 1930's, decade of the world's greatest depression, was tough for everyone—toughest of all on the farmer. Not only did he suffer depression, but he also was walloped by recurring droughts and the Dust Bowl.

When World War II ended the depression, the farmer prospered less. And when

the coming of peace brought an era of prosperity, the farmer got only a new problem as surpluses raised a depressing head.

New techniques for extracting and processing vegetable oils knocked the props from under hog and dairy farmers in the 1950's, even as they benefited consumers. Swine breeders were compelled to breed a new type hog with a minimum of virtually unmarketable lard. But what could the dairyman do about butterfat?

In the past couple of years still more problems have been born. The rise of the European Common Market threatened the markets of all farmers. The cholesterol and radioactive milk scares struck hardest at the dairyman.

The cholesterol scare came with the discovery that a fatty substance in the blood, cholesterol, appears to be a contributor to heart disease. Milk contains fats, might be a contributor.

A tremendous—repeat, tremendous—preponderance of medical men looked with open mind, decided they needed more proof, continued to recommend milk in the diet of most persons. A few raised an alarmist cry, a shrill, damning cry. It didn't matter that Americans are not among the leading milk drinkers in the world, and that in those nations that are, heart disease is less prevalent than in America; the public was alarmed.

At about the same time, it was discovered that milk could carry some strontium 90, a cancer-causing residue from nuclear bomb tests. Again the people were alarmed. The two factors combined to cut milk consumption in the United States by some 3 billion pounds in 1961.

Yet one of the Nation's leading food processors tested vegetables along with milk, found that when milk carried 5 strontium units to the glassful, cabbage had 210 strontium units; potatoes up to 50 units; peas 1,137 units; sweet corn up to 200; lettuce as much as 4,400 units. In other words, milk carried less strontium units than any other food tested, and it was not a dairy company running the tests.

The Common Market? American farmers should consider the problem. With power to slash tariffs, America hopes to persuade the nations of the Common Market that it is not to their advantage to subsidize farming in order to step up food production; that freer trade in other commodities would be worth concessions in agriculture.

Without the power to slash tariffs, there can be no such deal. And ECM nations are already laying their plans for tremendous agricultural gains. In brief, the American farmer is sure to lose if we retain high tariff walls, has a hope of gaining export markets in Europe if the tariffs do tumble.

In any case, it's a worry to farmers, conditioned to wonder what's coming next.

Mr. Bailey's Sour Note

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, while all Americans were rejoicing over the success of the *Friendship 7* flight of Col. John Glenn, the national chairman of the Democrat Party chose this opportunity to attempt to make political capital of the event.

Fortunately, few, if any citizens, other than Democrat Chairman Bailey, perhaps, are going to view this achievement as anything but a slambank, A–1, all-American success of which all can be immensely proud, regardless of our political affiliation.

No one asked John Glenn, Al Shepard, or Gus Grissom what their political registration might be when long before Mr. Bailey was Democratic chairman or Mr. Kennedy was President these astronauts stepped into the important roles they have assumed, and I do not think—despite Mr. Bailey's comments—that it is a point that has any relevancy to the accomplishments each of these astronauts has brought to this country.

Mr. President, it is unfortunate that Mr. Bailey attempted to inject partisan politics into this great achievement. I think particularly appropriate comments on Mr. Bailey's performance are those which appeared in last night's Washington Evening Star which I wish to place in the RECORD at this point to conclude my comments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Politics and the Infinite," and a column by Gould Lincoln, entitled "Glenn Feat Thrust Into Politics," both of which were published in the February 27 Evening Star.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICS AND THE INFINITE

Measured against the stars and the incomprehensible magnitudes of infinity, a man like Democratic National Chairman John M. Bailey seems to be quite absurdly small, to put it mildly. This holds true for all of us earthlings, of course, but he stands out at the moment as a particularly glaring example of how ridiculous a human biped can make himself look when he says silly things about the high heavens around us and our terra firma politics.

What silly things? Well, Mr. Bailey has hailed Astronaut Glenn's triple orbital flight as a triumph that must be credited to the Democratic Party and the imagination, energy, and know-how of the Kennedy administration. This is a real blooper, and a strangely stupid one in view of Mr. Bailey's reputation for being sensible, and in view also of the fact that Project Mercury was set up by the Republican Eisenhower administration.

Colonel Glenn, in any case, has set a nonpolitical standard, 'way up there above our little earth, around which all men of good will, intelligence, commonsense, and genuine patriotism can rally. In short, he has achieved something so grand that politicians like Mr. Bailey make themselves look foolish when they try to capitalize on it for votes.

GLENN FEAT THRUST INTO POLITICS

To many Americans the attempt by Democratic National Chairman John M. Bailey to play partisan party politics with the earth-orbiting flight of Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., claiming all the credit for the Kennedy administration, came with a sickening thud. It came at a time when the whole Nation, Republicans and Democrats alike, were rejoicing in the success of this remarkable achievement and in the fact that the United States had demonstrated once again the courage of its citizens and the worth of its scientists. Chairman Bailey was delivering a pep talk to Democrats in Hartford, Conn., in his own home State. And he seemed to be trying to use the Glenn space flight to cover up his disappointment over the knockout blow last week to President Kennedy's Urban Affairs Department proposal in the Congress.

The language used by Mr. Bailey was far different from that of Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON, who as Democratic leader of the Senate and as chairman of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, said in January 1958: "Why do we now stand in a posture of relative weakness? (Soviet Russians had demonstrated their capacity to launch a half-ton satellite into space.) When such a question is asked, as it should be asked, there is an ever-present danger that we shall frame our answers in terms of credit and blame. To do this now could well be fatal. There is little question what wrong decisions have been made. These errors are not divided along any partisan lines. As Prime Minister Churchill told the House of Commons on June 18, 1940: 'If we open a quarrel between the past and the present, we shall find that we have lost the future.'"

SPEAKS AS AMERICAN

Mr. JOHNSON was speaking not as a Democrat, but as an American at a time this Nation was faced with a major problem—that of regaining lost ground in the field of missile and space development. The record shows that Mr. JOHNSON has been a leader for years in the drive to promote the development of space science and of missiles capable of putting men into space.

It is of interest to recall that Vice President JOHNSON, as long ago as January 1958, was urging that "we make provision for inviting together the scientists of other nations to work in concert on projects to extend the frontiers of man and to find solutions of the troubles of this earth." This is similar to the recent proposal made by Premier Khrushchev in his letter to President Kennedy congratulating Colonel Glenn on his orbital flight. And in November of 1958 it was Senator JOHNSON who was chosen to present to the United Nations a resolution calling for a committee to explore the possibilities of joint United Nations actions on outer space.

It has been Vice President JOHNSON's deep belief that outer space could be a pathway to world peace. In his opinion, the United States now has a rare opportunity to seize the initiative. President Kennedy has already replied to Mr. Khrushchev that he welcomed the idea of cooperation in the development of space science and travel in the cause of peace.

For many reasons, therefore, it was very fitting that the Vice President should have been selected to ride with Colonel Glenn on his trip to the Capitol from the White House yesterday. And it was with fitting pride in Colonel Glenn and his accomplishments that the Vice President presided jointly with Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK over the meeting of Congress which listened to the astronaut tell of his experiences in space, and honored him. Colonel Glenn's fervent wish that man may go forward into more and more knowledge of outer space and that such knowledge may aid toward a peaceful world runs parallel to that expressed 4 years ago by Mr. JOHNSON.

BAILEY REMARK

Mr. Bailey's effort to make political capital out of the Glenn flight was couched in these words: "This week our country celebrated an inspiring achievement, the three orbits around the earth of Astronaut John Glenn. This magnificent flight symbolized what can be done by an administration (the Kennedy administration) with the imagination, energy, and know-how to set big goals and to reach them. It showed what America can do when urgency and determination replace apathy and indecision in the executive branch (presided over by former President Eisenhower) of our Government."

Senator HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa, chairman of the Republican policy committee of the Senate, countered with a statement that the Kennedy administration simply carried out the program of the Eisenhower administration—the Mercury program started 3 years ago. Senator HICKENLOOPER said that no responsible Democrat will seek to make political capital out of the result. He commented further that during the Truman administration less than $4 million was spent on intermediate range and intercontinental ballistic missiles; that starting in 1953 the Eisenhower administration built the program for development of heavy thrust missiles, and from 1953 through 1961, the Eisenhower administration planned, spent, and appropriated $14 billion for the intercontinental and intermediate range missiles alone. This program, he said, made possible the heroic feat of Colonel Glenn.

Support of the Immigration and Nationality Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a resolution adopted at the 33d annual convention of the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, Inc., on February 1, 1962, at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C., attended by more than 500 officers, delegates, and associates from all parts of the country. The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas since the enactment of the Immigration and Nationality Act in 1952, there has been an unremitting attack against this monumental legislation by Communists, hyphenated Americans, political auctioneers, and starry-eyed liberals; and

Whereas the maintenance of our protective national origins immigration system, embodied in the Immigration and Nationality Act, is vital to the preservation of this Republic; and

Whereas patriotic organizations and individuals have succeeded in repelling a direct frontal attack for repeal of the Immigration and Nationality Act; and

Whereas the enemies of the act have resorted to the technique of chipping away at the act by lax enforcement, administrative interpretations and amendments which have the effect of undermining the foundations of our cultural integrity and threaten our security; and

Whereas there are now pending in the Congress proposals to expand the classes of aliens who are admissible for permanent residence outside quota limitations, to pool unused quotas, to abolish the national origins quota system, and to recompute the entire basis of alloting quotas to the end that our historic immigration policies will be abandoned: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies Inc., calls to action all patriotic organizations and individuals to resist lax enforcement and administration of our immigration laws and to ferret out and defeat all amendments to the immigration laws which would weaken or undermine them by either admission of additional numbers of aliens or relaxing the requirements for admission or deportation.

SOCIETIES COOPERATING WITH THE AMERICAN COALITION OF PATRIOTIC SOCIETIES, INC.

The Alliance, Inc.
American Coalition of New York.
The American Institute.
American Public Relations Forum, Inc.
The Americans, Inc.
American War Mothers.
American Women's Legion of World Wars.
Anti-Subversive League of South Dakota.
Associated Farmers of California, Inc.
Associated Farmers of Richland County, Inc. (Ohio).
Better Government Forum.
Catholic War Veterans of the U.S.A., Queens County chapter.
Christian Women United.
Connecticut Volunteers.
Constitutional Study Group of South Dakota, Inc.
Dames of the Loyal Legion of the United States.
Dames of the Loyal Legion of the United States, District of Columbia.
Dames of the Loyal Legion of the United States, Pennsylvania.
Daughters of America, National Council.
Daughters of America, Clara Barton Council No. 71.
Daughters of America, Pride of Baltimore Council No. 14.
Daughters of America, District of Columbia Council.
Daughters of America, New Jersey Council.
Daughters of the Revolution, national society.
Daughters of the Revolution, New Jersey society.
Daughters of the Revolution, New York society.
Daughters of the Revolution, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
Daughters of the Revolution, colonial chapter.
Daughters of the Revolution, ex-officers club.
Daughters of the Revolution, Lafayette chapter.
Daughters of the Revolution, Liberty Bell chapter.
Defenders of the American Constitution, Inc.
Defenders of American Education.
Defenders of State Sovereignty and Individual Liberties, Arlington chapter.
Defenders of State Sovereignty and Individual Liberties, Virginia.
Delaware Defenders of the Republic, Inc.
Descendants of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence.
Farmers Liberty League.
Florida Coalition of Patriotic Societies.
Fraternal Patriotic Americans, State of Pennsylvania, Inc.
General Society of the War of 1812.
General Society of the War of 1812, District of Columbia Division.
General Society of the War of 1812, New York Division.
Grass Roots League, Inc.
Junior Order United American Mechanics, New Jersey.
Junior Order United American Mechanics, New York.
Junior Order United American Mechanics, Pennsylvania.
Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic.
Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, department of the Potomac.
Louisiana Committees of Correspondence.
Marine Corps League Auxiliary, Inc.
Massachusetts Committees of Correspondence.
Michigan Coalition of Constitutionalists.
Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, Commandery in Chief.
Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, Commandery of the District of Columbia.
Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, Commandery of the State of New York.
Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, Commandery of the State of Pennsylvania.
Military Order of the World Wars.
Minnesota Coalition of Patriotic Societies, Inc.
The National Huguenot Society.
National Service Star Legion, Inc.
National Society, Colonial Dames of the XVII Century, New York State society.
National Society, Congress of States Societies.
National Society for Constitutional Security.
National Society for Constitutional Security, chapter I.
National Society for Constitutional Security, chapter II.
National Society for Constitutional Security, chapter III.
National Society, Daughters of the Union, 1861–1865.
National Society, Magna Charta Dames.
National Society of New England Women.
National Society of New England Women, New York City colony.
National Society, Patriotic Women of America, Inc.
National Society, Patriotic Women of America, District of Columbia council.
National Society, Patriotic Women of America, New York council.
National Society, Sons and Daughters of the Pilgrims.
National Society, U.S. Daughters of 1812, State of New York.
National Society, Women Descendants of the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company.
National Sojourners, Inc.
National Women's Relief Corps.
National Women's Relief Corps, Department of Potomac.
Naval and Military Order of the Spanish-American War, National Commandery.
The Network.
New Jersey Coalition, Inc.
Ohio Coalition of Patriotic Societies.
Order of Fraternal Americans, Grand Council.
Order of Independent Americans, Inc., State council of Pennsylvania.
Order of the Founders and Patriots of America, California.
Order of the Founders and Patriots of America, District of Columbia.
Order of the Founders and Patriots of America, Massachusetts.
Order of the Founders and Patriots of America, New Jersey.
Order of the Founders and Patriots of America, New York.
Order of the Founders and Patriots of America, Rhode Island.
Order of Washington.
Patriotic Order Sons of America, national camp.
Patriotic Order Sons of America, State camp of Pennsylvania.
Philadelphia chapter, Council for Individual Freedom.
Society of Old Plymouth Colony Descendants.
Sons and Daughters of Liberty, national council.
Sons and Daughters of Liberty, State council, Connecticut.
Sons and Daughters of Liberty, State council, District of Columbia.
Sons and Daughters of Liberty, State council, Maryland.
Sons and Daughters of Liberty, State council, Massachusetts.
Sons and Daughters of Liberty, State council, New Hampshire.
Sons and Daughters of Liberty, State council, Pennsylvania.

Sons and Daughters of Liberty, State council, Rhode Island.
Sons and Daughters of Liberty, State council, Virginia.
Sons of the American Revolution, national society.
Sons of the American Revolution, California society.
Sons of the American Revolution, Empire State society.
Sons of the American Revolution, Iowa society.
Sons of the American Revolution, New Jersey society.
Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War Commandery-in-Chief.
Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, Massachusetts department.
South Dakota Anti-Subversive League.
Sovereignty Preservation Council of Delaware.
Taxpayers, Inc.
Texas Voters for the Constitution.
United States Day Committee, Inc.
United States Flag Committee.
Watch Washington Club.
The Wheel of Progress.
William Thaw Council of Americans, Inc.
Women of Army and Navy Legion of Valor, U.S.A.
Women's National Defense Committee of Philadelphia.
Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Inc.

Retraining of Jobless Persons Urged as Preferable to Shorter Workweek—ARA Pilot Training Program Is Defended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, passage yesterday in the House of Representatives of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1961 was an event of much significance.

In West Virginia, where unemployment has been a most difficult problem on a chronic basis, we are especially cognizant of the need for manpower development, training, and retraining.

It was in our State at Huntington that the Nation's first retraining program as a joint project of State and local instrumentalities was established. The U.S. Department of Labor and the Area Redevelopment Administration of the U.S. Department of Commerce proceeded under provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act.

This program, still in the early stage of its establishment and operation, has been maligned by critics of Federal Government participation in retraining activities. West Virginia's State vocational education director, S. D. McMillen, however, has expressed gratification and patient understanding of the progress which has been manifested.

On the subject of the validity of retraining of the jobless, I am reminded of significant comments by one of our State's most enlightened and forthright labor leaders, Miles C. Stanley, president of the West Virginia Labor Federation, AFL-CIO, who has expressed the belief that retraining—not a shorter workweek—is the more immediate answer to present unemployment problems.

In a number of morning newspapers of West Virginia, on February 12, 1962, there appeared an article by able Associated Press Staff Writer Dick Leonard in which he quoted comments of Mr. McMillen and Mr. Stanley. He also presented other pertinent facts on the general subject of retraining and concerning the pilot ARA retraining program at Huntington.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article by AP Staff Writer Leonard as published in the February 12, 1962, issue of the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BETTER THAN SHORTER WEEK—RETRAIN JOBLESS MEN, LABOR LEADER ADVISES

(By Dick Leonard)

The president of the 55,000-member West Virginia Labor Federation, AFL-CIO, believes that retraining of the jobless—not a shorter workweek—is an answer at present to unemployment problems.

"I think retraining is our best bet on a short-term basis," said Miles C. Stanley. "Ultimately we may have to go to a shorter workweek but right now such a step would be premature."

West Virginia launched its own retraining program a year and a half ago under the guidance of State Vocational Education Director S. D. McMillen. Of the 2,760 retrained, 1,475 are known to have found jobs.

"Our experience in the State program shows that people do want to be retrained for new occupations," McMillen said.

Stanley questioned whether people have progressed enough socially to know what to do with the additional spare time they would derive from a 25-hour workweek, such as that won by union electricians in New York recently.

He said one danger of the shorter workweek would be an increase in what he terms "moonlighting at bargain basement prices," one man working at two jobs, at least one of them for low-rate pay.

West Virginia, chronically plagued with the unemployment, had 64,200—10.4 percent of its labor force—out of work the first of this year. This compares with a national average of 5 to 6 percent.

"Our big problem is not overproduction, but underconsumption due to lack of purchasing power," said Stanley.

"I would like to stay with the 40-hour week and try retraining to equip the unemployed with new skills to meet the changing job demands."

Stanley made his remarks after a visit to the Nation's first Federal retraining program at Huntington.

"At Huntington, I saw a butcher who had quit his job because of varicose veins learning to repair small appliances—a job he could do while seated," Stanley said.

The $135,000 pilot retraining program is on schedule, officials said, with trainees enrolled in six of the seven courses offered—nursing aid, small appliance repair, automatic transmisison repair, stenography, route salesmanship, and table waiting. The program is geared to retrain 325 people by September 30.

A course for typists is being held up until a quota of 20 is reached. At last report, there were 13 enrolled.

There have been 45 graduated from nursing aid courses, with 10 of the 25 referred for jobs going to work.

After the program was launched last December, some conecrn was expressed because applicants were not rushing to sign up.

"I think some of the people at Huntington simply overanticipated the initial response." McMillen said.

"One of the problems we recognized at the start of our State program was that people who had been out of school for a long time—say, 25 years—naturally would be hesitant about returning to the classroom. We found that as people started attending, their friends and neighbors heard about it and became more interested."

McMillen doesn't expect the Federal program to be beset by the dropout problem which has plagued the State. The big reason is that Federal trainees receive a 23 weekly subsistence while enrolled. State trainees receive none. As a result, 1,847 failed to finish their courses.

"Some of our enrollees just didn't have any money," McMillen explained. "They just had to drop out and try and scrape along."

"They've had excellent daily attendance at Huntington," McMillen said. "A report here on the first 132 enrolled shows an average daily attendance of 121.66 That's higher than you'll find in the average high school."

McMillen sees the day when the Federal retraining will supplement the State's. He anticipates a Federal program offering classes of longer duration and training skills the State is unable to teach, such as radio, television, and chemical technicians.

McMillen also viewed the retraining program as one way of luring new industry and getting present industry to expand.

For example, three other Federal retraining programs have been set up in West Virginia. One in Grant County is training 100 power sewing-machine operators for a new textile industry locating there. One in Harrison County is training 150 airplane riveters for a new aircraft assembly plant at Clarksburg. One in Mingo County is training 100 millmen for a new woodworking concern at Williamson.

"I won't say retraining is the prime reason these industries came to West Virginia," McMillen said, "but it was a factor."

Bulgarian Struggle Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, since 1945 Bulgaria has been drawn into the Soviet orbit, and has become practically a Soviet colony. Just as in the past the Bulgarian people fought the Turks for their freedom, now they are struggling in their homeland against Communist tyrants. March 3 will be the 84th anniversary of their liberation day and I wish them fortitude and the courage to bear their trials which some day must assuredly pass away.

Louisiana's Representative, Hale Boggs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend to my colleagues an article in the March issue of the Diplomat magazine on a distinguished member of the Louisiana delegation, HALE BOGGS. Harnett T. Kane, one of the South's most noted authors, has written an engaging article, with a first-hand personal touch because the author has known the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] since the latter's school years at Tulane University in New Orleans. I have known HALE BOGGS since I came to the Congress from Louisiana's Third Congressional District in 1948, and it has been my privilege to watch his steady progress to leadership in the House. I venture to say that he is doing a fine job as majority whip and that he will continue to assume greater responsibility and leadership in the House. Mr. Kane pays fitting tribute to a fellow Louisianian and a Member of the Congress, and he does so with discernment and conviction.

The article follows:

PROFILE OF A PROMINENT AMERICAN—LOUISIANA'S REPRESENTATIVE HALE BOGGS

(By Harnett T. Kane)

"Representative HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana."

For 20 years or so official Washington has known the name and the man—one of the more engaging, as well as the more intelligent, of southerners. But last autumn the able Congressman from New Orleans stepped into a spotlight of heightened concentration when the became majority whip, third in line of leadership in the House.

In doing so the hard-working, even-tempered BOGGS attained the highest congressional post achieved by a Louisianian since the State joined the Union in 1812. For observers in Washington and in Louisiana, it was a significant victory for the 47-year-old man who has based his career on moderation in many things—not least, the vital issue of freer trade for the United States and the world.

At times HALE BOGGS has suffered to a degree under the shafts of racists, violent rightwingers, and simple screwballs. Surviving several such attempted "blitzes" he has gone steadily upward. To this writer, who has known him since their schooldays at Tulane University, he has demonstrated that the term "southern Congressman" need not be synonymous with blowhard or Claghorn.

In several ways he is the opposite of the arm-waving legislator who makes his mark by roaring into the wind. As a one-time neighbor said, "The fellow has authority, the quiet control of the man who knows what he is after, and knows how to get it." Yet he is not the hard driver who presses on his nerves and wears out those around him. His "sell" is the soft one, his manner that of a calm business executive who reaches his goal while his opponents suffer the nervous breakdowns.

Physically, he is a fairly big man—about 6 feet tall, weighing a little over or under 200 pounds, a bit more than he should. He has a voice that can ring any southern rafter, but he seldom raises it. He does best in a quasi-conversational tone, talking without card-sized notes or notes of any kind.

In the words of a veteran Washington observer, this "urbane lawyer from New Orleans can command the attention of an audience under the most trying circumstances. He is one of perhaps a dozen men with the ability to gain and hold the hushed attention of the House without so much as a gentle tap of the presiding officer's gavel."

BOGGS, it would appear, can get the women's votes by unleashing a certain natural Deep South charm, and by a well-ingrained courtesy plus a youthful smile that can turn into a grin. Though his is largely the politics of persuasion, on occasion he can sting like a hornet. Usually he prefers it the other way.

This writer remembers HALE BOGGS when he studied law and journalism while working his way through Tulane in New Orleans by means of assorted jobs. He edited the student paper, presided over the debating society, became a correspondent for downtown newspapers and then a full-fledged reporter.

Soon after he left college in 1937 he was in politics—the reform variety—as chairman of the People's League, opponents of the entrenched successors to Huey Long. Huey had said that if "the boys" (his boys) ever tried to exercise the powers he had hacked out, without the "Kingfish" to curb them, they would all end up in the penitentiary. Many did, and young BOGGS had a part in sending them there.

By 1940 he was the youngest Member of Congress. Three years later he was in the Naval Reserve. Returning to Washington affairs in 1946, he has remained deeply in them ever since. The sequel is a succession of honors: appointment to the House Banking and Currency Committee; sponsorship with Senator FULBRIGHT of the organization of the democracies to combat world communism; chairmanship of a special committee to investigate narcotics, resulting in the Boggs bill, providing mandatory jail sentences for offenders; chairman of the special committee which investigated the Internal Revenue Bureau; and many others.

HALE BOGGS has an absorbing interest in trade. He has been increasingly active in foreign trade matters, and has struck effective blows in behalf of President Kennedy's activities in this field. Recently, International House of New Orleans gave him its annual award for his "sound constructive interest in the liberalization of world trade." He is chairman of the Joint House-Senate Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy, which is now reviewing U.S. practices in the light of the enormously successful Common Market, and he will probably be the principal House leader working for broader trade legislation.

For several years he was vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and since 1955 has held the rank of deputy Democratic whip in the House. And it is no secret that BOGGS hopes eventually to be Speaker of the House, succeeding to the post of the late Sam Rayburn, with whom he was on closest terms. (Rayburn established the deputy post for BOGGS.)

In private life BOGGS has a sympathetic aid. When he was editor of the Tulane Hullabaloo, a handsome brunet was in charge of the Newcomb College section. In 1938 they were married; and he and Lindy Claiborne now have three children, Barbara, 22, Thomas Hale, 21, and Corinne, 18. Lindy launched vigorously into Democratic politics, worked for Kennedy and was cochairman of the Kennedy inauguration committee. Neither seems to advertise heavily the fact that in graduating from Tulane, HALE won a Phi Beta Kappa key. But that honor hasn't seemed to hurt him in practical affairs.

Coloradans Want the Packers and Stockyards Act Strengthened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, housewives, cattlemen, and livestock marketers in Colorado are concerned about the growing concentration of monopoly power in the food distribution industry.

Small packers are caught in a price squeeze, consumers are confronted with unrealistic "loss leader" prices, and farmers are forced to finance slow-pay buyers.

Congressman ROOSEVELT has introduced in the House a bill (H.R. 10392) to correct the administered price and monopoly tendencies in the food distribution business. This week Coloradans testified before the House Agriculture Committee in support of Mr. ROOSEVELT's bill.

I was happy to join them in this position and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that my own statement before the House Agriculture Committee be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLORADANS WANT THE PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT STRENGTHENED

(Statement by U.S. Senator JOHN A. CARROLL, of Colorado, before the House Agriculture Committee, February 26, 1962)

Mr. Chairman, several friends of mine from Colorado will be appearing before you this morning, testifying in behalf of Congressman ROOSEVELT's bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act (H.R. 3798).

I am proud to say I have worked closely with these men for many years on this serious issue, and I hope your committee will be able to act this year on the problem.

The State of Colorado has an immense economic interest in seeing its livestock industry prosper. Last year the value of livestock in Colorado was $370 million. Developments that tend to reduce competition in the industry are contrary to the best interests of Colorado ranchers, Colorado marketing businesses and the general Colorado economy.

This morning I appear before you, Mr. Chairman, principally to ask that two Colorado speeches on concentration in the food industry be included in your hearing record. These speeches define the plight of the independent livestock producers in the West and in a moment I shall describe them to you.

ACTION BY THE SENATE

Before I do I will take just a moment to review what we in the Senate have been doing to strengthen the Packers and Stockyards Act to provide for more competitive enterprise in the retail sales of meat:

1. In May of 1957 the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly (of which I am a member) held hearings on "Unfair Trade Practices in the Meat Industry." The bill before the committee was S. 1356 (the O'Mahoney-Watkins bill) to separate regulation of the meatpackers from the Department of Agriculture and place such reg-

ulation under the Federal Trade Commission).

2. On July 24, 1957, the bill (S. 1356) was reported to the Senate in Senate Report No. 704.

3. In April of 1958, the bill was recommitted for joint hearings by the Agriculture Committee and the Judiciary Committee.

4. On August 22, 1958, the bill (considerably modified and reduced in scope) passed the Senate, containing the Carroll-Young amendment concerning posting of country auctions. The measure became law on September 2, 1958, and is Public Law 85-909.

5. In July of 1959, the Senate Small Business Committee held hearings on "Unfair Competition in Food Marketing."

6. In June of 1960, the Senate Small Business Committee held hearings on "The Report of the FTC on the Growth of Food Chains."

So, as you see, Mr. Chairman, we in the Senate are concerned with this problem and I hope our interest will begin to quicken to where we will see even greater action and more widespread and effective legislative results.

Mr. Chairman, diverse interests are pulling together to preserve and expand the spirit of competition in the meat industry.

THE CATTLEMAN WANTS ANTITRUST ACTION

The farmer-cattleman stands to lose heavily in any concentration of buying power in the food chains, and he is now becoming acutely aware of his precarious position.

The Wall Street Journal reported recently that farmers are complaining about store chains and packers using livestock on their own feedlots as a pool to draw on intermittently to avoid constant bidding against each other in the marketplace.

"One irate farmer" said the Wall Street Journal, "wrote his Congressman: 'They make millions of dollars in profits from buying farmers' livestock at reduced prices without making a dime on their own feeding operations'."

And the usually cautious cattlemen's associations are concerned about the concentration in marketing.

The American National Cattlemen's Association, through its executive vice president, C. W. "Bill" McMillan in Columbia, Mo., on July 20 of last year called for strengthening of the Packers and Stockyards Division of the USDA "so that it can resist efforts of some elements in the meat team * * * to force single-channel marketing." This is precisely the intent of the Roosevelt bill.

When Congressman ROOSEVELT held hearings on this subject in Denver in November of 1959, there were many witnesses from all phases of the meat producing industry. I was privileged to sit with the House committee on that occasion and I have a strong remembrance of the intensity and persuasiveness of the testimony.

THE CRAIG, COLO., CASE

As a result of the several areas of pressure from private associations and from both Houses of the Congress, especially including the two Appropriations Committees, the Packers and Stockyards Division of the Department of Agriculture, under its forceful new director, Clarence H. Girard, has stepped up its watchdog operations. On September 14 of last year, Packers and Stockyards cracked down on seven meatpackers, three food chains, and two lamb dealers and charged them with price rigging and monopolistic practices in the marketing of lamb.

This case will be heard by the Department of Agriculture on March 6 in Craig, Colo., in the heart of our livestock country where some of the alleged violations took place.

As you can see, Mr. Chairman, interest in this issue is quickening in many places: the farmers with cattle, cattle feeders, the stockyards and yes, even the packers themselves.

The number of packers squeezed into bankruptcy in recent years is alarming.

I'm sure it was to fight the growing concentration of meat marketing power in the hands of food chains that led the packers to seek Supreme Court modification of the 1920 consent decree which keeps packers out of the retail food business. And I think the Court was right when on June 20, 1961, it unanimously rejected the packers' request. To do otherwise would have compounded the ocncentration. But it must be admitted even the packers themselves are in an increasingly desperate condition. The Roosevelt bill would help packers too, in addition to the cattlemen, the feeders and the marketing agencies.

IT IS THE CONSUMER WHO PAYS

But, Mr. Chairman, as always, the one who gains the most when monopoly is curbed and competition expanded is the consumer.

As long as meat is priced unrealistically in the chains as a "loss leader" the ultimate consequence must be: eventually higher prices to the consumer. This will occur as soon as competition in the growing and marketing of meat is eliminated and those functions are controlled by a few national food distribution hands.

In the end it is the consumer who pays for monopoly.

Mr. Chairman, the speeches mentioned earlier in my statement so logically yet dramatically describe the problem that Mr. ROOSEVELT's bill addresses itself to, I think they would help the members of this committee and the Members of the Congress to better understand the issue.

The first of these speeches is by Mr. Charles B. Jennings, assistant general manager, Denver Union Stockyards. In this speech, published in the January 24 issue of Cervi's Rocky Mountain Journal, Mr. Jennings describes the problem in the meat marketing industry as one of administered prices; prices controlled by large food chains.

The other speech that I commend for the consideration of your committee members is by Mr. Courtenay Davis, a cattle rancher of Horse Creek, Wyo. Mr. Davis' analysis of the monopoly problems of what he calls the cow business, reflects the broad opinion of cattle producers in the west.

Mr. Chairman, I think you will find both of these articles directed specifically to the problem you are considering this morning, and I think if you see fit to include them in your hearing record, they would virtually represent 2 witnesses appearings this morning in support of Mr. ROOSEVELT's bill (H.R. 3798).

I appreciate the courtesy you have extended me in hearing me this morning, Mr. Chairman, on this issue which means so much to the consumers, cattle ranchers and stockyards operators in my State.

Rugged Individualism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, Americans across the country are becoming more and more aware of the dangers confronting us and learning as well of the importance of patriotism.

An editorial which has appeared in the Montrose Ledger, in Montrose, Calif., seems particularly appropriate to consider in view of these trends. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I submit the editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

RUGGED INDIVIDUALISM

Recently, as July Fourth fireworks lit the evening sky, the question was asked, "What happened to those men who signed the Declaration of Independence?"

Paul Harvey, noted writer and radio commentator, looked the record up, and here's what he found:

Five signers were captured by the British as traitors, and tortured before they died.

Twelve had their homes ransacked and burned. Two lost their sons in the Revolutionary Army. One of the signers had two sons captured. Nine of the fifty-six fought and died from wounds or the hardships of the Revolutionary War.

But what kind of men were they, these men who boldly wrote their names to the declaration that lit the fires of liberty in souls of men throughout the world?

Twenty-four were lawyers and jurists. Eleven were merchants, nine were farmers and large plantation owners, men of means, well educated. Their security, their incomes, their worldly possessions made them substantially well off. But they signed the Declaration of Independence, even though they know that the penalty would be death on the gallows, if they were captured.

They signed and they pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

Carter Braxton, of Virginia, a wealthy planter and trader saw his ships swept from the seas by the British Navy. He sold his home and his properties to pay his debts, and died in rags.

Thomas McKeam was so hounded by the enemy British that he was forced to move his family almost constantly. He served in the Congress without pay, and his family was kept in hiding. His possessions were taken from him and poverty was his reward.

Vandals or soldiers or both looted the properties of Ellery and Clymer and Hall and Walton and Gwinnett and Heyward and Rutledge and Middleton.

At the Battle of Yorktown, Thomas Nelson, Jr., noted that the British General Cornwallis had taken over the Nelson home for his headquarters. The owner quietly urged Gen. George Washington to open fire, which was done. The home was destroyed, and Nelson died bankrupt. His grave is unmarked and unknown.

Francis Lewis had his home and properties destroyed. The enemy jailed his wife, and she died within a few months.

John Hart was driven from his wife's bedside as she was dying. Their 13 children fled for their lives. His fields and his grist mill were laid waste. For more than a year he lived in forests and caves, returning home after the war to find his wife dead. His children had vanished. A few weeks later he died from exhaustion and a broken heart.

Norris and Livingston suffered similar fates.

Such were the stories and sacrifices of the American Revolution. These were not wild-eyed, rabble-rousing ruffians. These were soft-spoken men of means and wealth and education. They had security, but they valued liberty more. Standing tall and straight and unwavering, they pledged: "For the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of the divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other, our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor."

They gave us an independent America. Can we keep it?

U.S. Navy Supply Corps Has Served the Nation Superbly—Now Moving Into Its 168th Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Senate was not in session on February 23, 1962—a significant date for a vital unit of the U.S. Navy. I refer to the 167th anniversary of the Navy Supply Corps.

Had the Senate been meeting on that date, I would have been privileged to express timely comments concerning the Navy Supply Corps and to have extended commendation to that vital instrumentality of our Defense Establishment.

But it is still appropriate that we take cognizance of the Navy Supply Corps anniversary, to express gratification for its accomplishments and valuable contributions to our national well-being in both time of peace and war. Congratulations to the U.S. Navy Supply Corps—a spry 167 years old.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement concerning the Navy Supply Corps handed to me by one of its loyal officers, Capt. James Corrick, formerly of my home community of Elkins where he was enrolled in public speaking classes taught by me at Davis and Elkins College.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

From its earliest beginnings on February 23, 1795, when the Office of Purveyor of Public Supplies was created, the Navy Supply Corps has dedicated itself to only one vital mission—support of our U.S. naval forces.

The corps, with the Naval Establishment, has matured steadily during its more than a century and a half of existence. From a humble start of supply support of only six frigates, the corps has evolved through the years and today includes in its responsibilities mobile logistic support of a nuclear-powered, missile-armed Navy that spans the oceans of the earth.

Today, the Chief of the Supply Corps is Rear Adm. John Crumpacker, whose official title is Chief, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts and Paymaster General of the Navy. He and his 5,000-officer corps are concerned with the highly successful mobile logistic support which in these times of emergencies and sweeping changes give our ships unprecedented endurance and mobility. These dedicated naval officers and the personnel serving with them are working tirelessly to meet the many challenges of the technological weapons system revolution in nucleonics, missiles, and space. They are also developing astounding innovations in transportation, packaging, food, materials handling, and the many other workaday functions of supply support.

The supply officer of 1962 is, first of all, a naval officer who has his own battle station alongside his line brethren. But he is also a business specialist with a background of training and experience in inventory management, finance, accounting, data processing, purchasing, and the many specialized management areas that spell out the motto of the corps, "Service to Seapower."

Bar Association Urges High School Courses Exposing Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Lawrence Sullivan:

BAR ASSOCIATION URGES HIGH SCHOOL COURSES EXPOSING COMMUNISM

(By Lawrence Sullivan)

WASHINGTON, February.—The American Bar Association, one of the most respected and influential professional organizations in the country, now is advocating and supporting actively on a truly national scale, a broad program for systematic high school education on the aims and tactics of world communism, "especially its contrasts with liberty under law."

The central objective of the new program, says he initial ABA report, is "to focus informed attention on the real enemy of freedom—the international Communist movement, and its imminent threat to our country."

In general terms, the project is based on the conviction that a "broader knowledge of the Communist conspiracy will assure its ultimate defeat."

Pursuant to a resolution passed unanimously by the house of delegates of the ABA in February 1961, a special committee was established to stimulate the new educational program, in line with the first proclaimed purpose of the ABA—"to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States and maintain representative government."

Lewis F. Powell, Jr., of Richmond, Va., was named chairman of the special committee on education. A distinguished lawyer, Powell also is a member of the Virginia State Board of Education. His first report on ways and means, a scholarly pamphlet of 24 challenging pages, was published February 6, 1962. Copies may be obtained free from the American Bar Association, 1155 East 60th Street, Chicago 37, Ill.

The title of the report is "Instruction on Communism and Its Contrast With Liberty Under Law."

The purpose of this pamphlet is to describe the program of the ABA and invite the cooperation of the organized bar at State and local levels.

An advisory committee of 12 eminent educators assisted the ABA committee in formulating the long-term national program. The work of this special educational committee supplements the broader program of the ABA, as carried on during the last 5 years by its permanent Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy, and Objectives.

For the present, the educational program is directed principally to secondary schools, both public and private.

The challenge of the world Communist conspiracy is described as the gravest problem in our time.

Whatever one's view may be as to teaching in depth the truth about communism, few would deny that it is a new and fanatical movement, with characteristics of repression and tyranny almost unintelligible to the American mind; that in less than half a century, and mainly within the past 16 years, this movement has gained control over one-third of the world's people; and that it has the will, and avidly seeks the final means, to destroy freedom everywhere.

At the moment, communism operates behind the false face of peaceful coexistence an attempt to terrorize humanity by atomic blackmail.

These are the harsh and almost incredible facts of the mid-20th century. This is the situation which has brought the world perilously close to the brink of destruction—a situation which well might have been avoided had the free people of America, and throughout the world, comprehended in our time the truth about communism.

As early as 1952 the National Education Association adopted a resolution declaring in part: "As a measure of defense against our most potent threat, our American schools should teach about communism and all forms of totalitarianism, including the principles and practices of the Communist Party in the United States."

To which the current ABA report adds: "The history of much of this century is incomprehensible without a considerable knowledge of the Communist movement and its history, doctrines, objectives, and tactics."

Again: "A history of communism and all its works would bear its own indictment of the system. Let the facts speak for themselves."

A 1960 survey of high school curriculums in 58 U.S. cities revealed that only 2 school systems offered semester courses touching communism in any way, and one of these was only an elective on Russian history. For the most part, our high school studies in history and the social sciences are generally those of the 1920's and 1930's.

"The essential point is to accord this subject [communism in depth] the importance and emphasis which it so urgently deserves."

Today there are, at most, one or two textbooks available for high school courses; and few high school teachers are qualified to lead courses on the real objectives and methods of world communism.

Yet an encouraging start has been made since 1960. Boston, Dallas, Indianapolis, Richmond, Va., and New Bedford, Mass., now have required high school courses on Communist history and tactics; and three States—New York, Florida, and Louisiana—have general laws encouraging, requiring, or approving systematic secondary education on the contrasts between communism and the American system of freedom under law.

Church-affiliated high schools and prep academies often have shown the way in such courses.

"Culver Military Academy (Indiana), and Episcopal High School, Alexandria, Va., are examples of preparatory schools which have specific courses. Catholic schools in particular have shown a commendable awareness and leadership in this area."

The ABA hopes to work through existing local committees and agencies, in close cooperation with the National Education Association, the American Legion, the National PTA, and existing scholastic magazines.

The report emphasizes that the program looks to solid educational work "rather than some form of counter propaganda."

"This must, of course, be done with determination and conviction, but also factually and with due regard to the Bill of Rights and standards of fairness which are the hallmark of the freedom under law we seek to defend."

An appendix lists a bibliography of 67 publications suggested as a basis for semester-course outlines for high schools on the repugnance of communism to every aspiration of freedom.

For those who still may harbor doubts as to the need for systematic education against communism, the Powell report quotes the classic dictum from Lenin:

"Give us a child for 8 years, and it will be a Bolshevik forever."

Supporting the Powell report comes "The Soviet World Outlook" from the State Department, quoting Lenin on morality: "We do not believe in eternal morality, and we expose all the fables about morality. * * *

At the basis of Communist morality lies the struggle for the consolidation and consummation of communism. That also is the basis of Communist training and tuition."

This is the demoralizing philosophy the ABA program seeks to counter in all our schools.

Censorship of Statements by Military Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the astute and capable editor of the Richmond News Leader, Mr. James Jackson Kilpatrick, author of the widely read book, "The Sovereign States," has written and published in the February 19, 1962, issue of his newspaper an editorial which I take pleasure in calling to the attention of the Senate. It is entitled "The Dirty Word." I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DIRTY WORD

It is no one's fault in particular, but the findings in Senator THURMOND's investigation of the muzzling of the military are not getting through to the people. The Senator has turned up a pattern here—a very disturbing pattern at that—but it's an almost impossible job to define and describe this pattern within the limitations of newspaper space.

The only comparable problem we recall arises whenever the question of slanted textbooks comes up. There is not the slightest doubt in our minds that many of the popular textbooks we have inspected in history and social studies are deliberately biased; as a general proposition, they are antibusiness and prounion labor; they are pro-U.N. and antinationalist; they are strong for the TVA and nationalized power and cool toward the taxpaying electric power industry. But the author's slant is laid on with devilish skill, and without quoting 3,000 or 4,000 words a charge of bias can't be sustained effectively. It isn't possible, taking one thing with another, for a newspaper to devote that much space to the subject, and few readers would stick with you if you did.

This is the trouble we find in covering Mr. THURMOND's case against the State Department and the Pentagon. There no longer is any doubt that some very soft and sticky fingers have been laid on the generals' speeches. But to describe what the generals proposed to say, and to compare these passages with what the censors permitted them to say, would require many thousands of words to develop a convincing case. One example—or two, or three, or four—seems trivial; it is not until the examples begin to mount up that it becomes apparent that Senator THURMOND is not seeing bogeymen. He is onto a bad business, and has performed a public service in exposing it.

The record the South Carolinian painstakingly has established shows that over and over and over, a hard line against communism has been deleted, and a softer line inserted. On May 9, 1961, a State Department censor, busily taking the bones from a major general's speech, ran his pencil through the word "war" wherever it appeared. On the margin of the manuscript, the censor explained his action: "War is a dirty word."

In another entirely typical case, the word "conflict" was repeatedly eliminated from a speech dealing in part with United States-Russian relations. The censor's instruction: "Use a softer term."

Adm. Arleigh Burke proposed to describe communism in a speech last June as "an alien philosophy that has taken over whole countries without firing a shot." The censor changed it to read: "communism is an expansionist movement that assigns a high priority to nonmilitary means."

Maj. Gen. William T. Thurman drafted a speech in which he proposed to speak of the Communists' "big lie propaganda techniques." It came back from the censors reading, "propaganda techniques." The explanation: "implying motives."

Lieutenant General Trudeau proposed to say that the Nation needed to steel itself in many ways, "locked as we are in vital competition with the Communists." The quoted phrase was deleted in favor of, "in order to negotiate from a position of strength for peace."

General Trudeau proposed a reference to "the vicious worldwide conflict forced upon us." The censors preferred: "our lives and future."

Again, General Trudeau proposed a reference to "the implacable mask of communism." The word "implacable" was struck out.

In other changes, a promise that "we will emerge victorious" became a promise that "we will achieve our goals", a reference to "the critical Communist threat" was watered down to "the Communist threat;" a pledge to "beat the Communist challenge" became a pledge to overcome "the threat of foreign aggressors."

It is perfectly true, as a number of scoffers have pointed out, that most of the censored speeches were the innocuous work of military ghosts. The speeches had no particular literary or oratorical merit to begin with, and the fatuous copy editing done on them had little effect one way or another.

But when some of the Senator's smoke has blown away, the fact of a fire remains. At high levels within the State Department, a policy obviously has been laid down—it is the sort of thing a bureaucrat comprehends by osmosis—of never being beastly to the Reds. A censor's action in deleting a word here, or a phrase there, may not present a cause for alarm; but a powder-puff policy up top justifies a deep and troubled concern.

Glenn Sparks Americanism Spirit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal said in the last week about Lt. Col. John H. Glenn. Astronaut Glenn has been catapulted into world attention not just by his great feat but because he represents America's resurgence of effort to maintain its world leadership in space.

I believe that two people have summarized the sentiments on this subject in a magnificent way that should be brought to the attention of the Members of the House. The first is Harriet Kirwan in her letter to the editor of the Evening Star of February 28, 1962; and the other is David Lawrence in his column entitled "Glenn Sparks Americanism Spirit" which appeared in the Evening Star of the same date.

I ask that both of these be brought to the attention of my colleagues.

The articles follow:

GLENN SPARKS AMERICANISM SPIRIT—EVIDENCES OF TRUE PATRIOTISM AND FAITH BRING PRAISE FOR EARTH ORBITER

(By David Lawrence)

Everybody here liked John Glenn. He captivated Congress. But it wasn't just because he had flown around the world three times. It was because he seemed to be a sensible, modest, earnestminded, and humble hero.

Long after the plaudits of the cheering crowds have given way to the silences of life, two paragraphs from the speech the astronaut made to a joint meeting of Congress will be remembered as the epitome of true Americanism, true patriotism, and true faith. For in these days it has become a fad to sneer at flag-waving. Argument is often heard that nationalism is a sin. Even the mention of the deity in governmental parlance is frowned upon by the Supreme Court as possibly giving offense to the atheists. So it was refreshing to listen to these words from Colonel Glenn over the nationwide television networks:

"I know I still get a real-hard-to-define feeling down inside when the flag goes by—and I know all of you do, too. As we rode up Pennsylvania Avenue today from the White House and saw this tremendous outpouring of feeling on the part of so many thousands of people, I got that same feeling all over again. And let's hope that none of us ever loses it. * * *

"As our knowledge of this universe in which we live increases, may God grant us the wisdom and guidance to use it wisely."

Much has been heard of late as to whether it is proper to indoctrinate troops with patriotic ideas and to develop in their minds a spirit of sacrifice by educating them to understand the cause for which they may be asked to die. John Glenn must have gotten his inspiration to service in public school days, as he pledged allegiance to the flag. For he is a dedicated man. He was ready to give his life to help advance man's knowledge of the mysteries of space which could conceivably affect the safety and welfare of all people in centuries to come.

It was this simple devotion to national service, shared by his fellow Americans, that made John Glenn's talk to a joint meeting of Congress a significant event in history.

Many heroes have gone before. Some have stumbled. They have become wrapped up in themselves. They have misunderstood the plaudits of the Nation and have fallen victim to a misguided egotism.

Back in the Spanish-American War in 1898, Capt. Richmond Pearson Hobson, U.S. Navy—together with seven volunteers—took a daring chance and sank a collier at the entrance to the harbor at Santiago, Cuba, in an effort to bottle up the Spanish fleet stationed there. He won nationwide applause and was awarded the highest honors by Congress. But he forsook his naval career to enter politics. He ran successfully for Congress, but after that was lost sight of because of his overzealousness in behalf of various political issues.

Commodore George Dewey, who ventured into Manila Bay and sank a Spanish fleet in 1898, came home to a hero's welcome. He was honored with all kinds of medals, and

the rank of Admiral of the Navy was created for him by Congress. He was given by national subscription a home in Washington. As was the custom in those days with others who had distinguished themselves, the house was supposed to be sold so that the proceeds of the gift could go to the hero. The admiral, who had just married a second time at the age of 62, immediately deeded the mansion to his bride. The Deweys never lived in it. The newspapers called it a grave mistake, and public opinion was chilled.

War heroes like Ulysses S. Grant and Andrew Jackson have ascended to the Presidency, and other military men who have distinguished themselves on the battlefield have gone into politics without losing their sense of balance or perspective. Dwight Eisenhower's popularity today is largely due to his commonsense and modesty. Gen. Douglas MacArthur, except for a brief venture into political speechmaking, has kept in the background, and still is held in high esteem by the Nation.

In the field of aviation, none had won such applause as was bestowed on Col. Charles A. Lindbergh when, in May 1927, he flew alone across the Atlantic to Paris. He was acclaimed in Washington and New York and given the highest honors. But his life afterward became highly controversial. He went abroad in the 1930's, looked over Hitler's military preparations—particularly the new German war planes—and suggested, in effect, that it might be better for Britain to embrace the swastika of the Nazis than to die under bombs.

He made a lot of speeches throughout America that seemed to favor appeasement, and lost much of the prestige he had won from his countrymen. He argued that he was trying to keep the United States out of war. He later served gallantly in World War II, but he never regained his prestige of earlier days.

What is Colonel Glenn's future? Many Americans, while realizing that international publicity is important in the propaganda battle with the Russians, hope that the famed astronaut will soon be able to settle down to the quiet pursuits of the soldier of science as he gives many more useful years to aid the cause for which he risked his life on the flight around the world.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

John Glenn represents all that is good in America. He is a man who would willingly give his life for his country. He is a devoted family man in an era when divorce is becoming fashionable. He is a regular churchgoer at a time when certain groups are trying to remove God from our American way of life. He is honest and forthright in an age when honesty in all walks of life is fast becoming passe. He isn't out for the almighty dollar. He isn't interested in any get-rich schemes at the sacrifice of principles. He isn't power hungry as proven by his devotion to the members of his team, showing him also to be unselfish and humble—qualities that are often lacking in other prominent people. He is a man of high moral standards.

If we want to be sure that America will have more John Glenns in the future, let us be sure to provide for our children the same kind of strong moral atmosphere that surrounded John Glenn and definitely contributed to the formation of his character.

If we really want to pay tribute to John Glenn, who has made us all once again proud to be Americans, let us do so by strengthening in every way possible the real force for peace in the future—our children.

HARRIET KIRWAN.

Helping the Wrongdoers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I should like to include this thought-provoking editorial from the Antelope Valley Ledger-Gazette, of Lancaster, Calif., in my congressional district.

Our Government officials rushing around the globe can have good results—and often poor ones. The editorial of February 20, 1962 follows:

Helping one's friends and hurting one's enemies used to be the first rule of foreign relations, for this is what one has to do if negotiations break down and matters turn to war.

Our Federal Government knows quite well that our most serious problem in foreign affairs is Russia and the conspiracy she sponsors so effectively, around the world, and in the United States. The aim of this conspiracy is to take over the whole world. Prime target is the United States. To control the world, we must be conquered.

The Federal Government knows this, and tells us so. And then does things as a government that are asinine. Our friends cannot tell by our actions if we will fight off the conspiracy—or knuckle under.

Consider President Kennedy's visit to Venezuela.

Venezuela is governed by Romulo Betancourt who is a trained Communist, though now he says he is not a member of the party. He controlled Venezuela from 1945 to 1948 as dictator until he was thrown out. He is now legally President of this oil-rich country, so important to the Rockefeller oil interests and Mr. Nelson Rockefeller personally.

It was in Venezuela on May 13, 1958, Vice President Nixon was publicly humiliated and attacked—and the United States—by mobs. No action was taken by the Government of Venezuela to express its horror and concern. Nor was any action taken by the United States.

When pipsqueaks insult the big boy, the big boy had better react, or his reputation will diminish. This is exactly what has happened in Venezuela.

Now of all countries in South America that our President ought not to have gone to, Venezuela was the one. But like the unerring arrow expertly shot, where does our Chief Executive go? To visit Romulo Betancourt of Venezuela.

Every so often someone takes heart believing that the "Americans are waking up"—and then our Government cuts the ground out from under them by having its President visit the ace conspirator. If you insult the United States enough it will send its top executive to talk about it.

All about the world Communists are telling themselves that they have us on the run. And they can prove it by our official acts.

And all about the world men who believe in freedom are heartsick at what they see, and losing hope because they cannot see how America will help them when their lives are on the block and they try to resist the conspiracy.

And thinking Americans are heartsick too, for consorting with evil men can only end in an evil day of defeat.

Then there is the recent stranding of Dutch troops being flown to Dutch Borneo there to strengthen forces about to meet Sukarno's threat of military invasion.

At this writing we have not seen any report as to what was done with the planes, interned on the ground in Alaska. But when the United States acts to interfere with what can only be to our advantage, then the American Government must be losing its mind.

If there is anything we do not want to see it is an increase in Sukarno's power. If there is anything we ought to prudently do, it is to help the Dutch in every way check his latest gambit as quickly as can be done.

But no, we have to throw a monkey wrench in the works.

How long must we go on fooling ourselves? How long will we have to put up with good intentions gone wrong? When will we realize that what the top executive thinks and does can be negatived by some functionary high or low who says it would be a good thing to visit Betancourt, "you might be able to sway him in our direction" or to give the order "ground those planes, they are taking troops off to prevent Sukarno from winning a war" he ought not to start and he deserves to lose decisively.

When do we start waking up to the fact that when America acts this way—something is wrong within?

Now we look forward to Mrs. Kennedy's ill-advised trip to India. India, of all places, where the great Nehru, exposed to the world for what he is, an amoral conqueror of small bits of land that for centuries belonged to Portugal.

We should be expressing our displeasure, not pleasure, with Mr. Nehru. But here we go again and the wife of our President is going to go off on a triumphant tour.

Triumphant for whom?

We do not like to say it, but there is no other answer and you ought to know it—triumphant for the pro-Communist forces set on winning the world by conquest.

And as we so generously give our aid—how can they lose?

Settled and Unsettled Areas of Segregation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the New York Times for today, March 1, 1962, contains a very illuminating article written by Arthur Krock. In this article, Mr. Krock discusses the recent Supreme Court decision in the Mississippi cases involving the freedom riders. The article points out that this decision is a far cry from the 1896 case of Plessy against Ferguson, and discusses the disproportionate power which the Court has assumed upon itself during that time.

This is a very revealing article which should be widely read; and for that reason, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SETTLED AND UNSETTLED AREAS OF SEGREGATION

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 28.—The last judicial prop under the effort of Southern States to evade or delay racial desegregation of public transportation facilities by means of conflicting local laws was swept away by the Supreme Court in its unanimous, peremptory (per curiam) ruling of February 26. The Court said sharply it had "settled beyond question that no State" can require this discrimination. And it cited three direct and eight corollary decisions as proof that settlement was made by due process of law.

In logical and factual sequence the Supreme Court then instructed a Federal district judge in Mississippi no longer to delay trying the cases of freedom riders, who have been jailed for insisting on their right to desegregated transportation, until State tribunals have passed on the constitutionality of the local laws in conflict. This delay was ordered by a three-judge Federal court, in consonance with a procedural principle which the Supreme Court itself had sanctioned. But, said the Justices on February 26, this principle could not be applied when its prior decisions have, as in this instance, made frivolous any claim that a State statute is not unconstitutional on its face. And the Supreme Court ruling strongly implied a notice to the Federal trial judge that jail sentences for insisting on desegregated transport facilities are invalid when this insistence is made peacefully.

The per curiam ruling, moreover, completed the funeral services and interment of the constitutional doctrine the Supreme Court proclaimed in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* (1896) and maintained until 1954. This doctrine, applied in that case also to transportation, was that if public facilities are equal they constitutionally may be separate. But, though the Supreme Court in 1954 reversed Plessy in general while reversing its principle as applied to public primary and high schools, State school laws have since been upheld whose incidental effect may be racial segregation.

The key statute is the Alabama pupil placement law. It establishes certain criteria—health, moral environment, effects on public order, etc.—on which local boards may grant or deny the requests of pupils for admission to or transfer from a public school. The Supreme Court found this "not unconstitutional on its face"—no statutory device to perpetuate total school segregation—but unconstitutional in operation when an enduring and deliberate pattern or single example of racial bias can be established as the reason for denial of admission or transfer.

THE CONTROVERSY THAT REMAINS

The asserted authority of the Supreme Court to ban legalized racial segregation has thus expanded since the 1954 decision. But, though this extension has indeed prevailed, it has not changed the view of many respected lawyers that neither the Federal Constitution nor any U.S. statute authorized the Supreme Court's 1954 ban on racial separation in the public schools on which its subsequent desegregation rulings in other areas are based. However, once the Court has assumed the function of making new public policy without specific constitutional or statutory foundation, as it did with respect to segregation in 1954, the policy can be nullified only by nonenforcement on the part of the Executive, or by acts of Congress to the contrary. Rarely has a President declined to provide this enforcement. And nullification by Congress is effectively restrained because ever since the Supreme Court found authority to declare both congressional acts and executive actions unconstitutional the American people have accepted this as necessary to orderly government.

These are the sources of the supremacy of the Federal judiciary over the other two coordinate branches of the Government of the United States that has become a fact of our national life. It is customary for lawyers and judges to deny this, but it operates nevertheless with the finality Charles E. Hughes conceded in his uniquely candid statement that, "the Constitution is what the judges say it is" at any time. That truth was clearly revealed in the school decision of 1954. Its rationale was that racial segregation is "a denial of the equal protection of the laws (14th amendment)" because separated school facilities are "inherently unequal." And this judgment was based on researches by sociologists from which they concluded that racial segregation "generates a feeling of inferiority" among Negro school children "that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone."

American Jewish League Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include a very fine statement from the American Jewish League Against Communism, Inc., in the Appendix of the RECORD. It is self-explanatory and needs no elaboration.

STATEMENT ON THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES BY THE AMERICAN JEWISH LEAGUE AGAINST COMMUNISM

On Thursday, February 22, 1962, the New York Times published a full page paid advertisement calling for the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. The advertisement was signed by some 610 persons, many of whose names consistently appear on public statements advocating Communist-inspired positions in the United States.

To the unsophisticated reader, it might seem that the presence of names of rabbis in this statement indicates that the American-Jewish community—in large measure—opposed the purposes of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. This is an incorrect appraisal of the situation. Marxism is abhorrent to Jews because it is a negation of the thousands of years of religious traditions of the Jews.

Along with the overwhelming majority of Americans of all faiths and political parties, the American-Jewish community supports in principle the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the other duly constituted bodies which deal with the menace of communism as it affects this Nation. We recognize that our country is in constant jeopardy from Communist attack and subversion from both within and without our shores. We recognize that it is the duty of responsible agencies of our Government, such as the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and indeed, the duty and responsibility of every American—to exert all efforts to uncover and expose the activities of avowed enemies of our country and their agents.

The recent publicizing of the overt anti-Semitic nature of the Communist regime in Russia has emphasized the inherent dangers of Communist infiltration and subversion to American Jewry. The Jewish people—as all people who believe in God—are doubly threatened by communism: their basic rights and freedoms as citizens of a free nation are under attack; their moral values and the right to practice their faith are under equal attack. Therefore we, as Americans of Jewish faith, join with our fellow Americans in supporting the House Committee on Un-American Activities and all other measures which fight the common enemy of our Nation and our faith.

The American Jewish League Against Communism cannot speak for the entire American-Jewish community. No individual or organization can do so. However, on behalf of our officers, members, and friends in the Jewish communities throughout the country, we take this opportunity to reject the counsels of those who signed this advertisement and who would weaken our Nation's vigilance against our enemies. We call instead for ever greater efforts in mobilizing and informing the American people so that all appropriate action may be taken to weaken and ultimately destroy those who would threaten our freedom.

Rushing Past the Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Wall Street Journal of March 1 and is very well worth our consideration at this time.

We should carefully weigh the various advantages and disadvantages of the programs for medical care for the aged.

The editorial points out and makes very clear that by including all the aged, the needy, as well as the self-reliant and even the rich, if they have social security coverage for Federal medical care, we may well be "swatting a gnat with a sledge hammer."

What is especially disturbing is the fact that under the proposed legislation many of our neediest citizens, who at present are not covered by social security, will get no help at all.

The editorial follows:

RUSHING PAST THE QUESTION

One thing can be set down with confidence about any Federal program of medical care for the aged. Once adopted, it will be with us forever and it will be bigger tomorrow.

This is not prophecy but the recollection of experience. The farm program, launched in haste more than a generation ago, is an example of longevity. The social security program is an example of how the modest beginning burgeons under political pressure. Its benefit payments and its taxes have been increased many times and its extent has been several times expanded.

This alone, you might suppose, would suggest some caution, some careful thought about what is done about old-age medical care, even by those persuaded that this is a Federal Government responsibility. Yet President Kennedy this week again prodded Congress to act at once. And Washington reports to this newspaper suggest growing pressure for action within Congress—this year, you see, is an election year.

This is unfortunate. Propaganda to the contrary, those who urge reflection before action are not Scrooge-like characters who would let old people die of ill treatment. The care of the aged and unfortunate has long been accepted as an obligation of soci-

ety; indeed, it is one of the marks of civilization. The question, rather, is what is the best and wisest way for society to meet this obligation.

It is, first of all, by no means certain that the Federal Government is the best instrument for this task. President Kennedy himself pays great tribute to our achievements; not only has our life expectancy surpassed the Biblical three score and ten but among the less fortunate people our medical care for young and old is an envy and a goal for matching.

Surely it is worth pondering the fact that this was achieved by an open society which put the primary responsibility upon each of us for caring for ourselves and then provided, through individual action and local responsibility, for the care of those still unable to care for themselves. What has been achieved, at any rate, is not an achievement of a Federal program.

But even if you believe, for some reason, that hereafter this should be a Federal responsibility, there still remains the question of the best means. What the President now proposes is that because some of us are unable to care for ourselves all of us must be put under the blanket care of the Federal Government.

Mr. Kennedy says that "only" half the old-age population has medical insurance. But this is just another way of saying that a good half of us already do. So even without counting those people who can care for themselves without insurance, and ignoring entirely the astronomical growth rate in private insurance plans, those who need help from all of us are only a minority of our number. In actual fact they are an even smaller minority than these figures suggest.

Is it sensible to meet this kind of a problem by having the Federal Government pay every old person's medical bill, the bills of the rich as well as the poor? This is swatting a gnat with a sledge-hammer. It doubles or triples the cost of taking care of those in true need.

The result is less money for the care of those needy than if the Government were not trying to pay a part of everybody's bill, needy and unneedy alike. Meanwhile, the taxes laid upon everybody make it more difficult for the rest to take care of themselves. Thus begins the inexorable circle—in which more and more people find themselves in need of "Government help," in which the demands grow for higher benefit payments, in which the taxes grow to pay for it. Then the circle spins all over again.

The question here is not, and never has been, whether society has an obligation to care for its old and unfortunate. The question, rather, is whether this proposal to make us all wards of the Government will provide the needy with what they need, whether it will provide better medical care for the whole society or diminish it.

This is not a question to be sloughed over. And certainly Congress ought not to rush past it in haste merely because of the emotional pull of "medical care for the aged"—or because this is an election year.

Hon. Irving M. Ives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened by the news of the passing of the Honorable Irving M. Ives, the former Senator from New York. Although we were not of the same political party, I have valued his friendship for almost 30 years, beginning when he was serving as speaker of the New York State Assembly and I was a member of the assembly from Brooklyn. His kindnesses to me at that time have not been forgotten.

During his 12 years' service as U.S. Senator from New York, from 1947 to 1959, there were many occasions on which we were together and our friendship grew and thrived. He was always deeply concerned with the well-being of our country and our people and could be counted on to do whatever was best for them.

Senator Ives' interests were varied—he was a soldier, banker, educator, and legislator—with the interests of America always guiding his activities. His talents in these fields were widely recognized, and many persons, like me, particularly respected him as an individual.

For the last few years, it was my pleasure to serve with Senator Ives on the board of directors of the City Title Insurance Co. of New York, of which board he was the chairman.

New York and the United States in his passing have lost a valuable public official and dedicated citizen.

Marketplace No Longer Has Old Limits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS BASS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article entitled "Marketplace No Longer Has Old Limits," which appeared in the Nashville Tennessean, on January 24, 1962. In my opinion, this is an outstanding article and one which merits the attention of the entire Congress.

The article follows:

MARKETPLACE NO LONGER HAS OLD LIMITS

Some weeks ago the president of one of the Nation's top banking institutions delivered what was, on the whole, a most forward-looking speech. But in a copy of his talk, I read a statement that stood out on the page as if it had been printed in Braille. "Business," he said, "must learn to live in the chill but invigorating atmosphere of competition."

I thought it had already learned to do this. Yet, as chairman of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, I know that in many instances competition—and particularly price competition—has been subverted by collusion, price fixing and division of markets.

We know that in some so-called administered price industries, not only has domestic price competition virtually disappeared but essentially their only competition is that forced upon them by imports.

An excellent example is the electrical equipment industry: It has been raising prices on turbogenerators, transformers and the like beyond all reason. So the Tennessee Valley Authority began shopping for these items abroad.

You know what happened: Not only did TVA successfully justify its actions, but it turned out that those companies which howled the most about TVA's buying abroad had been competing the least. Instead, they had been fixing prices on everything from lightning arresters to switchgear.

We were all, of course, shocked by the great electrical conspiracy. But I believe it has taught all Americans, and especially businessmen, an important lesson. It has taught us that no matter how hard some men may try to deliberately keep prices artificially high, there is always somebody in this world who is willing to supply quality goods at lower prices.

And here, I think, is the heart of the issue that our Nation will face this year as we examine our future role in world trade. We must recognize that today's marketplace is no longer bounded by the limits of a city, a State, a nation, or even a hemisphere. You can walk into almost any store nowadays and "comparison shop" not just among two or more American-made products in the same line but also among many similar products made in Japan or Europe or, in some cases, Latin America.

To the domestic manufacturer whose product is being undersold by foreign competition, this may represent an unhappy situation. Certainly we can sympathize with his plea for relief. I know that such pleas sincerely made and backed up by facts, will be heeded as we reexamine our foreign trade policies this year. I know, too, that American business is strong enough and vigorous enough to make whatever adjustments may become necessary.

We must not yield to the discredited temptation to build higher tariff walls in the mistaken belief that by doing so we are protecting American jobs. If we do, the Khrushchev dream of burying us could easily become our nightmare. Trade does not flourish for the nation that retreats into economic isolation. And when trade declines, jobs soon disappear.

It used to be said that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, with all of its merged military might, was the West's greatest deterrent to Soviet aggression. Today, in my opinion, the Russian leaders are far more concerned about the economic and political revolution that is sweeping across Europe.

The principal outgrowth of this revolution, the Common Market, is living proof of what can be done when nations, formerly at each other's throat, get together to raise the standard of living and the economic well-being of all their peoples. Just as the separate States of America became united with common tools of commerce almost 200 years ago, so are the countries of Europe discovering that unity creates strength.

Eventually, as Britain and other European countries join the Common Market, as they are expected to do, this vast economic community by 1970 could embrace a population of 300 million with an annual production of from $200 to $300 billion. These countries will be dealing from a position of tremendous strength—and Mr. Khrushchev knows it.

Our Government, our people, must respond positively to this challenge. We ought to view this greater unity in Western Europe as a blessing for the cause of the free world, not as a curse to ourselves. By doing so, we can make the future one of great opportunity—for ourselves and for all men who love freedom.

When the late Cordell Hull founded our Nation's reciprocal trade program, I am sure that many thought him to be wrong. But he was a statesman who thought far into the years ahead. And the emergence of our country as one of the world's great industrial powers proves that he was right.

Today, I think, Cordell Hull would be a happy man if our country faced up squarely to the new challenges in foreign trade which confront us, and then acted boldly and with imagination to meet those challenges.

I am confident that we won't let him down.

Copley Poll Discloses Public Well Informed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the San Diego (Calif.) Union of February 25, 1962, and a copy of the poll.

The article and poll follow:

COPLEY POLL DISCLOSES PUBLIC WELL INFORMED

Americans have a reputation as a thinking people. Because we are well informed by a free press and other communications media, it is indeed difficult to find an American who does not have an opinion on most vital issues of the day.

This fact was borne out in a poll by Copley newspapers in 15 California and Illinois communities. Factory workers, students, the clergy, professional people, farmers, businessmen—people from virtually every walk of life—were questioned. At least 98 percent of those interviewed had definite opinions on nearly every question.

Noteworthy was the response to this query: "Do you favor a firm stand, even risking war in Berlin?" Eighty-six percent said "Yes." The great majority also favored a similar policy in both southeast Asia and Formosa.

Such a cross section of American opinion indicates the public is attuned to the constant Communist threats menacing the free world and is in no mood to relax our strong military posture. Only 3 percent of the interviewees, for instance, indicated they favor a reduction in defense spending.

A widespread alertness about the internal threat of communism also was evidenced. Seventy-nine percent indicated they regarded Red operations in this country as a serious threat. An even 80 percent believe the Communist Party should be outlawed in the United States.

Particularly interesting were the responses of students. The poll for one thing revealed they do not follow too closely the views of their teachers on national and international affairs.

One of the striking differences was pinpointed when 63 percent of the teachers said they believed limited war without nuclear weapons was possible, whereas only 42 percent of students saw it as a possibility.

Teachers and pupils indicated an almost identical response as to whether we should risk war in Berlin to maintain a firm stand there. Eighty-four percent of the students said "yes" as compared with 86 percent of the teachers.

There was a greater split in thinking of the two groups about the menace of communism in the United States. Some 82 percent of students thought communism is a serious internal threat, a belief held by 71 percent of teachers. Only 64 percent of students thought the Communist Party should be outlawed, while 73 percent of teachers said it should.

From polls such as that conducted by the Copley newspapers it is refreshingly obvious that Americans continue to think for themselves in the best interests of their country.

Furthermore, such a study is solid reassurance that America's youth is keenly aware of national and international issues; youth is tough as well as wary; youth, when properly informed, will prepare itself to cope with the Nation's problems.

But we must not overlook the fact that youth must be properly informed.

COPLEY NEWS SERVICE QUESTIONNAIRE

National totals (4,532 returns)

	Percent			
	Yes	No	No opinion	No answer
1. Do you believe nuclear war likely within 3 years?	8	85	5	2
2. Do you believe limited war without A-weapons possible?	63	32	3	2
3. If possible, would you build a fallout shelter?	26	66	6	2
4. Do you favor a firm stand, even risking war, in Berlin?	86	9	3	2
5. Do you favor a firm stand, even risking war, in southeast Asia?	72	18	8	2
6. Do you favor a firm stand, even risking war, in Formosa?	70	20	8	2
7. Should the United States continue to support the U.N. if:				
A. Communist China gains admission?	42	28	3	27
B. The Secretary General loses his effectiveness?	39	47	8	6
C. Neutralists shift support to Russia, outvote United States?	38	49	7	6
8. In which area do you think war most likely?				
	Percent			
Berlin	23			
Cuba	11			
Formosa	3			
Southeast Asia	38			
Middle East	8			
North Africa	6			
No answer	11			
9. Do you think foreign aid should be—				
	Percent			
Expanded	12			
Reduced	46			
Eliminated	10			
Continued as is	26			
No answer	6			
10. Do you consider communism a serious internal threat?	79	18	1	2
A. If "yes," should Communist Party be outlawed?	80	16	2	2
11. Which area do you consider most vital to U.S. defense?				
	Percent			
Europe	34			
Africa	1			
Asia	4			
Middle East	4			
Latin America	50			
No answer	7			
12. (Due to the variable nature of the response, no attempt was made to tabulate the answers by area.)				
13. Do you consider increased inflation dangerous to U.S. economy?	86	6	4	4
A. From an international viewpoint?	71	12	8	9
B. From a domestic viewpoint?	81	8	5	6

COPLEY NEWS SERVICE QUESTIONNAIRE—Continued

National totals (4,532 returns)—Continued

	Percent			
	Yes	No	No opinion	No answer
14. Which do you believe the most effective inflation curb?				
	Percent			
Wage-price stabilization	50			
Reduced welfare spending	11			
Reduced foreign aid	16			
Longer workweek	2			
Reduced defense spending	3			
Reduced space programs	3			
Other	7			
No answer	8			

San Diego (594 returns)

	Percent			
	Yes	No	No opinion	No answer
1. Do you believe nuclear war likely within 3 years?	7	85	6	2
Businessmen (50)	4	90	2	4
Students (53)	7	87	4	2
Teachers (76)	5	82	9	4
White collar (70)	7	91	2	0
Housewives (59)	10	78	10	2
Blue collar (85)	12	82	6	0
Professional (119)	5	88	6	1
Clergy (36)	8	78	14	0
Others (46)	6	87	5	2
2. Do you believe limited war without A-weapons possible?	71	24	4	1
Businessmen	78	18	4	0
Students	62	32	4	2
Teachers	70	26	3	1
White collar	63	37	0	0
Housewives	59	27	10	4
Blue collar	68	28	4	0
Professional	81	15	3	1
Clergy	73	19	8	0
Others	80	15	0	5
3. If possible, would you build a fallout shelter?	30	62	6	2
Businessmen	18	70	10	2
Students	36	62	0	2
Teachers	41	54	3	2
White collar	29	61	9	1

COPLEY NEWS SERVICE QUESTIONNAIRE—Continued

San Diego (594 returns)—Continued

	Percent			
	Yes	No	No opinion	No answer
3. If possible, etc—Continued				
Housewives	27	66	5	2
Blue collar	29	65	5	1
Professional	33	62	2	3
Clergy	19	64	17	0
Others	22	54	17	7
4. Do you favor a firm stand, even risking war, in Berlin?	88	8	3	1
Businessmen	86	12	2	0
Students	91	7	2	0
Teachers	91	4	3	2
White collar	92	6	1	1
Housewives	85	3	10	2
Blue collar	89	10	1	0
Professional	92	7	1	0
Clergy	81	14	5	0
Others	80	9	7	4
5. Do you favor a firm stand, even risking war, in southeast Asia?	77	15	7	1
Businessmen	74	22	4	0
Students	81	12	7	0
Teachers	87	8	5	0
White collar	81	14	5	0
Housewives	68	12	20	0
Blue collar	75	19	5	1
Professional	81	13	6	1
Clergy	67	22	11	0
Others	67	17	11	5
6. Do you favor a firm stand, even risking war, in Formosa?	71	19	8	2
Businessmen	70	24	6	0
Students	72	21	7	0
Teachers	78	15	7	0
White collar	76	16	6	2
Housewives	68	17	15	0
Blue collar	67	23	10	0
Professional	73	20	7	0
Clergy	67	25	8	0
Others	69	17	9	5
7. Should the United States continue to support the U.N. if—				
A. Communist China gains admission?	42	27	3	28
Businessmen	42	30	0	28
Students	60	13	2	25
Teachers	57	21	4	18
White collar	34	30	0	36
Housewives	34	37	2	27
Blue collar	22	36	3	39
Professional	53	29	1	17
Clergy	33	31	5	33
Others	28	15	13	44
B. The Secretary General loses his effectiveness?	39	46	10	5
Businessmen	64	42	12	0
Students	51	34	9	6
Teachers	46	34	16	4
White collar	34	53	7	6
Housewives	29	52	5	14
Blue collar	29	55	7	9
Professional	45	49	5	1
Clergy	33	42	25	0
Others	39	41	13	7
C. Neutralists shift to Russia, outvote United States?	39	51	5	5
Businessmen	42	50	8	0
Students	53	32	7	8
Teachers	51	38	4	7
White collar	34	63	1	2
Housewives	26	47	15	12
Blue collar	31	55	7	7
Professional	43	48	7	2
Clergy	31	50	17	2
Others	28	48	15	9

8. In which area do you think war most likely?

[Percent]

	Berlin	Cuba	Formosa	Southeast Asia	Middle East	North Africa	No answer
Total	19	8	3	44	8	6	12
Businessmen	22	8	0	42	4	6	18
Students	21	11	4	38	11	2	13
Teachers	12	8	1	54	7	4	14
White collar	24	9	6	38	9	7	7
Housewives	22	9	0	41	7	3	18
Blue collar	17	14	3	40	11	5	10
Professional	18	7	3	51	7	9	5
Clergy	23	0	3	47	5	5	17
Others	20	4	0	41	15	7	13

COPLEY NEWS SERVICE QUESTIONNAIRE—Continued

San Diego (594 returns)—Continued

9. Do you think foreign aid should be—

[Percent]

	Expanded	Reduced	Eliminated	Continue as is	Revised	No answer
Total	13	46	11	23	2	5
Businessmen	14	42	6	26	0	12
Students	25	30	4	28	4	9
Teachers	22	32	10	33	0	3
White collar	7	50	16	26	0	1
Housewives	5	44	8	27	10	6
Blue collar	8	54	19	16	1	2
Professional	12	55	10	21	2	0
Clergy	17	47	0	31	0	5
Others	9	37	22	19	4	9

	Percent			
	Yes	No	No opinion	No answer
10. Do you consider communism a serious internal threat?	78	21	0	1
Businessmen	76	24	0	0
Students	77	23	0	0
Teachers	72	28	0	0
White collar	83	13	0	4
Housewives	88	10	0	2
Blue collar	86	14	0	0
Professional	72	26	1	1
Clergy	69	31	0	0
Others	74	22	4	0
A. If "yes," should Communist Party be outlawed?	80	16	3	1
Businessmen	84	13	0	3
Students	61	37	2	0
Teachers	78	20	2	0
White collar	81	14	3	2
Housewives	77	11	8	4
Blue collar	93	4	3	0
Professional	71	22	5	2
Clergy	88	12	0	0
Other	88	9	3	0

11. Which area do you consider most vital to U.S. defense?

[Percent]

	Europe	Africa	Asia	Middle East	Latin America	No answer
Total	34	1	5	3	49	8
Businessmen	40	0	6	2	42	10
Students	43	0	6	4	39	8
Teachers	37	3	8	1	46	5
White collar	41	3	7	3	40	6
Housewives	31	0	2	1	46	20
Blue collar	30	0	3	5	51	11
Professional	36	1	5	3	51	4
Clergy	28	0	3	0	58	11
Others	26	0	2	7	52	13

12. In my opinion, the greatest need today in the United States is:

	Percent[1]
(a) More religion, greater spiritual values, higher moral standards	12
(b) Better leadership, more responsible politicians	12
(c) Firm foreign policy	11
(d) Elimination of communism at home and abroad	8
(e) Reduced Government spending and waste	8
(f) More conservative government, fewer controls, less socialism	5
(g) Solve unemployment, automation problems	4
(h) Greater military strength	4
(i) Revised tax structure, eliminating inequities, adding incentives	4
(j) More patriotism	3
(k) More educational opportunities	3
(l) More responsible press	2
(m) More isolation, less dependence on other countries	2
(n) Protection of civil liberties, curbs on rightists	2
(o) More self-reliance, less dependence on welfare state	2
(p) Controls on inflation	2
(q) No opinion	26

[1] Percentages total more than 100 because of multiple answers.

NOTE.—Fewer than 2 percent cited elimination of racial strife; discontinuance of farm, other subsidies; expanded controls over unions; increased welfare programs; greater aid to underdeveloped countries; more support for Kennedy administration; more protection for free enterprise system.

COPLEY NEWS SERVICE QUESTIONNAIRE—Continued

San Diego (594 returns)—Continued

	Percent			
	Yes	No	No opinion	No answer
13. Do you consider increased inflation dangerous to the United States?	83	8	3	6
Businessmen	80	8	6	6
Students	77	11	6	6
Teachers	83	11	1	5
White collar	84	6	0	10
Housewives	86	2	7	5
Blue collar	83	10	2	5
Professional	83	10	0	7
Clergy	86	0	8	6
Others	80	9	2	9
A. From an international viewpoint?	72	12	7	9
B. From a domestic viewpoint?	80	10	4	6

14. Which do you believe is the most effective inflation curb?
(a) Wage-price stabilization.
(b) Reduced welfare spending.
(c) Reduced foreign aid.
(d) Longer workweek.
(e) Reduced defense spending.
(f) Reduced space programs.
(g) Other.
(h) No answer.

COPLEY NEWS SERVICE QUESTIONNAIRE—Continued

San Diego (594 returns)—Continued

[Percent]

	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)
Total	53	12	15	1	3	1	8	7
Businessmen	52	20	10	2	2	0	8	6
Students	58	6	6	2	6	0	13	9
Teachers	60	12	13	0	4	0	11	0
White collar	46	20	25	0	1	1	3	4
Housewives	59	3	10	2	0	0	6	20
Blue collar	54	2	19	0	1	4	2	18
Professional	45	20	16	0	4	1	10	4
Clergy	59	8	11	0	3	0	14	5
Others	48	11	18	2	0	4	6	11

Note.—Under "(g)" or "Other" were listed elimination of land speculation, harder credit, reduced subsidies, antitrust prosecution of labor unions, higher State and Federal taxes, balanced budget, greater labor-business cooperation, increased productivity.

Ike's Budget Chief Does Switch on Some Topics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, private power companies have for some time engaged in a campaign of vilification against publicly owned power systems. They have tried to create the image that public power drains the Treasury and harms the taxpayer, and that the private power companies stand ready to supply cheap electricity without subsidy or drain upon the tax revenues.

Yet the private power companies say not a word about how deeply they have their hands in the honey pot through the use of fictitious bookkeeping.

They keep one set of books based upon straight line depreciation, and another set of books based on accelerated and liberalized depreciation. When the problem of consumer rates is involved, the companies turn to their books with straight line depreciation, which show larger profits upon which the power companies' taxes are supposed to be computed; and the companies then insist that those taxes be included in the rate base which the consumer must pay.

However, when the power companies prepare their tax returns they use their other books based upon accelerated and liberalized depreciation which show a much smaller profit and smaller income tax.

Thus, the companies' rates to the consumers are made higher to include the phantom income taxes on the higher net income shown when they use straight line depreciation, but they actually pay lower income taxes on the basis of their accelerated and liberalized depreciation bookkeeping. The funds already accumulated by the power companies in but a few years through their collections of these phantom taxes, and nonpayment thereof to the Government, now amount to well over a billion—more than a thousand million—dollars.

But this is not all the private power companies have done with these phantom taxes. They have compounded this windfall by paying out cash dividends to their stockholders from these phantom taxes and advising their stockholders that the dividends are wholly or partially tax free. Thus, the Federal Treasury does not get the money that the companies had collected from the consumers for taxes. Nor does the Federal Treasury get taxes on the dividend income received by the stockholders from these distributions of cash dividends.

This amazing situation is beginning to receive more and more attention even from persons who ordinarily have sided with the private power companies in their attacks on public power.

One such person who has noted how the private power companies' practice of keeping double sets of books is detrimental to the public interest is Mr. Maurice Stans. Mr. Stans was President Eisenhower's Director of the Bureau of the Budget. He has no love for public power programs, but he has shown, in recent statements, that he understands the evils inherent in the private power companies' use of double bookkeeping to accumulate hundreds of millions of tax-free dollars for themselves and their stockholders through this device of phantom taxes.

The Sacramento Bee, of Sacramento, Calif., has performed a great public service in directing attention to Mr. Stans' recent statements on this subject. Members of Congress will be interested in reading the Bee's editorial of February 17, 1962, and I am therefore glad to insert it in the RECORD as follows:

IKE'S BUDGET CHIEF DOES SWITCH ON SOME TOPICS

Maurice Stans was President Dwight D. Eisenhower's Director of the Budget during the years of no new starts on Government hydroelectric projects and made several speeches questioning whether the rural electrification program should be continued.

Since retiring from the Government, Stans has become a director of several large corporations, one of them being the Southern California Edison Co. In addition he writes a newspaper column on finance.

It is understandable then that REA officials and others interested in Government power rubbed their eyes when they read a recent Stans column attacking the proposed tax credit for investment in new industrial plants, including that by the privately owned utilities.

This, Stans said, could be a Trojan horse loaded with unhappy consequences for all taxpayers. The basis for the statement is what has happened under the system of rapid depreciation in effect for several years for gas and electric utilities.

Wrote Stans: "Through rapid depreciation, private power companies have accumulated billions of dollars through interest free capital.

"By using the fast writeoff, private power companies have been able to charge consumers for more taxes than they, the utilities, actually pay to the Government.

"As a result at least 17 private companies have paid out cash dividends wholly or partially tax free."

What amazed Stans' readers most of all was his observation that the privately owned utilities, while enjoying these tax benefits, fight to the bitter end to prevent any effort of electric cooperatives to generate some of their own power.

He cited the battle of six private utilities to block approval of an REA loan to finance a generating plant in Indiana. Three of these companies, Stans stated, "alone had about as much gift in deferred taxes on December 1, 1960, as the amount of the loan—and the latter is not a gift."

The former Budget Director states the President and Congress should examine the rapid amortization windfall before they agree to another and bigger one, which is sound advice indeed.

Address by Senator Allen J. Ellender, of Louisiana, Before Wabash Valley Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on January 31, 1962, it was my pleasure to attend a meeting of the Wabash Valley

Association at Purdue University in West Lafayette, Ind., accompanied by my good friend and colleague, Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER.

At the meeting, Senator ELLENDER delivered an extremely interesting and effective address in which he outlined the evolution of the Federal interest in water resource development and the problems we must face now if we are to provide for the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Senator ELLENDER's excellent address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE ALLEN J. ELLENDER, OF LOUISIANA, BEFORE THE WABASH VALLEY ASSOCIATION, LAFAYETTE, IND., JANUARY 31, 1962

I am pleased to be here.

I propose to discuss the problem of stream control, a subject in which your association is deeply interested, and which this area and the Mississippi River Delta, where I come from, have in common.

First of all, let me commend you for the fine presentation made by your association before the Appropriations Committees last year. It was one of the most effective you have ever made before our committee. Your requests were supported by your Senators, Congressmen, Governors, the Indiana Flood Control and Water Resources Commission, the Wabash Valley Interstate Commission, mayors of communities along the river, farmers, bankers and businessmen throughout the valley, all of which indicates splendid teamwork. As I recall, they presented a united front except for some opposition from local interests in Mount Carmel to the construction of levees for the protection of Levee Unit No. 5 in Indiana until equal protection can be provided for Mount Carmel on the Illinois side. I express the hope that initial construction funds will be appropriated for fiscal year 1963 for Levee Unit No. 5, in accordance with the recommendations in the President's budget. The district and division engineers have completed their study of local flood protection for Mount Carmel. Their report was approved by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors at its January meeting, and it should be processed in time to be included in the omnibus flood control authorization act this year. If authorized, you may count on my support for planning funds for Mount Carmel. As you know, due to the length of the protective works required for Levee Unit No. 5, the Mount Carmel project can be completed prior to any adverse effects from the construction works for the protection of Levee Unit No. 5.

I would now like to review the evolution of the Federal interest in water resource development, and to analyze briefly the problems which we must face now if we are to provide for the future. Many of you are very well acquainted with the subject, but I hope to elicit your continued interest in our efforts on the Washington level.

Those of us in Congress who have been battling for Federal funds for the protection of our two most precious natural resources—soil and water—have been the targets for much unjust and vile criticism. Fortunately, the ill-advised, misinformed, narrow-minded, ax-grinding, shortsighted critics have not been able to gather much momentum, and in spite of them we have been able to proceed in an orderly way. Our effort has been carried on in a nonpartisan manner. I express the hope that in the next 10 years most of our great valleys and many of our smaller ones will be free from damaging floods.

I have for a long time entertained the view that our land and water resources belong to all the people, and those of the present generation are merely the guardians of those resources, charged with the duty of protecting and preserving them for the benefit of generations yet unborn. Food and fiber are the lifeblood of any country. Without them its people would all die on the vine, hence it becomes the duty of a nation to provide the guidance, as well as the funds, for posterity.

The Federal interest in the development of our waterways dates back to 1824, when the first improvements of rivers and harbors for navigation were adopted by Congress and assigned to the Corps of Engineers. In the beginning the Federal interest in waterways was confined to navigation. In 1879, when Congress passed an act creating the Mississippi River Commission, that interest was extended to include flood control. Later the California Debris Commission was created, with jurisdiction over the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers. In 1902 Congress established what is now the Bureau of Reclamation for the development of irrigation projects to provide water for the arid lands in the western portion of our country.

Up to this time the principal legislation enacted by the Congress in the field of water resources was single purpose; that is, navigation, flood control or irrigation. In 1927, however, the Congress directed the Corps of Engineers to make comprehensive water resources studies of the streams listed in House Document No. 308, 69th Congress, 1st session. The streams listed in that document constituted the principal rivers of the Nation.

The reports prepared under authority of that act became known as the 308 reports. They constitute the first comprehensive compilation of the water resources of our country. Indeed, the 308 report on the Tennessee River system was the basis on which the Tennessee Valley Authority was established in 1933. Similarly, the 308 report on the Sacramento-San Joaquin River was the basis for the authorization of the Central Valley project of the Bureau of Reclamation.

These reports were also the basis for many of the projects authorized in the First General Flood Control Act of 1936, which recognized that destructive floods on the Nation's rivers constitute a national menace by upsetting orderly progress, causing loss of life and a tremendous drain on our land resources, and further, that flood control is a proper activity of the Federal Government. That act established as national policy that the Federal Government should improve or participate in the improvement of navigable waters and their tributaries for flood control provided the benefits are in excess of the cost.

I believe that the key phrase here is "or participate in the improvement." The original omnibus flood control act required local interests to furnish lands, easements, and rights-of-way for all flood control projects. In later years, except for eliminating local cooperation on reservoirs, the Congress has taken steps to require additional local participation and we can expect that tendency to continue, where the benefits are purely local. For instance, the Flood Control Act of 1960 requires local cooperation of at least 20 percent of the total first cost on strictly local protection projects.

In the field of water resource development generally, legislation has enunciated broad policies, leaving the mechanics of project formulation and evaluation to the executive agencies and the Bureau of the budget.

In 1952 the Bureau of the Budget, in cooperation with the various Federal agencies concerned, issued the now famous—or should I say "infamous"—Budget Circular Letter A-47, setting forth a broad outline of benefit and cost computations to be included in the evaluation of reports, and prescribing methods of amortization of projects.

Since its language is very general, it is subject to interpretation, and the Bureau of the Budget has consistently applied a very restrictive interpretation wherever possible. This has resulted in unfavorable reports on many good projects that should have been recommended and built during the last decade.

Naturally, there has been a great deal of dissatisfaction with the policies set forth in this document by both the Congress and the Federal agencies involved. Several years ago the Senate passed a resolution authorizing the creation of a Select Committee on Water Resources, to be composed of members of the Committees on Public Works, Agriculture, and Interior and Insular Affairs, to study resource deevlopment and policies, including Budget Circular Letter A-47.

The select committee was headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma, the Honorable ROBERT S. KERR, and I had the privilege of serving on that committee. In passing, I might say that it was one of the few select or special committees to complete its task for less than the amount provided, spending only about $90,000 of the $325,000 authorized by the Senate for the study.

Furthermore, the committee completed its assignment within the time originally scheduled and then passed out of existence.

Grassroots hearings held in strategic areas of the country formed the basis of the exhaustive study of water resources made by the select committee. Its report, and the 32 technical papers prepared in connection therewith, have been hailed by members of both parties in Congress and by experts in the field of water resources throughout the country as the most significant contribution ever made in that field.

The committee report on the problems and the challenge set the stage for a greatly expanded water resource development program in the next two decades, but it is obvious that the program must be accelerated if we are to meet the challenge of economic and industrial development, and at the same time provide for the domestic water needs of our exploding population.

The magnitude of the problem facing this Nation in providing an adequate supply of water of good quality by the year 2000 can be grasped when we consider that the actual population of the contiguous portion of the United States in 1958 was 174 million, whereas the mean estimate of the population projection for the year 2000 is 329 million. The select committee's studies show that to meet the future needs for water supply would require a minimum expenditure of $12 billion in the next 20 years. I can assure you that only by complete development of our streams can we hope to provide for the water requirements which the economic growth of this country will demand in the years to come.

Last year an important step was taken toward comprehensive river basin development, when the Water Supply Act of 1960 was amended to provide that where the benefits from low flow regulation are general in nature, that is, not confined to a single area, the cost of storage for such regulation need not be reimbursed by the local interests.

Just recently the Bureau of the Budget has consulted with the executive agencies having a responsibility in the field of water resources with respect to an Executive order which will embody an interagency agreement relative to water resource development. One very significant feature of this proposed Executive order is that it will in effect repeal the restrictive policies pursued in the past by the Bureau of the Budget in its rigid definitions of the limitations imposed by Budget Circular Letter A-47.

The Secretaries of the agencies involved now have this agreement for approval, and I feel confident that we are about to enter a new era of resource development.

As I previously stated, our Select Committee on Water Resources has given us the blueprint for the future development of our water resources. Its report and the technical papers prepared in connection therewith will be our guide in this field in the future. It is important for the American people to realize that to a great degree their future lies in the extent to which they develop their natural resources. But this is not enough. It is essential that Washington and the President recognize this need.

For 8 years we labored under a philosophy of no new starts, vetoes for rivers and harbors and flood control authorization bills, and vetoes for appropriation bills that dared to provide unbudgeted new starts for resource development projects. That situation has now changed.

President Kennedy is scrapping the shackles of the last 10 years imposed by Budget Circular Letter A-47. He laid down the challenge in his special message to the Congress on natural resources last year, when he said, and I quote:

"This Nation has been and is now especially fortunate in the blessings [of natural resources] we have inherited. Our entire society rests upon and is dependent upon our water, our land, our forests, and our minerals. Wise investments in our resource program today will return vast dividends tomorrow, while failure to act now may be opportunities lost forever. We can no longer ignore our country's need for development. Our available water supply must be used to give maximum benefits for all purposes: hydroelectric power, irrigation, reclamation, navigation, recreation, health, home, and industry."

That is the challenge.

We have a blueprint for our resources development, a clear definition of the problem, and a challenge from our President to move forward. There remains only the application of engineering technique and vision to conceive the projects which will be necessary to nurture our future economic growth. In an expanding economy, and with an increasing birth rate, the economy of an area develops proportionately to the boldness and the imagination of the engineer. To the economist falls the task of applying the hard rules of economics which can turn these dreams into realities. Here again, the success or failure of a project may hinge on the vision and imagination the economist uses in his application of sound economic principles. It is in this context that the full significance of the rescission of Circular Letter A-47 becomes apparent. I hope that the Corps of Engineers will provide the vision and the leadership necessary to regain a position of preeminence in the field of water resource development.

Since assuming the chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Public Works of the Senate Appfopriations Committee, I have recommended increased appropriations for resource development, not only in Louisiana but throughout the country. I have fought for some new starts in both planning and construction each year in order to maintain a well-balanced construction and planning program. With constant opposition from the administration and the Bureau of the Budget, I have frequently felt as though I were a voice crying in the wilderness when I have tried to point out the importance of an adequate annual program in the field of natural resources. I firmly believed that increased appropriations were necessary if we were to continue to prosper as a Nation.

Today the picture is somewhat brighter, with a concise statement from the Senate Select Committee on Water Resources as to the need, and a direct challenge by the President of the United States to meet that need, backed up with budget requests that provide for the initiation of some new projects each year. With such a program we will meet that need.

I realize that the demand for new starts must be tempered by fiscal considerations with respect to other essential programs, and a desire to balance the Federal budget. After hearing all of the testimony in connection with the 1963 budget, the Congress may want to make some adjustments or additions to the President's budget request, but I feel certain that we will be operating in an atmosphere of understanding.

The change in attitude on the part of Government officials with respect to water resource projects has been reflected in the public press. Whereas a few years ago the newspapers and magazines carried derogatory articles and characterizations of the water resource program as "pork barrel," today we have syndicated articles on the editorial pages of our newspapers by such writers as Ralph McGill, entitled "Water: Growing Concern for United States." In his article he quotes various passages from the Bible relative to the dependence of civilization on adequate water, and then states:

"We read stories about ancient civilizations dying. Archeologists, digging into old ruins, translating weird writings on clay tablets, interpreting the rings of centuries-old trees found in desert ruins, which tell us that cities and civilizations 'died' because the water supply failed. It happened on our continent to the Mesa Verde Indians."

It is refreshing to hear that message preached by a popular columnist, who can reach more people in 1 day than I have been able to reach over the years with my message. The reason for that is simple: Most of the people to whom I have been able to carry my message are public-spirited individuals already interested in the pressing problems of water conservation.

My conviction in the necessity for this program stems from a study of the problem as it develops in these United States. I am profoundly interested in the problems which organizations such as yours bring to my attention. These are situations capable of correction before an economically productive area is permanently destroyed.

The urgent need for meeting these problems is vividly impressed upon me as I travel through portions of the Old World. On every possible occasion in the past 10 or 12 years I have stated that my travels have convinced me that unless we protect our greatest resource—water—someday many parts of our country may become as barren as the Gobi Desert or the lands I have seen in old Persia. Our history books tell us that about 500 years before Christ, the entire area of Persia was capable of sustaining the livelihood of 115 million people. Now it can adequately care for less than 14 million people.

One important aspect of water engineering that has been given little attention is pollution abatement. Aggressive action must be taken to eliminate both manmade and natural sources of pollution if we have any hope of meeting the water requirements of our growing industry and population by the year 2000.

Of 36 local protection projects, only the local protection projects at Delphi, Lyford Gill Township, Vincennes, and Brevoort on the upper Wabash, and Muncie, White River Levee Unit No. 8 and the Grassy Creek projects in the White River Basin have been placed in operation. Of the remaining 28 authorized local protection projects, those for the protection of Rochester and McCleary's Bluff, Ill.; Tri-Pond levee, Indiana; and Greenfield Bayou levee, Indiana, are in the budget for advance planning in fiscal year 1963, and Wabash River, Levee Unit No. 5, Indiana; Mason J. Niblack levee, Indiana; and West Terre Haute, Ind., are recommended for construction. Therefore, there are 22 projects, most of which were authorized a quarter of a century ago, that have not been started and for which no funds are requested for fiscal year 1963.

The situation with respect to reservoirs is somewhat better. The Mansfield and Cogles Mill Reservoirs on the Wabash have been completed and construction funds have been requested for the Mississinewa and Salamonie Reservoirs in the upper Wabash and the Monroe Reservoir in the White River Basin. That leaves only the authorized Huntington Reservoir in the upper Wabash, for which no construction funds are requested. I am hopeful that a good case will be made for the early construction of this project and that the Congress will provide funds for the initiation of this project in fiscal year 1963.

I believe you have an effective organization which can be of great value, not only to all of you in the basin but to the Congress as well. Within the framework of the authorized projects, you can assist in the establishment of priorities, and then present a united front when requests are made to the Congress for appropriations to implement existing authorizations. I feel that within the past few years real progress has been made toward providing a measure of flood control and water conservation within the Wabash Basin.

I am sure all of you realize that the major effort in this direction can only be made after completion of the outstanding comprehensive report on the Wabash River and tributaries. The estimated cost of that report is $605,000, of which $329,200 has been appropriated. The request for fiscal year 1963 is for $100,000, compared with $75,000 requested for 1962. That will leave a balance of $175,800 for completion of this study after fiscal year 1963.

Considering only the authorized projects, we find that within the Wabash River Basin there are about 36 local flood protection projects, of which 11 are in the White River Basin, its major tributary. In addition there are six authorized reservoirs.

As all of you realize, even if all of the authorized projects were built, you would not have the flood protection required for the Wabash Basin, you would not have the water conservation storage needed for domestic and industrial water supply required to meet the needs of this great river valley in the next two decades; nor do you have the advantages of low-cost water transportation, which will be a stimulus to the further economic development of this basin. The realization of these aims can only be accomplished with the completion of the presently authorized review report and the appropriation of funds to build the projects that will be recommended in that report. So I say to you today—to a large extent, the future of your area is closely related to the early completion of that report and vigorous local support for early construction of the projects that the Corps of Engineers will recommend for the Wabash Basin.

The procedures for survey reports and project development provide for coordination and cooperation by local and State agencies. It is only in this way that the full aspirations of an area for the complete development of its natural resources can be realized. In the case of the Wabash River Basin, I am pleased to see that the facilities of three great universities—Illinois, Indiana, and Purdue—are being utilized in making certain studies to be incorporated in the comprehensive plan for the future development of this great river basin.

I am hopeful that this study will show the economical feasibility of extending Ohio River navigation up the Wabash River to some logical point such as Terre Haute, Ind. Such a development would provide low-cost water transportation from points along the

Wabash River to the Mississippi River system, of which the Ohio and its tributaries are a part, to the Great Lakes and to the Gulf of Mexico. This comprehensive study, which includes a determination of the feasibility of navigation, comes at a time when our historic position of toll-free waterways is in jeopardy from a merciless attack by the railroad interests.

I cannot believe that these selfish interests will be successful in destroying the concept of toll-free waterways, one of the major factors in the rapid development of the Ohio and other river valleys of this Nation.

As you know, the President in his budget message recommended extension of the principle of user charges to inland waterways, and stated that a tax of 2 cents per gallon should be applied to all fuels used in transportation on these waterways, effective January 1, 1963. This, of course, is entirely different from the death-dealing measures being advocated by the railroads.

The railroads would like to see a tax on waterways which would amortize the first cost and cover all costs of maintenance and operation. At the present time the annual cost of maintenance and operation of our waterways runs about $100 million a year, whereas the fuel tax being recommended by the President is estimated to produce about $3 million during the first half-year of operation and about $10 million a year after it is in full operation.

The President's program contemplates extending to the waterways the fuel tax now imposed on the use of highways and airways. So long as this is a general tax on fuels, the amount of the tax is reasonable and equitably apportioned among the various modes of transportation, I think it would be unrealistic for the waterway operators to take the position that they and they alone should be excluded from the general application of a fuels tax.

If, on the other hand, when the details of the President's recommendations are made public, we find that coastal ports, the Great Lakes, and pleasure craft are excluded from the tax, we are faced with a different situation. The gas tax would then become a toll on our inland waterways in the form of a user charge. This would destroy our time-honored principle of toll-free waterways. At this point, regardless of the amount, I would oppose the measure in principle.

As one Member of Congress, I can assure you of my continued vigorous support of a program for the development of the natural resources of the United States, adequate to meet the needs of our children and our children's children.

The Little-People-to-Little-People Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate my very good friend and colleague, Congressman RODINO, of New Jersey, on his excellent speech of February 15, 1962, on the little-people-to-little-people program; and to commend his son, Peter, for his initiative and forethought in giving birth to the idea.

We have all been reminded at one time or another of the verse from Psalms, "Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings hast Thou ordained strength because of thine enemies."

In our modern day world, out of the minds of our junior citizens a worthwhile crusade has started. It is a crusade to further peace among Nations and among the peoples of Nations. It is a noble cause endorsed by our future leaders of the United States. It is a program we adults should follow and encourage.

Discrimination Against Small Colorado Grocers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, the small, independent grocers in my State are validly concerned about certain discriminatory provisions in the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act.

I have presented their case, with certain proposed amendments of my own, to the House Agriculture Committee.

I ask unanimous consent that my statement before the House Agriculture Committee be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS OF THE PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT TO PROTECT INDEPENDENT COLORADO GROCERS

(Statement by U.S. Senator JOHN A. CARROLL, of Colorado, before the House Agriculture Committee, February 26, 1962)

Mr. Chairman, I appear before you this morning on behalf of the small, independent grocers in Colorado.

The small, independent grocers in my State have, what I consider to be, a valid grievance against the administration of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act.

I am going to propose that the act be amended to cure what we consider to be a discriminatory condition.

Before I describe the problem in the State of Colorado, let me emphasize that our small, independent grocers fully support the purposes of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act. They encourage its full implementation.

What they do object to is the unfair imposition of an excessive amount of the financing of the PACA on the small, nonchain grocer.

I know that the Agriculture Department intends to recommend to your committee that the PACA be amended to change the licensing criteria for retail grocers. As I understand it, under the proposed USDA amendment, grocers who purchase more than $50,000 worth of fresh or frozen fruits and vegetables each year would be subject to paying the license fee.

NEW CRITERION PROPOSED

While there is no doubt that this change to a dollar volume criterion will be an immeasurable improvement over the old cloudy regulations of 1 ton or more (of the commodities) in excess of 20 times per year, it is still discriminatory against the independent grocer.

Under the proposed USDA amendment 63 independent Colorado retail grocers would be licensed.

However, at the same time, the PACA, unless further amended, would still permit the big Colorado grocery chains to operate with one license covering their hundreds of stores, most of which are many times larger than the independent retailers down the block who would have to be licensed.

POSITION OF ASSOCIATED GROCERS

Here is what Mr. Fred S. Fishburn, general manager of the Associated Grocers of Colorado, told me a few days ago:

"If the PACA is amended to require licensing of groces purchasing over $50,000 of fresh or frozen fruits or vegetables, 63 of our member stores would be affected."

"We do not agree with the proposal, because our members are still discriminated against because the chain headquarters takes out one license for the distribution and not any for the retail units while we take out one for our distribution warehouse and under the new proposal 63 of our members would be affected and need the license and many more will come under it as they grow and do more business."

The USDA admits that the 300 large grocery chains in the country (doing 39 percent of all retail grocery business) should be licensed, because they affect the code of fair trading practices under the PACA.

I don't think anyone disagrees with this.

The Associated Grocers of Colorado, a 27-year-old organization of privately owned, small, independent grocers, agrees that its own distribution warehouse in Denver and Pueblo should be subject to licensing, because it too, like the chain wholesale center, is affected by the code of fair trading practices with the fruit and vegetable farmer.

LICENSING SYSTEM IS DISCRIMINATORY

But it is hard to understand why the AG member stores should be subject to licensing. They draw their stocks entirely from one central supply source in the exact same manner as a branch store of a major supermarket chain. The branch store of the chain, however, is exempt from licensing, even though it may do three times the volume of business of its AG competitor across the street.

This to me seems to be pure and simple discrimination.

The 637 independent grocers in the Rocky Mountain region ask simply for equitable treatment.

They should not be penalized because they do not belong to a large national chain.

They should not be penalized because they espouse and put into practice the spirit of private ownership and free competition as exemplified in a small business.

It would seem to me that the Department of Agriculture and the Congress would encourage competition in retail food marketing, rather than place more restrictive burdens on the small businessman who challenges the giant, corporate food chains with a bit of competitive spirit.

CARROLL AMENDMENTS

I make two alternative proposals for amending the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, Mr. Chairman, both of which I will submit in proper form to committee counsel.

First, I propose that the act be amended to exempt from licensing, independent retail grocers who in a year purchase all of their fresh and frozen fruits and vegetables from the same wholesale source. This would cover a marketing organization of hundreds of small, privately owned grocery stores who buy their stocks cooperatively from one central supply source.

Second, if in the wisdom of this committee it feels that the purposes and objectives of the PACA are best served by licensing all retail grocers who purchase a certain dol-

lar volume of fresh or frozen fruits and vegetables, then I propose that the PACA be amended to provide for licensing of unit stores within a grocery chain that meet the dollar volume criteria. This amendment would equalize treatment between grocery chainstores and privately owned, small business groceries.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for your courtesy in hearing me today, and if the bill before you (H.R. 5023) is amended as I recommended, to protect the small independent grocer in Colorado, I assure you I will do all in my power to see to it that my colleagues in the Senate understand and support the action of the House.

Lincoln Day Address by Senator Vance Hartke, of Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, during the Senate's observance of Lincoln's birthday, I was absent from Washington spending a few days in my home State of Indiana.

During my stay there I was privileged to visit what is now Indiana's first national park, the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial, and address a large group of Hoosiers who had gathered together at the site of Lincoln's boyhood home to pay tribute to our 16th President on the anniversary of his birth.

Since I was not present in the Senate to offer my tribute to President Lincoln, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my remarks at Lincoln Park be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LINCOLN: AN INSPIRATION TO SUCCESS

(Address of the Honorable VANCE HARTKE, U.S. Senator, at Lincoln City, Ind., on the occasion of Lincoln's birthday)

My fellow Hoosiers, I come today to speak with you, not as a politician, not as a Democrat, not as a U.S. Senator. I come today as an American father concerned about the well-being of my children and your children—the children of all Americans.

Today we are gathered on the hallowed soil where once there played and worked a great American—a great President, Abraham Lincoln.

On this ground he lived and played and worked from the ages of 7 through 21.

But, age is both a biological and sociological concept. The annual revolution of the earth about the sun—the calendar year—has become a fundamental measure of time in ordinary appraisal and record of human affairs. Time, likewise, tends to keep pace with the development of language.

Even in the cradle, words take shape and assume pattern. Lincoln had an extraordinary interest in words: spoken, written and read. As an infant, he listened to his mother's voice. We are told that she recited to him bits from the Bible while she was at work in the cabin. Lincoln learned his letters from her at Knob Creek about the age of 5. And there is evidence that he was beginning to write letters soon after he arrived in Indiana. At age 8 he was reading the Bible and at 9 was reading Aesop's Fables. At 10, Robinson Crusoe.

There is no doubt, Abraham Lincoln was a book-loving boy.

Though Lincoln loved books, the first instrument placed in his hands, and one which often characterizes him, was an ax. He used his ax to cut through the thickness, foliage, and trees which formed, in those days, an indistinguishable network of vegetation.

To those of us living in Indiana today, it seems incredible that this very land was once a vast forest larger than New England.

But, as I said, there was no doubt, Abraham Lincoln was a book-loving boy.

Two books which left their lasting impression on Lincoln were Parson Weems' "Life of George Washington," and James Riley's "An Authentic Narrative of the Loss of the American Brig Commerce * * * With an Account of the Sufferings of Her Surviving Officers and Crew."

This latter book must have impressed Lincoln with the reality that slavery was not confined necessarily to those with dark skins, and that people of his own color might be enslaved by those powerful enough and disposed to carry out that purpose.

Today, there are throughout the world, those who would like to be powerful enough to carry out the purpose of enslaving all people who rejoice in freedom and liberty.

I said I came today as an American father. I do. But although I am an American father, I also have the great honor and distinction of being a U.S. Senator, wherein I have the opportunity to vote for those things which I honestly and sincerely believe will prevent the children of all Americans from becoming slaves of a diabolical society.

Lincoln had to read by a candle. Our children today can read by the finest electric lights. Lincoln's mother had to cook on a wood-burning stove, for which Lincoln had to cut the firewood. Today's children can watch their mothers bake a cake from a box; cook the vegetables taken from deep-freezer containers bought in a supermarket.

Lincoln's mother had to cook the food Lincoln and his father had killed from the surrounding forest, and the vegetables grown in their family garden.

Today's children can also become educated from watching a television screen in their own living rooms or schoolrooms.

Our children's schools are modern and highly equipped to give a seeking and curious mind the tools with which to find the answers to the problems of a complex society.

Historians tell us that when Lincoln came to Indiana, he was large for his age, so much so that his friends nicknamed him "long shanks." His height was the kind which is so nobly cherished by Hoosiers today on a basketball court. Lincoln did not get the chance to play basketball or participate in any sport. He was too occupied in his chores about the home, the farm, and the school.

But Lincoln never had the chance for a higher education, as he was never in a college or academy as a student. He followed a program of reading and study which he set up for himself, and his self-imposed discipline was rigid. His desire to know, to understand, was unquenchable.

The move by the Thomas Lincoln family from Kentucky to Indiana was transitional: it modified young Lincoln's southern heritage, but it did not erase that heritage. Southern Indiana was in Lincoln's youth a meeting ground between the North and South, and it remains so today. The Ohio River separates Indiana and Kentucky geographically, but there is a continuity of tradition, background, and environment in the region on both sides of this great river which is far more pronounced than any similarity that exists between northern and southern Indiana.

Had the Lincolns gone directly from Kentucky to Illinois, it is probable that the boy's southern experience might have been wholly submerged, and with it his capacity, later so evident, to understand and sympathize with the southern mind and heart.

Yes, I am proud to stand on this land with you today—the land to which Lincoln came in 1816, within a few days of December 11, the birthday of our great State.

I am proud to have sponsored with Congressman WINFIELD DENTON legislation which makes this land and the surrounding acreage the first national park for Indiana.

I am proud because I know that this shrine is symbolic of a youth who grew up in the traditions of everything which has made our country great.

And, today, in these years of crises when there are those who would enslave us, as Lincoln feared as a youth; we must—as parents—properly supervise our children and encourage them, just as Lincoln's mother, father, and stepmother encouraged him, and just as my mother, who is with me here today, encouraged me. We must set the example; we must provide the environment. In so doing, our children will not fail. They will not fail themselves, their parents, their country.

When Lincoln arrived in Indiana, he himself was but a small lad, and the State comprised but 15 counties. But in 1830, as the State's pioneer period was drawing to a close, Lincoln had come of age and stood 6 feet 4 inches tall. He grew up on our good soil of Indiana. The State also had grown, and comprised 60 organized counties.

The great seal of Indiana portrays the rising sun in the background and a buffalo sporting in a clearing. The center of interest is a tall frontiersman with an ax in hand engaged in felling a tree. This woodsman might well symbolize Abraham Lincoln, one of Indiana's finest contributions to civilization.

Abraham Lincoln did not fail his generation. Lincoln did not fail civilization. So this generation must not fail this generation. This generation must not fail civilization.

University of California Has Series of Lectures on Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the University of California, at its Berkeley and Los Angeles campuses, has instituted a series of lectures on the subject of communism. The lectures are attracting considerable public interest and praise. I wholeheartedly endorse this scholarly exploration and open discussion of communism. It is a far better approach than burying our heads in the sand. I agree with Governor Brown's comment on the lecture series that "if we are to challenge Communist doubletalk, we must have the facts about their record and sorry rule."

A report on the lecture series has just come to my attention and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The University of California has instituted a series of lectures designed to meet the challenge of communism to democratic principles through scholarly exploration and discussion of its history, theory, and practice. These lectures, presenting different speakers concurrently on two of the university's campuses, already have attracted considerable interest and favorable comment from press and public.

On the Los Angeles campus, the first lecture drew a capacity audience to hear Sidney Hook, Professor of Philosophy at New York University, speak on the subject, "From Marxism to Leninism to Stalinism." He emphasized the importance of going directly to the original sources for better understanding of communism.

Subsequent lectures at UCLA are by Merle Fainsod, Director of the Russian Research Center at Harvard University; Marshal Shulman, Professor of International Politics at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy; Stephen Spender, distinguished English poet and critic; and Robert Scalapino, Professor of Political Science at Berkeley.

On the Berkeley campus, five faculty members are developing the theme, "Historians Look at Communism." Martin Malia introduced the series with a consideration of "Communism in Russia." Following him are Richard A. H. Franz Schurmann on "Communism in China," Richard A. Webster on "Communism in Western Europe: the Italian Example"; Henry F. May on "Communism and America," and Carl E. Schorske on "Communism in Its Historical Setting."

The Christian Science Monitor, in a full account of the launching of the series, reported: "It brings to this area, where rallies have been held in recent months by several anti-Communist schools, a basically different approach to the subject of international communism, its nature and threat."

As California Gov. Edmund G. Brown remarked:

"If we are to challenge Communist doubletalk, we must have the facts about their record and sorry rule. Futhermore, we must have the facts to challenge Communists and their apologists to 'the moment of intellectual truth,' the test of comparison of our system with theirs. The university, I am happy to see, is contributing immeasurably toward arming the citizens of our State with the facts about communism."

And Justice for All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend John A. O'Brien, Ph. D., of the University of Notre Dame, has made a valuable contribution to the current debate on Federal aid to education in his pamphlet, "And Justice for All," a series of 66 questions and answers. It is so timely and informative that I include it in the RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

AND JUSTICE FOR ALL

(By Rev. John A. O'Brien, Ph. D., University of Notre Dame)

1. Why is the question of Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools of such widespread interest and why has it provoked such controversy throughout the Nation?

Answer. It is of universal interest because it affects the education of all our children. It has stirred nationwide controversy because it is a revolutionary measure and represents a radical departure from the century-old tradition of purely State support of grammar and high schools.

2. Is it fundamentally a religious issue?

Answer. No. It involves no dogma of religion and is solely a question of the most effective means of achieving the best education for all the youth of America.

The discussion should be carried on in a calm, friendly, objective manner, appealing neither to religious sympathy nor prejudice. What is needed is light, not heat, to find the best answer for our Nation's educational needs.

3. Is that the thought of the Catholic bishops?

Answer. Yes. Speaking to 15,000 members attending the convention of the National Catholic Educational Association on April 4, 1961, in Atlantic City, Bishop John J. Wright of Pittsburgh, the president of the association, said: "The debate should not be permitted to degenerate in its philosophic premises into a debate between Catholics and Protestants any more than it should be represented in its political context as a debate between Catholics and the national administration, above all the President."

4. Are there religious aspects to the issue?

Answer. Yes. The simple fact is that the only numerically important group supporting the inclusion of private nonprofit schools in Federal aid to education is composed of Catholics. Many Americans oppose the inclusion of private schools in the Federal program because their inclusion would inevitably benefit Catholicism. In this type of opposition there is some bigotry and considerable ignorance. Only the shining example of good Catholic lives and the calm presentation of sound arguments can eliminate these obstacles.

5. What is the Catholic reaction to President Kennedy's appeal for restraint in "sensitive areas" of the discussion of this subject?

Answer. Complete agreement. Praising the President for making such an appeal, Bishop Wright declared: "He will receive the loyal agreement and unqualified support of everyone on every side in this aspect of the matter." In both utterances Bishop Wright reflected the mind not only of the hierarchy but also of Catholics generally.

Catholics are glad to see the President show such concern for the improvement of the education of American youth. Many question, however, the effectiveness of the proposed measure, Senate bill 1021, to obtain the desired objectives. They do so on objective grounds and with no thought of impairing the separation of church and state, which they believe is the only reasonable and practical plan for our pluralistic American society.

Furthermore, Catholics favor the appropriation of funds necessary to meet all the real needs of our public schools, in which more than half of their own children are enrolled. They want to see public school teachers well paid and equipped with all the essentials to do an efficient and thorough job.

6. What is the basic problem of this discussion?

Answer. This whole discussion is on the central problem of public aid for the education of all schoolchildren, which the administration proposals simply render more acute. The principles developed here have a validity that will endure long after the present proposals have been disposed of, for the problem of public aid, for the education of all of America's youth is likely to be with us for some time.

7. What is the gist of the administration's proposals?

Answer. They offer a $5.8 billion program of Federal aid for improving education in the United States of America. Nearly $3 billion would go for loans to colleges over a 5-year period, for construction of classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and student housing. An additional $577.5 million would be for 212,500 college scholarships over 5 years based on students' ability and financial need. Maximum scholarship would be $1,000 a year. Federal loans for such scholarships would be available to students in public and private colleges. This is an eminently just and fair arrangement and is in conformity with previous Federal aid enactments.

8. Would funds also be allotted to elementary and high schools?

Answer. Yes. States would receive grants totaling $2.3 billion over 3 years for public grade and secondary schools to be used for erecting school buildings and paying teachers.

9. What is the declared purpose of such proposed legislation?

Answer. "The maximum development of every young American's capacity," said President Kennedy, and "rich dividends in the years ahead in economic growth, in enlightened citizens, and in national excellence."

10. Why have these proposals provoked so much opposition?

Answer. Because for the first time they would put the Federal Government into the business of elementary and secondary education in a big way. With the exception of some health legislation, like the National School Lunch Act, and the federally impacted areas program (areas in which Federal activities have significantly increased the local educational burden), the Federal Government has left these two areas of education to the States and local communities.

2. Because it would undertake for the first time to pay teachers' salaries.

3. Because it would set a pattern of unjustifiable discrimination between pupils attending public elementary and secondary schools and students enrolled in private nonprofit schools, church related and nondenominational.

11. Should the Federal Government enter into the education of children on the elementary and secondary school levels?

Answer. Many do not think it a wise policy for the Federal Government to intrude into an enterprise which has traditionally been conducted by the State and the local school districts. The Federal Government, it is contended, has enough to do without taking on the business of the little red schoolhouse and the local high school. Citizens of the community best understand their own educational needs and the means of meeting them. They are in the best position to see that their tax dollar gets the best returns.

Millions of citizens think it is unfair and unjust to discriminate against children attending private nonprofit schools, church related and nondenominational, by depriving them of any of the benefits of the proposed legislation. These students are Americans. They are the children of American citizens and taxpayers. They attend schools which teach with equal competence the secular subjects taught in the public schools. In addition, these schools give instruction in the Christian or other religions and ethics. They include love of neighbor (Protestant, Jew, Catholic, or unchurched) and of country; they set forth the highest ideals of American life and democracy. They develop a patriotism that has been tested and proven on every battlefield on which American soldiers have fought and died. They are American to the core.

Their pupils have the same right to participate in the benefits of public welfare and education legislation as any other children. To ignore their rights and the rights of their parents is contrary to the tradition of America and the spirit of fair play and justice, which have always characterized our Nation.

12. What is the position of Catholics on the need for Federal aid?

Answer. Historically, American Catholics have held that education is the concern of the State and of the local community. This position, however, had little or nothing to do with faith and morals. In terms of belief and discipline, there is no "Catholic" position on Federal aid. There are only positions held by Catholics. That is why the hierarchy recently advised Catholics to study the facts and reach their own conclusions. Thus Archbishop Karl J. Alter, of Cincinnati, chairman of the administrative board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, said: "The question of whether or not there ought to be Federal aid is a judgment to be based on objective, economic facts connected with the schools of the country. Consequently, Catholics are free to take a position in accordance with the facts." Part of the problem, of course, is that the facts themselves are in dispute. Advocates and opponents of Federal aid argue vigorously over State financial capabilities, classroom shortages, and the qualifications and salaries of teachers.

13. What are the findings of several disinterested research studies?

Answer. "Taxes for the Schools," published by the Institute for Social Science Research, Roger A. Freeman reaches the conclusion that all the needs of the elementary and secondary public schools can easily be met from State and local tax resources. He shows that public school enrollment in the last 20 years has gone up 42 percent while public school expenditures have shot up 567 percent. Even allowing for inflation, these figures show the ability of localities to support increases in school enrollment.

2. The alleged classroom shortage is also questionable. In December 1959, Louis Conger, Chief of the Projection Section in the U.S. Office of Education, estimated that 61,000 new classrooms would be needed annually during the ensuing 10 years. But without Federal aid, classroom construction has been actually running at a higher rate than that for more than 5 years already.

3. The number of teachers and their salaries has also been increasing. Between 1953 and 1959, the certified staff in public schools increased 34 percent, while the number of pupils grew by only 25 percent. Teachers' salaries have increased 40 percent in constant dollars since 1950.

Hence the objective findings of disinterested research show that the need for the Federal Government to enter into education on the elementary or secondary school levels is at least open to question and discussion.

14. Who are the chief proponents of Federal aid?

Answer. Public schoolteachers and administrators, especially through their organizations, the National Education Association and the Council of Chief State School Officers. Writing in the "New Republic" (Jan. 30, 1961) Christopher Jancks reports that the Governors and legislators of the various States, who are in the best position to know their educational needs, have shown little, if any, enthusiasm for Federal aid. "The only people," he says, "who consistently favor Federal action are educators of various sorts. * * * Federal support of the public schools could make private schools less able to compete in terms of teachers' salaries and school facilities, and might gradually tip the scales against them." Surely the latter is a motive which few fair-minded Americans would approve.

15. What is the position of Catholic bishops on nonprofit independent schools sharing in any Federal aid program?

Answer. Speaking in behalf of the bishops previously mentioned, Archbishop Alter said: "In the event that there is Federal aid to education, we are deeply convinced that in justice Catholic schoolchildren be given the right to participate." Similarly, Cardinal Ritter remarked: "If public funds are raised for the educational benefit of the children in America, then all children should share in that benefit."

16. What is the position of the Catholic laity on nonprofit independent schools sharing in any Federal aid program?

Answer. Although there have been a few dissenting voices, the public statements of leading Catholic laymen and laywomen and of their organizations have been in vigorous support of the right of all parents, children, and schools to share in any massive Federal educational program.

17. Why do Catholics believe that all schoolchildren should share in the benefits of any Federal aid program?

Answer. "It is unthinkable," declared Cardinal Spellman of New York, "that any American child be denied Federal funds because his parents choose for him a God-centered education." Catholics think it un-American for the Federal Government to say: "We will help you educate your child, and help him to become a more useful citizen, but only if you send him to a school in which he will learn nothing about his Catholic faith from the age of 6 to 18."

18. What is the principal argument used by those who wish to exclude private schools from Federal aid?

Answer. The principal argument they use is that including the private schools in the Federal program would violate the separation of church and state, which they say is commanded by the first amendment.

19. What does the first amendment say?

Answer. It says: "Congress shall make no law regarding an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." By forbidding the establishment of a national or state church, it safeguards the religious liberty of the individual. But it also does more: it forbids the Federal Government to lay burdens on the exercise of religious freedom which are not reasonably necessary to the attainment of important national purposes.

20. Do the nonprofit schools conducted by Protestants, Jews, and Catholics render a public as well as a private service?

Answer. Yes. In addition to teaching religion, these schools teach, with a competence equal to that of the public schools, the secular subjects taught in the latter. They thus render a valuable public service and should be included by the Government in any program to achieve educational excellence. To refuse to make public benefits available through these schools is to discriminate against them in favor of a religiously neutral school system. Many of the Founding Fathers of the Republic would be shocked at such discrimination. More importantly, such discrimination will frustrate the achievement of the proclaimed objective of Federal aid, the maximum development of every young American's capacity.

21. How many students are enrolled in Catholic schools?

Answer. A total of 5,663,648 students in 13,961 schools. Of these, 321,000 are in 267 colleges and universities, 41,871 in 537 seminaries, 886,295 in 2,433 high schools, and 4,414,482 in 10,724 elementary schools. They are taught by 168,677 full-time teachers, and the operating costs per year amount to about $2.3 billion. Approximately the same number of Catholic students are also enrolled in public schools. In many large cities a substantial percentage of the total public and private school enrollment is in Catholic schools; for example: Chicago 34 percent; Philadelphia 39 percent; and Pittsburgh 42 percent.

22. What is the enrollment in other church-supported schools?

Answer. About 400,000 students. Lutherans have 180,000 students in approximately 1,500 schools, including 30 high schools. Episcopalians have 480 schools with a total enrollment of 37,000. Other denominations have about 200,000 students in their schools.

23. How many are enrolled in other private schools?

Answer. About 900,000 students. This makes a total of about 6.8 million students in private schools, about one-fifth the number in public schools.

24. Do these private schools greatly reduce taxes?

Answer. Yes. The average annual cost for the education of a pupil in a public elementary and secondary school is $496, and for a college or university student is $1,414.05. This means that Catholics alone, by bearing the whole cost of educating 5,300,777 elementary and high school pupils and 321,000 college and university students, reduce the public school tax by $3,083,095,442.

If we add the savings effected by the education of the 400,000 students in other church-related schools and 900,000 in nondenominational schools, the educational tax bill of the general public is reduced more than another billion—a total savings well in excess of $4 billion.

25. Do parents who send their own children to private nonprofit schools pay additional funds for the education of other children?

Answer. Yes. After paying for the education of their own children, parents are taxed for the education of their neighbors' children in the public schools. This means that they carry double their share of the educational burden. But that is not all. On the $4 billion they pay for the education of their children in private nonprofit schools, parents are subjected to still another financial outlay, the income tax exacted by the Federal and State governments. Incredible as it seems, the payment made for the education of their children in independent nonprofit schools, though they save other parents more than $4 billion, are not deductible. This means that these parents bear a triple financial burden for the education of the Nation's youth.

26. Is this fact generally known?

Answer. No. Comparatively few people are aware of the staggering financial burden placed upon parents who send their children to any private nonprofit school, church related on nondenominational.

27. Is this triple burden fair?

Answer. No. It is discriminatory, unfair, unjust, and inequitable. It can be reconciled only with the greatest difficulty to the constitutional guarantee of equal protection of the laws.

28. What would the proposed Federal aid to elementary and high schools mean taxwise to millions of parents?

Answer. It would mean that the parents who send their children to private nonprofit schools are to be subjected to still another heavy financial burden—a fourth—from which their children would derive no assistance. They are expressly excluded from sharing in any of its benefits—a direct contradiction of the announced purpose of the bill: "the maximum development of every young American's capacity."

29. Isn't it true, though, that everyone pays public school taxes, whether he has children in the public schools or not, and that everyone benefits from the education given to children in public schools?

Answer. Yes. But people who are both taxpayers and parents do not benefit equally from their taxes and the public school system. Those who send their children to public schools do not have any additional educational expense; those who send their children to private nonprofit schools must shell out considerable extra money for the education of their children.

30. Why doesn't everyone send his children to public schools?

Answer. Some people are wealthy and do not mind the extra expense. Some are snobbish and do not want their children in the public school. Some have unusually gifted or retarded children, and want the special training available in private schools. But the reason most people send their children to private schools is religious; they do not want their children to get their secular education in complete isolation from religion. This is especially true of Orthodox Jews, Catholics, Episcopalians, Lutherans, and Seventh-day Adventists. The sincerity of these people's religious beliefs puts them at a tremendous tax disadvantage—so tremendous that it is in effect a public penalty for religious conviction.

31. Didn't the Supreme Court decide in the recent Sunday laws cases that the first amendment doesn't protect the exercise of religious liberty against economic disadvantages?

Answer. No. The Court held that the economic disadvantage which results to Jews and other Sabbatarians from Sunday closing laws is permitted by the Constitution because it is unavoidable; granting exemptions to Sabbatarians, the Court said, might well ruin the effectiveness of the Sunday laws, which are intended to provide a common day of rest. Several of the opinions in the Sunday laws cases strongly suggest that avoidable economic disadvantages are unconstitutional.

32. Has the Supreme Court upheld the right of parents to determine the education of their children?

Answer. Yes. In 1922 a law was enacted in Oregon requiring all children between 8 and 16 to attend public schools. In a unanimous decision the Supreme Court declared it unconstitutional and contrary to the basic principle of liberty upon which our whole government rests.

"The fundamental theory of liberty," declared the Court, "upon which all governments in this Union repose, excludes any general power of the State to standardize its children by forcing them to accept instruction from public school teachers only. The child is not the mere creature of the State; those who nurture him and direct his destiny have the right, coupled with the high duty, to recognize and prepare him for additional obligations."

33. What is one of the most obvious and important implications of this decision?

Answer. It is that the exercise of a constitutional right must not be made excessively difficult or onerous. To recognize a right and then make it intolerably burdensome to exercise is virtually to nullify it. A right is meaningless unless it is clothed with the means to practice it.

Thus the right to life in our country really means the right to a job or to a livelihood provided by the government. Otherwise the right is a merely verbal one without substance or meaning. So likewise society must breathe the breath of economic and social reality into parents' constitutional right to determine the education of their children and send them to the schools of their choice.

34. How can the State implement the parents' rights?

Answer. By freeing parents from the burden of double school payments, to say nothing of triple and quadruple ones. The State should help provide secular education in all competent schools, regardless of the religious doctrine which may also be taught or not taught in the schools. This does not mean that the public school system should be abolished. It does mean that it should not be made a sacred cow. The public school system, indeed, is essential for the literacy and culture of our country. Most American parents want it and are generally satisfied with it. They have a right to its continuation and excellence. They do not have a right to force it on everyone else.

35. Do other democratic countries pay for secular education in church-related schools?

Answer. Yes, practically all the countries of Western Europe. Visitors from those countries are shocked when they are told that a great democracy such as the United States provides no aid. In the Netherlands, public funds provide the entire cost of the education of children in both church-related and public schools. Parents are free to send their children to either type of school.

In the primary grades Catholic schools enroll 43 percent of the pupils; Protestant schools, 27 percent; public schools, 28 percent; the remaining 2 percent are in nonsectarian private schools. The system is highly acclaimed by all citizens as eminently fair and just, and in accord with the spirit of a genuine democracy. Here freedom of education is not an empty phrase but a living reality.

36. What is the system in England and Wales?

Answer. Publicly financed schools are divided into the voluntary controlled and the voluntary aided. The first are entirely supported by public funds, while the latter receive 75 percent of their funds from the Government. The "controlled" schools follow a common religious syllabus, while the "aided" schools determine their own religious instruction. The majority of Catholic and Anglican schools fall into the latter category.

37. How does Ireland meet this problem?

Answer. The Constitution of the Irish Republic provides that "the state shall not oblige parents in violation of their conscience and lawful preference to send their children to school established by the state or to any type of school designated by the state."

The state pays practically all the costs of teachers' salaries and school construction. Though the country is about 97 percent Catholic, it is careful to protect the rights of religious minorities and provide them with the same generous aid given to the majority. The Irish Republic thus sets an inspiring example of true democratic action for the rest of the world.

38. What about other European countries?

Answer. In one form or another, parents who send their children to church-related schools get public aid in France, Western Germany, Belgium, Switzerland, Sweden, Norway, Italy, and Israel. The general principle underlying the legislation in these countries is that such nonprofit private schools render a valuable public service which the Government should in justice help support.

39. What is the system in Canada?

Answer. The system varies in the different provinces. In the populous Province of Quebec public funds help parents educate their children in church-related schools. The Province of Ontario has a public school system, and a separate school system, almost wholly Catholic. The separation is made at the tax level. Education in the Catholic schools is paid for by the taxes on the real estate of Catholics, and education in the public schools is paid for by the taxes on the real estate of non-Catholics. In other words, the taxpayer designates to which school system his tax money is to be applied. This is an eminently fair and just arrangement and one that we in the United States of America might well follow.

40. How does the United States of America school arrangement impress most Canadians?

Answer. As anomalous, unfair, and undemocratic. When an educator from Toronto was told that parents have to bear the entire cost of sending their children to a nonprofit church-related school which teaches the secular branches taught in the public school and does so with equal competence, and that the parents are then taxed for the public school as well, he was astonished and horrified.

"Why," he remarked, "that's like buying groceries for your own family and then being compelled to pay a large share of your neighbor's grocery bill. I had thought that the United States was friendly toward religion in general and appreciative of the religious and moral instruction of youth, instead of placing an exorbitant price tag upon it." How apt is his characterization of the present anomalous situation in our country. It is strangely out of keeping with the whole spirit of the Constitution and the traditions of American justice and fairplay.

41. Why does a great democracy such as the United States lag so far behind virtually all the democracies of Western Europe and Canada in aid to all parents and children for educational purposes?

Answer. 1. Because most Americans have never thought seriously about it in terms of parental, educational and religious freedom.

2. Because many non-Catholic Americans are still afraid and ignorant of the Catholic Church.

3. Because of the mistaken notion that such aid is forbidden by the first amendment to the Constitution.

4. Because the complete case for such Federal aid has never been presented on a national scale.

5. Because of the failure to make unmistakably clear that no aid is asked by parents for the religious aspects of education in a nonprofit church-related school.

6. Because previously the discussion has centered around such fringe benefits of public welfare legislation as bus transportation, school lunch program, textbooks and medical and dental inspection of pupils, and not upon aid for the teaching of secular branches in private nonprofit schools.

42. Does the Constitution prohibit public financing in nonprofit independent schools of the teaching, not of religion, but of the same subjects taught in the public schools?

Answer. No. The Supreme Court held in the famous Everson case (1947) that tax money may be used to transport children to both public and private nonprofit schools (including church-related schools), because of the public benefit from the secular education given in both public and private schools. If the public can bring the child to the school, it is difficult to see why the public cannot teach him arithmetic in the school.

43. But aren't all subjects in Catholic schools taught from the Catholic point of view?

Answer. No. There is no Catholic point of view on arithmetic, geometry, physics, English literature, and many other subjects. Religion pervades the entire curriculum of a Catholic school only in the sense that the atmosphere is Catholic and that the relevance of religious to secular knowledge is made clear to the students. The Popes and bishops have urged repeatedly that the education in Catholic schools must be first rate in its secular as well as its religious aspects.

44. But wouldn't helping parents send their children to church-related schools aid religion, in violation of the first amendment?

Answer. No. The objection that such help would benefit religion is answered by the fact that the denial of the help hurts religion. But the recent decisions of the Supreme Court in the Sunday closing law cases have shown once again that mere help or hurt to religion from nonreligious governmental programs is not automatically fatal to the program's constitutionality. If the only way government can achieve an important nonreligious public purpose is through a program which aids or harms religion, then the program is constitutional unless the nonreligious public purpose is not important enough to counterbalance the aid or harm to religion.

Since Government cannot compel all parents to send their children to public schools, the only way government can achieve the urgent purpose of developing the intellectual resources of all American children to the fullest is by making improved secular education available in all competent schools, public and private. The fact that religious organizations running church-related schools will be better off from such a comprehensive program should be regarded as an extra benefit to the Nation, not as a detriment. The Supreme Court has said, after all, that "we are a religious people, whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being" (Justice Douglas in the *Zorach* case of 1952). Even nonbelievers, however, should be able to see that the improvement of the secular education of all American children is more important to the national welfare and defense than the secondary and unavoidable benefits to religious organizations. To say that these benefits make it impossible for government to provide better secular instruction in church-related schools is to make such schools obstacles to the national welfare and defense. There is nothing in the Constitution, the decisions of the Supreme Court, or the history of our Nation to justify such a result.

45. What do outstanding authorities on constitutional law say on this point?

Answer. Many of them declare that there is no clause in the Constitution which prevents public financing of secular education in church-related schools. They point out that the first amendment was designed to protect and promote religious freedom, not to destroy it by erecting one single type of school into a State-supported monopoly of education.

Most of the Founding Fathers were religious men. They protected religion in the Constitution and spoke with reverence of God. George Washington aptly expressed their sentiments when he said in his Farewell Address: "Reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle."

All the schools of the colonies and of the American Republic until about the middle of the 19th century were religious schools. The Founding Fathers knew nothing of the school from which all religious instruction is excluded and never envisaged it as the type that would become the most common. It is a late arrival on the American scene and totally alien to the religious traditions of the founders of our Republic.

46. What does Professor Sutherland say about the constitutionality of public aid in the form of long-term loans to public and to nonprofit private schools for school purposes generally?

Answer. An eminent authority on constitutional law, Prof. Arthur E. Sutherland of Harvard, was asked by Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK for his judgment on this matter. After studying the matter with great care Professor Sutherland reaches the conclusion that there is no clear constitutional prohibition against such aid.

"Assuming," he concludes, "that the existing Federal aid to education is constitutional—which seems to me a reasonable assumption—the distinction between these existing programs and the proposal which I discuss is not sufficiently evident to persuade me that a measure providing for long-term loans of the character which I have described, to aid education in basic lay subjects, would conflict with the provisions of the first amendment."

47. What does Dr. Robert M. Hutchins say on this point?

Answer. The president of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions and the former chancellor of the University of Chicago and dean of the Yale University Law School pointed out that tax exemption is given private schools because they are performing a public service. "If they are," he said, "and if this is a service that would otherwise have to be performed by the public, then there is no reason why private organizations should not receive appropriate assistance from the Government."

Objections raised against including such schools in the Federal program of aid to education, he characterized as "incompetent, irrelevant, and immaterial." He cited the GI bill that gave thousands of servicemen Federal funds to attend the college of their choice, public or private.

48. Have other noted authorities expressed similiar opinions?

Answer. Yes, hundreds have. Example: Twenty-one prominent jurists, including former Attorney General James P. McGranery, were requested to prepare an opinion on this subject. After painstaking study they reached the unanimous conclusion that there is nothing in the Constitution, which prevents public funds from being used to pay for the public service rendered by nonprofit schools in teaching pupils all the secular subjects taught in the public school.

"Once Congress decides that Federal aid is necessary," they say, "there should be full equality of treatment with respect to all children whether they be enrolled in public, private, or church-related schools. This is a matter of high principle. The parochial schools of this country are discharging a public service. They provide an educational program which fully satisfies present governmental standards for competence.

"The state and all the citizens thereof benefit from this educational effort. If massive Federal expenditures are to be made from the tax collections of all the people, this aid should not go only to a select segment, however large, of the population. To the extent that parochial schools provide a recognized and accredited secular education they are entitled to equal treatment."

49. Did not the first amendment erect a wall of separation, high and impenetrable, between church and state?

Answer. Yes, but not in all respects.

In the Zorach case Mr. Justice Douglas said: "The first amendment, however, does not say that in every and all respect there shall be a separation of church and state. Rather, it studiously defines the manner, the specific ways, in which there shall be no concert or union or dependency one on the other. That is the common sense of the matter. Otherwise the state and religion would be aliens to each other—hostile, suspicious, and even unfriendly."

50. What do other eminent authorities say on this matter?

Answer. Wilber G. Katz, former dean of the University of Chicago Law School and an expert on constitutional law, points out: "The basic American principle of church-state relations is not separation but religious liberty. * * * Separation ordinarily promotes religious freedom; it is defensible so long as it does, and only so long."

In his well-reasoned dissent in the *McCollum* case, Mr. Justice Reed suggests that the Court should return to the language of the amendment and interpret it rather than Jefferson's phrase, "wall of separation." It is a wise suggestion, for the meaning of the metaphor has become so confused that many can't distinguish the figure of speech from the principles involved.

51. What does the first amendment really mean?

Answer. Simply that, in ordinary circumstances, the Government may not directly and actively maintain or support any religion. Hence it prohibits any legislation designed to favor directly a particular religion. The key words are "in ordinary circumstances" plus "directly" and "actively." The anmdment doesn't forbid nonreligious legislation which has only an incidental or secondary effect upon religious activity or which accords religious people the same benefits afforded the general public. It does not forbid chaplains for the inmates of penitentiaries, hospital patients, or military personnel.

Thus Prof. Edward S. Corwin of Princeton, one of our foremost authorities on constitutional law, says: "The historical record shows beyond peradventure that the core idea of an 'establishment of religion' comprises the idea of preference; and that any act of public authority favorable to religion in general cannot, without manifest falsification of history, be brought under the ban of that phrase."

52. What is the danger in the proposed Federal aid to education exclusively through development of public schools?

Answer. It tends to achieve indirectly what is forbidden by the Constitution: compelling attendance at public schools. By combining its taxing power with its spending power, Government can gradually force public education willy-nilly down the throats of all citizens just as surely as by a specific ordinance.

"The real threats," points out the commission of 21 Washington lawyers, "lies in the unconstitutional threat posed by and inherent in any large-scale spending program solely for the benefit of public schools. * * * We can justify a demand that publicly collected moneys be distributed to all those who participate in the task of education, not just those in secular schools. Otherwise Government is on the side of the secularists."

53. Who are to be the beneficiaries of the proposed legislation?

Answer. The schoolchildren of America. The Government subsidies are to be provided so that there be achieved "the maximum development of every young American's capacity." Hence all pupils, regardless of the school attended, should share in these benefits. Otherwise the right of parents to determine the education of their children by sending them to schools of their choice will virtually be nullified. To count nonpublic, nonprofit schoolchildren "in" for purposes of taxation and "out" for distribution of taxes, as the proposed bill does, is unfair, unjust, and un-American to the core.

54. What is the bearing of the U.S. Supreme decision in the "Everson" case upon the proposed Federal aid bill?

Answer. The New Jersey law reimbursed parents for the cost of public transportation of their children to and from school, regardless of the school attended. Its constitutionality was challenged on the grounds that religious institutions were thereby benefited. Upholding the legislation, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the purpose of the legislation was nonreligious, and that the religious effects did not invalidate it.

55. What is the import of the decision in the Cochran case?

Answer. A Louisiana law provided that secular textbooks be furnished to all the children, whether they attended public or nonprofit private schools, including church-related institutions. Sustaining the legislation, the Supreme Court ruled that the books were primarily for the education of children, not for the benefit of the schools. "It may be significant," points out Professor Sutherland, "that in those cases (Everson and Cochran) the aim of the legislation was not religious indoctrination but the safety and the lay educational advancement of the schoolchild—the aim which I assume the Congress would have if it were to provide for such loans"—i.e., to nonprofit private schools, church-related and nondenominational.

56. What important distinction is brought out in both these decisions?

Answer. The distinction between the nonreligious character of the legislation and the religious effects of the legislation. There

is nothing in the Constitution prohibiting the use of public funds for the education of children in secular subjects, for transporting them to schools where those branches of learning are taught, or for providing them with textbooks for the same.

57. What legislative enactments are based upon the principle of equal treatment of students under the law?

Answer. The GI bill, the Federal scholarship plan, the College Housing Act of 1950, the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act of 1956 and parts of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Under these laws students receive Federal grants to defray their tuition at colleges, public or church-related. As the extension of Federal aid to students on the secondary and elementary level would involve only the same principle, it would be equally constitutional.

58. What then are some ways in which Federal aid may legally be extended to students in private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools, both church-related and nondenominational?

Answer. By providing such pupils with nonreligious textbooks and supplies, and by making available to them certain nonreligious educational services.

2. By some form of limited grant or benefit to the parents of all schoolchildren, including the parents of those attending private nonprofit schools. Examples: Parents might be reimbursed in part for tuition payments or Congress might provide them an income tax benefit in the form of a limited deduction, exemption, or credit.

3. By a program of matching grants or long-term low-interest loans for nonreligious facilities and equipment, in which both public and private nonprofit schools, including church-related institutions, would participate.

59. Does formal religious instruction in church-related schools occupy much of the teaching time?

Answer. No, only a small fraction—about 2½ out of 25 hours a week. Most of all the efforts, time, and funds are devoted to the teaching of secular subjects taught in the public school. In many of the facilities of the church-related schools, such as the gymnasiums, cafeterias, laboratories, and medical and dental offices, no religious instruction is involved.

60. Are Catholics the only one seeking to have their children share in the proposed Federal aid to education?

Answer. No. Members of other faiths are equally concerned. Speaking at the congressional hearing on this bill, Rabbi Morris Sherer, executive vice president of Agudath Israel of America, said: "Our organization of Orthodox Jews has chapters in every part of the United States and includes thousands of rabbis and communal leaders, amongst them the foremost Jewish scholars and religious authorities. We strongly favor Federal aid to parochial schools. * * * The Jewish parent who sends his child to a parochial school should not be unduly penalized for exercising the right of free choice, implicit in the American way of life, to educate his children in accordance with his religious conscience. * * *

"The memorandum distributed yesterday to Congress by the administration's attorney against Federal aid to parochial schools, conversely tends to prove that there is no clear-cut 'black and white' thinking on this issue of constitutionality. The brief is so full of loopholes, and draws so many hazy distinctions between legal and illegal aid, that it actually serves to add weight to our contention that diehard opposition to Federal aid to the secular programs of parochial schools is filled with inconsistencies."

61. What is the stand of Citizens for Educational Freedom?

Answer. This is a national organization of citizens of all faiths. At a congressional hearing, its president, David L. LaDriere, reported that his organization favors tuition grants for children in both public and church-related schools. "Fair treatment of children in nonprofit schools," he said, "involves complete equality with those in public schools, so far as Federal aid is concerned."

62. What does Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, advocate?

Answer. A prominent Methodist and former president of Ohio Wesleyan University, Dr. Flemming urges Congress to approve a program of loans for nonprofit private and church-related elementary and secondary schools. He suggests that Congress put aside the controversial feature of the present bill giving Government aid for public teachers' salaries and concentrate on a program of school construction.

63. What does Life magazine recommend?

Answer. In an editorial on this subject in its March 17, 1961, issue, Life said: "Certainly education needs all the going concerns it can get; the greater variety the better and the more religious schools the better too. * * * Democracy depends on education; but does that mean it can depend primarily on nonreligious education, which is often in effect antireligious? Protestants, Catholics and Jews have a lot more thinking to do on this subject."

64. What does Will Herberg say on this subject?

Answer. A distinguished author and professor of Judaic studies at Drew University, Dr. Herberg says: "Justice, I think, is entirely on the side of those who call for public support to parochial and other religious schools performing a public function; so also is the practice of other democratic countries, where, almost without exception, religious schools meeting the set requirements are given public support as public institutions."

65. What does Prof. Henry Steele Commager propose?

Answer. In the New York Times magazine of February 26, 1961, the distinguished American historian of Amherst College, Dr. Commager, makes substantially the same recommendation: "Society requires education because it has a paramount interest in an educated citizenry. * * * The problem of reconciling the tradition of separation of church and state with public aid to denominational colleges and universities is more complex and perplexing. Perhaps it is sufficient here to note that our academic cousins, the British and the Canadians, seem to have solved the problem by giving state aid to both public and denominational schools without impairing either religious or intellectual freedom, and that the time may have come when we should rethink our own traditional and instinctive attitudes in this area.

"Taxes to support higher education are like taxes to support elementary education, strengthen national defense, build roads, maintain hospitals, safeguard the young, operate libraries and museums, and maintain public order. The principle that underlies all of these enterprises is that they are essential to the well-being of society."

66. What important truths emerge from this friendly discussion?

Answer. 1. There is nothing in the Constitution that forbids the use of public funds, Federal, State, or community, for the education of the youth of America in all subjects except religion, in public, nonprofit church-related, or other private schools.

2. The method of allocating such funds must be worked out carefully, assigning them either to the students or their parents. The proposal of the Citizens for Educational Freedom that tuition grants, equal in amount to the help made available to public school children, be given in certificates to all other students, negotiable only at the school of their choice, fits in admirably with all the decisions of the Supreme Court.

3. No public funds may be allocated for the teaching of religion. This reflects the common interpretation of the Constitution at the present time. Whether that is to be the enduring view, only time can tell. We agree, however, with Life's editorial that all of us, Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, have "a lot more thinking to do on this subject" before we settle permanently for an education that is entirely divorced from basic religious and spiritual values.

4. What is desperately needed to settle the issue of a just and fair use of taxpayers' money in the education of the youth of America is an open mind and a willingness to consider with sympathy and understanding the views on both sides of this important question. Where there is such an open mind, good will, a spirit of brotherhood and a sense of fairness will find a reasonable solution. It is the purpose of this friendly discussion to contribute to that solution and thus to deepen our national unity and solidarity in spite of all our differences in race, color, and creed.

Discussion and Disagreement Are the Unique Strength of Our System, but Never in Our History Has Our National Unity Been More Firmly Forged, Republican Chairman Declares

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, yesterday there occurred in the House of Representatives an outstanding demonstration of bipartisanship when that body passed the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1961 by the overwhelming vote of 354 yeas to 62 nays.

There is need for a greater expression of bipartisanship and more movements in the interest of national unity.

Mr. President, in this regard I am privileged to invite attention to a speech by Chairman Carl Shipley of the Republican State Committee for the District of Columbia to the Reciprocity Club of Washington, D.C., on January 19, 1962. The subject of Mr. Shipley's remarks was "National Unity."

I have had occasion to differ with Mr. Shipley and have answered some of his prior remarks in this forum. I can understand and appreciate, therefore, his action in forwarding to me a copy of his Reciprocity Club speech with the appropriate comment: "Not all of my talks are critical of the President. I am enclosing one just to prove it."

Mr. Shipley's comments on national unity were made subsequent to the President's state of the Union message. I believe it is appropriate that they be accorded our cognizance and appreciation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the excerpts from his January 19, 1962, remarks which Mr. Shipley so thoughtfully supplied.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL UNITY

(Remarks of District GOP Chairman Carl Shipley to the Reciprocity Club, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C., January 19, 1962)

I am honored to be here today at the invitation of my good friend, Arthur Clarendon Smith, who has done so much for Washington.

Let not your enemies, or friends, around the world mistake the current debate on the President's state of the Union message for disunity. Never in our history has our national unity been more firmly forged. This is the result of our two-party system—one party entrusted by the people in a free election with executive responsibility, and the other bound by an honorable obligation to the electoral minority to criticize constructively, offer alternatives, stimulate thoughtful consideration of administration proposals. Congress is the policymaking branch of our Government. The people's representatives exercise the ultimate power. Only Congress can levy taxes, appropriate funds or make the laws. Congress can nullify a treaty, void a Supreme Court decision, invalidate an Executive agreement, reverse an Executive order. In short, the American people are sovereign, and we stand united behind our President in a national purpose to defeat communism everywhere it seeks to enslave the free.

The President is our national leader, elected by all the people, and he knows and the world must know we all support him as he executes the laws and administers the policies established by the people's Congress. Discussion and disagreement are the unique strength of our system. Those not familiar with our strange and wonderful system of government should take care not to confuse this strength with the weakness of disunity.

We Republicans—and that includes Barry Goldwater, Nelson Rockefeller, Dick Nixon and George Romney—can give particular support to the goal President Kennedy set for his administration recently. He told one important gathering:

"When business does well in this country, we have full employment, and this country is moving ahead, then it strengthens our image as a prosperous and vital country in this great fight in which we are engaged. * * * We are unable to maintain the kind of high employment which we must maintain unless [business is] making profits, and reinvesting, and producing; * * * the business community must prosper."

We are now in the midst of a business upturn without inflation—a rare experience. President Kennedy wisely said in his state of the Union message that "our wage and price gains must be consistent with productivity to hold the line on prices." The Republican Party will give complete support to the President in implementing this policy.

At another place the President told Congress "our goal must be a reasonable equilibrium in our balance of payments." He will have Republican support as he leads our country toward this goal along the path he outlined for his administration. He said:

"We shall continue to attract foreign tourists and investments to our shores, to seek increased military purchases here by our allies, to maximize foreign aid procurement from American firms, to urge increased aid from other fortunate nations to the less fortunate."

We agree with the President's statement that "our tax policies must spur modernization of our plants," and with his observation that "our export credit and promotion campaigns for American industries must continue to expand."

We Republicans believe in a general welfare state, where individual self-reliance and business enterprise are left unfettered to prosper. This is the only sure road to the full dinner pail, to a full employment economy, to an ever-increasing national growth rate. There is no other way to guarantee that every person ready, willing and able to work shall have employment equal to his capacity, regardless of race or creed. There is no other way to provide an adequate minimum of food, clothing, shelter and medical aid for those who without fault are unable to care for themselves or their families.

Spokesmen for our two great political parties must of necessity concentrate on the sharp differences in party policy. This, I suppose, might be called the theatrics of politics. Through emphasis on differences we arrive at the general consensus which most of the people will support most of the time. Unfortunately, it obscures the fact that on the vast majority of proposals and in a great majority of cases all Americans share a common conviction as to what is best for the national interest. But no one in the world should mistake the pyrotechnics of politics for disunity. We Americans, products as we are of our great melting pot, and regardless of race, religion, color or national origin, are bound together by chains of mutual respect and concern that no one can put asunder. We are brothers in the world's noblest experiment in representative government.

Vice President JOHNSON once stated his personal creed. It impressed me because it commenced, I believe, with "I am an American first." He placed all other considerations, including his responsibility as a partisan Democrat, a long way down the line. All of us should follow his wise guidance, and place our country's welfare ahead of all else—especially partisan advantage. Let all Americans, regardless of political party, join with President Kennedy in moving toward the vital national goal of business prosperity he has outlined. This is one area where the two great political parties stand on common ground.

What Price Coexistence?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the Soviets' offer of coexistence is one which must be met with caution. The past is altogether clear that what the Soviets say is not necessarily the truth as to how they will act.

Some sound editorial comments are contained in this article from the Antelope Valley Ledger-Gazette of February 15, 1962. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I commend the editorial to the attention of the Members.

WHAT PRICE COEXISTENCE?

Coexistence with Russia seems to have become an American foreign policy. News stories that Khrushchev is in trouble and needs some American support to keep his regime in power keep coming in (a regime that has no good at all to be said of it, from the millions of Ukrainians starved to death in the late 1920's under Khrushchev's tutelage, to the barbarous killings in Hungary, East Germany, and Poland in the uprisings of the middle 1950's.

Walter Lippmann, who has always believed that there will be no peace unless the great powers can get together, evidences the latest evidence of an American foreign policy of coexistence. He writes that in trading Abel, the Russian spy, for Powers, the American spy, Russia took back nothing, while giving up the only evidence they have that they can show their people that the Americans are devils scheming the downfall of Russia.

This being so, writes Lippmann, the trading of spies can only mean that Russia wants to improve conditions between the United States and Russia.

Well, we certainly hope that Russia wants to improve conditions with the United States. This would be all to the good. The problem is, as it always will be, when can we determine that what Russia does is for the general good of peace, or just prelude to a drive to gain another advantage?

Mr. Lippmann thinks he can make that judgment, and he has made it.

We think he is playing fast and loose with reason. The facts simply are that Abel has been traded for Powers. We can add to that that Khrushchev immediately asked for a summit conference and that it has been tentatively turned down. With the sorry history of summit conferences for a reference, certainly there is no solace to take from them.

No, Mr. Lippmann, over the years you have sought so firmly to believe that there is a point at which a balance can be struck with the Russians that would tend to reduce tensions, that you offer us as fact what is really conjecture, and dangerous conjecture at that.

We think it is just as reasonable to assume that Mr. Abel is worth more in Russia than in an American jail, he is an expert spy; and that Mr. Powers is worth nothing for he is not an expert spy. The exchange may tend to reduce tensions, but it is certainly true that if experience tells us anything, the Russians feel they have wrung all the usefulness out of the U-2 incident that they can.

Certainly calling for another summit conference with Powers still in a Russia jail would not have had a chance of success, for it was Power's capture that led Khrushchev to break up the Paris summit conference with a display of peasant oafishness that made great news stories but did not add to his stature.

We have to think when we read the news, think constantly and steadily. For every opinion we read, there is another that we may not read, and we will have to find it for ourselves, using our own reasoning.

There will have to be a lot more evidence that Russia is ready to become reasonable before we can believe it.

It is much safer to reason that our military power is great enough to induce caution—and that the release of Powers is evidence of this use of caution by Russia.

Not that coexistence will now be safe for us. You cannot coexist with evil.

W.J.V.

Plans To Share Nuclear Weapons and Information With Our Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article

written by our distinguished colleague, Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico, entitled "The Test Debate: We Need To Know More." The article was carried by the New York Times magazine in its issue of February 25.

I shall not attempt to write a review of this important statement, for it speaks for itself, and I know that it will be read by thousands of people in our country, as well as abroad. It is enough to say that it is a reasoned, thoughtful argument that, quoting Senator ANDERSON, "the public is also entitled to know more about our plans to share nuclear weapons and information with our allies," and "Americans should be told the extent of their oversea obligations." Beyond this, it is a plea that fuller information be given our people on the whole subject of our nuclear strength and nuclear tests.

Senator ANDERSON urges four important conclusions:

First. Release of fuller information on where the Russians stand in relation to U.S. nuclear strength;

Second. Deliberate action by the heads of departments to halt the odious practice of leaking classified information;

Third. Improvement of Defense Department security methods for protecting nuclear secrets to bring them into line with the AEC system; and

Fourth. A clampdown on the publication of technical weapons data of significant aid to unfriendly countries, or which contribute to the proliferation of atomic weapons.

Senator ANDERSON served many years as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and 4 years as its chairman. He has played a leading part in the development of our nuclear strength. His experience, thorough study, and judgment enable him to speak with an authority which deserves and receives attention and respect.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TEST DEBATE: WE NEED TO KNOW MORE

(By Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico)

WASHINGTON.—If the United States is still ahead in atomic weapons, why do we have to start testing again? This question has already touched off an intense and even vehement debate about both the danger and the value of testing. It gathers added heat as a decision by the President on nuclear testing in the atmosphere seems to be at hand.

Regretfully, the debate has been characterized more by heat than by facts. The American people need more knowledge about this issue, but excessive security may be keeping it from them.

My concern is that Government secrecy policies have imposed such narrow restrictions on what the public can be told that the test debate serves to befuddle rather than inform the people. There is enough that is awesome and frustrating about nuclear-weapons developments without the Government's imposing the added burden of confusion.

The controversy built up steam last September when the Russians again began detonating nuclear weapons. Arguments have been voiced on both sides of the question, with many prominent scientists urging our resumption of tests. They believe that the Russian tests displayed significant progress. I agree with them. Official Government spokesmen, however, have declared that this country continues to have the greatest atomic arsenal, with weapons of all sizes and functions. This leaves the public wondering: if that is so, why do we have to start testing in the atmosphere again?

This is not only a military matter; it is also a political and social question that should be intelligently discussed by an informed citizenry. It is their future that hangs in the balance.

That such an exchange of views is fundamental to our system of government was appreciated by Prof. Henry DeWolf Smyth who, in the closing days of World War II, prefaced his official account of the making of the atomic bomb by declaring: "The ultimate responsibility for our Nation's policy rests on its citizens and they can discharge such responsibilities wisely only if they are informed."

Present atomic secrecy practices are direct descendants of the measures taken during World War II to keep shrouded the Manhattan project, which sired the A-bomb. Early in the development of the weapon, the scientists who were aware of the destructive potential of the fission process imposed self-censorship on their own activities.

The basic security framework within which the Atomic Energy Commission now operates was derived from the Atomic Energy Act of 1946. Established by the act was a special statutory category of information called "restricted data," which was comprehensively defined to include virtually all atomic energy information.

By 1954, it was apparent that the law needed revision to make the atomic security system a more flexible tool of national policy. Major amendments were made in the law that year, including provision for the declassification of information that could be released "without undue risk to the common defense and security."

In the 1946 act, the criterion for declassification had been that the information could be published "without adversely affecting the common defense and security." The newer "undue risk" criterion recognizes that there is always an element of risk involved in declassifying information; it permits that risk to be weighed against the advantages to be gained by encouraging widespread dissemination of scientific and technical information relating to atomic energy.

This approach seeks security by achievement; that is, by the encouragement of research and development through free publication of information to advance our atomic art. In the final analysis, our best defense lies in accomplishment rather than concealment.

The condition of the world in which we find ourselves unquestionably justifies certain secrecy practices. To abandon them outright without reciprocal action on the part of the Soviet Union and other nations would threaten this Nation's defenses. Of increasing seriousness, too, is the fact that openness in atomic weaponry can accelerate the spread of nuclear arms to other nations—the so-called "*n*th-power" problem.

In the Times magazine 3 years ago I criticized abuses of the secrecy system in atomic energy. Many of us on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, as well as others, felt that extreme classification had retarded scientific progress. Disturbing us also was the fact that the public was being kept in the dark on fallout. The joint committee conducted public hearings to shed light on the nature of this unseen, unfelt pollutant.

There has been some improvement in recent years. For example, much of the information on our nuclear-driven rocket and nuclear powerplants for space satellites has been declassified. But the problem persists.

Our classification procedures can be ironic. At the same time that information in the realm of ideas and policy is kept hush-hush, technical information of military value is frequently released, to the marked advantage of unfriendly powers. The release of such data, I am convinced, results from the rather fierce competition for funds and mission assignments among the armed services, encouraged in large part by military contractors. Overclassification has encouraged "leaks" of information by some officials seeking to sway public opinion toward their own special interests despite possible damage to the broad public interest.

While there is a compelling need for meaningful public discussion of the broad issues involved in atomic armaments, the same arguments do not apply to the technical details of weapons and delivery systems. Even though the do-it-yourself spirit has taken firm root in home workshops, most persons are unable to fathom the intricacies of military gadgets. Moreover, I think it is fair to say that they have no desire to see the blueprints of an atomic bomb or know the operating characteristics of a submarine reactor (although at one time, I suggested that one of our early A-bombs be deactivated and displayed in Grand Central Station to remove some of the mystery in which these weapons are enveloped).

The United States operates an extensive and expensive intelligence apparatus to gather secrets of our enemies. Yet the kind of information this country pays dearly for in lives and treasure, other nations can obtain about us without risk—and free.

Well, not quite free. For $2.98, anyone can buy a plastic model of the Polaris submarine, the missile-carrying atomic-powered craft which is a key element in our deterrent strength. The model is based on official Navy blueprints and data furnished by the boatyard, according to a sheet of instructions accompanying each of the models.

Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover opposed release of this information because of its value to a foreign power. The toy model reveals the dimensions of the submarine, including the relative sizes of the reactor and machinery compartments, and indicates the size of the crew. Explaining his opposition, Rickover told the Joint Committee: "I see no reason why we should slave away and spend a lot of money and use up a lot of our talent and then just turn it over to a potential enemy. Can you conceive the Russians doing that?"

The Navy justified the release of the information to the model manufacturer on the ground that focusing attention on this vessel helps gain public support for the Polaris submarine program. There may be some truth in that from the Navy's standpoint, but in reality it was the Navy that originally dragged its feet on development of the nuclear submarine. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy campaigned determinedly for it, and the American people are convinced of its value. The Navy's concern appears tardy.

Our intelligence experts know how difficult it is to obtain photographs of secret Russian weapons. By contrast, available on any newsstand in this country are magazines carrying clear illustrations of advanced American arms. A case in point was a photograph showing a nuclear depth charge slung beneath one of our bombers. A little time spent with this picture would give photo interpreters valuable information about the antisubmarine weapon.

I make no brief for hiding basic scientific information. It is doubtful that fundamental knowledge can be kept secret, since experience demonstrates that scientists working far apart and unaware of each others' labors often have discovered the same concepts at virtually the same time. It is in technology that greater precautions must be taken.

The inconsistencies in secrecy procedures never cease to amaze me. Here are some more examples:

1. I recently picked up a copy of a nuclear-industry newsletter which had an extensive and authoritative report on radiation problems involved in atomic-propelled rockets. The report detailed the findings of a biomedical group at the AEC's Los Alamos laboratory.

The scientists, the report said, were optimistic about overcoming the radiation hazards of nuclear rockets. I have long advocated the development of this kind of space vehicle. When someone who saw the item in the newsletter asked for a copy of the report, it was denied because the document is classified.

2. "Confidential" was stamped on a document sent to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy by the State Department. It listed the names of persons from the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union who were representing their countries at the Geneva negotiations on cessation of atomic testing. Classifying the information in this confidential document was about as sensible as keeping the roster of the New York Yankees from the Cincinnati Reds; the members of the three delegations were known to the press as well as to those of us who had attended the Geneva talks.

3. Defense officials argued against public disclosure of the dates when the United States could fly a nuclear-powered rocket, although they maintained there was no military requirement for this craft. If the rocket isn't a military device, what difference does it make if another nation knows when it may fly? Incongruously, the Pentagon released the dates when the Atlas and Minuteman missiles would be operational.

Asked about this general problem of classification on another occasion Vice Adm. John M. Hoskins, Director of Declassification Policy, commented: "I've never known a man to be court-martialed for overclassifying a paper."

But overclassification presents more security problems than it solves. This was recognized by the Coolidge Committee on Secrecy Problems in the Defense Department when it warned that "overclassification has reached serious proportions."

"The result," the committee said, "is not only that the system fails to supply to the public information which its proper operation would supply, but the system has become so overloaded that proper protection of information which should be protected has suffered. The press regards the stamp of classification with feelings which vary from indifference to active contempt. Within the Department of Defense itself, the mass of classified papers has inevitably resulted in a casual attitude toward classified information, at least on the part of many."

Contrary to the popular notion that the military inherently is best able to keep secrets, evidence shows that the Defense Department's procedures for protecting atomic information are less stringent than those of the civilian AEC. Highly classified information, my experience shows, is passed on by Defense to personnel and contractors without the background investigation required for comparable transfer by the AEC. This is like trying to hold back the water by building a dam across half the river.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy's security subcommittee, of which I am chairman, has held the first of a series of hearings on what we believe is a double standard in the handling of nuclear secrets. A 1954 law stimplated that the Defense Department's regulations for safeguarding atomic secrets must be "adequate and in reasonable conformity" with those of the AEC. But recent months have brought a rash of leaks of secret information, apparently from the Defense Department.

An example of leaking—a favorite indoor sport in the Nation's Capital—is a recent Washington newspaper story headlined: "Secret Data Indicates Substantial Improvement in H-Bomb Efficiency." The story disclosed that analysis of the fall series of Soviet atomic tests revealed impressive improvements in nuclear weapons. The information came from a secret report. Disclosure of part of the report obviously served someone's narrow objective.

The Atomic Energy Commission corroborated the story to the extent of revealing that the Russians had made substantial progress. But the AEC added that there is no reason to believe that the balance of nuclear power has changed to favor the Soviet Union.

Slivers of information slipped to the press by officials, or preconceived appraisals by informed persons outside the Government, are no substitute for a frank explanation by the administration of the technical, strategic, and political reasons for its policy conclusions. President Kennedy has said that he will explain the basis for his decision on atmospheric tests when he reaches a final conclusion. I applaud that. I believe it would have served the national interest for the public to have had much of this information right along.

The blackout on fuller information on nuclear weapons testing is, I believe, accepted by the general public in the belief that the subject is too complex for comprehension and the information too vital to national security to be broadcast. This forecloses a widespread understanding of the options available to this country.

While the handful of leaders who must determine the Nation's course and their advisers are men of good faith and ability, the critical questions of war and peace cannot be left to the experts, free of scrutiny by citizens and Congress. The citizen cannot abdicate his responsibility. Without being given military secrets and without a scientific background, the citizen can still be informed and can understand the issues which underlie the test debate. Ignorance of these issues is neither necessary nor desirable.

It would be most useful to the current discussion if more information were provided the public, as the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has done in open hearings on radiation hazards. An official "White Paper" setting forth the basis for Executive decision has been recommended by some committee members.

Without compromising our intelligence network, the public can be told a good deal about what the Soviet Union has achieved in its recent atomic tests. The Russians have gained considerable sophistication in nuclear weapons. They know it. Why shouldn't the American people?

The approximate number of American, British, French, and Soviet tests has been disclosed. But it should be explained that, although we have conducted more tests than the Russians, a number of ours were to improve safety methods rather than to perfect new weapons.

I believe excessive secrecy left us out on the limb after the Russians exploded their multimegaton anticivilization bombs. Much was said about the heavy fallout which would result from these devices. Actually, the level of radioactive debris produced by them was far below expectations. It was some time after this fact was officially known that the AEC made the information public.

Although somewhat removed from the immediate issue of atmospheric testing, the public is also entitled to know more about our plans to share nuclear weapons and information with our allies. Americans should be told the extent of their oversea obligations.

Summing up, I would urge—

1. Release of fuller information on where the Russians stand in relation to United States nuclear strength;

2. Deliberate action by the heads of departments to halt the odious practice of "leaking" classified information:

3. Improvement of Defense Department security methods for protecting nuclear secrets to bring them into line with the AEC system; and

4. A clampdown on the publication of technical weapons data of significant aid to unfriendly countries, or which contribute to the proliferation of atomic weapons.

The educational campaign that has been conducted to inform Americans on the rather complex issue of foreign trade presents an excellent example of how a democratic society can promote its objectives through government-by-discussion. Within the bounds of essential secrecy, the same sort of effort can be useful in the test question, to gain popular support for upcoming Government decisions. The task is made easier by the continuing rise in educational levels in this country.

Viewing with foreboding the threat of Nazi Germany in the 1930's, Winston Churchill made a statement to his Prime Minister which is appropriate to the United States today. Churchill urged: "Tell the truth, tell the truth to the British people. They are a tough people and a robust people. They may be a bit offended at the moment, but if you have told them exactly what is going on, you have insured yourself against complaints and reproaches, which are very unpleasant when they come home on the morrow of some disillusionment."

The Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1962

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the Peace Corps reaches its legislative sanction date of 1 year on March 1. Its many accomplishments have contributed to the development of the talents of individuals at the local level, in underdeveloped countries. The majority of the corps are teachers and engineers.

The Corps' functioning units number 698 volunteers, distributed by assignment to 13 countries. These emissaries teach and help the ordinary people meet their problems of everyday life. The results have been so successful that even Nigeria—where early in the program, an ill-chosen descriptive statement on a postal card, by an innocent and dedicated Corps member, excited an overly sensitive, questionable student group, and resulted in a demand for Corps withdrawal—is petitioning for 300 more teachers, in addition to the present 30 in the functioning group. The authorities are working toward the projected figure of 2,300 corps members on assignment overseas, by the end of June, and are in hopes they might have 4,500 by June of 1963—if next year's $63.7 million budget is provided.

There are now over 6,000 requests by underdeveloped countries for Corps specialists in various fields. The applica-

tions to join the Corps number about 1,000 per month. In all, some 16,000 have applied. It is a fine testimonial to the American students' patriotic devotion to the cause of freedom, to volunteer for 2 years to spread one's talents and abilities and make every effort toward the instruction of natives living under primitive conditions; drawing on an actual expense budget and then receiving, at the end of the services, $75 per month.

The average age of the Corps membership is 25. It is surprising that the women members total one-third of the present membership.

The members of the Corps have quietly assumed, each in his or her individual capacity, the responsibilities under a personal assignment—the efficiency of each operation has earned merited praise.

Director R. Sargent Shriver presented a review of the Peace Corps' activity on the NBC–WRC television program, Saturday night, February 24. He stated, "They tell us that the Peace Corps is achieving a very important success at the local level in these foreign countries. Certainly, we in Washington hope that it is. And we hope that many more Americans will volunteer."

The great humility of Director R. Sargent Shriver is reflected in this understatement, for the tremendous number of requests for more Corps assignments, by the host nations and others, is indicative of the great demand for their exceptional services.

The President has spoken, giving his full endorsement toward increasing its scope of activity and membership.

The successful programing of Peace Corps activities, through the guidance and instruction of expert advisers and instructors, fulfilled the expectations of Director R. Sargent Shriver and his staff. The Nation is indebted to them for a wonderful job, well done. The future of the Corps lies in the Congress. Director Shriver has earned its confidence and appreciation for promises fulfilled.

Under unanimous consent, I include the following article from the Washington, D.C., Evening Star of February 27, 1962:

DOUBLED PEACE CORPS IS ASKED BY PRESIDENT

President Kennedy, saying the Peace Corps has fulfilled expectations, wants Congress to double the program.

In identical letters yesterday to Vice President JOHNSON and Speaker MCCORMACK, the President asked an increase in the Corps 1963 budget to $63.75 million. The budget for the current year, trimmed by a doubting Congress by $10 million, is $30 million.

The President said the new budget request, if granted would permit an increase in Peace Corps personnel from 2,400 to 6,700.

Mr. Kennedy, urging prompt consideration of the request, lauded Peace Corps volunteers for effective work in faraway places.

HISTORIC OPPORTUNITY

The expanded program, the President said, will fall short of meeting all requests from foreign countries. But it will, he added, "enable us to make the most of a historic opportunity to achieve better understanding among nations."

The President said that by June 30, there will be 2,400 volunteers in service or training, with 2,700 more scheduled to begin training in July or August.

"But the overwhelming response to this program in actual operation abroad," the President added, "makes further expansion both necessary and desirable."

NATIONS REQUEST MORE

"Volunteers have been welcomed with friendliness and affection in every one of the villages, towns, schools, factories, and hospitals to which they have gone to share their skills with the people of less developed nations * * * in many instances Peace Corps volunteers are working where no American has ever lived or even traveled."

All 12 countries in which volunteers are working now, the President said, have requested additional workers. In most cases, he said, the Peace Corps has been asked to triple and quadruple the number of men and women already assigned there. Nigeria, for example, has requested 400 additional teachers.

The President said more than 20,000 Americans have volunteered for the program. While the average age is 24½ years for men and 25 for women many of them, the President said, are in their thirties and forties and three are in their sixties.

About one-third are women—nurses, home economists, social workers, and teachers.

Report to the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States by the U.S. Delegation to the Italian Centennial Celebration at Turin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, in the summer of 1960, a concurrent resolution was passed by both Houses of Congress to "extend official greetings from the United States to the people of Italy on the occasion of the centennial anniversary of the unity of Italy and to provide for official participation by the United States in the celebration." I was the author of that resolution in the House, and it was subsequently cosponsored in the Senate by the then Senator John F. Kennedy of Massachusetts.

The celebration began in March of 1961 in the city of Turin, often described as the cradle of Italian unity, because it was there that King Victor Emmanuel II signed an act officially proclaiming unified kingdom of Italy on March 17, 1861. In conjunction with the celebration in Turin, a special observance of the centennial of Italian unification was held on March 16, 1961, at the Department of State under the patronage of the President of the United States and the President of the Republic of Italy. President Kennedy delivered the principal address. His Excellency Manlio Brosio, Ambassador of Italy to the United States, and Prof. Gaetano Martino, head of the Italian delegation to the U.N. General Assembly, represented Italy. I had the honor of serving as chairman at the ceremony.

Shortly before Congress adjourned last September, President Kennedy appointed a congressional delegation to represent the United States at the centennial celebration in Turin, which was scheduled to end on September 30, 1961.

The delegation was composed of House Members. I was again privileged to be named chairman of the delegation. Other members of the group were: the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER of New York, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the Honorable DOMINICK V. DANIELS of New Jersey, the Honorable DANTE B. FASCELL of Florida, the Honorable JOHN H. DENT of Pennsylvania, the Honorable SEYMOUR HALPERN of New York, the Honorable ROLAND V. LIBONATI of Illinois, the Honorable TORBERT H. MACDONALD of Massachusetts, the Honorable ABRAHAM J. MULTER of New York, the Honorable ADAM CLAYTON POWELL of New York, chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, the Honorable PETER W. RODINO, Jr., of New Jersey, and the Honorable ALFRED E. SANTANGELO of New York. We were also accompanied by Judge Felix Forte of Massachusetts and Mr. D. Thomas Iorio, Deputy Sergeant at Arms for the House of Representatives.

Several other House Members had been named to the delegation, but unfortunately they were not able to make the trip. They are: the Honorable HUGH J. ADDONIZIO of New Jersey, the Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY of North Carolina, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, Hon. SILVIO O. CONTE of Massachusetts, Hon. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO of Connecticut, Hon. ROBERT N. GIAIMO of Connecticut, Hon. GEORGE P. MILLER of California, chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, Hon. THOMAS E. MORGAN of Pennsylvania, chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE of Texas, chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

The delegation arrived in Turin on Thursday, September 21. That same evening we were received by the Italia 1961 and Torino 1961 Committees for the Italian Centennial Celebration. We were also the guests at a buffet dinner given by the U.S. Commissioner for the International Labor Exhibition at the Italia 1961 Exposition. The next day, Friday, September 22, we spent at the exposition. We dedicated the beautiful U.S. pavilion at the international fair which, incidentally, put the Russian pavilion, next door, to shame. We saw the historical exhibition which depicted the various steps, acts, personalities, and events leading up to the unification of the Italian nation a century ago. We also visited the International Labor Exhibition. In the evening an official dinner was given in honor of the delegation by the Italian National Committee.

As chairman of the delegation I brought greetings to the people of Italy on the occasion of the centennial and expressed our great pleasure to attend the celebration. I stated that we spent 2 days in Turin visiting the exhibition, adding: "I must say that this exhibition

certainly does live up to its reputation; it is most impressive and inspiring. And, the Torinese were very gracious hosts." I stressed the close diplomatic ties between our two countries over the past 100 years and then told them of the resolution adopted in 1960 by the U.S. Congress to participate in the centennial celebration and of the observance we had in Washington last March with President Kennedy as guest speaker. On behalf of President Kennedy and the American people, I saluted the celebration of the Italian centennial, the President of Italy, and the Italian people.

We spent another day in Turin visiting the Fiat automobile plant and the company's vocational training school. We then left for Rome, where we spent several days. We met with the U.S. Ambassador to Italy, G. Frederick Reinhardt, who is doing a magnificent job there for our country. The highlights of our stay in Rome were the dinner given by by Prime Minister Amintore Fanfani, our visit to the Chamber of Deputies, and the audience with Pope John XXIII, at his summer residence at Castel Gandolfo on Friday, September 29.

In addition, we saw a good deal of what modern and booming Italy has achieved in our own times, such as hospitals, factories, farms, and schools. As a former member of the House Committee on Agriculture, I was particularly impressed with a model farm near Rome which we visited on September 27. At all these visits and on every occasion that we met with leaders of government and with representative groups of the Italian people we brought to them a message of friendship and solidarity from the people of the United States, and we expressed our hope and desire that our visit would contribute toward strengthening these bonds of friendship between the two nations.

Beyond the ceremonial activities of our mission, we made visits to many towns and hamlets throughout Italy—the idea of a group of U.S. Congressmen visiting and talking with townspeople, is in itself a novelty—did more good to offset the tragic inroads of communism in Italy in recent years than some of our other efforts. We met with factory workers, farmers, scientists, economists, industrialists, smalltown mayors, and many others. I think we found what makes the friendly Italian nation tick—and this can only lead to better understanding. I wish it were possible to create a similar atmosphere of friendship, trust, and understanding with other nations throughout the world.

In an unusual and informal private audience with Pope John XXIII, our delegation received a special message from His Holiness to President Kennedy praising the latter's efforts to secure world peace in our time. He expressed his wishes for the President's continued good health and success in the solution of international problems. We, in turn, brought a message of greeting from the President. The pontiff individually spoke with each person in our group.

As we concluded our visit and prepared to leave Italy, all of us were of the unanimous opinion that our mission was a success, we were well received, and better relations between our two countries were promoted. Leaders of the Italian Government officially stated that the United States was the only nation in the world to send an official parliamentary delegation to Italy's centennial celebration. The reception accorded us by Prime Minister Fanfani and other members of his government was both warm and friendly. The Prime Minister specifically stated that our visit and our expression of support for the democratic processes being invoked to strengthen Italy against the forces of communism were most appreciated. We were not only pleased, but highly honored at such recognition.

At this point I should like to include as part of this report, the following documents and statements:

First. A letter from President Kennedy to President Giovanni Gronchi, of Italy, dated September 14, 1961.

Second. A letter from President Kennedy to Ambassador Giustino Artesani, chairman of the centennial committee at Turin, dated September 14, 1961.

Third. A letter from President Kennedy to me as chairman of the U.S. delegation, dated September 14, 1961.

Fourth. A letter—translated from Italian—from Prime Minister Amintore Fanfani to me, dated October 25, 1961.

Fifth. A letter to me from the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, dated December 26, 1961, expressing his views on the delegation's visit to Italy.

Sixth. A letter to the Honorable TORBERT MACDONALD from the Honorable PETER W. RODINO, JR., dated November 9, 1961, expressing his views on the visit.

Seventh. A statement submitted to me by the Honorable SEYMOUR HALPERN expressing his views on the visit.

Eighth. An article from the Chicago Daily News of May 23, 1961, "United States Eclipses Russ at Italy Exposition," which describes the exposition at Turin.

The documents and statements follow:

SEPTEMBER 14, 1961.

His Excellency GIOVANNI GRONCHI,
President of the Italian Republic,
Rome, Italy.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am happy to take the opportunity of this visit by a delegation of the House of Representatives of the United States to express to you the good wishes of the people of the United States for the people of Italy and their joy over the continued success of the celebration of the Centennial of Italian Unity at Turin. Italians indeed have a right to be proud of the progress their nation has made in the last century. Americans, many of them of Italian heritage, share this pride and wish the Italian people an even greater second 100 years.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

SEPTEMBER 14, 1961.

His Excelleny Ambassador GIUSTINO ARTESANI,
Chairman of the Centennial Committee,
Turin, Italy.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I take the opportunity of this visit by a delegation of the House of Representatives of the United States under the chairmanship of the Honorable VICTOR L. ANFUSO to the celebration of the Centennial of the Unification of Italy at Turin to convey to the people of Italy the best wishes of the people of the United States on the occasion of the Centennial Exposition.

It is appropriate that a group of legislators from America should attend your celebration which has already acquired such renown. The ties between Italy and the United States are many. One of the strongest of these is the special place that Italy has in the hearts of the many Americans of Italian ancestry. New citizens from Italy and their sons have contributed in untold fashion to the welfare and progress of the United States. As the membership of this delegation will attest, many have been elected by their fellow citizens to serve in the Congress.

One hundred years ago the risorgimento gave birth to modern Italy. Eighty-five years earlier the American Revolution had brought about the birth of the American Republic. Today, the ideal of freedom is once again challenged. Americans and Italians are again required to stand up to tyranny. This is our task in 1961, to hold high the torch of freedom lit here in Turin a century ago that it may continue to shine forth its message of encouragement and hope for men the whole world over.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., September 14, 1961.

Hon. VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ANFUSO: I am delighted to know that you and a delegation composed of Members of the United States House of Representatives and others are departing for Italy to participate in the ceremonies incident to the Centennial Celebration of the Unification of Italy which is being held at Turin.

I understand that you and your delegation will call on President Gronchi. I would be pleased if you would take the opportunity to present the enclosed letter to the President. I am also enclosing a message addressed to the Italian people to be delivered to the Chairman of the Centennial Committee.

My best wishes for a successful mission.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
WASHINGTON, D.C.,
Rome, October 25, 1961.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANFUSO: Also in the name of the Government over which I have the honor of presiding, I want to repeat the expression of my deepest appreciation to you, and to all those who made up the Presidential Committee, who, on the occasion of the Centennial of Italian Unity, personally conveyed their feelings of friendship.

The visit, because of the occasion on which it took place, and the eminent representation of Congress which participated in it, was only one of the happiest and most significant ceremonies of the Centenntial, but effectively contributed to a renewal of the feelings of friendship between our two countries, united in the common struggle to defend the principles of liberty, humanity, respect and tolerance for all peoples.

Very cordially,

AMINTORE FANFANI,
President of the Council of Ministers.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., December 26, 1961.

Hon. VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR VICTOR: In my previous trips to Italy since the end of World War II, I have been greatly impressed by the economic resurgence of our valued ally. Not just by the upward curve of the gross national product and the downward curve of unemployment, but by

the tangible, visible evidences of a thriving economy: industrial and residential building, improved roads, power, and other public services, and especially by the eager, confident manner and outlook of the people themselves.

On our most recent visit, all these criteria were again in strong evidence. Perhaps the last was the most significant to me. To be sure, we were received warmly by all officials of the Italian Government. That was to be expected in view of our mission. But the genuine and friendly treatment we received everywhere at the hands of the private citizens of Italy was a true indication of just how closely our two countries are bound together.

I do not mean by implication to denigrate the reception afforded us by the Italian Government. I could not expect a finer reception anywhere. I am sure that the fact of our being the first group of national legislators officially to visit the centennial added to the naturally gracious attitude of our hosts. While many of our group, even as I, had previously visited Italy, our visit as a Presidentially appointed delegation demonstrated the strong interest America has in the welfare of Italy.

As I have stated above, I have long been impressed with the vitality of Italy's economy. I believe that both the Government and private citizens throughout Italy appreciate the value of America's assistance in the rebuilding of the Italian economy in the past 15 years.

In summary, I would say with respect to the centennial, the delegation's visit was beneficial to each of us as Representatives in the House, and to the alliance between our Nation and Italy. As for that alliance, I believe it is based on a firm and responsible national politicoeconomic situation in Italy.

With kind regards.

Sincerely,

EMANUEL CELLER.

NOVEMBER 9, 1961.

The Honorable TORBERT MACDONALD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TORBY: Here are a few of my thoughts and impressions of our recent trip to Italy.

Ours was the first such group of representative Government officials to officially visit the Italian centennial. We, therefore, received a warm response from not only the Italian Government but also the Italian people.

Our visit forcefully showed the genuine interest of America, the history of the exploration of and immigration into America by Italians further strengthens those ties, with the result that people throughout Italy look upon America almost as their second fatherland.

The sociocultural link between the two countries reaches into the political arena. For the official position of the Italian Government is thus founded on the spirit and sentiment of the people, its Government and its people in the welfare of Italy, its Government and its people.

Perhaps even more impressive than the official and warm reception accorded us by all the various members of the Italian Government was the spontaneous reception of the Italian people. The natural ties of friendship and family already bind many citizens of both countries together.

The economic condition of Italy has steadily improved and is now strong and sound. Here, too, the Government and the people recognize the importance of America's contributions to the revitalization and rebuilding of Italian industry and business after World War II.

In all respects, then, our alliance with Italy springs from solid trust and understanding and is based on a responsible, solid politicoeconomic national structure. In addition, Italy is eagerly and effectively participating as an integral unit of our NATO military forces.

I strongly believe that our trip was most worthwhile for ourselves as Members of Congress, and especially for the alliance between the two nations. We have once again proved our basic interest in Italy's well-being, and our genuine friendship and admiration for her people. Italy and her people similarly have once again proved their ability and desire to be a fundamental and active member of the free world of which America is the leader.

Sincerely yours,

PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1962.

The Honorable VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR VICTOR: It was a distinct honor to be named by President Kennedy as a member of the official U.S. delegation to honor Italy on the centennial celebration of its unification.

Now that the occasion is behind us, I wish to express to you my high regard as chairman, and in retrospect, report to you the great achievement accomplished by the delegation.

As a result of the visit, I have concluded few countries have contributed as much to the development of western civilization as has the Italian Nation. We owe many of our laws, much of our culture, and a significant share of our growth to this land which has never lost its national pride through the many centuries which saw it develop into the world's largest empire, emerge after years of darkness as the seat of the Renaissance, fall victim to political slavery, and eventually rejoin the community of nations as the proud, productive country it now is. We in America know only too well of the many contributions made to our Nation by Americans of Italian origin. Fourteen Members of the House; one Senator, and many enormously talented and able people in all parts of public and private life are of Italian extraction.

It was only fitting that our country join in paying tribute to Italy on this significant anniversary, and the President is to be complimented on recognizing the importance of this celebration as a means of extending further bonds of American friendship.

It is important, too, that the Congress of the United States unanimously endorsed the President's intention to send an official delegation to the celebration, not only as a tribute to the achievements of this Nation but as a token of the good will of the American people.

I was indeed proud to have been named a member of this delegation.

As the official U.S. representatives, I feel we made a most meaningful contribution by personally dedicating the U.S. pavilion at the international fair at Turin. I'm sure we all agree, without qualification, that the American exhibition was exceedingly impressive and not only far outshown the neighboring Russian pavilion, but it was obvious that our presentation drew more crowds than any other exhibition.

At the official opening of this centennial, held at Turin in commemoration of that city's fame as the site of King Victor Emmanuel's proclamation of the establishment of the unified Kingdom of Italy in 1861, your presentation of the official greetings of the U.S. Government and the American people, as the chairman of the delegation, was brilliantly delivered and exceedingly well received.

I will always remember with great pleasure the rewarding experiences we shared in conjunction with our ceremonial activities, the touring of the fair, the dining with Prime Minister Fanfani, the memorable audience with Pope John XXIII, our visit with our counterparts, the Italian Chamber of Deputies, and the multitude of other phases of our visit.

Although we received a warm welcome in our official capacity from both the Italian Government and the Italian press, I'm sure you agree perhaps the most inspiring part of our trip was the cordial reception afforded to us during informal visits to Italian towns, villages, and factories. I shall never forget how we were greeted with such unsurpassed warmth and friendliness, and in village after village, how we received messages of respect and love for the American people. I truly feel that this part of our visit did more to cement United States-Italian relationships than any amount of money could have accomplished. Everywhere we were hailed as the representatives of a country that symbolizes freedom and good will. To think that this personal contact with the local citizens would exude such a fine reaction was heart-warming, especially in a country where the extreme left has been making such strides in recent years. This to me was one of the real highlights of the trip. The Italian press commented on the cordiality of our reception by the people and hailed our mission and its purpose. It was the most heart-warming experience I have ever known.

Another event that marked the great significance of the mission was the reception by His Holiness Pope John XXIII, who warmly received us. Following your individual introductions of our group to the Holy Father, he delivered a memorable message of peace and goodwill. And he complimented the objective of our mission and asked that we convey his respect and affection to the American people, which I'm certain will be contained in your report to the President and to the Congress.

The mission could not have been more successful. I am sure that the Italian people will long remember this unprecedented recognition by the President and the Congress of the United States on the occasion of their 100th anniversary. I know that every member of the official delegation will join me in expressing our thanks to the Government and the people of Italy and our everlasting expressions of respect and good will for the citizens of Italy.

Yes, I was privileged indeed to be your fellow delegate on this all-important, highly successful mission. May I compliment you on the superb job you have done as chairman.

Very sincerely,

SEYMOUR HALPERN.

[From the Chicago Daily News, May 23, 1961]

U.S. ECLIPSES RUSS AT ITALY EXPOSITION—ASSISTED BY AMERICAN INDUSTRY, OUR EXHIBIT IS FIRST AT LAST

(By George Weller)

TURIN, ITALY.—This year's centenary of Italy as a republic is marked by an exposition where the United States, too often second to the Soviet Union in showmanship, at last takes a first.

With a strong helping hand from American industry—tax-deductible, naturally—Tom Miller, the hefty Barnum of the Commerce Department, has put on a mobile imaginative exhibit that makes the Soviet pavilion look like yesterday's yo-yo.

Seing the rival exhibits—the American exhibit devoted to the art and science of communication, the Soviet display to a boring array of complex tools and loaded Leninist aphorisms—an Italian might read the international situation in reverse.

Aside from Soviet leadership of the race into space, he might even imagine that the supercommunicative Americans were winning in foreign policy, too.

The American exhibit gets "participation" right off by handing the visitor a black bake-

lite radio receiver the size of a ruler. He then walks around with this dark scepter at his ear, while it whispers to him—in his choice of four languages—a description of what he is seeing.

The transmission comes from a tiny wire strung overhead in each room.

When Italy's President Giovanni Gronchi led an advance party through, 22 of them were so enchanted with their lectours (made for $35 each by Frank McIntosh, of Bethesda, Md.), that they walked off with them.

But the souvenir hunters were out of luck. Outside the exhibit, the black wands will not pick up radio programs like an ordinary transmitter, but only the growl of elevators and power lines.

A mockup of the human brain the size of a garage stops the visitor in his tracks. From its various plates, the size of tabletops, wires trace the thought processes.

A singer opens up, the image identifying her face courses through the brain, and soon after this eye-message comes the confirmation through the ears.

These messages pass through odd portions of brain-land known as "upper little hill" for the eye, and "lower little hill" for the ear.

There's an American schoolhouse using the Hagerstown educational TV system.

For more Italian participation there's a huge earth, with the American satellite "Echo" hanging overhead. By pressing buttons the visitor can bounce signals off "Echo's" silver surface and back to earth.

He also sees the Navy's radio telescope in Virginia registering the soft rattlings of remote stars whose light started our way long before man was born.

In a room dark as a pilot's night there is a jet plane's control cabin. The visitor can sit at the pilot's controls as he slides down onto the striped lights of an airfield.

A mechanical computer blandly offers the Italian loaded questions he can ask, like "Why was the United States ready to open Commander Shepard's flight to the world press?"

The answers are all chockful of goodness—and not too much propaganda.

The taxpayers bill for the whole show is about $550,000, about one-eighth of the Commerce Department's annual budget for 12 to 14 international shows. But it would have been at least three times that amount without the tax rebate to tempt participation by American companies in the show, designed artictically by Manuel Jarrin of Detroit's Harley Earl Associates.

Upjohn pharmaceuticals contributed the electric brain, IBM the question-answer machinery, and General Electric much of the TV equipment.

The Yuri Gagarin exploit into space was curiously played down and fumbled by the Soviets, perhaps because the exhibit was designed before their space authority decided to leak details.

One Italian at the Soviet show wrote in the comment book, "Clever—but lacking in human warmth."

Another scribbled: "Hurray for liberty—the thing you don't possess."

John Glenn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, residents of South Dakota and in particular those who live in what we refer to as west of the river understand and appreciate the magnitude of the heavens since their view of the night sky is wide, deep, and clear. Accordingly it is fitting that one of the inhabitants of that section has written an inspiring poem saluting our orbiting astronaut, John Glenn. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the following poem "John Glenn" by Mrs. Jean West, of Oacoma, S. Dak., for the attention of the Senate.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN GLENN

(By Jean West)

Today we stood upon this earth
And watched our miracle in its birth.
Our hearts and prayers rode in the race
As Mr. Glenn rode out in space.
What thoughts, in solemn silence all,
As Glenn streaks 'round this earthly ball.
What thoughts in voice, and in the sound,
Amid the throngs of earth is found?
In fear, in hope, they all rejoice,
To hear John Glenn's calm steady voice,
And ever praising, they acclaim
John Glenn, our space-age hero's name.
We all say, "Go," chosen of many.
It was thy day of flight, John Glenn.
On "Friendships" craft, thy flight,
Through today and tomorrow's day and night.
And from out in space to us below,
The word from John was always "Go."
Up in the sky he rose, then gone—
T'is no false dream, but one
Of hope and faith in all the men,
At Cape Canaveral cut to win,
That long awaited day we face,
To put our man out there is space.
The world looked up that tense filled day,
To watch John orbit on his way,
Some tears were dried, he'll know we care,
By folded hands of silent prayer.
Then back to earth once more he came,
This "fireball" ride to blaze his name,
Across the land and around the world,
The hero banners are unfurled.
To greet our great new space-age man,
Courageous, famous, Mr. Glenn.

The President's Frustrations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of February 27, 1962:

THE PRESIDENT'S FRUSTRATIONS

Since President Kennedy is a student of history, he doubtless has read widely in the literature of the political scientists about the awesome powers of the Presidency. But we suspect that sometimes, in the still of the night, he must wonder where all that power is.

For he has fired off to Congress an unprecedented stream of messages, proposals, and exhortations, calling for sweeping changes in this country's domestic and foreign policies. These salvos, with rare exceptions, have fallen on an unruffled Capitol Hill like so many gentle raindrops.

The President's tax program is all chopped up. Ditto his farm program. His aid to education program gathers dust in a pigeonhole. And trial balloons launched by the White House, such as the plea for Presidential tax-cutting authority, are shot down on sight.

Just the other day, the President threw the full weight of his office and prestige behind an attempt to force a floor vote, in this election year, on his plan to create a Department of Urban Affairs. There was a vote, all right, but it resulted in a flat rejection of the President's proposal. Once again, Congress seemed unacquainted with the political scientists.

Of course, there's no denying the power of the Presidency; he can, for example, commit the country to a war anywhere in the world. Yet for all of that, Mr. Kennedy has had a reminder that the checks and balances the men of the past put upon that office have not been totally destroyed. Congress can, and does, say him nay on any number of things.

No doubt this is frustrating to the man who, for the moment, holds that office. But no President's frustrations have toppled the Republic. And it may comfort Mr. Kennedy, the historian, to reflect on what the Republic would be like if the powers of his office ever put him beyond disappointment.

Steven Smith—He Took a Walk With God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply moved to read the beautiful eulogy written by His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing to little Steven Smith, whose body was found on December 12, 1961, after he had wandered away from St. Coletta's School for Exceptional Children at Hanover, Mass.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include this eulogy together with a letter and a poem which I received from Mr. David Gimbel, of Brooklyn, N.Y., who sent to me Cardinal Cushing's fine tribute:

STEVEN SMITH—HE TOOK A WALK WITH GOD

The lifeless body of little Steven Smith, a pupil at St. Coletta's School for Exceptional Children in Hanover, Mass., was found Tuesday, December 12, 1961, at 8:20 a.m., in a wooded area by the side of an outlet of the North River as it passes through Norwell. The medical authorities have given their decision that the boy died by drowning the night he lost his way in the woods adjacent to the school. That was on the previous Friday afternoon.

This exceptional child came from an exemplary home where the highest ideals of the Jewish faith predominated. Some years ago, at the request of his parents, I placed Steven in the Kennedy Memorial Hospital. He remained there almost 4 years, as long as medical science and therapy of all kinds could help him. Then, at the request of his dear father and mother, I placed him in St. Coletta's School, where he has been in residence for the last 5 years.

"Stevie," as we affectionately called him, was one of our most precious charges among exceptional children. They are all very affectionate, very innocent. They know only what is good. Little Stevie was like the best of them, but, instead of looking for attention for himself, he was always helping oth-

ers. He had initiative, courage, but he was retarded to a degree that he would always be dependent on others.

Having loved and served him in life, we will not forget him in death. How could we? He took a walk with God to the mansions reserved for the elect among teenagers in the kingdom of heaven. A delegation of the Sisters from St. Coletta's School, the Kennedy Memorial Hospital, and myself were present for his funeral. We also accompanied him to his final resting place in Memorial Park, Sharon, Mass. The services at the chapel and at the cemetery were most impressive. The thoughts expressed by the good rabbi were a consolation to all and, I must admit, moved us to tears.

Ever since the little boy was lost I had been in constant communication with his parents, with the chief of police of Hanover, John W. Stoddard, the Sisters and others. They slept only for brief intervals during the long days and weary nights that they searched and prayed for the lost boy.

In the midst of all the publicity featured in our day about the evils prevalent in our country, it is good to be reminded that we are blessed with countless devout people who are ready at all times to sacrifice themselves for others. Over 2,500 individuals, men, women and children from many walks of life and from many places, near and far volunteered to join the searching parties that were on the highways and in the woods, along the banks of ponds and rivers endeavoring to locate the "lamb that was lost." How sad that the media of publicity do not feature the good things and not the evil things of daily life.

It is impossible to give adequate thanks for myself, for the dear parents of Stevie and the Sisters at St. Coletta's, to the chief of police of Hanover, John W. Stoddard, his fellow officers, as well as those of the State police for all their efforts to find the boy. It is likewise impossible to thank every one of the 2,500 and more volunteers who at one time or another participated in the search. To reach with gratitude and affection the many people and organizations that supplied food of all kinds for this small army of devoted friends is also beyond our power. They were an inspiration and an example worthy of imitation.

In the hope that our sentiments of gratitude and appreciation might be read by all to whom we are indebted, I have written this message as a tribute of love as well as gratitude, of prayerful mementos as well as fond memories.

Stevie has gone with God to Heaven, but his presence among us will remain as green as the holly that he and his chums were gathering in the woods of Hanover when he took a walk with God.

The police officials, the National Guard companies, the fire department chief and his firefighters, and all volunteers, too numerous to mention by name, have returned to their daily tasks. May they always remember that through their self-sacrificing example they have given to multitudes a beautiful lesson in charity in the best sense of the word. God reward them all. And may He comfort and console the parents and all the loved ones of "Stevie" Smith who took a walk with God that ended in eternal happiness.

RICHARD CARDINAL CUSHING.

BROOKLYN, N.Y., *February 22, 1962.*

Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: A little more than a week ago, I receive the enclosed leaflet from our beloved friend, His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing. This is the most beautiful expression of love, faith, and devotion that I had ever read. Words like these can only come from the depths of a heart that is dedicated to the Lord's most innocent creatures.

I was so moved by its beauty that in my own humble way, I put into verse what the good cardinal painted in his own words with such sweetness and brotherhood.

Through selfless and courageous men like His Eminence the world is becoming a much better and a more enlightened place to live and to worship in.

Perhaps in the not too distant future we may yet witness the birth of a new freedom. Freedom from the centuries old heartbreak of "mental retardation." As long as the good Lord brought forth upon this earth men of good will, the horizons of hope are well within reach for all of mankind.

With every good wish to you, I am,
Your devoted friend,

DAVE GIMBEL.

CLOSER TO GOD

(By David Gimbel)

Twas Christmastime at St. Coletta's, the most beautiful time of the year,
And exceptional children that we all love, were out to bring good cheer,
By gathering greens in the woods near by to add to the Christmas touch,
For in their little way, to them it meant so much.

But one of these innocent lambs, just strayed from the rest of the flock,
While shepherds hearts were filled with fear, as they anxiously kept watching the clock.
And as the night dragged on, with the approaching of the morrow,
All bowed their heads in prayer and hearts were filled with sorrow.

But men of every faith trudged to wind and cold, so they could bring the lamb right back within the fold,
And as the angels watched from beneath the leaden sky
It moved the strongest men, there was a tear in every eye.

After endless weary hours, on all lips there was a prayer.
But they found this angel child so lifeless lying there.
The lamb that lost his way lies buried beneath the sod,
But the soul of this precious child, is closer now to God.

Valley Forge Patriot's Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement answering the question "What I Can Do for Freedom?" written by CWO W. J. Huttig of the U.S. Naval Dental Clinic, Naval Weapons Plant, Washington, D.C. This statement by Mr. Hittig won the third place award in a national contest sponsored by "Freedom's Foundation," of which former President Dwight D. Eisenhower and former President Herbert Hoover are honorary officials. I understand that each year the subject for the competition is agreed upon by the officers of the foundation and the Office of Information and Education of the Department of Defense. Each year the top awardees from each service are taken to Valley Forge, Pa., for the national awards ceremonies. I believe that the members will agree with me that Mr. Huttig's contribution is worthy of our attention and thought.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT I CAN DO FOR FREEDOM

(By CWO W. J. Huttig)

I can make peace with myself. I can examine my conscience and determine if my goals, actions, deeds, and words are directed with honor and selflessness or merely with greed and self-interest.

I can make peace within my family. I can make an honest attempt to create harmony with each member; laying aside all real or imagined wrongs; working together, playing together, praying together toward unity and understanding.

I can make peace with my neighbor. I can forget petty nuisances and jealousies and forgive trespasses. I can endeavor to maintain my community, my property, and my appearance in a manner beyond reproach.

I can make peace with my coworkers and employer. I can work in harmony with my associates, regardless of race or religion, and not be covetous of their position or station. I can give my employer an honest return for my pay and settle disputes by arbitration rather than with strikes and violence.

Having thus made peace with myself, my family, my neighbor, my community, my coworkers, and employer, I have woven a thread to the cable of faith and solidarity that must, of necessity, bind our Nation together in a union of strength that will enable us to survive the rigors of the present and future years and insure freedom for this and future generations.

An Impossible Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram of February 26, 1962:

AN IMPOSSIBLE CHOICE

Agriculture Secretary Freeman has been touring the country in behalf of the administration's new subsidy and crop control plan. He reports that he has found opposition only to the part of the program intended to achieve a balance in farm production. This balance proposal would give farmers the choice of strict governmental controls over feed grains, wheat, and dairy products with high price supports or no controls and no supports.

Mr. Freeman's findings are understandable. For the balance proposal presents farmers with an impossible choice. The proposal calls for the toughest mandatory production controls ever imposed on corn and feed grains, wheat, and milk, to reduce supplies while continuing artificially high supports and subsidies. Three decades of Federal tinkering have demonstrated the failure of this approach. The way that farmers can regain their rightful share of the economy

is to gradually eliminate price fixing and controls and return to greater reliance on the competitive market system to put production in line with demand.

Under the Kennedy administration plan, the farmers would have the choice of accepting the tough controls (Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation calls them "undisguised regimentation") or face an abrupt cut-off of all price supports to which is added the threat of Government dumping of millions of bushels of grain on the market which would break prices. It is in effect an ultimatum to take regimentation or suffer substantial financial loss. The choice is obviously presented to force acceptance of Federal controls. All this adds up to an impossible choice.

The Farm Bureau has presented an alternative. It is essentially the course that former Secretary of Agriculture Benson tried over the years to get through Congress. Congress never would go all the way on it. The alternative is to use various devices to get farmers voluntarily to reduce crop production, including lower supports that would be more closely related to market prices. The goal is to make markets more responsible for guiding production and consumption, and to terminate Federal programs gradually, rather than abruptly.

Mr. Freeman shrugs off such proposals with the charge they would lower farm income a billion dollars a year, which would cost as much or more than the Government now spends to support prices. There is little doubt that a gradual reduction of price supports would be costly for 2 or 3 years. It would be worth it to get the farms producing for the market, not for Government subsidies. It would be worth it since it offers a reasonable prospect of success while keeping the farmers off the economic skids.

But the Administration is saying the farmers must choose between the toughest controls yet imposed along with high price supports, or the junking of all controls and going on the economic toboggan. In pushing its program, and accepting no alternative, the administration shows contempt for the wishes of the farmers and a reckless disregard for the welfare of agriculture.

Bulgarian Liberation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Bulgarian people have long been known as gallant and valiant fighters. During the Middle Ages they formed a flourishing kingdom in the Balkan Peninsula. In the 15th century, however, their country was overrun by the Ottoman Turks, and then for 400 years they were subjected to Turkish rule. But Bulgarians were never reconciled with their lot under the Turks, and made many attempts to free themselves from Turkish autocracy. Their last successful attempt was made in the 1870's, and in 1878 they succeeded in attaining freedom with the aid of imperial Russia. This success was confirmed by the Russo-Turkish Treaty, signed on March 3 of that year.

That day marks the liberation of modern Bulgaria from its Ottoman oppressors. The 84th anniversary celebration of that event is of special significance today, because once more Bulgarians find themselves subjected to a totalitarian regime not of their own choosing, but one imposed upon them by the Kremlin. Fortunately, they are just as determined to free themselves from Communist dictatorship as their grandfathers were in casting off the Ottoman Turkish rule. Let us hope that they will again attain their goal and live in freedom in their historic homeland.

U.S.S.R. Duping United States on Disarmament Talks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer, of McClure Newspaper Syndicate, entitled "U.S.S.R. Duping United States on Disarmament Talks."

The article follows:

U.S.S.R. DUPING UNITED STATES ON DISARMAMENT TALKS

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

My friend the late Jan Masaryk, son of the Great Thomas Masaryk and himself Czechoslovak Minister of Foreign Affairs when the commies took over, used to quote a Czech proverb:

"If my aunt had wiskers, she would be my uncle."

He meant that if the facts in a given situation were as his opponents said they were, he would agree with them. Since his aunt lacked whiskers, he was forced to conclude that she was not his uncle.

This story comes back to me in trying to understand the paradoxes of the Kennedy administration.

Just why, I ask myself, after Khrushchev's repeated threats and provocations at Berlin and other places, does President Kennedy invite Mr. K.'s son-in-law, Alekshei I. Adhubei, to lunch with him at the White House tomorrow? Doesn't our President know that thereby he strengthens an already overreadiness of the American people to underestimate the Communist danger?

Why does J.F.K. believe that we can find a new arrangement for Berlin advantageous both to the Russians and ourselves?

Why, after the Soviets duped us into stopping atomic tests so that they could go ahead in weapons, does the U.S. administration hesitate to resume atmospheric testing? Why does it permit the State Department to put out a pamphlet called "The Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty: Gateway to Peace" when there is almost no chance for reaching a test-ban treaty and it would not necessarily lead to peace? Soviet Marshal Malinovsky, has just boasted that the Soviets can "wipe off the face of the earth with a single nuclear rocket attack * * * all industrial and political centers of the United States" and boasted that the U.S.S.R. is now the stronger.

Why then are our President and Secretary of State so earnestly seeking a disarmament in which the U.S.S.R. has demonstrably not the slightest real interest (except as a further means of handicapping the American arms effort) instead of bringing the West's immensely superior resources to the task of creating a political and military preponderance?

For a long time—to repeat—I have been asking myself why J.F.K. persists in hoping that my aunt will grow whiskers? Now I think I have an answer. My colleague Walter Lippmann, whose views are said to impress President Kennedy, recently wrote:

"Neither they (the Russians) nor we (the Americans) can live indefinitely on the brink of nuclear war."

This implies that the Soviets today fear nuclear war as much as we do.

Perhaps they do—theoretically. But at present they do not need to fear such a war for they have a practical certainty that short of an attack by them on a major ally, we will not start such a war. Moreover, their further progress in spreading communism depends everywhere on starting so-called "wars of liberation" which they now believe President Kennedy—as in Laos—is afraid to "escalate" into bigger wars.

It is therefore a mistake to believe that they "fear nuclear war as much as we do." They do not.

Therefore, before they can seriously consider making "peaceful coexistence" really peaceful, still less accept any serious arms control or larger disarmament, the United States must first convince them that they cannot win any kind of war.

Secretary of Defense McNamara seems to know this. He recently told a Senate committee:

"We are resolved to continue the struggle in all its forms until such time as the Communist leaders * * * are convinced that their aggressive policies, motivated by their drive to communize the world, endanger their security as well as ours." And he might have added—until they realize that they cannot win by force or subversion or propaganda.

Here is the naked truth. Once the administration listens to Secretary McNamara and treats the enemy as the enemy, we shall start moving toward real peace.

Bill Would Give Small Business Greater Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to give small businessmen greater protection against predatory price discrimination by big business. This would be accomplished by strengthening section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act. That section would be expressly included in the antitrust laws in which the remedy provided by section 4 of the Clayton Act applies. Persons damaged by pricing practices prohibited by section 3 would be able to recover treble damages and the cost of suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee.

This legislation was made necessary by the decision of the Supreme Court in *Nashville Milk Co.* v. *Carnation Co.*, 355 U.S. 373 (1958). In that case the Supreme Court held, by the narrow margin of 5 to 4, that section 3 is not covered by the definition of antitrust laws, and hence that a suit for treble damages would not be for a violation of its provisions.

Section three is one of the most important provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act. It was designed to prevent several destructive forms of price discriminations, particularly sales at lower prices in one area than in another, or sales at unreasonably low prices, for the

purpose of destroying competition or eliminating a competition. Criminal penalties are imposed for violation of the section. Experience has demonstrated, however, that criminal penalties alone are insufficient to insure compliance with this law. The nature of the forbidden practices make it difficult to prove all elements of the offense beyond a reasonable doubt as required in a criminal case. For that reason, the decision on the Nashville Milk Company case, denying a civil remedy for treble damages, greatly reduced the efficacy of section 3.

Small businessmen have been the principal victims of the discriminatory pricing outlawed by this section. To protect them, and to protect consumers from the excessive prices and other abuses that follow when small business men are eliminated as competitors of big business, it is necessary that the same civil remedy be granted for damages resulting from a violation of section three as is available under other provisions of the antitrust laws. That remedy is provided by my bill, and I urge that this legislation be given early consideration.

Aid to Education: Private Schools Lessen the Taxpayer's Burden—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I have placed in the RECORD an article by Mr. William A. Norris which appeared in the Milwaukee Sentinel on February 21, 1961, under the title "State's Private Schools Ease Tax Burdens."

At this point, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to include in the RECORD Mr. Norris' second article on this subject, entitled "How Private Schools Affect the Tax Rate." This second article appeared in the February 23 edition of the Milwaukee Sentinel.

The facts brought out by Mr. Norris deserve our careful attention. I sincerely hope that they will be studied by Members of Congress and borne in mind when legislation dealing with Federal aid to education will be considered by this body.

The article follows:

HOW PRIVATE SCHOOLS AFFECT THE TAX RATE

(By William A. Norris)

Last Wednesday this column ran a table showing the percentage of parochial and private elementary school pupils in each of Wisconsin's 71 counties (as of the 1960 U.S. census).

Calumet County was high, with 69 percent of the pupils enrolled in nonpublic schools. Adams, Burnett, and Polk had zero percentage. (Polk was given a zero because it had less than one-half of 1 percent in nonpublic schools.)

That column pointed out that where there are a great number of children attending parochial schools (primarily Catholic, secondarily Lutheran), the property taxpayer is likely to benefit because there are relatively fewer children to be educated in public schools. I quote from my own column of 2 days ago:

"Within rough limitations, the percentage of non-public-school enrollment shows the percentage of potential school costs saved for the general taxpayers by the existence of the parochial schools."

That was a pompous sentence, for which I apologize. It came dangerously close to the gobbledygook of the statisticians. I should have said: "The more Catholic (and Lutheran) kids you have going to their own schools in your community, the lower your property taxes will be."

I should have put it that way in the first place, so that everybody could understand it without even wrinkling a brow. I am firmly convinced that the great majority of newspaper readers prefer not to be brow wrinklers.

How correct was I in my statement (however badly I put it) about property taxes being lower where there are a lot of children going to parochial schools?

I'll try to answer that question rather simply.

In 1960, when the census was taken, the 10 counties with the highest percentage of elementary pupils attending parochial and other private schools were (in order) Calumet, Manitowoc, Brown, Pepin, Outagamie, Ozaukee, Washington, Wood, Portage, and Marathon.

In that year these 10 counties had an average property tax rate of $20.50 per $1,000 of full value or equalized assessment.

Now let's look at the 10 counties that had the lowest percentage of elementary pupils enrolled in parochial and private (nonpublic) schools. They were, starting with the lowest percentage, Burnett, Adams, Polk, Forest, Florence, Vernon, Jackson, Sawyer, Washburn, and Waushara.

These 10 counties had an average property tax rate of $29.40 per $1,000 of full value.

That is $8.90 higher than the average for the 10 counties with the highest percentage of parochial and private elementary school students.

To put it another way: The 10 counties with the lowest percentage of parochial school pupils had an average tax rate almost 44 percent higher than the 10 counties with the highest percentage.

That would seem to be fairly conclusive proof that the parochial schools tend to lift part of the tax burden from the general property owner.

Kill the Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to discuss the administration's farm bill, and all its proposals for complete domination of the farmer by the administration, without referring at the outset to the political origins of the current prime mover in this fiasco, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman.

Most of us know, I think—but all of us should be constantly reminded—that Secretary Freeman is a former Governor of Minnesota, a great State which, among other accomplishments, produces much milk. And just incidentally, that great State failed to return Mr. Freeman to the Governor's chair in 1960, and thus we now have him as Secretary of Agriculture here in Washington.

Often when I examine some of the Secretary's proposals I have the feeling he thinks he still is Governor of Minnesota, and not Secretary of Agriculture in the Cabinet of the President of the United States. It does not seem to me he has made the transition. I cannot possibly criticize his zeal for Minnesota while he was Governor of that State, but I am compelled to attack his primary concern for his native State at a time when he is clearly beholden to all of the people of the United States.

All of this is by way of a preface to the Secretary's proposal to make a public utility of the dairy business. If Secretary Freeman had his way, all milk production would be based on a 1961 history of production. This means the deficit milk producing areas of the Nation—the South, the Southwest, the West and the Northeast—would be expected to stop exactly where they are so that the producers of surplus milk in the upper Midwest then could walk into these other areas to grab the market.

At times Mr. Freeman professes great love for the farmer of this country, but his actions belie his words.

I wonder if he has thought through what his bill would do to a young dairyman in one of the deficit areas. We have thousands of these young men who have invested everything they have, indeed, their lives, to develop dairy herds in areas they know are not producing enough fluid milk for their own needs. Like most young men, they develop their herds carefully and slowly, but always with a market in mind. They haven't gone into the milk producing business simply because it was "the thing to do"—regardless of market—but because they saw a market.

Now comes Secretary Freeman, who once testified he thought it unfair for some dairymen to receive $5 a hundred pounds for milk, and for others to be paid only $3 a hundredweight. I grant it is unfortunate that the difference exists, but I must point out that the Secretary apparently paid no attention to the costs involved as between the $3 farmer and the $5 farmer. He said nothing about the higher land costs which must be paid by the $5 farmers—those closest to the market—nothing very much about higher taxes, nothing about higher labor costs, nothing about higher service costs—the plumber, electrician, garage, and all of the many services a dairyman must buy. He said nothing about these. He simply wanted to leave the impression that some farmers in the country—notably those of his native region—were being discriminated against.

This fight for milk markets is an old one and it has many ramifications, but in the final analysis we all must recognize that basically it is a battle between farmers with a market and those without one. In essence, thus, the Secretary seeks to settle the battle by using the power of the Government.

I am not for that kind of settlement of economic battles. I believe firmly that competition, with all the advances and improvements brought about, will settle this issue, as it will many others.

Secretary Freeman got himself into a dairy surplus situation through his own folly by raising price supports on dairy products. It was freely predicted

at the time of his action of last April that increased price supports would mean a tremendous dairy surplus situation. The Secretary poopooed those predictions, and, oddly enough, he still will not acknowledge that price brought on excessive production. He chooses to ignore the facts.

I firmly believe that Congress should not ignore the facts—and I firmly believe that we will not. We have the safest and the best milk supply in the Nation, and we are the most efficient producers of wholesome milk. Our dairymen did not reach this status at the hands of economic coercionists like Secretary Freeman.

In the long run, the Secretary's proposal would mean higher milk prices because his bill would promote inefficient farming and inefficient farming simply has to be reflected in higher costs to the consumer. Mr. Speaker, I ask the able House Committee on Agriculture to perform the best possible service to all of the United States—kill the farm bill.

Need for More Effective National Agricultural Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Nation, today—possessing the most efficient agricultural production system in the world—needs now a more effective national farm policy.

Over the years, a complex system of laws have been written to the statute books affecting major aspects of agriculture.

However, the creation of a more realistic farm program must—in my judgment—be based, not upon Federal laws, but rather, upon economic principles applied by free enterprise.

In a weekend broadcast over Wisconsin radio stations, I made some recommendations which, if adopted, would, I believe, contribute to creating a more effective farm policy. I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Traditionally, agriculture has served as a foundation stone of our economy, providing an abundant supply of healthful foods for a fast-increasing population, now estimated at 185 million; creating hundreds of thousands of jobs—on and off the farm; providing the United States with a tool of great humanitarian value; as well as a strategic weapon in policymaking; providing a way of life for 15½ million Americans—about 8¼ percent of the population; and generally, serving the health and economic needs of the country.

Over the years, the American farmer—in meeting the food needs of our people—has written a real success story. As of now, an average farmer produces enough food for about 26 people. For the future, the ratio is expected to be even higher.

Unfortunately, greater efficiency and productivity, however, contain some built-in problems—the major one being the development of a supply-demand imbalance, resulting in a glutted market for dairy and other commodities.

The too-high stockpiles, however, represent—in my judgment—no real surplus—as long as there are people who need milk and other foods to meet dietary requirements.

Rather, the major challenge is to provide more efficient channels for distributing food to hungry people—as well as to find other—including commercial, industrial—uses for farm products.

Over the years, a variety of efforts—governmental and nongovernmental—have been made to meet, and resolve, this difficult problem. Uncle Sam, of course, has a responsibility for preventing an economic collapse in agriculture—traditionally the birthplace of depressions.

The U.S. economic system, however, has been founded upon a concept of free enterprise—operating in accordance with economic principles—not perpetual Government support. For this reason, I believe there is need for a more creative effort to find nongovernmental solutions for problems in farming.

True, the farmers and their organizations, including the Grange, Farm Bureau, Farmers Union, National Dairy Council, American Dairy Association, national farm organizations, and others, have made realistic attempts to (1) crystallize recommendations of their respective memberships on farm policy; and (2) present these proposals to Congress.

These proposals, however, often differ widely—resulting in a need for a tremendous "sifting job" by the committees of Congress.

Because of these factors, I believe the creation of a national agricultural policy council—comprised of representatives of farmers and farm organizations—would provide useful, constructive machinery for formulating more effective farm policy.

The responsibilities of such a council would include—

1. Crystallizing the major challenges in agriculture;

2. Formulating recommendations for improving agricultural policy—including ironing out, insofar as possible, major differences; and

3. Presenting a finalized version of farm recommendations to Congress.

If this were done, I believe it would help to accomplish the following objectives:

1. Create a stronger voice for the farmer and farm organizations in creating and establishing national agricultural policy.

2. Lessen the work of congressional committees in "sifting the wheat from the chaff" ideawise.

3. Provide better guidance for revising and improving the hodgepodge system of farm laws now on the books; and

4. Reverse the trend of policymaking—and public thinking—from looking to Uncle Sam for solutions of too many problems, and toward greater effort and responsibility in finding nongovernmental solutions to the economic problems in agriculture.

Strange Monopoly on Judicial Qualifications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of February 24, 1962:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 24, 1962]

STRANGE MONOPOLY ON JUDICIAL QUALIFICATIONS

President Kennedy gave an assurance before his election that appointments to the Federal judiciary would be made strictly on merit. The commitment was pertinent since his party in Congress has delayed the creation of more than 30 seriously needed Federal judgeships.

President Eisenhower, in order to alleviate court congestion, offered to divide the new appointments equally between Republicans and Democrats; but the congressional majority held out on the possibility of getting all the appointments made by a Democratic President.

Now 85 names have been sent to the Senate by Mr. Kennedy, including 3 recess appointments left by Mr. Eisenhower. Bernard G. Segal, chairman of the American Bar Association committee on the Federal judiciary, notes that not one of the 82 nominees presented by President Kennedy is a Republican.

Mr. Segal's committee also concluded in a review of the 85 appointments that 14 were "exceptionally well qualified," 41 were "well qualified," 23 were "qualified," and 7 were "not qualified" for lifetime service on the Federal Branch.

The Department of Justice, under the President's brother as Attorney General, deserves credit for the "exceptionally well qualified" and "well qualified" selections.

But doesn't it seem a little peculiar that out of all the lawyers in the United States who are regarded as Republicans the administration could not find seven whose juristic abilities would warrant their appointment ahead of the seven whom a bar association committee considers "not qualified"?

Hon. Louis Rabaut

SPEECH

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 16, 1962

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly saddened by news of the passing of my dear and valued friend and esteemed colleague for many years, the Honorable LOUIS C. RABAUT, of the great State of Michigan.

LOUIS RABAUT was one of the most distinguished, beloved men ever to serve in this great body. He was unique in his lovable, personal qualities, outstanding in his ability, and the wide sweep of his interests and his effective service to his district, State, and Nation.

LOUIS RABAUT was a great humanist and his humane feelings for his fellow man could not be excelled. He labored tirelessly throughout the many years of his distinguished public service for the betterment of human relations and for the advancement and improvement of human standards, for the elevation of the lot of the average citizen.

Warm and genial of nature, he had a host of close friends in this body and wherever he was known; his beaming, magnetic personality was felt in every gathering of which he was a part. A

talented singer, he was always very happy to lend his great gifts in this regard to every occasion when he was called upon to do so, and he not only sang beautifully and impressively, at formal and solemn occasions on the floor of the House and elsewhere but he also took special pleasure in singing for his friends at social gatherings and impromptu entertainments.

He was a most valuable member of the great House Appropriations Committee and enjoyed the confidence of his colleagues and the leadership of the House. He was clearly and indelibly marked as a great leader in the Congress and the country.

LOUIE performed many special services and supported and advanced many meaningful pieces of legislation. Among these, I have the feeling that he was especially proud of the measure he steered through Congress officially designating Rev. Francis Bellamy's famed "Pledge of Allegiance," with the addition of the compelling and meaningful words "under God," as our national pledge.

He put real heart service into this effort and not only secured the enactment of Public Law 287, 79th Congress, signed into law as House Joint Resolution 243, on Flag Day, June 14, 1954, by President Dwight D. Eisenhower, which made the Pledge of Allegiance official, but he also arranged with one of America's most beloved and distinguished composers, Mr. Irving Caesar, to write appropriate and very impressive music for the pledge.

In addition, LOUIE also arranged to have this historic work sung for the first time on the floor of the House of Representatives on Flag Day, June 14, 1955, by the official Air Force choral group, the "Singing Sergeants," under the direction of Capt. Robert L. Landers, AFRES, in special Flag Day ceremonies.

To the end of time, this immortal pledge will be recited and sung by millions and millions of people and little children in every hamlet, village, town and city in this great country, an enduring, perpetual recollection of one of Michigan's greatest sons, our beloved friend, LOUIS RABAUT.

LOUIE was very dear to me during the years I have been in the Congress and I esteemed and cherished him profoundly. He was one of our greatest leaders and one of our dearest friends. He was beloved, respected and admired wherever he was known, and the warmth of his heart, the radiance of his personality, the compassion and generosity of his impulse have been everlastingly impressed upon the annals of this great body and in the hearts of all those of us who were privileged to know and to love this noble soul.

LOUIS RABAUT'S family was part of his very being and he was indescribably proud of his devoted wife, his loving sons and daughters, of whom he often spoke in such a way that made it clear to all that his wonderful family was enshrined and forever locked in his heart.

He was proud of all his children, but I thought he was especially grateful for those who gave their lives in the religion to the service of the Living God, because LOUIS was a man of profound, religious faith who always worked and lived by the precepts of the Divine Master.

In his passing, a giant oak has fallen in the forest and a noble soul has gone to rejoin his Creator. With very heavy heart, I extend to his beloved and grieving family, his gracious helpmate and wife of many years, and his wonderful children—my most heartfelt sympathy for the truly irreparable loss which has come to them, to the House of Representatives, to the Nation and to all of us who dearly loved this great American and gracious, Christian gentleman.

I join his dear ones in mourning his passing, and sad of heart, pay tribute to his noble character and illustrious achievements. I pray that they will find that solace and comfort in their faith, as their dear, departed one would have them do, that will bring them reconciliation to the divine will.

The loving memory of this good and dear man will remain in my heart to the end of my days; it will dwell here in the historic precincts of this House, for very many years to come, inspiring and guiding the House toward noble goals, exalted ends and warm human fellowships, for such are the treasured bequests of the courtly gentleman from Michigan, Hon. LOUIS RABAUT.

May the good Lord smile graciously upon our beloved friend and colleague and grant him enternal rest and peace in his heavenly home.

WGN-Radio's in Wonderful, Wonderful Rut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, radio and television stations WGN in Chicago were presented the second annual "Mike Award" by the Broadcast Pioneers in a very inspiring ceremony held in New York.

I am very happy today to include an article which appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times on February 26, written by that newspaper's television editor, Paul Molloy, dealing with this subject.

Because I know there are a great many people all over the country who listen to WGN, a clear channel station, I thought this article was most timely.

The article follows:

WGN-RADIO'S IN WONDERFUL, WONDERFUL RUT

(By Paul Molloy)

NEW YORK.—It's permissible to wonder if WGN-Radio is in something of a rut. The independent, nonnetwork station has just picked off another impressive prize.

WGN received the "Mike Award" Sunday night at a dinner in the Latin Quarter night club tendered by the New York chapter of Broadcast Pioneers, sponsor of the award. Broadcast Pioneers is an industry group consisting of people who have worked in radio 20 or more years, or at least half that time in television. Its foundation was inspired by veteran broadcaster H. V. Kaltenborn in 1942, and its activities include maintenance of the Broadcasters' Hall of Fame and the welfare of needy veterans of the radio-television business.

BRICKHOUSE IS MASTER OF CEREMONIES

The award, presented before a glittering array of radio and television executives and prominent radio performers of yesteryear and today, was "in acknowledgement of WGN's dedicated adherence to quality, integrity and responsibility in programing and management, pioneering in the art, the science, and in service to the public.

The award was presented by Arthur Simon, president of Broadcasters' Foundation, Inc., the welfare arm of Broadcast Pioneers, and accepted on behalf of the station by Ward L. Quaal, executive vice president and general manager of WGN Inc., which also controls channel 9.

"This award has an extra special significance because it comes from a distinguished group of veterans in the broadcast industry," said Quaal in accepting the award. Simon described Quaal as "one of the truly great, inspired broadcasters in our industry—a radio pioneer in the finest tradition of broadcasting."

In the attendance of 650 notables were 5 members of the Federal Communications Commission—Robert Bartley, Robert E. Lee, John S. Cross, Frederick W. Ford and Rosell Hyde—along with ex-Florida Gov. LeRoy Collins, now president of the National Association of Broadcasters. FCC Chairman Newton Minow sent a congratulatory telegram citing Quaal for "this recognition of your long service in the public interest."

Jack Brickhouse was master of ceremonies at the dinner, which was presided over by Phil Edwards, president of the New York chapter of Broadcast Pioneers. After the ceremonies, entertainment was provided by Rudy Vallee and night club stars currently playing the New York scene.

WGN didn't wait until the Mike Award was a big girl before courting her. The station is only the second in the Nation to receive the honor, which last year went to station WLW in Cincinnati.

A HAPPY HABIT

But then awards are getting to be a happy habit for WGN. It has had more than its share over the 38 years of its life which includes such historical feats as remote broadcasts of the famed Scopes "Monkey Trial" in Tennessee, and the origination of the "Sam 'n' Henry" comedy team which was to endure later as "Amos 'n' Andy."

During recent years WGN won the Alfred P. Sloan Award three times and its sister station, WGN-TV, received the George Foster Peabody Award twice. In December, at the first convocation of the American College of Radio Arts and Sciences, WGN's programs and personalities took down nine top awards and Quaal walked off with the principal one—"Radio Man of the Year." (In January of 1961 Quaal was selected as TV Prevue's "Man of the Year" for 1960 by this newspaper.)

An Address by the Honorable Harold F. Linder, President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, January 22, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I commend to the atten-

tion of our colleagues the following address by the Honorable Harold F. Linder, president and chairman of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, before the National Credit Conference of the American Bankers Association meeting in Chicago on January 22, 1962.

Mr. Linder addresses himself to new programs to be employed by Eximbank to facilitate and finance U.S. trade overseas.

Mr. Linder's remarks follow:

EXIMBANK AND ITS NEW PROGRAMS

(Address by Harold F. Linder, President and Chairman, the Export-Import Bank of Washington, before the National Credit Conference, American Bankers Association, Chicago, January 22, 1962)

Let me say that it is a privilege for me to have the opportunity to talk before the National Credit Conference of the American Bankers Association. I am most grateful for your kind invitation.

I am sure the Export-Import Bank of Washington needs no introduction to this group of American bankers. You, of course, know that we are in business to finance and facilitate U.S. oversea trade; that we are required by our statute to make loans on which there is reasonable promise of repayment in dollars; and that we are enjoined to supplement and encourage and not compete with private capital interests. Perhaps to oversimplify our operations: We lend to foreign purchasers of U.S. goods who repay in dollars plus interest and on terms appropriate for the types of goods sold in the international markets. We borrow our funds from the Treasury and we pay the Treasury interest on the money borrowed. As is the case with all lending bankers, the difference between the interest we charge and the interest we pay enables us to pay a dividend to the Treasury and add to our own reserves. We are now paying an annual dividend of $30 million and added to our reserves of approximately $63 million during the past fiscal year. In addition to the Bank's prime function of assisting the U.S. exporter, the obvious and happy byproduct is that we who work at the Bank are in the fairly unique position of making a profit for Uncle Sam, without competing with private interests, and of contributing to our national objectives.

Since we have just closed out the calendar year 1961, I am happy to release here, for the first time, some figures on the year's activity. During 1961, Eximbank approved 907 loan and guarantee transactions representing a total of $1,114 million. Of possible interest to the many of you who finance exports to Latin America, $490 million of the total authorizations by the Bank were for Latin American countries. In addition, loans and guarantees were authorized for all major geographical areas of the world, with Asia receiving the next largest amount after Latin America.

But aside from the relatively cold dollar totals of Bank business conducted, when we look at the year 1961 in retrospect we must call it a year of adjustment to new patterns in world trade. It has been a period in which we set in motion programs for greatly enlarged assistance to U.S. manufacturers who wish to export more of their goods; this in the hope of improving the balance-of-payments position of the United States.

A recurrent theme at the National Foreign Trade Convention in New York last November was the plea to recognize realistically the fact that Europe and Japan are back on their industrial feet as able competitors in the world marketplace. Another was the plea to recognize the fact that the lush post-World War II years of the American sellers' market are no more. The world market is once again a competitive market. Within 2 years it will be a fiercely competitive market. In the words of one of Gen. Jeb Stuart's troopers, it will be a matter of "Git or git got." To respond correctly and imaginatively to the reality of this new trading world will test the fiber and ingenuity of the American industrial, banking, export, and insurance communities as well as that of the Government. And respond correctly and imaginatively we must, for it is we as Americans who have so long been the world's dedicated proponents of the principles of free competitive trade. Not to accept the challenge now would be inconsistent with our tradition as well as our preaching.

What will win for us in a competitive world market is the heavy application of the initiative, inventiveness, and drive which made our industrialists great in the first place.

No one can doubt that the need to keep the United States competitive in world markets is crucial. With this in mind Eximbank has devised new measures to assist U.S. foreign trade, and I should like to describe them for you.

One salient point we have kept before us is the desirability of getting small- and medium-sized U.S. firms into the export business. And the converse is true: we are equally interested to sell U.S. equipment to small- and medium-sized firms abroad. To help accomplish this, we are utilizing a type of credit known as an industrial bank loan. To illustrate, last February we authorized a $25 million credit to the Industrial Bank of Japan, and I might say we've done similar operations in three other countries. This bank in turn made the money available, through Japanese commercial banks, to small- and medium-sized manufacturers for the purchase of U.S. equipment. Within a few months, the credit was completely allocated to a good many small buyers—in fact, applications were more than three times the amount made available. We place a ceiling for a few hundred thousand dollars on the amount of any individual loan and reserve the right to approve allocations above $100,000. Literally hundreds of U.S. suppliers are receiving orders as the result of this kind of transaction.

A major effort of Eximbank during the past year has been to comply with President Kennedy's directive to assure that our Government provide assistance to American exporters at least equal to any such assistance to be found abroad. Two new programs have been initiated which we think will be of prime importance to U.S. foreign trade in the competitive years ahead. One is broadening of our guarantee system offered directly to commercial banks. The other is a plan to provide export credit insurance directly to exporters.

Our program with commercial banks and other financial institutions consists, essentially, of the offer of a combination of Eximbank guarantees on medium-term export transactions. It is designed to encourage nonrecourse commercial bank participation in export sales and to facilitate the buying of export paper from commercial banks by other financial institutions should they and the banks so desire. Eximbank will offer a political risk guarantee on that part of each medium-term transaction for which a commercial bank assumes the credit risk, provided an Eximbank guarantee covering both political and credit risks is taken on the balance of the commercial bank's participation.

To put it succinctly, if the commercial bank is prepared to take the credit risk for its own account on the early maturities—and by early I mean the first 18 months of a 3-, 4-, or 5-year credit or 50 percent of a 1- or 2-year credit—an Eximbank guarantee of the political risk on those early maturities is offered provided the commercial bank agrees to carry or resell the later maturities on which the Eximbank will issue a comprehensive guarantee including both the political and the credit risks. If, on the other hand, the commercial bank elects to ask us to carry the later maturities, then no political risk guarantee will be offered on the early ones. It is our purpose, through the offering of these guarantees, to make commercial bank participation more attractive. It follows that this will result in both an increase in commercial bank participation and a decrease in the volume of direct financial participation on the part of the Export-Import Bank. Moreover, if the commercial bank determines to take all maturities under our guarantees and wishes at any time to sell the paper which it is holding, our guarantees are assignable, the only restriction being that in respect of the early maturities on which the credit risk is taken by the originating commercial bank it must offer recourse on one-half of such early maturities.

The amount of cash payments to be made to the exporter by the foreign buyer in connection with medium-term credits also has been under review. This is a point which is basic alike to export credit insurance, nonrecourse financing by banks, and exporter credits granted directly by Eximbank. The 20-percent cash payment formerly required of the foreign buyer has now become more flexible and may be reduced in appropriate cases to as little as 10 percent. This step was taken to allow U.S. exporters to offer terms which in this respect are as advantageous as those sometimes offered by foreign exporters with the support of their governments.

We are trying to make this program known in the commercial banking world on as wide a scale as possible. This is one reason I am delighted to be here today. In addition to press releases and the sending of technical instructions to commercial banks, we are holding seminars at Eximbank in Washington for your foreign department personnel. These conferences should be of great educational value both to the people who will actually process the paper in the commercial banks and those concerned at Eximbank. At them, give-and-take discussion is the order of the day, and the first meetings have been most successful. It is of interest, I think, to report that since President Kennedy made the initial announcement of the new Bank guarantee program on October 27 nearly 30 nonrecourse participations by commercial banks have been approved by Eximbank.

The second new major program of Eximbank, as I mentioned, is in the area of direct export credit insurance to exporters. Since the spring of 1960, Eximbank had provided political risk insurance on short-term export transactions. But U.S. exporters, with varying degrees of heat, had been calling for a comprehensive insurance plan which would cover both political and credit risks, and which would include the medium-term field as well as the short term. A great deal of our energy has been addressed to meeting this demand during the past year.

We concluded that if comprehensive political and credit risk insurance was to be offered in this country, then, both in accordance with our mandate from the Congress and our own desires, we should do our utmost to bring in the private insurance companies and certainly to avoid competition with them. I might say it took us a bit of time to persuade those companies that this is a field into which they should enter, but once we were successful in so doing we have had a very full measure of cooperation. We explored throughout the spring and all last summer, through studies and frequent negotiation, and with the aid of consultants from outside the Bank, the possibility of creating an association of private insurance companies who would be prepared to issue a comprehensive policy to interested exporters. We now have an agreement with a considerable number of the leading insur-

ance companies of this country under the terms of which Eximbank will underwrite 100 percent of the political risk and the credit or commercial risks will be shared between the insurance association and our Bank. We hope that the time will come in the not too distant future when the private insurance companies will be prepared to take for their own account the whole of the credit risk.

On October 27 President Kennedy announced that the Export-Import Bank would soon inaugurate such a program. Initially, 20 private U.S. insurance companies formed the Foreign Credit Insurance Association.

They are engaged in casualty, property, and marine insurance. At the present time 35 additional companies have joined the association, making a total of 55. The FCIA has entered into a partnership with Eximbank for the issuance of comprehensive export insurance policies to U.S. exporters. This plan accomplishes two important things in addition to the issuance of policies. It brings about, as I indicated, desirable private participation, and we believe it will solve a mechanical problem of issue. Since insurance agents and brokers throughout the country will be placed in a position to accept applications for insurance policies at or near the exporters' places of business, it will not be necessary for exporters to negotiate the policies with us in Washington. You will appreciate that the task of preparation and installation of this system, as well as the gathering of staff, is one of considerable magnitude. Nevertheless, we believe that the Foreign Credit Insurance Association will be issuing policies before the end of February.

In the beginning, at least, we anticipate that most of these will be in the short-term field, that is, for credits up to, say, 1 year. And when your customers come in with such insured credits we believe that you, in turn, will be prepared to buy this paper from them with or without recourse and, most importantly, without regarding such purchases as impairing of their normal credit lines.

As with the program for guarantees to commercial banks, we expect to make the aavilability of comprehensive export insurance known throughout the land. Once the FCIA is in business we shal send Bank officials to all regions of the country to appear at prearranged meetings of exporters to discuss the program in detail.

The two new programs are complementary. Hence, Eximbank obviously will not offer guarantees to commercial banks on transactions for which an exporter has purchased FCIA insurance; and conversely, of course, FCIA insurance will not be wanted or needed for transactions on which Eximbank has given guarantees to commercial banks.

I should like to touch upon one other development of the past year, that of the creation of the new Agency for International Development, now called AID, and because many of you will be advising businessmen who may be confused by the Washington jungle I would like to explain our Bank's working relationship with AID. Their activities and ours in a large measure impinge on one another in the area which has been and still is, from the point of view of dollars involved, the most important business of the Bank. I refer, of course, to our long-term project lending. Let me start out by saying that the Executive order of the President setting up the AID organization provided for a Development Loan Committee, the Chairman of which is the AID Administrator and on which I have the honor to serve, along with the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for International Affairs, the Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, and the Deputy Administrator of the AID. In addition to this Committee, there will continue to be a liaison mechanism which I confidently expect will insure that conflicts between the Bank's and the new organization's lending policy will not arise. I rely for my confidence not only in the inherent logic of such an approach, but also upon the fact that I know we have excellent working relationships with the senior as well as the staff people in AID.

Obviously, project loans made by the Bank must be counted in the tally of development lending and aid; and it is necessary that the prospects of Bank loan authorizations be considered in setting levels for AID commitments. These two sources, together with a number of others are elements of a country program. It is important, then, that in developing such programs there be early and continuous consultation with the Bank on what may reasonably be considered within our range of lending operations. This means that dollar exchange requirements for the more economically productive investments, in countries which have adequate repayment capacity, should be initially thought of as a possible subject for Bank consideration. In this way, the Bank's resources may sensibly be woven into many country programs.

Indeed, maximum use of all U.S. Government (and free world) financial resources that is to say, AID should neither making loans that could be made by the Bank; that is to say, AID should neither make "hard" loans which the Bank was willing to make, nor authorize on "soft" terms transactions that could be financed on normal terms. On any other basis, AID loses its chief raison d'etre. Conversely, if the Bank were to make loans moved primarily by an aid philosophy rather than "to facilitate exports and imports" of the United States and "for specific purposes," then the Bank loses its character and strength.

In conclusion I would like to revert, gentlemen, to the importance of U.S. export trade, not only to our domestic economy but to the balance-of-payments position of our country. As the leading power in the free world, not only does our self-interest dictate, but we have a moral obligation, as well, to make every effort to provide for long-term loans and even grants, where necessary, to the less-developed countries. For our own protection we need to maintain troops and bases at key points throughout the world. These things can only be done if our balance-of-payments situation is improved. You are not the exporters, but you are the counselors of your customers, and, if you'll permit me to say so, I believe that you have an obligation to do whatever lies in your power to encourage and stimulate the export business of our country.

Now, gentlemen, I have endeavored to give you in capsule form some of the highlights of the [calendar] year 1961 at Eximbank, a summary of the Bank's new programs, and also what I confidently expect will be the basis on which the Bank will operate in relation to the new AID agency. If there are questions, I shall be happy to endeavor to answer them, and I thank you again for the privilege of meeting with you today.

Citizens Back Anti-Red Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union of Monday, February 26, 1962:

CITIZENS BACK ANTI-RED STAND

Americans are not easily hoodwinked by the prolific blandishments or the saber-rattling threats of communism. They understand that a sound economy and a strong military are essential to ward off envelopment by the Reds.

These facts were emphasized in a poll among residents of 15 California and Illinois communities served by Copley daily newspapers. Results of the study make up a package of unassailable evidence that the great majority of Americans think positively.

They may differ sharply in their views, but what they believe, say, and endorse, stem from their own thinking. This is a privilege guaranteed by the Constitution. The opposite, of course, is communism, which is found on brainwashing in which the individual becomes a robot of the state.

The great majority opinion in the poll indicated Americans have the courage and desire to support strong stands on such issues as Berlin, southeast Asia, Formosa, or other areas plagued by Communist threats. We should fight in those areas, most of the interviewees said, in the event that is our final means of preventing Communist takeovers.

A depth of understanding and alertness about domestic issues on the part of the American public also was indicated by the poll. The overwhelming majority said increased inflation was dangerous to the Nation's economy. Fifty percent suggested that cooperation between labor and management to stabilize wages and prices would be the most effective inflation curb, a thought that New Frontier economists would do well to ponder.

The widest diversification of answers was noted in opinions about the Nation's greatest needs. They varied from "more religion, greater spiritual values, and higher moral standards" to "more conservative government with fewer controls and less socialism."

There was one particularly succinct comment from a businessman in response to this section of the questionnaire. "It's high time the insidious communistic cancer was controlled from within. They are nibbling at our freedom like a horde of termites."

No single American would agree with every opinion or the majority thinking on every question in the poll. But the fact that the interviewees had a knowledge—and an opinion—about complex national and international problems was reassuring.

If the administration is looking for cues as to how the vast majority of the American public feels about communism it should study such polls as that conducted by the Copley newspapers. They prove Americans want and are ready to back up a tough stand against communism at home and abroad.

Lt. Col. John H. Glenn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a certified copy of a resolution recently adopted by the governing body of the borough of Sayreville, Middlesex County, N.J., in reference to Lt. Col. John H. Glenn's flight around the earth.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION RE LT. COL. JOHN H. GLENN

Whereas Lt. Col. John H. Glenn became America's first astronaut by orbiting the earth three times on February 20, 1962, making the round trip each time in 90 minutes; and

Whereas this feat ushers in a new era in space exploration; and

Whereas Lieutenant Colonel Glenn has called forth the respect and admiration of the entire world: Now, therefore, be it and it is hereby

Resolved—

1. That the mayor and council of the borough of Sayreville, N.J., hereby extend to Lieutenant Colonel Glenn and to all those who made his remarkable feat possible, sincerest congratulations and best wishes for many more similar accomplishments which may eventually unlock the deepest and seemingly impenetrable mysteries of the universe.

2. That certified copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith to President John F. Kennedy, the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, and to Lt. Col. John H. Glenn at Cape Canaveral, Fla.

JOHN M. KIERST.

Approved:

HAROLD H. BOEHM, *Mayor*.

Want $8 Billion for Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City, Pa., Derrick of February 26, 1962, entitled "Want $8 Billion for Schools."

The editorial follows:

WANT $8 BILLION FOR SCHOOLS

The American Association of School Administrators, meeting in Atlantic City last week, came through with a proposal for Federal aid to education that is fantastic, to say the least.

The administrators approved a resolution asking that the Federal Government pump $8 billion—that's right, $8 billion—more into the public schools each year.

This massive amount is 10 times as much as that requested by President Kennedy himself in his current proposal for Federal aid to education, which calls for expenditure of $2.5 billion spread over a 3-year period. It almost equals the total annual payments in interest on the public debt. It is approximately two-thirds as much as the total annual civilian payroll of Government.

Moreover, the school administrators are resolved to make their bid for massive Federal aid the basis for their legislative and lobbying platform. They're going to pressure for their proposal which is far and away the largest program of Federal aid to education ever suggested.

This proposal certainly should get a cold reception from legislators who seem ready to shunt aside the President's program, which is extremely modest by comparison, for the simple reason that the crisis on which Federal aid proponents base their pleas for funds is difficult to find.

For instance, the President says that a total of 600,000 classrooms must be constructed during the decade to meet the public school needs. He infers that the need can only be met through Federal aid.

The record clearly shows, however, that States and local communities are doing the job and doing it well. Only last week, a compilation of figures for the 1960–61 school year showed that new records were set with construction of over 72,000 elementary and secondary classrooms and the sale of over $2.4 billion of new issues of school bonds for elementary and secondary schools.

It's easy to see that at this rate of construction and expenditure, the classroom need projected by the President for the decade not only will be met, but will be exceeded. The crisis fades in the light of the fine job being done by States and local communities in meeting the problems of education.

And, of utmost importance, the job is being done without Federal aid and without the risk of giving over control of the schools to a Washington bureaucracy.

The Influence of Economic Theory on Current Events

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, Robert Lekachman, a brilliant professor of economics at Barnard College, and author, has discussed President Kennedy's economic message to Congress, in the February 5, 1962, issue of the New Leader. I am sure that my colleagues will benefit from Professor Lekachman's comments on the soundness of the President's proposals for dealing with recessions. I include the article under leave to extend my remarks:

KENNEDY'S BLUEPRINT FOR PROSPERITY

(By Robert Lekachman)

Few things that Lord Keynes wrote have been more quoted than the ringing affirmation of the intellectual's faith which is the very last paragraph of his most influential book, "The General Theory of Employment Interest and Money." The passage can bear still another citation:

"* * * The ideas of economists and political philosophers, both when they are right and when they are wrong, are more powerful than is commonly understood. Indeed the world is ruled by little else. * * * I am sure that the power of vested interests is vastly exaggerated compared with the gradual encroachment of ideas. Not, indeed, immediately, but after a certain interval; for in the field of economic and political philosophy there are not many who are influenced by new theories after they are 25 or 30 years of age, so that the ideas which civil servants and politicians and even agitators apply to current events are not likely to be the newest."

The passage inevitably springs to mind because the President's Economic Message has just unveiled a three-part program addressed to the mitigation of recession and the encouragement of rapid recovery. All three measures are logical applications of the notions Keynes and his American disciples discussed during the 1930's under the heading of compensatory finance.

Recently, economists have seemed to assume in absent-minded fashion that these principles have found their way into the hearts of our political masters. But I think the happy belief that even politicians comprehend the desirability of running surpluses when the economy booms and inviting deficits when economic activity is slack is based largely on a coincidence between legislation Congress has passed for assorted reasons and the policy objectives economists have come to approve.

The 50-odd introductory texts in economics which jostle for the privilege and the profit of instructing collegiate youth usually emphasize a set of institutional arrangements, generally labeled "automattic stabilizer," which set off the bad old days of Hoover from the bright new times of Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower and Kennedy. These stabilizers, symmetrical as well as automatic, check income contractions during recessions and retard inflationary income expansions during booms. The most important of the stabilizers are personal income taxes, unemployment compensation and agricultural subsidies.

The salesman whose commissions shrink from $15,000 to $10,000 suffers a true income loss that is smaller than $5,000 by the amount which would have been paid in tax if his income had remained at $15,000. Similarly, if a man who loses his job can collect 35 percent of his normal paycheck in the shape of unemployment compensation, his personal income drops 65 percent instead of 100 percent, and in all probability personal spending contracts by a still smaller percentage. And the same obtains in the case of the farmer and agricultural subsidies.

Although there is no question that these three stabilizers have had a valuable dampening impact upon the swings of the business cycle, it is equally plain that Congress did not adopt any of them out of a comprehension, much less reverence, of the verities of Keynesian economics. We failed to achieve a really progressive personal income-tax structure until the exigencies of armament expenditures during War War II and the Korean conflict compelled us to raise large tax revenues. The plaints of the farmers won them the manna of parity payments, a tribute partly to political reality and partly to the rural myths which persist in urban America. Our still inadequate system of unemployment compensation was primarily a response to obvious social need.

The point is currently relevant because it helps to explain the coolness which has greeted the President's commonsense reinforcements of these automatic stabilizers. Let us consider each of the Kennedy recommendations in turn, starting with the simplest:

Extension of unemployment benefit periods from the current maximum of 26 weeks to a new maximum of 39 weeks.

The extension is to occur only after two conditions are fulfilled: First, insured unemployment must reach 5 percent; second, the number of individuals who exhaust their benefits over a 3-month period must reach 1 percent of covered employment. The President proposes to finance the program by extending present payroll taxes on the first $3,000 of wage income to $4,800. The only serious objection to this fiscally prudent improvement is likely to come from the jealous guardians of congressional power who prefer the drama of ad hoc extension during each recession, and from those chronic pessimists about human behavior who suspect most of their fellow citizens of laziness.

Authority to reduce taxes promptly during recessions.

The justification for this step is extremely obvious. A reduction of 5 percentage points in the rates applicable to personal income—the maximum sought by the Chief Executive—will diminish tax collections by $5 billion within 6 months. These $5 billion will be extra income to the recipients of the

windfall and the greater part will be spent, with stimulating effects on the economy, on merchandise, and services.

A small tax reduction early in a recession may have a larger impact than a more substantial reduction made after the economy is in a severe slump. The corollary is a smaller total deficit when action is prompt and moderate than when it is delayed and massive. Moreover, if we keep our categories straight, we can see that tax reduction is essentially a conservative antirecession measure which expands the sphere of private choice. Conceivably it is recognition of this truth which has induced the intelligently conservative like the New York Herald Tribune and the Committee for Economic Development to embrace the notion.

In anticipation of screams from Congress (BARRY GOLDWATER has already termed the scheme unconstitutional, and others can be expected to see it as an infringement on their domain), the President's proposal gives Congress 30 days in which to reject a 6-month executive reduction. And before the President can so much as extend the reduction to a second 6-month period, he must make a new formal proposal which Congress is again free to veto within 30 days. Rationally, it would be entirely desirable to grant the President parallel authority to raise tax rates during inflations, but this the President evidently considered too much for Congress to swallow.

Authority, under carefully delimited conditions, to accelerate Federal spending on capital improvements by as much as $2 billion.

The safeguards are evident in the language of the Kennedy message: The President could initiate this program within 2 months after the seasonally adjusted unemployment rate (a) had risen in at least 3 out of 4 months (or in 4 out of 6 months) and (b) had risen to a level at least 1 percentage point higher than its level 4 months (or 6 months) earlier.

Of the $2 billion which the President could then release, as much as $750 million might represent simply an acceleration of direct Federal expenditures which Congress had previously authorized. Another $750 million would be transmitted to the States as grants-in-aid. Up to $250 million would be available as loans to States and localities to enable them to pay their share of project costs. The remaining $250 million would be distributed among these three categories according to the judgment of the President. In any event, authority to begin new projects would expire at the end of a year.

The very cautious wording of this proposal is an effort to head off some of the usual criticisms of public works as antirecession measures: it takes too long to get them started; they represent wasted resources; they frequently achieve their maximum impact upon the economy after the recession has ended and a different economic policy is appropriate. The modest amounts suggested and the concentration upon existing programs go far to meet these objections.

Forecasts are risky and revisions of the past are futile. Nevertheless, the President stands on firm ground when he declares that "the above criteria would have permitted Presidential authority to be invoked in each of the four postwar recessions—within 4 months after the decline had begun." Moreover, it is reasonably certain that early antirecession action would have produced deficits smaller than the $12 billion recorded during the last Eisenhower recession and the $7 billion reached during the first Kennedy recession.

This does not exhaust the merits of the proposals. Milder recessions are likely to enjoy the partnership of sounder recoveries and narrower fluctuations in employment, income and production. This would not only mitigate the human hardship of unemployment and business failure, but the growth rate is likely to be higher during gentler cycles than during the wider swings of business history.

Other equally wholesome byproducts may be anticipated, too. If times are more dependably good, both union and trade association pressure for high tariffs is likely to abate. The urge to reduce hours of work further than technical progress or national need justifies would also abate; it is fed now by actual or potential unemployment.

Of course, the adequacy of the Kennedy proposals depends upon a basically cheerful conception of the prospects of the American economy. If, as many economists believed in the thirties and a few hardy souls still believe in the sixties, the economy is always on the verge of stagnation, these smoothing, cushioning, and averaging devices will be insufficient. More substantial public investment programs will be required to fill the gap between the level of employment the private economy is capable of achieving and the full level of employment which is desired.

Unfortunately, the pundits grant the tax and public works portions of the President's program little chance of passage in this Congress. No doubt part of the explanation is no more than the natural reluctance of any legislature to surrender power to any executive. The attitude is comprehensible even if it is not entirely laudable.

But even beyond this fact of political life lies one of those simple truths which economists frequently have difficulty in grasping: the primitive belief of many Congressmen that a balanced budget is invariably a good thing, and an unbalanced budget is just as invariably a bad thing. The moral is pointed up by the circumstance that only a week or so ago Walter Lippmann considered it worth noting that a President had at last said the National budget was an instrument of economic policy, not a test of moral character.

In the light of all this, what shall we conclude about the merits of Keynes' insistence that ideas always eventually win the day? This much at least: It takes a generation to persuade intelligent businessmen and a literate President that intellectual coins which are shiny from use among economists can safely be recommended to the Nation. I may err next on the side of pessimism, but it also appears that another decade or two will be needed to induce Congress to reach equally sensible conclusions. It is best not to contemplate the grave probability that these majestic lags between professional and political opinion may lead to the adoption of policies which are many years out of date and many leagues behind the best thought of experts.

Humanity and Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to participate in a symposium conducted by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations in Miami, Fla., on February 25, 1962, which dealt with the subject "Judaism and Survival." During the course of the discussions I delivered a short address which I commend to the attention of our colleagues. We are all faced with the reality of this question of survival in a nuclear age and much thinking and clarification must take place before we find ourselves on firmer ground. When we do this thinking and obtain this clarification we will be much better armed against disaster.

My remarks follow:

HUMANITY AND SURVIVAL

The subject of our conference "Judaism and Survival" might just as well have been "Humanity and Survival." If the holocaust contemplated in these discussions should ever occur, and we all fervently pray that it will not, no part of any particular group or segment of mankind will survive. There will be no dividing by professions or by occupations or by colors or by religions.

It is fantastic to contemplate that such a catastrophe might be the ultimate proof that we are all brothers, regardless of color, race, creed, or place of origin.

No weapon of destruction ever devised by man ever did or ever will be able to discriminate or segregate in attacking its victims.

Therefore, the problem that seeks solution is not who shall survive but shall any survive?

At this point, I would like to inject into the discussion three brief statements, each by great Presidents of the United States of America. I quote: "There is a rank due to the United States among nations which will be withheld, if not absolutely lost, by the reputation of weakness; if we desire to avoid insult, we must be able to repel it; if we desire to secure peace, it must be known that we are at all times ready for war." So spoke George Washington in his fifth annual address to the U.S. Congress in Philadelphia on December 3, 1793. I quote again: "What constitutes the bulwark of our own liberty and independence? It is not our frowning battlements, our bristling seacoasts. Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us. Our defense is in the preservation of the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men in all lands everywhere. So spoke Abraham Lincoln in Edwardsville, Ill., on September 11, 1853.

Neither of these great men foresaw the thermonuclear missile age that threatens the universe today.

And now a last quote as follows: "We are amply strong for today and tomorrow, but we must consider the future, too." That is what President Kennedy said on February 8, 1962. In talking about meeting the Soviet threats to the security of the world, he pointed out that he and all of the American people are intent upon bringing about "total disarmament." I repeat, "total disarmament." In referring to that subject, President Kennedy said, "The only proper course for our Nation was to meet our defense needs while working toward a disarmament agreement." I continue to quote him: "It would be a great error to suppose that either of them makes the other wrong or unnecessary."

In these three Presidential statements, we find a good statement of our American principles based upon the fundamental moral principles which Judaism has preached throughout the years.

Even though I cannot agree, I understand the Quakers when they urge the only path to peace is by refusing to fight. I prefer the Judaistic principle that embraces that thought but goes further and adds to that concept, the principle that men were born to be free and, if necessary, they must fight for that freedom, and if the goal to peace can be obtained only by making that fight, then to battle we must go. What we must now do is follow the paths which may bring us to the ultimate goal of sholom peace.

The one way is to expend every possible effort to bring about complete and total disarmament. Not disarmament by the United States alone. Not disarmament by

us and our allies alone, but disarmament by the potential aggressors together with ourselves. We do not ask that the potential aggressors, who pretend that they are arming in defense against us, to disarm first. As evidence of our good faith, we say let us all disarm together.

While ceaselessly continuing our efforts toward that goal, which efforts have been opposed at every turn by the Communists, we must follow the other path by making ourselves so strong that they will never dare to attack us.

A part of that defense is to prepare for the offense which must follow any attack upon us. Another part of that defense is to prepare the civilian population against attack, an attack which will be directed against all of us without regard to color or race or creed.

It may be possible for someone to take a map of the United States and by drawing circles with a radius of 200 or 300 miles with the center of the circle placed in metropolitan communities and in strategic places, delineate a place or places in the desert or in the hills that might be immune from attack or immune from the effects of thermonuclear blasts. If one can find such a place or places to which he can resort, he might be temporarily safe. No one can assure him however, that the winds will not blow some of the radioactive material even to such a remote place. I have not tried the experiment but I am sure that if I did I would find very few places in the country that would qualify for this type of protection and I am just as sure that the few that would be found, if found at all, would accommodate only a tiny portion of our 180 million people.

Primarily the problem of civil defense is one for our Federal Government. Our Constitution places the responsibility, the duty, the obligation in the first instance upon the Federal Government. The fulfillment of the task is impossible without the combined cooperation of every State, every municipality and every one of our citizens.

For myself, I believe that attempting to build a shelter at one's home is of little value except possibly psychologically. It has a minimum of psychological value. There can be no assurance that the attack will come when you or I will be at home. The chances are that if an attack should come our families would be scattered, with some of us at home, some of us at work, and our children in various places, some at school, some at play, and some at work. I doubt if there would be sufficient time between warning and attack to gather our families together in one place.

Those of us who have the funds and the will to prepare such shelters at our homes will in my opinion when the time comes, receive into them anyone, even total strangers, who may be upon the street when the catastrophe comes upon us. So much for the individual effort.

The public effort must necessarily concern itself with the building of shelters as individual structures to accommodate the public or with using existing structures or new structures primarily occupied for other purposes. Either all or a part of them will be converted to shelters.

My own opinion is that the best of these shelters will not afford the protection that is required. No one can predict when or where these missiles will fall and only the aggressor will know the type that will be dropped. A direct hit will destroy everything above and beneath the ground for miles around. Another exploded in the air would contaminate everything above ground, vegetable, animal, and human, and may even seep through the ground to wreak the same havoc. The only good that can come of wasting money on shelters is the psychological feeling created at home among our people that they may be saved, and the idea abroad among our enemies that we intend to try to survive.

As for me personally, I would prefer to see the millions of dollars that our Government must spend for such purposes diverted to the prevention and cure of disease in the hope of having a healthier community that will never be subject to the dire consequence of blasts and fallout. In my opinion, every dollar of public money that is spent for public shelters must be spent in such a way that every public building or quasi-public building can be utilized for the benefit of all who are close enough to gain entry. I include not only public and parochial schools but places of public worship, the churches, the synagogues, and the temples. This means the Catholic churches must be prepared to receive in their shelters noncommunicants. The Jewish synagogues must be prepared to receive Christians into their shelters. In fact, all of them must be prepared to shelter the heathen, as well as the believers, if the monotheistic religions of the world intend to practice their preachment that we are our brother's keeper.

All these religions teach that the stranger in our midst must be treated as one of us. When disaster strikes will we turn our backs on these teachings and prove that we are no better than the wildest animals? I believe not.

Government by Leak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in view of today's statements in the press regarding President Kennedy's forthcoming announcement on nuclear air tests, I feel compelled to point out that this is a perfect example of Government by "leak" and reinforces my speech of February 21 concerning the President's hesitancy and indecisiveness on this question.

I am sure the leaders of both parties in the Congress would be interested in knowing of President Kennedy's thinking on this vital issue. As a member of the House Appropriations Committee I am particularly concerned since we have to appropriate the money for these projects. I cannot understand why the President feels it necessary to "leak" information to the New York Times, in a sense asking them what they think he should do.

I know that the majority of the Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle know what we should do and all feel affronted that the President does not see fit to be frank and open, even with members of his own party, on his final decision. The reasons for my convictions as to the thoughts of my colleagues are best illustrated in a letter from Senator THOMAS J. DODD dated August 9, 1961, to all of his colleagues in the Senate. I wish to include the letter at this point, all call special attention his remarks concerning President Eisenhower to which I referred in my speech of February 21.

The letter follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
August 9, 1961.

DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed you will find a resolution, urging the immediate resumption of nuclear testing, which I plan to introduce at an early date.

As you know, we have observed a voluntary moratorium on nuclear tests for almost 3 years now, without any assurance that the Kremlin has been observing a reciprocal moratorium. In view of the fact that the Soviets have violated more than 1,000 treaties and agreements, there is, to put it mildly, a grave chance that they have not observed their side of the honor moratorium.

As you know, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Atomic Energy Commission and many of the members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, who have access to all the information, have repeatedly urged the early resumption of nuclear weapons testing.

I would also like to point out that there exists no commitments, unilateral or otherwise, which would prevent us from resuming tests forthwith. President Eisenhower informed the world on December 29, 1959, that, because of the lack of progress at the Geneva Test Ban Conference, we would not further renew or extend the moratorium but would reserve the right to resume nuclear testing, with due notice to the international community.

I believe that this resolution reflects the attitude of the great majority of the American people and the great majority in Congress. I also believe that it could only be helpful in the present situation if the Senate passed such a "sense" resolution.

By its nature, this resolution should be introduced with broad bipartisan backing. I am therefore inviting members of both parties to join me in sponsoring the measure.

If you wish to be listed as a cosponsor, would you kindly advise Miss Jean Wegner in my office?

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS J. DODD.

President's Tax Proposal Discourages American Investment Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following column written by Donald I. Rogers for the New York Herald Tribune, February 25, 1962, points out the inconsistencies of the President's tax proposals. In one field, taxing foreign investments, the administration's proposals actually will discourage investments abroad by American companies while, at the same time, the administration is pleading with private American industry to invest in foreign companies:

INVESTING ABROAD—HAZARDOUS ENOUGH WITHOUT TOUGHER TAXES

The House Ways and Means Committee has voted its final approval of President Kennedy's proposal for a 20-percent withholding tax on dividends and some kinds of interest (as on mutual savings banks deposits) by a 15-to-10 vote, clearing the way for consideration of the Treasury's proposal that there be punitive taxation on American investments abroad to discourage further for-

eign investment on the basis that this contributes a drain on dollars and gold.

Aside from the fact that the Treasury's premise is incorrect, for statistics show that the investments of American corporations in foreign lands bring more dollars back to the United States than they send out, it would seem, in light of most recent developments, that the legislators might take another long look at foreign investments.

Perhaps they'll find that such investors stand in greater need of tax relief than tax increases.

Within the week, International Telephone & Telegraph Co., an American corporation owned by thousands of wage-earning, taxpaying middle-class Americans who have purchased its securities, lost an $8 million subsidiary in the state of Rio Grande do Sul, in Brazil because it was seized by the State under orders of left-wing Governor Leonel Brizola, a brother-in-law of Brazilian President Joao Guolart.

There is no recompense. There can be no tax writeoff.

The Brazilians moved swiftly and irrevocably, and pounced, pantherlike, on the assets of the American-owned company. There was a simple announcement.

Published in the official state newspaper (a local Pravada printed in Portugese) it said that the American firm's 30-year franchise had been canceled and that takeover of the company had been ordered to assure its continued operation. The implication was that if seizure hadn't been effected, phone service would have come to a halt, a ridiculous premise, though accepted by the locals.

The U.S. State Department has been asked by ITT to persuade Brazil to respect the action, but to date nothing has happened.

This seizure, or nationalization, of the telephone company followed a familiar procedure Governor Brizola had tried unsuccessfully to form his own telephone company and having failed to do so, then refused to grant a modest rate increase to National Telephone, the ITT subsidiary, so service could be improved. Then, when service wasn't good enough to meet Governor Brizola's standards, he nationalized the company.

End of ITT in Rio Grande do Sul.

Now, back to Washington. It is the Treasury's position that American industry has a special incentive to invest abroad because of higher rewards.

Can this experience in Brazil be called incentive?

International Telephone & Telegraph Co. has never been compensated, nor has anyone else who was so affected by Fidel Castro's seizure of the ITT subsidiaries in Cuba.

To be more practical than the Treasury has been in this matter, it must be realized that there doesn't exist in law a remedy for adequate tax writeoffs to compensate American property owners whose properties are seized by foreign governments.

True, our Government may take steps to try to get some form of compensation. But there has never yet been an effort to insure prompt, adequate, and effective compensation. Meanwhile, an effort is being made by the U.S. Government to impose punitive taxes on those Americans who do invest abroad.

This is a bit inconsistent, for the U.S. Government has made commitments since last year of $338 million to Brazil under President Kennedy's alliance-for-progress program, and in preparation is an additional loan for Brazil of $400 million from the American Government.

It is therefore all right, it seems, to lend money to Brazil, or any other foreign nation, but it would be improper to ask Brazil or any other foreign nation to guarantee the investments by private Americans.

Isn't this Nation supposed to be the citadel of private enterprise, which means, essentially, private investment? Are we ashamed to project this image to other less-developed nations? Perhaps, in the vast Santa Claus indulgence of the past 15 years, this is the one thing we have overlooked.

Certainly the House Ways and Means Committee and the Treasury Department should consider this aspect of foreign investment when sitting down to write new tax legislation.

Washington's Birthday Address by Maj. Gen. D. W. McGowan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I send to the desk a speech by Maj. Gen. D. W. McGowan, Chief of the National Guard Bureau, which he delivered on February 22 to the Washington Light Infantry Division of the South Carolina National Guard in Charleston.

This speech was made in honor of the birth date of President George Washington, the father of our country, and also in honor of the birthday of his distant cousin, Col. William Washington, the godfather of the Washington Light Infantry.

This significant role of the Southern Colonies in the American Revolution is one which is not well enough known in light of its vast importance toward obtaining our early freedom. The major general explains this unsuccessful attempt by the British to divide the Colonies by gaining firm control of the South accurately and informingly.

Because I am sure this speech will enlighten many people about the military traditions of organizations which have fought to protect our great Nation since its early colonial days, I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY MAJ. GEN. D. W. MCGOWAN, CHIEF, NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU, BEFORE THE WASHINGTON LIGHT INFANTRY, CHARLESTON, S.C., FEBRUARY 22, 1962

It is a pleasure for me to be here tonight among brothers-in-arms of the South Carolina National Guard. My pleasure is twofold, since I feel a sense of real kinship with the Washington Light Infantry. Your unit represents the State of South Carolina in the Centennial Legion, just as my old unit—troop B of the 102d Cavalry (the Essex Troop)—is the New Jersey member of that organization composed of the ancient military units of the Thirteen Original Colonies. Together they perpetuate the military traditions of organizations which have fought to protect our Nation since earliest colonial days, just as the Essex Troop and the Washington Light Infantry trained together for World War II combat at Fort Jackson. It is a kinship we all greatly value.

In meeting here on this particular date, we do honor to not one Washington, but to two: The man whose birth date it is, the Father of our Country, and his distant cousin, Col. William Washington, the godfather of your organization.

In a larger sense, we honor here today the spirit of American liberty which was born of our great Revolution, for just as both Washingtons embodied that spirit which gave birth to our liberty, so our National Guard units have fought in every war to preserve it.

The role of the Southern Colonies in our Revolution is one which is not well enough known nor appreciated, in my opinion, but it was one of vast significance to the eventual outcome at Yorktown. The British plan to divide the Colonies by gaining firm control of the South, and then to concentrate their efforts against the North, had not reckoned on the unconquerable spirit of South Carolinians. There were Royalists to contend with in these parts, to be sure, but there were also the frontier riflemen and the free yeomanry, crack shots, who didn't mind taking on the Redcoats, whatever the circumstances.

The British, in their attack on the South in June of 1776 by an army of 3,000 well-trained troops and a fleet of 11 men-of-war confidently expected to capture Charleston by assault.

It was during the cannonade of Fort Moultrie that the memory of Sergeant Jasper became forever enshrined in the hearts of loyal Carolinians. You will recall that it was at a crucial moment in the 10-hour battle when the flagstaff was shot away and fell outside of the fort; whereupon Sergeant Jasper jumped outside the ramparts, tore the palmetto flag of South Carolina from the broken staff and, surviving a storm of shot and shell, planted it on the palmetto log walls of the fort attached to a rammer staff.

So shaken were the British by their defeat that day, that it was nearly 3 years before they again turned their attention to the South.

With the capture of Charleston in 1780, however, the British believed they could at long last secure a stranglehold on the South, and their cavalry under the hated Tarleton ravished the countryside. But they soon found themselves faced with a new kind of warfare—guerrilla cavalry tactics.

The southern irregular cavalry lacked a central organization, but their hit-and-run raids hurt the enemy badly.

Led by the immortal Pickens, Sumter, and Marion, rebel raiders drifted out of their hideouts in the swamps to strike isolated outposts, gobble up supply trains, and wreck British formations, sapping and neutralizing superior enemy strength by pinning down hundreds of their regular troops.

And one by one, patriot forces snapped up the series of British posts which Cornwallis had so carefully established to maintain his hold on the Carolinas and Georgia.

Slowly the tides of the war began to turn. At Kings Mountain the Tories suffered a humiliating defeat at the hands of an inferior force of backwoods riflemen under Sevier and Shelby, with the total loss of their troops by death or capture.

Although Gen. Nathaniel Greene, who took command late in 1780, never got the credit he deserved, it was he, through his strategic marches and his skillful use of continentals and militiamen, who kept the war going here in the South and prevented the British from cutting the country in two.

At the Cowpens, Morgan so skillfully deployed his Continental regulars and militia, and so maneuvered them in the fight, that he nearly wiped out Tarleton's entire force. It was during this battle that Col. William Washington engaged Tarleton in fierce personal combat, and nearly annihilated his defeated force in its headlong rout. The subsequent strategic withdrawal of Greene north over the Dan River into Virginia was an epic.

Even Greene's later defeat at Guilford Courthouse in March forced the British

under Cornwallis to withdraw to Wilmington, and subsequently into Virginia.

The final blow to the British came at the battle of Eutaw Springs. Though not a clear-cut patriot victory, the British forces were so weakened by their losses that they never again engaged in a major battle. For all practical purposes, the war in the South was won.

When the Washington Light Infantry was organized in 1807, it determined to carry forward the tradition of the War of Independence and the exploits of these South Carolina militiamen, and specifically by honoring the memory of that great soldier hero of the victory at Cowpens—Col. William Washington.

In 1824, the company with other historic units in the States took part in a great patriotic celebration which was to have a very special significance for all guardsmen. Designated for the occasion as the "Fusilier Francaise," the Washington Light Infantry acted as a special guard of honor to escort the aging Marquis de Lafayette into Charleston on that French nobleman's triumphant and nostalgic return to the United States. It was in New York City that the famous 7th Regiment also served as a guard of honor to Lafayette, and for the occasion renamed itself "National Guard" in honor of Lafayette's "Garde Nationale," which he had commanded in France. From this triumphal tour, and from this adoption of the name, we of the States armed forces today bear the name National Guard.

In the Mexican War of 1847, the Washington Light Infantry formed the nucleus of Company A, of the Charleston Volunteers, and took part in General Scott's brilliant campaign from Veracruz through Contrearas, Churubusco, Chapultepec, and the Garita de Belen leading to the fall of Mexico City.

During the Civil War, the unit provided three companies; one serving under the immortal Wade Hampton, the other two as part of the 25th (Eutaw) Regiment, South Carolina Infantry. Of the original 414 officers and men from the original company, more than a fourth were killed in the great battles of that war.

Serving on the Mexican border in 1916 as Company B, 2d South Carolina Infantry, the unit became Company B, 118th Infantry in World War I, part of the 30th Division. It was this division with the 27th of New York that cracked the Hindenberg line in Flanders signaling the beginning of the end of World War I.

Entering World War II, Company B, 118th Infantry took part with the 30th Division in the climactic battle to halt Von Runstedt's armored drive on Mortain where he hoped to cut off Patton's armored columns fighting their way south from the Normandy beachhead into Brittany.

In subsequent combat, this National Guard division, Old Hickory, was to become known as "the workhorse of the western front." Thus, it is a proud heritage that the Washington Light Infantry carries forward—a tradition born at Lexington and Concord and, more specifically, here in South Carolina at the Cowpens, at Kings Mountain, at Camden, at Guilford Courthouse, and at Eutaw Springs.

And now to conclude by returning to our first President, whose birthday we celebrate, commander in his day of the Virginia Regiment.

Character was that quality which distinguished George Washington—probably not a military genius, he was, indeed, a great military leader, and a great President.

It was the force of his high character and the strength of his personality that held together the tattered remnants of his Continental Army through the unspeakable hardships of the winters at Morristown and Valley Forge. He knew defeat first at Long Island, again at Harlem Heights and at White Plains. Retreating with his dwindling forces across the Jerseys, Washington took refuge behind the Delaware River, opposite Trenton. For the decisive attack on the Hessians in Trenton—his own daring idea—three separate columns were detailed to cross the ice-filled Delaware. Only two columns made it—one of them accomplished nothing. Only the column which he personally led was to claim the victory—a victory that marked the turning point of the Revolution. Surely there is exemplified the imponderables of great military leadership.

The following story concerning our great President, I recounted at Savannah, Ga., just 2 years ago today to the Exchange Club:

Washington's insistence that the Civil Government be ever paramount, and that indeed he himself was but the servant of the Continental Congress, is supported by two incidents at the close of the war, which I will briefly describe.

The last wartime winter of 1782–83 was an unusually severe one. The fighting had long ceased. Although Washington thought the Army generally "was better organized, disciplined, and clothed" than ever before, serious trouble threatened in the resentment against its continued neglect by the Continental Congress. Washington warned a Delegate at Philadelphia, "The temper of the Army is much soured and has become more irritable than at any period since the commencement of the war."

An anonymous address attacked the "coldness and severity" of the Congress toward the officers' financial distress and urged them, should the Congress ignore a "last remonstrance," to desert the country during the war, or in event of peace, to refuse to lay down arms until redressed.

Upon reading the anonymous circular, Washington instantly ordered a meeting of officers for the 15th of May 1783 and decided that he himself, must attend and address the meeting.

Maj. Samuel Shaw of the Artillery was among the officers present at the meeting, and gives an account of it in these words:

"Washington opened the meeting by apologizing for his appearance there, but said that the diligence used in circulating the anonymous pieces rendered it necessary that he should give the sentiments to the Army on the nature and tendency of them."

The anonymous addresses, said Washington, were directed more to "the feelings and passions than to the reason and judgment of the Army," and he bitterly denounced the courses proposed by the papers to the officers.

After speaking of his own and of the officers' responsibilities for the Government, he then read a letter from Joseph Jones, the Virginia Delegate to Congress, which acted as testimony of the good disposition in Congress toward the Army.

Major Shaw further writes:

"One circumstance in reading this letter must not be omitted. Washington, after reading the first paragraph, made a short pause, took out his spectacles, and begged the indulgence of his audience, while he put them on, observing at the same time that he had grown gray in their service and now found himself growing blind. This appeal forced its way into the heart and moistened every eye. The general, having finished, took leave of the assembly."

Washington received a vote of thanks, and the officers expressed their confidence in Congress, repudiating the proposal of the anonymous addresses and quietly adjourned.

Instead of open revolt, by his unaffected and natural appeal, Washington had thus brought about formal expression by the officers corps of its confidence in the Continental Congress, the elected representatives of the people.

The second incident involves Washington's last official act as Commander in Chief of the Continental Forces.

The war was over. It was December of that same year, 1783. Savannah had been evacuated in July of the previous year. Washington had decided to return to civil life, with as little fanfare as possible, not only because this was the nature of that great man, but also because he felt that the enormous esteem in which he was held was potentially dangerous for the Nation. But the public would not have it so.

Congress was meeting at the same time in the State House at Annapolis, and Washington determined to deliver his resignation to that body in person. And so, after bidding his officers a moving farewell on December 4, at Fraunces' Tavern in New York, he set out on his long journey south. In the three cities through which he passed—Philadelphia, Wilmington, and Baltimore—he was joyously received with townwide celebrations. It was the same when he arrived in Annapolis. At his journey's end, he was an even greater hero than before.

In contrast, the Continental Congress was virtually without prestige. Added to a total indifference on the part of most citizens was the fact that many States had even neglected to send any delegation—The people had virtually forgotten that a national body existed.

But for Washington—hero though he was—this was the Congress and he was its servant. Why else had he fought?

On December 20, in Annapolis, Washington sent a letter to Congress, asking permission to resign and requesting the manner of doing so. The Committee informed him that the Congress wished him to deliver the resignation in person at noon of the 23d. The reply went on to set forth the following specifications:

1. He was to be accompanied by his two aides, but, while Washington was to be shown a seat, his aid's were to remain standing.

2. The President of the Congress would tell him when he might speak.

3. At the close of his address he should return his commission to the President and hear the President's reply.

4. That the Members of the Congress would remain seated and would keep their hats on. They were not to rise nor to uncover to General Washington. When, however, General Washington had become Mr. Washington, then the Congresmen were to rise and lift their hats.

5. After the ceremony, Washington was to bow to the Congress, but the Members were not to bow in return. They were to maintain their superiority to Washington, whether he were soldier or citizen.

And so it was. He arrived at noon on the 23d accompanied by his two aides, and took the seat assigned to him. After receiving the President's permission to speak, he read his brief address. At its end he "drew out from his bosom" his commission and placed the document in the President's hands. At every point, he conformed to the rules of the Congress. When the ceremony was ended, Congress rose and uncovered as a sign of respect to him.

And then Washington performed his first act as a private citizen. He returned Congress' mark of respect with a greater one.

He bowed, as Congress had specified he should.

This was his greatest hour.

The horses were at the door. Fifty miles lay ahead—the ferry across the clear Potomac—the last swift gallop along the lane to Mount Vernon—where Martha awaited him. George Washington, private citizen—home for Christmas.

Naval Reservists Fine Performance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I addressed my colleagues on the performance of the Air Force Reserve elements that had been recalled to active duty.

It was most gratifying to me to be able to speak so well of them because it has been my privilege to provide for the Reserves of all services with my colleagues of the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee for Reserves.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my fellow Members in this House, a similarly stellar performance on the part of the naval reservists who were called to active duty.

It is particularly gratifying to me because the home port of one of the destroyers called to active duty, the U.S.S. *Robinson*, was formerly in my district in South Carolina. This ship was manned to a large degree by reservists residing in or near Charleston, S.C.

The Navy's Selected Reserve responded immediately to the callup. It is not generally known but these naval reservists added a very substantial Navy of their own to the fleet. Forty destroyer-type antisubmarine ships steamed out to join the fleet and 18 naval air squadrons with 190 naval antisubmarine aircraft commenced antisubmarine surveillance patrols at once.

These ships and aircraft commanded and manned by reservists accomplished the transition from civil life to active service smoothly, quietly and without incident.

Some of the destroyers were off the Dominican coast during that crisis—others joined hunter-killer groups and are operating all over the Atlantic.

All of them moved to their stations at once without any postmobilization training.

Rear Adm. George P. Koch, U.S.N., who commands one of these groups has written a report on the performance of his reserve ships. I want to read a part of this report to you at this time:

Four Reserve ships that I have with me, the U.S.S. *Miller*, formerly home ported at Boston; the U.S.S. *Robinson*, formerly home ported at Charleston; the U.S.S. *Hunt*, formerly home ported at Jacksonville; and the U.S.S. *Remey*, formerly home ported at New York, have performed superbly in every manner. They joined the group after being recalled for only a period of 1 month and by the time we reached the eastern Atlantic were performing as well as the regulars. We are now in the rough seas north of Scotland and the fact that they are doing as well as the two regular ships I have with me certainly speaks well for the worthwhileness of our Reserve training program.

Some of the Reserve officers and men told me that they wondered at first if it was really necessary for their recall. They said that even though their morale was very high because they were doing something at sea on this cruise, the above doubt was not competely dispelled until they visited Berlin and saw the wall. Most of these people are professional and business men and when they are released I am sure that they will spread the word widely in their respective communities why it is necessary to spend as many defense dollars as we presently are. The visit to Berlin also had a tremendous effect on the West Berlin people. Our sailors' blue uniforms were the first they had seen in large numbers for a long time and I have received many letters thanking us for showing them that the United States is really behind their struggle for freedom. The mayor of West Berlin personally greeted the Reserves and made a speech to them in English in which he stated that he realized the hardships they were going through in giving up their businesses and leaving their homes because of the Berlin crisis and wanted to make sure that they knew that everyone in Germany, and in West Berlin in particular, was certainly thankful for their sacrifices."

Adm. George Anderson, our Chief of Naval Operations, upon being questioned by the press in San Diego made the following statement:

Question. There's been a lot of discussion about reservists recently. One ship of reservists sailed to the Pacific. Has the progress you've made with the reservists called up been sufficient to the point you think it is justified to continue that type of Reserve program?

Answer. We have been very pleased with the magnificent response of our Naval Reserve to the recall to active duty. It has justified our faith in the Reserve system, and I feel these officers and men have made a valuable contribution, as the President stated, in preventing hostilities. They have acquired a great deal of training, and we hope that conditions will permit them to be released prior to the expiration of the full year. We hope, also, that, if some individuals desire voluntarily to stay on active duty, we may be able to utilize their services. But I think that our Naval Reserve and our Naval Air Reserve—and I know the Marines feel the same way about the Marine Reserve—are a fine system, and we contemplate no major changes.

Such testimonials by the high command of the operating forces reinforce my conviction that our Reserve programs have justified our supporting efforts and our confidence in the American traditional "defense backup" that relies upon the minutemen of today—the personnel of our Reserve Forces.

The Giant Noneconomy Size

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation magazine, on December 9 of last year, carried an excellent article on "artful packaging" by John J. Lindsay, a reporter for the Washington Post and former Nieman fellow at Harvard, discussing some of the amazing testimony taken by the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, under the chairmanship of Senator HART of Michigan, into deceptive packaging and labeling practices on consumer items. I think this article deserves the attention of all Members of Congress, and therefore I have received permission to place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Lindsay covered very ably, I believe, the practices which are now so common in the packaging of food items and household products generally, and the interesting if not necessarily persuasive explanations of food industry packaging specialists and industry spokesmen—or apologists—for the methods used. Also included are excellent samples of the indignation expressed by consumers for the conditions they have found in the packaging of items found in the supermarkets.

Mr. Lindsay, in the article, refers also to the idea which has been put forward for Federal regulation of packaging sizes to require standard quantities in many food and household items, but he concludes that this may perhaps not be feasible and therefore we might have to depend upon the industry to police itself.

SIMPLE AMENDMENT WOULD END MUCH CONFUSION

I regret that he did not include any reference to the solution which I suggested to the subcommittee last July, and which is an important provision of my bill, H.R. 1235, an omnibus measure which would close many of the existing loopholes in the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act of 1938, our basic statute for consumer protection.

Under sections 403, 502 and 602, respectively, of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, a food, drug or cosmetic item is considered misbranded, and therefore subject to seizure and removal from the market "unless it bears a label containing first, the name and place of business of the manufacturer, packer or distributor; and, second, an accurate statement of the quantity of the contents in terms of weight, measure or numerical count." Subsection (F) of section 403 further alleges misbranding unless "any word, statement or other information required by or under authority of this act to appear on the label or labeling is not prominently placed thereon with such conspicuousness—as compared with other words, statements, designs, or devices, in the labeling—and in such terms as to render it likely to be read and understood by the ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase and use."

Mr. Speaker, the language of the present law would appear to be plain and clear and unequivocal, but unfortunately, the courts have varied in their interpretation of what constitutes sufficient "conspicuousness" under this definition. And that is the rub.

For I am convinced that if the required information which appears on all packages can be found on the label and read by the consumer, most women will exercise their inherent objections to being cheated in their food purchases.

My bill, H.R. 1235, which covers the whole range of Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act loopholes—including such things as factory inspection, certification of anti-

biotics, stricter controls over barbiturates and pep pills, pretesting for safety of cosmetics and also of prosthetic devices, closing of gaps in the new drug sanctions of the law, requiring proof of efficiency of new drugs and devices, and the removal of numerous special interest exemptions from regulation in the present law—has as one of its provisions the following additional requirement to be added on to the appropriate subsections of sections 403, 502, and 602, as follows:

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may issue regulations which specify the kind, size, and location on the label or labeling of statements required by this section.

This additional provision would enable the Food and Drug Administration to specify—as it does now in the Hazardous Substances Act—the size of type and other requirements for giving the essential labeling information, so that the housewife would not need a magnifying glass to determine the quantity of contents. Of course, she still might need a slide rule to determine the best buy by size or brand, but at least she would have the opportunity to make such computations. At present, she often cannot compute the best buy because she simply cannot read or find the tiny type in which the contents are specified on the label.

Mr. Speaker, I submit at this point, Mr. Lindsay's article from the Nation of December 9, 1961, as follows:

THE GIANT NONECONOMY SIZE

(By John J. Lindsay)

One of the more obscure virtues of a democratic society was revealed recently by Roy King, publisher of a food trade magazine, in explaining why food manufacturers short-weight the American housewife with tricky packaging and labeling. Testifying before the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, Mr. King said:

"In a democracy a citizen has an inalienable right to be different; and in this instance, the difference is the consumer's deviation from rationality as the foundation of her buying decisions."

It appears, according to Mr. King, that we are living in a "psychoeconomic era," which apparently means that while the practice of putting out a "jumbo" size of cereal that may contain a third less cereal than a competitor's "regular" size may "appear deceptive to the layman [sic] * * * it is not." It isn't deceptive because the housewife gets, instead of cereal, "attractive packaging" and the rich experience gained from being the subject of an emotional appeal made to her by the merchandisers.

All of this testimony the subcommittee found absorbing, but Senator PHILIP A. HART (Democrat, of Michigan) noted mildly that his colleagues were less interested in theory than in finding out whether the consumer was getting a "fair shake in the box" from the food manufacturers.

Since the subcommittee hearings began last summer—they are still in progress—a sizable number of housewives have trooped to the witness stand to argue, by their presence, with Mr. KING's theory of their "inalienable right" to be irrational. Take for example, Dorothy S. Wheeler, of Alexandria, Va., who thoughtfully brought along a few samples to show the Senators. She demonstrated a cake mix that was packaged in a container 20 percent larger than a rival product, but actually contained less mix. Then there was the instance of two bottles of vegetable oil, equal in height. But one had 25 percent less oil than the other because its "waistline" had been pinched to make for eye appeal.

The "irrationalist" legions got solid support from the articulate Mr. Marya Mannes, author and critic, who confessed that to her the modern supermarket is the "greatest exercise in planned confuison since the bazaars of Samarkand." She told the subcommittee that "most of us are simply too busy or too tired or too harassed to take a slide rule and an M.I.T. graduate with us to the supermarket and figure out what we're buying."

And the ominous thing about it, she said, is that "the makers of the goods we buy know this. In fact they know more about us than we know about them. They have spent millions of dollars studying us, the consumer." The big brothers in our society, she went on, are the "sellers and their brainwashing handmaidens, the behavioral scientists" who make the Orwellian nightmare seem like a refreshing dream. She estimated that the penny taken here and there in short-weight cartons and deliberate confusion of comparative prices and values is "greater than the staggering amount we forfeit to crime and corruption." Worse still, she observed, a sort of Gresham's law is at work in that "dishonest practices, because they succeed, will drive out honest practices because they don't."

An example of how this is actually working came up several months later during the hearings when Roy Zimmerman, a packager of private brands, conceded that in one instance his company was driven to advertise a quart of detergent as a "full quart—32 ounces" because a shelf-sharing competitor's brand containing 22 ounces was labeled "giant" size.

Here are further examples from the testimony of witnesses:

A baby-food processor brought out a new jar of applesauce containing a quarter of an ounce less than the old. An unwitting mother would, if she fed her child four jars a day, feed the child 24 pounds less per year without realizing it.

Two brands of soap pads were advertised at 13 cents each, but one box contained 4 pads and the other 5. Consumers complained that the distinction was made in print so fine that it could not be read without a magnifying glass.

Two brands of salt came in boxes containing identical amounts, but one box was an inch taller than the other.

Among detergents were found a giant size containing 3 pounds 5½ ounces, and a giant size containing 3 pounds 1¼ ounces. Both cost 77 cents each and looked the same size.

One breakfast-food company sold 6 biscuits in a box weighing 6 ounces, then brought out a new box, exactly the same size, containing 5 biscuits and weighing 5 ounces. One recurring complaint by witnesses was the reluctance of manufacturers to tell the consumer what he is getting. Seantor HART explained the theme of the complaints this way: "Day by day, shoppers, pay more and more for less and less in bigger containers bearing smaller and smaller type." The Senator knew whereof he spoke; at one stage in the hearings, he had to use a magnifying glass to read the print on a label.

Some witnesses suggested that a uniform Federal packaging and labeling law is needed to bring coherence again to the market place; to drive out the inadvertent, and possibly deliberate, chaos in the variety of cartons offered that contain the same thing.

That this is easier said than done was quickly made clear. Quite apart from the question of Federal interference, the industry leaders are divided among themselves on whether packaging anarchy is harmful and costly to the consumer, or is actually a beneficent gesture bestowed by the industry on a public that is clamoring for it (in accordance, one presumes, with King's law or irrationality).

When Senator HART suggested to Louis Cheskin, a Chicago motivational researcher, that the weight of a package's contents be stamped in large type on the label, Cheskin recoiled. "It would mutilate the psychological appeal of the package," he said. And when HART raised the question of establishing a uniform Federal packaging law, the witness feared for the American way of life. Cheskin said he opposed any "regimenting" of the packaging industry. It is only a short step from uniform sizes and shapes on store shelves to making every American dress like his neighbors he warned.

Senator HART and his colleagues were missing the point completely, it appeared. "Packaging," said Cheskin, "is the essence of the affluent society." Men package themselves in flashy automobiles; women with cosmetics and mink coats; families in fancy houses. Studies have shown, he went on, that people are more interested in packaging than in price.

But then the witness started to backtrack: of course, he said, only a stupid packager would cheat. An inferior product beautifully wrapped, like a vulgar woman beautifully groomed, is not likely to get a second chance. So, apparently, Senator HART and his colleagues were not missing the point, after all; the consumer is interested in value. The point of the hearings, which Cheskin apparently missed, was that consumers are confused by the multiplicity of product sizes and inconspicuous weight-labeling to the point where it is no longer possible to judge value received in terms of cost. None of the witnesses were complaining about the quality of the products—the point of Cheskin's vulgar woman analogy.

It was left to Edmund W. J. Faison, president of Visual Research, Inc., to go all the way. He told the subcommittee that trimming sizes rather than raising prices was in response to consumer demand. Consumers would rather, he said, get less than pay more. The easiest thing the industry could do is to raise prices, he said, implying that by cutting contents instead, the industry was sacrificing much in order to please the consumer.

Two industry witnesses, Robert L. Andrews and Roy Zimmerman, packagers of private brands, agreed that the consumer should, of course, be told exactly and clearly what he is getting. They both opposed federally imposed uniformity, however, preferring that the industry police its own marts.

Howe widespread are the abuses alluded to by witnesses? Are they deliberate, or just inadvertencies growing out of the packaging revolution brought about by the motivational researchers?

In one statement preceding the hearings, Senator HART proved reluctant to make harsh judgments. Some of the practices which resulted in the consumer"s plight "just grew up," HART conceded. If there is fraud in packaging, he said, it is not general.

One executive of a large grocery chain, who opposed Government regulation of packaging, said he had checked 68 items in one store and found only 3 in which the superduper, giant, or large economy size cost more per ounce than the smaller competing item. This works out to slightly more than 4 percent of the items checked, but if the ratio were applied to a complete inventory of products in a modern supermarket, where a display of 6,000 items is not unusual, some 250 items would fall under suspicion.

One witness, Mrs. Persia Campbell, economist at Queens College (New York City), and a consumer counsel to W. Averell Harriman when he was Governor of New York, raised the disturbing possibility that rising food costs—among others—might be concealed by labeling and packaging changes.

"If we are to deal adequately with inflation, we must have it out in the open," she said.

Few insiders here expect the subcommittee to recommend Federal interference in the packaging and labeling industry. It is expected, however, that a strong recommendation will be made to the industry to put its own house in order—or face Federal action.

Whatever else comes out of the hearings, the American consumer can be grateful for one marketing tip offered by the articulate Roy King. Since the whole thing is emotional, why fret about intelligent selection of the best buy? Buy the beans that give you emotional goosebumps—and never mind how much you are getting for your money.

Mr. Speaker, I now submit at this point the text of my statement to the Hart subcommittee last July explaining not only the packaging-labeling provision but other provisions of H.R. 1235 to close loopholes in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as follows:

STATEMENT PREPARED BY CONGRESSWOMAN LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, DEMOCRAT, OF MISSOURI, FOR SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE'S ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABELING AND PACKAGING OF CONSUMER PRODUCTS, JULY 3, 1961

I want to begin my statement by expressing my thanks to Senator HART, of Michigan, for serving as chairman of these excellent and useful hearings on packaging and labeling practices affecting consumers. I feel these hearings represent one of the most effective instances of consumer education we have had in the Congress in many years.

Every shopper who has had to fight the battle of the best-buy dilemma in the stores and who has had the feeling that no one in Washington seemed to know or care about the problem, at least knows at this point that we do care and are concerned. The question now arises, however: What do we do about it?

No purpose would be served by my going back over the ground you have already covered and discussing the myriad of confusing sizes confronting the consumer in trying to buy almost any packaged food or other packaged consumer product sold presumably by weight. Sugar, at least, still comes in 2- and 5-pound bags, and coffee, in 1- and 2-pound bags or cans, and that's something to be thankful for. We can quickly compare price on these items, and on a few more.

But, as your previous witnesses have so ably pointed out, the careful shopper absolutely needs a slide rule and the knowledge of how to use it in order to divide fractions of ounces into "so many for so much" prices, if she is to estimate even roughly whether the large economy size is a better value than the smaller size. Often the answer is that it is not a better value—that the large size costs disproportionately more. And this answer always comes as a shock, as if the manufacturers and retailers, after spending years educating the consumer to believe the larger size is always more economical, are now cashing in on that induced belief by deliberately turning it against the consumer and cheating the purchaser. For that is exactly what the packaging rat race seems to represent.

UTOPIA, OR DECENT CONSIDERATION FOR THE CONSUMER?

The solution—from the consumer's standpoint, certainly—would be a return to the traditional and recognizable weights and measures in net contents—pounds, half pounds, quarts, pints, etc., as in bread and milk and butter and flour and a number of other products. Despite what the manufacturers and merchandisers profess, I have yet to meet any consumer who really prefers a $1\frac{33}{50}$-pint size to a quart or a $7\frac{5}{16}$-ounce size to a half pound, and yet in many products that is what we are being offered, whether we know it or not.

And, just as you can compare the price of a half gallon of ice cream to the price for a quart, and the quart price to that for a pint, it would be wonderful if most other products came in double and triple or quadruple sizes, too, so that the consumer could readily estimate the degree of economy—or lack of it—in buying larger sizes.

Are we seeking utopia in asking that kind of consideration from the manufacturers and distributors? I don't think so. I think we are entitled to that kind of decency and consideration. Moreover, I think consumers should take a hand in this personally and ask for and insist upon standardized contents and show preference for products packaged in familiar quantity designations.

The Government, meanwhile, should move vigorously and effectively to enforce its newly upheld powers to crack down on deceptive packaging involving slack-filled containers holding an excessive amount of nothing.

VIOLATIONS OF INTENT OF FOOD AND DRUG ACT IN LABELING

Serious as it is to the consumer in trying to make intelligent choices in the stores, I am not nearly as concerned over the lack of uniformity of sizes which makes quantity versus price comparisons so mathematically difficult as I am over the fact that on many items, you just can't read the net weight, and thus can't make any computations at all. Oh, it appears on the package all right if it is a food item—but just try to find it. To me, this is indefensible, and an outright violation of the spirit and intent and clear wording of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

For instance, the law now says in section 403 that an article of food in packaged form shall be considered misbranded, and therefore subject to seizure and removal from the market "* * * unless it bears a label containing (1) the name and place of business of the manufacturer, packer or distributor; and (2) an accurate statement of the quantity of the contents in terms of weight, measure or numerical count"; and, in subsection (F), "* * * if any word, statement or other information required by or under authority of this act to appear on the label or labeling is not prominently placed thereon with such conspicuousness (as compared with other words, statements, designs, or devices, in the labeling) and in such terms as to render it likely to be read and understood by the ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase and use."

Senator HART and members of the subcommittee, it seems to me that the intent of the law is indeed clear. But apparently the courts have varied in their interpretation of what constitutes sufficient conspicuousness of the information required on the label and, as a result, finding the information is often a case for an eagle-eyed proofreader rather than the ordinary individual under customary conditions of purchase and use.

There are going to be hearings by the FDA soon on the information to be required and how it must be displayed on labels of hazardous household substances under the law we passed on this subject last year. If we were to permit manufacturers to use the required warning words of "Danger" and "Caution" and "Causes burns" or "Keep out of the reach of children" in the same circumspect and hidden manner as some of them do now on labels giving contents and weights on food packages, the hazardous-products law would be of little use.

SIMPLE AMENDMENT REQUIRED TO CLOSE LOOPHOLE

Now is this something we can correct? I believe it is, and by a very simple amendment to the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act—one which adds a new sentence to the end of subsection (f) of section 403 as follows: "The Secretary (of Health, Education, and Welfare) may issue regulations which specify the kind, size, and location on the label or labeling of statements required by this section."

That is all that would be needed to bring the information on contents and weights out from behind the veil of tiny type in noncontrasting inks or pastel colors and let the consumer really read what the package is supposed to contain. This will not end the attempts at cheating in package sizes, but it will give the conscientious consumer who wants it at least a fighting chance to make a comparison. And perhaps then we can educate more consumers to read the labels and make the arithmetical computations; and if enough of us do that and get mad enough about the conspiracy of cruelty to the consumer represented by these fractionalized quantities we can do something about it—by refusing to buy products in packages made up deliberately to mislead us on size and weight.

The language I have just cited as necessary to strengthen the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act in regard to enforcement of the information requirements on food labels is a paragraph out of a 41-page bill which I introduced on January 3 of this year to completely rewrite whole sections of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and close a variety of loopholes, some of which have been in the act since it was passed originally in 1938.

SPECIAL INTEREST EXEMPTIONS

For instance, and just as a simple illustration of the special interest provisions which still permeate the law after all of these years, you may be surprised to learn that soap is not subject to regulation under the act as a cosmetic (although some special purpose soaps might occasionally qualify as regulated drugs under certain circumstances). We use soap primarily to get clean and that, it seems to me, is a pretty fundamental cosmetic use. Moreover, if you believe the soap advertisements, you would also suspect that many soap products have magic qualities to make us beautiful besides. But, regardless of all that, soap is not a cosmetic under the 1938 act. It is certainly not a food. And it is usually not a drug. It is, therefore, in most instances, a nothing under this act—it is by and large, therefore, not subject to labeling requirements of the act.

And if you think food packaging is confusing and misleading as to weight and size and contents, try—just try—to figure out the price per ounce or the comparative cost of two competing brands of soap in the stores.

We have always, since 1938, had strict laws covering notice of presence of artificial coloring matter in foods and drugs. But not in ice cream, butter, or cheese. That special interest exemption, like soaps, has been in the act from the beginning.

SERIOUS HAZARDS TO HEALTH AND SAFETY

The illustrations I have just cited of loopholes in the act involve primarily economic considerations—being able to read the label information on size and weight of contents for purposes of comparative shopping. Much more important to the consumer, however, are the loopholes which jeopardize the health of the public.

For instance, we have a strong law now on the pretesting of chemicals used in or on foodstuffs to establish their safety before use. Last year, we passed a law requiring the pretesting for safety of all color additives, not just the coal-tar colors. Color—artificial color—is an important ingredient in most cosmetics. It is, however, the only ingredient in cosmetics which we require must be pretested for safety before marketing. Hence, we have never had an effective safe cosmetics law.

We have tried—consumers have tried—since 1938 to make the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act effective insofar as cosmetics are concerned—effective in preventing harmful beauty-aid products from reaching the

market. But all we can do now—unless the culprit ingredient is an artificial color—is to wait until some or many consumers are hurt or burned or disfigured or caused great distress or serious illness by a new cosmetic product in order to take it off the market.

Illicit traffic in barbiturates and pep pills is a national danger and disgrace. Our laws for coping with this traffic are weak and inadequate. How many people must die in head-on collisions on the highways or commit suicide from sleeping pills before we really crack down on the widespread bootlegging of these dangerous drug items?

When section 507 of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act was written some years ago to require certification of the antibiotic wonder drugs, we knew of only five of them. The law specifies that every batch of these five antibiotics or their derivatives must be certified as to potency and purity by the Food and Drug Administration. However, we now have a number of additional antibiotics. But unless they are made in combination with one of the five specified by name in the act, they do not have to be certified. Yet the certification tests from time to time have uncovered instances of improperly manufactured batches of antibiotics which would be either useless or fatal if used as prescribed by the physician.

Our factory inspection law is full of holes.

Therapeutic devices are being marketed without proof of efficacy and—worse than that—without required pretesting for safety. New drugs must be proved safe before they are marketed but they don't have to be proved efficacious.

Because of the loopholes in factory inspection in the drug field, many doctors hesitate to prescribe by common or generic terms, fearing that unless they specify a brand name (which often costs far more) the patient may get a substandard product turned out by a fly-by-night manufacturer.

PIECEMEAL APPROACH TOO SLOW IN MAKING LAW EFFECTIVE

My purpose in listing some of the glaring loopholes and faults in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is twofold:

First, I am seeking, of course, to point out an effective course of action in correcting the situation involving deceptive or misleading or inadequate labeling information which you have been spotlighting in these hearings. I think one section of my bill, H.R. 1235, would go far toward solving that problem.

More than that, however, I want to point out that this is only one part of a vastly broader problem of protecting the consumer from a variety of practices and conditions in the marketplace affecting not only our pocketbooks but our health and our lives. Since they involve primarily inadequacies or loopholes in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, I think all of these problems should be solved legislatively in one big comprehensive package—in a consumer bill—instead of in the piecemeal fashion Congress has been following on consumer legislation since 1938.

For instance, in 1953 we closed partially one of the loopholes in the factory inspection law. In 1954 we passed a pesticides residue control bill. In 1957, we finally succeeded in establishing compulsory Federal inspection of poultry. In 1958 we passed the Food Additives Act. In 1960 we passed the Color Additives Act. Presumably, in that same pattern of a little bit at a time, we could get a safe cosmetics bill through next year, unless the situation as regards certification of antibiotic drugs or the factory inspection loopholes or fake cancer remedies or unsafe therapeutic devices or barbiturates and amphetamines or new drug sanctions or some other single issue should win priority in committee consideration. This is not to criticise either the House or Senate committees handling changes in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. They have performed notable service to the consumer in many ways.

H.R. 1235 SEEKS COMPREHENSIVE CHANGES IN STATUTE

It just seems to me we can no longer settle for the piecemeal approach. You have spotlighted the problem of deceptive packaging and misleading or inadequate labeling. And, of course, it is a serious problem to the consumer. It can be solved quite readily, I think, through simple amendments to the basic statute. All I am urging is that we keep in mind, in seeking a solution for this one problem, that with very little additional effort—assuming enough consumers can be aroused to the need—we can go on to make the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act the bastion of our health and the protector of the consumer it was intended to be when originally drawn and before the compromises had to be made to achieve passage in the atmosphere of 1938. We must make of this law the device Dr. Wiley intended it to be more than a half century ago when the original pure food law was passed in 1906.

I have prepared this statement in the hope that I can enlist the support of the Senators on this subcommittee, and of the witnesses who have appeared, and of all of the consumers who are interested in the facts you are bringing to light—enlist your support behind H.R. 1235, an omnibus bill I have introduced this year to meet some of the problems you have brought out in your hearings here as well as a great many other important problems affecting the consumer. I would appreciate it if you would include the text of H.R. 1235 in the record of your hearings.

Bulgarian Liberation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Bulgarians have always constituted an important element in the turbulent history of the Balkan Peninsula.

There they lived in their historic homeland for centuries, and at times they attained greatness and glory. They had their powerful kingdom during the Middle Ages. Theirs was a formidable force to be reckoned with in all Balkan affairs.

But the uneasy balance of power in the area changed late in the Middle Ages with the appearance of a new force in the Balkans. The coming of the Ottoman Turks in the area in the 14th century spelled disaster to all nationalities there. All Balkan countries were overrun and their once free inhabitants were brought under the yoke of autocratic Ottoman sultans. Bulgaria thus became a province of the Ottoman Empire late in the 14th century.

Thenceforth for nearly five centuries, until the 1870's, Bulgarians endured the heavy and oppressive yoke of the sultans. During that time they were governed by callous and ruthless Ottoman agents. They suffered hardships, indignities, and iniquities. From all such harassments there appeared to be no escape for the Bulgarian people. They staged many rebellions, but each attempt was suppressed with savage fury. It was, however, world reaction to one of these atrocities of the Turks which finally brought liberation to the Bulgarian people.

In 1876 they staged a revolt, and it was suppressed by a wholesale massacre. Then Russia intervened to prevent the recurrence of such a terrible deed. In the ensuing Russo-Turkish war Bulgaria was liberated and in a treaty signed on March 3, 1878, the freedom of the Bulgarian people was recognized. That historic event of 84 years ago has become a Bulgarian national holiday and is being celebrated as such every year in all Bulgarian communities throughout the world—that is, throughout the free world.

As we are all aware, today Bulgarians are no more free than they were under the Ottoman Turks; they suffer as much under Communist tyranny, and unfortunately for the time being, perhaps, there is less chance for them to free themselves. But these stout-hearted, courageous and liberty-loving people of historic Bulgaria have not given up their hope for freedom; they have not yielded under the superior force of their enemies, and they still cling to their ideal, to their national goal for a free and independent Bulgaria. On the 84th anniversary of their Liberation Day we are one in echoing their patriotic sentiments, and in wishing them success.

Robert Kennedy on the Road

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, certain Congressman from New York are unduly exercised over the peregrinations and travels of our Attorney General Robert Kennedy. They are concerned as to his activity in traveling throughout the Far East where the image of Americans during the past administration was a little blurred and where communistic activities prevented our President Eisenhower from visiting Japan. Americans should not be concerned so much with what the Russians or the Communists are doing, but we should be concerned about what we Americans are doing.

It is refreshing to find that our leaders of government in whatever area of activity are bringing our viewpoints and our attitudes to the peoples of the world, especially in the Far East. "The Ugly American" must become a memory of the past. Our representatives, whether Congressmen, Attorney General, or diplomats, should meet the peoples of the world and indicate that we believe in the principles of democracy and that all men are created equal.

As Oliver Wendell Holmes once said, "An idea which cannot gain currency in the marketplace of public opinion has little validity." Robert Kennedy, in his verbal tilts with Communist spokesmen, has demonstrated that the idea of de-

mocracy can and will under proper presentation gain currency in the marketplace of public opinion whether it be in Thailand, Japan, Indonesia, or in the United States.

Criticism has been leveled that our Attorney General has neglected the store and that the Office of the Attorney General has been neglected. Press reports which show indictments against criminal conspiracies among the criminal element and in industry and even in the sacrosanct arena of the stock exchange show that the Attorney General has organized an effective organization throughout the country.

Mr. Kennedy's frankness and informality may worry diplomats and partisan politicians, but objective analysis indicates positive gains throughout the world. An editorial by William M. Beecher in the Wall Street Journal, Tuesday, February 27, 1962, illustrates instances of effective campaigning in the battle of the ideologies between democracy and communism and indicates the effectiveness of the activity of our Attorney General in his travels throughout the world. I believe a reading of this editorial will document some of the positive gains which the travels of Robert Kennedy have accomplished for the benefit of our country, the United States, and for democracy.

The editorial follows:

YOUNGER KENNEDY'S FRANKNESS, INFORMALITY WORRY DIPLOMATS BUT LEADS TO SOME GAINS

(By William M. Beecher)

THE HAGUE HOLLAND.—"I've got some definite ideas about what we should do, that I'd like to discuss with my brother," says America's nomadic Attorney General, nearing the end of his round-the-world whirl of diplomacy and debate.

Robert Kennedy is not divulging the advice he will be giving John Kennedy. One question intriguing those who have watched him in action is whether he will urge that other roving emissaries and perhaps even State Department professionals adopt some of his own techniques in dealing with foreign folk.

These might be summed up thus:

Shun formal black-tie dinners and gatherings with avowed friends. Get out on the campaign trail, as if it were election time, meeting the people—especially the people who are apathetic or hostile.

Be candid—even tough, on occasion. Insist on a little maturity even in the newborn nations. Don't claim perfection for America, yet avoid a defensive posture; take the offensive in proclaiming the practical advantages of capitalism, of democracy. Hammer the idea that these, not authoritarian collectivism, are the wave of the future.

DIPLOMATS SHAKEN UP

Whatever advice the younger Mr. Kennedy may give to the President, he has at least shaken up a good many Foreign Service career men by example. One veteran diplomatic observer who watched the Attorney General operate in Indonesia may have been fairly typical of their reaction; he was slightly unnerved by Bobby's performance, yet concluded that at least among some student leaders years of Communist propaganda have been canceled out in a few minutes.

The President's brother has also served as a symbol of American resolution not to retreat under Communist pressure He seemed moved by the sight of the ugly cinderblock East Berlin wall, with its crown of rusting barbed wire, and by the emotion of the West Berliners. He may well carry back to Washington an argument that the United States should give further evidence of a stiff posture in Berlin. In Thailand he gave assurances that the United States will rush aid if any serious trouble should filter across their thousand-mile border with Laos. During a refueling stop at Saigon he vowed that U.S. troops will not leave South Vietnam until the Communists are defeated.

But important as backing up allies may be, it was by no means as touchy as his encounters with neutralist sentiment. Professional diplomats held their breath.

When a group of Japanese Socialist leaders, whose party regularly captures about 40 percent of the vote, tried to force him to admit the immorality of nuclear tests, Bobby turned the tables on them. He noted that the United States for months negotiated in good faith with the Soviet Union on a test ban while the Soviets were secretly preparing a large scale series of tests. Even today the United States is willing to enter an agreement if it provides for inspection, he said: "As Socialists dedicated to the welfare of your country I can't understand why you don't support this."

HE ASKS FOR EXAMPLES

He then cited several times the Socialists had parroted Moscow's line criticizing the United States and demanded that they demonstrate their independence by citing three times they had also criticized the Reds in the last 2 years. They could come up with but one example.

"Do you feel a Socialist Party could exist in a system in which the Communist Party was in control? Could you have this kind of roundtable discussion with a Yankee imperialist like me?" he asked the party leaders.

They were silent and embarrassed. Commented the Japan Times: "He showed that the party's professed neutralism is not neutral at all. * * * This debate was instructive and we are left with the conviction that the Japan Socialist Party's hatred of America is a pose founded not on reason but on a desire to fall into line with Moscow and the Communist bloc for party political purposes."

When a small knot of leftist students at Waseda University in Tokyo shouted and hooted and refused to let him speak, Mr. Kennedy invited their leader to the stage to ask some questions. Instead the youth went into a long harangue against American imperialism, but Bobby patiently held the microphone for his adversary and refused to let the youth be thrown off the stage. Eventually he managed to answer some questions and made a brief speech. That night nearly 200 Waseda students went to the American embassy to apologize for the actions of the leftists; newspaper and television commentators praised Mr. Kennedy's calm demeanor under fire.

In Japan, in Indonesia, in Thailand, wherever he could get an audience, Bobby reiterated the thesis that democracy as practiced in the United States represents the future; that communism must not offer much of a paradise if it has to maintain itself with tanks in Hungary and fence in its followers with a wall in Berlin.

To a provocative question from a student of the University of Indonesia in Jakarta, Mr. Kennedy gave staccato response:

"We disagree with England. We disagree with France. I suppose a day does not go by that we don't disagree with them. We are going to disagree with Indonesia—and you are going to disagree with us. We should have a foundation of friendship so that every time an incident comes up and we don't do exactly the way you want us to do you don't say to hell with the United States. There's got to be a little more maturity."

Again and again he told Indonesians the United States could not publicly take a position on whether Indonesia has a right to take over West New Guinea from the Dutch. He said the United States could best serve the cause of peace by pushing the two sides together into settlement talks.

When an Indonesian student recalled the old American idea of manifest destiny represented in the slogan "Fifty-Four Forty or Fight" in the Presidential campaign of 1844, and in the war with Mexico, Mr. Kennedy shot from the hip.

The fifty-four forty slogan resulted in no fight; this Northern boundary dispute was settled in amicable talks, he said. As for the Mexican War, "Some Texans might disagree, but I think we were unjustified—I do not think we can be proud of that episode."

These words, uttered a little offhandedly, showed the potential danger of Bobby's brand of diplomacy; they did stir the ire of Texans. But his frankness turned a decidedly unenthusiastic Indonesian audience into a loudly admiring throng.

Westerners remarked that the Indonesian student view of the United States and its leaders was terribly unsophisticated and outdated. "They had a picture of a capitalist as being a cartoonlike figure, fat and sleazy, who might be expected to mouth a lot of self-serving ambiguities," said one of them. "Instead they saw a lean, dynamic young man who challenged them to ask questions and answered with candor. The effect was electric."

JAPAN VERSUS JAVA

In his traveling, Bobby talked to hundreds of students, labor leaders, businessmen, politicians and plain Joes. His barnstorming days were often 12 to 16 hours long, packed with handshaking, chucking babies under the chin, asking questions of farmers, workmen and housewives. He gave out PT-boat tie clasps left over from the 1960 campaign, and ballpoint pens bearing his name and title.

In Japan, which has a high rate of literacy and numerous newspapers and television sets, this technique seemed most effective; Kennedy activities were front page news for a week and everywhere he went people knew who he was and what he had been doing. It proved less effective at the riceroots level in Indonesia.

One bright afternoon the Kennedy cavalcade of sedans and a jeep-load of troops pulled into a rural marketplace of central Java. Bobby and his wife, Ethel, moved quickly into the crowd smiling and shaking hands. The natives pressed forward gleefully. To an outsider it seemed a very effective good will effort, but an English-speaking Indonesian came up to an American reporter and said: "They think you are Dutch; to them all white men are Dutch. I told them you are Americans and they responded, 'Oh, American-Dutch.'" So the whole incident may have proved merely that untutored Javanese will shake hands with a friendly fellow.

TALKS WITH LEADERS

Along with his well-publicized engagements with populaces, the Attorney General also found time for private talks with key officials in each country visited. He met on three occasions with President Sukarno of Indonesia, for example; the talks were described as "fruitful." Yesterday he was talking with high Netherlands officials. Quite apparently, the aim was to enhance chances for a peaceful solution of the crisis over West New Guinea. A main hurdle has been Indonesian insistence that the Dutch agree in advance that any peace talks will deal only with the time and manner of transferring sovereignty. If that precondition is dropped, it is thought, the Dutch might enter negotiations aimed at some face-saving solution.

There's no question the Attorney General's trip has had some impact on his own views. He was especially impressed, for example, with the energy and capabilities of the

Japanese; he is expected to counsel that great care be taken in revamping U.S. trade policies to ensure against damage to Japan, America's second largest customer for exports.

If most consequences of the Robert Kennedy expedition are difficult to measure with precision, at least one fact is crystal clear. Bobby has enjoyed it enormously—every bit as much as a rough go of touch football. And it's safe bet he would be game to do more of the same.

Defense Supply Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, as I have noted in previous statements in the RECORD there has recently been established, under the authority given to the Secretary of Defense by the McCormack-Curtis amendment to the Reorganization Act of 1958, a Defense Supply Agency. As with any other new organization in the Government there were, of course, many questions about how this would function and what its effect would be upon those interested in its field of authority. In regard to this particular agency there was some concern on the part of those who contract with our military services that it might mean injury to certain parts of the industries from which the U.S. military services procure their supplies.

Recently the New York Times published an article by Mr. Philip Shabecoff in which comment is made on this question and it is found that the Defense Supply Agency will in all likelihood cause only very slight dislocations in those industries which supply our military services. I am placing this article in the RECORD with the hope that it may be of service to those who are interested in the field of defense programs.

MILITARY BUYING SHIFT EXPECTED TO INJURE INDUSTRY ONLY SLIGHTLY

(By Philip Shabecoff)

The Defense Department's new Defense Supply Agency has been in official operation for almost 2 months and businessmen who supply food, clothing, and other materiel to the Armed Forces are examining themselves gingerly for possible injury. So far, no serious damage has been reported.

The Defense Supply Agency operates as a giant wholesaler to provide supplies for the Armed Forces. It consolidates the procurement and inventory functions previously handled individually by the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Because it is so new, military suppliers are still uncertain as to what effect the Agency will have on their business. "We're withholding judgment until we see how it works out," one supplier said. "There probably will have to be changes made and we'll suggest them as they come up," he added.

SOME LOSSES LIKELY

Several of the Agency's stated objectives, however, provide the suppliers with a good idea of what to expect. In general, it is thought that some suppliers will sustain temporary tactical losses as a result of the Agency's operations. However, businessmen dealing with the Armed Forces believe that the new organization will operate to their long-term strategic advantage.

One of the first operations of the Agency will be to reduce the supply inventory formerly maintained by the three military departments. An initial cut of some $200 million is expected to be made by the end of the year. This will be the first phase of a large inventory reduction program.

Col. Merton Singer, quartermaster of the 1st U.S. Army, estimates that as many as 20 percent of the items now on the inventory will be lopped off by the new Agency.

This program probably will cause some temporary losses to the military suppliers. "There may very well be a lag in orders," said James V. Daly, manager of the government department of Standard Brands, Inc., "and this lag may hurt for a while. However, I don't think anybody will be seriously injured by the inventory cuts."

Mr. Daly believes that at least part of the inventory lag will be offset by increased military procurement resulting from the expanding defense budget. He also feels that reducing the inventory will enable the suppliers to save money through more efficient production and distribution.

"As the Government reduces its inventory and only buys what it needs over a short period of time," he said, "the suppliers will be able to plan their own operations more efficiently."

Another objective of the Agency that suppliers feel may have an adverse effect at first but will be beneficial eventually is the standardization of supplies used by the Armed Forces.

As duplicate items are eliminated from the inventory, orders may drop. However, the suppliers will be able to standardize their own production in meeting Government orders and thus reduce the cost of their operations.

William S. Stuhr, president of the United Board & Carton Corp., explained the process this way:

"All of the services used to order cakeboxes of various sizes. For example, the Army might order 100,000 8-inch boxes and at the same time the Navy might order 50,000 8¼-inch boxes. To meet these orders we would run off the 100,000 boxes for the Army, stop the production line, rearrange it, and then run off the 50,000 cakeboxes for the Navy.

"With a standardized order, we can keep the production line moving for all 150,000 boxes. This obviously is going to save us money and it also is going to save the Government money."

Military suppliers believe they will find it to their advantage to deal with a central purchasing agency rather than with the separate departments.

"An electronics company, for example, had to do business with the Department of the Army, the Signal Corps, the Department of the Navy, the Marine Corps and the Air Force," Mr. Stuhr pointed out. "Now the military electronics buying is centralized. There is no question that this aspect of the new system will save businessmen money."

Mr. Stuhr is president of the New York Chapter of the Defense Supply Association, an organization of businessmen and military personnel concerned with supplying the Armed Forces. The association was built on the skeleton of the old Quartermaster Association when the Defense Supply Agency was established last fall.

The chief objective of the association, Mr. Stuhr said, is to promote the closest possible cooperation between the Defense Department and the industries with which it deals. He explained:

"The association keeps its members abreast of what is going on in the military supply field. We help them contact the proper Government agency, we assist in making bids and generally facilitate business with the Government. One committee has been formed to submit industry problems to the Defense Supply Agency. We believe that the association cuts down the Government's work and makes its relations with industry as smooth as possible.

"We know what the Government wants. The job of the association is to see that it gets what it wants as cheaply as possible."

The American People Will Be the Losers by Democratic Trifling With Judicial System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following column by David Lawrence, which was printed in the Washington Evening Star. I think it is important to the American people to know how little regard the President has shown for the sanctity of our judicial system in his appointment of Federal judges. In his desperation to inject party politics into every phase of our national life as an integral part of this administration's program to seize absolute power, he has completely disregarded ability and quality and has named only those who are tried and true members of the Democratic Party. There is no doubt that many of these men are well qualified and will make excellent judges. It is equally true that many capable people have been passed up simlpy because they are Republicans or have not sworn allegiance to the President's party. Such political maneuvering seriously threatens our whole judicial system and, in the end, it will be the people who will suffer the consequences.

The article follows:

DEMOCRATS ON THE FEDERAL BENCH—FAILURE TO INCLUDE ANY REPUBLICANS AMONG 82 NOMINEES IS CRITICIZED

(By David Lawrence)

President Kennedy has asked the American people to believe, that, in nominating 82 new Federal judges, he couldn't find in the entire United States a single Republican lawyer who, in his judgment, was qualified to be on the list. By reason of legislation last year creating 73 additional judgeships and because of some existing vacancies, Mr. Kennedy soon will have filled nearly one-third of the entire Federal bench—more appointments than any President heretofore has had an opportunity to make in a single term.

The display of partisanship was the result of a recommendation by the President's brother, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, who managed the last presidential campaign and who, it now is being charged, awarded the judgeships on the basis of political considerations.

Another Democratic Party leader, the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, sought in 1937 to have the Supreme Court enlarged from 9 to 15 Justices because, as he told the American people, some of the Justices on the

Court at that time held views that didn't go along with his. He wanted a majority that would outvote those with whom he disagreed. The scheme became known as court packing, and was defeated in Congress.

"Court packing" now, however, is back in vogue on a large scale. It is embarrassing for some Senators to oppose a partisan list of judges, because many of the nominations are made to curry favor with Senators who want friends or political associates named to the bench. Seventy Kennedy appointees have been confirmed already by the Senate, and probably the others will be accepted as a matter of routine. The fact that the Republicans have done this in the past does not justify it. Two wrongs do not make a right.

It is significant that Bernard G. Segal, chairman of the Federal judiciary committee of the American Bar Association, has just made public a report filed with the Attorney General condemning the process by which 82 Democrats were selected for the Federal bench. Adding to these the three recess appointments of the preceding administration, the qualifications of a total of 85 nominees were analyzed. The American Bar Association committee designated seven as "not qualified." Only 14 were designated as "exceptionally well qualified," and 41 were listed as "well qualified," while 23 were referred to as "qualified." The distinction between these classifications is one that is difficult to define, but apparently even mediocre nominees are frequently called qualified.

Certainly, the country is not getting the best qualified men or women to serve as Federal judges.

The big question is whether politically chosen judges will feel obligated to construe the law in ways that will carry out the policies of the Democratic administration. In these days of government by Executive order, the politically minded appointee can play politics on the bench. He may have been a good lawyer in private practice, but does this necessarily mean he will make an impartial judge?

In answer to criticism, Department of Justice officials are saying that they are merely doing what the Republican administrations did in the past—appointing more judges from their own party. But Republicans declare that the Federal judiciary was unbalanced, politically speaking, during the Democratic Party's occupancy of the White House from 1933 to 1953, and that President Eisenhower, by his appointments, was able to bring about for the first time in many years an equal division on the bench between the two political parties. In other words, as Mr. Eisenhower filled vacancies with Republicans, he overcame the Democratic Party advantage. Since an equal number of Republicans and Democrats was finally obtained in 1960, the argument is being made by Republican leaders that President Kennedy should have preserved the equal status instead of disturbing the balance once more.

Besides the 82 Democrats nominated for the Federal bench and mentioned in the report of the American Bar Association, Mr. Kennedy named 7 additional Democrats and 1 Liberal Party member. Two Republicans already serving on the bench under recess appointments given them by the preceeding administration were reappointed. So to date only 2 out of the total of 92 appointments are Republicans. By way of consolation, Department of Justice officials are saying there will be some Republicans named in the next batch of 43 appointments. But nobody is saying how much is some.

Why should any judge ever be appointed by the political process of recommendation by party brethren in Congress and by local politicians? Does this make for a judicial system of the highest integrity? Mr. Segal, of the American Bar Association committee, says wistfully in his report:

"We continue to strive and we continue to hope intermediately for bipartisanship, eventually for the ideal of nonpartisanship."

One wonders why in these days, when the errors and unmoral behavior of businesses or of some corporations or of private citizens become the subject of congressional investigation, there is no uproar at all about the unmorality that envelops the scandalous method of selecting Federal judges in America.

Alliance for Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include what I consider a major address on the alliance for progress proposed for the Latin American countries by President Kennedy.

The speech by the Honorable Teodoro Moscoso, U.S. Coordinator for alliance for progress, is a guideline for both ourselves and for our neighbors to the south. It was given before the National Press Club on February 15, 1962. I recommend its reading as a lucid, informed exposition of the responsibilities and obligations of both this country and the Latin-American nations.

The speech follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE TEODORO MOSCOSO BEFORE THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 15, 1962

During its short existence the alliance for progress has stimulated many questions, but the question which most people ask is, "Will it succeed?" It is a legitimate question. It is also obviously the crucial question about this enormous cooperative effort. It is a question asked in every country in Latin America, sometimes in hope, sometimes in disbelief. It is properly asked by people in the United States whose tax money will provide such an important stimulus for the alianza. It is asked in Moscow, where the Soviets realize quite as much as we that the future of democracy in the Western Hemisphere is riding on the success of the alianza.

There is only one possible answer. I can promise you that the alianza will succeed. It will succeed in part because it must succeed. It must suceed as D-day in Normandy had to succeed, and as the Marshall plan had to succeed—because failure would mean disaster. But it must also succeed as the American Revolution had to succeed—because powerful historical forces propel it.

You will hear me use the word "revolution" a great deal today. It is the only appropriate word, and certainly not a word of which any American need be afraid. Today Latin America is clearly in the midst of a far-reaching revolution. It is not a Communist revolution or even Communist inspired, though the Communists are exerting every effort to ride it for their own purposes. It is a revolution against poverty, illiteracy, social injustice, and human despair. It is also, in many places, a telescoping into a few years of many revolutions which North America and Western Europe have absorbed over a period of nearly two centuries.

To varying degrees, you can find strong elements of the French Revolution, with its land-hungry peasantry, and of the American Revolution, with its rejection of aristocracy in favor of a democratic middle class. The industrial revolution is also taking hold in many parts of Latin America, often spawning urban slums where poverty is accompanied by rootless despair. And on top of these upheavals, which the United States assimilated over many decades, Latin America is feeling the tremendous force of a growing social revolution, not unlike that which the United States has been absorbing gradually since the early days of the New Deal. This social revolution is welling up in tremendous force, because restless millions no longer accept ignorance, poverty, and disease as an inevitable way of life.

The Communists can only seize and pervert these revolutionary forces if we in the United States, and the real democrats in Latin America, abdicate our responsibilities and our traditions. There is nothing in the aspirations of the great masses in Latin America to which we in the United States cannot subscribe. They are aspirations which commend themselves to our consciences, to our democratic instincts, and to our sense of history. Indeed, the Charter of Punta del Este, which established the alliance for progress, is essentially an agreement for a peaceful revolution on a hemisphere scale.

For the United States, there can only be one possible course: to assist this peaceful revolution wholeheartedly with our resources and skills, with our political and moral backing, and then to see that it is not perverted or derailed en route.

The alliance for progress is already launching its programs and gathering momentum. No one in his right mind, least of all myself, would pretend that the task will be easy. Even if the situation were not so volatile, the sheer scale of the economic job is staggering. Latin America's rate of population growth is probably the greatest in the world. Today there are nearly 200 million people in Latin America. By the end of the century—in only 38 years—there will be 600 million, twice as many as in the United States at that time. Which means that Latin America will have to run very fast just to stand still, even in terms of today's living standards which are so desperately low.

Per capita income statistics smack of the cold detachment of the economist, but they are worth projecting in human terms. The average per capita income in the United States is $2,300; in Latin America it is $270. In other words, the average Latin income per person is about one-eighth as much as that in the United States. But even this figure does not render the true extent of poverty. For in many parts of Latin America, so much of the income is concentrated in the hands of a few rich, and so little in the hands of the many poor, that most people don't even come close to earning the average per capita income. In a country with a per capita income of $200, for example, this may mean that millions are living with an income of $100 a year or less; in fact, within a few hours' flying time from Florida, tens of millions of Latin families are living for a year on a sum which a middle-class U.S. family might easily spend in a few days of a winter vacation.

Against the background of tremendous population growth and desperate poverty, the scale of the task ahead is admittedly awesome. In a story in the New York Times recently, Tad Szulc stated:

"Little as it is still known to most Americans, the alliance for progress exceeds in scope and imagination the postwar Marshall plan for Europe. As a cooperative enterprise involving U.S. capital and know-how and Latin American effort, courage, sacrifice, and sinew, it has no parallel. For the years of the 'Decade of Progress' its financial cost is estimated at $20 billion. The investment in human talent, imagination, devotion, en-

thusiasm—and frustration—is obviously beyond calculation."

I do not believe that the Times exaggerated the facts. Certainly the stakes are enormous. The difficulties are formidable. And the time is short. Jose Figueres, the former President of Costa Rica, put it succinctly when he said, "It is one minute to midnight in Latin America." There is no time for dialectical exercises or philosophical musings. The United States and its Latin American allies must commit their material and spiritual resources with all deliberate speed. Like generals sending regiments into a decisive battle, we may not have the luxury of leisurely deployment of our troops, or of perfect textbook planning of how the battle should be fought. This means that in all probability we will make errors. But the one error we cannot afford to make is that of waiting, of letting the initiative slip out of our grasp. We must attack, massively, the enemies of poverty, injustice and hopelessness which still characterizes the lot of so many people in our hemisphere.

Let me recall the principal objectives of the alianza para el progreso, as laid down in the charter of Punta del Este. The first is to increase per capita income; the second is to achieve a more equitable distribution of national income; and the third is to diversify the national economies of Latin American countries.

These are the cardinal points which will be the focus of our efforts.

Each Latin American country will draw up and present its own long-term development plan. This will in turn be reviewed by the panel of experts or "nine wise men" of the OAS, who will counsel and assist each country in evolving a plan which will best accomplish the objectives under the Charter of Punta del Este.

More progress has been made in this direction than is commonly realized. The long-term development plans of two countries, Colombia and Bolivia, have already been presented. Those of at least three other countries are expected momentarily.

I mentioned earlier that we have the job of seeing that the peaceful revolution set forth in the Punta del Este charter not be perverted by the Communists. There is little danger of this if we all pursue the objectives of the alliance sincerely and vigorously. But we also have the job of making sure that it is not derailed by extreme right-wing elements who oppose social reforms—reforms which they fear would mean the end of their privileges and riches. This is a point on which I feel that there should be utmost frankness and clarity.

As you know, all the Latin American countries signing the charter of the alliance obligated themselves to undertake necessary reforms including land reform and more equitable tax structures. The declaration added that "these profound economic, social, and cultural changes can come about only through the self-help efforts of each country."

Moreover, when the U.S. Congress passed its economic aid legislation last September, it specified that the President, in making loans and grants to developing nations, shall "take into account the extent to which the recipient country shows a responsiveness to the vital economic, political, and social concerns of its people and demonstrates a clear determination to take effective self-help measures."

The legal and moral framework in which we must work is amply clear on these points. The United States is committed to giving maximum support to those countries which inaugurate necessary social reforms and make energetic self-help efforts.

I want to give our Latin American friends as much explanation of this point as possible. I am well aware of the tremendous adjustments which many countries must make to live up to their obligations, and of the power of those groups which may try to frustrate reforms in a number of countries. However, the objective of the alianza is not to redistribute the shares of an existing pie. It is to redistribute the shares of a rapidly growing pie. The rich need not get poorer as the pie grows, but the poor most certainly must become richer. The members of the traditional ruling class who support the alianza and its objectives have nothing to fear; indeed, I would hope that they would increasingly take the lead in modernizing their countries. But those who try to frustrate the alianza have a great deal to fear—not from the United States but from their own people.

The alianza clearly deserves the support of the poor because its great objective is the end of poverty, illiteracy, disease, and social injustice. But it also deserves the support of the privileged by its appeal to their conscience, their sense of patriotism, and also their sense of self-preservation. They have the choice between supporting the goals of the Alianza or risking a Castro-type destructive revolution. President Kennedy stated in Bogotá, referring to the leaders, industrialists, and landowners of Latin America:

"Unless all of us are willing to contribute resources to national development, unless all of us are prepared not merely to accept, but to initiate, basic reforms, unless all of us take the lead in improving the welfare of our people, then that leadership will be taken from us and the heritage of centuries of western civilization will be consumed in a few months of violence."

President Betancourt of Venezuela put it in a slightly different way when he remarked with wry humor: "Hay que ayudar a los probres para salvar a los ricos"—"We must help the poor in order to save the rich."

You can hardly expect U.S. taxpayers, already heavily burdened, to help underwrite development programs in countries where a few privileged people, far richer than the average U.S. taxpayer, are virtually free from taxation. Nor is it reasonable to expect North Americans, brought up in the tradition of the Homestead Act which offered 160 acres to every family able and willing to work them, to perpetuate agrarian systems where a handful of wealthy families own as much as 90 percent of the desirable land, while the great bulk of the farmworkers own almost no land at all.

Taxes were once described by Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes as being the price of civilization. Today taxes are also part of the price of rapid social and economic development so much needed in Latin America. Such development is not free. It entails short-run sacrifices for long-term gains.

Nor is land reform, complex though it is in many Latin countries, necessarily a forerunner of decline of production. A pertinent case in point is the recent experience of Japan. Only one-third of Japan's farmers owned their own land before World War II. As a result of a land-reform program begun since the war, 92 percent own their own farms today, producing more food and fiber per acre than anywhere in the world. At the same time, these newly prosperous farmers have become excellent customers for the factories of the cities, and have been key contributors to Japan's brilliant economic upsurge.

I am aware of the fact that there are many well-meaning people, particularly in business circles in Latin America and in the United States, who feel that the economic development phase of the alianza must come first and that, in good time, social reforms, education, and health will follow. In my opinion, this is not only politically untenable in a time of social ferment, but is also economically fallacious.

One fundamental fact emerges from any profound study of economic development programs. Their success depends, in the final analysis, on human resources. If the people of a country are healthy, educated, and purposeful, development programs usually work well, even where natural resources are severely limited. But where the people are diseased, illiterate, and inert, a development program has little hope for success unless these human resources are developed along with the economic resources. In other words, improving the education and health of the great bulk of the people is not just the fruit of development but is also an essential means of development. People must be developed, if industries and agriculture are to be developed.

The big job in Latin America, one calling for all the talents of the democratic leaders, will be to advance economic development and social justice in tandem, without allowing either to get far ahead of the other. Without social justice, which will win the support of the masses, economic development cannot go far, and without economic development, social justice can only mean sharing poverty. The two must be closely allied and interdependent.

I am sure that this audience knows that the role of the United States in alianza, important though it will be, must of necessity be far less than the role of the Latin American countries themselves. This is not only a fact, but a healthy fact. There are very sharp limitations to what any foreign country can do for others. Not only economic factors but psychological and political ones place the burden for success primarily on the Latin American countries themselves.

While $20 billion of public and private funds from the United States and other foreign sources will be a powerful stimulant and catalyst for economic development over the next decade, the Latin countries must contribute at least five times as much to their own development if the alianza is to obtain its full potential. And it is the Latin American political and intellectual leaders who must strike the spark of hope and unleash the creative energies of their people in an effort which promises to be one of the great epics of our hemisphere. The United States can help and counsel, but the real battle will be engaged by the Latins themselves.

One of the special character traits of Latins will be to their advantage in this great cooperative effort. Latins are a very proud people. Proud and sensitive. For those few people in the United States who view the Alianza as a gigantic boondoggle whereby the Latin American countries will live indolently on a kind of U.S. dole, I can only say to them that they do not know their Latins. The last thing they want is to be indebted to us or anyone else; the last thing they seek is permanent dependence on the United States.

One of the most moving examples of Latin pride at work has been seen in Miami in recent months. As you know, thousands of Cuban refugees arrived there without a dime, with no source of income, no immediate way of earning a living. A considerable number found, to their great anguish, that they had no choice but to go on public relief so that their families could have food and shelter. But then an astonishing thing began to happen, completely unique in the annals of the relief system. As these Cubans finally got jobs, usually very poor jobs, and even when they and their families were still living in extreme difficulty, they sent a substantial part of their modest pay checks back to the relief agencies which had helped them. In December alone, 874 Cuban refugees voluntarily returned $49,000 to relief agencies, despite the fact that most of them were still living in very difficult circumstances. Neither law nor U.S. custom in any way obliged them to do this, but their deep-seated Latin pride did. No one can read of these episodes

without feeling deep respect and compassion for such people.

This same pride will be one of the important motor forces in the success of the Alianza. The Latins will accept U.S. aid and technical assistance but only in order to be able to stand on their own feet as soon as possible. Indeed, there is already important evidence of joint efforts by the Latins to work out their own economic salvation with little or no help from the United States.

Almost unnoticed in the U.S. press a few months ago, seven Latin American countries laid the solid groundwork for a Latin common market. Meeting in Uruguay, the representatives of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru, and Uruguay last December cut their tariffs by an average of 27 percent on 2,500 items of trade, ranging from lemons to razor blades.

To a layman, this might seem like a technical matter of little import and less drama. But in fact, I see this as one of the great turning points in hemisphere history.

There is even a very poignant footnote to this development. It was back in 1826 that Bolivar urged the newly independent South American countries to subordinate their local interests in favor of a common market and eventually a United States of South America. Bolivar lost, and the die was cast for over a century, during which the Latin Americans went their separate ways while to the north, a common market allowed the United States of America to grow in power and prosperity.

Technically, what was initiated in Uruguay in December is called the Latin American Free Trade Association, but what was really created was an entirely new and possibly history-making epoch in Latin American affairs.

Few North Americans realize that 90 percent of the trade of individual Latin countries is with distant markets in the United States or Europe, and only 10 percent with each other. This is rather as though the great bulk of New York State's trade were with Europe, but virtually none with New England or the Middle West. Part of this trade pattern in Latin America is the fault of poor overland communications—which can and need to be improved—and part results from geographical and historical factors. In any case, there is no doubt that trade between Latin American countries themselves can eventually be multiplied many times, and that this fact itself will be an enormous stimulant to economic development in all countries.

The dynamics of a common market have been amply demonstrated in Europe in the last few years. Khrushchev is properly worried when he sees the burgeoning economy of Western Europe contrasting even more sharply with the sorry state of Eastern Europe. No one dared hope, even 5 years ago, that Western Europe would have come so far so fast under the impulse of a common market. No one could have foreseen that its magnetic draw would have been so great that even Great Britain would have to reject hundreds of years of economic policy in order to participate. And no one could have guessed that this Common Market would gradually create a new political power of the first magnitude.

I predict that these same forces will operate in Latin America, and perhaps even more powerfully. I am convinced that a growing common market will unleash dynamic new forces of unity as it has done in Europe.

In achieving unity, the Latin Americans have a much easier road than the Europeans. They have very little of Europe's bitter legacy of suspicion and hatred resulting from centuries of wars and hundreds of millions of dead. Nor do the Latins have to contend with the linguistic, religious, and cultural dissimilarities which make European unity so complex. In this, Latin America is most fortunate. This vast area—far greater in size than the United States and Europe combined—is peopled largely by men of Iberian stock, with identical or similar languages, with a common religion and similar cultures.

The first step, a free trade area, is well underway. In August of this year, Colombia and Ecuador will join the other seven countries for another round of negotiations. By then, the nine member countries will embrace 80 percent of Latin America's population. In addition, four Central American countries have not only started a regional common market of their own, but a common development program with its own regional development bank.

To those skeptics who once doubted the willingness and the ability of Latin Americans to work together, these are forceful refutations. There has also been some question as to the part which private enterprise will play in the alianza. This is a decision which rests, in the final analysis, with each country. Each will have to decide in which areas public funds are essential and where private investment can better do the job. India, for example, has already made a decision in this respect and so has the United States for that matter.

The point I would like to stress is that private initiative has a vital role to play in a developing economy and that, given the opportunity under proper ground rules, it can greatly accelerate the process of growth.

It will not be enough, however, if the United States conceives of its role as a supplier of machines, a purveyor of engineers and economists, and as a counsel, whether through government or private effort. It must also play an active role on the human level. If the alianza is left entirely to the economists, the technicians, and the government officials, it cannot fully succeed. For we are dealing with human emotions and aspirations not just economic charts, bricks, and machinery.

The alianza has seized the imagination and fired the hopes of millions of men from the Rio Grande to Patagonia. These hopes must be sustained and amplified in the years to come, and hope itself must help unleash the creative energies of millions of men who can visualize a better future for themselves and their children.

There is one element of great good fortune for the alianza which deserves special mention. At a decisive moment of history, Latin America has brought forth an impressive number of highly able and dedicated democratic leaders. I shudder to think where we would be today if, in place of men like Presidents Lleras Camargo, Frondizi, and Betancourt, we had Rojas Pinilla, Peron, and Perez Jimenez. There are many other impressive democratic leaders and promising young men coming up through the ranks. On these men will fall most of the burden of making the alianza a success, and on them will also rightfully fall the admiration and gratitude of the entire hemisphere.

As they and the alianza gain momentum, more and more of the people of Latin America will see Castro for the false prophet he is, as the perverter of legitimate aspirations of the masses for progress and not as an instrument of progress. Already, the alianza is the waxing hope for these people, while Castro is the waning hope. In a few years, I am confident that Castro's revolution will look to Latin Americans like a shabby mockery alongside the really great revolution which the alianza represents.

Economic progress, social justice, education—these are the things which 200 million Latin Americans need and yearn for. These are the things which the alianza is rapidly mobilizing to bring them, with their own self-help. This is a great and noble task, a task to stir men from Buenos Aires to Seattle. It is also a final meshing of the dreams of Washington and Jefferson, on one hand, and Bolivar on the other. Just as North American patriots aided and encouraged South Americans in their fight for liberation from Spanish imperial tyranny, so today the descendants of Washington will fight side by side with the descendants of Bolivar against the tyranny of poverty and injustice.

And many years hence, people will say that this was the time when all Americans, North and South, joined together to forge their finest destiny.

Do You Know This Man?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, as I have received from Mr. J. W. Shibler, of the Missouri Pacific Lines in Pittsburgh, Pa., a letter calling to my attention the excellent article in the Brookline Journal of Pittsburgh, Pa., of the issue of February 22, 1962, I am inserting this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This article is a reprint of an article originally carried in the Brookville American of Brookville, Pa. As both Mr. Shibler and the Brookline Journal are to be complimented on their civic and patriotic interest, I am placing this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that it may be called to the attention of the U.S. Congress and the American people:

DO YOU KNOW THIS MAN?

A reader has sent us the following word picture of a 20th century American:

"A young man lived with his parents in a public housing development. He attended public school, rode the free school bus, and participated in the free lunch program. He entered the Army, then upon discharge retained his national service insurance. He then enrolled in the State university, working part time in the State capitol to supplement his GI education check.

"Upon graduation he married a public health nurse and bought a farm with an FHA loan; and then obtained an RFC loan to go into business. A baby was born in the county hospital. He bought a ranch with the aid of the veterans' land program and obtained emergency feed from the Government.

"Later he put part of his land in the soil bank, and the payments soon paid off his farm and ranch. His father and mother lived very comfortably on the ranch on their social security and old-age assistance checks. REA lines supplied electricity; the Government helped clear his land.

"The county agent showed him how to terrace it; then the Government built him a fish pond and stocked it with fish. The Government guaranteed him a sale for his farm products at highest prices.

"Books from the public library were delivered to his door. He banked money which a Government agency insured. His children grew up, entered public schools, ate free lunches, rode free school buses, played in public parks, swam in public pools, and joined the FFA. He owned an automobile so he favored the Federal highway program.

"He signed a petition seeking Federal assistance in developing an industrial project to help the economy of his area. He was a leader in obtaining the new post office and

Federal building, and went to Washington with a group to ask the Government to build a great dam costing millions so that the area could get 'cheap electricity'.

"He petitioned the Government to give the local airbase to the county. He was also a leader in the movement to get his specific type of farming special tax writeoffs and exemptions. Of course, he belonged to several farmers' organizations, but denied that they were pressure groups.

"Then, one day, he wrote to his Congressman: 'I wish to protest these excessive governmental expenditures and attendant high taxes. I believe in rugged individualism. I thing people should stand on their own two feet without expecting handouts.

"'I am opposed to all socialistic trends, and I demand a return to the principles of our Constitution and the policies of States Rights.'"

Do you happen to know this man?

Development of Six-County Space Age Industrial Park—A Case History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the development of the Boardman Space Age Industrial Park in Oregon is of longstanding and continuing interest to me, representing as it does the results of years of joint efforts. Nearly 4 years ago, when the use of Boardman bombing range in Morrow County, Oreg., was being sought by the Navy, leaders in the community—notably County Judge Oscar Peterson—sought my assistance to secure the return of this area to private ownership. We recognized the tremendous potential that this area had—a potential sure to be increased greatly by the construction of John Day Lock and Dam on the adjacent Columbia River.

Throughout 1959 I worked closely with Judge Peterson and others in bringing the facts concerning this potential to the attention of the Armed Services Committees of the Congress. I am pleased to say that the Senate Committee gave specific recognition to this aspect of the situation in their report on the Navy's application for usage of the range and the House Committee made arrangements to receive testimony from Judge Peterson and the community during their consideration of the same matter.

Subsequently, as is well known, the State of Oregon became interested in the site and through the joint efforts of the State and the full congressional delegation here, arrangements have been made for development of a portion of the old Boardman range as a Space Age Industrial Park. Similarly, the counties involved have been working together to establish a Mid-Columbia Planning Agency to work with the State and with private industry in developing the industrial potential of the Boardman site.

At the regional development workship held recently by the National Association of County Officials, Judge Peterson presented a report which tells a part of this story in more detail. It is a pleasure to insert this paper in the RECORD.

DEVELOPMENT OF SIX-COUNTY SPACE AGE INDUSTRIAL PARK—A CASE HISTORY

(By Judge Oscar E. Peterson)

When I was first asked to take part in this panel at this community development workshop of the National Association of County Officials meeting here in Phoenix, I thought that will be easy at least so far as the subject matter was concerned. But then I soon learned that there were other panelists who were taking part in the discussions and that my part would need to be quite specific. This I have endeavored to do.

The Mid-Columbia area is in the north central part of Oregon stretching along the Columbia River for a distance of some 200 miles. The counties involved are Umatilla, Morrow, Gilliam, Sherman, Wasco, and Hood River. The Cascade Range forms the western boundary of the region. The area for the most part is strictly rural having a total population of 88,338. There are the cities of Pendleton, The Dalles, Hood River, Heppner, and some others but, as said, the area is mostly undeveloped and agricultural. It has a climate that can hardly be equaled so far as temperature and humidity is concerned. The rainfall is generally less than 15 inches annually. The soil is mostly coarse textures. Much of the area has available ground water.

The original idea of regional planning and development in the area was stimulated by the potential for the development of the Boardman bombing range and the possibilities that this development could have regional effects.

The Boardman bombing range, located in Morrow County, is a 96,000 acres site owned by the Navy. It is a relatively level site cut by streams and gulches. A good deal of the land surrounding the site is used for grazing of sheep. Where water is available, a variety of crops are grown. In a rather complicated land exchange which I will discuss a little later, the Boeing Co. has leased a part of the range and some adjacent land and expects to use the site for missile testing and other research.

For many years, I had recognized the tremendous potential we had here in our North Morrow County. After becoming county judge, a little over 4 years ago, I jumped at the opportunity of getting the Boardman bombing range into private hands, to bolster our agricultural economy as well as making space for industrial development. At least I thought it could be done. Much of the area both east and west was available, but here sat the bombing range, 96,000 acres of it, right in the midst of this economically very valuable part of Morrow County.

Just why is this so valuable in addition to the agricultural potential? As said, 32 miles of Morrow County borders the great Columbia River. The Boardman Bombing Range in the heart of North Morrow County also almost borders the Columbia River. In the Columbia River Basin we have more than 40 percent of the hydroelectrical energy of the United States, nine times more water flows down this stream than flows down the Colorado River, five times more than flows down the Missouri, two times more than flows down the Ohio where so much industrial development has taken place in recent years. In addition, slack water, even for oceangoing vessels, will soon be available all the way to Pasco, Wash., some 250 miles inland from the Pacific Ocean. The great multipurpose dams of Bonneville, The Dalles, and McNary are complete and the John Day Dam will be completed by 1967. In addition, other large projects are completed farther up the river from Pasco, including the Grand Coulee Dam. Four additional dams are scheduled for completion within the next few years which will make slack water as far inland as Lewiston, Idaho. Of these, Ice Harbor Dam, is now completed and three others, Lower Monumental, Little Goose, and Lower Granite are on the agenda. Truly, the Columbia River with its tremendous hydroelectric potential and the possibilities of its use in industrial development, can bolster our agricultural and industrial economy.

Other assets of the mid-Columbia area include the mainline of the Union Pacific Railroad as well as U.S. Highway 30 which will soon be a four-lane freeway.

Many of us have long recognized the great potential. Some 4 years ago, I took ahold of this, as said, in all earnestness. I contacted our Senators and Representatives in Congress, our Heppner-Morrow County Chamber of Commerce, the Morrow County Grange, the Inland Empire Waterways Association, the Public Land Committee of our Association of Oregon County Officials, as well as Forest E. Cooper, attorney for the association of county officials. I had the very finest of cooperation from most of the groups. I'm sure both Congressman ULLMAN and Senator MORSE can assure you of what a pest I made out of myself by continually bombarding them with letters, both from the groups which I represented, and myself about getting this Boardman range released into private hands. It was not until in November 1960, at the annual meeting of the Inland Empire Waterways Association meeting in Lewiston, Idaho, that I really met contacts that appeared to be going to be helpful in getting actual results. Mr. Robert Tarr, who was then the director of the State department of planning and development, and Mr. Warne Nunn, assistant to Governor Hatfield, contacted me and suggested I get the Governor and the State department of planning and development to work on the problem. They stated that there was a demand, immediate demand for large area of possibly 25,000 acres for industrial development. To me it sounded fantastic but with the additional cooperation, this was a possibility. Immediately I wrote Governor Hatfield. Also our Congressmen and Senators in Washington again, and sent copies to the Governor and the State department of planning and development.

From this time on, Governor Hatfield and the department of planning and development carried the ball. It turned out to be difficult for them as well. To get something back from the Federal Government into private hands or State hands is like trying to dip the ocean dry. Although much of the land was taken over from private citizens in Morrow County at prices from $1.63 to $8 per acre, as a war emergency, it was purported to be even more valuable to the Navy under a peacetime economy, and impossible to get a release. However, the Governor and the successor to Mr. Tarr, Mr. S. H. Mallicoat, of the State department of planning and development, through perseverence, succeeded in getting some trades and adjustments made whereby the west one-half of the bombing range was made available to the State and the east one-half was retained by the Navy for bombing range purposes. Options for some additional 55,000 acres were secured and incorporated into the 48,000 acres making something excess of 100,000 acres into what has become the Space Age Industrial Park. The original request for the 25,000 acres was for some space age defense industry that was looking this way. This first feeler did not materialize but it was not long until other inquiries were made. Even the workshop Saturn turned out to show some interest. Indeed with the tremendous potential for space age development, including guided missiles, I would say, there is nothing equal to this area anywhere in the United States. The Boeing people, from

Seattle, have now taken a lease on the 100,000-acre industrial park and we are looking forward to some great things to happen here in the very near future.

Now after the problem had somewhat gotten off local hands, other problems became paramount. The area in question, now known as the Space Age Industrial Park, has many features attractive to a space age industry. No company had as yet made a final decision to come into the area, the feeling was that a number of satellite industries, including machine shops and electronic firms would also be coming in. There undoubtedly, would be an influx of population. Existence of active community planning agencies is always a factor which is attractive to industry. Ken Tollenaar, executive secretary of the Association of Oregon Counties, asked, "Why don't you look into the possibility of forming a regional planning commission board with counties along the Columbia?" This seemed to have merit, so immediately we called together members of the county courts of Umatilla, Morrow, Gilliam, Sherman, Wasco, and Hood River Counties. The response was phenomenal. A regional organization was set up; myself as chairman.

Meetings were held at Heppner, Pendleton, The Dallas, and Arlington, in the spring and summer of 1960. There was a unanimous feeling there was a need for regional planning. It was also agreed that local governments other than counties be included as part of the regional planning commission. As a result, representatives of port districts and cities were asked to be present and many indicated that they would be interested in participating in the venture. It was agreed, however, that the regional commission should serve the local planning in an advisory capacity.

The matter of financing came up. Here again, Mr. Tollenaar gave valuable assistance. He discussed procedures with us and distributed a sample budget for the regional planning agency to illustrate the types of expenditures which might be required. This budget was based on the assumption that a Federal grant would be obtained under the provisions of Housing Act of 1954 (701 program) to finance 50 percent of the planning project. The several counties would make available some of the funds but port districts and cities would be asked to participate. All counties indicated willingness to participate, as well as several of the port districts. I must say, we have had wonderful response from the State department of planning and development. We were also assured of receiving $4,000 from them.

To be eligible for the Federal grant we had to make an interagency agreement between the ports and the counties and apply for the grant that a State agency is authorized to do planning for the State and major sectors of the State. This we arranged to do and are now known as the Mid-Columbia Planning Council, with myself as president, Judge D. R. (Sam) Cook of Umatilla County as vice president, and Judge Harris Higgins of Hood River County as secretary-treasurer. The need for some kind of land-use planning was quite apparent, not only for the north Morrow County but adjacent counties as well. In our efforts to organize the regional agency it became increasingly apparent that we contact reliable consultants, who might look at the area from an outside point of view. A nationwide consulting firm was decided upon. Some delay was encountered in securing funds under the 701 project. Additional State legislation was needed. This was taken care of in the 1961 session of our State legislature. Then just last week, the planning grant from the Housing and Home Finance Agency for the work in the mid-Columbia area was approved. We are now eligible for Federal grant funds at the rate of 2 to 1 for moneys expended in this program.

We are also making arrangements to hire an executive secretary who will be expected to do a portion of the work in collecting existing data for the consulting firm. He will also act as the contact man for industries and firms looking this way for new location sites. Although space-age industries are looking pretty much to the north Morrow County industrial park sites, almost equally valuable sites are in neighboring counties and possibly to attract investors a selling agency is needed. This is the thinking of the members of our Mid-Columbia Planning Council. A part of the work of an executive secretary would be to correlate some of the available information and pass it on. We need to attract industries to our State and especially to this eastern Oregon area.

It has taken nearly 2 years to get the program into working order but are now in positions to proceed. We are in an area of tremendous resources of which the surface has been barely scratched. We hope this planning and development project will assist.

In conclusion, I want to say that we are sincerely grateful to our Governor, Mark O. Hatfield, and the member of the State department of planning and development for bringing about this space age industrial park. Also, to Mr. Lloyd Anderson, deputy director for the department of planning and development, for the valuable assistance he has given us in getting the organization legally underway and handling the technical problems in applying for the Federal matching funds. Contracts have been signed between the department of planning and development and the Mid-Columbia Planning Council, and between the department of planning and development and the consulting firm, Ebasco Services, Inc. The house is now in order, and we are ready for business.

Little-People-to-Little-People Program Is an Inspiring Thing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to salute one of the youngest pioneers in the New Frontier. I am speaking of Peter Rodino, who has showed most clearly that the strength of America lies in the hearts and minds of her citizens both young and old.

Peter has studied in school, as have all young Americans, the history of present day efforts to achieve a peaceful world. After considering the implications to himself of present day problems, he decided that even at his young age there was something he could contribute to attaining peace.

His idea was to enlist young people of the United States in a crusade of their own, in a little-people-to-little-people program, in which they would strike a firm blow for peace.

Peter Rodino took the bull by the horns and wrote directly to Mr. Khrushchev of his hopes and of the hopes of all American children for peace. He has now started a crusade to urge many other children to write similar letters, and they are doing so.

In a day and age when so many lament the course of history and do nothing to contribute to the betterment of mankind, it is a refreshing thing to salute the vigor and imagination of a 10-year-old boy such as Peter Rodino. Certainly his father, the distinguished Congressman RODINO, of New Jersey, must be very proud of him.

God Save Us From Our Friends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD an article written by Mrs. Dorothy Bickel of Trail City, S. Dak., which describes the feelings of many farmers on the matter of agricultural legislation.

I am sure Mrs. Bickel speaks for many farm families when she writes as follows:

GOD SAVE US FROM OUR FRIENDS

(By Dorothy Bickel)

This is the cry of worried farmers everywhere. Our friends have already caused us enough trouble to last a generation and now they are trying to add to them with their selfish pressure groups begging for parity and higher farm prices.

Most all farmers are good businessmen. They know they must operate within a narrow margin of profit and still realize a profit without a bumper crop. Only good management can do that and that is the bulwark of our American economy.

The pressure groups (our friends) say the poor family farm cannot hold up its head to society on such a low income—they forget we are not trying to equal "high society." And our food bill is only a fraction of the medium class food bill. They (our friends) do not know we do not have to buy our eggs, butter, cheese, milk, cream, meat, poultry, potatoes, and if we are industrious, our farm garden can supply much more to can and freeze. Also our rent for a home is not high, we do not need fancy workclothes, expensive hairdo's and a new car each year. We are down to earth, common people, and we are proud of it. Consider the above items subtracted from the medium income society's wages and then you have a better idea of where we stand.

Our wheat prices today, per bushel, is 60 cents above world trade value so we cannot compete in the world's market. The Government buys this wheat and sells it for 60 cents less resulting in great loss of millions of dollars.

Because most countries do not want their internal economy disrupted by flooding it with free wheat, we cannot even give it away. So we stand with a monstrous mountain of surplus grain because of the high price.

Our friends say this is not high enough, you should get more for your wheat. Now, their bills are in Congress to raise prices for all grains once again. Of course we cannot raise as many acres of wheat, but we will get more for it—what's the difference anyway?

It sounds much like the laborer who had a union for a friend. His union friend

managed a wage raise for one man that caused another to lose his job completely. His union friend then got this fortunate man another raise—his employer had to raise the price of the product to cover the raise of his employees and the man without a job had to pay the higher price of the products.

We are not greedy farmers. We love the land, enjoy common, good fellowship, and most of all, we know that if we work hard, practice good management, we can always hold our heads up to society.

Our friends are trying to legislate prosperity for us that will cause us more headache in inflation, because of the great margin between what the Government pays us and then looses when it trys to resell it or store it. God, save us from our friends.

Our friends are crying so loud of our plight that the city folks begin to think that maybe we really are in trouble. Every good farmer today has many thousands of dollars more in property valuation than his city brother. The average farmer spends the first 10 years in farm operation just paying for his machinery, but he is happy building toward a goal, which is usually the building up of a bigger, better, more efficient business. The average farmer is a realist. He knows prosperity cannot be legislated—that it is earned only by hard work and good management and he takes pride in his ability.

He pays taxes and he knows that every Government project costs money. He knows that a politician who promises farm prosperity is promising to rob Peter to pay Paul and he will have to pay for it anyway. Above all, we farmers are Americans, we believe in economic freedom where supply and demand are the factors that determine the price of our products and if our wheat could compete in the world trade there would be no surplus. God save us from our friends.

Little People to Little People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great deal of interest that I read the remarks of my distinguished colleague from the State of New Jersey, the Honorable PETER RODINO, concerning the initiation of a little-people-to-little-people program.

There is indeed much merit in this suggestion and Congressman RODINO's son, Peter III, is to be commended for the effort to transform this meritorious idea into an effective program. At a time when understanding between the people of the world is essential to peace and cooperation, it could go far in breaking down the inaccurate stereotypes which exist in the minds of men.

The children of our country are our greatest asset. In many instances they, in their simplicity, can see and perceive more clearly than those whose minds are lost in intricate details. Certainly a children's crusade of letters urging the children of the world to join them in a campaign for world peace and security could be an important contribution to good will and understanding among the peoples of the world.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Attention, 1st Virginia Regiment Membership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, Brig. Gen. Edwin P. Conquest, retired, has been designated by the Governor of Virginia as honorary colonel in chief of the 1st Virginia Regiment, established on November 18, 1961, with the authority and approval of the U.S. Department of the Army.

General Conquest is now attempting to locate all personnel who would be eligible for membership in the 1st Virginia Regiment by virtue of their service with either the 1st Virginia Infantry or of any military organization stemming from it.

As I want to assist General Conquest in this worthy endeavor, I insert in this RECORD the memorandum General Conquest is now circulating among all known eligible personnel in an effort to make them, and others whose whereabouts are now unknown, aware of the existence of this fine organization.

General Conquest's memorandum follows in full:

HEADQUARTERS,
1ST VIRGINIA REGIMENT,
GRAYS ARMORY,
Richmond, Va., December 12, 1961.

To: All former members of the 1st Virginia Infantry (or of any military organization whose roots were in this famous and historic regiment), and who were honorably discharged from military service at any time before November 18, 1961.

1. On November 18, 1961, the Honorable J. Lindsay Almond, Governor of Virginia, with the authority and approval of the U.S. Department of the Army, established the 1st Virginia Regiment and commissioned me its colonel in chief.

2. I immediately gained the consent of Brig. Gen. Edwin Cox to serve with me as deputy colonel in chief. Together, with their consent, we have appointed Brig. Gen. John A. Cutchins, historian; Col. Robert Buford Rose, regimental executive; and Col. Herbert W. Harris, regimental adjutant. We have written to Col. James R. McAllister asking him to accept appointment as chaplain, and to Col. Richard A. Bowen asking him to be our regimental surgeon. Col. Lewis C. Lush has accepted appointment as assistant regimental surgeon. We have established the headquarters of the 1st Virginia Regiment at the Grays Armory, Seventh and Marshall Streets, Richmond 19, Va.

3. All former honorably discharged members of the Armed Forces who were formerly members of the 1st Virginia Infantry or of any military organization stemming from it, are automatically members of the 1st Virginia Regiment as of its date of origin, November 18, 1961; provided the date of such honorable discharge was prior to November 18, 1961. Present and future active members of military organizations stemming from the 1st Virginia Infantry will automatically become members of the 1st Virginia Regiment upon their honorable separation from the Armed Forces.

4. The mission of the 1st Virginia Regiment is (a) to assist the 1st Battle Group, 176th Infantry, VAARNG and the 1st Reconnaissance Squadron, 183d Armor, VAARNG and any other VAARNG organization which may in the future stem from these or from the old 1st Virginia Infantry; (b) to preserve the past history of these organizations, and to compile and preserve their current and future histories; (c) to serve as the connecting file between the old 1st Virginia Infantry and the present and future (if any) active military organizations stemming from it; (d) to maintain a regimental headquarters in Richmond and an organization of regimental components in Richmond and elsewhere in Virginia to keep in constant touch with our active units wherever these may be, and especially with such units or portions thereof called or ordered into State or Federal service.

5. I expect, with the aid of our staff and others, to draft and publish bylaws for the 1st Virginia Regiment. Meanwhile I shall welcome suggestions from you as to the conduct of our affairs, and will try to keep you informed of what we are doing and trying to do. This is our outfit, belonging to all of us, and we need everybody's help. I welcome the renewal of old and cherished associations with you all and earnestly trust that we shall all make the most of this unique opportunity to serve our State and Nation by fostering and encouraging the patriotic efforts of our own Virginia military units whose officers and members have sought our aid.

EDWIN P. CONQUEST,
Honorary Colonel in Chief,
1st Virginia Regiment.

The Promise of the Future in Electric Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on February 22, 1962, Hon. Joseph C. Swidler, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, addressed the Woman's National Democratic Club on "The Promise of the Future in Electric Power." The address is most informative as to the functions of the Federal Power Commission and as to the future of electric power in the United States. I am sure it will be of interest to Members of Congress and to the public generally. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PROMISE OF THE FUTURE IN ELECTRIC POWER

(By Joseph C. Swidler)

I am honored to have been invited to attend your George Washington birthday party. My first impulse when your Chairman invited me to talk about the regulation of electric power companies was to try to find the features of the Federal Power Commission's program which might be of special interest to women, the "woman's angle," socalled. However, I signed an order the other day forbidding any discrimination in the Commission on the basis of sex, and I do not propose to violate that order myself. What I am going to say to you today has no "woman's angle" in it. The role of electric power in the national economy is important to all of us because electric power, more than any other single industry, is the lifeblood of our economy.

Perhaps I should start by admitting that I am here under misleading, if not actually false, pretenses. You have every reason to think that the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission is primarily occupied with electric power problems. However, the Federal Power Commission regulates interstate natural gas as well as electric power companies, and on the basis of the way I spend my time, I might better be called a Federal Gas Commissioner.

I am pleased to be able to assure you that I am a great expert on both electric power and natural gas problems. I say this in reliance on the many tributes which I have received from representatives of both industries. The natural gas people say, without hesitation, that I am an outstanding expert in the field of electric power, and the power companies avow to a man that my true vocation is in working on natural gas matters.

I suppose that most of you have heard that in recent years the Federal Power Commission has had trouble in discharging its responsibilities effectively, particularly in the natural gas field. It was singled out a year ago as an outstanding example of the breakdown of the administrative process. The President has said the Commission has accumulated an "incredible backlog of cases."

It happens that all four of the present members of the Commission—there is one vacancy—were appointed by President Kennedy. Our only instruction is to restore the Commission as quickly as possible to its proper role as an outstanding example of effective regulation in the public interest. Every one of us, Democrat and Republican alike, is hard at work to justify the confidence that the President has placed in us.

I can tell you that the tide has turned, that the Federal Power Commission is infused with new energy and new ideas, and that improvements in organization, procedures and staffing are taking place almost daily. If I am to believe recent press clippings, the Commission has even succeeded in creating new confidence and optimism in the natural gas industry which was itself one of the victims of the lag in the dispatch of the Commission's regulatory work.

The Federal Power Commission is the Federal regulatory authority both in the natural

gas and the electric power fields, but we do not devote equal time to the two industries. Thus far, I am sure I have spent at least three-fourths of my time on natural gas problems. The same is true of the other Commissioners. Natural gas jurisdiction is a much more recent jurisdiction. In seeking to exercise its authority over natural gas companies the Commission for many reasons has become overwhelmed with a backlog of urgent cases which must be moved along. As a result, the Commission in recent years has sadly neglected its responsibilities in the electric power field. The present members of the Commission are seeking to redress the balance, because the problems in the electric power field are just as serious as those in the natural gas field, albeit they do not involve the same explosive urgency.

Perhaps you ladies will be good enough to invite me back on another occasion to let me tell you about the Commission's natural gas work. Today I shall simply describe in general the area of the Commission's responsibilities in the electric power field, and dwell for a few minutes on some of the power activities which have the greatest importance for the future.

As I am sure most of you know, the electric power industry is by far the largest in the country in terms of investment. It is the industry upon which all other industries depend as a source of energy. Whereas the natural gas industry serves 34 million customers, the electric power industry services almost twice as many, some 60 million customers. In 1961 it received more than $12 billion in revenues from the power consumers of the country. The performance of the electric power industry and the effectiveness with which it is regulated make a great deal of difference to the people of our country.

The overall job of regulating the electric utility companies is divided among the Federal Power Commission and the State and local regulatory agencies in the 50 States. Each of the States has its own system for regulating the local and intrastate aspects of the utility industry. The Federal Power Commission operates only on the national level.

Without going into details, the Commission has four kinds of responsibilities in the power field. One of them is with respect to the Nation's water-power resources. By waterpower resources, I mean the electricity generated by the energy from falling water. The water wheel utilized this source of energy directly in many of our old grist mills. Today great dams with huge hydroelectric stations have converted destructive rivers into controlled sources of low-cost electric power. The same dams usually provide great benefits also in flood control, navigation, irrigation, reclamation, sanitation and domestic water supply.

The Commission is, in effect, the custodian of the Nation's hydroelectric resources, with an obligation to assure that they are used in the national interest. No hydroelectric project of substantial size can be built—except by the Federal Government itself—without a license from the Commission. It is our responsibility to insure that licensed developments fit into a pattern of effective comprehensive development of the Nation's water resources. In the same context, we review the plans for water development projects of the major Federal construction agencies, the Bureau of Reclammation and the Army Engineers, to insure that the projects will conform with the public interest in the best overall development of the water resources of the region.

Our second area of responsibility is with respect to the interstate transmission and sale of electric power. The rates at which wholesale interstate transactions take place are regulated by the Commission. As more and more companies emerge from their local shells to become members of interstate power pools, this jurisdiction assumes a growing importance. About 80 percent of the privately owned segment of the industry is now engaged in interstate aspects of the power business and is thus subject to FPC jurisdiction. I should emphasize, however, that the local distribution of electricity, whether the electricity originates in the same State or another State, is outside FPC jurisdiction, and that the rates which the ultimate consumer pays for electricity are almost entirely regulated by State commissions. It is the interstate wholesale transactions which the FPC regulates.

A third area of our responsibility is the encouragement of interconnections among utility systems in order to improve the economy and dependability of their services. In the past the Commission has made numerous studies of interconnections between particular companies and has made a major contribution toward the growing trend of tying together all the Nation's electric systems into a single pool. I regret to say that in the past many of these reports were not released and that this phase of the Commission's responsibility is little known among the general public. This work is now being expanded to include the first interconnecting study on a national scale which has ever been undertaken in this country. In a moment I shall tell you about this project in some detail.

The fourth of our responsibilities is with respect to the books of accounts of the electric companies. I know that accounting must seem like a pretty humdrum kind of activity and I doubt that I can wrest any real drama from this phase of our work, but I think I can illustrate its importance without taking up much of your time. Before 1935 there was no national requirement that the power companies keep their books in any particular way. As a result, the books of accounts of the power companies had little comparability or significance. The absence of dependable bookkeeping made effective regulation almost impossible. Many abuses crept into the operations of the power companies and into their books of account. The buyers of the stocks and bonds of the power companies had no reliable information on the financial status of the companies in which they were investing, as many of them learned to their regret as a result of the scandals of the Insull days. My secretary, a very knowledgeable young woman, had never heard of Samuel Insull before I dictated these notes and I am sure his activities occurred before most of you were old enough to follow these matters. At any rate, he built up a public utility operating and holding company empire which collapsed in the early 1930's and investors then found that the securities of his company were sustained as much by air and water as by solid investment in income-producing facilities.

Congress determined that this should not happen again. As one of the measures to place the power industry on a sound footing for the future the Federal Power Commission was authorized to prescribe a uniform system of accounts for electric companies. These accounting standards are compulsory for all of the companies doing interstate business and because the State commissions have adopted virtually the same system of accounts, it has almost become universal. Compliance with these accounting requirements is policed by the Commission for the 80 percent of the privately-owned segment of the industry which comes under our jurisdiction. As a result the accounting systems of the electric power companies of this country now rest on a solid foundation. Perhaps all this sounds a bit remote, but it ends up making a noticeable difference in your light bill as well as in the strength and solidity of the electric companies in this country and the worth of the securities which they issue.

A companion to all of the Commission's other activities in the power field and in the long run one of our most important functions is the dissemination throughout the country of information and reports concerning every aspect of the power industry. These reports are the bread and butter, not only of the Federal Power Commission, but of all other regulatory agencies throughout the country as well as investor and consumer groups.

This summary should make clear that the Commission has pretty well mastered the problems of the 1930's which have been confided to it, but you may well be asking how we are doing on the problems of the 1960's and the years beyond. I want to tell you of our plans.

Perhaps you have a mental picture of the electric business as staid and unspectacular. You may be surprised to learn that the electric industry is one of the greatest growth industries of all time. Since it was born some 80 years ago, the industry has grown at a rate which on the average has doubled its physical plant every decade, and the end of this remarkable rate of growth is not in sight. Every industry prophet who has, in the past, risen to say that this pace could not be maintained in the decades to come, has been proven false as the years rolled by. Some of you may recall that Wendell Willkie said TVA would be unable to sell the output of Norris Dam, but within a decade TVA was utilizing every bit of available hydropower on the Tennessee River, after building a score of dams in addition to Norris Dam, and was busy building giant steamplants in order to keep up with the demand. Likewise the growth of the privately owned electric utilities has outstripped the predictions of even the most optimistic forecasters. Every projection based upon the assumption that the growth would taper off as appliance saturation increased has foundered on the fact that in our dynamic society new uses and new appliances are constantly being developed.

I must confess that in the past the FPC has been among those whose vision was as short as its estimates. Less than a month ago, however, the Commission announced the results of a new study of future power needs. They reflect the dynamic quality of this Nation's economy. We now estimate that the total energy requirements will grow from the 850 billion kilowatt hours a year produced in 1960 to almost 3 trillion kilowatt hours in 1980—more than a threefold increase. We estimate that total generating capacity will grow from 187 million kilowatts in 1960 to about 600 million kilowatts in 1980, also more than a threefold increase. If these forecasts are correct, and they are consistent with everything that has occurred up to now, the entire present investment of the electric power industry today will be only between one-third and one-fourth of the investment which will be in place 20 years from now. I know that these huge numbers expressed in kilowatts and kilowatt-hours are hard to evaluate. In dollars, if you can follow me better in those terms, I am talking about an estimated expenditure by the electric industry of perhaps $100 billion in the next 20 years for generating and transmission facilities alone. Think what this means in terms of investment and employment, and in the growth of our industrial potential and our ability to satisfy the wants and needs of our citizens.

This tremendous future growth of the electric power industry focuses attention on the most important activity which the FPC is now initiating. I refer to the Coordinated National Power Survey which I

mentioned earlier. It is an activity which may have a great bearing upon the question whether the anticipated expansion of the electric industry will take place in such a way as to bring about an abundant supply of electricity at lower rates for the entire country.

The Commission's survey, as proposed in the 1963 budget submitted by the President to the Congress, would suggest in broad outline how the Nation's 3,600 electric systems can key their future expansion plans to a national scale rather than to a local or area basis. The plan would provide for private, municipal, cooperative, State, and Federal electric systems to coordinate their facilities over wide regions, through extra-high-voltage transmission lines, using large, efficient steam powerplants, hydroelectric generating capacity, and nuclear and other new power sources as they may become available. Before describing the survey let me try to explain some of the fundamentals of our system of electirc power supply.

As you know, there are two basic means of generating electricity. One is to build a dam, with a powerhouse below it, to utilize the energy of falling water in our streams as it flows from the headwaters in hills or mountains to the two oceans. There are many remaining hydroelectric sites in all parts of the country. The Commission is constantly receiving applications for licenses for new hydro developments, and Congress each year appropriates hundreds of millions of dollars for Federal dams with power installations. Nevertheless, water power supplies only 18 percent of our power today and the undeveloped sites of our rivers can supply only a small part of the power needs of our country in future years. Steamplants supply the remaining 82 percent of today's power supply and investment in steamplants will constitute by far the major portion of the $100 billion more or less, which the electrical industry will need to invest in generation and transmission facilities during the next 20 years.

Most of you have probably never seen the inside of a large modern steamplant. It is one of the largest and most complex of modern industrial installations. Its function is simple, however. It is a plant where electricity is generated by the use of steam. The raw source of energy used in a steamplant is coal, oil, or natural gas, and in future years may be nuclear energy, when the experimental nuclear plants already in existence are perfected. The fuel is burned in a boiler and the energy is converted into steam at a very high temperature and under tremendous pressure. This high-pressure steam is directed into a turbogenerator so as to make it revolve thousands of times a minute in an electrical field, thus converting the energy into electricity. This is the process, more than any other, upon which the electrical age in which we live is based.

Steamplants vary in size from tiny stations with a capacity of a few hundred kilowatts that serve a small factory or community to huge modern stations of a million and a half kilowatts burning over 4 million tons of coal a year, and supplying more than enough power to meet all the requirements of Washington, D.C. Ten years ago the largest individual generating unit operating in this country had a capacity of 215,000 kilowatts. There has been a technological revolution in the last decade. Today, individual units of 1 million kilowatts are on order and single plants having a capacity of several million kilowatts are only a few years away.

The cost of producing electricity in steamplants varies almost as much as their size, and pretty much in relation to size. The large units operate at higher temperatures and pressures, are more efficient, require less investment per unit of plant, and use less coal and labor per unit of output. Large generating units make possible low-cost power to consumers.

At the same time that great advances have been taking place in the efficiency and economy of power generation by large-scale generating units, even more dramatic technological progress has been made in the field of electric power transmission. Transmission lines serve the same function as the large pipeplines which bring natural gas from the producing fields to the city gate. They bring electricity from the plants where it is generated to the area where it is used. The size of a transmission line is expressed in Kilovolts. A few years ago transmission voltages higher than 230 kilovolts were a rarity, while today there are lines in successful experimental operation at 500 kilovolts, and 750 kilovolts and even 1,000,000-volt lines are not far away. Remember, the capacity of a transmission line increases in proportion to the square of the voltage. A 500-kilovolt line can carry almost five times as much current as a 230-kilovolt line. The most significant fact is that these new larger lines can transmit electricity 500 to 1,000 miles on an economical basis as compared to only 150 to 200 miles with existing lower voltage transmission lines. This new development, called extra-high voltage or EHV transmission, when combined with low cost generation from giant plants located near cheap fuel sources, makes it possible to spread the benefits of low-cost power through the entire country. Never before have there been such great opportunities and benefits to be realized from national coordination of power system planning.

The technological breakthroughs in generation and transmission mean as much to the power industry as the airplane did to passenger traffic. They make possible a fully interconnected system of power supply for the entire country. The possible savings are enormous. With such a system, power could be generated with the largest and most efficient steamplant units interconnected with the powerplants at the hydroelectric dams.

In the past power companies have for the most part built steamplants no larger than were necessary to meet their individual needs. Many of the plants were located by reference to the service area of the particular power company involved, rather than where power would be produced the cheapest. I do not mean to imply that the industry has been unaware of the operating economies and improvements in service available from using larger generating units and interconnections between adjoining utility systems. There have been an increasing number of interconnections and pooling arrangements in recent years and plans are being announced almost daily for additional interties in both the publicly owned and privately owned segments of the industry. The technological breakthroughs in extra high-voltage transmission and giant generating stations would never have occurred without the pioneering efforts of leaders in all segments of the industry, both privately owned and publicly owned.

The fact remains, however, that we are far from having taken full advantage of the opportunity afforded by our resources and technology. The purpose of our survey is to point up the large savings that are available if individual companies can draw on a fully interconnected and coordinated system of power supply, that takes full advantage of the economies of the new technology of the power industry, and of low cost fuel sources.

The precise amount of the savings which might be derived from a fully coordinated power supply system in this country is, of course, difficult to estimate in advance of the survey. However, there is no doubt the savings would be substantial. For example, one of the large cost savings would be a reduction in reserve capacity, that is, the amount of capacity in excess of estimated peak loads required for possible breakdowns of equipment and other emergencies and contingencies. The Commission has in the past considered 15 percent as a normal reserve requirement. With a unified system of power supply, each power system could depend on much of the rest of the country for help in an emergency, and reserves of 10 percent should be adequate. When we consider that the installed capacity of the industry should at least triple by 1980, a saving of more than $3 billion could result from this feature alone.

There would be many advantages to the national coordination of our power systems in addition to a lowering of power costs. For example, fuel is the largest item of expense in operating a steam plant. Almost half of all the coal purchased in the United States is put to use as steam plant fuel, and the percentage of coal used in electric plant boilers increases from year to year. The delivered cost of coal in New England or even New York is about double the cost in the coal fields. With extra high-voltage transmission lines, the new giant plants could be located near the coal fields or other sources of low cost fuel hundreds of miles from where the power is to be used. It would no longer be necessary to locate steam plants in the urban areas where they add to air pollution. Plants to serve New York or Washington, for example, could be located in the coal fields of Pennsylvania or West Virginia, with resulting savings in money and health for everyone concerned.

In carrying out a survey of this magnitude the Comimssion will, of course, seek the cooperation and assistance of the electric power industry, and Federal and local governmental agencies concerned. We plan to establish consulting committees composed of top executives and technical experts from all segments of the power industry, and in fact we are holding a preliminary meeting with industry leaders within the next two weeks. The committees will work with us and serve as a channel for information and suggestions. The extent to which the results of the survey will be put into effect will depend on voluntary industry cooperation, because the agencies which must lay out their own money to provide generating and transmission capacity, in the final analysis, will and should have the final voice on where to locate their generating capacity and how to tie it together.

In an industry which is growing as fast as the power industry, no plan for the future can fail to take account of the constant changes in technology and in the patterns of growth in power use and power needs. The survey therefore can do no more than bring to bear one new but key consideration in the voluntary programing of expenditures for generation and construction: that is, the broad national interest in making the best possible use of the Nation's resources in capital, energy sources, and industrial technology.

So far as I know, the United States is the only industrially developed country in the world where there is no national plan or goal for power sytem interconnections, and where company-by-company decisions, made on the basis of local or regional interests, and without reference to any national standard, are still accepted as adequate to serve the national interest. Congress has prescribed a role for the Commission in the vital process of determining whether the power systems serving this country shall be efficient or inefficient, isolated or interconnected, coordinated or each sufficient to itself. That role makes clear the primary reliance of Congress on local initiative and responsibility, but it also makes clear the Commission's responsibility to set a national standard for the voluntary efforts of the

public and private agencies throughout the country. It is this role which the Federal Power Commission is preparing now to carry out.

The Fuel of the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, as we begin to employ heavier and heavier vehicles in our national space program, we shall find it imperative to master the technology to exploit the intense energies of a number of exotic fuels. One of these is hydrogen—the common stuff of the universe—which, despite its virtually unlimited availability, is extraordinarily difficult to handle. Our proposed lunar program and other major space enterprises will depend to a large extent on our ability to extract the enormous power of liquid hydrogen and similar elements. In order to acquaint my colleagues with some of the problems and prospects associated with this fuel, I should like to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a most informative article by J. S. Butz, Jr., which recently appeared in Air Force-Space Digest:

BIG H: KEY TO SPACEFLIGHT

(By J. S. Butz, Jr.)

U.S. success in space is keyed to the complete mastery at the earliest possible date of hydrogen as a rocket propellant. No foreseeable alternative to hydrogen exists if this country is to mount a moon expedition, or fly a nuclear rocket, or operate large B-52-size vehicles in space in this decade.

Hydrogen's preeminence as a propellant for reactive engines (rockets) has long been recognized. Its lightness (atomic weight: 1.008) allows it to reach a higher velocity and to produce more thrust per pound than any other element when streaming from a rocket combustion chamber of given temperature. However, until recent years there has been no practical hope of realizing the potential of hydrogen rockets.

Hydrogen is one of the critical elements of the universe and of life on earth, but it does not exist anywhere in nature in a form suitable for use in rockets. Hydrogen is the universe's most abundant element, accounting for 55 percent of the total mass, with helium 44 percent, and the heavier elements only 1 percent. The energy of the sun and the other stars is generated by the conversion of hydrogen to helium.

While the earth is an exception to the general rule and has very little hydrogen or helium for its mass, hydrogen is a key element in the chemicals of plant and animal life. Hydrogen chemistry is vital to modern industry, and hydrogen itself is one of the most thoroughly understood elements. A limited supply of hydrocarbon fuels carries the earth's energy burden today, and it is estimated that an essentially infinite supply will become available when the hydrogen in the world's oceans can be used to fuel controlled thermonuclear generators.

In spite of man's close association with hydrogen it has not been available until recent years in a safe and efficient form for rockets. Hydrogen must be condensed to a liquid state for it to be carried in reasonably small tanks and to keep the explosion hazard low. Since its boiling point is −423° F., liquefying hydrogen is a difficult and expensive job.

Until the early 1950's this process was limited to small laboratory quantities. Large-scale production began in the United States in connection with nuclear weapon research. Around 1955 the Air Force greatly enlarged the production capacity in anticipation of the need for hydrogen rockets. Since then many millions of gallons of liquid hydrogen have been consumed in U.S. rocket research.

Today, the U.S. space program is built almost completely around hydrogen fuel to keep both the budget and vehicle size low.

Virtually all existing space-booster plans will have to be reoriented if hydrogen engines do not prove to be better than 99 percent reliable. In such a reorientation, hydrogen would have to be replaced by a less efficient propellant. The result would be an upward spiral in the sizes and weights of launch vehicles. For instance, a Nova-type vehicle, designed for direct ascent from the earth to the moon and return without rendezvous, would weigh less than 10 million pounds at takeoff if it used hydrogen fuel in every stage but the first. If kerosene had to be substituted for hydrogen the vehicle's weight would go up five times—to about 50 million pounds.

For a kerosene-fueled rendezvous-type trip to the moon more than 1,750,000 pounds would have to be collected in a 300-mile-high orbit before the flight could begin. Using hydrogen this weight is reduced to about 400,000 pounds. When only simple orbital missions are concerned, this fivefold weight penalty decreases to a factor of two or three.

The Rover-type nuclear rocket would be just another run-of-the-mill space engine if hydrogen were not used as its working fluid or propellant. Helium is the only element which could possibly be substituted, but there probably is not enough helium available on earth to complete the development of such an engine.

Using hydrogen, Rover apparently will be able to fulfill the hopes of space planners by providing the high engine efficiency and high power needed for maned exploration of the near planets. Such an engine also should make multistage Nova- and Saturn-type vehicles obsolete by being able to send large payloads into orbit and to the moon in one stage.

While it isn't immediately clear from the multibillion-dollar price tag for the U.S. space program, hydrogen fuel is responsible for keeping the predicted cost down to manageable proportions. Certainly the cost of the lunar expedition would rise substantially if 50-million-pound vehicles had to be built or if nearly 2 million pounds had to be collected in orbit. And this expedition to all appearances is the biggest single item in either the military or the civil space budget within the foreseeable future.

Without hydrogen it would be impossible to achieve the planned reduction in direct orbital launch costs, from the current figure of well above $2,000 per pound of payload in a 300-mile orbit to around $500 per pound by 1967. If the nuclear rocket with hydrogen comes through as planned, along with an efficient booster-recovery system, this cost will come down to less than $100 per pound around the middle of the 1970's.

A descending cost curve probably means that the United States will be able to maintain an expanding space program. But if this curve levels off for any reason, it may prove difficult to retain the support of the Congress and the public for the more difficult and expensive projects.

The singular dependence upon hydrogen for increased performance is unavoidable. The main objective in rocket design is to increase specific impulse, or to increase the pounds of thrust produced by each pound of propellant burned each second. This may be done in two ways: First, the combustion temperature in the engine may be increased, but the lack of better heat-resistant construction materials blocks this method in the nuclear rocket.

Second, the molecular weight of the exhaust products may be lowered so that they can be accelerated to higher speeds. Hydrogen is best in this department because it is the lightest element. The only way to improve on hydrogen is to accelerate a stream of electrons or other subatomic particles. This is being done in the very efficient high-specific-impulse ion and plasma engines, but they do not produce enough thrust to be of interest for moon rockets or other short-travel-time space vehicles.

Hydrogen gives a specific impulse of around 400 seconds with most oxidizers in high-pressure engines, which is about 30 to 40 percent better than currently available propellant combinations.

When used alone in the nuclear rocket, so that the exhausting gas is only hydrogen, the specific impulse goes up to 700 seconds and more without an increase in operating temperatures.

The importance of specific impulse and the value of hydrogen has been understood since the time of Tsiolkovsky. However, until now operational requirements have not been pressing enough to force the conquering of its handling problems.

Most hydrogen-handling difficulties stem from the low boiling point at 423° below 0 F. other substances, even oxygen, are solids. Helium is the only exception. A double-wall Dewar flask, or vacuum bottle, similar to the ordinary thermos bottle, must be used to keep hydrogen in. Even in its liquid form hydrogen is very light in relation to its volume. Consequently, the vacuum-jacketed tanks needed on a hydrogen-fueled rocket are larger and heavier than customary. In most instances they will weigh about twice as much as a kerosene tank holding the same weight of liquid. This high tank weight hurts the hydrogen-fueled vehicle most in the first stage, which usually accounts for about 75 percent of the takeoff weight. However, hydrogen's high specific impulse more than overcomes this structural weight disadvantage, for a three-stage, all-hydrogen vehicle will do essentially the same job as one with a conventional booster plus three hydrogen upper stages.

Hydrogen's handling problems, which were of great concern 10 years ago, have fallen before a massive industrial and governmental research effort. Virtually every rocket engine company recognized the inevitability of hydrogen rockets and prepared themselves. Chemical firms specializing in supplying and transporting cryogenic fluids pushed their capabilities down to handle liquid-hydrogen temperatures. The Air Force and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (now NASA) sponsored research on performed in-house tests.

As a result there is now wide expertise in liquid-hydrogen technology. The materials problems have been overcome. The vacuum-jacketed pipes, pumps, valves, and tanks are available to transport and store liquid hydrogen. Superinsulations are available which have less than one-thirtieth of the thermal conductivity of the best types of a decade ago. They consist of a vacuum jacket enclosing 80 or more layers of aluminum foil and glass fiber to the inch. The jackets will hold a vacuum for years under shock and vibration conditions. This type of insulation can be applied to irregular contours and will allow structural supports and piping to be passed through it without affecting the tank temperature. Liquid hydrogen can now be stored on the earth for more than a year with less than 10 percent boiloff.

The use of such equipment was considered routine in industry more than 3 years ago.

The handling of liquid hydrogen has proven to be a practical operation, entirely safe as long as the proper precautions are observed. In this respect it resembles other low-temperature or high-energy propellants.

As these fundamental handling problems were being attacked, the Air Force, the NASA, and industry also pushed research studies on engine components which could accommodate hydrogen. Completely new combustion chambers, pumps, seals, bearings, etc., had to be developed to withstand the new temperatures. Hydrogen pumps turned out to be the biggest headache. Most rocket companies put a large percentage of their own research funds into this work.

The NASA's Lewis Laboratory pioneered in the development of a fairly large hydrogen thrust chamber (combustion chamber plus nozzle), in experimentation with flight-weight hydrogen pumps and in the study of engine controls. This work took place in the middle 1950's. Its encouraging results contributed to an Air Force decision to contract for the development of a complete hydrogen engine. Pratt and Whitney received this contract early in 1956.

The Air Force also contracted with Rocketdyne, a division of North American, in 1956 to develop a very large capacity, liquid-hydrogen pump for the Project Rover nuclear-rocket program. This move proved to be a most fortunate one, for pumps and some other cryogenic components have turned out to have the longest development time in this program, longer than that required for the test reactors.

In October of 1958 the Air Force received permission from the Advanced Research Projects Agency of DOD to contract with Pratt & Whitney for lightweight, 15,000-pound-thrust, hydrogen-oxygen engines for upper-stage use. This engine, the XLR-115, has since been transferred to NASA and redesignated the RL-10. It recently passed its preliminary flight rating test (PFRT) and is due to make its initial flight in the Atlas-Centaur vehicle around the first of the year.

As the responsibility for large boosters passed to NASA, the organization filled out its need for hydrogen engines. Studies showed that a fairly wide range of thrust-to-weight ratios could be tolerated for hydrogen-oxygen upper stages without seriously affecting payload capability. It was found that two engine sizes would be adequate for all of the upper stages contemplated by the agency, if the engines were arranged in clusters of up to six units. These two engines were the RL-10 and a 200,000-pound-thrust model. Rocketdyne received the contract for this latter engine, the J-2, in the fall of 1960.

With both the RL-10 and the J-2 engines NASA elected to use liquid oxygen as an oxidizer. Fluorine-hydrogen could provide slightly better specific impulse but lox has a long operational history dating back to the V-2 and Dr. Robert Goddard's vehicles. Fluorine's handling problems, extreme toxicity, and a tendency to set fire to everything but nickel apparently have been conquered. It is transferred around the country on a commercial basis. And Rocketdyne and Bell Aerospace, which have fired fluorine rockets hundreds of times, both have faith in its practicality. However, the press of time and the good performance of the hydrogen-oxygen combination apparently have delayed the serious development of a fluorine rocket for a number of years. If fluorine is used with hydrogen, it apparently will be in the final stage of a large vehicle where the combination's high specfic impulse will do the most good in increasing payload.

Little information is available on Soviet developments with liquid hydrogen, but, in view of its performance potential, there can be little doubt that the Russians are pushing hard in this field too. The fact that the United States is going all out on hydrogen engines would force them along the same road if they hadn't decided upon this course years ago.

While the Soviet hardware development is under wraps, their basic research activity is largely in the open, and it indicates an intense interest in hydrogen. A U.S. survey of Russian combustion research has shown that the preponderance of effort has been expended upon two propellant combinations, lox-kerosene and lox-hydrogen. Russia's operational rockets today use lox-kerosene, and most U.S. rocketmen predict that tomorrow the Soviets must and will go to hydrogen.

It is also generally predicted that the first nation to master hydrogen rockets will be the first on the moon. The exact state of the hydrogen race is hazy at present. The United States is behind its own development schedule, but considering the fact that a new propellant is involved the schedule has not slipped too badly.

Today the United States has three main concerns in the hydrogen race. These are: short development time, nearly 100 percent reliability required, and orbital storage of liquid hydrogen for long periods, a year and more.

The national objective of a lunar landing in 1967, if at all possible, requires that the J-2 be developed in record time. Its extremely rapid schedule calls for the first delivery to airframe contractors in the fall of 1962, only 2 years after work was started. The PFRT is due in early 1963.

No troubles have appeared during the first 15 months or so of development, but this period has been largely devoted to component testing. Running of the complete engine is due to begin about the first of the year, around a month behind schedule.

If the J-2 does not set a precedent for smooth development a major problem or two doubtlessly will have to be faced before it is successfully incorporated into a flight vehicle. This does not, however, lessen the critical nature of its schedule. If the J-2 slips, the U.S. moon-landing schedule, in all probability, will slip also.

In addition to the press of time from the moon program, the hydrogen engine is coming along in a period when an all-out push is being made to bring the reliability of rockets up to that of turbojets or better.

NASA's view on this subject has been positively stated by A. O. Tischler, Assistant Director for Propulsion in the Office of Manned Space Flight. He has said, "The reliability goal is unequivocally 100 percent. The difference between the reliability of existing systems and the reliability we need is real and must be recognized. The only valid point of view regarding engine dependability is that of the men who will some day be sitting a few yards in front of several clusters of these engines when they go."

All engines to be used in the moon-launch vehicle, the F-1, 1,500,000-pound-thrust lox-kerosene engine for the first stage, the RL-10 and the J-2 engines for the upper stages will have to meet the reliability requirement. However, the J-2 is the only one that has it written into the contract. This contractual requirement is for the engine to be at least 99 percent reliable during its qualification tests. These tests will take many months to complete, and they will begin shortly after the preliminary flight-rating test.

The flight-rating tests will call for a number of full duration firings of a single engine, probably about 20 as in the case of the RL-10, and then a tear-down inspection. Much more is involved in the qualification tests. Several hundred complete engine firings, possibly as many as 1,000, will be conducted and several thousand tests will be run on the engine components. According to Tischler each part will have to show a reliability so close to 100 percent that any test failure means that the part is not good enough.

The difficulty of achieving high reliability at an early date with a new type of engine is illustrated by the Pratt & Whitney experience with the RL-10. For the first 2 years this program was completely encouraging. Component tests were highly successful and the complete engine had run within the first year of the contract. Then three explosions occurred on the test stands during starting of the complete engines. This sudden ignition trouble was accompanied by difficulties in thrust control.

A redesign of the igniter fuel and oxidant porting solved the ignition problem. But the thrust control was not brought back to proper operation for several months during which extensive extra effort was expended by the company and Government agencies. The trouble was traced to part reproduction tolerances of several interdependent parts of the engine. Design changes and stricter manufacturing tolerances apparently have corrected the problem. Meanwhile, the engine has fallen more than 6 months behind the original schedule.

In addition to illustrating the delayed nature of many development problems, the RL-10 has demonstrated the rugged nature of hydrogen rockets. Very low temperature hydrogen is passed through the walls of the nozzle and the combustion chamber and does an excellent job of cooling. Most parts of the engine operate below 0° F. Ice collects in a thick layer on the outside of the engine if it is run in moist air. The combustion gases in a hydrogen-oxygen rocket are more than 1,000° F. cooler than those in a lox-kerosene rocket. These operating conditions breed reliability.

It will become necessary within the next few years to store liquid hydrogen in space for several days and possibly weeks if the United States is to put up 24-hour satellites and send men on prolonged spaceflights. Before the decade is out the United States probably will have embarked on missions calling for storage periods of a year and more.

The main requirement is to prevent a large percentage of the liquid hydrogen from boiling away during any storage period. In some cases the hydrogen would be carried in a vehicle's integral tanks. In others it would be placed in orbit in a separate tank and automatically rendezvoused with an orbital launch complex. Or these separate tanks might be towed along on longer trips beyond the moon.

NASA studies show that the lightest system will consist of heavily insulated, nonvented tanks containing subcooled liquid hydrogen. As the tanks absorb heat, the hydrogen will vaporize and the pressure in the tank will rise. Theoretically, it will be possible to build tanks capable of withstanding high internal pressure. In this arrangement there would be no hydrogen loss until the tank structural limit was reached. A popoff vent would then let vapor out and keep tank pressure below the critical. This vent, already developed, is ingenious because in orbit during zero-G it is uncertain whether vapor or liquid will enter the vent intake.

Even though the basic technology for orbital storage is available, detailed tank design cannot be concluded until the exact boiloff rate in zero-G is determined. Many experiments have been run during short-period zero-G maneuvers in aircraft and in flights by sounding rockets. Still it is not certain whether the liquid hydrogen will bubble as it boils or whether it will film boil. This makes a large difference in the heat transfer to the liquid in the tank and its boiloff rate. A positive answer to this question should be available after the first Centaur flight.

New Jersey National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, much has been written and much has been said about the recent callup of Reserve units by President Kennedy. It is sometimes generally assumed that morale has been low in these units and that performance has therefore suffered.

Last October two units from Camden, N.J., were called into Federal service. Recently, a delegation of Government officials, clergymen, labor leaders, and representatives of veterans' organizations visited the two units. Their findings: the Jersey guardsmen are doing a good job and their morale is good. It is with this thought that I ask for unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Courier Post, Camden, N.J., of February 17, which reports on the delegation's visit and findings.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOING A GOOD JOB

(By Howard W. MacDougall)

Last October several hundred south Jersey men left their jobs and families and began a 12-month tour of duty when two Camden units of the New Jersey National Guard were called into Federal service.

The men gave up their civilian lives, not because they wanted to, but because it was demanded of them as guardsmen. The Berlin crisis had cause President Kennedy to request emergency authorization to activate certain National Guard groups. These men were called.

Recently, a delegation of Government officials, clergymen, labor leaders, and representatives of veterans' organizations visited the two units—the 122d Ordnance Co. at Fort Chaffee, Ark., and the Headquarters Detachment, 30th Ordnance Battalion, at Fort Bliss, Tex.

The group had been invited by the New Jersey Department of Defense to visit the units and see firsthand how the troops were getting along after the first 4 months of active duty.

Upon returning, the consensus was:

The guardsmen are doing a good job, their morale is good (despite some unpleasant conditions at Fort Chaffee), and the gripes that are heard come from individual reservists called to active duty and not members of the National Guard.

Maj. Gen. James F. Cantwell, chief of staff, department of defense, headed the 21-member delegation. At both camps he held informal talks with the officers and enlisted men and stressed the importance of their role in the total mobilization picture.

Capt. James Kelly, of Bristol, Pa., company commander of the 122d, asked the primary questions confronting his men—when are we going to get out; what are we going to do, and where do we go from here?

General Cantwell told the 122d they should not plan on being released prior to October 1. The group may receive another assignment, he said, after they complete their Army training tests scheduled for this month.

He told both units:

"The callup of National Guard units was very essential. The Federal Government had no alternative. We are all proud of the job you people are doing.

"I believe, however, that the Federal Government learned that it would not be necessary to activate the National Guard again short of a shooting war.

UNFAVORABLE REACTION

"Too much turmoil and unfavorable reaction was created by the activation of the National Guard and callup of individual reservists. The Government probably would rather build up the active establishment in the future."

The reservists, or fillers who were called individually to fill specific billets in activated units, appear to fire the most pointed question, "Why was I called?"

General Cantwell said the Pentagon apparently called them into service because they had the necessary qualifications to complete the units. It was very impersonal, he stated.

The visitors, in a C-119, landed at Fort Smith, Ark., adjacent to Fort Chaffee, on a Sunday afternoon and were greeted by Maj. Gen. William Bullock, commanding general of the training center.

On Monday morning, General Bullock accompanied the group on a tour of the training facilities, before the group met with the men of the 122d.

The group was taken through tar-paper-covered barracks, converted mess halls with pot-bellied stoves, being used by the 122d. They ate in the mess hall and saw the coal stoves on which the chow was prepared.

Soot from the soft coal hung heavy over the area, but, as General Cantwell explained, the fort is in a soft coal region and uses the coal for heat and cooking to bolster the local economy.

VOW TO DO BEST

The men complained of the conditions, but realized they had to serve there and vowed to make the best of it. They hope for transfer after their tests, preferably closer to home.

An amazing contrast in living conditions was seen at Fort Bliss. The men of the 30th Ordnance Battalion there are quartered in clean, neat permanent buildings. They have just completed their tests and may be reassigned shortly or become part of the regular installation.

Maj. Gen. Marshall S. Carter, commanding general of the Army Air Defense Center and Army Air Defense School, greeted General Cantwell and his entourage when they landed late Monday afternoon at Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso.

A young missile officer, 2d Lt. Richard E. Waldt, of Baltimore, was assigned as escort officer for the group during its visit at Fort Bliss.

WILLIAMSTOWN OFFICER

Lt. Col. Robert A. Ware, of Williamstown, commanding officer of the 30th Ordnance Battalion, accompanied the group during most of its tours.

The visitors saw a train-fire demonstration at Fort Bliss' Castner range Tuesday morning and watched as men of the 30th received some practice train-fire. After noon chow with the 30th unit and General Cantwell's meeting with the men there, the group traveled to McGregor missile range in New Mexico.

At the McGregor range were members of B Battery, 2d Missile Battalion, 254th Artillery, stationed near Marlton. They had arrived the previous Sunday for their annual service practice.

The visitors headed for home Wednesday morning and after a 10-hour flight landed at Mercer County Airport outside of Trenton. The visitors included Assemblyman Maurice V. Brady, D. Hudson, representing Governor Hughes, Camden County Freeholder Director Healey and Freeholder Conroy, Mayor George Dooley of Stratford, Rev. Francis Flaherty of Holy Savior Church, Westmont; Rev. Samuel A. Jeanes, pastor of First Baptist Church, Merchantville; Murrell N. Woolman of Mount Holly, State commander of the American Legion; John M. Neafsey of Camden, Camden County Legion commander.

Also, Horace Camilli of Camden, president of Local 103, IUE, CIO-AFL; Dr. Leonard B. Irwin of Barrington, representing State Commission of Education Raubinger; John W. Sharp, Monroe Township committeeman; Albert J. Gifford of Gloucester City, Camden County veterans' service officer; Benjamin P. Thomas of Oaklyn, State adjutant of the VFW; Edward Duva of East Keansburg, State VFW sommander, and this reporter.

Also, Capt. John J. Combs, Jr., aide to General Cantwell; Maj. C. A. Tocco, PIO, State department of defense; Col. Edward B. Thorpe, State maintenance officer, NJARNG; Lt. Col. Herbert A. Muts, supervisor, NJARNG, Camp Drum, N.Y.; and Col. Perry Conant, senior Army advisor, NJARNG.

Colonel Glenn Cheers Us Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, America is proud today—proud of Col. John H. Glenn, the astronaut team, and of all the other men who helped in making the successful orbital flight possible. Occasionally, each of us needs an event to remind us of what a truly great nation we live in. This feat has revived in all of us our pride and self-confidence. The official newspaper of the Hartford Archdiocese, the Catholic Transcript, published the following editorial on Thursday, March 1, 1962. I believe it deserves the attention of the House:

COLONEL GLENN CHEERS US UP

Despite all its nagging troubles, internal and international, the United States has been enjoying real and rare exhilaration during the last 10 days. The reason is the successful orbital flight of Col. John H. Glenn, and its aftermath. The feat has revived self-confidence and given us a welcome opportunity to indulge in legitimate pride. It has diminished fear of the unknown, both the mysterious realm of space and the seemingly even more mysterious and ominous realm of Soviet intentions and accomplishments. It has brought reassurance that we are not lagging hopelessly behind in the race to new frontiers which have nothing to do with political sloganeering.

Matching in gratification the scientific success are the person and the postflight performance of Colonel Glenn. It is not frivolous to say that his being 40 years old has bucked up millions of Americans who had been unbearably depressed by the common assumption that 40 is the last frontier, the border beyond which are only decrepitude and uselessness. We have discovered that, instead of having to be shot at 40, one can be shot into space and perform brilliantly there. Major Glenn is likely to be regarded as the Ponce de Leon of the 20th century.

His age, however, is insignificant alongside what he represents and articulates for his fellow citizens of every age. So-called

science fiction is overpopulated with creeps and zombies, but in Colonel Glenn we see a normal, well-balanced, cheerful, radiantly human person who has performed an astounding scientific deed in reality, and not merely in the funny papers. He has come back from space and still resembles that pleasant, attractive, sensible, and helpful man who brightens every neighborhood. An astronaut is not a fearful freak, and the brave new world of tomorrow need not be populated with monsters of Aldous Huxley's imagining.

There were three elements in Colonel Glenn's speech to the Congress which heartened every hearer across the land. The first was the patriotic note he sounded. It was authentic and reasonable. On the one hand, we have been yelled and clawed at by people, in and out of high school, who not only spit on this ancient virtue, but also represent it as a vice and make one feel that subscribing to it is a sin. On the other hand, we have been shrilled at by chauvinists who would substitute extreme and, indeed, rabid nationalism for that true patriotism which is entirely compatible with loyalty to the family of nations. Colonel Glenn's position avoided both aberrations and bespoke commonsense.

Second, Colonel Glenn stressed the importance of a community of effort. He referred to his family, his associates, people near and far who had a part in the achievement he personifies. Again, two extremes were refused. One is that of sheer, lonely, antihuman individualism; the other that of oppressive, obliterating, equally antihuman collectivism. His achievement and his view are equally eloquent both of the unique importance of the individual and of the indispensability of free and intelligent cooperation by many individuals in a common and beneficial cause.

Finally, Colonel Glenn stressed the fact that his flight, epochal though it is, represents no more than wading the edges of a vast new ocean of knowledge. He said, "We're just probing the surface of the greatest advancement in man's knowledge of his surroundings that has ever been made." Study, speculation, experiment have millions of miles to go in the exploration of God's universe and the unlocking of the secrets with which he has studded it. This is a marvelous task for our own and future generations. As we and they go about it, it would be well to have on our lips the prayer voiced by Colonel Glenn: "As our knowledge of this universe in which we live increases, may God grant us the wisdom and the guidance to use it wisely."

Air Pollution and Water Contamination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, pollution of the air and contamination in the water is one of the greatest problems this country faces. In addition to the health factor, this problem concerns our pocketbook, for dollars of waste and dollars devoted to research and control are constantly being spent. This problem is important, not only to my State but, to the entire country; for this reason, the entire populace must realize that more sacrifices will be needed to combat this growing menace. The Daily Journal of Elizabeth, N.J., offered an excellent editorial on this subject on February 22. I feel it should be made available to the entire public. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPERTS SHOW COSTS OF POLLUTION

Science cannot yet measure precisely the impact upon public health of pollution in the air and contamination in the water, but governmental and industrial experts are beginning to appraise it in dollars—dollars in waste and dollars devoted to research and control.

This is of paramount concern to the New Jersey–New York metropolitan district, where the steadily intensifying atmosphere hints of the smog that blights Los Angeles, once darkened Pittsburgh, and harasses other major cities.

A variety of experts met in Elizabeth for a discussion of environmental health. They were informed the area wastes millions of dollars a year through the condition of the air and water. They were told, too, $15 million a year is being spent by a dozen key industries to detect and overcome pollution. They also were told that most New Jersey streams never can be purified, although their condition is being improved.

Those are generalities to the individual citizen, but when he is informed contamination in his surroundings costs him $65 a year it is understandable language.

The statements of the various experts at the meeting refute the careless charge that neither government nor industry acts against this plague.

Cleansing the atmosphere and the streams is a colossal undertaking begun too late, and contesting unequally against the growing industrialization of the whole area. Factories, traffic, private heating plants, fires all spew their fumes into the air. Adverse atmospheric conditions prevent dispersion and the sky is blotted out.

Industry is striving to minimize its contributions to this pollution, legislation has opened the way to suppression of others, and now the automobile manufacturer is perfecting a device that will diminish, if not eliminate, the effluvia from traffic. Factories remain the principal offenders against streams and coastal waters.

Progress is slow, but in some quarters it is positive. In others it appears to be nil.

An awakened people, an outraged people, can insist government and industry make greater efforts, but that insistence will mean larger expenditures by both. Industry will demur, but it is beginning to recognize an obligation. The public needs to realize that more from its pockets will be reflected in its health and a diminution in its losses because of pollution.

The Late Honorable Ralph Gwinn

SPEECH

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of the Honorable Ralph W. Gwinn.

I knew him very well. He was a Christian gentleman. He was a sound and constructive patriot who truly loved his fellow men and wanted this great Nation to be—and to remain—the land of the free and, as the home of the brave, to make a lasting contribution to the future of civilization.

Mrs. Horan, who also knew Ralph, and myself extend our deepest sympathies to his widow and to his family.

International Benjamin Franklin Society Award to Governor Rockefeller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, for some years I have been a member of the International Benjamin Franklin Society. On January 20, I attended its annual luncheon at the Biltmore Hotel in New York City celebrating the 256th anniversary of Franklin's birth. Brig. Gen. George L. Bliss, president of the Century Federal Savings and Loan Association of New York, president of the society, acted as master of ceremonies.

One of the society's most noteworthy activities is to award a gold medal each year to an outstanding citizen who exemplifies the example of public service set by Benjamin Franklin.

This year, the gold medal was awarded to Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller of New York. On this occasion, Governor Rockefeller made a fine address of great interest to all citizens. I ask unanimous consent to include his remarks and the citation in the Appendix of the RECORD:

TRANSCRIPT OF REMARKS BY GOV. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER AT LUNCHEON OF THE INTERNATIONAL BENJAMIN FRANKLIN SOCIETY, INC., BILTMORE HOTEL, NEW YORK, N.Y., JANUARY 20, 1962

General Bliss (Brig. Gen. George L. Bliss, president of the International Benjamin Franklin Society), distinguished former gold medal winners, distinguished officers of the society, and friends.

I don't think there is any honor that I could receive that means more to me than the one you have bestowed today because of my personal admiration of and respect for the extraordinary qualities of leadership, depth of understanding, patriotism, and dedication to basic values which are personified by the life of Benjamin Franklin.

Now I have found it intensely interesting to examine the speeches made on past occasions by recipients of this honor. They have underscored the almost infinite variety of Benjamin Franklin's genius.

For instance, when Herbert Hoover received your gold medal, he delivered a wry and witty speech in which he praised Franklin's devotion to fiscal integrity and personal liberty—two qualities which I would like to join in underwriting and which I try to apply in the State of New York.

Then Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., chairman of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, hailed Ben Franklin as our first scientist, and Dr. Herman B. Wells, president of the University of Indiana, acclaimed him as a patron and promoter of higher education—a founder of education and a great educator in his own right.

And Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker proclaimed Benjamin Franklin to be the patron saint of aviation and a crusader for air power 200 years before the Wright brothers proved that man could fly. Franklin was, after all, not merely a risk-taking experimenter with kites during thunderstorms, but an enthusiastic observer of the early French experiments with the hot air balloon.

I suspect that almost any individual you might choose to honor, including those who are here on the platform today—be he writer, diplomat, clockmaker, postman, wine taster, heating engineer, philosopher, electrician, fire insurance salesman, neighborhood wit, or almost anything else you can imagine—would readily find some area of identity with the great Dr. Franklin.

As one concerned with public affairs, who deeply believes that these dangerous times demand of us today a political creativity matching that of the Founding Fathers, I find in Franklin an outstanding example of the kind of creativity which the free world today so sorely needs.

As all the authorities on Franklin here assembled know well, he was, among many other things:

The senior member of the five-man committee which supervised Jefferson's drafting of the Declaration of Independence;

The first to envision an international organization comparable to the League of Nations or the United Nations; and

The senior delegate and great conciliator of the Convention which produced, after many trials, the Constitution of the United States.

Franklin was a giant among giants of creative intellect and patriotic devotion, who devised for this Nation, a structure of order within which free men could work and prosper in peace. American history since his time attests to this genius.

Today, on the international scene, the peril of world communism challenges us to devise a political structure for free nations that will serve the fundamental Judeo-Christian concept of man's dignity and individual worth on which this Nation was founded.

On the homefront we are no less challenged by a scientific revolution, fast population growth and urban development, and rapidly changing conditions to bring new vision, imagination and political creativity to solutions of the multiple problems which confront us.

I would like, on this occasion, ladies and gentlemen, to discuss a few of those problems which we meet on the homefront and which—thanks to the Founding Fathers and the Federal structure which they left us—we, as citizens, as free citizens, are able to face and deal with within our own jurisdictions.

I would like to take a moment to discuss the field of education for two reasons: First, because of Benjamin Franklin's great dedication to the cause of education as the fundamental strength of the Nation, and secondly, because of the wonderful young men who are here today with us, for whom this topic is of prime importance.

I would like to mention some of the problems in the field of education and discuss briefly how we have tried, in one of the now 50 States, to use the kind of imagination and creativity, the flexibility and inventiveness which so characterized his life, to face these changing conditions and changing problems.

I won't discuss the problem of primary and secondary education, because that is a problem that has already been well faced in this State. My primary responsibility has been the problem of producing the funds to finance the solutions worked out by others. That, in itself, is a problem, but I won't discuss that.

However, we now are faced with this tremendous challenge. The Heald report, prepared at the request of the board of regents and myself 2 years ago, pointed out that in New York State alone in the next 10 years we would have to double the higher educational facilities. That means that in the next 10 years we must reproduce what has been built up over hundreds of years. The Heald report further pointed out that within the next 25 years we would have to triple these present educational facilities. That was the challenge they presented to us.

As I was saying to General Bliss and Dr. Bronk (Detlev W. Bronk, president of the Rockefeller Institute) at lunch, one of our problems in this country is that it is much easier to deal with a crisis when the public feels its impact and demands action, but the swift pace of events no longer permits us to afford the luxury of waiting for the crisis to break before we try to find the solution. Therefore, we must anticipate the crisis, shape emerging forces as they appear on the horizon, and shape them so they serve our ends. The problem is a little more difficult because people—the public in general—has not felt the force of some of these emerging elements as they appeared. Therefore, it is our job to understand them and try to interpret them for the public and take the necessary action.

This type of problem is typical in the field of higher education because this tremendously increasing wave of young people who have been entering our schools since the Second World War, the Korean conflict, is just beginning this year—and will increase in the next 2 or 3 or 5 years—to reach college age. The students are entering our institutions and the institutions have expanded in order to provide for them.

The pressure is not yet on the parents because—perhaps with some difficulty—they are still able to get their children into college. But the problem will be intensified very soon, and if we have not moved before we feel the full weight of that pressure, we shall be confronted by a crisis. And this is what we want to avoid.

When one analyzes student enrollment in the higher educational institutions in our State as compared, for instance, with that of California, we find that 60 percent of the young people are in private colleges in New York State, and 40 percent in State institutions. In California 80 percent of the students are in State universities or 2-year colleges, and only 20 percent in private colleges and universities.

Therefore, when we say we must double our educational facilities in 10 years, that means that if the private colleges are going to take their share of the responsibility, they have to double their facilities in 10 years. And those who are associated, in one way or another, with the private colleges today, must now realize that this is the problem which confronts them.

Now in our constitution in this State, provision has been made for strict separation of church and state. Therefore, this means that the State cannot help the private colleges and universities in their expansion. And yet all of us, I think, in this room—and most of the people in the State—would agree that one of the rich heritages of the State has been this duality of educational opportunity between the private colleges—with the wide variations in cultural opportunity—and the public educational facilities.

So our challenge was to devise some means of helping the student so that the student can preserve that choice, the basic objective being that every young person who has the capacity and the desire to go on to higher education should be able to do so, regardless of individual financial ability.

As a result—I feel that this is in the tradition of Franklin's ingenuity and inventiveness—we developed the scholar incentive program, which is something that is new in this country.

We all are familiar with scholarships. The State has the regents' scholarships. We doubled the number of regents' scholarships, brought them up to 17,000 a year, which means that approximately the top 10 percent of our graduating classes will receive a regents' scholarship.

But I happen to be one of those who believe that all young people who have the capacity—not just the most brilliant people, but all of us—those of the lower IQ range but still of college capacity also ought to have an opportunity for higher education. Therefore we devised what is known as the scholar incentive program, which is a program which makes a scholarship available to all young people in this State who, in their senior year at high school, are classified by the board of regents as being qualified to undertake usefully 2 or 4 years of higher education. Then, when they apply to a college, where the tuition is $200 or more, they are eligible for a scholar incentive grant of $100–$300 a year, depending on need. If the students go on to graduate school, they are eligible for grants of $200–$400 a year, again depending on need.

This money, as we estimate it now, will go to about 122,000 young people in New York State, just to give you the magnitude of this program. It is a program of about $50 million a year, to be placed in the hands of the students themselves who are attending colleges where tuition is charged. This will preserve individual choice on the part of the young person, for they themselves can use the funds to defer part of their financial needs and they can determine what school they will attend and how they will fulfill their own educational requirements.

Now this is a new concept, but it is one that is adapted to the peculiar conditions in New York State, and one which I think can be varied in terms of the amount of the scholarship, depending on changing needs as time goes by. The result will be that more young people will be able to pay tuition, and therefore, in the long run, this will help in the growth of the private institutions.

To supplement this, we extended the borrowing power of the dormitory authority, and you are all familiar with that. We established, a number of years ago, a program to build dormitories on a lease-purchase basis. We expanded the power of that authority to build not only dormitories in the State university and private schools, but to build classrooms, libraries, laboratories, and so forth.

So here is a lease-purchase arrangement which private educational institutions can use to help them get the capital funds to build the plant, because it is not just a matter of helping the student to attend college, but there has to be a plant—the necessary equipment and facilities, gaged to the needs of the immediate future. This is an innovation in itself.

On the ballot this last year was a very interesting proposition calling for a $500 million guarantee for this dormitory authority, which is now the college buildings authority. This was turned down by the voters—and this is interesting—for fear that it impinged on the concept of separation of church and state. Thus the interest rate remains at whatever the authority can get in the open market.

In addition to this, we changed the student loan program. There is now no interest payable on a student loan for the first 5 years of the loan. A student can borrow up to $1,500 a year with only 3-percent interest charged for the second 5 years of the loan. This is a 10-year loan with a maximum of $7,500.

The result of this is that in this State a student in the top 10 percent of his class can

get a regents scholarship the equivalent of $700, a scholar incentive grant of $300, and then the student can borrow up to $1,500 a year, which would total $2,500 for our brightest students.

Thus we have in this State a really extraordinary flexibility to encourage higher education for all those who have the capacity and the desire to gain that education.

Now this permits us to go ahead with the expansion of the State university. In the 3 years that I have been Governor, we have doubled appropriations for the State university. Our building program under the master plan is now $750 million, so as to be able to absorb this tremendous growth and to supplement those endeavors which the private colleges do not initiate.

This year we have a study underway—with which Dr. Bronk is familiar—which will encompass the subject of medical education, which was not included in the Heald Report, because they didn't have the time. We will have a thorough study of the entire range of medical care, in its broadest aspects, and what the State should do in terms of educational facilities there.

So we will try—and I think we will succeed in this State—to anticipate and meet, based on the existing structure that we have, the needs of our young people for the future so that we will give maximum educational preparation to all those who seek it and who do not have the means to obtain it.

I think, ladies and gentlemen, that this approach is in the spirit and within the concept of Benjamin Franklin and, thanks to him and the work of his associates, we have a political structure in which the States still have retained a major portion of their sovereignty and are able to deal with their own problems themselves.

This has nothing to do with the Federal program, and obviously, a State like New York doesn't need Federal help because every dollar we get back from Washington costs us at least $3. So, from our viewpoint, on a financial basis, it is cheaper to do it ourselves.

However, we all believe in the concept of equalization, and therefore I have supported a program of Federal aid to education for school construction rather than for teachers' salaries. That leads into the philosophical question of home rule and local education, in which I happen to believe.

However, interestingly enough, we had a unanimous vote at the Governors' conference last year on the subject of supporting a Federal program of aid to school construction in areas of proven need. The Governors were against aid for teachers' salaries believing that the Federal Government ought not to try to influence the thinking of the teachers. And any money, under that plan, that went to the schools for school buildings, would actually free money that the local community could use for teachers' salaries.

I didn't mean to get off on that side subject, but it is an interesting corollary to this total picture.

Now let me discuss another area, just as a matter of interest—a subject of both personal and public interest.

I was looking, during the luncheon here, at this little pamphlet on the table, the American Credo Profiles, and under the heading, "Citizen and Soldier," I read this:

"When Pennsylvania was threatened by French and Spanish privateers in 1747, it was Franklin, the peace lover, whose pamphlet, 'Plain Truth,' urged the formation of a defensive militia."

I think we have an interesting parallel today. I may be treading on dangerous ground here, but frankly, I never was hesitant to tread on dangerous ground, so why should I be, in such a friendly audience?

I have, for quite a while, been a strong advocate of the need, as insurance, of fallout shelter protection. When I first proposed this, the reaction, very interestingly, on the part of a great many was that this was an immoral concept.

In reviewing the history of insurance—and this, of course, was a field in which Franklin was one of the prime movers—it is very interesting to note that while fire insurance, in its various forms—a field in which Franklin had been active—was widely accepted and was not controversial, when life insurance was originally proposed in the early 18th century, it was bitterly fought on the same grounds that fallout shelter protection was fought—that it was immoral; that to insure against an act of God was something you couldn't do or shouldn't do, and that this was something that should not be discussed. This debate went on for 150 years in this country. It was a very, very sensitive and sore subject, and only in the late 19th century did they finally come around to accept the concept when they changed the name from "death insurance" to "life insurance."

My personal feeling is that this same thing is true in relation to fallout protection—it is a form of life insurance, but it has aroused the same kind of reactions in the country which the other debate did. It is a deeper problem, even, than life insurance—or death insurance—and more complicated because it touches on a basic fear which we face in this country—a fear relating to nuclear weapons.

Dr. Paul Hoch—the head of the department of mental hygiene in our State and a brilliant psychiatrist—described the basic fear in the subconscious American mind. This fear developed after the atomic bomb was used on Hiroshima—from its moral impact and from fear of what might happen. Dr. Hoch felt that if a bomb fell in Chicago, New York City would panic. He said that unless people have a 35 percent chance of survival, they won't stand and fight; that they have to feel at least a 35 percent chance for survival.

Well now, with no protection and with the development of weapons, those who happen to be either where the nuclear weapon falls or downwind in the path of fallout for 5, 6, 700 miles, have no chance of survival because they have no protection.

Therefore it seemed to me that this was a problem which must be faced by the American people emotionally and personally. The reason they resented talking about fallout shelters was because it made them think about nuclear weapons and the whole problem we faced. Since they didn't have a solution to the problem they lacked the courage to deal with it realistically, and therefore the best approach, in their opinion, was not to think about it. And those who brought up the subject were not very popular. And I was told it was political suicide to talk about this, but to me it was one of the fundamental issues we had to face in this Nation.

I think this question goes back to a much more important problem: We pride ourselves on being the leader of the free world and we pride ourselves in our preservation of the great traditions of humanitarianism and concern for the individual, and therefore we are emotionally against the use of force. I don't think we, as a people, have very clearly faced the fact that force is an essential element of leadership. If we are to preserve freedom, we must follow Franklin's example. Franklin spent a great deal of his time in France getting money and support to mobilize force in order to establish freedom. And as he mobilized force to establish freedom, we have to be able to use force to preserve freedom.

Now the basic element of freedom since the last world war has been, first, our exclusive possession of the knowledge of nuclear weapons. May I give one interesting illustration:

I attended a meeting of the Inter-American Defense Council in 1945 when the Chief of War Plans in the U.S. Army spoke—a brilliant general. He analyzed the situation that would exist in the world after the war to military leaders from the Western Hemisphere. He said that when the world war was over, there would be only two areas in the world that could make war, that would have the resources. One would be the Western Hemisphere—not the United States, but the Western Hemisphere—and the other would be the Soviet Union. And he said the reason there would be only these two areas was because they were the only two that had the manpower, the natural resources, the industrial capacity, and the land mass which gave them that strength. And he said the balance of power between these two areas would be China.

Well, I don't have to remind anyone of what happened to China shortly thereafter, so that the balance of power went over to the Soviets. Had nuclear weapons not come in, his prognostication, in my opinion, would have come true. The balance of power would have shifted to the Soviets and we would not have been able to preserve freedom. Nuclear weapons were developed and we had exclusive possession of them as well as the delivery power. But that situation gradually changed. The Soviets acquired the weapon, either by stealing our own plans or developing some of their own, or a combination thereof; which exactly it was, I don't know. But they ultimately got possession of it and then, slowly, they developed a delivery capacity. Then they developed missiles with nuclear warheads, and they developed that more rapidly than we did.

I am not pretending to know just where we are now in the balance of power between the Soviets and the United States, but I think everyone admits that their progress in this field has been at a greater rate than ours, and therefore these weapons are a reality. And these weapons have been the source of strength in our preserving freedom.

Therefore I think we have to recognize nuclear weapons and regard them not as the great threat to humanity in the world, not as—well, let's call it an immoral source of power, but something which, if used by a free world intelligently, has been and can be the source of our strength to preserve freedom.

It seems to me that we, as a people, must first overcome our unwillingness to accept power as a part of the preservation of freedom, and secondly, must accept the fact that nuclear weapons are the basis of our power today in preserving that freedom. It we can get this perspective, then I think we can face some of the problems. But if we are paralyzed mentally and emotionally on this subject, then I don't think we will be able to preserve the position that we have been able to develope and preserve the freedoms which are the basis of our whole society.

One or two other elements in this field, it seems to me, merit attention. I am only saying this because New York is a State which is deeply interested in this question, and under the system established by our Founding Fathers, State leadership is still a very vital force in this country.

This State has pioneered—whether rightly or wrongly—in the field of protection from nuclear fallout, in legislation and in practice. At the present time our State appropriations in this field are one-third of the national appropriations.

But I have also been advocating the resumption—and I only say this because of the whole political picture and the entire relationship of this subject to Franklin's concept of preparedness—advocating the resumption of testing as an essential element of the preservation of this position of strength, and the development of protection of our civilian population.

Why? Because first we've got to recognize what we're up against, and take this insurance. Secondly, President Kennedy—who is negotiating on our behalf and to whose command we all have to look for the future security not only of our own freedom but of the world—has to be able to make decisions at a certain point, knowing that that decision may lead to the use of nuclear weapons which might lead to an attack on the United States. If the American people are not willing to accept use of nuclear weapons because they haven't got the capacity to protect themselves, they will not support him in that action. Then the Soviets will have achieved their goal, which is the ability to blackmail us into the complete takeover, step by step, of freedom in the world.

Now I think we have here another example of the kind of thinking which personified Benjamin Franklin—a man who was courageous, clear in his thoughts, statesmanlike, but yet dedicated to the basic values which made this country what it is today. And I think that's our responsibility today.

This is a field in which I have been deeply interested and concerned, because what good is it for us to solve problems in education or to solve problems in housing or in any of the other areas such as recreation or the social advances, if we don't preserve the fundamental values that our forefathers fought to achieve for us.

We have the capacity to do this—to maintain our security and the freedom of the world—if we view this problem in its proper perspective and in its true terms. But you can't do it at Government level without the support of the people.

Benjamin Franklin's great capacity to portrary these questions—whether it was in his pamphlet on "Plain Truth" or in the other articles he wrote—was an integral part of this whole process of bringing truth and reality to the people in a modest way. And, in a modest way, I am trying to do those same things myself.

These are the exciting problems we face. My contention, ladies and gentlemen, is that the same kind of faith and belief in this country, the same kind of ingenuity and imagination, the same kind of creativeness and statesmanship which Benjamin Franklin exercised during his lifetime are still needed, are still called for, and today the demands for these qualities and characteristics are even greater. Therefore, your dedication to Franklin's life and his principles in these days is a matter of tremendous significance to our country. I salute you and again thank you for your generosity in giving me the gold medal award this year. Thank you very much indeed.

CITATION ACCOMPANYING THE AWARD OF THE GOLD MEDAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL BENJAMIN FRANKLIN SOCIETY TO GOV. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER

The circumstances of his birth would have permitted Nelson Aldrich Rockefeller to enjoy a life of leisure and relaxation were it not for two factors. One was sound parental guidance and training, designed to instill acceptance of the philosophy that the concept which has made the United States of America a leader among the nations of the world is that the possession of a substantial personal fortune, whether earned or inherited, carries with it the responsibility of trusteeship to assure its administration in the public interest. The other was the ready, willing, and complete manner in which he absorbed and has subscribed to that principle.

Having so elected, he entered into service of his country in 1940, at the age of 32, by appointment to the Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. Successively thereafter, he served, under three national administrations, as Assistant Secretary of State, as Chairman of the International Development Advisory Board, as Chairman of the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization, as Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and as Special Assistant to the President until, in 1958, the people of his native State of New York elected him to serve as its chief executive.

Gathered to commemorate the 256th anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin, the members of the International Benjamin Franklin Society recognize in this record of public service the precepts contained in the writings of Franklin and the example of public service he set—both of which caused Franklin to be so widely venerated, not only in the land of his birth but throughout the world.

To you, Governor Rockefeller, the members of the International Benjamin Franklin Society, who have assembled here in New York on the occasion of its 39th annual meeting, present you with the society's gold medal in recognition of your outstanding leadership in the public service.

Romantic Past of Greenwich, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of this body that the State of New Jersey has a romantic past which can be seen in the community of Greenwich. New Jersey is the most urbanized State in America, yet authors such as Arthur D. Pierce have shown that even such heavily industrialized States can find peace and contentment just off the main highway. Greenwich is a quiet place in contrast to the average tourist places and I recommend this town to historically minded persons as well as those seeking to "get away from it all."

I ask unanimous consent to print an article of the Christian Science Monitor of February 20, 1962, in the Appendix of the RECORD, which explains this historic landmark in the Garden State of our Nation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TURNING BACK TIME IN NEW JERSEY

America's romantic past is usually just around the corner in New Jersey. One need not journey far to find it. For example, follow the New Jersey Turnpike and swing eastward from Salem or take "ye Old King's Highway" through Haddonfield and Swedesboro. Either way only 45 miles from Philadelphia, in a corner of Smugglers' Woods, there is a tucked-away town which will take the visitor back over the years as swiftly as his car has taken him forward over the miles.

Williamsburg, Va., has been called the city that turned back time. On the Cohansey Creek, deep in fertile Cumberland County, is another such community: Greenwich, N.J. There are differences between the two, of course. Greenwich is older. Planned in 1676, its layout as a town antedated that of Williamsburg by 15 years. Greenwich, too, is much as it stood in the 18th century; none of it reconstructed, and only some of it restored.

The Greate Street in Greenwich, however, resembles Duke of Gloucester Street in Williamsburg—straight for a mile and almost identical in width, 100 feet as against 99 in Virginia's lovely showplace. Huge and magnificent trees cast fascinating shadows on the quiet sidewalks. Stately homes as well as curious little "Pyrate's House" mark pleasant moments for the passer-by; and inside many of these homes are enormous fireplaces, age-mellowed cupboards, and countless treasures handed down from the early days of gracious living.

Because it was not a provincial capital, Greenwich lacks such glories as a Governor's palace and a capitol building. Greenwich did have a chance to become the Cumberland County seat, but that was taken away in 1748 and given to Bridgeton, then Cohansey Bridge, in an election which some said was stolen. While Greenwich has a couple of venerable but sign-beplastered grocery stores, its old craft shops are no more. A few modern structures have crept in, and gasoline pumps stand in grotesque contrast only a few feet in front of one of the most interesting of Greenwich's historic doorways. And whereas restored Williamsburg is now a place as busy as it is beautiful, thronged with visitors, students, and townsfolk, Greenwich is much the reverse. A seeker of peace, quiet, and contentment will find them there; and there, too, one can turn back time.—From "Smugglers' Woods, by Arthur D. Pierce. Copyright, 1960, by Rutgers, The State University. Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick, N.J.

Meeting School Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram of February 27, 1962:

MEETING SCHOOL NEEDS

The campaign for Federal aid to the schools is based on thesis that the Nation's schools are not keeping up with the times, that the population explosion will bury the schools and that local communities are unwilling and unable to do anything about it.

President Kennedy in requesting $5.7 billion from Congress for a 5-year program said that "600,000 classrooms must be constructed in this decade." He added that without Federal aid "we cannot hope to succeed in our efforts to improve the quality of our children's instruction and to meet the need for more teachers."

The President overlooked the progress the local school districts have been making and are continuing to make, without any Federal aid at all. It is this progress, substantial and seen on every hand, that makes the thesis on which the Federal aid campaign rests so very precarious.

"Let's," as Al Smith used to say, "look at the record." At the present rate of classroom construction, for example, communities

across the Nation will build not 600,000 classrooms in the next decade, but 700,000. Over the last 30 years employment in public education has increased 140 percent, compared with 45 percent in private industry. Pay for teachers has gone up 106 percent as compared with 91 percent for all other wage-earners. The school age population is expected to increase 20 percent in the next decade, but in the same period the number of certified teachers is expected to double.

These figures gained from various sources indicate that local communities have been mindful of school needs and have met them. They met them out of local and State tax sources. Would there be an incentive to continue this local attention to educational needs if there is a prospect of the Federal Government assuming the responsibility? We think not.

The Freight Rate Structure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, at present the subject of freight rate differentials has received great attention. On February 16 a three-judge Federal court in Boston handed down a decision that could result in the elimination of the lower railroad rates now enjoyed by ports south of the port of New Jersey-New York. This decision reverses an 1877 agreement which is now outdated. I feel that our port should at last receive fair treatment in the matter of rate differentials, for I see no reason why trade should be lost to the port of New Jersey-New York because of artificial, lower rates. Our courts have removed an old inequity. At this time, therefore, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD four articles from the following: the Record, February 26, Hackensack, N.J.: the Trentonian, February 22, Trenton; New York Journal of Commerce, February 19, New York City; and the Wall Street Journal, February 19, New York City, which point out important aspects of this problem.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Record, Hackensack, N.J., Feb. 26, 1962]

STOPPING A SWINDLE AFTER 85 YEARS

The overregulation that has done its faithful bit to ruin the railroads is prettily exemplified by the freight rate differentials that afflict the port of New York. Back in 1877 the Interstate Commerce Commission observed that ocean-shipping rates to Boston and New York were lower than the like rates to southern ports. Boston and New York had a natural competitive advantage. So the ICC decreed that regardless of the economic and geographic facts of life, railroad rates on freight coming into Boston and New York by land must be pegged higher than the rail rates to southern ports. Over the years since, the differential in ocean-shipping rates has disappeared. But the ICC has persisted in its delusion. Only last year it refused to remove the differentials. So rail rates into New York and Boston are still 60 cents a ton higher than rates into Baltimore and Norfolk and 40 cents higher than into Philadelphia.

A three-judge U.S. district court in Boston decided last week that the ICC differentials are unfair and must be vacated. The case was brought by the Massachusetts Port Authority. The Maryland Port Authority will appeal to the Supreme Court. At the hazard of seeming to mutter a suggestion to the Justices, one can agree with Senator WILLIAMS, Democrat, of New Jersey:

"Our New Jersey-New York port should at last receive fair treatment. * * * There is absolutely no reason why some of the trade that should go through our port should continue to be diverted elsewhere because of artificial lower rates."

[From the Trentonian, Trenton, N.J., Feb. 22, 1962]

A MATTER OF EQUITY?

New Jersey's U.S. Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., was quick to hail a decision of a Boston Federal district court that could result in the elimination of the lower railroad rates which now apply to ports south of New York, but there are indications that a hard fight lies ahead.

Railroad rate differentials were established in 1877. They were upheld by an Interstate Commerce Commission ruling in 1961. The Boston decision reversed the ICC. Philadelphia enjoys an advantage of 40 cents a ton over New York and Boston, while Baltimore and Norfolk have a 60-cent differential.

As Senator WILLIAMS points out, these were established originally when it was felt that southern ports needed an advantage in rail rates to overcome higher ocean shipping rates.

"Over the years," the Senator says, "the difference in ocean rates disappeared, but the ICC ruled as recently as last year that the southern ports should continue to have lower rail rates. This is manifestly unfair; we in New York and Boston port areas have fought it for years; the decision in Boston has put the matter in proper prospective, and I am very hopeful that this decision will be binding."

But Philadelphia and Maryland disagree rather vehemently. They contend that their favorable differential is based on the logical reasoning that shipments from the Midwest, for example, have a shorter haul than they would to New York.

The Maryland Port Authority has announced that it will file an appeal from the Boston decision; it can be expected that the port of Philadelphia will do likewise. It is obvious that the more southerly ports are not going to give up their advantage without a fight, even though Senator WILLIAMS and others believe that the case for what they regard as equity is strong.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce, Feb. 19, 1962]

RAIL DIFFERENTIAL STRUCK DOWN—NEW YORK, BOSTON PORTS HAIL RATE RULING

(By Alan F. Schoedel)

Port officials in Boston and New York are describing as a major victory the decision by a U.S. district court in Boston wiping out the compulsory railroad freight rate differential favoring ports to the south.

S. Sloan Colt, chairman of the Port of New York Authority, predicted that railroads, shippers, and all other commercial interests in the bi-State port district can benefit greatly from the court's decision. The Boston ruling eliminates what Mr. Colt called an "arbitrary, archaic handicap" for the port of New York.

John F. O'Halloran, executive director of the Massachusetts Port Authority, jubilantly declared that the port of Boston now could compete for freight from the Midwest as far west as the Mississippi, instead of being limited to its immediate New England area.

Ephraim A. Brest, chairman of the Massachusetts Port Authority, commented:

"We hope to utilize the opportunity provided by this decision to triple the 10 million bushels of grain currently exported through the seaport [of Boston]. Our grain elevators may well be doubled in capacity.

"Automobiles and trucks assembled in the Midwest could be shipped through the seaport of Boston at a lower cost than through any other North Atlantic port.".

FOUGHT FOR YEARS

The rail rate differential put Philadelphia 40 cents a ton and Baltimore and Hampton Roads 60 cents a ton below the import-export tariff for Boston, New York, Albany, N.Y., and Portland, Maine. New York and Boston and most of the railroads serving their ports have been fighting the differential for years.

In early January of last year they met with a setback when the Interstate Commerce Commission insisted that the differential be maintained, and refused permission for the Boston and New York railroads to lower their rates.

DECISION UNANIMOUS

In a unanimous decision on an appeal, the three-judge Federal court described this ICC ruling as "clearly erroneous" and discriminatory against Boston, New York, Albany and Portland.

Boston and New York saw their relative share of import-export commerce decline in the period from 1923 to 1955, the court noted, while the southern ports scored major increases.

Boston's share dropped from 4.7 to 2.5 percent, New York's from 28.6 to 14 percent, while Philadelphia's rose from 7.9 percent to 15.7 percent, Baltimore's from 8.4 to 10.4 percent, and Hampton Roads' from 4.3 to 17.1 percent, pointed out the opinion written by Judge George C. Sweeney.

Boston's share of midwest traffic was given as only 4.4 percent of exports and less than 1 percent of imports.

LONG IN EXISTENCE

The railroad rate differential on import-export cargo goes back about 80 years, but much of the time it was offset by correspondingly higher ocean rates on cargo through the southern-tier ports.

Between World War I and the 1930's, however, there took place a process of equalization of ocean rates for all the North Atlantic ports. The railroad rate differential remained in effect despite repeated attempts to upset it, and became a penalty on shippers using the northern-tier ports.

In New York, the port authority was joined by New York City and State, as well as commercial organizations, in waging the fight against the differential.

The Massachusetts Port Authority was joined by the Maritime Association of Greater Boston, the Chamber of Commerce, Federal Reserve Bank and World Trade Center. Railroads for the northern-tier ports spearheaded the fight before the ICC and the court appeal.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 19, 1962]

COURT REVERSES INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION, BACKS RATE CUTS BY RAILROADS THAT SERVE NORTHERN PORTS

BOSTON.—A Federal court here supported a proposal for lower freight rates sought by railroads serving certain northern ports so the carriers can compete with those serving ports to the south. The court said it will set aside a ruling by the Interstate Commerce Commission, which had prohibited filing the lower rates.

"If the court decision is allowed to stand, it would probably mean a significant addition to our freight volume," said a spokesman for the Boston & Maine Railroad. The trustees of the bankrupt New Haven Railroad declined to comment at this time.

Those two railroads and the Massachusetts Port Authority had pressed the case against the ICC in the courts.

In Baltimore, the Maryland Port Authority said it was shocked and astounded by the decision and would appeal it to the U.S. Supreme Court, the Associated Press reported. It quoted William L. Marbury, general counsel for the Maryland body, as saying: "Without the differential we will lose a large percentage of traffic through the port."

In Philadelphia, City Solicitor Berger said Philadelphia would also appeal the decision, which he said would "cause incalculable harm to the port of Philadelphia," AP reported. Mr. Berger said, "By long tradition, by history, by reason and authority the present rate structure is not discriminatory but necessary."

The ICC has 60 days to appeal the decision, but an ICC attorney working on the case said no decision has been made on whether to appeal.

PERMANENT INJUNCTION SET

In an opinion in which all three judges concurred, the court said it would issue a permanent injunction barring the ICC from enforcing its ruling that the two roads couldn't lower rates to compete for midwestern freight. The court held that the ICC ruling was "erroneous" and lacked a "rational basis."

Conceivably the opinion, unless appealed to a higher court and reversed there, could mean higher tonnages of freight for the ports of New York, Boston, Portland, Maine, and Albany, N.Y., and lower volume for Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Hampton Roads, Va.

There was "extensive evidence from shippers that the differential adjustment is a controlling consideration in the choice of ports," the court said. It held that the ICC ignored the principle that rate structures have been set to give all ports a competitive opportunity.

The ICC ruling grew out of proposed freight rates filed by the Boston & Maine and New Haven in June 1956. The roads, plus some other railroads serving northern east coast ports, proposed to lower their rates on freight traffic from the Midwest to and from the ports of New York, Boston, Portland, and Albany, called the northern-tier ports. "We were proposing that rates to the northern tier be equalized with those to southern ports from the Midwest," a Boston & Maine spokesman said.

Typical freight rates from the Midwest to southern ports have been traditionally 3 cents to 4 cents a hundred pounds under those between the Midwest and Boston and New York, the spokesman said.

The ICC issued an order in December 1960 denying the railroads permission to equalize the rates. The roads filed a complaint in January 1961 asking the district court in Boston to set aside the December order. The ICC held further hearings and in June came out with a new decision upholding the December denial. In July the railroads filed a new complaint.

AGREEMENT OF 1877 NOTED

The rate differentials the Boston & Maine and the New Haven seek to equalize are the result of an agreement by various railroads in 1877. The various rail differentials between ports on midwestern freight were set to compensate for ocean-rate differentials. The ocean differentials, which gave an advantage to the northern tier of ports, largely had disappeared by 1935, the court said.

Statistics were cited by the court as an indication of the changing importance of the northern tier of ports and the ports of the southern tier—Philadelphia, Baltimore and Hampton Roads. Between the years cited by the court, 1923 and 1955, New York's share of total U.S. ocean tonnage dropped to 14 percent from 28 percent and Boston's declined to 2.5 percent from 4.7 percent. Between those years Philadelphia's jumped.

Freeman Poultry "Birth Control"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, as we are giving thought to our Nation's agricultural programs, I felt that a recent editorial from the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel upon the subject of turkey marketing orders was informative and appropriate.

The editorial follows:

FREEMAN POULTRY "BIRTH CONTROL"

Despite the fact that American agriculture already has suffered much too long from the heavy hand of the Federal Government in inane price fixing and crop control, Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman nevertheless is continuing this discredited theme as his special forte in the activation of the "New Frontier." And in doing so he is actually threatening agriculture's own last frontier of time-honored and experience-tried flexibility for expanding or reducing production, which throughout its history (until the intermeddling of a federal bureaucracy) had made American agriculture the envy of the world.

Unlike major crops, which have had, and still have, Government controls and/or price supports, livestock and poultry have been comparatively free to adjust under the time-honored law of supply and demand.

And in most recent years, efficient livestock and poultry producers have done relatively well, and so have consumers, who have had an abundance of nutritious and tasty products to choose from at reasonable prices. True, there may be overproduction one year, and prices may be down, then the next year, as supply adjusts to demand, the price increases. This is free enterprise at work. And this has been the situation in the turkey industry. Or at least it was through 1961, which was one of those off years with too many turkeys and a money losing price.

Ever alert to effectuating his part in the "New Frontier," Secretary Freeman has proposed and is actively promoting a set of complicated Federal turkey marketing orders, which would regulate supply and raise prices by limiting the hatch of turkey eggs and the number of turkeys.

This, of course, is another sorry intervention by Government planners in an area that has served producers and consumers well—an area of our agriculture which still is the envy of the world—a last frontier where producers have made their own decisions and taken their own risks along with profits or losses.

The proposed marketing orders have been debated at public hearings, where strong opposition has come from many within the turkey industry who want no help from "Uncle Orville" in "solving" their problems. A goal of the marketing orders would be to give turkey producers the so-called "parity price" for turkeys, which would mean a 25- to 30-cent per pound increase, nearly double recent prices.

This, like proposals of a lot of other bureaucratic legerdemain in agriculture may sound good to some. However, a lot of realistic men in the industry know that the drastically higher prices would discourage exports, encourage imports, and cause many consumers to substitute other meats for turkey. Producers of substitute meats then would increase output to meet demand and the turkey industry's expanding market could come to a halt.

They know too that the quotas set under such a program would freeze capacity, breeds, egg producers and hatcheries as they are at present. This, naturally would forestall growth at all levels, make it difficult for new producers to enter the field, and discriminate against producers in a State like Indiana which imports about 70 percent of the hatching eggs and poults used in its turkey industry.

Such a program also inexorably creates and perpetuates false values. It makes it more important to have a Government-granted quota than to develop and use better methods of production and marketing generally.

The proposed orders make one wonder just how much more illogical Secretary Freeman can become in his concept of American agriculture. An expensive feed grains program has attempted to reduce production and stocks of feed grains. Yet, the turkey marketing orders, if adopted, would substantially reduce the market for feed grains and other feedstuffs—all being produced in abundance.

Moreover, under the guise of helping agriculture, the proposed orders would enmesh it in a maze of inequities inevitably resulting from the impossible problem of administration and enforcement.

Destruction—From Within

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I am serving my 21st year in this body and my 19th year on the Committee on Appropriations. I have more service here than either of our Senators and more than any House Member from our State except BILL COLMER. I have heard all the testimony and all evidence concerning our defense that any other Members of Congress, House or Senate, hear. I have been through the heart of Russia, Hungary, and Poland and in various trouble spots of the world.

Truly, Mr. Speaker, we are doing to ourselves what we say we are afraid Russia might do.

On February 22, once again, we heard George Washington's Farewell Address presented to the House. As that message was read, I could not help but think how far we have gone in throwing his advice to the winds.

Entangled in the internal affairs of nations throughout the world, committed to impossible commitments made when we had the atomic bomb and Russia didn't, now we find ourselves so deeply enmeshed that our leaders are unable to approve protection for American lives and property just off our doorstep in Cuba.

We find a Supreme Court unwilling to wait for the Constitution to be amended in the proper way.

Mr. Speaker, it is true that times have changed. But I remind you, human nature has not. George Washington's advice is just as sound today as it was the day he made his Farewell Address. Let me quote several passages from that great document:

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation, for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include excerpts from an address I made on Jefferson Davis' birthday. I hope these views will have the serious study of the entire membership and of the country:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN JAMIE L. WHITTEN, DEMOCRAT, OF MISSISSIPPI, ON THE OCCASION OF JEFFERSON DAVIS' BIRTHDAY

Members of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, ladies and gentlemen, it is a distinct honor to speak to you and to people of the United States here today on the occasion of Jefferson Davis' birthday. It has been my privilege to speak to you on similar occasions a number of times. I recall with particular pleasure General Howell, of Bristol, Va., who was with us when I first spoke here on June 3, 1946.

At that time he was 104 years of age, full of vim and vigor and fully convinced that when the people of any section of the United States used force of arms to require conformity upon people of another section it was destruction at its worst. Unfortunately, in the years since, he and all veterans of the Civil War have passed on to their reward. Today, however, we are indeed honored to have with us the grandson of General Pickett, who contributed so much to the Southern cause. We express to him our sincere congratulations on his rich heritage.

Jefferson Davis was born June 3, 1808, a man destined to lead a lost cause with courage and honor. Long before the outbreak of the Civil War, however, Jeff Davis had served his country well as a U.S. Representative, as Senator, and as Secretary of War. With all his ties to the Union, when the States of the South called him to support their cause, to protect the right of local self-government, he did not hesitate. His service as President of the Confederacy during the tragic war was such as to make us all proud.

Jefferson Davis possessed the highest principles of integrity, honor, and duty. He faced his problems with determination and energy.

THE CIVIL WAR OR THE WAR BETWEEN THE STATES

One hundred years ago, in 1861, the Civil War, or War Between the States, began. This centennial year is being marked by ceremonies, memorials, holidays, and reenactments throughout the South, which except for commemorating the valor of our forefathers I personally believe could well be used to point out how very similar our situation today is to that tragic situation of 100 years ago. Present conditions are so similar we should pause to remember that heartbreaking conflict, which pitted brother against brother and father against son.

As we look back upon those troubled times we can see that sound leaders of both sides deplored any effort to settle the issue by armed conflict. Unfortunately, the radicals of that day prevented a peaceful solution. Then, as now, they were not satisfied to run their own local affairs, but insisted that all other sections conform to their pattern. A terrible war resulted.

The terrible days of reconstruction were very similar to those we see in the Congo now, where all experienced leadership has been forced out, just as happened in the South.

Instead of forcing integration upon the southern States, truly it would be well for the rest of the country to learn from the States of the South that the way for peace and harmony is to provide for separate but equal facilities and protect each race in the enjoyment of its own way of life.

THE SUPREME COURT

We have a Supreme Court from whose decisions there is no appeal, which has taken unto itself the right to change the Constitution without constitutional amendment. In effect, the Court has said that even though, for the moment, certain statutes are constitutional, it reserves the right to declare them unconstitutional at a later time, unless they are carried out as the Court desires.

In the history of the world, those governments have stood which had something solid around which the tides of public opinion could ebb and flow. In our country it was the Constitution, the interpretations of which had become a part of it, had made it fixed and stable, a steadfast rock, around which statutes could be passed and decisions rendered. But when the Court sets aside all prior decisions as to what the Constitutions meant, decisions on which the States of the South had relied, it means that from week to week you don't know what the law is. A short time ago, we saw France call General DeGaulle back into power, to a position approaching dictatorship. Why? Because the French constitution was being subjected to the day-to-day whims of the legislative body, which meant that the nation had no stability in law.

What does the Supreme Court's recent line of decisions mean? My friends, by way of homely illustration, the accuracy and soundness of the description of the land on which this Capitol is placed depends on the permanency of the marker from which the first survey started. The Supreme Court has moved the constitutional marker from its place. As a result everything which was tied to such post or marker has lost its meaning; and, further, the Court has reserved the right to keep wiggling such marker around to serve the whims of a majority of its members.

OUR GOVERNMENT'S TACTICS

You may well ask why the Supreme Court took such action. My friends, I have many reasons and much evidence to support the belief that the threat of a Russian victory was used to bring about the unanimous decision by the Supreme Court in the Brown integration case. It was probably argued that if we don't bring about integration with the colored people in the United States, we will lose the contest with Russia throughout the world; and if we don't do this, Russia will eventually conquer the world. It was said by the press, "If Russia takes over here, the first thing they will do is set up a dictatorship. If Russia takes over," they charged, "they will do away with the right to trial by jury." "Yes," they said, "if we do not integrate, Russia will force on us a system similar to Hitlers in Germany or Stalin's in Russia."

What did they do in Germany and Russia? What was the source of their absolute control of those nations? Why, they had the courts issue decrees, then they used troops and government officers to enforce the decrees.

Haven't we done that here? We have seen the Supreme Court, unwilling to wait for constitutional amendment in the regular process, change the Constitution. We have seen the President send troops and Federal officials to enforce such decrees. Our Government did, itself, what we feared Russia might do.

We are told whe have to integrate all the races of the United States or we can't hold the friendship of the people of India, China, Japan, Africa, and all the rest. If that be true, why have China and Japan been at "daggers point" throughout history? Talk about India—in spite of what you read, we know in many areas people of the same color cannot even touch each other.

No, the agitation is right here at home. People are using the threat of Russia here in the United States to accomplish their personal desires and actually to impose the Russian system of required conformity upon us. My friends, if this were the real "McCoy," if the proponents of this destruction of our American way of life and the pride in our race were sincere, they would look at certain nations around us and wonder why those countries with the same great natural resources as we have, nevertheless, have such a low economic level. They would wonder why elections in those countries are often determined by violent revolutions. If John Marshall had held the same views as the present Chief Justice, and if Thomas Jefferson had been of the same opinion as our recent President, and had brought about integration in their day, perhaps by this time we would be on the same low economic level as some of our neighbors for whom Congress has provided hundreds of millions of dollars—without even a plan—all in the hope it might help our cause.

My friends, history clearly shows an individual must have pride or he makes no real progress. A family must have pride or it goes down the scale. So it is with countries. So it is with race. Any race, whatever it may be, which feels it must be intermixed with another acknowledges its own lack. Such a race will not serve itself well, nor that with which is wishes to intermix.

Don't believe my statement simply because I say it. Read history. It is replete with proof. In all history there is no exception.

Integration, where it has taken place, has only led to great turmoil. We all know that if you go into some sections of New York City at night you take your life in your hands; and you may be in danger there in the daytime. You can't go to certain areas of Chicago without danger to life and limb. The same is true of most of our major cities. Rape, murder, and robbery are commonplace in some areas of Washington.

THE FREEDOM BUSTERS

In recent weeks we have seen agitators deliberately go into areas of the South for the admitted purpose of violating laws of the States which have never been held to be beyond the power of such States, but rather have been held to be within the power; and then we have seen the Federal Government move its force in to protect such individuals in their avowed purpose of testing existing laws.

What if it were the law against murder they wished to test, or rape, or treason? Is there one rule in the Federal Government for laws the executive or the judiciary likes and another for the laws they don't like?

These so-called freedom riders, who might better be called freedom busters, could do what they wish in their own areas. They are out really to bust the laws which others have found best for themselves. Here we find them, with the support of Federal officers, attempting to force their views on people, black and white, who have different views and, therefore, different rules and laws for getting along peaceably and with mutual respect—and they do it on the basis of fighting intolerance. Could anything be more intolerant than to push their views on others?

Ladies and gentlemen, there are those who say if integration were forced into public places, the present controversy would end. Of course, it would not. Each step leads to the next one. Don't the people know that if every family were integrated, if every family were amalgamated, then there would be still a distinction based upon shades of color, upon purity of race. If you want proof, merely look at those countries where the white and black races have amalgamated.

My friends, power breeds desire for power. No dictator ever stopped short of taking it all. This concentration of supreme power in our Supreme Court, backed by the Executive, will not stop with school and public facility integration, nor with race. Once seized this power will be used to control industry, to control agriculture; yes, and eventually even labor.

In Russia everyone is supposed to own everything. However, for all practical purposes everything may as well belong to the Communist leaders, who control according to their own desires. In our country, if the present trend continues, it won't simply be the Chief Justice, the President, or even the Attorney General who issues orders, it will be every little Tom, Dick, and Harry who speaks in the big chief's name. So it has been in history and so it will continue to be, for the basic traits of human nature do not change.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY SHOWS THE SAME WEAKNESS

I was at the opening session of the United Nations last fall. I saw Khrushchev as he virtually ran the length of the floor to embrace Castro, though they had been together all morning. Yes, and I saw the representatives of Africa, the African Congo, each with a vote, though many of them represented virtually only a small tribe, recognized and seated there at our instance, another group for whose vote we must bid, not once and for all but on every issue as it arises.

Today, a hundred years after the Civil War, the United States has moved into almost every country which would let us in. We have granted funds and goods to foreign governments, which in turn sold such goods to their own people for what the traffic would bear. We extended this foreign aid primarily on the promise, but many times merely in the hope, that incumbent governments would support our wishes. Through this means we have made a few persons rich here and abroad. In many of these nations we have forced them to take on our ways, to the point many countries are virtually defenseless, both from revolution within or from enemy attack from without.

In many of these nations we have lined ourselves up with the 3 or 4 percent which have almost all the wealth, and left ripe for the picking by Russia the other 96 or 97 percent. Not only does our Government seem unwilling to permit the people of any State of the United States to run their local affairs as suits them, but it has spent more than $60 billion in foreign countries, largely in an effort to keep "our crowd" in, whether the people of the area want that particular "crowd" or not.

In view of these foreign entanglements I flinch each year when Washington's Farewell Address, warning of the dangers of foreign entanglements, is read in the House of Representatives. I feel it is almost sacrilege.

My friends, my speech here today is not meant to be an attack upon any individual nor upon any political party. Both parties and many leaders have contributed to our situation, including some in our own Southland who have put economic gain ahead of principle, comfortable position ahead of sound action.

We wish for our President the greatest success, not only on his present trip but throughout his tenure of office, for as he goes so goes the country. We are all in this boat. We had hoped, however, for a reassessment of all these matters which I have mentioned to you and, therefore, have been disappointed to see the request for more forced integration, not less, for more foreign aid, not less.

COURAGE IS REQUIRED TODAY

We do well to honor that great American, Jefferson Davis; we do well to remember the character and courage shown by him and the hundreds of thousands who stood by him 100 years ago today. I pray we may have the same courage today, not merely to save the South, but the Nation.

In this centennial year of the beginning of the Civil War, the American people would do well to review and recognize the great similarity between conditions which prevailed on June 3, 1861, and those which prevail today, June 3, 1961. They are so similar as to be frightening. Sometimes we, too, wish we could resolve the issue in some simple, clear-cut way. Such a course is not possible. Any solution will require helpful understanding on the part of many people. We must do our part.

Not since the Civil War have our people faced a more trying time. Our problems today call for the best within us. The attack on the Constitution and on our way of life is insidious. It comes under the guise of government. It is offered with an appeal to the natural tendency of Americans to be law abiding. It appeals to religion, is presented in the name of world peace, but creates strife, dissension and disturbance. It is said to be necessary to protect the rights of individuals, but is itself based on usurpation of power. We are told it is necessary in order to maintain our form of government; yet its starting point is the destruction by judicial decree of the rights of the States, of the Congress, and of the people. Yes, it begins with destruction of the Constitution itself. It can only lead to complete ruin.

History books are written one way for use in the Southern States, another way for the other States. However, one fact is inescapable. Might, for all practical purposes, has the same effect as if it were right.

It has taken us a hundred years to see just how far such a situation can go—today it is the Supreme Court and the executive department which take the place of the Union troops of a 100 years ago. Once again we see what might can do.

WE MUST CHANGE OUR COURSE

I sincerely hope that our Supreme Court, our President, and those who would control our newspapers, our radio and our television, will recognize, before it is too late, what the present course leads to. It was not merely the South which lost the Civil War, it was the Nation. It has taken a 100 years for us to fully see that might, when taken to be right, can destroy a Nation.

We must review our domestic and foreign policy and reverse our course. We must realize that any nation such as ours must permit local differences, reflected in local self-government.

We must realize that the people of other nations are not going to give up their right to change their government as they see fit. We must realize that friendship purchased with cash will fail when the cash is gone—not only that, but we must realize that in most countries those now out of control will, in the course of events, get into control; and then, the United States will be the subject of the greatest hatred. Thus, it is that we are in such a precarious situation throughout much of the world.

In conclusion, may I say, we must permit local self-government in our own Nation to reflect local views and meet local needs. We must return to a foreign policy which permits the peoples of other nations to run their own affairs. If we don't approve such a course in foreign fields, the peoples of foreign countries are going to do it anyway, and we will continue to be the loser. If we do not return to such a commonsense course in our own Nation, dictatorship will be followed by dictatorship, and all we hold dear will be gone, for no dictator can force the American people into a common denominator, Russian style, each of an exact shade of brown, each conforming to the dictates of an all-powerful Federal Government. Our people are too independent for that. We must allow for differences. If not, differences will destroy us.

Hon. Ralph W. Gwinn

SPEECH

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I share the sadness of his family in the passing of an earnest, conscientious, and able former colleague, the Honorable Ralph Waldo Gwinn, of New York.

I was not of his political faith, and, certainly, I differed often with him on legislation coming before us. If I could not speak well of our departed colleague, however, I should not address the chair at this time. I can acknowledge in all sincerity my deep respect for Mr. Gwinn. The motivation behind his public service is one of the strengths of our democratic system of government. He had a deep conviction that he held views in common with many citizens, and that it was his duty to commit his talents to the expression and advancement of these views.

As we can recall, our colleague was a distinguished lawyer, well into his middle years, when first he took the field as a political candidate. As he recognized, if there were no differences in the interpretation of law, including our charter of liberty, the Constitution, there would be little need for courts or lawyers. Ralph Gwinn believed with evangelistic intensity in the principle of government

under law. That we might differ on specific applications of this principle is not important now. What is important is that we Americans have a written guarantee of the opportunity to fight for the right as we see it, and an obligation to exercise this opportunity.

The loss of any fully committed fighter in this cause—as Ralph Gwinn surely was—is a loss to all Americans.

Hope in the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in these days when we hear so much criticism of all who try to do things rather than talk about them, it is good to learn something of the do-ers—men like Col. John Glenn in space, and the Honorable Musa bey Alami in Jordan.

Musa bey is one of the world's great intellectual and humanitarian leaders with the kind of courage and faith that, in very truth, have brought water to a parched earth and made the desert blossom as the rose. Born a Palestinian under Turkish rule in 1897, he became a Jordanian citizen when what remains of Arab Palestine was incorporated into the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan in 1949. Muslim by birth, his life has been motivated by the high ethical and moral standards of Islam. Scion of an ancient Jerusalem family, he grew up surrounded and deeply influenced by the holy places associated with Jesus—or Isa, as young Musa's Qur'anic teachers called him—and the prophets who came before him.

Musa's father, then mayor of Jerusalem, decided his 8-year-old son should attend St. George's, an English school. Some weeks later, fortified by friendly Muslim sheiks, the school officials visited the mayor to disclose the sad news that his son was not educable. They suggested he be apprenticed to a tradesman; and so he became a carpenter's helper at the American colony. Mrs. Anna Spafford, late mother of Jerusalem's beloved Bertha Spafford Vester, dissented from the educator's verdict and arranged for Musa to take some classes at the American colony school along with his work. Teachers reported him unusually apt. Thirteen years later he entered Cambridge University from which he graduated in 1922 with honors and the B.A. and LL.B. degrees. Long before, it had been discovered that the initial diagnosis had grown out of a registrar's conviction that it would never do to put the mayor's son in a lower class than others of his age group. So the Arabic-speaking boy of 8 had been started out as a third grader in an English-speaking school.

All that notwithstanding, Musa bey insists that the original verdict was a just one and that he has remained essentially uneducable. Looked at one way, most of his friends would agree he is right. He has never learned well the lessons he was supposed to have been taught. Any Arab knows the way to fame and fortune is through politics. Musa was too much the statesman and gave up politics for farming. But not until after he had failed to learn another lesson taught by top British and United Nations hydrologists. They said the Jordan Valley had no water resources, and that even if some water were found here and there, it would do no good. The soil was too salty even to support vegetation. Musa bey, still gloriously stubborn, just would not learn. He concontinued to reason that if the Jordan Valley had supported a large population millenia ago, there must have been water. The experts smiled benignly when he started digging with crude tools. Perhaps poor Musa would now learn the hard way. But for Musa, like another uneducable before him (a chap named Noah) the waters came. Only this time they came only up out of the ground and not down from heaven. From earth scorched by centuries of sun came water to wash away salt and give fertility to fields dried up since antiquity. Where once was only burning sand, today more than 40,000 acres are under cultivation, because one man would not accept the facts his mentors taught.

But between Cambridge and today's green lushness of the once dead Jordan Valley, Jordan water, enough to fill all Christendom's fonts and baptistries, had flowed under nearby Allenby Bridge. The young Musa had returned to take his place as a lawyer in post-World War I Palestine, now controlled by the British under a League of Nations mandate. His brilliant record at Cambridge brought him to the attention of the British officials who offered him employment in the legal department. From minor posts he rose by 1933 to government advocate, the only Arab to head a department in the mandatory government. In the meantime, his stature had grown throughout the Arab world. It was he who negotiated the agreement that secured Arab participation in the St. James Conference in London in 1938. He was the sole representative of Palestine at the preparatory conference for the Arab League in Alexandria in 1943. He had become the doyen of an increasing group of young Arab intellectuals in his own and neighboring countries. By war's end, he had emerged as the most progressive among the Arab statesmen of his generation. Almost any post was his for the asking. He appeared destined to emerge as the outstanding political leader of the newly freed Arab countries.

Then came tragedy. Musa bey and his young intellectuals came on the stage too late and with too many odds against them to save Palestine from the debacle of partition and war. When the holocaust was over, more than a million Palestinian Arabs were refugees, their homes gone, the lands from which their forebears had garnered a living for thousands of years turned over to other refugees about whose fate the world was more concerned. While America and Britain poured in dollars by the hundreds of millions to support and build new homes and a new life for those who supplanted them, the Arab refugees were, and remain in large part, kept alive by a 7-pennies-per-person-per-day United Nations relief fund. And they were the luckier ones, for tens of thousands of frontier villagers had lost their lands or businesses, yet could not qualify as refugees because they still dwelt in their old homes. Palestine, in many ways—eduactionally, culturally, economically—the flower of the Arab nation, had perished one fall afternoon in faraway Lake Success, and at the hands of its traditional friends, its land divided, the majority of its people homeless and destitute.

Musa bey Alami was among the homeless. But he was not destitute. While a large part of his fortune was now in other hands, he was still a wealthy man. He could have moved to Beirut or Cairo and lived in ease. He chose to share the lot of his dispersed kinsmen. And almost alone among those in a position to do so, he began to turn his face toward the future. While the politicians promised quick solutions and assured the refugees they would shortly return home, Musa bey remembered that the last incursion among the many Palestine has known in history, the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem in Crusader times, had lasted a hundred years. He left to the politicians the so-far fruitless negotiations that have followed. He left to United Nations to provide relief for emergent needs. He set himself to planning how his orphaned nation could be kept together in what of their homeland remained to them; to devising means to thwart frustration, despair and hopelessness. This was, and is, a task far more difficult than fighting hunger and disease; and, in the long run, more important. He understood that a nation can die while its people survive.

Fortunately, he had the vehicle through which to work. Back in 1945 he had organized and registered the Arab Development Society—A.D.S.—to improve the status of Arab villages by raising standards of agriculture, providing village industries, and setting up vocational schools. The Arab League approved the venture and called on all Arab governments to contribute to it. Only Iraq did but ceased when it found it was carrying the whole burden. The society had, however, continued to exist. Musa bey seized on it as the instrument through which to begin the struggle to save his people. No longer was the problem one of raising village standards—indeed, only some 200 out of more than 1,000 villages remained in Arab hands. Now he must deal with the human tragedy of a whole people in all its manifold aspects. He set to work to create the very conditions of ordered and happy living.

Musa bey Alami was never overly popular with many of the older generation of leaders. Now he was to find them aided and abetted by foreign interests that did not consider it desirable the refugees should remain in Arab Pales-

tine. Clearly, the only way possible for the refugees to remain was to make cultivable the wastelands of the Jordan Valley. To do this, sweet water must be found and the soil desalted. After opposition and obstruction almost incredible to believe now, Musa bey succeeded in obtaining permission of the Jordanian Council of Ministers to launch a project in an area of 2,000 acres of dead and wastelands lying between the River Jordan and Jericho. Pledging himself and what wealth he had left, leaving behind any political ambitions he may have had, and—perhaps most difficult of all, giving up the life of ease and luxury to which he had been born, Musa bey began his search for water. Using improvised machinery and methods, he and his servants, assisted by other refugees, began drilling in August 1949. With each setback, the scoffers were emboldened to make louder their derision and opposition. He was denounced publicly and, more effectively, privately to the King. He was threatened and labeled an agent of the imperialists, and with what reasoning one can only guess. Add to that muscles sore from unaccustomed manual labor and it is little wonder his resolve sometimes weakened. No one likes to be laughed at, and that is truer of Arabs than of most people. And Musa bey is an Arab of the Arabs.

Then one day in January 1950 sweet water finally gushed from the dead and waste soil of the Jordan Valley. Soon the soil was broken and cultivation begun. The Arab Development Society, thanks to Musa bey's persistence, could now get on with the job. Others followed and free enterprise farmers have developed more than 40,000 acres of rich cultivable land. Thousands of refugees have found employment.

The Arab Development Society, against odds unbelievable—including its planned razing by leftish elements in 1955, has continued to move ahead in its efforts to bring hope and economic security to the refugees. An experimental farm provides free information on the best methods of irrigation, farming, dairying, and poultry raising. A vocational training school has been established to give a home and training to orphan and destitute boys. Thousands of refugees have found employment at the Jericho center and more thousands have been trained and employed through the ADS frontier villages project in which whole villages have been guided into economic self-sufficiency through establishing village industries and home crafts.

As the significance of Musa bey Alami's work has become recognized, others have come to his aid. The Ford Foundation has provided more than $1 million of aid. The British World Refugee Year gave £50,000. Oil companies have helped. Point 4 and its successor agencies have assisted the vocational training program. Committees in Great Britain and the United States channel gifts from trusts, churches and individuals, and Musa bey continues to help from his diminishing personal resources. But the need continues great and the unimplemented projects are many. A prospective donor has indicated an interest in building a vocational training school for girls, but before any such offer could be accepted, funds for annual maintenance must be found. Even if sizable foundation or international agency assistance can be obtained, matching funds of not less than $500,000 will certainly be required.

The stakes are high and time is running out. For one thing Musa bey is getting older and his health beginning to show the years of moving from one crisis to another. Stability in the Middle East is in a large measure dependent on stability in Jordan. In Jordan, stability depends on the creation of hope and economic security. More than any other organization the Arab Development Society constitutes the best probability that the "unalienable" right of the "pursuit of happiness" will at long last replace the frustration, despair and hopelessness that have characterized the area since partition and the creation of the refugee problem in 1948.

Musa bey Alami merits a hearing from all men of good will. He deserves the help of all who believe in helping those who help themselves.

HOW OTHERS SEE HIM

Kennett Love in the New York Times:

Musa bey al-Alami is the man whose vision has proved so practical that the United Nations Relief and Works Agency, until recently the backbone of his opposition, and the U.S. Technical Cooperation Administration have now accepted his proof that the valley is a fertile area for development.

New York Times editorial:

Musa bey al-Alami has produced a miracle in the wastelands of the lower Jordan River, not far above the Dead Sea. But there are many acres in the Middle East that have not yet been developed. The Jordan Valley as a whole may once have supported many times its present population. There is power there, as well as water and soil not fully utilized and Mr. Alami's little oasis might yet make its triumphs echo around the world.

Baltimore Sun editorial:

They told Mr. Alami that nobody could live there. They showed him maps marking that particular spot as dead and waste. They—the United Nations Relief and Works Agency and the U.S. Technical Cooperation Administration—said that they saw no point in drilling a test well. Mr. Alami's vision of bringing blossom to that spot of desert, they said, was the foolish vision of a stubborn man. Mr. Alami proved his stubbornness by drilling a well anyway. Mr. Alami has shown that the qualities that count most in human affairs are still the old and honorable qualities of vision, stubbornness, and self-reliance.

Time:

Musa bey al-Alami has spent a lifetime tilting at windmills for his people. After World War II he doggedly preached his doctrine of reclamation and education while most Arabs could think only of their quarrels with the Zionists. He irrigated thousands of acres of desert land that others had thought hopeless, gave jobs to hundreds of refugees.

Harry Ellis in Christian Science Monitor:

Musa bey al Alami is proving that land classified dead and waste throughout history actually is rich enough to bear three crops of fruit and vegetables a year. Mr. Alami's project on the desert is another chapter in the story of men and women the world over who have risen to new heights of devotion when disaster of one kind or another has stripped them of their homes.

Hamilton A. Fisher in This Week, New York Herald Tribune:

Musa bey al Alami is a man with the mind of a Wall Street lawyer, the heart of a Quaker, the dreams of a Boy Scout, the face and body of a Wisconsin farmer, and the soft voice of a Hollywood crooner * * * (we) talked about his plans for Arab refugees. "Being a refugee," he said, "is a misfortune—not an occupation. We have to make people again out of the refugees."

Edwin Muller in Reader's Digest:

Musa bey al Alami got to be something of a joke as he went up and down the Middle East peddling his project. Then he made a decision: he would do the job himself * * *. (The refugees he has) made self-supporting and given new hope are not many compared to hordes still unaided. But to plant and harvest hope where none existed before—surely one man may be proud of this.

Newsweek:

Musa bey al Alami's dream is to expand the agriculture and start affiliated industries. In a country torn by strife and hatred, Alami's faith and perseverance have brought fresh hope and courage.

Norman Vincent Peale:

Musa bey al Alami (is) one of the world's great positive thinkers * * * he has made the desert blossom as the rose. I asked this amazing man what kept him going, kept him believing when everybody said it couldn't be done. "There was no alternative. It had to be done," he said and added, "God helped me."

Stewart Perowne in the London Times:

Musa bey al Alami is now the brain, and equally the heart, of a practical paradise. Others have been quick to copy him. The whole plain, from Jericho to the Jordan, which only 10 years ago was a calcined desert, is now starred with farms and groves.

The London Observer:

Musa bey al Alami has made many enemies. He is tolerant and sensitive, set apart from the narrow nationalisms that bedevil the Middle East. But for each of his enemies, he has a dozen friends who will remain with him forever, not only for his deep charm but because of his sheer pigheadedness in flying in the face of facts—and getting away with it so often.

(NOTE.—The American Sponsors of the Arab Development Society in Jordan—ASAD—was organized in September 1961 by Americans convinced that the most valuable assistance the United States can render abroad is to help those who help themselves. It is an ad hoc committee affiliated with the Continuing Committee on Muslim-Christian Cooperation, Inc., suite 500, 725 15th Street NW., Washington 5, D.C., and contributions—which should be made out to CCMCC-ASAD—are tax exempt.)

McDonnell Aircraft's Role as Prime Contractor for the Mercury Spacecraft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, the development of the Mercury spacecraft in

which Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., made his historic orbital flight on February 20 is a most interesting story. Feeling that Members of the Congress might like to know about the great amount of scientific engineering and technical work that made possible the building of a man-carrying space vehicle, I include as a part of my remarks the following statement of the McDonnell Aircraft Corp.:

McDonnell Aircraft, prime contractor for the design, development, and construction of the Project Mercury spacecraft for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, is a company of 21,000 employees with all facilities at St. Louis, Mo.

The firm was founded only 22 years ago with two employees—President J. S. McDonnell and an assistant. Today it is the largest employer in Missouri. When the company was incorporated on July 6, 1939, its facilities consisted of a second-floor office of a 40 by 40-foot building leased from American Airlines. McDonnell's present facilities total approximately 3½ million gross square feet.

The company grew as a fighter aircraft producer, having designed and built the first Navy carrier-based jet fighter, the FH-1 Phantom I. It currently produces aircraft, missiles, spacecraft, and electronic equipment, and conducts an automation center supplying complete electronic data processing services. A major product line is the FH-4 Phantom II for the Navy which holds six world's speed records, including the world mark of 1,606 miles per hour.

On November 7, 1961, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration announced that it would negotiate with McDonnell Aircraft for a two-man spacecraft in order to develop manned space flight rendezvous techniques.

MERCURY PROGRAM AT M'DONNELL

America's first manned orbital flight is scheduled 3 years after McDonnell Aircraft was notified by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration of the company's selection as prime contractor for the design, development, and construction of the Mercury spacecraft.

It was on January 12, 1959, that McDonnell was chosen to negotiate a contract with NASA for 12 spacecraft. Additional orders were subsequently issued for eight more spacecraft. Of the 20 ordered, McDonnell has delivered 16. The remaining four spacecraft are being modified for 18-orbit missions.

McDonnell work on a spacecraft concept actually began a year before the company's selection as prime contractor. This original design work was carried out with company funds by a group of 12 engineers headed by Raymond A. Pepping, who is now manager of advanced engineering for space design at McDonnell. This group grew to approximately 40 people by the time the company submitted its proposal to NASA in December 1958. In the 3 years to date, McDonnell personnel working on the project reached a maximum of 1,800 personnel, including 400 at Cape Canaveral who are responsible for final testing of the spacecraft as well as launching operations.

McDonnell's original contract called for the delivery of 12 spacecraft, with a minimum of supporting functions. As the program grew, the company became responsible for the development of two procedural trainers, an environmental trainer, seven checkout trailers, and for much of the prelaunch operations at Cape Canaveral, including the mating of the spacecraft to the booster, checkout and countdown.

McDonnell's responsibility in the development of the Mercury spacecraft included the design concept for each of its components as well as the production of certain major components such as couches for the astronauts and chimpanzees; a satellite clock which, among other things, indicates the precise moment the retrorockets are to be fired; and a psychomotor tester, with food and water dispensing systems, for chimpanzee flights.

DESIGN FACTORS

The original contract called for 12 spacecraft of identical design and envisioned the use of "off the shelf" equipment to a large extent. As the program grew, each spacecraft was individually designed for a specific mission and the need for newly designed equipment became necessary. Thus, the program called for the design and production of hardware that pushed the state of the art.

The principal design requirement was the safety of the astronaut and improvements that might increase this safety factor were incorporated as the program progressed. Probably no manned vehicle has ever been designed with so many redundant features. Each component on which the astronaut depends has at least one backup system and, in some systems such as stabilization control, there are three complete backups. To add to the engineering challenge, it was necessary that the spacecraft be designed to operate automatically, manually, or by ground control.

Two other design considerations of major import are worthy of note. First, was the need for designing the spacecraft concurrently with the research and testing conducted by both NASA and McDonnell, thus preventing a normal step-by-step development of the spacecraft because of stringent time limitations. Secondly, the basic spacecraft could weigh only about a ton, which necessitated the use of miniaturized instruments and specially designed space-saving components as well as the use of strong, lightweight metals—titanium, beryllium, and nickel-based alloys—which withstand far higher temperatures than most metals.

MANUFACTURING

In addition to the problems generated by extreme time limitations, the need to incorporate improvements during the manufacturing process, and space limitations in the small spacecraft, the production job also has been a particularly tough one in that new manufacturing techniques had to be devised to achieve the desired results.

An example of this task was the development of a technique for the automatic fusion-welding of titanium capsule skins only ten one-thousandths inch in thickness and nearly 6 feet long. At the outset of the spacecraft program there was considerable doubt as to whether successful welds of the desired quality could be achieved with such thin titanium sheets. McDonnell manufacturing people finally designed fixtures that provided inert gas shielding for both sides of the weld plus the exact amount of chilling required to control the temperature of the material in the area of the weld. This permitted the welding to be done in room air rather than a gas chamber in which all previous fusion-welding of titanium had taken place. The weld achieved by this new technique is believed to be the highest quality yet achieved in the industry.

Another interesting example of the extent of the manufacturing job is the "superclean white room" developed for the assembling of the environmental and reaction control systems. All controls, both reaction and environmental, must function perfectly and respond accurately and immediately. They can tolerate neither dust particles to interfere with operating mechanisms, nor rust which might originate from human contact during assembly operations, and which might cause equipment failure. Under certain conditions, the smallest metal particle could cause failure of a system if not removed.

To protect against these possibilities, McDonnell designed and built a 9,000-square-foot superclean white room which incorporates an air-conditioning filtration system that removes dust particles down to 0.3 micron in size, maintains a temperature of 74° F., and a relative humidity of not over 50 percent to provide for worker comfort, control perspiration, and dimensional control of materials. The room is pressurized at all times and anyone entering the room must wear white uniforms of dust-free nylon, nylon caps, and plastic shoes.

QUALITY CONTROL

About 125 McDonnell people have been assigned to quality control work. This means that there has been an average of one quality control man for every six production workers.

The basic job of quality control personnel is in two parts: (1) to assure conformance of the end product to design requirements and (2) to assure that the performance of contributing companies meets the stringent reliability standards required.

In addition to these steps, however, McDonnell took a third step beyond the normal quality control practices by establishing a team of experienced engineering and production personnel to conduct a continuing quality audit to insure that all methods, procedures, and functions are properly integrated to the production of end products of satisfactory quality level. Going far beyond ordinary product inspection, the quality audit evaluates design, production planning, manufacturing methods, tools, aids and skills, inspection systems, procedures and skills, and all other factors which can act to effect the quality of the end product.

DESCRIPTION OF SPACECRAFT

The Mercury spacecraft is approximately 9 feet high and has a 74-inch width at the base. Shaped like a truncated cone with a cylindrical upper section, it is topped by another, short truncated cone. Fitted around the second cone is a 14-foot trusswork tower which supports the escape rocket system.

The spacecraft may be described as having three principal sections. The base of the cone is the ablation heat shield, designed to protect the craft from extreme thermal conditions during reentry from orbit. This base contains provisions for attachment to the booster through use of a special adapter. At the apex of the cone is the cylindrical section which contains the devices for recovery of the spacecraft at the conclusion of the mission. In the midsection are the cabin and the systems which regulate flight environment, attitude data reading and telemetering, and recovery. A total of 165 control devices are located on the cabin panel just 24 inches in front of the astronaut.

The principal component systems and parts are:

Environmental system, which provides a 100 percent oxygen environment in the cabin and a separate environment in the astronaut's space suit. Two independent controls and a third emergency control are incorporated for maximum safety.

Stabilization control system consists primarily of a combination of horizon scanning and gyroscopic equipment to sense the spacecraft's attitude in flight. Control is achieved by means of a diffused system of low-thrust jets which use hydrogen peroxide as the propellant.

Escape system is the tubular tower and escape rocket attached to the top of the spacecraft by explosive bolts. The escape rocket can pull the craft free of the booster in the event of a malfunction during the launch sequence. Under normal conditions, the tower is jettisoned and a normal parachute sequence landing is made.

Retrograde rockets are enclosed in a housing on the ablation shield. These three rockets are used to slow the spacecraft to a speed so that it will effect reentry. Each

rocket can operate independently and, in an emergency, any one can effect reentry into the atmosphere.

Posigrade rockets are integrated in the retrograde rocket housing on the ablation shield. These small rockets separate the spacecraft from the booster when orbital velocity has been achieved.

Landing system consists of three parachutes—a 6-foot drogue parachute, a 63-foot ring-sail main parachute, and a large reserve parachute.

Recovery system includes a chaff packet with reflecting capability of producing a large radar echo; sofar bombs which produce shock waves that can be detected by picket ships; a dyemarker packet; a flashing light; and a beacon antenna.

Communication system provides for both voice and telemetry communication. This system includes ground command systems for the sequencing mechanisms, instrumentation telemetry, tracking beacons, voice and recovery radio.

Periscope is the primary instrument for manual navigation. The periscope provides the astronaut with a view of the earth beneath the spacecraft.

Instrumentation is designed to monitor the environmental conditions, physical condition of the astronaut, condition and performance of the spacecraft, and the operation of the craft's controls. This information is transmitted by telemetry and tape recorders for ground analysis and evaluation.

TESTING PROGRAMS

The Mercury spacecraft is probably the most thoroughly tested manned vehicle ever built. At both NASA and McDonnell facilities, the spacecraft underwent literally thousands of tests of various types.

Two of the most important areas of testing consist of the system tests, which are conducted on every spacecraft delivered by McDonnell to NASA, and the Project Orbit test, a program for gathering information for long-term operation of the spacecraft.

The McDonnell system tests are conducted in two phases; a single check of each individual system working by itself, and the interaction of the various systems working together.

During the operational test phase, the spacecraft is "flown to altitude" in the company's large altitude test chamber. The complete vibration spectrum that would be encountered by the spacecraft in flight is simulated by mechanical means.

A complete mission is simulated during this part of the test program during which all of the sequences required during prelaunch, liftoff, orbit, retrograde, and reentry are duplicated in the McDonnell White Room.

The Project Orbit test series is designed to gather information on the spacecraft program in general. A series of full-scale simulated mission tests at altitudes approaching 300,000 feet were conducted in a large altitude test chamber where the effects of low pressure on the spacecraft structure and systems was evaluated.

To further evaluate the effect of temperature extremes, a sheath in which heat lamps and cooling coils were installed, was used to record the effects of heat and cold.

CANAVERAL OPERATIONS

A team of 400 McDonnell engineers, mechanics, and technicians operate from hangar S at Cape Canaveral.

This group is assigned to final testing of the spacecraft and preparation for flight. This includes the mating of the craft to the booster and participating in the final checkout and countdown. Included in this group are a launch crew, consisting of personnel assigned specifically to each spacecraft; a pad crew, which is assigned to the area around the gantry; a blockhouse crew and a checkout trailer crew. Other crews are assigned to the environmental control and reaction control systems of the spacecraft.

First personnel to make up the McDonnell Cape Canaveral team arrived in September 1959. The large personnel buildup took place in June 1960.

SUBCONTRACTING PROGRAM

McDonnell Aircraft, as prime contractor, was assisted in the spacecraft program by an estimated 4,000 suppliers and subcontractors throughout the country. Direct subcontractors numbered 596 from 25 States, while 1,500 were second-tier subcontractors.

Progress of the Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a significant editorial entitled "Progress of the Allies," published on February 13, 1962, in the Washington Post. The editorial commends the recent report on "Economic Policies and Programs in South America" of a subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee as a "painstaking and worthwhile" study, and underlines some crucial policy questions that need further investigation. It is my considered opinion that at the earliest possible date hearings should be held into these matters.

One point raised in the editorial—the risk of placing exclusive emphasis on central planning—is developed at greater length in the text of the report. I should like to quote from page 25 of the report the following paragraph which places this point in its original context:

A major effort of U.S. policy toward Latin America should be to point up the merits of and assist these countries to develop a reliance on private enterprise and the processes of private investment decisionmaking. Every time we encourage reliance on centralized planning we risk playing into Soviet hands, by showing a distrust of our own characteristic national method and encouraging the technique of our ideological competitors. If formalizing the role of government in economic decisionmaking is to be our recommendation, it would not be surprising if the developing countries turned to the Soviet's example as notorious practitioners, and hence best equipped advisers in that line. We ought, in short, to be wary of trying to fight communism on the world stage by turning to socialistic and authoritarian instruments in the developing nations.

This, my colleagues, is a report in the finest tradition of congressional scholarship. Congress is often criticized for oversea junkets at the taxpayers' expense. With so much "top of the head" thinking and talking on the alliance for progress, this study is a refreshing example of solid research and reporting on the scene, and deserves our closest attention.

The report also illustrates the positive results of a constructive approach to oversea trips. My colleague and ranking Republican member on the Joint Economic Committee, Representative CURTIS, of Missouri, has in the past urged such an approach. Ideally, a bipartisan staff precedes the committee members abroad, schedules witnesses, and prepares background materials. The committee staff then returns to the United States, and briefs the members before their departure. The staff accompanies the members abroad, assists them during the investigation, and finally coordinates followup and preparation of the committee report. This last point, I may add, is the key step in the entire procedure. It is imperative that members who have the benefit of oversea investigation and observation report to their colleagues, so that all may share in the findings of the study.

Mr. President, the members of the subcommittee producing this valuable document are Senator SPARKMAN, Representative GRIFFITHS, and Representative CURTIS of Missouri. They, the bipartisan staff that assisted them, deserve our congratulations and thanks for the fine scholarship shown in this report.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRESS OF THE ALLIES

A small group of members of the Joint Economic Committee who traveled southward to look at the alliance for progress have turned in a painstaking and worthwhile report. Senator JOHN SPARKMAN and Representatives MARTHA GRIFFITHS and TOM CURTIS have asked many questions along the way, and they have come back with no ready answers.

They found that many Latin Americans seem to be more aware of the U.S. alliance obligations to supply dollars than they are of their own promise to reform taxation, land tenure and education. Their on-the-spot study has made them acutely aware of the difficulties of achieving rapid progress, singly or in alliance, on problems that have beset the southern republics throughout the century and half of their independent existence. They are concerned that the United States may become identified with programs where failure is likely. The northern allies must not end up with all the blame. Hence they caution against unrealistic expectations. Programs that are oversold will cause trouble mainly to the sellers.

They also note the risk of placing exclusive emphasis on central planning. If the United States should succeed in convincing the Latins that the Russian approach is superior, the Latins may end up turning for advice and assistance to parties who have more experience with those methods than we have. The travelers have some kind words for the American businessman abroad. They note that some of the leading governments have taken action to attract more foreign private investments, during the 1950's, the major source of foreign capital. But they are aware that much of the investment required for economic growth and social reform will have to be provided and directed by governments. Creation of an infratructure of schools, hospitals, roads and basic utilities is not a job for private enterprise.

The most persuasive and indeed compelling argument for the approach chosen under the alliance comes from the need that middle-of-the-road governments have to document broad social progress. Beset by reactionaries on the right and radicals on the

left, they are in urgent need to establish a broader basis of support. The report of the three travelers leaves no doubt at all about the urgency of this objective.

Accident Prevention Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, recently I submitted a statement for presentation before the House Health and Safety Subcommittee, holding hearings on H.R. 133, to establish a National Accident Prevention Center. This center would perform and administer basic research into accident prevention.

The need for such research into accident cause and prevention is great. The payoff from such research in terms of lives and dollars saved promises to be important.

Senators will remember hearing Colonel Glenn say "exploration and the pursuit of knowledge have always paid dividends in the long run—usually far greater than anything expected at the outset."

I believe this would be the case in accident research.

Because I know Senators would be interested in considering the proposal to establish a center of accident prevention research, I ask unanimous consent that my statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHN A. CARROLL IN REGARDS H.R. 133, TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL ACCIDENT PREVENTION CENTER, FOR PRESENTATION TO HOUSE HEALTH AND SAFETY SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEBRUARY 21, 1962

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee of Health and Safety: On December 15, 1961, 10 days before Christmas, 20 schoolchildren were killed and 15 hospitalized when the school bus in which they were riding was sliced in two by a passenger train. This grim and horrible accident in Weld County, Colo., stirred the hearts and minds of the citizens of my State.

This accident served to point out the staggering number of fatal accidents on our Nation's highways. Over 38,000 people were killed in the year 1960; 1,100 of these deaths were caused by collisions with railroad trains. Nearly 1.5 million Americans received disabling injuries and an additional 2 million people received lesser injuries. In the last 20 years, more than 25 million American citizens have been killed or injured on our highways.

These figures of death and carnage on the highways are but a part of the toll taken by accidents each year. More than 90,000 people are killed and 46 million injured by accidents of all sorts every year. This means in terms of our national productivity at least 110 million workdays lost each year. This is a staggering cost, both in blood and money.

Accidents are the principal cause of death for all ages between 1 and 35. Sixty percent of all deaths of young men between the ages of 15 and 25 recorded are due to accidents.

Thousands of lives, millions of dollars, are lost each year, Mr. Chairman. It is about time that a concentrated and directed effort was made by our Nation and its citizens to reduce this frightful waste.

I am pleased therefore to discuss today the bill H.R. 133, introduced by you, Mr. Chairman, and currently under the study of your subcommittee, to establish a National Accident Prevention Center.

There are many divisions of government, at all levels, local, State and Federal, which have an active interest in accident prevention. There are many private foundations and councils which are doing much useful work in the use of safety devices and the mapping of safety campaigns. I do not in any way underrate the important work being done by these public spirited organizations.

It is however undeniably true that very little work is being done in the field of basic research into accident prevention.

A witness before your committee, Robert J. Schreiber, executive director of research of Public Service Research Inc., has said:

"Accident research is not a very respectable professional discipline; there are no degrees granted in it, no scholarly journals of it. It is, at best, a sparetime occupation for all but a few. At professional society meetings, it is difficult to find even a half a dozen scientists interested in discussing it."

This is not a happy situation.

Basic research pays: yellow fever, smallpox, polio, diphtheria, tetanus, and whooping cough have been eliminated from the list of killers through the results of research and development.

In 1959, it was estimated by Dr. Alfred Moseley, Department of Legal Medicine, Harvard Medical School, that the amount of money going for polio research per polio death was $40,000; the amount for cancer research per cancer death was $360; the amount per heart death was $87. The amount for preventive research per death through aviation accidents was $500,000. And for automobile accident research we spend less than $5 per death.

That research can be of value in reducing accidents is clearly demonstrated in the field of aviation. The CAB, the FAA, the Air Force, and private industry have done extensive research into the prevention of aircraft accidents. Work has been done in pilot reaction and training, instrument developments, fuselage construction, etc.

The results can be seen in the rapidly falling air accident rate. From an average of 7.8 deaths for every 100 million passenger miles flown on American domestic scheduled airlines in the years 1933–37, the rate had dropped by 96 percent to 0.29, according to the CAB.

Our country—in both public and private efforts—is devoting many dollars each year to organized, directed research into the prevention and cure of cancer, tuberculosis, and mental illness. It is long past due that such an organized and directed attack be made upon the causes and prevention of accidents.

Accidents do not just happen. They are events which have causes—and scientists know very little about these causes. It has been generally agreed by the witnesses appearing before your subcommittee that the most important need in the area of accident prevention is for basic research. It has been agreed that scientists and personnel must be trained, that research be encouraged, that research results be applied in accident prevention.

It appears to me that H.R. 133 takes a sound approach toward filling this need for an organized program on research for accident prevention and control.

I am not an expert, Mr. Chairman, in the field of accident prevention or public health. I cannot comment upon the technical questions as to what form such a research center should take, as to how it should divide its funds between intramural and extramural research, as to where within the framework of HEW it should be placed.

Such questions as these I leave to the wisdom of the subcommittee. I know how much study and thought, over several years, you have devoted to this matter, and I would only wish to emphasize to your subcommittee the importance of seeing that there is no unnecessary expenditure, no overlapping of responsibility or division of authority.

Funds are needed for basic research: they are not needed for the construction of yet another expensive building or for the formulation of yet another bureaucratic hierarchy.

The people's money will be involved in this undertaking and it is necessary that there be no duplication of work undertaken by others and that full provision be made for the active encouragement of private research.

I am especially pleased, Mr. Chairman, to see that provision is made in H.R. 133 for the acceptance of private endowments from individuals and foundations. Such a program as is here proposed will surely attract the gifts of the public spirited.

I would also point out to the subcommittee that this measure has already received the support of the Denver Junior Chamber of Commerce, and I understand a resolution of support will be considered at the next Jaycee national convention.

Mr. Chairman, I would close with a personal reference. For several years I have been concerned with the appalling tragedies which occur in accidents at railroad crossings in particular, and on our highways in general. I have given much time and thought to this problem. I have talked with many people. I have read much material. I have seen the perfection of warning signals and signs, crossbars and crosswalks, cloverleafs, and crossovers; and yet the killing and carnage continue.

Accidents will never be eliminated but the number and severity of accidents can be reduced. They must be reduced.

Wholesale murder must be stopped and this, Mr. Chairman, is why I support the intent of H.R. 133.

Bulgarian Liberation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, until 1878 Bulgarians had been suffering under the yoke of Ottoman Turkish sultans. For four centuries their historic homeland had been part of the Ottoman empire, and they were subjected to the detested rule of their oppressive masters. During that long period they had tried to free themselves, but all their efforts were unsuccessful, and each revolt against their oppressors was ruthlessly suppressed. But during the Russo-Turkish war of 1877 to 1878 they were aided by the Russians, and as the result of that war they secured their freedom. In a treaty signed on March 3 of 1878 their freedom was recognized by the Ottoman Sultan. That day marked their liberation, and to this day it remains as their national holiday.

Since that distant day of 84 years ago Bulgarians have had their ups and downs, but during the last two decades

they have been suffering under Communist totalitarian tyranny. Just as their forefathers fought their Turkish oppressors, so today they are struggling for their freedom against their powerful oppressors. On the 84th anniversary of their liberation day let us hope that they will again regain their freedom and live in peace.

Classroom Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. Maurice H. Stans, onetime Director of the Budget, appeared in the Washington Post of March 5.

Here again we can see the great truth that figures can be made to prove anything. In fact they have frequently been made to prove that two and two cannot make four.

The discussion of the classroom shortage in this country can lead us up many a blind alley. If it is true that there is a shortage of 127,200 classrooms as of today, and we are assured of this on the highest authority, and if it is equally true that we are building classrooms now at the rate of 70,000 per annum, my meager arithmetic tells me that in 2 years we will have 140,000 new classrooms, which should prove ample. Unless, of course, here again two and two do not make four.

The article follows:

CLASSROOM SHORTAGE STATISTICS CONFUSING

(By Maurice H. Stans)

Behind all the oratory on Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools is the basic question of whether education can best be achieved under local financing and direction in home communities or by Federal financing and influence from Washington.

The argument is not new. The Congress debated it as vigorously 75 years ago as now. Unfortunately, facts are scare and are clouded over by digressive issues of politics, relegion and competition with the Soviets.

Of course, we all want our children to be well educated. And despite all the heated debate, there is little evidence that our present local system of education is inferior to that of the Soviets or of any other country. Johnny may not be able to spell, but so far he has grown up to be superior in science, industry, commerce and the improvement of living to Ivan or any other progeny of foreign birth.

DOCUMENTATION LACKING

But the struggle to shift the cost of education, and the responsibility for it to the Federal Government will go on, long after 1962. This principal ammunition will be statistics, and seldom will an important battle be fought with poorer firepower. One would expect that, in a matter of such vital importance, proponents of the cause of Federal aid would have a strongly documented case.

But if the past is evidence, the Congress will be asked to make historic decisons on a basis of figures far inferior to those which a sensible businessman would require for reaching his business conclusions. There ought to be a better way to resolve national problems.

The major case for Federal support of school construction rests on the alleged inability or unwillingness of local school districts to do the job. The key figures are the annual estimates of classroom shortages produced by the Office of Education from reports supplied by the States. Because of their sources, they are seldom questioned.

But an analysis of the figures leaves much in doubt. For example, the officially asserted shortage in 1954 was 370,000 classrooms. But this became merely 160,000 in 1955, even though only 60,000 rooms were built in the meantime. The difference was the result of a change in the process of gathering the statistics.

Since then the annual classroom shortages figure has moved slowly downward until it hit a low level of 127,200 in the fall of 1961. About half of this represents supposed shortages in capacity and the other half represents unsatisfactory quarters.

NO UNIFORM DEFINITIONS

When I was Director of the Budget, I set out to learn more about these classroom shortage reports. In February, 1960, a field survey team, made up of staff members of the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, went to nine States, with 50 percent of the classroom shortage, to find out how the figures were compiled. Their findings were astounding. Because there were no uniform definitions across the States, the figures were mostly undetailed or poorly supported estimates based more often than not on local or State attitudes of the moment.

For example, in Alabama, the survey revealed that the number of classrooms needed to replace unsatisfactory facilities dropped from 10,037 in 1958 to only 2,416 a year later. There had been a local redefinition of what constituted an unsatisfactory classroom. The survey concluded that "neither the 1958 nor the 1959 report provides a reliable figure on the classroom shortage" in Alabama.

In accounting for the substantial annual variations reported in Illinois, the report said that "* * * while many local superintendents report small rural schools as satisfactory, the State agency staff feels that these schools are unsuitable."

Some large cities were entirely omitted from the estimates. Inconsistencies were numerous. Understatements and overstatements were found. The conclusion of the study group was a forthright statement that "the fall report figures on the classroom shortage have, in our opinion, limited usefulness in discussions on Federal aid for school construction." And further that "the survey indicates that it is fallacious to compare successive years' totals to indicate a decline or increase in the classroom shortage."

TWO-YEAR BACKLOG

Even if taken at face value, "the classroom shortage figures reveal nothing about the financial capability of the States and local communities to handle the problem without Federal aid." In fact, they disclose nothing about actions taken or pending in the school districts to deal with the needs. This is important, for this reason: With classrooms being built at the rate of 70,000 a year, a shortage of 127,200 classrooms, if true, would be a backlog of less than 2 years. It takes 2 years to recognize needs, develop proposals, hold elections, sell bonds, design and build schools. It may well be that much of the deficiency is actually being met by prompt local actions about as fast as it becomes clearly evident.

In printed material and speeches by proponents of Federal aid, there appear repeated statements that there are 8 million schoolchildren in overcrowded classrooms. This round number stems from a 1959 press statement of the Office of Education to the effect that State figures show that public school enrollments were 1,843,000 in excess of normal school capacity and that "there are numbers of others whose education is being hampered to some extent by lack of adequate classroom facilities." This is extrapolation with a will.

Why must we deal with great national problems with such scanty, questionable data? If we as citizens are seriously to consider this issue, shouldn't we have a careful, nationwide survey of actual conditions, measured by uniform standards and with the findings pinpointed by cities, by school districts and by structures? If then, confronted by such evidence, some of the individual districts are clearly unable to act and the States cannot meet the needs, there may be a case for Federal assistance.

Farm Problem To Get Major Emphasis at Farm Forum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, much debate and discussion has transpired on the subject of the farm surplus problem. The problem will once again be presented for considerable debate in the upcoming 16th Annual Minneapolis Farm Forum to start March 12, 1962. In anticipation of that forum, Dr. O. B. Jesness, professor emeritus of agricultural economics, University of Minnesota, has presented an extremely enlightened survey of the surplus problem. An eminently qualified observer with proven good judgment, Dr. Jesness draws the farm surplus question out into the mainstream of national and international affairs. I commend highly to my colleagues his pervasive treatment of the farm surplus problem as presented in the following article from the February 25, 1962, Minneapolis Sunday Tribune:

SURPLUS PROBLEM SURE TO GET MAJOR EMPHASIS AT FARM FORUM

(By O. B. Jesness)

The 16th annual Minneapolis farm forum scheduled for Monday, March 12, again will concentrate on some vital farm and public problems. One problem which is sure to come in for considerable airing is that of finding a real answer to the perennial farm surplus question.

Is the choice, as some contend, really between rigid controls or no program? Were this the case the situation would fit the wag's definition of a dilemma: "You cannot stay where you are but have no place to go." Fortunately, it is not that bad.

Political Washington has shown great faith in price supports and other schemes to raise farm prices for more than three decades.

Now even Washington is showing some signs of admitting that prices may be the consequence rather than the cause, and that the real difficulty lies in surpluses.

In short, too many resources—manpower, land, and capital—are being used in such surplus lines as wheat, especially hard winter feed grains, dairy products, and cotton.

Congress did not see fit to grant the administration the sweeping powers it requested last year for dealing with farm surpluses. It did pass a feed-grain bill, one dealing with wheat, and a measure providing some expansion in possible use of market orders.

The administration has recently submitted to Congress another comprehensive bill to provide authority for controls over the amounts of surplus commodities which farmers will be permitted to produce and sell.

The intent is to require producers of such commodities to hold some of their land and other production resources out of use in an endeavor to get and keep output in line.

Both the carrot and the stick are in evidence. The carrot of attraction includes the rights to price-supporting loans and to payments for land diversion to cooperators. The stick is exclusion of noncooperators from price-support loans and also the alternative of no program in case proposed quotas are voted down.

However, the lines of attack available are not bound by any such limited alternative. Because the problem is one of too much productive capacity in some lines, the real answer lies in aiding some farmers to shift land and other resources out of agriculture or to less intensive uses, as for instance, from wheat to grazing in the Great Plains.

Part-time farming—allowing the excess resources to remain in the farms but keeping them out of use through controls—would be an inefficient and uneconomical operation.

Nor will the soil bank as operated in the past do the job. Much of the adjustment must be of a permanent type, not holding land out for 3 or 5 years. A highly selective program is needed to obtain adjustment in the commodities and areas where it ought to take place and on the farms and by the farmers who should make it.

One question unanswered with respect to proposed controls relates to how and when the change from across-the-board controls to selective adjustments is to be made.

Controls are likely to impede, not aid, adjustments. Once they are in effect and rights to produce have been assigned, changes to more realistic adjustment will be difficult and perhaps well nigh impossible.

In tackling the job of adjustment we might as well face the fact that it is difficult and there is no painless, costless way out.

Surely the farm forum will give attention to the Common Market and our relations to it. The Common Market, which had its origin just a few short years ago among six nations of Western Europe, is making remarkable progress in view of the anticipated difficulties.

Tariffs and other restrictions affecting the flow of trade among these countries are rapidly being made more uniform and lowered with the expectations that they will disappear completely in the not distant future. Agreement is in the process of being reached on farm programs.

Thus, the Common Market is on the way to becoming one of the most important trading areas in the world. England has taken steps to join and similar moves are in prospect on the part of several other European nations.

The attitude which the Common Market will take with respect to trading with the rest of the world is important to the United States. European countries are important buyers of farm and other products from us.

Will such trade be encouraged or will the Common Market move in the direction of greater self-sufficiency? We need a position from which we can negotiate effectively on a give-and-take basis.

We should do our best to convince those involved that it is to their advantage to buy from outside products which are produced more advantageously elsewhere. To do so we must be ready to buy from Common Market countries.

The administration has asked Congress to provide authority for carrying on negotiations, including adjustments in tariffs. Without this we will find ourselves on the outside looking in.

Nor can we overlook our situation with respect to our balance of payments and monetary gold. An increase in our export surplus is important to ease these problems.

To be competitive in exports it is important that we hold costs down and improve efficiency. To retain confidence in the American dollar it is important that we avoid inflation, balance the budget, and employ sound fiscal and monetary policies.

These are matters of concern to all Americans. Consumers have an interest in farm prices and food costs. As citizens they have an interest in a sound and prosperous agriculture. As taxpayers they are concerned with developing a farm program which will solve the problem.

Everyone is concerned with anything which relates to our relationships with the rest of the world, and to strengthening our ability to keep communism within bounds. There is something for everybody in sessions such as the farm forum.

Dow-Jones Research and Development Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, as one of the representatives of the State of New Jersey, I take great pride in the fact that our State is a center for research. While New Jersey has always been out in the forefront of scientific research, the latest developments are particularly welcome. Rutgers State University and the Bell Telephone Co. will cooperate in the construction and operation of a 15-million electron volt Van de Graaf accelerator, the first of its type. This aspect of nuclear physics will be researched on the campus of our State university.

It is with a great deal of pride that I ask this body for unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials from New Jersey papers that speak of our achievements, one is from the Daily Home News of New Brunswick—February 21—and the other from the Courier News of Plainfield—February 21.

I would also like to point out that a new Dow-Jones research and development center will be built in South Brunswick. An editorial in the February 22 issue of the Daily Home News—New Brunswick—describes this new addition.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Courier-News, Plainfield, N.J., Feb. 21, 1962]

RESEARCH LAB

All of us in New Jersey have watched with pride the development of our State as a center for research. We have been contributors to the success of some exciting new national programs, and at the same time we have seen these projects create work for our people and attract men of science and engineering ability to our area.

The latest development in this direction was the announcement this week that Rutgers University and the Bell Telephone Laboratories will cooperate in the construction and operation of a 15-million electron volt Van de Graaf accelerator, the first of its type. The new structure for fundamental research in nuclear physics will be built on the Rutgers campus in Piscataway to probe the structure of atoms.

Aside from the importance and usefulness of this research tool, and what the findings may ultimately mean to people, we believe that the teamwork between industry and the university is worthy of comment.

Rutgers is investing a large sum of money left to it in a bequest, and Bell is aiding the project with financial support over a period of years. As a result, Bell will have the privilege of using this research tool, and Rutgers will have an urgently needed research and teaching facility.

And what is more, New Jersey and the Nation will almost certainly benefit by the expansion of knowledge in the fields of nuclear physics.

[From the Daily Home News, New Brunswick, N.J., Wednesday, Feb. 21, 1962]

RUTGERS-BELL JOINT RESEARCH

Our area's spectacular development in the broad field of research received a tremendous addition this week with the announcement that Rutgers University, in collaboration with Bell Telephone Laborators, will erect a 15-million electron volt tandem accelerator.

The accelerator, with the highest energy ever built into an accelerator, is a precise tool for investigating the structure and properties of atomic nuclei. It will be located on the University Heights campus in Piscataway Township, near the new physics building now under construction. This new research tool will be used primarily by physicists at the university. The Bell people will make annual payments entitling them to one-third use of the accelerator for a period up to 10 years, and they will use it in nuclear physics studies as related to the communications technology of the future.

This is a most interesting and progressive cooperative program. Governor Hughes has placed a $700,000 appropriation in his budget to construct the building to house the accelerator. Rutgers will contribute about $1,200,000 to the accelerator's cost, from bequests to the university, Bell will contribuate annual payments for 10 years, and the Federal Government is being asked for funds for auxiliary equipment and operating expenses.

Dr. Mason Gross, Rutgers president, points to this program as an "exciting example of the benefits which can be gained through closer cooperation of industry and the colleges." This is truly an exciting chapter in the history of the State university, and an exciting chapter in the story of the growth of our area here as the research center of the world.

This new and expensive and complicated piece of laboratory equipment will not be unique. Two others have been put on order since the Rutgers one was ordered. But both the others are going to the west coast, one to the Atomic Energy Commission at Los Alamos and the other to the University of Washington. And the setting up of this accelerator on the Rutgers campus cannot fail to bring many interested scientists to our area, and to further our growing prestige as a research center.

[From the New Brunswick (N.J.) Daily Home News, Feb. 22, 1962]

ANOTHER FINE RESEARCH UNIT

Plans for creation of new research enterprises here in central New Jersey seem to be announced almost daily. And we find in each announcement confirmation of our often stated thesis that our area is to become the world center of research.

The coming of Dow-Jones to South Brunswick is particularly pleasing to us, for Dow-Jones is prominent in research and progress in our own field, the publishing field.

The new Dow-Jones research and development center will be on 100 acres in South Brunswick, near the new $20 million research center recently won through a compromise on zoning in the township. At the Dow-Jones center there will be research in graphic arts and communications fields, research now carried on by the firm in New York. And, since Dow-Jones does actual printing of its publications, the Wall Street Journal, Barron's Weekly, and the National Observer at locations scattered across the land, it seems likely that the South Brunswick installation might eventually include a large printing plant.

Dow-Jones has developed and manufactured a variety of innovations in graphic arts and communications, including the electrotypesetter system that enables the company to print editions of the Wall Street Journal, identical in content, in various parts of the country simultaneously. Dow-Jones has also been spectacularly successful in producing in the Wall Street Journal one of the Nation's very finest publications. The firm's new venture, the National Observer, a national news weekly, started a few weeks ago with the largest advance subscription list of any similar venture and with a host of leading advertisers contracting for space.

It is clear that the location of the Dow-Jones research and development center in South Brunswick will focus the eyes of the whole national printing and publishing industry upon Middlesex County and will bring here leaders in the field from all over the country to see what modern miracles in communications the Dow-Jones experts are working here.

The Late Honorable Irving M. Ives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, this Nation suffered a great loss in the recent decease of Irving M. Ives, a distinguished former Member of the U.S. Senate.

Irv Ives began his public service in the New York State Legislature. His ability, courage and dedication were recognized by his colleagues, and led to his election as minority leader in 1935, and as speaker of the assembly in 1936. From 1937 to 1946, he served with great distinction and forcefulness as majority leader.

As a Member of the U.S. Senate from 1947 to 1959, Senator Ives served this Nation with great honor and dedication. He earned and retained the high respect and sincere devotion of his colleagues.

Senator Ives was blessed with an innate kindness, a nobility of spirit, a mature wisdom of the mind, a deep sympathy for and an understanding of, his fellow men.

He leaves as his monument a better world to live in.

While we mourn his passing after a long illness, we at the same time are thankful for his long and conscientious devotion to the public interest.

An editorial in the Buffalo Evening News on February 26, 1962, superbly expresses the affection and esteem of our people for Senator Ives. The editorial follows:

IRVING M. IVES

Just as it was sad news 4 years ago to have to report that illness was forcing U.S. Senator Irving M. Ives to retire into private life, so it is sad news now to learn of the death of this able citizen who, throughout his long and useful public career, had just about everything going for him except good health.

Conviction, courage, competence, and commonsense—these were some of the qualities that distinguished Irving Ives during his 16 years as an evermore influential legislator in Albany, and his 12 later years as U.S. Senator. What shone through most impressively of all, though, was his quiet, steady, conscientious dedication to fairplay—especially in the two fields in which he was an acknowledged experts' expert, labor relations and civil rights.

Senator Ives' proudest monument happens to be no national law—although he was decidedly influential in shaping, usually moderating, the whole body of national labor legislation from Taft-Hartley to the eve of Landrum-Griffin—but rather the State fair employment practices law, known as the Ives-Quinn Act, which New York pioneered away back in 1945.

Senator Ives' only defeat at the polls in a 28-year public career was in his 1954 race for Governor against Averell Harriman. It was a contest he was reluctant to enter—even then for health reasons. But against this loss by the narrowest margin of any statewide race in history, he had the political satisfactions of being the only opponent ever to defeat Herbert Lehman (for Senator, in 1946), and then of winning reelection 6 years later by a plurality which still stands as an alltime State record.

The News is proud to have supported him in all his campaigns, and by way of final appraisal of his career, we can but reiterate our reaction to the announcement of his retirement in 1958: "Mr. Ives has been a good Senator, a credit to New York State, a man of great good will who, in an era rife with angry partisanship, has been a steadying, moderating influence. He has not been a spectacular type of Senator * * *. He has rather worked steadily for progress and decency in the fields he knows best."

Dollar Deficit Must Not Run Wild

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article entitled "Dollar Deficit Is One That Mustn't Run Wild." The article was written by Henry C. Wallich, professor of economics, at Yale University, and was published in the Washington Post on March 4, 1962.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOLLAR DEFICIT IS ONE THAT MUSTN'T RUN WILD

(By Henry C. Wallich)

There is a simple answer when someone begins to complain about the deficit: ask him which deficit he means, the budget deficit or the balance-of-payments deficit. Require him to define his terms: "You name it, we have it."

The budget deficit this year is $7 billion; the balance-of-payments deficit, 2.4 billion. If the President is right (and lucky), there will be no budget deficit next year, but the President will be very lucky indeed if the next balance-of-payments deficit is not bigger than the last.

Though the balance-of-payments deficit is currently much the smaller, it is much the more insidious. What a string of budget deficits would do to the dollar is a question about which reasonable men may differ. It would probably depend on circumstances. There is very little difference of opinion on what a string of balance-of-payments deficits of any size would do to the dollar. It would mean collapse.

LIKE CHECKING ACCOUNT

The balance of payments sometimes is discussed as if it were a profit-and-loss account, with surplus signifying a profit; deficit, a loss. If that were the case, all countries would of course be seeking to have surpluses all the time. Fortunately, it is a wrong analogy.

The balance of payments is one of those rare terms in economics which mean—almost, not quite—what they say. It is the balance resulting from the international expenditures and receipts of the Nation. Its closest analogy is a checking account.

The United States spends money abroad by buying a long shopping list of goods; its citizens travel and obtain other services; it gives foreign aid, keeps troops, pays pensions and acquires profitable investments abroad. On the other hand, the United States gets money from abroad by selling goods, rendering various services and obtaining an income on its investments.

Expenditures are debited to the checking account; receipts are credited. The cash balance in the account is symbolized by U.S. gold holdings. When there is a balance of payments surplus, the gold goes up. When there is a deficit, it goes down. For some time now, the gold has been going down.

There is an important qualification. The United States pays for its deficit not only in gold; it also pays by issuing IOU's. The United States has covered some $5 billion of the deficit of the last 4 years by paying out that much gold, but it has covered the remaining $8 billion by going into debt.

In contrast to what happens in a store, where the sales clerk asks, "Cash or charge?" the decision to pay gold or issue I O U's is not up to the United States but to the foreigner. The United States pays interest on what it owes to foreign countries or individuals if they choose to leave their money here. Many countries therefore prefer not to take gold for their surplus with the United States, but to keep the dollars they receive in the United States.

In this way, the United States in the last 4 years has avoided paying $8 billion in gold. But it faces withdrawal of this and other foreign-owned money—and of the funds of Americans as well—if people should cease to trust the dollar.

The decline in the U.S. international cash balance has been very substantial by these figures. That does not necessarily mean that the United States has lived beyond its means. In fact, the country has acquired, through investment abroad, income earning assets that exceed substantially the loss of gold and

increase in foreign dollar balances. But these investments are not liquid, and in an emergency the Nation could not count on being able to use them quickly.

BIG STEPS BLOCKED

Foreign countries have made it pretty clear to the U.S. Government that their confidence in the dollar has been stretched about as far as it will go. They are reluctant to have additional dollar I O U's unloaded on them as a result of further deficits. The United States, on the other hand, is reluctant to lose more gold because a reduction in the gold backing of the dollar would weaken confidence still further. Hence it is urgent to put an end to the deficit.

The first thing that comes to mind, naturally, is to cut some of the Nation's international expenditures. Unfortunately, it immediately appears that there is a hitch to almost everything big that could be done.

To cut imports by raising tariffs or through other restrictions would invite certain retaliation. Since the United States exports more than it imports, it has more to lose from reciprocal trade restrictions than to gain. To cut troop pay by pulling back the troops would fatally weaken the Nation's military posture.

Cutting foreign aid would not help much, quite aside from the damage to our international position, because most of the aid is given in the form of American products or is otherwise tied to purchase here. Foreign investments could be stopped, but they are already earning more each year than they cost and over the years the net gain from them will increase. Tourism could not be restrained without inventing an elaborate system of currency controls that would put an end to the use of the dollar as an international currency.

A great many minor means of saving dollars abroad are earning more from foreigners are of course open: Some savings on troop pay and foreign aid can always be made; foreigners can be induced to travel and invest in the United States. It is easy to put together pages and pages of good ideas, but in dollar terms there is only one thing that really amounts to anything—to export more.

The United States must sell more abroad. There is no question that the foreigner has the money; he has been getting it through the American balance-of-payments deficit. The obstacle is inadequate competitiveness of American products. Competitive after a fashion we are; how else would American exports exceed imports? But the margin of competitiveness is not sufficient.

The United States needs some $2 to $3 billion a year more exports, in relation to imports, than it now has. That would solve the problem. But the continuation of this small deficiency puts the dollar in jeopardy, prevents the administration from taking active measures to increase employment, and slows down the whole economy.

To make American exports more competitive, prices must come down or at least must be held constant while prices abroad drift upward. There are other factors, such as improved design, credit, service, selling, but price is the big one. The way to keep prices in line is to keep wages from advancing too fast.

Public pressure against price increases is necessary, too, to keep profits from advancing sharply if wages slow down. But since profits amount to only about 4.5 percent of the sales of manufacturing corporations, wages obviously are the key factor.

The President's Council of Economic Advisers has suggested that wage boosts remain within a limit that may be interpreted as 2.4 percent. If the Nation succeeds in doing that, it has a fair chance of working out of its balance-of-payments problem. If it doesn't the dollar will be in jeopardy and our means of maintaining our international posture will be inadequate and efforts to increase employment at home will suffer.

President and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following column from the Washington Post of March 3, 1962:

[From the Washington Post, March 3, 1962]

PRESIDENT AND POLITICS—ROUGH TACTICS CAN HURT

(By Roscoe Drummond)

President Kennedy continues to maintain evidence of unprecedented popularity. Nothing depresses it—neither the bitter pill of Cuba, the uncertainties in Laos and Vietnam, nor unsuccessful skirmishes with Congress.

The Gallup poll has been repeated nearly every month.

The findings have given him a high of 83 percent of voter approval. His rating has never dropped below 71 percent. The latest is 78 percent. No other President has achieved this level of popularity, neither Franklin D. Roosevelt nor Dwight D. Eisenhower.

But there is an unanswered question among the professionals in both parties. The question is whether Mr. Kennedy's present popularity is deep enough to withstand future adversity of such political shock as the defeat of his bill to create an Urban Affairs Cabinet post after the President thought he had arranged a dandy political coup.

Professional polling people have been seeking the answer to this question for both Republican and Democratic groups. Their findings are remarkably uniform; they may well be arguable, but they agree substantially on one point: that the widespread doing-a-good-job rating Mr. Kennedy is receiving is not an indepth approval, and could turn out to be quite fragile.

It remains to be seen whether the President's difficulties with his Democratic Congress will adversely affect his popularity. It will depend, I suspect, on how wisely and steadfastly Mr. Kennedy exercises his own leadership. Good Presidential leadership, even when occasionally defeated in Congress, could strengthen the standing of the White House.

But when Mr. Kennedy adds to his own defeat—as in the case of the urban affairs bill—by bitter, rough, ultrapartisan tactics and appears to think such tactics are going to be brilliantly successful—these circumstances are likely to lower the President's stock more than anything else.

When the House Rules Committee, which the Democrats had reorganized last year to make sure such things didn't happen, voted to kill the urban affairs bill, the President's political advisers—and he is his own closest adviser—thought they had a parlay which would be a politician's dream. It would detour the House Rules Committee. It would force a prompt vote by Congress. It would literally compel most Republicans to vote for it whether they liked it or not.

Mr. Kennedy's tactic was: use his Reorganization Act powers to put the bill directly before Congress where it would become law unless voted down; announce that the first Secretary of Urban Affairs would be a Negro, Robert C. Weaver, Housing Administrator; keep the Democrats shouting that if the Republicans did not vote for his bill they would prove they were anti-Negro and be punished at the polls.

This strategy began to fall apart immediately. The Republicans refused to be intimidated by the administration's intrusion of the irrelevant and unfair racial issue. They had supported Weaver's confirmation as Housing Administrator.

After Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK saw it as doubtful that he could get the House to approve the Urban Affairs Department, administration Democrats tried to wrench the bill out of the Senate Government Operations Committee, which was expeditiously conducting its normal hearings. They hoped that quick Senate approval would warn the House it better act favorably. They lost. Twenty-six Democrats joined with 32 Republicans in supporting the Committee's duty to hold these hearings. Then the House decisively disapproved, 264 to 150, with a near majority of the Democrats, including many from the populous States of the North and West, voting against the White House.

I am not suggesting that a President can be totally aloof from politics. He is and should be a politician. But there are limits and proprieties and degrees. Violating them will hurt, not help, Mr. Kennedy at a time when he most needs to unite the Nation behind the whole range of crucial measures to win the cold war. I doubt that Congress is out of touch with the country.

Condition of Nation's Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, basic to the success of our national economy is the confidence in its strength. The distinguished columnist Mr. David Lawrence addressed himself to this subject in a recent issue of the Washington Evening Star and I believe his comments are worthy of very wide attention:

CONDITION OF NATION'S ECONOMY—INSTILLING CONFIDENCE IN BUSINESSMEN TO INVEST CALLED BASIC PROBLEM

(By David Lawrence)

"Overlooking the obvious" is a common error in Government. Billions, for example, are being added to Government expense. The national debt isn't being paid off at all. It's growing bigger and bigger. Proposals are being made regularly by the Kennedy administration to give away Federal funds through various kinds of benevolence called "welfare." Little thought seems to be given to the obvious question—where is the money coming from to pay the bills and keep America solvent?

Scant attention has been paid here to the true condition of the national economy. Slight changes downward in the percentage of unemployment are emphasized even as hazy predictions are made about the growth of national output. The basic problem, however, is one of confidence—how to convince American businessmen that they can go ahead and invest money in America's future without risking large losses. The talk now,

however, is of a "slowdown" in recovery. The AFL–CIO openly speaks of a "Kennedy recession."

President Kennedy is a busy man. He has too many things to do. He is occupied with summit conferences, nuclear tests, orbital flights, projects to the moon, Peace Corps activities, troubles in Laos and Vietnam, as well as continuous conversations with our own allies. Sometimes it seems as if there ought to be two Presidents of the United States—one to concentrate on foreign affairs and the other to concentrate on domestic affairs. A well-organized Cabinet is an alternative that seems to have been overlooked.

While businessmen don't like to talk about it openly, they worry about the future as they haven't worried about it since the depression days of the 1930's. They are asked to speed up their operations—to buy new plants and equipment so as to become more efficient. They face "featherbedding" and union restrictions. They are confronted with demands for a shorter and shorter workweek at the same total pay. The prospect of extortion through strikes or threats of strikes is constantly before industries, large and small.

As for investment, businessmen ask themselves whether interest rates are ever going to come down and whether these may even skyrocket upward in the next few years. They are told that the international balance of payments is the cause of the trouble. Yet exports are high. They read that the Kennedy administration intends to penalize American companies that have built plants abroad to compete with Europeans. Yet Europeans are encouraged by tariff reductions to come here to compete with American companies. Business is told by our Government to risk its money in underdeveloped countries and, in effect, to abandon or disrupt profitable operations in Europe.

Inside America, the case that business has against the administration is even more serious. Depreciation allowances have been a part of the tax structure for decades past. The rates are out of date. The administration has attempted to throw a bone to business by advocating an 8-percent credit on new capital investments in certain industries. But this is trifling and, because it is limited in scope, it doesn't touch the fundamental ailment—the handicap of outworn depreciation rates as a whole.

Temporary stimulants are not a cure. A special investment credit, such as is being proposed, which may be granted 1 year can be withdrawn the next. There is no feeling of permanence about it, such as would follow a comprehensive revision of depreciation rates. The administration vaguely promises something like this, but doesn't seem to get it going. Here, too, there is nothing on which businessmen can make plans for even 5 years ahead.

There are plenty of people who have urged the administration to give more thought to the fundamental ills of the national economy and to be less concerned with temporary measures and gimmicks.

Practically nothing, for example, has been done to encourage the creation of jobs for the millions of youngsters coming out of school every year.

Uncertainty is the opposite of confidence. Uncertainty permeates the national economy today, particularly the enterprising men of business who would be spending money to create jobs if they could see a profit.

America boasts about its profit system, but few people call it by its right name—it's really a profit-and-loss system. That's why American business is worried. It sees today little chance for a fair margin of profit, and sees plenty of chance to incur a substantial margin of loss.

If the administration is to preserve the free-enterprise system and to spare America the kind of socialism which Nikita Khrushchev has been predicting as likely to be embraced by our grandchildren, the Kennedy administration must discover the obvious—which is that, unless the Government begins to concentrate soon on how to make business succeed, the Soviet prophecy could come true much earlier.

The Opinion Poll Results, 22d Congressional District of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, my constituents in the 22d Congressional District of Ohio have again given me their most generous cooperation in replying to my 1962 opinion poll on major issues facing the 2d session of the 87th Congress.

It is heartening to know that so many thousands of voters in the district are vitally interested and deeply concerned about Federal legislative matters. I would like to thank each person who replied to this questionnaire, and especially those who sent me detailed comments on their position on the various issues.

Over 15,000 replies were received within the 2-week period following the mailing of this poll. By far, the largest number of replies contained comments of constituents who were greatly concerned over increased Federal spending, and the recent attempts to centralize additional powers in the Federal Government in Washington, D.C. This feeling was strongly indicated by the overwhelming disapproval on the question of creating a new Department of Urban Affairs. Even though the 22d Congressional District is a 100-percent urban area, containing five wards of the city of Cleveland, and adjacent suburban cities, 61 percent of the replies disapproved of this new Department, while only 30 percent approved, with 9 percent having no opinion. It is interesting to note that the tabulation on this question was made on the day the House of Representatives, by an equally overwhelming vote, rejected this proposal.

With the great divergence of opinion, and the wide discussion on the value of a national civil defense fallout shelter program, it was especially enlightening to know that 72 percent of the replies received disapproved of the Federal Civil Defense shelter incentive program, with 18 percent in favor of the program, and 10 percent having no opinion. The consensus of opinion appeared in favor maintaining the strongest possible military deterrent forces, with increased emphasis being placed on efforts to work toward controlled disarmament and a just peace.

In the highly diversified industrial area that is Greater Cleveland, the residents of the 22d Congressional District approved the liberalizing of American trade policy through negotiated reciprocal trade agreements by a majority of over 4 to 1, with a 68 percent favorable vote, 15 percent negative, and 17 percent no opinion. Although the short range effects on local employment by a reduction of tariffs on foreign imports is not known, the heavy favorable vote for a liberalized trade policy indicates that public opinion looks with expectation to the overall positive effects of increased trade with our free world allies.

The decided shift of opinion away from Federal assistance to our public schools is very clearly shown in the comparison of replies to a substantially similar question on this subject during the past 6 years:

Year	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
1957	76.02	21.0	3.0
1958	63.7	30.9	5.4
1959	61.4	33.2	5.4
1960	54.9	38.5	6.6
1961	46.0	46.0	8.0
1962	39.9	55.3	4.8

The replies received this year seem to indicate that opposition to Federal aid to public schools falls primarily in three categories: First, those who believe education is a local and State responsibility, and fear Federal encroachment in this field; second, those who oppose Federal aid to public schools unless similar Federal aid is also given private schools; and third, those who are opposed to any further increase in nondefense Federal spending.

Every person is deeply interested in health care of our senior citizens. A 55.3 percent majority vote in favor of hospital care for the aged under the social security system was registered in this poll, with 40 percent opposing a Federal hospital insurance program, and 4.6 percent having no opinion. Again it is interesting to note the trend of public thought during the past 3 years on this much discussed question:

Year	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
1960	60.3	32.0	7.7
1961	58.0	35.0	7.0
1962	55.3	40.1	4.6

The 8-percent increase during the past 2 years in opposition to hospital coverage under the social security system stems primarily from, first, our young citizens who object to paying increased social security taxes for a period up to 45 years for this program; second, individuals who are not covered by social security, and third, those who believe private insurance programs can be developed to meet the health needs of our aged.

A solution to the problem of rising hospital costs must be found to prevent retired persons on limited incomes from dissipating their entire savings when illness strikes. If a reasonable arrangement is not soon forthcoming through hospital and medical associations, and private insurance programs, it is possible that the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives may approve pending legislation to bring to the floor of the Congress the question of hospital and nursing home coverage under the social security system.

The results of the poll follow:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
Do you favor—			
1. Hospital care for the aged to be financed through an increase in social security taxes?	55.3	40.1	4.6
2. Federal aid to the States for a 3-year period at an estimated cost of $2,100,000,000, to be used by the States for public school construction and/or teachers' salaries?	39.9	55.3	4.8
3. The proposal for 212,500 4-year federally financed scholarships for college students?	48.3	43.9	7.8
4. Federal financial assistance at a cost of $240,000,000 for a 3-year period to train young people who drop out of school and lack the ability to obtain employment?	39.9	52.3	7.8
5. Creation of a U.S. Department of Urban Affairs and Housing to assist cities in the fields of housing, mass transportation, and other community problems?	29.9	61.4	8.7
Do you favor—Continued			
6. Withholding of income tax on dividends and interest?	33.9	56.6	9.5
7. Liberalizing American trade policy through tariff reductions negotiated by reciprocal trade agreements?	68.0	15.0	17.0
8. A federally financed program to retrain unemployed workers estimated to cost $100,000,000 annually?	45.9	45.0	9.1
9. Purchase by the United States of $100,000,000 of United Nations bonds for financing special U.N. operations for the next 18 months?	39.0	48.7	12.3
10. Appropriation of $460,000,000 for the administration's Federal civil defense shelter incentive program to assist States and communities in building public fallout shelters?	18.2	72.3	9.5

Trade, Taxes, and Tariffs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, following my remarks, an article entitled "Trade, Taxes, and Tariffs," written by John W. Douglas, president of Republic Foil, Inc., of Danbury, Conn., and vice president of the Manufacturers Association of Connecticut.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRADE, TAXES, AND TARIFFS

(By John W. Douglas)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—In this timely article, Mr. Douglas pulls together facts gained from a study he made in 1960 of European tax procedures, programs, and policies, to highlight the many-sided dilemma of the American economy in meeting foreign competition at home and abroad. He also suggests some specific guidelines leading toward its successful solution. In addition to facts gleaned from his recent European survey, Mr. Douglas speaks from a rich background of experience in government and in trade association planning on behalf of the Aluminum Association, of which he is now president. With so much at stake concerning trade, tariffs, and taxes during the present session of Congress, the reading of this article should serve to stimulate some meaningful action to promote the adoption of a sane trade program.)

The United States is rapidly awakening to the fact that we are involved in a struggle for survival in the world marketplace and may be waging a losing battle. A healthy free world economy demands steadily increasing international trade which, in turn, depends upon a proper balance between imports and exports. In recent years the scales have progressively tilted toward an unfavorable balance in U.S. international trade. This condition has very serious implications. Government, industry, and labor are attempting to assess the causes and to propose remedies which will reverse the trend and strengthen the economy of the free world. As might be expected, this has led to violent and often bitter controversy.

Recently, President Kennedy announced his so-called bold new plan to replace the Reciprocal Trade Act with a new law granting him wide discretion to reduce U.S. tariffs across the board. This plan has strong proponents. It is also meeting with vigorous opposition, both from those who would obviously be injured and by large and thoughtful groups who believe that the implications of the program remain unexplored and that it will be used as a tool of the State Department. The writer counts himself among the latter group. Regardless of self-interest or political philosophy, a satisfactory solution to the problem is all important to our future and to that of the free world. To achieve this objective the facts must be faced. Our dirty linen must be aired and politics must give way to statesmanlike thinking at both the domestic and international levels.

COST ELEMENTS

The purpose of this article is to assess the effects of taxation upon the pricing of products. The sale of any product—whether in the domestic or export market—depends upon quality, service and price. Today, with certain exceptions, foreign producers can match the quality of U.S. manufactured goods and can offer satisfactory service. Consequently, price has become the controlling factor in sale of these goods.

The major items which constitue the cost and ultimately the sales price of a manufactured product are raw materials, machinery and equipment, productivity, general and administrative charges, labor, and taxes.

It is reasonable to assume that foreign raw materials are comparable in cost to those available to domestic producers. Foreign machinery and equipment is, in most instances, cheaper and equally as efficient and productive as their U.S. counterparts. General and administrative costs are usually below our charges.

A great deal has been written relative to the numerous advantages derived by foreign competitors through use of cheap skilled labor. This is, of course, the key factor in costs since among the industrialized nations of the world, wages and salaries typically account for between one-half and two-thirds of all payments for productive activity. Unless remedied, a glaring gap in this area can by itself contribute heavily toward the destruction of our economy.

TAXES: TROUBLEMAKER IN AMERICAN TRADE ARSENAL

The last, but certainly not the least, important item in the cost and ultimate sales price of manufactured products is taxation. The primary objective of a corporation is to seek the highest reasonable net profit after taxes. In the United States, taxes absorb more than 50 percent of the gross profits of manufacturing corporations. Consequently, it is self-evident that the Federal Government supplemented by State and local governments hold the key to pricing. Even more important, they hold the key to our future economic strength and growth, for under the free enterprise system, the source of money for expansion must be risk capital, whether in the form of plowed back earnings, borrowing, or new investment, and the availability of risk capital depends upon net profits or potential earnings after taxes.

UNITED STATES AND EUROPEAN TAXES COMPARED

The writer in 1960 conducted a study of European tax procedures, programs, and policies. Needless to say, the taxing methods applied in various countries vary widely and are unusually complex. However, the study did uncover certain basic facts which when compared with U.S. tax methods are enlightening.

Table No. 1 indicates tax revenue per populaion of 11 leading European nations for the year 1958 translated into dollars along with a series of comparative figures relating to taxation. These figures are given in comparison with U.S. figures of 1958 and also 1959 since the former was a year of recession in this country and 1959 figures can be considered as more normal ones; 1958 statistics were the latest ones available when the table was compiled. However, the writer understands that the comparisons remain relatively accurate when applied in 1961. The statistics are subject to some variation due to fluctuation in exchange rates and inability to make complete verifications. They do, however, provide a good comparison between the major sources of income in industrial Europe and the United States.

TABLE 1.—*Approximations of taxes, 1958*

Country	Taxable revenue population	Percent of gross national product					Percent of taxes				Percent of central government revenue (total revenue)
		Taxes	Corporation taxes	Personal taxes	Indirect taxes	Social insurance taxes	Corporation taxes	Personal taxes	Indirect taxes	Social insurance taxes	
Austria	$220	32.2	2.3	9.3	13.5	7.1	7.2	27.8	43.0	22.0	75.0
Belgium	280	22.5	2.1	4.8	9.3	6.3	9.2	21.3	41.5	28.0	----------
Britain	350	29.9	4.3	8.5	13.3	3.8	14.5	28.2	44.6	12.7	90.5
Denmark	260	24.5	1.3	10.6	11.3	1.3	5.5	43.4	45.6	5.5	----------
France	300	31.9	2.2	3.6	16.9	9.2	7.0	11.3	53.0	28.7	91.0
Germany	310	33.9	3.3	6.0	14.6	10.0	9.7	17.7	43.2	29.4	----------
Italy	150	28.3	5.9		13.6	8.8	21.0		47.8	31.2	90.8
Netherlands	260	28.6	2.7	9.0	9.5	7.4	9.6	31.3	33.1	26.0	98.4
Norway	350	32.0	16.0		13.4	2.6	50.0		41.9	8.1	70.6
Sweden	410	30.6	3.5	14.2	10.1	2.8	11.3	46.6	33.0	9.1	75.2
Switzerland	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
United States	680	25.9	4.1	9.4	9.0	3.4	15.8	36.1	34.9	13.2	70.5
United States, 1959	----------	26.9	4.8	9.7	8.7	3.7	18.0	35.4	32.7	13.9	----------

The major difference between European and U.S. taxes lies in the source and extent of distribution among taxpayers. U.S. corporation taxes represent the highest percentage of GNP of any country, except Britain which is approximately the same percentage, and with two exceptions, U.S. personal income taxes are higher in proportion to GNP than in Europe. It is safe to say that U.S. corporations and individuals in the middle- and high-income brackets pay heavier taxes than their European counterparts.

It is in the areas of social insurance and indirect taxes where European burdens are far heavier than those of the United States. It is difficult to accurately classify these two categories. However, social insurance taxes are generally considered to include unemployment, accident, sickness, vacation, retirement, and other benefits usually deducted from payrolls, while a large portion of indirect taxes fall on transfer of semifabricated goods and sales taxes levied on finished products.

TAX EXEMPTION: KEY TO EUROPE'S UNDERSELL SUCCESS

A study of the application of European social insurance and indirect taxes to exports unlocks an important secret of Europe's success in underselling American products domestically. This secret is simple—namely, partial or total exemption of these taxes on exports. Since these tax classifications make up a very substantial portion of European tax burdens, their forgiveness in whole or in part permits important reductions in the price of products sold in the United States and other foreign countries.

A study of the tax laws of industrial European nations will reveal that export transactions are exempt from indirect taxes in Austria. In Belgium, exports and the purchase of goods for export are tax free. In Britain, a purchase tax is levied on the sale of many products at the last wholesale transaction. However, exports are exempt. The heaviest tax in France is the value-added tax. Yet, export transactions are free of this tax and exporters receive full tax credit for taxes paid on earlier transactions. German manufacturers of exported goods receive a modest refund on the sales prices of these goods and exporters are forgiven the sales tax. In Italy, the transaction tax which applies to all sales by manufacturers is exempted on export transactions and on the purchases of goods to be exported.

Similar subsidies to encourage exports are applied by virtually every European industrial nation. It does not take a mathematician to calculate that U.S. producers could reduce prices sharply without reducing their profit margins if granted similar tax reductions. Unfortunately, however, our Government appears to have closed its eyes to export subsidies in negotiating reciprocal tariffs with foreign countries.

REMOVAL OF UNEQUAL SUBSIDIES NECESSARY TO AMERICAN SUCCESS

The healthy foreign tax climate does not stop with the encouragement of exports. It is designed to stimulate the investment of risk capital, to encourage the purchase of new equipment and to promote foreign earnings. European governments are applying with remarkable success the formula which built the United States into the greatest industrial nation on earth, namely a policy designed to encourage and stimulate growth of capital and wealth through free enterprise.

We can readily learn some lessons from our former pupils. First of all, we cannot compete in our own or in foreign markets against subsidized goods. These subsidies often make mockery of our present tariffs, much less proposed reduced ones. They become doubly distasteful when we consider that our money in the form of foreign aid has made most of these tax benefits possible. International tariff negotiations must aim at elimination of unequal government subsidies if we are to regain our competitive position in world trade.

TAX REFORM—A MUST

Secondly, the time for reform of our archaic tax structure is long past due. We can no longer afford to play politics with taxation. Immediate reform in the field of depreciation allowances is a must. Excessive individual and corporate tax rates are stifling investment and growth. Table No. 2 illustrates why the Herlong-Baker bill, designed to stimulate economic growth through an orderly reduction of corporate and personal taxes, should be given very serious consideration during the coming session of Congress.

TABLE 2.—*Tax growth, 1940–60*

Year	Population	Tax collection	Tax per capita
1940	132,122,000	$5,340,452,347	$40.42
1950	151,683,000	$38,957,131,768	$256.83
1960	180,529,000	$91,774,802,803	$508.37
Percent increase in 20 years	36.6	1,618.4	1,157.7

Thirdly, spending for all programs except those essential to military strength and security must be curbed and our allies must be required to carry a fair burden of free world commitments.

COOPERATION—A REQUISITE FOR THE FREE WORLD, AMERICAN BUSINESS AND LABOR

The business climate requires improvement. The Government would do well to offer encouragement and vigorous support in place of wrapping industry in a cloud of suspicion. Business, too, must become more resourceful in the fulfillment of its obligations. There are clear signs that the Department of Commerce is anxious and willing to form a closer bond with industry, and indications of imaginative thinking on the part of business are found in the recently announced program sponsored by a large segment of the aluminum industry, including the aluminum association and entitled, "Increasing Free World Aluminum Consumption." The plan calls for cooperation with free world nations in achieving an orderly export-import pattern, under which principal importing countries would insure access to their markets of specific quantities of imported aluminum products.

A built-in flexible provision would enable such exporting countries to participate in the growth factor so characteristic of the U.S. aluminum industry. As a result, while U.S. aluminum consumption rises, imports would be able to increase even more sharply.

Finally, management and labor must abandon their traditional rivalries and form a working partnership, for labor's stake in world trade is tremendous and only through a united front can we successfully compete.

In summary, the power to tax is the power to destroy. It can also be the power to create. Let us make sure that it is used for the purpose for which it was designed.

"It Needs To Be Stopped," Says Texas Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, last week I called to the attention of the House a mass mailing by the Russian Embassy here in Washington of packets of Communist propaganda to libraries throughout the country.

The disgusting thing about this situation is that we are paying a good share of the cost of distributing this material through the mails. The House responded to public reaction to such situations by adopting language in the postal rate bill to end the free and subsidized delivery of such material by the Post Office.

Based on reaction I have received since the House passed the postal rate bill, the vast majority of Americans wholeheartedly support this ban on free and subsidized delivery. They are awaiting the day when this provision becomes law.

A fine editorial expressing one small-town editor's feelings about this recent mailing by the Russian Embassy has come to my attention, and I want to share it with you. It is from the Crockett, Tex., Houston County Courier of February 8.

IT NEEDS TO BE STOPPED

Crockett is a small country town.

In terms of size, it might be said to dwindle to a speck in the eyes of the Nation, and fade away completely in the eyes of the world.

But Crockett is big enough for the Communists to have an interest in it, and they are actively at work in spreading their Communist propaganda here.

A few days ago, a brown paper envelope was received in the city's post office box. The mailing label on it read:

"City of Crockett Library, Crockett, Tex. PLU"

The return address on the envelope read:

"Press Department, Embassy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Washington, D.C."

Inside the envelope were three paperback books, two with covers printed in red, white, and blue, and featuring the picture of Khrushchev, and the third printed in brown and green without pictures.

The red, white and blue books were a two-volume set. Volume 1 was titled "Khrushchev Reports to the 22d Congress of the CPSU" and volume II was titled "Khrushchev on the Future."

The third book was titled "Program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union," with a paragraph on the cover explaining that this is "A book that belongs with the most important documents of world communism. It presents an analysis of world trends and a sweeping 20-year program for the transition from socialism to communism in the U.S.S.R. A basic source for everyone who wants to understand the thinking of the Soviet Communist Party."

The books were published by "Crosscurrents Press, 156 Fifth Ave., New York, N.Y.," a firm we cannot find listed in our Bowker's directory.

Some statements contained in just one of the books:

"Capitalism is the road of suffering for the people * * *." Socialism is the road to freedom and happiness for the people * * *. U.S. imperialism is the chief bulwark of modern colonialism * * *. The Soviet Union has consistently pursued, and will continue to pursue, the policy of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems * * *. Communism—The Bright Future of All Mankind * * *" and on and on with the same line.

Crockett Postmaster Henry Reinicke showed us a memo from J. Edward Day, postmaster general, recognizing that Communist propaganda from outside the United States is being mailed to persons in this country. He advises that it be marked "refused" and returned to the post office.

But these books were mailed in Washington, D.C., under bulk mailing permit No. 41462, and the envelope containing them had the notation: "Postmaster: This parcel may be opened for postal inspection if necessary."

Each of the books bore a printed price of 50 cents. But there was no cost to the city library for the books. In fact, they were not even asked for. They were unsolicited—mailed by the Soviet Embassy with the obvious hope they would be placed on the library shelves, read and "swallowed."

The Communist Party has been outlawed in the United States. Why, then, is the mailing of such material permitted? If the party is illegal, it should be prevented from spreading its propaganda and seeking converts.

It needs to be stopped. Write your congressman.

Jurisdiction Over State Lands Used for Federal Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. MOSS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, recently the Phoenix (Ariz.) Gazette carried an article by Jay Brashear, staff writer, on the importance to Arizona of passing S. 154, the bill sponsored by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and of which I am a cosponsor, to adjust legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over certain State lands used for Federal purposes.

You will remember that a similar bill was passed by the Senate last session but that it died in the House. It will evidently be impossible to clear up the status of more than 281,000 acres in Arizona, which are not a "legal no-man's land" until this or similar legislation is enacted.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article from the Phoenix Gazette printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATION PUSHED TO UNTANGLE LEGAL NO MAN'S LAND IN ARIZONA

(By Jay Brashear)

The U.S. Justice Department is pushing hard for pending legislation that would provide for some legal jurisdiction, either State or Federal, on 281,000 acres now making up a legal no man's land in Arizona.

This word was brought to Phoenix by Edward Lazowska, of Washington, a Department of Justice attorney attending the Western Regional Conference of the National Association of County Officials in Hotel Westward Ho.

Lazowska said the last inventory of Arizona indicates that there were 733,000 acres of Federal land where Washington has legal jurisdiction and State laws do not apply, 31,399,888 acres of Federal land where State law does apply.

"But on 281,065 acres in Arizona, no one can be certain whether State or Federal laws apply because it is not indicated anywhere in legal records," he said.

"Imagine the legal problems that could result if a serious crime were committed on any of that land. Would the State of Arizona or Federal Government prosecute the accused? Could either court make a conviction stick if it wasn't sure it had legal jurisdiction?" Lazowska pondered.

He said that one convicted murderer went free in Montana solely because of confusion over whether the Federal or State Government had jurisdiction over the land where the crime was committed.

Just as serious a problem is the one affecting any residents on the 733,000 acres of land in Arizona where the Federal Government has total jurisdiction.

Lazowska said any residents on these lands might be deprived of the right to vote, to send their children to public schools, or to exercise other rights that normally go to residents of a State.

"They're not living in Arizona, but in Federal enclaves in this State," Lazowska said.

"And this is not a problem only in Arizona. The Federal Government has jurisdiction over 8 million acres of land, 4 million of it in the 11 Western States," he added.

The Washington attorney said that, under existing law, the Federal Government cannot return jurisdiction to the States even if it wants to and the States are willing to accept it.

A bill now pending in the Senate would permit Federal Government to negotiate with the States, returning jurisdiction over much of this land where it isn't necessary to Federal operations and the States are willing to accept the responsibility.

The bill has been backed by most State and county government organizations, and by Attorney General Robert Kennedy. Opposition comes from some sources who fear that removal of Federal jurisdiction would result in an extension of racial segregation, according to Washington newspapers.

Television Broadcasting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today dealing with the very important subject of television broadcasting. This bill is a companion bill to H.R. 9267 and other bills introduced during the first session and earlier in this session.

The purpose of this bill is to make it possible for there to be a further development of commercial and educational television on the 70 UHF channels that are now allocated to television, at the same time making sure that the existing television service to the American public now provided by commercial and educational stations operating on the 12 VHF channels is not impaired.

This bill would achieve these two purposes in the following way: On the one hand, it would empower the Federal Communications Commission to require that any television receiver shipped in interstate and foreign commerce must be constructed so that it will be able to receive all of the present 12 VHF channels now allocated to television and all of the 70 UHF channels now allocated to television.

On the other hand, it would prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from deleting any VHF channel assignment from any community in the country, or from all communities in the country, when such action would serve the purpose of, or have the effect of, making all television stations in any community operate on UHF channels.

This bill would limit the FCC's power over television receivers to that necessary to assure the production of all-channel sets, would make it perfectly clear that the term "all-channel" means the present 12 VHF channels and the present 70 UHF channels, and most important of all, would prohibit the FCC from using all-channel receiver legislation as a means of shifting VHF television to UHF, either in individual areas or in a wholesale nationwide shift.

Last year, the FCC issued a notice in which it stressed the importance of all-channel receiver legislation in connection with its handling of television al-

locations matters. But the thrust of that notice was not toward providing for the further development of UHF television in connection with and alongside of VHF television. Rather, the notice contemplates doing away with VHF substantially, if not indeed completely. Thus, in the notice the Commission announced that it was starting proceedings that day to take VHF channels out of eight communities, that it was planning to start similar proceedings in an undisclosed number of other communities, and that ultimately it visualized a television system in which all stations, or almost all stations, would operate on UHF channels.

It is clear that the continuation of this policy by the FCC will lead to the complete elimination of VHF stations. UHF stations simply cannot do the job in providing the service to millions of viewers who are outside of heavily populated centers.

We do need to better utilize the UHF channels. If all television sets are built so they can receive both VHF and UHF stations, as my bill provides, the total television service can be increased rather than curtailed.

Although no VHF station in my State of Indiana is now threatened by any of the disclosed specific proposals of the FCC for shift to UHF, I am just as troubled by the FCC's proposal as if the situation were otherwise. Whether or not my State is directly affected by immediate proposals for shift to UHF, it is apparent that if this philosophy once gains a foothold it will not be long before all the States and all the people will be suffering from it.

Indiana is now served by television stations which operate on UHF channels. Both UHF stations and VHF stations provide a very valuable service to the public. But neither VHF channels alone nor UHF channels alone could possibly do the job that is being done, and in the future can only be done, not only in Indiana but across the Nation, by stations operating in both frequency bands. Although UHF stations can provide a worthwhile service within the limits of their inherent capabilities, they simply cannot cover the wide areas that can be covered by stations operating on VHF channels. If a VHF stations is shifted to a UHF channel, a great number of people will lose an existing television service and many of these people will lose their only television service. For the most part, these people would be located in rural areas, on farms, in small and medium-size communities, and in outlying sections. They now get television service because VHF stations in larger but distant communities are able to bring the service to them. If this VHF service were taken away, the only way they could get service back would be to build local stations. We all know, however, that television stations take a lot more money to build and operate than do radio stations. It just does not make economic sense to assume that these small and remote and lightly populated areas are going to be able to support their own local stations in order to replace the lost VHF service. Therefore, if we are to make sure that the public does not suffer loss of television service, we must make sure that VHF stations are not shifted to UHF.

If viewers can choose freely between VHF and UHF stations, then it will be possible for such stations to operate in the sme areas. At the same time, those viewers in outlying areas will still be able to receive the stronger VHF programs and will not be denied service as the FCC policy would eventually bring about.

Because television is so very important to the people of this country, and because th FCC's proposals and contemplated action threaten to destroy and to impair this television service, I believe it is essential for the Congress to state clearly that the public interest would not be served by an all-UHF system, but would be served under which the present 12 VHF channels and the present 70 UHF channels operated alongside each other. This bill would make this clear, while at the same time opening the way toward further development of our television system in this direction.

Conservation of Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, last Thursday, President Kennedy sent to the Congress a message on natural resources which, I believe, will stand as a landmark in the conservation movement. The message covered a full range of conservation problems—from acquisition of additional park lands to the improvement of our range, soil, and watershed resources.

The message contained some new proposals for financing resource programs and for coordinating various resource activities. Some of these proposals will require legislation, and I know the Congress will give careful study to such legislation as may be submitted. The newspapers are aware of the significance of this message.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Washington Post and Times-Herald of March 3, one from the New York Times of that same date, and one from the New York Herald Tribune of March 4 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 3, 1962]

THE GREAT OUT OF DOORS

President Kennedy's message on conservation is an impressive outline of policy in a very important field. Interest will doubtless be centered in his proposals for broadening the Nation's recreation facilities. The chief thrust of the message comes from its appeal for new national parks to be financed by a self-liquidating arrangement.

Taking note of increased leisure and greater demands for open-air recreation, the administration is moving to provide the facilities before it is too late. The 341 million visits to Federal land and water areas in 1960 are expected to double by 1970 and to increase fivefold by the year 2000. To meet this vast demand, the President would authorize advances from the Treasury up to $500 million as a "land conservation fund." Part of the fund would be used to purchase land for the Point Reyes National Seashore in California, the Great Basin National Park in Nevada, the Ozark Rivers National Monument in Missouri, Sagamore Hill National Historic Site in New York, Canyon Lands National Park in Utah, Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in Michigan, Prairie National Park in Kansas, Padre Island National Seashore in Texas, and the National Lakeshore Area in northern Indiana.

The President offers a practical method of replenishing the "Land Conservation Fund" through admission and user fees, sale of surplus Federal nonmilitary lands, and so forth. It is reasonable to ask the people who take advantage of the national parks system to pay the cost of its maintenance and extension. But the Government cannot wait until capital accumulates from these sources to finance its acquisition of new park lands. In many instances delay would greatly increase the cost of the land or render it unsuitable for recreation purposes. By creating the proposed fund Congress can serve the interests both of economy and of conservation.

Suggested also is a program of matching grants to encourage the States to provide more outdoor recreation. Surplus Federal lands would be turned over to the States for recreational use, where desirable, under a proposed amendment to the Federal Surplus Property Disposal Act. The President also asks once more for a study of the country's ocean, lake, and river shorelines and for enactment of the wilderness bill.

In line with the recent report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, the President will create an Outdoor Recreation Advisory Council and a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. Viewed as a whole, these projects are a formidable undertaking. It is a pity, however, that the White House did not include another recreational project of great importance to this area—the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal Historical Park.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 3, 1962]

THE CONSERVATION MESSAGE

President Kennedy's message to Congress on conservation showed, as did his similar message a year ago, a fine grasp of the interrelationship of our natural resources.

There is an inherent unity in the problems affecting our lands and waters, the minerals beneath them and the living things they support. To employ these resources wisely, to enjoy them fully and to protect them for future generations requires a national policy of coordinated planning and balanced use. This is the policy of the Kennedy Administration sparked by a Secretary of the Interior who really believes in conservation and understands it, Stewart L. Udall.

In the Presidential message, there was particular emphasis on outdoor needs—park, seashores, wilderness areas, wildlife—in line with the recent report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, of which Laurance Rockefeller was chairman. To pay for the acquisition of recreational lands while they are available the President asked Congress to provide $500 million in Treasury advances over 8 years as a land conservation fund, to be repaid from user fees and other special sources of revenue. Every day's delay means the loss of needed lands, and higher prices for the lands acquired. In addition to specifically naming several park and recreation areas that have

already been studied, the President also called for final action on the wilderness bill, a key preservation measure that will not cost a cent because all the affected areas are now in Federal ownership.

While setting aside new parks, stepping up wildlife programs and preserving wilderness to provide the nonmaterial aspects of a decent human environment, we cannot neglect the lands and resources that produce the food and fiber for material living and the raw stuff and power for industry. Indeed, the one requires the other, and Mr. Kennedy stressed the opportunities to build the productivity of forests, to harness the rivers more effectively, and to develop new techniques for utilizing minerals more efficiently.

While comprehensive in scope, the President's message fell seriously short in its recommendations for coordination of the divergent, often conflicting, Federal agencies and programs dealing with lands and resources. The proposed Bureau of Outdoor Recreation within the Department of Interior could not conceivably be an effective agency to coordinate recreation policies in Defense and Agriculture. Nor is it likely that a council of Cabinet officers will coordinate river-basin planning any better than the Cabinet itself has been able to do it. Coordination equal to the task could be achieved if, as we have long advocated, the natural resource agencies were to be given unified direction under a Department of Natural Resources; but the President, like the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, has shied away from this politically explosive but fundamental reform.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 4, 1962]

FOR THE LAND, AND FOR OURSELVES

President Kennedy's conservation and recreation message to Congress goes far beyond its specific recommendations to define a broad policy for using the riches of our land wisely and profitably. It is an arresting and farseeing document.

For decades the resources of this country were heedlessly consumed because there was always more black soil, more coal, more forests, more of everything. But now we are beginning to run out of land. The population is increasing rapidly and the cities and suburbs along with it. New factories, new laboratories, new airports and cities eat up more space, and the country and the fresh air disappear.

There are two dangers in this development. One is the depletion of the land itself, of minerals and water resources. The other is the disappearance of natural beauty and the citizen's contact with it.

The second danger is Mr. Kennedy's immediate concern. He proposes increase in national parkland and outdoor recreation facilities; the disposal of surplus Federal land to the States and cities for parks; the acquisition of public shorelines; the preservation of the few remaining tracts of true wilderness; the coordination of all the Federal agencies involved; and the establishment of a land conservation fund to pay for these things.

To help finance the fund, those who enjoy the outdoors would be asked to pay moderate fees. Other money would come from unclaimed motorboat gasoline tax refunds and charges on boats using Federal waterways. To start the program going, the President suggests a $500 million advance from the Treasury to be repaid over the years as the fund's regular revenues accrue.

As for the land itself, his goals are necessarily longer term, just as they are wider. They include the conservation of the soil on watershed and range; the management of minerals and the protection of mineral industries; planning for future power requirements; a comprehensive plan for timber resources, both in small and big forests; and the promotion of various research programs in fields such as oceanography and sports fisheries.

This is a very big order, and obviously much of it will remain in the domain of the hopeful for the present. But the President not only sees that this kind of planning needs to be done, but that it is the right time to propose it.

The public at large has become conscious of—indeed, it has begun to feel guilty about—the threat to what it has aways taken for granted as well as its responsibility to the future. Where is the man today who will deride that responsibility or dismiss that threat? He no longer exists.

Policy Statement of Missouri Republican State Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the middle of last month, the Republican State Committee of the State of Missouri met in St. Louis. One part of the activities of this group was the adoption of a statement of policy by the State committee. The statement was drafted by the committee's policy committee and accepted unanimously by both of that group and the State committee itself. Because of the scope of this statement and the importance of its message, I am placing it in the Appendix of the RECORD at this point:

POLICY STATEMENT OF THE REPUBLICAN STATE COMMITTEE OF MISSOURI

Missouri Republicans believe that they have an obligation to the people of Missouri to provide a strong two party system in the interest of better government.

In order to accomplish these ends, we must and will do our best to provide good candidates for the various local, county, State, and Federal offices.

We also must bring out clearly the issues which distinguish Republicans from Democrats. In seeking to accomplish this purpose, however, we must ask the people to realize that the Democratic Party has controlled the executive branch of the Federal Government 22 out of the past 30 years, and the Congress in both Houses 26 out of the past 30 years. At the State level, the Democrats have controlled the governorship 26 out of 30 years and all State offices 30 out of 30 years, the State senate 26 out of 30 years, and the State house 22 out of the past 30 years. At the city, county, and local level, they have had a similar predominance.

Accordingly, the primary consideration in determining what the two political parties stand for is to consider what the Democratic Party has stood for at the Federal, State, and local level. The Republican Party, to a large degree, has been relegated to the position of the loyal opposition. It has had little opportunity to demonstrate to the people what it can do. When it has had this chance the record has been a good one. One thing certain the people can rely upon is that it is their initiative and their own institutions which have kept the country moving forward, not any political party or any government in Washington. The grass did not grow in the streets under either President Eisenhower or Governor Donnell. We believe we have a dynamic economy progressing rapidly, not a tired, sluggish economy going nowhere, as the Democratic leaders have described it.

The first point that the Republican Party desires to make is that it is truly a political party. Although there are differences of opinion among Republicans, these differences can and are resolved without the sacrifice of any basic principles, because there is agreement upon basic principles. The Democratic Party is composed of different elements whose views are so divergent that it cannot reach a decision which does not require one or more of the elements to sacrifice their basic principles. The Democratic Party has this weakness within its warring ranks, and its decisions are frequently no more than political deals devoid of principle. This aspect of a coalition for political power as opposed to a true political party lies at the base of a great deal of the confusion in the minds of the people as to what the two political parties stand for. The Democratic Party, which has dominated the political scene, actually stands against the very things it stands for. Accordingly, on almost every issue the stand taken by the Republican Party is both supported and opposed by some element of the Democratic Party.

The Republican Party stands for constitutional government and government by law, duly enacted according to properly established legislative procedures, and not by men. The dominant element of the Democratic Party at the Federal level is in basic disagreement.

The Republican Party stands for representative government and the importance of maintaining strong constructive legislative bodies of the Federal, State and local governments. The dominant element of the Democratic Party at the Federal level is in basic disagreement. It seeks to transfer even greater powers from the Congress to the Presidency.

The Republican Party stands for a proper balance between the powers of the Federal Government and State and local governments, which means in these times a greater, not a less, emphasis on the powers of State and local government. The dominant element of the Democratic Party at the Federal level is in basic disagreement. It seeks to enlarge further the Federal Government at the expense of the State and local governments. The Democratic Party, where it is in control at the State and local level, follows this philosophy of federalism. It defaults on its State and local responsibilities and runs to Washington, D.C., to give its responsibility in return for Federal handouts. This is true of the Democratic Party in the State of Missouri, although it sometimes takes on the aspects of the Democratic Party in the deep South where States' and local rights become a banner, not so the States and local governments can act, but so that they can prevent action. The net result is the same. Democratic State and local governmental authorities fail to meet their responsibilities, which enables their Democratic colleagues at the Federal level to argue that the people must look to a bigger Federal Government to make up for this default.

The Republican Party stands for the private enterprise system in economics. It believes that government already, particularly at the Federal level, has entered into the field of economics too deeply. The dominant element in the Democratic Party in Washington seeks to carry the Federal Government further into the field of economics. It espouses a system of economic planning on the part of the Executive branch of the Federal Government. The Republican Party believes the marketplace is the most efficient and progressive mechanism for allocating our resources, not a Federal bureaucracy. To preserve the mechanism of the free marketplace, it believes in (1) Strong, antitrust laws adequately enforced.

(2) A free and representative labor movement without monopolistic powers. (3) Foreign competition resulting from fair and truly reciprocal trade agreements.

Republicans believe in a strong, free, and representative labor movement governed by its own membership, but it recognizes that the future of the labor movement depends upon union leaders properly representing the interests of the workingman in business and in industry without monopolistic power. The Republicans also recognize that there is a place for the nonunion man, for local and independent unions, as well as big labor unions. The Democratic Party is completely split on this issue. The Southern Democrats would thwart the development of a strong, free labor movement. The ADA Democrat would permit union boss dictatorship of union affairs as well as monopolistic control by national labor leaders in business and in industry. The ADA Democrats, where they recognize unionism, talk only in terms of big labor and show no concern for local and independent unions, or the nonunion worker, even though Big Labor represents the least number of our 68 million workers, approximately 15 million.

The Republican Party believes that a healthy and progressive agriculture enterprise operated by free farmers is basic to our economy or to any economy, and that a reliance on the free marketplace is essential to attain these objectives. The Democratic Party agriculture policy rejects the theory of the free marketplace and, in its stead, requires a Federal bureaucracy, the Department of Agriculture, to establish and maintain the market. This is bureaucratic dictatorship of the worst sort requiring rigid police powers, ultimately with penitentary sentences in order to carry out its edicts.

The Republican Party is opposed to further burdens being placed upon the Federal tax system which has shown over the past 30 years its inability to carry the load of the cost of the increased Federal Government. The Republican Party believes that national defense is essentially the responsibility of the Federal Government and that it must keep its revenues available primarily to meet the needs of national defense and that it can do this if we ease some of the load of nondefense expenditures. Very clearly the dominant element in the Democratic Party follows a different philosophy. In spite of lip service, its actions show it does not advocate a balanced budget. It does not propose that Federal expenditures be limited to the Federal tax receipts. It deliberately espouses a system of deficit financing which calls upon the sale of more federal bonds to make up the difference, increasing the Federal debt by printing and selling more Federal bonds, devaluing the currency over a period of time, and resulting in the imposition of the tax of inflation on our people to make up the difference between Federal expenditures and Federal revenues from ordinary tax receipts. The Republican Party is opposed to the use of inflation to balance Federal deficits. It is opposed to Federal deficits in peacetime. Inflation is the unfairest tax of all, hitting the lower income groups the most, and letting the higher income groups off scot free. The Republican Party supports a balanced budget.

The Republican Party believes that all Americans should be treated equally in political as well as in governmental matters, and decries the deliberate efforts of the Democratic Party to separate Americans by race, creed and color in their political appeals and actions. The Republican Party notes that the southern wing of the Democratic Party uses race segregation as an election issue, while the northern wing of the Democratic Party uses race integration as an election issue. Yet both segments of this unholy coalition join together every 2 years to elect a Speaker of the House of Representatives and a President pro tempore of the Senate and distribute the powerful committee chairmanships among themselves. This results in irresponsibility of the most extreme sort. For example, it makes Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, of New York City, chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House, which handles all civil rights matters, and makes Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, of Mississippi, chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, with similar jurisdiction. Congressman CELLER and Senator EASTLAND dare not appear on any public platform together except as bitter antagonists, and yet in the process of their work they are closeted constantly in House-Senate conferences working out the differences beween House and Senate bills.

The Republican Party stands consistently for all civil rights. However, it points out that property rights are human rights too and in accord with, not in conflict with, other human rights. The Democratic Party has attempted to sell the people on the idea that property rights are in conflict with human rights.

The Republican Party stands for the enforcement of the full right of franchise and deplores the action of the Democratic Party in separating this right into two parts, one the right to vote and, two, the right to have the vote counted honestly.

The southern wing of the Democratic Party stands accused of violating the first part of the right of franchise, while the northern city Democrats stand accused of violating the second part.

The Democratic Party, through chicanery, prevented the jurisdiction of the Civil Rights Commission from being extended to cover vote fraud in the last Congress. This cynical action clearly demonstrates that the coalition of northern and southern Democrats is quite aware of the full right of franchise and does not intend to see that it is enforced.

In matters of personal well-being, the Republican Party believes that the primary emphasis must be on the individual from the standpoint of his own integrity and his own self-reliance. The next emphasis, properly, is on the family, then on the religious organizations, then on the neighbors operating informally or formally through community chest type programs, then the local government, then the State government, and then, and only if necessary, the Federal Government. The Republican Party believes that government is the servant of the people, not the copartner of the people, as many Democratic spokesmen claim it to be, and as the Democratic programs seek to make it to be.

The Republicans believe that one of the major issues that faces our Nation today is international communism. It is a threat to us on three fronts: (1) militarily, (2) diplomatically, and (3) through internal subversion. The Republicans believe in the military field that we are well ahead, have always been ahead, and will support all defense programs to keep us ahead. In the area of diplomacy, economics and subversion, Republicans believe that the prime program is an affirmative one of improving and promoting our system which requires a full understanding of the merits of the representative system of government and the system of private enterprise in economics. The difficulty of improving and promoting our system lies in a lack of understanding on the part of all too many Americans of what our system of representative government and of private enterprise on economics are. The Democratic Party through its programs is actually undermining representative government under the Constitution and the system of private enterprise.

A negative policy, however, must also be followed to thwart the affirmative efforts of the Communist international movement to infiltrate our society. This effort must be conducted with care and skill so that, in the process of defeating it, we do not undermine the basic civil liberties and the institutions upon which our society is based.

The Republican Party believes that peace at any price is both immoral and unrealistic, that this is no more than an attempt to clamp the lid on a seething pot of injustice. The Republican Party cherishes the human cry for individual freedom and justice that produced our great economic and political institutions from the throes of our own Revolution. The Republican Party believes that international peace based upon economic and political freedom and justice can be established and maintained in world affairs for ourselves and for others, and stands ready to promote whatever policies and machinery will bring about that desired end.

The Republican Party believes about the world as its great President, Abraham Lincoln, did about our Nation—that it cannot exist for long half slave and half free, and that there can be no compromise with what our people believe to be the forces of evil.

On the other hand, the Democratic Party espouses a foreign policy which suggests that there can be a state of coexistence and compromise with nations and forces which are opposed to individual human freedom and justice.

The Republican Party does not believe that this progress toward freedom and justice will result in war and certainly strives to accomplish these ends without war, but the Republican Party believes that a policy based upon the thought that war must be avoided at all costs lacks courage and determination in our basic beliefs. Accordingly, the Republican Party believes that our people and our Nation should be prepared for this eventuality if this is God's will.

Finally, we wish to reemphasize the importance of a political party assuming the responsibility for political action when it has been entrusted with the power to act by the people at the polls. One of the favorite excuses offered by the Democratic Party today is to blame the Republicans for its inability to carry out the programs it claims it espouses at the local level, at the State level, and at the national level. The Democratic Party at the Federal level controls the House and Senate by topheavy majorities; it controls the Presidency. It is both irresponsible and ridiculous to blame the Republican minority for its own inability to act. The people can and should properly conclude that the inability to act on the part of the Democratic Party stems from the fact that it is not truly a party but a coalition of divergent political elements, the southern Democrats, the city machine Democrats, and the Americans for Democratic Action Democrats, seeking to go in opposite directions but held together by the desire of each of these elements for political power and the emoluments that go with political power.

We believe the paramount issue that faces America today is to clarify the policy of the United States in national and domestic affairs and in the peoples' thinking, and that as long as this three-headed political coalition for political power called the Democratic Party remains in political power this cannot be done. We, as Republicans, believe the Republican Party has a duty far beyond its own interests to provide the people with the political mechanism to bring about this change. This duty can be met by providing good and qualified candidates, clarifying the issues, and not compromising the basic principles enunciated.

Spirit Must Not Be Forgotten

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, in all of the national rejoicing over the successful orbital flight of Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., it is important that the spiritual aspects of his remarkable achievement not be overlooked. These have been pointed out dramatically and movingly by the distinguished and respected editor of U.S. News & World Report, David Lawrence, in the March 5 issue of that publication. Certainly all men of conscience share Mr. Lawrence's expressed hope that the "spiritual emotion that swept the world" as Colonel Glenn explored and returned from space can also transform a world beset with fears of self-destruction into a brotherhood of peace. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of this column by Mr. Lawrence be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAN'S FINEST HOUR

(By David Lawrence)

Millions of people throughout the United States and millions overseas joined in spontaneous prayer as they waited for the fateful word that Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., had descended safely after circling the earth three times on Tuesday, February 20, 1962.

The event was historic, not merely because of the conquest of space by an American astronaut, but because of the worldwide manifestation of an impulse that came from the hearts of millions of human beings everywhere. It was probably the most universal expression of the spiritual feeling of mankind that we have witnessed in our time.

Both television and radio brought the word to Americans, but overseas—where they had only radio contact—there was equal excitement. When in history have so many persons been united in fascinated wonder and, indeed, in such common anxiety, lest a single human being lose his life?

Any one of the multiple gadgets in the mechanism could have failed. The man, tightly positioned in the capsule—from which 't would have been impossible for him to have emerged through his own efforts—spoke often over the radio as he traveled around the earth three times in 5 hours. Somehow, there was a feeling that this part of the journey would probably come out all right, because unmanned vehicles had often accomplished it. But what of the descent?

As the people listened for word from the astronaut, they became apprehensive. They waited in grim silence. Neither the television cameras nor the recording instruments could as yet tell the world what it most wanted to know. For 45 minutes there was suspense. People asked each other: How long a time must elapse during the descent, and, after the capsule touched the water, how long before it could be recovered?

Wherever people were watching or listening—in public places, railroad stations, stores, factories, business offices and schools, as well as in countless homes—tens of millions of men and women began at that time their spontaneous prayers. They prayed that this selfless man might be spared. They prayed that the service he had endeavored to render to his country would not end in tragedy. They listened hopefully and fearfully. They gave thanks when word finally came that the capsule had been taken aboard a standby vessel of the U.S. Navy and that Colonel Glenn had actually emerged safe and sound.

In those few minutes, more people prayed together for the same objective than at any time in history. Humanity gave vent to its most noble instinct—its common sympathy and its deep faith in that Divine Power which the finite mind cannot see but can truly feel.

What a lesson this episode teaches. What a message it relays to us in this age of atomic weapons and fallout shelters.

Even Nikita Khrushchev—archfoe of democracy and the man who symbolizes atheism itself—caught some of the meaning of this strange and unprecedented occurrence. For, while the Soviets claim that two of their astronauts circled the earth last year, neither our Government officials nor the scientists of the free world have received to this day all of the scientific information so necessary to establish the proof of those claims. President Kennedy, at his press conference a few days ago, noted the continuance of this secrecy—in contrast to our open society.

But the head of the Soviet Government realized as soon as Colonel Glenn's mission was successful that there was an opportunity to bring Russia into the orbit of worldwide publicity, too. He proposed that America join with the Soviet Government to explore outer space by cooperative endeavors. Whether his suggestion will ever come to fruition is uncertain. For the Moscow regime has made pious recommendations like this before in disarmament conferences and in the United Nations General Assembly, but the Soviets have wiggled out of their promises when the end seemed to justify the means.

President Kennedy, however, rightly took at face value the Soviet Premier's statement and promptly urged that conferences be begun to put it into effect. It was reasoned that nothing would be lost and something might be gained by the further exchange of views on how outer space can be utilized in the cause of world peace, and not just to seek advantages in the "cold war."

Will another miracle happen? Could the spiritual emotion that swept the world as Colonel Glenn was descending to the earth be extended to reach the hearts and minds of the millions of persons behind the Iron Curtain? For by their concerted will they can transform a world beset with fears of self-destruction into a brotherhood of peace.

Miracles do happen when the world shows its humility in prayer. The voices that besought Almighty God to save the life of Colonel Glenn can speak again, as even more of us petition Him to save humanity from nuclear war. For those prolonged minutes of prayer on Tuesday, February 20, constituted man's "finest hour."

A National Lottery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, while we in the United States continue to wear blinders and refuse to accept the obvious, most of the civilized countries throughout the world recognize the wisdom of a national lottery.

Most South American nations are not wealthy but find that lotteries are the most productive revenue raisers.

Argentina is a good example of a country utilizing a lottery for the best revenue raising device.

In 1961, the gross receipts of the Argentine national lottery came to over $39 million, an increase of $14 million over the year before. The government's profit was about $17 million which was spent for social programs and public and medical works.

Mr. Speaker, if we opened our eyes and establish a national lottery in the United States we could, painlessly and voluntarily, pump into our Government Treasury over $10 billion a year in much needed additional revenue. This tremendous new income to our Government could be used for tax cuts and a reduction of our national debt. Why can we not profit from the financial know-how of our South American friends.

Ukrainian Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the American Friends of the Antibolshevik Bloc of Nations, Ukrainian Division, the Organization for Defense of Four Freedoms for Ukraine, the Ukrainian American Youth Association, and the Ukrainian Home of Rochester, Inc., had a recent meeting in Rochester, N.Y., at which they unanimously adopted a resolution to condemn the Soviet Union for the murder of Stepan Bandera, the leader of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists.

Mr. President, although the Russians continually broadcast their desire to liberate other people of the world from alleged colonial exploitation, they are, in fact, themselves, the greatest oppressors of other nationalities in the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include a copy of the resolution and the summary of the views expressed at the February 4 meeting in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UKRAINIAN RESOLUTION

We, citizens and residents of the city of Rochester, N.Y., present at the political meeting or rally, held on February 4, 1962, after hearing a detailed report of the confession of the murderer of Stepan Bandera, the leader of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, unanimously state the following:

1. The murder of Stepan Bandera, leader of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, by Russian KGB agent, Bogdan N. Stashynsky, is only one of the links in the whole series of political murders committed by the Soviet KGB on Ukrainian freedom fighters. The first victim of the Soviet secu-

rity service was Simon Petliura, head of the Ukrainian National Republic in 1918–21, who was assassinated in 1926 in Paris by S. Schwartzbard, an agent by the Soviet security police.

The second victim of the same criminal Moskovite government was Col. Eugene Konavalets, founder and first head of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, who was killed in 1938 in Rotterdam, Holland, as a result of the explosion of a time bomb slipped into his pocket by Soviet secret agent, Valiukh.

2. The physical destruction by Bolshevik Moscow of the leaders of the Ukrainian national idea, the foremost carriers of the Ukrainian liberation struggle in the free world, attests to the fact that the ideal of liberation of Ukraine and other nations enslaved by Communist Russia is so powerful and so dangerous for Moscow that it does not hesitate to commit terroristic acts even on the territory of the free nations. These inhuman and abhorrent Bolshevik methods Moscow applies to all freedom-loving and outstanding leaders, who incessantly point out the menace of Russian communism to the free world as a whole.

3. Official participation and direction of the Soviet Government in the planning and execution of political murders should serve as a signal and warning to the still free Western World that bolshevism under the leadership of Nikita S. Khrushchev has not changed and has not ceased to be an imperialist movement, and that it still is endeavoring to conquer the entire world by methods which are repulsive and condemned by the whole civilized world: violence, terror, and assassination.

4. Before the free world, and especially in the United Nations the Russians pose as "defenders of liberation of the Asian and African nations from colonialism," but at the same time they practice the worst possible form of colonial oppression and enslavement over the non-Russian nations under their domination and use all and every means at the disposal of their cruel and totalitarian regime to suppress and strangle every manifestation and aspiration of these non-Russian nations to freedom and national independence.

Therefore, we assembled here, do unanimously—

1. Accuse the Soviet Government of crimes committed in Ukraine and call on the free world at large to condemn Nikita S. Khrushchev, Alexander N. Shelepin, and the entire Government of the Soviet Union for the planning and execution of the muder of Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists Stepan Bandera;

2. Wholly support the decision of the Attorney General of the United States of America which proclaimed that the Communist Party of the United States is an illegal and conspiratorial organization and an agent of Moscow, and that all its activities are directed toward the destruction of the United States;

3. Appeal to the Government of the United States to prevail upon the Government of the German Federal Republic, on the territory of which the Russian secret agent committed the crime, to apply appropriate sanctions against Moscow, and assure the guarantee of personal security to all exile leaders in West Germany;

4. Demand that the criminal, B. Stashynsky, be put before a court of justice for his heinous crime;

5. Appeal to the free world to take a keen interest in the fate of the captive nations, enslaved by Moscow, and in particular the enslaved Ukrainian nation, and to provide them adequate support for the realization of their national liberation;

6. Appeal to all Ukrainians to mobilize their moral and material resources for the struggle and victory by increasing and strengthening their patriotic activities and to be ready for the fulfillment and realization of the ideal for which the finest sons of Ukraine lived, fought for and died: Simon Petliura, Eugene Konovalets, Roman Shukhevych, Stepan Bandera and thousands of known and unknown heroes who died for the establishment of a free, independent and sovereign Ukrainian state.

SUMMARY OF VIEWS

Americans of Ukrainian descent gathered at a meeting at 292 Hudson Avenue, Rochester, N.Y., on February 4, 1962, expressed their deep regret about the contents of a letter addressed by Secretary of State Dean Rusk to Congressman SMITH in connection with the resolution calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

1. The people gathered at the above described meeting unanimously declared that the assertion uttered by Secretary of State Rusk has no historical ground, is erroneous, and from a political point of view detrimental to the national interests of the United States.

Such an assertion helps Russian propaganda and makes stronger the position of Moscow in her struggle against enslaved nations.

2. The Soviet Union interprets this assertion as a distinct disadvantage for the United States. They try to convihce the enslaved peoples of their empire that the United States, regarded by the enslaved peoples as a champion of freedom and guarantee of their liberation, refuses the right of self-determination and national independence to the Ukraine, Armenia, and Georgia and recognize them as "traditional parts of the Soviet Union" while the constitution of the U.S.S.R. is recognizing them as separate republics and some of them like Ukraine and White Russia are members of the United Nations.

3. Such views of the Secretary and his political advisers give the basis to conclude that they are not sufficiently acquainted with the historical problems of Eastern Europe; these views arouse the suspicion that they are disposed to give their support to the preservation of the Soviet Russian Empire, while a considerable number of excolonial peoples of Asia and Africa, often without any historical and national traditions, have been recognized as independent nations.

Therefore, the participants of the meeting:

1. Appeal to the Secretary of State Dean Rusk to reexamine and to change his views that inflicted moral and political damage on Ukrainians and other nations concerned.

2. Appeal to Secretary of State Dean Rusk to give his fullhearted support to the resolution of Congressman FLOOD regarding the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

3. Appeal to the Congress of the United States of America to reexamine the American foreign policy, in particular its position with respect to the nations enslaved by Moscow; doing that in the interests of American security.

Ralph Waldo Gwinn

SPEECH

OF

HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened when I learned of the passing of our former distinguished colleague from New York, Ralph Waldo Gwinn. His passing came as a great shock to me.

I had the great privilege of serving with Ralph Gwinn in the House. I recall his interest in education, and I served with him on the House Committee on Education. I have never met a finer Christian gentleman. My association with Ralph Gwinn will always be an inspiration and a challenge to me.

Ralph Gwinn was a devoted and conscientious public servant. He was a champion of constitutional government, and had strong personal convictions on national issues. He believed in States rights and was sincerely concerned over the trend toward centralization of power in the Federal Government.

Ralph Gwinn rendered outstanding service as a Member of Congress, not alone to his district in New York, but to the entire Nation. He will be remembered by all who believe in maintaining constitutional government and our free enterprise system.

I greatly enjoyed and valued my personal association and fellowship with Ralph Gwinn. It was always a delightful experience to visit with him. I shall always be grateful for his friendship which has meant so much to me over the years. His passing is an irreparable loss to the Nation, and to me personally.

Mrs. Chenoweth joins in extending our deep personal sympathy to Mrs. Gwinn and the other members of the family.

Seaboard World Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, one of the most energetic and imaginative airline managements today is that of Seaboard World Airlines, one of the pioneers in the development of air cargo and presently our only international all-cargo carrier. One of the men who has contributed most to that energy and imagination is John Mahoney, who was the subject of a feature article in Air Transportation magazine. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AT SPOTLIGHT ON JOHN H. MAHONEY, SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT, SEABOARD WORLD AIRLINES

Five years ago he received a sort of "Dear John" letter in reverse. It read:

"I am sorry that you are leaving American, for you have done a good job for the company. You will always have friends here. Best of success in the new job."

The letter was signed by C. R. Smith, president of American Airlines.

This was the start of a new phase in John H. Mahoney's active life. He had resigned the important post of traffic director for American to become vice president and assistant to the then president of Seaboard & Western (now Seaboard World) Airlines,

Raymond A. Norden. A couple of years later he switched to Capital Airlines to take over another vice presidency. Then, in 1960, with the new administration already in the saddle at Seaboard, Mahoney was enticed back as a senior vice president and a director. He walked back with the full knowledge that he was about to tackle one of the toughest jobs in the air transportation business, for Seaboard was in distressing financial straits and the airfreight industry was rife with rumor of imminent collapse.

The first thing the prematurely grey bachelor did was personally to make the rounds among key shippers, forwarders, and cargo agents, determined to unearth through candid conversation the why and wherefore of one large part of Seaboard's precarious position. He had enough of Seaboard's own analysis of the multifaceted problem. The commercial customers, he reasoned, ought to have certain valid views also. It turned out they did. Mahoney set about altering the public image of the transatlantic all-cargo airline.

At last year's annual dinner of the Air Freight Forwarders Association, held in New York's Waldorf Astoria, John Mahoney was named "Air Cargo Man of the Year." In the presentation of the plaque which went with the award, Thomas D. Griffin, Air Freight Forwarders Association president, stated that Seaboard had come "full circle to the understanding that it is only through mutual awareness of the contribution that the airlines and forwarders each make to the development of the airfreight market, that the problems of the coming era can be solved." The award was an undeniable feather in Mahoney's cap, coming, as it did, at a time when the North Atlantic air carriers were embroiled in a bitter debate on the composition of the future air freight rate structure. Seaboard's position was closest to that supported by the consolidators.

In the back of Mahoney's mind, of course, was the sure knowledge that soon his company would be taking delivery of the big swingtail projects, the highly publicized Canadian-built CL-44 freighters, which reportedly was able to accommodate 65,000 pounds. Somehow they had to be filled to bring back paydirt to Seaboard. A magic word to Mahoney—and to his company—is "volume." If achieved, it would be handing a coup de grace to the ill of the carrier.

"The CL-44 is the key to it all," he told the writer. "We will live or die on its success. But I'm confident the plane will turn the trick."

All things considered, 1962 will be a critical year for Seaboard.

As so often occurs in the transportation industry, Mahoney is carrying forward a tradition which started with his grandfather, who immigrated from County Kerry and found employment as a railroad brakeman. John's father was a railroadman also, serving as a sales manager for the New Haven, and later for the New York, Ontario & Western.

A native New Yorker, John first saw the light of day 43 years ago in the Bronx, was taken to New Haven at the age of 3, and after some years in the Nutmeg State, moved to Quincy, Mass. He went through high school there, then returned to New York where he enrolled at Columbia University, majoring in economics and transportation.

College was no romp. Young Mahoney toiled his way through to the bachelor of science degree he eventually received. During these years he worked as a private secretary and accountant for a Wall Street investment broker (who preferred eccentric hours of labor, which was all right with the college student), took on tutoring assignments, and even worked summers as a counselor in a Boy Scout camp.

Graduation came in June 1940 but Mahoney was unable to attend the commencement exercises, for on the day following his final exam he had started working for American Airlines; and while the dean was busy handing out sheepskins to a long line of solmen-faced graduates uptown in Morningside Heights, Mahoney was in midtown pounding away at a teletypewriter.

Early next year he was transferred to space control. Another move not too long afterward brought him to reservations, then to passenger sales. During the latter part of 1943 he became a statistician wholly concerned with passenger matters. The only commercial cargo flying at that time was express.

Mahoney's days as a civilian were numbered. In March 1944 he joined the Navy as an ensign. He was assigned to NOACT. This was the network of naval air cargo terminals which racked up an outstanding record during the war. His boss was a man he was destined in later life to meet again on a professional executive level—John C. Emery.

"I got terrific cargo experience at NOACT. I had to dig deep into the guts of it—materials handling, loading, traffic, warehousing."

Most of the time found him at the Pearl Harbor facility. There also were NOACT assignments in Oakland, Philadelphia, and New York. Two years after exchanging civvies for Navy blues, Mahoney was separated with the rank of lieutenant, junior grade.

Those who are familiars of Mahoney know well his zeal for work. Seldom does he reach his desk after 7 a.m. This is not a latter-day manifestation of insomnia. When he was due to start his military service, he worked right through the last Friday at American, and reported for Navy duty early Monday morning. And when he received his honorable discharge on a Friday in March 1946, he was back at his desk at American the following Monday.

Mahoney returned to the post he vacated, but soon he was moved up to the job of schedules and tariffs analyst—not for long, however. He was tapped to assume the position of assistant to the director of that department, eventually was elevated to assistant director and in 1955 he became director of traffic.

Some insight into what makes John Mahoney tick is provided by this sidelight. Toward the middle fifties, when it was clear to all his friends and associates that his star at American was in its ascendancy, he decided that his direct sales experience was too far in the background to be of any value to him. He needed first-hand work as a refresher. Characteristically, he took on a job selling the Encyclopedia Britannica after work every evening of the week and on Saturdays and Sundays. Not only did he receive what he acknowledges was good sales training, but he made money at it as well.

It was in the decade starting with his return to the airline that Mahoney's reputation began its gradual rise in the industry at large. He was in charge of publication of the first airfreight tariff which American produced in 1946. He sired the successful plan to publish airline timetables in local time.

"Prior to the spring of 1953, all airlines published their timetables in standard time during the summer. This meant that the airline customer always had to translate from the timetable, and never knew exactly whether the arrival or departure times in the timetables corresponded with the local clocks in the cities where he or his shipment was likely to arrive and depart. With the blessing of American Airlines, I put on a campaign in 1952 and the early part of 1953 to persuade all of the airlines to publish their timetables in local time. It was a more difficult task than you would imagine, because airline people are more set in their ways than they should be in view of the fact that they are part of a new, modern, and growing industry. In any case, we achieved success with the coming into effect of daylight saving time in the spring of 1953, and all airline timetables have been published in local time ever since."

Then, too, there was the no-show control program which he worked out, and which in 1956 was adopted by all of the domestic airlines and adhered to for a number of years. (It became a casualty of later airline policy, but the CAB currently is demanding improvement in no-show procedures.) Under his supervision the family fare plan was initiated. There were other developments, all of which helped to raise Mahoney's stock.

It would be a mistake to assume that his association with a domestic airline left him a babe-in-the-woods insofar as international transportation was concerned. When American Airlines acquired American Overseas Airlines, his duties directly involved him in the affairs of the International Air Transport Association. With the exception of the 1 year he spent at Capital, Mahoney has been part and parcel of the international scene.

Which is why, at Cannes in the autumn of 1956, a consultant for Seaboard & Western Airlines approached him on behalf of the Norden brothers, Raymond and Arthur. This led to discussions with the Nordens who indicated their interest in utilizing his talents in traffic and International Air Transport Association matters. The decision was not an easy one to make, but make it he did: on February 1, 1957, he showed up at Seaboard headquarters and was escorted to his new vice president's office.

In more ways than one it was a new look for him. His job not only diverted his talents to serving the needs of an international all-cargo operation, the months that followed found him spending steadily increased portions of his time in the labyrinths of Washington, engaged in innumerable wrestling matches at the Civil Aeronautics Board, Commerce Department, Pentagon, and with Members of the House and Senate. Eventually he was endowed with a revised title more in keeping with his activities. In July 1958, he was named vice president—industry and Government affairs. It was a far cry for a traffic expert, but he fitted the job well and liked it.

Mahoney's association with Seaboard was to last only 2½ years. Now a regular Washington gadabout, he was invariably in the eye and an object of interest of certain Capital Airlines executives. Capital was headquartered in that city. It had its fiscal headaches, heightened by difficulties with a British creditor aircraft manufacturer. Several of the airline's keymen were alumni of American. They put the bee on Mahoney, making it attractive for him to join them. On October 1, 1959 he became vice president—marketing service, an office which concerned him with both passengers and freight.

His new job was not as clear cut as the title might suggest. It was not without entanglement in Washington politics, but by now Mahoney knew his way around with ease. Then came the news of the planned merger of Capital Airlines and United Air Lines. Mahoney was selected to handle Capital's end of the merger. A large part of the monumental task was to handle the company's liaison work with the Federal and State Governments. His title now was so alien to the duties he was actually performing—a throwback to Seaboard—that the airline changed it to vice president—corporate affairs.

Mahoney's return to Seaboard as senior vice president was a complete surprise to the industry. It had been assumed by many that he would move on to United, or alternatively be snapped up by one of the domestic

all-purpose air carriers. There is no question that the shipping community on both sides of the North Atlantic (not to speak of the competitive forces) are eyeing closely the deeds of Mahoney and Seaboard's president, Richard M. Jackson.

Seaboard adheres to an integrated marketing sales philosophy. Thus, funneled to Mahoney, are the following functions: sales, advertising, public relations, market research, schedules, tariffs, industry and Government affairs, customer service, and mail—a heady mix.

What is the airline's sales philosophy under his direction? Mahoney put it briefly:

"The transatlantic airfreight line caters to a sophisticated knowledgeable group of shippers made up of industrialists, traffic managers, airfreight forwarders, cargo sales agents, and others in the industry—a market composed of people who know the transportation business as well as we do, and who accept hard economic and service facts only, not fancy appeals to emotion or status. For these reasons, selling aircargo transportation is quite different from selling soap, cigarettes, cosmetics, or even air passenger transportation.

"The successful cargo sales organization does not waste its money or efforts on the time-honored appeals and practices of consumer sales, which incidentally have been misapplied many times in the past in the sale of industrial items like cargo transportation. Nor should a cargo airline attempt to sell air transportation alone, without selling all the services and facilities that go along with it.

"An airfreight sales philosophy, therefore, must be based on fulfilling the customer's need for an integrated, rapid and economical transportation service. It requires the sale of a 'package,' consisting of all the elements that go into the entire distribution function, such as packaging, through rates, et cetera. The makeup of this 'package' frequently is different for different customers."

Mahoney makes no secret of his dissatisfaction with the North Atlantic airfreight rates. This is made all the more acute by a CL-44 operation. To a certain extent it will be alleviated temporarily by Seaboard's having received CAB approval to lease about one-third of the CL-44's capacity to Lufthansa—a brainchild of Jackson. It is Mahoney who directs the sales push behind the programs. The all-cargo line's passenger top-off proposal is another product of Jackson's fertile imagination. This proposal, if it can successfully pass through the CAB bottleneck, would sell nonfrill passenger space to and from Europe at very low fares, to the extent of the space in the rear of the big cargo cabin which might remain unfilled.

A soft voice and an easygoing manner are a disarming cover for a man under almost constant pressure. ("But don't get the idea I'm unhappy that way.") When he is in town, he commutes between his apartment in Jackson Heights, a section of Queens, and New York International Airport where Seaboard's headquarters are located. Business duties send into the air to the tune of some 50,000 miles per year.

He speaks French, and during his travels he resorts to this language whenever he can. On a recent vacation in Tahiti he was delighted to discover that he could practice on the unsuspecting natives to his heart's content. Spanish is another language with which he is conversant, although his opportunities to use it are fewer.

The BS degree Mahoney received in 1940 only whetted his appetite for self-improvement. Between then and 1957 he took numerous courses, at universities and accredited specialized schools, squeezing them into his busy daily discipline. Among them were statistics, research, traffic, salesmanship, finance, marketing, public speaking, speed reading, memory training, parliamentary law, languages. This almost ceaseless drive to acquire specialized knowledge left its hallmark on every project with which he was associated.

Mahoney admits to a liking for the theater, and he will make a dash for a box office whenever opportunity allows him. As for the movies, he hasn't seen one in years. His reading fare is weighted toward nonfiction—in the main, history and travel.

His trim figure he ascribes to two or three gym workouts a week. Getting physically rough with Seaboard's senior vice president is a mighty risky undertaking. He is a judo expert with proficiency awards to his credit.

If John Mahoney's rigorous routine causes some eyebrows to lift, it perhaps is because he believes, as the French say, rien ne réussit comme le succès. And on the day of victory, someone else has pontificated, no one is tired.

Meanwhile, Mahoney is in a remorseless battle, and no one knows it better than he.

R. M.

Burris Jackson Elected President of National Cotton Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, an outstanding Texan, Burris C. Jackson, of Hillsboro, in Hills County, Tex., has been elected president of the National Cotton Council of America, a high office which he is highly qualified to fill.

Mr. Jackson's record of achievements, which resulted in his elevation to leadership of the world's greatest cotton organization, assures that he will give distinguished service to his fellow men.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Hillsboro Mirror of Thursday, February 1, 1962, entitled "Burris Jackson, President of National Cotton Council."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hillsboro (Tex.) Mirror for Feb. 1, 1962]

BURRIS JACKSON, PRESIDENT OF NATIONAL COTTON COUNCIL

NEW ORLEANS.—A widely known cotton leader from Hillsboro was elected president of the National Cotton Council of America at the final session of the annual convention in New Orleans late Tuesday.

Burris C. Jackson, recognized for years as a top leader of the industry, was unanimously elected to the presidency of the world's greatest cotton organization.

Delegates representing every part of the cotton industry, representatives of the Government and business interests allied with cotton and visitors from all over the world attended the council's annual meeting.

Two U.S. Senators, other high Government officials, the Nation's top bankers and economists addressed the council sessions.

Jackson is the second Texan in the history of the council to be elevated to the presidency. The first Texan to serve was the late George Chance, a large plantation owner of Bryan.

The Hillsboro man, who was declared cotton's "Man of the Year" in 1959, has probably held as many if not more high honors in the cotton industry than any other living man.

He is chairman of the American Cotton Congress, chairman of the statewide cotton committee of Texas, chairman of the national affairs committee of the American Cotton Shippers Association, a past president and chairman of the cotton improvement committee of the Texas Cotton Association, chairman of the Texas Cotton Research Advisory Committee, chairman of the legislative and public relations committee of the Texas Cotton Ginners' Association, a member of the U.S. Department of Agriculture Cotton Advisory Committee, and for 23 years a member of the board of directors of the National Cotton Council.

Jackson said he would serve as president of the council 1 year, which would likely be the final position that he would accept in cotton, and he called upon the cotton industry and the people generally to help solve the tremendous burdens placed upon American cotton because of unwise governmental programs and a great production in foreign countries.

The council maintains general headquarters in Memphis, but has a large staff in Washington, D.C., New York City, and at various places throughout the world.

Burris Jackson is the son of a Hillsboro pioneer, the late Gen. Will E. Jackson, one of the State's leading cotton men, who became an outstanding military figure and a great civic leader.

He married Frances Robertson, daughter of W. C. Robertson, another Hill County pioneer, who was president of the Hill County Cotton Oil Co., Union Oil Mill at Hubbard, and a cotton gin owner.

At the time of their marriage in 1934 Jackson was president of the Hillsboro Lions Club and she was the club sweetheart. He served as governor of Lions Clubs in Texas and held many other civic honors.

In 1938 the Hillsboro man was elected president of the Texas Cotton Association, the youngest man ever to be elected to that position. When he served as vice president of the East Texas Chamber of Commerce and chairman of its cotton committee he led a fight to establish a broad cotton research program in Texas, resulting in the present cotton and cottonseed research conducted by the State.

He was a star athlete in Hillsboro High School and as a boy was a leader in the Order of DeMolay, having led Hillsboro to 10 first-place victories in State degree tournaments. He served as State master councilor of DeMolay, the highest honor in the State, and later served as president of the International DeMolay Alumni.

He served for 3 consecutive years as president of the National Association of Postmasters, after having served as president of the Texas Association of Postmasters. He was the only man to hold the national honor for 3 terms.

He served on the official board of the Methodist Church for more than 30 years, and before his service in the Army in World War II he was active in the Red Cross, infantile paralysis program, and many other public endeavors.

He is a member of the Texas Civil War Centennial Commission under appointment by the Governor of Texas.

He is also commander of Hillsboro American Legion Post, which has won a place on the State and National honor roll for 3 straight years, and his work with the American Legion has been nationally recognized.

Frightening Aspects of Urban Affairs Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a great victory was won by the people of America over the politicians of our 20 largest cities when both the Senate and the House 2 weeks ago emphatically rejected President Kennedy's attempt to create a new Federal Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. That action also helped to preserve the dignity and importance of the position of State Governor and served to bolster the concept that States have rights of their own which should not be invaded by the Federal Government.

However, since many believe that this whole attempt was more of a political gimmick and a campaign device than an earnest effort to meet the problems of the people in our cities it is as sure as taxes that another attempt will be made next year to add this extra Cabinet-level Department to our ever-growing Federal political structure. And the high command of the Democratic Party has already announced its determination to make the Department of Urban Affairs a major campaign issue in our great cities of the North while, as usual, it will try to lull the South into supporting its candidates while opposing virtually every major policy and program of the New Frontier. So long as people in America continue to vote against their convictions and to vote against their own best interests because of some unthinking devotion to prejudices of the past or in response to the demands of a handful of political leaders it is of course difficult if not impossible to get the Government in Washington to conform with the desires and attitudes of the people in America.

Looking ahead, the Monroe News Star of Monroe, La., has written an editorial which merits reprinting and which should be carefully read by all freemen.

I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRIGHTENING ASPECT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

In a recent speech here, South Dakota's U.S. Senator KARL MUNDT pointed out a very frightening practical political aspect of President Kennedy's proposal for a Department of Urban Affairs in his Cabinet.

Few—if any—people in Monroe have considered the stranglehold such a department would give the Federal Government in Washington over the political machines in the large cities in the United States. And these large cities primarily control national elections; and they are the major factor in State elections, also.

To point this up, look at the influence on statewide elections New Orleans wields in Louisiana. Scarcely a candidate can be elected without getting a sizable vote in New Orleans.

Now, if the Federal Government can control doles to cities, what municipal official in the larger areas, controlled by machine politics, won't succumb and accept the aid so that he can go before the electorate and say, "Look what I have done for you. Reelect me."

And he will be called a progressive mayor because he has built monuments to his administration and he will be reelected.

The mayors thusly elected owe their office then to the White House and will in turn bestow their machines' support to the proper party during national elections.

Monroe voters don't understand fully the workings of city machine politics because they don't exist here for practical reasons. But the truly urban areas are ruled and controlled by such politics.

What would New Orleans be without the old regulars, or New York City without Tammany Hall?

Senator MUNDT described the approval of the Department of Urban Affairs, if it comes, as a marriage between the White House and the political machines of the 20 larger cities in the United States. This is probably the wisest and most valid conclusion yet drawn about the matter.

And while the Senator, who is a member of the Senate's Government Operations Committee hearing debate on the measure, predicted defeat of the urban affairs proposal during this session of Congress, he added that it will continue to be introduced in future sessions. All thinking voters had better stop and think again. Monroe and rural areas of the United States will be bypassed completely at the polls. The national politicians will completely ignore the rural and suburban vote and carry the favor of the big cities.

The main opposition to the Department in the South thus far has been along political lines. But it has all been because the South felt President Kennedy was trying to induce Negroes through the announced intention of appointing a Negro as Cabinet officer in the Department. This is probably true. But through analysis you can see that the scheme for vote getting is even more nefarious and on a much larger scale than simply the Negro minority in the large cities of the North.

Whatever action can be taken to halt this dangerous political maneuver must be taken. If Americans go to sleep at this switch they may have lost forever their most precious privilege—the power to name and maintain their own government and its officials.

Decatur Daily Celebrates Golden Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding daily newspapers in our State is currently celebrating its 50th year of service to the people of north Alabama. This splendid publication is the Decatur Daily which was founded in 1912 by Mr. William Randolph Shelton, whose son and grandson, Mr. Barrett Shelton and Mr. Barrett Shelton, Jr., are now seeing to it that the Decatur Daily's admirable reputation is maintained.

Such newspapers as the Decatur Daily are invaluable components of our free and democratic press. It is, for this reason, that I wanted to particularly take this occasion and this means to extend my congratulations to the Decatur Daily and to express on behalf of all those to whom it brings the facts of today's world situation my sincere appreciation. I insert hereunder a pertinent editorial from the Birmingham News, Alabama's largest daily paper, which expresses the sentiments of all of us familiar with the Decatur Daily's splendid record:

HAIL, DECATUR

The Decatur Daily, founded by William Randolph Shelton and now operated by his son, Barrett Shelton, and grandson, Barrett Shelton, Jr., this week celebrated its 50th year of service to north Alabama. The Birmingham News is delighted to extend congratulations on half a century of dedicated attention to the State's welfare.

The Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in Wisconsin

SPEECH

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, lovers of the out-of-doors were heartened by the inclusion in President Kennedy's conservation message of a request for the establishment in 1962 of an Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in Wisconsin among his list of 10 national park proposals on which action is urged.

A description of the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve is contained in my article in the March 1962, Eagle magazine "The Battle of the Glaciers":

THE BATTLE OF THE GLACIERS

About 1 million years ago, long before man was on the scene, an epochal battle of the elements began in North America. Four times, over geological ages, a great ice cap formed in the Labrador-Hudson Bay region, advanced into the heartland of North America and retreated under a warming sun.

The clearest evidences of the gigantic struggle are today to be found scattered throughout Wisconsin. This great saga in the natural history of North America is due to be illustrated and interpreted soon in the proposed Ice Age National Scientific Reserve.

Early in 1962, National Park Service Director Conrad Wirth gave his official blessing to the proposal. Bills to make the Ice Age Reserve into law are now before the House and Senate.

The Ice Age Reserve will be made up of segments of the 500-mile-long record of glaciation located within the State of Wisconsin, and will provide recreation for thousands of visitors.

Today, the once glaciated heartland—the area south of the pine-spruce forest on the Canadian border and lying between the Ohio River approaches to the Appalachians on the east and the Missouri River approaches to the Rockies on the west—is the most intensely developed region in the United States. With its rich soil, its abundant water, and its temperate climate, it has long since been

almost wholly cleared for farm, for city, and for factory.

The whole vast area contains the greatest population concentration in the United States. Like people everywhere, the people of the heartland are enjoying new leisure and need an opportunity for healthful recreation and for communion with nature. Yet in the whole area there exists today hardly a national park worthy of the name. Creation of the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve will meet a long-felt need.

The idea of a national scientific reserve is a new one for the National Park Service. The national parks, 7 national historical parks, 83 national monuments, 12 national military parks, 1 national memorial park, 3 national battlefield parks, 3 national battlefield sites, 12 national historic sites, 13 national memorials, 10 national cemeteries, 1 national seashore recreational area, 3 national recreational areas.

But the remnants of the ice age in Wisconsin did not readily fit into any of these categories. For one thing, they were situated in clusters hundreds of miles apart. This suggested that most of the administration should be done by the State of Wisconsin, which is on the spot anyway. Furthermore, hunting and lumber operations are quite properly prohibited in the national park system proper. But there seems to be no reason to stop a hunter from trailing a rabbit in the Wisconsin glacial area, or a lumber operator from practicing sustained yield forestry in the moraine forest.

So the ice age proposal envisages a national scientific reserve, under the National Park Service, but with the land still owned by the State of Wisconsin or even by Wisconsin county governments. Uncle Sam, under the proposal, would share the costs of the reserve—50 percent of the cost of buying land; 75 percent of the cost of supplying interpretive services—lectures, nature walks, and visitor centers; and 50 percent of the cost of maintaining everything else in the Reserve, such as camping, picnicking, and swimming grounds.

Under the proposal, the reserve will include all the main features of glaciated terrain. The massive North American glacier, up to two miles thick, scoured ground and polished the land as it advanced and retreated. The four major advances of the glacier are called the Nebraskan, the Kansan, the Illinoisian, and the Wisconsin. The latest one—the Wisconsin—occured a mere 10,000 years ago. Since it came last, it obliterated earlier glaciers.

The Wisconsin glacier was divided into five lobes or fingers—the Lake Michigan Lobe, the Green Bay Lobe, and several lobes farther west. The hills of boulders, pebbles and clay left at the edges of these fingers are called moraines, and they extend over Wisconsin for 500 miles from Lake Michigan to the Minnesota border. Their soil is rocky, which accounts for the happy accident that they have been saved from farming and are mostly hardwood-covered today.

The moraine areas abound in glacial geology. Melting ice masses caused depressions in the ground hundreds of feet deep, called kettle holes. Where the moraines acted as a dam, lakes and swamps were created. At other times, the melting glacier deposited its debris as high cones that look like volcanic craters, known as kames (the original kames are to be found in Scotland). Again, streams of melting water under the glacier dumped their rocks in snake-like, hogback ridges, sometimes miles in length, known as eskers (the originals occur in Ireland). Finally, there are drumlins—long, cigar-shaped hills facing toward the ice's retreat.

The reserve would concentrate on four areas:

1. The Kettle Moraine State Forest, 120 miles of moraine in southeastern Wisconsin. Here the examples of kames, eskers and kettleholes are unsurpassed.

2. An area full of drumlines near Campbellsport, Wis.

3. Devil's Lake State Park, 50 miles west of Madison. Here a mighty battle occured between the advancing glacier and the preexisting bedrock of southwestern Wisconsin which, by some fluke no geologist has ever been able to explain, escaped the glacier. The glacier scraped out the softer hills on its way, but retreated before the massive obstacles of quartzite which still towers over Devil's Lake. This large and beautiful lake makes the area as delightful for family as it is tantalizing for the scientist.

4. The Chippewa wilderness in northwestern Wisconsin near Bloomer. Here the moraine created more than 300 kettlehole lakes and swamps, full of songbirds and waterfowl.

The bill encourages private conservation organizations, such as the Ice Age Park and Trail Foundation, to continue building woodland trails on the intervening moraines to link up these four main units. In the future, a family that wants to make a 20-year project of it will be able to hike the 500 miles in easy stages. In the process, they will have a chance to know nature, and to understand how the great midcontinent section of America was formed.

When the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve is dedicated a couple of years from now, the man who had most to do with conserving it will not be present. He is Raymond T. Zillmer, who died in December 1960, at the age of 70. Ray Zillmer was a highly successful Milwaukee lawyer who loved the outdoors as much as he did the law. Over his long life, he had walked almost every inch of the 500-mile-long remnants of the ice age. For years Ray Zillmer was a one-man propaganda agency for the establishment of the ice age reserve. When the 500-mile trail that will link together the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve is built, his friends and fellow outdoorsmen have agreed to call it the Ray Zillmer Trail.

Commenting on the proposed ice age reserve, Geologist Robert H. Rose of the National Park Service said: "This could well rank among the greatest of the many significant adventures upon which the National Park Service has embarked in the past or with which it may become intimately identified in the future."

Mr. Speaker, I also include an editorial from the March 4, 1962, Milwaukee Journal:

KENNEDY WOULD SPEED UP CONSERVATION DEVELOPMENT

President Kennedy has made clear to Congress his desire to push ahead faster and farther on many conservation fronts. His message is one of specifics, mentioning a wide variety of projects the President considers worth while and even urgent. Of special interest in this area is his approval of the proposed Sleeping Bear Dunes Park in Michigan and the Indiana Dunes Lake Shore Park, both on Lake Michigan, and the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in Wisconsin.

Prompt acquisition of choice sites for national parks and other recreational areas, before they are converted to other uses, is imperative. "Actions deferred are frequently opportunities lost and, in terms of financial outlay, dollars invested today will yield great benefits in years to come," the President observes.

His recommendations for new Federal outlays for this purpose are, by present day standards, modest. He proposes that part of that new money come from entrance, admission or user fees at national parks and recreation areas—there are some fees now—and annual user charges on recreation boats.

The President announces that a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation will be set up in the Interior Department. He again endorses the long delayed bill to set aside certain Federal tracts as wilderness areas.

More significant than some of these details, however, is the great stress the President puts on conservation research and planning for the future. A White House Conference on Conservation will be held this year to stimulate national thought, discussion and effort along these lines.

Following a good start made in the Eisenhower administration, the Kennedy administration is stepping up the tempo of conservation progress at the national level. It has set even more ambitious goals. The one danger, judging from the President's message, is that its efforts may be so dissipated by espousing many diverse conservation projects, including those at the State and local levels, that not enough push will be put behind the big and vital Federal undertakings on which most conservationists are agreed.

Which Road for Transportation: Private Management or——?—Part VIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I have long been concerned with the seemingly ever-increasing crisis in our Nation's regulated transportation industry. Solutions are not easy, of course, but they must be found, especially in the interest of our defense position. Some solutions are offered by nine men in a series of interviews with Traffic World magazine printed in booklet form. I urge that my colleagues give their attention to these interviews, the eighth of which follows:

INTERVIEW EIGHT

(Judge E. Barrett Prettyman, of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, was named by President Kennedy to head the Administrative Conference of the United States, which was created to assist him, Congress, and the administrative agencies "in improving existing administrative procedures." Judge Prettyman has long been interested in administrative law, as indicated by "Trial by Agency," published in 1959 by the Virgina Law Review Association. The book is made up of lectures on administrative law delivered at the University of Virginia Law School in March 1958.)

President Kennedy suggested in his message to Congress, on the regulatory agencies that judicialization might well be the proper method in some controversies, but that new procedures for the analysis of facts based upon more informal methods and mobilizing the techniques of other discipiines, can be the answer in other cases. What are the new procedures likely to be?

First, informal procedures for many cases in various areas. The courts came to that a long time ago—informality in handling less complicated cases. There are many such areas—the Internal Revenue Service, for instance—where there are many cases involving minor questions. At the Interstate Commerce Commission also, they have similar methods of dealing with matters of lesser importance. In some of the agencies they handle all cases the same way—even small cases get the full panoply of treatment. It will take some time to reach suggested remedies in this phase of the general problem.

The thought the President expressed, of "utilizing the techniques of other disciplines," would seem to refer to the judicial system of informal proceedings for small matters, or the minimum of procedure in certain classes of cases, at the Internal Revenue Service and the ICC, or wherever there are special informal procedures for minor matters.

Do you feel that there is any basic conflict between court procedures and the so-called quasi-judicial procedures of the administrative agencies—an attitude which seems to be reflected in the administrative law section of the American Bar Association?"

If you have competing applicants for licenses or permits, and the decisions must be upon an open record, the decision as to which one should get the license or permit is an adjudicatory process—the applications have to be judged, and everything has to be aboveboard. In a court, you can't talk to the judge. He has no part in bringing the action. He has no part in posing the issues. His function is to decide the controversy. When you come into one of these agencies where you have the same thing ultimately to be done, in lots of instances the same people have something to do with making the rules and writing the pleadings. Then, also, they have other duties—rulemaking and ratemaking duties, where they have to talk to people to find out what is best, just like a Congressman. A large section of the bar say that all adjudicatory functions should be taken out of the agencies and that a separate court should be created.

The second Hoover Commission made some of its recommendations without distinguishing between the agencies in the executive branch of the Government and the administrative agencies traditionally regarded as arms of Congress. Will the Administrative Conference endeavor to keep clear the line of division by treating the two types of agencies separately, and making separate recommendations to the President and to Congress?

The administrative agencies are regarded by Congress as arms of Congress. They implement statutes and this is legislative work. So far as they do purely executive work to carry out laws enacted by Congress, they are purely executive. Thus, they are part executive and part legislative—they are quasi-judicial and quasi-legislative in nature. And then they have quasi-judicial functions, such as we have mentioned. The matter was fought very bitterly in 1913, when the Federal Trade Commission was created.

My own idea is that it is too late to do very much about it. In "Trial by Agency" I referred to the debate on whether or not this combination of functions was permissible under the division-of-powers concept basic to the Constitution, and said that "the Supreme Court has long since set the controversy at rest by decisions upholding the validity of one or another agency action." I said that "despite their polycharacteristics, the constitutional validity of these establishments and offices has been affirmed over the years by an ad hoc process of necessity."

One of the repeated criticisms of the administrative agencies is the delay in disposing of proceedings. The President said that it is essential to protect private and public interests through maximum efficiency and fairness in the performance of the agencies' duties. How can the proceedings permitted under the rules of practice of the agencies and the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, be speeded up?

There are a great number of ways in which agency procedures can be expedited. The judiciary has discovered some ways, and some of the agencies have discovered many ways. I suppose the Conference will make this one of the major areas of study, and come up with some recommendations. Some of the recommendations might require changes in the Administrative Procedure Act, but any such result would come only after a long period of time. Many pieces of legislation, after they have been in effect for a long time, ought to be reviewed.

Under the terms of the Executive order creating the Administrative Conference, the Conference has to do only with the efficiency and fairness of administrative procedures. Would it be within the scope of the order for the Conference, after study, to make any recommendations, in the interest of fairness and efficiency, as to the amount or scope of regulations—such as transportation?

My personal opinion is: No. On the other hand, procedure and efficiency are pretty broad terms. The Conference will first take up matters well within its scope. There is plenty to be done there. If the Conference works, if it becomes a permanent organization and has been in operation 6, or 8, or 10 years, has high-class people in its membership and is established as an effective body, then it is quite possible it would gain such a stature that people would want to know its views about the broader aspects of regulation.

The Judicial Conference started out as a small group fo chief judges discussing their problems. Over the years it has grown in stature until it has reached a point in the esteem of the public and of Congress where it is asked to consider supremely important subjects: For example, the bill creating new judgeships. The Judicial Conference is always asked nowadays where judges are needed.

The administrative agencies have the responsibility for regulating industries with billions in capital investments and producing large gross incomes. Will the Conference have anything to say about the specific qualifications which should be possessed by members of the agencies?

I think that would not be one of the first things to be studied. The Conference might have something to say quickly about the qualifications for such officers as hearing examiners, lawyers practicing before the agencies, etc.—that would be a natural thing. Again, as in the answer to the preceding question, after a time and assuming the Conference gains the necessary stature, it might have something to say about the qualifications which ought to be possessed by members of the independent regulatory agencies.

Senator Benjamin A. Smith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, Senator BENJAMIN A. SMITH, who has announced he will not be a candidate for election this fall, has in a short few months won the respect and admiration of his colleagues in Congress and the people he serves.

Taking this opportunity to add my voice to the many, in praise of the high level of conduct and energy he has displayed as the junior Senator from Massachusetts, and the bipartisan spirit of cooperation which has always characterized his performance in office, I commend to the attention of the House and Senate the following editorial from the Standard-Times of New Bedford, Mass., entitled, "BEN SMITH Served Well":

BENJAMIN A. SMITH II has served well in his 14 months as junior U.S. Senator from Massachusetts. He has introduced important legislation and stated his views clearly and firmly on many issues.

Senator SMITH's announcement that he is not a candidate for election comes as no surprise. He received an interim appointment to the upper House from former Governor Furcolo at the behest of President-elect Kennedy in the fall of 1960. Since the President's brother, Edward M. (Ted) Kennedy, is expected to announce his senatorial candidacy within a month. Senator SMITH had no real choice but to retire from the Senate.

The former mayor of Gloucester has conducted himself in a straightforward and dignified manner during his short senatorial career.

He showed particular interest in Greater New Bedford. Among other things, he met here with community leaders to discuss ways of improving the economy, asked the Tariff Commission to grant relief to the textile industry and requested the Food and Drug Administration to support the sale of fish flour in the United States.

All this was done in good order, leaving the community with the impression that Senator SMITH was giving it maximum representation in the Senate. New Bedford Institute of Technology showed its recognition of Senator SMITH when it granted him an honorary degree.

Senator SMITH has made his mark in a short time. His services in the Senate will be missed.

Immigration Questionnaire Helps in Private Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit the following sample questionnaire, which I feel may be of value to my colleagues and others having an interest in, or connection with, problems of immigration and naturalization. Because of the heavy volume of immigration cases handled by my office over many years, this form was developed to aid me in determining the merits of private legislation in immigration cases. Consultation with legislative and administrative authorities and by my own experience, in this area, indicates that such a form is of exceptional value. It is my hope, therefore, that my colleagues who share a similar legislative problem in their congressional duties may benefit from a review of this procedure.

The questionnaire is as follows:

QUESTIONNAIRE ON IMMIGRATION CASES

1. Full name_____
2. Other names by which alien may be or have been known_____
3. Present legal residence address_____
4. Country of citizenship_____
5. Names and addresses of husband or wife, and children, if any (state citizenship of each)_____
6. Date and place of last entry into United States_____
7. Means of entry (name of vessel, crossed border, or other)_____
8. Legal status at time of entry (Immigrant for permanent residence; returning

legal resident; visitor; student; seaman; transit visa; illegal entry; or other)--------

9. Present legal status in United States (state whether in same status as at entry; under orders to depart, either voluntary or order of deportation; whether Immigration Service or State Department proceedings are pending; and nature of proceedings (visa application; application for extension of visa; deportation proceedings; or appeal to Board of Immigration Appeals)----------

10. Where is file located? (Immigration Service, San Francisco or Washington; State Department; American consulate in foreign country; or other)----------

11. File or identification number--------

12. If under orders to depart United States, give departure date----------

13. Name and address of attorney, if any--

---

14. Names and addresses of closest relatives in United States (give relationship and citizenship)----------

15. Occupation in United States (name and address of employer, type of work, how long employed)----------

16. Character references (give names and addresses and attach their signed statements)----------

17. Detail any Immigration Service charges (previous criminal record, or any charges of Communist or Nazi affiliations or activity)-

Alien's signature----------

(If alien is not in United States, sponsor should sign in above space)

The Tractor Driver Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, January 4, 1962, the U.S. Department of Labor issued news release No. 4967, in which Secretary Goldberg announced that $400,000 in Federal funds would be made available by the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for training tractor drivers; that they would receive $24 per week and would have 160 hours detailed study in the classroom, and so forth, a copy of the order being included hereafter in my extension of remarks.

On January 4, I discussed this program with a representative of the Memphis, Tenn., Commercial Appeal, which has a wide circulation in all north Mississippi. The January 5, 1962, issue carried the following news story:

DELTA WILL GET TRAINING FUNDS: FEDERAL PROGRAM TO SPEND $435,000 FOR TEACHING TRACTOR DRIVERS

(By Morris Cunningham)

WASHINGTON, January 4.—A Federal area redevelopment program aimed at training 1,200 tractor drivers in 16 Mississippi Delta counties was announced Thursday.

Representative FRANK E. SMITH (Democrat, of Mississippi) hailed the new program, but Representative JAMIE L. WHITTEN (Democrat, of Mississippi) expressed some misgivings.

A total of $435,000 in Federal funds will be allocated to 20 schools in the 16 counties to provide subsistence payments and 8 weeks of classroom and practical instruction and experience to the trainees.

BIG STEP FORWARD

Mr. SMITH called the project "a major step forward in meeting the goals of our agricultural leaders in improving the available supply of farm labor."

He said "this is a specific type of vocational training needed to improve the efficiency of agriculture in the Mississippi Delta."

Taking a different view, Mr. WHITTEN said, "I realize good tractor drivers or handlers of equipment will be an asset to much of Mississippi, including a part of my own district.

"I hope this does not mean, however, that this is the entering wedge into Labor Department supervision of wage rates and hours in agriculture which could upset the local economy. Anyone who checks the advisers to the Department in this area would wonder as to the wisdom of spending approximately $500,000 for this purpose."

Subsequently a number of people have taken issue with my stand. The New York Times quoted from a number of them in its issue of February 4, 1962, copy of that article being attached hereto.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the cost to the Federal Government of almost a half million dollars, I believed this program might well lead to many undesirable results.

In all my public service I truly believe I have spoken my piece and made it clear where I stood. Seldom, if ever, have my motives or sincerity been questioned. For that I am thankful.

First elected to public office when 21 years of age, I have served continuously since, first as a member of the Mississippi Legislature, then as district attorney of the 17th District of Mississippi and now I am serving my 21st year in Congress. My only platform from the beginning has been to give to the job my very best.

At the beginning of the next session, less than 40 Members out of 435 will have had more continuous service in the U.S. House of Representatives than I. I am serving my 19th year on the Appropriations Committee, where I am Chairman of the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee. I also serve on the Appropriations Subcommittees on National Defense and Public Works.

THE NEW YORK TIMES

The story in the Commercial Appeal of January 5, 1962, expresses my views with regard to a tractor driver training program which was set up for the Mississippi Delta. I am sorry that the article appearing in the New York Times of February 4, under a Greenville, Miss., dateline, questions my position when I raised serious doubts about the advisability of spending $435,000 for this program and expressed the fear that approval by Secretary of Labor Goldberg of such a program for agricultural workers might lead to bringing them under control of the Department of Labor, by the wage and hour law, and under the control of a few labor leaders.

Since then, according to the National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor Information Letter No. 18, from which I quote:

A much smaller ARA project has been inaugurated in New Jersey. There, 25 farmworkers are taking a 16-week course in the operation, maintenance, and repair of farm equipment. The New Jersey average regular wage in 1961 was $1.16. With the new skills trainees hope to find jobs in south Jersey paying about $2.50 per hour. Trainees spend about 4 hours a day in class and are paid weekly subsistence payments based on State unemployment payments.

I repeat, if I had thought the program to be to our best interest, as well as that of the Nation, I would have said so. However, I have traveled through Russia, Hungary, and Poland. I know that much of the time the chief means Communist leaders have used to dominate the people has been by control of the supply of food. I am strongly opposed to anything which might possibly lead to such a situation here. No doubt many will say it could not happen here. How about the Supreme Court, the right to jury trial, use of troops, and so forth

AGRICULTURE

I have always supported agriculture, for I believe it basic to the welfare of all Americans. I am privileged to hold a national position as a member of the Appropriations Committee and as chairman of the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee. The annual farm appropriation bill, providing funds for rural electrification, soil conservation, extension, price supports, and all the rest has been initiated by my committee and passed in my name. Our committee, at my instance, set up the watershed and flood prevention pilot plants, which resulted in Public Law 566, which means so much to De Soto, Marshall, Panola, Yalobusha, Tate, Lafayette, Carroll, Benton, Montgomery, Union, Tippah, and practically all the rest of the counties in Mississippi.

It has been my pleasure, as the only member of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives from Mississippi to help meet many problems. The Boll Weevil Laboratory and Poultry Laboratory at Mississippi State University, the Cotton Ginning Laboratory at Stoneville, and research at Clemson, N.C., and Lubbock, Tex., as well as the Forestry Research and Soils Sedimentation Laboratory at Oxford, have all been initiated by the bill of which I was the author. My membership on the Appropriations Subcommittee for Defense brought the Naval ROTC unit to "Ole Miss."

Mr. Speaker, our U.S. Senators are qualified to and do look after the diverse interests of the various groups and sections of our State. This is also true of Members of the U.S. House of Representatives. Each of us in the House is called on by the entire State in the area of our committee jurisdiction. My own assignment, as I said, is on the Appropriations Committee, where all programs must eventually be resolved.

FLOOD CONTROL

Before I came to Congress four reservoirs, one project had been authorized and two reservoirs—Arkabutla and Sardis—had been built in my present district, taking water off the delta, including my own home county of Tallahatchie. When lands were taken for the construction of these reservoirs, landowners had been given no right to

jury trial; no provision was made for recreation, and little attention was given to the tax loss to the counties affected. Releases were obtained by the Government for road damage and crossings destroyed, frequently with only very small payments made. Feeling was bitter.

When I came to Congress late in 1941, Grenada and Enid Reservoirs, the other two units provided by law, had not been built. After years of effort, by the use of my position on the Appropriations Committee, I got the Congress to provide for the right of jury trial as to the value of lands to be taken, and also for payment back to the counties of De Soto, Tate, Panola, Yalobusha, Lafayette, Marshall, Grenada, and Calhoun—which were above the dam and adversely affected—of 75 percent of land rentals for roads and schools. A total of $998,000 has been paid back to these counties, and the annual payment runs about $107,000 per year.

We persuaded the Corps of Engineers to include recreation facilities in the initial plans for the construction of these two reservoirs; and we insisted upon and got a high level crossing at Graysport as a part of the project, something so sadly lacking in connection with the reservoirs built before I began my service here. In these efforts, Senator EASTLAND fully cooperated and steered such measures through the Senate. This was before Senator STENNIS was elected to the Congress.

COOPERATION TODAY

Mr. Speaker, where there was bitterness and conflict before, today there is a greatly improved relationship with recreation and land rental returns offsetting tax and economic loss above the dams and the benefits of flood control going to the other. Unfortunately, a cash settlement was made by the Government, a release obtained, and no crossing provided in the plans for a crossing at Harmontown; but this I hope we can remedy.

Today we find watershed protection and flood prevention in the hill section merged with flood control; and under a provision of which I was the author, "where the Corps of Engineers 'lays down its shovel,' the jurisdiction and responsibility of the Soil Conservation Service begin."

Other facts which will surprise many people is the fact that the flood control projects below these reservoirs were all authorized before 1950, during the time Mr. Whittington, whom all will remember, was Congressman, and since then it has been our Committee on Appropriations which has initiated all new starts and funds for construction in addition to providing funds for watershed protection and flood prevention, all of which is shown by the records.

HEADQUARTERS,
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, D.C., February 21, 1962.

Hon. JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. WHITTEN: As per your request, I am pleased to furnish you five copies of the pamphlet entitled "Water Resources Development by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in Mississippi" with pertinent data on features of the Yazoo Basin project attached to the map.

The pertinent data attached to the map are as follows:

YAZOO BASIN, MISS.

Four headwater reservoirs authorized by the 1936 Flood Control Act as amended by the 1937 and 1941 Flood Control Acts.

Arkabutla Reservoir: total estimated cost, $12,820,000; completed June 1943.

Sardis Reservoir: total estimated cost, $11,960,000; completed October 1940.

Enid Reservoir: total estimated cost, $15,360,000; completed December 1951.

Grenada Reservoir: total estimated cost, $31,570,000; completed December 1953.

Local protection works authorized by the 1936 Flood Control Act as amended by the 1937 and 1941 Flood Control Acts.

Greenwood: total estimated cost, $5,140,000; appropriated to date, $2,623,000; description, 28 miles of levees and floodwalls with related drainage structures.

Belzoni: total estimated cost, $317,000; completed November 1959.

Yazoo City: total estimated cost, $2,210,000; completed in 1957.

Main stem: authorization, 1936 Flood Control Act as amended by the 1937 and 1941 Flood Control Acts. Total estimated cost, $21,800,000; appropriated to date, $9,768,000; description, 266 miles of levees and 272 miles of channel clearing with 44 channel cutoffs and related drainage structures.

Tributaries: authorization, 1946 Flood Control Act. Total estimated cost, $28,600,000; appropriated to date, $6,542,000; description, 360 miles of channel clearing with 126 miles of levees and related drainage structures including McKinney Bayou pumping plant.

Upper auxiliary channel: authorization, 1936 Flood Control Act as amended by the 1937 and 1941 Flood Control Acts. Total estimated cost, $14,253,000; appropriated to date, $27,000; description, 48 miles of new channel with levees.

Lower auxiliary channel: authorization, 1936 Flood Control Act as amended by the 1937 and 1941 Flood Control Acts. Total estimated cost: $10,930,000; completed January 1962.

Yazoo backwater: authorization, 1941 Flood Control Act as amended by the 1944 Flood Control Act. Total estimated cost, $32,600,000; appropriated to date, $1,152,000; description, 98 miles of levees and 26 miles of channel clearing with related drainage structures.

Big Sunflower River, etc.: authorization, 1944 Flood Control Act as amended by the 1946 Flood Control Act. Total estimated cost, $9,440,000; appropriated to date, $6,768,000; description, 619 miles of channel clearing on Big Sunflower River and Steele Bayou and their tributaries.

I trust that the enclosed data will serve your present needs.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM F. CASSIDY,
Major General, U.S. Army,
Director of Civil Works.

If there are any who doubt my deep interest in putting the protection of our own country first, I need only to point to the RECORD, where it was my motion which overrode President Eisenhower's veto of the public works appropriation bill of 1959, saving the Greenville Harbor project, the Pascagoula Harbor project, and about 60 others—pages 17051–17059, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 8, 1959. For this action I received much commendation.

[From Missouri Delta Farmer, Portageville, Mo., September 1959]

VETO BARRIER BROKEN

By a vote of 280 to 121 in the House of Representatives, and 72 to 23 in the Senate, the Congress overrode the President's veto of the public works appropriation bill. The action was a precedent breaker in two respects. It marked the first defeat of a veto during President Eisenhower's tenure and it was the first vetoed bill in the history of the Congress ever reported back to the House still carrying in full the material objected to in the veto message. All former vetoed bills have either been reported back to the House and passed without the interdicted matter or have not been reported back at all.

Congressman JAMIE L. WHITTEN of Mississippi (members of Missouri Cotton Producers Association will recall that he addressed our annual meeting at Kennett in 1956) offered the bill which passed over the Eisenhower veto. The entire Nation is indebted to Congressman WHITTEN for this action involved the retention of the right of the Congress to initiate needed public projects, a right which has proven so necessary in the preservation of our national strength and freedom.

Thanks, Congressman WHITTEN.

COMPETITIVE SALES FOR COTTON

Mr. Speaker, in 1955 when American cotton was being held off world markets and American acreage was being moved overseas, I used my position as chairman to break the line; and 32 million bales of cotton have been sold in world trade since.

STAPLE COTTON COOPERATIVE ASSN.,
Greenwood, Miss., July 12, 1955.

Hon. JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JAMIE: The transcript you sent me of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is most interesting. I personally think you have done the grandest job we have ever had any Congressman do for our section. I want you to know we are not only proud of you, but we are grateful to you for all that you have done and are doing for us.

You come nearer being right in your programs and what you propose than anyone I know. I sincerely hope that the program you are sponsoring will, in a large measure, be adopted. In fact, it must eventually be adopted. One cannot sell any commodity without making the price competitive.

I thought of you many times while I was in the Far East, and I want you to know I am one person who really appreciates your efforts.

Cordially yours,
W. M. GARRARD,
General Manager.

When the Department of Agriculture cut American cotton acreage 30 percent in 1 year, putting thousands of farm people out of business, I prepared a bill supporting the farmer's share of the domestic market at full parity and allowing the American farmers to recapture the tremendous world market they formerly held. The Department relented and we are back in business.

Mr. Speaker, I have opposed foreign aid and the Peace Corps. I actively opposed stacking the Rules Committee; and may I repeat, I do oppose having the Secretary of Labor get into the domestic agricultural labor field in any way, because I am afraid of where such a program would lead.

With this record, Mr. Speaker, I believe all will know I sincerely believe the tractor training deal would have been detrimental to the people of Mississippi and of the Nation, the 183 million American consumers who could be brought to their knees if food production were to ever get into the hands of a few persons.

I am conservative because I believe I am right. Times have changed, but human nature has not.

[From The New York Times, Feb 4, 1962]

MISSISSIPPI KILLS FARM PILOT PLAN: FACTIONS AND FEAR BAN MOVE TO TEACH NEW SKILLS

(By Claude Sitton)

GREENVILLE, MISS., February 3.—Factional politics and fear of Federal control have killed a pilot program to ease the southern farmer's transition from the mule to the machine.

The program, which would have provided training for farm equipment operators, was scheduled to begin on Thursday here in the Yazoo-Mississippi Delta.

Labor Department officials have ranked the project as the largest of its kind under the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961. They had expressed hope that it would set the pattern for similar undertakings in other Southern States.

But opposition from a powerful group of planters led by officials of the Farm Bureau Federation recently forced local advocates of the project to retreat, and there appeared to be no chance that it would be revived.

TWO FACTORS ARE SEEN

Persons on both sides of the issue were interviewed this week in a swing through the delta. Generally, they attributed the project's defeat to two factors.

The first stems from the likelihood that congressional redistricting will force Representatives FRANK E. SMITH and JAMIE WHITTEN into a Democratic primary battle this year.

Mr. SMITH issued the first announcement of the training program and gave it his endorsement. Mr. WHITTEN then declared his opposition. It thus became a political issue and a number of the strongest critics are WHITTEN partisans.

The second major factor is the widely expressed concern that the program might lead to a Federal minimum wage for agricultural workers in this area and to unionization. Those holding this view were vague in their explanations of how this would result.

The controversy also has racial overtones, and this seemingly accounted in large measure for the ease with which the plan's opponents obtained its rejection. One opposition leader said his supporters felt that the trainees, probably 80 percent of whom would have been Negroes, might attend integrated classes.

There was general agreement here and in Washington on the need for upgrading workers' skills.

Farming in this moist basin of sandy loam and buckshot clay is an industrial venture engaged in largely by corporations. The stockholders may be local farmers or absentee investors.

Considerable capital is required. Many plantations have 1,000 acres under cultivation. Good land, when it is available, brings $200 an acre.

Thousands of dollars are tied up in farming equipment. It is not uncommon for a plantation to have 20 or more tractors worth about $6,000 each. Elevating scrapers for drainage work run about $19,000, and a two-row cottonpicker sells for $20,000. Thousands more go into modern fertilizers, insecticides, and improved seed strains.

WAGES AT $8 A DAY

The prevailing wage for tractor drivers and other equipment operators, according to a number of planters, is about $8 a day. The traditional Christmas bonus raises this figure to approximately $10 a day. One farmer said his drivers averaged 200 workdays a year.

Farmhands also receive free housing, which is of relatively good quality on the larger plantations.

Because of his investment, the planter can ill afford poorly trained operators, who might turn over a tractor or wreck a cottonpicker at the height of the season.

In discussing the proposed training program, Labor Secretary Arthur Goldberg noted that only half of the 40,000 drivers in the 16-county area had adequate training. The estimate was obtained from the Mississippi Employment Security Division.

He added that more than half the 50,000 rural males in the area between the ages of 20 and 49 were either unemployed or underemployed. Nevertheless, there is a shortage of equipment operators.

About 3,000 workers were expected to apply for training and an initial group of 1,200 was to be selected for 8 weeks of instruction in the classroom and the field.

The executive board of the Delta Council, an organization of planters and others dedicated to promoting economic and social development, drew up the plan. It was patterned after a smaller State program that had been in operation since 1953.

STATE UNITS BACKED PLAN

The plan was approved by the State's agricultural and industrial board, its employment security commission and its department of education. The vocational agriculture division of the latter department was to administer it.

When Labor Department officials in Washington received the plan last December, they were enthusiastic. One later described the project as a real glittering breakthrough in area redevelopment.

Secretary Goldberg approved a labor grant of $230,000 to finance the program, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare agreed to provide an additional $205,000.

Representative SMITH, whose district covers most of the delta, announced Federal approval of the plan January 4. He called it a major step forward in meeting the goals of our agricultural leaders in improving the available supply of farm labor.

Mr. WHITTEN, who represents some delta counties, was critical. "I hope this does not mean that this is the entering wedge into Labor Department supervision of wage rates and hours in agriculture, which could upset the local economy," he was quoted as having said.

Oscar C. Carr, Jr., president of the Delta Council, hailed the action and asserted that "this is not a giveaway or welfare program. Trainees who do not make satisfactory progress will be dropped," he said. "Training will be aimed at developing skills in the actual operation of farm machinery and preventive maintenance."

PLANTER OPPOSITION BUILDS UP

But a storm of opposition was building up among the planters, particularly those in Mr. WHITTEN's district and many of those belonging to the Farm Bureau Federation. That national organization of big farmers has opposed area redevelopment.

H. H. Huddleston, of Lamont, vice president of the bureau's delta district, recalled this week that his telephone had rung incessantly with calls of protests following announcement of the program.

He and other Farm Bureau leaders organized a meeting of 83 farmers from 17 counties at Cleveland, Miss., on January 8. Mr. Huddleston described the proceedings as very spirited and said "some of the strongest criticism of the plan came from WHITTEN's district."

The planter, who said he was speaking as an individual, noted that Mr. WHITTEN was a conservative with considerable seniority while Mr. SMITH was something of a freshman, in Congress, a rather close friend of the President and a strong party line man.

The chief issue, according to Mr. Huddleston, was the belief that the progress might be "a preliminary to Federal takeover and control." He said it had never been made clear what the trainee's certificate would mean.

"Would that mean he was entitled to an 8-hour day?" asked Mr. Huddleston. "Would that mean a minimum wage? Would that mean minimum housing standards?"

It was observed that the training plan would have paralleled the one in existence. "When that program was inaugurated," Mr. Huddleston replied, "we didn't have the Warren court up there."

After a second reference to the "Warren court," he was asked if the racial issue were involved. "Absolutely," answered Mr. Huddleston. "Don't you think that (desegregation) is the next step?" He then asserted:

"We're in supoprt of the idea to train tractor drivers and machine operators. But we are opposed to the acceptance of Federal grants, particularly from the Department of Labor. We can finance it ourselves if necessary."

A further objection expressed by Mr. Huddleston was that he and most other planters had not been consulted while the program was being planned. He noted that he was a member of the Delta Council's agricultural committee.

Another opponent, Whitney Smith of Webb, said "we didn't think that it would be right because of the type of people we would get" in the training course. The planter said he also disapproved of the fact that the State Employment Security Division would screen applicants.

As a result of the opposition, B. F. Smith, executive vice president of the Delta Council, announced on January 10 that the organization was reconsidering the program. In a letter dated January 15 to council members, President Carr said in part:

"Because of concern with regard to possible Federal controls and other implications of the program as voiced at a meeting in Cleveland the Delta Council executive committee does not feel that it would be in the best interest of the area for the proposed farm machinery training to be initiated at this time.

FEEL PLANTER MISUNDERSTOOD

A number of persons said the plan would have been difficult to defeat had the planters understood it clearly.

"I am not in favor of unionization of farm labor or the placing of farm labor under minimum wage laws, but I think possibly that the program itself has been misconstrued," declared Hal DeCell, editor of the Deer Creek Pilot, a weekly newspaper at Rolling Fork.

One of the State's most prominent delta planters, James Hand, Jr. of Rolling Fork, said he still favored the program. He is chairman of the board of directors of the Delta Implement Co. and a former president of the Delta Council.

"If we can train the worker to be more productive, we can pay him more," said Mr. Hand. "I think that where the program is wanted it ought to be available."

TWELVE HUNDRED TRACTOR OPERATORS TO BE TRAINED IN MISSISSIPPI

Twelve hundred farm tractor operators will be trained in the 16-county region of the Yazoo Delta of Mississippi under a plan approved today by Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg.

In what is the most comprehensive training program approved to date under the Area Redevelopment Act, more than $400,000 in Federal funds will be made available by the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to launch the program on February 1.

Secretary Goldberg said the trainees will be split up into groups of 20, each undergoing an 8-week course with subsistence

payments to the trainees based on the average weekly unemployment compensation payments in Mississippi, currently set at $24 a week.

The Secretary said the Mississippi Employment Service estimates that over half of the 50,000 rural males between the ages of 20 and 49 in the 16-county area are unemployed or underemployed, and that more than 3,000 are expected to apply for training. The employment service will conduct the screening of applicants.

A detailed course of study providing 160 hours of classroom and 160 hours of practice, under supervision of trained instructors, will be given.

Twenty schools in the 16-county area, all having approved programs in vocational education, will be utilized in the training program. The State supervisor of agricultural education will be responsible for overall supervision and administration, the Secretary said.

The 16 counties, all in the northwest and western portion of the State bordering on the Mississippi River and the Yazoo River are: Bolivar, Desoto, Holmes, Humphreys, Issaquena, Leflore, Panola, Quitman, Sharkey, Sunflower, Tallahatchie, Tate, Tunica, Warren, Washington, and Yazoo.

There is an estimated 30,700 farm tractors in the region, according to the Mississippi Employment Service. An estimated 40,000 workers are operating such farm machinery now, although not more than half are adequately trained.

The Secretary expressed the hope that this training will organize workers with year-round employment, with daywork provided for members of the operator's family to help achieve rural family stability in the years ahead.

Approval of the Yazoo Delta program is part of the overall economic development plan approved for the entire State of Mississippi by the ARA. The actual amount earmarked for the delta training program of $435,000, which excludes the Labor Department's administrative costs, is more than half of total funds already granted to other ARA training programs in four States.

West Virginia has 4 programs approved for 1,100 trainees; Pennsylvania has 6 programs for 400; Connecticut has 1 for 200 and Rhode Island has 1 for 180 trainees, all costing a total of slightly less than $800,000 to date.

ADA—Radicalism of the Collectivists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, Americans for Democratic Action, the group that represents the extreme left of the political spectrum, is discussed in an article which appeared in the January 19, 1962, issue of the Weekly Crusader—this is a publication of Christian Crusade, the address of which is 9 East 4th Street, Tulsa, Okla. The title of the article is "Radicalism of the Left—Americans for Democratic Action." I think the article will interest many Members of Congress and therefore under unanimous consent I insert it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

RADICALISM OF THE LEFT—AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION

One of the most classic examples of the "double standard" not only tolerated, but promoted across America today, is the incessant condemnation of the "radicalism of the right." These vociferous rantings engaged in by the majority of the Nation's press, the major news and entertainment magazines and even the top levels of public office, never seem to find cause for condemnation of our more deadly enemy, the "radicalism of the left." While Christian Crusade, the John Birch Society, and other conservative organizations are distorted, smeared and lied out, the Americans for Democratic Action, one of the most powerful political action organizations in America today, is virtually unknown among the masses of the American people.

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER said in a recent speech that "if President Kennedy is worried about the influence of extremists in America, he should purge his own administration of the 'radicals who are raising — with this country.'" He further said: "The extremist groups of the left are far more dangerous than those of the right. There are no members of the John Birch Society in the Kennedy administration, but more than 40 members of the ADA (Americans for Democratic Action) are in places of power. They are the ones that are raising — with this country."

The Americans for Democratic Action was born in the Willard Hotel during April 1947 in Washington, D.C. Among those involved in the founding of the ADA was Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, who was mayor of Minneapolis, Minn., at that time. HUMPHREY described the ADA's aims as militant political action from the grassroots right through to the national level without turning into a third party movement.

On June 2, 1954, the late Kit Clardy of Michigan made a speech on the floor of the House of Representatives regarding the Americans for Democratic Action, which he called a Trojan horse. Mr. Clardy said that in his opinion the ADA had probably done more than any other group in the Nation to foster and promote many of the aims of the Communist Party while loudly protesting that it was anti-Communist.

In an analytical examination of the ADA, Mr. Clardy revealed that they fought against the adoption of the Subversive Control Act, calling it a dangerous and futile attempt to repress the Communists, as though repressing Communists was a bad thing. I regard it an act of self-defense. They urged withdrawal of our recognition of the Chiang Kai-shek government. They opposed adoption of the Smith Act, under which many Communists now have been convicted. They pilloried the FBI for daring to bring Judith Coplon to trial, saying: It has given the public a chance to see how silly an FBI report can really be.

They have urged a continuation of diplomatic relations with all the Communist nations. They have opposed the rearmament of Germany.

"If they have ever openly attacked the Communist Party position on any subject, it has not been called to my attention. They have contented themselves with relatively mild generalizations, and in the very next breath, have urged the program I have thus far detailed. They deny the existence of an internal threat and speak softly about the problem in far-off lands. I challenge anyone to name a single Communist tracked down and exposed by the ADA. While I can cite many instances where ADA members have defended Communists exposed by others, I have never found them on the firing line where Communists were being uncovered. I have never found them exposing Communist fronts or denouncing Communist propaganda. * * * If embracing a large segment of the Communist Party line makes one an anti-Communist, then they qualify. But the real point I want to make is that ADA is a Trojan horse infiltrating our lines for the purpose of selling us socialism * * *.

"ADA's tolerance of Communists and communism in our midst * * * may stem from their lack of understanding of Communist philosophy. They seem totally unaware of the fact that communism demands the destruction of all other societies. * * * They continually speak of the threat of communism in America as a phantom. * * * They have never admitted the guilt of Alger Hiss. If we followed their advice the Communist conspiracy would soon take over."

As if to substantiate Representative Clardy's analyses of their ideological viewpoints, the ADA adopted the following resolutions at their 14th national convention in Washington, D.C., during May 12 through May 14, 1961.

In their resolution on Asia, the ADA called for unification of Korea under the U.N.; more aid to the pro-Soviet "neutralist" Nehru of India; recognition and admission to the U.N. of Red China; and other similar policies. The ADA called for "democratic elections in Formosa but made no mention of any democratic election for the suffering, enslaved people of Red China. The ADA contended that the inhabitants of Formosa should be able to decide themselves whether or not they "rejoin mainland China." Again there was no mention of the right of people of Red China to vote whether or not they had rather be under Free China or under the Communist dictatorship. Knowing that a large portion of the population on Formosa are refugees from Red China, there is no question that the people of Formosa would vote to remain under Free China rather than attach themselves to Communist dictatorship.

The ADA resolution in Latin America said that the United States would give "moral and political support" to what the ADA called democratic regimes of the Americas. The next sentence further explains their position. They said: "Alleged anticommunism should not be used as an excuse for U.S. aid to dictators." This type of fuzzy thinking is undoubtedly the reason why pro-American government leaders in Latin America are referred to as dictators while Communists and pro-Communists are referred to as Premiers or Presidents. The resolution equated Castro's cruel Communist dictatorship with the Cuban people. They said that they "recognize the right of the Cuban people to self-determination," meaning that this is precisely what has happened in Cuba. The ADA further went on to "deplore the fact that Castro has departed so far from his originally declared objectives." In the light of Castro's admission that he has been a Communist and will be one until he dies, the ADA is just admitting that they were fooled by Castro in the first place. The ADA intellectuals further said that the experience of Cuba should "alert us to the need for revolutionary changes in many parts of Latin America." This resolution in Latin America called for us to deal through the Organization of American States instead of acting in the interest of the United States of America.

In their resolution on disarmament, the Americans for Democratic Action called for total disarmament under control of the United Nations. They said that the disarmament situation demands a revolutionary effort, joined sincerely by the United States, to achieve general and complete disarmament subject to effective inspection and control. From the wording here, we get the idea that they are inferring that the United States is not sincere. However, we did not find anything in this ADA resolution suggesting that the Soviet Union's disarmament

proposals were insincere. They did disagree with the Soviet proposal for a three-party administration to head and control the inspection organization of the disarmament setup.

The foreign policy molders of the ADA called for our Nation to continue its suicidal aid to Communist Yugoslavia and Communist Poland. They called for amendment of the Battle Act in order to give the President authority to expand loans and grants to the Communist dictatorships of Eastern Europe. Of course, the ADA did not use the word "dictatorship" because they obviously look upon Communist governments as legitimate representatives of the people.

The ADA resolution on immigration called for a weakening of our immigration laws, which are America's first line of defense. On the domestic front, the ADA resolutions said that the current spending programs of the Federal Government are clearly inadequate. At a time when the extent of Federal spending has already seriously weakened our Nation, the ADA calls for Federal spending to be raised by several billion dollars.

The Federal debt for the fiscal year 1961 was over $289 billion, which was the highest debt level of any fiscal year in history. This placed every American around $1,613 in the red. The budget deficit for fiscal year 1961 was $3.9 billion, well above earlier estimates. Last summer Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT said that the present administration has been spending $650,000 per hour more than its revenue. Certainly if the ADA's spending policies were realized in their entirety, the path of our Nation toward suicidal death would be greatly accelerated.

An inevitable companion of the greatly increased spending recommended by the Americans for Democratic Action would be more and more Government controls over us and, accordingly, fewer liberties for the American people. Throughout history, tyrannies have risen to power through the means of making the people think that they were getting something for nothing.

All of the blasts against and the condemnation of the voices of the right are way out of proportion. There are only two admitted members of the John Birch Society who hold office in Washington; both are Congressmen from California—Congressman ROUSSELOT and Congressman HIESTAND. However, the radicalism of the left, about which there has been a virtual news blackout, is in a much more favorable position to influence Government policy since the ADA has managed to staff the present administration with 3 White House aids, 3 Cabinet officers, and 31 key administrators in vital areas of finance, labor, civil rights, public works, power, housing, and foreign policy.

Members (or former members) of the ADA who are prominent in the New Frontier, are:

Theodore C. Sorenson, special adviser to the President; Arthur S. Schlesinger, Jr., administrative assistant to the President; Harrison L. Wooford, special assistant to the President on civil rights; Chester Bowles, Undersecretary of State; Mrs. Katie Louchheim, assistant to Mr. Bowles; G. Mennen Williams, Assistant Secretary of State; Phillip H. Coombs, Assistant Secretary of State; Jonathan B. U. Bingham, U.S. Representative on the UN Trusteeship Council; J. Kenneth Galbraith, Ambassador to India; James Loeb, Jr., Ambassador to Peru; Adlai Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations (not a member, but ADA World identifies him as a founder); Arthur Goldberg, Secretary of Labor; Frank W. McCulloch, Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board; George L. P. Weaver, Assistant Secretary of Labor; Esther Peterson, Assistant Secretary of Labor; Charles Donahue, Labor Department Solicitor; Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; Wilbur J. Cohen and Mrs. Jim G. Aiken, congressional liaison officers for Department of Health, Labor and Welfare; Orville Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture; Charles Murphy, Undersecretary of Agriculture; Robert G. Lewis, Deputy Administrator of Price Supports; John A. Baker, Director of Agricultural Credit Services; Henry H. Fowler, Undersecretary of the Treasury; Frederic C. Belen, Assistant Postmaster General; Charles H. Stoddard, Director of the Interior Department's review staff; Archibald Cox, Solicitor General of the United States; William Taylor, special assistant to the Director of the Civil Rights Commission; Thomas K. Finletter, U.S. Ambassador to NATO; Robert C. Weaver, Housing and Home Finance Administrator; Jack T. Conway, Deputy Housing and Home Finance Administrator; Sidney H. Woolner, Commissioner of Community Facilities; Howard Morgan, Federal Power Commissioner; Philip Elman, Federal Trade Commissioner; George Docking, Director of the Export-Import Bank.

During October 1958 ADA invited Roy Cohn, former counsel to the McCarthy Senate subcommittee investigation communism, to speak at a meeting in New York. Apparently this invitation was a move to show that they "tolerate" opposing views. Roy Cohn bluntly told them what he thought of the organization. He said:

"I am unalterably opposed to just about everything for which you stand. It is the fuzzy irresponsible thinking of you and those associated with you which has contributed to the gains made by the atheistic communistic conspiracy in the world * * *. Your activities have aided communism, not fought it * * *. There is no useful purpose to be served by your continued existence."

It is a fact that the ADA objected strongly against the congressional investigation of the John Birch Society, which it opposes. Could it be that the ADA feared such a precedent which would allow an investigation of the ADA's roll in the present administration?

Why, if we have an impartial and free press within our Nation today, are right-wing groups so thoroughly smeared and attacked while virtually nothing is said about the left-wing counterpart—that far more appeasing leftwing group, the Americans for Democratic Action?

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of March 3, 1962:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, March 3, 1962)

The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 passed handily (354–62) but, like the iceberg, its provisions and far-reaching consequences were more unseen than seen. Unemployment, for those unemployed and for Government representatives responding to the situation of insecurity and privation of those unemployed, has always been a troublesome issue. Political demagoguery has only heightened the dilemma and confused the issue. Government and politicians once into the situation can only expand their influence whether this effort serves to solve the problem or not. In 1946 the Federal Government used this language to describe government's role in the economy relating to jobs and joblessness (from the Full Employment Act of 1946): "The Congress declares that it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practical means consistent with its needs and obligations and other essential considerations of national policy, with the assistance and cooperation of industry, labor, and State and local governments, to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining, in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and general welfare, conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment, for those able, willing, and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power." Here then, government could move in with complete authority, or do little. It is all a matter of interpretation and the language in the act sets no limits. Union leaders, primarily, and others, have stressed, and overstressed the detrimental effect of automation (Machinery replacing people), sometimes losing all sight of fundamentals. Union officials, especially, consistently demand greater Federal participation in solving the problem.

Realizing this, a group of Republican Members of Congress analyzed the facts and then stated that automation is an example of a dynamic economy and that of our unemployment problems are the outgrowth of prosperity and an improved standard of living, not of a weakness of our economic system, therefore the need was for retraining. Any newspaper want ad section proves the large number of jobs going begging, qualified people are needed and many unemployed lack the proper skills for the new age. Here are some excerpts from this study: "Automation increases jobs, though many people believe the reverse to be true." "In our free economy, economic growth and the improvement of living standards depend not primarily on what Government does but mainly on what is done by individuals and groups acting in their private capacities."

The resolution, H.R. 10363, embodied the Federal Government's effort to provide the needed retraining. In my view it goes much too far with almost unlimited power placed in the hands of the Secretary of Labor. For example: Automation and occupational training. Under this broad heading the Secretary of Labor is to (1) survey the needs, (2) prescribe the programs needed, (3) test, counsel, and select the people to be retrained, (4) establish their pay and transportation costs, (5) provide placement in jobs, (6) continued counseling service, and other programs, and (7) use public relations media to inform the public. To me we have gone overboard. A worthy objective has caused us to lose all sense of perspective. As I see it, we should stimulate private, local and State agencies, not replace them or subordinate them, as most assuredly this bill will do. As the Republican report study said: "Government makes its basic economic contributions not through the volume of its own expenditures but by promoting conditions favorables to the exercise of individual enterprise and private effort. Accordingly, a dominant purpose of government at every level must be the preservation and invigoration of institutions that favor and support enterprise. In particular, the Federal Government should encroach no more than necessary on the province of private action. And within the area of public action, the Federal Government must avoid encroachment on the province of State and local units." Sixty-two of us opposed passage of the measure, yet, to a man we believe in the need for retraining, without Federal domination.

The annual Presidential prayer breakfast once again united in prayer and spiritual dedication the President, Vice President, Cabinet Members, House and Senate Members, Supreme Court, military leaders, Government workers, and Christian laymen of all denominations. It was a refreshing and heartwarming experience. Rev. Billy Graham and Gov. Price Daniel also addressed us. All present were conscious of our deep and abiding sharing of spiritual convictions, which, if practiced as professed, would force a strength no earthly power could challenge.

The appearance of Col. John Glenn before a joint meeting of Congress furnished one of the most thrilling experiences I have had, in this city. No person could live through this experience, feel the deep emotion of the jammed-packed House of Representatives and the galleries, listen to the simple, but sincere and stirring words of Colonel Glenn without being stirred with a new birth of patriotism and pride in the Nation and the system which made possible the achievement and embodied its success in this kind of man. This was America at its best and all Americans responded.

Conservatism represents a dynamic force, dedicated to the preservation of a way of life that has offered greater opportunity for man to attain the goal of happiness than any other system ever devised. Ours is a forward-looking philosophy, geared to this century and the next.

Irate Wives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the Lowell Sun, a leading newspaper in New England, has a talent for pinpointing issues in highly compelling fashion. In last Saturday's edition, the lead editorial focussed the spotlight on the current unhappy Reserve situation. Under leave to extend my remarks, this editorial follows:

IRATE WIVES

The siege of Fort Devens may well provide an unprecedented chapter in the military history of the country.

A group of wives whose husbands are on active duty with the Reserves contend they will picket the fort unless their spouses are sent back to civilian life, or, at least, until they are assured by the military that definite dates have been set for this purpose. If that fails, they may extend their protest activities to the Pentagon.

Last July at the height of the Berlin crisis, the President was empowered to call up 250,000 reservists for active duty for not more than 1 year and to extend the active duty training periods of reservists beyond the usual 2 weeks a year. The Senate approved this action by a unanimous vote and the House endorsed it by a vote of 403 to 2. The overwhelming nature of the vote indicates just how serious the situation appeared to our Government at that time.

The fact that Reserve units were called up probably did not come as a surprise or shock to those who have been engaged in part-time military training, for where else would the Government have turned for a fast replenishment of its military reservoir?

The contention that so many reservists have been assigned to duties which do not make the best use of their personal talents is just one of those things we suppose, where military needs and classifications are quite different from those of civilian life.

But, since the Berlin crisis has now eased off, a review of the national need for keeping so many reservists in harness could be in order.

The wives who are now complaining of the disruptive effects on homelife, civilian employment and family income have a right to be heard. The campaign of the self-styled irate wives may give Secretary McNamara some sleepless nights.

The Positive "No"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, in a Lincoln Day speech delivered on February 13, 1962, in Bolivar, Mo., Representative DURWARD G. HALL made some timely remarks concerning the positive principles of conservatism. Conservatives in Congress are sometimes called "negativists" because they oppose many of the collectivist proposals of the Kennedy administration. This epithet is a misnomer. By opposing many of the collectivist proposals of the President, we conservatives are doing what we can to preserve the principles of individual freedom and private enterprise so eloquently expressed in our Declaration of Independence and Constitution.

I am a Republican, but I am first an American. I believe that collectivism is the antithesis of Americanism; hence, I am compelled to oppose every proposal of the President which would increase the dependence of the individual on the Federal Government.

I ask unanimous consent to have Representative HALL'S remarks printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE POSITIVE NO

I'm a little sick of hearing all the New Frontier talk that the Republican Party is opposed to everything, that it has no positive principles of its own. I'd like to give you my version of the positive no, and what it means to the preservation of our country and our way of life.

Republicans believe in freedom of the individual and so believing they must necessarily oppose everything that would take away that freedom.

Republicans believe in free enterprise. And so believing, they must necessarily oppose everything that would destroy free enterprise in favor of a socialistic form of government that concentrates power and authority in politicians, instead of free individuals.

Republicans believe in the freedom of the marketplace, and so believing they must necessarily oppose everything that would place absolute authority in the hands of the master planners instead of placing it in the hands of millions of consumers who express their wants in the open market.

Republicans believe in self-determination. And so believing, they must necessarily oppose everything that puts us in a compromising position with international communism.

Republicans believe in the rewards that go to freemen whose own initiative and zeal for work creates prosperity for the rest of society. And so believing, they must necessarily oppose Socialist schemes to redistribute the wealth or anything else that takes away individual incentive.

Republicans believe in local responsibility and local authority to meet local needs. And so they must necessarily oppose everything which would sap our reliance on local initiative and transfer responsibility to "the great White Father in Washington."

Republicans believe in fiscal responsibility, and so believing, they must necessarily oppose everything which will plunge our Nation deeper and deeper into debt, and place the burden for our own irresponsibility on future generations on your children and mine.

Republicans believe in the American workingman, and so they must necessarily oppose liberal socialistic schemes that attack and weaken the private sector of our economy, which must provide jobs for our workingmen and women.

In short, Republicans believe in America, and they have little faith in those who have no faith.

Republicans believe that history must not necessarily be repeated, that the fall and decline of previous great civilizations such as Rome and Greece, were due in part to the decline of reliance on the individual. And so believing, they must necessarily oppose those things which will cause Americans to lose faith in themselves and look to Washington for solutions of local problems.

As Republicans and as Americans, we are plain sick and tired of the volumes of messages coming from the White House calling for greater and greater Federal expenditures, for bigger and bigger bureaucracy.

Republicans believe in a strong, dynamic, National Government and so believing they must necessarily oppose everything which will detract from our Federal Government's ability to meet national and international problems by diffusing our energies over a vast multitude of local problems.

Backs U.N. Bond Buy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter printed in the February 26, 1962, issue of the Hudson Dispatch, a newspaper published in my congressional district, written by a sincere and patriotic American, the Honorable Phelps Phelps, former U.S. Ambassador to the Dominican Republic, which urges support of President Kennedy's plan for the purchase by the U.S. Government of $100 million of United Nations bonds.

The letter follows:

BACKS U.N. BOND BUY

EDITOR, HUDSON DISPATCH:

I have been reading with great interest the reaction of Hudson Dispatch readers and columnists to President Kennedy's plan for purchasing up to $100 million in U.N. bonds. I have also kept informed on opinion in Washington and in other sections of the Nation and I am somewhat less than encouraged at the apparent provincialism displayed in some quarters.

This is not a political tussle between President Kennedy and his Congress as some appear to feel, nor is it merely another round in the cold war title fight between the United States and Russia, as others believe. It is a death struggle for the little nations of the world, a direct assault upon their positions as international forces and their right to help decide the international issues which face the world in increasing numbers these days.

We can better understand this, perhaps, if we consider what the world would be without a U.N. The day the U.N. fails, the world will embark upon a road that can only lead to another war. The small nations, for economic as well as political reasons, will be forced to choose sides, either with capitalism or communism; neutralism will not be tolerated. And the world will be back at Sarajevo in 1914 or Poland, 1939.

President Kennedy's plan for helping the United Nations out of a financial hole, offers the best chance of keeping the United Nations alive. It offers the best opportunity of demonstrating to large countries or blocs of countries that they cannot use the U.N. for selfish purposes. It offers the best opportunity of emphasizing that the United States will not let the small nations be blackmailed out of their right to hope and to work for peace in concert with all other nations of the world.

PHELPS PHELPS.

Free Rides if Kennedy Trade Plan Is Approved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 12, 1962

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, because of the continuing blackout by most of the news media, the administration spokesmen and the highly organized pro free trade group, it is refreshing to find a newspaper—foreign to be sure—with this courage to tell us what the end results of our new trade bill will be.

If we pass this new trade legislation as it is now proposed in H.R. 9900 I can only suggest we greet each other when we meet with the famous greetings of another promoted of another day and another year.

We can honestly say "Hya sucker."

The article from the Financial Post, of Toronto, February 19, 1962, follows:

FREE RIDES IF KENNEDY TRADE PLAN IS APPROVED

(By C. Knowlton Nash)

WASHINGTON.—There are a lot of nuggets for Canada in President Kennedy's new trade program.

If the program becomes law, Canadian exporters should shout "hallelujah." It's a big if, however, with Congress in a hesitant mood to grant Kennedy the sweeping trade powers he wants.

A detailed FP study of the Kennedy proposals shows they contain almost everything Canada could hope for. In fact, they contain almost everything Canada has been urging on the United States in recent years in the general area of trade policy.

If Kennedy gets his way, here's how Canada would benefit generally:

Canada would get free rides on a number of products as Europe and the United States develop free trade in about $4,000 million worth of goods during the next 5 years.

The present teeth in the protectionist peril point law would be pulled.

The present protectionist escape clause would be drastically diluted.

Canadian exports would benefit from a U.S. across-the-board 50 percent cut in a vast number of items not coming under the free trade category.

There would be free trade in a large number of items which now face tariffs of 5 percent or less and this would eliminate U.S. barriers on a wide range of Canadian goods.

Despite the tremendous potential gains for Canadian trade in Kennedy's trade proposals, statements from Ottawa have been less enthusiastic than observers had expected.

Reason for this: The entire Kennedy trade program is predicated on the British joining the Common Market.

The major free trade provision, for instance, would be worth very little without British membership in the Common Market. Also the program is aimed at inhibiting the British from taking too extensive trade preferences into the market.

The Canadian Government, in contrast, is trying to get the British to take in as extensive trade preferences as possible for the Commonwealth. Thus Washington and Ottawa are at odds on this key point.

Aside from this, however, there are many specific ways in which Canada will reap enormous benefits from the Kennedy program if Congress approved it or any substantial part of it.

One section of the program calls for Presidential authority to declare free trade in any item which now has a tariff of 5 percent or less. This covers hundreds of millions of dollars worth of Canadian exports to the United States.

Some examples:

Canadian nickel could enter the United States free.

So could Canadian salmon, cod, haddock, hake, white fish, fish fillets and fish cakes.

Free entry would be authorized for many kinds of Canadian lumber.

Also free entry for Canadian peat moss, for Canadian salt, maple sugar, some pulpwood and fiberboard, some grass seed, cattle hides and a host of other items.

Probably the single greatest beneficiary in Canada under this section would be the International Nickel Co. which has a dominant share of the U.S. market.

Some U.S. officials working on the trade program, in fact, have dubbed this section as "the Inco amendment".

The other free trade provision says the President would have authority to abolish tariffs on goods if together the United States and the Common Market countries produced 80 percent or more of the total world export value of all the articles within any category.

There is room here for some so-called free rides for Canadian exports.

Since free trade would apply to all countries—not just the Common Market and the United States—it means Canada would have free entry into both Europe and the United States for commodities involved.

In addition, there might be some articles within a category in which Canada is a dominant supplier and which might also get this free-trade treatment.

In such a case, however, Canada likely would have to be involved in negotiations with the Common Market and the United States.

Washington is reluctant to let Canada—or any other country—have too many free rides and would seek concessions from Canada. These concessions, however, might not have to be on the specific commodity involved in the free ride.

Proposals on agricultural trade are somewhat more limited than those relating to industrial products. But they are written so that, for instance, Canadian cheese might be able to finally surmount the present U.S. restrictions. This would mean several million dollars a year to the Ontario and Quebec cheddar cheese industry.

One striking omission in the Kennedy proposals: The absence of teeth in the peril point procedure for the U.S. Tariff Commission.

In the past many Canadian firms, anxious to get lower tariffs, have been encouraged by U.S. administration support on specific items only to find their hopes dashed by peril point rulings in the Tariff Commission.

These rulings are made just before a tariff-cutting session and are a haven for protestionist-minded U.S. firms frightened of import competition.

In the Kennedy proposal, the peril point decisions would be made by the President, not the tariff commission. The words peril point, however, are not in the proposed law.

Another protectionist haven, the escape clause, also is drastically weakened.

Over the years, millions of dollars have been spent by Canadian companies sending delegations to U.S. Tariff Commission hearings to argue in escape clause cases and tens of millions of dollars worth of business has been lost by Canada because of escape clause actions.

But under Kennedy's proposals, this action would be significantly reduced. Escape clause actions would only occur, in the language of the proposal, as extraordinary relief.

Only whole industries could seek higher tariffs through escape clause action—not individual companies as at present. The whole emphasis of the Kennedy program is on providing aid to companies hit by import competition through domestic subsidies, loans, retraining, relocation allowances and other trade adjustment actions.

The proposal also makes it much harder than at present for escape clause actions by making stringent tests for complaining industries.

An industry has to be experiencing significant idling of productive facilities of firms, prolonged and persistent inability to operate at a profit and widespread unemployment.

In addition, the industry must have taken reasonable efforts to correct these problems themselves and the problems must be traced directly to lower trade restrictions.

One particularly important benefit for Canada under the Kennedy trade suggestions relates to a 4-year limit on any trade restrictions imposed under the new escape clause or extraordinary relief section.

In addition, if the President so wishes, the restriction can be lifted before the 4 years are up. The President, however, also can extend the restriction if he desires.

This new section would give Kennedy much more room to maneuver than he now has.

For Canada, for instance, this would affect the present U.S. restrictions on lead and zinc shipments to the United States. It could mean that by July 1, 1963, the lead and zinc restrictions could automatically come off.

There are about a dozen other commodities now under restriction through escape clause action which might be affected by this section, but lead and zinc is the main one for Canada.

For the future, it means even if restrictions are slapped on, Canadian firms would have a much better chance than they now have to get rid of the trade barrier within a certain time limit.

One other protectionist loophole in the present trade law is the national security section which authorizes restrictions if the national security is endangered. This section is put into Kennedy's proposals in largely the same way as it is at present.

Senator Carl Hayden

SPEECH

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, the greatest single truth about the life of Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, is that his career reflects credit on us all.

CARL HAYDEN and men like him have built into the Senate of the United States its profound reputation for the only aristocracy the democratic process encourages—the aristocracy of character. Because of him his State has been helped to enviable growth. That same influence of his strong but unspectacular statesmanship, has, in the massive accumulation of the years, yielded spectacular benefits to the country and the legislative method.

Here is a half century of service in the Congress—the longest in history, for which in this document we seek to honor him—eight terms in the House and six in the Senate, that makes Senator HAYDEN our elder statesman in the most meaningful sense of the term. More than that he is the grand old man who, through merit, enjoys from his colleagues, his constituents, even his opponents, all that any man can hope for in the way of affection, or respect, or both.

To his own generation and to generations yet to come he is an object lesson in selfless dedication to the public good. Men in political life, striving for public office, will marvel at the example he set for winning the wholehearted endorsement of his constituency again and again and again, without any of the devices of display and self-promotion which so many find indispensable for attracting deserved public recognition.

The record will validate my statement that there is hardly a piece of legislation of any consequence in CARL HAYDEN'S 16 years in the House and 34 years in the Senate that does not, at some point, bear the mark of his wisdom, his counsel, his persuasive and amicable collaboration. Yet in a half century of legislative history he made no more than a total of three speeches. He took his seat in the House when Arizona became a State in 1912. A descendant of colonial Americans he has been written about as the only real-life frontiersman still in public life. His father, a Connecticut Yankee, brought 14 cattle-drawn wagons over the Santa Fe Trail in 1848 and CARL HAYDEN was the first white child born in the town his father founded, then called Hayden's Ferry, now Tempe.

Young HAYDEN, in a rifle match in 1911, won the national long-range title by scoring 15 bullseyes out of 15 at 1,000 yards. And he had been the Maricopa County sheriff before he became a Congressman. He was a major of Infantry in World War I. One can think of him taking his education at what is now Arizona State University and at Stanford, in California. But it is difficult to think of CARL HAYDEN carrying a gun, much less using it.

Sagacity and tolerance, plus a genius for conciliation, have been his great weapons, not violence—physical or forensic. My association with him on the Joint Committee on Printing is a highlight in my experiences as a Member of the House. He is an inspiring chairman, and a force for understanding and objectivity in the complex work of the Joint Committee on Printing.

In a State having a large Indian population it was he, a champion of social security, who fought and won for the Indians their right to come under its benefits. HAYDEN may be said to have joined a divine partnership with Almighty God to preserve His scenic wonders in Arizona. Together they turned green and verdant the parched lands of the desert through legislation HAYDEN sponsored and saw enacted into law. His strategic espousal of better and badly needed highways can be seen, for example, in the Hayden-Cartwright bill of 1934 that bears his name. His workaday contribution to our legislative history is immense.

Great tributes will be paid CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, down through the years. None will be greater than the monument he built to himself by his achievement and his character.

The Coming Battle Over Trade

SPEECH

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include my article in the March 1962 issue of the Progressive entitled "The Coming Battle Over Trade":

THE COMING BATTLE OVER TRADE

(By HENRY S. REUSS)

When President John F. Kennedy sent his foreign trade program to Capitol Hill in January, his message to Congress accompanying the recommended proposals gave them added stature and importance. He chose to call the trade program the greatest challenge of all. Yet, paradoxically, the President's clearest chances of persuading Congress to adopt his recommendations rest on his ability to depict the program less as an economic trade measure than as a means of furthering the unity of the free world.

As late as last November, it seemed dubious that there would be any foreign trade program presented to this Congress. Most of the President's advisers were counseling caution: The public is not yet ready; let's wait until Britain is safely in the Common Market; there is too much risk of defeat in Congress.

But President Kennedy sensed, as he did on the eve of his decision to enter the West Virginia primary 2 years ago, that there is a tide in the affairs of men, which, taken at the flood, leads on to victory. What he has asked for represents a sharp break from the cautious aims of earlier reciprocal trade agreement acts.

Instead of the usual timid tariff-cutting powers of 20 percent or so, the President asks for power, over a 5-year period, to reduce tariffs by 100 percent on goods produced mainly in the United States and Western Europe, such as automobiles, consumer durables, machine tools, machinery, and most chemicals; and by 50 percent on other industrial product. The principle of nondiscriminatory, most-favored-nation treatment which we have followed ever since 1934 is retained.

Protectionist safeguards are considerably watered down. Under the President's current plan, industries jeopardized by import competition would be helped primarily by methods other than tariff raising. These trade-adjustment procedures would include unemployment compensation, retraining, and relocation allowances for workers, tax benefits, and loans to industries to encourage diversification.

The fundamental reason for such relatively radical powers to be placed in the hands of the President is the astonishing economic and industrial development of Western Europe in the past decade, culminating in the creation of the unprecedentedly successful Common Market. The immediate and urgent need for such wide-ranging powers is to give the President the strongest possible bargaining power in his efforts to open up Western Europe's growing market.

Our payments position has been deteriorating for almost a decade. Though our exports of goods have been exceeding our imports by a strong margin—$20 billion to $15 billion in 1961, our overall deficits, taking into account our military expenditures abroad, our foreign aid, and our private capital investment overseas, have been around $3 billion a year for each of the last 4 years.

The most constructive single way in which the United States can get rid of her persistent payments deficit—a deficit brought about mainly by our assuming our world responsibilities for defense, aid, and investment—is by expanding our exports. And the burgeoning Western European market is the most promising area in which to expand. For the last 2 years our exports to Western Europe exceeded $6 billion a year, almost one-third of our total exports.

The President's proposals, if approved by Congress, will not in themselves solve our foreign payments problem. But they will give him a powerful tool with which to negotiate with an increasingly unifying Western Europe, not only on trade and tariffs, but on other world responsibilities where the European countries have been dragging their feet.

Since World War II, the United States has steadfastly traveled away from narrow nationalism and isolationism in its major actions affecting other countries. Europe has renounced colonialism and has moved to erase national economic boundaries on the Continent. These are huge steps forward. They have been approved and applauded by the United States.

But it must be said candidly that Europe does not yet have a world view. Its sense of responsibility has not grown in pace with its prosperity and growing power. Its actions in certain major policy areas are not reassuring and, if persisted in, may diminish or nullify U.S. efforts in the free world community.

The measure by which prosperous Western Europe still fails to live up to its responsibilities is readily seen in the U.S. balance of payments with continental Europe. During the third quarter of 1961, we were in deficit to Europe by $1.5 billion.

The deficit was not due to our inability to sell goods to European customers. Indeed, we had a merchandise trade surplus—an excess of U.S. exports to Europe over imports—of $532 million in these 3 months. But this favorable balance failed by a huge

margin to cover $2 billion in other payments to Europe, mainly because of large tourist expenditures, private capital investment, money transfers to Americans living in Europe, troop pay and other defense expenditures, and short-term capital movement.

These figures are for the most recently available quarter. They may overstate the extent of the current dollar outflow to Europe. But there is no question that the balance is tipped toward Europe by a substantial margain.

There are many constructive steps Europe could take to correct this situation. First, the European countries could substantially lower their tariff walls so as to buy more goods and services from the United States. They could also open their markets to Japanese exports. Japan's extra earnings would tend to be spent in the United States for more food, raw materials, machinery, and other goods. Second, they could greatly enlarge foreign aid expenditures on an untied basis, and try to channel purchases to the United States. Third, they could, directly or indirectly, pay much more as their share of the defense of Europe. Fourth, to protect the dollar while all these adjustments were being made, the more prosperous European countries could join in an adequate international credit agreement.

By forming a customs union, the six countries of the Common Market—Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg—have gained tariff advantages over the United States. The advantages come from the fact that member countries of the union will gradually reduce their tariffs to each other while working toward a common set of duties toward the outside world. These builtin advantages—discriminations against outsiders—cannot fail to affect U.S. exports adversely. Moreover, since there is every likelihood that the customs union will soon expand to include the United Kingdom and the remaining European countries, Western Europe will have combined to place obstacles to an expansion of imports from the United States just when more imports will be needed.

Germany, with more than full employment and confronted with the need to import labor from other countries, persists in protecting a high-cost inefficient domestic coal industry and in limiting annual coal imports from the United States to 5 million metric tons. Its domestic consumption is more than 110 million tons annually. An expansion in coal exports of 10 million tons per year could mean an increase in U.S. exports of $100 million. It exports $6 million of certain kinds of leather to the United States, yet holds down imports of similar leather from the United States to $50,000 per year.

The Common Market countries want more tariff protection on wheat, feed grains, and other agricultural commodities important to U.S. trade. The argument among these countries now turns on how high that protection should be. Again, this attempt to increase agricultural production through higher tariffs comes when labor shortages in European industry are multiplying, and a shift away from inefficient agriculture to industry would be advantageous.

Until very recently, Europe's bilateral foreign aid expenditures consisted almost entirely of grants or loans to colonies, former colonies closely tied to the mother country's economy, or export credits and guarantees. Almost none of the aid was given in a way which could result in purchases outside the aid country, and so did nothing to correct payments imbalances. Apart from a new program in Germany, there appears to be little prospect in the near future for foreign aid of the kind which would help the U.S. balance of payments.

The United States spends about $3 billion per year outside this country for defense. Nearly half of this is spent for the defense of Western Europe. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, we spent more than a billion dollars in Germany, France, and Italy, three of the countries which have gained most in reserves from us in recent years.

To reverse this flow, the countries which are in current surplus payments position could increase their troop support in NATO, making it less necessary for this country to send troops from the United States; pay for local base operating expenses, such as pay for civilian personnel, land rental costs, construction, and locally purchased goods and services; and purchase their own equipment and materials from the United States.

The United States does not expect gratitude for past favors from Europe, nor does it need to ask for aid out of weakness. What the United States and the rest of the free world do expect are a sense of responsibility and a sense of common purpose on the part of the European countries.

The President's request for greater freedom in negotiating tariff reductions is designed primarily to enlarge our opportunities for trade with Western Europe, but it is also conceived as a bargaining power of considerable strength in achieving a more equitable sharing of responsibilities in foreign aid and the common defense.

The potential European markets for U.S. goods is impressive. The U.S. internal market for automobiles, TV and radio sets, refrigerators, and washing machines is 90 percent or better saturated, except for replacements. But from testimony before the Joint Economic Committee last December, saturation in Western Europe is only about 22 percent for automobiles, 22 percent for radios, 13 percent for refrigerators, and 16 percent for washing machines.

Yet the new external tariff of the Common Market will contain some staggering discriminations against our goods. The proposed Common Market external tariffs (subject to reductions up to 20 percent in return for reciprocal U.S. reductions) are 29 percent for automobiles, 20 percent for radio and TV sets, 19 percent for washing machines, and 18 percent for automatic dishwashers.

These tariffs, it should be emphasized, will in most cases be considerably higher than the previous tariffs of some of our best and fastest-growing European customers, such as Germany and Benelux. Given the ability of one Common Market country to enter the other without tariffs, our exports to Europe—if nature is allowed to take its course—will contract rather than expand.

The United States could lead a Spartan life, keep wages and prices stable, and make admirable productivity gains, yet see much of our export trade gobbled up by countries to which the Common Market accords a sweeping discriminatory advantage.

The President is proposing, instead, that we face the realities of a new international situation with a fresh and aggressive tariff policy aimed at expanding our foreign trade, even at the cost of some temporary dislocations here at home. For the first time since 1934, our trade proposals are less a sentimental curtsy to Adam Smith and more a hardheaded imperative for America's international solvency.

How will the President's trade program fare in Congress? In the traditional trade battle the protectionist voice is always disproportionately loud. A Congressman whose district includes a bird-cage factory employing seven workers will hear plenty about the threat of Italian imports. Meanwhile, thousands of workers in the district whose end-products go into exports are never heard from. Consumers, who stand to benefit from varied and cheaper goods, are similarly unorganized and silent.

The protectionists are effectively organized into the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy. The Committee opposes the trade adjustment program almost as vigorously as it opposes low tariffs. The trade adjustment plan attempts to rescue a victim of import competition by helping it to switch to other lines. Once this is accomplished, the Committee loses a constituent—perhaps accounting for its lack of enthusiasm for trade adjustment.

Pessimists over the prospect for the President's trade proposal can point to two other factors:

Congressmen from the South, formerly the citadel of free trade, have become increasingly protectionist in the last decade. The need for cotton exports formerly carried the day, but now the textile industry, hit by competition from Europe, Japan, and Hong Kong, commands increasing protectionist strength.

Unemployment still hovers around 6 percent, our most persistent domestic economic problem. Congressmen are always tempted to export unemployment—"let's keep up our exports, but let's protect our domestic industries from cheap foreign labor by high tariffs."

With all the old protectionist arguments once again advanced, with much of the South deserting free trade, with a high plateau of unemployment—how can the administration get even a timid trade act through Congress, much less the ambitious bill presented?

Ironically, in 1962 boldness may succeed where timidity would surely fail. The reason is the Common Market, and the revolution it has wrought. The Common Market is moving faster than even its originators dreamed. Since the Treaty of Rome was signed in 1957 by the Inner Six—France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg—internal tariffs have been reduced 50 percent, and will disappear by 1966.

Prosperity within the Common Market—an internal market of 170 million people—is without precedent. The area's gross national product is rising at close to 6 percent a year, twice the recent rate of the United States' and Great Britain's. West Germany's gross national product doubled in the 5-year period 1955–60.

Now Great Britain, Denmark, and Ireland have applied for membership in the Common Market. Others in the Outer Seven are expected to follow; when organization is completed, the area could have a population of close to 270 million. Even more than economic, the Common Market's purpose is political. As the sharp edges of age-old European nationalism are removed, the chances of conflict diminish. West Germany and France could be allies, not enemies.

The United States has consistently supported the Common Market, even if it hurts us. Now, the Common Market is beginning to hurt. But it need not hurt long, if we have the courage to make the bold policy changes necessary.

What is inspiring about the Common Market is its power to move men's preoccupation away from narrow nationalism. If we choose to sit on the sidelines and do nothing, we could watch the Common Market, as enlarged, further divide the free world. If, on the other hand, we seize its logic and apply it broadly, we can play our part in the creation of a community of free nations that can grow beyond our dreams. Only such a strong community is capable of meeting the requirements of the underdeveloped countries, of offering a magnet to the peoples back of the Iron Curtain. The adventure could be what the West needs to recover its spirit over the next two decades.

Will Congress give the President the powers he seeks? I think so. The President and the people have sensed an historic tide, and Congress must move with it, too.

Developing Leadership Through the FAA—Splendid Address by Alabama State President Jimmy Barnes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago it was my privilege to attend a meeting of the county Future Farmers of America presidents in Alabama. The meeting was sponsored by the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce and the Alabama State Fair Authority. At a banquet sponsored by the Alabama State Fair Authority, at the Fairgrounds in Birmingham, the State Future Farmers of America president, Mr. Jimmy Barnes, of Route 1, Sulligent, Ala., was introduced and made an excellent talk on the subject of "Developing Leadership Through the FAA." Jimmy's remarks were so well taken that I am happy to insert them herewith in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I wish that every Member of Congress could have heard this fine young man give his speech. The substance of what he said and the manner in which he presented it was most inspiring:

DEVELOPING LEADERSHIP THROUGH THE FFA

"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth."

When man first set foot upon the shores of this great land he found a vast wilderness where dangers lurked behind every rock and tree. He could see only the few things near at hand, and knew nothing of what lay beyond the short range of his sight. But courage and daring forced him on and on. He cut and carried, plowed and seeded, planned and built, until our country took the form that it has today. Ours today is a land of intermingled friendship; a land in which skyscrapers and silos fuse into the common landscape, and hearts beat in unison.

When the poet Samuel Walter Foss said:

"Men seem as alike as the leaves on the trees,
As alike as the bees in the swarming of bees;
And we look at the millions that make up the State—
All equally little and equally great—
And the pride of our courage is cowed.

"Then Fate calls for a man who is larger than men.
There's a surge in the crowd, there's a movement—and then
There arises the man who is larger than men—
And the man comes up from the crowd."

he was talking about leadership. I'm thinking of the FFA, whose primary aim is the development of agricultural leadership, cooperation, and citizenship.

Our FFA organization is the dream of Henry C. Groseclose, who realized as a freshman at Washington and Lee University too well the handicaps under which a farm boy enters college. This dream became a reality when the Future Farmers of America organization was launched in Kansas City, Mo., on November 20, 1928. Here, 35 Vo-Ag students with leaders came together in the establishment of what is now the largest farm boy organization in the world.

We have come a long way since 1928. Since that time FFA has grown from a group of about 10,000 to over 383,000 today.

In 1917, the Smith-Hughes Act was passed by Congress establishing vocational agriculture courses in high schools. These classes enabled farm boys to obtain a working, scientific knowledge of farming. The result was that the coming generation of farmers was better trained for its vast job of feeding the people of the United States. Still, there were neglected phases of the farm boy's life. He had no organized recreation, social life, or training for future leadership in his community.

FFA realized early that the ability of a farmer to express himself before a group of people was vitally important. Consequently in 1929, the public speaking contest, was inaugurated. Parliamentary procedure is another field in which the FFA offers leadership training.

A third important phase of the leadership program is officer training. An FFA officer gains invaluable experience as he meets the many problems of the organization and learns to cope with them. The recreational and social program varies with each chapter, but some activities are almost universal. The annual FFA banquet is a highlight of the social year. It helps to develop understanding of our program and its accomplishments among parents, teachers, and others interested in FFA work, and offers a challenge to FFA members. In community service, the FFA program includes conducting farm safety and fire prevention programs, beautifying the community, and conserving the natural resources on the farm.

Each of us remembers our first meeting as Greenhands. We were silent while advanced students quoted the creed as follows: "I believe in the future of farming, with a faith born not of words but of deeds—achievements won by the present and past generations of farmers; in the promise of better days through better ways, even as the better things we now enjoy have come up to us from the struggles of former years. I believe that to live and work on a good farm is pleasant as well as challenging; for I know the joys and discomforts of farm life and hold an inborn fondness for those associations which, even in hours of discouragement, I cannot deny. I believe in leadership from ourselves and respect from others. I believe in my own ability to work efficiently and think clearly, with such knowledge and skill as I can secure, and in the ability of organized farmers to serve our own and the public interest in marketing the product of our toil.

"I believe we can safeguard those rights against practices and policies that are unfair. I believe in less dependence on begging and more power in bargaining; in the life abundant and enough honest wealth to help make it so for others as well as myself; in less need for charity and more of it when needed; in being happy myself and playing square with those whose happiness depends upon me. I believe that rural America can and will hold true to the best traditions in our national life and that I can exert an influence in my home and community which will stand solid for my part in that inspiring task."

This, my fellow future farmers and friends, is the ultimate aim of the leadership expected from each of us. All of this proves that our organization has been built on sound American principles. We believe in practicing brotherhood. This brotherhood is not found on the world-owes-me-a-living creed, nor is it based on jealousy of one individual toward another, nor as one group expecting to profit at another's expense. No, it simply promises that a future farmer believes in himself.

I am proud to be a member of an organization whose program has attracted the backing of corporations, business and professional men, the entire width and breadth of our country. Realizing that food, fiber, and shelter is the backbone of any nation, they believe in us with greater zeal than ever before. Each year, they pour more time and money into our program. We could not get along without them.

Today, 1 American farmer feeds himself and 25 others. Yet statistics show that two-thirds of the human race suffer from malnutrition. If farmers everywhere could be blessed with the know-how, the freedom, and the machines so typical of America, the hunger and famine which have stalked mankind since time began might well become a memory. Even though our country is not at war, there is still a gigantic task before us. Never before in man's long history has a need for scientific training been so clear. The American farmer stands at the crossroads of one of the most important periods in his history, and now as never before he stands out as the shining symbol and guiding light to the lovers of democratic freedom throughout the world.

With 180 million people in our country, the farm area per person is only 11 acres, and 3 million people are being added every year. By the end of the century, with our population growing the way it is, we will be down to an average of 5 acres for every person. This exploding population poses a formidable challenge to the farmer as early as 1975. The U.S. Department of Agriculture estimates that if our people are to have three square meals a day by then we will have to produce at least 50 percent more eggs, hogs, vegetables, cattle, and milk. In addition to feeding our own people, we supply food to the hungry nations abroad. These facts indicate that there will be an ever-increasing demand for everything that agriculture produces. And that is the challenge of agriculture today. To meet this challenge requires a new type of farmer—a farmer equipped with a wide variety of skills and a broad range of knowledge. There was once a time when we spoke of a farmer as "just a farmer." But that time has passed. To be a good farmer you have to be a variety of experts rolled into one.

To be a good farmer takes sound business ability. He must be able to size up the markets carefully and buy right as well as sell right. He must be a good business executive and organize his farm as a profitable business. Each year new machinery for farm use is introduced to the market. The maintenance, repair, and operation of this complex equipment, requires a man who knows what he is doing. In addition to these skills, those who are going into farming must have a belief in the future.

Men who are willing to accept this challenge of agriculture—and able to accept it—don't just happen. They must be trained. They are the product of the vocational agriculture program and the Future Farmers of America. Personally, I have found inspiration and guidance in the FFA organization. May it live on and grow to reach new heights in the training of farm youth and play its part in continuing the words of Lincoln, when he said, "That this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

The Blessing of American Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, no man in America today can speak with

greater authority on all facets of agriculture than my fellow Georgian, Hon. D. W. Brooks, of Atlanta, manager of the Georgia Cotton Producers Association. He has built that cooperative marketing and purchasing organization since 1933 from a $2,100 shoestring to a $24 million net worth and a $150 million annual business volume today.

Recently Mr. Brooks addressed the Kiwanis Club of Athens, Ga., and gave that group the benefit of his observations and conclusions resulting from his world travels. He painted the vivid contrast between American and Russian agriculture and emphatically pointed out the strength which free enterprise farming gives the United States as compared with the basic weakness which communized farming imparts to the Soviet Union. He stressed the great blessings and benefits which the American consumer derives from an agricultural system of abundance, and he set forth his own recommendations for strengthening and channeling American agriculture.

Mr. President, I feel that this address can give every Member of Congress a new insight into both the problems and pluses of agriculture and I ask unanimous consent that the text of it as printed in the University of Georgia Alumni Record be printed herewith in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA AND FOREIGN AGRICULTURE

(Address by D. W. Brooks)

During the past 50 years we have seen the greatest miracle of production on the farms of this country in the entire history of mankind. We hear a lot about the industrial revolution of this country, but very seldom do we hear about the agricultural revolution. Actually when you make a careful study of the economics of this country, you soon find that the agricultural revolution is even more impressive than the industrial revolution.

A careful study of this agricultural revolution is almost like reading a novel dealing with miracles. Getting away from generalities, it is very easy to move to facts. During the past several years the increase in productivity per capita in industry has been about 2½ percent, whereas the per capita increase in agriculture has been 7 percent, or almost three times as great. Throughout the history of mankind the world has either been starving or on the verge of starvation, but the problem of agriculture in this country for many years has been one of overproduction and overabundance of practically every agricultural commodity. Very few consumers in this country understand just what this has meant for them. Never has a group of consumers had it so good.

For almost 50 years 1 hour of industrial labor has consistently bought more and more food and clothing each year. On an average an hour of industrial labor today will buy some three times as much food, and I might add much finer food, than an hour of industrial labor would buy 40 to 50 years ago, and it is getting better all the time. Whereas in most countries of the world it requires from 50 percent up of the income of the people just to obtain food, in this country our people can buy all the fine food they can possibly consume for a little more than 20 percent of their income. In fact, if they would eat the same kind of food they ate only a few years back, they could buy that kind of food at much less than 20 percent of their income.

As an example, we can use the product that is most produced in this area; namely, broilers. Whereas 6 years ago we produced 1,092 million broilers in this country, this year we will produce approximately 2,100 million or more than 1 billion more. The price has moved down from 25 cents to less than 15 cents per pound to the producer, and actually farmers will obtain only a little more than $100 million more gross income from producing more than 1 billion extra broilers. Putting it another way, they will obtain an average of approximately 10 to 12 cents per broiler, or 4 cents per pound for producing this extra billion broilers.

The years 1947–49 are considered the stable price period between two wars. Whereas nonfood items have increase in price 32 percent from that period to the present, prices received by farmers for food products are actually down 13 percent. This further illustrates what farmers have accomplished for consumers.

Because of a lack of understanding, very often you hear consumers complain about the price they are paying for certain foods. Even in the case of milk they are buying approximately three times as much for an hour's work as they formerly had to pay—and it is pasteurized, homogenized, and every other kind of "ized" as compared to raw milk a few years ago.

The great problem of American agriculture today is what to do with this tremendous abundance that has been brought about by the most efficient agricultural production in the history of the world. There is just so much food that can be consumed by people in this country. There are only three ways to meet this problem.

Number one is through exports of farm commodities. Our agricultural exports are now furnishing a large percent of the total exports which we desperately need to bring about a balance in our payments position. For several years now we have been sending out of this country 3 to 4 billion more dollars each year than we have been getting back. Agriculture is bringing back more than $5 billion, but that is still not nearly enough.

We can also use our food and clothing, which are the products most needed by people around the world, in our desperate struggle with communism. Certainly a full stomach is very conducive to a democratic way of life, and an empty stomach often moves people toward communism, because communism can always outpromise any other type of economy. In fact, I am sure that "stomach communism" has been the strongest of all communisms around the world.

The third thing we can do is to control and reduce drastically production in this country. No doubt in time some of this will have to be done, as distasteful as it might be, in order that agriculture might obtain at least reasonable prices for its commodities.

So much for American agriculture. Now what about agriculture around the world? It has been my privilege to visit most of the countries of the world many times, as we have sales offices in these countries. My training is in agriculture and naturally I have been interested in the agriculture of all these countries during the years. Although there is some good agriculture around the world, generally speaking it is very poor in comparison with ours. When you put it on a per capita production basis it is terribly poor.

I have just returned from another trip around the world visiting most of the countries. Just prior to this trip, I also spent considerable time studying agriculture behind the Iron Curtain, including Russia, Poland, Yugoslavia, et cetera. On this recent trip I went 2,000 miles along the Chinese border. I had the privilege of visiting with many refugees. They all told the same story, namely, that hunger today is the worst in all of China's history. Many of these refugees stated there had always been hunger in China and many people had starved. But under the present Communist system of herding the people into communes, they could allocate the amount of food to every individual because they had to eat in communal kitchens, and now the entire population is in the throes of starvation. Based on many diets which they described to me, it was rather apparent that the average intake for Chinese now is 600 to 900 calories per day, an amount which we use in this country only when we place people in hospitals. Because of this desperate situation the refugees without exception told me that things were so bad and people so weak that they could not work as usual, consequently, they could not produce more. Therefore, the situation is getting worse week by week, month by month, and year by year.

When I told this story to some of my friends they immediately said that Russia would help them. My immediate reply was—with what? I had recently been in Russia and had not only seen the agriculture of Russia but had had conferences with the Minister of Agriculture and his associates.

Based on these observations and conferences I came away from Russia with very definite ideas concerning their weaknesses. I am confident their greatest weakness is in agriculture. For example, when you go into any country one of the ways to test the agriculture of that country is to start ordering different kinds of food. From observation I knew that meat was short in Russia. Having had some rather difficult experiences in many countries where I had eaten something and then asked what I had eaten, I had long since learned it was far better to find out and know what you are eating ahead of time. Consequently, the first night in Russia I ordered chicken. It took two hours to get it and it was not good chicken as compared to U.S. chicken, but at least it was chicken. The next night I ordered chicken again. It took 2 hours to bring out the food, and the meat they brought out had no relationship to chicken. I was already hungry and did not want to wait 2 hours longer for more food, so I began to nibble on the meat they brought me. At first I thought it was rabbit. Then I discovered it was not rabbit, and frankly I never dared ask what it was.

This experience definitely indicated a shortage of meat, which I had already partially discovered. Furthermore, I soon learned that they did not have any of the finer foods that we take for granted in this country. All you could get was rather heavy, coarse food.

Also, I learned that they were having to keep almost 50 percent of their people on the farms in order to have enough of the coarse food available to the rest of the population, as compared to less than 10 percent of the people on the farms in this country. This fact, of course, definitely confirmed a very poor agriculture. Then as I checked into their agricultural practices I found them as a whole antiquated as compared to this country and in only a very few instances did they have anything that would approach decent agriculture.

Speaking here in Athens where the broiler industry is heavily involved, I might illustrate what I am speaking about with broilers. The Minister of Agriculture learned I knew something about broiler production and was very anxious to ask me questions because of their desperate need for meat. One of the first questions he asked was if it required 3½ to 4 pounds of feed to produce a pound of meat. My reply was it required 2¼ pounds of feed. This excited him very much and he questioned the accuracy of my figures. My reply was if he would just get on the plane and come back with me he could weigh the feed and weigh the broilers, and I thought I could convince him that this was

no unusual feat in broiler production, but an average operation. Second, he asked if it took 14 weeks to raise a broiler that would weigh 3 pounds. My reply was that we could produce a broiler weighing 3¼ to 3½ pounds in 8½ to 9 weeks. This he found incredible; in fact, from his viewpoint, impossible. I again explained to him that he could easily find out if he could come over and take a look.

After this exchange I then observed to him that apparently he and his people had no standing in the Politburo. He kept protesting and wanted to know why I made the statement. I said the reason I made it was because all I had heard about industrial development in Russia was that they had made lots of progress, but when I looked at agriculture it was terribly poor, in fact, about as poor as any agriculture on earth. Therefore, I had to assume if Russia was becoming a modern nation practically none of the resources of Russia were being placed in agriculture. He finally partially admitted this might have some basis in fact.

Then I made another statement which very much excited him, namely, that they might be able to regiment industrial workers in Russia by putting them on an assembly line where they could tell whether they did their job or not, but in my opinion the reason why agriculture was terrible all behind the Iron Curtain, in fact, all over the Communist world, was because they were trying to impose on independent farmers a system of government that would not produce in agriculture. I explained to him that the capitalistic system was the only system that had been able to get real production and high scales of living around the world, regardless of the criticisms of it.

I knew that both he and Mr. Khrushchev had a very weak spot, namely, that when Stalin liquidated landowners of Russia, either by shooting them or sending them to Siberia, he was afraid to take everything away from the workers who were left on the farms. Therefore, they left them with one acre which they could farm individually and personally, supposedly to produce vegetables and fruits for the home and one cow to produce the milk. Actually, my checking in Russia showed between 40 and 50 percent of all the fruits and vegetables produced in Russia was produced on these one acre plots and some 53 percent of all the milk was produced by these individual cows. So I explained to him that human nature does not change whether they call themselves Communist or Capitalist, that the way the scale of living of people around the world moved up was by giving freedom of action to the individual and rewarding him for his action, and that the capitalistic system had so far provided this better than any other system which had yet been developed. This statement seemed to be a heavy blow, but I think he fully understood and got the point, because he knew as well as I that the highest producing acres were the ones that the farmers personally operated, and the high producing cows were the ones that the individual family had. In fact, he had seen what I had seen many times in Russia, that is, old ladies with their individual cows moving them from one bunch of grass to another, and the government cows were getting along the best they could.

We now see the spectacle of the whole Communist world hanging on a thread of starvation because they have tried to impose on farmers in these countries the socialistic, communistic philosophy which they have imposed on industrial workers. So far I have found no place on earth where this system has worked for farmers, and I am confident that the most vulnerable spot in the whole of communism is their agriculture. Since this is our strongest field, it seems to me that we need to get this story over fully and completely to the uncommitted peoples of the world. The Communists through all these years have been promising more food and clothing to the people who would join them, whereas the facts are now, and they are facts which can be easily proven, that the best way to starve to death and to have the lowest scale of living is to communize the agriculture of the world.

I am hoping that we in the Western World can use this very effectively to influence that part of the world which is now uncommitted to turn their backs on communism, which, instead of leading them to a better life, actually leads them certainly down the road to hunger. At the same time I hope the people of this Nation will come to realize what an asset they have in modern day agriculture in this country.

Bulgarian Liberation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, March 3 was a historic day for Bulgaria. As we know, the 19th century say the rebirth of many once free but long oppressed nationalities in Europe, particularly in the Balkan Peninsula. In the course of that century nearly all oppressed peoples in that troubled peninsula cast off the Ottoman yoke, asserted their freedom, and proclaimed their independence. The Bulgarian people did this in 1878, and this fact was proclaimed in an international treaty signed March 3 of that year.

Bulgarians had a grand and glorious history in the Middle Ages. For centuries theirs was the most powerful kingdom in the Balkans. But they could not resist the Ottoman Turks. As these newcomers advanced into the Balkans in the late 14th century, they overran the whole region. They conquered Bulgaria and made it a province of the Ottoman Empire. For 400 years they held sway over Bulgaria.

Throughout that time indomitable Bulgarians, who had not known foreign rule over them and who had up to then successfully repelled all attacks upon their free way of life, fought back their oppressors. Almost all the time their leaders were fomenting trouble for Ottoman rule, organizing rebellions and advocating revolutions. In all this Bulgarians were true to themselves; they simply refused to be reconciled with their lot, and wanted to free themselves. But the Turks, whenever there was any disturbance, punished the innocent masses with massacres. This went on for decades. Finally in the 1870's Bulgarians again rebelled against their overlords, and again the Turks meant to put an end to the recurrence of such uprisings by killing more Bulgarians. By this barbaric act the Turks went too far, and sympathizers for the Bulgarian cause were alarmed, though they could not agree among themselves as to the method of helping the Bulgarians. Then the Czar of Russia declared war against the Turks, went to the aid of the harassed Bulgarians, and when the war came to an end early in 1878 Bulgaria attained its freedom. Her freedom was recognized in an international agreement on March 3, and that day has become a Bulgarian national holiday.

For 84 years Bulgarians have been freed from the Ottoman yoke, but it would be incorrect to say that since then they have enjoyed freedom and independence. Certainly they have not been masters of their own fate for the last two decades. Since then they have been suffering under the relentless tyranny of Communist totalitarianism. They are imprisoned in their historic homeland and denied freedom. At the time of the 84th anniversary of their Liberation Day, let us hope that they attain their dearly cherished and richly merited goal, freedom and liberty.

A Case for Dr. Rush

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the President has recommended a hospitalization plan tied in with social security, and in my opinion, misnamed a medical care plan which program will undoubtedly be before the Congress for further study, I wish to insert an article which appeared in the last issue of the Journal of American Insurance, entitled "A Case for Dr. Rush":

A CASE FOR DR. RUSH

It can only be theorized how Dr. Benjamin Rush, physician, citizen, and one of the most versatile men in the 18th-century America, would have resolved the present-day controversy over voluntary versus compulsory health care for the aged. His talents terminated about 150 years ago. But he reappears on the American scene today as an examplar of sagacity, good sense, and dedication that are needed to settle the issue of how we are going to meet the health-care needs of our aged.

He started the practice of medicine among the underprivileged of Philadelphia. He established in that city the first dispensary in the United States in 1786. He would have become the greatest American physician of the 18th century even if the plague of yellow fever had never occurred in Philadelphia in 1793. But in that scourge, one of the great tragic episodes in the human history of the land, he attained a hero's rank.

That crisis, like today's problem of the aged's health care, was a problem of the whole people. But unlike today's health-care job, it wasn't left to Congress. Through Dr. Rush's leadership and courage it was solved by local initiative and free enterprise—the banding together of a group of citizens to function as an emergency committee, the opening of an isolation hospital on Bush Hill and the decreeing of certain health rules. That probably was the Nation's first test of what is now the historic American concept of doctor-patient, Federal-State relationships.

That concept is on trial again amid the confusion, misinformation, and controversy

about health care for the aged. The issue, first of all, is a political-action device par excellence—emotional in nature, hard to define, difficult to oppose and highly topical for press and public airing. Yet legislated health as a basic human right can never be anything more than a form of welfare, the fastest growing item of Federal spending. It is certainly not insurance in the established meaning of the word.

MANY OF THE AGED HAVE SETTLED THE ISSUE

In the absence of a Dr. Rush, the Nation's 17 million people who are 65 years old or older may have something to say about how they prefer their health-care problems to be handled. Today 53 percent of the aged who need and want health insurance have it; by the end of this decade an estimated 80 to 90 percent of the aged will have it.

That is assured by the many established programs. Just as one example, a surprisingly large number of these people will still be protected in group health-insurance plans of the companies where they are employed. (Nearly 30 percent of the older age population are still on the job.) And at the rate older persons are now coming into programs provided by the insurance industry, the health-care problem of people 65 years old and older will decrease over the years rather than increase. Of those not covered—now or later—a surprising percentage have said they don't want it.

Admittedly there still remain those who need protection and for whom society must take the responsibility. Society can—and has—through free ward care by the communities in which these people live, by charity (e.g., United Community Funds) or by State legislation to implement the Kerr-Mills amendment to the Social Security Act.

That poses the issue of whether our voluntary system of health and medical care—acknowledged to be the best in the world—shall be preserved or shall it be supplanted, step by step, by a large, central, national bureaucratic authority starting with compulsory medical care for the aged under the Federal social security system.

Proponents of compulsory health insurance for the aged would have Congress and the people believe that private insurance must be displaced, for its cost is high and its coverage limited."

Private insurance has never pretended that it was utopia. But it will stand on its public-acceptance record through 210 years of protecting the value of life and property under our free enterprise system. As for protecting the older-aged population, the record is exemplary and constantly improving. The 53 percent of Americans 65 years of age and older who in 1961 were covered by some type of voluntary health insurance numbered 9 million persons. That is approximately three times the number similarly covered 9 years ago. Moreover the percentage of aged people with health insurance is growing faster than the rate for younger people.

Even the proponents of social-security health care admit that private insurance "helps some." In truth, health-insurance benefit payments during 1961 were $6.3 billion, an increase of 11 percent over 1960.

Whatever the future health-care needs of the aged may be, the private insurance industry has massive resources and generations of experience for doing the job. At least 288 voluntary health-insuring organizations currently issue new individual hospital or surgical policies to persons 65 years of age or older. These organizations include long-established insurance companies, Blue Cross-Blue Shield and other insuring plans.

At least 51 insurance companies offer individual health-insurance policies guaranteed renewable for lifetime. At least 31 of these companies issue this lifetime protection to persons 65 years of age or older.

Several insurance companies offer policies through a mass enrollment approach to all senior citizens regardless of medical history.

At least 82 insurance companies, which issue 90 percent of the group health insurance written by the insurance business, and a number of other insurance organizations offer policies continuing coverage under group plans for retired employees.

At least 214 insuring organizations give retirees the option to convert from their group plan to an individual policy of their own.

Still newer methods of mass enrollment of the aged in health-insurance plans are rapidly being devised by private initiative and private voluntary effort.

CONNECTICUT-65 IS MODEL FOR SOUND ACTION

One of the newest advances—Connecticut-65 extended health insurance—has been an assured success from the start. (Public Act No. 95, May 3, 1961.) This unique private experiment was developed by 10 Connecticut-domiciled insurance companies and has now been augmented by the participation of 22 other companies licensed to write health insurance in that State.

The Connecticut act authorizes insurance companies to join their experience and facilities in providing the coverage as the Associated Connecticut Health Insurance Cos. They not only will give public accounting of the program's financial operation but also are committed to administer the coverage in such manner that any excess of premiums over losses, expenses and a risk charge will be used by the association for benefit of the people insured. Thus it is practically a nonprofit program.

CHILDREN ARE PROVIDING FOR THEIR PARENTS

In the coverages offered all senior citizens in Connecticut, major medical-care insurance is emphasized, but there is also provided a base plan of benefits for those who do not have other basic hospital and surgical coverage. When the plan was introduced, 20 percent of the total potential prospects among the Connecticut aged bought health insurance during a 30-day period.

Significant in the Connecticut-65 and similar plans is that many children are providing the health-care insurance for their parents. Enrollees in Connecticut-65 also demonstrated that people want the most complete protection available and that they are willing to pay a higher price for the best protection. Three out of four selected the $10,000 maximum in preference to the $5,000 maximum. That experience and other guideposts from Connecticut-65 are being made available in response to growing interest on the part of other States.

In still another breakthrough, 26 States with some 60 percent of the Nation's aged population now have plans of medical assistance for the aged in operation under the Kerr-Mills legislation of 1960. Other States are appraising their local needs under the plan. The Kerr-Mills amendments of 1960 to the Social Security Act were dual: (1) They offered more Federal funds for health and medical care to recipients of old-age assistance, and (2) they initiated an entirely new Federal-State grants-in-aid program of medical assistance for the aged. Together, the two programs are designed to help meet the health-care needs of all persons 65 years of age or older who are in need or who have relatively small incomes.

Though succeeding in the historic American tradition of doctor-patient and Federal-State relationships, Kerr-Mills medical assistance for the aged has not escaped attack from proponents of the Federalized plan under the social security system. Kerr-Mills detractors are suspected of having two great fears: (1) that medical assistance for the aged will fail to support their extravagant claims of the medical indigency of the aged, and (2) that the increase in private medical-care insurance, pensions and other assets of the aged soon will reduce the role of medical assistance for the aged and render social security health care even more indefensible than it has been.

A National program of complete social-security health services as a "basic human right" has been urged since the 1952 report of a commission set up in the Truman administration. However, the idea of a massive Federal program had its beginnings in the mid-1940's.

In the 87th Congress the issue of voluntary versus compulsory health insurance for the aged swirls and swells around four House and three Senate bills. Primate among these is the administration's Health Insurance Benefits Act embodied in the King-Anderson bills (H.R. 4222 and S. 909). In its behalf President Kennedy said in his State of the Union message to Congress: "* * * in matters of health, no piece of unfinished business is more important or more urgent than the enactment under the social security system of health insurance for the aged * * *."

A principal supporter of the administration bill, the AFL-CIO, has made it a "definite must" in its legislative program; the full resources of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have been put behind it.

Three other proposals besides the administration bill are up for consideration in the 87th Congress. Either as single bills or in combination, they account for the other House and Senate bills previously referred to.

FEDERAL PLAN IS COSTLY, SERVICES LIMITED

The administration's King-Anderson program would cost an estimated total of $1.1 billion annually with an estimated load of 14,250,000 people as of 1963. Covered would be 13,750,000 persons eligible for old age, survivors, and disability insurance and including employed aged and a half million railroad retirees. Hospitalization, home health service, and diagnostic, laboratory and X-ray services would become effective October 1, 1962; nursing-home benefits July 1, 1963. Surgeons', physicians', and dental fees are not covered, nor are expensive drugs used outside a hospital. But more critically important is that the program does nothing whatsoever for those not having social security.

Financing of the program would be done by increasing the OASI taxable wage base from $4,800 to $5,000 beginning with 1962; there would also be a rate increase beginning in 1963 of one-half of 1 percent of the first $5,000 of employee wages; three-eighths of 1 percent of the first $5,000 for self-employed persons.

Although the King-Anderson program is an administration top priority issue in 1962, it is highly vulnerable in six areas.

1. Such a massive Federal program is not required when private enterprise and individual voluntary effort are already well-established and functioning in an expanding role, as has been shown.

2. The program would establish the principle of socialized medicine by providing Government-paid and Government-regulated hospital and nursing-home service.

The proposal calls for providers of health-care services to enter into agreements with the Government under which they will be paid for their reasonable costs for services they supply. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will be empowered to make such contracts and to determine the prices to be paid for services by hospitals,

nursing homes and other providers. This can only mean government regulation of hospitals, nursing homes and health-care agencies; it will inevitably affect control of the practice of medicine within such institutions and agencies. With the principle of Federal medical care in effect, the avowed objective of a complete compulsory medical-care program would be assured.

3. It would open the floodgates to the spread of socialized medicine through Government-paid and Government-regulated personal health care which cannot be restricted to the services in the bill nor to aged persons under social security, whether they are retired or working.

Omitted services such as doctor visits, surgery, dental care, drugs and medicine are far more important to many older people than, say, hospital care which is included. Former Congressman Amie Forand tipped the wink on a federalized program providing the complete range of health and medical care when he said, "If we can only break through and get our foot inside the door, then we can expand the program after that."

No provision is made for the health-care needs of aged widows otherwise getting full benefits at 62, for widowed mothers with dependent children, for disabled workers with young wives and dependent children, nor for persons who are not on social security. Moreover, with age alone determining who gets and who doesn't get health care, it seems inevitable that Congress will be compelled to lower the age requirement to 60, then to 50 and finally to delete the age limit. Labor's Walter Reuther has let it be known: "If we could get the principle established, we want to build on that principle, just as we built on the social security principle."

4. Consider the costs. No one really knows what the ultimate cost of a universal compulsory health and medical program would be.

For health care of the aged alone, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare bases its tax requirement on a cost estimate of $1 billion annually in the early years, rising to $2.5 billion by 1990. Experienced insurance actuaries estimate costs at $2.5 billion a year at first, rising to $5.4 billion a year by 1983. And the total payroll tax on the basis of insurance actuarial figures would be 11 percent on a $5,200 base by 1968, not 9¼ percent as scheduled. Nor does the spiral stop there; it has been advocated that the taxable wage base be raised in steps to $9,000.

5. The program would prostitute the established concept of insurance.

Promises and prospects of a sound social insurance system are patently illusory. What is emerging is not a funded program under which a person's own tax dollars are set aside for his own benefits as are policy premiums under insurance. Besides, there is no magic whereby social security can prefund tax dollars for those employees who are now retired.

Essentially the system is one which pays benefits to present beneficiaries from current tax collections. The social security trust fund of approximately $20 billion may seem huge to some. But it is only a fraction—one-fifteenth—of the future liability of more than $300 billion. Thus payment of future benefits depends almost wholly on the willingness of workers and their employers to pay the necessary taxes for future benefits.

6. There is a constructive alternative approach through private initiative and private voluntary effort, as has been shown, whereby older people can protect themselves against health-care costs.

They are, in fact, already doing it in increasing numbers—and getting the kind of protection best suited to their own personal and family needs.

Look Out for Labels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Look Out for Labels," published in the February 12, 1962, issue of Life Lines. It contains vital thoughts that sparkle in a manner that is dazzling to the mind in this era of blaring confusion in the realm of ideological identity. I comemnd it to the attention of the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOOK OUT FOR LABELS

An immense amount of damage is being done to the cause of freedom in America by a successful campaign to divide Americans over labels. This campaign has enlisted the aid of many outstanding citizens of this country; it is evident in the daily newspaper accounts of speeches given across the country.

Many outstanding Americans are being trapped into making statements which can be twisted into something other than the intention of the speaker. We hear a great deal of talk about extremists, talk which is used to cast a shadow over the integrity of many groups of loyal Americans who are not afraid to speak their minds on subjects concerning the future of freedom, though their views may be in the minority. Efforts are being made to shame all Americans from outward displays of patriotism by the use of sneer words and smear words.

This campaign has its origin within the inner councils of the psychological warfare school of the mistaken. It is tragic that many Americans forget that our country and the freedom we now enjoy came about by the efforts of extremists. It is tragic that Americans cannot disagree honestly about any issue concerning our Government and its course without recourse to a tactic which was originated by the international Communist conspiracy—the tactic of vituperation for anyone who disagrees.

This land of the free has always been big enough even to tolerate error, so long as reason was left free to combat that error. Free Americans will not let the present campaign of intimidation succeed. Now is the time for all Americans to speak up, for in the dull, gray area of silence and conformity lies the total surrender of freedom as we know it. There must be respect for the right of others to hold opinions which differ from ours; just as there must be courage to espouse those principles which we believe vital to the continuation of freedom. When Americans who disagree on political, economic, social or religious matters fall to the level of castigating each other rather than standing firmly and logically for the principles in which we believe, then we have truly reached "the maximum hour of danger" to freedom.

An immense amount of nonsense has been poured out over the words "liberal" and "conservative." Like a flock of timid sheep we have been stampeded by it. Every candidate for public office shouts his liberalism or his conservatism and beats his breast to prove that he is more liberal or more conservative than his opponent. Thoughtless Americans have tried to smear into silence everyone who asked what it means to be a liberal or a conservative. The words, "radical," "tory," "extremist," "superpatriot," "leftwing," and "rightwing" are filling the air.

Americans who permit themselves to be coerced into silence or intimidated into inactivity by this broadside of a mistaken ideology are letting freedom go by default.

Here are thoughts contained in an article by Samuel B. Pettengill—thoughts which we believe all Americans need to think about. He says:

" 'There is a time to sow, and a time to reap.' Every farmer is a liberal in the spring when he plows a fresh field, tries a new feed, experiments with a new fertilizer. In the fall he is a conservative. He conserves the fruit of his toil. He harvests his crops and stores them in the barn where they will not mildew or rot.

"Every youth seeking his first job is a liberal. When he gets his first pay he is a conservative if he is worth his salt. Andrew Carnegie thought it was the supreme moment of his boyhood when he ran home to his mother with shining eyes, holding a few dimes he had received for a week of 12-hour workdays.

"When Old Dog Tray goes sniffing through the brush for rabbits he is a liberal; when he buries a bone he is a conservative.

" 'Go to the ant, O thou sluggard, consider his ways and be wise.' The ant is a conservative. The grasshopper who lays up nothing for cold wet days is a liberal.

"The beehive is a symbol of conservatism, provision for winter days, a shelter against the storm.

"The home is the heart of conservatism. A savings account, a life insurance policy, a Government bond, sound money, a share of stock, a roof over one's head; what are these things but things to be conserved?

"We fight our wars as conservatives. We want to conserve our freedom, the American way of life, the integrity of our frontiers, the soil we call home. Every soldier and sailor is a conservative. We, who remain at home, must conserve a free America for them while they fight for it abroad.

"Workingmen struggling to improve their condition are liberals. When they fight to keep their gains they are conservatives. What is the use of being a liberal unless you are equally brave to conserve whatever good liberalism has won?

"The Declaration of Independence was a liberal document; the Constitution of the United States a conservative one. It was to 'insure' domestic tranquillity, and 'secure' the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

"The trunk of a tree is conservative. It stands immovable against the tempest. The branches, twigs, and leaves are liberal. The roots are conservative. One represents stability and power, the other freedom and movement; one, strength; the other, growth. It is a divine harmony. It proves that the true liberal must also be conservative; the genuine conservative a liberal. Without the giant trunk the tree would fall; without the leaves it would die. Each is necessary to the other. Why should the leaves curse the trunk that holds them to the sun; why should the trunk condemn the leaves which keep the sap flowing from the well springs of life?

"In time the lower branches die. The husbandman (or statesman) prunes them off. He is a liberal in cutting them; a conservative in taking the faggots home to warm his hearth.

"The attic is a conservative institution. In it we store Grandma's old spinning wheel, Grandpa's musket, or the little toy soldiers our soldier sons once played with.

"Lloyd George once said, 'Men will not fight for a boarding house.' He was right. We should be liberal in helping all men and

women to be able to earn and own that conservative thing called home.

"New Year's Day is liberal. Resolutions are made, dreams are dreamed, and hopes flourish. Christmas Day is conservative. It conserves the love of parents, the bond between husband and wife, the laughter of children, charity for the poor, and remembrance of the Master and His mercy.

"Why be tyrannized by a word? Let us be as liberal as seeds in the springtime, as conservative as the laws which hold the great stars in the sky, or the stars in Old Glory."

We are living in a dangerous and challenging age. The challenge of freedom which has been laid down by the international mistaken conspiracy does not leave the free world any alternative but to meet this challenge with greater dedication, more intelligent defense and offense, and ever-increasing knowledge of the nature of our enemy. This is a challenge which must be met by every free individual, for it is a war for the minds of men which is being waged against us. This challenge must be met also by all free individuals working together against our common enemy. This is not a time for fighting among ourselves. It is a time when we need to respect the rights of those Americans with whom we disagree on matters of political, economic, social, or religious issues; but it is also a time in which we must be fearless in standing for our own convictions. The enemy has sworn to divide us and make us fall to fighting among ourselves; the enemy intends to thus weaken our Nation so it will fall into his hands without the firing of a single shot.

In the words of Edward Lipscomb, "There are men today who still have faith in their country, faith in their fellow men, and faith in themselves * * * men of courage, men of compelling conviction. All of them did not die 2,000 years ago. All did not live in 1776.

"Ours is the call to get iron in our blood, bone in our backs, fervor in our souls, and determination in our hearts * * * to know all we can, be all we can, and do all we can in a cause that is greater than we can ever become.

"Ours is the call for modern application of the same type of triumphant heroism which brought our Nation into being. There are no horses to be ridden through darkened streets, but there are many Americans to be awakened; no lanterns to be hung in steeples, but many an illuminating example to be set; no muskets to be shot, but many messages to be spread; no cannon to be faced, but many unyielding stands to be taken.

"In accepting that call, we shall find that we have lifted ourselves to the rich fulfillment of those who lose themselves in devotion to what they know is right. We shall find enduring gratitude and happiness through living for principles devised to outlast us."

Our choice today is not between being Red or dead. Ours is the determination to be neither. Men who love freedom shall live and be free, and our children shall be free after we have gone.

Are We Financing Negotiations of Latin American Countries With the Soviet Union?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, while we prepare to sink more billions into Latin America, many of these same countries are thumbing their collective noses at us as they prepare to do business with the Soviet Union and, in several cases, prepare the way for a Communist takeover. Silly, is it not? Would it not be just good commonsense to protect ourselves in any deals we make in Latin America? Or is it in the self-interest of the United States to finance Red plots in this hemisphere so that we can wring our hands in despair each time we are betrayed? I call your attention to the facts in the following article from the Washington Daily News written by Virginia Prewett, a noted authority on Latin America:

ECONOMIC COLD WAR IN HEMISPHERE

(By Virginia Prewett)

While Castro-Communist-inspired political subversion in Latin America holds public attention, another kind of penetration is shaping up. This is the displacement of U.S. private investors by Latin American state-controlled industries created by the Soviet bloc.

Three events illuminate this penetration:

1. United Nations sources report that Bolivia is discussing deals for the Soviet bloc to create a number of new industries there, on the excuse that "U.S. Capital isn't interested."

Pending Czechoslovakian offers to put $4 million in equipment and experts' services into a new sugar mill and nearly $2 million into a major antimony smelter are reportedly near acceptance. Since the new industries will be part of the official political machinery—a state enterprise—they'll give the Soviet bloc a direct handhold on both the political and economic life of Bolivia.

2. Brazilian economic nationalists, including President Joao Goulart's Labor Party and his state governor brother-in-law, are intensifying a drive against U.S. investors.

3. Both our State and Defense Department in late January expressed official anxiety lest Soviet-bloc economic penetration in Latin America injure U.S. security interests. Both urged national security to get the CAB to approve an otherwise "illegal" investment by Pan American Airways in a Costa Rican airline.

EXPROPRIATION

Bolivia years ago plunged into the economic nationalism now threatening in Brazil. U.S.-owned properties were expropriated. Nevertheless, the United States over a decade has poured nearly $250 million into Bolivia, helping to pay government payrolls and subsidize commissaries in the state-owned mines.

In the late 1950's U.S. private capital even began to return to Bolivia, but rising nationalism since Castro's success in Cuba has killed this current.

The Bolivian situation bears a crude reality: Just after Castro tossed U.S. investors out of Cuban sugar mills, the Bolivian regime that U.S. taxpayers have supported has brought Soviet bloc economic "imperialism" into Bolivian sugar mills.

ALLIANCE

Bolivia is discussing broadening this pattern at the very same time while asking for $400 million in U.S. alliance for progress aid over the next decade.

On past performance, Bolivia's ultranatalistic regime's formula has failed. Official apologists say "things are better," but productivity is down and even though the United States has agreed to help the state-owned oil industry, the economic picture grows ever blacker.

And now that Bolivia has squeezed and scared out the West's private capital, the regime starts to bring in Communist economic influence, always the tool of Russia's political ambitions.

As we watch this, Brazil is starting on the same road.

If U.S. private capital's participation in the economic life of Central America is necessary as a buffer against Soviet economic penetration threatening our security, then how much more important is it in enormous South America.

Well Done, John

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation last week turned out in a great show of American spirit to honor Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., for his historic orbital space flight.

The astronaut is a great national hero, not only for his deeds, but also for his words. In an appearance before a joint session of Congress, Colonel Glenn evidenced his deep patriotism and a tremendous appeal as a symbol of a fine American.

The honors bestowed upon him are those accorded only our greatest heroes. He has personified our national spirit at its best.

An editorial in the State Journal of Lansing, Mich., of Wednesday, February 28, 1962, I believe, accurately reflects the tremendous feeling aroused by John Glenn's speech before Congress. I ask that it be reprinted in the RECORD as a remembrance of this great occasion.

The editorial follows:

WELL DONE, JOHN

Joint sessions of Congress have been addressed by notables far more experienced in public speaking than Astronaut John Glenn but none has made better use of such an occasion.

The space hero's triumphant reception and his words should be a source of inspiration to all his countrymen. In its solemnity and in its spirit of exaltation the occasion was the high point of a national celebration in which some 300,000 persons who were present in Washington and many millions more throughout the land took part.

The cold rain which fell on the Nation's capital failed to dampen the spirits of the throngs who lined the streets to pay tribute to the first American to orbit the earth.

John Glenn told the wildly cheering Congress that space promises unimaginable benefits for mankind.

"We are just probing the surface of the greatest advancement of man's knowledge of his surroundings that has ever been made," he said.

"It is hard to even envision the benefits that will accrue in many fields."

But while the astronaut had much to say of the significance of the space age for mankind as he modestly stressed the fact that Tuesday's achievement was the result of teamwork in which thousands of Americans took part, the most dramatic moment came when the man who retained his composure while orbiting the earth three times told of his reaction to the celebration and to the spirit which it evidenced.

"This has been a great experience for us all," said America's pioneer in orbital flight, "and I am glad to see that pride in our country and its accomplishments are not a thing of the past.

"I still get a hard-to-define feeling when the flag goes by as I know you do, too. Today, as I rode up Pennsylvania Avenue from the White House, and saw the tremendous outpouring of feeling on the part of so many thousands of people, I got that same feeling.

"Let us hope that none of us ever loses that feeling."

Nothing that John Glenn said in his appearance before Congress was of greater importance than his reference to the way in which his fellow Americans had evidenced their pride in national accomplishment and his stressing of the vital role of patriotism in the life of the Nation.

Everything that America is able to accomplish in future space exploration and in all other fields and all its contributions to the preservation of freedom will be dependent upon the spirit of its people of which Astronaut Glenn spoke so movingly in the Nation's capital Monday.

The world's attention was focused on John Glenn's flight through space last week. It is to be hoped that the words he spoke Monday also had the close attention of his countrymen.

Operation Americas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on August 1, 1961, eight young men from New York State embarked in a surplus Navy "duck" on a private good-will mission to South America. I commended them for their initiative on the occasion of their departure, and have been pleased to note their progress along the way. They have been received enthusiastically by students in Mexico, Guatemala, San Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Panama. Recently, I received a letter from Mr. Robert Hinds, the group's leader, relating some of the achievements and hardships which they have experienced. I ask unanimous consent to have this exciting report on a most extraordinary mission printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT ON OPERATION AMERICAS

In going across the United States we had the opportunity to speak to 14 Rotary clubs. There we received recognition from adults who liked our thoughts, ideals, and principles. This was stimulating to our group because ordinarily adults are skeptical of young people's ideas, but not so with "Operation Americas" and its eight college students and its mission of friendship. Once south of the border we talked with students in all Central American countries except Costa Rica because that school was closed.

To our surprise our mission was met with skepticism of the type: Whom are these kids trying to fool? Are they Government propagandists? What really is their mission? This soon changed to interest and enthusiasm when our auditors recognized our sincerity of purpose, the purpose which started project "Operation Americas" and kept it alive in its conception and in its application. Our purpose has been to break through nationalism and provincialism and any other kind of "ism" to bring the true feeling of friendship to the students of Latin America.

In the student of Latin America we found very strong attitudes about the United States. For the most part the students of Central America expressed similar thoughts. They felt the United States imperialistic. They believed that the United States was taking advantage of them because of its economic strength. Our mission was to demonstrate by living example that the people and college students in the United States are interested in the social and economic problems of Latin American nations. We feel that in our objective we have been successful.

We were appalled at finding leftist organization college groups better organized than any of the rightist groups. Discovering this condition and realizing we are not Latin American specialists, we proved that an honest and sincere approach through a simple and common ground of music and folk song, and athletics such as baseball and basketball, reached our fellow students and opened up the door to better fellowship and understanding. We managed to incite a spark of comradeship.

Despite minor inconveniences and a few problems of travel, we arrived in Panama after 5 months of visiting, to be suddenly beset by a whole series of misfortunes. Shortly after arriving in Panama our duck, the *El Pato Valiente*, broke her timing gear and had to be towed to the Canal Zone where assistance was given by Army personnel.

Our differential needed replacement. Our tires being such an odd size for Latin American supply that complete replacement was necessary with the changing of rims. More significantly we had discovered we had reached the end of any road communication into South America.

To continue south required some means of covering a 215-mile water gap. At this time we were faced with a major and momentous decision, the one on our entire trip of most consequence. Should we turn back frustrated or should we book passage on a vessel for ourselves and our vehicle, luxuriating in an ocean voyage but thoroughly depleting our finances? Or should we attempt a most hazardous and daring voyage in our duck in the open ocean?

After carefully weighing the terrible hazard of attempting a crossing on our own in the duck, against the other two choices it was the unanimous decision of the group that we must go on. We would fail too many people who had faith in us by going home. They were talking to their Latin American friends through us, we couldn't turn back; nor would it be possible to pay for the transportation. With a great prayer we set forth into mountainous seas on our way to South America.

Misfortune continued to plague us. The seas proved too much for our frail craft. After 3 days of buffeting the seas and barely covering 50 miles, our outboards gave out and the propellor on our main motor broke. Only through the good graces did we make shore and beach our craft on a jutting sand spit.

Two members of our party hailed a passing coconut boat to return to civilization, the six others remained behind to guard the vehicle and to make whatever repairs possible; though faced with the prospect of living in the jungle on coconuts and whatever else they could find. Sore, weary, frightened, discouraged, beset by questions, it took the two of us 3 days to return to civilization which was Colon, Panama.

It required a telephone call to our families at home to bring the needed assistance. Despite discouragement and disappointment, plus one final blow of misfortune in the accidental gunshot wounding of one of the members of the crew that remained behind in the jungle, our group was as determined as ever to continue onward to South America. There is a promise of means to bring the vehicle and the stranded men back to civilization.

Our group is still fired with the enthusiasm to continue and is making every effort to go on to South America, but this time by having the vehicle and personnel travel the hazardous gap aboard an oceangoing vessel.

Sincerely,

BOB HINDS, Jr.,
President "Operation Americas."

Court Packing Seems Back Again as 82 Democrats Named Federal Judges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following column from the Ann Arbor (Mich.) News of February 28, 1962:

COURT PACKING SEEMS BACK AGAIN AS 82 DEMOCRATS NAMED FEDERAL JUDGES

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy has asked the American people to believe that, in nominating 82 new Federal judges, he couldn't find in the entire United States a single Republican lawyer who, in his judgment, was qualified to be on the list. By reason of legislation last year creating 73 additional judgeships and because of some existing vacancies, Kennedy will soon have filled nearly one-third of the entire Federal bench—more appointments than any President heretofore has had an opportunity to make in a single term.

The display of partisanship was the result of a recommendation by the President's brother, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, who managed the last Presidential campaign and who, it now is being charged, awarded the judgeships on the basis of political considerations.

Another Democratic Party leader, the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, sought in 1937 to have the Supreme Court enlarged from 9 to 15 Justices because, as he told the American people, some of the Justices on the Court at that time held views that didn't go along with his. He wanted a majority that would outvote those with whom he disagreed. The scheme became known as court packing, and was defeated in Congress.

BACK IN VOGUE

Court packing now, however, is back in vogue on a large scale. It is embarrassing for some Senators to oppose a partisan list of judges, because many of the nominations are made to curry favor with Senators who want friends or political associates named to the bench. Seventy Kennedy appointees have been confirmed already by the Senate, and probably the others will be accepted as a matter of routine. The fact that the Republicans have done this in the past does not justify it. Two wrongs do not make a right.

It is significant that Bernard G. Segal, chairman of the Federal Judiciary Committee of the American Bar Association, has just made public a report filed with the Attorney General condemning the process by which 82 Democrats were selected for the Federal bench. Adding to these the three recess appointments of the preceding administration, the qualifications of a total of 85 nominees were analyzed. The American Bar Association committee designated seven as not qualified. Only 14 were designated as exceptionally well qualified, and 41 were listed

as well qualified, while 23 were referred to as qualified. The distinction between these classifications is one that is difficult to define, but apparently even mediocre nominees are frequently called qualified.

Certainly the country is not getting the best qualified men or women to serve as Federal judges.

PROBLEM OF OBLIGATION

The big question is whether politically chosen judges will feel obligated to construe the law in ways that will carry out the policies of the Democratic administration. In these days of government by Executive order, the politically minded appointee can play politics on the bench. He may have been a good lawyer in private practice, but does this necessarily mean he will make an impartial judge?

In answer to criticism, Department of Justice officials are saying that they are merely doing what the Republican administration did in the past—appointing more judges from their own party. But Republicans declare that the Federal judiciary was unbalanced, politically speaking, during the Democratic Party's occupancy of the White House from 1933 to 1953, and that President Eisenhower, by his appointments, was able to bring about for the first time in many years an equal division on the bench between the two political parties. In other words, as Eisenhower filled vacancies with Republicans, he overcame the Democratic Party advantage. Since an equal number of Republicans and Democrats was finally obtained in 1960, the argument is being made by Republican leaders that President Kennedy should have preserved the equal status instead of disturbing the balance once more.

Besides the 82 Democrats nominated for the Federal bench and mentioned in the report of the American Bar Association, Kennedy named seven additional Democrats and one Liberal Party member. Two Republicans already serving on the bench under recess appointments given them by the preceding administration were reappointed. So, to date, only 2 out of the total of 92 appointments are Republicans. By way of consolation, Department of Justice officials are saying that there will be "some" Republicans named in the next batch of 43 appointments. But nobody is saying how much is "some."

WHY POLITICS?

Why should any judge ever be appointed by the political process of recommendation by party brethren in Congress and by local politicians? Does this make for a judicial system of the highest integrity? Segal, of the American Bar Association committee, says wistfully in his report:

"We continue to strive and we continue to hope intermediately for bipartisanship, eventually for the ideal of nonpartisanship."

One wonders why in these days, when the errors and immoral behavior of businesses or of some corporations or of private citizens become the subject of congressional investigation, there is no uproar at all about the immorality that envelops the scandalous method of selecting Federal judges in America.

Ralph Waldo Gwinn

SPEECH

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I served with Ralph Waldo Gwinn on the Committee on Education and Labor from the time I entered the Congress in 1947 until he retired in 1958. He was ranking member of the committee in the 2d session of the 85th Congress after our colleague, Samuel McConnell, retired. Therefore, I knew him well, and I respected him.

Ralph was a deeply religious man. He taught Sunday school and was active in church work.

He believed in the things for which he stood. He never took a position out of political expediency. There was no subterfuge in him.

Highly personable, and a delight to be around, he was an extremely able lawyer, author, and educator.

A man of high purpose and devotion to principle and possessing great force, he brought to everything he did intense energy and conviction.

He had many interests. He was a trustee of DePauw University and of the Asheville School for Boys. He was president of the International Association of Daily Vacation Bible Schools, and he also was president of the National Republican Club and director of the Christian Rural Fellowship.

A constitutionalist, Ralph Gwinn respected and defended the great principles which are set forth in our Constitution. He believed profoundly that the greatness of our country was due to individual liberty and the free enterprise system.

I join my colleagues in extending sincere sympathy to the members of his family. We shall all miss him.

Resolutions Memorializing the Congress of the United States in Favor of the Establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs in the President's Cabinet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following: Resolutions adopted by the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts:

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES IN FAVOR OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS IN THE PRESIDENT'S CABINET

Whereas the guidance, assistance, and supervision of the Federal Government is required in the increasingly complex and vital areas of city planning, urban renewal, traffic control, slum clearance, city administration, and those matters especially pertaining to the social and economic well-being of urban areas; and

Whereas the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs in the President's Cabinet would assure uniformity of action, eliminate overlapping functions, and insure an integrated program; and

Whereas the guidance within the President's Cabinet would aid inestimably in the financing of such projects, thus promising relief from burdensome taxation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives hereby urges the Congress of the United States to take such action necessary for the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs in the President's Cabinet so as to provide more adequate assistance, guidance, and supervision in matters pertaining to urban affairs; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to the members thereof from this Commonwealth.

Adopted by the house of representatives February 19, 1962.

WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
Clerk.

Attest:

KEVIN H. WHITE,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Alabama Peanut Week: March 4 Through 10

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, this week is Peanut Week in Alabama. All of our citizens are taking cognizance of this fact because the peanut industry has come to be one of the most important in the economy of our State.

In the southern part of Alabama, and particularly in the area known as the Wiregrass Section, the finest peanuts in the world are grown. I say this because of my personal inspection, by tasting, of peanuts from other parts of the United States and the world. It happens that I have always thought that there was nothing better than a good "goober"—as we in the South call them—and I have munched peanuts most of my life. Of course, aside from the great and direct pleasure Alabama peanuts increasingly provide our fellow Americans, who love raw, roasted or boiled goobers, peanuts are also used in a variety of food products.

For example, the peanut butter industry uses about 50 percent of all peanuts used for food purposes and about 20 percent of all peanuts picked and threshed. The U.S. Department of Agriculture reports that over 80 percent of our homemakers use peanut butter in their homes. Salted peanuts, sold in grocery stores and candy stores around the Nation, constitute the second largest usage of peanuts in America. Of course, good homemade fudge and other candy, with peanuts, is an alltime American favorite.

Aside from the usage of peanuts in food products for humans, the peanut, both nut and plant, is used in countless other ways. The peanut has, to repeat, become one of our most important agri-

cultural products. It is therefore fitting that this week has been set aside to honor the peanut and all those who are engaged in producing peanuts and peanut products.

I am pleased to join in the celebration of Alabama Peanut Week.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

PAWTUCKET, R.I.,
February 14, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Please allow me to congratulate you on your sponsorship of House Resolution No. 211 prescribing for the institution of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. In accordance with my highest regards for the measure, I have written my Congressman, The Honorable ST. GERMAIN of Rhode Island, and earnestly asked him to support you in said matter.

It is the purpose of the captive nations, I believe, by its mere presence, to provide America and the remainder of the free world with a potent means of attack in our cold war against the Soviet Union. Khrushchev unceasingly condemns the Western Nations as imperialistic colonial powers, but no country could be more guilty of colonialism than Russia. It retains in a bearhug embrace some 22 non-Russian nations. This piece of evidence is beneficial in showing so-called neutral nations that, in actual fact, it is Russia, and not the West, that is the great imperialistic colonial power. A skillful introductory step was the letter memo of Adlai Stevenson to members of the United Nations regarding the U.S.S.R.'s colonial empire. In one of the finest documents ever presented by a U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Stevenson proficiently exposed the extent of Russia's embrace on her colonies. But, this step is just a beginning in the proper direction, more steps must be taken for any chance of substantial success.

In the view of our own Western thought, we can see the friction involved in the U.S.S.R. The people of the various republics are restrained and fettered as a wild animal in the first stages of domestication. These people cry for freedom. For this reason alone, any inkling that the outside world is interested in their plight will ignite new hope in their lives. The resolution would produce such a manifestation. Khrushchev is aware of this inasmuch as it will spell mediate and ultimate steps in the destruction of the Soviet Union.

The consequences of this resolution, therefore, cannot be overly accentuated. The committee provided for in this resolution would keep a constant vigil on the diverse happenings in all the captive nations. It would accomplish the major task of centering attention on Moscow's extensive colonial empire.

I thank you for your time and consideration.

Very truly yours,

PAUL F. DEGASPARRE.

TOLEDO, OHIO,
November 29, 1961.

Hon. THOMAS L. ASHLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ASHLEY: It is imperative that you give your full support to the passage in the next session of Congress of Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD's House Resolution 211, which would establish a Special House Committee on Captive Nations.

Such a committee is needed in Congress in order to insure a continuing study of the problems of (1) obtaining greater recognition by the world at large of the desperate plight of those peoples of the captive satellite nations which are held by force within the Russian orbit, and (2) finding the most effective methods of utilizing the ever-present and extremely powerful yearning of these captive peoples to rid themselves of the yoke of Soviet domination and oppression.

In July 1959, Congress passed, unanimously, the Captive Nations resolution; however, since then, the State Departments of two administrations have done nothing at all to enforce or implement the resolution.

That Khrushchev and the Soviets are mortally afraid of the Captive Nations resolution, and what might be accomplished through its implementation, is evidenced by the violent manner in which the resolution has been attacked by Khrushchev on numerous occasions. This fear of the resolution by the Soviets is understandable, inasmuch as Khrushchev and his crowd desire only to berate all of the other countries of the world for what he likes to call "imperialistic colonialism," but when the spotlight of free world attention and publicity is thrown upon the fact that Soviet Russia is the world's greatest offender as colonialist empire builder, then the shoe (Khrushchev's) is on the other foot.

The continuing study by a committee, such as is proposed by Congressman FLOOD's resolution, could provide worthwhile information to the State Department, and other agencies of the executive department, on developments within the Captive Nations. The proposed committee would be in a position to inform the public of happenings within the Captive Nations. The creation of such a committee would, in addition, provide hope and encouragement to all of the peoples of the Captive Nations, and serve as assurance that the free peoples of the world have not forgotten them and their problems.

Very truly yours,

F. J. MARTIN,
Chairman of the Board.

The Martin Bros. Container & Timber Products Corp.

SAN JUAN, PUERTO RICO,
February 27, 1962.

The Honorable FERNOS ISERN,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It has been brought to my attention, through the "Manion Forum" dated November 12, 1961, that Congressman FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, has originated, and is sponsoring, House Resolution 211 which has the purpose of establishing a Special House Committee on Captive Nations.

As we look in retrospect at the growing fear and agitation expressed by the Kremlin since the passage of the resolution in 1959, combined with Adlai Stevenson's letter memo to the members of the United Nations emphasizing the 22 nations held within the Communist "colonial" grip—it seems inevitable that only positive, vital contributions to our national security could emerge from the establishment of a special committee devoted solely to the study of these and other captive nations.

I therefore, wholeheartedly urge you to support this measure and to do all in your power to aid its passage. Let it be known to the world that it is Russia, and not the West, that is the greatest imperialist power; that we accept it as our duty, as a free nation, to kindle the fires of hope in helpless hearts.

If I can be of help in any way, please do not hesitate to contact me. Wishing you much success, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

JON F. CARMAIN.

DECEMBER 4, 1961.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member House of Representatives,
U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C.

Congressman FLOOD, I think your resolution No. 211 is excellent; I read the details of your resolution in a Manion Forum.

Dr. Dobriansky was the guest speaker and writer on this occasion and clearly outlined the logic behind your proposal. I am continually amazed by the position our State Department takes and feel that some of those birds should either "wise up" or else hand up their keys. I hope to see the establishment of the committee you recommend; I consider it a necessity in the cold war.

Sincerely yours,

GEO. P. MACATEE III.

ALTAVISTA, VA.,
December 8, 1961.

Dr. LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
Chairman, National Captive Nations Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DOBRIANSKY: I noted with close attention the Manion Forum broadcast of November 12, on which you appeared.

Regarding your quotation from Secretary Rusk's letter, when considered from several standpoints, his statement was incredible. Instead of being concerned about our advocating "the dismemberment of a historical State," if the Secretary would do his homework, he would find that the Soviet Union's own constitution provides us with a mag-

nificent opportunity to exploit the very point you were touching on, and which Secretary Rusk was decrying. I am enclosing copies made from a book titled "Soviet State Law," which I secured from a Commie bookstore in New York. The first is merely the inside front page, for identification purposes. The second item is page 1 of the appendixes, which contains the Constitution of the U.S.S.R. Getting down to the specific point in question, you will note in the third item that article 17 of the Soviet Constitution, in a satanic jest, provides for the right of any union republic to freely secede. Article 18, also quite a joke, provides for the territorial integrity of its union republics (although it apparently is not concerned with the territorial integrity of the Soviet Union's neighbors).

The last item is a matter of general interest, and certainly helps clarify why the Commies have such an unbroken record of violated treaties and agreements. You will note that article 14(a) of the Soviet Constitution provides for the denunciation of treaties, in the very same line of the same sentence in which it provides for their ratification.

One would think that a person in the position of Secretary Rusk would be aware of these rather basic items, but I suppose that for him to demonstrate such awareness would be contrary to the general trend and unstated policy in our State Department today. As the late Secretary of Defense Forrestal said at the time of the fall of China to the Reds, "These things can't all be accidents, or some of them would happen in our favor."

Sincerely,

LANDON B. LANE.

Symposium by the Federation of the Italian-American Democratic Organizations of the State of New York, Inc., on the Subjects of Medical Care for the Aged Under Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, on January 14, 1962, the Federation of Italian-American Organizations of the State of New York, Inc., of which I am president, conducted a symposium in two sessions on two very vital subjects: "Medical Care for the Aged Under Social Security" and "Federal Aid to Education." The panelists on the topic of Medical Care for the Aged Under Social Security were: Congressman Eugene J. Keogh; Dr. Renato, J. Azzari, past president and current member, board of trustees, Medical Society of the State of New York; Joseph B. O'Connor, New York regional director, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and Sidney Zagri, legislative counsel, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers. After the discussion, a spirited question and answer program followed. My preliminary remarks in opening the symposium and the speeches of Dr. Renato J. Azzari and Mr. Joseph B. O'Connor follow:

REMARKS BY HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO, OF NEW YORK

On behalf of the members of the Federation of Italian-American Democratic Clubs, we welcome you to this afternoon's session of our annual legislative symposium. We believe an informed public can make intelligent decisions, and consequently, we have attempted to obtain men who are expert in the subject matter to be discussed.

We gather here to discuss the problem of medical care for the aged under social security. The ancient Roman and orator Cicero, in his essay "De Senectute," concerning old age called this period the finest stage of life. Today this period is regarded with trepidation and uncertainty. Today with the lifespan lengthened by reason of medical advances, our senior citizens, because of the mounting costs of medical care and the unavailability of facilities in time of need, face the future with insecurity.

Legislation has been introduced in Congress to provide a social health program for 16 million senior citizens. President John Kennedy supports such a program as do many other knowledgeable people and segments of our economy. As a cosponsor of the medical insurance bill under social security, I, of course, support the measure and its principle. Many important people and honest intentioned people oppose this program. As Oliver Wendell Holmes once said, "An idea which cannot gain currency in the marketplace of public opinion will soon disappear."

Today we are in the marketplace of public opinion to see which idea will prevail.

We have obtained panelists to discuss the pros and cons and then we shall have a period of questions and answers. The panelists will speak generally and specifically. They will discuss H.R. 4222, the King-Santangelo bill. They will touch upon the extend of the need for legislation on this subject and the character and nature of basic medical care requirements of persons age 65 and over, whether and to what degree such medical care requirements are now being met through existing governmental, nongovernmental, and individual programs, the extent to which individuals 65 and over can now finance their medical care requirements. They will discuss whether or not there is a need for legislation on this subject, what the medical care requirements for persons 65 or over are, the extent to which they are receiving medical care through governmental, nongovernmental, and individual programs. They will discuss further what the effect of the proposal will have on the utilization of hospitals by aged persons, the quality and availability of hospital care and facilities, the availability of nursing care and the effect which this program will have on the standards of medicine. Finally, they will touch upon a very important matter and that is what the cost will be in terms of dollars and standard of medical services and the regimentation of a profession as compared to the benefits to a large number of citizens in the twilight of their lives. Lastly, they will discuss the subject of how this cost will be met.

The major arguments in favor of this program are as follows:

1. The social insurance approach on a national basis will provide aid for the aged regardless of where they live and medical care will be granted regardless of the backwardness or progressiveness of the individual State.

2. The cost of this insurance is met when people are working and not when they are retired and their income has diminished.

3. The benefits are related to actual costs.

4. The system gives freedom of choice by removing financial barriers.

5. The program eliminates the means test and restores dignity and self-respect in the days of retirement.

Those who oppose the measure of medical care under a social security system contend:

1. That there is a great danger of the program leading to socialized medicine.

2. That as a consequence of socialized medicine, the quality of medical care would decrease.

3. That costs under a socialized system have risen and there would be a rise in the future.

4. That the program would lead to a limitation of the use of new drugs and biologicals and would not provide for improvement by general practitioners.

5. The program would lead to an overburdening of doctors with unnecessary paper work and reduce the earnings of medical men.

6. That free service would lead to overutilization of the facilities and thus patients would not receive proper medical care and would thereby suffer.

7. That the utilization of older persons would deny the use of hospitals and facilities to younger persons.

8. The program would encourage dependency and destroy incentive and self-reliance.

9. The program would attempt to improve service for a minority group (senior citizens) and downgrade the services for the remainder of the population of 180 million people.

10. The program would lead to a waste in funds in order to use up the budget.

11. The program would lead to collusion between patients and pharmacists to use funds for drugs for nonessential purposes, such as cosmetics.

Our Nation shall be called upon to make a vital determination. A nation's moral fiber is judged by the regard the government has toward its people, especially toward its senior citizens. The problem is the care of over 16 million of our senior citizens. These people, because of improved standard of living and scientific and medical advances, are living longer than ever before and man's life expectancy is now 70 years of age. Older persons have larger than average medical care needs. In 1960, half of the people over 65 had incomes of $870 or less a year, and are in no position to afford medical costs when they are retired and not working. In my opinion, America's great need today is medical care for the aged. Whether it be under a social security insurance program or whether it be based upon a needs test, or mainly under private insurance plans is the problem confronted not only by you, but by your congressional representatives. We invite your questions after the speeches, and ask that those questions be critical, penetrating, and provocative.

REMARKS OF DR. RENATO J. AZZARI

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, distinguished members of this panel, ladies and gentlemen, first, I want to thank this fine organization for inviting me to participate in a discussion of this issue of whether we should finance medical care for the aged through social security.

If I may say so, the position of medicine in this question has been badly misconstrued. Indeed, I personally have been amazed at the great amount of misunderstanding that currently prevails regarding the views of the medical profession. One might almost say that there has been a deliberate, concerted campaign to tell the American people things that are simply not true, and to withhold from them important information that would give the public an accurate picture of the significance of the King-Anderson bill, the measure that is supported by the current administration and that would provide the funds for a medical care program for old people through our social security system.

Allow me to make one point crystal clear. The medical profession in this State and throughout the Nation is unequivocally in

favor of the best and most complete medical care for our elderly citizens.

Please remember that the high quality of medical care has resulted in the present problem—longer life and continuing medical care for our senior citizens, regardless of ability to pay. The medical profession stands, as it has always in the past, ready and willing to provide for our aged population, but under the American way—voluntarily, without direct Federal intervention.

I am, of course, fully aware that I am speaking before a group that is dedicated to the principles and ideals of the Democratic Party. But I wish to assure you that medicine's stand on the King-Anderson bill is nonpartisan. We are opposed to this measure not because of the party label attached to it, but because of what it would mean to the quality of medical care in this country.

The situation confronting me this afternoon reminds me of any number of stories—all of them ending with the scene in which the poor, hapless victim barely escapes with his life. My mind is also cluttered with the image of Daniel in the lion's den—well, I only hope that I succeed in taming my adversary; though, to be perfectly truthful, you all look friendly enough.

Seriously, I know from personal experience of the fine work done by the Federation of Italian-American Democratic Organizations of the State of New York, and of the fair and patriotic way you approach all your problems. Indeed, I have been aware for many years of the important role you play in the life of our State, and of your constant efforts to promote the great aims of this great country. Furthermore, your very invitation to me to appear and express the views of organized medicine on a highly controversial question is the best evidence of your generous and objective approach; and I, for one, have the greatest admiration for the federation.

To get to the matter before us:

Many of those who support the King-Anderson bill would make it appear that they are the only ones who favor medical care for the aged. If you oppose this legislation, they say, you are not only a reactionary of the rankest sort but are actually opposed to helping old people who need but cannot pay for medical care.

Nothing could be further from the truth.

Medicine is as concerned as ever with the medical care received by the American people. If we oppose the King-Anderson bill, it is not because we do not want to help the elderly, but because we feel that this measure represents a fraud and hoax on the Nation.

Let me spell this out a little more clearly.

If the King-Anderson bill were adopted, it would provide the following:

1. Old people would be entitled to hospitalization for a maximum of 90 days a year for each illness.

2. They would be entitled to 180 days a year in a nursing home.

3. They would be entitled to hospital outpatient diagnostic services.

4. They would be entitled to home health services, with a maximum of 240 visits a year.

This may seem like an excellent proposition to some of you, but I wish to assure you it isn't.

First of all, if you were unlucky enough to require hospitalization, you would have to pay $10 a day for the first 9 days you were in the hospital, with a minimum payment of $20.

Second, if you needed hospital out-patient diagnostic services, you would be required to pay a minimum of $20 for each diagnostic study before the Government began making its payments for the services rendered.

Third, 180 days a year in a nursing home seems very generous, but look at the consequences of such a provision. Under the King-Anderson bill, you would be unable to enter a nursing home directly. Instead you must first be admitted to a regular hospital. What this would mean is there would be a tremendous overuse of hospital facilities, thus causing the already high costs of this program to skyrocket even higher and, in addition, creating fantastic medical care problems.

Fourth, this bill—which some of its supporters seem to think is the answer to all our ills—would apply only to those people covered by the old-age and survivors insurance provisions of the Social Security Act—and that would leave out a good 3 million persons who are 65 or over.

Fifth, you would not be getting any of this free—not by a long shot. Under the provisions of this bill, every employee and employer would be required to pay an extra ¼ of 1 percent on their social-security tax, and the self-employed would have to pay an extra ⅜ of 1 percent. The taxable earnings base would be increased from $4,800 to $5,000—if not more.

I say "if not more" because Secretary Ribicoff testified last summer that the base would probably have to be increased to $5,200 to cover the cost of the program, thereby cutting even more sharply into take-home pay.

Sixth, the program would cost a minimum of $1½ billion a year, and if the testimony of Secretary Ribicoff and other administration leaders is any indication, this would eventually soar to even more inconceivable heights—wrecking the entire social security system as well as ruining the finest medical care setup ever seen on earth.

Medicine also opposes the King-Anderson bill because of what it would do to the quality of medical care in this great country.

For one thing, the measure contains certain phrases and clauses that would ultimately bring compulsion, regulation and control into our medical care structure, displacing the freedom and personal relationship that have made American medicine what it is today.

The King-Anderson bill places the emphasis on financial matters rather than on the quality of the medical services that should be rendered to elderly patients.

It would cause overuse of hospitals and nursing home facilities—and that would do no one any good, least of all those old people who really needed to get into a hospital or nursing home but could not because of overcrowded conditions.

The supporters of the King-Anderson bill say that it is needed because, among other things, most old people today are in poor health and poor financial condition. Now I do not know where these gentlemen obtained their statistics, but authoritative surveys in the last few years have shown: (a) that the great majority of elderly people are in no worse health than the rest of the population, and (b) they are fully capable of taking care of their own financial needs.

If I may quote from the testimony presented last summer before the House Ways and Means Committee by the Reverend Stanley Parry, C.S.C., chairman of the Department of Political Science of the University of Notre Dame:

"The statistic that three-fifths of all those over 65 receive less than $1,000 cash income per year is indeed an amazing one. It would seem from it that the aged in America are a poverty-stricken group. On the face of it, this is a misleading statistic. I do not say it is a false one, but obviously the aged as a group are not in the sorry fiancial condition this statistic suggests. There are not 9 million impoverished aged in America. There are only 2.5 million of them on the public assistance rolls in America. Moreover we learn from the report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, that the median (that is average) total income of retired social security beneficiaries is $183 per month. We learn also that the average retired couple has a median net worth of $9,620, that 75 percent of OASDI (old-age, survivors, and disability insurance) beneficiaries own their own homes and 87 percent of these homes are mortgage free.

"Remember, there are only 15.6 million aged in America. Of these, 1.5 million receive pensions from corporations, 10.8 million receive some form of Government compensation, 1 million receive privately purchased annuities, 3.7 million are recipients of currently earned income. If we subtract the 2.5 million receiving welfare, and consider the overlap indicated in the figures above, signifying that many receive income from more than one source, it is difficult to perceive the shape of poverty here. To draw the picture in dollar terms, the aggregate income of persons over 65 is between $25 and $30 billion a year. Of this, $6.7 billion derives from OASDI assistance, $1.7 billion from employment, $7 billion from interest, dividends, rent, and so forth. Far from showing the existence of permanent causes of indigence in the aged, the statistics suggest a hopeful withering of the causes of the indigence that does exist."

Medicine also opposes this legislation because of what it portends for the future. Don't you good people realize that once the Federal Government begins something, it not only never relinquishes it, but expands it, enlarges it, magnifies it? In the ease of medical care for the aged, if the King-Anderson bill were ever enacted into law, it would quickly be expanded from a limited program for the elderly to a national compulsory health plan for the entire population. Do we want this? Do we need this?

I quoted before from the testimony of Father Parry, of Notre Dame. With your permission, I shall now offer another quote from this learned authority's acute and perceptive presentation before the House Ways and Means Committee. Referring to the fact that, under the King-Anderson bill, everyone over 65 would be entitled to medical care benefits whether he could afford to pay for them himself or not, Father Parry declared:

"Under this bill, to put it at the most illuminating marginal case, a married adult earning $4,500 a year would have to contribute to the expense of a 9-day hospital sojourn followed by lengthy nursing home care even in the case of an elderly widower living in a $15,000 house and having $25,000 in the bank." (Unquote.)

What do we physicians offer as an alternative to the King-Anderson bill? I do not know how many of you are aware of it, but Congress passed, and the President signed, a law back in 1960 which, if it is allowed to develop normally, will not only provide more and better medical care for those old people who really need help in meeting their medical and hospital expenses, but will do so without wrecking our economy or American medicine.

This law is called the Kerr-Mills Medical Assistance to the Aged Act, and here's what it does.

1. It makes health care available to everyone over 65 who cannot afford such care—and this is regardless of whether the person is covered by social security or not.

2. It provides grants to the States on the basis of per capita income and the services which each State choose to provide.

3. It supplements rather than supplants voluntary health insurance programs, which—as you know—are covering an even greater number of people in the 65 and over category.

4. This is a really important argument: It allows the States to provide for medical care rendered by physicians as well as services rendered by hospitals and nursing homes. So, if an old person is ill, he doesn't have to go to a hospital to be taken care of. Instead, he can visit his family physician.

Isn't this a much more flexible and realistic program than the King-Anderson bill?

In New York State, as many of you doubtless know, the legislature last year passed the Metcalf-McCloskey law to implement the Kerr-Mills Act. This legislation (despite the opposition and sabotage of many of our elected officials in our State and local government) has shown what can be done with a law that is adaptable to the particular needs of each State.

The Metcalf-McCloskey Act, of course, is not a perfect piece of legislation but, as a result of the hearings held some months ago by the Metcalf committee, it will be amended in the current session of the State legislature—thus meeting even more effectively the needs of our old people.

I should like to close with some remarks about socialized medicine as it is working out in Great Britain. If you will recall, when the English National Health Service Plan was first introduced, it was viewed as a kind of medical utopia, and anyone who criticized it was considered a horrible and heartless wretch who would not only take candy from children but deprive an entire nation of needed medical care.

Well, time has shown that the British system has even more kinks in it than many of us suspected, and it is now being criticized increasingly by some of the best minds in the British Isles.

For example, Prof. D. S. Lee, a prominent English economist, recently made these interesting points: he said that medical care in his country is now dominated by political considerations and that the only way to restore the high standards that once prevailed was to eliminate the national health service completely. He urged his countrymen to return to the practice of allowing tax concessions to those who could provide for themselves and of offering direct assistance to the few who could not—the very principle that underlies the Kerr-Mills Act.

Professor Lee added, and I quote: "To those in England who object that the clock is being put back, we must reply that it is desirable to put the clock back if it is telling the wrong time."

Isn't this a description of what would happen in America if the King-Anderson bill were passed? And isn't it true that the Kerr-Mills Act would solve whatever medical care problems confront our old people?

We here in the United States still have a chance to insure that the clock will tell the right time—at the right time—and that time is now.

MEDICAL CARE AND SOCIAL SECURITY

(By Joseph B. O'Connor)

I appreciate the opportunity to appear before your organization on the administration's proposals for health insurance for the aged under the social security program.

As of today there are approximately 16 million Americans over 65 years of age, many of whom are plagued anew by fear. With lifespan lengthened, with medical science breaking into undreamed realms of discovery, the Nation's aged now face another aspect of insecurity—how to meet the mounting costs of medical care.

Let me set forth the administration's position clearly:

1. The high costs of medical care for the aged are going to be paid for in this country. The issue is not whether to pay these costs. The only issue is how to pay them.

2. The alternatives to health insurance that have been suggested are not adequate, not fair to the elderly who need the care and not fair to the public who pays for it.

Private insurance plus public welfare cannot do the complete job. If the medical assistance for the aged program, enacted by Congress in 1960, is expanded to cover a major share of the costs, the drain on State treasuries will be fantastic. If the issue is left to collective bargaining, the pressures on employers to absorb the total cost will be overwhelming. If hospitals have to collect from those who can pay the costs for those who cannot, the burden on middle-income hospital patients will be unconscionable.

3. The facts will show that paying for hospital costs under the social security system is the conservative answer, the practical answer, and the fair answer.

THE NEED FOR ACTION

In his special message to the Congress on health and hospital care, the President described the need of the aged for insurance against health care costs. You may recall that he said: "Those among us who are over 65—16 million today in the United States—go to the hospital more often and stay longer than their younger neighbors. Their physical activity is limited by six times as much disability as the rest of the population. Their annual medical bill is twice that of persons under 65—but their annual income is only half as high."

The President went on to say: "26 years ago this Nation adopted the principle that every member of the labor force and his family should be insured against the haunting fear of loss of income caused by retirement, death, or unemployment. To that we have added insurance against the economic loss caused by disability. But there remains a significant gap that denies to all but those with the highest incomes a full measure of security—the high cost of ill health in old age."

A few facts that show the general situation of the aged are:

1. Nine out of 10 of the people who live to be 65 go to the hospital at least once between age 65 and death.

2. Among couples, in about half of the cases the husband and the wife will each have at least two hospital stays between age 65 and death, and

3. At least four hospital stays for half of the couples after age 65.

When an aged person goes to the hospital he is likely to stay longer than a younger person because he is more likely to have serious and long-lasting disease. People over 65 are in hospitals, on the average, over 2½ times as much as younger people.

In recent years these problems have been aggravated by rising hospital costs. The costs have more than tripled in the last 15 years.

As indicated in a report of the American Hospital Association, the financial impact of repeated hospital stays becomes apparent when we consider that the median yearly income for a widow is about $1,000, and for an aged couple is less than $2,500. About one-third of the aged have no assets that can readily be turned into cash, and about half have less than $500. Much of the health insurance available to the aged provides very limited protection and that only at high cost to them, and less than half of the aged have any hospitalization insurance at all. This is not surprising, since it is impossible for most retired people to pay currently the high premiums that, considering the high incidence of illnesses among older people, would be necessary to provide adequate coverage.

THE PRESENT ROLE OF GOVERNMENT

In proposing that the Federal Government play a part, the administration is not suggesting anything new. The Government is already involved in meeting the cost of personal medical care for the aged, as well as other groups, and on a large scale. The administration is simply proposing a more logical, a more equitable, a more efficient, and a more fiscally responsible approach to medical-care problems with which the Government is already involved and has been for quite some time.

In 1959, total expenditures for personal health and medical care in this country amounted to $22.5 billion. Almost 22 percent of this total—about $4.9 billion—was paid from public funds. Federal expenditures amounted to almost $2 billion, or about 40 percent of the total public spending for personal health and medical care.

The 1960 legislation providing for increased Federal grants for direct payments to providers of medical care under old-age assistance and for medical assistance for the aged will, of course, increase public expenditures for health care. If all States were to put into effect medical assistance programs for the aged comparable with the average program now in effect or under study in the States, and if health insurance for the aged is not provided under social security, the annual cost, Federal and State, for this category alone would be more than $650 million. If the State programs were to provide better benefits in the future than the average now provided, the cost of medical assistance for the aged, in the absence of a health insurance program for the aged under social security, could run to as much as $1 billion a year or even more, with the Federal Government paying somewhat more than half a billion dollars. The Federal Government is already in medical care, and on a large scale.

THE SOCIAL INSURANCE METHOD

Provisions for health insurance benefits for the aged are a necessary part of income protection in retirement. Without such benefits the social security program cannot adequately provide basic security for the aged. For most older people, old-age, survivors, and disability insurance cash benefits are barely large enough to keep them housed, clothed, and fed, and half of the beneficiaries do not have any significant additional regular income. The benefits are not large enough to meet the costs of expensive illnesses or to pay large health insurance premiums during retirement. The only way to remove the threat to the financial independence of older people posed by the high cost of illness is through providing the aged with basic health insurance protection in addition to their monthly cash benefits. And this can be assured only through the social insurance method.

The method of providing paid-up health insurance protection for retirement has not been followed on any large scale in private insurance, nor is it likely that it will be. The social insurance method, then, is the only practical way of enabling most people to pay during their working years toward meeting the health costs they will face in old age.

The social insurance approach, on a national basis, makes possible provision of basic protection for the aged regardless of where they may happen to live. As you know, the State programs of medical assistance for the aged can, depending on State action be very narrow, both in eligibility, and in benefits, or on the other hand can provide virtually comprehensive medical care to a substantial portion of the aged.

New York, for example, has enacted a comprehensive program providing a broad range of medical services and a relatively liberal definition of medical indigence. Unmarried aged people with annual incomes of $1,800 or less and couples with incomes totaling $2,600 or less are eligible. Kentucky's program, on the other hand, is limited to individuals with an annual income of $1,200 or less and couples with annual incomes of $1,800 or less, and it provides payments only for 6 days of hospital care for acute emergency and life-endangering illness.

Variations such as these and the fact that most States have no program at all raise the very serious question of whether this

country can long tolerate a situation in which health care is available to many of its aged citizens in New York and Massachusetts but not to people similarly situated in Kentucky or North Carolina. There is nothing fair or equitable in a situation of this sort. The problem is nationwide, and it should be dealt with nationally.

The social insurance approach would provide health insurance protection for the aged without limiting the patient's choice of doctor or hospital. In fact it makes possible greater freedom of choice than now exists, since the most important limitation for those who have not been able to pay—the financial barrier—would be removed. The only limitations on the patient's choice, for any beneficiary, would be what they are today for those that are able to pay; namely, that a hospital may be unable or unwilling to accept a patient and that one's physician may not happen to have hospital privileges at the hospital of one's choice. Thus, contrary to the argument of those who say that the plan would limit the patient's freedom of choice of doctor or hospital, it would in fact broaden freedom of choice for many and limit it for none.

We have, then, in the social insurance approach these advantages: It is the only way in which people generally can pay during their working years toward meeting their health costs in retirement; it is sound and fiscally responsible; it makes possible provision of basic protection for the aged regardless of where they live; it preserves and increases freedom of choice of doctor and hospital; and it does all this in a way that is consistent with the dignity of the individual.

THE COST OF THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL

The cost would be met by an increase in the tax rate of one-fourth of 1 percent each for employers and employees and by three-eighths of 1 percent for self-employed persons, effective in 1963, together with the net gain to the program from an increase in the taxable earnings base from $4,800 to $5,000 a year effective in 1962. This increase of tax of one-fourth of 1 percent by the employers and the employees on the $5,000 base would mean a contribution of only $12.50 a year for this protection or a little more than $1 a month.

HOW WOULD THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN WORK?

President Kennedy proposes a fiscally responsible method of financing hospital care and certain related health services for the aged in a way that protects the dignity of the individual. There are differences in the method of collecting the funds and in the population groups affected, but what the plan would do would be very much like what Blue Cross plans have been doing for many years: it would pay hospital bills without interfering with hospital operations.

About 95 percent of today's workers will have this protection when they reach age 65. The other 5 percent of present workers would be largely Federal employees who are already protected under their own system, self-employed physicians, and those State and local government employees who are not brought under social security.

THE BENEFITS PROVIDED

The proposed legislation would provide for the payment, through the social security program, of certain health costs for people who are aged 65 or older and entitled to old-age, survivors, and disability insurance or railroad retirement benefits. A person would have the health insurance protection at age 65 even though his monthly cash benefits are being withheld because of earnings from work. In general, the following health services would be paid for under the proposed program:

1. Inpatient hospital services, including bed, board, drugs, and other supplies and services of the kind customarily furnished by the hospital.

2. Followup skilled nursing-home services provided to a patient after his transfer from a hospital, including bed, board, nursing services, drugs, and other services and supplies which are customarily provided by skilled nursing homes.

3. Home health services furnished by or through a public or nonprofit agency under a plan prescribed by a physician, including nursing care, physical, occupational, and speech therapy, medical supplies (other than drugs) and appliances for temporary use, and certain part-time or intermittent homemaker services.

4. Outpatient hospital diagnostic services of the kind customarily furnished by or through the hospital to its outpatient for diagnostic study.

There are two reasons why the proposal focuses on hospital services. First, the hospital is the center of modern medical care, and hospitalization is required in a large proportion of major illnesses. Second, hospital care is very expensive; people who need hospital services generally face a heavy financial burden. Medical expenses for older people who are hospitalized are about five times as great as the medical bills of older people who are not hospitalized.

The chief reason why certain services other than hospital inpatient services are covered is to promote economical use of the latter. Thus, the efforts of the health professions to reserve hospital beds for the care of the acutely ill who need the intensive care that only a hospital can furnish would be reinforced by the proposal. The provision for payment of the cost of skilled nursing-home care after a hospital stay, for example, would relieve the hospitals of the problem of caring for patients in the post-acute stage of illness. Pressure for hospital care of such patients could be expected to develop if only hospital care were covered by the proposal. Similarly, because the plan would pay the costs of outpatient hospital diagnostic tests, there would be no incentive to get inpatient care where not required for diagnosis. In addition, of course, payment of the costs of outpatient diagnostic services would promote early detection of disease. Payment of the cost of home health services, too, would encourage the use of these less expensive services, where medically appropriate, rather than those of a hospital.

For both inpatient hospital service and nursing-home services, there is a limitation on the number of days of care that could be paid for in a period of illness—a maximum of 90 days for hospital care and a maximum of 180 days for skilled nursing-home care. (This 2-for-1 provision is designed to provide an incentive to use nursing-home facilities, where medically appropriate, rather than hospitals. In addition there is an overall limitation of 150 units of service which may be paid for in a single period of illness. A "unit of service" is defined as 1 day of inpatient hospital care or 2 days of skilled nursing-home care—again a 2-for-1 ratio. If someone eligible for benefits under the plan should go into the hospital and stay for 70 days, for example, and then require followup skilled nursing-home care, he would be eligible for payment for the cost of up to 160 days of such care.

A period of illness is so defined in the bill that a new period could not begin unless there had been a lapse of 90 days during which the individual was neither an inpatient in a hospital nor a patient in a skilled nursing home.

For home health services an annual maximum of 240 visits is provided. Home health services involve periodic visits to the patient's home by therapists, nurses, and other professional personnel. The limitation placed on the payment of the costs of home health services is written in terms of "visits" rather than "days" so that the amount of home health services covered would be unaffected by whether a variety of services is offered on the same day or different days. A larger amount of service is covered in this area than in hospital and nursing-home care because home health services are far lower in cost than are hospital and nursing-home services.

The proposed health insurance program would not provide first-dollar coverage. There is no coverage of a "deductible" amount of $10 for each of the first 9 days of inpatient hospital care in a benefit period, and the minimum deductible amount is $20. Also, there is a deductible amount of $20 for each hospital outpatient diagnostic study.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROGRAM

Overall responsibility for administration of the program for social security beneficiaries would rest with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. State agencies would be used, however, to carry out those services they are best equipped to perform. The bill, for example, authorizes the Secretary to enter into agreements with the States to have them conduct any activities that may be needed to determine whether a provider meets the conditions for participation in the plan. The States could also be reimbursed under such agreements for making available consultative services to help providers to meet these conditions. This help would be in the nature of technical advice on request and would make available to institutions desiring assistance the benefit of State and community professional experience.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

To summarize: Older people have low incomes and high health costs. We believe that many refrain from seeking care they need because they cannot pay for it or are unwilling to ask for help. Others, who do seek care, are made destitute by the cost of the care they get.

With the cost of health care rising and the number of older persons increasing rapidly, the need for protection against the cost of health care for the aged is an urgent and pressing one. The only satisfactory way of providing the aged with adequate health insurance protection is through a system under which the cost of the health insurance will be paid by people during their working years, together with their employers. The social security program is the only practical mechanism which follows this approach and through which in the future practically everyone in every State in the United States can secure basic protection.

Many more facts and figures could be cited. But statistics cannot measure the anxiety and suffering of elderly people who see their small savings, their homes, their security, about to be swept away by the near certainty of expensive illness.

Behind the facts and figures are human beings—average Americans—facing retirement on low income, knowing that in the days ahead there are almost certain to be large hospital bills. Many can just make it day by day on social security supplemented by minimum income from other sources, barely meeting the costs of rent and food and shelter. What they worry about is what happens if they get sick? Will their children be able to help? Will they have to sell their homes, draw the last dollar from the bank, for the first time in their lives apply for relief and go through the humiliation of a test of need, ask help from friends?

Even if medical care on a means-test basis were adequate and available for all needy, it would not be the answer. They, just as you and I, want protection before disaster strikes—not relief after they have lost everything. Growing older has its inevitable sadness; must we add the cruelty of fear and insecurity?

A quarter of a century ago we faced a problem much like the one we face now. We chose, as our basic solution then, a system of social insurance, under which the people, with their employers, would build their own old-age security while working by paying social security contributions into special funds from which payments would be made to them when they were no longer working. Now, after 25 years, few would question the wisdom of that decision.

Why Should We Finance Our Own Destruction?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, before we vote $100 million to keep the United Nations solvent, would it not be just commonsense to demand that the Soviet Union meet its obligations? The following editorial from the Dallas Times Herald makes the point.

WHY SHOULD WE BAIL OUT U.N. WHILE REDS ARE FREELOADING?

The Soviet Union is freeloading in the United Nations.

If any argument were needed to bolster the position of Americans opposed to the plan for this country to buy $100 million worth of United Nations bonds, it has now been provided.

Backers of the bond scheme contend the financial emergency arose from the U.N. operation in the Congo, with the Soviet Union and certain other nations refusing to pay their pro rata part.

The truth of the matter is that the Soviet Union isn't even paying its part of the regular U.N. assessment. And neither are the other members of the Soviet bloc. For that matter, some of the free world nations also are in arrears.

The Soviet Union on January 31 owed $1,568,843 on its 1961 assessment. The amounts owed by Byelorussia and the Ukraine bring the Soviet total to $2,736,432. And others in the Red bloc that haven't paid up include Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, and Rumania.

Other nations in arrears for one reason or another include Nationalist China, France, Bolivia, and Haiti.

No doubt the supporters of the bond plan in this country believe strongly in the United Nations as an agency for peace. No doubt they believe that by bailing out the United Nations we can set a fine example and encourage greater fiscal responsibility.

But nations, like people, don't behave that way.

The Soviet Union and the Communist bloc have sworn to "bury us." There is considerable evidence that they believe they can do it through economic warfare rather than military operations.

It just doesn't make sense for us to keep the United Nations going financially so that the Soviet Union, as a dead beat with three votes to our one in the General Assembly, can continue to wage any kind of warfare against us.

Assuming other nations' obligations won't help them develop a sense of fiscal—or any other—responsibility.

Now is the time for Congress to take a good, hard look at this phony U.N. bond scheme and then say: "Thanks. But no, thanks."

The Congress and the Nation's Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address which I delivered at the New York Academy of Medicine, New York City, on November 2, 1961:

THE CONGRESS AND THE NATION'S HEALTH

It is an honor for me to have been asked to speak to you tonight. My great respect for the medical profession gives me, on such an occasion, a feeling of pride, and a feeling of humility, as well.

What message can I, a layman, bring to you about the Nation's health? There is nothing I can say that will add to your knowledge of the state of the art of medicine. I am sure there are no facts in the realm of medical research that I can reveal that are not already available or known to you. What I can do is to give you the views of a Congressman whose major concern is the health of our citizens, and who has been privileged to have some responsibility in the tremendous growth of Government-supported biomedical research.

In terms of my own experience as a lawmaker, I have not only served with pride as a Congressman from the Second District of Rhode Island for the past 20 years, but for the major part of that time I have also had one of the most satisfying committee assignments that it is possible to draw in the House of Representatives. As chairman of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations for the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I have had a part, each year, in the deliberations that determine the levels of the Federal medical research effort. It is my belief that the increasing amounts of money that have been allocated annually for these purposes have not only stimulated research primarily within the Public Health Service, but have quickened the pulse of medical research and medical education throughout the country.

During these years, I have been able to see the desires and the will of the people reflected in the actions of Congress. The citizens of this country have made it known clearly that they want the means to better health, and Congress has attempted to make these means available.

During these years, too, I have reflected often upon the responsibilities that Congress has to the people of the United States. Benjamin Disraeli, Britain's prime minister some 80 years ago, wrote, "I repeat, that all power is a trust; that we are accountable for its exercise; that from the people and for the people all springs, and all must exist." We in the Government take this trust seriously. We recognize that power is a mighty force; that its misuse can result in tragedy; that its proper use can bring the benefits and joys of peace, health, and prosperity. But, as Benjamin Disraeli said (paraphrasing, no doubt, Lincoln's words at Gettysburg in 1863), this Government, and our power, comes from the people, and must be totally for the people. To forget that this Government and this Congress were created by the will of the people is to forfeit their trust in us.

To be worthy of this trust in carrying out the will of the people is not always an easy task. Speaking from my own experience, and particularly that part of it concerned with the means to better health, we in Congress have some difficult decisions to make; but I am convinced that congressional action in support of medical research has enabled this science to make great strides in developing new knowledge for the benefit of man.

Medical research has accomplished things that would astound the physician of a generation ago. Imagine your predecessors' reaction to the modern hospital, with its bewildering machinery overflowing the operating room, with its battery of indicators and tubes in the recovery room, with its awesome equipment for radiation therapy.

Think of some of the other benefits this boom in research has brought:

New vaccines, notably those for polio, provide the means for wiping out this killing and crippling disease. The new measles vaccine, just emerging from the trial stage, will save the lives and the health of many thousands of children. Open heart surgery for the repair of defective organs, unthought of a generation ago, has only begun to reach the height of its healing powers. New drugs are easing the pains of arthritis and arresting the scourge of staphylococcal infections. New studies are investigating the causes of mental retardation and cerebral palsy.

Expanded programs for fellowships and traineeships open the way for many more young people to enter the fields of medicine, nursing, and dentistry.

Through other programs, medical schools are able to expand their teaching faculties and their facilities, and many more established and promising biomedical scientists are able to enter or continue their chosen fields of research.

New hospitals are being erected. New centers for research are being planned.

These accomplishments are concrete. They reflect, at least in part, the will of the people as implemented by Congress.

But this is not the happy ending of the story, or even more than a segment of the story.

Why aren't the morbidity and mortality tables responding in a similarly dramatic fashion to these accomplishments of medical research? Why aren't all the people getting the benefits of the new vaccines, the new drugs, the new hospital facilities?

According to recent estimates released by the National Health Education Committee, a third of the American people are ill or handicapped. A third of this great, powerful, and prosperous Nation—roughly 60 million people are suffering some form of illness or impairment. And yet there are existing avenues of prevention, treatment, or cure open to most of them.

Here are a few facts for you:

Two hundred and sixty thousand people die every year from cancer. Some 75,000 of them could survive if present knowledge about cancer were fully applied.

At least half of the crippling from fractures, strokes, and arthritis is unnecessary.

For more than 20 years, the technical power to wipe out syphilis has been at hand, yet 200,000 children and youth under 20 contracted a venereal disease last year and the number is apparently increasing.

Strep sore throat ranks second on the list of communicable diseases reported to the Public Health Service—tens of thousands of cases each year. Yet only a few lucky ones get the prolonged treatment that will protect them from rheumatic fever and heart disease. Every year about 20,000 of the unlucky, untreated ones die of rehumatic fever or rheumatic heart disease.

You, as physicians, and I, as a lawmaker, are not living up to our responsibilities by permitting such conditions to endure. I am not so fatuous as to think that everyone can be cured of disability or disease, or that humanity, in the next few decades, will achieve good health for all. But something must be done—some reasonable ap-

proach must be made toward closing this gap between discovery and application.

Where does the trouble lie? I do not think anyone can give the answer to that in one simple, dogmatic sentence. The answer is complex because man himself is complex. The environment in which modern man finds himself is becoming more intricate and more hazardous. Yet, paradoxically, man and his problems are products of his own environment and of the social and cultural structure that he has created.

In time recently past, illnesses were generally acute and had a specific cause. Many of today's illnesses are chronic or ill defined How many patients complain of fatigue, or an aching back, or migraine, or indigestion? And how are these ailments diagnosed?

Some medical men have concluded that stress is the contributing cause of many of these ailments. Stress of competition on the job, stress of economic difficulties, general stress that evolves from a number of sources. The housewife is fatigued from the demands of the children, the household, and the community. The aged are under strain because so few of them have a secure place in society. Even the young people show signs of the strain—the problems of freedom of the adolescent, of dating, of job holding have assumed larger proportions in recent years * * * the problems of entering college, of keeping up with studies, of finding a good job after graduation. Many of these problems, you will say, have always been with us. I agree, they have. But have they ever loomed as large and as frightening as they do today?

Add to these social stresses those brought about through scientific and technological change. Noise imposes stress these days—the roar of heavy traffic, construction machinery, jet planes. The air we breathe in any large city is a menace to some degree. Our food is subject to contamination by insecticides, pesticides, additives, preservatives. The water we drink is rarely free completely of industrial wastes and contamination. As for the threat—the perhaps ultimate hazard—of radiation fallout, who has been able to say with authority what the effects on man will be now, and in generations to come, and who can assess the psychological damage it has already done?

How can any one group of medical men possibly solve the problems and cure the ills of modern man? The average general practitioner, a medical graduate of some 20 years, overburdened, lacking time to keep up with the new drugs, the new treatments, methods, and diagnoses, does his best but is rarely able to cope with the multiplicity of factors that may bear on his patient's condition.

The medical specialists, then, What do they contribute to the cure of man's ills? They contribute, I would say, many valuable pieces. Many of today's medical specialists have narrowed their fields down to a very specialized piece of man's anatomy. Contributions to knowledge and to individual cures prove valuable—but all too often, treatment of a specialized area of the anatomy fails to cure the whole man.

Nineteenth century health methods don't fit a 20th century society. We cannot keep research, disease, and environment in separate compartments. We must view man, his society, and his living conditions as a whole, and treat him accordingly. To get at the basis of your problem, we must call on other groups beyond medicine—the political groups, the social workers, the voluntary agencies—in fact, the whole society. Not only must these scientific disciplines and these social groups be brought into the scheme, but their lines of study and their activities must be adequately coordinated to provide directives for action and an integrated, overall view.

This, you might say, is the talk of a dreamer. It is. But it is the talk of a practical man, too. Early in my life I was a bricklayer. To build a wall you lay a brick at a time, but to know how high, how wide, and how fancy to build the wall, you have to be able to visualize the whole structure. A single analogy, but I think you see what I mean.

The time is approaching, but has not yet come, when we can visualize and treat man in his entirety—as a physiological mechanism, a mind, and a unit of his environment.

C. P. Snow, the English scientist-author, said, "The intellectual life of the whole Western society is increasingly being split into two polar groups. At one pole we have the literary intellectuals; at the other pole the scientists, and as the most representative, the physical scientists. Between the two a gulf of mutual incomprehension—sometimes, particularly among the young, hostility and dislike, but most of all lack of understanding."

Lack of understanding—lack of communication. In this sense, modern society is indeed fragmented. And yet we have at our command a truly astonishing technology—the mechanical means for reaching all but a handful of the world's isolated people. We have techniques for disseminating the printed and the spoken word everywhere. What is lacking is the intellect. So far, we have not used our technological means to accomplish the only truly valid end—the betterment of mankind.

In the development of medical care, we have fallen down sadly in communicating clear-cut patterns to follow. Studies a year or so ago showed that only one-sixth of the adults of the lowest social economic group susceptible to polio in New York City availed themselves of polio vaccine, even though this vaccine was offered free and was easily available. Among our highly educated, wealthier citizens, there have been many instances of people who have delayed seeking treatment for a serious symptom until the time is past when a cure can be offered.

We cannot shrug our shoulders and blame public apathy for these omissions.

We must move beyond our old patterns and solutions of health problems. Let us look at the individual, first of all, as part of his environment and culture. Let us use the full range of sciences to bring their learning and their techniques to bear on his problems. Then let us develop our methods of communication among the scientific disciplines, and between the scientists and the laymen.

I was tremendously encouraged to learn, 2 years ago, that the Stanford University Medical Center has made a fine start in this direction. The center was relocated, you may recall, on the Stanford campus near Palo Alto. Let me quote a few words from the president of Stanford University: "Central to this new Stanford program is the concept that the future progress of the medical sciences is inextricably linked with progress in the social sciences. It followed that the medical school should be so located and organized as to promote the closest possible relationship between teachers, investigators and students in all these fields. It followed also that opportunities for enriching the general education of the medical student would be greater if the medical school became, physically and philosophically, an integral part of the university." "A university," he said, "must be responsive not only to changes in the realm of man's knowledge but also to changes in the society in which new and old knowledge may be applied."

I applaud this concept. Today's physician or even the physician of the future cannot solve all medical problems alone. The physicist, the biochemist, the virologist—all these and many more research workers are uncovering new knowledge for his use. The psychologists are adding quantities of knowledge about man's motivations and behavior. The sociologist contributes the results of his studies on the effects on man of the society and environment.

Coordinating and integrating knowledge in this manner will inevitably prove more of a burden than the individual physician can manage. But is he, necessarily, the only one who can control out health destiny? The familiar and longstanding doctor-patient relationship epitomized by the family physician is a comfortable and reassuring one; but, in these days of specialization among physicians and moves by families, how many of our citizens are able to maintain such a relationship?

I think we can find, and we are finding, additional and more complete ways to solve some of our health problems; to find disease in the symptomless stage when it is still curable, to assure universal immunization, to treat chronic illness.

I realize that I may have drawn a picture of man as medical object being acted upon by numbers of learned men, who use quantities of knowledge and dozens of highly technical machines. If so, I believe it poses a question: Why should not man, as medical patient or as potential patient, have a voice in these health issues himself? Not only should the experts use highly developed communications systems to convey information to the individual, but the individual should be able to communicate his desires and ideas to the experts, as well.

Certainly there is tremendous value in mingling the voices of the experts and the non-experts on such issues as mass screening clinics to find the people who need medical treatment but don't know it; nursing home standards; organized home care programs; environmental health plans, and many other areas. Let us have a truly integrated effort to solve our health problems.

Please do not think that I underestimate the dedication and the contributions of our physicians. Individually, and through their professional organizations, their accomplishments have been truly wonderful, in the best sense of that word.

Nevertheless, I think it is time that we recognized that changes in the makeup of our society and changes in the nature of its health problems call for public as well as professional action.

One positive and, I predict, far-reaching step in this direction was taken this year with the passage of the Community Health Services and Facilities Act, which authorizes the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to make grants to public or nonprofit private agencies or organizations for the development of outside-the-hospital health services, particularly for the chronically ill and aged.

The purpose of this act is to support studies, experiments, and demonstrations that will lead to new or improved community health services outside the hospital, with particular emphasis on services needed by these two large groups. Grants can be made to any State or local public agency or any nonprofit private agency or organization, such as health departments, welfare agencies, voluntary health associations, hospitals, or educational institutions.

The out-of-hospital services mentioned include nursing care and homemaker services, physiotherapy, and nutritional and social esrvices for the sick at home; information and referral services, such as evaluation, placement, and counseling for the chronically ill and aged; and medical, dental, laboratory, and other services aimed toward prevention and early detection of disease, and evaluation of health status.

The ultimate objective in this new effort is to devise many new, improved, and more economical methods of organizing and de-

livering out-of-hospital health services. Some examples of the types of projects the Public Health Service hopes to include are demonstrations of how to coordinate the resources of community agencies so as to include all elements of a comprehensive care program; demonstrations of ways to provide specialized services to patients in nursing homes and in home health programs from a central source; demonstrations of the feasibility of a community, diagnositic, detection, and preventative medicine program.

Notice that these last points are not confined to the chronically ill and the aged. The Public Health Service's description of the Health Services and Facilities Act carries this new plan far beyond these special groups in stating, "Particular emphasis will be given to the problem of services for the chronically ill or aged, but attention will be given also to the potential for expansion to the health needs of the total community."

This, I am confident, will be a strong and meaningful start in the right direction to permit small groups, communities, counties, to pick up, carry on, improve upon and refine the health service ideas that germinate in the demonstration projects. Beyond that, here are many opportunities for developing and broadening the concept of the Health Services and Facilities Act. In considering what we might refer to as comprehensive health services, I am confident that there are many ways to prevent, alleviate, or cure a large number of man's ailments, but that one reason this existing knowledge is not fully used is that the necessary methods for applying it are not well understood by the key publics who must develop and support these methods. This, of course, is the problem of the lack of communication, as I pointed out earlier.

We might focus our attention on two major weaknesses in the present community patterns of health and medical care. First, the fact that existing services and facilities do not reach all who need them. Second, inadequate services and facilities prevent even those who are reached from getting the full gamut of preventive, restorative, and curative services.

There is no clear-cut definition yet of what kind of a comprehensive health pattern a modern community needs, nor is there a fully developed set of objectives and standards. However, there is general agreement on many of the basic elements of such a pattern.

Let us look, first, at the term "comprehensive." It can convey a dual meaning: no person is left out; no type of care is left out. It evokes the vision of a community health pattern that assures everyone the health and medical care he needs, when and where he needs it.

The term "services" is probably the best single word to describe the broad range of services and facilities that make up this ideal community health pattern. It is preferable to the word "care" both because it emphasizes the way care is achieved—the means, not the end product—and because the term "health care" has come to be associated with controversial measures for financing care.

While the Community Health Services and Facilities Act will certainly stimulate many States and communities to modernize some of their health activities, the more clearly the end goal can be visualized, the more constructive such action is likely to be. It is tremendously important that the public be shown how the separate pieces of the health programs can be fitted together to form a total pattern.

To communicate this concept to the general public, it would seem best to explain the theory it stands for in the simplest possible terms. So, at the outset, comprehensive health services might be considered to include only three basic health objectives: (1) Prevention, or preserving, health; (2) secondary prevention, or slowly down disability; (3) treatment, or speeding recovery.

While each of these objectives can be discussed in terms of almost any disease or disability, the initial discussion might be limited to a few which most concern the public and for which easily understood action can be taken.

Prevention, for example, may be discussed in terms of such obvious examples as immunization, fluoridation, rheumatic fever and TB prophylaxis, and VD control. Secondary prevention might stress early diagnosis through periodic checkups and through screening programs for diabetes, glaucoma, and cervical cancer. Secondary prevention will also feature restorative services in terms of the best known examples: stroke and arthritis exercises, and cardiac diets. Treatment may be approached from the standpoint of providing ancillary services, such as nursing, homemaker, therapeutic, social services, in homes and nursing homes, and the progressive care concept in hospital treatment.

The first steps in combined community action might include the cooperation of such groups, as health departments, to coordinate activity: Medical societies, to reach patients for early diagnosis and obtaining nonmedical services for long-term patients; voluntary agencies, whose own programs will be strengthened as the public gains a better understanding of the comprehensive health services concept; welfare agencies, for reaching low-income groups; hospitals, nursing homes, and other institutions offering restorative and other supplementary services; and finally, civic groups, including service clubs, unions, church groups, and others, for additional help and cooperation—especially in furthering health education or health consciousness.

All of this effort can, of course, be supplemented by television programs, films, booklets, newspaper features, newsletters, and reminders through schools.

Public leaders and group leaders must certainly be brought into the development of this concept and its promotion.

Prominent among planners should be the Government's health authorities, and the Nation's leading physicians, scientists, and medical educators. This is an ambitious concept, and that is why I have taken this opportunity to discuss it with you.

In a group such as yours—one of the outstanding medical groups in this country—are the men of vision who can help to implement these ideas. I have touched on some areas of discomfort, I am sure, but just a stirring of unease is sometimes necessary to produce action and what we need now is action. The time is certainly upon us when we must take bold steps to apply the sum of our knowledge to the sum of our needs.

The public has indicated its desires to Congress. Congress recognizes its responsibilities and has acted. A great medical center has shown what can be done in adapting its programs and courses of learning to meet new needs.

Gentlemen, we have the men, the intelligence, and the technology. The question is, do we have the wisdom and the courage to address ourselves to the emerging needs of our times. I think we do. You, leading physicians of this country have the ability to help in this move toward an application of our scientific knowledge to improve the health status of man.

A Grand Member of the Nez Perce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include an article by Rowena and Gordon Alcorn, of Tacoma, Wash. Mr. and Mrs. Alcorn are enthusiastic students of our American Indians and have done much to preserve their interesting history and culture, particularly of those whose origins are in the Pacific Northwest.

Here is an interesting account of Peace Pipe, now 100 years old, one of the very few, if not the last, survivors of what we have come to call Chief Joseph's War of 1876.

Butterfly Valley was hot in the June sun as we climbed to a small Indian cemetery on Thunderbird Hill above Lapwai, Idaho. Dry grass and pebbles made slippery footing, but it was surprising how seldom our old Nez Perce friend paused to rest.

Albert Moore, Peace Pipe (Tuk-Tar-Mal-Way-Une), we have known since 1935, but this summer was the first time he had shown us where his family is buried. There in a row are five graves. His first wife and their three daughters, Lena 6, May 14, and baby Isabell 2 years, are here. His second wife whom he married in 1916 and who died in 1959, is here too.

A few feet up higher on the hillside is the grave of Albert's father, Thomas Moore (Il-Lul-Lah), born in 1823 and died in 1920. Thomas was educated in the Rev. Henry Harmon Spalding's mission school at old Lapwai on the bank of the Clearwater River. That missionary had done his work well, for on the headstone is this inscription: "Let God's Will Be Done."

We stood for a few moments beside this grave while Peace Pipe reflected sadly. I am the only one left—they are all here now except my mother, Im-Nah-Mah * * * she is buried in the mission cemetery at Spalding (Old Lapwai).

Peace Pipe has a noble heritage. His mother was the niece of Chief Timothy (Ta-Moots-Tsoo), the devoted friend of the white man. Timothy was the first Christian convert of Spalding's work with the Nez Perces. Im-Nah-Mah was also a first cousin to Chief Looking Glass, and she belonged to his band.

As we walked on down the hill from the cemetery, Peace Pipe pointed out a stream winding through the tall grass. "We always called this Soldier Creek because in the old days, troops stationed at Fort Lapwai rode their horses to and from Lewiston through this ravine here on Thunder-Hill." He made a sweeping gesture, "When I was a younger man, I used to farm these fields along the slopes there."

REMEMBERS BUFFALO

"I was born in an Indian tepee," Peace Pipe continued, "the year after the big snow, 1861. This was south of Clarkston in what is now Asotin County. There was a big longhouse there surrounded by many buffalo-skin tepees. My parents took me to the hunting grounds across the Rocky Mountains over Lolo Pass when I was about

five years old. * * * I can remember seeing millions of buffaloes roaming on the plains of Montana. * * * We camped for several seasons in the Bitterroot country where the Musselshell and the Missouri rivers join."

The Nez Perces were superb horsemen. They traveled long distances on their spotted ponies between the Montana plains and their homeland in Washington, Idaho and Oregon. The braves hunted and fished while their women gathered edible roots for winter food. In June, from the expansive Weippe Prairies high above Kamiah, Idaho, kous roots (member of the carrot family), were collected, scraped and dried. They were eaten whole or chopped into a coarse meal. In late August and early September, camas bulbs were harvested. They were baked in pits for several days until they were a dark brown. This set the sugar and made them more palatable. So rich and nutritious is this food that two kous and two camas roots will sustain an adult for an entire day.

For the one and only time, the nontreaty bands of the Nez Perce Nation, after extreme provocation by renegade white men, clashed with U.S. Army forces in a 4-month running campaign. The first battle took place at Whitebird Canyon on June 17, 1877.

The Indians won that battle, but knowing that General Howard would attack again, the Nez Perces under the leadership of Chieftains Joseph (Too-Hool-Hool-Zote), and White Bird, moved back into the country beyond Kamiah where they encamped in a broad meadow across the south fork of the Clearwater River, opposite the present site of the village of Stites, Idaho.

Downstream a few miles, at the junction of the south and middle forks of the Clearwater at Kooskia, was the permanent camp-village of the Chief Looking Glass band. A surprise attack by Howard's forces from the hills sent the remnants of this band to join the other Nez Perces farther up the south fork.

For 2 days, on July 11 and 12, 1877, a heated battle was fought between the redmen and the soldiers along the high promontory since known as Battle Ridge. Outstanding Nez Perce warriors were: Hair Combed Over Eyes, Yellow Wolf, Rainbow, Five Wounds, Wounded Head, White Hawk, Red Moccasin Tops, Shore Crossing, Bird Alighting and Swan Necklace.

Peace Pipe, who was 16 years old at the time, recalls that battle vividly, because some cannonballs from the army howitzers fell into the Nez Perce encampment. Toward the close of the second day of fighting, it was decided that the women, children and old men must leave the area, so they packed their belongings and departed for Kamiah.

WOMAN LEFT BEHIND

Yellow Wolf, fighting a delaying action, was the last warrior to leave Battle Ridge. As his horse was fording the Clearwater, he noticed that the camp was deserted, but he heard a woman crying. There he found Springtime, Chief Joseph's wife, endeavoring to quiet her horse which was terrified by those cannon shots from across the river. She had been unable to mount the rearing animal with her cradleboard containing her month-old infant, born just before the Battle of Whitebird Canyon.

Yellow Wolf held her mount while Springtime swung up on its back; then he handed the tekash (cradleboard) to her. When she had adjusted it firmly in place, she and Yellow Wolf raced through the canyon to join the other tribesmen. Chief Joseph, unaware that Springtime was not with the rest of the women, was grateful to his cousin, Yellow Wolf, for assisting her.

The next day, on July 13, Howard struck again, in the Battle of Kamiah Crossing. After this encounter, a hurried council was held by the Nez Perces. Chief Joseph wanted to head down into the wild and rugged terrain of the Salmon River country (River of No Return). There, he argued, the Nez Perces could hold out for a long time against the soldiers. Chief Looking Glass and the other chieftans were for fleeing over Lolo Pass to seek sanctuary in Canada.

Joseph was outvoted, so preparations for the long trek over the Rockies began at once.

PEACE PIPE REMAINED

Peace Pipe wanted to go with them, but Im-Nah-Mah, his mother, persuaded him to remain behind at Kamiah with her. "Our people," she said, "will never reach that country of the Red Shirts (Canadians). There will be too many soldier-coats on the road." Peace Pipe was said to see his young friend, Shining Light, depart with the others.

Just before they left, Chief Red Heart, with his band came into the camp. They were returning from a buffalo hunt in Montana, and not in accord with the other tribesmen, they decided to stay at Kamiah.

Cyclone Coming (Hatya-Takonnin), an old medicine man, begged his son, Speaking Thunder, not to go. The aged Nez Perce raised his hand in warning "Death awaits you on that trail. * * * It is dark with blood * * *.

"All going will die or see bondage * * * soldiers too many."

Speaking Thunder left on the retreat, but he never again saw his father, for he went into captivity when Chief Joseph surrendered at Bear Paw. He died at the "Hot Place" (Eeikish Pah) (Missouri River).

After the war had ended, Im-Nah-Mah encouraged her son to get a good education, so in 1881, when he was 20 years old, Peace Pipe enrolled at Pacific University, at Forest Grove, Oreg. When he left Lapwai on horseback, he had his bedroll, a supply of dried buffalo meat, and sacks of kous and camas roots. More important, he had 19 silver dollars that Im-Nah-Mah had saved for him.

FRIEND OF MEANY

Around 1900, Peace Pipe met the late Dr. Edmond S. Meany, professor of history at the University of Washington. He was a guest many times at the Meany home in Seattle. Peace Pipe served as interpreted for Dr. Meany when he visted Chief Joseph, who had been banished to live at Nespelum after the war of 1877. Meany and Joseph became very good friends.

Only once was Joseph allowed to visit his birthplace, the lovely Wallowa Valley which the Nez Perces called the "Land of Winding Waters." (Max Wilson, an attorney who has lived at Joseph, Oreg., most of his life, told us that he remembers seeing Chief Joseph for the 2 days he was there in late August 1899.)

After finishing his education at Forest Grove, Peace Pipe attended a Bible school in Los Angeles, and also took part in several films between the years 1915 and 1920. When he returned to Lapwai, he served as a Presbyterian minister for a while.

Last Sunday, Peace Pipe celebrated his 100th birthday. This makes him the oldest member of the Nez Perce Nation. Shining Light (Way-Yah-Tah-Nah Tolah-Kah) was just 1 day older than Peace Pipe. When Chief Joseph surrendered at Bear Paw, Shining Light escaped on his fast pony and raced for the Canadian border, 50 miles away. There he stayed in the camp of Chief Sitting Bull, the Sioux. Later he returned to live in Idaho and married Tema Peo, daughter of a Umatilla chief. He was known as Johnson Hoyt in later years. He died on June 10, this year and was buried on the north fork of the Clearwater at Ahsahka in the little cemetery by the Presbyterian church of which he was a member for many years.

OLD DAYS RECALLED

Peace Pipe and Shining Light always enjoyed talking about those exciting days long ago when the Nez Perce were rich and powerful. They knew many chieftains; Joseph, and his handsome brother, Ollokot, Yellow Bull, Looking Glass, Timothy, and Lawyer. They remembered also those mighty buffalo hunters and brave warriors, Rainbow, and Five Wounds who were slain at Big Hole on August 9, 1877.

Today, at 100 years of age, Peace Pipe is spry and alert and possesses a lively sense of humor. He still takes Indian sweat baths, which he calls "the sweating," at regular intervals. He is an avid baseball fan and rarely misses the games at Lewiston. He played on that city's team during the 1880's.

Many startling changes have taken place in the Northwest during this Nez Perce tribesman's century-long life span. His uncle, Ta-Moots-Tsoo (Chief Timothy), saw Lewis and Clark in 1805 when they stopped by his Alpowa village located a few miles down the Snake River from Clarkston, Wash. Timothy lived until about 1891 so Peace Pipe remembers his kinsman very well.

Last summer, the city of Lewiston, Idaho, held its centennial celebration. Resplendent in his full tribal regalia, Peace Pipe rode in the big parade held on the 100th anniversary of the founding of the city, the year he was born.

Again the State Department Policy Makes Us Wonder Just Whose Side Some of These People Are Supporting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, whenever any leftwing world leader or head of a Communist-oriented nation wants to visit the United States to insult and upbraid us, there is no difficulty in having his visit approved by the Department of State. How different when the one lone friend of freedom in Africa is invited by Americans to visit this land which symbolizes the freedom in which he believes. The State Department throws up its hands in horror and refuses to allow Moise Tshombe to set foot inside our shores. I wonder, sometimes, who the real policymakers in the State Department are and which side are they supporting. I should think Congress and the American people would want to know. I believe it is time that the administration is called to account for the strange actions coming out of the State Department. Certainly a full, complete, and open investigation of the State Department and its personnel is warranted to explain the failure in Cuba, in Laos, in other parts of Asia, and to ascertain the real reason they do not want Tshombe to give his side of the story. In this connection I would like to include as a part of these remarks the following editorial from the Dallas Morning News:

TSHOMBE EXCLUDED

The State Department frequently has used any means at its disposal to prevent exposure of its policies and actions to public scrutiny and possible criticism. But seldom has it been so blatant in its efforts to suppress the truth as it has been in the case of its role in the Congo.

Denial of a visa to Katanga President Moise Tshombe by the State Department is only

the latest in a long series of acts of censorship. The stanch anti-Communist leader of Katanga has been invited to appear at a Madison Square Garden rally of Young Americans for Freedom—a nationwide organization of conservative students and young adults—on March 7.

He was also due to appear on the coast-to-coast "Meet the Press" television program, to speak at a National Press Club luncheon, to meet with a group of Congressmen and to make talks at the University of Virginia, the Overseas Press Club in New York City, the Boston Law College Forum, and the World Affairs Council in Los Angeles. He had been scheduled to appear in Dallas, but the program was canceled.

The American people will be denied the opportunity to hear Mr. Tshombe state his own case. State's first excuse for denying the visa—obviously a phony one—was that Tshombe's application was "incomplete." Under pressure it admitted that the real reason was that current negotiations in the Congo are too important and touchy to allow Tshombe to leave the country. This excuse is equally phony.

If negotiations are so crucial, why was Cyrille Adoula, the Central Government's premier, permitted to come to the United States a few weeks ago to speak at the United Nations and plead his side of the story (which also happens to be the State Department's side of the story) in Washington? And how is it that he is now able to visit Moscow, if it is so important that Congolese leaders stay at home?

The State Department, of course, has a vivid memory of the bitter opposition expressed by the American people to its active support of the U.N.'s war on Katanga late last year.

State is still pursuing that policy—or an extension of it—by playing the dangerous game of giving unqualified support to the neutralist central government of Cyrille Adoula. And it doesn't dare risk another outburst of public indignation—particularly when Congress is about to take up the U.N. bond issue, which is an outgrowth of its Congo operation.

We hear a lot from Washington these days to the effects that if only the American people can get the facts, they will make a wise decision. Why, then, is the State Department suppressing half of the story?

If its policy in the Congo is as good as officials tell us it is, why is State creating the impression that it is vulnerable? Denial of the right of Tshombe to state his case makes that impression inevitable.

Vulnerability of State's policies in the Congo should be obvious. It is backing the regime of one of pro-Communist Patrice Lumumba's heirs, a man who has said that he will pursue Lumumba's policies and who only a few weeks ago said, at the U.N., that Lumumba was still his country's and his own greatest hero.

This man, Adoula, is also surrounded by three of Lumumba's closest Communist collaborators—Christohpe Gbenye, Remy Mwamba, and Victor Lundula—who run the central government's armed forces, its police forces and its ministry of justice.

State's policy is still to make a whipping boy out of Tshombe and to oppose his government of Katanga, which has just ratified the Kitona agreement for reuniting the Congo. The only stipulations which the Katanga assembly placed on the agreement were: (1) that the central government take a strong stand against communism, (2) that it immediately end military operations against Katanga, and (3) that it renounce use of international force (U.N.) to settle internal problems.

If Adoula's government can't accept these limitations, then our State Department had better change its own policy—and pronto.

Communists in Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, in the October 1961 issue of Christian Crusade—this publication is printed in Tulsa, Okla.—there appears an article by Matt Cvetic entitled "Communists in Agriculture." Mr. Cvetic, a former counterspy for the Federal Bureau of Investigation and an expert on the techniques and activities of the communist conspiracy in this country, knows what he is talking about. I think his article should be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and under unanimous consent, I include it herewith:

COMMUNISTS IN AGRICULTURE

(By Matt Cvetic)

Many letters come into my office asking whether the Communists have infiltrated our farming areas. Others raise questions such as: What interest could the Reds have in the Farm Belt?

The Reds are vitally interested in our Farm Belt strictly from a Communist military standpoint. Long ago Napoleon said: "An army travels on its stomach". As the breadbasket of the Nation, our Midwest is an ideal area for Communist subversion, and the Kremlin knows this only too well. They are as interested in securing a foothold in the farm belt as they are in gaining control of unions, church groups, or other sections of American Society which are vital to their plot to overthrow our Government.

For the purpose of infiltrating farming areas, the Communists have operating in the United States, an agricultural commission of the Communist Party. The purpose of this Red farm commission is to function within the agriculture areas in our Nation, infiltrate the farmers' organizations, seek positions of trust in these groups and then influence them along Communist lines.

Unfortunately the average American does not seem to grasp the Red threat in his midst because he does not know how the cunning Communists operate. He expects the Reds to swarm into the farm regions—like a plague of locusts. However, secret Red agents do not operate this way, either in the farm belt, industry, church groups, education, or any other field. The Red agent, like the confidence man, moves in furtively, wheedles his way into the confidence of the community, joins groups and organizations, then works to secure a controlling post. One Red agent in a stratgeic position is worth a thousand rank and file members.

To give an illustration of Communist operation in the Farm Belt, and within the framework of farm groups in our country, let me go back to the late forties when I posed as a Communist for the FBI.

During those years I attended many Red strategy meetings at which plans for gaining control of farming organizations were discussed. Occasionally I secured the meeting places in Chicago, Pittsburgh and other cities.

On the day of the meeting, Communists from the Farm Belt furtively slipped into town, usually registered in a hotel under a fictitious name, or stayed at the home of a trusted Red.

These sessions were held over a 2- or 3-day period, and were called for the purpose of giving the new Kremlin directives to the Communists present. At these Red gatherings there would be as many as 40 or 50 present. (Today for party security reasons they gather in much smaller groups.)

Upon receiving his new party orders, each Communist present gave his own progress report. This report consisted of describing in detail the success which the particular Communist enjoyed in his "area of operation." At the close of these furtive meetings each Red agent would return to his base of operation—there to carry out the new orders which he received. Needless to say, when a Communist projects the party's line into his or her farm organization, he makes it appear as a new idea coming from his own little progressive brain.

Just how can one fight communism, whether it is in the Farm Belt, union, church group or elsewhere? Spotting a Communist by an average layman is rather difficult. Remember, the Red is a trained conspirator, well versed in the skills of the confidence man. He is hardly going to telegraph his Communist membership to you. More than likely, if accused, he will vehemently deny it—unless he or she is called before a congressional or judicial body under oath, in which case, he will shout to high heaven about his civil rights and finally end up hiding behind the fifth amendment. Will he reveal his party membership? Never. Like the average confidence man, this would cook his Red goose.

Fighting communism by trying to prove party membership is practically impossible for the average citizen. This is a job for trained police intelligence. However, there is a way in which every American can fight communism, and at the same time meet the challenge of their sympathizers and dupes. This is: Fight them on principles and issues.

If one studies literature on Communist techniques, he will soon learn the Communist and his fellow traveler religiously follow what is known as the party line. Once acquainted with this Red method one will soon learn to watch for it at meetings and other gatherings. Every Red is compelled by party discipline to further the party line whether he is in a union, farm group, educational institution, church group, or wherever he is active.

Here is part of the Kremlin's party line as of today:

1. Support for Castro and his Communist government.

2. Recognition for Red China and Outer-Mongolia.

3. Admission of Red China and Outer-Mongolia to the United Nations.

4. Abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and other Government bodies concerned with our security.

5. Smear and slander of anyone who opposes communism.

6. Seeking U.S. disarmament and the suspension of atomic tests unilaterally, thus rendering us easy prey for the Soviet Union.

7. Inducing the people of the United States to subordinate their will to the decisions of the United Nations.

However, the fact that someone may be advocating one or more of these objectives does not make him or her a Communist, but if someone is consistently following a set pattern of pro-Kremlin projectives, you have a right to be suspicious.

In order to acquaint yourself with communism and its subversive techniques, read the many excellent books written by America's top authorities on the subject. Listen to raido programs which are specifically aimed at informing you on the Red menace. Start a study group in your school, church or civic group.

Once informed, you will be in a better position to challenge those who, by design or through ignorance, are working to promote the Red revolution in our Republic.

Capital Budget—Needed Reform for Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, as a long-time proponent of the adoption by the Federal Government of the capital budget concept, and as the sponsor of H.R. 1968, which would achieve this goal, I am pleased to call the attention of my colleagues to the following article which appears in the current issue of the American Federationist:

CAPITAL BUDGET—NEEDED REFORM FOR PLANNING

The annual Federal budget is the single most important fiscal document in America. Its all-pervading influence is felt by every citizen, by the Nation's economy and by the free world.

Each year the Federal budget, as submitted to the Congress by the President, reflects the projected outlay and income of the largest employer of labor; the largest customer of private business; the biggest real estate holder; the largest single lending agency; the operator of the largest electric utility system; the administrator of the largest scientific research establishment.

This is not to mention the immensely expensive national security programs, including foreign aid and national defense, past, present, and future.

An estimated amount in excess of $83 billion dollars will be spent by the Federal Government in fiscal 1962, representing about 16 percent of the entire forecast gross national product for the Nation in 1961. Money for sustaining such outlays is obtained through collection of taxes, receipts to the United States and borrowing.

There has grown up an unnecessarily narrow limit of understanding by most citizens of the role that is played or can be played by the Federal budget. Far too many Americans regard it as the yearly mad news related to Federal spending and taxes. In practice, it serves principally as a document prepared for use by the Congress. It has not been modernized to play the kind of broad and constructive role that a national budget is capable of playing.

Failure to use the potential of a modern national budget strengthens the position of individuals and groups which oppose Federal spending for economic growth and stability and who have been, in the main, successful for more than a decade in stopping or watering down vitally needed programs in the public sector. Their most effective rallying cries are those of "fiscal irresponsibility," deficit spending, "unbalanced budget" or "chushing national debt."

A basic need in the Government of the United States is a comprehensive financial policy. This cannot be achieved without a proper system of fiscal reporting and planing. The best uses of such a system lie within a comprehensive set of budgeting data and clearly set forth accounting system based on the best relevant business principles.

A proper Federal budget is one which can be used effectively to aid in establishment of wise monetary and tax policies and in the process of social and economic planning that establishes targets of national growth and programs calculated to strike them.

Unfortunately, the Federal budget, as it is now constituted, does not provide an adequate tool for these purposes. As a matter of fact, it is of far more value to the forces of the status quo than to advocates of an active and necessary role by Government.

THE PRESENT FEDERAL BUDGET

As submitted annually to the Congress by the President, the Federal budget is a single system comprising all Federal transactions except those involving trust funds such as old age and survivors' insurance, unemployment compensation, and railroad retirement. In a technical sense, it serves principally as an expenditure forecast, although it does not specify how much of the needed revenues will be raised and in what manner.

The budget document has been prepared by the Bureau of the Budget along general guidelines established by the policies of the President. This means that annual requests for funds from Federal departments and agencies have been reviewed and cut down by the Bureau of the Budget and then approved with or without revisions by the President, prior to submittal of his budget message. There are two main aspects of the annual Federal budget.

THE PROGRAM BUDGET

What can be called the program budget is a summary ledger sheet of receipts and expenditures, actual and estimated. In the cash budget are lumped together receipts to the Government from various kinds of taxes from the trust funds, from customs duties, and from miscellaneous receipts.

A separate section breaks down budget expenditures by major function, with capital and current expense items commingled. Among the general functions are major national security, international affairs, veterans, labor and welfare, agriculture, natural resources, commerce and housing, general government, interest and allowances for proposed legislation and contingencies.

By subtracting total forecast budget expenditures from that of estimated budget receipts, an estimated budgetary surplus or deficit for the next fiscal year is obtained.

As it stands, the Federal program budget is a system of financial recordkeeping without economic significance. It is a hodgepodge of current expense and capital items with no basic financial meaning. At best it is an expenditure forecast, but it overstates the need for tax revenue by several billions each year as well as overstating the net amount of the national debt.

THE CASH BUDGET

For each fiscal year a ledger sheet is prepared showing the effects of Federal Government operations on cash balances and on the public debt. Data includes results of trust fund operations.

For example, if there was a cash balance of $5 billion at the beginning of a given fiscal year, a $1 billion budget surplus from the previous year and a net gain of $500 million from operations, there would be an unadjusted plus balance of $6.5 billion from operations. The cash balance at the close of the year (let us assume $5.5 billion) is then subtracted from $6.5 billion, leaving $1 billion. If the public debt were $285 billion at the start of the year, it would thus be reduced by $1 billion to $284 billion at the close of the year.

By laboriously plowing through special tables and analyses included in the massive budget document, it is possible to obtain more detailed data on anticipated receipts, self-liquidating public works and loans and Federal aid to State and local governments. There are also details on special kinds of receipts, expenditures and appropriations, together with historical data.

The present organization of the budget, however, makes it impossible to measure the worth or calculate the depreciation of Government assets, what they consist of, and under what programs. There is no section which sets forth Government earnings, whence derived, and how related to costs.

By means of a recently adopted "Federal Government expenditures and receipts in the national income account," a method is available of measuring the effect of Federal financial operations on the national economy. Federal receipts are accounted for on an accrual basis, rather than at the time of collection of revenue. Federal purchases are entered when goods are delivered and services performed, instead of at time of payment. Exchanges and transfers of existing assets are excluded.

There remains, however, no differentiation between capital investment and current expense programs (a capital budget and a current expense budget). Without this separation there cannot be constructive use of the budget for administrative management, legislative control and effective economic analysis.

CAPITAL AND CURRENT EXPENSE ITEMS

Current expense items: These are often termed the "housekeeping expenses of government" but also include by far the largest item in the budget—major national security, the military, mutual security, military assistance, the weapons program of the Atomic Energy Commission and stockpiling and defense production. In the aggregate these represent about 60 percent of the 1962 fiscal year budget.

In addition to national security, there are the running expenses of the legislative, judiciary and executive branches of the U.S. Government, of the independent offices, the cabinet level departments and interest payments on the public debt.

Current expense items, then, are those which are not investments in physical or financial assets and which are not expected to yield a return in dollars.

Capital items: In 1947, James Webb, the then Director of the Bureau of the Budget, defined a capital investment as that which involved creation, improvement, or acquisition of durable assets; or acquisition of recoverable claims.

Developmental and commercial activities of the U.S. Government are capital by nature. They include the tremendous lending programs for housing, agriculture, maritime, veterans, small business, rural electrification and aid to foreign countries. These loans are being repaid with interest and therefore are not properly classified as current expenditures.

In addition, the Federal Government as a developer of natural resources has invested billions of dollars in the reimbursable features of water development projects. Returns to the United States are in the form of revenues from marketing Federally generated power at wholesale and repayment of reimbursable irrigation and municipal water charges by homesteaders and towns and cities. In this category are the programs of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Interior.

An approximation of what is involved in the easily identified lending and self-liquidating resources development activities of the Federal Government can be reached by reference to tables 1 and 2.

Since these programs began, about $2 billion has been returned to the Federal Government from the wholesale hydroelectric power receipts, repayment of reimbursable irrigation costs, from municipal and industrial water supply. This would leave a net outstanding investment of slightly more than $12 billion in reimbursable features of Federal resources development programs.

Federal self-liquidating lending and resources development programs presently aggregate approximately $36 billion worth of investment by the American people. To consider these as current expense or public debt expenditures is completely misleading. As

a matter of fact, the total of these capital investments in tables 1 and 2 represent about 12.5 percent of the estimated 1961 gross public debt of $288 billion.

In attempting, however, to arrive at an applicable definition of assets owned, acquired and disposed of by the United States to expand the scope of a capital budget beyond the reimbursable lending and resources programs, one meets a number of difficulties.

There is a fairly well defined category of capital expenditures for the Federal-State highway program, for grants-in-aid and loans for other purposes such as hospital construction, building airports, municipal services, area redevelopment loans and grants and the like.

TABLE 1.—*Major Federal credit agencies—Outstanding loans estimated as of fiscal 1961* [1]

[In millions of dollars]

	Loans outstanding
Housing and Home Finance Agency	5,244
Veterans' Administration	1,568
Department of Agriculture	5,442
Department of Commerce	800
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	133
Treasury Department—British loan	3,260
Export-Import Bank	3,285
Department of State	4,154
Total	23,886

[1] Source: Special analysis of Federal credit programs in the 1962 budget, Bureau of the Budget, January 1961.

NOTE.—Programs under Housing and Home Finance Agency, FNMA, Urban Renewal, Community Facilities, Federal Housing and Public Housing Administrations; programs under Department of Agriculture; Rural Electrification, Farmers' Home Administration, Commodity Credit Corporation; programs under Department of Commerce, Maritime Administration; expansion of defense production; Small Business Administration; programs under Department of State; International Cooperation Administration, Development Loan Fund.

TABLE 2.—*Federal resources agencies and programs total investment in reimbursable features* [1]

[In millions of dollars, June 30, 1961]

Agency:	*Total reimbursable investment*
Department of Interior	8,509
Tennessee Valley Authority	1,800
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	3,953
Total	14,262

[1] Sources: 1960 annual reports of the Secretary of the Interior, Columbia River Power system, Tennessee Valley Authority; U.S. Bureau of Reclamation: "Repayment of Reclamation Project Construction Costs," June 30, 1960; Office of Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water and Power; letter of May 12, 1961, from Civil Works, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

NOTE.—Includes final costs, estimated or final, of projects in operation or under construction.

Then there are the vast array of physical assets owned, acquired, managed or disposed of by the United States. How can an inventory of these be taken and a realistic determination made of their value? The answer to this question is not immediately forthcoming.

Such assets include hundreds and millions of acres of public lands—some valuable for mineral production or mineral reserves, for grazing, for watershed cover, protection of fish and wildlife, recreational facilities, commercial timber production. Also owned or under lease-purchase contracts are public buildings. The United States has inventories of water development projects which provide public benefits and aid the economy by means of enhancing navigation, controlling floods and mitigating soil erosion but yield no tangible dollar return from beneficiaries.

Other possible capital expenditures include public assistance payments to the States, worker training, a vast and variegated effort in research and development in many fields. The latter have already yielded much and will yield more assistance to technological and economic development in the future. Yet none of these effects can at this time be precisely measured by conventional accounting methods.

WHERE IS THE CAPITOL BUDGET USED?

Private business corporations for many years have, as a matter of adequate management, differentiated between investment and current expense items in their bookkeeping procedures in order to determine assets, liabilities and corporation indebtedness.

Many States and scores of municipalities have moved far ahead of the Federal Government in adopting capital budgeting in one form or another. Some Federal agencies use capital budgeting for their internal operations—although this is not reflected in the overall Federal budget.

In 1954 there were 16 States employing capital budget classifications, although there is wide variance in their definitions of what a capital item consists of, in the inclusiveness and operation of the budget, as well as where the responsibility for its preparation lies.

As long ago as 1953, a U.S. Census Bureau report showed that $2.8 billion or nearly 25 percent of the $11.5 billion aggregate State expenditures consisted of capital outlays. Per capita outlays by the States for capital items was about $5 in 1942. By 1953 it had increased more than threefold to $16.

A questionnaire on use of the capital budget was sent in 1957 by the International City Managers Association to 813 cities with populations over 10,000. Replies were received from 792. Capital budgeting was in use by 198 municipalities or 25 percent of those replying to the questionnaire. Los Angeles alone of the cities with a population over 1 million did not use a capital budget; Houston, Tex., and Minneapolis, Minn., were the only exceptions among the cities with populations of 500,000 to 1 million. Among the 19 cities in the 250,000 to 500,000 population range, the capital budget was used by 13. Only 156 of the 709 cities between 10,000 to 250,000 employed a capital budget.

Municipal capital budgets covered periods ranging from 2 to 20 years; 88 cities with 5 years; 45 cities, 6 years; 24 cities, 7 to 20 years; only 34 cities, less than 5 years.

In a large number of other countries, capital budgeting has been long in use. An incomplete list includes Italy, Belgium, The Netherlands, Sweden, Union of South Africa, India, United Kingdom, Canada, and Ecuador.

Sweden makes wider and more sophisticated use of capital budgeting than perhaps any other nation. After 1937, annual budget balancing was abandoned in favor of balancing it over the length of the business cycle. The budget would show deficits during a depression period and surpluses during boom years. Since World War II Sweden has measured the financial soundness of the Government by changes in its asset position. Main attention, however, is given at present to the effects of total current and capital transactions on Sweden's overall economy, although the budgetary structure has not been formally changed to reflect this.

TOWARD A U.S. CAPITAL BUDGET

Perhaps the earliest small move in the direction of separating capital from current expense in U.S. fiscal management accounting took place when the Federal land banks providing mortgage credit to farmers were established in 1916 during the Wilson administration. Except for initial capital stock, the transactions of the Federal land banks were excluded from the regular operating accounts of the Federal Government.

In 1932 the act creating the Reconstruction Finance Corporation passed Congress and was signed into law by President Hoover. In a message to Congress on the budget in December of that year, President Hoover wrote: "The authorization of large programs of self-liquidating works to be financed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation provides aid to employment * * * without burden upon the taxpayers."

In his fiscal 1940 budget message, President Franklin D. Roosevelt proposed establishment of a budget which would differentiate between capital and current outlays. But nothing was done and increased governmental intervention in the economy further confused the fiscal operations, as reflected by annual budget documents.

Awareness of the need for a Federal capital budget and support for it have been growing slowly but steadily since the end of World War II. As early as 1947, Senator WAYNE MORSE proposed it be undertaken as an initial major budget reform. The first Hoover Commission report of 1949 included a capital budget as one of its principal fiscal recommendations.

In 1959 identical bills to authorize a capital budget were introduced in both Houses of Congress. Hearings on the House bills were held by a House Government Operations Subcommittee. Organized labor endorsed the goals of the bill as representing "reform * * * long overdue and badly needed in order to establish commonsense and realistic accounting procedure to the largest and most important business on earth, the U.S. Government."

The 1960 Democratic Party platform and Presidential Candidate John F. Kennedy specifically pledged a capital budget as necessary to provide the country with an accurate picture of costs and returns. Both pledges were restricted to investments in the United States in reimbursable features of resources development projects.

The 1959 capital budget bills were reintroduced at the beginning of the 87th Congress by Senators MORSE and NEUBERGER, of Oregon, and in the House by Representatives ULLMAN and GREEN, of Oregon.

Organized labor, conservationists, cooperatives, housing groups, municipal, public power, and some farm organizations have augmented their support for the capital budget principle although there remain some difference among them as to a proper and realistic definition of a capital item.

No hearings were held on the proposed legislation during the first session of the present Congress. The reason for present inaction was that Treasury Secretary C. Douglas Dillon hedged on the Democratic position when he wrote to Senate Government Operations Committee that "The Treasury Department is unable at this time to support the proposed measure * * * The Treasury Department is presently planning a thorough study of this subject as soon as more pressing requirements permit. When it has completed this project, I shall make appropriate recommendations to the Bureau of the Budget for its consideration. In the interim, the Treasury Department would urge that congressional action on this subject be deferred."

In the face of gathering support for a Federal capital budget and budget reform, this footdragging has delayed but will not derail a push in the next Congress to enact a sound, workable capital budget bill. The steadily increasing momentum toward a

larger government role in the field of economic undertakings is a fact of life.

A rapidly increasing population, increasing urbanization, mounting unmet requirements in a vast range of essential public services, will bring about an inevitable increase in governmental capital investments both in total amounts and probably in the proportion they bear to the gross national product.

In fiscal 1939, this proportion represented by Federal monetary outlays was 10 percent of the gross national product. By fiscal 1962 it had risen to an estimated 15 percent.

The money to bear increasing Federal expenditures for the public sector of the economy will come from taxation and from borrowings from commercial banks, savings institutions and the public. With a capital budget in operation, however, the borrowings will come to be more generally associated and in many instances specifically associated with capital investments.

TOWARD A COORDINATED FISCAL POLICY

The first step toward bringing order to Federal fiscal policy confusion is basic budget reform. Such reform is indispensable to establishing equity in tax reform. An equitable distribution of the tax burden cannot be made on the shaky foundation of a budget that is a conglomeration of capital and current items balanced mainly by adding up columns of figures to determine if the totals match.

Moreover the present budget structure, by overstating the amount of money that has to be raised by taxes generates inevitable pressures for new forms of taxation—a manufacturer's excise tax or general sales tax which always lay heaviest on those least able to pay. Capital investment, carried as current expenses, inequitably increases the financial burden on today's taxpayers for benefits accruing to the next generation.

A capital budget approach which separates Government management of assets from disbursement of funds for operating expenses will provide the Executive with the means of directing national resources, both human and natural, to meet the many unmet needs for public investment. Equally important, it will provide a fiscal book of accounts capable of acting as a guide to formulation of sound and progressive monetary and taxation policies.

The present administration has become increasingly preoccupied with the alleged threat of inflation at a time when too many workers and too large a proportion of plant capacity are idle.

If the administration's evaluation is correct, this means efforts to hold the line on both wage and price increases, to restrict contributions by the Government to capital formation such as public works projects, grants-in-aid, and the like. If the reverse is true, as labor argues, Federal programs are required for more capital formation and for other programs and fiscal policies that will create jobs and greater consumption.

It is not claimed that a capital budget will resolve this kind of argument. It would, however, provide the administration with meaningful data to analyze the situation, not merely confined to the period of a single fiscal year, but over a longer time period such as the duration of a business cycle.

No one argues against a balanced budget being in the national interest. It is desirable to spend within our means and by so doing maintain the value of the dollar. But it is necessary to reform the Federal budget in order that the term "balanced bulget" makes sense. This is particularly important with respect to attitudes of international bankers regarding the U.S. dollar, confidence in which is shaken when the Federal budget is out of the balance. The United States will then attempt to establish a "balanced budget," in part to meet this situation, but it is not really balancing a budget which reflects the soundness of the Government's financial position nor the state of the domestic economy.

A double budget system provides administrative and management advantages by enabling the measurement of economic results of Government with producing programs. The relationships between a Federal long-range program and its total expenditures can be measured as to feasibility in terms of annual budget results. Conversely, the annual budget results can be analyzed as part of the long-range plan.

Moreover, assessment can be made of Government capital formation transactions on consumption and a fairly accurate analysis of reduction in private outlays resulting from Government receipts.

A natural outgrowth of capital budgeting would be its establishment as part of a consolidated Federal cash budget which has long been recommended. A consolidated cash budget separating capital from current expense items would present a clearer picture of the inflationary or deflationary effects of Federal financial operations. It would also make it possible to employ Federal retirement accounts to use in the general economy to stimulate purchasing demand.

Labor consistently supports progressive fiscal policies and programs of the Federal Government to use the Federal budget as a powerful lever for sustaining full employment with an adequate rate of economic growth. Labor has an equally immediate interest in the equities of tax reform.

In its policy resolution on budget reform adopted by the fourth constitutional convention in December 1961, the AFL-CIO strongly supports:

1. The businesslike modernization of the Federal budget to differentiate between investments on lending, resources development and other programs which are partially or wholly self-liquidating.

2. The establishment of a consolidated Federal cash budget based on the capital principle and including trust funds.

3. Realistic assessment of what must be done to achieve basic tax reform on the principle of equitable sharing of the Federal tax burden.

4. Long-range social and economic planning including capital investment programs, accompanied by accurate measurements of economy.

5. A basis for realistic administrative decisions on what kinds of fiscal and public investment policies are necessary to exert the optimum strength of the Federal Government to stimulate full employment and economic growth and to establish the goals thereof.

6. An accurate determination, both domestically and abroad, of the true state of balance or unbalance in the U.S. budget cannot but produce opposite and healthier conclusions and reactions concerning the American economy and Federal finances than those which now arise from an unrealistically conceived Federal budget.

If these things are done, American citizens will have a clearer understanding of their Government's budget—what it consists of and what it can do under wise policies and programs for their economic and social betterment, giving value received for tax dollars.

Report on Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, on my military inspection tour of Alaska and the Far East this last fall, I became keenly interested in the economic, social, and political problems of South Korea.

In two recent articles, the Christian Science Monitor has called attention to the matter of education in South Korea, and the progress and problems confronting the governing junta.

Mr. Speaker, I commend these articles to my colleagues' attention:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 12, 1962]

EDUCATION IN KOREA

(By Edward Neilan)

It wasn't long ago that North Korea revised its education figures every time South Korean educational statistics were released. An increase in the number of universities reported in South Korea would be followed shortly by an announcement from Pyongyang that the number of universities there had increased. When South Korea listed a figure, the North Korean total would be three or four higher.

Lately, the game has ended. Communist North Korea no longer is making any pretenses about higher education. The stress now is on enlarging the technical work force. A large part of the 7-year plan (1961–67) as announced by Premier Kim Il sung at the fourth congress of the Korean Workers (Communist) Party in September, is based on such expansion.

A crash program of trade school and on-the-job training will mean that by 1967 technical workers will number as many as 108 per 1,000 workers, as contrasted to the present 32.

The Peoples Korea, a Pyongyang-financed weekly published in Tokyo, says, "A 9-year universal compulsory technical education will be systematically established in order to equip the younger generation with modern science and technology and to turn them into well-developed Socialist constructors."

Meanwhile, the ruling military government in Seoul, South Korea, has said that at the beginning of the new semester next March, 12 of the nation's 37 private 4-year universities will be closed.

On the surface, this would appear to be retrogression rather than advance. Closing of schools is seldom identified with educational progress. However, in ordering the closing of schools and the concurrent reduction of college and university students from 140,000 to 50,000, the junta says it is attacking a social evil.

Colleges had become big businesses in Korea and even an absentee student could buy a diploma.

Junta leader Gen. Park Chung-hee said recently, "We are not afraid to take a step backward in order to take two steps forward." This is held an important attitude, for past Seoul regimes have been too conscious of their progress image and paid little attention to the quality of the institutions they were developing.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 13, 1962]

KOREA AND THE JUNTA

(By Stuart Griffin)

SEOUL, KOREA.—Many who had previously questioned whether even military government rule could lift South Korea from economic chaos have since come to think that the junta of young colonels and generals, though a dictatorship, is by and large a good thing for the Republic.

Confidence returns. Business is back on its feet. The junta steadily gains acceptance through achievement. Mistakes are tolerantly called honest errors in the wake of expended efforts. With hard work and a continuing political calm progress itself, not just hope for progress, will come. This many businessmen here feel.

This air of incipient optimism is welcome to the United States, which has pumped $4,500 million into the peninsula since 1953 only to find itself alined with a government militarily strong but economically feeble and politically authoritarian such as the United States freshly finds anathema here.

This optimistic atmosphere naturally invigorates Koreans, too.

Even after the May 16 coup, the Republic of Korea (R.O.K.) was known as "a peninsula of poverty." Its economy stagnated. Business was frightened and hesitant. Unemployment neared 2,800,000, 3,200,000 if marginal employment was reckoned. Agriculture, on which 65 percent of 23,500,000 South Koreans subsist, was so unproductive that the poorer two-thirds of the population lacked enough to eat. In a land where rice is the staple, hoarding constituted a serious matter. City people, no less than rural folk, got by on $60 a year, average wage.

The junta, revolutionarily bent on righting conditions of the poor in a Korea long beset by tyranny, corruption, and do-nothingness, faced a bleak future after the dawn takeover. Soon it, too, was on trial, for all its power, with the people it was pledged to aid. And it had few friends, least of all that pro-Chang regime United States, whose Seoul-based high command looked on reproachfully at a dictatorship it felt was prejudicial to the discipline it felt the R.O.K. required to stave off North Korea's Communist threat.

The colonels and generals, thus, could only look up.

Their junta took brisk action. Rice stocks went on the open market. Price freezes discouraged inflation; austerity stanched nonessential consumption spending. Sound credits given farmers helped bring better net returns on crops. A back-to-work-or-else drive got underway and this gave the R.O.K. momentum it long needed, long lacked. The 90 percent officialdom left after the junta sheared off a lazy 10 percent fell to work with a will.

The junta corraled rebellious students and hustled potential demonstrators into the fields alongside farmers. Drives on black-marketing and smuggling were unleashed.

The hard-working if puritanical junta faced other problems, deemed at first insuperable. International Cooperation Administration (ICA) funds in dollars went begging and for a long time close to $51 million in U.S. aid sat idle in the Bank of Korea. Timid businessmen, fearing deflation and depression, with plants shut down or with operating hours drastically curbed, would not risk twice-devalued hwan funds to buy U.S. dollars for even needed imports.

Purchasing power struck rockbottom. Industry ground to a halt. Unemployment mounted. So sluggish and alarmed was the R.O.K. economy that even when price freezes were lifted on all but rice, barley, and anthracite, prices did not rise.

Worse, the junta and the 1,500-man U.S. operations mission (USOM) glared suspiciously at one another, unable to forget grudges and shoulder the economy into life. Many Koreans felt the United States sought to use the R.O.K. as a dumping ground for U.S. surpluses, to shackle it further to Washington by compelling Korea to use aid funds to support "buy" and "ship American" policies.

The 1,300 to 1 exchange rate caught in Koreans' craw too, those who argued revaluation alone could spur recovery. No internal market commodity could sell at prices as high as import price equivalents at such an unrealistic rate. So imports just had to cost less when bought with hwan.

But could even the junta convince U.S. authorities who had engineered the double curency devaluation to ease the cost to the American military of what it bought in the R.O.K., currency included? Many wondered.

Gradually junta measures brought first order, then reform. Grudging support came from the Embassy, the ICA-USOM, finally from the American high command. Plants began to hum. Working capital accumulated. Large industry recovery paced revival in scall-medium-scale industry.

The colonels and generals' military government strove to end farmers' misery, to end a vicious old system, endemic in Korea. Farmers historically had had to borrow on future crops; sell these when harvested—and mortgaged—for the little they could obtain. Grain prices, thus, used to dip before harvest, rise when the crops were gathered in and sold. But profits never went to near-starving farmers but instead to merchants and moneylenders, often the same people.

The junta's effective price-support loan system before the barley harvest worked well. Grain was marketed and crop prices held. Now a similar price-support loan system is in effect for the key rice crop and equally sucessful results in firm held prices are sought.

Vexing problems remain, of course. Capital spending is absent. Rediscount loans of the Bank of Korea to private banks do not exist, proof that these city banks maintain only scanty commercial and industrial financing. Money is doubtless more plentiful but its circulation is sluggish. Unemployment stares the junta, as previous regimes, squarely in the face.

Worse, some of the basic discontent, what have been termed the "frustrations of the Korean peoples' unattained aspirations," such as the young military clique struck to terminate, remains.

There is hope, though, and change, too, is in the air. For the first time in a very long time Koreans appear to believe that their new Government, autocratic though it may be, has at least common peoples' interests at heart, and that it is doing all it can to alleviate if not end the age-old wrongs and misery.

Military Cold War Education and Review of Speech Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, during the hearings being held by the Special Preparedness Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, the Reserve Officers Association submitted to the subcommittee a statement which has some bearing on the issues under consideration. This statement appears in the March issue of the ROA monthly magazine, the Officer.

The ROA is an independent, nonprofit association which for 40 years has devoted itself to the cause of national security through an adequate defense posture. It is a nonpartisan, nonpolitical organization which we all know for the character and dedication of its staff, and its membership throughout the Nation, and overseas where reserve officers are on duty.

The ROA view is of some importance, as it throws light on an area of concern to us all, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONCE CLASH OF IDEAS ENDS, DEBATE DISAPPEARS, WE ARE FINISHED AS A NATION

We recognize that the issues are complex and are subject to oversimplification, and for that reason we will confine our paper primarily to the principles involved. Our comments are listed under captions which follow.

ROLE OF THE MILITARY IN NATIONAL SECURITY

National security is the primary function of the military departments under the control of the Secretary of Defense. We are attaching hereto a brief outline of some of the major aspects of national security.

During periods of peace or "cold war," our national security posture may determine the success or failure of our diplomacy.

If diplomacy fails, national security becomes the sole responsibility of the President and the military.

It follows, then, that the proper role of the military should be a dominant one, subject to the decisions of the President and his civilian Secretary of Defense.

We believe strongly in the concept of civilian control of the military; however, this control should be kept in proper perspective. The purpose underlying the establishment of this principle was to prevent military dictatorship.

There is no magic whereby political appointees to high level positions in the Secretariat can, in the brief span of a few months or a few years, acquire knowledge of national security affairs, as they relate to the defense of the Nation, superior to that of the senior military officers. These officers must possess broadest professional knowledge, acquired by study and experience during the entire course of their adult lives.

Civilian control should therefore be tempered by the military advice from those competent to give it. Disregard of this advice could seriously endanger our country. Should this occur, the military chiefs should, under the requirements of their oaths, warn the President directly.

There must be a balance between an adequate military posture and the Nation's fiscal solvency. The President and the Secretary of Defense share a part of this responsibility, but it should never be forgotten that the provisions of our Constitution place the overall responsibility for this balance upon the Congress. The President is the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces which are raised, maintained, and regulated by the Congress.

Discipline is essential to the Armed Forces and requires support of the President's decisions by the military. However, in view of the overriding Constitutional authority of the Congress, it follows that the military should answer any and all questions by congressional committees openly, honestly, fully, and without reservation.

ADEQUACY OF TROOP INFORMATION AND EDUCATION

We are aware that the military services have a substantial troop information and education program. It is obvious that emphasis on this activity should be increased.

We are convinced that it has not always been adequate in the past and that it is a matter of overriding importance for the future.

This topic includes the development of discipline with a dedication to our Nation and its constitutional way of life, along with a knowledge of its enemies.

Each service has different problems and should be allowed to use methods best suited to its own purposes. All of this is a part of military leadership and must be a command function to be prosecuted at all levels of command.

Partisan politics, of course, should be completely excluded. We do not, however, equate communism with politics.

PARTICIPATION OF MILITARY PERSONNEL IN NATIONAL SECURITY SEMINARS

We believe that the national security seminars have in general been productive of much good in our country.

The President of the United States recently called attention to the vital importance of free public discussions when he said:

"An open society grows or withers according to the power of its ideas and to the vitality of its interior dialogue.

"If ever the United States should reach a point where the clash of ideas comes to an end, where debate disappears, where everybody agrees with everybody else on everything, then we are finished as a nation—and the ideal of freedom, to which our Nation has been dedicated since the times of Washington and Adams, Jefferson and Hamilton, perishes." (Time, Dec. 29, 1961.)

The seminar as such is a part of the pattern of American life, and should be encouraged. If they are to be really effective and sound opinions are to result, an essential ingredient should include the tempered and responsible contributions of professional military officers, from all of the services, in their primary area of knowledge.

PROPER USE OF MILITARY IN EDUCATING THE AMERICAN PUBLIC TO THE DANGER OF THE COLD WAR

We believe firmly in this principle which was established by the National Security Council in 1958. In support of this position, we submit herewith a copy of our letter to Senator FULBRIGHT under date of August 28, 1961.

Our association believes that your committee is undertaking a very important work. It will undoubtedly add materially to public understanding of these complex issues and in addition make a major contribution to the Nation's security. We look forward to your findings and recommendations with interest and complete confidence.

San Francisco's Tribute to Mr. Otto I. Schmaelzle, Principal of George Washington High School, San Francisco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the tremendous pressures which the schools face, the excellence which many of them have managed to achieve is indeed a feat deserving of our highest respect and gratitude. Moreover, examing such excellence, always reveals that it rests squarely upon the service of individual educators of great talent and dedication.

Within San Francisco is ample evidence of such excellence and of the energetic dedication upon which it rests. I wish to share with you, and your colleagues, a tribute to San Francisco's George Washington High School and its principal, Otto I. Schmaelzle, which was written recently by George Dusheck, San Francisco News and Call-Bulletin staff writer.

George Washington is a high school widely renowned for its rigorous academic standards and the outstanding record its graduates make at the colleges and universities which they attend. Accustomed to receiving honors, George Washington recently received a new one, notification from the University of California that the performance of its graduates had rated it first of all high schools sending a substantial number of graduates to U.C.'s freshman classes during the past 3 years.

Behind such a steady achievement stands the strong leadership of Otto Schmaelzle, who will be retiring in June after serving the school with an insistent aim toward academic excellence ever since his installation as principal in 1945. His record and the record of Washington under his guidance deserve our attention and our sincere tribute.

I commend the article, which follows, to our colleagues:

WASHINGTON HIGH'S PHILOSOPHY—COLLEGE PREP NOT ONLY GOAL—PRINCIPAL TELLS RETIREMENT PLAN

(By George Dusheck)

Otto I. Schmaelzle, the big, brisk, articulate principal of George Washington High School, who will retire in June, recently was visited by an alumnus who's been elected to Phi Beta Kappa at Stanford.

"What course at George Washington was most helpful to your university career?" asked Schmaelzle (pronounced "Schmalzley"), curious to know whether it was physics, history, or possibly a foreign language.

"Auto shop," said the Phi Beta. Schmaelzle was and looked astonished, and the Stanford man explained:

"It taught me to work with my hands. It brought me in contact with students who were not bound for college. It impressed me once and for all that there is a real world in addition to the world of imagination and ideas."

This anecdote is part of Schmaelzle's answer to the charge, which he has often heard, that George Washington puts all of its energy into students preparing for college, and neglects those for whom a high school education is the end of the trail.

NO NEGLECT

"It is true that 75 to 80 percent of our graduates go to college," he says. "It is not true that we neglect the other 20 to 25 percent. They get as good an education as we can give them. We have first-rate commercial and business courses. We teach industrial arts and homemaking, and those who take these courses are graded just as carefully, competitively, and strictly as those who take academic courses.

"As a matter of fact, every student who is an academic major is required—like the young Stanford man—to take at least one year of a nonacademic subject. We think those who do not have had their education partially neglected."

But Schmaelzle makes no pretense of hiding his pride in George Washington's strength as a college-preparation school. It has won more awards of excellence from UC for the university performance of its graduates than any other California high school—public, private, parochial; academic or comprehensive; 4-year or 3-year.

TOPS AGAIN

The newest (No. 9) came this month. UC notified Schmaelzle that George Washington was No. 1 among all high schools which sent any substantial number of graduates to UC's freshman classes during the past 3 years.

Similar reports have come from Stanford, City College, San Francisco State, University of San Francisco. George Washington graduates generally get higher than average grades in colleges and universities everywhere in the United States—but in most cases the number enrolled in these out-of-State colleges is too small to be significant.

All this has developed since Schmaelzle came to George Washington as principal in 1945, after a 16-year career in other parts of the San Francisco school system. He does not claim the credit for himself alone. He has had indispensable help from his faculty.

In the early days, when the George Washington idea was swimming against the stream of progressive educationists' dogma, he needed and got help from board of education members.

Earlier this year he told a group of youngsters fresh from junior high schools:

"There is no denying the fact that scholastically George Washington is a hard school. We demand a great deal in the classroom. We reward you with strict standards of grading. No doubt it is true that a C grade here would be a B or even an A grade in another school. We do not intend to change this."

On another occasion, while talking to the whole student body over the school's closed-circuit radio network (built, maintained, and operated by the students), he said:

"Our record clearly shows we need not apologize for our standards of work. This record clearly justifies our method of teaching, our strict standards of grading, our forceful discipline, as well as the fact that we are a district, comprehensive school."

This phrase inevitably invites the question: What does he think about the controversy over Lowell, a nondistrict noncomprehensive, so-called purely academic school whose graduates don't do quite so well as George Washington's at UC and some other other universities?

NO, THANK YOU

Schmaelzle smiles and shakes his head.

"I would rather not get into that fight. I think our record speaks for itself. Those who work hard at George Washington get the best high school education that San Francisco and possibly that California affords. Period."

What about his future?

"I have made no plans, although I have had offers to teach. I think I would like to have a freer job—possibly as a consultant to high schools that want to raise their standards."

AND THE FUTURE

What about the school's future?

"It is in good hands—a dedicated, enthusiastic faculty; a student body with a tradition of achievement and self-government; a school department and school board that recognize the worth of what has been accomplished.

"A tradition of success and top morale are a hard combination to beat."

Air Transportation and Economic Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a discus-

sion of the future of international aviation, which was given before the Joint Airline-Government Inspection Agency facilitation meeting in San Mateo, Calif., by Harvey J. Wexler. Mr. Wexler, an economist with the Air Transport Association, has been for several years one of the most perceptive and objective advisers to the Senate Aviation Subcommittee on the subject of aviation economics. He is one of the few people whose views on the economic future of aviation are entitled to the attention and respect of the Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY HARVEY J. WEXLER, ECONOMIST, AIR TRANSPORT ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, BEFORE THE JOINT AIRLINE-GOVERNMENT INSPECTION AGENCY FACILITATION MEETING, VILLA HOTEL, SAN MATEO, CALIF., TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1961

The advent of transcontinental rail service in the latter part of the last century made economic developments and problems in any given region or local area national matters. Today, high speed air transportation has, to a large extent, internationalized economic developments and problems, in addition to the tremendous domestic benefits it has provided. Foreign customers, producers and financial centers are only hours away. Twenty-three United States plus two Canadian scheduled international airlines operating some 300,000 route miles are linking North America to almost 100 different territories and foreign nations.

The jet age has made the Orient, Europe, Latin America, and other seemingly faraway places our next door neighbors. For example, the U.N. in New York is closer to the capitals of each of its member nations today than California was to Washington, D.C., when California obtained statehood.

More and more people are traveling faster and more conveniently over greater and greater distances—thanks to air transportation.

The distribution of goods and commodities is one of the most fundamental aspects of our economic growth—both domestically and internationally. The distribution process determines to a major extent our standard of living and for that matter, the standard of living of others abroad. It is an important factor in determining our rate of economic growth and also our national security.

Mr. Khrushchev said, and without validity, "economic development is the most important weapon in the hands of the Soviet Union." Economic development is an equally important and potent weapon in the hands of the United States, Canada, and other members of the free world. And air transportation is an important element in what the Pentagon would term "this complex weapons system."

Distribution costs amount to more than production costs in the creation of our gross national product. Hence, it is the field of distribution that provides us as a nation with a challenge of greatest potential magnitude. It does, so to speak, represent a "new frontier" in business.

We see manifestations of this daily. For example, the new uses of electronic data processing, mechanized accounting practices, high speed tele-communications, modern techniques in inventory control and new concepts of marketing are all results of this challenge to improve the efficiency of our distribution system.

Airfreight is contributing to this distribution revolution which we are witnessing.

The distribution process involves a great deal more than transportation. It encompasses such matters as level and composition of inventories, warehousing, insurance, reorder leadtime, customs and duties, interest on capital required to finance inventories, packaging and crating, and of course improved consumer or consignee satisfaction—just to mention some of the salient elements. Transportation, of course, is one of these elements.

The total distribution cost concept is the concept of measuring all of these related but individual cost elements in the distribution process of a given commodity or product in order to ascertain the total cost involved. Through the use of airfreight, it becomes possible to reduce leadtime as well as reduce other costs such as packaging, insurance, pilferage, etc., for some commodities. Thus, even though airfreight may result in a higher out-of-pocket transportation bill to the shipper, it can and often does reduce other costs by an even greater amount, thereby yielding the shipper a net saving. These savings improve the efficiency of our overall distribution system. In addition, these savings by the producer or shipper release funds for other purposes. Whether such funds flow into increased research, expanded production facilities or some other area, consumers ultimately benefit.

One executive of a large chemical company has estimated that American business could reduce aggregate inventories and costs related thereto by some $5 billion through the expanded use of these various new distribution systems, techniques and concepts.

Obviously, by reducing costs and enhancing efficiency, business is able to realize larger profits. Labor likewise benefits through the creation of new jobs. In short, the distribution revolution is healthy, economically sound and benefits business, the consumer, and the national interest in general. It enables each of us to enjoy the benefits of technological progress.

Of equal importance is the fact that international airfreight is bringing markets and producers closer together. Just as jets are bringing people and places closer together, likewise shippers and customers are being drawn closer and closer. All of this leads to a better world for us and for those with whom we do business.

You, in your day-to-day tasks, are very much a part of making this distribution revolution a reality.

Today our ATA member airlines' international and oversea airfreight and mail revenues exceed the level of international passenger revenues of 15 years ago. The international economy is dynamic and changing rapidly. Today we read about U.S. foreign economic aid aimed at helping to develop economies in Latin America, Africa, and Asia. It is sometimes difficult to imagine that a decade and a half ago the economically underdeveloped part of the world with which the Marshall plan was largely concerned was Western Europe. Today, only 15 years later, Western Europe is both a formidable competitor of and a major market for the United States.

What the future has in store no one knows. But I think it reasonable, if not conservative, to state that we are well into the air age—an age characterized by increasing use of air transportation for both travel and movement of goods. The world's re-order cycle, i.e. from the time a decision is made to place an order until the time the commodity or product is received, used to be 6 months; now it is 4 to 5 days. The air age is not only affecting various consumer businesses but it is having its impact upon factories, financial institutions and communications—not only here but overseas as well.

All of this is not without problems. A great deal has been accomplished—but much remains to be done.

As our aircraft operate faster and faster, it is necessary to likewise speed up and streamline other distribution elements, thus insuring that the various segments of the distribution cycle are kept in phased balance. Tremendous strides have been made in the field of industrial communications. Looking closer to transportation, we find that the time a shipment is actually airborne is but a fraction of the total transportation time. There is, of course, the movement to and from the airport. Of vital importance is the amount of time required for processing at gateways.

I noted with interest an international air freight study published in England last month. The study showed that 80 percent of the time required to handle an air shipment between the United Kingdom and the European Continent was "static" time. This is time spent without physically moving the goods closer to their destination, i.e. time required for packaging, customs, inspections, documentation and other paperwork.

It is readily apparent that if the advantages of air shipment are in part nullified by time-consuming and costly delays on the ground, international air freight's growth, development, and public usefulness will be seriously inhibited.

Through mutual understanding and joint cooperation, we can try to solve these problems.

The airlines have developed improved materials-handling systems and equipment. Modern air freight terminals have been and are being built. Mechanized loading systems are being developed. Progress and refinements are being made in containerization. Speedy and efficient systems are commonplace for the loading and unloading of shipments carried on our present jets. Each of these helps, but cannot be expected to solve everything. Streamlined procedures expanded facilities, and increased personnel by the Government for facilitation are necessary to keep pace with jet age. Customs and inspections throughout the world are being speeded up.

Our Nation's airlines are moving ahead dramatically in air freight. In addition to a payload of passengers, a new 600-mile-per-hour jet can carry as much cargo on some flights as an entire all-cargo DC-4. In addition, carriers have, and are converting more long-range, piston powered aircraft for all-cargo use. Several airlines are introducing new turbine powered airfreighters with unprecedented high cargo lift capacities in civil aviation.

It goes almost without saying that today the impact of government upon our economy is tremendous. Federal, State, and municipal governments spend approximately one-third of our national income not to mention the many regulatory and indirect economic effects of government. Looking at the other side of this balance sheet, most of the revenues received by government are derived either directly or otherwise from taxes on wages, profits, or interest. It becomes apparent that only through mutual understanding and joint cooperation by government and industry can overall national objectives be realized with maximum effectiveness and efficiency. This group demonstrates this type of needed working relationship.

We, who are in the business of international air transportation, whether we be affiliated with government or industry, recognize U.S. international economic relationships. We deal with it on a regular and recurring basis. It is very much a part of our day-to-day existence. However, the importance of our international economic relationships is not always appreciated nor is the role which air transportation plays always well understood.

In the course of the past year the U.S. international balance of payments presented itself as a problem. The front-page publicity

which the problem received provided a gratuitous benefit; namely, it brought home to not only the businessman, the Government official, or the labor leader, but to virtually every adult American the fact that the United States is no longer an isolated economy. Through the delicate and somewhat complex international economic and financial machinery, our material well-being is interwoven with those of others. The relationship between the economies of the world is much like a bowl of marbles—moving one marble affects the others. As Under Secretary of State Ball stated, "For in today's complex world we are faced—to a greater extent than most of us had previously realized—with the unassailable fact of economic interdependence."

As a nation, we have long recognized our political and military affiliations (and problems) with foreign nations. The U.S. international balance-of-payments problem in recent times can leave little doubt in anyone's mind that we as a nation are also economically linked to the international community.

The United States now exercises a major international economic role as a consumer, financier, and producer of goods and services. Air transportation is an important part of this role. The speed, ease, and economy of international air transportation has literally internationalized many phases of our national progress, challenges, and goals.

I look forward to a vastly expanded fleet of jet airfreighters. With such new aircraft and greatly expanded volumes of traffic, costs could be reduced, thus further expanding the amount of airfreight traffic carried. One international airline president stated:

"Such cargo jets would handle annually some five times the load of present-day (piston powered) cargo aircraft. Cargo rates would be cut nearly in half. Ordinary letter mail and at least half of our oversea parcel post could move by air. Volume cargo business by air carriers would follow."

Certain trade patterns are evolving in international airfreight. There is the long haul, intercontinental movement carrying both consumer products and industrial goods. Then there is the local or regional transportation fanning out from the major international gateways. This network or system, including trucking service, links literally thousands of points throughout the world. No longer does an ocean or distance per se form an international trade barrier.

The techniques and concepts being exercised and developed in airfreight could well result in helping to solve a very basic problem for our Goverment in some of its foreign economic aid programs. Many of the economically underdeveloped parts of the world are sorely lacking regional and domestic transportation systems which are so basic to the development of any economy. The requirements of these economies are to move goods and commodities, including agricultural produce, as well as, of course, some people over what is often very difficult terrain. The question in many of these areas, as one authority simply put it, "is whether to build 5,000-mile concrete highways or 5,000-foot concrete runways."

In conclusion, I should like to say that international airfreight is a dynamic economic, political and social force—just as international air travel is.

How well this force operates and how effective it is in helping realize our national goals depend on the climate or environment provided by Government and industry, respectively and jointly. I personally share the view expressed so well by one airline executive:

"In my humble opinion the scheduled airline industry is one of the greatest forces for good in the world today. The more people travel and get to know each other the better world we will have. Our biggest job is to improve the distribution of the world's products."

Washington and Glenn—Pioneers in Peril

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the tremendous and heroic achievement of Colonel Glenn has been related to those of our first President in an exceptionally well-done feature article by Mr. Robert H. Goldman, of the Lowell Sun. It certainly is worthy of the thoughtful attention of the Congress.

THE DRAMA OF HISTORY—WASHINGTON AND GLENN PIONEERS IN PERIL

(By Robert H. Goldman)

LOWELL.—At Bridges Creek, Westmoreland County, Va., George Washington was born (February 22, 1732.) He was to grow to manhood in a new young country and become endowed with a keen moral sense, a lofty purpose, and the rare power of winning the confidence of men. His character and principles have brought him renown, his valor and heroism, his sense of responsibility, his infinite labor in behalf of his countrymen, make him stand in majesty before the generations of men to whom he bequeathed his strength in freedom.

Today the spirit of that freedom has become the fiber of his people's way of life; their recollection of Washington is stirred with regard and with affection. They admire his courage, his integrity, they hold him in a niche of high esteem; his name is upon the lips of their children, as it is written: "First in war and first in peace." Truly he was first in peace. He helped to establish a frail, small Nation in a world where kings and queens reigned supreme, in a world where tyranny and subjugation were the climate of the day; a small Nation declaring that the individual was free—and that liberty was his birthright. He, Washington, as the first President of that Nation, set before his people the example of righteousness and endowed them with the burning desire for liberty—forever and a day.

It is well that at this time we recall the man, Washington, who made possible the elation of our people on February 20, 1962, when the freedom-bred astronaut, John Glenn, brushed the heavens and reaching beyond the everyday swept into the fathom-deep world of Tomorrow into the world that is destined to challenge the moon, the planets, and the stars. Men who have dreamed of lands that sprawl beyond the horizons above in space, saw the beginning of earth's challenging forces, as a free man rode the earth—for all the world to see.

It was George Washington (whom it is recorded refused a crown) and the Founding Fathers who dedicated this land to us and to John Glenn. Freedom is our courage and our heritage, it is the strength of our purpose. It is our hope and it is our firm desire to preserve that freedom for which our founders gave their fortunes and their lives.

In spite of the strangeness of this age, the precipiced dangers of this hour in history, we are allied to immemorial ends, to the ideals established long, long ago in the dawn of our Nation, a nation welded together with the simple, grave, inspired words that all men are created free. The generations that came to these shores blended well into the ideologies of the Founding Fathers. From many lands, from many civilizations, from many varied religious faiths they came and they brought with them the zeal and the spirit of men who would remain free. From across perilous seas they came, to a land the immigrants called the golden land.

Golden, indeed, seems the lands today—golden in the gleam of memory; rich indeed seems our reward of today as we hail the deed of valor of one of our true pioneers—John Glenn.

In the words of our earnest President Kennedy—in speaking of Glenn's "voyage" he said, poetically: "This is the new ocean, and I believe the United States must sail on it and be in a position second to none." Valiantly did John Glenn set sail on the new ocean and "sailed" across the world three times. Tensely we followed his course with hearts that spoke to one another, and prayer in word or inner thought. We who were fortunate enough to witness the miracle deed to which so many dedicated men of science gave their all, will never forget. In his capsuled enclosure Glenn swept through the world from darkness to light, from sunrise to sunset. The lights were on in far-off Australia as a greeting to Glenn—and the countries of the world who manned the stations greeted his voice with joy and thanksgiving. It was a great day to remember.

Washington and Glenn, two pioneers, who sailed perilous pathways: Washington, through a Valley Forge of heartbreaking adversity brought the ship of state to anchor safely in a new world where men could live in that freedom.

The dreams and struggles of Washington rise ineloquence and circle the world of freemen today. And today, in this great land set to the westward, the hearts of Americans are filled with the splendor of John Glenn's achievement. Men are destined to orbit the world again and again—the scrolls that time will write for mankind will inscribe their deeds, but the pioneer of the free world, John Glenn, who sailed the perilous distances around the planet earth, will be first in memory as is the man who first pioneered our destiny as a free nation, the revered George Washington born 230 years ago, on the 22d of February. Thus the first American entered earth's orbit, in the birthday week of the American first in war and peace.

The Little-People-To-Little-People Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, PETER RODINO, on February 15 spoke to the Congress of a most outstanding example of the spirit that has made this Nation strong.

I refer to his remarks concerning the little-people-to-little-people program and the initiative shown by his 10-year-old son, Peter.

I wish to express my wholehearted approval and support of this program. When our "little people"—such as Peter Rodino—are able to articulate their beliefs and concepts of America in such a clear, concise, understandable manner to their fellow humans, we need never fear that democracy will give way to totalitarian systems of government.

With the effective support of America's adults—and my colleagues here—"out of the mouths of babes" truly can come "the battlecry of freedom."

Bulgarian Liberation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the fate of the more than a score of captive nations now under the heel of international communism is an issue that concerns us every day in the Chambers of this building. I know my colleagues and I will never have peace of mind until all these nations are again free to select their own governments and take their places once more in the community of independent countries. Contemplation of their fate is even more distressing when the calendar date reminds us of a day of glory once celebrated openly in one of these countries. Saturday was such a day. And since we were not here assembled then, I speak today about its significance.

On the 3d of March 1878—84 years ago Saturday—the valiant five-century struggle of the Bulgarian people was ended. On that date, with the signing of the treaty of San Stefano, Bulgaria became again a free and independent nation. This was no new nation, artificially created at the treaty table. Twelve centuries before, the Bulgarian Empire flourished for 337 years. Here was the cradle of Slavic civilization. Here Sts. Cyril and Methodius brought Christianity to full bloom. Here was developed the first Slavic alphabet, and stemming from it, the major Slavic literary tradition that spread to Russia, Serbia, the Ukraine, and Byelorussia.

The culture and heritage of these golden days prepared the Bulgarians for the cruel and oppressive treatment they were to receive at the hands of the Ottoman Turks. Occupied, ruled by these heartless invaders, Bulgarians still clung to their language, their institutions, their religion; and no amount of torture and reprisal could shake their faith that freedom would again live in their land.

It is ironic that it was the Imperial Russian Government that assisted restoring freedom to Bulgaria. But though it was the treaty between Russia and Ottoman Turkey that made possible this freedom, Bulgarians did not accept the rule of the reactionary czars. Freely electing a national assembly, they received from that assembly the Tirnovo Constitution, the most liberal and democratic document in Bulgarian history. And they continually refused to become a participant in Russia's Pan-Slavic drive for domination of the Balkans.

The Balkans have never known a true peace since early in this century; but Bulgaria persisted in her efforts to live in peace and under freedom until she was caught up in the Nazi-Red power struggle of World War II. For 3¼ years, the Nazis occupied the nation. And in June 1944, the Reds moved in—where they remain today.

Even as they maintained their integrity and dignity and ideals during 500 years of cruel and inhuman treatment, so, too, the Bulgarians today live for the day of their new freedom. Let us here and now pause to respect their martyrs and to pray that their liberation from tyranny will come in our day, and that Bulgaria will again be a nation of freemen, living under laws enacted by their own chosen representatives.

Which Road for Transportation: Private Management or ———?—Part No. 9

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the following is the last in a series of nine interviews on the problems of the Nation's transportation system published by Traffic World magazine. Being particularly concerned myself with the increasing crisis in transportation, I urgenty commend this and the other eight interviews to my colleagues:

INTERVIEW NINE

(Frederick M. Glass headed the Project Horizon group which made a report on aviation matters to President Kennedy in mid-1961. His answers, therefore, have particular relevancy to that field, but are also of value in connection with the general attempt to establish guidelines for the future.)

In view of the area of management over which Federal regulation has spread in the field of transportation, do you see any escape from ultimate domination of transportation management by the Government to the extent that we will have nationalized transportation?

Yes, but it will require great vision and facing of reality by regulatory agencies, management, and labor.

Will you express your view as to the possibility (often suggested by air cargo advocates) that the air cargo carrier will ultimately replace the long-haul motor carrier as a transporter of all but extremely heavy and bulky traffic?

No. While there would be a very substantial increase in air cargo transportation, long-haul motor carriers will always be a very important factor.

In the achievement of the Nation's aviation goals, should the Government subsidize development of an all-cargo aircraft?

Not subsidized directly, but through common development with Government funds of airplanes which will have both military and civil application.

Over the next 10 years, will the Nation and the aviation industry be best served by more trunk airline competition, or less?

Less.

In achieving the Nation's aviation goals, should the Civil Aeronautics Board remain a separate agency or become a part of an integrated agency exercising regulatory control over all modes of transportation?

Separate.

Should the air transport industry be required to pay user charges for Government-financed facilities?

No. Present transportation tax should be repealed and user tax assessed directly against users, i.e., passengers or shippers.

Should the Nation continue to subsidize local service airlines?

Yes.

Will the Nation be best served by development of fewer airports serving several communities or regions, or should smaller airports for direct service to individual communities be developed?

Fewer, serving traffic on a regional basis.

Should the Government reorient its MATS program to provide for carriage of persons and property by commercial carrier wherever possible?

Yes, but in accordance with recommendations set forth in Reed committee report.

Has any recognizable advantage to the public interest come from the appointment of the CAB Chairman by the President?

Yes.

It has been suggested that the antitrust laws might supersede the present regulatory scheme in the field of transportation. Is there any validity in that suggestion?

Absolutely none.

Do you think that the State Department should reevaluate its policy concerning route authorizations for foreign air carriers to require stricter adherence to the economic and traffic provisions of the Bermuda agreement?

Yes.

Use of District of Columbia Stadium by Groups Practicing Segregation Prohibited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to prohibit the rental or leasing of the District of Columbia Stadium to any person which discriminates on the basis of race, creed, color, and for other purposes.

The bill also provides that the stadium shall not be used by any group which in the course of its business is a party to a contract, express or implied, and which involves or results in segregation among its employees on the basis of race, creed, or color.

The legislation further provides that the District of Columbia Armory Board may in its discretion allow an organization, so contracting, to use the stadium where it is shown to the Board's satisfaction that the contract was entered into under circumstances beyond the control of the using group or organization.

This bill is a result of my protest to Secretary of the Interior Udall against the practice of segregation by the Washington Senators Baseball Club in its Florida quarters at Pompano Beach.

I wrote the Secretary of the Interior on three occasions for the purpose of

arranging a meeting with General Quesada, president of the Washington Senators Baseball Club. In reply, the Secretary of the Interior noted that he thought such a conference would be helpful in resolving this matter.

On this basis, I invited General Quesada to meet with me to discuss this problem. General Quesada refused and declined the invitation; thus, making it necessary for me to introduce corrective legislation.

In view of the fact that President Kennedy has recently insisted that there be no discrimination in employment in industry in which there is contractual relationship with the Government, I request that the same theory be followed here.

It is clear that General Quesada treats the matter of segregation in a very cavalier fashion. Unfortunately, as president of the Washington ball club, he shows no desire to submit any suggestions or program for the future, but chooses rather to remain a willing party to practices of segregation.

I am advised that the contract for the housing of its players entered into by the Washington Baseball Club was so entered into in open and notorious disregard of the rights and feelings of its Negro players. Other clubs with big league management, training in Florida, in fact within several miles of the Washington training camp, have had the initiative, desire, and spirit that resulted in their finding quarters on a nonsegregated basis. General Quesada places the blame totally on the State of Florida, notwithstanding the fact that other clubs in that area were able to solve their housing problem. It is clear from his reply that General Quesada doffs his self-praised cloak of civil righteousness upon leaving the District and wears the mantle of separate but equal when in Pompano Beach, Fla.

It is shocking that the club is willing to avail itself of the talents of its Negro members and will not make any effort to afford them the rights guaranteed under the Constitution and reannounced by our Supreme Court. Quesada is obviously content with present conditions and refuses to discuss it further.

The Government, by reason of its percentage lease of the stadium, shares the profit and loss of the venture. The officials of the ball club accepted and became part of the pattern of discrimination in the town of Pompano Beach, Fla. This brazen action by the officials of the ball club to subvert civil rights to money profit or loss is reprehensible and gives rise to this legislation which I strongly urge my colleagues to support.

Bulgarian Liberation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, on March 3 we set aside a day in honor of those who gave up their lives fighting for Bulgarian liberation. I extend my personal admiration for the courage which these people have demonstrated in their struggle for freedom dating back to the suppression by the Turks in 1396. However, the fight for freedom has not yet been completely won.

Today the Bulgarian people suffer under the brutal rule of a puppet government which gets its orders from the Soviet Union. It must be stated, to the credit of the Bulgarian citizens, that the Communist way of life has failed to extinguish many of the traditions which have lived on through the centuries.

Our friends in Bulgaria can look back to two great men for inspiration, Father Paissii and Bishop Sofronii.

The approximately 50,000 Bulgarians who have emigrated to the United States have contributed immeasurably to our economic and cultural way of life. Organizations such as this have proven to be effective instruments in our attempt to make it clear to the Soviet Union that we stand unalterably opposed to her ambitions for total world domination.

May the day be near when the Bulgarian nation will once again be free to pursue her goal of greatness.

Bulgarian Liberation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I join with my distinguished colleagues today in tribute to the people of Bulgaria and to our own Americans of Bulgarian ancestry, to commemorate the 84th anniversary of Bulgarian independence.

Although on March 3, 1878, the Bulgarians won their independence from the tyrannical Ottoman Empire, the people of Bulgaria have enjoyed precious little freedom in the past 84 years. From 1878 until the start of World War II, this strategically valuable nation was a political battleground.

We are all aware of the Communist takeover in Bulgaria during the closing months of the war. Perhaps at that time, however, it was impossible to gage the treachery of the Soviet Union, which would ultimately stifle all freedom of thought in the countries under its suppression domination.

We Americans, secure in our traditions of human liberty and the dignity of freedom, join with free people everywhere in deploring the Soviet Union's enslavement of countless thousands behind the Iron Curtain.

In all justice, the day must inevitably come when the Bulgarians, as well as their brothers in other captive nations, will be truly free to determine their own course of government.

I congratulate the people of Bulgaria on this 84th anniversary of their moment of independence. I trust that the memory of this significant date in their history will give them hope and faith in a future which recognizes that all men must be free if we are ever to attain lasting peace.

Round and Round It Goes and Where It Stops Nobody Knows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a letter from one of my constituents which rather accurately reflects the feeling many of us have with regard to the New Frontier view of the dairy products situation. I include the letter from Mr. Paul Moore, of Nichols, N.Y.

NICKOLS, N.Y.

DEAR MR. ROBISON: On February 12 I attended a farmer meeting in Candor where the proposed milk quota program was explained. It is beyond my comprehension that anyone can hope to help America or any segment of the American people by using methods so much against the American way of life as the proposed Government control of the dairy industry. It would seem to me that if strict Government controls were the best way to cure a sick agriculture, then they must also be the best way to run agriculture or any other business at other times. If so the American way of life must not be as good as socialism. This I do not believe.

I will try to explain to you, my idea as a dairyman, the way the dairy farmer would try to meet this challenge if it were put to use. Also the effects I believe it would have on agriculture as a whole, and the Nation, and also why I don't think this proposal would work.

At the aforementioned meeting, a figure was used, for explanatory purposes, that the quota be set at 93 percent of the 1961 production. Since this figure will serve as well as any, I will use it also.

If production is cut 7 percent it is logical to assume that cow numbers will be cut 7 percent also. However, since most farmers will sell their lowest producing cows, this figure must rise even higher. Perhaps 10 percent of the cows would be sold. He would also sell approximately 10 percent of his dairy heifers being raised for replacements. As all farmers must cut production this 10 percent would have no market except beef. Ten percent of all dairy cows and heifers dumped on the beef market at one time would ruin the beef market, causing the beef farmer hardship. The dairy farmer would also receive a very low beef price for his surplus cows and so would suffer a huge loss on them.

When the farmer reduces his production 7 percent he will also reduce his feed grain use approximately 7 percent, thus enlarging the feed grain surplus.

Since the dairyman will have 10 percent less cows, he will need 10 percent less hay, silage, and pasture.

This 10 percent of his former forage land will be used to grow feed grains for his herd, thus cutting expenses for feeds. This will cause a great deal more surplus of feed grain in the Midwest, thus causing the feed grain program to cost more or the grain farmer ruin. The result would be strict controls on grain which the dairy farmer could grow for his own use. More Government controls.

The dairyman must now strive for better quality forage to reduce his grain cost by allowing more and better forage to keep his production up while feeding less grain. We are right now being told by the agricultural colleges and all farm papers, how tests prove both higher yield and better quality forage can be quite easily attained. This will mean increased production or the same production with less feed cost. If production is increased, more cows will go on the beef market to enable the farmer to stay within his quota.

What now, controls on tons of hay or silage we can grow? These controls may be necessary to prevent destruction of the beef and grain farmers. If these farmers suffer financial ruin, their buying power will be gone and industry will suffer.

In the event of all these controls, the farmer who needs more profit must cut expenses further; probably by patching up his old machinery instead of buying new. Remember World War II, when new machinery was not available and you will see that this is possible. Now we need production controls on industry to prevent surplus of machinery.

From the figures used at the meeting on February 12, I assume that unless Government supports on dairy products were raised, the dairyman would still have less money than now.

It is also, I feel, very un-American and most deplorable when a high Government official such as the Secretary of Agriculture resorts to methods (which I am unable to distinguish from blackmail) of threats of cutting off all Government supports unless the farmer votes for his proposal.

I personally feel that it would be much better to cut off all supports to the dairy farmer than to shackle him with the strict quota. I sincerely hope you will do all in your power to defeat the proposed milk quota bill. My father, Guy Moore, and brother, Robert, who are my partners on our dairy farm also agree with me on this proposal.

Thank you.

PAUL MOORE.

Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, with the receipt of the President's message of February 27, 1962, the Congress is once again reminded that the strength of a nation can be no greater than the health and vitality of its population.

I am in total agreement with this premise and am indeed proud to support the President's legislative recommendations, as outlined in his message. These include the training of health personnel, the need for a nationwide vaccination program to stamp out the remaining childhood diseases, aid for medical research, mental health and retardation, and increased health levels for domestic agricultural migrant workers. I have a very personal interest in this last item as author of H.R. 10227, providing migrant workers with health clinics, and as chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Labor, which subcommittee has held hearings and has recently reported out favorably a series of migratory labor bills.

I am this day concerned, particularly, with the lack of protection afforded our elder citizenry.

To be sure, most of us are protected against financial setbacks such as retirement, death, disability, and unemployment, but little has been done to protect our older citizens against the hardships of prolonged and expensive illness.

Therefore, I rise in support of H.R. 4222, a bill to provide health and medical care for the aged by means of a health insurance program for the elderly under the social security system.

The need for this legislation is made imperative by statistics indicating that our older citizens are hospitalized more often, for longer duration and thus at greater personal expense. Much argument is unnecessary as, of course, we are aware that the income of those, up in years, is by comparison very low.

This bill and the President's program would not interfere in any way with the freedom of choice of doctor, hospital, or nurse. It would not specify in any way the kind of medical or health care or treatment to be provided. But it would establish a means to pay for minimum levels of protection.

I have seen hundreds of letters urging Federal action and the social security approach. They contain pitiful statements as to suffering and hardship and inability to provide themselves with the medical care they desperately need. We should not allow their pleas to go unheeded. We cannot ignore that later years of millions of Americans are plagued anew by fear and insecurity, as a result of their inability to meet the mounting costs of medical care.

The high costs of medical care for the aged are going to be paid for in this country. The issue is not whether to pay these costs, but how to pay them. The alternatives to health insurance are not adequate and not fair to the elderly who need this care.

The social security program is the only practical mechanism which provides the aged with adequate health insurance paid by people during their working years, together with their employers.

We cannot continue to ignore the anxiety and suffering of elderly people who see their small savings, their homes and their security about to be swept away by the near certainty of expensive illness.

I trust we will meet this challenge and I, therefore, urge my collagues to support this legislation and join in earnestly requesting early and favorable consideration by Congress.

World Understanding Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, last week I spoke of the magnificent current issue of the magazine of the International Rotary Clubs, the Rotarian. Two of the articles, by the French Dominican priest, Father Bruckberger, and the Russian-born, American sociologist, Dr. Sorokin, I have already brought to the attention of the House. Today, I want to point out the effort being made by the International Rotary on behalf of the advancement of good will and peace among the peoples of the world. I can think of no better way to explain the effort than to read the letter that Rotary President Abey has addressed to Rotarians throughout the world:

INVITATION TO WORLD UNDERSTANDING WEEK—MARCH 18–24, 1962

Dear fellow Rotarians, a tremendous force is at work in the world fellowship of Rotarians. Rotarians are leaders in their communities, and they are neighbors in a world community. Committed to foster the advancement of understanding, good will, and peace among the peoples of the world, we are challenged today as never before to realize our purpose through concerted action. Today's crisis is tommorrow's opportunity.

For half a million Rotarians in 127 countries, an opportunity for concerted action is the week of March 18–24, 1962. World Understanding Week summons you and your club to join with Rotarians around the world in a common effort.

As President of Rotary International, may I appeal to you to make this effort significant in the scale of world events, worthy of our world fellowship, effective in its contribution to the world's desperate need. Use the 2,000 invitations from Rotary Clubs of 65 countries listed in "Targets for Today" to communicate for understanding. Devise means for reaching large numbers in your community with the information you obtain firsthand. Test your leadership in the world community by involving the people of your own community in the quest for understanding.

I repeat: Do something important—something which will attract the attention of your community, something which press, radio, and television will find worthy of coverage, something which bears significantly on the crisis facing us today.

I am counting on you and your club to take a vigorous part in the observance of World Understanding Week.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH A. ABEY, *President.*

The 84th Anniversary of Bulgarian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues today in paying tribute to the 84th anniversary of Bulgarian independence which occurred on March 3, 1878. Just 84 years ago the act of San Stefano restored independence to the people of Bulgaria but since 1944 her people have been enslaved under Soviet Communist rule. But within the hearts of these people and of all the sons and daughters of Bul-

garia all over the world burns the bright hope that the day will soon come when they will be free again and resume their rightful place among the peace-loving nations of the world.

It would be a most effective action by the House of Representatives if we could establish the long-delayed and much-needed special Committee on Captive Nations. This committee would be an effective House vehicle to expose Soviet colonialism in Eastern Europe, and to thoroughly reveal it for world consumption. Bulgaria and the other nations suffering under Communist domination must not be forgotten.

I extend my special congratulations to civic, patriotic Bulgarian-American organizations whose effective work in support of the principles of our American Constitution and maintenance of Bulgarian nationalistic traditions are sincerely appreciated.

Ralph Waldo Gwinn

SPEECH

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound regret that I have had the word of the passing of our former colleague and friend, Ralph Waldo Gwinn, and I know that I voice the universal sorrow of all of his former associates as we contemplate the loss of this stalwart American.

Ralph Gwinn was typical of that much-maligned group of conservatives who could not help but see, and vigorously decry, the encroachment of entrenched bureaucracy upon our lives. Ralph Gwinn believed in the sanctity of our constitutional privileges, but along with many of us, he could not help but sense that erosion of our liberties that must always accompany an expansion of centralized government to the displacement of local autonomy.

In his private life Ralph Gwinn was a generous, a genial, and a God-fearing man. As a founding member of our House Breakfast Prayer Group he gave public testimony to his continued reliance on divine power for guidance in the decisions every Congressman must make and he was fervent in his prayerful solicitation of that help that must always come from higher sources. Our departed friend and colleague was a man of highest principles, a man of virtuous life, and a shining example of integrity in a materialistic world.

Our hearts go out to his loved ones in this sad hour and we extend to them our heartfelt condolences with the assurance that even as they have lost a beloved helpmate and counselor we, too, have lost a stanch friend. May an all-kind providence sustain them in this time of parting.

Sears Best Citizen Is Jefferson County Native

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, all of us from Jefferson County and Alabama are very proud of the fact that Mr. Floyd Davis, Sr., of the wonderful community of Midfield, was recently selected as the "Sears Citizen of the Jubilee Year" for the southern territory of Sears, Roebuck & Co.

Mr. Davis was one of only six outstanding Americans employed by Sears to be selected for this signal honor, in recognition of unusual civic pride and community service. By quoting pertinent portions of the announcement of Mr. Davis' selection by Sears, I want to acquaint the Members with this laudable program which Sears initiated and with the admirable contributions which my constituent, Mr. Davis, has made through the years as a good citizen of his community and our country.

The article follows:

SEARS BEST CITIZEN IS JEFFERSON COUNTY MAN

WASHINGTON.—Mr. and Mrs. Floyd Davis, Sr., 330 Bessemer Superhighway, Midfield, were honored by Senators, Congressmen, and officials of Sears, Roebuck & Co. for "outstanding community service."

Davis, of the Sears store in Ensley, was one of six national winners in a citizenship contest conducted among 150,000 Sears employees as part of the company's 75th anniversary celebration. He and his wife came here this week to visit the White House, see Congress in session, tour Mount Vernon, and take in other historic sites.

This much they knew before they flew here from Birmingham—but they found surprises in store for them, too.

Crowdus Baker, president of Sears, and James T. Griffin, vice president, flew here from Chicago to pay tribute to Davis and the other award winners "and their wives, who made it possible for them to do all these things."

Baker pointed out that Sears employees have a proud tradition and an outstanding record in civic and welfare activities. "We feel it is most fitting," he said, "that we can recognize during our jubilee year some of the wonderful employees who have helped make Sears an important part of the American scene over the past 75 years."

Reading a citation which listed Davis' winning qualifications, Griffin noted that he:

Organized and served as cochairman for the incorporation of Midfield, served on the city council and as an alderman.

Was adviser to the committee for incorporation of Hueytown, Ala.

Served on the planning and zoning commission of Fairfield, Ala.

Is a charter member of the Civitan Club in Midfield; a member of its board of trustees; past secretary, treasurer, vice president, chaplain and twice president. Received the Civitan International Award (1960-61) as outstanding club secretary.

Helped organize Grace Covenant Presbyterian Church, Midfield, and has served as a deacon, elder, Sunday School superintendent, on the board of trustees and two committees.

Has been active in Little League Baseball as a member of the executive board and chairman of fundraising; served as finance chairman of Little Boys Baseball, Inc.

Has served as chairman of Community Chest and March of Dimes drives, and as a solicitor for the Heart Association and American Cancer Society.

"This is just a part of the list of the accomplishments," Griffin said. "We are proud of Floyd Davis because he is an outstanding representative of his community and of our company."

What Good Are We Doing the United States by Pouring Billions Into Brazil?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, how much are we protecting the self-interest of the United States by pouring billions of dollars of American taxpayers' money into Brazil? Even while we are preparing a big reception for the President of that country and, I suppose, making plans to give him additional billions, his brother-in-law wantonly seizes the property of American taxpayers and serves notice that he intends to seize more. I think it is time we have an understanding with these countries demanding our money that we expect at least a working partnership.. The following editorial from the Dallas Morning News, an article from the Wall Street Journal, and one from the Washington Daily News deal effectively with what is happening to us in Brazil.

QUO VADIS, BRAZIL?

In all of Latin America, no greater threat to freedom and Western institutions exists than that posed by Brazil. For more than a year now, the largest country south of the border has been tottering on the brink of revolution, facing one crisis after another.

Already dominated by leftist elements, the Government of Brazil may, before the end of this year, pass completely into their hands—either as a result of next fall's elections or through more violent action. If this happens, communism will have made a far deeper inroad into the hemisphere than it achieved by establishing a beachhead in Cuba.

At the root of Brazil's crisis are a galloping inflation and a need for vastly increased foreign capital investment. Yet, the present Government of Brazil has done all it can to discourage solution of these basic problems—indeed to make them worse. Last year Brazil's cost of living rose by a staggering 40 percent. This year the rate of increase has surged to 60 percent.

In spite of a $50 million loan by the United States to Brazil last fall and another $40 million loan in January—part of a $338 million package granted last May to help Brazil combat its inflation—the President of Brazil has frequently denounced "blood-sucking foreign capital" in recent months.

The Brazilian senate is now studying a law which would drastically limit money taken out of Brazil by foreign investors. This law, which would probably drive much foreign investment out of the country and certainly prevent any new investors from coming in, was passed by the chamber of deputies last November.

President Goulart has named numerous leftwing extremists and Communists to key government posts. His own personal secretary, Raul Riff, is a self-proclaimed Communist. The Communist Party holds firm control over several of the big labor unions. Brazil has established diplomatic relations with the U.S.S.R., sent observers to the Belgrade "neutral nations" Conference last fall and provided the strongest resistance to any OAS action against Cuba at the recent Punta del Este Conference.

The Governor of Rio Grande do Sul, a Brazilian State, has seized an $8 million subsidiary of the U.S. International Telephone & Telegraph Co. The firm's 30-year franchise was canceled and the amount of $400,000 was deposited in a Brazilian bank to "indemnify" International Telephone & Telegraph Co. for its loss—hardly a fair price to pay for a utility worth 20 times the amount.

News reports have emphasized that this act of piracy was committed not by the Government of Brazil, but by one of its states. It is interesting to note, however, that the man who ordered the seizure, Gov. Lionel Brizola, is the brother-in-law of Brazil's President Goulart. Brizola has been accused of using state funds to finance Communist Party activities in Brazil. He is chief of the Communist-tinged National Liberation Front, which advocates seizure of all foreign property in Brazil.

The seizure came on the heels of another announcement from Rio de Janeiro that the Brazilian Prime Minister had just approved 45 projects costing $589 millions to be carried out in Brazil with alliance-for-progress aid. Most of this money will come out of the U.S. Treasury.

Is it asking too much for the U.S. Government to consider a fair indemnification of International Telephone & Telegraph Co. and other companies threatened with expropriation, and to deduct the necessary amount from funds earmarked for Brazil under the alliance-for-progress program?

At the least, the State Department should give Brazil a firm ultimatum that any future expropriation of American property will result in cancellation of all aid. To do less would be to condone—indeed, to reward—piracy.

BRAZIL STATE REPORTED PLANNING TO EXPROPRIATE 2D UNITED STATES-HELD UTILITY: THREATENED ELECTRIC UNIT OWNED BY AMERICAN & FOREIGN POWER; ITT LOST SUBSIDIARY EARLIER

The Brazilian State of Rio Grande do Sul was reported yesterday to be preparing to expropriate American & Foreign Power Co.'s wholly owned electric company in the town of Pelotas there. Company officials in New York, however, said they had not received official notice of such a move.

The same Brazilian state earlier this month expropriated a telephone system of International Telephone & Telegraph Corp.

United Press International reported Gov. Leonel Brazola of Rio Grande told a press conference his state is preparing to expropriate the Pelotas company, which he said was the only foreign firm now operating in Rio Grande.

The American & Foreign Power subsidiary is Rio Grandense Light & Power Syndicate, Ltd. American & Foreign Power, a majority-owned subsidiary of Electric Bond & Share Co., values its investment in the Rio Grandense utility at "about $3.5 million."

According to an American & Foreign Power spokesman, Rio Grande has nearly completed building a state-owned power station. "Governor Brazola has been saying for some time he would expropriate our company when the state's power station was built," he added.

Porto Alegre, another Brazilian state, seized American & Foreign Power Co.'s electric company in that state in 1959. According to American & Foreign Power, which estimates it had a $14 million investment in the Porto Alegre subsidiary, this expropriation is being challenged in Brazilian courts.

Earlier this month, Rio Grande do Sul seized the American-owned telephone system serving its state, Conpanhia Telefonica Nacional, a subsidiary of ITT. The state is said to have set aside about $400,000 as compensation for the expropriation. ITT set value of the unit at $6 million to $8 million.

The U.S. State Department has criticized the action by Rio Grande do Sul in the ITT case as contrary to the spirit of the alliance-for-progress aid program.

BRIZOLA THREATENS FOREIGN FIRMS

RIO DE JANEIRO, FEBRUARY 28.—Gov. Leonel Brizola of Rio Grande do Sul said last night he believes the government should take over all foreign enterprises in Brazil, including banks owned by citizens of major nations.

Governor Brizola said his state government is preparing to expropriate the American-owned National Telephone Co., February 16, offering $400,000 as token compensation for properties in 18 cities valued between $7 and $10 million.

The state government seized the American-owned National Telephone Co., February 16, offering $400,000 as token compensation for properties in 18 cities valued between $7 and $10 million.

A suit filed this week by International Telephone and Telegraph, owner of the Rio Grande Co., challenged the state government's right to seize its installation without "fair and adequate compensation."

Spokesman Louis Olszyk said the company has applied for an injunction forbidding the Brizola regime to hold and operate the company. It asked that the state government be required to pay for the use of the equipment and for any damage resulting from its operations.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

Modern Tax Laws To Help Modernize Nation's Industrial Capacity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR A. KNOX

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished American industrialist who is the head of a company operating plants in my congressional district, as well as elsewhere in the Nation, has recently made a very perceptive observation as to the way our free enterprise system achieves expanding productivity and more and better job opportunities for our American citizens.

Mr. Henry Harnischfeger, the president of the Harnischfeger Corp., has pointed out that our tax laws must be modernized so as to allow the modernization of our Nation's industrial capacity. This distinguished industrial statesman has urged the American people to lend their support to the current endeavors in the Congress to provide liberalization and reform of our antiquated and inadequate depreciation allowances.

Mr. Harnischfeger points out that plant modernization is essential to our economic and military strength. A modern industrial capacity is essential if we are to preserve our American standard of living and high wage scales in the face of mounting competition in both domestic and international trade.

As one who has been advocating real depreciation reform for many years I genuinely welcome the observations of Mr. Harnischfeger in behalf of liberalized depreciation. This industrialist knows from experience the problems of competition, the investment required to provide a job in industry, the effects of inadequate depreciation on the ability to maintain modern plant facilities and the problems of competing and providing jobs with obsolete equipment.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is urgent that the Congress act this year and act wisely in developing proper legislation to permit industry an adequate writeoff for depreciation and obsolescence on its capital investment. This solution that the Congress approves should not be a gimmick, a gadget, or a temporary expedient that becomes a regulatory device in the hand of the bureaucratic economic planner. The overwhelming burden of the testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means last year on the subject of revenue revision was directed in favor of effective depreciation reform. The Congress should heed this request from knowledgeable people such as Mr. Harnischfeger and act to provide our American free enterprise system with the tax rules necessary to maintain American preeminence and constantly improving job opportunities for our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I will include an article from the Escanaba Daily Press of March 2, 1962, which reports on remarks by Mr. Harnischfeger and the commendable record of civil contribution that the Harnischfeger Corp., has made to the well-being of the community of Escanaba:

HARNISCHFEGER LINKS WORK TO U.S. DEPRECIATION RULE

Strong operations in the Escanaba and other plants of Harnischfeger Corp., above and beyond the recent annual patterns, depend heavily on what Congress does in 1962, says President Henry Harnischfeger.

He spoke as Harnischfeger completed its 15th year of operation in Escanaba.

Offering a new range of P. & H. equipment that buyers could operate more economically and efficiently than obsolete equipment they are now using, Harnischfeger estimated that American industry is operating $100 billion worth of obsolete machinery, a part of which is in lines that could be replaced with Harnischfeger products.

"The key to unlocking this vast business is Congress approval of upward revision in allowable depreciation rates," said Harnischfeger. He asked all persons interested in Escanaba industrial growth to write to Michigan's Senators PATRICK V. MCNAMARA and PHILIP A. HART, U.S. Senate Office Building, and Congressman VICTOR A. KNOX, House Office Building, Washington, D.C. A personal letter or postcard urging liberalization of depreciation allowance will be helpful, he said.

WORLD COMPETITION

"U.S. industry must get its house in order to prepare for lowered tariffs and greater competition," said Harnischfeger. "Our allies in Western Europe have more modern industrial plants than that of American industry as a whole. Most of their equipment was installed after World War II. To hold our own with them and to keep ahead of our foes in the cold war, American industry must have the incentive to replace its 20- and 30-year-old equipment.

"Industry can do it if Congress opens the door. Our producers must be given the same liberal depreciation that foreign nations have, so that industry can more quickly regain its investment in capital equipment. In that way it can stay in business while modernizing its operations.

"Depreciation is an intricate subject. Without getting into the details, higher rates of depreciation in corporate tax schedules mean less capital is tied up for fewer years and buying of new equipment and building of new plants is therefore stimulated.

TO AFFECT BUSINESS

"What Congress does in 1962 will have a strong bearing on America's ability to stay strong and on the steadiness of work in Harnischfeger plants."

Work in Harnischfeger's Escanaba truck crane plant was fairly steady in 1961, although operations did not come up to previous peaks and operations were less stable in its Escanaba welding division.

On March 3, Harnischfeger Corp., completes its 15th year of operation here. A decade and a half after the Milwaukee firm's modest start in manufacturing in Escanaba, which resulted in the phenomenal growth that brought the community's current boast that it is the "Truck Crane Capital of the World," Harnischfeger described the corporation's present situation and outlook.

As 1962 began, he said, customer inquiries were coming in at their highest rate in the company's history. Harnischfeger credited the rise to the possibility of liberalized laws governing depreciation.

PAYROLL OF $4.8 MILLION

Within recent weeks, he said, competition for sales of excavators, truck cranes, and welders has become more intense. It has been a period of major trade shows, bringing manufacturers, dealers, and customers together. The influence of manufacturers overseas, in West Germany, Italy, England, France, and Japan is being felt increasingly in free world markets, particularly in South America.

P. & H. has been making strenuous efforts to get a bigger share of what has become a smaller market, said Harnischfeger.

STARTED IN 1947

He said that P. & H. in its 15th year in Escanaba had a payroll of $4,876,931. This spending, increased many times in local circulation, has been a major economic support of the community, augmented by expenditures of nearly a million dollars for supplies, materials, power, taxes, and other items.

Harnischfeger Corp. in 1947 leased an idle plant building owned by the city of Escanaba with a promise to build its operations to 150 employees within 5 years. In the first full year of operation, 1948, there were 55 employees at year's end and the year's payroll totalled $25,000.

By early 1953, when the 5 years were up, Escanaba workers had shown their abilities and the company had more than kept its promise to the community. Employment averaged 600 in that year, four times the pledged amount.

Dividing the payroll of nearly $5 million in 1961 were more than 950 employees in the various Escanaba operations of P. & H. It moved into its first Escanaba building in March 1947 and within 7 months had shipped its first a.c. welding machine. That year output was broadened to include d.c. welders and ground was broken for the Danforth Road truck crane plant. Through the years additions have increased total floor space to 240,000 square feet, up from the original 25,000.

SKILLS TAUGHT

Theodore F. Derse has been Harnischfeger Corp. general manager in Escanaba since 1960. Between 1950 and 1960 Robert O. Losse, now Harnischfeger director of industrial relations in the headquarters office in Milwaukee, was general manager in Escanaba. The largest part of P. & H.'s roster in Escanaba is made up of persons born and raised in this area.

The Harnischfeger operation in Escanaba has been closely watched in the Upper Peninsula because of its pioneering in heavy machine industry in an area which historically has been devoted to extractive mineral industry and wood industries. The company has operated the largest in-plant training program in the history of the Upper Peninsula to teach employees skills in metal working needed for its manufacture of welders, excavators, cranes, and other machines.

Public Lands and Public Records

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, a 4-year fight against unnecessary secrecy in the Bureau of Land Management has been successful. I have just been informed that reports made by the Bureau's engineers on the value of public land for which applications have been filed will now be made available to persons interested in the reports.

At first glance this may seem to be a small matter, but those of us from the fast-growing West recognize the importance of the public lands held in stewardship by the Federal Government. As the pressure for settling these public lands has increased in recent years, there have been complaints about Bureau of Land Management decisions on applications for private use of the land.

Only by making available the records of the Bureau's actions can the complaints be silenced, but for a number of years the basic documents showing land examiners' valuations of parcels of public lands have been withheld from the public. Secretary Udall was asked to look into the secrecy surrounding the Government handling of public lands, and he has informed the subcommittee that field examiners' reports on the value of public lands will now be made available to those who are applying for the lands and to others concerned with public land problems.

Following is the subcommittee's letter of inquiry and the Department's answer:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SPECIAL GOVERNMENT INFORMATION SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
December 22, 1961.

Hon. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Following a study by the Special Subcommittee on Government Information of the availability of reports prepared by Bureau of Land Management field examiners, the Bureau changed its practices and made available to the public a great deal of additional information from the reports. This action was taken in the latter part of 1960—more than 2 years after the subcommittee first questioned the Bureau's information practices—and the first experience with the new system is being gained under the Kennedy administration.

A staff investigation indicates a number of important questions remain unanswered. Under the previous system, a single narrative report was filed by a field examiner reporting on the value of land to be classified as homesites under the Small Tracts Act. All of the facts collected by the field examiner, along with his conclusions and recommendations on the value of each tract, were included in the single report, and the previous administrators of the Interior Department refused to make available all parts of that report. This restriction applied not only to public access to the document but also to access by persons who had applied for the homesites under the Small Tracts Act.

The subcommittee has been informed that under the system which the Bureau of Land Management is now using the field report it divided into a series of documents. These documents include various reports covering the many factors which must be considered in determining the classification and value of public lands. The subcommittee has been informed that nearly all of these documents are public records and, as such, are available to persons applying for homesites under the Small Tracts Act. However, one of the more important documents in the field examiner's report is marked "Administrative use only." Bureau officials informed the subcommittee that this document—form 4-1499 which includes the field examiner's conclusions and the value which he set on the tract being claimed—is not made available to the public or even to persons applying for the specific tract.

This practice appears to conflict with Bureau of Land Management regulations as well as with Interior Department rules. More important, it obviously conflicts with the policy of public access to Government information which President Kennedy set forth in his state of the Union message last January.

A Bureau of Land Management memorandum, identified as release "130 6/27/58," lists the Bureau documents which will be classified as for administrative use only. The memorandum states that comments by employees which are not statements of fact will be restricted to "administrative use only" and adds:

"However, estimates are usually statements based on fact. Therefore, such things as estimates of value * * * are not 'for administrative use only.'"

The practice of withholding the field examiner's estimate of value certainly appears to be in direct conflict with this memorandum. If the withholding is required in all cases, it also appears to conflict with Interior Department regulations on the availability of official records. Section 2.2(a) of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations, states that Interior Department employees responsible for the custody of a record shall determine whether disclosure of the record "would be prejudicial to the interests of the Government and whether the person making the request is properly and directly concerned with the subject matter." Persons applying for land under the Small Tracts Act certainly are "properly and directly concerned" with field examiners reports on the value of the land for which they have applied. Yet Bureau regulations apparently prohibit access to such information.

The subcommittee would appreciate an explanation of the apparent conflicts with the Bureau memorandum and Department regulations. The subcommittee also would like a general explanation of the reason for withholding the field examiner's conclusions on the value of specific homesites from persons applying for the homesites. Also, please cite the specific statutory authority for withholding the information.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. MOSS,
Chairman.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., February 14, 1962.

Hon. JOHN E. MOSS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This replies to your letter of December 22, 1961, which we acknowledged on January 12, concerning the availability of reports and other papers prepared by the Bureau of Land Management.

After further consideration, it has been determined that form 4-1499, "Land report—Field examiners conclusions," can and should be revised to remove any limitation on the availability of that record to persons properly and directly concerned, as provided by Department regulations. The Bureau of Land Management will take necessary action promptly to accomplish this revision. In amending its manual instructions the Bureau will also clarify those contained in the memorandum of July 13, 1956 (V BLM 6.1, App. No. 1, release No. 130, June 27, 1958), from which you quote concerning "estimates of value" which have their basis in fact. As in the past, the designated classification officer will continue to make his decision on the basis of facts. The field examiners will continue to investigate and to assemble and present the facts.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

Resolutions Adopted by the Atlantic AMVETS Post No. 1, Atlantic, Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions adopted by Atlantic AMVETS Post No. 1, Atlantic, Iowa:

AMVETS, THE AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II AND KOREA, THE ATLANTIC AMVETS POST NO. 1, ATLANTIC, IOWA

We, the members of the Atlantic AMVETS Post No. 1, meeting in a regular session this date of February 27, 1962, in Atlantic, Iowa, do strongly urge our elected Senators and Congressmen, to thoroughly investigate and rectify the below-mentioned facts, that threaten the security of America:

"Whereas H.R. 9567, known as the International Organizations Recission Act of 1962, is now in the House Foreign Affairs Committee, under date of January 10, 1962;

"Whereas our Nation cannot survive as a Republic as long as it is shackled to an international organization, by a treaty, which supersedes the American Constitution;

"Whereas the one amendment that would have protected the Constitution, was defeated by a very narrow margin under strong propaganda pressure from the Council on Foreign Relations, Inc.;

"Whereas the United Nations Charter, by a secret agreement between Alger Hiss and Molotov, requires that the United Nations military staff should always be a Communist, and that agreement has never been broken, and there is now a Communist filling that post, Mr. Arkadov. This argeement has cost America thousands of dead and wounded by its required No-win-wars (both hot and cold wars) e.g., the Korean war defeat, the Cuban fiasco, and defeats of American foreign policies (worldwide in scope) e.g., the naked aggression in Katanga, the Hungarian rebellion, the Indian invasion of Goa, and many, many other losses, as in the Congo, Indonesia, South Vietnam, Laos, etc.;

"Whereas the basis of planned world disarmament by negotiations, as spelled out in State Department publication No. 7277, which bears the misleading title, "Freedom From War," would gradually transfer all heavy American fighting forces and nuclear equipment from the control of the American military staff into the direct control of the United Nations, which is under the direct control of the Communist military staff,

with the ranking officer in charge always to be a Communist (and who is now Mr. Arkadov): Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we strongly urge our Senators and Congressmen to rescind and revoke membership of the United States in the United Nations, as may now be carried out by the passage immediately of H.R. 9567 in the House, and a companion bill in the Senate; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we do strongly urge our duly elected Senators and Congressmen to stop all foreign aid, to all Communist countries, especially Tito Yugoslavia and Communist Cuba. And that all trade, either directly or indirectly, of any real or potential war materials be stopped from reaching all Communist countries and their worldwide colonial possessions, and also stopped from reaching all the so-called neutral nations; finally, it is hereby

"*Resolved*, That we do request our legally constituted investigative bodies in the Senate and the House to make a thorough and immediate study of the Council on Foreign Relations, Inc., of 58 East 68th Street, New York, N.Y., and to determine what, if any, relationship exists between the Rockefeller-CFR complex to the establishment, and to determine if there is, as has been reported, that the directors of the Council on Foreign Relations make up a sort of presidium for that part of the establishment that seeks to control our destiny as a nation."

AMVETS, THE AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II AND KOREA, THE ATLANTIC AMVETS POST NO. 1, ATLANTIC, IOWA

We, the members of the Atlantic AMVETS Post No. 1, meeting in a regular and duly authorized session, this day of February 27, 1962, in Atlantic, Iowa, do strong protest the below facts and reports:

1. Our returned war veterans are being taxed out of their homes by the gargantuan $92½ billion budget with its annual interest rate of $9½ billion on the $300 billion national debt; and

2. The Veterans' Administration is upping foreclosures on veterans' homes (with foreclosures at an all-time high, and still rising); and

3. The $38 million in excess taxes collected on Iowa real property—explained by an error of budget padding; and

4. The American taxpayers paying over $1 million to study the affectional relation of an infant monkey and its mother; and

5. The American taxpayers paying over $1 million for liquors and drinks to entertain foreign dignitaries who arrive for more handouts; and

6. While moving under the Reorganiztion Act of 1949, and defying the House Rules Committee, the President has sent to Congress his plan for a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. This proposal to become law within 60 days unless rejected by either the House or the Senate (we strongly urge the rejection of this new approach of furthering the centralization of more power in Washington, at the sorry expense of the local and State governments); and

7. The American taxpayers' dollars being used to lobby and use undue pressure, to force of Congress to pass some very questionable legislation, and ill-advised squandering money bills through Congress; and

8. The administration's pressures to have our elected Congress vote away their constitutional powers to lay and collect taxes; and

9. The use of centralized pressures and tax powers to control press, radio, and news media, withholding important news from the public and taxpayers; and

10. The censorship and "muzzling" of our high-ranking military officers; and

11. The refusal of high-ranking bureaucrats (in nonelected Government positions) to answer pertinent questions regarding security measures, vital to our elected Congress in their routine duties of protection of American independence and our national survival; and

12. Secrecy and "meddling in American diplomacy"; the weakening of the United States stand at Punta del Este Conference, which is now referred to as "the second Bay of Pigs for the administration * * * the first being the Cuban fiasco, April 1961"; and

13. That three of the administration's "bright young intellectuals worked behind the back of State Secretary Rusk, to weaken the American position"; the three, reported by Walter Trohan, of the Chicago Tribune, are noted to be Walt Whitman Rostow, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., and Richard N. Goodwin; and

14. The U.S. disarming policy against our own military, by the policymakers, noted in the text of the official policy presented to the United Nations * * * State Department publication 7277, which bears the misleading title, "Freedom From War," planned to be carried out this year, secretly, in 1962; and

15. Our disarmament program being intimately meshed with the campaign against our military as revealed by Representative ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, Democrat, of Wisconsin, last September 7 in his notes on the evolution of the Democratic Advisory Council proposal, a national peace agency: Therefore,

We the members of the Atlantic AMVETS Post No. 1, meeting in a regular and duly authorized session this 27th day of February 1962, do hereby resolve, That our elected Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States, employ every means within their power, and exert all their influence to the end that the protests outlined above, be investigated, verified, and corrected to preserve life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness in the United States of America.

We, as men who fought for our country do request this consideration and this action, because we feel that the safety of our Nation is in the balance.

Tax Bill Hits Oldsters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy's proposal that taxes on dividends be withheld at the sources of the dividends is discussed in the March 1, 1962, issue of the Herald Examiner, a newspaper published in Los Angeles, Calif. The editorial points to the adverse affect that implimentation of the proposal would have on our senior citizens who derive their incomes from investments. I think the editorial should be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, and under unanimous consent, I include it at this time:

TAX BILL HITS OLDSTERS

A new Federal tax bill which already has cleared the hurdle of the House Ways and Means Committee threatens to affect millions of Americans, especially those in the retirement or old-age bracket.

In the tax bill will be included a new system of tax withholding on dividends and most interest.

As Herald-Examiner Financial Columnist Leslie Gould puts it: "There are around 3 million 65 years and older shareowners. These are the ones who will be hardest—and unfairly—hit by the dividend withholding. This income may be their major source of revenue, but they may have to wait to collect all of it."

In southern California, where so many thousands of retired couples have come to live out their declining days, the problem will be particularly acute.

The Government's principal purpose in urging the new withholding plan is praiseworthy. The administration has stated its belief that the plan will net millions of taxpayers who have been forgetting to declare dividends and interest. Thus the Federal Treasury will be greatly enriched, and other honest taxpayers will not be stuck so heavily in the future.

However, there is another phase which must be considered. If money due the taxpayer is withheld from him for a year or more, this means that the taxpayer will be deprived of the use of that money which he normally would have received as soon as the bank or corporation paid it.

The old people, the pensions and the families which have retired with a little nestegg which emphasizes income from dividends and interest must not be by-passed or forgotten in the rush to get some extra bucks for Uncle Sam.

This new control over personal incomes would start at the rate of 20 percent earned through interest or dividends. The taxpayer, however, still has the privilege of applying for a refund if he can prove that he paid more taxes than he owed.

Under the plan, children under 18 could obtain exemption from withholding taxes on their savings accounts by filing statements with their savings institutions. Taxpayers 65 and older who expect to have no tax liability at the end of the year also could file statements with their savings institutions.

However, there would be no exemptions from withholding taxes on dividends. Stockholders anticipating no income tax liability at the end of the year could claim the withheld taxes by applying to the Treasury as often as four times a year.

The oldsters, of course, would be penalized because they would be deprived of 20 percent of the dividends cash they had been receiving. And even though they could apply for refunds as often as four times a year, what would that mean?

For those too weary almost to get to grocery stores or drugstores, it would be a heavy chore to be constantly filing refund claims. Also, with typical official redtape, how soon would they be paid these refunds?

Amendment to Social Security Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to correct an unfair provision of the Social Security Act. Under the present act, it is possible for an employee to work for 30 years or more in a textile plant—or at some other trade—be totally disabled to perform the job he has been working on, and still not draw his social security disability benefits because of the provision of the law which states that a person

must be unable to engage in any substantial gainful activity.

Mr. Speaker, the bill I have introduced today will change the law so that any person—textile employees and employees of other industries, or workers at any trade, as well as, self-employed people such as farmers—can draw his social security disability benefits when totally disabled to perform his present job which he has been working on for so many years.

Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of the industrial employees of my district are textile employees. I am familiar with their problems. I have visited in their homes. I have been in the textile plants. It is unfair, Mr. Speaker, when a person becomes disabled after having worked for 30 years on a specific job, to require that person to go out and try to learn another job or to make him do something which he is unfamiliar with.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that when an employee has worked for 30 years in a certain industry or trade and has been on one job for 15 continuous years at the time he becomes disabled to perform the duties for that job, then that person should not be denied the disability benefits which are rightly due him.

Again, Mr. Speaker, may I emphasize that my bill—which follows—will cover those people who have worked for 30 years in an industry or trade which includes the self-employed people such as farmers:

H.R. —

A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide, for individuals who have spent substantially all of their working lives in one trade or industry, a more realistic definition of "disability" for purposes of entitlement to disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 216(i)(1) of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "For purposes of clause (A) of the first sentence of this paragraph, an individual who for a total of at least thirty years prior to the onset of his physical or mental impairment has been engaged in employment or self-employment in one trade or industry, and who for a total of at least fifteen years has been performing within such trade or industry the particular type of employment or self-employment last performed by him on a regular basis before the onset of such impairment, shall be deemed unable to engage in any substantial gainful activity if he is unable, by reason of such impairment, to continue to perform that particular type of employment or self-employment."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 223(c)(2) of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "For purposes of the first sentence of this paragraph, an individual who for a total of at least thirty years prior to the onset of his physical or mental impairment has been engaged in employment or self-employment in one trade or industry, and who for a total of at least fifteen years has been performing within such trade or industry the particular type of employment or self-employment last performed by him on a regular basis before the onset of such impairment, shall be deemed unable to engage in any substantial gainful activity if he is unable, by reason of such impairment, to continue to perform that particular type of employment or self-employment.

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply only with respect to monthly insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for months after the month in which this Act is enacted.

James Trenary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I have recently learned that Mr. James Trenary, one of our most generous and distinguished citizens, is dead. Beginning as a mail boy with the United States Trust Co. of New York, James Trenary rose to the heights of executive vice president and trustee. He was chairman of the banking law section of the New York Bar Association and chairman of the U.S. Olympic Yachting Committee. For these successes we honor him.

Even more important than his prominence in business was Mr. Trenary's long and loyal devotion to causes which resulted in no direct personal gain. His work with New York City boys clubs and with the Young Men's Christian Association will not soon be forgotten by any of those organizations.

The Greater New York YMCA Board recently adopted a resolution memorializing him. In comprehensive form it describes his life of unusual dedication to his fellow man, and especially to those young people who particularly need counsel and guidance from such men as James Trenary. I therefore include the resolution at this point in the RECORD:

The Young Men's Christian Association—and, indeed, men in so many walks of life and no longer young—have been profoundly affected by the death of James M. Trenary on December 11, 1961.

His work with the association has been tireless and devoted, serving as a trustee since 1947 and a director since 1955. In 1954 he was chairman of the citywide finance drive and for 5 years served as chairman of the West Side Branch of the association. In recent years he has been a member of the executive, finance, and capital development committee. Long recognized as one of our best informed laymen, he has been of inestimable help in counseling our executives and in recruiting board members.

It is not our purpose to recount details of his generous service which is so familiar to all of us. His outstanding leadership in furthering the association's ideals and services to the youth of New York City has already been recognized through his induction into the Order of the Red Triangle—the highest award the association can bestow upon a layman.

However, when a man of Mr. Trenary's stature in business and finance passes from this life, it is natural and fitting to point with pride to the scope and worth of his accomplishments. As executive vice president and trustee of the United States Trust Co., of New York, an energetic force on many committees of the American and New York State Bankers Associations, as chairman of the banking law section of the New York Bar Association, and as chairman of the U.S. Olympic Yachting Committee, his success was considerable and commendable.

Even more commendable, however, was his success as a human being. Mr. Trenary never lost sight of his start as a mail boy with the trust company. Although his career with that organization unfolded with increasing significance through the years, he never lost his identity as "one of the boys." Nor did he miss an opportunity to counsel, extend a helping hand, or to just know the young men in his business organization.

In fact, as Mr. Trenary's recognition as a business executive increased, his interest in young men kept pace. Where he had formerly reached many boys on a personal level, it now became possible to help so many more by putting his ability and training to use in an executive capacity. His work as vice chairman and president of the Madison Square Boys' Club, of New York City, merited him, in September 1961, the Silver Keystone of the Boys' Clubs of America—"in recognition of outstanding service to boys."

When Mr. Trenary came to our association in 1940, it was not difficult for him to officially promote the ideals and objectives of the Young Men's Christian Association—he had been living and practicing them for so many years. While we take great pride in the tangible accomplishments of Mr. Trenary in behalf of the organization, there is an even greater satisfaction in knowing that these were truly a labor of love. Therefore be it

Resolved, That the foregoing statement, adopted as a resolution of this board, be spread on the minutes of this meeting and that a copy thereof be sent to his family and such friends and associates as the president of the association shall deem appropriate.

Communist Terrorism in East Germany—Walter Ulbricht, Chairman of Soviet Zone State Council, Intensifies Judicial Terrorism in East Germany—First Death Sentence for Diversion—So Far 107 Death Sentences in Political Trials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, the following information has reached us from Berlin: According to a list drawn up by the West Berlin Investigation Committee of Jurists in the Cause of Freedom, the courts of justice in the Soviet Zone have, since the founding of the so-called German Democratic Republic on October 7, 1949, pronounced at least 107 death sentences in political trials against opponents of the Ulbricht regime. The most recent death sentence was pronounced in the Christmas week in 1961 by the District Court of Frankfort Oder on Walter Prädel, a 50-year-old worker of Dannenberg—in the district of Bad Freienwalde—for grave diversion. According to a report by the Soviet Zone news agency ADN, Prädel, on October 7 last year, that is to say exactly on the 12th anniversary of the founding of the German Democratic Republic, set fire to two granaries belonging to the Agricultural Producers' Cooperative Society in Dannenberg, thus causing damage to the extent of DM146,000. Prädel is said to have ad-

mitted in court that he was so angered by the blockade measures introduced on August 13 that he started the fires in order to cause supply difficulties and bring about a mutiny.

Prädel, who, in addition, was also reproached with his Fascist past, thus meets the facts stated in the charge of diversion. The paragraph of the supplementary criminal law of December 11, 1957, pertaining to this crime is worded as follows:

Persons who attempt to destroy machines, technical plants, means of traffc and transport, or other objects of vital importance for economy or for defense, or to render them useless or to damage them, in order to undermine the economy or defense strength of the German Democratic Republic, are to be sentenced to not less than 3 years' imprisonment on account of diversion. Confiscation of property can also be imposed.

On the strength of the same paragraph, the accused can in serious cases of diversion be sentenced to imprisonment for life or to death. So far, the sentences passed on diversionists were for the most part long terms of imprisonment. The case of Walter Prädel is the first one known to have occurred in the Soviet Zone in which the death sentence was pronounced on account of grave diversion.

It could not however be ascertained whether the sentence on Prädel and the death sentences in the other cases have been carried out, since the Soviet zone judicial authorities do not allow any information in this respect to reach the public. According to the latest legislation, the state council, under the chairmanship of Ulbricht, has the right to grant a pardon; in most cases an opinion by the Politbureau of the SED is submitted to the latter as a recomendation. According to the Communist doctrine, political offenses, which are directed against "the Socialist state power and order of society," are regarded as more serious than even the vilest of crimes which have been committed as a result of the criminal tendencies of the accused. Hence the decree of January 30, 1961, by the state council, pertaining to the further development of the administration of justice, states:

If citizens violate the law and thus the basic principles of social coexistence, our state and our society must use all their authority to assert justice and the law.

Accordingly, the state council decrees that "the laws shall be applied in all severity against enemies of the workers' and farmers' state and against persons who commit serious crimes at the instructions of or under the influence of imperialist aggressors."

Thus it is the fundamental attitude of the offender toward the socialist state and the extent to which he is a "danger to society" which mainly determine the degree of punishment. According to the directives of the state council, severer punishments than hitherto must therefore be imposed on "persons who are a danger to the further social development, to the further unity of human society, to the further consolidation of the new relations between human beings, and to the socialist conditions which are assuming a more definite and permanent form to an ever-increasing degree." It is thus obvious that the administration of the criminal laws in the Soviet zone is more than ever an instrument of power used by the Communist state to assert its political aims and liquidate its opponents; that is to say, in Ulbricht's regime there is no independent legal administrative body, a third force, as it were, in the state.

As stressed by the Investigation Committee of Jurists in the Cause of Freedom, the number of sentences in political trials which they have been able to ascertain, is by no means complete; for not all trials are made known publicly. Hence it can be assumed for certain that the number of sentences is actually much higher. Thus the figure of 405 political sentences with a total of 1249 years imprisonment or confinement in a penitentiary, given in the yearly report for 1960 published by the abovementioned committee, has meanwhile risen to 774 sentences with a total of 2070 years detention. The number of political prisoners in Soviet Zone prisons has meanwhile increased from about 10,000 to 12,000 again, after dropping to about 9,000 at the end of 1960 as the result of an amnesty.

In 1961, 629 political sentences with a total of 1,580 years imprisonment or confinement in a penitentiary were made known publicly; and in this connection we should like to point out that since August 13 the number of political trials has increased considerably. For instance, within 2 months of August 13, 1961, four sentences involving imprisonment for life were pronounced; five accused were sentenced to 15 years each, one to 14 years, two to 13 years and four to 12 years penitentiary. In this respect it must be stressed that sentences on political prisoners are extremely severe in the Soviet Zone, and that a long term in a penitentiary is in effect frequently equivalent to the death sentence in the case of persons whose health is poor and whose powers of resistance are low.

The persons sentenced to death for poltical reasons since the founding of the so-called German Democratic Republic include six women. In some cases execution of the death sentence was made known inasmuch as the legal authorities of the Soviet Zone sent bills for the cost of the execution to the families of the persons executed. Cases in which political prisoners—according to Stalinist example—"were liquidated by administrative means," have not been included in the statistics of death sentences. Nor have the 91 death sentences pronounced on Germans in the Soviet Zone by the Soviet military tribunals from 1950 to 1953, which were made known, been included in these statistics.

The Late John Crosby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the State of Minnesota has lost one of its most illustrious and noted citizens, Mr. John Crosby. His contributions to the State have meant much to our economic, educational, and social progress. They will continue to play a large part in our development.

The following article and editorial appeared March 1 and 2 in the Minneapolis newspapers:

JOHN CROSBY, BANKER, INDUSTRIALIST, DIES

John Crosby, 94, attorney, industrialist, banker and one of the builders of the Washburn-Crosby Co., which evolved into General Mills, died early today at his home at 2104 Stevens Avenue.

His father, John, was one of the original partners in the formation of the Washburn-Crosby milling firm.

During his long and active career he served as a Minneapolis alderman from the then fifth ward from 1897 to 1901, the last 2 years of that term as president of the city council.

Native of Hampden, Maine, he came to Minneapolis in 1877, when he was 10 years old. His education included Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass., from which he graduated in 1886. He graduated from Yale in 1890. Three years later he obtained a law degree from Harvard.

Mr. Crosby began practicing law in 1893. For 3 years he was associated with the law firm of Koon, Whelan and Bennett. In 1893 he began practicing on his own but in 1908 he became a partner in the law firm of Kingman, Crosby & Wallace.

The Washburn-Crosby firm was founded by Crosby's father and Cadwallader C. Washburn, a former Wisconsin congressman and governor and a general in the Union Army in the Civil War. At 21 young John Crosby became a director when the company was incorporated in 1889. Ten years later he became legal adviser to the company while practicing law in Minneapolis. In 1910 he was named company treasurer and held that post until 1919.

PRESIDENT OF FIRM

In that same year he became president of the company after the death of John Washburn. In 1925 he was named chairman of the board.

Three years later he became a director of General Mills, when it was formed by a merger of Washburn Crosby and other milling companies. He resigned in 1951, after serving for many years as chairman of the audit committee and on the board's executive committee.

At that time he had completed 62 years with the firm.

His business activity extended beyond the milling firm. He served as a director of the St. Anthony & Dakota Elevator Co., the Brown Grain Co., Barnum Grain Co., Imperial Elevator Co., St. Anthony Elevator Co., Royal Milling Co., Kalispell Milling Co., and Rocky Mountain Elevator Co.

He was one of the founders of Blake School at Hopkins, where he served as trustee from 1911 to 1919, and he founded Northrop Col-

legiate School for Girls, serving on its board for 20 years, a large part of that period as president. He was also one of the original trustees of the William Hood Dunwoody Industrial Institute.

He also was a trustee of the Minneapolis Society of Fine Arts, Minneapolis Institute of Arts and Minneapolis Foundation.

BANK DIRECTOR

Banking was another phase of his career. From 1909 to 1951 he was a trustee of the Farmers & Mechanics Savings Bank. From 1914 to 1951 he was a director of the Northwest Bancorporation.

Though active in law, business, and banking, he also found time for hobbies. He enjoyed cribbage, pack trips to the Rocky Mountains, hiking, gardening. For many years he took the role of Santa Claus at General Mills Christmas parties for employees.

He was for more than 60 years a member of Plymouth Congregational Church. He also was a member of the Minneapolis Club, the Skylight Club, Woodhill Country Club and the Alpine Club.

In May 1897 John Crosby was married to Margaret Hastings, Vermont-born Minneapolis girl, who survives him. In the family are one son and two daughters. A son, John, is a retired rancher residing in Berkeley, Calif. A daughter, Margaret, is an archaeologist residing in Boston. Another daughter, Caroline, is Mrs. Richard Field, wife of a Boston attorney and professor of law at Harvard University. There was another son, Henry, who was vice president of General Mills in charge of engineering control, who was killed in a plane crash at Trumansburg, N.Y., in 1953. Another son, Albert, a former vice president of Washburn-Crosby and later vice president of Farmers and Mechanics bank, died in 1947. There are 14 grandchildren and 23 great-grandchildren.

Funeral services for Mr. Crosby will be 11 a.m. Saturday in the chapel of Plymouth Church, with private burial in Lakewood Cemetery.

JOHN CROSBY

The death of John Crosby could be described as the end of the pioneer era of this city and State. He was one of the last survivors of the small band of early settlers who contributed so much to the building of this community.

When Mr. Crosby came to Minneapolis as a boy of 10 in 1877, this was a city of only about 45,000 population. Minnesota then had a population of fewer than 700,000 people. Our Nation counted only 47 million Americans.

Because of leaders like Mr. Crosby, Minneapolis and Minnesota grew rapidly. In those early days, before the age of specialization, Mr. Crosby was intimately connected with many facets of the business, educational, and social life of the community.

He was a lawyer, businessman, industrialist, and banker. He also was a founder of Blake School and of Northrop School, served as one of the original trustees of the Dunwoody Institute, and was a trustee of the Minneapolis Society of Fine Arts, the Minneapolis Institute of Arts, and the Minneapolis Foundation.

He was active in such organizations as the Skylight Club where he presided as an urbane master of ceremonies for some years and the Minneapolis Club to which he remained faithful until recent months. In attending the 70th anniversary of the Skylight Club in 1960, when he was 93, Mr. Crosby recalled with pleasure his attendance at meetings over the years and hoped for the club's continued success.

But he found time for public life, too. Like many of the other leaders of his day, he took seriously his responsibilities to his community. He served as a Minneapolis alderman for 4 years and as council president for 2.

To the very end he remained interested in what was happening here and in the world. He went his way calmly and unpretentiously, giving a friendly word of support here and there and providing more substantial help to the various organizations with which he was associated. But, like the pioneer he truly was, he continued to look ahead. Because he did, our road is a better and clearer one.

Judicial Review

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Stars and Stripes-National Tribune on March 1, 1962.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

For the past week a subcommittee of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee has been hearing testimony from veterans' organizations and other interested parties on the provisions of H.R. 849. This is a proposal which would establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals separate and distinct from the Veterans' Administration so that a veteran could carry his case to a court of last resort if he is convinced that his claim is a just one.

The measure was introduced by Representative OLIN TEAGUE, chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. The bill provides for a Court of Veterans' Appeals made up of five judges, all of whom must be attorneys, to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. In addition, the bill provides for the appointment of 50 commissioners who would conduct hearings, receive evidence and furnish such reports as are requested.

Veterans' organizations are divided insofar as the merits of the legislation are concerned. Both the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion take the position that appointment of such a court violates the concept of a single Government agency to dispense veterans' benefits. They say this method has been successful for over 40 years and they see no need for such a drastic change at this time. It seems to us that this statement is open to contradiction.

It is the thinking of the opponents of the legislation that the VA should not be in the position of acting as judge and jury on the propriety of its own actions. The Disabled American Veterans formerly opposed to the principle involved have changed their position and now support the passage of the legislation. Those favoring the measure believe that substantial economies could be effected should the proposal become law. They point out that the reappeal of claims which has become more frequent of late could be avoided. They stress the experience in England where an independent appeals court was established about 40 years ago which is said to function admirably and efficiently in support of their position.

In our opinion it seems only just and fair that a veteran should have a court of last appeal. This is particularly true when it is realized that the decision from which the veteran is appealing has been made by the VA and in the natural course of human behavior they are loath to change their position on a decision previously given.

It should be remembered that the welfare of some 22 million veterans, their widows, children and dependent parents will be affected by the passage of this or similar legislation. We are confident the Veterans' Affairs Committee will give serious and impartial consideration to the merits or demerits of this particular proposal.

Excise Tax on the Transportation of Passengers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, the 10 percent Federal exise tax applicable to the transportation of passengers has for some time been recognized as detrimental and discriminatory to the transportation industry of the country. Moreover, it has proven to be an unwise policy that has been harmful to the national interest.

One unfortunate result of this unwise tax has been Government subsidization of certain segments of the transportation industry. Federal Government subsidy of the transportation industry, exclusive of the railroads, has in turn resulted in frequent financial instability of local and national railroads. A case in point is the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad, which has been forced into a receivership largely because of Government-subsidized competition. Should the transportation tax be repealed, and the New Haven allowed to retain the proceeds accruing from the repeal, an estimated $3 million yearly tax saving would be helpful in restoring financial health to the company.

It is interesting that the tax on the transportation of passengers was adopted during World War II for the purposes of discouraging travel and raising revenue. However, like so many "temporary" measures, it has over the years become an accepted part of our budget and the Government has come to rely on the revenue which it produces. Virtually the only argument for continuing the tax is that we would otherwise lose revenue necessary to support various Federal programs. In this regard, I have several suggestions to make.

First, that we are not contributing to the financial or economic strength of our country by continuing a tax which is not only unjustified but which is crippling a vital national industry.

Second, that some of the revenue lost by repealing the tax will be made up by elimination of a deductible expense and by a more profitable transportation industry.

Third, that long, hard look at the curtailment of some of the Federal spending programs would be more appropriate and more in the best interests of the country than continuing to penalize the transportation industry.

Finally, that the agencies of the Federal Government best acquainted with the needs of the rail, bus, and air travel

industry, namely, the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board are unanimous in their support of the prompt repeal of this tax. In 1961 the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission called the tax highly inimical to the best interest of the country, and the Chairman of the CAB stated that continuation of the 10 percent excise tax on passenger transportation will aggravate the critical financial situation facing the airline industry today.

In light of the foregoing, I have introduced a bill to repeal the 10-percent tax presently imposed on the transportation of passengers. I feel that its adoption would strengthen the economy of the country, and would correct an inequitable injustice with regards to the transportation industry.

That Dark Year—1913

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DALE ALFORD

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, Karr Shannon, who writes a daily column entitled Run of the News in the Arkansas Democrat at Little Rock, Ark., has diagnosed our current ills and believes they all began in 1913, the year the income tax was imposed upon the Nation. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include his column of January 26, 1962, in the RECORD:

AND IT ALL STARTED WITH THE FEDERAL INCOME TAX

(By Karr Shannon)

The United States has seen some dark years—years of depression, panic, famine, flood, war, and other crises. But one of the darkest years in our history was 1913.

In that year there was no famine, no flood, no depression, no bank closures. We were at peace with the world. We had the respect and friendship of all countries around the globe.

We had a national debt of only $1 billion. The Federal Government was being operated on less than $725 million per year. The dollar was stable. Our credit was tops. And we had inestimable billions of dollars in untapped resources. The people were prosperous—and happy.

Up to that year the United States had minded its own business, and had avoided entanglements with other nations so far as possible.

What happened in 1913—only 49 years ago—to make it one of the darkest years was adoption of the 16th amendment to the Constitution. This amendment gave Congress the right to levy income taxes. And an income tax was enacted the very same year.

BEGAN AS MUSTARD SEED

It was a small tax that "hit only the rich"—only 1 percent on incomes up to $20,000 and a small surtax on incomes of more than $20,000.

But that little, insignificant tax started it. It was the seed, the beginning, of just about every problem, every crisis we suffer today.

From 1913 forward our Federal Government has become more and more centralized, more powerful, more domineering, and the several States, and the people, have been deprived of more and more of their rights.

It all started with the Federal income tax. It gave us a start on the road to ruin. It has been downhill all the way. Each year has given impetus to speed.

During those 49 years we have fought three horrible wars in which millions of Americans lost their lives. All these wars—World War I, World War II, and the Korean war—pertained to foreign entanglements. They were all fought in foreign lands and on foreign seas.

During those 49 years the national debt has rocketed from $1 billion to near $300 billion—an amount that is beyond the imagination, beyond our ability to pay—ever.

IT HAS HAPPENED TO US

During those 49 years the annual cost of Federal Government has gone up from less than one billion to around $80 billion (nobody knows for certain).

The Federal income tax today is not 1 percent, but 20 percent on net incomes of less than $2,000—with a scale of increases on up to 91 percent on any amount over $200,000.

In less than three decades, we have gone from a free republic to the welfare state. We have been plunged into socialism by tinhorn statesmen, braintrusters, theorists, mountebanks, do-gooders, university snobs, one-worlders, crackbrains and downright crooks.

Bureaucracy has supplanted democracy. The dole has supplanted work. Crackpots have supplanted statesmen. Boondoggling has supplanted efficiency.

This was all made possible because of the billions and billions of dollars taken from our citizens through the graduated income tax.

HAVOC AT HOME AND ABROAD

Along with this, we have had "planned economy" and "pump-priming." We have tried taxing ourselves into prosperity—and lost. We have tried borrowing ourselves into prosperity—and lost again. Our Constitution has been repeatedly violated, and is now superseded by the United Nations Charter.

We have created havoc in our own Nation, and made a still worse mess in our foreign relations. In 1933 we yielded to FDR and recognized the godless Soviet Union. After World War II we joined the United Nations and lost our freedom.

Since then we have blundered every step of the way. We have squandered and thrown away on so-called "foreign aid" what our forefathers thriftly built up and saved. Wherever we have spent the most money, communism has flourished most. And the more billions of dollars we give away, the more we are hated throughout the world.

Meanwhile, at home, we have been "legally" robbed; we have been hoodwinked, hoodooed, brainwashed, lied to, betrayed, and bought off with our own money. National leadership has been at an all-time low for years. And taking their cue from the higher-ups, State and local governments also have lost all sense of finance—and plunged headlong into debt, waste and corruption.

All of this is the result of what happened to the United States in that dark year—1913.

The Late Ambassador Yturralde

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked to learn this morning of the untimely death of the Spanish Ambassador to the United States, Mariano de Yturralde y Orbegoso.

During his service in Washington, Ambassador Yturralde impressed many persons in the Government, in the diplomatic corps and in private circles, with his personal and professional qualities.

He was an able and experienced diplomat who represented his country in important posts around the globe.

During his service in Washington, he worked ably to advance friendly and constructive cooperation between his country and the United States, for the purpose of strengthening the security of the free world against the Communist menace.

I would like to express my sincere condolences to his widow in her deep grief, and to the Spanish Government upon the loss of such a distinguished and devoted servant.

The U.N. and the John Birch Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, in the headquarters of the United Nations Association of Los Angeles one will find a display of reprints of newspaper articles attacking the John Birch Society. This is most disturbing to me since the U.N. is supposed to be neutral on the internal affairs of its members.

It is curious that this association, while displaying material which is critical of the society, has never displayed material which is critical of communism. Don Carpenter discusses this matter in an editorial which was printed in the February 11, 1962, issue of the Herald published in El Monte, Calif.

Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE U.N. AND THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

According to Mr. Khrushchev, Communists plan to bury Americans. According to Lenin, communism and capitalism cannot coexist; one must be destroyed. He didn't propose that communism would be the victim. However, in the United Nations, in which the impossible partnership of capitalism and communism exists, there has never been an official position against communism. Naturally.

This policy has been carried into the southern California offices of the American Association for the United Nations. Those who frequent the headquarters in Los Angeles have never found material criticism of communism; after all, for the association to attack a segment of the world partnership would constitute disloyalty to the world group.

However, the United Nations Association of Los Angeles is not neutral in all things, it does not maintain the middle-of-the-road-posture in all things.

The John Birch Society, for example.

On display in the Wilshire Boulevard headquarters these days are reprints of newspaper articles attacking the John Birch Society, published first in the Santa Barbara News-Press, the New York Times magazines,

and the New York Herald Tribune. The articles blast the society as rightwing extremist, and brand these so-called pro-Americans as Fascists. They criticize people who use their own money to fight communism, they ridicule Americans who take seriously what President Lincoln said about a government of the people, for the people and by the people. And, in typical fashion, they smear the members of the John Birch Society for what they term "smear tactics."

Of course, the good folks in the United Nations worldwide organization have a perfect right to engage in politics. They'd be unnatural if they didn't. But why do they level the battering ram of criticism at what they term the "extreme right?" Why do they not also blast the extreme left? Why do they not criticize the effort to transform the United States into a Soviet America; do they not realize that their idealistic efforts toward "world peace, world security and world justice" would be for nought if communism were in the saddle world wide?

At present the United Nations is the most Fascist, antidemocratic organization in the world, for the peoples of the world have never elected a single "representative." People who deplore the fact that Robert Welch was not "elected" to lead the John Birch Society, should be just as scandalized at the fact that America never voted for Adlai Stevenson to lead the United States in the U.N. And they have never voted for or against any candidate for the office of Secretary General.

The big difference is that anyone who differs with Welch can resign from the John Birch Society.

But where does one go to resign from the United Nations?

DON CARPENTER.

Honest Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, the defeat of the Burns Creek power project was very important to the economy of my State of Wyoming and means continued employment for many coal miners in the Kemmerer area. The editorial written by Roy Peck of the Riverton Ranger very clearly places this project in its proper perspective and I am including this editorial so that others may learn the true facts on this project.

HONEST RECLAMATION

Disapproval of the Burns Creek power dam, just across the Wyoming border in Idaho, was not, as some are prone to say, a victory of private power over public power.

It was rather a victory for honest reclamation as opposed to misused reclamation.

It was a victory of the working man of the Nation over the Washington bureaucrat.

It was a victory for free enterprise over unnecessary public spending.

The private power versus public power controversy at Burns Creek was fanned all out of proportion to the real issues at Burns Creek.

The Burns Creek project would have cost $48 million according to USBR estimates. Actually, most reclamation projects usually cost half again as much as the original estimate.

The Burns Creek Dam was 98 percent power generation, only 2 percent true reclamation purpose.

The West has benefited immensely from reclamation. There will be future benefits. But had Burns Creek become a reality the true and rightful purpose of reclamation would have been destroyed.

Eastern voting blocs in Congress, already turning against reclamation, would have found it exceedingly distasteful to favor other reclamation projects had this $48 million boondoggle passed.

Hundreds of coal miners will now have work, and pay taxes, producing the fuel to fire steam power generating facilities.

Western Wyoming's coal industry can well provide the electricity planned for Burns Creek, at less cost, and pay taxes while it is doing it.

Forget the private-public power controversy where Burns Creek is concerned. This was rather a refreshing victory for free enterprise and the true American way of doing things.

Food Safety Is Clear Challenge for Women—Article by James and Ann Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Ann Cottrell Free, who writes a column for the McClure Syndicate with her husband, James Free, recently interviewed me and several other Members of Congress on the problems of assuring the safety of the food products bought by the American housewife. Out of this research came an excellent column written by Mr. and Mrs. Free which was distributed nationally and appeared, I understand, in many newspapers.

I was glad to find this column appearing in the St. Louis Daily Record, and I submit it for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Daily Record, Feb. 16, 1962]

FOOD SAFETY IS CLEAR CHALLENGE FOR WOMEN

(By James and Ann Free)

WASHINGTON.—The question of how loud the voice of the American woman is being raised in the land is perplexing.

Persons here who are concerned with her interests wonder if she couldn't be more effective, particularly in the field of food safety.

There are times when her silence on issues would make one think she was developing the characteristics of a timid mouse or a sleeping princess.

Then again, she comes out of her lair a roaring lioness demanding her interests be protected—or else.

"It all depends on how well she has been informed," maintains Representative LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, Democrat, of Missouri. The Congresswoman has long been a champion of stronger food, drug, and cosmetic laws. "Too often the information doesn't reach the housewives," she says.

HOUSEWIFE INSULTED

Much the same view comes from Senator PHILIP A. HART, Democrat, of Michigan. But his is a brighter story, for the work of the Senate subcommittee he leads has been reaching the women. And they have responded—their husbands, too. Senator HART winds up this week a second go-round of hearings on the packaging and labeling of food and household products.

Just a few days ago, further concern by housewives about labeling practices was reported by Carla S. Williams, the Food and Drug Administration's expert on consumer problems. She told the Advertising Federation of America in no uncertain terms that "the American housewife is insulted because of abuses taking place in the packing, labeling, and advertising fields."

Clearly, Senator HART's investigations have dramatized a problem and opened a channel of communications for consumers who felt they've been done in by deceptive labeling. They've found someone who cared.

But to date few such special channels have been opened to the rank and file in other areas pertaining to food. A serious case in point concerns the long-range cumulative effect of additives and pesticides in food.

FEAR 3,000 PESTICIDES

Among the few groups of women who have awakened to this problem with blood in their eyes is the small League of Women Voters of Swarthmore, Pa. In a 16-page booklet these women outline their concern over the long-range hazards from the 3,000 chemicals being used in food and the pesticide residues that cling to raw foods and milk.

They conclude their well-documented bulletin with the demand (or is it a plaintive cry?) with, "Somebody should do something."

Referring to the additives in food to preserve them, color them, soften them, the Swarthmore women charged "there is abundant evidence that the chief reason is economic profit and not the health and welfare of the consumer." They point to claims of some scientists that these additives could contribute to degenerative diseases.

As well as the substances deliberately put into foods, they complain about the pesticides that get in advertently. FDA decides by tests on animals (which some persons do not consider 100 percent accurate) how much of a pesticide may be left on a raw product at the time of harvest. FDA will not permit any traces of some chemicals as they are so injurious. But FDA can keep up with only a tiny fraction.

"When I eat vegetables and fruits," says Representative JOHN FOGARTY, Democrat, of Rhode Island, "I wonder if I am lucky in getting a bite of that one-fifth of 1 percent the FDA had money and manpower to inspect."

It remains to be seen whether the FDA will ever get enough money to do the job properly.

"Women's groups are concerned about these things," said Mrs. Sullivan. "They want pure food and protection from all hazards, but I believe they speak in too soft a voice and are much too passive. They've got to fight for what they want."

Food safety is clearly a woman's field, so it seems that the evidence shows that a challenge faces the American woman.

Annual Pancake Day Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, today is Shrove Tuesday, a day of special significance throughout the religious world since it marks the beginning of the lenten season, a time of religious meditation.

Shrove Tuesday has in recent years taken on added significance for England and the United States since on that day an international event, the annual International Pancake Day Race is held between housewives of Olney, England, and Liberal, Kans. This event has helped illustrate the good will between our two countries, and interest in the most unusual race has become widespread.

In the 12th annual race last year, Liberal tied up the score to make it 6 to 6. The English won the first two races, but the Liberal women attributed that to the experience of their English cousins, and were not discouraged. In 1952, a Liberal housewife put the United States in the winning column—the year a well-known Liberal businessman, Mr. Jim French, was general chairman. In 1953 Olney avenged the previous year's loss, but 1954, 1955, and 1956 were winning years for the Kansas ladies; 1957, 1958, and 1960 were winning years for the English, but in 1959 and 1961 the Liberal ladies gain tied the score.

This year, despite the presence of Gov. John Anderson, Jr., of Kansas, and Senators Frank Carlson and James Pearson, Olney, England, emerged the winner of the derby.

We extend our congratulations and best wishes to both winners. In this event victory is secondary as the race is symbolic of international friendship in the highest degree.

A Chinese Wall Around Agriculture?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from a farmer in Jersey County, Ill., enclosing an editorial which appeared February 1, in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring this article to the attention of my colleagues. It offers good advice on the farm problem:

HOW NOT TO SOLVE THE FARM PROBLEM

Ezra Taft Benson was in town last week and made a sage comment on the "farm problem." In this country, of course, the problem is abundance.

Our efficient American farmers grow more food than we can eat or sell abroad. Washington encourages this by guaranteeing a high fixed price for most staple crops.

As a result, farmers pile up growing surpluses of wheat, corn, cotton, butter, and cheese in Federal storage bins. Now there is talk of putting turkey farmers, potato-growers, and beekeepers under price props.

Benson said the economics of the farm problem is simple—but "the politics of the problem" are baffling.

What former President Dwight Eisenhower's farm expert meant was that basically the return to a free market would solve our difficulties. Unfortunately, it is almost dogma with the Democratic Party that the only way to solve the farm problem is put it under more and more Government controls.

Yesterday, President Kennedy's new farm message reflected his party's philosophy. It urged more land be taken out of production, but that the Government guarantee high prices for the crops grown on the remainder.

Also, farmers would be offered Federal loans and technical aid to turn some of their surplus land into riding stables, fishing lakes, and other playground areas for city dwellers. This plank in the farm platform sounds as if Lewis Carroll wrote it.

Of course, the effect would be to put the farmer under Washington's thumb even more than he is now.

Mr. Benson pointed out that when he left office, three-fourths of agriculture was free (of Federal control) and doing fairly well.

For example, price props for dairy products were cut when he was in office, to bring prices down to competitive levels. But the present administration turned back the clock.

Washington promised higher prices. As a result, it has had to buy up huge quantities of surplus dairy products to keep them off the market.

Last year, the Agriculture Department had 15 million pounds of butter in cold storage. Now, it has 150 million pounds.

Last year, there was no surplus cheese in Uncle Sam's deep freeze. Now he has 54 million pounds of it.

We also have 1,412 million bushels of wheat in storage and $2,300 million worth of surplus, stored corn.

Farmers are growing for storage—not for consumption.

Of course, this is not the farmer's fault. It's the fault of the Department of Agriculture. If Washington would guarantee Detroit's automakers a high price for their cars, Uncle Sam would have acres full of idle motor rusting away.

In effect, Washington is trying to build a Chinese wall around agriculture and create for it a special protected economy within this ghetto. It hasn't worked in the past—and it never will.

Medicine's Forgotten Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of the membership an article which appeared in the March 1, 1962, issue of the Reporter entitled "Medicine's Forgotten Women."

This article sets forth quite clearly the plight of our American nurses and the conditions under which they must work. I feel quite strongly that we must do something to raise their standard of living commensurate with the profession they represent.

The article follows:

MEDICINE'S FORGOTTEN WOMEN

(By Barbara Carter)

The mounting concern over the Nation's health would seem to indicate that at last we are taking the issue seriously. President Kennedy has put medical care for the aged in top place among "legislation that must be passed by Congress this year." The U.S. Public Health Survey has just begun its first intensive examination into the general public's health. And Congress has authorized (once again) more spending for medical research than the administration requested.

But the welfare of nurses, whose role is an essential one in nearly all health services, has not been the subject of much public concern. The consequences of such apathy are beginning to tell, and nurses in several States, including Illinois, Tennessee, and California, have taken the unprecedented step of resigning en masse to protest their employment conditions. Meanwhile, the nursing shortage has risen to 20 percent, doubling the vacancy rate since 1958, and the percentage of high school graduates entering the profession has dropped significantly. Some hospitals, such as Fordham and Greenpoint in New York, have been ordered closed for lack of nurses, and some new wings have never been used for the same reason. Yet the public apparently still takes the nurses for granted, and the nurses have thus far been unable to do much about it.

A few figures are in order. Almost two-thirds of the Nation's 504,000 active registered nurses are employed in hospitals, and 60 percent of these are general-duty nurses, the position where the most vacancies are reported. The average salary earned by a nurse at this level in a nongovernmental hospital is $3,900. (The situation is somewhat better all around in Government hospitals, but private nonprofit hospitals employ more than two-thirds of all hospital nurses.) The average factory worker earns almost a thousand dollars a year more—$4,730. And the average classroom teacher, whose economic distress has been widely publicized in recent years, earns what suddenly appears to be a generous $5,215 a year. The wage of a New York City busdriver, which was raised to $108 a week after the New Year's Day strike, is appreciably more, especially with overtime pay, than the national average of $103.85 for the top hospital nursing position, that of nursing director.

Money, however, is only part of the picture. The large majority of nurses do not have unemployment insurance, do not get time and a half for overtime, do not get compulsory social security coverage, and do not have a voice in determining their own working conditions. Very few of them have been able to engage in the type of collective bargaining that leads to a negotiated contract. If their benefits haven't increased, their burdens have, particularly in the added numbers of auxiliary personnel to supervise.

After the Second World War, while standards of living were generally moving upward in the United States, nurses found themselves at an unusual disadvantage. In 1946, their professional organization, the American Nurses' Association, which was founded in 1896 to foster high standards of nursing practice and education, initiated an "Economic Security Program." Nurses, who are especially sensitive about their status as members of a profession, still find it difficult to engage in what they prefer to call "union-like" activity, and at the beginning of their program they voluntarily gave up the right to strike. At the same time, however, the American Nurses' Association trained its State association officers to serve as representatives—when asked—to negotiate with employers on salaries, hours, and so forth. By 1947, it had been able to negotiate contracts and engage in collective bargaining in three or four States. But then came the Taft-Hartley Act, which for the first time specifically excluded nonprofit hospitals, or half of the country's hospitals, from the legal obligation to bargain collectively. Since then, the nurses' representatives have been able to negotiate contracts in a total of only seven States.

The Taft-Hartley bill's reference to hospitals, which had been sponsored by the American Hospital Association and Johns Hopkins Hospital, was slipped in from the floor by the late Senator Millard Tydings of Maryland, and adopted with practically no debate.

In prior hearings, the hospital association had argued that patients' fees and charitable contributions were not a proper subject for collective bargaining, and that citizens should be protected from strikes against nonprofit hospitals. The latter point, as far as nurses are concerned, was irrelevant, since they had already given up the right to strike. The president of Johns Hopkins Hospital had pointed to a somewhat mystical connection between the community and the hospital (" * * * in effect simply two parts of the same entity") and concluded that "It would, therefore, seem highly unethical and detrimental to the public welfare for [a] hospital * * * to be compelled to bargain with a stated group or labor union. * * *"

Senator Tydings may not have understood the American Hospital Association's maneuver. When he offered his amendment, he was asked only one question: "What does the amendment do * * *? Does it prevent hospital employees, particularly nurses, from organizing * * *?" "I do not think it would," Mr. Tydings replied, and added, "I do not think the amendment will affect them in the slightest way as to salaries. I will say * * * they can still protest, they can still walk out." With this assurance, the Senate promptly adopted his amendment.

Since then, hospital administrators have tended to act as if the exclusion not only frees them from any legal requirement to bargain collectively, which it does, but also as if it forbids them to negotiate with nurses' representatives, which it doesn't.

If the nurses ever succeed in getting the clause out of the labor act (and the AFL-CIO itself is reluctant to bring up the subject of changes just now) and if its removal were to prompt the nine States that have added the provision to their labor laws to do the same, the most the nurses could hope for would be a better chance to state their case. The real issues would still have to be fought out, and here the nurses are very much alone against a highly organized and formidable opponent, the American Hospital Association. Moreover, the nurses are divided among themselves.

CRISIS AT KEWANEE

Hemmed in both by Taft-Hartley and their own resolve to avoid the more militant forms of unionism, nurses are left with little alternative but to endure or walk out individually, as Senator Tydings casually suggested. Twenty-four of the forty-six nurses at Kewanee, Ill., Public Hospital did just that last summer. Their story is instructive.

It began in January 1961, when Kewanee, a nonprofit hospital, raised patients' fees explaining that the nurses were getting raises. At that time, the beginning salary for a general-duty nurse at Kewanee was $235 a month, $79 below the State average for beginning nurses. In March, after the nurses had pointedly inquired about the heralded raise, the administrator of the hospital offered them a tempting choice: either a salary increase with a 50-percent cut in the nursing staff, or the same salary with the same number on the staff. The nurses chose the latter.

In April, however, a raise was given, but by that time the nurses, through information supplied by the State branch of the American Nurses' Association, were more aware of their position relative to the rest of the State. Their average salary, after the raise, came only to $279, while the going rate for nurses in the State was $333. At this point 75 percent of the hospital's nurses decide to make their State association their bargaining agent.

As a first step, they undertook a systematic study of their situation. They discovered that some of the hospital's practices violated State licensing laws, and were in the process of surveying current salaries on the nursing staff when the hospital administration fired the nurse who was gathering this basic information.

The ANA representative and the local chairman thereupon asked the hospital administrator for a meeting, which was refused in line with the Illinois State Hospital Association's policy that "funds allocated for the care of patients will not be subject to bargaining with third parties representing only employee interests * * *." "The legal precedent for this policy," it was explained "has been clearly established by the exemption granted hospitals" by the Taft-Hartley Act.

The Kewanee board, however, agreed to meet with the nurses on condition they not bring along an ANA representative.

They met on June 20. On the one side sat the owners of three local businesses, a bank representative, a traffic manager, a personnel manager, and two attorneys; on the other, a few nurses chosen as spokesmen by their group. Before the women could make any presentation of their grievances, they were told that the board would not deal with them as a group but only on an individual basis.

Up against what seemed a blank wall, 24 nurses resigned, carefully spacing out their departures. Their decision was not made without a great dea lof soul searching, and the repercussions were nationwide. Not only was the story covered in the State press, but the hospital's version received full play in the Illinois Hospital Association's newsletter, which in turn was picked up verbatim by the New York Hospital Association and carried in a number of other States hospital newsletters. It almost sounded like a call to arms.

ON TO SLAVERY

Despite the formidable opposition amassed against them, 17 of the 24 nurses working for below-average salaries without night differential or overtime pay in a Southern hospital (which will not be identified here because of possible reprisals against the nurses) decided to ask their State branch of the American Nurses Association to assist them as bargaining agent. The administrator's reply to the American Nurses Association was brief: "I have no intention of permitting third-party interference in the management of this hospital when no conflict exists in any department. * * *" The administrator lost no time in notifying the State hospital association that trouble was brewing. It duly sent a letter to each administrator of all the member hospitals in the State inviting them to meetings to discuss ways to implement their resolution against collective bargaining. The Kewanee incident was very much on their minds. "In Illinois," the invitation warned, "a smilar pattern has developed in one of the hospitals resulting in a number of the nurses resigning from the staff and with full accounts being published in the press on a statewide basis." Included was a "Statement of Policy to Serve as a Guide to Member Hospitals." Its fifth and final point was: "Each hospital should realize the importance of communicating immediately with the central office of [the State] hospital association if approached by any group concerned with collective bargaining. The association will serve as a clearinghouse and will mobilize such help as may be available from member hospitals informed of developments within the State and maintain liaison with the American Hospital Association.

Earlier, the administrator had written a fatherly letter to the hospital nurse who was chairman of the local unit. "It was," he confessed, "* * * a great disappointment to me to receive a letter from the State Nurses' Association recently in which they state you had instructed them to represent 17 nurses * * *. The [State] hospital association and I, as administrator of this hospital, consider it unnecessary, unethical and ill advisable to enter into third-party dealings * * *. If I might digress for a moment, let me warn you of the communistic influence in this country which is usually spread by parasitic groups that makes their living creating dissatisfaction when it does not exist, and appealing to the greed of individuals who may act without thinking of its effect on his fellow man. The cycles in history show that benefits gained are paid for by giving greater contributions to these parasitic groups which will lead you through socialism and communism, on to slavery. It has been estimated that if all graduate nurses lower themelves to this status, the dues they would pay into the 'slush' fund would be over $24 million each year to spend on creating additional discontent."

Having delivered himself of this beguiling interpretation of the history of collective bargaining, the administrator returned to the point of his letter. "How can hospitals respect your ability, sincerity, and loyalty," he asked the nurse, "if your work is guided solely by selfish interests? In conclusion, I wish to advise that if you go through with this ill-advised act, you have lost your professional status and will receive no other consideration than nonprofessional employees. I urge you to carefully weigh your action in respect to your profession, your hospital, and the people of this city."

In the end, the nurses' professional organization was kept out, through the nurses on their own were able to get some improvement of their position.

And so it goes. In Idaho, four hospital nurses were fired for disloyalty and "gross insubordination" as they attempted to improve their conditions. In Iowa, a Dubuque industrial hospital fired its head nurse and forced two others to resign when they sought assistance from the Iowa Nurses' Association. In Tennessee, the staff nurses of a Nashville hospital, who were getting about $25 a month less than other nurses in the Nashville area but whose protests were of no avail, finally gave 2 weeks' notice, but got their raise on the date their resignations were to become effective.

Some 280 nurses in 8 nonprofit hospitals in Orange County, Calif., joined the ANA in order to improve their economic condition, to establish better nursing practices, and to persuade the hospitals to enter into collective bargaining with them. The hospitals first offered a $30-a-month increase over the $72.50 weekly starting salary, then brought such pressure to bear that nine nurses were forced to resign and one was fired. Nevertheless, the campaign has had some success: a few hospitals have provided regular salary increases, payment for overtime, and unemployment benefits.

And finally this January, again in Illinois (only 165 miles from Kewanee), all the nurses except the director in a Jerseyville hospital announced their resignations. The issues here were not so much salary as nursing standards, and an unusual feature was the medical staff's support of the nurses. The doctors, in fact, had sent a resolution to the board, noting that routine care of the patients had deteriorated alarmingly and asked that the board fire the administrator. By early February, the administrator had resigned and a settlement of sorts had been reached, but the nurses' State bargaining representative was excluded from the arrangement.

One decisive American Nurses' Association success should be mentioned here—one that the seemingly more sophisticated members of the labor movement might well envy. The nurses' association has found a

more effective means of bringing in southern Negro members than many more experienced labor leaders can boast. They took them directly into their national association when the local southern organizations demurred, and today all their State branches accept Negroes as members.

ON EVERYBODY'S HATE LIST

In spite of the increasing number of courageous but isolated acts of protest by the nurses, their national organization wonders, "How far can we push them when we have no way to protect them?" Moreover, by no means all nurses are behind their professional organization. Not only do their environment and the pressures they face militate against active outspoken support, but their national organization has suddenly dropped its cloistered role as handmaiden to the American Medical Association and come out independently for medical care for the aged under social security, Federal aid to higher education, and a stepped-up "economic security program."

"Now we're on everybody's hate list," was the remark of one American Nurses Association member, ruefully acknowledging that American Nurses' Association membership has dropped suddenly as a result. In 1958, when it first took its stand on Federal care for the aged, its membership totaled 190,463. Today it stands at 170,000.

The American Nurses' Association independence on these matters has jolted the American Medical Association as much as the positions themselves. In 1959, one considerate member of the Florida Medical Association supplied a formal resolution for the State nurses' group to use in reversing their stand on Federal care for the aged. Though they turned it down flat, the same tactic has been tried in other States. Last spring it was reported in Medical World News that a special meeting of American Medical Association officials and State leaders had decided "to work on the grassroots level to get local nursing groups to repudiate the American Nurses' Association endorsement of the social security approach to aged care coverage."

"Why aren't nurses our allies any more?" Dr. Alfred P. Ingegno asks in the November 6, 1961, issue of Medical Economics, which is described as a "business magazine for doctors." He pointed to the charge that "* * * in some areas doctors have been putting pressure on nurses to bend them to medicine's point of view" and recommended that "we should support the American Nurses' Association effort to improve the salaries and working conditions of nurses in hospitals. By aligning ourselves with the nursing profession as it strives for adequate recognition, doctors will be serving an urgent national need for more nurses. * * * It's obvious that the most natural way to stimulate interest in nursing careers is by keeping the nursing profession satisfied, both professionally and economically. It's a better way than scholarships, subsidies, Government programs, and pep talks. All these get endless discussion, while everyone—doctors included—turns his back on the hard economic facts of nursing life."

The doctor's remarks touch on a difficult point. Though having the same needs as other employed persons, the nurses are inhibited to a large degree by their concern for their patients and by their determination to maintain their status as professionals. Yet in spite of the stiff professional opposition against them, they have come out strongly for the Kennedy administration stand on Federal care for the aged and Federal aid to higher education.

For its part, Washington's only recent actions on this serious matter have been a drive to recruit nurses among Indians to be trained in New Mexico, and a 4-cent stamp honoring the nursing profession.

Social Security Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, at present a retired person may earn up to $1,200 without losing his social security benefits. If he earns from $1,200 to $1,700, he may retain $1 for every $2 earned; beyond the original $1,200 and $1,700, he loses $1 for each $1 earned. Upon reaching the age of 72, no earning limitations apply and a person may retain all his social security benefits, regardless of how much he earns.

It is generally believed that the 2-for-1 principle becomes effective as soon as a man is 65; and likewise, that he is permitted to retain all his social security benefits beginning with the month in which he reaches age 72. Unfortunately, this is not always true, as has been pointed out by Mr. Dwight S. Sargent, personnel director of the Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, who has done extensive research on the subject of earning limitations upon older workers. A member of former President Eisenhower's White House Conference for the Aging, Mr. Sargent was a leading supporter of legislation which established the 2-for-1 principle, and more recently has made additional proposals to further modify the earnings test.

I think his views sets forth the problem—as well as a workable remedy—in a very clear and comprehensive way. Mr. Sargent's presentation follows:

Some incentive has been written into the retirement test regulations of social security by the adoption of the 2-for-1 principle to the first $500 of earnings a year over $1,200 a year. But the old penalty still really applies in the year a man first qualifies for social security and again in the year when he becomes 72. The law requires that in either case, all earnings for the calendar year be used for purposes of the retirement test.

For example, an individual retires at 65 on July 1 of 1961. Assume he earned $4,000 during the January to June period before he was 65. His social security for himself and wife would be at the rate of $184.50 a month, or $2,214 a year. If he earned $101 a month for the 6 months July to December—a total of $606—he would lose all 6 of his social security checks for this period which would have equaled $1,107.

This is the result of the law which requires in this case that his earning for the first 6 months in the calendar year, $4,000, be added to his earnings after 65, $606, in figuring his earnings for purposes of the retirement test.

A similar unfair rule applies when a man reaches 72. Assume a man reaches 72 on July 1, 1961. He had earned $101 a month for the 6 months, January to June inclusive, a total of $606. He had received for this period, assuming the man and wife both qualified, six social security checks of $160 a month, a total of $960. Now if he made the mistake of thinking that because he was now 72 he could earn all he wanted to and keep his social security checks too, and earned $3,000 between July 1 and December 30, he would have to give back the six checks he had received for the January to June period.

Again the law requires total earnings in the calendar year to be used in figuring for purposes of the retirement test. So his $606 is added to the $3,000 which he earned after becoming 72 and the $3,606 total then disqualifies him for any social security for that year.

I think the cure is very simple. The $1,200, then the 2 for 1 for the next $500 and the 1 for 1 for earnings over $1,700 should be prorated on a monthly basis for the applicable months in the year in which a man first applies for social security and in the year in which he reaches 72. This would mean that in the first example, the $4,000 earned before the man became 65 would not be used in figuring the retirement test. For the balance of that year—6 months—he could earn $600 free, then 2 for 1 for the next $250, and 1 for 1 for all earnings over $850.

By the same reasoning in the second example, the man who was 72 on July 1—his earnings after 72 would not be used in figuring the retirement test. For the first half of that year when he was 71½–72, he could earn $600 free—then 2 for 1 for the next $250 and 1 for 1 for all earnings over $850.

Beside from being simply fair, it would also simplify the work of the social security offices. They now try to warn people as to the rule, compute annual earnings and in some cases have to recapture checks with all the grief involved in that.

Mr. Speaker, it seems only fair that the benefits of the 2 to 1 principle, as well as the right to retain all social security payments regardless of money earned, should commence precisely at the point where a person becomes 65 and 72, respectively. However, it is unfortunate that many older workers lose incentive because of these limitations on the retention of their social security benefits. I have therefore introduced a bill containing changes that would safeguard a worker so that he would not be deprived of social security benefits because of the happenstance of his birthday in any particular month during the year in which he becomes eligible.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, this House recently passed a bill in behalf of higher education and that bill is now hamstrung because of the addition to it by the other body of approximately a billion dollars in outright gifts. Today I received a very interesting and thought-provoking letter from a man well qualified and directly engaged in the education field. He is, Herbert S. Gary, principal, Portsmouth High School, Portsmouth, Ohio. Because his reaction and suggestions to the problem of Federal aid to education are so constructive, I thought it worthwhile for my colleagues to have the benefit of Mr. Gary's ideas and I am herewith including in my remarks his suggestions:

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

In the United States of America today the people are faced with a mighty challenge in providing an adequate education for the young people. We no longer live in the days of "the little red schoolhouse" with the muddy country roads, the village blacksmith, the horse and buggy, the spelling bee, orations, and provincialism. With a practical understanding of the forces that bring about our problems we can solve them and secure the peace and happiness we all desire. The only way is to provide young people with an advanced education so they may actively participate in our society as responsible citizens.

We live in the atomic age that has brought us to the threshold of space flight into our solar system. But we also live in a world that is threatened by an outdated Marxian cult that is rapidly approaching the realization of its goal of world domination.

The American people with our way of life still hold the worth and dignity of the individual as supreme. We have not lived up to the challenge of communism by providing for the individual. We are constantly struggling for civil rights for all, old-age benefits, retirement benefits, and a proper education.

We have turned to the Federal Government to ask it to provide for the individual. We have come to think that our Government must do everything for us. We have learned to rely upon the legislative branch of Government to make laws and pass appropriations to secure the individual.

The individual today finds it hard to do much for himself. Yet we still hold that he should be capable of helping himself if he is adequately educated and trained.

The problem crisis of securing a higher education (college, business, nursing, barber, beautician, and technical education included) is becoming more acute with rising costs, increased enrollments, and dwindling faculty members.

Federal aid to education in the form of scholarships and direct cash payments to the institutions of higher learning is a good typical solution to the problem; however, it does not place much initiative upon the individual's capacity to rely upon himself to find the answer.

There is a practical way for the individual and his family to help himself. To encourage all Americans to obtain an advanced education the Federal Government should provide for income tax writeoffs. This plan would encourage individuals and families to spend money on education.

Technical training is usually 1 or 2 years in length. The average college training is 4 years in length. The average annual cost for a college education today is approximately $1,750. Through a simple form that could be certified by an institution of higher education a dollar-for-dollar writeoff could be allowed.

If a family pays an income tax of—say, for simple explanation—$1,750 and a son's or daughter's educational costs are $1,750, a total writeoff of $1,750 would be allowed. If the family paid only $800 a year in income taxes, 2 or more tax years could be accumulated for a writeoff.

If the direct dollar-for-dollar writeoff plan would not be practical, a deduction plan similar to the $600 per individual deduction could be made. In this case, if there were three in a family, the $600 personal deduction would be allowed, or a total of $1,800. The educational costs could then be an added deduction. Credit could be accumulated where needed over a 2- to 4-year period to cover the actual yearly cost of education.

Of course, only when the student maintained satisfactory educational standards, would the institution be allowed to certify the educational writeoff deduction privilege.

It would be possible for a family to have an 8-year writeoff on educational expenses. Even if only a 50 percent writeoff allowance was made, an approach to individual initiative would be encouraged.

What would the potential gains be over the loss in tax dollars to the Federal Government? Well, it would produce startling results. Actually the Internal Revenue Bureau would eventually regain all tax dollars because it is a proven fact that the better the individual is trained the more money he will make. College graduates have higher earnings than high school graduates. These people who would benefit by an educational writeoff on income taxes would repay a thoughtful Government by progressively higher incomes and paying higher income taxes.

The Congress of the United States would not have to make large appropriations for "Federal aid to education" because this plan would be Federal aid to individual initiative.

Many parents who want to send their children to college or to a training school simply cannot afford to because of lack of money. Under this plan the lower income tax parents could now afford the education they desire for their offspring.

This program would encourage scholarship, and shortly would amaze the most doubtful people in America. We could literally "bury the Communists" with educated American citizens who would increase the productivity of our great industrial society.

Educational writeoff allowances would encourage many more people to attempt the route of education. More jobs would become available with increased enrollments (provide teaching positions, workers and in all allied fields that render services and supplies to educational institutions).

Emphasis would again be placed upon individual scholarship and brain power. Unlimited talents would be uncovered and made available for the service of our society. A great social enlightenment or social revolution would take place. Intellectual power would be released that would provide an absolute leadership for America to bring world peace.

Fantastic. A wild scheme. Figure it out for yourself. There could be no loss—no loss in tax dollars, no loss in individaul initiative, no loss in educational standards, no loss to social standing for the individual. Confidence in America would be restored. Our wealth and prosperity would increase rapidly.

Education is the only sure answer for the individual to walk the earth in dignity befitting all men. Understanding of the universe is within our reach, but the individual must be encouraged to strive for this understanding. A simple educational writeoff deduction on income taxes could be the pathway to the future of America.

FEDERAL AID TO LOCAL DISTRICTS

The most direct and most worthwhile application of "educational cost tax writeoff" would be to make a dollar for dollar writeoff on income taxes and income tax deductions of local school property (personal and real estate) taxes.

This approach to local "Federal aid to education" would have a far-reaching effect upon local support of public education. Such a program would encourage the citizens of local school districts to pay for better schools and remove an objection to these taxes that exists now.

The property owner would get direct relief on tax dollars spent for education and would show him where his tax dollars went—locally. Adequate provisions could be made for people who lease or rent property to be given the benefit of the tax writeoff. The landowner could deduct the "tax writeoff" from rent or have the renter pay the property tax, lowering the rent to the amount of the tax. However, such tax writeoffs could encourage people who now rent to purchase a home, adding to the stability of the community and the individual.

Such a program would increase the desire of people to support schools on a higher level, and realize that they had a direct part to play in supporting education.

Industries, donors and sponsors of students in high school or college education expenses could be allowed "tax writeoff" provisions. This would encourage many people who are able to help needy students to give this help and yet get tax relief.

In my estimation income "tax writeoffs" or deductions would be the most outstanding direct Federal aid that could be given to individuals and education. There is no doubt it would stimulate individual initiative and help education obtain money it needs.

These are my personal views, based upon years of experience in public education.

HERBERT S. GARY,
Principal, Portsmouth High School, Portsmouth, Ohio.

Cotton Textile Imports Pose Trade Problem for President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, in the Congressional Quarterly for the week ending February 23, 1962, an interesting article dealing with cotton textile imports and the cotton problem appeared. I feel that this is of such interest to our colleagues and the public generally that it should be incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Under unanimous consent, I include the article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

COTTON TEXTILE IMPORTS POSE TRADE PROBLEM FOR PRESIDENT

Cotton is proving to be a troublesome problem in President Kennedy's attempt to gain broader tariff negotiating powers. The administration is facing heavy and often conflicting pressures from three major sources: Domestic textile manufacturers, who want curtailment of low-wage foreign competition from such countries as Japan, India, Hong Kong, Pakistan, Portugal and Spain; foreign producers, including European allies as well as low-wage countries which have traditionally relied on their textile industries as a major source of income; and U.S. cotton growers, who want continuation of price support and export subsidies which keep the price of U.S. cotton considerably above the world market price (Weekly Report, p. 15).

In his farm message January 31, Kennedy indicated part of the dilemma: "There is a sharp conflict between the demand for cheap cotton that can compete effectively with substitute fibers and the need for support levels high enough to assure farmers an adequate income; between the interest of textile mill owners—who face stiffening world competition—in low raw material costs and the interest of the producer in income sufficiently high to cover his costs; and between our Nation's desire to expand further our world trade in cotton and to hold down a Federal budget already augmented by cotton export subsidies" (Weekly Report, p. 181).

In recent efforts to solve the problem, the President: Obtained a tentative agreement February 9 at Geneva to limit foreign sales of cotton textiles to the United States and to expand European markets for cotton textiles produced in low-wage countries; ordered hearings before the Tariff Commission on imposition of an "import equalization fee" on imported cotton goods designed to offset the cost advantage in raw cotton enjoyed by foreign manufacturers (domestic manufacturers must buy at supported prices); announced new depreciation schedules for textile machinery; and ordered a new cotton price support program, details of which were to be worked out later, which would permit increased export of raw cotton without further Government costs for export subsidies.

Parts of this program have currently run into obstacles in the hearings before the Tariff Commission, which began February 13. Conflict between domestic and foreign textile manufacturers over the domestic market led to: a threat by representatives of Japan and Hong Kong that their countries would not sign the Geneva agreement to limit foreign expansion into U.S. markets if the equalization fee were imposed, plus threats that U.S. exports of raw cotton would be imperiled; and prospects that the domestic manufacturers would press for restrictive clauses in the President's trade bill unless they got full protection through Executive action.

U.S. cottongrowers produced an estimated 14.3 million bales of raw cotton in both 1960 and 1961. Exports of raw cotton in calendar 1960 totaled 7,776,000 bales, valued at $869,214,000, while raw cotton imports for the year, controlled by a quota system, totaled 134,000 bales, valued at $23,183,000.

U.S. exports of cotton products in 1960 contained the equivalent of 486,000 bales, valued at $284,181,000. Imports of cotton products in 1960 equaled 525,500 bales and were valued at $264,649,000. In 1961, the United States imported 142,000 bales of raw cotton, valued at $26,987,000. Exports of cotton products equaled 497,100 bales while imports equaled 394,400 bales.

GENEVA AGREEMENT

The President February 15 released the details of a 19-nation agreement concluded February 9 by the Cotton Textile Committee of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The 5-year agreement, which would take effect October 1, 1962, was similar to a 1-year agree ment which took effect October 1, 1961. Nations would have until October 1, 1962, to sign the agreement.

The 19 nations tentatively agreeing to the pact were: Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, Britain (representing itself and Hong Kong), India, Japan, Norway, Pakistan, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, the United States and the six Common Market nations (Belgium, France, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and West Germany).

It would permit any importing nation threatened by market disruption in any category of cotton textiles to freeze imports for up to 2 years at the level of the first 12 months of the 15 months preceding the freeze. Following that, annual increases in cotton textile imports could be limited to 5 percent. The agreement also provided for more rapid expansion of export markets in countries which had previously mantained quantitative restrictions on imports of cotton textiles.

The effect of this agreement would be to hold the foreign share of the U.S. domestic textile market to about 6 percent by the end of the 5-year period. (It was currently slightly more than 5 percent). It would also provide expanded markets in Europe for cotton textiles produced in low wage countries.

At a briefing for Congressmen on the agreement February 15, Commerce and State Department spokesmen said that the agreement was the most restrictive signed by the United States in the last 10 years, and that the United States had to draw on a reservoir of good will in order to bring the other nations to agreement.

Seventy-five Members of Congress from textile producing areas February 16 sent a letter to President Kennedy thanking him for arranging the agreement, but asking for similar agreements on textile fibers other than cotton. Some Members expressed concern that the agreement would not be strictly administered, however. The signers of the letter were among the 126 Representatives and 36 Senators who sent a letter to the President June 23, 1961, criticizing the President's textile actions. (For background on earlier actions see 1961 Almanac p. 67; 1961 Weekly Report p. 1347.) One, Representative CARL VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia, spokesman for the House textile group, had also sent a letter to Kennedy January 24, 1962, calling for country and commodity category import quotas.

On the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture the President November 21 asked the Tariff Commission to study the advisability of imposing an equalization fee of 8.5 cents a pound on the cotton content of textile imports. (The Government pays exporters a subsidy of 8.5 cents a pound on both raw cotton and cotton content of manufactured goods to make these items competitive at world prices. Thus, the fee would equalize the competitive advantage on the U.S. markets enjoyed by foreign manufacturers who buy cotton at the world market price.) The President's petition was made under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act on the grounds that cotton goods coming into the United States were reducing domestic markets for raw cotton, thus interfering with the Department of Agriculture's price support program (Weekly Report p. 15).

Hearings on the proposed fee began February 13. Commissioner Ben D. Dorfman said that the Commission was not limited to the 8.5-cent fee in making its recommendations. Robert C. Sherman, Director of the Cotton Division of the Department of Agriculture's Foreign Agricultural Service, testified that without the fee, the import of processed cotton materials would interfere with and render effective the cotton program and operations of the Department. Sherman recommended the fee to help control what he called a tidal wave of imports. Karl D. Loos, representing 47 cotton growing and textile associations, urged that the Commission recommend immediate imposition of the fee.

Hearings continued February 14, 15, 16, 19, and 23. Highlights of the testimony included: testimony by Sherman that the tentative agreement reached at Geneva (see above) would still leave need for Tariff Commission action on the import equalization fee because it would not cut the present level of imports; testimony from Senators and Representatives from textile areas supporting the fee, including Senator BENJAMIN A. SMITH, II, Democrat, of Massachusetts, who appeared as spokesman for a conference of New England Senators, Representative W. J. BRYAN DORN, Democrat, of South Carolina, who appeared as spokesman for the House textile group and presented a letter signed by 95 Representatives supporting the fee, and Representative BASIL L. WHITENER, Democrat, of North Carolina, who called the foreign textile industry "an economic Frankenstein's monster which should be destroyed immediately."

Opposing the fee were representatives of the Common Market, Japanese, and Hong Kong textile industries, and of American importers of foreign-made textiles, William J. Barnhard, representing Common Market textile interests, opposed the hearings as illegal, on grounds that the President had not "made a finding" before recommending hearings, as he was directed to do by section 22. Barnhard said the fee would lead to a decline in Common Market imports of U.S. raw cotton (currently 47 percent of the common market's supply), and possibly to duties on U.S. textiles.

Mike M. Masaoka, an economist representing Japanese industry, said Japan currently buys about 1,600,000 bales of U.S. raw cotton a year, about one-half her total consumption, at a value of about $200 million, and exports to the United States the equivalent of about 130,000 bales of cotton, at a value of about $70 million, in the form of manufactured goods. Shigemitsu Suzuki, chief of the Japanese delegation to the Geneva cotton meeting, said he would recommend that Japan refuse to sign the agreement, if the fee were imposed. Leon Henderson, representing the Association of National Textile importers, called the fee a return to "McKinley's wall," and said the proposal "thwarts" the trade program "to which the President (has) committed himself."

At a press conference February 22, Suzuki warned that Britain, France, Italy, Hong Kong, and Japan had made it public that they would not sign the Geneva agreement if the fee were imposed. The Japanese Parliament's lower house February 16 unanimously urged the Japanese Government to make a strong stand against the fee.

The Tariff Commission was not expected to make its report until April.

DEPRECIATION ALLOWANCES

President Kennedy February 15 announced that the Internal Revenue Service had completed its revision of depreciation schedules for the textile industry, designed to bring depreciation schedules into line with current obsolescence rates. The schedules formerly in effect were established in 1942. The White House said that the revised schedules would "enable the industry to speed modernization of its equipment to meet foreign competition and provide more jobs for American workers." On the average, the new schedule allowed owners to claim depreciation tax deductions over a 40 percent shorter period than formerly.

The revision of the depreciation schedules was undertaken as a part of the President's May 2, 1961, program of assistance to the textile industry (1961 Almanac p. 67).

COTTON CONTROLS

In his January 31 farm message, the President said he would ask for a program to establish the cotton acreage allotment at a level which would produce the cotton needed for domestic use and a specified portion of the export market; and authorize growers to exceed their allotment by 30 percent, and to market the cotton grown on the excess acreage "under a plan which would net the grower approximately the world price." He said that this would keep price support expenditures down without penalizing the efficient growers. The Department of Agriculture is expected to send a cotton bill to Congress within a month.

The Department of Agriculture February 15 announced that the current export subsidy of 8.5 cents a pound will be extended to the 1962 crop marketing year, which begins August 1. The subsidy is subject to change without prior notice as the difference between the domestic price of cotton and the world price fluctuates. The Department also announced that the price support rate for the 1962 crop will average 31.88 cents a pound, the same as in 1961.

RELATED DEVELOPMENT

In a speech before the Charlotte, N.C., Chamber of Commerce, Secretary of State Dean Rusk Feberuary 21 said that tariff protection for the textile industry would be destructive to private enterprise. He stressed the benefits to the textile industry of the

Geneva agreement on cotton, and tax relief, loans, and technical assistance which are part of the President's trade program. Rusk said that North Carolina had exported more than $600 million worth of agricultural and manufactured goods in 1960, and said that the State had much to gain and little or nothing to lose from the President's program.

Magnificent Resolution on Proper Local-Federal Relationship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEM MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I would ask to be spread upon the RECORD the following full text of a resolution from Crescent City, Calif. It is a most well reasoned resolution expressing the sincere convictions of the city council, and expresses in compelling terms the basic relationship between our Federal and local government. The resolution, reminding us of this is so very timely and necessary. I appreciate the opportunity to present this fine and spirited resolution for examination by Members of Congress. I wish to commend Mayor William Peepe as well as Council Members Rupert, Manosar, Free, and Gargaetas for formulating and sending this resolution for my attention. I wish to join with them in applauding the sentiments expressed, and say that I shall do all in my power to implement its objectives.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION 764

Whereas the growth of political and economic power in a centralized government demonstrates the urgent need to return to the principles for which our forefathers fought and died in the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas we, as did the founders of this Nation, must, with determined purpose, turn away from the destructive trend toward an all—powerful paternalistic Government, and re-establish, the individual, with his natural and inalienable rights to "life, liberty and pursuit of happiness" as the center of things and reassign to government its primary role as a responsible servant, not master, of the American people; and

Whereas our Federal Constitution provides a delicate, yet adequate, system of built-in restraints against the accumulation of arbitrary power and the proven tendency of governments to expand in the direction of absolutism; and

Whereas our restless desire to display love of country; our faith in basic American traditions, institutions, and principles; pride in our unequaled heritage; recognition of the imperative necessity for more affirmatively exercising the duties and responsibilities of citizenship, requires greater participation in the processes of our Government; and

Whereas formal expression of our ideals, philosophy and guiding principles should be made and promulgated as extensively and expeditiously as practical: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

1. That our Republic cannot long endure unless the American people, individually and collectively, continually insist and demand that the Federal and State Governments confine their respective powers and regulations to matters within certain constitutionally and historically designated areas, and leave to the local governments the power and authority to fulfill their rightful functions and obligations;

2. That the American tradition of home rule and self-determination as applied to local government should be preserved and strengthened;

3. That public officials should, whenever consistent with our Federal and State constitutions, divest themselves of excess power, given to them or taken by them, and reaffirm their respect for such fundamentals as truth, justice, charity, humility and their faith in the basic concepts of the United States of America, as a Republic, bound together by moral and religious principles and governed by great and unmatched concepts of limited Government and exercised within a protective structure of law which, though strict and sometimes unyielding, is at the same time compassionate and responsive;

4. That, subject to the apparent need for some uniformity, and a common frame of reference, local governments should be reasonably free to determine the scope and extent of services each will render, and to establish appropriate internal organizations and operating policies free from Federal and State supervision and control;

5. That trained and experienced personnel in local areas, familiar with local problems and qualified to advise and administer local affairs should be utilized to the fullest extent;

6. That, men in public office, at all levels, must reevaluate their positions of trust and leadership and must be continually alert to keep their constituents honestly and fully informed, lest an uniformed public give up liberty and freedom on the erroneous assumption that the loss will help achieve other goals of growth or security;

7. That, instead of striving for more efficient control and regulation of individuals, consideration should be given to establishment of a National Citizens Committee, which would as its sole duty and obligation, guard against excessive governmental controls, and consolidation of dictatorial powers; encroachments which affect our fundamental legal processes as spelled out in the Federal and State constitutions; disregard of the constitutional principles of limited Government; and abuse of individual rights and freedoms;

8. That, while expressing appreciation for our liberty and freedom under the greatest democratic Government ever established by man, and before that delicate balance between freedom and total governmental control becomes tipped beyond the American peoples powers to restore, responsible citizens must emphasize the fact that political power, at all levels of Government, must be kept within its proper bounds, lest we fail to meet our grave and perhaps last challenge, to preserve and extend freedom.

Are We Weakening?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, despite the strong talk emanating at times from the President, apparently the people of Berlin are not quite convinced.

I hope we do not back down in any respect. It would be most helpful if we could get consistent assurances from the President to this effect, without having his closest advisers—many of whom are "agrarian reformers"—making statements contradictory to the President's pronouncements.

In an article appearing in today's New York Herald Tribune, Marguerite Higgins comments on this situation:

THE RING OF DOUBT—II

(By Marguerite Higgins)

BERLIN.—"Is there a difference in Berlin morale today and in the time of the first blockade? Yes, and I think the main thing is this: Back in 1948 all of us Berliners were made to feel almost as heroes for resisting Russian pressure. Today we feel that our outspoken feeling against the Communists is almost an embarrassment to the administration. During the blockade we were proud of the sense of wonder and excitement among Americans that all of us preferred to suffer cold and hardship rather than give in to the Communists. Today by contrast we hear constantly about the difficulties of maintaining Berlin's freedom, its so-called geographical disadvantage, etc. It is as if, by merely existing in this particular location we are a constant source of irritation to Washington in its efforts to reach a modus vivendi with the Russians."

This was spoken recently by a Berlin newspaperwoman who also happened to serve as this correspondent's secretary and right-hand man during the 1948 Soviet blockade.

Is her's a parochial point of view? After all the Presidential assurances from Washing, high-level morale-building visits, etc., American officials can perhaps be pardoned for believing that the city of Berlin, like an overanxious wife, makes such a persistent clamor for evermore ardent expressions of American affections as to cause irritations where none need exist.

But Berlin's doubts are not so simply accounted for. These anxieties stem mainly from the conclusion among top authorities in the city—authorities intimately versed in the tactics of communism—and among the people that there is all too frequently a cleavage between views in Berlin on how to deal with Soviet pressure and the views of certain top-level—and often prevailing—State Department and White House advisers.

The Washington school that alarms Berliners is the one that believes the Soviet system is satiable; that a solution—as distinguished from a mere truce—is possible; in other words that an accommodation between East and West can be achieved through some sort of compromise that would make it worthwhile—and politically feasible in the Communist world—for the Russians to abandon their announced intentions to use all means short of nuclear war to become the first successful one-worlders—Communist one-worlders.

And if Berlin's morale, the West's first line of defense in Europe, has managed recently to stage a comeback, it is in part because there are indications that President Kennedy has not yet chosen between the satiable and insatiable school of advisers. So Berliners have great hopes that he will eventually side with their view of Bolshevik insatiability which, naturally, they consider the only realistic one. And the recent visit to Berlin of Attorney General Robert Kennedy, whose plain speaking won him not just Berlin's affection but—a far rarer prize—their respect, has reinforced that hope.

Says a veteran Berlin official: "A crucial example of this conflict on dealing with the Russians is the question of what is or is not provocative. It is our conviction that the Russians stand to gain enormous and unnecessary advantage over misplaced and confused Western notions about what is pro-

vocative. Consider the case of Steinstuecken [a tiny community outside the American sector of Berlin, which, however, has historically been an administrative part of the American-occupied part of the city]. It is America's right, and indeed duty, to look after this enclave. And yet after August 13 when your authorities in Berlin began to exercise this right [flying over the small amount of intervening East German territory between the American sector of Berlin and Steinstuecken by helicopter] some Americans in high places denounced this as provocative.

"It has always amazed us," the Berlin official continued, "that Americans such as Ambassador Thompson in Moscow are so convinced that soft words and friendly gestures make an impression on the Russians. Aren't you transfering your own values without evidence that they mean anything to the Russians?

"Those who believe Russia is satiable," he concluded, "think that socalled restraint—such as ignoring Steinstuecken—will bring counterrestraint from the Russians. Our side believes that a failure to exercise Western rights will merely encourage the Russians to usurp them. Thus the comparative freedom of the little enclave of Steinstuecken exists in our opinion only because of active American demonstration of concern. Sometimes it seems to us the West used the excuse of nonprovocation to give moral gloss to unjustified passivity in the face of Soviet pressure. And what troubles us is that this thought may also cross the mind of the Communists, constituting the true provocation—a provocation to move in at the first scent of hesitation."

Erasmus Hall, Brooklyn, N.Y—We Lead the Nation in Science Scholars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, last week a group of 40 boys and girls selected from 23,768 high school seniors were invited to Washington for the 5-day science talent institute, March 1 through 5. During which they were judged for $34,250 in Westinghouse science scholarships and awards in the final phase of the science talent search conducted by Science Clubs of America, an activity of Science Service which also conducts the National Science Fair-International.

The achieving of honors in the science talent search, earned by the top 10 percent of those who complete entries in the science talent search, is an evidence of science ability and interest which can be taken into consideration by colleges and universities in admissions and granting of scholarships. For this reason this honor list is distributed to all the universities and colleges of the United States utilizing a list furnished by the American Council on Education.

The science talent search was the pioneering endeavor to discover at the senior high school year level those who have the potentialities to become the research scientists of the future.

All boys and girls awarded honors in the science talent search are considered so outstanding that any institution of higher learning will be justified in considering their abilities carefully.

It is my great privilege to record that 5 of the students out of the 40 selected are students of Erasmus Hall High School of Brooklyn, N.Y. It is the first time in the history of the Westinghouse national science talent search that any school has had five top winners. I wish to commend John F. McNeill, principal of Erasmus, and in particular the instructors in the science department without whose guidance and interest this would not have been possible.

The names of the winners of whom we, in Brooklyn, are all so proud are Carl Feit, 18 Maple Street, Brooklyn, N.Y.; Herbert I. Fried, 1792 East 22d Street, Brooklyn, N.Y.; Peter E. Grafstein, 921 Washington Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y.; Miriam Herzfeld, 80 Woodruff Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y.; and Ralph Zuckerman, 711 Ocean Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y.

I am pleased that our President, John F. Kennedy, saw fit on the occasion of the visit of the science award winners to the White House to accord special recognition to the Erasmus students.

The Recommendations of the Washington Real Estate Board To Revise the Zoning Regulations of the District of Columbia Are Clearly in the Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the recommendations of the Washington Real Estate Board to revise the zoning regulations of the District of Columbia are clearly in the public interest and should have broad community support.

The Washington Real Estate Board is one of the outstanding organizations in the Nation's Capital, and is made up of many of its leading citizens. What they sought were changes that would make apartment buildings more economically feasible by allowing from two to three more stories than are permitted by present regulations.

The Washington Real Estate Board recommended the rezoning into R-5-D use of the area from Connecticut Avenue east to 14th Street and between Massachusetts Avenue and Florida Avenue, except for those portions presently zoned Special Purpose and Commercial. This proposal was made to first, satisfy the desire of many people to live in the central portion of the City of Washington; second, to provide investment opportunity; third, to provide a larger tax base; and, fourth, prevent the necessity for costly urban renewal by Government action.

In support of its recommendation states that—

In many cities throughout this country, a recentralization process is taking place, a large part of which involves large apartment projects. The attractions of central-city living are many—less traffic to fight, more cultural activities readily accessible, and so forth. The attractiveness of these qualities make properly located apartments sound investments, and, at the same time, gives a larger tax base. To realize this economic potential in Washington, D.C., it is necessary to have properly located land zoned for high-rise apartments. Also, this land should contain enough area to prevent monopoly prices, which prices discourage investment.

The area we propose for rezoning is an in-town, highly desirable area close to employment and borders the good areas of Massachusetts Avenue and Connecticut Avenue. It is also an area where investors would be willing to invest.

The Evening Star, Washington, D.C., March 2, 1962, reported on March 2, 1962, that the National Capital Planning Commission turned thumbs down on this Washington Real Estate Board rezoning plan to encourage intown high-rise apartment construction.

According to the Evening Star:

A change in zoning for the area northeast of Dupont circle and Logan circle would be premature at this time, the Commission decided.

It also would be harmful to proposals for apartment construction even closer to downtown, the Commission added.

I find it little short of astounding that a plan to "prevent the necessity for costly urban renewal by Government action" was so quickly rejected by the National Capital Planning Commission.

The National Capital Planning Commission has consistently favored only those plans which involve the expenditure of vast amounts of Federal funds.

The National Capital Planning Commission gives its wholehearted support only to such urban renewal plans as these:

First. The Southwest urban renewal project in Southwest Washington in which the Federal Government has an investment of more than $70 million.

This project is notable for its $325-a-month luxury apartments. Clearly, people who can afford such apartments do not need Federal aid, and, especially, from a program which is essentially a slum-clearance program.

Second. Parking lots requiring the destruction of houses which would cost up to $50,000 to $75,000 each to replace are planned in the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project. According to the Evening Star of November 24, 1960, the gross cost of this project is $24,811,000, and the net cost $17,751,000.

The Evening Star, February 28, 1962, reported that the plan being developed by the National Capital Planning Commission for the Adams-Morgan project will be submitted to two neighborhood organizations in the project area, and later to block groups there. No mention is made of any presentation of the plan to the Kalorama Citizens Association, or the Kalorama Triangle Restoration Society, the two major groups of citizens in the area.

The Kalorama Citizens Association and the Kalorama Triangle Restoration

Society have both been critical of the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project plan being developed by the National Capital Planning Commission.

Like the members of the Washington Real Estate Board, the fine members of the Kalorama Citizens Association and the Kalorama Triangle Restoration Society believe in the ability of private industry to do the job of restoring the city without the necessity of vast expenditures of funds by the Federal Government.

One of the Nation's leading housing authorities, Harry A. Barbour, has developed for the Kalorama Citizens Association a parking plan, which would be fair to the merchants and citizens of the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project area, and which would save the taxpayers millions of dollars. The National Capital Planning Commission has shown no interest in this privately developed plan, and no concern for the money it would save.

There are a number of legislative proposals in the Congress which would help and encourage private industry to take a larger and more significant part in the renewal of the city of Washington. One of these measures is my H.R. 10364, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a depreciation deduction for the wear and tear of real property used as the taxpayer's principal residence. The National Association of Home Builders supports the depreciation approach embodied in H.R. 10364.

Under this bill each homeowner would be permitted to deduct an amount each year computed by taking into account the cost—or other basis of the property—the useful life, and the salvage value of the property.

But legislation is only part of the problem.

What is more important is the appointment of citizens to the National Capital Planning Commission who believe in private property, who believe in the rights of private citizens to be secure in their homes, and who believe that private industry should be given an all-out opportunity to rebuild, restore, and renovate the city of Washington.

I include the recommendation of the Washington Real Estate Board which I have been discussing, and I commend it to my colleagues as a better urban renewal plan than any plan which has been developed by the National Capital Planning Commission in recent years. I particularly like that aspect of it which depends upon private investment rather than a vast infusion of Federal funds with the willful misuse of the rights of eminent domain for parking lot purposes as proposed by the National Capital Planning Commission in the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE WASHINGTON REAL ESTATE BOARD TO REVISE THE D.C. ZONING REGULATIONS

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1

Rezone into R-5-D use the area from Connecticut Avenue east to 14th Street and between Massachusetts Avenue and Florida Avenue, except those portions presently zoned "Special purpose" and "Commercial."

This proposal is made to: 1. Satisfy the desire of many people to live in the central portion of this city; 2. To provide investment opportunity; 3. To provide a larger tax base; 4. Prevent the necessity for costly urban renewal by Government action.

In many cities throughout this country, a recentralization process is taking place, a large part of which involves large apartment projects. The attractions of central-city living are many—less traffic to fight, more cultural activities readily accessible, et cetera. The attractiveness of these qualities make properly located apartments sound investments, and, at the same time, gives a larger tax base. To realize this economic potential in Washington, D.C., it is necessary to have properly located land zoned for high-rise apartments. Also, this land should contain enough area to prevent monopoly prices, which prices discourage investment.

The area we propose for rezoning is an in-town, highly desirable area close to employment and borders the good areas of Massachusetts Avenue and Connecticut Avenue. It is also an area where investors would be willing to invest.

To document in a general way these opinions, we have taken a typical square, analyzed it, and then projected the major statistics to the area as a whole, making certain general conclusions.

The square that we selected as typical is square 153, which is bounded by S Street on the north, New Hampshire Avenue on the east, R Street on the south, and 18th Street on the west; and it is bisected by Riggs Place. The square is fairly centrally located, and it contains a variety of property types and boundary streets. It is presently zoned 59 percent R-5-B and 41 percent R-5-C.

Exhibit A shows the existing statistics. A summary of the pertinent information is as follows:

Area of square 153 (square feet)	135,973
Total assessed valuation	$1,082,449.00
Real estate taxes (including any tax-exempt property)	24,896.33

Exhibit B consists of a series of photographs of square 153.

Exhibit C shows the maximum possible potential use of square 153 if it were changed to R-5-D zoning. Here is the summary of the main points:

Total assessed valuation	$8,890,420.50
Total real estate taxes	204,479.67

These figures represent the theoretical maximum use, and we now subtract from these figures the present assessed valuation, and the present real estate taxes (including tax-exempt property) and we get:

Theoretical maximum increase in assessed valuation	$7,807,971
Theoretical maximum increase in real estate taxes	179,582

We realize that probably not more than 25 percent of the land area that we propose for change in zoning would be used for the high-rise apartments, but that in order to get this 25 percent, that the land value for a higher use would have to be as great as the existing use of land with existing structures. Low-density zoning would not make assemblages economically possible, whereas high-density apartment zoning would.

Exhibit D shows that the total area within the boundaries examined by this study is 7,055,000 square feet; and that square 153 comprises 1.9 percent of this total.

Exhibit E shows the estimated area in the total study area which would not be rezoned; i.e., property now zoned "R-5-D," "Commercial," or "Special purpose." This total comes to 2,221,000 square feet.

Subtracting this latter figure from the total area, we get 4,834,000 square feet to be rezoned, of which Square 153 comprises 2.8 percent.

Using this 2.8-percent figure, we get for the total area, a total theoretical maximum increase in assessed valuation of $278,856,125 and a total practical (25 percent of this) increase of assessed valuation of $69,714,031. We also get a total theoretical maximum increase in real estate taxes of $6,413,667 and a total practical increase in real estate taxes of $1,603,417.

Besides this increase in real estate taxes, several other beneficial results would come from a change to R-5-D zoning: 1. An increase of investment of about $109 million (total construction cost of new construction for Square 153 from exhibit C, multiplied by 25 percent, and this by 100/2.8); 2. An increase in employment through construction of new buildings; 3. The new structures would attract high-class occupants; 4. The remaining structures would attract high-class occupants, and their rehabilitation would follow.

Exhibit F shows photos of various properties located in the area suggested to be rezoned to R-5-D, along with several apartments built in the R-5-D zoning elsewhere.

Exhibit C—Maximum possible potential use of Square 153, if zoning were changed to R-5-D

Total area of ground (square feet)	135,973
Floor-area-ratio of R-5-D	6
Total building gross floor area permitted (square feet)	815,838

Figuring on a land cost of $1,500 per apartment unit, we get a:

Total land cost of	$1,440,000.00
Add construction cost at $15 per square foot of buildings	12,237,570.00
Total potential true value	13,677,570
Total potential assessed value (65 percent of this)	8,890,420.50
Total potential taxes	204,479.67

(Another interesting item: Total land value of $1,440,000 divided by the total ground area of 135,973 square feet will give a value of $10.59 per-square-foot true value; also, because of the present scarcity of R-5-D zoned property, prices for such zoned land have been over $15 per square foot and requiring high rents.

Exhibit D

The sample square selected, namely No. 153, contains 136,209 square feet. The entire area to be recommended for zoning R-5-D contains 7,054,803 square feet. Therefore: Our sample is 1.9 percent of the total.

These figures were arrived at by an actual total of square No. 153 and of all the odd-shaped squares in the whole area. The rest were done by rule measurement on the platbook, with appropriate deductions made for intervening streets, alleys, etc. We can assure you that these approximates are reasonably accurate; we spot-checked several in each plan to be sure that the rule measurement was close to the actual totaling of each lot.

It is our suggestion that the taxable income on our example, namely square No. 153, be reduced to dollars. Then, convert this same square to the maximum allowed under R-5-D and the resulting taxable return produced. This will, we believe, demonstrate our point.

Exhibit E

Estimated approximate area of various zonings.

	Square feet
Special purpose	853,000
Commercial:	
C-2	428,000
C-3-B	111,000
C-M-2	267,000
C-M-3	351,000
Total	1,157,000
Residential R-5-D	211,000
Total area not to be rezoned	2,221,000

(Calculations of area made by approximate rule measurements in platbook.)

National Defense Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, during the period of February 12 to 22 each year, the Reserve Officers Association sponsors the observance throughout the country of National Defense Week. This period, falling as it does between the birth anniversaries of two of the Nation's great Presidents, offers a splendid opportunity, and obligation, to all of us to contemplate the importance of national defense, and the role each citizen has in preserving national security.

The President of the United States recently directed a message to the Reserve Officers Association upon the occasion of National Defense Week. This carries a message of some importance to all of us, and I am submitting it to the RECORD for the information of all concerned:

"CITIZEN-RESERVIST HAS UNIQUE ROLE"

With the observance of National Defense Week, February 12-22, President Kennedy, himself a member of ROA, sent the following letter:

"To the Reserve Officers Association:

"In your sponsorship of National Defense Week, you are helping our citizens to sharpen their awareness of our continuing need for a strong defense. As one who has served, along with many of you, I know how important citizen backing can be to the men and women of our Armed Forces. As the Commander in Chief, I appreciate your past service and support, and I anticipate a fervent continuation this year and in the future.

"The citizen-soldier, either on active duty or in his place in the community in time of peace, has a unique role in our country. Through many wars, from the American Revolution to World War II and Korea, the minuteman spirit has been a matter of pride and acclaim among our people. This spirit was a truly unselfish one in its broadest aspect, and I hope that unselfishness will persist and will be your guiding principle whenever the broad interests of national security as considered, by your association, as well as by your individual members.

"On behalf of the men and women of the Armed Forces, I salute your observance of National Defense Week.

"JOHN F. KENNEDY."

Mr. Speaker, I also submit for the information of the Members of this House an article published in the current—March—issue of the Officer, the monthly magazine of the Reserve Officers Association, written especially for that fine publication by Gen. George H. Decker, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army.

This article deals especially with the reservists of the Army, and of their performance in the recent callup, in which nearly 120,000 Army reservists are serving today during the buildup of the Active Army.

General Decker, who ranks with the most competent and most dedicated of the Army Chiefs of Staff in recent history, himself is a graduate of a civilian college and obtained his Army commission by the ROTC route. He therefore has the additional advantage of knowing and understanding the reserve officers of the Nation, most of whom are ROTC graduates.

There are many of us who are Members of this House who are now, or have been, Reserve officers. I am sure that the other officers, as do I, cherish their association with the Army, and appreciate the opportunity of reading General Decker's views on the reserves.

The article follows:

THE LATEST CHAPTER IN THE ARMY RESERVE'S SUCCESS STORY

(By Gen. George H. Decker)

(NOTE.—Gen. George H. Decker became Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, in October 1960 after serving as Vice Chief of Staff, and earlier as Commander in Chief, United Nations Command/commander, U.S. Forces, Korea, and commanding general, 8th U.S. Army, Seoul, Korea.

(General Decker was an ROTC graduate of Lafayette College in 1924, and his military career began June 15, 1924, when he was commissioned a second lieutenant of Infantry in the Regular Army. His first assignment was at Plattsburgh Barracks, N.Y., with the 26th Infantry. In August 1936, he was selected for attendance at the Command and General Staff School, Fort Leavenworth, and upon graduation served with the 10th Infantry at Fort Thomas, Ky., and Fort McClellan, Ala. Following the outbreak of World War II, General Decker was transferred to Fort Sam Houston, Tex., for duty with the 3d Army as Deputy Chief of Staff in August 1942. In February 1943, he was ordered to the southwest Pacific area to become Deputy Chief of Staff of 6th Army. In May 1944 he became Chief of Staff of 6th Army and served in this capacity throughout the New Guinea campaign, the operations to recapture Leyte, Mindoro and Luzon in the Philippine Islands, and during the early phases of the occupation of Japan. Upon inactivation of the 6th Army in January 1946, General Decker returned to Washington, D.C., for assignment to Headquarters, Army Ground Forces, and 2 months later was transferred to Army Service Forces Headquarters. In July 1946, he was appointed Deputy Commander and Chief of Staff of U.S. Army Forces, Middle Pacific, with station in Hawaii. In June 1948, he returned once again to the United States to assume command of the 5th Infantry Division at Fort Jackson, S.C. In March 1950 he was assigned to the Office of the Chief of Staff of the Army for duty with the Office of the Comptroller of the Army, and the following month was designated Chief of the Budget Division. General Decker was named Comptroller of the Army in May 1952. After almost 3 years as Comptroller of the Army, he assumed command of VII Corps, stationed at Stuttgart, Germany, in February 1955. On June 1, 1956 he was selected to become deputy commander in chief, U.S. European Command, stationed at Camp des Loges, near Paris, France, and on July 1, 1957, he became commander in chief, United Nations Command/commander, U.S. Forces, Korea/commanding general, 8th U.S. Army. General Decker's next assignment, on August 1, 1959, was as Vice Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, in which capacity he served until September 30, 1960. He assumed his present duty as Chief of Staff, U.S. Army on October 1, 1960.)

In time of war or national emergency, the Active Army looks to the Reserve components to provide efficiently organized and well-trained units ready for immediate mobilization, rapid expansion, and prompt deployment. In addition to these units, the U.S. Army Reserve provides selected personnel whose highly individualized and specialized skills are indispensable to the orderly expansion of the Army.

The recent successful buildup of Army combat power has once again demonstrated the unquestioned ability of the Army Reserve to successfully accomplish its increasingly demanding mission. The Army buildup added yet another striking chapter to the Army Reserve's story of service to the Nation. A review of that chapter is in order.

The year 1961 was one of increasing tensions. Berlin, Laos, Vietnam, the Congo, Cuba: everywhere one looked—it seemed—there was a crisis or potential crisis. In this highly charged atmosphere, then, the President announced that he was requesting the Congress to authorize an increase in active Army strength from 875,000 to approximately 1 million men. At the same time, the President requested authorization to order to active duty certain Ready Reserve units and individual reservists. This was the only way an immediate, meaningful increase in Army strength could be achieved.

By Joint Resolution, the Congress approved the urgent requests of the Commander-in-Chief. He was authorized to order to active duty for not more than 12 months any unit or individual member of the Ready Reserve. The Congress, however, limited the callup to not more than 250,000 ready reservists.

Some 75,000 members of the Army Reserve answered their Nation's call to the colors. Of these, approximately 36,000 were in the 444 mobilized company and detachment size USAR units. The remainder were requested individually as fillers for both Army Reserve and other mobilized Reserve component units.

At the outset of the emergency, and the partial mobilization that it necessitated, it was recognized that the U.S. Army Reserve would make a truly indispensable contribution to national security and to world peace. For the call of reservists to active duty would permit the Army to achieve quickly the improved posture that the dual pressure of events and free world commitments had made necessary.

Within a few months after the callup, more that 40,000 seasoned troops had been deployed to Europe. They are there now, guarding the frontiers of freedom with our gallant NATO allies, and evidencing to potential adversaries our unshakable resolve to stand by our pledge to the people of West Berlin.

Availability of a trained Ready Reserve force made feasible the rapid build-up of the combat-ready forces in strategic reserve in the continental United States, and facilitated the rapid expansion of the Army's training base.

As specific examples, the 301st Logistical Command (U.S. Army Reserve) now on active duty at Fort Bragg, N.C., assumed the vital missions of several Army units deployed to Europe; and the 100th U.S. Army Reserve Division (training), now at Fort Chaffee, Ark., took over a substantial share of the additional training load.

The U.S. Army Reserve can be justifiably proud of the significant contribution it has made to our present high state of military preparedness. Our strategic reserve has been strengthened. Our training program has been expanded. Our deployed forces have been reinforced. And all of these key steps were taken with the U.S. Army Reserves timely assistance when it was sorely needed. In short, the investment which the American people have made in their Army Reserve program has paid a big dividend at exactly the right time.

In recognizing the splendid performance of the Army Reserve, however, one must not forget that it involved individual hardship and sacrifice. Those of us who are professional soldiers know full well and appreciate these sacrifices. They are not easy. But sacrifice has always been inseparable from the soldier's tradition, and there is no one

of us who would not make any sacrifice to preserve the peace.

It is now clear that the partial mobilization of the Reserve Components accomplished its intended purpose. It is equally clear that it was accomplished with precision and dispatch. As Secretary of the Army Stahr has pointed out: "The call up of Army National Guard and Army Reserve units and personnel has gone exceedingly well. It has been far superior to any previous mobilization in this country."

The partial mobilization has also had valuable secondary effects. First and foremost, it has provided today's Army with extremely valuable experience that can only be duplicated in time of crisis. As experienced officers, the members of ROA can appreciate that dry runs have merit, whether in weapons familiarization or high-level planning. But they can appreciate equally that the maximum benefits comes from "firing for record." The experience all of us have gained from the recent call up may well be a deciding factor in some future circumstance as yet unforeseen.

But the partial mobilization has also pointed up a few areas where improvements are necessary. Currently these problem areas are the subject of rigorous analysis by the Army staff, and I am sure that a sound solution will be forthcoming. Solution of these problems will guarantee an even more effective mobilization in the future if one should be necessary. This increased preparedness and effectiveness is the goal toward which all of us are working.

Discussion of problem areas, however, must never obscure the basic truth brought home to all of us so clearly in the recent callup. The U.S. Army Reserve can perform its mission, did perform it, and will continue to be depended upon to perform it in the future.

The callup, then, has not—as some have suggested—weakened the Army's fundamental belief in and commitment to a viable Reserve system. On the contrary, it has confirmed our belief that a strong Army Reserve program is essential to national security.

The high state of preparedness evidenced in the callup is, to be sure, primarily a tribute to the dedication and devotion of the reservists themselves as well as tribute to the hard work of active Army personnel on duty with the Reserve components. But one must recognize that the splendid performance of the reservists is also a tribute to the work of professional organizations like ROA, which has so successfully sought to imbue its members with the loftiest of ideals. ROA can well be proud of the part it has played in encouraging reservists to achieve the highest standard of professional military excellence.

From its beginning nearly 40 years ago, the Reserve Officers Association has worked tirelessly, ceaselessly, and selflessly to insure that the Nation has a dynamic Reserve program, a program with strength in depth but one still flexible enough to adapt itself successfully to unending innovations in military tactics, weaponry, and organizational concepts.

The days ahead will be days of tremendous change for the Army. But there will be, I am confident, no change in the fruitful relationship of trust and cooperation that has always existed—and must continue to exist—between the Army and the ROA.

In the future, as Army reservists return to their civilian pursuits, they will go not only with the good wishes of their comrades in arms in the Active Army but also with the heartfelt thanks of their fellow citizens throughout America. For a grateful Nation has learned once again that its citizen-soldiers are ready, willing, and able to do all that their country asks * * * and then some.

Rendevous With Freedom or Communist Enslavement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, President Ernest L. Wilkinson of Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah, recently reviewed the basic tenents of conservative, fundamental Americanism in a speech delivered before the California Taxpayers' Association's 36th annual membership meeting in Los Angeles. The speech is discussed in a column by George Todt which appeared in the February 20, 1960, issue of the Los Angeles Herald Examiner. Under unanimous consent I include Mr. Todt's column in printed in the appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION: FREEDOM AT STAKE?

"Government is not reason, it is not eloquence—it is a force. Like fire, it is a dangerous servant and a fearful master."

GEORGE WASHINGTON.

Never have I heard a finer address on the American free enterprise system than one by President Ernest L. Wilkinson of Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah, when he appeared as principal speaker before the California Taxpayers' Association's 36th annual membership meeting in Los Angeles last week.

His speech was absolutely superb and ought to be "must" reading for everybody who disagrees that socialism is the wave of the future.

May I suggest that those of my readers who are interested might write Dr. Wilkinson at BYU and request a mimeographed copy of his remarkable address.

I consider this gentleman one of the great educators of the Nation. He is a real free enterpriser and champions the basic tenets of conservative, fundamental Americanism.

TOP EDUCATOR

He was a successful lawyer when he took over the helm at BYU in 1952. Then the total enrollment was 5,000 students. Seven years later, it was up to 12,000—and now the "Y" is the largest educational institution in the Intermountain area.

The eminent university president is also chancellor of the unified educational system of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. He is highly qualified in his field.

Here are some of the high points of his address:

"Each generation of freemen has its rendezvous with destiny, for freedom can never be vouchsafed from one generation to another. One generation, as did our Revolutionary Fathers, may win it on the battlefield. Another generation, as we are now doing, may allow their government to wrest their freedom from them.

"Our rendezvous today will determine whether we shall continue to live in a 'land of the free and home of the brave'. Or whether we shall so worship the false god of paternalistic government that, in due time, we shall join 20 recorded civilizations which have come and gone—not by conquest from without, but because of the surrender of individual freedom and responsibility to a centralized, all-powerful government.

ON TWO FEET

"Everywhere we hear the hue and cry of Soviet accomplishments in education, science, and space technology. To face this challenge the President of the United States, with statesmanlike vision, has summoned us to duty with these words: 'And so, my fellow Americans; ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.'

"This has the ring of our Revolutionary Fathers, who pledged, on the altar of freedom, their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor.

"On the other hand, the same President, in derogation of his 1961 inaugural address, has now proposed an ambitious series of Government projects, ranging from oceans to outer space, many of which confer special privileges or grant Federal bounties to various segments of our society."

TEST GOES ON

"Among these generous Federal proposals are: Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools, and to colleges; new grants for building medical, dental, osteopathic and public health schools; medical care for the aged under Social Security; an augmented school lunch program; a permanent—not 'emergency'—system of extended unemployment benefits; an expanded food stamp plan."

A CHALLENGE

"Also, an expansion of the area redevelopment program to more than 250 areas with more than 18 million people involved. Extended aid for children of the unemployed; authorization for five new public power projects under the Bureau of Reclamation; expansion of loan funds to the Rural Electrification Administration.

"Also, expansion of national park program; increased grants for urban renewal; Federal aid for urban mass transportation; more Federal housing units for the elderly; increased subsidies for ocean shipping; a new Secretary of Urban Affairs so we can now subsidize city dwellers as well as farmers; in short, a staggering list goes on and on."

Let's relearn the practice of standing on our own two feet again.

The Capitol of the United States and George Stewart, Architect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein three articles by Morgan Beatty, commentator for NBC, on the national program of this broadcasting company of very intersting daily commentary known as "Emphasis."

Mr. Beatty's articles have to do with the Capitol of the United States. In this, his most interesting commentary, which is composed of three parts, he discusses the Capitol of the United States. First, he takes up the east front and entitles it "East Front Capitol, U.S.A." Another section is entitled "The New Capitol," and the concluding one deals with the same subject.

Really, Mr. Speaker, in a sense, this has to do with what George Stewart, our distinguished Architect, has done in the rebuilding and securing of the structural permanence of the Capitol and of the

remaking of this venerable institution to accommodate modern conditions.

We in the Congress so frequently become impatient with the progress of the construction of the Capitol. Little do we take time to reflect on the priceless treasures enshrined in this historic building. George Stewart has protected every single arch, cornice, column and stone for posterity. Without fanfare or trumpet, he has gone about his job of endless research in order to do what the original planners of the Capitol set out to accomplish.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt that many of us have taken the time to talk to George Stewart about what he has done for America. He possesses an endless store of fascinating information on the building in which we daily write modern history.

Morgan Beatty has rendered a great service to the Nation and to the Congress in his articles which I include herewith. He has given me a real appreciation for George Stewart and I, in turn, want my colleagues to have this same information because we have amongst us an architect, a historian, a curator, and a man jealous of the past, proud of the present, and concerned for the future. These articles make me happy that we have a man of the character of George Stewart performing such an important task for future generations:

EAST FRONT, CAPITOL, U.S.A.

(By Morgan Beatty)

Some people like to commune with nature. Others with the giants of philosophy or music. Me—give me the Capitol of the United States of America.

I stand on the crown of Jenkins Hill and visualize George Washington standing there with that Frenchman of the blazing eye and erratic mind. I like to think of the moment they ended their tramping. One day, on Jenkins Hill, Pierre L'Enfant turned to his American patron and declared, "This hill is a pedestal waiting for the American monument."

The other day I stood at the same spot with my old friend, George Stewart, formerly of Delaware, now almost married to the history and the future of the U.S. Capitol. He is the Architect of the Capitol.

This man carries a reverence in his very soul for the Capitol. He was showing me how his plans had been maturing. His plans? No, actually. He feels he and the Congress have been carrying out the good plans that have moldered for a hundred years in the Architect's office.

The 1960 phase of these plans is almost completed now. The east front has been extended by 32½ feet and the building stands almost the way the great Walter planned it.

Oh, you don't know Walter? Thomas U. Walter? The Architect of the Capitol from 1851 to 1865? What a pity. This man had an awesome vision of the future.

"George," I said at last, "He would approve every last thing you and Mr. Sam Rayburn, and the rest, have done. He would have approved every one of your alterations. You have followed his thinking, or improved it, to the very last item of the extension."

"I hope so, Morgan," George replied, "but a man never quite knows. Take, for example, the marble in the east front. Thomas Walter, in extending the wings a hundred years ago, picked eastern marble. And he would have used the same marble in the east front. So much dignity, so much massive beauty in it, you know. But he was thwarted in his plans by the Civil War. Well, it's a hundred years later now. We couldn't go to Massachusetts or Maryland for our marble. And, as you see, it's just as well. Georgia marble matches as if some higher power had willed it so."

"And," said George Stewart, "we hope we are planning 500 years ahead the way Walter planned a hundred years ahead. Georgia is the only State in the Union with a quarry big enough to guarantee matching replacements, either on the wings or on the front—or on the west side, where we go to work next. Neither Massachusetts, nor Colorado, nor Maryland had enough matching marble."

And I said—Oh, I'm sorry—the clock—join me a couple days from now so I can tell you more about the new Capitol, the changing monument, where L'Enfant told Washington that Jenkins Hill was a pedestal awaiting a monument for the United States of America.

THE NEW CAPITOL

(By Morgan Beatty)

Let's see—where were we the other day? Oh, yes, inspecting the dome of the U.S. Capitol—the new dome, if we may stress the renovation of 1960—just completed.

If you visited Washington last year, as millions of us did, you must have seen the ugly scaffolding around the Capitol dome and wondered why.

The recitation of the guides is entirely too fast and full of facts to get at the truth of the story. That dome is tied close to the origins of our country and it is especially symbolic of our greatest period of trial—the Civil War.

The old low wooden dome was especially embarrassing to Abraham Lincoln because the great statesmen and the crowned heads of Europe made much fun of it; used it as a symbol of a makeshift country with temporary trappings. So President Lincoln, despite the demand for iron, for shot and shell in the Civil War, ordered the planned new dome to go up as a symbol of our survival. He made a special reference, you may recall, in the Gettysburg address, the soldiers died that "our Government shall not perish."

Thomas U. Walter designed the dome, the first iron skyscraper ever erected, double cast iron plates weighing all together nearly 9 million pounds. The idea, of course, was to avoid both wood, light and temporary, or carved stone, that would require many years to build, because of the problem of vast weight.

Mr. Walter well paved the architectural highway to the Flat Iron Building and to every skyscraper that now rises above the horizon of American cities. And, considering the limited knowledge of such construction in 1850, he accomplished a miracle of construction.

For example, they didn't know, 100 years ago, how much such a dome would expand and contract in the seasons and under the heat of the sun. The Architect of today, famous George Stewart, the father of the new Capitol, started out 2 years ago with a little hammer, high on the catwalk between the two case-iron shells. He found corrosion, even tapped a hole in the dome with no effort at all. Later, Engineer Froham Davis and his associates found what may have been alarming signs of deterioration. Nobody will ever know because all has been repaired now; new skirting, cracks in the bronze Statue of Freedom repaired, new stainless steel bolts all around. They discovered that the Capitol dome turns every day like a sunflower turning with the sun; as much as 4 inches. Lubrication of the plates, hoop style reinforcements that give with expansion and contraction—all of these repairs, too numerous to mention, were made with painstaking care so that Walter's original plates survived.

And, of course, much work had to be done at the base because Walter had designed the dome for an extended east front. But the front was not extended in 1850—not until 1961.

A Virginia Congressman said, many years ago, that the dome of the Capitol was like a derby hat too big for the brim. False ironwork covered this defect for nearly a century. But now that part of the new Capitol is finished, painted in exactly the same shade of light gray that marks the Georgia marble of the east front.

Truly it can be said—to rephrase Daniel Webster—that we have developed the resources of our land, built up its institutions, promoted all its great interests. And in our day we have performed something worthy to be remembered.

U.S. CAPITOL

(By Morgan Beatty)

No living American can boast the love and reverence for the symbols of his country as eloquently as George Stewart.

And we don't mean eloquence in words and flowery phrases. We mean deeds of eloquence. And George Stewart is in an ideal position to practice the love and reverence he quietly boasts.

He is Architect of the U.S. Capitol, now finishing the extension of the east front and other improvements—revisions of the old Capitol that we planned over a hundred years ago.

To say that George Stewart loves every stone in the Capitol, every tree and every bush on the grounds, is to put it mildly. And his greatest regret in life is that inevitably age will remove him before he completes another of his beloved projects. It is an inspiration to walk with George at the street level of the new extension of the east front. Casually he points overhead: "84 arches in this entrance area in the center," he says. And then he carefully explains, "The Roman arch—for strength, of course—was adopted in the old east front ceiling. When the Capitol was built—this part of it—after 1800, there was no cement, sand, and lime. Hence, many arches, many arches, much strength. Yet, when we began to extend the front, the sand trickled out of the arches like it does from an hour glass."

"We have used cement and modern construction but we have retained the spirit and flavor of the Roman arch. And, as you see, our Capitol now has a full blown front entrance. Never had one before. A reception room for Congressmen to greet their constituents. And (walking out to the front) what do you think of those lamps flanking the main stairs, Morgan?"

There was a proud twinkle in George Stewart's eye.

"There's something familiar about those lamps," I said, "but I just can't—." George pulled out a photograph of the Lincoln inauguration. "We studied all the records, looked at all the paintings of the front of the Capitol, and, no question about it, the Lincoln lamps were made for this front. Of course, they have long since disappeared. So, we did the next best thing. We had the lampmakers study all the photographs of Lincoln's day and we have now the exact replica of the Lincoln lamps—the lamps that every child will see in his history book when he looks at the photographs of the Lincoln inauguration. And when he visits the Capitol he will recognize them, with a little urging from his teacher.

Then George led me over to the north wing. A luncheon was underway in the Old Supreme Court Room, originally the Senate Chamber. "This may soon be a thing of the past," said George. "This room, where the Louisiana Purchase was confirmed, where Samuel Chase was tried, where the Electoral Commission decided the crucial Hayes-Til-

den contest, this room may be restored exactly as it was when the Court sat—dark red draperies and all. And, over here, ah, yes, the first Senate Chamber used by the newly free people of the new United States may be restored exactly as it was in every detail."

And on and on we went through the transformation of our Capitol under the 1960 plan—the marriage of the past and the future. I thought suddenly of Daniel L. Burnham, one of the first modern Americans who felt a reverence for our Capitol City. When he presented plans so grandiose that they took the breath of Senators and Congressmen, Daniel L. Burnham answered their hesitance with this advice:

"Make no little plans. They have no magic to stir men's blood and probably themselves will not be realized. Make big plans, aim high in hope, and work, remembering that a noble logical diagram, once recorded, will never die but, long after we are gone, will be a living thing, asserting itself with ever-growing insistency. Remember that our sons and grandsons are going to do things that would stagger us. Let your watchword be order—and your beacon—beauty. Make no little plans."

George Stewart is making no little plans for us. Next he would like to tackle the west front of the Capitol, to recreate the original design and add 4½ acres of floor space.

Social Democracy and Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Monroe (Mich.) Evening News of March 2, 1962:

SOCIAL DEMOCRACY AND LIBERTY

"'To be genuine and effective, Liberals must welcome the cooperation of the democratic socialists, the socialist trade unionists and all other truly democratic forces," George Meany, president AFL-CIO, in the American Federationist.

Democratic socialism, we are told by some labor leaders, economic theorizers, impractical idealists, Liberal politicians, fuzzy-headed entertainers, one-worlders and pious churchmen, is the wave of the future, the salvation of mankind. Not only is it the obvious bulwark against communism, we are told, but also against the excesses of capitalism.

We are not told, however, that socialism—whether it be of the Communist or the so-called democratic variety—is authoritarian in concept and is the very antithesis of liberty and individual freedom.

In recent years, a great amount of effort by the above-named segments of the population has been given to the job of making socialism a respectable commodity, a salable product, a palliative pill. Emphasis and concern gradually have been swung away from the individual, the sanctity of personal integrity and honor, the inviolable and God-given dignity of the individual.

Many educators, politicians, labor unions, segments of the press and even some churchmen have been advocating subservience as opposed to freedom—freedom of the majority to dictate, subservience of others to conform to a national norm as applied by the State. These pitchmen for socialist objectives have played down the individual's rights and responsibilities. Instead, we have been harangued to concern ourselves with national interests, group social formulas. This is the new credo, the new promise of tomorrow.

Yet, the socialists—whether they are Communists or Social Democrats—forget to mention the coercion and control that such a government must exercise if it is to bring about the idyllic paradise the social autocrats promise. The end, of course, is totalitarianism. Already we can see around us the reach for control as the Federal Government seeks more and more authority in areas which once were entrusted to the individual.

Unfortunately, true supporters of democracy are being cast in a dark and unwholesome role. Concern for the truly unfortunate and indigent has miraculously become the monopoly of the social democrat * * * or so we would be led to believe. This, of course, is hogwash. By the same token, there are many who, with the best of motives and sincere concern, have been duped into believing that the road to liberty and freedom for all is down the road to socialism.

There is some hopeful indication, however, that more and more Americans are beginning to see through the morass of contradications, phony philosophizings and demagogic preachings of the social democrats and their kin.

The Slippery Road to the Summit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I hope President Kennedy has learned from experience about going to the summit with Khrushchev and then being knocked all the way down.

The following article by Roscoe Drummond in yesterday's New York Herald Tribune is very disquieting, from the standpoint of the commitment of our President:

KENNEDY AND THE SUMMIT

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The lure of the summit seems irresistible. Khrushchev calls and we answer—first with a no, next with a maybe, then a virtual yes.

President Kennedy is already caught in the toils of a presummit dialog with Premier Khrushchev from which I doubt he can extricate himself. Whether he knows it or not, he is hooked. Yet he always affirmed he would not let himself get hooked.

From the day he took office, Mr. Kennedy said he was not going to get trapped into the mistake of going to an unprepared negotiating summit conference. After the personal, get-acquainted meeting with Mr. Khrushchev in Vienna last spring, the President was more than ever convinced that the summit was the wrong place to start trying to resolve any of the great disputes which make up the cold war, and that an unprepared summit meeting is worse than no meeting at all.

Now, it seems to me, Mr. Kennedy is in exactly the position he said he was going to avoid; he is more than halfway to an unprepared summit, and there is no visible way to turn back. Here is how it happened:

The President proposed to Mr. Khrushchev that the foreign ministers go to Geneva to open the 18-nation disarmament conference March 14.

Mr. K. countered with the suggestion that the Disarmament Conference be turned into an 18-nation summit, that all heads of government attend.

Mr. Kennedy replied with his usual caveat. A summit conference should be prepared in order to be useful. If there is no advance evidence that it is going to be useful, it ought not to be held. He said that progress on disarmament could provide that evidence.

Then he went further. He mentioned a date for a summit. He said he hoped for such a meeting by June 1—if disarmament talks showed progress. By proposing a summit date the President weakens his stand that there must be no summit without adequate preparation.

And now British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan has further undercut Mr. Kennedy's reservation. Mr. Kennedy had said there was one condition which would have to be met for a summit: A progress in the disarmament talks. Mr. Macmillan added another condition: Lack of progress in the disarmament talks.

And here we are—with the President nearly full cycle around and facing a summit which will be hard to avoid under any circumstances. Between them Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Macmillan have named two opposite conditions which would justify a summit—progress or lack of progress at Geneva, either one.

This means that, in effect, we are giving to Mr. Khrushchev almost total initiative to determine whether and under what circumstances a summit will be brought into being.

I am not at all suggesting that negotiations with the Soviet Union on our great differences are improper or undesirable. They are entirely in order.

But I point out that postwar negotiations between Russia and the West have been successfully conducted only by the foreign ministers or ambassadors.

Lack of success has always marked the attempted summits which have turned out to be either a negotiating failure or a propaganda circus.

If President Kennedy was right—as I believe he was—in insisting that a summit must be preceded by some advance evidence of attainable agreement, he is venturing on very dangerous ground to water down this precondition.

U.S. Citizens Hard To Hoodwink

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the February 27, 1962, Glendale News-Press entitled "U.S. Citizens Hard To Hoodwink."

The editorial reports on the findings of a poll taken by Copley newspapers in various communities in California and Illinois.

The findings present helpful insight into the views and beliefs of many citizens which I believe will be of interest to the Congress.

It was encouraging to note that the citizens according to the poll favor a determined stand against communism at home and abroad, and also that there is

an awareness of the danger of increased inflation to the Nation's economy. The editorial follows:

DO THEIR OWN THINKING—U.S. CITIZENS HARD TO HOODWINK

Americans are not easily hoodwinked by the prolific blandishments of the saber-rattling threats of communism. They understand that a sound economy and a strong military are essential to ward off envelopment by the Reds.

These facts were emphasized in a poll among residents of 15 California and Illinois communities served by Copley daily newspapers. Results of the study make up a package of unassailable evidence that the great majority of Americans think positively.

They may differ sharply in their views, but what they believe, say, and endorse stem from their own thinking. This is a privilege guaranteed by the Constitution. The opposite, of course, is communism, which is founded on brainwashing in which the individual becomes a robot of the state.

The great majority opinion in the poll indicated Americans have the courage and desire to support strong stands on such issues as Berlin, southeast Asia, Formosa, or other areas plagued by Communist threats. We should fight in those areas, most of the interviewees said, in the event that is our final means of preventing Communist takeovers.

A depth of understanding and alertness about domestic issues on the part of the American public also was indicated by the poll. The overwhelming majority said increased inflation was dangerous to the Nation's economy. Fifty percent suggested that cooperation between labor and management to stabilize wages and prices would be the most effective inflation crub, a thought that New Frontier economists would do well to ponder.

The widest diversification of answers was noted in opinions about the Nation's greatest needs. They varied from "more religion, greater spiritual values, and higher moral standards" to "more conservative government with fewer controls and less socialism."

There was one particularly succinct comment from a businessman in response to this section of the questionnaire. "It's high time the insidious communistic cancer was controlled from within. They are nibbling at our freedom like a horde of termites."

No single American would agree with every opinion or the majority thinking on every question in the poll. But the fact that the interviewees had a knowledge—and an opinion—about complex national and international problems was reassuring.

If the administration is looking for cues as to how the vast majority of the American public feels about communism they should study such polls as that conducted by the Copley newspapers. They prove Americans want and are ready to back up a tough stand against communism at home and abroad.

Brooklyn's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Robert S. Bird has written a highly informative and full account of the continuing economic and social renaissance taking place in Brooklyn, N.Y.

In an article published in the New York Herald Tribune of February 21, 1962, Mr. Bird comments on the extensive variety of skilled and unskilled labor available in Brooklyn and the wealth of resources for small-plant industrial development. I foresee—with him—a very bright future for the residents of New York City's most populous borough.

I commend Mr. Bird's article to the attention of our colleagues:

LOOKING INTO THE FUTURE OF BROOKLYN

(By Robert S. Bird)

One of the best things about Brooklyn, looking at it from a certain economic viewpoint, is that it has some of the most awful looking scenery in the world along with some of the most superlative.

The reason is that in its industry aspect Brooklyn is, above all, a place where new manufacture gets started. Brooklyn does not have enough land available for big plant expansion. But it does have a wonderful balance of skilled and unskilled labor supply and plenty of small-industry space for the fellow who has an idea and needs a place to start manufacturing it.

Much of Brooklyn's flourishing industrial health comes from these small fabricating shops, and that is why you see along the waterfront fringes of the borough so many unlovely neighborhoods of little, one-story brick building monstrosities, converted old warehouses, half-open wood sheds beside what look like scrap metal dumps, and all kinds of other shops, Jerry-built and improvised.

Because of these innumerable little plants which account for a great volume of industrial activity, some quarters in Brooklyn make the claim that the borough has the largest diversity of manufacturing in the world.

In any case, business is on the upturn in Brooklyn, and both manufacturing payrolls and total payrolls were moving steadily upward according to the last borough report on this activity, which measured the year 1960 against 1959. It showed that not only were payrolls up but so was employment.

BUSINESS IS BOOMING

All this has been reflected in the crowded downtown shopping places, where retail business is also booming. The borough's biggest department store, Abraham & Straus, the second largest in the city and the fourth in the Nation in point of sales, did the greatest business in its history last year. This was true of both its total business, including branch stores, and its downtown store on Fulton Street.

Everywhere downtown evidences are seen of this economic health. The St. George Hotel on Brooklyn Heights, which is a most sensitive barometer of ups and downs in Brooklyn, is about to embark on a $2 million renovating and redecorating program for its vast, 2,500-room hotel building. And its dozen-odd banquet rooms are busier than they have been in 5 years, reflecting a full cross section of Brooklyn activity from social meetings to industry conventions.

"We have almost no space available on Saturday nights this winter," an official said, "and we take this to mean that Brooklyn is now spreading its wings again, having recovered from a bit of letdown 5 years back."

Although the entire shipping industry of the whole port of New York is off a little from earlier years, Brooklyn's waterfront is handling 60 percent of the total port business in high value cargo. And the farthest advances and most important improvements have been made in its piers. The port authority alone has spent $65 million on Brooklyn waterfront improvements, and the city has expended another $30 million.

Brooklyn piers are accommodating 5,000 vessels a year. And anyone watching from Brooklyn Heights a freighter being warped into a Brooklyn pier can figure that that ship will drop in Brooklyn on an average approximately $100,000 in pier rents, labor costs, tugboat charges, fuel expenses, repairs, stores, insurance, freight forwarder costs, and trucking outlays.

The diversity of raw materials coming into Brooklyn and of manufactured and processed products going out is astonishing. Only by actually visiting the piers and watching the cargo moving can the enormity of this world trade of Brooklyn be appreciated—everything from jetplanes to old clothes cleaned and baled for shipment to Africa.

The profile of the borough's industry is reflected by a few figures. There are about 8,500 manufacturing plants, 10,826 retail trade establishments, 2,724 wholesalers, 2,643 construction firms, 4,202 finance, insurance related businesses, 1,526 transportation, communication public utility firms and 727 miscellaneous business activities.

Of Brooklyn's approximately $6.5 billion worth of family income, about $1 billion is derived from manufacturing and the rest of the broad group of service industries. The "atomization" of the borough's industry is shown in the fact that 5,000 of its manufacturing plants employ fewer than twenty people, and 2,000 more employ less than 100 persons. There are comparatively few giant industries in the borough.

INDUSTRIAL PARKS PLANNED

But change is also extending to the manufacturing area, most conspicuously in a big new industrial park which is being laid out in the Flatlands neighborhood for new, small and middle size industrial plants. This is expected to begin a trend, for the borough has been hampered not only by lack of industrial space but by an extensively deteriorating industrial plant.

Another improvement in the manufacturing area is the new zoning law which is aimed at eventually eliminating housing in most industrial areas. Some of the fringe neighborhoods on the waterfront are blighted with ramshackle homes standing amid factories and junkyards, jeopardizing both the health and safety of the tenants and taking up space which could be more valuably used for new industries and expanding old ones.

Brooklyn considers itself fortunate in its labor supply. To home a viable industry of the diverse kind which best flourishes in Brooklyn it is necessary to have on hand both skilled and unskilled labor.

The 300,000 persons now employed in manufacturing in the borough include both skilled workers, who have an unusual freedom of choice of where to work, and a substantial supply of unskilled workers, who are mostly the new Negro and Puerto Rican arrivals.

Still another factor is contributing to stability in Brooklyn's industry. That is the opportunity open to the entire labor force to obtain educational and technical training to help workers fill the ever-expanding jobs newly available in the advancing fields of technology. Brooklyn is abundantly supplied with both public and private schools of this category.

HELD OWN IN DEPRESSION

During the national recessions of the last decade, including the setback of 1960, Brooklyn did better than most industrial and business communities in holding its own. In 1960, when some setback was encountered around the country and in employment in Brooklyn as well, the borough continued its industrial expansion with new factory and storage construction and homebuilding. Its volume of retail business rose by $80 million over 1959.

About 15 percent of the borough's income is derived from its waterfront activities, and here almost 3 miles of dilapidated wooden piers dating back to the sailing ship era have been torn down in the last 5 years. They have been replaced by commodious steel and concrete structures, attractively painted and maintained, with modern facilities for loading and unloading ships safely.

The shoreline itself, extending from Newtown Creek down the East River and along the Upper New York Bay to the gigantic Army terminal at 58th Street, Bay Bridge, has continued down through the years as the vital seaport that has contributed so much to the borough's growth.

Brooklyn's high share of high-value shipping in the port is no accident. Longshoremen there have traditionally maintained an excellent production rate compared with other port areas. Ship operators pay high rates for the new Brooklyn piers because of the high productivity they afford in loading and unloading. In contrast to Manhattan where there are several unrented piers, Brooklyn's waterfront usually has no vacancies.

Since longshoremen traditionally prefer to live near their work, Greenpoint, Red Hook, south Brooklyn, and parts of Bay Ridge are still largely populated with waterfront workers, and most of their homes are attractively maintained and furnished.

EIGHT MODERN TERMINALS BUILT

The improvements along the waterfront of Brooklyn began with the port authority's purchase in 1956 of 24 rickety piers along a 2-mile stretch south of Brooklyn Bridge, and another segment was acquired later. Already eight modern ship terminals have replaced broken-down structures and four more are to be built.

At the same time a program of modernization has been in progress under city auspices. A huge ship terminal is nearing completion at the site of the old 39th Street ferry in Brooklyn, and the terminals at 29th, 31st, and 33d Streets have been improved.

Working conditions of the longshoremen are vastly improved over the old days and Anthony Anastasio, top union boss on the Brooklyn docks, is well embarked on a number of welfare projects for the 12,000 members of his big Local 1814 of the International Longshoremen's Association. The union has a fine new headquarters at Union and Court streets, and plans are underway for a hospital and medical clinic building. This would serve not only the dockworkers but their families free.

The variety of world cargo that moves over the pier is unbelievable. On a recent day prowling around the docks at Bush Terminal, when nearly 1,000 trucks visited the piers on that one day, these were some of the products that were outward bound for African and Far Eastern ports:

Frozen chickens, heavy machinery, air conditioners, electric light bulbs, lubricants, automobile parts, structural steel, chemicals, and cotton remnants.

In a warehouse were such diverse products recently arrived from foreign countries as electronic tubes from Japan, duck feathers from Formosa, typewriters from East Germany, Easter candy from Canada, rubber from South Asia, chick peas from Mexico and thousands of bags of coffee from South America.

All of this shipping and industrial activity largely goes on around the fringes of the borough, beyond the residential neighborhoods which cover so much of Brooklyn's 90 square miles. But most of the neighborhoods have their own retail businesses and shopping streets; some of them doing well and some not so well, depending on whether the neighborhood is going down or up or holding steady. And these make a powerful contribution to the borough's economic health, too.

BUSTLING AIR PREVAILS

Downtown Brooklyn is a complete shopping area in itself, containing, besides department stores, fine specialty shops and popular chain stores. The sidewalks and the stores have a crowded look and bustling air. But Brooklyn's shopping district is almost unique in one way—a shopper can drive downtown without delay and without parking problems. There is public parking space in the area, and parking garages, and this—along with the fact that most through traffic bypassed the shopping streets virtually eliminates the problem that plagues most big communities.

Several other factors also contribute to downtown Brooklyn's brisk business health. All of the subway systems come into this area and all of the buses from the outlying neighborhoods converge here. The shops are easy to reach.

Also, a visitor in Brooklyn stores notices that the friendliness which is characteristic of most Brooklyn people is displayed in the stores themselves. Shopping in Brooklyn is like shopping in a small town, almost.

Much of the change and upbeat visible in Brooklyn was generated and advanced in recent years by the late John Cashmore, who was Brooklyn's vigorous borough president from 1940 until his death last year. The immediate development of Brooklyn is now in the hands of an old-time Brooklynite who once was in business in the borough, Borough President Abe Stark.

A ruddy-faced, white-haired man with a kindly manner and quiet energy, he displays an intimate and vivid grasp of the borough's geography, economy and potentialities. He talks about these things quietly, without booster bombast or rosy picture-painting. As he mentions specific programs being planned or underway he constantly analyzes them in terms of people.

The borough president gives the impression that Brooklyn is in good hands, that the borough government has a care for Brooklyn, and that 1962 is just the beginning for the next stride forward.

Soviet Parliamentary Exchanges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Reds always have a motive in any kind of exchange and the proposed parliamentary exchange is no different.

Edith Kermit Roosevelt, in the March 3 issue of the Long Island Daily Press, shows us what the Reds have been after since they first took over in Russia:

HOW REDS LOOK AT CONFERENCES

(By Edith K. Roosevelt)

The purpose of the Soviet bid to exchange their parliamentary leaders with our congressional leaders is to establish the legitimacy of the Soviet regime's claim to be a democracy.

By luring us into this exchange they would equate their institutions with our own and we would concede that Soviet and American "parliaments," "law," and "democracy." have a common frame of reference.

Since the time of Lenin, the Soviet Union has chosen to call its system "democratic" centralism." Under this "democratic" system the few top leaders argue the Government's case pro and con. They can vote and what the majority decides goes. The minority must shut up—or be shut up.

For Communists, democracy is a technique for the control of large numbers, a method to familiarize the "masses" with decisions already made at the top and to insure that the whole nation does its best to carry out those decisions.

Communists boast of their courts. And in fact, they even make the effort to eliminate their foes through their star chamber "law" courts—in addition to dispatching them by induced "suicide", "illness" and ordinary butchery. Soviet law serves as a cover for crime and a systematic instrument of terror.

Likewise, trade unions are not professional associations to protect the interests of their members. They are "schools of communism" and tools to benefit the Communist dictatorship.

By now these facts are well known in the West. But some of those in positions of leadership continue to believe that a just system of "world peace through world law" can be established with the Communist state.

Thus far, in meeting with the Soviets, Americans have sought to communicate and express truths. We assume that the purpose of a meeting is "to make a deal" to serve the interests of both parties. We assume agreements or contracts will be honored because this is in the interests of both parties.

But to our Soviet counterparts, a conference or international negotiation is a tactical maneuver. The meeting can be used whether an agreement results or not.

The Soviets use conferences to pressure the West into making some concession. If an agreement must be concluded, they can break it whenever necessary.

In analyzing how the Soviets use conferences and contacts as a weapon, Dr. Stefan T. Possony, chief of political research, Hoover Library, Standford University, said recently: "You will find that whenever the Soviets come to a conference, they want us to give something. They beautifully prepare why it would be advantageous for us to give and why, if we were to give, peace would be assured—for another interim period."

In his letter to Roll Call, the newspaper for Congressmen, Soviet Diplomat Georgi M. Kornienk admitted as much in Communist style doubletalk when he said the exchange of Soviet-United States parliamentarians would "create better understanding between the two countries in the interests of peace."

Do these exchanges and talks further the cause of "peace?" Look at the map since World War II.

Pipe Manufacturers Cooperation in Halting Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, a concerted effort has been made by the major concrete manufacturers in the State of Florida to assist President Kennedy's anti-inflation program. The terms of this fine action are set forth in an article dated February 14 from the Lakeland Ledger:

PIPE INSTITUTE TO CURB HIKES

Manager-Director Bolivar Hyde, Jr., of the Florida Concrete Pipe Institute, Inc., has announced that the major concrete manufacturers in the State have voted unanimously to "hold the line" on price hikes

in compliance with the recent economic message to Congress by President Kennedy.

The policy decision was made by members of the board of directors of the Florida Concrete Pipe Institute, Inc., at a recent meeting at State headquarters in Lakeland. Hyde said that members of the institute hope other State associations will follow suite in supporting the President's anti-inflation program.

National Cemetery Needs for Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on February 23, 1962, Lt. Col. William B. Freeland, deputy adjutant general for veterans' affairs of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Military Affairs, submitted to our colleague, Chairman J. T. RUTHERFORD, of the Subcommittee on National Parks, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, a statement of national cemetery needs for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, because of the extraordinary and exemplary performance of duty of the servicemen of Pennsylvania and the excellent statement Colonel Freeland has submitted, describing our statewide cemetery requirements to bury these noble patriots, I should like to introduce into the RECORD a copy of this statement for the benefit of all of my colleagues:

STATEMENT OF NATIONAL CEMETERY NEEDS FOR COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

(Submitted to Hon. J. T. RUTHERFORD, chairman Subcommittee on National Parks, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, by Lt. Col. William B. Freeland, deputy adjutant general, veterans' affairs, Pennsylvania Department of Military Affairs)

The veteran population of Pennsylvania is approximately 1,642,000 with 25 percent of these veterans above 50 years of age or about 410,500 veterans.

All veterans are now reaching the age where the trials and tribulations and the insecurities of life are beginning to take their toll and thus, their susceptibilities to the ills and infirmities of age are becoming increasingly greater. In addition, many veterans have service-connected injuries and disabilities that inevitably detract from their life expectancy. It is therefore reasonable to suppose that in the immediate years ahead a greater number of deaths among these veterans can be expected.

In 1965, approximately 13,395 Pennsylvania veterans will die. About 1 percent will request burial in a Pennsylvania national cemetery—therefore 134 graves will be required in 1965. In view of these calculations, it is apparent that the ultimate number of grave sites required for the present living 1,642,000 Pennsylvania veterans will be about 16,400 graves. If the wives of these veterans also request burial with their husbands, this number would be increased accordingly. Of course, it should always be kept in mind that during the prolonged periods of the cold war thousands of additional Pennsylvanians now serving their country would also apply for final burial in a national cemetery. This number is an unpredictable figure—but allowance for same should be considered in the final determination for future graves.

At a meeting of the Joint Veterans' Council for Pennsylvania, it was indicated that a wise choice of location for a new national cemetery in Pennsylvania would be on ground adjacent to but outside the boundaries of the present cemetery and historic Civil War Battlefield at Gettysburg. It was pointed out that a new national cemetery at this site could also act as a centrally located memorialized burial center for the veterans of States adjoining Pennsylvania.

Gettysburg is in very close proximity to many of the famed national shrines of American history, of the Civil War, the Revolutionary War, and the colonial period. It could be expected that a national cemetery adjoining these historical shrines would attract relatives and friends and also many tourists to visit the graves of those heroes of our country's wars who are buried in this hallowed ground. Many of these people would go on to visit the other historical shrines. These pilgrimages would engender a re-birth of pride and patriotism in the deeds of our forefathers.

It was also the concensus of thinking of the Joint Veterans' Council at their meeting that the 100th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg (1963) would be a very appropriate time to dedicate the new national cemetery.

A location for a second cemetery in Pennsylvania was discussed and no actual location was given preference although it is agreed that somewhere in western Pennsylvania would be the most logical location.

In the event the Gettysburg location would not be feasible—an area near Indiantown Gap Military Reservation east of Harrisburg, Pa., and about 40 miles from Gettysburg is suggested.

It is the desire and the hope of veterans in Pennsylvania that the subcommittee of which you are chairman will see fit—in its deliberation—to recommend to the full committee and through them to the Senate and the full Congress that one or more national cemeteries be established in Pennsylvania in the very near future.

Is 10 Days' Glory All a Hero Is Allowed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, during a period of some 10 days Lieutenant Colonel Glenn orbited the earth three times, became a national and international hero, was greeted by the President and Vice President, addressed a joint session of Congress, was the hero of a New York ticker-tape parade and a celebration in his Ohio hometown. Then he was sent back behind NASA's security gates.

Have we seen the last of Colonel Glenn?

Has he been sent to obscurity?

Is it the policy of this administration that the American people shall be allowed heroes who are not members of the administration's family only on a short-term loan?

Does Pierre Salinger feel his clients must be insulated from competition with the public's heroes?

Lieutenant Colonel Glenn's activities and whereabout are controlled by the Government. How long he remains isolated from the public will provide the answers to the questions I have raised. I hope these answers are no and that they will be forthcoming promptly.

The Only Safe Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Allentown Daily Call of March 3, 1962:

THE ONLY SAFE DECISION

The unpleasant decision to resume atmospheric nuclear testing, announced by President Kennedy with such obvious reluctance, was not initiated by the White House. It was mandated last September when the Soviet Union broke the 3-year voluntary moratorium by testing 40 weapons of its own.

Whether the test series the President now has ordered for late next month will be implemented also could be decided in the Kremlin. If Khrushchev is willing to agree to a plan that will effectively ban such tests in both the East and the West, no nuclear weapon need ever again be exploded.

There is nothing that would please the American people and their President more. There is little that would bring as much joy and as much hope for all people everywhere.

Mr. Kennedy gave the Soviet Premier the opportunity to take this monumental step toward peace when he told him quite frankly there still is time. If he sends his emissaries to the 18-nation Geneva Conference opening week after next with instructions to negotiate a sound, workable agreement banning all nuclear tests, the President and the British Prime Minister will meet him to sign it.

He thus placed the responsibility of any further tests squarely on the shoulders of the man who ordered them resumed in the first place. He also gave him the opportunity of standing before the world as the man who made it possible to end them.

Mr. Kennedy made it eminently clear, however, that nothing but a firm and solid agreement with effective controls will suffice. The time for arguments long since has passed. America has been hoodwinked before by the Russians. It cannot jeopardize its own security and that of the free world any longer by giving Soviet scientists the opportunity to narrow the nuclear gap and develop weapons to be used against this country and its friends.

The issue, as the President defined it, is not the possible danger of the relatively small amount of radioactive fallout he promised would be carefully guarded. It is the lives of hundreds of millions of people in this and other nations that would be at stake if there was no adequate deterrent and defensive force to guard against the weapons the Russians are giving increasing evidence of developing. Without the right to test, this Nation's scientists are stymied in building a countering force.

The United States, he made quite clear, can delay no longer if the Russians persist in continuing their stalling tactics until they

gain a fateful advantage that would mean the kind of freedom Americans have for so long cherished.

Never has Mr. Kennedy documented any message from the White House so completely and precisely. Never, he said, has he made a more painful decision. Never have more Americans agreed with his judgment or prayed more fervently that it will open a new highway to peace.

Hold On to Your Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit for inclusion in the RECORD a speech by Capt. P. A. "Dick" Horton entitled "Hold On to Your Constitution."

Mr. Horton recently won a George Washington Honor Medal from the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge for this speech and I believe it may be of interest to many Members of Congress and the public:

The speech follows:

HOLD ON TO YOUR CONSTITUTION

(By P. A. "Dick" Horton)

The Battle of Bunker Hill had been fought and tempers were hot in the Continental Congress. Richard Henry Lee, of Virginia, presented his resolution:

"That these united Colonies are, and of a'right ought to be, free and independent States; that they be absolved from all allegiance to the British Crown."

John Adams, of Massachusetts, quickly seconded this resolution.

But there were many who thought this was too drastic action; many felt that total severance from Britain was impossible; others had fears of the consequences. Many, including Dickinson, remained strongly opposed to it and were determined to speak out their minds against it. Jefferson, utterly helpless in debate, sat silent and very uncomfortable while the hot battle raged. John Adams in this supreme hour bore the whole burden of supporting a measure which he regarded as the consummation of all the labor expended by him since he came into public life. His intense earnestness compelled him to be magnificently eloquent. Jefferson later said, "John Adams was the Colossus of that debate."

Adams wrote a letter to his wife, Abigail, in which he said: "Yesterday the greatest question was decided which ever was debated in America, and a greater perhaps never was nor will be decided among men."

Declarations are not unique in the world, but the Declaration of Independence is unique. Here for the first time in recorded history, a nation was born with a declaration of national purpose. To liberate men from domination, and that all men were endowed by their Creator with inalienable rights.

Since the dawn of history, men in authority have often coerced and enslaved the weak. We must recall that at that time the world was ruled by kings, potentates, tyrants, and dictators. Every nation had its special ruling class that clamied this authority by divine right. Living as they were in the forests, on the plains, and in vast open spaces, the colonists enjoyed a sense of freedom without restraint. It was when they saw their freedoms taken away piece by piece that they offered their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to defend that freedom. The cost was 7 years of sweat, blood and tears, and many broken lives, bodies, and fortunes. They soon learned that the Articles of Confederation under which they were operating were entirely unsatisfactory.

A convention was called to meet in Philadelphia to amend these articles. As the Convention proceedings got underway, the small States became suspicious of the larger States, each delegate seemed to be determined to gain some advantage for his State. Several plans were proposed and tempers were hot. It looked as though nothing could be accomplished and the meeting would break up in disorder.

Benjamin Franklin, the sage of the Convention, who was then past 80 years of age, moved that the Convention be adjourned and further stated, that for 7 years they had met during their struggle for independence and at each meeting they had opened their session with a prayer. That the great Architect of the Universe had looked kindly upon their cause and answered their prayers; that they reconvene and when they did they would open their session with a prayer.

These prayers must have been answered because 100 days later on the 17th of September 1787 these men brought forth a document of government which is proclaimed throughout the world as the, "finest expression ever made of the determination of a free people to govern themselves and to protect their liberty."

Our Founding Fathers who brought forth our great Constitution knew this. These men of 1787 drew from deep wells of experience in government. Most of them were well educated, and they were all successful men. Despite their youth (Hamilton was 30, Madison 36, and Washington 56), all of them had lived under and helped to write colonial charters and had studied the operation of foreign governments with great care. The oldest man and the sage of the Convention, Benjamin Franklin, arose during the Convention and said:

"We have gone back to ancient history for models of government and have examined the different forms of those republics which, having been formed with seeds of their own dissolution, now no longer exist. And we have viewed modern states all around Europe, but find none of their constitutions suitable to our circumstances."

When the Constitution was completed, they had brought forth a new concept of government. It was not a federal government; it was not a national government; but it was a little of each, a more perfect union. As John Marshall said:

"The Government of the Union, then is emphatically and truly a government of the people. In form and in substance it emanates from them. Its powers are granted by them, and are to be exercised directly on them, and for their benefit."

At that time there were 3 million people in the 13 States and like the Revolution itself it fell to the lot of a limited few to lead the way. It became necessary for Hamilton, Madison, and Washington himself, to convince the American people of the great value of this Constitution which was finally ratified, but the Declaration of Independence had expressed implied rights that individuals would have even as against the Government. Rights that were granted by their Creator. Most of the States ratified the Constitution with an understanding that these rights would be incorporated by amendments to the Constitution. Ten of these amendments were enacted at the first session of Congress and in presenting the resolution offering these 10 amendments to our Constitution Congress said:

"The convention of a number of the States having at the time of their adoption of the Constitution, expressed a desire, in order to prevent misconstruction or abuse of its powers, that further declaratory and restrictive clauses should be added and as extending the ground of public confidence in the Government will best insure the beneficent ends of its institutions."

BILL OF RIGHTS

Here you have the confirmation of the fact that We, The People, are sovereign. The Bills of Rights could better be called a Bill of Prohibition. Contrary to the general belief that here are certain rights or privileges that are granted to us by our Government, these 10 amendments prohibit the Government from making or enforcing certain restrictive acts against us. If you recall in the first amendment, the first matter to be mentioned was freedom of religion, which to our people of that day was of paramount importance. The amendment states:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof * * *."

And so on through the nine amendments. The 10th amendment was a masterpiece of thought, vision and complete clarity:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

This was indeed a new concept of government. The long struggle of our people in England and America to bring rulers under restraint of law was at long last crowned with victory. Since the beginning of civilization, the world had been ruled by tyrants. Wherever men were weak they were ruled by tyrants and where tyrants were weak they were replaced by other tyrants. They have carried the sword; they have borne the sceptre; they have worn the cassock or carried the mace. From the days of the Magna Charta to the Bill of Rights, step by step tyranny has been defeated. But tyranny is not dead. Always versatile, it appears today in a new garb, black robe on the one hand and school textbook on the other. It is more difficult to detect now but it is just as evil as though it carried a sword.

USURPATION

An eminent jurist, Judge Learned Hand, in a booklet entitled "Our Bill of Rights," said the Supreme Court in some of its opinions acted like "a third chamber" * * * "resting on nothing else than a 'coup de main' or pure usurpation * * *. The Court has evolved into an anomalous body, unknown to the Founding Fathers; unknown to the Federal Constitution, unknown indeed, to anything in the history of constitutional law, making our Constitution read like modern judges want it to read. The Supreme Court Justice is no longer a jurist, he is a zealot."

No one would destroy our Supreme Court of even weaken its legal powers as they were designed by our Founding Fathers. But like them we must recognize the evil that is in men who seek power and in some way we must try to curb the members of this Court from reading into our Constitution law principles which were never intended or stated; or from using the basis of their decision a quotation from the book written by a Swedish radical Socialist named Myrdahl. Many years ago Chief Justice Taney stated:

"The Constitution is a written instrument. As such its meaning does not alter. That which it meant when adopted it means now * * *. It is not only the same in words, but the same in meaning, and delegates the same powers to the Government, and reserves and secures the same rights and privileges to the citizens; and as long as it continues to exist in its present form, it speaks not only in the same words but with the same meaning and intent with which it spoke when it came from the hands of its framers, and was voted on and adopted by the people of the United States. Any other rule of construction

would abrogate the judicial character of this Court, and make it the mere reflex of the popular opinion or passion of the day."

On the hundredth anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution, President Grover Cleveland said:

"God grant that posterity may find it unimpaired; and as we rejoice in the patriotism and devotion of those who lived a hundred years ago, so may others who follow us rejoice in our fidelity and in our jealous love of constiutional liberty."

The Constitution is a living document—a basic charter protecting every American which has, since its adoption, served as the beacon light of freemen. Foes of our form of government, foes of liberty within and without our country around the world are continuously making insidious attacks on the fundamental principles embodied in the Constitution.

"Love of country is one of the loftiest virtues which the Almighty has planted in the human heart, and so treason against it has been considered among the most damning sins."—EMERY A. STORRS.

Our history reveals that no other nation since the beginning of time has produced so many great and noble men, so much wealth, so much happiness, so many improvements for human enjoyments. And all of this because of the Christian concept of individual freedom which was so well protected by our Constitution. The average American immersed in the tidal wave of inflation, big money and big deals is more money conscious than ever in history. Many, many are so involved that they fail to participate in or even discuss the defense of their freedom. While the sugar-coated poison is fed to them, they lose their freedom piece by piece. It is no secret, for years the Russian Socialists and their followers in their country have plotted to destroy our freedom and sovietize America.

In a recent statement by the chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER declared his congressional committee has repeatedly warned that the "strength of the Communist movement in any of its ramifications bears little relationship to the number of its members; that instead, its strength and effectiveness are in direct ratio to the intensity of the effotrs of the few who are trained and disciplined agents." Vividly illustrating his point, Mr. WALTER disclosed, "it was with only a relative few that Lenin seized control of the Government of Soviet Russia. Only a few—some 3 or 4 percent—in Soviet Russia today are Communists. Only 1 to 2 percent of the people of the captive nations are Communists. The Communist conspiracy operating on American soil—let it be emphasized and reemphasized is part and parcel of the world conspiracy and the thousands of Communists in the United States are for all intents and purposes foreign agents on American soil who are dedicated to our destruction."

In a recent decision regarding the loyalty oath, Justice White of the Supreme Court, stated:

"History even in our times warns us that the saddest epitaph ever carved to the memory of a vanished free state is that its people failed to raise their hands to keep their freedoms and liberties while yet they had that power.

"We in this country certainly do not want a 'saddest epitaph' for the free nation of the United States of America that its people have 'failed to raise their hands to keep their freedoms and liberties.' "

Dr. Frederick Schwarz, an authority on the Communist menace, said:

"The apathy of the American people to this known danger is a form of insanity."

It must indeed be a form of insanity that would persuade an American to exchange his constitutional freedom for regimented Socialist slavery.

At the dedication of the Bunker Hill Monument the great statesman and patriot, Daniel Webster, said:

"Hold on, my friends, to the Constitution of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands. Miracles do not cluster, and what has happened once in 6,000 years may never happen again. Hold on to your Constitution, for if the American Constitution should fall there will be anarchy throughout the world."

Shabby Politics or Mastery in Political Strategy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on January 29, 1962, the two St. Louis metropolitan newspapers wrote editorials on President Kennedy's actions in respect to the proposal to create a Department of Urban Affairs.

Both editorials agreed that the President's actions were motivated by politics rather than statesmanship. But they were in disagreement as to the efficacy and the morality of the politics. Now that the battle has cleared away it is difficult to see how this can become a campaign issue. The Democrats as a party just barely gathered a majority of their own votes for the measure. The Missouri Democrat delegation voted 5 to 4 against the President's proposal.

The Post-Dispatch editorial concludes:

This is the sort of political maneuvering that should be expected of a President who served in both Senate and House and who displayed a mastery of political strategy in the 1960 campaign. There will be more of it in Washington in the coming months.

It will be interesting to see if this proves to be the case. Here follows the two editorials:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Jan. 29, 1962]

PRESIDENT'S SHABBY POLITICS

The House Rules Committee voted last week to kill President Kennedy's bill to create a Department of Urban Affairs. This was a rebuke administered to a Democratic Chief Executive by the members of his own party.

Democrats control Congress by a heavy majority almost 2 to 1 in the Senate, and 4 to 3 in the House. The division is even more lopsided in the House Rules Committee. It has 15 members, 10 of them Democrats.

Thus, it should come as a shock to most Americans to hear how President Kennedy assessed the blame for the defeat of his bill. At his last press conference, he said:

"I am somewhat astonished * * * that all of the Republican members of the Rules Committee opposed the bill * * * I had gotten the impression * * * they shared our concern for * * * the problems of two-thirds of our population who live in cities."

The President levels his political rockets against the minority GOP in Congress, when he can't begin to convince his own party members of the House.

This is as lame and flat an excuse for failure of Presidential leadership as we have heard for a generation.

The Republicans are concerned about urban problems. That's why the five GOP members of the committee voted against the President's bill. They criticized it because it would put the cities under the thumb of a new Federal high lord executioner, as Congressman CLARENCE J. BROWN, of Ohio, put it.

After smearing the GOP as callous toward city dwellers, the President then paved the way to charge them later with racial prejudice.

He said he would submit the proposal again and appoint Robert C. Weaver as head of the new Department, if Congress gave the Department its blessing. Mr. Weaver is the Negro head of the Federal Housing Administration. He would be the first member of his race in the Cabinet.

Mr. Kennedy's strategy was obvious. He can now say that a vote against his proposal is a vote against Mr. Weaver.

This, of course, would make lively ammunition to use on the GOP in next fall's congressional campaigns.

But frankly we were surprised to see President Kennedy stoop so low as to drag the racial issue into a matter where it is completely extraneous. This is an attempt to exploit Mr. Weaver's name and race to gain a purely partisan end.

This may be good, rough-and-tumble politics, but it's shabbier politics than Americans expect from a President of the United States.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Jan. 29, 1962]

MR. KENNEDY, POLITICAL EXPERT

Armchair politicians await with interest the reaction of Republicans to President Kennedy's tactics in connection with the proposal for a Department of Urban Affairs. Last week, shortly after the Republican-southern Democratic coalition in the House Rules Committee killed legislation for such a department, Mr. Kennedy announced he would create the new Department by Executive order.

This does not assure his plan will succeed, for either branch of Congress can veto the proposal. But Mr. Kennedy added a dimension. He said flatly at his press conference that if he can create the Department he will appoint Robert C. Weaver to head it. Mr. Weaver would become the first Negro to occupy a Cabinet post.

If Republicans wish to vote against the Department they will have to vote against a Negro Cabinet officer. And they will have to vote on the record. This would put them in an odd light, since in the last election campaign the Republican vice presidential candidate, Henry Cabot Lodge, promised that if Richard Nixon were elected President he would name a Negro to his Cabinet.

A Republican vote against Mr. Weaver (which is what Democrats would call it) would hurt the party's chances in the big cities, where Republicans lack strength, in the November congressional elections. Mr. Kennedy can expect southern Democratic opposition too, but that would not be particularly significant. If Congress does knock out the plan, Mr. Kennedy will still be ahead politically, for he will get credit among Negro voters for having made a genuine pledge.

This is the sort of political maneuvering that should be expected of a President who served in both Senate and House and who displayed a mastery of political strategy in the 1960 campaign. There will be more of it in Washington in the coming months.

Petitions From Massachusetts on Veterans Legislation and Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, several of my constituents from the town of Adams, Mass., have requested that I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two petitions which they have signed. The petitions reveal the signers feelings on two important issues of the day, veterans legislation and medical care of the aged. Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the petitions:

ADAMS, MASS.,
February 11, 1962.

U.S. Representative SILVIO O. CONTE,
House Office Building,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CONTE: Enclosed you will find a petition signed by 10 voters, citizens, and taxpayers of Adams, soliciting your support for the medical care for the aged bill under social security as sponsored by Senator HUMPHREY.

We feel that the Democratic Party approach to this problem is more humane, dignified, and practical than that put forward by the American Medical Association and the Republican Party.

Our feeling is that these elder citizens should in no way be abused or used as a political football as in the Newburgh, N.Y., welfare fiasco, as it provides the world with a poor example of American so-called generosity.

Your support will be appreciated.

GEORGE R. WATERMAN.

The following voters, taxpayers, and residents of Adams do hereby petition your support for the medical care for the aged bill under social security—Senator HUMPHREY'S bill.

George R. Waterman, 81 Commercial Street, Adams, Mass.

Harold R. Waterman, 81 Commercial Street, Adams, Mass.

Raymond H. Torrey, 50 Grove Street, Adams, Mass.

Francis H. Mahar, 197 Columbia Street, Adams, Mass.

Roger W. Mahar, 17½ High Street, Adams, Mass.

Clarence A. Martin, 6 Martin Avenue, Adams, Mass.

Elsie Leja, 50 Grove Street, Adams, Mass.

Viola Torrey, 50 Grove Street, Adams Mass.

Shirley Lyons, 41 Elm Street, Adams, Mass.

Gerald H. Bush, 242 Columbia Street, Adams, Mass.

ADAMS, MASS.,
February 11, 1962.

U.S. Representative SILVIO O. CONTE,
House Office Building, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CONTE: Considering the fact that the World War I vets had their bonus bonds in 1922, only 4 years after the armistice, whereas nearly 20 years have elapsed since the cessation of hostilities in World War II with no action on our behalf, we feel that the time has come to revive the VFW sponsored "World War II Bonus or Adjusted Compensation Act" which was defeated in the House by one vote either in 1946 or 1947, although ably supported by the incomparable ex-Representative from Mississippi John W. Rankin.

The cost of this bill would be much less than what we give away yearly to former enemy nations, as well as with the money being spent here, be a tremendous boost to our economy in overcoming the present depression.

Please revive this much needed bill.

GEORGE R. WATERMAN.

The following veterans and members of Adams Post 160 of the American Legion and Burnett Bednars Post 1995 of the VFW and members of the ladies auxiliaries of those outfits hereby ask your support in reviving the "World War II Bonus or Adjusted Compensation bill."

George R. Waterman, 81 Commercial Com-Adams, Mass.

Harold R. Waterman, 81 Commercial Street, Adams, Mass.

Raymond H. Torrey, 50 Grove Street, Adams, Mass.

Roger W. Mahar, 17½ High Street, Adams, Mass.

Francis H. Mahar, 197 Columbia Street, Adams, Mass.

Viola R. Torrey, 50 Grove Street, Adams, Mass.

Elsie Leja, 50 Grove Street, Adams, Mass.

Shirley Lyons, 41 Elm Sreet, Adams, Mass.

Warren Parrott, 26 Summer Street, Adams, Mass.

Donald Vigiard, 31 Bellevue Avenue, Adams, Mass.

Paying for the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Walter Lippmann, the dean of American columnists, has written an incisive and clear explanation of just what paying for the United Nations means. His column appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of February 20, 1962, and I commend it to the attention of our colleagues.

One point, which I am sure Mr. Lippmann would not mind some elucidation on, is that the Government of Italy disputes his statement that they are to be included in the list of those nations who have refused to pay for the U.N. operation in the Congo. That friendly Government maintains that they support the U.N. operation in the Congo and fully intend to pay their share of the cost, administrative difficulties being the only reason for the payment having not been made.

Mr. Lippmann's column follows:

PAYING FOR THE U.N.

(By Walter Lippmann)

While Congress is considering the President's request for authority to buy half of the proposed $200 million issue of United Nations bonds, we must ask ourselves what precisely is the crucial question. It is not whether the United Nations is to survive. That is a misleading overdramatization. The critical question is whether the United Nations can and should continue to enforce peace, as it has been doing since 1956 on the Israel-Egyptian frontier, since 1960 in the Congo.

The deficit, which the proposed bond issue is to cover, has nothing to do with the regular operations of the United Nations. The deficit arises wholly from these two highly controversial peace-keeping operations.

On the regular assessments for the regular budget the record is very nearly perfect. For the 4 years 1956–59 inclusive, the collections were virtually 100 percent. For the 1960 assessments—those for the year when the great number of new states were admitted—the collections by the end of 1961 were already 94.6 percent. Countries in arrears do not lose their General Assembly vote until the amount owed is equal to the contributions due for the preceding 2 years. On the 1961 assessments, nearly 86 percent has already been collected. Of what has not been collected, China owes over half and the rest is owed chiefly by smaller Latin American countries.

All of this goes to prove that the normal and conventional activities of the U.N. are financially sound and that they have the support of the whole membership—West, East, and neutral.

The deficit is caused by the two special operations. One, known as UNEF, consists of about 5,000 troops under U.N. command, the troops being drawn from seven countries, none of them a great power. These troops keep the peace along about 140 miles of the Israel-United Arab Republic border. This operation costs about $20 million a year.

The other special operation deals with the Congo and is known as ONUC. Its average cost since July 1960 has been about $10 million a month. As of January of this year 21 countries had contributed to the operation with a total of about 16,000 soldiers. None of the soldiers came from any of the great powers, so that the U.S.S.R., the United States of America, the United Kingdom, and France have no fighting men in the Congo.

The deficit is not due to the fact that these two operations are very expensive. They have been financed by special assessments, and various countries have refused to pay because they disagree with the purpose or the conduct of the special operations. Because the peace-keeping costs are not part of the regular budget, the nonpaying nations can escape the penalty of losing their U.N. vote.

The Soviet bloc and most of the Arab States have refused to pay either for the Middle East or for the Congo. France, Belgium, Italy, Portugal, Spain and South Africa have refused to pay for the Congo. There are a few others who have not paid, probably because their governments are bankrupt. The bulk of the deficit is due to the fact that, for their own reasons, a great many countries dislike the special operations and would like to put an end to them.

We have always supported the special operations in the Middle East and the Congo and we have been paying about 40–50 percent of the cost. This sort of thing cannot and should not go on, not because we cannot afford these trifling sums but because the United Nations should not become dependent on any one great power. The true significance of the bond issue is that it opens a way out of this quandry. The central fact of the bond issue is that interest and amortization are to be covered by the regular budget if, as is expected, the International Court of Justice approves the plan. Our share of the peace-keeping costs therefore would decrease to our regular share of the U.N. budget—32 percent. And the penalty for refusing to pay the interest and amortization will be the loss of the right to vote in the General Assembly.

Without insisting that every detail of the plan as represented to Congress is perfect, it is clear that the plan, which we conceived and invented, is good for the U.N. and good for the United States. It saves

the U.N. from having to abandon the special operations which are playing such a mighty part in keeping the peace in the Middle East and in the heart of Africa. It brings to an end excessive dependence of the U.N. on the United States, and it brings to an end the unacceptable doctrine that a member can keep its privileges and still refuse to pay its share of operations duly authorized by the constituted authorities of the United Nations.

International Pancake Day Race—March 6, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, today is Pancake Day in Liberal, Kans. This is a historic occasion commemorating the race between housewives of Liberal, Kans., and Olney, England. I would like to revise and extend my remarks to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article pertaining to the history of the pancake race and a schedule of the events taking place in Liberal for Pancake Day. These articles were presented to me by Mrs. Binnie Dick, goodwill ambassador of the Liberal, Kans., Junior Chamber of Commerce. Mrs. Dick is the three-time national and two-time international pancake race champion, and she holds the present international record.

The articles follow:

HISTORY OF PANCAKE DAY

(History by Virginia Leete)

One of the strangest athletic events to be found in the world takes place in two towns on opposite sides of the ocean each year on Shrove Tuesday, the day before Lent begins.

On that day, the housewives of Liberal, Kans., United States of America, and those of Olney, Buckinghamshire, England, run 415 yards through the main streets at 11:55 a.m., flipping pancakes in skillets, in a traditional race to determine the international pancake racing champion. In the 12th annual race last year, Liberal tied up the score 6 to 6.

It all started more than 500 years ago in England when housewives customarily used up accumulated cooking fats baking pancakes on Shrove Tuesday before Lenten fasting began. Legend has it that one day a housewife baking pancakes lost track of time until suddenly she heard the church bell ring, calling everyone to the shriving service. In her haste she ran to the church, clad in her apron and with skillet still in hand, and thus became the first pancake racer.

Other women of Olney, in following years, not to be outdone by their neighbors, got into the act. The one who reached the church first was kissed by the vicar. The kiss came to be called the kiss of peace, and was accompanied with the words, "May the peace of the Lord be always with you." This is still the traditional prize for the winners of the pancake races both here and in England.

Liberal got into the competition in 1950 after a picture of the Olney racers appeared in a magazine. The Liberal Junior Chamber of Commerce decided that their housewives might be just as fast on their feet as their British cousins. The Jaycee president, R. J. Leete, arranged the first race with the vicar of Olney, Rev. Ronald Collins, who manages details of the race over there. After an exchange of letters and cables, the contest was on.

The English won the first race, but the Liberal women chalked that up to their years of experience and were not discouraged. The next year, England won again, only adding to the determination of the Liberal women who hail from hardy pioneer stock. The next year the Liberal gals achieved their first victory. Olney avenged the loss in 1953, but Liberal found the winning combination and swept the 1954, 1955, and 1956 races. Olney came through to win both the 1957 and 1958 races, putting them one up on the Kansans. Liberal evened the score in 1959, lost in 1960, and won again in 1961 to tie the score.

The race course in each town is laid out in the shape of an S. In Liberal, the women run over brick and asphalt streets. In Olney, the race starts at the village well, and over cobblestone streets goes past thatched-roof cottages and the Old Bull Inn. Both races, according to age-old tradition, end at a church, where the kiss of peace is administered in England by the church verger and in Kansas by the British consul for the area. At the present time, it is H. C. Littler.

Winning times are compared over trans-Atlantic telephone to determine the international champion. The call takes place immediately after the Kansas race is finished. Both races are run at 11:55 a.m.; however, due to time differences, the race in Olney actually starts some 7 hours earlier than the one in Liberal.

In addition to the traditional kiss, winners in both races get a prayer book with a handwritten message from the vicar and a frying pan from the Liberal Jaycees. The winning town gets the traveling trophy, a pancake griddle engraved with past winners' names. The Kansans, being a little more money-minded, perhaps than the English, give their winner a cash prize of $250, with $100 for second and $50 for third.

Athletic attire is prohibited in the race. Regular housewifely garb of housedress, apron, ordinary street shoes, and a headscarf (to be used as a head covering in the church ceremony following the race in England) are required.

According to rules set up by the English, a housewife is defined as any woman 18 years of age or over, having housewifely duties, and a 6-month resident of the town. A contestant does not necessarily have to be married, according to the English rules, but most of the contestants have been married women. Three local wins disqualifies a contestant.

Along with the race, a whole day's celebration is planned in Liberal. Naturally, the sponsoring Jaycees cannot cope with such an extensive program, so the whole town pitches in. Each civic club sponsors a different event.

Because the race is just for fun and has no commercial aspects, it receives extensive coverage by television, national radio networks, and international wire services.

The race has always been carried out in a spirit of friendly competition and has remained a strong and permanent link of international friendship between the people of the two countries. The vicar has paid two visits to Liberal, and on one occasion brought his wife, Dora, along. Both have endeared themselves to the citizens of this Kansas town.

With everyone having so much fun, the pancake race is likely to continue for a long, long time. It all seems a little crazy, perhaps, but watch the little towns of Liberal, Kans., and Olney, England, shine if pancake racing is ever added to the Olympics.

INTERNATIONAL PANCAKE DAY WINNERS

In 1950,[1] Olney, Florence Callow, 1:10.4; 1951, Olney, Isobel Dix, 1:12.1; 1952, Liberal, Joan Zimmerman, 1:08; 1953, Olney, Isobel Dix, 1:07.2; 1954, Liberal, Binnie Dick, 1:07.7; 1955,[1] Liberal, Binnie Dick, 1:05.1; 1956, Liberal, Nina Jordan, 1:14.6; 1957, Olney, Sandra Sibley, 1:08; 1958, Olney, Sandra Sibley, 1:10.8; 1959, Liberal, Mary Collingwood, 1:08.8; 1960, Olney, Carol Vorley, 1:10, and 1961, Liberal, Carolyn McGlammery, 1:10.

INTERNATIONAL PANCAKE DAY, 1962—OFFICIAL SCHEDULE OF EVENTS AND TIMES

Monday, March 5: 9 p.m. till?—Official Pancake Day dance in Ag Building at Liberal Fairgrounds, sponsored by Liberal Pancake Lions Club.

Tuesday, March 6: 6:45 a.m.-1 p.m.—pancake breakfast in National Guard Army, sponsored by Liberal Jaycees; 9:30 a.m.—Pancake Day parade. Marching bands, floats, beauty contestants, international pancake racers, sponsored by Liberal Rotary Club; 11 a.m.—Kids pancake races over last part of the International Race Course, sponsored by Liberal Jaycees; 11:55 a.m.—International pancake race. Sponsored by Liberal Jaycees; 1 p.m.—Blue Angel Airshow Sponsored by Liberal Jaycees; 3:30 p.m.—Miss Flipper beauty contest at Rindom Hall, sponsored by Liberal Noon Lions Club, and, 7:30 p.m.—Amateur contest at Rindom Hall. Sponsored by Liberal Kiwanis Club.

[1] Present international record.

Do It Yourself—Alianza Doctors to Doctors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the Members an article from the Miami Herald of Miami, Fla., under date of February 28, 1962, detailing the doctor-to-doctor mission of a group of Dade County dentists and physicians. This is a magnificent story of an effort by a group of professional men in south Florida which has made a significant contribution to the cause of freedom and the United States. At the same time, it provides a pointed answer to the many among us who ask, "What Can I Do?" to foster and preserve freedom. Here is a perfect example of what the American people can do, the only essential ingredients are interest and initiative. South Florida and its people have an abundance of both.

I am confident my colleagues join me in congratulating Dr. Cherry and the other doctors, dentists, and public officials who participated in this excellent mission. I take this means to acquaint my colleagues and others about this so that Dr. Cherry's idea can spread throughout the land.

The article follows:

MIAMI GROUP HAS A DO-IT-YOURSELF ALIANZA: DOCTORS-TO-DOCTORS—AND TO COSTA RICA

(By Bert Collier)

The scene was a charity hospital in San José, Costa Rica, one day last week. A group

of Dade County dentists and physicians, in the country to give lectures and hold clinics for their Costa Rican counterparts, had just presented the hospital with a gift of drugs valued at more than $8,000.

Vice President-elect Carlos Saenz, himself a physician, rose to express appreciation in behalf of his country.

"The fact that a group of busy doctors and dentists took the time to come down and show their friendship for the people of Costa Rica is the finest gesture we have ever seen," he declared.

The ceremony was the climax of an outstanding example of international goodwill by a group of private citizens. The 12 dentists and 9 doctors paid their own expenses, rearranged their crowded schedules to squeeze out 5 days of free time and wangled the drugs—priceless to those who received them—from their associates and from pharmaceutical houses eager to help such a project along.

The idea was conceived by Dr. Robert Cherry, a Coral Gables dentist, during a visit to Cartagena, Colombia, last year. Cartagena is Coral Gables' sister city in the people-to-people program and many lasting friendships have been formed as the result.

On that first trip Dr. Cherry's host was a dentist. "Why don't you bring some doctors and dentists down here to talk over mutual problems?" the Colombian suggested. "We need your help and it would certainly contribute to better relations between our countries."

Back in Coral Gables Dr. Cherry followed through by organizing the first "doctor-to-doctor" mission. The Dade County professional men discussed techniques and modern medical discoveries with the Colombians and presented gifts of drugs to charity clinics. They mingled with the people, talking and demonstrating democracy.

The result was so spectacular that the participants received personal thanks from President Kennedy and Senator William J. Fulbright of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, among others, and were encouraged to plan similar pilgrimages elsewhere.

This year Costa Rica was chosen. Working through the Costa Rica consul in Miami, Rafael Castro Canas, Dr. Cherry arranged the itinerary and recruited the participants. The group included Drs. E. W. Cullipher, Homer L. Pearson, Thomas J. Baker, M. A. Gonzalez, M. David Sims, Robert F. Dickey, Kenneth Whitmer, Leon Mims, and H. M. Nogueieras, physicians, and Drs. Herman Anderson, Kenneth Wittich, Homer Briggle, William Briggle, David Blaser, O. D. Pacetti, Charles Magrill, Richard Putman, Ben Wilkerson, Al Aker, L. L. Lund, and Dr. Cherry, dentists.

Raymond Poore, administrator of the South Miami Hospital, and Coral Gables Mayor Robert L. Searle, went along. Mayor Searle made a side trip over the mountains to present the keys of Coral Gables to officials at Atenas near the west coast. He was told he was the first U.S. official ever to visit the town.

In addition to their professional contracts, Dr. Cherry was received by Costa Rica's President Mario Echandi and by U.S. Ambassador Raymond Telles.

Ambassador Telles told him their visit was the finest contribution ever made by individuals to bettern understanding between the two countries.

"We hope that the results will spread to other Central American countries and their doctors and dentists are helped to serve their people better," said Dr. Cherry. "We found the Costa Ricans were wonderful people, highly literate, and highly intelligent; overwhelmingly pro-American, and in need of our understanding and help.

The United States can do a great job of helping. If we only get started and provide services that reach the people."

Dr. Cherry's doctor-to-doctor operation is informal, has no official sponsorship or auspices and requires no appropriation by Congress or any other body. It is simply people acting out of friendship with other people, doing what they are best equipped to do. Dr. Cherry desires no exclusive rights to his idea, but will eagerly share it with any other group of doctors or dentists in the land.

There is no doubt of its value. Word of the successes in Cartagena last year and San Jose this year has got around. The Dade County group has invitations to visit Venezuela, Peru, Colombia, Nicaragua, and even India, where an official of Kerala Province solicited their help in organizing a hospital. "It will save 30,000 lives," he said.

Saving lives and protecting health is the mission of practitioners of the healing arts. When they can at the same time promote international understanding and good will, it is a public service in the spirit of the President's suggestion that we ask not what our country can do for us, but what we can do for our country.

An Address by the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, January 19, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the interest of our colleagues the following address by the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, before the Savings Bond Conference at the Sheraton-Park Hotel in Washington on January 19, 1962.

Secretary Dillon enumerated the major specific goals of our economic policy as the reduction of unemployment; a rate of economic growth sufficient to provide jobs for the new millions coming into the labor market each year, and elimination of the balance of payments deficit. To accomplish these goals he urges a sharp increase in the level of private investment.

The Secretary's remarks follow:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS DILLON, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, AT THE 1962 SAVINGS BONDS CONFERENCE, SHERATON-PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 19, 1962

I want to thank you for your interest in the savings bonds program. We value it as one of the Treasury's most important tools in managing the public debt, as well as a most effective way of encouraging individual citizens to share in the financial affairs of Government. It is also one of our country's most successful volunteer undertakings. Through the years, it has enlisted the patriotic support of hundreds of thousands of people, under the leadership of distinguished individuals like yourselves. With your help, the savings bonds program will make an ever greater contribution to the economic strength we urgently require to fulfill the heavy responsibilities history has thrust upon us.

Our economic policy plays a vital role in meeting those responsibilities, for it will determine whether the future finds us weak or strong—idling along at half speed—or running at full throttle, powered by our tremendous productive potential.

To achieve that potential, our immediate economic goals are these:

First, to reduce unemployment. We simply cannot afford the misery and waste of having a large part of our labor force idle.

Second, to reach a rate of economic growth sufficient to assure jobs for the millions of workers entering the labor market in the years ahead, to guarantee to our citizens the benefits of a thriving economy, and to build the capacity to meet our international obligations.

Third, to eliminate the deficit in our international balance of payments, and its accompanying gold loss, for a sound dollar is as essential abroad as it is at home.

And, finally, to maintain reasonable price stability, so that our citizens may enjoy the full fruits of their savings, so that our economic gains are not wiped out by inflation, and so that our goods can compete successfully in world marketplaces.

We made considerable progress over the past year toward these objectives. At the close of 1961, our domestic economy reached record highs in terms of gross national product, personal income, industrial production, and manufacturers sales and new orders. Unemployment has finally begun to drop, and we expect it to decline further in the months ahead. Our gold loss in 1961 was just half the 1960 figure, the basic deficit in our balance of payments was cut by two-thirds, and the overall deficit by more than a third.

These gains were achieved in good measure because our fiscal and monetary policies were geared to the requirements of last year's recession and early recovery.

Largely because of increased defense needs, coupled with recession-level revenues, our national budget was in deficit—a deficit that, because of the recession, was both acceptable and inevitable. However, the economic growth forecast for 1962, with resulting higher revenues, makes it both desirable and possible—barring unpredictable international emergencies—to achieve a fully balanced budget in fiscal year 1963, as the President has recommended.

One of our most urgent national needs is a heavily accelerated flow of private investment into productive channels. A balanced budget stimulates such investment because it makes it unnecessary for the Government to tap the savings and credit that would otherwise be available for private investment. A balanced budget also facilitates the task of our monetary authorities, who strive to assure an adequate supply of funds for private investment at the same time that they guard against inflation.

Our policy of balancing the budget and simultaneously stimulating the flow of funds into private channels, reflects our firm belief that Government spending is not a satisfactory substitute for private investment. We look to private funds to finance the new factories, new tools, and new machinery that create more, better, and cheaper goods. A substantial and increasing flow of private investment is essential to economic growth in our free society.

It is disturbing, therefore, that our present level of investment is far from adequate. Over the past decade, nearly all of the major industrial nations of the free world had a substantially higher rate of domestic investment than the United States. Furthermore their ratio of productive investment to total output has been growing, whereas ours has been declining. Investment sparked the phenomenal growth of Japan and the Common Market countries of Western Europe, by contributing to rapid modernization of productive machinery and equipment. More modern equipment means more efficient production, and lower unit cost—hence more competitive capacity. As a result, friendly foreign nations are providing increasingly stiff competition for American manufacturers, both here and abroad.

For the future, then, a major goal of our economic policy is a sharply increased level of productive private investment, because it will:

Help our balance of payments by making our manufacturers more competitive, thus increasing our export surplus.

Help speed economic growth by increasing our productive capacity.

Help reduce unemployment by providing more jobs as new markets create new demand, and increased research and technology penetrate new manufacturing frontiers.

Finally, and most important, heavier investment will help to maintain price stability through lower production costs and higher productivity.

In addition to presenting a balanced budget, we are also proposing changes in our tax treatment of depreciation to stimulate business investment in productive machinery and equipment. Our program of depreciation reform involves both new legislation and the full use of existing administrative authority. On the legislative side, we are asking for an 8-percent tax credit for new investment in productive equipment. On the administrative side, we are updating depreciation schedules to take account of technological advances which have altered previous standards of obsolescence. This has already been largely accomplished for the textile industry, and we plan to announce revisions in depreciation guidelines for all other major industries this spring.

Such use of tax policy to stimulate the modernization and expansion of productive equipment is a major part of our effort to accelerate the long-range economic growth we need to achieve our true potential and to improve our balance of payments.

The heart of our balance-of-payments problem is this: We must generate a large enough commercial trade surplus to counterbalance our essential expenditures abroad. These expenditures include, in relative order of magnitude: First, the cost of our military forces overseas; second, private American investment in other countries; and third, that portion of our foreign aid not spent here for American products or services.

Our trade surplus—the excess of commercial exports over imports of goods and services—is substantial. But in recent years it has not been large enough to offset the balance-of-payments impact of our oversea operations. That shortfall constitutes the basic deficit in our international payments.

Preliminary figures indicate that last year our basic deficit was no more than a third of the basic deficit of $1.9 billion in 1960, and was far below the $4.3 billion in 1959. During the first 6 months of 1961 we actually ran a surplus in our basic accounts, as imports shrank because of the recession. During the third quarter, a sharp rise in imports brought with it the renewal of a substantial basic deficit which continued in the final quarter of the year—although at a diminished rate. With the sole exception of 1957, when the Suez Canal was closed and we exported unusual quantities of oil to Europe, 1961 provided the best record since we started running deficits in 1949. True, advance repayments of long-term debts—amounting to $650 million—were unusually large last year. However, the improvement was still substantial.

But improvement in our basic deficit is not enough. We must bring it under complete control so that we can look forward to full balance—and to surpluses; whenever they may be required in our overall national interest. We can accomplish this only by enlarging our export surplus, and by reducing outpayments when we can do so without curtailing activities vitally important to our Nation's future.

Our own security and our responsibilities to the free world require us to keep our troops abroad. We cannot endanger our security by withdrawing them in order to balance our international accounts. But we can and must find every possible way of limiting or offsetting the dollar outflow that inevitably accompanies the stationing of troops overseas. We are doing just that through a combination of economies and cooperative arrangements with certain of our allies. As a result, we can look forward to a substantial reduction in the dollar drain of our oversea forces.

In the case of private investment, we do not desire to reduce the flow abroad by imposing controls that would run counter to the principles of free trade and free competition so basic to our national purpose. We can, however, lessen the special inducements to American investment in other industrial countries that are part of our present tax system. That is why we are urging tax legislation to minimize such incentives.

Although our foreign assistance programs contribute to our annual dollar outflow, they do so to a far lesser degree than their overall amount might suggest. Two-thirds of all foreign aid expenditures are now being made here in the United States. Only the remaining third affects our payments position. We are making vigorous efforts to cut the balance of payments impact of foreign economic aid still further, and we hope to get it down to approximately one-fifth.

In the long run, however, the only way to eliminate our basic deficit is by increasing our export surplus. This will require the combined efforts of management, labor, and Government. Management and labor must work together to assure reasonable price stability so that our exporters can maintain their price competitiveness—and, we hope, improve it. Industry must modernize at a rapid rate. I have already told you what Government is doing in the field of depreciation reform to assist modernization. Government must also help to assure a supply of export credit to our traders as good as that available to their oversea competitors. We will very soon be in a position to do so for the first time through the operation of an export credit insurance program developed jointly by the Export-Import Bank and the insurance industry. Finally, American business—of which only a small percentage is now in the export field—must aggressively search out foreign trading opportunities wherever they may be. This is in the best tradition of our trading forebears, and it has never been more necessary than today.

Fortunately, the possibilities for increasing our oversea sales are excellent. The world is entering an entirely new trading era that holds out great promise for our exporters. In the case of our existing markets, we have only to look at the scope of the resurgent prosperity of Western Europe, and the emergence of the European Common Market, to see Europe's potential for our exports. And, although our markets in less-developed areas are limited today, as these countries grow and prosper, their demands for our goods will also grow.

Furthermore, in Europe and other parts of the world, thousands of American products are still virtually unknown. American business is just beginning to probe huge potential markets for them. Success in developing these markets will require bold enterprise and skillful competition.

If American business is to find new customers in Europe, we must deal with the Common Market on the matter of mutual tariff reduction. Congress must grant the President power to negotiate on a broader basis than present legislation allows. If Congress fails to provide this authority, American producers will be seriously handicapped in their efforts to retain and to expand their share of this large and rich trading area.

Now, let me turn to our overall payments deficit, which reflects both our basic deficit and short-term capital flows. Through 1959, short-term flows were small and usually favorable to our balance of payments. This was natural, since the currencies of other industrialized countries were not generally convertible, hence, not too attractive to foreign holders. However, with convertibility, money began to flow from one financial center to another in search of higher interest rates or speculative profits. The result was a substantial outflow of short-term funds from the United States, which in 1960 amounted to $2 billion.

This large short-term outflow obscured the dramatic improvement in our basic balance during 1960 and led to an overall deficit of $3.9 billion. Although altered in nature, substantial short-term outflows continued during 1961.

These short-term flows can be caused by various factors—a lessening of confidence or disparities in interest rates—as in the fall of 1960, or credits related to trade—as was largely the case this past year, when a substantial part of the outflow was in the form of bank loans to Japan to finance her growing imports.

Such short-term flows, when carried to excess, can be unhealthy — even dangerous. We have worked hard to neutralize them. We have held our short-term interest rates at levels that largely negated the attraction of foreign market rates. The Federal Reserve has increased the legal limit on the interest that may be paid on time deposits, thus enabling American banks to compete more effectively with their foreign counterparts. Our most recent step was taken earlier this month when the United States and nine other members of the International Monetary Fund agreed that $6 billion in additional resources should be provided for standby lending commitments to the Fund. These supplementary resources would be used to protect the world payments system, and would be available to the 10 participating countries, including the United States.

One aspect of our balance of payments deficit is worth stressing: The balance of payments is an accounting of transactions that affect the gold and liquid liability of the United States. It does not reflect long-term claims represented by U.S. investment abroad. For the 3 years 1958 through 1960, for instance, our payments deficits totaled $11 billion, of which about $5 billion represented our gold losses and $6 billion represented liquid dollar gains by foreigners. However, this loss was to a large extent matched by increased U.S. holdings of both short-term and long-term foreign assets.

Total foreign assets and investments of all sorts in the United States rose by about $13 billion from the end of 1957 to the end of 1960. During the same period, total U.S. Government and private loans and investments abroad (excluding loans repayable in local currency) increased by about $14.5 billion—a net gain to the United States of $1½ billion. However, we also lost $5 billion in gold. Thus our overall gold and international investment position showed a loss for the 3-year period of only about $3.5 billion net, in contrast to the deterioration in our current position of $11 billion as measured by our balance of payments account.

While this demonstrates that our long-term position is considerably stronger than balance of payments figures alone indicate, it in no way reduces the importance of putting an early end to the substantial payments deficits we have had since 1949. We must get our current balance in order so as to end the drain on our gold stocks.

I have outlined the principal elements of our foreign and domestic economic policy. Our prospects, both at home and abroad, are good, but we have much to do to insure that they remain so.

At home, I think everyone agrees that our first obligation is to reduce the unacceptably

high level of unemployment. To be sure, for the last 2 months unemployment has dropped close to 6 percent, after hovering near 7 percent most of the year. And we expect it to drop below 5 percent by the end of the year, as long-range expansion takes hold. However, there is a hard core of unemployment which continued expansion may not touch. That is why we urgently need a manpower retraining bill, to ease the lingering human misery and chronic economic waste that such unemployment represents.

In addition, nearly a million young people in our country are neither earning nor learning. This dismal fact illustrates the need for a Youth Employment Opportunities Act, to insure that such frightening waste of our national potential does not continue.

And finally, although we look forward to prosperity, we cannot guarantee that there will never be another recession. To prepare for that possibility, President Kennedy has asked for three major countercyclical measures: broadened unemployment insurance, a standby program of public works, and the authority to promptly initiate limited and temporary tax reductions. These are needed in the earliest stages of recession—when quick action can accomplish effective results.

The achievement of our economic goals will not be easy. But it is our responsibility to demonstrate to the world the economic vitality of a free nation, and the value of a free enterprise society where labor, business, finance, and Government work together within the framework of a competitive price system, responding to the market forces of supply and demand.

The stimulus of competition has brought us the world's highest standard of living. Let us use our economic strength to develop our Nation to its true potential, to distribute the benefits of growth among our people, and to share our way of life with all the peoples of the world who choose the path of freedom.

Do Your Own Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, government by relatives has been exemplified in the past by Trujillos and/or other dictatorships.

Now, surprisingly enough, in our own country, we have the brother of the President assuming the duties and the responsibilities in making pronouncements which ordinarily belong to the Secretary of State or the Vice President.

Robert G. Spivack, in Sunday's New York Herald Tribune, raises some very interesting, if not embarassing, questions which should be answered by the Kennedy administration if we are to continue with orderly constitutional government:

ROBERT KENNEDY'S ROLE

(By Robert G. Spivack)

WASHINGTON.—Probably no member of the Kennedy Cabinet is more respected, feared, or resented than the President's young brother, Robert, the Attorney General.

His recent round-the-world tour has once again focused attention on the role he plays in the administration. The likelihood that an even younger brother, Teddy, will soon declare himself a candidate for the Senate seat once held by Daniel Webster also has given rise to speculation about a Kennedy "dynasty."

Are the strong feelings about Robert justified? Or is he on the receiving end of criticism that is really meant for the President but only whispered, not expressed out loud, because he is President?

The role of Robert Kennedy—he prefers not to be called Bobby—merits examination because it has suddenly dawned on this politically conscious city that he is emerging as the "strong man" of the administration.

Labor racketeers have reason to know at firsthand that he is a hard opponent. Once Robert became aware of what they were doing, he never let up in exposing them. While few went to jail, he managed to upset their modus vivendi. He made the public aware of how phony were the "anti-Communist" professions of some racketeers and how fraudulent the boasts of others about being pillars of local society.

As Attorney General he has also turned in a credible performance. He appointed a high caliber staff, from Byron "Whizzer" White down through the chiefs of the civil rights, criminal and antitrust divisions.

Insofar as the freedom riders and others who have sought first-class citizenship for Negroes are concerned, the Robert Kennedy record leaves little to be desired. After a year of tremendous activity there has been relatively little substantial criticism against the Justice Department.

Of course, there remain some questions about wiretap legislation, how deeply concerned he is about civil liberties, and there have been allegations of favoritism in the handling of German war assets. On the whole, though, as Attorney General, young Robert has acquitted himself.

Where Robert has come in for strong criticism has been in the method of his political operations. There are many Democrats who still have not forgiven him for the campaign waged against HUBERT H. HUMPHREY in West Virginia.

The decision, however, to send him around the world poses other questions. No matter how many reports he makes to Secretary of State Dean Rusk, foreign governments are less likely now to look to the State Department for word on the administration attitude regarding Berlin or Indonesia or other trouble spots.

Sending Robert did not, as one writer suggested, mean a "conflict of interest." It meant a downgrading of the Secretary and his subordinates. There have been reports that Foreign Service officers abroad sent back glowing reports of the trip. Would you expect them to report back, even if it were true, that "the President's brother made a poor impression on the natives?"

The second man to be injured by Robert's tour was the Vice President. The idea has been implanted that foreign diplomats would do well to call on Robert at "the Little White House" in the Justice Department when they want to know what's what.

Allowing the Vice President to ride in the same car with John Glenn does not cancel out the impression that he now occupies a "Throttlebottom" position in the administration.

Robert Kennedy's talents are in the domestic field, not foreign affairs. A real test of his capabilities would be to assign him the role of getting congressional action on two portions of the President's program that are in danger: the public school aid bill and the medicare program.

If he could get favorable action out of a hostile Congress, his reputation as a man of action would climb higher than it did even in his arguments with noisy students in the Far East.

Such accomplishments would erase much of the criticism being expressed about the role Robert now plays. Also there would be something solid for the administration to show the voters when the Democrats ask for public support in November.

Five Great Decisions of U.S. Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, for the past few days I have been lecturing on the merits of the current issue of the magazine of the International Rotary Clubs. All the articles are deserving of the attention of all Americans, young and old, everywhere across our land. Previously I have showed how two Europeans see us through the eyes of their own experience—though by terming him a European, I do not mean to denigrate Professor Sorokin's contributions to his beloved, adopted nation—today, our lesson is given by an American who has travelled to all corners of the world, and in fact, is far away from his home base at this moment, the Honorable Chester Bowles. There is certainly no need for me to recount the varied accomplishments of our distinguished former colleague. If I were to single out one talent, one achievement, it would have to be his consummate ability to communicate with all men, and in such communication to inspire and retain the warmth, respect and trust of all men.

The Ambassador's subject is our foreign policy during the present century. He focuses on what he considers to be—correctly, I believe—the five areas of decisions America has faced during the first seven decades of the 20th century. The first four are history now; the fifth, and greatest, in large part governs our actions today. The objective of the decision we have taken, in the Ambassador's words, is: "to help assure for the people of the world their freedom of choice." In carrying out this objective, he believes—and I subscribe completely to his belief—that "our assistance can be truly effective only to the degree that it reaches directly the people of the recipient countries." I do not want to subtract from the impact of the Ambassador's article; but to this last quote I shall allude again, at another time. Now, in its entirety, may I read you this little classic:

A generation or so hence, what will historians say about America's influence over the course of events in the mid-20th century?

I believe that they will focus their attention on at least five areas of decision in the first seven decades of this century. In two instances they may say that we failed, in two others that we succeeded; the fifth still hangs in the balance.

What, then, were these five decisions?

First was our tragic failure in 1919 to join the League of Nations and to throw our

power behind a program to preserve the newly won peace.

Second was our equally costly failure to understand the revolutionary upheaval in China and its relevance to our future security, following the collapse of the Manchu Empire in 1911.

Third was our success in meeting the Nazi threat to Western Europe.

Fourth was our brilliant and decisive response to the awesome challenge posed by the postwar economic and political chaos in Europe.

Fifth, and finally, is the fundamental decision which we face in the 1960's in regard to our relations with two-thirds of the people of this earth, who live in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America, whose rising hopes and demands for a better life have created the most powerful, the most dangerous, and yet promising revolution in the long and eventful history of the human race.

This decision involves a deep-seated, totally unprecedented, and far-reaching commitment, not only by the American Government but by the American people as well. It is a decision to pledge our power, our resources, our energies, and our fortitude in support of individual dignity, expanding economic opportunities, and a greater measure of social justice for all men everywhere and in opposition to those who would destroy those universal rights and values.

Let me therefore briefly examine U.S. reaction to each of the first four areas of decision in the hope that it may help provide perspective in dealing with the fifth.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS—THE FIRST CHALLENGE

In 1917 the United States had entered World War I as an innocent newcomer to international politics. Fortunately we entered it under the leadership of a President who realized that the world of 1914 had vanished forever.

Recently it has been fashionable to dismiss Woodrow Wilson as a visionary. And yet his vision was rooted in a higher realism, a clearer sense of the nature of reality, than that of almost any of his contemporaries. Over and over again Wilson warned us that if we rejected his vision and seceded from the emerging world community, we would not only "break the heart of the world" but would pay for our failure in blood.

But the habits of isolationism were still strong and its advocates skillful and determined. We had acted generously enough, they said, in sending our boys overseas to "solve Europe's problems." Now it was time to bring them home, to keep them home, and to accept the call for a return to normalcy.

And so Woodrow Wilson was repudiated and his League of Nations rejected. America, which could have provided the spirit and the sinews necessary for the beginnings of world order, turned its back on the future. I believe that the historical judgment of A.D. 2000 upon America's withdrawal from world responsibility in 1919 will be severe.

CHINA—THE SECOND CHALLENGE

In 1911, after 2,000 years of remarkable continuity, the Chinese Empire came to an end. Since the mid-18th century, Americans had had many close connections with China. At the birth of the Chinese Republic we were admirably positioned to understand the physical and psychological needs of the emerging new China and to exert a positive and perhaps decisive influence over economic and political developments there. Yet we were so busy watching the soaring stock market, listening to our new jazz bands, and enjoying the benefits of our booming economy that only a handful of farsighted Americans were even consicous of the challenge.

When in 1920 and 1921, Sun Yat-sen urgently pressed us for substantial loans with which to further the unification and economic development of China, we abruptly turned him down. And so, following a similar turndown in the capitals of Western Europe, a now desperate Sun Yat-sen turned to the new Communist government in Moscow for the help which the Atlantic nations had denied him. The Kremlin recognized the stakes which were being played for in China and eagerly grasped the opportunity. By 1923, Soviet technicians, Soviet political advisers, and Soviet capital began flowing into China. Again, in 1927, when Sun's successor, Chiang Kai-shek, turned against the Communists and outlined his plans to establish a modernized non-Communist state, America—fat, contented, far away, and secure—failed to understand the challenge.

In 1931 the Japanese Army moved into Manchuria. There is no need to dwell on the grim and unhappy story of China since then. The 1930's found us caught up in our own problems, unwilling to provoke the naval power of Japan or to give the wobbly Chinese Government the assistance it needed so desperately.

No one knows precisely when we finally lost our capacity to influence events in China. Some observers assert that as late as 1941 a comprehensive American military, political, and economic effort might have provided an effective democratic alternative to communism. By the end of the war, however, it had become clear that nothing less than massive American military intervention could change the course of events.

In view of public weariness with war and crises and the efforts of political leaders in both parties to cater to this natural state of mind, the necessary action was not even debated. So it was that we failed to meet the second great foreign policy challenge of our century. Americans will live with the consequences of this failure for many generations to come.

SUPPORTING BRITAIN—THE THIRD CHALLENGE

The third challenge was one which we belatedly but effectively recognized and met.

In early September 1939 when the Nazi Panzer divisions and Stukas struck suddenly across the Polish border, our first instinct was withdrawal into isolationism. The Neutrality Act, curbing shipments to the Western European nations, expressed our national mood.

Yet the old myths of self-sufficiency were weakening. We were beginning belatedly to recognize the interdependence of nations that Woodrow Wilson had pleaded with us to accept. And so in Britain's darkest and finest hour we came to her support.

In the following years American industry and military power provided the decisive power that crushed the totalitarian forces which American membership in the League of Nations might have kept from exploding into aggression in the first place.

REBUILDING FREE EUROPE—THE FOURTH CHALLENGE

The fourth challenge began to take shape soon after the end of hostilities in Europe. Western Europe's cities were in ruins from years of bombing and street fighting. Food, fuel, and building materials were inadequate. The entire European economy was on the verge of collapse, with mounting inflation everywhere.

In East Germany and Poland nearly 200 Soviet Army divisions stood ready and able to roll, almost unopposed, to the English Channel. All through Western Europe, Communist Parties which had been effectively associated with the underground resistance to Nazism moved vigorously to sow confusion, to establish united fronts, and ultimately to seize power.

At this critical moment farsighted men and the crisis came together, and the result was a brilliant, creative national effort that checked the Soviet military, political, and economic threat, rebuilt the foundations of a new free Europe, and almost certainly prevented a third world war. The Truman doctrine of the defense of Greece and Turkey was followed by the Marshall plan for the economic and political recovery of Western Europe. Then came the North Atlantic Treaty Organization for the military defense of Western Europe and the Berlin airlift.

In 1949, as the fresh challenge of the newly free, desperately poor, yet largely uncultured nations began to emerge, we again broke new ground through the point 4 proposal for a constructive partnership with Asia, Africa, and Latin America. These were years of brilliant, creative, nonpartisan response to an unprecedented challenge.

THE FIFTH AND GREATEST CHALLENGE

The fifth challenge is now only gradually coming to be understood. It calls for sober, mature, pragmatic action in the pursuit of one simple objective: the creation of a free world community where choice is possible, where the dignity of the individual is recognized and protected, where the economic opportunities for all people are constantly expanding.

What is required of us?

The first essential is that we understand the nature of the forces which are upsetting the old order, disrupting old societies, and creating fervent new hopes and expectations.

At the heart of this revolution lies the universal promise of expanded human dignity, greater opportunity for the individual, and an increased measure of justice. Although its ways are often violent, irrational, and destructive, this revolutionary promise is based on the human values which may be found in almost every religion on earth.

Although the Soviet Union did not create this revolutionary wave, it is seeking to divert it for its own purposes. In this effort the Soviet Union has some very major advantages.

First of all, the Kremlin clearly understands the revolutionary forces which were loosened by World War I and which have been unleased by World War II with a strong assist from new industrial, agricultural, and communications technology.

Moreover, the image of the Soviet Union is not blurred by conflicts between races or a record of discrimination against the darker skinned people of the world.

Although the Soviet Union's industrial and economic resources are substantially less than the United States, they are more than adequate to the task. Equally important, the Soviet Union has the capacity through its totalitarian government to focus its resources—educational, industrial, economic, and political—where they can best serve the Soviet cause.

Yet there are many formidable obstacles in the way of Soviet success. For one thing, the announced national and ideological objectives of the Soviet Union are sharply opposed to the new nationalism which has become the driving force of the new nations of Asia and Africa and the awakening lands of Latin America. Because the Soviet Union is opposed to nationalism, it is also opposed to the United Nations, where these new nations have found a global forum in which to express their views. The Soviet Union is also deeply opposed to formal religion, which it considers "the opiate of the people." It is committed not to the expanded freedoms which the whole world seeks, but to the harnessing of the individual to the service of the state.

What about the strengths and weaknesses of the United States?

Our disadvantages as we approach the fifth great challenge are substantial. The most damaging of these is the fact that the American people are uncertain about the nature of the conflict and are skeptical of its meaning for their own future. We are plagued with a long record of racial discrimination.

Paradoxically, our intensified efforts to solve this problem may be expected to create a continuing series of "incidents" which will tend to create distrust among the two-

thirds of the people of the world whose skins are darker than most of ours.

Finally, while our economy has recently recovered from a recession, we are nowhere near producing to our full capacity, and the President's trade proposals, which would lower many tariffs, meet strong opposition.

Although these disadvantages are sobering, it would be a profound mistake to underestimate our very great strengths.

Our first great asset is that we were born a revolutionary people, under a towering revolutionary leadership. Great American liberal leaders such as Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt have risen one after another to challenge the American people to reexamine their society, to renew their commitments to liberty and freedom, and to adapt their constitutional principles to the fast-flowing developments of a changing world.

Another great asset is our extraordinary American educational system. But the most important advantage of all is one of which we appear least aware: the fact that what we want for the people of the new emerging continents is precisely what they want for themselves.

We have no desire for satellites or nations subservient to our will. We have no wish to control others or to force them into tidy, preconceived concepts of history. For the people of Tanganyika, Bolivia, Burma, Korea, and of other nations, young and old, we want expanded economic opportunities, increased dignity and justice, more doctors to take care of their sick, more food to feed their hungry, more and better schools to wipe out their illiteracy, improved communications so that we can better understand each other, the right to travel, to trade, to move freely, to speak, to think, and to worship in their own way, within cultures of their own choosing.

Our objective can be briefly stated: to help assure for the people of the world their freedom of choice.

In carrying out this objective. I believe, first, that our assistance can be truly effective only to the degree that it reaches directly the people of the recipient countries—that it gives them a sense of personal participation, of justice, and a better life; second, that our aid should be directed primarily to those nations that are willing to help themselves: to tax their people equitably, reform land tenure, extend rural credit, and strive for social justice; and third, that the need has been shown for long-term financing of economic development at more adequate levels. Only on the basis of such a long-term commitment can our friends in other lands plan for effective use of our aid.

Such, then, is the challenge and the nature of the decision that confronts the American people. What will be their response?

If we, of America, are true to our heritage, there can be but one answer. I hope that the historians of the year 2000 will be able to record that America's response to the fifth great decision of the present century was confident, bold, compassionate—and everlastingly right.

Keep Control of Schools at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, two of the very fine weeklies in my congressional district, the Floral Park Bulletin and the Franklin Square Bulletin, in the Thursday, March 1 issues, sensibly editorialized on the massive propaganda effort of those professionals who want Federal control over our local schools. The editorial follows:

FEDERAL AID

Hugh Davies, president of the New York School Boards Association, has reported that member school boards in New York State have expressed strong opposition to Federal aid to general support of public schools.

We think this is a wise decision on the part of the boards.

We believe Federal interference with the educational system is an invasion of States rights.

In giving aid to schools the Federal Government would insist on running all phases of education, regulating curriculum and all programs. It would be frustrating and demoralizing to educators and students alike. It could cause a definite downgrading of the educational system.

We must not forget, we are the Government. Any money the Federal Government gives it first must get from us in the form of taxes. In this case it would take a great deal and return little.

It would cost millions to set up and administer a Bureau of Education. It would require thousands of employees. Millions, perhaps billions, would be spent before schools received a cent and for this cent they would pay dearly with rules and regulations.

No longer could parents approach the school board with complaints or suggestions regarding the curriculum; it would have become law.

At the present time there is some difficulty adjusting State aid to school districts. It will take time, but this will be worked out to the best advantage. It is, we know, impossible to reach a figure that will be approved by all. Undoubtedly the State will find it necessary to levy new taxes to handle the problem of education. They will not be as great as Federal taxes would be, and the money will be returned to New York State school districts, something that cannot be said if we are taxed federally for school aid.

International Travel and Our Balance of Payments Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, there recently appeared on the editorial pages of two of Washington's great newspapers, comments concerning problems that affect us all, particularly those of this great body who are involved in concern with the air transport industry.

I am sure we all recall the recent strike threat which faced Pan American World Airways and Trans World Airlines—strike threats, by pilots, over which the carriers themselves had little or no control. Fortunately, through the efforts of Secretary Goldberg and mutual commonsense on the part of the carriers and the pilots, these strikes have been averted—at least temporarily.

Mr. Speaker, I would not attempt to pass myself off as an expert on international air transport, but I do know this: every time one of our transatlantic planes is grounded, American passengers have no recourse but to use foreign lines. This means that the balance of payments, a problem that is becoming more complex daily, must continue to go more and more in our disfavor.

Insofar as possible, we must seek to keep our people flying our international lines. Perhaps some legislation, or some Executive order, is necessary to assure that our Government people traveling abroad use our U.S. flag carriers whenever and wherever possible. By the same token, it is the responsibility of our international airlines to guarantee to our people—both Government and civilian—that their services are better than their competitors from abroad. Having recently completed an extensive official trip around the world, I know they are.

Perhaps whoever flies what internation airline appears inconsequential to some, but I do not agree. Every time a U.S. Government employee—or, for that matter—a plain U.S. citizen—utilizes the services of a foreign airline he creates a balance of payment unfavorable to the United States.

I am happy to learn that Pan Am and TWA are attempting to work out an arrangement with their pilots, and with their flight engineers, which will bring about harmony with labor and management so that Americans will travel aboard American carriers. If you will pardon local pride, I hope they will do so as often as possible from Friendship International Airport.

These editorial comments to which I earlier alluded are striking in contrast. One, from the Washington Post of February 23, concerns itself with the general problem of balance of payments. The other article to which I refer was written for the Washington Star of March 1 by David Lawrence and concerns organized labor. Mr. Lawrence and I disagree on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of fairplay and in the belief that commonsense is so important if we are to prevail in competition from abroad, under unanimous consent, I include both articles in the RECORD for consideration by all the Members of this body.

The articles follow:

THE BAD NEWS

News about the state of the balance of payments, whether good or bad, tends to be broken gradually, as partial data keep coming in. By now it is scarcely a surprise to learn from the Department of Commerce that the payments deficit in 1961 was $2.4 billion. This is considerably better than the $3.9 billion gap in 1960. But all of the improvement came in the first half of the year, and since then things have been going downhill again. The fourth quarter of 1961 was about as bad as anything yet experienced.

The Department of Commerce now comes up with the details of that very poor showing. By no means all of the year end outflow, as had been rumored, was due to window dressing by financial institutions in other countries and hence likely soon to be reversed. There was some bona fide capital transactions that just happened to coincide

during that one quarter. Such a bunching of payments is not likely to occur again. On the contrary, the next quarter will look better because these payments are out of the way. But neither will the money come back in the near future.

The United States made no progress during 1961 in raising exports, the principal means of achieving payments equilibrium. Exports remained at about the same level as in 1960, if Government financed shipments are excluded. Part of the payments improvement came from the payments of debt by foreign countries. This sort of thing is helpful, but it is the equivalent of using up reserves, and brings no permanent gains. U.S. foreign investments, which the Treasury wants to curb, brought a major increase in returns. But the fundamental problem of closing the payments gap will apparently be with us in 1962 as it has been in prior years.

LABOR LEADERS MEET FACTS OF LIFE

(By David Lawrence)

Strange news items are appearing these days—as, for instance, reports that the AFL-CIO is voicing criticism of President Kennedy and is predicting a "Kennedy recession" if he doesn't soon put through a program to pep up the Nation's economy.

Such criticism can be misunderstood as meaning a break between labor and the administration which it helped so effectively at the polls in the last presidential election. The truth is that something deeper is involved.

For the all-important fact is that labor union leaders are coming face to face with reality and are looking for a scapegoat on whom to blame their expected inability to get hereafter unlimited increases in wages and benefits for their members.

Labor union leaders are adept as politicians. They must run for office periodically, and in the larger unions this is tantamount to running for Congress or for any other high office in public life. The candidate has to prove constantly that he is getting the maximum for his constituents.

The facts, however, are piling up against the labor union politicians. The leaders are confronted with a simple truth—American businesses face stiff competition from abroad, where wage costs are lower. In the not-far-distant future the United States is to reduce tariffs. Goods are to come in from the European Common Market countries in large quantities. How can a high level of employment be maintained when that happens? It isn't enough to rely on retraining programs. Something more fundamental has to be done in labor-management relations.

So it's probably an easy way out for labor leaders to begin blaming the administration for not creating more public works programs and for failing to stimulate employment artificially in other ways. This, however, isn't going to be the permanent answer, and the labor union leaders and economists are slowly beginning to realize it.

A new era in labor-management relations has been opened up as a result of world conditions. British labor organizations in the last several years have had to face similar crises and adapt themselves to various self-restraints while austerity programs were carried out by the Government.

It is something novel and unfamiliar, however, to American labor leaders to conform to any pattern of restriction in wage increases. They resent and dislike heartily the recommendations of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, which recently offered certain guidelines on productivity. Its suggestion that maybe labor and management and the consumer public should all share in the benefits of productivity hasn't been well received by labor, which seems to feel that it should not be restricted in any effort to obtain the maximum of productivity's benefits, even if shareholders get nothing, and if the public has to bear increased prices instead of benefiting from lower prices.

Incidentally, the steel negotiations are being watched carefully by the labor leaders in other industries. Already they don't like what they hear. They don't relish governmental intervention at all. They are inclined to voice criticism publicly and privately of the rôle played by Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg. He, however, is doing what the President wants him to do—trying to avert a steel strike. The Secretary cannot help it if he has to take a course which he never would have supported had he remained as general counsel of the Steelworkers Union.

The labor leaders have expected Mr. Goldberg to become their partisan supporter. But the issues have grown bigger than any individual. It's a condition and not a theory that Secretary Goldberg faces. It is interesting to note, too, that in management circles they also don't like what the Secretary of Labor is doing. They feel that the whole pattern seems to be one of governmental regulation of or interference with collective bargaining and that both sides in labor disputes will be hampered if this continues.

But the facts of economic life are that the country can't stand big strikes. The last steel strike, it now is recognized, did as much as any other single factor to bring about a maladjustment in the national economy called a "recession."

Another significant development emphasizes that the facts of economic life are emerging in clear view in the railroad industry. A presidential commission, consisting of representatives of labor, management, and the public, has just filed a lengthy report that calls for a drastic overhaul of "featherbedding" and other uneconomic practices which have helped to put the railroad industry into a perilous position financially. The labor representatives naturally have to issue a dissenting report. But adoption of the recommendations is nevertheless in large part necessary if the railroads are to be saved.

Labor leadership, broadly speaking, is in a tight spot politically inside all unions. Sooner or later, the rank and file will have to be informed that the days of unlimited wage increases, threats of big strikes and demands for increased benefits—irrespective of whether they can be borne by management—are over. Henceforth, collective bargaining is going to require a sense of mutual responsibility which it has heretofore lacked, and there will be little use of introducing scapegoats. For the real culprits are new competition at home due to improved machinery, and new competition abroad in world trade due to the establishment of the Common Market in Europe.

Spending the United States Into Bankruptcy Through Foreign Aid Will Not Stop Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, some commonsense arguments against continued foreign aid programs are contained in the text of the following advertisement sponsored by Warner & Swasey Co. in the U.S. News & World Report:

AMERICA GONE BROKE WILL BE NO HELP TO THE WORLD

For years we have been giving away our billions all over the world, too keep countries from going Communist. It has been a poor investment, for more and more countries and areas turn left in spite of our billions.

Some Americans say we should continue to give away our savings because it is the charitable thing to do, and we can afford it. Is it? Can we? We have been pouring out our earnings for years to people most of whom tax themselves at lower rates than we pay in order to make gifts to them. And many, many of these nations who not only accept our gifts but demand more, are no nearer self-support nor the self-respect it brings, than when we started to pay their bills.

If (as seems to be true) foreign aid simply makes foreign nations expect it, and if it does not prevent the spread of communism or its blood-brother neutralism, aren't we simply making more and more countries more attractive prey for Communist aggressors? Aren't we just supplying the wealth that will make those areas worth conquering, without forcing them to use our aid to make themselves strong enough to resist our common enemy?

Where is the charity—where is the good sense or decency—in that?

Preserve Our Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE SILER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, at the request of one of my prominent constituents, who is patriotic, discerning, opposed to socialism, and greatly interested in the future of our country, I would like to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD his complete letter of March 2 that I have received today in the mail. This constituent, who requested that his letter be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, is Mr. Lewis Howard, of London, Ky., and his letter is, as follows:

LONDON, KY., *March 2, 1962.*

STEPS OUR NATION MUST TAKE TO WIN THE COLD WAR AND PRESERVE THE FREEDOM IN OUR REPUBLIC

First, a few words about myself so you may understand that I am writing from direct experience. The following was not taught me at Harvard University—as for schooling, I managed to get an eighth grade diploma by going to school 5 months a year and working on a farm the remaining months, therefore, the most of my education has come from travel and business, though the schooling I did have I was taught to believe in freedom instead of socialism and communism like some of our schools are teaching today.

I left the farm at the age of 21, came to the Hazard, Ky., coalfields in 1934 and started working in the coal mines when day labor was $4.60 per day. I took time out from mining to help fight World War II, with the thought in mind that we were fighting for free democracy. I was one of the lucky ones, I returned with part of my health. Upon my return from service, I was forced to quit hard labor, so I went in the mining

business with $3,000 and a reputation of an honest man. Today I have an investment in coal mines totaling about $1 million. I help furnish employment for about 500 employees. These mines are some of the few non-union mines left in our Nation today.

This year I was the winner of the highest academy award given in our Nation by the American International Academy, this was given to me for fighting for a cause that I believed to be right. Also, for this same reason I was made a Kentucky Colonel by our present Governor, Bert T. Combs. The above was only written to help you understand the writer.

Everyone knows we are at war with Russia—cold or hot, it is yet a war. 1. Who ever heard of winning a war fighting the defensive side? 2. Who ever heard of winning a war with negotiations?

For question No. 1, if we win this war we must seize the offensive side and fight it with everything we have to win. The defensive, for the past year, has been well demonstrated, it has cost us Cuba, the Berlin wall, Laos and now fighting a defensive war in South Vietnam; this was also demonstrated in the now divided country of Korea, which is left for the Communist to hack away little by little. If freedom is to survive we must seize the offensive and push freedom harder than the enemy pushes communism. We must liberate the countries that were once free—yes, China included.

Now the big question is, How do we do this?

First, we have a house-cleaning job to do at home—every known Communist in our country should either go to prison or be deported to Russia.

Second, every person that we have in our Government that has any leanings toward communism or socialism or the appeasement policy, should be thrown out or impeached from the leadership of our Republic (we have more than most of us want to believe).

Third, if we sell freedom throughout the world, another way we must clean house is to get rid of everything that has a tendency to lead us away from freedom toward socialism or communism. We must stop the twist shows that are being put on with our Constitution of the United States. It is being twisted to suit the pink and red cause and for the destruction of our freedom.

Fourth, the free enterprise system is what made our country great. We can sell free democracy to other countries if we practice it at home. This is one of our biggest house-cleaning jobs—our Government must stop this socialism and sell the business back to free enterprise. We can use this money to pay off our national debt. This would relieve this awful tax burden we are under. The free enterprise way, everyone bears his share of the tax burden. By setting our own house in order is the only way we can qualify ourselves to sell free democracy to the world.

Our great losses previously mentioned has weakened the faith of our freedom loving people. We can throw the Communists out of Cuba within 36 to 48 hours. The quicker it is done the better off we will be. This will regain our lost faith and start us on the offensive side of this war, once we seize the initiative we should never weaken.

About the negotiations, this is the most foolish thing I ever heard of—Russia never did live up to any agreement they ever made. If we had a stack of signed agreements a mile high they would not be worth one little match that it would take to destroy them. This is just a slow way of giving our enemies what they want. Russia will only respect one thing—this is power. We must act now before it is too late. We must make our enemies understand that we aren't going to be kicked around any further, and start pushing freedom back to its original boundaries.

I heard President Kennedy say in one of his campaign speeches, when he was downgrading our country, that he didn't know if our form of government could survive or not. If this is all the faith he has in our Government he would do our great Nation a service if he would resign and leave our country. I will say this, if we continue to follow the same trend that we have since Mr. Kennedy became President, we won't survive.

To all freedom loving people, we must stop this appeasement policy now, before it is too late. It is already later than we want to believe. We should heed the words of Patrick Henry, "Give me liberty or give me death." All we have seen and heard for the past 15 months is big noise and promises and no action. While the Communists whittle the free world down country by country.

People wake up—May God help us if we continue to follow this downward road to destruction.

Sincerely,

LEWIS HOWARD.

When Are We Going To Stop Selling Out to the Federal Bureaucrats?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the story of Newburgh, N.Y., and the State of New York in handling its welfare programs should warn all segments of our society that so long as we continue to sell out to the Federal bureaucrats by accepting Federal aid, we continue to undermine our foundations of freedom. Perhaps all of us, States, local communities, and all the pressure groups should take warning as pointed out in the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune:

PAYING THE PIPER

Seven months ago the New York State Board of Social Welfare, which administers the relief programs, cracked down upon the little city of Newburgh, which was trying to keep chiselers off the relief roll and reduce costs. The State board denounced the Newburgh plan as illegal and inhuman and said it would jeopardize the State's reimbursement from the Federal Government. A suit was started to block the plan, and soon an injunction was issued against 12 of the 13 Newburgh rules.

Now the State board has taken a new look at the Federal Government's welfare regulations. The board expressed concern over steadily increasing domination by Federal authorities and the consequent loss of State and local autonomy, and declared:

"We believe that a stand must be made now by this State and, hopefully, every other State to stop and reverse the trend of Federal domination, of a growing complexity that is getting completely out of hand, and of the constant threats to withhold Federal funds because of alleged nonconformity with Federal regulations."

The board urged Congress to amend the welfare laws to limit Federal power to make the States obey rules set by Federal administrators. Under the board's plan, the power of Federal bureaucrats to review a State's welfare program would be confined to review of the State's welfare laws, rather than the State's welfare plans, as is now the case. Federal administrators then could not stretch Federal requirements and threaten to withdraw Federal funds unless a State amended its plans.

Joseph McD. Mitchell, city manager of Newburgh, hailed the State board's statement as a major and dramatic shift, of policy and said it repudiated Federal schemes to steal more power from States and localities. He took credit for stimulating the board's action.

Maybe New York has started something which will cause Congress to put reins on the Federal welfarists, but we fear it may be too late to turn back. Once a State starts accepting Federal handouts for welfare or any other purpose, it must spend the money according to Federal rules. The changes proposed by the New York board would not make much difference. If New York or any other State really wants to run its own welfare program, it will have to give up Federal aid.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

The Case of Yugoslavia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, since so much interest has been focused on our country's relations with Yugoslavia, I am sure my colleagues will find the following editorial of particular benefit.

THE CASE OF YUGOSLAVIA

When good American citizens gather together and wax indignant over some particular aspect of foreign policy, it is a clear sign that neither editors nor the Department of State have done their duty in explaining the reason for that policy.

The case of Yugoslavia has attracted attention recently, because of the matter of the training of Yugoslav military pilots in Texas, and the sale or gift of older jet planes to Yugoslavia. The plea is made that Yugoslavia is a Communist country. Therefore the United States should have nothing to do with her, in the way of helping her grow stronger with American military and economic aid.

This kind of open-and-shut reasoning can be understood, because it assumes that if communism is bad in Russia, it is bad everywhere else. Therefore, Americans should have nothing to do with it anywhere.

This kind of reasoning overlooks the fact that there can be Communist countries that are friendly and helpful to our main policy opposing the kind of Communist expansion that calls for world conquest, like that of the Soviet Union and China. It overlooks in particular the record of Yugoslavia as being the first Communist country to stand up and defy Moscow, and thereby contribute mightily to the opposition to expansion of Soviet Communist imperialism.

That first was done in 1948, when Tito risked his neck by bringing an end to the looting of his country by the Russians. He was denounced and vilified by Stalin, by Molotov and now by Khrushchev. In such circumstances Americans would have been foolish, and would have harmed American interests, if they had not helped Tito.

The difference between Belgrade and Moscow is considerable. Tito made peace with Italy over disputed places in and around Dalmatia in the Adriatic. He made peace with Greece at a time when Greece was fighting for its life against Moscow-supported Communists. Wisely, America contributed enough in the way of military supplies to keep Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania from attacking Yugoslavia, at Moscow's urging.

While America has given, during these intervening years, something more than $2 billion to Yugoslavia, much of it has been in the form of surplus farm products. This has been a cheap price to pay, especially considering the gargantuan size of some farm surpluses, to keep the Red armies of Moscow from advancing to the shores of the Adriatic. What is more, Americans have won the friendship of the Yugoslav people, which is something any traveler to that country will see quickly.

This fits in with a wise policy of being friendly with the Soviet satellites of Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary. America has given some of its surplus food to Poland. What chance would there ever be of weakening the hold of Moscow on those countries, if the United States treats them in an unfriendly way? If the United States does not help Yugoslavia maintain its independence, as America has done, Yugoslavia would have been compelled to capitulate to Moscow. This would have advanced Moscow's boast of world conquest.

The important fact to keep in mind is that the paramount American objective is to neutralize and to contain the expansion of Soviet Communist imperialism. It is a task that will last for decades, if not for generations. Whatever America can do to weaken this powerful expansionist movement should be done when the opportunity offers. The deviation of Yugoslavia created a crack in the military and political armor of Moscow. That crack has been widened and made reasonably permanent by U.S. help.

Would it be wise, therefore, at this late date to undo what America has done, with reasonable success, by changing the United States policy of friendship, with Yugoslavia, and sealing that crack to make Moscow stronger by driving Yugoslavia back into Moscow's orbit?

Television Transcript of February 28, 1962, "Today" Program on Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following television transcript of "Today," which appeared on February 28, 1962:

Mr. CHANCELLOR. Well, tomorrow is the day that President Kennedy is scheduled to send to Congress his message on conservation. Now almost everybody in this country is willing to go on record in favor of conservation, but there is a division of opinion as to just what should be done about it. Beginning with Theodore Roosevelt the conservationists have put up a thin but vociferous line of champions who have given battle to preserve our natural resources. They have deplored the destruction of land, timber, minerals, water resources, and wildlife. They have not been shy in accusing business interests of exploiting the land without giving a thought to the future.

Private enterprise has countered these arguments by claiming that the conservationists are stirring the ashes of old crimes. They say that modern miners, ranchers, lumbermen, and other businessmen recognize conservation as something which is in their own interest. They say they can best practice conservation with a minimum of Government direction. Some claim that conservation is the smokescreen which conceals another Federal grab for power. But above this rather ancient quarrel there looms a relatively new danger—that is, the threat that our wilderness will be smothered by those who love it most. An expanding population with increased leisure time is being attracted more and more to outdoor recreation, and thus we now face the problem of how to re-create ourselves without laying waste to the countryside.

Well, beginning with this half hour on "Today," we are going to present a series of studies on the subject of conservation. We hope to present all sides of the question, and that's kind of a big order. It embraces a lot of territory, but we will do our best to be objective about this issue because we realize it is sensitive to a number of people. Today we will begin with an examination of the various conservation measures which are before Congress, or which are in the offing.

Our guest will be Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, the Democratic Senator from New Mexico, and we'll be talking with him in just a few moments.

Washington will be next, where Martin Agronsky is sitting with Senator CLINTON ANDERSON.

Senator ANDERSON is a prime mover in conservation legislation, a cosponsor of the wilderness bill which is now before the House. He is chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. He is also a member of the commission which prepared a report for the President and the Congress—the report on outdoor recreation for America. With such credentials, Senator ANDERSON, we feel you are well equipped to be our first guest, and we're very happy to have you and Martin Agronsky, that noted walker who is standing there with you. Good morning, gentlemen. Martin, would you like to begin?

Mr. AGRONSKY. One more credential, by the way, for Senator ANDERSON—former Secretary of Agriculture in Mr. Truman's Cabinet?

Mr. CHANCELLOR. That's right.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Senator, can you tell us what the President is going to recommend in his message on conservation? I know you have been talking to him about this.

Senator ANDERSON. I think he'll do his own announcing, but I would be greatly surprised if he doesn't deal with the question of water pollution, and air pollution; if he doesn't deal with some of the recommendations in the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission's report. I would be surprised if he doesn't suggest some things about maybe a Federal Conservation Corps, similar to the old Civilian Conservation Corps.

Mr. CHANCELLOR. Oh, really?

Senator ANDERSON. I would also be surprised if he doesn't deal with seashore saving a little bit, because I know that's dear to his heart. He's lived along the coast enough so that he's very interested. And what we do to preserve the amount of seashore that now is available and still can be obtained for the public—in fact I think the President's message on conservation is going to take place along with Theodore Roosevelt's great message a long time ago. He is, in my opinion, going to be a great leader in

that field, and I believe his message will be a very, very strong one.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Well leaders need followers. What is Congress going to do about his recommendation?

Senator ANDERSON. I'm going to be one of the followers, and speak to others. But we have already done more I think than many Congresses have done. We have helped establish the Cape Cod seashore area, we're working on other areas like Point Reyes in California, we had a hearing yesterday on Padre Island, and reported that bill out, or will today—and so it goes. We're trying our very best to make sure that things like the wilderness bill pass. The President gave us tremendous help on the wilderness bill, and I believe he delighted the hearts of all those who are tremendously interested in this great subject of trying to make sure that we don't lose all the things that tell use what this continent was like when the white man first settled it.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Senator, I do want to hear from you something that interested me—this Conservation Corps—what is that?

Senator ANDERSON. Well it's Senator HUMPHREY's idea. He has suggested that the Civilian Conservation Corps did fine work, back in the depression, and as a man who was one of Harry Hopkins' relief administrators, I agree with him. I think—the boys went into the areas and created parks, and trailways, and roads, there's a great deal of unemployment among the young now. I don't know what the President's going to say, but I would be surprised if he doesnt' give Senator HUMPHREY's bill a little pat on the back, because this offers some possibilities for doing the work that we want done at very low cost, because it will be really work for young men who do not find other opportunities for employment.

Mr. AGRONSKY. John?

Mr. CHANCELLOR. Well, the wilderness bill has passed the Senate. Is that correct, sir?

Senator ANDERSON. Yes, it has, and gone to the House.

Mr. CHANCELLOR. And from your vantage point, there on the Hill, I know Senators don't often like to comment officially on what's going to happen in the House, but what do you think?

Senator ANDERSON. Well we have a great ally in the House in JOHN SAYLOR, Republican, of Pennsylvania—I say that to show that this is bipartisan. I talked to JOHN a short time ago, and he said that he hoped it would pass the House—he believed it would. The chairman of the committee, the House Interior Committee, Congressman ASPINALL is also a very fine man and a very loyal supporter of the wilderness idea. GRACIE PFOST is another, and I think with these fine leaders we can expect favorable action in the House. It's a little harder there, because you have the Rules Committee to worry with and other things of that nature, but I think that prospects are extremely good for its passage.

Mr. CHANCELLOR. Well, Senator, one of the groups that is opposing the wilderness bill is the National Lumber Manufacturing Association. We've had word from them that 65 million acres of Federal land will be denied future development and general recreational use, if the wilderness bill goes through. What do you say about that?

Senator ANDERSON. Well I only wish they'd take a look at the wilderness areas and decide how much timber is on them. At the present time we're not cutting all the timber we could cut. And the use of lumber is going down a little bit—aluminum siding comes in—various other things are developed. But beyond that the timberlands that we have could be better utilized, and there's not too much commercial timber in these wilderness areas. There may be some in the primitive areas—there's a difference between them. In the early thirties, the Secretary of Agriculture set up primitive areas, which were neither fish nor fowl, they didn't declare them to be wilderness, but they took them out of the ordinary forest, and these areas are going to be reappraised under the wilderness bill—many of them I think will be put back into ordinary forests, and I think the lumbermen should be interested in that. But beyond that I have ridden horseback over some of these wilderness areas, and I think that the opportunities for keeping them as they are are far more favorable to the general cause of conservation than opening them up for exploitation. The Gila wilderness in my State, the very first one, and the largest one, is a sample of a fine tract of land that's useful for people to study how things were originally. But nobody in his right mind would cut very much timber from it.

I just hope the lumber people are wrong, and I believe they are.

Mr. CHANCELLOR. Well if I could pursue this, sir, why do you think they've taken this attitude about the bill?

Senator ANDERSON. For the same reason that the oil people are worried about it. They hate to see anything put out of the possibility they could reach out and take it if they want it. The oil people are worried about the area, and I said to a very prominent oil man, suppose you come in and offer us a dollar an acre, as you do for any rough land, and we'll give you the whole wilderness area and let you explore it—it will be so many million dollars a years. He said, I wouldn't want it—but he wants it left open so he could take it, and I just think that he worries too much about it.

Mr. CHANCELLOR. Sir, are there any cities under the wilderness bill that would have unemployment problems if you were to take over and make wildernesses out of areas that are now being commercially utilized near those towns?

Senator ANDERSON. We're not proposing that these areas that are involved in the wilderness bill are areas that already are either in wilderness or in primitive status as far as the Forest Service is concerned, or they're parts of national parks under Federal domain. Nobody in the city would be worried about the passage of this bill. But on the contrary people in the cities would have a chance to get out into the open country and show their children something about what this country was like originally. I think that's of great value to the country.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Senator, I had yesterday from your colleague, PAUL DOUGLAS, both a telephone call and a very full envelope on the Indiana Sand Dunes bill. We're going to move from the forest to the seashore for a moment. What about our seashores—what's happening there—is it covered to any extent in the bill?

Senator ANDERSON. Well, yes, there is a special bill on the acquisition of seashores, which has passed the Senate and gone to the House, and I was very happy to sponsor it. We suggest that the Government should put up about $25 million a year to match the money that the States might put up, and counties might put up, municipalities, in order to acquire seashore areas. Had we done this 20 years ago, we could have acquired all we wanted for a few million dollars. Now the price is going up very, very rapidly, and that's what PAUL DOUGLAS is worried about, about the dunes—he wants to save them now, while it's financially possible. I agree with him, it ought to be done. We ought not to chop away the industrial chances of Indiana, but we ought to take these remaining stretches of land and try to preserve them. If we do it now, the people of Chicago, for example, and the people of northern Indiana will have a perfectly wonderful recreational area. Most of the national parks are where the people aren't. They're out in my State, they're in Colorado, they're around various other areas, and the population is limited in those areas. We need to be able to attract people from all over the country.

Now the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission found that people going out for recreation don't want to go too far from home. They enjoy walking, they enjoy bicycle riding, they enjoy canoeing, but they don't want to go too far, and if the people in Chicago could have this great weekend opportunity in the Indiana Dunes, I think they would enjoy it, and I think that as the population builds up in the cities, because you're building up in the cities very rapidly, we need to have places where future generations can go. You don't want to get to the point where you have to have priority in order to get to the Yellowstone National Park, and you're almost there now. If you want to go to Yellowstone Park in your automobile, you'd better be real sure you're not going on a day when somebody else has planned to go there. That's too bad. We ought to develop these areas, and I believe the Park Service will. But we ought also to have areas close to the great cities.

Mr. AGRONSKY. Standing room only in the wilderness.

Senator ANDERSON. Well it isn't that bad, but it's pretty rough to try to find a spot when you go to Yellowstone now because there are so many cars, and so few trails. I'd advocate opening up more areas of Yellowstone—I believe that will be done. But along with it, you need to provide for the average person close to home a spot for recreation. That's what we're trying to do with Indiana, that's what we tried to do with Cape Cod—we had all the problems you could imagine in Cape Cod, and a very prominent Massachusetts young Senator tried to get a bill through, and he didn't succeed. But when he got to living on Pennsylvania Avenue, we all pitched in and tried to save the area that he and Senator Saltonstall had worked to save. And it's a fine thing for those people, and will be. There are other areas, like the Point Reyes area in California, that's going to be a very remarkably fine establishment, and those people with all the recreational opportunities that California has, can still stand just a little bit of seashore for the commonfolk. The rich have no trouble finding a place to go.

Mr. CHANCELLOR. Senator, you have sponsored a bill in Congress involving water resources. Does that tie in with the overall wilderness bill in any way?

Senator ANDERSON. No. That's more to take care of the general situation that arises when we try to tell you what's going to happen to water. We're going to be awfully short of water, in cities and elsewhere in a short time—even in great areas like Los Angeles they have problems of water supply, and more and more our cities are going to be deficit areas as far as water is concerned. We have to find something we can do, and the water resources bill says let's pool all the engineering knowledge we have and try to find out what we can do to save the cities from facing a great water shortage in years to come. I think it's a fine bill.

Mr. CHANCELLOR. Martin, one of the things I'm sure we'd both like to talk about is this whole business of a Federal takeover that has been charged against this kind of legislation. Would you care to frame a short question on that?

Mr. AGRONSKY. Well, I think it's framed, really—do you feel, as many of the critics of the conservation bill contend, that it is really a way of the Federal Government moving in and taking over what really private industry should develop?

Mr. ANDERSON. Not at all. Not at all. The average State can't afford to do it for itself. For instance, why should New Mexico provide a park—we've got all the parks we want for ourselves. It becomes a national problem, and therefore the Nation

has to take charge of trying to find these places, without regard to State lines.

Mr. AGRONSKY. John.

Mr. CHANCELLOR. I just want to say thank you, Senator, for spending this time with us this morning, and all good luck to you in your work, and every time we go for a walk in the wilderness we'll begin thinking of you—not that we hadn't thought of you before. And Martin, thanks to you. I went walking with Agronsky last weekend in Washington in Rock Creek Park, which is a great example of a park, in a great American city. I think that just about brings us to the conclusion of this hour.

City Protests One-Sided Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, many people in my district have written to me in protest against the Federal Government's intervention in the pollution affairs of my State of Washington and the highhanded manner in which State and Federal representatives decided against the pulp and paper industry at a pollution conference in Olympia, Wash.

It is the opinion of many that the State pollution control commission made exorbitant demands on the industry without first establishing water quality standards and then determining whether or not these standards are being violated.

Mr. Speaker, the city council of Port Angeles, Wash., on February 15, 1962, passed a resolution which I believe states the facts of the case in understandable and precise terms. Under leave to extend my remarks I include this resolution in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION 4-62

A resolution of the City Council of the City of Port Angeles protesting the acts of the State of Washington and the U.S. Government in connection with the Joint State-Federal Conference on Water Pollution held in Olympia, Wash., January 16-17, 1962

Whereas the Washington State Pollution Control Commission has on file appeals by seven pulp and paper mills which appeals are from requirements established by the Washington State Pollution Control Commission in temporary permits granted to the mills and are based on the contention that the State has not in accordance with law set reasonable standards for waste disposal but has on the other hand set arbitrary standards not based on facts and studies; and

Whereas the State did call for the assistance of the Federal Government in bringing about pollution control before it, the State, had heard the appeals and determined that pollution actually existed in violation of legally set reasonable standards; and

Whereas the act of calling in the Federal Government was premature in that the Federal Government has no place in the matter until the State cannot enforce its standards which have not yet been legally set; and

Whereas the conference chairman, Mr. Murray Stein, chief of enforcement for the U.S. Public Health Service, and Mr. James M. Quigley, Assistant Secretary, Health, Education, and Welfare, adopted the State's view that pollution exists which is subject to abatement under Federal law, and that this pollution comes notably from the pulp and paper industry before the industry and appellants had had an opportunity to present their side of the case; and

Whereas the city of Port Angeles is vitally interested in the multiple-use concept of public waters, and two of its largest industries are Rayonier, Inc., and Fibreboard Paper Products Corp.: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Port Angeles, That it go on record as protesting the actions of the State and Federal Governments in handling the problem of pollution control in a one-sided manner before any extensive hearings have been held and studies made wherein the appealing mills have had an opportunity to present their case; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be circulated to our Representatives and Senators in Washington, D.C., as well as other interested persons, including the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Passed by the city council this 15th day of February 1962.

JAMES E. MAXFIELD,
Mayor.

Attest:

B. B. MCNEECE,
City Clerk.

Approved as to form:

TYLER C. MOFFETT,
City Attorney.

Questions on the A-Test Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the editorial entitled "Questions on the A-Test Issue," by David Lawrence, appearing in the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., on Tuesday, March 6, in its entirety at this point in the RECORD. This editorial emphasizes, as I did in my speech on February 21, that the President's decision might very well have been too late. Moreover, there is no assurance of any safeguards for the future. In other words, President Kennedy failed to answer many of the basic questions—where do we stand now as compared with the Soviet Union and why hasn't our Government "debunked" the fallout propaganda?

The article follows:

QUESTIONS ON THE A-TEST ISSUE

(By David Lawrence)

After hearing President Kennedy's eloquent and forceful address the other night about resuming nuclear tests, it seems as if someone might readily write a play entitled "How To Confuse the Public Without Really Trying."

There is no issue emanating from Government nowadays which is beset with so much confusion, contradiction, and mystery as surrounds the argument over nuclear testing.

The New York Times said editorially this week that Mr. Kennedy's "stature as a forceful national leader will be determined less by the literary quality of his pronouncements than by his success in rallying the country behind his goals."

When the President finished his television address on nuclear testing, almost everyone agreed with the plausibility of the argument. But there was so much left unsaid and unexplained that one wonders how long it will be before the public will demand a greater sense of responsibility to the Nation than the administration has shown thus far on the issue of nuclear testing.

For one thing, the President didn't explain why, when the Soviets resumed testing on September 1 last, he didn't immediately authorize resumption of tests by the United States—both in the atmosphere and underground—without waiting 6 months. Why, for instance, was it necessary to spend 6 months examining the question or preparing for such tests? Is it conceivable that in a nuclear age the U.S. Government wasn't prepared for a prompt resumption of tests when it found out that the Soviets were cheating? How much evidence can there be that a similar delay in "studying" the issue may not eventuate if a nuclear attack actually occurs?

How can the American people accept Mr. Kennedy's proposals to trust the Soviets again of they sign an agreement on testing before the end of April? This is the date the President held out as bait to obtain another moratorium on testing.

The sequence of paragraphs is worth examining. First, the President openly accused the Soviets of violating their pledges when he said:

"On September 1 of last year, while the United States and the United Kingdom were negotiating in good faith at Geneva, the Soviet Union callously broke its moratorium with a 2-month series of more than 40 nuclear tests. Preparations for these tests had been secretly underway for many months."

Then, in the latter part of the address, Mr. Kennedy nevertheless told the American people he was willing to take another chance on a written pledge by the Soviets, as he declared:

"If the Soviet Union should now be willing to accept such a treaty, sign it before the latter part of April, and apply it immediately—if all testing can thus be actually halted—then the nuclear arms race would be slowed down at last, the security of the United States and its ability to meet its commitments would be safeguarded, and there would be no need for our tests to begin."

Earlier in the same speech, Mr. Kennedy had stressed the importance of testing and of learning as much as, if not more than, the Soviets have learned by their recent tests. He said frankly that a further Soviet series of tests in the absence of Western tests "could well provide the Soviet Union with a nuclear attack and defense capability so powerful as to encourage aggressive designs." Mr. Kennedy then added:

"Were we to stand still while the Soviets surpassed us—or even appeared to surpass us—the free world's ability to deter, to survive, and to respond to an all-out attack would be seriously weakened."

But, in spite of this, the President now wants to accept the written word of the Soviets and run the risk of further delays in America's testing.

Even more surprising perhaps was the President's carefully worded statement that "the exposure due to radioactivity from these (American) tests will be less than one-fiftieth of the difference which can be experienced, due to variations in natural radioactivity, simply by living in different locations in this country."

Yet millions of well-meaning, sincere, and patriotic persons in this and other Western countries have been persuaded in the last 5 years by Soviet and pacifist propaganda and by misguided pronouncements of various scientists that atmosphere testing is a terrible danger to mankind. Why hasn't our Government—under this and the preceding administration—debunked the idea before? Mr. Kennedy's address didn't clear up this phase of the confusion, either.

Thailand Fears Desertion by Anti-Communist Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, as support for the Secretary of State's announcement of this week regarding U.S. policy in Thailand, I want to call attention to an excellent article by Robert B. Hewett which appeared in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of March 5:

THAILAND FEARS DESERTION BY ANTI-COMMUNIST NATIONS

(By Robert B. Hewett)

HONG KONG.—Thailand, whose worried foreign minister will meet today with President Kennedy in Washington, D.C., is the only openly declared military ally of the United States on the southeast Asia mainland. And Thailand's anti-Communist leaders now are fearful that the pro-Western alliance is more of a danger than a protection for their country.

Mr. Kennedy's main task at the meeting with Thailand's foreign minister, Thanat Khoman, will be to make another try at quieting such fears.

The President can succeed only by solidly committing the United States even more deeply than it is already to the defense of southeast Asia against Communist subversion and aggression.

One such "guarantee" that is being seriously considered by the Pentagon and the State Department, according to informed sources in this area, is the transfer of at least token U.S. forces to Thailand from Army and Marine units now based on Okinawa.

The Thai government headed by Prime Minister Sarit Thanarat, tough but realistic army field marshal, is haunted by the possibility that the United States will "abandon" southeast Asia, rather than fight, if Communist pressure gets too great.

Such apprehensions have hardened into genuine fears in the last year as a result of what Thai leaders consider a weak and vacillating U.S. attitude toward Communist aggression in neighboring Laos. Sarit says flatly that implementation of the plan for a "neutral" Laos, being pressed by the United States and Britain, in conjunction with Russia, means that in a short time Thailand will be facing infiltration from a Communist-dominated country along 625 miles of its exposed northeast border.

At the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) conference of foreign ministers in Bangkok a year ago Thailand's proposal that SEATO troops be sent to help the American supported government of Prince Boun Oum fight Communist Pathet Lao rebels was rejected largely because of British and French refusal to become involved militarily under almost any circumstances.

The United States after early strong words by Mr. Kennedy hinting at possible U.S. military action against Laotian Communist guerrillas, also went along with the British-French plan to negotiate for a "neutral" Laos.

If the United States and other SEATO allies decide under Communist pressure that Laos is indefensible, Thai leaders reason, perhaps some day they will decide under further Communist threats that Thailand is also indefensible.

There is talk in some Thai circles that it might be safer to edge away from the pro-Western alliance now and plump for Burma-style "nonalinement" rather than risk being left all alone as the only southeast Asian nation except Red-harrassed South Vietnam taking a belligerent stand against Communist expansion and Red China.

It is hard to judge just how much such Thai "neutralist" talk is genuine and how much is really designed to pressure the United States and other SEATO allies into taking stronger action in Laos. But unquestionably disillusionment with SEATO is strong and growing stronger.

There are many complicated reasons why the United States—the only real Pacific military power in SEATO—has hesitated to get embroiled militarily in Laos. The predominant one is that the Laotian government itself, unlike South Vietnam, has not shown much determination in fighting Communist rebels despite large amounts of American military and economic aid.

Thai leaders, primarily interested in seeing that their next-door neighbor is not a Communist-run Laos, so far have not been much impressed with the valid U.S. military reasons for trying to keep Laos from becoming a big-power battleground.

Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON and Attorney General Robert Kennedy have been among U.S. leaders who have visited Thailand within the last year to explain U.S. views. They have promised Thai leaders that seeking a neutral regime for Laos does not mean the United States is weakening in its SEATO defense commitments to Thailand.

But the main reason for Khoman's visit to Washington is to get more reassurances and concrete support directly from Mr. Kennedy.

"The Thais will fight against Communist expansion—if they feel they have any hope of winning," one Western diplomat commented to this reporter recently in Bangkok.

"They know, however, there is no hope of winning if the United States won't commit troops if necessary."

This almost psychopathic fear of the Thais that they might eventually be abandoned is one reason why it would be worthwhile to station some U.S. military units in Thailand. The presence of even a small number of U.S. forces would be regarded as a further U.S. commitment to Thailand's defense.

Actually this sort of morale stiffening has been started on a small scale with little publicity. A few U.S. Air Force jet fighter planes—less than a squadron—have been based at Bangkok for several months.

U.S. Air Force pilots and ground crews from Okinawa and the Philippines have been rotated for "training duty" to reinforce a regular U.S. military advisory training team in Thailand.

Last week an advance party of a U.S. Army construction engineers battalion based on Okinawa arrived in Thailand. The rest of the 1,500-man battalion will follow later this month.

Army Engineers will be in Thailand for 18 months to help with Sarit's crash program to build 10 strategic roads into the isolated northeast section which fronts on the Laos border, an area where Communist agitators are already active among Thai.

Khoman, after talking with Secretary of State Dean Rusk in Washington Friday, told reporters that Thailand was urging the United States to endorse measures to revitalize SEATO.

Thailand wants the 8-nation alliance to be able to act quickly in response to Communist-provoked crises even if "one or two" SEATO members disagree, Khoman said.

Khoman obviously was referring to Britain and France. France particularly has been opposed to getting involved militarily in southeast Asia ever since being forced to give up its Indochinese territories in 1954. Britain also displays much more concern with European and Mideast oil problems than with its fading Asian commitments.

Other members of SEATO are the United States, Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, and Thailand. South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia are not members of the alliance but were declared by SEATO members to be "under the protection" of the Organization.

Sarit's government believes (rightly) that the United States is the only real Pacific military power in SEATO, and wants closer direct ties with the United States, rather than dependency on trying to get collective action from the 7 other nations.

Last month Sarit canceled a SEATO air exercise scheduled over Thailand and was quoted by a Bangkok newspaper as saying that such a SEATO maneuver was "useless." It was Sarit's way of demonstrating his disillusionment with SEATO as an effective alliance.

Awards for Awareness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in most cases, editorial writers work in comparative anonymity, their work but not their names before the public. At a recent meeting of the All-American Conference To Combat Communism, a nonpartisan organization now in its 13th year, John Costello of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat editorial staff was honored for his outstanding contribution to public awareness of the Communist menace to the freedoms of our Nation. I want to add my commendation to that of the conference—which is made up of various national civic, religious, women's and youth groups—and thank John Costello for the work he has done.

Two of Costello's editorials for which he was honored follow. They appeared, respectively, in the September 20, 1961, and March 11, 1961, issues of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat:

WHY AID PRO-RED NEUTRALS?

In our haste to help the needy nations of the world, the United States has given more than $8,240 million to 23 states that pride themselves on their neutrality. This means, they claim, that they reserve the right to say a plague on both your houses to Washington—or Moscow.

"You can't buy us with foreign aid," they boast.

Earlier this month, all 23 plus 2 others met at Belgrade. Marshal Tito, their Yugoslav host, set the tone of the meeting when he blasted the United States and lauded the U.S.S.R.

Before the meeting of "neutral" states broke up, they issued a statement condemning Western "colonialism" and "imperialism"—but not Communist imperialism and aggression.

The United States does not want or expect the countries we aid to lick our boots. But it certainly should insist that they do not bite the hand that feeds them.

Instead, what we have done is throw open the gates of the Treasury and shouted to one and all: "Come and get it."

It's time this policy be stopped.

Not long ago, the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress added up the aid we have given 23 of these 25 self-styled fence-sitters in the cold war. The totals are:

Country:	*U.S. aid*
Afghanistan	$182,900,000
Burma	94,500,000
Cambodia	298,100,000
Ceylon	74,900,000
Congo	78,300,000
Cuba	52,000,000
Ethiopia	181,300,000
Ghana	6,600,000
Guinea	3,800,000
India	3,071,000,000
Indonesia	583,000,000
Iraq	67,000,000
Lebanon	89,900,000
Mali	2,500,000
Morocco	307,700,000
Nepal	43,500,000
Saudi Arabia	46,600,000
Somali	13,300,000
Sudan	53,500,000
Tunisia	255,200,000
Egypt-Syria	438,800,000
Yemen	17,000,000
Yugoslavia	2,280,300,000

In addition, these 23 nations received $1,201 million of U.N. aid, of which Washington contributed about $480,400,000.

These figures do not include the huge subsidies Cuba reaped by the U.S. purchase of Cuban sugar at a price fixed above the world market price. Nor do they include the $100 million or so that this country has contributed to support the U.N. force in the Congo.

There our money is being spent to force a coalition government, heavily infiltrated by Communists, on the old Belgian colony.

At last Congress has become fed up at this policy of spending money like drunken sailors on fair-weather friends who pocket our aid, then thumb their noses at us.

Last week, the Senate gave its approval to another $4,196,600,000 foreign aid bill, but not before it attached a rider by a unanimous vote.

This amendment was proposed by Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, a liberal New York Republican. It reads:

"It is the sense of Congress that in the administration of these funds great attention and consideration should be given to those countries which share the view of the United States on the world crisis."

"I think it is about time," the author said, "that the Congress is placed on record as specifically preferring the extension of U.S. aid to those countries which have a genuine appreciation of freedom and a genuine concern for the welfare of mankind."

When the so-called neutral states failed to issue a ringing condemnation of the U.S.S.R. for provoking the Berlin crisis and resuming A-bomb tests, they tipped their hands for good.

They are "neutral" against us—but not against Moscow.

SENATOR DODD SAVES THE DAY

Senator THOMAS J. DODD and the Senate Internal Security Subcommitte, have just blocked the sale of 45 unique, U.S.-made machine tools to the Soviet Union.

This news will break the hearts of Soviet missilemakers.

If this sale had gone through, Moscow could have vastly improved overnight the accuracy of Soviet guided missiles. These missiles are aimed at us. Thus, our machines would have made it far easier for the Soviet Union to hit the bull's-eye, with its nuclear-armed ICBM's, and wipe us out.

Here was an almost classic example of what Premier Nikita Khrushchev has always claimed "capitalists" will gladly do: Sell their own hangman a rope.

The Soviet Union had offered a high price—$1,450,000—for 45 high-precision ball-bearing machines made by a Vermont firm. The machines mass-produce tiny ball bearings of top quality.

There are only 72 of these machines in the United States. Our Defense Department buys 85 percent of their output. The Pentagon uses them in many ways where tiny, accurate instruments are a must: for navigation, fire control, in computers and in guidance systems "for aircraft * * * ships, missiles and other space vehicles."

The maker of this marvelous machine asked the Commerce Department whether it would be OK to sell 45 copies to Moscow. The Pentagon vigorously objected.

But down in the lower echelons of the Commerce Department, a minor official differed with the defense chiefs. Thus, the Department wound up taking the position:

1. Russia could buy virtually the same kind of machines in Italy, Sweden, West Germany or Switzerland. So why take the business away from an American firm?

2. Even in Russian hands, the U.S.-made machines did not constitute a "significant strategic hazard" to us.

In its exhaustive hearings, the Senate subcommittee was given ample expert testimony that disproved both points.

Moscow is way ahead of us in making powerful rocket engines that hurl their missiles or spaceships into the sky. But it is way behind us in making tiny instruments that guide our missiles and spaceships more surely and accurately than any in the world.

It will take the Russians 5 years to catch up with us, working on their own, the experts testified. But if we sold them our machines, they could bridge this "missile gap" almost overnight!

President Eisenhower's Commerce Secretary, Frederick Mueller, and the incumbent Commerce Secretary, Luther Hodges, had both OK'd an export license for the unique machine. But Hodges withdrew the license, after seeing the evidence that Senator Dodd, a Connecticut Democrat, and the Senate subcommittee spread on the record.

Later, three more licenses granted for the export of machine tools to the Soviet Union were canceled by Secretary Hodges. All three could have been used to build up Soviet military might.

This is a happy ending to an almost tragic tale.

It calls attention to the great importance of our bar on the sale of munitions-making machinery to Moscow.

It also points out the crying need for other free nations to clamp equally strict controls, which do not now exist, on these exports to Moscow.

Eddie Rickenbacker on U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, Eddie Rickenbacker recently delivered a speech in which he made some comments concerning the United Nations. His comments are recorded in the February 1, 1962, issue of the Tulsa Tribune. When a man of Mr. Rickenbacker's stature discusses important issues, it behooves us to take notice. It is especially important that we know his views on the U.N., since we will soon consider the President's proposal to invest $100 million in U.N. bonds.

I think the Tribune article should be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and under unanimous consent, I include it at follows:

MOVE OUT OF U.N., DEFY REDS, RICKENBACKER PLEA

The American penchant for hero worship was evident at Eddie Rickenbacker's speech at Municipal Theater Wednesday night.

About 1,000 persons gave the board chairman of Eastern Airlines and World War I flying ace two standing ovations. He spoke at the first public session of Christian Crusade's anti-Communist leadership school.

His speech—peppered with patriotic punchlines—was punctuated frequently by cheers from the entranced crowd.

Occasionally someone would shout "Amen" or "That's right" after Rickenbacker made a point.

He said this was his first trip to Tulsa in 51 years. He arrived here at 6:45 p.m. and spoke at 9 p.m.

He was dressed as conservatively as his remarks sounded. He wore a gray suit and vest, light blue shirt, and maroon tie.

"Let's get out of the United Nations and regain control of our foreign policy," was a remark that drew applause. "If we quit supporting the U.N. it would collapse overnight."

"A nation afraid is already dead," Rickenbacker said. "We're all going to die sometime, so why not do it for a good cause?"

Rickenbacker called for a repeal of the income tax law and strengthening of States' rights.

"There is no such thing as world opinion at which we have been kneeling like cowards," he said.

"Let's sever relations with Russia and the so-called neutrals. What have we left to negotiate with them except our complete surrender?" he asked.

"Why are we seeking a nuclear ban when the only thing standing between us and the hordes of Russia and China is nuclear power?"

"We have renounced the Monroe Doctrine for world opinion. But the world will not respect our rights until we stand up and defend those rights," Rickenbacker said.

"If we would warn the world that the Monroe Doctrine will be backed by military might, there will be no Communist uprisings in Central and South America, I guarantee you," he said.

"The crowd now in Washington is knowingly promoting frontiers without freedom," he said.

"Congress must be dedicated to defend the freedom of this Nation. Let's face facts. The enemy is not only at the gates of this Nation but within them," Rickenbacker said.

Rickenbacker has been an American hero most of his life. He worked his way up from mechanic to fame as an auto racing driver and winner of the Indianapolis 500-mile race before World War I.

As a fighter pilot in World War I, he was America's first ace, downing 26 German airplanes and inspiring thousands of young men to make aviation their career.

During World War II he visited Air Force combat bases throughout the world as an envoy of Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson. On one of these missions, he and seven companions survived 21 days on a rubber life raft after their B-17 went down in the Pacific and the Nation feared he was lost.

"Where are the superpatriots?" Rickenbacker asked at one point.

As far as much of the crowd was concerned, they were looking at one.

Community Facilities Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, on February 15, there appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—volume 108, No. 22, page A1121—an article from the New York Herald Tribune written by Donald I. Rogers. The letter made charges about the Community Facilities Administration which were answered by Commissioner Sidney H. Woolner in a letter to the editor of the New York Herald Tribune. Since the Roger article has been placed in the RECORD, it seems only fair that Mr. Woolner's reply be entered into the RECORD also. This is all the more desirable since I am informed that the reply was not printed in the Herald Tribune except in the form of excerpts selected by Mr. Rogers for a column published on February 20. In the interest of fairplay and to insure the presentation of both sides, here is Mr. Woolner's letter:

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., December 13, 1961.

The EDITOR,
New York Herald-Tribune
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: Your Mr. Rogers, in his article of November 17, made an attack on the Community Facilities Administration which, through its omission and distortion fact, was thoroughly misleading to your readers.

Mr. Rogers invited the Investment Bankers Association to give attention to what he described as "the Federal Government's deliberate and dishonest intervention in the private banking industry in the case of some sewer bonds for Charleston, W. Va." I will give you the facts by which your readers can judge as to the fairness of this charge.

A representative of the Community Facilities Administration was in Charleston on July 31, 1961 to discuss assistance that might be given by the Housing and Home Finance Agency in repairing the damage done by the disastrous flood of July 19 which killed 22 persons.

In the course of discussing available aids, he mentioned the public facility loans program, which makes loans at 3⅝ percent to communities under 50,000 population for essential public facilities when the financing is not available otherwise on reasonable terms. In communities such as Charleston, in areas designated by the Area Redevelopment Administration as eligible for its aid, these loans can be made at an interest rate of 3⅜ percent if their populations are below 150,000. The interest rate is above the average annual interest rate on all interest bearing obligations of the United States, but low enough to give a special boost to communities in economic difficulties.

The disaster director of the city, upon hearing that this type of loan is available, passed the information along to the mayor, who that very morning was engaged in opening bids that had been sought from private investors for a $4 million sewer issue. Based on past experience, the city had expected bids of 3 or 3¼ percent. Instead, the lowest bid was 3.9453 percent. The city officials were disturbed by the high cost of accepting this low bid. They questioned CFA's engineer further about the public facility loans program and sought confirmation of the information he gave them. He did not at any time offer to make a loan to the city of Charleston for the simple reason that he had no such authority, and he knew that very well.

Charleston city officials calculate that the acceptance of the 3.9453 percent bid would have cost the city $879,000 more than a public facility loan. They knew that public reaction would be unfavorable if they disregarded this opportunity to save money for the city. Hence they decided to reject all bids and to make application for a public facility loan.

The final chapter in the story indicates how far off base were Mr. Rogers' charges against CFA. The application for a public facility loan was approved, since it met all the requirements of the law. In accordance with CFA regulations, the bonds were offered to private bidders. The bids were opened on November 20.

In accorance with CFA's requirements, the first 10 years of maturities were sold privately for 2.93 percent and the second 10 year block for 3.621 percent. CFA took only the last 19 years at its 3⅜ percent rate.

Your Mr. Rogers is entitled, of course, to take a position in opposition to the program by which the Federal Government helps areas of chronic unemployment in their redevelopment efforts with low-interest loans for public facilities. If this is an issue in the minds of some people, we are glad to have it debated, as long as the facts of the matter are fairly presented.

Sincerely,

SIDNEY H. WOOLNER,
Commissioner.

Local Enterprise Provides Fresh Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, it seems that every time you turn around there is someone who is asking the Federal Government to solve problems that were handled in the past by local communities. With this in mind, it is refreshing to read a news item that tells how the town of Buckeye, Ariz., solved its water supply problem through its own efforts.

This city with the technical help of private industry and the financial help of private capital is on its way toward providing fresh water for its people. This is the first saline water conversion system in America designed to treat an entire municipal water supply.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the news release to which I referred:

SALINE WATER CONFUSION TO PROVIDE ALL MUNICIPAL WATER FOR ARIZONA TOWN

BUCKEYE, ARIZ.—The town council of Buckeye, Ariz., today awarded a historical $297,741 contract for construction of the first saline water conversion plant of any type to treat an entire municipal supply in the United States. The Phoenix general contracting firm of N. P. Van Valkenburgh Co. was the lowest of five bidders on the project which calls for installation of a 650,000 gallon-per-day brackish water desalting plant manufactured by Ionics, Inc., of Cambridge, Mass.

The new plant scheduled for completition in the summer of 1962 under the supervision of John A. Carollo, consulting engineers, will be the largest and lowest cost commercial electrodialysis plant ever built.

The new plant will be almost three times as large as any commercial electrodialysis plant previously built and will produce fresh water at an estimated average treatment cost of 50 cents per thousand gallons including all charges for operation, maintenance, and bond amortization of the treatment plant, but not including water supply, distribution or general water system costs. The 50-cent figure compares with treatment costs of $1.50 or more for other saline water converters currently in operation here or abroad. Reported costs of 90 cents to $1.25 for such plants are actually about $1.50 on a comparable load basis, since low wintertime water usage reduces the annual output of most municipal waterplants to approximately half of their full capacity. The water costs at Buckeye will decrease in future years as the new Ionics plant, which has excess capacity, serves a larger demand.

"This breakthrough in practical saline water conversion is particularly fitting on the 50th anniversary of Arizona's statehood because of the importance of good water to the past and future of Arizona," said Mayor John W. Beloat, a lifelong resident of the Buckeye area.

"I understand that there are more than 1,000 towns and cities which have highly mineralized water like Buckeye, but the Buckeye project is the first to bring modern, large-scale saline water conversion to the community level on a self-supporting basis without any Federal or outside aid.

"The town of Buckeye's existing water supply is a hard, corrosive and salty liquid derived from deep wells with a mineral content of 2,200 parts per million by weight—about one-fifteenth as salty as sea water," explained George Hamner, Buckeye town clerk. "The new plant will remove nearly 5 tons of excess salts and minerals from the town water supply per day, thereby reducing the total mineral content to 500 ppm—the level recommended by the State of Arizona and the U.S. Public Health Service. Ninety-four percent of Buckeye's qualified voters turned out for a special election last September 12 to approve a $305,000 water revenue bond issue for the project by a 2 to 1 margin. A new water rate schedule was also approved to provide the additional water revenues needed for the project. Water rates were increased by about 50 percent for municipal users and by 85 percent to 174 percent for larger users.

"In spite of the higher water rates, we believe most of the citizens of Buckeye will save money on water when the new plant goes into operation," said Leonard Dankowski, chairman of the industrial development committee of the Buckeye Chamber of Commerce. "For many years Buckeye residents have suffered the annoying and costly effects of a highly mineralized water supply—poor taste, purchasing and handling bottled water, waste of soap, purchase of water-softening agents, corrosion and salting-up of appliances, and rapid deterioration of everything which the water touches—from plumbing to automobile radiators. For every dollar which we spend to purchase the untreated water from the municipal system, we pay about $2 more in hidden costs to use or avoid the salty water. Our committee conducted a survey in 1960 which reached two-thirds of all the municipal water customers in Buckeye. Fifty-seven percent of those interviewed reported spending an average of $6.42 per month for the purchase of bottled water for drinking; 98 percent said they wanted better water; and about two-thirds said that they would be willing to pay more for it. We estimate that the hidden costs associated with highly

mineralized water costs each municipal water customer an average of $10 per month, not counting what he pays the water department for the untreated water in the first place."

To dramatize the advantages of good water, a public demonstration of a small Ionics desalter of 6,000 gallons daily capacity was organized with the cooperation of local firms and service groups and held in Buckeye last summer, giving all citizens an opportunity to see the before and after effects of the water in washing machines, dishwashers, evaporative coolers, and beverages. This small plant has been operated in Buckeye since last May on a 24-hour day, 7-day week basis. Citizens of Buckeye and surrounding communities have been driving into the station and hauling away about 1,000 gallons each day in bottles and tanks to try out the new water.

In the electrodialysis process developed by Ionics, excess salt and mineral particles are electrically forced out of the brackish water through special plastic membranes leaving fresh water behind and producing a brine on the other side of the membrane.

The electricity for the project will be purchased from the Arizona Public Service Co., whose western division headquarters are in Buckeye, and who cooperated with other Buckeye firms in the project demonstration.

Another significant first for the project is its financing through established private institutions for underwriting and sale of municipal bonds—the first such financing to cover any saline water conversion plant so far as is known. The financing was planned by Mr. J. W. Refsnes of Refsnes, Ely, and Beck, Phoenix, Ariz., the town's fiscal agent. The bonds were sold at a net interest cost of 4.452 percent to the lowest of three bidders—a syndicate consisting of William R. Staats & Co. of Phoenix, and Barcus, Kindred Co. of Chicago.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, the question of foreign economic assistance will soon be again taking the attention of the Congress. This program, of course, has very ardent supporters and very outspoken opponents. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an editorial which appeared in the Levittown Times, a newspaper of lower Bucks County, Pa., in the issue of Saturday, March 3, 1962, which contains some facts that all of us could well consider during the coming debate on this question:

FOREIGN AID IN PERSPECTIVE

In the current fiscal year ending June 30, the United States expects to spend $2,896 million for foreign aid and finance, international information and exchange activities and a number of related programs.

The proposed budget outlay for these items in fiscal year 1963 is $100 million higher than the anticipated 1962 total. It would thus shade $3 billion.

The notion has been gained by some Americans that expenditures of this order represent so serious a drain upon the Nation the ultimate effect will be to "bleed us white."

There is no question that foreign assistance payments, in conjunction with such other international payments as those we make to our service personnel stationed overseas, do affect our world balance and hence our gold supply.

Yet, in relation to the total Federal budget, to the economy as a whole, and to certain other kinds of spending by Americans, the outlays for foreign programs do not seem extraordinary.

For instance, in 1960, Americans coughed up $8.4 billion for charitable contributions of all kinds. That figure compares with $4.6 billion contributed for similar purposes in 1950.

Even after allowing for price increases in the 1950–60 decade, this advance is whopping. And it is obviously a great deal more than double what the Government expects to spend next fiscal year on a wide range of foreign programs.

As a matter of fact, within the $8.4 billion 1960 charity figure is a still more interesting comparative sum. In that year, individual Americans personally contributed $333 million for gifts abroad.

That total substantially exceeds the $285 million the Federal Government proposes to spend in fiscal 1963 for so-called "development grants" abroad. This is a main category of outright assistance to foreign nations, and is kept distinct from such other programs as those involving repayable development loans.

The $33 million in 1960 private foreign gifts is also larger than the $300 million proposed this coming year for the food-for-peace program.

Comparisons of this kind, placing our foreign programs properly in the scale of magnitude, afford Americans useful perspective as Congress prepares again to plunge into the always sharp debate over foreign assistance programs.

Roscoe Drummond's Article Deserving of Serious Thought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Roscoe Drummond, widely syndicated columnist. It is a penetrating study and I think all of my Republican colleagues will be deeply interested in it:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 7, 1962]

WILL THE GOP ACT?

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The heavy ice of Democratic resistance to anything more than a token representation of the Republican Party on the powerful professional staffs of congressional committees is beginning to break a little bit.

Not much—but enough to show that when individual senior Republicans insist upon some of their rights as a minority party, it is not going to be easy for the Democratic chairman to stand forever against reform.

Senator PRESCOTT BUSH, of Connecticut, ranking Republican member of the Joint Economic Committee, which is responsible for studying the administration's new trade bill, has finally pressured the Democrats to allow the minority to employ the services of one expert and a secretary. The same for Representative JOHN W. BYRNES, of Wisconsin, minority member of the House Ways and Means Committee, chairman of the Republican policy committee in the House.

But because the top Republican leadership in Congress has not yet been willing to make the crucial, if unpleasant, fight for adequate, competently paid professional staffing on all the committees, the minority representation remains so sparse it can hardly be seen with the naked eye. At present any little bare bone tossed to the minority is due largely to the character and whim of the Democratic chairman.

Thus Representative CARROLL D. KEARNS, of Pennsylvania, senior Republican on the House Committee on Education and Labor, himself a good scrapper, has run up against a "Berlin wall" in the form of Democratic chairman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL of New York.

Here is Chairman POWELL's record on staffing: When he became chairman last year his committee had a professional staff of 20; now it has about 48. Mr. POWELL assured Mr. KEARNS that if the committee received sufficient funds, he would authorize a minority professional staff of four, two professionals and two secretaries. With Mr. KEARNS' assistance, the committee received the largest investigative appropriation in its history, $633,000. Now Chairman POWELL has cut the minority staff to two, one professional, one secretary. Thus on the vital House Education and Labor Committee the proportion of majority to minority staff is 24-to-1.

It needs to be understood that adequate and competent professional staffs for both the majority and minority parties are not a routine housekeeping matter. It is crucial to the effective functioning of the committees and to the functioning of our two-party system of government. One of the surest ways to cripple the minority is to deprive it of professional staffs on the congressional committees. There is no reason to doubt that the Democrats know exactly what they are doing in holding the minority staffs to somewhere between puny and zero.

These professional staffs draft practically everything which emerges from the congressional committees—every report, every finding, every recommendation, nearly every proposal for investigation.

What do you think the minority party staff can do when it is outnumbered 24 to 1? It can't even keep track of what is going on.

With such egregious imbalance as now prevails, the Republican teams of these committees are usually left on the bleacher seats in center field with the majority at bat all the time.

Many Republican Congressmen are becoming restive under the inaction of their own leadership. Representative BRUCE ALGER, of Texas, for example, has just written every colleague in the House demanding a Republican conference to deal with this matter. Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri and Senator CARL CURTIS, of Nebraska, whose campaigns to end this crippling inequity have been lonely ones, are gaining new supporters.

What surprises me is that the leadership of the Republican Party has been willing to let this go on so long. If the Republican leadership does not get up out of its rocking chair soon—something is going to bust.

Fuel Import Increase Avoids Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, for years I and my colleagues in both the House and Senate have been fighting Federal

import restrictions on residual oil. We have addressed appeal after appeal to the administration to lift this discriminatory burden from New England electrical consumers and our users of industrial heating oils.

We had hopes that the President would see fit to relieve us of the onerous quota system on such imports, since we have all heard his request for greater authority to liberalize trade and tariff policies. We had hoped that since the President favored freer trade he would demonstrate his commitment to this objective by freeing residual oil imports. After all, the President now has this authority and needs no further authorization from Congress. Exercising it in this instance would demonstrate his good faith and belief in freer trade. It would be proof that the further authority he asks for in other trade areas would be used to promote the general welfare, rather than be used as an instrument of politics, by granting concessions to one region of the Nation at the expense of others.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, our hopes have so far proven unfounded. The administration has again avoided facing this issue, and has tried to sweep the problem under the rug. Instead of abolishing import restrictions as recommended by the Office of Emergency Planning, the Department of the Interior has thrown New England a bone by raising quotas somewhat, an insignificant amount in view of the economic hardship these restrictions have proven during the last 2 years.

The New England Council has been of considerable assistance to me and to others who have been leading the fight against this restrictive trade policy. I have always found the council helpful in supplying reliable statistics on the impact in New England of higher fuel costs resulting from the present quota system. A highly respected, broadly regional, nonpolitical organization, the New England Council is truly a representative agency dedicated to the economic well-being of this important six-State area. As such it deserves to be heard on the latest setback to our cause for fairer prices to New England industry and consumers.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I submit the following statement by the New England Council, which comments on the failure of the administration to lift residual oil trade barriers.

I also commend to my colleagues in Congress, at this time, an editorial from the Boston Herald of December 30, 1961, which bears significantly on this issue:

FUEL IMPORT INCREASE AVOIDS ISSUE

The announcement last week by the Department of Interior, raising allocations of residual fuel oil to 507,000 barrels per day, is unwelcome news.

It has been interpreted by many as an alternative to complete removal of quotas as advocated by the Office of Emergency Planning.

It is inconceivable that the administration would countenance an action of this sort as a substitute for the only possible solution—the removal of the entire quota system. Increased quotas will provide no relief from the abnormal marketing conditions which have plagued east coast consumers of residual oil since the imposition of the quota program.

Nine months ago, the then Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization ordered a national security investigation of residual oil quotas. Hundreds of consumers from all parts of the country in good faith prepared elaborate presentations of the hardships encountered under the import quota program. An intensive study of these presentations has been conducted by the Office of Emergency Planning and a report with recommendations has been prepared for the President's action. We are confident that this objective study will be acted upon in accordance with the mandate of the Trade Agreements Act. A failure to act decisively at this time would be a serious breach of faith on the part of the administration and a gross disservice to the millions of people throughout the East who have been taxed by artificially inflated costs.

New England has been asked to support a policy of free trade for the products which it has traditionally manufactured. We have been asked to compete in the marketplaces of the world without the artificial restrictions of tariffs and quotas. Yet at the same time, we suffer under the burdens of a restrictive trade policy for this, an essential raw material. We seek only consistency in the trade policies which affect our ability to compete with the rest of the Nation and with other manufacturing countries of the world.

We are confident that the President, who is aware of the great discriminations and of the many inequities created by the residual oil quota program, will act promptly upon the recommendations of the Office of Emergency Planning.

PROTECTIONISM IN OIL

Fuel costs for industries and utilities are higher in New England than in any other region and about 50 percent higher than in the country as a whole. All New England consumers of electric power—residential included—are affected by industrial fuel costs.

The soft coal industry has lobbied into being a protectionist policy which arbitrarily adds to the cost of fuel in New England. This is the import quota system on residual oil, New England's prime cheap industrial fuel. The coal industry fears that this heavy oil is cutting down the market for coal.

The Kennedy administration, which is working on a policy for freer trade, could have few sharper examples of protectionism gone wild.

To protect the coal industry, New England's high fuel costs are made higher.

This is the wrong place to assess the costs of supporting coal. The cost of such support should be shared by all the country, not principally by New England.

The administration is not unaware of the problem. The import system on crude oil and refined products as distinct from residual oil is being reviewed by a Petroleum Study Committee drawn from seven Cabinet agencies. It will look into how much protection the domestic oil industry needs. Residual oil does not figure here, because it is of slight consequence to American producers.

The administration need not await the findings of this committee to rescind the restrictions on residual oil imports. Quotas could and should be lifted immediately. If the coal industry needs more special assistance, then this assistance should be found by some more equitable means.

The New England Council, through James S. Couzens, chairman of its fuel committee, has urged the Government to lift residual quotas for a test period of 3 years. The 3 years of quotas on residual have had no effect on domestic oil exploration, but have skyrocketed the prices of residual, Mr. Couzens observes.

New England faces diminished protection on some of its products; it ought not to have to bear besides the cost of protecting the coal industry.

The New Frontier in the Arts—More Publicity Than Art So Far

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, if there is anything which the New Frontier is getting reams of publicity out of it is its supposed interest in, and concern for, the arts.

Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson is the most recent New Frontiersman to come out for culture. He will narrate Copland's "Lincoln Portrait" in a concert during the opening week of the Lincoln Center. A few days ago he indicated he couldn't tell Romney, the painter, from George Romney, of American Motors.

The New York Times music critic, Harold C. Schonberg, has this to say about the first-week programs at Lincoln Center:

Some Lincoln Center supporters have been watching recent developments with something of the sinking feeling of a lover discovering that his beloved has false teeth.

Mr. Schonberg goes on to say, regarding Adlai E. Stevenson's role as narrator in Copland's "Lincoln Portrait," that:

Is it nasty cynicism to suggest that the juxtaposition has more of a publicity than a musical angle? ("So what'll we have on our first program?" "Well, fellers, we gotta make a big splash. Now there's this here Adlai Stevenson * * * what an idea. You've blown the lid off the pressure cooker with that one.")

Well, this about sums it up for the New Frontier except that the New York Times music critic makes the point that:

There are many things that Lincoln Center could have done. If the enterprise is to be looked on as an American cultural dream come true, the American elements could and should have been played up. The best of our composers should have been commissioned to write music for the occasion; and the best of world music, appropriate to the occasion, also could have played a part. Or if Lincoln Center had wished to stress its international role, the door should have been thrown open to the great foreign artists and organizations.

Lincoln Center, and the New Frontier, have struck out on all counts: new American music, and the best of world music, and great foreign artists and cultural organizations. But they do have Governor Stevenson's narration.

I include the New York Times article which I have been discussing.

A WRONG START: FIRST WEEK OF PROGRAMS AT LINCOLN CENTER LACKS FLAIR AND IMAGINATION

(By Harold C. Schonberg)

Some Lincoln Center supporters have been watching recent developments with something of the sinking feeling of a lover discovering that his beloved has false teeth. It was bad enough when the Boston Symphony, announcing its entrance into this citadel of democratic culture, raised its prices in Philharmonic Hall some 50 percent. But now that the first week's programs at Lincoln Center have been announced, it would seem that commercial considerations have prevailed over artistic ones, and that all the

ideals we had been reading about have been set to a singing commercial.

There are many things that Lincoln Center could have done. If the enterprise is to be looked on as an American cultural dream come true, the American elements could and should have been played up. The best of our composers should have been commissioned to write music for the occasion; and the best of world music, appropriate to the occasion, also could have played a part. Or if Lincoln Center had wished to stress its international role, the door should have been thrown open to the great foreign artists and organizations. Gaze upon our handiwork, they could have been told. Perform for us in our new hall, beside the best of our own musicians.

FAR FROM VISIONARY

But what actually has been announced is a long way from the great vision that Lincoln Center has been talking about. The two New York philharmonic programs, certainly, are not calculated to inspire confidence among musicians throughout the world, or among those of the concertgoing public who have taste.

Lincoln Center is supposed to represent high standards, adventure, the best in the performing arts. The opening concert, one had expected, would be something very special, a symbol of what the center is to stand for. And what does the announced opening program actually stand for? An extravaganza, a big patchwork that has neither the virtue of consistency nor taste, a gaudy affair that rings as hollow as a broken drum.

CHORAL BEGINNING

Leonard Bernstein will be leading the Philharmonic and 12 vocal soloists in a movement from Beethoven's "Missa Solemnis," a movement from Mahler's Eighth Symphony, a new work commissioned by the Philharmonic from Aaron Copland (the nature of the score has not yet been announced, but presumably it is for chorus and orchestra) and Vaughan Williams' "Serenade to Music."

Presenting single movements of masterpieces is a disservice to the composer and the kind of esthetic amputation one would not expect from the director of a major orchestra in one of the world's musical capitals. It is the kind of program that will make a big noise, and will parade many faces, but its content has elements more of the circus than of idealism and imagination.

FROM PHILADELPHIA

The Philharmonic is not the only organization with opening-week programs that are making musicians giggle. Eugene Ormandy and the Philadelphia Orchestra will come up with a routine in which Adlai Stevenson is narrator in Copland's "Lincoln Portrait." Is it nasty cynicism to suggest that the juxtaposition has more of a publicity than a musical angle? ("So what'll we have on our first program?" "Well, fellers, we gotta make a big splash. Now there's this here Adlai Stevenson * * *." "Gad, what an idea. You've blown the lid off the pressure cooker with that one.")

On this program, Van Cliburn will play the Rachmaninoff Third Piano Concerto (isn't he ashamed?). Walter Piston will be represented with a piece d'occasion, the "Lincoln Center Overture." This is the only work commissioned by Lincoln Center during the opening week. Ravel's well-worn "Daphnis and Chloe" ends this program.

The Boston and Cleveland orchestras will present new works by Samuel Barber and Alvin Etler. Otherwise the selections are traditional: "Eroica" Symphony, Brahms Violin Concerto and the like. At least these are respectable programs. But it cannot be said that there has been much of a special effort to do something memorable.

Fortunately the opening week will have at least one event worthy of the occasion, and it is coming from the most conservative organization on the premises—the Metropolitan Opera. On September 29 and 30, Ernest Ansermet will direct the American premiere of Manuel de Falla's "Atlantida." This is a major work by a major 20th century composer. Here, then, will be the excitement and adventure promised by Lincoln Center.

The ironical part of the first week is in the three popular-priced concerts, with seats from $4 to $1. (The opening concert on September 23 is a benefit at a $250 top, $100 bottom; and the other concerts during the week have a $30 top. All of these are benefits.) But are the Metropolitan Opera and the big orchestras being offered to the public at popular prices? No; in the cheaper series are the Juilliard String Quartet, the New York Pro Musica and the two-piano team of Gold and Fizdale.

It so happens that these are among the finest organizations in America. But they normally attract an audience of connoiseurs. What Lincoln Center in effect is saying is that the organizations everybody wants to hear are being priced out of average reach during the first week of benefits, and that the only popular-priced concerts being offered are those that have the least glamour and the least audience appeal.

MONEY PROBLEMS

Now, the need for money is pressing, and nobody would begrudge Lincoln Center any number of benefits for whatever the traffic can bear. And one is certain that the opening week of concerts are not going to set the pattern for the future operation. But it is equally certain that Lincoln Center has made a bad start, sacrificing ideals to what it may consider necessity. Though, really, where's the necessity? The audience will come, on this auspicious occasion, no matter what is played. It could have been just as easy to search out, with imagination and resource, fine and unusual pieces of music of past and present that would have been appropriate to the occasion, and to present them with all possible honesty and dignity.

It is true that the first week will probably bring Lincoln Center a few hundred thousand dollars. But there are other considerations. See Mark, viii, 36.

A Thought for the Governor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Mrs. Doris Loghry of Port Angeles, Wash., sent me a letter the other day in which she said that after learning of my opinion, she thought it would be gratifying to me to know a lot of people feel the way I do concerning the question of whether or not the pulp and paper industry is polluting Washington State waters.

Well, I am gratified and pleased that the clipping she enclosed in her letter indicates that there are a lot of people who agree with me. None of us wants pollution, but also we don't want our mills closed down if they are not adversely affecting the marine life of Puget Sound.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include the clipping from the Port Angeles (Wash.) Evening News.

A THOUGHT FOR THE GOVERNOR

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Following is an open letter to Gov. Albert D. Rosellini which was read over KONP recently. It is printed here in response to a number of calls received by the local radio station.)

DEAR GOVERNOR: A recent press release informed us that you were off to the east coast on a mission of finding new business for the State at Washington. Much of the propoganda put forth in your last campaign, and still issuing from your office, is designed to inform us of your efforts in this direction.

In the meantime, here in our own State, ones of the most crucial matters concerning already existing industries is threatening to deprive us of those sources of employment. If the present pollution controversy succeeds in penalizing the mills for their operation, as in every appearance it intends to do, there is an excellent chance that at least several of them will close out their operations here and move elsewhere.

When the controversy first arose, I believed it was your position to step in and acquaint yourself with the facts and give this difference of opinion some direction.

Instead, you chose to call in the Federal Government, apparently feeling that the State of Washington was unable to resolve this difference through our own insight and efforts.

The result was the blatant expression of office that emerged in the so-called hearings in Olympia that were designed to last a week, were stacked from the very beginning, and which terminated in 2 days with an obviously prejudiced decision.

Governor, have you ever talked to Mr. Vinton Bacon, an expert on pollution? Have you ever read the Gunther McKee report on pollution in regard to the oyster growers that the State paid $16,000 for?

Have you ever stopped to think what the unemployment rolls would look like in this State if the pulp mills left?

Did you ever consider how many empty houses and closed businesses would result from the movement of millworkers to wherever their plants moved?

The Pollution Commission of the State of Washington isn't stepping on the mills half as hard as they are stepping on the thousands of people who depend on those mills for livelihood. Yet that commission which sits in judgment does not have a member on it from business, labor, or education.

It is loaded with people whose natural sympathies lie with a minority group which blames pollution for their problems because they cannot come up with real scientific answers of their own.

It's not too late yet to save a sad situation. It's time to stop this arbitrary and capricious establishing of requirements for pollution control and for the State to set down definite, decisive standards based on pure scientific analysis of exactly what constitutes the pollution of our waters.

As the first man in our State, you have the largest responsibility toward its people. This is a time of crisis and the people need your help as much as you needed their votes in the last election. We would like to see you tell the Federal people to go back to their desks in Washington, D.C. We would like to see created a balanced, intelligently informed, unbiased Pollution Control Commission. And we would like to see good, solid American democracy give the mills a fair shake in presenting their side of the pollution problem based against scientific standards on pollution established by the State of Washington.

Remember the old adage that keeps healthy businessmen healthy: "It's much easier to keep an old customer with you than it is to solicit a new customer."

BOB GARDNER,
Manager of Radio KONP.

PORT ANGELES, *February 20.*

The Truth About the John Birch Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, several of my colleagues in Congress have told me that their opposition to the John Birch Society is based on what they have read in newspapers. Unfortunately, many of our newspapers have been prone to distort the truth about the society. An editorial which discusses the society objectively appeared in the February 15, 1962 issue of the Ramona Sentinel, a newspaper published in Ramona, Calif. Because I believe Members of Congress will profit by reading the editorial, I, under unanimous consent, include it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

BETWEEN SCYLLA AND CHARYBDIS?

It has become custom for politicians to disclaim support from the John Birch Society, indeed, even conservative candidates for office painstakingly and precisely, in the eyes of the public, seek to divorce themselves from the Bircher element. The liberal press and television, and the Republicans also, deride the Birch organization every opportunity that arises. The President sees fit to attack the Birch Society with regularity. At the present, the continued besmirching of the Birch Society from all sides has evoked an image of a sinister, malevolent creature, in the minds of the average American.

Is this image, that has been forcefully crammed into the minds of the public, a true one? I think not. It has been my experience that nearly every individual who expressed his fearful disapproval of the society, when hard pressed admitted his opinions were formed and grew under the constant tutelage of the newspapers, which seem to relish the harrassment of the Birchers. Newspaper awards have been given to those newspapers who have published "exposés" of the organization. Exposé implies a public disclosure of a heretofore unrevealed truth about the society. Even a casual perusal of Birch literature, to the clearheaded individual would reveal nothing more dangerous than a relatively small political group, espousing conservative doctrine which works for the abolishment of the UN and the impeachment of Chief Supreme Court Justice Warren.

Actually, a truly informed public could not become alarmed at what the Birchers are doing. Very few people, it seems, really know what they do: the public, after the frenzied editorial comment of the press, only imagine the dangerous things done by the Birchers. What does the society actually do? Its members write letters to Congressmen. They collect tapes on communism and play them for anyone who will listen. They send tracts on Bircher doctrine to those whom they think will read them. Their theory of government resembles that of the late Robert Taft. Is this the budding "Nazi" menace pictured by news media? It is difficult to understand the furor created by the forming of this society. The public's image of the group is distorted beyond good sense, actually.

But, the critics shout, the Birchers have labeled our former Presidents "Communist dupes." Here, in the eyes of Americans, the Birchers have committed the unpardonable sin. Our former and present Chief Executives have been duped constantly by the Reds, but in polite American society you "don't say things like that"—in fact, you don't even think things like that. But the fact is that a billion people have been snatched from under our Presidents' not-so-watchful noses and absorbed into the Communist bloc. Now really—at the conference tables, in the summit meetings, on the world diplomatic stage, did we lose the billion people because of the astuteness of our Presidents, or was it because our Presidents were duped by a more-astute Communist hierarchy? I think we know the answer to that question.

Birchers are labeled "superpatriots" by their critics. But let it be known that there is a vein of something worthwhile is many of these people. I personally know of a local couple that have spent every penny of their life savings of $5,000 to alert people in this area to the dangers of communism. Is this inordinate interest in America patriotic—or eccentric? Who knows—this is 1962 and American ideals have changed over the years. But I wonder, if the hat was passed in Ramona, and $10 solicited tomorrow from every resident to "Help save America," how many would actually contribute the $10—much less their life savings?

An unusual characteristic of these people is their knowledge of the current world scene. Extensive files are kept by local Birch members, on world happenings, and they are extremely well-versed on the global situation, and its every fluctuation. It would be safe to assert that as a group they are much better informed than their critics.

The John Birch Society is not terribly important, but it is publicly overrated by the American liberal element for obvious political reasons. The liberal program is profoundly simply. They first worked to create an image of the society that was unacceptable to the public. Now it is obvious that the liberals will seek to tie all Republican candidates' names to the Birch Society. That is why Republicans and Democrats alike repudiate even the support of the group. Reference is made to the Birch Society (membership 60,000 prox.) constantly, indeed it has become a household word as the great danger to America—while a billion Communists are awaiting without to devour us.

Ever hear of the John Reed Club? I'll bet the reader 10 to 1 he hasn't heard of it. The club, of Communist affiliates, was named after John Reed, one of the original Communists in the United States. He died in the Kremlin and was buried there. The Communist clubs have functioned for 25 years with John Reed hero of the American Communist movement. The Reds want to "bury us." Isn't it of singular interest that, after a quarter-century of operation, the Reed clubs have received no publicity to speak of? A question arises: why single out the innocuous Bircher group as a whipping-boy, when the Reed clubs—a fearful, real, threat to America—are given no publicity at all? A curious paradox.

In my opinion, the facts are these: the Birchers are in no sense the cause for alarm the news media imply, neither are they the great white knights the Birchers think they are; the society is feared when there is nothing to fear; the public is in a frenzy about the Birchers, and in fact, this frenzy is the sole extent of the danger surrounding the society.

As is the current practice, I disclaim relationship with the group too—but not for the usual reasons. I believe the Birchers are too inflexible in their assertions. I am in agreement with much of their political philosophy, not because it is Bircher, but because I held that philosophy long before I ever heard of John Birch. I do not agree with the Bircher view that the United Nations should be abolished, nor that we should take the trouble to impeach Justice Warren. To the question: are the Birchers dangerous to America, I could truthfully answer: "Not nearly as dangerous as 'Americans for Democratic Action'."

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a translation of excerpts from an address delivered in Detroit, Mich., on February 25, 1962, by Joseph Kajeckas, Charge d'Affaires ad interim of Lithuania, in commemoration of the 44th anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence. After paying tribute to G. Mennen Williams, former Governor of Michigan and now Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, Mr. Kajeckas said the following:

At the present time, Mr. Williams' concern in the State Department has become the whole African continent. In his present capacity, he has had the opportunity to witness the rise to independence of many African nations, at a time when the blessings of freedom and independence are denied to Lithuania, an ancient nation of freedom-loving people. It is thus not surprising that Mr. and Mrs. Williams have a warm feeling for the Lithuanians of the State of Michigan; when they were guests at the Lithuanian Legation in Washington on February 16, Lithuanian Independence Day, they asked me to extend to their Lithuanian friends in Detroit their greetings and very best wishes.

As we think of the newly emergent African nations, we should note that the Soviet Union is very quick to recognize and applaud the independence of nations far from the borders of the Soviet Union. And yet sad experience has shown that the Kremlin has no respect for independent neighboring nations, such as Lithuania. The Lithuanian nation had signed many solemn pledges and treaties with the Soviet Union, by which the Soviets had promised to respect Lithuanian sovereignty "for all time." Yet because Lithuania was easy prey to military might, these solemn promises were broken at the convenience of the Kremlin, and for 22 years the Lithuanian nation has been enslaved by Red tyranny. In no period of Lithuanian history has our nation suffered such cruel and overwhelming losses as in this period of subjugation by Soviet Russia. The crimes of genocide committed against the Lithuanian nation are well known to the free world. The mass deportations which continuously decimated the Lithuanian population serve the free world as a reminder of exactly what kind of respect the Soviets have for human decency, law and order when these come into conflict with Soviet self-interest.

The Soviets continue to Russify the Lithuanian people, to falsify history, and to attempt to dehumanize the spirit of a freedom-loving people. Yet the one thing that the Soviet occupants cannot enslave is the ardent desire of the Lithuanian people to be free. The one thing they cannot kill, no matter how many mass graves they dig, is the Lithuanian people's hope that the day of justice will come, and bring with it a rebirth of freedom for a long-suffering nation.

History teaches us that tyranny, such as that of the Soviets, cannot endure indefinitely. The fate of Hitler and Mussolini is a case in point. More recently, we have seen Stalin, the man so long honored as a fatherly demigod, relegated to a dishonored grave at the base of the Kremlin wall. Sic semper tyrannis: thus always to tyrants.

In the struggle of the Lithuanian people to regain their independence, their greatest friend has been the United States. For almost 22 years, the Government of this country has refused to recognize the illegal and forcible occupation of Lithuania, and continues to support the undying aspirations of the Lithuanian people. As in previous years on Lithuanian Independence Day, the Department of State has reiterated its position on February 16, and I am pleased to quote to you now a letter I received this year from the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk:

"On the 44th anniversary of the rebirth of Lithuania as a free and independent state I extend to you, as the representative of Lithuania, the good wishes of the Government and people of the United States for the Lithuanian nation. Though their independence has been suppressed by forced incorporation into the Soviet Union, the Lithuanian people have not ceased to show their determination to maintain their ideal and preserve their national heritage. The American people admire your countrymen for this devotion to freedom. The United States, by refusal to recognize the Soviet annexation of Lithuania, registers its support of Lithuania's cause as well as its faith that the Lithuanian nation will endure."

At the same time, I am pleased to note that, on February 16, President Kennedy received a delegation of Lithuanian Americans at the White House in honor of their homeland's independence day. This was indeed a great honor for our country. In the Senate and House of Representatives, many tributes were paid to Lithuania and her just cause, including the fine statements of the elected representatives of the people of Michigan.

I would like to take this opportunity, on your behalf and that of the entire Lithuanian nation, to thank publicly the Government of the United States and her people for their continued espousal of the Lithuanian cause. Truly, the story of Lithuania serves as a lesson to the free world; it teaches all freedom-loving peoples that liberty is indivisible by nature, and that as lon gas any nation is enslaved, there can be no true and lasting peace for the world as a whole. On yet another anniversary of the day when they joined the community of free nations, the Lithuanian people renew their determination to continue their efforts in behalf of their just cause of regained independence, and look with firm courage and hope to the day when nations will be able to live in mutual trust and peace with justice. The coming of such a day depends on universal adherence to the moral principles on which such a peace is based; and this must be paramount in our minds, as we witness the redoubling of the determination of brave people to preserve those principles.

Hon. Wall Doxey

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in expressing sorrow for the passing of a distinguished son of Mississippi, Wall Doxey. Wall Doxey served his State and his Nation well during two of the most trying decades in this country's history.

His years in the Congress, first as a Member of this House, then as Senator from Mississippi, were marked with dedication and distinction. His great concern with the natural resources, forests, and agriculture of this country is reflected in the many laws that bear his name.

A staunch American and a devoted public servant throughout his long life, Wall Doxey's passing cost Mississippi and the Nation an outstanding citizen. I wish to express my deepest sympathy to his son, Wall Doxey, Jr., and to the other members of his family.

Two-Price Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues a provocative editorial which appeared on March 2, 1962, in the Journal of Commerce. Al Wyss, foreign trade news editor, has raised several interesting questions about the proposed cotton equalization fee. It does seem sensible to call a spade a spade and recognize that the suggested fee is in effect an increased tariff. Is this consistent with the President's request for authority to reduce tariffs to deal with the European Common Market?

The editorial also questions the continuation of price supports for cotton which result in the two-price cotton system. The idea of direct production payments to farmers should be thoroughly explored by Congress.

The article follows:

THUMBS DOWN ON LEVY

The U.S. Tariff Commission has just completed holding hearings on what may well be one of its most momentous cases in a number of years. It must now decide whether or not to recommend the imposition of an 8½ cents a pound import equalization fee on cotton textiles.

Its recommendations to the President can have far-reaching consequences on world trade. The Commission's recommendation will be of vital importance not only to overseas and domestic producers of cotton textiles but also to our cotton farmers. If accepted by the President, it could adversely affect U.S. cotton exports, one of our biggest dollar earners, and accordingly the balance of payments.

A recommendation to impose such a fee, which is the equivalent of a substantial tariff, would be a step backward. It would deal a serious blow to increased and freer trade between the United States and many of its trading partners in the Western World.

When President Kennedy ordered the Tariff Commission to study the advisability of placing such a fee on all imported cotton textile products, he was seeking to offset the 8½ cents export subsidy which the Government pays on exports of raw cotton.

This subsidy has enabled the United States to sell cotton in the world market and dispose of a substantial surplus. It also resulted in the inequitable two-price cotton system whereby American cotton textile producers must pay substantially more for their cotton than foreign textile producers.

No one, including competing overseas textile producers, question the validity of eliminating the two-price cotton system. It is grossly unfair for American mills to be forced to pay 8½ cents a pound more for raw material than their overseas competitors. But the proposal now being considered by the Tariff Commission to equalize cotton costs is the wrong one which could result in more harm than good.

An 8½ cents a pound import fee on the content of textile would make it practically impossible for foreign producers to compete in this market on many fabrics and would curtail shipments of textiles from overseas producers, including Japan, Hong Kong, and Western Europe, drastically. By raising substantially the already high U.S. tariff on cotton goods, it has been estimated that it would cause a drop in Japanese cotton goods exports to the United States of about 60 percent.

Hong Kong exporter spokesmen have said that their shipments here would be slashed even more severely and that the fee would increase the cost of U.S. imports of Hong Kong textiles by 18 to 20 percent.

Imposition of such a fee consequently would undo the progress made by the Geneva international textile pact for fostering a steady growth in world textile trade on an orderly basis. It would indeed be a feather in the cap of extreme protectionists.

And it would jeopardize the Geneva textile agreement because competition by overseas textile producers would be so difficult here that the pact would be meaningless to them. For this reason, some countries, like Japan and Hong Kong, have threatened not to sign the Geneva pact if the cotton textile equalization fee is imposed.

Moreover, the danger that such an equalization fee would reduce U.S. exports of raw cotton cannot be overlooked. Dollar earnings from cotton exports over the past several years have averaged almost $1 billion. As Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi, pointed out, expansion of our cotton exports is vital to us as a nation as well as to the cotton industry.

But, if oversea producers are forced to reduce textile shipments here drastically, they will buy much less U.S. cotton.

A spokesman for the European Common Market, Attorney William J. Barnhard, predicted at the Commission hearings that if the special fee was imposed, the EEC countries will sharply cut the amount of U.S. cotton they buy. And spokesmen for Japan have pointed out that comparable grades of raw cotton are available on the world market at prices equal to and in some instances below the so-called U.S. export-subsidy price.

The United States is seeking to expand raw cotton exports both to reduce its surplus and strengthen the balance of payments. Consequently, any move which could adversely affect such exports should most certainly be avoided.

The two-price cotton system should be eliminated. But the way to eliminate it is not by slapping a fee, or the equivalent of a tariff, on imports.

One thing which could be done, as suggested in this newspaper in the past, is to eliminate price supports for cotton entirely and pay farmers the difference between the market level of cotton and a certain percentage of parity as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Such a system is favored by many in the cotton trade who also believe that it probably would not be as costly as the present price support system.

It is at least worth a trial. But in any event the imposition of any import equalization fee is a move which should be avoided. It would result in many more disadvantages than warranted by the special benefits it would give to U.S. textile producers.

What Freedom Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE D. NORRELL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mrs. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, we are aware of the interest that many of our veterans' organizations have evidenced over the years in our young citizens, and we know about some of the programs these organizations have established.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars has sponsored for 15 years a nationwide Voice of Democracy essay contest among high school students. The subject of the essay this year was "What Freedom Means to Me."

It was my privilege to attend the VFW annual dinner honoring Members of Congress, and to meet and hear the student from Lincoln, Nebr., read the essay that she wrote and which won first place in the national contest. This student's name is Janice Woelfle. Second place was won by Maja Swetschin of Crookston, Minn.; third place by Jill Mackler of East Rockaway, N.Y.; and fourth place by Eric D. Alpert of New Bedford, Mass. From my own State of Arkansas, James V. Spencer III, of El Dorado was the State winner in the contest.

I believe there are some thoughts expressed by these five high school students from which we can all gain. Every one of us needs a reminder from time to time that, in the words of the first place national winner, Janice Woelfle:

Freedom is our heritage. Freedom is our opportunity. Freedom is our job.

The essays of the five students are here presented:

"WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME"

(By Janice Woelfle, first-place national winner)

Three Americans were out sightseeing in a Soviet city 2 years ago.[1] One was Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, the second was a U.S. Army officer, and the third a Russian-speaking official of the U.S. Embassy. It was a unique day for them. In their tour of the U.S.S.R., they'd managed for once to shake off their Kremlin-appointed guide.

As they walked down the street, a young man suddenly accosted them. He was about 30 years old, quite well dressed for a Russian, with the look of a professional person.

"Are you Englishmen?" the young man said in Russian.

The Embassy man replied, "No, we're Americans."

"Americans. That's even better," the young man said excitedly. "I've wanted so long to talk to an American."

"Why?" the Embassy man asked.

"Because you Americans are such lucky people. You can read what you want, hear what you want, say what you want. We can't."

The young man peered nervously over his shoulder to see if anyone were listening. He knew he was risking his life to speak like that. "Always remember," he went on, "they aren't fooling us about you Americans. We want this to be your kind of world." Then he walked away—fast.

This incident, experienced and related by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, is typical of the effect democracy has on the people of the world; and it is so true. We are lucky.

Because of democracy, we can go to a public library and select any book from the "Iliad," or the "Odyssey," to "Alice in Wonderland." We can listen to the "Classical hour," the "Top 50 Tunes," "Back to the Bible Broadcast," or political panels on our radios without fear of being found and punished. We, young and old alike, have the unequaled privilege of casting our vote for class officers, school cheerleaders, or the President of the United States.

I am 17 years old and a senior in high school. Next year, I plan to go on to college and eventually I hope to become a teacher. I have been free to make my vocational and college choice. My family attends church together each Sunday, and we are free to choose our own church. Every year we take a vacation and are free to enjoy the tumbled splendor of the Rockies, the wild coast of Maine, or the warm, sunny beaches of California without having to apply for a passport or ask for permission.

My father is president of his local electrical union where they are free to bargain for higher wages or improved working conditions. I can choose between a movie or a football game; my family can purchase all types of clothes from Bermuda shorts to the most beautiful of formals.

Freedom of press, freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of choice, the right to vote—all freedoms are made possible only through democracy.

Yes, democracy is voting in November, going to the church of our choice, speaking for what we feel is right, and being able to decide what we will read, see, hear, and do. But it is more than this. It is also the shout of a crowd as their team makes the final touchdown; it's the glow in the eyes of a little girl as she sits on Santa's knee; it's the joy on a 3-year-old's face as he pretends that he's a boat in a mud puddle. It is the tender look on a mother's face as she gazes at her newborn child. She knows his future is insured because he was born in a free, democratic country.

Countless times throughout our history we have defended our rights and the rights of other people to be free, but the job is far from done. To further protect and insure the future of every baby, now and yet to come, we must continuously speak for democracy. Yes, we must act for democracy. For only through our democratic processes come the guarantees of rights, liberty, and freedom. Our freedom is a give-and-take process, a mutual agreement among Americans to "pursue happiness" as long as it doesn't infringe on the rights of others.

Yes, our country is a great country and it presents a great hope to the Communist-held world.

"Always remember," the young Russian continued, "they aren't fooling us about you Americans. We want this to be your kind of world."

Freedom is our heritage. Freedom is our opportunity. Freedom is our job.

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

(By Miss Maja Swetschin, second place national winner)

The British have their London; the French have their Paris; you Americans have your Washington; every country has its capital. In the country from which I come, Berlin is our capital of freedom. But there at the wall is the terminus of freedom. For us—for all free people. Terminus freedom. Behind it—nothing. Nothing but spiritual desert. For the people who are forced to live in this desert, Berlin is a dream, a dream of freedom! Unattainable? But freedom is stronger than concrete or barbed wire. Also at the terminus freedom—in Berlin.

Freedom, people say, is the highest treasure of life. But what it really means everybody has to find for himself, personally. Is freedom your inheritance, something you take as self-evident as the sunshine? Is freedom your personal right, that you, you are permitted to do whatever, however you want? Does it concern only your hopes, demands, desires? Is freedom your privilege, the precious, valuable foundation of your life, which you are aware of and thankful for, which you guard against any violation? Is freedom your task, a special value, for which you have to prove dignity and maturity? A duty, under which you see yourself in relationship to your neighbors and to God; a gift which you are responsible to preserve? Is freedom your burden, robbing your sheltered, comfortable, irresponsible, passive conformity, forcing you to think and act? Is freedom your goal, which you want to attain, something, which—being not at all perfect or equal here—becomes a dream, an abstraction? Perhaps freedom is too complex and manifold, or too intimate and personal, or too trite and boring, or too painful and grievous to speak about?

For me, a German foreign exchange student, the answer lies in Berlin, the divided city. At night:

Light, beaming neon tubes, courting, offering, attracting on the west side of the wall; darkness on the east side. Advertisement is useless; the party determines producing and consuming. Cars, to be bought by everybody in the West; the party distributes them only to high officials in the East. Bars, in which bands play whatever people like, waltz or rock'n roll, on this side; on the other side a ballroom where you dance to the whistle of the totalitarian regime. Church bells, ringing, inviting all people to communicate in brotherhood here; alarm drums there finding a heretic, deviating from the party line by going to church. Tickets for plane and train trips for everybody in the West; in the East a private trip ends at the Iron Curtain or in jail. TV or radio stations, newspapers from all parts of the world here; propaganda there, the same, unalterable propaganda, lying, deceiving, but eventually penetrating and somehow settling down in the subconscious. Gossip, criticism any place in the West; in the East fanatical children denouncing their parents, if one thoughtless word escapes their lips. Here the variety and decision of activities and recreations; there the so-called social activities forcing all people to take part if they want to live. Individualism, peculiarity, deviation, permission to be different, self-determination, respected conviction on the west side; on the east side one belief, one ideology for all, encircling people in one spot, limiting their horizon in one direction, on one goal.

Freedom, thousands of little, single liberties, which you learn to recognize and to appreciate after you have lost them. The right to say "Yes" or "No," the right to be educated or to vegetate, the right to be yourself or not to be—examples in light and shadow over Berlin, our outpost of freedom; Berlin, where the liberty bell rings, the gift of the Americans. Its sound is heard on both sides of the wall to manifest the existence and also the price and value of freedom. May everybody hear its ringing.

[1] "The Man in the Street." An experience of Senator JACKSON's as written in the book "The Day I Was Proudest To Be an American," edited by Donald Robinson.

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

(By Miss Jill Mackler, third place national winner)

For centuries past, youth has reached the shores of America to be welcomed by the outstretched arm of the Statue of Liberty, the very same symbol of freedom that extends her hand in welcome to all today. This symbolic structure that became a note of promise of the future for those landing on free shores for the first time, remains as a token to us, the teenagers in America today. It is a token of what this Nation has promised and stands for. Just as the torch in her hand has burned brightly through the years, so does it kindle the hearts of the younger generation today with sparks of friendship and the flame of liberty. It is the torch of freedom; it burns as a reflection of man's search and fight for freedom down through the ages of time.

Held within the confines of her left hand, she offers to the world a record of man's love and moves for freedom inscribed by time alone in the pages of her sacred book. The pages depict the remnants of once war-shattered cities, as those of Atlanta, Hiroshima, Berlin, destroyed in man's fight for freedom; and the writhing faces of battle-scarred freedom lovers across the face of the earth—long evidences of man's striving to achieve the personification of an ideal.

We, as young citizens of America and the future ruling forces of the world, view with pride the rights given to our citizens today, evolved through years of steady progress—freedom of speech, freedom of worship, and freedom of the press. With an intermingling of gratitude and pride, we reivew the laws engraved into our statutes, laws that have given us self-government and have lifted the chains of bondage and slavery from our bodies and hearts. We are free to search and find the ultimate freedom—freedom within ourselves. A freedom that encompasses not only life and liberty but the entire being of each individual as well. This true liberation emanates from the heart and mind—from the very soul of mankind.

As young people, we are not blind to conditions that have existed throughout history. We know that minority groups, so often the object of world hate and misuse, have left their mark on the world today. But here in America, these people are rising above world prejudice. They are striving for more than the gift of life. They covet lives equal to those led by all other men. It is a striving for not only the liberties granted by law, but also for the liberty of freedom from fear; to enjoy respect, to pursue a satisfying position in life, to live within an atmosphere of harmony and mutual concern. A gift equaled only by the gift of life itself—this is freedom; the freedom extended to all those who search for it; to find it within the valleys, the plains, the towns, and the cities of America.

America, so rich in resources both natural and cultural, but above all, rich in human resources, has evolved from a wilderness conquered by our ancestors. These pilgrims in an unknown land cleared the path for the establishment of a new world, an ocean's distance from the old, a world erected on principles of equality, self-government, and freedom. We must not turn our backs on the principles by which we live, or ignore the needs of our fellow men; for, if left unguarded and uncared for, the weeds of slavery and tyranny can choke and overrun freedom's footpath. The generations to come and the citizens of today must safeguard our liberties.

Just as the Statue of Liberty stands in our harbor, never failing, promising freedom to those who seek it, as Americans, so too must we be constant and unfailing in adhering to the spirit of freedom, which is, in truth, the spirit of America.

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

(By Mr. Eric D. Alpert, fourth-place national winner)

"From every mountainside let freedom ring." These immortal words are contained in one of our Nation's most beloved songs. But what is freedom? Why is it that millions have sacrificed their very lives for its preservation? To me, freedom is something which God intended for mankind, for the Bible teaches, "Proclaim liberty throughout the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof."

I feel extremely fortunate to have been born in America, a land where men are free from the rule of tyranny, a land where men can assemble when and where they choose, say what they feel, worship as they please, elect whom they want to represent them, and, in fact, do whatever they like within the bounds of reason and morality. Even if, perchance, a man is accused of overstepping his bounds, he knows, assuredly, that he will not be unjustly punished with no questions asked, as is the case in some parts of our world, but that he has the privilege of coming before a court of unbiased persons, stating his case, and receiving fair verdict and punishment.

"Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable." These words of Daniel Webster exemplify my belief that from freedom there emerges brotherhood, and from brotherhood there emerges unity. In a truly free society, where the freedoms I have previously mentioned are fervently upheld, every man can understand his neighbor and live compatibly with him, regardless of any differences of creed or color. If this type of brotherhood is prevalent throughout a nation, then peace and unity must result, crime must disappear, wars must cease eternally. But it is not so. There is war, there is crime, there is strife. Why? Is it because freedom is failing? No, it is only because men have their own failings that there must be prejudice, jealousy, and strife. We may never see a truly free society; there may never be one, for it would symbolize perfection, a state unattainable by man, but nevertheless, a goal toward which he stubbornly aims, for he is never satisfied.

America has been referred to both as the cradle of liberty and as the land of opportunity. Is there a definite connection between these two qualities? Yes, I think so, for even though our free society is imperfect, one of our prime American axioms is that "all men are created equal." Every person has the opportunity to decide how he wishes to direct his own life, and I feel that this enhances the speed of man's progress, since, with education available to all, the cobbler's son may become President, the President's son a cobbler, for freedom erases hereditary power and bestows honor based upon the achievements of the individual.

Great gifts to mankind have come from men such as Edison and Einstein, who were free to use imagination and curiosity to probe into science, pushing back humanity's frontiers of knowledge and opening the doors to the worlds of electricity and atomic energy. Yes, freedom cries for originality and advancement by encouraging men to use their own creativity to better themselves and their society in a constant struggle to achieve worldwide unity.

I therefore strongly support the principles of freedom and the American way of life, for I feel that each and every citizen, from the poorest to the richest, by being able to express his candid opinion, owns a share in democracy and in the destiny of our country. I echo the words of Benjamin Franklin, who said, in 1776, when freedom was grasping the colonies, molding them into the United States of America, "Where liberty dwells, there is my country."

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

(By James V. Spencer III, first-place, State winner)

We, the citizens of the United States, living under the comforts of a democratic Government, seldom think of democracy as little more than a word. But this one word has shaped, to a large extent, the destiny of our own country and the destiny of the entire world.

The definition of democracy, as defined by Abraham Lincoln in his immortal Gettysburg Address, is a government of the people, by the people and for the people. Our Government, our democracy, is based upon the proposition, as stated in our Declaration of Independence, that "all men are created equal." Now while the equality of men obviously does not mean that men necessarily are equal in ability, in earning power or merit, it does mean that they should enjoy equality of opportunity, and should each have the same rights.

Today, in our democracy, we are faced with many problems. But are these problems any greater than when Hitler and Mussolini challenged our country with World War II? I might also add, what happened to Hitler and Mussolini and what did their own people do under their dictatorships? Well, Hitler's people called him a "madman" and, when the allied troops entered Rome, the Italians welcomed these invaders of their own country as liberators. Today Hitler's and Mussolini's infamous deeds and exploits are but pages in the annals of time, but democracy still remains as a testimonial to its greatness. I contend that if the peoples of the world knew democracy as we know it, and could understand it without the lies of propaganda, then they would accept it as the best existing basis for government. All my life I have enjoyed our democracy and I have seen daily the fruits it bears: I have seen freemen working at their different jobs each able to succeed and to make a living for his family. I have seen homes in which love and fellowship prevail, homes which know no fear from within, and homes whose members are able to trust one another. But to continue to enjoy this democracy that we all hold so dearly, we must carry out our responsibilities as citizens, and those are, to realize our rights and privileges under a democracy, but at the same time not to infringe on those of any one else. Also, an important privilege as well as responsibility is to vote. Knowing about the issue of the candidate, or candidates, and then voting accordingly.

We daily see democracy at work all around us. Our long-awaited vacation, our right to succeed in the world of business according to our ability, and also on the fact that every day we take advantage of at least one of the Bills of Rights, these are but a few of the ways that we can see democracy in action.

So many times, we take democracy for granted, and seem to forget how our countrymen shed their blood for freedom in the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Spanish American War, the bloody days of World War I and World War II, and also the Korean conflict. In all these wars, their purpose was to preserve our democracy.

Should we take for granted the principals for which these, our fellow Americans, fought and died? This is the question and we are the Americans.

I speak for democracy because I believe it to be the eventual answer to world peace, and because I am also an American.

Good Work by the Soil Conservation Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most effective programs of the Department of Agriculture is that provided by the Soil Conservation Service. Recently an excellent example of the work of Soil Conservation Service in Jackson County, in the district I have the honor to represent in the Congress, has been called to my attention through a letter written by Mr. Richard L. Mitchell of Cookeville, Tenn. I believe Mr. Mitchell's comments and observations on the work of the soil conservation program may be of interest to the Department and others, and therefore I ask unanimous consent to have this letter reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD. The letter follows:

COOKEVILLE, TENN.,
February 15, 1962.

Mr. D. W. MOYERS,
Area Conservationist, Soil Conservation Service, Cookeville, Tenn.

DEAR MR. MOYERS: I want to take this opportunity to express my appreciation for the excellent technical advisory services I have received from the Jackson County Soil Conservation District in the past year in the development of my farm in the sixth civil district of Jackson County, Tenn.

Like so many people who have not been actively engaged in farming, I have wondered over the past years just what benefit the farmers have been deriving from the Soil Conservation Service. I have had a hazy idea about soil conservation, but, for some reason, I seemed to have the thought that these services consisted of general theoretical platitudes to farmers concerning the benefit of soil conservation, without very much real practical help. I find that I was completely wrong.

My wife and I became the owners of a farm in the sixth district of Jackson County this last year. I had had no connections with farming since I was a boy in my teens and used to hire out on a farm in Overton County, during summers back in the thirties. My farming at that time consisted primarily of chopping out corn in limestone and sassafras new grounds. For some reason or other it didn't appeal to me very much. But in later years, as I began to see the improvement in our section of the country in farming; began to see what was obviously being done by farmers in this area toward cleaning up their farms and improving their lands, my wife and I got an intense desire to own a piece of farmland and attempt to develop it.

This last summer, we decided to take the plunge and obtained what we think is a good farm—perhaps without too much prior thinking as to just exactly what we would do with it. I knew generally what I wanted to end up with, but I found that I knew practically nothing about how to specifically go about it. I knew I wanted green pastures; I knew I wanted fine tobacco; I knew I wanted good fences; I knew I wanted plenty of water in the location where it would be most needed; I knew I wanted to produce bales and bales of hay; I knew I wanted the best grain production possible; but I did not know what to do in this field or that field in order to get what I wanted. That is when I turned to the Soil Conservation Service.

Immediately after contact, I was visited by Donald Bivens, soil conservationist for Jackson County's Soil Conservation District, and by Bill Medley, farm planner. They not only went over the farm with me and spoke in the generalities which I had expected, but after their conversation with me, they gave me specific advice, returned with a complete program, presenting me with a booklet containing a soil and water conservation plan which goes into detail concerning my entire farm, field by field, including plans for ponds and for timber conservation. When I listened to them and read their soil and water conservation plan, I realized that there was a good chance that I could really do what I wanted to do with that farm. I realized that it could not be done overnight—after all, is there anything real good ever done quickly, especially when we are dealing with nature? But I had confidence in what I was doing under Donald's and Bill's supervision, and had confidence that the little money which I could put into it from time to time would be worthwhile in the long run.

I can already see, after these few months, the slow but sure development of a farm plan which may eventually culminate in the dream my wife and I have had. I do not know how it will finally come out, but I do know that without the technical assistance of the Jackson County Soil Conservation District, it would have been almost a hopeless situation. When I think of the great benefits that I received from this service, it makes me realize what greater benefits good farmers can and do receive, who themselves know better than I how to put the proper practices into effect. I know now what has helped to make sections of our country into beautiful green farming country, whereas I can remember just a few years ago when most of it was comprised to a great extent of wornout land, sage grass fields, rocky gullies, and scrub timber. Of course, part of it is due to the finances that have been made available through this section of the country. A great amount of it is due to Federal financial help, such as the feed grain program and other crop support programs. But all of the finances in the world will not help a farm unless there is long-range planning which will put permanent value in the land. For a man to obtain Government financial assistance and not put it back in the land by following good soil conservation practices is to me just like a man sitting in his house in the wintertime and tearing the boards off of his walls to feed a fire to warm himself. Someday he will be out of boards and have neither the fire nor the house.

These are the reasons I feel that of all of the services to farmers in Jackson County, I feel that the technical advisory service of the soil conservation district is the best and most important, if properly used and followed. I am sure of one thing. I do not know how my farm will eventually turn out, but I do know that if it is developed properly it will be because of the assistance I am receiving from men like Donald Bivens and Bill Medley, and if it does not turn out right, it will not be their fault.

Jackson County is a wonderful county. It has some of the best farmland in the country, and it is not just the level river and creek bottoms that can become green, but also the ridge farms of Jackson County, for they have great potential in them. Jackson County farmers are some of the best in the world. They have had to be to do what they have done in the years past, before good scientific conservation practices were put into effect, and I feel that if they properly utilize the services now available to them, that we can see the countryside growing greener and cleaner and more productive.

I just wanted to drop this line to attempt to express to you my appreciation for this wonderful assistance I have received from your organization.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD L. MITCHELL.

Marxist Publication in the United States Attacks the John Birch Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, in order to keep abreast of what the Communists are up to in this country, I regularly read their publications. It is through these publications that the Communist hierarchy instructs the rank and file of the Communist Party, United States of America. I have been somewhat amazed by the ability of Communist publications to influence many of our non-Communist news disseminating media. On December 16, 1961, there appeared in People's World, a Communist newspaper printed in San Francisco, Calif., an article which apparently set forth the general pattern for the attack on the John Birch Society members who hold public office. I believe my colleagues in Congress might be interested in the article and ask unanimous consent to have it placed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

GOP TROUBLE FOR ROUSSELOT IN 25TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

LOS ANGELES.—Not all Republicans in the 25th Congressional District are happy with their party's incumbent, Representative JOHN H. ROUSSELOT, an avowed member of the John Birch Society, who is seeking reelection.

One who voiced his dissatisfaction was Al Du Rant, president of the 58th assembly district Republican assembly. The 58th assembly district comprises the northern half of ROUSSELOT's district and includes Al Monte, Arcadia, Duarte, Irwindale, and Azusa, where ROUSSELOT's main strength lies.

"I can't in clear conscience support Congressman ROUSSELOT," said Du Rant, who added that he helped to elect the Birchite 2 years ago. That was before ROUSSELOT's connections with the Birch Society were known.

In addition, Albert M. Gilmore, a senior research engineer at the Caltech jet propulsion laboratory, has announced he will oppose ROUSSELOT as a Republican candidate.

Gilmore said, "ROUSSELOT has turned his back on the Republican Party and the people of the district by embracing the Birch Society."

Besides the trouble which seems to be brewing for ROUSSELOT in the Republican primary in June, he will, if he squeaks through, be up against the job of wooing votes from the Democratic majority in the reconstituted district to win. But the Republicans have the first shot at the Birchite in June.

Urban Youth Employment Needs Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by Eli E. Cohen, executive secretary, National Committee on Employment of Youth, at the National Consultation on Public Urban Youth Work Programs, in New York City, on February 5, 1962.

URBAN YOUTH EMPLOYMENT NEEDS TODAY

Let me start by quoting an industrialist: "The following deficiencies in our national life have created this (youth) problem:

"1. There are not jobs enough to take care of the youth who need them and want them.

"2. Our educational system is not adequate, in size or character, to prepare multitudes of youth for the work opportunities that are available.

"3. Nationally speaking, there is not equal opportunity for education. Vast areas of the United States have inadequate educational systems.

"4. There is a gap measured in years between the time a youth leaves school and the time he finds a job. During this period society completely abandons him."

The man who wrote this is Charles W. Taussig, at the time president of the American Molasses Co. Although it appears to describe accurately our current situation, the statement actually was written in 1938 in the foreword of a book[1] on the National Youth Administration. If what was written during one of the Nation's worst depressions can apply so aptly to our youth today, I submit that we are confronted with a problem of staggering dimensions.

There are, of course, major differences between the 1930's and the 1960's. We have made vast technological advances, for example, but automation has reduced the place in our economy for the unskilled and inexperienced. We have established a system of unemployment compensation to cushion the effects of unemployment, but the youngster who has not worked since leaving school, or who has worked only intermittently, has not built up the credits to benefit from this program. Unemployment is not nearly so widespread, but for the long-term unemployed there is little solace in the fact that more people are employed than ever before.

There were 65 million Americans on jobs in January of this year. Four and one-half million, or almost 6 percent of the labor force, were unemployed. One and one-quarter million of these had been unemployed for 15 weeks or longer. Young people constitute approximately 20 percent of the unemployed whereas they make up less than 10 percent of the labor force.

It has been said by many that youth unemployment merely reflects the total unemployment situation and that there can be no genuine answer until we have solved the problem of adult unemployment. While this, of course, is true, it tells only part of the story.

For the fact is that unemployment hits youth harder than any other age group in our population. The nearly 1 million unemployed youth represent a rate of joblessness two to three times that of the national average. Even if—by the stroke of a magic wand—we were able overnight to create enough jobs for all who want to work, there would still be many youths unable to qualify for the available employment, or having been hired, unable to perform satisfactorily enough to be retained. Some lack rudimentary work skills, sense of responsibility, or acceptable work habits and attitudes. Therefore, we need not only an increase in the total number of jobs, but also an expansion in the types of employment suitable for inexperienced youth—entry jobs requiring no experience, minimal skills and less demanding hiring requirements. To what extent this is achievable will be discussed later.

It is obvious, then, that we have a twin-headed problem—lack of jobs and marginal employability on the part of many youth. For some the unemployability is absolute—they are just not ready to work; for others it is relative—they are capable of working but unable to meet the hiring requirements of employers. These requirements are rising. A generation ago, an elementary school diploma was considered adequate. Today high school graduation is a minimum requirement for most jobs. I venture to predict that within the next 10 years post-high school eduction for 2 years—at a junior or community college or technical institute—will replace the high school diploma as a basic requirement for employment.

Automation has accentuated the trend toward higher levels of education. It is debatable whether a college education is needed to watch dials or push buttons, but employers are reluctant to entrust the operation of expensive equipment to employees whom they do not consider reliable, and level of education seems to be a major index of reliability. Regardless of whether automation in fact requires more education or less, all the forecasts are agreed that automation will mean greater opportunities for the educated and skilled and fewer for the undereducated and unskilled.

In the meantime, automation is taking its toll with loss of jobs and displacement of workers. In the mass production industries, such as steel and auto, we are producing more with fewer workers. In some cases, company employees displaced by automation are reassigned to other duties. As a result, the hiring of new employees declines sharply. And this is where the new youthful entrants to the labor market are hurt; the normal job turnover from which they previously beneficial has dropped and indeed in some cases is nonexistent.

Let me cite one example of what automation can mean. A glass plant has been developed, employing 14 workers, that is capable of producing 90 percent of all the electric light bulbs needed in this country, 100 percent of the radio and television tubes (except for pictures tubes) and, in its spare time, can manufacture Christmas ornaments.

Automation is not restricted to manufacturing operations. It appears in offices in the form of machines that replace clerical workers. Vending machines and self-service techniques have eliminated many sales clerks. Automatic elevators have displaced an estimated 40,000 manual operators. It is argued that in the long run automation will produce more employment. This is open to question, but in any case, to date, it has meant fewer jobs. Whether there will be more jobs or less, the nature of many of the occupations of the future will certainly be different.

Up to now I have been talking about youth as if they had monolithic characteristics. While they have much in common—their age, for example—young people, for our purposes this morning, fall into three fairly distinct groups. First, there is the college-bound who, as a group, will do all right in the job market. Next are the high school graduates who, on the whole, will manage but not without some difficulty. Nonwhites in this group, however, will experience greater difficulty. Finally are the dropouts—those not completing high school—who will find a most unwelcome reception in the labor market.

Compared to high school graduates, dropouts suffer greater unemployment, take longer to find jobs, get poorer jobs, and earn less money. Untrained and incompletely educated, they are often underemployed, face the prospect of a lifetime of blind alley jobs, and sometimes remain chronically unemployed. They are the vulnerable, dispensable, and unwanted in our work force.

Negroes, Puerto Ricans and other minority group members are arbitrarily excluded from many training and employment opportunities. The inequality of opportunity is reflected in lower incomes and poverty, poor housing and slum neighborhoods, and lower levels of education and skill. I have seen one set of statistics that graphically makes a point: In one Pennsylvania community, Negro college graduates earn only 5 cents an hour more than Negroes with an elementary school education, whereas Negro college graduates earn 7 cents an hour less than white Protestants with only an elementary school education.

Discrimination strikes even deeper in a personal sense. Aware of the barriers to their employment, many minority group youngsters are reluctant to enroll in available training courses. Thus when opportunities for them do in fact open up, they are unprepared with the skills needed to be hired. In giving up in the first place, they become the victims of a vicious circle, and many lose their desire to improve their situation.

Another especially disadvantaged group are those youth who migrate to the big cities from the rural areas, many of whom are Negroes and dropouts. Unprepared for both city life and work, they flounder for a long time and many never really find themselves.

Some of the dropouts, inmigrants, and minority youth might possibly be marginally employable regardless of the state of the economy, but the premium automation has put on training underscores the urgency of reaching these youngsters and motivating them toward work and training. They have ability and talent. Studies of dropouts reveal that 70 percent have at least average intelligence and are capable of completing high school. From 6 to 13 percent are smart enough to do college work. But they are victims of economic, social, cultural and psychological pressures which they have not been able to cope with alone. They are rejecting a situation that they feel has rejected them.

The problem of our nearly 1 million unemployed youth is a formidable one, but it may be relatively minor in size compared to what is ahead of us in the future. I don't need to tell this audience about the phenomenal rise in the birth rate following World War II. Shortly we shall see the greatest influx of young workers in our country's history. In 1960 2 million of them entered the job market; it will rise to 2.5 million in 1965 and to 3 million in 1970. Altogether 26 million youth will seek jobs in the decade of the 1960's, 40 percent more than in the fifties. Seven and one-half million of these will be dropouts, of whom 2.5 million will not have gone beyond elementary school.

And, if you want to look beyond 1970, let me tell you a prediction made the other day by Secretary of Commerce Hodges: his 5-year-old granddaughter will live to see the population of the United States increase to 400 million from its present 180-plus million.

Where are we going to get the jobs for these millions of youngsters, and how are we going to prepare them for working in an automated economy? It is natural to look

[1] Lindley, Betty and Ernest K., "A New Deal for Youth—The Story of the National Youth Administration," The Viking Press, New York, 1938.

to private business and industry for the additional jobs needed, but there seems to be no indication that the private sector of our the current unemployed, let alone the ineconomy will graw fast enough to absorb creased numbers coming into the labor market in the future. Only last month the Kennedy administration forecast a reduction of unemployment to 4 percent by mid-1963. Without taking into consideration the expected increase in the labor force next year, this reduction of unemployment by one-third would still leave approximately 3.5 million unemployed, of whom over 600,000 would be youth.

Earlier in this speech I raised the question whether we can achieve an expansion of entry jobs for inexperienced youth. The tide seems to be against us. Figures from Detroit, for example, show that there has been a 55 percent loss over 5 years in jobs available to 16- and 17-year-olds; entry jobs for this group in that city have been diminishing at the rate of 2,000 a year for the last 10 years. Some have gone so far as to suggest that in the private economy of the future there will be no place whatsoever for young workers, that automation will not need the labor of the young and the old, that we need to develop new social institutions to keep them off the labor market but gainfully occupied.

What are the alternatives? Shall we dump the idle youth into our rivers? We can be sure they won't return to school in any large numbers—they did not like school in the first place. There is reason to question the wisdom of a policy that urges their return to the classroom before our schools have strengthened sufficiently to attract them and deal more effectively with their special needs.

However objectionable it might be to some, the only alternative is to have Federal, State, and city governments establish work and training projects geared to the special needs of youth. To those who may be worried about the cost, I can only respond: Can we afford the continued neglect of millions of young lives?

You will hear in a few minutes about some prototype programs that will suggest what can be accomplished by a massive Government program. In the meantime, let me say that they will provide jobs and constructive activities and an opportunity to earn money for youngsters who would otherwise be idle, aimless, and unwanted. If they are solidly based, they will do even more than that. They will develop occupational skills and teach youth how to work—to report on time, take responsibility, accept the authority of a boss, get along with coworkers. They will offer tryout experiences in a variety of jobs to help young people find out in what types of work they have the most interest and ability. They will encourage further education and training. They will operate in an atmosphere that will help give the young people feelings of being worthwhile and useful and will encourage self-confidence.

Successful Government work programs will depend upon more than having ample funds, important as the dollars are. They will depend on understanding and appropriately trained staff. Imagination in developing useful work projects will be of paramount importance. Counseling will be necessary to prepare the youth for subsequent entry into private business and industry.

In stressing the role of Government, I intend in no way to minimize the importance of private industry in this whole picture. Industry is where most of these youngsters will ultimately find themselves, and we must keep working with industry to maximize the opportunities there. Nevertheless, in this consultation, we need to focus on a part of the picture to get the most mileage out of our discussions. Rather than scatter our attention, we would do better to call another consultation in the near future on those aspects of the problem not covered adequately during these 2 days. In my opinion, the time spent here will have been of great worth if out of this consultation can come the stimulation for the widespread establishment of public urban work programs for youth and the development of sound guidelines for their organization and operation.

While we don't have all the answers to solve the grave youth unemployment problem, there are beginning to be signs of light. Never before have I seen such interest and activity in this problem. Symbolic of all this is that fact that the President of the United States appointed 3 months ago a President's Committee on Youth Employment. And there has been introduced into the Congress a bill—the Youth Employment Opportunities Act—to establish public work and training programs for youth.

We have the wisdom and resources to lick this problem. We unlocked the secrets of the atom and are currently putting a man into space. Surely we can find the way to train and employ our youth.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marked the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

On February 16, 1918, the people of Lithuania declared their independence from the czarist regime in Russia, and for 22 short years were citizens of a free and independent state. During that 22-year period from 1918 to 1940, the people of Lithuania proved themselves to be peace loving, energetic, industrious, and determined in the cause of free government, and the republic, admitted to the League of Nations on September 22, 1921, became a welcome and respected member of the world community.

In 1940 Lithuania was overrun and annexed by the Soviets, and the Iron Curtain was placed between this small Baltic state and the rest of the free world. Since that time the people of Lithuania have been subject to the oppressive rule of the Communist regime.

We all know that the same spirit which inspired independence in 1918, and which made Lithuania a respected member of the world community for 22 years thereafter, is still present among the more than 3 million people of that land.

We are also aware of the substantial contributions made to this country's strength and freedom by Americans of Lithuanian descent who, unlike their relatives and friends behind the Iron Curtain, are free to celebrate this important occasion today.

Our faith in the ultimate victory of freedom and self-determination for all people is inspired by the spirit of the Lithuanian people, and, as leaders of the free world, we Americans must pledge, on this occasion, all our efforts and energies to this end. And the free world would do well to remember that what has twice happened to Lithuania could happen to any other nation that fails to keep itself strong enough to defend its liberty against aggression.

Statement by the Honorable Joseph M. Montoya, of New Mexico, Praising Air Reservists and Air National Guardsmen Since Recall to Active Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has indeed the right to be proud and happy over our recent accomplishment in achieving orbital flight of an astronaut. And it was with pride that I stood here this past Monday with all Members of the Congress applauding Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., for his magnificent achievement. Yet, this wonderful American refused to accept our good wishes for himself personally, and went out of his way to speak of all others involved in the Mercury program, and to acknowledge their significant accomplishments.

The selflessness of this man, Mr. Speaker, reminded me that we might tend at times to fail to acknowledge adequately the deeds of men behind the news, the men who do so much, but about whom we know and hear so little. At this time, I refer specifically to the Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard units who readily answered the Nation's call in time of crises and who today continue their duties and patrols with supreme devotion to duty. They continue to perform their assigned tasks with cheerful determination in spite of personal and family difficulties, inconveniences, and disruptions of civilian pursuits. Secretary of Defense McNamara has written the families of recalled reservists and guardsmen, has appropriately acknowledged the Nation's debt, and has rendered the thanks of a grateful country.

I think we should make it clear in this chamber, Mr. Speaker, that the sacrifices of air reservists and guardsmen and their families have been for a vital purpose and that the Nation does appreciate their continued service. It is not of small significance to note that this is a continued willingess to serve since Air Reserve units are made up entirely of volunteers who have embraced their call to duty in the finest traditions of our Armed Forces and who lost no time in making their presence known.

Air guardsmen flew more than 200 jet fighters over the Atlantic within a month after recall, providing much needed fighter strength for Air Force combat units in Europe. Secretary of the Air Force Zuckert was most complimentary about these units and their accomplish-

ments and Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Air Force Chief of Staff, wrote these air guardsmen as follows:

The movement of the newly federalized ANG units to Europe was executed in an orderly, efficient, and professional way. This required the utmost in leadership, planning, and cooperation on the part of all units and personnel involved. All obstacles were overcome by ingenuity and determination in spite of the extremely short preparation time available. The end result of the safe and expeditious arrival of the fighters should be a source of great pride to all who had a part in the operation. I wish to offer my congratulations for the outstanding manner in which this difficult and vitally important task was successfully accomplished.

In addition to the flight of these fighters, Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard squadrons entered on duty with four-engine transport aircraft, the first to be assigned to these components. In 3 months of active duty, the crews of these units flew almost 4 million miles on troop carrier and cargo missions. Also, there are many Air Guard tactical fighter and reconnaissance squadrons which are on combat-ready active duty and poised for deployment wherever national security may require.

Mr. Speaker, these are only a few of the accomplishments of our dedicated Air Reserve and Air National Guard units and I think all of us should be aware of the magnificent job they have done and are doing. In rising to the call in time of crisis, the record shows convincingly that these air reservists and guardsmen are a valuable component of our defense structure and deserving of our high regard and prayerful thanks.

Increased Compensation for Postal Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, although I am the most recently elected Member of the House of Representatives, and as such would certainly not presume to tell the membership what to do, I would like to take the liberty of making a recommendation on behalf of our postal employees.

There has been a bill introduced by the ranking member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service—H.R. 9531—which would provide the postal workers with a well-deserved increase in compensation and a liberalization of the step and longevity increases. Because I feel that this legislation is highly desirable and long overdue, I am today introducing a companion bill and would urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

The question of increased compensation for the postal employees has been before the Congress on previous occasions and action has been taken to somewhat alleviate the situation. However, with the devaluation of the dollar and the continued spiral of living costs, further assistance and consideration must be given our Federal employees. During the past years the salaries of these employees have not kept pace with the increases granted those in private industry. Many workers have been forced to work at additional employment, and in many instances it has been necessary for the wives to leave the home and seek work in order to supplement the family income in an effort to provide the bare essentials.

This group of employees has served the American public well and faithfully over the years and I earnestly believe that their hard work and diligent efforts should be rewarded. I therefore urge that this legislation be enacted as quickly as possible.

Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a resolution prepared by the Laymen's Association of the Red River Presbytery, Synod of Louisiana Presbyterian Church, which is a tribute and message of congratulations to Col. John Glenn.

Under unanimous consent, I include this resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because I am convinced that the humble, Christian attitude of this outstanding American was responsible in great measure for the success of his recent orbital flight. This resolution calls this fact to our attention and I would like my colleagues to have the opportunity of reading this tribute:

Whereas on February 20, 1962, A.D., Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps, one of America's astronauts, orbited the earth three times in less than 5 hours and being a consecrated Christian, a devoted husband and father, reared by fine Christian parents, and a sincere, active worker in the Presbyterian Church, has, by his accomplishment, won a very large part of every American's heart, from the President of the United States to the last alien to receive his citizenship and yes, even the people behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. On this day, the Nation and the world joined Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., and his family in prayer that the Almighty God would spare this fine Christian man to complete his mission and bring him back safely with knowledge of astronautics that no other man in this world possesses. With this man raised with a true Christian faith and with the help of the other dedicated men and women who have worked so earnestly to make this mission possible, we now know that this mission was God's will and that John's faith had not been in vain, even in outer space: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Laymen's Association of the Red River Presbytery, Synod of Louisiana Presbyterian Church, United States, at its 43d annual spring rally in scheduled session February 24, 1962, at the Alabama Presbyterian Church, Choudrant, La., instructed its secretary to prepare a resolution of congratulations to Lieutenant Colonel Glenn and that a copy be spread upon the minutes of this association.

Now, therefore, in the behalf of the laymen of the Presbyterian churches situated in northern Louisiana, I congratulate you, Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps, for a job well done. Your successful flight at this moment is unmeasurable, yes, with all the data recorded, and your faith in God and display of patience and courage have indeed been an example to the American people and to the world. America is proud of you and our thanks to your dear parents, devoted wife, and lovely children for helping so much in making your life so adaptable that you, with God's help, were able to accomplish this mission. I have a most strong feeling that every Presbyterian and other Christians join me in this congratulations. I wish that I possessed the vocabulary to properly describe your achievement, but as a human being I can only say again, "Congratulations Colonel," and I assure you that it will be our prayer and that of all the Christian people of our generation that they will possess the knowledge of the power of God on this earth that you witnessed in outer space "remembering to keep the faith." and that God has a purpose for every man on this earth, yes, also in outer space.

And It's Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, in this day when the mass media spew their stereotyped and colorless news and opinions on us, I find it often stimulating to pick up and read a little weekly paper published in Circle Pines, Minn.

I would like to share with my colleagues an editorial from Circulating Pines of February 15, 1962, which expresses so well my feelings and those of many of my fellow Minnesotans:

AND IT'S HOME

We know a Californian who has lived on the east coast and in the south. He's a salesman and has pretty well covered the United States. You know what his favorite State is? Minnesota. "I'd give my eye teeth to be transferred here," he says. "Minnesota seems like home to me. People here are friendly and hospitable. And you don't find the dog-eat-dog tactics in business that's the rule on the west coast.

The gentleman isn't the only person to remark on the difference in the moral climate between Minnesota and other parts of the United States. No doubt the Minneapolis minister now living in California who had his home bombed while he was exposing the Communist-like tactics of the radical rightists, is aware of it. We have radical conservatives in Minnesota, too. And they don't have much respect for the truth or for justice, but so far they haven't resorted to the extremes and violence of rightists groups in other parts of the country.

MODERATE MINNESOTA

Politically Minnesota is pretty evenly divided between Democrats and Republicans, but Republicans are more liberal than most southern Democrats. According to Theodore White in his "Making of the President," Minnesota under the Democratic leadership

of HUBERT HUMPHREY and Orville Freeman had achieved about the cleanest, most efficient government of any State in the Union. HUMPHREY and MCCARTHY are certainly among the most able Senators in the U.S. Senate. We're not saying Minnesota politics are perfect and that there aren't business interests trying to bribe public officials and sometimes succeeding. All we're saying is there's a lot of honesty and concern for the welfare of the ordinary citizen in Minnesota politics. And Minnesota citizens are fairly well informed and inclined to be moderate.

If we were a Negro or a Jew we'd rather live in Minnesota than most any other place in the United States. Not that the ugly cloud of race prejudice has completely lifted even from Minnesota. But a Negro can vote and has a fair chance of getting a job that challenges his abilities. He still meets discrimination in housing, but concerned people are working hard to change this situation.

Even in something like women's styles Minnesota shows moderation. Hair stylists have told us Minnesota women don't go in for bizarre hair styles as they do on both the east and west coasts. Here a woman finds the hair style that seems to suit her best and sticks to it through several style changes. And a local matron who visited Philadelphia recently described the extreme styles in women's clothing there and added, "They thought I looked dowdy, but I just told them the women of Minnesota had good sense and didn't waste their husband's hard-earned money following every crazy fashion that came along."

MIDWESTERN HAVEN

Just why Minnesotans seem to have preserved more of the old-fashioned virtues of honesty and stability its hard to say.

Probably geography has something to do with it. Perhaps the character of the original settlers played its part. Certainly the strong cooperative movement has ameliorated the business climate. Even the physical climate has its influence. Who but rugged, hardy characters would willingly endure Minnesota weather.

But regardless of the reasons, there's no doubt that Minnesotans have so far escaped the frantic, compulsive pace of the east and west coasts. Minnesota is a Midwestern haven where culture thrives along with wheat and corn on the farmlands. Maybe its provincial; maybe it's a bit complacent. But Minnesota is a mighty good place to live. And it's home for us.

Point of View on H.R. 8900 and S. 1241

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call the attention of the House to the following telegram prepared by a group of prominent college presidents from throughout the midwestern part of the United States. It reflects their point of view on H.R. 8900 and S. 1241 and what they feel passage of this legislation would do to education at the college and university level.

I commend these gentlemen for their great interest in the futherance of the American system of education and their dedication to the cause of a truly free system of higher education:

MARCH 6,1962.

"We, the undersigned college presidents, jointly and individually, stand in absolute opposition to those provisions of H.R. 8900 and S. 1241 which would provide construction grants, or student scholarships, for private and church-related colleges. Such provisions would embark this country upon a radically new program and policy of support of privately endowed higher education which will have devastating consequences to the individual institution and therefore will prove inimical to the public interest. Supporting communications will follow."

Signed by John Howard, president of Rockford College, as Coordinator, and other presidents including those of the following colleges: Augustana College, Beloit College, Carroll College, Claremont Men's College, DePauw University, Franklin College, Hanover College, Hillsdale College, Indiana Central College, Monmouth College, Transylvania College, Wabash College, and Wheaton College.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. John A. Howard, president of Rockford College, Rockford, Ill., has expended considerable time and effort in carefully analyzing H.R. 8900 and S. 1241. His conclusions are contained in the following statement wherein he concludes that the adoption of a general Federal subsidy, as provided in H.R. 8900, would have a destructive effect on our colleges and universities.

DESTRUCTIVE EFFECTS UPON COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES OF A GENERAL FEDERAL SUBSIDY

(By John A. Howard)

In the operation of our Government one fundamental strength is the process of making decisions only after a thorough examination of all views pertinent to those decisions. On the issue of Federal aid to colleges and universities now before Congress in H.R. 8900 and S. 1241, the views of those who oppose such aid have not been as fully stated nor as widely publicized as the views of the proponents. We therefore issue this statement because we believe the reasons which support our view are worthy of profound reflection and careful evaluation by all citizens, including the legislators and educators who shall decide the future relationships between the Federal Government and this Nation's institutions of higher education.

I. IS THE FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT NECESSARY TO MEET THE LEGITIMATE NEEDS OF THE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES?

The Federal Government derives its income from the people, either receiving it from them in current taxes or borrowing against future taxes. Consequently, it has no funds available to it that are not available to the people themselves. As the Government inaugurates new programs, it must obtain more money from the people to carry out these programs. In short, the people can, through private gifts, or through lower levels of government, support any increased domestic educational programs just as extensively as the Federal Government can.

The issue, therefore, is whether the people will choose to support specific educational endeavors and to what extent. It stands to reason that the private sources that support independent education, and the State or local governments that support public education are in more direct touch with the educational institutions which they support than the Federal Government could possibly be. They are therefore in a better position than the Federal Government to judge what instructional and what building programs genuinely deserve more funds and how much.

Ultimately, the only necessity for the Federal Government to underwrite higher education arises if the people do not choose to make funds available of their own accord, and Congress decides it is a better judge of what the people ought to do than they, themselves are.

Congress has, in the past, enacted legislation to resolve major problems that face us as a nation. It has directed funds to those educational activities of which the expansion was believed to be critically important for the safety or the development of the Nation. Such, indeed, has been the reason to support the establishment of the foreign language and science programs under the National Defense Education Act.

Now, however, the Federal Government proposes to advance from the provision of assistance in particular fields to a general outlay for all institutions of higher education in their building programs and their scholarship funds. This transition—from the particular to the general—is a drastic change of national policy, and should not be undertaken without the most thorough evaluation of the consequences. We believe that the destructive results of this course will far outweigh the benefits.

II. WHAT EFFECTS WOULD FEDERAL GRANTS FOR SALARIES AND BUILDINGS HAVE UPON INDIVIDUAL COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

In the first place it may be assumed that such a program once begun will continue to expand indefinitely. It is not in the nature of political reality for Members of Congress to withdraw, once it is established, a large-scale program of financial assistance while the need persists. On the contrary, Congress will be under continuous pressure to increase the volume of aid and increases will be voted. Therefore, more Federal tax dollars will be collected to be spent on education, and less dollars will be available to education from other sources, provision for tax-deductible gifts notwithstanding, since gift dollars are only partly offset by tax savings. As the Federal Government shoulders this burden, not only will there be less money available to other sources of support, but there will naturally follow a diminution of the sense of need to provide funds for education on the part of State or local governments and private individuals or groups.

At the present time the variety of sources of funds for colleges and universities reinforces the diversity of educational programs and educational philosophies among the various institutions: one college now attracts funds because of the religious nature of its program, another because of its freedom from religious influences, one for its conservative views, another for its liberalism. It is generally agreed that the diversity of our educational institutions is a principal cause not only for the advanced state of educational services in the United States, but also for the vitality and success of our economy, our culture and our political system.

As the various colleges turn more and more to a single source of revenue—the Federal Government—the differences that set one college apart from the next will inevitably be reduced. The tendency toward sameness will result both from the enabling legislation itself and from the judgments and interpretations of the people who administer the programs.

Any legislation which gives money away must have some restrictions to insure that the money is spent for the intended purpose. Those restrictions, however broad and reasonable they may be, cannot fail to diminish the variety and the flexibility of the internal operations of the separate educational institutions. A provision of one bill, now be-

fore Congress, for instance, would make construction funds available to religious institutions, porvided they are not spent for facilities in which religious activities take place. If enacted this provision would make it necessary for any institution which begins the first morning class with prayer to change its program in order to qualify for the grants.

Totally apart from the provisions of the laws, the human factors that are active in the seeking and dispensing of enormous sums of money will also bring about conformity among colleges. Any successful manufacturer tailors his product to the personal inclinations of the public which buys his product; any successful salesman shapes his sales talk according to the known bias of his customer. In this instance, the Federal Government, which proposes to underwrite a third of the cost of construction and provide substantial scholarships to students, will become in one congressional vote the largest single customer of all private colleges and a substantial customer of all public ones, a customer in the sense that the Government will decide whether to buy for the Nation the services of each college, with its Federal grants.

College executives, however determined they are to maintain independence of planning and programing for their institutions, will find it necessary to tailor their educational programs to meet the legal requirements of governmental subsidy on the one hand, and the personal views of the men who designate the recipients of Government grants, on the other.

III. IS NOT THIS LINE OF REASONING BASED IN PART ON AN ASSUMPTION THAT THE OFFICERS OF GOVERNMENT WILL BE LESS THAN OBJECTIVE, HONEST, WISE, AND FAIR?

No, the honesty or the ability of those who administer the funds may be assumed, but is irrelevant unless the plan is to dispense funds with an absolute evenhandedness, with like shares for the excellent, the mediocre, and the questionable. We cannot believe the intention would be to support the good and the bad with equal grants. Therefore, at some points in the law and at many points in the administration, value judgments will be made which will fit some institutions as they are and bend the others to the pattern. The matter of the disclaimer affidavit in the present National Defense Education Act loans is a case in point.

IV. ARE THERE OTHER CAUTIONS IN CONSIDERING A GENERAL FEDERAL SUBSIDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION?

Yes, there are many, but the one of paramount importance is the effect upon the individual citizen of the philosophy of this Federal aid program, that the Government will take care of our educational needs and solve our educational problems, and thus relieve each citizen of the responsibility to judge what is good in education and to provide through private gifts and State and local taxes the funds to operate successfully the kind of education he believes in.

The ultimate strength of our Nation is in direct proportion to the degree to which the individual citizen accepts responsibility for his own welfare and his own behavior, and rises to assume a responsibility for what happens to the group. As the people of a nation are led to believe that their wants and needs will be met by a paternalistic government, they are relieved of the compulsion to take action of their own accord. While this encouragement to the citizen to divest himself of responsibility is generally dangerous to the State as well as to the character of the citizens, it is critically so with regard to education.

At the present time a college must compete with its sister institutions for money, for faculty, and for superior students. The stature and vitality of its educational program and the efficiency and harmony of its operation affect directly its capacity to attract funds and able personnel. Competition in this instance breeds excellence and encourages pioneering endeavors. A college administrator with a new educational plan seeks out a source of funds which regards that plan as worthy of investment.

As the Government becomes the main dispenser of funds, the tendency will be to refrain from innovation and to hold to those programs which have in the past elicited Federal grants, or to experiment only in those directions which are known to be well received by the agents who pass Federal judgment. In the selection of college executives, the candidate's ability to please the keeper of the Federal purse will become an increasingly important consideration. In short, the continued success of a college will no longer depend on the character of its educational program to the same extent, but rather upon its ability to get its share of Government largesse.

CONCLUSION

This statement we believe to be a wholly positive action to protect our institutions of higher education from a cure for grievous problems, a cure which may appear to be the easiest one, but a cure which we believe will deform the patient—if it does not kill him. At Rockford College, our convictions on this matter are so firm that we have declared our intention to seek no funds under the pending legislation, however generous the provisions may be.

We make this presentation in the fervent hope that Congress and the people will refrain from providing a general subsidy of higher education, if they recognize the consequences of such a course.

The National Government must concern itself profoundly with the extent and the character of educational services, but the general underwriting of higher education by the Federal Government we regard as wholly contrary to the best interests of the separate educational institutions and therefore hostile to the welfare of our people.

Is Patriotism in America Fading?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the Gastonia Gazette, Gastonia, N.C., carried an excellent editorial on March 2, 1962, entitled "Is Patriotism in America Fading?"

We Americans are in the habit of taking our liberty and our traditions of a free people for granted. The editorial from the Gazette contains some very sound observations on this serious matter, and I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

IS PATRIOTISM IN AMERICA FADING?

"This has been a great experience for all of us on the program and for all Americans, I guess, too, and I'm certainly glad to see that pride in our country and its accomplishments is not a thing of the past.

"I know I still get a real hard-to-define feeling down inside when the flag goes by and I know all of you do, too.

"As we rode up Pennsylvania Avenue today from the White House and saw this tremendous outpouring of feeling on the part of so many thousands of people, I got that same feeling all over again, and let's hope that none of us ever loses it."

The above statement is from Astronaut John Glenn's address to Congress this week.

It is an unusually fine expression of the patriotic credo; and, coming from a man who has become America's greatest hero, it is extremely timely and poignant.

Then, talking to the Senate Space Committee, Colonel Glenn was asked about his religion. He replied:

"But, I feel that, to me at least, my religion is not a fire-engine type of religion and not something that I call on in an emergency and then put God back in the woodwork in His place at the end of a particular stressful period.

"We try to live every day as best we can, and I think that is the way. I would say the same thing happened on the mission. My peace has been made with my Maker for a number of years, and so I have no particular worries about the future along that line."

Back when the forefathers of this country were planting the seeds of democracy, the very first thing they cultivated was a fundamental belief in God.

Then, building upon this belief, they created a constitutional form of government, designed to serve the people.

Within the framework of that Constitution, they built in guaranteed freedoms.

When a man stands besides a parade route and watches a flag go by, these are the things his mind's eye should see.

It should see Washington at Valley Forge and Pilgrims hovered over a thanksgiving table.

It should see Paul Revere and a ride in the night.

It should see Thomas Jefferson and Theodore Roosevelt and Charles A. Lindbergh.

It should see Bunker Hill and the hundreds of Americans who lost their lives there. It should see Iwo Jima and Wake Island.

It should see John Glenn and *Freedom 7*.

Now and then, we get the idea that patriotism is old fashioned. Did you stand at attention the last time the flag came by?

Now and then, we get the idea that people are too lackadaisical about the rights which they accept so freely but which came so hard.

In a sense, we are like irresponsible inheritors of great wealth—not having had to work for these tremendous assets, we are not fully aware of their importance, nor do we fully appreciate their value. We have a tendency to squander them foolishly.

We believe that patriotism is fading.

We believe that life has become so sweet for the average American that he has lost the essential, all-American taste for freedom at any cost.

Maybe, with the assistance of people like John Glenn, we shall get it back.

Resolution Calling Upon the President To Issue a Proclamation Declaring the Week of March 25, 1962, as Voluntary Overseas Aid Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced Concurrent Resolution 450. This resolution calls upon the Pres-

ident to issue a proclamation declaring the week of March 25, 1962, as Voluntary Overseas Aid Week.

The record of accomplishments of the nonprofit voluntary agencies is a tribute not only to their prudence and ability, to their partnership with our Government, but also to the American people whose generous support of these agencies has made this splendid record possible.

At the present time 58 voluntary agencies are actively engaged in people-to-people programs in some 100 countries and areas. In 1961, these agencies distributed $12.4 million of self-help, educational, and medical supplies, $37 million in clothing, and $25.3 million in cash to over 100 million people.

In addition, agricultural commodities, with a Commodity Credit Corporation value of $147.4 million were made available under Public Law 480 to the agencies.

The Atlantic Convention of NATO Commissions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Ralph Pittman, a member of the NATO U.S. Citizens Commission, recently handed me a statement by Mr. Alexander Warden, another member of that Commission. It points up many of the matters with which all members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization should be concerned. Hence, it appears to me that it should be made available to the Members of Congress and under unanimous consent, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE ATLANTIC CONVENTION OF NATO CITIZENS COMMISSIONS

For nearly a year now friends have been angling gingerly up to the question, "Just what is this government thingamajig you're mixed up in now?"

To which, with what unaccustomed dignity can be mustered, the reply, "I am a member of the NATO U.S. Citizens Commission."

"Oh, I see," is the retort courteous, meaning they do not see at all. A more illuminating answer needs some definitions. Otherwise an inquirer will be unhorsed on the first turn.

Most of us know we belong to NATO. But what is NATO, in this day of alphabetical mish-mash where, like women's skirts, everything is abbreviated? NATO is the North Atlantic Treaty Organization of 15 nations of the Western free world. The other 14, just for the record, are Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Western Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, Turkey and the United Kingdom.

What has NATO done? To date, truly a magnificent job in the military area of its wide scope. It has ready, for instant push-button use at its Paris headquarters, a nuclear power second only to that of the Soviets. Perhaps not second, for there is no telling just what the Russians do have. They haven't said, and their word on anything is suspect. But NATO has enough to make Nikita Khrushchev look well at his hole card before triggering an action which might lay Moscow in ashes within the hour. For example our Montana Missilemen, with range of 6,300 miles, could be exploding in the Kremlin in not over 40 minutes.

NATO has also in sight its planned ground strength of 30 divisions. This has been delayed only because of budgetary problems in some nations, and because most of the French Army is busy in Algeria. My own prediction is that De Gaulle will clean up this mess soon and with complete success. De Gaulle is no idol in France, but he is the father image of the tricolor and he will prevail.

Difficult and exasperating as the Frenchman has traditionally been to govern, he has a steadying undercurrent of realism that always controls those spectacular geysers of emotion so dear to his histrionic heart.

We were thoroughly briefed at NATO in Paris by our own General Norstadt, the top commander in this colorful headquarters. To hear him is to gain great pride in our deterrent power and to believe with him that a shooting war is not likely.

Well, if Khrushchev isn't going to shoot, what is he doing? Quite a lot, and all of it disturbing. Checkmated in the military area, this conniving dictator has in high gear a diabolical plan to bring us to our knees. His monolithic juggernaut is busy grinding through 70 nations, working in their economic areas, trying to corral them into the Communist camp and put us into economic quarantine. In this way he expects to strip us clean and pick our bones at his leisure.

How is he doing this? By going into the grassroots of the many new nations of the world in Africa and Southeast Asia, into Latin America from his Cuban bridgehead. His emissaries deal not with the inexperienced, inept or perhaps corrupt top echelons of governments. Instead they cultivate bright young people whose eyes shine with the fever of discontent. These go to Moscow for thorough indoctrination. Then back to their native lands with fat purses to foment trouble and sell the Communist line with glittering promises. Catering to hungry bellies, they don't need to spend time philosophizing on idealogies.

Has this been effective? Well, already of the total world population of 3 billion, 1 billion or one-third bow to the hammer and sickle. The free world has only half a billion. Who will get the allegiance of the remaining billion and a half? The big door prize is world domination, and Khrushchev is out in front and setting a fast pace. For example, currently he is peddling his oil from the Middle East as low as 75 cents a barrel.

We haven't done much to counteract this formidable threat. Of course, no democracy can move with the speed of a dictatorship where one man's waking word can be implemented into action in hours. We did recognize the mounting danger, but it took us nearly 10 years to act, before establishing by congressional action in the closing months of the Eisenhower administration our own NATO Citizens Commission on which it has been my interesting privilege to serve.

Our Commission was directed by the Congress to work with parallel commissions from the other NATO countries, toward a greater NATO unity in the neglected economic and political areas which now loom as our key battlefronts. We are finally in a program of fighting Communism, and not just talking about containing it.

Members of our Commission were not appointed until last spring, and then by statute half by the Vice President and half by the Speaker of the House. When the appointments were made, I was in Hong Kong sort of looking around for Suzie Wong, and that is not easy if your wife is along. Came a cable from an old Associated Press pal who lives to job his friends. Sure that it was a phony, I never even bothered to acknowledge.

Let me emphasize the bipartisan nature of the Commission, which at its initial meeting in Washington last April selected as Co-Chairmen Christian Herter, Former Secretary of State under Eisenhower, and Will Clayton, former Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs under President Truman and generally accredited with authorship of the Marshall plan. Most of the others are men of proven international stature. I was under no illusions as to my own inadequacies, but took the appointment because it did constitute a recognition of Montana, which happens far too seldom from our National Capitol.

We proceeded to urge the formation of Citizens' Commissions in the other NATO countries, this by letter. We never got a single answer. So, by two's and three's and like Morman Missionaries, we made pilgrimages to the capitols of Europe. We found our letters had never got through channels of red tape to the eyes for which they were intended. Once we appeared, there was quick success.

The next step was a meeting in London of a small preparatory committee from all the Commissions to set the stage for an Atlantic convention. Paris was chosen as the place and January 8 as the starting date, with 98 delegates to assemble from the 15 countries. And so we went to Paris. You may rhapsodize about loving Paris in the springtime, but only a blindly devoted mother could love her in bleak and rainy January garb. Then is the season for inside bird-watching, and that is only good after the lights come on.

Delegates were seated alphabetically, with each desk equipped with microphones with light controls to flag the attention of the presiding officers, and earphones. Gifted translators were never more than a word or two behind speakers, regardless of language. At kickoff time, with all media aiming cameras, lights flashing and a babel of tongues, the decibel level was high. I remarked to an associate from Mississippi that confusion was in the saddle and his observation was "Yeah, sounds like there's a possum loose in the henhouse."

Who voiced an invocation? Nobody. Here was an unexpected impasse. Christians and Moslems were sitting shoulder to shoulder. A standing moment of silence was the simple and sensible solution.

After the opening plenary sessions of the convention, it was quite clear that there was a wide gap between two schools of thought. One favored plunging at once into a full-fledged Atlantic union, complete with charter, constitution, parliament, judiciary, common currency and common foreign policy. The other wanted to go more slowly, fearing uproar at home over abandoning suddenly so much of the popular concept of national sovereignty. The target was the same; the difference was in the timing.

Two ad hoc committees, one political-economic and the other cultural, on which I served, were formed and went into closed sessions to grind out their credos and resolutions. Open plenary sessions were then resumed to fold the committee homework into final findings.

The result was an inevitable compromise, as in most parliamentary go-arounds. Yet the resultant declaration of Paris, with fortifying resolutions, was hailed as a big forward step in more NATO unity and a brave call for action.

It declared for a true Atlantic community in 10 years, with the pattern for it to be spelled out in the next 2 years. Its resolutions were a blueprint for (1) establishment of the nucleus of an Executive authority on political, economic, military, and cultural matters, (2) legislative participation on questions of concern to the Atlantic community, and (3) a NATO high court of justice for settling legal differences therein. There was an air of genuine zeal, a climate

of crusade to set wheels in motion for action.

By resolution, hands of friendship, with no strings attached, beckoned to all the emerging and developing nations, with assurances of help toward their goals of self-improvement and their attainment of respectable international stature.

Another important resolution was adopted at the behest of the Germans, seeking a NATO documentation center. The Russians have one, staffed by 200 scientists and manned by 17,500 technicians. It sorts every scrap of paper from anywhere in the world pertaining to any scientific development, translates it into Russian, and distributes it over the whole Soviet Union. NATO's lack of such a mechanism means the loss in obscurity of much of value. While we can't expect to get the Russian material, we ought at least to be able to use that of the free world, whatever the country or language of origin.

In the weekend between the two weeks of all-day sessions, many of us accepted a spontaneous invitation from the West German Government to visit Berlin to see the wall, erected so suddenly last August to close the last escape gap in the 6,000-mile Iron Curtain which is no mere figure of speech but a gun-pointing barrier extending from the Arctic down through Europe and clear to Iran.

As we deplaned in Berlin we were met with a barrage of newspaper and audi-video abuse from East Berlin which called us war mongers, NATO warriors, and charged us with coming to impede the talks on the Berlin crisis. Such nonsense is, of course, typical of the Communist-inspired vituperation.

The wall is an ugly, sinister barrier and a monument to the abysmal failure of communism as a way of life. To ride up and down its 50 kilometers through the American, British and French sectors is a grim and saddening trip. The air of tension is sobering.

As we stood at the British sector gate, suddenly an East German flag was coming down on top of a building. Immediately a British tank moved through us to train its guns on the flagpole. There was no incident, but the British were ready.

At the gate known as Checkpoint Charlie in the American sector, there is a sign in large letters facing into East Germany which says, "The assassins are among you."

We saw with our own eyes on this Sunday morning the never-ending crosses and wreaths and flowers and mourning friends and relatives at the many spots where those trying to escape to freedom had been shot down by the East German police. We saw people standing on chairs, boxes, and ladders, holding up children, and waving at friends or relatives in the drab, dreary purgatory that is East Berlin. There was no waving back or smiles from the doomed and despairing side. They don't dare.

And always, glints from the broken glass on end that tops the wall. Always the endless triple strands of rusty barbed wire on top of the jagged glass, even on top of all buildings that form part of the wall, buildings that have been evacuated and bricked from foundation to roof on the inside.

The lesson was clear to us as it is to all delegations invited to West Berlin from all over the world: "If you think communism will do anything for you, look at this."

I have tried to tell the why of the Atlantic Convention, something of its mechanics, and what it did. But what does this mean to us here in the United States?

Let's take a deep look into the crystal ball, swirling as it is from the winds of change gusting over the world.

It is comforting to feel that we are not likely to fry in our beds tonight from the nuclear holocaust of a shooting war. But the only alternative on the horizon is a deadly and exhausting cold war that will go on unabated, from crisis to crisis, in challenge that never ends.

It will be a conflict of constant maneuver and clash on the shifting economic battlefront. We'll have two jobs to do. We must help the rest of the free world to stem and stalemate the Communists, remembering always that they never fight by the Marquis of Queensbury rules. Then for ourselves we must hold our own in trading with the rest of the world. To come out of all this smelling like a rose will take some doing, but now is no time for the moaning counsel of despair. There's work to do.

Well, how are we fixed to fight this cold war? Maybe we're better off than we think, provided we adjust as we must. So, a quick inventory.

On the asset side, we're a long way this side of bankruptcy. Thanks to a Government dedicated to liberty and freedom and the dignity of the common man, and thanks to large natural resources, we've scaled great heights. We have a dynamic economy hard to catch.

In industry we create in mass production with machines, advanced technologies, and skilled labor. Such know-how often yields two or three times as much per man-hour as foreign plants, lets us compete in their markets against the bugaboo of wage differentials.

Likewise, in scientific agriculture. Today in our own Montana, with strip farming, summer fallow practices, and chemical weed controls we wrest a wheat crop from dry land under subnormal moisture conditions that spelled total failure hardly a generation ago.

Bold and imaginative, we use the tools of invention, industrial and market research, gifted salesmanship, and convincing advertising.

Another asset is the cheapness of American capital. Our firms can borrow money at 5½ or 6 percent. In England, with the lowest capital costs in Europe, the going rate is 8½ to 9 percent. In West Germany, if you can get it at all, the interest tag is a fat 13 percent.

Up to now, such assets have been enough to keep us in clover, but there are some threatening clouds on the economic horizon. Technically, we still have a favorable balance of trade. I say technically because our 1961 paper balance of some $5½ billion of exports over imports was more than wiped out by the $8 billion cost of foreign aid and maintenance cost of our defense bastions around the world. So we actually spent more abroad than we got, and in the last 6 months of 1961 another $⅔ billion of our shrinking gold supply took flight overseas.

This deficit has to be corrected and turned into a genuine favorable trade balance, because a chronic deficit will spell devaluation and flight from the dollar, more inflation, and a declining standard of living. It should be painfully obvious that we cannot possibly live on our domestic economy alone, that we must have the additive of a healthy and favorable trade balance. Any retreat into an isolation and reliance on our domestic markets behind tariff and quota walls will bring dreary consequences. For example, the Common Market countries, to whom we now export $5 billion, can in retaliation deny us access to their own fast expanding home markets. The free world then splits into economic adversaries. Our own export industries, the livelihood of 6 million American families, go into stagnation. Mr. Khrushchev would raise a brimming beaker of vodka in delighted toast with a roar that would echo around the world and into space.

Even with all our resources, are we self-sufficient? If you think so, ponder that in major minerals our only exportable surplus is coal. Ponder, too, that General Motors needs 38 import items to make a car; the telephone companies need 22.

There's been rumbling because so many substantial American firms have established branches abroad, 42 of them in the Common Market countries. The total investment exceeds $6½ billion, and no doubt a lot of American jobs have gone down the drain with the shift. Yet a current study by the National Industrial Conference Board provides facts to put this picture in focus.

Factually, lower European wages were not the impelling motive for this hegira, but a desire to get inside the tariff barriers abroad and also to cash in on the growth potential offered by the foreign markets.

There are other significant facets. Two out of three American subsidiaries found their costs of materials higher overseas. More than one out of four reported total costs higher than in American home plants. A number of others found their costs about the same. More than one out of three were enjoying no overall cost advantage over similar operations in the United States.

Perhaps it is obvious that I've been trying to lay a foundation. And here is the only conclusion I have been able to reach. In my thinking, aggressive international trade is by all odds the best route for us to take. Not only are its direct benefits so vital, but it may prove the broad avenue toward amity in the political area. You know, if you are doing business every day on a mutually advantageous basis with a man, you're not going to have sleepless nights over how he parts his political hair or worships the deity of his choice. The same with nations. Conversely, straining first for conversion to our political philosophy might be just to struggle futilely through the maze of bristling thickets and be torn to shreds on the thorns of foreign suspicions.

That is why I subscribe to the President's plea for broad authority to make trade deals, at arms' length as expedient, with the rest of the world. He seeks and needs the power to negotiate across the board for reductions or eliminations of tariffs on whole categories. Item-by-item dickering, with restrictions and quantity controls as provided in the outworn Reciprocal Trade Act of 1934, is hopelessly inadequate.

We must guard alertly our $5 billion of exports to the Common Market countries, who reached clear back to the end of the 18th century to take a leaf from the book of the American Colonies after the Revolutionary War in forming the United States instead of degenerating into a mess of little principalities. The parallel is interesting, the result spectacular.

We can't neglect Japan, our chief Pacific bulwark against communism. Excepting only Canada, Japan is our best export customer, bought in 1961 over a billion more than she sold us. Curiously, one of our important export items to Nippon was inexpensive toys.

Surely we can't exclude Latin America. And if the developing countries of southeast Asia and Africa can't sell us, they may turn for guidance to the Communists who will come running.

Decisions can't wait for oratorial delays in the Congress. Before solons can finish extolling the virtues of their constituents and the needs of their bailiwicks, the booming parade of international trade can disappear down the road and around the bend.

I yield to no one in fear of reposing too much power in single hands. But surely no President would perform other than in the national interest. And I submit that any man who can negotiate the hurdles of presidential primaries in a score of States, who can then fight his way to nomination in his national convention, and then be elected, is a pretty fair horse trader in his own right.

As to damage of a freer trade policy to us, it has been estimated that only about 30 percent of our imports compete with American-made products, so that dollar damage here might be limited to 1 percent of our gross national product. Meanwhile, our exports would be mounting.

Brookings Institute points out that enough tariff-lowering to increase our imports by a billion dollars a year, bringing in goods to compete with those of 72 American industries, could displace no more than 86,000 workers. Other economists project that abolishing all tariffs would not affect over 500,000 jobs.

Hence I salute the President's proposal as a giant stride in foreign policy. It looks at international trade for the first time in our 150-year history from the plateau of national interest. This is in contrast to our traditional tariffmaking born of sectional pressures and logrolling. To me his proposal is a clear and ringing answer to the critical clamor that we have no foreign policy. Here is one that may well be carrying the seeds of our economic salvation.

This is a new world, with challenging new horizons. At stake may be our economic survival. To put it bluntly, shall we shoot for our proper part of something, or take chances on getting all of nothing?

As these fast-rolling years unfold, it will take real political courage and high economic statesmanship to preserve our Western heritage and hold our key place in the family of nations. Right decisions can win this cold war, and victory in the cold war will prepare firm footing for another giant stride, this one towards that great hope of all mankind, world peace.

Saturn Rocket Moves Down Tennessee and Mississippi Rivers—Full Development Will Mean Savings in Time, Money, and Efficiency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the giant Saturn rocket, developed and built at the George C. Marshall Space Flight Center at Huntsville, Ala., is now on its way down the Mississippi River and through the Gulf of Mexico to Cape Canaveral.

Because of the tremendous size of our new rockets, water transportation is the most practical method of moving them from their development center to the launch site at Cape Canaveral. A recent editorial from the Nashville Tennessean has pointed out that had the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway been built and were it in use the water route from Huntsville, Ala., to Cape Canaveral would be a thousand miles shorter. This shorter route would obviously have sped up the movement of this rocket and would have had the effect of speeding up our space effort.

Of course, the benefits to commerce would also be very great if the waterway were completed.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Nashville Tennessean be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD. The article follows:

THE SATURN MIGHT HAVE HAD SHORTCUT

When the giant Saturn rocket began to move down the rivers toward Cape Canaveral last Saturday, proponents of the Tennessee-Tombigbee quickly noted a space age advantage the Nation might have had.

If the waterway were in existence now, the Saturn's trip from the Marshall Space Flight Center at Huntsville would be a thousand miles shorter, and much quicker. "The shorter route would be an important factor in the event of a national emergency," a waterways spokesman said, "and would give us two outlets to the gulf instead of one." Commerce and the space effort both would benefit.

The waterway authority spokesman could also have pointed out the price of delaying this canal for a century. A hundred years ago, the Corps of Engineers turned the project down as being too expensive. It would have cost then about $2 million.

Even 25 years ago, it could have built for less than a third of its estimated cost today.

How singularly expensive is myopia.

A Great Opportunity for the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Ralph McGill is the publisher of the Atlanta Constitution, one of the most outstanding newspapers in America. Mr. McGill wrote a column which appeared in the Washington Star of March 1, 1962, calling upon the bar associations in the South to tell the people of that region the truth about Supreme Court decisions. It is a great challenge, one that our American legal tradition should meet with vigorous action.

Mr. McGill's article follows:

GREAT OPPORTUNITY FOR THE SOUTH

(By Ralph McGill)

An old story repeats itself.

At a segregationist meeting in Macon, Ga., where a bus boycott was in effect against segregated practices, vicious and false antisemitic and anti-Negro literature was handed out and a speaker assailed the refusal to ride as a Communist plot.

This story and other like it point up a failure by the bar associations of the South and make even more relevant an article in the Journal of the American Bar Association by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Mr. Hoover called on the lawyers of the Nation to assist in the campaign to maintain our faith in law as the Nation's major bulwark in the fight against communism.

He described how Communists seek to tie themselves in with struggles for human and civil rights. They do not believe in such rights. They seek merely to confuse the prejudiced and the uninterested. Denunciation of American legal institutions is an old Communist trick. The Nation, but more especially, the South, needs enlightenment about communism. But as Mr. Hoover wrote, "It must be factual."

It is not, of course, a Communist plot for one citizen to wish to ride a bus in the same manner as any other citizen. There is no Communist plot in colored children's being admitted to school. Indeed, to deny equal citizenship rights plays into the hands of Communists.

Mr. Hoover called on the American bar to help educate us—factually—on Americanism and communism.

Not a single State bar association in the South has provided any leadership in a time of crisis. No one argues that the membership of those organizations unanimously would agree with the constitutional interpretations of the U.S. Supreme Court in cases involving schools, transportation, and use of public tax-supported services. While they have been silent, individual members have given aid and comfort to the extremists, including the Communists, seeking to destroy confidence in the American system of courts and law.

In all the South only one local bar association (that of Atlanta) has given the people the basic information that a Supreme Court ruling is binding on all courts, Federal and State. The extremists perhaps have done more than Communists to weaken faith in our judicial system. The Communists want to smash our system of laws. To do so they hypocritically, as Mr. Hoover said, "sow seeds of doubt concerning the validity of our democratic institutions." That they should have help is shocking.

In State after State we have seen the extremists—with the bar association silent—seek to destroy confidence in the FBI, local and State police, and the courts. In some States the political leadership actually has advised the people not to talk with the FBI. Juries have been inflamed against bringing in a true and proper verdict.

The bar associations are faceless. They do not have to run for office. They can do what individual politicians lack the courage to do. They can tell people of their States the truth—which is that segregation is no longer legal in public life. No private right has been, or will be, disturbed.

A Louisiana law permitting "local option" closing of schools has, for example, recently been declared unconstitutional. It was described for what it was—"a transparent artifice." Lawyers knew this. Some years ago the Supreme Court ruled that the constitutional rights of children are "not to be discriminated against in school admission on grounds of race or color."

These rights, the court further said, "can neither be nullified openly and directly by State legislatures or State executive or judicial officers, nor nullified indirectly by them through evasive schemes for segregation whether attempted ingeniously or ingenuously." That is so plain it cannot be misunderstood.

Bar associations could be helpful if they would educate the people of their several States rather than permit deceivers to destroy faith in our American principles.

Our Enemies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein the following poem by Paul Scott Mowrer entitled "Our Enemies" which appeared in the New Hampshire Sunday News, published in Manchester, N.H.:

OUR ENEMIES

Yes, they would break us, bury us—if they could.
Their envy sparks their hate, because they fear.
Could they but sap our strength, dismay, mislead
By lies, growls, ruses, treacherous hardihood;
Subvert and seize weak states, one there, one here,
Until, our friends lost and our faith, we cede,
Then might they force their servile godless creed,
Their tyrannous rule, on mankind everywhere.

Yet may we thank this threat, that bids us see
How mean, how vain our dreams of ease, how near
Akin our cause to that of all earth's brood,
How timeless man's brave struggle to be free;
Tilt ardor once more ban complacency,
And evil thus be altered into good.

PAUL SCOTT MOWRER.

Michigan's Small City Blood Banks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, in Michigan—and in the 10th Congressional District in particular—there is in operation a very fine program in small cities and rural communities for the banking of human blood. One of the leaders in this program is Dr. W. G. Gamble, Jr., of Bay City, Mich., who established one of the first blood banks in Michigan. Dr. Gamble, who is the medical director for northern and eastern Michigan blood banks, has recently written an interesting article entitled "Blood Banking Small Cities, U.S.A."

In view of the widespread interest in this program I am presenting his article for the RECORD:

BLOOD BANKING SMALL CITIES, U.S.A.

(By W. G. Gamble, Jr., M.D.)

The word "blood" from the beginning of history materializes in the minds of all who hear or see it as a symbol of life, and is associated with mysticism, superstition, heathen rites, as well as established religions. As recorded in the Old Testament when "Abel's blood cried out from the ground," this substance has received special significance, and as such, has crept into the literature, religious, medical, fiction and otherwise, with certain connotations not justified in what we consider the views of modern scientific knowledge. Blood has been associated with hereditary characteristics, for example, "the blood line," and even to this day in medicine, we have infiltrated the minds of the laity with many misconceptions regarding blood, donation of blood, and the operation of blood banks.

The writer, who established one of the first blood banks in the State of Michigan, and is also a founding member of the American Association of Blood Banks, has met peculiar problems which are pertinent to the establishment and maintenance of blood banks in small cities and semirural communities in this State. We have always considered that the smaller communities were entitled to this service and that the usual makeshift methods were inadequate. For example, some of the volunteer organizations who maintain potential blood donors on emergency or rush call basis, the walking blood banks, the mass card-index system, and so many others, which to us (and I believe to other people) have proven a failure or, at best, are defective in many ways. The average community should have the various types of blood on hand, with very few exceptions, for emergencies as well as routine work, at all times. We frown upon mass appeals, crocodile tears, and heartthrob stories over radio and television; as well as the witch hunt for rare blood types.

For many years we have entered several communities, all centered around the local hospital and established drawing stations, where friends, or relatives, or organizations could replace blood used by the individual patient. Usually on an acceptable exchange basis, with minimal processing fees, there is no such thing as free blood service. Someone has to pay this cost, and the most likely individual to pay this is the family or the responsible individual. It is true that mass drives in case of disaster or under extraordinary circumstances are justified, but over a period of 20 years under the system used by us, allowing a certain amount for loss and unavoidable disasters, most of the communities in which a form of this organization has been set up have never refused a patient blood, have never asked if they could pay for it, or replace it; but also impressing on the individuals or their families that they are responsible for the replacement of the blood. Sometimes one meets those who claim they have no friends; the helpless, the forlorn, the forgotten, but by building up amounts of reserves on a varied basis, we can say it has worked out fairly adequately, sometimes with a loss but usually the blood is replaced. Our argument against mass appeals, large quantity replacements, and other methods is that first, it is inefficient; second, it results in a large loss of blood; and third (and most important), the community soon tires of these heart-rending appeals. We still have selfish people in the communities who do not give to their own families or friends, and yet, during these drives, time and time again, appeal to the same people and masquerade their fallacious charity under false motives.

By having a central regulated system of blood replacement or return, may we say that blood is not a commodity that can always readily be bought and sold, but it can be replaced. For very definite reasons which need not be outlined here, when one sells something outright in a marketplace, one can place a guarantee or warranty on the product. Our lack of medical knowledge of the transmission of certain diseases, for instance, infectious hepatitis, makes this impossible with blood and furthermore, unless one exercises the greatest care and control, blood is easily contaminated, often outdated, and may transmit many substances which increase morbidity.

We will not develop the subject of care and preservation of blood, except to realize that this is a precious commodity, a labile protean substance and the most careful technician cannot be too cautious.

Another source of blood in small cities of the United States is the organization of blood donor clubs. These can be church organizations, fraternal, community, labor, industrial and otherwise. In other words, in a small community there is greater personal communication and one is more likely to donate blood to a member of his organization or family for replacement than he is for a stranger. These clubs usually appoint a secretary or treasurer of the organization and allow them to set up their own rules, with some guidance from us, mainly to avoid chiseling by outside interests. Should a member of their organization enter any hospital, they draw on the central account for replacement. In this way they have a sense of belonging, a sense of possession, and a sense of participation. Sometimes it is difficult to make people understand because they do not see behind the scenes regarding the technicalities of the processing, the hiring of personnel to maintain the blood bank, or the other factors which enter into the cost of operation of a blood bank. By a process of education and indoctrination, they soon learn to understand many of the features of blood banks, which are hotly debated by misinformed, sometimes self-motivated and misguided people throughout these United States.

We have used mainly the return basis, with carefully refrigerated, insured containers, and supply our participating hospitals with fresh blood at a certain predetermined time. Should they need additional blood, our communication by means of radio or otherwise, can be anticipated. Should a small disaster occur in that community, blood can usually be sent in a very short time. On rare occasions we have resorted to emergency methods of transportation, such as planes, State police, and other methods. Should at any time the hospital's blood bank supply be exhausted of any particular amount or type of blood, this prevents delay in its delivery.

The indoctrination of the blood bank personnel and the technicians of the various hospitals is a matter of personal education, and this is also true of the physicians. The rules regarding addition of foreign substances to the blood are avoided by the use of plastic containers. With a self-contained typing unit (such as we now use), errors in typing are cut to the minimum. Our greatest problems (and we do have some of them) have been with the physicians in various hospitals who wish to use part of the blood, put it in an ordinary refrigerator and use it later. I think this has caused our greatest argument because, as our late secretary of the Medical Association once said, "in the medical profession, we have no privates, only generals." Ofttimes, it is hard to get a suggestion across which is submitted by the ancillary blood bank personnel who are not physicians regarding the transfusion, processing and preservation of blood.

The necessity of having on hand the correct and varied amount of blood types, and the care of the blood while in their possession, is a job which belongs to a dedicated personnel, otherwise, we would find ourselves in considerable difficulty. One can accumulate large amounts of blood which can be outdated, and while it can be converted into plasma and other products, it must be realized that to convert it is a more or less serious financial loss. It is, therefore, the duty of any individual who recruits donors, or replacement donors, to gradually feed these donors into the drawing stations so that the central blood bank will not be overloaded with a large amount of blood which has to be converted into byproducts because of outdating.

By reciprocal arrangements in our local communities, we have helped each other, and this has worked out with a considerable amount of success. Of course we strongly support the ideas of the central blood bank exchange by paper credits, as it saves a considerable amount of time, energy and avoids those places where blood banks do not have a Federal license to cross State lines.

One of the bug-a-boos of the blood bank in small cities of the United States is the tremendous amount of paperwork required. This has been solved to a certain extent, but it is far from satisfactory because every time one adds additional records, he adds to the cost of running the blood bank. As was said before, this cost must be paid by someone. I am afraid that many blood banks are not realistic in their cost accounting, and I am sure that if their records were inspected by

the Department of Internal Revenue, or any efficient cost accounting, they would realize that the processing and the handling of blood is not as they picture it. In fact, I think their cost would be about double. Many organizations have "free services," but someone somewhere gives their time and their energy. There are many other details such as housing, lighting, heat, quarters and incidentals, which are never taken into account. In fact, some places charge a great deal of the blood bank operation back to the laboratory.

We believe that the administration of the blood banks in small cities of the United States should be under the laboratory department, but if they are efficient in their cost accounting, it should be separated, so that one does not get the idea that blood service is free. A careful analysis of any of these costs in an unprejudiced manner will relieve us of some of the misapprehensions and unreliable statistics which plague the operation of the ordinary hospital or community blood bank.

One of the advantages of the community blood bank is that there is less waste, and more efficiency. Blood does not readily deteriorate, does not need to be converted into plasma or discarded, if one can secure dedicated people whose whole function is to handle this sphere of laboratory work. To be trite man cannot serve two masters. We believe that our separation of the blood bank from the laboratory has been one of the things making the blood banks in small cities of the United States acceptable to the hospitals, physicians, and the patients.

The blood banks should be open and staffed 24 hours a day because hospital personnel, however well trained they may be, are unfamiliar with certain routines of the blood bank and tragic accidents can be avoided.

We do not mean to state that we did this in 20 years and that this is a summation of triumphs, successes, and achievements, rather we mean to convey by this article that this is a record of trials, failures, and of sleepless nights and anxious days. A blood transfusion is sometimes far from a safe procedure in spite of all the controls in a well-run blood bank and if large amounts of blood are available as it is today, it is to be used with caution.

We think that any community, provided they wish to comply with certain regulations, can, and should have, blood in sufficient quantities 24 hours a day, if the citizens are public spirited enough to understand that this is a vital need.

One difficulty which we have encountered is that of the so-called reaction rate. If we continue to give blood in ever increasing amounts and repeated transfusions to the same individuals over a period of years, this reaction rate will continue to rise. We are well aware of antibodies developing in the plasma, in the red cells and possibly in the platelets, for which it is not yet practical to test in the blood banks in small cities of the United States. Another thing which should be emphasized further is the sometimes untoward reaction which occurs due to unknown factors. The occurrence of jaundice after large amounts of blood are left in the peritoneal cavity, or pleural cavity, or are inadequately removed, is another condition which ofttimes causes the blood bank to be blamed for mismatched blood. I realize that there are peculiar mild febrile reactions which are not explained in spite of subtyping and the occasional occurrence of truly rare types of blood, but these are infinitesimal. Two years ago we adopted a questionnaire to investigate any untoward reaction, no matter what the cause. This investigation is still in the process of completion and is helping us to correct and explain some of the unusual reactions which have occurred.

The article above has been a record of 20 years experience in the upper part of the Lower Peninsula, and the Upper Peninsula, but we do not mean that we cannot or will not progress in the future. However, any success has a price tag which eventually has to be paid by the patient. One could use more elaborate controls, more than are now advocated by the U.S. Public Health Service, the American Association of Blood Banks, and others, but we have to closely watch the economy. Of course, no one can put a price tag on morbidity and mortality, yet one must be practical and if these smaller communities are going to be served in an economical manner, one has to use considerable commonsense, combined with a dedication of loyal personnel. It is a process of continued education to the community, which we do not think can be met by hysterical appeals.

The National Association of Letter Carriers Pay Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of a companion bill to H.R. 9531, I am convinced that this postal pay legislation would eliminate many of the inequities that exist in the present postal pay structure.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following resolution adopted by the National Association of Letter Carriers at their pay conference held in Washington, D.C., March 5–7, 1962:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS PAY CONFERENCE AT THE STATLER-HILTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 5–7, 1962.

Whereas this conference congratulates President John F. Kennedy upon his wisdom and foresight in proposing increased pay for Federal employees; in particular we commend him for the following statement made to Congress in the message on Federal pay:

"We properly establish high standards for our public servants. We investigate their character and associations before considering them for employment. We hire them only after they have passed difficult examinations. We require them to abide by rigorous standards of conduct and ethics. We demand consistently high performance from them on the job. Accordingly, the salaries for the services they perform should be fixed under well-understood and objective standards, high enough to attract and retain competent personnel, sufficiently flexible to motivate initiative and industry, and comparable with the salaries received by their counterparts in private life. To pay more than this is to be unfair to the taxpayers—to pay less is to degrade the public service and endanger our national security."

Whereas while we are in agreement with the proposed program of the President, the pay schedule proposed by the administration in the lower pay levels in the postal field service schedule falls far short of the standard set by the President in his message to Congress. We find the following defects in the administration proposal:

1. There is no basis of comparability for postal employees. No study was made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of comparability or the progression of pay for postal employees. A synthetic comparison was established between GS–5 and level 4. The duties of the employees, their responsibilities, the physical demands upon the individuals, the hazards of the job, the opportunities for advancement in GS–5 and level 4 bear no relation whatsoever to each other. The benchmark of comparability was an arbitrary and capricious decision on the part of some official or group of officials who had the responsibility of establishing a basis of comparison.

2. Presently the postal employees have seven pay steps, together with three longevity steps. Steps 2 to 7 are reached after 1 year of service in step and are on an automatic basis. Longevity steps are reached after 13, 18, and 25 years of service. As presently constituted the terms of service necessary to reach the longevity grades are too long. Congress by an overwhelming vote voiced their approval of changes in the longevity schedule in 1961. The administration proposal provides for a much greater stretchout than that provided in the present structure. Pay increases would be on a 1-year basis for the first three steps, 2 years for the next three, and 3 years thereafter. Thirteen steps in all are provided, and it would take 27 years to reach the top pay step. Less than 30 percent of all employees would ever reach that step. The increases would not be automatic but would be subjected to the caprice of the administrators and in some instances curtailed by budgetary requirements.

3. The pay increases provided for in the administration proposal for level 4 employees are much too small. The first-year increases range from $120 to $180 in the seven automatic steps. A carrier presently in steps 1 and 2 after 6 years of operation will be receiving only $25 per year over his present pay. A carrier presently in step 4 after 4 years of operation would have the same $25. This munificent increase represents 68 cents per pay period or 34 cents per week. Obviously, such a proposal is no pay raise at all.

4. The pay proposal would not be effective until January 1, 1963, and then only in part; two subsequent increases would follow in 1964 and 1965. Present postal pay scales are from 2 to 4 years behind increases in pay in outside industry. An immediate adequate adjustment is required.

5. Rural carriers. The bill provides for a change in the manner and method of paying rural carriers. This proposal would result in pay reductions in many instances.

Whereas H.R. 9531 and companion bills introduced in the House by Congressman MORRISON and many other Members of Congress provide a fair, practical adequate adjustment: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this Conference advise the officers of the National Association of Letter Carriers to work with the administrative leaders and Members of the Congress for the adoption of the pay, pay procedures and pay principles provided for in H.R. 9531.

Expropriation of American Property in Brazil

SPEECH

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the very eloquent statement by the gentleman from Indiana. I certainly want to join with the other Members and congratulate him on this very timely message. I agree with the gentleman that it is unthinkable that the American taxpayers' money and their dollars will be used to subsidize a government that would seize the private property of American corporations. I certainly concur with the gentleman and assure him that his legislation will have my unqualified support.

Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors Resolves That Annual Tournament of Roses Parade, Pasadena, Calif., Has Pageantry and International Good Will Sufficient To Justify Appropriate U.S. Stamp Commemorating the Same

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to insert, for the attention of your own distinguished self and all the other readers thereof, the text of the resolution unanimously approved by the Board of Supervisors, Los Angeles County, Calif., together with text of reply dated February 14, 1962, from the Post Office Department to my letter of previous date transmitting the information about said resolution:

RESOLUTION BY SUPERVISOR WARREN M. DORN

Whereas the Tournament of Roses had its simple beginning in 1889 with the decoration of horses and buggies with flowers in a New Year's Day parade; and

Whereas the Tournament of Roses parade now attracts hundreds of thousands of visitors to Los Angeles County each year to witness this colorful and dramatic wintertime event; and

Whereas the wide publicity directed each year by the Tournament of Roses to its participants strengthens the bonds of friendship, good will, and understanding between the city of Pasadena and other cities, States, and nations with entries in the parade; and

Whereas the eyes and ears of the Nation are focused upon southern California every New Year's holiday with television audiences estimated at 60 million persons enjoying the pageantry and excitement of this most spectacular celebration; and

Whereas on January 1, 1964, the Tournament of Roses will observe its 75th anniversary, one of the outstanding civic spectaculars of its kind throughout the Nation and throughout the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles recommend that an appropriate stamp be designed by the Post Office Department of the Federal Government to commemorate this event; and be it further

Resolved That, if such a recommendation be accepted, this stamp be placed on sale in all post offices throughout the country to direct the attention of people of this Nation and the world to this significant occasion.

FEBRUARY 14, 1962.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DOYLE: The Postmaster General has asked me to thank you for your letter of February 5 concerning the issuance of a commemorative stamp to mark the 75th anniversary of the Tournament of Roses Parade in Pasadena on January 1, 1964.

We received a similar resolution from the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors and you may be assured that this proposal will be fully explored by our Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee as the 1963–64 programs are formulated.

It is difficult, however, to offer encouragement for the approval of any particular stamp because we have so many requests and are limited to 15 special issues a year.

Your personal interest in this request is very much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. KELLEHER,
Special Assistant to the Postmaster General.

Moise Stay Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the Yuma Daily Sun in Yuma, Ariz., recently published an illuminating editorial on the role of the United Nations in the Congo.

The editorial follows:

THE CONGO NEEDS STABILITY, UNITY

The role of the United Nations in the Congo continues to be widely misunderstood by many Americans. And no doubt this misapprehension is encouraged on the one hand by those with vested interests in the Congo, and on the other hand by the natural enemies of the U.N. In any case, these attacks do not foster an understanding of the real situation there.

The latest example of this attempt to undermine the U.N.'s operation in the Congo is the effort to bring to this country the leader of the would-be secessionist state of Katanga, Moise Tshombe. The State Department, consistent with the U.N.'s struggle to achieve a unified and orderly Congo, has correctly resisted this attempt to glorify and to recognize Tshombe.

What makes Tshombe attractive to many Americans is that he has been pictured as the only steadfast anti-Communist statesman in the Congo. But what is generally ignored is that as late as July of 1961, Tshombe appealed to the Soviet Union for help. Also ignored is the fact that this secessionist leader maintains a mission in Communist Czechoslovakia. They forget—if they ever knew—that he is scarcely in control of his own province, and that many of the tribesmen are against him. Likewise forgotten is the fact that Tshombe made seven agreements with the U.N. or with the Central Government of the Congo to cooperate and bring his province into the federal state—and violated all seven of them.

To understand today's situation in the Congo, it is necessary to have some knowledge of the background. When Belgium suddenly granted the Congo independence in mid-1960, there were only 17 Congolese with college educations, in a land as big as the United States west of the Mississippi River. There was only one Congolese qualified as an engineer, although there had been 542 Belgian engineers in the Congo. There were nearly 5 million acres of farms enjoying mechanization—but not one Congolese had been trained as a tractor driver or mechanic. There was not a single Congolese doctor. There was a Congolese army—but with Belgian officers. There were no people with political experience.

Under such impossible circumstances, the Congo was suddenly thrust into independence. As the Belgians left, unrest swept the country. The economy naturally began to grind to a halt. Panic set in. Within a few days, the country was falling apart.

Into this chaotic situation, the U.N. Security Council gave Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold permission to recruit a military force and to give aid in economic and social fields. A small force of 16,000 troops was gathered from more than 20 countries, most of them from Asia and Africa. Their purpose was to prevent disorder and hold the Congo together while giving the people a chance to work out their own destiny.

In a few short months, the Soviet launched its attack on the U.N. It demanded that U.N. troops be removed immediately. This was the time when the troika plan, which would have given Russia a veto over all U.N. operations, was proposed. It was privately known that Communist China was ready to put troops at the disposal of Patrice Lumumba, the Premier. The Soviet Union also had been contacted about giving military assistance.

For a while, the U.N. had a sticky situation on its hands. Both Kasavubu, the President, and Lumumba, the Premier, each claimed to be head of state. Lumumba's subsequent murder, and a meeting of the Congolese Parliament in August of 1961 resolved this rivalry. For the Parliament overwhelmingly elected Cyrille Adoula as Congolese Premier, indicating a broad degree of unity within the country.

At this point, with unity and order about to be achieved, the people in control of the rich Katanga province made their strongest drive to secede from the Congo, using Moise Tshombe as their front.

Katanga, as the facts will show, is immensely rich. It contains a vast industrial and mining complex that could be compared to the Pittsburgh area. In control of this rich complex is Union Miniere, a tremendous corporation whose major stockholders are French, Belgian, British and American. It is reasonable to suppose that the industrialists would be perfectly willing to get rid of the responsibilities of the Congo, provided they could keep the rich province of Katanga.

But this would strip the Congo of much of its wealth. It would be no more fair for Katanga to secede from the Congo, than it would be for the Phelps Dodge Corp., to secede from Arizona, to escape Arizona school and property taxes.

Much of the trouble in Katanga has come from Belgian, French, and South African soldiers of fortune—men who fight for pay. This obviously is not a sacred cause. It is a selfish one and one that the U.N. correctly opposed. Tshombe is neither anti-Communist nor antidemocratic. He is merely a tool of special interests in Katanga and this is no time to bring him to the United States and let him preach his divisive, secessionist schemes. It would be far more truthful to bring to America the board of directors of the rich mining company, and let them try to explain why they want to divide the Congo for their personal profit. What the Congo needs now is stability and time—time to learn how to operate their country's institutions and manage their economy.

President Kennedy's New Frontier May Spell Doom for the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, even those with the most elementary knowledge of economics should be able to recognize the fact that if you continue to squander your money, constantly spend more than you earn, and drown yourself in debt, you are inviting disaster. Yet, this very simple and all-too apparent truth is either unknown or deliberately ignored by the brain-trusters around the President. The spending policies of the Kennedy administration, if allowed to continue unchecked, can have only one ending, disaster and ruin for the United States. The following column by Henry J. Taylor from the Washington Daily News points out the inevitable result of the Kennedy spending programs. This Congress and the American people must be aroused to the danger of the reckless disregard of responsible Government being practiced by the President and his advisers:

CALAMITY IS ON THE WAY

(By Henry J. Taylor)

President Kennedy is carrying us smack toward a devaluation of the dollar. Unless the New Frontier sobers up, this calamity is on its way. Then, dazed and uncomprehending, what are we supposed to say?

Government spending eats like a hog. The more it eats, the more it grows. The more it grows, the more it eats. It is the nature of the animal. And we pay every penny.

Our solvency and security are indivisible. The President's programs are eating more taxes than at the very top of the war. Yet Mr. Kennedy asks that the legal debt limit be lifted to borrow still more billions because the Government cannot pay its bills. Meanwhile, America's gold reserve has fallen to a 22-year low. Just the deficit alone ($7 billions) forecast for the current year represents more than a third of all the gold we have left.

Treasury Secretary Dillon himself has stated: "The free convertibility of gold and the dollar is the cornerstone not only of our monetary policy but of the entire international financial system." In short, our dollar is the prop which keeps chaos from sweeping the free world.

But at some point the spending strain becomes unbearable and the many costs of the debts cannot be borne. In any family household the result is easy to foresee.

What finally applies to overspending in a family applies to a government. This is why nearly everybody knows that sooner or later extravagant government must end.

Mr. Kennedy and his New Frontier advisers simply do not look at it that way. This is the core of the tragic problem; their viewpoint is like that of the man who says, "Whisky doesn't hurt me." Presenting the grim facts is like punching a pillow. Secretary Dillon has joined the binge and even states that the deficits are "entirely appropriate." Appropriate for whom?

In a plunge of recklessness hardly paralleled in modern economic history they contend, behind the scenes, that all this debt and spending should not worry us too much. "We owe it to ourselves," they say. Well, the French owed it to themselves. So did the British before the pound had to be devalued. So has every nation where the country became helpless or the politicians were turned blind.

Name the nation and you will find that history everywhere has debunked this ruinous concept, demolishing it in the agony of the unsuspecting people and the defeat of peace.

Yet, "don't worry, we owe it to ourselves" always bobs up once more whenever politically expedient.

The President and his advisers pursue the idea—in which there is also much political advantage—that if you spend enough it will somehow do some good. That part is obviously true. But it is also a first-class way to go broke. Then the perpetrators pass on and leave the country behind them—unsaved by even their best intentions.

For we cannot remain carelessly solvent. And the minute government officials belittle the gravity of debt and are callous about the efforts people must make to pay the taxes the nation loses its financial moorings and the people lose their shirts.

Which Is the Voice of America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Robert G. Spivack, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of February 18, 1962.

Mr. Spivack wonders why we give the red carpet treatment to a medieval dictator who thrives on human slavery and practices the most brutal kind of discrimination. Are we the Nation sponsoring the enlightened alliance for progress in Latin America or are we the Nation buying King Saud's good will? Which is the voice of America?

Mr. Spivack's article follows:

SAUD'S RED CARPET

(By Robert G. Spivack)

WASHINGTON.—Neither the President nor the country is well served by uncritical acceptance of everything the administration does.

Criticism need not be negative or niggling. It can be helpful.

The recent regal entertaining of King Saud of Saudi Arabia is a case in point. There was considerable private grumbling about it, but almost nothing said in public. That was a disservice to all of us.

Perhaps some national purpose was served in two meetings with the President and a gala affair arranged at Palm Beach for the visiting monarch. Perhaps the White House and the President's prestige were somehow used to make relations easier between American oil interests and the Arabian King.

Whatever the reasons for the red carpet treatment given this rich ruler of a land that still practices slavery, the American public was entitled to an explanation. In years past—and let it be noted the Kennedy administration is not the first to pay Saud homage—the excuse has been that we needed to renew our rights to the airbase at Dhahran. So Saud had to be humored.

This excuse no longer applies.

The President was asked about the airbase at a news conference. "We have never requested renewal of our base rights," he said. "It's not a matter which is at issue between the two Governments."

"It would lapse then?" a reporter inquired.

"Yes," the President said. "We do and we've made preparations for that and that's what is the desire of both countries. So it has not been a subject, really, of discussion between us."

Why then was Saud wined, dined, and feted? There has been no official explanation. From the Middle East there are reports that Nasser and Saud are at each other's throats. Perhaps it was to build him up. It is noteworthy that Ted Kennedy, the young brother with Senate ambitions, was in Israel while Saud was here. Chester Bowles, the President's special assistant, was dispatched to Egypt. This would seem to be good deployment of diplomatic and political forces.

But it does not satisfy those who feel there should have been nothing more than a pro forma greeting to Saud. Instead, at Palm Beach there was a debate among some eminent women of wealth as to whether they should shake hands with the monarch or curtsy.

What causes such strong feelings against Saud? He is resented because he insists on a "no Jews allowed" policy, not only for his own people but also for Americans. It is a policy in which our Government acquiesces. No one of the Jewish faith may represent us in any diplomatic capacity in Saudi Arabia. No Jew may be employed by the oil company.

Christians also have reason for resentment. Church services are forbidden in Saudi Arabia. Children of Americans living there must be sent abroad to be baptized. In this benighted land if you receive a post card from Israel, that is grounds for arrest and deportation, even if you are not Jewish.

Why not write this off as an eccentric local custom? We cannot; the Communists will not permit us to, even if our conscience does. We are telling the whole world, especially the people of Latin America, that the U.S. Government is pledged to social reform. We insist that colonialism, imperialism and dollar diplomacy are not for us.

Mr. Kennedy himself has called upon the so-called elite classes of Latin America to take the lead in social and land reform, lest they be swept from power by a local Castro.

Teodoro Moscoso, speaking in behalf of the alliance for progress, said the alliance deserves support of the poor because "its great objective is the end of poverty, illiteracy, disease and social injustice." It also deserves support of the rich "by its appeal to their conscience, their sense of patriotism and also their sense of self-preservation."

Romulo Betancourt, of Venezuela, put it sardonically when he commented, "We must help the poor in order to save the rich."

These are noble sentiments, and the alliance for progress is a fine example of America putting its best foot forward.

But are we to say that the development of social democracy is only for Latin Americans and that no Arabs need apply? Are we to help get rid of the Batistas, Trujillos and that ilk, but pay homage to the Sauds of the Middle East?

Which is the voice of America?

Residual Fuel Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

include the following statement issued by the New England Council.

RESIDUAL FUEL OIL

The announcement last week by the Department of Interior, raising allocations of residual fuel oil to 507,000 barrels per day is unwelcome news.

It has been interpreted by many as an alternative to complete removal of quotas as advocated by the Office of Emergency Planning.

It is inconceivable that the administration would countenance an action of this sort as a substitute for the only possible solution—the removal of the entire quota system. Increased quotas will provide no relief from the abnormal marketing conditions which have plagued east coast consumers of residual oil since the imposition of the quota program.

Nine months ago, the then Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization ordered a national security investigation of residual oil quotas. Hundreds of consumers from all parts of the country in good faith prepared elaborate presentations of the hardships encountered under the import quota program. An intensive study of these presentations has been conducted by the Office of Emergency Planning and a report with recommendations has been prepared for the President's action. We are confident that this objective study will be acted upon in accordance with the mandate of the Trade Agreements Act. A failure to act decisively at this time would be a serious breach of faith on the part of the administration and a gross disservice to the millions of people throughout the East who have been taxed by artificially inflated costs.

New England has been asked to support a policy of free trade for the products which it has traditionally manufactured. We have been asked to compete in the marketplaces of the world without the artificial restrictions of tariffs and quotas. Yet at the same time, we suffer under the burdens of a restrictive trade policy for this, an essential raw material. We seek only consistency in the trade policies which affect our ability to compete with the rest of the Nation and with other manufacturing countries of the world.

We are confident that the President, who is aware of the great discriminations and of the many inequities created by the residual oil quota program, will act promptly upon the recommendations of the Office of Emergency Planning.

Going Places

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, now that the dust has begun to settle from the heels of our most recent roving ambassador, I think it is time we reexamined the merits of "amateur diplomacy." My colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] addressed the House recently on the Attorney General's world tour. I was interested to read the Reporter's comments on this trip—a trip which raises "some legitimate questions about the virtues of tourist-type diplomacy and the growing role of the Attorney General in matters of foreign policy." These questions, raised by Mr. LINDSAY and seconded by the Reporter, require a more adequate answer than the Kennedy administration has given us to date. Criticism from this particular journalistic source, which has been favorably inclined toward the administration in the past, cannot be dismissed as mere partisan comment. I trust the Reporter will continue its constructive critical review of national politics regardless of partisan political considerations.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert the following editorial from the March 15, 1962, number of the Reporter to be reprinted in the RECORD:

GOING PLACES

Suppose that a younger brother of President Eisenhower, running for the Senate in an eastern State, had made a ritual Tel Aviv-Warsaw-Dublin grand tour? Suppose that Pat Nixon rather than Ethel Kennedy had been quoted as asking the Japanese, "Did I read that your cats have no tails?" or "Do the Japanese use snuff?" Suppose that the New York Times had written of Richard M. Nixon rather than Robert F. Kennedy that the students "loved his slang ('You're crazy,' "Pick up your marbles,' "The hell with you')," although, to be sure, "the effectiveness of this tough talk is another question." Fairly or unfairly, the antiadministration press would have had a lot of fun. What solemn criticism of free-wheeling diplomacy and reminders of the gravity of the world situation would have followed the news that an official of the Eisenhower administration who had been stoned, splattered, or publicly heckled abroad had returned to find, as a Washington paper reported, that his staff had put a welcome sign "on his chair with an egg splattered on one side reminiscent of an egg thrown at him in the Far East?" In fact, there were serious grumblings back in 1953 about exactly what and on what authority Vice President Nixon had told the Formosans in the course of his Asian tour.

The right to travel, as any civil libertarian will tell you, is a fundamental one, and we would be the last to suggest that it be denied to anyone on the basis of high governmental position or kinship with the President. But Robert Kennedy's recent trip does, it seems to us, raise some legitimate questions about the virtues of tourist-type diplomacy and the growing role of the Attorney General in matters of foreign policy. Both questions were taken up not long ago by Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, Republican, of New York, in a letter to Secretary Rusk and in statements on the floor of the House. LINDSAY criticized first the free-wheeling foreign missions on the part of highly placed amateurs who do not have the background, training, language ability, or capability to carry on the enormous burden of diplomacy in the context of today's long struggle, and went on to remark, "It has become common knowledge in Washington that some Embassies of other countries with the knowledge that the Attorney General is available for this kind of extra curricular invitation are indulging in a kind of scramble to get the ear of the Attorney General. This can lead to all kinds of special pleading. Even worse, it can make a shambles of diplomacy." In the Times, A. M. Rosenthal also wrote from Tokyo that when the Japanese asked him questions they had the delicious sensation of being on a direct pipeline to the President. To Congressman LINDSAY, Mr. Rusk replied that the Attorney General had undertaken the trip at his request, that it was helpful for Cabinet officers to travel, and that Mr. Kennedy had eminent qualifications for the mission.

With all due respect to Secretary Rusk, we wonder if Congressman LINDSAY didn't have a point. True, the Attorney General proved a snappy man in a student debate during his trip, but we wonder if student debates oughtn't to be left to students. If the trip was a success within the framework of amateur diplomacy, in our opinion it left something to be desired in the realm of professional diplomacy. Mr. Kennedy apparently checked his statements with the State Department and spoke only U.S. policy. But what policy did he have in mind when he talked of the hope of an easier life for the East Germans because of "the great changes" taking place in the Communist world? And when the Attorney General commented that it wouldn't be easy negotiating away the wall, what exactly did he mean?

The State Department is now busy explaining to a Senate subcommittee that it has all the foreign-policy enunciators it needs for the time being and justifying its crackdown on the speeches of the military. "The conduct of foreign affairs today is an intricate, subtle, changing, and always uncertain task," Under Secretary George Ball explained to the Senators the other day. Statements can be easily distorted and are often misinterpreted. On the other hand, returning from his tour, the Attorney General said, "We don't have the spokesmen speaking up for us that we should." We are inclined to agree with Mr. Ball. There may be far too many spokesmen now.

Cancer Progress Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an address which I delivered at the annual meeting of the American Cancer Society, Rhode Island Division, Butler Health Center, Providence, R.I., on October 4, 1961:

REMARKS OF HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE, SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND, AT ANNUAL DINNER MEETING OF THE AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY, RHODE ISLAND DIVISION, BUTLER HEALTH CENTER, PROVIDENCE, R.I., WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1961

It is a real pleasure for me to be with you this evening at the annual meeting of the Rhode Island Division of the American Cancer Society and to hear the report of your activities. It is most gratifying to all of us to learn of the progress being made in the field of cancer research with the hope of greater encouragement in our conquest of cancer.

On September 14 of this year I introduced in the House of Representatives a resolution designating 1962 as "Cancer Progress Year." This resolution passed the House by unanimous consent on September 15 and went on over to the Senate. Unfortunately, the 1st session of the 87th Congress adjourned on September 27 before the Senate could act on the measure, but I feel certain that as soon as the Congress reconvenes we can look forward to affirmative Senate consideration of the Fogarty resolution.

The year 1962 will mark the 25th anniversary of one of the most important pieces of legislation enacted by the Congress. I refer to the National Cancer Institute Act of 1937, signed into law by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on August 5 of that year. I believe that the Congress which established this Institute, and has since so liberally sup-

ported its great work, should now take formal recognition of this important anniversary and thus lend encouragement and support to the Institute and the American Cancer Society in their efforts for the control of cancer.

Several months ago I suggested in a public address that steps be taken both within and outside the Government, to observe this anniversary in an appropriate manner. I suggested that due note be taken of the progress made against cancer during this quarter century, and of the task remaining before us for the conquest of this dread disease. I urged that we rededicate ourselves to the furtherance of this unfinished task by all possible means.

I am happy to say that the National Cancer Institute and the American Cancer Society, are cooperating in the arrangement of a number of activities by which 1962 will be observed as "Cancer Progress Year." These activities are designed to note both cancer progress and needs, to encourage support of cancer research and related projects, and indicate how the individual can wage a personal battle against cancer.

My purpose in introducing this legislation in the House is twofold:

1. I want to take cognizance of the magnitude and importance of the contribution the Cancer Act of 1937 has made to medical research in this Nation and the world over. This legislation inaugurated the modern era of medical research. It is indeed a milestone on the highroad of human progress.

2. The urgency of the challenge still confronts us and the Congress, for its part, can offer no more convincing reaffirmation on its belief in the importance of health to the vitality of the Nation than to make certain that adequate funds are provided to continue this great and rewarding work.

As we approach the anniversary of this important act, the American people should be brought to full appreciation of the wisdom and foresight shown by the Congress in establishing the National Cancer Institute in the late thirties. At that time infectious diseases were being brought under better control and chronic and degenerative diseases were emerging as the big problem of the future. In 1937 heart and circulatory diseases were the leading cause of death in this country, and a year later cancer moved into second place ahead of both influenza and pneumonia. From then on, sulfa drugs and later the antibiotics, sharply curtailed deaths from infectious diseases, and the population increase of those liable to the threat of chronic disease was on the march.

The National Cancer Institute was the first specifically disease-oriented unit of our medical research center at the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda. This has now become the greatest such center in the world. The Cancer Institute became the nucleus of a whole new concept of Federal responsibility for the conduct and support of medical research on a scale beyond the resources of private philanthropy or commercial enterprise. It was the nucleus of an effort that was destined to be and has brought this Nation world leadership in medical research and related fields. This, I am glad to say, means that in this area of endeavor, the United States need not, "catch up," or "close the gap." Instead, we have the assurance that the most thorough and comprehensive attack ever made on the disease that afflicts mankind is now in operation. At this point, though we may well take pride in what has been accomplished in the past, we must do so in light of the problems that lie ahead and the rich potential for dramatic new gains that are within our grasp. I would therefore like to mention a few of the accomplishments and problems and then look forward to some of the possibilities for exciting progress in cancer research in the very near future.

Through my committee assignments, and because of my keen personal interest in the need for sound and progressive medical research and health programs, I have been closely concerned for some years with these activities. I have become well acquainted with the people who do research and with those who plan and administer research programs. I have talked to scientists in their laboratories, and I have discussed their accomplishments and needs in hearings on their annual appropriation requests.

From these encounters I can tell you that those who are engaged in cancer research are ever mindful of these among a number of factors:

1. Cancer is not a single disease, rather it is a group of diseases.

2. Medical science must concern itself with a variety of approaches to new knowledge about cancer, the extent of which is proportional to both the need and the opportunity.

3. The progress clearly apparent to date is but a beginning.

We have made progress in defining the role of man's environment in the production of cancer. The first cancer-causing material was identified in the 18th century, but it was not until 1937 that modern cancer research began to identify a number of substances that produce cancer in laboratory animals, and some that cause cancer in man.

Past benefits in this area include:

Removal of the hazard of lung cancer in the chromate ore industry.

Removal of the hazard of bladder cancer in the dye industry from betanaphthylamine.

In the very near future we look to:

Clarification of the hazard to man of potential carcinogens of food additives, and

Economic poisons such as insecticides.

Clarification of the hazards due to radiation, air pollution, and water pollution.

An appreciation of these hazards will lead to definite control measures.

We have also made progress in cancer detection, even though no generally reliable test has been developed. Suitable use of one test can save the bulk of the 14,000 lives a year taken by cancer of the uterus in women. This is a cell examination by the so-called Papsmear technique named for Dr. George N. Papanicolaou of Cornell University Medical School. This simple test detects the presence of cancer months or even years before the disease becomes invasive or is likely to show any symptoms. Such early diagnosis permits early treatment and cure in most cases. In fact, I think it is safe to say that the course of action permitted by this one simple test accounts for a significant part of the 40-percent reduction in uterine cancer deaths noted over the past 25 years. Much of our current scientific activity is directed to the development of other equally simple and effective test procedures.

Tremendous gains have been made in improving cancer treatment.

Surgery and radiation have been radically improved individually.

They are now advantageously used in combined treatment.

The effectiveness of this combination is further enhanced by new drugs.

Hormone therapy is also generally effective and in dramatic use in a number of important cancers—prostate, breast, and uterus, to mention three. Such therapy in addition has been developed as a supplemental form of therapy.

A curative drug for one form of cancer is now available on prescription—methotrexate, for one of the uterine forms of cancer.

What is the significance of these and other findings in cancer research? In 1937, of every 100 people in this country who discovered that they had cancer, 75 died. Only 25 won their personal battle with cancer. Today that number has risen from 25 to 33. One may say that this is indeed a small increase, but it is a gigantic increase when applied to the thousands who fall victim to the disease in this country each year. And it is of even greater significance when viewed in the perspective of one individual.

The young mother who can return to her family.

The bright and cheerful youngster whose leukemia can now be successfully treated for months and even years.

The family whose chief breadwinner can return to his occupation and several more years of happy and productive life.

These are the chief reasons why I said earlier that we must not only continue and expand these research activities which have been so fruitful, we must approach with renewed vigor some of the avenues that are rich with potential for even greater success.

Although the discovery that viruses can cause tumors in animals was made in the first decade of this century, scientists today believe that it will shortly be demonstrated that several important human cancers are likewise caused by viruses. They are strongly of the opinion that now is the time to advance research in this field with vigor, and many of our scientists have swung over to the study of human cancers with the methods already so successful in the work with animals.

I am told by those who plot and assess the course of cancer studies that the involvement of virology has been the most significant advance in the modern area of medical research. Cancer research has long made use of all the biological science and some of the physical sciences as well, but only in the last 3 or 4 years has virology assumed the prominent role which now identifies it unquestionably with the cancer field.

In this connection I can say with confidence that we are close to scientific proof that leukemia in human beings is a virus-caused disease. Very recently two investigators at the National Cancer Institute reported that they had extracted viruses from the blood of leukemic rats. When injected into other rats, these viruses caused leukemia sooner and in a higher percentage of animals than viruses recovered from other tissues. The scientists are now using the same technique in the search for viruses in the blood of human leukemia victims. It is not wishful thinking to believe their efforts will be crowned with early success.

I am equally confident that the further extension of these studies in virology will lead, and I trust not in the too distant future, to the identification of other specific viruses that are causally related to other and equally important cancers. It is not too odd a speculation to project beyond this certainty to the use of viral products in the early and specific diagnosis of cancer and hopefully to its prevention.

Along with these important and promising studies in surgery, radiation, chemotherapy, and virology, attention is also being given to the role of our body chemistry and genetic makeup in both cancer development and treatment.

The mechanisms by which the body resists both infection and cancer growth are under searching inquiry. We have all heard of those rare cases of cancer that disappear spontaneously. I am told that cancers do not always spread easily through the body but do encounter some kind of resistance. I understand that research on this phenomenon is already beginning to reveal small amounts of substances in healthy individuals that are active against

tumor cells. One cannot predict how close the continued study of such happenings will bring to us an understanding of this disease.

A more complete understanding of why some people develop cancer and others do not suggests still another possibility. I am told that hereditary makeup determines an individual's resistance to cancer as well as many other characteristics, that a number of diseases are due to defects in the genetic makeup and that there is the possibility that chemical substances eventually can be utilized to modify the body's genetic apparatus and to correct genetic defects and enhance resistance to cancer.

From the standpoint, then, of where the past accomplishments of research are leading us, I believe we can confidently look forward to the following new milestones along the road of conquest over cancer. Some seem certain, among them being:

A number of drugs that will cure different forms of cancer.

Definite proof that certain forms of cancer in human beings are caused by viruses.

Chemicals that will kill cancer-causing viruses before they can begin their evil work.

Other prospects, further off, are reasonable expectations. Among these are:

A vaccine that will immunize human beings against cancer.

Drugs that will enhance the body's natural resistance to malignant disease.

Drugs that will overcome genetic defects that render a person liable to cancer.

The modern era of medical research inaugurated by the National Cancer Institute Act of 1937 requires a big investment. But the dividends already are good, and these will grow progressively. I am convinced we must do more if we are to capture for ourselves and at an early date the possibilities that are clearly before us. This means we must finance research itself, but also it means that we must provide the new laboratory and hospital buildings required, and we must extend the training of young people who will make possible these advances.

I am convinced, through my familiarity with the needs and potentialities of medical research, that this broad type of research support offers the only possibility of lifting the burden of cancer and other chronic diseases from the human race. The patterns of research programing have been established through experience and are rooted in the accomplishments of medical science in this modern research era. To ignore the requirements of the whole complex and become preoccupied with limited objectives would be to disavow the wisdom of the Congress in inaugurating and supporting the new era of medical research, and to disinherit the beneficiaries of the ultimate victory over cancer.

The Congress is gravely concerned about the international tensions that have developed out of the ambitions of world communism, particularly over the Berlin crisis and the resumption of nuclear testing by Russia. In this connection and at other times the President has emphasized the importance of keeping the Nation strong in its human as well as its material resources. To be strong the Nation must safeguard its health, and this depends on the conquest of disease.

I should like to close by expressing congratulations to the National Cancer Institute on its 25th anniversary which will be observed next year, and also to the Congress on its foresight and the support it has given the expanding programs of cancer and other medical research over the years. The research effort which the Congress recognized as a necessity in the thirties, which had its foundations laid in the forties and hit its stride in the fifties, is paying off in the sixties. How well it will continue to pay off depends upon its continued support.

Marketing Orders on Turkeys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the opportunity to read a statement by one of Nebraska's fine businessmen, John Cooper, in regard to proposed marketing agreements and proposed orders relative to turkeys and turkey hatching eggs.

Mr. Cooper is executive vice president of one of Nebraska's best-known family firms—the O. A. Cooper Co., of Humboldt. This firm has been in business since 1879 as feed manufacturers.

Under permission previously granted, I now include the text of Mr. Cooper's testimony earlier this year at a hearing in Kansas City on these proposals:

My name is John R. Cooper. I am executive vice president of the O. A. Cooper Co., with offices at Humbolt, Nebr. We are feed manufacturers, founded in 1879, operating continuously since that time and incorporated under the laws of Nebraska in 1918.

Our company does a substantial business in Nebraska and its adjoining States and consider ourselves an integral part of agriculture in that field for production of meat, milk, eggs, and wool. This of course includes the production of turkeys for marketing and in which we have been involved for a good many years.

However, I am speaking in opposition to any marketing agreement and orders regulating the handling of turkeys as an individual and patriotic citizen, known in my home State of Nebraska at least, as having had the same experience as Secretary Freeman in the last election.

I am stating my position in the form of a plea to the Secretary of Agriculture, not to submit this or any other order for the same or similar purpose at this time.

My position was stated at a similar hearing held in Chicago on December 8, 1961. That statement is a matter of record and in the interest of time, I reaffirm the points then made, but will not repeat them.

I now wish to direct my remarks to Secretary Freeman. First, let me congratulate the Secretary on his independent position at this time, and Assistant Secretary Ralph, for his statement that the orders have not received the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. Secretary, I respectfully submit that the present debacle in turkey prices is the result of what appears to be a deliberate attempt by certain powerful corporations in the feed business in the United States, to effect a substantial monopoly of the turkey feed business in this country. This conspiracy is at the point of succeeding if a quota system for turkey growers is adopted at this time. The conspiracy was initiated by reckless financing of turkey production, and the encouragement of unsound expansion, the promoters did not assume the risk. As a result of pyramiding, it took only 1 bad year to topple the pyramid; but on paper only the grower has lost, for his losses are covered by his indebtedness to his feed company financier.

Now if the marketing orders go into effect, high prices are assured; but the grower because of his heavy indebtedness to his feed supplier is not a free agent, he cannot negotiate his feed purchases, except from his 1961 source of supply. That source of supply can price the feed as he wills. Possibly it would be to his advantage to regulate prices in such a way as to keep his customers in bondage indefinitely. At this point the conspiracy is a screaming success, with a large captive market, competition excluded, and margins simply a matter of conscience. I submit, Mr. Secretary, that such a result should not be permitted to happen.

Suppose the order is submitted and approved, and the above prediction comes true. Then the emboldened conspirators will move into the same pattern in the swine industry. Here again, with their tremendous financial resources, they can buy business with credit; credit covering facilities, living, and stock as well as feed, as was done with turkeys. Hog production will be pushed ruinously high, prices will be pushed ruinously low. Profits from dogfood, breakfast food, turkeys, and whatnot will float the feed company, but not the grower. The cry will go up for swine marketing orders, then swine production will be frozen, and the feed business that goes with it, and a second scalp will hang from the belt.

Now, let's look at cattle. It will not be hard to find people to open up huge feed yards if the credit is made available. The new yards will outbid the established feeder for the feeders available. When overproduction brings down prices, the remedy will be right at hand, production orders, and the business of cattle feeding will be frozen in the hands of the late comers and with the same people selling the feed and the third scalp will dangle from the belt.

Let's look at packers. They now feed out a very small percentage of the total cattle, but they do feed some (primarily to regulate the plant killing procedures on days of light receipts). If they see the old cycle of turkeys and swine repeating, they will be forced to get in big to get their quotas and assure their source of supply, to the further harassment of the family farm type of feeder.

Up to this point, my presentation has all been negative, and was intended to be so, but now, Mr. Secretary, permit me to give the positive side of the picture.

If this thing is dropped firmly, here and now, and everyone knows that Uncle Sam is not going to bail out the feed company, then the front office will change policies, and only the normal, conservative risks will be taken, and production will again follow consumption instead of leading it. When an independent turkey grower finances with his own money, or that of the bank, or Production Credit Association, or other local agency, he automatically adjusts production to price; he cuts in bad years and expands in good ones, with the market increasing consumption in years of low prices and cutting down in years of higher prices, and price fluctuations are flattened to the point that they can be lived with. When feed companies furnish unlimited and often wacky financing, to all kinds of growers, with all degrees of growing and financial skills, production no longer follows needs, it just goes up and up, as it has with turkeys and broilers.

Unsound financing and integration have not been major factors in cattle or swine production and feeding, and prices are satisfactory for the efficient producers and a bargain for the consumer.

I suggest, Mr. Secretary, that the cause of the disease, (unwise feed financing and integration) be treated and not the current symptom (low prices). Once the big feed companies know that Uncle Sam will not aid and abet their little plans, the price situation will correct itself—and this year. Mr. Secretary, our company respects its competitors as good businessmen, but when they resolve in a program that spells doom for our customers, the family farmer, and for us

with our customers, we must take a position.

We further submit, Mr. Secretary, that the national welfare and political implications of nationalizing our animal industry is not good. The way to win the cold war is to make our system work, not to copy the corporate farm of Russia, that we know does not work.

We have every confidence in the resourcefulness and ability as well as the competence and desire of the American farmer to continue to lead the world in their functions, operations and management of agriculture as individuals. Specifically, in the turkey industry, we are currently cognizant of the tremendous reduction in poults started and eggs set so far this season, in fact it is official that at least a 12-percent reduction and probably more is taking place in turkey production for 1962 as compared with 1961. This is caused by the old law of nature commonly known as "supply and demand." Our troubles will correct themselves with this kind of forward thinking on the part of the people so directly and completely involved.

I say, Mr. Secretary, that you are resourceful enough to help the turkeyman, who, beguiled by the feed company's blandishments, has been caught between their greed for more tonnage and the relative inelasticity of the human stomach, and that you can do it without initiating the socialization of our animal agriculture.

I say help that turkeyman, and then ask him what he wants. Don't require him to make a choice when he is down.

Well Done, Mr. Attorney General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, our able Attorney General seems to be suffering the "slings and arrows of outrageous fortune" in connection with his recently completed trip. I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the New Republic of February 26, 1962. This is an eyewitness report of the Attorney General's encounter with the Japanese. The only proper word to describe the results is "success."

The article follows:

TYPHOON BOBBY WAS HERE

(By John Barr)

TOKYO.—"Typhoon Bobby" hit Tokyo at 7:26 p.m. on February 4, whipped as far west as industrial Osaka and sent shock waves as far south as America's keystone of the Pacific, Okinawa. Calm has at last returned, but for 6 days and nights, the Attorney General swept through 18-hour rice-roots schedules, leaving outrun newsmen, outargued socialists, outsmarted students breathless in his wake. This was the tour—so rousing a success to anyone on the spot—that was subjected to the caviling of the New Republic (Nov. 27, 1961) on the ground that it would be inappropriate for the Attorney General to confer with chiefs of state on world issues. Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, Republican of New York, was quoted as saying, "The Attorney General is untrained and without background in the business of diplomacy."

That Robert F. Kennedy's visit (no, that word is too sedate, unseasonable storm is better) was unorthodox and unprecedented is undeniable. That he was hooted and howled at along the way could be seized on as proof that diplomacy should be left to diplomats. Yet his very kid-brotherness gave him a chance to practice a kind of precinct diplomacy denied any other U.S. representative, even so highly respected and competent a one as Ambassador Edwin O. Reischauer.

His position as U.S. Attorney General interested the Japanese press and people not one whit. He enthralled them simply because his surname is Kennedy, and because each time he spoke the Japanese could close their eyes and effortlessly imagine they were really hearing the President. It was this "Kennedyism" (the young, handsome face that brought giggling gasps from schoolgirls, the hundreds of Japanese who confused Ethel with Jackie and crowded excitedly around "the President's wife") that made his impact more dramatic than that of Rusk, Hodges, Freeman, Goldberg, even the Fuji-climbing Udall—all here last November for economic talks at Hakone. Labeled "the fireball" by weary American Embassy workers who had to pad out his already packed schedule with 6 a.m. ice skating and dawn demonstrations of the Japanese art of self-defense, Kennedy created the biggest trans-Pacific splash since the cancellation of Ike's visit.

Critics may draw a parallel between the demonstrations of 1960 and the anti-Kennedy agitation witnessed on this trip. But there is little similarity in atmosphere between then and now. Even the highly volatile Zengakuren student organization, so much in evidence at the Hagerty incident 2 years ago, made only lukewarm efforts to disrupt Kennedy's avowed wish "to see the factories, farms, and universities that have made Japan one of the world's great nations." And those on both the left and right who chose to make nuisances of themselves were either effectively, professionally "shot down" by lawyer Kennedy; or, discredited and disavowed by the great mass of Japanese.

He encountered, but chose to ignore, the first dissonance. Following his arrival statement at Tokyo International Airport—which he prefaced with a fumbling sentence in much-appreciated Japanese—a small knot of uniformed ultrarightist of the Greater Japan Patriotic Society scoffed with police, bashed a misspelled "Welcome Mr. Kennedy" sign over one policeman's head in an attempt to reach the honored guest with handclasps and a petition urging U.S. preventive war against the Soviet Union. The President's brother gave them a cold blue eye, turned his attentions to lines of students in celluloid collars, won laughter, applause from all but the greater patriots.

His most publicized adventure occurred, of course, at Tokyo's massive Waseda University, where some 100 Zengakuren extremists, scattered strategically in a pro-Kennedy mob of 6,000 (in an auditorium for 2,500) punctured the rah-rahs and hear-hears with strident shouts of "Kennedy Go Home," "Hands Off Cuba," and "Give Back Okinawa," cut the public address system to silence him and sent a two-man shock force to storm the plaform. Determined to hold a give-and-take bull session, Kennedy showed remarkable patience, if not the blandly smiling indulgence of two dozen Waseda professors on the platform not one of whom lift a finger to establish a semblance of discipline. (To have done so would have been "an infringement of students' rights" under Japan's curious postwar conception of academic freedom.) Indeed, the Attorney General even held a battery-operated mike for one of the haranguing students who spilled out an assembly line of anti-American slogans.

Finally, Bobby lost patience, turned his back on the chaos by sitting on a table, profile to audience, arms folded, head bowed. This was enough to partially awe the students and allowed him sufficient silence to strike a few well-aimed blows: Democracy carries with it responsibilities, freedom is not synonymous with license. Yet even that rowdy scene, which he later termed, "a most interesting experience," was, all in all, a success. The Japanese press was quick with apologies, 200 Waseda students called on Ambassador Reischauer that night with formal regrets, and the very behavior of the 100 isolated them from the prevailing mood of welcome that was the hallmark of the tour.

But the most impressive thing RFK did and which no one else, including the President, could have managed, was to say a lot of things that have long needed saying in Japan to Japanese. To businessmen, still wailing over the failure of the Hakone Conference to remove overnight all obstacles to United States-Japanese trade, the Attorney General was friendly but firm, pointing out that America's first duty is to Americans, that America has staggering unemployment and economic troubles of its own, that, in effect, it cannot be guided by Japanese sensitivities each step of the way.

To politicians he gave an appreciative ear to Japanese longings for return of administrative reins in the Ryukyu Islands and promised to bring the intensity of those longings to the President's ear. At the same time he adroitly sidestepped a blundering suggestion by Kakuei Tanaka, chairman of the ruling Liberal Democratic Party's policy board, hinting that in return for the Ryukyus, Japan would amend its anti-war constitution and rearm.

To representatives of the Japan Socialist Party, major opposition group in the nation, Kennedy offered hardheaded arguments, touches of Irish temper, and in an hour-long debate he won hands down. He insisted that the party's professed neutrality is not that at all. He challenged them to list three examples of their party's opposition to policies of the Soviet Union, apart from protest against Russia's resumption of nuclear testing. The embarrassed Socialists had no answer. If he embarrassed some ("I guess he likes to argue because he's such a young man," one debate opponent said limply afterward), he also won the respect of the embarrassed. His willingness to talk frankly on any issue with anyone surprised many, pleased everyone.

Typhoons, particularly unseasonable ones, make deep impressions on the Japanese and are long recalled. Congressman LINDSAY and the New Republic should have been here.

Your Business and Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report concerning your business and Federal aid to education which was prepared by the research and editorial staffs of School Management Magazines, Inc.:

YOUR BUSINESS AND FEDERAL AID

Businessmen have dropped the ball. Almost completely apathetic to Federal aid for education. Don't understand it. Don't support it. Don't recognize a clear-cut case of enlightened self-interest.

Why? Three reasons seem to stand out. First, people "vote their pocketbook." A businessman has two pocketbooks: personal and corporate. Federal aid might help his company's profit picture, but it also threatens his personal tax burden. It's a rare bird who will support a measure that might mean higher personal taxes.

Second factor is emotional. Genuine fear of "Federal control." Arguments that this "bogeyman" doesn't exist go largely ignored. It's much easier to appeal to a businessman's fear of more control in Washington.

Third issue is "who will pay." Those opposed to Federal aid insist that richer areas, which, they feel, are doing an adequate job of education, will be forced to pay tax dollars to support poor areas.

Congressmen recognize these pressures. Now add the parochial school problem, plus southern fear of desegregation. Result: In the face of public apathy, and in spite of Kennedy pressure, Congress is not likely to come to grips with the basic issue. At best, unless businessmen go to bat, we won't see more than a higher education bill in 1962. Even this is still in doubt.

What's at stake? Plenty. Education is financially undernourished, particularly at the elementary and secondary levels. In the parts of the Nation where it is closest to starvation, local sources of tax revenue are inadequate. The financing situation is getting worse. Continued deterioration invites disaster.

Short-range problem. Schools squeezed for funds cannot cut back on staff or salaries. Must cut purchases, make do with present facilities and supplies. From your point of view: means more emphasis on "bargains," and "low bid." Resistance to new purchases must follow. Biggest danger: national failure to train needed skills for industry, defense, social needs and to assist in adjustment to automation.

As a businessman, you may reject Federal aid as the solution. But you can't play ostrich.

Desperate situation. The money must come from somewhere if we are going to reduce the 127,000 classroom shortage, train 90,000 new teachers, meet the continuing population explosion, provide the needed seats in college classrooms. You can't squeeze blood out of a stone. State and local resources, in many areas, just are not adequate to the demand. Unfortunately, other areas, able to spend more than they do, won't cough up the funds.

Who are the slackers? The table on the next page will point the finger if you know how to read it. How it works: school districts get the bulk of their money from two sources—local property taxes and State aid. When you take the funds from these two sources, and divide it by the number of students in a State, you get the "per pupil income." Subtract the amount spent on debt service, interest, and transportation. What is left is all that is available for net current expenditure per pupil. This amount is shown in the first column. This is what is spent on each pupil's education each year in the median district in each State. Thus, California's median district spends $362 per pupil while Maine spends only $222.

Is Maine slacking? No. In fact, when you examine its local effort in terms of what it has to work with, it is exerting more than three times as much effort as California to pay for a good education. Local districts get their money from property taxes. Maine has only $8,624 of true property valuation behind each student, compared to California's $34,653. Moreover, many States tax on the basis of income. Maine's per capita income is only $2,204, as compared with California's $3,068. This last is a factor in California's ability to provide greater State aid.

Should New York pay for Alabama? New York spends $466 per year for educating a student. Alabama spends only $158. A child in the median district nationally gets $315. All three are Americans, entitled to equal opportunity. All three will vote. All three will serve in the Armed Forces. All three will work. Moreover, all three have a right to move to another part of the country—and will. The mobility of America's population is perpetual. When a poor section of the Nation can't afford to educate its citizens properly, it becomes a national problem.

Ranking of the States

What they spend			Local effort based on true property values			Other factors	
States	Per pupil	Rank	Rank	Amount raised for $100 of property value	Property value behind each pupil	Percent paid by State	Per capita personal income
New York	$466	1	8	$1.41	$17,510	42.4	$3,122
New Jersey	445	2	9	1.36	28,252	23.8	2,866
Oregon	419	3	12	1.27	23,423	29.4	2,768
Illinois	399	4	28	.85	48,419	20.4	2,799
Alaska	395	5	16	1.14	11,508	47.5	3,178
Nevada	392	6	42	.43	53,733	55.1	3,317
Rhode Island	385	7	14	1.18	23,199	24.9	2,584
Connecticut	375	8	10	1.31	22,906	26.6	2,967
Arizona	367	9	19	1.01	19,096	40.9	2,298
California	362	10	30	.48	34,653	40.4	3,068
Wyoming	360	11	40	.47	25,581	45.2	2,896
Washington	351	12	43	.42	19,494	61.6	2,564
Colorado	350	13	30	.79	25,109	22.1	2,843
Wisconsin	347	14	11	1.29	20,587	21.3	2,458
Ohio	341	15	20	.98	25,568	29.1	2,462
Kansas	341	16	22	.95	41,773	22.7	2,562
Delaware	339	17	48	.33	14,459	79.6	3,172
Minnesota	337	18	3	1.64	12,853	37.9	2,343
South Dakota	333	19	7	1.52	13,632	8.2	2,225
Massachusetts	325	20	1	2.01	13,178	26.9	2,746
Pennsylvania	325	21	5	1.54	15,192	51.1	2,446
Iowa	321	22	2	1.66	19,951	11.6	2,225
New Mexico	318	23	46	.41	21,604	70.6	2,213
Maryland	312	24	27	.85	21,432	36.5	2,609
Indiana	309	25	18	1.02	27,217	31.4	2,425
Michigan	302	26	21	.96	17,140	43.6	2,411
Missouri	299	27	26	.90	24,288	29.4	2,632
New Hampshire	297	28	6	1.53	16,317	5.7	2,348
Montana	292	29	17	1.07	13,345	25.3	2,166
Utah	291	30	25	.90	13,275	43.4	2,130
Texas	279	31	38	.54	23,489	50.0	2,089
Nebraska	277	32	13	1.21	19,546	4.0	2,406
Louisiana	275	33	45	.41	17,957	68.2	1,688
Florida	271	34	29	.82	14,457	55.0	2,225
North Dakota	260	35	23	.94	10,783	28.3	2,161
Idaho	259	36	32	.72	21,020	32.6	2,018
Oklahoma	244	37	35	.64	15,333	42.8	2,200
Vermont	237	38	15	1.14	21,633	22.0	2,140
Virginia	231	39	24	.91	17,067	36.1	2,100
West Virginia	228	40	34	.68	17,671	57.0	1,752
North Carolina	223	41	47	.37	17,672	71.1	1,950
Maine	222	42	4	1.56	8,624	29.6	2,204
Georgia	208	43	33	.69	9,655	64.1	1,910
Kentucky	208	44	37	.57	17,659	55.3	1,708
Tennessee	190	45	44	.41	14,432	55.2	1,759
South Carolina	179	46	41	.46	16,060	71.8	1,678
Mississippi	174	47	36	.61	10,544	54.4	1,532
Arkansas	173	48	31	.72	15,135	50.8	1,700
Alabama	158	49	49	.24	13,249	69.1	1,664

Heart of the matter: Federal aid can be tied to local effort—and should be. Congress is now entertaining several such proposals. And each of these proposals has another fact in common: the Federal Government itself would not directly distribute the funds it provides. The State departments of education would control the money, and local boards of education would spend it. NDEA is handled in this way and there has been no Federal domination or control.

No other solution: An individual State can help its impoverished school districts, up to a point. But impoverished States—particularly States already making a heroic effort in terms of their wealth—must get Federal help. All the niggling arguments against it only cloud the basic decision which must be made: How else are we going to support free public education to meet the standards and needs of the 1960's?

Current Teachers' Salaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, American education is a vital issue in this Nation. We are constantly seeking a better finished product. Teachers play a major part in this picture. Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., research director, American Federation of Teachers, is author of a new publication entitled "Survey of Teachers Salaries, September 1961." The study includes 881 salary schedules in districts with at least 10,000 population. Dr. Reuter has written the article "Current Teachers Salaries," which is a summary of his publication. I consider the article to be of great national interest, because it gives facts. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix

of the RECORD, I include Dr. Reuter's article:

CURRENT TEACHERS' SALARIES

(By Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr.)

INTRODUCTION

The study this year of teachers' salaries includes 880 salary schedules in the United States and one in the Canal Zone. Of the 880 districts, 209 are in the Northeastern States, 367 in the Central States, 168 in the Southern States and 136 in the Western States. The study of the 880 districts with population of 10,000 or more compares with the 1960 study of 855 districts.

MAJOR CITIES

Once again 34 major cities with a population of 400,000 or more are considered separately. The average salary for all the teachers with at least a degree is $6,419. The average beginning salary for teachers with a bachelor's degree is $4,509, with the average ceiling in this category of $7,176. For the master's degree the average beginning salary is $4,953 and the ceiling is $7,659. The average beginning salary for the teacher with a year beyond the master's degree is $5,186 and the average ceiling salary is $8,285. The average beginning salary for the doctorate is $5,274 and the ceiling is $8,309. Concerning the four categories mentioned above, the average beginning salary is $4,981 and the average ceiling is $7,857.

NATIONAL SUMMARIES

The beginning teacher with the bachelor's degree has a national average, in 1961, of $4,328 and the ceiling is $6,228. For the master's degree the average beginning salary is $4,567 and the ceiling is $6,819. For the teacher with a year beyond the master's degree the average beginning salary is $4,839 and the ceiling is $7,256. For the teacher with the doctorate the average beginning salary is $5,124 and the ceiling is $7,887. The average national beginning salary for a teacher with a degree or above is $4,715 and the ceiling is $7,048. The average national salary of teachers in the four classifications of bachelor's through doctorate is $5,881.

REGIONAL SUMMARIES

The Northeastern region of the Nation is composed of nine States. The average bachelor's beginning salary is $4,181, and the ceiling is $6,479. The sectional averages for the beginning master's degree and ceiling are $4,455 and $6,896. The sectional averages for the beginning salary for a year beyond the master's and the ceiling are $4,733 and $7,367. The sectional averages for the beginning salary for the doctorate and the ceiling are $5,015 and $7,744.

The central region of the Nation is composed of 12 States and the average bachelor's beginning salary is $4,399, with the ceiling at $6,511. The sectional averages for the beginning and ceiling for the master's degree are $4,734 and $7,149. The sectional averages for the beginning and ceiling for a year beyond the master's are $5,031 and $7,698. The sectional averages for the beginning and ceiling for the doctorate are $5,408 and $8,254.

The southern region of the Nation is composed of 16 States and the District of Columbia and has an average beginning degree salary of $3,848 and a ceiling of $5,372. The sectional averages for the beginning and ceiling for the master's degree are $4,168 and $5,900. The sectional averages for the beginning and ceiling for a year beyond the master's are $4,581 and $6,325. The sectional averages for the beginning and ceiling for the doctorate are $4,866 and $7,523.

The western section of the Nation includes 13 States and has an average beginning salary of $4,582, and the ceiling for the bachelors' is $6,549. The sectional averages for the beginning and ceiling for the master's degree are $4,913 and $7,331. The sectional averages for the beginning and ceiling for a year beyond the master's are $5,009 and $7,635. The sectional averages for the beginning and ceiling for the doctorate are $5,205 and $8,026.

STATE AVERAGES

The States are reported below. Each of the 50 States has a reported State average for the teacher with the bachelor's degree.

Average bachelor's degree salaries

	Starting	Ceiling
Alabama	$3,241	$4,052
Alaska	6,197	7,835
Arizona	4,603	7,252
Arkansas	3,691	4,803
California	4,922	7,424
Colorado	4,403	6,677
Connecticut	4,395	7,222
Delaware	4,400	7,150
Florida	4,108	5,551
Georgia	4,045	5,330
Hawaii	4,020	6,000
Idaho	4,219	5,441
Illinois	4,687	6,693
Indiana	4,636	6,693
Iowa	4,259	6,354
Kansas	4,250	5,957
Kentucky	3,895	5,146
Louisiana	3,550	5,840
Maine	3,875	5,403
Maryland	4,350	6,767
Massachusetts	4,256	6,436
Michigan	4,712	7,108
Minnesota	4,493	7,120
Mississippi	3,337	4,253
Missouri	4,250	6,340
Montana	4,609	6,429
Nebraska	4,167	5,966
Nevada	4,850	6,367
New Hampshire	4,021	5,803
New Jersey	4,449	7,366
New Mexico	4,340	6,140
New York	4,625	7,526
North Carolina	3,797	5,403
North Dakota	4,475	6,663
Ohio	4,280	6,328
Oklahoma	3,638	5,141
Oregon	4,387	6,635
Pennsylvania	4,099	6,384
Rhode Island	4,185	6,322
South Carolina	2,816	3,701
South Dakota	4,060	5,890
Tennessee	3,746	5,302
Texas	4,465	5,778
Utah	3,947	6,281
Vermont	3,725	5,848
Virginia	4,000	5,693
Washington	4,511	6,143
West Virginia	3,545	4,313
Wisconsin	4,524	6,913
Wyoming	4,560	6,519

Showdown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I have always regarded my constituents as having more than a generous measure of commonsense. This letter from a resident of my congressional district that appeared in the Portland Oregonian, March 1, more than confirms my estimate. I think it speaks for itself. I recommend that it be read as an effective antidote to the dreary, tiresome, windy harangues from both the right and left political wings in this wonderful country of ours.

SHOWDOWN

To the EDITOR:

Haven't we heard enough from the lunatic fringe?

Let's find a roomy, isolated arena—the giant meteor crater in Arizona should do nicely. Then, let's ship Gus Hall and a few thousand of his comrades, and Robert Welch and a few thousand of his followers there. Provide each Commie with a blue book and each John Bircher with a Communist manifesto.

Since suppression of free speech, curbing the right to vote, and destruction of anyone whose beliefs differ from theirs are ideas common to both sides, nothing would be gained by having them read what they've got. Instead, hand out matches to everyone; a true-blue (or red) radical loves the sight of a brightly burning book. Then they can all throw blazing copies of hate literature at each other, while the rest of us continue to guard the right of our citizens to express themselves without fear of recrimination from Communist or Fascist.

Mrs. EVELYN PRATT.

Mariano de Yturralde

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, our good friend, Mariano de Yturralde y Orbegoso, the popular Spanish Ambassador to the United States, died yesterday—Tuesday—at Doctors Hospital.

He was truly a real Ambassador of good will and, during his Ambassadorial sojourn here, advanced the prestige of Franco's government in American official circles, as well as on the Hill.

There was something typically American about this genteel and noble man, his open candor and complete ease with guests at conference or dinner was symbolic of Spanish politeness and courtesy.

His training and background prepared him for the high positions that he has held within his government. He was a true and sincere friend of the United States.

The United States has lost a strong, friendly influence in Spanish circles of power, the Congress a splendid official personage of the old school of chivalry, who instilled confidence, sympathy, and support for Spain's needs and interests among nations. Spain has seen the lamented departure from the American scene of one of its most loved and respected patriotic sons, whose official duties here were contributory to the general acceptance of Spain as a friendly and an unquestioned distinguished ally of the United States.

We, individually, mourn with his gentle lady, Mrs. Yturralde, and join with her in prayers and extend our condolences to her in her sad bereavement. We, of the Congress, who knew Ambassador Yturralde venerate his memory.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I wish to include the following two articles:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Mar. 6, 1962]

MARIANO DE YTURRALDE, SPANISH ENVOY, DIES

Mariano de Yturralde y Orbegoso, 57, Spanish Ambassador to the United States since August 1960 died yesterday at Doctors Hospital after a series of abdominal operations.

The Embassy said he died of pulmonary complications and peritonitis which developed after an operation last Thursday.

Arriving in Washington on August 19, 1960, Mr. Yturralde came from Lima, Peru, replacing the Count de Motrico as envoy here. This was his second assignment in the United States. He had been commercial counselor here in 1948.

The affable Mr. Yturralde had held numerous diplomatic posts all over the world during the Franco regime.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk said it was "a great shock to those of us who have come to appreciate his personal and professional qualities during the period he represented his country in Washington.

"On behalf of myself and my colleagues in the Department of State, I wish to express my sincere condolences to the Spanish Government on the loss of a devoted servant and to his widow in her grief."

A Basque by birth, Mr. Yturralde was a staff officer for the Franco forces during the Spanish Civil War. After the cessation of hostilities, he entered diplomacy.

HELD NUMBER OF POSTS

He served as director general of economic policy during negotiations with Great Britain and Switzerland. In 1949 he helped negotiate a transportion agreement between Spain and Sweden and an economic-financial commission to the United States and Canada.

In 1952 he was named director general of foreign policy at Madrid, and the following year became Ambassador to Canada. Two years later he went to Dublin as Ambassador and then to Lima.

Mr. Yturralde's first wife, Conchita Martinez de Campos, died in Burgos, Spain, in 1938. In 1941 he married Dona Isabel Arguelles, who was at his bedside at the time of his death.

A requiem pontifical mass will be offered at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow in St. Matthew's Cathedral. The Most Rev. Patrick A. O'Boyle, Archbishop of Washington, will officiate.

A book for signatures will be kept at the Embassy, 2801 16th Street NW., for those who wish to express sympathy.

The Ambassador's body will be flown to Madrid at 8 p.m. tomorrow aboard a U.S. Air Force plane. It will be accompanied by the widow, the State Department Chief of Protocol, Angier Biddle Duke, and Luis Pedraso, Second Secretary at the Spanish Embassy. Full military honors will be given Mr. Yturralde at the departure from Andrews Air Force Base.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 6, 1962]

SPANISH ENVOY YTURRALDE DIES

The Spanish Ambassador to the United States, Mariano de Yturralde y Orbegoso, died yesterday at Doctors Hospital following two operations within 10 days. He was 57.

The Ambassador, who had held his post here since August 19, 1960, was admitted to the hospital last week to be operated on for an abdominal abscess. Embassy spokesmen said he died of pulmonary complications and peritonitis after a second operation.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk said that the Ambassador's death was "a great shock to those who have come to appreciate his personal and professional qualities during the period he represented his country in Washington."

Rusk continued, "On behalf of myself and my colleagues at the State Department, I wish to express my sincere condolences to the Spanish Government on the loss of a devoted servant, and to his widow in her grief."

Senor Yturralde was born in the Basque Provinces of Spain and graduated from the University of Laval in Canada. He entered Spain's diplomatic service in 1929. During the Spanish Civil War, he was on the headquarters staff of Generalissimo Franco.

The Ambassador came to Washington from Lima, Peru, in 1960. He had previously served in missions in Dublin, London, Montreal, and Ottawa. He was assigned as commercial counselor in the Embassy here in 1945.

The Ambassador is survived by his wife, Isabel. He lived here at 2801 16th Street N.W.

A requiem mass will be offered at 10:30 a.m., Thursday, at St. Matthew's Cathedral.

The Most Reverend Patrick A. O'Boyle, archbishop of Washington, will officiate. The Ambassador's body will be flown to Spain after the service.

A book of signatures is being kept at the Spanish Embassy, 2700 15th Street NW., for those wishing to express condolences.

Mentally Retarded Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, in my district, a very devoted person is performing a pioneering and moving project for what are usually known as mentally retarded children but which, as Sister John so well puts it, should be referred to as "exceptional" children. I am inserting Sister John's letter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD partly because I hope it will inspire a wider base of support in an area where Federal assistance can properly be given, and partly because I feel that not enough people realize the existence of this problem and the tremendous amount of good work which can be accomplished by devoted people with sufficient financial assistance. The letter follows:

FEBRUARY 28, 1962.

Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROOSEVELT: I have been asked to forward to you a short résumé of our program.

The Holy Innocents Guild, Los Angeles, was formed in May of 1959. At the time of its institution, it appeared as small and as helpless as those whom it sought to help. Its charter members were 25 laywomen, and myself—a sister of the holy family.

The occasion of the guild's formation was the first teacher training course for exceptional children ever given in this area. (A teacher training course usually lasts from 8 to 10 weeks. Then, as now, the program offered different guest speakers each week. Each speaker is an expert in his or her particular field: a mental hygienist, a child psychologist, and so forth. These experts volunteer their time to share their knowledge with our people who are interested in the field of mental retardation. Their special contributions are supplemented at each class by my own teaching of methods in training and related subjects.) The first course had drawn the 25 women, mostly parents or friends of the mentally retarded. At the final class, after receiving their diplomas qualifying them to teach the holy innocents, the women begged for a permanent program. They reviewed facts and figures already known: that the national average of mental retardation is 3 percent of the total child population; that the Los Angeles quota is estimated at around 150,000 children plus an undetermined number of adults; and that this figure was rapidly increasing due to the tremendous population increase in the City of the Angels. Of the 150,000 mentally retarded here, some one-third could be said to be Catholic. This last group needed religious help. All the children needed help of some type, even simple methods of home training and the like. Finally, and this was the selling point, the parents were desperate for help, encouragement and recognition of their children as human beings. For even 3 years ago, the shadow of the unknown was still rampant in the field of mental retardation, causing extreme and unnecessary suffering to parents and children and providing barriers in getting proper assistance and facilities.

Most of the women who asked for a workable program were housewives. Some had business training. A few had the advantage of outstanding educational backgrounds. All had a common goal and great determination. All pledged their time and support and whatever financial help they could give. They desired that the mentally retarded child be recognized for what he is: A citizen and a person. Help must come, if these holy innocents were ever to reach their individual capacities for learning and doing.

The result of this was a talk with Rt. Rev. Msgr. John K. Clarke, archdiocesan director of the Los Angeles Confraternity of Christian Doctrine. Monsignor Clarke was in sympathy with the proposed program. He immediately gave permission for the work to be placed under the auspices of the Confraternity. Without further ado, the Holy Innocents Guild was born. Mimeographed letters went out to people who might be interested, asking help. The word spread like a fire upon a hitherto desolate and dry plain. Within a few short months, the guild had many members, little material aid, but much accomplished. Parents called—and continue to call—from far distances to seek assistance. Now, 3 years "old" the guild has the following landmarks behind it:

Sixty-two children have received first Holy Communion. We have had 4 confirmations, with a total of 380 retarded children and adults receiving this sacrament (a valuable accomplishment, since certain requirements must be met for the reception of Communion, and children never thought to be "smart" enough suddenly blossomed under the guild's zealous work). We have had 25 classes in religious instruction for some 400 children, and there have been 12 teacher training courses, providing us with 130 qualified adults prepared to instruct the mentally retarded.

Early in the program we adopted the term "exceptional" for these little ones, rather than "retarded." This term is based on a statement made by Richard Cardinal Cushing, who said that these were worthy and deserving of exceptional care and help. We determined to stress the whole child. Twenty-four out of twenty-five of all those retarded have certain potential. Some can be self-helping. Many advance to the point of later holding jobs in their adult life and contributing useful work to society. All can be helped to some extent. All need—and deserve—the advantage of both secular and religious assistance, which "round out" or form the whole child. The number of cases where parents were overwhelmed at the improvement in their children can only be mentioned briefly; from the very beginning the gratitude expressed by parents has been such that it is impossible to record it.

The Holy Innocents Guild views the future with great hope, but with a certain anxiety. So much needs to be done. At every turn, we are meeting certain problems that can be resolved only by an increased budget. The most pressing needs are:

1. Adequate housing facilities for exceptional adults, whose parents have died, etc. Such housing should provide an atmosphere where they can continue to advance; where they can utilize their potential to the best of their ability. To this end, we must hope for a home—and more homes—where trained lay people (possibly members of our teacher training course) can act as staff, or at least as supervisors.

2. A foundation fund, to provide emergency help for parents whose exceptional children require special medical services, etc.

3. A fund with which to pay trained lay teachers, even as regular teachers are paid, that the people qualified for this work may devote their entire time to this program.

To date, we have various memberships in the guild, ranging from $3 annually, upward. Once every 2 months, we send out a mimeographed bulletin entitled "Exceptionally Yours" which contains articles of help, encouragement, plus special announcements of guild activities, etc. This represents the greater portion of our financial-gathering efforts, which is supplemented occasionally by voluntary donations.

In addition to the three major needs listed above, we would like very much to produce a film showing the work with our exceptional children and the accomplishments that can be made.

So far, our one contribution to the literary field has been a manual, "Christ Our Light," written by another sister and myself, which is geared to helping either teacher or parent in the instruction of the mentally retarded. This manual is accomplished by a color book which corresponds to each lesson of the text. Christ Our Light, both manual and color book, was recently published by William Sadlier, Inc., of New York City. In addition to this, Monsignor Clarke has permitted publication of a small booklet, "Religious Instruction for the Mentally Retarded" which explains briefly the work and purpose of our exceptional children's program.

This, then, is the Holy Innocents Guild. From its infancy, but 3 years ago, it has reached a certain maturity and dignity nourished by and built on hard work, sacrifice and much love and prayer. It is our hope that the program can be expanded so that all the "holy innocents" of every faith and every age level may benefit. Yes, and even more: that in sharing in this work people and even nations may come to a greater understanding of humanity, and hence may advance a few steps further toward our great universal goal: freedom for man, and lasting peace.

Very sincerely yours,
Sister M. JOHN, S.H.F.

Thomas Garrigue Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on the 7th of March men of goodwill everywhere pause in their activity to remember and honor the birth of one of the great patriots of history, Thomas Masaryk, the father of Czechoslovakia.

One hundred and twelve years ago when he was born, his country was but a province of the decadent, oppressive Austro-Hungarian Empire. Throughout the life of the empire, Masaryk was the leader, the teacher, the spokesman in Vienna for his people, and the tireless champion of their burning, righteous cause for freedom.

With the disintegration of the empire during World War I, the Czech people were given their opportunity for self-determination. It was altogether natural and fitting that they elected as the first President of their new Republic the man who had inspired and led them to their victory, Thomas Garrigue Masaryk.

Under his direction, the government of the new nation took shape. Under his leadership for the next 17 years, the nation prospered and became one of the true democracies of the world. At the age of 85, President Masaryk stepped down from office; but for the 2 years remaining before his death, he was revered as George Washington was in our own country after he retired to private life. He was still the Father of his Country.

While death is never but sad, Thomas Masaryk's death was a blessing for the noble man. For hardly a year after his world-mourned passing, his nation was sacrificed to the monstrous greed of the Nazis. And with their defeat, rule was seized by the Reds, who have held it ever since.

The magnificent monument—a healthy, happy, thriving nation—that this great man had designed and erected no longer stands. But his spirit burns in the breast of every Czech, and the venerated memory of his selfless service keeps alive their hopes that the Red terror will be driven out and liberty will return to their native land. I join in the prayer that this day shall be soon.

Impressions of Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, Howard Matzke, Ph. D., is a professor of anatomy in the Kansas University School of Medicine. He is also an exchange professor of anatomy in the College of Medicine, University of the Philippines. In June of 1960, Dr. Matzke and his family were in the Congo, and he has written an article based on his experiences at that time, entitled "Impressions of Africa." This article was read before the surgical staff of the Philippine General Hospital, and reproduced in the September 1961 issue of the Surgical Bulletin of the Philippine General Hospital. I am pleased to be able to share Dr. Matzke's impression of Africa with my colleagues. Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the article herewith:

IMPRESSIONS OF AFRICA

(By Howard Matzke, Ph. D.)

On June 12, 1960, I landed with my wife and two children at the small airport serving Bukavu, capital of the Kivu Province of the former Belgian Congo. We were greeted by an African who drove us for 30 miles along the beautiful shores of Lake Kivu to the Institute for Scientific Research in Central Africa (IRSAC). The institute, founded by the Belgian Government in 1947, is located at an elevation of 6,500 feet far from any center of civilization. It was my intention to spend 3 months here carrying out research on the central nervous system of primates.

With the advent of independence on June 30, our troubles began. All communications with the rest of the Congo and the outside world broke down. Within a few weeks the European population of Bukavu dwindled from 7,000 to 500. Panic prevailed. On July 15 my wife and two children accompanied by the wife and two children of another American, Dr. Donald L. Price, were flown to Kampala, Uganda British East Africa by East African Airlines. This special airlift was for women and children only. Dr. Price and I were left to our own devices. We left IRSAC on July 22 in a truck with all of our personal and scientific possessions. After 3 days' rugged travel over every type of African terrain except desert, we arrived safely in Kampala. The many interesting and harrowing experiences encountered on this journey are a story in themselves. We remained in Kampala until January 1961. It was possible to continue the research project at Makerere Medical College and at the same time teach the course in neuroanatomy. We also traveled extensively throughout the four East African colonies of Uganda, Tanganyika, Kenya, and Zanzibar. During these travels, we had the opportunity to see and talk to the most primitive as well as the most advanced of the African people.

It is probably impossible to understand the problems of Africa and its inhabitants without living amongst them for some time. Africans are capable of learning, just as capable as any other group of people. I can attest to this having taught in an African institution of higher education. They are, however, handicapped by longstanding tribal traditions, customs and superstitions. Western concepts of democracy and religion are difficult for them to appreciate. This may be illustrated by some of our own personal experiences in the Congo in respect to some Africans' ideas of independence.

The day after independence, about 20 Africans appeared at our door at dawn requesting work. To them independence meant employment for all. The occupants, including women and children, of a nearby village were in a continuous state of intoxication on banana beer for 2 weeks. To them independence meant the end of the world and they were "living it up" before the fateful day arrived. One houseboy asked his mistress whether independence would arrive by boat or plane. In one tribe, two factions fought to death over where independence should be placed. One group wanted it in the center of the village and the other, in front of the chief's hut. During the independence celebration, our own houseboy refused to let us take his picture. When we left the house, he locked the doors and drew the curtains. He, obviously, was afraid of something. He never did this before or after the independence celebration. The above examples illustrate that at least these Africans had no concept of the meaning of independence.

One can better understand the African if it is realized that of necessity they have had to live a day-to-day existence. Generally, it has not been their practice to project to the future. It is, therefore, difficult for them to adopt the two greatest determinants of Western thought, Christianity and democracy. Both of these are essentially a promise of something better in the future.

In the remote area of Karamoja in northeast Uganda, I had the privilege of meeting a most remarkable man. He was a missionary of the Irish Baptist faith who had spent 34 years in this area. When asked how many

Africans he had converted to Christianity, he promptly answered, "None." However, he qualified this by stating that none were converted in the sense of Western ideas of Christianity. He had baptized thousands and his chapel overflowed every Sunday. However, many of his leading parishioners had 10 wives, adhered to such longstanding practices as selling one's daughters in matrimony, visited the witch doctor when afflicted by some mysterious ailment and participated in many other pagan ceremonies. The missionary, however, was not discouraged. He realized it would take several generations to convert the mass of Africans to Christianity. He already was making greater headway with the children of his first converts. The greatest advances in Christianity has been made where the missionaries have established schools, hospitals and seminaries. Such establishments serve two purposes. The first is to attract the African by a genuine offer of help that he can understand. The second is to train the African to assume the responsibilities of health, education, and the spreading of Christianity himself.

This same philosophy should guide all our efforts in Africa. Africa is desperately in need of help but the aid should be given only after considerable thought. Dollars alone are not the answer. In all cases, the needs and desires of the African should be foremost. The African, after all, is not an American, Asian, or European. He is an African and as such has his own identity which he desires most of all that other peoples will recognize. He cannot be purchased, but he is willing, and even demanding, of help. Our criteria as to what, when, and how to aid. Africa should be based primarily upon the needs, desires, and culture of the people of Africa, not on those of America, Asia, or Europe. Will it do any good to tell the African male that he will never get any place until he helps his wives work in the field? Not, since this part of their culture and way of life. They will, no doubt, be insulted by the mere implication that what they are doing is wrong. It is, therefore, of paramount importance that we first understand them before we try to help them. This, as stated before, is difficult unless you have had the opportunity of living amongst them.

After determining the needs of the people and considering their customs and beliefs, the aid given should be earmarked for specific purposes. In many instances, the nation given financial help may not have the technical know-how to implement the consummation of the project for which the aid was intended. In these cases, technical advisers should be supplied to be certain the program is carried out and that the general public will truly benefit. Crash programs as well as long-term projects should be equally considered since the needs of Africa are not only for the present but will exist for a long time to come.

Two of the most critical needs of Africa are education and health. A great deal has been written about supplying thousands of scholarships to African students at American and European schools. We must be very cautious in this approach. In order to be of benefit to his native land, the African must learn to recognize and solve the problems of Africa, not those of America and Europe. What good will it do the African medical student in the United States to learn about electron microscopy when 90 percent of his people are infested with parasites? Parasitology may be covered in 1 hour out of a 4-year medical course in the United States. It may be nice to learn all about growing wheat, but of what practical value is it to the African in whose country wheat is never grown?

Serious consideration should be given to sending the expert to Africa and teaching the African in his own environment. This also requires assistance in building appropriate education and health facilities. The people selected, however, should be mature, understanding and adaptable. They should be endowed with an appropriate mixture of idealism and realism. On the surface the Peace Corps may appear to be the answer. It is true, that these young people can contribute a great deal to international understanding if their programs are carefully selected and they are appropriately trained. However, the basic needs of Africa can be solved only by mature, adaptable individuals who can readily recognize the needs and evolve a program which, although it has long-term implications, shows some advancement acceptable to the Africans at that time.

We must realize that Africa is a continent of peoples surging relentlessly toward independence and recognition as a people in their own right. Their wishes and customs may not be understood, and at times, even be repulsive to the Western World. In international dealings, where does the primary responsibility of understanding lie, with the underdeveloped nation or the overdeveloped nation? I think the answer is clear and obvious.

The Speaker Speaks on Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have been impressed by the many fine articles which have appeared in the Armed Forces Management magazine during the past several months. One of the best, in my opinion, appears in the current issue—March 1962—and is entitled "The Speaker Speaks Out on Defense," by C. Paul Means, which I insert herein.

This is a fitting tribute to you, Mr. Speaker, in respect to the many fine things you have done during the past 3 decades to improve the scope and quality of the defenses of our country. While you and I have had some differences of opinion with regard to some subjects, it has been a source of satisfaction to have worked with you in many ways during the past 10 years to improve the Nation's defenses and particularly in the field of supply management where there has been so much waste due mostly to the diffusion of common functions in many separate organizations. As Mr. Means points out in his article, the McCormack-Curtis amendment of 1958 has given Secretary McNamara a tool that he is wisely and courageously employing to initiate actions to correct the deficiencies we have so long deplored. I am pleased also that the author has given recognition to the efforts of Senator Douglas, Congressmen Vinson, Hébert, Dawson, and Bonner and Comptroller General Campbell.

The article follows:

THE SPEAKER SPEAKS OUT ON DEFENSE

(By C. Paul Means)

On McNamara: "He has made an unprecedented record in reorganizing the sprawling, disorganized Defense Establishment. He has accomplished feats which none of his seven illustrious predecessors was able to do or tackle."

On reorganization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff: "There may have been too much 'scare talk' that a single chief would be a 'man on horseback.' An objective study must be made to determine the most effective staff organization to meet present and future needs."

On Army reorganization: "It is doubtful that there will be a disapproving resolution introduced by either Armed Services Committee to counter what Secretary McNamara has recommended."

On defense spending: "If we must err, let's err on the side of strength rather than weakness." The Speaker agrees generally but must examine specifically the fiscal year 1963 budget.

On the Defense Supply Agency: "Many years of study convinced me that the largest source of economy in the Defense Department without impairment to its strength lay in integrating common supply and services. I would hope that DSA can be expanded until it embraces some 60 percent of the annual military budget plus the great and real personal property holdings of the departments themselves. Another matter of prime importance is to extend uniformity in all aspects of the supply operations to the various commands."

On program packages: "Valuable tools to help both congressional and military leaders determine the relative cost and importance of both complimentary and alternative weapons systems and forces."

Essentially the same faces confronted Defense witnesses across congressional committee hearing rooms this year as they began outlining the $51.6 billion defense budget request for fiscal year 1963. Though the revolutionary new method in presenting the budget created a stir, and the hearings into the so-called muzzling of military officers made some headlines, nothing much seemed to change the Defense-congressional relationship established last year during Secretary McNamara and his team's first visit to the Hill.

But there was a difference—the total effect of which cannot be assessed until the end of this second session of the 87th Congress.

That difference is a new Speaker of the House of Representatives: JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

The Speakership of the House is the second most powerful post for political action in the American governmental system, and the most powerful in ability to authorize military programs and appropriate funds to carry them out.

The Speaker presides over 437 independent minds in the larger of the two legislative Houses of Congress, and the most difficult through which to pass legislation. His leadership and ability can help guide legislation through committees onto the floor to successful passage, or many times it can effectively block passage.

Where the Speaker stands on the major defense issues, therefore, is of vital interest to those concerned with the fate of the present defense budget and/or any of its particulars.

M'NAMARA'S PREDECESSORS

On those matters which he is ready to express an opinion, the Speaker doesn't equivocate, and his unequivocal admiration for Robert S. McNamara gives powerful backing to the Defense Secretary and his program of sweeping changes.

"During the year that McNamara has been Secretary, he has made an unprecedented record in reorganizing the sprawling, disorganized Defense Establishment. He has accomplished feats none of his seven illustrious predecessors were able to do or tackle," is the Speaker's assessment.

McCormack knew McNamara's "seven illustrious predecessors" well, having been the No. 2 Democrat in the House during all of their tenures in office. Of the seven, McCormack has greatest respect for James S. Forrestal and Robert A. Lovett.

He believes that Forrestal made a mistake in not pressing for more defense unification in 1947 under "his express and implied statutory authority."

"Perhaps the most knowledgable of all of Secretary McNamara's predecessors," McCormack thinks, "was Robert Lovett * * * who knew what should be done 'but did not take up arms' to do it."

The Speaker cites the letter Lovett wrote to President Truman shortly before he left office in 1952, recommending reorganization of the "responsibilities and authorities of the Chiefs of Staff of the three services" * * * and, among other suggestions, "reorganization of the technical service organization in the Army."

McCormack approves of the Army reorganization plan McNamara has proposed, and believes "that shortly we will see a streamlined Army under responsible commands."

"IF WE MUST ERR * * *

"It is doubtful that there will be a disapproving resolution introduced by either Armed Services (Senate or House) Committee."

Nor should McNamara have too much trouble in getting his $51.6 billion in new defense money. Though McCormack will leave details of the budget request subject to critical analysis by the House Armed Services Committee under Chairman Carl Vinson (Democrat of Georgia) and the House Appropriations Committee under Chairman Clarence Cannon (Democrat of Missouri), he has confidence in the judgment of Secretary McNamara and believes that "if we must err, let's err on the side of strength rather than weakness."

Although McCormack expresses approval for many of McNamara's first year moves, he is most pleased with the action establishing the Defense Supply Agency—an action McNamara could not have taken if it had not been for the McCormack-Curtis amendment to the Defense Reorganization Act of 1958. This legislation, according to the Speaker, "removed any possible doubt as to the authority of the Secretary of Defense to integrate supply and service functions when it would be in the best interest of the Government."

After the passage of this amendment, McCormack was disappointed that Secretaries of Defense Neil H. McElroy and Thomas S. Gates "took little or no action utilizing its powers."

GETTING THE MESSAGE

Upon the designation of McNamara and his Deputy Secretary, Roswell Gilpatric as the new defense leadership, McCormack took special pains to see "they were familiar with the wide potentialities of the amendment for organizing common activities in the DOD."

The Speaker pointed out to the new defense team that "this authority could be used by a strong Secretary on his own initiative without referring the matter to Congress for action * * * that the amendment was very broad in scope embracing some 60 percent of the annual military budget plus the great real and personal property holdings of the departments themselves."

In case McNamara and Gilpatric hadn't gotten the message about how much power they really had, the future Speaker also pointed out "it was evident that only a few major reorganization matters need be presented to the Congress."

McCormack believes that establishment of DSA also helped resolve another situation he and many others in Congress and in the Defense Department had wanted to do something about for over a decade: streamlining the Army Technical Services Organization.

The Speaker indorses the observation made by Lovett in his letter to ex-President Truman that: "It has always amazed me that the system (the interdependent Army Technical Services) worked at all and the fact that it works rather well is a tribute to the inborn capacity of teamwork in the average American."

With the establishment of DSA, according to McCormack, "which took from the various Army services the common supply activities, it became inevitable that the Army needed to be reorganized."

REDUCING SURPLUSES

McCormack now hopes McNamara and DSA's new head, Lt. Gen. Andrew T. McNamara, will push forward rapidly toward the goal where DSA will in fact control "60 percent of the annual military budget plus the great real and personal property holdings of the departments."

The Speaker also wants DSA's charter expanded so that its authority won't apply just to the zone of interior, but also overseas—"out where the fighting would go on."

He also wants DSA to be able to control inventory "below the depot level" so that hoards stored away under stockpiling regulations can be ferreted out.

A major share of congressional credit for the Defense breakthrough to an efficient supply operation is given by the Speaker to Representative Thomas B. Curtis, Republican, of Missouri and Senator Paul Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois, who drafted legislation and prodded the Pentagon toward this goal for a decade.

During the past year the Speaker, Curtis, Douglas, Representative F. Edward Hébert, the Comptroller General of the General Accounting Office, Joseph Campbell and others met with McNamara and Gilpatric as an ad hoc group to study the supply problem and to give the new Defense leaders a feel about how Congress felt about other contemplated reorganizational moves.

The Speaker's interest in military affairs is not of recent origin.

He backed the Selective Service (peace time draft) bill in 1939, and as House majority leader in 1941, he is credited with pushing through the House an extension of the peacetime draft act by one vote—just 3 months before Pearl Harbor.

In 1955, McCormack took out after the Air Force's contracting activities for the SAGE early warning system. Coining the term, "government by contract," McCormack charged the Air Force action was an example of "wanton negotiated contracting whereby a subsidiary, Western Electric, was the prime contractor whose specifications were carried out by the parent company—American Telephone & Telegraph."

LITTLE DUPLICATION?

He questioned the authority of the Air Force to enter into contracts of this nature under an obscure proviso of the General Services Administration Act. The Speaker helped to draft specific legislation in 1956 to permit the Air Force to enter into long-term contracts for SAGE utility services. According to Chairman Vinson of the Armed Services Committee, McCormack's initial exposure of the Air Force contract saved the Government some $83 million a year for the 10-year period of the original contract or approximately $830 million.

The Speaker has had an interest in unifying common defense services since World War II. He remembers the false statements may by some service-oriented witnesses befor congressional committees after the establishment of the Air Force to the effect that "because of cooperation between the services there was very little duplication, and therefore very little unification needed."

The first real effort at unifying military supply efforts was during World War II when the "Army had been forced to establish the Army Service Forces to manage its common service functions. Post bellum pressure, however, caused Eisenhower (then Chief of Staff) to dissolve the ASF in 1946, thus permitting Ordnance, Engineers, Signal Corps, Chemical Corps, Quartermaster Corps, etc., to once again go their almost separate ways."

During the period 1951–52, the subcommittee of the House Expenditures Committee headed by Herbert C. Bonner, Democrat, of North Carolina, pressured the Defense Department into establishing a unified procurement and distribution system for medical and dental supplies.

Incoming Secretary Wilson, according to McCormack, gave in to pressure and dissolved the experimental single managership. McCormack protested Wilson's decision and demanded some action in other areas of common supplies and services.

At about this time, the Speaker reflects, the second Hoover Commission studied military mismanagement of common supplies, and the famous "Hamburger Hearings" under Congressman William L. Dawson, Democrat, of Illinois, took place.

In November 1955, according to McCormack, Wilson established under pressure common supply management "under the new name 'single manager' and took the much publicized subsistence area as the guinea pig."

THE 1949 ROADBLOCK

McCormack then demanded to know what Wilson was going to do with the medical supplies which had been handled the same way, and what the Secretary was going to do for other common commodities. Shortly thereafter Secretary Wilson began to announce single-managerships in many new areas.

Speaker McCormack, along with Representative Curtis, Senator Douglas and others began to realize the establishment of many single managerships would lead to implications and the need for combining these operations under a single control. The major problem with this idea, according to McCormack, was the provision in the 1949 amendment to the National Security Act which provided that there should be "'three departments separately administered—which was a barrier to any and every action across the board for improved management, as services could say they could not be separately administered if there were any type of standardization, consolidation or unification or anything."

The big lift to defense unification moves, according to McCormack came with President Eisenhower's bill to Congress in 1958 to reorganize the Defense Department.

When Representative Vinson asked McCormack's aid in getting the reorganization bill through the House, McCormack indicated that the bill would be much strengthened if an amendment drafted by McCormack and Curtis were added, which said:

"Whenever the Secretary of Defense determines it will be advantageous to the Government in terms of effectiveness, economy, or efficiency, he shall provide for the carrying out of any supply or service activity common to more than one military department by a single agency or such other organizational entities as he deems appropriate. For the purposes of this paragraph, any supply or service activity common to more than one military department shall not be considered a 'major combatant function.'"

This amendment effectively canceled the "three departments separately administered" language of the 1949 bill and effectively opened the way to put 60 percent of the annual DOD appropriation under central

control; and to last year's establishment of the Defense Supply Agency.

SCARE TALK

McCormack also approves McNamara's moves to unify other common services such as intelligence, recruiting, and special services. The McCormack-Curtis amendment also gave the Secretary of Defense the authority to make these moves. As to McNamara's future plans to revise the present structure of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Speaker notes that the 1958 reorganization law gives the Secretary of Defense power to make many changes without congressional approval.

He believes there may have been too much scare talk that a single chief would be a "man on horseback," and believes an "objective study must be made to determine the most effective staff organization to meet present and future needs."

How long the mutual admiration between the Speaker, who believes in Defense reorganization, and the Secretary of Defense, who is doing the reorganizing, will last only time will tell. Between them, they may change a lot of Defense landscape in the next few years.

Where Some of the Money Went—A Report on a National Defense Education Act Success Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the appropriation of Federal funds is not always synonymous with the phrase "wasteful spending," even though we are often accused of the latter every time we do the former. We are particularly subject to this kind of attack whenever we provide funds for improvement of the Nation's educational system and the quality of teaching.

I recently had called to my attention an article in the magazine the Suburban Educator, published by the St. Louis Suburban Teachers Association, on some of the summer institutes for modern language teachers conducted under the National Defense Education Act of 1958. The young man who wrote the article, a German language teacher in University City Senior High School in a congressional district adjoining mine, has participated in three National Defense Education Act summer institutes, twice as a student—at Colorado in 1959 and in Germany in 1960—and last summer as a member of the institute faculty at the Southern Illinois University National Defense Education Act German Institute. There, he made available to other German language teachers some of the things he learned during the two previous summers of study under the National Defense Education Act program.

Mr. Speaker, because of the strong interest among Members of Congress in the effectiveness of the programs we enact into law, and in the validity of the expenditures we authorize and appropriate funds to cover, I am submitting the article I referred to for inclusion in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a report on an National Defense Educational Act success story—what the opportunity can mean to a high school language instructor to work and study for a summer in a country where he is surrounded by those speaking the language he teaches.

I was happy to support the original National Defense Education Act of 1958. I think it deserves broadening. Consequently, I was delighted to read this article in the Suburban Educator of last year on the experiences of Mr. Wallace G. Klein as a participant in the Stanford Advanced German Institute at Bad Boll, Germany, in the summer of 1960, as follows:

[From the Suburban Educator]

SUMMER INSTITUTE IN GERMANY FOR AMERICAN LANGUAGE TEACHERS PROVES REWARDING

(By Wallace G. Klein, University City Senior High School)

(NOTE.—The author of this article is a teacher of German at University City Senior High School, University City, Mo. In 1959 he attended one of the first modern language institutes under the National Defense Education Act at the University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo. This year he was selected to attend the Stanford Advanced German Institute at Bad Boll, Germany. Using materials and tapes produced by the materials development committee of the modern language association, he is putting into practice in a pilot class of beginning German the techniques demonstrated at these institutes.)

He's coming. He's here. Four automobiles swung sharply into the courtyard; the local police snapped to attention; cameras clicked in every window. Out of the second car, the one with the eagle pennant on the right fender, stepped a pleasant, smiling white-haired gentleman, Bundespräsident Lübke. After being greeted by the local citizenry, Mr. Lübke was warmly received by the members of the Stanford Advanced German Institute, who had been his guests just 3 weeks before at his official residence in Bonn.

The return visit by the President of the West German Federal Republic was undoubtedly the most exciting of many high points of the Stanford Summer Institute, a history-making venture made possible by the National Defense Education Act. Under the direction of F. W. Strothmann, chairman of the department of modern languages, Stanford University, 78 American secondary school teachers of German made full use of an excellent opportunity to practice and improve their command of the language they teach to American students at home. Coming from 24 States, the 78 were selected from over 300 applicants. Because this was an advanced institute, most were graduates of last summer's institutes in Colorado, Maine, Michigan, New York, South Dakota, Texas, and Washington.

Almost a year of planning by Professor Strothmann and his associates paved the way for the amazingly smooth operation of the undertaking. In addition to classes in applied linguistics, composition, and language-teaching materials and methods conducted by American instructors, we had conversation and pronunciation classes directed by native German instructors. Lectures in German by qualified experts provided material for discussion of such topics as German education, Naziism and how it came about, the present German constitution and government, and the German picture of America. We teachers were also given an on-the-spot briefing on the Berlin situation during a 6-day stay there which included a visit to the East Sector of Berlin (and a warning about which subways and trains not to take to avoid landing in the East Zone of Germany).

The institute enabled us to learn firsthand about the cultural heritage of Germany. Classes were held 4 days a week, and long weekends were devoted to trips which, thanks to the planning of the institute staff, were filled with worthwhile cultural experiences. It would be difficult to say which was the most memorable sight, the hand-carved wooden Marienalter of Tilman Riemenschneider in Creglingen, the medieval cities of Rothenburg and Dinkelsbuhl, or the magnificent baroque Wieskirche, to name a few. Undoubtedly two of the cultural highlights of the trip were the Mozart concert in the charming rococo theater of the Schwetzingen Palace and the Max Reinhardt production of Faust on the church steps in Schwabisch-Hall.

Because the German schools were in session until the latter part of July, it was possible for each of us to visit a school in Berlin and in Stuttgart and to observe the classroom procedure for at least half a day. During these visits we not only asked questions ourselves but were queried by the students about school life in America. Afterward we invited our German teacher colleagues to a boat trip on the Spree, during which we exchanged ideas, language practice, and an abundance of international good will. We found personal contacts such as this exceedingly important. At the Evangelische Akademie at Bad Boll, a well-known German conference center near Stuttgart, we were not only comfortably housed but also had an excellent opportunity to speak German, learn about the German people, and strengthen the ties of German-American friendship. How amazed our German friends were when we sang German folk songs and frequently knew more verses than they.

At the invitation of the West German Government we traveled to Cologne and Bonn, stopping on the way to see the ruins of the castle at Heidelberg with its view of the Neckar Valley. A visit to the inspiring Cologne Cathedral, a viewing of the recent archeological excavations in that city, and a commanding view of the Rhine Valley from the heights of the Drachenfels were among the other tourist attractions we enjoyed. We will certainly remember the gaiety of the evening we sang and danced with German guests under the candle-lit, vaulted ceiling of the Gürzenich Keller. (A few of us have the memory of the motherly German woman who was so relieved to have German-speaking guests in her pension that she could not do enough for us and wept when we presented her with a small farewell gift.)

Our first meeting with the German President took place in Bonn. The reception at the Villa Hammerschmidt began with the proper observance of all formalities and protocol, but these soon disappeared as President and Mrs. Lübke mingled with us for about an hour and engaged small groups of us in very friendly conversation. These very cordial, informal chats led to the discovery that the President would be in Stuttgart on a later weekend and would be interested in visiting us at our headquarters and in hearing what we had learned during our 8-week stay in Germany. And so his return visit was arranged and took place as scheduled. After leaving Bonn we traveled part way up the Rhine by steamer, taking in the beautiful scenery, photographing the castles and ruins which dot the landscape, watching for the legendary Mäuseturm (Mouse Tower) and Loreley rock, and singing Rheinlieder.

A week later the President of Germany was our dinner guest at Bad Boll. Naturally,

we felt honored that he was willing to devote so much of his valuable time to our group. In his discussion with us he stressed the importance of the exchange of cultural and spiritual ideas by means of personal contacts as well as through books. He expressed particular interest in our work as language teachers and our desire to stress the spoken language, confessing that his early study of English had not been sufficient to enable him to carry on official business without the aid of an interpreter. (Mrs. Lübke, incidentally, is a student of six languages.)

President Lübke sounded us out on our impressions of Germany and, when we praised the scenery and hospitality of his country, insisted that we express our criticisms as well as our likes. He himself pointed out that Germany's amazing economic recovery and ample consumer goods had made many Germans too satisfied with their material well-being and less sensitive to the need for spiritual development and to the problems of the rest of the world. He concluded by asking us to return to our communities as witnesses to the fact that the German people are no better and no worse than any other and that those who are in positions of leadership in Germany are committed to fostering a democratic Germany whose future is irrevocably bound to the peaceful progress of the Western World.

Our students should certainly benefit from the wonderful opportunity we had to practice our German, to learn firsthand about German culture, past and present, to gather useful materials for our classrooms. Equally important, however, is the good will toward America which our visit fostered. Some Germans resent the fact that many Americans stationed in Germany make no effort to learn the language and live almost completely in their "Little America," rather than mingle with German families. Our group acted much to the contrary. One German woman said, "My contact with these teachers has forced me to change all my old ideas about Americans." Commenting on the fact that we even spoke German among ourselves, another German complimented our behavior in a restaurant and said, "I thought you were a bunch of visiting German tourists from somewhere else." Let us hope that these institutes will be continued so that other teachers may have an opportunity to profit from the experience and to contribute to this feeling of international good will.

P.S.—The Office of Education has just announced that another institute will be held at Bad Boll for German teachers and that advanced institutes will also be set up in France and Russia this summer.

W.G.K.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include leletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

World Protest to Soviet Nuclear Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the world finds itself—unless a new globally acceptable formula for disarmament can be discovered—on the way to a more costly and deadly arms race of the future.

If this is allowed to happen, it will enhance the risk of nuclear war, increase the dangers to humanity from radioactive fallout, and heighten tensions in an already high tension world.

Yesterday, I was privileged to review some factors which I believe could make a constructive contribution to progress in arms control and reduction.

I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from my statement printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY, OF WISCONSIN

Around the globe 3 billion people have a great stake—survival, itself—in the nuclear arms race into which Mr. Khrushchev is now propelling the world.

As in the past, the United States has clearly stated its willingness—yes, eagerness—to ban nuclear tests—if the Soviets would agree on realistic steps for arms control.

Unfortunately, the Soviet Premier, dedicated not to peace, but to world conquest, will endorse no such goal. Instead the Kremlin leader now threatens to step up the arms race; for example, by possible further nuclear bomb tests in the atmosphere in addition to the series exploded last fall.

As a policy, this flagrant disregard for peace and the safety of humanity enhances the risk of a nuclear war; increases the dangers to humanity from radioactive fallout; and heightens tensions in an already high-tension world.

The number one concern, of course, is the survival and safety of humanity. Secondarily, however, there is a universal responsibility for discontinuing the immoral dissipation of human and natural resources through expanding quickly obsolescent arms programs.

The people of the world have a right; in fact a responsibility, to cry out in protest against Khrushchev's devil's advocate policy leading toward ever greater waste of God-given resources, and perhaps extinction.

Reportedly, Mr. Khrushchev may now be willing to agree to minister-level talks on disarmament. During the more than 350 previous sessions on arms control, however, there has been lots of talk, talk, talk, but very little positive action. Regretably, the willingness again to talk has not been accompanied by a compromising attitude that holds out promise for reaching realistic agreements.

Recently, I recommended that the U.N. hold a special session, if necessary, to create a workable formula for control and reduction of arms. Recognizing the great stake in the arms race, I believe that such a special session of the U.N.—concentrated upon making a realistic progress toward halting the arms race would be well justified. The specific steps would include the following:

1. The U.N. Disarmament Commission would be given the responsibility—and a deadline—for crystallizing and presenting major alternative proposals to the General Assembly; and

2. The General Assembly would, then, meet in a special session to "hammer out" a workable program.

In accordance with reason and logic, the U.N. would, I believe, find it not only desirable—but essential—to endorse safeguarded inspection for any realistic program—the principal roadblock to East-West agreement. Acceptance of this principle by a majority of nations would pull the rug out from under the Soviet position.

The establishment of universally recognized standards of disarmament, of course, would not assure automatic compliance by all nations. Nevertheless, the adoption of a fundamentally sound program would: (1) Give direction and guidance to—and set goals for arms reduction and control; (2) clearly and distinctly point a finger at Communist—or other—nations that attempt to roadblock progress; and (3) provide encouragement for greater dedication of manpower and resources by nations—individually, and collectively—to disarmament.

Recognizing that the wheels of the U.N. grind exceedingly slow, however, I believe the people of the world—individually and nationally—should also now raise their voices in protest to Soviet policy. If this were done, it would help to: focus blame—where blame is due—for lack of fruitful negotiations on disarmament: on the Soviet Union; exert great moral pressures of the world on the Soviet Union; and forge a stronger bond between peoples dedicated to real progress toward disarmament and peace.

Aid for the Nondemocratic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the New York Times, of January 17, 1962, is one of the most succinct and basic statements I have seen on why the United States must not adopt a policy which would cut off all aid to nondemocratic countries.

I hope that this article will be widely read and earnestly considered in Congress and by the American public. The issue of aid not only to new nations, but also to some of the older nations of Europe which are not free of Soviet domination but whose people have never lost their aspirations for the freedom and liberties of democracy is constantly before us. I believe that the points established in the New York Times editorial are basic facts which we must not leave out of our considerations and action as we fight for peace and freedom in the world:

AID FOR THE NONDEMOCRATIC

To aid or not to aid is one of the knotty questions U.S. Congressmen are facing. Senators GORE, HART, and NEUBERGER, all first-rank liberals fresh from a study mission to Africa, warn the administration against extending aid to newly independent nations that do not respect "basic rights and freedoms."

Their hearts are in the right place but, in this case, not their judgment. Of course, the United States does not want to help regimes that commit themselves irrevocably to dictatorial polices of a totalitarian nature. We do want to give the fullest eccouragement to governments that are trying to lay the foundations for real democracy.

But what about governments—in Africa, the Middle East, Asia, and Latin America—that are not democracies today but that aspire to achieve democracy in the future? What about governments that might or might not end up as democracies if we and other Western nations are patient and helpful? What about governments that we could feel fairly certain would commit themselves to the Communist bloc if we turn our backs on them?

We live in a dangerous, uncertain world nowadays. The newly independent nations of Africa are floundering. They do not have populations or politicians trained to Western styles of politics. They do not have adequate civil services, or administrators, or traditions that would help them make speedily and effectively the difficult transition from tribal life to modern independence.

The three Senators singled out Ghana, where the United States is committed to help build a hydroelectric project on the Volta River. As an article in Sunday's New York Times magazine by our correspondent Henry Tanner pointed out, Ghana's President Kwame Nkrumah has developed dictatorial tendencies very quickly. He has cast sheep's eyes toward Moscow. This is too bad; but it is not very surprising nor is it a development that need forever condemn Ghana to an antidemocratic regime. At least, it need not do so if we display some patience and persuasion. But Ghana would probably be driven further into the Communist camp if the United States should back down on economic aid.

The basic purpose of our assistance is not to force the underdeveloped countries into our own image, but, as the President has repeatedly made clear, to help them maintain their own freedom and independence from foreign control. There will be an interim period in which these countries will have to find themselves as they establish their own governmental institutions; and if we can assist them to do so along democratic lines, so much the better. But while we certainly want to help embryonic democracies, this does not mean that we have to cut off all aid to nondemocracies. That would be the surest way to block their progress toward freedom.

Pawnee Buttes, Colo., as Site for New National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, this administration has shown a commendable interest in the expansion of outdoor recreational opportunities for the Nation's rapidly growing population. Visits to national parks have increased in recent years at a rate far more rapid than the increase in our numbers as a people.

Among the splendid national parks, however, there are none at this time which preserve for posterity the natural majesty of the Great Plains. There is now an effort being made to create a national park in the tall grass region of eastern Kansas, to be sure. But in the true Great Plains area—the region west of the 100th meridian, where climate and natural environment are distinctly different from other parts of the United States—there is need for a national park, or at the very least, a national monument.

This is the region of short grass and low rainfall, where the buffalo and later the longhorned cattle once grazed. It has a stark grandeur and a balance of nature peculiarly its own. Future generations of Americans should be given the opportunity to experience and enjoy the wonders of this region.

An ideal site for a Great Plains National Park, it has been pointed out, is the Pawnee Buttes area of my State of Colorado. Unlike most of the region, its natural condition has not been much disturbed by the plow, the barbed wire fence and other encroachments of human habitation. Key areas of Pawnee Buttes are already in public ownership—administered by the Forest Service as a part of the National Grasslands. Local ranchers need not be dispossessed and moved out in order to create a new national park on the site.

I called this matter to the attention of the Secretary of the Interior last summer, and we have been in contact about it ever since then. An excellent report on Pawnee Buttes has been prepared and submitted to the Secretary by a distinguished citizen of my State, Dr. Robert L. Stearns, who is a former president of the University of Colorado and of the Boettcher Foundation, and is a member of the National Parks Advisory Board.

Regional interest in the subject has been growing steadily. The Greeley Tribune, a conservative and respected daily newspaper in the area, has given editorial support for a Pawnee Buttes National Park. The Rotary Club of Sterling, another nearby city, has heartily endorsed the idea. Unlike the situation at certain other prospective national park sites, there has been no objection by local residents or by business interests—in fact, quite the contrary.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my correspondence with the Secretary of the Interior on the subject of Pawnee Buttes, together with news articles from the Denver Post and the Greeley Tribune, an editorial from the Greeley Tribune, a recent resolution by the Sterling Rotary Club and an article from the Washington Post of March 3, entitled, "The Great Out of Doors."

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 25, 1961.

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR STEW: For years people in the Great Plains region have talked of the creation of a Great Plains National Monument.

Recently the tempo of this talk has accelerated. More interest is being shown.

The people of the High Plains have been thinking in terms of setting aside some Federal land to preserve the natural charm and beauty of typical plants, animals, birds and sunlit land in the semiarid plains that have played such a historical part in the colonization of the western half of the United States.

In connection with this, an article appeared in the Empire magazine section of the Denver Post on August 13, recommending that an area in northeastern Colorado called Pawnee Buttes be declared a national monument to the Great Plains.

Without necessarily endorsing Pawnee Buttes as the only likely site in Colorado for a Great Plains National Monument, may I suggest that you have the Interior Department staff study the proposal made by Mr. J. V. K. Wagar in his Denver Post article.

With warmest personal regards.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. CARROLL.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., October 6, 1961.

DEAR SENATOR CARROLL: Your letter of August 25 suggested that someone from the Department of the Interior study the national monument possibilities of the Pawnee Buttes area in northeastern Colorado.

Although National Park Service officials have studied this area in the past, I have asked them to reevaluate the site as soon as they can. As you perhaps know, they have undertaken a study of the whole Mixed Prairie in order to identify those sites which are of national significance and are also suitable for addition to the national park system. Progress has not been as rapid on the overall investigation as they had hoped because of other study commitments, but they now contemplate its completion during 1962. Pawnee Buttes was scheduled for consideration in conjunction with this study. However, a specific area study of the Pawnee Buttes grassland will now be moved up.

Dr. Robert Stearns, who is a member of the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments, will be invited to participate in this investigation. Also I hope to be in Colorado soon and plan to see the Pawnee Buttes area if at all possible.

We appreciate your interest in the national park system and will let you know just as soon as we know the dates of the study.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, November 22, 1961.

DEAR JOHN: I thought you would be interested in perusing the enclosed preliminary report which was submitted to me by our mutual friend, Bob Stearns, of Denver, who, as you know, is a member of my Advisory Board on National Parks.

Please return the report and enclosures when you are finished.

Sincerely,

STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

DENVER, COLO.,
December 6, 1961.

Hon. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR "STEW": Many thanks for letting me see the interesting and excellent report which Bob Stearns submitted to you about the Pawnee Buttes area. I will undoubtedly be in touch with you later on this proposed Great Plains National Monument, and I am pleased to have the benefit of Bob's reaction to it.

The material is returned herewith as you requested.

Warm personal regards.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. CARROLL.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. JOHN A. CARROLL,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CARROLL: Secretary Udall has referred to us your letter of December 6, 1961, and Dr. Robert Stearns' report of November 15, 1961, covering his visit to the Pawnee Buttes area with representatives of the National Park Service.

We are hoping to increase our efforts this summer to locate the most outstanding remaining areas of mixed prairie from which we might propose one as an addition to the national park system. We will keep the Pawnee Buttes area very much in mind during this investigation. The excellent analysis of Dr. Stearns will assist us in our evaluation.

We shall, of course, keep you informed as to the progress and results of our studies.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT W. LUDDEN,
Acting Assistant Director.

[From the Greeley Tribune, Sept. 30, 1961]

STUDY TO BE MADE OF PAWNEE BUTTES AS NATIONAL PARK

WASHINGTON.—The Pawnee Buttes area in Colorado will be studied as a potential national park, Senator JOHN A. CARROLL, Democrat, of Colorado, said Saturday.

CARROLL said the Park Service will study the area in northeastern Weld County at the order of Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall.

CARROLL asked that the study be made after Udall suggested last spring that a third park in Colorado may be justified. The State now has Rocky Mountain and Mesa Verde National Parks.

The Senator's interest was stimulated by an article by J. V. K. Wagar, Colorado State University professor, who described the buttes as "towering like two great rocky ships rising above a sea of gramma and buffalo grasses, capped by waves of yucca."

[From the Denver Post, Oct. 1, 1961]

PAWNEE BUTTES MAY BE PARK

WASHINGTON.—The Pawnee Buttes area in northeastern Weld County, Colo., is soon to be looked into by the National Park Service as a possible national park, Senator JOHN

A. CARROLL, Democrat, of Colorado, has been informed.

This site, Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall told CARROLL, offers interesting possibilities as a potential Great Plains National Park.

Pawnee Buttes had been called to Udall's attention by CARROLL in a letter he wrote the Secretary August 25 following the appearance of an article in the Denver Post's Empire magazine by J. V. K. Wagar, professor at Colorado State University at Fort Collins.

In his letter to Udall, CARROLL emphasized that other areas might be equally or more suitable but suggested that a careful study be made of Pawnee Buttes.

The area in question is south and slightly east of the point where the borders of Wyoming and Nebraska meet with the northern Colorado line.

Most of it is little used shortgrass country now part of the national grasslands administered by the U.S. Forest Service.

[From the Greeley (Colo.) Tribune, Oct. 2, 1961]

GOOD NEWS ABOUT PAWNEE BUTTES

Persons interested in conserving and promoting the scenery and the natural and historic objects of Weld County were no doubt pleased with the anouncement by Senator JOHN A. CARROLL that Pawnee Buttes will be studied as a potential national park.

As pointed out in the Associated Press story from Washington, CARROLL's interest in the buttes, located in northeast Weld, was stimulated by a recent article in the Empire section of the Denver Post. That article, written by J. V. K. Wagar, Colorado State University professor, was discussed in this column.

CARROLL requested the study of Pawnee Buttes after Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall suggested last spring that a third park in Colorado might be justified.

Considered one of the scenic and geologic wonders of the Great Plains, Pawnee Buttes certainly deserve consideration if Colorado is to have another national park in addition to Mesa Verde and Rocky Mountain National Parks.

One of the world's richest fossil areas, the gigantic natural monuments were visited as early as 1873 by scientific expeditions. It was there that much work was done on the evolution of the camel and the horse.

This scientific background, along with the geologic wonders of Pawnee Buttes, no doubt would fascinate many a traveler.

RESOLUTION OF THE STERLING ROTARY CLUB, STERLING, COLO., FEBRUARY 22, 1962

Whereas there has not been any portion of the Great Plains area of the United States set aside to be preserved in its natural condition;

Whereas, if much longer delayed, additional difficulties will be encountered in obtaining suitable area with sufficient acreage;

Whereas there is in northeastern Weld County, Colo., a logical site containing most of the geological, botanical, and wildlife specimens native to the Great Plains: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Rotary Club of Sterling, Colo., go on record urging proper authorities to proceed with due process for the establishing of a Great Plains national monument or park to include the Pawnee Buttes and surrounding area of about 10,000 acres or so much as may be deemed adequate for the purpose above mentioned.

That a certified copy of this resolution be sent to the Governor of Colorado; to each of Colorado's Senators and Congressmen; to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Director of National Parks.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 3, 1962]

THE GREAT OUT OF DOORS

President Kennedy's message on conservation is an impressive outline of policy in a very important field. Interest will doubtless be centered in his proposals for broadening the Nation's recreation facilities. The chief thrust of the message comes from its appeal for new national parks to be financed by a self-liquidating arrangement.

Taking note of increased leisure and greater demands for open-air recreation, the administration is moving to provide the facilities before it is too late. The 341 million visits to Federal land and water areas in 1960 are expected to double by 1970 and to increase fivefold by the year 2000. To meet this vast demand, the President would authorize advances from the Treasury up to $500 million as a land conservation fund. Part of the fund would be used to purchase land for the Point Reyes National Seashore in California, the Great Basin National Park in Nevada, the Ozark Rivers National Monument in Missouri, Sagamore Hill National Historic Site in New York, Canyonlands National Park in Utah, Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in Michigan, Prairie National Park in Kansas, Padre Island National Seashore in Texas, and the National Lakeshore Area in northern Indiana.

The President offers a practical method of replenishing the land conservation fund through admission and user fees, sale of surplus Federal nonmilitary lands, and so forth. It is reasonable to ask the people who take advantage of the national parks system to pay the cost of its maintenance and extension. But the Government cannot wait until capital accumulates from these sources to finance its acquisition of new park lands. In many instances delay would greatly increase the cost of the land or render it unsuitable for recreation purposes. By creating the proposed fund Congress can serve the interests both of economy and of conservation.

Suggested also is a program of matching grants to encourage the States to provide more outdoor recreation. Surplus Federal lands would be turned over to the States for recreational use, where desirable, under a proposed amendment to the Federal Surplus Property Disposal Act. The President also asks once more for a study of the country's ocean, lake, and river shorelines and for enactment of the wilderness bill.

In line with the recent report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, the President will create an Outdoor Recreation Advisory Council and a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. Viewed as a whole, these projects are a formidable undertaking. It is a pity, however, that the White House did not include another recreational project of great importance to this area—the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal Historical Park.

Red Setbacks in Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I submitted for the RECORD earlier today a recent New York Times' editorial which pointed out that the surest way to block the progress of nondemocracies toward freedom is for our Nation to adopt a policy which would cut off all aid to such nations. I now submit for the RECORD the following article by news foreign analyst, Russell Barnes, writing for the Detroit News, which vividly illustrates in the case of Guinea, Africa, the validity of the Times viewpoint and of our present foreign policy considerations in this regard.

RED SETBACKS IN AFRICA

(By Russell Barnes)

It need hardly be expected, but some Soviet writer could write a good book called "The Ugly Russian," based on recent Soviet foreign aid and political failures in Africa.

Persons who think the United States has been doing a bad job in Africa—allowing the Communists to capture the Dark Continent by default—should take a look at the Russian record in Africa.

The most recent Soviet setback has been in Guinea, a Negro state about half again as large as Michigan on the west coast. It is a rather primitive country with 3 million population, but with favorable prospects. It has possibly the world's largest deposits of bauxite, also diamonds.

Guinea was formerly French. But when President de Gaulle in 1958 offered French oversea possessions independence or membership in the French Community, Guinea chose independence. It was the only French territory in Africa to reject the Community.

RED-TRAINED LEADER

The big reason was undoubtedly Sekou Toure, the Guinea nationalist leader. French-educated, Communist-trained Toure, a labor leader who learned his trade in France, chose to take Guinea out of the French Community and to organize what he called a neutralist republic on the African west coast.

The African Marxist proceeded to run his country through a Communist-style single party and a political bureau. He concluded trade pacts with four Communist countries. He gave Western visitors a frigid reception. He traveled extensively behind the Iron Curtain. Guinea seemingly had become a Communist bridgehead in Africa.

But then last month Toure turned against the Reds. Soviet Ambassador David Solod suddenly left Guinea. Solod is understood to be one of the leading Soviet African specialists, and to have engineered the first Red arms deal with Egypt. But unconfirmed reports say Toure requested Solod's withdrawal.

That theory is substantiated by the fact that Toure in a public speech declared he had definite proof that the officials of a certain Eastern bloc embassy had been engaged in a deliberate incitement of students to pressure Guinea into joining the Communist bloc.

MIKOYAN REBUFFED

In further substantiation of the theory the Russians have fouled their net in Guinea, Soviet Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan, the Kremlin trouble shooter, flew down to Conakry this week. His aim was presumably to smooth over Soviet-Guinea relations in the wake of the sudden departure of Solod. But Mikoyan seemingly didn't succeed.

Speaking in Mikoyan's presence at the opening of a Russian commercial exposition, Toure bluntly asserted that while Guinea will accept aid from any country on a footing of equality, Guinea refuses to be drawn into choosing sides in a power struggle between world blocs.

But in addition to being caught organizing demonstrations against Toure's government, Conakry observers say the ugly Russians also alienated Guinea by:

Unloading on Guinea a million East German screwdrivers—one for every three persons in a country mostly of mud huts stuck together without screws.

Shipping to Guinea thousands of heavy machines, including two snowplows, although the average year-round temperature is 85°.

Landing about 35,000 pieces of bathroom equipment, either sinks or toilet bowls, with no purchasers. Few Guinea homes have running water.

Sending to Guinea technical advisers who do not speak either French or English.

The Russians seem to have bungled their opportunities in Guinea as much or more than Americans have in other parts of the world.

The Soviets have also been failing in other parts of Africa.

African specialists watching the situation in the Dark Continent say that the Communist failure to make friends and influence people in Africa can be ascribed to:

The widening ideological breech between Moscow and Peiping resulting in different approaches by Russia and Communist China to Africa, which have been mutually destructive.

The failure of the Russians, in particular, to understand the African mind.

CONGO COLLAPSE

The first big setback to Soviet fortunes in Africa occurred a year ago in the Congo. Moscow had put its money on Oriental Province Leader Patrice Lumumba. When Lumumba was murdered last February 12, it was a serious blow.

But the Reds shifted their support to Antoine Gizenga, Lumumba's deputy. But now Gizenga seems to have let them down. This week a strong effort was being made to oust Gizenga as president of the African Solidarity Party. The Adoula central governor was also pressing Gizenga to return to Leopoldville to carry out his duties as first Premier of the Congolese Central Government.

The evidence indicates Soviet hopes of taking over the Congo have collapsed.

In Egypt, in the northeastern corner of the African Continent, reports have spread of Russian-Egyptian frictions, first, because of President Nasser's harassment of Egyptian Communists and, second, because Russian progress on the Aswan High Dam has reportedly not come up to Cairo's expectations.

But this week Egyptian officials and members of a Russian mission in Egypt denied there had been friction.

On balance, the United States would seem to be doing a better job in Africa than Russia.

National Conference of Christians and Jews—Brotherhood Week Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a couple of weeks ago a friend of many Senators, Mr. Edward H. Foley, formerly Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, delivered an excellent address at the National Conference of Christians and Jews Brotherhood Week dinner. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of his remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY E. H. FOLEY AT NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS BROTHERHOOD WEEK DINNER, FEBRUARY 19, 1962, SHERATON PARK HOTEL

May I express the heartfelt thanks of the President, myself, and our distinguished guests for your generous support of this important effort to make the brotherhood of man under God a practiced reality as well as a professed ideal.

The name of this gathering—the National Conference of Christians and Jews—is a formal name for an informal and enrichening process which has been in progress for 20 centuries. The Judaic-Christian concept of freedom for the individual, respect for other individuals, and the worthwhileness of individual effort—all born of the first perception by the Jewish prophets of one benevolent God—is the underpinning of Western civilization. We and our ancestors have come so far together on this main road that we almost forgot what is so obvious to our common enemies of the totalitarian atheistic world—that our differences are de minimis compared to our identity of common heritage.

The God of that Judaic-Christian tradition who created all men bestowed upon none a monopoly of His grace or of His wisdom. In the mighty mountain range of our common culture and our common life, no race, no creed is without its mountain peak of radiant individual genius—all guides of the path we have come together and must continue to travel together. Moses and Christ, Newton and Einstein, Saint Patrick and Isaiah, Dante and Spinoza, Burbank and George Washington Carver, Horace Mann, and Booker T. Washington, mountain peaks of Western culture, belong to all of us, and are a part of our common pride and hope.

Your support of the National Conference of Christians and Jews comes at a time of creative breakthrough in the intellectual and spiritual history of the United States. Many forget that this organization was founded by Newton D. Baker, Charles Evans Hughes, and Roger Straus, after the prejudice that erupted in the defeat of Gov. Al Smith, in the hope that 1928 would never happen again—to try to insure that this Nation would gladly accept into the direction of the state, capacity of any race, creed, section, or color, that in the trials these founders saw ahead this Nation would always be able to mobilize its full resources of ability. Organized civilization never had as much ability as it needs; these farseeing founders were concerned not only with social justice but with the survival of free government as well.

Tonight's meeting sees the fulfillment in practice of that hope on which the organization was founded; a national administration in which free government denies itself no ability available to it.

John F. Kennedy was neither given nor deprived of the responsibility of the Presidency because of his religion. He won it by convincing his party and his country that he had the ability to organize a successful party and to become a brilliant President.

Arthur Goldberg and Abraham Ribicoff were not picked for the Cabinet because they were Jews, but because they were the most highly qualified for their most difficult tasks in labor and human welfare.

Robert Weaver in the Cabinet will have been chosen not because of his race but because of his experience and ability in the problems of population shifts of 20th century civilization.

Our speaker tonight is a Mormon, a member of a religious minority which has known misunderstanding, fear, hatred, and oppression. Today he sits in the Cabinet, as before him sat Ezra Taft Benson, a member of that same once persecuted religious minority.

We are on the right track at last, spiritually and intellectually—not only treating each of God's children for what he has made of himself, regardless of his religion or race, but also giving our embattled Western civilization its maximum strength to respond to its challenge of today. For in the battle against atheistic totalitarianism, social justice, and the survival of free government are indistinguishable.

Always in the darkest hours over the span of 2,000 years, first in Europe, then in the English-speaking worlds, God has sent us leaders. In this moment of eternity when He has passed to the English-speaking peoples the responsibility for the defense of His tradition He has already given us Churchill and Roosevelt. The test of our own worthiness as well as a capacity to survive is whether under new leadership we can respond to the challenge of our times as wholeheartedly and as highheartedly as our fathers before us.

It is more than as an American, it is as a proud heir of the whole Judaic-Christian tradition that I give you as a champion in the mold of these forebearers, the man we honor here tonight, the President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Ladies and gentlemen, I propose a toast to our President.

And now it is my great privilege to present to you a devout and patriotic American, a devoted family man, and a dedicated public servant, the national chairman of Brotherhood Week, the Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Stewart L. Udall.

Lure of Summit Hooks Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD an article which appeared in the March 4, 1962, edition of the Washington Post, by Roscoe Drummond, "Khrushchev Calls the Tune" or "Lure of the Summit Hooks Kennedy."

KHRUSHCHEV CALLS THE TUNE—LURE OF SUMMIT HOOKS KENNEDY

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The lure of the summit seems irresistible. Khrushchev calls and we answer—first with a no, next with a maybe, then a virtual yes.

President Kennedy is already caught in the toils of a presummit dialog with Premier Khrushchev from which I doubt he can extricate himself. Whether he knows it or not, he is hooked. Yet he always affirmed he would not let himself get hooked.

From the day he took office, Mr. Kennedy said he was not going to get trapped into the mistake of going to an unprepared negotiating summit conference. After the personal, get-acquainted meeting with Khrushchev in Vienna last spring, the President was more than ever convinced that the summit was the wrong place to start trying to resolve any of the great disputes which make up the cold war, and that an unprepared summit meeting is worse than no meeting at all.

Now, it seems to me, Mr. Kennedy, is in exactly the position he said he was going to avoid; he is more than halfway to an unprepared summit, and there is no visible way to turn back. Here is how it happened:

The President proposed to Khrushchev that the foreign ministers go to Geneva to open the 18-nation Disarmament Conference March 14.

Mr. K. countered with the suggestion that the Disarmament Conference be turned into an 18-nation summit, that all heads of government attend.

Mr. Kennedy replied with his usual caveat. A summit conference should be prepared in order to be useful. If there is no advance evidence that it is going to be useful, it ought not to be held. He said that progress on disarmament could provide that evidence.

Then he went further. He mentioned a date for a summit. He said he hoped for such a meeting by June 1—if disarmament talks showed progress. By proposing a summit date the President weakens his stand that there must be no summit without adequate preparation.

And now British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan has further undercut Mr. Kennedy's reservation. Mr. Kennedy has said there was one condition which would have to be met for a summit: progress in the disarmament talks. Macmillan added another condition: lack of progress in the disarmament talks.

And here we are—with the President nearly full cycle around and facing a summit which will be hard to avoid under any circumstances. Between them Mr. Kennedy and Macmillan have named two opposite conditions which would justify a summit—progress or lack of progress at Geneva, either one.

This means that, in effect, we are giving to Khrushchev almost total initiative to determine whether and under what circumstances a summit will be brought into being.

I am not at all suggesting that negotiations with the Soviet Union on our great differences are improper or undesirable. They are entirely in order.

But I point out that postwar negotiations between Russia and the West have been successfully conducted only by the foreign ministers or Ambassadors.

Lack of success has always marked the attempted summits which have turned out to be either a negotiating failure or a propaganda circus.

If President Kennedy was right—as I believe he was—in insisting that a summit must be preceded by some advance evidence of attainable agreement, he is venturing on very dangerous ground to water down this precondition.

Influences in the Life of Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD one of the best and most interesting speeches I have ever read on the life of Abraham Lincoln. I am especially proud of it as it was delivered by my very good friend and neighbor in my home town, Roy A. Holand, of La Moure, N. Dak., to the Lions Club at Kulm, N. Dak., on February 20.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INFLUENCES IN THE LIFE OF LINCOLN

(By Roy A. Holand)

Mr. Chairman and friends, during the month of February, our thoughts as Americans turn to the lives of two of our great Americans whose birthdays we celebrate this month, George Washington and Abraham Lincoln. It is well that we pause amidst our work and pleasures to reflect upon their lives. While each of these men lived in a time quite different from today, yet they offer us lessons and guides for our individual and national lives that are well worth reviewing. This evening I would like to think with you about Abraham Lincoln.

In giving a talk about Lincoln, it is sometimes difficult to know just what to talk about. This is so not because of any lack of information on his life, but rather because of the abundance of material about him. Perhaps no personality of history other than the Christ has had so much written about him as has Lincoln. It is easy in speaking of him to give timeworn and oft-repeated stories and platitudes about him. I hope that some of the things I will say will be new to you or at least may be presented in a different light.

In speaking of Lincoln, the first thought that comes to mind is that of a self-made man. To a considerable extent this was true. As a youth he had little opportunity for schooling. In fact, during his entire life he did not attend school for more than 12 months. His education had to be gained on his own initiative. Then later Lincoln spent the greatest part of his life in the profession of law, at which he became an outstanding practitioner. A good case could be made for his being called a self-made lawyer. He never saw the inside of a lawschool either before his law practice or during it. Then Lincoln became one of our great presidents, but he had little actual experience in government before his ascendency to the presidency. Yes, one could build a good case for his being called a self-made man, and a great one at that. But there were certain persons and forces that had a great influence upon the shaping of the life of Abraham Lincoln. Today, I would like to think, with you, about some of the influences that helped shape his life, and to then recall the kind of man they caused him to become.

Perhaps the greatest influences in the life of Lincoln took place during his youth. The great humility of this man is but characteristic of his birth and the circumstances of his youth. How anyone could be born into a more humble home than was Abraham Lincoln, is difficult to imagine. His father, Thomas Lincoln, was illiterate except for his being able to scribble his name and to read simple things. Thomas was a migrant, without sustained industry and unable to support himself and his family. Abraham's natural mother, Nancy, came from a supposedly illiterate and superstitious family. In spite of her background she was able to read and write, but what she lacked in social heritage and education she more than made up in kindness and motherly love. No doubt the innate kindness that was born into Abraham was given its first encouragement from his mother, Nancy. It was of her that Lincoln was speaking when later in life he said that all he was and ever hoped to be he owed to his angel mother. After the passing of Nancy Lincoln, while Abraham was still a boy, Thomas Lincoln remarried. Abraham's stepmother, Sarah, was also to have a helpful influence upon his life. Here we have examples of two women who exercised great influence upon the course of history. I am sure that neither of them, at the time, ever suspected that her life could ever be meaningful, much less famous.

Another factor in the early life of Lincoln which strangely helped shape him into the great man he was to become, was the poverty surrounding his birth and much of his early life. At first this may seem contradictory to state that being born into such a poverty stricken home could be a factor ultimately making for his greatness. While Lincoln might have been a great man if he had been born into wealth, yet he did not allow the destitution of his youth and early life to deter him from achieving greatness. Certainly few persons have lived under more poverty stricken circumstances than did Lincoln. You are no doubt familiar with the cabin in which he was born—with its dirt packed floor, its one window and one door.

Nor did the financial circumstances of the Lincoln family improve much with the passing of time. So limited were the Lincoln family holdings that in moving from Kentucky to Ohio they were able to load all of their family and possessions on a raft and they floated down the Ohio River in search of a new home. Their journey inland found all of this humble cavalcade loaded on the backs of two borrowed horses and one wagon. Historians tell us that their new home in Ohio offered them protection on only three sides for the first year. In fact, so destitute was the Lincoln family that when Nancy Lincoln, the mother, died, the family was without the means with which to buy a coffin. Thus it was that a coffin was made by Thomas from trees surrounding the Lincoln cabin. The boy Abraham whittled wooden pegs with his knife to help hold the coffin together.

While one might be inclined to sympathize with Abraham Lincoln for his having to endure such poverty during his youth and early life, still these conditions may have been a factor making for his greatness. He learned that he had to work if he was to eat and prosper. Lincoln became self-reliant. The creed of the frontier of helping others became a part of his being. He came to feel that one did not always need as much money to live a happy and useful life as some people think. It is fortunate that Lincoln ascribed other primary values to life than financial values. At no time in his life did he become financially acquisitive and upon the conclusion of his legal career his total financial worth did not exceed $20,000. Had he been money minded it is doubtful whether he would have entered and continued in the legal field, with its small fees. Nor would he have felt that he could afford his interest and participation in politics, without which he would likely never have become President.

It is impossible in this brief talk to relate all of the persons or forces that had an influence on the life of Lincoln, for there were many. Friends, tutors, law partners of many kinds all had their influence. One of the experiences often overlooked that did help shape his life was his experience as a lawyer. Anyone who engages in any occupation or profession for nearly 25 years of his life is likely to be affected by the nature of his work as well as his associations in it. That was true of Lincoln.

The work of the average lawyer of Lincoln's day differed somewhat from today in that there was much more trial work in Lincoln's time. People of that day, especially in the frontier communities, were much more litigious than they are today. It appeared that lawsuits would sometimes be started on the drop of a hat. For example, during the July 1838 Sangamon County term

of court, the firm of Stuart and Lincoln tried 60 cases. This is only 1 year after Lincoln was admitted to the bar. Historians now tell us that during his lifetime Lincoln argued a total of 243 cases before the Illinois Supreme Court. This seems incredible, were it not for the fact that the trial of cases before the supreme courts of that day was much simpler than it is today. To try that many cases before a supreme court today would represent a lifetime of work for one man, and that was only one of the courts before which Lincoln practiced.

Not only did Lincoln confine his law work to Springfield, Ill., he traveled over a rather extensive area. An important part of his work and lifetime experiences occurred while he was traveling the circuit. The eighth circuit of Illinois of that day consisted of about nine counties. Not all of the outlying counties had resident lawyers, and those that did often wanted the assistance of an experienced trial lawyer. To make the full circuit in Lincoln's day took a period of 10 to 12 weeks, twice a year. In some ways the travel of the 200 miles round trip was as arduous as the legal work itself. During the late 1830's and early forties, travel over the roadless prairie was mostly by horseback, but later buggies came into use.

Upon reaching the county seats, the weary travelers often found the accommodations to be unsatisfactory. Courthouses and courtrooms were small and inadequate, mostly glorified cabins. One of Lincoln's fellow circuit riders recalled, as related in John Duff's book "A. Lincoln: Prairie Lawyer" that the "inconveniences of country taverns, irregular hours of sleep and meals poorly prepared, were all an exacting part of the life of the circuit; a man had to be uncommonly healthy to stand the wear and tear of it." One recalled having slept 20 in a room, some on bed ropes, some on quilts, some on sheets with a straw or two under them, but, oh, such snoring. If there were any compensations for enduring these primitive conditions, it may have been that the charges were commensurate to the facilities—or lack of them. A lawyer who traveled the circuit recalled Lincoln's paying a bill for their suppers, lodging and breakfasts, and the feeding and stabling of their horses for the night, with the total bill coming to 75 cents.

Lincoln loved the life of the circuit. He never complained about its inconveniences and he became a legendary character in the towns he visited year after year. With the gaining of experience, he developed into an outstanding lawyer, and contrary to some notions about him, he became the equal of any lawyer that he met. It should be stated that his practice not only covered a large area, but he handled a great diversity of cases. He had to be prepared for anything, and sometimes the work had to be done for a very slight fee. In fact more than once Lincoln had to take out his fee in merchandise as is evidenced by a note given to Lincoln as follows:

"SPRINGFIELD, ILL., *February 14, 1842.*

"On or before the first day of November next, I promise to pay A. Lincoln $20 in good firewood about 4 feet in length, at the selling price when delivered, to be delivered at any place designated by said Lincoln, in the city of Springfield—for value received.

"JAMES GAMBRELL."

One of the aspects of Lincoln's law practice that helped condition and season him for his later duties as President, was the partisan and controversial nature of his work. The trial of cases in that day, as today, meant taking one side of a controversy and presenting it in the best possible manner. Being largely dependent on the trial of cases for a livelihood and sometimes being assigned to handle a free case to try without any pay, did not offer much selection of a side. Regardless of the facts that he found, it would be necessary to make the most of it. After the trial was over, he would forget any disagreement or controversy which existed in the trial, which is sometimes difficult for nonlawyers to understand. In the controversy of a lawsuit he not only encountered able opposition, but he met the criticism that usually comes to a trial lawyer who seeks to do his work well.

One of the saving features of Lincoln's disposition and temperament was his sense of humor which manifested itself in many situations, and which was sharpened by his experiences at the bar. Many illustrations of his humor could be given. One time he was serving as an examiner for the bar association, and Lincoln, never being one to stand on formalities after briefly examining an applicant, merely wrote that he knew more than Lincoln did when he was accepted and that the applicant should be admitted. Another would-be aspirant for the bar came to Lincoln's home for examination only to find the examiner shaving. Lincoln continued with his shaving and interrogated the would-be lawyer as he proceeded. Upon completion of the examination, Lincoln wrote the admitting judge that the applicant should be admitted to the bar because he was smarter than he looked.

Yes, Lincoln's experiences as a lawyer prepared and continued him for his duties as President. It taught him to appreciate human nature for he represented all types of persons and causes, but he was at his best when he spoke for the underprivileged and the downtrodden. Lincoln learned to disagree with others and still respect their points of view. It taught him to meet opposition and defeat without becoming discouraged. He also learned to think and speak plainly, for which he later became famous.

When Lincoln took over the presidency, he assumed a position and responsibilities that called for all the ability and patience that one man could muster. You will recall that during the early part of the Civil War, the North was poorly prepared for this struggle. The early battles of the war were won by the southern armies, but late in 1863 it appeared that the northern forces would eventually emerge victorious. Through it all Lincoln had to organize, unite and encourage the North to put forth its maximum effort in the cause of saving the Union. During much of the war, Lincoln was severely criticized, oftentimes unfairly. Opposition and criticism was nothing new to Lincoln, but he had never before faced it so sharp and on so large a scale.

As the time approached for the making of the peace, there was much public discussion as to the terms of the surrender. Some southern leaders had told their men that Lincoln was bloodthirsty and if a surrender should become necessary, they could expect very harsh treatment at the hands of the North. Some elements in the North were bitter and they did want revenge. But such was not the spirit of Lincoln. With the primary purpose of the Civil War having been accomplished, that of saving the Union, he thought it important to heal the wounds of the war as soon as possible.

Lincoln held no ill will for the South because they believed differently than he did about some of the issues of the day. He had disagreed with people and groups many times before and after the question was resolved, joined as citizens and friends in facing the new tasks before them. He recognized when the war was over that they would have to live together as Americans; that we would have to work together to achieve the other unfinished tasks for which this Nation was founded.

Some of the people of the South were quite astonished to learn the kindly and forgiving nature of the terms of the surrender. But those who really knew Abraham Lincoln were not surprised when he ordered that the southern soldiers merely lay down their arms and go home to their peaceful pursuits. He followed this with orders that their hungry soldiers be fed at once, that the wounded be cared for and that those who desired horses for their farmwork be given them. This was the nature of the kind, understanding and forgiving Lincoln.

It was unfortunate that the plans of Lincoln for the reconstruction of the South and the reuniting of the North and South should be ended by that tragic night in Ford's theater. Had he been permitted to carry out his plans, the wounds of the Civil War which have continued to this day, would have been healed long ago.

In looking back over the life of Lincoln, one sees a man who accomplished what might might appear to be the impossible in life. We see a child born and raised in poverty, yet discovering and building his life on greater values than financial ones. We see a child who had little opportunity for Christian training, yet developing into a life marked by its kindness, forgiveness and brotherly love. We see one who faced hardships and disappointments throughout his life, overcoming them and moving on each time to some greater service for his fellow men. One of Lincoln's statements which indicated the spirit of the man was given in his second inaugural address, which came just after the close of the Civil War when he said: "With malice toward none, with charity for all, with a firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive to finish the work that we are in, to care for him who has borne the battle, his widow and his orphans, and to do those things that will achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all mankind."

Educational Television

SPEECH

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 132) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of television facilities to be used for educational purposes.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, on March 7 the House of Representatives passed H.R. 132, a bill designed to set up a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of television facilities to be used for educational purposes.

Although commitments in Maine prompted me to be absent when a vote was taken on this legislation, I would like to state for the record that were I present, I would have voted in favor of this bill.

During the last session of Congress, I introduced legislation—H.R. 2910—which had the same intent as H.R. 132, my bill differing from H.R. 132 only in the means by which the desired end was to be attained.

The instant legislation makes provision for $25 million in Federal grants,

with no State to receive more than $1 million and each State matching the Federal extension on a 50–50 basis. My bill provided $1 million for each of the States and was minus any provision for State matching.

The Senate last year passed legislation providing assistance to the States in the construction of television facilities, this legislation differing in some respects from the bill recently passed by the House. I feel confident that, in due course, the differences in these bills will be reconciled and that ultimately in the course of this congressional session a law will emerge that will serve the interests of each of our States in the area of educational TV.

There can be no doubting that a program such as this promises to produce a great harvest of benefits, for it will bring to both students and adults alike an opportunity to deepen and broaden their educational opportunities. The fact that educational TV is today in its infancy should never cloud our vision to the great promise it holds as a supplement to regular classroom education.

I would like to state that we in Maine are already getting off the ground with educational TV, and the University of Maine, Colby, Bates, and Bowdoin are particularly active in this regard.

The legislation recently approved by the House will give an impetus to these and other educational institutions in Maine, enabling them to proceed at a faster rate in the direction of a comprehensive and effective system of educational TV, a system that will bring enhanced educational benefits to the citizens of Maine and all the other States of our Union.

Youth Groups Active in Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the conservation of our natural resources—for commercial and industrial, as well as recreational, purposes—remains an essential and significant part of our national policy.

Recently, the Green Bay Gazette, of Green Bay, Wis., published an informative article, by John Lee, entitled "Youth Groups Active in Conservation."

The article reflects not only a community interest in conserving our natural out-of-door heritage, but also a realistic, constructive effort to interest and utilize the talent and energies of our greatest national resource—our youth—in promoting better conservation practices.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Green Bay Press-Gazette, Jan. 7, 1962]

YOUTH GROUPS ACTIVE IN CONSERVATION

(By John Lee)

Cooperation with youth groups is one of the facets underscored this week by Paul Romig, general chairman of a resources survey being conducted by the Brown County Conservation Alliance.

An analysis of youth organizations active in the county is basic in any study of conservation resources. The future belong to our youth, Romig declares.

Alliance cooperation with groups of young people in creating projects which eventually will insure and enhance their natural inheritance, is one of the major objectives of the current exhaustive survey by nine alliance teams, according to Romig.

Importance of conservation of natural resources is vital to coming generations. Urban sprawl and the ever-turning wheels of progress promise to take an increasing toll from the wealth of our lands, forests, and waters.

INTEREST OF YOUTH

Romig believes that perhaps the greatest obligation of adults today is to awaken the interest of youth in maintaining the natural wealth of our countryside. The great outdoors has a story to tell to the men of tomorrow, he contends.

The alliance study underway hopes to point up ways and means whereby the 16 member clubs of sportsmen and conservationists may stimulate interest in basic conservation through the many boys and girls organizations operating in Brown County.

The alliance and the DePere Sportsmen's Club has assisted the Rockland Boys 4–H Club toward creating a valuable and constructive wetlands project. The Green Bay Bird Club has sponsored Junior Audubon Clubs and Bluebird trail projects for youth groups. The Brown County sportsmen are working with a Boy Scout troop on a forestry project on land near Suamico.

ENERGY AND ACTION

All of these projects stimulate interest of youth in conservation. The projects call for energy and direct action. While the projects are fun for boys and girls, a foundation of interest in natural resources of lasting importance is created.

Organizations such as Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, 4–H Clubs, Future Farmers, and others are interested in conservation programs. The public and parochial schools offer opportunities for cooperation and assistance from adult organizations.

Gerald Ronsman, of the Peaks Lake Retriever Club; Vince DeVroy, Golden Arrow Archery Club; Frans W. Warden, Brown County Sportsmen's Club, and Jerry Apps, Brown County 4–H agent, are committee members on the youth group cooperative study.

PUBLIC HUNTING

Problems incidental to maintaining, improving, and expanding public hunting grounds in Brown County are under study by an alliance committee headed by Ted Muenster, of the Northeastern Beagle Club.

Brown County has been fortunate in having relatively substantial areas available for public hunting. The State conservation commission has operated a leasing program with considerable success and some publicly owned land has been open to hunters.

Due to the metropolitan complex of the Green Bay-De Pere area it seems clear that private lands must play an increasingly important role in the county's outdoor recreation future. If private lands are to be made effective and are to become a widespread part of recreational resources, the necessary leasing programs must have the support of the general public and the cooperation of landowners.

ANOTHER CROP

It is suggested that recreation could be thought of as another crop for the land—the farmer could gain additional income and the hunter could have a place to hunt. Private land use may be, in some cases, extended to fishing, picnicking, camping, and hiking.

The problem of providing and protecting "seed" stock of game birds and animals is part of the study project. Improved cover and habitat offers oportunities for better hunting. The committee hopes to inventory the public hunting ground situation as a background for determining further action.

Working with Muenster on this survey and project are Ronald Vander Loop, Green Bay; John Corrigan, Oneida, and Alva Baeten, Denmark, with Harold Shine, of the State conservation department, as adviser.

Retreat in Reverse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OTIS G. PIKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, there is not one of us who has not been exhorted from the pulpit to live his religion in his daily life, but not many of us have a preacher who makes it his business to step down from the pulpit and mingle with us in our daily lives to see what our difficulties are in carrying out his exhortations.

A recent article in Newsweek describes how one rabbi in my district managed it, and I respectfully ask permission to bring it to the attention of the Members today. The problems the businessmen of his congregation face are not very unlike those confronting Congressmen:

As normally practiced, the retreat is a withdrawal from the secular world for a few days of orientation in the world of the spirit. The rabbi of one Long Island synagogue, however, has reversed this ancient custom. At Temple Beth Torah in Westbury, N.Y., Rabbi Aaron Pearl goes out—for his soul's good—to mix in the marketplace.

According to Ahbe Treu, a Manhattan furrier, the Conservative synagogue's "reverse retreat program" began about 3 weeks ago in this way: "We were having these lectures on ethics and business at the rabbi's home, and one evening one of the boys leaned over and said to me: 'The rabbi can't sit there and tell me how to run my agency.' It hit me. If religion isn't relevant in the marketplace, I said to myself, then where? So I asked the rabbi to come to my workrooms, and he jumped at the chance."

These days, Rabbi Pearl is not only learning the businessman's pressures and problems, but getting an inkling of what to say to the wife who complains that, "my husband's always snapping at the kids when he comes home. What's his problem? Doesn't he know what I've been putting up with at home all day?"

The energetic, 35-year-old New Yorker has been spending 2 or 3 mornings a week with the men of his 200-family congregation, and he expects his "retreat" to go on for another 3 months. So far he has visited an electronic-equipment manufacturer, an

insurance agent, a trucker, a furrier, and a hardware-store owner.

"The strain on a man who has to be able to lay his hands on any one of 20,000 different items of hardware," exclaims the rabbi. "He even has to keep his temper with the lady who says: 'No, not that shade of green, a little lighter—but not that light. * * *' No wonder he doesn't always sound cheerful at home."

One day last week at a furrier's shop Rabbi Pearl learned of a common moral problem of the trade. "The furrier," he recounted, "is told by a salesman: 'I've got a special load of beautiful furs here. Been saving them just for you. Fantastic price. * * *' He knows that the salesman is offering the bargains in return for a 'present.' He may not like the idea, but he knows that if he doesn't cooperate some other furrier will. It all helps build up the day's tension."

POINT

Instead of preaching, Rabbi Pearl prefers to use discussion groups to get his moral lessons across, whether they have to do with giving or taking payola, mistreating employees, or telling off-color jokes. "And I always try to make the point without shaking a finger at anyone," he says. "They catch on."

One man, who caught on that he could lead a more ethical business life than he had once thought possible, sums up congregational reaction to the rabbi and his experiment in this way: "He has more than filled the vacuum that existed in our community by his understanding and concern. I know that my problems are his problems."

By the end of the retreat, says Rabbi Pearl with a grin, "at least no one can ever say to me again: 'You don't know what I go through at the office.' "

Mrs. E. L. Survant Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, a friend from my State of Colorado has been honored nationally as 1962 winner of the national 4-H Club alumni recognition award. She is Mrs. Eugene L. Survant, of Trinchera, a small ranching community in Las Animas County.

Her devotion to many good causes affecting the home lives of farm and ranch families has been well known in Colorado for years. It is gratifying that she has now been chosen for national recognition as well.

I could say much more about Mrs. Survant and her outstanding contributions to the community welfare, but the story is pretty well told in an article which appeared in the Lamar (Colo.) Daily News of February 26. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLORADO CIVIC LEADER TO GET TOP NATIONAL 4-H ALUMNI AWARD

A Colorado civic leader, who lives on a ranch near Trinchera in Las Animas County, has been named 1962 winner of the national 4-H Club alumni recognition award. This is the highest honor the 4-H program has for former members, says the National 4-H Service Committee.

Mrs. Eugene L. Survant was a member of a club in Las Animas County in the 1920's, completing projects in cooking and clothing. She will be honored at the 10th annual alumni anniversary banquet during the 41st National 4-H Club Congress in Chicago next November. She will be awarded one of eight gold alumni keys presented each year to outstanding alumni who have "continued to live by 4-H ideals."

Mrs. Survant, a member of the Colorado and national chapters of the Master Farm Homemakers Guild, is vice president of the National Home Demonstration Council. It has a membership of about 1 million women.

She served at the same time as president of the Colorado Home Demonstration Council and as vice chairman of the State agricultural planning committee. She also is on a national safety council committee.

Mrs. Survant, mother of two sons, has overcome unusual communications and transportation obstacles to participate in outside activities. Her rural home has no telephone, is 13 miles from a hard-surfaced road and 40 miles from Trinidad, the county seat.

A member of the Las Animas County extension staff, in recommending her for a national 4-H Club award, said she appeared to take the handicaps in stride.

"I have personally witnessed Mrs. Survant," he wrote, "when dressed in her best, she has climbed into a four-wheel drive vehicle, traveled in low gear over snow or mud clogged roads to attend meetings, make train or bus schedules."

Her work in a national organization also has enabled her to participate in international activities. She is serving as tour chairman for a meeting in October of the Associated Country Women of the World in Melbourne, Australia.

Mrs. Survant also has been active in the political side of community life and has worked as vice chairman of the Democratic Central Committee of Las Animas County.

She became active in 4-H a second time when her two sons became old enough to join the local club.

The alumni program is sponsored by the Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp., Chemicals Division-Agricultural, of Little Rock, Ark., and is conducted nationally by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Since 1953 when the program was launched, 80 prominent men and women have been cited for the national 4-H alumni key award. Four of them are from Colorado. Besides Mrs. Survant they are former Gov. Dan Thornton; Dr. Ben F. Lehmberg, pastor of the First Methodist Church, Colorado Springs; and David A. Hamil of Atwood and Washington, D.C., long associated with REA.

Subsidies?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, in his foreign-trade message, the President has proposed Federal subsidies for businesses and workers injured by imports.

The bill to implement his message, H.R. 9900, devotes 42 of its 61 pages to such subsidies. One hundred million dollars would be the initial amount called for from the Federal Treasury.

Not only are subsidies, in my opinion, unwise, but another feature of the bill disturbs me. The Trade Relations Council of the United States, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y., describes this feature as follows:

Government intervention: Once a firm seeks adjustment it becomes virtually a ward of the Federal Government. An administering agency surveys it and certifies its eligibility and determines the kinds of assistance to be provided. Before certification the agency "may provide technical assistance to aid the firm in preparing a sound adjustment proposal," and, after certification, "may provide * * * such technical assistance as in its judgment will materially contribute to the economic adjustment of the firm."

Technical assistance is defined as "information, market and other economic research, managerial advice and counseling, training, assistance in research and development, and such other technical assistance as may be appropriate." Such assistance is to be provided "by agencies of the United States where appropriate," and the firm must "share the cost of technical assistance when and to the extent the agency deems it appropriate."

In short, Government becomes a partner in management.

Financial assistance: Various kinds of financial assistance, including loans and tax relief are available for certified firms. The administering agency may protect its loans by selling the firm's assets, or it can "renovate, improve, modernize, complete, insure, rent, sell, or otherwise deal with * * * any real or personal property conveyed to, or otherwise acquired by it in connection with such guarantees, agreements, or loans * * *."

The administering agency and General Accounting Office shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient pertaining to adjustment assistance.

There is a penal provision that anyone making a false statement, or who knowingly fails to disclose a material fact, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned for not more than 2 years, or both.

As I read these words, I seriously wonder if one large business organization which endorsed it ever got around to reading the bill. If so, they had better not let their members find out what is in it.

The TRC has published a brochure which clearly indicates the reasons why subsidies are anathema to import-vulnerable businessmen and workers alike. Its text follows:

Since 1934, U.S. Government programs have reduced our tariffs, risking injury to American industry and their workers. Our tariffs are now among the lowest, in many cases the lowest, of all industrialized nations. In authorizing tariff reductions the Congress, fully aware of possible injury to American industry and its workers, provided, by law, positive safeguards to prevent such injury or to stop it if it does occur.

If vigorously and faithfully administered these safeguards will keep the tariff reduction program in balance, and injuries to industries and jobs from imports can be avoided.

A NEW CONCEPT—LET INJURY OCCUR

Liberal trade advocates, impatient to reduce or eliminate our tariffs, want these safeguards ignored and bypassed. They recognize that American industries may be liquidated and jobs destroyed in the proc-

ess, but they claim such losses may be necessary in order to gain our foreign policy objectives.

To take care of such import injuries, liberal trade advocates are suggesting use of existing and a proposed expansion of Federal programs (particularly area redevelopment proposals) designed for an entirely different purpose. These are Government dole and subsidy programs designed to assist communities beset with unemployment due to depleted natural resources, or technological production changes, or the migration of industries to other parts of the country.

WHAT IS MEANT BY GOVERNMENT DOLES AND SUBSIDIES FOR IMPORT INJURY

Domestic industry and its employees unable to compete with imports would go out of business, give up their jobs, or find other businesses and jobs.

Workers who lost jobs would be given a Government dole until they found other jobs, and retraining for new jobs wherever and whenever they could find them.

The local communities affected by the unemployment and closing of the plants, would be given an assortment of Government loans, Government advice, and other assistance. Both displaced employees and the communities would become wards of the Federal Government.

DANGER IN SUCH A COURSE

Reliance on Government subsidies and doles, instead of present safeguards, to deal with import injury puts the economic welfare of foreign countries—their industries and their workers—ahead of our own welfare and progress.

It jeopardizes our economic growth and the creation of new jobs.

Government subsidies and doles are palliatives. They do not attack the cause of import injury.

THIS IS THE ISSUE—PREVENTION OR REPAIR?

What is best for America and our friends?

Is it not best to prevent loss of jobs and job opportunities?

Why not maintain our fences atop the cliff; instead of letting them decay and substituting a first-aid station in the valley below?

Farmer Footing the Bill for Rising Market Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, there have been so many erroneous and misleading headlines and news articles concerning farm price supports that it is refreshing when a newspaper like the Fargo Forum, of Fargo, N. Dak., carries an editorial which puts farm-price supports in their true perspective.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD one of the best and most accurate editorials I have ever read in a long while entitled "Farmer Footing the Bill for Rising Market Costs," which appeared in the February 27 issue.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMER FOOTING THE BILL FOR RISING MARKET COSTS

The farmer's share of the consumer food dollar dipped to 38 cents last year, down 1 cent from 1960 to match 1959. The farmer's share has been slipping since 1951 when it was 49 cents.

An Agricultural Department marketing report showed that the reduced farm share reflected a 2 percent increase in charges for processing and marketing farm products. Farm prices for food products declined 1 percent.

Yet it is the price of food in the big cities in the East that is helping to generate opposition to any kind of a farm program that would help the growers of the Great Plains States. The farm program critics complain again and again that the farmer is being spoon-fed by the Government. Yet these same critics would complain bitterly if the farmer could require that the price tag on food in the supermarket show the farmer's share compared to the share paid the transportation firms, the processers, and the retail markup.

All these, plus taxes, of course, are part of the food dollar. But it is the farmer who gets the blame when food prices soar. In recent years the cost of food is much more easily explained by the rising trend of wages paid in the transportation, processing, and retail fields.

The trouble is that as these costs rise, the increases are not added to the price of food in the market, but taken away from the farmer's share of the food dollar.

It is no wonder that the people who preach for control of farm production find so much support amongst the farmers themselves in many areas.

Lincoln Day in Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the dedication in Israel of an Abraham Lincoln building on the campus of Bar-Ilan University presented an opportunity to emphasize once more the strong cultural and historic bonds that exist between the United States and Israel. Bar-Ilan University is an American patterned institution for liberal arts, sciences, and humanities. The building erected with American help will be used for the study of physics, and thus stands as a symbol also of modern science in the ancient Middle East. Commissioner Bernard Katzen, who delivered the Lincoln Day address at the university, is a consistent advocate of aid to Israel's institutions of higher education, and it is especially fitting that his efforts in making this building possible be recognized in this way.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address by Commissioner Bernard Katzen, of New York, at the Lincoln commemorative exercise held on the campus of Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan, Israel, on February 12, 1962, together with a press release from the office of the Governor of New York, containing a message to be read at the commemorative exercises.

There being no objection, the address and press release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY COMMISSIONER BERNARD KATZEN AT OCCASION OF LINCOLN COMMEMORATIVE EXERCISE HELD AT CAMPUS OF BAR-ILAN UNIVERSITY, FEBRUARY 12, 1962

As I stand before you today, I feel a deep sense of humility and an abiding joy to serve once more as a link between this great University of Bar-Ilan and my country. When I came to Israel several years ago, we planned and dreamed together about the expansion of Bar-Ilan. I was proud and happy to serve as the catalyst in blending the aspirations of our two countries through common appreciation of learning. How especially felicitous is this occasion, when the speaker, the day, the building and the country form a unique combination. The speaker, a commissioner of the New York State Commission Against Discrimination—a government agency dedicated to achieving equally of opportunity without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin—appointed by Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, himself a dynamic protagonist of Lincoln's philosophy and ideals; associated on the commission with the Hon. Ogden R. Reid, former Ambassador to Israel, so beloved in this land, whose own beliefs and the traditions of his family reflect their true love for equality and humanity. The day is February 12, the birthday of the Great Emancipator. The building is the Abraham Lincoln Building located on the campus of a notable institution of learning—Bar-Ilan University. The country is the land of the Bible—Israel.

I remember vividly the privilege I enjoyed of receiving a visit from the late, revered Dr. Pinchas Churgin, the founder and then president of Bar-Ilan University. This distinguished, modest and dedicated educator sat in my office and talked of Bar-Ilan, then in its infancy. He told me of his hopes and dreams for the university, of how it was patterned after our own American universities though set in a religious background. He envisioned the time when this university would not only have a significant impact on the educational structure of Israel, but would attract scholars from all over the world.

Today, a new physics building, the Abraham Lincoln Building, stands for all to see. Dr. Ronald A. Weitzman of Princeton University holds the American Chair in Psychology in your university, and many countries are represented in the student body of this great world center of learning. Our hopes and dreams have come true. In a deeper sense, the restoration of Israel as a free and independent nation is also a dream come true. It is the realization of the yearning of the Jewish people for centuries. This dream found an echo in the hearts of men of good will the world over. They saw Israel as a haven for the oppressed and a land where freedom and human dignity would find full expression. It is, in part, a realization of Abraham Lincoln's own vision of freedom and equality. It is an embodiment of Lincoln's firm and unwavering faith in the inherent dignity of man. It is, therefore, particularly fitting that we gather here today in the land of Israel to pay tribute to Lincoln, who has become a symbol of man's struggle for freedom, not only in his day and in his country, but throughout the centuries and throughout the world.

At 7 o'clock in the morning of April 15, 1865, as Edwin McMasters Stanton, the then Secretary of War, witnessed Lincoln drawing his last breath, he gave poignant expression to the martyrdom in these unforgetable words, "Now, he belongs to the ages."

The wave of sadness that swept the world at Lincoln's passing is dramatically portrayed by a document found in the National Archives at Washington. The document was dated May 13, 1865, and was a dispatch to the State Department from the American Consul at Odessa which enclosed within it a letter written by an Odessa Jew, Abraham Nadich, a grain dealer in Rostoff on the Don. The consul stated that the letter was "one evidence of the intensity of feeling in this remote country for the loss to the world of President Lincoln" and he suggested that "a copy be presented to Mrs. Lincoln and perhaps it may be considered worthy of publication in the newspapers."

May I read to you a portion of this letter: "a copy of it be presented to Mrs. Lincoln and redeemed him from his fate" (referring to his assassination), "I would have accepted it as a great boon. * * * Members of our Jewish community should like to pray a requiem for the soul of the holy martyr. * * * Abraham Lincoln. Thou belongest not to thyself and America only, but to the whole world."

What was there about Lincoln which would have caused a Jew from Odessa to willingly sacrifice his son to save Lincoln? What was there in the life of this man which in the short space of 56 years could evoke the prescient sentiment of Lincoln's Secretary of War Stanton's pronouncement then, and continues to reinforce it in the light of history?

Lincoln was indeed unique; he won immortality in his own time, and has remained an inspiration to the future. His values were the values of humanity and compassion. His greatness was founded in his utter simplicity, for his beginnings, much as Israel's own beginnings, were those of the pioneer, whose victories were victories over the resistant and unrelenting wilderness. In such a setting the pioneer spirit was strong within him—the indomitable will to survive and grow in a period of threat and privation—the simple, natural qualities of one who lived close to hard realities.

We are told that although Lincoln's formal education ended with the death of his mother, when he was a boy of nine, he was so possessed of the need for ever more learning that he sought every possible avenue to acquire knowledge. He was not dismayed at the thought of walking many miles in order to borrow a book from the schoolmaster in a neighboring town, and when by accident the book was ruined, having been left where the rain entered his log cabin, he gladly worked, splitting wood rails until he could earn enough to defray the value of this book. This book and the many others bespoke his yearning for knowledge and wisdom, the tools he was later to use in the leadership of his beloved country, and these were the intellectual skills he translated into capacity to serve through learning. He developed the power to articulate his philosophy in such a way that not only he but others could understand and act upon it. The famous Lincoln-Douglas debates are historical testimony to just a fraction of this talent.

Lincoln, though not a professed member of any sect, grew up in a Bible-reading atmosphere. Both his natural mother and, later, his stepmother felt it basic to his upbringing to infuse the boy with a love for the Scriptures. He drank from the wisdom of the Prophets. And as the boy learned the values and the lessons taught by the "Good Book," so did the man, the Great Emancipator, live by these teachings and principles. What has been a basic tenet of Judaism was also the belief which guided and sustained Lincoln. For his great love and compassion for his fellowman surely had its Genesis in "And thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

How striking is the parallel of Lincoln action and the prophesy of Isaiah: "They shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks." Following the bloody Civil War which pitted brother against brother and father against son, Lincoln plunged into the work of reconstruction. He laid aside the tools of war to heal the wounds and to reunite families. He approached this gigantic task with these memorable words: "With malice toward none; with charity for all, with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us bind up the Nation's wounds." Lincoln lived to see his faith vindicated, but, like many a liberator from the time of Moses, the first great emancipator, and throughout history, he could see the promises fulfilled only from a distance.

How fitting that this man should have been named Abraham, and how strong the unbreakable thread that joins the Abraham of Israel to the Lincoln of America. "And He called his name Abraham." Ahv Hamohn Goyeem—the father and leader of the great host of peoples. He led his people into a Union which, as he declared, could not exist "half slave, half free." He led his people into an acceptance of the fundamental egalitarian concept of American democracy—"All men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

When Lincoln proclaimed freedom for the Negro, he was at one and the same time bringing a freedom to his own white brethren; for Lincoln recognized that, even as shackles had enslaved the Negro, so had the maintenance of a system of slavery imprisoned the moral and spiritual values of his people.

Closely related to this quality of human understanding and self-respect was the recognition of the dignity of work and of the worker. In a reply to the New York Workingmen's Association, an important Jewish labor group, he said: "The strongest bond of human sympathy, outside of the family relation, should be one uniting all working people of all nations, tongues, and kindreds."

Another quality of Lincoln that stands out in high relief was his humility. During the early stages of the Civil War, Lincoln was criticized by his friends and associates for taking too much abuse from Gen. William B. McClellan, General of the Army of the Potomac. His friends were shocked by the fact that General McClellan was openly derisive of the President. Lincoln replied to these protests, saying, he would hold the reins of the general's horse if the general would produce victories. Lincoln was concerned only with the results which were achieved and not with any recognition of his part in achieving them. The idea of self-aggrandizement was repugnant to him.

Consider that aspect of Lincoln's character which supplies us with a needed sense of balance in our own rapidly changing world. We tend, sometimes, to cling to the old and familiar, or to plunge unthinkingly into the new, simply because it is new. Lincoln's objectivity and a calm wisdom are strikingly expressed in a letter to Horace Greeley, dated August 22, 1862: "I shall try to correct errors where shown to be errors, and I shall adopt new views as fast as they shall appear to be true views." Here is flexibility without weakness. Here is progress without panic. Here is the wisdom of a great and good man.

There are many other facets of Lincoln's personality which are worthy of note. His humor was an endless joy to all around him. When, for example, a literary man objected to Lincoln's calling a certain Greek history tedious, saying, "Mr. President, the author of that history is one of the profoundest scholars of the age. Indeed, it may be doubted whether any man of our generation has plunged more deeply into the sacred fountain of learning," Lincoln's rejoinder was, "Yes, or come up drier." Lincoln was profound but never dry. Despite the vast sweep of his intellect, there was a freshness and clarity to his thinking which made his words come alive.

Above all was his passion for freedom. Lincoln said from his heart: "Freedom is indivisible; when it is denied to some it is diminished for all," and again in his second annual message to Congress, Lincoln said, "In giving freedom to the slave we assure freedom to the free—honorable alike in what we give and what we preserve." Here, too, his words were matched by his deed—the Emancipation Proclamation which he signed January 1, 1863, thus ending the scourge of slavery in the United States. Lincoln's concept of freedom is as true and penetrating today as in his times, perhaps more crucial. In an age of space and celestial exploration, of industrial expansion, of automation and of technological marvels, we must not lose sight of human values and human freedom. The world is experiencing a yearning and quest for independence, a thrust for the economic, social, intellectual and spiritual fulfillment of all people, a ferment of challenge and adjustment. We must find the answers to the problems of production and distribution so that we may feed the starving, clothe the shivering, and shelter the homeless. This is all part of freedom today—freedom to walk taller as we walk together.

I need hardly point out that the values by which Lincoln lived and which made him great are the values you cherish here. This is the bridge between us—the tie that binds.

Minister Abba Eban so ably expressed it, in an address in New York on February 11, 1953, "I do not know of any two peoples who have created unified cultures out of so many divergent elements which might have seemed destined to disrupt the fabric of the national mind." Surely Lincoln, who sadly but inevitably led his country into a great Civil War to resolve these divergent forces and preserve the Union, typifies this drawing together of diverse elements in order to create an underlying unity. You have seen in this man an ageless symbol of those things you hold dear—the search for learning, deep moral and ethical and spiritual values, and the freedom of every individual to be himself. In this university, which is open to all regardless of race, religion or nationality, you are meeting the tremendous task facing us all today of using men's ingenuity to solve the problems that have plagued us down through the centuries, the problems of the apocalypse, if you will. As an American, I am moved by the fact that you have drawn upon the vision and the warm humanity of Lincoln to inspire you in this mighty effort.

Our job, yours and ours, is to review the past in order to understand the dimensions of the challenge of the future. In our common task of building a world structure of peace, freedom and equality, we are strengthened by our common traditions. Again I draw upon the ringing words of Abba Eban tracing the historical affinities that undergird the Israel-American partnership: "What happened in each case was that men thirsting for freedom, driven by insecurity and persecution but also drawn by the attraction of building a new civilization, emigrated from all parts of the world to a new land across the seas. They reclaimed that land from primeval devastation. They liberated themselves from colonial shackles. They established a free republic which they then defended against every adversary and peril until it secured its recognized place in the international family. In their cultural effort, they merged their diverse immigrant

cultures into the unity of a new civilization. They maintained throughout every ordeal the original moral heritage which had inspired their underlying unity of purpose."

As your nation and ours are linked in our common endeavor—liberating the peoples of the world from the physical, intellectual and moral jungles of the past—we face forces of conflict loose in the world.

Israel, surrounded by enemies, stands as a symbol of resistance to those who would rob free peoples of their liberty and historical mission. Lincoln, too, resisted slavery at all costs. The precedent of Israel and the example of Lincoln, should give impetus to the surge for freedom all over the world.

We have many gains to build upon as well as evils to overcome. There is a steadily increasing standard of living for people throughout the world; there is new knowledge of space and of our own world; there are the beginnings in the U.N. of a world order based on human rights and grounded in reason, not force; and there is the growth of many new nations of freemen.

It is truly heartwarming to see your Nation and ours linked in the joint mission of giving help to the newly emerging African countries. This partnership of our older democracy with your younger and vibrant democracy in meeting the needs of Africa and Africans takes on a deeper significance from the fact that these new democracies are emerging in the very land from which slaves were once cruelly abducted. I think of the students from Africa attracted to Israel by the breadth of its purposes and the illustrious quality of its teaching. I know of the welcome which greeted them here, of your deep concern for their intellectual growth and well-being, and for the well-being of the thousands back in their homelands as well.

Indeed, it is the students from Africa, Asia and so many countries of the world and you, the students of Israel, using your brains and talents as instruments of pure science and of ultimate truth, who render the greatest tributes to Lincoln and all he stands for. Yours is the spirit that spells survival in a world of crisis and, more importantly, reinforces our worthiness to survive. Yours is the dream which your country and mine are steadily forging into a living reality. No words of mine can honor Lincoln as truly as your daily search for wisdom and beauty honors him.

Throughout Lincoln's life, there was emphasis upon deeds, not words alone, as the ultimate test, the true tribute. This thought was expressed by Lincoln with a special poignancy in his brief but unforgettable address at the dedication services of the Gettysburg Military Cemetery. Edward Everett, former President of Harvard University and the then Secretary of State, who had spoken for 2 hours on that occasion before Lincoln rose to address the gathering, later wrote to the President saying: "I should be glad if I could flatter myself that I came as near the central idea of the occasion in 2 hours as you did in 2 minutes."

In those 2 minutes, Lincoln epitomized not only the central idea of that occasion but the central idea of his own life, and the central idea of our common endeavor as we face the critical days of the present and build together for the future.

I shall conclude my remarks today on Lincoln by letting his own thoughts flow through to you in the crowning message of his lifetime—the Gettysburg Address. The words are imperishable. They will forever strike a responsive chord in the hearts of free men and they are particularly applicable to your own struggles, to your own dreams and to your own high purposes:

The Lincoln Gettysburg Address will be delivered by Aviva Gershuni, a student of Bar-Ilan University.

[Press release]

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany.

Governor Rockefeller will present an engraved portrait of Abraham Lincoln today to Commissioner Bernard Katzen of the State commission against discrimination, which will be hung in the Abraham Lincoln Building of Bar-Ilan University, Israel. Commissioner Katzen will present the portrait and a New York State flag to the university when he makes the Lincoln Day address there on February 12.

The Lincoln portrait is a signed engraving by William Edgar Marshall (1837–1906) and was done in 1886.

It is believed to be a reissue of a portrait of Lincoln which Marshall painted and engraved in 1865.

Marshall was born in New York City and began engraving at a watchcase factory at the age of 17. In 1856, he began portrait engraving and became highly proficient. In 1863 he went to Paris to study portraiture under Couture, returning to the United States in 1865 when he undertook the portrait of Lincoln.

In addition to the portrait, Governor Rockefeller also gave a message to Commissioner Katzen to be read at the commemorative ceremonies at Bar-Ilan University on Lincoln's birthday.

The message said in part:

"Please convey my warm personal greetings to Dr. Tuvia Bar-Ilan, acting director general of the institution of higher learning which bears his revered father's name; to the learned faculty, to the students of the university, and to all the distinguished guests present at the ceremony. In extending this greeting I express the abiding sentiment and good will of all the people of the Empire State toward the people of Israel.

"When I learned that you were to deliver the Lincoln Day address at the Abraham Lincoln Physics Building of Bar-Ilan University, it seemed to me appropriate to ask you to present to the university this engraved portrait of the Great Emancipator, as a token of the shared ideals of brotherhood and equality of opportunity which animate the people of Israel and the people of the Empire State. As one whose life is devoted to the realization of Lincoln's ideals, you are eminently fitted to make this presentation.

"It is a privilege to share through you in the ceremony commemorating Lincoln as a symbol of greatness not alone for his time but for all time, and not alone for America but for all mankind."

The National Lottery of Belgium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, I brought to the attention of this Congress the popular and profitable Argentine national lottery in South America. Today, I would like to tell the Members of this House about the Belgian Government lottery. This small nation, like so many others, derives no small benefit from its national lottery.

In 1961 the national lottery of Belgium gross receipts came to almost $15 million. The net income of $5 million was used for the Congo Social Welfare Fund and various other charitable works.

Mr. Speaker, Belgium has realized that a lottery can be of great worth in obtaining funds for deserving causes. We certainly would do well to come to the same realization.

A national lottery in the United States would raise $10 billion a year in additional revenue which certainly can help bring tax relief to our wage earners and reduce our ever-growing national debt. What are we waiting for?

Survey of Outdoor Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the following editorial was published in the Spokesman-Review, of Spokane, Wash., on Thursday, February 1, 1962, concerning the report presented to the Congress and to the President by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIQUE SURVEY HAS BROAD BACKING

Having had an ample appropriation of public funds and adequate staff assistance, the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission has now presented to the President and to the Congress a final report that is unique in many respects.

Chairman Laurance S. Rockefeller's group has made an exhaustive survey of the outdoors in American life, the rapid development of outdoor recreation, and the role of governmental and private interests in meeting the demands of the future.

This report, whose major recommendations are briefed elsewhere on this page today, is worthy of serious study—for its factual information and its many-sided approach to the problems and proposed solutions.

The recreational opportunities and limitations that confront the people of America are well outlined in this vital document.

It is hoped that all citizens concerned with the wise conservation and use of the Nation's natural resources will give careful consideration to the Commission's surveys and findings.

Whatever Congress may decide to do in the establishment of new Federal polices and programs in this field, it now has before it some well-reasoned proposals that have the unanimous backing of all 15 members of the Commission.

Senators like HENRY M. JACKSON, of Washington, HENRY C. DWORSHAK, of Idaho, JACK MILLER, of Iowa, and CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico have joined Representatives like JOHN P. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, GRACIE PFOST, of Idaho, RALPH J. RIVERS, of Alaska, and JOHN H. KYL, of Iowa and have had the counsel of several nongovernmental commissioners expert in their field, such as Bernard L. Orell, vice president of the Weyerhaeuser Co.

The outdoor recreation report is indeed notable for the fact that in an area beset by scores of conflicts, the members of the Rockefeller Commission were able to agree upon their facts and their recommendations.

Aspen, Colo.: America's Most Cosmopolitan Small Town

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President I think it entirely fair to say that there is no town in our great Nation that closely resembles Aspen, Colo. It was originally a silver town which flourished, went broke and then all but died. In the last 15 years it has undergone a spectacular renaissance and is now a unique habitat of skiers, artists, musicians, fine cuisine and distinguished visitors from all corners of the Nation and the world.

Despite its growth, Aspen has maintained its friendly, easy going Western flavor, seasoned with a dash of cosmopolitan charm that makes it truly unique. It is situated far from major cities in the heart of the rugged Rockies, yet it manages to be one of the most civilized spots it has ever been my pleasure to visit.

In its march 3 edition, the Saturday Evening Post salutes Aspen with a six-page illustrated spread. The article was written in a light vein by Robert L. Whearley, a versatile and gifted reporter for the Denver Post. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Aspen: Ski Heaven" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASPEN: SKI HEAVEN

(By Robert L. Whearley)

It happened in Aspen, Colo.: The cold winter sun had disappeared behind Ajax Mountain when the young man skied down the slope in a breakneck schuss, trailing a streamer of powdery white snow. As he neared the foot of the mountain, he slowed himself with a series of precise turns and then, with a ski pole dangling from one wrist, reached into a pocket for a comb and proceeded to slick back his hair. He kept on skiing, right into the residential district. The cocktail hour was at hand, and he was late.

To say that Aspen is probably the most cosmopolitan small town in America is pure understatement. Where else, residents ask, do you see Grosse Point and Newport society matrons, wearing full-length mink, gold-lamé stretch pants and heavy ski boots, doing the twist in the crowded barroom of a Victorian hotel, while at a table nearby a bearded ski bum from Brooklyn plays chess with a Hollywood star?

Perhaps it is unfair to identify the town simply as Aspen, Colo. A qualifier is needed, and the best qualifier is wintertime Aspen.

In the off-seasons—April 15 through mid-June and September 30th until Thanksgiving—Aspen is a placid community tucked away inconspicuously at the base of 11,300-foot Ajax Mountain, in the upper reaches of western Colorado's Roaring Fork Valley. Its 1,500 year-round residents take a breather earned in the season just past, and a deep breath of anticipation for the one that lies ahead. Oh, a few fishermen and hunters may drop by en route to Independence Pass, but for the most part these belong to that group distastefully described by innkeepers as "sleeping-bag types."

In the summertime culture is king. Soul-weary organization men meet in the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies to read and discuss the ideas of Locke, Rousseau, and Freud and to hear from such dignitaries as Supreme Court Justices Hugo Black and William J. Brennan, Jr., Ambassador Adlai Stevenson and President Lee DuBridge of the California Institute of Technology. Noted musicians—Isaac Stern, Darius Milhaud, Mme. Rosina Lhevinne of the Juilliard School, and the like—take part in the summer music festival; many of them stay on until fall to give private lessons to advanced students.

But in the winter months a peculiar madness overcomes Aspen. Winter is the time of deep powdery snow in the high country, and deep powdery snow is the life substance of skiers.

Days are governed by the schedules of the lifts that transport skiers from down here to up there: 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. All that goes before, or after, is incidental to the dubious business of steering one's self down a snowy incline while balanced on an expensive pair of well-waxed, parallel boards.

To save skiers the bother of coming down for lunch, an expensive restaurant called the Sundeck was built atop Ajax Mountain. Cocktail time is reckoned from the hour when the lifts shut down until midnight. This is not to sugegst that the sociable hours end at the stroke of 12. Aspen's dozen bars close at 2 in the morning, but party time often lasts until dawn in the posh private homes on Hopkins Avenue and nearby Red Mountain Dinner? It's squeezed in during the cocktail hour—sometimes.

The town's 60 lodges and inns owe their success to the legions of skiers (45,000 last year) who visit Aspen's slopes during the winter. Cross-country buses pull into town with ski-filled canvas pourches strapped to their rear ends. A week is the usual stay, with a number of skiers staying on for 2 weeks, sometimes 3. They bring with them not only their skis, imported boots and bulky sweaters, but also the wherewithal for a rousing good time. Aspen is only too happy to oblige.

To understand Aspen, you have to understand its history. It was founded in the summer of 1878 by a band of prospectors who trekked across Independence Pass from Leadville in search of silver and gold. These were not the wild-and-woolly Westerners of legend, as a pioneer's daughter, Miss Louise Berg, hastens to explain: "They were honest God-fearing people of education. We never had any lynchings here."

The prospectors made rich silver strikes. In a few years the population of Aspen boomed to 15,000, a figure never since equaled. Then, in 1893, when Aspen silver mines were producing about $10 million a year, come the demonetization of silver, and the bottom dropped out of the silver market. For the next half century Aspen dozed with little more than its memories of the past to sustain it.

In 1945 Chicago industrialist Walter Paepcke joined forces with Friedl Pfeifer, an ex-skitrooper who had been stationed at nearby Camp Hale, Colo., in organizing the Aspen Skiing Corp. They built lifts and cleared the slopes. Paepcke bought up key properties, leased others, and began restoration of the town.

At the same time he started the development of Aspen as cultural center. Aspen made its mark with the intellectuals of the world in 1949, when the International Goethe Convocation was held there to celebrate the biocentennial of the German poet's birth. The following year the Institute for Humanistic Studies was established. Celebrities began to settle in Aspen—among them, Actor Gary Cooper, Writers John P. Marquand and Fred Glidden (Luke Short), and Designer-Painter Herbert Bayer.

Even before Paepcke's death in 1960, murmurs of discontent were being heard in the little town on the Roaring Fork. Some of the oldtimers didn't want Aspen to become a major resort; quiet little towns were already too scarce, they argued. But they were outvoted by the newcomers, who had problems of their own—how, for example, to be commercial without being too commercial and attracting riffraff. Bayer, a member of the Aspen Zoning and Planning Commission, put it like this: "We want the better-type visitor, not the 2-day tourist." As one means of attracting sophisticated types, Bayer's commission put through stiff new zoning rules, banned neon signs and forbade inns to put up signs larger than 10 square feet.

Geography helps to keep small spenders away from Aspen. The closest large city is Denver—210 miles northeast, via State Highway 82 and U.S. Highway 6, and across two major mountain passes—11,992-foot Loveland and 10,603-foot Vail.

Distance, to be sure, doesn't stop the determined skier of limited means. Such a skier was David Michael, a onetime Fulbright scholar who now is justice of the peace in Aspen (part time) and an up-and-coming abstract painter (full time). Before coming to Aspen to live four years ago, Michael, a native Georgian, worked for a map company in Denver.

"A bunch of us used to get off work Friday night, drive like mad through the snow to get here and then catch a few hours' sleep in the car before the lifts opened next morning," he recalls. "We'd ski all day, carouse all Saturday night, and then ski all day Sunday and drive back to Denver Sunday night. I'm afraid we really weren't at our best Monday morning when it came time to go to work."

Other youngsters, whose names haven't yet appeared in the Social Register, and who aren't really trying to get in, manage to gravitate to Aspen. They are variously known as students on sabbatical leave, and just plain ski bums. They come to Aspen to work for ridiculously low wages as busboys and barmaids ($2 a night is par), but since night life does not begin until the lifts shut down, they have plenty of free time for skiing.

One who might be classified as a student on sabbatical is Charla Winn, 23, a pretty blonde who is somewhere between her sophomore and senior years at the University of California, Berkeley; she isn't sure just where between her sophomore and senior years. Every time she gets close to graduation, "I panic and change my major or something." Her current major is philosophy, but she has been out of school almost a year.

Charla is a barmaid at the Golden Horn, one of the better known night spots in Aspen. There, in a dark, smoky basement resembling a prohibition speakeasy, a room resounding with hot jazz and the cacophony of a hundred shouted conversations, she delivers drinks to the customers' tables. She works until 2 in the morning, but even so she's up early the next day to ski. Why does she ski? She's not quite sure of that either, except that she thinks it's great sport, one "that takes every bit of concentration and energy you can give it."

Now Charla is not a ski bum. She likes Aspen for itself and not just for its white slopes; where else, she asks, can a girl walk home from work at 2 in the morning with perfect safety?

A true ski bum is a fanatic who places the quality of the snow above all else. Innkeeper Jack Cammack, a onetime ice-cream manufacturer who came to Aspen 2 years ago because it looked like a good business bet, tells how two busboys once walked out on him right in the middle of breakfast. "They suddenly decided the snow wasn't all they thought it should be; they took off for Sun Valley or someplace."

Cammack, a skier himself in a restrained sort of way, owns the Aspen Inn, a new $500,000 lodge near the foot of lift No. 1 on Ajax Mountain. When he came to Aspen, a controversy was still raging over the wisdom of an earlier decision not to compete for the winter olympics. "It would have put Aspen on the map, sure," he admits, "but does Aspen need it?"

Like Cammack, many of Aspen's substantial citizens agree that Aspen doesn't need to be on the map. To them, the town is a hideaway with a special kind of charm that would be lost if it ever became too popular. They want to cater to skiers, of course, but only to those skiers who can afford to pamper rich tastes.

One of Aspen's few concessions to the masses is the annual Winterskoal, or Salute to Winter, held in January. It is nothing more or less than a winter carnival, but the word carnival does not suit the character assumed by Aspen.

During Winterskoal there are organized ski races and the usual unorganized night life. Often celebrities will slip into town to see the show—James Arness, television's "Marshal Dillon," was on hand for the 1962 Winterskoal; he came on condition that there would be no publicity on his visit, and that was fine with a town that is awed by nobody.

For those in the public eye, a sojourn in Aspen provides a tonic of temporary anonymity, a spiritual marshaling yard for the campaigns that lie ahead. In other words—they can think out loud without having to look over their shoulders in fear a newspaperman is within earshot; they can stroll down Main Street without having to run a grinning, glad-handed gauntlet of favor seekers. Many of President Kennedy's New Frontiersmen seem to find this aspect of Aspen particularly refreshing. The President's brother, Attorney General Robert Kennedy, spent a relaxed week in Aspen last fall. Other recent visitors: Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, one of his assistants, Paul H. Nitze, and Federal Aviation Administrator Najeeb E. Halaby. In fairness it must be admitted that William E. Stevenson, the new Ambassador to the Philippines, went just the other way; he was a resident of Aspen, and executive vice president of the Institute of Humanistic Studies, when his diplomatic appointment came through last December.

The only semblance of high society in Aspen is the so-called Red Mountain set, a reference to artists and executives who have homes on Red Mountain just north of town. These are not homes in the usual sense; they are $40,000 to $100,000 dwellings that, in many cases, serve only as mountain retreats for their wealthy owners.

Just below the Red Mountain set on the social ladder is the jet set, a younger crowd. But social rules aren't rigid in Aspen. The people who come to ski and see know they belong, or they wouldn't be there. A few tradespeople are accepted in Aspen society, and this seems to be one of the charms of the town. Mrs. Tukey Jonas, proprietor of the Centerline, an interior-decorating salon, explains, "Go to a party here, and, just as often as not, you're liable to find someone like Thornton Wilder off in the corner, talking literature with the town barber. That wouldn't go in the east. Things are more informal here, more fun * * * more Aspen."

"Fast Pencil" Freeman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, this editorial from the Indianapolis Star of recent date, pointing to the New Frontier in mathematics, appears under the hopeful Lincoln quote, "Let the people know the facts and the country will be saved."

"FAST PENCIL" FREEMAN

Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, may yet establish a reputation as the "Fastest Pencil in Washington." Nobody can twirl a statistic like Orville. He can use them with mirrors, or fire off a string of figures with either hand. It's quite a spectacle to see what he can do when he puts his mind to cutting a few didoes in arithmetic.

"Fast Pencil's" latest attempt to bully the taxpayers was carefully planned over a period of several months. Last year, his boys in the Department of Agriculture announced that they were starting a new and better way to keep books on the farm surplus. Nobody knew what they were up to at the time, and no one in town knew exactly what to make of the scheme.

Then, a few weeks ago, the Freeman crowd galloped into Washington whooping and hollering that they had cut the farm surplus down to size. They claimed they had whittled $1,500 million out of the stocks held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. "Fast Pencil" was the biggest man in town, but not for long.

A soft-talking Eastern type from Delaware, Senator JOHN WILLIAMS, called his bluff. This Republican lawman said "Fast Pencil" talked big but that in a showdown, he couldn't back up his brag.

WILLIAMS said that Freeman conveniently didn't mention the small matter of $1,530,503,000 in storage, handling and hauling charges when he was bragging about the $1,500 million reduction. When that item was added to the $7,647,739,000 Freeman said he had on hand as of November 30, 1961, the total cost of the surplus came to about $9,177,739,000. On November 30, 1960, the total price was $9,150,087,000 with the handling, hauling and storage included.

Senator WILLIAMS said that instead of reducing the surplus, Freeman's plan had probably increased the price to the taxpayers by about $27,652,000.

Faced with this kind of calm, tough talk, "Fast Pencil" came up with another answer. Freeman said that the Government had $7,685,946,000 in farm surplus on December 31, 1961, compared with a revised figure of $7,908,135,000 for the same date in 1960. Handling, storage and hauling were separate figures. Even by his own figures, Freeman's $1,500 million had shrunk down to a reduction of $222,189,000 with those other charges still to be added.

On a percentage basis, and using figures furnished by "Fast Pencil" himself, there has been a reduction of 2.8 percent in the farm surplus—maybe. That doesn't include those costs that have to be paid for storing, hauling and handling. By Freeman's own figures, the Department of Agriculture spent only $700 million of the taxpayer's money in the emergency feed grain plan to save $222,189,000 in surplus. This is real efficiency. Roughly speaking, this means Americans must only spend $3 in the farm plan to save $1.

The New Frontier claims this is a highly successful farm program. Nuts.

Learning From the Past

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, today our country is embroiled in questions relating to disarmament and peace. While it is true that the past is prolog, nevertheless there are lessons to be learned from the past which can guide us to the future. It has long been apparent to most of the Members serving on the Armed Services Committee and having access to classified information, posture briefings, et cetera, that the decisions which we make in the field of armaments may determine whether or not we survive as a Nation. An excellent editorial on this subject appeared in the March 4, 1962, issue of the National Observer. I believe this article to be of great value in relating the past to the future and under leave to extend and revise my remarks, the editorial follows:

ARMS AND PEACE

In the long history of men's efforts to achieve peace by disarmament, the Washington naval treaty signed in February 1922 was unique. The great powers of that day actually agreed to something, and the United States in a dramatic move to show its good faith deliberately sank several of its battleships.

Yet in the end, of course, the result was failure, just as it was for the disarmament conferences that preceded and followed it. If that treaty had any effect at all it was to make Japan stronger and the United States weaker when the Second World War finally came. The peace of 1945, such as it was, was won not by the limitation of arms but by their might.

How all this happened, though it be history, is not without its instruction now that the great powers of today are once more talking of peace through disarmament. A new series of meetings is scheduled this month in Geneva, and there is at least a possibility that by summer President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev may meet personally at the summit.

The argument for disarmament as a means to peace is not difficult to explain, and its recurrence despite all past discouragements is a mark of its deep appeal to the hearts of men.

A war is fought with weapons, be they arrows or nuclear rockets. Without weapons an organized war between nations would be impossible in the modern world. If weapons

could be limited in number and deadliness, even if not abolished entirely, warfare between nations would be less efficient and therefore less destructive.

This simple correlation between weapons and war can be further extended. Quite often in history a war between two nations has been preceded by a military buildup on both sides; the outstanding example of this was World War I, as each side raced to outarm the other. So to many it seems reasonable to conclude if arms could be limited in such a way that two potential foes were clearly on a par, neither supposing that it had any advantage, the pressures toward war would be diminished.

This reasoning, which was explored by men of good will as long ago as the struggle between Rome and Carthage, is more poignant today because of the nature of modern war. The nuclear bomb is more than a quantitative change in the power of a weapon, as was the gun over the arrow; it makes war hideous for victor and vanquished alike and casts its shadow upon civilization itself.

From this prospect came the rallies to "Ban the Bomb" and such slogans as "Better Red Than Dead." From it too comes the quieter, but nonetheless incessant, drive to go again and again to the meeting table in the hopes of peace through disarmament.

Unfortunately, history lends no encouragement to these hopes. The 1922 Washington Treaty failed to preserve the peace not because it failed in disarming (in this and the 1930 conference a great deal was agreed to) but because disarmament could not remove the fundamental causes of World War II. These lay in the ambition of Japan to have hegemony over Asia, and of Germany to have hegemony over Europe. Hitler's ambition, for example, would hardly have been deterred even if every nation in Europe had been reduced to the simple weapons of Napoleon's day. In fact, Japan and Germany were encouraged by the fact that Great Britain and the United States invited aggression by their weakness.

So history really suggests that the correlation between arms and war is actually the reverse; arms are not the cause of war but their consequence. The war mood was antecedent to the guns of August 1914. This country has fought two wars with Britain but we have lived at peace with that country for more than a hundred years. We have never fought a war with Canada, with France, or for that matter, with Russia. This living in peace was not for lack of arms either in our own hands or theirs. It came simply from the fact that no issues arose between us to bring us to war.

Today the danger of war between the United States and Russia does not arise from the fact that each has an arsenal of nuclear bombs. If they could all be put back in Pandora's box, the ambitions of Russia would remain unchanged. Those ambitions have already overrun all of Eastern Europe. If America and Russia were equally cut back to no weapons more powerful than an infantryman's rifle what would there be to deter those ambitions at Berlin?

If those ambitions change, that is another story. Then America and Russia would need no disarmament treaty to keep the peace between them. Each would eagerly lay down the oppressive burden of arms. Except, of course, for the threats to peace from the ambitions of an awakening China.

What history suggests, wise men learned long ago. Our first President told the infant Republic that our peace lay in our strength to make war, and we have had no peace whenever we have forgotten it. It is true that arms too may fail to preserve the peace. But history and reason together have to be put aside to believe that disarmament avails so long as in men's hearts the ambition for war prevails.

Accomplishments of Our Air Reserve Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, due to a number of involved and rather complex factors, the public seems largely unaware of the magnificent job done by members of the Air Force Reserve during the current period of the Berlin crisis.

The Air Reserve units, which are made up of volunteers, have made many sacrifices for a vital purpose and I think it is only right that our Nation show its appreciation for the demonstrated willingness of the members of the Air Reserve to continue to serve on an active basis. The purpose of these remarks is to remove any cloud of doubt or suspicion that may hang over this fine organization.

In order to set the record straight, the Air Force Association has undertaken a project to enlighten all Americans as to the work and accomplishments of our Air Reserve Forces.

First, it has been specifically demonstrated, according to people who know the military, that the Air Force Reserve record shows convincingly that the Reserve forces are a valuable component of our defense structure.

The patriotic response of the Air Reserve forces, plus the sacrifices the men and their families have borne willingly, merit the Nation's gratitude.

Appropriate recognition of the Reservists should be given them to assure their continued strength and usefulness when they are released from active duty.

Here are some specific accomplishments of the Air Reserve Forces:

First. Air Guardsmen flew 218 single-engine jetplanes over the Atlantic within a month after being recalled to active service, providing much-needed conventional fighter strength for Air Force combat units in Europe. In a recent letter to President Kennedy, Chancellor Adenauer of Germany wrote that, in his opinion, the buildup to which these units contributed was the prime factor influencing Khrushchev to back down on Berlin.

Second. The number of complaints from Air Force recallees was nearly zero—no greater under the circumstances than would have been experienced with career personnel.

Third. Five Air Force Reserve and six Air National Guard squadrons entered on duty with four-engine transport aircraft, the first to be assigned to their respective components. In 3 months of active duty, their crews flew almost 4 million miles on troop carrier and cargo missions.

Fourth. The remaining 13 Air Guard tactical fighter and reconnaissance squadrons on active duty in the United States are combat ready, poised for immediate deployment wherever national security may be threatened.

The Secretaries of Defense and Air Force and the Air Force Chief of Staff have publicly expressed their high regard for the mission capability of Reserve forces personnel and appreciation for the spirit in which reservists' wives and families have accepted the recall. Their pertinent statements are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington.

DEAR FELLOW AMERICAN: During the last several months more than 150,000 men in the Reserve forces of the United States have been called back to active duty. This has been brought home to you in a very personal way, I know, because a relative of yours is among the reservists now in uniform, and it is for that reason I am writing you.

Every reservist called back to active duty is making a special contribution to his country's security, but I recognize—and the President recognizes—that this has meant difficulty, inconvenience, and the disruption of civilian pursuits for thousands upon thousands of Americans, including the families who were left behind when the reservists reported for duty. The necessity for such sacrifice is not always understood. That's why your service has been using its internal information program to explain the callup and to answer many of the questions which I know have been raised.

As we enter a new year the United States continues to face a strong and determined adversary who is pushing and probing at freedom in many parts of the world. The United States is the chief defender of freedom in this world, and we can fill this role and maintain the peace only so long as we ourselves are strong and determined. The 150,000 recalled reservists have helped to keep us strong, and their recall has surely evidenced our determination.

We are taking other steps, of course, to convince the Soviet bloc we mean business, and as we build our strength in these other ways it will become possible to release the reservists from active duty. But in the meantime their country owes them a very great debt, and you who are sharing in the sacrifices they have made are equally entitled to the thanks of a grateful nation.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. MCNAMARA.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C.

Secretary of the Air Force Eugene M. Zuckert dispatched congratulatory messages today to the Commander of the Tactical Air Command, Gen. Walter C. Sweeney, Jr., and to the commanders of the former Air National Guard units now in Europe. The messages are as follows:

TO COMMANDER TAC

"My congratulations to TAC on the professional manner in which you conducted the operational deployment of units from the Air National Guard. The success of the deployment reflects the cooperation between our active duty and Reserve forces and underscores the high degree of proficiency of both. Please extend my congratulations to all TAC units and personnel participating in this successful operation."

TO COMMANDER USAFE FOR INDIVIDUAL UNIT COMMANDERS

"My warmest salute to the men of your command on their highly successful deployment to Europe. The manner in which the deployment was conducted so soon after recall could only be the result of sustained superior performance. It is my desire that every man in your organization knows of the pride the whole Air Force feels in this accomplishment, which reflects the high standards set and maintained in Air National Guard training."

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C.

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay has congratulated the Tactical Air Command and the Air National Guard on the outstanding manner in which the recent movement of more than 200 jet fighters to Europe was accomplished.

The Air Force Chief of Staff, who has just returned from a visit to Europe to inspect the recalled units of the Air National Guard, sent the following message to Gen. Walter C. Sweeney, Commander of the Tactical Air Command, and Maj. Gen. Winston P. Wilson, Assistant Chief of the National Guard Bureau for Air:

"The movement of the newly federalized ANG units to Europe was executed in an orderly, efficient, and professional way. This required the utmost in leadership, planning, and cooperation on the part of all units and personnel involved. All obstacles were overcome by ingenuity and determination in spite of the extremely short preparation time available. The end result of the safe and expeditious arrival of the fighters should be a source of great pride to all who had a part in the operation. I wish to offer my congratulations for the outstanding manner in which this difficult and vitally important task was successfully accomplished. Please pass the above on to your people who were responsible for this."

Tactical fighter units included in the deployment to Europe were elements of the 122 Tactical Fighter Wing, Fort Wayne, Ind.; the 131 Tactical Fighter Wing, St. Louis, Mo.; the 121 Tactical Fighter Wing, Columbus, Ohio; the 102 Tactical Fighter Wing, Boston, Mass.; the 108 Tactical Fighter Wing, McGuire Air Force Base, N.J.; and the 117 Tactical Reconnaissance Wing, Birmingham, Ala. They are equipped with F-84F, RF-84F, and F-86H aircraft.

Organizations which assisted in the deployment included the Military Air Transport Service, the Strategic Air Command, the Air Force Logistics Command, the U.S. Air Forces in Europe, the Air Defense Command, the Navy, and the Coast Guard.

Benefits From Area Redevelopment Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as a result of the passage of the Area Redevelopment Act and of the cooperation of not only the area redevelopment agency but also of existing agencies of the Government, especially the Small Business Administration, southern Illinois is at long last getting help to solve their problem of extremely high unemployment.

The Small Business Administration has made a $500,000 loan to the city of Carbondale, Ill., so that Technical Tape, Inc., can have a plant there. It is estimated that this will create 1,000 new jobs for the area. In addition, of course, we have moved forward very quickly on the Rend Lake project near Benton, in southern Illinois.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Gov. Otto Kerner of Illinois to Mr. John Horne, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Springfield, February 19, 1962.

Mr. JOHN E. HORNE,
Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORNE: As Governor of Illinois, I would like to express my gratitude to the Small Business Administration for its role in the attainment of the $500,000 Area Redevelopment Administration loan to the city of Carbondale for the Technical Tape, Inc., plant. Because of this loan, more than 1,000 new jobs will soon be coming to an area which has long suffered from persistent unemployment.

Small Business Administration was responsible for evaluating and processing this loan. The agency made appraisals of financial statements and helped in obtaining bank participation. It was also responsible for servicing the loan and disbursing the money.

Small Business Administration is to be commended for giving this project top priority, for the quickness with which it moved through all its required procedures, and for the assistance it furnished the Area Redevelopment Administration, the city of Carbondale, Technical Tape, and the other participants in this project.

Sincerely,

OTTO KERNER,
Governor.

Islip Student Lincoln Essay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President recently, I had the pleasure of speaking in Islip, Long Island, N.Y. At the dinner which I attended, the Reverend Canon S. Peters read a prize-winning essay on Abraham Lincoln. I was very much impressed by the sentiments expressed in the essay, which was written by an Islip high school student, Eve Simone Jacobsen.

I ask unanimous consent today to have Miss Jacobsen's timely and perceptive essay printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INFLUENCE OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN ON US IN 1962

(By Eve Simone Jacobsen)

Lincoln's principles direct the actions of every free nation and form our world's conscience. These precepts have daily effect upon all mankind, although their full universal acceptance is not as yet a reality.

Against secession, Lincoln said, "this Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free." His belief in national unity has expanded into one of world unity, of unity among all creeds and of unity among all races. Leaders of Western countries combat the spread of communism and the existence of dictatorships with this concept in mind. Communist China, in a real sense, has herself proven its validity through failures of peasant communes under Communist overseers.

"You can have no conflict without yourselves being the aggressors." National policy, NATO, and the United Nations have incorporated the essence of this promise for the protection of freedom and peace.

No truer or more appropriate warning for modern society has yet been voiced than, "I think the necessity of being ready increases—Look to it." As is in accordance, fallout shelters and defenses receive international concern, although Lincoln never experienced a world war or saw a hydrogen bomb.

To Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation we owe the American Negro's progress and his contributions to our civilization, its arts and sciences.

The greatness of Lincoln brought recognition to doctrines which are based on truth, justice, and understanding. These are the maxims by which the United States has attained its present influence and which, when practiced, lead humanity nearer to all that is good.

Has the U.N. Failed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the February 19, 1962, issue of the Los Angeles Herald Examiner a column by George Todt entitled "Has the U.N. Failed?" The column centers on Representative JAMES B. UTT's H.R. 9567, a bill to rescind and revoke membership of the United States in the United Nations and the specialized agencies thereof and to repeal the immunities act relative thereto. Mr. Todt makes some points that should be brought to the attention of Members of Congress. I ask unanimous consent to have the column printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

HAS THE U.N. FAILED?

(By George Todt)

"The Gallup poll is neither an idol nor a sacred cow insofar as I am concerned," Congressman JAMES B. UTT of neighboring Santa Ana told me recently.

"When it purports to show that 89 percent of the American people think the United Nations organization has done a wonderful job—well, Mr. Gallup must not have sent any of his 1648 questionnaires to people in my district."

The fiery little Congressman is one who has a bill presently in Congress to take the United Nations out of the United States—and the United States out of the United Nations.

U.N. CONTROLS US

Before afficionados of the U.N. cry out in mortal hurt, permit me to point out that this bill—considering the ideological makeup and complexion of both Congress and the administration—is going exactly nowhere in this session of Congress.

But it does point up, regardless of Mr. Gallup's bland assertions to the contrary, that the U.N. does not have the complete confidence of a large segment of the American people.

Let's stop kidding ourselves.

The operating personnel of the U.N. is 40 percent Communist and votes Red en masse. Some of the neutral nations play

ball in the same camp. Despite our bribes, known as foreign aid.

The U.N.'s handling of war in Korea, Congo, and India has done much to raise doubts and alarm Americans in both parties.

The overzealousness of certain U.N. adherents to take us into world government—which is bound to be Marxist Socialist under present conditions—does not increase U.N. popularity here.

The list could be added to, but why bother?

Reasonable persons, both pro and con, must realize by this time that U.N. popularity and respect for it has waned.

The answer does not lie in vicious diatribes against those who point out our problems and mistakes. Let's have a solution.

Actually, I do not see how the U.N. can long continue to pretend to speak for a world which is half slave and half free.

It seems to me a form of global schizophrenia.

The alternative to breakup of the U.N. today is not the straw man of war or "isolation"—and anyone who takes such an absurd position is an extremist. What is another avenue which we might take now?

LION AND LAMB

I think that going back to regional alliances of nations based on mutual, sympathetic aims—military, economic, cultural and respect for religious practices—is more practical than trying to make the lion and the lamb lie down together.

This course is only practical when a new lamb is the main course for the lion on succeeding mornings.

Suppose we and the Communists were in opposing blocs of nations in routine alliances, instead of the present U.N. arrangement; would this mean no contact between the groups?

Not at all—at least not necessarily, unless so desired.

But the important thing is that our side could accomplish vital matters without being subject to an irresponsible and selfish Soviet veto.

Presently nothing is being accomplished in the U.N. for us because the Reds invariably veto major matters that conflict with their interests. They muddy the waters and confuse issues. Why take it?

I believe we need good allies and should not become isolationists—but we ought to be choosy about who we allow to become our allies.

MORE WITH FEWER

We could get far more done by working with fewer but more qualified allies than a conglomerate of enemies, neutrals and friends.

Congressman UTT said he is of the considered opinion that the U.N. has control of our national sovereignty at this time, if it might choose to exercise it.

This seems hard to believe. The American people can always say nix to the celebrated world body by the simple expedient of withholding crucial funds.

The Utt resolution will not pass Congress this time—but it is an indication that the Gallup poll is not the only criterion.

Fish Flour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I was very much encouraged to read last week in the Washington Post that Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall served cookies made from fish flour to a number of congressional and Interior Department staff members. The occasion was a briefing by the Department of Interior to outline its programs to the staff members and congressional aids in attendance. I laud Secretary Udall for his forthright stand of approval for this product.

The Food and Drug Administration informed my office this morning that my appeal was one of the three successful appeals filed in opposition to the proposed order for a standard of identity on fish flour. The other successful appeals were filed by Mr. Harold Putman on behalf of Vio-Bin Corp., and by Mr. Kleinfeld on behalf of Menhaden Fisheries. Food and Drug Administration further informed my office that a public hearing will be held when an impartial, competent hearing examiner is obtained.

Because of the importance of this product to the problem of hunger in the world, I wish to place my appeal in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I also want to let the many individuals and State and Federal agencies supporting this product know that a public hearing will be held in an attempt to obtain Food and Drug Administration approval of fish flour.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my letter of February 24, 1962, to Mr. Beryl McCullar, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 24, 1962.

Mr. BERYL MCCULLAR,
Hearing Clerk, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MCCULLAR: I am writing to object to the Standard of Identity for Fish Flour as set forth in the Federal Register, January 25, 1962, issue. The order is Title 21, Chapter I, Subchapter B, Part 37. Writing as a U.S. citizen and as a U.S. Senator, I object to this standard of identity. I object to the requirements that the fish, before processing, must have its head, fins, tail, viscera, and intestinal contents removed. I further object to processed whole fish not being approved for sale as a food product within the United States, while it is approved for sale abroad.

The order would require an unreasonable increase in cost in the processing of the food. The product made from whole fish flour has been tested by private and Federal Agency laboratories and found to be clean and safe for human consumption. After testing the whole fish product, Food and Drug Administration has never challenged its purity. Its only objection is that some consumers in America would object to it. Such an objection, in the face of expert laboratory reports affirming the products cleanliness and safety, is insufficient to justify the removal of various parts of the fish and the resulting increase in cost.

The Food and Drug Administration is not empowered to bar a clean food product from consumption in the United States using as the sole basis of its position that some consumers would object to the product. These esthetic objections attributed to parts of the consuming public are overruled by the wealth of medical and sociological evidence available and supporting the approval and use of the product made from the whole fish. These esthetic objections are further overruled by the fact that the Food and Drug Administration has seen fit from the evidence before it to approve the manufacture and export of whole fish flour.

The Food and Drug Administration may not properly bar this product on a unilateral interpretation of the unsupported views of a small minority of the consuming public.

I insist on a public hearing being held to consider the objections filed to the Standard of Identity mentioned above. The issues which should be covered are (1) the cleanliness and safety of the whole fish flour, (2) the authority of Food and Drug Administration to bar a clean and safe food product without reasonable justification, (3) the right of American citizens to insist upon and obtain the use of a safe food product at the lowest reasonable cost.

With best wishes.

Faithfully yours,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

Taxation and Subsidy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote three paragraphs from a very thought-provoking letter I have received from my friend, Dr. R. C. Erdmann of Rapid City, S. Dak., part of which is as follows:

Another hangnail of thinking is the contention that we as a nation can live vicariously and accept the world's responsibilities. In our attempt to stand out with bold autonomy, we have not infrequently resorted to the coining and usage of terms and manners that to us have represented emphasis, but to others misgivings of meaning and connotation. As a result, we continue to create, especially with our money, new and bitter enemies instead of new and true friends. We should be proud and distinctly desirous to explain in detail how our Nation was conceived and how we progressed from bondage through true freedom and brotherhood of man. We should be proud that until in recent years, we grew strong by the independent individual helping himself without assistance except for the guarantee of freedom granted in a free-agency system. If something has to be promoted worldwide, let us promote true freedom and free-enterprise without the hinderances of monetary hand-outs and big government control. Beyond any doubt, we must first begin our right living within our domestic boundaries. It is time that we disclaim the political ostriches that have lived amongst us—heads of denial and rejection in the sand and backends of exaggeration and liberal verbosity in the air.

Perhaps, by this time, even you think I am urtraconservative? If so, I sincerely believe we need more ultraconservatives to provide a necessary and substantial dike to control and withstand the omnipresent and omnipotent restless sea of liberalism that prevails in our country today. I do like to think of myself as a segment of the small existing portion of the Republican Party known as the conservative element because the Republican Party is the only political-minded organization I belong to. As such I sincerely hope my freedom of thought and expression will never be overcome or buffered by the indulgences and mechanisms of our strong present-day opposition.

When our civilization pushed westward it was done by rugged individuals who asked for nothing except freedom. They were strong and would have preferred death to a life based on taxation and subsidy. I think it is only fitting and proper that we honor and be proud of those fine people and maybe we should, while we acknowledge their accomplishments, mimic and endorse their endeavors whenever possible.

Midwinter Conference of National Officers and Department Commanders, Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, as Members of this House are aware, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, under Commander in Chief Robert E. Hansen, of Minnesota, held that organization's midwinter conference of national officers and department commanders at the Sheraton-Park Hotel, February 3–6, 1962. One of the important and traditional features of these annual conferences of the National and State leaders of the Veterans of Foreign Wars is the appearance before the conference of outstanding authorities on matters pertaining to national defense, foreign affairs, and the Communist threat.

Among the principal speakers at this VFW conference was Capt. Barry Brannen, USNR, retired, who has long been recognized as a foremost authority on the techniques and objectives of Communist aggression. Captain Brannen, a distinguished lawyer in Beverly Hills, Calif., has written and spoken extensively on the subject of Communist methods.

It was in recognition of his longstanding patriotic efforts that the VFW awarded to Capt. Barry Brannen the Commander in Chief's Silver Medal and Citation.

The presentation was made by VFW Commander in Chief Robert E. Hansen, at the commander in chief's luncheon on February 5, in the cotillion rooms of the Sheraton-Park Hotel.

Captain Brannen was the naval member of the Allied Control Commission for Rumania. He had an early opportunity to observe firsthand Communist techniques for taking over a nation. He understood quickly what was taking place and he has, since that time, lectured and written extensively on this and other aspects of communism.

I recommend this speech by Captain Brannen to the attention of Members of the House. It is, in my opinion, one of the most concise, understandable, and perceptive analyses of Communist methods that I have read.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include Commander in Chief Hansen's speech of introduction and presentation to Captain Brannen, and Captain Brannen's address to the assembled officials of the Veterans of Foreign Wars:

PRESENTATION OF COMMANDER IN CHIEF'S SILVER MEDAL TO CAPT. BARRY BRANNEN, USNR (RETIRED), CONFERENCE OF NATIONAL OFFICERS AND DEPARTMENT COMMANDERS, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, SHERATON-PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 5, 1962

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States has always felt a deep sense of appreciation for the citizen who does more than that which is just required to be a good citizen.

Captain Brannen, USNR, is such a person. He is a distinguished lawyer. A senior captain in the U.S. Naval Reserves, he has a notable record in war; he has served his country well in peace. Captain Brannen, has been selected as the recipient of a high award of the Veterans of Foreign Wars because he has contributed so much to warning our Nation as to the techniques and objectives of the Communist conspiracy.

Within the last few months a very widely accepted book has been published entitled "Kremlin Target: U.S.A." The author, Mr. Donald Dunham, emphasized that the pattern of Communist takeover techniques occurred immediately after World War II in Rumania.

This is a sound line of reason on the part of the author of this recent book, and it is pertinent to the award we are now making, because Capt. Barry Brannen was one of the first authorities as—early as 1944—to recognize the significance of Communist techniques in Rumania. Even then he warned as to the significance of those Communist methods of conquest.

Captain Brannen was then in a privileged position to observe communism in action. In October of 1944 he was assigned as the U.S. naval representative on the Allied Control Commission for Rumania. During the 15 months—which were of crucial import in the history of the East-West conflict—he saw firsthand, and understood full well, the methods of Communist aggression being used in Rumania. In his position, he not only observed, but to the full extent of his authority he resisted the Red encroachment.

His observation of communism was not limited to the Balkans. Following his assignment on the Allied Control Commission in Rumania he was assigned to intelligence duties in Asia and the Middle East.

He has contributed greatly, as an author, to an understanding of Communist methods and objectives. While time does not permit a complete list of his publications, I mention his widely recognized and very prophetic article "Conquest by Chicanery" in the U.S. Naval Institute proceedings. This was a description of Russian deception in destroying the Rumanian armed forces and the taking over control of the country.

Another of Captain Brannen's key articles on Soviet techniques was "The Soviet Conquest of Rumania" in the Foreign Affairs magazine. It set forth the purpose and technique of using a coalition government to achieve communistic control of a nation.

In addition to anticommunism efforts, he has lectured and written extensively on defense organizations. He is recognized as a leading authority on that subject. Incidentally, he is a strong advocate of the Joint Chief of Staff system which the Veterans of Foreign Wars has long supported as a key feature of our national security.

I would like to point out that we are honored in having with us on this occasion a longtime friend and fellow naval officer of Captain Brannen. I refer to a distinguished member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, our own Vice Adm. Leland P. Lovette.

Captain Brannen, in recognition of your perceptive and practical writings on communism, because of your unceasing efforts to apprise our military personnel and Nation as a whole of the dangers and particularly the techniques of Communist aggression, because of your continuing contributions to our national security, it is, for me, a pleasure, on behalf of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, to present to you at this time this citation and Commander in Chief's Silver Medal.

SOVIET PATTERN OF CONQUEST

(Address by Capt. Barry Brannen, USNR (Ret.) Conference of National Officers and Department Commanders Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D.C., February 5, 1962)

Commander in Chief Hansen, Admiral Lovette, General Hittle, and Veterans of Foreign Wars: I want to say first of all how very much I appreciate this award. I am very happy to receive it and very grateful to you for giving it to me.

Our chairman mentioned that I had the privilege of serving for 17 months on the Allied Control Commission for Rumania. This sometime happy land and people have passed into legend.

On October 23, 1944, as a result of a coup d'etat, the Rumanians came in on our side of the war. From that time forward, they followed Winston Churchill's advice and worked their passage home. They fought bravely on our side at a cost of 169,000 casualties. They captured 55,000 Germans in their country alone and fought on until the end of the war.

In line with the assurances made in the Atlantic Charter and the Declaration of the United Nations, they thought they were fighting for some measure of personal freedom: that is, political freedom, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, freedom of religion, and equal political rights. In the end they found themselves under the Soviet yoke and enchained far more than they ever were under the Germans.

Now what happened in Rumania is important because it furnished the introduction to the Western World of the Soviet technique of conquest. This was the first time the West had seen it at close range in action, although it could be guessed at from the annexation of Bessarabia, Latvia, and Estonia, and the ruthless occupation of Bessarabia.

What happened in Rumania should have provided a warning and a lesson. But it did not. And the Soviets applied the same technique in Bulgaria, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia. The Communists used these policies in Manchuria and Indochina and they may now be using them again in Laos.

There are three salient factors in this process that I would stress. The first is that in the Soviet political process, truth is policy. Truth is not necessarily related to facts, if the facts are not in accordance with what the Russians have been told to believe, or want to believe or are directed to believe.

I remember standing by an old German gun implacement at Constanza. A Russian officer approached me, his blue NKVD hat perched jauntily on his head. He pointed to the gold star on my uniform and said: "You have on our star." I told him that what I wore was not a Soviet star, but the emblem that identified a line officer in the Navy of the United States. But as I talked, the star on the tunic of an American Air Officer at my side attracted the attention of the Russian. He said: "He has on our star, too." The officer explained that it was not a Russian star, but served to designate an officer in the U.S. Air Force who had qualified as a pilot in particular types of aircraft.

But our words made no impression and seemed to glance harmlessly off his mind.

Just then, General van Schuyler, later Chief of Staff for NATO, arrived on the scene. The Russian looked up and at once pointed to his Army uniform and said: "Why, he has on our star, too."

Later on, in 1945, I witnessed a further illustration. The last freely elected Premier of Rumania, General Rodescu, had been surrounded by Russian soldiers in his home and was virtually a prisoner. At a meeting of the Allied Control Commission, we suggested to General Vinogradoff that this was contrary to assurances given the British when General Rodescu left the British Embassy, wherein he had sought sanctuary. General Vinogradoff, who was the Chief Soviet Representative on the Commission (and who was, certainly, not the worst Russian we saw in Rumania) presided at the meeting. He said that we could not expect him to feel sympathetic toward General Rodescu, the man who on February 24, 1945, supported the Rumanian Fascists and saboteurs of the armistice and who had directed his soldiers to fire upon a mass demonstration of 50,000 people peacefully assembled in the Calea Victoriea.

Now, General Vinogradoff knew that I was in Bucharest on February 24 and he also knew that I knew that there was not a single word of truth in what he said. On the contrary, the difficulties of that day stemmed from a Communist-inspired attack on the Defense Ministry in an effort to bring down the Government. But the general was not in the least embarrassed and seemed to take it for granted that I could distinguish truth from policy.

The second aspect of the Soviet technique is that there is no chicanery to which the Soviets will not stoop to advance their policies or their cause. Some of us here in the United States may have been surprised at the news from Hungary, a few years ago, when the leaders of the uprising were invited to confer under a flag of truce and, at the conference, were first impressed and later executed. A flag of truce had been respected for some 2,000 years and earlier. But those of us who were in Rumania were all too familiar with the device.

We recalled that immediately after the coup d'etat of October 23, 1944, which brought Rumania into our side of the war, there was a conference between Soviet and Rumanian naval authorities at Ismail. On August 30, the Russians directed that all Rumanian monitors on the Danube be sent to the Russian port of Reni and on September 1, the Soviet commander directed that Rumanian war vessels of all other categories, then in the Danube ports, sail to the Russian port of Ismail. The purpose of neither order was disclosed. When they arrived, the vessels were immediately disarmed and altogether 208 ships, there and in Constanza, were seized upon the pretense that there was a mutiny on the Rumanian navy. Many of the personnel of these vessels were taken prisoner and were still in Russian hands when I left the country.

The third aspect that I would stress is that Soviet political penetration follows a pattern that can be recognized. In each of the former axis satellites, the Soviet methods were the same, that is, terrorization of the civil populace by the Russian military, or, as in the case of Czechoslovakia, by the threat of military occupation; the introduction into the country of Communist sympathizers and saboteurs; the creation of a political front composed of the Communist Party, the Socialist Party (if possible) and of other Communist-controlled splinter parties newly organized for the occasion, and finally, the overthrow of the coalition and the formation of a Communist government, principally through the suppression of all political freedoms and civil rights.

The process was always helped when the Communists insisted on control of the key ministries of defense, to control the armed forces, and interior, to control the police. When these demands are made anywhere in the world, Communist motives must be deemed suspect.

It is quite possible that we are now approaching a critical period in American history. While the process has been a slow one, the American people are being actively alerted to the overshadowing Soviet menace. Missile sites in both the East and West are gradually being dispersed and in the not too distant future we should approach a stalemate, which, in effect, would militate against the start of a nuclear war. But until that time comes, we will have the omnipresent Soviet threats and the problems which arise from calculated risks they are prepared to take. This is the climate in which Soviet successes have been achieved.

With overwhelming forces in Rumania and Bulgaria, Russia threatened Turkey in 1947. In my opinion, only the intransigence of the Turks, the absolute certainty that they would fight and the American program of aid to Greece and Turkey prevented the loss of the easternmost provinces of Kars and Ardahan and the possible loss of control of the Straits. The free world was threatened that Russian troops would fight in Korea and that they would appear in Egypt during the Anglo-French invasion. We are lately threatened that they will be used to destroy Allied occupation rights in Berlin.

We can expect that Soviet "fishermen" will appear wherever there are troubled waters and it is up to us now to determine what our national policies will be.

It is necessary for us, as a people, to realize that there can be no appeasement of totalitarianism. Slavery may be bearable, and a people in chains may survive, but communism binds the mind and spirit. When it exists there is neither good nor evil but only the awful attempt to impute moral responsibility to a wholly impersonal state.

We cannot tell if our civilization will survive another war, but we know that it will surely perish if no resistance to the forces of evil is made.

In such a struggle, time is not neutral nor necessarily on our side. The bell now tolling in Berlin is urgent. The same tones were heard in the valley of the Somme some 20 years ago last June. It was there that France, proud and as yet unconquered, faced her hour of crisis and the world measured her chance for survival. The German forces moved south past Amiens and General Wiegand rallied his forces for the critical defense of Paris. He urged them to defend their heritage and their liberty and to fight in the great French tradition and said: "Hold tight to the soil of France." And when the battle at last reached crescendo, he told his men: "This is the last quarter of an hour."

The lesson was not lost upon millions of Frenchmen who endured the horrors of the occupation. It should not be lost upon us.

Regimentation Doesn't Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, for a vivid example of the shortcomings of a regimented agriculture, we need look only to the present situation in Soviet Russia. This account is from the March 5 issue of the Wall Street Journal:

WASHINGTON.—Even as Nikita Khrushchev's Communist Party Central Committee assembles in Moscow today with the avowed aim of remedying shortcomings in Soviet agriculture, the best-informed U.S. onlookers are becoming increasingly convinced that Red-grown food and fiber won't bury the free world any time in the foreseeable future.

Early harbingers are hinting that this could be the fourth straight year to bring a bumper crop of Kremlin disappointment. Latest weather reports are convincing free-world analysts that parts of the vital grain-producing Ukraine and of the Siberian new lands are very dry. Much more than normal rainfall, they believe, will be needed to put the soil in shape for adequate spring planting and crop production—even after the recent rainstorms that swept from Germany into Russia.

By the account of the Communist Party newspaper Pravda itself, many Russian farmers aren't prepared for spring planting, only a few weeks away. One reason, it's implied, is passive resistance to new farming methods proposed by Mr. Khrushchev, notably a plan to throw into annual crop production some marginal land normally kept in grass for soil-building purposes. The Moscow meeting starting today is expected to adopt such a plan.

WARNING FROM SCIENTISTS

Indeed, U.S. officials report, some of Mr. K.'s own scientists are warning him that he's bucking Mother Nature in trying to expand livestock feed production rather indiscriminately. Feed crops, he's been told, can deplete the soil quickly, especially in the arid new lands of Kazakhstan in southwestern Siberia, making the land vulnerable to dust storms. Furthermore, Soviet scientists have cautioned, shortages of moisture in such places make it hard to ripen feed grains successfully.

Basically, Washington experts report, Premier Khrushchev's 1959-born effort to expand and reshape Soviet agriculture is bumping into serious obstacles: Chronically unfavorable weather across large stretches of Russian farmland, limited acreage of truly fertile soil, lack of adequate incentives for farmers to boost production, blundering inefficiency in the Red bureaucracy, and a tendency of Soviet officials to follow the party line blindly no matter how meager the results.

Some gains are expected, all right, sooner or later. U.S. Government analysts figure Russia may gradually succeed in its new emphasis on raising crop yields per acre rather than pushing plantings deeper into Siberia's virgin lands; more fertilizer and better use of machinery may help do the trick. And Washington officials expect Mr. K. will use the Moscow meeting to renew his farm production drive, probably trying to bully farmers into accepting tougher state controls.

DEPENDENCE ON PRIVATE PLOTS

But if Russia's ruler should meddle too deeply in the still-important private sector of Soviet agriculture, U.S. officials emphasize, he'd risk disaster. For Russia still depends heavily on the output of tiny farmer-owned private plots, worked on the side by members of collective farms; though making up less than 5 perecnt of all Soviet farmland, the private plots yield nearly half the nation's meat, milk, and green vegetables and most of its eggs and potatoes.

So far, American farm experts conclude, Russian agriculture has made only token advances toward the ambitious goals of the current 7-year plan, trumpeted so loudly by Mr. K. at its unfolding in 1959.

The reverberations have been manifold: Soviet farm output these past few years has

lagged behind population increases; while there's nothing like Chinese-style starvation, the Russian diet remains heavy in bread and potatoes and rather light on meat and milk. Farm exports have been sluggish; the USSR may find it hard to spare all the food and feed grains its satellites need, and trouble in earning free-world currency with farm-goods sales is hindering Moscow's efforts to buy West European machinery to spur industrialization.

Finally, the uninspiring example set by Soviet agriculture in contrast with Western abundance may hamper export of the Red faith to newly developing nations. "Everything we see," notes a U.S. official, "indicates Khrushchev wants to prove that Communist-style agriculture is the best system for them to adopt."

TARNISHED VISION

The 7-year plan, aimed at outstripping U.S. farm abundance, brightly envisioned a total 1959-through-1965 production increase of 70 percent, with especially steep gains in meat and milk. But that vision seems somewhat tarnished now.

Assuming Soviet farm output just before World War II equaled an index figure of 100, the 1965 goal would be 200—and U.S. Agriculture Department specialists figure last year's performance was only 130. While that marked a gain from the 126 of the year before, it still fell short of record 1958, the year before the master plan was thrown into gear.

Total grain deliveries from Russian farms to the Government did mount last year to 54 million metric tons, roughly 7 million more than in 1960. But they fell far short of the official 1961 goal of 63 million tons and trailed the 1958 record as well. Much of the lag was in livestock feed grains, the raw materials of the meat and milk Mr. Khrushchev is eyeing so eagerly. Last year's production of corn, oats, and barley, Russia's major feed grains totaled 34 million tons, 4 million less than the 1958 harvest.

For lack of more feed, Soviet production of meat is floundering along year after year at just under 14 billion pounds a year, less than half the goal for 1965. Even this low level is being bolstered by distress slaughter of feed-short livestock. Soviet officials admit livestock numbers did not increase during 1961, in contrast to other recent years. "If feed production cannot be greatly improved, meat production will really begin slumping in a very few years," an analyst says. Because grain is short, Russia's livestock raisers have turned to other feed, including potatoes and pumpkins, that Americans consider less than ideal for meat making.

LAGGING MILK FLOW

Russia's milk flow, too, lags behind schedule. Early estimates indicate 1961 production was little or no higher than the 112.5 billion pounds of the year before. That in turn marked a slip from the 113.3 billion pounds of 1959, the first year of the 7-year plan. The 1965 goal is over 200 billion pounds.

By contrast, the United States turned out far more meat and milk last year—30 billion pounds of meat and 125 billion pounds of milk—for a considerably smaller population; the United States has around 185 million mouths to feed, while the Russian population is approaching 220 million. Figured per capita, American farm production now stands more than 20 percent above the pre-World War II mark; Russia's corresponding gain is 13 percent.

Even more startling is the fact that since World War II Russia has increased its sown acreage by 50 percent, but has succeeded in lifting total farm production only 30 percent; the United States has decreased planted acres by 13 percent in the same space of time, yet has increased output 35 percent.

Soviet food supplies are suffering an extra blow from agriculture's setbacks elsewhere in the Red world. Last year, to no one's surprise, stricken China had to halt all exports of food and fiber to Russia.

Not only has Russia lost these imports, but farm failures within its empire—in East Germany, for instance—are stimulating export demand it may not be able to meet; ordinarily 75 percent of Soviet farm exports go to other Iron Curtain countries. Russia's total grain shipments abroad fell to 6.8 million metric tons in 1960 from more than 7 million in 1959—and may have slipped again last year. Most of the wheat the U.S.S.R. has been shipping out, U.S. experts report, came out of the leftover from the big 1958 harvest, not from any more recent crops.

EXASPERATING U.S. COMPARISONS

Kremlin exasperation of farm troubles is heightened by the realization that America's far larger output comes from an Agricultural plant that's operating at only about half its potential capacity, and that the U.S. food-and-fiber outpouring is attained through the efforts of only about 15 million farm workers, as against more than 100 million toiling on the Russian land.

By the Communists' own account, of course, inefficiency, ignorance and mismanagement deserve much of the blame for farm failures. Mass firings of farm officials and reshuffling of responsibilities late in 1960 have plainly failed to solve these troubles.

In a Moscow speech to farm managers last November, Premier Khrushchev complained they made ambitious production plans lightly and then explained failures by saying: "That year the wind blew that way and this year it blew this way." He declared: "We need less sweat and more brains. We have the machines and we have other material resources. We must learn how to use them."

Beyond this, Mr. K.'s plans for boosting feed crops are meeting resistance from some of his own underlings. He wants especially to increase production of corn and sugar beets, with their high feed value; he'd substitute them for lower value oats or for soil-building grasses used in crop rotation plans, despite some scientists' fears of soil depletion.

HOW DOES DAISY VOTE

Said he in a recent speech: "Give the cows a good silage of corn, sugar beets, hay and straw and ask: 'Well now, Daisy, and what fodder do you vote for?' I am convinced, comrades, that the cow will immediately go up to the sugar beets." Second choice, he contended, would be corn.

For oats, Mr. Khrushchev has nothing but scorn. He has told one group of farm officials: "I would say as a joke that if these officials will continue to be stubborn and keep land in oats, we will start feeding them oatmeal * * * the coarse stuff [that] you cannot tell, damn it, whether you are getting your ration or the horse's."

And the Soviet Premier has openly challenged charges that it was he and the Communist Party that actually first promoted the "ley" or grass rotation plan he now considers wasteful. P. A. Vlaayuk, president of the Ukrainian Academy of Agriculture, recently delivered such a charge in the Premier's presence. "To listen to you," Mr. K. replied, "the party elaborated the ley system while the scientists supported the party in this. No, the very opposite is true. Scientists proposed this system and pushed collective and state farms into applying it everywhere."

Whatever tactics Russia's masterminds apply, the U.S. officials foresee basic problems of geography persisting. For one thing, some Russian soils are thin and sandy; the Soviets have nothing to compare with the rich U.S. corn and cotton belts. Weather is another problem. "A large area of the country has a low, highly variable precipitation and is subject to frequent droughts," says a U.S. Agriculture Department study. It was a pair of droughts—one last spring in the Siberian "new lands" and another last summer in the Southern European U.S.S.R.—that damaged 1961 grain crops and undid Mr. Khrushchev's predictions of record farm output.

DRAWBACKS OF CLIMATE

As compared with American weather, Russia's climate is not moderated by warm, moisture-laden winds blowing off oceans or large lakes. Because the U.S.S.R. lies much farther north than the United States the average growing season is short; there are only about 130 frost-free days around Moscow, about the same as in central North Dakota. There isn't time to replant in late spring if an unseasonal hard freeze decimates young crops; to delay planting beyond any possibility of late cold snaps means a gamble that early fall frosts won't nip maturing plants.

Certainly U.S. farm specialists do expect that some of the changes now being made, notably the effort to wring more production from each acre of Soviet farmland, may pay off sooner or later. "Even a small increase in yield per acre," notes a U.S. official, "would significantly increase production because of the large acreages involved."

Already the big effort to lift harvest instead by expanding planted acreage has slowed considerably. Last year the U.S.S.R.'s total cropland rose only 2 million acres from the 502 million tilled in 1960; in that year planted acres had leaped 16 million from the year before. Since 1954, all told, some 90 million Soviet acres have been put under cultivation for the first time.

FIRING FARM BUREAUCRATS

However disappointing the results so far, the Red regime has apparently tried to meet some of its farm problems head-on. Late in 1960 the Kremlin fired dozens of agricultural bureaucrats up to and including Minister of Agriculture V. M. Matskevitch, mostly for failing to meet output goals and for furnishing false production figures; some were actually tried and imprisoned.

Responsibilities for operations, supervision and planning were taken away from the Ministry of Agriculture in Moscow and transferred to Gosplan, the state planning committee, and to the ministries of agriculture of the U.S.S.R.'s 15 constituent republics.

A new organization was created directly under the Council of Ministers, which is chairmanned by Mr. K., to assume the function of supplying agriculture with machinery, fertilizer, spare parts, tractor fuel and other production needs. A new state committee on procurement was established to direct government acquisition of farm products for public distribution, and the U.S.S.R. shifted to a more flexible yardstick for required deliveries from collective and state-owned farms. Instead of demanding the same fixed quantity each year from every acre of land, whether in the fertile Ukraine or arid Kazakhstan, contracts with each farm are made on the basis of a capacity figure that recognizes differences in soil and climate.

New production incentives were established. As a concession to owners of private plots, 80 percent of income from sale of meat, livestock, poultry, eggs and dairy products was made tax-free. Annual interest on state loans to collective farms was cut. Prices of trucks, machinery, gasoline and spare parts were slashed 40 percent, according to a Kremlin announcement.

County-City Cooperation in Planning Capital Investment Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, we are fortunate in the county of San Diego to have the services of one of the most distinguished authorities in the field of public works serving as the director of public works.

Mr. Jean Vincenz recently was requested to deliver a paper to the National Association of County Officials at a community development workshop held in Phoenix, Ariz.

I am pleased to have this opportunity of calling this document to the attention of you and our colleagues in the Congress:

COUNTY-CITY COOPERATION IN PLANNING CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

All of us are aware that cooperation of a county with its major city in providing for construction of adequate office facilities has occurred in many areas of the United States. Likewise, long-range planning of county engineers and county boards with city engineers and city councils—with relation to long-range planning for construction of major highways—is a feature of executive cooperation that is occurring repeatedly. Definitely, such long-range planning and cooperation has resulted in direct benefits to the taxpayers.

In the field of sewage collection and disposal, county-city cooperation has happened less frequently—yet certainly it is not new. Such cooperation occurred only recently at Denver with its surrounding counties and cities; in King County, with Seattle, where a tremendous metropolitan sewerage program is progressing; in Baltimore; in Cook County, with Chicago. Undoubtedly, many other examples could be cited. Formation of the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts, which serves every city in that county, was begun almost 40 years ago and has served as an example to numerous other areas in the United States. Certainly it was as result of the success of such county-city cooperation in Los Angeles County, Alameda County and the San Francisco Bay cities and Orange County, in California, that the idea of the long-range sewerage plan for the San Diego Metropolitan Area was developed.

This San Diego project serves as an excellent example of the importance, value, and necessity for long-range planning as well as the importance, value, and necessity of county-city cooperation. At the start of this story—which I will keep brief—it is emphasized that leadership by the county was a very important element. With such leadership, and willingness on the part of the County Board of Supervisors to accept their part of the responsibilities in providing such leadership, the resulting cooperation was definitely accelerated. To state the matter more bluntly—without the acceptance of responsibility by the Board of Supervisors, this project could have been delayed many years, or else the result could have been a patchwork of sewerage systems with resultant higher costs to the taxpayers and less desirable health standards.

The City of San Diego had previously displayed a neighborly spirit in its willingness to provide sewage disposal for two or three of the smaller adjoining cities under contract arrangements. This decreased the requirements on the smaller cities for capital investment and required only one sewage disposal plant for the several communities. But as result of the terrific increase in population in the San Diego metropolitan area, it became increasingly apparent in 1951 that all of the cities and sanitation districts in the metropolitan area were faced with an urgent necessity to provide new and greatly enlarged sewage disposal facilities.

The county provided the leadership for the formation of an advisory committee with representatives appointed from all of the metropolitan area cities and districts interested in the problem. This advisory committee met regularly over a period of several months, studying possible solutions and arriving at a unanimous decision to appeal to the County Board of Supervisors to employ a board of consulting sanitary engineers to make a study and prepare a master plan for sewage disposal for the San Diego metropolitan area. After careful consideration, the County Board appropriated approximately $55,000 for the employment of such a board of engineers, and a master plan for sewage disposal throughout the entire county was developed and published.

Now the fact that many problems were encountered—and that 9 years passed before the project in the metropolitan area was finally under construction—is a matter entirely besides the point of our present consideration. The feature that I am emphasizing is the importance of cooperative county and city long-range planning in order to develop a project that will result in greater efficiency and definite savings. In my opinion, it was necessary to have the leadership of the Board of Supervisors to obtain unified thinking and a willingness to cooperate among the seven cities and three sanitation districts. There was not always agreement on phases of the master plan—but it established a goal—something tangible to work toward—and a realization thta the master plan as developed was not slanted in any way that would tend to favor one community over another.

Leaders in Congress; the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and those who guide the work of the U.S. Public Health Service, have long recognized the extreme importance of improving water pollution control. To this end, funds have been made available to encourage communities to build proper sewage disposal facilities. The last Congress passed Public Law 87-88, which encourages joint cooperation among communities in the planning and construction of proper sewage disposal facilities. Leaders of the National Association of County Officials had emphasized the need for such legislation to congressional committees. Assistance as result of this measure has been of great value in our area in tying together the final loose ends toward the financing of this $50 million project—for which contracts have just recently been let.

This same assistance is available to all communities of the United States. I would like also to emphasize to all of you the availability of funds through the Community Facilities Agency in the development of studies and plans which will lead to the ultimate construction of major projects in metropolitan areas.

Supervisor Robert Cozens, who is now a member of our board, served for a couple of years as chairman of an advisory committee studying the sewage disposal problem which faces the cities and communities of the north coastal area of San Diego County. In 1959, this advisory committee appealed to the board of supervisors for funds to employ a board of consulting sanitary engineers to up date the previous study and report as it applied to their particular area, taking into account the extremely rapid growth that had occurred and was occuring during this past few years. Again the board appropriated the necessary funds—and a master plan was developed in greater detail. At present, three communities are actively working together to move forward toward the accomplishment of an important phase of this master plan. Again, a very definite incentive to action has been supplied by the Federal funds available for both planning and construction.

In conclusion, I think it might be helpful to cite one other type of community cooperation which is proving helpful in our county. San Diego County, through its department of public works, has assumed responsibility for refuse disposal for practically the entire county, including the cities. At the present time, we have an agreement with one of the school districts to operate a large sanitary landfill on a piece of property owned by the school district, with the plan that the grade of the land will be raised to a level which will permit its use as a recreational area for the school to be built on the adjacent solid land. In another part of the county, the same type of arrangement is being worked out with a high school. It is planned by the school district to construct a high school at this particular site in about 6 years. In the meantime, the county will utilize the adjoining area for a sanitary fill in a manner which will greatly increase in value the existing relatively useless land.

These are just a few of the ways in which the county can cooperate with the cities and districts to the advantage of the people we serve. San Diego County has proven that cooperation through long-range planning can and does pay large dividends.

Steps Necessary To Win the Cold War and Preserve Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from one of my constituents, Col. Lewis Howard, of London, Ky., on the subject of the steps our Nation must take to win the cold war and preserve freedom in our Republic.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LONDON, KY.,
March 2, 1962.

Hon. THRUSTON B. MORTON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

SENATOR MORTON: Steps our Nation must take to win the cold war and preserve the freedom in our Republic:

First, a few words about myself so you may understand that I am writing from direct experience. The following was not taught me at Harvard University—as for schooling, I managed to get an eighth grade diploma by going to school 5 months a year and working on a farm the remaining months, therefore, the most of my education has come from travel and business, though the schooling I did have I was taught to believe in freedom instead of socialism and communism like some of our schools are teaching today.

I left the farm at the age of 21, came to the Hazard, Ky., coal fields in 1934 and started working in the coal mines when day labor was $4.60 per day. I took time out from mining to help fight World War II, with

the thought in mind that we were fighting for free democracy. I was one of the lucky ones, I returned with part of my health. Upon my return from service, I was forced to quit hard labor, so I went in the mining business with $3,000 and a reputation of an honest man, today I have an investment in coal mines totaling about $1 million. I help furnish employment for about 500 employees. These mines are some of the few nonunion mines left in our Nation today.

This year I was the winner of the highest Academy Award given in our Nation by the American International Academy, this was given to me for fighting for a cause that I believed to be right. Also, for this same reason I was made a Kentucky colonel by our present Governor, Bert T. Combs. The above was only written to help you understand the writer.

Everyone knows we are at war with Russia—cold or hot, it is yet a war. (1) Who ever heard of winning a war fighting the defensive side? (2) Who ever heard of winning a war with negotiations?

For question No. 1, if we win this war we must seize the offensive side and fight it with everything we have to win. The defensive, for the past year, has been well demonstrated, it has cost us Cuba, the Berlin Wall, Laos, and now fighting a defenseive war in South Vietnam, this was also demonstrated in the now divided country of Korea, which is left for the Communists to hack away little by little. If freedom is to survive we must seize the offensive and push freedom harder than the enemy pushes communism. We must liberate the countries that were once free—Yes, China included!

Now the big question, How do we do this?

First, we have a house cleaning job to do at home—every known Communist in our country should either go to prison or be deported to Russia.

Second, every person that we have in our Government that has any leanings toward communism or socialism or the appeasement policy, should be thrown out! out! or impeached from the leadership of our republic (we have more than most of us want to believe).

Third, if we sell freedom throughout the world, another way we must clean house is to get rid of everything that has a tendency to lead us away from freedom toward socialism or communism. We must stop the twist shows that are being put on with our Constitution of the United States. It is being twisted to suit the pink and red cause and for the destruction of our freedom.

Fourth, the free enterprise system is what made our country great. We can sell free democracy to other countries if we practice it at home. This is one of our biggest housecleaning jobs—our Government must stop this socialism and sell the business back to free enterprise. We can use this money to pay off our national debt. This would relieve this awful tax burden we are under. The free enterprise way, everyone bears his share of the tax burden. By setting our own house in order is the only way we can qualify ourselves to sell free democracy to the world.

Our great losses previously mentioned has weakened the faith of our freedom-loving people. We can throw the Communists out of Cuba within 36 to 48 hours. The quicker it is done the better off we will be. This will regain our lost faith and start us on the offensive side of this war. Once we seize the initiative we should never weaken.

About the negotiations, this is the most foolish thing I ever heard of—Russia never did live up to any agreement they ever made. If we had a stack of signed agreements a mile high they would not be worth one little match that it would take to destroy them. This is just a slow way of giving our enemies what they want. Russia will only respect one thing: This is power. We must act now before it is too late. We must make our enemies understand that we aren't going to be kicked around any further, and start pushing freedom back to its original boundaries.

I heard President Kennedy say in one of his campaign speeches, when he was downgrading our country, that he didn't know if our form of government could survive or not. If this is all the faith he has in our Government he would do our great Nation a service if he would resign and leave our country. I will say this, if we continue to follow the same trend that we have since Mr. Kennedy became President, we won't survive.

To all freedom-loving people, we must stop this appeasement policy now, before it is too late. It is already later than we want to believe. We should heed the words of Patrick Henry, "Give Me Liberty or Give Me Death." All we have seen and heard for the past 15 months is big noise and promises and no action, while the Communists whittle the free world down country by country.

People, wake up—may God help us if we continue to follow this downward road to destruction.

Sincerely,

LEWIS HOWARD.

The Governmental Climate in Orange County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a talk given by Supervisor William J. Phillips, of Orange County, Calif., entitled "The Orange County Story—1961," on January 26, 1962, before the National Association of County Officials regional meeting in Phoenix, Ariz.

Orange County, Calif., is a major portion of my congressional district. Disneyland and Knott's Berry Farm are two great tourist attractions in the county, and "The Orange County Story" is most interesting as it is the fastest growing county in the United States, having jumped from a population of 216,000 people in 1950, to 825,000 people in 1961. This rapid growth has presented terrific problems for schools, highways, and general public services. Supervisor Phillips explains how this challenge was met by local efforts and explains the present planning to provide for 2½ million residents in that county within the next 15 years.

The address follows:

THE GOVERNMENTAL CLIMATE IN ORANGE COUNTY

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I have been asked to tell you today our thinking in local government and the governmental climate in Orange County. But first, we must pose the problems that face us and the impact upon our economy of the fantastic times in which we live.

We live now in a space age—evidently we and the Communist nations have substituted rockets and nuclear warheads, in place of the stone axes of the cavemen.

But as the world is only now feeling the full impact of communism, it is also just reaping the bonanza of reborn capitalism. Industry, capital, the tools of production, today belong not to a few tycoons but to 12½ million stockholders. Family income, which was $631 per year half a century ago, now stands at an average $6,800. Pensions and jobless pay and welfare benefits number among the established fruits of men's labor, in addition to wages. And the horseless carriage which triggered it all serves 2 out of 3 families, instead of the 1 in 20 at the eve of Ford's revolution.

This cornucopia is filled, of course, through the teamwork of business, labor and government. At the moment, business enjoys an explosive growth rate. It has to, for the steady rise of the break-even point has made volume the key to profit. The boom is powered also by our new technologies with their miraculous new products. Innovations such as electronics and plastics have been the catalyst for a $440 billion gross national product which is forecasted to reach $642 billion by 1967.

All of this rampaging energy forces business to seek new elbow room. And it seeks it in places other than the central city. Take the contemporary phenomenon known as light industry, typified by electronics. Companies in this category, for competitive reasons, must maintain a "prestige image" and consciously avoid industrial slums. They tend increasingly to decentralize, to start new plants in fresh uncontaminated areas. This cracking of geographic barriers has been stimulated by modern transportation economies—superhighways, seaways, jet aircraft. Public and private power developments, and the emergence of distant markets have made industrial parks from once primitive backwoods areas.

There is another force at work, of course. I refer to our exploding population. We are multiplying at a pace unmatched in recorded history. Three million new citizens in this country each year demand goods and services from both the private and public sectors. The pressure they generate has reinforced the trend toward industrial dispersion. It has also accelerated the inevitable sequel to industrialization—urbanization.

We have witnessed a mass migration from farm to metropolis—from city to suburb—and, as a side oscillation, from region to region and job to job. But our mobility has also created vast sociological problems.

We know that many long-settled areas, which in a more static age could rely on family roots, suddenly awaken to find their commerce and citizenry gone. Tradition no longer either protects or quarantines. More fertile areas find themselves pregnant with new residents and incubating new industry. Still others are impoverished by job-seeking multitudes who strain public services to the breaking point.

As society becomes more fluid, our communities complete strenuously for tax-bearing, job-making industry. The property tax is still the major single source of local governmental revenue. And government naturally seeks to attract the greatest amount of high-value property within its boundaries. The now fashionable search for light industry depicts the hunger of communities with undeveloped land to tap a new vein of tax values.

"Where should be build our plant?"—this dilemma assails management every day. It has provoked industrywide research into the anatomy of the business climate—led to the structuring of elaborate yardsticks and indexes—and aroused the interest of local governments across the Nation, as this meeting proves.

Before betting its future on a new area, management invokes a host of criteria. You probably know them already; most certainly you should. For county governments, in my opinion, are the logical trustees of regional

development, which is the manifest destiny of our urban society. We must take the initiative in planning for industrial expansion. Our mutual job, it seems to me, is to become cognizant of each other's plans so that we may gear them for an orderly fulfillment of our social and economic future.

Foremost in business thinking is adequacy of transportation and abundance of qualified labor. There can be no substitute for a working area in which employees have easy access to their jobs and employers easy access to markets. In the competitive sweepstakes, high speed air, rail, ship, and highway transportation facilities represent an enormous advantage for a manufacturer.

With respect to the manpower pool, it's not enough to have people in quantity. They must abound in quality, too. Management gages the vocational aptitudes of the populace—to see whether a "fit" is probably in terms of staffing requirements. The company also looks at labor turnover rates compared with national averages. Are local employees willing, by temperament and philosophy, to deliver an honest day's work for an honest day's pay? Has the community been affected by the virus of featherbedding? Is it oriented toward that medieval French Parliament which sought to ban axsharpening in order to prolong the work of cutting down trees? How do industrial accident rates and absenteeism line up on the national curve? All these factors, which can be measured, are decisive in the choice of a new plant site.

Nearness to markets and raw materials ranks next in the poll. We might consider this a corollary of the transportation system. Certainly no community with a well-developed network of rails and highways and airports should feel disqualified from bidding for a new plant, whether contiguous to direct market and source areas or not.

Ample power sources—water, electricity, gas, telephone—these, quite obviously, are essential to modern business. Management scrutinizes local utility services to determine, first, whether they can meet current needs at reasonable rates and, second, whether they can be extended to new plants outside present service areas.

This puts a premium on planning. It spotlights the ability of our educational systems to nourish such industries. It demands intelligent land use, to insure logic and beauty in the juxtaposition of bedrooms and businesses. And last but not least, it underscores the value of adequate health facilities.

This is a legitimate competition. Government has a responsibility to determine land use, to prevent blight, to insure an adequate tax base, and broaden employment opportunities. The thing which you must carefully consider, however, is the way you go about the business of attracting industry.

In some areas it is a practice to offer fantastic lures and incentives, disregarding the intrinsic economic value of the sites involved. Business does not welcome bribes as a substitute for permanent, stable, long-range economic values.

The attitude of government exerts a commanding influence on any business climate. I'm not talking about partisan politics. I refer to the personal orientation of officials toward business. Their hostility can erode the foundations of the economy faster than sabotage. And they can maneuver the jobmaker into such a position that he is publicly suspected, rather than respected, by the community he serves.

I oppose the domination of Government by any economic unit. So do all responsible business leaders. They request cooperation, rather than harassment, from government—local, county, State, and National. Nothing more. They don't want to be singled out for fleecing or for favors.

Finally, business looks at what might be termed the environmental credit rating of a community. How does it measure up in terms of progressiveness, in terms of health and welfare services, in terms of social and cultural institutions?

Orange County was a county of pastoral peace—beautiful orange groves—small towns and a population of 216,300 people in 1950. Today, it is still beautiful—but it is booming. We are gaining in population at the rate of 220 people a day—over 80,000 new citizens a year.

Today, in 11 short years, Orange County has a population of over 825,000—compared to that 1950 figure of 216,300 people.

We know that we must have a well-integrated program of expansion—we must provide the proper climate, as it were, to a sound development for the years ahead, or live in complete chaos. We have chosen our way—we are going forward—development is well over seven times as great as it was in 1950.

Recognizing that we had to plan was an important part of our story. After all, each person uses 200 gallons of water a day, 100 gallons of sewage facilities, 3.7 pounds of trash disposal facilities, and they bring in one car for each 1.9 persons. Also a sound economy demands new industries to supply jobs for the flood of new residents.

Today, we feel that we are on our way toward solving many of our problems by planning and implementing our services on a long-range basis. All of our planning is based now on at least 20 years ahead. We feel that one of the most attractive factors to industry locating in our area is in our streamlining of all governmental methods and services, and concrete plans for development of highways, airports, water, sewers, utilities, and land use master planning—all pointed toward expansion as needed; 825,000 people shouldn't and can't pay for all the services needed by 2,500,000 residents.

We have an excellent master plan of highways based on city-county roads on a grid system—east-west and north-south. Every 2 miles will be a major county road, 120 feet in width, every mile a primary road 100 feet in width, and on the half miles, secondary roads 80 feet wide. As the land use is changed, the builder paves from the center line of the street and puts in the curbs and gutters. In this way, new land uses have provided over 100 miles of improved highways at no cost to the taxpayer. All cities, and the county, hold to set back standards as approved by the joint city-county agreements. Our bridges are all expansible and very functional in design, and all are self-cleaning and self-draining. All that we have to do to increase the size of the bridge is to unbolt the spring bumper rails, pour a new bridge next to the existing one, bolt the bumper rails back on, and lo and behold, we have an enlarged four- or six-lane bridge.

We have developed and passed bond issues for sanitation and flood control. Work is well underway on both of these projects and keeping ahead of the influx of people. We have also developed and begun a master plan of freeways and expressways with our neighboring counties. We have developed uniform building codes for our county in cooperation with industry and the labor unions that have now been adopted by all of our cities. Our air pollution control program is well developed and efficiently operated county-wide, and is coordinated with our neighboring counties, the State and national programs of research. New facilities are presently being constructed, or are complete, for juvenile hall, psychiatric hospital, county hospital, branch jail, county library, audio visual, and professional teachers libraries, health and sanitation, welfare, finance, branch courts, engineering, etc. In fact, we have developed (with a 25-man citizen's committee and Welton Beckett Assoc.) a master plan development survey to explore and recommend the probable needs of each governmental service and facilities required, extrapolated on growth factors, as indicated from the Stanford Research Institute's "Survey on the Economic Development of Orange County to the Year 1980." We are also developing a master plan of airspace, airports, satellite, and emergency landing fields, and support facilities in cooperation with the Armed Services, commercial airlines and surrounding counties. We are working with out neighbor counties on a Los Angeles regional transportation study to assess the highway needs for the region. We are also working on a county airport airspace need study.

We have found that the use of top flight consulting firms has materially expedited our renovation of county government. We have installed a completely new system of fiscal controls, aided by a fine survey by Booz, Allen & Hamilton, on data processing. In conjunction with this study, we have a high performance finance and budget system that really works. We have also been able to raise the interest return on the moneys we control, $20–$25 million a month, by over 2½ percent, plus raising our bond ratings on Moody Investors Index from BAA to AA.

We employ roughly 3,300 employees in our county government, including parttime, one of the lowest ratios of county employees per thousand population in the State of California. Our tax rate, in spite of the fantastic demands for service for the deluge of people, is the lowest of any metropolitan county in the State. In fact, in 1960 our county tax rate was 83 cents a hundred under the average of the 58 counties of California.

We believe that county government does not have to offer land, or other costly inducements to industry to attract them to our area. We believe that foresight, efficiency in operations, and a friendly cooperative attitude; coupled with a stable tax base, sound transportation systems, and a stable work force who live in their own homes in an area of their choice, will outweigh the giveaway approach for industry searching for the proper place to locate and invest their money.

To sum up the picture as we see it—we, in county government, must continually reassess our operations; we must streamline our services and facilities. We must call for, and listen to, outside help in the way of facility planners, consulting firms and research groups, and share our experiences with others. If we are to attract sound investment dollars in new industries, we are going to have to be as progressive and sophisticated in our thinking as industry itself is.

The best illustration of coping with our problems was said by "Boss" Kettering of General Motors as follows: "Research is a high-hat word that scares a lot of people. It needn't. It is nothing but a state of mind—a friendly, welcoming attitude toward change. It is the problem-solving mind as contrasted with the let-well-enough-alone mind. It is the composer mind instead of the fiddler mind. It is the tomorrow mind instead of the yesterday mind."

We must have the tomorrow mind if we are to succeed.

Committee Staffs: Will the GOP Act?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Committee Staffs" written by the eminent columnist Roscoe Drummond

and published in the Washington Post on March 7, 1962, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE STAFFS: WILL THE GOP ACT?

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The heavy ice of Democratic resistance to anything more than a token representation of the Republican Party on the powerful professional staffs of congressional committees is beginning to break a little bit.

Not much—but enough to show that when individual senior Republicans insist upon some of their rights as a minority party, it is not going to be easy for the Democratic chairman to stand forever against reform.

Senator PRESCOTT BUSH of Connecticut, ranking Republican member of the Joint Economic Committee, which is responsible for studying the Administration's new trade bill, has finally pressured the Democrats to allow the minority to employ the services of one expert and a secretary. The same for Representative JOHN W. BYRNES, of Wisconsin, minority member of the House Ways and Means Committee, chairman of the Republican Policy Committee in the House.

But because the top Republican leadership in Congress has not yet been willing to make the crucial, if unpleasant, fight for adequate, competently paid professional staffing on all the committees, the minority representation remains so sparse it can hardly be seen with the naked eye. At present any little bare bone tossed to the minority is due largely to the character and whim of the Democratic chairman.

Thus, Representative CARROLL D. KEARNS, of Pennsylvania, senior Republican on the House Committee on Education and Labor, himself a good scrapper, has run up against a "Berlin wall" in the form of Democratic Chairman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, of New York.

Here is Chairman POWELL's record on staffing: When he became chairman last year his committee had a professional staff of 20; now it has about 48. Mr. POWELL assured Mr. KEARNS that if the committee received sufficient funds, he would authorize a minority professional staff of four, two professionals and two secretaries. With Mr. KEARNS' assistance, the committee received the largest investigative appropriation in its history, $633,000. Now Chairman POWELL has cut the minority staff to two, one professional, one secretary. Thus on the vital House Education and Labor Committee the proportion of majority to minority staff is 24 to 1.

It needs to be understood that adequate and competent professional staffs for both the majority and minority parties are not a routine housekeeping matter. It is crucial to the effective functioning of the committees and to the functioning of our two-party system of government. One of the surest ways to cripple the minority is to deprive it of professional staffs on the congressional committees. There is no reason to doubt that the Democrats know exactly what they are doing in holding the minority staffs to somewhere between puny and zero.

These professional staffs draft practically everything which emerges from the congressional committees—every report, every finding, every recommendation, nearly every proposal for investigation.

What do you think the minority party staff can do when it is outnumbered 24 to 1? It can't even keep track of what is going on.

With such egregious imbalance as now prevails, the Republican teams of these committees are usually left on the bleacher seats in centerfield with the majority at bat all the time.

Many Republican Congressmen are becoming restive under the inaction of their own leadership. Representative BRUCE ALGER, of Texas, for example, has just written every colleague in the House demanding a Republican conference to deal with this matter. Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS of Missouri, and Senator CARL CURTIS of Nebraska, whose campaigns to end this crippling inequity have been lonely ones, are gaining new supporters.

What surprises me is that the leadership of the Republican Party has been willing to let this go on so long. If the Republican leadership does not get up out of its rocking chair soon—something is going to bust.

Classroom Shortage Statistics Confusing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget under President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Maurice H. Stans, in commenting in a recent article on the struggle to shift the cost of education, and the responsibility for it, to the Federal Government declared that:

But if the past is evidence, the Congress will be asked to make historic decisions on a basis of figures far inferior to those which a sensible businessman would require for reaching his business conclusion. There ought to be a better way to resolve national problems.

I include the article by Maurice H. Stans for the information of my colleagues, both Democratic and Republican:

CLASSROOM SHORTAGE STATISTICS CONFUSING

(By Maurice H. Stans)

Behind all the oratory on Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools is the basic question of whether education can best be achieved under local financing and direction in home communities or by Federal financing and influence from Washington.

The argument is not new. The Congress debated it as vigorously 75 years ago as now. Unfortunately, facts are scarce and are clouded over by digressive issues of politics, religion, and competition with the Soviets.

Of course, we all want our children to be well educated. And despite all the heated debate, there is little evidence that our present local system of education is inferior to that of the Soviets or of any other country. Johnny may not be able to spell, but so far he has grown up to be superior in science, industry, commerce, and the improvement of living to Ivan or any other progeny of foreign birth.

DOCUMENTATION LACKING

But the struggle to shift the cost of education, and the responsibility for it to the Federal Government will go on, long after 1962. The principal ammunition will be statistics, and seldom will an important battle be fought with poorer firepower. One would expect that, in a matter of such vital importance, proponents of the cause of Federal aid would have a strongly documented case.

But if the past is evidence, the Congress will be asked to make historic decisions on a basis of figures far inferior to those which a sensible businessman would require for reaching his business conclusions. There ought to be a better way to resolve national problems.

The major case for Federal support of school construction rests on the alleged inability or unwillingness of local school districts to do the job. The key figures are the annual estimates of classroom shortages produced by the Office of Education from reports supplied by the States. Because of their sources, they are seldom questioned.

But an analysis of the figures leaves much in doubt. For example, the officially asserted shortage in 1954 was 370,000 classrooms. But this became merely 160,000 in 1955, even though only 60,000 rooms were built in the meantime. The difference was the result of a change in the process of gathering the statistics.

Since then the annual classroom shortage figure has moved slowly downward until it hit a low level of 127,200 in the fall of 1961. About half of this represents supposed shortages in capacity and the other half represents unsatisfactory quarters.

NO UNIFORM DEFINITIONS

When I was Director of the Budget, I set out to learn more about these classroom shortage reports. In February, 1960, a field survey team, made up of staff members of the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, went to nine States, with 50 percent of the classroom shortage, to find out how the figures were compiled. Their findings were astounding. Because there were no uniform definitions across the States, the figures were mostly undetailed or poorly supported estimates based more often than not on local or State attitudes of the moment.

For example, in Alabama, the survey revealed that the number of classrooms needed to replace unsatisfactory facilities dropped from 10,037 in 1958 to only 2,416 a year later. There had been a local redefinition of what constituted an unsatisfactory classroom. The survey concluded that "neither the 1958 nor the 1959 report provides a reliable figure on the classroom shortage" in Alabama.

In accounting for the substantial annual variations reported in Illinois, the report said that "* * * while many local superintendents report small rural schools as satisfactory, the State agency staff feels that these schools are unsuitable."

Some large cities were entirely omitted from the estimates. Inconsistencies were numerous. Understatements and overstatements were found. The conclusion of the study group was a forthright statement that "the fall report figures on the classroom shortage have, in our opinion, limited usefulness in discussions on Federal aid for school construction." And further that "The survey indicates that it is fallacious to compare successive years' totals to indicate a decline or increase in the classroom shortage."

TWO-YEAR BACKLOG

Even if taken at face value, "the classroom shortage figures reveal nothing about the financial capability of the States and local communities to handle the problem without Federal aid." In fact, they disclose nothing about actions taken or pending in the school districts to deal with the needs. This is important, for this reason: With classrooms being built at the rate of 70,000 a year, a shortage of 127,200 classrooms, if true, would be a backlog of less than 2 years. It takes 2 years to recognize needs, develop proposals, hold elections, sell bonds, design and build schools. It may well be that much of the deficiency is actually being met by prompt local actions about as fast as it becomes clearly evident.

In printed material and speeches by proponents of Federal aid, there appear repeated statements that there are 8 million school children in overcrowded classrooms. This round number stems from a 1959 press state-

ment of the Office of Education to the effect that State figures show that public school enrollments were 1,843,000 in excess of normal school capacity and that "there are numbers of others whose education is being hampered to some extent by lack of adequate classroom facilities." This is extrapolation with a will.

Why must we deal with great national problems with such scanty, questionable data? If we as citizens are seriously to consider this issue, shouldn't we have a careful, nationwide survey of actual conditions, measured by uniform standards and with the findings pinpointed by cities, by school districts and by structures? If then, confronted by such evidence, some of the individual districts are clearly unable to act and the States cannot meet the needs, there may be a case for Federal assistance.

Federation of Single Young Adults on Communism, Narcotics, and U.S. Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, on June 25, 1961, the Federation of Single Young Adults held a convention during which they passed three resolutions relative to communism, narcotics, and U.S. foreign policy which I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of Congress. Under unanimous consent, I include the resolutions in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CONSIDERATION OF THE PROBLEM OF COMMUNISM

Whereas the free and God-fearing peoples of the world, and esepcially those of the United States, are engaged in an ultimate struggle with a godless Communist conspiracy; and

Whereas this atheistic criminal conspiracy has vowed to destroy the American way of life and replace it with a tyrannical reign of terror, suppression, and slavery; and

Whereas an intelligent and successful offenses against these destroyers of humanity must first of all be informed and armed with accurate knowledge of the enemy; and

Whereas the time to begin this education of the young people of America, and especially of the State of California, is while they are in their teens, and the logical place is in the high school; and

Whereas there exists at present no facility or provisions for the education of the youth of California in the blessings of Americanism and the horrors of communism: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the State of California require as a prerequiste to graduation from high school, a course in Americanism as opposed to communism; and be it further

Resolved, That the teachers be screened for their fitness to teach this course, and also that the textbooks be very carefully selected, with an eye to the purpose of this course; and be it therefore

Resolved, That this resolution be transmitted to the Legislature of the State of California, to the various executive officers of the State of California, to the assemblymen and senators of Los Angeles and Orange Counties, to the school boards and city councils of these same counties and city councils, and the general public throughout the State of California.

PROBLEM OF NARCOTICS

Whereas the use of narcotics among young people in the State of California has steadily increased in the last several years; and

Whereas the use of narcotics leads ultimately to the corruption and destruction of both the physical and spiritual faculties of the persons involved; and

Whereas the illegal use of narcotics violates the laws of both the State and of God; and

Whereas the addiction of young people especially is most tragic; and

Whereas the lack of moral fiber in a narcotic user is very noticeable; and

Whereas the increase of crime of all types among addicts is proven by statistics; and

Whereas this deplorable state of affairs must, by any possible means, be improved: Therefore be it

Resolved, That additional education be given to young people on the evils of the use of narcotics; and be it further

Resolved, That stiffer penalties be imposed for narcotic convictions, especially for first offenses; and be it further

Resolved, That exceptionally harsh penalties be imposed upon criminals selling drugs to minors; and be it further

Resolved, That younger persons arrested for narcotic violations, and those convicted of first offenses, be separated from older and/or repeat offenders; and be it further

Resolved, That more rehabilitation centers be provided and that first offenders, and especially young offenders, be confined to hospitals, not jails; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be transmitted to the Legislature of the State of California, to the various executive offices of the State of California, to the assemblymen and senators of Los Angeles and Orange Counties, to the school boards and city councils of these same counties and the general public throughout the State of California.

CONSIDERATION OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Whereas the challenge of our times has presented to each adult citizen of this Nation an opportunity to serve these United States through contribution of self, the promulgation of ideas and expressions of thought; and

Whereas it is good for the young adults of this Nation to take an active interest in their country's national and international policies, because these policies can affect the lives of all adults and especially the young adults of this Nation; and

Whereas it is also good for young Catholic adults to give not only of their time to their Nation, but advance and contribute sound and intelligent viewpoints toward influencing both national and international policy, and

Whereas Catholic thought toward advancing sound policy can and should be based on the premise that the dignity of man and freedom for all under law is of prime importance in advancing the cause of the free world, and

Whereas this assembled convention of young Catholic adults of Los Angeles desire to make known their collective viewpoint on national and international policy to their legal representatives in both the executive and legislative branches of the National Government of these United States: Now therefore be it

Resolved:

1. That the following foreign aid programs of the United States be limited to assisting those nations which recognize the dignity of man and freedom for all their citizens under law; and

2. That aid be denied to all Communist Governments explicitly; and

3. That aid be denied to those nations which oppress or deny to their citizens the above stated premise; and

4. That efforts be made to promote in every way the dignity of men and freedom of all under law throughout these United States.

Hon. Sam Rayburn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the second of a series of articles from the Atlanta Journal:

MR. SAM—PART II

The first summer of the 20th century, long and hot, was in its waning months. Sam Rayburn, now 18, had come to a realization months before that to make his dream of a political career come true he needed more education—much more. He had already absorbed all that the public schools of Fannin County in north Texas could offer.

He wanted to go to college. Yet he knew only too well the straitened financial circumstances in which his father was operating the farm.

As they labored and sweated together, chopping cotton under the broiling August sun, Sam also recalled his father's customary admonition to all his sons:

"Character is all I have to give you. Be a man."

But the youth spoke up and asked if he could go to college.

"Sam," he said sadly, "you know I'd like for you to go. But how can I send you with only 40 acres in the farm and 14 people in the house to feed?"

Sam gulped and answered:

"I didn't ask you to send me, Paw, I asked if you would let me go. I figure I can work my way."

And thus it was settled.

When it came time for Sam to go off to Mayo Normal College at Commerce, Tex., his father rode with him to the railroad station. His parting handshake pressed in to Sam's palm $25—the total cash assets of the farm, and the paternal good-by was the words, again, "Be a man, Son."

Mayo's was a private institution operated by an earnest pedagogue who founded it to fill a void in higher education facilities for the farm families of the area. It was later absorbed into the State system as East Texas State College.

Prof. William Leonidas Mayo was sympathetic to the plight of the applicant from Flag Spring whose desire to learn far exceeded his ability to meet the tuition fee. He helped Sam find some of his numerous jobs which included ringing the college bell, sweeping out the public school of Commerce, making and tending fires in the college and the school—plus any other jobs that came along. For performing these various tasks Sam earned an average of $8 a month.

Sam paid a deposit on his tuition, got his board on credit. His earnings paid for washing and ironing his clothes. After his first year at college he taught in a rural, one-room school for a year, to help pay off his debts.

He returned to college for another year, working harder than ever. He completed the 3-year course in 2 years.

A half century later he expressed to friends his lifetime gratitude to Professor Mayo, not only for his encouragement and

considerate treatment, but for his method of instilling learning and the desire for it.

"During the morning exercises," said Mr. Sam, "he was the most inspiring man I ever knew. He made a student feel like a criminal if he didn't work, and not only that but to work to his utmost capacity."

It was a habit the pupil never lost.

The proud possessor of a diploma certifying that he had earned the degree of bachelor of science in education, Sam returned home and to teaching as a regular vocation.

He taught for 2 years in the rural schools of Fannin County. But the day he happened to learn that members of the State legislature are paid $5 a day for their services to the State he decided upon a definite course of action. Five dollars a day was then a munificent sum. It could pay his way through the law school of the University of Texas which, conveniently to his purpose, was located in Austin, the State capital.

That is to say, it could—if he got elected.

So, in 1906, at the age of 24, he ran for the office of State representative from Fannin County. He was without experience in politics, but he had taught school in several areas of the county and thus was known by name to the parents of his pupils. What's more, he was a handsome and personable young man.

On his cow pony he campaigned for 3 months, visiting every town and village, calling at every farmhouse, no matter how remote. His dimpled smile charmed the housewives, many of whom discussed the progress of their children at school. The men were impressed by his down to earth, knowledgeable talk of local farm conditions. Some had heard of the big, hard-working, and religious Rayburn family.

He won: By 163 votes. To this day, the name of the Honorable Sam Gardiner of Honey Grove, his opponent, is remembered as the man whose defeat started Sam Rayburn on the path to national greatness.

This first victory was as sweet to Sam as the honey he ate daily with his breakfast. But more than that it was the beginning of 54 years as a public servant during which he developed a political wisdom and a principled philosophy.

For instance, a friend came to Sam in the heat of the campaign and said: "I want to vote for you but I'm planning to run for county prosecutor and the fellow you're running against has a lot of power in my district and I will need his support. What would you advise me to do?"

"I told my friend," said Sam, recounting the incident, "to go ahead and vote for the other fellow, as I was going to win anyway."

This policy of refusing to bring pressure to get a man to vote against his own interest was to pay off handsomely later in Congress.

"Things even out in the long run," the speaker said recently in reviewing his career. "You may lose a vote one time, but you will get it back again when you need it more."

Any legislative body is a tough training ground for the political man; a test of his character and abilities. It could also be, and often was for many, a burial place of hopes for future higher office.

In the imposing red granite State capitol at Austin, Sam Rayburn had his first contact with a legislative body. If the country boy was overawed by this new experience, in a big city, he kept it to himself.

He found a place of lodging convenient to both the capitol and the University of Texas. He registered at its law school, learned the hours of classes in the various subjects and worked out a tentative schedule.

As it later turned out, while he studied many nights, even during the biennial sessions of the legislature, most of his law school classwork was done between sessions which usually lasted no more than 6 months. But they were hectic and sometimes boisterous.

The membership was a cross-section of a State emerging from the pioneer era. A rugged and hearty crew, cattlemen from the ranches in the South and West, farmers from the wheat, sheep, and goat farms in the West and Northwest, and from the cotton farms of the central and eastern sections.

There were, too, the "city slickers" from the larger centers of population, Houston and Dallas—and the "wild-catters" from the burgeoning oil fields.

The railroads were fighting against State regulatory measures; electric utilities were seeking for power sites the waters that farmers needed for irrigation or stock watering.

This was the background scene of the 30th session of the Texas Legislature upon which Sam Rayburn entered.

Point Reyes National Seashore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call our colleagues' attention to a bill which I believe to be of the greatest importance—the measure which the National Parks Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs today approved by a unanimous vote, to establish a national seashore on the Point Reyes Peninsula, Marin County, Calif.

The close proximity of the Point Reyes Peninsula, with all its outstanding natural attributes, to one of our Nation's most heavily populated and fastest growing regions—the San Francisco Bay area—is unique. The National Park Service, in fact, has said that the Point Reyes Peninsula provides a combination of scenic, recreation, and scientific interests which can be found nowhere else in this country so near a large center of population.

Mr. Speaker, the Seventh California District which I represent is a part of the metropolitan San Francisco Bay area, and I have been receiving a steady stream of correspondence from my constituents urging that this Point Reyes National Seashore be established. One of the latest groups to voice its support is the Association of Bay Area Governments—an association representing 6 counties and 58 cities. This endorsement is particularly important, for it is a definite indication of the solid community support for this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Members of the House to approve the Point Reyes National Seashore at this session of the Congress. I urge, furthermore, that this action be taken without delay, for delay in acquiring these shores so vital to an adequate public recreation system will not only result in increased costs, but, even more important, in lost opportunities.

Packaged Factories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, my attention was recently called to an article which appeared in World on February 28, 1962, concerning an unusual new company which has been formed to provide packaged factories to some of the less developed nations.

In the developing countries of Latin America, Africa, Asia, and the Middle East, there is urgent need for small industries to make products that raise standards of living, increase employment, reduce import requirements, and train people in modern manufacturing techniques.

An unusual new company has been formed in the United States to meet this need for accelerated industrialization. I wish to call attention to a recent article that explains how this company is pioneering new approaches and new procedures in establishing useful small industries in the developing nations of the world.

I ask unanimous consent that the article referred to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PACKAGED FACTORIES GO ABROAD

(By Frederic M. Philips)

Bidco's product is packaged factories.

Bidco stands for Business and Industry Development Co., a Washington firm quietly founded on one man's dream 18 months ago. Today it has representatives in 31 nations, dealing around the world.

Its packaged factories represent a practical, visionary, free-enterprise, for-profit approach to the development of underindustrialized nations.

Here's what the concern offers to oversea businessmen, governments of underdeveloped nations:

Construction and equipment of a moderate-sized plant in any one of some 25 categories (from tractor factory to slaughterhoue to drycleaning plant), training of local personnel to operate it, guidance through a period of years in operation and marketing, impressive assistance in initial financing.

Under negotiations at present:

Five tractor plants in Asia and the Middle East—at Tieppo, Syria; Teheran, Iran; Bombay, India; Manila, the Philippines; Djakarta, Indonesia.

A Beirut, Lebanon, plant for maintenance, rebuilding of automobiles.

Three building-board (from sugarcane residue) factories at Bombay and Amritsar in India, Teheran.

A laundry and drycleaning plant at Teheran.

A multipurpose industrial complex (pumps, hardwares, tractors, wood products, automotive equipment) in Ceylon.

Price tags on the packages vary from $30,000 for the laundry to $2 million for a building-board operation. Going price for a tractor factory is $200,000, bakery $137,900, peanut butter factory $123,600, macaroni and

noodle plant $175,600, milk and ice cream plant $137,600. Bidco profit margins are set at 5 to 10 percent.

The concern also has a packaged blueprint for pulling together capital for overseas individuals (as in most cases above) or governments (as in the case of talks going on now with Nigeria and Ivory Coast, for example). Bidco will help arrange private and governmental loans in this country, including major U.S. international, bank, and development organizations.

FOCUS ON TRACTORS

Special focus for Bidco and foreign entrepreneurs in many parts of the world; tractor plants, which would annually produce some 2,000 small vehicles priced at about $350 each. "They could revolutionize agriculture in many countries," declares founder-president-moving spirit Gwynn Garnett. "With wide use of tractors, their farmers would take a century-leap from the oxen and water buffalo stage of tilling the soil. There would be a good profit for the tractor-manufacturer, a reasonable profit for us, immense advantage for the farmers and the countries."

Wyoming-born Garnett—former Agriculture Department official here and overseas, Pan American Airways consultant, American Farm Bureau Federation executive—speaks with crusading zeal of Bidco in general and the tractor road to progress in particular. His operation, to which he has drawn a hit parade of experts and top-level associate companies, is after a dollar profit. But Garnett and his associates also are proud of the fact that their activities could bring health, wealth, and happiness to many regions abroad.

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

"We see ourselves as a private enterprise adjunct to Government foreign aid," Garnett says. "Government foreign aid can't do certain kinds of jobs. We are interested in moderate-sized businesses abroad. We survey the needs of underdeveloped nations, try to help their own people get into fields important to them. We are tapping private enterprise abroad, linking it with our own.

"There's also this satisfying fact. Here is a type of operation with which the Russians cannot compete, a flexible person-to-person type of resource development that we in the world's most advanced capitalist state can carry out."

At the heart of the Bidco setup is its alliance in this country with a family of successful businesses. Each one is a prototype for a packaged factory. Iowa's Speedex Tractor Co. successfully produces the small tractors that Bidco hopes to introduce abroad. Tractor plants that Bidco sets up will be similar to the Speedex plant Stateside; Speedex will play a prominent role in training, supervising associated with the project. Other concerns, from modest outfits like Bomarc dry cleaning in Baltimore, Md., to Caterpillar Tractor, Peoria, Ill., will serve likewise in other fields.

Obviously, Bidco is just getting off the ground. At this point, there are no Bidco-provided factories in operation. But executives in the Washington office say groundbreaking on the first—"probably in the Middle East"—is dead ahead. They expect others to follow in short order. And they like the way a Washington financial expert wrote about their activities when they made 30,000 stock shares ($5 per) privately available a few weeks ago: "It's an idea which could create throughout the world the image of the likeable American. If Garnett doesn't put it across, someone else, perhaps benefitting from his experience, certainly will." The Bidco folks say they're going to do the job.

New England Residual Oil Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on February 27, all members of the New England delegation in the House of Representatives signed a letter to the President urging him to remove the current restrictions on the importation of residual oil commonly used for fuel. On March 1, the Department of the Interior announced that the allocation of residual oil to New England had been increased slightly. It is my hope that this action is not a substitute for complete abolition of these harmful and costly restrictions.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following commentary on this action which reflects my feelings as well as those of the New England Council, the body which issued the statement:

NEW ENGLAND RESIDUAL OIL QUOTAS

The announcement last week by the Department of Interior raising allocations of residual fuel oil to 507,000 barrels per day is unwelcome news.

It has been interpreted by many as an alternative to complete removal of qoutas as advocated by the Office of Emergency Planning.

It is inconceivable that the administration would countenance an action of this sort as a substitute for the only possible solution—the removal of the entire quota system. Increased quotas will provide no relief from the abnormal marketing conditions which have plagued east coast consumers of residual oil since the imposition of the quota program.

Nine months ago, the then Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization ordered a national security investigation of residual oil quotas. Hundreds of consumers from all parts of the country in good faith prepared elaborate presentations of the hardships encountered under the import quota program. An intensive study of these presentations has been conducted by the Office of Emergency Planning and a report with recommendations has been prepared for the President's action. We are confident that this objective study will be acted upon in accordance with the mandate of the Trade Agreements Act. A failure to act decisively at this time would be a serious breach of faith on the part of the administration and a gross disservice to the millions of people throughout the east who have been taxed by artifically inflated costs.

New England has been asked to support a policy of free trade for the products which it has traditionally manufactured. We have been asked to compete in the marketplaces of the world without the artificial restrictions of tariffs and quotas. Yet at the same time, we suffer under the burdens of a restrictive trade policy for this, an essential raw material. We seek only consistency in the trade policies which affect our ability to compete with the rest of the Nation and with other manufacturing countries of the world.

We are confident that the President, who is aware of the great discriminations and of the many inequities created by the residual oil quota program, will act promptly upon the recommendations of the Office of Emergency Planning.

Retraining of Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the House of Representatives recently passed a worker retraining bill. We, in the Senate, passed a different version last session and the bills are, therefore, going to conference. I believe it imperative that this committee come out with a good compromise bill. One of the newspapers in my State, the Courier News, Plainfield, N.J., ran an editorial on March 2 entitled "Retraining," which points up the necessity for a good bill. I believe their article describes the key issue when it states: "Dealing with individual people and their opportunity for work brings the problem very close to home."

I ask for unanimous consent to have the Courier News editorial reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RETRAINING

For years the Nation has been worried about and wondering what to do about the numbers of workers who are thrown out of work each year because of automation and because they lack the skills demanded for today's increasingly complex jobs. It is a national problem that reaches into every local community.

On Wednesday, the House of Representatives passed a 2-year $262 million, worker-retraining bill by a vote of 354 to 62. The bill differs in many respects from the 4-year $655 million retraining program passed by the Senate last year. Now it goes to committee for compromise. Some Senate-House version seems certain for adoption.

Just last week one of the top union leaders in the United Automobile Workers said: "One of our saddest experiences is to see so many once useful citizens being thrown into the technological ashcan, so to speak, because they do not have the skills a new industrial society demands."

The purpose of both bills passed in Washington, and both Republican and Democratic versions of the legislation, is the same. The purpose is to create new skills among workers who are unskilled or whose old skills have become obsolete. It also provides Federal aid for States to create new vocational training programs in schools and technical institutions. The man seeking retraining would apply to his local employment office.

Plainfield was used as an initial test area for this program and for retraining Mack workers. We know that it was only partially successful. But the purpose of the program is right, and the problem is one that cries for a solution. The appropriation of huge sums of money at a Federal level is part of the solution. Dealing with individual people and their opportunity for work brings the problem very close to home.

Power Revenues From Reclamation Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill designed to restore commonsense to the reclamation program and much-needed relief to the taxpayers of the United States.

The Bureau of Reclamation has become the largest marketer of hydroelectric power in this country. Each year new efforts are made to extend this Federal power empire still further as new projects come before the Interior Committee for consideration. The time has come to recognize that this is big business and no longer a mere incident of the irrigation of land. The Federal taxpayer, wherever he may live, is entitled to expect the Congress to apply business principles to the Bureau's power operations.

In 1906 the Congress first allowed the use of power revenues to assist in the repayment of project costs for other than power purposes. But power was an unimportant incidental of project operations until comparatively recent times.

Two leading Democratic Senators were among the first to recognize the fact that electric power was becoming a major element to which business methods should be applied, and both of these men were from reclamation States. I refer, of course, to the Hayden-O'Mahoney amendment of 1938—52 Stat. 291, 318—which reads as follows:

All moneys received by the United States in connection with any irrigation projects, including the incidental power features thereof, constructed by the Secretary of the Interior through the Bureau of Reclamation, and financed in whole or in part with moneys heretofore or hereafter appropriated or allocated therefor by the Federal Government, shall be covered into the reclamation fund, except in cases where provision has been made by law or contract for the use of such revenues for the benefit of users of water from such project: *Provided,* That after the net revenues derived from the sale of power developed in connection with any of said projects shall have repaid those construction costs of such project allocated to power to be repaid by power revenues therefrom and shall no longer be required to meet the contractual obligations of the United States, then said net revenues derived from the sale of power developed in connection with such project shall, after the close of each fiscal year, be transferred to and covered into the General Treasury as "miscellaneous receipts":

Provided further, That nothing in this section shall be construed to amend the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057), as amended, or to apply to irrigation projects of the Office of Indian Affairs. (C.L. 2421.)

Since these two Senators certainly have never been regarded as anything but supporters of the Federal reclamation program, I can only assume that their amendment was designed to give the taxpayer a break. They knew that tying up power revenues in perpetuity for the benefit of remote irrigation projects would some day cause the rest of the country to lose confidence in the program as a national program. These projects are the property of all the people and not the exclusive bounty of a few in some State or region. When project costs have been repaid, these revenues should provide relief to the overburdened Federal taxpayers of Pennsylvania and Idaho alike, just as Senators O'MAHONEY and HAYDEN provided almost 25 years ago.

The House Interior Committee is departing further and further from these sound principles. When the direct and indirect beneficiaries of a reclamation project cannot repay its costs, the pressure is on to use so-called surplus power revenues from installations hundreds of miles away to make up the difference. It seems to make no difference whether there is any economic relationship between the project assisted and the source of power revenue. This is the boldest kind of subsidy, yet these facts are hidden under the rug so the public will not realize the true situation. My bill is designed to stop these abuses. It is time we in the Congress told the Bureau of Reclamation in its project planning that we mean business.

My bill goes one step further than the Hayden-O'Mahoney amendment. That provision requires these power revenues to go into the Treasury's "miscellaneous receipts" accounts, thus allowing them to be used for general expenses of the Federal Government. I propose that they be used exclusively for the reduction of the public debt. The taxpayer at least should have one revenue source earmarked for this purpose in this area of free-spending profligate Government.

My bill is as follows:

H.R. —

A bill to provide for the application of power revenues from reclamation projects to the reduction of the public debt

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the revenues derived from the sale of power developed in connection with any project, heretofore or hereafter constructed by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws as defined in the Act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), shall be used only for the repayment of the costs of such projects until such costs shall have been repaid; and after such costs shall have been repaid, such revenues, after the close of each fiscal year, shall be transferred to and covered into the General Treasury as "miscellaneous receipts" and shall be applied only for the reduction of the public debt of the United States.

Use Your Head, Mr. Ball

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the New York Daily News:

USE YOUR HEAD, MR. BALL

In the superheated Senate investigation of administration muzzling of military men, Under Secretary of State George W. Ball remarked that he didn't understand the talk about an alleged "no win" White House attitude toward the cold war. Everybody else understands it. It means a lot of people suspect the Kennedy administration of not wanting to win. If Ball isn't smart enough to understand it, is he smart enough to be Under Secretary of State?

Vinson Honor Points Up South's Influence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very fine editorial on the service of the Honorable CARL VINSON. It is from the Florida Times-Union of Friday, March 2:

VINSON HONOR POINTS UP SOUTH'S INFLUENCE

Georgia's veteran Representative, CARL VINSON, of Milledgeville, whose 47 years of continuous service ra nks him as dean of the U.S. House of Representatives by a substantial margin, will be honored by the Reserve Officers' Association as the "Minute Man of 1962" at its annual conference in Washington tonight.

For most of his long service, Mr. VINSON has been identified with the national defense, first as member and chairman of the old Naval Affairs Committee, and later as chairman of the consolidated Armed Services Committee during eras of Democratic organization of Congress.

Mr. VINSON's tight-reined control of his committee and his good-natured refusal to treat with awe even the highest military brass has become a Washington tradition.

For all the deference paid the Georgian, often called "Mr. National Defense," officers, men and civilian chiefs of the armed services all recognize in him a true and stanch supporter who in lean years has almost singlehandedly fought their battles in Congress.

Such is the basis of the tribute being paid him tonight, when the Association's award will be presented by House Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK. The ceremony also serves to point up vividly the advantages accruing to the South from the relatively high seniority of its congressional delegations.

Senority, by inviolable tradition, controls the advancement of committee members to the chairmanship. As a result, 12 of the 20 chairmanships of House standing committees are now occupied by southerners. In the Senate, the proportion is even higher, with 10 of 16 standing committees headed by southerners. Representative VINSON's colleague, Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, second ranking member of the Senate, is VINSON's opposite number as chairman of the Senate armed services group.

This potent combination of influence has been a major contributing factor to the South's many and tremendously important military instalaitions of every type, equaling the attraction of a salubrious climate and desirable terrain.

Similarly, the weight of southern committee chairmanships in Agriculture all add up to a tremendous reservoir of influence to the South's advantage and promise for its future growth.

As long as southern voters continue to recognize the practical advantages flowing from their traditional preference for electing and keeping Democratic Representatives and Senators in Congress, the National Republican Party will face heavy odds in breaking the Solid South at the congressional level.

Japan Trade Benefits United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, for a number of years I have been interested in our problem of the balance of trade. With the current widespread discussion on the various aspects of it, I believe that the following statement of Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs Philip H. Trezise which appeared in the February 6 issue of the Journal of Commerce Import Bulletin is helpful and timely. Mr. Trezise notes the huge surplus that U.S. traders have built up with Japan—almost $700 million in 1961—and he predicts even greater export volumes in the future. In particular, he suggests that the United States may crack Japan's domestic market for "chemicals, dyes, textiles, and leather and plastic goods."

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article in which Assistant Secretary Trezise's views are made known.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAPAN TRADE BENEFITS UNITED STATES, STATE DEPARTMENT OFFICIAL SAYS

Are international politics the only good reason for the United States to strengthen its trade ties with Japan?

Not according to one of the administration's top foreign trade experts. Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs Philip H. Trezise points to an equally important reason: Trade with Japan makes "the United States more prosperous, creating jobs and wealth * * * [in line] with our interest in promoting our own economic well-being. All of us benefit * * *."

"The dimensions of the Japanese market are not always fully appreciated in the United States," Secretary Trezise observes. "In calendar 1961 we sold to Japan about $1.7 billion worth of commodities. Japan was far and away our largest customer, next to Canada. The data are incomplete, but it seems that after Japan our next largest foreign customer was the United Kingdom which purchased from us goods worth about $1.2 billion."

"The outlook," the veteran Foreign Service officer notes, "* * * is that Japan will grow as a market for American goods. This will be true for raw materials, for agricultural products, and for industrial producers' goods. It will be increasingly the case, also, for a broad range of consumer manufacturer and luxury items. As personal incomes rise in Japan, and as restrictions on imports are removed, opportunities for sales of such items as cameras, toys, textiles and leather and pastic goods—I select these examples advisedly—will increase."

But a continuingly heavy volume of sales to Japan demands that the Asian country also be able to sell to us, the Secretary states. This is the only way it can finance its heavy purchases of American-made products.

"This is a fact of international trade that seems sometimes to sit badly with us." Secretary Trezise acknowledges. "I wonder, however, if it is really as onerous as is sometimes suggested. The proposition that imports are a burden is true in the same sense that the grocery bill is a burden. Still, despite the pain of paying the grocery bill, we find it desirable to have the groceries.

"The same thing can be said of imports, including imports from Japan. The American consumer, who is not the most vocal element in our society, has registered his approval of Japan's sales to us with his pocketbook vote, and the volume of our purchases from Japan has increased fairly steadily.

"Furthermore, some imports from Japan have had an evident stimulating effect on U.S. industry and consequently upon the employment of American labor. Postwar Japan has been responsible for a number of innovations which deserve more attention than they have received in this country. Let me cite a few cases.

"In the optical field, for instance, Japan manufacturers have offered us a whole range of fine quality equipment, some of it reflecting highly ingenious improvements on what existed before.

"Has it been a bad thing for our camera addicts that the Japanese industry has offered them cameras highly competitive with the better European products and with those of our industry? One would judge that the customers do not think so, for Japanese cameras have had steadily increasing acceptance in this country. Moreover, it seems obvious that the impact of Japanese cameras has been to give impetus to sales of photographic film and to domestic employment in the film-producing and in the film-processing industries. In a dynamic society, nothing stands still. Imports can displace domestic production temporarily and locally but they can also lead through a chain of actions to the expansion of domestic industry.

"It would be an interesting bit of analysis to examine in detail the effect on the American house building industry or better still upon the do-it-yourself industry, of commodities such as hardwood plywood, and ceramic tile from Japan. The effect on housing costs, from the consumer's point of view, has surely been favorable. The result almost certainly has been to widen the market and to increase employment in the building trades and in a variety of other activities.

"A most impressive case has been the small transistor radio. I am correctly informed, this product was in the first instance a Japanese innovation, although it was based on technology developed in the United States and licensed to Japanese companies. The astonishing rise in Japanese sales of this item in the United States within a brief period suggests very strongly that the American market was created by the product. This having happened, however, our own industry responded by developing a competitive product. During the first half of 1961, Japanese exports of transistors radios were off by half a million units as against the same period in 1960. During the same period, factory shipments from U.S. firms of directly competitive radios increased by more than a million units. Here there seems to have been an almost classic case of the kind of competitive response that we associate with an enterprise system, and from which we have obtained a new, widely sold product and new jobs as well.

"One could run through many more commodities imported from Japan and argue that the American consumer, and often related American industries, have been the gainers for imports. We need not think of our purchases from Japan as acts of political necessity, or even as the unavoidable means of sustaining our exports. Imports are part of a desirable process in which we get from a highly productive and increasingly inventive industrial economy in Japan a great many useful things which make our lives more comfortable and our economy stronger."

"We Can Take It," 150th Armored Cavalry Regiment, West Virginia National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, West Virginians are a breed of Americans unto themselves. That is why "We Can Take It" is the motto of the 150th Armored Cavalry Regiment, West Virginia National Guard, now on active duty at Fort Meade, Md., and Camp Pickett, Va. The tough, proud, self-reliant West Virginians have met with, and conquered, all difficulties inherent in a recall to arms. In the best traditions of the National Guard, they are demonstrating that they can, indeed, "take it" without a whimper. I am proud to report that professional observers who have seen the 150th in action say that this Armored Cavalry Regiment ought to be heralded as an example of what the Reserve components can do when the Nation calls on them.

I am equally proud of a story by Lt. Col. Forrest K. Kleinman, in which he relates the zest for achieving combat readiness on the part of members of West Virginia's 150th Armored Cavalry Regiment. It is a story that appeared in the January 1962 issue of Army, and which I feel all Americans will want to read so that they can also be proud of their fellow Americans—the men from West Virginia. I ask unanimous consent to have this story printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEST VIRGINIA NATIONAL GUARD

(By Lt. Col. Forrest K. Kleinman)

You'd never know by the way he goes about his business that only a few weeks ago he was teaching a high school class in history or pleading a client's case in court. He wields authority just as he wears his trim field uniform—with accustomed ease.

The ease is not surprising, for he has been at the business of war before. In fact, he's probably had considerably more combat leadership experience than the average career officer of his rank.

Chances are that he took a demotion or a freeze in promotion to secure his present assignment. So he is also 5 to 10 years older than his Ready Reserve or Active Army counterpart.

But he is not relying on what he learned in the last war to ready his unit for combat today. Through extension courses and attendance at Army schools, he's kept up with the tactical changes occasioned by the revolution in firepower. He has fired every weapon on his unit's table of distribution and has a reading acquaintance with most of the new weapons and equipment forthcoming under the Army's modernization program.

He comes naturally by his lifelong interest in the military. His ancestors have fought in every major war of American history. It is not at all unlikely that he is a direct descendant of a Greenbrier long-rifleman—one of those rangy western Virginia mountain men prized by Gen. George Washington for their dauntless conduct on the battlefields of the Revolutionary War.

If you spend much time with him, you are liable to get a stiff neck from looking up. For the men from West Virginia still stand tall in their combat boots.

A ZEST FOR HIS JOB

The most impressive thing about him is his zest for his job. It belies his occasional gray hair and belittles his recent reduction in income. It sparks a grin instead of a grimace when he hears of holidays he'll celebrate on the firing range instead of at home. It lights his eyes with pride as he displays a target that his tank gunners riddled. It wakes him before reveille and keeps him going long after taps.

He is proving once more that he is a sound investment of America's defense dollars. That is the image of the National Guard officer I brought back from a recent visit to the 150th Armored Cavalry at Fort Meade, Md., and Camp Picket, Va.

The men he leads are impressive, too. But their military qualifications and civilian backgrounds are so diverse that it is impossible to draw a composite portrait.

As might be expected, the regiment's noncommissioned officers are considerably older than the privates and junior specialists. Nearly all have served in the Active Army—many as noncommissioned officers. Some hold the same jobs.

Typical of the latter is M. Sgt. (E7) Edward N. Gatens who was a platoon sergeant in the 628th Tank Battalion during the Korean conflict. In 1956 he joined the National Guard and today is serving as a reconnaissance platoon sergeant in Troop B of the 1st Squadron.

It takes an experienced soldier to ramrod an armored cavalry reconnaissance platoon, for today it is the most complex organization of its size in the Army. Designed for tactically independent missions, it has a scout section, tank section, armored infantry squad, and a heavy mortar (support) section. Some military thinkers believe it is the rightful prototype of the basic tactical unit for atomic battle.

A plumber in civilian life, Sergeant Gatens decided he'd better harden up his 38-year-old muscles for the job before his platoon entered active Federal service. So he enrolled in an arduous 2-week physical training course for members of his squadron.

Did the course work?

"That's why we oldtimers are having no trouble keeping up with these young bucks," Sergeant Gatens said gratefully.

Another oldtimer with a die-hard attitude is M. Sgt. Troy J. Carr, a platoon sergeant in G Troop. A guardsman since 1934, Sergeant Carr was not legally obligated to enter active service. But he closed his restaurant in Gassaway, W. Va., and hung a sign on the door: "Gone with Uncle for a year."

Isn't he afraid he will lose his clientele?

"My best customers are here with me in my platoon."

Most guardsmen in the lower ranks also evince cheerful acceptance of the regiment's active service—even though many joined to avoid the uncertainties of selective service. One young college instructor said that the men in his unit would feel rather sheepish if they went home without completing their combat readiness training program after the big sendoff they were given by the people of their community.

In most communities, farewell banquets, dances, and parades were held. Local merchants contributed TV sets for unit dayrooms, writing kits, and even free GI haircuts.

SPIRIT OF THE ONE CONCEPT

What about the fillers—the Ready reservists from other areas who filled the regiment up to strength? How are they making out?

Lt. Col. James H. Francis, the Charleston lawyer who commands the 1st Squadron, responded to the question with a puzzled stare.

"What fillers? We don't have any fillers in this squadron."

"None at all?"

"We have some men who recently joined the squadron, but they are members—not fillers."

The entire regiment has been imbued with the spirit as well as the semantics of the one army concept. This was confirmed by private interviews with new members. Some of them had gripes but not a single allegation of favoritism or clannishness on the part of the original members. Similar interviews with original members evoked nothing but praise for their new teammates.

First Lt. Van A. Trail, commanding the 3d Squadron's howitzer battery, introduced Cpl. Donald D. Laughrey, an Ohioan, as "one of the outstanding soldiers in the battery." An oil driller in civilian life, Corporal Laughrey was called to active duty from the Ready Reserves and joined the battery as a filler—I mean new member.

Corporal Laughrey shrugged off the big difference in pay and the fact that he has already had 2 years of involuntary active duty through selective service. Unfortunately his stoicism is far from universal among recalled reservists. Many of them have married, started careers, bought homes, and fathered children since their release from 2 years of active service. In the absence of a shooting war, they think it unfair that their lives should be interrupted a second time when most of their physically fit contemporaries have never served at all.

"Whatever happened to the universal military training program?" one of them asked.

Maj. Rupert T. Mallory, the regimental chaplain, said that he has heard more griping from the relatively few reservists with 2 years' prior active service than from all other men in the regiment. A decorated veteran of the 77th Division's Pacific campaigns, Major Mallory reminds them that all the good things of life they now enjoy were made possible only because some Americans in every generation "did more than their share."

NO SERIOUS MORALE PROBLEM

Troop morning reports and sick books indicate, however, that the gripes reflect no serious morale problem. No doubt it is hard for a reservist to feel sorry for himself very long when he is surrounded by cheerful volunteers whose financial sacrifices are at least as great as his own.

First Lt. Charles J. Austin of the 1st squadron's howitzer battery coined a subtle quip to explain his selection for active duty from the Ready Reserve. In civilian life he is a data processing supervisor for the U.S. Public Health Service. Since his graduation from Xavier University (Cincinnati) in 1956, with a B.S. degree in mathematics, he has worked daily with electronic computers similar to the data processing machines used by the Army in selecting reservists for recall to active duty by MOS.

"The machines finally got me," he said with a grin.

The wide diversity between the civilian occupations and the military positions held by most officers in the regiment is not only unavoidable but beneficial. This opinion was voiced by Lt. Col. Donald D. Borror, 2d squadron commander, who is a glasscutter in civilian life. "The difference generates zest and enthusiasm for our military jobs," he explained.

In his case it would be a waste of military experience and education as well as enthusiasm if the Army assigned him on the basis of his civilian skill. A post-Pearl Harbor volunteer, he rose to command a rifle company of the 83d Division in European combat. Since he joined the West Virginia National Guard in 1947, he has graduated from the basic and advanced courses of the Armor School, the Command adn General Staff College, the Chemical School, and the Special Warfare School. In addition he has taken numerous refresher courses.

Appropriately enough, the member of the regiment with the most service is the commanding officer—Col. Daniel D. Holliday, who enlisted in the regiment in 1927. In civilian life, he is sales manager for a bakery company. The two jobs have more in common than appears at first glance. No less an authority on military leadership than Gen. William F. Dean once said: "It takes as much salesmanship as tactical knowledge to take a hill."

Colonel Holliday displayed both during our tour of his regiment's training. Enroute by L-20 to Camp Pickett from regimental headquarters at Fort Meade, we studied the battle sites of Civil War cavalry operations. As Colonel Holliday remarked, he has more firepower under his control today than all the Cavalry comamnders in Blue and Gray combined. Just one of his reconnaissance troops would have saved the day for Lee at Gettysburg. (A contrary opinion is dramatized in an unusual article by Capt. Joseph H. Devins, Jr., which will be published soon in Army.)

It was by studying Civil War cavalry operations—particularly Jeb Stuart's—that German military planners evolved the panzer concept for integrating and mechanizing combined arms teams. The concept is exemplified today by the organization of the U.S. Armored Cavalry Regiment. Each of its three squadrons contains a tank troop (M-48's), howitzer battery (105 SP), headquarters troop providing communication and logistical support, and three reconnaissance troops—each a combined arms team in itself.

Like the battalion in the new ROAD concept, the squadron is a self-contained administrative organization. The regimental echelon is purely tactical as in the Armored Division Combat Command and the ROAD brigade. The rank currently authorized for the squadron commander—lieutenant colonel—seems inadequate. He has considerably more responsibility and materiel than the current battle group commander of the pentomic division—a colonel. Though Colonel Holliday didn't say so, it seems equally obvious that the regimental commander's job calls for a brigadier general.

The organization is designed for deployment over a large area in screening operations for a corps or field army. Its combat power enables it to develop confused or fluid situations and thus permit realistic assessment of the enemy's capabilities and intentions. Three such regiments are now deployed in Europe to screen NATO ground forces along the Iron Curtain. The only other U.S. armored cavalry regiments in active service today are the 6th at Fort Knox, Ky., and the 150th which was called up to replace the 3d Armored Cavalry Regiment in Strac.

PREPARING FOR THE STRAC ROLE

At the time of our tour of Camp Pickett, the regiment was in the second week of its 8-week intensified combat training program. Mortar and tank crews of all three squadrons were engaged in live firing and basic tactical training under a regimental committee system. Meanwhile the scout sections and infantry squads were firing rocket launchers and undergoing small-unit tactical exercises at Fort Meade.

When we visited the tank range, Capt. Marvin P. Martin, commanding Troop A, 1st Squadron, proudly displayed a moving target that had been completely severed by accurate fire.

A special agent for the C. & O. Railway Co. in civilian life, Captain Martin is no stranger to gunfire. He was a machinegun squad leader in the 27th Infantry from the Pusan Perimeter to the Yalu and back again. But his natural aptitude for the cavalry was recorded by S. L. A. Marshall in "The River and the Gauntlet." Captain Martin helped save his unit from being overrun by his ability to read the omen of frozen horse manure.

By the time this report is published, the regiment will be undergoing squadron tactical tests conducted by experts of the active Army. But completion of the 8-week intensified combat training program will merely mean the beginning of a more advanced phase of preparation for the Strac role. Amphibious and airborne training may be scheduled for the regiment so that it might team up with Strike Command units in emergency.

Many potential hotspots in the world, such as the Middle East, afford ideal terrain for armored cavalry operations. So the officers and men of the 150th realize the urgent necessity of their rugged training program, and they say "we can take it."

In fact, "We Can Take It" is the regiment's official motto. But Colonel Holliday emphasized that it stands for much more than intensified training. It stands for the objective—whatever and wherever the objective may be.

"And if ever we are given a combat objective," he said, "we'll bet our lives that we can take it."

Are Wolves as Stupid as People?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer:

ARE WOLVES AS STUPID AS PEOPLE?

We do not guarantee the authenticity of the following tale, for it has been passed along quite a bit, and it was not new when we spotted it in the Freeman magazine for February. Indeed, the Freeman's editor had certain reservations when he wrote: "Whether wolves really are as stupid as people is quite beside the point of the story." But it does illustrate a point, and here it is:

It seems that some years ago Alaskan Eskimos discovered a really neat way to get rid of wolves. They buried razor-sharp knives in the ice, with the sharp edge sticking up. Then they covered the blade with seal blood.

Along came Mr. Wolf. He licked the seal blood from the knife, and in so doing cut his tongue. Then, "delighted by the seemingly inexhaustible supply of nourishing blood, he stood there licking, until he dropped in his tracks from loss of blood, then froze to death."

This business of nourishing himself with his own blood, with fatal results, has a parallel in our Federal financing. Federal supports sound like an easy way to pay for many of the things we'd like to have, but where does the Government get its money? From us, the taxpayers. We are, then, simply spending our own money under the impression that it is somehow free—and when the Government continues to spend more than it takes in, the national debt simply grows. As it grows, it weakens the financial stability of the Nation, and adds to the terrible burden which must be borne by future generations.

"Today," according to the story in the Freeman, "the Kentucky farmer is taxed to subsidize the electric bills of a plumber in Tennessee. The Tennessee plumber is taxed to subsidize the Kentucky farmer. We are trying through the Federal process to nourish ourselves with our own blood."

Now, assuming the story has some basis in fact, do you seriously contend that wolves are any more stupid than people?

Campus Conservatism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, on June 13, 1961, the gentleman from Indiana, JOHN BRADEMAS, inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the May 27, 1961, issue of Ave Maria, a magazine published at Notre Dame, Ind. The article was an interview with the Reverend Laurence Murphy, M.M., then a student pursuing his doctorate in philosophy at the University of Notre Dame.

The interview was concerned with the "new surge of conservatism" on the college campuses across the Nation. Certain of Father Murphy's statements struck me as particularly harsh indictments of conservation in general.

In an attempt to obtain a scholarly and informed critique of those statements which were most disturbing to me I sent a letter to the chairman of the political science department at that same University of Notre Dame where Father Murphy was pursuing his doctorate.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the letter I sent to the Reverend Stanley Parry, C.S.C., regarding this matter and his most interesting and informative reply:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 18, 1961.

The Reverend STANLEY PARRY,
Department of Political Science, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind.

DEAR FATHER PARRY: I have read with great interest the interview with Father Murphy which Representative BRADEMAS placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 13 and which is enclosed.

As you know, I have followed closely the development of college campus conservatism. I strongly believe that this wave of conservative thought, despite Father Murphy's assertion that the wave is a mirage, needs direction and depth. I think many conservatives have failed to think through and articulate their conservatism to its spiritual foundations. If this were not so, Father Murphy would not have the opening to assert that conservatism is "a mood of selfishness, of complacency, of fear." The gist of Father Murphy's presentation is that conservatism is materialism, and I fear that with some conservatives it is.

I plan to do some writing for publication on creative conservatism. My thoughts would be helped immeasurably if you, in your very busy schedule, could give me a critique of the Father Murphy interview. This might include how you, as a conservative (contrasted with a libertarian) would answer these charges:

"The conservative sees the danger, the liberal sees the opportunities."

Conservatives overemphasize "the evils of communism to the exclusion of a positive effort to attack those evils which spawn communism: racial discrimination, human misery, social injustice, and the like."

"They emphasize freedom without its responsibility. Now the effort to engage responsibility for the common good is very difficult, and it is easier to be extremist."

The conservatives "tend to withdraw, to be defensive, to look back to the good old days when things weren't so bad."

The conservative has "an inadequately formed social conscience."

Father Murphy talks about the role of the liberal in helping the less fortunate. How would you articulate the role of the conservative in helping the less fortunate?

Father Murphy admits that even he, on a theological level, is a conservative. How would you articulate the way to move logically from conservative theology to conservative social outlook and action?

The Father Murphy interview is simply expressed and well-prepared. It seems to me that our answers have to be even more compelling and understandable to the everyday college student. Therefore, I would be greatly indebted to you for any help you can afford my thinking.

With best wishes and kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Member of Congress.

UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME,
Notre Dame, Ind., October 17, 1961.

Hon. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LAIRD: Although I spoke at some length to your assistant about the problems raised by Father Murphy's article, I think I ought to send you a letter concerning the issues of Camp Conservatives.

Let me observe first that there is an odd phenomenon that can be observed in colleges and universities. In the 1930's the college life was controlled and dominated by conservatives; they held all the positions of power. Nevertheless, one can observe during the 1920's and 1930's the gradual growth of a student movement with liberal orientations. I cannot explain in any adequate fashion why this happened, but it happened. There were enough liberals on the faculty to encourage and direct this movement. Now in the 1950's and 1960's something similar to the earlier development is happening again. Only this time the academic world is dominated by liberals. And in this context there is an emerging conservative

movement among students. The same mysterious development occurs, only this time toward conservatism rather than liberalism. And here again, there are a few conservative academicians around who foster and guide the development. The most interesting aspect of the new conservative movement among students is the extent to which the students themselves spread it and organize it. Conservative faculty members for the most part observe it and by their lectures give it direction and content.

This type of development is by no means an emotional thing. I think it is rooted in the experiences of the inadequacy of the prevailing orthodoxy. Earlier the simple businessman's philosophy was inadequate for the problems of the day. And today the liberal cliches no longer solve problems. The student, therefore, in the first instance, thinks out of a simple experience rather than from the developed idea. He gradually formulates his ideas. Father Murphy, however, assumes that the conservative student is simply emotionally disturbed. These observations are a kind of introduction to the comments I will make on the specific items you have mentioned.

The first generalization is that the conservative sees the danger, the liberal sees the opportunities. I would think that the exact opposite is true. Liberal thought is obviously dominated by a preoccupation with the problem of security whether it be social security or bomb shelters. He is afraid of war, population, unemployment, and for each of these he proposes a paternalistic control of life in order to avoid the dangers. It is true that he would also use the state for positive things in international welfare programs, but this is becaue he is afraid of individuals and will not trust them to act alone. The conservative on the other hand is the risk seeker. He is confident in our economy. He is sure America would survive a war. Basically he wants to open the doors of the political tomb the liberal is constructing. In view of this I simply cannot see any truth in the liberal myth concerning the fearful conservative and the courageous liberal.

Now it is true that the liberal proposes certain gradiose schemes for America and the world which the conservative rejects. For instance, the conservative could never accept as realistic policy the idea of removing all hunger and disease from the world. This is sometimes used as evidence that the conservative lacks confidence and buoyancy, but it seems to me that it shows only that the conservative is aware of the limitations on human life. And such awareness is the mark of maturity rather than the sign of fear.

With regard to the second charge concerning the conservative and communism, it is rooted in a materialistic fallacy characteristic of liberal thought. The simple fact is that communism is not spawned by racial discrimination, social injustice, and the like. It is true that these social evils give Communists a chance to disrupt the society but they seldom produce any notable members of the party. Communists become Communists because of a spiritual disease, not because of material want. And it is the more highly educated and more fortunate members of the community who become Communists. The liberal anti-anti-Communist policy is rooted in what has been called the openness of the left to communism, and I fundamentally think that without knowing it they share one common position with the Communists; namely, that the material is the primary basis of life.

With regard to the third proposition, what is said here is in effect that there is no responsibility where there is no law enforcing it. The general idea is that all activity insofar as it is private is bad and it becomes good insofar as it is politically controlled. This liberal mentality automatically views any demand for an area free from political control as a demand for a license to commit acts of private interest. Further, this charge rejects the Burkean view that society itself even apart from the political order is a partnership in all the things of life, living a life of its own and depending on political regulation only for the preservation of certain aspects of its order. The conservative believes that freemen are the best servants of the common good and that regulated men find ways to live on and exploit the society as a whole.

The fourth generalization is simply stupid. It is one of those strawmen liberals constantly build. It is true that there are reactionaries in the society who do want to go back but one cannot label conservative everything that is not liberal.

The fifth generalization is extremely characteristic of the liberal mind. At the root of it lies a vast inability to grasp the technical elements in social problems. The liberal is fundamentally a "do-gooder" who constantly imposes his own conscience on the community through the mechanisms of law and administration. In this he acts with the ruthlessness of a man who knows that God is on his side. We speak of "Blue Laws" as though they were something that happened in the 19th century. But in my book there have been more blue laws passed since 1945 than ever were passed by the Puritan colonists. It is true that these laws do not make the citizens go to some church on Sunday, but they do make the citizen live according to the liberal religion, which is a religion of security looking forward to the coming kingdom of comfort. As against this the conservative thinks that social justice will best be served by leaving the institutions of the community work in their normal and regular manner. The conservative knows that there are injustices in the community. He also knows that in all probability there never will be a time when the community will be free of all injustice. The problem as he visualizes it is to decide whether the community is organized so as to foster improvement rather than decay. He knows for instance, that you cannot improve the condition of Negroes by forced integration. He knows that you cannot increase the income of unskilled workers by legislated salaries.

There is a great deal of talk about helping the less fortunate, and any decent man knows that they should be helped. The issue is by what mechanism. It has become evident from both domestic and foreign giveaway programs that the less fortunate are not helped by them. Moreover, the conservatives have a serious objection to having the state engage in the business of Christian charity. The state's job is with justice, not charity. And private groups, especially in areas where the issue is one of charity, do a much better job.

Finally, I am enclosing your letter to me in case you have forgotten what you said way back in July. If you want me to extend any of my observations let me know.

Sincerely,

Rev. STANLEY PARRY, C.S.C.,
Head, Political Science Department.

Observance of National Holidays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an editorial published in the Fairfax County Sun Echo, Saturday, March 3, regarding the observance of our national holidays to properly pay respect to those for whom the legislation was created. The article refers to a TV and radio broadcast made by Col. Waldron E. Leonard regarding such observance.

Colonel Leonard is Director of Veterans' Affairs for the District of Columbia and president of the Metropolitan Area Council of Veterans' Organizations, which membership consists of the department commanders of recognized veterans' organizations of the District of Columbia, Virginia, and Maryland. He has served as chairman for 15 years of the I Am an American Day and Citizenship Day programs within the District of Columbia. He is a member of the Fairfax County School Board. I believe his suggestion warrants consideration.

The article follows.

OBSERVANCE OF NATIONAL HOLIDAYS

(By Roosevelt Der Tatevasion)

It was mighty nice of you. One of the participants on WMAL TV and radio program "Comment" was none other than Col. Waldron Leonard, member of the Fairfax County School Board. The subject was the observance of President General Washington's Birthday. We were highly honored when Colonel Leonard read and called attention to our editorial of last week entitled "Father of Our Country."

The gist of Colonel Leonard's comment was that there is too much commercialization of such national holidays as George Washington's Birthday. He is of the opinion that if there is to be commercialization, it should begin after 11 a.m., when appropriate ceremonies and observances have been completed. Colonel Leonard says that this is especially true since the President grants a national holiday leave to many thousands of Federal employees primarily for the purpose of giving them time to observe and attend appropriate ceremonies.

When you think about it, there's a great deal of sense in what Colonel Leonard says.

How Propaganda Interferes With Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the New York Times of February 28, 1962:

WASHINGTON: HOW PROPAGANDA INTERFERES WITH POLICY

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 27.—The administration has decided against turning its astronauts into oversea propagandists. There was some pressure on President Kennedy to do so but in the end he said "No."

This was undoubtedly the right decision. The most effective propaganda is what the astronauts do rather than what they say and, anyway, policy decisions for propaganda purposes have seldom proved to be either good policy or good propaganda in the long run.

The President is already in an increasingly embarrassing position because he has al-

lowed propaganda to influence the question of reopening nuclear testing.

Once the Soviet Union had broken the nuclear test suspension with over 50 major explosions in the atmosphere, the way was clear for the President to announce then and there that the United States would resume testing in self-defense.

Nobody could have objected to that, and the blame for breaking the ban would clearly have lain with the U.S.S.R. In fact, there was never much doubt that the President would go ahead with atmospheric tests after the Soviet tests, but for propaganda reasons no announcement of a U.S. decision to test was made.

SHORT-RANGE THINKING

The reason for this is now clear enough. Washington wanted to dramatize the Soviet tests, to let the world see who had broken the test ban, and meanwhile to appear to be standing aside itself and not testing.

As part of this propaganda campaign the administration put out almost daily statements about the possible contamination of the world's milk supply as a result of the radioactive fallout from the Soviet tests, and encouraged State governments in this country to do the same.

This produced two results: First, the Russians got the tangible advantage of the tests and we got the intangible advantage of the propaganda; and, second, the announcements about the possible contamination of the milk supply here merely added substantially to the Government's milk surplus and probably cost millions of dollars to buy up the unsold milk.

SHIFT OF ATTENTION

Months have passed since then with the result that announcing the reopening of U.S. tests in the atmosphere now is harder to make than it would have been when Moscow broke the ban. For, with the passage of time, attention has shifted in many parts of the world from the Soviet tests to the new disarmament conference coming up in Geneva in a couple of weeks and from test-explosions to Khrushchev's efforts to call another big splashy summit conference.

Having waited this long, the United States will now undoubtedly be blamed for poisoning not only the atmosphere but the Geneva Conference. Yet the lesson of this incident is not to allow propaganda to dominate policy again, but to go ahead and announce the tests which the administration feels are essential to maintain the balance in the arms race.

This might not be justified if there were the slightest evidence that the Soviet Union is really ready for serious negotiations on an inspected disarmament system, but there is no evidence to support this and Khrushchev has even had the impertinence to declare that renewed U.S. tests now would be an aggressive act.

RESERVES AND SHELTERS

No doubt there are times when decisions have to be made or not made for propaganda purposes, but more often than not the propaganda-directed decision leads to trouble.

President Kennedy's callup of the Army Reserves and his appeal for family fallout shelters last summer illustrate the point. These acts were taken, not because anybody here believed the Reserves or the shelters would deal effectively with any war situation over Berlin, but primarily as propaganda devices to indicate that the United States was determined to defend its rights over Berlin.

The result was that the Reserve callup and the shelter program annoyed and confused the American people more than they frightened the Soviets. In fact, these two decisions were handled about as badly as anything done here since the Cuban affair, and the administration has not dealt with the consequences even yet.

Maybe by the end of the coming summer, the Reserves will quietly be released, but the shelter program is still a mess, and so many people have been scared by the original propaganda shelter anonuncements that nobody in the administration and few in the Congress are willing to come out flatly against what is likely to be an extremely costly blunder.

Fortunately, in the case of the astronauts the President has put policy before propaganda. His decision is to get on with the job and let John Glenn's space shot speak for itself. Under the circumstances, this is not a bad idea for nuclear testing either. It would have been easier to announce the thing months ago, but since the administration still feels that the Soviet tests have to be matched, the sooner the announcement is made before the Geneva Conference the better.

Address by Hon. Gordon H. Scherer, Member of Congress, Ohio, Annual Meeting of the American Road Builders Association, San Francisco, Calif., March 5, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have permission to insert with my brief remarks an excellent address made by our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, GORDON H. SCHERER, at the annual meeting of the American Road Builders Association in San Francisco, Calif., on March 5, 1962. It is unnecessary to say that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER] is an authority on the highway problem and the part the Federal Government plays in its construction and maintenance. His opinions are highly respected all over the country by those connected in any way with this important project.

The address follows:

WE GOT IT—LET'S KEEP IT

(Address by Hon. GORDON H. SCHERER)

When we passed the 1956 Highway Act after 3 years of intensive study and debate, I thought, as far as the Congress was concerned, we had the highway program all wrapped up and in the bag; that we could hand this bag to the engineers and you contractors and in due course, 40,000 miles of Interstate System would be available to the well-pleased highway users of this country. I and others envisioned a lot of happy, satisfied, and grateful road contractors and supply people for the biggest public-works program in the history of the world.

I soon found out how mistaken I was. The 1956 act was a good piece of legislation but not that good. It was based on some false assumptions. Some people had completely missed the boat on the total cost and a number of other things. In the past we have discussed rather fully the reasons for these mistakes. We are not going to talk about them again today. Suffice it to say that the net result was a 60-percent increase over the original estimated cost.

The trust fund, which for the first time was corralling highway user taxes for road-building, was $14 billion short. That's a whale of a lot of money even in New Frontier dollars. In fact, it's inflated dollars that are partially responsible for the cost increase. And let me say here and now that no one can blame this increased cost on the contractors. Calculated on 1954 dollar values on which the original cost estimates were based, contractors' prices remained rather stable and in some instances in the last few years declined slightly.

When the trust fund went busted because of cost and other miscalculations and the program almost came to a grinding halt, Congress had the whole ball of wax tossed back in its lap. I need not remind you that contractors, their suppliers, and equipment people who had expanded their organizations to meet the challenge laid down by this mammoth construction program began to hurt badly.

Eisenhower did not want to see the program which he started in 1953 bog down. He, therefore, recommended to the Congress additional financing which would complete the program on schedule and keep it at the construction level contemplated by the 1956 act. The Democratically controlled Congress balked.

For months while construction slowed down to a snail's pace, politics stymied the providing of additional needed funds. When Congress finally acted in late September of 1958, it did only a piecemeal temporary job. However, when Mr. Kennedy took over in January of last year, he was smart enough to see that the new highways had been opening new frontiers in every nook and cranny of the United States as early as 1956 when the White House was only a gleam in his eye. He was not going to let a new frontier disappear simply because it has a Republican label. Kennedy promptly and properly dusted off the Eisenhower financing program which I had introduced, polished it up a little bit, and sent it up to Capitol Hill.

By this time the Democratic majority in Congress had more respect for the boss at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue—some say it was fear of his patronage whip. Congress then rather quickly with bipartisan support provided the money to complete the entire program on schedule.

In the meantime a number of other pesky bugs in the program were eliminated. Today I feel, as I did in 1956; namely, that Congress' legislative job is complete, done, finished. Under the law as it now is, the money for the program will be available. In other words, "we have got it." Now let's not throw it away. Do I hear someone ask: "SCHERER, if we got it, how can we throw it away?"

Well, let me tell you a few ways it can be done.

First, this program needs continued public confidence and support. While, as I have said, the method of financing is provided, the remaining sum of $38 billion needed to complete it is not in the bag, waiting to pay contractors' bills.

This highway trust fund money is being extracted from the taxpayer daily through the entire life of this construction program. Public opinion and pressures have a unique and peculiar way of influencing your Congressman's vote. Any day of the week this or any future Congress can upset the entire financing scheme. It can abolish the trust fund. In fact, it can abolish the program. It can stretch it out to reduce the tax load. Remember, there are a lot of people who advocated and still advocate stretching it out. This is the last thing you and I want.

If this trust fund is ever abolished and we are compelled to look to the general fund for highway money, you are going to have to compete for dollars with a long list of socialistic, welfare-state programs. Let me tell you that the pressures from some of

these starry-eyed planners and special-interest groups for Federal handouts are no powder puffs.

Now what causes a loss of public confidence more quickly than anything else? You know, it's waste, inefficiency, fraud, and corruption.

Immediately after the passage of the 1956 act, in a speech to the American Association of State Highway Officials at Atlantic City, I said:

"Whenever you have a public works program of this magnitude, whenever you have as much money to spend as will be spent before this job is done, money for buying the huge quantities of material I have referred to, money for acquiring rights-of-way which may be harmful to some but helpful to others, you are bound to have pressures exerted that you would never dream could exist."

I pointed out at Atlantic City:

"It is bad enough when a section of a pavement goes bad because of an oversight on the part of an inspector, or a bridge fails as the result of defective steel, or when through carelessness or ignorance we pay too much for a parcel of land. However, when these things happen because of bad faith or fraud, we then lose the public's confidence in the whole program * * *."

In concluding, I said:

"If there ever was a program which needs universal public support and confidence, it is this one which you gentlemen are about to carry out. Before we are through, traffic may increase to such an extent that the program will have to be expanded, or unfortunately we may have further inflation. These and other occurrences which we cannot foresee may require that we ask the people of this country for more money, more taxes, to do this job." These things have happened since 1956. We had to ask for $14 million more.

Now, as I have said many, many times, in a program of this size, involving the expenditure of billions of dollars—involving millions of people both in and out of government—you are bound to have some mistakes and some fraud. I have also said a number of times that, while we have had some shortcomings in this program, the mistakes, deficiencies, and derelictions have been relatively few compared to the many fine accomplishments.

However, gentlemen, as time goes on—as our Highway Investigating Committee continues its work there are just too many sharp and questionable practices being brought to light. Frankly, I am more than concerned.

Now, as I have said, while I am convinced that the inefficient, the chiselers, and the grafters are small compared to the total number of capable, conscientious, honest, and dedicated highway contractors and suppliers, these few give the vast majority and the whole program a bad image—as they call it—in the public mind. It gives the enemies of the program an effective club—a golden opportunity—to clobber it.

People like to read about controversy, failures, mistakes, fraud, and corruption much more than they do about honesty, success, and accomplishment. Some writers, magazines, and newspapers, for purely merchandising advantage, overemphasize, distort, and sensationalize because of reader interest. Some investigators of the highway program, even though they do a good job, are carried away with their findings and do not keep the failures and shortcomings in proper perspective with the tremendous fine accomplishments of the total program.

Let me give you just one example. Many major newspapers include a magazine section called Parade. On Sunday, February 4, this magazine carried an article entitled "The Great Highway Robbery" with a subheading saying, "Graft in the New Road Program Is Stealing Your Money."

Now I am not saying that some of the incidents mentioned in this article did not happen. As I said a few minutes ago, I warned against these very things in 1956. What I am saying is that this article gives the public the impression that the entire program is riddled with fraud and corruption; that most of those connected with it are out-and-out crooks.

Let me give you a few quotes from the Parade article:

"Chief counsel of the highway investigating committee says, 'Throw a dart at a map of the United States. Wherever it sticks, we can find something wrong with the new highways.' "

The next sentence in the article reads: "A House investigator claims: 'Half of the country's State highway officials ought to be in jail. They have pocketed bribes, winked at shoddy work, and thumbed their noses at the taxpayer in appalling fashion.' " A small minority have done these things, but to say that half of our highway officials ought to be in jail is just plain unadulterated libel. It's inexcusable to permit staff members to make public statements of any kind.

When I turned to the last page of the Parade article, I saw the picture of a bridge which had collapsed. Under the picture was this caption: "Horrible example. New bridge on U.S. 50, West Union, W. Va., collapsed during high water. Luckily, a dynamite truck had crossed minutes before. Investigators blame faulty standards," the article concluded.

This picture, together with the statements I have just read from this article, gives every highway engineer, every contractor, in fact, the whole program, a black eye.

Having been on the Roads Committee for 9 years and having looked at and observed miles of new roads and bridges, I knew what, of course, the general public did not know—that this was an old highway and a very old bridge. The fact is that this bridge was originally planned and designed in 1927. It was actually constructed more than 30 years ago. Furthermore, no Federal-aid highway funds were involved, although that is beside the point. The bridge was washed out in a flash flood 2 years ago. Even at that time there was nothing to show that it had been constructed to faulty standards when it was built more than a quarter of a century ago.

Now you contractors have some bad apples in your barrel. So do the engineers. But also other businesses—doctors, lawyers, government employees, politicians, and, in fact, every walk of life has its share of bad apples.

Currently the Blatnik committee is investigating highway scandals in Massachusetts.

So far in Massachusetts the wrongdoing has not involved contractors. It has involved politicians. State employees, real estate men, and shyster lawyers. Now the trouble is that this small minority of "fast buck" artists gives all of these industries and professions a bad name. These bad apples give the bad apples in the field of journalism, namely, careless, unscrupulous and sensation-seeking reporters an opportunity to discredit the whole highway program.

There is another serious and often unforeseen consequence resulting from these bad apples. We all know that the Federal-State partnership in this highway program over the years has been highly successful. While it has been a partnership, the States always have been the senior partners.

Both you and I want to see this partnership continued. I want to see the States remain the senior partner because for one reason it fits into my basic philosophy of government, and I believe it does yours. I am opposed to expanding the vast bureaucracy on the Potomac.

I certainly don't want to see this bureaucracy to grow and grow and arrogate unto itself more and more control and greater and greater power.

There are those, of course, who don't agree with you and me in this respect. They oppose the Federal-State highway partnership. They want to see Washington become the senior or controlling partner in this highway enterprise so that eventually there will be no partnership at all. Washington will be the sole boss and the State highway departments merely errand boys.

What I am trying to say is that some of these sharp practices and misuse of highway funds place in the hands of our opponents the most effective weapon for destroying the Federal-State highway partnership, and for centralizing complete control in Washington. This is the direction in which we are and have been heading with practically all governmental activities.

Because of the disclosure of irregularities similar to those I have discussed, my extremely capable colleague on the Public Works Committee, BILL CRAMER, who is a States Rights man if there ever was one, felt the need for the enactment of a Federal-aid highway reform act. He introduced legislation accordingly. This bill follows Federal highway money into the States and makes the use of it subject to further Federal regulation. It makes the improper use of it subject to Federal criminal prosecution and penalties. You can see the trend.

There is a strong movement on foot by those who advocate an all-powerful centralized Government to eliminate the private consulting engineer and to have all work done by Government engineering departments. Where does this eventually lead? Can anyone say that, if this trend continues, Government will not some day be building highways; that civil service employees will not eventually be operating bulldozers and laying concrete.

You say, "It can't happen here." Government agencies and Federal employees as of this moment are gradually producing more and more electric power in this country, and civil service employes are laying conduits for power distribution.

Why do you think the administration proposed a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing? This legislation was defeated but the President warned that it will eventually become law. If it does then for the first time the Federal Government will be bypassing the States and, as sure as night follows day, this Department with Cabinet status, will gradually absorb and control more and more functions of local government. The proponents of this Department are those very same people who want to hold up and delay the building of highways within urban centers until the professional planners can conduct studies for mass transportation facilities. Some of these planners advocate the use of highway trust funds not only for mass transportation studies but also for the actual construction of transit systems.

In the District of Columbia today, interstate highway construction has been stopped until mass transportation studies are completed. You know how long these studies take. How much redtape is involved. The cities are now being strangled by traffic bottlenecks. With the movement of population to urban centers, if highway construction is stopped until these mass transit systems are developed, you are going to have chaos in our cities.

Think of the tremendous economic loss, in accidents, in time loss, in vehicle operating costs, while we attempt to get agreement on the type, location, and financing of a new mass transit system. With the tremendous increase in urban population, you are going to need not only presently planned highways but additional highways, as well as mass transit systems.

It took us years of fighting to get highway taxes put aside for road construction.

These user taxes are being held in trust (for those who pay them) to be spent on highways. It would be morally wrong now to divert them to build other transportation systems. Let the users of those systems pay for them.

The congressional highway investigating committee, as I have said, is pointing its finger at State highway officials, contractors, consulting engineers, realtors, lawyers, etc., who are not toeing the line. The question is, will this committee have the courage to unmask wrongdoing and political chicanery at the Federal level?

In my remarks to the American Association of State Highway Officials at Denver last October, I said:

"Although I cannot prove it at this time, I am reliably informed that the White House is ready to add some 150 miles to the Interstate System in West Virginia. Of all places where this valuable mileage is not needed and not justified is the State of West Virginia."

Lo and behold, in less than a week after the October American Association of State Highway Officials meeting, this mileage by order of the White House, was given to West Virginia.

I then immediately addressed a memorandum to the chairman of the investigating committee. This memorandum tells the full story. Here it is:

"The Department of Commerce, after consultation with the White House, has allocated 180 miles for a new interstate highway between Washington, Pa. and Charleston, W. Va. This 180 miles has been taken from the remaining 285 unallocated miles of the Interstate System.

"As we all know, these 285 miles have been held in reserve for vitally needed final mileage adjustments required to complete the Interstate System. This mileage, like money in the bank, was to be used to connect segments of the Interstate System and to provide bypasses around population centers where traffic density is great and accident rates high. Almost every State in the Union has made a request for an allocation of some mileage from this road-bank to relieve critical traffic needs. The Bureau of Public Roads has consistently turned down all applications because this 285 mile reserve is needed for final adjustments.

My memorandum continued:

"As an example, Texas asked for a 6-mile addition to an interstate route to close a gap over the Houston ship canal. This 6 miles will carry about 96,000 vehicles a day by 1975. The only presently approved route will have to carry more than 200,000 vehicles a day. This application for 6 miles was rejected. Yet, it is admitted that the new West Virginia route in 1975 will not carry in excess of 5,000 vehicles a day and possibly less.

"Knoxville, Tenn., requested a 10-mile segment to take heavy through traffic around the city. It was denied. There are dozens of other examples.

"There is already under construction a designated interstate route between Charleston, W. Va., and Washington, Pa., which is only about 7 miles longer than the new interstate route between these two cities, to be built over costly mountainous terrain. Talk about waste. Some which the committee is now looking at is peanuts compared to this.

"If an improved road is needed between Washington, Pa., and Charleston, W. Va., the existing Federal aid primary highway could be improved or rebuilt and no one would be hurt.

If this were done, West Virginia, of course, would have to pay 50 percent of the cost. As you know, West Virginia will only be required to contribute 10 percent of the cost of this new interstate highway. It's obvious that the Kennedy administration wants to pay 90 percent of an expensive superhighway that is not needed as a reward for what the West Virginia politicians did in the presidential primary.

"If the administration wants to help West Virginia, it shouldn't loot this precious reserve of vitally needed mileage and engage in an unconscionable waste of money on a superhighway that's not needed. In fact of all the places where this valuable mileage is not needed is in the State of West Virginia, especially when compared to the critical requirements of the other States.

"This unwarranted allocation violates one of the basic concepts of the new highway program. In this program we abandon the old pork barrel formula of dispensing highway funds. We sold it to the people of this country on the promise that we would build these expensive highways where the traffic was and not necessarily where the votes were. By this blatant, callous, political maneuver we have destroyed this fundamental principle of the 1956 act.

"The dedicated experts in the Bureau of Public Roads, whose job it is to build adequate highways where needed, vigorously opposed the allocation of this valuable mileage to West Virginia. The politically inspired and often inept in the Department of Commerce steamrollered the Bureau of Public Roads. In fact, I am reliably informed that the Department of Commerce is letting political considerations control many decisions on highway locations, etc.

My memorandum concluded:

"Our highway investigating committee should make its first order of business when it returns in January to condemn this misuse and abuse of power by the Department of Commerce, and attempt to find a means to reverse this action of the administration.

"If we don't face up to this challenge, I don't see how our investigating committee can in fairness and in all good conscience continue to point its finger at shortcomings of State highway departments contractors, engineers, and others throughout the country—shortcomings and derelictions which have a far less adverse and costly effect on the highway construction program than this recent action of the Department of Commerce."

This memorandum was sent October 30, 1961. It is now March 5, 1962, and to date I have not so much as received an acknowledgment of same.

We got this highway program. Let's keep it and not throw it away by permitting some of the things I have mentioned here today.

Delaware Park Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am glad to hear that Secretary of Interior Udall has strongly reiterated his support for a Tocks Island project which has been recommended as part of the $591 million Delaware Park plan. This project is an excellent example of Federal-State cooperation, for the States of New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and New York would pay 24 percent of the project while the Federal Government will pay an additional 24 percent. In addition, the State of Delaware will pay 4 percent of the cost.

This proposed recreation area is one of the first of its kind undertaken by the Federal Government in the Northeast and I vigorously support this action. It is with a great deal of pride that I ask for unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the news article of this project which appeared in the Newark Sunday News of March 4. I hope that my colleagues on this distinguished body will approve the detailed plans of the Tocks Island project which the administration will submit to us in the very near future.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UDALL MOVES ON DELAWARE PARK PLAN

The Kennedy administration is expected to submit detailed proposals soon to Congress for the Tocks Island project, which would create a vast reservoir and recreation area along the Delaware River from the water gap to Port Jervis.

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall told a Senate committee Friday that land acquisition is expected to begin soon for the reservoir, which would be 30 miles long and 3 miles wide.

The project—part of a $591 million plan to develop and control the river's resources and involving the Federal Government and four States—was not included in the President's recent conservation message to Congress. But the Secretary said he expected to present plans for the program soon.

Udall said the administration wants to put added emphasis on recreational developments in areas of heavy population. Planners have predicted that the area around the Delaware will double in population in the next 50 years.

The Tocks Island project, to center on a $93 million dam a few miles north of the water gap would be built by the Army Engineers under the Delaware River Basin Compact, which went into effect last fall.

It has been expected that work on the reservoir, which would hold 189 billion gallons, would begin in 1967 and be finished in 1975. The recreation area would be one of the first to be undertaken by the Federal Government in the Northeast.

Under a recent agreement between the Army and the Interior Department, land surrounding reservoirs would be acquired for recreational purposes. It has been estimated that the Tocks Island work would provide 60,000 acres of recreational land in the nine areas along a reservoir covering 450,000 acres.

The National Park Service has pointed out that the project would be in one of the most densely populated regions of the country, with more than 30 million persons living within 100 miles of the river.

UNINHABITED

Tocks Island itself, a small uninhabited strip of land in the middle of the river, and large portions of sparsely settled Pahaquarry Township in Warren County and Flatbrookville in Sussex would be inundated by waters backed up by the dam. Communities on the opposite side of the river in Pennsylvania also would be flooded.

The Delaware compact, which was signed last November 2 by President Kennedy and the Governors of New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania and Delaware, is designed to meet growing demands for water, power, and open space, and to prevent pollution, flooding, and drought.

The Federal Government and New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania will each pay 24 percent of the cost of development, while Delaware contributes 4 percent. The work is under the supervision of a five-man commission headed by Gov. David L. Lawrence, of Pennsylvania.

The compact, covering the 12,750-square-mile basin of the Delaware, envisions 19 major and 39 minor dams, and several hydroelectric plants in addition to the recreation areas. New Jersey Power & Light Co. has announced plans to construct a 400,000-kilowatt plant in Paha quarry when the Tocks Island Dam is completed.

SIX YEARS OF PLANNING

The compact was drafted during 6 years of planning and discussion, and after a quarter century of futile attempts to devise some means of cooperative, coordinated development of the region.

Udall at first opposed the pact because it made the Federal Government an equal partner with the States, but later changed his mind and said the urgent needs of the area had to be met as soon as possible. The demand for water in the basin is expected to rise fourfold to 14 billion gallons a day in the next 50 years.

The recreation areas in the Tocks Island project would include trails, drives, campsites, cabins, marinas, and beaches. Four smaller reservoirs and recreation sites are planned on the Paulinskill, Pequest, and Musconetcong rivers.

The Tocks Island area would be designed to serve 4 million visitors annually. It would provide 100 miles of shoreline on both sides of the Delaware.

Much of the land to be flooded is now dense forest, part of it in the vast Worthington tract, a State preserve. But for some year-round and summer homes, several summer camps and resorts, a few historic buildings, and at least one famous trout stream—Flat Brook—would be obliterated by the rising waters.

The Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, hearings before the Public Lands Subcommittee on S. 1797, sponsored by seven Senators, to establish an Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore were concluded last week.

The hearings showed vigorous support for the proposal on the part of the cities of Lake County, Ind., and Congressman RAY MADDEN, of the First District of Indiana, and the many citizens of Indiana who came here at their own expense to testify.

Very importantly, the steelworkers in the area and the autoworkers, the two groups most directly affected, have announced their support of my bill.

And on March 1, President Kennedy recommended to Congress in his conservation program message the enactment of legislation to establish a national lakeshore in northern Indiana. He made this recommendation on the advice of Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall whose representatives at the hearing unqualifiedly endorsed our bill.

The main contention surrounds the saving of unit No. 2 of our bill, which is presently undeveloped and which is owned by Bethlehem Steel. If a harbor is built at the site proposed, the western half of the portion of unit No. 2 bordering on the lake, then steel mills, grain elevators, and huge oil tanks will be erected on and all around unit No. 2. This, in turn, will destroy the use of both the existing Indiana State park and of any other land which might be saved. Thus, saving unit No. 2 is the most crucial issue.

Many of the great newspapers of the Nation are supporting S. 1797 and giving it encouragement. I ask unanimous consent that three recent editorials, from the Washington Post of March 6, from the Louisville Courier-Journal of February 27, and Chicago's American for March 4, which support S. 1797, be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD along with my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DUNES IN DANGER

It would take something of a legislative miracle to save the Indiana Dunes, the unique and lovely shoreline that stretches for 4½ miles along Lake Michigan. But it would be a miracle that reflected credit on Congress. In essence, the question before the Senate Public Lands Subcommittee is whether private interests will prevail over the undoubted public interest in preserving a matchless recreational area located by good chance in the midst of a metropolitan complex of 7½ million people.

The private interest is upheld by the steel companies that want to locate two giant mills on the dunes, and by a powerful array of Indiana politicians who feel that the benefits of industrial development and a new harbor outweigh other public needs. On the other side are 100,000 Hoosiers who have petitioned for the preservation of the dunes, steelworkers and auto workers whose unions want to save the dunes, and a galaxy of conservation groups. President Kennedy's conservation message, it should be noted, also endorses the creation of a national lakeshore area in northern Indiana.

Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, has introduced a bill that would create a 9,000-acre national shoreline park west and south of a tiny 2,100-acre State park. Opponents of the Douglas bill maintain that even if two steel mills are erected and the Burns Ditch Harbor gouged out, the small State park would be left. And so it would, amidst the smoke and clangor of the steel mills and the pollution flowing from an industrial harbor. Enough of the dunes would be left to make clear to future generations how much has been irreparably despoiled.

Testimony heard by the Senate subcommittee has made clear that no recent detailed studies have been made by the Corps of Engineers of other possible harbor sites. The record should also note that at least one Indiana Congressman, RAY MADDEN of the industrial Lake County that adjoins the dunes, is firmly in support of the Douglas measure.

When the Senate subcommittee takes up the bill introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS and six other Senators, it might recall Carl Sandburg's words: "The dunes are to the Midwest what the Grand Canyon is to Arizona and Yosemite to California. They constitute a signature of time and eternity. Once lost the loss would be irrevocable." Four members of the nine-man subcommittee are in favor of saving the dunes. One more vote could provide the beginning of the miracle.

THE DUNES GIVEAWAY HEADS FOR A SHOWDOWN

The battle to save what is left of Indiana's matchless dunes on the shore of Lake Michigan will be renewed once again this week in Washington. Hearings are to be held before a Senate subcommittee on Senator PAUL DOUGLAS' bill to make a national preserve out of the dunesland the spoilers want to destroy with a port development in the Burns Ditch area.

It is a sad commentary on Indiana's political leadership that a Senator from Illinois must lead the fight to save one of Indiana's irreplaceable natural resources. Indiana's Governor Welsh will be on hand to lead the fight against the Douglas bill. The Governor, we regret to note, has resorted to tactics that can only diminish his stature as a public official. None of the onus is removed from his shoulders by the fact that his Republican opponents also have a long record of distortion on this issue.

During the 1960 gubernatorial campaign Mr. Welsh led the voters to believe that he had an open mind on the dunes question. "As Governor," he said "I would ask for a complete study and survey of the entire lake front to determine the best use of land and water facilities for all concerned." He further promised that a decision would be made only "after all necessary investigation, research, and planning has been studied and thoroughly examined. I can further state that at this time I have no fixed notion and that my mind is absolutely open."

It suddenly became firmly closed after he was elected. No real study of alternative sites has ever been made. Governor Welsh immediately began pushing for the Burns Ditch location, which will primarily benefit one steel company and in the process destroy the most attractive remaining dunes. Moreover, a deepwater port at the Burns Ditch location will result in the pollution of the beaches at the adjoining Indiana Dunes State Park. Although it is only one of 22 Indiana State parks, Dunes Park registers one out of every four visitors in the entire system.

THE LINE OF ATTACK

In a speech last week, Governor Welsh revealed the line of attack he will make on the Douglas bill. He will try to tie Senator DOUGLAS to Chicago interests who want to block the port for competitive reasons. This assault on Senator DOUGLAS' integrity could open up a Pandora's box that some Indiana politicians might prefer to remain sealed. The charge against DOUGLAS is easily refuted. He has stated time and again that he has no objection to a new port in Indiana, preferably in an area, such as Lake County, which is already industrialized. But he doesn't want the dunes sacrificed.

We suggest that a more fruitful line of inquiry lies in another direction; into the background of the drive for a Burns Ditch port; the land speculation, and the connection between certain business and industrial interests and Indiana officials and politicians. The Senate subcommittee might find this very illuminating indeed.

WHY DESTROY THE DUNES?

We are enthusiastically in favor of steel mills and of harbors to accommodate the Chicago area's new ocean shipping, but we think both can be provided without ruining the Indiana sand dunes, which are among the country's most remarkable and interesting natural phenomena.

So we hope the Senate public lands subcommittee, which is starting a study of Senator PAUL DOUGLAS' (Democrat of Illinois)

bill to create a 9,000-acre national park east of Gary, will approve the measure.

DOUGLAS' proposal is opposed by two steel companies which own part of the duneland. They plan to build mills on it and create a harbor to serve them. And this plan is supported by Indiana's U.S. Senators and Governor, together with most local politicians in northern Indiana. At public hearings just completed in Washington, the Indiana politicians pointed out that a large proportion of the people who use the dunes area for recreation live in Chicago. It is true, but we don't see that it makes any difference. A national park is for the use of the public, without regard to State lines.

Objectors to DOUGLAS' plan also say that Indiana needs more steel mills to provide more jobs and profits. This is a sensible argument, but it does not ensue that the new mills must be built in the dunes. There are other sites that could be used. The new mills built on them would function usefully, adding to Indiana's prosperity; and they would do it without obliterating the unique dunes country.

Also, the proposed harbor should be built with a much wider purpose than just to serving one or two steel mills. The meeting of the oversea ship routes and the inland waterway barge lines at the Illinois-Indiana line calls for cooperation of the two States to plan harbor facilities. These must be designed to serve the growing world trade of the area for a long future.

Fighters for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article from the New Republic of February 26, 1962.

The letter written by Mr. Sal B. Hoffmann, international president of the Upholsterers International Union, speaks for itself in telling the never ending story of the fight for freedom.

The article follows:

FIGHTERS FOR FREEDOM

A rally of conservatives in Madison Square Garden March 7 is having a hard time. First, General Walker was dropped from the program, at Senator GOLDWATER'S insistence. Then, Senator DODD sent his regrets. Finally, the brightest star, Moise Tshombe, won't be there because he has been denied a visa; anyway, his presence might have been embarrassing. Only last week, Mr. Tshombe repeated his charge that the United Nations has intervened in Katanga "for the profit of the U.S. capitalists."

But the absence that interests us most is that of Sal B. Hoffmann, international president of the Upholsterers International Union. When the Young Americans for Freedom, Inc., appealed to him to support their rally, Mr. Hoffmann declined with an explanation worth quoting at length:

"I am certainly interested in the fight for freedom. For some 80 years my international union, and for some 42 years I, as an individual union officer in every type of post, paid and unpaid, have battled for freedom from want, freedom from fear, freedom from tyranny of arbitrary authority on behalf of the least educated, the lowest paid, the most lowly born of our population, the thousands of industrial workers following my own and my father's trade. For 40 of those years, since their first appearance on the American scene, my union, like the AFL as a whole, and I, have been notable for our recognition and continuous resistance, both in our union and public life, and now internationally, to the Communists, who, though they frequently speak to us falsely in the name of various freedoms, are freedom's bitterest foes.

"While some of your officers and, presumably, your members also, are too young to have borne any part in this battle against communism or to even have firsthand experience with this struggle or with fighting off the real article, I have no doubt that your education and advantages in today's America have insured that you are arrayed with us against these obvious foes of freedom. But when I read your program, I find some doubt as to whether your political education has taught you all of the real history of the unfolding of freedom in these United States. With all of the certainty of youth, you assert the superiority, in accord with the genius of the Constitution, of State power as against Federal powers. I seem to remember that a hundred years ago it was State powers which guarded and perpetuated the institution of chattel slavery, and that it was Federal power alone that destroyed this institution of complete denial of freedom. And, I also remember that Federal power alone was able to wipe off the books of the most vociferous of the States now asserting the sacredness of State power, such infamous laws as the Black Codes, which even in 1865, after 4 years of costly Civil War, still made it a capital offense to teach a black man to read and write.

"As I read my country's history, every major subsequent advance made since the legal extinction of slavery by Federal enactment, and aimed to remove its odious remnants in law and practice, has required the use of Federal power.

"As a trades unionist, I certainly know that every major advance in my lifetime, in freedom from want and economic oppression of the people who earn their bread with their daily labor, has been by the exercise of Federal power, frequently not only at the expense of, but, as in the case of slavery, over the bitter opposition of State powers.

"Before you or most of your members were born, I lived and worked in this country when there was no protection against the arbitrary will of an employer or his foreman, whose power over the economic life of the workmen was so great Chief Justice Taft once declared that the very tone of voice, independent of the words used by the master to his workmen, could constitute intimidation. It was Federal power superseding State power that ended virtual industrial serfdom in big industry.

"I am certain that your two listed keynote speakers, Senators GOLDWATER and TOWER, do not understand the whole and indivisible nature of the freedom you assert. I have listened and heard them speak only for that portion of freedom which is useful for the already rich, well born, well educated, powerful and comfortable. All of this brings me to inspect your more elderly advisers. At least two of them spent long years forwarding the Communist cause in literature, in teaching and in labor, while organized elements, like my union and myself, were fighting that Communist offensive, including their part in it. These are high-grade intellects and they are properly welcomed back to freedom's side. But they, in all proper humility, might well refrain from lecturing organized labor in such patronizing tones, as John Dos Passos and Dr. Bella Dodd have unpardonably done, to those who only a few years ago were holding the line against the Communists, while Dos Passos and Dr. Dodd, in communism's era of much greater domestic strength than now, were passing up the ammunition to our Communist foe.

"Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker is also on your list. I remember that in the days of the great illusion about Soviet cobelligerency on the part of almost every large section of America, except organized labor, Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker came back from a visit to the Soviet Union, with its state-controlled slave trade unions, and publicly praised to the skies the no-nonsense treatment of labor in the territory of our great Soviet ally as compared with the presumably lily-fingered softness to organized labor back here in the United States of America. I have never heard Mr. Rickenbacker repudiate that wartime nonsense and may be forgiven for doubting if he has even understood the nature of freedom here, except an anarchic, selfish individual part of it, which is no guide for you and me, any better than he understood what he saw in Soviet Russia in wartime.

"I will not send you money, since the men you sponsor as speakers and their supporters didn't seem to need it the last time I looked. I do send you much more valuable advice, and the cost of time, brain sweat and effort to a boy merely educated in tax-supported Philadelphia public schools and the hard college of the labor movement, is so considerable, that I feel like a very generous man."

Peter Rodino III's Little People-to-People Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, within the past few weeks, an idea advanced by a 10-year-old boy has won many friends and caused much enthusiasm. I refer to the little people-to-people program proposed by Peter Rodino III, son of the distinguished legislator and good friend of mine, the gentleman from New Jersey, PETER RODINO. The boy suggested a few weeks ago that "a fallout of letters" from youngsters in this Nation might convince Mr. Khrushchev that an end should be put to the fallout of bombs.

It seems to me that this suggestion again emphasizes the need for communication among all peoples, especially when tensions, misunderstandings, and disagreements among nations can cause fatal or dangerous failures of communication. Letters from our children, telling about their lives here and their hopes for a better world, would help keep the channels of truth and understanding open.

Representative RODINO and his son are to be congratulated for the work they have begun. I think that they will encourage many young students to begin letterwriting campaigns to many other nations. I believe that their drive will give impetus, too, to the student-to-student letterwriting campaigns now un-

derway. These campaigns, not necessarily directed to those behind the Iron Curtain, help draw nations closer.

I was impressed recently, for example, by a recent article in Homes-News of Ocean Township, N.J. This story described a correspondence-for-peace project begun by eighth-grade students of the Ocean Township School at Oakhurst, N.J., and it gives a heart-warming excerpt from a letter written by a Japanese student.

The officers of the club—Leslie Wexler, president; Linda Kane, vice president; Chris Kelley, treasurer; and Jeanne Hoppach, secretary—and the others in the group are receiving advice and assistance from their teacher, Mr. Buehler.

Here and in other towns of New Jersey and the rest of the Nation, interest is growing in correspondence among students in many lands. With the help of Representative RODINO and others concerned about mutual understanding among all Nations, we may soon have even greater numbers of youngsters who believe that they can contribute to that goal.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article referred to printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUPILS CORRESPONDENCE IS AIMED AT WORLD PEACE

TOWNSHIP OF OCEAN.—Seventy-seven Ocean eighth graders have organized a teenage correspondence-for-peace program which they believe will grow in the coming months and become an important and effective instrument for better understanding among young people throughout the world.

The primary purpose of the club is to exchange views and ideas pertaining to the social, economic, and political life of a country. It is hoped the correspondent's knowledge of these subjects will not only be a source of stimulating information but more significantly, a step toward promoting good will.

The student movement was given impetus by Senator HARRISON K. WILLIAMS who congratulated the pupils on their efforts to bring knowledge of the United States to young people throughout the world.

One letter recently received by Debbie Kirk from Keiko Oomiya of Japan sums up essentially the important results of such an exchange. Keiko Oomiya writes: "You may be interested to know that Japanese boys and girls are very eager for knowledge of the people of other lands, especially the United States—not the kind of knowledge that one finds in the geography and history books, but the little things that interest young people everywhere.

"I am particularly interested in American life, how Americans live at home, how they think, what they wear, the kind of music they listen to, the types of programs that are telecast, the books they read, and the hobbies they pursue."

The members will enjoy discussing such letters as this at their bimonthly meetings and the club officers express the hope that many students will profit greatly from this international letter exchange.

Although most of the students are corresponding with pupils from Europe, there is hope that the Soviet Union will be receptive to the club's request for Russian correspondents in the near future.

We Must Stand Firm in Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, the charges regularly made against the Committee on Un-American Activities and anti-Communist organizations in this country are that they are exaggerating the Communist menace and the results of Communist enslavement.

There was recently brought to my attention an article entitled, "How They Live in the Soviet Zone." This article was published in the Bulletin, a weekly survey of German affairs published by the German Federal Government. This well-written article gives us further evidence of the results of Communist rule and why we must stand firm in Berlin. The article follows:

HOW THEY LIVE IN THE SOVIET ZONE

(What are conditions really like in the Soviet-occupied part of Germany? A United Press International reporter with relatives in the Soviet Zone visited them recently. On his return to the Federal Republic, he told his story. It is published below as it appeared in the international press on February 1. "East Germany" refers to the Soviet Zone. The Federal Republic is referred to as "West Germany." To protect the reporter's family and friends, he avoided mentioning place names.)

East Germany today is more then ever a land of shortage, suspicion and sorrow.

The Berlin wall and tighter border restrictions instituted by the Communist government have turned the country into a prison for its 17 million inhabitants.

East Germany has always appeared drab and dull by comparison with West Germany, but the contrast has never been so depressing as now.

Parents are afraid their children will tell Communist police they have been watching West German television stations or listening to Western radio programs.

MAIL IS CENSORED

Telegrams and letters are opened and censored by the government.

Meat, potatoes, butter and milk are scarce everywhere, and in some areas near-starvation conditions prevail.

Clothing is largely of poor quality, expensive, and hard to get.

The economy is weakened by the flight of thousands of refugees, yet the country must support an army of 300,000 heavily armed men and additional workers' militias organized to discourage any uprisings.

PEOPLE FEEL THE STRAIN

To replace the lost manpower, 1,000 skilled workers have arrived from Russia to settle in East Germany. Contingents from Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Communist China, and North Korea are supposed to follow.

The strain of economic struggle and the Government's repressive measures have wearied the people's emotions.

One of the latest steps of the regime is censorship of mail to or from areas outside East Germany. Such letters are opened. The contents of personal letters have appeared in newspapers in a cynical display of the Government's interference in the private lives of its citizens.

LOYAL CITIZENS AS AGENTS

Telegrams are no longer delivered direct to the addresses. Instead, the contents are read on the telephone to a contact chosen for his loyalty to the Government, who records the message and then delivers it.

The Government has started distributing petitions in state-run factories, offices, and schools in which the signers state they no longer want to receive mail or packages from the West.

FURTHER PROHIBITIONS AHEAD

Opposition to the petitions is strong, but many East Germans fear the petitions are the first step toward cutting off all mail service with the West.

There are already severe penalties for listening to radio broadcasts from the West.

Television aerials turned to receive programs from West Germany were ripped down recently from roofs by gangs of young Communists in many places.

Many set owners who can still get Western programs are afraid to turn them on. Some East Germans sit in darkened rooms watching the clandestine programs after their children have gone to bed. They fear the children might—intentionally or inadvertently—betray them to authorities as ideological defectors.

The grimness of East Germany begins at the Berlin wall, but extends far, far behind it.

How the Soviet Union Exploits Sports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, an article in the February 1962 issue of the American Legion magazine points up the importance of international sports, and sets forth what we in this country can do to meet the challenge of the Soviet Union in this field where that nation has far-reaching aims and programs.

The article was written by John J. Karch, and I include it here for the information of my colleagues:

HOW THE SOVIET UNION EXPLOITS SPORTS

(By John J. Karch)

"The triumph of Soviet sportsmen," Prime Minister Khrushchev declared, "means a victory for the man of the new Socialist society, which has already given so much proof of its superiority in the field of science, technology, and culture." The Communist Party leader referred to their victory at the XVII Olympic games, staged in Rome in 1960 where the Soviet team scored more than 200 points over the U.S. contingent.

One of the vital aims of the Soviet empire, publicly announced and repeatedly emphasized, is to compete successfully with the United States in all sectors of human endeavor, including sports, and thus prove the superiority of the Socialist system over ours.

In February 1960—before the Olympiad—President Eisenhower declared it his view that it is not necessary to keep up with the Soviets in all areas, including sports. Less than a year later, after the Olympics, the White House released the "Conclusions and Recommendations of the President's Committee on Information Activities Abroad" which admitted that some Soviet sporting victories have had certain propaganda value.

But the committee, headed by Mansfield D. Sprague, did not appear disturbed, for it believes that the problem does not justify any fundamental departure from the established American practice of participating in the Olympic games and other international competitions on a private and amateur basis.

Not only the committee was undisturbed; no one else appeared particularly troubled, and the report received only scant notice; the slight reference to sports—two short paragraphs in some 20 released pages—none at all. This shows pathetic complacency and indifference to an important American activity and an almost appalling lack of appreciation, or knowledge, of Soviet propaganda efforts in sports. It leads one to realize that our situation is serious and calls for much self-evaluation and an examination of Soviet philosophy, aims, and programs in this significant field in which impact is made upon many millions of people in all nations.

The Soviet Communist Party claims that "there has been an immeasurable growth in the international prestige of our country and all socialist states." The recent successes of Soviet sports figures in international competitions, including the Olympic Games, are a contributing factor. "All over the world," David Lawrence says, "the prestige of the United States goes down as Russia's standing goes up. Here's America, a rich country with plenty of money to buy anything, but somehow our international standing is confined to such mildmannered sports as track and baseball and sometimes tennis." In short, the performances of international athletic games contribute significantly to, or detract from, a nation's prestige in the world. We must face this aspect of prestige squarely and do something about it.

It is no secret that the Soviet unequivocal aim is to dominate the world, and its leaders pursue policies to accomplish that aim. Moscow's use of the conventional military, political, and economic forces are relatively well known; much less is known about their unconventional techniques of which the chief weapon is propaganda. This is directed by the Agitation and Propaganda section ("Agit-prop") of the Secretariat of the Communist Party.

Among the first tasks of the party propaganda, as resolved by the central committee, is the duty to bring home the "superiority of the socialist system * * * by citing remarkable examples of Communist labor and way of life." Physical culture is a way of life, and the many Soviet victories in athletic events are remarkable examples often cited by Soviet propaganda. During 1961 Soviet athletes competed against representatives of 69 countries—a kind of cultural export commodity.

The Sprague Committee recognized that the Soviet Union attaches "considerable propaganda importance" to sports events and noted that "it spends large resources and marshals hundreds of thousands of its youth to dedicate themselves at government expense to become international sporting champions." While admitting that sports are an important weapon in the Soviet arsenal, the committee fell short of a real contribution by saying that the problem does not justify any fundamental change by the United States in international sports activities.

The aims of the gigantic Soviet sports program are manifold and purposeful. The tremendous development of sports is not merely for physical fitness but a calculated political phenomenon. Sports are predicated upon mass participation based upon competitive principle which must be manifested in all contests.

Within the U.S.S.R. this has the beneficial advantage of facilitating party control over its energetic youth, assisting it in the attempt to create a new socialist man, increasing labor productivity, and contributing to military discipline.

For display outside the Soviet Union, the Soviet youths are trained to become international champions—winners, not merely participants—to illustrate the superiority of the socialist system.

Pravda noted that at the Olympic games the attention of world public opinion was concentrated on the performances by the representatives of the United States and the U.S.S.R—the "two sporting giants" so to speak. It claimed, quite inaccurately, that American athletes had been preparing for 4 years to make up for their failure at the 16th Olympics at Melbourne; and accurately, that Soviet sportsmen too had been preparing thoroughly for the Olympic games. The resulting difference of over 200 points in the unofficial team scores, according to a statement in Pravda, "is convincing evidence of the high skill and the will to win of our remarkable sportsmen."

Moscow hailed the Soviet triumph as one for peace and the Czechs obsequiously said the friendship of Soviet athletes made the greatest impression. Communist East Germany characterized the Rome games as a good example of peaceful coexistence. Hungary stated that the Olympics presented a great demonstration of the peace and friendship between peoples which was due largely to the sportsmen of the socialist camp, but that the Soviet victory demonstrated the superiority of socialist sport.

The successes and bright future of socialist sports and conversely, the deterioration and doom of capitalist sports, was predicted by an article, "Sport and Society," in the Soviet journal Problems of Philosophy. Sports in the West were characterized as exploitation of athletes by the capitalists as a means to prepare for war. Socialist athletic events, the journal proposed, are "convincing propaganda for the idea of peace, and their political significance is great."

This inattention by the United States is especially incredible in view of the pride taken by Americans in being so sports minded and is perhaps due to a large extent to a lack of appreciation of social and propaganda values derived from international athletic competitions.

Americans pride themselves also on organizational ability, but there is glaring deficiency in organization, coordination, and purpose in our sports activities. The Soviet bloc states, however, are impressively organized and have a definite aim—to be the best and to win.

This vast Soviet sports program is financed by the government and the trade unions; the latter allocate about one-fifth of their annual budget for this purpose. Despite this, Moscow makes the incredible claim to living up to amateur regulations.

The selection of athletes and teams to represent their country in international meets is important inasmuch as the individuals and the teams are assumed by the world public to be the best that particular country can offer. The disparity in the selection of athletes to represent the United States and the bloc states in international competition is conspicuous and places us at a decided disadvantage even before the events get under way.

In the United States, Olympic hopefuls are hastily assembled by the Olympic committee every 4 years—a few weeks before the games—at a designated spot, usually reached at their own expense, with the first three in each event qualifying for the team. This "do or die" approach occasionally disqualifies some of our best competitors.

In the socialist states, the call to begin preparations for the next Olympics is sounded immediately after the current games are concluded, and the process of selecting the team begins many months before the actual competition.

For example, the potential Czech track team was narrowed down to 43 men and 14 women as early as June 1959—that is, some 15 months before the Rome games in 1960. The final choice was made during the track season in 1959, and the candidates began intensive training as a team. This was a whole year in advance of the Olympics.

At the present time the Soviet Union is preparing for the 1968 Olympic games, which it hopes will be held in Moscow. A village to house 1,900 athletes is under construction in the suburbs, to be completed in August 1962.

Perhaps even more disheartening is the incredible handling, or more accurately mishandling, of groups that represent the United States in international competitions in the intervening years.

The reader may recall the scandalous result of the world basketball championship in Chile in early 1959. The United States lost to the Soviet team—still a believe-it-or-not incident—and became immediately the butt of jokes. The result was a loss of national prestige well publicized in Latin America and elsewhere. According to the New York Times Sports Columnist Arthur Daley, "It was a propaganda defeat of the first magnitude." Yet, relatively few Americans were even aware of these games.

The Soviet Union and the satellites always send their best athletes to international meets. The Polish United Workers (Communist) Party organ Tribuna Ludu announced a four-point policy for its teams as long ago as September 1949:

"1. Polish representatives should receive proper training.

"2. Teams should be composed of the best athletes available in a given field.

"3. The level of our representatives should not be much lower than that of our adversaries.

"4. Each trip should produce a positive result in training and propaganda."

Moreover, the bloc teams are in training the year around and never hurriedly assembled as the American teams often are. Small wonder, then, that they win.

In the socialist countries the athletes are hailed as heroes, held in high esteem by the Government and party leaders and the common folk alike, and given uncommon recognition, much in the fashion of the ancient Greek Olympians. The Supreme Soviet, the state's legislative body, conferred orders and medals upon 317 Soviet athletes and coaches for outstanding achievements after the last summer and winter games. And the highest distinction, the Order of Lenin, was awarded to some 10 winners, men and women.

Do the Communists have in their sports organization no shortcomings? In line with socialist practice of criticism and self-criticism, inadequacies are admitted. For example, the trade unions and Komsomol are remiss in providing physical facilities at many industrial and other enterprises in the Soviet Union; there is a lack of equipment; some instructors are poorly trained; and some youths are not sufficiently inspired.

Other problems, not so readily admitted, smack of the unsocialist practices of professionalism, favoritism, and of gambling. The party paper, Pravda, makes it clear, however, that it is the "duty" of the party, government, trade unions, and komsomol to remove shortcomings which hinder the growth of the mass character of sports and skill in them.

What does the future hold for us, considering the energy, organization, and purpose of the bloc sports programs? Our situation is serious but not hopeless and will probably continue to deteriorate before it gets better.

Specifically, what can we do?

1. We can make an honest and realistic appraisal of our sports activities to lay the

groundwork for the long haul in order to regain our prestige.

2. Our public, business, and other leaders should give greater recognition to sports programs. Many are seen at games and at postseason banquets, but they should also take a real and active interest by giving their moral support and financial assistance to sports development. Encouragement should be given not only to participants of championship caliber but to all youths.

3. The United States can increase its participation in international competitions so that our athletes may be made sharp, more alert, and better prepared physically and psychologically to meet the best from the foreign lands.

4. The best U.S. representatives for all international meets should be picked with the utmost care.

5. Adequate expenses should be provided—by government and private sources—to obviate the necessity of door-to-door begging for transportation and living expenses. This does not suggest a departure from amateur sports into professionalism, but only that it would enable us to send our best competitors instead of pick-up teams.

6. There should be established a wide range of competitive and individual sports from grade school through college and beyond; that is, establish sports programs to include not only the "bread and butter" teams of football and basketball but, internationally, the equally important sports of track (particularly distances) and field, soccer, gymnastics, fencing, cycling, water polo, etc.

7. In school, encouragement—not force—for participation, particularly in the minor sports, must be used not only by the physical education teacher, but by other teachers and administrators as well. Many of our educators are downright opposed to athletics in high schools and colleges.

A changed attitude on the part of many of our doubtful educators from ridiculing athletics and athletes to unstinted support for sports programs would indeed be a most welcome omen.

8. Like the educators, our editorial writers should be immensely helpful to our Nation by drawing attention to our plight and by calling for action.

9. We should stress victory, not merely participation. Our children are taught that it isn't important whether you win or lose, but how you play the game. Nothing could be more nonsensical. In reality, teams and individuals play to win. The millions of spectators in the United States and throughout the world attend sports events and exhort their teams to win. In the Olympics and international meets, only the winners are honored.

10. High priority should be given the establishment of sport programs for girls. Our poor showing in international events is justified often by saying that our girls are prettier than those of other more successful countries. The not so pretty Soviet amazon has been the stereotype created for us and generally cited as the excuse when Soviet girls win.

11. Facilities that will be required for the expanded programs should be provided. This can be accomplished by a combination of Federal grants, donations by business groups, possibly assistance from the labor unions, and contributions by various foundations who have been active in educational and cultural activities.

12. Press, radio and TV should give greater and more consistent attention to international competitions and minor athletic events. Our promoters and sponsors of foreign representatives could assist greatly by arranging for events that would catch the imagination of the writers and readers. An ideal duel, of course, occurred recently between Russia's Valery Brumel and America's John Thomas in the high jump.

The sportswriter and commentator can be of real service by giving due recognition to the long-neglected sports and not being flippant or disparaging about them. Let's do away with discriminatory cataloging of sports as major and minor. This is harmful; it only discourages some able boys from becoming skilled athletes in the so-called minor sports.

13. Attention should be given to physical culture by our social scientists—an area they have too long neglected.

14. Serious thought should be devoted to adopting the international metric system used in international meets. This is unfamiliar to us, and our athletes must acclimate themselves, again hurriedly, to running or swimming, for example, 100 meters instead of 100 yards. Although the differences is small, it is very important considering the incredible speed in the shorter distances where it counts.

15. Our Olympic Association should initiate with the International Olympic Committee adoption of an official scoring system, thus abandoning the widespread practice of unofficial scoring now in existence in most countries although not recognized by the Committee.

President Kennedy has observed that the ancient Greeks prized physical excellence and athletic skills among man's great goals and among the prime foundations of a vigorous state. The actions of the Sino-Soviet bloc have indicated clearly their vivid awareness of these forces. Why cannot the Americans of the 1960's be equally aware?

INTERNATIONAL COMPETITION

The purpose of international competition, to the Reds, is the opportunity to show the world that Ivan is superman.

Russian ego was given a strong boost by gloating press accounts of Soviet victories, and defeats suffered by U.S. teams.

1. Headline from Young Communist Pravda: "Brilliant Victory for Soviet Sport."

2. "Our sportsmen have justified the hopes of the Soviet peoples."

3. "The strongest in the world * * * Soviet sportsmen won 103 medals and in the unofficial team count took 683.5 points, running over the U.S. team by 219.5 points. The Olympics in Rome was a triumph for Soviet sport. No other country achieved such brilliant success. Even the American sportsmen who have a half-century of experience of participation in the Olympics and who were considered the strongest in the world are taking away from Rome only 34 highest Olympic awards."

4. Headline from Pravda: "Soviet Sportsmen Has Justified the Hopes of their People."

5. From Pravda: "Glory to Soviet sportsmen—heroes of the 17th Olympics."

6. "A victory in which we take pride."

7. "The secret of our success—mass work."

8. "Excerpts from press comments."

8a. "New York Times: 'The sportsmen of the United States have won many fewer gold medals than they expected. America is losing her position.' "

Taxing Thrift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the Journal of Commerce of March 6, 1962.

The Journal points out the best arguments against the proposed increased taxing of savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks. Point 3 of their argument against this increased taxation, however, would be obviated if my bill H.R. 10268 is passed. It will prohibit the commercial banks insured by FDIC from accepting deposits in excess of certain percentages of their outstanding real estate loans, thus in effect requiring them to invest their savings account money in the mortgage market.

The editorial follows:

TAXING THRIFT

Back in 1959 when commercial banks began an all-out campaign to have more Federal income taxes imposed upon their chief rivals for saving deposits we both questioned the wisdom of the tax proposals and were critical of the American Bankers Association, now heavily influenced in its thinking by the smaller banks, for backing with its great prestige an idea that had many unsound features.

In the light of watered-down proposals recently given approval by the House Tax-writing Committee it now looks as if there will be a substantial increase in the tax burden imposed upon savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks through a scaling down of the portion of their earnings that they are permitted to add to reserves before figuring income taxes. The addition to their tax burden apparently will not be immediately big enough to force cuts in interest dividends to the savers but it will lower the ceiling on their growth and usefulness.

We disagree completely with the expressed view of a big commercial banker in Buffalo that the country could get along without such specialized thrift organizations. He probably knows better and a remark like that won't do commercial banking any good.

In short, we still feel as we did 3 years ago. We are in favor of tax equality but what is proposed under that slogan is phony equality. As Congressman MULTER, of New York, said last year if real equality were involved commercial banks would be required to segregate time and savings deposits, invest them under the same conditions required of other thrift institutions and make them all subject to the same tax formula.

Here are some of the reasons why we question, in the national interest, steeply increasing taxes on thrift institutions:

1. Most mutual savings banks and savings and loans are generally conceded to have capital or surplus funds that might be inadequate in abnormal times for depositor protection. The only way they can accumulate more is out of earnings. Commercial banks can raise more capital from stockholders at any time; indeed, they may be required to.

2. Savings banks and savings and loans are the main support of the mortgage market which finances new homes—residences and apartments. The proposed tax rise will cripple them the most by 1966 and later when new family formations on the basis of population growth will be in another sharp upswing. It is idle to suppose that commercial banks will buy mortgages in anything like the ratio savings banks and savings and loans invest in them; they never have; indeed such purchases for commercial banks might even be unsound.

3. If commercial banks do not invest the bulk of their savings deposits in mortgages and savings banks and savings and loans for any reason cannot keep up with mortgage supplies, new and bigger contributions by the Federal Government to support the mortgage market may be inevitable, and amounting to many times the aggregate of new taxes collected from thrift institutions. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board takes

a dim view of the thrift tax proposals and proves statistically that it could cut into the housing supply at the wrong time.

There are a host of other arguments against the thrift tax; for example, savings banks and savings and loans have to pay interest on every dollar they get; commercial banks get the bulk of theirs free; savings depositors in both may have taxes withheld on such interest as is paid and this in turn, while theoretically equitable, will be another hindrance to savings growth.

This country, financing itself and so much of the capital requirements of the world, needs to encourage more savings, not less. Quoting again from Mr. MULTER, Congress in 1951 saw fit to protect mutual institutions by section 593 of the Internal Revenue Code and the case for changing the rules is something of a strawman. We still feel it is of questionable public interest and that many commercial banks have been misled into an effort to sow a bunch of dragon's teeth which later on may come up and bite them.

Major Step by California in Dealing With Employment Discriminaton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe there is no more important problem confronting us today than to insure that all Americans—regardless of their race, religion, ancestry, age, or sex—have equal opportunities for equal treatment. In brief, to carry out the fundamental promise of America that all men are created equal and in this land will be given equal opportunity to grow and prosper.

The House Committee on Education and Labor has already taken a significant step forward in dealing with the acknowledged problem of discrimination in employment by favorably reporting the equal employment opportunities bill.

It is with a great deal of pride that I now call my colleagues' attention to another notable step forward in this field—a press release from the California State Department of Industrial Relations announcing that California has become the first State in the Union to establish a statewide committee on equal opportunities in apprenticeship and training for minority groups.

I congratulate Mr. John Henning, director of the California State Department of Industrial Relations, and those who worked with him on the formation of this committee, and wish them every success in their work. I also commend this announcement to my colleagues' attention:

MAJOR STEP BY CALIFORNIA IN DEALING WITH EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION

California today became the first State in the Union to establish a statewide committee on equal opportunities in apprenticeship and training for minority groups.

The occasion was marked by the approval of articles of organization by John F. Henning, administrator of apprenticeship and director of the California State Department of Industrial Relations.

Other participating in the approval ceremony were Webb Green, Los Angeles, committee chairman; Arthur Bradford, San Francisco, cochairman; Kei Hori, San Francisco, secretary; Albin J. Gruhn, San Francisco, president of California Labor Federation and Charles F. Hanna, San Francisco, chief of the division of apprenticeship standards.

Henning said "The formation of this committee represents a milestone in the long history of apprenticeship. It will vigorously encourage the creation of more opportunities for qualified minority youth to become skilled craftsmen."

The formation of the committee is the result of recommendations by the California Federation of Labor, AFL–CIO, and the California Conference on Apprenticeship to the California Apprenticeship Council to amend its rules to include the formation of such a committee.

The committee is composed of representatives of labor, management, minority organizations, members of the California Apprenticeship Council, members of the California Conference on Apprenticeship and representatives from governmental agencies.

The committee will conduct an all day workshop on equal opportunity in apprenticeship at the forthcoming California Conference on Apprenticeship April 25, 26, and 27, 1962, Statler Hilton Hotel, Los Angeles.

Principles of Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE CURTIS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Members and others will be inspired by the statement of principles "For Americanism and Genuine Democracy," first published by the Hearst papers on April 21, 1935, and reaffirmed in editorials in those papers of March 4, 1962.

This statement expresses fundamental principles which have stood the test of time, although developments during the 27 years since the statement was drafted might call for some revisions and new points of emphasis. The statement follows:

FOR AMERICANISM AND GENUINE DEMOCRACY

The Hearst papers are American papers published for the American people.

They support the American system of government, the American Constitution, American institutions, and American ideals.

They labor to maintain the American standard of living.

They are opposed to the various forms of tyranny which our American forefathers came to this country to avoid.

They are in favor of American independence, American rights and liberties, free speech, free assembly, freedom of thought and action, and freedom of the press.

They are advocates of rugged individualism, and of the industrial independence and enterprise which have made our country the richest and greatest in the world.

They are opposed to paternalism in government.

They believe with Thomas Jefferson that the least governed country is the best governed country, particularly in view of recent political experiments, which have done nothing but prove that the most governed country is the worst governed country.

They are opposed to communism, fascism, or any form of despotism.

They are opposed to intolerance, as well as to fanaticism.

They are opposed to race prejudice and to class conflict.

They believe in opportunity for all and equality before the law.

They believe in the capitalistic system, so-called, which is the only practical economic system of proven worth and with adequate reward for merit.

They believe in compensation in proportion to service rendered, and in no limit to the extent of the compensation if the extent of the service is equally great.

They believe in the creation of wealth through industry and the distribution of wealth in wages.

They believe that the attempt to distribute wealth through theft is not only disastrous morally but economically, and means the ruination of industry and the destruction of all possible prosperity.

They are opposed to any form of politics and economics which endeavor to grade down the most prosperous to the level of the lowest; and they believe ardently in the American system of politics and economics which for a century and a half has successfully raised the lower strata to a nearer level with the upper.

They believe in the deportation of alien cranks and criminals, particularly those who came to this country to find freedom of speech and remained to abuse it; who came to this country to gain the liberties which they are unable intelligently to understand and enjoy; who came to this country to find prosperity and who are trying to create in this country the conditions which have brought adversity to other lands.

They are opposed to government by any clique or class.

They believe in genuine democracy, the rule of the majority.

They believe that America should be for Americans and that Americans should be for America.

U.S. No-Win Policy Against Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Mr. Holmes Alexander, one of the most outstanding and respected news columnists in this country, has written an excellent column which I feel merits the attention of the Senate. It is entitled "Lebanon's Malik Dislikes Kennedy's No-Win Policy" and was published in the February 23, 1962, issue of the Greenville News of Greenville, S.C.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEBANON'S MALIK DISLIKES KENNEDY'S NO-WIN POLICY

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—You don't contradict the President. He doesn't get answered back—except in some oblique, inoffensive way.

Something like this happened recently in a speech here last October at the John Carroll Society dinner by the statesman-scholar Charles Malik, former Ambassador from Lebanon, now a professor at the American University. Dr. Malik gave the best retort I have heard to the President's oft-spoken thesis that we must have a no-win policy against Russia—a policy made imperative because (as the cliche goes: "there is no alternative to peace.") Mr. Kennedy reiterated this thesis last February 14.

"Question. A number of the rightwing critics say that your policy is based on a no-win policy in the cold war. Would you address yourself to this charge?"

"The PRESIDENT. There will be no winners in the next nuclear war, if we have one."

This is all very familiar. But now let us hear Dr. Malik on the same subject:

"MALIK. When one expresses the hope that the West will stand firm at this or that crucial point * * * one is often confronted with the rejoinder: 'Then you are advocating nuclear war and the destruction of the human race?' Of course nothing could be further from one's mind than that. But nothing is more pleasant to communism than to have the West constantly retreat under the threat of war. * * * Nothing is more urgent than to deploy the forces of freedom * * * (so) as to make, under the umbrella of nuclear stalemate, the threat of nuclear war at least as threatening to communism as it is to the West."

This is exactly what such rightwingers as Senators THURMOND and GOLDWATER are trying to do. It is what the President ought to do. He ought to "make * * * the threat of nuclear war at least as threatening to communism as it is to the West."

Well, why doesn't the President do so? In my opinion there is approximately a six-word answer to that: Stevenson, Wiesner, Rostow, Schlesinger, Bowles and Cleveland. On the record of what they have said and done, and of their known positions, these advisers and some others are the President's accommodation men. Dr. Malik, a much better diplomat than I am, pays tribute to them without using any names. You might say that Dr. Malik, in another passage of the speech just quoted is talking about accommodationists anonymous.

"MALIK. I am certain they do not want to see the West overwhelmed, but some of them, I feel, do not at heart want to see communism overwhelmed either. * * * They appear to be unwilling to contemplate the possibility of erasing it from the earth. They seem badly to miss it then. Some people—worthy products of Western thought and life—feel emotionally and existentially happier and more secure in a world in which Marxism-Lenninism is powerful and entrenched. What is it in the spirit of Marx that so strangely captivates them?"

Neither Dr. Malik nor I nor any responsible and respectful critic of the President and his advisers are talking about Reds in Government. We are talking about intellectualists, pacifists, coexistentialists. These persons, as Dr. Malik is saying, don't want to overwhelm communism, with or without nuclear war. They do not want to see communism obliterated from the earth by starving it to death, scaring it to death, revolutionizing it to death. And Dr. Malik asks why these persons so willing that communism, their country's mortal enemy, should live?

My guess is that Dr. Malik, a man of surpassing knowledge about life and its people, knows the answer, but rather than put words into his mouth I will suggest an answer of my own.

Accommodationists anonymous are violent anti-Fascists. The horrors of Hitler are never out of their minds. Never do they stop seeing businessmen-in-jackboots or dreading that somehow the horrible radical right in America—or in some important ally like West Germany—will spawn another fuehrer.

To accommodationists anonymous there is nothing worse than fascism, and communism does have the quality of being anti-Fascist. This is why our AA's are always for socialism in domestic affairs, and this is why they are never very much against communism in world affairs.

If America is to survive, communism must be destroyed. The President isn't getting the right advice from his advisers on accommodation.

Germany Dizzy Over U.S. Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the San Diego (Calif.) Union:

GERMANY DIZZY OVER U.S. POLICIES

(By Constantine Brown)

Europe's political skies are cloudy again. Conditions in France are difficult; the rank and file of French people are sick of Algeria, which has cost them some $8 billion and tens of thousands of lives. The violent opposition of the minority led by generals with no political sense has created a situation which could plunge France into chaos should President de Gaulle disappear from the political scene. This disappearance would cause all the promising aspects for a Federated Europe to disintegrate.

Germany has become significantly restless. Until a few weeks ago, the De Gaulle policy toward Russia, "no negotiations unless the Kremlin approaches us with concrete proposals," was fully accepted by all Germans. Recently, however, a new trend has been noticeable in the Federal Republic. Not only responsible newspapers but political leaders, such as Dr. Mende, the head of the Liberal Party which supports Konrad Adenauer in Parliament, have urged direct discussions with Moscow in answer to Khrushchev's repeated approaches to Bonn.

Khrushchev is reported to have strongly hinted that even the question of unification of Germany could be settled if the Bonn government shows a real understanding of the situation and desire to meet the Russian policies halfway. Of course, the understanding of Russia's policies is German neutrality, that is to say, leave the NATO.

So far the Bonn government has instantly rejected these approaches. But now, when a public demand has been created for negotiations, some members of the Adenauer cabinet are giving them a second thought. For the time being Germany is waiting to see how the French crisis will end.

Underlying this tendency to lend an ear to the Kremlin is the fear by some important political segments in West Germany that our Government, in its search for peace, might be tempted to make concessions to the Muscovites at the expense of Germany's national goals.

The best illustration of German thinking is a recent conversation this reporter had with two leading members of the Bundestag—one a Christian Democrat and the other a member of the pro-Adenauer Liberal Party. They said in effect: "Washington's policies make us somewhat dizzy. The President makes strong public speeches which almost convince us that the unity of the West in unshakable. Then he acts as if he had changed his mind."

Questions on the A-Test Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I support wholeheartedly President Kennedy's decision to resume nuclear testing in the atmosphere. In his speech, President Kennedy made a clear case proving that this question had been studied thoroughly from every angle. He, also, proved to my satisfaction that he had only made the decision reluctantly. He did not rush into it hastily, but only after careful analysis of Russia's 40 or 50 tests of some months ago.

The phase of the President's speech which is incomprehensible to me is how he can be willing to accept a new written agreement by the Soviet Union to ban nuclear testing after the sad experience we have just undergone by virtue of the Soviet Union's complete violation of its prior agreement on this same subject. The President made a very clear case against the Soviet Union on this point in justifying his decision to resume atmospheric testing. How can he feel justified in accepting their word a second time?

It seems to me that this is terribly dangerous. The President, himself, said that a new series of tests by the Soviet Union might well put the Soviet Union ahead of us in the nuclear race. Since our nuclear power is a main deterrent against war, we are risking war by giving the Soviet Union another chance to make progress while we are standing still.

The following article by David Lawrence which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of March 6, 1962, points up this question very clearly and, also, raises some other questions which could well be answered. Mr. Lawrence's article follows:

[From the Washington Star, Mar. 6, 1962]

QUESTIONS ON THE A-TEST ISSUE

(By David Lawrence)

After hearing President Kennedy's eloquent and forceful address the other night about resuming nuclear tests, it seems as if someone might readily write a play entitled, "How to Confuse the Public Without Really Trying."

There is no issue emanating from Government nowadays which is beset with so much confusion, contradiction, and mystery as surrounds the argument over nuclear testing.

The New York Times said editorially this week that Mr. Kennedy's "stature as a forceful national leader will be determined less by the literary quality of his pronouncements than by his success in rallying the country behind his goals."

When the President finished his television address on nuclear testing, almost everyone agreed with the plausibility of the argument. But there was so much left unsaid and unexplained that one wonders how long it will be before the public will demand a greater sense of responsibility to the Nation than the administration has shown thus far on the issue of nuclear testing.

For one thing, the President didn't explain why, when the Soviets resumed testing on September 1 last, he didn't immediately authorize resumption of tests by the United States—both in the atmosphere and underground—without waiting 6 months. Why, for instance, was it necessary to spend 6 months examining the question or preparing for such tests? Is it conceivable that in a nuclear age the United States Government wasn't prepared for a prompt resumption of tests when it found out that the Soviets were cheating? How much confidence can there be that a similar delay in studying the issue may not eventuate if a nuclear attack actually occurs?

How can the American people accept Mr. Kennedy's proposals to trust the Soviets again if they sign an agreement on testing before the end of April? This is the date the President held out as bait to obtain another moratorium on testing.

The sequence of paragraphs is worth examining. First, the President openly accused the Soviets of violating their pledges when he said:

"On September 1 of last year, while the United States and the United Kingdom were negotiating in good faith at Geneva, the Soviet Union callously broke its moratorium with a 2-month series of more than 40 nuclear tests. Preparations for these tests had been secretly underway for many months."

Then, in the latter part of the address, Mr. Kennedy nevertheless told the American people he was willing to take another chance on a written pledge by the Soviets, as he declared:

"If the Soviet Union should now be willing to accept such a treaty, sign it before the latter part of April, and apply it immediately—if all testing can thus be actually halted—then the nuclear arms race would be slowed down at last, the security of the United States and its ability to meet its commitments would be safeguarded, and there would be no need for our tests to begin."

Earlier in the same speech, Mr. Kennedy had stressed the importance of testing and of learning as much as, if not more than, the Soviets have learned by their recent tests. He said frankly that a further Soviet series of tests in the absence of Western tests "could well provide the Soviet Union with a nuclear attack and defense capability so powerful as to encourage aggressive designs." Mr. Kennedy then added:

"Were we to stand still while the Soviets surpassed us—or even appeared to surpass us—the free world's ability to deter, to survive, and to respond to an all-out attack would be seriously weakened."

But, in spite of this, the President now wants to accept the written word of the Soviets and run the risk of further delays in America's testing.

Even more surprising perhaps was the President's carefully worded statement that "the exposure due to radioactivity from these (American) tests will be less than one-fiftieth of the difference which can be experienced, due to variations in natural radioactivity, simply by living in different locations in this country."

Yet millions of well-meaning, sincere, and patriotic persons in this and other Western countries have been persuaded in the last 5 years by Soviet and pacifist propaganda and by misguided pronouncements of various scientists that atmosphere testing is a terrible danger to mankind. Why hasn't our Government—under this and the preceding administration—debunked the idea before? Mr. Kennedy's address didn't clear up this phase of the confusion, either.

Panama City Provides Needed Catalyst

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Florida Times-Union of Monday, February 26, which tells of the effective work being done in Panama City, Fla., in my district, in the field of adult education. I am pleased to note this recognition of a very fine program which could well be followed elsewhere:

PANAMA CITY PROVIDES NEEDED CATALYST

The city government of Panama City, with the aid of the State department of education, today enters the second week of a program under which municipal employees are allowed to attend night classes to further their education. In the belief that the employees will thus gain equipment which will redound to the benefit of the community they serve, the city commission is footing the bill for those who attend high school and junior college classes.

Commenting on the venture, State Superintendent Thomas D. Bailey predicts that it may prove the catalyst that will start a revival of interest in adult education in Florida. Let us hope he is right, and let us remain aware that there are two functions which the school system of Florida must serve in this connection.

The Panama City action dramatizes two concepts in education, the one which is motivated by the practical aspect, and the other which takes cognizance of the cultural significance. The Panama City government's interest in providing employees educational opportunities of necessity must be that of adding to their practical operational skills. Conceivably, it may also be that which carries the long-range view of permitting them to prepare for retirement.

The word "school" derives one of its better meanings from the Greek "schole" with which it has etymological kinship. The Greek word "schole" meant "leisure," implying that there was a correlation between what people did in school and the amount of free time they had to do it. In other words, the Hellenic idea of schooling was far from the bread-and-butter aspect.

Who is right, then, we or the Greeks of antiquity? To dismiss the Hellenic ideal as nonsense which infects the minds of the traditionalists is to ignore the fact that we are living in an age which provides us with more leisure. To inveigh against schooling which provides "practical training" is to ignore the store our society puts in the material aspects of living.

How are we going to spend our leisure time in retirement? Will activity in the realm of intellect prolong our "harvest years" or reduce them?

Superintendent Bailey's hopeful expression about a revival of interest in adult education points up the great responsibility his department has in keeping the program in proper balance. Meanwhile, we have scored a big gain at Panama City in the recognition that education is a continuing process, one that can and should last throughout a lifetime.

Additional Depreciation Deductions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 10608.

This bill proposes to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide for additional depreciation deductions and to eliminate certain inequities in the valuation of inventories, as follows:

First. An elective provision whereby taxpayers will be permitted to take additional depreciation each year in a graduated amount. For assets having a useful life of 4 years and under 6 years, the additional depreciation would be 7 percent of the depreciation otherwise allowable. For assets having a useful life of 6 years and under 8 years, the additional depreciation would be 14 percent of the depreciation otherwise allowable. For assets having a useful life of 8 years or more, the additional depreciation would be 20 percent of the depreciation otherwise allowable.

Second. An elective provision whereby taxpayers will be permitted in valuing inventories to set up a reserve up to 20 percent of the first $100,000 of finished goods purchased and held for resale.

Both amendments would be effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1962.

The provision with respect to depreciation, when coupled with the revision of Bulletin F by the Treasury, should provide industry with the latitude in accounting for depreciation which has been overwhelmingly supported in the testimony before the Ways and Means Committee. As a corollary to the relief to industry, the Congress should grant relief to the small businessman who must reinvest his funds in inventory. Unless the wholesale and retail trades are willing and able to stock the goods produced by industry, any increased capacity to produce will remain idle.

The Secretary of the Treasury has stated that the provisions with respect to depreciation allowances for productive facilities, as supplemented by Bulletin F and the Treasury rulings, failed to recognize fully the economic obsolescence of such assets. The Secretary has also publicly stated that the useful lives prescribed in Bulletin F will be consolidated and reduced by between 20 and 30 percent. However, he advised the Ways and Means Committee that even after those revisions, American industry still will not be permitted to amortize the cost of productive equipment as rapidly as its foreign competition. Therefore, the first part of the bill provides for an election whereby the taxpayer can accelerate the depreciation of equipment to a greater extent than the revised Bulletin F. This amendment should meet the needs of the manufacturing or productive segment of the economy in which there must be a relatively large investment in depreciable

personal property such as machinery and equipment.

In addition, it should be recognized that the products of industry must be sold to the consumer if the additional productive facilities are to be fully utilized. The distribution and retailing segment of the economy must also be in a position to grow with the growth of industry. There are more than 1½ million small merchants who must stock the increased output of industry if the goods are to be sold. This amendment is intended to facilitate the carrying of that stock by deferring the tax on a part of their income which is reinvested in inventory.

The small merchant frequently is unable to set aside after taxes, sufficient income to carry the necessary increases in his inventory which may be required either because of inflation, the introduction of new products, or normal growth. If these merchants are to compete with the large merchandising chains, some form of "reinvestment" tax relief will be necessary. The second part of the bill will permit the small distributor and retailer to defer the tax on an amount equivalent to 20 percent of the taxpayer's reinvestment in inventory.

ADDITIONAL DEPRECIATION DEDUCTIONS

This part of the bill provides that the taxpayer will be permitted to take additional depreciation each year in a graduated additional amount:

First. For assets having a useful life of 4 years and under 6 years, the additional depreciation would be 7 percent of the depreciation otherwise allowable.

Second. For assets having a useful life of 6 years and under 8 years, the additional depreciation would be 14 percent of the depreciation otherwise allowable.

Third. For assets having a useful life of 8 years or more, the additional depreciation would be 20 percent of the depreciation otherwise allowable.

For example, if a taxpayer installs some equipment having a useful life of 4 years on account of which the taxpayer would be entitled under existing law to an annual depreciation deduction of $100, this amendment would increase the annual deduction to $107. If the property had a useful life of 7 years, this amendment would increase the annual deduction to $114. If the property had a useful life of 10 years, this amendment would increase the annual deduction to $120.

The additional depreciation provided for in the attached amendment is based upon a percent of the depreciation otherwise allowed and would automatically reflect any increase in depreciation which might be allowed as a result of the pending Treasury study.

Under existing law, a taxpayer is permitted to compute depreciation under either (a) the straight line method; (b) the sum of the years digits, of (c) the double declining balance. The additional depreciation which would be allowed by this bill is always applied to reduce the taxpayer's basis or cost for depreciation purposes. However, the additional depreciation allowed is not charged to the declining balance under the double declining balance method in order to reflect more nearly the same proportionate increase as in the case of the other methods.

A comparison of the depreciation allowable under existing law for an asset having a useful life of 10 years and the depreciation which would be allowable if this bill is adopted, is shown on the following schedule:

Depreciation deductions—Comparison, 10-year asset, cost $1,000 (assuming no salvage value)

Year	Straight line		Sum of years digits		Double declining balance	
	Existing law	Proposed amendment	Existing law	Proposed amendment	Existing law	Proposed amendment
1	100	120	182	218	200	240
2	100	120	164	197	160	192
3	100	120	145	174	128	154
4	100	120	127	152	102	122
5	100	120	109	131	82	98
6	100	120	91	109	66	79
7	100	120	73	19	[1] 52	62
8	100	120	55	----------	42	50
9	100	40	36	----------	34	3
10	100	----------	18	----------	27	(?)

[1] Taxpayer may elect to change to straight-line depreciation for this year and subsequent years.

Mr. Speaker, a taxpayer may elect to claim the increased depreciation deductions with respect to all or any part of his eligible assets. He may elect to take the additional deduction in one year, fail to elect it for the next year, and then elect it again later on for subsequent years with respect to the same eligible assets. The additional depreciation deductions need not be elected by the taxpayer for the first year in which depreciation is claimed with respect to an eligible asset. The bill will not increase a taxpayer's total depreciation deductions with respect to an asset over the asset's useful life. When an asset's tax basis is exhausted, the depreciation deductions will cease. If the salvage value of the asset exceeds 10 percent or if the taxpayer has failed to elect to disregard salvage up to 10 percent, total depreciation deductions, as increased by the election provided in this amendment, may not reduce the basis below the salvage value which would otherwise have to be taken into account in computing depreciation deductions.

INVENTORY ADJUSTMENT

In providing accelerated depreciation, the first part of the bill is intended to meet the needs of the manufacturing or productive segment of the economy in which there must be a relatively large investment in depreciable personal property such as machinery and equipment. However, the products of those industries cannot be sold to the consumer without the distributing and retailing segment of the economy. There are more than 1½ million "small merchants" who must stock the increased output of industry if the goods are to be sold. This second part of the bill is intended to facilitate the carrying of that stock by deferring the tax on a part of their income which is reinvested in inventory. The small merchant frequently is unable to set aside after taxes, sufficient income to carry the necessary increases in his inventory which may be required either because of inflation, the introduction of new products, or normal growth. If these merchants are to compete with the large merchandising chains, some form of additional tax relief will be necessary.

Section 2 of the bill recognizes the need, created in part by inflation, for additional investments in inventory by allowing the taxpayer to reduce his taxable income for the year by an amount equal to 20 percent of his closing inventory of finished goods purchased and on hand for resale. This reduction of taxable income, however, is limited to $20,000 or, if lower, to 50 percent of the net income from the business for the year computed without such reduction.

Since the reduction of the closing inventory value will have the effect of deferring—not exempting—from tax the amount by which the taxable income is so reduced, the inventory adjustment is at the election of the taxpayer. If he elects to reduce the closing inventory value, the amount of reduction will automatically be reflected in the opening inventory of the following year, and to continue the deferral of tax the closing inventory of subsequent years—first computed as if the election had never been made—will be similarly reduced unless the taxpayer elects to terminate the election. If the taxpayer terminates his election, the closing inventory for that year is computed as if the election had never been made, with the result that the amounts previously deferred through the inventory reductions are included in taxable income.

The provision for the inventory adjustment was limited to $20,000, or 20 percent of the first $100,000 in inventory, because it is estimated that numerically more than 95 percent of taxpayers in the distribution and retail businesses have sales with less than $1 million per year. Such taxpayers would not normally have inventory in excess of $100,000. The effect of the amendment is to place the small businessman on a more nearly equal basis with the large chain mechandisers. The latter will be more likely to adopt LIFO or other more sophisticated methods of inventory valuations. Actually, such taxpayers could readjust inventory without this amendment.

The amendment will not apply in the case of a taxpayer who uses the LIFO method in valuing inventories since that method by itself grants some relief against the effects of inflation.

Mr. Speaker, in order that the legislation language may be more readily available I include here the text of bill H.R. 10608:

H.R. 10608

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for additional depreciation deductions and to eliminate certain inequities in the valuation of inventories

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby amended, as follows:

SEC. 1. INCREASE IN DEPRECIATION DEDUCTIONS.

(a) ADDITIONAL DEPRECIATION DEDUCTIONS.—Part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 (relating to itemized deductions for individuals and corporations) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 181 ADDITIONAL DEPRECIATION DEDUCTIONS.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, a taxpayer may elect, for any year, with respect to such section 181 property as he shall designate, to increase the portions of the deductions allowed under section 167 and section 178 which are attributable to such designated section 181 property by the following percentages:

"(1) In the case of section 181 property having a useful life of eight years or more, 20 percent;

"(2) In the case of section 181 property having a useful life of at least six years but less than eight years, 14 percent; and

"(3) In the case of section 181 property having a useful life of at least four years and less than six years, 7 percent.

"(b) Definition of section 181 property.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in this subsection, the term 'section 181 property' means—

"(A) tangible personal property, or

"(B) other tangible property (not including a building and its structural components) but only if such property—

"(i) is used as an integral part of manufacturing, production, or extraction, or of furnishing transportation, communications, electrical energy, gas, water, or sewage disposal services, or

"(ii) constitutes a research or storage facility used in connection with any of the activities referred to in clause (i).

"(2) PROPERTY USED FOR LODGING.—Property which is used predominantly to furnish lodging or in connection with the furnishing of lodging shall not be treated as section 181 property.

"(3) PROPERTY USED BY GOVERNMENTAL UNITS.—Property used by the United States, any State or political subdivision thereof, any international organization, the government of any foreign country, or any agency or instrumentality of any of the foregoing shall not be treated as section 181 property.

"(4) LIMITATION.—No property shall be considered section 181 property unless—

"(A) It is used section 181 property, as defined in subsection (c), or

"(B) It is property—

"(i) the construction, reconstruction, or erection of which is completed by the taxpayer after December 31, 1961, or

"(ii) acquired after December 31, 1961, if the original use of such property commences with the taxpayer and commenecs after such date.

In applying this section in the case of property described in clause (i) there shall be taken into account only that portion of the basis which is properly attributable to construction, reconstruction or erection after December 31, 1961.

"(5) PROPERTY WITH CARRIED-OVER BASIS.—If property is acquired from a transferor in whose hands such property was section 181 property, and if the basis of such property in the hands of the taxpayer is determined in whole or in part by its basis in the hands of the transferor, such property, if otherwise eligible, will be section 181 property with respect to the taxpayer notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (4).

"(c) DEFINITION OF USED SECTION 181 PROPERTY.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the term 'used section 181 property' means property acquired by purchase after December 31, 1961, which otherwise meets the definition of section 181 property but which does not meet the requirements in sub-paragraph (B) of paragraph (4) of subsection (b). Property shall not be treated as 'used section 181 property' if, after its acquisition by the taxpayer, it is used by a person who used such property before such acquisition (or by a person who bears a relationship described in section 179(d)(2)(A) or (B) to a person who used such property before such acquisition).

"(2) DOLLAR LIMITATION.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The cost of used section 181 property acquired during any taxable year which may be taken into account under this section shall not exceed $50,000. If such cost exceeds $50,000, the taxpayer shall select (at such time and in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate shall by regulations prescribe) the items to be taken into account, but only to the extent of an aggregate cost of $50,000. Such a selection, once made, may be changed only in the manner, and to the extent, provided by such regulations.

"(B) MARRIED COUPLES.—In the case of a husband and wife who file separate returns for the taxable year, the limitation under subparagraph (A) shall be a total of $50,000 for both taxpayers, allocated between them as they shall elect under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, or, in the absence of such election, $25,000 for each return.

"(C) AFFILIATED GROUPS.—In the case of an affiliated group the $50,000 amount specified under subparagraph (A) shall be reduced for each member of the group by apportioning $50,000 among the members of such group in accordance with their respective amounts of used section 38 property which may be taken into account.

"(D) PARTNERSHIP.—In the case of a partnership, the limitation contained in subparagraph (A) shall apply with respect to the partnership and with respect to each partner.

"(d) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) PURCHASE.—The term 'purchase' has the meaning assigned to such term by section 179(d)(2).

"(2) COST.—The term 'cost' has the meaning assigned to such term by section 179(d)(3).

"(3) AFFILIATED GROUP.—The term 'affiliated group' has the meaning assigned to such term by section 1504(a), except that—

"(A) The phrase 'more than 50 percent' shall be substituted for the phrase 'at least 80 percent' each place it appears in section 1504(a); and

"(B) The term 'includible corporation' as used in section 1504 shall mean any corporation (without any exclusion under section 1504(b)) which has deductions allowed or allowable under section 167 or section 178.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1962.

SEC. 2. ADJUSTMENT OF INVENTORY VALUATION.

(a) ELECTION TO REDUCE INVENTORY VALUATION.—Part II of subchapter E of chapter 1 is amended by adding at the end of subpart D (relating to inventories) the following new section:

"SEC. 473. ELECTION TO ADJUST INVENTORY VALUATIONS

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, a taxpayer may elect to reduce the inventory value of finished goods purchased and held for resale in the closing inventory for the first taxable year for which the benefits of this section are elected by an amount equal to whichever of the following is the lesser:

"(1) 20 percent of the inventory value of such finished goods;

"(2) $20,000.00; or

"(3) 50 percent of the net income from the business for the year computed without such reduction of the closing inventory value.

"(b) SUBSEQUENT INVENTORIES.—If the taxpayer elects the benefits of this section for a taxable year, then for each subsequent year until the election is terminated the value of the closing inventory, determined as if this section had not been applicable to any year, shall be reduced by an amount equal to whichever of the following is the lesser:

"(1) 20 percent of the inventory value (determined without regard to this section) of the finished goods purchased and held for resale in the closing inventory;

"(2) $20,000.00; or

"(3) the higher of (A) 50 percent of the net income from the business for the year computed without any reduction of the closing inventory value under this section, or (B) the amount by which the closing inventory for the preceding taxable year was reduced under this section.

Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, a taxpayer may elect to terminate the election under this section, in which case the inventory value of the closing inventory for the year of termination shall be computed as if this section had not been applicable to any year.

"(c) SPECIAL RULES.

"(1) LAST-IN FIRST-OUT INVENTORY.—This section shall not apply to taxpayers using the method of valuing inventory prescribed in section 472.

"(2) MARRIED INDIVIDUALS.—In the case of a husband or wife who files a separate return, the amount specified in paragraph (2) of subsections (a) and (b) shall be $10,000 in lieu of $20,000. This paragraph shall not apply if the spouse of the taxpayer does not use, and is not required to use, inventories.

"(3) AFFILIATED GROUPS.—In the case of an affiliated group, the $20,000 amount specified in paragraph (2) of subsections (a) and (b) shall be reduced for each member of the group by apportioning $20,000 among the members of such group in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate shall by regulations prescribe. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term 'affiliated group' has the meaning assigned to such term by section 1504(a), except that all corporations other than foreign corporations not engaged in trade or business in the United States shall be treated as includible corporations.

"(4) PARTNERSHIPS.—In the case of a partnership, the $20,000 amount specified in paragraph (2) of subsections (a) and (b) shall apply with respect to the partnership and with respect to each partner.

"(5) ESTATES AND TRUSTS.—This section shall not apply to estates or trusts."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1962.

Does Administration Lack Faith in American People?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the San Diego Evening Tribune:

THE EFFETE WEST: DOES ADMINISTRATION LACK FAITH IN AMERICAN PEOPLE?

(By G. C. Murray)

Our national political administration evidences a compelling desire to place American interests in the hands of the United Nations. Why?

Bluntly, the administration must lack faith in the ability of the American people to compete.

Nowhere is the answer more clearly drawn than by Under Secretary of Defense Roswell Gilpatric. On the television program, "Issues and Answers," speaking of the nuclear deterrent, this key member of the administration said:

"We want to get away from the conception of a race, a competition, a struggle always to be ahead."

If you think you read that line wrong, read it again. That is our Under Secretary of Defense speaking. Is it any wonder that the Communists speak of us as being "effete," or tired?

From our education in the current gag hearings, we may assume that Gilpatric's words were cleared by the Defense Department. Likewise, one must conclude that, if Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, U.S. Navy, retired, Lt. Gen. Arthur Trudeau, U.S. Army, and others, had included such defeatism in their censored speeches, rather than pointing out the true nature of communism and need for action against it, there never would have been a gag in the first place.

This is part of the long, twilight sleep potion which we are being administered.

"We are not trying to put ourselves in an aggressive posture," the Under Secretary of Defense went on. "Ours is entirely a deterrent posture."

He didn't have to say it. The Communists know it very well.

We have proved it for their benefit in southeast Asia, and are continuing to do so. We are also proving it in Cuba and in Berlin. We won't mention the Congo.

While the world has watched anxiously for a show of fortitude we have, as always, protested our nonaggresisve intentions. But the Communists have not hesitated to pick up the ball that is too hot, evidently, for American leadership to handle.

As F. O. Micsche noted in his book, "The Failure of Atomic Strategy," "It is easy to be brave if one knows how fainthearted the other is."

But to return for more of our Under Secretary of Defense's words:

"But if they (our adversaries) feel they are so outnumbered that they have such an inferiority, it might provoke them to adventurous opportunistic moves that in a more stable situation they would not feel it necessary to take."

In other words, do not get so strong that your enemy feels insecure.

One must marvel at the gentleman's attitude. Does he recall that late last fall the Soviet exploded history's most powerful nuclear bombs?

But again, we must remember that this must have been a "cleared" attitude. One which sadly reflects administrations feeling that Americans, who in the past have set the pace for world competition, cannot now stand up to Communist competition.

With such reasoning, it is not strange that one of the administration's main answers to the Communist threat has been the establishment of an Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Unfortunately, since the Under Secretary of Defense is merely speaking for the administration, it will do no good to nominate him as well-qualified for one of the $20,000-a-year jobs with the Disarmament Agency.

American individualism and the "In God We Trust" attitude are being displaced by faith in statism—the all-powerful Central Government.

The citizenry is trained to look up to the Government for security. Is not the next logical step a search at the Federal level for an even higher "state"—an international one—to have faith in?

The proof is in the pudding.

Great Britain and the Common Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the new British Ambassador to the United States, the Right Honorable Sir David Ormsby Gore, K.C.M.G., on February 15 delivered a most interesting speech to the English-Speaking Union in New York City, discussing Britain's historic decision to seek membership in the European Common Market. His discussion is most pertinent to our own foreign trade program and I commend his remarks to every Member of this body:

EXCERPTS FROM THE SPEECH BY THE BRITISH AMBASSADOR RT. HON. SIR DAVID ORMSBY GORE, K.C.M.G., AT A LUNCHEON GIVEN BY THE ENGLISH-SPEAKING UNION AT THE UNIVERSITY CLUB, NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 15, 1962

THE COMMON MARKET

Of course, the most dramatic experiment in the reduction of barriers to trade between industrial countries in recent years has been the formation of a European Common Market. The results of this have been spectacular. For example, in the 1950's the overall rate of growth of the six countries of the Common Market was double that of the United States.

I should like to say one or two things about Britain's historic decision to seek membership in that Community.

What has impelled us to take this step toward what will amount to the integration of our economy into that of Europe?

First, we have suffered grievously in two World Wars. We are as anxious as any other Western nation to make impossible the kind of division in Europe which brought about those wars. We are also conscious of the constant threat of Communist imperialism and we believe that the Common Market, by strengthening the political and economic cohesion of Western Europe, will enable us to resist that threat not only in Europe itself, but throughout the entire free world.

From a purely economic point of view, we realize that modern industrial societies cannot achieve maximum efficiency except in a vast continental market. Being an island has ceased to have any real significance in the economic as well as in the military field. It is with these considerations in mind that for a decade it has been the policy of the British Government to create and form part of a wider European market.

Why then have we not been in the Common Market from the beginning? Is this a case of our dragging our feet during the pioneering stage of a bold step forward and then seeking to jump on the bandwagon when it has proved itself successful? This would, I suggest, be a grossly unfair interpretation of our policies.

In the first place, membership of the Common Market involves problems for us that do not exist for the founder members. The pattern of our trade is markedly different from that of most European countries. In 1960, 40 percent of our trade was with the Commonwealth and 24 percent with other countries outside Europe and North America. Over 10 percent was with the United States. Only 25 percent was with Europe, roughly 15 percent with the countries of the Common Market, and 10 percent with those European countries outside the market who are members of the European Free Trade Association.

Obviously, if we enter the Common Market this pattern of trade is going to change. Proportionately we shall trade more with the Common Market countries and less with the Commonwealth, the United States, and any group outside the Common Market, although we of course hope for a net increase in trade all around. This is a serious matter for us politically as well as economically, because we believe that our relationship with the United States and the relationship of all the Commonwealth countries with each other are vital to the political and economic stability of the entire non-Communist world. It is a serious matter for the non-Common Market countries of Europe who have combined with us in this European Free Trade Association. But the consequences of such a radical change in our trading pattern are likely to be most serious of all for our Commonwealth partners, who include, of course, some of the most important of the developing nations. Their economies have to a large extent been built upon the premise of free enry into the great British market. We are, therefore, determined that we will not do anything which will seriously disrupt the economies of these nations, and British Government spokesmen have repeatedly made it clear that if our joining the Common Market involves such a serious disruption, we shall not join it. We are not going to sell our friends down the river or undermine the economy, and therefore the political stability, of nations which we have painstakingly led to independence over the years.

That is why we have been devoting many months to studying and debating in detail the effect which our membership in the Common Market was likely to have upon each Commonwealth country. We have now reached a point where we think that it is possible to find a solution, or rather a series of solutions, to the problems of the Commonwealth. We believe that if the political will exists we can join the Common Market without disrupting the Commonwealth economies and without maintaining any preferences incompatible with the Treaty of Rome. It is upon this assumption that we are now negotiating in Brussels with the Six.

I do not have the time to go into detail about the proposals which will have to be discussed, but I will suggest to you certain lines of thought. It may be possible for some of the least developed members of the Commonwealth to enter into an association with the Common Market on the same terms as those which are due to be established for the Associated Overseas Countries of the Common Market, these being largely the former French territories in Africa.

Then, again, the problems of some other countries might be handled on a commodity-

by-commodity basis. The problems of tropical products, such as tea and cocoa, for example, might best be met by fixing a zero or a very low level for the common external tariff of the Community. Certain materials are not likely to cause difficulties because the Common Market raises no tariffs on most of them. But these, I should emphasize, are simply lines of thought. There is no single solution to this problem. We have to break it down both by commodities and by separate areas of trade. That is why these negotiations are taking time. We cannot afford to content ourselves with overgeneralized declarations which paper over the cracks. We are not seeking modifications in the founding charter of the Common Market or to establish a special and favored position, but rather to work out with the Community how inevitable adjustments may be most sensibly completed. This will involve careful bargaining between us and the Common Market and we do not expect quick results. Nevertheless, I am confident that agreement can be reached provided that the political will exists and provided that the intensity of the bargaining is restrained by our consciousness of the high cost of failure.

THE UNITED STATES AND THE COMMON MARKET

Throughout the difficult months ahead, the most important requirement is that the United States, Britain, and all the Common Market countries should march in step. The United States itself has played a generous and farsighted role in promoting first the recovery of Europe and then its economic unification. Your continued help and leadership are essential if we are to resolve our problems. The enlargement of the Common Market will, of course, present you with problems of your own. It is obvious that the emergence of a united economic community with a considerably greater population and a greater foreign trade than that of the United States will have financial and commercial implications for you. But we believe that the key to successful adjustment all around lies in the adoption of liberal and outward-looking policies by all three: Britain, the United States, and the Common Market. And if we follow such policies, we shall build an arch across the Atlantic resting on two immensely powerful pillars and this will strengthen the unity of the entire free world.

SUMMING UP

This brings me back to the point from which I started: the need for an increasingly close North Atlantic partnership or community. This cannot yet be a community in the institutional sense in which the Common Market is a communtiy. We are, however, all of us committed to the same basic objectives in our foreign economic policy. We are all agreed on reducing barriers to trade, on fostering economic growth, on combating inflation, on improving the international machinery of trade and payment. These objectives have been incorporated in numerous joint declarations from the Bretton Woods Agreement to the Convention setting up the Organization for Economic Development and Cooperation which was ratified by Congress last year. They are incorporated in the Common Market's Treaty of Rome. We have made substantial progress since the war. The resources of the free world are now immensely greater than those of the Communist world; they include 70 percent of the world's steel, 84 percent of its petroleum, 80 percent of its aluminum, and 80 percent of its electric power. But we shall not be able to mobilize those resources or achieve the ambitious goals which we have set ourselves merely by cultivating our own garden and judging every proposal that comes up in terms of its short-term advantages to our own group, our own country or our own business. We must work together in a practical way. We must deliberately coordinate our national and international economic policies. We must shape them to harmonize with each other whatever group we belong. This will require mutual understanding and a mutual sense of responsibility between all the nations and all the various groups of nations in the free world: the developed and the less developed; the alined and the nonalined; the Common Market and the Commonwealth; and particularly between the English-speaking peoples.

Communists in Venezuela

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, on February 26 in a special order before the House I submitted remarks entitled "Tito Betancourt Demands a Billion." In this speech I pointed to the extent of Communist influence in the country of Venezuela.

Joseph E. Evans in his article which appeared in the March 7, 1962, issue of the Wall Street Journal supports many of the points which I made in my speech. Because I think his article should be brought to the attention of Members of Congress, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

COMMUNISTS IN VENEZUELA

(By Joseph E. Evans)

CARACAS, VENEZUELA.—"When the Communist danger appears to be subsiding," says an anti-Communist student at the heavily Red-infiltrated Central University here, "that's just the time to watch out." It's a warning that might apply not only to Venezuela but to some other South American lands as well.

As though to underscore the seeming Communist docility of the moment, Venezuelan Red party big shot Jesus Faria argues: "We want to organize a genuinely democratic and patriotic government, not specifically communistic. We'll work with other opposition parties, with the military, with Catholics, with Protestants. And if we only had freedom to express ourselves and explain our program, the vast majority of the people would be with us."

Here, then, is one of the political paradoxes of Venezuela, which many regard as Communist Castro's No. 1 target in South America, partly because of its geographical convenience at the top of the continent.

The popular appeal of Castro here, whatever his current personal fate in Cuba, is diminishing somewhat in the wake of the cruelties and repressions in Cuba and Castro's announcement of his own devout adherence to the Marxist-Leninist religion. It's even said that Castro has been a good thing for the Americas, because he has frightened some thinking people and made others begin to think.

REDS ON THE RUN

At the same the Venezuelan Communist Party is on the run, at least to a degree; some of its leaders have been in hiding, many of its lesser functionaries are in jail, its public voice is all but stilled. In fact, you can hear the contention that the danger from the extreme right is as great as from the extreme left.

And yet, for all that, no one in his right mind would bet 5 centimos that the Communist-Castroite conspiracy is licked or that this oil-loaded nation, which is larger than Texas and Oklahoma combined, will be spared further upheavals stemming from that conspiracy.

The present crackdown on Communists results directly from the street-fighting and bombings of late January, aimed at the moderate leftist government of President Romulo Betancourt; once a Communist himself, he is now considered by some to be practically a middle-roader. This violence coincided with the Punta del Este, Uruguay, meeting of the Organization of American States which kicked Castro out of the inter-American system; the blame for the trouble is pinned by the government squarely on the Communist Party and its extreme-leftist allies. ("Of course," sighs one Red with pseudo-saintly forbearance, "they blame us for everything, even if it rains too much.")

A sniff of the atmosphere of those January days can be sensed in a government communique: "In the recent disturbances the police and military authorities have confiscated rifles, revolvers, pistols, submachine guns, grenades, explosives and a great quantity of home-manufactured bombs of the Molotov type which were found in the hands of the activists and the snipers or were abandoned in buildings and places from where they were shooting against the civilian population and the military and police forces."

In the opinion of not a few qualified people here, this was definitely a Communist attempt to take over the country. One Venezuelan Communist returned from abroad, smack into the arresting arms of the police, apparently convinced that the Red revolution was already a success.

A SURFACE CALM

Since January, with political prisoners estimated in the thousands, things have been calm on the surface. Visit Caracas' huge (100,000 people) 23d of January housing project, named for the date of the 1958 ouster of Dictator Perez Jimenez, and all is quiet, although this place was the source of much of the violence. At another troublesome housing project, it's hard to find an admitted Communist.

For example, Marcelino Lovera, a 42-year-old plumber with six children living in a two-bedroom apartment, insists he had no interest in politics and doesn't understand anything about Castro. Outside in the sunshine, Auto Mechanic Miguel Garcia, 38, says there are plenty of Communists in the project, but he wants no truck with them.

On a Sunday afternoon seemingly cheerful crowds of well-dressed caraquenos of varying hues fill the big Park of the East, their children playing on the grass, or picnic in a nearby area with a waterfall.

And throughout Caracas you see many more wall writings to the effect that Communists are murders and traitors than you do inscriptions of the "Viva Castro" ilk. Like many other appearances, this is deceptive. The Reds say, and they may well be right, that the anti-Communist slogans are the work of the police, writing over the Red ones in the night. "You can tell," says one leftist, "because the anti-Communist writings are so neatly painted; the police don't have to hurry."

With the government cracking down and the Reds lying low for the nonce, what is the present scope of the Communist-Castro threat here? How do the Reds operate? What appears to be their real strategy?

To begin with, the Communists are not without legal political influence. The party has not been outlawed, though its card-carrying membership is thought to be no more than about 30,000 out of a Venezuelan population of some 7 million.

Pedro Ortega Diaz, chief of the Communist Party's parliamentary section, con-

tends that in the national congress there is a working majority against Betancourt's Democratic Action Party; that is, Communists, factions that have split from the AD, plus other opposition parties. Other politicians hotly dispute that there is any such antigovernment majority, though the opposition might be able to block almost anything the government wanted.

But what seems certain is that Betancourt's government, despite its phenomenal success in staying in power 3 whole years—longest in Venezuelan history for a self-styled democratic government—is not especially popular. The evidence of disaffection and apathy is on every hand.

Even educated Venezuelans who are anti-Communist deplore the lack of political freedom which hits the Communists hardest (constitutional guarantees, long suspended, have been only partially restored). In a chance encounter a lawyer speaks cautiously and softly against the government, pleads not to be quoted by name; that is a familiar plea here. People also complain that the government gives jobs only to cement support for the AD, and that there is tremendous featherbedding in the government bureaucracy.

Then there was Betancourt's monster rally last month in Caracas' El Silencio Plaza; it was called by the AD, the Social Christian Party (Copei) which is in coalition with the AD, and the Confederation of Venezuelan Workers (CTV). The meeting was advertised in every possible way as a demonstration of support for Betancourt and his party on his third anniversary in office, and of total opposition to communism.

PEASANTS ARE APATHETIC

But the bulk of the people attending turned out to be simple campesinos (peasants) brought in from the country by the Government in trucks and buses. Many of these men are AD supporters because of political patronage and because they have acquired a bit of land under the agrarian reform program. They were pretty apathetic as party leaders drearily harangued them from a balcony for two and a half hours. It was not much of a show from the Government point of view.

There is economic discontent as well; people speak variously of depression or recession during the past couple of years. The economy is growing slightly, but at a rate far below that of the spectacular boom years of Perez Jimenez. One reason is lack of confidence in the Government's ability to stay in power, a deficiency to which the Red harassments contributed in no small measure.

Now it's not too easy for the Communists to capitalize on all these circumstances. But experience has shown they can incite large segments of Caracas' 1.2 million people. The poorer people are not exactly starving; many a miserable windowless hillside shack here boasts a TV antenna and a car in front. Rather, it's that, in a nation almost totally devoid of a history of democratic government, many lower class citizens are flammable; they can be stirred up by agitators about anything from a law requiring insurance for taxis to anti-imperialism—especially in a city where U.S. and other foreign investment ("domination") shrieks from practically every neon sign.

So the Reds, among other tactics, carefully pick their targets. The Sears-Roebuck organization here is a favorite one. In the past year or so 10 of the 11 Sears stores in Venezuela have suffered bombings of varying degrees of damage. If the Communists could frighten people into staying away from the stores and so cause Sears to pull out, it would be a sizable victory for them, for Sears is doing a lot of economic good, not only in the consumer goods it provides but in promoting local industry.

SPECIAL PRECAUTIONS

Sears, however, show no signs of quitting; quite the contrary. Speaking of the special precautions that have to be constantly taken against terrorist activties, an executive says: "It's something you just get used to, like commuting from Westchester to Manhattan."

In addition, the Communists have their notorious university strength; a hard core of Red students (there are plenty of Red professors, too) has shown its ability to incite others to riot and violence. The university here has just lately reopened after being closed 3 weeks in the wake of the January disorders—one of the numerous closings which infuriate non-Communist students who would like, if possible, to get an education. Says an adult: "More and more people are getting fed up with that situation; it's a national disgrace."

But, under the South American tradition of university autonomy, the government is not supposed to touch the place, and the government must, indeed, take care of what it does. In this and other areas, Betancourt wants to avoid acting too much like a dictator; on the other hand, he seems increasingly to recognize that he must protect himself against the Communist-Castroite conspiracy.

And, though the AD Party has made impressive progress in whittling Communist influence in the labor movement, there are still Red-run unions to do the leaders' bidding when required. Some observers believe a serious new Communist effort to take over by force would bring out masses of anti-Communist workers in opposition; all that can be said is that Communist-led workers, in infamous coalition with Communist-led students, can cause an impressive amount of trouble.

A PREVALENCE OF ARMS

Beyond all this, there are still other, perhaps more ominous, Red activities.

For one thing, despite the confiscation after the January uprising, there remains a dismaying prevalence of arms. A magazine here has a full-page spread of pictures of police frisking individuals and inspecting cars in the Caracas area. Its text raises the question: Where are all the arms coming from?

A big part of the answer seems obvious, Communist Cuba, for all its shortages of necessities, has no shortage of Communist-bloc weapons, and Venezuela has a very long coastline (part of the old-time pirates' fabled "Spanish Main") for smuggling. In fact the Castro outfit has gone further; in the past few weeks a couple of Castro guerrilla training camps have been uncovered inside Venezuela, and there are probably others. In one leftist's view, these activities herald the civil war to come.

Some officials nonetheless discount the likelihood of a Red take-over in the exact Castro military style—that is, the building of a guerrilla army in the interior and then marching on the capital. They note that the inhabited northern strip of the country can be kept under quite good air surveillance, and that the vast, little-populated southern area, where an army might be built up without immediate detection, lacks adequate communications for a march on the capital. In any case, segments of the Venezuelan armed forces are said to be getting special antiguerrilla, or "counter-resistance," training.

RED STRATEGY

Summing up the views of a good many people, plus personal observations, one could outline the apparent Red strategy somewhat as follows:

Whenever feasible, attempt to terrorize the population, keeping them in an atmosphere of fear and uncertainty. On some violent occasion, such as the January business, the police or the army might cave in, or numbers of them might defect to the rioters, and the Communist coup would be fact.

Short of that perhaps too-wishful eventuality, keep up the terror tactics in the hope that the military will take over from a Government they might regard as too weak. Then the Communists could hope to get a real united front against a military dictatorship, spearhead a revolt against it, and so come to power that way. Unquestionably they would like to topple Betancourt before his term expires less than 2 years hence.

Even if he manages to stay the course, however, he cannot succeed himself; and, whatever the lack of popularity of his party, there doesn't seem to be anyone around with as much political sex appeal as he has. Thus a lot of people worry about two possible dangers in the 1963 elections—either an extreme-leftist-dominated coalition coming to power, or a man on horseback returning to ride through a situation of possible political chaos.

Meantime much depends on the Government's firmness against the Communists and the Government's own relations with the military. On the first point the Government certainly seems to have the upper hand at the moment. The second point is not entirely clear; some leftists say the President is already a captive of the military (the few civilian Presidents in Venezuelan history usually were), while others say the military is preponderantly loyal to him.

What most observers agree on is that there are some military officers, as there are civilians, who hanker for the days of Perez Jimenez; for that reason a rightist coup, which could serve the Reds, cannot be ruled out. At the same time some military officers might be susceptible to Communist promises of heady rewards for cooperation with them.

FRAGILE ROOTS

One trouble in this regard is that the Latin American tradition of using a military career for personal advancement still exists, whereas the tradition of the military as a bulwark of democratic institutions has but fragile roots. A possibly promising part of the military picture is that the officers have eyes to see how the Communists have taken over the armed forces in Cuba, and many would not want it to happen to them.

While it is clearly unwise to generalize about South America from this one country, it perhaps should be noted that the pattern of Red penetration appears with depressing familiarity in other nations. No one could predict that this or that country is ripe for a Communist seizure this month or this year; in the case of Venzeuela, it might get by, given luck and increasing anti-Communist toughness on the part of the Government.

But a visitor trying to take a realistic look must conclude that there is nothing presently to prove that Venezuela is immune to the fate of Cuba, by one eventual route or another.

Anniversary of 4-H Clubs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, New Jersey is the most urbanized State in the country, yet 12,000 of our State's youths are joining in the celebration of National 4-H Club Week, an

organization devoted to the improvement of agriculture. Our youths are concurring with the national theme, "4-H Is Good for Youth an Good for You," but are singling out "plan and plant for beauty" as one of their main projects. I have previously read into the Appendix of this RECORD my thoughts on the importance of "Keeping America Beautiful" and I am proud to commend the New Jersey 4-H Club for its efforts toward the realization of esthetic values in our society.

I ask for unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Camden Courier-Post of March 1, which reports on the activities of the New Jersey 4-H Clubs.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWELVE THOUSAND NEW JERSEY BOYS, GIRLS TO MARK 4-H BIRTHDAY

NEW BRUNSWICK.—Approximately 12,000 New Jersey boys and girls will join more than 2 million of the Nation's youths in observing National 4-H Club Week.

Nationally, the theme of the week is "4-H is good for youth—and good for you." Rollyn P. Winters, State 4-H extension leader of Rutgers University, said New Jersey members concur with this, and single out "plan and plant for beauty" as being one of the projects 4-H'ers follow. In looking over a statistical breakdown of membership in 1960, 2,715 lived on farms, 5,534 members lived in rural nonfarm homes, and 3,811 lived in suburban and urban areas.

The New Jersey 4-H program offers more than 30 different projects for boys and girls 10 to 21 years of age, Winters said.

The fastest growing project in New Jersey deals with horses and ponies, he reported. This had 772 followers in 1959 and 1,130 last year.

"About half of all members gave demonstrations, which helped them learn to express themselves before groups," he says. "Almost one-fifth of the membership took part in the 4-H camping program and gained experience in group living."

Camden County's 480 4-H members will observe National 4-H Week by participating locally on 4-H Sunday, March 4, setting up window displays, and joining in a 4-H rally March 9. At this time window display awards will be announced, a 4-H camp film will be shown and square dancing will be offered.

Manpower Development and Training Act Passage Will Improve Prospects for Solving Unemployment Due to Automation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of S. 1991—the Manpower Development and Training Act—I am privileged to consider today's actions by the Senate in accepting the report of the conference and in taking final affirmative action on the measure to be highly gratifying developments.

I join the distinguished majority leader and other colleagues in paying a deserved tribute to the diligent and resourceful senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] for the competence and leadership he has demonstrated as chairman of the Subcommittee on Manpower and Employment of our Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in managing this legislation. It was a real privilege to be associated with him as a cosponsor, as a subcommittee, and committee member, and as a conferee in this 87th Congress.

We were associated similarly in our efforts to advance the cause of retraining legislation during the 2d session of the 86th Congress when we were cosponsors of a modified version of the measure moved through the passage stage today. The senior Senator from Pennsylvania diligently joined me in holding hearings on our bill on that occasion when I presided as chairman of the then new Subcommittee on Manpower and Employment. I believe we succeeded in some degree in laying a foundation for the legislation on which the Senate acted affirmatively today.

Mr. President, it is my judgment that the enactment of S. 1991, a cornerstone in the administration's program for improvement of the economy and as a means to help solve the unemployment problem, will be regarded in future years as a major legislative accomplishment.

In West Virginia we are vocational training and retraining conscious because we recognize in these programs very necessary means to the end of helping to overcome our chronic unemployment problem. As we strive to diversify our industries and our economy, we must develop our manpower resources in full measure and we realize that this will require extensive retraining of many of our available workers.

In this connection, I am privileged to call attention to a pertinent editorial published in the Sunday Gazette-Mail, Charleston, W. Va., March 4, 1962. That editorial appropriately points out that the problems and hardships of the automation era which have plagued West Virginia are likewise being experienced in other States—indeed, in some States only recently.

The Gazette-Mail editorial emphasizes that in West Virginia "the development of retraining programs—both for those replaced by mechanization and youths who drop out of high school—is progressing, and this improves the prospects for attracting new processing and conversion type industries." Then it appropriately adds:

West Virginia, of course, has a long way to go before it can sit back and say "we have met the challenge." But the very fact that unemployment problems are now developing elsewhere as a result of automation makes it clear that we cannot expect to shove our people across the borders—even if we wanted to—and this should serve to stimulate our efforts toward a sound solution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial from the Charleston (W. Va.) Sunday Gazette-Mail to which I have referred and from which I have quoted and emphasized in part.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEAD START HELPS IN UNEMPLOYMENT FIGHT

Being one of the first States in the Nation to face the problems and hardships of the automation era hardly stands out as a major asset for West Virginia. And yet, the State's difficulties of the past several years, brought about primarily by mechanization in the coal industry, may well turn out to be a blessing in disguise.

The truth is that these same problems are developing more and more frequently in more and more areas. And West Virginia, on the way to solving its problems, may well move into the spotlight as the Nation's laboratory for ways of relieving the impact of automation on employment.

Labor Department economists say the United States needs to find 1,250,000 new jobs a year for youths coming of age in the labor market and 1,500,000 a year for older workers displaced by the very processes which increase productivity.

And President Kennedy a few days ago described this as the major domestic challenge of the sixties—to maintain full employment when automation is replacing men.

It is not difficult to understand the enormity of the problem when, in Detroit, there is a machine nearly 350 feet long, weighing nearly 500 tons, which turns out more than 100 automobile engine cylinder blocks per hour. Passing castings down a production line, it turns, positions, drills, reams and taps them under electronic controls.

And in numerous plants across the United States smaller but similar outfits do complex machining jobs, working from punched tapes. Recently an industrial tool company advertised "a general-purpose automation device designed to work on any assembly line"—to pick up, turn over, insert, transfer or rotate parts and control stamping or other operations. It is being used already to help make clocks, typewriters, and electrical components.

The Christian Science Monitor, commenting on the revolutionary developments of the era, pointed out last week that in various industries a single machine has taken over the work of from 5 to 6 to more than 40 men. But these changes do not affect the face of all industry at once; they occur at certain places while other occupations continue unaffected.

Taking issue with a gloomy forecast of a recent study which envisioned a division of work in which three or four leisure classes will become discontented and disinherited drones while the fourth, professionals and executives, will continue to be overworked, the Monitor observed:

"This states accurately the dangers of undirected technological change; but like the innovators it looks too narrowly at the machine and underestimates the resourcefulness of human beings. Some response from them will be needed to the opportunities inherent in change; and it should be expected."

Then, the Monitor reaches this conclusion: "One remedy always offered is public works; and these have a place. But technological change is operating in the construction industry, too. The broadest of all remedies is to share with the consumer some of the gain in productivity through gradual and continual price reductions or quality improvement."

We agree, and we think some of the things happening in West Virginia serve to confirm the observation about the resourcefulness of human beings.

For example, in both the Underwood and the Barron administrations, West Virginia moved to take up the unemployment slack through public works programs that brought many improvements—and are continuing to

do so—in State parks and forests and along the highways and streams.

But the State has not stopped there. Perhaps because necessity is the mother of invention, the State is placing new emphasis on a long-neglected natural resource—timber—and is making progress in establishing industries for the processing of the valuable hard woods within the State. Also, tourism is getting increasing attention as a major means of providing employment in the various services it entails.

The development of retraining programs—both for those replaced by mechanization and youths who drop out of high school—is progressing, and this improves the prospects for attracting new processing and conversion-type industries.

West Virginia, of course, has a long way to go before it can sit back and say "we have met the challenge." But the very fact that unemployment problems are now developing elsewhere as a result of automation makes it clear that we cannot expect to shove our people across the borders—even if we wanted to—and this should serve to stimulate our efforts toward a sound solution.

West Virginia has had a head start in dealing with a problem that is now developing in many other sections. We are experienced, so to speak, in such things as adjusting economic and human factors and in finding our way out of dilemmas—and this provides encouragement that we can look to the sixties with renewed hope and optimism.

The President Needs Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, there was an article in yesterday's Evening Star by William S. White, giving eloquent support to President Kennedy's decision to resume atmospheric nuclear testing. I think every American should read it.

By coincidence, I had expressed much the same sentiments, though less skillfully, in my weekly news column, written just a few hours before I read Mr. White's column.

The two articles follow:

THE PRESIDENT NEEDS SUPPORT

(By William S. White)

The great crisis of his administration to date faces President Kennedy in his determination to resume nuclear tests in the air by April's end unless the Russians meantime sign an honest and enforceable pact ending all such testing.

Neither inside this country nor among our allies is he receiving that truly massive support to which he is so entitled in the wake of this lonely and terrible—and right and unavoidable—decision.

Never has an American leader had to take alone a more dreadful responsibility. Never has an American leader more patiently sought to summon up a stout courage among his own people and among the allied leaders. And, sadly, rarely has an American President, in circumstances so fateful as these, seemed to have been so let down by so many.

What is wrong with this country when the first thousand telegrams to the White House after the President's speech announcing his intentions show an even division between those citizens backing and those opposing his course? Was there such a division after Pearl Harbor? And is this present issue of national survival less starkly demanding? Whatever the subsequent flow of wires, this initial response can reflect no credit upon this country.

If it is true that these 1,000 telegrams were weighed by "aginners" and so did not reflect true national sentiment, then what is wrong with those who support the President but do not say so? Do they decline because he is something called a Democrat and they are something called Republicans? Does it matter in the smallest way, in such a moment in history, who is a Democrat and who a Republican?

Do not the silent ones realize that once a President, of whatever name and whatever party, commits himself to so fateful a policy it is not that man or party but rather all the United States of America which is in that instant so committed?

Are they unaware that nearly every responsible Republican officeholder and ex-officeholder—indeed, almost every man of whatever politics who faces the facts of life about American security—is standing with the President here?

Do the silent ones not realize that this decision was not gladly taken; that no one is really in favor of nuclear fallout? Do they not know that no man under solemn oath to care for the security of all the people could possibly have made any other decision?

Are they not aware that months of incredibly patient search for alternatives—of waiting and appealing even after the Russians had broken the old testing armistice and sent two-score atomic blasts aloft—went into that decision?

Do they suppose Mr. Kennedy is happy to open himself now to the honest but deluded moanings of the pacifists, the half-pacifists, the peace-at-any-pricers? Should the President have waited and waited while the Russians tested when and as they pleased and so at length developed an atomic power capable of the total destruction of the United States?

And what of the Allied leaders? This columnist has never gone snooping about to find and eagerly proclaim Allied "divisions." But it is no longer possible to avoid saying that Prime Minister Macmillan of Britain is being much less than a tower of strength to the United States—and the West in general. The same goes for President de Gaulle of France.

Mr. Macmillan thinks us too "tough," but is in plain fact playing to domestic softliners in England. General de Gaulle still thinks us too "soft," but is in plain fact playing to an honorable old man's dreams of a French "grandeur" that will come no more.

When are all concerned—here and abroad—going to pull up their socks? To accept the fact that the decision has been made? To accept the fact that there is no salvation in national or international self-delusion?

PRESIDENT CHOSE ONLY REALISTIC PATH

(By DON MAGNUSON, U.S. Congressman, 7th District, Washington)

WASHINGTON.—Russian Premier Khrushchev's charge that the U.S. decision to resume atmospheric nuclear testing is "a new expression of an aggressive course in international affairs" should fall on deaf ears all around the world.

This is the man who last year suddenly ended the moratorium on tests with some 50 atmospheric tests in rapid-fire succession. The fact that the tests followed so quickly the abrogation of the agreement proved that there had been long preparation for the work before the Russian leader let his intentions be known.

If that action was cynical, his recent comments on President Kennedy's decision are more so. He would deny to the United States the same course which he took in extremely bad faith.

Mr. Kennedy's decision was an agonizing one. He made it in the face of almost unprecedented pressure from many of his fellow Americans. I have seen them streaming through Washington the past few months by the thousands, picketing the White House and carrying signs demanding that no new tests be undertaken. Many of them have visited my office to try to persuade me that their course is the only proper one.

The thought of nuclear warfare is horrible beyond description, and the possible effects of fallout from atmospheric testing are a corollary danger which thus far has defied accurate definition.

But the alternative is to wait supinely, doing nothing, while an unprincipled and uninhibited enemy catches up and passes us in nuclear capability—remember that.

It seems to me that President Kennedy chose the only realistic path, painful though it is. What we must understand is that his motivation is not preparation for nuclear war, but its prevention. If we yielded superiority, we certainly would be in grave danger of attack. If we maintain superiority—or at least equality—we have a good chance of averting war.

Now for the business of hammering out a workable test ban for everyone concerned—effectively policed.

Shotgun Wedding for Space-Science and Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Dr. Willard F. Libby which appeared in Air Force magazine Space Digest in February.

Dr. Libby is a former member of the Atomic Energy Commission and the winner of the Nobel Prize for Chemistry in 1960. He is now professor of chemistry at the University of California.

His article is as follows:

SHOTGUN WEDDING FOR SPACE SCIENCE AND EDUCATION?

(By Willard F. Libby)

I believe it is abundantly clear that progress in the space program depends largely on the quality and number of technical people available to the program. The money that has been appropriated and has been promised to be appropriated is adequate, no doubt, for all that the people now on the program are capable of doing with good performance. An improvement on the program can be made if either or both the quality and quantity of the scientists and engineers on the program are increased. This is, in brief, the gist of my argument that we must make an early and firm marriage between space and education.

Some may reply that they are married. I would say: They haven't even met. After 5 years on the Atomic Energy Commission, during a great part of which I was primarily concerned with a marriage between the atom and education, I see no similarity between the relationships of the space program, both at NASA and the Department of Defense,

and the university and scientific community that exists between the Atomic Energy Commission and the same community. Recall the history of the development of atomic energy. It came out of the universities, it was fostered by men drawn from the universities, and has always been nurtured and supported by the universities in active partnerships with the Atomic Energy Commission—both through direct contracts, and through the operation of large central laboratories, jointly controlled and administered. Little of this sort of thing exists in the space program.

It seems as though the space program has been too urgent and too immediate for the kind of long-range planning involved in this marriage. This so often appears to be the case; and yet, it is true in this instance, in my opinion, that the long-range planning cannot be avoided in the long run. It is an absolute necessity that the universities take a leading role. They should, and must, propose to the Federal Government a mechanism by which this union can be made firmly at an early date. It is the duty of a great university to lead in such matters. It is from the university that the atom came, and I firmly believe that it will be the universities that will help us develop a leading position.

We cannot long afford the neglect of the long-range planning which is so essential for successful leadership in this technological modern world. Technical education is of the most vital concern to every citizen of this country—whether he be an engineer or scientist or not.

Now, consider the present situation. As a professor at the University of California at Los Angeles, I have been concerned about this problem for a number of months—in fact, ever since joining the university 2 years ago. We have kept records, and I would say that less than 1 in a thousand of our students, probably less than 1 in 5,000 of our students, shows any interest whatsoever, other than in the Sunday newspapers, in the space program—certainly not enough interest to declare it as their objective at the time—the end for which they are doing their studies. Now, this is wrong. This is not the way to get people to work in space. This is not the way to make the space effort strong. The only reason that the atomic energy program is now strong is that there is this firm marriage between the atom and education. A continuous stream of youngsters is moving into nuclear physics and nuclear chemistry and nuclear engineering and nuclear biology. A casual perusal of the scientific abstracts will show you immediately the virility of these fields. The same thing must be done for the space program, and the only way in which it will ever be done is for the universities and the Federal Government to get together to see that the kind of subjects and kind of teaching and kind of research programs are done in the universities which are necessary to excite the interests of the more intelligent undergraduate students in space. And I insist on the classification "undergraduate," for, by the time the student is at the graduate level, his mind is usually made up. The time for decision is during the freshman and sophomore years. And nothing now presents a case for space to the early undergraduate students.

You may well say, "Well, what is a space curriculum? And why give a degree in space? Does it not consist of just the basic subjects: Physics, chemistry, biology, etc.?" Well, the answer is, "Yes, but so does atomic energy." The point is that like atomic energy, space so greatly magnifies and amplifies particular parts of the broad areas of physics, chemistry, and biology that it deserves a special status and a special treatment and a special curriculum. We should train space engineers. We should offer degrees in this field, and this should be done at an early date. We should have vigorous research programs in the universities staffed by our best research men working in this area. This is not done now. We should greatly increase by an order of magnitude, two orders of magnitude, the total number of people of high quality in the university who are concerned with the program.

How shall we accomplish this great end, granting that it is necessary? What shall we do to see that it is done at an early date? How much will it cost? Is it possible? All of these great questions can only be answered by careful, detailed consideration of each of them. However, following the atomic energy analogy, I think we could do worse than to immediately launch a much-enlarged fellowship program in the graduate schools supporting graduate students in the space field. We should encourage the universities to offer degrees in this area, and the universities should encourage the Federal Government and ask the Federal Government for grants in support of activities in this direction. Buildings should be built to house these activities, and the worries of the Federal Government so often reflected in such matters should be temporarily set aside so it would be possible to accelerate this program. This was all done by the Atomic Energy Commission and should be done again in order to accomplish these great ends with something like the dispatch with which the atomic and hydrogen bombs were built. It is absolutely necessary to sidetrack temporarily some of the usual safeguards in times of emergency. And the space program is so late in its eduactional activities that it is going to take drastic efforts to catch up.

In addition to the activities in the university, the space program should see that space centers are set up. We should have a National Laboratory for Space located in the Los Angeles area, in my opinion. This might well be an outgrowth of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory or of the Aerospace Corp. or some similar organization; but it should be a joint effort in which the universities have a full part to play, feel welcome, and are full partners. Why is this necessary? Well, first, it is necessary to have a successful educational program; and I hope that in the previous remarks I have made the case that an educational program is absolutely essential to our national aim to get on with space work. Therefore, the national laboratory is desperately needed, and we should not waste any time in authorizing its foundation.

And there should be more than one of these—probably several in different parts of the country. The necessity for this is great, and we cannot long delay without suffering seriously in our program.

Regardless of any question of fairness in the matter of federally supported institutions, regardless of any consideration of the just deserts of southern Californians or westerners or any other people in any particular area of the country—from a management point of view, there is in my mind no doubt that the space program needs a vigorous educational activity, and that a vigorous educational activity does certainly need its national laboratories as well as strong university programs.

Now, this costs a great deal of money. But the amount it costs is tiny as compared with the amount the engineering efforts which are already launched will cost. A small percentage of the funds now committed to enormous engineering programs would suffice. This country cannot afford to hesitate in spending it. The universities have a responsibility to see that the Federal Government is told about the kind of program it should support, and the Federal Government has the responsibility to respond favorably. Now, such a marriage must be worked out by mutual understanding and cooperation, and it is urgent, therefore, that the NASA and the Department of Defense begin conversations with the leading universities.

In general, we are at the point of exhausting our fundamental knowledge, and the engineers are on the tail of the research scientists every day. Now, in space I think the engineers are, shall we say, less expert in their particular area and in certain other areas, for, in general, they are engineers trained in other fields who have in recent years come over into space. As we all know, adults do not learn as easily as youngsters, and a program developing space engineers from scratch will probably produce a better product. But the biggest gap is not in the engineers. It's in the scientific corps working on the space program. The number of top scientists working on the space program is far too small. The number of good graduate students aiming toward a career in space science is pitifully small. This must be corrected, and the methods and moves I've suggested, I am sure, if adopted, would correct it.

There may be people who say they would support the university efforts but would forget the national laboratories and keep the inhouse principle paramount, developing these particular space laboratories as solely Government programs. Or developing industrial programs, keeping the universities at their job of teaching. It may be there is some truth in this, and it may be the Atomic Energy Commission has gone too far in merging these. I do not believe so. I think the Atomic Energy Commission Educational Program is one of the miracles of modern times. I think this [country] and the Western World and the whole world owe a great debt to the Federal Government, and the Atomic Energy Commission, for having carried forward in very difficult times, and through considerable budgetary controls, the support of basic research and education in the universities, as well as an enormous contractual program with the industries in the manufacture and development of atomic devices.

I believe that it is not possible to do a good job of engineering production without a steady stream of youngsters coming into the plant who have new ideas and new insight; and if something is not done about the educational program in space, it will be abundantly clear within a relatively short time that it does little good to let large space contracts to industry if their full-page ads in the Sunday newspapers are of no avail. A very sad situation can develop. It isn't that there won't be a flood of applicants for the well-paying jobs, but it is that there will be few applicants qualified. Of course, people of high intelligence can change from one interest to another on the basis of their new interest—perhaps for financial reasons or other reasons. But their heart isn't in it, usually. The man who has to leave aeronautical engineering to become a space engineer for financial reasons is probably on the average not as interested in space as the boy who begins studying space engineering and carries it through as his life work.

Certainly it is true of scientists that they do not need, and will not be forced, to change their interest. The demand is so great for the scientists qualified to do this difficult branch of work that they will not go into space unless they are interested. The only hope to get our scientist into space is to interest them. They cannot be coerced by economic means. In fact, a scientist who responds should be closely questioned as to quality. It is very necessary to be certain that the staffing of the space program be of highest quality. It could be that a large part of our present efforts should be deferred until the number of trained people is adequate. For money does not make the trip to the moon possible. It is trained people with stars in their eyes who will make this dream trip possible.

Bill Hess Still Interested

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's mail I received a note from our former colleague, William E. Hess, of Cincinnati, whose distinguished career in this House covered more than a quarter of a century.

He enclosed the lead editorial from the Cincinnati Enquirer of March 3, 1962, entitled "The Right Under Scrutiny." His thoughtfulness in bringing this editorial to my attention indicates that Bill hasn't lost one iota of interest in national affairs and conservative government. The thought-provoking editorial from the Enquirer follows:

THE RIGHT UNDER SCRUTINY

No political phenomenon in American history, we venture to say, has been more thoroughly scrutinized, analyzed, hypothesized and categorized than the resurgence of the so-called American rightwing.

One of the early treatments came from Newsweek magazine, now an offshoot of the Washington Post and Times-Herald combine. Newsweek's ink was scarcely dry before Time presented an almost identical analysis. Thereafter came a parallel opus on the subject by Life. And the current issue of Look, with its lead article, "Who's on the Far Right?" just about completes the circle.

The television industry has taken up the inquiry, too. The Huntley-Brinkley team, for example, has been acutely alive to the menace from the right. And only last Friday night, Eric Sevareid of the Columbia Broadcasting System, presented an hour-long study, "Thunder on the Right."

It goes without saying that practically none of these diagnoses has had much good to say about American conservatives.

The typical presentation—like Eric Sevareid's on CBS television—begins with a seriocomic look at the Minutemen as a representative manifestation of public concern about the Soviet menace. It proceeds to hint at sinister, mercenary motives behind such causes as Dr. Fred Schwarz' Christian Anti-Communist Crusade; at what just has to be the racist demagogy behind the work of the Reverend Billy James Hargis; at what looks like the ranting lunacy that dominates every waking hour of the John Birch Society's Robert Welch. And it winds up portraying the followers of each as frustrated, ill-informed, misguided crackpots.

There is little or no attention to the effective, responsible political figures of the right—like Senator BARRY GOLDWATER and Senator HARRY F. BYRD, to name only two. Nor is there any more attention to the scholars of the right—William F. Buckley, Jr., Frank S. Meyer, Russell Kirk or Gerhart Niemeyer.

On the contrary, there is characteristically a lumping together—what the liberals used to decry as guilt by association—of the Goldwater followers, the American Nazis, the Birchites, the Daughters of the American Revolution, and the Christian Anti-Communist Crusaders, as though they were equal in stature, equal in number, equal in purpose and significance.

The extraordinary coverage accorded the American rightwing would not be so remarkable had the consecutive thinkers responsible for it displayed, at some point in their varied careers, an equal concern about the American left.

But we can recall no spreads in Time or Life or Look, for example, about the Institute of Pacific Relations, which all but dominated this Nation's disastrous Far Eastern policy in the days following World War II.

We can recall no CBS television spectaculars on the Americans for Democratic Action or the American Civil Liberties Union.

We can recall no jests in Newsweek about the occasion on which the managing editor of the Washington Post joined forces with the editor of the Democratic Digest to hire a confidence man to get the goods on the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, whose "tactics" they found so reprehensible. They instructed their conman, by the way, to use any tactics that served his purposes.

We can recall, finally, no exhaustive treatment of the prodigious campaign to abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee, although it strikes us that it is no more illogical to abolish a standing committee of Congress because you object to its findings than it is to advocate the impeachment of a Supreme Court Justice because you object to his.

Maybe, on the other hand, we're all wrong. Maybe it's all just a remarkable coincidence that so many of our liberal observers should reach the same conclusions about the same problems at the same time and in substantially the same degree.

And maybe the rightists are just lucky to be getting so much publicity.

The Leaguers, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, an organization whose beginnings I remember well has for the past many years performed a great service to the community by aiding the development of culture and education in my home town, Newark.

Despite the disadvantage of not having a real center for their varied helpful activities, the Leaguers have done a remarkable job for youths and adults alike. Now they seek a center for their truly humanitarian program. Nothing grandoise, just a building that will enable them to carry on their projects under one roof.

In an editorial, the Newark Evening News, on Tuesday, the 6th, drew attention to the effort of the Leaguers to raise money for their center. It gives me a distinct pleasure to point out to all who read the RECORD this truly noble example of genuine neighborliness:

THE LEAGUER'S GOAL

At a time when most fundraisers scorn anything but millions, there is an engaging modesty about the campaign goal of the Leaguers, Inc., a Newark organization that encourages cultural and educational development among Negroes. It is asking for $200,000 to build a center for its admirable program.

Mrs. Reynold E. Burch, founder and for 13 years executive director of the Leaguers, explains the new building will not be a recreation center, but a place for work, study, and service. It will contain a lecture hall, library, office, kitchen, and rooms for club activities, vocational counseling, applied arts, conferences, and class sessions.

The Leaguers have awarded $85,000 in college scholarships, provided college board review classes, placed many youths in jobs, established remedial reading and tutoring services, organized student-parent workshops, conducted language classes. Recruited by the organization are 125 high school students now giving weekly volunteer service to welfare agencies.

Having won deserved recognition for community service, the Leaguers have earned the support they now seek from the community.

SOS: Save Our Streams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the March 1 issue of Conservation News, published by the National Wildlife Federation, features an essay by Ernest Swift entitled "Conservation and the Construction of Public Roads."

Mr. Swift refers to my bill, S. 2767, now before the Committee on Public Works, which would protect fish and wildlife and other recreation values in highway construction by requiring approval of the Secretary of the Interior of project surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates for Federal aid roads.

He states that the idea behind the bill "is being substantially endorsed by conservation groups from many States, who resent the callous disregard given to recreational and esthetic values."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert the article, "Conservation and the Construction of Public Roads," in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSERVATION AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC ROADS: PART I

Long before the advent of white men on the North American Continent, game trails were being used as routes of travel by the Indians. Herbivorous animals such as buffalo, elk, and deer had a canny instinct for easy courses which avoided steep elevations and obstructions. Invariably, game trails led to water, to food, or to areas of protection against winter storms. It was logical that Indians used these trails when hunting or as a means of traversing the country. Many of the trails were very distinctive, having been worn down by countless hooves and moccasins.

The early white man, recognizing logic of the Indian, also used game trails in penetrating the continent. However, in the eastern United States and Canada the numberless rivers and waterways, man's most ancient highways, better served the first explorers. Travel by water was faster, often more safe, and provisions and trade goods could be carried. Lewis and Clark used the great continental artery, the Missouri River, on their notable expedition.

But following the explorers, the church, and the traders, came armies and then settlers. Armies are not so constituted as to travel light, and settlers, cutting loose from

home communities, took as many worldly goods as could be piled in a wagon. Meager by present standards—plunder they called it—they took tools for farming, as well as furniture, and a few dishes and fine linens as a symbol of civilization.

Until the prairies and then the plains were reached, roads had to be cut through a thousand miles or virgin forest. These new gashes through timber, full of roots and mosquito holes, invariably followed game and Indian traces; and wandered through mountain gaps, around promontories and into sylvan valleys where food for stock, fuel, water, and wild meat could be found.

West of the Mississippi, forests were of less consequence, until the mountains were reached, and then the massive ramparts were more of an obstacle than trees. First there was the long, waving prairie grass, dwindling in lushness with the advance toward the western sun, then buffalo grass, and finally desert with its punishing heat and sparse waterholes.

The long line of freight wagons with their many oxen and mules, pulling out of St. Louis for Santa Fe; Oregon and California, left their historic imprints across 2,000 miles of open country, mountains and desert. The deep ruts left by these prairie schooners still can be traced in some regions and have been given immortality by way of historic markers. And, with people surging off into the wilderness from the main line of travel, more wagon ruts followed in the wake of the vanishing game and Indians. Settlements began to spring up which were connected by stagecoach lines; and civilization resolutely crept into the hinterlands.

In the forest country of New England, New York, Pennsylvania, and the Great Lakes States, tote roads were axed through to supply distant lumber camps with beans, salt pork, and tea. As the forest fringe receded, stoic but chronically hopeful frontiersmen followed the old logging trails with wagon, family and livestock to hew out a farm among the stumps. In much of the South it was easier to drive a team of mules and wagon through the pine forests to a new plantation site, a turpentine or logging camp.

Such was the beginning of roads in the United States, mere threads of travel following the ancient paths of game herds and red men, with possible confusion where there was a fork, and an equally questionable destination.

No doubt I will be accused of reactionary sentiments if I advert to recalling the sand trails where I hiked or drove a wagon some 50 years or more ago. But such roads could be a means of some education. A bare board across a wagon box for a seat developed physical endurance and patience, and was an ideal point of observation. Many of my first conservation lessons in tree, flower, and bird identification were the result of a slow-moving team along two sandy ruts with a grassy hump between, where a wheel hub would occasionally scrape the bark from a tree as the wagon rolled and swayed over an exposed root or boulder.

With a heavy load, 3 miles an hour was average progress; with an empty wagon, possibly 4. With some, the mind became a blank of stoic patience, but to me it was a fascinating panorama of nature and wonderful smells. Invariably, red squirrels vented their indignation at being disturbed, and there were occasional deer, a wolf track in the sand, and over long, long intervals, a bear in a raspberry patch.

The brisk chill of winter ushered in a different but equally fascinating world. There was the contrast of green pine, balsam and spruce, often festooned with snow, and interspersed with leafless hardwoods and aspen. Roads were unplowed in those days, and the sleigh—now a museum piece—was the sole conveyance. With hot bricks as foot warmers, and the music of heel chains, the crystal snow vistas would be punctuated with occasional tracks of some wild creature in search of food. There would be the silent flight of a lumberjack, and then on the clear, sharp air would come the raucous croak of a raven, or the impertinent challenge of a bluejay. And nothing can surpass the beauty of a small stream with miniature rapids fighting the ever-encroaching ice as it edges out from the banks, and overall, flanked with a blanket of tufted snow.

I am glad that I was privileged to attend these seminars of nature via the old woods road. Many a person today has nostalgic memories of such experiences as a trace across an unplowed prairie in heat and in cold, with the North Star as the only guide.

By 1860, railroads had reached the Mississippi River and the covered wagon was becoming less important as a mode of travel. The Civil War empasized the importance of railroads to both the North and the South and, when hostilities ceased, the Nation was ready to span the continent with steel rails, by joining the Central Pacific coming east from Sacramento and the Union Pacific from Omaha.

From then on, railroads were built with a frenzy, piercing many an unknown wilderness. But from the settlements which spring up, it was still the horse, wagon and buggy and the old country road that connected the hinterlands with this new phenomena of speed and comfort.

The explosion of an atomic bomb changed the portent of future civilization beyond all imagination and, with it, the lives of all individuals. However, the autombile, with a somewhat longer time fuse, also drastically reshaped the Nation's living pattern; and with the arrival of the model T—the Tin Lizzy—available at a very modest price, many traditions became buried under a new and strange era.

The model T was easy with which to tinker, economical to operate, and versatile in its uses. It could negotiate sagebrush and sand trails into mining, cow and logging camps. It brought isolated plainsmen and back-country farmers in touch with the outside world; this in spite of the fact that it might have to be put up on blocks during the winter months. People could visit around the neighborhood more often and seek out relatives at a much greater distance than formerly; and a few daring easterners ventured west to Yellowstone Park and other scenic regions. These early conquests promoted the camera business and the sale of magazines, portraying the conquistadors in linen dusters and goggles, with their open-air vehicles loaded down with camp equipment. Often it showed them prying themselves out of the mud, or with a team of horses hitched to the front.

The tempo of life became accelerated; there was more sophistication, and the so-called country bumpkin disappeared as the range of travel broadened. Garage signs appeared over blacksmith shops, and hand-cranked gas pumps replaced watering troughs.

As the rich, level prairies were homesteaded, roads were built on section lines. They were narrow, with definite right angle corners so as not to take up any more valuable plowland than was necessary; and was at a time when the Nation's population was much less than half its present density.

In the hill and mountain country, roads often followed the valleys, and for egress made switchback cuts in the hill or mountainside to the rim above the valley floor.

Identifications were much more colorful than a mere number on a sign. There would be the valley road, the river road, the sandy creek road, the swamp road, the Swede road, the Russian road, or a musical Indian name; and not a few went by some vivid Anglo-Saxon terminology to indicate their impassibility or rough elevations.

Prior to the automobile, roadbuilding was a township, village or municipal responsibility, with much of the maintenance carried on by each landowner working out his poll tax. I distinctly recall substituting for my father in working out the poll tax. Road construction and repairs were a matter of teams and slushers or wheel scrapers, dump wagons, a breaking plow and hand shoveling, and with a generous application of dynamite for stumps and rocks. Bridges and culverts were of wood and swamps were corduroyed.

As the Nation became dedicated to the automobile, such methods no longer sufficed. The gas tax came into being for new and improved road construction and, to insure comparable standards, State highway commissions were established and granted some very positive authorities in spending and determining highway routes. The automobile also developed many new professions, among them the highway engineer. Finally came the Bureau of Public Roads, created by the National Congress, with even greater authorities and fabulous sums to spend.

With the scent of public money in the air, the superhighway, the cloverleaf, and the doubledeck roads have been sponsored enthusiastically by industries such as the automobile manufacturers, oil and gas interests, equipment, cement and construction companies, and a vast army of superbureaucrats. Transcontinental roads have been officially blessed as a military necessity and as public works projects to prime the national economy.

As is common when a program grows to such gargantuan proportions with almost unlimited powers, and becomes so expensive, so dislocating to many people, and with so much land covered by concrete, and so ruthless in relation to other resources affected, all in the holy name of progress, many people begin to question the validity of certain aspects and the justifications set forth.

Based on these rapidly growing protests, Congressman GLENN CUNNINGHAM of Nebraska, introduced H.R. 8595 in August of 1961, limiting powers of the Bureau of Public Roads to condemn rights-of-way through lands dedicated and used as public parks, including city and municipal, county, and State parks. To further indicate a growing concern, S. 2767, which would protect fish and wildlife and other recreation values in highway construction by requiring approval of the Secretary of the Interior of project surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates for Federal-aid roads, was introduced recently by Senator LEE METCALF, of Montana.

Both of these proposals would have far-reaching effects in regulating the activities of the Bureau of Public Roads. No doubt they will bring forth some plain-and-fancy protests. But, the idea is being substantially endorsed by conservation groups from many States, who resent the callous disregard given to recreational and esthetic values.

The 50th Anniversay of Death of Judge James C. Allen, Former Congressman and One of Olney's Famous Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, recently an article appeared in the Olney Daily Mail, Olney, Ill., reminding the people of the great services of Hon. James Cam-

eron Allen, deceased, who probably was Olney's most renowned citizen of his day. He was a lawyer, prosecuting attorney, a member of the State house of representatives, Clerk of the National House of Representatives, circuit court judge, Member of the U.S. Congress, and an active member of various local organizations. From information available, I am the fourth Olney U.S. Congressman to ever serve in the Congress.

In view of the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the death of this fine citizen, I am pleased to insert this well written article from the Daily Mail in the Appendix of the RECORD:

January 30 was the 50th anniversary of the death of the late Judge James C. Allen, who passed away on January 30, 1912 at the age of 90. Judge Allen was probably Olney's most renowned citizen in his day. He was born on January 29, 1822, and died the day following his 90th birthday.

Judge Allen, who was the father of the late Mrs. John Ratcliffe, James Allen, and William Y. Allen, of Olney, was for many years a circuit judge. He moved to Palestine about 1856 and served four terms in Congress and was also Secretary of the House of Representatives during that time. He moved to Olney in 1877 after being elected circuit judge for many years.

He was a leader in the Democratic Party of the State and in 1860 was the Democratic nominee against Richard Yates, Sr., who was elected Governor of Illinois that year. During the Civil War, President Lincoln requested Judge Allen to accept a commission as brigadier general but he declined the nomination.

Judge Allen is reputed to have been considered as the Democratic nominee for President in 1860. He attended the famous Democratic Convention in Charleston, S.C., in 1860 and was a strong contender with Judge Stephen A. Douglas for the nomination. Because of the closeness of the Civil War, the Charleston convention was dissolved, and later Southern Democrats nominated John C. Breckenridge, while Northern Democrats nominated Judge Douglas.

Judge Allen delighted to tell his friends in Olney how near he came to being nominated for President.

Judge Allen was a law partner of the late Judge T. A. Fritchey for many years.

Postal Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting this bill as a companion bill to H.R. 9531, to be known as the postal pay bill.

The year 1962 is now in its third month, and the postal clerks and carriers are still as full optimism and hope as they were when the new year dawned. The postal employees have looked forward to a new year that would, at last, bring with it the closing of a salary gap that keeps them on a treadmill, a treadmill which permits them never to catch up with their industrial counterparts, nor the cost of living.

In introducing my bill, I am trying to insure salary adjustments, long owed, frequently promised, but never yet delivered.

Man can exist rather inadequately upon promises and faith, but to live he needs demonstrations of the same in performance. With his ever-shrinking purchasing power very much in evidence, the clerk and carrier need a dramatic demonstration. This bill is one of the ways we, in the Congress, can show our determination to help; I am doing just that.

In support of this well-deserved raise in pay, it is only necessary to point out that in 1947–49 the postal employee was 16 percent behind the cost-of-living index at that time, compared to his 1939 standard. From 1949 to 1962 the cost-of-living index rose from 101.4 to 128.2 as shown by Bureau of Labor's consumer index figures. This increase of almost 27 points plus the 16 percent minus at the start of this period comes to 43 percent. The postal employees received approximately 20 percent in salary increases in this same period. Thus, they are still 23 percent behind the consumers index or cost of living.

While this bill does not grant an amount that large it does approach a decent comparable living wage for one of the most faithful servants of the Government.

Well-paid postal workers, along with other adequately compensated Federal employees makes for a proud Government service which manifests itself on a high level of morale. Pride in one's work raises productivity, eases tensions, and makes recruitment easy rather than difficult.

The salary adjustment is needed this year, 1962, and should be allocated now, not over a period of 3 years, or any other stretch of time.

The space age requires careful research and quick decisions. The cause of the postal employee is just; the problem of pay adjustment has already been thoroughly studied, so, accordingly, I look forward to a speedy remedy for the most faithful of our civil servants.

Lockheed Welcomed to Clarksburg, W. Va., at Recognition Dinner—President W. A. Pulver, of Georgia Co., Delivers Significant Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, one of our most significant advances in West Virginia in the efforts we have been making—and continue to make—to diversify our industrial base and improve both the economy and the employment status of our people, has been that of welcoming new units of major aviation and space age firms.

A few weeks ago we were privileged to have ground-breaking ceremonies for a new plant of North American Aviation near Princeton, W. Va. On Monday, March 5, 1962, at Clarksburg, an industrial recognition dinner event was held honoring the entry of a unit of the Lockheed-Georgia Co., subsidiary of Lockheed Aircraft Corp., as a new producer-employer in that community.

I was honored, along with Representative CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, to be among those who participated in the noteworthy event attended by 250 citizens, including officials of the Lockheed organization, Federal, State and local officials, and community leaders.

Speaker for the occasion was W. A. Pulver, president of the Lockheed-Georgia Co. Mr. Pulver was generous in his endorsement of West Virginia as a State in which to locate new manufacturing ventures, and spoke of the excellence of the work already being performed in the new assembly unit at Clarksburg during the 2 months the Lockheed organization has been building there.

The capable president of the Georgia company also brought to the Clarksburg community a meaningful message which spelled out in considerable detail the fabulous history of the now highly diversified Lockheed organization and the many products it has pioneered and produced for the aviation and space era. He inspired in his audience and, I am sure, in the citizens of the Clarksburg community generally a feeling of pride that they now are privileged to share in the outstanding achievements of and the work being performed by Lockheed for our country's defense effort and for progress throughout the free world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the speech delivered by Mr. Pulver at the recognition dinner in Clarksburg.

There being no objections, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY W. A. PULVER, PRESIDENT, LOCKHEED-GEORGIA CO., CLARKSBURG, W. VA., MONDAY, MARCH 5, 1962

After our relatively short relationship here I can certainly give my wholehearted endorsement to any manufacturing concern considering locating a plant in West Virginia and, I know I also speak for each of my associates here tonight. I am sure that there has never been a more wonderful reception given by any group of citizens in any State, or in any city than that given the Lockheed Co.—both in helping us get started, and, during the 2 months we have been building our organization here in your midst.

So for each one of us here tonight; my associates at the Georgia Co., and our corporate officials, I say, thank you. We sincerely appreciate all you have done.

We have sent you some fine men, too, from our organization and they have brought their families into your city. I'm sure you are going to find them good citizens of Clarksburg and West Virginia. We want them to be just that and I'm sure you can count on them. We too, as a company, intend to be good citizens. We want to grow with you here in Clarksburg. We hope to be likened to your General Jackson—a "Stonewall" in our determination to be good citizens.

In our short time with you we have, so far, employed 66 of your citizens. I am proud of them. Both Jason Tuggle, who directs their work here, and our manufacturing manager, Roy Mackenzie, must be satisfied

by the work they send back to our Georgia plant since it becomes a part of our Hercules airlift transports. Both of these men tell me that the initial work being done by you West Virginians is very good and that they are pleased.

Last Monday we began a companywide freedom bond payroll deduction campaign and by 11 a.m. that day the Clarksburg plant had 100 percent participation. I cannot think of a finer demonstration of enthusiasm. If such reports keep coming in and getting better with experience, we may have to be looking for additional work to put up here.

My thanks to our new West Virginia family for this excellent performance. We hope they will continue as they have started and get better day by day.

And so, to all of you here tonight, our appreciation for helping us get on with our job.

Now—I thought you might be interested in us as a company, now that we are here—and I'd like to tell you a bit about us. Basically, the Lockheed-Georgia Co. is engaged in manufacturing airlift for the U.S. military services, for those of our allies, for corporations, and, we hope, that again within a few years, for commercial airlines as well.

Within the past year, our Marietta plant has been dubbed Airlift Center, U.S.A. Of course, we are very proud of this. This name comes from the fact that the C-130 Hercules, the C-140 Jetstars, and the new C-141 jet cargo transport are all manufactured there. To help supply the subassemblies for the famed Hercules family of airlifters, we have opened our Clarksburg plant.

Today the Hercules, I feel, is one of the most famous aircraft of the jet age. It is capable of making very short takeoffs and landings on rough fields which have not been prepared as runways.

It cruises at about 350 miles per hour; is powered by Allison propjet engines.

The Hercules is capable of landing its cargo or paradropping it.

Over 380 of these airplanes have been delivered from our Marietta facility.

To date the Hercules family is composed of some 15 different models: The C-130A is the basic assault transport for the Tactical Air Command. This is the original model which began setting records for airlift and airdrop all over the free world; landing most anywhere there was a cleared spot, on ice, snow, sand, mud or what have you.

Another was developed for the Royal Australian Air Force.

The GC-130A drone launcher-director is used for carrying target drones aloft to test our defenses against enemy aircraft.

The RC-130A, sometimes called the Big Eye, which the Air Photographic & Charting Service uses as a platform for its cameras in recharting, accurately, the principal areas of the world. Since the day of the missile has come upon us, this recharting has become very essential because the cities of the world aren't where we thought they were at all—some 5 miles or more from where our maps showed them to be.

The C-130D, ski-equipped Air Force Hercules, was the first big transport ever to land at the South Pole, an event ranking in Antarctic exploration with the first flight of Admiral Byrd over the pole itself.

The Royal Canadian Air Force uses a verison of the Hercules in supplying and resupplying their stations in the frozen north.

A transport version has been delivered to the Indonesian Air Force; one USAF model, the JC-130B, is designed for use by the Air Force in aerial recovery of the Discoverer-Agena space capsules from their orbital flights.

A search and rescue version for the U.S. Coast Guard.

Then, the GV-1, a combination aerial refueling plane and assault transport for the U.S. Marines. The Navy uses still another version of the GV-1 as a transport.

A further modification known as the BLC-130, a very short field takeoff and landing type aircraft which can take off and land in less than 500 feet fully loaded.

Our latest, but by no means last, is the C-130E, a long-range, nonstop, ocean hopping version designed for the modernization of the Military Air Transport Service. First deliveries are scheduled in April.

I deliberately took what might appear to be a long time listing these, but with a purpose. Your Clarksburg plant will probably be making parts for many of these versions and for those now under wraps for some time to come.

Much of this Nation's ability—much of the free world's ability, to put forth strong arguments for peace, or, if necessary, to wage a brush-type war, depends upon these Hercules aircraft for fast deployment of men and supplies.

One of the most encouraging things to me in recent months has been the use of the magnificient Hercules transports by our friends abroad for the economic development of countries in transition. India and Peru have used them particularly well.

For example, air force officers of Peru hit upon the idea of using the Lockheed Hercules to transport heavy roadbuilding equipment 400 miles from the heavily settled coastal cities, over the snowcapped Andes, to the rich jungle area which, till now, has been cut off from the coast. Five Hercules were supplied by the U.S. Government, and with U.S. Air Force crews flying them, these planes loaded the bulldozers, road scrapers, and modern machinery; flew them inland, landing on strips that were hardly capable of handling small single-engine aircraft; and discharged equipment the likes of which the natives and Indians had never seen before.

Today, this machinery is being used to cut a road down through the mountains and jungles to the coast, opening up untold resources.

The Lockheed-Georgia Co. is also engaged in building an airplane which takes off straight up and descends straight down. In level flight it flies like other jets at 500-mile-per-hour speeds. We call it the Hummingbird.

We are engaged, also, in developing and manufacturing the first true jet cargo transport—the U.S. Air Force C-141 which will transport a cargo load of 93,000 pounds domestically. It will transport more than 60,000 pounds of cargo nonstop across the Pacific. It will make its first flight next year. A couple of years after that we expect to have a commercial version of this airplane—the Lockheed 300—which will be very attractive to the commercial airlines and which, with a new, all-inclusive cargo transportation system which we are developing, we hope will revolutionize the movement of goods and commodities for better living everywhere.

Our company is also engaged in nuclear fields. Today we are working on developing the use of nuclear propulsion for spacecraft, in manufacturing nuclear reactors for universities, and in the manufacture of nuclear instruments.

In the mountains of north Georgia—yes, we have some mountains in Georgia, too, even though you West Virginians might say they are hills.

At any rate, in the hills of north Georgia we have a nuclear research lab that is unique.

Here, three flatcar loads of machinery or equipment can be radiated while being operated, thus providing our scientists with accurate knowledge as to what happens to this equipment in a nuclear environment.

Our industrial products branch is working with trucklines in developing better means of loading and unloading trucks, and with railroads in the development of rail coal cars made of aluminum.

That, ladies and gentlemen, with some other work on space programs and research, is the type of company which has moved into your midst. We are growing and expanding.

But the Lockheed-Georgia Co. is only one company in the total Lockheed Aircraft Corp. Lockheed gained its stature long ago as a builder of aircraft. Two airminded brothers, Allan and Malcolm Lockheed, in 1913 flew their first plane, a multiplace, tractor-type seaplane. Hundreds of people had their first air experience in this plane during the 1915 San Francisco World's Fair.

In the late 1920's Allan Lockheed opened shop in Hollywood, Calif., to start construction of a plane which brought worldwide fame—the Vega. To accommodate increased production, he moved to Burbank and built others: the Air Express, Sirius, Altair, Orion—famed names in aviation history—Wiley Post, Amelia Earhart, Charles Lindbergh, and many others.

In June 1932, when the original company was in financial difficulties, a group of investors headed by the late Robert E. Gross purchased Lockheed, reorganized it and has managed it ever since. In the intervening year, nearly 40,000 planes have been manufactured by Lockheed. Many innovations have been pioneered by our company, including the first all-metal and the first successful pressurized airplanes; the first operational U.S. jetplane, the first straight-wing supersonic aircraft, the F-104 Starfighter; the Constellation series of planes introduced reversible props and 350-miles-per-hour flight schedules to the transport field; the World War II P-38 fighter was the first to fly over 400 miles per hour in level flight, and was the first twin-engine fighter.

Early ramjet test and reentry vehicles are among Lockheed contributions to our Nation's program for the conquest of space.

In the missile and space field, Lockheed entered later than some other companies but today has successfully launched more space and satellite vehicles than any other company, and its Navy Polaris missile is a strong deterrent, riding as it does on nuclear submarines, under oceans, ready to strike an aggressor any time.

Today, the Lockheed Corp. is engaged in many fields, but still we are basically oriented in aerospace—and we are primarily engaged in transportation; providing systems for moving things and people, in the air, through space, on and under the ocean, and on the land.

Looking at Lockheed in 1962, we feel that ours is a well-managed, aggressive, growing company with demonstrated engineering competence and is largely governmentally oriented.

But what does that mean? May I give you a quick look at some of the other major companies which make up the Lockheed Corp. today and show some of what they are doing?

I've told you about our Georgia Co. Now let's take our California company. The Lockheed-California Co. at Burbank is the senior member of the Lockheed family and our corporate offices are located there.

Since the midforties, the principal antisubmarine patrol bomber of the United States and its allies has been the Lockheed P2V Neptune. In 1946, one of these planes flew nonstop—without refueling, from Perth, Australia, to Columbus, Ohio—11,236 miles, to set a world record for distance which remained unbroken until about a month ago, almost 16 years, when a B-52 bomber finally set a new mark. More than 1,000 of these planes have been produced.

Now entering service is a new Lockheed-California product, the Orion, which, with advanced electronic gear, can radar-scan vast ocean areas every few seconds to search out and destroy enemy submarines. This

missile age subkiller can carry nuclear depth charges, torpedoes, and rockets. Its prop-jet engines give it short field capability and both low- and high-altitude efficiency.

Most renowned of current Lockheed-California aircraft is the F-104 Starfighter—the holder of the world's aircraft altitude record at 103,395.5 feet (almost 20 miles) and the only aircraft ever to hold the world's speed, altitude, and time-to-climb records at the same time. In addition to the U.S. Air Force—Germany, Canada, Japan, the Netherlands, Italy, and Belgium also base their defense around this fighter.

But today, the airplanes you see flying, are already obsolete—the engineers say. The Lockheed-California Co. is doing research in wind tunnels capable of testing at speeds up to 10 times the speed of sound, seeking to better the aircraft of tomorrow.

And one of those planes of tomorrow is the supersonic transport which you have probably read about. Lockheed has a design proposal for a 90-passenger, 2,200-mile-an-hour airliner which will fly you across the Atlantic in less than 2 hours at 60,000 feet—too quickly for you to enjoy a feature length movie.

One-fourth of Lockheed's people are working with military, civilian, and industrial agencies to help the U.S. take a clearly leading role in space achievement. Our Missiles and Space Co., at Sunnyvale, Calif., specializes in this field. Much of their effort is directed toward concepts and systems years in the future; however, it has already led to space systems and hardware that are useful today—including our Agena, the satellite sometimes called the work horse of the space age. Last year 11 Agenas went into orbit and 6 instrumented capsules were recovered, 3 by crews flying our Georgia-built Hercules. To date, these Agenas have orbited 30,000 pounds into space, three-fourths of the total U.S. space payload. And last year a Midas defense alarm satellite was put in orbit.

Perhaps the best known of the Lockheed Missile and Space Co.'s products, though, is the Polaris, which can be fired from nuclear submarines under water. Its present 1,500 nautical mile range can strike virtually all potential military targets from launch sites under the sea. Lockheed is manager of the Polaris missile system which involves the teamwork of 9,000 subcontractors.

Lockheed Aircraft Service Co. in Ontario, Calif., is the world's largest and oldest aircraft maintenance and modification company. It operates from seven bases. Its activities range from fleet maintenance for military and commercial customers to complex modifications of individual aircraft, such as Navy WV-2's which fly the Atlantic and Pacific early warning barrier patrol flights 24 hours a day. These airplanes are maintained by LAS at Idlewood Air Terminal in New York and at Keehi Lagoon in Honolulu, Hawaii. LAS also operates the FAA's Bureau of Research and Development Center at Atlantic City. They also maintain all aircraft assigned to the Army's electronic proving ground at Fort Huachuca, Ariz.

Newest Lockheed family member is Lockheed Propulsion Co. This facility, at Redlands, Calif., can manufacture solid propellent motors having up to 50,000 pounds of thrust.

The Beaumont Proving Grounds here have test stands with thrust capability up to 400,000 pounds. Already under construction are a 2 million pound test stand and a building to house one of the largest X-ray machines in the country—a 25-million-electron-volt Betatron, so powerful it can pick out the head of a pin in 40 inches of solid propellant. It will be used to insure that large motors are completely free of flaws.

The Vanguard upper-stage rocket is manufactured by LPC. It helped orbit Vanguard I in March 1958—4 years ago. This satellite still orbits the earth—scientists expect it will remain in orbit for 1,000 years.

The Mercury escape rocket that provides margin of safety for astronauts, such as Colonel Glenn, in the event the Atlas booster should malfunction on takeoff, is also manufactured by our propulsion company. These solid propellent escape rockets have functioned perfectly in all tests.

Lockheed brought a Seattle shipbuilding-heavy construction firm in April 1959. It is called Puget Sound Bridge & Drydock Co. Since its beginning almost 75 years ago it has completed more than 1,000 projects, including ship construction and repair, erection of dams, powerhouses, bridges, buildings, military and industrial installations.

And we are in the electronic field—Lockheed Electronics Co. is headquartered in Plainfield, N.J. Perhaps our greatest contribution in this to date has been in the radar field.

Many of our electronics people at this facility are concerned with the production of a small computing register which produces a printed invoice at the completion of a fuel-oil delivery from a truck.

And I still haven't covered all the fields Lockheed is in. But that is the way our company has diversified in today's world. The many-sided demands of the cold war and new technical concepts have combined to change the aircraft industry drastically to embrace whole new fields of activity and has moved the old aircraft industry from one of just airplane production to an industry of research and development.

While we in Lockheed have remained interested in air, missiles, and space, you can also see that we now engage in electronics, nucleonics, propulsion systems, shipbuilding and submarines, oceanography and surface transportation.

What are some of the things we look to in the future? We believe much of the work we are doing today, in the development of nuclear power for space travel, will hasten the day of widespread use of atomic power throughout the world.

We are interested in large satellite communications systems. We envision automated warehouses, hospitals, libraries and post offices. These are in the conceptual stages now, but in the systemized world of the future, the advances in the aerospace industry today will play a great part in the shaping of the lives of people everywhere.

We, as a people, living in the greatest Nation on earth, are going to see discoveries in great new areas.

Thousands of grownups and children watched Colonel Glenn's flight on TV, and there, during that history-making event, were kindled thousands of adventuresome desires. For some of us—who have viewed man's 50 years of flight in this atmosphere, have also witnessed the miracle of television and the development of the wonder drugs—these orbits in space stimulate our minds also. They make us realize how small each of us really is. They seem to challenge us to cooperate, to stop our bickerings, to work together for the betterment of man, to get on with the job our Creator has given us, and for which we were put on this earth.

We have just begun to grow. We, in these United States, have risen somewhat reluctantly perhaps to the leadership of the free nations on this earth. Destiny has now chosen us to lead our planet in the exploration of the universe. With God's help—and with the people of this Nation working as one, to carry out the teachings of the Good Book—I am confident our Nation will unselfishly lead the world toward better tomorrows in an ever unfolding universe.

Our Nation was founded by great-thinking men who dared to dream big and who had the courage to make these dreams come true. Some have said our youth today has been too ready to accept this accomplished refinements of pleasant living—unwilling to challenge the future for new and even better things.

I believe, however, the pioneering spirit is still there.

Perhaps it has been dormant. But Colonel Glenn's flight has ignited a spark of pride. I'm sure other events to follow will keep it burning.

We must all fan that pride into achievement for the benefit of all mankind.

Our company believes in that kind of a future, and we are determined to be a part of it.

More Liberal Censorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great indignation throughout the country as a result of the State Department's refusal to permit Moise Tshombe, the anti-Red Katanga leader, to come to the United States.

This feeling is particularly bitter because so many Communist leaders and sympathizers have been permitted to visit the United States and appear before many American audiences.

My constituent, Mrs. Joan Scalia of New Milford, N.J., has sent me a very fine editorial on this subject from the Brooklyn (N.Y.) Tablet of February 24, 1962. Because of the wide national interest in the matter under unanimous consent I include the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

MORE "LIBERAL" CENSORSHIP

The State Department has refused a visa to Moise Tshombe, popular Katanga leader, friend of the United States and ardent anti-Communist to visit our country. The reason given for setting up the bar against him was first that he had not "properly applied," his application was "incomplete," etc. After procrastination and a demand from many that the Katanga leader be admitted, the State Department publicly rejected his visit as undesirable at this time and in the "current" circumstances, that his visit "would interrupt and jeopardize the progress" being made for a united Congo.

The "progress" to which the State Department referred was, as noted Washington correspondent Arthur Krock said, "the forced product of United Nations punitive military measures in Katanga that were made possible only by the military and financial backing of the United States."

The real reason for barring Tshombe, of course, is that the State Department feared the truth, objected to free speech, could not permit Americans to hear what the Katanga leader had to say in his own defense. Tshombe's appearance in the United States would have been embarrassing not only to State Department but to the U.N. Secretariat and Assembly majority. According to the Katangan Information Services in New York, some of the invitations Tshombe had accepted before the State Department supplanted evasions with an adverse decision were:

In Washington, a "Meet the Press" program, a luncheon speech to the National Press Club and a meeting with a group of Members of Congress; speeches at the University of Virginia, the Overseas Press Club in New York City, the Boston Law College Forum, the World Affairs Council in Los

Angeles and a rally in New York City of Young Americans for Freedom. The schedule opened the prospect that influential groups throughout the country would hear the other side of the administration's Congo policy from its principal target.

The barring of Tshombe is a typical example of what passes for liberalism—freedom to express one group's ideas but barring of any opposition. Thus, from Khrushchev to Lumumba to Castro, we had a series of Communists receiving visas and official welcomes, but Tshombe, the anti-Communist, is denied admittance to the country. It is not without significance that the press asserts G. Mennen Williams and his liberal group won the day in barring Tshombe. And to close the deal, as Arthur Krock said on Tuesday, "Usually in these circumstances the same protests would be loudly registered by self-classified liberals and the civil liberties groups. But not a peep from any of them so far."

Give Reds No Quarter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the story in today's Washington Daily News regarding current Communist tactics in Chile.

The problem described is just another proof that the Western Hemisphere is in immediate danger of Red subversion. Since our national security could be at stake, we must give these Reds no quarter. We have seen what has happened in Cuba. Now the Dominican Republic, Brazil and Chile find themselves heading toward the Communist camp, and unless we take strong measures now to help the democratic elements in these countries, they will be lost to the community of free nations.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting into the RECORD the text of the story as published in today's Washington Daily News:

"TERRIFIED AT ALLIANCE"—U.S. AID BLASTS CHILEAN COMMIES

(By Richard H. Boyce)

SANTIAGO, CHILE, March 8.—An angry American has lashed out at Chilean Communists here, telling them: "What I see in the Red press here is proof the Reds are terrified by the Alliance for Progress. They have good reason to be. For we will keep them on the run."

Richard N. Goodwin, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, is in Santiago as a part of a U.S. task force to study Chile's economic needs.

TO REPORTERS

His strong words were delivered to Communist reporters who sought to question him after a discussion of United States and Chilean officials. Teodoro Moscoso, director of the Alliance aid program, and head of the visiting U.S. mission, said: "We have not yet studied all the possible methods of aiding Chile through the Alliance."

Apparently he thought Mr. Goodwin's words might be interpreted as a specific promise of aid before decisions were reached. But Mr. Goodwin said afterward: "We will keep putting the needle to the Reds."

The Communists are strong in Chile. There is danger that failure of President Jorge Alessandri Rodrigues to ease inflation and skyrocketing living costs will lead to a Communist-leftist takeover in the 1964 elections. Thus the Reds needle Sr. Alessandri constantly and are using the hatchet on the Moscoso-Goodwin visit.

GRINGOS

The Red press calls the Americans "gringos" and the mission "La Dolce Vita" (the sweet life) in allusion to the impressive presidential luncheon given for the visitors.

The Communists charge that the real reason for the visit is a United States attempt to force Chile to break relations with Cuba. Messrs. Goodwin and Moscoso say this is nonsense.

Laredo, Tex., Boy Makes Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE M. KILGORE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, of all the celebrations on Washington's Birthday, none is more colorful and rich in tradition and international good will than the annual Washington Birthday celebration in Laredo, Tex. It brings together high officials of the sister Republics of Mexico and the United States in this picturesque south Texas city.

Traditionally, during the celebration, "Mr. South Texas" is named.

This year the honor went to Hon. Thomas C. Mann, the U.S. Ambassador to Mexico.

Ambassador Mann, a native of Laredo, is the first Texan to hold this post. He is a distinguished and able spokesman for the United States. His work in Mexico is both sensitive and vital to the success of our entire Latin American program.

When Ambassador Mann was presented with the "Mr. South Texas" Award at the Laredo celebration this year, he spoke on the doctrines of communism in the following learned speech:

THE DOCTRINES OF COMMUNISM: REMARKS MADE BY THOMAS C. MANN, AT LAREDO, TEX., ON FEBRUARY 25, 1962

Today I would like to say a few words about the theories and doctrines of communism and the historical developments which gave rise to them. More specifically, I will undertake to compare some of the principal tenets of the American Revolution with some of the principal Communist dogmas.

In the next few days, I hope to make some additional remarks about another aspect of communism: How Communists disguise their doctrines behind a curtain of words.

I

Communist doctrine has its roots in the industrial revolution which began nearly 200 years ago.

You will recall that in the darkness which descended on Europe after the fall of Rome, political and economic power was in the hands of kings and noblemen. Land, a principal source of wealth, was divided between them. The right to govern descended with the land from generation to generation.

Most of the people were serfs, bound to the land and bound to the service of its owner in peace and in war. They accepted an inferior status for themselves and for their children as an immutable law of nature.

Industry was limited and consisted of the small cottage kind managed by skilled craftsmen who organized themselves into guilds. Those who wished to learn a trade were required to apprentice themselves to a master.

This primitive pattern of society was changed, suddenly as it were, by the discovery of machines to replace hand looms in the manufacture of textiles; of ways to harness steampower in industry and transportation; of the use of coal in the manufacture of iron and steel; and electricity and the means of its use. Other advances were made in industrial engineering and in transportation and communications.

The industrial age, the age of the machine, had arrived and with it mankind had, for the first time, an opportunity to produce consumer goods for all the people. For the first time, there were prospects of raising the masses of people out of their misery and into a new world of relative abundance.

For the nobility, the arrival of the machine age meant the beginning of the end of their power and wealth.

For the peasant on the land, it meant large-scale migration to new, mushrooming factory and mining towns unprepared to receive them. It meant working for whatever wages were offered, often at below subsistence levels. It meant chronic unemployment, child labor, long working hours in inhuman working conditions. It meant miserable housing, poverty, disease and despair.

For governments, the age of the machine created an urgent need to reform systems and doctrines so as to be able to cope with new political, social and economic problems in a society suddenly grown complex. Economics was in its infancy yet new fiscal and monetary policies had to be devised. The problem of the cycle of "boom and bust" which seemed to plague all economies had to be solved if steady economic growth and stability in levels of employment were to be achieved. There was an urgent need to devise means to prevent a growing disparity in the income of the few rich and the many poor—to achieve a more equitable distribution of the national income.

For the few who had the capital to build factories and expand them, to open mines and exploit them, it meant mushrooming fortunes. For them it also meant a new political power based not on social position or ownership of land but on industry and commerce.

All of these developments set the stage for revolution. Changes in political, economic and social practices were both desirable and inevitable. The only real question was the direction they would take.

II

By 1776—before the industrial revolution had reached its full momentum—our own Revolution had already been launched. Its immediate aim was to safeguard and expand for our people the liberties which the common man had so slowly and painfully won from his masters. It therefore radically altered the old political order through the creation of constitutional and representative government all of whose powers were derived from the people.

Our political system was grounded on the simple premise that the people could not only be trusted to govern themselves but they could also be trusted to debate and decide what changes should be made so as to bring about the greatest good for the greatest number.

Thomas Jefferson, in a letter to one of his contemporaries, described this principle in these words:

"We both consider the people as our children and love them with parental affection.

But you love them as infants whom you are afraid to trust without nurses; and I as adults whom I freely leave to self-government."

Another eminent revolutionary theorist, James Wilson, expanded on this principle. He maintained that the people rather than the state were the masters. It was the people who had the right to elect their representatives and to depose them when they were unfaithful to their trust. He conceived of the state as "a complete body of free, natural persons, united together for their common benefit; as having an understanding and a will; as deliberating, resolving and acting; as possessing interests which it ought to manage; as enjoying rights which it ought to maintain; as lying under obligations which it ought to perform."

While our revolution was initially political in character, its doctrines of freedom and equality based on the dignity and inalienable rights of the individual opened the way for eliminating the economic and social injustices which came with the industrial revolution. It was based on the premise that if the people are given power they can be depended on to look after their interests. This premise has been proven sound by history. Reform did come, political reform, social reform, and economic reform. They continue unabated to this day.

But our revolution did not seek to destroy the existing social and economic system. On the contrary it recognized the value of Christian ethics in man's relationship to man and in international relations. It sought to conserve what was good in these systems and to change what was bad.

Our revolution moreover did not seek to cast the mind and spirit of man into a mold of total and absolute conformity. Rather it sought to free the mind and spirit of man so that he could continue his age-old search for a more perfect truth, so that he could continue to learn from experience, to improve, to change, to progress. This cardinal principle of our revolution was expressed by Thomas Jefferson in these words:

"I have sworn, on the altar of God, eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

III

Another kind of revolution was proposed by Karl Marx, a German philosopher who lived in Western Europe between 1818 and 1883. Marx's ideas were later interpreted and expanded by Lenin. In the comparison of the principles of our revolution with Marxist-Leninist doctrine are to be found the principal issues which today divide the free world and the Sino-Soviet bloc.

First, Marx and Lenin thought that the only reality was material. This idea needs to be better understood by us. It means they ascribed no value to the spirit or the dignity of man, that they believed man does live by bread alone. It means that no value is given to ethics, to charity.

Listen to the words of Lenin:

"When people talk to us about morality we say: For the Communist, morality consists entirely of compact united discipline and conscious mass struggle against the exploiters. We do not believe in eternal morality and we expose all fables about morality."

This thesis is in basic and fundamental conflict with our principle that human dignity is worth while and that the individual has certain inalienable rights. On this encompassing concept of the absolute importance of the material rest other concepts of Marx and Lenin to which I will now refer.

Second, Marx and Lenin differed from our principles in that they did not trust the people to govern themselves—to decide for themselves which forms would achieve the greatest good for the greatest number.

Hence, instead of democracy they proposed dictatorship. They proposed not even a dictatorship by the majority of the people but a dictatorship of the "proletariat" defined in Marxist doctrine to mean the minority who work for wages, particularly in the mines and in the factories. The small farmer, the student, the white collar worker, the intellectual, the businessman, the professional man are, in Marxist-Leninist theory, excluded from the term "proletariat." When Communist doctrine condescends to refer to the social groups at all, it refers to them collectively as the "toiling masses"; no provisions watever is made for their participation in government.

Marxist-Leninist theory recognizes two kinds of democracies. One is "bourgeois," defined as all those whose economic systems permit employers of labor to own means of production. The other is 'socialist," defined as all those patterned after the Soviet Union. In neither definition does the quality of freedom which individuals enjoy nor the degree of their participation in government decisions have any relevancy.

This is a fair summary of the theory. Now let us look for a moment at the practice.

The "proletariat"—the factory worker and the miner—are used, as theory says they should be, in the first violent and bloody stages of revolution. But once the party apparatus is firmly in power, there is no instance in all history where the proletariat has actually had any voice in government.

Also used to prepare the way for the overthrow of constitutional and parliamentary institutions and to participate in the violent stages of revolution are individuals from all social groups who, rightly aspiring to the correcting of social injustices, have been deluded into thinking that they are doing good for their people when they turn them over to the tender mercies of a Communist dictatorship.

It is difficult to believe that these people really understand that they themselves are, in Communist doctrine, marked for extinction. Communism devours its own children. But it first destroys not only the opposition but all those who are considered to be potential opposition because they might have an independent thought of their own. In Communist theory, refusal to submit to the discipline of the party, is to be guilty of deviationism, the most serious of all Communist crimes. Gratitude for help given to Communists in difficult times is, in Communist doctrine, not a virtue. In Communist theory, the only virtue, the only end, is to gain power for the party and then to hold it permanently and exclusively. The means by which this is accomplished are unimportant.

It is the Communist Party which actually rules or, more precisely, a very small group at the top of the party hierarchy and sometimes, as in the case of Stalin, only one man.

Membership in the party is, of course, by invitation only. But although party members constitute only a small fraction of the population, a Communist government is always a party government, a Communist army is always a party army, a Communist state always a party state. Party members occupy all important government positions. They are the only ones who have and exercise power. They are the new lords and nobles. They are the new ruling class.

They exercise more power than any aristocracy of the Middle Ages because they control all property, tangible and intangible, real and personal, agricultural and industrial. Since individuals under their control have no property and no possibility of producing wealth of their own, they have no resources with which to oppose tyranny. This monopoly of the means of production is an effective means of crushing all opposition—of depriving the people of what Jefferson referred to as the "right of revolution." This is the central reason why no country on which communism has fastened itself has ever even temporarily regained its freedom against the wishes of its rulers.

The Communist ruling class is more ruthless than the old aristocracy because it is without ethics and charity. Every Communist revolution has been written in the blood of its people. Every Communist regime has been built on the bones of its people.

The point which I wish to stress here is that the acceptance of Marxist-Leninist doctrine and practice inevitably and automatically means the loss of all of the rights of the individual so slowly and painfully acquired through the ages. It means a return to semifeudal tenets: All industry and all land belong to the crown; the people are bound to a particular industry or farm selected for them by their rulers. It means a return to serfdom under a new set of masters. It signifies the betrayal of the basic principles written into the constitution of every republic.

Third, Marxist doctrine differs from our revolution in that it sets up a new kind of tyranny over the mind of man. Marx wrote, and Communists still claim, that his doctrine was the only scientific explanation of history, of events past and to come. The doctrine claims there is no possibility of error in it, that it is the alpha and the omega of all truth, that it brings all reality, past, present, and future, into, one complete frame.

I suppose one should not be too surprised that one man should claim to have a monopoly on truth, that he should believe mankind has nothing more to learn from experience and meditation, that the human mind should be cast into a 19th century mold of dogmatism. But it seems incredible that any intellectual of our day and time would accept this as either noble or true.

Djilas is one of the most eminent theorists in the Yugoslav Communist movement. I do not agree with everything he has written. But he knows communism in theory and in practice and his descriptions of Communist tyranny over the mind are accurate and graphic:

"A citizen in the Communist system lives oppressed by the constant pangs of his conscience, and the fear that he has transgressed. He is always fearful that he will have to demonstrate that he is not an enemy of socialism.

"The school system and all social and intellectual activity work toward this type of behavior. From birth to death a man is surrounded by the solicitude of the ruling party, a solicitude for his consciousness and his conscience. Journalists, ideologists, paid writers, special schools, approved ruling ideas and tremendous material means are all enlisted and engaged in this 'uplifting of socialism.' In the final analysis, all newspapers are official. So are the radio and other similar media.

"These oligarchs and soul savers, these vigilant protectors who see to it that human thought does not drift into 'criminal thought' or 'antisocialist lines'; these holders of obsolete, unchangeable and immutable ideas—have retarded and frozen the intellectual impulses of their people. They have thought up the most antihuman words—'pluck from the human consciousness' and act according to these words, just as if they were dealing with roots and weeds instead of man's thoughts.

"On the one hand, the ideological discrimination in Communist systems aims at prohibiting other ideas, on the other, at imposing exclusively its own ideas. These are two most striking forms of unbelievable, total tyranny.

"History will pardon Communists for much. But the stifling of every divergent thought, the exclusive monopoly over thinking for the purpose of defending their personal interests, will nail the Communists to a cross of shame in history."

Fourth, our revolution held that a government "of the people, by the people, and for

the people" was desirable and necessary to guarantee the essential rights of the individual and to protect him from the tyrannies of classes and groups; to provide free education for the people; to pass laws and guarantee their administration with equal justice for all; to prevent man's exploitation by man; and to provide for the common good and for the national defense.

Marxist-Leninist doctrine, on the other hand, insists that since government is the tool of the bourgeois and that since the triumph of communism will signify the abolition of classes, government in a classless society will no longer be necessary and will wither away.

Few would dispute the triumph of the Communists in the Soviet Union more than 40 years ago. All of the classes that existed under the czars were ruthlessly liquidated and a new order was established, based on Marxist-Leninist doctrine, in which the Communists themselves were the sole masters. But the Soviet Government shows neither any sign of withering away or any intention of reducing the privileges and powers of its bureaucrats. Now more than ever the principal purpose of the party is to perpetuate itself in power.

Do Communist leaders today still believe in this utopian myth of the disappearance of the state? This would seem doubtful even allowing for man's capacity for self-deception. But they could never admit their disbelief not only because Marxist-Leninist doctrine is for them a secular religion but because to do so would remove the only doctrinal justification they have for their rise to power by blood and terror. So the myth remains as a hope for their people of a better life hereafter.

Fifth, American doctrine is that it is both feasible and inevitable that the social and economic injustices which existed within the society of the 18th and 19th centuries will be corrected by the people themselves operating through democratic institutions. We have nearly 200 years of history with which to judge this claim.

In the days of Marx a few families owned all of the great industries. Today literally millions of stockholders own our industry. Profits are divided so widely that our type of capitalism today has been accurately described as a "people's capitalism."

Workers for wages have organized themselves into powerful unions and confederations which have achieved what Marx could only have considered an unbelievable miracle. The voice of labor is one of the most powerful in our land. Old problems of child labor, inhuman hours of work, unfair wages, unhealthful and unsafe working environment and chronic, widespread unemployment have all been corrected.

Our farmer, like the worker, enjoys the highest standard of living in history based on land and other reforms which took place many decades ago.

Monopolies have not been tolerated since passage of the Sherman and Clayton Antitrust Acts, many years ago.

Our taxation is based on ability to pay so that it is no longer possible to acquire very large fortunes or to pass them on to succeeding generations. We have achieved, in sum, a social justice that goes hand in hand with ownership by the people of our industries and farms. And we have achieved this without sacrificing freedom.

In Marxian theory of 1850 none of this could happen. Marx wrote that "class struggle" between the proletariat and the bourgeois was inevitable. More than 100 years of history not only in our land but in many others proves that this was a bad guess. But the Communists are stuck with a doctrine they cannot abandon and so they must continue to talk, as if we still lived in the mid-19th century, of "imperialism," "exploitation," "monopolies," and "social injustice."

IV

Our principles and our faith are the product of the experience of hundreds of millions of people who through the ages have survived on many frontiers and by trial and error progressed to ever higher horizons of freedom and justice.

Our principles are the product of a long and rich cultural heritage based on the philosophy of the Greeks, the law of the Romans, the long struggle for freedom of the peoples of the West, on the revolutionary concepts of the enlightenment.

We will not abandon our principles. We will not surrender our freedom. We will instead renew our faith in our country, in its leadership, and in the inevitable triumph of freedom.

How Stands the Monroe Doctrine?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. IRVING WHALLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Des Moines Register:

HOW STANDS THE MONROE DOCTRINE?

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—"What is the present status of the Monroe Doctrine?" Reporter May Craig asked President Kennedy at his news conference week, but he gave no direct answer. The setting, the brief time at Kennedy's disposal and the delicacy of the problem presented to the United States by Marxist Cuba all counseled against a definitive reply.

But a frank discussion of the status of the Monroe Doctrine after the evolution of Cuba into a Communist state and the Pan-American Conference at Punta del Este would be useful to Americans.

Candid treatment would require recognition of the facts that the doctrine has been modified by historical developments since its promulgation in 1823 and that one of these modifications is a policy decision of the United States by which all the nations of the Western Hemisphere are asked to share in the enforcement.

This basic U.S. responsibility, as stated by President Monroe, was that no European nation would be suffered to impose its sovereignty or system of government on any of its former colonies in this hemisphere that had won independence. The doctrine excluded existing European colonies from its scope, but was positive in its declaration that henceforth the continents of the Western Hemisphere were not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by European powers.

CHANGED IN 1895

In the course of the 19th century the doctrine was enlarged to include in its restriction all nations outside this hemisphere, also an effort by any of these nations to transfer to another its existing dominion.

But, though the United States continued to assume responsibility for its enforcement until the Organization of American States was created and tendered partnership, the Venezuela boundary crisis in 1895 produced an important policy clarification by Secretary of State Olney. The doctrine, he said, did not countenance an attempt by the United States to change an established form of government anywhere in the Americas, or prevent any people from freely changing theirs.

INTERVENTION A VIOLATION?

This clarification is relied on by some international lawyers as demonstrating that intervention in Cuba by the United States would be a violation of the Monroe Doctrine as well as an act of aggression. These lawyers assume that such intervention would be based on a claim that the presence a few miles off our coast of a member state of the world Communist hegemony endangers the United States.

Events at Punta del Este suggest that other American states would support a Cuban charge that U.S. intervention was a violation of Olney's assurance.

HISTORICAL AUTHORITY

But if or when President Kennedy should, with the approval of Congress, invoke the Monroe Doctrine for military intervention in Cuba, as required for hemispheric security, and the OAS did not back it up, he would have historical authority for his action. Professor Samuel F. Bemis, of Yale, a foremost student of the Monroe Doctrine, indicated some time ago that he has no doubt that our intervention in Cuba, in the circumstances listed above, would be a legitimate employment of the doctrine, and of the Olney clarification, because the communization of Cuba was not a free will exercise of the Cuban people.

Even this inadequate summary may explain why the President didn't make a responsive answer to Mrs. Craig. His reticence was further justified by the circumstances that at Punta del Este the required two-thirds majority could not be obtained for Cuba's "expulsion" from the Pan-American system, and was obtained for Cuba's "exclusion" only after undisclosed "considerations" offered and pressures applied to little Haiti extracted her indispensable 14th vote.

National Watch Inspection Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD a resolution recognizing that March is National Watch Inspection Month.

Following is the text of the resolution submitted by the National Watchmakers Association:

Whereas the United States of America set great value of the importance of chronometery and horology and those dedicated in the study thereof; and

Whereas the American Watchmakers Institute has designated, throughout our Nation, the month of March 1962 as a time to emphasize the highly technical accomplishments achieved in its chosen field of service; and

Whereas the master watchmaker has dedicated himself to such science and renders untold benefit to his fellow citizens in the practice of such craft; and

Whereas the unique skill of the master watchmaker plays so vital a role in the highly complex field of mechanical instrumentation which is now of utmost importance to the security of our Nation and the free world: Therefore be it

Resolved, That March 1962 will be Watch Inspection Month, and we do hereby urge the people of our United States to join in congratulations to the master watchmaker and in wishes for his continued achievement in the performance of outstanding service throughout Watch Inspection Month.

Hon. Sam Rayburn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the first of a series of articles from the Atlanta Journal:

MR. SAM—PART I

(By Jesse Laventhol)

(NOTE.—Sam Rayburn will long be remembered as one of the best-beloved politicians—and among the most astute—in American history. His life story is an inspiration to young men and old, and his career in the House of Representatives is important to an understanding of the events of the last half century.)

Here is the first of eight articles on "Mr. Sam's" life—from his days on an off-the-road Texas farm to his years of great power as Speaker of the House. The author, a veteran newspaperman, is now executive assistant in the Office of Coordinator of Information for the U.S. House of Representatives, a job that brought him into frequent and close contact with "Mr. Sam."

North Texas land leaves its mark on the people who work it. In the 1880's not many had the fortitude to try to wrest a livelihood where winters were harsh and blistering summers caked the soil or brought the rain in floods.

But one who did was William Marion Rayburn, a veteran of the Confederate Army. He had gone, a volunteer at 18, to 4 years of heart-searing war with Gen. Nathan Bedford Forrest's cavalry and had witnessed the surrender of Gen. Robert E. Lee at Appomattox.

He came home to the family farm, to which he was heir—home to the Clinch River Valley of Roane County in mountainous east Tennessee—to find the place in ruins. Roving bands of guerrillas had pillaged the house and ravaged the earth. They were bushwhackers, loyal to neither North nor South, only to the loot they could gain. The main prey of their marauding forays were defenseless households of women, children, or old folks.

Former cavalryman Rayburn undertook the task of restoring the homestead to its former comfort and the soil to its once rich yield of corn crops. Under these adverse circumstances he also had the courage to get married.

The young woman he courted and wed was Martha Waller, of a neighboring farm family. Like himself, she was of Scot ancestry and both came of a rugged breed of Calvinists who, over the centuries past, had found it necessary to fight to defend their religion and their homes in the granite highlands of Scotland.

Their family flourished but their fortunes did not. Ten children were born to this union before the Rayburns gave up the losing struggle, sold the farm for what they could get, and, with an itinerant uncle, headed southwest for Texas, where, later, an 11th child was born.

William Rayburn was 47 years old when in 1887 he bought 40 acres with a small framehouse and settled with his large brood and their few possessions on a belt of black land at Flag Springs, near Windom, in Fannin County, Tex. Here the battle against poverty was renewed.

This was cotton country and corn farmer Rayburn knew little of raising cotton. Nevertheless all hands pitched in laboring from sunup to after sundown, each to his own chores. There was everything to be done in setting up a new place and getting it going. Even chunky little Sam, then but 5 years old, did his share.

But that first summer was nearly disastrous, even though the price paid for cotton had risen to 9 cents per pound. Two and a half bales of their crop yield was all the Rayburns could sell; the rest was ruined by damp weather that year. They scrimped and managed to have barely enough to eat, and so they got by.

Sam was always a little fellow. He never did grow beyond 5 feet 6. But labor on the farm hardened his muscles and developed his physique. He grew to be sturdy, stocky, and energetic. Like most country boys he went barefoot most of his early summers, learned to ride a horse bareback.

In the early years of the one-room rural school at Flag Springs he had what fun there was to be had in the isolation of this back-country community, joining his fellow pupils or playing with his brothers and sisters when there was time—which wasn't often.

Ed White, a companion of that day, born and bred in Flag Springs, recalls:

"We had about 100 boys and girls in 1 room at that time but the teacher, Mr. (Charles C.) Farley managed to keep order. He had a stack of good bois d'arc switches in the corner and he knew how to use them.

"I don't remember now whether Sam ever had to have one used on him or not, as he was a pretty well-behaved boy and always knew his lessons. We also had the bumping block. These were the heavy, wooden blocks on which the women would climb to mount their horses, and when the boys felt that another one needed a bit of punishment, four or five would catch him and bump him against the block.

"I don't know if Sam ever got bumped, but I expect he did, as just about every boy around got bumped at one time or another.

"Sam was a pretty good baseball player. I think he was an outfielder, but his older brothers, Tom and Dick, were pitchers. Sam was a hard worker and, like all the rest of us boys, didn't have too much time to play. But whenever he could he enjoyed getting out to go swimming, hunting, or to play 'stinkbase' with the rest of us."

This was a game, White explained, in which the boys chose sides. A player would "make a dare" by venturing toward the other side, and if he was caught he would be put on the "stinkbase" and have to stay there until rescued by teammates. (In the author's day—in the effete East—this game was called "prisoner's base").

"Sam was a good mixer and always ready to help a neighbor," White went on. "I recall that one day he and I put in a full day's work helping to work out the crop of a woman whose husband had died only a short time before. He did as much work as any man in the field that day."

George W. Payne, another native of Flag Spring and schoolmate, reminisced on those boyhood years:

"Sam was a pretty good hand in the field at any job his dad gave him whether it was plowing, hoeing, or harvesting. We had all 'walking equipment' then and a boy had to be pretty strong to keep up with the mules pulling the plow, and to do the other work he had to do.

"I guess that's one reason Sam could stand up under the work of politics as well as he did.

"Sam did just about everything we did and was a pretty smart boy, too. Sam was always smart. In the spelling bees he was usually the winner or one of the last to get spelled down.

"Of course we didn't study all the things they do in school today, but Sam always knew the answers to any question on any of our subjects that Mr. Farley would ask him. There were no chairs or desks in the first school we had here. We all sat on long benches, about 10 or 12 of us to the bench and there wasn't much running around during classes.

"When he had the time Sam would come out on Sundays and ride calves with us or in the winter we would go rabbit hunting when the snow was on the ground and we could track them with our dogs. In the summer we had a couple of swimming holes, called buck hole and doe hole because deer came there for water."

These were the moments of happiness snatched from a boyhood that was a routine of poverty, hardship, and, above all, loneliness.

Years later, at a little gathering in his apartment in Washington, he was stirred by guest's remark that on a tour of farm areas he had found the farmers all seemed to be well supplied with cars.

"Listen," he said, "when I was growing up back in Flag Spring the worst thing about the life was being lonely. Loneliness can kill a man. Many was the night I'd go off alone and sit on the fence, and look at the sky and stars and look up and down the road and just wish to God that somebody—some neighbor, some stranger, anybody—would come by. I'm glad farmers now have the means to get around, meet their friends, and drive to other cities. I think it's wonderful. They're not lonely any more."

This man, with boyhood memories of the sticky gumbo of the rain-churned black soil, who studied by kerosene lamplight, and watched his mother slave over an iron pot wood fire to cook and wash for her large family, took the farmers out of the mud, and made their lives easier all over America.

But that satisfaction lay a long time ahead.

Sam, perhaps because of his loneliness, threw himself into the world of books, particularly history. He devoured every volume he could find about Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Adams, and other early leaders of the Nation. And in the pages of the Memphis Commercial Appeal and the Louisville Courier-Journal, to which his father subscribed whenever he could afford them, Sam read of the postwar political personages and happenings.

His father's occasional angry denunciations of the Yankees coincided with the news of events described in these papers, which espoused the southern cause and devoted much space to national politics. Sam's curiosity on the subject was insatiable.

An event of his boyhood that fixed his ambition forever and determined the course of his life was a political rally in later life, reminiscing on the subject, he said he couldn't fix the date because "it's too far back." But the principal actor in the episode, a man who immediately became Sam's hero, was Joseph Weldon Bailey.

Records show that Bailey, Democratic leader of Gainesville and an elector on the Cleveland-Thurman ticket of 1888, was elected to Congress from the Fourth District of Texas in 1891, was reelected for three more terms and ultimately became U.S. Senator.

Sam was about 12 years old when this most distinguished political orator of the area, and candidate for reelection to Congress, was advertised to appear at the fairgrounds at Bonham, the county seat. The boy was in a dither of anticipation.

But the morning of the great event his two older brothers had gotten their father's permission to go before Sam had a chance to do so. He was stuck that day with the

chore of hauling in firewood. From the high seat of the wagon, in which he was to bring loads of cut logs from the woodlot to the house, he watched his brothers gaily gallop off to town. He saw to his chores through a blur of bitter tears.

In the course of their report at the breakfast table next morning on the excited doings in Bonham they let drop that local leaders had persuaded the great man Bailey to deliver a repeat performance that day. This time Sam didn't wait for anything. Without finishing breakfast he jumped from his chair, ran out of the house, stopped at the pump to wash his feet, saddled a pony, and rode off.

It was raining. The road was muddy and it was 11 miles to Bonham, but the boy rode on in high excitement. In the 5 years since they had moved to the Texas farm Sam had never been to the county seat.

When he arrived, he saw the townsfolk and visitors arrayed in their best storebought clothes. Without shoes and in rainbedraggled shirt and pants—somewhat mudspattered, too, since he had whipped the horse to arrive on time—the lad was too mortified to go in through the main entrance to the Tabernacle, as the place was called. It was a floor with a roof, usually open for the evangelistic revival meetings held there.

Because of the rain this day its sides were enclosed by canvas, like a circus tent. Sam found an open flap and slipped in unnoticed. All attention was centered upon the striking figure in handsome clothes and black flowing tie. Bailey orated for 2 solid hours while the boy stood entranced by the flow of eloquence, "with rain running down my neck from the edge of the roof," Mr. Sam related later.

When it was all over, he hurried around front to see the Congressman emerge, surrounded by admirers escorting him five or six blocks to the streetcar line—with little Sam running behind, in vain hope of greeting his idol.

As he rode home, still entranced, the boy wondered if he would ever be as big a man as Joe Bailey, and then and there he vowed that one day he would be not only a Member of the House of Representatives, but its Speaker.

Incidentally, Bailey was reelected that year (1893) to his second term. And by strange coincidence his career in Washington ended, by his resignation from the Senate January 3, 1913, the same year that Sam Rayburn's began there, on March 4.

Don't Burden the Innocent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of February 27, 1962:

DON'T BURDEN THE INNOCENT

Despite the best efforts of law enforcement officers, every city has criminals walking its streets. One sure remedy would be simply to clap the whole population in jail. Fortunately for criminals and noncriminals alike, this is generally rejected as unenlightened.

The same indiscriminate approach, however, characterizes the administration's dividend-and-interest-withholding plan now before the House Ways and Means Committee. Its perfectly laudable aim is to collect the estimated $600 million annually of taxes on such income currently going unreported. But the means would penalize the honest taxpayer in order to catch the dishonest or the merely neglectful, while placing a heavy accounting burden on many banks and corporations.

The administration wants a flat 20 percent of such income withheld, to be paid over to the Treasury without requirement of individual withholding statements. The burden of computing the tax withheld would fall on the individual taxpayer (unless voluntarily assumed by the bank or corporation), who then would have to file for a refund if due.

For millions of taxpayers this would be a payment in excess of the tax actually owed. It would hit especially hard at those with incomes too low to be taxed at all, or at more than a nominal rate.

Tax-exempt institutions would be deprived of the use of large sums of money while waiting for their refunds. Instead of losing money to which it is entitled, the Treasury would probably end up keeping a lot to which it is not entitled—particularly from small individual taxpayers who, either through ignorance or through baffiement at the redtape involved, would never claim their refunds at all.

In enforcing tax laws as in enforcing any other, protecting the innocent is as important as catching the guilty. And this includes saving the vast majority, who do report income honestly, from unnecessary rigmarole, redtape, and overpayment.

Yes; It Can Be Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Muncie Star of March 5, 1962:

YES; IT CAN BE CUT

A Washington news story a few days ago said Members of Congress were finding that their mail reflects little interest up to now in the Federal budget for the next fiscal year. This is remarkable in view of the fact that the budget proposed by President Kennedy is the biggest since the peak spending years of World War II, and not much below those. Has the Government's insatiable appetite for annual rise in the budget caused people to give up battling against these constant increases? Perhaps it looks hopeless when the defenders of the budget ask, "But where would you cut?" as if that were an unanswerable question.

The question is not unanswerable to a committee of the Council of State Chambers of Commerce. Going over the budget, it came up with specific recommendations for trimming $6,381 million from the proposed appropriations, and $4,570 million from the year's proposed expenditures.

A Federal year's appropriations and actual expenditures are not the same, because the budget is not made on cash basis. Some of the money actually to be spent next year was appropriated in this or prior years. Some of the funds to be appropriated in the coming year will not be spent until following years. This fact is one of the centers of controversy about the budget. It makes budget interpretation more complicated and budget control more difficult, through reducing the opportunities for immediate effective cuts.

The council's tax committee recognized this fact, and the trimming it recommends is aimed even more toward reducing future spending than toward cuts in the year just ahead. If the Federal budget is ever going to be controlled this is the way it will have to be done—by curtailing the future pattern as well as current spending.

Would the cuts proposed by this committee mean a drastic retrenchment of Government? Not at all. A substantial part of the reductions would be achieved simply be refraining from eight of the new spending projects the President has proposed. None of them would be greatly missed. For, as the the committee pointed out, the need for them has not been established beyond reasonable doubt, and in any case to the extent that the objectives are desirable they can in almost all case be met by private or State and local means.

Another substantial reduction would be achieved by relatively small curtailments in existing welfare, subsidy and public works programs, in some cases just by holding these at current levels instead of expanding them. Nearly another billion would be added by terminating the rural electrification loan program, which has long since achieved its stated objectives, and simply putting four other loan programs on a self-sustaining basis by limiting new loans to current repayment receipts.

Finally, important savings could be realized by beginning the termination of foreign aid and by curtailing proposed expansion of civilian employment.

These proposals are really quite moderate. But they constitute a concrete answer to the challenge, "Tell us where you would cut." There are places to cut, and Congress will find them if the people at home demand it.

The American Negro's Key Role in Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, there are many of us in and out of Government who are, by observation and experience, deeply aware of the fact that the American Negro has and stands willing to make his own unique and vital contribution to the progress of world freedom in the area of United States-African relations. In this regard, I would like to call to the attention of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD readership the following New York Times magazine article authored by Joseph C. Kennedy, a social psychologist and staff member of the African Research Foundation and the Human Ecology Fund. In presenting the article, however, I certainly would emphasize that it would be a grievous mistake for any person to think that the significant contribution the American Negro can make and is making in international affairs is in anywise limited to Africa. I am sure that every thoughtful person in the world today realizes that three-fourths of the entire world is populated by nonwhite peoples; that the other one-fourth, with rare exception, is well mixed; and that this

world, all over, is viewing with critical eye and weighing with consequential judgment the practical execution by vying systems of government of their espousals of the equality and acceptance of man on his merit as man.

The article follows:

THE AMERICAN NEGRO'S KEY ROLE IN AFRICA

(By Joseph C. Kennedy)

(NOTE.—Joseph C. Kennedy recently spent a year in West Africa on a grant from the African Research Foundation and the Human Ecology Fund. He is a social psychologist and a member of the staff of the latter organization.)

One of the first questions asked of an American Negro returning from Africa these days is: "As a Negro, how were you treated by the Africans?" Should the American Negro going to Africa for the first time expect to be treated better—or worse—than any other group going there? Is there some special relationship between the African and the nearly 19 million Americans of African descent?

Recently I spent a year in West Africa—in Ghana, Nigeria and Liberia—traveling more than 30,000 miles into large cities with recently constructed modern buildings, and into tiny villages which could be reached only after walking miles through thick forest. I talked to hundreds of literate and illiterate Africans. I went into schools and colleges and talked to students.

From my experiences I am convinced that a very special relationship exists between the African and the American Negro, that there is a skin-color affinity which creates an unusual bond of warmth and draws the two together.

This is not to say that this bond is immediately apparent, that the African immediately reaches out to embrace the American Negro. Indeed, the first reaction on the part of the American Negro to being in Africa is one of mixed and confused feelings—so much so that the Negro who spend only a short time in Africa is bound to return home just as uncertain of his relationship with Africa as when he went.

Any American Negro going to Africa for the first time must arrive with an uncertain image of Africa and of what to expect. In America he has long heard Africa described as the Dark Continent—a land of tribal dances and mud huts and filled with primitive, black people. In America, he has known black skin to be associated with inferiority, and he has been penalized for his own dark skin color. Adding to this uncertainty, he has heard and read of Negroes who have gone to Africa with great expectations of warmth and brotherhood, but who have met instead with frustrations and disappointments.

At the national airport in Accra, Ghana, this image of the Dark Continent is immediately disturbed. The airport is a mixture of African and Western cultures: Ghana Airways' Bristol Britannias and Russian Ilyushins with their neatly uniformed African air hostesses; women dressed in brightly colored cloth with small trays on their heads and children on their backs; African men in either European dress or kente cloth; magazines from various parts of the world.

And there are many other contrasts. While there are the small, nearly impassable dirt roads, and houses with thatched roofs and mud-brick walls, while at night the drumming from a nearby village can be heard in Accra, there are at the same time, in the heart of the city, modern office buildings and a supermarket where nearly anything can be purchased—from a suit of European clothing and Elvis Presley records to Maxwell House instant coffee and frozen foods. There are a modern museum, hundreds of hornblowing taxicabs, 4-lane streets with white-gloved African policemen, and a smart 100-room hotel where tea is served in the afternoon and an orchestra plays for dinner.

Although the preconception of Africa is affected immediately, the expression of the bond between the African and the American Negro may not come so quickly. I had been in Ghana for several weeks before I had my first encounter with any special relationship. I had been preparing a questionnaire which I would use in my research and had gone to a small village about 30 miles out of Accra for pretesting. I was accompanied by a Ghanaian interpreter, my wife, and 6-year-old son.

As I was talking to an elderly African woman, she held out her hand to my son, took him on her lap and smiled as she whispered, "My grandson." Here was an old African woman we had never seen before, who had never been out of Africa, but who spoke of kinship with a 6-year-old American boy.

Shortly after this encounter, another incident took place which was both puzzling and confusing. Driving with my interpreter along a narrow dusty road which cut through dried, sunburnt fields, past village after village, frequently we would see small clusters of children walking along the road to the village school. Sometimes there would be long, straggling lines of women and children returning from the river with gourds of water on their heads, or there would be people moving about in the village. As we passed along the way, the children would wave and smile, and call out "Hi, father" or "Hi, oburoni."

When I asked the interpreter what this meant, he laughed and said, "Well, oburoni is Twi (one of many Ghanaian languages) for 'white man,' and I guess they are calling you 'father' because the only oburoni they have seen has been a Catholic priest."

I learned later that the word oburoni has gone through interesting mutations to acquire its present meaning. Originally and literally it meant "people from the corn land" or "those who brought the corn." Of course, the people who introduced corn to Africa were European or American missionaries and they were white. So, today, oburoni means both "European"—or non-African—and "white."

As I moved around the country I realized that the people who perceived me as "white" were the uneducated people and children. Also, that "white man" or "European" often was used to describe people who wore European or "different" dress, who had a certain kind of job, and so on. Thus, a very dark-skinned American Negro could be called "white man" because he did not speak an African language.

However, this "white man" description actually has greater dimension than simply dress, job, language, and so on. At the completion of each interview with an illiterate person, through my interpreter I would say, "Now, tell me, what kind of person am I?" Usually the answer would be, "You are a white man," or "European," or sometimes, "You are a red man"—a skin-color description sometimes used in place of "white."

On one occasion though, I had been talking to a Ghanaian man about 50 years old who happened to have skin color identical with mine. This man spoke halting English. I had asked him, "What kind of person am I?" He had said he didn't know. Then I said, "Well, do I come from Ghana, am I Ghanaian?" His reply was, "No, you are not Ghanaian." "Why not?" I asked. "Because we Ghanaians are black." Placing my bare arm beside his I said, "But what color am I?" "You," he said, "are white."

While contributing to a puzzling problem, perhaps this uneducated Ghanaian man, through his skin-color confusion, had a lesson to teach which all America could learn—if black can become white and white become black, depending upon the situation, how valid is a social system which places merit in the color of a man's skin?

While many illiterates had this perception of "white man," often there were mixed perceptions. In one especially beautiful village, which stood along a lagoon among coconut trees and sand, I had been taken to meet the chief before interviewing. After the chief and elders had been seated, and some of the young men had entered the house, the chief sent for the person to be interviewed, "the first educated man in this village," a man of about 45.

As the educated man began to answer questions, a few women entered and sat, and others peered through the windows. Children looked in from the door. Only the educated man and some of the young men spoke English. Occasionally the educated man would laugh and say, "That's a hard one." The interpreter would translate for the audience and they would laugh.

For 40 minutes they all sat, listening but not understanding a single question or word. Finally, on completion of the interview, I asked the teacher who was acting as interpreter to ask the elders what kind of person I was.

As he went around, they all replied, "You are white," until he came to the chief. The chief replied, "From America, you come from America, because of your hair. You are a black man. You are one of us." The elders, the women, and the children in the door smiled. Here was another seeming contradiction. But actually the chief appeared to use the word "American" only to mean American Negro (identified by curly hair as well as skin color); if he had been dealing with an American white he probably would have said oburoni or "European."

Later, outside under the shade of the coconut trees, men and women walked over to gaze at me from time to time, then exchange a few words among themselves. When I looked at them, they would move behind the trees. About 12 children stood around looking and smiling. I was told the people and children had never seen a European before. The chief came out and gave me a pan filled with coconuts and two bottles of warm beer. Finally, when the interviews were finished and I was leaving, all of the young educated men asked for my address and requested that I write to them.

The association between being black (or American Negro) and "one of us" was the predominate association among the educated population, whether in the schools or in the villages. It was here at this educated level that a pronounced skin-color affinity was found, that the bond of warmth was most evident. So many times in so many places, Africans would say to me: "You are Negro, aren't you?" or "Why has it taken you so long to come back?" or "Why don't more American Negroes come here to help us, to teach us?"—and "Welcome, brother."

Social scientists have often said it is impossible to go "cold" into a vollage and gather information, that a period of time must transpire in which rapport is established. Yet the success of my work depended on the ability to arrive at a village early in the morning, establish contact, interview people and leave late in the evening.

In Ghana, Nigeria, Liberia—wherever I I went—I met with cooperation and warmth. During the day, and at the end of the day, I was always offered food, and at night a place to sleep. After hours of talking to people, they would shower me with gifts of bananas, pineapples, kola nuts, live chickens. Wherever I went, I entered the village an unannounced stranger but left as a friend.

This acceptance in the village was possible because, on entering a village, I first made contact with an educated person—the headmaster of the school, a teacher, a local council member and so on. These persons recog-

nized me either as an American Negro, or at least as a nonwhite, and accepted me. One of these persons then took me to the chief who accepted me, and then the people would accept me, too. Without this initial acceptance from the educated person, I undoubtedly could not have so readily gained entree in the villages.

Within the secondary schools this bond of warmth was quite evident. On numerous occasions, after interviewing, I would address the student body. Often the headmaster would introduce me by saying, "He is an American Negro; do you know what that means?" The students would reply, "His parents came from Africa; he is one of us."

In the universities or technical colleges or teacher-training colleges, invariably the students would ask about segregation in the United States—how could it exist, how bad was it, what was being done about it? Often they would say: "We believe you because you are Negro" or "You have given us honest answers" or "This is the first time we have been able to ask a Negro about this." Just as invariably, these students would ask about African-American Negro relationships, saying, "Will more Negroes come back to Africa?" "Why don't they come here to work with us?"

Many Americans have said that these demonstrations of African-American Negro ties among the educated are political, that it is politically expedient to profess such a relationship, that if there is preachment of pan-Africanism, there certainly should be this kind of verbal service to the concept. Yet, many of the people I met were not politicians. They were schoolteachers, or farmers, of kente cloth weavers, or fishermen, or clerks, or taxi drivers—just people who seemed truly moved and happy at seeing their brothers from America.

Once, while visiting the University of Nigeria at Nsukka, I was returning from a village with three professors from the university—one American Negro and two American whites. As we stood on the manually operated ferry boat which was large enough to carry just one car across the stream, two young Nigerians came over to me.

They began to talk, "You are Negro, aren't you? He is, too, isn't he?"—pointing to the other American Negro. "We can talk freely with you, but can't with those other Americans." "What other Americans do you mean?" I asked. "Those white Americans," was the reply.

Later, one of these boys—they were students in a teacher-training college—wrote to me. "On that day you met us on the river bank," he said, "you know that we did not hesitate in coming to meet you, for we immediately knew that this must be one of our brothers from the United States."

Other people whom I met at social affairs, or gave rides to along the road, or passed on the street, often asked for my address and wrote to me. A Ghanaian said in a letter: "I was even considering that you might have been a distant relative of mine." And a Nigerian wrote: "We did [studied] a lot about our African brothers in the United States. How they were treated in olden days and all other stories about them. But now we learnt some of them are high Government officials and lecturers in the universities. In fact, people in Africa admire the great progress that our African brothers are making in the United States. I hope that you people will create such tendency in us * * *."

Again from Ghana: "We wish that the Negroes all come back to Africa. Will it be possible?" From Nigeria: "I will visit you * * * I want to have an American friend through you, preferably a Negro * * *. I hope we will be good friends." And from Togoland: "I pray God that everywhere you will go, you may be successful by the grace of God. Now I want you to know well that we are brothers."

Whether written or spoken, whether in the home, over an African dinner or on the road, whether in the movies where the audience gave a tremendous cheer every time a giant like American Negro William Marshall appeared in an old American film or while watching an old TV rerun of "Harlem Review," whether in the village or in the college, whether in the words of an American Negro in Africa who says, "This isn't new, this reminds me of Harlem" or of an African who says, "When I was in the United States and went into Harlem it reminded me of home," or whether in response to a direct question, "Should the American Negro be treated more like a brother by the African than the white man is treated like a brother" (and 7 out of 10 say "Yes")—wherever it is, this expression of a very special relationship between the African and the American Negro is real.

That this relationship is found predominantly among educated Africans, and to a lesser degree among the illiterates, is as it should be, for it indicates that this relationship, as with all relationships among people, is learned—born out of the knowledge of the common suffering of all black men who originated in Africa. It is this knowledge which creates the skin-color affinity and bond of warmth that draws the African and the American Negro together.

That this skin-color affinity exists should not be confused with reverse racism. It is not, for the white visitor is treated well in Africa also. Nor should it be thought that a special relationship based on skin-color identity is a desirable and final one. Someday the color of a man's skin will not matter.

Because this affinity exists, however, the American Negro has a particular role in Africa, a role which only he can fill for all America and which America cannot afford to deny him. Sensitive, honest, understanding relationships are essential to building good will between America and emerging Africa, and in this America's greatest asset is the American Negro.

One result of the skin-color identity is that the American Negro and the African can move together in an easy, relaxed way. Every American Negro, regardless of his own skin color, has long associated with dark-skinned peoples and can be at ease with other black men, while many white Americans, no matter how unprejudiced, can never be at ease with Negroes—can never relax and forget that they are whites and blacks together.

When any two people first come together, there is a subtle but sure awareness of uneasiness, of being uncomfortable, whether in sharing a dinner or a conversation. But where there is lack of tension, there can be acceptance and brotherhood. That is why the American Negro and the African can say, "Welcome, brother" and be sincere. That is why perhaps, as several Africans and American Negroes have remarked, "Slavery was evil, but now maybe good will come out of it. Now maybe American Negroes who have become highly educated and developed will come back and help lift their brothers."

This is the role the American Negro can take in Africa. Perhaps, too, this was meant to be his destiny.

A Salute to the FFA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from Daniel Morris, a high school student of vocational agriculture in the town of Scituate, in my home State of Rhode Island. Dan is secretary of his local high school FFA chapter and in this capacity reminded me of National Future Farmers of America Week. He stated the 380,000 FFA members located in the 50 States, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands were commemorating the 34th anniversary of their organization and invited me to join the 45 FFA members in his school in celebrating this national event. This I was pleased and privileged to do. Furthermore, I wish to have entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this statement as a reminder to all of us of the importance of vocational education and the Future Farmers of America organization to our country. Back in 1917 the Congress of the United States passed the Smith-Hughes Act which provided initial funds to establish vocational education including vocational agriculture courses in our public secondary schools. Since then we have expressed our interest and confidence in this type of instruction by the passage of other bills including the George-Barden Act, which authorizes the appropriation of additional funds for the further development of this type of education and youth organizations.

In 1950, a Federal charter was voted by Congress—Public Law 740, 81st Congress—to incorporate the Future Farmers of America. I have a very personal interest in the welfare of the FFA and take great pride in its achievements. This farm youth organization has as one of its specific purposes, the development of character, training for useful citizenship, and fostering patriotism. These and other purposes of this organization make it the kind of organization that merits our full support.

Agriculture is the Nation's largest and most basic industry, employing approximately one-third of the working population. Many of these members and former members are actually farming and others are engaged in part-time farming or occupations closely related to agriculture. These closely related occupations are in agricultural business, agricultural industry, agricultural services, and agricultural professions.

This country needs thousands of new farmers every year to replace those who retire, or otherwise leave the occupation. Abundant agricultural production is the backbone of America's national strength. As our population increases, more people will be dependent upon fewer farmers for the production of nutritious food and other agriculture products needed to keep our people healthy and comfortable. The future farmers of today will be the farmers of tomorrow.

Agriculture in our Nation has progressed from the one-horse plow to a modern business operation. Well-trained farm boys who have studied vocational agriculture have contributed to this improvement. Many of these former FFA members have become our Nation's outstanding farmers and agricultural leaders.

Membership in the FFA is made up of youth who are students of vocational agriculture in approximately 9,000 high

schools. Members of FFA believe in the future of farming.

The motto of the FFA is: "Learning to do; doing to learn; earning to live; living to serve."

The FFA practice of "learning to do by doing" not only is applied in the area of production and management but also by them in teaching the principles of democracy. The FFA is a truly democratic organization. They establish their own annual program of activities and learn to abide by the decision of the majority. These and similar democratic principles are demonstrated in meetings of the 9,000 FFA chapters.

I am sure each of you also has many youths like Daniel Morris in your respective States. Therefore, I hope you will honor them by joining me at this time in saluting the FFA on the 34th anniversary of this outstanding youth organization.

U.S. Strength Lies in Standing on Principles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the strength of our Nation has been built upon our adherence to principle. From the very beginning of our national life, we set forth those great truths for which we stood and whenever these truths were challenged we stood ready to defend them with whatever means necessary. It never occurred to our forefathers to worry about world opinion. Every generation of Americans have had to stand and be counted for what is right or wrong and we have always chosen the right, until very recently when be began to base our foreign policy on expediency with the result that we have lost prestige and our position of world leadership has been seriously threatened. In the interest of our own future freedom and the freedom of all mankind, I plead with the administration on behalf of the American people: Let us return to principle. In this connection I would like to include with these remarks the following editorial from the Dallas Times Herald:

PRINCIPLES, NOT WORLD OPINION, SHOULD GUIDE FOREIGN POLICY

Foreign policy of the United States should be based upon a conviction of what is right and not of what is expedient.

It should be shaped by principles, not world opinion—or what someone says is world opinion. That is an uncertain matter at best and subject to change by the propaganda efforts of our enemies.

This means we are going to have to build our own foreign policy and not be swayed by the actions or words of politicians in other countries, who obviously would like to reshape our policy to suit themselves.

We are going to need more firmness in foreign policy, as urged earlier this week by Senator JOHN TOWER, who placed more reliance upon principles and less on what neutralist leaders think about us.

In many instances this may require a toughness that has been lacking at times.

Fortunately there have been signs of a toughening of foreign policy in some areas. One of these is the decision to remain in Berlin despite the Communists' ultimatum to get out or be forced out before the end of 1961. At the same time, though, we allowed the Reds to build the Berlin wall while we wondered what effect our tearing it down would have on world opinion or on Soviet policy.

Another spot where there has been a toughening of foreign policy has been in South Vietnam, where we are building up military strength for any showndown the Reds may force. This is in sharp contrast with the lack of decisive policy we have had in Laos. It is also in sharp contrast with the lack of decisive policy we displayed in the Cuban invasion fiasco, which failed—and also became a U.S. defeat in world opinion—because we were concerned over how world opinion would regard our providing sufficient air cover to insure success.

We do need a firm foreign policy.

It must be an American foreign policy—not one put together by world opinion. And it must be based upon principles and not upon what is expedient.

Air Pollution: An Important and Continuing Health Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the serious national and international health problems is that of air pollution. Much has been accomplished in this field in recent years, but much more remains to be done. One of the significant articles on this subject appears in the March 1962 issue of Today's Health, published by the American Medical Association.

I was impressed with one result of an intensive study which has been conducted since 1948 following a disaster in Donora, Pa.

Five thousand nine hundred and ten residents were made ill but did not die. However, one significant result is noteworthy. Those people subsequently had more sickness and a higher death rate than their neighbors not affected by the air impurity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the thoughtful article, "Our Unclean Air," by Jack Kaplan.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR UNCLEAN AIR

(By Jack Kaplan)

Some came without support, feeling their way to benches and chairs in the emergency room. Some came leaning heavily on the arms of friends or relatives. Some came on stretchers. But all of the 120 patients who sought help in the emergency ward of New Orleans' Charity Hospital one November morning in 1960, like the 200 or so patients in a single 24-hour period the week before, were coughing, gasping for breath, wheezing, choking, and expectorating.

At least five times as many as those treated at Charity Hospital in this "asthma epidemic" turned to private physicians for relief. That added up to a conservative estimate of some 1,500 people affected—surely health disaster proportions. Small wonder, then, that Tulane University scientists and public health officials went all out to get at the cause of the outbreak of asthma—a disorder of the upper respiratory system frequently triggered by allergic irritations.

To some scientists, the whole thing was a puzzle. Not so to the men of the Public Health Service Air Pollution Medical Branch. Soon, they came up with a diagnosis: Air pollution was responsible—air pollution from industrial installations studding the New Orleans waterfront.

Although the PHS has not succeeded in identifying all the specific pollutants responsible for asthma plagues, it has succeeded in forecasting the atmospheric conditions which bring them about. The PHS found, for example, that often when the wind begins to travel from the southern industrial part of New Orleans, an outbreak can be expected. This knowledge allows hospitals to prepare for adequately handling swollen caseloads resulting from the asthma epidemics. Of even greater importance was the fact that the PHS made so strong a case against air pollution that Mayor de Lesseps S. Morrison announced that the city was preparing effective legislation against air pollution.

More than 10,000 other communities across the land are affected by air pollution—the mixture of dirt and chemicals in the air spewed forth from incinerators, our factories, our asphalt and tar roads, our automobile exhausts, and many other sources. Whether it takes the form of Los Angeles' smog (smoke-fog), New York's smaze (smoke-haze), or El Paso's smust (smoke-dust), this aerial garbage is becoming more and more widespread. So serious is the menace of growing air pollution that authorities are saying that the situation is critical—that America will have to step up its air pollution control program in order to save the health—if not the lives—of its citizens.

Recently the World Health Organization, pointing to the fact that yesterday's thick fogs have now become choking acrid smogs as the result of our rapidly zooming pace of industrialization, sparked a global drive against air pollution by pinpointing the fact that "it has taken a series of fatal smog disasters in recent years" to jolt us out of our complacency about aerial filth.

Let's focus for a moment on these disasters: Look, first, at Meuse Valley in Belgium in the first week of December 1930. Did not 60 people die there and many thousands become ill as a result of an air pollution catastrophe? How about our own Donora, Pa., in 1948, where 5,910 people were made ill and 20 people died as a result of an acute air pollution episode?

Aside from any other effect of air pollution, it hits all of us in the pocketbook. President Kennedy said in a recent message that air pollution "causes an estimated $7½ billion annually in damage to vegetation, livestock, metals, and other materials."

It is not difficult to back up that forthright statement. Take, for instance, the damage to crops: $3 million damage has been reported every year since 1953 in the Los Angeles area alone. Again, 1 area in the State of Washington supported more than 2,000 dairy cows prior to the establishment of an industrial plant. Result of the air pollution from the plant on vegetation? Only 100 cows can be raised in the area.

Do not think that California, which has figured so much in the news because of its vigorous fight against air pollution, is the

only State with damage to crops. Air pollution has caused farm produce damage in many other States, including Florida, Idaho, Montana, New Jersey, Oregon, Tennessee, Utah, and Washington.

So the economic costs of air pollution mount up: You and I pay more than we realize for laundry and cleaning bills; for new pairs of nylon stockings ruined by air pollutants; for new rubber tires that become cracked by smog; for the cost of automobile accidents caused by the poor visibility of smog-infested air; and for medical bills because of respiratory ailments; and in some cases, for depressed property values.

It goes without saying that industry has its share of the air pollution burden. For example, a recent announcement has it that private industry will up its contribution for research on air pollution from $4 million last year to $6 million in the current year.

Pittsburgh and St. Louis showed they could clean up polluted air by controlling the burning of solid fuels.

With the chemical revolution we now have what is termed by the experts "invisible air pollution." That is to say, chemical gases, fumes, and other invisible pollutants like carbon monoxide have become a form of airborne poison consisting of a number of dangerous chemicals commonly found in the air over many communities. In some cases even air which appears clear and clean may be seriously polluted. And public health physicians are seriously concerned about another characteristic of invisible contaminants—the fact that two or more of these invisible chemicals, while relatively harmless in themselves, may join in the air to produce a new chemical pollutant injurious to human health.

Another myth of the contemporary air pollution picture is that the action of the wind prevents airborne poisons from concentrating harmfully over our cities. True, commonsense would seem to dictate that aerial garbage ordinarily would be gone with the wind. But many of our cities are so located—that is, they are set deep in a basin or ringed by mountains like Los Angeles—that they have the makings of a built-in ventilation problem. That means aerial poisons stick around.

Then, again, a further complication is known as a temperature inversion—a meteorological phenomenon in which the lower air is unable to rise because the higher, hotter air has failed to cool off and move away.

Perhaps our most widespread erroneous notion is that air pollution stems wholly from industrial and commercial sources. The fact is that individuals like you and me—that is, homeowners and autoists—produce about one-half of air pollution.

In Los Angeles, for example, it has been shown that the petroleum industry discharged only 305 tons of gasoline vapors into the air daily—but the discharge from auto vehicles amounted to over 1,000 tons. Another example from Los Angeles: Backyard incinerators were fingered by authorities as producing more than 65 percent of the air pollutants before they were banned by law. Then—to cite another case—there is the recently completed survey of the Elmira area in New York which indicated that only 40 percent of the contaminants discharged into the atmosphere came from industrial sources.

Although, as we have seen, it isn't fair—or accurate—to place all the blame on industry, it certainly—as in the case of the New Orleans asthma epidemic—must come in for its share. For good reason. The burning of fuel oil and coal for power figures considerably as a source of aerial filth just as some of industry's advances, technologically speaking, send a mixture of poisons into the air.

It wasn't a freakish accident that a recent poll by Consumer's Union unearthed the consensus that 12 regions—Los Angeles, New York, Philadelphia, Cincinnati, St. Louis, Chicago, the Kanawha Valley of West Virginia, the Niagara area, Pennsylvania's Allegheny County, Detroit, Birmingham, Ala., and the Ohio River Valley—are the worst contaminated areas in the land. Obviously, these regions include some of the most highly industrialized centers in the country. And the startling fact is that only the first four of these have relatively worthwhile control programs.

Of course, industry puts a number of impurities in the air whose sources are varied numerically and geographically. Cleveland, Buffalo, and Youngstown were in the news lately, reporting difficulties with air pollution problems stemming from steel mill production. The stretch on the Texas gulf coast around Houston and the area hugging the Mississippi from New Orleans to Baton Rouge are beset with petrochemical fumes. The Lehigh Valley in Pennsylvania is plagued with cement dust. In Polk City, Fla., phosphate mining distributes fluoride as a pollutant. Uranium mining dirties the sky of Colorado and Utah. In parts of the South, wastes from cotton gins pollute the atmosphere.

The question of control brings up the problem of auto exhausts which Los Angeles has discovered to be the No. 1 contributor to its well-known smog. We hear a great deal about automobile exhausts these days. We hear, for instance, that each day our 70 million auto vehicles in the country put over a trillion cubic feet of exhaust into the air. We learn, again, that General Motors is sponsoring a research project at the Sloan-Kettering Institute to study the relationship of auto fumes to cancer.

We read that the Federal Government is sponsoring a 2-year research project on the effect of vehicular exhaust on the Nation. Finally, we read that PHS spokesmen have gone to bat and asked Congress for action to control the auto exhaust problem.

How come all this current agitation?

Well, experts have found that products of partial combustion of gasoline and, to some lesser degree, evaporation from vents—the crankcase, carburetor, and fuel tank—are responsible for one of our major headaches in atmospheric pollution. Of the nearly 150 chemicals found in car exhausts, most are harmless. But there are a number of real troublemakers, pollutionwise, among them—particularly the hydrocarbons which are fractions of gasoline unburned or partially unburned because of the incomplete combustion of the fuel in the engine cylinders. Research of scientists like Prof. A. J. Haagen-Smit at the California Institute of Technology has shown that, when the sun shines on these gasoline derivatives of auto exhaust, it activates them through a series of photochemical reactions to form the airborne irritants in smog like ozone, a dangerous gas.

If this is the background of why experts are so preoccupied with the auto exhaust problem, their concern focuses mainly now on the fact that they have no power, legally speaking, to control the vast outpouring of auto exhaust pollutants.

Air Pollution Commissioner Benline, of New York City, put it this way:

"Air pollution experts operate on the philosophy that, since it is impossible to get rid of our pollutants once they have entered the atmosphere, we must control them at the sources of emission. In the last decade or so, the alliance of science and enforcement has given authorities legislation that makes it possible for them to move to control all sources of air pollution.

"But the trouble with the auto exhaust problem is that we have no legislative teeth to enforce its control. Sure, California has made a good beginning with its law requiring cars from this year forward to have antismog devices. But that's not enough. We need action on a Federal level backed up by State legislation requiring blowby (blowby fumes are those that seep into the crankcase from the engine, escaping into the air) devices to be on all new cars sold in New York. We have tested several blowby devices and found that they do improve the control of crankcase fumes."

Commissioner Benline was careful to point out, as other experts have, that blowby devices—which prevent pollutants escaping from the front end of the car—can only control "up to 30 percent of the total pollution from a vehicle." The final answer, then, is the use of an exhaust control device for the tail end of the car in conjunction with blowby devices. So far two types of devices have presented themselves as leading candidates to do the job—both using the principle that the only way to eliminate gasoline vapors from auto exhaust is to burn them out. One is the catalytic afterburner—a muffler-like gadget which mixes air with exhaust and feeds it through a bed of catalytic chemicals that convert hydrocarbons to harmless oxygen and water. The other is the direct-flame afterburner—a device in which gasoline hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide are burned to carbon dioxide and water by an open flame rather than a catalyst. Although some 25 companies are reported working on the afterburners—which are supposed to be capable of burning 90 percent of the exhaust gases—no acceptable device has as yet been put into mass manufacture.

Today medicine is exploring an important new research frontier with great meaning for the lifespan of all of us.

Heavy pollution of the air is strongly associated with ill effects on health over a long period.

Atlantic City: Baghdad on the Sea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, Asecon Island, N.J., is one of the most frequented resort areas in the United States, for on this tiny 1-mile island is located Atlantic City. While Atlantic City is known as a resort town it is constantly building a greater reservoir of permanent dwellers. In addition, the city has an interesting and picturesque history, which Lora Kelly has captured perfectly in her article in the Senior Citizen of December 1961, entitled "Atlantic City, N.J.: Baghdad on the Sea."

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that her article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATLANTIC CITY, N.J.: BAGHDAD ON THE SEA

(By Lora Kelly)

How would you like to spend a holiday vacation on Absecon Island? Never heard of the place? It is unlikely that many of the 16 million visitors who go there annually

ever heard of it either, before they arrived, and maybe not even then.

But once you mention Atlantic City you strike a familiar note. Instantly it is recognized as a famous playground tops in popularity for a hundred years. It happens to be located on Absecon Island off the Jersey coast, a tight little isle 10 miles long, 1 mile wide with an Indian name meaning place of the swans.

The first permanent settler was Jeremiah Leeds in 1788. Doubtless he was looked upon by his friends as being slightly "teched in the head" when he decided to build a cottage on the low sandy wasteland. Covered with briars and dotted with frogponds, it nevertheless in his day became the scene of occasional beach parties from the mainland, with only his cottage and a few shanties for shelter. The land was originally owned by Thomas Budd, an Englishman who came to America in 1678. It was a tiny segment of a royal grant held by the Steelman family, early settlers in New Jersey. Budd acquired the property in settlement of a claim against the Steelmans and the west Jersey proprietors who were successors to the King. Since beach lands were then valued at 4 cents an acre, this was a real estate operation rivalling Peter Minuit's deal with the Indians in Manhattan.

Aside from roving redskins and a few hardy adventurers the island was practically deserted until around 1800. At the time of the Revolution there were only three families settled there to make a livelihood by fishing and hunting. More moved in later over the old Indian trail or turnpike which still runs out of Florida Avenue today. They set up a saltworks which proved unsuccessful, so Absecon Island merely marked time for the next half century.

But in 1852 things began to happen. The Camden and Atlantic railroad laid its tracks connecting the island with the mainland. Two years later the terminus was platted and incorporated as Atlantic City, a young town already gaining a reputation as a fine seaside resort. Enterprising innkeepers and boardinghouse owners provided accommodations for the family trade which probably slacked off during the Civil War period but the foundations had been firmly laid. By the time the 1870's rolled around excursion trains were bringing throngs of mainlanders eager to hear what the wild waves were saying and to be refreshed by the salt-sea air.

The Victorian ladies exchanged their voluminous flounces for bathing outfits sunproof from head to toe. Their lords and masters were only a shade less conservative as to coverage but wholly uninhibited in the matter of stripes.

But for one beachfront hotelkeeper there was a sour note in all this seaside gaiety. He was Joseph Keim whose guests tracked sand into his clean premises. How to deal with this annoyance without offending the patrons puzzled him until he hit upon a brilliant solution—one which was to have far-reaching effects never dreamed of in his philosophy—he would build a beach boardwalk.

With the aid of a railroad conductor, Alexander Boardman, Keim persuaded the city fathers to issue scrip and later sell bonds to pay for the improvement. There was opposition to the project but the younger element who favored it triumphed.

When it was opened in June 1879 it didn't amount to much but it served the purpose. A crude affair only 8 feet wide, it was built in sections laid flat on the sand. Every fall they were taken up and put in storage to prevent damage by winter storms. Extensions were added from time to time but flimsy construction and havoc wrought by high winds necessitated replacements of a more substantial nature. The first elevated walk was a wooden structure built in 1890, appropriately celebrated with a torchlight and fireworks procession just 8 months after its predecessor's destruction.

The present boardwalk dates back to 1896, a pretentious structure of iron, wood, steel, and concrete now about 60 feet wide with planks laid in herringbone fashion. Subsequent extensions have lengthened it to a total of 8 continuous miles of wooden protection along the ocean front of Absecon Island.

Keim's bright idea was further augmented along in the 1880's by the invention of a hardware dealer, William Hayday. He called it a rolling chair, and it proved an immediate success with wasp-waisted belles and their escorts afflicted with fallen arches. This contribution to the pedal comfort of the traveling public so increased in popularity that now a fleet of 2,000 is in operation. One of the most familiar sights along the Boardwalk, this type of horseless carriage apparently has come to stay. Another lasting contribution to the American way of life was the introduction of the first picture postcard in 1893 by Carl Voelker, Sr., a newspaper publisher. Imported from Germany, the innovation so caught the traveling public's fancy that millions of the cards have flooded the mails ever since.

It was in the 1880's that the Nation's first amusement pier over water was built by a Baltimorean, Col. George Howard, opening with a large pavilion extending 650 feet out to sea. It offered band concerts, thearticals, and vaudeville, a traditional entertainment fare now featured on the Steel Pier, a star-studded showplace for the best talent of Hollywood and Broadway. And for one low admission you can enjoy name bands, first-run movies, water shows, diving horses, exhibits, or simply relax on the picnic and sun decks.

Four other giant piers reach their long fingers out to sea, each with the same basic attractions but supplemented by special characteristics of their own. On the Million Dollar Pier you can watch net hauls by fishermen, and explore an Italian village, while on Central Pier the model homes exhibit and the aquarium containing oddities of the sea, are fascinating sights. The Garden Pier is Atlantic City's art center, also the chief rendezvous for music lovers where the festival orchestra with prominent soloists delight summer crowds. Its Spanish architecture is particularly charming. Steeplechase Pier is a wonderland for youngsters and adults who like to ride.

A few blocks to the right of Garden Pier is Lighthouse Park which you may wish to visit if you prefer your pleasures on dry land. The tall shaft facing Absecon Inlet, affectionately called Old Ab is a cherished landmark, once an important guide to mariners.

The New Jersey coast is famous for its fishing waters with ideal opportunities for the hook, line, and sinker set. Depending upon your degree of interest you may engage in the sport to any extent you wish. You may fish off a pier with a minimum of equipment or you may charter a boat wherein to cruise all the coastal waters from Sandy Hook to Cape May Point. Or you may book a reservation on an open party craft which assures you space at the rail and a chance to haul in most anything short of a Hemingway catch.

Even if you are a busy delegate to a convention with no time for seeing sights there is one you can't miss. That is the great auditorium to which your badge entitles you to free admission. If Atlantic City ever decided to hold a town meeting of its permanent residents (around 65,000) it could seat them all comfortably in the many rooms of the auditorium with space to spare. The huge structure facing the boardwalk has accommodations for any type of assembly from a trade show to a national convention. So mammoth are the dimensions of the main hall that within a matter of hours it can be transformed into an ice skating rink or a fullsize indoor football field. Giant sliding trusses support the roof so spectators have a clear view in any direction. The Nation's annual tribal custom of crowning Miss America with royal pomp and circumstance is here immediately visible to an audience of 25,000 to say nothing of millions of television viewers throughout the land. Contestants from every State in the Union vie for the scholarships and valuable prizes which await the lucky winner.

The beautiful ballroom, recently air conditioned, seats 5,000 diners at banquets held usually as a convention climax. Said to be the world's largest auditorium, it is also the setting for the world's largest pipe-organ, the only one of its kind with seven manuals. Better have plenty of time on hand, if you want to investigate it thoroughly. The tour will take 4½ hours.

Since Atlantic City is open all year round increasing numbers of vacationists are finding it a salubrious spot for spending winter holidays. At Christmas and New Year's Eve the boardwalk is a veritable fairyland of lights. Most of the concessions are open for business. Hotels, restaurants and nightclubs are ablaze with spectacular entertainment and special services are held in the city's numerous churches. Escorted tours of surrounding communities are available.

While Atlantic City's chief industry is catering to the tourist trade it nevertheless has a solid civic background. A glance at its official list of associations, societies, clubs and fraternal orders reveals no less than 175 groups devoted to service and good fellowship. Practically all the great national organizations are represented here so you may readily find some kindred spirits no matter what sort of joiner you happen to be.

Increasing numbers of older people are coming to regard Atlantic City as a snug haven for retirement, a situation which is here looked upon as a community asset, rather than a problem. The local branch of the Zonta Club, under the leadership of Mrs. Thomas Fox early sensed the importance of recognizing the newcomers and promptly initiated a Golden Age Club. From its first meeting attended by only three women and one man, the club has grown in an incredibly short period of 2 years to a membership of nearly 500. The Zontians themselves are active career women under whose sponsorship imaginative programs have brought much pleasure and satisfaction to all concerned. Constructive activities are stressed to fulfill the desire to be useful and to be considered worthy citizens, more needed than needy. Looking to the future the Zonta Club leaders have set their sights on another goal—that of lower cost housing for pensioners with limited budgets. They are pointing out to city authorities and others that suitable quarters should be made available to seniors within walking distance of stores, shops, restaurants and amusement centers.

Thus Atlantic City refutes the tourist claim that "it is a nice place to visit but one wouldn't want to live there." Permanent dwellers in the Place of Swans have a wonderful time, too.

How To Cope With Communist Tactics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly impressed by a recent article written by FBI Director John Edgar Hoover, entitled "Shall It Be Law or Tyranny?" which was published in the February 1962 issue of

the American Bar Association Journal. Mr. Hoover wrote:

An analysis of Communist tactics in undermining the laws of our land should give us an insight into how to cope with this danger. The answer must be an increased reliance on law, a renewed faith in the democratic processes of government. Just because the Communists have no respect for law and order does not mean that we should retaliate in kind. Cries for legal shortcuts, vigilante methods, and less reliance on legal processes, though based on the most patriotic of motives, are most shortsighted. These would undermine our cause.

The world-famous director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation points out:

We must be very careful with our facts and not brand as a Communist any individual whose opinion may be different from our own. Freedom of dissent is a great heritage of America which we must treasure.

Today far too many self-styled experts on communism are plying the highways of America giving erroneous and distorted information. This causes hysteria, false alarms, misplaced apprehension by many of our citizens. We need enlightenment about communism—but this information must be factual, accurate, and not tailored to echo personal idiosyncrasies. To quote an old aphorism, we need more light and less heat.

I include for the information of my colleagues the final section of this able article by Mr. Hoover:

SHALL IT BE LAW OR TYRANNY?

(By John Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation)

(NOTE.—The Communists have long recognized the irreconcilability of law and their ultimate aims of violent revolution, writes Mr. Hoover. They utilize the freedoms guaranteed by our form of government as a cloak to mask their assaults on democratic concepts of law and order. The answer to these tactics must be an increased reliance on law, a renewed faith in the democratic processes of government.)

HOW TO COPE WITH COMMUNIST TACTICS

An analysis of Communist tactics in undermining the laws of our land should give us an insight into how to cope with this danger. The answer must be an increased reliance on law, a renewed faith in the democratic processes of government. Just because the Communists have no respect for law and order does not mean that we should retaliate in kind. Cries for legal shortcuts, vigilante methods and less reliance on legal processes, though based on the most patriotic of motives, are most shortsighted. These would undermine our cause. May I quote from a most distinguished American jurist, a gentleman who has had firsthand experience with Communists in his courtroom. Speaking in November 1956, before the graduating class of the FBI National Academy in Washington, D.C., Judge Harold R. Medina said:

"I would have you always conscious of the fact that your first duty, above all others, is to maintain the integrity of our laws and our freedoms. No convictions based upon some violation of these laws or constitutional rights can possibly benefit our Nation in the long run."

Judge Medina then continued:

"What I wish to leave with you today is that all these and others are rights of an accused which come to us because men fought and struggled for freedom. Once lost these precious freedoms are most difficult to regain; once whittled away or disregarded and neglected, they cease to be realities and vanish into thin air. You men stand at the first line of defense; and I would have you be constantly mindful of your trust."

Our fight against communism must be a sane, rational understanding of the facts. Emotional outbursts, extravagant name calling, gross exaggerations hinder our efforts. We must remember that many non-Communists may legitimately on their own oppose the same laws or take positions on issues of the day which are also held by the Communists. Their opinions—though temporarily coinciding with the party line—do not make them Communists. Not at all. We must be very careful with our facts and not brand as a Communist any individual whose opinion may be different from our own. Freedom of dissent is a great heritage of America which we must treasure.

Today far too many self-styled experts on communism are plying the highways of America giving erroneous and distorted information. This causes hysteria, false alarms, misplaced apprehension by many of our citizens. We need enlightenment about communism—but this information must be factual, accurate, and not tailored to echo personal idiosyncrasies. To quote an old aphorism, we need more light and less heat.

I should like to congratulate the American Bar Association for its excellent work in this field. Many years ago the American Bar Association recognized the seriousness of the Communist danger. Your special committee on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives is doing a magnificent job. This committee's plan, already being implemented, of fostering high-level, dignified, objective seminars on communism through the cooperation of local bar associations throughout the country is excellent. This committee, moreover, is encouraging a study of the contrasts between communism and free government in our secondary and college-level schools. I feel that the American Bar Association is rendering a distinct public service and should receive the commendation of grateful citizens all over the country.

The majesty of the law, in today's world, is not just a figure of speech or a rhetorical flourish. It is the diadem of American freedom, the reality which distinguishes us from tyranny. It is our heritage, our refuge, our glory.

"Let the ruling classes tremble at the prospect of a Communist revolution," proclaimed the Communist Manifesto. We tremble not. The ideas of Marx and Engels, though tipped with deceit and chicanery, shall not dislodge the goddess of justice—that eternal lady who rules our destiny as a nation under God.

Governor Swainson, of Michigan, Cites Inadequacy of Kerr-Mills Program, Supports Medical Care for the Aged Under Social Securiay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, providing medical care for the aged, under the social security system, is one of the great unfinished tasks of our society. In my judgment, the King-Anderson bill provides the best method of helping our older citizens live out their retirement years with an increased measure of dignity and security.

Gov. John B. Swainson, of Michigan, carefully analyzed the Kerr-Mills program in a recent letter to President Kennedy and found it a significant failure. On the basis of Michigan's experience with Kerr-Mills, Governor Swainson renewed his support of the King-Anderson bill.

Under unanimous consent, I include Governor Swainson's letter in the Appendix of the RECORD:

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Lansing, Mich., February 27, 1962.

The Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Since the inception of the Kerr-Mills medical assistance for the aged program in the fall of 1960, Michigan has led the way among the 50 States in seeking to gain maximum benefit from the program. We were the first State to adopt the Kerr-Mills program; we were the first State to grant funds under the program; and the Michigan contribution of $4½ million during the first year of the program's operation has constituted one of the largest State expenditures for the Kerr-Mills program in the Nation. In short, we have expended a vigorous effort to provide adequate medical assistance for our older citizens through the Kerr-Mills program.

Despite our concerted effort to provide medical care for our aged citizens within the framework of the Kerr-Mills program, the results of our first year's operation under Kerr-Mills indicates that the program has been a significant failure in providing medical assistance for the senior citizens of our State. During the first 12 months, the Kerr-Mills program in Michigan provided medical assistance for only 1.85 percent of our citizens age 65 years and older. While the percentage of our senior citizens continues to soar, this contribution to the solution of their health problems seems strikingly inadequate.

When the Kerr-Mills bill was passed it was estimated that 60,000, or less than 10 percent of our citizens, age 65 years and older, would be eligible for medical assistance for the aged. The fact that less than one-tenth of our senior citizens could qualify for medical assistance under the Kerr-Mills program disheartened us at that time. But now that the program has been in operation 1 year and we find less than 2 percent of our senior citizens are receiving assistance, we are even more discouraged.

The Kerr-Mills program has not worked in Michigan. It is my firm belief after carefully watching the program in Michigan for a year that it cannot work.

Because the program fails to recognize the basic medical care problems of the aged it fails to produce a viable solution to one of the most pressing problems of modern times. Rather it becomes little more than a salve to the conscience of those who seek any program, however inadequate, in order to placate the public's plea for a solution to the health problems of the elderly.

On the basis of experience with the Kerr-Mills program in Michigan I feel compelled to announce once again my unequivocal support of H.R. 4222, the King-Anderson proposal for medical care for the aged through social security. As I indicated in a statement of support for H.R. 4222 to the House Committee on Ways and Means on August 7, 1961; the provision for the rational and dignified payment of basic health care through the social security system is the only sound, responsible way for us to resolve this most urgent problem. Only by allowing our citizens to provide for the medical care demands of their old age through systematic contributions to our workable and efficient social security system while the individual is actively in the labor force can we make adequate provisions for the medical needs of

our aged that is in keeping with the basic precepts of human dignity. With 638,184 citizens in Michigan 65 years of age and older, it is my belief that the time for action is now.

I applaud you on your diligent fight in support of the King-Anderson bill and offer, once again, my unwavering support.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

JOHN B. SWAINSON,
Governor.

Clean Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, clean elections are a prime requisite of good government. The fact that vote theft is on the increase is a matter of deep concern for citizens of both political parties. According to the nonpartisan Honest Ballot Association, some 3 million votes are lost or stolen in every national election and the figure rises each time Americans go to the polls.

Thus the United States has not yet succeeded in freeing its electoral process from the taint of fraud.

Last summer, as the first sesison of this Congress neared adjournment, we passed legislation extending the life of the Civil Rights Commission. While that measure was under consideration in the House Judiciary Committee, it was amended on motion of Congressman CRAMER, Republican, of Florida, to protect the voter against fraud. The bill was reported out with that amendment. Earlier the Assistant Attorney General, Mr. Byron White, had written that the Civil Rights Commission is the appropriate agency through which such protection should be forthcoming.

In order to avoid voting on this amendment or having it become law the Democratic House leadership abandoned the bill and tacked on a straight extension of the Civil Rights Commission on an appropriation bill in the Senate. The extension of the life of the Civil Rights Commission came to the House as part of a House-Senate conference agreement on the appropriation bill, a sorry commentary on civil rights legislation.

It is well known that ballot theft occurs most frequently in the large metropolitan centers. It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that political leaders in those cities will become aware of a campaign for clean elections launched in February 1961 by the Women's Division of the Republican National Committee. The campaign is nonpartisan. It has drawn the support of distinguished nonpartisan organizations.

The principal weapon of this clean elections campaign is a booklet titled "Are You a 'Shadow' Voter?" produced in the Women's Division of the Republican National Committee. It is a small document, only 12 pages in length, but it is a historic first. It exposes the various types of vote fraud. Sound advice for the citizen's protection accompanies each type of violation. The booklet has become a bible for Republicans, Democrats, and Independents—in fact, all citizens who wish to see America's free elective process above reproach. It has been endorsed by the Fair Campaign Practices Committee, which never before has so honored a publication of a political party.

For the record, I should like to insert an article describing this worthwhile campaign. The article appeared in the November 1961 issue of the Public Relations Journal. It is titled "Republicans Stage Nonpartisan Political Relations Program That Works" and was written by Vera R. Glaser, director of public relations for the Women's Division of the Republican National Committee. Mrs. Glaser, a former member of the staff of the New York Herald Tribune's Washington Bureau, has done a service for all citizens in presenting this story, in writing this booklet, and in spearheading the campaign behind it.

REPUBLICANS STAGE NONPARTISAN POLITICAL RELATIONS PROGRAM THAT WORKS

(By Vera R. Glaser)

As America approaches the 1962 elections, a little gray booklet is skyrocketing on political best-seller lists, promising to stay at the top at least through 1964's Presidential contest and at most until Republicans and Democrats agree that the specter of vote fraud no longer haunts the polls.

"Are You a 'Shadow' Voter?"—a nonpartisan guide for foiling ballot thieves has aroused lively interest among public relations counselors. Its 12 pages contain startling exposés of political skulduggery, plus pointers for the voter's protection.

The pamphlet, produced in the Republican National Committee Women's Division, spearheads a public service campaign started last February. It is writing a different and absorbing chapter in the saga of political public relations.

What is the story behind "Are You a 'Shadow' Voter?"—why and how was the clean elections campaign started?

THE PUBLIC SERVICE CAMPAIGN

George J. Abrams, chief investigator, Honest Ballot Association of New York, has been warning for years that, "Vote frauds are on the increase. Over 3 million votes are stolen or lost in every national election."

On the morning after an election it has become almost routine for the losing party to receive letters and telegrams charging the winners with "fraud." Nothing in the past, however, compares with the 135,000 complaints from 25 States which flooded the Republican National Committee beginning with election day 1960 and lasting through the month of November.

Regardless of other differences, however, the political parties do agree on one thing: Backbone of any campaign organization is womanpower. At the precinct level women perform hundreds of small jobs which add up to a winning campaign—stuffing envelopes, typing, ringing doorbells, getting out the vote.

Therefore, in the view of Mrs. Clare B. Williams, assistant GOP chairman, her women's division was the logical force to combat irregularities at the polls. Republican women, she decided, would pioneer for all voters, regardless of party, who recognize the crucial tie between clean elections and honest government.

Public relations decision No. 1 at GOP Washington headquarters was to hold action until presidential campaign emotions had cooled. An objective appeal for clean elections then could properly be directed to the pride every American holds in his free elective system.

Four months were permitted to elapse.

Then, on February 27, 1961, for the first time in political history, a practical, comprehensive set of anti-fraud rules was released. Its title, "Are You a 'Shadow' Voter?" refers to the "shadow" status of those whose ballots are illegally nullified.

The murky methods it spells out for voters include "tombstone" voting, padding voter lists, spoiling or disqualifying ballots, jamming voting machines, "floaters," laxity of law enforcement officials, party "phoneys," disqualifying valid voters, chain balloting, vote buying, and collusion.

Opposite each type of theft are instructions for its prevention or for apprehending offenders.

Launched with an appeal for support, shadow voter's first mailing went to 1,500 civic, educational, public affairs, business, labor, religious, political, farm and philanthropic organizations.

President Kennedy was sent a copy, as were all Members of Congress, Governors, State legislators, and mayors.

A FLOW OF FACTS

Political public relations, unlike its corporate version, often places heaviest emphasis on publicity. To build support for clean elections, the program led off with a flow of factual information to mass news media.

This was backed up by contacts with public affairs organizations, such as the American Heritage Foundation and League of Women Voters, and with business and labor groups active in politics.

The Republican National Committee's speakers' bureau and readied for the lively demand for "Shadow Voter" talks which came on the heels of the booklet's first appearance.

Advertising was not a part of the public relations schedule, since no funds were available.

Taking advantage of the fact that the Nation's Capital is a major news center and the booklet a real political first, newly printed copies sped to 1,000 leading newspaper, radio and television correspondents, columnists, and editorial writers.

Results?

A booklet produced under Republican auspices—as this one was—might be expected to wow only the GOP. When it rings the bell with other political publics, that's news. Brisk demand from Democratic and independents, high schools and colleges, businessmen, union members, lawyers, nonpartisan groups, and just plain folks, has sent "Shadow Voter" into its seventh printing.

Total distribution: 100,000 copies as of October 1961.

Within 3 months of the booklet's debut, the nonpartisan Fair Campaign Practices Committee, shattering precedent, released a statement of high praise from its New York headquarters. Never before had the committee endorsed a party publication. Their action underscored "Shadow Voter's" even-handed tone, opening the way for every American to use it in protecting his precious heritage, the right to cast his ballot freely for the candidate and political party of his choice, secure in the knowledge that it will be counted as it was cast.

The Associated Press and United Press International moved first- and second-day stories on their wires. Magazines, newspapers, radio and television devoted news, feature, and editorial coverage and support.

A Capitol Hill chorus sang compliments on both sides of the aisle. Massachusetts Congressman BRAD MORSE and New York Senator KENNETH KEATING inserted praises in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Representative WIDNALL, of New Jersey, proposed an "honest election army" of collegians armed with booklets.

The Australian and British Embassies, among others sent runners for copies.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce distributed copies to its political participation committee. Unions and corporate managements requested additional copies.

Here are some of the areas in which the booklet has been and will be used.

Norden Division of United Aircraft, developers of the Norden electric vote counter, uses it in information programs related to improving elections.

Union Electric Co. featured it at a three-session program of political education.

B'nai B'rith Citizenship and Civic Affairs Division plans to tie the brochure into its first vote drive.

The Borden Co. distributed it to leaders of its citizenship training programs at 30 plant operations. Other corporations used it similarly.

"It will take personal courage, skilled poll watchers, and honest officials to carry through a reform," the booklet concludes. "But it is a worthy reform, and one that should be demanded by voters of every party. Frauds are a threat to every honest voter."

Proposed Farm Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD an editorial from the Clinton County Republican News, St. Johns, Mich., which I feel deserves a few minutes' time of all the Members. The editorial follows:

PROPOSED FARM PLAN BASED ON RIGGED VOTE SETUP

When President Kennedy outlined the administration's new farm commodity programs in his message to Congress he noted that they could become effective only after they are approved democratically by a two-thirds majority in a producer referendum.

Now this implies that the Nation's feed grain and wheat growers and milk producers are to have a free choice between the far-reaching acreage and marketing controls the Government is proposing, and the withdrawal of Federal price supports with a return to free farm markets.

But the fact is that these farmer referendums would by no means be free, in the sense that a citizen going to the polls to vote on an issue is under no outside pressure to vote either way. That is because the Government has served notice on farmers that if they reject the new farm program, it will throw on the market 10 millions tons of surplus feed grains and 200 million bushels of wheat from the vast Federal surplus stock.

The American Farm Bureau Federations has applied, and properly so, some strong language to this Hobson's choice offered the farmer.

"The use of Government stocks of grain," it says, "* * * to compel farmers to accept proposed control programs" amounts to "naked coercion" and "makes a mockery of * * * democratic farm referendums."

Now there are plenty of farmers who would be willing, without hesitation, to vote down the still more regimented system of agriculture the administration is proposing, and to start from scratch with no Federal planning and crop controls at all—if they had a free choice.

But there, staring them in the face, are those surplus millions of tons of grain. They are there, they exist, and it cannot be ignored that in some manner they are going to have to be liquidated.

They exist, however, as the accumulations of years of Federal farm policy mismanagement. And because that is so, it is specious of the Government to say, now, that if the farmers turn down the new farm program, these grains will suddenly be dumped on the market.

In blunt language, what this amounts to is bribery and blackmail.

Bribery, because this is what the Government is saying: "If you vote for more regimentation, we'll continue price supports."

Blackmail, because the Government is saying: "If you vote against the farm program, we'll bust you."

If there is anything democratic about a referendum so rigged, it is pretty hard to see.

You Can Fight Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a thought-provoking article written by Mr. Mark Clutter, formerly chief editorial writer for the Wichita Beacon until that newspaper was purchased by the publishers of the Wichita Eagle. Mr. Clutter currently a member of the editorial staff of the Long Beach (Calif.) Independent, Press-Telegram. The article, entitled "You Can Fight Communism," was published in the February issue of VFW magazine, a publication of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. I believe we all are aware of the outstanding work of this veterans organization in the promotion of Americanism.

The article follows:

YOU CAN FIGHT COMMUNISM

There isn't any way that you, a plain citizen trying to make a living and rear a family and get a little pleasure out of life, can fight communism directly.

That negative statement appears to contradict the title of this article. Actually it does not. It merely sets limits which must be recognized by anyone who wishes to do his part in defeating the Communist conspiracy.

You can't fight communism directly because the enemy is mostly invisible. He seldom presents a target, and when he does, it may not be a real target. The Communists are a secret, criminal, highly disciplined gang. They know how to work underground, how to use the gullible, how to infiltrate and pervert worthwhile institutions. To catch them and break up their plots is a job for skilled operatives, such as agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The Communists are, as J. Edgar Hoover, FBI Director pointed out, "masters of deceit."

The chances are that you, a VFW member, don't know any Communists or deep pink fellow travelers. You just don't move in those social circles. How can you fight people you can't identify?

How does a military commander act when the position and plans of the enemy are unknown? He makes his forces as strong and battle-ready as possible. He tautens discipline. He prepares for attack from any possible quarter. He knows his own position thoroughly.

Such strategy is the basis for an effective anti-Communist campaign. Since we, as citizens and veterans, cannot seek out and destroy the enemy, we must make ourselves so strong that he cannot prevail against us.

Any positive and effective anti-Communist campaign must be essentially a pro-Americanism campaign. The conflict is, in its present phase, a war of ideas. Two opposing ways of life are struggling for world supremacy. It is important to know what communism means, but it is far more important to know what Americanism means.

How good an American are you?

There can be no doubt of your emotional loyalty to flag and Nation. If you were less than loyal in your feelings, you would not belong to the Veterans of Foreign Wars. But do you truly understand what Americanism means? Do you know your own position?

VFW members generally are better informed about Americanism than the average citizen, but one would not have to look far to find a comrade who had only the sketchiest ideas of the laws and traditions that define our freedom.

The lack of understanding of Americanism in the general population is shocking. A survey conducted in some eastern high schools not long ago showed that many young people did not understand or believe in the basic freedoms guaranteed in the Bill of Rights. Such boys and girls would be pushovers for wily Communist recruiters.

VFW posts are in an admirable position to educate their members and their communities in basic Americanism. Such programs can be both direct and indirect in method. Posts can sponsor lecture series, courses, and essay contests. They can make it quite clear to school boards that they favor strong courses in American history and government.

Patriotism is a virtue somewhat out of style in our apathetic era. To revive it, many Americans must learn why they should be proud of their Republic. By teaching and example, VFW posts can help bring about renewed patriotism.

VFW work that seems to have no direct bearing on either Americanism or communism can contribute directly to the preservation of our Nation. Consider, for example, the children's and youth programs which so many posts emphasize. All studies of delinquency show that children who participate in organized sport and recreation are much less likely to end up in the hands of the police. In many communities, the police are so aware of this fact that they organize baseball leagues and other activities, knowing that it is better to prevent trouble than to have to deal with it.

Wherever veterans are engaged in intensive youth work, they are fighting both crime and communism. The doctrines of the Reds have no appeal to healthy, happy people. Communism attracts the confused, the despairing, the unwanted, the emotionally sick.

Wherever VFW members, acting as groups or as individuals, effectively carry out the patriotic, fraternal, historical and educational ideals of their organization, they are fighting communism. This is true in small matters as well as great. The musketry over the grave of a fallen comrade is, in one sense, a volley against communism, for the ritual proclaims that the man, obscure though he may have been, had served the true and enduring cause. Any activity that makes the post an example of Americanism in action has an effect on the entire community.

It is impossible to fight communism passively. Communism feeds and flourishes on passivity. The nonactive VFW member may feel that he is as much against communism as anybody, but he is creating, by default, those conditions under which communism spreads. Only through active, personal com-

mitment is it possible to build the good society that is invulnerable to the lures and snares of the enemy.

The typical VFW post today has too few workers who recognize their patriotic obligations. Some members are overworked. For awhile they try to do everything. Then fatigue and discouragement, together with business and personal obligations, force them to quit. They leave a vacuum that can't be filled because so many members give only lipservice.

The nonactive members have good alibis which usually contain a bit of truth. The typical World War II veteran has reached the busiest time of his life. He has a wife and a house full of youngsters. He has more business or job responsibilities than he had 10 years ago. "I can't do everything," he says lamely.

That is true. No one asked him to do everything. But he can do something. He can devote himself to some worthwhile post project for a few hours a week. It is quite likely that, once he becomes active, he will find considerable personal gratification in being useful beyond the confines of home and shop.

Try to imagine a post in which every member did something. Such a post, large or small, would rank as the most dynamic and worthwhile in the world. Its influence would extend throughout the community. Its example would inspire other posts and other community service organizations.

And wouldn't it be fun to belong to such an effective post.

Communism is a militant movement. Its leaders, like all clever generals, prefer to attack the weak, the disorganized, the undisciplined. The Communists frankly state that this is their strategy. They always move into areas of weakness. The do not—in fact, they cannot—infiltrate a strong and healthy society.

The Communists are quick to exploit conditions of injustice and social disorder. They have, from time to time, played their evil roles in racial conflict, in labor unrest, in governmental corruption, and in organized crime. But they are also quick to recognize intellectual confusion, a weakness of a different kind. Their infiltration into education, the communications media, entertainment, government, and even religion has been possible because some leaders in these fields have lost their intellectual integrity. They no longer know what they think or what they represent.

The Communists always work against just and sensible solutions of social problems. They seek to turn racial tensions into bloody riots. They do not want unions to gain their goals through peaceful bargaining; they want bitter strikes. They seek to turn any infiltrated institution from its true goals. The Communists always fight for more and more injustice, strife, confusion, and hatred. This is frankly stated party policy and is always true, although their propaganda seems to say the exact opposite.

This should make the work of the dedicated and anti-Communist quite simple. To fight communism, he must fight for justice, good social order, and the principles of Americanism. Communism or no communism, those are the causes for which a decent man should fight.

Nikita Khrushchev predicted, "Your grandchildren will be Communists." In the context of his remarks it was as clear that he believed this would happen in America, not as a result of war or external pressure, but through apathy and decadence. Communism would move into one area of weakness after another until it had everything.

Few Americans share Khrushchev's view. There is magnificent strength in the American people. The Nation that lifted itself out of the depression to arm the free world while fighting on every front, and that has since maintained world peace, albeit a hair-trigger peace, is not decadent. Our grandchildren will not be Communists.

The important thing is to increase our strength. On the military front it is necessary to maintain constant alertness and a ready battle force. But communism is both an external threat and an internal conspiracy. This world war of ideas must be won on the civilian front. Americans must continue to create the good society of freemen. Through our way of life, we must show that the Communist promises are a lie. Dynamic Americanism is the answer to the Communist conspiracy.

In this great struggle, the Veterans of Foreign Wars has the opportunity to play a magnificent role.

Teaching Machines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, the need for more advanced teaching methods is one of the great challenges of our time. Only this week the House, for example, passed a bill which will, if adopted, make greater use of television in the field of education. Much has been said and done, too, about teaching machines which would both speed up and improve our educational system and permit us to make better use of our relatively limited number of teachers.

One of the simplest, least expensive and most practical of these devices has been developed and patented by my friend, Mr. Alphons J. Hackl, of Washington, D.C. Because of its very low cost it may well revolutionize the field of teaching machines.

Mr. Hackl is president and general manager of Colortone Press, printers of publications and educational material. He is also publisher of the new Washington Community News, an urban community paper the first issue of which will appear in April. Formerly, he was publisher of the Foreman's Digest, the Drivers' Digest, and associate editor of the Quarterly Review of Public Relations. He is also author of a little booklet on "What Are the Hidden Meanings of Color?"

He is a member of the National Society of Art Directors, the American Institute of Graphic Arts, the National Society of Training Directors, the Business-Industry Group of the National Science Teachers Association, the American Management Association, the Printing Industry of America, the Lithographic Technical Foundation, the Institute of General Semantics, and many other civic organizations.

Mr. Hackl is listed in "Who's Who in Business and Industry." He is a native of Canada, educated in Austria, and has resided in the Washington area since 1936 with time out for military service in the U.S. Armed Forces for 4½ years during World War II. He is a U.S. citizen and served during World War II as a captain in the Military Intelligence Service. Before the invasion of Europe, he was in charge of a training team in Ireland training U.S. troops in German weapons, German army tactics and strategy. He served with the 5th Infantry Division on the G-2 staff in General Patton's army from Normandy to Czechoslovakia. After the signing of the armistice he saw brief service as intelligence officer with the War Crimes Commission investigating the Mauthausen concentration camp.

Mr. Speaker, because of the wide interest in the subject of education, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on teaching by machine given by Mr. Hackl on February 20, 1962, to a group of association executives at the Burlington Hotel in Washington:

TEACHING MACHINES: AN ADDRESS BY A. J. HACKE

My wife was taking a course in statistics at the George Washington University last fall. At the same time I felt a need for a brush up in algebra because I had graduated such a long time ago from the Handelsschule in Salzburg, Austria, and I was interested in becoming more familiar with up-to-date American terminology.

We purchased a hardware teaching machine and the accompanying texts in statistics and algebra. The machine appeared cumbersome to me, and being sensitive to typography, design, and color, I naturally missed the normal page size graphs and book discussion text. As a graphic arts specialist, it became apparent to me that the hardware was not necessary, and that a book format utilizing a teaching machine or programed learning principle, and incorporating features permitting the use of contemporary graphic visual communication methods could be developed at a fraction of the cost of a hardware machine.

I then started on a thorough investigation of the teaching machine principle, programed learning, and read up on available literature of this new field.

After making several prototypes which I tried out on my wife and friends, I finally reached a stage of development advanced enough to show it to the instructors at the National Radio Institute. They were immensely enthused and amazed at its simplicity, educational soundness, and low cost, because their staff up to this point had become extremely discouraged at the high cost of existing available teaching machines.

At this point, I should also mention that without the hope and encouragement my friends gave me assuring me that I was on sound ground and pursuing the problem correctly, I might not have continued to devote sufficient time to bring my device to its present state of perfection. After much thought, the name "Program-Matic" is the one I chose as most descriptive.

A quotation by Professor Thorndike in 1912 seems pertinent:

"If, by a miracle of mechanical ingenuity, a book could be so arranged that only to him who had done what was directed on page 1 would page 2 become visible, and so on, much that now requires personal instruction could be managed by print."

Perhaps you are wondering why I am speaking to a group of association executives about education and teaching machines but whether you are in trade association work or if you are a parent it is highly unlikely that you will get through this year without coming into contact with teaching machines in one way or another. As a child you might already have come into contact with this (exhibit I—teacher's rod), the world's oldest teaching machine, but as we shall see

later—today's methods are a little different—for reward instead of punishment has been found a far better teacher.

For one—the school population during the last 12 years has doubled while the number of teachers has almost remained the same—then, more new knowledge has been accumulated during this century than in the entire history of mankind put together. Already there is talk of extending public school education to the junior college 13th and 14th grade level—also—what should be of greatest interest to you as trade association executives is the rapid obsolescence of trades and skills.

I can see it in my own field—printing and lithography—in lithography the stone transfer man is no more, and in printing the flatbed pressman is rapidly being replaced by the fellow who can run an offset or rotary web press—the same may hold true of nearly all fields including the professions such as medicine and engineering. This is the one reason why the total number of unemployed is less than the total number of existing job vacancies—there are more jobs than unemployed—but the unemployed do not possess the necessary skills enabling them to hold down the jobs for which vacancies exist.

From this you can readily see that something has to be done to fill this gap—between more students and fewer teachers, and more jobs and fewer skilled people to fill them.

Happily something has come along that promises to fill this gap, and every indication bears out the claim of certain educators and psychologists that the teaching machine can speed up learning for both bright and dull students alike. Only last week the magazine Science calls the teaching machine the first major technical innovation in education since the development of printing. Already there is evidence that eighth graders can finish an entire ninth grade course in algebra in only one term when the teaching machine approach is used. In one case in Roanoke, Va., a student who wanted to enter Anapolis very badly and thus was motivated pretty strongly, finished 5 years of math in 1 year. In another experiment conducted by an IBM psychologist at a university, the class using teaching machines finished 27 percent sooner than the class exposed to conventional methods of instruction. The average grade in the teaching machine class was 95 percent as against 86 percent in the regular class.

Literally millions are being poured into research to perfect this method by both industry and Government. The U.S. Office of Education alone is spending slightly under $2 million on 27 different projects. These teaching machines take the form of expensive electronic hardware costing as much as $5,000 per unit to simple devices such as the Program-Matic which I have been working on for the last few months and for which a patent has been filed.

You may ask, What is the underlying principle that makes the teaching machine or programed learning so successful?

The first U.S. patent ever issued for a teaching machine was issued to H. Chard in 1809 for a device known as Mode for Teaching To Read. Socrates, with his Socratic method, certainly points up the fact that what we now know as the teaching machine is not something new, but it was not until Dr. Pressey at Ohio State in 1927, and Dr. Skinner at Harvard in 1956, rediscovered the principles of programed learning that modern advances were made. It was however, Dr. Skinner's more recent experiments and findings about what takes place in the mind during the learning process that gave programed learning the push and impetus it has today.

By breaking down complex knowledge into the smallest bits of information and offering a reward instead of punishment to the subject, Dr. Skinner was able to teach difficult tasks even to lower animal life such as pigeons. He proved that pigeons could be taught to play ping-pong, sort electronic parts in an assembly line, and act out Romeo and Juliet. In dealing with humans these same principles of imparting small bits of information one at a time in the form of Socratic questions are utilized in programed learning.

According to Science magazine, teaching machines are currently in use at Harvard, Oberlin, Hamilton, Dartmouth, Earlham, Hollins, Indiana University, University of Arizona, University of Illinois, University of Pittsburgh, Ohio State University, and the University of Southern California. By the end of 1962, there will be available 250 programs in elementary, high school, and college mathematics, 60 in science, 25 in electronics and engineering, 25 in foreign languages, 120 in social studies; and others in contract bridge, parliamentary procedure, fundamentals of music, and even in chess and etiquette.

With my machine, the pupil learns from questioning. Correct answers offer a reward. This gives humans encouragement and assurance to proceed. The immediate feedback of the correct answer also makes for faster learning and better comprehension. This is what makes these miracles of modern education practical and explains why so much is being accomplished through the introduction of teaching machines in various schools all over the country today.

Colonel Glenn, Our Astro-Ambassador

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am sure none of us shall ever forget the glorious achievement of Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, U.S. Marine Corps. Columbus, Magellan, and their fellow explorers are joined in man's history by this modest, courageous, accomplished American.

Like so many other historic heroes, Colonel Glenn is a man of many talents. In this Chamber, and in committee rooms on both sides of our Capitol, we heard and applauded his extreme, yet always modest eloquence. In New York, though no longer among his countrymen alone, Colonel Glenn was no less effective in enunciating the cause of space exploration. Because his New York appearance before the U.N. will have far more significance in the course of future thought and future events, I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to a story written by Mr. Showell of the Newark Evening News that appears in today's edition of the paper.

[From the Newark News, Mar. 7, 1962]

GLENN AIDS U.S. POSITION AT U.N.—ASTRONAUT'S DIPLOMATIC SKILL ADVANCES PEACEFUL SPACE PROGRAM

(By Philip S. Showell, Jr.)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—The U.S. delegation believes Lt. Col. John H. Glenn's visit here made a "very substantial" contribution toward peaceful use of outer space.

The astronaut's poise and political potential were in evidence to millions during 2 days of motorcades through the metropolitan area. What was evident only to ambassadors and the international civil servants here was the Marine hero's talent for personal diplomacy.

"Glenn by being Glenn, plus the outcome of Project Mercury, enables us to deal on outer space from a position of real strength," commented the U.S. diplomat charged with pursuing Washington's aims in this area. "And in negotiating with the Russians this is the only position to hold."

The spaceman improved prospects for positive action from the first meeting March 19 of the 28-nation Committee on Peaceful Use of Outer Space, according to the diplomat.

Glenn's contribution was especially vital, he said, since it was made in what is developing as a major test area of the Soviet Union's desire for a cold-war thaw.

PHILOSOPHER, TOO

A hot pilot, with 15 Distinguished Flying Crosses and 18 Air Medals, Glenn proved in a reception here with ambassadors from the 28 nations making up the outer space committee that he was "a mature guy . . . and damn close to being a philosopher," the U.S. aid added.

The freckle-faced flier gave them a 20-minute briefing on his triple orbit of the earth. The ambassadors proclaimed themselves fascinated and Glenn expressed his surprise at the detail and cogency of their questions.

The response to the astronaut's appeal for more cooperation in space exploration through the U.N. was greeted with a standing ovation by the 500 foreign newsmen and international civil servants gathered in the Economic and Social Council Chamber.

The program Glenn advanced was embraced in a resolution adopted by the General Assembly last December 20. It will be the focus of initial deliberations by a committee whose convening was obstructed for 3 years by the Kremlin's obstructionist tactics.

Though U.S. Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson used Soviet Cosmonaut Yuri Gagarin's orbit last spring to comment on the need for "blasting the outer space talks off the launching pad here" there was no followup until late fall.

FREE SPACE

The resulting Assembly resolution directed the Outer Space Committee to meet before the end of this month to develop ways and means of implementing its provisions. The measure provides for:

Declaration that space is as free as the seas and subject to international law and the U.N. Charter.

Creation of a public registry of all orbiting objects.

Reports by the World Meteorological Organization and allied groups to the Economic and Social Council on space exploration.

Reports by the International Telecommunications Union and similar organizations to the Economic and Social Council on communications satellites.

Though lacking the drama or urgency of a Congo crisis, this program is considered by U.S. sources to be vital. It takes little imagination to realize that manned satellites which improve weather observations or telecommunication can also better spot targets and guide, or even launch missiles toward them.

Colonel Glenn is back at work now at the Project Mercury headquarters. But U.S. diplomats agree he was far from vacationing here Friday. The pledges of support for the outer space program which have followed the astronaut's visit indicate he put in a full diplomatic day.

Classroom Shortage Statistics Confusing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly stated that I favor Federal aid to education whenever the need for such assistance is clearly demonstrated, and provided such aid does not discriminate against any group of children.

In testifying on March 27, 1961, before the Subcommittee on Education, of the Committee on Education and Labor, I addressed myself, in part, to the question of need for Federal assistance.

Using a number of concrete examples, I demonstrated to the committee that many of the statistics purporting to show classroom shortage were ambiguous, confusing, contradictory and even downright misleading.

I was interested to read in Monday's edition of the Washington Post a column by Mr. Maurice H. Stans, former Director of the Budget, entitled "Classroom Shortage Statistics Confusing."

Using his own examples, Mr. Stans arrived at conclusions similar to those which I outlined before the Subcommittee on Education a year ago.

I thought that the membership of the House would be interested in this article. I wish to place it in the RECORD under leave granted to extend my remarks.

There is one more thing I would like to add: Education is one of our greatest assets. It is in our national interest to provide our youth with every opportunity to advance their education. And there are some problems in this field which cannot be solved through local and State action alone. In those instances, the need for Federal assistance may be urgent.

I am not opposed to Federal aid for school construction, but I believe that we should first determine the extent of need in this field. This is very important. And, unfortunately, available statistics on this subject are thoroughly inadequate. I would strongly urge the appropriate committees of the House, and the U.S. Office of Education, to attend to this problem and to provide us with detailed and reliable statistical data on which we can then base sound and constructive legislation.

The above-mentioned article follows:

CLASSROOM SHORTAGE STATISTICS CONFUSING

(By Maurice H. Stans)

Behind all the oratory on Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools is the basic question of whether education can best be achieved under local financing and direction in home communities or by Federal financing and influence from Washington.

The argument is not new. The Congress debated it as vigorously 75 years ago as now. Unfortunately, facts are scarce and are clouded over by digressive issues of politics, religion, and competition with the Soviets.

Of course, we all want our children to be well educated. And despite all the heated debate, there is little evidence that our present local system of education is inferior to that of the Soviets or of any other country. Johnny may not be able to spell, but so far he has grown up to be superior in science, industry, commerce, and the improvement of living to Ivan or any other progeny of foreign birth.

DOCUMENTATION LACKING

But the struggle to shift the cost of education and the responsibility for it to the Federal Government will go on, long after 1962. The principal ammunition will be statistics, and seldom will an important battle be fought with poorer firepower. One would expect that, in a matter of such vital importance, proponents of the cause of Federal aid would have a strongly documented case.

But if the past is evidence, the Congress will be asked to make historic decisions on a basis of figures far inferior to those which a sensible businessman would require for reaching his business conclusions. There ought to be a better way to resolve national problems.

The major case for Federal support of school construction rests on the alleged inability or unwillingness of local school districts to do the job. The key figures are the annual estimates of classroom shortages produced by the Office of Education from reports supplied by the States. Because of their sources, they are seldom questioned.

But an analysis of the figures leaves much in doubt. For example, the officially asserted shortage in 1954 was 370,000 classrooms. But this became merely 160,000 in 1955, even though only 60,000 rooms were built in the meantime. The difference was the result of a change in the process of gathering the statistics.

Since then the annual classroom shortage figure has moved slowly downward until it hit a low level of 127,200 in the fall of 1961. About half of this represents supposed shortages in capacity and the other half represents unsatisfactory quarters.

NO UNIFORM DEFINITIONS

When I was Director of the Budget, I set out to learn more about these classroom shortage reports. In February 1960, a field survey team, made up of staff members of the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, went to nine States, with 50 percent of the classroom shortage, to find out how the figures were compiled. Their findings were astounding. Because there were no uniform definitions across the States, the figures were mostly undetailed or poorly supported estimates based more often than not on local or State attitudes of the moment.

For example, in Alabama, the survey revealed that the number of classrooms needed to replace unsatisfactory facilities dropped from 10,037 in 1958 to only 2,416 a year later. There had been a local redefinition of what constituted an unsatisfactory classroom. The survey concluded that "neither the 1958 nor the 1959 report provides a reliable figure on the classroom shortage" in Alabama.

In accounting for the substantial annual variations reported in Illinois, the report said that "while many local superintendents report small rural schools as satisfactory, the State agency staff feels that these schools are unsuitable."

Some large cities were entirely omitted from the estimates. Inconsistencies were numerous. Understatements and overstatements were found. The conclusion of the study group was a forthright statement that "the fall report figures on the classroom shortage have, in our opinion, limited usefulness in discussions on Federal aid for school construction." And further that "the survey indicates that it is fallacious to compare successive years' totals to indicate a decline or increase in the classroom shortage."

TWO-YEAR BACKLOG

Even if taken at face value, "the classroom shortage figures reveal nothing about the financial capability of the States and local communities to handle the problem without Federal aid." In fact, they disclose nothing about actions taken or pending in the school districts to deal with the needs. This is important, for this reason: With classrooms being built at the rate of 70,000 a year, a shortage of 127,200 classrooms, if true, would be a backlog of less than 2 years. It takes 2 years to recognize needs, develop proposals, hold elections, sell bonds, design and build schools. It may well be that much of the deficiency is actually being met by prompt local actions about as fast as it becomes clearly evident.

In printed material and speeches by proponents of Federal aid, there appear repeated statements that there are 8 million schoolchildren in overcrowded classrooms. This round number stems from a 1959 press statement of the Office of Education to the effect that State figures show that public school enrollments were 1,843,000 in excess of normal school capacity and that "there are numbers of others whose education is being hampered to some extent by lack of adequate classroom facilities." This is extrapolation with a will.

Why must we deal with great national problems with such scanty, questionable data? If we as citizens are seriously to consider this issue, shouldn't we have a careful, nationwide survey of actual conditions, measured by uniform standards and with the findings pinpointed by cities, by school districts, and by structures? If then, confronted by such evidence, some of the individual districts are clearly unable to act and the States cannot meet the needs, there may be a case for Federal assistance.

The New Textile Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lancaster News, Lancaster, S.C., of March 5, 1962:

THE NEW TEXTILE AGREEMENT

Although many American textile manufacturers have their fingers crossed on its effectiveness, there seems to be general satisfaction over the terms of the new 19-nation agreement covering foreign trade in cotton textiles, reached in Geneva February 9 and made public on February 16.

The satisfaction stems from an article in the agreement which leaves the United States in a position to protect domestic markets from a flood of low-priced cotton goods and another which shifts the burden of opening foreign markets to the more prosperous countries of Europe.

Under the agreement, any nation facing disruption of its domestic market by a surge of imports in general or in any specific type of cotton product can request the exporting nation to restrict its shipments. If no response or agreement is reached in 60 days, the importing nation can act unilaterally to freeze imports for 1 year at the level of the first 12 of the preceding months.

In an emergency, this freeze can be imposed immediately without waiting the 60

days. If the condition persists, the endangered country can continue the freeze for an additional year. Following this 2-year restriction, the agreement provides that the imports accepted by the endangered country may be held to a 5-percent increase in each of the next 3 years.

In addition to this protective article, the agreement seeks to expand the European market for cotton textile products from nations such as Japan and India. The European nations have agreed to end quota restrictions against cotton textiles over the 5-year period of the Geneva agreement.

The 19-nation party to the agreement represent more than 90 percent of the free world trade in cotton textiles and include the Common Market countries.

The Geneva agreement did not concern itself with President Kennedy's suggestion that the United States impose an 8.5-cent equalization fee on imported cottons to balance the subsidy now being given raw cotton exports from the country.

Some Japanese manufacturers have said they will urge their country not to accept the Geneva agreement if this is done. Even if Japan refuses to sign, the United States could still impose restrictions on imports unilaterally.

The Corn Tassel: Symbol of Abundance in a Hungry World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Margo Cairns, secretary of the Corn Tassel National Floral Emblem Association, and more affectionately known as the "corn tassel lady" has provided me with more reasons why the corn tassel should be proclaimed as our national floral emblem.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include these reasons in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE CORN TASSEL: SYMBOL OF ABUNDANCE IN A HUNGRY WORLD

(By Margo Cairns)

No nation in the history of the world ever owed so deep a debt to any thing material as the United States owes to its native American plant, corn. From Jamestown to Plymouth, from the farms of George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and George Mason, to the Ohio and Mississippi Valleys, from the rich prairie lands of Iowa to the Pacific Ocean, corn fed the settlers, their flocks and herds as they conquered the wilderness and molded the Nation.

GRATITUDE

Though the corn tassel was honored and revered in sacred rites by the Incas, Aztecs, Mayans, and American Indians, it was never exalted as the floral symbol of a people. Each State in the United States chose a flower dear to it, but none selected the corn tassel, the pride of our vast land. Was the corn tassel protected through the centuries that it may now signal to all the world our national gratitude for our national treasure—by proclaiming it the floral symbol of the United States of America?

CENTENNIAL YEAR, 1962

On May 15, 1862, President Abraham Lincoln signed a bill creating the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The official seal of that Department depicted wheat; later it was changed to show a shock of corn; thus clearly symbolizing that corn is the foundation of the U.S. agriculture, its oldest and most valuable crop. In this centennial year let nationwide gratitude proclaim the corn tassel our national floral emblem.

Redistricting in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the New York State Legislature, dominated by the Republican Party, perpetuated a great injustice to the residents of New York when they redistricted the congressional districts. The American Public Service Bureau succinctly explained the machinations and procedures which the Republicans used to accomplish their nefarious ends. The informative article follows:

NEW YORK DEMOCRATS ROCKED BY "ROCKY"

New York's Republican team—Governor and legislature—lost no time, at a 1-day special session in Albany last week, in reorganizing the State's congressional delegation. It was a real blitz operation and so effectively did they do their work that the Democrats probably will have only a minority voice in Congress for the next 10 years. From being the majority party, with 22 present Congressmen to the Republicans' 21, the Democrats now have a potential of only 15 seats in a reapportioned total of 41. The State's quota presently is 43, with 2 vacancies.

This puts New York in the forefront of States required by proportionate population losses reported by the 1960 Federal census to reduce the representation to which they were entitled under the old count.

Understand, please, that what New York did last Friday, without advance publicity and without public hearings, was final, a complete legislative performance, not simply the presentation of a draft subject to further consideration. A redistricting bill was passed by both senate and assembly and immediately was signed by the Governor. It will be months before other States, including Massachusetts, get around to taking action on redistricting. Enactment of the New York statute was by the slenderest of margins and may not set a pattern, but it does set some kind of a record for speed in the busiest of all our busy States.

New York Democrats, flushed with election successes in New York City and New Jersey only 3 days before, were stunned by the swift Albany eclipse and the directness with which it was accomplished.

The new congressional setup is what is known as a gerrymander. One new congressional district, shaped like a submarine, stretches halfway across the State from a point just south of Rochester to one northeast of Schenectady, with its 'periscope' probing the shores of Lake Ontario. Congressman SAMUEL S. STRATTON, a likely candidate for Governor next year, whose five-county 32d District was carved up and appended to other districts in a three-way split, said the events of the day had added a new term to the catalog of political infamy—"Rockymander," because of the Governor's active part in putting the plan across.

Passage by the Republican-stacked senate had been discounted. In the assembly, however, where three were absent and five Republicans defected, the tally showed the GOP to be two votes short of a majority.

Full assembly membership being 150, at least 76 votes were needed for enactment and a canvass showed only 74 in favor, 71 opposed, the speaker not being polled. At this point, Governor Rockefeller sped from his second-floor suite to the speaker's chamber on the floor above where, after some discussion, a Republican off-horse from the Orchard Belt was summoned and persuaded to change his vote from "no" to "yes." Thereupon, Speaker Joseph F. Carlino cast the 76th and deciding vote that put the Democrats in storage, perhaps until after the next Federal census. As might be expected, the Democrats responded with fusillades in all directions. They plan a campaign of education among the State's 7,200,000 voters, implemented by legal action based on the contention that this redistricting denies equal protection of the laws to all citizens guaranteed by the 14th amendment to the Constitution.

BURDEN ON ROCKEFELLER

It is interesting to note that the Herald-Tribune Wednesday morning put the burden of defending the new lineup on a personal and political favorite of Publisher John Hay Whitney—Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller. The "Trib" editorial was an ambivalent bit of moralizing. It decried the harsh language—"political larceny in the robber baron tradition"—aimed at the Governor with White House approval by National Democratic Chairman John M. Bailey, but justified the freezeout as precisely the kind of thing the Democrats would have done had they possessed the votes.

California, only other large State to have complied thus far with the redistricting directive, came up with a redraft that probably will result in the replacement of three Republican Congressmen.

The California situation was disposed of last May without difficulty by a Democratic legislature and a Democratic Governor. It was undertaken in an atmosphere that lacked the pressure of New York's diminishing representation since California, a rapidly expanding Commonwealth, is entitled to add 7 new Representatives to the 30 seats already held. An idea of the rate of growth in California can be had from the fact that the State gained 7 seats as a result of the 1950 census and these, with the 8 now to be added, give a total increase in little more than a decade of 15 Congressmen—3 more than the whole new Massachusetts delegation.

Massachusetts, which probably won't get around to redistricting before the deadline next summer, has been retreating from the possibility of being forced to elect its entire Congress delegation at large.

Present members find this prospect revolting. It would inevitably result in nearly all of the winners being residents of the Greater Boston area. Years ago, when Minnesota found it impossible to redistrict and all House candidates ran at large, the victors were all from Minneapolis and St. Paul. South Carolina once elected its entire delegation from the city of Charleston in a companion case. The at-large type of election, experience shows, strongly favors the cities over the upland precincts. In the 1961 redistricting, 16 States will gain in representation and 9 will lose. Beside Massachusetts and New York, the critical States, because of divided political control, are Pennsylvania and Illinois. Here we have strong Democratic control of both legislative branches, but a Republican Governor. Pennsylvania, which will lose 3 seats, dropping from 30 to 27, has a Democratic Governor, a Democratic house of representatives, but a Republican senate. Illinois, which loses a single seat, reducing its total from 25 to 24, has a Demo-

cratic Governor, a Democratic house and a Republican senate. Contests at large would give Illinois a delegation that might be heavily weighted by members from Cook County, while Pennsylvania probably would choose nearly all of its Congressmen from Philadelphia and Pittsburgh.

Representative at large also may be chosen in States that have no shrinkage problem but fail to reapportion to provide districts for the one or more additional Congressmen to which their advancing population now entitles them. In Michigan, Ohio, and Texas, if no attempt is made to change the existing congressional alinement, all Congressmen who have been elected by district will continue to represent their local areas and only the men chosen to fill the newly created seats will be elected at large. Connecticut, although electing five of its six Congressmen from districts, has chosen one at large since 1932. New Mexico has preferred to elect both of its Representatives at Large since 1942. North Dakota, from 1932 through 1960, has been electing its two Congressmen at large although, in 1960, the voters approved a law to elect them by districts, beginning in 1962.

DISTRICTS NOT CONSTITUTIONALLY ORDERED

The question of whether to elect by districts or at large is a matter of political preference. There is no mandate in the Constitution that prescribes a method. In early years, many States elected all of their Representatives at Large. Only since 1842 has Congress undertaken to divide responsibility along district lines. In that year, a law was passed requiring election from separate representative districts but, although the practice was generally adopted, the House never has been willing to force compliance by refusing to seat a Congressmen elected at large. Between 1842 and 1911, this condition was specifically written into all reapportionment legislation. After the 1911 redistricting, based upon the 1910 census, no reapportionment was carried out until the census of 1930, when the implementing legislation omitted the election-by-districts provision, which thereupon expired. However, in the case of *Colgrove* v. *Green*, carried to the Supreme Court in 1946, Justice Frankfurter said it was possible that the Court, if called upon to act, might direct the House to abide the district provision in accordance with constitutional guarantees of fairness and equal protection.

Many big and important changes were involved in the 1932 redistricting, due to rapid national growth during the two decades since the last one, resulting in the same instability that exists today.

In four States which lost seats by the 1932 apportionment, agreement upon a new districting plan could not be reached. They were Kentucky, with 9 seats; Minnesota, with 9; Missouri, with 13 seats; and Virginia, with 9. As a result of legislative frustration, 40 House Members from these States were elected at large in the election of 1932. During the same redistricting crisis, 7 States which had gained in representation under the 1930 census apportionment, were likewise at odds, so that a total of 12 Representatives were elected at large from these States as well. Because of these differences, the 73d Congress, which served from 1933 through 1935, had no less than 52 Members who had been elected at large. This number, however, had receded to nine by the time the 74th Congress took over. If Massachusetts, or any other large State threatened by a stalemate, should compel its candidate for Congress to run statewide this year, it would be the first time in 30 years that any such State had permitted its entire delegation to be elected at large.

The Peace Corps Essential Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans Times-Picayune, of March 6, 1962:

THE PEACE CORPS ESSENTIAL EFFORT

To the idealism and high hope of its inception the Peace Corps now has managed some solid accomplishments.

As it enters its second year, its initial ventures are progressing successfully. All 12 countries where corpsmen are at work have asked for more, including Nigeria where the Corps only unfortunate incident (involving a misplaced post card) occurred. Requests for Peace Corps programs in other lands will be met this summer. With some 600 corpsmen already at work, another 1,800 are training for assignments in 24 other countries this summer. Given the necessary, and anticipated, appropriation, 6,700 young Americans are expected to be at work on Peace Corps missions around the world by June 1963.

The work has been more useful than spectacular. There might not be much of high drama in a couple of young Americans showing a gang of jungle workmen how to build a sewer, or in the routine of teaching personal hygiene in a native village high in the Andes, or in superimposing modern agriculture on the wornout soil of Afghanistan.

But it is essential work. For it represents a start, however modest, in the long hard task of dragging poor nations into the modern age. These are the kind of chores the Peace Corps is performing, along with work in mechanics, transportation, vocational training, and urban development.

These solid successes have many causes. One, of course, is the willingness of Americans of all ages to devote their talents and their efforts to a patently idealist undertaking. Another is the cooperation of industrial concerns and labor organizations in finding, training, and making available the many necessary skills.

Others are the care that has gone into the planning of Peace Corps projects and the hardheaded realism that has gone into administration of the program.

This, indeed, is the essential ingredient, the hook upon which continued success hangs.

Success has not come cheaply. It is costing $40 million this year and is expected to cost $63 million next. But the program has been void of frills. Training of the corpsmen has been sound. They have been well supplied with the tools for their work. And, no doubt, they have been compensated with some deep satisfactions for their efforts.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Spyglass on John H. Glenn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a tribute to Col. John H. Glenn, by Miss Lena G. Doll of Detroit, Mich.:

SPYGLASS ON JOHN H. GLENN

(By Lena G. Doll)

Doughty dauntless astronaut,
Rooted deep in the free world's need
To attain bold proof of its teeming energies,
To use the knowledge of all man's span
From time immemorial through the rise of man,
To overcome the terrestrial bars
To win threshold of entrance to the sphere of stars—
This is the thread which you held taut.

Prototype of the blond Norseman,
Sea heroes when the world was young,
When man stood up to match the mountains and the sea;
Sky hero of the world today,
This complex scientific electronic age,
A fitting front drop for the stage
Of your orbital flight by star and gage,
To lift the hearts of hope that keep men free.

When well on your flight, guiding *Friendship's* snub nose,
The starlight glittered your space-flight clothes,
Now, that stardust is well scattered, as everyone knows—
Some brushed off on the great, it does seem;
Some sparkles each worker on the Mercury team;
Some is left in the White House; some on the Hill;
Some down Broadway, wherever you will;

But another bit of your triumph is quite a surprise,
You put stardust luster in all of our eyes.
Though you are lavish in spending, of stardust there's more,
You can never again be the same as before.

Hold fast to your stardust, your flights and your plan
Our hero of rightness, who proves that you can.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Voice of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHIL WEAVER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, every year the Veterans of Foreign Wars hold a contest among the young people of the country known as the Voice of Democracy contest. This is not a debate, but a statement of principles by the young men and women who enter the contest.

This year's winner was Miss Janice Marie Woelfle, of Lincoln, Nebr., and her presentation was one of the best I have ever heard when she spoke to the VFW here in Washington.

Miss Woelfle's delivery and manner were remarkable. But even more remarkable was the content of her essay on "What Freedom Means to Me." The thoughts contained are simple, logical and completely true. They are beautifully put together and make sense. They should be an inspiration, not only to her own generation, but to all Americans because of the freshness of her approach.

The essay, taken from the VFW magazine, follows:

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

(By Janice Marie Woelfle, first place national winner, 1961–62 VFW Voice of Democracy contest)

Three Americans were out sightseeing in a Soviet city 2 years ago. One was Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, the second was a U.S. Army officer, and the third a Russian-speaking official of the U.S. Embassy. It was an unique day for them. In their tour of the U.S.S.R., they'd managed for once to shake off their Kremlin-appointed guide.

As they walked down the street, a young man suddenly accosted them. He was about 30 years old, quite well-dressed for a Russian, with the look of a professional person.

"Are you Englishmen?" the young man said in Russian.

The Embassy man replied, "No, we're Americans."

"Americans! That's even better," the young man said excitedly. "I've wanted so long to talk to an American."

"Why?" the Embassy man asked.

"Because you Americans are such lucky people. You can read what you want, hear what you want, say what you want. We can't."

The young man peered nervously over his shoulder to see if anyone was listening. He knew he was risking his life to speak like that. "Always remember," he went on, "they aren't fooling us about you Americans. We want this to be your kind of world." Then he walked away. Fast.

This incident, experienced and related by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, is typical of the effect democracy has on the people of the world; and it is so true. We are lucky.

Because of democracy, we can go to a public library, and select any book from the "Iliad" or the "Odyssey," to "Alice in Wonderland." We can listen to the "Classical Hour," the "Top 50 Tunes," "Back to the Bible Broadcast," or political panels on our radios without fear of being found and punished. We, young and old alike, have the unequaled privilege of casting our vote for class officers, school cheerleaders, or the President of the United States.

I am 17 years old and a senior in high school. Next year, I plan to go on to college and eventually I hope to become a teacher. I have been free to make my vocational and college choice. My family attends church together each Sunday, and we are free to choose our own church. Every year we take a vacation and are free to enjoy the tumbled spendor of the Rockies, the wild coast of Maine, or the warm, sunny beaches of California without having to apply for a passport or ask for permission.

My father is president of his local electrical union where they are free to bargain for higher wages or improved working conditions. I can choose between a movie or a football game; my family can purchase all types of clothes from Bermuda shorts to the most beautiful of formals.

Freedom of press, freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of choice, the right to vote—all freedoms are made possible only through democracy.

Yes, democracy is voting in November, going to the church of our choice, speaking for what we feel is right, and being able to decide what we will read, see, hear, and do. But it is more than this. It is also the shout of a crowd as their team makes the final touchdown; it's the glow in the eyes of a little girl as she sits on Santa's knee; it's the joy of a 3-year-old's face as he pretends that he's a boat in a mud puddle. It's the tender look on a mother's face as she gazes at her newborn child. She knows his future is insured because he was born in a free, democratic country.

Counties times throughout our history we have defended our rights and the rights of other people to be free, but the job is far from done. To further protect and insure the future of every baby, now and yet to come, we must continuously speak for democracy. Yes; we must act for democracy. For only through our democratic processes come the guarantees of rights, liberty, and freedom. Our freedom is a give-and-take process, a mutual agreement among Americans to pursue happiness as long as it doesn't infringe on the rights of others.

Yes, our country is a great country and it presents a great hope to the Communist-held world.

"Always remember," the young Russian said, "they aren't fooling us about you Americans. We want this to be your kind of world."

Freedom is our heritage. Freedom is our opportunity. Freedom is our job.

America Needs a Realistic Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in the March issue of American Mercury appears an article entitled "America Needs a Realistic Foreign Policy." This article was written by Mr. Anthony Harrigan, associate editor of the News and Courier of Charleston, S.C.

Mr. Harrigan points out the fact that although the existing world order has undergone many changes in recent years, our foreign policy has remained almost stagnant. He emphasizes our positive values and recommends changes in our policy to capitalize on these values.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA NEEDS A REALISTIC FOREIGN POLICY

(By Anthony Harrigan)

Para-Communist revolution has been a permanent feature of the post World War II era. Its characteristics—once so strange—are now familiar. Yet American foreign policy, despite an almost unbroken string of defeats and reverses, is essentially the one laid down in the 1940's when the future seemed about to open into an epoch of international cooperation.

American foreign policy hasn't undergone fundamental change, but the world order has altered almost beyond recognition. Latin America, formerly composed of reliable anti-Communist states, is about to erupt as a result of revolutionary pressures. At our national doorstep is the Cuba of Fidel Castro, an outpost of Asiatic tyranny.

Africa, an economic and strategic base for the free world in the fight against Hitlerism, is a whirlpool of disorder. Suez is in the hands of an Egyptian dictatorship. Algeria and the Sahara, so essential to the future well-being and security of France and Europe in general, seem on the way to falling under the control of forces antagonistic to the Western World. Half of ancient Europe is captive behind the Iron Curtain. In Asia, vast territories have fallen to the conquerors of communism.

As a result of these fantastic successes since 1945, the Communist empire and its allies are supremely confident, while in the United States the inadequacy of our foreign policy is hideously apparent in the record of Western withdrawal and defeat. Indeed the grim truth is that the West is in full retreat everywhere, and only complete reversal of policy will prevent total disaster at the hands of anticivilization forces.

The decade in which we are living in all likelihood is the decade of decision for the United States and its NATO associates. Either the West regains its former strength and assertiveness or sinks rapidly into eclipse, with all its values despoiled. The 1960's will see the West regain and hold vital strategic positions and materials or lose strongpoints and assets essential to successful defense of the United States and associated countries. The 1960's will witness a new stressing of Western authority or a moral collapse in which NATO countries in effect will become colonies of non-Western countries, paying tribute in order not to arouse their enmity.

The truth is the United States not only reacts to Communist countries with real military power but also to supposedly neu-

tralist countries who enforce their will on the West though utterly lacking in power. Careful analyses of deteriorating economies in Afro-Asia and Latin America, combined with rising populations, make clear that the gap between the Western countries and the so-called underdeveloped countries is certain to be widened, irrespective of aid programs. The result of this gap undoubtedly will be an increase in envy and resentment directed against the United States, as the richest of the free nations.

In this new decade, Americans find themselves in a world of unprecedented complexity, of rampant nationalism in states that weren't even imagined 20 years ago and which are wholly synthetic creations.

As the United States moves through this decade, it must display a greater insight into necessity. Certainly, this Republic cannot afford to go on acting as though disordered lands can achieve order, trusting foolishly in obsolete ideas of cooperative internationalism, resisting candid recognition of a world state of insoluble tension and strife, and holding to the idea that dollars are a substitute for intelligence and authority.

The United States must dispassionately pursue a new realism in foreign affairs. It must sort out friends and foes, determine which areas and countries are worth saving or converting to our side, and amend policy so that ties to the United States are based on respect for American strength, not an illusory affection for American ideals and behavior.

Beginning with establishment of the United Nations Organization in San Francisco, the United States founded its foreign policy on the faulty assumption that all nations have a shared interest in order and a rational approach to global issues. In the years that have followed, with communism constantly creating new resentment, a condition of long-term unrest has resulted that cannot be dispelled for many decades.

As the United States has become involved in a cold war with the Soviet Union and Communist China, foreign policy planners have confused American political and strategic needs. The notion has gained wide currency that alteration of old patterns of life and political order is automatically to the advantage of the United States. This notion could be fatal to the Republic. The dangerous consequences of it can be seen in the Congo and in Cuba where misguided diplomats equated anti-Western violence with our own American Revolution. In so doing, these diplomats and thought leaders ignored the truth that the national genius of the American people is not to be duplicated in lands of primitivism or feverish emotionalism, forgetting that what may seem good to the people of an Afro-Asian or Latin country may be hurtful to the United States. In simple fashion, one may say that what's good for Ghana isn't necessarily good for Uncle Sam. Many Americans have foolishly assumed that proclamations of independence and democracy in faraway countries immediately created a community of interest with the United States.

Making economic aid the foundation stone of U.S. foreign policy, we have distributed this largess with insufficient regard to precise political and strategic objectives of the United States. In applauding so-called independence movements, several administrations have done terrible damage to real and lasting allies of the United States. An immature enthusiasm for slogans helped ease Britain, France, and Holland out of lands important for their future as free nations.

The underlying mistaken notion is the expectation that vast expenditures would produce new allies in the underdeveloped nations that were as reliable as the old faithfuls of Western Europe. In point of fact, these expenditures on foerign aid to emerging nations have caused the United States to be widely regarded as a rich fool ripe for plucking. Instead of contributing to a stable order in the American interest, U.S. diplomacy has amounted to an indiscriminate pulling up of stakes, destroying an order favorable to the West in Cuba, Algeria, the Congo, and Indonesia—to name only a few areas—and supplanting of this order with disorder favorable to the interests of the Communist enemy.

In short, those in charge of American foreign policy seem to have lost sight of the requirements of American survival and victory. The very foundations of national security have been undermined. And the tragedy is that this has been brought out in many cases by well-meaning but confused policy planners who wanted to be good and do good. In attempting to construct what in some quarters has been deemed a more just world, those responsible for U.S. foreign relations have done injustice to civilized Western nations, not excluding our own United States of America.

After the expenditure of scores of billions, after having helped strip our allies of vast territories containing enormous riches, the United States faces a danger of defeat that only a few imagined possible 15 years ago. A few, a very few, were prescient enough to glimpse some of the danger ahead. Prof. William Barrett, writing in Partisan Review in the winter of 1946 warned that victory in the war just ended might be regarded as "Russia's victory over Europe—with the witless aid of America."

To cut our losses and end the retreat, the United States must make plans to cope with the realities in the proletarian nations.

First of all, the United States must accept the fact that it is not likely to be the recipient of much affection from the proletarian nations. After all, rich nations and poor nations, like rich relatives and poor relatives, cannot be expected to get on together without tension. Familiarity between such nations breeds anger, resentment and envy. The economic gap between the United States—a "have" nation—and the "have not" nations creates a psychological gap that assistance widens rather than closes.

The United States must accept the fact of systematic revolution in Afro-Asia and Latin America. But this does not mean encouragement or applause for revolution. Indeed acceptance of the idea of permanent or at least semipermanent revolution leads directly to acceptance of the idea of permanent or semipermanent counterrevolution. In other words, the United States must be prepared to live dangerously, to live for a long period under conditions of tension and strife, intrigue and twilight war. These are destined to be the natural conditions of national life in the last four decades of the 20th century.

The United States has attempted to treat the paracommunist revolution as though it were a chapter from the English and American experience, which it is not. The Nkrumahs and Sukarnos have been regarded as though they were George Washingtons and Abraham Lincolns, who they certainly do not resemble.

American foreign policy planners have attempted to solve problems that defy solution on a rational basis, whereas the Communists only seek to foment strife, not to solve anything. The enemy bases his policy on fear and respect, in contradistinction to the U.S. effort to elicit affection. The U.S. policy is predicated on assuming that order is possible in the midst of a social revolution that may extend over many years. The Sino-Soviets, on the other hand, have the short range objective of creating chaos where it does not already exist. American programs are related to the ambitions and desires of foreign countries, not to American needs and requirements. In short, U.S. foreign policy is, as described by Dr. Gordon Tullock of the University of South Carolina, "other-directed."

The Communists have one simple aim: they seek to frustrate the West at every opportunity. Instead of seeking to frustrate Communist forces, the United States endeavors to make backward nations wealthier so that they then may—it is hoped—choose the American way or some middle way of mild Socialism. The lack of realism in the U.S. approach is appalling. Not only will poor countries in all likelihood never become rich (Ireland will never be as wealthy as Germany, for instance), but free choice for backward nations is out of the question when the enemy is deeply involved in mind warfare, including massive propaganda.

The only sensible approach for the United States is to launch its own mind warfare campaigns, to learn frustration tactics, to make zigzags, and to annul enemy objectives, not to attempt to find quick, easy solutions to problems as old as humanity.

In order to take practical measures, Americans must regain the psychological initiative. The people of the United States, and their leaders in government, must rid themselves of bad conscience about the requirements of survival and victory and find anew the confidence to assert American supremacy.

Recognizing the structuration of the world today, with its scores of angry and envious states riddled with hatred for the West, we see that the world is upside down. But Americans must learn to live with everything topsy-turvy. In a world of madmen and insane states, Americans should start treating the new nations as maniacal, not as sane, civilized political communities. If we so regard the world, acting accordingly, we will be in less danger of having our national throat cut by some insane political force—the Castros and Lumumbas of the day. Acknowledgment of unreason should enable the United States to manage the explosive peoples of the globe.

Calling a spade a spade should open new perspectives on polictial action. In this connection, it is well to bear in mind the remark of Raymond Aron that the "revolutions of the 20th century have settled down into long-term despotism, prolonging for decades the phenomena of terrorism which used to be characteristic of the first revolutionary frenzy." This truth is inadequately realized, however, and there is danger of hysteria in the most sophisticated circles of Western thought. As Dr. Salazar, of Portugal has said—without the West paying any attention—"in certain countries we find a kind of wave of panic and intimidation which corresponds to a lack of faith in the principles of Western civilization."

Americans fully understand that their country is the prime mover in the world, but fail to act upon this understanding. It is as plain as rain that the British Empire is dead and gone. Yet the United States declines to assume the imperial responsibilities to which it is heir. American recourse to economic diplomacy is avoidance of a more direct responsibility and its corollary, control. But the time is long since past when Americans can afford naivete, when we can agree not to intervene and settle a situation with force, and when we can respect the sovereignty of all nations, ignoring the ridiculous pretensions of some states.

Failure to live up to our power may prove to be fatal. As John Eckland has written in Liberator, "Algeria could be held; Suez could have been held; south east Asia could have been, and still can be, held; Eastern Europe, Tibet, Laos, North Vietnam—they all could have been free—save for a lack of

nerve in the highest places of all, the U.S. Presidency since 1933."

Raymond Cartier, writing in Realities, made the same point. "I believe," he declared, "that if the Americans had had the courage to win the war in Korea, the Chinese revolution would have collapsed."

Now, at this late date, we must begin to utilize our power or go down under attack by revolutionary forces. We must learn to bend backward nations to our will. The hour is too late for the United States to tolerate those states that will not aline themselves with America and the free world forces. We are called on to lead in resisting communism and the para-Communist nations, in confirming the will to survive and to win. The United States has the principal share of free world power, weapon asnd money, and the farflung strategic responsibilities as well. But power is meaningless unless it is displayed. Therefore, the United States must, in dealing with the underdeveloped nations, impose terms and conditions, reminding them of the strength of the American sword and shield. The first law of nature has not been repealed by any modern morality, and it is time that Americans acknowledge that truth to themselves.

In stressing a victory strategy, Americans can expect international friction. The world has become accustomed to an America willing to subordinate its national interest to the vagaries of "world opinion." But in this life-or-death struggle, there is no room for shyness about our determination to survive, regardless of the ambitions of other states—the so-called neutrals that want our national substance but will not join in mutual defense.

In sum, the American presence in the world must be much sterner and more determined than in recent years. This presence will be effective when the policy planners cease looking on the world as a morality play. An end must be made to the idolatry with which we regard verbal abstractions such as "peace," "law," and "disarmament." We must reject the hallucinations of a single-world-order approach and examine with a steely eye what James Burnham has called the jagged truths of interest and power and struggle. If we fail to do this, the United States will commit suicide on the installment plan, having lost understanding of what is needed for survival and victory—power, not words and empty formulas of international cooperation.

The Late Honorable Ralph W. Gwinn

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, it was distressing and saddening to me to have learned of the untimely passing of my former colleague and good friend, Hon. Ralph W. Gwinn, and as I was flying back to my district the afternoon I had learned this bad news, I reflected upon what our friendship had meant to me.

When I came to the House in 1955 as a 32-year-old Congressman and one of the few Republican Members of Congress from the Deep South, I was badly in need of a strong, friendly hand. Ralph Gwinn placed that hand on my shoulder.

Ralph Gwinn possessed the experience, wisdom, and love of country that I appreciate, and I came to respect him, and his judgment, from the very beginning of my House service.

I can recall his urging me to take the lead in establishing true, two-party government in my State. Ralph Gwinn had a passionate interest in local government, and in civic and educational and fraternal affairs on the homefront as well, and it was his belief that a Member of Congress still owed a certain amount of his energies to his home community.

I particularly used to enjoy sitting down with Ralph for a discussion of the subjects that were of interest to us both. One was constitutional law, and on this subject he was without peers, for he had been interested in this since his graduation from Columbia Law School.

He was a firm believer in the principles of conservatism, and during his tenure in Congress, at a time when he was ranking minority member of the Education and Labor Committee, he grew restless as he thought of the great need for getting across to the Nation the message of conservatism and constitutional government, and so he left this body in order to preach his beliefs from coast to coast.

He was in great demand as a speaker at Republican rallies and meetings, and both the older and the fledging members of the party revered him for his unwavering fight against reckless, spendthrift government.

He was a man of courage, dedicated to his adopted State of New York, ready at all times to defend his beliefs and his friends, and sternly determined that the basic principles on which this Government was founded should never be disregarded and shunted aside. Those who knew him best will admit that Ralph Gwinn would have fought the entire Government if necessary to back up what he thought was right.

I know that our friend and colleague is at peace with his Maker, and it is my prayer that he have eternal rest and comfort after his many years of being a saintly human being.

Sharing the Defense Burden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, following my remarks, an editorial entitled "Sharing the Defense Burden." The editorial was published on March 9 in the New York Times, and points out that a joint congressional committee recently called on the industrially developed nations, especially those of Western Europe, to assume a larger part of the burden of the economic, financial, and military defense of the free world. The editorial also refers to the importance of this matter and the danger to our balance-of-payments problem if we continue to carry a disproportionate share of the burden, despite the abundant resources which are at our disposal. As the New York Times so wisely states, on the correction of our balance-of-payments problem rests the soundness of the dollar and the key to the economic stability and progress of the entire free world.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 9, 1962]

SHARING THE DEFENSE BURDEN

Both President Kennedy and a joint congressional committee have again called on the industrially developed nations, especially those of Western Europe, to assume a larger part of the burden of the economic, financial, and military defense of the free world. This burden still rests to a disproportionate degree on the United States, which, as the President pointed out, is carrying it to the maximum of its ability all around the world, from Berlin to Saigon, in Latin America, Asia, and Africa.

This disproportion is not only morally untenable in view of the equal stake of all these nations in the common defense and the vast amount of American aid that sparked their recovery, it is also detrimental and potentially dangerous to all be-because it upsets our balance of payments. And on this rests the soundness of the dollar, key to the economic stability and progress of the free world.

The United States has been able to carry this maximum load thus far partly because it amassed a vast gold hoard during and immediately after the war, partly because it still exports far more—$5.7 billion more last year—than it imports, and partly because it has around $2.5 billion in profits a year on its foreign investments. But despite this strong position the United States still expends more dollars abroad than it takes in—$2.4 billion more last year—with the result that its gold holdings have dropped by some $7.5 billion in the last dozen years.

Tourist expenditures, foreign investments, which at times proceeded at a faster rate than the return on them, and shifts of "hot" money seeking both tax havens and higher profits account for part of this deficit. But the largest part is due, first, to the $3 billion annual cost of keeping our military forces abroad, and second, to the approximately $4 billion a year in foreign economic and military aid.

It is on the last two accounts that the other nations, especially the newly rich with dollar and gold surpluses, are asked to contribute more. Their contributions have increased lately, but still lag behind the American contribution in terms of gross national product and especially in the military defense that is part of their own self-defense. They cannot afford to ignore the call to them.

Emotional Fakery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on March 2, the Cleveland Plain Dealer had

an excellent editorial on the question of medical care tied in with social security and under unanimous consent, I include the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

EMOTIONAL FAKERY

The President's renewed pitch for health insurance benefits for the aged through social security must be construed as another attempt for legislation through emotional appeal instead of reason. How, for instance, can a person possibly be against this bill unless he hates old people who are sick and indigent?

He can oppose it because it is not what it pretends to be. It implies strongly that with its passage the problems of old people will be taken care of because their hospital and nursing home expenses will be paid for by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. What hospitals and what nursing homes?

Do you know of any such institutions that are even partly idle, just waiting for business? (Federal hospitals are exempt from the bill.) Do you know that by the articles in the bill, participating hospitals must apply for, and be granted, provider of services licenses? Do you know there is not and cannot be short of nationalization of hospitals, any force compelling hospitals or nursing homes to enlist in the program?

Section 1601 of the bill provides that no Federal officer or employee shall have anything to do with supervision or control of medicine or manner of medical services in a hospital or nursing home—but another clause states that determination of costs of services is the privilege of the Federal Government. Do you know that section 1611 states clearly that the Welfare Secretary, alone, determines what each provider of services (hospital) shall receive and when the amount shall be paid?

This is exercise of controls through the back door and typical of the wording of all proposed legislation to date dealing with socialized medicine or hospitalization. The President in this bill suggests boldly there are facilities which do not exist; he denies the success of the Kerr-Mills Act; he ignores the fact that private health and hospital insurance rapidly is doing a more nearly complete job in the area; he refuses to acknowledge his program not only is impractical but, in the main, adds more power to the central Government, more red tape, more bureaucracy, more turning over to Washington the chores which should be done on a community and State level.

Because we do have compassion for all taxpayers as well as the aged and sick, we can honestly oppose this bill. We think it's not what it pretends to be. If it could deliver half of what it promises by implication, you wouldn't be getting it for the suggested price of an additional $13 per year, for you and for your employer, on your social security tax. The bill is just a wedge in the door, another political attempt to convert the business of health into a nationalized product.

Mayor's Prayer Breakfast Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Mayor Roe Bartle, of Kansas City, Mo., sponsored a mayor's prayer breakfast on the morning of February 22. Over 500 of Kansas City's outstanding Christian laymen were in attendance. An excellent program was arranged and I had the honor of presiding at the meeting.

The message for the occasion was delivered by the Honorable Albert A. Ridge of the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Judge Ridge is an outstanding Christian layman who devotes much of his time to civic affairs and worthy charitable organizations. It was an outstanding occasion and an outstanding message.

I ask unanimous consent that the message be made a part of these remarks and printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In every age of history, fragments of society have been characterized by various names. Currently, it is generally called the space age. But if we consider it from the standpoint of rectitude and virtue, perhaps we Americans should more properly term it the age of indifference.

Why So? Because of the apparent indifference of so many of our people to the lack of moral values in our present-day professions, government and business. This is not geographical with us, though only certain parts of our society has been blighted. It may be found in all phases of our society. As a consequence, are we now living in a sea of moral vacuum?

If proof is needed for such statements, only look at world affairs; the attitude of people, old and young, concerning religion; the text of leading world media of communications in their various forms; and the headlines in our daily papers disclosing the betrayal of public and private trusts.

You, intelligent men of strong religious faith, must recognize that to be so, and you must know that it does not augur any good for us, presently or for our future. Because I believe such is your perception, I say to you, men of strong religious faith: "It is good for us to be here," at this mayor's prayer breakfast.

I say "men of strong religious faith" in sincere commendation of each of you—without thought of flattery. I can reach no other opinion of you—responding as you have to an invitation where greater emphasis is to be placed on morality and spirituality in the professions, government and business. I believe you have been urged to respond to that invitation by a power stronger than any which human personality might engender. As I perceive that power, it stems from your appreciation that "Not by bread alone shall man live, but by every word of God." Luke 4: 4.

That time is ripe when more emphasis must be given to morality and spirituality in our professions, government and business, cannot be gainsaid. But, if that is to be done, where shall we commence? First, let us recall to mind the primary source from which those religious verities come into our lives. This may be done in two ways: (1) by an excursion in theology; or (2) it might be more readily accomplished by way of historical example. Because of time limits, let us take the latter course.

I do so by recalling to mind events in the recorded history of our country, where our forefathers, by expressions of strong religious faith, gave vent to morality and spirituality in their public lives—and so expressed their ideals and ideas—that their thoughts and expressions have been accepted by all men of strong faith as statements of religious principles essential to the maintenance of our way of life.

You have heard it said that at the basis of every Judaic-Christian political theory of government there is a theology; that is a doctrine of God, and man's relation to God. That truism is characterized by historical events occurring in this beloved country of ours more than any other. It is so self-evident with us—we treat with it as the cornerstone that has made our Government—"The last best hope of man on earth!" Let me name a few such events:

The Mayflower compact was opened by our Pilgrim forebears with these words: "In the name of God. Amen." The subscribers thereto signed it mutually "by the grace" and for "the glory of God."

The Liberty Bell, when it was cast in 1751, was inscribed with these words of Moses: "Proclaim liberty throughout the land unto all the habitants thereof."

In the Declaration of Dependence of God the Continental Congress, in 1775, a year before the Declaration of Independence was signed, called upon all the citizens of the Colonies to observe and set aside "a day of public humiliation, fasting and prayer; that we may, with united hearts and voices, unfeignedly confess and deplore our sins and offer up joint supplication to the all-wise, omnipotent and merciful dispenser of all events" for the welfare of our country.

The greatest event appearing in our recorded history expressing morality, spirituality and our belief in God and the rights of man, was of course the signing of the Declaration of Independence, where it was said: "All men are created equal, endowed by their Creator with inalienable rights"—not some men, but all men, everywhere. To better exercise those rights, man creates government and endows that government with specific authority over him. The primary purpose of government is to secure those rights for each individual citizen, and the only just powers given to government come from the consent of the governed.

These thoughts expressed by our forefathers are only a modicum of similar events recorded in the history of our country. They give positive evidence, however, that indifference to morality and spirituality was not the way of life of those who brought this beloved country of ours into existence. Such godly concepts, premised as they are in the teachings of the Old and New Testaments, were deeply rooted in the philosophy of our forefathers.

Therefore, recorded history establishes that our Founding Fathers had thoughts concerning morality and spirituality which they singleheartedly recorded and made a part of the founding documents of this, our beloved, country. Further, that they gave vent to these thoughts in their professions, government, and business. The seeds they planted provide the life roots from which the Constitution of these United States derives its essential vitality. Such expressed principles of religious liberty and democracy, and their democracy, and their accommodating their lives thereto, is what gave us our American political creed.

No greater proof of that statement can be made than by recalling to mind Washington's First Inaugural Address, delivered on April 30, 1789. Meeting, as we are, on the natal anniversary of the Father of our Country, it is most appropriate that we be reminded of his first offical act. These are his words: "In this first official act, my fervent supplication to that Almighty Being, Who rules the Universe * * * that His Benedictions may consecrate to the liberties and happiness of the people of the United States, a government instituted by themselves," and he immediately asked God to aid him "to execute with success the functions allotted to [his] charge."

Does not this point up for us that the essential unity which exists in our scheme of government is premised in morality and

spirituality? To me, it does—and that if the citizens of this beloved country of ours are to maintain our heritage we cannot be indifferent to those concepts, we must adhere to them and make them a part of our daily lives as our forefathers did, before we can give emphasis thereto in our professions, government, and business. That we are morally obligated to do so, let us recall the words of the Apostle Paul: "Now, there are varieties of gifts, but the same spirit; and there are varieties of ministries, but the same Lord; and there are varieties of working, but the same God Who works all things in all." 1 Corinthians 12: 4–7. By that, I think Paul was speaking of unity of purpose for the common good.

When you survey the weave of our Government, as made by the Founding Fathers, you will find the predominant skein to be justice—considered as a virtue and not as we usually look upon it, as being legal. To my way of thinking, that virtue, more than any other, is what molded and now maintains our way of life. Justice, like the cardinal virtues of faith, hope, and charity, ornaments the soul of man and gives to it greatness and nobility. Justice as a virtue is really the cornerstone of our Government.

The virtue of justice encompasses the virtues of religion, patriotism, gratitude, liberality, and other related virtues.

1. Religion, which regulates man in his relation to God, disposes man to pay loyal worship to his Creator, to love his neighbor as himself, and disposes man to seek eternal life in the presence of his God. To men of strong faith in God, it is not essential to explore the value of this virtue in man's life, nor its value as a priceless asset of our Government. I think it proper, however, to recall to mind that George Washington, who knelt at Valley Forge as portrayed before us, bade us remember that "The unity of Government, which constitutes [us] as one people" has "two indispensable supports—religion and morality."

(2) Patriotism is a virtue appended to Justice. Perhaps, this is to some of us an unaccustomed thought. Let us offer proof that love of country is a virtue. Ethically speaking, the constituents of all virtues are principally two: First, a virtue is a fixed habit. A person is not generous who once in a long while performs a generous deed. He is not obedient who at rare intervals submits to lawful authority. Generosity constantly inclines one to generous deeds, generous words, generous thoughts. I do not say that he who is generous may not become mean; for a virtue may be lost. My point is, that virtue is an habitual state, not a single act or a transitory phase of mind or soul. For example, the virtues of truthfulness. We do not consider a person truthful who tells the truth once in a long while. Nor do we consider a person untruthful who once in a long while departs from the truth under stress of fear or some other strong emotion. He is truthful who habitually strives to be truthful in word and deed. In the second place, virtue inclines to good, not to evil. When the habitual state of one's soul is naturally, easily, and so to speak gracefully, in good thoughts, good works, and good deeds, it is called a virtue.

Now, it is evident to all right-thinking men that there is an habitual state of the soul which inclines man to think and feel and speak and act in the good interest of his country. That is what I call the virtue of patriotism. Let us view it as we should view every virtue—in relation to our duty to God. Again, time will permit only a fleeting vista.

Throughout the Old Testament, Jerusalem, the Holy City, is a symbol and a center of patriotic devotion, as well as of religious worship. By the waters of Babylon, the Jews bemoaned and lamented their exile, and the sacred text itself celebrates the beauty of this twofold devotion.

In the New Testament, the duty of obedience to lawful authority is emphasized over and over again, and you may see therefrom an obligation of the virtue of patriotism. St. Paul summed it up thus: "Let every soul be subject to higher power; for there is no power but from God. Therefore, he that resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinances of God" (Rom. 13: 1). Moreover, if there is one virtue on which Judaic-Christian theology insists, it is charity, to love one's neighbor. Finally, and the most important of all considerations, comes the reflection that God has created [all] men, not for man alone, not for God alone, but also for his fellow human beings. The truth is that the unit of human nature is not the individual, but the family. And the state, as we view it, is an aggregate of families. Therefore, our attitude toward our fellow citizens, our duty toward them, and our love of country which is theirs and ours—all of which is regulated by laws, which in the nature of man have some divine sanction—is the measure of patriotism.

How essentially practical is the virtue of patriotism. It is a virtue. I have dwelt on it at some length to make manifest an appreciation that morality and spirituality are to be found in patriotism. This is too often overlooked or not perceived, when we consider our relation to our Government.

But, going back to a consideration of justice—other virtues annexed thereto are gratitude and liberality.

Gratitude inclines one to recognize the benefits received from another. Show me the business or professional man, or any citizen, who can honestly say that he is not most grateful to our Government—city, State, or Nation—for the benefits he receives therefrom, and I shall point out to you one who is not generous, but biased and grudging.

Liberality—properly defined, restrains the assertion of immodest affection for wealth by withholding seasonable gifts or expenses. This virtue requires our financial support of persons in need—and those eleemosynary institutions that are so related to, and a vital part of, our community—who have a right to call upon us for charitable support. This virtue is also concerned with the payment of our just share of the cost of government, as required by law. I am aware that the Old and New Testaments, and history generally, condemns unjust taxation, but at no place does it condemn just taxation as being unethical, even though at times it may become burdensome.

From what I have so tersely stated, let me sum up the virtue of justice in this fashion: Individually, it disposes and obligates each of us not to violate the property—bodily integrity—good name of another. It obligates us to our fellow man. To those who exercise public authority, it obligates them to distribute the benefits of government to all citizens, equally, regardless of race, creed, or color. Rank favoritism, partiality, official negligence, oppression and extortion of any sort, are anathema to justice. History, remote and recent, records that all the internal upheaval of society has been caused by agonized attempts to resist or shake off, the clutch of injustice. Injustice is, therefore, a vicious thing since it denies that which God has valued—the inherent rights of man—which man inherits from his God.

I am not privileged, nor do I desire, to discuss before you, controversial political or religious issues. What I have said has been kept general in order to emphasize that religious values are basic values which must be a common concern for all of us—the values are essential to the unity of purpose which must exist among us, nothwithstanding our different religious beliefs, if we are to preserve the heritage that is ours.

Washington reminded us in his Farewell Address: "With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have in a common cause fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess are the work of joint counsels, and the joint efforts"—of all our people. When Washsaid that, I believe he intended to remind us that we, as citizens, have a basis in religion for a public philosophy concerning government, essential to the maintenance of our way of life. Although he did not spell it out in so many terms, I think he was showing us that notwithstanding our different religious beliefs we should form a public consensus—that is, a secular-minded purpose concerning government which flows to us from religious principles—and which must have meaning for us, in our relation to government and our relation with one another. Such a "consensus" is more than public opinion. It is a unity of secular faith in government. That was the sine qua non that brought this Government of ours into being and is the absolute essential to the maintenance of our Government now.

Each of our Presidents, from Washington to Kennedy, has given public expression of his faith in God. At a breakfast such as this, not long ago, President Kennedy said: "No man who enters upon the office to which I succeeded can fail to recognize how every President of the United States has placed special reliance upon his faith in God." You men of strong religious faith readily understand that must be true.

On this memorable day, it is most fitting and proper that "We, the people" who proclaim, "In God we trust," should give open expression to our faith in God. Let us rededicate ourselves—to the norms of religious values and unity of purpose that has made us great as a people. The professing of such faith is vital to morality and spirituality, in all walks of life. If we but give emphasis thereto, and with God's grace not begin any action without remembering that He is witness of it—that He performs it, together with us, and gives us the means to do it—and never conclude any action without the same thought,—offering it to Him as belonging to Him;—and in the course of action, whenever the same thought shall occur, stop for a moment and renew the desire of pleasing Him,—we shall always give emphasis to morality and spirituality in our professions, government, and business.

This last word: President Kennedy, Senator CARLSON, and all our trusted leaders in Government, as well as all right-thinking laymen, challenge our attention to the fact that, "today, our Nation is passing through another time of trial. In many ways, our dangers and our problems are far greater—and certainly more complex"—than ever before. To meet this crisis, they tell us, "we will need to draw upon the best that this Nation has" intellectually and materially. But, even more than that, "we need to call upon our great reservoir of spiritual resources."

It is not necessary for us to explore the specific area of events that make such a clarion call necessary. Religious and patriotic men as you are, you apprehend the danger now confronting our country. If we are to fit ourselves to respond to such a call, you know our response must come primarily from our faith in God—from our hearts—and will depend on our reliance on one another, which in justice is due and owing by all to our country.

As President Kennedy said in his inaugural address, "Let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking [God's] blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own."

All the News That's Fit To Tint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I believe one of the best promoted myths of the day concerns the so-called objectivity of the New York Times. While the Times is a great newspaper as far as the depth and breadth of its coverage is concerned, it daily indicates that it fails to come close to objectivity. Day after day, it grinds out the anticonservative line and hands it down like dispatches from the Delphian oracle.

This they are certainly entitled to do. But it is not conceivable that they can do this while at the same time holding to a self-proclaimed posture of "middle of the road" or "unbiased." The New York Times is of the liberal persuasion, not middle of the road—or to use the reverse of its favorite terminology, "leftist." They brandish the words "right" and "rightist" like they were cancerous but show little concern for the extreme left in our society and refrain from repeated use of the term "leftist."

Many articles could be cited but three recent ones were particularly indicative of this overall slant. A front page article in the March 8, 1962, issue carried a heading of "Eighteen Thousand Rightists Rally at Garden" to feature its story on the YAF rally at Madison Square Garden. Times Writer Peter Kihss noted that the garden was "packed by an enthusiastic crowd of 18,000 persons." Later in the article the following appeared:

> Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, was the main speaker at a counterrally by Americans for Democratic Action and College Young Democrat groups in the St. Nicholas Arena. That hall, at Broadway and 66th Street, has a capacity of 4,000 persons. Admission was free.

Two of the Times' favorite devices were applied here. First, the protection of groups such as the ADA which certainly should out of consistency be called leftist if the Times brandishes the rightist terminology so readily to anyone or any group in the spectrum from conservative to the far, far right. You can be sure of one thing: it just is not done that way by the Times. Second, the use of half-truth or evasion. The statement was made categorically that 18,000 persons attended the YAF rally but all Mr. Kihss states here is that the St. Nicholas Arena will hold a capacity of 4,000. Were 4,000 in attendance? No, by every other report of the affair there were not more than 2,500 but Mr. Kihss uses an evasion of the truth to elevate the stature of the leftist meeting.

On March 10, 1962, the Times carried a single column, two-line heading "Far Right Called a Menace by Pike." Reading the story, the very first paragraph says, however:

> ROSLYN, LONG ISLAND, March 9—The Right Reverend James A. Pike, bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of California, said here tonight that both the radical right and the Communists were enemies of democracy.

Again, the same tactics by the New York Times. As I have had considerable experience with newspaper work and composition I know that it is often difficult to set headings of the one column variety and it is not very easy to use the word "conservative" in small headings. However, it is just as easy to use the term "leftist" to describe the liberal to Communist spectrum as it is to use the term "rightist." Why then is this not done?

In a straight reporting job, supposedly objective, under the heading "Debate Rises on Medical Care for Aged," Times writer Marjorie Hunter makes this statement which carries the badge of authority and fact:

> This tax, estimated to bring in about $1 billion in the first year, would be more than enough to finance the program and cover about 14,750,000 of the Nation's 17 million persons of 65 or over.

The more than enough allegation is subject to criticism since it cannot be supported by fact. Most honest observers conclude that it is almost impossible to tell exactly what the program will cost. A great amount of evidence indicates the billion dollars will not be nearly enough.

Four cartoons are adjacent to the story. Usually, the Times, in a slight concession to objectivity, will show differing views in the cartoons but all four of these are promedicare.

The New York Times bleeds very profusely at what it considers to be unfair and unjust. It might be well to have the editors take a close look at their own columns. The proud heading on the front page "All the News That's Fit To Print" might better read "All the News That's Fit To Tint."

Jurisdiction Over State Lands for Federal Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. MOSS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, on March 5 I called attention to an article in the Phoenix (Ariz.) Gazette on the importance to Arizona of passing S. 154, the bill sponsored by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and of which I am a cosponsor, to adjust legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands in the States used for Federal purposes. That article indicated the difficulties which exist in administering criminal law and the serious problems which arise in other fields because of the confused and chaotic state of legislative jurisdiction over Federal land areas within the States.

Because the Federal Government through the years has acquired exclusive jurisdiction over some 5,000 land areas within the States, just as it acquired such jurisdiction over the District of Columbia, these land areas have become Federal islands the residents of which may be denied by the surrounding State the right to vote, to send their children to public schools, or to exercise other basic rights that normally go to residents of a State. S. 154 would permit adjustment of legislative jurisdiction over individual land areas, by the head of the Federal agency controlling the land, in instances where the State gave its consent, so as to eliminate such problems and bring the jurisdictional status of Federal land areas into line with current use of the individual areas.

The problems which S. 154 is designed to solve are not peculiar to Utah or to Arizona, but exist throughout the United States. The Washington Evening Star, on this past February 20, published a letter to the editor from one Fred L. Royer which outlines efforts made by a group of Federal employees at the Veterans' Administration hospital at Perry Point, Md., to procure the fundamental American right of voting, a right which could be made available to them and thousands of persons similarly situated through exercise of the authority which would be given by S. 154.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter which was published in the Washington Evening Star printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT'S "MEN WITHOUT A COUNTRY"

> At the head of Chesapeake Bay in Cecil County is located the Veterans' Administration Hospital, Perry Point. On this Federal enclave about 250 adults of voting age rent quarters: they are employees (and wives of employees) of the hospital. They represent a wide spectrum of occupations, but the majority are in the professions of medicine, psychiatry, psychology, nursing, social work, and management specialities. They are active participants, leaders, and supporters of many institutions in the surrounding communities—churches, Boy Scouts, PTA, Little League, etc. Many of the elective offices in these organizations are filled by Perry Point residents. They pay their Federal taxes; they also pay all Maryland taxes. Except for the fact that they rent Government property, there is no distinction to be made between them and the residents of the surrounding community. Yet because they live on Federal property, they cannot vote. When one is closely involved in community affairs and expends considerable effort in supporting its institutions, it is difficult not to feel severely deprived when he cannot exercise that most precious and important right to vote. This is especially true when the same feeling of civic responsibility which leads one to participate in community activities also leads to a desire to have a voice in the election.
>
> In November 1961 a group of civic-minded residents registered at the Cecil County Court House. Several weeks later we received letters from the board of election supervisors that our registrations were canceled, on the grounds that we were not legally citizens of Maryland. It seemed rather incongruous that Maryland could consider us as citizens for purposes of taxation but declare us as noncitizens for purposes of voting.

The group sought legal advice. According to my limited understanding of the subtle legal points involved, it appears that the weight of legal opinion has been that because the Federal Government exercises exclusive jurisdiction over its property, the residents thereon were in fact not residents of the State; consequently, they could not vote, and until 1947 they could not be taxed. At that time, Congress passed the Buck Act which gives the States the right to tax (and collect tax from) such residents. This was, of course, a just piece of legislation for such residents do use the facilities of the State which surround their enclave. Our point of view is that if Congress gave up sufficient jurisdiction to tax and collect it, then the exclusive jurisdiction principle cannot hold any longer from a logical point of view. It should be possible, therefore, for the State to simply pass a bill defining such residents as legal residents of the State, providing they can meet all other requirements. Our group, which includes most of the 250 residents of voting age, is therefore introducing a bill into the Maryland Legislature to accomplish just that.

In the event that we are unable to accomplish our goal in the legislature, we shall take the issue to the courts. We have a firm belief that the law must be and is built upon what is morally right. It seems difficult for us to believe that in this era of great awareness of civil rights, in this time of awakening of many people to their social and civic responsibilities, individuals who should and want to vote should be deprived of that right. If legislation can enable the States to collect taxes, then legislation or the courts should be able to quickly give us a vote.

FRED L. ROYER, Ph. D.

PERRYVILLE, MD.

Administration's Farm Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a resolution adopted without opposition in a meeting of the Kansas Association of Wheat Growers, Kansas State Grange, Kansas Farmers Union, Farmers Cooperative Commission Co., Farmers Union Jobbing Association, and the Southwest Kansas Irrigation Association, in Hutchinson, Kans., on February 14, 1962, endorsing the overall provisions of the administration's farm proposal:

Whereas representatives of the Kansas Association of Wheat Growers, the Kansas State Grange, the Kansas Farmers Union, the Farmers Cooperative Commission Co., the Farmers Union Jobbing Association, and the Southwest Kansas Irrigation Association, meeting in Hutchinson, Kans., February 14, 1962, represent a wide area affected by the administration farm bill at present being considered in Washington, D.C.: Be it

Resolved, That this group endorse the overall intent of the administration farm bill to (1) bring the production of the agricultural plant into balance with disappearance; (2) support prices for orderly marketing and maintaining farm income; and (3) recognize the need for soil conservation in land retirement programs. We believe this bill offers the most satisfactory machinery for bringing these about at this time; be it further

Resolved, That those working with the bill be urged to (1) hold the certificate program to a two-price system for reasons of simplicity, workability, and economy; (2) make the program for recreational facilities under the land retirement program a voluntary program; and (3) see that certain guidelines or limitations be placed in the bill for (a) amounts of grain to be drawn from CCC stocks and (b) payments to be made on diverted acres.

Wisconsin Participants in United States-India Farmer Exchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the creation of an effective U.S. policy to promote peace in the world requires not only good governmental policy but also nongovernmental support by our citizens.

Earlier this week I was privileged to discuss such participation with two outstanding citizens of Wisconsin, the master of the Wisconsin State Grange and his wife, Mr. and Mrs. Elmer Marquart.

Participating in a farmer-to-farmer exchange program to India, sponsored by the Farmers and World Affairs, Inc., program, Grange Master Marquart and his wife have just returned from a 2-month, 7,000-mile tour of 8 of the 14 states of India. In connection with the constructive way in which these farming folks, as well as other individuals, are participating constructively in promoting better relationship with other nations, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, first, a résumé of highlights of our discussions on the farmer-to-farmer exchange programs; and, second, information on the Farmers and World Affairs, Inc., program.

There being no objection, the summary and the memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMER AND WORLD AFFAIRS, INC.

WHAT IS IT?

Farmers and World Affairs, Inc., is a nonprofit, educational organization, incorporated in the State of Delaware on August 1, 1956.

Established to promote peace through mutual understanding, Farmers and World Affairs seeks to help American farmers become better informed about world problems and find solution to some of the complex questions of international relations—questions of world trade, armaments, helping the less fortunate, making the United Nations more effective, etc.

Farmers and World Affairs is not a membership organization. It solicits no dues and is supported entirely by voluntary contributions. It does not pass resolutions, or make statements on national policy, or engage in legislative activity. The farmers it serves are encouraged to work for world peace in and through their own national and local farm organizations.

WHO IS IT?

Farmers and World Affairs, like any organization, is composed of people—people who are farmers, who know farm thinking and farm problems, people who are intensely interested in peace.

Its president, Edward F. Holter, is national lecturer of the grange. Its executive secretary, Ray Newton, grew up on a New England farm, and worked for 29 years with the American Friends Service Committee, developing educational programs to promote international good will and understanding. Its board of directors is composed of outstanding leaders of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Farmers Union, and the National Grange, selected in consultation with the presidents of those organizations. Also on the board are members of the American Friends Service Committee, an organization devoted to building understanding and lessening tensions the world over. All board members serve as individuals, and not as official representatives of their organizations.

WHY IS IT?

For hundreds of years the world's peoples have yearned for peace. If mankind is to survive in the nuclear age, the nations of the world must abolish war—now, before it is too late. If the United States is to take the lead in this endeavor, its citizens must understand the problems involved and what must be done to solve them.

Farmers have always been among the most peace minded of American citizens, both as individuals and in the official policies of their organizations. As an important segment of American society, they can make a real contribution toward the elimination of war and the promotion of world peace by (1) becoming better informed about the economic, political, and military facts of life in the nuclear age; (2) facing the moral responsibilities these facts pose; (3) sharing their understanding with others in public and private discussion; (4) developing the kind of personal friendships with farmers in other countries that will help to build a true world community.

HOW DOES IT WORK?

Farmers and World Affairs works largely with the already existing educational processes of National, State, and local farm organizations.

It helps those responsible for educational programs to become better informed about international problems; find appropriate pamphlets, films, recordings, and other educational materials on world affairs; become more skilled in the use of educational tools and techniques in this field; devise interesting and significant activities for grassroots groups; develop people-to-people contacts with farmers in other countries.

Farmers and World Affairs makes these services available through institutes, conferences, short courses, discussion groups, personal contacts. It distributes information and educational materials on a nationwide basis and plans to operate in various regions of the country through a gradually expanding field staff.

INDIA FARMERS LIKE U.S. FARMERS WILEY INTERVIEW REVEALS

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, in a weekend radio-TV program for Wisconsin stations interviewed Mr. and Mrs. Elmer Marquart, of Knowles, Wis., participants in United States-India farm exchange program. Under sponsorship of the Farmers and World Affairs, Inc., program the Wisconsin State Grange master and his wife just recently returned from a 2-month, 7,000-mile tour of India. The objectives of the exchange program include efforts to promote peace through understanding, to become better informed about international problems; develop people-to-people contacts with farmers in other countries; and share new understandings with other U.S. citizens in private and public discussions.

HIGHLIGHTS OF TOUR

During the tour of 8 of the 14 States of India, highlights of the Marquarts' activities included 66 different group meetings; visits to 8 colleges—including girls', agricultural, and other colleges, as well as 14 schools of lower educational levels; 12 meetings with state and national officials, such as governors and mayors; attendance at about 20 different religious meetings; visits to 10 factories—including silk, sugar, and farm implement plants; visits to 16 different villages; and attendance at the agricultural fair at Madras, India, including the U.S. exhibit.

The major impressions of Mr. and Mrs. Marquart were reflected in the following observations:

1. India farmers like U.S. farmers.

2. The exchange—also bringing Indians to the United States, including Wisconsin, next year—will be beneficial in (a) acquainting them with U.S. production methods, (b) creating a correct picture of how individual Americans live, and (c) exposing them to our free way of life.

3. Undergoing a great awakening, the Indian people—despite great economic and other handicaps—show real promise for the future. During the recent elections, the Communists made an open, strong campaign effort to convert India to communism. Around the country there were many prominently placed posters displaying the hammer and sickle. Nevertheless, the majority of people believe in democracy.

4. The women work very hard performing household duties, at factories and building construction jobs, and on the farms.

5. The Indian farmer was surprised at the revelation that the American farmer really gets his hands dirty.

During the exchange tour, the Marquarts photographed about 700 color slides and 100 black and white pictures to be used in discussions and lectures.

Concluding, the Marquarts said: "Every night we went to bed we gave a prayer of thankfulness that we had the opportunity of being born in the United States."

Down to the Last Piece of Paper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of my colleagues to the following statement of the New York State Board of Social Welfare and a resolution of the Supervisors Association of the State of New York:

STATEMENT BY THE NEW YORK STATE BOARD OF SOCIAL WELFARE

This board has been concerned over the years with the many problems that have stemmed from Federal-State relationships in the public welfare field, especially with the steadily increasing domination by Federal authorities and the consequent loss of State and local autonomy.

Back in 1951 the Governor of New York State appointed the (Kelly) commission to study federally aided welfare programs and examine the problems of Federal-State relationships and the more immediate threat of withholding Federal funds because of certain variances in assistance standards and practices in local public welfare departments. More recently the New York State temporary State commission on coordination of State activities identified the danger of the current situation in this growing complex of Federal-State-local welfare machinery.

These and other studies by New York State indicated that there was no disagreement on the fundamental objectives of all modern public welfare—to help people who have no other resources but public aid, and to provide that assistance as promptly, as effectively, and as economically as possible, in accordance with the best self-help practices. What is involved is the bureaucratic network of Federal regulations, reporting, auditing, bulletins, State letters, interpretations, conformity reviews, and a snowstorm of other administrative paper requirements.

Once again this board finds it necessary to express concern, its very real alarm, over another threat to extend Federal dominance in public welfare—the latest welfare proposals of the Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Here again, this board and the staff of the State department of social welfare do not quarrel with objectives—providing for needy people who must be helped, rehabilitating individuals who can profit thereby, and using every known modern technique for breaking the chain of dependency in sorely deprived families. Our anxiety arises from the specific ways and means proposed to reach these objectives.

These new proposals, if adopted by the Congress, would give the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in Washington full power to dictate in detail to all the States, and therefore to all the thousands of local communities in the Nation that administer public welfare, just how it is to be managed, almost down to the last piece of paper.

The discretion vested in the Secretary is without limitations.

The philosophy implied and inherent is in flat contradiction to the historic concern of New York State and its localities for home rule and ignores the basic right and responsibility of the State and its localities to decide how they will conduct their public business.

We believe that a stand must be made now, by this State and, hopefully, every other State, to stop and to reverse the trend of increasing Federal domination, of a growing complexity that is getting completely out of hand, and of the constant threats to withhold Federal funds because of alleged nonconformity with Federal regulations.

To accomplish this urgently needed change, this board proposes that:

1. Because many of these problems stem from federally required State plans, the Social Security Act should be revised to require that, not a State's plan, but its State laws, should be used as the basis for determining whether a State is in conformity with Federal law.

Such a revision would also shift the responsibility for accepting or refusing Federal welfare funds from administrators to legislators. The amount of funds that are now available to a State such as New York, over $200 million annually, is so great that the decision to accept or refuse such funds should be made by those who have the duty to decide the major fiscal policies of the State. After all, the effect of such fiscal decisions goes far beyond the interest or jurisdiction of any single State agency.

2. The Federal administrator's powers to review a State's program for conformity should be limited to reviewing a State's welfare laws. This would restrain Federal administrative personnel from continuously stretching Federal requirements and threatening a State agency with withdrawal of Federal funds unless its voluminous State plan is amended again and again to conform to the latest Federal interpretation of its own regulations.

3. Determinations stemming from this review procedure should be appealable to an appropriate Federal court, which would render a decision after a hearing in which the facts indicated whether a State did meet the requirements of the Federal law or whether its claims for Federal funds were made in good faith or that it withheld the Federal share of recovery funds from the Federal Government.

This board respectfully asks Governor Rockefeller to request the New York State Legislature to memorialize the Congress to consider the grave threats to the Federal-State-local welfare system, and to all government relationships, represented by this imbalance of powers, and to act quickly and forthrightly to correct the situation.

This board also asks the New York State delegation to the Congress to give its special attention to the Federal legislative proposals before that body in the interest of New York State and all States.

RESOLUTION OF THE SUPERVISORS ASSOCIATION OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK FAVORING MODERNIZATION OF PUBLIC WELFARE ADMINISTRATION

Whereas a part of the rising cost of tax-supported welfare programs is paid from local real property taxes levied by county boards of supervisors; and

Whereas studies by private management consultant firms employed by county boards of supervisors and committees appointed by boards of supervisors have revealed inefficient administrative practices and wasteful spending of welfare funds in certain counties; and

Whereas the study conducted for the Temporary State Commission on Coordination of State Activities listed many inadequacies in the administration of welfare programs in this State; and

Whereas the principles and philosophies of public welfare administration formulated during the great depression are still with us today; and

Whereas public welfare programs have been characterized by continued expansions instead of the development and application of new ideas; and

Whereas the Supervisors Association of the State of New York has repeatedly resolved in favor of public welfare investigations and the implementation of useful recommendations; and

Whereas the solution to the public welfare problem lies in the direction of the reduction of dependency and cost and not in the direction of more welfare bureaus and spending; and

Whereas the Governor of the State of New York has appointed and given full power to a commission of 11 citizens of this State to examine every aspect of public welfare in this State; and

Whereas the U.S. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has announced a program to curb welfare frauds and reduce dependency through programs geared to get recipients back on the job; and

Whereas Secretary Ribicoff estimates that the changes he is making will cost the Federal and State Governments more money; and

Whereas the first year's cost of the administrative changes which the Secretary plans to make would be $17.3 million: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Supervisors' Association of the State of New York go on record in favor of eliminating obsolete practices, principles, and philosophies in the administration of public welfare, and modernizing the theory and practice of welfare administration to fit today's needs and thereby reduce dependency and its costs; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, New York State's

Members of Congress, the Governor of the State of New York, and the members of the New York State Legislature.

FRANK J. LANGE,
Executive Secretary.

Censorship: Some Conclusions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the March 10, 1962, edition of the Navy Times contains an excellent editorial entitled "Censorship: Some Conclusions." This editorial deals with censorship in three particular areas: Speeches, statements to Congress, and professional articles, and in my opinion contains some very constructive suggestions about this problem.

In order that all people who are interested in the problem of censorship might have access to these ideas, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CENSORSHIP: SOME CONCLUSIONS

For weeks now the pros and cons of censorship have been aired before and by the Stennis subcommittee. Enough of a record has been compiled on this vital matter to allow us to reach some conclusions.

The first is, we are glad these hearings are being held and we're glad Senator THURMOND raised the fuss which produced them and that Senator STENNIS has conducted them so fairly. If they aren't turning out just the way Senator THURMOND could have wished, neither are they turning out to justify Senator FULBRIGHT and others who favor restrictions on military men's talk.

Skipping seminars for the time being—the record hasn't been made on that topic yet—we want to talk this week about speeches, statements to Congress and articles in professional journals.

Speeches, first. We stand somewhere between those who favor censorship and those who oppose all review.

Specifically, we think a "review" of speeches any U.S. official, civilian, or military, is making in an official capacity is very much in order. A man, even a Secretary of Defense or a CNO, might conceivably say something which could do great damage. So it is wise to submit these to a central clearinghouse.

However, for top officials this should be a review—not censorship. That is, the clearinghouse should suggest changes, not make them. As General Eisenhower and Admiral Burke pointed out, top officials have got to be assumed to have discretion—more discretion, we add, than a junior "censor"—or they don't belong in their jobs.

We are sure that 99 44/100 percent of the time, top officials will accept suggestions. But in that small fraction of the time in which they disagree, it is wrong to force them to appeal over the heads of censors.

In this respect columnist David Lawrence had a suggestion some weeks ago that makes sense to us. It is that, where a top official chooses not to delete a recommended change, he include in this speech a clear statement that the views he is expressing are his own.

There is a two-edged sword, by the way, in this censorship business. Now and then foreign governments or peoples have reacted strongly to pronouncements by U.S. citizens. Our Government has always reminded that such statements, under our system of Government, are not official. But how can such a defense be raised if the world knows that every statement by an official is censored?

Now how about officials below the Secretary and Joint Chiefs of Staff level? Should there be censorship or review? We'd say the Defense and State Departments should be able to make changes. But even then there ought to be provision for an officer of any rank to say what he thinks—provided he precedes it with a disclaimer, as Lawrence proposes.

What are we so afraid of? In years not so long gone by we've seen officers who preached very extreme views. Somehow their services survived and the Nation survived. Nor did the public at large consider that either type of extremist was speaking for anybody in the military but themselves.

But they should remember that if they take sides in any controversial political matters, they are fair game for the retort discourteous—to be made fun of as "brass" be branded as militarists, demagogues and the like. So while we insist upon their right to speak, we think they ought to exercise the right sparingly.

One point more, and we're through with speeches. We reject the statement that the controversy over censorship is really one of relatively junior ghostwriters, disputing with relatively junior censors.

Only to the extent that the ghostwriter submits for clearance a speech which his superior has not previously read or dictated as to theme, is it a battle of juniors. If the superior has read and approved the speech and is preparing to deliver it himself before an audience, it is his speech. It is not a ghostwriter's speech.

Statements to Congress. Here there is no room for compromise. Even former Defense Secretary Lovett, who favors censorship of speeches, made it clear that his stand did not apply to requests from Congress for information to enable it to discharge its constitutional responsibility.

We don't agree with Air Force Chief of Staff LeMay's argument before Congress last week that the budget neglects bombers in general and the B-70 in particular. But we defend his right to speak his piece and the legislators to hear his exact views. God help the United States. God help us all if the day ever comes when the LeMays, or the Burkes, or the rest can only tell Congress what the administration wants Congress to hear.

Or as President Kennedy himself put it: If ever the United States should reach a point where the clash of ideas comes to an end, where debate disappears, where everybody agrees with everybody else on everything, then we are finished as a Nation."

In this connection, we think Fleet Admiral Nimitz should not have submitted his statement to the Stennis committee on censorship to Defense for clearance. The submission raises the natural doubt: Was Congress given Admiral Nimitz' position on censorship or Admiral Nimitz' position as modified by Defense? Well, with Nimitz we know; it was Nimitz' views Congress was hearing. But if it were a lesser man than Fleet Admiral Nimitz, would we know? Would Congress know?

Professional articles. Here too there is no room for compromise.

As Kennedy said, "If ever * * * the clash of ideas comes to an end * * * we are finished."

The administration should practice what it preaches.

Imagine censoring three articles by lawyers for lawyers out of the JAG Journal.

Imagine making the editors of the Naval Institute carry their prize essays to censors.

In the climate of today would naval officers have been able to point out some of the dangers of deep selection or criticize the way marine accidents are investigated?

Or would Marine Colonel Heinl have been able to write his famous article which criticized policies which seem to assume officers are thieves and liars?

We know the answer to that one. Heinl's more recent article reviewing the Marine Corps' several fights for its life has been held up for months now by censors. We read that article; it was furnished to us in galley proof form before all this censorship of articles began. We printed a review of it. We were tempted to write an editorial at the time on the theme of how fortunate it is that we have a Congress, for it time and again saved the Marines, when Presidents (at least three), the Army and even the Navy would have destroyed or curtailed the Corps. But we had other things at the time which seemed more important.

Why would a Navy professional journal like the Proceedings publish an article which criticizes so many, including the Navy?

Because the Navy subscribes to Kennedy's statement. Because it knows that out of free debate comes correction of wrongs, comes improvement. Because it knows that if it is to get and keep the kind of thinkers it needs, it has got to let those thinkers think. Which is to say, speak out.

An anti-Navy columnist recently wrote that the Institute refused to publish pro-ASW, anticarrier article. Maybe it did—or maybe the defense censors did it for them. We don't know. But we do know that anticarrier, pro-ASW articles have appeared in the Proceedings in the past.

To appear in the Proceedings, an article must be approved by the board of control. At every opportunity, since this censorship menace reared its head, we've been buttonholing every admiral, general and captain on the board of control we could find. We asked each this question: Have you ever voted for the publication of articles with which you personally disagreed?

Those we contacted—with one exception—said "Many times." The fifth said: "I've approved many articles about which I had personal doubts; I would not approve one which I thought was fundamentally very wrong."

These are the voices of professionalism, of free inquiry speaking.

This spirit must be preserved. The only censorship in professional publications must be for security.

Power Coordinating Plan Offers Saving to Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following editorial from the Rock Island Argus, Rock Island, Ill., of February 2, 1962:

POWER COORDINATING PLAN OFFERS SAVING TO PUBLIC

Fourteen power companies, including the Iowa-Illinois Gas & Electric Co., have offered the Federal Government a money-saving plan for coordinating its hydroelectric plants

in the Missouri River with those of the private concerns.

If the Government rejects this partnership offer, it will leave itself open to charges that it likes to waste money and encroach on private enterprise. It is almost unbelievable that it would take such an attitude; yet the private companies' plan has opposition.

The proposition is this: The Government's eight plants in the Missouri, built or on the planning board, will generate only 900,000 kilowatts of power when the water is low. This really becomes the ceiling. Although they can generate 1,850,000 kilowatts at high-water, it can't be guaranteed the year around.

The 14 companies—12 private concerns, 1 electric power cooperative and a public power district in Nebraska—offer to exchange power with the Government plants so that the latter will have available 1,850,000 kilowatts the year round.

These companies, located in Iowa, Wisconsin, Nebraska, Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota, have the facilities for guaranteeing 900,000 kilowatts of power yearly, some of it from the Riverside plant in the quad cities.

What is the alternative? The Rural Electrification Administration would provide the additional power by borrowing through the Reclamation Bureau. It would borrow at 2 percent but the Government would have to pay 4 percent to get the money. The REA, armed with an exemption from the corporate income tax, would expand its war against private enterprise. Even so, it could supply only 400,000 kilowatts—short of the need in a low-water year.

The case for the 14 companies was presented to Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall this week by representatives of the 14 companies, including W. H. Wiese, manager of Iowa-Illinois' electric production department. A decision has not been made.

What they offer is a sort of partnership, for which there is precedent in California and other areas. The partnership idea in situations of this kind is favored by a good many Members of Congress. But the REA backers, ever striving to enlarge their empire, are on the job in Washington. Supporters of free enterprise need to make themselves heard.

While this project is of particular interest to the Middle West, it should be of concern to taxpayers throughout the Nation. Why waste money to promote REA's empire building?

President Kennedy said he wanted to make American free enterprise a showcase for the world. Here is a case where his administration can show its sincerity.

B-58 Crosses Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday March 5, America's only supersonic bomber, the General Dynamics B–58, shattered three speed records in a nonstop flight from Los Angeles to New York and back.

The B–58 is built in Fort Worth, Tex., whose congressional district it is my privilege to represent. Because of my familiarity with this remarkable aircraft and the men who build it and fly it, I have long realized what a truly versatile and powerful weapons system it is.

I am happy to say that this opinion has been shared by a majority of my colleagues in the Congress. You will remember that the Congress last session appropriated $525 million for continued production of manned bombers—either the incredible B–58 or the far slower B–52.

For some reason, the administration and the Defense Department saw fit not to use this money to continue bomber production. As a result, the B–58 production line late this year will grind to a stop. We can only hope that our military planners are correct in believing there is no longer a need to produce manned bombers.

B–58's now have flown more than 18,955 operational hours, of which more than 840 hours have been at speeds in excess of the speed of sound.

In the past, there may have been those who have interpreted my active support of the B–58 as a selfish cause—that I was fighting for its continued production only because it represented a major industry in Fort Worth.

For that reason, and for the reason that the entire Nation has a right to be proud of our B–58's and the men who fly them, I would like to insert into the RECORD this report on the historic March 5 flight from a source that is zealously objective—The Christian Science Monitor. Here is what the Monitor had to say about it:

B–58 CROSSES FRONTIER

(By John C. Waugh)

LOS ANGELES.—Across 12 States, dragging a sonic boom behind it, a triangular-winged, wasp-waisted bomber with a quaint, long-legged landing gear didn't just barely break old records. It pulverized them.

It took but 2 hours, 1 minute, 39 seconds to get from Los Angeles to New York; only 2 hours, 15 minutes, 12 seconds to get back; and only 4 hours, 43 minutes, and 51 seconds for the whole trip—4,900 miles nonstop.

"You could've fired off a cannonball at the same time we passed over Los Angeles, and we would've been able to land in New York and eat lunch before that cannonball got there."

That's how Air Force Capt. Robert G. Sowers described how fast he was going the day he and two crew members went to New York and back in a B–58.

They didn't even pack a lunch. "It didn't take that long," Captain Sowers noted.

Flying that power-laden supersonic bomber, Captain Sowers and his two-man crew, on March 5, smashed three cross-country speed records for manned aircraft, pushing back still another aeronautical frontier.

SPEED—WITH A DRAW

This shaved 4 minutes off the old west-to-east record, set in 1961 by Navy Lt. Richard Gordon in an F4B–1 fighter-bomber. It sliced 1 hour and 21 minutes off the east-to-west mark set in 1957 by Capt. Robert M. Sweet in an Air National Guard RF–101C Voodoo. And it bettered by 2 hours and 3 minutes the old round-trip top speed, also set in 1957 by Captain Sweet in his Voodoo.

Backed against a wall by TV cameras and curious newsmen, Captain Sowers, shortly after he had announced the mission's end with a resounding sonic boom plainly heard over Los Angeles, confessed he had gone as fast as 1,450 miles an hour at times, twice the speed of sound. His average speed was 1,044.3 miles an hour.

"Let's see," drawled Captain Sowers (nearly all pilots who break speed records seem to possess drawls—Captain Sowers even more so, being from North Carolina), "that works out to about 20 miles per minute. Think of some place 20 miles away and we get there a minute later, with a little time to spare."

The flight March 5 included such time wasters as having to refuel three times, which involved going at a pokey 500 miles an hour for 17 minutes each time ("like stopping at a service station," drawled Captain Sowers). It also involved turning around out in the Atlantic after having shot over New York. That wasted another 10 minutes.

PRIDE OF THE 43D

Like a sprinter in the starting block, the record-setting B–58 got off to one false start. "We were up in the clouds over Los Angeles and the validators on the ground couldn't see us," explained Captain Sowers. "So we had to turn around and start over again."

Two B–58 "Hustlers," whose four powerful General Electric J–79 engines generate 64,000 pounds of thrust wide open, enough to power 84 diesel locomotives, began the journey. One dropped out on the way back over Sedalia, Mo., after encountering minor mechanical trouble.

Both aircraft operate out of the Strategic Air Command's Carswell Air Force Base in Texas. And as of this moment, Captain Sowers and his crew—navigator Capt. Robert MacDonald and defensive systems operator Capt. John T. Walton—are the pride of Carswell's 43d Bomb Wing. Among the things they were awardede here in Los Angeles on their return was the coveted Bendix Trophy.

The B–58's, products of Convair, a division of General Dynamics Corp., are now operational weapons in the SAC arsenal.

An Application of Logic to the Farm Problem and the Nation's Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statement of Mr. Carl H. Wilken, Director of Research, National Foundation for Economic Stability, before the House Committee on Agriculture on March 8, 1962.

Mr. Wilken sets forth facts and figures that ought to be of interest to every American who seeks an equitable solution of the farm problem and who, at the same time, is interested in fiscal sanity for this country.

The statement by Mr. Wilken follows:

STATEMENT BY CARL H. WILKEN BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. Chairman, members of the House Committee on Agriculture, My name is Carl H. Wilken, Director of Research of the National Foundation For Economic Stability, incorporated in 1959 for the purpose of making an initial and continuing study of the record of our economy as a whole and its many segments.

We have been discussing the so-called farm problem for many years. During 10 years of the past 35, the record indicates we had the answer in operation. But, our business leaders and others did not realize

that this was the case, and today we are more confused than ever.

My purpose in appearing before the Committee is to briefly review this period and, using 1946–50 as a base of 100, to point out what has taken place in the past 11 years.

At any point that the average price of farm products at wholesale is at the same level as the price of other than farm products, the buying power of rural areas, an important reciprocal market for industrial goods, is in balance with the rest of our economy.

If the committee will consult the record it will be found that in the 10 year period 1943–52, a period in which for all practical purposes we had a program of 90% of parity price supports on leading farm crops, the average price of farm prouducts was 91% of 1947–49 as 100 and the price of all commodities at wholesale averaged 91.11% or almost exactly 100% of price balance.

In the past few months, I have finished a comparison of the income of private enterprise, or all our business units, including farm operations, with wages and salaries and the capital costs in operating our economy.

The purpose of the study was to determine the effect on private enterprise resulting from a downward movement of approximately 100 percent of price balance in 1946–50 to a wholesale price for farm products of 88 percent of 1947–49 as 100 in 1961 as compared to a wholesale price of 127.7 percent for other than farm products at wholesale, which reflects 68 percent of parity, or price balance.

In my opinion, much of the opposition to price supports on farm products is the lack of understanding on the part of the public as to the importance of farm prices and income to other segments of our society. For example, in the 10-year period 1943–52 we averaged $31.1 billion of gross realized farm income. Approximately 45 percent of this total became the income of farm operators and 55 percent created income for businessmen and others in our rural communities.

Our rural towns with 10,000 population and under and the territory surrounding these small communities represent approximately 45 percent of the total population of the United States. And, for that reason, when farm income falls off, the result is a reduction of the buying power of our rural population which is needed as a market for the goods which have to be produced by other segments of the economy to meet existing wages, salaries, and capital costs.

To illustrate, in the period 1929–32 when farm prices fell off 55 percent, thus reducing the value of our farm production, a loss of 55 percent of the rural market followed. Industry, in cutting back production to balance with this loss of markets, suffered a loss of income, and as labor became unemployed our payrolls dropped in proportion.

But, for some reason, we did not realize that the 55-percent drop in farm prices brought about a loss of 55 percent of our 1929 national income. Nor did the people living in Nebraska, Iowa, and other farm States realize that the State incomes dropped over 50 percent.

In like manner, since 1950, as farm prices moved downward we have failed to realize that the income of rural States dropped in proportion, and that our business operations lost markets and operating profits.

If the committee wishes I can relate the total underpayment to agriculture in the period following 1950. I feel it very important to point out that private enterprise operated at a heavy loss and that this was true of the United States as a whole.

The proof is evident that we were operating at a heavy loss by an increase of $514 billion in the total debt (public and private) in the 11 years following 1950. To illustrate the effect of this debt expansion rather graphically, I would like to point out that in the 5 years 1946–1950 the average income of farm operators was $15.1 billion and the net interest incorporated into national income figures averaged $4.3 billion.

In 1961 the farm operators' income had dropped to $13.1 billion, while on the other hand the net interest had moved up to $20 billion. In other words, in 1961 we were creating approximately 50 percent more national income from the interest on our debts than from all of our farm operations.

This clearly proves that as farm income moved downward and forced the economy to operate at a loss, we offset the loss by an increase in the total debt.

In many appearances before this committee, I have pointed out that the record reveals that for each $1 of gross farm income, the turnover of this dollar in trade channels generates $7 of national income.

I have pointed out that in the 10-year period 1943–52, when farm prices were in balance, we averaged $31.1 billion of gross realized farm income. In the same period we averaged $216.7 billion of national income. Simple arithmetic proves that in this period we did have $6.97 of national income for each dollar of new earnings from farm production. I can give the committee many examples which prove the operation of this turnover of farm income from 1919 to 1952.

Society has been led to believe that due to price supports, agriculture has been overpaid and subsidized by the rest of the society. It is mathematically impossible for society to subsidize agriculture unless the average price of farm products is at a higher level than the average price of other than farm products.

I have pointed out that in 1961, farm prices were approximately 68 percent of the level of other than farm products. At this point, farmers and others in rural areas were subsidizing the rest of society with about 32 percent of the income they should have had.

I would like to point out that this matter of price balance is very important and that for each 1 percent of this price balance there is involved approximately $5 billion. Therefore, in my opinion, the first step that Congress should take is to establish an accurate yardstick to determine the price of farm products. This can and should be a simple formula which any farmer or citizen can easily understand.

Personally, I would suggest that the price balance between farm products at wholesale and other than farm products at wholesale in the 5 years 1946–50 be used as a base of 100.

For example, in 1946–50 the price of corn received by the farmer was $1.54 a bushel. At present, the price of other than farm products is 32 percent higher than in 1946–50. The price of corn, to be in balance, should be 132 percent of $1.54, or $2.03 per bushel. Last week the price at many local markets in the Midwest was $1 a bushel.

To illustrate what has taken place, in 1946–50, the average wage per hour in industry was $1.329. This has moved up to $2.36, or 77 percent, while, on the other hand, the price of corn has moved down from $1.54 to $1.

The difference between $2.03 and the current price is the subsidy which corn producers and others in rural areas are providing for the rest of society.

The current effective parity for corn is $1.62, or 2 cents a bushel less than the price actually received in 1947–49 and in reality only about 80 percent of parity; and, if used as a yardstick for price supports, will shortchange the corn producer 20 percent, even though he receives 100 percent of parity for 100-percent production.

Another obstacle to sound farm legislation is the surplus complex which has been built up since we abondoned the 90-percent price supports. Society believes that as a result of so-called high-price supports the farmers opened up a large spigot and flooded the country with farm products.

I would like to call the attention of the committee to the record of farm production as set forth in the President's Economic Report to Congress in January 1962.

The facts prove that the average annual increase in farm production from 1929 to 1942 was greater than the average increase from 1942 to 1961; furthermore, that from 1942 to 1961 our population increased 37 percent and our total farm production increased only 33 percent.

The facts do reveal that we have approximately $8 billion of farm crops in storage, but I would like to point out that it took us 10 years to build up the supply; in other words, an average of $800 million a year.

In analyzing the so-called surplus we should be realistic. We cannot avoid seasonal surpluses no matter what kind of program is enacted. We must have an adequate carryover of farm products from year to year, unless we wish to run the risk of a complete collapse of our economy in case of a drought year such as we had in 1934 and again in 1936. The current stockpile would be completely inadequate to protect our livestock industry.

Next, I would like to compare this stockpile, or inventory, with the $94 billion inventory in the hands of manufacturers, and wholesale and retail trade. This supply is almost 12 times the agricultural stockpile, but it has not been permitted to break the price of other than farm products. Society is not objecting to the cost of carrying this inventory, the reason being that they do not realize that, although industry pays the direct cost, the consumer has to pay it when he buys goods for his family. He should pay the costs because the inventory is necessary for an efficient operation of our economy.

I would suggest to the committee that any farm program to be successful must result in an average of 100 percent of price balance at the marketplace. In the same way that industry pays the cost of carrying its inventory, farmers and users of farm products should pay the costs for both seasonal and an adequate annual carryover with which to level off weather cycles which no legislation can control. Further provisions should be made for reserves in the stockpile to be released to prevent the price of farm products from moving above 110 percent of price balance. Such a program with a 90 percent price support would provide flexibility, and also permit an average of approximately 100 percent of price balance, which the record proves we did have in the 10-year period 1943–52.

In my opinion, the principal need is an educational program pointing out to society that it is impossible to have a solvent economy unless farm prices are in balance.

To illustrate, the overall balance sheet which I prepared reveals that by using 1946–50 as a base of 100, agriculture as compared to wages and interest in the 10 years 1951–60 was underpaid in terms of gross realized farm income a total of $210 billion.

This underpayment and loss of market brought about an underpayment of $321 billion to private enterprise. It was divided in an underpayment to farm operators totaling $134 billion, an underpayment to small business totaling $76 billion, and a shortage of $111 billion in terms of corporate profits after taxes for corporate enterprise.

The underpayment in 1961 was approximately $32 billion which, in turn, finds the income of private enterprise $53.5 billion too low to balance with 1961 payrolls and interest.

To offset this loss of income in 1961, we added $55 billion to the total debt. A continuation of the current dislocation will

force us to add $70 billion to the total debt each year to offset our operating loss in any effort to have full employment and production.

It will make it completely impossible to balance any of our budgets, Federal, State or private. To illustrate, corporate profits before taxes in 1961, to be in the same balance with wages and interest that existed in 1946–50 and previous years, should have been $69 billion. The actual total was $46 billion, a shortage of $23 billion.

The direct result of this single factor was a loss fo $12.5 billion of Federal tax revenue from corporate profits. Secondly, corporations were short $12.5 billion of new capital for expansion. With this type of operation we will find ourselves duplicating the depression of 1929–33 with five times as many dollars involved in terms of national income, and $1,080 billion of total debt as compared to $214 billion in 1929.

These sums may seem fantastic, but I am prepared to meet with any special subcommittee which the chairman may appoint to discuss the record which reveals the situation.

In closing I would like to point out that if the committee follows the advice of some groups and discontinues farm price supports, it will force a collapse of the economy as a whole.

John Birch Society Critics, Be Specific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, the collectivists establishment in this country has leveled many charges against the John Birch Society, none of which has been proved. Believing that the end justifies the means, collectivists have used the most deplorable guilt by association tactics conceivable in their effort to destroy the society. The collectivist attack on the society is discussed in a column by George Todt which appeared in the February 15, 1962, issue of the Los Angeles Herald Examiner. Under unanimous consent I include the column in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

BE SPECIFIC, CRITICS

(By George Todt)

"That government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."—Lincoln, Gettysburg Address.

Curiosity prompts me to ask this question: Is the hysterical, largely emotional vendetta conducted by certain politicians and members of the mass communications media against the John Birch Society really justified—and on what specific grounds? Can it be spelled out? The charges, please?

Is bigotry, intolerance and discrimination being demonstrated against this group? Any prejudice or bias here? Isn't it bad no matter from what direction it emanates?

Many libelous and slanderous attacks have been made against JBS, but few could stand up in court.

Thus far most of the vituperation has been based in "guilt by association" smear tactics—which are usually deplorable!

COMPETITION NEEDED

I am not a member of John Birch Society and have no intention of joining it. Contrary to the innuendo of a local wag in the press, Robert Welch is no idol of mine. But the immortal Voltaire was. He is reported to have said, in the spirit of fair play, this gem:

"Think for yourself and let others enjoy the privilege to do so, too."

With the single exception of genuine traitors who masquerade as citizens of our Republic, I buy that 100 percent, along with the right to express what one thinks.

This writer is an honest conservative in ideology now and in the past—but never once in my career have I suggested that the liberal elements of our Nation not be heard. Upon occasion, I have defended them.

Competition in ideas should be welcome to all of us. Let's take the best from all sides at difference and make a superior product.

We need more construction, less destruction.

In the case of the John Birch Society, let's insist that its critics know what they are telling us.

Let them cite chapter and verse of the purported wrongs.

Let them tell us if their charges are based on hearsay or firsthand evidence.

DON'T BE FOOLED

Joe Doakes must not permit himself to be fooled by cunning hatchetmen with selfish axes to grind. Demand the facts.

Having heard the hateful charge that the John Birch Society is a fascist organization, recently I requested permission to attend a regular session of a chapter in session. What was it like?

The meeting was opened with prayer, the pledge of allegiance to the Republic and singing of the Star Spangled Banner. Speeches supporting the American free enterprise system were heard. The Americans for Democratic Action and British Fabian Socialists—ideological blood brothers, or Marxian hands-across-the-sea—were denounced. The pros and cons of controversial legislative issues were aired by the membership. Patriotic books were recommended. Writing to Members of Congress was urged. Actually, an educational study club composed mainly of neighbors.

This is fascism?

Altogether I have observed three meetings in the Burbank, South Pasadena, and Wilshire areas of Los Angeles County.

AGAINST FABIANS

My conclusions reported to my readers have come after an on-the-spot survey. I was there, Charlie.

How many critics of the John Birch Society can say the same? Why the savage attacks? What are they, in reality, shooting at?

My own educated guess is that the John Birch Society is being smeared not because the innocent members are against communism of the Bolshevik variety from the Soviet Union—but actually because of their fierce patriotic resistance against the ADA and its Fabian Socialist principles here in the United States.

The ideological tenets of the Fabians do not emanate from the Founding Fathers at Philadelphia. But what of Karl Marx?

How explain the outstanding voting records of two local John Birch Society Congressmen—EDGAR W. HIESTAND and JOHN H. ROUSSELOT—who both received scores of 100 percent on the conservative Americans for Constitutional Action (ACA) index?

Do we judge these men by hatemongering and hysterical charges against them by emotional rabblerousers, or by the record?

Let's remember the down-to-earth Biblical quotation: "By their works ye shall know them."

President Kennedy's Advice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a report from the Council of State Chambers of Commerce.

This supplements remarks that I made last week on the House floor at the time the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill was before us.

This is a reasonable report and is in concert with President Kennedy's advice of October 26, 1961, to the heads of the major Government agencies.

The report follows:

FEDERAL CIVILIAN PERSONNEL: AN AREA OF POTENTIALLY LARGE BUDGET SAVINGS

Last October 26 President Kennedy called on his Cabinet officers and other heads of major Government agencies "to follow a most careful and frugal policy with respect to commitments and expenditures under the 1962 budget as enacted by the Congress." With specific reference to Federal civilian employment, he said:

"I am also especially desirous that the number of Government employees be limited to the minimum consistent with getting the job done. There is no question that employment can be held substantially below the levels which would be possible under the funds authorized by Congress, if strong efforts are made to achieve increases in productivity and efficiency, to use better techniques of management and production, and to staff each activity with only the minimum number of employees needed to carry out our objectives. I expect each of you to make such efforts."

In view of the substantial increase in Federal employment since the Kennedy administration took office in January 1961, the President's October order certainly was appropriate, albeit somewhat belated. The fact is that from the end of January 1961 to the end of October the number of civilian employees in the executive branch rose by approximately 76,500 to 2,417,600. This was in contrast to a declining trend in Federal employment from 1952 to 1958 and then a stable level through 1960.

On the basis of the President's Federal employment economy order, there was reason to expect that the sharp personnel rise of the preceding 9 months would be halted and, possibly, even reversed. But this has not occurred. Budget projections of civilian personnel for June 30, 1962, and June 30, 1963, show substantial additional increases as of those dates. The projected totals are 2,492,300 next June 30 and 2,538,400 a year later. These totals compare with employment of 2,355,200 on June 30, 1960, and 2,341,100 on January 31, 1961.

RECENT TRENDS IN FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT

At the outbreak of the Korean war in June 1950 the executive branch of the Government employed 1,951,600 civilians. The total was increased rapidly during the mobilization period and rose to 2,589,500 in June 1952 with most of the increase being in the Defense Department. Thereafter, the number of employees receded rapidly until June 1954. The trend of employment in the executive branch since then is shown in the following figures from Civil Service Commission reports:

	Defense Department	Post Office Department	Other departments and agencies	Total
June 1954	1,208,900	507,100	665,700	2,381,700
June 1955	1,186,600	511,600	673,200	2,371,400
June 1956	1,179,800	508,600	683,600	2,372,000
June 1957	1,160,900	521,200	707,000	2,389,100
June 1958	1,097,100	538,400	719,800	2,355,300
June 1959	1,078,200	549,900	726,900	2,355,000
June 1960	1,047,100	562,900	745,200	2,355,200
June 1961	1,042,400	582,400	782,200	2,407,000
June 1962 [1]	1,068,500	593,300	830,500	2,492,300
June 1963 [1]	1,060,600	608,700	869,100	2,538,400

[1] Estimated.

Civilian employment in the Defense Department declined steadily from June 1954 through December 1960 when the total was 1,032,000. Since then it rose to 1,042,400 in June 1961 and 1,059,100 in December 1961. A further rise to 1,068,500 is budgeted for June 30, 1962, after which the total is expected to decline by 7,900 during the 1963 fiscal year.

In the 6 years from June 1954 to June 1960 employment in the postal service rose 55,800 for an average annual increase of 9,300. In the 3 years after June 1960, however, the number of postal employees will rise 45,800 or an average of 15,267 a year, if current budget requests are to be approved by Congress.

The most rapid increase in civilian personnel has been in the departments and agencies exclusive of the Defense Department and the Post Office, and particularly since 1960. In the 6-year period ended June 1960 the number of these employees rose 79,500 for an average annual increase of 13,250. But on the basis of the 1963 budget, the number will rise another 123,900 in the 3 years subsequent to June 1960. This represents an average annual increase of 41,300.

Following are the major departments and agencies in which percentage increases from June 1960 to June 1963 are particularly large:

Department or agency	Employees		Increase	Percent increase
	June 1960	June 1963		
Agriculture	98,694	116,388	17,694	17.9
Health, Education, and Welfare	61,641	82,669	21,028	34.1
Interior	56,111	70,157	14,046	25.0
Labor	7,096	8,956	1,860	26.2
Treasury	76,179	89,876	13,697	18.0
General Services Administration	28,211	34,521	6,310	22.4
Housing and Home Finance	11,105	14,981	3,876	34.9
Federal Aviation Agency	38,132	48,959	10,827	28.4
National Aeronautics and Space	10,232	26,300	16,068	157.0

Of the foregoing listed personnel increases, perhaps the most readily explainable is that in the National Aeronautics and Space Agency. But even there the need for a 157-percent increase since June 1960 is questionable inasmuch as all but a very minor part of the space program activities are conducted by contract with the Government. Only two major Federal agencies show little or no personnel increase between June 1960 and June 1963. They are the Department of Commerce and the Atomic Energy Commission.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REDUCTION OF BUDGETED PERSONNEL

In a study of the Kennedy budget for fiscal 1963 the Federal Expenditures and Tax Committee of the Council of State Chambers of Commerce noted with concern the recent rapid increase in Federal civilian personnel and the further large increases projected for many agencies in 1963. The committee concluded that it is again necessary for Congress to take a firm hand in cutting excess Federal employment through the appropriation acts as it has successfully done at times in the past.

On the basis of its analyses of employment growth, the council's committee believes that the following reductions are feasible and desirable:

1. The 608,700 postal employees budgeted for June 1963 represents an increase of 45,800, or 8.1 percent, since June 1960. The projected increase in mail volume during the same period is 10.4 percent. In the 5 years from 1955 to 1960 postal employment rose only 10 percent while mail volume rose 15.3 percent. According to that proportion, postal employment should rise no more than 38,300 from 1960 to 1963. This is 7,500 less than projected in the budget, and elimination of that number of new positions is proposed. This would save an estimated $47 million in salaries and other costs on a full-year basis.

2. Civilians in the Defense Department should be limited to the December 1960 total of 1,032,000, or 28,600 less than budgeted for June 1963. On a full-year basis this reduction would save about $210 million.

3. Employees in all departments and agencies exclusive of Defense and the Post Office should be limited to 769,100. This is 23,900 more than were on the payrolls in June 1960 and 100,000 less than are budgeted for June 1963. The full-year effect of this personnel reduction would be about $730 million in savings.

The Congress could effect these personnel reductions almost entirely by disallowing proposed new positions and by limiting the filling of vacancies that are created in the process of normal attrition involving resignations, retirements, and death.

HOUSE CUTS PERSONNEL IN FIRST 1963 APPROPRIATION BILL

A few days ago the House acted on the first of a dozen or more appropriation bills for 1963 which Congress will consider in this session. This first bill, providing funds for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and some miscellaneous agencies, was approved by the House as recommended by its Appropriations Committee. The changes made by the committee and the House in the President's requests included a number of specific disallowances of proposed new positions.

The principal personnel change was a 6,130 reduction in proposed additional Post Office employees. This cut compares with the council committee's recommended reduction of 7,500. Another significant House action was the disallowance of 2,914 of 4,514 proposed new Internal Revenue Service positions. In other bureaus and offices of the Treasury Department the House allowed an average of less than half the new positions requested.

These actions of the House Appropriations Committee and the House are more modest economy efforts than proposed by this council's committee on expenditures and taxes. Also, they relate only to proposed new positions. Nevertheless, they are an encouraging sign of genuine concern in Congress with respect to the rapid increase in Federal employment. These actions are doubly encouraging because the Treasury-Post Office bill is, traditionally one of the most difficult appropriation bills to cut.

If House actions on this bill lead to more aggressive actions on subsequent appropriation bills, and with the concurrence of the Senate, the personnel savings in 1963 would be quite significant. But these savings would be much more significant if Congress would limit the filling of vacancies which occur in old positions as well as disallowing new positions. The Congress has done this before and can do it again.

Shakopee Demonstrates Education Commonsense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Maurice H. Stans served brilliantly as Director of the Budget in the Eisenhower administration, and is one of the most articulate of spokesmen for sanity in Government. I am sure that he began to develop his sound views in his hometown of Shakopee, Minn., which is in my congressional district.

Mr. Stans borrowed from his Shakopee background for an article in the Washington Post of March 12, 1962, in which he discussed Federal aid to education, and uses the Shakopee experience as a basis.

The article follows:

U.S. SCHOOL FUNDS BELIEVED UNNEEDED

(By Maurice H. Stans)

Taxpayers in my old hometown of Shakopee, Minn., in 1959 were confronted with the need of enlarging the school facilities. The educators and architects put before them a proposal to build a new high school at a cost of $1.3 million. The program was defeated in the election almost 4 to 1—but not because the voters were against education or were unwilling or unable to support its necessary costs. They turned it down because they believed the plans were extravagant.

About 6 weeks later, a more economical proposal calling simply for an addition to the existing school building was presented to the taxpayers. By an enthusiastic vote of 5 to 2, they approved a $200,000 bond issue to meet the cost.

In an earlier article I questioned the validity of the statistics being cited to the public in support of Federal aid for elementary and secondary school construction. I suggested that we are entitled to a lot more facts on what individual school districts really need—and what they can and will do about it when inadequate or substandard conditions are pointed out—before committing billions of dollars of Federal money to such a program.

MEETING RESPONSIBILITIES

Since all Americans favor a sound educational system, it might be assumed that the case for Federal support would rest on evidence that the local school districts have failed to provide one that is satisfactory. Yet the facts seem to demonstrate that by and large they are meeting their responsibilities—in their own way, as did the people of Shakopee.

Here are figures from the Office of Education: Over the past decade (of the 1950's) more than 600,000 new classrooms were built, while increased attendance required only 400,000. This means that 200,000 classrooms were made available to replace old ones or to reduce the size of classes. This provided a significant improvement in school conditions.

Since 1956, our communities have been building an average of 70,000 classrooms a year, on their own. In the 4 years between 1956 and 1960, enrollment rose 15 percent, the number of classrooms increased 23 percent, and the number of pupils per classroom declined from 29 to 27.1. And all this without general Federal aid.

And here are some more reported figures: The peak increase in elementary and sec-

ondary public schools occurred in the fall of 1953, when student enrollments rose 1.4 million. Since then, the postwar wave has been subsiding, and now the annual increases are about 1 million.

FURTHER SLOWDOWN

From 1965 to 1970, the statisticians tell us the average growth will be only about 600,000 pupils per year. If our communities continue to build just 50,000 classrooms a year, this will provide enough facilities to take care of the student growth and give 25,000 classrooms a year to replace old ones or further reduce the average pupil count per classroom.

The contention that States and local communities are unable to meet rising educational costs does not stand up under critical examination. The States and communities in the 1950's boosted school revenues 164 percent to meet the mushrooming 43 percent expansion in enrollment. With our economy continuing to grow they should be better able by far to match the lesser needs of the 1960's when enrollment will grow by only 20 percent.

A few years ago, the argument was heard that thousands of school districts had reached the ceiling of their bonding limits for school debt and so were prevented from meeting their requirements. Yet a survey by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in December 1959, showed that only 237 of the Nation's more than 40,000 school districts reported that they needed classrooms, were at the limit of their debt capacity and were unable to obtain State aid. For those few in this category, the Eisenhower-Flemming 1960 proposal of limited long-term aid through loans and grants would have been a full and adequate solution; the Congress ignored it.

TWO LESSONS ILLUSTRATED

The experience of Shakopee illustrates two important lessons. First, planners can engage in flights of fancy when they submit proposed courses of action; only local knowledge of actual requirements can hold this type of wishful waste in check. Second, when the voters are convinced of the need for money and that it will be well spent they will approve and support all reasonable requests made of them. They want their children to be well educated.

Since the turn of the century, increases in school expenditures have far surpassed the growth in any other measuring rod of progress, including gross national product, personal income, and personal consumption expenditures. And all except a negligible portion in recent years has been voluntarily paid out of the pockets of local taxpayers.

Certainly the facts do not make a strong case for using vast appropriations of Federal funds at the elementary and secondary school level. To a degree unequalled by any other nation in history, primary and secondary education has been provided in this country to all who has sought it. And it has been done well and at less cost to the taxpayer by the States and local school districts.

The National Lottery of Costa Rica

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to apprise the Members of this House about the Costa Rican national lottery where gambling is respected and treated as recreation and relaxation.

Costa Rica is a small and poor country with a population of approximately 1 million persons. Yet, the Government has realized the worth of a national lottery. The gross receipts from the national lottery in 1961 amounted to almost $10 million. The profit or net income to the Government which was over $3 million was earmarked for the support of mental institutions and other charitable hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, Costa Rica is another country that recognizes and capitalizes on the human urge to gamble. How long will it take us to realize that the natural gambling spirit of our American people should be regulated and controlled for the benefit of our treasury? It is about time that we stopped being reckless with the tax and revenue advantages offered by a national lottery.

Mr. Speaker, why cannot we show the same intelligence and sound judgment? If we would have the courage to wipe out hypocrisy, we could raise $10 billion a year in additional revenue which would help to cut our high taxes and reduce our mounting national debt.

What Is the Real Reason for H.R. 10010?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the administration farm bill, H.R. 10010, proposes to control supplies of feed grains and wheat by restricting only one factor in production—namely, land.

The bill provides for mandatory cutback in acreages planted in these commodities, with the goal of bringing supplies and demand into balance.

The ineffectiveness of this approach is eloquently stated in an article in the Journal of Farm Economics, November 1959. The article is titled, "Some Further Reflections on Supply Control." The author was Dr. Willard W. Cochrane, then professor of economics at the University of Minnesota. His conclusion was set forth in this quotation:

Many attempts have been made to control supply in American agriculture. One of the techniques employed in the past to control supply has been the beliberate restriction of one important productive input; namely, land. This technique generally has proved ineffective as farmers have substituted other factors for land, typically, capital.

Programs aimed at curtailing marketable supplies through restrictions on land use could perhaps be made to effect supply reductions through reducing the inputs of other factors, if rigorously conceived and effectively administered (e.g., the rental, or sale, to Government of entire farms). But the development and application of more and more new knowledge to agricultural production, tends to make the substitution of capital for land easier and easier.

Thus, the effective adjustment of supplies to demand at some determined fair price through control over one input, land, seems less and less promising. This is a control technique for a backward, static agriculture, not the dynamic agriculture of the United States in the 1950's and 1960's.

Believe it or not, the same Professor Cochrane is now the chief economic planner for Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, from whose office H.R. 10010 originated.

What has happened since 1959 to make desirable the control of only this one factor in production—land?

Has U.S. agriculture suddenly become backward and static, or has the economics rulebook become outdated?

This, of course, is a rhetorical question, as the principles of economics have not changed and—despite continued interference by Government—U.S. agriculture continues to be dynamic.

What, then, is the real reason for H.R. 10010? If it is not intended to advance a dynamic agriculture, why was it introduced? Is it a bald play for votes, or, perhaps, part of a scheme to wreck the private enterprise marketplace system, and get the farmer so entangled in Government redtape that the economic planners will be able to control all phases of American agriculture from now on.

Removal of Residual Oil Import Restrictions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, in behalf of over 2 million consumers, the Oil Users Association has responded to an Interior Department ruling which will increase residual oil quotas by 10 percent beginning April 1. In a resolution passed unanimously by the board of directors, the association said that the increased allotment was inadequate. With the economic problems created by the quotas growing in seriousness each day, I do not see how there can be any disagreement with the statement of the association.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Oil Users Association:

Resolved, That the Oil Users Association cannot accept the recent ruling of the Secretary of Interior to increase residual oil quotas by 10 percent as a substitute for complete removal of controls. No matter what quantity of residual oil is imported under a restriction program, the inequities of improper distribution and the hardship of higher prices will continue. This in turn results in higher bills of upward of 2 million customers which our members serve along the Atlantic seaboard.

In response to a request by the administration, a great many conscientious people have spent a great deal of time presenting full and informative statements on every facet of the oil restriction program. These studies have revealed that without any

shadow of a doubt the restrictions should be removed entirely, and we respectfully urge the administration to take whatever steps are necessary to remove such restrictions at an early date.

Bureaucratic Control Over the Dairy Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, last week the House Committee on Agriculture rejected the Kennedy administration request to freeze dairy price supports at present levels.

Some dairy farmers will be unhappy about this, but I guess the taxpayers do not have any cause to complain.

The milk surplus this year, as I understand, is estimated to be about 10 billion pounds out of a total output of approximately 127 billion pounds; and I have read that soaring Government price-support costs are expected to exceed $600 million this year—more than double those of last year.

Meanwhile, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman's proposed solution to the problem as contained in the administration's 1962 farm bill does not seem too pleasing to many dairy farmers. At least I see where some farmers who retail their own milk direct to consumers have told the committee they do not want to be placed under controls, and the farm bureau opposes compulsory checkoffs under Federal milk orders for market research and promotion.

On the subject of the new plan, I have received a letter from an independent dairyman in the State of Washington which really shocked me. I had no idea of the extent of regulatory power and control which is in the hands of a local Federal milk marketing administrator. This letter describes arbitrary harassment and restrictions which are available under the present law.

I would have hardly believed it possible in America. But what really astounded me was when I read in this letter that the new farm bill would eliminate the independent dairyman completely. It would provide increased power to the milk marketing administrator so that he could compel all dairy farmers to accept production controls.

Mr. Speaker, I have long said Secretary Benson was right when he advocated freeing the farmer by degrees from Government regulation and control. More and more I am convinced that the billions of dollars in subsidies the Government pours into the agricultural mess are wasted and that we should return bit by bit to the law of supply and demand.

If I ever doubted such a policy, the letter referred to which I will include in full reassures me that I have been right from the start and that the law of supply and demand is best for farmer and consumer alike.

The letter from the independent Washington State dairyman follows:

SNOHOMISH, WASH.,
February 27, 1962.

Subject: The proposed Food and Agriculture Act of 1962.

Hon. THOMAS PELLY,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PELLY: In the proposed Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, Congress is being asked to approve another major extension of Government controls over the dairy farmer. The civil servants of the Department of Agriculture, who will be given increased power under the act, are trying to sell dairymen on the idea that they should accept production controls. I am sure that you will hear from representatives of the Department and of the large milk cooperatives that there are no objections to the bill on the part of the dairy farmers. As the largest independent dairyman in the State of Washington, I wish to object.

I wish to make it clear at the outset that I am not asking for any Federal aid of any kind, including present subsidies for manufactured milk products such as powdered milk, butter, and cheese, nor am I requesting any guarantee as to the price I receive for my milk or the creation of a market for milk I produce beyond my needs. I have never received any of the approximately $2 billion spent on milk regulation and subsidies and am not asking for any. I wish merely to be allowed to conduct my business without officious interference and regulation under this proposed legislation which, if past experience is any guide, will far exceed the intent of Congress in passing such legislation.

With the support of the four largest dairy organizations in this State which, together, control over 90 percent of the milk in this State, the Department of Agriculture has imposed extreme restrictions on my operations because I do not wish to be a party to the local Federal milk marketing order. In order to remain free of regulation under the order, to be exempt from the pricing and pooling provisions of the order (which would require the payment of 20 percent of the value of my milk to my competitor without anything in return), I have been subjected to harassment and restriction at every turn by arbitrary bureaucratic controls over my local business.

The order itself provides that I cannot purchase or receive one ounce of fluid milk from any source other than my own facilities. Administratively, this has been extended to a warning from the milk marketing administrator that I was jeopardizing my exempt status by receiving a test tube of milk which I offered to test for a neighbor. I cannot buy any packaged or processed milk from any dairy farmer who is also "exempt" from the order, and I can purchase no more than a hundred pounds a day of such products from regulated sources.

There is an exemption to these limits in the case of an emergency, provided the emergency does not exceed 45 consecutive days and does not occur more than once a year. If I were to have a fire which destroyed any of my necessary facilities and those facilities could not be rebuilt within 45 days, the purchase of milk on the 46th day would subject me to pricing and pooling.

The Agricultural Adjustment Act provides that no order shall be applicable to any person in his capacity as a producer and yet the order provides that during certain months I can neither buy nor sell a dairy herd, cattle barn or milking parlor without submitting the matter to the Federal Milk Marketing Administrator, except that I may, without prior approval, engage in an "occasional sale of individual cows," a term which the market administrator is unwilling to define. Under the order, I cannot sell milk to a store in which I have any interest at all, such as one share of stock, if that store also sells the milk of another producer or processer. The Milk Marketing Administraor has ruled that I cannot borrow a vacuum pump, a pulsator, or other part of a milking machine, a truck for transporting milk to market, a plow, a tractor or any other agricultural implement used in the production of feed for my herd from my next-door neighbor, merely because he is also a producer-processer who does not wish to be regulated under the order. The Administrator has told me that I cannot hire part time a man working for that same neighbor, even though that man might be on his day off. A copy of the Puget Sound milk marketing order and a letter from the market administrator describing some of the above restrictions are attached to this letter. It should be noted that many of the restrictions in the Puget Sound order are taken almost verbatim from the New York-New Jersey order. The difficulty they have caused me illustrates the results of trying to apply Federal uniformity to solve essentially local problems. It does not work.

As mentioned, I operate in Snohomish County the largest independent dairy farm in the State of Washington. My operation is completely integrated in that I process all of my own milk and sell it through three of my own stores located in and around Seattle. Despite the fact that none of my milk crosses State lines, I am told that I "affect" interstate commerce and that, therefore, the Federal Government can regulate and control my purely local business from Washington, D.C.

My original operations were started in 1957 after I was 70 years old with no previous experience in the dairy industry. When the crop which I was growing became unprofitable, I decided that a dairy farm could be an extremely successful operation if modern merchandising methods were applied to get milk from the cow to the consumer. The keystone of my operation is the elimination of wasteful delivery routes and the substitution of my milk barns. These are drive-in stores which sell only milk and related products, contributing to high volume and low costs. The use of returnable glass bottles in sizes convenient for large families has further decreased costs. Through careful planning and management, my operation produces enough milk to satisfy the demands of my customers without overproducing to the extent that I must dispose of any surplus milk to other outlets. This has been accomplished at prices which give me a reasonable return and yet provides the consumers with milk at lower prices than they pay in buying milk from the large proprietary processors and the dairy cooperatives which have instigated and profited by milk regulations.

For a short initial period, I operated solely as a milk producer subject to pricing and pooling under the Federal milk order. I soon realized that the benefits of an act intended to help dairy farmers was inuring primarily to the large proprietary processors and the management of the large cooperative association. I secured copies of the Federal milk order in this area and verified the fact that I would not be subjected to Federal regulation as long as I processed and sold my own milk. I could buy milk from, and otherwise deal freely with, my neighboring producer-handlers and could purchase milk when needed from regulated processors by paying the highest market price plus the processor's markup. On the strength of this situation, I established my milk barns. As soon as my operation became successful and I presented a competi-

tive problem to the large cooperative, which operates a completely integrated farm-to-retail operation, and to the proprietary processors, successful efforts were made to modify the order to control my business in a fashion never contemplated by Congress in enacting the Agricultural Adjustment Act. Some of these restrictions have been set out before. These radical changes in the rules governing me and my business came about quickly and without any action by Congress. Our competitors, acting with the cooperation of the Department of Agriculture, effected the changes in a few months.

The theory of the Agricultural Adjustment Act is that farm producers should have control of the program instituted on their behalf. To implement this, it is required that any marketing order be approved by a certain percentage of handlers, (a technical name for persons who process milk), and two-thirds of the affected producers. If the required percentage of handlers refuse or fail to approve the order, it may be approved by the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the producers if the Secretary of Agriculture determines that issuance would effectuate the purposes of the act. The statute also permits a cooperative association to vote the votes of all of its members, the so-called block vote. In our area, the milk cooperative controls the votes of over 70 percent of the dairy producers in this State, allowing it to meet the order approval requirements with a single vote. If internal voting is allowed on a particular issue, 35 percent of the producers can impose their will on all other dairy farmers in the State. It is not merely a producer's cooperative which sells the milk of its members to independent handlers, but it operates, through several subsidiary corporations, the largest handling business in the State of Washington. At the present time, the affairs of the cooperative are completely dominated by the management of its handling portion of its operations. The block vote has enabled the management of the handling portion of the cooperative business to dictate the entire marketing of milk in the Puget Sound marketing area, regardless of the wishes of individual farmers and with no qualms whatsoever about regulating the business of their competitors. Nationally, no milk order has been adopted in any part of the country without the block vote. It is obvious that, with the power of approval or disapproval of any milk regulation vested in the management of the largest handler in the region, such regulation will of necessity reflect that handler's wishes and desires and will be designed to benefit the handling portion of the business and not the producer-members themselves.

With this control over the decisions of the Department of Agriculture in the hands of the few persons making up the cooperative management, it is almost impossible for an independent voice to be heard. For example, when an amendment to the Puget Sound marketing order was considered recently, I received no ballot whatsoever, but was merely informed that the producers, i.e., the cooperative management, had approved the amendment and would permit it to go into effect. The present procedures for allowing an independent dairy farmer to object to the regulations of the Department of Agriculture, (procedures which would presumably be retained in the new legislation), are so extensive and so time consuming that they become a mockery. Since the position of the Department is generally the position of the management of the cooperative, the cooperative has managed to throw the burden of defending its position onto the Federal Government to be paid for at Federal expense, while the independent must use his own funds to challenge what he believes is not correct. So far, this effort has cost me thousands of dollars. Under the present system, two complete administrative hearings with related departmental appeal procedures are required before court review can be obtained. In our experience, over half of the independent producers who wished to challenge increased regulation by the Department of Agriculture were forced by financial reasons to abandon their protest even prior to final submission of their objections to the Department of Agriculture. The burden was so heavy that all of us were forced to abandon any appeal to the courts, a result certainly not contemplated by Congress.

It is apparent that the Agricultural Adjustment Act was not intended to control retail competition and yet, the amendments to the Puget Sound milk order which regulate my operations were instigated because of competition at the retail level with the large dairy interests. This was acknowledged in the Department of Agriculture proceedings on those amendments. The Agricultural Adjustment Act specifies that it shall authorize no action which has as its purpose the maintenance of higher than minimum prices to producers, and yet testimony in the records of the hearing indicate that one of the objectives of the cooperatives in proposing regulation of my operation was that it wanted to be able to pay premium prices to its producers.

The intent of Congress as expressed in the Agricultural Adjustment Act is to avoid unreasonable fluctuations in supply and prices and to insure a reasonable return to farmers. Experience in the Puget Sound marketing area has shown that Federal regulation does not promote the orderly marketing of milk or aid the farmer in the price he can obtain for his milk. In the 10 years since the institution of the Puget Sound milk marketing order, the percentage of surplus milk, that is, milk not used in fluid consumption, has increased from approximately 14 percent of the milk produced to over 50 percent of the milk produced. The average order minimum price paid to a farmer per hundredweight of milk has dropped approximately $1.40 from $5.84 in December 1951, to $4.45 in December 1961. In contrast, my operations have shown that an individual can control his production so that he has little or no surplus milk. The effects of the order encourage the production of surplus milk to a point where, at the present time, it has gotten out of hand.

This perversion of the intent of Congress to merely control unreasonable fluctuations in supply and prices and maintain parity prices stems from the following chain of regulation. The payment of subsidies to handlers in this area for the production of nonfluid forms of milk, such as powder, cheese, and butter, has removed all incentive from handlers to control their usage and manage their business economically. The price formula used in the marketing area, under which milk not used for fluid consumption is priced unrealistically low, offers an incentive in the opposite direction to the handlers to encourage surplus milk, since the more surplus milk there is in the market, the lower the price which the producer receives and the better the profit margin of the large handlers. These large profits have enabled handlers, and in particular the large cooperatives, to buy out many smaller competitive handlers who were not able to compete under the artificial price structure of the milk order. The price formula encourages new producers to come into the market since, though they are merely adding to the surplus and not encouraging more fluid consumption, they are entitled to a price based in part on fluid usage at the expense of other producers. One of the proposed legislative findings in the bills now under consideration is that farmers cannot provide a balanced and adequate supply of milk at fair prices to farmers and consumers without Federal assistance. Experience in this marketing area proves that farmers cannot provide an adequate and balanced supply at fair prices with Federal regulation.

The major effect of present agricultural legislation in the dairy industry has been to create monopolistic control in the hands of the cooperatives. Any proposed regulation which ostensibly confers approval of the program on the individual farmer and permits a cooperative to exercise that franchise for those farmers is a snare and a delusion. If the Department of Agriculture, prodded by the large cooperatives, had extended its power this far under the present law to control local business from Washington, D.C., it needs little imagination to picture the extent to which the Department would go if it were given additional broad powers to set market quotas as would be done under the proposed legislation. It seems safe to say that any quotas established would favor those who have the power to approve or disapprove of any quotas. Even if the quotas were to do no more than reduce each farmer's proportionate share of current production, my production, which I have carefully controlled to avoid a surplus, would be so limited that I would be forced to buy from the cooperatives at their prices in order to supply my consumers' needs. Under those circumstances, at best I would have to raise my price to my consumers, and at worst, I would be forced out of business entirely, leaving them at the mercy of the large handlers. Further, if an act specifically designed to raise prices to farmers has, through manipulations sponsored by the cooperatives and the Department of Agriculture, resulted in the opposite effect, there is no guaranty but that prices under any new legislation would also decrease unless the Federal Government is willing to pump billions more of hard-earned tax dollars into the agricultural hodgepodge. The proponents of this legislation are using a situation caused and created solely by prior Federal agricultural legislation as a reason for further regulation, regimentation, and destruction of free enterprise among dairy farmers in this country.

Present law has cost the taxpayers billions of dollars for dairy subsidies. The proposed bill does not eliminate subsidies. It merely adds to the cost of subsidies the costs of enforcing complicated regulation supporting an increased Federal bureaucracy. When these costs are added to the increased price of milk which taxpayers will pay, the result can only be the largest blank check ever presented to the people of this country, with no more assurance of an eventual successful solution than the word of the same persons who have been proven to be so wrong in the past.

Before the enactment of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, the dairy industry was admittedly sick. Federal regulation and control was implemented. The industry is still sick. My operations prove that new methods of modern management without Federal regulation and even with bureaucratic interference has been able to result in a fair price to me and a lower price to my consumers. The answer appears plain to me. The time has come to allow the free forces of a competitive market to come into play. Turning the control of my business over to my competitor will not help.

I wish to reiterate that I have no interest in any Federal subsidy, guaranteed payment plan or method for disposing of milk which I have produced because I cannot control my production. I do not ask that other taxpayers contribute one dime to support me and my operations. All I ask is to be let alone.

Yours very truly,

WILLIAM FLOYD MCKENNON.

U.S. School Funds Believed Unneeded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to present for the RECORD a thoughtful and valuable statement by Maurice H. Stans, formerly Director of the Budget, under the heading "U.S. School Funds Believed Unneeded," which appeared in this morning's Washington Post:

U.S. SCHOOL FUNDS BELIEVED UNNEEDED

(By Maurice H. Stans)

Taxpayers in my old hometown of Shakopee, Minn., in 1959 were confronted with the need of enlarging the school facilities. The educators and architects put before them a proposal to build a new high school at a cost of $1.3 million. The program was defeated in the election almost 4 to 1—but not because the voters were against education or were unwilling or unable to support its necessary costs. They turned it down because they believed the plans were extravagant.

About 6 weeks later, a more economical proposal calling simply for an addition to the existing school building was presented to the taxpayers. By an enthusiastic vote of 5 to 2, they approved a $200,000 bond issue to meet the cost.

In an earlier article I questioned the validity of the statistics being cited to the public in support of Federal aid for elementary and secondary school construction. I suggested that we are entitled to a lot more facts on what individual school districts really need—and what they can and will do about it when inadequate or substandard conditions are pointed out—before committing billions of dollars of Federal money to such a program.

MEETING RESPONSIBILITIES

Since all Americans favor a sound educational system, it might be assumed that the case for Federal support would rest on evidence that the local school districts have failed to provide one that is satisfactory. Yet the facts seem to demonstrate that by and large they are meeting their responsibilities—in their own way, as did the people of Shakopee.

Here are figures from the Office of Education: Over the past decade (of the 1950's) more than 600,000 new classrooms were built, while increased attendance required only 400,000. This means that 200,000 classrooms were made available to replace old ones or to reduce the size of classes. This provided a significant improvement in school conditions.

Since 1956, our communities have been building an average of 70,000 classrooms a year, on their own. In the 4 years between 1956 and 1960, enrollment rose 15 percent, the number of classrooms increased 23 percent, and the number of pupils per classroom declined from 29 to 27.1. And all this without general Federal aid.

And here are some more reported figures: The peak increase in elementary and secondary public schools occurred in the fall of 1953, when student enrollments rose 1.4 million. Since then, the postwar wave has been subsiding, and now the annual increases are about 1 million.

FURTHER SLOWDOWN

From 1965 through 1970, the statisticians tell us, the average growth will be only about 600,000 pupils per year. If our communities continue to build just 50,000 classrooms a year, this will provide enough new facilities to take care of the student growth and give 25,000 classrooms a year to replace old ones or further reduce the average pupil count per classroom.

The contention that states and local communities are unable to meet rising educational costs does not stand up under critical examination. The States and communities in the 1950's boosted school revenues 164 percent to meet the mushrooming 43 percent expansion in enrollment. With our economy continuing to grow they should be better able by far to match the lesser needs of the 1960's when enrollment will grow by only 20 percent.

A few years ago, the arugment was heard that thousands of school districts had reached the ceiling of their bonding limits for school debt and so were prevented from meeting their requirements. Yet a survey by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in December 1959, showed that only 237 of the Nation's more than 40,000 school districts reported that they needed classrooms, were at the limit of their debt capacity and were unable to obtain State aid. For those few in this category, the Eisenhower-Flemming 1960 proposal of limited long-term aid through loans and grants would have been a full and adequate solution; the Congress ignored it.

TWO LESSONS ILLUSTRATED

The experience of Shakopee illustrates two important lessons. First, planners can engage in flights of fancy when they submit proposed courses of action; only local knowledge of actual requirements can hold this type of wishful waste in check. Second, when the voters are convinced of the need for money and that it will be well spent they will approve and support all reasonable requests made of them. They want their children to be well educated.

Since the turn of the century, increases in school expenditures have far surpassed the growth in any other measuring rod of progress, including gross national product, personal income and personal consumption expenditures. And all except a negligible portion in recent years has been voluntarily paid out of the pockets of local taxpayers.

Certainly the facts do not make a strong case for using vast appropriations of Federal funds at the elementary and secondary school level. To a degree unequaled by any other nation in history, primary and secondary education has been provided in this country to all who have sought it. And it has been done well and at less cost to the taxpayer by the States and local school districts.

Rural America: Outcast or Partner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure last week of addressing 6,000 delegates at the 20th annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association at Atlantic City, N.J. At the request of many who heard me I am giving this same speech before the House of Representatives so that Members of Congress can respond to requests for copies of this speech.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the 6,000 delegates to the 20th annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association did me a great honor by inviting me to address them. They were delegates from the heart and roots of our Nation. My hope is that I fulfilled the challenge and honestly reflected the sentiments of this great institution of Congress.

There is a saying in Washington that whenever an important officer of our Government boards a plane and the pilot asks where to, the answer invariably is, "Take me anywhere because we have troubles everywhere."

In these times of worldwide evolution and revolution, I do not vision a more appropriate subject for a talk before this group of distinguished Americans than the one chosen, namely, "Rural America: Outcast or Partner."

A famous historian once wrote: "No nation dies that is fit to live." Rome endured as long as Rome had a rural economy to back it up. Our Nation became the envy and marvel of the world because it had the rural economy to back it up. Take any part of the globe. Point to a nation with a healthy rural economy and there you have at the same time a healthy stable nation. Take any part of the globe again and point out a nation with a sick rural economy and there you have at the same time a sick nation infested with chaos, dictatorship, and revolution after revolution. Stability in any nation is impossible unless that nation is supported by a vigorous and prosperous rural population. To be a stable nation make no mistake about it—rural life must be a partner, not an outcast.

The pages of history are replete with evidence that the nations which give only passing attention to their rural people are doomed. Nations in Latin America, Asia, Africa are classic examples of how difficult it is to have stability in government with a poverty-stricken rural population. Seeing no hope in the rural portions of their country these people are concentrating in cities already overpopulated. They see no future in rural life. They vision no opportunity in rural life. They seek only to get away from rural life at the earliest opportunity. Basically this is why there is poverty and deprivation in many parts of the world. The flood of people from rural areas of the world to the cities has become alarming and if not checked will result in even greater problems than those we are now facing.

One has but to visit the universities of these nations to visualize how alarming is this migration from rural life to the cities. In one country, I have seen, for instance, where there is poverty almost unbelievable, you will find 50 students studying law and politics to 1 student studying agriculture or the production of food. In another country I could name you will find a similar alarming ratio. There are countries with a ratio more alarming than the examples I have given. These are examples which exist worldwide. Ask them why such a lack of interest in agriculture and these students will tell you, "There is no future in rural life and we have no desire to return to it." As a result these nations have a surplus of lawyers and government employees but not enough people in rural

areas to produce the food and fiber that builds nations. In these countries rural life has become an outcast—rather than a partner in the national picture.

Even Communist China is beginning to see the folly of concentrating their efforts in all directions except rural life. In their efforts to industrialize their nation, they lost sight of the importance of having people produce food and fiber. As a result, reports of starvation and near revolution are leaking out to the world. Communist Russia boasts of the hundreds of thousands of engineers that are graduated each year. They make no boasts of the number of farmers they graduate. They, too, forget about the importance of food and fiber production in the rural areas. Experiment after experiment are the order of the day to revive their rural economy. All these have failed because even in the so-called people's government it is more of an honor to be an engineer or a scientist than it is to be a farmer.

In rewarding engineers, scientists, artists, and propagandists they forgot to reward the important people of the rural areas. For that lapse of memory these two Communist nations are paying a heavy price. It will more than likely be the making of their downfall. Even dictators cannot afford the price of allowing the rural sections of their nations to be an outcast rather than a partner. Everywhere in the world we see glaring disaster because nations ignore the well-being of rural life. Basically that is what is wrong with the world and most of our troubles stem from this fact.

We must not let this happen in the United States. There has, of course, been a tremendous volume of material written on rural America. It might be well to remember that nothing but an inspiring subject can produce so much praise. We cannot overlook the fact that rural America has historically produced a very large share of our leaders in almost every field. Certainly the percentage of statesmen who had their origin in rural America is out of all proportion to the relationship of the number of people to our total population. Generally speaking, the same is true in regard to outstanding teachers, preachers, lawyers, bankers, and even doctors and scientists.

It would be foolhardy indeed to deny that a child who grows up to maturity in the open and close to nature does not normally develop greater self-reliance, a deeper and more personal appreciation of the handiwork of God, and a clearer understanding of people and of the forces of nature than do those children who are doomed to spend their entire youth in the great cities. I sincerely believe that the country is the best place in which to raise a family, and that a substantial rural population adds strength to the character of any nation. In rural America you see the best examples of democracy in action. Our Nation would never have risen to such heights except for the backing of a democratic force in rural America.

In these days when the whole stability of the world is threatened by aggressive communism, it seems to me that we should give serious thought to the social forces which normally oppose communism. No where has communism been able to attract basic support from rural areas. On the contrary, rural areas have, throughout the world, constituted the hard core of opposition to communism. Even the Russian peasants refused to accept communism, even though they were subjected to persecution and pogroms which involved the liquidation or murder of millions—possibly as many as 15 or 16 million farm people. No where in America do we have a firmer and more determined bulwark against communism than in rural America. If we convert these family farms into factories in the field, with hired transient labor, we may soon find these very rural areas which have so long resisted communism might become cells in the apparatus.

But let us consider the purely financial side of this question. First, we must understand that the modern-day family farm is not 40 acres and a mule on an Ozark hillside. It has been variously defined but for practical purposes I think we can agree that by a family farm we mean a farm large enough to profitably employ the labor of a farm family most of the year and small enough that its operation does not require the employment of more than a minor amount of outside labor. Of course, the size of such a farm will vary. In the livestock areas of the West, it may be of several thousands of acres. In a specialized fruit and vegetable area, it might be no more than 10 acres.

Such units are not self-sufficient. On the contrary, they are the home of many of the most substantial customers of American industry, of American labor, and of American retail business. These family farms provide some of our greatest markets for gasoline and for steel, as well as for a multitude of other products. They maintain the small towns of America. These small towns, in turn, are essential to the economic welfare of our great cities. I need not belabor the point that a loss in farm buying power is always reflected in loss of city income. I need not belabor the point that 100 family farms are better customers than 10 industrial farming units on the same land.

What is not so clearly understood is that if we allow these family farmers to be driven from their land into the city, we have not solved the problem of financing their existence. Industry has been absorbing rural migrants just about as fast as it can at its present rate of expansion. A reduction in the number of its rural customers is not going to increase the rate of industrial expansion. If the migration to the cities increases, is it not inevitable that the newcomers will either displace existing workers or go on direct relief? In either event, have the taxpayers gained anything by uprooting these rural families?

It will surely cost no less than $2,000 a year per family to care for these people in our cities. Probably it will cost much more. Many so-called farm authorities are now advancing that we push possibly half of our present population off the farm. How silly can people get. This would result in economic chaos. That would mean in round numbers around 2 million families, or a direct out-of-pocket cost of about $4 billion to the taxpayers—largely local taxpayers. Do you, as a resident of Chicago or Los Angeles, or Atlantic City want to shoulder that burden? Might it not be much cheaper and surely much better to continue a program of aiding farmers to aid themselves than to deliberately create such a social as well as financial problem? Anyway we look at it, when we apply the cold test of arithmetic, can anyone believe that it would be profitable to destroy the farm families or to force them to move to the cities?

Disturbing reports have been coming from the broad rural domain of America during the past decade. There are reports telling of increasing numbers of farm families leaving the rural areas because of deteriorating economic conditions. There are also other disturbing signs on our horizon. In recent years we have been hearing reports of heavy purchases of land by nonfarmers, and of rapid increases in land values. Such developments tend to make it more difficult for young men to get started in rural America. The present high investment cost of land, buildings, machinery, and livestock tend to limit rather than to encourage expansion of the rural tradition. This situation is cause for a further shifting of agriculture into the realm of big business. Rural America is losing its appeal to the young at heart. The future bodes even darker promises. If the young at heart stay away from rural life, where are we going to get people to stay on the farm?

Greater changes took place in farms and agriculture during the last 10 years than for any other 10-year period recorded by a nationwide census. When you see cold figures on this matter—it scares you. The last rural census shows that we have significantly fewer, but larger farms than in 1950. The number of farms, 3,700,000 counted as a result of the last census of agriculture, was the smallest number of farms reported by any census of agriculture for the 50 States since 1870. Just think of it—we have fewer farms in our Nation today than we had 90 years ago.

While this revolution has been going on in the rural section of our economy what has been happening to farm population? Total farm population has decreased from 30,500,000 in 1940 to under 20 million today, a decrease of nearly 35 percent. In 1940, farm population accounted for 24 percent of our total population. Now only 11 percent of the population was classified as farm population. So you see rural America is going backward instead of forward.

For the 10-year period 1950 through 1960 the farms of this country experienced a net migration from the farms of more than 800,000 persons annually. Just think of it—800,000 people leaving our farms each year? This mass migration from farms is expected to con-

tinue in the years ahead. Unless these people who leave the farm have jobs to go to in the cities and are trained for specific kinds of work, the migration of such a large number of people to your cities will create serious unemployment, and social and economic problems in those cities. If this trend is not reversed rural America might well lie prostrate. Our Nation will be an awfully sick nation if we permit this to happen.

As I reflect on this matter of our decreasing rural population and the number of problems that such a situation creates, a number of thoughts come to mind. I wonder why Congress embraces new production and distribution technology with outstretched arms, yet usually faces the economic situation it creates with closed minds. Consider this paradox for a moment: Is it not true that many leading legislators, farmers, and citizens of the country generally are looking forward impatiently to new technologies in the process of development, and at the same time looking backward—almost desperately—to the patterns of community behavior and government which prevailed when they were youngsters? Frankly, I think one of the great challenges of the 1960's is: How can we get farmers and the public generally to understand that if we embrace new technology, we must also embrace new governmental arrangements—new rules of the game, so to speak. New technology, including new economic organization of industry and agriculture, creates new economic situations. These, in turn, require changes in the rules and regulations by which our economy operates if democracy is to survive. Unless rural America is once again made a partner rather than an outcast our future might well be a repetition of what ails the world.

The challenge of the sixties to all farm leaders and to all those interested in the welfare of rural life is basically the challenge of getting a widespread understanding of the totally new economic, social, and political situation in which rural America finds itself. Congress and all Americans better wake up to this fact of life—before it is too late.

Of all citizens in our Nation, the one group that has had the vision and knowledge to foresee this challenge in preserving a strong rural America has been those connected with the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. Your resources and your help from the Federal Government have been limited. Yet you have performed wonders. When the Area Redevelopment Act was under consideration last year I was the first to propose that the rural development aspects of the program be assigned to the Rural Electrification Administration.

The Rural Electrification Administration has given new impetus to rural life. The Rural Telephone Administration has given new benefits and hope to rural America. I vision in the future that there will be a Rural Industrial Administration to help in establishing small industries in rural America. And finally, I vision a Rural International Administration to establish a cooperative way of developing the underdeveloped nations of the world. So far our foreign aid program for the most part has been a miserable failure in getting help to the grassroots of the needy nations. A Rural International Administration working through cooperatives might be the answer to our foreign aid program.

I am convinced that you and your associates are the most qualified and the most genuinely interested in the preservation of a rural American sector in America and in the world. Your job increases with the years. I hope and pray that for the good of America and the world you do as well in the future as you have done in the past. I wish you all Godspeed and success in your convention activities.

Sunrise to Sunset Broadcasts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, earlier this year there was held a State meeting of the Nebraska Junior Chamber of Commerce at Columbus, Nebr. On that occasion the Nebraska Junior Chamber of Commerce was gracious enough to invite the senior Senator from Nebraska to address them, which he did. The meeting was typical of the organization, which is composed, so typically, of representatives of the junior ages in business, the professions, and in agriculture. The organization considers a great many issues.

The president of the organization, Mr. Jack D. Campbell, of Lincoln, has forwarded to me three resolutions which were adopted at the meeting in Columbus. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The resolutions have to do with broadcast days described as sunrise to sunset, the efforts to combat the unchecked flow of Communist propaganda mail in our country, and also with the proposed health care service measures under the social security system, which are now being considered in this body and the other body.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS OF NEBRASKA JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

I, Jack D. Campbell, president of the Nebraska Junior Chamber of Commerce, do hereby certify that the following are true and correct copies of resolutions adopted by the delegates present at the winter board meeting of the Nebraska Junior Chamber of Commerce held in Columbus, Nebr., on February 11, 1962:

"RESOLUTION NO. 1

"Whereas there is presently pending before the Federal Communications Commission a petition, Docket No. 14419, for the amendment of section 3.87 of the rules of said Commission, by which amendment there would be strict interpretation, construction, and enforcement with regard to broadcast days described as sunrise to sunset and, further, by which amendment presunrise operations might be suspended by said Commission; and

"Whereas within the State of Nebraska there are 15 commercial radio stations which may be affected by the proposed amendment and the regulations prescribed thereunder; and

"Whereas the areas served by the commercial radio stations aforementioned within the State of Nebraska are primarily and predominately agricultural, without service by unlimited time stations; and

"Whereas it would be in the public interest and in the best interest of the inhabitants of the areas aforedescribed that there be prompt communication of weather, school, market, and road conditions, as well as other items local in nature, at such times each day, including that time of the day described as presunrise, that the information can be considered and acted upon by the inhabitants and public in general with regard to the conduct of their affairs, both domestic and business: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Nebraska Junior Chamber of Commerce at its winter meeting held at Columbus, Nebr., on the dates of February 9, 10, 11, 1962, That the Nebraska Junior Chamber of Commerce, as a matter of public record, signify its opposition to and disapproval of the petition, Docket No. 14419, and the proposed amendments to section 3.87 of the rules of the Federal Communications Commission; be it further

"Resolved, That, by this resolution, the Nebraska Junior Chamber of Commerce should and hereby does publicly oppose and disapprove the amendment to section 3.87 of the rules of the Federal Communications Commission, as proposed in Docket No. 14419.

"RESOLUTION NO. 2

"Whereas the U.S. Congress is now considering a postal rate increase; and

"Whereas tons of Communist literature are reported being delivered in the United States every year at the expense of the American taxpayer; and

"Whereas there is no reciprocation on the part of Russia and, in fact, just the opposite with jamming of the Voice of America and deliberate censorship of U.S. information in the Soviet Union; and

"Whereas some Congressmen are actively working to bar such Communist propaganda from the U.S. mails: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Nebraska Junior Chamber of Commerce go on record earnestly endorsing all efforts to combat the unchecked flow of Communist propaganda.

"RESOLUTION NO. 3

"Whereas the Nebraska Jaycees feel that the King-Anderson bill, H.R. 4222, and all similar bills originating in either the Senate or the House of Representatives which propose health care service for the aged under the social security system should be opposed: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Nebraska Junior Chamber of Commerce go on record as opposing the above-stated bill and all other bills in that regard and that we as individual members communicate our feelings on this bill to our Congressmen."

Americans on the Move

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, on the question as to how Alaska is do-

ing after 3 full years of statehood, I have heretofore reported upon impressive developments in the production of oil, timber products, and so forth. Inasmuch as the grant of statehood put Alaska very much in the news and emancipated it from the status of "Seward's Folly" so to speak, widespread interest in the 49th State has prompted a great influx of people from all the States—some to stay and many to look. Thus, tourism in Alaska is growing apace, and word is spreading of the attractions of the "Great Land," including native arts and crafts. With tourist bookings already 50 percent higher than in February of any previous year, Alaska's visitors will be pouring in by jetplane, by motorship, and by car through Canada over the Alaska Highway. Pointing to the progress and potential of tourism in Alaska, the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner in its editorial of January 26 recognizes warm and human values. The editorial reads in part as follows:

With our State division of tourism and our Alaska Visitors' Association, tourism is beginning to take its place as a major industry alongside of our fishing, mining, and timber—and it wouldn't be at all surprising if the tour industry surpassed any of the three named in a short while.

Like a slumbering giant, the tour industry has virtually been with us since the striking of gold in the Klondike, but until a few years ago little was done to capture the dollars which our great land beckoned.

We feel that with our natural scenic beauty, our rivers, trees, mountains, lakes, fishing and hunting we have everything a tourist wants.

But we also have something else—our native people.

The native Indians and Eskimos of Alaska are unique and without a shadow of a doubt, individualists of the highest sense of the word.

For that matter, most of our oldtimers are cast from this same mold of individualism. If you don't believe that, just attend a pioneers lodge meeting some Monday night.

In many countries, the people themselves are recognized as a major tourist attraction.

We are proud of our Alaska natives and equally proud of our pioneers who settled this country during and after the gold rushes. We feel that these people have a great story to tell, just as the mountains, rivers, valleys, glaciers and trees have long been pictured as the face of Alaska.

Hon. Sam Rayburn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I am including herewith No. 3 and No. 4 of a series written by Jesse Laventhol on the life of the late beloved Speaker Sam Rayburn:

MR. SAM: No. 3

(By Jesse Laventhol)

WASHINGTON, November 18.—As a minor figure in the cast, Sam Rayburn played little part in the drama of the Texas Legislature at Austin in his first session in 1907.

He was content merely to get acquainted, make friends and try to "learn the ropes." Of the more experienced members, only a few could or would take the time to guide this quiet but eager black-haired freshman through the factional political maze. One of these was Sam Ealy Johnson, of Stonewall, Gillespie County.

The younger Sam's gratitude for his attention was expressed in deed in later life as he lent a similar helping hand in Washington to his mentor's son, LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON, then yet unborn.

Later, in his second and third terms, with knowledge gained by experience and in his law studies—he was admitted to the bar in 1908—the "gentleman from Fannin County" threw himself into the vortex of debates with zest. Even then, however, as was his lifetime custom, he never spoke at great length, always with restraint rather than emotion, and armed with facts.

His ability earned respect and when, during the 32d session of the legislature, in his 5th year in the house, a vacancy in the speakership developed by resignation, Sam was elected to that office. He was 29, the youngest speaker in the history of the Texas House up to that time.

An incident following his elevation which illustrates the caliber of the man was an effort to oust the clerk of the house, an appointee of the former speaker.

The move was made by the latter's foes, who wanted Speaker Sam to appoint a woman of their choice. Mr. Sam felt the present clerk was competent and that to make the change would be unfair and an act of vengeance.

"Sam," their leader threatened, "if you don't appoint her, I'm going to put before the house a petition signed by a majority of the members."

"Ben," replied Sam, "I don't care if every member of the house signs your petition, I still won't appoint her."

He didn't, and the petition plan was dropped.

That whole session was a stormy one for the fledgling speaker who, looking back at it in later years, said he got through it "by God, ignorance, and desperation."

In a rare obeisance to sentiment, Sam in that tumultous session defended Joe Bailey, his boyhood idol, then U.S. Senator, from attacks by a legislative committee investigating the alleged connections of Texas political figures with the Standard Co.

When Sam, a few months later that year (1912), announced his candidacy for the Fourth District seat in the U.S. House of Representatives, being vacated by a Bailey foe, the Senator gratefully supported him.

The Bonham Texas Daily Favorite, in its issue of July 16, 1912, ran the following two-column headline on page 1:

"Hon. Sam Rayburn heard in Bonham. Stores all close and everybody goes out to hear Fannin County's gifted son who is a candidate for Congress. County well represented."

Important to the people who crowded the Bonham courthouse the day before this item appeared was whether and how Sam Rayburn would respond to charges circulated by his opponents that he had been a paid railroad attorney while a member and speaker of the house in the State legislature.

In its special edition marking the dedication of the Rayburn Library October 8, 1957 the Daily Favorite recalled and quoted from the story appearing under that earlier headline, with the comment:

"And here, early in his illustrious career that has never been marred by an act of dishonesty, Sam Rayburn sounded a principle that has been his guide through all his years in national leadership."

"Never in my life," he said in answering the railroad attorney charge, "have I represented a public service corporation.

"When I became a member of the law firm of Steger, Thurmond & Rayburn, Messrs. Thurmond and Steger were representing the Santa Fe Railroad Co., receiving pay monthly. When the first check came after I entered the firm, Mr. Thurmond brought to my desk one-third of the amount of the check, explaining what it was for.

"I said to him that I was a member of the legislature, representing the people of Fannin County, and that my experience had taught me that men who represented the people should be as far removed as possible from those concerns regarding whose interests he was liable to be called upon to legislate.

"And that on that ground I would not accept a dollar of the railroad's money, though I was legally entitled to it. I never did take a dollar of it.

"I have been guided by this principle in all my dealings."

This straightforward answer obviously carried weight with the voters.

On the ballot were eight candidates for the Democratic nomination for U.S. Representative at that primary election held July 27, 1912, with the winner, of course, assured of victory in the general election in November. Of the 21,336 votes cast in the 5 counties of Collin, Grayson, Fannin, Hunt, and Rains—then comprising the Fourth District—Sam Rayburn was high man with 4,983 votes.

He won with a lead of 500 over his nearest opponent, Tom Perkins, of Collin County.

From that day, though many tried, none could oust Rayburn from representation of that district in any election that followed every 2 years for nearly half a century.

Sam, a shy newcomer to the National Capital, arrived in the crowds and excitement for the inauguration of President Woodrow Wilson on March 4, 1913.

He was fortunate in his choice of a hotel not far from the Capitol—the old Cochran, long since gone—which happened to be largely populated by fellow Members of Congress. Sam joined the outer fringe of inconspicuous listeners who sat around the lobby listening to the pearls of political wisdom dropped by oldtimers such as "Judge" Cordell Hull, of Tennessee, a leader in the House and later Secretary of State.

Sam went after an assignment to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

He made his request to his fellow Texan, Representative John Nance Garner, who, fortunately, had just been made a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and was able to fulfill the request. By the rules of the Democratic Party caucus, its members on Ways and Means constituted the membership of the party's committee on committees which doles out the assignments of Democratic Members.

It was more than 2 months before he stepped into the well of the House to make his maiden speech. In the speech he echoed the Democratic policy of tariff for revenue only as against the Republican policy of protectionism. But the young man also delivered himself of his intentions and goals as a legislator.

"Mr. Sam's creed"—this excerpt from that speech of May 6, 1913, in his own handwriting—was presented to him 46 years later by a group of 45 admiring Senators:

"It is now my sole purpose here to help enact such wise and just laws that our common country will by virtue of these laws be a happier and more prosperous country.

"I have always dreamed of a country which I believe this should and will be. And that is one in which the citizenship is an educated and patriotic people, not swayed by passion and prejudice, and a country that knows no East, no West, no North, no South, but inhabited by a people liberty loving, patriotic, happy, and prosperous, with its lawmakers having no other purpose than

to write such just laws as shall in the years to come be of service to humankind yet unborn."

These were the early years of hard apprenticeship. It was 18 years before he moved up to the committee chairmanship on December 7, 1931, in the 72d Congress as his preceptor, Garner, advanced to the speakership.

MR. SAM: No. 4

(By Jesse Laventhol)

Sam Rayburn came to Congress during the regime of Speaker Champ Clark. But it was not until the ascendancy of Nicholas Longworth, the Ohio Republican and son-in-law of "Teddy" Roosevelt, that he became a key Member of the House.

It was during Longworth's period as leader and later as Speaker that Mr. Sam, under John Garner's sponsorship, was admitted to the Bureau of Education, an inner circle or private club of selected men of both parties, who met in a small office on the street floor of the Capitol Building.

Here, to the tinkling of ice on glass, and the gurgle of bourbon (mostly) being poured. Rayburn heard the frank discussions of parliamentary politics. More and more, as he demonstrated his ability as a bill mechanic, as an astute dealer with his fellow Members, he was given larger responsibilities in party management and as helmsman for steering legislation through the House.

At the 1932 Democratic National Convention in Chicago, Mr. Sam was leader of the forces for Speaker Garner for President, but there was no stopping the results of James A. Farley's advance spadework with the delegates, and Rayburn settled for second place for his fellow Texan.

With the beginning of the Roosevelt administration and the 73d Congress the following March (the Norris Act eliminating the "lame duck" lag between election and assumption of office had not yet become law), Mr. Sam really came into his own as chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. He was ready to put his long period of training to use under his own steam.

He played a major part in enactment of New Deal legislation eliminating abuses attributed to the economic royalists and rehabilitating and reforming the economy. That first Roosevelt year he sponsored the Truth in Securities Act and the railroad holding company bill.

In 1934 he was the author of bills creating the Securities and Exchange Commission for regulation of the stock exchanges, and the Federal Communications Commission to administer the airwaves in the public interest. In 1935 he put through his Public Utility Holding Company Act after the bitterest struggle seen on Capitol Hill up to that time, defeating the strongest lobby ever mustered by big business.

In all of these, he presided over the hearings, giving the opposition the fullest opportunity to express their views, studied long hours to master the subjects, and worked with F.D.R.'s bright brain trusters—Tommy (the Cork) Corcoran; Dean James M. Landis, of Harvard; and Benjamin V. Cohen, who drafted the various measures to Mr. Sam's liking.

In 1936 he joined with Senator George W. Norris in sponsorship of the Rural Electrification Act which brought light and labor-saving facilities to farm homes all over America.

A year later he was elected majority leader, with the blessing and tacit support of F.D.R., and moved up to the speakership on September 16, 1940, upon the death of William B. Bankhead, of Alabama.

From the beginnings of his career Sam Rayburn made it his job to know people, to study them, and to learn how to deal with them, how to persuade and to lead them.

As he grew older and more influential, more and more new Members, some Republicans as well as Democrats, sought him out for advice at the beginning of each new Congress. To each he patiently outlined the duties.

"A Member who is here only a short time," he would say, "is of little help to his own district. As you build seniority, your influence grows. And you can only be reelected if you make a good record. To get along here you have to go along."

When it is considered that between 2,500 and 3,000 men and women have come to and gone from the House during the 48 years of Speaker Rayburn's service, it becomes clear that this great reservoir of good will which he built up was an important source of his power.

As one of his staff of House put it: "Sam Rayburn was casting bread upon the waters every day he was here."

Like his predecessors—only 43 men before him held this office under the Constitution since 1789—the Speaker functioned in four distinct roles: In the chair, as leader of his party in the House, as Representative of the Fourth District of Texas, and as administrator of 4,000 House officials and employees.

It was from a welter of contending forces, and from the great human complex that is the House of Representatives, that Speaker Rayburn for 17 years had to produce a legislative program for the Nation.

And it had to be done under the strict rules of parliamentary procedure, on which 11,000 precedents have been established. Moreover, he had to perform in such fashion that the measures agreeable to a majority of the Members were also acceptable to the President.

Once, reverting to the Texas cowhand's language, about bucking broncos, Mr. Sam said: "I just try to ride the House.

"You can't really say how you lead," he responded on another occasion. "You feel your way, receptive to those rolling waves of sentiment. And if a man can't see and hear and feel, why, then, of course, he's lost. One thing I can say from experience, there's no such thing as a rubber-stamp Congress."

How did he do it?

One answer lies in that bread he cast upon the waters. Another lies in the character of the man. He was the soul of integrity.

Sam's word bore the highest value of any political currency in Washington. If, he told a man he would try to get him on a particular committee, or help clear a bill that was beneficial to his district or even give a constituent a job as elevator boy, he honored his promise.

"Mr. Speaker," spoke up a reporter at a Rayburn press conference, "You see about a hundred people a day, and you tell them this or that, or what you will or won't do, but you never make notes. How do you remember all that you said?"

"If you tell the truth the first time," snapped Sam, "You have no trouble remembering."

Another element of his power was the restraint with which he exercised it. He respected the convictions of every man on any question, whether he was a Republican or a Democrat.

"When two men agree on everything," he said, "You can be sure that one of them must be doing all the thinking."

Less than a year after his elevation to the speakership, Sam Rayburn faced his first great test in that office. The time was August 1941.

The Nazi armies had invaded Russia and were sweeping toward Leningrad. France had fallen; Britain was being battered by a bomb blitz. Japan had invaded Indochina, and was threatening the Philippines.

Looking back, the United States at the time seemed paralyzed by a strange admixture of apathy, fear, and internal dissensions. President Roosevelt was under attack by isolationists and America Firsters for sending planes, guns, and tanks to England.

Although the Neutrality Act of 1939 was still on the statute books, the 76th Congress had enacted in September 1940 a Selective Training and Service Act to draft 600,000 men into the Army for 12 months. On May 27, 1941, the President had declared an unlimited national emergency.

As the time approached for beginning the discharge of the first draftees, the administration asked the Congress to extend their service and to further build up the Armed Forces.

The battle in Congress was bitter and the ultimate result in doubt.

While the debate raged on the floor for 3 days, an aroused Sam Rayburn was laboring behind the scenes to corral votes to back up the President. He worked as he always worked—in man-to-man fashion. He approached each waverer on the basis of his knowledge of the individual's prejudices, his political position back home, or his sense of personal obligation.

If all appeals failed, he looked a Congressman in the eye—Sam's direct, brown-eyed gaze could be hypnotic—and say, "then do this for me. I won't forget it."

When the big test came August 12—the roll call on final passage of the President's bill—the vote was 203 in favor, 202 opposed, 27 not voting. A margin of a single vote thus kept the American Army intact—less than 4 months before December 7.

American Legion Commended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, over the years one of the American Legion's most effective weapons in combating Communist internal aggression has been its affirmative approach to the problem. It has preached and taught the American heritage. The fourth district of the Department of Ohio has been particularly diligent in this phase of the manifold activities of the Legion.

The Cincinnati Enquirer, in its March 1, 1962, editorial entitled "Legion Americanism Awards," pays fitting tribute to the American Legion. The editorial follows:

Not many national organizations have worked longer, more tirelessly or more effectively to strengthen the American heritage than the American Legion. As the largest of the Nation's veterans' organizations, the Legion's membership spans three American wars. It is an impressive link between those who fought at Chateau Thierry and those who fought at Iwo Jima and Heartbreak Ridge.

It is singularly appropriate, we think, that the Legion, with its tradition of advancing American principles, should set aside an occasion to honor a group of Cincinnati institutions that, in its judgment, have contributed to a better public understanding of Americanism. Such an occasion is coming up March 15 when the Legion's Hamilton County Council is sponsoring the first Americanism awards dinner of its kind.

The speaker for the event will be William Strube, vice president of the Christian Anti-Communist Crusade. Headed by Dr. Fred C. Schwarz, an Australian physician, the Christian Anti-Communist Crusade has become one of the most effective of a variety of organizations dedicated to alerting the American people to the threat of international communism. Mr. Strube is ideally equipped to speak on the subject "What Can We Do To Combat Communism?"

The Legion's awards dinner deserves to be a truly community occasion. We hope that it attracts the public interest and participation it deserves.

The Threat of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, all of us have been cheered by recent figures showing stability of both the wholesale and consumer price indexes during 1961. This is a welcome development—provided we do not become complacent and let down our guard against inflation. Just the other day, for example, the AFL-CIO executive council announced from Bal Harbour, Fla., that inflation is not a present threat in America.

Nothing could be farther from the truth. I can think of nothing that would be more damaging to our unhappy unemployment situation, the President's new trade program, and our balance-of-payments deficit problem than another round of inflation.

The ever-present danger of inflation is emphasized by an article which appeared in the March 8, 1962, issue of the Wall Street Journal. The article points out what it terms "an important trend in the economy"—the fact that price increases on manufactured goods are beginning to outnumber price cuts, as rising sales create a climate in which price increases can be made. Another reason for the boosts, according to manufacturers, is the continued climb in labor and material costs. The Journal warns that the upward trend could take on a more general character, and could affect the whole economy, particularly if steel prices go up after a new labor contract is signed, later this year.

Mr. President, the warning is perfectly clear. This is no time to relax our efforts to hold the price line.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANY RECENT INCREASES WIPE OUT REDUCTIONS MADE IN 1960–1961 SLUMP—MEAD RESTORES BOX QUOTES—DEMAND RISE AIDS LUMBER—STEEL USERS BET ON BOOST

"We are nickeled and dimed to death by small price increases every time we order component parts and materials."

So states John Jipp, marketing vice president of Ampex Corp., Redwood City, Calif., maker of recording machines. His comment pinpoints an important current trend in the economy: New price increases on manufactured goods recently have begun to heavily outnumber new price cuts.

A Wall Street Journal survey of businessmen throughout the country turns up reports of price increases since January 1 on 59 highly diverse manufactured items ranging from steel frames for skyscrapers to blue denim cloth for overalls. By contrast, price cuts were reported on only 28 items, and of these no less than 13 were chemicals of various types. A big reason for the trend: Climbing sales are emboldening many companies to pass on to customers higher costs that they had to absorb for many months during the 1960-61 recession and in the early stages of recovery.

STRONGER TONE, NO SPIRAL

The boosts indicate a marked strengthening in the tone of industrial pricing since last fall. Then a similar survey found price cuts about equaling increases in number and outweighing them in importance. But the recent firming of prices scarcely adds up to any sweeping climb. A number of the recent increases have been small. And some affect goods of only limited importance to the general economy—such as a special type of screw bought by Scripto, Inc., Atlanta manufacturer of pens, pencils and cigarette lighters.

In addition, a number of current price increases recapture only part of deep—though often unannounced—price cuts posted during the recession. In the course of a general round of paper-industry price boosts, Mead Corp. of Dayton, Ohio, last week put into effect increases ranging from $3 to $11 a ton on corrugating material for shipping containers. But it says this increase will recover only 35 percent of price cuts made on corrugating material since early 1960.

The Government's official index of all wholesale prices, though remarkably steady over the past 4 years, has moved up slightly since the middle of last year. Prepared by the Labor Department and using the 1947–49 average as 100, it stood at 119.1 at last report on February 27. In June of last year it was 118.2.

The current spate of mostly small price boosts on scattered products could broaden later into a more general move affecting much of the economy. This might well happen if steel mills post a general price increase when they eventually sign a new labor contract with the United Steelworkers of America. The present contract expires June 30.

STEEL PRICE FEARS

Chances of avoiding such a boost darkened considerably when early negotiations between the two sides collapsed last week with the union demanding contract terms twice as costly as the mills had offered. Even before that, many steel officials doubted they could hold down labor cost increases enough to continue the price stability they have maintained on most products since mid-1958. A few mill executives insist any increase at all in labor costs will force a price boost.

Steel users are even more pessimistic. Many think a price increase is a foregone conclusion, and are concentrating on trying to predict how big it will be.

"I'm guessing the increase will average about $3 a ton on mass-tonnage items like sheet and plate, or about 2 percent of their current average price of about $150 a ton," says an official of a big Midwestern farm equipment manufacturer. Robert Biesel, executive vice president of General American Transportation Corp., says he is looking for about a 3-percent increase in steel. "We would definitely have to pass it along to our buyers of railroad equipment," he adds.

Prices of a few specialized types of steel, and some steel products, already are rising in line with recent gains in the industry's sales and production. Cannon Electric Co. of Los Angeles says it got a notice from Republic Steel Corp. a few days ago that Republic will raise the price of tool steel about 5 percent on March 15. Roy Whitney, Cannon's procurement manager, reports another Eastern mill is trying to get Cannon to pay a $10 service fee on each order in which the mill certifies that the steel meets certain specifications. In the past this service has been free.

STRUCTURAL STEEL RISES

In New York, Paul C. Cone, executive vice president of Diesel Construction Co., builder of the 59-story Pan American Airways skyscraper, says structural steel fabricators currently charge $260 to $270 a ton for framing steel delivered and erected for large buildings. "A few months ago," he says, "you could talk $250 a ton." The current price is still far below the $300 a ton framing steel commanded in mid-1960, when fabricators began chopping prices to compete with reinforced concrete. But many building men believe prices will recover further now as the breakdown of steel negotiations spurs fears of an eventual strike and steel shortage.

Rising demand is pulling prices higher in many other industries, too. "A spurt in coal production allowed Joy Manufacturing Co. of Pittsburgh to boost prices 6.5 percent early this year on a line of parts for coal-mining machinery," says W. L. Wearly, president. In the Pacific Northwest, lumber mills have boosted prices $5 per 1,000 board feet for green fir lumber and $4 per 1,000 square feet for fir plywood since the start of the year; both are key building materials. "Production just couldn't keep up with slight increases in orders," says one lumberman.

In a few cases, higher demand has allowed companies to put into effect at last price boosts that earlier couldn't be made to stick. Producers of asphalt roofing materials for instance, tried to raise prices 5 to 7 percent a few months ago. But Lloyd A. Fry Roofing Co. of Chicago, a top company in the field, refused to go along. Buyers then succeeded in getting the other producers to offer special discounts which in effect canceled the price increase.

Last month, however, with sales rising, the Fry concern raised prices 3 to 5 percent, and the other producers were able to revise their discounts to meet Fry's price. This leaves their prices below those they had tried to charge, but higher than the prices they actually had been able to get.

RED INK TO BLACK

In some cases, higher demand has enabled companies to boost prices enough to turn loses into profits. At the bottom of the recession last year, Standard Pressed Steel Co., Jenkintown, Pa., maker of precision fasteners for a variety of industries, grabbed one order for machined metal parts by bidding $22 per 1,000. The price was $3 per 1,000 below its cost, but orders were scarce and the company wanted to keep its machines and men busy.

By the time the contract came up for renewal a few weeks ago, however, Standard had "enough profitable work to keep us busy," says Thomas H. Hallowell, Jr., president. So the buyer was told he would have to pay $35 per 1,000—a 59-percent increase—or take his business elsewhere. He paid.

Mead Corp., too, acknowledges that its container division took some orders for boxes and containers last year at prices below cost. But "we're not going to do that again," says J. G. Donohoo, general sales manager of the division. Mead, like other papermakers, raised container and box prices 7 to 9 percent last week, returning them to the January 1961 level. Since sales through mid-February were running 11.3 percent ahead of the 1961 period, "we think the revised prices will stick," says Mr. Donohoo.

LABOR AND MATERIAL COSTS

Though rising sales create the climate in which price increases can be made, most manufacturers say the basic reason for boosts is a continued climb in labor and material costs. Textile mills, for instance, are paying about 3.5 cents a pound more for cotton than they were a year ago, largely because of a new Government price support policy. The largely nonunion southern section of the industry also raised wages 5 percent in the last few weeks. Prices subsequently have been raised a penny or two a yard on such cotton fabrics as denims, flannels, corduroy, twills, and sportswear fabrics.

In the Midwest, Koehring Co. and Harnischfeger Corp. this winter raised prices of construction equipment 2 to 5 percent. The biggest reason is that, like auto makers, they negotiated a contract with the United Auto Workers Union last fall. Under this pact, they will raise wages 2.5 percent of 6 cents an hour, whichever is greater, each year for 3 years.

But a purchasing director of one company says the boost also reflects these price increases on component parts: A 3-percent rise on heavy-duty coiled springs, a 10-percent rise on pipe fittings, a 5- to 6-percent boost on some types of bolts and a 5-percent increase on valves.

HIDDEN PRICE INCREASES

A good many price increases aren't called price increases by the companies putting them into effect. They're accomplished by revising discounts, allowances or sales-contract terms. But the result is the same: A buyer pays more.

Aluminum companies currently are making their customers pay a higher net price for metal because of an action that looks at first glance like a price cut. Last month, Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp. lowered by 5 cents a pound the price it pays customers for returning scrap from the aluminum they buy. Aluminum Co. of America and Reynolds Metals Co. followed a few days later with slightly different revisions in scrap-buying prices.

Since the money aluminum buyers get for returning scrap to the mills serves to reduce the net cost of aluminum they buy, the cut in scrap prices has the same effect as an increase in aluminum prices. H. C. Brackney, chief purchasing agent for the missiles and space systems division of Douglas Aircraft Co. in Santa Monica, Calif., figures his company now is paying 5 percent more for such key products as aluminum bars, sheets, and tubing because of the scrap revision.

DRUG DISCOUNTS

Southwestern Drug Co., a Dallas-based distributor, recently got a notice from one of its major suppliers that the standard discount on a broad line of drugs would be slashed to 33.3 percent from the previous 40 percent. "It means we have to pay more," says Pierre Bradshaw, a Southwestern official. Southwestern consequently has raised its prices to drugstores.

In other cases, companies have raised prices formally and officially, but the moves have attracted little attention. Some of the more important recent moves of this type include: Increases of 3.3 to 10 percent on electric typewriters and 2.5 to 5 percent on dictating machines by International Business Machines Corp.; a general boost of 7.5 percent last month on copper tubing; price increase on lumber used by southern furniture manufacturers, ranging up to 10 percent on pecan wood; boosts of 3 to 5 percent on forklift trucks, and 2 to 4 percent on farm tractors, by midwestern manufacturers; a modest but unspecified rise on gypsum board, a key building material, by U.S. Gypsum Corp.; and a boost of 10 to 15 cents a barrel in west coast prices of heavy crude oil.

CEMENT MILLS FOILED

Some other industries would like to raise prices, but can't do so because of a combination of excess production capacity and keen competition. Some east coast cement mills raised their list prices 10 cents a barrel January 1. But canny buyers were able to play one mill off against another to wangle an offseting increase in discounts. Also, they got the mills to absorb an additional 10 cents a barrel in transportation costs. Results: While official cement prices still are higher than at yearend, actual prices are a dime a barrel lower.

Chemical prices have been much weaker. Dow Chemical Co. figures industrywide prices have been dropping an average of 2 percent a year for several years. It adds gloomily that the "trend has continued on the downswing" in 1962.

Since January 1, Dow counts price cuts on five products, and increases on only two. Its latest cut last week knocked about a quarter cent a pound off the price of styrene, a synthetic rubbermaking material. Another midwestern chemical concern says prices of hydrofluoric acid have gone down 15 percent since January 1, after dropping 10 percent in 1961.

Excess capacity is blamed for most of the chemical price cutting. But some producers also complain about new competition from the petrochemical operations of major oil companies. Low-priced imports have hurt, too. Southwestern chemical buyers say Japanese urea, a fertilizer chemical, is selling on the west coast at $10 a ton below the average U.S. price. The U.S. price itself is down 12 to 15 perecnt from its usual $94 a ton.

Judgeships and a Broken Pledge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, when the President appoints a judge, not because of his qualifications but because of his political affiliation, it is the people who suffer.

I submit for the RECORD the editorial which appeared in the Sunday, March 11, edition of the New York Herald Tribune:

THE FEDERAL JUDGES AND MR. KENNEDY'S PLEDGE

President Kennedy once solemnly pledged to appoint as Federal judges only persons "of unquestioned ability—the best men available."

But his record has fallen short of his promise. And it returns an ironic echo to Deputy Attorney General White's recent remark that "I don't think the question of party affiliation is related to ability. If politics would affect the judges' work on the bench, they should not be there at all."

So far Mr. Kennedy has sent 89 nominations to the Senate. Of these, three were recess appointees of Mr. Eisenhower. There is not a single Republican among the other 86.

Seven of those 86 were given a flat rating of "not qualified" by the American Bar Association's committee on the Federal judiciary, which screened all prospective nominees. Such a rating is given only after exhaustive study and considerable soul-searching, and usually with regret. It represents a considered vote of no confidence by the organized bar, which hardly squares with the President's announced criterion of "unquestioned" ability. But they were nominated anyway.

The average quality of Kennedy judicial appointments has been extraordinarily high. Nearly two thirds got American Bar Association ratings of either "well qualified" or "exceptionally well qualified," both of which are marks of positive enthusiasm. But this makes the misfits stand out all the more sharply. And recent years have shown that any Federal judge may suddenly find himself at the center of a judicial storm that can shake the Nation. There simply is no longer room on the Federal bench for second-rate or even borderline men.

As for politics, partisan appointments are nothing new. Complaints about the practice go back to John Adams' day. But Mr. Kennedy had a unique opportunity, which he flubbed, to establish the principle of bipartisanship. He took office at a time when eight Eisenhower years of largely Republican appointments had restored the Federal bench to an even partisan balance. Creation last year of seventy-three new judgeships gave him an unprecedented number of vacancies to fill. Both the public and the bar were asking that the courts be taken out of politics.

But his record so far has continued the discredited tradition of one-party appointments.

The problem here is one not only of getting good judges, but of bolstering public confidence in the integrity of the bench and the quality of justice. Such confidence is undercut by anything that smacks of distributing judgeships, like postmasters' jobs, as patronage plums to the party faithful.

Any President is under heavy political pressures from the Senate when he names judges, and Mr. Kennedy's record would doubtless have been better without these pressures. The chairman of the American Bar Association Committee, Bernard G. Segal, stresses that he finds "very substantial bases for satisfaction" both with the high quality of most appointments and with the way the Justice Department has cooperated with the association. But the Federal judiciary ought to meet the standards for Caesar's wife.

There still are 43 unfilled vacancies. It is not too late for the President to start living all the way up to his pledge, and to invite public confidence by giving his nominations at least the appearance of genuine bipartisanship.

A Plan Without Subsidy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following editorial from the Moline Dispatch, Moline, Ill., of February 6, 1962:

A PLAN WITHOUT SUBSIDY

A group of 14 electric-power suppliers in the upper Midwest, including the Iowa-Illinois Gas & Electric Co., has submitted a good proposition to the Federal Government.

The proposal is for a cooperative arrangement between private and public power interests that would bear a distinctive advantage for the taxpayers of the country.

It has to do with the Government's development of a series of dams on the Missouri River. One of the functions of these dams

is to produce hydroelectric power for areas along the river. Like all hydro systems, the productive capacity of this network will fluctuate seasonally; the water supply available at the dams will be greatest in the summer months when the electric load is down, and will be limited in the winter months when the load is at a maximum. The capacity will also fluctuate from time to time according to river levels.

The 14 suppliers making the proposal, including 12 private power companies, one electric power cooperative, and a public power district in Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Nebraska and North and South Dakota, utilize steamplants to produce power and thus are not subject to river fluctuations.

Their proposition is to supply the river system with power during its periods of low capacity; in exchange, the group will take power back from the river system when it can produce more than it needs.

Importantly, the proposition would permit the river system to serve its area with a steady, reliable supply of power without any additional investment of public money and power plants and transmission lines. The alternative to this proposal—an alternative that will have powerful political support in Washington—is for the Government-supported Rural Electrification Administration to construct costly new power producing facilities to make up the "deficit" in the Missouri River network.

And whatever the REA does, the taxpayers have to subsidize, because the REA borrows money for its projects from the Federal Treasury at consideraly lower interest than the Treasury has to pay to get the money in the first place. That is the sense in which this proposition is in the interests of the taxpayers.

Collective Agriculture: It Doesn't Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, back in 1932, William Z. Foster, who at that time was probably the outstanding proponent of communism in the United States, wrote a book called "Toward a Soviet America." At that time the movement to establish collective farming and farm communes in Russia was well underway and Mr. Foster was lavish in his praise of the potential of this approach in assuring an adequate food supply in the Soviet Union. He also predicted the complete failure of the ability of the American free enterprise system to produce an adequate supply of food and fiber for the growing population of the United States. It is interesting that after 30 years Premier Khrushchev today seems to be recognizing the failure of the Russian agriculture program to bring about the achievements predicted by Mr. Foster. The Russian problem still exists as one of an inadequate supply while our farm problem in the United States, if we have one, is definitely one of the productive capacity somewhat beyond our consumptive ability.

Roscoe Drummond, in his column in the Washington Post under date of March 10, 1962, has some interesting comments in regard to the comparative productivity of agriculture in the United States as compared to Russia and I commend this article to the attention of the Members of the House. Under unanimous consent, I extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and include the article by Mr. Drummond:

COLLECTIVE AGRICULTURE—IT DOESN'T WORK

(By Roscoe Drummond)

What is the rest of the world to think when the two largest Communist countries, with abundant farmland, are unable to feed their people?

Millions have been starving in Red China. Most reports indicate that conditions are getting worse, not better.

Now Premier Nikita Khrushchev candidly and with a kind of desperate urgency is telling his party leaders that something must be done quickly to get food production off dead center in Russia.

Not that Russians are starving. They are not. But Khrushchev frankly states there is not enough meat in the Soviet Union, that crops have continuously fallen short of planned increases to serve an expanding population and that if things don't get better "the cause of communism will be seriously damaged."

This is the state of affairs in the Soviet Union after 45 years of communism and after 30 years of collectivization of its agriculture.

Is there something inherently wrong with the Russian farmer? Or is there something inherently wrong with communism?

Let us look at some of the pertinent facts. With nearly half the entire Soviet population on the land, it cannot reliably feed the urban half of its population—and the shortages mount. In mainland China 85 percent of the population farms—and the shortages mount. With more farmers leaving the land for industry every year, United States agriculture not only feeds this Nation but helps feed others—and the surpluses mount.

In the United States one farmworker is able to produce abundant food and fiber for 26 people.

In the U.S.S.R. one farmworker is able to produce inadequate amounts of food and fiber for 4 to 5 people.

In the Soviet Union 45 percent of the total labor force is engaged in agriculture and forestry—and it isn't enough.

In the United States only 9 percent of the total labor force is engaged in agriculture and forestry—and it is more than enough.

How does this affect comparative prices? The best comparison of national prices is the amount of time one has to work to buy the same thing. In Moscow, a worker has to work 2 hours and 24 minutes to buy a dozen second-grade eggs; in New York, 17 minutes. A pound of salted butter takes 3 hours and 4 minutes worktime to earn the rubles to buy it; in New York, 20 minutes work. A Moscow worker can earn enough in 9 minutes to get a pound of rye bread; New York, 6 minutes; a pound of beef, 1 hour and 22 minutes work in Moscow; 21 minutes in New York.

Mr. Khrushchev has tried almost everything to lift Soviet farm production. He has tried exhortation, education, and uprooting old farm managers and replacing them with new crews of Communist administrators. He has tried blaming it on Stalin and is now taking some of the blame himself.

But the Soviet colectives, much overstaffed and embracing more than 17 million households, are falling far short of producing enough to meet either the plans or the needs of the U.S.S.R.

The reason food shortages in Russia today are not far greater than they are is that the tiny private plots reluctantly allotted to Soviet farmers—allotments which comprise a tiny fraction of the total acreage of the collectives—grow more than half of the country's produce.

Communist collective agriculture has never worked anywhere, neither in Red China nor in the Soviet Union nor elsewhere in the Soviet bloc. The greatest agricultural efficiency in the Soviet bloc today is in Poland, where collectivization has been radically reduced and private farming reencouraged.

Within the Soviet Union Khrushchev is staking his reputation—and perhaps his leadership—on galvanizing Soviet agriculture as part of the Communist society.

To the party central committee this week Mr. K. suggested the possibility of greater incentives to individual farmers and the allocation of more land to the peasants in return for more active participation on the collectives.

These measures would seem more likely to help than anything else. The private sector of Soviet agriculture is overwhelmingly the more efficient and more productive. But can Khrushchev encourage private farming in the U.S.S.R. and risk the ire of his colleagues by admitting to the whole world that Communist agriculture can neither overtake the West nor feed its own people adequately?

Role of Springfield Armory Will Continue as Important Research and Development Center for Small Arms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the importance of the infantryman in war, and of the modern conventional arms he carries, was emphasized again last week by Brig. Gen. Chester W. Clark, Chief of the Army's Ordnance Research and Development Division, in a speech before the Springfield Women's Club in my home city of Springfield, Mass.

I think that General Clark's message was most appropriate and timely, because we must not forget the importance of the foot soldier and rifles, even at a time when our attention is so preoccupied with the resumption of nuclear testing, and the awesome destruction that results from nuclear blasts.

Mr. Speaker, I am also happy to know that as the Army continues its research and development of small arms, the role of the Springfield Armory, which has served this Nation since the Revolutionary War, will continue to grow in importance. The Springfield Armory is the Army's small arms research and development center and has pilot line production facilities for the new M-14 rifle and the M-60 machinegun. Under previous permission I wish to have printed with my remarks an article from the Springfield Daily News of March 7 concerning General Clark's address to the Springfield Women's Club:

GENERAL CLARK LAUDS ARMORY FOR WORLD'S TOP SMALL ARMS

The increasing importance of conventional arms in shoring American defenses throughout the world was subject of an Army general's talk to an unlikely city audience today—the Springfield Women's Club.

Brig. Gen. Chester W. Clark, chief of the Army's Ordnance Research and Development Division, saw nothing unsual in speaking to women on so masculine a subject: They are the wives, mothers, sisters, and sweethearts of servicemen, he said, and have a legitimate interest in such things.

The truth of this assertion was borne out by the attendance. The lecture, in the fine arts museum auditorium, was one of the largest club gatherings of this season.

The general illustrated his talk with colored films featuring many of the latest weapons now operational with field troops, together with others in late stages of development.

Several of these, including the M-14 rifle and M-60 machinegun were products of the Springfield Armory, which General Clark lauded as the foremost developer of small arms in the world.

Other weapons shown included a number now being used by the Soviet armies, among them armored weapons, missiles, and heavy tanks.

General Clark expostulated this fact: That far from losing his position as the most important single element in modern warfare, the footsoldier, properly equipped and trained, has become a more important ingredient than ever in successful military operations. In support of this, he cited the guerilla and counterguerilla operations now going on in Cuba, Congo, Laos, and Vietnam.

Queried as to the future of historic Springfield Armory in light of the Army reorganization that is now being studied, General Clark saw, as he put it, no change or diminution of the armory's role. Its importance will grow along with the increased emphasis on conventional arms now evident.

General Clark came here from his Washington headquarters by train and will return there tonight. His hosts here are Col. Charles L. P. Medinnis, commander of the Springfield Armory, and Mrs. Medinnis, through whom his appearance was arranged.

Trade Extension Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, as hearings begin today on the Trade Extension Act of 1962—H.R. 9900—the following statement by Mr. Charles A. Cannon, president of Cannon Mills Co., Kannapolis, N.C., should be must reading for every member of the Committee on Ways and Means. Mr. Cannon has spent a lifetime in the textile business and is a keen student of its problems. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include a statement he issued a few days ago on the adverse impact unrestricted textile imports will have upon the millions of American citizens now working in the textile and apparel industries in our country. I commend this statement to the consideration of every Member of Congress. It follows:

The continued existence of many thousands of business units and the jobs of more than 2,105,000 employees in the American textile industry are threatened by our import policies. Combined, the textile and apparel industries currently employ 2,105,000 men and women—one-eighth of the 16,636,000 persons engaged in all manufacturing enterprises in the United States.

The extent of the damage already done to employers and the employees of the textile industry is shown by the following figures for the industry (excluding 1,213,000 employees in the apparel and related industries):

	1947	1957	1961	Decrease (percent)
Number of employees	1,335,000	1,000,000	892,200	34
Cotton system spindles	28,800,000	21,200,000	19,600,000	32
Profits on sales (percent)	8.2	1.9	1.9	77
Profits on net worth (percent)	18	4.2	4.0	78

Average annual consumption all cotton

[Units of 1,000 bales]

	United States	World	United States as percent of world
1924-30	6,645	24,769	26.8
1930-40	5,902	27,385	21.5
1940-50	9,672	26,646	36.3
1950-60	9,013	41,259	22.1
1959-60	9,025	48,194	18.1
1960-61	8,268	46,919	18.0

Only a small part of the decrease in the United States is explained by the increase in domestic production of manmade fiber products.

These figures show the upward trend in imports and downward trend in exports of cotton products and manmade fiber fabrics:

The cotton content in cotton products

[Units of 1,000 bales]

	Imports	Exports
1954 (1st year for Public Law 480)	101.0	604.5
1955	181.2	547.5
1956	225.0	530.4
1957	199.1	579.1
1958	233.8	521.0
1959	360.0	492.6
1960	525.5	485.6
Percent increase (+) or decrease (−)	+420.0	−20.0

Manmade fiber fabrics

	Imports (pounds)	Exports (Square yards)
1954	1,174,000	200,846,000
1955	1,641,000	198,882,000
1956	2,773,000	192,743,000
1957	3,284,000	171,429,000
1958	4,865,000	156,767,000
1959	11,012,000	168,004,000
1960	10,215,000	154,449,000

The chief exporters of textile products to our country are Japan, Hong Kong, Portugal, Spain, Egypt, India, France, and Italy.

The increase in textile product imports and resulting loss in domestic production and jobs are explained largely by these factors:

1. Our furnishing modern equipment at low cost or no cost to so-called underdeveloped countries.

2. The low wages paid in the foreign countries range from less than 10 percent to not above 50 percent of the American wage level.

3. The availability of American cotton at no real cost to foreign countries under Public Law 480.

4. Our low tariff rates.

5. Our export subsidy of 8½ cents per pound or $42.50 per bale.

6. Our failure to establish proper import quotas and regulations.

These factors are in addition to the advantage which the foreign spinner has in securing his cotton at one-third less than the American manufacturer. The foreign cotton is excluded from the American market by quotas. The total amount of upland cotton being allowed to come in in any 1 year is less than 1 day's requirement for American spinners.

Our Public Law 480 sales of cotton to so-called underdeveloped countries has hurt the American textile business. Beginning about 1947, we furnished money and equipment to Japan and other countries so that in many places the foreign producer has newer and more effective machinery than we have at home. Beginning in 1954 and through December 5, 1961, under Public Law 480 we have shipped or authorized 6,011,344 bales of cotton valued at $994,564,652 to various countries, all of which is supposed to be in excess of their traditional consumption of American cotton. These 6 million bales, at a value of $1 billion, were not paid for in dollars but in restricted local currencies which could be spent only in the foreign importing country which received the Public Law 480 cotton, all of which contributed to their local economy.

The goods manufactured from American or foreign cotton, are available to be exported to the United States and sold to us for dollars which they can readily exchange for gold.

Some of the beneficiaries through Public Law 480 cotton have been:

Burma	$32,000,000
Taiwan	7,000,000
Korea	47,000,000
Pakistan	35,000,000
Colombia	12,000,000
India	157,000,000
Indonesia	58,000,000
Italy	77,000,000
Japan	52,000,000
Poland	94,000,000
Spain	119,000,000
Yugoslavia	82,000,000

Japan, Pakistan, India, Italy, and Spain (as well as Hong Kong, Portugal, and Egypt) have been substantial exporters of cotton goods to the United States and are pressing to increase their shipments at the expense of the American manufacturer.

The following shows price differentials on a number of fabrics in the New York market during December 1961:

Comparative gray goods prices

[Cents per yard]

Construction	American price	Japanese-free Chinese price
40"-136/60-3.65 (combed)	26	24
47"-136/60-3.10 (combed)	30	29
47"-109/58-2.84	27½	25½
46½"-80/84-3.43 (combed)	30	28¾
40½"-42/44-3.00 (soft filled sheeting)	21	17½-18
40½"-42/44-3.50	17¾	14¾-16¾

The above figures readily explain how the foreign competition can quote lower prices than the American mills can possibly afford

to make. It is a well recognized fact that many textiles are sold at very close prices. A difference of one-eighth of a cent a yard, which is less than 1 percent of the value, often is the controlling factor as to whether a mill is to continue to operate or run short time.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Unemployment is high in the United States. A continuation of our import policy on textile goods threatens to increase that unemployment. By contrast, we know that many foreign countries have a labor shortage including Japan, West Germany, and Switzerland who are profiting as a result of our failure to protect ourselves against imports from low-wage countries.

In the apparel industry, there are about 1,213,000 employees and, therefore, in the combined textile industries there are about 2,105,000 out of a total of 16,636,000 employed in all manufacturing industries, or 12.6 percent (Labor Department's Monthly Report on Labor Force, November 1961, issued December, table 3).

The administration recognizes that the textile and apparel industries are employers of a large part of our whole manufacturing employees (12.6 percent) and are probably more vulnerable to imports of competing products than any other large industry on account of the foreign countries having lower raw material prices (American cotton available to foreigners at 33⅓ percent under American support price, and cotton represents, in many instances, one-half the cost of American gray goods). The foreign countries have advantage of lower wage costs, their rate being 10 to 50 percent of the American wage rate (the American labor cost frequently runs as high as 50 percent of the sales price of gray goods).

Further decrease in employment in the textile and apparel industries will add to the serious problems of unemployment. In many areas, the textile or apparel workers are a large portion of the entire labor force in the area and State.

In addition to present loss of employment in the textile and apparel industries, the entire future of our cotton farmers, ginners, compressors, and warehousemen (not included in manufacturing industry figures) is threatened. If the domestic mills, which pay the Government support price, or higher, for the greater portion of U.S. cotton consumed, are destroyed, then it follows that raw cotton interests must live on the world price plus such additional subsidy or dole that the Government may wish to pay them.

We are familiar with the depressed conditions in the coal mining areas of West Virginia and Pennsylvania. Those same conditions will probably arise within a few years in the many areas in many States where a large proportion of all manufacturing industry employees are those engaged in producing textile products and apparel. In many places this proportion is 50 percent or as high as 80 percent of the total number of employees in the manufacturing industry in the State.

It will be impossible to retain or to move a large number of the employees, many of whom have made the textile industry their life's work, are skilled employees in the industry, and have established their homes, their families, and their expected future, based on the stability of the textile industry. The liquidation of this industry, employing a large number of people and so necessary in time of peace or war, will bring social unrest, family disruption, and heartaches to a great number of people in wide areas of the country where the industry is located.

The suggestion that these people be retrained and possibly moved to other localities is not realistic when we consider that we consider that we have not retrained and taken care of some 4 million employees who are now unemployed and, yet, it is proposed that we begin to add to this number an additional 2 million employees. If this program were put into effect today, our unemployment would rise from 6 to 9 percent.

It seems quite clear that our import policy has largely caused this decrease in American jobs. The textile industry is hurt by our cotton pricing controls. But we probably can survive if we get an equalization fee to offset the 8½ cents per pound subsidy on cotton exported to foreign countries, plus protection in the form of fair tariff rates and quotas against excessive importation of fabrics and apparel from low wage countries.

Foreign countries have no just basis to object to any of these procedures. Practically all of them have restrictions which prevent or limit our shipping many items into their borders. There is little reciprocity in practice.

THE COMMON MARKET APPROACH

In his state of the Union message, President Kennedy ties his foreign trade recommendations to his concept of the European Common Market (comprising France, West Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg), which is still in experimental form.

He recognizes we need a new law. The Reciprocal Trade Act has not accomplished true reciprocity and has resulted in our giving up much and getting very little in return.

No one as yet can be sure as to how the Common Market will operate and how it will affect our country. The six European countries in that group along with the United Kingdom form (as the President says) "an economy which nearly equals our own." The Common Market principles will apply, if at all, only to countries of a somewhat similar economy. Therefore, it would be unwise to apply to low wage countries practices which some persons think will work well with seven nations whose wages and living standards are more like ours than is true with many other parts of the world.

And yet, in his message the President says, "nor are we abandoning our non-European friends nor our traditional most-favored-nation principles."

We should insist that the principles of reciprocity and fair dealing be practiced by all the nations with whom we desire to have trade. We certainly should look long and hard before we make commitments which may make a bad situation worse.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The administration recognizes that the textile industry is so important to our American economy and employs such a large proportion of our manufacturing labor force that it must be given special treatment.

I recommend such special treatment through legislation as follows:

1. Collect from importers an equalization fee to offset the advantage given to foreign producers who now buy American cotton 8½ cents per pound under the price paid by American mills.

2. Establish fair quota limitations on imports of textile products, including yarns, based on the average of 1955–59 imports.

3. Insist that many other countries increase their imports from the areas requiring help through increase in exports of the products of those areas and thus relieve the growing pressure on the United States.

These actions are necessary in order to keep our American textile industry healthy and strong—ready for war and other emergencies and meanwhile employing our American men and women.

CHARLES A. CANNON.

FEBRUARY 1962.

After the above article had been delivered to the printer, I learned through the press some of the details of the International Cotton Agreement reached in Geneva.

I believe the tentative agreement, subject to the approval of 19 nations, insures a continuing threat to the employment in the textile and garment industries in the United States. I believe that legislation making mandatory my recommendations will be required to protect the American textile industry, recommendation No. 1 calling for an import fee of 8½ cents a pound on cotton and recommendation No. 2 calling for the establishing of ceilings by quotas on imports.

The preamble provides protection for all participating countries except the United States, as follows:

"Recognizing further that such action should be designed to facilitate economic expansion and promote the development of less developed countries possessing the necessary resources, such as raw materials and technical skills, by providing larger opportunities for increasing their exchange earnings from the sale in world markets of products which they can efficiently manufacture; * * *"

I anticipate increasing hardships in and liquidation of the American textile and garment industries if this provision is carried out.

C.A.C.

Oratory Masterpiece on World War I Veterans at Convention Here Last June by Dr. Malone, Regional Commander

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of the Congress, the following address which appeared in the Saluda Standard, Saluda, S.C., Thursday, March 1, 1962:

ORATORY MASTERPIECE ON WORLD WAR I VETERANS AT CONVENTION HERE LAST JUNE BY DR. MALONE, REGIONAL COMMANDER

It would be commonplace to say that we owe a debt to the past for our blessings, that we have an obligation to the present in which we live, that we have a responsibility to future generations. It is also a familiar saying that we reap where others have shown and we sow where others may reap. Thus we justify our existence.

But as we glance back over the years of our lives, as we search in the halls of memory, do we ask ourselves now and then, "Is there any incident or event in my life that has an imperishable quality, that will live after I am gone, not only in my relatives and friends, for they, too, will pass, but in the structure and fabric and institutions of my country?"

In answer to that question is the subject of this talk, and if a text were chosen it would be found in a paragraph of a book, "Sesame and Lilies," written by an English author, John Ruskin, "this, if anything of mine, is worth your memory."

We were the soldiers, sailors, marines in the World War I. We are of the generation that remembers "Goodby Broadway, Hello France," "It's a Long, Long Way to Tiperary," "Pack up Your Troubles in Your Old Kit Bag," and "Mademoiselle From Armentieres."

We remember Camp Green, Camp Dix and Camp Lewis, St. Nazaine, Brest, Bordeaux, Chaumont—and Paris and Verdun, Chateau Thierry, Catigny, Belleau Wood, the Marne,

St. Mihiel and the Argonne Forest. We remember too, chlorine and mustard gas, barbed wire entanglements, the trenches, no man's land, and the cooties. We knew the Unknown Soldier.

And many more incidents and events too numerous to recall. Each of us cherishes his own memory; all of us shared the same experiences. How many memories were revived and stories told these past few days of this convention? Surely many that most of us heard for the first time. And perhaps all of us have said more than once since 1919.

"I wouldn't exchange that period for any other years of my life but I wouldn't want to go through it again."

We are of a generation that said: "Here am I, take me." We exchanged our name for a serial number on a dog tag, civilian clothes for a military uniform, a house for a ship or pup tent or barracks, a comfortable bed at home for an army cot or hammock, or just Army blankets.

We offered our life, "a little gem of time between two eternities, no second chance to us forevermore."

One hundred thirty-one thousand died in the service. Thousands returned with wounds and scars, mutilated, disabled. Most of us came back healthy in mind and body, stronger men, more loyal citizens, with a deep respect for our country and its institutions and an unwavering determination to do all within our power to maintain our way of life.

We remember November 11, 1918, Armistice Day. The last gun has been fired, the World War was ended and we started the long road back to pick up the pieces, to resume, if we could, where we left off, difficult for most of us, impossible for many. Conditions at home were changed; we were changed; nothing was the same. Many a soldier went to war a boy and returned a man.

Though we discarded the uniform, we did not forsake the cause for which we served. We joined the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the Purple Heart, and during the past 43 years we have given immeasurably of our time and thought and energy in service to God and country, cleansed and purified and enobled by military service in time of war, were often weighed in the balance but never found wanting.

Now we are the veterans of World War I. There were more than 4 million in service in 1918; there are less than 3 million now living. The most precious lapel ornament is not the emblem of the American Legion or the Veterans of Foreign Wars, or even the Veterans of World War I of the United States, it is the bronze discharge button of the First World War. We belong to an exclusive organization. The membership is limited, and the lists were closed 43 years ago.

Are we the old soldiers? Do we take the place of the Civil War veterans who are gone. Old in years, yes, but rich in wisdom and experience and youthful in spirit with memories of the past, our eyes on the present, and our hopes of the future.

You may remember these familiar lines from Robert Browning:

"Grow old along with me. The best is yet to be;
The last of life, for which the first was made:
Our times are in His hand who saith, 'A whole I planned,
Youth shows but half; trust God: see all, nor be afraid.'"

What of the year 1917? What was going on in the world? You remember only too well.

The plight of the Allies was serious, the outcome of the war hung in the balance, the triumph of Germany a threat to the peace and safety of our own country. Desperate and in great peril, the Allies cried, "Send us American soldiers. Let the American flag be unfurled on the fields of France and let the tramp of American armies thrill anew the worn spirits of those who have borne of battle for 3 long years."

"The Americans are coming!" The shout went up in the streets and homes of England and France and Belgium. Men, women, and children laughed and wept and prayed. "The Americans are coming!"

The outcome is history. Before the end of the war 4 million men had been brought into all branches of the service; more than 2 million went overseas.

We are not heroes, we are not special or superior or peculiar individuals. We are not a special class of people; we are of the general population of our country.

How are we different, distinctive? In what way are we distinctive? We are average men, women, ordinary men who performed a special kind of service for our country in time of war. We were 4 million of a total population of 105 million in 1917. We gave up our individual liberties as citizens for the Articles of War, our freedom for regimentation and military discipline. We placed our lives in the hands of others for the duration. We had to learn that individuals do not count. A squad, a platoon, a battalion possibly a company was a calculated sacrifice by the strategists if necessary to reach an objective or hold the line.

To paraphrase two lines from Tennyson's Charge of the Light Brigade: "Ours not to reason why, Ours but to do and die."

Or like the French troops addressed by Marshall Joffre at the First Battle of the Marne:

"Soldiers of France, we are attacking. Advance as long as you can. When you can no longer advance, hold your position. When you can no longer hold it, die!"

What, then in your life deserves to last beyond your time? What is your contribution to society, what is the imperishable incident or event in your life that deserves to be remembered? It is hard to put in words, but——

We held the line, we pushed the enemy back we saved the day we gave our lives and strength to achieve victory. We altered the course of civilization. We preserved and protected the people of our country, our institutions, our way of life. We helped to make America safe for Democracy, if not the world. Our country would now be a far different place in which to live had we not served in World War I.

Can we say then to our generation and future generation: "This is the best of me; for the rest I ate, and drank, and slept, loved and hated, like another; my life was as the vapor and is not; but this I saw and knew; this, if anything of mine, is worth your memory.

Unnecessarily Costly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial March 8, 1962, the Illinois State Journal, Springfield, Ill., warned against adopting a compulsory and unnecessarily costly medical aid plan before the Kerr-Mills bill has a chance to prove its worth. The text follows:

UNNECESSARILY COSTLY

Federal farm subsidies, devised hastily in the depression years as a temporary measure, are still with us today, vastly more complicated and costly than when they were conceived.

The social security program was originated in the midthirties on a modest basis. It too has blossomed into a gigantic, complex division of Government with taxes on both employee and employer increased many times.

The lessons learned from these two programs should make it obvious that any Federal plan of medical care for the aged will not only be with us forever but will constantly become more complex and expensive.

President Kennedy again is urging Congress to act at once on his medical care for the aged program that would be undewritten by another increase in social security payments.

It would seem that experience would suggest extreme caution in consideration of the President's medical program for the aged. We do not question the necessity for such care. Where it should emanate is the issue involved.

The medical profession independent of government, provides the finest care for all Americans—particularly the aged—that is available anywhere.

The Wall Street Journal commented: "Not only has our life expectancy surpassed the Biblical three score and ten but among the less fortunate people our medical care for young and old is an envy and a goal for matching."

The medical care available in the United States is the world's finest. It is denied no one in emergency. It is based on the premise that local responsibility will provide for those unable for one reason or another to care for themselves.

The care has been augmented by free enterprise plans involving the American Medical Association and insurance companies.

Mr. Kennedy declares that about half the old-age population has medical insurance. Does he know that many of the other "half" are able and willing to pay for their own care?

He would have everyone pay to take care of poor and rich alike, at the expense of every taxpayer—or contributor to the social security fund.

This is an emotional election year. We hope Congress can ignore this fact in its evaluation of a medical plan that would burden the Nation into infinity.

Medical care for the aged through a voluntary plan supported by the Federal Government certainly is to be desired. The present plan, which became effective this year in many States, should be given sufficient time to prove its worth before a compulsory system is forced on the Nation.

Hypocrisy in the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, the recent debate in the United Nations over Portugal's West African province of Angola presented a one-sided picture of the so-called revolt by the natives against the Portuguese. Soviet-bloc countries, led by Poland and Bulgaria, made charge after charge against Portugal, which is a NATO partner of the United States

and a fierce enemy of the Communists. Their charges were echoed by most of the African and Asian nations, whose constant preoccupation with colonialism has weakened the real mission of the United Nations—to promote international cooperation and world peace. The African and Asian nations are in the majority in the U.N. In the long debate, their version of the Angolan tragedy was predominant in the press.

Fortunately, however, several newspapers in this country have made an effort to get the story behind the headlines and present the American public with an objective picture of what is actually going on in this troubled area of the world. One such newspaper is the Washington Post, whose own oversea correspondent, Robert H. Estabrook, has traveled widely throughout Angola and has interviewed top Portuguese officials. The result has been a number of well-balanced, candid reports. Mr. Estabrook pulls no punches. He does not espouse any given line. Rather, he tries to tell both sides of the story. In some instances he is critical of the Portuguese administration in Angola.

More importantly, his reports reveal that most of the stereotyped impressions, echoed across the United States, are incorrect and do discredit to Portugal and the hundreds of thousands of Americans and Portuguese descent in this country.

In his most recent dispatch from overseas, Mr. Estabrook discusses these stereotypes, comments on the charge that Portugal conducts forced labor in Angola and points up the Communist's hypocrisy throughout this controversy.

I commend this article, "Hypocritic Oath: Hyperbole in U.N.," to my colleagues in Congress. Because it is vitally important we understand this explosive situation—where planned terrorism and propaganda make it disturbingly likely that much of the unrest in Angola has been imported—I intend to insert in the RECORD an earlier series of articles by Mr. Estabrook. The series will provide valuable background for anyone truly interested in this situation. Because they are lengthy, I will insert one or two articles daily, starting tomorrow, until the entire six-article series has been reproduced:

HYPOCRITIC OATH: HYPERBOLE IN U.N.

(By Robert H. Estabrook)

LONDON.—It is not very fashionable in some international forums these days to say a good word about Portugal. The Portuguese dictatorship, though not savage like that of the Nazis, is in many ways repressive. Despite notable recent improvements, some features of the Portuguese record in Africa are not good. Portuguese history and culture differ markedly from those of the remainder of Western Europe, and often they are poorly understood. The self-righteaus pride of the Government, and its seemingly allergy to change, sometimes repels sympathy.

But a major factor in international attitudes about Portugal probably derives from stereotypes. Portugal is a dictatorship and insists that its African territories are oversea provinces; it is therefore reprehensible. In the same way the British are either Colonel Blimps or phlegmatic schemers; the French detached but logical; the Germans stodgy but hard working; the Japanese inscrutable; the Africans happy-go-lucky; the Americans exuberant money-worshipers; and so on. Whatever glimmer of truth there may be in such labels, they seldom apply accurately to whole nations or peoples.

Precisely because stereotypes about Portugal do exist, it is refreshing to read the report of three jurists appointed by the International Labor Organization to investigate charges of "forced labor" in Portuguese Africa. Portugal was substantially exonerated of the charges brought by Ghana. The three judges—one each from Senegal, Switzerland, and Uruguay—were not uncritical of some labor-recruiting practices in Angola, Mozambique and Portuguese Guinea. But after investigation they concluded that most of the Ghanaian charges were without foundation. Some, such as the allegation that the situation on the Benguela Railway in Angola "is sometimes worse than slavery," were palpably mischievous.

It is by no means necessary from this vindication to applaud the entire Portuguese approach or to conclude that even reforms undertaken in good faith have come quickly or broadly enough. Portuguese insistence that happenings in Angola are no concern of the United Nations, for example, creates many suspicions that an on-the-spot U.N. survey might help to dispel. Nevertheless, for those who bothered to read them, there was some rather plaintive eloquence in the remarks of the Portuguese delegate to the General Assembly during the recent Angola discussion:

"There is a country which, by reasons of doctrine and of actual circumstances, denies the freedom of expression, of thought, and of opinion; yet its delegates pose as some of the most aggressive defenders of freedom. There is a country where slavery is an institution which is protected by the state and where even recently a new director of slaves was appointed publicly and officially: yet the delegates of this country pretend to be some of the stoutest champions of human rights. There is a country where the opposition has been jailed or deported, the press suppressed and freedom of any type abolished: yet its delegates act as if they were the boldest defenders of democracy and individual freedom.

"One government declared that it would not carry out the resolutions of the Assembly, even if unanimous, if its interests are affected: yet its representatives go even to the extent of boredom in constantly accusing others of not carrying out resolutions of the United Nations. The most virulently anticolonial country possesses the biggest colonial empire in history and is trying to make it still bigger; the country where racial and religious segregation is most intolerant appears as a champion of racial equality and freedom of belief; and the government which has decreed compulsory forced labor for its country assumes the role of a judge of other people's actions."

There is more than a little truth in this. Sometimes it has seemed as if the formal expressions of that mystical entity called world opinion were like Henry Ford's Model T—you could have any color you wanted so long as it was black. As in the apocryphal story of the American who posed a critical question in Russia only to be asked, "Well, what about your sharecroppers?" it does not follow that this international game of reverse the charges automatically clears the spokesman. Portugal is not guiltless. What does follow is that nations, like people, tend to be most vigorous in their judgments when the standards are applied to someone else.

Let him who is without hypocrisy cast the first ballot.

The Testimony of Stratagems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following:

THE TESTIMONY OF STRATAGEMS

When a man's financial affairs are in good shape he does not have to resort to stratagems. He turns to them only when mismanagement has got him in difficulty.

Sometimes these little maneuvers—postponing a bill here, borrowing a bit more there—can be useful; they can give him a respite to put things back in order. But the resort to stratagems is itself testimony to the fact that he is skating on thin ice, and they will avail him little if he uses them only to postpone a reckoning.

So it is with some of the latest moves of the U. S. Government to bolster its foreign exchange position and protect the dollar. Within the past year the United States has persuaded West Germany to prepay some debts it owes us and it has had the rules of the International Monetary Fund revamped to increase our access to usable reserves. This, together with some other measures to put our hands on foreign cash, have given us some relief from the dollar pressure of a year ago.

To these measures we have added another stratagem. For something like a year now the Federal Reserve, in cooperation with the Treasury, has been acting directly in foreign exchange markets to support the dollar.

The idea of any such stabilization operation is quite simple. Whenever the dollar weakens in value relative to important foreign currencies because foreigners are selling dollars to get marks or francs or whatever, the Federal Reserve steps into the market to buy dollars, bidding the price back up again. In theory, it will then resell those dollars later if and when the dollar grows stronger.

This kind of operation is not unknown to foreign central banks. Moreover it is a useful technical device for dampening the swings in the price of dollars on the world market. It discourages the dumping of dollars every time foreign money centers get a temporary case of the jitters, and it takes the steam out of short-term speculators who hope for a quick profit on quick price changes.

But as a move to strengthen a weak dollar it is useless. The first difficulty is that to buy dollars the Federal Reserve must have the foreign currencies with which to buy them. If the pressure on the dollar is heavy or prolonged, the Fed must find some way to increase its supply of these currencies.

The obvious way is to buy them from the foreign central banks. But this creates a new difficulty, because the purchase of foreign currencies puts more dollars in the world dollar pool when the objective is to decrease the number of those dollars. So there is created the need for other maneuvers.

One such was the German prepayment of its debts. Another would be for the United States to delay payment of some foreign bills from 1 fiscal year to the next. Still another would be to borrow a bit more; last year we did borrow from the Swiss and last month we borrowed from the Italians. Another would be to gamble in the futures mar-

ket, like any other speculator; this we did just a year ago with West German marks.

But the prepayment of debts is a one-shot device. There is a limit to what foreigners will lend us. And we can't win by speculating in the futures market if the fundamental forces push the futures market against us. All are vain if we do not put our own affairs in order.

These stratagems can give us respite, and that we suppose is a merit. But it is a sad thing that the Government of the United States, of all governments, should be reduced to them. None of them would be necessary if we had wisely managed our financial affairs, and the resort to them is itself testimony to our mismanagement.

Coalition in Laos Assailed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. position in Laos is of serious concern to many thoughtful and well-informed Americans. Our problems there have by no means evaporated as some would have us believe. As an excellent expression of the gap between our pronouncements and our performance, I call attention to a letter which appeared in the New York Times of March 9, 1962:

COALITION IN LAOS ASSAILED—OUR POLICY VIEWED AS TOLERATING INVASION OF FREE WORLD

(The writer of the following letter formerly served with the International Cooperation Administration in Laos.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In Laos we have embarked on a policy of coalition with communism: withdrawal of our military mission and abandonment of our once firm determination to help Laos remain in the free world. At the very moment we proclaim the "freedom of space," we are tolerating invasion of the free world.

When the Communists capture Laos they shall be capturing one-half of Thailand and one-third of Cambodia, for there are more Lao in those areas than in Laos. And the Communists will be capturing minds throughout Asia of friends who must now fear that we will ultimately fail to defend them as we have failed to defend Laos.

To comprehend what is happening in Laos, we must understand that the ultimate outcome of its struggle for survival has always depended upon our resistance against an unceasing Communist political-psychological-military onslaught. Long ago we made this moral commitment; long ago, we pitted the strengths of democracy against communism.

FAITH IN PLEDGES

In Laos, although there was never a signed agreement, this pledge existed in our policy papers, our words, our very presence in that country. Without faith in this, no Lao could have dared oppose an internal takeover, since it meant opposition not only to the Pathet-Lao but to North Vietnam.

Since 1949 the struggle for Laos has gone on, sometimes peacefully, sometimes violently. Since 1955, we have helped those Lao who wanted to defend their country. But our help has never been firm nor consistent. Again and again, we measured it in money, yet what were dollars worth in 1961 when the Lao Army alone faced the Pathet-Lao led and supported by North Vietnamese? Our advisers were under orders to leave their Lao units the moment the first shot was fired.

Coalition government as a solution to the Lao problem is not new. It was tried in 1957 when the selfsame Souvanna Phouma as Prime Minister almost presided over a Pathet-Lao takeover. Then Souvanna had the political and military support of most non-Communist Lao; now, his only significant support rests upon the Pathet-Lao and North Vietnamese Armies.

A recent revelation by one of his supporters—that Souvanna cannot even enter most of the areas controlled in his name—only confirms what is self-evident. Yet we now insist that Souvanna Phouma be given control of the Lao Army in the interests of a political solution.

EXTENT OF LOSS

We may fool ourselves by proclaiming a "neutral and independent" Laos as our objective, but we are not fooling the Lao, nor the Communists, nor our other friends in Asia who knew the extent of our promise to Laos. What we lose in Laos is not real estate but human beings who hoped they might someday share the rewards that come to those who work for a free country—and who had faith that we would help them achieve it.

Let us face the truth. In today's world independence anywhere, in Berlin, in the Congo or in Laos, is dependent ultimately on us. And we can preserve our own inalienable rights only by helping others to achieve theirs.

The fate of Lao independence rests with us; the Lao cannot achieve it alone. This is true of the rest of southeast Asia as well. These are not distant strangers whom we may desert in Laos; these are friends who have trusted us. And it is not their concept of democratic freedom which is on trial before the world; it is ours.

RUFUS C. PHILLIPS.

McLEAN, VA., *March 5, 1962.*

Please Tell It to the Pentagon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States is constantly telling the American people that educational standards in the country should be raised.

The citizens in Nassau County, N.Y., want to improve their Community College with their own money and all that is needed is for the Department of Defense to withdraw its ridiculous plan to house a few of its officers in the very heart of that part of Mitchel Field which Nassau County plans to use for the college.

What about it, Mr. President?

The following editorial on the matter appeared in the March 8 issue of the Long Island Daily Press:

PLEASE TELL IT TO THE PENTAGON

Somebody ought to get the Mitchel Field signals straight in Washington.

The Defense Department says it needs 127 houses at Mitchel to house officers in Army, Navy and Air Force.

But those houses happen to be in the middle of the built-up section of Mitchel. Nassau County needs the other buildings in the built-up section so that its Nassau Community College, a part of the State university, can start operating right away.

So it comes down to a simple question of which is most in the public interest—housing for 127 officers (complete with officer's club, swimming pool and bar)—or classrooms for 2,000 students next September (and 20,000 by 1970)?

It can't be both.

Nassau can't be expected to build a crazy-quilt campus around the 100 acres which the Defense Department wants for its 127 officers.

President Kennedy, Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Ribicoff, and the other gentlemen of the New Frontier keep saying that education is most important to America.

We wish they'd tell it to the Defense Department.

The Community Facilities Act of 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 10667, the Community Facilities Act of 1962. This bill would supplement the present community facilities loan program by authorizing Federal grants to encourage the construction of needed public facilities in smaller communities—those up to 50,000 population—communities suffering from substantial and persistent unemployment, and disaster areas. It would provide $500 million in grants to cover up to 50 percent of the cost of local projects. This bill would help to achieve two vital and urgent objectives—to reduce unemployment, which continues at an intolerably high level, and to increase our investment in public facilities necessary for the health and welfare of our people.

No one can be complacent about the fact that we still have over 4½ million men and women out of work even after a year of recovery from the last recession. In fact, if the labor force had shown its normal high rate of growth we would be speaking of a figure of well over 5 million unemployed. All of us who understand the plight of a person out of work will agree that the Congress has a moral obligation to take prompt and effective action to provide job opportunities as quickly as possible.

We should waste no time in acting on measures which will increase employment. Certainly no one can doubt the seriousness of our present situation. The overall rate of unemployment—5.6 percent—is far too high and the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers has predicted that the rate this summer will still be 5½ percent. While there has been some reduction in the overall rate since a year ago, it is important to note that the number of long-term unemployed, those who have been fruitlessly seeking jobs for 27 weeks or more, exceeds 700,000 and is still above the year-

ago level. To these people all of the increases in economic indicators are meaningless and we cannot ignore their plight.

The record of recent years in an ominous warning that we cannot expect time alone to completely solve our unemployment problems. It has now been 5 years since the rate of unemployment has been as low as 4 percent of the labor force. In that time we have had two recessions and one recovery period that fell far short of true prosperity. We are now in another recovery period which all of us hope will be more successful. However, there are many who doubt that even further substantial gains in output will provide all of the jobs we need to put idle workers back on the payrolls and provide employment for the new workers entering the labor force.

One special factor—one which in sheer numbers outweighs either growth in the labor force or even the critical amount of excessive unemployment we now face—is the problem of automation. Advances in technology annually eliminate 1.8 million jobs according to a recent estimate by the Secretary of Labor. This fact goes far to explain why we have not been able to achieve full employment over the past 5 years and is one which raises the question of whether or not our economy left to itself will be able to provide useful jobs for all in the years just ahead. The tremendous increases in productivity have inevitably brought increased pressure to reduce working hours in order to spread available employment. I do not believe that in this time of international danger and with millions of Americans still living in poverty that we can seriously consider deliberate measures to reduce production. It will be far better if we take advantage of increasing productivity and the slack demand for labor to undertake an expanded program of public investment in sewer and water facilities, streets and sidewalks, public buildings, and the like.

For two decades we have all too often forgone these needed projects because of wartime restrictions and under the pressure of booming consumer demand. These expenditures will make our communities better places in which to live and add to our real national wealth.

The bill provides that these grants can be made in communities up to 50,000 population, designated redevelopment areas, and disaster areas. I realize that some will wonder why larger cities are not eligible unless they are redevelopment areas. The fact is that larger cities have been the primary beneficiary of a number of other Federal grant programs. For example, nine-tenths of the money under the urban renewal program so far has gone to communities of 50,000 or more. This has served to stimulate construction activity in those places. Experience has shown that the private construction expenditures generated by urban renewal run to five times the amount of the Federal grants. In addition, the renewal process eliminates blight thereby lessening some of the special needs for local government expenditure, which all agree are exceptionally heavy in slum areas, and at the same time urban renewal restores and improves the local tax base and increases government revenue. This makes the city benefiting from the urban renewal program better able to finance the other obligations of government, including public works. Similarly such programs as Federal aid for airports and Federal aid for mass transit are of primary benefit to the large cities. Let me say that I heartily endorse these programs and have been in the forefront of the fight to bring many of them into being. My point here is simply that I feel that small communities also are entitled to Federal assistance in meeting their problems, both as a matter of equity and as a matter of general public welfare.

At present the principal Federal aid to small communities for public works is the community facilities loan program. While this program can contribute much to meet the needs, the fact remains that even with the low-interest rate and liberal terms of these loans many communities cannot adequately meet their needs. In fact, the grants provided under the bill I have just introduced will undoubtedly take some of the pressure off the loan program since private lenders will more readily purchase local bonds at reasonable interest rates if part of the financial burden has already been taken care of through Federal assistance.

The bill also would make communities designated for aid under the Area Redevelopment Act eligible for these grants without population limit. I do not feel that there is any danger that a few large cities will take a disproportionate share of the grant funds provided in view of the fact that the bill sets a $500,000 limit on the aid extended to any individual project. Let me also note that the Area Redevelopment Act authorized some funds for Federal grants to help finance public works in redevelopment areas, but tightly restricted the use of these funds to projects which can be tied in directly with permanent increases in employment opportunities and was not intended to meet the basic normal needs of a community for public works.

Finally, communities designated as disaster areas may be made eligible. We are all familiar with the havoc wrought by tornados, hurricanes, floods, and other natural disasters. The recent destruction along our eastern seaboard from heavy storms is a grim reminder of this ever-present threat. They not only exact a heavy toll of a community's investment in public works but at the same time they cripple the local government's ability to finance repairs and replacements. This bill would help to relieve their plight.

The bill which I have just introduced should not be confused with, nor does it conflict with, the standby capital improvements bill now pending before the Public Works Committee. That legislation is designed to be used only if the economy falls into another major recession and contains a "triggering" formula which would keep it from going into effect now.

In contrast, the assistance provided by my bill would be available immediately to attack our present problem of high unemployment. I feel strongly that we cannot say to the millions of men and women now out of work that they must wait until another recession strikes before their Government will act to aid them.

The employment impact of the grants provided under my bill would occur promptly. It has long been recognized that there is a tremendous backlog of need for local public improvements. In particular, there are many projects which have been fully planned under the advance planning program and are ready to start right now. Many others are now in the planning process under that program. Altogether, it is estimated that plans are ready or are now being worked on for more than a billion dollars of public works that would be eligible for assistance under my bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going into the details of the bill at this time. I plan to call hearings on the bill by my subcommittee in the near future to examine every aspect and detail of the problem.

At this time let me summarize the bill briefly. It would authorize Federal grants totaling $500 million to be provided by the appropriation process. These grants could cover 50 percent of the cost of the eligible project but in no case more than $500,000 for a single undertaking. Any project now eligible under the existing community facilities loan program would be eligible for these grants. Other provisions are described in the following section-by-section analysis of the bill.

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY, COMMUNITY FACILITIES ACT OF 1962

Section 1 of the bill provides that the act may be cited by its short title—the Community Facilities Act of 1962.

Section 2 sets forth the congressional findings and policies which form the basis for the new community facilities grant program embodied in section 3 of the bill, emphasizing the necessity for an emergency acceleration of needed public projects in all parts of the Nation to reduce unemployment and foster economic growth. This need is particularly pressing in smaller communities, in areas suffering from substantial and persistent unemployment, and in areas affected by major disasters.

Section 3 adds to title II of the housing amendments of 1955 a new section 208, establishing a Federal program of grants to assist in the construction of needed community facilities.

Subsection (a) of the new section 208 provides the basic authority for the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to make grants to municipalities and other political subdivisions and instrumentalities of States to finance specific projects for public works or facilities.

Subsection (b) limits the amount of any such grant to one-half of the cost of the project involved or $500,000 whichever is less.

Subsection (c) provides that grants under the new program will be available only to communities having a population of less than 50,000, except in the case of communities situated in depressed areas, as designated under the Area Redevelopment Act, or in disaster areas—

as determined by the President under the Act of September 30, 1950. This subsection also provides priorities—the same as are provided in existing law in the case of community facilities loans—for grants to towns having a population of less than 10,000 for the construction of water works, sewage facilities, gas distribution systems, and other basic public works.

Subsection (d) prohibits any grant under the new program if a grant, or commitment, has been made with respect to the project involved under any other Federal law.

Subsection (e) provides that the types of community facilities for which grants may be made under the new program shall be the same as those for which loans could be made, in accordance with regulations of the Administrator—the types of such facilities are not specified in the statute—under the existing program on the date of enactment of the bill.

Subsection (f) prohibits the use in any one State of more than 10 percent of the aggregate grant funds made available under the new program.

Subsection (g) authorizes the appropriation of up to $500 million for grants under the new program, and provides that amounts so appropriated shall remain available until expended.

Section 4 is purely technical.

Section 5 amends section 110(d) of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide that public works or facilities for which grants are made under the new community facilities grant program may not be included as local grants-in-aid under the slum clearance and urban renewal program.

Cincinnati Schools Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker in an article in a recent Reader's Digest, Dr. Max Rafferty, a school superintendent, asked what has happened to patriotism. He says we have been so busy educating for what we call life adjustment that we have forgotten to educate for survival. Dr. Rafferty said that although he was talking about a small minority, there are still too many phony sophisticates who clutter up our colleges, agitate against our ROTC, and parade in support of Fidel Castro. He pointed out that just 10 years ago there were too many young men who sold out their fellow American soldiers and licked the boots of brutal Chinese and North Korean invaders and made tape recordings praising communism.

The department of community relations of the Cincinnati public schools, under the directorship of John F. Locke, are meeting Superintendent Rafferty's challenge to our schools and colleges.

An article from the board of education entitled "American Patriotism Gets Fresh Emphasis in Bulletin," appearing in the February 16 issue of the Cincinnati Public Weekly News Bulletin tells how the challenge is being met:

AMERICAN PATRIOTISM GETS FRESH EMPHASIS IN BULLETIN

Another, and most significant curriculum bulletin, has been added to the number of courses of study to come off the press this year. "Patriotism," and how the Cincinnati public schools develop, cherish, and preserve it, is the subject of the 74-page bulletin.

" 'Patriotism' is a word with varied meanings. A simple definition is 'love of country'; more significant are the feelings, attitudes, and values involved which, when translated into behavior, reflect a way of life. The patriotic person values his country—its principles, its ideals, its aspirations; he accepts responsibility for helping to make these become realities."

This paragraph is the opening statement of this new publication off the press early in February. The publication summarizes the basic philosophy of the Cincinnati public schools and cites representative practices which implement this basic philosophy.

ELEMENTARY-SECONDARY

Much of the material represents a compilation from previously published curriculum bulletins at both the elementary and secondary levels. Included in the new publication is a section on fostering patriotism in the school.

Included under this general topic are sections on the growth of citizenship, the study of government, the study of the threat of communism, the study of current events, the study of the contributions of patriots, a study of local points of historical interest and a summary of the ways in which patriotic occasions are observed in the Cincinnati public schools.

The booklet also includes a section devoted to the flag, the great seal of the United States of America, the national anthem and other national songs. Also included is a list of approved audiovisual aids and supplementary books which have been selected by committees of teachers and which are used throughout the system in helping to develop patriotism in pupils.

IDEALS OF CITIZENSHIP

In discussing the ideals of citizenship, the patriotism bulletin states: "Citizens of the United States should demonstrate their belief in the American way of life in their day-by-day behavior. To perpetuate our free society, children need to learn to act in ways which exemplify the national ideals. The ideal citizen may be characterized in the following ways.

"He is loyal and devoted to his country. He strives to strengthen, improve, and unify American life. He shows respect for the dignity and worth of each individual; he displays concern for his fellow men; he strives to insure freedom of choice for all.

"He takes advantage of the right of self-expression; he thinks critically and formulates his own opinions; he expresses these freely and purposefully through discussion, writings, or the ballot in order to influence decisions. He accepts liberty under law and respects authority; when he believes there is a need for a change, he effects it through the orderly process of government and law.

"He recognizes the reciprocal relationships that exist between the individual and society; therefore, he is willing to contribute service, time, ideas, and money to enhance the life of the individual and further the goals of society. He knows the need for a well-rounded cultural life and encourages creative activity in the humanities and the sciences; he regards the literature and history of the past as vital to understanding the present. He has concern for the role of the United States in world affairs; he recognizes that his country has an important responsibility in international affairs.

"Children develop democratic concepts gradually through identification with individuals whom they emulate and through their own everyday experiences. Adults, therefore, and especially educators, must preserve the American way of life by exemplifying it and must provide children with experiences from which can emerge the conviction that our national ideals are priceless."

Reaffirming the role of the school in preparing young people for citizenship, the concluding statement of the bulletin notes that:

"For citizens of the United States, pride in our country, faith in its ideals, and loyalty to the precepts upon which it was founded constitute patriotism. The Cincinnati public schools accept as their responsibility the preservation of the American way of life by fostering this patriotic spirit and transmitting to pupils knowledge of their American heritage. As the schools imbue today's youth with an abiding faith in the freedom of man, they hope that this faith will grow stronger with each succeeding generation."

Re-energizing Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, at the request of many delegates at the 20th annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association I include the speech of Hon. Norman M. Clopp, Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SPEECH OF NORMAN M. CLAPP, RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION ADMINISTRATOR

President Yarbrough, members of the NRECA board of directors, Mr. Ellis, distinguished guests, and distinguished leaders of rural electrification in America, I want you to know how much I appreciate the privilege of addressing this great gathering. This year I come before you as the full-fledged Administrator of REA. You may recall that when you invited me to your annual meeting in Dallas last year, I was only the Administrator-designate. I can now report to you it is official. It has been since exactly one year ago last Saturday, March 3.

The warm and wonderful reception you gave us then is a memory Mrs. Clapp and I will always cherish. I am happy that she can be with me again, here in Atlantic City, as we see old friends once more and meet new ones in this great association.

It is an exciting and unforgettable experience to participate in a meeting like this where there is drawn together under one roof the representative leadership of the cooperative rural electrification movement in the United States. Thousands strong here today, you represent nearly 5 million rural consumers; 20 million Americans; one-ninth of the population of this great Nation. You come together with a record of accomplishment to your credit unparalleled in history. You have shown the experts that the blessings of electricity can be brought to rural

America on a sound economic basis where they said it could not be done. They said it would not pay. You have made it pay, and you have repaid the Federal Government more than $1 billion of the $3,800 million advanced to you through the REA program.

It is sometimes said that one comes to inspiring meetings like this one to get his battery charged. It does give us all a chance to draw on the experience and enthusiasm of others who share our common problems and join in our common efforts. But batteries are obviously obsolete in a gathering of rural electrification leaders, so with your permission I propose to talk to you today in terms of "reenergizing" rural electrification.

And we need to reenergize rural electrification, from top to bottom, from north to south, from coast to coast. We need to reenergize the management and the members of our cooperatives with renewed faith and practice in cooperative principles. We need to reenergize our friends and our communities with renewed understanding of the significance of cooperative rural electrification. We need to reenergize our Government at all levels with the vision and belief of such founding fathers of rural electrification as George Norris, Sam Rayburn, and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Last fall, when I addressed many of you at the 10 regional meetings of this association, I spoke of the crisis facing rural electrification today, a crisis compounded of greater needs for electric power, of mounting encroachments upon the service territories of cooperative rural electric systems, and of a massive propaganda assault upon the REA program by predatory power companies seeking to skim the cream again—on milk they did not produce.

It is a crisis in which the gains of a quarter century can easily be lost. Fine electric systems built to bring rural consumers the blessings of electricity can be forced into involuntary servitude by ruthless power suppliers if REA-financed generation and transmission are denied them as a readily available alternative. The hope of lower cost electric service for millions of rural Americans can be destroyed if cooperative rural systems are stripped of their more densely populated areas and deprived of the right to serve the larger industrial and commercial loads that develop in their service territories. The growing investment of millions of rural people in their own electric systems can be lost forever if we do not speak out clearly and effectively against the campaign of misrepresentation aimed at the REA program.

Last week this crisis came into sharp focus as a parade of power company executives and witnesses went before two committees of Congress to propose the strangulation and eventual destruction of your rural electrification program. In their testimony can be seen the shape of things to come.

One or another of them proposed increasing the interest rate on REA loans, opening up to power company inspection the applications on file at REA for generation and transmission loans, requiring the Administrator to hold formal hearings on generation and transmission loan applications, repudiating by law REA's third criterion for making generation and transmission loans, and even eliminating altogether the present authority to make REA loans for generating facilities.

Now these gentlemen are all entitled to their opinions and they are entitled to petition the Congress. These are basic rights which make America a land of the free. But let there be no misunderstanding. They speak not as friends of rural electrification, not as good-faith partners in industry, not even as misunderstood negotiators. They are proposing the destruction of the rural electrification program and the destruction of your cooperative systems as a significant force in the industry.

And the vital spot is generation. If they can strike at that hard enough to effectively deprive rural cooperative distribution systems of this escape from oppressive power contracts, the distribution systems themselves will eventually wither on the vine.

Let me assure you here today that as long as I have the privilege of serving as Administrator of REA there will be no sellout or surrender.

The great objective of the rural electrification program has from the beginning been to bring better living to rural people through the blessings of electricity. That is still its objective. The job is not done when the hookup is made. That is only the beginning. Keeping the energy coming to meet the ever growing needs for electricity in rural area, supplying it at the lowest possible cost, and maintaining a new dynamic force in the redevelopment of rural communities—this is the job ahead.

It is for this task that we must reenergize. We have started at REA. We have just completed the first full year under the new administration of President Kennedy—and it has been a full year for us at REA.

President Kennedy pledged to you that he would "restore REA to its former role of preeminence—freeing it from constant concern over political interference, higher rate of interest, and budgetary starvation—and enabling that remarkable American institution to get on with its work of providing low-cost electricity and telephones for every American farm family."

President Kennedy pledged all that and he is doing every bit of it. The loan authority, which was tampered with in the previous administration, is now clearly and firmly delegated to the Administrator of REA again. So far as this administration is concerned, the debate about higher interest rates on REA loans is over and done. And in the face of stringent budget requirements, President Kennedy has requested the Congress to provide an increase of $100 million in REA's lending authorization for generation and transmission facilities in the coming fiscal year. If the Congress grants this budget request, it will mean that REA will have authority to loan a total of $345 million for the advancement of rural electrification next fiscal year.

When I spoke briefly to you in Dallas last year I told you of my concern over the major problems of power supply and territorial integrity facing the cooperative systems in the REA program.

In the months which followed we have moved ahead on both fronts. Calendar year 1961 set a new record for REA generation and transmission loans; more than 56 percent of all REA electric loans for the year was approved for G. & T. facilities. We made the Hoosier loan, which had been kicked around from pillar to post for years. Three G. & T. loans are new starts: Hoosier Cooperative Energy, Inc., Arizona Electric Power Cooperative, and South Texas Electric Cooperative.

We added the third criterion to REA generation and transmission loan policy. Under this criterion, G. & T. loans may be made where it is found necessary to protect the security and effectiveness of REA-financed distribution systems. Security in this sense means the system's ability to survive. Effectiveness means the ability of the system to deliver power to its consumers most efficiently and at the lowest possible cost. Both are threatened when a cooperative system is dependent for its power supply upon a hostile supplier.

In the cooperative rural electrification program today—and contrary to the talk you hear—the cooperatives generate only 16 percent of the power put into their systems. You buy 38 percent of it from the power companies, and the rest you purchase from public sources. You are important customers of the power companies. In the year that ended last June 30, you paid them $92½ million for power. At REA we hope and we expect that you will be able to continue to buy energy from the power companies, but we are determined that you will not be forced into dependence upon hostile power suppliers.

The wholesale power supplier who seeks and intends to reserve for itself the right to serve at retail the area of its wholesale customers is always a potential hazard to that cooperative. If the cooperative has to rely on that power company for its source of power, it is always in some potential jeopardy.

Now there are power companies across the country that take their responsibility as wholesale power suppliers seriously enough to respect the interests of their whoelsale customers. Although there may be, in some cases, a potential conflict of interest in these relationships, it is not an actual hazard because of the attitude and the responsible policy of the company concerned.

But where power companies have built up a record of consistent and demonstrated hostility to the interests of the cooperatives, the potential hazard is so serious that it becomes a threat to survival and must not then be tolerated. This is the significance of the third criterion.

We have set out to eliminate the dual rate restrictions which we found in the wholesale power contracts of 19 different power companies supplying 189 REA borrowers a year ago. Five of these companies have agreed to drop the dual rates from their contracts with our borrowers, and we hope four more will in the near future.

We are moving with the technology of the industry toward larger scale generation, which offers lower costs. But in moving into larger scale generation we are seeking at the same time to preserve the unique and priceless contribution of the cooperative rural electrification program—democratic control of the power supply by those who use the power.

And we are moving to secure for rural cooperative systems the available benefits of high voltage transmission systems and interties.

To help your cooperative rural electric systems in the battle for territorial protection we have developed through the Department of Agriculture's Office of General Counsel a model Territorial Integrity Act which we hope will provide a focal point for the efforts of cooperatives in all States where territorial protection is needed for their systems. It is our conviction that effective territorial protection for rural electric cooperatives in the areas you developed in good faith can only come through State legislation.

The rural electrification program of REA is not trying to take anything away from anybody. The cooperatives are not invading the cities or usurping anyone else's rightful business. They seek only protection for what they have built. They seek only recognition of their right to serve all consumers in their service areas, large or small, thick or thin. This they must do if they are to provide the best possible rates and service to their members. They seek, too, recognition of the right to remain in service areas they developed as rural areas originally but which have since been caught up in the tide of population growth and municipal annexation.

These are the objectives of the model Territorial Integrity Act. It is under discussion and consideration at this meeting. I urge you to study it and see if it does not fit the need in your State. Our greatest strength must come from unity and co-

ordinated effort in this struggle for protection.

The rural electric cooperatives still average only 3.3 consumers to the mile of line. When this is compared with the average of well over 40 customers to the mile of line in the commercial utility industry, and when the revenue comparisons show an even greater contrast, it should be obvious that the cooperative systems must have adequate statutory protection if they are going to survive over the long haul.

Ladies and gentlemen, in all this, all we ask is fairplay.

And in this past year, as part of Secretary Freeman's emphasis upon diversified economic development of rural areas, REA has played an active part in the coordinate efforts of the Department toward this objective. We have given added assistance to our borrower systems in developing community projects which tend to bolster the economic development of the rural communities on which they depend. New emphasis has been given to the section 5 loan as a means of both stimulating the sale of electricity by our borrowers and adding new business opportunity in their areas. It is an essential countermeasure to offset the rising number of idle services on rural electric lines.

All this has been done as part of our reenergizing at REA to get on with the "work of providing low-cost electricity for every American farm family," as President Kennedy put it. It has been possible only through the willing and eager response of a reorganized and revitalized REA staff organization. I want to express my own appreciation to the people of REA for the way they have responded to the needs of the program and to the challenge of this crisis in this first year of my responsibility as Administrator. I know I express your appreciation, too.

But reenergizing REA is not enough. This is a process that you must join through your respective cooperatives and through NRECA.

You have a great and effective association in NRECA. It does your work well. I want to express my admiration for your fine president, R. A. Yarbrough, your vice president, Al Hauffe, and Paul Tidwell, your secretary-treasurer. I want to commend your board of directors for their wise and able direction and pay tribute to the dynamic leadership talents of your general manager, Clyde Ellis, and the fine staff of people who work with him. Rural America owes a debt of gratitude to them for what they have done for this program. And it is all made possible through you.

But you cannot leave the job to them, any more than you can leave it to REA. Their strength, their effectiveness is drawn from you. We can all help, and help in substantial ways, but if cooperative rural electrification survives this crisis, if rural America is to retain the full benefits of cooperative rural electrification and realize its great potential for future community development, it will be because you and your people back home have the determination and desire to save your systems and keep them working toward better living in rural America.

You built those systems not because you wanted to get into the utility business, but because you saw in them an opportunity to improve the life of your family, your neighbors, your communities. It was not the lines or the poles you were interested in, but the benefits they would bring.

And you set up cooperative organizations dedicated to these aims of community service and consumer benefits.

Electric service has been a mighty tool in raising the standard of living on the farm and in rural communities. It has brought many comforts to rural life that once were reserved for the city dweller. It has brought relief from much of the drudgery that has long been the lot of rural people. It has made it possible to produce more wealth, more income. It has contributed to the overall wealth and prosperity of the Nation.

But there is much more to be done, and the same cooperative spirit and dedication to people's needs that characterized the early missionary zeal of rural electrification in this country is needed still in the job ahead.

Survival of the cooperative electric systems which have meant so much to development of rural areas in the past 25 years is vitally important. They are priceless community assets.

The benefits of electricity to rural living grow with the application of electricity to an increasing number of tasks. They grow as the cost of power comes down, and rural people are able to afford to use electricity for more different things. The continuing task of rural electrification—the job that isn't done—is to keep the power coming, in the increasing amounts demanded by rural people today, at as low a cost as is technically and operationally feasible. It is also our task to help rural people apply that power wisely and efficiently to as many different productive uses as possible.

Let's look at that objective just once more: To improve rural living through the benefits of electricity. Do the power companies say that job is done?

It has been estimated that three-fourths of our young people leave the rural communities where they grew up by the time they are 30 years of age. There are a number of reasons for this migration. First, more children are born in rural America than are needed to fill the jobs in agriculture that are being opened up through death or retirement. In addition, many farm jobs have been taken over by machinery, and there is a strong trend toward farm consolidation, fewer farms, fewer farmers.

It is not enough to accept this migration with a shrug and to pretend it doesn't matter—because it does matter. If we are to attain any economic and social stability in our rural communities, if we are going to provide even minimal standards of health, education, and community facilities, we must retain our human resources in rural America by providing economic opportunities for more of our children in the rural communities. The alternative is a serious and continuing deterioration of our rural communities.

Is our job done? Over half of the poverty in America today is rural poverty. Over 15 million rural people live under conditions of the direst poverty by American standards. Much of this problem emerges from underdevelopment of our available resources—agricultural, natural, and human.

Electricity—and modern dial telephones, too—can mean new jobs for our young people and our unemployed. Electricity can power lathes and rock crushers as well as milking machines. Through the application of electric power, we can add value to our local resources by processing and finishing them, by getting them ready for the ultimate consumer. These are some of the benefits that we still can add to rural life, to our rural communities through the benefits of electricity.

The Nation needs its rural electrification cooperatives. It needs them as a permanent functioning element in the electrical industry. It needs the benefits they have brought and will continue to bring to people in rural areas. It needs the stimulus it gives to national prosperity and growth.

Above all the Nation needs the renewed dedication of rural electrification leaders like you to build for a greater future in rural America, for the entire Nation will inevitably share in its fruits.

It is for these reasons that this current crisis in rural electrification is so serious. It is for these reasons we need so desperately to reenergize rural electrification with that old missionary zeal which characterized its drive and leadership in the early days of the program. With it, the current challenges can be met and the crises overcome. With it, we will go on to greater achievements in the service of America. Twenty million strong working together cannot fail. We must not fail.

Mundt Asks Again for Realinement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, following is an editorial which appeared in the Aberdeen (S. Dak.) American-News which should be of interest to every Member of Congress and every American.

The editorial points out the difficulty many American voters are having in attempting to vote for the kind of government they believe in:

MUNDT ASKS AGAIN FOR REALINEMENT

Realinement of political parties is a favorite subject of South Dakota's Senator KARL MUNDT. For years he has been pointing out in speeches in the South the inconsistencies of the party alinements as they exist today.

Recently in a speech at Tucson, Ariz., he interested an audience of more than 500 in his views.

MUNDT said that the names Democrat and Republican could be eliminated, as their meaning has been lost.

The division of political thinking now, he said, is between those who favor more Federal power in the hands of the few, and those who would call on the Government only for those functions which the people cannot do for themselves at lower levels.

"I would divide the people into the party of those who want to call on the Federal Government first, and those who believe in calling on the Federal Government last, the FGF's and FGL's," the Senator said.

He explained: "In the 24 years I have been in Washington, there has been a shift in political thinking. The axiom used to be that economic conditions determine political decsion.

"Now it's exactly the reverse—political decisions determine economic conditions. The Washington politician is a 14-foot-tall individual, with more and more power being concentrated in his hands. He controls more and more the destinies of the ordinary people, instead of being controlled by them, as in the past."

Senator MUNDT defined those he termed the "Federal Government firsters." The most powerful group desiring more power in the hands of the Government, he said, is the Committee on Political Education (COPE). While deploring its objectives, the Senator declared that COPE is going about its political activity in the American way by thorough and systematic organization.

The next important FGF group, MUNDT said, is the Americans for Democratic Action, self-styled intellectuals. The third powerful FGF group is the NAACP, which delivered 82 percent of its people's vote in the 1960 election on the side of more centralized government, MUNDT said.

On the other side of the line are the "Federal Government lasters," MUNDT pointed

out. They comprise groups such as Americans for Constitutional Action, business and professional people, and citizens who feel that the Government should have less power, but cannot vote their sentiments through a party wholly committed to this philosophy.

According to Senator MUNDT's definitions the southern Democrats and the conservative Republicans of the Middlewest and Southwest have much in common. They would be the nucleus of the FGL's.

Is Governor on a Tightrope?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has intervened in in the pollution affairs of Washington State at the request of the State Governor. This means the State and Federal Governments have concurrent jurisdiction and have ordered the pulp and timber industry on Puget Sound to take antipollution measures which would cost more than $50 million, perhaps as much as $75 million.

To soften the burden thus placed on the industry, the Governor has suggested that the Congress let the mills accelerate amortization of the facilities installed for waste recovery.

Mr. Speaker, there appeared in several newspapers, including the Bellingham (Wash.) Herald, an article by Mr. C. E. Johns in which he raises the question of whether or not the Governor is on a tightrope. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. John's article:

DOES GOVERNOR FEEL HE'S ON TIGHTROPE IN POLLUTION CONTROVERSY WITH INDUSTRY?

OLYMPIA.—We are inclined to wonder whether Governor Rosellini may not feel that he is walking a tightrope in the moves to get a group of the larger pulp and paper mills in the State to comply with new antipollution directives which the industry says will cost the mills $50 million.

Just supposing one or more of the big industrial concerns should decide that in view of the State coercion and the cost entailed, it could not stand the impact of installing expensive antipollution equipment, and should go out of business here. It would be a very embarrassing development to the State administration which has made one of its principal pitches to justify its tenure on the program to attract and develop industry through a favorable industrial climate. The objective is basically to create more jobs.

COMPLEX SUBJECT

Let it be said that we have no information or indication that any such thing will occur. Also we are without sufficient information to make any judgment as to whether there is widespread pollution, or whether it is at present in an area of tolerance which is not critical. The subject is complex and even the experts do not seem able to agree on the extent of the existing pollution.

However, the record is that after the State moved to force nine pulpmills in the State to install waste liquor recovery processes, and have them in operation by November 24, 1963, Governor Rosellini moved to request the Federal Government to come in and help get action. The U.S. Public Health Service came into the case and alined itself on the side of the State pollution control commission for the purpose of achieving the corrections sought.

FIRST OF ITS KIND

A conference on the subject was called, the first of its kind embodying joint Federal and State consideration of intrastate pollution under new legislation which provides for Federal action where a State calls for help. At the conclusion of the hearing, Murray Stein, chief enforcement officer for the U.S. Public Health Service read a statement which the said Federal Government would help the State pollution control commission sion get seven pulp and paper mills in the Puget Sound area to comply with the new State antipollution directives.

Immediately Lawson Turcotte, president of the Northwest Pulp & Paper Association branded the conference as a "sham." He said the industry had been promised that the conference record would be open for a week so that more information could be submitted.

On the basis of the decision handed down, we can only conclude that Federal officials made their decision before the conference convened, said Turcotte.

GOVERNOR MOVES NEXT

The next move came from Governor Rosellini. Last Tuesday he sent a three-page letter to this State's two U.S. Senators, requesting that they initiate legislation which would soften the blow if costly equipment were installed by the mills to meet the State demands. It would have the effect of affording the waste discharging industries the right of an accelerated tax writeoff or amortization of the facilities and equipment specifically installed for waste recovery processes.

"It is apparent that requests made of them (the pulp and paper mills) will involve major capital outlays, and that legislation of the type I suggest would provide a suitable, equitable, and desirable incentive for industry to proceed with the water pollution abatement programs which have been suggested to them," said Governor Rosellini in his letter to the two Senators.

"It is most certainly not my desire to unduly penalize the important pulp and paper industries in this State; rather I feel that in every reasonable way it should be encouraged," Governor Rosellini said. "I do, however, feel that the problems of water pollution abatement must be squarely faced, and I equally feel that they could more easily, readily, and equitably be achieved by legislation of the type I propose."

So that is why it appears to us that Governor Rosellini, who reached for the big stick when he called in the Federal Government to back up the State, does not want to let the situation get out of hand. The industry has humped its back against the aggressive Federal attitude which has apparently assumed that a bad situation exists and has implied that unless the industries hop right into the installation demanded, the power of the Federal Government will be exercised.

MORE PLACATING

This latest move of the Governor is more placating. We note that he uses the term "requests" in describing the pollution directives in his letter to the Senators. He says abatement programs have been suggested. We have not therefore looked on a Government directive as a polite request, to be acted upon or rejected at will. The intent of the pollution control commission apparently was to go into the trial stage to mandate compliance, after preconference hearings. But we shall skip that point.

Nevertheless we think the conclusion justified that the Governor is on a tightrope and he is trying to tip the pole to maintain balance and control. We have no idea what Senators WARREN G. MAGNUSON and HENRY M. JACKSON may think about legislation to afford tax writeoffs. It does not look to us as though the Kennedy budget can stand many tax writeoffs in the next fiscal year. But we shall have to leave that in the hands of the Senators.

Maybe the Governor should have left the U.S. Public Health Service out of the pollution hassle and settled it himself. As for the proposed tax writeoffs, it would seem that the Governor has concluded outlay of the $50 million is necessary. That would be a necessary assumption before steps were taken for amortization. We thought that question of need and how far the industries have to go still was awaiting determination.

Letter to National Commander, Veterans of World War I, U.S.A., Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a recent letter to the national commander of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., in response to a recent communication from him on the general subject of pensions for veterans of World War I:

JANUARY 30, 1962.

Mr. JOHN BASHARA, Sr.,
National Commander, Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., Washington, D.C.

DEAR COMMANDER BASHARA: This has reference to your letter of January 24, 1962.

In your letter reference was made to a Senate subcommittee report which points out that over half of the 16 million Americans over age 65 are forced to exist on an income of less than $1,000 a year. A realization of this has led the Congress to develop a pension system based on the principle that those with the least income and the greatest need should get the most help. Although you expressed concern for this group of veterans who are forced to live on less than $1,000 a year, H.R. 3745, being sponsored by your organization, has little to do with the plight of this large low-income group. Under existing law a veteran with dependents, with less than $1,000 income per year, may receive a pension of $90 a month. If he is single, with income less than $600 a year, he may receive $85 a month. Passage of H.R. 3745 would give the veteran with dependents $120 per year more income. The single veteran would receive $180 per year more income. Most of the cost of H.R. 3745, which has been estimated by the Veterans' Administration at $942,327,000 the first year, would go to substantially increasing the income of veterans who are now in the top quarter of the income bracket for their age group.

This situation was made clear by Commander Erickson in his testimony before the Veterans' Affairs Committee last year. In discussing the cost of H.R. 3745, Commander Erickson pointed out that the bill would add 631,221 veterans to the rolls at an initial cost of $775,341,378. Obviously these individuals are added to the rolls because they cannot now meet the $3,000 and $1,800 income limits of the existing law. In other words, while your letter expresses great concern for the large number of individuals who must live on less than $1,000 a

year, the organization is sponsoring legislation which costs nearly $1 billion a year, more than three-quarters of which would go to veterans in the highest income brackets, with an insignificant amount going to the large group of veterans for which concern has been expressed.

Your letter contains the following statement:

"I am a firm believer in commonsense and honest dealings. I feel that grouping all veterans of our last three wars into a single classification works a distinct hardship upon the aging men who fought in 1917 and 1918. Their problems are basically different from the younger veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict.

"World War I veterans today are old, baldheaded, suffer from physical disabilities and find it difficult to secure gainful employment. They resent becoming charges upon their children, who however much they may want to help, find such assistance under today's economic conditions almost impossible."

The pension program available to veterans is based on the individual meeting certain requirements relating to disability, income, and unemployability. Pensions are paid based on the circumstance of the individual and have nothing to do with the general characteristics of a particular group. To paraphrase your statement, an old, baldheaded World War II veteran suffering from physical disabilities finds it difficult to secure gainful employment and live on a meager income just as a World War I veteran confronted with the same identical circumstances has problems. A relatively small number of World War II veterans are now in their sixties. I can think of no justification for treating two individuals, identically circumstanced but serving in different wars, in a different way insofar as non-service-connected pension payments are concerned.

Your letter contained the following statement:

"Our Government has been most generous to veterans of former wars and it is our firm conviction that granting separate and distinct pension legislation for the older veterans of World War I would help to solve the immediate problems of caring for the Nation's aging population. In this manner, the country could give recognition and appreciation for services rendered over 40 years ago."

You are quite correct that our Government has been most generous with veterans of former wars. This is particularly true of veterans of World War I. World War I veterans comprise 15 percent of all the participants of all of the Nation's wars. They have received 28 percent of all of the Nation's expenditures for veterans (an amount exceeding $30 billion). Expenditures for veterans' benefits per participant in World War I have reached approximately $7,000 per man. By 1963, half of the 1,400,000 living World War I vetreans will be receiving a pension. During fiscal year 1963 an average of 1,090,200 World War I veterans and 483,900 World War I veterans' widows will receive nonservice-connected pensions. The World War I pension roll is increasing by 8,121 per month. The fiscal year 1963 budget requests $1,873,681,000 for nonservice-connected pensions for veterans, widows, and dependents. Of this amount $1,388,489,000 will go to World War I veterans and World War I widows. The Veterans' Administration budget for nonservice-connected pensions will increase by $114 million this year.

In a few days you will receive the calendar of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs showing current legislation pending before the committee. There are now more than 160 nonservice-connected pension bills pending before the committee. Each of the major veterans' organizations is sponsoring a different proposal. Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., is sponsoring H.R. 3745. The American Legion has rejected H.R. 3745 and is sponsoring a bill which raises rates and income limits within the framework of existing pension law. AMVETS has opposed general pension bills and bills such as H.R. 3745 and is proposing minor modification of the existing pension program. VFW is supporting a program for a separate and liberal pension program for World War I veterans. DAV has declined to support specific nonservice-connected pension bills and has taken the position that service-connected veterans deserve priority consideration.

The Committees on Veterans' Affairs has been making an extensive study of the operation of Public Law 86–211. We hope to have this material ready for consideration by the committee before too long. Information available to the committee at this time indicates there are several hundred thousand veterans and widows in the United States who are entitled to a substantial increase in their pension under Public Law 86–211. These individuals are in the low income bracket and are of the group for which you expressed concern. I regret to advise that information we are assembling indicates that individuals and groups associated with your organization must bear a substantial share of the responsibility for these unfortunate veterans and widows with very low income not electing the benefits to which they are entitled, and in some areas there appears to be an organized campaign against Public Law 86–211, without regard to the welfare and individual circumstances of veterans and widows. In view of your expressed concern for the lowest income group, it appears that action should be initiated by your organization immediately to put an end to the activities which are going on and so adversely affecting many veterans and widows.

Very truly yours,

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman.

Discouraging Thrift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, an article by Donald I. Rogers which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune, recently, discusses the President's attack, through his tax program, on savings, and thrift:

TAX WILL HURT THRIFTY

(By Donald I. Rogers)

There has been surprisingly small opposition to the administration's proposal to impose a withholding tax on dividends and interest on savings, possibly because the public has considered the measure to be too onerous to stand a chance of passage.

It begins to look, though, that the administration's tax bill, almost intact, will come out of committee with considerable general support.

Even though the interest paid on savings accounts has been taxable for decades, the withholding feature is the one that will hurt many savers who have limited incomes, or who actually survive on the interest they receive from their deposits.

Many mutual savings banks have countless depositors, particularly those whose interest payments make up a good share of their meager income, who complain that withholding will affect their entire financial situation.

Enforcing payment of the tax is one matter. Deducting 20 percent of the interest payments in advance is something else again. Congressmen and Treasury officials who favor this feature of the tax proposals cannot have studied carefully the impact that withholding will have on millions of peopleand particularly on their thrift habits.

The law, incidentally, is aimed not only at the savers but at the savings institutions, for in addition there is provision to increase the taxes levied against mutual savings banks to make them share a tax burden more in line with commercial banks.

Ignored is the fact that mutual savings banks are non-profit institutions, and the transcending fact that commercial banks are permitted competitive advantages in that they can offer a wide variety of services which laws and regulations prohibit to the mutual savings banks.

If the Treasury is telling the truth, it must be admitted that a very high percentage of depositors have not been reporting interest received. Whether technically right or wrong, the Government, it seems to us, has no right to allow a condition to exist for decades and then suddenly impose a "take it first and refund it later" position, in an area of the economy that so vitally affects the existence of many who are relatively defenseless, such as widows or elderly retired persons.

Moreover, the Internal Revenue Service is completing installation of a tax payer number and electronic computer system to make sure that untaxed dividends and interest are reported, which makes totally unnecessary the heavy burden on the banking industry of withholding taxes at the source.

Personal exemptions and other deductions are supposed to protect people with small or limited incomes, but the administration's attitude on interest and dividends would hardly seem to fit into this pattern.

There is the point, too, made many times in the past, that a tax on dividends paid to owners of securities, is double taxation, for the corporation has already paid a tax on its income, and dividends are distributed out of what remains after taxes.

The same might be said of a tax on interest payments, for a saver is taxed when he earns his income, and deposits only what is left after taxes. Then the savings bank reinvests the money to the benefit of the economy, and out of earnings, pays its taxes to the Government, and out of what remains, pays interest to the saver. This, in fact, may even be triple taxation.

On dividend payments to stockholders, the Government allow a $50 deduction. If such a withholding plan is to be put in force against interest payments on savings, in spite of the new IRS equipment and in spite of the hardship it can cause, surely Congress should consider not a $50 deduction, but something very much higher.

There are some countries which encourage thrift by giving reasonable tax exemption to interest received. But then, in this, the leading capitalistic Nation of the world, we take a dim view of thrift, prudence, and capital formation.

What Really Sparks Economic Growth?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, during the present time, we read and hear a great deal about increasing our economic

growth. Many proposals are made for that purpose.

Under unanimous consent I wish to insert an article written by Dr. David McCord Wright, professor of economics and political science, McGill University, Montreal, Canada, covering this subject:

WHAT REALLY SPARKS ECONOMIC GROWTH?

(By Dr. David McCord Wright)

In aiding the developing countries, Professor Wright urges that the West must realize:

We will need to build not only dams and power stations, but, more important, a culture.

Growth involves continual adaptation to constantly shifting tastes and methods.

The nemesis of despotic efficiency is growing narrowness.

In any consideration of aid to underdeveloped economies, we frequently run into a basic misunderstanding. That is the idea that technology, period, is what has made the West strong—that growth is a mere matter of getting certain projects built—that, as a colleague once put it to me, "there is nothing Western about a steel mill." He meant that we can take the technology and leave the social system wholly to one side.

But suppose it turns out that there is a connection between culture and growth, and not just between growth and science? How can we really consider the problem if we omit its basic dimension? Could it be that, if social aspects are barred, the problem is barred? Let us try to find a way around this difficulty.

The first thing we have to realize is that growth not only comes through change but also causes change. You can't just charge into a country, build a few plants and projects, and rest on the 7th day.

There are two reasons why not. First, while you have been occupied with your new plants and projects, other countries have been making progress, too. At the very moment when you complete your plant, you may find it has become obsolete. Second, no matter how big your general scheme may have seemed when you began it, it is certain soon enough, to be too small.

A CONTINUING PROCESS

It is evident, then, that what one must really be trying to do, if one is to accomplish any lasting good, is not just to build a given amount of wealth or impart a given set of skills, but to set in motion a process—a process of continuing and adequate growth. This shift of emphasis, from plant to process, implies a profound change in our whole basic approach.

At the outset we must realize that the process of continuing growth is never a matter of simple extension. You don't keep growing simply by increasing the output of all plants by an across-the-board, mechanical increase of, say, 10 percent. The pattern of wants will necessarily change, and it will change unsymmetrically. For people, when they acquire more means, inevitably experiment with new avenues of consumption. If nothing else offers, they at least turn to new combinations of old gratifications.

PRODUCTION METHODS MUST CHANGE

Worse yet, the pattern of production methods must also change—unsymmetrically—even if there are no new inventions. For a shift in the scale of plant shifts all the technical relationships.

Finally, and most difficult of all, the law of diminishing returns begins to operate as we expand. Unless genuinely new and productive ideas are imported or discovered, growth will become harder and harder to achieve.

The really basic consequences of this line of reasoning is that the growth process is one of continual adaptation to a continually shifting pattern of tastes and methods. The relative importance and exchange values of various industries, materials, and skills are constantly changing. Failure to adapt produces the so-called surpluses and gives the illusion of "poverty in the midst of plenty."

If we take an overall view, abundance is still far away. Talk of abundance, indeed, in a poor world can be very harmful. It takes our minds off the main job, which is continuing growth. It overestimates the means at our disposal and implies that thought and effort are no longer necessary.

ADVANCE INTO UNCERTAINTY

Returning, then, to our consideration of the nature of the growth process, we must remember that the process of continuing growth involves a continuing advance into uncertainty. Even in the completely planned state, an advance into new technological territory involves a margin of possible unforeseen change. Neither the wants of the consumer nor the necessary methods of the producer can ever be wholly forecast. And if this is true of the comprehensively planned state, how much more is it true of the relatively free market?

But the effects on industrial order are of the first practical importance. Authority and decision are needed if the industrial ship is to be successfully piloted into a "fog of futurity." The industrial vessel can hardly survive its hurricanes under a system of collective debate among the crew. Also, where all the subgroups are allowed to resist change in the name of security and participation, then growth itself is in danger of stopping.

KHRUSHCHEV'S METHOD

But there is danger, too, in the other extreme. This view would introduce central power to quell the subordinate pressure groups and reduce uncertainty to a minimum by budgeting change and growth in advance. This is the essence of Mr. Khrushchev's method. Many people, dazzled by its real or apparent achievements, seem to think we should adopt that method too.

From the standpoint of historical perspective, there is nothing of creative adaptation in such advice. Centralized despotism is one of the oldest and stalest of ideas, where growth and stability are concerned. Short-run achievements can be very impressive, especially where the despot has gotten hold of a good technological or economic formula to begin with. All subordinate pressure groups can indeed be crushed.

CENTRAL AUTHORITY SLOWS DEVELOPMENT

But the nemesis of despotic efficiency is growing narrowness. Continued inspiration requires, among other things, the continued presence of a margin of independent change and experimentation. Indeed, aside from despotism, wherever all action has to be cleared through central authority, however democratic in intent, the needed independent margin is lacking. Instead of continued change, development gradually slows down, and often a fresh start may be obtained only through general upheaval, in which much of the ground previously gained is lost.

France under Louis XIV was tightly and efficiently organized. Every town had its specialty set for it and standards of quality prescribed. English economic life at the same time was relatively chaotic. France was the more powerful at first; but England soon left her behind. For example, the enormously profitable Hudson's Bay Co. fell to England because of the narrow bigotry with which the French bureaucracy prosecuted unauthorized exploration.

THE WESTERN APPROACH

As one looks back over the history of the West, it will be seen that the great achievement of the capitalist industrial revolution has been not any given bit of growth, but the phenomenon of continuing growth. And I submit that this continuing growth, of which we have no other recorded instance, is at least partly rooted in the organizational peculiarity that distinguishes our culture: the market direction of society.

There is no need to talk in terms of "pure" or "perfect," but merely of the simple fact of competitive diffusion. The market order makes possible continued development because it allows room for independent experimentation that does not need to wait on the will of the central planner. The market order achieves a working compromise between authority and order by giving management authority within the firm. That authority, however, is limited by the presence of rival powers and the comparative ease of transfer from one organization to another.

Thus, when the political and economic control of society is relatively diffused rather than concentrated, shifts in sovereignty, power, and technique can take place with a minimum of upheaval. No indispensable great man can drag down the whole political and economic fabric of the state with his death. We have scant evidence that Russia offers us anything new toward the solution of these thorny problems or has progressed beyond the state despotic formula.

WE MUST BUILD A CULTURE

Considering now the practical aspects of the nature of the growth process, what is really important to understand is this: To start the development process going, we will need to build not only some dams and power stations but, more important, a culture. We will never get anywhere, in a longrun view, until we stop thinking in terms of bricks and mortar, of gifts, or a few externals. It isn't so much that planning isn't useful, but rather it's a question of what you're planning for.

Are you trying to lay the foundations of a pluralist, developing, adaptable society in which the citizen has a wide sphere of freedom in action and government does not depend upon one man's will or on that of a small group? Do you want your society to be more or less market responsive rather than centrally directed? Do you want a fair break given to all sorts of varying points of view, in the hope that their clashes will give a vigorous intellectual life?

If you want all of those things—particularly if you are trying to set such a system going for the first time—you will need plenty of thought and action. But it won't be the same kind of action you'd get if all you wanted was to construct certain projects and teach certain skills.

JAPANESE TRANSFORMATION

The Japanese were fortunate when they reentered the West. The West was then confident, sophisticated, and aware of the social roots of its own achievements. The best seller of the time was Samuel Smiles' "Self Help." The Japanese read it. They got instructions from many sources as to the root needs of a developing culture, and they put those ideas to work. Chance and internal politics had already led to an internal transformation from feudalism, even before Perry's ships. Their Government, it is true, did then deliberately set out to create an exchange industrialism. But they planned it so as not to have to keep planning.

THE UNDERDEVELOPED NATION

How different, how very different, is the case of the modern underdeveloped nation. It will get technical help and loans and gifts, to be sure. But it will get only the most truncated or garbled understanding of the cultural tradition that lies behind our growth. We will never be doing the full job until we proceed on both lines at once. What is needed is a perfectly neutral exposition of the requirements of economic growth and successful democracy, set in

proper historical perspective. But to give this we have got to be much more realistic in our thinking, and be willing to discard many of our own pleasant illusions.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Newsletter of March 10, 1962:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Tex., Mar. 10, 1962)

The Treasury, Post Office, and Executive Office appropriation bill, 1963, amounted to $5,461,671,000 (compared to last year's spending this is an increase of $148 million. Yet the total is $114 million less than requested by the various agencies. This is one of the subterfuges by which Congress can talk out of both sides of its mouth—the executive department ups the requests, then Congress cuts back below this figure, but still increases spending over the previous year.) Eleven thousand two hundred and thirteen new employees will be added in this one appropriation bill; 20,696 were requested. The same old game of juggling figures. Expenditures under the Treasury Department, not shown in the bill, included $9,431 million for general and special funds. Of this, $9,300 million was allocated to payment of the interest on the national debt. This amount is $400 million more than last year, a necessary increase to effectively refinance the debt. Yet this interest payment was the subject of bitter campaign criticism by Candidate Kennedy and most Democrats, who stated that the Democrats would reduce interest costs below the high level paid by the Republican administration. Now the Kennedy administration increases the high Eisenhower interest cost of $8,900 million of last fiscal year to $9,300 million. The President is learning the economic facts of life. It is good he is learning, but it's too bad such lessons were not learned before he took office, and are now learned at the expense of the taxpayers.

Educational TV, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, to establish a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of television facilities to be used for educational purposes, provoked debate without confronting the basic issue of Federal aid to education. Everyone is for educational TV. The laudable goal or name, "educational TV," blinded many to the question of by what right Federal Government should enter a field not its constitutional province, and where private efforts are doing well. As Gov. Price Daniel said in a letter to the committee in opposition to the bill, "At the present time this matter is being provided for by private funds through institutions of higher learning, and it appears that this will be a successful operation in our State." Dallas, as usual, is way out in front in initiative in this area. Of three educational TV stations in Texas, two are in Dallas—KERA-TV and KRET—both without benefit of Federal funds. The obvious lesson is again overlooked. Federal Government and big government advocates have no hesitancy of moving into new fields; indeed, are politically eager to do so. The $520,000 for needs survey and $25 million for television facilities construction, as Federal-State matching grants, is, of course, but the foot in the door.

Increasing the size of the House of Representatives produced a confusing but refreshing debate. Refreshing because there was little if any political partisanship. Confusing, because of meritorious arguments on both sides, and amendments not fully understood. Finally, an amendment made the bill so unpalatable to even the proponents of enlargement that the bill was sent back to the Judiciary Committee for further study. The bill sought to add 3 new permanent members beyond the 435 total, a fixed number since 1911 when New Mexico and Arizona were admitted to the Union. At conflict with the precedent of adding members with the admission of new States, which now included Hawaii and Alaska, is the regular decade census (1960) which shows population increases and the necessary reapportionment of Members of Congress, State by State against population change, up or down. By congressional legislation of 1961, 9 States gained 19 seats and 16 States lost 21 seats. A doubled population from 1911 to 1960 shows an increase of representation per Congressman from 212,000 to 410,000. Hence, the need for reapportionment. Those States already having taken action by State legislature took issue with Massachusetts, Pennsylvania and Missouri who each would get an additional member. There were two good sides to the argument with as many different views as were members. For my part, because I disapprove increasing the size and role of Federal Government I shall not approve any increase of membership. Rather, I shall insist on an increasing reliance on State and local government, administration and initiative. Thus, I would be sympathetic to reducing Congress to 400 or fewer members. Despite my disapproval of gerrymandering or States failure to redistrict (as in the case of the Fifth District of Texas) consistently I still feel that this is a matter of State government and does not warrant Federal intrusion or control. We, in Texas, should responsibly do our own reapportionment. In this connection, once again I must criticize my State for not reapportioning Dallas County to secure for 1,100,000 people the degree of Federal representation they deserve. But this is up to the people of Dallas and Texas and we do not want the Federal Government dictating to us. Obviously, if we refuse to do what is right, it is probable the Federal Government will step in.

This week I testified before the House Committee on Education and Labor in opposition to a bill to increase the jurisdiction of the Davis-Bacon Act. Davis-Bacon gives the Secretary of Labor absolute authority in setting wages on government construction and contracts. Wrong as this principle is, the bill on which I testified would now include fringe benefits by law and by Government edict a further erosion of individual freedom and liberty.

Home Rule and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Warren (Pa.) Times-Mirror of March 5, 1962:

HOME RULE AND FREEDOM

The proponents of State control are becoming frightened. They built their empire, beginning in the depression-rocked thirties on the concept of letting the people think—but just a little bit. Now the people have begun to think too much. They are seeing through the schemes of our planners. This has been called a conservative reaction. That's oversimplification. We feel, the far right aside, that the United States—that is, the people of the United States—are finally beginning to understand what's happening to them.

Little by little our freedom of action has been taken away in the past decades. No, that's not right. Little by little we have surrendered our freedom for the promise of pie-in-the-sky and two Cadillacs in every garage. The pie's not up there and the last time we looked, the car in the garage was definitely not a Caddy. Meanwhile, we have sold our birthright for a mess of pottage.

We have been told, over and over again, that we are not clever enough, not intelligent enough to rule ourselves. We must have Big Brother in Washington make our decisions for us. He began by telling us how we must spend a large share of our income. The final step is complete regulation of every American individual, from cradle to grave.

This is true not only of Washington but, on a smaller scale, of every State capital. The individual municipal and township governments have, little by little, been relegated to the position of rubber stamps, a local endorsement of State or national mandates. We have been put there by an economic squeeze; a fraud upon the people. We have been offered matching funds for this and that—our own money, by the way—and if we don't conform, then no State aid. This is the way in which most school boards in this State, and others, have been whipped into line. This is the stick and the carrot with which the big government boys operate on us.

Meanwhile, we have seen the powers which once were vested in the people slowly surrendered into the hands of the big government advocates in Harrisburg, Washington or where have you. We have, perhaps through our own indolence, permitted this to happen with hardly a cry of protest. We have kidded ourselves that we are getting something for nothing.

There are those who will tell you we have nothing to fear from Washington or Harrisburg, because they're one of us. The problem of States rights is no longer considered, any more than the problem of community rights. Yet we do not believe, no matter how wise and farseeing the people in the capitals may be, that Washington can legislate intelligently for the whole United States on every (and that's the key word) question, any more than Harrisburg can intelligently mandate standards for the entire State, in every question. What's good for GM is not necessarily good for the Nation. What's good for California may not be good for Pennsylvania and what's good for Philadelphia or Scranton may not be good for Warren or Erie.

Yet the people in these capitals would have us think so. Why? Because these people have an utter contempt for the intelligence and the welfare of those they govern. This is not often evident. It does leak out occasionally when one of the more inept of their spokesmen stoops to ridicule to make his point.

But now, we are certain, the people of the United States are beginning to wake up. They are beginning to ask if the game is worth the candle; if what they are getting in return for what they are surrendering is at all equal. This awakening seems to be taking place among the great body of the American public—and is reflected, unfortunately, in some of those crackpots of the far

right who run it to an extreme. But it is a middle-of-the-road conservative current which is taking hold in America today and frightening the wits out of those who know better and who have ruled us in peace and quiet for three decades. And in their fright, they use the old Navy system: "When in danger, when in doubt, run in circles, scream and shout." This is the sorry picture we are being presented with today.

This desire for more home rule is evident in the mass of feeling against the school reorganization law the now-famous Act 561. Those who foisted it upon the people of this State are beginning to become frightened. Their public utterances show it; their tactics show it.

One last word of warning to the advocates of complete State control: It's only a short step from pie-in-the-sky to pie-in-the-eye.

Duck.

Happy Birthday, Girl Scouts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate the golden anniversary of the founding of one of the most important groups of good citizens in America. Fifty years ago today, under the inspired leadership of Juliette Low, 12 young ladies in Savannah, Ga., came together for the first meeting in this country of the Girl Scouts. From the beginning, this was a movement that brought forth only good. As Mrs. Low said:

If it isn't right, the girls won't take to it and it won't last.

But this was right, and has always been. The girls took to it, in ever greater numbers, and the more than 3 million membership today is dramatic proof that it continues to grow and flourish.

We all know and recognize the outstanding contributions made to American life by these fine young ladies and their dedicated leaders. Perhaps the most important contribution has been the sound preparation that the Girl Scouts have made towards their members becoming responsible 20th century women. They have properly stressed the dignity of motherhood, the sanctity of the home, the responsibility of active citizenship outside the home. For the past 35 years, they have also been in the van promoting world peace and understanding by exchange of visitors among the nations of the world. And after World War II, their epic "clothes for friendship" drive provided clothes for more than 150,000 children in Europe and Asia.

Whether in the city or rural areas, in rich, moderate, or poor economies, we know that the Girl Scouts of America will continue to exert a healthy, desirable influence on all with whom they associate. Today I am happy to join with our President and other great leaders in all walks of life throughout the world in extending to this truly noble organization sincere congratulations for the achievements of the first 50 years, and sincere hopes for comparable achievements in the next 50.

The International Implications of Our Race Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, most people who opposed discrimination against others because of race, color, or creed do so because they feel such discrimination—as well as segregation—is morally wrong. For this reason, they sometimes feel it is irrelevant to consider the effects which discrimination at home has on our relations with other countries, particularly with those whose citizens are not of the white race.

Discrimination is morally wrong, and for this reason alone it should be eliminated. Moreover, we must constantly appraise the damage being done to the cause of freedom around the globe by our lack of consistency in discrimination in our domestic affairs. We must realize that grave damage is done in our relations with foreign countries which reinforces and intensifies the damage done to our own citizens at home.

A recent letter to the editor of the Yale alumni magazine by Mr. Marshall Bartholomew has set forth the international implications of our race problems with great clarity and understanding. I believe that many other Members of the House will find Mr. Bartholomew's letter of especial interest, and so would like to insert it in the RECORD:

Gentlemen, since almost every shade of personal opinion has already been expressed regarding Chaplain William Sloan Coffin, Jr.'s participation in the freedom ride of last May, I would applaud your decision to close the books on this subject at your own discretion were it not for the fact that there exists motivations for the urgency of the chaplain's actions which have not been mentioned and which I believe should go into the record.

For those who were born in Alabama or Mississippi and have never left home the matter of racial discrimination may seem—as one of your Yale Alumni magazine correspondents has expressed it, "their own business," but for those of us whose work has taken us into foreign countries there lurks the firm conviction that it has long since become everybody's business.

Having traveled and lived abroad (my mileage away from home adds up to more than 150,000 miles during the past 50 years), I am perhaps more keenly aware of how the rest of the world reacts to racial discrimination in our so-called land of the free than are many of my fellow countrymen; aware also that the problem of discrimination is not just a hangover from the Civil War but a matter which concerns the North as it does the South.

I wonder how many Americans who look and listen every day to TV and radio realize that to every city, town, and village, whether in Asia, Africa, or South America, Radio Peiping, and Radio Moscow are beaming in day by day the news of every color incident which occurs in what the Communists like to call the colonial-imperialist United States. It was only yesterday that on the Huntley-Brinkley TV new report I watched moving pictures of white men beating up Negroes at a bus station in a Mississippi town, and only a few weeks ago I recall that when the Nigerian attaché on his way to Washington from New York was refused food and drink at a roadside restaurant on Route 40 in Maryland, he, with admirable self-restraint, said in a newspaper interview: "We are not here to embarrass, but to cement mutual understanding and good will between our countries. * * * I hope the people who do this sort of thing will realize the damage it does to the United States abroad." It doesn't take much imagination to appreciate the propaganda effects of news items like these.

This problem comes closer to Yale than most men who have graduated since World War II realize. As a founding member of Yale's International Student Center I have become personally acquainted with succeeding generations of foreign students who live and learn for a year or longer in New Haven. Of the more than 60,000 foreigners presently studying in American colleges and universities there are, according to the student directory for the academic year 1961–62, 557 enrolled at Yale. They come from 77 countries.

How naive can we Yalensians be if we fool ourselves into believing that these intelligent young men and women, many of whose skins happen to be black or brown, will return to their homelands full of good will and peaceful intentions after having been forced to ride in segregated sections of interstate buses or refused a cup of coffee at a roadside restaurant?

Of the three whites and three Negroes who took that much publicized freedom ride I haven't seen it mentioned that one of them is now a faculty member at Wesleyan College in Middletown, Conn., but that he had been born, brought up, and educated in Montgomery, Ala., before coming north to Yale for graduate study. He felt deeply enough about the vital importance of this race issue to join with Chaplain Coffin in taking risks for himself and his family—not out of a spirit of bravado but because as a Christian and as an American he could no longer stand on the sidelines and remain a passive onlooker at the struggle for equal constitutional rights not only for all American citizens, but for the large number of foreign students and diplomatic representatives who as long as they live are bound to look back in anger at the humiliations and embarrassments inflicted upon them while they were our guests in the States.

There are at present 22 African countries in the United Nations. Their votes can obviously offset our single vote at any meeting of the General Assembly. With the Russians offering housing for African U.N. delegates in New York, we can appreciate that racial discrimination is not confined to the South. It has clearly become a national problem and—if history follows its usual pattern—it is equally clear that time is running out. If substantial progress toward desegregation cannot be achieved (at least as it concerns public means of transportation and places to eat and sleep) under the leadership of such moderate and intelligent men as Martin Luther King and Ralph Abernathy, we may anticipate that their successors, backed by world opinion and encouraged by the Soviet Union, will be far less temperate and responsible in pressing their demands for equal rights.

I hope that no outraged Yale alumnus will cease contributing to the alumni fund because of what I have written. It is in the best American tradition to publicly debate honest differences of opinion; moreover, it may soothe the feelings of those who wish to maintain the status quo to know that I retired from the Yale faculty 8 years ago and am no longer living in New Haven. Many years ago I cheered for the Reverend Henry Sloane Coffin when he shocked his aristocratic Presbyterian congregation by inviting underprivileged east-siders to attend services in his Madison Avenue church. Now I should like to cast my vote for the nephew

of that distinguished Yaleman. Chaplain Coffin has inherited the courage to practice what he preaches.

MARSHALL BARTHOLOMEW, '07 S.
GREENWICH, CONN.

The Nation's Responsibility for Health Care in Changing Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address which I delivered to the Rhode Island Conference of Social Work, Sheraton Biltmore Hotel, Providence, R.I., on October 5, 1961:

REMARKS OF HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE, SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND AT RHODE ISLAND CONFERENCE OF SOCIAL WORK, SHERATON BILTMORE HOTEL, PROVIDENCE, ON THURSDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1961

It is a pleasure and a privilege to be here with you today. I appreciate this opportunity to join with you who are dedicated to the proposition that this Nation, this State, and we, as individuals and as members of families and larger groups, have a responsibility, which we must discharge, to assist those among us who need help.

Your forward-looking theme: "Changing Times—Changing Problems—Changing Programs in Health, Education, and Welfare" is a challenge to all of us who are in a position to contribute to the aims of your program.

The topic assigned to me, "The Nation's Responsibility for Health Care in Changing Times," is one about which I am happy to speak—one which is, as you know, close to my heart, and with which I have been closely involved for more than 20 years as your Representative in the Congress of the United States.

Almost everything about us reminds us of the rapidly changing times in which we live. Jetplanes scream from coast to coast almost as fast as the sun; old landmarks disappear in the city and are replaced with tall and shiny new buildings; rockets push satellites into space; and men calmly contemplate visiting the moon.

Yes, the pace at which so-called modern life propels us toward the future on the jittery toboggan we call civilization seems mighty fast to us; but if one pauses to reflect on it, we have adapted reasonably well to it all. Today, more people are living longer than ever before, thanks to the achievements of medical science.

One hundred and thirty years ago, when the pace of civilization had, as he termed it, "accelerated beyond a bearable state," an English doctor advised his patients to "take a vacation—and get away from it all." That advice still is given. This physician was Dr. James Johnson, fellow of the Royal College of Physicians, and physician extraordinary to the King of England. Nearly a century and a half go this observant physician was among the first to diagnose and prescribe for the wear-and-tear syndrome of modern living. He recognized that the increasing pace of life in the London of 1831 was taking its toll and creating tensions, that the stress of life was responsible for illnesses and complaints otherwise unexplainable.

Facts about this particular Dr. Johnson of London have been recently revealed by a professor of medical history at the University of Chicago and published in a book entitled "Change of Air, or the Pursuit of Health." To, Dr. Johnson, the London of 1831 was the scene of evermounting tensions compared to the good old days prior to the industrial revolution. He mistakenly concluded that the condition he described as "wear and tear on the living machine" was a disease peculiar to the English when he wrote. "In London, business is almost the only pleasure—in Paris, pleasure is almost the only business."

I mention this historical bit about Dr. Johnson primarily to bring home the fact that change is always with us, yet we can—we must—adapt ourselves and our activities to it to stay ahead of the game.

We, too, have a tendency to look back at the past through rose-colored glasses, as did the good doctor in 1831, bemoan our present-day situation, and yearn for the good old days which, really, weren't so good, when you come to think of it.

Concerned as I am, and have been for many years, with the health of our people in this great country of ours, I think it is most important today to plan for a better tomorrow, and to take what action we can to insure that in the many tomorrows to come we continue to work for that most basic of human values—health.

Without health we cannot be strong. Unless we as people are strong we cannot long survive. To improve health we must urgently seek knowledge of life—we must, on a large scale, conduct health research. We must train more research scientists and more physicians. I see this responsibility as a national responsibility.

I realize that health programs and research have particular meaning to persons in the welfare field who are uniquely aware of how much poor health is a primary factor in the need for assistance and welfare services. Good health enables all of us to surmount problems that might otherwise overwhelm us.

This country has assumed unequestioned world leadership in the scientific aspects of medicine. We have built, in the midst of a world seemingly bent upon self-destruction, the greatest potential for life extension this mortal coil has ever seen. Facing up to forces in the world which seemingly have little regard for the value of human life, this country has strongly demonstrated its adherence to the moral principle that human lives are inherently precious. The moral and nonpartisan support that the citizens of this country, through the Congress, have given to the development of our great, federally supported health research programs, is conclusive evidence that this country has high regard for the importance and dignity of human life, not only for American citizens, but for people all over the world who are suffering.

As chairman of the subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, which includes among its responsibilities the annual appropriations for the U.S. Public Health Services. I am proud of have played a role in the development of many Federal programs which cumulatively have had a far-reaching impact on the health and welfare of this Nation and of the world. I have strong feelings about the Nation's responsibility for the health of its people, and I am only too happy to dwell upon this subject for a while.

I would like to note that this Appropriations Committee also carries responsibilities for welfare programs of special interest to many of you. I need only refer to child welfare and health programs of the Children's Bureau and grants to the States for public assistance. May I remind you further of my own interest in the area of mentally retarded children which cuts across the welfare and health fields, and my sponsorship last year of the White House Conference on Aging, in which health and welfare interests were closely joined.

When I first became a member of the subcommittee, the research program of the National Institutes of Health, the research branch of the Public Health Service, was small and limited principally to its own epidemiological and laboratory study of communicable diseases. Funds available for research and training in non-Federal situations were relatively insignificant. About that time, however, important changes were taking place in the shape of our population and its environment, creating new health problems and, therefore, the need for new research efforts. The most significant of these changes were the emergence of the problems of chronic disease and environmental health. Thus, from the very beginning of my service with the subcommittee we have devoted more and more attention to the national research needs in these two areas.

To most people concerned with the problem—and who among us is not concerned with health?—the course seemed clear. If a nation's scientific resources could produce so well under the stress of war surely, directed toward the objective of better health for millions of people, these same scientific resources could flourish and be productive in peace. It was a national problem that called for the application of national effort.

As a result of a consensus of opinion, both of laymen and scientists, the Congress in 1945 began to increase appropriations for Federal funds used by the Government to stimulate medical research, to capitalize on the opportunity to support man's effort to extend his horizons in the life sciences.

In concurrence with the advice and counsel of experts both in and out of Government, we in the Congress determined that a year-by-year buildup of the grants-in-aid mechanism developed at the National Institutes of Health was the method of choice. The National Institutes of Health was an organization with experience in the granting field and possessed a tradition of first-class medical and biological research.

Appropriations of Federal funds to be used for the stimulation and support of medical research in non-Federal institutions throughout the country were steadily increased. Universities, medical schools, hospital laboratories and other research centers began to develop and expand their activities. This is the research program in which I have been most deeply interested. My committee has had the responsibility for its appropriations, which have become a significant part of the Nation's total investment in medical research.

Appropriations for the National Institutes of Health, including its own operations and grants for research projects and awards for fellowships and training, amounted to less than $3½ million in fiscal year 1946. For 1962, the current fiscal year, that appropriation, recently authorized, stands at more than $738 million. Although this is, indeed a substantial increase over a relatively short period of 15 years, it definitely is not a blind effort to buy new knowledge—rather it has been a carefully developed year-by-year program designed to take advantage of new opportunities to meet growing national needs. Let me tell you, briefly, about some of its major elements.

The first major expansion was in the area of research project grants. In 1945 this appropriation totaled $85,000 this year the comparable figure stands at more than $433 million—supporting about 12,000 research projects in virtually every nonprofit research center in the country. Let me assure you now that prior to each year's increase in

funds for this purpose the Congress received convincing evidence of the accomplishments and potentialities of existing research projects as well as the existence of promising ideas and leads for new and necessary research projects or programs.

Those of us dealing with the total problem of medical research in the Congress were also aware of two more vital elements of the program—the availability of trained manpower to do the work and the necessary facilities in which the research must be conducted.

To keep these three elements of a large and rapidly developing program—research projects, research manpower and research facilities—in relative balance has been no easy task.

The needs and potentials of the stimulated research projects for trained manpower received attention early, and funds for research training, including fellowships, began their advance in 1947. In that year the appropriation for fellowships and training grants totaled $428,000 compared to $57,000 in 1945. But as each year passed and as it became more and more evident that scientific manpower was the most important single factor limiting further progress in the life sciences, the program was expanded until today the annual investment in tomorrow's health research manpower stands at more than $147 million.

The third vital element in the Public Health Services's pattern for research support—facilities—received only emergency attention during 1949 and 1950 for heart and cancer research facilities, totaling about $22 million. More recently, again responding to an evident need for nationwide expansion of health research facilities and equipment, the Congress passed legislation authorizing $30 million to be made available each year for construction and equipment of facilities in all of the health fields. As of the completion of this fiscal year—1962—about $105 million will have been awarded to more than 321 nonprofit institutions for the construction and equipment of research facilities in virtually every State in the Union. Through matching funds, initial investment will result in the creation of facilities having a value of more than a billion dollars. The great contributions of this program were recognized by Congress in the closing days of the current session, when it extended the authorization for 1 more year and increased the amount from $30 to $50 million.

The picture of meaningful growth in the Federal support of medical research amply demonstrates how seriously we regard the Nation's responsibility for the health of the Nation's people in these times. It is a fair assumption, I believe, that this great expansion of effort has played an important part in the progress that has taken place in the last decade.

At this point I would like to emphasize that I have been speaking only about Federal funds for research support made available through the mechanism of the National Institutes of Health. Much more modest amounts of Federal money are made available through other agencies for this purpose, but NIH is the primary and major source. As we have built up this mechanism, mounting the greatest medical research effort this world has ever seen, support for research from private sources has also increased remarkably. Although the percentage of Federal funds devoted to research has increased as the percentage of private funds for this purpose has decreased, the actual dollar amount of non-Federal assistance to medical research has increased from $42 million in 1940 to an estimated $335 million in 1960. It seems to me that this affords clear proof that the increasing availability of Federal funds for research and training has stimulated rather than discouraged private expenditures for these same purposes.

I have already noted that we in the Congress who have been responsible for determining levels of appropriations for medical research were not unacquainted with the great potentials which were inherent in this activity. Consequently, we have made it our business to be kept informed concerning the accomplishments made and the new developments worth pursuing before voting on the funds for appropriation each year. We have a high regard to the taxpayers' money and we certainly take a good hard look at every major proposal before we approve it. Under this kind of stewardship, we have become convinced that medical research pays off.

Let me mention just a few accomplishments of medical research, and let me emphasize that I see them not just as scientific achievements but more in the light of their meaning to the public as a whole. I am thinking, for example, of the discovery and development of synthetic hormones and related agents for rheumatic diseases such as arthritis; the widespread of availability of penicillin and the development of other antibiotics; the development of chemical agents used in the student and treatment of mental illnesses—agents which have helped to reduce the length of stay in mental hospitals the improved protection against rheumatic fever and resultant heart damage in children; new, effective tests for the detection of cancer; surgery of the heart; the discovery and application of new vaccines for polio; the use of radioactive isotopes in studies of body chemistry and the action of drugs; the development of new compounds providing effective treatment of tuberculosis; and many, many others.

Although I am a layman, I am also a Congressman dealing daily with medical research, and I hear a great deal of discussion of new and better chemical agents, new drugs, new treatments, and even the claim that 50 percent of today's prescriptions could not have been written 10 years ago simply because the materials incorporated in them did not then exist. These things may be so, but I believe that the real demonstration of the effectiveness of today's medical treatment, incorporating the findings of medical research applied to practice, lies in the statistics which graphically show our progress toward better health in broad terms.

The most significant single index of health progress may be a comparison of overall death rates. I am told that the decline in death rates since World War II for some of the major illnesses dramatically shows how over a million lives have been saved by modern medicine.

Influenza, for example, has been reduced by 90 percent in its death rate. Once great killers like rheumatic fever, tuberculosis, diseases that cause maternal deaths, and appendicitis have all been reduced in rank as killers by more than 70 percent. The death rate due to syphilis has been brought down by over 60 percent pneumonia, over 40 percent; some kidney disorders, 60 percent; infant death rates, over 30 percent; and paralytic polio, the disease about which much is still unknown, has been reduced most dramatically over the past 2 years. Even high blood pressure, one of the greatest medical problems in terms of numbers afflicted, has seen some improvements in treatment and reduction in death rates in the past few years.

Most of these tremendous advances, of course, have been made against the infectious or communicable diseases, and the removal of many of these from the listing of great killers has brought into focus our present problems, upon which we are spending most of our effort today—the chronic diseases, the disorders which face our aging population now that they are surviving to higher average age levels. The chronic diseases are forceful reminders that people who are now surviving or bypassing the acute infectious diseases and the rigors and hazards of infancy, childhood, and young adulthood, live longer only to face the rising incidence of these long-term crippling and killing disorders.

Of course, this dramatic progress carries with it problems for the welfare field in the very fact that handicapped children survive and old people live longer. Thus there is placed upon our States and communities heavy responsibilities for providing assistance and help to these individuals to whom medical science has given extended life. This is as it should be for together our health and welfare program offer to them not only a healthier life but also a more secure and happier one.

Great progress is being made, and research into the chronic diseases is producing great gains. For example—although we cannot yet cure or prevent diabetes, we can control it. First, the discovery of insulin made it possible to control it with injections and proper diet. In recent years, the need for using a hypodermic needle has been obviated in many cases by the development of totally new types of antidiabetic drugs which can be taken in tablet form. This development may save no more lives, but it makes living much more pleasant for the diabetic who can use the tablets.

And, we have had great developments in the field of the rheumatic diseases—rheumatoid arthritis, for instance. We still cannot cure this disease, but thousands and thousands of arthritics who, a few years ago, would probably have been bedridden, are now active, productive, and relatively healthy members of the working population, their pain dramatically reduced and their joints relatively free—there are many examples like these. Treatment of the various disorders of the heart and circulatory system have been markedly improved, saving lives and extending the useful and productive spans of many, many others.

Yes, great progress has been and still is being made. Research has been and is paying off, and the accumulation of basic knowledge of the life processes is building up. Heartening breakthroughs are being made with great regularity; momentum has been achieved and must be maintained.

The Nation has seen its responsibility and has acted. The potential of medicine as far as the future is concerned is bursting at the seams with possibilities, but there are still many problems. Research has progressed, knowledge has increased, but the application of that knowledge in the practice of medicine has in some cases lagged too far behind.

This, my friends is one of the greatest challenges of our changing times. There is no alternative; if we are to capitalize on the great gains that have been emerging from the research laboratories; if we are to achieve the better health and fuller life that is desired and deserved in these changing times—then we must also have a change—a change in the rate at which we apply new health knowledge for the benefit of the people in this country and in every country of the world. This challenge, I am confident, will be met through the concerted efforts of organizations such as yours and through the individual effort of physicians, civic leaders, nurses, health educators, and enlightened citizens who are willing to make the effort to achieve the goal.

Together, we will bring about the changes to meet the needs of our changing times.

Farm Subsidies, Supports, and Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, all of us are well aware of the said history of farm subsidies, supports, and controls. We know all too well of the surplus crops rotting away; of the heavy burden placed on the taxpayer to pay for their storage; and of the Government's power to tell a farmer what he may and may not grow. Yet despite our knowledge, an occasional incident or letter brings home to us with greater impact than any academic analysis injustices to the farmer which the farm process fosters.

Just the other day I received a copy of a letter to Secretary Freeman from a Mr. O. D. Smith, of Saranac, Mich., whose plight is undoubtedly multiplied many times over by farmers throughout the land. Since I know that Members of the House are deeply concerned with our agricultural problem, I would like to place in the RECORD at this point Mr. Smith's letter:

FEBRUARY 20, 1962.

Hon. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: On January 22 I wrote you and pointed out that basing future production on past production only was not fair because everyone has not had the same opportunity to establish a record of past production chiefly because of the age differential between farmers, and that your control programs would stop growth entirely which punishes small and beginning farmers. I offered to take out of production at no cost to the Government the percentage of my land that you feel contributes to surplus. I advised that farmers in this area do not want controls and explained all this in detail. Your farm bill reflects that you apparently felt this all very unimportant.

I purchased my farm 2 years ago with my money and I pay the taxes, now. I am told that you are going to run it, or require me to make it into a park or fishpond, and if I don't do as you say, I will go to jail. My farm consists of good land, a fair barn with 13 stanchions, and an old, old house. It has produced fine crops in the past and has been a dairy farm. The years that you picked to base my future production on were years when I have been repairing and building, procuring equipment, and learning how to be a farmer. Now it appears that all I am going to have for my family out of all this investment in time, money, and hard work is an old farmhouse.

You said on "Meet the Press" this type of government does not imitate communism. Maybe not—I don't know what name you have for it, but don't call it democracy.

There is something fundamentally wrong with your program when it creates this kind of chaos, and I am sure that thousands more farmers are equally affected.

I am taking the liberty of sending copies of this letter to everyone I can think of, and will continue to do so until you convince me I have no moral right to seek to be a farmer, or the situation is corrected.

Very truly yours

O. D. SMITH.

Land Acquisition for Highway Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, the attention of the Congress, and in great measure of the country, has been focused in recent months on alleged improprieties in connection with the progress of our Federal highway program. This naturally is a matter of great concern to all of us and, in fact, is presently under study by a committee of the House.

In view of the general interest in this problem, I place in the Appendix of the RECORD three newspaper articles, recently invited to my attention, appearing in the Haverhill (Mass.) Journal, which relate to land acquisition for highway purposes in that State.

There has been much confusion in connection with the highway program. It is situations like those discussed in the news articles printed below that causes many of us to doubt the decisions being made:

[From the Haverhill (Mass.) Journal, Dec. 20, 1960]

STATE PAID $223,750 FOR WYZANSKI LAND

(By Henry J. Price)

A Federal judge and his family received $223,750 from the State for three parcels of land taken during the construction of the Central Artery in Boston, the Journal learned today.

Judge Charles E. Wyzanski, Jr., and three members of his family received the money for land taken by the State on John and Blackstone Streets in 1951 when William Callahan was Commissioner of Public Works.

The amount was paid in a settlement with the Department of Public Works. The original offer for the property set by the DPW's board of review had been refused by the Wyzanski family, but a settlement was reached with the Attorney General's office before the case came up for trial in Superior Court.

Since that time the State law has been changed and now requires that any settlement on land damage cases be approved by the court.

The property located at 37 John Street, 83–89 and 73–81 Blackstone Street, was listed to Max E. Maud, Jr., and Arthur R. Wyzanski, the estate of Carrie W. Risenfield and Judge Wyzanski. It was taken by the State in February and March 1951.

Both Wyzanski and Callahan are currently involved in the Thomas Worcester tax case Wyzanski is hearing the case and Callahan has been subpenaed as a witness.

[From the Haverhill (Mass.) Journal, Dec. 22, 1960]

WYZANSKI AWARD $106,188 ABOVE OUTSIDE APPRAISAL

(By Hank Price and Dick Long)

BOSTON.—A before-trial settlement for three pieces of property taken from Federal Judge Charles E. Wyzanski, Jr., and relatives during construction of the central artery cost the State $106,188 more than an outside appraiser valued the property.

A search of records revealed that the $223,750 settlement obtained by Judge Wyzanski and relatives was also $64,750, or about 40 percent higher than the $159,000 recommended by the department of public works on the recommendation of its board of review.

Richard L. Casey, who was hired by the department of public works, to assess the property, estimated it to be worth a total of $117,562, or $106,188 less than what the State actually paid.

The property was taken in 1951 during the administration of former Commissioner of Public Works William F. Callahan, who is currently under subpena as a witness in the Thomas Worcester tax case, which is being heard by Judge Wyzanski.

OTHER PROPERTY LOWER

The property, located at North and Blackstone Streets from a detailed search of the records reveals that properties adjacent to the Wyzanski land and buildings brought lower sums in comparison to the Wyzanski award.

The State paid a total of $191,750 for two parcels owned by the Wyzanskis on Blackstone Street, which measured approximately 5,067 square feet whereas Harvard University obtained a total $230,000 for its four adjoining parcels which measured approximately 10,379 square feet.

The Harvard property, which included buildings similar in structure also included a corner location.

For other adjoining land and a building on Blackstone Street, the Hark Bros. Corp. received $46,000 for a parcel of land measuring approximately 1,906 square feet.

CORNER LOT, BUILDING

Wyzanski and relatives also received $32,000 for a corner lot and a 1½ story building located on North Street. This property measured approximately 1,250 square feet. The adjacent property, which included a multistoried building owned by Philip T. Theopold and trustees of the Boston Real Estate Trust and which measured approximately 1,150 square feet was taken by the State for $23,000.

A settlement in the Wyzanski land-taking case had been reached in 1954 in a before-trial settlement between former Attorney General George Pingold and Attorneys George A., Walter H., and Charles S. McLaughlin.

It was approved then by Public Works Commissioner John A. Volpe and his associates, Fred Dole and Lewis J. Fritz.

FILES STATEMENT

In an unprecedented move, Wyzanski filed a statement on the land-taking deal with the clerk of Federal courts Tuesday after the Journal published the story on the award.

Wyzanski termed the award "niggardly," and pointed out that one building was returning an annual income of $12,500 and had been referred to by his relatives as "our meal ticket."

In each case, the properties had been appraised by independent appraisers and then forwarded to the real estate board of review.

Casey said the Wyzanski properties were worth a total of $117,562. One of the parcels located at 73–81 Blackstone Street, for which the State paid $140,000, was valued at $62,740. The independent appraiser set a value of $29,605 on the building and land of 83–89 Blackstone Street, for which the State paid $51,750. He estimated that the property at 35–41 North Street, was worth $25,217. The State paid $32,000 for this property.

SECOND APPRAISER

A second appraiser, Elson M. Blunt, Jr., valued the Wyzanski properties at $151,400 and the department of public works valued the three parcels at $197,400.

By parcel, the appraisals were as follows: 83–89 Blackstone Street, department of public works appraisal, $47,000; Richard L. Casey, $29,605; Elson M. Blunt, Jr., $38,000; review

board, $40,000—payment was $51,750; 73–81 Blackstone Street, department of public works, $126,000; Casey, $62,740; Blunt, $92,800; review board, $95,000—payment was $140,000; 35–41 North Street, department of public works, $24,400; Casey, $25,217; Blunt, $20,600; review board, $24,000—payment was $32,000.

[From the Haverhill (Mass.) Journal, Dec. 29, 1960]

WYZANSKI BUILDING IN 1937 WAS CONDEMNED AS UNSAFE

(By Hank Price)

BOSTON.—The State paid Federal Judge Charles E. Wyzanski, Jr., and relatives $51,750 for a building on Blackstone Street that had been condemned as unsafe and a common nuisance by the city of Boston in 1937, the Haverhill Journal and Manchester Union Leader learned yesterday.

A search of the records in the city building department revealed that on October 19, 1937, a notice to abate the nuisance was served on Charles E. Wyzanski, Jr., and Arthur R. Wyzanski, trustees of the M. E. and C. E. Wyzanski Trust.

"The building situated at 83–89 Blackstone Street, Ward 3, in said Boston, of which you are the owner, being unsafe as to endanger life and is therefore a common nuisance, you are hereby notified forthwith to remove the cause of danger and abate the nuisance," the notice said.

It noted that the party wall between the building at 89 and 91 Blackstone Street was defective, the brick front was loose and a very large fracture appeared in the third, fourth, and fifth stories.

In 1954, after the property was taken for construction of the Central Artery, the State paid $51,750 for the property as part of a total settlement of $223,750 for three parcels on Blackstone and North Streets, owned by the Wyzanski family.

The settlement had been reached before trial by Wyzanski's counsel, Attorney George McLaughlin and former Attorney General George Fingold.

NO REPAIR RECORD

There are no records on file in the Building Department of the City of Boston to indicate that any major repairs were made to the property between 1938 and 1951, when the property was taken except that new shingles were applied.

In a voluntary statement filed with the clerk of Federal court last week after the settlement was first disclosed, Judge Wyzanski termed the settlement "niggardly."

The property had been taken in 1951 when William F. Callahan was commissioner of public works.

Callahan is scheduled to appear today in the stormy Thomas Worcester tax hearing at which Judge Wyzanski is presiding.

Records of the city building department also reveal that on October 5, 1937, the Wyzanskis applied to the city for a permit to remove the upper stories of the building at 83–89 Blackstone Street, but later abandoned the petition.

NOTHING DONE

On January 14, 1938, almost 3 months after the order to abate the nuisance, the city sent a followup notice which informed the Wyzanskis that "an inspector of this department reports that to date nothing has been done to remove the cause of the complaint."

The letter also warned that "if you do not take immediate action to remedy the conditions complained of, the matter will be referred to the law department of the city of Boston for prosecution."

In answer to the warning, the Wyzanskis stated in a letter they were prepared to carry out the recommendations but the owners of the adjoining premises (M. W. Huse et al.) or parties in control of the building, failed to cooperate.

CITES FIRE HAZARD

The letter further stated that the Wyzanskis contemplated removing the upper stories of the building, leaving only the street floor and basement.

In May 1938, a report from the Boston Fire Department described the property as in reality "two separate buildings." It said the basement of the building at 83–85 Blackstone Street, was occupied by Francis Cohen, wholesale meat dealer and the first floor contained a tavern, operated by John Carr. The second, third and fourth floors of this structure were unoccupied.

The department report signed by Deputy Chief John J. Kenney, complained that in 83–85 Blackstone Street, there was "a large accumulation of waste combustible rubbish, consisting of wastepaper, wood shavings, wooden boxes and wooden shelving." He said the condition was "a distinct fire hazard."

Occupying the first floor at 85–89 Blackstone Street, was a restaurant. The upper floors of the building were unoccupied.

The chief also noted that if a request to eliminate a stairway between the first and second floors was granted, "the entire building should be void of any occupancy whatsoever."

On May 23, 1938, the Wyzanskis were notified that the complaint of nuisance had been referred to the city's legal department for prosecution.

The Wyzanskis engaged architect Sumner Schein and instructed him to "remedy the defects."

On July 7, 1938, a building permit was requested by Schein to "resash store front and/or other changes." The building permit also said upper floors of the building would not be occupied as agreed with the Boston Fire Department.

Schein estimated that the total cost of the repairs and work would be $1,500 and a permit was granted on July 18, 1938. Work was completed on August 16, 1938, the building records show.

The upper stories of the buildings were never removed and when the State took the building in 1951, they were still multistory structures.

According to records in the assessor's office, between 1941 and 1951, the valuation of the property was abated from $48,000 to $44,000.

In Wyzanski's statement last week concerning the landtaking, the judge said he saw Attorney General Fingold to discuss the settlement.

AGREE TO SETTLE

"The attorney general saw me in his office," Wyzanski's statement said. "He agreed and instructed the assistant to agree, that, to settle the Wyzanski claims and to avoid further litigation, the Commonwealth would pay to the Wyzanskis sums which represented amounts about equal to the values assessed by the city of Boston, minus taxes due to the city, plus interest due from the Commonwealth to the claimants."

In a letter to the attorney general's office following the conversation, Judge Wyzanski failed to mention the value or yield of the 83–89 Blackstone Street, or the North Street property taken by the State.

Judge Wyzanski did state however, "I believe that the substance of our agreement reflects our attempt to arrive at figures fair to the Commonwealth and the private parties; figures on which I am quite prepared to stand publicly in any tribunal."

Our Advantage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important bills of our lifetime will soon be before us for our consideration. I refer to the President's recommendation for a new tariff policy. Much has already been written about this legislation, which was introduced into this Chamber by the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] as H.R. 9900. One of the more moderate, thoughtful pieces that have appeared was an editorial in the Newark Evening News, Friday, March 9. Worthy of our consideration, it is especially timely as hearings on the matter have just started today.

Eighteen months of negotiations between the United States and 24 other nations, including the six members of the Common Market and the United Kingdom, have resulted in trade and tariff agreements that President Kennedy has described as "very satisfactory and important." On a dollar-and-cents basis, the complex agreements involving hundreds of items are decidedly to our advantage.

The United States gained concessions on exports which had a total value of $4.3 billion, according to 1960 foreign trade figures. In return, this country made reciprocal tariff cuts on imports valued at $2.9 billion. But more important, as Mr. Kennedy explained, we obtained abatements on those items which are most essential to expansion of our foreign trade. Any such growth is especially desirable in view of our international payments deficit.

As far as American consumers are concerned, the tariff reductions are not likely to have a great effect on prices of imported goods. The average cost of a foreign car, for example, would be reduced by about $21.50; a $1,000 Persian lamb coat would cost about $20 less—and only a nickel would be saved on a bottle of Scotch, Irish whisky or British gin.

Some industries and workers may be hurt by the agreements, the first of which are to go into effect July 1. But by the same token, other industries and workers may be expected to profit from the easing of restrictions by other countries on imports of American goods.

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, under which the pacts were negotiated, apparently has outlived its usefulness. Our representatives at the tariff talks were so hampered by the law's restrictions, that only Mr. Kennedy's reduction of many duties below the "peril point" saved the negotiations from collapsing.

This is the law which Mr. Kennedy has asked Congress to replace with one providing greater tariff-cutting authority. The importance of the agreements, therefore, lies in their relationship to the administration's new foreign trade policy.

Particularly in regard to the Common Market, the new trade agreements may be regarded as a successful test of the ability to find a common basis for further mutually acceptable arrangements. If nothing else, the agreements should alert Congress to the fact that the growing influence of the Com-

mon Market presents both a challenge and an opportunity to open a field of economic relations profitable to both sides of the Atlantic.

Goodell Bill Approval Demonstrates Republican Initiative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSICA McC. WEIS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 15, 1962

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Krock from the Sunday, March 4, 1962, edition of the New York Times, entitled "GOP's New Tone."

GOP'S NEW TONE—LEADERS SEEK TO DISPROVE THE CHARGE THAT PARTY IS WHOLLY NEGATIVE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, March 3.—There was a new tone in the comments to the press made by the Republican leaders of Congress at this week's production of their public discussion of current events. The tone was triumphant with the claim of having proved that something the Democrats keep charging the Republican Party with simply isn't so. This charge is that the Republican Party's position in Government and politics is wholly negative—against whatever the Democratic administration proposes, whether it is act or policy, whether it is for legislative or executive action. To disprove this Senator DIRKSEN, of Illinois, and Representative HALLECK, of Indiana, the aforesaid minority leaders at the Capitol, submitted Thursday's passage by the House of the so-called retraining bill.

To bolster their rebuttal of the charge of negativism for its own and only sake, the Republican spokesman cited the following circumstances: (1) The bill was written by a Republican (Representative GOODELL, of New York), and accepted by the Democratic leadership as a substitute for a Democratic measure; (2) although the latter had been substantially modified in the House committee, controlled by Democrats, from the Senate version passed last year, the Democratic leaders had to turn to the Republican draft to get a House majority; (3) and the bill finally approved, though more restrictive on the details of its administration, completely met the objective of the retraining proposal made by President Kennedy.

BALANCE OF POWER

These statements were accurate. The Democratic leadership was obliged to provide their substance, since this was one of the occasions when it can summon a majority only by Republican aid because of defections of southern Democrats from administration legislative drafts. The Republicans granted only the concession of allowing their measure to carry the name of a Democrat, Representative HOLLAND of Pennsylvania. But they won their main points, including the reduction to $262 million from the Senate-approved 2-year spending total of $655 million. And they established their claim of willingness, as well as having the legislative power in the House, to put through administration proposals the Republicans deem constructive.

When they conclude otherwise, the Republicans are usually able to make a majority with the southern Democrats instead of joining forces with the administration Democrats, as they did on the retraining bill. And this latest demonstration of their exercise of the first, or constructive, function lent the new tone to this week's production of what has been known, and hitherto mostly derided, as the "Ev and Charlie Show."

LOYAL OPPOSITION

Its latest performance was replete with evidence that the minority leaders of Congress plan to establish themselves and their followers firmly as a loyal opposition. The term is British, and hence only partly applicable to American politics. But with this reservation, DIRKSEN and HALLECK sought to earn it for the Republican Party as represented in Congress by defining their general standards of opposition.

These Republicans, said DIRKSEN, would support President Kennedy's foreign policies, once they were made, but pending this they would reserve the right to criticize. In domestic matters they would, said HALLECK, fight to the finish against administration legislation which he described as "wornout" cures for entrenched economic-social ills, such as standby authority to spend for public works to reduce unemployment; the President's preposterous request for the power to manipulate taxes, and so on. Though the President, he said, had assured Congress on January 20 that the economy was moving durably upward, subsequent reports of business failures, increasing mortgage foreclosures and declining farm prices imposed on a constructive opposition the duty of supplanting with sound alternatives the old disproved measures for lasting economic recovery to which the administration again had reverted. The prospect of this comment is that, though the Republican opposition will get an argument over its claim to the adjective "loyal," this opposition on domestic legislation will be aggressive and active on the congressional front from now until November, when all the House seats and one-third of those in the Senate will be filled at the general election.

DECISIONS IN U.N. CITED

DIRKSEN, who took over the spokesmanship on foreign affairs, was thorough in illustrating what he meant by saying that Republicans reserved the right to criticize in this area while policymaking was pending; the administration, he said, with a consequent loss of prestige, has alienated a succession of the most important U.S. allies by catering in the U.N. to the representatives of the new Afro-Asian nations whenever they raise the cry of colonialism.

The Senate minority leader scrupulously respected his opposition formula in the area of foreign affairs by refraining from any criticism of administration military defense policies, or those dealing with Cuba, Laos, and Vietnam, or of any actions taken and current results therefrom.

CONSTRUCTIVE ROLE

But in the congressional province of the Republican Party they clearly sought to establish its role as the constructive opposition in the United States, an effort which was fortified by the events just preceding that led to the passage by a Democratic House of the Republican draft of the retraining legislation sought by the President. HALLECK and DIRKSEN cannot commit the Republican State and local leaders to this or any other concept of opposition. But until a party convention assembles and chooses national candidates, the Republican public record is made in Congress.

But this record will not always bear the Halleck-Dirksen stamp if and when in the current session the small group of eastern Republican liberals, who last year supplied the votes to give the President majorities he could not acquire on the Democratic side, make the same dissenting interpretation of loyal opposition, and with the same result.

Recovery Doesn't Produce Those Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, on February 28, there was published a book laying bare the pricing economics of steel. The book, "Pricing Power and the Public Interest," is written by Gardiner C. Means, perhaps the most seminal economist in the United States today. He introduced two concepts into economic thought 25 years ago. The first is the concept in our industrial system of differentiating between ownership and control of our giant industrial enterprises. The second concept is that of administered prices, first published in a Senate document in the 74th Congress entitled "Industrial Prices and Their Relative Inflexibility."

And with a few brief remarks on this important book I wish to ask unanimous consent also to introduce a disturbing article appearing in the Washington Post of February 25, 1962, by that newspaper's able economics writer, Bernard D. Nossiter. In the article which bears a relationship to Mr. Means' book, Mr. Nossiter points out that since World War II, each of the four business recoveries in production following slumps has had increasingly less power to expand jobs. And the later recovery has produced an increase of only 99,000 nonfarm jobs between the 5th and 11th months after the cycle trough.

As for Mr. Means' latest book, Mr. Speaker, it is one to be read because it deals with perhaps the keystone in our pricing system—the steel industry. Fromm and Eckstein in "Steel and the Postwar Inflation" have pointed out that the role of steel in recent price inflation is of particular importance. If, these authors declare, steel prices had behaved like other industrial prices, the total wholesale price index would have risen by 40 percent less over the 1949–59 period and by less than 52 percent less between 1953 and 1959. Finished-goods prices would have risen by 23 and 38 percent less respectively.

Now why did steel prices behave as they did? I think a clue is that America's largest corporations have grown to such great size and power that they are no longer bound by the traditional restraints of competitive supply and demand pricing. Instead, they are able to administer their prices so as to earn whatever rates of profits they desire. Only the fear of new firms entering their industry, attracted by high profits, sets an upper limit to the prices which these large corporations charge.

Now Mr. Means turns to the steel industry as a laboratory to test this theory. Since the end of World War II, the price of steel has risen steadily, as pointed out a few sentences ago. Organized labor's continuing demands for higher wages are blamed by steel company officials.

Now until about 1953, Mr. Means shows that prices did, in fact, barely keep pace with rising costs. Steel companies earn a profit of about 8 percent on investment after taxes. But this picture changed after 1953. The steel companies, exploiting their power to administer prices, had succeeded in doubling their rate of profit so that by 1959, it reached 16 percent on capital invested after taxes. Now, to my mind, this goes a long way toward explaining the general inflationary trend in this country. It also throws some light on the competitive position of the United States in world markets. An additional factor, beside this doubling of profits, was the adoption of stock option plans by the United States Steel Corp. and Bethlehem Steel Corp., the two big giants of the industry. These stock option plans, by tying the incomes of high company officials to the profit rates of their companies, gave them an incentive to increase profit margins that are lacking when incomes are derived mainly from salaries.

Uncontrolled pricing power can lead to prices that are disproportionate to costs. And this causes resources to be improperly allocated. Technological advances can be retarded.

Now historically in this country, public policy has two means of confronting companies and industries that do not follow the competitive model of Say's law of markets—that is, that total demand for a good must in the end equal total supply. One is antitrust prosecution under sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act and section 7, as amended, of the Clayton Act. The second is Government regulation such as we find in the field of utilities. Mr. Means shows how neither of these two is suitable for dealing with administered price industries. The countervailing power by trade unions certainly does not seem to have helped. Nor is there evident a noticeable sense of social or public responsibility within the industry.

"Administered price," as defined by Mr. Means, is a neutral technical term to distinguish prices which are set by individual companies and kept constant for period of time, such as we find in steel producers, from those, as in the steel scrap industry, which are set by classical competition and the law of supply and demand. The administrative character of steel pricing can be easily seen by comparing wide swings in production accompanied by little change in prices. This is particularly noticeable in 1952 and again in 1954.

Mr. Means suggests that corporations exercising administered-price power should be granted a standing of "collective enterprises"—between that of the regulated firm, such as a utility, and a firm in a field where supply and demand operates. Government would have a hand in establishing a target rate of return a collective enterprise must earn in order to attract new capital and carry on expansion. Corporation managers would receive bonuses, in the case of ordinary firms, when a responsible rate of profit is achieved. If profits were below or above this figure, the bonuses would be quite small. This ties the "self-interest of management to economic performance." I hope this concept will be discussed in months to come, both on and off the floor of the House and the Senate and among thoughtful economists everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, there now follows Mr. Nossiter's article:

RECOVERY DOESN'T PRODUCE THOSE JOBS

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

In blunt language, President Kennedy has singled out the task of finding jobs in an automation era as the gravest domestic challenge of the 1960's.

His press conference words 10 days ago probably startled citizens enjoying the fruits of the affluent society. "Hasn't everything been going up but prices?" they might have asked. We've had recovery for a year now. What's all the fuss about?

The President's words, moreover, seemed out of joint with his own economic report. That document held out the prospect of a rising wave of output shrinking unemployment to 4 percent by the middle of next year.

One clue to Mr. Kennedy's concern may lie in some dull-looking figures compiled by the Labor Department a few days before the President spoke out. These statistics showed that the current recovery in production has yielded the fewest additional jobs of any in the postwar period. Moreover they showed that each of the four recoveries has had increasingly less power to expand jobs.

For each of the four postwar business cycles, the Labor Department counted the gain in wage and salary jobs outside of farming 11 months after recovery had gotten under way. In other words, the last slump hit bottom in Februray, 1961, and the department counted the number of nonfarm payroll jobs that had been added by January 1962 the previous slump hit bottom in April, 1958, and the department counted the jobs in March, 1959, and so on.

Here's what the comparison revealed:

Increase in nonfarm jobs 11 months after cycle trough

1948–50	3,462,000
1953–55	2,170,000
1957–59	1,942,000
1960–62	949,000

The weakness of the latest recovery shows up more graphically if this comparison is made:

Increase in nonfarm jobs between 5th and 11th months after cycle trough

1948–50	2,405,000
1953–55	1,427,000
1957–59	1,306,000
1960–62	99,000

Was this because the latest recovery just wasn't as strong generally as the other three? No, that's not the answer. Output of goods and services has risen about as rapidly in the 1961–62 recovery as it did in the three earlier advances.

What all this indicates is that it takes many fewer persons to turn out the same amount of goods, that productivity rose at a staggering pace, that machines are now doing much more of man's work. (The soft word "indicates" is used advisedly because the period involved here—11 months—is so short that economists are reluctant to draw hard conclusions about productivity from it.)

In other words, it looks as if the old link between rising output and rising jobs has been wrenched severely. One trouble with this conclusion is that it flies in the face of the best economic analysis.

Studies by the Joint Economic Committee and Mr. Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers agree that automation has not made any new contribution to the unemployment dilemma. The President himself reflected this view at his press conference and in his economic report when he said that rising output by itself would solve much of the unemployment problem.

In line with this view, he has proposed relatively small-scale programs to train a few hundred thousand youths and retrain about the same number of older unemployed workers.

Virtually every business spokesman has scouted the notion that automation has caused or will cause an employment problem. Management insists that the new industries and new demands created by advancing technology will, over time, supply all the new jobs that are needed.

However, the suggestive evidence of the Labor Department's figures and similar studies elsewhere are raising some disquieting doubts about the belief that a conventional rise in output will call forth the historic number of additional jobs.

There is in all this, too, another source of concern: if the administration's theory is correct, where will the demand come from to call forth the extra output that will yield the needed jobs? The administration's answer is clear: from the private economy, particularly from business investment.

For the year starting July 1, the Government plans to run a surplus that, measured in terms of economic impact, will take out $4.4 billion more from the spending stream than it will put in. Private citizens in general and the business community in particular are counted upon to counteract the drain.

This optimism has caused considerable anguish among some of Mr. Kennedy's strongest supporters in the academic world. A recent symposium conducted by Prof. Seymour Harris, of Harvard, uncovered opposition to the balanced budget from such Kennedy stalwarts as Prof. Paul Samuelson of MIT and Alvin Hansen, formerly of Harvard.

But even if the private sector performs as buoyantly as the administration expects, some doubt persists that it will yield enough of an increase in jobs. On top of the deficiency caused by any spurt in technological advance, the Nation will soon be confronted with an enormous increase in the number of youths looking for their first job.

Thanks to the birth explosion of the 1940's, the number of new jobseekers in this decade—after subtracting those who will retire—is expected to average 1,350,000 a year. That is 50 percent more than the 900,000 who came in annually during the 1950's.

Naturally enough, the trade unions have been making the loudest cries about the shortage of jobs. In negotiations with management, however, they have gotten virtually nowhere in coping with this problem.

The unions' solution of spreading the work through shorter hours has run into an unyielding wall of employer opposition in every industry where jobs and not labor is scarce. The administration's opposition also has been so strong that the hard-pressed United Steelworkers, for one, have virtually taken the shorter workweek demand off their bargaining table in Pittsburgh.

An AFL–CIO economist, Nathaniel Goldfinger, said a few days ago: "Collective bargaining procedures between unions and employers can provide cushions for the workers who are displaced. But collective bargaining itself cannot solve this problem."

And if the suggestive statistics are really pointing to a new era of explosive technological advance, a whole new order of problems is at hand. One of the more thoughtful union leaders, President Ralph Helstein of the Packinghouse Workers, has explored some of them.

"Will we not have to change our ideas, because of the new technology, as to what constitutes work, and how income is provided," he asks? "Over the centuries, income for most of humanity has depended on

work. Is there a necessary relationship between income and work? That is, without work can there be income?

"There are thousands of Americans whose current income is unrelated to work. There are other thousands whose current income reflects work done at some previous point in time, either by themselves or their forebears. This suggests that income and work are not tied together by inexorable laws but rather by the traditional operations of our economic system. The problem is: How do we assure income for workers if work is not available?"

Increase in Number of Patients Treated in Veterans' Administration Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Public Law 86-639 authorized the prebed care and the completion of bed occupancy program, usually referred to as the PBC/CBOC operation of the Veterans' Administration hospital system.

The CBOC program has been in operation for a number of years but the prebed care became effective July 1, 1960. In essence, this program permits laboratory and other necessary tests for veterans who have been authorized to be admitted to a Veterans' Administration hospital by performing such tests prior to their actual admission. This may occur within a 14-day period before admission. After the patient has been discharged from the hospital he may be cared for—checkups, medicine, and so forth—for as long as 1 year following his discharge.

At the time the legislation was considered, which led to the enactment of Public Law 86-639, the Veterans' Administration advised that such enactment would likely lead to the equivalent of a 10 percent inpatient turnover which would require, if the results were to be duplicated, the construction of at least five 1,000-bed, fully staffed G.M. & S. hospitals at an annual operating cost of $40 million. Construction cost today is between $20,000 and $30,000 a bed.

The Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration has indicated that in the current fiscal year 17,900 more patients were treated in the first 6 months than were treated in a similar period a year ago. If this trend continues, over 35,000 more veterans will receive medical care in Veterans' Administration hospitals in fiscal year 1962 than were treated during the preceding fiscal year, even though the average daily patient load (ADPL) has dropped. Perhaps the most encouraging news is the substantial decrease—approximately 2,000—in the waiting list.

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs recently conducted a study of the PBC/CBOC program which has been printed in House Committee Print No. 165. The initial results of this law are quite encouraging, but the great potential of better treatment, greatly increased turnover rates, shorter stays in hospitals, and more attention to our sick and needy veterans, has not yet been realized.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the press release of the Veterans' Administration, dated February 19, 1962:

Veterans' Administration hospitals are treating thousands of additional patients without a corresponding increase in beds.

The agency's 171 hospitals had 28,000 more patients in fiscal 1961 than in fiscal 1960, with an increase of only a few hundred in the number of beds available for use.

The rate at which VA hospital beds are freed for new admissions, or turnover rate, has risen substantially and continues to increase. Present predictions are that the agency's hospitals will treat 30,000 more patients in fiscal 1962 than in fiscal 1961 and 58,000 more than in fiscal 1960.

Ability of the hospitals to shorten the period of stay, and thus care for so many more veterans, results from improved medical staffing, increasing efficiency of hospital programs and the VA's new program of prehospital and posthospital care.

In the psychiatric field, improvements in treatment and the growth of newer VA programs for the mentally and emotionally ill have played a major part in promoting recovery and thus increasing the VA hospitals' turnover rate. The programs include foster homes, halfway houses, day-care centers, and vocational counseling and job placement.

The new program of prehospital and posthospital care, authorized for the VA by Congress in 1960, is proving highly successful in helping the agency's medical and surgical hospitals treat more patients without increase in beds.

The law allows VA hospitals to perform certain prehospital and posthospital medical services for non-service-connected patients without placing them in a bed. It applies only to veterans who are scheduled for admission to, or are patients in, VA hospitals.

The average monthly hospital turnover rate for VA medical, surgical, and neurologic patients rose from 81.4 percent for fiscal 1960 to 84.9 percent for fiscal 1961, and to 89.1 percent for the first 3 months of fiscal 1962.

The yearly turnover rate of psychiatric patients in VA hospitals rose from 66 percent in 1955 to 78 percent in 1960, and to 85 percent in 1961.

The waiting list of veterans seeking admission to VA hospitals for non-service-connected conditions went down from 19,000 in October 1959 to 18,000 in October 1960, and to 15,400 in October 1961. The October 1961 list was made up of 11,600 psychiatric patients (most already in State hospitals) and 3,800 medical, surgical, and neurological patients.

New Orleans and the Americas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my fellow colleagues, and urge them to read a fine and provocative series of nine articles written by Reporter Bill Stuckey for one of my hometown newspapers, the New Orleans States-Item. The series of stories relates the longstanding and many-sided close relationship which has existed for over a century between the City of New Orleans and the nations of Latin America and their peoples. In an objective and thorough manner, Mr. Stuckey has traced the history of the relationship between the Crescent City and the Americas, and pointed up the cultural and national ties that have linked New Orleans—with its Hispano-Gallic background and culture—to the peoples of Spanish—and some French—heritage who have colonized and settled all the countries south of the Rio Grande. Mr. Stuckey has noted that New Orleans—in his words, "the geographic and spiritual middle ground between the Yanquis and the Latinos"—may well prove to be "the perfect lens of understanding" in today's concerted effort, through the alliance for progress, to improve the trust and understanding between our country and the other American nations, and to raise the standards of living of all the peoples of the Americas.

In his series of articles, Mr. Stuckey outlines the reasons for today's close relationship between New Orleans and Latin America; the size and national diversity of the Latin "colony in New Orleans, which is really not a colony at all because these peoples have been assimilated throughly into the culture of my city; the principal Latin American natives who have become leading citizens of New Orleans; some of the prominent Latin exiles from various nations south of the border who have sought refuge in the Crescent City in the past century; the famous filibustering expeditions which have originated in and launched from New Orleans the close ties which exist today between the New Orleans medical profession and the Tulane and Louisiana State University Medical Schools, and the doctors and scientists of Latin America, and the joint work they are doing to combat disease and raise public health standards; the exchange of students and teachers between Tulane University in New Orleans and Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge, with those of universities in Latin America, and the joint programs they and their institutions have engaged in; the New Orleans-based companies which have subsidiaries in the Americas, especially in Central America, and the other investments in businesses throughout Latin America; and the harmful effects to the city's economy which have resulted from Fidel Castro's seizure and communization of Cuba.

I should like to add that Mr. Stuckey did such a splendid job on this series of stories for the States-Item, that his newspaper now has him writing a regular, weekly column entitled "New Orleans and the Americas." Furthermore, Mr. Stuckey's work fostered the formation of a New Orleans Pan-American Union Organization by the consuls of 13 Latin American countries who are stationed in the Crescent City. The first two articles in this fine series follow here; the other articles will be inserted, two at a time, through the remainder of this week.

The first article, "City May Be Perfect Means for Understanding," and the second article, "Latin Community Here Is Elusive to Public Eye," follow:

CITY MAY BE PERFECT MEANS FOR UNDERSTANDING

(By Bill Stuckey)

Take a look at the "typical" Anglo-American—the brutal landgrabber, crude heretic, a gunboat diplomat and supporter of tinpot dictators, the ogre with dollar bills sticking from his ears.

And examine the "typical" Latin American—ignorant and mercurial, fast asleep as he rides his burro to nowhere, waking only for an occasional riot in the capital.

Such images are typical only of the misconceptions peddled by the propagandists of the Spanish-speaking Americas and the misinformed of the United States. They mirror the present and the truth about as accurately as a decaying tomato peeling in a garbage can mirrors the whole fruit.

Buffeted by the shock waves of the Red explosion in Cuba, men of good will in Washington and the Latin republics are trying as never before to bring the distorted reflections into truer focus.

And in New Orleans, the geographic and spiritual middle ground between the Yanquis and the Latinos, they may find the perfect lens of understanding.

Few if any American cities have such a broad network of cultural, educational, scientific, and economic ties to Latin America—particularly to Latin America above the Equator. Few U.S. cities have lived so long and harmoniously with local Latin populations.

FEW INSTITUTIONS LIKE INTERNATIONAL HOUSE

Few cities have had in operation so long such institutions as an International House, an International Trade Mart, and other elements of a professional machinery of hospitality and good will.

With prominent Latin political officials arriving almost weekly for official visits or vacations (President Frondizi of Argentina was a recent example), New Orleans has an unparalleled opportunity to influence the Americas. The thousands of Latin students who have studied here also have provided such opportunities.

The flow of run-of-the-mill Latin visitors, here alone is staggering. Consular officials of tiny El Salvador, for example, say that an average of 200 Salvadoreans arrives here each week for visits or business.

The fact that a former New Orleans mayor is now the U.S. Ambassador to the Organization of American States is a fair indication of the importance Washington already puts on this city in the national effort to restore hemispheric understanding.

INTERMINGLING SURPRISE

The extent of the vast intermingling between things Orleanian and things Latin might even surprise the locals. Consider these vignettes from the Latin life of New Orleans.

Louisiana State University medical school student uses "magic potions" from the north to drive the evil spirits from the belly of a witch doctor in Venezuela's Amazonian valley.

The architect of a Guatemalan public housing project works on a new endeavor, the design of a national theater for Guatemala City, in a Tulane University drafting room.

A Peruvian destroyer steams into a New Orleans shipyard for repairs.

Ambassador Chep Morrison, of the Organization of American States, relaxing between rounds of water skiing, tells of how a group of students in 1946 asked him to lead a rebellion against the then-ruling junta of Guatemala. (He politely declined.)

A Nicaraguan relaxes at a house party and says, "I enjoy Louisiana politics. They remind me so much of Nicaragua. You do the same things we do except pull the trigger."

BEAMS SPANISH MUSIC

At a wharf where a Latin freighter is berthed, a sound truck from the First Spanish American Baptist Church broadcasts Spanish music, instructions, and directions for the seamen.

Official greeters of the city say goodbye to a former president of Ecuador and rush off to meet the former mayor of Monterrey, Mexico, while local State Department officials check on details of impending visits by a Bolivian juvenile delinquency expert, six Uruguayan political cartoonists, a Haitian lawyer, and an Argentine mathematician.

A famous New Orleans surgeon confirms that he has operated on former dictator Juan Peron of Argentina, the late President Somoza of Nicaragua, an ex-president of Guatemala, and one, two—or was it three?—Panamanian heads of state.

A crew of archeologists from Tulane's Middle American Research Institute probe the ruins of a dead Mayan city in Yucatan, in what could become one of the century's major archeological finds.

A New Orleans engineer acts as adviser to the First Minister of British Honduras and two Cabinet members in construction of schools, public works, and emergency housing for the hurricane-hexed residents of Belize.

PAN-AM SOFTBALL LEAGUE

An officer of the Puerto Rican Club organizes a Pan-American softball league, while a group of intensely serious Cubans organize their return to their homeland.

A Guatemalan freight forwarder took an active part in the campaign of Mayor Victor H. Schiro (who lived briefly in Honduras) while a Puerto Rican lawyer buttonholed voters for James A. Comiskey.

A French quarter bar offers "Adelita," a song of Pancho Villa's army, as a jukebox selection.

A local historian dryly notes the several similarities between the New Orleans-backed invasion of Cuba by Narciso Lopez in the 1850's and the disastrous Bay of Pigs invasion last April. Both had very small armies and were depending on mass uprisings to aid them.

A child in Tegucigalpa wears a shirt provided him by the welfare committee of the Honduras Association of New Orleans.

Don Adolfo Hegewisch, dean of the small but influential Mexican colony here and president of the local Simon Bolivar Society, lays a wreath at the base of El Libertador's statue at Canal and Rampart.

CASTRO AND TRUJILLO

A park employee named Castro poses for newspaper pictures beside a street sign bearing the name of Trujillo.

Fernando Alvarado, president of the Honduras Association, and a spokesman for the city's largest Latin colony, tells of the time that the Hondurans beat LSU at football. "Soccer football, of course," he smiled.

That only scratches the surface.

Certain problems face New Orleans today which may force her to draw heavily on her long experience with, and understanding of the Latins.

If Congress makes New Orleans a principal Cuban refugee center, as at least one Miami civic leader has requested, the resulting flood of refugees could bring local economic dislocations and tensions.

And as a city which depends on foreign trade for its life—much of it from Latin America—New Orleans must find ways to meet the increasing competition from Miami, Houston, and other ambitious U.S. cities.

Regardless of the outcome, New Orleans remains the vast reservoir of good will, experience, and influence which Washington must have to change the cries of "Rossia, si. Yanquis, no." to "Yanquis, amigos."

LATIN COMMUNITY HERE IS ELUSIVE TO PUBLIC EYE

(By Bill Stuckey)

Buttonhole a New Orleans politician, ask him how the Latin American bloc is going to vote, and he will answer you with, "What Latin American bloc?"

Ask a cabdriver to take you to the Latin Quarter and after no little bit of confusion, you will probably wind up in the Vieux Carre.

Try to find a central source of information on persons living and working here who were born in Latin America—a source, say, like the local Spanish-language newspaper. After a string of futile inquiries, you'll find no such central source—and no such newspaper.

Strange. Local Latins themselves estimate their numbers at anywhere from 10,000 to 30,000 (the guess varies from person to person).

How can so many people be so elusive? With the exception of the 1,000 or so Cuban refugees, the public eye is seldom focused on Latins here as a group. Why?

After much talking and much looking, it begins to dawn that there is no distinct Latin unit here with separate institutions. To a remarkably complete degree, local Latins have been absorbed into the social fabric and mainstream of the community.

But the same Latins who are all but invisible as a group apart are everywhere as individuals.

Occupationally, they range from exporters to sculptors, surgeons to stevedores, sailors to university professors, students to elevator operators. Economically, the heavy majority appears to belong to that vast and varied grouping known as the middle class.

Civicly, the Latin population here has brought forth outstanding community leaders—as well as the normal percentage of "nobodies." Crime among the Latins is relatively negligible, the police report.

Although you can find a few concentrations of Latins in the Napoleon Avenue and nearby uptown areas, and groups of Cuban refugees in the Mirabeau area and the St Thomas housing project, they live generally throughout the city. They face no residential barriers here.

The factors which made it comparitively easy for Latin-born residents to blend into the local landscape and to achieve individual prominence underline New Orleans' potential role as the focal point of understanding between the United States and Latin America.

One researcher, former Tulane graduate sociology student Norman Painter, noticed the high degree of social assimilation of Latins here following a study of 67 Spanish-speaking residents in 1948.

He concluded that Latins are not forced into clannish units as in the East or Middle West due to lack of hostility shown toward them here. There is no Latin bloc because the Latins don't need to huddle together for protection, he wrote.

In his meticulous report, he carried this a step further by producing quotes by Latins about local hospitality which would be at home in any chamber of commerce or international house promotional tract. Interestingly enough, many of the strongly pro-New Orleans Latins he interviewed had lived in several other U.S. cities before settling here.

"New Orleans seems more like my country—not an American city," said one. Another volunteered, "I feel more at home here than in other States."

Although it's risky to generalize about 10,000 to 30,000 persons, and some things have changed since 1948, comments of dozens of Latins living here today bear out many Painter conclusions—and add some new ones. Some of these generalizations on the local

acceptance of pre-Cuban refugee Latins follow:

The Latins here did not come in a sudden mass migration and consequently did not increase competition for jobs or create other economic dislocations. Although the bulk of the New Orleans Latin population moved here in the 1950's, they moved in slowly and steadily.

Far from increasing job competition, many found bilingual jobs, created by the postwar expansion of Latin commerce here, waiting for them.

Unlike other U.S. cities, the Latin physical appearance does not draw much attention in this decidedly mediterranean community.

Nor does a Spanish name raise many eyebrows. A Gonzales, for example, is not going to create much of a stir among the Guidrys and the Guglielmos.

And the machine gun-clatter of Spanish doesn't attract much notice in a city where "Aqui se Habla Español" signs abound, and where as International House officials boast, a Latin can get anything from a cab to a haircut without speaking a word of English.

As a Catholic, the Latin also is not going to draw any special scrutiny from natives of this city of hundreds of thousands of Catholics. (The minority of Latin Protestants are also provided for here through the First Spanish American Baptist Church at 1148 Felicity or the newly instituted Spanish service at First Methodist Church.)

Latins find similarities between New Orleans and their home nations which range from the Spanish architecture of the Vieux Carre, to the strong coffee, to the moist, tropical climate. In food, they can find the potatolike yucca, the black beans and the tropical fruits cherished in Central and parts of South America in several New Orleans markets.

If you tend to regard claims about local hospitality with skepticism, remember that New Orleans—as a city heavily dependent on Latin foreign trade—has long knocked itself out on the governmental and civic group level to be polite to Latins. Some of this might have rubbed off on the general populace.

The character and background of many of the Latins here also contributed to their speedy absorption into New Orleans society.

Most of the persons Painter interviewed in 1948 were from large Latin port cities, were from families heavily weighted occupationally toward commerce or the professions, and had attained a relatively high degree of education in their native countries or in Europe. Many others living here now were educated in local elementary, high schools and universities before they made their decision to live in New Orleans.

And a substantial number of today's New Orleans Latin residents are wives of U.S.-born citizens—which might also help them to adjust more quickly.

Another factor which might have kept Latins from welding themselves into a distinct and separate unit is that they came from at least 20 different Latin republics—each with its own national tradition, idioms and, in some cases, with built-in hostilities toward the neighboring nation.

Use the word Latin American in New York, and the native there will generally think in terms of Puerto Ricans; in Texas and California, of Mexicans. But in New Orleans, Latin American means:

From 3,500 to 7,000 Hondurans; groups of Nicaraguans, Cubans and Puerto Ricans who number at least 1,000 each; more than 300 Guatemalans and about the same number of Mexicans; smaller groups of Colombians, Costa Ricans, Argentines, Salvadoreans, Brazilians, Ecuadoreans and Venezuelans, and smatterings from almost every other country, island or colony in the Americas.

(The recent religious survey conducted in New Orleans may produce more precise estimates of the local Latin population, through ascertaining what language is spoken in the home.)

Attacks on Rightwing Groups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the January 26, 1962, issue of the Weekly Crusader which is published by Christian Crusade, 9 East Fourth Street, Tulsa, Okla., an article entitled "What's Behind the Attacks on the Rightwing Groups?" Under unanimous consent, I include the article in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WHAT'S BEHIND ATTACKS ON THE RIGHTWING GROUPS?

On November 26, the Communist Worker attacked the anti-Communist movements of America with a headline article by Daniel Mason which cried, "President Kennedy last weekend slammed hard at the ultrarightist, anti-Communist organizations as enemies of the American people."

In recent weeks those of us who are concerned about communism and have tried to lift our voices in opposition to its growing threat—internally and internationally—have found ourselves attacked, vilified, and lied about in many segments of the liberal American press and condemned by individuals, including the Executive.

Sincere anti-Communist workers of America have read in the papers that we are allied with the anti-Semitics, the anti-Catholics, the Nazis, and the Fascists. In the January 13, 1962, Saturday Evening Post, Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG, of Ohio, went so far as to say: "I believe the radical right today is an even deadlier threat to our democratic traditions and institutions than are the American adherents to communism."

When lovers of patriotism and Christian freedom are branded by an American Senator, as being a greater menace to the continuation of our constitutional form of government than the Communists themselves, we begin to see what a successful job the Communists have done in selling their own position and in creating suspicion of those groups that dare oppose godless, anti-Christ communism.

In advertising this particular editorial by Senator YOUNG, "Danger on the Right," the Saturday Evening Post took ads in newspapers across the country, headlining them, "American Nazis, Are They Really a Threat?" Under the picture of a Nazi, followed this senational announcement: "The American Nazi Party is a nest of hatemongers and it is only one of 1,000 radical rightwing groups. In this week's Post, a Senator speaks out in a voice of dissent. He rips into homegrown Fascists and tells why he thinks they are even more dangerous than Reds." People who are familiar with the editorial policy of the Saturday Evening Post will find this difficult to understand since the Saturday Evening Post has led all national magazines, in the last few years, in anti-Communist rightwing editorials. The article was followed by another in a later issue: "Danger on the Left," by BARRY GOLDWATER.

LIBERALS WAR ON PRO-FREEDOM GROUPS

In his article in the Post, Senator YOUNG tries to establish as a fact that anyone who is anti-Communist must be also anti-Jew, anti-Negro, anticlergy, anti-Republican, anti-Democrat, and antifreedom. He attempts to prove that the basis of conservative movements is fascism. He misrepresents the anti-Communist cause, falsely allies reputable profreedom groups with fascist groups and then praises the activities of organizations such as the Americans for Democratic Action, American Civil Liberties Union and the general liberal press. For some reason, it is apparent, the liberals of America have declared war against the anti-Communist, profreedom, pro-Christian conservative forces of America. Are our detractors really only misguided idealists who feel that we have reached the place where we should give up our national sovereignty and bow to world government organization, even though the Soviets would be the predominant force in it? Writers in every issue of the Communist Worker, Political Affairs and every pro-Communist or liberal newspaper and publication in the country delight in attacking the rightwing anti-Communist forces in America.

Yet the truth is that the anti-Communist forces referred to in these publications as the rightwingers, are the furthest thing from fascism. Fascism is national socialism, just as is communism. The anti-Communist conservative forces oppose fascism, socialism and communism—all national dictatorships—with all their strength. Christian Crusade would fight as hard against a Fascist as against a Communist, for they are the same. They are socialistic dictators who steal the wealth and fruits of man's labor. The extreme right today is the opposite of fascism, nazism and communism, total dictatorships under which the people have no rights except those granted by the government. Fascism, nazism, socialism, and communism are all found on the extreme left, because they are all alike.

The rightwingers, that is the reputable anti-Communist groups of the United States, with which Christian Crusade is affiliated, believe in freedom, in national sovereignty, in Christian constitutional government. They are opposed to government encroachment on their rights.

THE WHY OF THE ATTACKS

The reason behind these recent attacks against the anti-Communists is apparent. The anti-Communist movements of America have been growing. More and more people are listening to the voice of Christian Crusade and similar profreedom movements. Liberals have been pointed out as men who hold dangerous philosophies. Under liberalism, there is no right or wrong. Under liberalism, there are no facts or truths.

Under liberalism—the extreme liberalism—which attempts to buy friends with money, buy off enemies with money, solve all the problems of the world with money, we have seen our Government come closer and closer to bankruptcy. In 1930, the annual budget was $3 billion. In 1940 the Government was spending $9 million. In 1950, the Government had increased its annual expenditures to $40 billion. By 1960, to $80 billion per year. Present indications are that our Government soon will be spending over $90 billion per year.

Of the $80 billion the Government spent in 1960, $9 billion went for interest payments on back Government debt. Eleven cents out of every dollar of taxes goes to pay interest on Government debt. Yet in the last session of Congress, liberal Congressmen, afflicted with "spenditis," proposed legislation that would have added another $50 or $60 billion to our

present annual spending if their bills had passed. The anti-Communists say that this is liberalism spending a nation into its grave.

THE WHO OF THE ATTACKS

Who instigated the attacks against the anti-Communist organizations? Edward Hunter, expert on Communist brainwashing tactics, testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security in July 1961: "I have watched an actual grassroots movement against communism develop all across the United States of America, and I have noted a new, highly coordinated drive go into high gear to tear this anti-Communist movement up by the roots and destroy it. Though the grassroots movement was a spontaneous local development in most areas, there is nothing spontaneous nor local about the drive to crush it. It is an organized, psychological warfare operation that has all the marks of staff planning.

"A quick Red operation is attempting to push this administration, the press, and the public into a trap that would eliminate the anti-Communist program in the United States. The Reds have carefully analyzed the Kennedy administration's conciliatory and good will traits as vulnerable to exploitation.

"The Communist argument is simply that communism is no danger here in the United States, only abroad. They want us to drop the program that would enable our public and our troops to recognize the face of communism. It's their major line and a major danger to us. If the Reds can put it across—and they have already achieved some conspicuous successes with it—we shall have disarmed ourselves in the realm of mind warfare right here at home. Our submersion into communism would inevitably follow unless we should be able to awaken from the trance in time.

"The Reds have always demanded that inquiry of any kind into Red manipulation should be forbidden, calling it undemocratic, a reactionary or Fascist activity, illegal, unfriendly, hostile. They use 'rightist' or 'extreme rightist' as smear words to describe anti-Communist teachings. Opposition to communism is labeled by the Reds 'anti-Communist bias' and, since Americans are justifiably opposed to real bias, we are on that ground expected to avoid anticommunism itself. Yet any reference to pro-Communist bias is dismissed by them as 'McCarthyism.' This is the double standard. We are pressed not to engage in anticommunism, but if we don't, we leave the field open to the pro-Communists by default. This is the trap. Of course, the Reds have a psychological warfare planning section specifically given the responsibility of operations within the United States, their principal foe, whose free existence makes their world conquest impossible. To think otherwise would be worse than naive, it would be criminally stupid."

In the future, whenever you read an attack against an anti-Communist leader or organization, you can be sure it was instigated by Moscow. Although the attacker may not be a Communist, an intentional Red, nevertheless, he is carrying out the Communist goal of destroying and repudiating the pro-freedom forces in America, which challenge the forces of anti-Christ communism.

Don't be deceived by this talk about fascism. The anti-Communists are as much opposed to fascism as they are to communism. They deplore anti-Semitism, anti-Catholicism and all racial prejudice. The responsible, reputable anti-Communist groups have only one thing in mind; that is to serve God, preserve freedom and to keep America God's greatest Nation under the Living Son.

Christian Crusade is 14 years old. When we first raised objections to the United Nations and to foreign aid to Communist countries, we were virtually alone. Fourteen years ago, I would go into a major city of the United States to deliver an anti-Communist address, and I was lucky to get 30 or 40 people out to hear me. The American people were not concerned about growing communism internally or the growing threat of communism internationally.

COUNTERACTION BY PEOPLE SHOWS NEW STRENGTH

But with Cuba's going Communist, with the recent public admission that our Government has been underwriting the Communist governments of Poland and Yugoslavia with foreign aid and military supplies, the American people began to open their eyes. Thanks to the courageous speeches of a few men in Congress and a handful of patriotic magazines and newspapers that printed the truth, the American people began to be concerned.

Prior to the last few months, efforts to alert the people to the progress and menace of Communist subversion, were given the hush-hush treatment. Anti-Communist books were ignored by publishers and reviewers, termed "red herrings" by public officials and dismissed as crackpot ravings by a complacent citizenry.

However, with mounting Soviet pressure upon the United States everywhere, a general movement of resistance and counteraction spontaneously sprung up all across the country. There are literally scores of responsible organizations trying to alert all the American people. Many are doing excellent, effective work in the fight against communism.

OPEN MASSIVE SUBVERSION

This new factor of coordinated pro-America opinion has brought about a sharp change in international Communist policy. Eighty-one Marxist-Leninist parties, assembled from all over the world, in Moscow on December 5, 1960, issued a strategy statement—a Red manifesto—against the rising tide of pro-Americanism in the United States. On July 29, 1961, the Soviet Communist Party reiterated its statement of tactics to be employed against the anti-Communists in the United States. Also in July, the weekly Worker called for a united front of all leftists, both Communist and non-Communist against patriotic Americans and their organizations.

Thus began a new, massive effort at subversion of the United States, this time no longer covert but openly and defiantly undertaken.

The anti-Communist movements in America need the financial support of people who believe in freedom. They are fighting not only a damnable political philosophy but also an organized, militant atheism. The rightwing, anti-Communist organizations are on God's side. They are the opposite of leftwing, pro-Communist groups that would destroy America and subjugate us all to a slavemaster in Moscow.

Effects of Out-of-Door Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George W. "Heap" Alexander:

HUNTING AND FISHING AIN'T PEANUTS

(By George W. "Heap" Alexander)

A recently completed national survey of hunting and fishing in the United States brought forth some remarkable facts. This was the second such nationwide economic study of sport fishing and hunting in our country. The first was made in 1955, the recent one covered the year 1960. The survey work was done by the U.S. Department of the Interior, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. Funds derived from excise taxes on sporting arms and ammunition and on fishing tackle paid for the survey costs, and the survey was made at the request of the States. The 1960 survey shows these out-of-door activities are even more significant now to our national economy and way of life than they were in 1955. Here are some of the many revealing facts disclosed by this study:

In 1960, 30 million citizens hunted and fished, as against 24 million in 1955. These people, in 1960, spent $4 billion in their activities, as compared to $3 billion in 1955. Considering and comparing such sum in more everyday terms, this $4 billion was more money than U.S. citizens spent for physicians' services, telephone bills, radio or television receivers. Staking the money laid out for hunting and fishing against other sports shows the remarkable fact that the money spent in 1960 in the United States for all baseball, boxing, basketball, football, movies, theater, concerts, and other spectator sports combined amounts to less than one-half spent on these two sports. To again compare: $4 billion would buy about 666,666 top-priced cars, and at least twice as many low-priced cars. Such figures are really big business, affecting national economy greatly and big enough to filter on down to county economic level like Clarion County.

In doing all this hunting and fishing, and spending these sums into our economy, these people did some traveling. They traveled to the tune of 13.2 billion miles. That kind of car traveling represents a whale of a lot of piston pushing. It represents 55,000 trips to the moon or 530,000 trips around the world. Last week's three-orbit flight of Colonel Glenn, to which you and I and most of the world thrilled, covered just approximately 5 hours' time to go around the world three times. At the same fantastc rate of speed he traveled, it would take him 100 years in outer space to cover the mileage piled up in the big open spaces, by rod and gun users, right here on earth.

Of the two sports, fishing led in numbers participating and money spent. A total of 14,750,000 men and 5,683,000 women fished in 1960; and they spent $3 billion. A total of 11,169,000 men and 860,000 women hunted in 1960 and in doing so spent $1 billion. From 1955 to 1960, the number of fishermen increased 22 percent; the number of hunters increased 24 percent. Their combined expenditures for the two sports increased one-third. Small game hunters outnumbered big game hunters 12 million to 6 million, and fresh-water fishermen outnumbered salt-water fishermen 21 million to 6 million.

To bring this business closer home, let's go to a spot about 80 miles north of us on a single Sunday a few weeks ago. The spot is Presque Isle Bay in Erie County, and the business is ice fishing for sport. On this one day 4,000 fishermen tried their luck fishing through the ice. The average catch was nine fish per fisherman. Estimating these fine eating yellow perch at three to a pound, the overall catch approximated 6 tons. We have no way of proving it, but each fisherman we bet spent at least 50

cents for bait. That would be $2,000. The money spent by these 4,000 citizens, many who came a long way, for gear, bait, and travel expenses, would not be a trifling sum. This all went on in one little spot, one day, United States. In addition, 4,000 people took on some good clear winter air activity and had a good time.

Since all recreation is increasing yearly—with more people going and with less places to go—with our economy increasingly affected, it is very apparent that much thought must be given the use and conservation of outdoor space, as well as the potentials of outer space.

Foot Soldiers Arsenal Modernized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1962

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following:

VISTAS IN SCIENCE

(By Thomas R. Henry)

FOOT SOLDIER'S ARSENAL MODERNIZED

Another war will not be altogether a combat with rockets, missiles, and nuclear bombs and with the fighting forces hundreds of miles apart.

The mud-slogging doughboy still will have his place—perhaps the most important of all in the long run. He will be armed in a fashion that will make his predecessors in other wars—even those of 1942—seem rather primitively equipped. And, as of old, he will meet his foe face to face.

More than 30 new weapons—quite aside from rockets and missiles—which were unknown as late as the Korean war, have been produced, and largely issued, by Army Ordnance engineers.

Among them are a new rifle, a new kind of machine gun, a grenade-launcher, a light antitank weapon and antipersonnel mine. Outstanding, according to an ordnance report, is the new M-14 rifle which can fire 20 rounds without reloading. Previous Army rifles have been limited to eight rounds.

VERSATILE MACHINEGUN

The new M-60 machinegun is air-cooled and can be fired either from a tripod or a lighter bipod. A 90-millimeter recoilless rifle, the M-67, is an accurate antitank gun with a considerably greater range than the older bazooka type weapons.

The newest rocket grenade antitank weapon, the M-72, is small, light and easy to operate. Made of aluminum and plastic, it weighs only a little over 4 pounds. The M-79 grenade launcher has a range that bridges the gap between the distance a hand grenade can be thrown and the minimum range of a 81 millimeter mortar.

The Army found an already developed antitank weapon in France and has purchased from the French Government rights to all its models. All are guided missiles.

The M-18 antipersonnel mine is a device for defense against massed infantry attacks and for defense of isolated outposts. Projecting a fan-shaped array of high velocity fragments parallel to the ground in a chosen direction from a remote position, it exceeds all previous models in both range and lethality.

Three new tanks for an armored division have been put into production. One is a main battle tank, the M-60. It carries a 105-millimeter gun which gives it significantly greater firepower than tanks used in the past. Its diesel engine gives it increased speed and maneuverability and its new infrared fire control provides for night fighting.

Among the new vehicles is the M-151, which resembles the World War II jeep but weighs less, can travel faster and cruise farther. Other vehicles are the mechanical mule, a half-ton transporter and the Mighty Mite, developed by the Army for the Marine Corps. Also in this area is the Goer, a new departure in the design of military wheeled vehicles. It can, says an ordnance report, "go anywhere and makes possible movement of supplies and fuel to areas which are inaccessible to other military vehicles."

Now entering production is a new amphibious cargo carrier, which can be used as a personnel carrier to accommodate 10 men in addition to the driver. To retrieve tanks disabled on the battlefield the Army is produing a tank-recovery vehicle designed to lift and recover the heaviest armored tanks with comparative ease.

OTHER IMPROVEMENTS

Two new howitzer weapon systems which can cruise further and fire at longer range are being developed. They will replace similar vehicles used during the Korean conflict.

The artillery will be provided with two new self-propelled weapons which will permit better frontline support of the infantry. One carries a 175-millimeter gun, but weighs only 62,000 pounds compared with its predecessor which weighed 100,000 pounds.

For infantry battle groups the Ordnance Corps is developing an atomic weapons system in two types. Both fire projectiles which are larger in diameter than the gun tubes and are fastened on pistons inserted in the gun tubes.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

Tribute to Col. John H. Glenn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, since his history-making flight on February 20, Col. John H. Glenn has been receiving the plaudits of people the world over. But rather than bask in the limelight as he could so easily do, Colonel Glenn is the first one to speak of the team effort involved. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix "There Stands a Man," an editorial from the Paterson News which expresses, I believe, the feeling of all of us about this fine American.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THERE STANDS A MAN

When John H. Glenn stood yesterday before Members of the U.S. Congress to receive honors reserved only for the elite great of our country, it was well said by more than one legislator:

"There stands a man."

And a man he is, this rather slight, freckled, balding 40-year-old astronaut whose odyssey into orbit last week has projected the whole Nation into space delirium and proclaimed to the world our determined march into the future.

America's astronauts—Colonel Glenn and his associates—represent what we have all been taught to regard as typical Americans.

There he stood, on the rostrum in the Nation's Capitol, a modest, praise-sharing son, husband, and father who less than a week ago had risked his life in an awesome challenge of space to orbit three times around the universe.

Yet it wasn't Colonel Glenn who performed this miracle, at least in his mind. It was his teammates; it was the scientists who had wrapped up the package of miracle ingredients which made the flight possible; it was the thousands of workers who had labored in the creation of all the intricate parts which combined in the final effort to make the flight possible.

Where stood Presidents of the country, generals like Eisenhower and MacArthur and Marshall to address Congress and the country, there stood John Glenn, a young American lifted to exultant heights in the skies but with feet firmly on the ground.

Through all of the pulsating honors bestowed on him since his orbital triumph, Colonel Glenn has always spoken of "we," and his manner of saying it reveals the depth of his sincerity. He means just as he said when he told Congress:

"When I think of past sessions that involved heads of state and equally notable persons, I can only say I am almost humble to know that you consider our efforts to be in the same class."

Colonel Glenn's performance in his historical flight and his behavior since is perhaps the most powerful reply to President Kennedy's inaugural challenge to Americans to ask not what their country could do for them but rather what they can do for their country.

Having risked his life in a manner awesome even to contemplate, he is prepared to venture still further into the mysteries of space should his country call.

And how did he feel about the cheers of the quarter-million who stood in a drenching rain in the Capital to see their new hero?

He had the "same hard-to-define feeling inside" he gets when the American flag goes by.

"Let us hope that none of us ever loses that feeling," he challenged and it is the fervent hope here that millions of Americans, young and old, will feel the same way about it. Especially is this so in an era of weirdness when there are some in our midst who would chant: "Better Red than dead."

This is a great American, this Hero Glenn, a son of all of us.

He and his associate astronauts have charted the way to a new world which is in the infancy of its discovery.

One of the leaders of the space command put it in perspective when he said that even while we're cheering this notable exploit, we are merely applauding a beginning as did those who hailed the Wright brothers in their crude plane.

In the lifetimes of millions of our present-day youth, there will be traffic in orbit, trips to the moon, and other planets. We have just started and as Glenn told Congress yesterday, the avenues of discovery which will flow from all phases of the space research dwarf all that has gone before.

And smiling John Glenn goes down in history as the pioneer, the Wilbur and Orville Wright of American space achievement.

Constitutional Right Against Unlawful Search and Seizure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the Columbian Lawyers Association conducted a symposium at the Concord Hotel, Catskill Mountains, N.Y., during the weekend of February 22, 1962. One of the panelists was Mr. Sylvester Cosentino, former president of the Columbian Lawyers Association and practicing attorney in the city of New York, and another panelist was Mr. Joseph Cerbone, assistant district attorney, Bronx County. The subject under discussion was the effect of recent Supreme Court decisions upon the enforcement of law and the trend of prosecution as the result of the case of *Mapps* v. *Ohio* decided by the U.S. Supreme Court (367 U.S. 343).

Mr. Cosentino presented a paper from the viewpoint of the defense counsel whereas Mr. Cerbone presented a discussion from the viewpoint of the enforcement officers. The discussion was very provocative, stimulating, and lively. Mr. Cerbone stressed the obstacles with which the assistant district attorney encounters in the enforcement of law and the ridiculous extent to which certain Justices are going in the interpretation of the case, Mapps against Ohio. Mr. Cosentino presented an analysis of the principles underlying the constitutional protections against unreasonable search and seizure and gave a panoramic view of the entire subject. Mr. Nicholas Iannuzzi presided at the symposium and was the moderator during the question-and-answer period. I believe that those interested in the preservation of constitutional rights will profit by a reading of the paper presented by Mr. Sylvester Cosentino which follows:

SPEECH MADE TO COLUMBIAN LAWYERS ASSOCIATION ON FEBRUARY 24, 1962, AT CONCORD HOTEL, CATSKILL MOUNTAINS, N.Y.

At the outset, I wish to state that the subject of search and seizure cannot be covered in one lecture. This subject has many ramifications. At this time I wish to give credit to Kings County Judge Nathan Sobel for his treatise on this subject, and from which I obtained most of my material.

During my short talk, I will try to cover the points which I feel you may encounter in some of your cases. At the outset may I state that the enforcement authorities, police and Federal agents are now contriving gimmicks to circumvent the theory and law established by the *Mapps* v. *Ohio* case decided by the U.S. Supreme Court (367 U.S. 343), which is the latest case decided on search and seizure.

Up until the time the Mapps case was decided, the New York State courts permitted without limitations the admission in criminal trials of evidence obtained by police as as result of unreasonable search and seizure.

Many State courts and legislatures felt that it was a matter of discretion whether or not to adopt the "exclusionary rule."

The exclusionary rule is the nonadmissability of evidence obtained by search and seizure.

New York State must now follow the ruling in the Mapps case, by virtue of the fourth amendment to the Constitution of the United States "the right of the people to be secure in their persons, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable causes; supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized."

Mapps has now made the "exclusionary rule" applicable to all the States via the 14th amendment.

You must remember that the "exclusionary rule" is almost wholly applicable to the "contraband cases."

For example, the State courts decisions are almost exclusively concerned with possession of narcotics, weapons, policy slips, and other gambling paraphernalia. The

Federal court decisions are concerned with these plus possession of illicit whisky, counterfeit coin and stolen property transported in interstate commerce.

In discussing unlawful search and seizure we must also discuss the lawless conduct of police which the "exclusionary rule" is designed to deter.

There are no statistics available to establish how many law-abiding citizens are subjected to detention and humiliation and their persons and homes searched in violation of law without "contraband" or other evidence of crime being uncovered. According to the statistics available—in 1960—in New York City, there were 35,000 felony arrests, of which there were 11,000 discharges. There were 100,000 misdemeanor arrests which resulted in 37,000 discharges.

Mr. Justice Clark in the Mapps case said:

"The ignoble shortcut to convictions tends to destroy the entire system of constitutional restraints upon which the liberty of the people rest. * * * Our decision, founded on reason and truth, gives to the individual no more than that which the Constitution guarantees him, to the police officer no less than that to which honest law enforcement is entitled, and, to the courts, that judicial integrity so necessary in the true administration of justice." (81 S. Ct. at 1695).

With that eloquent statement, we may conclude the practical discussion of the effect of Mapp, by observing that to the presumption of innocence, the privilege against self-incrimination and the right not to be convicted by coerced confessions, we now add the freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures even when they product evidence of guilt. The courts of this State have done reasonably well in coping with these basic principles of reason and decency. They have caused neither breakdown in law enforcement nor failure of justice. This newest safeguard articulates an ancient principle that ours is a government of laws in which the end does not justify the means. We are now commanded to exclude unconstitutionally obtained evidence, something which many conscientious trial judges have been doing for a long time.

In other words, it will be the Constitution and the law, which the "exclusionary rule" is designed to enforce and which the constable has violated, which sets the criminal free.

It is important to note that not all, but only "unreasonable" searches are prohibited. The Constitution protects the "person" as well as the "houses" and "papers and effects" from unreasonable search.

The history of the constitutional prohibition against unreasonable search and seizure is basic to an understanding of its legal significance and scope.

For discussion of the history of the fourth amendment see *Boyd* v. *U.S.* (116 U.S. 616); *SGRO* v. *U.S.* (287 U.S. 206); *Harris* v. *U.S.* (331 U.S. 145, 157–163); *Rabinowitz* v. *U.S.* (339 U.S. 56) and cases cited.

For history of search warrant statutes (see *People* v. *Kenipner* (208 N.Y. 16)).

In 1949 *Wolf* v. *Colorado* (338 U.S. 25)—a due process issue clarified the issue by announcing that the (security of one's privacy against arbitarary intrusion by the police) is "implicit in the concept of ordered liberty" and as such enforcible against the States.

"We have no hesitation in stating that were a State affirmatively to sanction such police incursion into privacy it would run counter to the guarantee of the 14th amendment" (p. 28).

In simple terms this meant that State legislation (or judicial decision) sanctioning (1) the issuance of search warrants without probable cause or (2) expanding the right of police arrest without requiring prior probable cause or (3) permitting searchers contemporaneously with or incidental to an unreasonable arrest, would violate Federal due process (see *Marcus* v. *Search Warrants* (367 U.S. 717)).

But the Court in Wolf added that because of the contrariety of views in the States with respect to the "exclusionary rule" that rule would not be imposed upon the States so long as the States imposed other sanctions (criminal prosecutions and civil suits) against police conduct in violation of the Constitution. The exclusionary rule therefore stood in the anomalous position of a constitutional requirement which could be disobeyed by the States. The State courts stood in the anomalous position of permitting convictions by evidence obtained in violation of the State and Federal Constitutions.

It wasn't too long before Federal officers encouraged State police to search and seize the unconstitutional evidence for use in the Federal courts. This was called the silver platter doctrine, and when Federal officers unconstitutionally obtained evidence which would not be admissible in Federal courts, often they simply turned the evidence over to State officers for use in State courts. This was the "reverse" silver platter doctrine.

In a series of cases culminating with *Elkins* v. *United States* (364 U.S. 206) the silver platter doctrine was outlawed. For a detailed discussion of all silver platter doctrine cases prior to Mapp, see "Admissibility of evidence, et cetera, a Federal problem," North Western L. Rev. November–December 1960.

The Mapp decision, June 19, 1961, finally determined all controversy with respect to the exclusionary rule in all courts, Federal and State.

Mapp holds that:

1. The exclusionary rule is of constitutional origin and as such it is a command of the due process clause of the 14th amendment upon the courts of the States to exclude in criminal trials all unconstitutional evidence obtained as a result of an "unreasonable" search.

2. The "exclusionary rule" will be enforced by the Supreme Court as strictly against the States as it is against the Federal Government.

It must be noted that the search warrant statutes Federal (FRCP 416) and most States, including New York (CCP. 792), are limited to:

1. Stolen or embezzled property (referred to as fruits of a crime);

2. Property used as a means of committing a crime, referred to as instrumentalities; and

3. Property possessed with intent to use in the commission of a crime (contraband).

A warrant cannot be issued for papers, records, letters and documents which are referred to as mere evidence to be used for the purpose of convicting an indicted or prospective defendant.

But at times, papers et cetera, may also be used as instrumentalities as for example forged checks, shipping documents or false passports. (See *U.S.* v. *Kirschenblatt*, 16 F. 2d 202) and *Gouled* v. *U.S.*, 285 U.S. 298, 309, 311).

Instrumentalities could include blood stained garments or shoes found at the commission of a crime. *U.S.* v. *Guido*, 257 F. 201, et cetera.

Contraband, is of course, weapons, narcotics, counterfeit, papers, such as policy slips and bookmaking plays and records.

The fourth amendment expressly sanctions reasonable searches for fruits, instrumentalities or contraband.

But under the fourth amendment no search for mere evidence is reasonable.

A statute permitting the issuance of a warrant for mere evidence would be unconstitutional under the fourth and fifth amendments. A statute requiring the compulsory production of such evidence before a legislature or administrative agency or a grand jury or a court would be unconstitutional by virtue of the fifth amendment (no one can be compelled to be a witness against himself in a criminal case).

In *Gouled* v. *U.S.*, 225 U.S. 298, 306:

Where one accused of a crime is obliged to supply evidence against himself or whether such evidence be obtained by an illegal search of his premises, or seizure of his private papers, the result is the same. In either case he is the unwilling source of the evidence, and the fifth amendment forbids that he shall be compelled to be a witness against himself in a criminal case.

This case further establishes the law that an unlawful or unreasonable search for papers to be used merely as evidence violates the defendant's privilege against self-incrimination. It of course violates the fifth amendment.

The case of *U.S.* v. *Lefkowitz*, 285 U.S. 452–464–465 holds: A search whether with a validly issued warrant or incidental to an arrest without a warrant is restricted to fruits, instrumentalities or contraband. If the product of the search is merely evidentiary in nature, the search is unreasonable and unconstitutional. The officers may be armed with a valid search warrant or the search may, by every other standard, be a reasonable search incidental to a lawful arrest, nevertheless if it produces merely evidentiary materials it is with respect to such evidence an unreasonable search and seizure and such evidence may not be used to convict the defendant.

Peculiarly—it has never been decided whether mere evidence may be searched for and seized if found on the person—but it is the opinion of many criminal lawyers and judges in criminal courts that if such evidence were seized because of the interplay of the fourth and fifth amendments, such search and seizure would be unconstitutional.

To sum up—

If a search is unreasonable for any reason, the seizure of any evidence, whether contraband or mere evidence violates the fourth amendment. But when mere evidence is seized in an unreasonable search the court has held in many decisions that such seizure violates the fourth and fifth amendments.

But if a search is reasonable by every other standard, it becomes unreasonable solely by the fact that mere evidence is seized. In such a case heavy reliance is placed on the fact that the defendant's privilege has been violated.

Amply stated: The police cannot lawfully seize from the person or the home or the automobile of a defendant that which he cannot be compelled to produce in court.

A classic case on search and seizure and the manner in which agents will try to twist the facts to get around the Mapp case may I relate the facts in a case in which I went to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Carlo, et al., v. *U.S. of America*—

On May 24, 1960, Federal agents of the Bureau of Narcotics entered the apartment of one John Carlo, and seized a brown paper bag containing six envelopes, within which were 6 ounces of heroin and two cardboard boxes, one containing 1½ quarter kilos of heroin and the other with $21,000 in currency.

After the arrest, but before the indictment, I made a motion to suppress the evidence and return of the $21,000, on the ground that they were obtained by an unreasonable search and seizure in violation of his constitutional rights. A hearing was held by a Federal judge. The testimony was as follows:

Agent D testified: "I was across the street from the defendant's apartment house; I saw the defendant's wife leave the premises;

shortly thereafter I saw defendant's brother enter the premises. I followed the man up to the second floor and saw him enter the Carlo apartment and waited in the hallway until other agents came along with Mrs. Carlo and a child. At that time, one of the agents told me that Mrs. Carlo was under arrest, and that she wanted to leave her child in the house" (the circumvention of the law now begins, the agents are now bringing in first the arrest then a consent on the part of one of the defendants for them to enter the apartment). "Mrs. Carlo entered the apartment followed by the child and the agents, and I walked in. At that time another agent placed the brother of the defendant under arrest for a supposed sale of narcotics in the early part of February of that year." Agent further testifies that after the arrest of Joseph De Carlo (again the circumvention of the unlawful search and seizure rule) because no search could be made unless it was incidental to the arrest. He further testified that after the arrest he found the narcotics and the money. In order for a search and seizure to be legal or lawful there must be probable cause for same, and in this case the agents testified that they had observed the sale made by the defendant, Joseph De Carlo, in February of 1960, and arrest took place May 24, 1960, and because of that sale, and because of his arrest and arrest of Mrs. Carlo and her permission they had the right to search the property.

Judge Murphy who decided my application denied the suppression of the narcotics, but granted the return of the $21,000. However, the Government applied for a resettlement stating that the money had been turned over to the Internal Revenue Department, and Judge Murphy then reversed himself and denied my application for the suppression of the narcotics and the return of the money.

The Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed on the ground that there was insufficient time for the agents to obtain a search warrant, and further stating that they were constrained to hold with the seizure of the small brown paper bag and the examination and retention of its contents by the agents were lawful and proper, and that when John Carlo admitted that they belonged to him there was probable cause to arrest him and as incidental to this arrest the search of the apartment for narcotics was lawful. That none of the arrests was a mere pretense for the making of a search of the Carlo apartment. That they refused the return of the currency because of the fact that the Internal Revenue Department had filed a lien against the defendant and his wife, in an amount larger than the $21,000 that they found.

PROBABLE CAUSE

That term is included in the fourth amendment and in most State counterparts. For a history of the requirement of probable cause see *Henry* v. *U.S.*, (361 U.S. 98) and our statutes governing the issuance of warrants to arrest. See CCP section 150, subdivision 2, our statutes permitting an arrest without a warrant: see CCP 177, subdivisions 3, 4 and 5, and our search warrant statutes CCP 796. Thus there must be no arrest, with or without a warrant, except upon probable cause, and no search warrant may issue except upon probable cause. The determination of probable cause must be based solely on facts and circumstances known to the arresting officer before the arrest, or in case of a crime committed in his presence, contemporaneously with the arrest. It should be observed that the nature of the proof to establish probable cause for a search warrant, and for an arrest with or without a warrant may be different. The former is primarily directed at the product, i.e., fruits, instrumentalities, or contraband—of the crime and the latter is directed at the person who committed the crime.

A case which defines probable cause is *Brinegar* v. *U.S.*, 338 U.S. 160.

"In dealing with probable cause, however, as the very name implies, we deal with probabilities. These are not technical; they are the factual and practical considerations of everyday life on which reasonable and prudent men, not legal technicians, act. The standard of proof is accordingly correlative to what must be proved."

The pertinent comment is that the fact and circumstances to establish probable cause will differ with the kind of crime committed. The kind of information to establish probable causes which the police officer will obtain in a homicide, robbery, and burglary will be vastly different as a practical matter from the kind customarily obtained in the policy and narcotic cases. As a practical matter it must be repeated that rarely is there a product of a search in homicide, robbery, and burglary cases. It is also important to note that many arrests for such crimes are made while the crime is being committed in the presence of the police officer. Probable cause will be an issue mainly in connection with arrests made in private premises and on occasion in automobiles for the narcotic and gambling crimes. Probable cause requires only knowledge of facts and circumstances which would convince the police officer that the person arrested is probably the person who committed the crime.

Probable causes may become stale before the arrest or search occurs. It may be noted that a search warrant must be executed in 10 days *CCP 802 and SGRO* v. *U.S.*, 287 U.S. 206, and more recently *Di Bella* v. *U.S.*, 284 F. 2d 897, 906, and 907.

I can go on for many hours on this subject and not cover it completely, but may I conclude by saying that the courts, because of the Mapps case have become more liberal in deciding when a search and seizure is illegal. You must bear in mind there are two methods by which a search and seizure can be tested as to its legality and that is (1) a motion on written papers before a trial, when information is brought to the attention of the defendant that there is an unlawful search and seizure, and (2) if the question arises during the trial then, the court, must call for a voir dire and decide after a hearing, as to whether or not search and seizure was illegal.

It has become the common practice in the courts of the city of New York, and that includes the county courts and the Court of General Sessions, that a motion should be made in part I before a trial, if the question of unlawful search and seizure is one of law, but if it is one of fact, the trial judge must decide the same during the trial. In the Federal courts you proceed under rule 41e, motion must be made in the calendar or motion part if based on law, and if facts of unlawful search and seizure are brought to the attention of the defendant, before the trial, motion must be made in the motion part. If facts of unlawful search and seizure are discovered during the trial, then the trial court must hold a voir dire on the same. Under the substantive law of search and seizure the following are very, very important:

1. Incidental search of fixed premises.
2. Area of search.
3. Exploratory search.
4. Practicability of obtaining search warrant.
5. Search of automobiles.
6. Seizure of unrelated crime.
7. Poisoned evidence.
8. Searches by consent (waiver).

1. INCIDENTAL SEARCH OF FIXED PREMISES

With a warrant an officer may search the premises.

Without a warrant—only when man is arrested then the officer has the right to search the premises.

Only in certain cases as incident to arrest there is no sanction for the search of a private dwelling without a warrant.

2. AREA OF SEARCH

Search warrant must prescribe with particularity the premises to be searched.

3. EXPLORATORY SEARCH

At the time of issuance of warrant, the judge signing same predetermines the motivation and purpose of the search.

In exploratory search there is generally an arrest often with probable cause, but the arrest is a pretext for the search.

See page 61, *U.S.* v. *Lefkowitz*.

4. PRACTICABILITY OF OBTAINING WARRANT

Even if arrest is valid—facts may establish a sufficient opportunity to obtain a warrant and this can be considered on the question as to whether or not the incidental search was legal.

5. SEARCH OF AUTOMOBILES

(a) Warrant is necessary to search automobiles.

(b) If one is stopped for violation of traffic law, does not give officer right to search the car. Only in drunken driving case can an officer search the car to look for open whiskey bottles (because there are no fruits, instrumentalities or contraband found in car).

6. SEIZURE OF UNRELATED CRIME

If an officer must trespass to obtain the product, but either as a seizure or as the product of an incidental search, unrelated contraband in open view may be seized (*U.S.* v. *Charles*, 8 F. 2d 302).

But if the contraband is not in open view then, it is no longer subject to seizure but it may under two circumstances be subject to lawful search incidental to an original lawful arrest.

I will generalize:

1. On the person—Any product found on the person after a valid arrest is legal evidence.

2. Hidden contraband—If hidden in a desk, closet, drawer, et cet., the right to search and seize depends upon the reasonableness of the search incidental to the original arrest.

7. POISONED EVIDENCE

The product, i.e., the fruits, instrumentalities or contraband of an unlawful or unreasonable search is not admissible in evidence against the accused.

Also excluded is evidence of what police saw or observed in the premises even if the product was not seized (*Williams* v. *U.S.*, 263 F. 2d 487; *McGinnis* v. *U.S.*, 227 F. 2d 598; *McDonald* v. *U.S.*, 335 U.S., 451–455–456).

"We find no basis on the cases or in logic for distinguishing between the introduction into evidence of physical objects illegally taken and the introduction of testimony concerning objects illegally observed."

8. SEARCHES BY CONSENT (WAIVER)

If we consent to a search all products seized are admissible in evidence.

It is incumbent upon the people to prove by clear and convincing proof that such consent was given (*Rigby* v. *U.S.*, 247 F. 2d 584; *Amos* v. *U.S.*, 255 U.S. 313).

Very important—even if an officer has a warrant to search before the search and seizure becomes legal he must inform the person or persons in the premises of his purpose for being there.

Consent cannot be found from submissiveness or the neglect or failure to argue with a police officer. In fact intimidation and duress are almost necessarily implicit in such situations (*Higgins* v. *U.S.*, 333 U.S. 18).

In Higgins, the householder said, "all right"; the officer was "perfectly welcome to look anywhere in the room"; in Johnson, the officer testified the householder "stepped

back acquiescently and admitted us." In both cases it was held there was no consent.

I hope that I have imparted sufficient information to give you a working knowledge of the question of search and seizure.

I wish to thank the officers and the program committee of the organization for having invited me here today, and I wish to thank you for attending this short talk.

Salute to Colorado Springs and to Maj. Gen. Marshall Sylvester Carter, U.S. Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, two newspaper items last weekend called attention to the magnificent attractions of the city of Colorado Springs and its surrounding area in my State of Colorado.

In the Washington Evening Star, for Saturday, March 10, a biographical sketch described the qualifications of the new Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Maj. Gen. Marshall Sylvester Carter. I note two paragraphs of this article:

> The happiest tour of duty for the Carters was the 4-year assignment at Colorado Springs, Colo. General Carter was chief of staff of the North American Air Defense Command on working days and an outdoorsman during his time off.
>
> Although he was born on an Army post, Fortress Monroe, Va., September 16, 1909, and has lived all over the world, he lists Colorado Springs as his home.

Another item, in This Week, Sunday supplement, is titled "Take a Diplomat's Tour of America." It is written by Angier Biddle Duke, Chief of Protocol of the United States. Mr. Duke says that in showing the United States to distinguished foreign visitors he tries to suggest places other than the large metropolitan centers, to give a picture in depth of our country. Of the 10 spots listed by Mr. Duke, the third is Colorado Springs.

People everywhere are discovering the wonders of the Pikes Peak region, and learning that it was here that Katharine Lee Bates was inspired to write "America the Beautiful."

Colorado Springs began as a tourist mecca and a city of fine homes. It still boasts these attractions, but much has been added in recent years—the splendid new Air Force Academy a few miles to the north; the North American Air Defense Command now being given a new hard site under Cheyenne Mountain; Fort Carson, where the new 5th Division is being activated; the new headquarters of the International Typographical Union, and a whole host of other private and public installations and enterprises. A major cultural attraction is Colorado College, a fine private liberal arts institution.

Recreation in the area is unparalleled at any season of the year. Accomodations range from the modest to the fabulous, as embodied in the internationally renowned Broadmoor Hotel. The Cheyenne Mountain Zoo is one of America's best.

Thousands of new people are continually discovering this overwhelmingly beautiful spot and deciding that this is the place to live. The economy there is growing at an unprecedented rate, and is providing jobs for the many who would like to settle in Colorado Springs.

I hope that those of my colleagues who have never had the pleasure of visiting Colorado Springs will avail themselves of the first opportunity to do so. It will be an eye-opening and thoroughly enjoyable experience, I can promise.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt from the article by Mr. Angier Biddle Duke in This Week magazine for March 11; together with an article from the Washington Evening Star for March 10 titled "Carter Well Qualified for Intelligence Post."

There being no objection, the excerpt and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLORADO SPRINGS

Here and in the surrounding countryside you get a feeling for the infinite variety of America. You're within easy driving distance of cattle ranches, irrigated farms, ski resorts—including the famed ski and cultural resort at Aspen—and the mining towns of the storied Old West. The plains, streams and valleys recall the spirits of folk heroes such as Kit Carson and Jim Bridger; and Leadville, even today the thriving center of a mining district, was once the home of the legendary Senator H. A. W. Tabor and his wife, Baby Doe.

Nearby is Pike's Peak, rising 14,100 feet from the front range. There's a wonderful cog railway, and a highway, too, to take you to the top, where on a clear day you can see for 100 miles in all directions.

At the foot of the Rampart range, 13 miles north of Colorado Springs, lies the 17,500-acre United States Air Force Academy. Its modern design and architecture reflect the youth and energy of its young men who will soon be flying the space craft of the future.

CARTER WELL QUALIFIED FOR INTELLIGENCE POST

"Pat" Carter, the Nation's new No. 2 intelligence officer, "is a box of brains," according to his friends.

More formally known as Maj. Gen. Marshall Slyvester Carter, U.S. Army, the 52-year-old soldier-diplomat will be the Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, succeeding Gen. Charles P. Cabell, of the Air Force, who resigned.

The White House made it clear yesterday that General Carter will be a man of vast influence in the intelligence community. He will be the principal executive officer of the CIA and will have considerably wider powers than his predecessor.

General Carter will be given the CIA's seat on the U.S. Intelligence Board, while the new head of CIA, John A. McCone, will preside as chairman.

VOICE IN DECISIONS

The new status of General Carter's job automatically will give him a clear vote in national security decisionmaking, but administration sources say that Mr. McCone's method of operation will give the general even more scope.

Unlike retired CIA Director Allan Dulles, Mr. McCone prefers to delegate a great deal of power to his top men. Also, it is said, he is more open to suggestions from his subordinates.

General Carter's friends say that this will suit Pat just fine. He is used to taking hold of a difficult situation and running it with quiet efficiency.

The late Gen. George C. Marshall, who made General Carter his office director when he was Secretary of Defense, once wrote this of General Carter: "One of the top men of the Army. An officer of the highest integrity and dependability. Has broad knowledge of world affairs and figures."

Former Secretary of Defense Robert A. Lovett, who used General Carter in the same capacity, said: "General Carter is an officer of unusual ability. He is eminently qualified for high position of trust and responsibility."

TO REDUCE HUNTING TIME

There is one thing about the job General Carter will not like, however. It will take him away from hunting and fishing, the hobby of both the general and his wife, Preot.

The happiest tour of duty for the Carters was the 4-year assignment at Colorado Springs, Colo. General Carter was Chief of Staff of the North American Air Defense Command on working days and an outdoorsman during his time off.

Although he was born on an Army post, Fortress Monroe, Va., September 16, 1909, and has lived all over the world, he lists Colorado Springs as his home.

He came by his brains and his liking for the Army naturally, his friends say. His father, the late Brig. Gen. C. C. Carter, was a long time professor of philosophy at West Point and dean of the academic board.

Pat Carter went to West Point; he was graduated in 1931, and his son, Robert Marshall Carter, is a cadet there now, due to graduate this spring.

TAUGHT AT WEST POINT

General Carter also attended the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (master of science, 1936) and the National War College (1950).

He joined the Coast Artillery Corps after graduating from West Point and served in Hawaii, Panama, and the United States and was himself a teacher at West Point.

During World War II he was on the War Department General Staff and deputy and assistant chief of staff at the China theater headquarters.

He became assistant executive to the Assistant Secretary of War in 1946 and then was appointed special representative in Washington for General Marshall, then in China.

That was his entry into the world of diplomacy. His next assignment was in the State Department as a special assistant to the Secretary. In 1949 he became deputy to the ambassador for military assistance programs for Europe, stationed in London. His personal rank was minister.

After the War College and short service as commander of the 138th Antiaircraft Group in Japan, General Carter joined General Marshall's office in Washington. He stayed on with Mr. Lovett and then, in 1952, became a deputy division commander in Alaska.

He served in 1955 and 1956 as commanding general of the Fifth Region, Army Antiaircraft Command, Fort Sheridan, Ill., and then went to Colorado Springs.

In 1959 General Carter became chief of staff of the U.S. 8th Army in Korea, and just a year ago went to Fort Bliss, Tex., to run the Army Air Defense Center and Air Defense School.

General Carter is "widely liked, by everyone who ever worked for him," one colleague said. He has a "delightful, subtle sense of humor."

In the evenings he likes to be with a few close friends—not in the Washington social whirl.

The city's hostesses may not gain from the new appointment, but the country should, one friend said. "They couldn't have picked a better guy."

Franking Privilege Too Excessive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, for years the Post Office has been operating at a sizable deficit. In order to eliminate this deficit and to enable the postal service to more nearly pay its own way, the House recently passed a bill to raise postal rates on several different classes of mail. While raising postal rates is neither pleasant nor popular, it was necessary, and the bill was passed.

During the debate, one class of mail came under especially heavy attack. I refer to third-class bulk mail, or the so-called "junk mail." Many members felt strongly that this class of mail was not paying its way, was placing a heavy burden upon the entire postal system, and should properly cost the sender more money. In the end, third-class rates were raised from 2½ cents to 3½ cents per piece and from 16 cents to 21 cents for bulk mail.

I find it difficult to approve of the action taken by the Congress when, in the waning hours of the last session, it voted itself the privilege of sending under frank mail addressed only to "Occupant." That this privilege is being and has been abused by Members is a matter of record. For example, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] has reminded us that when the Congress previously had this privilege one Member sent out over 4 million copies of a single speech. I favor the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts to repeal the franking authority granted Congressmen to send "Occupant" mail for the following reasons:

First, it defeats the purpose of the postal rate bill, and would add greatly to the expense of running the Post Office. Those who say it is cheaper to deliver mail with the simplified form of address do not realize that while this may be so in any given instance, the privilege invariably results in a much greater quantity of mail being sent. It is this increase in quantity which proves so costly in the long run.

Second, as the gentleman from Massachusetts has pointed out, the House folding room is simply not equipped to handle the greatly increased workload which is already being thrust upon it. Surely it does not make sense to bypass or delay mail addressed to constituents by name in order to handle a large batch of material destined for an unknown "occupant."

Third, I believe that most people would be offended to receive something from a Member of Congress who cannot even take the time to find out who they are or where they live.

Finally, I would call the attention of my colleagues to a privilege which is vital to proper representation—the right to send mail to constituents under frank. For the very reason that this privilege is so important, all necessary steps must be taken to insure that it is not abused. Use of this simplified form of address is an abuse, and will open the door to further abuses in the future.

FRANKING PRIVILEGE TOO EXCESSIVE

In this area of mailing privilege, as in all other areas, the Congress must lead and not follow. It must set an example for the country, and not seek to be an exception to rules which have been established for good and sufficient reasons. I strongly urge adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Our Real Strength Is in Small Towns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I desire to call to the attention of the Congress and the country a masterful bit of writing by George E. Sokolsky which has appeared in many newspapers of America served by the syndicate distributing the Sokolsky daily column. This article is devoted to a tribute to the small towns of America and their contribution to the development and maintenance of our great American way of life. It is inspired by the achievements of Col. John Glenn—himself a product of a typical American small town in Ohio.

Mr. President, I have said many times that one of the distinctive contributions our country has made to the art of living is the fact that here, more than anywhere else in the world, we have developed a vast community of small towns and minor cities—ranging from a few hundred in population to perhaps 200,000—wherein American citizens combine the enjoyments and advantages of urban city living with the many extra advantages and values of neighborly and considerable life in a nonmetropolitan community.

In traveling abroad, I have many times been impressed by the fact that all cities are very much alike regardless of the country or the nation in which they are located. They all have their beautiful cathedrals; their great public buildings; their parks and boulevards; their operas and their theaters; their large apartment houses and their beautiful and spacious homes. Each, also, has its slums; its vice centers; its crime gangs; its busy indifference toward its fellow citizens; its hustle, bustle, and noisy rush for pelf or power. But there is very little to distinguish a city abroad from a city at home. Somehow or other, cities tend to merge into one great common pattern of developments and life.

However, few foreign countries, indeed, have produced the equivalent to our American small town where we find many variations among such communities but where each has an individual pride in its achievements or its potentialities. Here in America these smaller communities have their public libraries; their schools and marching bands; their athletic teams and recreational spots; their churches and their chambers of commerce; their neighborhood clubs and service organizations; their considerate interest in the achievements and accomplishments of their local residents. Here, also, life has a leisurely pace and a cultural tone unobtainable in the great fleshpots of humanity represented by our great metropolitan areas. Thus it is understandable that so many of our American leaders and citizens of distinction have their roots in this unique American development—the small town with its great complex of human activities and cultural opportunities.

True, our small towns also have their problems and their limitations and it is for that reason that the Senate has enacted special legislation to create a Presidential Commission to Study the Problems of Small Towns. Unfortunately, the House has not as yet approved of this legislation which it has twice been my privilege to sponsor through the U.S. Senate. The bill should be approved, Mr. President, because it is important to all Americans that our American small towns continue to develop and that they continue to make their important contributions to the growth, and prosperity, and the preservation of our great Republic.

I am hopeful the Sokolsky column will awaken new interest in this legislation and I ask unanimous consent that it appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR REAL STRENGTH IS IN SMALL TOWNS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Most striking in the Glenn excitement has been the quiet dignity and decorum of this ordinary American family from a little Ohio town suddenly thrust into the most exacting limelight. Big city folk might learn much from this quiet family that fitted the situation as though to the manner born. There was no letting down the bars; no acting up. Colonel Glenn addressed the mayor's luncheon in New York without a manuscript, in eloquent, forensic English. He reminded me of Will Rogers at his best.

The astronaut's wife, Annie, riding through the rain in Washington, was a picture of what in Europe would be called the well born, for this is universally true, that they who are aristocrats by nature need not wear the trappings of aristocracy to be appreciated. Somehow, this family brought back the American small town into our lives and it is clean and wholesome and decent.

One of the major social illnesses of American life since prohibition has been an in-

creasing vulgarity in private conduct. Good manners have gone by the board and nobody wants to be a square, not even a grandmother who finds it necessary to wear a wig and nowadays do the twist, an imitation of African licentiousness, particularly ugly when done by adults.

Maybe Victorian manners were stuffy and heavy but they were not cheap and vulgar. The barroom was not brought into the home nor did one sit down to dinner with floozies and degenerates. They had their place somewhere in the dark. When manners go by the board, morals cease to exist and a home can be a brothel no matter how many children are in it.

The prohibition era with its flappers and the mixing of "family" people with whoever could provide liquid entertainment left its mark upon society and whoever raises his voice "for the good, old days," sounds like an old fogey which he may very well be.

But as one saw on the television screen, hour after hour, this fine family of Americans who so obviously live the family life, which we hold out as our way of life, whose relationship is one of unashamed love, one for the other, who required no artificial stimulants to cover up the "each goes his own way" attitude which is so fashionable in the big cities—this family on the screen taught us a lesson which is not too easily forgotten.

Colonel Glenn himself is conscious of the moral values in his flight, for in his extemporaneous address at the Waldorf-Astoria he referred to them and speaking of patriotism, he said that it was not out of fashion.

The Russians and West Germans, each in a different way, have shown to what a disciplined life can accomplish in a short time. We have been showing our youngsters an untruthful picture of an undisciplined life, of sheriffs and drunkards and gunfighters and such who are supposed to be the heroes of the West. But such people could not have built a great country such as ours. They could not have done much even to improve Dodge City. They could not have built anything. Into the building of the West went brains and brawn and character and the small towns of States like Ohio have given back to this country a fair return on that investment in men and women of character who have served this country not for their private advantage but for its glory.

Thus we come back to our main theme—by the accident of his heroism, Colonel Glenn permitted us of the big cities to take a peek at the real strength of the United States, the small towns where neighbors live together in fair amity and understand that there is much to do for the United States and that there must be strong and clean men and women to do it.

Perhaps out of it will come some moral advantage, some strengthening of our young people. Perhaps out of it will come a revival of values which have been lost in the madness of sterile years of selfish hedonism which usually follow wars. If such a change may come upon us, the astronaut has done more than to orbit around the earth. He may have saved his country from moral defeat.

Inventories of Manufactured Milk Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the National Milk Producers Federation issues a weekly publication entitled "News for Dairy Co-ops," a pamphlet containing a bounty of information helpful to the dairy industry.

The March 9 issue of this publication contained a schedule showing the inventories of manufactured milk products currently held by Government, and I insert this table into the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues.

Of particular interest are the uncommitted stock figures for butter, cheese, and nonfat dry milk depicted this year against last year, and the very marked inventory disparity immediately prompts one to ponder the motivating forces behind the large inventory holdings of the present.

The table follows:

Government price support program, week ending Mar. 9

[National Milk Producers Federation Weekly Market Report, Mar. 9, 1962]

[In thousand pounds]

	Butter		Cheese		Nonfat dry milk	
	This year	Last year	This year	Last year	This year	Last year
Uncommitted stocks, Feb. 28	205,373.4	0	42,560.3	0	227,731.0	127,310.5
Purchases during week	11,379.1	3,441.8	4,146.6	0	14,976.0	13,247.2
Sales during week	662.1	3,441.8	0	0	2,648.5	6,066.0
Donations	0	0	150.0	0	4,484.5	27,077.1
Uncommitted stocks, Mar. 7	216,090.4	0	46,556.9	0	235,574.0	107,414.7
Purchases since Mar. 29	366,074.0	130,784.4	155,796.5	197.0	1,172,150.1	759,270.6

Higher Standards for Radio and Television Broadcasts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, recently, Dr. T. Earle Johnson, professor and head of the department of speech, at the University of Alabama, delivered an address to the news media of Alabama, primarily the broadcasters on both television and radio. His address, entitled "Excellence in Our Lives," is a most interesting one, and I believe it would be well for especially those who own and operate our radio and television stations to take to heart and to try to carry out the excellent advice Dr. Johnson gave.

Television station WBRC, located in Birmingham, Ala., on February 22 had an "Editorial of the Day" based upon Dr. Johnson's speech entitled "Excellence in Our Lives." I ask unanimous consent that the speech and the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCELLENCE IN OUR LIVES

(By T. Earle Johnson)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and friends, I was extremely pleased and flattered when your president, Mr. Giddens, asked me to speak to you today. I was especially delighted with the subject he asked me to discuss, for it is one in which I have long been interested. I am not sure, however, that I shall say what he intended that I should, or hoped that I would. As a matter of fact, I am very doubtful that I shall. I understand he chose me on a recommendation by his secretary, Mrs. Youngson, who heard me speak on this subject last spring to the AAUW.

As a matter of fact, Mrs. Youngson suggested to me that I simply use the same speech she had heard, flattering me by saying that "it was wonderful; just the thing to set the proper tone for the opening session of your meeting." She assured me that I didn't need to change a word. But I decided differently after reading it over. It was given almost a year ago to a group of women. This is a different day and quite a different audience. I hope, Mrs. Youngson, you are not disappointed.

My subject is "Excellence in Our Lives"—and I have some very strong feelings on it. I believe that every educated person, especially those of us who teach, must engage in what virtually amounts to a crusade, or we are lost. We must declare war on the cheap, the shoddy, the vulgar, the inferior, on sloppy low standards, and fight for higher standards, for a superior product—in short, for "Excellence in Our Lives."

And you gentlemen in the field of communication, you who are broadcasters, are among our most influential teachers. And whether you will, or no, you are teaching every minute you are on the air; every listener or viewer is a potential pupil if not an actual student; you help mold public opinion, establish habits and customs, develop tastes, influence behavior; your potential power for good, or for evil, is enormous. Yours is indeed a sobering responsibility. On Monday of this week, the Birmingham Post-Herald carried an editorial entitled "An Applauded Crusade."

Newton N. Minow, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, came up with some gripping statistics in a recent speech before the Radio and Television Executives Society in New York. He said:

"At 5 o'clock this afternoon 13 million children (under 12) will be looking at their favorite TV programs.

"At 6 o'clock, the viewers will number 15 million; at 7 o'clock, 18 million; and an hour later, 17 million. Altogether, as the FCC computes it, some 27 million youngsters each day are preoccupied with what they see on the screen."

"We all know," he said, "that the potential of television to help or hurt our children is enormous. We know that television occupies more of a child's time each year than school, or than church."

So, for the first time, the FCC, under its new, youthful and energetic chairman, is going to ask station licensees what they are doing about providing programs for children. Parents universally will endorse this move, or any other sensible steps for the improvement in quality of TV fare.

Mr. Minow said recently that he did not expect to win all the battles in his many-

sided crusade for better television, but if he wins this one, American families will be forever grateful (Monday, October 9, 1961).

You may agree or disagree with Mr. Minow's policies, but his statistics are awesome. And I for one at another time and on another occasion would indict you for what you have done to the musical taste of my teenage daughter and her generation.

I am sure you know that I am well aware of your difficult problems of programing, and also that there is little or nothing you can do to improve the quality of the canned and live programs supplied you by the networks, studios, and sponsors. Yet something must be done if the quality of your product is to be improved. But what?

First, may I quote Arthur E. Fetridge who, predicting the course television will take during the next few years says: "I may be wrong, but certainly all the signs point to mediocrity and more mediocrity. The more common place a presentation, the more people watch it. The masses say they want mediocrity, and until the sponsors force them to accept something far better, mediocrity is what we are going to get."

Second, may I suggest that you abandon the cliche, "We must give the public what it wants," in favor of "Excellence in our lives."

Perhaps you will readily agree with much that I shall say. I know that I am not alone when I say that I have become increasingly concerned during the past few years with a decline in excellence, or rather in a lack of pride in workmanship. It seems to me that this is evident in all phases of our national life. Frankly, it seems to me that far too many of us are "simply trying to get by." May I give you a few personal examples; during recent years I think there has been a definite deterioration in the quality of term papers handed in by my graduate students. Certainly I now get more poor papers, even some which can only be described as messy or dirty. Many students do take personal pride in their work but we need more of them.

Several months ago an excellent editorial appeared in the Saturday Review entitled "The Retreat From Excellence." No doubt some of you read this article and enjoyed it as much as I. Nevertheless I would like to share some parts of it with you for it expresses so well the point of view I am trying to express.

The author, a former headmaster of an eastern academy begins by saying, "A worried mother recently called me by telephone to ask me to intervene for her son who had failed to win a scholarship at a well known private school. "How did he do on his tests?" I asked. "I don't know" she confessed plaintively. "But what difference does that make? He is a lot better than most boys who get scholarships."

"I tried to explain to her that this lad, in our democracy could in due season marry, vote, run for office, and qualify for social security, but that when he applied for financial aid at a school, he entered into a contest in which he had to match his brain power against that of others. But the mother just didn't understand that the mere fact of her son's existence didn't make him the equal of anybody in competition. Her attitude is a significant illustration of a pattern which is recognizable throughout our society. The pattern is simply that we are increasingly ignoring the important differences among people. We live in an age of the average, and even the average is not as high as it should or could be."

That one citizen is as good as another is a favorite American axiom, supposed to express the very essence of our constitution and of our way of life. But just what do we mean when we utter that platitude? One surgeon is not good as another. One plumber is not good as another. We soon become aware of this when we require the attention of either. Yet in political and economic matters we appear to have reached a point where knowledge and specialized training count for very little.

A newspaper reporter is sent out on the street to collect the views of the various passers-by on such a question as "Should the United States Defend Formosa?" The answer of the barfly who doesn't know where the island is located, or even that it is an island, is quoted in the next edition just as solemnly as that of the college teacher of history. With the basic tenents of democracy—that all men are born free and equal and are entitled to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness—no decent American can possibly take issue; but that the opinion of one citizen on a technical subject is just as authoritative as that of another is manifestly absurd. And to accept the opinions of all comers as having the same value is surely to encourage a cult of mediocrity.

In fact the prevelence of such a cult of mediocrity is evident in many phases of our national economy. There are many examples which I could give to prove this point but perhaps one or two will suffice. One of the more obvious is the system under which all workmen, regardless of skill or attitude, receive the same pay for the same job. Under the existing policy nobody has any incentive for toiling harder or longer or more effectively than his less aggressive neighbors. I am sure you are familiar with the fact that a union regulation forbids a member to lay more than a specified number of bricks in an 8-hour day. Have you ever watched a union bricklayer work? I have. In fact I watched them work on this very building and recall very distinctly how shocked I was at the very leisure manner in which they layed the bricks. Now there are many union bricklayers who are able to lay more than the specified number and who would like to do so for more money. Yet they find themselves frustrated. Labor leaders insist that it is more important to protect the normal, or below normal workmen than to encourage the exceptionally eager ones. It should be possible to do both. But the present tendency is to eliminate competition among employees and thus to restrain the ambitious laborer.

Clearly this policy does not, indeed cannot, stimulate increased production. The principle of leveling down is here perfectly illustrated in one of its worst aspects.

A second example is the widespread acceptance in our country of the doctrine of promotion by seniority alone. This has had much the same consequence, especially in education. A teacher of average ability, once appointed to a school or college staff, can be sure of moving up automatically as retirement or death removes his older colleagues. There are many reasons why a teacher should have tenure, and I do not wish to imply otherwise. What I am saying is that a system of automatic salary increments, and of promotion in rank, based upon seniority alone or even chiefly that, is to encourage mediocrity rather than promoting excellence.

There are other forces, too, which are promoting mediocrity in our educational system. The Carnegie Foundation for the advancement of teaching, summarizing some of the problems created by these forces, recently reported:

"Very large numbers of superior students are still not working up to their capacity, not being challenged to their best performance, not pursuing the hard intellectual programs which will develop their talents."

George F. Kennan, writing recently in an article in Life, referred scathingly to an educational system in which quality has been extensively sacrificed to quantity. In a majority of secondary schools he points out that the emphasis is not primarily on scholastic attainment; the vacations are too long, the standards are too low, and too much emphasis is placed on athletic activities. In this connection may I add another personal example. Only this week a school which had participated for many years in our high school debate program had to withdraw simply because the students who had been interested in debate decided to go out for basketball. I am certainly in favor of a well-rounded program for a school including basketball in its proper place but I think that the development of the minds of our better students through such activities as debate will in the long run be crucial if we are to survive. I am not at all sure but what the philosophy underlying such practices has not already damaged the competitive spirit of young Americans. Our college graduates are reported to be much more interested in security than in competition. The inclination to take a chance or indulge in a calculated risk is said to be not so prevalent as it was in our pioneer days. Each spring representatives from a number of large corporations come to the university to interview seniors for possible employment by their companies. They report an increasing tendency on the part of our seniors to look for security, for certainty of promotion, for regularity of salary increases, rather than for challenging opportunities, for a competitive chance. They report finding dozens of fine-looking, well-groomed fellows ready for routine assignments. But there are very few energetic, ambitious, restless men with creative imaginations, ready to break loose from conventional procedures and move into untried fields. The desire for security and for mediocrity belong together.

Even in politics, perhaps I should say especially in politics, specialized knowledge is far from obligatory—in fact in our State I fear that it is a definite handicap to the candidate for office. Let us consider a typical primary election in Alabama, and ask ourselves, what were the basic issues on which these contests were decided, especially those for local offices. I think it would be fair to say that all the candidates began by trying to prove themselves to be good family men, active members of a church, and a good friend and neighbor. Many of them stopped there and in too many cases that was all the evidence needed to elect them to office. A talented candidate with a good knowledge of history and economics who spoke the English language accurately and well would very likely have found the voters notably lacking in enthusiasm for him. And if politics seems to offer an advantage to mediocrity, it is solely the fault of the voters. A considerable proportion of us is prepared to accept back-slapping, vague enthusiasm, and expressed good intentions as substitutes for ability and talents.

It is significant to note that the number of first-rate statesmen in the United States during the postrevolutionary period, when the country had a population of not much over 3 million, was much greater than it is today when we have some 180 million. Perhaps one of the chief reasons is that our generation has reversed the pattern and established a cult, not of genius but of mediocrity, by approval of conformity and uniformity and the related colorless virtues which keep a social organism static. Various observers deplore the growing tendency to distrust those who are different, those who deviate in their thinking or writing or behavior from what we have been taught to consider normal. Uniformity of ideas seems to be regarded as a protection against the dangers of so-called radical thought.

In his latest book, "The American Conscience," Rober Burlingame has summed all this up as follows:

"We are prosperous. We are complacent. Religion has become, for the most part, a social convention. Skill is anonymous, thought is under pressure to conform, secu-

rity has replaced venture as a dominant aim, intellect is in the discard, and politics are dictated by mediocrity." And from the editorial in the Saturday Review may I again quote:

"Against any program for developing excellences are allied several evil forces; the sinister operations of politicians who thrive on public ignorance, the corrupting power of the press through its appeals to mass psychology; the decline of the pioneer spirit; the general relaxation of people seeking a fast and often a criminal buck; and the enervating influence of widespread luxury. These are no new phenomena in a democracy, but they have been spreading further and reaching deeper in our times than in any American period with which I am familiar. And their combined effect is to promote the commonplace, the average, and even the mediocre."

My thesis is self evident. Widespread mediocrity in key places, in business or in education or even in politics, can be deadening even destructive to any country. For us in America, it is vital to provide a cultural climate in which exceptionally high intelligence, or superior talent, is detected early and subsidized accordingly. So much that is good is going on in these United States and such a small number of dedicated people are doing so much on so many levels, that any acceptance of mediocrity seems pitiful. Very possibly we have been anesthetized by material prosperity and lack the vigor to move into action. But I think not. Somehow our national leadership in religion, in the arts, in statecraft, and in education must rise to the occasion and must counteract the blight which mediocrity has been casting over our boasted culture.

Perhaps we should now turn the coin over and look at is obverse side. Last year Life magazine published a series of articles entitled "The Great Debate on National Purpose." In one issue, two educators wrote very pointedly toward my thesis. Prof. Clinton Rossiter of Cornell wrote:

"We stand at one of those rare points in history when a nation must choose consciously between greatness and mediocrity. The United States may well go on for centuries as a territorial entity in which men and women can pursue reasonably useful and satisfying lives. Will it also be, as it has been, a unique civilization whose decline would be counted a major calamity in history? That is the choice we must now make. If we choose greatness, we choose effort—the kind of national effort that transcends the ordinary lives of men and commits them to the pursuit of a common purpose, that persuades them to sacrifice private indulgencies to the public interest, that sends them on a search for leaders who call forth strengths rather than pander to weaknesses. Such an effort must have its beginning in the mind and hearts of Americans and take the form of clear statement of the meaning and goals of a unique people. America will not flourish, not in the hot winds of this volcanic age, unless it can develop a profound, inspiring, benevolent sense of mission. While this is only the first short step to the grandeur to which we may still properly aspire, it is the kind that must be taken boldly before any other can be attempted."

D. John Gardner, president of the Carnegie Corp., in his part of the debate called for more dedicated people, more dedicated teachers in pursuit of excellence. He said "If—as a nation—we understand, expect, and honor dedication, the supply will be ample. But if we assume that dedicated men are exceedingly rare and probably a little foolish the supply will be low. It is my conviction that free and responsible individuals are proud to offer such devotion if given the opportunity. People would rather work hard for something they believe in than enjoy a pampered idleness. They would rather sacrifice their comfort for an honored objective than pursue endless diversions. It is a mistake to speak of dedication as a sacrifice. Every man knows that there is exhilaration in intense effort applied toward a meaningful end. The religious precept that you must lose yourself to find yourself is no less true at the secular level. We fall into the error of thinking that happiness necessarily involves ease, diversion, tranquility—a state in which all of one's wishes are satisfied. For most people happiness is not to be found in this vegetative state but in striving toward meaningful goals. The dedicated person has not achieved all of his goals. His life is the endless pursuit of goals, some of them unattainable. We want meaning in our lives. When we raise our sights, strive for excellence, and dedicate ourselves to the highest goals of our society, we are enrolling in an ancient and meaningfull cause; the agelong struggle of man to realize that best that is in him. Man reaching toward the most exalted goals he can conceive, man striving impatiently and restlessly for excellence has produced great religious insights, created great art, penetrated secrets of the universe and set standards of conduct which give meaning to the phrase 'the dignity of man.' On the other hand, man without standards, man with his eyes on the ground, has proven over and over in every society, in every period of history, that humans can be lower than the beasts, sunk in ignorance, morally and ethically blind, living a life devoid of meaning." Thus saith John Gardner, of the Carnegie Corp.

At its simpliest level the pursuit of excellence means an increased concern for competence on the part of the individual. Keeping a free society free—and vital and strong—is no job for the half-educated and the slovenly. In a society of freemen competence is a primary duty. The man who does his job well tones up the whole society and the man who does a sloppy job—whether he is a janitor or a judge, a surgeon or a mechanic—lowers the tone of all society.

But excellence implies more than competence. It implies a striving for the highest standards in every form of life. We need individual excellence in all its forms, especially in every kind of creative endeavor, but also in political life, in education, in industry—in short, universally. And not the least, we need excellence in standards of individual conduct.

But Gentlemen, you as broadcasters have a very special role in this crusade for excellence. It is not enough for you merely to do a better job, be a better man, live a better life. As a broadcaster you are far more than a businessman, although you operate a private business. For it is a business which in a very real sense is a public trust, almost a public institution, which your license requires that you operate "in the public convenience, interest, or necessity," a public responsibility first imposed upon you by the original Radio Act of 1927. Oh, how we need men in your ranks for whom this is not a hackneyed phrase getting a minimum of lipservice, but rather is a clarion call for public service, men who knowing their responsibilities, hear and respond with excellence; men of ability and integrity who by their very existence rekindle the belief that we as a people can live above the level of moral squalor.

We as a people must have a definite optimism concerning the future of mankind, and you in the mass communications must give it to us. It follows that one of the best ways to serve mankind, to pursue excellence, to exemplify the highest of such standards, is to be that kind of a person. And when the rest of us see you and recognize you for what you are, we shall salute you. We shall tip our hats and bow to you, for the future of our civilization is in your hands.

CULT OF MEDIOCRITY

A recent provocative talk to the Alabama Broadcasters Association by University of Alabama Speech Department head, Dr. T. Earle Johnson, is properly gaining a wider audience in being reprinted in a journal called Vital Speeches of the Day. We would hope that a publication of wider readership would take it up from there.

Dr. Johnson stated forcefully, "we must declare war on the cheap, the shoddy, the vulgar, on sloppy low standards, and fight for higher standards, for a superior product, in short, for excellence in our lives."

During the past few years a decline in excellence, a lack of pride in workmanship, evident in all phases of our national life, is cause for concern. Dr. Johnson says, "It seems to me that far too many of us are 'simply trying to get by.' "

"We are increasingly ignoring the important differences among people; we live in an age of the average and even the average is not as high as it should or could be.

"The cult of mediocrity is evident in many phases of our national economy. For example, the system under which all workmen, regardless of skill or attitude, receive the same pay for the same job, and the doctrine of promotion by seniority alone.

"The cult of mediocrity has influenced our political life to the extent that today, when our population is 180 million, we have fewer first-rate statesmen than in the post-Revolutionary War period when the country had only 3 million population." Today, a talented candidate with a good knowledge of history and economics who spoke the English language accurately and well would find the voters notably lacking in enthusiasm for him. And if politics seems to offer an advantage to mediocrity, it is solely the fault of the voters. With obvious 20–20 perception, Dr. Johnson concluded with, "we need individual excellence in all its forms, especially in every kind of creative endeavor, but also in political life, in education, in industry—in short, universally, and not the least, we need excellence in standards of individual conduct."

Suffice it to say, we would be happy to entrust our children's education to such as Dr. Johnson.

Trillion-Dollar Federal Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I opposed the $2 billion increase in the Federal debt ceiling. If we are to save ourselves from national bankruptcy, we must find ways to cut down Federal expenditures. It is imperative that we as a Congress reject domestic spending programs of a so-called welfare flavor which we cannot afford.

Recently, Maurice H. Stans, Budget Director for former President Eisenhower, estimated that the national debt has reached $1 trillion. His comments concerning the debt are reported in an article which appeared in the March 5, 1962, issue of Newsweek. I think his comments will be of interest to my colleagues in Congress and, therefore, under unanimous consent, I include the article in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TRILLION-DOLLAR DEBT?

While Congress was debating whether to raise the Federal debt limit to $300 billion, Maurice H. Stans, Budget Director for Eisenhower, took adding machine in hand last week and totted up the jolting conclusion that the Government owes more than $1 trillion.

Stans, now president of Los Angeles' Western Bancorporation (a bank holding company) and a syndicated business columnist for the Los Angeles Times-Mirror, added up the bills this way: National debt, $300 billion; committments to pay civilian and military pensions, $70 billion; commitments for future veterans' benefits, $300 million; commitments to Government spending programs, $150 million; commitments to social security, $250 billion. Grand total: more than $1 trillion, or about $22,000 for every family of four in the United States.

The Passing of a Great Football Coach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the March 1, 1962, issue of the Carroll County (Md.) Times, written by my friend, Charles Mooshian, which is an eulogy of Richard C. Harlow, the nationally known football coach and humanitarian, a resident of Maryland. Richard C. Harlow made his mark in the athletic world, but beyond that, he was a noble character who did a great many good deeds. I feel that he is most worthy of excellent tribute paid him by Editor Mooshian.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RICHARD C. HARLOW

In the passing of Richard C. Harlow, the Nation has lost a great football coach and humanitarian. At his death, Harlow was 72.

We say Nation because, as one of the country's most beloved football coaches, Mr. Harlow belonged to the Nation and not only to Westminster, Carroll County, and Maryland. He coached football for 36 years at Penn State, Colgate, Western Maryland College, and Harvard.

At the funeral in Baker Memorial Chapel, February 21, Dr. Lowell S. Ensor, president of Western Maryland College, praised Harlow "as a patriot, scholar, Christian gentleman and coach * * * a great man, a man of great accomplishments and unusual characteristics."

In addition to Dr. Ensor, officiating at the funeral were the Reverend Robert H. Hiller, the coach's pastor, and the Reverend William W. Wood, Gettysburg, who captained the first football team Harlow coached at Penn State.

Coach Harlow was almost like a father to his players. He coached not just to win, but as a basic quality of character. Perfection was his goal and he taught that to his players, not just for football but in life.

Mr. Harlow had served his country honorably in two world wars and in time of peace he concerned himself with good citizenship and a deep loyalty to his country.

He was a Christian gentleman, first, last, and always, and was a regular attendant at church services and "not just a Sunday Christian."

Mr. Harlow was voted coach of the year in 1936 and was elected to the football hall of fame in 1954. He coached in the Blue-Gray bowl games in 1951-53. He received the Stagg award in 1948.

A few years ago Harlow checked on 606 of his men he had coached "to see how well the boys have done since leaving college." He got his answer.

After eliminating three Harvard graduates who were earning more than $150,000 a year, Harlow reported an average annual income of $12,000.

He was prouder of two other discoveries. He had loaned $27,000 to his college players. It had all been repaid except $165 "from a boy who was killed in World War II." He was also pleased to find out that only four of those who married became divorced.

Our sincere sympathies go out to his widow and daughter in their hour of bereavement.

By Their Fruits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate, regularly writes an article entitled "Spires of the Spirit" for the Sunday Star.

Dr. Harris writes quality articles with remarkable consistency, written pieces that treat comprehensively of human nature and man's spirit.

Dr. Harris' article appearing in the March 11 issue of the Sunday Star was a particularly fine piece, dealing with the subject of charity as relating to two leaders of the world. This piece possesses considerable impact and impressed me greatly, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

BY THEIR FRUITS

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris)

The ebullient individual who for the present stands at the apex of the Soviet pyramid of tyrannical rule is an expert at personal and political vituperation. Whether or not the charges he bellows have any relation to the truth never seems to bother him in his crude off-the-cuff flings at anything or anybody arousing his ire. By the leaders of the free world it would be freely acknowledged that in the school of rough and tumble polemics he has earned his A.B.—which is Adept at Billingsgate.

One of the best known targets of the Kremlin boss' scorn, sarcasm, ridicule, and ranting discount has been his gracious host—that great American, Dwight D. Eisenhower—whose agreement made possible Khrushchev's visit to our shores. In spite of the fact that he was President of the United States and a general whose strategy in World War II helped save Russia from defeat by the German hordes, he has been vilified as have been few men in public life by this Red chieftain who prophesies that our children will live under communism.

With all the wails of pained surprise, and all the copious crocodile tears regarding a plane mission bent on gathering information solely for our defense, nothing was said about the network of espionage covering our Republic and which uses even the U.N. and the Soviet Embassy as centers for its plots against freedom. By the loud cries of the Red spokesman the world was called to witness the accusing image of the U-2 stamped like the scarlet letter on the back of Uncle Sam. In hysterical rage Khrushchev reached up to the sky of hope and deliberately pulled down a rainbow of better understanding. He hurled at General Eisenhower names which suggested the vocabulary of a barroom brawl. But even so, as the Greatest Teacher of the ages declared: "You cannot expect figs from thistles."

And here stands Dwight Eisenhower, loved and trusted by his countrymen. He knew full well every uncouth appellation by which he had been called. By a reporter at a press conference he is asked: "What do you think of Nikita Khrushchev?" What a chance to get even, to set multitudes in the seats of the scornful rocking with jibes of ridicule. How easy to join in kind one who had been reviled by false witness and who said, "There was once a man who did me a wrong but I waited 12 years—I waited until I sold the chairs from under him. My God, but that's conquering." But was it? What do we get when we get even? When someone criticized Lincoln, because even under provocation he showed no malice or spirit of revenge, he replied, "I never thought that pays." And so he selected a man as Secretary of War who had called him "a gorilla" and worse.

The reply of former President Eisenhower is an exhibition of the flowers of sweet charity which grow in the garden of virtues that alas Khrushchev has never known, and for that he is to be pitied.

In Ike's characterization of the one who had reviled him is displayed the fruit which comes to its fruition in a climate in which a godly childhood home, a deeply felt religious faith, and a personal allegiance to things true and high, excellent and of good report, are vital factors. His is the answer of a personality which has all that communism lacks. By their fruits ye shall know them!

One reporter who heard the former President's answer regarding Khrushchev remarked—"It was without a trace of bitterness or resentment. He tries to see the other fellow's viewpoint and problems."

Consider a sentence or two in Mr. Eisenhower's reply: "I do not think that Mr. Khrushchev, himself, is necessarily a cruel man. I am sure he loves children, he is always talking about his own family, but even as a dictator he has his own problems and therefore in assessing his personality we must not make the mistake that everything he does is evil, or entirely of his own volition."

If, as one remarked looking at the undeniable black record, that in the gracious portrait drawn there was some whitewash, nevertheless the whiteness comes out of Ike's goodness.

Such forgiveness is the fruit of the spirit in the practice of one whom I have seen in a solemn service of prayer take the bread and wine reverently as the symbol of that Holy One from whose birth the ages are reckoned, and upon whose shoulders the government at last must rest, a service in which the President of the United States joined with deep devotion in singing his favorite hymn—

"Just as I am, without one plea,
But that Thy blood was shed for me,
And that Thou bidd'st me come to Thee,
O Lamb of God, I come, I come."

In such a high hour he was opening his own life to the spiritual forces and the moral verities which alone can save the world both from the crass materialism of atheistic communism and of that which is sapping the

inner life money-mad and pleasure-mad America.

In these two men to whom we have listened, living and leading in this day of destiny when humanity is called to choose the blessing or the curse, life or death, the words of the Master of Men are vividly illustrated—"By their fruits ye shall know them!"

Report on Germany by Rabbi Martin M. Weitz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, Rabbi Martin M. Weitz, Beth Israel Congregation, Atlantic City, toured extensively in Germany last October with a delegation of 10 Americans, guests of the Federal Republic of Germany. He has written up his experiences in a report entitled "Mission to Berlin (II) and West Germany—1961."

The full report contains perceptive observations on the cities and areas visited, including Bonn, Cologne, Duesseldorf, Bremen, Hamburg, Munich, the Black Forest, Baden-Baden, Stuttgart, and Frankfurt. I believe that some of Dr. Weitz' comments on Berlin, as well as his overall conclusions, will be of widespread interest, particularly with regard to the treatment of Jews in West Germany today. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that these portions of Rabbi Weitz's report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISSION TO BERLIN (II) AND WEST GERMANY—1961

(By Rabbi Martin M. Weitz)

Here with the Senate of free Berlin, our delegation had a chance to take perspective—and I quote here part of my report that day to the Atlantic City Press:

"BERLIN.—We have just come as a delegation of 10 Americans into the very heart of the crisis in Berlin. Each of us felt the tension, the dry electric air that is natural to Berlin climatically, that is unnatural because of what Berlin is today to the world of crisis.

"This very day we were taken in U.S. Army vehicles through port of entry which decisively indicates the lack of communication. And here some days ago a truck from the East, with full speed, crashed its way through the West with its cargo of lives—refugees of 1961.

"Today we observed how during the night they put up new barriers in the form of a double S of heavy slabs of stone, concrete, and metal, so anything on wheels will be forced to a snail's pace under heavy surveillance.

"We kept our eyes open, our mouths shut, and our hands taut, while our hearts made up for lost emotions. We saw what is called so often the Chinese Wall on both sides, or what we prefer to call the Wailing Wall for men today. It is not too high, yet it is formidable; it is not too thick; yet it is provoking; it is not too well built, yet it is symbolic. Every few feet a "Vopo" stands sentry. Homes, four stories high, have two or three stories from the ground up bricked in and walled up.

"Families were dispossessed. Handshakes were made at first over the barbed wire—but now are verboten. We witnessed the setting of a church with wall across its chancel. People on Sunday mornings faced each other while the minister turned in both directions to keep his congregation united while "Vopos" stood guard. Wreaths were placed on its west side in tribute to lives that ended when longtime residents jumped from the bricked-in dwellings to freedom, but failed.

"Even in the Marienfeld Refugee Camp we listened to the stories of many that came across through fire and water to reach safety and sanity. One of them was on crutches, for he jumped from the third floor and landed on a waiting truck, while his wife followed; she is now in the hospital. Their son made it for he had youth to help. The truck made it, for during the darkening twilight the guards did not see straight nor shoot right.

* * * * *

"The entire stay in Berlin was full of interest, excitement, and challenge. Arrival at Tempelhof Airport in the heart of the city made one realize that this very enclave was the scene of the Berlin airlift some years ago and that the city is exposed anew and on all sides to a threat from the Kremlin and its satellites. For West Berlin is out on a limb from the tree trunk of West Germany.

"Why do so many Jews return? Among the many reasons no doubt these would be major:

"1. The Federal Republic of Germany has deliberately attempted to make amends to the Jewish people for the suffering inflicted by the hated Nazi predecessors.

"2. Anti-Semitism is not tolerated in West Germany. Its constitutions, federal and state, and its penal codes are vigorous safeguards for all minorities and individuals, and are in high lineage of Goethe and Lessing, not of Bismarck and Hitler.

* * * * *

Before our delegation left Berlin—ahead of me—a number of us, seminar style, tried to summarize our impressions. Mine were in this spirit, as relayed to all interested, via this homeward report:

"Each of the 10 delegates invited by the Federal Republic of Germany is now not only responsive to world crisis and its changes of continental values but feels that the "Great Divide" of decision is latent and potent in the very heart of Berlin.

"From our tour of 10 outstanding world-renowned West German communities—Bonn, Cologne, Düsseldorf, Bremen, Hamburg, Berlin, Munich, Stuttgart, Frankfurt, as well as the Black Forest, Baden-Baden, the Alpine villages around Munich and other cities, our group felt that West Germany today is not only an important NATO ally but also the economic heart of Europe.

"Though we were 'wined and dined and champagned and beered and castled and palaced' we probed beneath the surface as best we could and looked beyond the answers to our questions by mayors of cities, presidents of parliaments, and the representatives of the Federal Republic.

"We visited with all rabbis available as well as the leaders of the communities, saw rebuilt synagogues, sat with representatives of the 30,000 Jews who now live in West Germany, including 6,000 in Berlin, and tried to find their motivation for returning, their present status in commerce and business, their feelings of security and answers to the possibility of a good future for the Jewish community throughout Germany, in the years ahead.

"We also had many fascinating discussions and conferences with graduates of the Ventnor Foundation, whereby the foster children of Dr. and Mrs. Hilton Read, of Ventnor, have participated as medical interns in scores of American hospitals on the eastern seaboard. From them we learned much about the progress of medicine in the heart of Europe.

"Each of these young men is a living testament to the creative bridgebuilding for freedom across the 'lost horizon' via medicine and we are convinced that each of them today is a 'lightning rod' for values of American democracy in action, whether in the hospital, the home, or the lifeline of modern Germany."

Our major impressions of the tour are as follows:

Each of us on this mission, including three judges, a mayor from Minnesota, director of labor for the State of California, head of the welfare department for the city of Detroit, officers of foreign policy associations and others through this venture became friends because of many shared experiences.

We feel the economy of West Germany will increase considerably despite pressure from the Soviets for at least a decade, unless it is halted by war or the spread of communism.

"We feel there is a rising standard of living so people are more enamored of things than of ideas, that there is a general feeling of national amnesia regarding past Nazi barbarism, not just to forget but to prevent its reoccurance at any cost.

"We feel Jews returning to former homeland are sincerely welcomed by the West Germans, who to this end have done their utmost to rebuild Jewish life. Synagogues have been reconstructed, societies of Christians and Jews have been established, and history books have been rewritten. It is even against the law to give the Nazi salute in West Germany today.

"We feel there is a growing pattern of democracy in the West German Government which will provide a stable, free state and a balanced economy.

"We asked many questions of many people, visited dozens of institutions and meetings and probed and checked answers to our many inquiries.

"Perhaps the best answer we were given was one by a 1961 refugee from East Germany, as we talked to him in the Marienfelde Campe in West Berlin. He was on crutches and had difficulty talking.

"He was asked why his wife was not with him.

" 'She is now in the hospital and I, as you see, am in this condition because we jumped from our third-story window to a waiting truck at the wall at dusk a few days ago, as we made our escape from the Russian Zone. My wife and I agree that our few broken bones, bruises, and scrapes are a small enough price indeed to pay for freedom.' "

John Glenn's Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, Astronaut John Glenn further endeared himself in the hearts of all Americans with his forthright statement about his religious convictions.

Special note is made of this in the Mount Pleasant, Mich., Daily Times-News published in the district I repre-

sent. The Times-News commented editorially as follows:

JOHN GLENN'S FAITH

Most men are usually hesitant about expressing their religious convictions in public, at least, in any great detail. If it is an honest modesty, it does not spring from any sense of shame or fear of ridicule, but from the feeling that a man's deeply held religious or philosophical beliefs are, in the last analysis, uniquely his own.

Such a man undoubtedly is John Glenn. But Astronaut Glenn, now that he has rocketed into history as one of this country's most celebrated heroes, has found he may no longer indulge this prerogative of a private citizen.

To some, statements of Glenn's personal beliefs are as important as the scientific information he brought back with him from space. Even a Senate committee showed great interest in the spiritual aspects of his adventure.

To many, the temptation would be great to "put in a good word for God," for that is what the public expects and wants. But with plain honesty, Glenn spoke on a level far above that of an athlete endorsing a particular brand of cereal or cigarettes or shaving cream.

"There have been people in the past," he said, "who have tried to put words in my mouth that at a certain time I suddenly lapsed into a prayerful state, or something like that, and this just isn't the case."

He went on to say that his religion is not a fire-engine type, used only for emergencies. He had made his peace with his Maker a long time ago and he tried to live every day as best he could. He was busy with controls and instruments while in orbit, not prayers.

Unspoken, but obvious, however, was the fact that Glenn's whole life is imbued with a prayerful attitude—a reverence—toward his country, his family, his job, and his purpose on earth.

John Glenn spoke for himself. This is all he could do or should be asked to do. But his moral example lends powerful influence to his words.

Getting acquainted with this courageous man as we have and standing shoulder-to-shoulder with him in his moment of supreme trial as the rocket ignited and soared has been a tremendous emotional and spiritual experience for all of us in this country.

Interrelationship Between our Nation's Youth and Our Nation's Woods and Streams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the conservation and enhancement of our Nation's resources, both human and natural, is of significant importance to the Congress. Recently I read an article which sets forth a most striking interrelationship between our Nation's youth and our Nation's woods and streams. This article speaks of the education of youth by going with dad, an activity which I can well remember from my youth. Today's urban centralization has, to a great extent, brought this traditional activity to an end for there is no place for a boy in a factory or in an office with his father. Therefore, the boy must look to the weekends to learn many of the lessons which only his father can pass on to him. This is one of the reasons why we must give the most careful thought to the preservation of our great woodland areas for they are classrooms where important lessons of democratic life can be learned. They are classrooms where the boy can learn many traits of manhood.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article written by Joe R. Hinds, manager, Howell-Oregon Electric Co-op and appearing in the Rural Electric Missourian be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A VISIT WITH THE MANAGER

(Joe R. Hinds)

For many years I have been telling my friends, business associates, people I meet from other States—in fact, anyone who'll listen—about the many advantages we have here in the heart of the Ozarks. One of these advantages is outstanding.

Nowhere will you find a better atmosphere for bringing up children than on an Ozark farm. Rural America, especially rural Missouri, has produced more than its share of the Nation's destinguished statesmen, teachers, scientists, and businessmen. And perhaps the biggest single advantage that the Ozark farm boy has over the city boy is this: The farm boy gets to go with dad.

Recently the editor of the Iowa Rural Electric News wrote a widely publicized story about this same subject—"Going With Dad." He pointed out that for the city boy, dad might as well be nonexistent between 7 a.m. and 6 p.m. There's no room for a boy in dad's office or shop—or on a factory assembly line. While the city boy is learning to tie knots in a Boy Scout session (or tin cans on a dog's tail) the farm boy is learning about life—people—politics and practicability.

I can well remember when I got to go with dad. We covered the countryside buying cattle and we rode horseback. Dad always had some pretty fair fox-trotting horses and many is the day we spent together in the saddle. Perhaps that's why I'm still partial to fox-trotting horses. They remind me of the times I got to go with dad.

Sometimes we went to auctions, to the feed mill, to the blacksmith shop, to a neighboring farm, or just down to the barn. You listened to what people had to say—about politics, prices or livestock. You listened and you learned. And somewhere in the process of listening you received an education. The kind of education you could never get out of a textbook.

You learned respect—you learned to love the land, your country, your parents, your family and your home. You acquired a homespun philosophy that was based on the principles of the Golden Rule. Honesty and stability are trademarks of rural America. The boy who gets to go with dad doesn't end up in juvenile court. And the man who as a boy learned his politics and economics from down-to-earth "dirt" farmers has little time for communism or any other kind of anti-Americanism.

I'm glad that as a boy I got to go with dad and I'm concerned in the realization that with the decreasing farm population fewer and fewer boys will have that opportunity.

One of the reasons I'm greatly concerned with conservation and resource development is that I hope that we can provide adequate facilities—farily—where a city boy can go with dad. Resource development means more than water, electric power, flood control, navigation and timber—important as all these are to our economic future. Resource development also means that city boys, yet unborn, may have an opportunity to go with dad on a weekend trip in these beautiful Ozarks.

And who is there that can measure the value of such an experience? Who can put a price tag on clear thinking—right living—and a chance to go with dad?

Meade County Soil Conservation District Annual Report for 1961 and Work Plan for 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include the annual report for 1961 of the Meade County Soil Conservation District and the work plan for the year 1962. This information was sent to me by Mr. Mickey Winfrey, district clerk of the Meade County Soil Conservation District, and I think it points out to a good advantage the fine results which have been obtained through this program.

The report follows:

ANNUAL REPORT FOR MEADE COUNTY SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT 1961

The year 1961 was blessed with above normal moisture and winter wheat protection was excellent. Dry land milo production was about as good as irrigated and for the county the yield was better than it ever has been.

A large acreage was planted for silage and the yiled would average better than 10 tons per acre.

Fall weather for harvesting was good and all feed and most of the milo was well taken care of.

The summer rains came at the proper time and native grass was green all summer long so that livestock came through the summer in good shape, however, the grass did not cure in August so that the cattle did not make the gain on grass that was expected.

The Soil Conservation District held an essay contest for the seventh and eighth grades with 103 participating. A poster contest was held for the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades with 122 taking part. The entrants did an excellent job. Twelve board members which included their wives and one daughter judged the posters and essays at the Roy Seybert home. Each entrant in the poster and essay contest were presented with an automatic pencil at the annual meeting and the winners were presented silver dollars as awards.

The schools over the county were supplied with conservation cartoons and the good that can come from this is hard to estimate.

The radio and television stations cooperated well and whenever the district desired information to go out they were always willing to do the job. The local weekly papers used information when it was given to them. The daily Hutchinson paper is good at using conservation news and information.

The farmers are using stubble mulch tillage and are really operating the sweeps for moisture conservation and soil blowing has been held to a minimum.

Soil Conservation Service personnel and supervisors presented programs over television and the WUC presented programs to Arena, Lions, Kiwanis Clubs, and government classes at the high school.

The annual meeting had to be postponed because of bad weather and it will be held in February with D. F. Abbott as the featured speaker. The meeting is well planned and will be well attended as all folks in this area are using and becoming more familiar with conservation work.

Bankers' awards will be presented to four cooperators who have done excellent conservation work. Those receiving awards are Mr. and Mrs. Don Bacon, Fowler; Mr. and Mrs. Roy Marrs, Fowler; Mr. and Mrs. Harry Vann, Fowler; and Mr. and Mrs. Paul Bridges, Meade.

Howard Mendenhall was reappointed as a district supervisor and is doing an excellent job.

The board chairman attended the State meeting in Emporia and Joe Friesen and wife are planning to attend the national meeting in Philadelphia.

Norman Hatfield operated the two tandem grass drills for those wanting to hire the job done. The single drill was used by several individuals themselves and as the season was excellent the stand would be good.

Tree orders were again taken with cash deposits so that there would be definite assurance of trees being received.

Monthly meetings were held regularly except for July when all supervisors were busy harvesting. The regular supervisors and the alternates attended all meetings good and took part when asked and put on committees.

The August meeting was held in the Meade City Park with watermelons furnished to supervisors, assistant supervisors, extension folks, ASC chairman, and Soil Conservation Service folks and all of their families.

Treasurer's report for 1961

Balance brought forward on Jan. 1, 1961	$5,037.66
Receipts:	
Donations	5.00
Grass seed	241.80
Trees	65.00
Drill rent	1,440.11
Total	1,751.91
Total	6,789.57
Expenditures:	
Supplies	524.34
Machinery repair	87.64
Meeting expense	139.42
Trees and freight	58.75
Education and advertising	234.91
Dues	114.86
Bonds	3,010.00
Miscellaneous (postage and etc.)	14.87
Total	4,184.79
Total	2,604.78
Petty cash adjustment	6.04
Balance carried forward	2,598.74
Bank statement reconciliation:	
Bank statement Dec. 31, 1961	2,613.34
Outstanding check	14.60
Balance on hand	2,598.74
Bills payable	∞
Bills receivable	∞

Treasurer's report for 1961—Continued

Bonds owned: 8 series E bonds, $4,000 face value	$3,000.00
Serial numbers on file	5,598.74
Petty cash (for small expenses)	5.00
Net worth	5,603.74

[1] None.

INVENTORY OF PROPERTY

Camera, $115; calculator, $481; sandlove grass seed, 60 pounds; graphing table; file cabinet; display cabinet; display board for literature; three grass drills; one furrow seeder; and one subsoiler.

Soil and water conservation practices applied with SCS assistance

	Unit	July 1 1960–June 30, 1961	On the land June 30, 1961
Terracing	Mile	118	1,053
Contour farming	Acre	3,120	26,325
Pond construction	Number	5	198
Land leveling	Acre	133	4,132
Deferred grazing	do	7,535	10,000
Diversion construction	Foot	7,958	85,478
Stubble mulching	Acre	2,665	6,865
Grassed waterways	do	11	568
Irrigation pipelines	Foot	5,619	67,293
Range seeding	Acre	3,709	24,297
Proper irrigation water use.	do	133	2,437
Proper range use	do	7,535	10,000
Pasture furrowing	do	101	1,840

ANNUAL WORK PLAN FOR MEADE COUNTY SCS DISTRICT FOR 1962

A. Prepare annual work plan for new year of 1963.

B. Prepare and use all available publicity and advertisement outlets to encourage all soil conservation approved practices.

C. Continue to cooperate with ASC county committee in developing ACP program and ask their assistance in developing GP program.

D. Prepare extra copies of annual report to be supplied to the following:

1. State and national SCS officials.
2. State and national legislative officials.
3. Other key personnel.
4. Chairman of KASCD.

E. Chairman to appoint following committees:

1. Awards: Purchase cooperator signs for completed plans. Secure awards for essay and/or poster contest, bankers awards and district dealer program and service pins for eligible supervisors.

2. Essay and/or poster contest: To promote the essay or poster contest in all schools within the county for the fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth grades. This committee will work with the school officials.

3. Farm and City Week: This committee to promote the Farm and City Week and work with local county businessmen and civic organizations.

4. Education, publicity, and soil stewardship—

(a) Sponsor Soil Stewardship Week.

1. Contact all churches and work with them to organize Soil Stewardship Sunday programs and furnish speakers from district supervisors or other sources. These speakers to speak at morning and/or evening services thus speaking at two churches in one day.

(b) Sponsor field trips.

(c) Promote activities with FHA, 4-H, FFA, and others.

(d) Keep newspapers, radio, and TV stations informed of activities.

5. Annual meeting committee: Make arrangements for annual meeting.

(a) Speaker.
(b) Program.
(c) Building.
(d) Refreshments.

F. Secure affiliate members and endeavor to obtain alternate supervisors to attend monthly meetings and assist regular supervisors at all times. Also encourage attendance by alternates and regular supervisors to State and National meetings.

G. Operate and maintain district-owned equipment.

1. The photo equipment to be used for publication of work done by district cooperators. The purpose of this work is to encourage others to participate in like practices. These pictures are to be published in newspapers or other places where the general public can view them.

H. Invite guests to monthly meeting to encourage and broaden the general work and interest of soil conservation.

I. Recognize outstanding cooperators through awards, news articles, or announcements at field days, etc.

J. Start preparations for a 15th anniversary progress report.

1. Committees to be appointed by the chairman for the following:

(a) Financing.
(b) Preparation.

Educational TV

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 132) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of television facilities to be used for educational purposes.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, there is broad agreement among all of us that we must do more to meet the educational needs of our country. Those who have made studies of our schools agree with educators that we must expand and improve our programs at a time in history when we simply cannot settle for second place.

Unfortunately, the sea of education is not a placid one, nor is it free of the rocks and shoals which threaten to bring many Government programs to an unhappy end. Unless we are ever mindful of the dangers involved, we may find to our regret that what begins as Federal aid ends as Federal control. Thus, the problem is really twofold: How to increase and improve our buildings, facilities, and teachers while retaining control at the State and local level.

One answer which meets both elements of the problem is the educational television legislation now before us. Throughout the bill we find numerous safeguards which specifically reserve to the States authority to approve applications and plans before funds are allocated. Those on the local level will be responsible for the way in which educational television programs are used, just as they are now responsible for the use made of textbooks, films, and other educational aids. Conversely, section 398 specifically forbids any Federal department or employee to exercise control over educational television broadcasting or over the curriculum, program of instruction, or personnel of any educational broadcasting station.

The potential advantages are numerous and are readily apparent to those considering the proposal. We are well aware of the rapidly increasing costs of school construction and maintenance, and of the equally rapid increase in the need for school expansion in the decades ahead. When the cost of this construction is added to the projected cost of teachers' salaries, it is evident that widespread savings could be realized by the use of educational television. In rural areas where the population is scattered, television would permit a better utilization of teachers in order to present a more diversified curriculum and equalize educational opportunities.

It behooves us to act immediately. Today only 20 percent of the channels that are reserved for educational television broadcasting have been utilized, and there is grave danger that unless considerably more stations are soon activated, the demand for commercial purposes may be impossible to turn down. Since the number of channels sets aside for educational purposes equals only about 10 percent of all stations, and since the demands made upon them will unquestionably multiply in the years ahead, they should not be lost from lack of use.

Most of the testimony before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was in favor of the bill. Very few witnesses opposed the legislation and those appearing on behalf of commercial television generally favored the educational television on the grounds that they were not able to adequately supply educational services within the framework of their own networks.

In the final analysis, however, it will be the citizens themselves, acting together at the school, district, and State levels who will determine the success of educational TV. Where civic leaders spend necessary time and energy, we can expect excellent results in the years to come. Already Alabama and Colorado can point with pride to their achievements in this area. I am convinced that with the safeguards written into this bill, we can move ahead to obtain better education, with positive assurance that the Federal Government will not prescribe teaching methods or the curriculum. I urge the bill's adoption.

Portugal Fighting Clock in Angola

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I announced Monday that I would insert in the RECORD this week a series of candid reports on the Angolan situation by Robert H. Estabrook of the Washington Post. I respectfully commend the attention of my colleagues to the first of this six-article series, entitled, "Portugal Fighting Clock in Angola."

Mr. Estabrook's series presents a balanced report on an important international situation that has too often been reported emotionally, rather than objectively. The end result has been a distorted picture of the Portuguese position. It is my hope this series will help clarify the true issues.

The article follows:

PORTUGAL FIGHTING CLOCK IN ANGOLA

(By Robert H. Estabrook)

(NOTE.—Estabrook, editor of the editorial page of the Washington Post, has just completed a trip to Lisbon and the Portuguese African provinces of Angola and Mozambique.)

LONDON.—Is there time?

Can education, economic opportunities, and a sense of participation be afforded nearly 11 million Africans in Angola and Mozambique rapidly enough for the promise of a multiracial society to flower before it is blighted by nationalism or white racism?

These are the great questions that loom after an inquiring visit to the two vast provinces of Portuguese Africa. The answer will depend, first, upon the sincerity and urgency with which Portugal seeks to carry out the ambitious programs it has announced, and, second, upon the forbearance of others.

In the face of much world criticism of past repression, real and fancied, Portugal has been struggling to halt a campaign of savage terrorism in Angola and at the same time to initiate sweeping reforms and improvements. There can be no doubt whatever of Portugal's determination to continue her association with the two oversea provinces.

"Independence," as demanded by the critics, is considered unthinkable. But the kind of self-determination envisaged by the more enlightened officials as the culmination of educational and economic gains could lead to a more or less autonomous commonwealth status in a larger Lusitanian, or Portuguese, community.

DECADE AT THE MOST

Administrators shy away from fixed dates, but many of them are aware that Portugal has a decade at the most to make her programs meaningful to the Africans and acceptable to the white residents. They hope that good faith, plus a backwash of world feeling about the effects of premature independence in the Congo, will give them the time they need.

Portuguese policy has combined substantial performance with enormous pride, stubbornness, an overdeveloped sense of history and resentment of outside criticism. Yet the goal it proclaims—a genuinely multiracial society—is the only formula that stands any conceivable chance of success in preserving these territories as places where Africans and Europeans can live amicably together.

On paper, these objectives are of the sort to which most of the world could subscribe. Africans are now automatically Portuguese citizens; they have the choice of assuming rights and obligations under public law or of continuing to observe their tribal customs.

There is no legal color bar. In theory, Africans can aspire, through education, to rise as far as their abilities will carry them. Elaborate plans are being put into effect to concentrate populations in new villages with schools and medical facilities. Many private employers have adopted advanced social welfare programs.

But there also are some severe complications:

A guerrilla war in Angola, organized from outside the country but fed originally on local grievances, that bears many resemblances to previous conflicts in Kenya and Malaya.

A past performance which in 4½ centuries did more to salve white consciences than to improve the condition of the Africans, only a few thousand of whom until now have been assimilated into "civilized" status.

Constant and strident criticism in the United Nations, some of it warranted by past abuses but some of it absurdly exaggerated—with a response from Portugal that affairs in Angola are an internal matter.

A system of government in Lisbon that is dictatorial in nature, highly centralized and extremely conservative in its financing and that denies many effective political rights to Portuguese at home as well as abroad.

A security police that is accused of brutally abducting Africans suspected of nationalist connections and holding them for long periods without trial, and that is widely feared even though there is not the pervasive dread found in Iron Curtain countries.

The presence of half a million white residents, both native and immigrant, who regard Angola and Mozambique as their homes, who are conscious of their own rights at a time of concentration upon more rights for the Africans and who in a crisis could become a colon movement similar to that in Algeria.

A contract labor system for some Africans which is by no means as bad as the "forced labor" sometimes depicted by critics but which makes Portugal an easy target.

An attitude of some officials toward the outside world that has made it difficult for Portugal to present her own case convincingly.

Notwithstanding these difficulties, change unquestionably is in the air in Portugal's oversea provinces. Whether this change is to be considered a gale or a mere zephyr depends upon your point of reference.

Some Government administrators resolutely deny that anything was wrong to begin with, and a few seem to have their minds still firmly rooted in the 15th century. But others, while insisting that complaints in the U.N. and the experience of Goa had nothing to do with the acceleration, concede that the pace must be very much faster in developing education and economic and political rights for the Africans.

Despite the existence of many common problems, the atmosphere in the two provinces is markedly different. Angola is much more on the front line of change. Mozambique is more relaxed, and accordingly there is less feeling of urgency.

Angola, a huge region on the west coast bordering the Congo, northern Rhodesia and southwest Africa, has an area almost twice that of Texas with a population of only about 5 million, less than 5 percent of it white. Portugal has effectively governed it for nearly 400 years, and in some parts of it the white settlers were there before the Africans.

Among white residents, particularly ranchers in the southern part, there is an ebullient frontier spirit reminiscent of the American Southwest. The bush still is the predominant feature but modern towns in the interior contrast with old churches and fortresses along the coast. Residents of Luanda, the capital, which has a white population of about 40,000 out of a total of some 250,000, contend that it is the most handsome city in West Africa.

Angola coffee is known all over the world, and there also is fantastic mineral wealth, particularly diamonds, in the northeast. The Benguela railway links the riches of Katanga and the Rhodesias with west coast ports. Sugar and cotton are important exports and a beef cattle industry is growing.

But over Angola, as a consequence of the terrorism and of resentment of past governmental policies, hangs a cloud of tension. Despite official completion of the military

phase of the campaign to repacify the northwest, nerves remain on edge.

Mozambique, by contrast sits languidly as an unburnished jewel on the east coast, bordered by Tanganyika, the Rhodesias and South Africa. It also has an area larger than that of Texas with a population of somethings over 6 million, some 300,000 of it white.

Until recent years, Mozambique was largely administered by the Companhia de Mozambique, a private concession exploiting agriculture. Its principal products have been cotton, palm oil, and similar commodities. The interior mountains are known to contain mineral wealth, but it is not yet developed.

Lourenco Marques, the capital, named after an early trader, is a remarkably lovely city of 200,000 that is both an important port and a popular vacation resort for South Africans and Rhodesians. Beria, farther north along the coast, also is a busy port with rail connections to Rhodesia.

Friction has not come to Mozambique, at least in any large amount. The Africans there, though perhaps not so far advanced in opportunity as in Angola, appear happy, friendly and well fed. No one can yet assess the influences across the border from Tanganyika, but the force of African nationalism is not now evident.

Neither Angola nor Mozambique, however, can be wholly insulated from outside influences. Portugal found this out with a rude shock last February and March when a terrorist uprising broke out in Angola.

There had been disturbances among the African population of Luanda in February, apparently timed to coincide with the visit of foreign journalists. These seemed well organized and concentrated upon specific objectives such as the police barracks. In the ensuing melee, some 20 Africans were beaten to death.

This particular uprising has been laid by the Portuguese to the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA) under Mario de Andrade, an expatriate Angolan with Communist connections who then had his headquarters in Conakry, Guinea.

In turn, that uprising apparently forced the hand of the rival Union of the People of Angola (UPA), headed by Holden Roberto, who had been working among the large Angolan community across the border in the Congo. The UPA originally had focused upon discontent among the African Angolans, particularly the past requirement that farmers grow cotton and sell it to the Government at low prices.

Anyhow, on the night of March 15 the terrorists struck in northwest Angola, apparently in an effort to command the attention of the United Nations Security Council, which had been hearing complaints about repression in Angola. Between 1,000 and 1,500 Europeans and Africans were massacred during the next few days, usually with field knives, and others were grotesquely maimed.

The precise motives for the outbreak were obscure. There can be little doubt, however, that the terrorists appealed to feelings of unity in the Bakongo tribe, which exists in the Congo as well as in Angola, and made use of a combination of superstition, intimidation and religious fetishism to turn once placid Africans into fiends.

The Portuguese response, once the first shock had worn off, was one of wholesale reprisal in kind. Settlers who had seen their families butchered did not ask questions and tended to wreak vengeance on every African they encountered. In the indiscriminate slaughter, perhaps 10,000 Africans were killed.

It is this aspect which critics of Portugal have seized upon in the U.N. What disgruntles the Portuguese is the fact that very little attention was given to the original terrorism, which far exceeded anything experienced during the Mau Mau uprising in Kenya.

Anyhow, the Portuguese armed forces, which had been at minimal strength in Angola, were quickly built up to some 30,000. As the army moved in, the terrorism was controlled, and in October the Government announced that the military phase of operations had been completed.

This was perhaps a slight exaggeration. Guerrilla raids continue in some areas, although the main lines of communication are open. Communities remain under the equivalent of martial law. But in the main, pacification has been carried out. Africans who fled from their homes have been returning and more or less normal life has been restored.

In the process, the Government tended to become suspicious of Africans whose total loyalty was not proved, and this often meant Africans with education. Here other abuses arose. Suspicion fell especially upon native Protestant pastors, many of whom were abruptly arrested and jailed, and upon white missionaries.

Some Government officials have looked upon Protestant missionaries as inherently revolutionary, and a few missionaries were expelled from the country. In several instances native pastors were imprisoned on no more evidence than that their names had been found on lists of potential nationalist contacts, and in at least one case an arrested student died after beatings.

A LESSON LEARNED

But if the Government acted cruelly in this aspect, in other ways it learned the lesson. High officials concede that the net result of the terrorist attacks was to cause new thinking and to speed up programs to improve conditions for the Africans.

In September, new laws were promulgated in Lisbon emphasizing citizenship and political status for the African population. In Angola proper, a major effort has been undertaken to build new villages for the Africans with schools and dispensaries.

Meanwhile, in Angola and Mozambique as well, there is a social paradox. Segregation does not exist by law, but Luanda and Lourenco Marques are essentially white cities with heavy African majorities. New white immigrants from Portugal have the effect of limiting the economic opportunities open to Africans.

It is impossible to find an African taxi driver in Luanda (although there are African bus drivers across the continent in Beira), and it would be extraordinary for an African to be able to afford any hotel room in Lourenco Marques. The number of Africans proceeding to Lisbon for a university education (there are no universities yet in either Angola or Mozambique) is minuscule.

The literacy rate among Africans in both countries is still pitifully small. Yet the literacy rate in Portugal itself is only about 60 percent.

ANOTHER PARADOX

And this leads to another paradox. In Mazambique, an African laborer is said to earn more than a European laborer in Portugal because of the difference in the standard of living.

It is not at all unusual in Angola to find local mayors or government officials who are pure-blooded Africans, and doctors and administrators from Goa or the Cape Verde Islands are common. In the shops of the Benguela railway at Nova Lisboa, Africans perform the jobs calling for the highest skill.

The fact that some trained Africans earn more than white immigrants from Portugal in turn causes some minor frictions. But government officials contend that these frictions will be reduced or eliminated with time and assimilation.

This is the bundle of contradictions, tensions, dangers, and opportunities that Portugal faces in Africa. The multiracial policy has worked imperfectly; there have been abuses and delays, and there is an almost neurotic response to the opinion of others.

But changes are definitely in process and the Portuguese, who have been better mixers than most of the other European colonizers, appear to be awaking to a momentous challenge—if there is time to meet it.

The brighter young administrators are acutely conscious that it is a race for time—and that world criticism is likely to continue until there are real political rights for all Portuguese. The goad for success is the recognition that either of the usually mentioned alternative courses—a poorly prepared African independence or perpetuated domination by a small, white minority—could lead to catastrophe.

Preface to a Political Theory of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most distinguished American political scientists is Dr. Hans J. Morgenthau. An author of note and a well-known educator, Dr. Morgenthau has taught political science to thousands of American students.

He is at present professor of political science at the University of Chicago and has written an essay entitled "Preface to a Political Theory of Foreign Aid," one of the most brilliant discussions of foreign aid, published recently by the public affairs conference center of the University of Chicago. I commend it to the attention of our colleagues and urge them to consider Dr. Morgenthau's thesis:

PREFACE TO A POLITICAL THEORY OF FOREIGN AID

(By Hans J. Morgenthau)

Of the seeming and real innovations which the modern age has introduced into the practice of foreign policy, none has proven more baffling to both understanding and action than foreign aid. The very assumption that foreign aid is an instrument of foreign policy is a subject of controversy. For, on the one hand, the opinion is widely held that foreign aid is an end in itself, carrying within itself a justification both transcending, and independent of, foreign policy. In this view, foreign aid is the fulfillment of an obligation which the few rich nations have toward the many poor ones. On the other hand, many see no justification for a policy of foreign aid at all. They look at foreign aid as a gigantic boondoggle, a wasteful and indefensible operation which serves neither the interests of the United States nor those of the recipient nations.

The public debate on foreign aid has contributed little to understanding. In the spring of every year, the Nation engages in such a debate, carried on almost exclusively in terms of the amount of money to be spent for purposes of foreign aid rather than of the substantive purposes which a policy of foreign aid is supposed to serve. The administration tries, as it were, to sell a certain amount of foreign aid to Congress, and Congress refuses to buy that amount. Congress generally appropriates about 10 percent less than what the administration has

requested, and the administration spends that amount as it sees fit within the general categories of the appropriation bill. It is only when glaring abuses and inefficiencies are uncovered, as for instance in our foreign aid to Laos, that the question of the substance of our foreign aid policy is raised in public, and even then it is raised in the negative terms of remedying the abuses and inefficiencies rather than in the positive terms of what the purposes of our foreign aid policy are supposed to be and what kinds of measures are best calculated to serve these purposes.

It is pointless even to raise the question as to whether or not the United States ought to have a policy of foreign aid. To ask that question is as pointless as to ask whether or not the United States ought to have a foreign political or military policy. For the United States has interests abroad which cannot be supported by military means and for the support of which the traditional methods of diplomacy are only in part appropriate. If foreign aid does not support them, they will not be supported at all.

The question, what kind of policy of foreign aid out we to have, can then not be evaded. As it has developed in recent years, our policy of foreign aid is fundamentally weak. It has been conceived as a self-sufficient technical enterprise, covering a multitude of disparate objectives and activities, responding haphazardly to all kinds of demands, sound and unsound, unrelated or only by accident related to the political purposes of our foreign policy. The United States has been in the business of foreign aid for more than a decade, but it has yet to develop an intelligible theory of foreign aid that could provide standards of judgment for both the supporters and opponents of a particular measure.

SIX TYPES OF FOREIGN AID

The first prerequisite for the development of a viable philosophy of foreign aid is the recognition of the diversity of policies that go by that name. Six such policies can be distinguished which have only one thing in common: the transfer of money and economic services from one nation to another. They are humanitarian foreign aid, subsistence foreign aid, military foreign aid, bribery, prestige foreign aid, and foreign aid for economic development.

Of these different types of foreign aid, only humanitarian foreign aid is per se nonpolitical. The aid which governments have traditionally extended to each other in case of natural disasters, such as floods, famines, and epidemics, falls in that category. So do the services, especially in the fields of medicine and agriculture, which private organizations, such as churches and foundations, have traditionally provided in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

While humanitarian aid is per se nonpolitical, it can indeed perform a political function when it operates within a political context. The foreign aid private organizations provide will be attributed for better or for worse to their respective governments insofar as humanitarian aid emanating from a foreign country is recognized by the recipient country to perform a political function. Thus the agricultural aid which the Rockefeller Foundation has provided for many years to certain Latin American countries is likely to take on under contemporary conditions a political function which it did not perform previously. The same has been true from the beginning of the work the Ford Foundation has been doing in India. By the same token, humanitarian aid extended by a government may have political effects.

Subsistence foreign aid is extended to governments, such as those of Jordan and Libya, which do not command the resources to maintain minimal public services. The giving nation makes up the deficit in the budget of the recipient nation. Subsistence foreign aid is akin to the humanitarian type in that it seeks to prevent the breakdown of order and the disintegration of organized society itself. It performs the political function of maintaining the status quo. It maintains it without, as a rule, increasing its viability. Where there is a political alternative to an unviable regime, subsistence foreign aid diminishes its chances of materializing.

Bribes proffered by one government to another for political advantage were until the beginning of the 19th century an integral part of the armory of diplomacy. No statesman hesitated to acknowledge the giving and accepting of bribes. Thus it was proper and common for a government to pay the foreign minister or ambassador of another country a pension, that is, a bribe. Lord Robert Cecil, the Minister of Elizabeth, received one from Spain. Sir Henry Wotton, British Ambassador to Venice in the 17th century, accepted one from Savoy while applying for one from Spain. The documents which the French revolutionary government published in 1793 show that France subsidized Austrian statesmen between 1757 and 1769 to the tune of 82,652,479 livres, with the Austrian Chancellor Kaunitz receiving 100,000.

Nor was it regarded any less proper or less usual for a government to compensate foreign statesmen for their cooperation in the conclusion of treaties. In 1716, the French Cardinal Dubois offered the British Minister Stanhope 600,000 livres for an alliance with France. He reported that Stanhope, while not accepting the proposition at that time, "listened graciously without being displeased." After the conclusion of the Treaty of Basel of 1795, by virtue of which Prussia withdrew from the war against France, the Prussian Minister Hardenberg received from the French Government valuables worth 30,000 francs and complained of the insignificance of the gift. In 1801, the Margrave of Baden spent 500,000 francs in the form of diplomatic presents, of which the French Foreign Minister Talleyrand received 150,000. It was originally intended to give him only 100,000, but the amount was increased after it had become known that he had received from Prussia a snuffbox worth 66,000 francs as well as 100,000 francs in cash. The Prussian Ambassador in Paris summed up well the main rule of this game when he reported to his government in 1802: "Experience has taught everybody who is here on diplomatic business that one ought never to give anything before the deal is definitely closed, but it has only proved that the allurement of gain will often work wonders."

Much of what goes by the name of foreign aid today is in the nature of such bribes. The transfer of money and services from one government to another performs here the function of a price paid by the former to the latter for political services rendered or to be rendered by the latter to the former. These bribes differ from the traditional ones, of which we have given examples above, in two respects: they are justified primarily in terms of foreign aid for economic development, and money and services are transferred through elaborate machinery fashioned for genuine economic aid. In consequence, these bribes are a less effective means for the purpose of purchasing political favors than were the traditional ones.

The compulsion of substituting for the traditional businesslike transmission of bribes the pretense and elaborate machinery of foreign aid for economic development results from a climate of opinion which accepts as universally valid the proposition that the highly developed industrial nations have an obligation to transfer money and services to underdeveloped nations for the purpose of economic development. Thus, aside from humanitarian and military foreign aid, the only kind of transfer of money and service which seems to be legitimate is the one made for the purpose of economic development. Economic development has become an ideology by which the transfer of money and services from one government to another is rationalized and justified.

However, the present climate of opinion not only assumes that highly developed industrial nations have an obligation to extend foreign aid for economic development to underdeveloped nations. It also assumes as a universally valid proposition that economic development can actually be promoted through such transfer of money and services. Thus economic development as an ideology requires machinery that makes plausible the assumption of the efficacy of the transfer of money and services for the purpose of economic development. In contrast to most political ideologies, which operate only on the verbal level and whose effects remain within the realm of ideas, this political ideology, in order to be plausible, requires an elaborate apparatus serving as an instrument for a policy of makebelieve. The government of nation A, trying to buy political advantage from the government of nation B for, say, the price of 20 million dollars, not only must pretend, but also must act out in elaborate fashion the pretense, that what it is actually doing is giving aid for economic development to the government of nation B.

This practice of giving bribes as though they were contributions to economic development creates of necessity expectations, in the giver and the recipient, which are bound to be disappointed. Old-fashioned bribery is a straightforward transaction; services are to be rendered at a price, and both sides know what to expect. Bribery disguised as foreign aid for economic development makes of giver and recipient actors in a play which in the end they can no longer distinguish from reality. In consequence, both expect results in terms of economic development which in the nature of things could not have been forthcoming. Thus both are bound to be disappointed, the giver blaming the recipient for his inefficiency and the recipient accusing the giver of stinginess and asking for more. The ideology, taken for reality, gets in the way of the original purpose of the transaction, and neither side believes that it has received what it is entitled to.

Until recently, military aid took the lion's share of the foreign aid programs of the United States. A shift in favor of nonmilitary aid occurred during the 1961 session when Congress appropriated in excess of $2 billion for military aid, while the total voted for all the other foreign aid programs amounted to in excess of $3 billion. To the latter amount must be added approximately $1 billion from the proceeds of the sale of agricultural commodities for foreign currencies to be used for economic grants and loans to purchasing governments.

Foreign aid for military purposes is a traditional way by which nations buttress their alliances. The 17th and 18th centuries are the classic period of military subsidies by which especially Great Britain endeavored to increase the military strength of her continental allies. Glancing through the treaties of alliance of that period, one is struck by the meticulous precision with which obligations to furnish troops, equipment, logistic support, food, money, and the like were defined. The loans which France extended to Russia after the conclusion of the alliance between the two nations in 1894 fall in the same category. This traditional military aid can be understood as a division of labor between two allies who pool

their resources, one supplying money, materiel, and training, the other providing primarily manpower.

In contrast to traditional practice, military aid is today not only extended to allies but also to certain uncommitted nations. The military aid the United States has been giving to Yugoslavia is a case in point. The purpose is here not so much military as political. It seeks political advantage in exchange for military aid. It obligates the recipient toward the giver. The latter expects the former to abstain from a political course which might put in jeopardy the continuation of military aid. Military aid is here really in the nature of a bribe.

What appears as military aid may also be actually in the nature of prestige aid, to be discussed below. The provision of jet fighters and other modern weapons for certain underdeveloped nations can obviously perform no genuine military function. It increases the prestige of the recipient nation both at home and abroad. Being in the possession of some of the more spectacular instruments of modern warfare, a nation can at least enjoy the illusion of having become a modern military power.

As bribery appears today in the guise of aid for economic development, so does aid for economic development appear in the guise of military assistance. In the session of 1961, Congress, for instance, appropriated $425 million for economic aid to strategic areas, and it is likely that in the total appropriations for military aid in excess of $2 billion other items of economic aid are hidden. This mode of operation results from the reluctance of Congress to vote large amounts for economic aid in contrast to its readiness to vote virtually any amount requested for military purposes. Yet the purposes of aid for economic development are likely to suffer when they are disguised as military assistance, as we saw the purposes of bribery to suffer when disguised as aid for economic development. The military context within which such aid is bound to operate, even though its direct administration be in the hands of the civilian authorities, is likely to deflect such aid from its genuine purposes. More particularly, it strengthens the ever present tendency to subordinate the requirements of aid for economic development to military considerations.

Prestige aid has this in common with modern bribes that its true purpose, too, is concealed by the ostensible purpose of economic development. The unprofitable or idle steel mill, the highway without traffic and leading nowhere, the airline operating with foreign personnel and at a loss but under the flag of the recipient country—they ostensibly serve the purposes of economic development and under different circumstances could do so. Actually, however, they perform no positive economic function. They owe their existence to the penchant, prevalent in many underdeveloped nations, for what might be called "conspicuous industrialization," an industrialization spectacular in producing symobls of, and monuments to, industrial advancement rather than satisfying the objective economic needs of the country. This tendency sheds an illuminating light upon the nature of what is generally referred to as the "revolution of rising expectations."

We are inclined to assume that the "revolution of rising expectations," that is, the urgent desire to improve one's lot by means of modern technology and industry, is a well-nigh universal trend in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Actually, however, this trend is universal only in the sense that virtually all underdeveloped nations want to appear as having achieved industrialization, while only a fraction of the population, and frequently only small elite groups within it, seek the social and economic benefits of industrialization and are willing to take the measures necessary to achieve them. For many of the underdeveloped nations the steel mill, the highway, the airline, the modern weapons, perform a function that is not primarily economic or military but psychological and political. They are sought as symbols and monuments of modernity and power. They perform a function similar to that which the cathedral performed for the medieval city and the feudal castle or the monarch's palace for the absolute state. Nehru is reported to have said, when he showed Chou-En-Lai a new dam: "It is in these temples that I worship." And the more underdeveloped and less viable a nation is, the greater is likely to be its urge to prove to itself and to the world through the results of prestige aid that it, too, has arrived in the mid-20th century.

The advantage for the giver of prestige aid is threefold. He may receive specific political advantages in return for the provision of aid, very much after the model of the advantage received in return for a bribe. The spectacular character of prestige aid establishes a patent relationship between the generosity of the giver and the increased prestige of the recipient. The giver's prestige is enhanced, as it were, by the increase of the recipient's prestige. Finally, prestige aid comes relatively cheap. A limited commitment of resources in the form of a spectacular but economically useless symbol of, or monument to, modernity may bring disproportionate political dividends.

The giver of foreign aid must perform the task of distinguishing between prestige aid and aid for economic development. It is in the nature of prestige aid that it is justified by the prospective recipient in terms of genuine economic development. The prospective giver, unaware of the distinction, is likely to fall into one of two errors. By mistaking prestige aid for aid for economic development, he will either waste human and material resources in support of the latter, while the purpose of prestige aid could have been achieved much more simply and cheaply. Or else he will reject out of hand a request for prestige aid because it cannot be justified in terms of economic development, and may thereby forgo political advantages which he could have gained from the provision of the prestige aid requested. The classic example of this error is the American rejection of the Afghan request for the paving of the streets of Kabul as economically unsound. It may be noted in passing that the Soviet Union, pursuing a politically oriented policy of foreign aid, paved the streets of Kabul, even though that measure had no bearing upon the economic development of Afghanistan.

FOREIGN AID FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN PARTICULAR

None of the types of foreign aid discussed thus far poses theoretical questions of the first magnitude; rather they raise issues for practical manipulation which can be successfully met by common sense tested by experience. Foreign aid for economic development has been the primary area for theoretical analysis and speculation, and these have been primarily of an economic nature. Economic thought, true to its prevailing academic tradition, tends to look at foreign aid as though it were a self-sufficient technical enterprise to be achieved with the instruments, and judged by the standards, of pure economics. And since Western economic development, from the first industrial revolution onwards, has been due to the formation of capital and the accumulation of technical knowledge, we have tended to assume that these two factors would by themselves provide the impetus for the economic development of the underdeveloped nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. This tendency has been powerfully supported by the spectacular success of the Marshall plan, conceived and executed as a strictly economic measure for the provision of capital and technological know-how. Yet it is not always recognized that this success was made possible only by the fact that, in contrast to the underdeveloped nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, the recipients of Marshall aid were among the leading industrial nations of the world, whose economic systems were but temporarily in disarray.

The popular mind, on the other hand, and, through it, much of the practice of foreign aid have proceeded from certain unexamined assumptions, no less doubtful for being deeply embedded in the American folklore of politics. Thus the popular mind has established correlations between the infusion of capital and technological know-how into a primitive society and economic development, between economic development and social stability, between social stability and democratic institutions, between democratic institutions and a peaceful foreign policy. However attractive and reassuring these correlations may sound to American ears, they are borne out neither by the experiences we have had with our policies of foreign aid nor by general historic experience.

The first of these assumptions implies that underdevelopment is at least primarily the result of lack of capital and technological know-how. Underdevelopment is regarded as a kind of accident or at worst as a kind of deficiency disease, which can be taken care of through the infusion of capital and technological know-how. Yet a nation may suffer from deficiencies, some natural and insuperable, others social and remediable, which no amount of capital and technological know-how supplied from the outside can cure. The poverty of natural resources may be such as to make economic development imposible. Nations, such as Jordan, Libya, and Somalia, are in all likelihood permanently incapable of economic development for that reason. Many of the nations which are the permanent recipients of subsistence aid are likely to fall in the same category.

A nation may also suffer from human deficiencies which preclude economic development. As there are individuals whose qualities of character and level of intelligence make it impossible for them to take advantage of economic opportunities, so are there nations similarly handicapped. To put it bluntly: as there are bums and beggars, so are there bum and beggar nations. They may be the recipients of charity, but short of a miraculous transformation of their collective intelligence and character, what they receive from the outside is not likely to be used for economic development.

Some nations are deficient in the specific kind of character and intelligence which goes into the making of a modern economic system, but their general qualities of character and level of intelligence qualify them for the necessary transformation. They are, to use a rough analogy, in a medieval stage of cultural development, still awaiting the equivalent of the moral and intellectual revolutions which in the 16th and 17th centuries created the cultural preconditions for the economic development of the West. Yet we tend to take the existence of these preconditions for granted, forgetting that without the secularization and rationalization of Western thought and society the industrialization of the West would not have been possible.

A civilization, such as the Burmese, which depricates success in this world because it stands in the way of success in the other world, puts a cultural obstacle in the path of industrial development, which foreign aid by itself cannot overcome. Saving, that is, the preservation of capital or goods for future

use, has become so integral a part of our economic thought and action that it is hard for us to realize that there are hundreds of millions of people in the underdeveloped areas of the world who are oblivious of this mode of operation, indispensable to economic development. We have come to consider the productive enterprise as a continuum in which the individual owner or manager has a personal stake. Yet in many underdeveloped areas the productive enterprise is regarded primarily as an object for financial exploitation, to be discarded when it has performed its function of bringing the temporary owner a large financial return in the shortest possible time. Foreign aid poured into such a precapitalistic and even prerational mold is not likely to transform the mold, but rather it will be forced by the mold into channels serving the interests of a precapitalistic or prerational society.

The economic interests which stand in the way of foreign aid being used for economic development are typically tied in with the distribution of political power in underdeveloped societies. The ruling groups in these societies derive their political power in good measure from the economic status quo. The ownership and control of arable land, in particular, is in many of the underdeveloped societies the foundation of political power. Land reform and industrialization are in consequence an attack upon the political status quo. In the measure that they are successful, they are bound to affect drastically the distribution of economic and political power. Yet the beneficiaries of both the economic and political status quo are the typical recipients of foreign aid given for the purpose of changing the status quo. Their use of foreign aid for this purpose requires a readiness for self-sacrifice and a sense of social responsibility which few ruling groups have shown throughout history. Foreign aid proffered under such circumstances is likely to fail in its purpose of econoimc development and, as a bride to the ruling group, to strengthen the economic and political status quo. It is likely to accentuate unsolved social and political problems rather than bring them closer to solution. A team of efficiency experts and public accountants might well have improved the operations of the Al Capone gang; yet by doing so, it would have aggravated the social and political evils which the operations of that gang brought forth.

Given this likely resistance of the ruling group to economic development, foreign aid requires drastic political change as a precondition for its success. Foreign aid must go hand in hand with political change, either voluntarily induced from within or brought about through pressure from without. The latter alternative faces the giving nation with a dual dilemma. On the one hand, to give foreign aid for economic development without stipulating conditions that maximize the chances for success maximizes the chances for failure. On the other hand, to give aid "with strings" arouses xenophobic suspicions and nationalistic resentments, to be exploited both by the defenders of the status quo and the promoters of Communist revolution.

Furthermore, once one has decided upon bringing about political change in opposition to the ruling group, one must identify the alternative group as the instrument of political change. Sometimes, one may have a choice among different alternative groups equally unattractive. Sometimes, and not infrequently, the absence of any alternative group either forces one to create one or else leaves one no choice.

Finally, the promotion of drastic social change on the part of the giving nation creates the precondition for economic development, but it also conjures up the specter of uncontrollable revolution. In many of the underdeveloped nations, peace and order are maintained only through the ruthless use of the monopoly of violence by the ruling group. Determined and skillful foreign intervention may not find it hard to weaken the power of the ruling group or to remove it from power altogether. While it may be able to control events up to this point, that is, to instigate drastic reform and revolution, it may well be unable to control the course of the revolution itself. More particularly, a democratic nation, such as the United States, is greatly handicapped in competing with Communists in the control of the revolution. The revolution may start, as did the Cuban revolution, under the democratic auspices of the unorganized masses dedicated to social reform and supported by the United States, and may in the course of its development be taken over by the highly organized and disciplined Communist minority, the only organized and disciplined revolutionary group available.

Successful foreign aid for economic development may have similarly unsettling political results. Economic development, especially by way of industrialization, is likely to disrupt the social fabric of the underdeveloped nation. By creating an urban industrial proletariat, it loosens and destroys the social nexus of family, village, and tribe, in which the individual had found himself secure. And it will not be able, at least not right away, to provide a substitute for this lost social world. The vacuum thus created will be filled by social unrest and political agitation. Furthermore, it is not the downtrodden masses living in a static world of unrelieved misery which are the likely protagonists of revolution, but rather those groups that have begun to rise in the social and economic scale but not enough to satisfy aroused expectations. Thus, economic development is bound to disturb not only the economic status quo but, through it, the political status quo as well. If the change is drastic enough, the social and political effects of economic development may well amount to a prerevolutionary or revolutionary situation. And while the United States may have started the revolutionary process, it will again be a moot question as to under whose auspices it will be ended.

The United States faces a number of formidable handicaps in the performance of the task of controlling social and political change in the underdeveloped nations either as a prerequisite for, or a result of, foreign aid for economic development. First of all, the United States is a Western capitalistic nation. It is a conservative power both domestically and internationally, and must so appear particularly to the underdeveloped nations. Both in its civilization and social and economic structure, it belongs to that complex of nations which until recently were able to hold Africa, Latin America, and the outlying areas of Asia in a condition of colonial or semicolonial dependency. It has military alliances with these nations, and while it has generally shunned and even opposed outright colonial policies, it has actively and successfuly participated in the semicolonial exploitation of backward nations. Thus the resentment against the former colonial powers attaches also to it, and its policies of foreign aid are frequently suspected as serving in disguise the traditional ends of colonialism.

Furthermore, the United States, by dint of its pluralistic political philosophy and social system, cannot bring to the backward nations of the world a simple message of salvation, supported first by dedicated and disciplined revolutionary minorities and then by totalitarian control. In the nature of things the advantage lies here with the Communist powers. They are, as it were, specialists in exploiting a revolutionary situation, which is bound to cause us embarrasement. For while the Communists are able to direct a revolution into the desired channels through their use of a disciplined minority, we, even if we are convinced that revolution is inevitable and therefore do not oppose it, tend to look with misgivings upon it since we cannot control the direction it will take.

The Communist powers have still another advantage over the United States in that their problems and achievements are more meaningful, at least on the surface, to the underdeveloped nations than are ours. The Soviet Union has achieved, and Communist China attempts to achieve, what the more enlightened underdeveloped nations seek: a drastic increase in the standard of living through rapid industrialization. The Communist powers use totalitarian control as their instrument and Communist doctrine as rationalization and justification. Seeking the same results, the underdeveloped nations cannot help being attracted by the methods which brought these results about elsewhere. In contrast, the slow process, stretching over centuries, through which the nations of the West achieved a high standard of living through industrialization must appeal much less to them. That appeal is lessened even more by the economic processes of the free market and the political processes of liberal democracy through which, in a large measure, Western industrialization was achieved. For these processes require a degree of moral restraint and economic and political sophistication which are largely absent in the underdeveloped nations. The simple and crude methods of totalitarianism must appear to them much more congenial.

Thus we arrive at the disconcerting conclusion that successful foreign aid for economic development can be counterproductive if the social and political goal of the giving nation is the recipient's social and political stability. In some cases at least, the falure of American aid for economic development may have been a blessing in disguise in that it did not disturb a stable status quo whose continuing stability was our main interest. Such aid, intended for economic development, actually performs the function either of a bribe or of prestige aid. Here again, however, these functions are likely to be impaired by disappointed expectations of economic development of the giving and the recipient nation.

It is equally a moot question whether or not successful foreign aid for economic development is conducive to the development of democratic institutions and practices. This is obviously not the place to raise ex professo the issue of the relationship between democracy and economic development. But that no necessary relationship exists between the two, recent history has made clear. The most impressive example is the Soviet Union. Its rapid economic development has gone hand in hand with totalitarian government, and a case could well be made for the proposition that the former would have been impossible without the latter. It is more likely than not that where the intellectual and moral preconditions for economic development are lacking in the population at large and are present only in a small elite, as they are in many of the underdeveloped nations, the imposition of the will of that small minority upon the majority of the population is not only a precondition for the start of economic development but also for sustained economic growth.

As concerns the promotion of a peaceful foreign policy, economic development is likely to be counterproductive, provided a political incentive for a belligerent foreign policy is present. The contrary conclusion derives from the popular, yet totally unfounded assumption that "poor" nations make war on "rich" nations for economic advantage and that "rich" nations are by definition peaceful because they have what they want. In truth, of course, most wars have been fought not for economic but political advantage, and, particularly under modern technologi-

cal conditions, only economically advanced nations are capable of waging modern war. We did not consider the Soviet Union a military threat as long as it was economically underdeveloped; it became such a threat at the very moment its economic development had transformed it into a modern industrial power. Similarly, Communist China today is only a potential military threat by virtue of its economic potential, both likely to be activated by economic development.

Foreign aid for economic development, then, has a very much smaller range of potentially successful operation than is generally believed, and its success depends in good measure not so much upon its soundness in strictly economic terms as upon intellectual, moral, and political preconditions, which are not susceptible to economic manipulation, if they are susceptible to manipulation from the outside at all. Furthermore, the political results of successful foreign aid for economic development may be either unpredictable or counterproductive in terms of the political goals of the giving nation. In any event, they are in large measure uncontrollable. Foreign aid proffered and accepted for purposes of economic development may turn out to be something different from what it was intended to be, if it is not oriented toward the political conditions within which it must operate. Most likely, it will turn out to be a bribe or prestige aid, or else a total waste. To do too much may here be as great a risk as to do too little, and "masterly inactivity" may sometimes be the better part of wisdom.

CONCLUSIONS FOR POLICY

The major conclusions for policy to be drawn from this analysis are three: the requirement of identifying each concrete situation in the light of the six different types of foreign aid and of choosing the quantity and quality of foreign aid appropriate to the situation; the requirement of attuning, within the same concrete situation, different types of foreign aid to each other in view of the overall goals of foreign policy; and the requirement of dealing with foreign aid as an integral part of political policy.

The task of identifying concrete situations in view of the type of foreign aid appropriate to them is a task for country and area experts to perform. Can this country not survive without foreign aid? Is its government likely to exchange political advantages for economic favors? Would our military interests be served by the strengthening of this nation's military forces? Does this country provide the noneconomic preconditions for economic development to be supported by foreign aid? Are our political interests likely to be served by giving this nation foreign aid for purposes of prestige? Can a case be made for foreign aid in order to alleviate human suffering? What kind and quantity of foreign aid is necessary and sufficient to achieve the desired result?

To answer these questions correctly demands first of all a thorough and intimate knowledge and understanding of the total situation in a particular country. But it also requires political and economic judgment of a very high order, and it does so in two different areas. On the one hand, it is necessary to anticipate the susceptibility of the country to different kinds of foreign aid and their effects upon the country. On the other hand, when this task has been performed, it is then necessary to select from a great number of possible measures of foreign aid those which are most appropriate to the situation and, hence, most likely to succeed.

In most situations, however, the task is not that simple. Typically, an underdeveloped country will present a number of situations calling for different types of foreign aid to be given simultaneously. One type of foreign aid given without regard for the effects it may have upon another type risks getting in the way of the latter. One of the most conspicuous weaknesses of our past foreign aid policies has been the disregard of the effect different types of foreign aid have upon each other. Bribes given to the ruling group, for instance, are bound to strengthen the political and economic status quo. Military aid is bound to have an impact upon the distribution of political power within the receiving country; it can also have a deleterious effect upon the economic system, for instance, by increasing inflationary pressures. Similarly, the effect of subsistence foreign aid is bound to be the support of the status quo in all its aspects. Insofar as the giving nation desires these effects or can afford to be indifferent to them, they obviously do not matter in terms of its overall objectives. But insofar as the giving nation has embarked upon a policy of foreign aid for economic development which requires changes in the political and economic status quo, the other foreign aid policies are counterproductive in terms of economic development; for they strengthen the very factors which stand in its way.

This problem is particularly acute in the relations between prestige aid and aid for economic development. The giving nation may seek quick political results and use prestige aid for that purpose; yet it may also have an interest in the economic development of the recipient country, the benefits of which are likely to appear only in the distant future. Prestige aid is at best only by accident relevant to economic development; it may be irrelevant to it, or it may actually impede it. What kind of foreign aid is the giving country to choose? If it chooses a combination of both it must take care to choose an innocuous kind of prestige aid and to promote economic development the benefits of which are not too long in coming. Afghanistan is the classic example of this dilemma. The Soviet Union, by paving the streets of Kabul, chose a kind of prestige aid that is irrelevant to economic development. The United States, by building a hydroelectric dam in a remote part of the country, chose economic development, the very existence of which is unknown to most Afghans and the benefits of which will not appear for years to come.

It follows, then, from the very political orientation of foreign aid that its effects upon the prestige of the giving nation must always be in the minds of the formulators and executors of foreign aid policies. Foreign aid for economic development, in particular, whose benefits to the recipient country are immediate and patent is a more potent political weapon than one whose benefits are obscure and lie far in the future. Furthermore, the political effects of foreign aid are lost if its foreign source is not obvious to the recipients. For it is not aid as such or its beneficial results that creates political loyalties on the part of the recipient, but the positive relationship that the mind of the recipient establishes between the aid and its beneficial results, on the one hand, and the political philosophy, the political system, and the political objectives of the giver, on the other. That is to say, if the recipient continues to disapprove of the political philosophy, system, and objectives of the giver, despite the aid he has received, the political effects of the aid are lost. The same is true if he remains unconvinced that the aid received is but a natural, if not inevitable, manifestation of the political philosophy, system, and objectives of the giver. Foreign aid remains politically ineffectual as long as the recipient says either: "Aid is good, but the politics of the giver are bad;" or "aid is good, but the politics of the giver—good, bad, or indifferent—have nothing to do with it." In order to be effective for the establishment of a community between giver and recipient, the procedures through which aid is given, and the subject matter to which it is applied, must lend themselves to the creation of a connection between aid and the politics of the giver which reflects credit upon the latter.

The problem of foreign aid is insoluble if it is considered as a self-sufficient technical enterprise of a primarily economic nature. It is soluble only if it is considered an integral part of the political policies of the giving country, which must be devised in view of the political conditions, and for its effects upon the political situation, in the receiving country. In this respect, a policy of foreign aid is no different from diplomatic or military policy or propaganda. They are all weapons in the political armory of the nation.

As military policy is too important a matter to be left to the generals, so is foreign aid too important a matter to be left to the economists. The expertise of the economist must analyze certain facts, devise certain means, and perform certain functions of manipulation for foreign aid. Yet the formulation and overall execution of foreign aid policy is a political function. It must be performed by the political expert.

It follows from the political nature of foreign aid that it is not a science but an art. What that art requires by way of mental predisposition is political sensitivity to the interrelationship among the facts, present and future, and ends, and means. The requirements by way of mental activity are twofold. It requires, first of all, a discriminatory judgment of facts, ends, and means and their effects upon each other. However, an analysis of the situation in the recipient country and, more particularly, its projection into the future and the conclusions from the analysis in terms of policy can only in part be arrived at through rational deduction from ascertainable facts. When all the facts have been ascertained, duly analyzed, and conclusions drawn from them, the final judgments and decisions can be derived only from subtle and sophisticated hunches. The best the formulator and executor of a policy of foreign aid can do is to maximize the chances that his hunches turn out to be right. Here as elsewhere in the formulation and conduct of foreign policy, the intuition of the statesman rather than the knowledge of the expert will carry the day.

Paper's Four Editors Average 79 Years of Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, heavy emphasis is placed these days on young people and the vigor they can inject into business, labor, and government activities. Certainly there is much to say for that approach, but not if it means we are to neglect the effective action provided by many persons of beyond the normal retirement age. As evidence I would like to submit the following article, appearing in the St. Paul Pioneer Press for March 4:

PAPER'S FOUR EDITORS AVERAGE 79 YEARS OF AGE

(By Don Spavin)

STILLWATER.—If the weather and aching bones have about convinced you it's time to retire, consider the case of four Stillwater men.

The quartet, whose ages add to 316 years, an average of 79, not only are still working every day but are important cogs in a newspaper which itself is no youngster.

Ned Easton, 79, once a carrier boy for the Stillwater Gazette, is publisher and business manager. His day begins at 8 a.m., and "ends when we're through."

Edgar "Ed" Roney, 79, "2 weeks older than the boss," also once carried the paper he now edits. Spry and sharp, he handles most of the news that fills the pages, writes his share of it and keeps a day that would tax the vigor of a young man.

Vaudeville lost a good song-and-dance man when Irving "Stub" Daly decided "I'd rather eat regularly than entertain the King of England," and turned to selling newspaper advertising. He's a young 75.

Oldest of the quartet is Frank Giossi, 83. As with his boss, the Gazette has been Frank's life from his youth as a carrier boy up through the ranks to the job of composing room foreman.

"I'm really not much of a newspaperman," Ned said. "The business end has been my bailiwick from the start. My wife, Gussie, and I, in partnership, carry on a proud paper that was founded by my grandfather."

Ned is the third generation of Eastons to operate the Gazette. A fourth generation, Ned's son, Phil, now heads the advertising department.

Ned and Gussie's paper came into being in 1870 when A. B. Easton tossed his journalistic hat into a Stillwater ring well filled with other hats. Almost a dozen newspapers had tried to fill a need of the growing pioneer village from 1854 when the first paper, the St. Croix Union, was founded. There were the Messenger, Democrat, Gazette, Lumberman, Daily Sun, St. Croix Post and Daily Call, plus a handful of foreign-language papers.

Grandpa Easton got his baptism of newspaper fire when the Civil War came along and turned A. J. Van Vorhes, publisher of the Messenger, into a soldier. A. B. Easton stepped in as publisher. Later he founded the Gazette, a weekly, without subscribers but with abundant hope.

William, the second newspaper Easton, learned the business under his dad, then took over.

As the city grew, so grew the newspaper. From a weekly it progressed to a daily, plus the weekly which many of the farm customers still wanted. On January 1, 1905, the third Easton, Ned, 23 years old and fresh from 2 years at the University of Minnesota, was hired as a bookkeeper.

"I started work in our new building, just a year old then, keeping the books," Ned recalls. "I've been doing the same thing ever since. Not much progress, I guess."

The new building, a red-brick structure at Second and Myrtle Streets, still serves as headquarters of the Gazette.

Ned, the boss, and Ed Roney, the editor, both began as carrier boys for the newspaper they now operate. In grade school together, they grew up in Stillwater; both worked around the lumber booms as boys, and both were athletes in high school—Ned a baseball player, Ed a star trackman.

Ed went off to Carleton College in Northfield, then to Spokane and the Twin Cities, gaining newspaper experience.

In 1938, Ed was working as market editor on the St. Paul Daily News. When it folded, he found himself without a job at 55.

He turned to free-lance writing in his home, and it was there that Ned Easton found him when an emergency left the Gazette without an editor.

"Come down and fill in until I can get a replacement," Ned urged Ed. That was in 1943, and the replacement's never been found.

Stub Daly was the maverick of the quartet. As a young man he decided to work up a song-and-dance act. For years he hoofed and sang his way around the United States.

"Some days we lived high on the hog," Stub said. "Other times we starved for art's sake. Eating regularly, then, became a problem."

Stub decided in 1917 to head back home and regroup. He took a job in a war plant manufacturing shells, and when the war ended took over the management of the Stillwater News, owned by his wife's family. He operated the News until 1943, when it was combined with the Gazette. He became an advertising salesman.

Of the quartet, Frank Giossi and the newspaper have been a part of each other probably the longest.

A carrier boy, Frank graduated into the back shop. As his skill in the mechanical end increased, so did his responsibilities. Frank became foreman of the composing room.

Then as the years melted away he finally gave up the foreman's job to become head of the mailing department.

With 65 years service on the same newspaper, he's there every day, seeing that the customers get their paper on time and in good condition.

Impact of Residual Oil Imports on Coal Mining Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the problem of residual oil imports and their impact upon the coal mining industry has been a most serious one. As a Representative from one of the prime anthracite coal producing regions in the Nation, I am acutely aware of the severity of this long and continuing problem. Such imports, as the records will show, have had an adverse effect upon the anthracite industry. In support of this position, I am in receipt of a detailed letter from the president of District No. 1, United Mine Workers of America, with offices in Wilkes-Barre, which sets forth the seriousness of the problem. As part of my remarks today, I include the aforementioned letter dated March 9, 1962:

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Wilkes-Barre, Pa., March 9, 1962.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: On behalf of the mineworkers and their families in District No. 1, United Mine Workers of America, permit me to bring to your attention the impact that residual oil imports have on the coal mining industry in the area under my jurisdiction.

Residual fuel oil, produced abroad and on occasion priced as if it were a waste product, has disrupted the coal markets on the eastern seaboard and has displaced millions of tons of coal, depriving many thousands of men of jobs in coal mines. The importation and sale of this foreign oil has created an unfair competitive factor, harmful to the mining industry. If the Federal Government had seen fit to place a ban or strict limitation on the importation of this residual oil, the mining industry in this area would not be in its present sorry predicament and our community would not be in its present depressed economic condition.

Despite modernization of mining facilities and notable improvement in productivity, the anthracite mining industry is in a deplorable state, largely because of the dumping of foreign residual oil in its market areas. The fact that coal sales have constantly declined in the face of a growing national economy reveals the cause of so many economically depressed areas, residents of which are not sharing in the national economic growth and prosperity with their fellow Americans.

The situation with respect to District No. 1, United Mine Workers of America, embracing Lackawanna and Luzerne Counties, including the cities of Scranton and Wilkes-Barre, has been worsening each year. Our records show that the working force in the district has declined from 39,989 in 1950 to 4,741 as of December 31, 1961. The retired and idle membership in our district has jumped from 8,446 as of June 30, 1951, to 12,251 as of December 31, 1961.

Anthracite mineworkers earn an estimated $20 per day and they work an average of 200 days per year. In the year of 1961, for example, our working force dropped by approximately 1,073 from the previous year. This represents a loss of earnings of approximately $4,292,000 annually.

The decreased employment is a consequence of declining production brought about by the loss of domestic heating markets to cheap foreign residual oil. Total production of anthracite in 1950 was 21,123,444 tons. In 1960 it had declined to 6,268,410 tons. With the exception of 1956, when exports expanded temporarily, the downward trend in anthracite production has persisted since 1946.

Constantly declining production of anthracite has plagued the anthracite health and welfare fund, which was established in districts Nos. 1, 7, and 9 (all in Pennsylvania) by agreement between the United Mine Workers of America and the Anthracite Operators in 1946. The fund's sole source of income is a royalty payment by the operators of $0.70 a ton on each ton of coal mined for use or sale. The fund was created for the sole purpose of providing benefits to mineworkers and their dependents or survivors.

The anthracite production decline and the resultant loss in revenue to the fund has caused its trustees to reduce monthly pension payments to retired mineworkers from $100 to $30 and death benefit payments from $1,000 to $500. The latter payments had to be suspended entirely in February 1958. Pension payments had to be interrupted at times because of lack of sufficient income.

A total of 7,162 death benefit claims were paid by the fund to widows and orphans of deceased district No. 1. members of the United Mine Workers of America between 1947 and the date of suspension of such payments in February 1958. A total of $5,715,586.61, or approximately 50 percent of all such disbursements by the fund for this phase of its program, was paid in district No. 1. Presently, there are approximately 9,500 recipients of the pension payment in district No. 1. On the basis of $30 monthly, annual pension payments total about $3,420,000—a substantial contribution to the economy of our community.

The stability of the fund is threatened by the continued high rate of foreign residual oil imports. It would not only be a severe blow to the economy of the local communities, but it would add considerably to the cost of Federal and State Governments if the fund were to become inoperative.

Comparative population figures of the U.S. Bureau of the Census graphically illustrate the effect of importation of foreign residual oil on Lackawanna and Luzerne Counties, the

cities of Scranton and Wilkes-Barre, and the basic industry of these communities:

County or city	Population		
	1950	1960	Decline
Lackawanna County	257,396	234,531	22,865
Luzerne County	392,241	346,972	45,269
Scranton	125,356	111,143	14,213
Wilkes-Barre	76,826	63,551	13,275

A vital natural resource such as coal should not be endangered by foreign imports of substitute fuel if for no other reason than the peril to our Nation's security in a national defense emergency. Such imports could lead to sapping our Nation's strength in case of war.

The problem of keeping our coal industry in a position to meet the Nation's requirements in the future is of tremendous public interest and is of vast concern to all Americans. In the interest of national defense, as well as the growth of our economy, we should be primarily concerned with the conservation and development of our natural resources, their intelligent use today, and their development and exploitation tomorrow.

The anthracite industry is this region's basic industry, and we firmly believe that the Federal Government should take all means of aiding it. Equitable quotas on the importation of foreign residual oil, if not total elimination of the importation, and elimination of the unconscionable dumping of natural gas in the East at certain periods of the year would be a positive and effective contribution toward the recovery of our ailing industry and the revival of the economy of our communities.

The Federal and State Governments stand to gain by restoration of the anthracite industry to prosperity and our communities to economic growth. Men and women now living on public assistance will become tax payers instead of tax consumers. Our national security will be strengthened by the conservation of a natural resource which may tip the scales in our favor in some future emergency.

It is our earnest hope that the quotas on importation of foreign residual oil will be reduced substantially, if not entirely eliminated. That is the hope also of all the people of our communities so adversely affected economically by the present quota system.

Respectfully yours,

AUGUST J. LIPPI,
President, District No. 1.

Hon. Ralph W. Gwinn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, on March 1, 1962, the eloquent tribute paid by the Members of the House to the memory of our late and beloved colleague, Ralph Waldo Gwinn, made it clear that he will not be forgotten.

Although the eulogies took many forms, they shared a common recognition of Ralph Gwinn's integrity, conviction, and courage. These same virtues have been cited in a recent editorial appearing in the Yonkers Herald Statesman, and because it expresses in such a concise and fitting way Mr. Gwinn's worth to his party and his country, I would like to insert it at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

RALPH GWINN'S ULTRACONSERVATISM SERVED CONGRESS AS VALUED ANVIL

Ralph W. Gwinn represented the 27th congressional district of Westchester County in the House of Representatives for 14 years.

During the period from 1945 until 1959 he bespoke a Republicanism that virtually made him a stereotype of the fundamentalist or ultraconservative branch of the party.

For his efforts he was rated high as a target for liberal attack and a sounding board for foes of Federal intervention into the lives of the individual citizen.

Mr. Gwinn, like it or not, was a man of conviction. He performed a service in the legislative debates of the postwar era which, if not so effective as he hoped, at least provided an anvil against which paternalistic legislation had to be pounded and from which rang sparks of outrage which lighted areas requiring tempering. Viewed in retrospect, he provided a valuable counterweight to the right when the tendency of Government was to swing ever farther to the left.

Finally, even his severest critics had to concede the sincerity of Ralph Gwinn's convictions and to respect the unflinching courage with which he fought for those convictions.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to share with Members of the House a letter which Mr. Richard Ince, of Bronxville, has written to the Bronxville Review Press & Reporter. Mr. Ince observes that many obituaries of Ralph Gwinn made no mention of his religious affiliations, although he was a man of great faith who worked actively in his home church. Ralph Gwinn was also a charter member of the Layman's Movement for a Christian World, former chairman of the board, and a director since its inception in 1941, and it is to this association that Mr. Ince directs our attention. In the midst of our tributes to Ralph Gwinn, we should be especially mindful of the spiritual qualities which made him such a respected and admired friend and colleague, and so I include Mr. Ince's letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

MARCH 2, 1962.

The EDITOR,
The Bronxville Review Press & Reporter,
Bronxville, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: We note that the obituaries of Ralph Gwinn appearing in the New York papers spoke of his political activities, but said nothing of his religious affiliations. All of us who knew Mr. Gwinn intimately knew he was a man of great faith. We who are members of the Reformed Church of Bronxville know of his fine work as a member of Consistory.

I wish, however, to write of his relationship to the Laymen's Movement for a Christian World, of which Mr. Gwinn was a charter member, former chairman of the board, and a director since its inception in 1941.

In its formative years, though Mr. Gwinn was a candidate for Congress, he gave time as chairman of the board of the laymen's movement to see that an effective program was developed and that adequate funds were secured for the new organization.

Mr. Gwinn was drawn to the laymen's movement because he was firm in his Christian convictions. He felt that the emphasis on the application of one's faith to one's daily responsibilities—whether in business, one's profession, politics or education—was important and necessary.

Though a devoted conservative in politics, never once did Mr. Gwinn try to persuade his fellow directors or members of the laymen's movement that they should become conservative Republicans. He was strong for a person to be active in politics on all levels and believed that as a Christian, one should especially take on this responsibility.

The laymen's movement, with headquarters at Wainwright House in Rye, N.Y., has as its purpose the application of religious values to day-to-day experiences of the business and professional man. Those in Bronxville who have been directors of the laymen's movement in addition to Mr. Gwinn are Thomas B. Gilchrist, James E. Kavanaugh, John P. Holmes, John L. Carson and myself.

Mr. Gwinn will be long remembered for his warm friendliness, his religious faith, and his high sense of what he considered to be truth, justice and freedom.

There is a devotional date book published by the laymen's movement with an inspirational quote for each week. The one for this week is: "The Spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak."—Matthew 26: 41.

Ralph Gwinn always displayed a willing and powerful spirit. Those of us who knew and loved him will greatly miss his stately presence.

RICHARD W. INCE.

Court Packing Back in Vogue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by David Lawrence which was carried in the San Diego Union:

COURT PACKING IS BACK IN VOGUE

(By David Lawrence)

President Kennedy has asked the American people to believe that, in nominating 82 new Federal judges, he couldn't find in the entire United States a single Republican lawyer who, in his judgment, was qualified to be on the list. By reason of legislation last year creating 73 additional judgeships and because of some existing vacancies, Mr. Kennedy will soon have filled nearly one-third of the entire Federal bench—more appointments than any President heretofore has had an opportunity to make in a single term.

The display of partisanship was the result of a recommendation by the President's brother, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, who managed the last presidential campaign and who, it now is being charged, awarded the judgeships on the basis of political considerations.

Another Democratic Party leader, the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, sought in 1937 to have the Supreme Court enlarged from 9 to 15 Justices because, as he told the American people, some of the Justices on the Court at that time held views that didn't go along with his. He wanted a majority that would outvote those with whom he disagreed. The scheme became known as court packing, and was defeated in Congress.

Court packing now, however, is back in vogue on a large scale. It is embarrassing for some Senators to oppose a partisan list of judges, because many of the nominations

are made to curry favor with Senators who want friends or political associates named to the bench.

It is significant that Bernard G. Segal, chairman of the Federal Judiciary Committee of the American Bar Association, has just made public a report filed with the Attorney General condemning the process by which 82 Democrats were selected for the Federal bench. Adding to these the 3 recess appointments of the preceding administration, the qualifications of a total of 85 nominees were analyzed. The American Bar Association Committee designated seven as "not qualified." Only 14 were designated as "exceptionally well qualified," and 41 were listed as "well qualified," while 23 were referred to as "qualified." The distinction between these classifications is one that is difficult to define, but apparently even mediocre nominees are frequently called qualified.

Certainly the country is not getting the best qualified men or women to serve as Federal judges.

Social Security Health Care Revived

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence:

SOCIAL SECURITY HEALTH CARE REVIVED

(By David Lawrence)

President Kennedy has again sent to Congress his controversial program of medical care for the aged financed through an increase in social security taxes.

The proposal failed last session, and despite the optimistic forecasts of administration spokesmen, most observers believe it will fail again this year.

We think it should fail. We are not persuaded that health care should be financed through social security.

This would put social security into an entirely new and very costly field. The initial cost is estimated by Mr. Kennedy at a little over a billion dollars a year. But this is only a beginning. It would inevitably cost much more than that.

And the cost will be in large measure borne, under the social security tax system, by those of modest means. Some in low income brackets will be paying for health services for elderly persons who are better off financially than those being taxed.

Furthermore, initially at least, younger people—and those with their own heaviest financial responsibilities—will be paying the bill. While this is basically true of the whole social security program, it will be more noticeable if the costly health care program is added.

President Kennedy noted in his message to Congress that "only about half of our aged population has any health insurance." But this is a two-edged argument. The total of elderly with health insurance has been increasing rapidly and is helping to solve the problem. It might do much more with proper encouragement and perhaps some Government underwriting of catastrophic medical costs.

And while Mr. Kennedy denies his program would be a step toward socialized medicine, once started, pressures would build to extend social security health insurance below the age of 65.

Maybe this country wants socialized medicine. But we should go into it with our eyes open, fully conscious of its pitfalls.

Questioning the Kennedy program of medical care for the aged must not, however, blind us to the existence of a very real problem.

Millions of elderly people in this country are not at present adequately safeguarded in the event of illness—particularly in case of long hospitalization or nursing home care.

It is the middle income group which is hurt most. The indigent usually get free care. The wealthy can afford to pay. But those with modest retirement incomes are hard hit. Even if they are fortunate enough to avoid any major medical expense, the specter of a big hospital-surgical bill which would wipe out their savings hangs over their heads.

Something needs to be done to help this group. It may be the "medicare" program enacted in the last year of the Eisenhower administration is a step in the right direction. It has hardly as yet been given a fair test and it may need to be revised.

Greatest danger is that this vital problem will be dealt with on a political rather than a realistic health protection basis. There is a problem. There must be a reasonable answer. But we do not think that answer is to make health care a social security responsibility.

Relief Necessary for Rubber Footwear Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received from Frank J. Emmett, vice president of the Tyer Rubber Co. in Andover, Mass., and my letter to the Chairman of the U.S. Tariff Commission, regarding the serious tariff situation that endangers our rubber footwear industry:

TYER RUBBER CO.,
Andover, Mass., March 5, 1962.

The Honorable T. J. LANE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LANE: We are sorry that my visit to your office last Wednesday morning was at a time when committee meetings preempted my opportunity to become acquainted with you. I shall try again soon.

We appreciate the time and courtesy your secretary extended to me and the consideration she showed in promising to put before you the blue bound "Memorandum on Tariff Classification of Rubber Footwear" I left with her. After having read it, we hope you will refer again to paragraphs 4 and 5 on page 1; paragraphs 3, 4, 7, and 8 on page 2; and paragraph 2 on page 5.

Since a large segment of the footwear industry is located in our State of Massachusetts, it would be most helpful if this letter would serve as a basis for you to register your concern about our situation. We request that you write the Tariff Commission, the Bureau of Customs, and Mr. Edwin F. Rains, Assistant General Counsel of the Treasury Department.

If we can be of further assistance in helping you to help us, I shall be there within a few hours of your call.

Sincerely,

FRANK J. EMMETT,
Vice President.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 12, 1962.

CHAIRMAN,
U.S. Tariff Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I want to bring to your attention the fact that the obsolete and limited definition of rubber footwear in the Tariff Act is making it very difficult for American manufacturers of rubber-soled footwear with fabric uppers and waterproof footwear to compete with imports of these products—even here in the home market.

In 1933 a Presidential proclamation was issued putting rubber footwear imports under the American selling price. This meant that such imports would pay duty on the valuation of like or similar American-made footwear, not on the declared or invoiced value.

Today's problem arises from the fact that the term "india rubber" is used in the present Tariff Act to describe the material, and the Bureau of Customs has ruled that this covers only "natural rubber." As a result, imported footwear held to be wholly or in chief value of any synthetic rubber, or any substitute for rubber, such as the various so-called plastics, evade the American selling price even though like or similar footwear is produced and sold by the American manufacturers.

The definition of rubber footwear in the Tariff Act must be modernized to cover the materials now being used by the industry in making its products. The restricted definition of "india rubber" fails to allow for such substitutes for rubber as synthetic rubber and elastomeric synthetic plastics. These waterproof materials are basically the same.

It is clear that, unless the technicalities of the law are corrected to meet modern realities, the protection given to this American industry through the Presidential proclamation will be seriously weakened, if not completely voided.

Relief for the Rubber Footwear Industry can be provided by a more reasonable interpretation by the Bureau of Customs of the similitude provisions of the Tariff Act, or by amendment of the Tariff Act of 1930, so that footwear of these types will be subjected to the American selling price whether made of natural rubber, synthetic rubber, or plastics.

Trusting in your cooperation to help remedy a situation that endangers our rubber footwear industry, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS J. LANE,
Member of Congress.

Capitalism: The Key to Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the trend toward socialism or collectivism in this country is partly attributable to the failure of many of our schools to offer capitalist or free enterprise-oriented courses. Too often

students are exposed to the collectivist approach to man's economic problems.

During the last few years several special schools of sound, free enterprise economics have been founded. The curriculum of these schools has been designed to explain, first, the relationship between free enterprise and individual freedom; and, second, why free enterprise cannot coexist with collectivism. One of these schools, the Free Enterprise Institute of Los Angeles, is offering a course entitled "Capitalism: The Key to Survival." The course is described in two articles which appeared in the October 15, 1961, and the January 29, 1962, issues of the Register, a newspaper published in Orange County, Calif. The description points to the basic incompatibility of collectivism and free enterprise. Believing the articles will interest my colleagues in Congress, I, under unanimous consent, include them in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Register, Orange County, Calif., Oct. 15, 1961]

NOTED INSTITUTE LEADER WARNS "AMERICAN SOCIALISM CAN'T DEFEAT RUSS COMMUNISM"

"We can't expect to defeat Russian communism with American socialism. The only way we can destroy communism and every other form of collectivism, whether home grown or imported, is to make constant and vigorous use of the most powerful creative force the world has ever seen, a dynamic, unfettered capitalism backed by a constitutionally limited republic." This is the personal philosophy of Joseph A. Galambos, director of the Free Enterprise Institute of Los Angeles and the guiding philosophy of the institute which he founded early this year for the purpose of demonstrating how to use capitalism as the weapon for victory over collectivism.

Galambos is presently teaching the institute's basic course, "Capitalism: The Key to Survival" in four locations in the Greater Los Angeles area. "Although this is only the second offering of the course, we have more than tripled our original enrollment, largely by word-of-mouth publicity and by means of what I call presentations given to the public wherein I describe my overall strategy for victory with special emphasis on this course."

He will give such a presentation entitled "The Strategy of Victory" at the Disney Hotel at 7:30 p.m., on Friday, October 20, at which time he will introduce his unique program to Orange County. He plans to offer "Capitalism: The Key to Survival" on a subscription basis in Orange County early next year.

A physicist by profession, Galambos was graduated from the College of the City of New York and completed his graduate studies at the University of Minnesota and New York University.

He has taught physics, astronomy, and mathematics at the University of Minnesota; Carleton College, Northfield, Minn.; New York University; Brooklyn College; Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken, N.J.; and Whittier College.

An articulate spokesman for laissez-faire capitalism as well, Galambos is thoroughly at home on the lecture platform and has addressed service clubs, youth groups, church groups, and political clubs in addition to formal teaching.

"People who don't know me too well frequently ask, 'Whatever made you give up science to do this?' In the first place," Galambos explains, "I haven't given up sciences as anyone who takes my course will soon realize. My training in the scientific method has helped me develop the precision of thought which makes my entire strategy possible. Secondly, science is, truly speaking, all knowledge, not just physics or chemistry. And no man can pursue true knowledge except as a free individual in a free society. Any man who thinks he can shut out the world and follow his profession or occupation while civilization collapses around him is living in a fool's paradise. Whatever a man achieves in his lifetime will be quite meaningless unless he devotes some of his creative energy developing an environment in which that achievement can survive. My course demonstrates exactly what individuals can do to help create such an environment."

The 37-year-old physicist is well qualified to discuss the practical, as well as the theoretical aspects of capitalism. While teaching in New York, he operated a realty management company. Shortly after he moved to California in 1953 to accept a position as a research physicist in the missile industry, he founded his own securities brokerage firm. An outspoken critic of what he terms "socialism in our defense industry," he quit the missile industry in 1959 to return to teaching. While teaching at Whittier College, he delivered an original series of lectures entitled "The Decline and the Renaissance of Laissez-Faire Capitalism." "These were seven separate lectures which had nothing to do either with the institute or my present course. The series had no connection with my teaching at the college either. I merely gave the lectures at night in an unused classroom. The first night the room was packed to the doors and about 30 more people stood outside in a cold, dark corridor to hear what I had to say. Later we moved the lectures to the college auditorium."

His rigorous schedule (he often works 20 hours a day and has been known to work continuously for 48 hours) leaves him little time for relaxation and little patience for those who complain of fatigue. "Whatever you do," warns his wife, Suzanne, herself a woman of considerable energy, "don't ever tell Joseph that you can't do something or be somewhere because you are too tired. He'll snap your head off, and, if he doesn't," she adds smiling, "I will."

Although the Free Enterprise Institute is less than a year old, Galambos has received a number of inquiries from other parts of the country. He plans to offer his basic course on a nationwide basis within 2 years and will offer any or all of the 20-odd courses which the institute has available as quickly as the market for them is created.

In keeping with his concept of an integrated program for victory, one facet of which is to make fundamental libertarian literature readily available, Galambos recently set up a retail book outlet known as the CCI Bookshelf (CCI stands for constitutionalism, capitalism, individualism) under the managership of Donald H. Allen of Los Angeles. Another of his plans for the immediate future is the setting up of a publishing business early next year. ("We will publish a magazine, pamphlets, and books, and we will reprint some of the best fundamental literature which has been allowed to go out of print.") Another facet of the overall program is a special course to be offered to corporations for their present management and also for those who are being groomed to run the corporations later on. ("We must counteract the heavy dose of collectivism being forced down the throats of corporation executives these days and being lapped up by every business school graduate who knows nothing else; otherwise, before we know it nearly every corporation in the country will have rotted from within.")

"Briefly, my strategy for victory is twofold," concludes Joseph A. Galambos. "Education for those who are educable; images for those who are not. If you want to know what I mean by this, take the course, 'Capitalism: The Key To Survival' and find out."

[From the Register, Orange County, Calif., Jan. 29, 1962]

COLLECTIVISTS STEAL WORDS, WILL FREEDOM BE NEXT?

The word "liberal" has been stolen by the collectivists and the Socialists, according to the founder and director of the Free Enterprise Institute.

Joseph A. Galambos, speaking in Santa Ana, Saturday, said most people today have an entirely different meaning of the word "liberal." Yet, its true meaning is "freedom" and the capitalists should strive to get it back in its proper place.

In the hour-long talk at the Ebell Club, Galambos emphasized his point by asking if capitalists can be called antiliberals? In addition, Galambos said "We would try to get back our car if it were stolen so why not our most precious private property—liberal freedom."

Other words "we have been suckered out of are: 'progressive,' and 'democratic,'" he declared. These words too should be restored. Galambos said the Communists and Socialists have cleverly used these words to their advantage.

Primarily, the speech entitled "How Freedom Will Win" dealt with private property—both tangible and intangible. He said too many people talk about freedom but haven't the slightest idea what they are saying.

A course, "Capitalism: The Key to Survival," is being offered by the institute at the Disneyland Hotel on February 20, he said, in which Americans can gain a better understanding of freedom and the understanding of a word we should all be proud of—"capitalism."

"We pay lipservice adherence to capitalism and constitutionalism but we permit these great ideas to become contaminated with collectivist programs which appeal to the many with fraudulent something-for-nothing promises that actually provide nothing for something," Galambos said.

"Private property is freedom, and freedom is private property," he continued. An illustration on how property sharing would work on a personal basis was given by the speaker.

A Communist agitator, in questioning a farmer, asked if the farmer would be willing to share one house if he had two houses.

"Of course," the farmer said.

"If you had two cows would you give one away to your neighbor," he was asked next. The answer was the same.

Last came the question concerning two pigs. Would the farmer give one away on this property-sharing idea?

"No," replied the farmer. "I have two pigs."

So it goes for others who are quite willing to share so long as they are not doing the sharing. To receive is all right but to give of one's own is a different matter, Galambos reemphasized.

He charged the Government is no longer a protector—its prime obligation—but a destroyer. The Government isn't to tax or harass but to protect its citizens.

"We are living in a world which has completely forgotten the original meaning of the Declaration of Independence," the institute leader stated. "The American Revolution is looked upon as an attribute against tyranny."

Americans must look deeper than a fight against communism but at the long-range program of fighting for laissez-faire capitalism—private property, freedom, it was noted. "We are not practicing freedom any more as we are giving away too much of our private property."

In giving numerous illustrations to get his points across, Galambos asked how people

traveled 300 years ago, and 3,000 years ago. Little has changed during both eras as horses and oxens were used.

"Where's the progress?"

"But look at it 300 years ago and today," he declared. "This is no accident because of capitalism."

"Where did the progress take place? In the United States and other progressive countries," he answered.

A look at the least progressive countries such as China, and other so-called backward countries gives the answer. There, he added, there is no protection of private property.

Another strong word Galambos used was "stimulate."

"A real school stimulates and doesn't pound in your head what they call knowledge." He said some people say they have been educated at certain schools but actually there is no end to education except when you die.

Capitalism doesn't violate the law of nature but socialism and collectivism does violate this law the director said. To build freedom one must know how to extend to others. "This is how it will grow."

Summing it up, Galambos said the "law of supply and demand" and the "natural law" is the total regulator. "Remember, you can't fight communism with socialism. It's ridiculous to think you can fight communism by increasing our own controls and defend freedom by attacking private property."

To Come to the Aid of the Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of my colleagues an article by Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg which appeared in the New York Times Sunday magazine of March 11. The Secretary of Labor has ably explained the need for a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts. This has been a continual interest of mine. I urged the passage of H.R. 4172 during the last session. I hope at this session Congress will recognize the important role the arts play in our national life by establishing a Federal Adisory Council on the Arts.

The article follows:

TO COME TO THE AID OF THE ARTS

(By Arthur J. Goldberg)

WASHINGTON.—It has been said of Americans that we are respected for what we can do but not for what we are, that we know how to work but not how to live. Much of this is mere caviling by those who are blind to the drive, the hard pragmatic realities and the absorbing challenge of American history, and who would judge a people on the posture of their arts rather than their sum of achievements in the economic and political and social fields.

At the same time, it is a useful reminder to us that the condition of the arts is a vital question in any society—and should be so especially in ours, with its ideals of measurement of worth by individual, not mass, standards. President Kennedy's recent appointment of August Heckscher, director of the Twentieth Century Fund, as White House cultural coordinator is an indication that the arts will enjoy greater consideration in the environment of public policy than has been their fortune in the past.

How is it with the arts in America today? Their condition can be described as extremely healthy in one aspect, but extremely hazardous in another.

There is a great difference between interest in the arts and support for the arts. There is an even wider difference between the cultural life we enjoy and what we might enjoy. The total figures measuring artistic activity in America are impressive enough to convince one that a new era may be at hand; yet they are less impressive when one looks at them in terms of the people involved.

The Department of Labor's recent edition of the "Occupational Outlook Handbook" includes for the first time a section on the performing arts—musicians, dancers, actors and singers. The employment outlook as reported, based upon the most careful and extensive surveys and interviews within each occupation, can only be described as bleak. Employment opportunities in each of the fields are limited and highly competitive. The earnings are not large, and in the case of many artists, employment is intermittent.

We do not have too many artists; we have too few opportunities for them. It is true that the artist will practice his art even under the most difficult conditions, but it is also true that, in a nation as prosperous and progressive as our own, there is no reason why the artist cannot be productive and reasonably compensated. In proposing my own six-point solution, I admit to some basic convictions.

First, I believe a flourishing cultural life is an essential, not an ornament, to the health and strength of a free society.

Second, I doubt if economic success is a proper or meaningful test of the value of the arts, and especially the fine arts. Whether they are able to support themselves at the box office is the least meaningful criterion of their true value.

Third, I believe it is well within the proper responsibility of government in providing for the general welfare to do its part to help rescue troubled art forms from obsolescence.

In a complex, modern society like our own, art of all kinds is called to one of the essential services of freedom—to free man from the mass. Art—whether on a stage, in a gallery, or in a concert hall—asserts the supremacy of the individual. The insight of the artist leads to cultural discovery for all of the people. No one who has known the impact of a great artist's work can fail to appreciate the legend of Michelangelo who went in the dark of night to his studio, inflamed by the rumor that a competitor had laid claim to his statue "Pieta," and chiseled across the ribbon of the gown the inscription, still deep etched to this day, "I, Michelangelo, made this."

My second conviction—that economic success is not a proper criterion for judging the value of either the artist or his art—is controversial to the extent that it goes against the grain of an affluent middle class with a tendency to measure the value of an art form in terms of financial worth or personal status. One dire result of this tendency is "made taste," whereby a publisher, an art dealer, or a producer peddles price and sensationalism in place of quality. There is great contempt for the arts in attitudes that reduce them to investments, status symbols, or vehicles for sensationalism.

The danger, of course, is that those art forms without commercial value lead a precarious existence on the edge of extinction. This works to the extreme disadvantage of the artist who may feel impelled to try to become financially successful merely to justify himself in terms of the society around him.

In the same way, artistic institutions are suspect if they are not able to stand the test of competition—as though opera and professional football were similar profitmaking ventures and a loss at the box office a fit prelude to failure for both.

To free our art forms from destructive financial tests is to protect them from the tyranny of the majority. Alexis de Tocqueville, whose observations on democracy are illuminating to generation after generation, feared that democracy might fail precisely because the majority will would lead to the triumph of conformity and mediocrity. It has certainly been one of the great failures of the television industry that it has been subservient to the will of the majority, as measured by "experts," and in reaching for the most common of artistic denominators has rejected the aspirations of the minority, even though that minority may number several millions of people.

In sum, if art is essential to a free society, then it must be supported and encouraged and helped to flourish. If the arts are to flourish, they must be relieved of total dependence upon the marketplace, and upon majority opinion and taste.

I recommend a six-point partnership for the support of the arts in America. It is predicated on acceptance of the arts as a new community responsibility and is based on the principle of diversity and variety. The members of the partnership are the public, private patrons and benefactors, corporations, labor organizations, local and State governments, and the Federal Government. Each of the partners has a distinct responsibility.

Regardless of any subsidy the principal source of financial support for the arts must continue to be the public. An art form without an audience ceases to have meaning. And how many times have we heard people decrying the state of an art form like the theater but seldom attending and offering no support?

There are esthetic problems in public support, of course. If the theater or the ballet do not offer living art to the public, then the public might well turn away. It is the responsibility of the artist to merit public support. A viable art requires a voluble public. Whatever its form—whether through increased participation in season subscriptions or through special contributory associations—public support is the keystone to artistic vitality, and the public must expect to provide a greater portion of the costs.

This is not to discount the continually vital role played by the second group of partners—those individual patrons and benefactors who have been bearing the main burdens for support of institutions like the Metropolitan Opera, and through whose generosity many communities now enjoy great art museums and other cultural resources. Furthermore, in a period of artistic experimentation such as our own, many of the best artists will run ahead of, or even contrary to, the general standards of the time. They will be forging ahead, leaving general public attitudes and perceptions far in their wake. Here the support of enlightened patrons can have the most profound and fruitful consequences.

Third, the American corporation, a center of unprecedented power and wealth, has only recently awakened to the value of the arts as a complement to architecture and as a medium by which the "image" of the business can acquire distinction. While many corporate executives are sponsors of the arts, and some companies help support the arts in their communities, the corporation as an entity has not, as a rule, considered support for the arts in the same light it has support for educational, charitable and health activities. One can hardly walk into a corporate building erected in

the past 5 years without noticing the painting and sculpture that adorn the reception rooms and private offices—work often done on commission. But, thus far, the contributions of business to the arts remain only a fraction of its generous contributions to other community needs.

This is true, also, of the funds and foundations that have risen from corporate fortunes. It may be impossible even to suggest an adequate proportion of expenditure for the arts; a review of the statements of our largest funds and foundations, however, reveals what appears to be comparative neglect of such support. When two noted American funds recently offered assistance to a Washington repertory theater, Arena Stage, for example, it was the first such artistic venture for one.

Even more important, in my view, would be the great vote of confidence in the American artist that corporations could cast through their advertising. Each year, truly vast sums of money are poured into corporate advertising—yet the amount that involves the fine arts is relatively small, and the art forms sponsored by advertisers are few.

A responsibility similar to that of corporations is the one that attaches to the American labor movement, which by its nature is pledged to the betterment of the American community. Labor unions have been slow, on the whole, to develop specific forms of support for the arts—but the exceptions, like sponsored concerts for children and the showing of paintings in union-sponsored exhibitions—are notable. They indicate what can be done, and should be done in larger measure.

The next larger partner in the program of diverse support is the local government—the primary source of public support for the arts. A subsidy program that resulted only in large collections of art works in big cities, showing only to certain urban audiences, would defeat its own purpose. Art grows out of the life and spirit of a community; the artists reaches for his inspiration to the world around him, and today art, more than any other enterprise, preserves the intimate and personal nature of American life outside mass institutions.

Today, communities willingly provide housing and custodial care for art collections and historical museums; one wonders why more of them should not provide for operas, ballets, symphonies and local repertory theaters as well. Universities now make provision for professors-in-residence and artists-in-residence; why shouldn't municipalities?

The sixth partner is the Federal Government. I believe one of the most important immediate steps which the Federal Government should take is to establish a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts.

At present, the interest of the arts in America is represented in the councils of the Federal Government only in the individual attitudes of members of government, encouraged by the example of President and Mrs. Kennedy. But still the artist is without the kind of representation that will permanently insure that his interests are heard regardless of prevailing attitudes.

A Federal Advisory Council, composed largely of artists themselves, would provide that representation. The field of the arts is, at present, rich in one aspect—in ideas and proposals to improve the economic status of the individual artist, and to rescue endangered art forms from economic oblivion. But there are few formal vehicles by which these ideas can be examined and brought to reality. There is, especially, almost a total lack of public policy in regard to the arts, at a time when many proposals—such as those relating to taxation—bear directly upon public policy. The Council would have those two most important assets—undistracted concentration on its subject, and a voice of prestige and formal influence.

As a national clearinghouse of ideas, the Council could have an effect not only upon the making of public policy in regard to the arts but also in influencing national attitudes regarding them. Its proposals would be designed as much to encourage private initiative as to influence governmental action. By keeping constantly alert to the status of our cultural resources, the Council would also be alert to ways to maintain and increase them.

One much-needed function in the arts field is that of liaison. While there are many strong and independent spokesmen in each of the artistic disciplines, there is no agency that can approach or cooperate with local and State governments and private institutions on a permanent, statutory basis so that public policy is a coordinated whole serving the art community. Short of individual bills by Congressmen and individual petitions to State and local governments, art is the orphan of American public policy.

What is to prevent the realization of this needed assistance? Those who flatly rule out any and all Federal participation in a support program for the arts generally hold one of two views, sometimes both: tax dollars should not be spent for what one writer called "a luxury in life"; and if tax dollars were to be spent, inevitable government control of the arts would follow.

The first of these objections is based on a misunderstanding of my proposal, which does not envision large Federal outlays. But the second is voiced by those who are genuinely concerned about the freedom of artistic expression, and their concern is not to be dismissed lightly. Distinguished critics have reminded us of the shortsighted and often shabby treatment some artists have experienced at the hands of politicians. Others have marked the tendency of government to watch its money carefully and attempt to set standards for its use.

I might say that this live sense of danger is in itself the best guarantee that we could have for artistic freedom. Also, the very concern that the arts might be subjected to control is additional evidence that they are relevant and important in American life and opinion.

Regardless of how the arts are supported, there will be efforts from some quarters to control their content. The question is—what measure of success do those efforts enjoy?

We should be perfectly honest and open about the problem of interference with the freedom of the arts and attempts to compromise the integrity of the artist. To close our eyes to the problem is neither right nor necessary—but what is necessary is to provide for safeguards against it. One of the reasons I have advocated a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts is the value of such a body in standing between the artist and the direct political process that might affect him.

We should acknowledge also that the marketplace exerts its own form of censorship which can be as unyielding and rigid as any feared by opponents of subsidy. I received a letter from an artist in Texas who described to me his feelings at being asked to rush several paintings to a New York gallery for a showing, and then receiving them back with high praise but apologies that they were too controversial. Every summer theatre and repertory theatre has had the experience of having to fall back on standard successes or suffer ruin. Subsidy, in short, may be less a straitjacket than the box office.

The object of my proposals is to free the artist, not bind him. The best protection against the danger of interference—admitting full well that the danger exists—is a community that recognizes it and is prepared to cope with it.

At the same time, there are certain policies that lessen the danger of interference, if they do not eliminate it. One of these is the principle that public support is most successful, and least subject to abuse, when it represents only a portion of the total funds involved. The matching grant should be the basic form of Federal participation in support of the arts, with the Federal share always representing the smaller of the funds involved. One of the guiding ideas of the six-point partnership I propose is that artists are likely to retain maximum control over their work when a maximum number of governements, institutions, and individuals are contributing to their support.

The final solution lies, of course, only with a larger and more active art public. Assistance of all kinds to the arts should include provisions whereby more people in more places have access to the arts, so that the dilemma of the artist will eventually find its best and happiest solution in an increased clientele and a sympathetic public. I do not propose State-supported institutions, such as exist in many European countries. A free democratic society can compete and succeed in a free, democratic way.

In discussing the issue of support, none should lose sight of the object of support—the artist himself. The achievement of the American artist has been very great. That achievement will grow larger with time. It is given to us now to do what we can to foster it.

National Cemetery Needs for Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Military Affairs, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, with offices in Harrisburg, recommends that a new national cemetery be located on ground adjacent to the historic Civil War battlefield at Gettysburg. In support of this plan, Lt. Col. William B. Freeland, deputy adjutant general, veterans' affairs, Pennsylvania Department of Military Affairs, testified before the House Subcommittee on National Parks on February 23, 1962, and as part of my remarks today I quote the testimony of Colonel Freeland:

STATEMENT OF NATIONAL CEMETERY NEEDS FOR COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

Submitted to: Hon. J. T. RUTHERFORD, chairman, Subcommittee on National Parks, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Submitted by: Lt. Col. William B. Freeland, deputy adjutant general, veterans' affairs, Pennsylvania Department of Military Affairs.

The veteran population of Pennsylvania is approximately 1,642,000 with 25 percent of these veterans above 50 years of age or about 410,500 veterans.

All veterans are now reaching the age where the trials and tribulations and the insecurities of life are beginning to take their toll and thus, their susceptibilities to the ills and infirmities of age are becoming

increasingly greater. In addition, many veterans have service-connected injuries and disabilities that inevitably detract from their life expectancy. It is therefore reasonable to suppose that in the immediate years ahead a greater number of deaths among these veterans can be expected.

In 1965, approximately 13,395 Pennsylvania veterans will die. About 1 percent will request burial in a Pennsylvania National Cemetery—therefore 134 graves will be required in 1965. In view of these calculations, it is apparent that the ultimate number of grave sites required for the present living 1,642,000 Pennsylvania veterans will be about 16,400 graves. If the wives of these veterans also request burial with their husbands, this number would be increased accordingly. Of course, it should always be kept in mind that during the prolonged periods of the cold war thousands of additional Pennsylvanians now serving their country would also apply for final burial in a national cemetery. This number is an unpredictable figure—but allowance for same should be considered in the final determination for future graves.

At a meeting of the joint veterans council for Pennsylvania, it was indicated that a wise choice of location for a new national cemetery in Pennsylvania would be on ground adjacent to but outside the boundaries of the present cemetery and historic Civil War battlefield at Gettysburg. It was pointed out that a new national cemetery at this site could also act as a centrally located memorialized burial center for the veterans of States adjoining Pennsylvania.

Gettysburg is in very close proximity to many of the famed national shrines of American history, of the Civil War, the Revolutionary War and the colonial period. It could be expected that a national cemetery adjoining these historical shrines would attract relatives and friends and also many tourists to visit the graves of those heroes of our country's wars who are buried in this hallowed ground. Many of these people would go on to visit the other historical shrines. These pilgrimages would engender a rebirth of pride and patriotism in the deeds of our forefathers.

It was also the consensus of thinking of the joint veterans council at their meeting that the 100th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg (1963) would be a very appropriate time to dedicate the new national cemetery.

A location for a second cemetery in Pennsylvania was discussed and no actual location was given preference although it is agreed that somewhere in western Pennsylvania would be the most logical location.

In the event the Gettysburg location would not be feasible—an area near Indiantown Gap Military Reservation east of Harrisburg, Pa., and about 40 miles from Gettysburg is suggested.

It is the desire and the hope of veterans in Pennsylvania that the subcommittee of which you are chairman will see fit—in its deliberation—to recommend to the full committee and through them to the Senate and the full Congress that one or more national cemeteries be established in Pennsylvania in the very near future.

Kennedy Medical Aid Unneeded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego (Calif.) Union, of March 3, 1962:

KENNEDY MEDICAL AID UNNEEDED

Federal farm subsidies, devised hastily in the depression years as a temporary measure, are still with us today, vastly more complicated and costly than when they were conceived.

The social security program was originated in the midthirties on a modest basis. It too has blossomed into a gigantic, complex division of government with taxes on both employee and employer increased many times.

The lessons learned from these two programs should make it obvious that any Federal plan of medical care for the aged will not only be with us forever but will constantly become more complex and expensive.

President Kennedy again is urging Congress to act at once on his medical care for the aged program that would be underwritten by another increase in social security payments.

It would seem that experience would suggest extreme caution in consideration of the President's medical program for the aged. We do not question the necessity for such care. Where it should emanate is the issue involved.

The medical profession, independent of government, provides the finest care for all Americans—particularly the aged—that is available anywhere.

The Wall Street Journal commented: "Not only has our life expectancy surpassed the Biblical three-score-and-ten but among the less fortunate people our medical care for young and old is an envy and a goal for matching."

The medical care available in the United States is the world's finest. It is denied no one, in emergency. It is based on the premise that local responsibility will provide for those unable for one reason or another to care for themselves.

The care has been augmented by free enterprise plans involving the American Medical Association and insurance companies.

Mr. Kennedy declares that about half the old-age population has medical insurance. Does he know that many of the other "half" are able and willing to pay for their own care?

He would have everyone pay to take care of poor and rich alike, at the expense of every taxpayer—or contributor to the social security fund.

This is an emotional, election year. We hope Congress can ignore this fact in its evaluation of a medical plan that would burden the Nation into infinity.

Medical care for the aged through a voluntary plan supported by the Federal Government certainly is to be sired. The present plan, which became effective this year in many States, should be given sufficient time to prove its worth before a compulsory system is forced on the Nation.

Nebraska Jaycees Endorse Action Against Free Delivery of Communist Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would call to the attention of the House a resolution recently passed by the Nebraska Junior Chamber of Commerce meeting in State convention.

This resolution, reprinted below, brings out the basic fact in regard to this propaganda deluge from Communist countries—the fact that there is no reciprocity in regard to our printed material, that the Communists control their press and other communication channels, even jam the Voice of America.

Because we are blocked in our efforts to promote free exchange of ideas and information, the Nebraska Jaycees believe we should halt the free delivery of this Communist propaganda. The House has responded to such urgings by overwhelmingly endorsing section 12, H.R. 7927, which gets to the heart of this problem by action on the postal rate bill.

This legislation is now pending before the other body, and hearings have begun before the Post Office Committee.

The text of the resolution follows:

NEBRASKA JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE RESOLUTION

I, Jack D. Campbell, president of the Nebraska Junior Chamber of Commerce, do hereby certify that the following is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the delegates present at the winter board meeting of the Nebraska Junior Chamber of Commerce held in Columbus, Nebr., on February 11, 1962:

"Whereas the U.S. Congress is now considering a postal rate increase; and

"Whereas tons of Communist literature are reportedly being delivered in the United States every year at the expense of the American taxpayer; and

"Whereas there is no reciprocation on the part of Russia, and in fact just the opposite with jamming of the Voice of America, and deliberate censorship of U.S. information in the Soviet Union;

"Whereas some Congressmen are actively working to bar such Communist propaganda from the U.S. mails: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Nebraska Junior Chamber of Commerce go on record earnestly endorsing all efforts to combat the unchecked flow of Communist propaganda."

JACK D. CAMPBELL, *President*.

Khrushchev Seeks To Halt Our Tests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Spokane Spokesman-Review:

KHRUSHCHEV SEEKS TO HALT OUR TESTS

It has now been 6 months since the Soviet Union abruptly resumed an extensive series of atmospheric tests of atomic weapons.

The Russians broke what may have been termed a gentleman's agreement on all such testing. In spite of worldwide shock over this display of Communist immorality, the Arctic and Siberian blasts were continued until the Reds found out what they needed to know about their own nuclear developments.

The U.S. Government continued its own self-imposed moratorium on atmospheric testing. But now there is a distinct possibility that the nuclear experiments will be

resumed. An announcement of the type of testing may be made by President Kennedy this evening.

Because of previous official statements, it has been generally known in this country that our atomic experts have been getting the Pacific testing grounds ready.

Many preparations are required to conduct a series of tests that could provide the technical knowledge needed by our own Government—above and beyond the advances made up to the time that our testing program was halted. It may still be a month or more before the new testing program can begin.

During the long interval since the Soviet Union proved out its own weapons last year, Soviet Premier Khrushchev has been maneuvering to prevent American testing. His most recent maneuvers have featured his desire for an 18-nation summit conference later this month at Geneva.

Because of the skill of the Communists in manipulating "world opinion" President Kennedy is being hard pressed to call off the proposed American tests. If he makes an announcement indicating resumption of American tests, we can depend upon a new cry being set up to halt the pending experiments.

Actually, the President has delayed for a long time the testing program that most of his own atomic and defense experts have been urging upon him. Khrushchev and many of his followers around the globe hope to bamboozle the United States into a position of impotency. It is hoped that our own responsible officials will not be frightened into acceptance of such a position.

It is also hoped that the President will not agree to attend another summit meeting until our own Government is well prepared to discuss the grave issues seriously with a Khrushchev who is prepared to demonstrate—by deeds and not by propaganda—what the Communists mean by their pleas for peaceful coexistence.

Outlook for Nation's Daily and Weekly Newspapers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, across the Nation our daily and weekly newspapers are performing a unique, splendid, and indispensable service to the people of America. Playing a vital role in American life, newspapers keep citizens of our free country informed on day-to-day, community-to-space topics—presenting a wide variety of news, commentary, editorials, features, and other special newspaperisms.

In a world of fast-changing events, we will depend—to an ever-larger degree—upon newspapers, as well as other media, to keep abreast of happenings that may affect our progress—and yes, our survival.

Consequently, we need to preserve and perpetuate a climate in which this significant media may grow and progress.

Recently, the National Publisher presented an informative article relating to the outlook for 1962 entitled "Higher Circulation, Ad Linage, and Profit." Disclosing the findings of a nationwide survey by the National Publisher, I ask unanimous consent to have the article pirnted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGHER CIRCULATION, AD LINAGE, AND PROFIT

A rising trend in newspaper publishing activity is foreseen for 1962 by the vast majority of the Nation's weekly and small daily newspaper publishers.

A nationwide survey conducted by National Publisher points to these conclusions:

General economic conditions will improve during the year in areas served by weekly and small daily newspapers. Only 3 percent of the publishers indicated that conditions in their areas might be worse.

The vast majority of publishers expect advertising linage, circulation, and net profits to be higher. None is looking for miracles. In fact, there is almost unanimous agreement that costs for shop wages and supplies will be up. Publishers are counting on more linage and, in about 20 percent of the cases, higher rates for advertising, to boost income.

Publishers are to spend approximately $12 million on new plant and equipment in 1962. This covers the plans of one-third of the publishers. The others plan no expansion, and a few contemplate a shift to offset in which they will contract with another newspaper or a commercial printer for the printing.

More than half of the publishers plan special promotions to improve the economies of their own communities. Most of these will seek to bring new industries into the communities. They include promotions to increase tourist business, a growing source of income in many small towns near forest or resort areas.

Nearly 40 percent of the publishers state that expected improvement in agricultural income will have the greatest effect upon the economies of their circulation areas.

In the survey, questionnaires were sent to 1,200 weekly and small daily publishers from coast to coast. Over one-fourth had responded by presstime. A detailed statistical look at what they see ahead for 1962 is included in charts on following pages. Not included in the charts are some significant plans publishers have for boosting local economies, circulation, advertising linage, and net profit during the new year.

Most publishers have set up specific goals for 1962. More than half are seeking to increase the circulation of their newspapers.

CIRCULATION PROMOTION

Projected circulation promotions include such offers and activities as these:

A free want ad with a year's subscription; a free gift for the dashboard of the car for a year's subscription, a campaign of premiums and commissions for subscription salesmen; house-to-house canvassing using a special staff; telephone surveys to increase subscriptions; using teams of young people selling on commission in fringe areas; increasing the number of newsstands handling the paper; offering incentives and bonuses to carrier boys; making annual special offers during County Fair Week, and other special weeks.

The prospect of rising circulation in many localities is supported by a record of growing population. This is due in some areas to new highway link-ups with urban centers which make the areas accessible to commuters. In most cases, however, increased population is tied to the arrival or expansion of new factories, new industries, or new Defense Department bases.

A majority of publishers responding to the NEA survey plan campaigns to bring new industry into areas and otherwise improve the local economy.

Some of their plans involve:

Working closely with the local industrial development committee; support of and work in rural development programs; promoting the town as a trading center; issuing a special hunter's edition circulated to some 6,000 out-of-State hunters; offering financial aid to employ a full-time new industry sales contact man; promoting a downtown facelifting to make the town more attractive to shoppers and to new industries; issuing special tourist editions; printing a special Industry Appreciation Week edition to promote expansion of industries already in the area; providing editorial emphasis on attracting new industries; engaging in campaigns to beautify the town and thus increase its attractiveness to new industry.

The increased advertising linage publishers expect in 1962 is tied more to the practical estimates of growing retail and manufacturing trade than to the establishment of new industries. These are more likely to affect linage in 1963 and 1964 than in 1962.

BUSINESS LOOKS BETTER

For the immediate future, publishers base their expectations on upward trends they see among existing businesses. The survey discloses that between 50 and 90 percent of advertising income for weekly and small daily newspapers comes from local retail display. From 2 to 30 percent comes from national advertising. Classified advertising produces from 1 to 15 percent of newspaper revenue. Legal advertising brings in from 1 to 40 percent of revenue for a range of newspapers. Income from advertising by local manufacturers runs from zero in most cases up to 10 percent in a few.

These figures compare with results shown in the 1961 national weekly newspaper cost study. In this study publishers attributed about 71 percent of their advertising revenue to local retail display; 12 percent to classified; 10 percent to national display; and 7 percent to legals.

It follows that the vast majority of sales promotions run by weekly and small daily newspapers will be tied in first, with the retail trade, and second, with national advertising.

BUY HOMETOWN

Promotions planned in these areas for 1962 include:

Buy hometown campaigns; special shopping center editions; a wide variety of retail promotions such as Dairy Month, a monthly trade day, oil progress week, Mother's Day, and so on; centennial or sesquicentennial editions.

In looking toward sources of additional revenue in 1962, nearly 20 percent of the publishers stated that they plan to increase advertising rates, and 10 percent said they plan to increase subscription rates. The 1961 national weekly newspaper cost study disclosed that about 9 percent of a weekly's total income comes from circulation. Price raises for subscriptions can mean substantial increased income.

Higher circulation and more advertising linage spells expansion for many newspapers. In order to serve larger numbers of subscribers better, many publishers are planning to build new or expand existing facilities and to buy new equipment during the year.

TO SPEND $12 MILLION

Based upon the returns to the survey, it is estimated that weekly and small daily newspaper publishers will spend in the neighborhood of $12 million for these purposes during 1962.

One-third of all publishers replying to the survey stated that they are planning to buy new plant and/or equipment. Most of the plans call for spending from $1,000 to $40,000 for new equipment and $1,000 to $20,000 for plant remodeling or additions.

In some cases publishers plan to spend up to $200,000 for new plant and up to $150,000 for new equipment. Where publishers expect to buy both new plant and equipment, the ratio runs from 50 to 60 percent of total expected expenditures for new plant and 40 to 50 percent of the total for new equipment.

Costs, of course, are a constant challenge to weekly and small daily publishers and will continue to be so during 1962. A total of 72 percent of publishers expect wage costs to rise and 80 percent expect costs of printing supplies to go up. Only 4 percent expect any reduction in any publishing costs.

Of those who indicate specific objectives in 1962, over 75 percent placed increasing production efficiency high on the list, while 35 percent specifically mentioned efforts to hold down printing costs as a major objective for the year.

While weekly and small daily newspaper publishers are working continually to improve their product, many of those responding to the survey mentioned definite plans for changes to improve editorial content of their newspapers. Twenty-seven percent plan greater emphasis upon editorials, 20 percent plan to carry news of interest to women, 15 percent plan to carry more sports news, and 2 percent plan to print more news from Washington, D.C.

MORE COLUMNS AND PHOTOS

Nearly all weekly and small daily newspapers are 100 percent locally written today. However, in planning to enliven their pages for 1962, some 15 percent indicate they will buy more cartoons and columns, while 50 percent state that they plan to buy and use more photographs.

In summing up: Publishers are looking forward toward better general economic conditions in 1962 with more circulation, more advertising linage, and higher net income. What's more, most already are undertaking campaigns to improve their communities and to make their readers and their advertisers more prosperous in 1962.

Outlook for hometown newspapers in 1962

[Percent]

Region	Advertising linage			Circulation			Net income from publishing			Costs, wages and supplies			General economic outlook		
	Higher	Lower	Same	Higher	Lower	Same	Higher	Lower	Same	Higher	Lower	Same	Better	Worse	Same
1. Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Rhode Island, and Vermont	71	12	17	88	0	12	44	17	39	94	0	6	41	6	53
2. Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia	86	0	14	76	0	24	70	10	20	95	0	5	67	4	29
3. Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, North Carolina, Mississippi, Panama Canal Zone, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, and Tennessee	75	0	25	78	3	19	38	31	31	97	0	3	69	0	31
4. Arkansas, Colorado, Kansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas	44	0	56	39	0	61	40	30	30	96	0	4	28	6	66
5. Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, and Wisconsin	59	6	35	69	4	27	40	23	37	84	4	12	62	4	34
6. Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota	54	9	37	57	1	42	47	23	30	91	1	8	61	3	36
7. Arizona, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Utah, and Wyoming	90	0	10	80	0	20	60	20	20	90	0	10	80	0	20
8. California, Oregon, Washington, Alaska, and Hawaii	65	13	22	63	4	33	29	21	50	92	0	8	55	4	41
All regions, total	63	6	31	66	2	32	44	23	33	91	1	8	59	3	38

Americans Must Have the Basic Knowledge To Distinguish Freedom From Dictatorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Roscoe Drummond which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of February 18, 1962.

Whether we shall survive as a society depends in large measure upon the protection we maintain against encroachments on individual freedom. An educated American is not one to be easily brainwashed or hoodwinked into believing ideological nonsense, whether from the left or the right.

Mr. Drummond's article follows:

COURSES IN COMMUNISM

(By Roscoe Drummond)

I suspect that the questionnaire test given to groups of U.S. soldiers will show that the GI's do not know any more, or less, about communism than most other people.

Senator JOHN C. STENNIS, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee investigating the censoring of speeches by the military, suggests that servicemen spend several hours a week studying communism and the U.S. system of government.

Quite possibly some troop indoctrination on what the Soviet bloc is up to, and why it requires the United States to put its young men into the Armed Forces is useful.

However, the need for thorough, factual education on Communist methods purposes and policies is not primarily a troop need; it is a national need.

I am talking about sound education dealing with communism in depth and specifically contrasting its doctrines and objectives with the American system of freedom under law.

Such courses as these ought to be required in high schools and colleges throughout the country. If they were, there would be little need for additional troop indoctrination.

Nothing adequate is being done.

A special committee of the American Bar Association headed by Lewis F. Powell, of Richmond, Va., formerly chairman of the Richmond School Board, finds that, with rare exceptions, courses on communism in the schools are conspicuously absent. It shows that the high school curriculum in the social sciences today is just about what it was 30 and 40 years ago.

The bar association committee is encouraging high schools and colleges to establish up-to-date courses on communism with the goal of creating "more than an uncomfortable awareness that communism threatens freedom and our country."

"It means," the Powell report stresses, "a great deal more than creating feelings of fear, antipathy or hatred. The real need is for widespread knowledge in depth."

The report warns against trying to make education about communism a form of counter-propaganda. On this point it says—and I think rightly:

"In America, the education process is closely and properly related to a principal objective in our society—freedom of the individual. This obviously includes freedom and capacity to think and make national choices. In light of these great traditions, the subject of communism (like any other subject) should be taught factually, thoroughly and objectively.

"This is indeed in our national interest as American students jealously reserve to themselves the right to make rational choices, and they would be the first to resent—or later be disillusioned by—teaching which departs from these traditional standards."

This is why the content of courses and teaching of communism should remain the responsibility of school authorities.

In implementing such a program the American Bar Association report wisely counsels that "great care be exercised to avoid—in fact and in appearance—all implications of domestic politics. As the subject of communism tends to evoke extreme and emotional reactions, special care must also be exercised to avoid extremist influence of both the right and the left, and to refrain from branding as pink or Communist, differing or unpopular views.

The need for troop indoctrination is peripheral. The overriding need is for a clear, steady public awareness, which will not be lulled into apathy or misled by passing shifts in Soviet policy of what the Communists are trying to do to the free world.

We face many years, if not many decades, of continued conflict. To win the cold war we must know why we have to achieve sustained public support of the sacrifices and measures needed to win. The place to begin this education is in the schools and colleges.

Hat Corp. Chairman Calls Hatless Kennedy Business Handicap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, although I am somewhat reluctant to offer suggestions of a personal nature, I am impelled to do so today on behalf of the great hat-producing industry of my district, Fairfield County, Conn.

Once it was thought that no man could be dressed properly without a hat. I consider this to be so still and it is with regret that I have noted our President making so many public appearances bare of head. Indeed, he is seldom seen even with hat in hand.

I know the wearing of a hat has come to be a matter of personal preference but would like to suggest most respectfully, that the President is presented with the unique opportunity of appearing to his best advantage while, at the same time, giving impetus to the employment to thousands of persons.

The enormous impact of the White House on customs and manners is generally acknowledged. In illustration of this, I am submitting for the RECORD, the following article from the Wall Street Journal reporting the proceedings at the recent annual meeting of the Hat Corp. of America:

HAT CORP. CHAIRMAN-CALLS HATLESS KENNEDY BUSINESS HANDICAP

NEW YORK.—Shareholder William R. Agnew waved a newspaper picture at Hat Corp. of America Chairman Bernard L. Salesky at the annual meeting and asked, "Can't you do something about this?"

The large photograph showed President Kennedy sitting relaxed and hatless at the tiller of a sailboat. The caption read: "The American Look."

"And this is an even sadder commentary," continued Mr. Agnew, holding up a photograph of Premier Khrushchev of the Soviet Union. Mr. Khrushchev was wearing a large felt hat.

Mr. Salesky replied, "This is one of the heartbreaks of my business career." He added, "If you can figure out a way to get Khrushchev to stop wearing hats and Kennedy to start wearing hats, Hat Corp. will supply you with hats for life."

Chairman Salesky disclosed that Hat Corp. has made efforts to get President Kennedy interested in hats. The company sent a dozen hats to the President. He said the hats were delivered by Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and former Governor of the hat-producing State of Connecticut, and by Alex Rose, president of the United Hatters, Cap, and Millinery Workers International Union. Mr. Rose is also a power in New York State's Liberal Party, which strongly supported President Kennedy in the last election. President Kennedy accepted the hats, Mr. Salesky said. "But we haven't seen him wearing them."

Hat Corp. also supplied the President's tophat for the inauguration parade, Mr. Salesky said. "But when we looked at the press pictures, he wasn't wearing it." Some helpful publicity did result when the man who made the topper appeared on the television program, "What's My Line?" the executive added.

Mr. Salesky was philosophical about the Presidential hat problem. "Everybody has handicaps and the great handicap in our business happens to be the men who go without hats," he shrugged. "President Eisenhower wore a hat and maybe the next President will, too."

Percy A. Brown—1883-1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening, March 3, 1962, Mr. Percy A. Brown, a truly outstanding businessman, civic leader, public official, and patriot, died at the age of 78 in Wilkes-Barre, Pa. He had served his city, county, State, and Nation with distinction for nearly three generations. With his passing I have lost a longtime friend and loyal supporter and especially all who serve in public life know the significance and meaning of such sentiment. Mrs. Flood joins me in extending to his family and associates our deepest regrets and condolences on the passing of Percy Brown.

On Monday evening, March 5, 1962, the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader published an eloquent editorial on the life and career of Percy Brown and as part of my remarks today I quote the aforementioned editorial from that newspaper:

PERCY A. BROWN—1883–1962

"Lives of great men all remind us
We can make our lives sublime,
And departing, leave behind us
Footprints on the sands of time."
—HENRY WADSWORTH LONGFELLOW.

Like a comet flashing out of nowhere and rushing breathlessly through the skies, holding the fascinated populace in awe with its might and illumination, a man who commands widespread attention appears on the local scene every generation or two. Such an individual was Percy A. Brown who came to Wilkes-Barre as a boy of six from a Butler Valley farm at St. John's in the lower end of the county without any special advantages and rose to the exalted status of leading citizen.

Today, as the human comet that was the life of Percy Arthur Brown faded over the distant horizon, never to be forgotten by those who knew him, his fabulous career will be recalled, not only in his adopted city, but the length and breadth of our land, such was the impact of his dynamic personality and the lasting impression he made through his monumental achievements and innumerable good works.

The boy, who started from scratch at the age of 13 and was a nationally known figure in business and banking circles at the time of his death at 78, left an imperishable record, locally and nationally.

Mere mention of the name of "Percy A. Brown," here or elsewhere, was enough to command attention, such was the public image he created. In the normal course of events, the name of "Percy" frequently has been a handicap to a child, conjuring up visions of a sissified, cringing-type youngster. But Percy A. Brown changed all that, breathing new meaning into the name, for no more virile, robust, and respected citizen was to be found in these United States, demonstrating that a name means only what its owner represents.

In this community, the name of Percy A. Brown stood for quality, character, integrity, and leadership, be it the individual or the business with which it was so intimately linked.

It has been written if a man builds a better mousetrap the world will beat a path to his door, no matter where he is. That was true in the case of Percy Brown. The impressive record of service and success he complied in Wilkes-Barre as a businessman, banker, and civic leader brought him important recognition far beyond our borders. The Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., the Central Railroad of Pennsylvania, enterprising firms in New York and Kansas City, the National Restaurant Association, and many others called on him to sit on boards and committees and to serve in an executive capacity, sharing his talents and prestige. In every instance, the job sought the man where he was concerned, no small personal compliment. Many offers he was forced to turn down because of his overcrowded schedule, for he was unwilling to associate himself with a concern or organization without carrying his share of the load.

Percy Brown was a perfectionist and drove himself harder than any member of his organization. In business for 57 years, it was not uncommon for him to be up at 5 or 6 a.m., even though he did not retire until midnight. Both as a boy and man, he knew the meaning of hard work and frankly he thrived on it, deriving endless pleasure from routine chores as well as his extracurricular activities. Combined with ability and courage, his industry explained the success he achieved.

His market and restaurant were closest to his heart despite his farflung interests. This was where he started and where he preferred to be. There also was a matter of personal pride involved here since he regarded his customers as guests and there was no finer host than Percy Brown. The East Northampton Street establishment, which has a therapeutic and esthetic value apart from its culinary aspects, reflected his personality more than anything else in his career.

His public service was equally outstanding, although the emphasis was elsewhere. That he already was dealing with the community as a businessman and banker made the transition to the role of public servant relatively simple; in fact, it was difficult to tell where one began and the other left off, so intimately were those two phases of life connected.

Although he figured prominently, on occasion, in Federal, State, and county politics, again it was Greater Wilkes-Barre that was his chief concern in this realm. For many years, he was active in school affairs, his contribution to the betterment of the school system including a tour of duty on the board of education. City hall also knew him through his activity in central city development, with special stress on parking and lighting in association with the late Charles Weissman and others. Incidentally, he was a team worker, one who welcomed counsel and help.

No reference to his public service would be complete without a mention of his contribution to the Nation's welfare through his service on the Committee of Five to frame a grocery code under the National Industrial Recovery Administration during the depression and the experiments for army rations he supervised as a Government food consultant during the Second World War, as well as his service to the Commonwealth as

a member of the Pennsylvania Restaurant Code Authority.

As a good-will ambassador and prominent figure in the chamber of commerce and other organizations, he pioneered in the establishment of local airports, in the development of highways and in the expansion of industry, contributing generously of his means as well as his time to projects that had as their objective the welfare of the public. Crestwood Industrial Park is among his many public monuments.

As a public benefactor, he had an active part in many campaigns to raise funds. The current appeal of Mercy Hospital, in which he was listed as a cochairman, was the last in which he was engaged because of the intervention of death. A man of generous impulses, his private benefactions were so extensive that he easily qualified for a place among the leading philanthropists of the region since the turn of the century.

It was inevitable that many honors should come to him and they did, including such distinctions at the 33d degree in Masonry and inclusion in the hall of fame of the restaurant association. The list is long and impressive not only expressing the gratitude of organizations on behalf of the public, but matching the friendships he made.

It is hard to believe a man of his vitality is gone, just as it is difficult to envision that a lad from the Heights, whose roots were deep in the soil of his native St. John's, would be known and respected not only from coast to coast and border to border, but across the seas. To be sure, life will go on without him, as it has in the case of other notables since the beginning of time, but Greater Wilkes-Barre will not be quite the same because there is nobody to fill his vacant chair. His passing concludes a stirring chapter in the history of our town.

J.F.K.'s Spending Program and Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by David Lawrence in the Salt Lake Tribune:

J.F.K.'S SPENDING PROGRAM CASTS PALL ON BUSINESS

WASHINGTON.—Overlooking the obvious is a common error in Government.

Billions, for example, are being added to Government expense. The national debt isn't being paid off at all. It's growing bigger and bigger. Proposals are being made regularly by the Kennedy administration to give away Federal funds through various kinds of benevolence called welfare. Little thought seems to be given to the obvious question, Where is the money coming from?

The basic problem is one of confidence—how to convince American businessmen that they can go ahead and invest money in America's future without risking large losses.

The talk now, however, is of a slowdown in recovery. The AFL-CIO openly speaks of a Kennedy recession.

President Kennedy is a busy man. He has too many things to do. Sometimes it seems as if there ought to be two Presidents of the United States—one to concentrate on foreign affairs and the other to concentrate on domestic affairs.

A well-organized Cabinet is an alternative that seems to have been overlooked.

While businessmen don't like to talk about it openly, they worry about the future as they haven't worried about it since the depression days of the 1930's.

They are asked to speed up their operations—to buy new plant and equipment so as to become more efficient. They face "featherbedding" and union restrictions. They are confronted with demands for a shorter and shorter workweek at the same total pay. The prospect of extortion through strikes and threats of strikes is constantly before industries, large and small.

As for investment, businessmen ask themselves whether interest rates are ever going to come own. They are told that the international balance of payments is the cause of the trouble. Yet exports are high. They read that the Kennedy administration intends to penalize American companies that have built plants abroad to compete with Europeans. Yet Europeans are encouraged by tariff reductions to come here to compete with American companies. Business is told by our Government to risk its money in underdeveloped countries and, in effect, to abandon or disrupt profitable operations in Europe.

At home, the case that business has against the administration is even more serious.

Depreciation allowances have been a part of the tax structure for decades past. The rates are out of date. The administration has attempted to throw a bone to business by advocating an 8-percent credit on new capital investments in certain industries.

But this is trifling and, because it is limited in scope, it doesn't touch the fundamental ailment—the handicap of outworn depreciation rates as a whole.

Uncertainty is the opposite of confidence. Uncertainty permeates the national economy today, particularly the enterprising men of business who would be spending money to create jobs if they could see a profit.

The United States boasts about its profit system, but few people call it by its right name—it's really a profit-and-loss system.

That's why American business is worried. It sees today little chance for a fair margin of profit, and sees plenty of chance to incur a substantial margin of loss.

Hon. Harry Evans Watkins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Fairmont, (W. Va.) Times under date of March 9, 1962:

LOCAL BOY MAKES GOOD

When Harry Evans Watkins was named, 25 years ago, to the newly created office of judge of the Northern and Southern District Courts in West Virginia, he was one of the youngest members of the Federal judiciary. He was appointed on recommendation of the chief sponsor of the legislation which established a third judgeship in West Virginia, the late U.S. Senator Matthew Mansfield Neely, who never regretted his decision.

The wisdom of naming a relatively young man to the bench, although he was well grounded in the practice of his profession, is pointed up by the fact that Judge Watkins is now observing the 25th anniversary of his appointment still at the peak of his mental and physical vigor. Long years of additional service lie ahead for him.

Selection of Judge Watkins on so many occasions to serve in other districts from New York City to Florida and the frequent requests that he sit with the circuit court of appeals testify to the high esteem in which he is held by his confreres of the Federal bench. Few jurists of his age have been so honored.

There's no doubt Judge Watkins would have himself been elevated to the appellate division had a vacancy occurred during the incumbency of a Democratic President. As it was, a junior colleague, Judge Herbert S. Boreman, of Parkersburg, was named to the circuit court of appeals by President Eisenhower when the last appointment was made from West Virginia.

As U.S. Attorney Robert E. Maxwell said so eloquently at a testimonial honoring Judge Watkins here yesterday, he has brought to the bench "courage, character, and conscience," the three great essentials of a jurist.

While all West Virginia takes pride in Judge Harry E. Watkins, Fairmont is especially happy to claim him as a local boy who made good.

President Kennedy Seeks To Impose His Controls Over Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, evidently no field of human endeavor is to be overlooked by the Kennedy administration in its apparent effort to impose Federal controls over the American people. Some interesting thoughts on Federal encroachment in the fields of the arts is contained in the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune:

NO, THANKS

Looking about for new worlds for the spenders to conquer, Secretary of Labor Goldberg last December 14 proposed that the Government start subsidizing the arts. Mr. Goldberg, as arbitrator, had just given 91 dissatisfied musicians a raise of $10 a week at the expense of the Metropolitan Opera Company of New York, and this vicarious philanthropy had encouraged him to view himself as a patron of the arts, and, by extension, to confer the same role on Washington.

Since then President Kennedy has appointed a national cultural coordinator in the person of Mr. August Heckscher, a spavined onetime editorial writer, late of the Twentieth Century Fund. What Mr. Heckscher is coordinating at the moment nobody seems to know.

Now let us relate these matters to a painful decision reached by the Royal Academy of Arts in London. The academy is faced by rising costs. It has decided that, rather than take a Government subsidy, it will sell one of the great masterpieces of its collection at public auction.

The work to be offered is a sketch by Leonardo da Vinci of "The Virgin and Child With St. John the Baptist and St. Anne." The academy believes it to be the most famous work of art ever to be submitted at auction. It is believed to be the only remaining preliminary study of the many Da Vinci prepared for his major works.

The academy stated that it had decided to sell the masterpiece to remain on a self-sustaining basis. In its long history since 1768, it has cherished its independence, and its president, Sir Charles Wheeler, has announced that "it is our intention never to seek Government aid." The Times of London has commended the academy for its "proud courage."

Britain has pursued a policy of granting subsidies to the arts since the end of World War II. It is credited with managing to avoid political interference, but the Royal Academy didn't want to labor under even the appearance of compromising its integrity.

The academy knows that art of any kind can only flourish in an absolute climate of freedom, and that when Government intrudes with its patronage, then Government has the compulsion to assume "responsibility" for standards, performance, or choices which otherwise are the sole business of the artists themselves, the institutions where their talents are displayed, and the private citizens who encourage the arts with their contributions, patronage, and support.

And if these things are true in art—as the Royal Academy believes them to be—they are equally true in every other domain into which the Federal Government seeks to intrude, offering bribes from the public treasury for compliance with its dictates and rules.

This conclusion applies whether Government is seeking to manage the operations of agriculture, to get its fingers into the schools, to dispense medicine at public expense, or to coordinate the arts. We could wish that a little of the pride of independence which impels the Royal Academy to a great sacrifice rather than accept Government largess would start catching on in this country.

A Kingdom for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, two of America's distinguished citizens, Dr. William Hitzig, of Mount Sinai Hospital in New York, and Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review, recently attended the convocation ceremonies at the University of Ethiopia. The events which transpired at that time and their background are of such great significance that they should be made available to the American people.

They were transcribed in a brilliant article which appeared in the Saturday Review of January 20, 1962. The article follows:

ADDIS ABABA.—To an American, education has long since ceased being a phenomenon. The wonder of it has been completely metabolized, along with home milk deliveries and running water. To most Africans, however, education is the most revolutionary part of a revolutionary age. It represents a flying leap from the 10th to the 20th century. It is a road map out of feudalism. It is the tangible proof of liberation and the first fruit of freedom. It is a certificate of self-respect. It is a promise that fewer babies will die in infancy. It is an admission ticket to the office of a qualified doctor and a lifetime away from leprosy. It is emancipation from witch doctors. It is better crops and enough food. It is a whole host of great expectations that come with self-government. It is what people think about and talk about.

It wasn't always this way. Only 30 years ago in Ethiopia, for example, the Government had to offer material inducements to parents to send their children to elementary schools, of which only a handful existed. Formal education was suspect, as though the youngsters would be made to undergo an alien experience that would distort or harm them. But then the winds of a new Africa began to blow through the continent and people began to understand the connections between knowledge and an independent and healthy nation. Books ceased being a repository for fearsome markings and became a vehicle for achievement. Today, there are dozens of elementary schools in Ethopia. The problem no longer is one of incentive; the problem is how to find space for the children whose parents are clamoring to get them in. In many districts, 20 children have to be turned away for every 1 lucky enough to be admitted. It would appear that education in Ethiopia, as in the rest of Africa, is second in importance only to national independence itself.

A shopkeeper in Addis Ababa spoke for most parents when he told me: "My father thought the best legacy he could give me was enough money to set me up in business. This is not what I intend to do. I may or may not leave my sons some money. But I intend to leave them something far more important than money. I will leave them the best education it is within my power to give."

Even those African children who were lucky enough to receive such a heritage found that it generally took them only as far as elementary school. Fifteen years ago, there were hardly 2 dozen college-educated men in Ethiopia. Less than 2 years ago, when the Belgian Congo received its freedom, only 14 Congolese men had college degrees. Children of wealthy parents sometimes went to Europe and America for university training, but not all of them came home again.

A national program of higher education, therefore, is the key to any long-term program for producing an educated citizenry. In 1950, Emperor Haile Selassie I of Ethiopia began what at that time seemed a daring program. He instituted a liberal arts and education school, followed later by a college of engineering, an institute of building technology, a public health training college, a college of agriculture, and a college of mechanical arts.

By 1959, enough separate college units were in existence to warrant their ultimate consolidation and expansion into a university. His Imperial Majesty retained a survey team from the University of Utah to make recommendations toward that end.

Dean Harold W. Bentley and his team arrived in Addis Ababa early in December, 1959. When they turned in their report several months later, the Emperor not only accepted the recommendations but persuaded Harold Bentley to stay on as Acting First President of the University of Ethiopia.

"The very first time I met Dr. Bentley, I knew it would be hard for me to let go of him," the Emperor told us as he reviewed the events leading up to the dedication ceremonies of the university on December 18, 1961. "For years I wanted a university in Ethiopia. I wanted it to have high standards. I wanted it to achieve excellence. And then, within 15 minutes after I started to talk to Dr. Bentley, I said to myself, 'Here is the man who can give it to me.' "

This was the beginning of an association that already is taking on the status of a legend. When the question of a site for the university came up, in the early discussions between the Emperor and Dean Bentley, various locations were considered. All were either too remote or lacking in spaciousness and natural apepal. Then the Emperor hit on the answer. He would move out of the royal palace, with its various buildings, vast gardens, and fields and turn the entire establishment over to the university. Bentley was elated. There could be no more dramatic proof that the university had become the No. 1 objective of the Government. This was reinforced when the Emperor agreed to serve as the chancellor; he also agreed to give a course in Ethiopian history and Government.

Another specific incident gave tangible encouragement to Hal Bentley. One of the foreign professors at the liberal arts college was severely critical of the Government. In general, he thought the rate of social progress was much too slow. After the abortive December 1960 revolt against the Government, the foreign professor left Ethiopia. Though he had had no part in the uprising, the similarity of some of his views with those of various intellectuals involved in the revolt made for an awkward situation. While out of the country, the professor wrote a rather harsh article about the Emperor. As soon as Hal Bentley saw the article, he brought it to the attention of the chancellor. He stressed that he had no interest in political affairs of the Government; as acting university president, however, he would urge the chancellor to invite the foreign professor, about whose academic ability there was no question, to return to Addis Ababa and resume his post at the university. This was an exercise in academic freedom without which no university could expect greatness. As he made his recomemndation Bentley wondered whether the distinction he was making between Selassie as Emperor and Selassie as chancellor would be accepted.

The distinction was recognized. The chancellor saw the point at once. He wrote to the professor, inviting him cordially to return to Ethiopia. The professor readily agreed; the professor is expected in Addis Ababa next week.

This incident has made a profound impression on the entire academic community in Addis Ababa, including many of those whose sympathies were not entirely with the crown. Hals Bentley is off to a good start. Indeed, one of the young African professors remarked that he hoped to write a book someday that might be juxtaposed against "The Ugly American," by Lederer and Burdick. It would be called "The Essential American," and it would be about Hal Bentley.

On December 18, 1961, the dedication ceremonies for the new university were held on the steps of the royal palace. The Emperor formally handed over the palace and grounds to Ato Yilma Deressa, chairman of the board of governors of the university. There was a full imperial ceremony, with invocation and benediction by the Patriarch of Ethiopia, His Holiness, Abuna Bassilios. Representatives of the faculty and student body spoke, as did Dr. Bentley. From all over the world came academic delegates, all of whom were presented to the Emperor. Virtually the entire diplomatic community turned out for the affair. Faculty and students brought the audience up to 3,000. Not far away were some 10,000 schoolchildren who had come to the imperial grounds as part of the celebration.

All in all, as some one remarked, it was a proud hour for Ethiopia. It was also a proud hour for the United States. Among those present was the Deputy Assistant Secretary in the Department of State's Bureau of African Affairs, Mr. J. Wayne Fredericks, who had brought greetings from President Kennedy. It was a proud hour for the United States, because American financial aid had helped to make the university possible and because a man by the name of Harold W. Bentley was giving himself to it.

New Orleans and the Americas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting into the RECORD the second pair of articles in a nine-part series by Reporter Bill Stuckey of the New Orleans States-Item, on "New Orleans and the Americas." The third article in the series, "Largest U.S. Colony of Hondurans Here," and the fourth article, "Exile Latin Answer to Oppression," follow:

[From the New Orleans States-Item Feb. 1, 1962]

NEW ORLEANS AND THE AMERICAS—LARGEST U.S. COLONY OF HONDURANS HERE

(By Bill Stuckey)

Here's one statistic which is overlooked in the city's promotional literature:

More nacatamales are eaten in New Orleans than in any other U.S. city (maybe). You didn't know that, now did you?

The succulent nacatamale is a dish of chicken, potatoes, olives, rice, and corn, wrapped in a banana leaf—and consumed with great relish by the natives of the Republic of Honduras.

And the Hondurans of New Orleans, who may number as many as 7,000 persons, comprise the largest U.S. colony of former residents of that Central American country, at least according to the estimates of Fernando Alvarado, president of the Honduras Association of New Orleans.

The Honduras Association is also the largest and most active of local Latin clubs.

Drop around to the Italian Union hall some night when the Hondurans are meeting—and you'll find that they have done much more than just make New Orleans the nacatamale capital of North America.

Formed 3 years ago by Dr. Victor Herrera, former Honduran consul general here, the association's purpose is to help Hondurans meet the problem of adjusting to a new environment, to keep down the homesickness and to provide activities for Honduran families and children.

It sponsors soccer teams, softball teams—even a girls' basketball squad. Recently, the association's newly formed children and youth department put on a variety show for Honduran consular representatives, city officials, and dozens of beaming parents.

Its hospital committee visits every Honduran who comes to New Orleans for medical treatment (Hondurans regard New Orleans as the principal U.S. medical center, said Alvarado). Its welfare committee gathers clothing and other necessities of life for needy children back in Honduras.

There are many dances and picnics, with the big social event of the year being September 15, the anniversary of the declaration of independence from Spanish rule in 1821 (Mexico and all Central American nations except Panama observe their independence day on the same date).

The group also aided in drives to aid the hurricane-hexed natives of British Honduras, and joins in other civic activities.

The majority of local Hondurans are white-collar officeworkers, said Alvarado, a former Honduran consular officer who now heads the consular department of a local steamship agency. There is also a small nucleus of professional people, including Dr. Paul Reyes, a surgeon and the first president of the association.

And, like the Nicaraguans also, many Honduran sailors and dockworkers live here.

Why so many Hondurans here? Alvarado said many Honduran families send their children to parochial schools here—and many decide to stay. Dr. Reyes speculated that job opportunities hold the biggest lure, since there are only three major categories of jobs back in Honduras—agriculture, working with the American fruit and steamship companies, or political jobs.

But Honduras is only one of at least 20 countries represented here. Have a look, for instance, at the ambitious Puerto Ricans.

Just as New Orleans has the potential of becoming the major focal point of understanding between the United States and Latin America, the local Puerto Ricans are uniquely qualified to play the same role between Latins and other residents.

Luis Ortiz, a lawyer and a founder of the newly formed Puerto Rican club, feels this could be the principal role of local Puerto Ricans. The natives of that island, he points out, are born with U.S. citizenship and have a long, intimate acquaintance with U.S. institutions and customs. They're equally at home with Latin culture due to centuries of Spanish rule.

In New Orleans, they claim to have a higher percentage of professional men, highly trained technical people, and executives than any other local Latin nationality.

One goal of the 50-member club is to acquire a building in which all Latin organizations may meet or keep offices, said Ortiz. Another pan-Latin project is the formation of a Pan American softball league, in which local teams would play teams in Mexico and possibly other Latin nations.

Proud of the accomplishments of Puerto Ricans in their homeland through the economic revitalization program called Operation Bootstrap; proud of Puerto Ricans who have achieved prominence in U.S. affairs, such as alliance for progress Director Tedoro Moscoso, and proud of the civic role of local Puerto Ricans, the group will strive to maintain the good name of their people, Ortiz said. They're particularly sensitive about impressions that all Puerto Ricans are fugitives from the "West Side Story" and travel in lawless packs.

Socially, the local Puerto Ricans are great homebodies, said Ortiz—except for an occasional dance, a picnic, a soccer game or a "lecon asado" barbecue in the park.

The Mexicans:

Ask a Mexican anything about local Mexicans and more than likely he will tell you, "See Don Adolfo. He knows."

All roads to things Mexican in New Orleans lead to Adolfo Hegewisch—former president of International House; former president of the Cordell Hull Foundation for student-teacher exchange between the United States and Latin America; president of the historical and educational Simon Bolivar society here, and long a prominent figure in shipping and foreign trade here.

In addition to these distinctions, he is president of the Mexican Patriotic Committee, the closest thing to a nationality organization among Mexicans here. The primary purpose of the group, organized by Consul Ruben Gaxiola, is to maintain contact between Mexicans and persons doing business in Mexico, and occasionally to help a Mexican in distress. Its major social event is a September 15 Independence Day banquet (which 600 persons attended last year, said Hegewisch).

A high percentage of local Mexicans work in exporting, importing and other offshoots of foreign commerce. Others are financiers, doctors, and white-collar workers. The editor of the Nation's only bilingual law review, Tulane University's Inter-American Law Review, is distinguished Mexican legal scholar Rodolfo Batiza. Other Mexicans prominent in local university circles were the late Andres Horcasitas and the late Jose Ortiz Monasterio.

There are no other formal Latin nationality organizations in New Orleans, aside from the Cuban refugees, who will be discussed in another article. But several other Latin nations represented here have produced community leaders, a few of whom are:

Dr. Ernesto Huete, dentist, and Hernan Arostegui, International House publicity director, Nicaragua; Dr. Alberto Prieto, Panama; Mario Bermudez, city international relations department director, Colombia; Father Gabriel Gonzalez, Guatemala; Dr. Mauricio Escardo, Loyola University philosophy professor, Uruguay, and Al Alice, director of the state commerce and industry departments' foreign trade division and former president of the Export-Import Managers Club, Costa Rica. And that merely scratches the surface.

There are some institutions which cater primarily to Latins of all nationalities here. In the religious field, there is at least one Catholic sodality, the 150-member St. Frances Cabrini parish hospitality and immigration committee, and the First Spanish American Baptist Church.

The large Latin consular corps here, representing 18 nations, could be considered an important local Latin group. They handle details of inter-American trade, visits, assist local Latin nationals with individual problems and perform many other tasks.

Although several local Latins participate as individuals in local politics, there is no distinctly Latin American political group.

Guatemalan-born Juan Sencial, now a U.S. citizen and an executive of a freight-forwarding firm said he once tried to form such an organization but was unsuccessful.

He estimates that no more than 2,000 to 3,000 persons of Latin birth are eligible to vote here. Most don't participate in politics, he said.

[From the New Orleans Statesman-Item, Feb. 2, 1962]

NEW ORLEANS AND THE AMERICAS—EXILE LATIN ANSWER TO OPPRESSION

(By Bill Stuckey)

Everything was fine when you went to bed last night—but when you awake you find you have become counter-revolutionary, a danger to the public peace, an enemy of the people and persona non grata in general.

The government changed while you slept, you see, and now in the bright light of day, it has been found that your political beliefs are undesirable. So what do you do now?

Throughout the turbulent history of their countries, thousands of Latin Americans have found only one safe answer to that question—go into exile.

And for more than a century, thousands of Latin American exiles have fled to New Orleans. This is because the city is relatively close to their native countries, is more Latin in flavor than other nearby U.S. havens, and is blase and polyglot enough to allow the refugees to blend quietly into the background. For the latter reason, it is also a good place for the exile to plot his return.

Latin exiles who have escaped to New Orleans over the years form a long and sometimes impressive list.

A notable example was a young Mexican lawyer named Benito Juarez, who came to New Orleans in 1853 to escape reprisals from the regime of General Santa Anna. After 2 years here, he returned triumphantly to Mexico and helped to overthrow Santa Anna. He was later elected president and is now considered one of Mexico's national heroes.

Not so fortunate was Gen. Jorge Ubico, who was known as the "Little Napoleon of the Tropics" during his 13 years as president of Guatemala—and who fled here in 1944 on the heels of a student strike. He died in a

New Orleans hospital 2 years later of natural causes, and possibly of unfulfilled dreams of return.

Some exiles decided to live here permanently and eventually achieved prominent positions in the community. Among these was the late Jose Ortiz Monasterio, a former aid to long time Mexican President Porfirio Diaz. Monasterio left Mexico City in 1915, during the long revolution which followed the Diaz regime, eventually settled here and later became active in Loyola University's Ibero-American Relations Department.

In recent years, the city has also seen groups of Nicaraguans opposed to the late President Luis Somoza, Sr. (an anti-Somoza organization here dissolved following Somoza's assassination in the mid-1950's); anti-Trujillo Dominicans; Guatemalans who were forced from their country during the pro-Communist regime of Jacobo Arbenz, and a few Venezuelans who fled when Perez-Jimenes resigned.

Then, 3 years ago a young Cuban revolutionary known to his supporters as Fidel—supported, as some refugees today will note bitterly, partly by supplies and encouragement from certain New Orleans circles—drove Fulgencio Batista from power.

That event opened the latest, and possibly the most significant chapter in New Orleans long history of offering safe harbor to Latin political refugees.

As Castro's politics grew more crimson, thousands of Cubans found themselves in a relatively novel-type Latin political dilemma. Not only their politics had been found undesirable to the new government, but their religion and personal property as well. They chose exile.

Though most headed for Miami—more than 80,000—about 1,000 came to New Orleans.

The Cuban refugees here offer what is probably the most diverse cross section of a Latin society that New Orleans has ever seen in an exile group.

For example, there is a man, who refugees say headed Batista's equivalent of the FBI. And there are disenchanted young men who once wore beards and berets, and once roamed the Sierra Maestra Range with Castro.

There is Julio Bringier who, before he escaped Cuba, was one of Cuba's three supreme court justices. His son Carlos, also a lawyer and the former judicial secretary of the Cuban high court, also lives here now.

There are at least half-a-dozen more Cuban lawyers, about 10 or 12 doctors and dentists, former owners of huge sugar and cattle plantations, and many accountants, former business executives, engineers, technicians and professors.

But there are also hundreds of Cuban truckdrivers, seamen, waiters, stenographers, widows and orphans. Seldom, perhaps, have so many "little people" been displaced by a Latin revolution.

New Orleans greeted them with more emotion than this blase city usually shows to exiles—partly because of religious sympathies, partly because of business losses local firms suffered in the Castro expropriations, partly because of the militant anticommunism of influential segments of this city.

Last fall, the archdiocese of New Orleans ordered a special collection of food, money and clothes and a Catholic Cuban Refugee Center, directed by Mrs. Albert Cerniglia, was established. Of 786 refugees who have come to the center for help to date, housing and jobs have been found for most of them, Mrs. Cerniglia reported.

Although some lawyers and other highly educated Cubans now must work as clerks or factory laborers, they at least have some sort of livelihood. The State employment service reports that relatively few refugees have asked for work there.

More than 100 Cuban children now go to school in local parochial schools, about a dozen in public schools.

Mrs. Cerniglia and other Catholic leaders are currently working on a plan to bring about 30 refugee priests here to supervise church activities for, and tend to the spiritual needs of Cubans and other local Latins.

English classes have been established for Cubans at the St. Thomas housing project and in St. Cabrini Parish, Mrs. Cerniglia said.

Other religious groups, including the First Spanish American Baptist Church (whose pastor, Donald Levy, is a nonrefugee Cuban) also have plans to help.

Efforts by local refugees to topple the Castro regime have also been given open support by city hall. Proclamations from the mayor's office, for example, have opened several fund drives by the local branch of the Miami-headquartered Frente Democratico Revolucianario—including the recent F.D.R. "Crusade to Free Cuba."

Even so imminent authority as Castro himself has said that New Orleans was a training ground for the disastrous Bay of Pigs refugee invasion last April—and is now a center of preparation for new invasions.

A new group was recently formed by lawyer Carlos Bringier and other refugees—the Unidad Cubana Revolucionara Anti-Communista. This group, which already claims the largest membership of any local Cuban organization, seeks to unite Cubans of all political coloration in preparation for the return to Cuba. (Although its newsletter is known as Crusada, the organization has no connection with the Frente's "Crusade To Free Cuba.")

Possibly the greatest significance of the local refugees is the general awakening they have effected among local citizens toward this city's stake in Latin America—and the losses it would suffer if all Latins went Red.

In addition to the Cuban organizations, local professional and businessmen have formed still another Latin-oriented, anti-Communist organization here called Information Council of the America's (INCA). Organized by Dr. Alton Ochsner, the council tape records descriptions of life in a Communist state by local Cuban refugees and hopes to distribute these tapes to radio stations throughout the Americas.

INCA leaders emphasize that the tapes are in working-class Spanish. They also say that the Cuban refugees might become the most effective weapon the United States ever had in the cold war.

Unfortunately, the local refugees might bring some disadvantages too, some citizens feel.

If, as one Miami civic leader recently requested a congressional committee, the Federal Government closes Miami as a refugee center and shifts the refugee program here, a mass migration of Latins might materialize. This could bring a housing shortage, increased competition for jobs and other dislocations of the local economy, as at least one civic group, the Executives Club of Louisiana, feels. Mayor Schiro has also voiced similar sentiments.

Juan Sencial, born in Guatemala, now a U.S. citizen and a local political figure, fears that such a move would create vast "Spanish Harlems" here.

But that is still in the future. At present, many New Orleanians and Cuban refugees alike feel they face only one problem.

His name is Castro.

Emotionally Disturbed Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address which I delivered at the first meeting of the advisory board and executive committee of the Rhode Island League for Emotionally Disturbed Children, at Johnson's Hummocks, Providence, R.I., on October 23, 1961:

I am very happy to be here with you this evening and to be given an opportunity to talk with you on this occasion.

I would like, first of all, to congratulate you on the vigor of your organization, and on the determination with which you are pursuing your goals. I find it hard to believe that the Rhode Island League for Emotionally Disturbed Children is less than 6 months old. I would say your growth and your accomplishments, since that May evening when the league was formally organized, have been almost incredible.

In the 6 months since then you have more than doubled in size from 75 persons to the 164 persons who now comprise your membership. Furthermore, these members, as I understand it, live in all parts of our State. You have, in addition, formed the advisory board, which, working with the executive committee, should greatly assist you in reaching your objectives.

In the past 6 months, bound together by your sure objectives, you have managed to accomplish a great deal.

First, you have made the community aware of your needs, the first step needed in planning for and obtaining community action. You have pointed out that there are 2,530 emotionally disturbed children in Rhode Island, badly in need of education, for whom almost no educational facilities are available. The exceptions are the relatively few who are being taught at the Bradley Hospital and in a single public classroom in Coventry.

You have pointed out that these children are of normal intelligence, and that their inability to profit from a normal classroom experience is due to emotional disturbance.

You have stated that not educating these children, and not treating them for their emotional ills, can only lead to further problems. Without proper educational and treatment facilities, it is sadly true that these children, many of them, will be incapacitated for normal living in their adult lives.

You have reminded the community that their stated intentions toward, and legal responsibilities for, these children are clear. These youngsters fall under the same 1950 law that requires special schooling for mentally retarded and physically handicapped children.

You have also—and I am sorry that this is so—had to remind your fellow citizens that they have not moved as quickly to meet the needs of the emotionally disturbed children as they have the mentally retarded and physically handicapped children. Although 21 school boards and communities have made provisions for the education of these children, Coventry is the only community with a special class for children of normal or

above average intelligence who suffer emotional problems disqualifying them from regular classrooms—and this one special class has only been in existence for a year.

This endeavor on your part—to inform and to educate your fellow citizens concerning the needs of this group—has borne fruit. The Governor, alerted to your needs, sought to establish an 11-member commission to study the feasibility of such educational facilities, and a bill backing such a move was introduced in the general assembly.

You have moved ahead in other ways, too. Just last week the Providence YMCA started, with your help, a specialized physical education program for these children. Other steps to make available to them the recreational opportunities all children need have been taken. A Boy Scout troop and a Girl Scout troop have been—or are being—formed. The Providence Kiwanis Club is sponsoring a bowling team for them.

And, I suspect, you had something to do with insuring the establishment, this fall, of a special course of study for teachers of exceptional children at the University of Rhode Island.

For the future, your goals are both specific and far reaching. First, as I understand it, you seek to establish special classes for these children in the various communities of our State.

Second, you hope to bring into being a centrally located school and treatment center for residential and day pupils.

This is truly an impressive record of accomplishments for so young an organization and these are exciting goals. I have no doubt that you will reach them. In the 21 years I have served as your Congressman, in my lifetime spent here in Rhode Island, I have seen too much evidence of effective community action to doubt that a year from now—2 years from now—you will be well along the way toward reaching your major objectives.

But effective community action on the part of Rhode Islanders is only to be expected, if my reading of the history of our State is correct. This honorable tradition, of caring for our own, and caring for them as well as our fiscal resources and mental and physical energies will permit, was started in the early days of the Providence Plantations.

And, while other parts of the country were still a wilderness, the citizens of Providence, mindful of their responsibilities to that unlucky portion of our fellow beings who are by the visitation of providence, deprived of their reason, established Butler Hospital.

I can think of no greater tribute to the community action undertaken then than the community actions you are seeking to undertake now. Before Butler was established, citizens committees and advisory groups similar to this one met, talked, discussed, learned, and moved toward their objectives. With the concerted backing of the community, expressed in large and small donations of time and money, they succeeded in establishing an institution of which we are still proud.

I have the distinct feeling, these days, that we are as one might say, "doing our ancestors proud." Last fall, at this time, I dedicated a recreation building at the Emma Pendleton Bradley Home. Last week I helped dedicate a central medical laboratory at the State hospital for mental diseases.

In the past few years, we have witnessed what has been the rebirth of Butler Hospital, and the renewal of the Joseph Ladd School for the Mentally Retarded. Nor are we finished with our task of providing health services for our fellow citizens. The next few years will witness the establishment—hopefully—of a new medical school at Brown University. And in the achievement of that goal, we will be helping not only our own people, but the entire Nation as well.

This brings to me a point I wish to emphasize. In establishing and developing the Rhode Island League for Emotionally Disturbed Children, you have addressed yourselves to a problem that not only exists in this community but is shared as well by communities and metropolitan areas all over the Nation. There is uniform agreement that a solution to the problems of the emotionally disturbed child will improve the lives of millions of young children and reduce the numbers of adults who constitute a national social and health problem.

In my duties as chairman of the House committee responsible for the appropriation levels of the Federal health and medical research programs, I have become quite familiar with programs which are aimed at solving these national problems and which might be useful to you in establishing and operating a central school and treatment center for emotionally disturbed children. Although the majority of the assistance is concentrated in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, there is no single program which operates across the board to provide special education programs or services.

The manner in which a school or center is planned and organized, its affiliations with public or private agencies or institutions of higher education, and the type of its total operation would determine its eligibility for assistance under various research and demonstration programs.

For example, a facility for emotionally disturbed children might receive support for research, experimentation, and demonstration provided in connection with diagnostic, therapeutic, and treatment services.

One such project that received Federal support until this past June was the special group program for acting-out children carried out by Dr. Laufer at the Bradley Hospital.

I want to emphasize at this point that the so-called demonstration is usually supported on a fairly short-term basis under a philosophy that the program once underway can be carried on effectively under local and State support. Other such projects that have recently received Federal assistance were two projects at Butler Hospital—one was concerned with treatment instead of hospitalization, and the other was concerned with the influences of personnel on chronic mental patients.

Another type of project, under a program administered by the Office of Education is cooperative research in education. Under this program, the Commissioner of Education is authorized to enter into cooperatively financed contractual agreements with universities, colleges, and State educational agencies for research and demonstrations in any aspect of education. The needs for research related to the education of emotionally disturbed children most certainly require emphasis in this program. One of the most meaningful ways to develop this emphasis is for groups such as this league to dramatically demonstrate the needs of the emotionally disturbed.

Third, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation also provides research and demonstration grants. These grants support part of the cost of special facilities and services of State vocational rehabilitation programs. Projects are not limited to dealing with persons of employable age. For example of a project currently being supported is the day-care center providing psychiatric and vocational services for emotionally disturbed adolescents located at Butler Health Center.

Fourth, the Children's Bureau provides special project grants for demonstrations, studies, and professional training programs which may contribute to the advancement of crippled children's services. Under the program, a grant could be made to support demonstrations or studies of medical care and treatment for emotionally disturbed children. The only restriction would be that funds could not be used for teachers' salaries. An example of this type of project is the day-care center for brain-injured children with communication problems currently being supported at the Bradley Hospital.

Most of the programs and projects I have just mentioned are carefully designed to meet specialized needs and to investigate new approaches to old problems with the hope that such new knowledge will contribute to our national resources in this field. Being Federal in scope, they are designed to complement, rather than supplement public and private, State and local, efforts to meet community needs.

Now, what of the future?

I firmly believe that this next 12-month period is going to see some truly significant developments in this field at the national level.

I would suppose, for example, that many of you have noted the President's recent action in appointing a panel of distinguished persons to investigate the needs of the mentally retarded in our Nation, and to make recommendations for appropriate services in this specialized field.

It was most appropriate that President Kennedy take such action, for other recent developments on the national level have been primarily concerned with the needs of the children and adults who are mentally ill and emotionally disturbed.

I am thinking, first of all, of the recently issued final report of the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health. This study, as a result of an act of Congress, took 5 years and involved a series of the studies to evaluate how well we as a nation are caring for our mentally ill and promoting the mental health of our citizens.

The final report makes recommendations for a comprehensive approach to this problem, and calls for action at all levels of government. I have no doubt that, at the Federal level at least, actions will be taken to implement the report's recommendations.

Many of these recommendations bear directly or indirectly on the problems of the emotionally disturbed child. Recommendations concerning research call for accelerated programs in basic research designed to find the ultimate causes of the mental disorders and hence prevent their occurrence.

Recommendations for recruitment and training call for a vastly expanded effort to stimulate the interest of American youth in all categories of mental health work as a career.

Recommendations of the Joint Commission concerning treatment facilities emphasize the need for early treatment, for intensive treatment, for treatment in community facilities, for comprehensive treatment, with the goal in view that the emotionally disturbed child or adult will be given the help he needs, when he needs it, so that, in his future life, he can live as a self-respecting, self-sufficient, productive citizen.

The Joint Commission report also recommended that Federal, State, and local expenditures for emotionally disturbed and mentally ill children and adults be doubled in the next 5 years, and tripled in the next 10.

For my own part, I am vitally interested in seeing the joint commission report implemented for the benefit of the individual children with whom this league is concerned.

Another important and encouraging development at the national level occurred just a few days after John F. Kennedy was inaugurated as President of these United States. At his request, a Center for Research in Child Health was established on February 17, 1961. At the same time legislative proposals were undertaken to create a National Institute of Child Health and Human Development to encourage research and provide

a focal point for solving human health problems from the earliest age to maturity.

The legislative proposals were introduced in both Houses of Congress and referred to the appropriate committees. I am hopeful that hearings on both the Senate and House bills will be held early in the coming session of Congress and that a Public Law will be enacted at the earliest possible moment.

I feel, in talking and visiting with you here in Rhode Island, and in participating in the momentous developments that are occurring in Washington, that truly our Nation and our community are of one mind concerning the needs of all our children.

I know you will achieve the goals you have set for yourselves.

I suspect, however, that when you achieve these goals, others will beckon to you, and that this league, established to care for a very special group of children, will not be content until every emotionally disturbed child in this State is given every possible opportunity to develop his fullest potential.

I feel certain the time, the intelligent effort, and the Federal, State, and local funds needed to achieve these goals will be forthcoming in good measure.

Thank you for letting me be with you this evening.

The First Year of the Alliance for Progress: Gains, Obstacles, and Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, today marks the first anniversary of the alliance for progress. In tribute to the occasion I call to the attention of my colleagues the splendid yearend review of the program published in the New York Times on Sunday, March 12:

THE FIRST YEAR OF THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS: GAINS, OBSTACLES, AND CONTROVERSY

(By Tad Szulc)

WASHINGTON, March 11.—One year after President Kennedy invited Latin America to join the United States in a new alliance for progress, his ambitious 10-year program for the hemisphere's development is acquiring shape as an economic, social, and political project.

Mr. Kennedy described his program on March 13, 1961, as "a vast effort, unparalleled in magnitude and nobility of purpose, to satisfy the basic needs of the American people for homes, work and land, health and schools."

Today, the alliance for progress still faces formidable obstacles, and its operations are the target of mounting controversy in Latin America and in Washington.

The United States has committed in the program's first year a total of $1,029,576,000 in loans and grants. Seventy-five percent of that commitment has not yet been disbursed and the actual projects are just getting underway.

However, the first signs of the program's impact are already dramatically visible. For example, there is the school-lunch program in the troubled Andean Department of Puno in Peru, where 26,000 children were fed by surplus U.S. food and school attendance rose 50 percent in the first year of the alliance.

It was in the Puno area that hungry and landless Indian peasants fought Government troops recently when the Government sought to oust the peasants from four big cattle ranches they had seized.

BASIC REFORMS ARE SLOW

The basic reforms in Latin America that President Kennedy said were vital to his self-help program are generally slow in coming. But in a number of the republics there has been encouraging progress. In others, opposition to land and tax reforms is a problem.

This opposition involves the flight of United States and private local capital to tax havens elsewhere in the world. Political instability and the fear of expropriation also cause a withdrawal of capital. This damages efforts to create investment money to match official U.S. aid.

The entry of new private capital, which President Kennedy regards as a vital adjunct to official loans, is still running at what is considered an unsatisfactory level. The net inflow in 1961 was about $200 million.

The fundamental concept of the alliance was set out in a charter that was signed by 19 countries at Punta del Este, Uruguay, last August 17. Following are the key provisions of the charter:

"The United States intends to furnish development loans on a long-term basis, where appropriate, running up to 50 years and at very low or zero rates of interest.

"For their part the countries of Latin America agree to devote a rapidly increasing share of their own resources to economic and social development, and to make the reforms necessary to assure that all share fully in the fruits of the Alliance for Progress."

PROGRAM HAS CAUGHT ON

Although Latin America lags behind the United States in fulfilling her share of the charter obligations, the overall conclusion emerging from reports by correspondents of the New York Times in Latin America is that, on the whole, the revolutionary concept of the Kennedy program has caught on.

A sampling of public opinion in Latin America last November showed that in Bogotá, Colombia, 71 percent of those questioned were aware of the alliance. The figure was 64 percent in Montevideo, Uruguay; 45 percent in Buenos Aires, and 25 percent in Rio de Janeiro. In Bogotá, the figure was reported to have increased greatly following President Kennedy's visit there last December.

The progress of the alliance varies sharply from republic to republic. It ranges from gains in land reform and low-cost housing in Colombia and Venezuela to the inability of Chile to establish a meaningful agragrian program and Uruguay's failure to do any serious planning.

Part of the picture is hope—hope by the people of Latin America that the alliance for progress will mean a new future. There is also a rising effort to plan for fundamental development measures.

A PROMISING PATCHWORK

The alliance for progress became operative only last August, when its charter was signed. This may explain why the story of its first year is a patchwork of promising prospects and foot dragging.

The reports to the Times agree in general that the rising public pressure for reforms and for a serious attempt to mobilize domestic resources to meet development objectives is bound to influence the reluctant groups. Part of the value of the program is that it acts as a catalyst for reform.

The United States made its latest effort to encourage basic reforms in Latin America last Thursday, when it pledged up to $350 million in assistance to Chile, including $40 million in foodstuffs for 1962 alone.

Although it was not spelled out in the communique, the U.S. commitment on the bulk of these funds is highly conditional. The aid will depend on whether the Chilean projects are sound enough to be approved and on whether Chile will carry out her commitments under the alliance.

The impression of officials here and of observers in Latin America is that hasty judgments must be avoided. They warn that instant results must not be expected and that the program's first achievements may not immediately match the impatience of the U.S. Congress and public opinion.

They believe that punitive moves here because of impatience could choke the program in a quicksand of resentment and recrimination.

The report from Rio de Janeiro said:

"In the initial stage, while the broad national programs are being worked out and the necessary technical work is being done, emergency projects are meeting the political-psychological problem of building up popular steam behind the alliance.

"The feeling now is that the emergency projects are the instrument by which the people will be shown as immediately as possible that the alliance is at work."

In Brazil, public opinion samplings showed considerable skepticism about the alliance and about U.S. aid. However, Lincoln Gordon, the U.S. Ambassador to Brazil, has warned that it must be remembered that the aid program there is just entering the phase of practical realizations.

Most of the U.S. aid to Brazil, which runs into hundreds of millions of dollars, has been directed toward the strengthening of Brazilian finances, an objective that is not readily clear to the masses.

Plans call for loans to the huge, drought-parched, and destitute northeastern area of Brazil and for the building of schools and roads, irrigation dams, and of food-storage warehouses. Shipments of wheat for bread and of dried milk for children are already arriving.

Celso Furtado, director of the Brazilian Government agency in charge of planning for the northeast, said recently that the alliance had to be brought down from the level of technical groups to language and facts that evoke response from the people.

The bread and dried milk are aid that the people, many of whom have never tasted such foods, will understand.

One yardstick for measuring the impact of the alliance for progress is the intensity and virulence of Communist and other leftist attacks upon it.

OPPOSED BY COMMUNISTS

The Times correspondents report that Communist propaganda is portraying the alliance as a sinister Yankee scheme to perpetrate imperialism and protect U.S. economic interests and the interests of millionaire associates of the United States in Latin America.

While the alliance is thus being buffeted in Latin America by public attacks from the extreme left and by powerful behind-the-scenes opposition from rightist groups, it is also facing serious problems in Washington.

Basically, the program is still hampered by uncertainties as to what its operational structure should be and by the failure of its top planners to get across clearly to the Latin Americans the notion that it really is intended to be an alliance in the fullest sense of the word.

Although Latin Americans are pleased that the United States has already committed more than $1 billion in loans and grants, many observers feel that the program must create much more of a political and psychological impact.

This is held to be particularly necessary because the alliance for progress is seen on the political level as a major challenge to the Communist-backed revolutionary pressures of the Cuban type.

These observers believe that to be in tune with the revolutionary spirit pervading

Latin America, Mr. Kennedy's program must inspire a sense of participation among the Latin American masses.

JOINT PLANNING URGED

It has been suggested that there should be established joint planning and execution commissions involving United States and national specialists in each of the 19 countries participating in the alliance.

The present system is that development plans are elaborated by local planning boards. Then the blueprints are sent to Washington for review by an international panel of economists and for ultimate decision by the United States as to whether they should be financed.

The advantage of joint commissions is said to be that both sides share responsibility for the plans, thus eliminating one cause of possible resentment.

The same principle, it was suggested, could be applied to the administration of development projects.

Another dividend that could be derived from such joint efforts is that auxiliary organizations of local citizens could be sponsored to spread the idea of participation that is deemed so essential to the success of self-help and community development projects. It is believed that such a system would help to strengthen the concept of democratic procedures.

The U.S. missions of the Administration for International Development cannot sponsor local citizens' groups for the alliance. The Latin American countries, with two notable exceptions, have failed to do so. The answer may lie in joint commissions.

HELP FROM PANAMA

The two countries in which the alliance is being actively promoted, aside from frequent speeches by officials and newspaper articles, are Panama and El Salvador.

The Panamanian delegation that went to the inter-American conference in Punta del Este, Uruguay, last August to sign the alliance charter, later became a national committe for the alliance. Its members have been traveling across the country spreading the program's gospel.

In El Salvador, a bright spot of the alliance in terms of national self-help, a citizens' committee for the program has been working for several months.

The criticism that is often heard of the United States approach to the alliance is that too much stress is being placed by Washington on the purely financial aspects of the program, while its political and psychological aspects seem to be largely neglected.

Alliance officials here have been under White House orders to exceed the $1 billion mark in loan commitments in time for the alliance's first anniversary because President Kennedy promised last year that such a financial objective would be reached.

Actually, of the total of more than $1 billion committed, only an estimated total of 25 percent has been disbursed. The balance is being held pending studies of specific projects, the completion of loan-agreement negotiations and the carrying out by the Latin American governments of their legislative or executive obligations under the alliance.

A total of $150 million in loans was committed to Argentina in February to bolster the government there, although no projects have yet been submitted.

In the opinion of many Latin American and U.S. observers, the success of the alliance should not be measured only by the amounts of authorized aid, but by the impact of the program in terms of basic reforms.

TWO PROBLEMS RAISED

This question of reforms and of the performance at home by the Latin American governments has raised two serious problems.

The first is that the United States has not yet been able to work out even general criteria for granting aid and harmonizing political pressures and realities of foreign policy with a key requirement of the alliance charter; the requirement that the recipients of aid practice self-help through basic reforms in land tenure, tax legislation and financial stability.

The quandary facing the administration is whether it is wise to rush aid to countries that have failed to fully carry out reforms, even though such countries may require aid to remedy or prevent dangerous internal instability and even the fall of their democratic governments.

Advocates of withholding aid until reforms have been carried out contend that to provide aid before reforms is akin to agreeing to blackmail. They say this would turn the alliance into a wasteful giveaway program.

But the administration believes that in special cases political considerations must be allowed to outweigh insistence on fulfilling obligations of the charter to the letter.

It is argued that a U.S. failure to provide aid in urgent circumstances may let a friendly regime fall and is certain to play into the hands of the Communists and their allies. The Communists could then be expected to claim that they were right in having charged that the "Yankees" are not true friends in the hour of need.

The second problem is the growing impatience of Congress. Senators and Representatives have been protesting that in most cases Latin-American land and taxation reforms have not been carried out and that many countries have not put their financial houses in order.

This criticism is certain to be reflected in congressional reaction to the administration's forthcoming request for alliance funds.

President Kennedy plans to ask Congress to authorize $3 billion in alliance aid for the next 5 years. Mr. Kennedy believes that long-range planning is impossible if there is no assurance of funds. The President will also request an appropriation of $600 million for Latin America for the fiscal year 1963.

There are indications that these requests will run into rough weather on Capitol Hill. The Senate majority leader, MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, has long been an advocate of aid to Latin America. But he said in a recent report on Brazil that the United States should refrain from long-range commitments to that country because the Brazilian regime had been unable to govern effectively and make good use of financial assistance.

Brazil has been the largest recipient of U.S. aid in the last 12 months. She has been assigned $357,190,000 in loans, but she now requires $583 million more for emergency development projects.

The administration believes that there is danger of a political collapse in Brazil because of economic and social problems and that Brazil is thus a case where special considerations should prevail.

Representative OTTO E. PASSMAN, the Louisiana Democrat who is chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee, described the administration's long-term aid request as asinine because of the failure of most of the Latin American countries to approve land-reform legislation.

Senator RUSSELL B. LONG, also a Democrat of Louisiana, offered a bill this month to halt all aid to countries that expropriated U.S. property without fair compensation. He asked specifically for an administrative stop on all aid to Brazil, where a subsidiary of the International Telephone & Telegraph Corp. of New York was settled last month by the Governor of Rio Grande do Sul.

The administration feels, however, that Congress is being hasty in passing judgment on Brazil in particular and on Latin America in general.

Its view that the problem should be appreciated in a wider perspective is supported by the reports of the Times' correspondents who have surveyed the alliance in the field.

Alliance activities in Washington began in a comprehensive way only 4 months ago, when Teodoro Moscoso was sworn as administrator of the program on November 14.

Bureaucracy and organizational problems have delayed the alliance's work here. Mr. Moscoso still has problems in recruiting personnel and it was only 10 days ago that his organization was finally gathered under one roof at the State Department.

RESISTANCE TO REFORM

It must also be noted that the alliance proposes a fundamental and drastic change in centuries-old patterns throughout a region inhabited by more than 200 million people—a region vibrating with mounting revolutionary pressures.

Administration officials and Latin Americans emphasize that it is impossible to expect lightning results in such a heroic undertaking. They acknowledge that there is powerful resistance by vested interests who still do not seem to realize that opposition to reforms may push their countries into revolution.

They note that the United States is continuously prodding governments into the moneyed groups into accepting reforms. In several cases, especially in Chile, these efforts have earned the Kennedy administration the open hostility of the conservative class.

Warnings have also been sounded by administration officials and Latin Americans against the tendency to relate to the alliance such problems as the expropriation of the telephone company in the south of Brazil.

While the telephone seizure was deplored, in part because of the adverse impact it may have on new private investments in Latin America, it was stressed that the seizure did not represent the policy of the Brazilian Government.

The Times' correspondent in Rio writes: "Premature efforts to link the alliance to everything that happens in Latin America can have and are having a negative effect."

On the larger question of how much has been accomplished in Latin America, it is indicated, relatively speaking, that there has been more progress than Congress realizes.

For example, land reforms are being pressed in five countries. Mexico and Bolivia have had land-reform laws for years. Guatemala started reforms in 1953. Venezuela approved her land-reform law in 1960 and is carrying it out effectively. In Colombia, land reform legislation was approved last year.

There are land-reform bills before the parliaments of Brazil, Peru, and Ecuador. In the Dominican Republic, much of the land is owned by the government, which is now studying a redistribution program.

The need for land reforms varies from country to country. In Chile, Peru, and Ecuador, where the masses suffer from land hunger, reforms are urgently needed. Argentina says her problem is not land redistribution, but higher production and foreign markets for her meat.

In Brazil, the needs vary from one section of the country to another. Thus, the coffee-rich State of São Paulo has a land reform law, while in the drought-stricken northeastern region the first need is for an irrigation program.

Tax reforms have been approved in Venezuela, Colombia, Uruguay, Panama, El Salvador, and Costa Rica. In many other countries, tax collection systems are being improved. Chile and Peru need tax readjustments urgently if they are to add to the al-

liance funds in a reasonable ratio. Guatemala has no income tax at all.

Comprehensive long-range development plans have been submitted by Colombia, Bolivia, and Chile. Venezuela, Panama, and Honduras are completing their plans.

A special plan has been prepared for the northeastern area of Brazil where the United States will concentrate on a program to aid 25 million people. The United States will invest $33 million in that area immediately and a total of $428 million over the next 4 years.

Perhaps the most important long-range contribution of the alliance has been to introduce the concept of nationwide development planning in Latin America. Despite a shortage of trained economists, all the countries now have central planning boards.

PATTERN FOR THE FUTURE

The initial projects have also demonstrated how much can be accomplished with well-used funds.

In the Dominican Republic, $20 million in new loans, part of a larger financial package, is expected to make it possible for the new democratic regime to start an emergency public works program. The program is designed to absorb most of the 400,000 unemployed, who are now ripe ground for leftwing agitation. In Peru's Puno Department, $6 million is being used for emergency public works to absorb unemployed Indians.

The United States does not expect that its loans and grants will do all the work of the alliance. Great emphasis is being placed on private investment and the immediate goal is to increase the annual flow of private U.S. capital to $300 million. The estimated total of private capital invested in Latin America in 1961 was $200 million.

Additional resources are available from the Inter-American Development Bank, which authorized $178 million in economic development loans in 1961. The total of funds earmarked for Latin America in 1961 thus approached $1,500 million.

The alliance has already become the vehicle for a new and major form of U.S. political and ideological leadership in Latin America.

It has become the cornerstone of U.S. foreign policy in the hemisphere, dedicated to the proposition that Latin America must evolve peacefully and democratically toward social justice and prosperity and must not fall prey to violent revolutions that could result in Communist control.

President Kennedy supervises the alliance personally and sees it as the most important element of his administration's foreign policy. He is convinced that although the cold war against world communism may not be won in Latin America, it could well be lost there.

For this reason, the administration believes that patience, understanding and vision are required to overcome the obstacles in the path of the alliance.

In a recent speech here, Mr. Moscoso summed up the problem this way:

"In all probability we will make errors. But the one error we cannot afford to make is that of waiting, of letting the initiative slip out of our grasp."

Senator Andrew F. Schoeppel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, on January 21, 1962, the citizens of Kansas were plunged into sorrow because death claimed the life of Senator ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, a man who to them had become a symbol of rugged individualism and the guardian of principles that have been the cornerstone of our system of government since the birth of our Republic.

People in the towns and villages, and on the farms from one corner of the State to the other, lost a true friend and faithful public servant. Their feelings in this great loss are best expressed in the editorials of their hometown newspapers—the voice of rural America.

Editorials from Kansas newspapers, the Hays Daily News, Hays, January 22, 1962; the Salina Journal, Salina, January 23, 1962; Hutchinson News, Hutchinson, January 24, 1962; the Norton Daily Telegram, January 26, 1962; and the Ellsworth Messenger, January 24, 1962.

[From the Hutchinson News, Jan. 24, 1962]

PRAISE OF A POLITICIAN

Senator ANDREW SCHOEPPEL served his State in Congress with more than average distinction for 13 years. It is to the misfortune of Kansas, and of the Senate as well, that cancer has prevented him continuing that public service for at least 5 years more.

SCHOEPPEL was a good Republican, even if his philosophy came much closer to that of GOLDWATER than of Eisenhower. He was a Senator with considerable stature in the opinion of his conferees. He was a politician.

Despite the unhappy connotations this term has gained in certain circles, it is here used with admiration and respect. A politician is one well versed in the science of government who puts his special knowledge into practical use.

To these professionals public service is both a career and a livelihood. It is no more ignoble for them to remain as constantly as they can on governmental salaries than it is for others with different but no more specialized skills to use them to support their families.

SCHOEPPEL began at the bottom of the political ladder as county attorney in the rural community where he had been reared. He advanced by way of the chairmanship of an important regulatory State agency to the governorship. After the two conventional terms in that office, he went on to the Senate, where he was serving at the time of his death.

In each of these public offices he gave considerably more than value received. He did so because he was a career politician who knew the business and came to know it even better all the time. His record of effective service was far better on average than those who come into office with no experience other than that they have gained from the campus, the countinghouse, or the executive desk.

Rather than being reviled as they are occasionally, the politicians of the Schoeppel type should be recognized as the invaluable officeholders they are. Without them our democratic system of government could not function at all.

[From the Hays Daily News, Jan. 22, 1962]

ANDY SCHOEPPEL

All Kansans were shocked to learn yesterday of the death of Senator ANDY SCHOEPPEL. Death of the capable, hard hitting and conservatively bent two-time Governor and thrice-elected Senator who began his professional career in Ness City is keenly felt in the stretches of western Kansas where he was correctly considered "one of our own."

His successful career in public office speaks eloquently of the high esteem in which he was held throughout the entire State, and the respect accorded his sincerity and judgment by Senate colleagues speaks equally well of his ability.

SCHOEPPEL was a big man in every sense of the word. After interrupting his studies at the University of Kansas to enlist in the military during World War I, he enrolled at Nebraska and earned his law degree. While there he was an outstanding athlete, being named on Walter Camp's All-American team. He was on the Cornhusker 11 that beat Notre Dame and its famous Four Horsemen, a feat which wasn't often done in the heyday of Knute Rockne.

In his younger years, while practicing law at Ness City, ANDY became well known in Hays. During the 1929 football season he was head coach at Fort Hays State while the regular pigskin mentor, Bill Weidline, was on leave of absence. Not a member of the faculty, he commuted from his Ness City residence for drills and games. The win-loss column was not enviable as his team won two games and lost five.

An admirer and friend of long standing was heard to say this morning the Nation has lost another of those individuals who still believed in the traditional American free enterprise system, and this is so sadly true.

[From the Salina Journal, Jan. 23, 1962]

LOOKED, ACTED THE PART

The late ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL looked more like a U.S. Senator than do most Members of that august body—except, of course, those from the old South and Texas where the senatorial appearance is carefully cultivated. He was tall of stature, rugged of feature, deep of voice, and his hair was lionesque.

He was in a notable line of succession, starting with Jim Lane and including Edmund Ross, Preston B. Plumb, Joe Burton, Charles Curtis, and Arthur Capper, Senators of varied but colorful attributes.

SCHOEPPEL was not an orator but a good stump speaker. He was not a scholar but a student of politics. He was at his best in conference, over coffee cups, around the table, mouth to ear.

He was a conservative, not an innovator, and he appealed most to men of means, whom also were the men he admired, but his public image was such that he was elected and reelected without difficulty.

Certainly he was a hard-working servant of his State and his party. The praise that is now being paid throughout Kansas to his memory is entirely deserved.

Within his vision and capabilities, SCHOEPPEL successfully resolved the dilemma that confronts all representatives in this Republic:

The duty both to represent the wishes of the constituents as they may be determined and to exercise independent judgment based on information peculiarly available to a Senator. Often these two duties conflict.

They may be reconciled by compromise, just as legislation is itself achieved by compromise.

But Senator SCHOEPPEL had little compromising to do. His thoughts were largely the thoughts of the articulate majority of Kansans. His inconsistencies were typical of Kansas inconsistencies. If he did not go far out on a limb, neither are those Kansans in politics given to great adventure these days. He acted the picture as well as looked it.

There may not have been much excitement around his office, but he was secure and the voters were happy with the frequent letters to the home folks.

[From the Ellsworth Messenger, Jan. 24, 1962]

THE FATES UNKIND

At a time when socialistic tides are surging strong and the American dream of in-

dividual freedom, man the master of government, needs championing as never before, the Nation could ill afford to lose Senator ANDY SCHOEPPEL.

Through the years I have had occasion to be with him on numerous issues and on occasion against, and through it all I came to appreciate the basic, rugged, political integrity of the man and his devotion to constitutional principles.

Andy wasn't a brilliant man like BARRY GOLDWATER. He wasn't a crusader type, but he was rock solid in his convictions and his vote was in accord. Constituents never had to concern themselves that ANDY was voting one way in Washington and talking another on the home front. As he believed so was he.

His death leaves a gap in the ranks of the conservatives in Washington. He was a good Senator, all things considered, and that is high praise in a period when congressional stature seems at an alltime low.

[From the Norton Daily Telegram, Jan. 26, 1962]

SCHOEPPEL

A flood of editorials has hit the Kansas press praising the late Senator ANDREW SCHOEPPEL to the sky as one of the greatest Kansans who ever lived.

The fact is that when it came to getting something done in the way of legislation, Senator SCHOEPPEL was almost a complete failure. But the times were not ripe for legislative approval of views he held sacred.

He served in a Congress overwhelmingly controlled by men willing to sacrifice the Nation's solvency to buy the next election. ANDY SCHOEPPEL wouldn't buy this. As a result he was the target of vicious personal attacks on the part of liberals. But he never compromised his convictions.

He was a rugged individualist all his life, a throwback to pioneer days. There are mighty few of them left in this day of comfort, compromise, and convenience.

ANDY SCHOEPPEL was a magnificent failure—it isn't likely he will be replaced by anyone near his equal.

Out of Many—One

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, over the past several days I have referred to the current issue of the Rotarian, the magazine of the international Rotary organization. In the 60-some pages that make up this magazine there is found some of the best writing I have ever read about our Nation and her citizens. I have earlier brought to the attention of my colleagues articles by Father Bruckberger, Professor Sorokin, and our former distinguished colleague, the Honorable Chester Bowles, plus a letter to Rotarians throughout the world written by Rotary President Joseph A. Abey.

Today, I shall cite a piece by Oscar Handlin, who is often described as the foremost authority on U.S. immigration, and who is the author of "The Uprooted," Pulitzer Prize winning book on the subject. A graduate of Brooklyn College, Professor Handlin received his Ph. D. in history at Harvard University, where he has for many years been a professor in the history department and director of the center for the study of the history of liberty in America. A world traveler and popular lecturer, Dr. Handlin writes frequently for the Atlantic and professional journals. Newest—October 1961—of his many books is "The Dimensions of Liberty," which he wrote in collaboration with his wife, Mary. Following is Dr. Handlin's story of the ethnic composition of America.

OUT OF MANY, ONE

(By Oscar Handlin)

The great seal of the United States, adopted at the very birth of the Republic, bears the Latin phrase "E pluribus unum." The years have made those words of a strange language familiar to countless Americans. Even those who do not know their precise meaning have an intuitive understanding of the significance of the phrase "Out of many, one." The achievement of that goal has been one of the central experiences of the Nation.

The Founding Fathers had two elements in mind when they adopted that motto. They recognized by it that the Nation they were creating would emerge, one and united, out of the 13 separate colonies that were in revolt against England. They did not wish to destroy the peculiarities of Massachusetts or Georgia or the other new States, but they were striving to make them one country. By the same token they recognized that the population of the United States had been drawn from many different sources; it included Englishmen and Dutchmen, French Huguenots and Germans, and Jews and Catholics, in a variety that could be found nowhere else on the globe. The Founding Fathers had no desire to weaken any of these strains or to subordinate some to others, but they wished them all to blend into one people.

It was in that spirit that the "Letters of an American Farmer" explained, as the Revolution drew to a close, that the Americans were a "mixture of English, Scotch, Irish, French, Dutch, Germans and Swedes. From this promiscuous breed, that race now called Americans, has arisen. * * * Here individuals of all nations are melted into a new race of men, whose labors and posterity will one day cause great changes in the world. Americans are the western pilgrims who have carried along with them that great mass of arts, sciences, vigor, and industry which began long since in the Near East. They will finish the great circle."

In the 180 years since then, the prophecy of the American Farmer has been amply fulfilled. In that period about 45 million newcomers entered the United States. They and their descendants form the American people. They still retain many of the distinctive cultural signs of their origin. But they have coalesced into one nation capable of acting constructively together.

This immense movement of populations came in five great waves. In the early years of the Republic, down to about 1820, most of the new arrivals were men and women of the same origins as those who had earlier come to the colonies. Englishmen, Irishmen, and a few Hollanders and Germans formed the bulk of this movement; and the Napoleonic Wars kept its number low. Generally, only a few thousand entered each year.

The 40 years after 1820 saw the arrival of the second and much larger wave. The improvement of transatlantic transportation and the opening of the frontier made room for increasing numbers, and agricultural distress in Europe set large groups of peasants adrift. The impulse to come to the New World spread gradually westward to draw across the Atlantic Ocean hundreds of thousands of Englishmen, Irishmen, Germans, and Scandinavians.

The Civil War put an end to that phase of the migration. But the restoration of peace touched off a third and still larger movement which extended until 1890. This time the central source of emigration was in Northern Europe; the Scandinavian countries and Germany contributed a large proportion of the westward flow. But there were still significant numbers from Ireland and England; and Eastern and Southern Europe also began to contribute to the general shift of population.

The largest wave of all extended from 1890 to 1924, with a brief interruption in the war years. This time the annual numbers of admission often passed the million mark, and the newcomers were drawn from every end of the Old World, from Ireland to Armenian Turkey, from Italy to Finland. Many of these people still moved west to the agricultural regions of the United States, but many more entered the great cities and provided the manpower for the development of American industrial might.

After 1924, conditions in both Europe and America put an end to this type of migration. The United States in 1924 adopted a new policy that strictly limited the number who could enter and, unfortunately, did so in terms of national-origin quotas that kept the totals even below the legal limits. Furthermore, the nationalistic regimes of Europe were much less willing to see their peoples depart than had been those of the 19th century. But the United States still kept its gates open, though more narrowly than formerly, to the refugees from the political and religious persecutions that still disturbed the Old World. In the 1930's some Germans who wished to escape the rigors of the Hitlerite dictatorship, and in the 1940's and 1950's some fugitives from totalitarian communism were still able to flee westward toward freedom.

In addition to the massive migration of Europeans, there has always been a significant movement into the United States from within the North American Continent. Canadians in considerable numbers drifted freely across the border when opportunity called them. Both the French-speaking population of Quebec and the English-speaking people of Ontario left their mark upon the United States. From Mexico the movement northward brought not only seasonal migrant laborers, but also people who wished to establish themselves permanently in the United States. And from Puerto Rico and the other Caribbean islands have come a steady stream of migrants that continues to this day.

About 10 percent of the American population is composed of the descendants of immigrants of another sort, people who came through no choice of their own in the course of the African slave trade. That movement began early in the 17th century and reached its peak between 1680 and 1750. On the eve of the Revolution there were somewhat more than half a million Negro bondsmen in the colonies.

Slavery was long regarded as an evil, but Americans were seriously divided about the best way to end it. Not until the agony of the Civil War was legal emancipation achieved; and it took much longer before the freedmen began to approach actual equality of conditions. Yet, even in the periods of their deepest degradation, the colored Americans were capable of making noteworthy achievements. The toilers in the fields developed the great staples of cotton, tobacco, and wheat. Scores of artesians and fishermen demonstrated that they were able to lead independent lives. And occasional poets like Phillis Wheatley, orators like Frederick Douglass, and scientists like George Washington Carver showed

that talent could assert itself under the most difficult conditions.

After 1940, depression, war, and new global responsibilities awakened Americans to the need for making democracy real for every element of the population. Furthermore the Negroes themselves had advanced enough to be dissatisfied with limited equality. In the next two decades there was a gradual amelioration of their condition in every part of the country. In increasing numbers, colored Americans left the planations of the South and found places in the national economy. With widening educational, occupational, and political opportunities they began to reach toward genuine equality and to surmount the obstacles color once put in the way of their full participation in American life.

Color and cultural differences also complicated the position of the Indians. On their arrival the first colonists found a handful of redmen scattered through the forests of the Eastern United States, in all this vast area perhaps 30,000 of them. Out of contact, in the Southwest were somewhat larger and more settled groups of tribes. There was a long, tortured relationship between the newcomers anxious to turn the wilderness into farms and the natives who sought to preserve their heritage as it was. The expansion of settlement remorselessly pushed the Indians toward the Pacific, until the frontier was gone. Then the Dawes Act of 1887 attempted to draw them out of their tribal isolation. That effort was no doubt premature; many preferred to maintain their own way of life on their reservations. Yet in the last two decades an increasing number, even of the most tradition-minded, have felt the attractions of the dominant currents of American life and have been assimilated.

Among the millions who came to make America their new home were a variety of types. The chief motive of some was the quest for political or religious liberty. The Pilgrims fled the rigors of Stuart England in 1620 to be able to create in the wilderness a Bible Commonwealth in accord with their own interpretation of God's law. The Huguenots left France after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685 to escape the alternative of forcible conversion. The Russian "May Laws" of 1882 drove out thousands of Jews who sought to escape the discrimination of the ghettos. The Armenians fled from Turkish persecution. All found refuge in a land where they could worship in their own way and without fear of constraint.

In no respect was the New World more different from the Old than in its tolerance which permitted men of every faith to hold to their beliefs without interference. That did not imply a lukewarmness about religion. On the contrary, tolerance grew from the conviction of Americans that religion was so important that it was not to be governed by the external discipline of the State, but only by the internal rules of the individual conscience.

The Nation's freedom also attracted those who suffered from political persecution. Such a young man as Carl Schurz, for instance, as a university student enlisted in the effort to make Germany a liberal democracy. When the Revolution of 1848 failed, he and thousands like him concluded that where liberty was there their country would be, and they came to the United States. Schurz went on to a successful career as a soldier, statesman, and writer in his adopted country, and found there a congenial setting for ideas that could not then be expressed in Europe.

Almost three-quarters of a century later the spread of totalitarianism drove other liberty-loving men across the Atlantic from Europe. To escape communism, Alexander de Seversky came to the United States, where he played a prominent role in the development of the aircraft industry. To escape fascism, Albert Einstein and Enrico Fermi followed the same path and made valuable contributions toward unlocking the secrets of the atom.

Important as such distinguished fugitives were, they were few in number. Much more numerous were the men drawn by the magnets of opportunity. The New World had space; men could rise in it who, at home, would have been compelled to stay in lowly positions whatever their talents. The immigrants had no illusions; they knew that the streets of Chicago were not paved with gold, that dollars did not spring of themselves from the soil of the Dakotas, and that hard work awaited them everywhere. But they welcomed that hard work, for they also knew that they had a chance to be rewarded with comfort and dignity out of their reach where they were.

A poor Scottish lad, Andrew Carnegie, came to America with his parents because they had no work and the alternative to migration was starvation. Beginning as a bobbin boy at $1.25 a week, Carnegie moved steadily upward from one position to another until he became master of a great steel empire. And having earned his fortune he devoted almost equal energy to disposing of it constructively. In every walk of life there were enough men who worked their way up to prove that the dream of success was not wholly a delusion.

Opportunity, however, did not mean merely economic opportunity. It also meant access to the professions and to education and, above all, the room to have one's talents recognized. The artistic, cultural, and scientific history of the United States contained frequent instances of men who made their mark in this manner. Victor Herbert would have remained a humble musician in casual orchestras had he remained in Dublin; and in Norway O. E. Rölvaag would have ended, as he began, a poor fisherman. The New World gave them their chance to develop their talents in music and literature.

More numerous still were the victims of economic disaster who formed the great bulk of immigrants in any given period. The Irish and the German victims of famine in 1849 were peasants for whom there was no room in the old world. No other course was open to them but to flee, and among them were few men of distinction. Yet they too found space and opportunity in the expanding farms and growing cities of the new world.

It was not easy to absorb all these people. Every group of newcomers had to learn afresh how to earn a living under American conditions, how to survive in the strange physical environment of the forests or plains, of the great cities or mining and mill towns. In addition, they had to absorb altogether new techniques—how to behave as citizens in a free republic; how to conduct their own cultural, social, and philanthropic associations; and, above all, how to adjust to a society that was full of strangers. Almost all these people came from homogeneous towns and villages. They now had to learn to get along peacefully and cooperatively in a world that mingled many different kinds of men.

Naturally there were frequent tensions and sometimes open conflicts between native- and foreign-born Americans, or among different groups. Occasionally, impatient Americans lost faith in the assimilating capacity of their society and wished to limit the rights of the foreign born, or, later, to exclude them entirely. From the Alien Acts of 1798 to the Know-Nothings of 1854 and the Ku Klux Klan of 1924, there were some who made the newcomers scapegoats for the national ills. But in the long run these intemperate voices proved to be a minority. The majority of Americans understood that they were all immigrants or the descendants of immigrants and that the country had profited from the process that brought all those millions together to build their country.

The gains to the United States from this vast movement of peoples were impressive. The Nation found an enormous advantage in its ability to use the talent brought to it. For many years it was spared the necessity of suffering from manpower shortages by the arrival of the immigrants. The economic advantages were manifest. The steady stream of newcomers gave an important impetus to the spread of settlement along the frontier across the continent. The unending mass of newcomers helped to build the great industries and thriving cities of the 19th century. Immigration eased the pains of industrialization. Americans did not suffer from the growth of the factory system as Englishmen or Frenchmen did, for the laborers who toiled at the machines were men who came from abroad and were glad to be able to take the places they did. Nor did the cycle of prosperity and depression affect the United States as it did other countries. The extra hands came in the years when they were needed; when the pace of expansion slackened, the tide of immigration fell off. Industrial power thus came without the excessive human costs it exacted in other societies.

The United States also gained more directly. Many of the technical skills and much of the knowledge that crossed from the Old World to the New came in the minds of immigrants. Mennonite farmers from Russia brought over the strains of wheat suitable to the arid Great Plains, and Cornish tinworkers helped establish a new industry in the United States. Americans learned to brew lager, and to make pianos, plastics, and flashlights with the aid of men born elsewhere.

Newcomers also enriched the cultural life of the Nation. Theodore Thomas, Walter Damrosch, and Arturo Toscanini helped to develop its musical life; Barney Williams, Dion Boucicault, and John Drew were among those critical in the development of the drama; and the movies, long dependent on talent from abroad, would not have been the same without Charlie Chaplin, Pola Negri, and Rudolph Valentino. Sculptors like Houdon and architects like Hoban embellished the spreading cities; and scientists like Alexander Agassiz, I. I. Rabi, and Michael Pupin raised the scholarly level of the universities. Scripps, Bok, and Pulitzer laid the foundations of great newspapers and magazines; and doctors like Jacobi and Goldberger made important advances in the practice of medicine.

Indirectly, too, the immigrants contributed to the practical side of American democracy. The thousands who arrived year after year gratefully took the humblest jobs in their new homeland because even those were better than what they had in the old. Some of them in time would rise, but meanwhile their presence raised the level of all who had preceded them. Upward social mobility thus became a national characteristic. The faith that men could make something of themselves and that children need not be held to the status of their parents added an important dimension to the meaning of freedom in the United States.

Migration also tended to keep the social system fluid. The variety of men who became Americans could not be compressed into a single mold. Irishmen, Englishmen, Italians, Germans, and Russians changed in the melting pot of the New World. But they did not dissolve into a single, homogeneous lump. The process of fusion never finished although the mixture became richer and stronger.

The associations through which men cooperated to attain common goals most dramatically expressed the complexity of the process. There did not result one church, or one form of philanthropy, or even a single

medium of communication. Rather each group, drawn together by common interests and antecedents, learned to serve its own needs in its own ways. Consequently, they did not, as a matter of course, turn to government when a task had to be performed, but instead often attempted to do what had to be done by voluntary means.

Finally, immigration created important links between the United States and the rest of the world. Americans knew that a potato rot in Ireland, the landholding system in Sicily, the failure of a revolution in Germany, a pogrom in Russia, or a massacre in Turkey vitally affected them. They were not an island, cut off and isolated from events elsewhere, but part of a larger whole. And for Europeans this was long the land of hope and promise, not only insofar as some of them could come and take advantage of its opportunities, but also insofar as it held up a model to the rest of what men could make of their environment.

More than a century ago a great French student of society asked: "How does it happen that in the United States, where the inhabitants have only recently immigrated to the land * * * and brought neither customs nor traditions with them * * *; where they met one another for the first time * * *; how does it happen that everyone takes as zealous an interest in the affairs of his township, his country, and the whole State as if they were his own?" The answer to De Tocqueville's question was simpler than he realized. They were his own—every man's own. Free institutions, the product of American history, made each man, of whatever origin, aware that he had a stake in the Nation and could control its Government.

The work of the melting pot is far from finished. True, immigration of the 19th century sort has come to an end. Our world no longer accords the individual the freedom of movement he enjoyed before 1914. But strangers in smaller numbers still continue to seek the shores of America. They are evidence of the continued economic and political disorder of the lands from which they came.

And the problems of learning to get on together under rapidly changing conditions are still with us. But so long as Americans retain their faith in the institutions under which they grew great, they still have much to teach the rest of the world. And the long process of immigration was one of the elements that sustained that faith through the years.

Wrecking the Judicial System by Use of Presidential Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, no President in history has been more brazen in playing politics than the present occupant of the White House. President Kennedy and his advisers make no pretense in paying off political debts and rewarding faithful Democrats without regard to the public interest. Nowhere has the abuse of power been more wanton than in the appointment of Federal judges by President Kennedy. Just for the record I would like to call your attention to the score as given by the Chicago Daily Tribune in the following editorial:

SCORE: 83 TO 0

President Kennedy has announced that he will nominate George N. Beamer of South Bend to fill a new judgeship in the northern district of Indiana. Mr. Beamer is a Democrat.

With this appointment Mr. Kennedy has named 83 Democrats to the Federal bench. He has appointed three Republicans, but all of these had been given recess appointments previously by President Eisenhower. Last May, when President Kennedy signed the bill creating 73 new judgeships, he said:

"I want for our courts individuals with respected professional skill, incorruptible character, firm judicial temperament, the rare inner quality to know when to temper justice with mercy, and the intellectual capacity to protect and illuminate the Constitution and our historic values in the contest of a society experiencing profound and rapid change."

The President also promised that "the paramount consideration in the appointment of a judge would not be his political party but his qualification for the office."

But no Republicans need apply.

Average Weekly Earnings of Various Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 19, 1962

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Mr. Donald Laughlin, legislative chairman of the Milwaukee Postal Union, I have asked the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to prepare for me a comparative study of the wage rates received by postal workers and various production workers during 1961. The study follows:

To: The Honorable HENRY S. REUSS.
From: Economics Division.
Subject: Comparison of postal clerks' pay with pay in private industries.

The pay scale for postal clerks in grade PFS-4 ranges from $4,305 to $5,305; the hourly rates range from $2.09 to $2.55. On the basis of a 40-hour week, the weekly earnings are:

	Hourly	*Weekly*
PFS 4—1	$2.09	$83.60
2	2.17	86.80
3	2.24	89.60
4	2.32	92.80
5	2.40	96.00
6	2.47	98.80
7	2.55	102.00

The Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Elmer B. Staats, in his testimony before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee stated that the average hourly earning of the PFS-4 is $2.43, or $97.20 for a 40-hour week.

You will note in his testimony he states that most of the jobs in the postal service have few direct counterparts in private industry, making it impossible to price the private industry jobs by the methods used in pricing jobs for comparison with Federal classified work. Later, with reference to comparing average earnings in manufacturing with average earnings in the postal service, he says, "General wage trend information is pertinent, but almost impossible to apply directly in Federal salary fixing." He points out that there are too many variables involved in reaching an average wage in manufacturing industry, producing too rough a standard for direct use in Federal rate fixing.

The legislative director of the Postal Clerks' Union challenges the application of comparability. In his testimony he declared: "We know of no employment in outside industry that can be exactly compared with that of a post office clerk." Transportation and public utilities jobs, he said, come closest to postal clerk work for purpose of comparison.

Average hourly and weekly earnings in 1961 for production workers by industry appear in table C-7, pages 39–44, of the February 1962 edition of Employment and Earnings.

MARY R. HESLET.

Mr. Speaker, relevant items from the aforementioned table follow:

Average weekly earnings of production workers by industry, 1961

Durable goods:	
Ordnance and accessories	$113.70
Lumber and wood products	76.44
Furniture and fixtures	76.21
Stone, clay, and glass	95.00
Primary metal industries	114.55
Fabricated metal products	100.85
Machinery	107.16
Electrical equipment	94.24
Transportation equipment	113.12
Instruments	96.87
Miscellaneous manufacturing	75.84
Nondurable goods:	
Food and kindred products	89.16
Malt liquors	124.58
Meat products	97.58
Tobacco manufactures	69.06
Textile mill products	65.04
Apparel and related products	57.70
Paper and allied products	99.45
Printing, publishing, etc	104.67
Chemicals and allied products	106.81
Petroleum refining	124.42
Rubber and plastic products	96.32
Leather and leather products	62.66
Transportation and public utilities:	
Railroads (class I)	112.41
Local transit	98.01
Motor freight	108.16
Pipeline transportation	131.45
Telephone communications	93.38
Electrical, gas, etc	112.48
Wholesale and retail trade:	
Wholesale trade	93.56
Retail trade	64.01
Finance, insurance, and real estate:	
Banking	69.19
Security dealers and exchanges	132.79
Insurance carriers	89.79
Services and miscellaneous:	
Hotels and lodging places	45.54
Personal services	49.28
Motion pictures	116.67

Please, Mr. Ribicoff, Let's Not Shake Up the American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, several months ago the Secretary made a similar remark which inspired a letter to him. In it I stated I thought it time men in high positions quit lying awake nights thinking up new ways for spending the taxpayers' money.

I was immediately reminded of the thousands being poured into the 19th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, and with that statement I agree. However, I was not told how much we pay for the privilege of receiving this amount. And further, I was not thoroughly convinced that it is acceptable business policy to spend approximately $1.45 in order to receive $1 in return. Apparently, I am not too familiar with the modern texts on arithmetic. In my day I was taught that if we continue to spend more each day than we take in, it eventually means disaster.

No, Mr. Secretary, if the American public needs "shaking up," let us "shake it up" to the grim reality of a $300 billion national debt, costing more than $9 billion annually in interest charges.

The National Association of School Directors has not been sufficiently shaken to approve Federal aid. A recent poll in New York indicated 431 school boards out of 511 were not sufficiently shaken to approve it. For six consecutive years the Louisiana School Boards Association was sufficiently shaken to voice unanimous opposition.

May Heaven protect us from our benefactors.

The foregoing was inspired by an editorial in the York (Pa.) Dispatch Saturday, March 10, which follows:

PUBLIC NEEDS "SHAKING UP"?

Uncle Sam isn't spending enough money.

Now we see Abraham Ridicoff, Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, urging educated American women to start a crusade to convince Congress that American schools urgently need Federal help.

In Ribicoff's view, the danger that we face is not control of schools, whether Federal, State, local, or private.

"The danger is apathy. That is what our adversaries (Russia and Red China) are banking on."

Speaking before a group of college alumnae, Ribicoff declared: "We must together shake the American people up."

So far as we have been able to observe, the American public is not apathetic toward the school problem. Schools are a hot issue everywhere.

Nor does the public need to be shaken up. We have been shaken up. Sputnik did that—showed the Nation how deeply the school system had sunk into the fantasy of progressive education, which actually downgraded education in favor of training.

On the financial front, the American public is supporting the public school system in a most generous way. Here are some interesting facts, pointed out by U.S. Senator BARRY GOLDWATER in his book "Conscience of a Conservative":

"In the school year 1949–50 there were 25 million students enrolled in various education institutions in the United States. In the year 1959–60 there were 34.7 million—an increase of 38 percent. During the same period revenues for school use, raised largely at the local level, increased from $5.4 billion to $12.1 billion—an increase of 124 percent."

Some school districts may need Federal aid.

But as you don't cut off the arm to cure a bleeding finger, neither should you impose a gigantic new spending program on the American taxpayers where a general need has not been conclusively demonstrated.

Clearly the school question is a local issue. It appears, from Ribicoff's remarks, the Federal Government is trying to force its way into a situation where it is not generally wanted.

Secretary Ribicoff Says His Department Is Too Big and Calls for a Department of Education, Arts, and Sciences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has proposed a new Department of Education, Arts, and Sciences on the Presidential Cabinet level, and expressed the opinion that his present Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is too big. He said the education area of his Department should be merged with the arts and sciences to give them the importance they deserve in national affairs.

Secretary Ribicoff was addressing the alumnae of seven top American women's colleges in a meeting at the State Department auditorium in the Nation's Capital. The alumnae clubs were those of Barnard, Bryn Mawr, Mount Holyoke, Radcliffe, Smith, Vassar, and Wellesley Colleges.

Secretary Ribicoff said the cold war will be won or lost between the classrooms of America and the schools of Moscow and Peiping.

If the President sent a plan for a Department of Education, Arts, and Sciences to the Congress it is my belief that it would have an entirely different reception than that given his plan to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. Certainly education is one of the major concerns of the American people, but it cannot be argued that a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing is of major concern to our people.

While I strongly disagree with many of the points made by Secretary Ribicoff in his speech, I include it here for the information of my colleagues. In doing so, of course, I certainly in no way support many of his conclusions:

EDUCATION IS POWER

(By Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare)

This meeting is a first in many ways.

You alumnae clubs of Barnard, Bryn Mawr, Mount Holyoke, Radcliffe, Smith, Vassar, and Wellesley have had many meetings. But this one marks the first time, they tell me, that you have pooled your rather formidable forces in our Nation's Capital.

And I have spoke at many academic functions, at many colleges, and universities. But this marks the first time that I have spoken to so many hundreds of representatives of our most distinguished women's colleges and their guests.

This is enjoyment for me. It is also quite a serious challenge. For tonight we come together to consider serious questions and to ponder serious answers.

These have to do with the strength of our Nation—nothing less—and our Nation's need for help in a time of need.

A nation's strength, of course, lies in the strength of all its people. A nation's strength is tested in many ways and in many times.

It is tested in the output of our farms and industries, in the achievements of our great men and women, in the capability of our arms, in the genius of our science, and in the vigor of our commerce.

But it is tested too in quieter places: In the well-being of its older citizens, in the care provided for the unfortunate and afflicted, and, most importantly, in the aspirations of its youth and the caliber of its schooling.

I believe this is most important for our democracy is no stronger than our hopes for the future. Our country can be no richer than our teachers' minds and our children's opportunities.

This has always been true. But, since quiet strength is less tangible than arms or missiles, it has always been more difficult to realize.

Thomas Jefferson stated it very clearly. When his proposals for public education were defeated in the Virginia legislature, he said this:

"Legislators do not generally possess enough information to perceive the important truths, that knowledge is power, that knowledge is safety, and that knowledge is happiness."

Knowledge is power, knowledge is safety, knowledge is happiness—these are important truths. But legislators did not generally perceive them in Jefferson's day, and many still do not, as we found to our dismay last summer. And legislators are not beings set apart on some high and mighty pinnacle. They represent constituents. They reflect the thoughts of the people of these United States.

An outstanding graduate of Vassar, now President of Radcliffe, said last year that "there has probably never existed on this earth a group of people with quite the freedom in the use of time that educated American women now possess."

How right this is. And how great a potential for national good rests in this freedom possessed by women of intellect and training.

For what, after all, is freedom in the use of time? Is it the unfettered right to a narrow enjoyment of affluence and self or even family fulfillment? I know the alumnae of these colleges agree with me that it is not. Rather it is the pursuit of more meaningful goals—the recognition of necessity, the ability to control reality, to master the tools and do the job at hand.

There are many jobs at hand, of course, for you and for the leaders of your Government. But I submit that one urgent job confronts us both. This is the improvement of our educational system in these United States.

Somehow, someway, we must together shake the American people up. We must remind them that education is no longer a private affair. It is, as President Kennedy has so well put it, "the right, the necessity, and the responsibility of all."

You educated women are a source of great strength in our land today. We need you to help disturb the public apathy toward education, to dispel the simple trusting faith in our ability always somehow to muddle through.

We need your help in clarifying the issues and straightening out the facts. We need your help in explaining that education is a public charge, because it is national power. It is the source of national economic growth, for advances in science and technology cannot be made without it. It is the guardian of our democratic institutions, for only an educated responsible people can successfully govern themselves. It is the benefactor of the individual, for it secures his happiness by enabling him to develop his own talents and to fulfill his personal aspirations.

We need your help in untangling old hackneyed myths that hold us back and confuse the basic questions. These questions are stark and simple: Are we to have adequate schools and excellent teaching? Or are we to deprive ourselves and our children of the maximum contribution they are capable of making to themselves and to the world?

We owe it to ourselves and to the world, to our own dignity and self-respect, to set our own standards of educational behavior, regardless of what other nations might do. And we owe it to ourselves and to the world to strengthen our ability to meet the challenges to those new tyrannies whose leaders threaten to bury us.

This is a power struggle of immense proportions, and the power on each side is education.

"Socialism does not require war to spread its ideals," Nikita Khrushchev tells us. "Its weapon is its superiority over the old system in social organization, political system, economy, the improvement of the standard of living and spiritual culture."

He is convinced that capitalism and democracy are in their final stages of decay. "The United States," he told the 22d party congress last fall, "the strongest capitalist power, is past its zenith and has entered the stage of decline."

And his massive manifesto to this Congress outlined a 20-year plan for Soviet education, geared to hasten our decline. Its major goals are these:

Eleven years of compulsory education for all children (it is now only seven) with major emphasis on the basic sciences and Communist ideology;

Public upbringing of children in nurseries and boarding schools (to separate them from any deviationist influence of their parents);

Drastic improvement of school facilities—new buildings, better equipment, broad emphasis on physical fitness, and more attention to the arts; and

Expansion of higher education and specialized secondary schools and adult education programs, so that "tens of millions of people" will be given specialized training in the scientific and technical fields.

This is a 20-year plan. In this period our Nation too will be carried forward, if only by momentum.

Some of these goals are monstrous and should always be rejected by a free society.

The Soviet Union treats education as a source of power and has set about methodically to obtain that power. We have not.

American education today, as a whole, is still superior to education in the Soviet Union, an impressive recent National Science Foundation study tells us. But the Soviets have already gained a sharp advantage in the fields of science and technology.

In the three decades from 1928 to 1959, we produced 60 percent more college graduates than the Soviet Union. In the same period, however, they produced almost twice as many engineers. Yet only 10 years ago we were ahead of them in this field. In 1950, we graduated 58,000 to their 36,000. Today, in the early 1960's, according to this study, the situation is reversed: They will be training engineers at the rate of 126,000 per year. Meanwhile we are training only 45,000—fewer than we were training 10 years ago.

In the same 30-year period—1928–59—the Soviet Union trained almost 2½ times as many medical doctors as we did and 2½ times as many agricultural specialists. In chemistry, physics, mathematics, biology, and the earth sciences, we still hold a slight edge, but it is narrowing. In all other fields, they lag far behind us, as one might expect, since they have little interest in free exploration of the humanities and the social sciences.

Their major efforts so far have been in the training of specialists needed by the state. This they have resolved to continue. In addition, beginning next year, they plan to expand their elementary and secondary schools and increase adult education programs. Their ratio of students per classroom teacher, incidentally, according to their 1959 statistics, was 18 to 1. Ours that year was 26 to 1.

Across the Pacific, there is another threatening power—massive, ruthless, and again dedicated to the obliteration of our way of life. Although they may differ with their Soviet comrades on various matters, and although the Bamboo Curtain is so tight that we can learn little about them, their aim is clear. Their aim is power. And their weapon is education.

In Peiping, in June 1960, a conference of educational and cultural activists was told that, in 1957 and 1958, a resolute struggle was launched * * * on the educational front to refute the bourgeois concepts of education for education's sake, culture for culture's sake, and separation between mental and physical labor, to resolutely implement the guiding principles of making culture and education serve the politics of the proletariat as well as other party policies."

In the decade from 1949 to 1959, a period proclaimed in China as the "great 10 years," the Communists report that enrollment in adult literacy courses climbed from 657,000 to 40 million; that primary school enrollments increased from 24 to 86 million; that secondary school enrollments jumped from a little more than 1 million to almost 10 million; and that higher education, where the critical scientific and technical skills are developed, went from 117,000 students to 660,000.

Impossible, exaggerated claims? We really aren't sure. And we don't know much about the quality of Chinese mass education. But we do know—and this is what is important—we do know that Communist China is making an unprecedented, gigantic effort to teach its people the skills they need for world domination.

I am not suggesting that we should follow their example. I am not suggesting that we should turn our educational institutions into factories for the production of scientists and technicians. I specifically reject this notion. I am suggesting, however, that there is a direct connection between education and defense, between education and power, which the people of this country have not fully grasped.

The Department of Labor has estimated that in the next 10 years we will need 72,000 engineering graduates a year for industry and defense projects. But less than 45,000 engineers were graduated last year at all levels, and enrollments in engineering have declined again this year for the third year in a row.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration alone needs 13,000 additional scientists and engineers to land a manned expedition on the moon. Where will they come from? Defense supporting industry is already short of scientists, and institutions of higher education have been hard put to compete with industry in this field and to hold onto their teaching staffs. The well of talent, which has nourished us so generously in the past, today is running dangerously dry.

What are we doing about it? What are we doing to strengthen the educational system upon which the future of our Nation, the strength of our people, and the readiness of our arms depend?

We are allowing several million schoolchildren to sit in crowded rooms and double sessions this year because we lack 127,000 classrooms. We seldom attract our ablest students to the teaching profession because we won't pay teachers a decent wage. We have permitted outmoded restrictions to exclude well-educated and qualified women from the classrooms. We have voted "no" to local school bond issues; "no" in our State legislatures; "no" to Federal aid.

Every year we are letting a million young people drop out of high school before they can learn a skill or a trade. The result is a labor market glutted with unskilled workers, delinquency, crime, and crowded relief rolls.

Every year we rob the Nation of the talents of thousands of bright, eager students who cannot afford to go to college.

And consider what will happen in the next few years as the tidal wave of students now in the lower grades hits the colleges. Where are the facilities to teach them in, even if they can pay their way? Where the professors to instruct them? College enrollments last fall (1961) were 3.8 million. In 1970 they are expected to be almost double that number—if we can squeeze them in.

And what about the quality of education in our schools and colleges? We used to question the quality of Soviet scientific training until sputnik proved us wrong. We raise our eyebrows at the claims of the Chinese Communists. "Most improbable," we say. But we may be mistaken again. How about ourselves? How do we measure up?

It is comforting to hear the President say: "Americans are still the best educated and best trained people in the world."

We are the best, but one out of every five of our elementary and secondary schoolteachers has substandard training. We are the best, but most teachers' colleges have lower standards than professional schools of medicine, law, and science. We are the best, but over 8 million Americans aged 25 or more have attended school for less than 5 years, and more than a third of these absolutely cannot read and write.

We are still the best despite these things. But our progress is not sufficient to meet our needs, and our national conscience hurts. We have wrung our hands for years about our educational failures. The colleges complain that they have to teach high school level subjects. The high schools blame the grammar schools, and the grammar schools blame the parents. "Why can't Johnny read? Why can't Johnny spell? Why can't Johnny add?" There are reasons, many reasons, all the way up the line. And all of us must share some of the blame.

American education needs help now, all the way up the line. And all of us must share in giving that help. In plain language, more money is needed—from local and State governments when possible. But when they cannot do the job alone, they need Federal funds.

There is absolutely no substance to the contention that Federal money means Federal control. Federal aid to education is no innovation; it has had a long and honorable history from the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 through the Morrill Act of 1862 to the National Defense Education Act of 1958. The Federal Government, under Democrats and Republicans, has provided billions of dollars for education without any encroachment on local institutions.

No one in our Department or anywhere else in the Federal Government has any intention of controlling education or any power to do so, nor will anyone have so long as our Nation remains alive.

The danger that we face today is not control, whether Federal, State, local or private trustees. The danger is apathy. The danger is that our people—yourselves among them—should not exercise their responsibilities under freedom, and that no responsibility should exist. The result would be the erosion of our human resources.

That is just what our adversaries are banking on, and they are willing to wait a generation—or two, if necessary—while we allow our schools and colleges to struggle along, unaided.

This administration is not willing to sit idly by and let this happen. We feel that the Federal Government has the responsibility to provide leadership in the field of education, to give generous assistance to the States and to higher education, so that they in turn can fully assume their own responsibilities for the education of our youth.

We have given careful study both to the education needs in the country and to the most appropriate manner the Federal Government can help to meet these needs.

We have asked the Congress for legislation to provide assistance to institutions of higher education for construction of academic facilities and for scholarships to talented and needy students. We are encouraged by the action that both Houses have taken on this legislation and are hopeful that the full needs of higher education will be recognized here.

We have asked for across-the-board aid to States for public school construction and teachers' salaries.

We have requested legislation for a comprehensive program to improve the quality of instruction in the schools.

We have asked for special training programs for scientists and engineers, to meet our defense and industrial needs; for doctors and dentists, to meet our critical health needs; for teachers of handicapped children; for an adult education program to erase illiteracy in our population; for a program to bring education to the children of 1 million migrant agricultural workers; for research services to stimulate the development of educational television; and for aid to the arts.

These are urgent needs where we feel the Federal Government can and should come to the aid of the States and communities and their needy citizens.

Does this usurp local power? Does this threaten academic freedom and local autonomy? Not at all. It does give State and local governments and institutions of higher education the wherewithal to do their job. It does offer every young person with talent the opportunity to develop that talent for the national interest and for himself.

The power of education, this supreme power which governs our national safety and our individual happiness, this power rests in our hands, and in yours.

You have always recognized your obligations to your own distinguished colleges. Through your continuing support, these great private institutions will remain a wellspring of talent for American life and culture. But yours is a broader responsibility.

Let me take this opportunity to ask the educated women of this land, alumni of your colleges and others, to use their ability, to put their freedom in the use of time to work in a massive effort in behalf of education. Visit your public officials and share your thoughts with them. Visit your elected representatives—they are eager to know your views and will be deeply influenced by them.

I leave the details to you. Despite antiquated rules and shopworn regulations, intelligent educated women who have their own families safely launched can help enormously in our education crisis. In New York City, for example, a small number of educated women have volunteered to perform many of the tasks for which classroom teachers have no time. They are giving individual attention to children with emotional problems and language handicaps. They are conducting after-school sessions in remedial reading and in the arts.

But more than this. Alfred North Whitehead wrote half a century ago:

"When one considers in its length and in its breadth the importance of this question of the education of a nation's young, the broken lives, the defeated hopes, the national failures, which result from the frivolous inertia with which it is treated, it is difficult to restrain within oneself a savage rage. In the conditions of modern life the rule is absolute, the race which does not value trained intelligence is doomed. Not all your heroism, not all your social charm, not all your wit, not all your victories on land or at sea, can move back the finger of fate. Today we maintain ourselves. Tomorrow science will have moved forward yet one more step, and there will be no appeal from the judgment which will then be pronounced on the uneducated."

The uneducated American is like the fallow field or the abandoned mine. Liberal education, which is one of our great goals in the present struggle, is also one of our greatest assets.

The young men and women who are being graduated from our universities will outlast any of the latest missiles which are coming off the assembly lines. They will not only enrich our national life and fortify our national safety, they will teach and foster educational growth.

They will continue the tradition of intellectual freedom that has been growing for thousands of years. Their development is worth our time, our public funds, our energy, and our dedicated support.

The 1961 George E. Stringfellow Cancer Editorial Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, there are many ways of fighting cancer. Throughout our country, researchers are discovering more and more about the mysteries of this disease, what it is and how to combat it; professional and laymen are telling the American public about cancer and what the individual can do to protect himself; thousands of people in every walk of life are caring for those already struck by this fearful killer. Foremost among voluntary agencies involved in every part of the cancer control movement is the American Cancer Society, and one of the most active of its 60 divisions is the New Jersey division.

In 1946, George E. Stringfellow, of East Orange, organized and served as first president of the New Jersey Division of the American Cancer Society. He has been an active participant in the division ever since that time and has lent his name to a cancer editorial contest which has gained wide recognition and which has played a prominent part in spreading the message that cancer is not a hopeless disease, that it can be cured, that we are saving one out of three cancer patients today and that in the United States alone there are over 1 million people who are alive and well 5 years after their cancers had first been diagnosed.

The George E. Stringfellow Cancer Editorial Awards were given to four New Jersey newspapers during the 1961 contest: The Record—Hackensack—in the daily newspaper class with William A. Caldwell's editorial, "Sometimes It Gets Too Late To Talk"; the Blairstown Press in the weekly class, circulation 3,000 to 6,000 with Rita Robertson Fuller's editorial, "Do Ya Really Hafta Go?" the Passaic Citizen in the over 6,000 circulation weekly class with Martin Gately's "Saddle Up"; the Journal—Ramsey—in the under 3,000 circulation weekly class with Stephen Haff's "The Cancer Crusade."

Cancer will strike one of every four persons. It will touch two of every three families. It is known to all of us because we have seen it take our loved ones, our friends, and our associates. It is a problem and a disease which we must face and which eventually we will conquer. For these reasons, I wish to have these editorials inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD. Here are the winners in the 1961 George E. Stringfellow cancer editorial contest:

SOMETIMES IT GETS TOO LATE TO TALK

(By William A. Caldwell)

Ordinarily when the old man would let himself in the back door at night Lassie would trot out to the kitchen and say "Hi" and, while the old man rambled around putting his galoshes here and his hat and coat there, Lassie would skip along looking up brightly and keeping the ears at attention and wondering if we mightn't sit and have an apple and ale before going to bed.

Lassie was a dog, collie—little compact 1947 Canadian model collie.

So we'd let us get talked into having an ale and unwinding, maybe reading a few pages of the next week's great books assignment, and Lassie would sit across the kitchen tall and attentive, with the white jabot starched tidily and the head tilted to one side, hoping to be told something and hoping to understand it.

Sometimes there were things you could say to a collie that you'd hesitate to mention if you supposed people might be awake.

Lassie was never shocked or grieved or troubled in your behalf—just sat there paying close attention, so close she'd sometimes tremble, and never uttering a judgment.

That's all over now.

A PROBLEM IN COMMUNICATION

One night last week your reporter got home a little late from a meeting of our American Cancer Society chapter. It had been a good meeting. In this Bergen County chapter are skilled, tough, purposeful people who happen to believe that cancer can be licked and that we're going to do the job. But it's such a complicated job, so much more complicated than you can say when you say "research" and "education" and "service to the patient and his family"—and it is going to get much further complicated as the years go on.

Some of the talk at the meeting had dealt with the difficulty, as the county of 70 towns flows together into a region or city, of our doing the April crusade the way we've done it. In the Bergen County chapter we've insisted our workers, even when they are people of great humbleness and simplicity, are educators. Whether or not they get money at the house where they call, they leave on the table in the hall the exquisitely simplified message. This is what cancer is. This is what it can do if you don't let your doctor catch it in time. These are the seven danger signals.

On the way home a man has unmentionable doubts.

What is this arrogance of ours, this bland presumption we are teachers? What good really are we doing by insisting that our job isn't done till we've called at every door in 70 towns? In an over-organized community whose workers are tired and whose people are shallow-rooted and maybe increasingly unconcerned, in which the old domestic habit of caring has been referred to government, why don't we just go out and ask for the money and forget the education?

It's a question of no broad general interest, but it's what a man wonders about puttering home at night.

AFTER IT'S OVER

Lassie didn't come to the door. We put the coat and hat in the closet and pulled down Kierkegaard's "A Concluding Unscientific Postscript," and went to see if cold ale could be arranged. Lassie was lying under the dining room table. An effort was being made to get up, but it wouldn't work. We had to sit in the kitchen alone—the rest of a working family gets to bed a little early—and go again through all those doubts about whether ACS insistence on talking to undifferentiated people about cancer makes much sense.

The bride and the kids noticed next day a swelling down Lassie's long jaw, and the dog was taken to the doctor's.

He said it was cancer-melanoma, which is one of the rougher cancers. Technically it might be operable, he said, but a lot of the jaw would have to come away. And Lassie might not even survive the little anesthesia necessary for an exploration. The cancer had been around a while. Lassie was down to fur and bones. And 14 years is awfully old for a little dog.

Did he mean—?

That's what he meant. So the kids said goodby, keeping it cool because Lassie was sensitive to emotional subtleties—a neurotic dog to come down to it. Lassie had stayed there before, and turned, very tired, to follow the doctor to find a place to sleep.

We're not being sentimental about it. In its lifetime together a family is apt to run through quite a few dogs' lives. But we sat in the kitchen a few midnights later and reflected that there was a life, a sweet innocent life, that could have been saved if there'd been a way to talk to Lassie about something as dull and unlikely as the seven danger signals.

Even in absentia Lassie has this knack of resolving the old man's doubts.

DO YOU REALLY HAFTA GO?

(By Rita Robertson Fuller)

April is not only the month of daffodils and sunshine. It's also the month when each New Jersey editor takes to his typewriter in a mad effort to write an editorial that will win for his paper the Stringfellow Award, presented annually to a weekly and daily paper for "outstanding service to the cancer control program." At the same time, he hopes to promote interest in the campaign currently underway to raise funds so that the American Cancer Society may continue its research into the causes (and thus find the cure) for the disease which, more than any other, strikes terror into all of our hearts.

We've been at it for a good many years now, and had about decided to skip it this year. Not that we're any less interested in helping to conquer the killer that took our mother and father; just that we were desperate for a new approach to an editorial which would shake you, our readers, out of the complacent feeling that things really can't be as bad as we make them out to be, that after all, your few bucks can't make that much difference.

COLLABORATION

We were going to skip it, that is, until one of our visitors pointed an accusing finger at us and demanded "Where's that thing you usually write about cancer while they're collecting for it?" We told him that we just couldn't think of anything new to say. "I'll help you," he offered, if you'll take care of the mistakes I make." So I suppose that you might say we collaborated on this year's effort * * * the drained-out, thought-out columnist and the tired, unhappy little man whose wife last year became one of the 147 Warren Countians who lost their fight to cancer. And if, in so doing, we persuade you to help in the fight for those now suffering from cancer, or those who will fall prey to it later, it's all worthwhile. However, even more rewarding is the feeling that perhaps between us all—you, the contributor, and we, the collaborators of this week's column—we just might save a life. For research will surely find out how to prevent this killer from taking our children, our prime-of-life adults and our oldsters with no regard to age, standard of living, or how much they are needed here.

He pulled the armchair up beside our desk, our unhappy friend who wouldn't let us quit. "I'll tell you how it was," he said, but I don't want my name in it. I'm not looking for sympathy. And I know that I don't speak so good. After all, I never even got into high school. But I've worked hard all my life, and so did my wife. Together, we made a good life for ourselves and then, just when it looked as if we'd be able to take things a little easier, have a few of the things we'd never been able to buy, she's gone. And I'm telling you, you don't know what it's like to go home after work and find no one there to care how the day went; no good-smelling things on the stove; the bed not even made. Believe me, it's lonesome.

DELAY AND FEAR

"Like I always said, when ya gotta go, ya gotta go. And I guess it was just her time. But sometimes at night I get to thinking that if'n I'd known sooner, perhaps I could have made her go to the doctor in time. You see, she was always scared to death of cancer. Her mom died of it just about the same age as she did. And she was scared stiff that if she went for a checkup, like the ads say you should, they'd find something that she didn't want to know. So she didn't go when she first found out that she had this little lump. Didn't go at all, in fact, 'til one night when I came home from work and found her crying with fear and pain and pried it out of her that she'd known for a long time there was something wrong. Looking back, I suppose I should have worried some, too. But all I did was kid her about all the weight she'd lost. 'Hon', I said, 'you'd better start eating. You're getting plain scrawny.' But she just laughed and told me that that was the fashion now.

"Soon's we'd had supper, I wisked her up to the doctor and he said no more fooling—up to the hospital with you. So we went and the very next moring they operated on her. And we told her that everything was going to be OK but we knew different. And she knew too, but she didn't tell us. We kidded each other the best we could. And everybody did everything the could. But, like the doc said, it was just too late."

He pushed back the armchair, got up slowly and reluctantly started up the road to the empty house, the unstarted supper, the loneliness he'd have to get used to.

COMMONSENSE TACTICS

So, that's why the Press has a column on the cancer campaign this year after all. And if you could talk to our lonesome friend, we're sure that you, too, would reach for your check book.

But there's something else we'd like to suggest. After you've put your John Henry on that slip of paper and mailed it to your local chairman, how about reaching for the phone and asking your favorite doctor for the checkup that should be an annual affair.

"When ya gotta go, ya gotta go," our philosophical friend said. But we wonder. We like it here and we've no intention of going any sooner than we have to. We think that an ounce of prevention is worth many pounds of cure and we intend to see to it that we and those we love have every possible chance of staying around this wonderful part of the world just as long as possible. How about you? Do ya really hafta go?

SADDLE UP

(By Martin Gately)

"The Jersey Kid," garbed in dark cowboy pants and shirt and wearing two long guns, walked down a half-deserted street not far from here. His eyes, dancing with a merriment that comes with utter delight in life and joy in all living things, were shaded by his black sombrero.

The sombrero could hide a little of the Kid's dark eyes, but it was helpless when it came to obscuring his wide grin. Watching the Jersey Kid's grin was a little like being very young again. Wherever the Kid went, everybody's heart lifted a little, and life became more joy than burden.

It wasn't high noon for him yet. And we weren't really a neighborhood yet. And we didn't know—how could we—that the Kid was going to change everybody's lives before it was all over.

He was only 3 years old. And in our neighborhood then, we feared the killer. Our fear was so great we never talked about the killer or even admitted he existed. Every now and then the killer would strike. But we never really did anything about it.

It was more pleasant to think of a nice little fellow like this tiny cowboy, who would live so many years, a delight to his parents, a joy to us all.

You would be in the garden, cutting back the rose stems, or on your porch, getting off your checks to the butcher, the baker, the candlestick maker when the Jersey Kid spotted you.

The little drama always played itself out the same way. The Jersey Kid would invite you to draw and you would come a-running with your imaginary guns blazing. The Kid's crazy-long guns would be out and firing. You would reach for your chest, clawing at the pain of the Kid's bullets, as you spun to earth and became motionless and dead.

'Do it again," the Jersey Kid said, and who, could resist the charm of his grin, the radiance glowing in that young face?

These were great days in the neighborhood, happier days than we knew. And then they stopped. The Jersey Kid lost interest in the gun duels. He got in the carriage with his baby sister. He was tired and made his mother carry him a lot. There had to be a reason for this.

And there was. The worried parents took the boy to a specialist, who scraped his marrow and came up with the answer: acute leukemia.

The little guy who had delighted so many had come to his high noon. Six months, the specialists said.

How could you believe it when you saw the Jersey Kid the day he came back from the hospital that first time, his cheeks rosy again, the mischievous grin spreading in fresh delight at everyone he saw?

You didn't believe it. And you did. The killer picking on such a sweet little guy? It was impossibly cruel.

The boy's parents are hard-working, independent people who pay their own way. Thus the mother was reluctant to heed a neighbor's suggestion to call the American Cancer Society's local chapter. She certainly didn't want American Cancer Society funds or services coming to her when there were so many poor people who must be facing a similar situation.

"Look," she said when she finally was persuaded to make the call. "My husband earns a good, steady salary. We're not well off, but we're not poor, either."

The mother had seen and heard a thousand faces and voices of kindness since the boy was stricken and she had learned not to give in to tears at all, or she would be surrendering to them all the time. Yet the

words of the woman at the American Cancer Society struck straight at her very heart.

"We don't help poor people or rich people," the woman told her. "We only help people who have cancer."

The American Cancer Society offered transportation, provided for much of the boy's medicine, his weekly blood counts, and necessary X-rays.

So the parents knew they weren't alone in what they faced. And suddenly we sensed our neighborhood changing, as all of us tried in every way we could to help. Suddenly none of us were strangers to each other anymore. We had a common cause in the little boy. If his days were to be shortened, we must try to make each day nicer for him.

A neighbor who was a pilot took the Jersey Kid and his father up out of Teterboro.

"Fly me over the hospital," said the Jersey Kid, and added, when the pilot did, "I see Dr. Levine waving at me."

It was a tiny two-seater, and when it came to earth, there was a big passenger plane warming up nearby.

"Now I want to go on the big one," the little boy said.

"But you can't," the father explained gently. "You have to be a passenger."

"Oh," the little boy said and was content with that.

His father took the youngster everywhere he could—on boat rides, to special places that delight the hearts of youngsters. And in the neighborhood, there always were sitters to help the young mother; there always were little boys and girls to run errands for her. The Jersey Kid and what had happened to him had the magic power to evoke the best that was in everyone in our neighborhood and to make us walk the radiant path of the Golden Rule. And slowly it came home to us that the stricken boy was doing far more for us than we could do for him.

Months went by, the dreaded 6th month among them. The little fellow had his setbacks, inevitably followed by periods of renewed strength and vigor.

A number of things were happening to our little neighborhood. Although the little boy's case was not publicized, people came from miles around to help in whatever way they could. Some had lost children to the killer. They brought all kinds of wonderful toys. And they brought with them a spiritual strength born in their days of test and trial, in the burning crucible of their loss.

Thus our neighborhood was growing, spilling over city and township lines, bringing purpose to lives wherever the little boy's story went. Firemen made him their honorary chief. He was a happy picture as he sat in his big chief's toy auto, with a real chief's combat helmet on his head.

His life must have been very sweet to him as it was to us, through the 7th, the 8th, the 9th, 10th, 11th, and 12th months, and even part of the 13th. He shared all his toys with the neighborhood kids, who made a hangout of his home before the killer attacked him in the glands, swelling up his little stomach, assailing his legs, making it difficult for him to walk.

"It's a miracle," everybody said, a miracle that he should live so long beyond the time allotted him.

It was, in all truth, a miracle; a miracle of love, disguised under a prosaic name—the American Cancer Society. Our neighborhood was bigger and greater than we knew, even in the greatest days of its glory and dedication to the little boy. For the research made possible by neighbors everywhere never stopped. It had been going on before the Jersey Kid was stricken. It went on through all his days, giving to him and to little children like him everywhere more months of life in which to spread their joy and inspiration.

The story of the Jersey Kid ended—if such stories as his ever really end—14 months after he first was known to have leukemia.

Close to the physical end, he could not hold his blood. He was hemorrhaging it out faster than they could give it to him. He was blind, and those once chubby arms and legs were pencil thin. Yet, oddly, the Jersey Kid's face was still the same. There was little pain, but the brave boy knew.

"Mommy, why did God make me so sick?"

Perhaps God gives loving mothers the answer to such searching questions.

At any rate, she said, "God took everything away from you because He loves you so much, He wants you to be with Him. And when you are with Him, you will see He has prepared for you everything you will ever want."

"Oh," said the little boy, and was content with it. A little later, he asked his mother to whisper a prayer in his ear. He died soon after she did.

We heard, at the heart-shattering wake, the details of how the Jersey Kid met his high noon and how the specialist, one of the Nation's foremost, had said with tears in his eyes, "He gives me hope."

The Jersey Kid, who inspired us to be better than we really were during his too-brief days on earth, still lives in our hearts and gives us hope, too.

That's why we take the annual drives of the American Cancer Society so seriously. When the signal comes for the start of the campaign, it isn't really a neighbor telephoning us, asking us whether we'll take Summer or Autumn Street or Main this year.

We know better. We know it's the Jersey Kid out there somewhere, calling on us to help the Texas Kid, the Alabama Kid, the Illinois Kid—the children and adults everywhere we must save from the killer in the best organized, most effective way we can.

Won't you saddle and ride with us, neighbors, wherever you are, and help us stamp out forever this cruel outlaw who killed the Jersey Kid?

THE CANCER CRUSADE

(By Stephen Haff)

Despite rumors, unsupported claims, and optimistic exaggeration, there is at present only one known way of curing cancer—eliminating it before it involves a vital part of the body.

Stories in popular magazines about new methods of curing the ailment and claims that some secret medicine will do the trick are alike unsubstantiated. All one has to do to be sure of keeping cancer from getting a deadly foothold is to make certain that it is discovered in time for surgery or radiation treatment to get rid of it.

As much as the American Cancer Society has hammered this home in its attempts to awaken people to the need for seeking medical advice immediately on discovering any of the danger signals, thousands die needlessly every year. At risk of seeming repetitious, let us again point out these danger signals:

Unusual bleeding or discharge, a lump or thickening in the breast or elsewhere, a sore that does not heal, change in bowel or bladder habits, hoarseness or cough, indigestion or difficulty in swallowing, or a change in a wart or mole.

While its early elimination is still the only way to fight cancer, this is so merely because the vast effort that has gone into research as yet has only found indications, but no specific agents that will cure the disease without killing the patient. The progress of leukemia can be slowed, but there is no evidence as yet of a real cure, while the other forms of cancer are yielding to nothing but the knife or radiation therapy.

Millions of dollars are going into cancer research, most of them contributed by the people through the American Cancer Society. This month again provides an opportunity through the annual cancer crusade to donate more to the Cancer Society, to help in the fight to discover a cure and to educate everyone regarding cancer's dangers.

When the volunteers call for cancer contributions, remember that the battle against the dread disease is a long, slow process, which can be speeded only by putting more minds to work on it, and paying for keeping those minds engaged in that work.

Greater Springfield Central Labor Council, AFL–CIO, Adopts Resolutions in Support of President Kennedy's Legislative Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Greater Springfield Central Labor Council, AFL–CIO, recently adopted resolutions pertaining to legislation recommended to Congress by President Kennedy. The resolutions deal with automation, health benefits for the aged, area redevelopment, and aid to education.

Under unanimous consent I wish to insert these resolutions, adopted by the Greater Springfield Central Labor Council, AFL–CIO, at this point:

AUTOMATION—RESOLUTION I

Whereas the Greater Sprinfield Central Labor Council, AFL–CIO, recognizes automation's potential as a necessary force for the Nation's progress and strength and will work with all responsible groups, governmental and private, toward its successful introduction in the Nation's economy as a source of better living and a stronger national environment. Joblessness is not the price of progress and true progress cannot occur unless automation's challenge is met.

Whereas we urge all affiliates to continue to work for increased improvement in collective bargaining agreements to safeguard against hardships both on the job and from joblessness caused by automation's impact. Some progress has been made in attempts to solve these problems, but new developments will call for additional programs and policies.

The executive branch of the Government through the Council of Economic Advisers has a legislative mandate to find necessary targets for the overall economy that would provide for necessary economic growth and maximum employment, production and purchasing power. We commend the departments which have begun to assemble information and ideas at the Federal level, which will be helpful in recognizing what efforts must be made to improve current programs and procedures or to institute new ones to meet an everchanging growing force in our society. The Secretary of Labor has begun to work in these areas and we urge him to continue and extend the efforts already underway. More far-reaching efforts must be made to make possible rational planning to deal with the problems of automation. For this purpose we urge the creation of a technological clearinghouse: Therefore be it

Resolved, the Greater Springfield Central Labor Council, AFL–CIO, calls for federally supported, nationwide program of training and retraining with broad scope and flexibility, similar to the proposals to the last Congress which—

(a) Cited the need for economic improvement as a necessary environment for training and retraining.

(b) Recognized the need for reports to the President and Congress by the Secretary of Labor based on studies of developments in technology and the labor force.

(c) Authorized funds for vocational retraining and on-the-job training of unemployed workers and provided for training allowances up to 52 weeks.

(d) Called for strengthening of the U.S. Employment Service.

(e) Called for Federal standards for unemployment compensation.

(f) Proposed youth training programs designed to improve the education and training of the coming labor force for the new needs of the Nation.

HEALTH BENEFITS FOR THE AGED—RESOLUTION II

The rising tide of support for health benefits for the aged through social security should bring the speedy enactment of the Anderson-King bill (S. 909; H.R. 4222) by the Congress. The latest evidence of the soundness of this approach is its endorsement by the governing council of the American Public Health Association, which speaks for the outstanding health experts of the Nation.

The issue is not a partisan one since representatives of both parties have declared their support. This bill would supplement, not replace, private insurance, and public assistance. It would provide basic health benefits to 14½ million persons aged 65 and over eligible for social security and railroad retirement benefits. The bill wisely provides for financing both hospital care and alternative forms including outpatient diagnostic services, skilled nursing care, and home health services.

Our members are willing to pay contributions necessary to assure even more adequate protection for their aged parents and for their own years of retirement.

In a desperate and misguided effort to defeat the social insurance approach, leaders of the American Medical Association are still spending huge sums on false and misleading propaganda and are exerting improper pressures on organizations and patients: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Greater Springfield Central Labor Council, AFL–CIO, reaffirms our support for health benefits through social security as the most effective method of financing paidup insurance for health care of the aged. We urge our affiliates to continue their efforts to enlighten the public and their Congressmen on the value of this approach. We call upon Congress to pass this vital bill in this session of Congress.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT AND PLANT PIRACY—RESOLUTION III

When President Kennedy signed the Area Redevelopment Act on May 1 the event marked the culmination of a 7-year effort to enact a comprehensive program of Federal aid for the chronically depressed areas of the Nation. The AFL–CIO is proud to have played a leading role in the achievement of this point 4 program for Americans: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Greater Springfield Central Labor Council AFL–CIO, commends the 87th Congress and President Kennedy for speedily fulfilling their commitment to enact into law a comprehensive program of aid for the chronically depressed areas of America—so long delayed by the vetoes in the Eisenhower administration.

We now urge those who will administer this long-term program to act immediately to bring aid to the stricken areas. We also urge them to resist any pressure to approve the use of their limited resources on projects which cannot be expected to achieve new and lasting job opportunities in the distressed areas. Also they must guard against the use of these funds for direct or indirect aid to any project which would merely transfer jobs from one area to another, a prohibition which clearly reflects the wishes of the Congress.

We urge all AFL–CIO affiliates in areas eligible for aid to assist in immediately establishing local redevelopment committees, and insist that official AFL–CIO representation be on these committees. Only through active participation can organized labor make its full contribution to the effective implementation of the act, on the one hand, and guard against its misuse, on the other.

Finally, we call upon the Congress and the administration to end the improper use of the revenue raised from the tax-free State and local bonds to entice runaway employers. No Federal law or practice should tolerate this vicious use of public funds for private purposes. It is incomprehensible that the Federal Government should continue to abet the creation of new distressed areas through the tax loopholes on the one hand, while at the same time its Area Redevelopment Administration is seeking to mitigate the tragedy of chronic distress where it already exists.

AID TO EDUCATION RESOLUTION—IV

Whereas, 2 years ago, the AFL–CIO called upon the President and the Congress to enact a realistic program of aid to education consistent with the great domestic and international challenges before this Nation. A broad program of school aid was proposed, ranging from aid for public school construction through provision of broader opportunity for our youth to obtain higher education; and

Whereas, Today, 2 years and many congressional hearings later, none of the essentials of this program has been enacted. The sole contribution to America's flagging educational system was a 2-year renewal of the National Defense Education Act and aid to federally impacted areas: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Greater Springfield Central Labor Council, AFL–CIO, calls upon the President and Congress to do the following:

1. Enact Federal aid for school construction and teachers' salaries, with special aid to low-income groups.

2. Provide aid to higher education in the form of construction loans and grants and Federal scholarships.

3. Provide other aid to education beyond the high school, for technical education, junior colleges, and community colleges.

4. Enact a 20th-century Morill Act to provide an "education bill of rights" for all American youth, consisting of tuition and subsistence payments.

5. Provide an occupational program for high school students, for the improvement of guidance and counseling services linked to actual part-time work experience within the schools themselves.

6. Adopt a program of adult education to qualify adults for a broader range of job opportunities, with a maintenance allowance while undergoing such education.

COPE RESOLUTION—V

We are conscious of the challenges with which we are confronted. Much remains to be done toward the achievement of an informed, politically alert trade union movement capable of fulfilling all of its obligations in the political arena.

We hold it to be a primary obligation of trade union membership that each member of an affiliated international or national union be a registered voter. It is a primary obligation of each local union and central body to insure that each member and each adult in his or her family is a registered voter.

We urge that each local union appoint a COPE committee which will designate a COPE chairman charged with the responsibility of coordinating the local's COPE program with the city or county COPE concerned to the end that every union member will receive all possible assistance in becoming eligible to vote and will have the opportunity to participate fully in every phase of the COPE program: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Greater Springfield Central Labor Union Council, AFL–CIO and all its affiliates will help reverse historical tradition. Off-year voter apathy must be overcome. Greater expenditure of effort and precision of planning must be achieved, if we are to assist effectively in the election of additional liberal Senators and Representatives in 1962.

We rededicate ourselves without reservation to the defense of the principles of our democracy which have made our country strong and great. We commit ourselves to the expansion and broadening of our political education and political action programs. We pledge to render all aid, assistance and support the policies and programs of the AFL–CIO committee on political education.

Physical Fitness for Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, recently there has come to my attention a woman who is distinguished in her field and one who is fast becoming a national watchword in physical fitness. Paige Palmer, known to millions of television viewers as the first lady of TV exercising, has, for 15 years, created an interest in health and physical well-being probably unequaled in the United States. Her daily program originates from WEWS in Cleveland, Ohio, and is seen in many other cities.

When John F. Kennedy took office as President and urged the Nation to strive toward physical fitness, Miss Palmer renewed her efforts to bring better health through exercise, nutrition, and fashion to American women, and now has one of the highest ratings of any daytime television program in the country. One of her great contributions has been to design inexpensive exercise equipment specially suited to women's needs.

Paige Palmer's girlhood convinced her that while physical fitness was important and exciting, other things were needed to keep one healthy and attractive: proper diet, grooming and, appearance.

I was a tomboy—

She says—

athletics were my forte so it was natural that I became interested in physical education. But when, through exercise and diet I won a national contest for the perfect girl figure, I decided then and there that I would do whatever it took to keep trim and healthy. Surprisingly, I've dicsovered it isn't really

difficult. You can take it from me, the results are worthwhile.

I suggest that this nationally famous expert in her field be considered for membership in the President's Committee for Physical Fitness so that the entire country may take advantage of her knowledge and experience.

California Youth Legislators Vote Course on Communism—YMCA Model Assembly, Senate Declare Education Is Necessary To Oppose Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present for the information of your own distinguished self and all the other Members of this great legislative body, and any others who may read it, the text of a release in the Los Angeles Times, Sunday, February 11, 1962.

The fact is reported in paragraph 1 of this release that these youthful legislators attending the model legislature at the State capital of my native State of California from the total State area overwhelmingly passed a bill Saturday morning that would put a course about communism in all secondary schools in the State by 1963, is, to me, Mr. Speaker, encouraging and very significant.

The article follows:

YOUTH LEGISLATORS VOTE COURSE ON COMMUNISM—YMCA MODEL ASSEMBLY, SENATE DECLARE EDUCATION IS NECESSARY TO OPPOSE REDS

(By Mary Ann Callan)

SACRAMENTO.—Both the assembly and the senate of the 1962 YMCA model legislature reconsidered and overwhelmingly passed a bill Saturday morning that would put a course about communism in all secondary schools in the State by 1963.

While the bill, even though signed by youth Gov. Pete Bumerts, will not actually become law, the 360 teenagers attending this legislative training session were fully aware that their actions here are real—in the sense of reflecting youth's concern about the Communist menace throughout the world.

It was this theme that pervaded the debate in favor of the bill's passage, bringing it "off the table" in the final hours of this 3-day session to leave the impression, as the youngsters themselves stated, "that we do know the dangers ahead and are concerned about doing something positive about them."

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIANS

Spearheading the fast action in their respective houses were Assemblyman Mac Strobl, 16, Los Angeles, and Senator Jim Looney, 17, Fullerton.

The opposition to establishing the course on communism, held by proponents of an alternative bill, defeated Friday, for a State committee to study its feasibility, crumbled when the model legislature learned that such a committee actually exists in the real State legislature and will give its findings to the lawmakers next month.

Said Strobl: "We must fight for the continued right to sit in these chairs of the legislature by preserving our democratic system of government and of life. I think educating our youth about communism, its methods and its consequences is the best way to fight for this right."

EDUCATION STRESSED

In the senate, Looney, too, echoed his belief in education "as one of the most effective methods."

"All of us," he said, "are firmly convinced that the two opposing ways of life cannot exist in the same world. If we are to maintain our way, we must prepare to battle, but we cannot fight blind. We recognize our enemy but we do not know enough about their system, how they fight and, thus, how we can fight them better."

He said he believed that this country has already wasted from 10 to 20 years in informing its citizens about the methods of the enemy and that "we must begin now to do this."

The senate promptly affirmed his argument.

The bill that passed requires the governing board of every secondary school district "to make available a semester course on communism, teaching the theories of communism as written by Marx and Engels, and fully cover the history of modern-day communism."

It also required that teachers receive approval of this governing board every 4 years.

Teaching about communism to their own age group was by far the hottest issue in this year's YMCA training session, now in its 14th year. The usual concern of youth on highway safety, more effective licensing of drivers through mandatory training courses, and physical exams was also present.

Both houses also passed a bill on scholarship loans for students in State colleges and universities, with the hope that more from their age group could be afforded a higher education.

Though the training session had only four legislative sessions, the youth went through exactly the same procedure and protocol as the actual lawmakers—a process, so YMCA officials believe, that is at the heart of the effectiveness of the learning project.

The Little-People-to-Little-People Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, there are committees in the House and Senate which have spent many hours, in and out of session, on the subject of juvenile delinquency. Millions of dollars are being spent every year, and will continue to be spent in the future in an attempt to turn the tide against the alarming rate of increase in crime among the members of our younger generation.

How doubly refreshing it is, therefore, to learn of the little-people-to-little-people project of Peter Rodino III, the 10-year-old son of our distinguished colleague from New Jersey.

Young Peter's approach to the problem of securing a peaceful world for himself, his children and the generations to follow will prove to be effective, without doubt. But of primary importance is Peter's awareness that a problem does exist, of his desire to seek a solution, and of his initiative, not only in commencing a most commendable program, but in enlisting the aid and support of his immediate friends until the plan has expanded to national scope.

How proud we must be of such youngsters who are willing—yes, eager—to assume the responsibilities of citizenship at such an early age. We are pleased with the effect the little-people-to-little-people letters will have in the children's crusade for world education. We are proud of our young citizens who are playing an active role in statesmanship and world diplomacy.

And particularly as parents, we must not forget what heartwarming satisfaction young Peter's efforts must give to his father, our colleague, PETER W. RODINO, JR., of New Jersey.

Startling Facts Brought Out in Report on Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Fort Lauderdale News, Fort Lauderdale, Fla., should be must reading on the part of all those who are interested in the economic health of our American railroads:

PAYMENTS OF $35.1 MILLION PAID OUT BY RAILROADS TO MEN WHO SIMPLY QUIT JOBS

(By Jim Rosemond)

It has long been recognized that the railroads of the Nation are off the track insofar as operation, service, and income are concerned.

Recent revelations, though, have focused the spotlight on some of the real causes for the mess that has been created.

Foremost among the surveys that have been released lately is that of the Presidential Commission, named 15 months ago to study the plight of the roads.

Now, it would seem that the foremost objective of the railroads would be to better serve the public. And from the results of the Commission's report it is seen that only five of the public representative on the Commission were able to arrive at an agreement on the problems. The Commission was formed by President Eisenhower.

The five labor representatives on the Commission went howling to the communication media to denounce the whole report. Management's five turned out be not too happy with the report, but in the interest of reaching some kind of sensible settlement, went along with those who were named to represent the public.

The whole matter now is in the hands of President Kennedy, and it will remain to be seen what the minds in the administration will determine as to activating what seems to be a constructive program for the cure of at least part of the troubles that beset the railroads.

In the report a drastic overhaul of labor practices is recommended, including the halting of featherbedding the revamping of wage structures, and the modernization of working policies and conditions.

One of the points at issue is the present employment of 45,000 firemen-helpers of engineers on diesel locomotives. This practice is known as featherbedding because no firemen are needed on the diesels.

The railroads claim that if they could eliminate firemen on all but passenger runs that they could realize a saving of $250 million a year.

The unions claim that the firemen are needed on the engines for safety's sake.

But when it comes to the installation of new technological changes that would bring improved safety measures, in addition to other programs, the union stands against such proposals.

The report did recommend that the carriers should have an unlimited right to introduce technological change, but it tied this up with a provision that any changes affecting workers would have to be negotiated with the employees.

So, if the union bosses don't like the changes, and it is a season for them to make a showing, they will be sounding strike talk in loud voices.

Many outmoded working rules exist in the rail system, tied down by disputes with workers or weakness in management. The whole system lags far behind its competition in the fields of airlines, but systems, trucks, and other carriers.

President Kennedy, no doubt, will face a wall of dissent from the unions as he proceeds to unwind the Commission's report.

H. E. Gilbert, president of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, says that railroad management risks a rail transportation crisis if it insists on making the report of the Commission a binding arbitration award. Crisis, of course, means strikes.

The stage of strike talk has not as yet been reached but the fires are ever present. Gilbert looks for "hardnosed" negotiations with strike talk now premature. But in the same breath he says:

"I don't believe 45,000 locomotive helpers (firemen) will surrender their rights to perform their jobs, nor the security given their future by a collective-bargaining agreement.

"The key issue in the firemen's case is the work now performed by our craft. We intend to protect the right of our members to do the work as long as it is there."

But the Commission report says it isn't there.

While we are on the subject, let's take a quick look at the provisions of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. Here is benevolence and brotherhood beyond all boundaries.

All of the States, says Nancy Ford writing in Modern Railroads, provide for disqualification of employees discharged for misconduct. Fifteen States provide for disqualification for disciplinary misconduct. The RUIA has no disqualification clause and RUIA is supported by railroad contributions only, none from employees.

In addition to $28.4 million paid in 6 years, ending June 30, 1961, to workers discharged for misconduct, $21.6 million was paid in maternity benefits; $33.9 million in sickness benefits. A total of $18 million has been paid since January 1955 to workers on strike or unable to perform their duties because of picket lines. In addition, many more millions have been paid to furloughed workers during the steel strike and for unemployment and sickness payments.

But here is the payoff—in the 6-year period ending June 30, 1961, $35.1 million have been paid out to 55,000 persons who simply quit their jobs. And we repeat all of this is at the expense of the railroads with no employee participation.

The report certainly gives an insight as to who has been running the railroads.

It will be interesting to see what President Kennedy will do with this hot potato.

Jewish Home for Convalescents Honors Aaron Fishman, Community Leader, for 25 Years of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of his being honored by his community in New York City for 25 years of service, at a testimonial dinner of the Jewish Home for Convalescents at the Hotel Biltmore recently, I take pleasure in placing into the RECORD the story of a very useful lifetime of my Columbia College colleague, Aaron Fishman. I believe that this story should be told because it is illustrative of American opportunity and gives fine example of standards and attitudes toward one's fellow men that merit following. This is a story of great human interest.

The child of an immigrant family that settled on the lower east side of New York at the turn of the century, this boy grew up in what was a laboratory of human relations. The hardship of settling in a new country would be a lesson that would not be forgotten by those who were raised under that family roof. "To befriend the stranger within thy gates" would not only be a Biblical injunction—it would be a way of life for its members. The growing up together with the families of minority groups and different cultures would definitely shape the course and provide the pattern of his future activity. He is fortunate in having developed a theme, a way of life that gives consistency and purposefulness to his philosophy noted in the Columbia College story of achievement: "To discourage fear, encourage courage, and to live with compassion."

The laboratory of the East Side was bound to call upon him sooner or later. He always responded to the opportunity for creative activity and this call turned out to be a rich field when he discovered the great crop of outstanding citizens who came out of his elementary school, Public School 20. Listed among its graduates were U.S. Senator Jacob K. Javits and his brother, Benjamin A. Javits, who has just endowed the Fordham University Halls of Law; a president of the board of education, Charles H. Silver; George and Ira Gershwin; Irving Caesar; Edward G. Robinson; Paul Muni; Irving Maidman; Harry Golden; and Symon Gould, the persistent candidate for President of the United States on the Vegetarian Party ticket. Aaron Fishman and his fellow alumni were intrigued by the fact that so many nice boys came out of poor neighborhoods. The school was now nonexistent. The alumni association which their oldtime teacher, Lawyer Nathaniel Phillips, had organized, was the focal point of reunion.

To make people aware of the importance of the teacher in our social structure, they planned the Our Teacher Award to express appreciation to the teachers who had served them. "Time for another diploma" was the award that recognized the achievements of the former student. Senator JAVITS was inspired to introduce a joint resolution in the Senate creating National Teachers Recognition Day on the fourth Wednesday of April. At a reunion dinner which paid tribute to the president of the board of education, Charles H. Silver, of the class of 1900, Mayor Wagner announced that there would be a new Public School 20.

The school had a remarkable story to tell—an object lesson in "what America has meant." Aaron Fishman was selected as the chairman of the dedications committee charged with the program of embellishment of the new school and the establishment of good school-community relations. They have already obtained from Carl Sandburg a dedication tribute that will be set in the marble walls of the school. Alumnus Harry—"Only in America"—Golden, the Sandburg biographer, brought it about.

For all of his activity in behalf of his old East Side school, Aaron Fishman received the Ecce Quam Bonum Award of his fellow alumni.

His experience at Columbia University followed a similar pattern of interest. It is the interesting story of two boys who never knew each other at college, but who, 25 years later, formed a team to benefit their university and to engage in interfaith activity. This story was highlighted at a "man of the year" dinner at the Columbia University Club in 1957 when a dual award was made to Aaron Fishman and Charles Pratt Healy for eminent service to college, university, and community. Dr. Grayson Kirk, the president, referred to their activities as the "Chip and Aaron enterprises," and Dean Lawrence Chamberlain spurred them on.

The teamwork began when the family of John Jay, President of the First Continental Congress and First Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, was offering his estate to Columbia, his alma mater. The board of trustees requested Charles Healy, its counsel, for wills and special gifts to bring back a picture story of the estate at Katonah, N.Y. Healy called upon the photographic skill of Fishman and they brought back a story in color for the trustees' meeting. They also made a photo study of the American Assembly at Arden House for the school of business.

Aaron Fishman undertook a 2-year job of research which produced his famous "Story of Acievement," a new streamlined format in college yearbooks which told the story of what had happened to the classmen and to the university in the 30 years since graduation.

It included the story of the Comptroller General of the United States, Joseph Campbell, Composer Richard Rodgers, Novelist Henry Morton Robinson, among others. The publication also projected the image of Columbia University across the Nation to the alumni groups of other universities and made the plans of publication available to them.

An interest in foreign students engaged the activity of the team when it interceded in behalf of a boy from India so that he could obtain his doctorate. After that, students from Pakistan and the Latin countries found their way to Aaron Fishman's door.

In his chosen profession, the law, Aaron Fishman was destined to make his mark in the pattern of foreign people interest. The opportunity to reunite families came frequently in his immigration work. Recently the press reported the story of his successful repatriation of a Greek-American from Cleveland whose loss of records and his nonvoluntary military service in a foreign army prevented his readmission to this country. Senator LAUSCHE, of Ohio, supported his campaign with the State Department.

During the war years his natural bent for people-to-people contact made him valuable when he directed the Red Cross and national war fund campaigns among foreign nationality groups in New York City. Under the sponsorship of the Zionist Organization of America he teamed up with Ed Sullivan in planning the friendship food train which was sent to Israel as a gift of the people of the city of New York. More recently he has given important aid in helping to relocate Cuban friends in this country.

His father had been a founder of the Jewish Home for Convalescents at Grand View on the Hudson. When he succeeded him as a director, he established there the annual seminar of social workers of the city hospitals. He addressed himself, at the request of the urban league, to Jewish convalescent homes to extend their services to the Negro community. He obtained affiliation with the Greater New York fund. He joined the home in the efforts of other local committees to halt the throughway authority from wiping out the home, and with it the historic villages on the Hudson, as it pushed ahead with its roadbuilding program. He argued before the Governor that human values must not be destroyed for a road. The home and the villages have survived.

His wife, Debbie, also a lawyer, directs the national speakers' bureau for Hadassah. She has shown a similar interest in peoples' cultures, and has assisted him in his community activities.

On December 10 past, at the Hotel Biltmore, the home for which Aaron Fishman has been counsel and public relations director for 25 years rendered him and his wife a testimonial dinner in recognition of their devoted services to the cause of the needy ill. Messages from Mayor Wagner, Senator Javits, Israel Ambassador Harman, the Hadassah National Board, Columbia College, and the 20 Alumni Association praised their various cultural and welfare activities. Dr. Louis I. Newman, of Temple Rodeph Sholom, in offering his invocation referred to Aaron Fishman saying:

We praise him as a champion of good and worthy causes. We acknowledge him as a true humanitarian, as one whose name leads all the rest as a lover of his fellow, in the example of self-sacrifice and indefatigable labor which our friend sets for all of us. Even as he bears a priestly name, may he continue to be like a true son of Aaron, loving peace and pursuing peace.

Supreme Court Justice Owen McGivern in presenting him with a scroll of recognition said:

The best compliment I can pay Aaron Fishman is to say that if everyone in the world were like him there would not only not be any wars but not even rumors of wars.

In his replying remarks, Aaron Fishman said:

During this past decade, I am happy to say, we have been speaking in terms of human values, human dignity, and people-to-people contact. These are the concepts that will save the world. We cannot meet problems with violence and ignorance.

It was my father who bequeathed to me the legacy of his interest in this convalescent home. I cherish his great love for his fellowmen, by following in his footsteps. You have just heard a tale of woe. Our institution has reached a stage of crisis. I have the feeling that we are going to like it, and that we stand at the crossroads of a bigger and a better future. We are going to give ourselves not only to the needs of convalescence. Since the crying need is the welfare of the aged, we aim to convert part of our facilities for such a purpose, in addition to our present convalescence program and so put our institution to full use. We hope that the philanthropic foundations, and you our friends will back us up.

Steel Price Increase?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, a pertinent question which could have a serious impact on our economy is raised in the following editorial from the Dallas Times Herald of March 6, 1962, relative to negotiations in the steel industry:

SHARP INCREASE IN STEEL PRICE COULD PUT UNITED STATES OUT OF MARKET

Steel wage negotiations, begun so hopefully more than 2 weeks ago, have bogged down.

The result is that the talks have been called off until some time after May 1.

The outlook at the present moment is not good, despite the efforts of both steel companies and the union to grapple with the wage contract problem early in order to avoid a strike.

The problem won't be an easy one to solve. And it will involve more than merely the steel companies and the union members who work in the steel plants. The public and the entire Nation's economy will be vitally affected by the outcome of the talks when they are resumed.

For one thing, the workers are insistent upon bettering their own position. At the same time, the companies feel they are being squeezed between the necessity to holding the price line and the pressure for wage increases. Any appreciable increase in the cost of producing steel necessarily would be passed on to the public in higher prices or result in a sharp drop in profits.

Higher steel prices would mean a new round of inflation, which would be felt by labor as well as the general public.

The problem takes on an even more serious aspect when considered in the light of foreign competition. It now is possible to buy some types of imported steel more cheaply than it is to buy domestic steel of the same type and quality. And the foreign competition is increasing. The European Common Market probably will make the problem still more difficult.

There is the strong possibility that any sharp increase in wages and prices in the steel industry could have the effect of pricing domestic steel out of the market.

Annual Career Service Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, tonight at the Sheraton Park Hotel the eighth annual Career Service Awards program of the National Civil Service League will focus the Nation's attention on the loyal corps of men and women in the civil service.

I congratulate this year's award winners as well as all civil service employees so constructively engaged in the business of Government. I commend the National Civil Service League for its 81-year history of promoting better Government through better personnel. One of the critical problems facing our Nation today is the need to maintain the moral tone, integrity, and prestige of the public service on the highest plane.

The league's awards bring national recognition to outstanding civil servants who have upheld the highest tradition of public service. It brings increased recognition to all faithful Government workers who make public service their lifetime work.

I depend upon many of our capable Government employees for information and assistance in my job as a representative. Because my Sixth Congressional District in Maryland is adjacent to the District of Columbia, I have the good fortune and honor of having many warm personal friends in the civil service. I am proud to say that some of the best men and women in America are in Government service.

Four of the recipients of the ten awards to be given this year reside in the Sixth Congressional District of Maryland. I am very proud to represent Assistant Secretary Leo R. Werts, Philip S. Hughes, Dr. Howard B. Andervont, and Dr. Wayne C. Grover. A brief biographical sketch of each seems to illustrate the sound basis upon which the awards have been made and I include them herewith:

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES

LEO R. WERTS

Leo R. Werts, recently promoted to Assistant Secretary of Labor, is one of 10 leading Government administrators to receive this year's Career Service Award from the National Civil Service League.

He is credited with developing an exchange program of labor leaders between this country and Germany in 1948 which has resulted in a non-Communist German labor movement friendly to the United States.

Mr. Werts was selected by the Ford Foundation in 1959 to conduct an 18-month study of labor problems in India, and make recommendations for solving that country's critical manpower situation.

Secretary of Labor Mitchell selected him to make a fundamental review of Labor Department programs and administration for which he received the Department's Distinguished Service Award, its highest honor. He was appointed to his current position by Secretary Goldberg, filling a post vacated by a former Career Services Award winner, James C. Dodson.

Mr. Werts graduated from George Williams College, Chicago, in 1929 and received a degree from the University of Chicago the following year.

He entered Government service as a program director of the Chicago YMCA in 1923, and entered Federal service as a field representative of the Department of Labor in 1935. His present position was attained in 1959.

He lives at 4819 Cumberland Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md., with his wife. They have a married daughter.

The league, a nonpartisan citizens' organization devoted to improving the Government service, will honor the winners at its eighth annual career Service Awards banquet on Tuesday, March 13, at 7 p.m., in the Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D.C.

PHILLIP S. HUGHES

Phillip S. Hughes, assistant director for legislative reference, Bureau of the Budget, is one of 10 leading Government administrators to receive this year's Career Service Award from the National Civil Service League.

His principal job is to review all legislative proposals coming from executive agencies, and determine how they fit into the legislative program of the President.

Also, he assists in developing the President's legislative program, and reviews bills pending in Congress, after which he advises congressional committees on the President's views.

The requirements of this job make him one of the few career employees meeting regularly with the President. "His position is one of the highest and most delicate in the Federal career service," according to his nomination for the award.

Among his most significant contributions has been his leadership in development of postwar legislation relating to veterans' affairs. He was chief of the research division in the VA's Seattle office from 1946 to 1949.

Originally from Chicago, he graduated from the University of Washington, in 1938. He lives at 3710 Taylor Street, Chevy Chase, Md., with his wife, Jean, and four children.

The league, a nonpartisan citizens' organization devoted to improving the Government service, will honor the winners at its eighth annual Career Service Awards banquet on Tuesday, March 13, at 7 p.m., in the Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D.C.

DR. HOWARD B. ANDERVONT

Dr. Howard B. Andervont, former chief of the Biology Laboratory, National Cancer Institute, is 1 of 10 leading Government administrators to receive this year's Career Service Award from the National Civil Service League.

He is being cited for his "outstanding record of public service as an internationally famous authority in cancer research and a leader in the scientific community."

Dr. Andervont began his 31-year Government career in 1930 as team biologist of the first cancer research group established by the U.S. Public Health Service. With the expansion of cancer research in the 1940's, he became Chief of the newly created National Cancer Institute's Biology Laboratory.

When he became eligible for retirement in 1961 he relinquished his responsibilities as laboratory chief, and is now editor of the Journal of the National Cancer Institute.

He is credited with being the first to develop a method of studying the herpes virus which produces a skin disease, by transmitting it to mice, and followed this with intensive work with animals relating cancer to viruses.

Under his direction the biology laboratory made many outstanding discoveries, including discovery of the Moloney leukemia virus of mice and rats, and the first conversion of normal to cancerous cells in the test tube.

In 1961 he received the Distinguished Service Award of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. He is a member of the Society for Experimental Biology and Medicine, American Society of Experimental Pathology, American Association for the Advancement of Science, and the Washington Academy of Medicine.

He was graduated from Mount Union College, Alliance, Ohio, in 1923, and received his doctorate in science at Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., in 1926.

His family includes two married daughters and a son, and he now lives at 8201 Rayburn Road, Bethesda, Md.

The league, a nonpartisan citizens' organization devoted to improving the Government service, will honor the winner at its eighth annual Career Service Awards banquet on Tuesday, March 13, at 7 p.m., in the Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D.C.

DR. WAYNE C. GROVER

Dr. Wayne C. Grover, Archivist of the United States, is one of 10 leading Government administrators to receive this year's Career Service Award from the National Civil Service League.

He is credited with developing the National Archives "from a small independent agency centered in Washington to a nationwide organization providing service of immeasurable benefit to the Federal Government and to the public."

At the same time, through higher standards of evaluation, he has managed to reduce the contents of the National Archives Building by 15 percent.

More than 95 percent of all current Federal records have been appraised for future preservation or disposal according to a plan developed by Dr. Grover, so that important historical materials will not become lost among masses of unimportant papers in Federal agencies.

Also, he has encouraged policies to make more than 95 percent of all records in the National Archives available to the public. Valuable records existing outside of Washington are preserved in Federal Record Centers in the areas in which they were created, and also are available to the public.

He has assisted in making private materials in the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library and other presidential libraries available to the public, and has assisted in the development of private research centers and libraries such as the Sam Rayburn Library in Texas and the Ford Motor Archives in Michigan.

Starting as a clerk in the National Archives following his graduation from the University of Utah in 1935, he advanced to specialist in the records of the War Department. He subsequently attained the rank of lieutenant colonel in the Army and was awarded the Legion of Merit for his work.

He became Assistant Archivist in 1947 and head of the agency the next year. His 13 years of service in this capacity cover almost half of the time that the National Archives has been in existence.

In 1959, Dr. Grover received the Distinguished Service Award of the General Services Administration, its highest honor. He received a doctorate in political science from American University in Washington in 1946 and was conferred honorary doctorates by Brown University in 1956 and Bucknell University in 1960.

He is a fellow and former president of the Society of American Archivists and a member of the American Political Science Association, American Society for Public Administration, and the American Historical Association.

Dr. Grover's family includes his wife, Esther, and four daughters. They live at 2303 Linden Lane, Silver Spring, Md.

The league, a nonpartisan citizens' organization devoted to improving the Government service, will honor the winners at its eighth annual career service awards banquet on Tuesday, March 13, at 7 p.m., in the Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D.C.

Commonsense in Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, last evening I attended the annual meeting of the Brown University Club of Washington. At that time, we were privileged to hear a message from President Barnaby C. Keeney, which I believe is of sufficient importance to warrant publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Dr. Keeney, a historian, received his B.A. degree in 1936 from the University of North Carolina. In 1937 he received his master's degree and the Ph. D. degree in 1939 from Harvard University. He has received many honorary degrees of doctor of laws from outstanding colleges. It might be interesting to note that he came to Brown University as assistant professor of history after being a history instructor at Harvard until he entered the Army in 1942. While in military service he participated in the battles of the Rhineland, Ardennes, and central Europe and was awarded the Silver Star, the Bronze Star, and the Purple Heart. After separation from the military service with the rank of captain and serving several years at Brown, in June of 1951 he took a leave of absence and served with the Central Intelligence Agency.

At one time President Keeney received a grant from the Carnegie Foundation of New York to study graduate education throughout the United States.

His background and experience have given him the ability to speak with authority in the educational field. We are proud of the contribution that he has been making, not just to Brown University, but to our great Nation.

President Keeney's remarks follow:

ADDRESS BY HON. BARNABY C. KEENEY

Our times have been described as an age of many things: of the atom, of space; but really it is an age of uncertainty, for so many new things have been learned that it is very difficult for anyone to put them together and even more difficult for anyone to understand all the implications of this new knowledge upon his beliefs.

It has often been observed that students who reach a high level of scholarly attainment as undergraduates often do not continue their scholarly habits in later life.

This is particularly true of my generation, of whom a relatively small percentage studied beyond the bachelor's degree in graduate or professional schools. It is even truer that many of us who spent three or more years after college in advanced studies have not carried on scholarly activities in our ripe years.

Americans buy, borrow, and often read a great many books and periodicals. Yet we are not generally a bookish people, because most of the books we buy, borrow, and read are not particularly serious books.

If they do have serious vain, they are likely to be highly contemporary.

Americans do not, as a people, spend much time reading and pondering the great works of the past. Many bankers learned some Greek in college. If one is found who habitually reads it afterward, he is the subject of considerable comment, and his ability as a banker is likely to be questioned. I know of only one such example, so really this is not a serious matter.

Various efforts have been made to get men of affairs to take more seriously their continuing intellectual development.

Those who would do so are helped by a lurking guilt in the prospective converts, for most people feel that they ought to give more attention to serious study. Some of them quiet their consciences by subscribing to one of the book clubs or to one of the hard-backed magazines. Others do so by reading weekly the book review section of the New York Times. This is highly successful therapy, so effective that few of the patients read the books they have read reviewed. Somewhat more successful have been the great books and other courses designed to get adults to read and to discuss important works of the past.

Yet, a change is taking place, and this change can be measured by comparing the alumni magazines of good colleges at 5-year intervals over the past.

Gradually they have developed from publications designed to conceal any intellectual content in the colleges to publications that devote a very large part of their space to serious discussions of critical questions, past and present, by men qualified to discuss them.

The same is true of alumni meetings, which used to be devoted almost entirely to nostalgia and extracurricular affairs, but which are now serious and often very stimulating events.

One of the efforts to cause men of affairs to carry on the intellectual life was developed at Aspen, Colo., some years ago and still continues. The effort consists of a seminar of 20 or so people who spend 2 weeks reading and discussing great books of the past and stimulating books of the present. The people who attend are generally men and women of substance, leaders or near leaders in their businesses or professions—doctors, lawyers, oil men, management consultants, wholesale merchants, retail merchants, manufacturers, brokers, and so forth.

The discussions are led by moderators and resource people; in the sessions I attended last summer these were a very mixed bag—I, a Government official who is a New Frontiersman, a former Secretary of State who is not, the director of the British Information Service in America, a labor leader from Nigeria, the deputy mayor of a city in India, the commandant of one of the military academies, and the director of a rest home for social scientists. The one thing we had in common was that, while only one of us was a competent and practicing scholar in the areas under discussion, we each had a pressing interest in the subject, which might be briefly described as "the individual in society."

Some of the attendants had not read a book more than 10 years old since they left college (some had not been to college), others had read occasionally, but none of them had had such a concentrated dose in their mature years. The effects were, first of all, a wondering recollection that the ancients had considered so many problems that are still contemporary and, second, a growing willingness to learn from them. The discussions were of high quality and from time to time had an atmosphere of scholarliness.

While I was gasping at Aspen, my colleagues in the salubrious climate of Providence were planning the alumni leadership conference.

This short and exciting affair was designed "to provide alumni and alumnae leaders with an opportunity to observe at first hand those attributes of Brown which qualified it for selection by the Ford Foundation as a recipient of a challenge gift, and to study the program that has been developed to meet that challenge."

It was intended to be a beginning of greater activity by the university and its alumni in what is called continuing or adult education—what we may call alumni education.

Appropriately enough, at this conference, alumni and alumnae joined together in thought and activity as they had joined together in the classroom, the library, and the laboratory while they were in college.

The real purpose of alumni education is not primarily to impart information, although this may be accomplished incidentally; it is to focus attention on areas of uncertainty, areas where opinion is fluid, where the final decision has not been made, and the definitive formulation has not been written.

In these areas there is opinion on every aspect and, since we do not know what is right or sure, all opinions must be considered, if not accepted.

An example of such a question is our attitude toward education.

Generally speaking, Americans were indifferent, though friendly, toward education until the population explosion made it clear that a great many children of a great many parents were going to have trouble getting the sort of education they wanted.

Discussion opened with agitation to enlarge indiscriminately existing colleges and to create new ones, so that everyone could attend.

That aspect of it has settled down with the general acceptance of the notion that not all people are fitted for college and that, in order to accommodate those who are fitted, colleges must be not only enlarged but greaty improved.

Now the discussion has moved into a more sophisticated phase and is centered around the question, Do we really know how to decide who is best fitted for what college?

The answer seems to be "no," and already efforts are being made to find firmer bases of judgment. In an attempt to do something about this problem of student selection, an executive of a foundation and I have brought together a group of academic administrators, psychologists, sociologists, and testers to study the various factors involved.

It is beginning to appear that we will be able to find some means of identifying the potentialities of student applicants, and thereby facilitate their enrollment in suitable institutions.

We at Brown are also concerned about the intelligent boy or girl who does not plan to enter college and may drop out of school before graduating from high school.

In some cases, this occurs because the family background is not conducive to educational aspiration; in others, because of racial or social conditions and hopelessness of educational achievement; in still other cases, because of a complicated series of personality problems, motivation, and behavior.

We have been studying the last of these through the institute we established last summer for bright boys with bad grades.

We have received funds to continue this project for another summer.

We have also received funds to attack the first two aspects of the problem, again from the Carnegie Corp. of New York.

We are going to arrange with some of the other colleges and universities in Rhode Island to work together on these questions.

We plan to take an experienced admission officer, full or part time, and have him work with the students in junior high schools where the decision is often made to enter or not to enter a college preparatory course and where study habits or the lack of them tend to get set.

We will establish relationships with principals and guidance teachers and, through discussion with the students, will show them that it will be possible for them to attend college if they do well in school.

The colleges involved will set aside a certain number of scholarships and places in the class for such students.

The admission officer will continue to work with these students through junior high school, and will probably bring them onto the campus in the summer between the junior and senior years of high school for examination and indoctrination.

Before the furor over the population explosion had died down, sputnik blasted off, and Americans who were already vitally interested in education became deeply concerned about its quality.

They made the simple conclusion that the Russians had the first sputnik because they had better education.

The real reason, of course, is that they had the first sputnik because they tried earlier and harder than we.

Out of this came great agitation to improve education and science, even to dragoon students into science. Again some useful things came out of an agitation that started out in something less than a sensible way.

One of the ironies is that the first massive Federal intervention in education came out of it and that the act enabling the Federal efforts is labeled the National Defense Education Act.

For a time education was thought of as defensive for something or against something, but this, too, is settling down.

Gradually our people are comprehending that our present efforts are one-sided and, eventually, a more comprehensive approach to educational problems will be devised.

Another example of the sort of problem on which adults should focus is more complicated: What are we willing to give up to defend what we stand for?

Here opinions range all the way from the extreme right to the extreme left.

The rightists feel that all those who do not agree with them should be deprived of their civil liberties on the grounds that through exercising these liberties they impede the national effort.

The leftists, on the other hand, feel that we should give up our liberty itself by disarming unilaterally and laying ourselves open to totalitarian conquest. They feel now that we should give up our lives by refusing to protect them on the grounds that a willing-

ness to protect life may encourage the Government in an aggressive policy or even in a strongly defensive policy.

Yet the people, as a whole, are beginning to realize that we must not give up our liberties in either way, but that we must make better use of them and abandon the sort of abuse that leads to slothfulness and indecision.

The people are beginning to realize, too, that self-interest must play a large part in foreign policy and that our foreign policy has been so amorphous that the important question of our own interest has been almost forgotten.

A most complicated sort of problem that is appropriate for the study of adults is, What is the good life?

This is, of course, a litfetime study and a subject which must be done on one's own rather than taught. It ought to be one of the principal activities of every literate human, but it is not.

We hope very much that it will be possible to set up a series of activties for our alumni and alumnae coordinately, on the campus and elsewhere, that will strengthen their dedication to scholarship and their thoughtful consideration of great issues which they began and, in many cases, set aside just after they left here.

I hope that what went on this summer at the university and what has gone on at alumni and alumnae meetings will continue and grow.

Before too long, I hope, the summer campus will teem with alumni returning to refresh themselves, to redirect themselves and their thoughts, and to bring their views to test with one another's and with our faculty's.

Foreign Hospital Care for U.S. Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

STATEMENT OF HON. THOMAS J. LANE

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, the burdens of your work on this committee would be lightened considerably if all the proposals that come to you for study and decision could correct a manifest injustice, in the manner that H.R. 8144 does, which I introduced on July 13, 1961.

Its objective is to fill in an omission in the original law providing for the hospitalization and treatment of eligible veterans. At present, only veterans with service-connected disabilities who are temporarily traveling or living abroad, and who are U.S. citizens are entitled to hospital care in foreign countries, from funds furnished by the Veterans' Administration.

H.R. 8144 will extend those hospital benefits to U.S. veterans who have not relinquished their citizenship, but have chosen to make their permanent homes in other countries. There is precedent for this under veterans legislation governing other benefits for those who suffered disability as a result of their service in the Armed Forces of the United States.

In fact, the law does not restrict disability compensation to those residing in the United States. It is payable to eligible veterans who reside, temporarily or permanently, in a foreign country, regardless of citizenship status, or whether the disability was incurred in war or peace. No distinction is made between temporary and permanent residence abroad in the payment of such benefits as disability compensation and pension, but a discrimination does prevail for hospitalization and medical purposes.

H.R. 8144 seeks to eliminate that contradiction, by making care and treatment in public or private hospitals abroad, available to eligible veterans, even when they have taken up permanent residence outside the United States.

When this amendment was first proposed, some people anticipated administrative difficulties. But, in view of the fact that the hospital and medical program for veterans is already operative in foreign countries for some veterans who are residing there temporarily, there is no administrative problem involved by the moderate extension of these benefits to veterans who are residing there permanently.

American veteran organizations have chartered a number of posts, barracks, or chapters in other nations, to perpetuate the comradeship of those who once served in our Armed Forces, but have decided to make their permanent homes in other lands.

When they are stricken, there is no way under the present law to provide them with medical care comparable to that which is available in Veterans' Administration hospitals to veterans who live in the United States. Veterans traveling in, or temporarily residing in a foreign country are eligible for these equivalent hospital benefits but those living permanently in such countries are excluded.

I respectfully suggest that they, too, should be entitled to these benefits with the help of this committee and its favorable report on H.R. 8144.

Should Old-Age Medical Care Be Financed Through Social Security?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by the Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, entitled "Should Old-Age Medical Care Be Financed Through Social Security?" It was carried in the March 1962 issue of the American Legion magazine:

SHOULD OLD-AGE MEDICAL CARE BE FINANCED THROUGH SOCIAL SECURITY?

(By Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri)

Superior quality usually commands a premium price. Thus it is that American medical service, unsurpassed throughout the world, is relatively costly. Many elderly citizens, whose longevity is itself a tribute to our high health standards, are admittedly confronted with serious financial problems when they become ill or infirm.

Those, however, who would solve this problem through the social security system are completely wrong. The concept is both morally and financially unsound.

It is terribly distressing to witness the outpouring of false propaganda calumnizing our highly developed medical and insurance industries for political expediency's sake. That high officials of the Government should engage freely in this slanderous campaign is doubly deplorable.

Contrary to their outcries, noncancelable hospitalization and medical service insurance policies covering persons over 65 are now well within the means of most of our senior citizens or their families. This was clearly demonstrated in House hearings.

State and local programs providing care for the truly indigent are of long standing. Thus, protection is to a large degree available to all, within the framework of a free society.

Under the plan advocated by the administration, who would be protected? Only those who have social security. Literally millions of aged Americans are not covered by the system, and would not receive a dime's worth of medical care. Furthermore, the widespread notion that those who do stand to benefit from the proposal will be able to sit back and relax, confident Uncle Sam will take care of all their medical expenses, is a hollow fiction. Even casual study of the bill reveals that the payoff is strictly limited.

And who will pay the freight? Will it be wealthy oil speculators, stockholders, ranchers, attorneys, and physicians, No, under the "liberals'" plan these so-called fatcats—supposedly a favorite tax target—will go scot free. The tax increase will bite into the paychecks of workers who pay social security.

What's more, the whole social security system to which our wage earners are contributing will be undermined. No actuary in his right mind would endorse a formula so sure to create financial chaos.

Lastly, consider the impact of social security financing upon our system of private medicine, which has made the United States a world leader in this field.

When the Federal Government makes a contract with a supplier of goods or services, fees and standards must be acceptable to the bureaucracy. The administration plan for medicare means that doctors and hospitals must subscribe to the bureaucrats' rules or be excluded from the program. This is socialized medicine, pure and simple, and the historic right of an American to choose his own doctor is consequently infringed, if not destroyed.

Chelsea-Revere Are Oil Centers of New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Post-Gazette published in Boston on March 9, 1962.

CHELSEA-REVERE ARE OIL CENTERS OF NEW ENGLAND

There is no question that Revere and Chelsea, with a strong assist from East Boston have become the oil distributing centers of New England and rate highly along the Atlantic seaboard.

Proof of the magnitude of the distributing business which has grown by leaps and bounds in the past 5 years was visible last Saturday when five tankers of the 100,000 barrel type, which reduced to gallonage means close to 5 million, were discharging cargoes simultaneously into the huge tanks which now line both shores of Chelsea Creek.

The Boston harbor traffic of tankers has become virtually constant. These oil carrying ships predominate in the Boston commercial statistics. It is an odd day when there are not 2 tankers discharging within the Boston harbor confines and it is not unusual to have 8 or 10 tied up at docks. It was out of the ordinary Saturday to see three tankers berthed alongside one another pumping petroleum products from their tanks into the constantly growing number of storage tanks comprising the oil farms in Chelsea and Revere.

The spell of real cold weather in the major

portion of the New England territory served by the Revere-Chelsea oil farms may have been responsible for the parade of tankers in Chelsea Creek Saturday. They transferred so many millions of gallons, principally of fuel oil, into the land storage tanks that the conclusion was obvious that available supplies for distribution had been greatly depleted.

Virtually all of the oil and gasoline distributed from Revere and Chelsea is transported by motor tank trucks, most of which have a capacity in excess of 5,000 gallons. They are operated around the clock and the mobilization of such trucks is conclusive proof that the use of coal has dwindled and that the railroads have lost tremendous revenue by the substitution of motor vehicles for railroad tank cars.

Just a glance at the identifying information on the trucks shows that communities more than 100 miles away from the oil farms have become dependent upon highway vehicles for their supplies of oil.

Plymouth, N.H., and Greenfield depend upon the storage tanks in Revere as well as the communities at shorter distances from the oil farms. A passing notice of the type of tank trucks reveals that heavy fuel oil has replaced coal in the generating plants of many industries. A considerable percentage of the truck tanks is equipped to transport nothing else than this heavy oil.

Trade reports show that there is intensive competition among the oil companies for the business of distributors. They shop around seeking the best deals that can be made. It all adds up to the fact that the oil distributing business dependent upon Boston Harbor and Chelsea Creek has become tremendous.

It is seldom that one of the big tankers is in port for 24 hours. The rapidity with which they pump cargoes into land tanks is amazing. The turn around time at the unloading piers is many hours longer than at the loading docks in Texas, Louisiana, and Caribbean oil ports.

Foreign Credit Insurance Is Now Offered by a New Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on February 5, 1962, credit insurance for U.S. exporters, covering both oversea commercial and political risks, became available through the newly formed Foreign Credit Insurance Association—FCIA.

On February 6, 1961, 17 days after taking office, President Kennedy issued a directive to the Export-Import Bank to provide facilities to insure American exporters where an extension of credit was warranted. On October 27, 1961, he announced that two fundamental and complementary steps were being taken to effectuate that directive: the Export-Import Bank was setting up a system of export credit insurance to exporters and was going to issue export transaction guarantees directly to commercial banks and other financial institutions.

The new programs were to provide additional credit facilities for American exporters to place them on a basis of equality with their competitors in other countries. These programs had been worked out, at the request of the President, by the Secretary of the Treasury and the President of the Export-Import Bank with the assistance of banking and exporter consultants.

On January 30, 1962, the Export-Import Bank and the newly created FCIA held a joint press conference in New York to launch the new programs I commend to the attention of our colleagues the record of that press conference followed by a most informative pamphlet issued by FCIA to explain its objectives and the component parts of its service:

FOREIGN CREDIT INSURANCE OFFERED BY NEW AGENCY

NEW YORK, January 30.—Credit insurance for U.S. exporters, covering both overseas commercial and political risks, becomes available Monday, February 5, through the newly formed Foreign Credit Insurance Association.

Details of the program were announced today by Harold F. Linder, President and Chairman of the Board of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, and Thomas H. Bivin, Chairman of the governing committee of FCIA.

In cooperation with the Export-Import Bank, the FCIA will insure in a single policy both commercial credit and political risks on short term transactions resulting from U.S. export sales to buyers in friendly foreign countries.

This new insurance guarantees payment of credits extended by a U.S. exporter to a foreign buyer. The policy contains coverage and provisions designed to give American exporters the best service of its kind in the world.

"This program will provide two important benefits for exporters," Mr. Bivin said. "First, exporters will be more disposed to extend credit to customers abroad and, second, they will be better able to obtain more financing from commercial banks than if the accounts were not insured."

Foreign credit insurance does not itself provide the financing required by the insured exporter. Such financing is available from commercial banks and other private financial institutions.

FCIA is an unincorporated association comprised at present of 57 capital stock and mutual insurance companies. Membership is open to all responsible and qualified insurance companies. The insurance will be offered through the member insurance companies and their agents and brokers.

Credit or commercial risks to be covered include insolvency of the buyer and protracted default. Also covered will be political risks of inconvertibility of a foreign currency to dollars, cancellation, or restriction of export or import licenses, expropriation, confiscation, war, civil commotion, or like disturbances.

This type of insurance has long been offered to exporters in foreign countries, mostly through Government agencies, but has been available only on a limited basis to U.S. exporters.

"This concept of meeting the need for an insurance program through private companies is in keeping with the American free enterprise system," Mr. Linder said. "The program enables the exporter to purchase his credit insurance through a local agent or broker and eliminates any need for direct negotiations with Eximbank in Washington."

Coverage will be offered in most foreign nations except for the "Iron Curtain" countries.

At the suggestion of the U.S. Government through the Export-Import Bank, the FCIA was formed in late 1961. Earlier in the year President Kennedy had directed Eximbank to take steps to assure American exporters were placed on a basis of full equality with their competitors abroad. The President specifically mentioned the desirability of utilizing private U.S. financial enterprises more effectively.

After studying foreign export assistance plans, Eximbank concluded that the system best suited to American needs was a partnership between the private insurance sector and the U.S. Government. The FCIA represents such a partnership. Officials of both the private insurance industry and the Government are convinced that the export credit insurance about to be issued is, as a package, at least equal to that offered anywhere in the world, and is superior to most.

The underlying interest of the Government in increasing U.S. exports relates directly to its concern with the overall balance of our international payments. Balance-of-payments deficits can be attacked most directly through an increase in oversea sales of American goods.

On January 19, 1962, President Kennedy said, "A 10-percent increase in exports and our balance-of-payments problem is defeated."

It is the aim and purpose of the FCIA and the Export-Import Bank to help increase the volume of American exports through export credit insurance which both protects the exporter and places him in a better position to obtain financing for his transaction.

Policies issued by FCIA will have Eximbank underwriting 100 percent of the political risks with FCIA and Eximbank sharing the credit risks with FCIA. Last September Congress enacted legislation clarifying Eximbank's authority to enter such an arrangement with private insurance companies. The Bank at the same time was empowered to insure export transactions in an amount up to $1 billion.

The first FCIA policy will cover all U.S. products which may be legally exported from the United States on terms of 180 days or less. In appropriate cases, this cover may be had for transactions whose terms are up to 1 year. As soon as practicable, policies will be made available for export transactions whose terms are as long as 5 years. In all cases, terms of repayment in the transaction are not to exceed those customary for the goods in international trade.

The premium rates on short-term policies where all export sales are covered will vary according to the terms of payment and the foreign country of the buyer and they will range from 20 cents to $1.72 per $100 of gross invoice value.

Political risk coverage of the FCIA short-term policy is as extensive and inclusive as any to be found among insurers of international trade transactions. For example, FCIA treats any external expropriation of or intervention in the buyer's business as a political risk and it is therefore covered to 95 percent of potential loss. Common practice abroad is to consider expropriation and intervention as simple default of payment with coverage of 85 percent of potential loss. Further, coverage against other acts of government such as war and civil war is broader than is usual in delineating the elements of "political risks." In supporting political risk claims, the exporter will be required to submit the "best evidence reasonably available to the insured," that the loss was covered by the policy.

FOREIGN CREDIT INSURANCE ASSOCIATION

FOREIGN CREDIT INSURANCE

Insurance for exporters

On February 6, 1961, President Kennedy issued a directive to Eximbank to provide facilities to insure American exporters where the extension of credit is warranted.

Eximbank then invited private insurance companies to take part in a broad program of providing foreign credit insurance.

The Foreign Credit Insurance Association was formed in response to that invitation. Membership in the association is open to any insurance company that may qualify. Eximbank and FCIA are proceeding in this undertaking in accordance with Federal law which authorized Eximbank to establish this program.

FCIA, at the direction of Eximbank, is

to administer the details of the program. Eximbank will assume 100 percent responsibility with respect to political risks. Eximbank and FCIA's member companies will share the policy obligations with respect to commercial credit risks.

The Foreign Credit Insurance Association's purpose is to offer private insurance facilities in partnership with Eximbank in order to assist U.S. exporters to become more competitive in foreign trade through a sound foreign credit insurance program.

ADVANTAGE TO EXPORTERS

A powerful stimulus to new export business

Credit insurance is a valuable aid to the exporter entering a new market or expanding his sales in an existing market. It assists the exporter in extending terms of credit to a new buyer although there has been no prior business transaction with him or in extending credit where previously sales were made only on a more restricted basis.

Limits credit losses in dealings with a foreign buyer

This new program insures payment of credits extended by an insured exporter to a foreign buyer, and may assist the insured exporter in obtaining financing through commercial banks and other private financial institutions. With this program, an exporter whose foreign accounts receivable are insured under FCIA policies should be, more disposed to extend proper credit to his customers abroad; more readily able to obtain financing from his commercial bank or other private financial institution than if the accounts were not insured.

AID TO CREDIT MANAGERS

The FCIA program will augment the function of credit departments. Credit insurance is not intended to supplant or eliminate the work of a credit department. Export credit insurance is designed to protect against loss through failure to pay despite current reliable credit data obtained by credit departments.

The collection of payments will be the function of the insured exporter; it will be to his benefit (since premiums will depend upon claim experience) to exhaust every avenue in making collections. FCIA will advise and collaborate with the exporter in effecting collections, but will be unable to serve as a collection agency.

WHAT EXPORT CREDIT INSURANCE COVERS

The FCIA-Eximbank policy covers both commercial credit and political risks.

Commercial credit risks will be insured equally by FCIA and Eximbank. Political risks will be insured solely by Eximbank.

Commercial credit risks include insolvency of the buyer and his protracted default exclusive of any risk defined in the policy as a political risk.

Political risks are defined in the policy and include such risks as inconvertibility of foreign currency to dollars, expropriation, confiscation, war, civil commotion on like disturbances, and cancellation or restriction of export or import licenses.

Indemnity

Since the insurance offered by the members of FCIA and Eximbank is intended to reinforce and not replace sound credit judgments of the exporter, the insured retains a liability of 15 percent of any losses arising out of commercial credit risks and at least 5 percent of any losses arising out of political risks.

TYPES OF POLICIES

FCIA initially will provide insurance for short term credit transactions up to 180 days—in special circumstances, up to 1 year. Coverage for credit terms in excess of 1 year is being developed and will be offered soon.

The basic policy form provides insurance beginning on the date of shipment. An amendment to this policy providing cover from the date of the sales contract is also available. The contract form of policy will meet the needs of many exporters, particularly those who are fabricating to special order where the loss may occur before shipment, but after the contract is made.

Coverage is offered in most foreign nations except for the "Iron Curtain countries."

RATES AND PREMIUMS

Premium rates vary by country to which shipment is made and by credit terms extended to the buyer.

Eligible markets are grouped in three classes depending upon the market climate.

Insurance rates for commercial and political cover may vary from 20 cents to $1.72 for short-term credit. These rates apply per $100 of gross invoice value of shipments. A deposit premium is required at inception and each policy will be subject to a minimum premium.

The insured will report each month and pay premiums on eligible shipments made during the preceding month of the policy term (normally 1 year).

The insured may elect at policy inception to include shipments to Canada and shipments under irrevocable bank letters of credit if payable in the United States.

HOW TO APPLY

To apply for foreign credit insurance an exporter obtains an application form through an insurance agent or broker or an FCIA member company. Submission of this form will constitute a formal request for a quotation. If the exporter elects to purchase the coverage described in the resulting quotation, he will submit to FCIA a signed copy of the policy together with the requisite deposit premium.

LIMITS OF LIABILITY

The policy will be subject to an overall aggregate limit of liability for the period of the policy (generally 1 year).

Each short-term policy also will specify the maximum amount of credit outstanding to each buyer at any one time which will be covered by the policy. This maximum amount of credit covered by the policy may be fixed in either of two ways.

Discretionary credit limit

In each short-term policy, FCIA will specify an authorized limit per buyer to be used by the exporter without prior submission of the buyer's name to FCIA. FCIA will not make a prior investigation of those buyers for whom the exporter uses the limits so authorized. Within this limit, the insured exporter is responsible for the exercise of good credit practices in extending credit to be covered by the policy. When making shipments to a buyer under a discretionary limit, the insured must have in his possession and retain favorable, current, written credit reports—from at least two reliable sources—on that buyer which justify extension of the credit contemplated.

The exporter's special limit

If the insured desires a credit limit higher than his discretionary limit on sales to a particular buyer, he may apply to FCIA for a special limit which will apply to all future sales to that buyer. In agreeing on a special limit, it will be necessary for FCIA to complete a credit investigation of the buyer. Once established, a special limit will supersede the discretionary limit for that buyer and will continue in effect until withdrawn or amended. The form used by FCIA to approve each special credit limit is to be attached to and made a part of the policy.

How to obtain a special limit

In order to establish a special limit, FCIA must have sufficient credit information to justify such action for a particular buyer. Accordingly, with each application for a special credit limit the insured should submit such information if available to him. If FCIA is obliged to procure this information a fee of $10 will be charged. The amount of this fee will be reevaluated each year in light of the actual cost of collecting credit information. To facilitate the procurement of the necessary information it is suggested that application for limits on and credit information concerning new buyers be submitted as soon as it is known negotiations with a foreign buyer will result in a firm order.

Maintaining a credit limit

When a policy is renewed, the discretionary and outstanding special credit limits and policy aggregate limits will be continued, unless otherwise specified in the renewal endorsement.

The credit information on a particular buyer will be reviewed periodically by FCIA at its own expense. The insureds can assist in keeping cost to a minimum by notifying FCIA if the special credit limit on a buyer is no longer needed, and insureds periodically will be asked to review outstanding special credit limits so that such limits may be withdrawn voluntarily wherever possible.

Credit limits are on a revolving basis

Unless otherwise provided, all authorized credit limits, whether discretionary or special, will apply separately to each buyer on a revolving basis, i.e., as payments are made for earlier shipments, the credit limit becomes valid for further business.

Excess business

The insured will declare and pay a premium on all of his business involving eligible shipments including any credit sales made in excess of agreed credit ceilings for the following reasons:

1. As payments are received from a particular buyer the totals outstanding are reduced to a point where the excess business will come within the scope of the credit limit; and

2. The credit limit authorized by FCIA in its opinion represents the limit of prudent trade and any excess business may lead the buyer into overtrading, with a consequent increase in the risk to both exporter and insurers.

IN THE EVENT OF LOSS

Overdue accounts

The insured will report in the monthly shipment reporting form all amounts which at the end of the previous month remained wholly or partly unpaid for more than 90 days from the due date of the indebtedness in respect of shipments previously declared.

Notice of potential loss

The policy provides for notice in writing of the occurrence of any event likely to cause a loss, within 30 days of the insured's knowledge of such occurrence. Moreover, the policy contains specific conditions concerning the efforts to be made by the insured to minimize or prevent loss.

Payment of claims

All claims should be filed using the prescribed form. Proceeds may be assigned to a bank or any other financial institution, with the approval of FCIA.

Recoveries

The insured will be allowed and urged to continue to seek payment from the buyer even after payment of the claim. Recovery action is in the common interest of both the insurers and the insured. FCIA will be subrogated to all of the rights of the insured as respects recoveries.

The policy provides that, after payment of any claim, any sums recovered from the buyer or any other source shall, after reimbursement of the expenses of recovery, be shared between the insurers and the insured in the proportion in which they shared the original loss.

Appendix

A Look at World Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the orchardists of West Virginia are a progressive people in every sense of the word. Not only are they intensely interested in finding more efficient ways of producing fruit more abundantly; they also are keenly alert to all suggestions regarding the marketing of their produce more proficiently. They also seek new sales horizons, and in the past few years they have been successful in marketing their fruit in oversea markets.

With the growth of foreign markets, our orchardists are eager to become more active with regard to world affairs. It was for this reason that I chose to discuss world events when I had the honor and pleasure of addressing the annual dinner meeting of the 1962 convention of the West Virginia Horticultural Society, in Charles Town, on February 22. I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LOOK AT WORLD AFFAIRS

(An address by Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD, of West Virginia, before the West Virginia Horticultural Society, Martinsburg, W. Va.)

As we celebrate the birth of the first President of the United States—George Washington—we are reminded of the strength with which men are fortified by an ideal. As Commander in Chief of the Revolutionary Army, he and his men endured almost ceaseless hardships because of their faith in the ideal of representative government.

Today, that faith which George Washington, and our forefathers, held in representative government burns with equal fervor in the hearts of all Americans. And it is this faith that has made us the world's strongest bulwark against all tyrannical forms of government that has led us to open our hearts and our pocketbooks to assist all governments which may be too sorely beset or too weak to resist totalitarian encroachment.

George Washington was a wise and sagacious President. In thinking about our new Nation, and the need for it to live in peace and prosperity, he cautioned against foreign entanglements. In his day, Europe was far away and embroiled in political chicanery. Africa was a continent of which very little was known. Little or nothing was known of the Asian nations. Rightfully, our preoccupation was with our frontiers to the north, to the south, and to the west, for in the east the broad and turbulent Atlantic was a formidable barrier against possible encroachment, political or otherwise, by European nations.

Through the decades, the world George Washington knew has grown smaller and smaller. We can talk to persons in the farthest corners of the earth almost instantaneously today. Man can travel around the world in minutes. We have ballistic missiles that can speed to a target more than 5,000 miles away in a matter of minutes. Today, our only barriers against encroachment by any enemy are our industrial might and our military strength and the alliances which we have made with friendly nations.

Until a few years ago, Laos, Vietnam, Algeria, the Congo, Iran, Indonesia, were geographical locations known to Americans through books, motion pictures, and travelogs. Yet, today, what happens in these countries may vitally affect the lives of every American, for in effect they are the frontiers of our freedom.

While the world has grown smaller in the sense of time, it also has grown more crowded with people. Forty years ago there were about 1.8 billion people in the world. Now there are 3 billion. Forty years from now it is estimated there will be over 6 billion. Thus, in one long lifetime, we will have doubled the world's population.

About one-fifth of the world's people live in the United States, Canada, Western Europe, Japan, and other economically advanced countries of the free world. A third live in Soviet Russia, China, and other countries of the Communist bloc. The rest—and almost half the people in the world—live in the underdeveloped free world countries in Asia, Africa, Latin America, and the Middle East.

Between 1945 and 1959, 20 new states were formed in our world. In 1960, 18 additional states came to crowd the world scene. In 1961, two more new states were born, and in the current year, one new state has come into being. In addition, between 1948 and 1954, four new Communist states were created.

We count the 41 new states as belonging to the free world. However, released from colonial order, these new states grapple with nearly overwhelming problems of rapid change and political weakness. Thus, American policy toward these new countries, and others like them, seeks to promote orderly growth and change at home. At the same time, it seeks to help them overcome internal subversion inspired by Kremlin agents, for their independence is important to all free-world nations.

The heaviness of the problem we face in assisting nations to overcome internal subversion, and in resisting threats to their independence from abroad, is one Americans cannot afford to be reluctant to bear. In this age of hydrogen bombs, intercontinental missiles, and possible platforms in the sky, freedom becomes indivisible. The loss of freedom by any nation makes our own freedom less secure.

The Communist heirarchy knows full well that if it is to conquer the entire world it can only succeed by piecemeal subversion. Thus, from day to day, from nation to nation, and from continent to continent, their agents work to make freedom divisible. By striking in many places at one and the same time, they hope to throw the free nations of the world off balance, to make it appear that resistance is useless, and that American attempts to aid stricken countries are wasted effort and useless expenditures of manpower and money.

The ever present threat of Communist imperialism makes free-world progress a prime goal. At the same time, however, thwarting Communist designs requires powerful military strength. To this end, the more developed nations of the free world have been developing impressive armed forces, built up, in the main, with the help of military aid from the United States. Welded together by alliances such as NATO, SENTO, SEATO, and ANZUS, these military forces represent the free world's first line of defense.

Countries other than the United States are providing about 80 percent of the free world's ground forces; over 40 percent of the available military aircraft; about 57 percent of its combat ships. Moreover, all of the land on which oversea bases have been built is provided by other countries.

In military manpower, the United States and those nations with which we have bilateral or multilateral mutual defense agreements, have an approximate total of 8,680,000 men in their combined armed forces. This compares to about 9,300,000 in the Sino-Soviet bloc. Of the free world total, the European NATO powers have 3 million men under arms and the United States currently has 2.6 million. In the Far East, where the Republic of China and the Republic of Korea are two significant bulwarks against Communist expansion, the allied forces total more than 1.5 million men.

Thus, when we talk of the military aid which we are extending, we should also remember the military help which we are receiving from our allies. For by ourselves we would be hard pressed to offset the military threat of Communist aggression. In fact, our freedom would be a precarious matter.

The outcome of the cold war between the free world and the Communist world is still uncertain. However, there are facts which seem to support the view that communism is losing ground.

In recent years, many have considered that neutralist countries such as Iraq, Guinea, and Egypt, were pro-Communist because they did not ally themselves with the free world and sometimes appeared to support the Communist foreign policy line. It was feared that acceptance of aid from the Soviet bloc might lead to Communist penetration of these countries. Recently, however, there have been actions by several of these governments which indicate that they recognize the danger of Communist infiltration.

For example, during early 1961, relations between Egypt and the Soviet Union were marked by charges in Pravda and other Communist newspapers that Communist leaders in the United Arab Republic were being persecuted. On June 6, 1961, the Cairo Government accused the Soviet Union of attempting to exert pressure on the United Arab Republic, saying that Russia was suffering under a misconception if she believed that Egypt's positive neutralism was some sort of an alinement with the Communist camp.

Similarly, in late 1960, Pravda criticized the Iraqui Government for banning a pro-Communist Baghdad newspaper, and a series of protest messages were sent to Premier Kassem regarding the persecution of pro-Communists in Iraq.

At the end of 1961, in Guinea, antigovernment pamphlets and demonstrations believed instigated by the Communists resulted in President Touré asking for the recall of the

Soviet Ambassador. Moreover, before Guinea agreed to accept a new Ambassador, a promise was secured from the Soviets that there would be no further meddling by them or their cohorts in Guinea's internal affairs.

Of course, all of us know of the widening rift between the Soviet Union and Red China, and the fact that little Albania no longer takes orders or directions from the Kremlin. These rifts are deep, and they have shaken the Communist world. They are perhaps responsible for less belligerency on the part of Khrushchev—less saber-rattling at the free world, because he no longer is certain about Russia's long border with Red China.

The threat of communism in Western Europe has receded. In contrast to Eastern Europe, where industrial and agricultural production have not risen as expected, and living standards remain low, Western Europe has moved from economic recovery to prosperity, with the promise of greater economic strength as the Common Market develops further. The number of French Communists is reported to have dwindled from a million to fewer than 200,000, and in Italy, it is reported that the Communist Party membership dropped by more than 60,000 in 1961 alone, and that this decline is continuing.

Discontent within Communist countries is manifested by the number of refugees who have fled from Communist domination. It has been estimated by a West German official that up to mid-1961, 3½ million persons had fled East Germany, and, despite the wall and barbed wire, it was announced December 23, 1961, that nearly 10,000 additional East Germans had managed to flee to West Germany since August 13, when the Communists began construction of the Berlin wall.

On the Chinese front, approximately 1 million Chinese refugees had fled to Hong Kong between the time of the Communist takeover and 1961.

But it is in agriculture that the greatest loss of ground for communism can be recorded. In the United States, some 10 percent of the population is engaged in agricultural production which feeds the entire country and produces a huge surplus for export. In the Soviet Union, 45 percent of the population is engaged in agriculture, but in almost every category there is no exportable surplus produced, and in several important categories—such as meat and dairy products, and certain grains—not enough is produced to adequately feed their own people.

In Communist China the agricultural situation is still worse, and malnutrition is reported to have resulted in a loss in industrial production. One British visitor to Communist China has estimated that the national diet in that country averages only 600 calories per day, which is one-sixth that in the United States.

On the other hand, in our country, agricultural production has zoomed despite a reduction in the number of farmers. From 1950 to 1960, the number of farmworkers in the United States shrank by 2.8 million. This was a decline of 28 percent, and compares with a population increase of 18.4 percent during the decade.

Yet, with fewer farmers this is what we accomplished in the 1950–60 decade: The yield of corn per acre increased 41.7 percent; that of wheat went up 57 percent; that of cotton 66.5 percent; rice by 43 percent; and sorghums for grain by 100 percent—all in 10 years' time.

Then there is the race for space—a race in which communism had a big head start, and which has been used by the Kremlin as a tool for blackmail, as a lever to make smaller countries acceed to its will.

For more than 3 years our Government has been trying to get the Soviets to cooperate in space technology. For 3 years the Russians have turned us down cold. And each time one of our rockets failed, the Russians thumped their chests like victorious gladiators.

Now that an American astronaut has circled the globe, Mr. Khrushchev sings another tune. Now he says we ought to "cooperate in space technology." Now he says that all mankind would benefit from this kind of cooperation.

What Mr. Khrushchev now knows is that American technology, once it begins to run, can outrun that of any other nation on earth. He now knows that once we put our shoulders to the wheel of progress, we make a mighty push.

Early last year, it was doubted that we could put a man in orbit before 1 or 3 years of additional research and experimentation. We did it in 1 year. Early last year it was believed that it would be at least 10 years or more before we place astronauts on the moon. Don't be surprised if we succeed in this great feat by 1965 or sooner.

The accomplishment of Astronaut Lt. Col. John H. Glenn speaks of the power and ability of American science, engineering, and industry. I think the Russians are now painfully aware of this, and have become fearful of our rapid advancement. They know, too, that each of our space successes makes their vaunted might look ever smaller in the eyes of the free nations of the world.

With each passing day, it becomes increasingly imperative that all Americans understand the foreign relations of our Government. These are not partisan relations. Rather, in Congress and in the White House, our foreign relations are handled on a bipartisan basis. Insofar as world affairs are concerned, Americans of both political parties stand solidly together. We must never lose sight of the fact that all of us have one common enemy—international communism—and that only by united effort, by united thinking, by united action, can we ultimately destroy this enemy.

In this badly shaken world, the day of peace never seems to be dawning. But, we hope that one day it might dawn, because free men and women have the courage, the purpose, and the will to make it dawn.

Brotherhood Week Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address at the Brotherhood Week luncheon of Jewish Teachers Association of New York, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, February 22, 1962:

In the public school system of New York City, in about 1925, the three major religious groups, the Catholic Teachers Association, the Protestant Teachers Association and the Jewish Teachers Association joined to help each other solve common problems. This group is known as the Coordinating Community of Teachers Religious Faiths. A major objective of this group was to cooperate with the organizations of other faiths for the promotion of good will and understanding. The three organizations have collaborated in numerous activities such as brotherhood and interfaith programs in the city of New York.

All three groups exchange invitations frequently to various professional functions, such as forums, art exhibits, luncheons. They also interchange information regarding their programs, e.g., group insurance, banquet plans, tours and excursions.

Since its earliest years the Jewish Teachers Association—Morim, to use its Hebrew name (Morim is the Hebrew word for teachers), has annually donated 50 percent of its dues to cultural and educational activities, such as university libraries, the children's ward in a hospital, educational programs on radio or television, the mayor's committee (Mayor Wagner) for scholastic achievement providing scholarship aid to needy high school graduates of all faiths, and research studies on mentally retarded children.

Throughout the years a newspaper, the JTA Bulletin, has been published quarterly. Its first editor was Dr. David J. Swartz, now an assistant superintendent; and its current editor is Irving Roseblum, principal of one of the city schools. An early issue of the Bulletin recounts the program of a forum on our cultural heritage directed by Dr. Herman P. Mantell and conducted at Temple Emanuel, Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

The annual luncheon of Morim has long been noted as one of the outstanding professional and cultural affairs on the busy calendar of noteworthy events in New York. Traditionally the luncheon has been conducted at the Waldorf-Astoria during Brotherhood Week. The 35th annual luncheon was held this year on Washington's Birthday. The featured speaker was Louis Nizer, attorney, lecturer, and author of "My Life in Court." A gathering of 1,500 responded warmly to the welcoming greeting, "Shalom," of Dr. Herman P. Mantell, president. The program in accordance with protocol opened with the singing of Hatikvah by Commissioner Sylvester Garamella and "The Star-Spangled Banner" led by Mrs. Harriet Popper, accompanied by Mrs. Belle Seretoff. The invocation was delivered by Rabbi Arthur Hertzberg of Temple Emanu-El of Englewood, N.J. The noted guests were then introduced by Past President Irving Rosenblum. Included among the guests were the Honorable Herbert Zelenko, Congressman from Manhattan; distinguished jurists, Hon. Thomas Aurelio, George Postel, Daniel Gutman, James E. Lo Piccolo and Morton R. Tolleris; Hon. Louis I. Kaplan, commissioner of investigation; members of the board of education, Hon. Brendan Byrne, Hon. Morris Iushewitz, Judge Samuel R. Pierce, and Hon. Clarence Senior, Comptroller Abraham D. Beame, Associate Superintendents John B. King and Joseph O. Loretan; Superintendents Arthur Huhson, David J. Swartz, Dr. Abram Kanof, president of American Jewish Historical Society; Mrs. Pauline Mantell, First Lady of Morim; President Emil H. Tron, of the Protestant Teachers Association; President Leonard J. Fliedner, of the Catholic Teachers Association; and Jacob Jacowitz, school news editor of the New York World-Telegram. The officers for the year were presented: Dr. Herman P. Mantell, president; Harris Shafner, vice president; Michael Leinwand, treasurer; Miss Dorothy Posner, secretary; Borough Vice Presidents Frank Sacks, Jerome Greenblatt, Leonard Marmelstein, Martin S. Dodell, Norman Harris; Editor Irving Rosenblum; Membership Chairmen Emanuel M. Ebbin and Harry A. Geller.

The report of the year's activties, delivered by Dr. Herman P. Mantell, stressed the cultural, educational, and social program for the year—the nonsectarian art exhibit of teachers' paintings and sculpture, interfaith committees, the musicale, forums, dance, teas, summer and holiday excursions, proposed group insurance, convalescent service, and charitable donations.

The legislative program for funds for public education was discussed by City Comp-

troller Beame, followed by an interlude of folk singing directed by Marc Olf. Following this, Dr. Mantell bestowed the famed AVODAH Award of the association, granted for distinguished service to humanity through Jewry, upon Yeshiva University "in recognition of its pioneering years, its ever-expanding service, and its glorious vision of the future." The Honorable Charles H. Silver responded for the university. He, in turn, received a surprise award for his many years of devotion to the welfare of the children and the teachers in the educational system of New York.

Dr. Mantell expressed the gratitude of the association for the untiring efforts and diligent service of luncheon Chairman Martin S. Dodell and his assistant, Miss Ann Kessler. Following a solo "Bless This House," rendered by Commissioner Garamella, the benediction was pronounced by Rabbi Harold H. Gordon, executive vice president of the New York Board of Rabbis.

With a final Shalom in farewell, President Mantell closed the program for the 35th annual luncheon and extended a reunion invitation for the 36th, scheduled for February 12, 1963, at the Waldorf-Astoria.

A distinguished array of speakers has addressed the association at its annual luncheon. Among the noted speakers were: M. Maldwin Fertig, counsel to Governors F. D. Roosevelt and H. Lehman; Dr. Julius Mark, senior rabbi of Temple Emanu-El of New York; Dr. Abraham Leon Sachar, president of Brandeis University; Benjamin Cohen, Assistant Secretary of U.N.; Dr. David de Sola Pool, Spanish and Portuguese Synagogue; Dr. Israel Goldstein, president of World Jewish Congress; Rabbi Robert Gordes, Temple Beth El of Rockaway Park; Rabbi Emanuel Rackman, president of the New York Board of Rabbis; Hon. Semah Cecil Hyman, consul general of Israel in New York; Rabbi Harold H. Gordon, executive vice president of the New York Board of Rabbis; Dr. Alexander M. Dushkin, dean of School of Education of Hebrew University in Jerusalem; Hon. Irwin D. Davidson, judge of Court of General Sessions of New York.

At the Civil War centennial luncheon of February 22, 1961, the guest speaker was the noted rabbi and eminent author-historian, Dr. Bertram Wallace Korn of the Congregation Kenneseth Israel in Elkins Park, Philadelphia. An acknowledged authority in the role of Jewry in the Civil War, he held his audience enthralled throughout a well-documented exposition of the story of the "Jew in Gray and Blue."

The New Haven Railroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I wish to speak very briefly of the New Haven Railroad situation, which is very serious indeed. I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the New Haven Register of Monday, March 12.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW HAVEN RAILROAD NUMBERS ITS DAYS

In predicting that the New Haven Railroad can hold out until the first of next year as a financial entity, the trustees of the road have provided the Governors of Connecticut, New York, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts with a gentle ultimatum.

Unless something is done in terms of public aid within the next 9 months railroad service in this region could, conceivably, move close to collapse.

And the fact is that very little has been done by any of the States to meet the urgencies of the situation.

The Register has never wholly endorsed public intervention in an essentially private enterprise.

Even the prospect of a railroad authority operated in behalf of the States served by the New Haven involves, in our opinion, numerous imponderables and potential dangers.

But—it is perfectly clear that the railroad continues to run downhill despite exceptional and energetic efforts by its trustees to make financial sense out of a welter of expensive contradictions and uneconomic complications.

And it is equally clear that solutions must be proposed, analyzed, exposed to amendment, officially reviewed, and publicly discussed, if there is to be any hope for the New Haven Railroad in its ebbing financial strength.

The Federal Court cannot keep the railroad functioning unless grave financial problems have been resolved.

The trustees cannot continue to improvise in their search for funds and for operating procedures if the Government assistance which they have so consistently labeled essential—in a position that is generally upheld—is kept under wraps and highly tentative.

There is good reason for caution by the Governors in this unprecedented call for railroad support. But Byron R. White, Deputy U.S. Attorney General, highlighted the price of inaction when he remarked last week: "Any further steps depend upon what the States do"—thus indicating that the Federal Government as well as the railroad awaits definitive action by those public officials whose constituents most depend upon the carrier for passenger and for freight service.

The interstate staff committee set up by the States of Connecticut, New York, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts cannot function much longer as the behind-the-scenes operation it has been to date, nor can the Governors much longer stand in the committee's shade as the railroad languishes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the editorial calls attention to the very dangerous situation in which the New Haven Railroad finds itself, and to the necessity of the States getting busy and taking action promptly. I am afraid that the States have delayed too long and will delay too long in taking effective and essential action to keep the passenger railroad service rolling. I have called on Governor Rockefeller to join with Connecticut in setting up a public authority which would take over and operate the commuter passenger business on the New Haven Railroad. The Governor has not felt that this would be appropriate action for him to take. In fact, I do not believe he approves of the plan itself.

I feel that, unless some such plan as that is worked out, this very important commuter service, particularly between Connecticut and New York, may be ended by the trustees of the railroad or by the Court. This would have a very serious effect upon the economic, the social, and, in fact, the whole life of many communities in Connecticut.

Flexible Hero, Space Villain, Forgotten Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, Alvin Silverman, chief of the Washington bureau of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, wrote a most interesting column for the Cleveland Plain Dealer of March 4, in which he points out that when the bouquets were handed out for the success of Project Mercury one man who played a very important part was overlooked. He is Dr. T. Keith Glennan, the Administrator of National Aeronautics and Space Administration during the Eisenhower administration. Dr. Glennan was responsible for setting up the Project Mercury program, yet his name has not been mentioned by the President or Vice President.

Mr. Silverman's column follows:

FLEXIBLE HERO, SPACE VILLAIN, FORGOTTEN MAN

(By Alvin Silverman)

WASHINGTON.—Memo to Sil, from Phil Goulding:

If you are stuck, as usual, for a Sunday column, try these themes: the space hero, the space villain, and a forgotten man of the U.S. man-in-space program.

Point out to your readers, if any, that John Glenn is surely one of the most adaptable individuals of our age.

All of us have written of his humility, modesty, intelligence, humor, skill, faith, and patriotism. But I think back a bit to how he has adapted himself to a dozen different environments.

The seven astronauts were introduced to us at space agency headquarters here on a sweltering day in April 1959. Most of us who cover military and space activities left the room that day with the impression that John Glenn was the outstanding man of the group.

He seemed to handle himself better than the other six. His reasons for having volunteered were a little deeper.

THOUGHT HE WOULD BE FIRST

During the next couple of years, we believed that Glenn would be first into space. When he was named along with Alan Shepard and Gus Grissom, as the three candidates for the initial up-and-down mission, there was no surprise. It was assumed that Glenn would be tapped.

There was nothing from him to encourage or discourage this view. He behaved as he had before, stressing the importance of the program and discounting the individual importance of being first.

The guessing game continued until Shepard walked out of Hangar S at the cape on the morning of the first scheduled launch.

Glenn was only the backup pilot, the one who moved every step of the way with Shepard, ready to step in if something happened to Al. He adapted to this role magnificiently.

You may or may not know that the astronauts and their families live in a Cocoa Beach motel while at Canaveral. We bump into them constantly—on the beach, lounging at the swimming pool when their rigid schedules permit, eating meals in one of the few restaurants.

PASSED OVER AGAIN

There was every chance for Glenn to say something, in an informal chat, to betray his own real feelings. I don't know whether he then knew he would be making the first orbital flight. If he did, he said nothing to kiss off the Shepard mission as relatively unimportant compared to what was coming for him.

After *Freedom 7's* success, while Shepard was being honored by the President, speculation began that Glenn, as backup pilot, would naturally make the next Redstone suborbital flight. But Gus Grissom was named instead.

Glenn was backup a second time. Again, he silently continued to do his job, ignoring the news stories, adapting himself to a bridesmaid's role, praising Shepard and Grissom.

NASA grew up, got smart, recognized that the potential evil of public exposure before a mission was less than the confusion of a guessing game and named Glenn, in November, for the first orbital shot.

The whole world knows of a series of subsequent adaptations—to delay after delay, to the weightless environment of space, to potential incineration, to Presidential greetings, to extravagant parades, to a joint session of Congress, to three congressional committee appearances.

THE FORGOTTEN MAN

This is a remarkably flexible hero. If you do write about him, you might add the thought that the titanic welcomes have gone about far enough and that it is now time to give him a few more days alone with his family and put him back to work.

The villain, of course, is the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, John Bailey, who is ordinarily a pretty nice guy. How could he have the unimaginable gall to credit Glenn's flight to the "imagination, energy and knowhow" of the Kennedy administration?

Plans were made, funds obtained and schedules drafted long before Mr. Kennedy was elected to office.

This brings you to the first of the forgotten men. Whatever happened to T. Keith Glennan, NASA boss who created Project Mercury? Since he left for South America February 16 and has not yet returned, I don't know whether he was invited to the Glenn launching.

I do know that he did not attend either of the other two launchings and that his name has not been mentioned by the President, the Vice President, his successor or anyone else handing out the bouquets. This is Keith's program. Someone might be kind enough to say so.

The Cry of Communist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, one of Nevada's outstanding editorial writers is Paul A. Leonard, editor of the Nevada State Journal in Reno. In a recent editorial, Mr. Leonard saw fit to comment on the danger of attaching labels to various groups to confuse certain issues as they may arise.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, Mr. Leonard's editorial entitled "Constant Communist Cry Aids and Abets Subversives."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSTANT COMMUNIST CRY AIDS AND ABETS SUBVERSIVES

At a meeting of the Reno City Council, Monday night, the topic of the proposed sewer-use fee came up for discussion.

One of the opponents of an ordinance to establish such a fee intimated that, lurking somewhere in the proposal was a Communist plot.

So, it appears now that a plan to help dispose of a city's sewage cannot even be broached without its being labeled communistic.

There are two dangers in this growing practice of constantly hinting this, that and everything else is communistic.

One is that such blanket and irresponsible indictments tend to confuse real issues for the betterment of a community. No logical reasons are necessary in such demagoguery. If something isn't to your liking just say it's communistic. Whether there's one iota of truth in the charge or not that puts the cloak of suspicion around it.

The second danger inherent in this type of thinking is that it hampers the battle against real communism. There are so many cries of Communist being hurled nobody will be able to tell when a bona fide case pops up.

Furthermore, such charges tend to make a joke of the internal communism threat. The public, constantly hearing that this person, that plan, or this project is communistic will eventually reach the conclusion that there is really no such thing existent, and will laugh off the entire problem, leading to fatal consequences.

Thus, those who pretend to see communism lurking in everything with which they disagree are the people who are aiding and abetting it the most, other than the Communists themselves.

At the present time the ultrarightwingers in the Nation are fostering this "cry wolf" tendency which will weaken our vigilance.

They, like Khrushchev (strange bedfellows) are attempting to destroy the United Nations. They claim the U.S. Supreme Court is a nest of Socialists and worse. They described President Eisenhower's purposes and actions as treason. They hold that 7,000 U.S. Protestant clergymen are actively helping the Communists. And so forth.

At this rate it won't be long until the entire Federal Government, then all the local governments will be painted with the Red brush. Then all the clergymen, Protestant or otherwise, then all the lawyers, the doctors, the merchants * * *.

Soon it will be a simple matter for those who really seek to destroy our Nation from within to hide. Everybody will be branded and it will be impossible to tell the guilty from the innocent.

If one was of the same stripe as these blanket accusers he might be impelled to wonder whether some of their groups might not be open to infiltration. There could be no more fertile, or safe ground from which to carry out the aims of subversive elements.

The real Communists would not hesitate in joining with the ultrarightwingers in screaming, "That's communistic" about every other group or proposal if they thought it would further their plans for disrupting the orderly processes of government, and so hasten the day when they could take over.

We Need the RS–70

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I should like to include the following editorial from the Antelope Valley Ledger-Gazette, published in Lancaster, Calif., on March 7, 1962.

The eidtorial, written by sharp-thinking John Valentine, editor of the Ledger-Gazette, makes a bold case for the B–70, now labeled the RS–70. In my judgment, this great weapons system is essential to the future defense of this great Nation.

I most heartily back the House Armed Services Committee in its unanimous approval to supply $491 million to get this program under full development. To my mind, we have delayed far too long already. Above all, I hope the current controversy is not clouded over by an executive versus legislative skirmish. The overriding fact and one which must be uppermost in the minds of both branches of our Government is that the United States needs the best defenses it can obtain.

The RS–70 is a vital link in that chain of defense.

The editorial follows:

Civilian control of the military services has always been a primary policy of the United States.

This means that making war, or not making war, has always been the prerogative of the civilian arm of the Federal Government.

The historical background for this policy lies in instance after instance of military leader of other nations taking over a government and then waging war to aggrandizement of himself and his country—and often with an adverse result.

The American founders were determined not to let this situation develop in their new country. The President can lead us to the brink of war, but only the Congress can declare war. And the heads of the military departments in the Federal Government have always been civilians.

Civilian control of the military services, however, has never meant that the civilians will tell the military men how to fight the war the civilians have started.

A crucial contest of this principle is now coming to a head in Congress. It has been building up for a long time.

The question is not as to whether or not the civilians will control the military services, that is, keep them under control so they may never drag the Nation into a war the people did not want. It is a question as to whether or not the civilians tell the military men what weapons they may have to fight with.

The weapon is the B–70.

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Air Force Chief of Staff (military head of the Department of the Air Force) and his civilian boss Mr. E. M. Zuckert appeared before the Senate Military Appropriations Subcommittee to plead for 100 more Minuteman missiles and an ex-

pansion of the B-70 program so that the military equipment that the plane is to carry and the control gear for its use will also be built. At present the three planes being built at Palmdale are planes only—they are not weapons.

General LeMay, who has the honor of being considered this Nation's top big plane expert, and who has the reputation of being able to express himself forcefully and authoritatively, said before the Senate subcommittee that having, or not having, the B-70 as a usable weapon could "make the all-important difference between winning and losing" a war after the initial attack by an enemy.

We take this to mean, and believe that he meant to say, that having or not having the B-70 to use could mean the difference between survival or destruction as a Nation in the event of war.

We speak of war coldbloodedly because it is that—a coldblooded thing that is fought and won by steel-willed men who know what they need to do the job and who are given what they need.

Now this doesn't mean that military men will not ask for things they "might" like to have, but do not need. General McClellan, head of the Army of the Potomac during the Civil War, never could get all he wanted. And he never fought a successful campaign because he had not the nerve or the dash or the will of the successful military leader. But as between the Secretary of War and General McClellan, there was never any reluctance to try and get for the general what he wanted.

Now, as between the military leaders of the Air Force under the leadership of the best military man the United States has, General LeMay, and the leadership of the Department of Defense under Mr. McNamara, the President has chosen to support Mr. McNamara.

And as between a man trained in warfare and a man not trained in warfare as to the weapons to be provided for the defense of the United States, our vote will have to go to the military leader.

If General LeMay says that the B-70 could make the difference between winning and losing a war after the initial attack, then this expression of opinion is, for us, controlling.

Behind that opinion lies centuries of warmaking. And almost 200 years of fighting by Americans on the American continent and around the world. And 4 years of the most intense fighting in which aviation played a major role in air, ground, and sea forces in World War II.

The exotic weapon—today the exotic weapon is the missile—has always excited the civilian leader who is enthralled by the prospect of winning an easy war.

There are no easy wars. They are only hard, brutal, bloody wars in which many people are killed and much property is destroyed. But it is who survives in the end that makes the difference as to the future of our race, and it is this future that the American military man has traditionally been charged with protecting.

If LeMay wants the B-70 as a full weapons system because he conceives it as the possible difference between winning and losing, we will give up a great deal to make certain that he gets it.

Mr. McNamara has made an excellent name for himself as the civilian head of the Department of Defense. He has made no name for himself, and it is not expected that he should, as a strategist. If there is any event to judge him by, the Bay of Pigs fiasco, which we are convinced no military man, let alone an American military man, could have ever approved, had the choice been clearly a military one, certainly would tend to make his ability as a military man suspect.

In his announcement of his position Mr. McNamara said, "In view of the size of these forces (missiles and bombers and submarines), it does not appear wise at this time to make a final commitment to a $10 billion B-70 production program. To do so would, in my opinion, be a serious waste of the Nation's resources."

He could have left the last sentence out.

For in General LeMay's opinion if we do not provide the weapon the Air Force wants, it is very probable that we will have wasted all of our resources, men and material, and be denied the use of them for ourselves because we risked them and lost them in a war we were not prepared to win.

We realize that there is an Antelope Valley interest in the B-70 program. Our more avaricious natures tend to see this program as the means to boom and fortune for the get-rich-quick artists that follow national defense.

We have tried to eliminate this from our thinking. If General LeMay had agreed with Mr. McNamara we would be writing that we ought not to get excited, that in fact the best judgment of our military and our civilian leaders is that the program is in such a posture that it could be expedited if needed, or completed simply as an experiment, depending upon developments around the world.

But the military men do not agree with the civilians, and in this game of chance, we stand with the military men.

Colonel Glenn's Orbital Flight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, from the smallest town to the largest metropolis, millions of Americans were thrilled by the heroic achievement of Lt. Col. John Glenn, Jr., and they rejoiced at his safe return from his spectacular orbital flight into outer space. Millions of words recorded this stirring adventure, Mr. President, in stories and columns of metropolitan dailies and smalltown weeklies. In Nevada we are fortunate in having an outstanding columnist, Walter Cox of the Yerington, Nev., Mason Valley News, whose weekly pillar is a source of pleasure and enlightenment to a great many readers. Mr. Cox, in my opinion, expressed the typical reaction of most Americans to Colonel Glenn's daring experience. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that Mr. Cox' column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLONEL GLENN'S ORBITAL FLIGHT

(By Walter Cox)

Tuesday, February 20, was a big day for you and me. John Glenn, Jr., backed by a group of space experts, placed the good old United States of America back on the map in the race for security and peace. In short, he and the men who built his rocket and space capsule, kept the wolves, or Russians, from our door. Colonel Glenn, according to his own statement, bounced from the space capsule as fresh as a daisy. You can't say the same for millions of Americans on Pacific standard time. We were up at 3:30 and stayed with the flight until noon. You might say we were pretty pooped despite armchair navigation. As your stomach turned over during the countdown, and then convulsed a few times prior to the landing, you also did a bit of prayer work over the 5-hour stretch. As the fellow along Main Street said, "I had a difficult time recalling my prayers. But I did a good job."

Speaking of prayers, Colonel Glenn has done a great bit of missionary work for our modern teenage youth and also those in their twenties. The colonel never thought that church going was sissy stuff. A Presbyterian, he never missed church on Sunday and was sustained in his many combat missions in the past world conflict and Korea by his faith in God. Let's hope that his "he man" contribution to the boys of the Nation will be as great as his contribution to the aviation of the United States and the world.

A Warning Against Loss of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to the editor that appeared in the Milton, Ind., Eastern Indiana Farmer.

The letter, written by Albert Ferris, follows:

READER WARNS AGAINST LOSS OF LIBERTY

Are you aware there is a new crack developing in our Liberty Bell? No, not in the one which hangs in Philadelphia, but in the one which proclaims the right of the individual farmer to manage his own business free from Government coercion. The threat is embodied in the two identical bills H.R. 10010 and S. 2786 now before the Agriculture Committees of the Congress. To some degree, any final appraisal of these so-called food and farmer control measures is premature since many amendments thereto may be accepted. However, as introduced, they do contain provisions so drastic as to snatch the breath of every freedom-loving farmer.

Without going into details, these bills propose compulsory quotas on dairy products, feed grains and other agriculture crops with penalties involving fines, prperty confiscation penalties involving fines, property confiscation and even jail sentences. While purporting to be inoperative unless ratified by two-thirds of the producers, the only choice is between acceptance and ruin. In other words the alternative to ratification is having a ruinous quantity of Government-stored grain dumped on the market. This amounts to an ultimatum of 'take it or else." The retention of the historic basis for acreage allotments is definitely unfair in that it gives a high base to the farmer who has not rotated crops and hence is most to blame for the surpluses while penalizing the farmer who has conserved the soil.

Certainly some of these vicious features should be eliminated if the program is to be considered at all acceptable. If you do not want to farm in a straitjacket, write your Congressman. Remember Ben Franklin advised, "He who seeks security at the price of liberty will likely lose both."

The Constitution and Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, over the years, the balance of power among the executive, judicial, and legislative brances of the Government has been a foundation of great stability and strength of the U.S. system.

Throughout history, however, there have been efforts—from time to time—to upset this balance.

For this reason, there is a need for constant vigilance.

Currently, the Congress is considering proposals for revising U.S. reciprocal trade agreements.

As administrator of the program, the executive branch has requested broad, flexible powers to participate in tariff-changing treaties—without the consent of the Senate.

The Congress, in my judgment, must proceed cautiously and carefully on these recommendations.

Why? Because, first, too drastic downward revision of tariff rates could spell life or death for segments of the domestic economy; and second, the granting of tariff cutting powers to the executive branch could be a dangerous, and precedent setting shifting of constitutional authority and responsibility from the legislative, to the executive branch.

Yesterday, the Washington Star published a thoughtful analysis of this question by David Lawrence entitled "the Constitution and Kennedy."

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Mar. 13, 1962]

THE CONSTITUTION AND KENNEDY

(By David Lawrence)

What has happened to the Constitution under the Kennedy administration? This question projects itself naturally as a result of the new controversy that is developing over the power of the President to finalize tariff agreements with foreign countries.

Mr. Kennedy seems to think Congress can delegate to him power to make such trade treaties through an enlargement of the present law on reciprocal trade agreements. But the issue is broader than tariffs.

If, for example, Congress can delegate to the Executive the treatymaking power on tariffs without the necessity of ratification by the legislative body, then the power to impose taxes or to change at will existing tax laws can also be handed over to the President. Yet the Constitution specifies that Congress alone shall have power "to lay and collect taxes, duties, imports and excises."

The Constitution also says plainly that the President of the United States shall have power only "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

Within the last few days, however, President Kennedy has ignored the Senate's rights and has merely sent to Congress notification of far-reaching agreements on tariffs reached with the 6 nations of the European Common Market and 18 other countries, including Great Britain.

Never before in American history has such a treaty or agreement with so many countries in the world been withheld from formal submission to the Senate. The document which reported the negotiations to the House and Senate does not even request approval of the pacts. It assumes that the President will get the necessary authority under a modification of the existing reciprocal trade law.

The Executive, of course, inherently possesses certain powers to negotiate treaties with foreign governments on tariffs. This is far different, however, from the authority he has been using under the reciprocal trade law, which delegates power to negotiate only within certain limits. It permits, for example, a tariff reduction of 20 percent to be made, but no more, and the President is supposed to report to Congress those instances where his proposals would depart from what are known as peril points in industry. It is then up to Congress to specify by law whether it will sanction a departure from these limits.

Mr. Kennedy in his message to Congress on March 7, reporting on the new tariff treaties, says that "our negotiators were grievously short of bargaining power" in the negotiations at Geneva. This is clear proof that the executive branch of the American Government has been, in effect, negotiating a treaty and has not just been carrying out instructions within certain limits, as covered by the Reciprocal Trade Act passed by Congress in 1958.

The negotiations started in September 1960, but a deadlock ensued. President Kennedy confesses to Congress that he deviated from the instructions or limits contained in the existing law, when he says:

"Accordingly, after months of negotiation and when no other recourse was available to save the situation, I authorized our Geneva delegation to offer new concessions on a number of items at rates below the peril point findings.

"In taking this step, we avoided the collapse of the Geneva talks and we held open the way to a future of economic cooperation, not separation, between the two common markets, the one in Western Europe, and the other in the United States."

But the President really did have a legal alternative. Had he been adhering to the treatymaking power given him under the Constitution, he could have negotiated a treaty and, after affixing the signature of the United States to it, he could have asked for ratification by a two-third vote of the Senate.

It may, indeed, be questioned whether, in order to conform to constitutional requirements, the President isn't really obligated to get a two-thirds consent by the Senate anyhow when he makes agreements with 24 countries involving not only tariff duties but various contingent actions, including possible reprisals by the United States against quotas imposed on our trade by other governments.

Should a subject of such transcendent importance—affecting industries throughout the United States—be handled by such a vague process as were the agreements made by the American delegation at Geneva with a total of 24 different countries? Certainly the framers of the Constitution did not intend that the treatymaking power, which requires a two-thirds approval by the Senate, should be bypassed. The President has attempted to exercise the very same authority in a different way. Such a procedure has never been upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States.

If Congress, by a majority of both Houses, can pass a law delegating authority to the Executive to make agreements with foreign governments which are final, then the whole treatymaking power, in which the Senate has hitherto played a coordinate part, falls to the ground. That's why it is being asked: What has happened to the Constitution under the Kennedy administration?

Edison's Greatest Contribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, one American whose permanent niche in history is unchallenged is Thomas Alva Edison. His contributions to the advancement of our civilization are so well known that it would be redundant for me to list them here.

It was my good fortune, as a young man, to have had the opportunity to meet this great man in person when accompanying my father, who was a physician, to his home in the course of his professional service. To see Mr. Edison and to hear him speak was an unforgettable experience.

It is fitting that Mr. George E. Stringfellow of East Orange, N.J., who knew him well as a daily associate, should have been called upon to add to the Edison memorabilia in an address before the Rotary Club of Hamilton, Ontario, Canada, on February 15, 1962, as part of Canadian Electrical Week. Mr. Stringfellow's address was delivered during the week of the 115th anniversary of Mr. Edison's birth and the 75th anniversary year of what many persons consider to be his greatest contribution to society—organized research.

Under leave to extend my remarks, it is my pleasure to place Mr. Stringfellow's very timely and illuminating address in the RECORD.

EDISON'S GREATEST CONTRIBUTION

(By George E. Stringfellow)

Mr. Toastmaster, honored guests, and gentlemen, it is a privilege to speak to you on the subject of Thomas Alva Edison. I know of no country where the memory of Edison is more revered than in Canada. This is perhaps due to the fact that but for a quirk of fate Edison would have been born a Canadian. Some of you may not be familiar with this bit of Edison lore, so I will tell you about it.

As far back as the history of the Edison family is traceable, one characteristic stands out. The Edison clan were nonconformists.

We first encounter this trait among the English forebears who, in the middle 1600's migrated to Holland in protest against religious and other restrictions of Oliver Cromwell.

The first Edisons arrived in the new world in 1730. They came from Holland. They settled in Caldwell, N.J., which coincidentally is hardly more than a stone's throw from West Orange where, 150 years later, Thomas Edison was to establish his home and laboratory.

During the American Revolution, one branch of the Edison family remained loyal to the crown.

John Edison, a practicing Tory, was Thomas Edison's great grandfather—was im-

prisoned in Newark, N.J., and was sentenced to death which was commuted.

After the revolution John Edison and his family were resettled in Nova Scotia. Near what is now Digby. This was the first contact the Edison family had with Canada.

The Edison clan migrated westward in 1811 and helped to establish the town of Vienna in the province of Ontario.

Edison's grandfather, Capt. Samuel Edison, served with the British in the War of 1812.

This Samuel Edison was an innkeeper in Vienna. His son, the father of Thomas, was also named Samuel. He was born in Vienna. It was there that he met and married Nancy Elliott, schoolteacher daughter of a minister.

Two of Thomas Edison's older sisters and an older brother were born in Vienna.

The nonconformist streak in the Edison line broke out again and Thomas Edison became destined to be born in the United States.

His father, Samuel, joined in the unsuccessful Papineau-Mackenzie rebellion in 1837 and, with a price on his head, fled across the border and established his family in Milan, Ohio. It was there, on February 11, 1847, that Thomas Alva Edison was born.

A few years later the Edison family moved to Port Huron, Mich.

Young Tom, then about 15, learned telegraphy, an art which was to provide him with an association with Canada. He served as a telegraph operator for the Grand Trunk Railroad at both Sarnia and Stratford Junction, in Ontario.

It was my pleasure and privilege to have worked for more than a decade with Thomas Edison and I can assure you that nonconformity motivated many of his decisions. He was not a revolutionary in the sense of battles and plots. Thomas Edison was a revolutionist in his approach to science.

Had he not been a nonconformist he could not have compiled his stupendous record of achievement. Had he not been a nonconformist, he would have accepted as truth the myths of the then prevailing scientific knowledge. Only the strong swim against the current. Thomas Edison was strong. He swam upstream to establish new scientific truths and to open new vistas of progress.

The Edison strain of nonconformity did not end with Thomas. The sons and daughters left by Thomas Edison possess this strain in strong measure. For example, Charles Edison, one of the sons whom I have had the privilege of knowing best, demonstrated a high degree of individualism and ability, as a businessman, as Secretary of the Navy and as Governor of New Jersey. 1962 is more significant than most in considering Edison's contributions to progress and scientific knowledge.

We are here today to honor Edison's memory on the 115th anniversary of his birth, which took place last Sunday. But more importantly, 1962 marks the 75th anniversary of what many persons consider to be his greatest contribution to society—organized research.

In 1887, 75 years ago, Edison opened his original laboratory at West Orange, N.J. This laboratory is now a federally operated museum under the name of the Edison National Monument. It was first of all the many great organized research laboratories.

Today's laboratories, whether in Canada, the United States, or elsewhere, were sired by Edison's work.

In the decade immediately preceding 1887, Edison labored long and effectively in his Menlo Park, N.J., Laboratory.

The phonograph, the electric light, a complete system for the generation and distribution of electric power—these were just a few of the "firsts" at Menlo Park. He saw in his Menlo Park Laboratory the inadequacy of its facilities. He envisioned the establishment of an "invention factory" which was his descriptive term for "organized research." The term "organized research" was not to be coined until years later.

In the words of the late, Charles F. Kettering, Edison's original West Orange Laboratory was the "birthplace" of organized research.

How well Edison planned for and succeeded in his "invention factory" is attested to by the fact that during the last 44 years of his life spent in West Orange, he was granted 520 patients.

These 520 inventions covered, among other things, electric motors and generators, incandescent and fluorescent lamps, continuous nickel and copper plating, the depositing of metals in a vacuum, magnetic concentration and briquetting of iron ore, scores of improvements in recording and reproduction of sound, primary and storage batteries, and the "movie" camera which gave birth to the motion picture industry.

Organized research did not spring full-bloom from Edison's mind. It came about as a result of rules, practices, and habits which he developed and acquired over many years of experience. Edison believed in, subscribed to and practiced the philosophy that generally speaking there are four basic principles in management and he consistently applied these four principles, which are: (1) plan, (2) organize, (3) delegate, and (4) supervise.

Edison always had plans of action. He outlined these plans to his subordinates. Edison built an organization of men and equipment to carry out these plans. He delegated ample authority to his subordinates to the end that they could effectively discharge their responsibilities.

Having done these prerequisites, Edison himself exercised intelligent supervision.

My own association with Mr. Edison dealt principally with his unique nickel-iron-alkaline storage battery.

Some 10 years of work and 50,000 experiments went into this development.

Starting in the early twenties, it was my good fortune to be placed in command of the storage battery operations. In this connection, I would relate to you a "ghost story" involving Mr. Edison, his storage battery, and myself.

I recognized for several years before Mr. Edison's passing on October 18, 1931, that time, the inexorable reaper, would some day catch up even with Edison. Realizing that a great amount of important data concerning nickel-iron-alkaline batteries were contained in his head, rather than on paper, I worked out with Mr. Edison a plan whereby, over a period of months, I would submit to him a series of questions to which he would write the answers. These questions and answers were carefully filed.

This led, 5 years after Mr. Edison's passing, to the publication by Howard Blakeslee, science editor of the Associated Press, the story of how Thomas Edison, though dead, continued to serve as a consultant to the storage battery operations.

When problems arose, we, who survived Mr. Edison, frequently found answers to those problems in his answers to my questions, thereby eliminating costly delay. Mr. Edison thus continued to serve as a consultant years after his passing into the great beyond.

His serving as my daily consultant during the last decade of his long and productive life is an experience I shall never forget. Any success which I may have attained is due in a large measure to this exposure to so great and good a man as Thomas A. Edison.

Edison's inventions and discoveries produced vast industries, millions of jobs and billions in property values.

Whatever you do—wherever you turn—you see the invisible hand of Thomas Alva Edison.

When you listen to a phonograph, when you use a dictating machine, when you send a telegram, when you get a market quotation, when you listen to your radio or television, the invisible hand of Edison is there.

Edison's inspiration, his incentive in life, was to advance the welfare of mankind.

Little wonder that his memory commands a devotion rooted deeply in human gratitude.

If it were possible for us to ask him today, "What is wrong with this war-weary world?" I am sure his answer would be, "Nothing that the application of the principles of Christianity and hard work won't correct."

I close my remarks by quoting a statement made by Edison near the end of his life:

"Be courageous—history repeats itself again and again. Be as brave as your forefathers. Have faith. Go forward."

We, the heirs of this great man would do well, I think, to emulate his integrity, his industry, his philosophy, and his stewardship.

Role of Congress Must Be Maintained

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, one of the continuing and most vexing questions that affects our Government is what is the proper balance among the three principal branches of our Government. I am pleased to call attention today to a speech by Mr. Adam K. Stricker, Jr., of New York City, in which he deals extensively with this subject and in so doing lends support to my proposal for a congressional trade veto which seeks to restore to the Congress some reasonable portion of its power in trade matters. I ask unanimous consent that this speech appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Taylor, Mr. Hayes, members of the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Pittsburgh, and honored guests, it is indeed an honor for me to address this distinguished group. As you know, the time assigned to me is extremely limited and your interests are very diverse. Hence, I believe it would be a mistake to attempt to deal with specific legislative proposals, as it would be impossible to do justice to them.

On the other hand, there are a number of broad basic trends that dominate the approach to all legislative problems in this session of the Congress and that also characterize the philosophy of this administration. Therefore, I shall attempt to deal with these aspects of the Washington scene, as I believe they will be with us for many months to come.

If anyone asked me to list the one dominant factor that pervades the approach of the New Frontier to all Government relations, I would have to say that it is the tendency to concentrate more power in the executive branch of the Government than has ever existed before. In many ways the Congress—which, under the Constitution, is the legislative branch of the Government—has been asked to relinquish its functions to the Chief Executive.

I do not make this statement in a partisan sense. Partisan politics is not our purpose. On the contrary, we are concerned primarily with the relationship of Govern-

ment to business in order that the creative forces of our private enterprise economy may make their maximum contribution to growth and the economic well-being of everyone. However, there are certain basic and fundamental facts which cannot be ignored.

During the 1st session of the 87th Congress, the President submitted seven reorganization plans to the Congress. Basically they all were directed to the same end result: they would allow the independent agencies, which have always been considered as an arm of the Congress, to delegate decisions to single members, to examiners, and to individuals or groups of employees.

Plan No. 1 affected the Securities and Exchange Commission; plan No. 2, the Federal Communications Commission; and plan No. 5 dealt with the procedures of the National Labor Relations Board. Each of these proposals to reorganize these quasi-judicial agencies with rulemaking power was rejected by one branch of the Congress, thereby setting them aside.

On the other hand, Reorganization Plan No. 3 reorganized the activities of the Civil Aeronautics Board; plan No. 4, the Federal Trade Commission; plan No. 6, the Federal Home Loan Bank; and plan No. 7 abolished the Maritime Board and transferred its regulatory functions to a new Federal Maritime Commission. These are all now in effect.

Each of us in the business community is particularly concerned with the activities of the Federal Trade Commission inasmuch as its Chairman is the former chief counsel of the Kefauver Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, Paul Rand Dixon. Another member of this Commission, Everett MacIntyre, has had long service as Geenral Counsel of the House Small Business Committee.

The reorganization of the Federal Trade Commission enables these individuals to exert a far greater influence over the activities of the business community than was the case in the past.

President Kennedy has proposed a number of sweeping delegations of power by the Congress to the executive branch in his state of the Union message as well as in his economic report and budget message. For example, among other proposals, he has asked for standby authority, subject to veto by the Congress, to reduce taxes. It would be naive to ignore the political implications of such a request. Certainly, if any legislative authority is specifically granted to the House of Representatives in the Constitution, it is that of levying taxes.

The President has also requested the authorization of standby capital improvements authority. Specifically, he recommended that the Congress authorize the President to accelerate and initiate up to $2 billion in public works when unemployment is rising. Past experience demonstrates that additional expenditures on such projects are not the most effective means of stimulating the economy. Furthermore, those initiated during a recession are usually completed during the subsequent recovery phase of the business cycle and thus add to inflationary pressures.

Probably the most important single topic that will be considered by this Congress is legislation to establish a new trade agreements program to supplant the present Trade Agreements Act which is scheduled to expire on June 30 of this year. Without attempting to review any of the facets of this legislation which are extremely involved, the one dominant characteristic again is the large area of discretion which is given to the Chief Executive. In fact, it is so great that bills have been introduced by Senators KEATING and JAVITS of New York which would provide for a congressional veto of a trade agreement.

I might add that the use of congressional vetos rather than a veto by the Chief Executive is a complete inversion of our normal procedures of Government. However, such a requirement is the only feasible means of maintaing congressional responsibilities for legislative matters which clearly belong to the Congress.

While I do not intend to discuss the merits or demerits of free trade, there are certain factors that must be carefully considered in terms of our overall competitive abilities. Many industrialists and labor leaders are concerned that American labor costs expressed in our monetary units are considerably higher than those which prevail in other countries. I would like to suggest a new yardstick to use in appraising American labor costs. For many years, almost every employee has adjusted his living standards to his take-home pay after taxes and social security deductions rather than to his gross income. On the other hand, employers have been concerned primarily with the basic wage scale which includes all taxes, since this is his cost of production.

Furthermore, for many years we have become accustomed to a basic 52-percent corporate income tax. Obviously, this cannot be paid out of the capital funds of any corporation. It must be factored into prices, and, of necessity, when we operate in an economy where wage rates are tied to a cost-of-living index, they too must reflect the higher tax burden prevailing throughout the American economy.

I propose that one way by which we might enhance our competitive position is to reduce the cost of Government wherever possible and, hopefully, ultimately our tax burdens. This will increase the purchasing power of employees and, in a competitive economy, it will reduce the prices of our products.

An examination of the President's budget message is a disturbing revelation. The so-called administrative budget—and I shall have more to say about this in a minute—for the 1961 fiscal year which ended June 30, 1961, showed expenditures of $81.5 billion. The estimate of expenditures for the fiscal year which will end on June 30 of this year total $89 billion, and the President is requesting appropriations for the fiscal year which will start on July 1 of $92.5 billion. In other words, in a period of only 1 year, we plan to add $10 billion to Federal expenditures in the administrative budget.

In the fiscal year ending this June, budget receipts will total $82 billion, and for the next fiscal year they are estimated at $93.7 billion. In other words, the entire growth in budget receipts is predicated upon the continued recovery of the U.S. economy. However, this process provides a budget surplus of $463 million, approximately one-half of 1 percent of the Federal budget. I raise the question as to whether it would be better to forecast a substantial surplus rather than to preempt whatever growth may occur by increased expenditures.

I am sure that many of you believe that this $93 billion figure for the administrative budget represents the total receipts by the Federal Government from the public. Unfortunately, this is not the case. On the contrary, when we include social security and other trust fund items, the Federal Government through taxes of one kind or another is drawing approximately $117 billion from the American people.

The administration reports that the gross national product for the calendar year 1961 was $521 billion so that in terms of what we have already achieved, we are committing more than 24 percent of all that we produce to the public sector of the economy. These costs must be factored into the prices of all goods and services and into the wages and salaries of those who produce them so that they may have the ability to support our economy through their personal expenditures.

It might be of some interest to note that in 1960 the total share of our gross national product contributed to Government purchases of goods and services was just under 20 percent; hence the public sector as contrasted with the private is growing by 20 percent.

Before leaving the subject of gross national product, it should be emphasized that this statistic represents the total expenditures by private individuals, business institutions and government for goods and services. Necessarily, an increase in governmental activity raises the gross national product, but this does not necessarily increase the well-being or productivity of our economy.

I should like to make a passing reference to a subject which has been discussed for many years, namely tax reform. As each of you knows, there is a normal personal income tax rate of 20 percent starting with the first $2,000 of taxable income. After $2,000 there is a surtax which rises with one's taxable income to a maximum of 71 percent. The combined normal and surtax rates in the top bracket amount to 91 percent.

It may surprise most of you to learn that the same revenue yield presently derived from personal income taxes could be achieved with a flat rate of approximately 23 percent applied to all personal incomes after the present exemptions and exclusions. This is, of course, below the capital-gains rate. The imposition of a less punitive tax would do a great deal to deter tax avoidance and concentrate more of our energies on the task of increasing the national income.

It is obvious that there will be many compromises involved before the 1962 legislative session is concluded. However, so many of our problems presently involve our overall balance of payments that it is essential that we recognize that in spite of the statements which have been made from time to time that our balance-of-payments position has improved, the fact remains that during the first 6 weeks of 1962, our erosion of gold reserves totaled $100 million.

Let me remind you that unless our basic legislation is changed, a gold reserve of 25 percent must be maintained to support Federal Reserve notes and other currency issued by the Federal Reserve System. Although there was substantial earmarking of gold by the Federal Reserve banks for foreign accounts in 1960, there was little actual transfer of the metal to foreign sources until 1961. We now find that three-quarters of a billion dollars worth of gold was shipped out of the United States last year. This is the largest outflow on record. Unfortunately, much of this metal has been transferred into speculative hands and out of the world's monetary system, thus reducing the base to support the world's currency.

All of the problems which confront America can be solved, but they will require hard work, patience, and understanding. Your representatives in Washington, by and large, are dedicated individuals who will welcome your views. Intelligent suggestions by the business community can play an extremely important role in the months ahead.

Thompson Ramo-Wooldridge of Cleveland Selected To Work on Apollo Spacecraft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like

to include the following letter from R. J. Watson, Washington representative of North American Aviation, Inc., and a press release issued by this company which points out that Thompson Ramo-Wooldridge of Cleveland, Ohio, has been selected to design and develop the electrical power source for the Apollo spacecraft that will take the first Americans to the moon and back. Cleveland has been given a responsibility as well as an honor in having one of its industries selected to do this important work.

The letter and release follow:

NORTH AMERICAN AVIATION, INC.,
Washington, D.C., March 9, 1962.

Hon. FRANCES P. BOLTON,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BOLTON: Enclosed is a press release which I believe you will find of interest. Thompson Ramo-Wooldridge's Tapco Division plans to do the subcontract work on this important Apollo project in their Cleveland facility.

With best regards, I remain,
Sincerely yours,

R. J. WATSON,
Washington Representative.

DOWNEY, CALIF.—Two companies have been selected to design and develop the electrical power source for the Apollo spacecraft that will take the first Americans to the moon and back.

Named for multi-milliondollar parallel contracts to build the Apollo fuel cell, were the Pratt & Whitney Aircraft Division of United Aircraft, Hartford, Conn., and the Tapco Division of Thompson Ramo-Wooldridge, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio.

Howard Cathers, director of material at the space and information systems division of North American Aviation, principal Apollo contractor, said that competitive contracts will be awarded to insure two different approaches to the design of the fuel cells an extremely critical component of the spacecraft. "The fuel cell an entirely new approach to the power supply problem made necessary because of the weight considerations of a spacecraft" he explained.

The fuel cell will supply the power for all electronic and electrical systems of both the manned command center module and the service module. Located in the service module, the fuel cell performs the same basic function as the battery in an airplane. But, where a battery uses heavy solids such as lead, the fuel cell utilizes oxygen and hydrogen as its source of energy. A by-product of the system is potable water which will be used by the threeman crew on the journey to the moon and back.

Apollo subcontractors are selected following an intensive procedure which includes evaluation of hundreds of points covering technical design, ability to produce, probable cost, and program management.

Case Against Present Foreign Aid Concept

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, no one has ever stated the case against the concept of foreign aid as presently practiced by the United States more forcefully or convincingly than did the respected columnist, George E. Sokolsky, in his column which appeared in the March 14 issue of the Washington Post. Mr. Sokolsky skillfully points out with irrefutable documentation how the present aid concept has failed to win friends or influence nations and how it is impossible for a free nation like ours to win in a contest of bribery with the Soviet Union. This column more closely represents the views of the junior Senator from Georgia than any presentation he has seen to date. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN AID

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Prof. Hans J. Morgenthau, an expert in foreign affairs, is often critical of the logic of our effort to operate in this field without a fixed policy, so that those with whom we are dealing can know what it is. The term "world opinion" is negative because that does not represent a positive approach but is an uncertain reaction to a shifting pressure. He says:

"As it has developed in recent years, our policy of foreign aid is fundamentally weak. It has been conceived as a self-sufficient technical enterprise, covering a multitude of disparate objectives and activities responding haphazardly to all kinds of demands, sound and unsound, unrelated or only by accident related to the political purposes of our foreign policy * * *."

This has unfortunately been true since the inauguration of the Marshall plan and the results are not satisfactory for if we wanted to win friends and influence nations by aid, we have not succeeded in doing so. Our remaining friends are only those nations which must be on our side out of self-interest, or are those which belong to the so-called West, which means that they can only avoid being conquered as long as they hang together.

On the other hand, aid can be a form of bribe to governments and it must be pointed out that such bribes have not been unusual in history. Morgenthau provides numerous instances. The great Talleyrand was not above taking bribes and presents as he passed from one stage to another of his amazing career. In the 20th century, this is a dangerous business. Soviet Russia bribes more effectively than we do because Russian machinery for that purpose is more efficient. A bribe can also be used for political blackmail and therefore the Russians have the advantage of secrecy, for they need not report. Our attempt to conduct secret diplomacy via the CIA has not been too effective because somehow it leaks out.

For purposes of bribery, therefore, a totalitarian government, such as Soviet Russia's, is more effective than a nation that is controlled by a free institution like Congress, representing the people. It is difficult to record a single instance in recent years of bribery succeeding on our side. The best example is Tito of Yugoslavia, who has received upward of a billion dollars from us since foreign aid started. The advantage has been that Tito, while a Communist, has not been absorbed by the Soviet Universal State, but he would not have been anyhow, certainly not during the era of Stalin, for Tito believes in national rather than universal communism.

Furthermore, in all critical situations in the United Nations, Tito voted against the United States, joining with Nehru and Nasser in organizing the uncommitted nations. On the whole, it can be said that while Tito has been a troublemaker within the Soviet Universal State, he has always created many difficulties for the United States, whose foreign-aid policy it has been to keep him in power.

Perhaps the greatest weakness in our foreign-aid policy has been that it has stimulated jealousy among nations. For instance, we poured enormous sums into the rehabilitation of our former enemies but we ignored the Latin American countries close at hand, with the result that Latin American jealousy has stimulated the anti-American and pro-Communist movements in those countries.

This subject requires restudy. Foreign aid is of three sorts: military, economic, humantiarian. Which type can we afford to retain? Which type will bring us the greatest benefit? We ought to get a net return for our pains.

Time To Get Moving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I call attention to an editorial in the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner of March 10, 1962.

As the editorial which follows suggests, now is the time to get moving on the great B-70 program. Already, there have been too many delays.

TIME TO GET MOVING

The B-70 bomber controversy, which has been alternately on the back and front of the stove for months, is boiling again. It is a dispute that involves the vital question of the Nation's security, and it has been pulled and hauled around, and back and forth, far too long.

Our position is identical with that of Gen. Curtis LeMay, Air Chief of Staff.

It is that while we have made notable advances in missiles and let's hope will continue to do so, manned bombers will be essential to our deterrent strength for a long time to come. We cannot afford to put our security eggs in one missile basket.

President Kennedy and Defense Secretary McNamara are resisting pressure from the House Armed Services Committee, headed by Representative CARL VINSON, to spend an additional $491 million for stepped-up production of the B-70 program. Three prototypes are in the works—to what degree of progress we do not know—at a cost of $180 million.

The Air Force program calls for 140 of these bombers, at a cost estimated by the President at $10 billion. They could not be operational until 1970 or 1971. The President's argument is that we ought to see how the prototypes work out before going ahead full throttle.

All right, but let's get going as fast as possible, and spend as much money as needed, in getting those prototypes into being. In addition to their security importance, they have also great potential value in the development of America's commercial airliners of the future. Let's stop stalling.

Meanwhile, the B-70 issue has aroused additional controversy as to the rights and duties of Congress as opposed to the executive branch of the Federal Government.

Congressman VINSON has raised this point:

"It is eminently clear that the role of Congress in determining national policy, de-

fense, or otherwise, has deteriorated over the years."

VINSON added that "Perhaps this is the time and the occasion to reverse the trend." Certainly it is a cause for public concern.

Oregon Independent Grocery Association Representatives Meet With Secretary of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Association Representatives Meet With Secretary of Agriculture." The article was published in the Oregon Independent Grocer for February 1962. This is a very important article, Mr. President, and deals with some of the problems which confront this retail grocers' association.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSOCIATION REPRESENTATIVES MEET WITH SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

SPOKANE, February 12.—Three representatives of the Oregon Independent Retail Grocers Association met here today with Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman and made a formal request for the establishment of the food stamp plan of distribution of surplus foods in Oregon as soon as possible.

Claude Hall, association director and chairman of the legislative committee, presented a written statement to Freeman in which the association outlined specific reasons why the food stamp plan should be considered for Oregon, Jerry Horn, association director, Lebanon, and Harold E. Carlson, secretary, also participated in the meeting and made statements in support of the food stamp plan.

"Many sections of Oregon have been penalized by a high percentage of unemployment during this winter because of curtailed production of lumber and lumber products. Due to this high unemployment, welfare rolls have also been greatly increased and the State of Oregon has had difficulty in meeting welfare demands and in providing an adequate diet for all welfare beneficiaries.

"Eleven Oregon counties are distributing surplus foods through local welfare distribution centers which are not properly equipped to handle foods in an efficient and economical manner in comparison to the distribution services which are available at independent and chain food markets.

"Welfare and old-age beneficiaries who are eligible for an allotment of surplus foods under the present standards as established by county and State welfare agencies must travel to the nearest central county food distribution center in order to secure their monthly allotment of surplus foods.

"The food stamp plan of distribution of surplus foods has already been established on a 'pilot program' basis in a number of areas including Detroit, Mich.; Ohio, suburbs of Chicago and other designated distress areas. This food stamp plan has been reported as being successful during the past 6 months in which it has been in operation in these test areas according to representatives of the Food Marketing Service of the Department of Agriculture.

"We also have been informed that the U.S. Department of Agriculture plans to expand the operation of the food stamp plan of distribution of surplus foods within the near future.

"In behalf of the Oregon independent grocery industry, we therefore urge that you as Secretary of Agriculture should give every consideration to the establishment of the food stamp plan in Oregon within the near future.

"Our association and its membership pledges its cooperation in assisting your Department in any manner possible in registering the food markets and promoting the best cooperation possible with your Department in carrying out the food stamp plan of distribution of surplus foods in Oregon.

"Oregon is composed of 36 counties which represent a large geographical area. Therefore the establishment of central country distribution centers for handling surplus foods by the local county welfare agencies would require old-age and welfare recipients to travel long distances in order to receive their monthly surplus food allotments. We are confident that most of these people would prefer to have the privilege of receiving food stamps and to have the convenience of redeeming them at their local community food markets.

"We wish to express our appreciation for your courtesy in meeting with our Oregon association committee and thank you for the consideration which you have given to our statements." (End of quote.)

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WELLINGTON, ILL.,
March 5, 1962.

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you very much for the copy of your House Resolution 211 and the article on it. I would like to ask for another copy of the resolution because I gave my copy to a friend who is passing it around.

I certainly hope this resolution goes through and I will ask my Representative, LES ARENDS, to give it favorable consideration.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

JUDY THOMAS,
Mrs. Jerry Thomas.

TULSA, OKLA.
February 24, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have read with great interest your proposal for a Special Committee on Captive Nations. It seems today that many political leaders support freedom in only some ports of the world. I wish to extend my complete approval of your move to help these often forgotten, enslaved nations. I should like to ask for any information on this committee and its work which is available.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD E. JOHNSON.

JOHN FLYNN & SONS, INC.,
Salem, Mass., March 6, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM BATES,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: In writing you, I would like to voice my wholehearted support in favor of Congressman FLOOD's Resolution 211. Of the many captive nations bills submitted on the Hill, I believe this one to be of paramount importance because it provides for a special House Committee on Captive Nations. This committee would, of course, have the full powers of a congressional committee. Consequently, it would be a separate entity able to work decisively, effectively, and objectively without being hampered by the red-tape and protocol of the larger bureaucratic organizations that muddle about in the field of captive nations policymaking.

Moreover, this singular committee would be, in my opinion, a prolific source of cold war propaganda. The United States could assume the role of matchmaker, promoting Albania against Russia one week and Russia against Red China the week after. Also, it would furnish vast amounts of material for such organizations as the Voice of America. Lastly, in establishing this committee, America, through its Congress, could launch the most valuable propaganda campaign in the history of the cold war with what is probably the most effective cold war weapon—captive peoples; now, it is merely a question of overcoming our apathy or timidity in using it. Therefore, I urge you to vote for and support House Resolution 211.

Very truly yours,

PATRICK J. FLYNN.

MINNEAPOLIS BOARD OF REALTORS,
Minneapolis, Minn., February 26, 1962.
Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I would sincerely appreciate a copy of House Resolution 211, to form a special Committee on Captive Nations.

Thank you very much for your kind consideration.

Very truly yours,

LEE DOUCETTE,
Executive Secretary.

Medical Care for the Aged: A Response

SPEECH
OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, during the hearings of the Ways and Means Committee into the subject of health services for the aged under the social security system, July 24 through August 4, 1961, Dean J. Douglas Brown, professor of economics of Princeton University, testified and presented a prepared statement he had presented before a Senate subcommittee in March 1960. The dean stated that no one in opposition to the extension of the OASDI program to include hospital care for the aged had challenged the facts or the reason in his analysis.

I stated that though I had not had at that time gone over his statement that I certainly did challenge both his facts and his reasons and that I would be pleased to read the details of it and supply him with my criticism.

Unfortunately over 4 months transpired before the committee hearings were printed and made available to the members of the committee or to the public—which is another story and a serious one—so I was unable to reply to Dean Brown until recently.

On January 16, 1962, I replied to Dean Brown. On January 22, 1962, he replied to my letter. I believe that both of these letters should be a matter of public record. Certainly my letter to Dean Brown should be public information particularly as several people who have since had an opportunity of reading the hearings have written to me for copies of my letter to Dean Brown.

Accordingly, I am setting out the two letters:

JANUARY 16, 1962.

Dean J. DOUGLAS BROWN,
Dean of the Faculty and Professor of Economics, Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.

DEAR DEAN BROWN: During your testimony on Thursday, July 27, 1961, before the Ways and Means Committee on the subject of health care for the aged, you stated concerning the prepared statement you had given in March 1960, before the Senate committee, "although it had been widely circulated, no one in opposition to the extension of the OASDI program to include hospital care for the aged beneficiaries has challenged the facts or the reason in my analysis of the program we face."

When I began my interrogation of you, I stated, "It has not been called to my attention but I can assure you it is challenged as of now and I shall be pleased to read the details of it and supply you with my criticism."

A little later, as the result of the acting chairman of the committee interposing in my method of questioning you, I terminated my questioning with this statement, "I will prepare an answer, however, to your statement and send it to you so that you can then, at least, recognize there are people who disagree with you."

The committee hearings terminated on August 4, 1961, were not printed and made available until the second week of December, a rather disturbing thing, inasmuch as they contained much data and material which should have been available to the public as soon as possible. Hence, this delay in carrying out my intended course of action.

Of course, I have made many public speeches on the floor of the House and elsewhere which effectively contradicted most of the points you sought to make. These speeches certainly challenged your conclusions. However, I have gone over your paper specifically.

I agree with item 1 of your analysis. The proportion of the aged to the working population will continue to rise. However, I would add this caveat: so long as the health professions continue to meet with the amazing success they have been meeting with in the past in improving the health and extending the life expectancy of our people. Seriously damage our health care institutions and professions, and this trend could be very quickly reversed. This is what I believe the King bill or any compulsory health program through social security would do.

Item 2. "The costs of living for the aged, and particularly the necessary costs of health care, will continue to rise." If we continue to mishandle our fiscal policies so that we have more inflation, this will regrettably be true. However, I would never base the premise for a sound program upon the assumption of continued inflation. It is true if quality improvements continue in standard of living, including health care, as I trust they will, and we fail to divide up the productivity gains which usually accompany these advancements fairly between wages, investment return and price to consumer, there may be continued rising costs from this cause which, though similar to inflation, is not correctly so labeled. Neither of these two premises upon which your conclusion is based can rest unchallenged.

Item 3. "Since it is clear from experience that the current income of most superannuated persons will be inadequate to meet these rising medical costs, the excess of current costs over current income will need to be provided by one or more of the following means."

This begs the question. One of the basic items our committee has been trying to get accurate data on is what are the income capabilities of our older people. There has been more misleading half-information on this subject than almost any other aspect of the problem. What we are trying to get information and data on you blithely conclude "is clear from experience." What kind of scholarship is this? What data do you leave another scholar to benefit from to analyze or to challenge?

The misleading half-information I refer to is that which states that an older person's medical expenses are higher than that of any other age bracket, in a context that leads the student to believe that this gives a true picture of the older person's total budgetary expenses in relation to other age groups. As a matter of fact, every other item in an older person's budget is less than that of any other age group * * * food, clothing, shelter, recreation, transportation. Many items are no longer in an older person's budget which are in the budgets of almost every other age bracket. The net result is that the older person's total expenditures are less than those of any other age bracket, including the one more costly item, medical expense.

Furthermore, figures have been given of median income of aged people per person, rather than per family, to create the impression that the older people have much less income than a proper analysis of their income by couple, within a family or whatever reveals. Furthermore, the fact that older people have more equities, more savings, more liquid assets, more personal property than other age groups is usually ignored. Seventy percent own their own homes. Most of these homes are fully paid for. Their average equity in their home is $8,300.

The manner in which you advance the second point in your analysis seeks to capture some of this misleading overtone by the emphasis on the heavy medical costs without a proper reference to all aspects of an older person's budget and well-being.

By my disagreement with your blanket and a priori assertion, I do not mean that I believe there is no budget problem which faces some of our older people. The questions we are seeking to find the answers to are how many older persons do face a budgetary problem? How acute is this problem? Your unsubstantiated assertion throws no light on this matter.

You will find in the testimony in the hearings much information on the subject which is extremely helpful. The Delaware study (pp. 1219–1933), State of Washington study (pp. 1014–1056), North Dakota study (pp. 584–596), Texas study (pp. 855–921), Vermont study (pp. 156–1569) and Oregon study (pp. 1531–1539) in particular. These studies strongly refute your unsubstantiated assertion.

You list only six ways in which the assumed budgetary problem of the older people can be met. For the sake of further criticizing your presentation, let me tentatively accept your unfounded premises and check out your syllogism.

First, in none of the six ways you set out do you refer to what I would say are the priorities in caring for our older people in our society. The first responsibility is the person himself or herself. This is "means (a)" which you list. The second is the person's family. You completely skip this. The third is the person's church. You completely skip this. The fourth is the person's employer; perhaps in this respect you regard a person's personal savings to include employee retirement programs. It is true in our sophisticated economy the close relationship between employer and employee has been minimized, and the extent to which employers cared for their retired personnel is probably not too big a factor. But it still is a factor and you skip it. The fifth is the neighbors, formalized into community chest agencies or, just unorganized, which you skip. Sixth is the local government. Seventh is the State government.

After these seven have participated in order we can start considering what part the Federal Government might have to play to supplement or take over the full burden.

Your concept with which I disagree is based upon Federal planning which eliminates all the institutions in our society which I have enumerated. You may wish to argue that these institutions should be eliminated, but good scholarship does not call for your ignoring them.

I think you are required to advance your reason why you feel that those institutions have no part to play in meeting this problem and why they cannot properly and effectively meet it. This as I pointed out, you do not do.

Then I would observe that your suggested six means are by no means exclusive each to itself. Certainly "(a) personal savings," is a base for all of the other five.

But to get to the real meat of what I believe in our disagreement. Why have you eliminated from your list, prepaid health insurance * * * paid for during a person's working years? That is all a compulsory program of health care through the social security system provides when it matures. As I asked you in my brief interrogation, what is there about prepaid health insurance during one's working years that makes it peculiarly and only workable through Government? The answer is obvious. There is none. Indeed, somewhat the contrary. For many reasons which I allude to later, private companies are much better suited to handle programs of prepaid health insurance than the Government.

Many labor-management contracts are being written today which call for health insurance to accompany the worker into retirement * * * prepaid. The cost of this is borne out of the worker's productivity during his working years. This is done privately and extensively, increasingly so.

You challenged my statement that private insurance companies were already offering health insurance fully paid up at 65, with immediate coverage at the time of taking it out, whether the age was 20, 30, or what. But the record is there for you to read (p. 838 of the hearings). The premium is, of course, lower the younger the person is. One reason private companies can do this is the gain they can obtain from the life expectancy factor. A person at 20 is paying a higher premium than he would pay if he merely had an annual policy, because this premium is leveled out over the 45 years he is paying. If that person dies at 40, the insurance company gains in the higher premiums collected. Those who live on to the age of 65 gain the benefit from this actuarial factor. There are other saving aspects which make private insurance feasible, not the least of which is the fact that private insurance companies can invest their reserve funds in the living economy. Government, of course, can put it only in Government bonds which are sterile.

I suggest that instead of dismissing the insurance industry as schizophrenics as your statement attempted to do, you study some of their testimony and, particularly, read the list of policies, pages 819 through 840, that are now available to older people and all people in our society in the rapidly advancing field of health insurance. Beginning on page 819 and going through page 840 of the hearings is the report of the Health Insurance Institute on "Guaranteed Lifetime Health Insurance, for Persons Over 65, for Persons Under 65" dated July 1961. Beginning on page 831 running through page 837 are the plans of 53 companies for guaranteed renewable lifetime hospital-surgical expense plans—issued to persons under 65 years of age. Selected yearly premium range: $84.80 to $233.60; male, 55. On page 838 are the plans of seven national insurance companies, Aetna, Continental Assurance, Continental Casualty, Empire State Mutual Life, Metropolitan Life, Prudential Insurance, and Security Life Insurance, for guaranteed renewable lifetime hospital-surgical expense plans fully paid up at 65, selected yearly premium range: $80.64 to $188.60; male, 35. On page 839 through 840 are the plans of 12 national insurance companies for guaranteed renewable major medical plans with lifetime coverage or extended benefits beyond 65. Selected yearly premium range: $40.45 to $91.92; male, 45.

Then I would call your attention to a point I have been trying to make for some time. We have two distinct problems in this matter of health care for the aged.

1. We have the problem of the present group of people over 65. They reached this age when there was little noncancellable health insurance available, when there was practically no labor-management agreements that provided for prepaid health insurance after the worker retired and there was little private prepaid health insurance for retirement available. Such a group as we now have over 65 will never be with us again, because people now becoming 65 increasingly have had a chance to get this kind of health insurance and they increasingly have it. (See charts pp. 799 to 800 showing increase of coverage of all ages from 59 percent in 1952 to 73 percent in 1959 and for people over 65, 31 percent in 1952 to 53 percent in 1959.) In other words, our first problem is a problem that is phasing out. We can figure what the costs of this group might be and move to meet it. The Kerr-Mills Act is available for that purpose.

2. The second problem is to see that people over 65 in the future have health insurance. This is the permanent program. This is the program that is springing into existence under our very eyes, when today over 75 percent of our people have health insurance.

Then I would say what I have said so many times. The greatest problem of the aged today in health care is not lack of money as much as it is lack of facilities. There are not enough efficient, healthy, safe, well-run nursing homes. There aren't enough visiting nurses to enable an older person to remain in the bosom of the family. In both these areas, as a legislator, I have moved forward by sponsoring bills which are now law.

1. FHA guarantees to private nursing homes which meet these high standards, and

2. Extending Federal aid to vocational education for practical nurses.

These laws are doing much to ease the health cost burdens of our older people, including reducing the health insurance premiums.

I must refer to the colloquy between us which appears on the bottom of page 555 of the hearings. You answered one of my questions with one of your nonsequiturs as follows:

"In the McNamara hearings a policyholder of the Omaha Co. which you mentioned testified that when he became ill they canceled a noncancelable policy."

Although this had nothing to do with what I was interrogating you about, I allowed you to distract me by responding to your observation. I said, "I will have to examine that."

"Dr. BROWN. It is in the record.

"Mr. CURTIS. I understand it is in the record. I find that that sort of reference, when you get into detail, usually it does not come out. You will pardon me if I take exception to that.

"Dr. BROWN. Congressman, you can believe anything you want that I say or not. All I say, as a student of the subject, is that that type of insurance paid for over 30 and 40 years, to be paid out in 10 or 20 years of old age, is virtually impossible to organize or sell." (How wrong you are as witness the policies listed on pages 819–840.)

Note, Dr. Brown, how I merely stated that I will have to examine into the details of a generality that was testified to in the record, yet you unfairly treat it as if I were questioning your veracity.

What I am obviously probing is your scholarship. Since when does good scholarship permit you to take a broad general statement of a witness as irrefutable proof that what the witness says is true? Particularly when it is attacking the integrity of someone else? Nor does that mean that the witness is a liar. He may be ignorant, he may be mistaken. Why do fellow scholars go over each other's work papers? Because they think they are liars or cheats? Of course not. It is because we all know we can and frequently are mistaken.

Now, please read the interrogation I conducted of this same witness, Mr. Eugene S. Simmons, who fortuitously did appear before our committee later, pages 1192–1200 of the hearings. I did follow through, as I told the witness I would, on the one aspect of the matter where I thought the insurance company might have been in error. I am enclosing a copy of the final response from the insurance company for you to read.

In other words, what I had merely surmised from previous experiences turned out to be exactly true, "when you get into detail it usually does not come out." Far from the older person being abused it was the insurance company that was abused and you put your name as a scholar behind this unfair attack? Your whole testimony conforms to this example. It avoided details like the plague. You cited no authorities; showed no working papers. You only talked of 40 years of scholarship but did not exercise it.

I grow increasingly disturbed about America when I find men with reputations for top scholarship; men who possess Ph. D degrees and teach in some of our outstanding institutions of learning, indulging in this kind of scholarship, and becoming arrogant and insulting if someone tries to check over their working papers.

If I seem unduly harsh in my expression, it is only because I feel so deeply the need to shake our good people, and I regard you as one, out of this dangerous game of believing those who are in disagreement are lacking in humanity or are ignorant or are crazy. The exact words you used were that the representatives of organized medicine were motivated "by defense of special interest," that political representatives of any large organization were "the last to recognize that times have changed, because this requires thought." And that "the leaders in private insurance are enjoying a siege of schizophrenia."

You are advocating a program, the King bill, which will help only the older people on social security, not the 3 million people who were born too soon ever to be covered by social security, the very people who probably need help the most.

The people the King bill will help includes millions of older people who need no help. These people, some of them the richest in America, will not pay 1 cent for the coverage the King bill would extend to them. This coverage would be paid for by a tax on wages up to $5,200. All wages and salaries above $5,200 would escape paying any tax. All income from investments and sources other than wages would be exempt from this tax.

Under what possible justification even granting we had as serious social problem as you say we have can you pass the cost of this program onto the backs of the lowest wage earners through a regressive payroll tax of this nature? If this is a social problem the cost should be borne out of general revenue where the graduated income tax assumes the greatest burden.

Now if you want to start from scratch and begin a program of health care for all people on social security who pay in something and so gain coverage just as we did with the original Social Security Act that is something else again. However, this is the group not yet 65 and this is the group that is pretty generally covered by health insurance today, an increasing amount of which is prepaid.

The answer is the promoters of the King bill can't make their case when they relate the problem to the permanent program. Their case must be made for the present

population over 65 in the guise that their problems are the same as the people who have not yet reached this age. This is just not the case.

The hearings revealed what the King bill is really about. It is just the beginning as Aime Forand was fair enough to state the Forand bill to be just the beginning.

Both bills call for the Department of Health, Eduaction, and Welfare to enter into contracts with the hospitals and other health institutions covered fixing fees and rates. Obviously if a hospital or institution was in disagreement with the HEW on a fee or a rate that hospital could not take a social security patient and be paid the cost out of social security funds.

This means that those who selected this hospital or this institution could not use it. It means that if their doctor was on the board of that hospital and not listed to practice on a hospital that was in contract with HEW the patient could not have that doctor.

This is the reason the Forand bill, the King bill or any bill which utilizes the social security system on a compulsory basis leads to socialized medicine and denies the free choice of hospital and doctor. That is why such a system would cause the deterioration of our health institutions.

We have the greatest health care system in the world today. Its success, not its failure, has created the problems we are talking about. It is our system's success that has permitted people to live 10 years longer. This creates the problem of financing this extra 10 years of life. I suggest that the way to solve our new problems and to gain more success is to improve the system that produced the success, not cast it aside and adopt a radically different system which has proven unsuccessful wherever it has been tried. This latter course would create poorer health care for all of us, including our older citizens.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

RESPONSE FROM THE INSURANCE COMPANY

Mr. Simmons purchased a policy form 36 in 1929. This policy provided mainly income protection insurance designed to pay a monthly income while the policyowner was disabled and not working. The premium was $36 per year.

During the years 1929 through 1958, Mr. Simmons received benefits on 17 different occasions, totaling $942.16.

In the fall of 1958, Mr. Simmons filed for benefits for phlebitis and listed his occupation on the application for benefits as retired. Since his policy was not designed for a person who was not working, such as fire insurance is not designed for one who does not own a home, we offered to replace Mr. Simmons' policy with a plan which would pay benefits for hospitalization. Subsequently, we offered our well-known senior security plan to him.

Through personal contact and letters, we emphasized the importance of this coverage to him. We encouraged and actually urged him to accept this new plan, but he refused.

Mr. Simmons gives the impression that we accepted his premiums from 1952 through 1958 knowing that he was retired. Actually the first notification of his retirement was in late 1958.

Mr. Simmons reports that "10 or 15 years ago I received a notice from the company that they were increasing benefits to include a portion of the hospital bills." No such action was ever taken with regard to Mr. Simmons' policy or as a matter of fact to any policy which we offered at that time.

In his statements and in the press coverage thereof, Mr. Simmons has indicated we simply canceled his policy. These statements are just not accurate. True, we did not renew his form 36 policy because he no longer qualified, but we did offer him continuing coverage for which he qualified and for which he had a greater need. We notified him of this as soon as we knew he retired.

Mr. Simmons' specific question at this time seems to be in regard to the fact that we accepted his premiums from 1952 to 1959. We did so because we did not know he was retired. Had he notified us, we would have offered him a conversion policy similar to the one offered when we were finally notified.

There is no question about the premiums being earned since during those years Mr. Simmons qualified for benefits under the old policy and we were obligated to pay these benefits and did. We could convert his policy only after we had paid those benefits covered by the policy. Hence, we retained the liability during those years.

We will be having another senior security enrollment beginning February 1, and this will afford Mr. Simmons an excellent opportunity to secure this coverage. We would, of course, be very pleased if Mr. Simmons took advantage of this opportunity.

One part of Mr. Simmons' testimony needs clarification. It is true that the company collected premiums from Mr. Simmons from 1952 until 1958. We did this because it was not until 1958 that Mr. Simmons notified us that he was retired. Had we known he retired in 1952, we would have taken the same action as we did in 1958. In that interval of 6 years, Mr. Simmons paid the company a total of $192 in premiums. During that time, on March 21, 1952, he applied for benefits and was paid $40; on October 14, 1952, he applied for and was paid $106.66 in benefits; on October 31, 1955, he applied for and was paid $50 in benefits; and on September 19, 1958, he applied for and was paid $112.50 in benefits—a total of $309.16. So it appears that the policyowner was more than adequately compensated during these intervening years.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY,
Princeton, N.J., January 22, 1962.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CURTIS: I appreciate your long letter concerning my statement in the hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means last July on health care for the aged. I am faced with a serious problem in giving you an extended answer since I must enter the hospital on Wednesday for an operation which will put me out of circulation until March. Meanwhile, as senior educational officer here, I am under great pressure in clearing my desk.

It must be remembered that I was given but 10 minutes for my statement before your committee. Much of the data supporting my conclusions were in the statement of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the supporting documents he presented. I had reviewed extensive material on the subject for Secretary Fleming earlier. I have long been associated with the Social Security Administration on various councils and committees as well as informally since the original legislation was passed and have found their statistical studies to be trustworthy. All I can say is that I have used only data in which I have confidence. I am not affiliated with any party of interest and have been on tenure at Princeton since 1934. I am deeply concerned in solving the problem of taking care of our older citizens in the most effective manner, and came to support the proposed extensions of OASDI only after careful study.

To me, the proposed extension of OASDI is the truly conservative method of meeting the problem of health care for the aged.

The aged face a very different set of factors than the currently employed. Theirs is a life risk, involving risks which come after working life is over for most, and for which arrangements must be made to transfer financing from one long period in life to another of uncertain length, as in OASDI generally. Further, their costs are higher and their ability to adjust to costs far less.

I feel strongly that the social insurance method of meeting hospital care for the aged is truly more conservative than the general tax-relief method. The latter is most difficult to control, is essentially open-end, involves sharp differentials between States, leads to abuse, and undermines the basic sense of self-relance which is a precious asset to be conserved in our way of life. Human resources are our greatest asset, but such resources are not just human beings, but human beings with valued attributes of self-reliance and motivation. The United States faces a problem of growing dimensions in protecting our older citizens without undermining self-reliance. I am convinced that we will meet this problem with least cost and least loss through the social insurance method. With the rising costs of health protection in old age, the advantages of a contributory OASDI program will be increasingly offset if relief payments for health care become a larger and larger supplement to old age insurance benefits.

The need for positive intervention by the Federal Government in protecting our aged citizens arises out of forces which are, in large measure, beyond our control: increasing life expectancy, a shifting balance of aged to general population, rapid industrialization which reduces employment for the aged, rapid urbanization which increases living costs for the aged, the declining purchasing power of savings over the longer span of life and, more recently, the rapid rise in cost and complexity of health services. These conditions are nationwide, and find the States in widely differing circumstances in meeting them. Subsidization of State relief programs, while needed as a residual method, is inadequate and yet costly in meeting the major basic problem. The only effective method of meeting the basic problem, I sincerely believe is Federal social insurance. I am enclosing a clipping which you may have seen.

The hope that private insurance can meet the basic problem of health care for the aged is, I am convinced, as futile as was the hope that private savings and insurance would make OASDI unnecessary. The missing elements in private insurance are lack of compulsion, lack of wide and uniform coverage, and the ability under current plus limited reserve financing to meet changing costs through time. Many insurance executives realize this. With keen competition and the need to protect their solvency, private insurance carriers must continue to restrict contractual health benefits for the aged in the fact of great uncertainties and the need to keep premiums attractive. Private insurance will continue to be a valuable method to supplement basic protection for older persons of above-average income, but, I am convinced, it cannot do the basic job.

The cost of hospital service to the aged has come to be too great to be met by millions of aged, by voluntary support, or by many local communities. As a member of our local United Fund board and in studies of our local hospital, I have seen this problem grow serious even in a prosperous community. My State, like many others, needs to spend far more on mental hospitals before it should assume a greatly extended support of hospital services for the aged. There should be a new source for the latter support, not involving State and local financing for the majority of aged persons. The best new source is a payroll tax under Federal social insurance. This, to me, is practical economics, and should be weighed as such.

The doctors of the country have every professional reason to fight for adequate health care for the aged and for us all.

But, after many years of study, as an economist, I cannot see how they can assure such care without a new means of financing it in the case of the greatly increased proportion of aged persons. They have conceded the fact that insurance is necessary. But private insurance can't do the job. As far as interference with professional freedom is concerned, the relief method is much more likely to intervene and encourage abuse than the insurance method. Under limited and varying local budgets, their fees, number of visits, and extent of services are likely to be arbitrarily adjusted to local and changing financial circumstances. One is led to believe, therefore, that the opposition of the American Medical Association is more political than professional, and more a resistance to change, than a recognition of how best to adjust to changing conditions in our country.

I sincerely hope that you will have time to consider the points I have outlined. I do assume to be a scholar in this field; if I am not, I have been in the wrong job for a long time. I fully realize, however, that I am in a field in which attitudes on policy differ widely, but that does not relieve me of the obligation to be as judicious as possible. If I can add to this very brief analysis after I return from the hospital, do let me know. If you want to check on my general reliability, do ask Charlie Thomas, Clark Hungerford, or Donald Danforth in the St. Louis area.

With kindest personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

J DOUGLAS BROWN.

On Trusting Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include an article by the Reverend Clay Cooper, of Spokane, who is the leader of an influential and spiritual group who conduct the projects of "Vision" in the Inland Empire.

This article, Reverend Cooper states, is a distillation of 12 years of Bible research to learn what God may be trying to say to our Christian Nation, and surveys in more than 50 nations.

The article follows:

SHALL AMERICA NEGOTIATE

(By Clay Cooper)

The time has come for something to be said, from the Scriptural standpoint, on this business of negotiating between the professedly Godly nation and one avowedly, boastfully atheistic. Especially when such negotiations impinge upon moral values, involve the spiritutl good of humanity and prevent, or delay, the "doing of God's will on earth." The purchase of Alaska from the Russians was one thing. The artful give and take which jeopardizes, in some cases surrenders, the temporal and eternal welfare of mankind is quite another matter.

Our day is cursed with a brand of summitry which, after bargaining and compromise, seals off huge pieces of the world from the blessings and benefits of Christianity. The question here, is this: What nation has the moral prerogative to sell the spiritual birthright of another for a temporizing mess of pottage?

THE NATIONAL DIRECTIVE

Now, first of all, one cardinal point must be thoroughly understood. It is this: The function of the Christian nation may be quite different from that of the Christian church. The church's job includes the evangelizing of the world with the "truth that makes men free," on a purely nonpolitical, nonmilitary level. "My kindom is not of this world * * * else my servants would fight," said Jesus. The mission of the church is missions * * * minus force. But there is also a national directive. It has often been a punitive one, including the waging of holy wars. Proof of this can be found in the record of God's own judgment falling upon a chosen people who were cursed only for, "keeping back the sword from blood." This failure is viewed, in Holy Writ, as a national crime and described as "neglecting the work of the Lord." (Jeremiah 48: 10.)

WHAT ABOUT DIVINE SANCTION?

The records show God as having sometimes used a nation "called by His Name," to rise up and destroy a godless one when great issues were at stake. On the other hand, there is the total absence of divine sanction on the matter of negotiation.

NEGOTIATE OR DEMAND . . . WHICH?

Moses, the leader of Israel, did not appear before the mighty Pharoh, King of Egypt, to negotiate, but to demand "Let my people go" (Exodus 5:1). Pharaoh called for negotiations. He expressed willingness, four times over, to give a little and take a little, each time giving a little more. He suggested first that the Israelites "go sacrifice in my land." This was unacceptable. Then, "go * * * but don't go very far away." This was flatly turned down. Next, "go ye that are men * * * leave your wives and children behind." (Exodus 8). But Moses was adamant. He had not come to parley. He refused to bargain away, or concede, one single trifle. His obdurate reply to the final suggestion "Leave your flocks and herds," was classic! "Not a hoof shall be left behind."

GOD'S MEN REFUSED TO DICKER

Then there is the example in Nehemiah. The Samaritan leaders, realizing they could not overcome by open arms, resolved to employ deceit and strategem. With amicable manner, they invited him to dicker at the conference table. Nehemiah turned down one invitation after the other. Four of them. He refused on the grounds, "I am too busy. Why should the work cease, whilst I leave it and come down to you" (Nehemiah 6:3). The fifth invitation got the same reply. First came ridicule. Then came threats. Then came compromise, the invitation to negotiate. (How similar were the ancient tactics to today's.) But all offers were categorically rejected, and in the will of God too.

God-fearing statesmen have always been at their best when refusing to bend. Patrick Henry's shining hour came when he shouted, "Give me liberty or give me death." Such a position in this day of togetherness may seem extreme, and capable of dire results. But what of it? The still pertinent question is, "What fellowship hath light with darkness, what concord hath Christ with Belial?" (2 Corinthians 6:14).

WHAT OF PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE?

Peaceful coexistence was out of the question when the ark of God was placed in the house of Dagon. Something had to give, and it was Dagon who fell on his face (1 Samuel 5). Oil and water simply do not mix, and for a people "called by God's name" to negotiate with the godless, is to do so on a Samson-Delilah basis. It has never yet been known to "work together for good." There never has been, and never will be, a basis for negotiating good, or evil; right or wrong; God, or Satan.

But what of the consequences? Perhaps failure to try to negotiate would mean war. Refusing to knuckle down a bit to tyranny, or to be diplomatic with dictators might result in annihilation. Isn't it better to be Red than dead? The Bible provides ready-made answers to such mushy thinking.

The atheist Rabshakeh, speaking in the name of King Sennacherib, appealed to the people of Israel, "Don't listen to your own King * * * make an agreement with me by a present * * * and come out to me." In return they were promised "every man his own vine and fig tree." How like the Utopian promises made by his counterpart today. The alternative was threatened annihilation (2 Kings 18 and 19). But what was the reaction? Stone silence. The people "held their peace, and answered him not a word: for the King's commandment was, answer him not." Do not negotiate.

Readers of Scripture will associate this firm refusal with the immediate intervention of God Almighty, and the miraculous slaughter of 185,000 of the enemy. To have negotiated would have been to invite disaster.

HIGH COST OF FRATERNIZATION

But how soon do men forget, and by the same token how often need to be reminded. Later, this same King Hezekiah invited representatives of the King of Babylon to view all "his precious things, the silver, gold, spices, etc.," and the results were catastrophic. Isaiah prophecied that as a direct consequence and penalty, "The days will come, that all that is in thine house * * * shall be carried into Babylon * * * and thy sons they shall take away" (2 Kings 20). Fraternization with Satanic forces, at high national levels, seems always to have been the precursor of what was hoped would be avoided. War. Carnage. Slavery. And then there were the Gibeonites who came with guile to Joshua, Israel's leader, and said, "now therefore make ye a league with us." Here again, was a classic mistake. "They asked not counsel at the mouth of the Lord," completed the pact, and with very unhappy results. (Joshua 9).

A DIVINE COUP D'ETAT

King Ahab, too, almost got entangled into committing his people by negotiation. Thirty-two kings joined in confederacy under Benhedad, King of Syria. They layed seige against Ahab and Israel. Their price of peace was the turning over of the nation's wealth and a large portion of its people, namely, the wives and children. Ahab agreed momentarily to what would have been ruinous to the nation. He then listened to the wise counsel of the elders and, just in time, reneged on the bargain. Marshaling his own men, he caught Benhedad in the midst of a drunken orgy, and disposed of him and the problem forthwith, under God. And just before the coup d'etat, he challenged his braggadocio with, "Let not him that girdeth on the (war) harness, boast himself as he that putteth it off." The poetic way of reminding Benhedad not to count hs chickens before they were hatched (1 Kings 20).

A NATION'S MORAL DUTY

It becomes the duty of the statesmen of every nation whose God is the Lord, to recognize the futility of trying to do business with the Devil by negotiating with atheistic regimes whose sworn plans and purposes include the segmenting of the world, piece by piece, and sealing each one off from its spiritual heritage and from God. A masterful strategy, but certainly one which no conscionable country could, or should, be a party to.

One question looms large. "What nation in this day can qualify as godly?" Some light is afforded by recalling that there was

perhaps not a time when Israel was wholly sanctified in all its parts, yet God claimed the nation as "my people" (2 Chronicles 7:14). Likewise, no one will contend that all individual Americans are godly, but it can be truthfully said that any degree of alienation from God, by citizens in high places or low, is without official sanction. Ungodliness is unconstitutional, and un-American. And unpatriotic. The Lord is really an integral part of America. He is woven right into the warp and woof of the Constitution of the United States. So we may affirm, even if our citizenry is not saturatedly Christian, our Nation may still properly and constitutionally be designated as a godly nation. Further evidence?

A NATION UNDER GOD

On June 14, 1954, the Congress of the United States amended the pledge to the flag to include God's holy name. Every American citizen is now obliged to pledge allegiance to the flag representing a "Nation * * * under God." In 1955 an act of Congress provided that the inscription, "In God We Trust," which has appeared on coins since 1862, should also become a part of the design of all U.S. currency. Also under the Eisenhower administration, Congress passed a resolution making "In God We Trust" the official motto of the United States of America. And isn't there significance in the fact that our international postcards, and the prepaid reply card, both bear the same motto? It must mean something, too, that the official cancellation machines of the U.S. postal service register the appeal, "Pray for peace."

Every year, by presidential proclamation, there is a national day of prayer as well as a day of thanksgiving to God for His bounties. Each newly elected President, when taking the oath of office, voluntarily places his hand upon a Bible. The "Star Spangled Banner" goes: "May this heaven-rescued land, praise the power that hath wrought and preserved us a nation." Our national hymn concludes with the plea, "protect us by Thy might, great God our king."

If we must admit, shamefacedly, there is much to be desired in godliness on the personal and individual levels, certainly our Nation, as a nation, cannot be said to be Ungodly at the official, constitutional level.

SHOCKING RESPONSIBILITY POSED

This then, competely disqualifies us from conniving with a nation whose god is anti-God. It becomes the duty of every nation built along godly lines, resting on foundations of faith and recognizing the Lord as supreme, to assert her position as a "Nation Under God," and fulfill her moral obligations in the earth. These could be solemn, profound, even awful and shocking responsibilities.

Have we ever noted how large a part of sacred history is devoted to the violent overthrow, sometimes the obliteration, of corrupt, anti-God powers? If we recoil from the probability of our own land becoming God's instrument of destruction today, then we need to do some objective thinking. It has always been better that the godless nation be decimated, than that the godly nation should be assimilated.

What could seem to us as unspeakable tragedy, the annihilation of an atheistic power, might in the mind of God be but an incident * * * a necessary one. Look what He, Himself, did to Sodom and Gomorrah. To Nineveh. To the antediluvian world. Slicing off the head of Goliath was not a dainty duty for David, nor was the Philistine massacre that followed, pleasant. (1 Samuel 17). But God was in it, and the nation actually imbued by Him for the task.

JEHOVAH A GOD OF WAR

The Scriptures declare, "All nations are before Him as nothing" (Isaiah 40: 17). Then how much less than nothing the godless ones. When their cup of iniquity is full, God is never averse to war. "The adversaries of the Lord shall be broken to pieces," sooner or later (I Samuel 2: 10).

When God opened up His arsenal on ancient Egypt, the great empire was reduced to rubble (Exodus 6: 15). At the destruction of Jericho, there was nearly complete annihilation. Only one woman survived, and her near kinsmen. Samson prayed to the God of heaven, received strength, tugged at the pillars of the house where 3,000 pagan lords reveled, and it came crashing down on their heads. The backbone of the godless regime was broken. And what happened to Abimeleck? A woman cracked his skull open and "thus God rendered the wickedness of Abinelech" (Judges 9: 56). And what did He decree for "the first of the nations," Amalek? (Numbers 24: 20). "Thou shalt blot out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven," was the commission the spoilers were "not to forget" (Deuteronomy 25: 25). It's also interesting to read how the Reubenites, the Gadites and the half tribe of Manasseh "cried to God as they fought" and disintegrated the foe. God helped them to war in answer to prayer.

Of a onetime Arabian civilization, Isaiah prophesied, "Thus saith the Lord, within a year * * * no more, no less, shall Kedar's glory be all over and few shall be left of the archers of Kedar's army * * * for so the Lord, Israel's God, declares" (Isaiah 22: 16, 17).

Accounts could be multiplied from both sacred and profane history of God's destructive dealings with godless realms and kingdoms. And while He sometimes caused one to eat up another, it is also true that He frequently appointed the nation called by His name to utterly destroy another in order to perpetuate His honor and glory in the earth. And, when there was failure to do so, God's judgment would fall upon His own.

A NATIONAL WARNING

An ancient example of this, should serve as a warning to nations professing Him today, and still "mingling with the heathen." One reference will suffice. "They did not destroy the nations, concerning whom the Lord commanded them. * * * Therefore was the wrath of the Lord kindled against His people, and He gave them into the hand of the heathen" (Psalm 106). This could happen again * * * to us.

The national warnings of the prophets need to ring throughout the lands today. "Woe to them that go down to Egypt for help, looking not to the Lord (never heeding Israel's Majesty, never counseling the Eternal—Moffatt). The Egyptians (Russian and Chinese Communists, et al.) are but men, not God. Both supporter and supported shall collapse and crumble" (Isaiah 31—Moffat Translation). "Because you trust in wile and guile, and lean on your own policy * * * bent on no plan of mine, weaving a treaty I never sanctioned, the strength of Pharaoh shall be your shame. Your strength lies in ceasing to make leagues, your strength lies in quiet faith."

EVIL NONNEGOTIABLE

Having rediscovered these truths, that evil cannot be negotiated, that a nation owned by God is forbidden to enter an immoral give and take agreement with an atheistic power, and that dire consequences can only come to those which do; let those nations claiming God as Lord stand up and strike what ever blows are necessary, not so much to make the world safe for democracy as to smash the barriers that wicked systems have erected to prevent the doing of God's "will on earth." Let them stand up to their moral obligations * * * military too * * * and never fear the consequences of refusing to placate the godless. Said the Psalmist, "Through God we shall do valiantly." Isaiah added, "You must be calm. Never quail, never be afraid." And Moses declared, "If thou shalt harken diligently * * * the Lord shall set thee on high above all (godless) nations. The Lord shall make thee the head and not the tail. But if thou shalt not harken (to execute His commands), cursed shalt thou be in country and town."

These words and warnings, of one-time leaders of Judah and Israel are the guidelines for our own American statesmen, and those of all "Nations whose God is the Lord," today.

Agriculture Department Questioned About Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following exchange of correspondence between Hubert Alexander, a farmer of Rushville, Ind., and Louis M. Smith, Director, Livestock and Meat Products Division, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The article follows:

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT QUESTIONED ABOUT IMPORTS

RUSHVILLE, IND.

Because of the concern many of us have about the Government's efforts to open the doors for more agricultural imports, I thought readers of the Eastern Indiana Farmer may be interested in a reply I received today from the Department of Agriculture about these imports.

I think that 1 pound of imported ham is too much when hogs are selling for an average of $16.45 as reported in last week's Eastern Indiana Farmer, and I note that this price is $1.65 below that of a year ago. How can we expect to have good farm prices with importation of farm products? How can Government programs work to reduce production when they open the door to more imports?

HUBERT ALEXANDER.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE,
Washington, D.C.

Mr. HUBERT R. ALEXANDER,
Rushville, Ind.:

This is in reply to your letter of February 15 in regard to meat imports.

Imports of pork in 1961 were equivalent to 187 million pounds of dressed meat and 1.6 percent of domestic production. Most of the imports consisted of canned hams and shoulders from European countries and Canada and fresh and frozen pork from Canada. Demand for foreign canned hams continues fairly constant from year to year. During the past decade there has been a substantial increase in domestic production of canned hams.

Beef and veal imports have been relatively large since 1957, reflecting the higher cattle and beef prices in the United States and the advent of large shipments of these meats from New Zealand and Australia in 1958 and 1959. Formerly New Zealand and Australia were obligated to ship most of their surplus meat to the United Kingdom under long time arrangements, but they are now free to ship to all areas of the world. Most of the imports consist of frozen boneless beef and veal from Australia and New Zealand. Foreign supplies complement U.S. production by supplying lower grade processing meat

which we have not been producing in large enough quantities to meet the unusually strong demand. During the past 3 years, 57 percent or more of U.S. beef production has been produced from grain-fed cattle. Imported beef and veal is mostly used in processed products; most of the higher grade domestic beef is sold to consumers as fresh chilled cuts. Exporters to the United States incur fairly large transportation and marketing costs in addition to U.S. tariffs. The Department imposes inspection and sanitary controls to prevent the spread of livestock diseases and to insure that imported meat is fit for consumption. However, it has no authority to limit imports for economic reasons.

During 1961 the Department bought 41 million pounds of frozen ground beef and 26.7 million pounds of canned pork and gravy for schools participating in the national school lunch program. Since last August the Department has also bought 117.9 million pounds of canned chopped meat and 12.3 million pounds of frozen lamb carcasses for distribution to nonprofit charitable institutions and needy families and 83.3 million pounds of lard for these uses and distribution to schools.

All of the meat products which the USDA buys for school lunch and other programs must be prepared from animals slaughtered in the United States. Products produced for sale to the Government are produced in federally inspected plants and are packed under sufficient supervision to be assured that packers comply with this requirement.

Your local school might have purchased and served imported canned beef. Only a part of the products used in school lunch programs are bought by the Federal Government. Local schools have their own funds to buy additional products from local sources.

We appreciate your interest in this matter.

LOUIS M. SMITH,
Director, Livestock and Meat Products Division.

U.S.-Leased Air Bases in the Azores

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I inserted in the RECORD the first of a six-article series by Robert H. Estabrook, of the Washington Post, who has recently visited Lisbon and the Portuguese provinces in Africa. I respectfully commend the attention of my colleagues to the second installment of the series:

OFFICIAL LISBON TAKES NO BLAME FOR TROUBLES

(NOTE.—This is the second of six articles by the editor of the editorial page of the Washington Post who has just completed a trip to Lisbon and the Portuguese provinces in Africa.)

(By Robert H. Estabrook)

LONDON.—"If Portugal had been Adam," commented a foreign observer in Angola, "it would have complained that Eve alone caused all the trouble."

That, in essence, describes the attitude of influential members of the Portuguese Government in Lisbon following the abortive military revolt, the loss of Goa, the terrorism in Angola, and the criticism in the United Nations.

Talking to government officials in Lisbon, one is struck by their phenomenal ability to perceive the mote in everyone else's eye. Some of them are, or recently were, absolutely wallowing in self-pity, and they convey the impression of what amounts almost to a national suicide complex.

One important Cabinet Minister said flatly that Berlin is not of the slightest concern to Portugal, a NATO ally, and that he did not care in the least whether Khrushchev took that city.

This same official, asked after a lengthy tirade whether there were not a few things that the United States had done right, replied bluntly:

"I can't think of a single thing in the last 15 years!"

A similar attitude prevails toward the United Nations, which Portuguese officials regard as having been taken over by the Communists and the Afro-Asian bloc. Portugal resents U.N. discussion of Angola, which is regarded as an internal affair. American support of the U.N. operation in Katanga is viewed incredulously as contributing to a Communist takeover of what had been a smoothly functioning commercial arrangement.

Unquestionably the loss of Goa came as a profound shock in metropolitan Portugal (although in the African overseas provinces, beset with their own concerns, it seemed far less a vital matter). The failure of the United Nations to do anything, and the inability or unwillingness of Britain to make military bases available, aided the quest for scapegoats.

The United States was caught up in this quest because of resentment over American votes in the U.N. calling for self-determination in Angola. In the view of Portuguese officials, the administration in Washington has been attempting futilely to appease the Afro-Asian bloc and to curry favor with the Negro vote at home.

REFLECTED IN POSTERS

Plastered all over downtown Lisbon last month were posters: "No one will forgive governments which give in to unjust pressures and do not defend their obligations in Goa"; "The presence of Portugal will remain in Goa beyond Nehru and his cynical pacifism."

Apart from these official posters were others, hand-lettered and not ostensibly of Government origin, which drew curious throngs: "Down with British treachery" and "Throw the United States out of the Azores."

Against this background, the United States is conducting negotiations for renewal of the agreement covering military bases in the Azores, and there are some who believe that Portugal is asking a very high price.

What seems to have increased the demoralization, particularly among younger Portuguese, is the knowledge that the army did not fight to the last man against the Indian conquest of Goa. Others observe that it is difficult for an army to fight to extinction without at least some hope of successful defense.

The New Year revolt of army officers in Beja in an attempt to overthrow the government of Prime Minister Antonio de Oliveria Salazar, Portugal's dictator for more than 30 years, added to the uneasiness.

This revolt was quickly put down, and the official explanation is that it was the work of Communist. But there also are indications that the Beja affair may have been merely the top of an iceberg, and that the discontent went very much deeper.

Reportedly one group in the army had favored informal negotiations between Portugal and other countries for the gradual liquidation of Portuguese rule in such overseas territories as Goa and Timor, with the retention of cultural ties. This group wished to concentrate future Portuguese efforts on retention and development of Angola and Mozambique.

STABILITY QUESTIONED

Such currents, though now seemingly deflected, raise the question of the long-range stability of Salazar's regime. Because of the restrictions upon loyal political opposition in Portugal, there is danger that if an uprising should succeed it would swing far to the left and might be taken over by the Communists, who maintain an organized underground.

In the face of all this, the austere and monastic Salazar at 72 remains unperturbed, convinced of Portugal's historic mission and of the correctness of policy at home and abroad. One result of long years of authoritarianism is a pervasive popular apathy.

Dissent is muzzled, although it does exist. Some Portuguese speak out freely at private parties in condemnation of the regime, in oversea provinces there is even a modicum of press criticism, and a few officials are astonishingly candid in their indictment of the government.

But if Salazar views the world through lenses focused on Lisbon—he has never visited Portugal's oversea territories—there are other, younger officials who are well aware of the challenges posed for Portugal by a rapidly changing world.

One of these is the 39-year-old Minister of Overseas Affairs, Adriano Moreira, a former political science professor sometimes mentioned as a possible successor to Salazar. His particular task has been to devise new policies for speeding the evolution of Angola and Mozambique.

Moreira avoids talk of eventual independence for these oversea provinces, but he speaks frequently of "auto-determination," meaning a kind of self-determination in a Portuguese Commonwealth. It is quite apparent that attitudes have been influenced by the terrorism in Angola and, despite the disclaimers, by the criticism in the United Nations.

REFORMS UNDERTAKEN

Accordingly, last September a series of reforms was undertaken whereby African residents of Angola and Mozambique automatically became Portuguese citizens. New provisions were made for exercise of the political franchise and for land ownership. Accelerated programs of education have been undertaken and Dr. Moreira has announced plans to build universities in both oversea provinces.

Simultaneously, there is a concerted effort to make more meaningful the often-stated faith in a multiracial society, Portugal, an extraordinarily poor country by European standards (with a per capita income of only a little over $200 has spent large amounts of money in providing new facilities overseas.

At the same time, 50 private companies have banded together in a consortium to do something about Portugal's sagging world public relations. They have retained a New York public relations firm with offices in Lisbon and in Africa.

One of the companies represented in the consortium is the Benguela Railway, which hauls minerals from Katanga to the Angolan port of Lobito. The railway is 90 percent owned by Tanganyika Concesions, Ltd., in London. "Tanks," in turn, owns 14 percent of the Union Miniere, which operates the Katanga mines. "Tanks" has undertaken its own public relations campaign, often vehemently anti-U.N., in London.

MAY NOT BE ENOUGH

Neither the reforms nor the public relations efforts nor the obvious sincerity of younger officials seeking adjustment to change may be enough so long as Portugal remains an authoritarian state. The denial of effective political expression to citizens at home and abroad and the self-righteous reaction to outside comment make it difficult

for Portugal to present a credible case to the world.

But if the Portuguese system itself evolves, and if the efforts to adjust to new conditions in Africa are undertaken broadly and speedily, there is a chance that Portugal can bring its new Commonwealth into being—that is, if the outside world will grant the time.

Mr. Speaker, Portugal has been a strong opponent of communism and a loyal NATO ally of the United States. The tensions between Portugal and this country could jeopardize our use of what some experts have called "the most valuable real estate for defense in the free world," U.S. leased airbases in the Portuguese Azores. Under leave to extend my remarks, I respectfully commend the attention of the House to an Associated Press article on these bases, as published in the Sunday Standard-Times of New Bedford, Mass., March 11:

AZORES BASE HAS VITAL ROLE IN U.S. DEFENSE NET

LAJES FIELD, THE AZORES.—Some military experts, if they had their way, would erect signboards at either end of this airfield's 11,000-foot runway saying: "This is a piece of the world's most valuable real estate for the defense of the free world."

Little has been said about the worth of this mid-Atlantic base and its backup field at nearby Santa Maria Island during the 10 years the United States has enjoyed guest privileges here. Now that international political developments caused Portugal to hint that its agreement with the United States might not be renewed when it expires at the end of 1962, Government and military leaders are taking a fresh look at its place in military plans of the free world.

Today the 4-square-mile Lajes Base, essentially a refueling and supply center linking the United States with its farflung military and defense operations in Europe, Africa, and the Middle East, is a point of growing concern in Washington.

"Break that link," said a visiting official who reviewed the role of Lajes in the Western World's defense plans, "and we may as well forget about moving and supporting brushfire forces anywhere on this side of the world in event of an emergency."

NEUTRALITY HONORED

Lajes Base began as a British airfield during World War II, with American forces permitted to use it only as technical advisers because of Portugal's neutrality.

Britain, which has a centuries-old treaty with Portugal, signed an agreement with Lisbon in 1943 in which both parties noted the Portuguese policy of neutrality but cited the indispensable nature of the islands to air transport.

After the war the United States negotiated a new agreement.

But now Portuguese officials have threatened these guest privileges might be lifted unless the Kennedy administration ceases supporting moves for independence of Portuguese African possessions.

A Portuguese air force colonel commands Lajes Base, which is officially known as Portuguese Air Base No. 4. But beyond that gesture of sovereignty for Portugal, Lajes is as American as Indiana, and almost 5,000 Americans—half of them military—live and work there in harmony with the Portuguese hosts.

What does Lajes contribute to defense of the free world?

Primary mission of the Lajes Base, carved out of volcanic rock on Terciera Island of the Azores group, is to provide logistic support for transatlantic military air transport.

WELL-LOCATED BASE

This means that the "crossroads of the Atlantic," located 2,480 miles east of New York and 980 miles west of Lisbon, Portugal, extends the weight loads of military aircraft by providing a well-located refueling base.

"Close Lajes to our warplanes and all westbound planes would have to fly empty to carry enough fuel to make the Atlantic crossing," one military technician explained. "And those flying eastward with favorable winds would find their payloads drastically cut if they could no longer land here for fuel."

Additionally, Lajes is the base for big, fat-bellied KC-97 tanker-planes that refuel U.S. nuclear bombers enroute to or from deployment in Europe and Africa.

Smaller but speedier tactical air command KC-50 six-engined tankers fly up from Lajes with fuel for every eastward and westward movement of U.S. jet fighter squadrons across the Atlantic.

REFUELING BASE

The U.S. Navy, too, uses Lajes Base for refueling and serving its transatlantic planes. During such astro-shots as the Mercury project and others, fleets of Navy radar and search planes assigned to this area of the Atlantic have operated from Lajes.

Additionally, a newly completed U.S. Navy undersea weapons facility has been installed at one end of the Lajes Base, surrounded by high security fences.

Also huge radio transmitting and receiving centers have been created here, relaying and backstopping military communications of all types between Africa, Europe, England, and the northern air routes. Highly important today, these would multiply in essential value in the event of hostilities, experts here declare.

Some details of this base operation are confidential. But public statistics show the base wing and its seven component squadrons handled 14,000 aircraft departures in the fiscal year 1961—slightly more than 40 long-range planes per day.

Last November, in the midst of U.S. redeployment to Europe, was Lajes' heaviest operational month since the base began operations under a new agreement in 1946.

BUSY INSTALLATION

"We can't say exactly how many planes and crews we handled, nor what they carried," the U.S. base commander, Brig. Gen. Eugene B. Le Bailly, told questioners. "But believe me, we were hustling all the time."

Portugal has never put a price tag on granting use of the Jajes base to the United States and other NATO powers. Its government insists free use of the facility was part of Portugal's own contribution to NATO.

The host country has received, since the postwar assistance program began, approximately $100 million from the United States, half of which has been in the form of military assistance.

Portugal has not hinted what it will ask for an extension of the existing Azores base contract—beyond saying it expects more political support from Washington in the future than it has had as an ally in the past.

But military experts are expected to report to President Kennedy that whatever the asking price for an extension of the base agreement, it can hardly be too high.

But if there is discord at governmental levels, there is none between U.S. military forces here and their hosts.

"We feel at home here," said a serviceman's wife from the Middle West, who has been more than 2 years at Lajes. "We like the Portuguese, and they like us. I hope nothing happens elsewhere to spoil this relationship."

HARMONY AT BASE

"If the people in Lisbon and Washington got along as well as we do here," said one American official, "there would be no question of continuing the base as it is."

Benefits from the base are not one-sided. Nearly 3,000 Portuguese nationals work directly for the American forces in the Azores, take a healthy share from the total annual payroll of $8,913,000.

Almost as many depend for their living on the production of foodstuffs bought by the American installation, or working for contractors building American projects currently worth about $10 million.

Rentals of homes to American personnel poured $315,000 more into Portuguese pockets in 1961.

Inhabitants of Terceira, third largest island in the Azores with a population of 72,000, shudder at the possibility of Portugal's terminating its agreement with the United States.

"We would starve if that happens," said a Portuguese storekeeper at Angra de Heroismo, the island capital.

While many things here remain as they were decades or even centuries ago, the people of Terceira Island have picked up many elements of the jet age.

PUPILS KNOW PLANES

Portuguese village schoolmasters report their pupils know every type of plane visiting Lajes, and know and call by their names many of the 5,000 Americans who live and work there.

Before the first airbase was established here, Terceira residents lived almost exclusively by agriculture and fishing. Grains and grapes grew in tiny squares ringed by rock walls, to protect them from high winds.

Whalers still go out in small wooden boats with hand-thrown harpoons.

Animal-drawn carts and wagons are far more common than autos, and oxen are still a favorite means of plowing or drawing laden vehicles to market.

Americans living in the Azores find the slow tempo of Portuguese island life refreshing and pleasant. The Portuguese, in turn, are happy to speed up some segments of their dairly activities to match that of the Americans.

While the straight-laced Portuguese still frown at American women wearing shorts, they hope to turn nearby Saint Maria Island into a tourist center.

COLUMBUS' CHURCH

Attractions include one of the world's finest spear-fishing areas. And the church where Christopher Columbus attended Mass on his return from the voyage of discovery to America.

Portuguese, many of whom have relatives in the United States, like America and its servicemen on Terceira. But several of them here are openly hostile to U.S. policies regarding Portugal's African territories.

Yet Portuguese officials are not inclined to talk about renewal of the airbase agreement.

"We have given these base facilities freely," said one official. "We didn't ask payment for them because we and the United States were partners in NATO. But we can't understand the American Government voting against us in the United Nations on the Angola question."

Few people here, either American or Portuguese, believe Washington and Lisbon will fail to negotiate their differences—and a new extension of the base agreement.

OFFICIALS AGREE

Officials of both countries are agreed that if the United States were forced to move out, Portugal lacks the trained manpower and the economic resources to continue operation of Lajes as an international Atlantic crossroads.

Both are equally hopeful that this question will never be raised—that before too

long American and Portuguese delegations will sit down to discuss and iron out their differences and agree on an extension of the Lajes and Santa Maria base pacts.

"It would hurt the United States to lose these bases," said one Portuguese civilian here: "But perhaps in the long run it would hurt us more."

Points of Interest Revisited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans are disturbed over many of the provisions in the proposed new Revenue Act of 1962.

Mr. J. F. Saunders, a writer on fiscal matters for the Cleveland Plain Dealer, sums up the situation very well in his article "Points of Interest Revisited":

POINTS OF INTEREST REVISITED

(By J. F. Saunders)

At the risk of espousing monotony, suggestion is made again that you express to your Representative in Congress your relentless opposition to a measure that would require banks and savings institutions to withhold a part of any interest due you on July 1 and January 1.

You may recall that this legislation was introduced in the last session but, thanks to vigilance of the precincts, it never got off the ground on Capitol Hill. However, political office holders are a patient lot when it comes to new bleedings of the taxpayer. They accept a temporary setback stoically and philosophically, always confident that they may still slip through the measure at a later date when the public may be preoccupied with other matters. When it is too late to protest and cry out in our agony, the stolid tax agent will inform us that the new law is now firmly inscribed on the imperishable books of time.

Be advised that this second drive for a 20-percent grab of any interest you may have coming already has clearance in the House Ways and Means Committee, a giant step on its way to becoming law. Under this measure, no matter how little interest may be owed you 20 percent of it would be deducted at the teller's cage and you might hope to reclaim it after filing your return on April 15 and after the Government had gotten around to conceding that it was rightly yours.

It would make no difference whether your savings book showed only the $5 your aunt placed to your credit when you were graduated from high school, or the $1,000 you scraped together painfully for some hour of emergency, you still would get only 80 percent of the interest due when you presented the book for payment.

Since much of the money in banks and savings firms belongs to little people who save for a rainy day, never acquiring enough capital for more lucrative investments, no powerful organization sent a spokesman to the committee's hearings to appear in your behalf. You have no lobbyist except your collective selves, but together you are a persuasive one if you decide to make your voice heard.

There are many taxes that are obnoxious burdens, but this legislation to slip the fat hand of the government into the interest till reeks to outer space and its adoption could well close out the political careers of many of those voting for it. The sweetness of such revenge at the polls would be tempered, however, by the distress of an added nuisance tax. This tax would be levied even on those not earning enough to be required to pay income taxes and it would be necessary for them to submit a formal claim in writing to regain the pittance held back on the interest date.

Millions of persons with frozen incomes have urgent need of the full amount of their interest on savings on the day it is due. Why should the government be permitted to withhold a portion of it, when it may have no right now or later to any part of it?

To compensate the savings firm for the headache of this complicated bookkeeping procedure, the government would consign to them the use of your interest money for months before they had to make a settlement with Washington. Thus, your banker could put your money to work without cost to him while you would be paying him well for use of any money of his that you might have had to borrow.

Some old-fashioned parents still try to instill in children the important habit of thrift when they first start to earn money as babysitters or as newspaper delivery boys. Under the legislation now pending, these litle savings accounts would have 20 percent of interest due deducted and sent to Washington unless the child filed an exemption certificate.

Passage of this legislation could be the greatest blow to the thrift habit since the Federal debt lid was fitted with an escalator motor. Boys and girls saving money for college educations would find a government tax man elbowing them away from the teller's window while he pockets a percentage of their pitiful interest. Sure they could recover it later, but why subject depositor, savings company and Government to all that trouble?

All around the country, committees are busily testing the temper of the taxpayer in probing actions to determine just how much harder they can belt him without goading him into open rebellion. The last straw in the ever mounting tax load could be this intrusion of Uncle Sam into the private domain of banker and depositor which ought to be protected by the same seal that guards the confessional and the physician's examining room.

We can do nothing about the Government's willingness to settle with the racketeer and the hoodlum for a fraction of what they owe in income taxes. We can only be envious of a Congress that votes itself higher salaries, bigger expense accounts and more comfortable pension plans. This is the same Congress that regards Monday as part of the leisurely weekend, that takes 10 days off to celebrate Lincoln's birthday and another 10 at Easter, and spends our money like drunken sailors on world junkets in the autumn that include such strategic areas and trouble spots as "Liz" Taylor's movie set and the Paris tourist traps.

But we can warn this Congress that we do not want any noses of the Federal Government poked into the savings books of the small depositors for an early sniff of additional tribute and that, while we may weep if this preposterous measure is passed, we will know what to do about it when the November day of reckoning for all politicians comes to pass.

Brief Explanation of H.R. 10650, the Revenue Act of 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including in today's RECORD a brief summary of the provisions of H.R. 10650, the Revenue Act of 1962, prepared by the staff of the Committee on Ways and Means. This brief summary is being included in the RECORD so that it will be widely available to all Members of the House of Representatives, as well as the interested public. It is expected that the report on this bill, which will contain detailed information relative to every section of the bill, will be filed on Friday.

Mr. Speaker, the summary is as follows:

BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE REVENUE ACT OF 1962, H.R. 10650

1. INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT (SEC. 2)

(a) *General*

The most important section of the bill provides that a business can subtract from its tax liability 8 percent of its new investment in tangible business assets other than buildings. This tax credit is an outright subtraction from the tax and is in addition to the full allowable depreciation of the cost of the asset.

The amount of the credit that can be taken in any year is limited by the amount of tax. The limitation involves the figure of $100,000 of tax liability. For a taxpayer whose tax (before the credit) is not over $100,000, the credit can offset his tax dollar for dollar. Where the tax is larger than $100,000, the credit is limited to $100,000 plus 50 percent of the part of the tax over $100,000. Any dollar amount of credit which is not usable (because of this limitation based on the tax) may be carried over and used against tax of the following 5 years.

The credit is available for investments in tangible personal property and certain real property used in business so long as it is not a building or a structural component of a building. The credit will apply to assets such as blast furnaces, outdoor machinery, etc., which under State law might be classified as real estate.

(b) *Short-lived assets*

The investment credit is not available for property which when acquired has an expected useful life (for depreciation) of less than 4 years. Where the expected useful life is between 4 and 6 years, one-third of the normal 8 percent credit is allowed; where the life is between 6 and 8 years, two-thirds of the normal credit; where it is 8 years and over, 8 percent is available. Without the above limitations, short-lived property would otherwise get an advantage over long-lived property because a new credit would be available on the short-lived property each time that it was replaced.

(c) *Limitations and exclusions*

Property used in regulated public utilities, other than transportation, generally will be entitled to one-half of the normal credit (e.g., 4 percent for 8 years and over). No credit will be allowed with respect to property located outside of the United States. The credit is not allowed for equipment used in residential housing but it will be available for equipment used in hotels and motels.

A limited credit is available with respect to the purchase of used property up to $50,000 of purchases a year.

Where new property is acquired by a firm in the business of leasing property, it may permit the lessee of the property to take the investment credit to which the owner of the property would be otherwise entitled.

The bill provides that if property on which the taxpayer originally obtained the credit is sold within 8 years of the time of acquisition, the taxpayer will be required to recompute the credit to which he was originally entitled, basing it now on the actual period for which he held the property. If the property is disposed of within 4 years, for ex-

ample, the taxpayer, in accordance with the general rule, would not be entitled to any credit. This readjustment rule also applies where the property is shifted to an ineligible status (e.g., outside the United States).

(d) Effective date

The investment credit will apply with respect to property acquired after December 31, 1961. In the case of property constructed or reconstructed by the taxpayer, the credit will only apply to so much of the property as was built after that date.

2. LEGISLATIVE EXPENSES (SEC. 3)

This section provides a deduction for the costs (including dues to organizations) directly related to appearances before and communications with a legislative body or a committee thereof or individual members thereof, provided they are otherwise ordinary and necessary business expenses. This applies to the U.S. Congress and the State legislatures as well as county and city boards and councils. The provision will not relate to advertising or other expenses relating to political campaigns for candidates or expenses to influence public opinion on legislative issues or to influence voting on things like referendums.

3. ENTERTAINMENT EXPENSES (SEC. 4)

In the area of travel and entertainment expenses, a major change from present law deals with the proof required of the taxpayer in establishing his deductions. Under present law, by reason of the application of the Cohan rule, the taxpayer may obtain a deduction merely on the presentation of evidence that indicates that it was likely that he spent some amount of money on these items. Under the bill, the taxpayer is not permitted to have deductions for travel, entertainment, or gift expenses unless he substantiates by adequate records or other sufficient evidence the amount of the deduction and the circumstances surrounding the incurrence of the expense.

In addition, it is provided that where an activity is of a type "generally considered to constitute entertainment, amusement, or recreation" the expenses thereof will be disallowed except to the extent that the taxpayer establishes that "the expense was directly related to the active conduct of a trade or business" and it is only deductible to the extent that it is so related. These new tests are in addition to the requirement under present law that the expense must be ordinary and necessary to the conduct of a trade or business.

Under present law, the costs of a facility, such as a yacht, are deductible to the extent used for business entertainment. The bill provides that deductions will be allowed for facilities only where they are used for business entertainment more than half the time and then only to the extent of the business use. The expense of a particular use, to be deductible, must also be directly related to the business.

The bill also provides that certain items in this area will not have to be proven to be directly related to the business. These exceptions include business meals under conditions conducive to discussion, entertainment, etc., provided to employees, expenses of certain meetings, items made available to the public, and items treated as compensation of employees. Thus the cost of taking customers to dinners in restaurants to promote good will will continue to be deductible if it is an ordinary and necessary business expense.

The bill also provides that no deduction will be allowed with respect to business gifts to the extent that the gift exceeds in value $25 per recipient per year.

The present law provides a deduction as a business travel expense for the entire amount expended for meals and lodging. The bill amends this to provide a "reasonable allowance" as a deduction for amounts expended for meals and lodging.

These new rules on entertainment and gifts are effective after June 30, 1962.

4. MUTUAL THRIFT INSTITUTIONS

The bill considerably changes the present law tax treatment of mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations effective for incomes in 1963. Under present law, these institutions are permitted to take a deduction for an addition to bad debt reserves in an amount equal to their entire income so long as the aggregate reserve does not exceed 12 percent of deposits. The present law provision has resulted in most institutions having no tax liability.

Under the bill, the thrift organizations will have the opportunity to take a deduction for amounts set aside in a loss reserve on real property loans based on either of two alternatives. The alternative that will be more frequently used will be a deduction of 60 percent of the taxable income of the institution computed without regard to any loss deduction. Alternatively, the institution may take a deduction for an amount set aside in a loss reserve necessary to bring the reserve at the end of the year up to 3 percent of loans on improved real estate (or whatever amount their experience indicates is necessary for an adequate reserve). Under this second alternative, losses on other than real property loans may be reserved under the general provisions applicable to other taxpayers.

This provision will be available to both mutual institutions and to savings and loan associations with outstanding stock. In the case of a stock company, however, distributions to shareholders will serve to cut down the reserve deduction.

The bill provides several technical amendments in the savings and loan area. A special rule is provided for treating losses arising in connection with the foreclosure of mortgages in a way that is realistic from the standpoint of banks. The bill also amends the definition of savings and loan associations.

5. MUTUAL FIRE AND CASUALTY INSURANCE COMPANIES (SEC. 10)

The bill provides that mutual fire and casualty insurance companies will, effective for incomes in 1963, be subject to tax in a way similar to stock fire and casualty insurance companies with certain modifications. This change would have the effect of requiring the mutual companies to include in their tax base the gain from operations, that is, the excess of insurance premiums over operating expenses and insurance losses paid. (At the present time, these companies are taxable on their investment income only, with an alternative tax of 1 percent, if higher, on gross receipts (premiums and investment income). The bill removes completely the 1-percent alternative.)

The major modification with respect to mutual insurance companies is that a portion of the gain from operations which is made subject to tax in this bill may be deducted from income currently and put into a deferred income account. The amount that is added to the account will be one-fourth of the underwriting gain plus 1 percent of incurred losses (claims payable). After an amount is added to the deferred income account, it will be available to meet underwriting losses. If the amount set aside in a taxable year in the deferred income account is not used to meet these losses during the following 5 years, there will be added back into taxable income in the sixth year the amount remaining from the 1 percent of incurred loss formula and one-half of the amount remaining out of the one-fourth of underwriting gain formula. An additional deferral is provided for companies with concentrated risks in windstorm, etc., coverage.

The bill provides that the mutual company will get a deduction for dividends paid to policyholders. In all cases, an underwriting loss which the company would show without regard to the deduction for policy dividends will be substracted directly from investment income. Other underwriting losses would be charged against amounts in the deferred income account and would be substracted from investment income only when the deferred income account was exhausted. Certain additional relief is provided for small companies (whose gross receipts are below $900,000).

The bill contains a special rule relating to the factory mutuals. Generally these are to be treated in the same manner as stock companies. It is provided, however, that the amounts out of the premium deposit which the company would be obligated to return to the policyholder if the insurance contract were terminated at the end of the year will not be included in earned premiums. (These amounts must be subtracted from the cost of insurance for the business policyholder.) Furthermore, the factory mutual company must add to their gross income 2 percent of the earned premiums computed in the foregoing manner.

The reciprocal insurance companies will be permitted to treat as policy dividends amounts which they would be obligated to return to the policyholder if the insurance contract were terminated at the end of the year. In addition, it is provided that for certain purposes the reciprocal might compute its own tax by including in its taxable income the taxable income of the corporate attorney-in-fact attributable to relations with the reciprocal. In this case the reciprocal can take a credit for the tax paid by the corporate attorney-in-fact. This would, for example, result in a refund of tax to the reciprocal where the reciprocal had net losses and had no income against which to charge them.

6. GAIN FROM DISPOSITIONS OF CERTAIN DEPRECIABLE PROPERTY (SEC. 14)

This section provides that if depreciable property, other than buildings, is disposed of, then there will be included in ordinary taxable income in the year of disposition any gain on the disposition of the property to the extent that it represents depreciation taken after December 31, 1961.

Under present law, property may be depreciated (deductions taken against ordinary income) and, then, when it is disposed of, the current value of the property may be considerably in excess of the basis (the original basis reduced by depreciation taken), thus converting deductions from ordinary income into capital gains. The bill takes the approach of recognizing that in such a case the depreciation actually allowed on the property as a deduction from ordinary income has been excessive and should be restored to ordinary taxable income. The rule applies not only to sales or exchanges of the depreciable property but it applies also to depreciable property disposed of in a number of situations where under present law there would be no recognition of gain or loss. This provision will not apply to buildings or to any property which is a structural component of a building.

7. TAX TREATMENT OF COOPERATIVES (SEC. 17)

The bill deals with the problem, in the taxation of cooperatives, arising from certain court decisions under the Revenue Act of 1951 whereby some portion of the income of cooperatives has been able to avoid tax.

Under the bill, it is provided that a cooperative will be permitted to take a deduction for cash dividends or dividends paid in the form of written notices of allocation (so-called script). A written notice of allocation will be deductible only if it is either (1) payable in cash within 90 days at the option of the patron, or (2) the patron has con-

sented to include the amount of this written allocation in his own income. This consent can take either of two forms. First, it may be a written consent which may be given once by a patron and remain in effect unless it is revoked. Second, the patron who is a member of the cooperative may consent to this inclusion by the co-op adopting a bylaw requiring all patron members to pay tax on these written notices of allocation.

Both the cash dividends (other than those of consumer cooperatives) and the noncash patronage dividends will be subject to withholding at a rate of 20 percent under the same general provisions as withholding for interest and dividends described below. The patron would take credit on his tax return for the amount withheld.

Certain technical provisions of the law presently applicable only to farm cooperatives are extended to nonfarm cooperatives. These include the ability to take deductions for noncash patronage dividends and to take into account for a taxable year dividends allocated within 8½ months after the end of the year and to file their returns under certain circumstances up to 8½ months after the end of the year. The new provisions do not apply to REA cooperatives.

8. WITHHOLDING ON DIVIDENDS, INTEREST, AND PATRONAGE REFUNDS OF COOPERATIVES (SEC. 19)

The bill provides that a payer of dividends, interest, and patronage refunds (of marketing or producer cooperatives) will be required to withhold tax at a rate of 20 percent. There is no requirement that the payer notify the recipient of the amount withheld. It will be made clear on the tax return that for every 80 cents that an individual receives as dividends, interest, or patronage refunds, he may calculate the amount that has been withheld by taking one-fourth of this (20 cents). He will report his gross income as $1 by adding the amount that he receives plus the amount that has been withheld, and he will take credit in his tax computation for the amount that has been withheld.

The bill contains several provisions cutting down on overwithholding:

1. Exemption certificates: All individuals who expect that they will have no tax liability for the year will be able to file an exemption certificate and avoid the withholding on bank interest, series E-bond interest, and dividend income. Individuals under 18 may file exemption certificates whether or not they expect tax liability.

2. Quarterly refunds: Married couples with with less than $10,000 of income and single persons with less than $5,000 receiving dividend or interest income, if they expect to have less tax liability for the year than the amount withheld, as well as tax-exempt organizations, may file quarterly claims for refund. It is anticipated that this refund procedure will be operated in such a way that the refunds may be paid promptly. The claim for refund may be filed at any time during a quarter, rather than waiting until its close.

3. Offsets: It is provided that corporations and tax-exempt organizations may take credit for amounts withheld from them against any liabilities that thy have as withholding agents of income and social security taxes. For example, if an organization has had withheld from it $200 on dividends that it receives, then when it deducts withholding from dividends, or in certain cases wages, that it pays, it is permitted to offset $200 against the amount which it holds as a withholding agent and otherwise would pay over to the Treasury. Where the offset provision is not adequate with respect to withholding on a tax-exempt organization, the quarterly refund provision is still available.

The bill provides that amounts withheld may be retained by the withholding agent until 1 month after the end of the quarter in which the dividends or interest are paid.

The withholding provisions will be effective January 1, 1963.

FOREIGN PROVISIONS

The provisions dealing with foreign income are as follows:

F-1. Foreign earned income and pensions of individuals (sec. 12)

Under present law a U.S. citizen is permitted certain exclusions from taxable income for income that he earns while abroad. This exclusion is unlimited if he establishes that he is a bona fide resident of a foreign country; and it is limited to $20,000 a year if he is not a bona fide resident of the foreign country but remains abroad for 17 out of 18 consecutive months.

The bill imposes a ceiling on bona fide residents. It provides that for the first 3 years during which an individual is a bona fide resident in a foreign country the annual exclusion of foreing earned income will be limited to $20,000. If this individual stays beyond 3 years, his annual exclusion from then on will be to $35,000.

Under present law if an individual employed abroad is under a pension or annuity plan established by the employer, any contributions made to this pension or annuity plan by the employer while the individual is abroad are treated as tax-exempt income even though received by the annuitant when he is in the United States. The bill provides that any amount contributed by the employer to the pension plan will be taxable to the individual upon retirement wherever he may then live. But, this rule will not be applied to amounts contributed by the employer with respect to periods prior to December 31, 1962.

F-2. Estate tax on foreign real property (sec. 18)

Present law excludes from the gross estate of a U.S. citizen or resident the amount of real estate located outside of the United States. The bill removes this exclusion as of the date of enactment for newly purchased real estate. In the case of real estate held by the decedent on February 1, 1962, the real estate may still be excluded from the gross estate if he dies before July 1, 1963.

F-3. Distributions by foreign trusts (sec. 9)

Under present law some tax advantage may be obtained where a U.S. grantor establishes a trust outside of the United States. The foreign sources income received by this trust may be accumulated without any U.S. tax liability and in a later year paid over to a U.S. beneficiary. This accumulated income, paid out in a later year, under present law is treated as a distribution of the corpus of the trust and does not involve further U.S. income tax.

The bill provides that after the date of its enactment, if a foreign trust established by a U.S. grantor makes any distribution of prior accumulated income, any U.S. beneficiary who receives this accumulated income will be required to include it in his own income and to take credit for any taxes that the trust has already paid. The bill contains alternative formulas for spreading the income back over prior years so as to prevent the imposition of excessive surtax rates due to the bunching of income in a year in which the accumulation is received by the U.S. beneficiacry.

F-4. The gross-up of foreign dividends (sec. 11)

Under present law a corporation which owns at least 10 percent of the stock of a foreign corporation may obtain a foreign tax credit with respect to taxes paid by the foreign corporation at the time that it receives dividends from the foreign corporation. This tax credit is also available with respect to dividends received through the first foreign corporation from any 50 percent subsidiaries which it owns.

The allowance of foreign tax credit to the domestic corporation in such cases, together with the exclusion of the foreign taxes paid, results in an overallowance for these foreign taxes. The bill eliminates this overallowance through a technique referred to as the gross-up. Wherever a U.S. corporation receives a dividend from a foreign subsidiary (where it would be entitled to a foreign tax credit under present law) it will receive credit for foreign taxes paid attributable to the dividend only if it includes in its income the amount of the foreign tax for which it receives credit. (This corresponds to the treatment of individuals who take credit on their income tax return for the amount that has been withheld by the employer and report as income the gross wages before withholding.)

This provision will apply with respect to all dividends from foreign corporations received after December 31, 1964. It will apply to dividends from foreign corporations received during 1964 to the extent that these are paid out of current earnings and profits.

F-5. Allocation of sales income between a U.S. corporation and a foreign subsidiary (sec. 6)

Under present law, a U.S. corporation selling products abroad through a foreign sales subsidiary may obtain considerable tax advantage by charging a low price to the foreign sales subsidiary so as to show very little profit on the U.S. manufacturing operation and thus incur very little liability for U.S. tax. When the foreign sales subsidiary sells the product at a substantially higher price, the total profit might be reflected in the income of the sales subsidiary where it might be subject to a very low rate of tax. This is also possible, in reverse, by paying a high price for things bought from the foreign subsidiary. The provision in existing law to deal with this distortion of income (sec. 482) gives the Secretary of the Treasury authority to adjust the sales price on the transaction between the parent and the subsidiary, but this has proven to be extremely difficult to administer.

The bill provides that, in lieu of adjusting the sales price between the parent and the subsidiary, where there are no arm's-length transactions to establish a price, the Secretary of the Treasury may reallocate taxable income between the subsidiary and the parent to the extent that this income arose from sales or purchases of property at other than established arm's-length prices. This reallocation of taxable income may be on the basis of a formula that would involve, on the one hand, the assets, payroll, and selling expenses located in the foreign country and, on the other hand, the assets, payroll, and expenses located in the United States. All the profit may be subjected to the U.S. tax if the foreign subsidiary is little more than a "paper" corporation.

F-6. Controlled foreign corporations (sec. 13)

This section deals with a number of problems existing under present law which have the effect of permitting U.S. investors to conduct certain operations through a foreign corporation.

A foreign corporation is defined as a controlled foreign corporation if at least 50 percent of its stock is owned, directly or indirectly, by American interests. The bill provides that a U.S. person who owns, directly or indirectly, 10 percent of the stock will be taxable on certain income of this controlled foreign corporation whether or not it is distributed as a dividend. This U.S. person will be taxable on the portion of this income which is attributable to the shares that he held directly or to the shares that he holds through foreign persons (corporations, trusts, etc.).

The amounts on which the U.S. person is taxed may be classified as: (1) Subpart F income, and (2) profits considered as being distributed.

Subpart F income is, in general, those types of income which are taxed to the U.S. shareholder on the ground that the income is of a type that could as well have been received directly by the American owner. This includes:

(1) income from insuring U.S. risks,

(2) income earned on the basis of ownership of patents, copyrights and exclusive processes developed in the United States and transferred to the foreign subsidiary,

(3) certain interest, dividends, rents, royalties and profits on sales of property for use outside of the foreign country of organization (where the property is sold to, or was acquired from a related corporation). Income in this category (3) may be kept out of the tax base by being reinvested in a business in a less developed country.

The amount treated as having been distributed is the profit accumulated after 1962 to the extent that it is invested in certain prohibited types of property which include:

(1) assets which are over and above amounts necessary for the operation of the business,

(2) assets used in a "new" trade or business in a developed country, i.e., one which the company has been engaged in for 5 years (or on December 31, 1962),

(3) most assets situated in the United States.

These income inclusion provisions are drafted to avoid having the same income taxed under more than one provision. It is also provided that income which is taxed to a U.S. person under these provisions will not be subsequently taxable to the same person if it is paid to him as a dividend. Appropriate provisions are included for the adjustment of basis in stock and for the appropriate foreign tax credit.

F-7. Gain from certain sales of stock (sec. 16)

The bill provides that on the redemption or liquidation of the stock of a controlled foreign corporation any gain will be taxed to the American shareholders as ordinary income to the extent of their share of the earnings and profits. This provision applies only with respect to shareholders having an interest of 10 percent or more. Similarly on sale by such a shareholder of his stock, gain will be taxed as ordinary income to the extent of the earnings of one controlled corporation during his holding period. This change is related to the preceding section limiting the advantages of tax deferral through the use of foreign corporations. This will have effect with respect to income where there is allowed some deferral of tax on ordinary income and it will prevent this income from later being realized by the American investor at capital gains rates rather than ordinary income rates.

F-8. Foreign investment companies (sec. 15)

Under present law, a pure investment company organized in certain foreign countries, particularly Canada, has considerable advantage taxwise over regulated investment companies organized under the laws of the United States and subject to U.S. taxes. The principal advantage of these foreign investment companies is that they may accumulate income with little or no tax at the corporate level, and this income might later be realized by the investor through the sale of his stock and, then, be taxable only at capital gains rates. (It might never be subject to income tax if the basis of the stock is increased because of transfer by death.)

Under the bill, it is provided that when an investor sells his stock in a foreign investment company (which is either registered in the United States or principally owned in the United States) the portion of his gain attributable to retained earnings of the investment company after 1962 will be taxable as ordinary income. A technique is provided in the bill for a registered foreign investment company to elect tax treatment substantially identical with the tax treatment of a U.S. regulated investment company, thereby providing current tax on the dividends and "pass through" treatment for the capital gains on a current basis.

It is provided that the effect of this provision cannot be avoided by the step-up basis of property resulting from transfer at death.

F-9. Property distributions from foreign corporations (sec. 5)

Under present law, where property other than money is distributed by a corporation and received by a second corporation which is a stockholder, the amount of the distribution to be taken into account by the recipient (e.g., as a dividend) is the lower of the fair market value of the property or the adjusted basis of the property in the hands of the distributing corporation. The bill modifies this rule by requiring that distributions from foreign corporations be taken into account at fair market value. This will prevent American parent corporations from realizing on the profits of a foreign subsidiary, at a minimum U.S. tax liability, through having the subsidiary distribute appreciated property.

F-10. Distributions of foreign personal holding company income (sec. 7)

The bill changes the provisions in present law dealing with foreign personal holding companies. At present, the income of these companies is taxed to certain U.S. shareholders only if 60 (or in certain circumstances 50) percent of the income is from foreign personal holding company income sources. Under the bill, the foreign personal holding company income will be taxed proportionately to the shareholders if it represents 20 percent or more of its income. Where the foreign personal holding company income represents 80 percent of the total income, then all of the income of the company will be taxed to the shareholder.

F-11. Information on foreign entities (sec. 20)

The bill extends the provisions of existing law that permit the Secretary of the Treasury to obtain information with respect to certain foreign corporations owned by Americans. This extension of the information provision is necessary for the enforcement of the provisions dealing with controlled foreign corporations.

How To Meet the Medical Care Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, that there are other and better answers to the problem of medical care for the elderly is illustrated by an editorial from the Watonwan County Plain Dealer, of St. James, Minn. Under unanimous consent, I wish to place the editorial in the RECORD:

It has been charged that the medical fraternity and allied groups have little if any interest in the medical problems of elderly people in the lower income brackets—and that, therefore, the Federal Government must provide medical care, preferably by adding it to the social security system.

Those who have been misled into believing that should find much food for thought in a joint announcement in mid-January made by the National Association of Blue Shield plans and the American Medical Association.

The announcement concerned a plan to provide low-income people, 65 or older, with a variety of medical services for about $3 a month, on a voluntary, private basis. This is another important step in the direction of achieving through voluntary, private initiative, an effective solution to the problem of meeting health care needs of the aged.

Another plan which also provides this kind of aid to the needy in the over-65 age bracket, is the Kerr-Mills bill which was passed last year. This bill provides Federal subsidies, through a system of joint Federal-State administration, for elderly people in the very low income brackets. Citizens of Minnesota will be eligible for this aid as soon as our legislature passes the necessary measures to implement it. Thus far 38 States have taken advantage of this new law.

There are also many State and local welfare programs which provide medical services for people who canot afford to pay.

There is therefore no need to push this Nation closer to socialized medicine, which has been such a fizzle in England, by adopting the forced medical aid program that is being pushed by President Kennedy and the Democratic administration.

The President Shows Little Regard for the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, no one who has viewed the actions of this administration, nor has studied the legislative proposals sponsored by the President can fail to be alarmed at what is developing. President Kennedy is riding roughshod over the Constitution and through his actions and his proposals is setting our feet on the road to dictatorship. Whether he is doing this knowingly or through a lack of understanding of his constitutional powers as President matters little if, in the end, the American people lose their freedom. I think we should soberly consider the warning implicit in the following column from the Washington Evening Star, written by David Lawrence:

THE CONSTITUTION AND KENNEDY: BYPASSING OF TREATYMAKING PROCESS HELD NOT INTENDED BY U.S. FOUNDERS

(By David Lawrence)

What has happened to the Constitution under the Kennedy administration? This question projects itself naturally as a result of the new controversy that is developing over the power of the President to finalize tariff agreements with foreign countries.

Mr. Kennedy seems to think Congress can delegate to him power to make such trade treaties through an enlargement of the present law on reciprocal trade agreements. But the issue is broader than tariffs.

If, for example, Congress can delegate to the Executive the treatymaking power on

tariffs without the necessity of ratification by the legislative body, then the power to impose taxes or to change at will existing tax laws can also be handed over to the President. Yet the Constitution specifies that Congress alone shall have power "to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises."

The Constitution also says plainly that the President of the United States shall have power only "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

Within the last few days, however, President Kennedy has ignored the Senate's rights and has merely sent to Congress notification of far-reaching agreements on tariffs reached with the 6 nations of the European Common Market, and 18 other countries, including Great Britain.

Never before in American history has such a treaty or agreement with so many countries in the world been withheld from formal submission to the Senate. The document which reported the negotiations to the House and Senate does not even request approval of the pacts. It assumes that the President will get the necessary authority under a modification of the existing reciprocal trade law.

The Executive, of course, inherently possesses certain powers to negotiate treaties with foreign governments on tariffs. This is far different however, from the authority he has been using under the reciprocal trade law, which delegates power to negotiate only within certain limits. It permits, for example, a tariff reduction of 20 percent to be made, but no more, and the President is supposed to report to Congress those instances where his proposals would depart from what are known as peril points in industry. It is then up to Congfiress to specify by law whether it will sanction a departure from these limits.

Mr. Kennedy in his message to Congress on March 7, reporting on the new tariff treaties, says that "our negotiators were grievously short of bargaining power" in the negotiations at Geneva. This is clear proof that the executive branch of the American Government has been, in effect, negotiating a treaty and has not just been carrying out instructions within certain limits, as covered by the Reciprocal Trade Act passed by Congress in 1958.

The negotiations started in September 1960, but a deadlock ensued. President Kennedy confesses to Congress that he deviated from the instructions or limits contained in the existing law, when he says:

"Accordingly, after months of negotiation and when no other recourse was available to save the situation, I authorized our Geneva delegation to offer new concessions on a number of items at rates below the peril point findings. * * *

"In taking this step, we avoided the collapse of the Geneva talks and we held open the way to a future of economic cooperation, not separation, between the two Common Markets, the one in Western Europe, and the other in the United States."

But the President really did have a legal alternative. Had he been adhering to the treatymaking power given him under the Constitution, he could have negotiated a treaty and, after affixing the signature of the United States to it, he could have asked for ratification by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

It may, indeed, be questioned whether, in order to conform to constitutional requirements, the President isn't really obligated to get a two-thirds consent by the Senate anyhow when he makes agreements with 24 countries involving not only tariff duties but various contingent actions, including possible reprisals by the United States against quotas imposed on our trade by other governments.

Should a subject of such transcendent importance—affecting industries throughout the United States—be handled by such a vague process as were the agreements made by the American delegation at Geneva with a total of 24 different countries? Certainly the framers of the Constitution did not intend that the treatymaking power, which requires a two-thirds approval by the Senate, should be bypassed. The President has attempted to exercise the very same authority in a different way. Such a procedure has never been upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States.

If Congress, by a majority of both Houses, can pass a law delegating authority to the Executive to make agreements with foreign governments which are final, then the whole treatymaking power, in which the Senate has hitherto played a coordinate part, falls to the ground. That's why it is being asked: What has happened to the Constitution under the Kennedy administration?

Communist Hate Campaign Against John Birch Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, the Communist Party of the U.S.A. blueprinted its hate campaign against the John Birch Society in a 47-page booklet dated June 1961, entitled "The Fascist Revival—The Inside Story of the John Birch Society." The booklet is disussed in a letter to the editor which appeared in the March 2, 1962, edition of the Los Angeles Herald Examiner. I include the letter in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

GOVERNMENT PAMPHLET

The following is from a U.S. Government Printing Office pamphlet, pertaining to a hearing before the subcommittee to investigate the administration of the Internal Security Act and other internal security laws of the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate:

"Never, since the most virulent days of Goebbels' hate propaganda, has anything appeared in the United States comparable to a 47-page booklet, dated June 1961, put out by the Communist Party of the U.S.A. in connection with its drive to smother the expanding anti-Communist movement in this country."

The 35-cent booklet is titled "The Fascist Revival," and purports to tell "the inside story of the John Birch Society."

The virulent tone of the booklet, with all stops out in vituperative propaganda, indicates that the Communist Party would like to create a new, Pavlovian trigger word for this period in its psychological warfare, and believes "Birchite" might be put into the language this way, replacing "McCarthyite." The impact of the latter fabricated word apparently no longer is strong enough to meet Red needs.

The Communists now seek to create a new scare word. This would evoke a conditioned response in a background of fear, founded on the specter of a Fascist plot inside the United States, which would attack all minorities, and spread terror to everyone.

This Red propaganda objective is a terror maneuver. It would be what they call the "correct" line for this time, to make the American public jittery through pressure from abroad, by manufactured crises in places such as Berlin and Laos, and by pressure at home through visions of a "Fascist revival." A jittery United States would be off-balance and vulnerable.

JAMES OVIATT.

How Much Sacrifice?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

HOW MUCH SACRIFICE?

Tariff reduction agreements are now being entered into for many items of industrial production in the United States, and the Government plans to open the door for more importation of foreign manufactured products.

What this action will do to certain industries that face stiff foreign competition remains to be seen, but if we were to guess, we would say that some American industries will be forced out of business as a result.

Imports of foreign farm products are also coming in for a great deal of attention.

In recent weeks, the Department of Agriculture has made no secret of the fact that large amounts of Australian beef are being imported into the United States to be used in making low-grade hamburger. They say that there is not enough production of the lower grades of beef in the United States to satisfy the demand. It may be very stupid to suggest that if American beef were used that the cattle market would be better—even if slightly better beef were used for such grades of hamburger.

Last week, it was announced that casein, a milk product used in making glue, paints, paper, and fabrics, is now imported for the most part from Argentina, Poland, Holland, and other places. In 1937, 67.5 million pounds of casein were produced in the United States, but by 1956 it shrank to 2.5 million pounds, and now it is too small to count. Still, 90 million pounds were imported last year from abroad. The reason experts give for the decrease in American output of casein is that it is more profitable for dairy companies to turn out powdered milk and sell it to the Government, to be stored in Government bins.

If you have the same reaction to that news as we had, you were confused, if not irritated.

Now, efforts are being made to cut down still further the tariffs on foreign farm goods as well as industrial goods. We have learned in economics and history that tariffs can cause wars if some nations are denied a chance to sell their products, but, by the same token, let it be said that Americans must realize that their standard of living can be forced down while other nations are improving theirs. In other words, an adjustment of living standards could very well be the result. Everyone would like to see our foreign friends have improved living standards, but we wonder how much sacrifice Americans are willing to undergo?

R. T. M.

Diversion of Air Service From Friendship Airport to the Federal Airport at Chantilly, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. JOHNSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a house joint resolution passed by the Maryland General Assembly on March 8, 1962. This resolution urges the Congress of the United States, the Federal executive and administrative officials to take such action as deemed necessary to prevent the Federal Aviation Agency and the Civil Aeronautics Board from improperly diverting air service from Friendship Airport to the Federal Airport at Chantilly, Va.

Whereas Friendship International Airport has been located intermediate between Baltimore and Washington; and

Whereas said airport was designed and constructed with adequate runways and taxiways to serve the largest type jet aircraft in commercial use; and

Whereas because of the inability of Washington National Airport to serve such passenger jet traffic, said Friendship Airport has since the latter part of 1959 been handling efficiently and satisfactorily all of the rapidly growing passenger jet traffic of the entire Baltimore-Washington complex in addition to propeller-type service for the Baltimore metropolitan area, including northern and eastern counties of Maryland as well as the eastern shore of said State; and

Whereas notwithstanding the fact that the landing field facilities at Friendship are fully capable of handling much additional jet engine and propeller engine traffic, the Federal Government began in 1956 construction of a third airport approximately 30 miles westward from the center of Washington near Chantilly, Va.; and

Whereas said third airport, like the Washington National Airport, is presently under the jurisdiction and control of the Federal Aviation Agency, a regulatory body primarily concerned with safe and proper use and operation of aircraft; and

Whereas the Administrator of said Agency and the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board have expressed publicly their desire and intention to prevent Friendship Airport from continuing to supply air service to residents and businesses in that section of Washington and adjacent areas in Maryland where such air service can be more expeditiously and more conveniently supplied than at Chantilly, Va., and at less operating expense to the carriers due in large part to the fact that Chantilly Airport has required an expenditure approximately six times as great as Friendship: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland, That we urge the Congress of the United States as well as executive and administrative Federal officials to take such steps as may be effective in preventing the Federal Aviation Agency and the Civil Aeronautics Board from ordering or coercing or inducing by indirect means air carriers to undergo additional and unnecessary expense through improper diversion of air service from Friendship International Airport to the Federal Airport at Chantilly, Va., for those residents in the northern and eastern sections of the city of Washington and in adjacent Maryland suburban areas where such service between residence or place of business and plane-side can be more expeditiously and more economically supplied at Friendship; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution are sent to each and every Member of Congress, as well as to appropriate Federal officials, with the urgent request that the congressional acts under which said Federal Aviation Agency and said Civil Aeronautics Board function be amended (a) to separate the Washington National Airport and the airport at Chantilly, Va., from the management and operating control of such agencies and (b) to require that in granting certificates of convenience and necessity and in regulating service thereunder maximum convenience to the public and economy in air carrier operation shall be prime considerations after the enforcement of safety.

Good Intent—But

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, is it necessary to set up a system of Federal aid to provide free immunization facilities as part of an expanding national health service? That is the question which the Lakefield Standard of Lakefield, Minn., raises in an editorial which I include at this point in the RECORD:

No one can argue with the purposeful intent of President Kennedy's proposals contained in his recent health message to Congress.

The end result of his proposed program for nationwide immunization, better health centers, and mental health improvement, among other features, would certainly be beneficial to our Nation.

But there would seem to be a practical limit to the amount of good which we will allow to be financed through Federal aid.

Federal aid, after all, is still our own money doled back to us with a Government prescribed plan for spending it.

Once any type of Federal aid legislation becomes law, Americans have no choice but to pay the bill and then try to get their share of the "free" services rendered.

In other words, we would all be required to pay for the immunization program at the same rate, whether or not we desired to be immunized. Even the people of Rochester, Minn., home of the best medical facilities in the world, would be required to pay their share for the improvement of medical centers. And so on, for case after case.

While our Nation's health stands to benefit a great deal if the President's proposals are written into law, the right answer isn't always that simple.

The same result would ensue if all persons were required by law to be immunized, if they were required to face periodic mental health examinations and if law required communities of a certain size to provide medical centers.

But such legislation would likely meet with overwhelming opposition from the standard bearers of both freedom and thrift.

We can see little difference, however, between this and an overextensive program of taxing everyone to provide services which may or may not be wanted.

Americans have become accustomed to a certain amount of Federal aid. It is already a part of our lives.

But we think the time has arrived for both Mr. Kennedy and Congress to stop turning to the idea of Federal aid as the solution to most of our Nation's ills.

Equal Employment Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the Executive Director of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity recently sent me, among other things, a review of the status of the Committee's overall effort. Particular attention is directed to two of Mr. Feild's statements:

Every study published by the Census Bureau in the 20th century has indicated wide differentials in the status of workers in terms of their race and ancestry. The problem of racial discrimination remains widespread. Although there are 22 States and dozens of cities with enforceable fair employment practices laws, embracing nearly two-thirds of the Nation's population, there is not a competent authority anywhere in the Nation who does not recognize that widespread employment discrimination because of race continues to persist in every region of the Nation.

Candor dictates that acknowledgement be made that administrative resources do not yet exist in the Federal Establishment commensurate to the size of this task.

In no way do I wish to underestimate the fine work of the Committee in establishing a climate encouraging fair employment practices. Nor are my remarks to be construed as criticism of the fine work done by the Committee. Nevertheless, it must be recognized that the Committee lacks the autonomous structure necessary to achieve maximum effect in this tremendous task.

For this reason, the House Committee on Education and Labor recommends enactment of H.R. 10144, to be known as the Federal Equal Employment Opportunity Act. This bill will provide the necessary machinery for a broad attack on this problem of vital concern to every American citizen.

Mr. Feild's letter follows:

FEBRUARY 27, 1962.

Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ROOSEVELT: I have your letter of January 16 asking for the report of this Committee's activities in the southwestern region of the country. Before reprting some activities undertaken by the Committee in the southwestern region, it may be well to review for you the status of the Committee's overall effort.

As you know Executive orders prohibiting discrimination in contractor and public employment have existed since June 25, 1941, when your illustrious father, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, issued Executive Order No. 8802. The most extensive and

effective efforts of the Federal Government to effect contractor employment were undertaken during the World War II period. For example, the independent Fair Employment Practices Committee, headed by the late Bishop Francis J. Haas, in its brief 3-year existence processed 8,000 complaints, held 30 public hearings, expanded its operation to include 15 field offices and a staff of 119 persons. This committee received two congressional appropriations to conduct its operations. At no time since this period has any Federal effort been as well supported, financially or administratively.

As you know that independent committee was dissolved following passage of the so-called Russell amendment in 1944, which limited the existence of independent committees established by the Executive to 1 year without congressional review and appropriation. This limitation was obviated to some degree by the previous administration by the establishment of an interdepartmental committee rather than an independent committee, whose operations and administration of the Executive order under which they functioned were carried out through the structure of the regular Federal agencies. This continues to be the basis for this Committee established under Executive Order No. 10925.

While the Committee itself is given certain powers, its primary responsibility and authority rests upon its reviewing and coordinating functions. Any and all operations conducted directly by the Committee and its small staff have been undertaken within this context.

For the first 9 months of its existence, the primary effort of the Committee has been devoted to comprehensive reorganization of th procedures and activities that it found to exist when it came into being. Basically our efforts have been directed toward the development of two comprehensive operational systems: one would afford more effective means of processing complaints filed under the Executive order by aggrieved individuals; the other aimed at the development of administrative capability within the regular procurement structure would enable the contracting agencies to undertake programs of affirmative action designed to promote compliance with the standards established by the Executive order. The problem of developing these two systems has presented complex difficulties which grow directly out of the organization of the Federal Establishment and the enormous size of the manufacturing economy.

For example, the scope of the Federal bureaucracy involved in the Government's contract operations has no counterpart anywhere in the world. Defense procurement alone last year involved nearly $25 billion. Additional procurements within the scope of the Executive order counted for more than half again that amount. To do this, it is estimated that some 15 million contract transactions were necessary. The best analysis we have been able to make indicates that more than 260,000 manufacturing companies, operating 287,000 establishments, received contracts or subcontracts with a nondiscrimination clause attached. These companies employ 17½ million workers. Certain additional areas subject to the Executive order, such as construction and utilities, would enlarge the number of companies involved by several thousands and the number of workers involved by several millions.

From another aspect, every study published by the Census Bureau in the 20th century has indicated wide differentials in the status of workers in terms of their race and ancestry. The problem of racial discrimination remains widespread. Although there are 22 States and dozens of cities with enforcible fair employment practices laws, embracing nearly two-thirds of the Nation's population, there is not a competent authority anywhere in the Nation who does not recognize that widespread employment discrimination because of race continues to persist in every region of the Nation.

The sketchy analysis given above is designed to indicate the exent to which the Federal Government has extended its nondiscrimination employment standard throughout American industry through its contract activity. It is also designed to indicate something of the size of the administrative task that is involved if these standards are to be achieved or enforced. Candor dictates that acknowledgment be made that administrative resources do not yet exist in the Federal establishment commensurate to the size of this task. Turning to the Federal bureaucracy, if the Executive order is to be implemented through the operations of the regular agencies an adequate appraisal must be made of what this involves. Again, for example, there are over 60 contracting agencies with literally hundreds of procurement offices employing literally thousands of workers. There is no more complex aspect of Government than the operation of this procurement system.

This Committee has concentrated its efforts on the development of its programs working through the regular agencies on three initial problems:

1. The development of reasonably uniform regulations and directives to guide the agencies. Most of this task has been completed, though experience is indicatng the need for additional directives and coordination as time goes on. Little of this codification of procedure was in existence when this committee was established.

2. The need for adequately trained specialist personnel located at appropriate places throughout the procurement structure to enable the agencies to fulfill their responsibilities under these regulations and directives. The need here is not so much for large numbers of specialists as it is the right kinds of specialists in the right places. The Defense Department has, through the Air Force, already implemented a promising pilot program in this connection and the other services are currently completing studies which will shortly be implemented. General Services Administration and Atomic Energy Commission and several other agencies are currently taking steps to improve their capability as well.

3. A reporting system has been needed to assist the agencies in the comprehensive, systematic evaluation of contractor employment practices and of their own efforts. After many months of careful study and discussion with those affected in industry, labor, Government, and, civic affairs, the comprehensive compliance reporting system for manufacturing contractors has been completed. This is now going into effect and will provide those responsible for contract administration for the first time with an analytical tool that will enable them to adequately appraise the administrative problems they face. As with any new system, experience in its operation will be needed, undoubtedly changes will be required, but it is nonetheless believed that this system should result in elevating Federal effort to a new degree of effectiveness.

The reorganization process described above is not yet complete and will not be complete for many months. Meanwhile, the corollary development of an improved system of dealing with complaints of aggrieved individuals has also been taking place. Clearly the capabilities inherent in the implementation of the problems described above are essential to the operation of any good complaint processing system. Again it must be stated candidly that the capability of the agencies to process any appreciable volume of complaints effectively has not yet been developed. In our first 9 months of operations, the committee's review staff returned over one-half of the agencies investigative reports for reinvestigation.

We are nonetheless encouraged by two things. One, that increased public confidence that the Government will do something about complaints seems to be evident in the fact that more people are filing complaints. This Committee has had as many complaints in 9 months against Government contractors as the previous committee had filed with it in 5 years. More significant, perhaps, is the fact that we have achieved corrective action in two-thirds of those complaints that we have acted upon within our jurisdiction. It is of concern to us that we face backlogs in processing existing complaints due to organizational problems; is a concern to us that the nature of the Federal bureaucracy inevitably requires greater periods of time for action than we would like; it is of concern to us that many problems in the complaint area have not yet been resolved.

We are convinced, however, that the counterpart development of an affirmative action program initiated by the agencies involving systematic review of contractor manpower practices and, where appropriate, provision for needed technical assistance to achieve compliance will do a great deal to alleviate inadequacies of the current complaint process.

No description of the Committee's efforts to reorganize governmental capability to meet this problem would be complete without reference to other areas in which simultaneous effort through other agencies has been under way. The Labor Department has been developing new programs designed to meet problems in the field in the operation of employment services. The Department has also been developing new standards designed to eliminate discrimination in apprenticeship programs. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been reviewing many problems involved in the important field of vocational education. And, finally, the Committee has been directly concerned with the attainment of nondiscriminatory practices on the part of labor unions as they impinge on the employment process. Significant, though not yet wholly satisfactory, progress has been made in each of these areas. Determined and continuing efforts are going forward and it is hoped that the conditions described by Mr. Clarence Laws in the testimony you included with your letter will be improved and corrected in the months ahead.

This leads me to a brief listing of some of the Committee's activities in the southwestern part of the country.

As a part of our regional program of action in Federal employment, we recently met with over 150 Federal executives in New Orleans coming from agencies in that part of the country. Emphasis was placed on the need of greater and better utilization of minority workers in the Federal service. This was attended by individual agency representatives from the area including Texas, especially as this pertains to problems of Negroes and Latin Americans. The Committee has been jointly involved with various contracting agencies in resolving discriminatory practices by contractors in many parts of this region. New opportunities and practices in electronics have been worked out. A significant breakthrough appears to be imminent in the oil production areas. These involve complex negotiations with unions, as well as contractors. As reported by Mr. Laws, the Committee is aware of significant developments by utilities.

The Committee understands that the Air Force will concentrate part of its new pilot program in this region, centering in its air procurement office in Dallas. The Committee also understands that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has been concerned with employment service

practices, vocational education facilities, and contractor practices concerned with the forthcoming establishment of new missile production facilities in the New Orleans area. The Committee has initiated direct discussions of this problem with the prime contractors involved.

I hope this brief summary may be of some value to you as you review this important problem. I will be more than happy to discuss this and any other aspects of the Committee's operation with you at any time.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN G. FEILD,
Executive Director.

Important Civil Rights Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, all questions and problems pertaining to civil rights are of great interest to the people I represent, who reside in the 23d District of New York. I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my statement to the Committee on the Judiciary concerning two proposals now under consideration:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on the Judiciary, it is very gratifying to me that the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am happy to be a member, has under consideration two proposals of vital interest and importance—to abolish the poll tax, and the elimination of unreasonable literacy tests for voters. These are the two civil rights proposals which President Kennedy included in his state of the Union message. I introduced bills providing for abolition of the poll tax and for the elimination of unreasonable literacy tests so that countless citizens of our country who are now prevented from participation in the essential democratic process of voting may enjoy the rights guaranteed them under our Constitution.

There is overwhelming evidence to show that many thousands of qualified Americans are denied the right to vote solely because they are Puerto Ricans or members of the Negro race. Six grades of formal education is sufficient qualification for voting in all elections where any State now requries any form of literacy or educational test. Congressional action making a sixth grade education an automatic and uniform standard for meeting literacy requirements would go a long way toward bringing relief from the evasive practices now in effect.

Illiteracy has practically disappeared in the United States; the quality of elementary education furnished by our schools is of high caliber; any person who has completed six grades of education in a State-accredited school can reasonably be expected to be literate—it follows that any test of literacy that denies the right to vote to any person who has completed six grades of education is arbitrary and unreasonable.

Congress should now take action to make effective the guarantees of the Constitution so that persons will not be denied the right to vote on account of race or color.

It has been said that the poll tax is not as serious a barrier to Negro voting as it once was. However, there is evidence to show that the poll tax is still used as a method of intimidating Negroes; furthermore, a poll tax of $2 or $3 a year is a financial burden on many Negroes. Five States continue to collect the poll tax and it remains a serious impediment to minority voting in Mississippi and Alabama; it is certainly a relic of our past which is incongruous and in direct conflict with the image we are trying to present to the world as a nation which practices true democracy. This device for disfranchising the poor must be abolished.

During my service in the New York State Legislature and ever since coming to Congress, I have fought the evils of discrimination based on race, color, creed, or national origin. The purpose of the bills now under consideration by our committee is to eliminate discrimination in connection with voting rights. I urge that the Committee on the Judiciary take favorable action and I trust that the Congress will pass the necessary legislation so that all our citizens can enjoy voting privileges on an equal basis and that we will thereby advance a step further in the battle for civil rights. I, for one, shall continue a constant, militant program in the field of civil rights, for unless the fight is won here, at home, we cannot hope to maintain our position as a leader for equality and freedom on the world front.

Washington Post Is Spewing, Wears Blinders on Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith an editorial from the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News, published under date of March 6, 1962. This editorial illustrates the gross hypocrisy of one "bleeding heart" newspaper, the Washington Post, with respect to their reporting of racial incidents:

WASHINGTON POST IS SPEWING, WEARS BLINDERS ON CRIME

The liberal eggheads are still weeping in their beer mugs over the ill-fated invasion of nitwit freedom riders in Mississippi last summer.

Here is the latest expression of heart-warming, soul-satisfying tolerance from the leftwing Washington Post of Washington, D.C.

In defending the freedom riders, the Washington Post says, "* * * The State of Mississippi like a blind and mumbling crone, sits by the roadside cursing the stream of progress passing it by which it can neither see nor comprehend.

"How the racists are distorting the image of the South. To a world which once thought southern synoymous with hospitality and charm and grace and kindness, the face of the South is now pockmarked with the smallpox of storm trooper arrests in Maryland, harpies shrieking outside a schoolhouse in Louisiana, mobs burning buses in Alabama, courts spitting at the blindfold figure of justice in Mississippi. Is it not time, and more than time, for the South to remember its own traditions of chivalry and to rejoin a Union whose Constitution its fathers had so large a share in framing?"

Hark, dear people of Dixie, that's what the Washington Post thinks of us all down "heah."

We want to express our heartfelt appreciation for these kind and tolerant words from the liberal Post.

The Post has been so completely bugged by the race-mixing theories until the very mention of the region known as the Southland activates the Post's gushing thyroid glands and makes them big-eyed with hatred.

It is nigh a certainty that when the Washington Post unwraps its biggest adjective guns and starts popping away at you, you are on pretty solid ground.

And while the Post fires away at Dixie, there is a great amount of social crusading vitally needed right under the shadow of that newspaper.

The latest crime figures from the Federal Bureau of Investigation are out. Here's the sordid record while the Post adjusts its thick blinders to the biggest pockmark of all.

During 1961, Washington had: 88 murders, 100 reported rapes, 1,348 robberies, 2,955 aggravated assaults, 4,902 burglaries, 2,464 grand larceny cases, and 2,459 auto thefts.

Anyone with a schoolboy's comprehension can see the stream of "progress" that the Washington Post so gallantly espouses.

Citizens from Mississippi find it necessary to visit the Nation's Capitol from time to time. With a crime record like that of Washington, decent people desperately need and deserve better protection in such a savage atmosphere.

We hereby urge our Mississippi Senators and Congressmen to double the appropriation for the Washington Police Department for the coming year. We praise them for voting recently to strengthen juvenile laws for the District of Columbia in an effort to cope with the rapists, muggers and doped up hoods roaming the streets. In speaking against a softer bill, one Congressman said it was merely "putting a shin plaster on the cancer of Washington's frightening teenage crime."

Oh, incidentally, while this modern stream of "progress" tickles the Washington Post and while that publication displays its preoccupation with various subjects in the Southland, will some kind reader please send another pair of mule blinders to the Post's loquacious editor?

Thanks.

Colonel Glenn Reminds Us That God Is Important in Our Lives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in this day when the world is suffocating in the depths of materialism, it is important that we pause, now and then, to remember that God, our Creator, must be a part of our scheme of things if we are to endure. The Nation and the world was forcefully reminded of the importance of God in our thinking by Col. John Glenn as set forth in this editorial from the Dallas Times Herald:

[From the Dallas Times Herald, Mar. 11, 1962]

MOTTO FOR TODAY—IN GOD WE TRUST

Faith in God has been an underlying principle of this Nation and its people from the earliest times, even before we had an established government.

The Mayflower Compact, the beginning of American democracy, began: "In the name

of God, Amen." Both the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States give ample evidence of the signers' faith in God.

But what of today? In whom do we trust as we contemplate travel to the planets and beyond?

On the one hand we are engaged in vast scientific and material progress. On the other hand we are under heavy assault by an atheistic foreign ideology. More than ever before we need an all-sustaining faith in God.

In the vast darkness of the space we hope to conquer, the words of Lt. Col. John Glenn shine as stars of faith for earthbound man and astronaut alike:

"I can't say that while in orbit you sit there and pray—it's a very busy time. But I feel we should all live our lives as if this were the last day.

"I fall far short of this every day—I am trying to live the best I can. My peace has been made with my Maker for a number of years so I had no particular worries on that line. * * *

"I don't know the nature of God any more than anyone else. He'll be wherever we go."

Those are the words of a man who lives with achievements of science, who calmly faces the threats of a godless alien power.

More especially they are the words of a man of abiding faith.

They are the words of a faith that all our people need to travel the dark, uncharted way before us.

Another Try at Cramp's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, Philadelphia is maintaining its momentum in redevelopment not only in housing, commercial projects, recreational facilities, and cultural objectives, but also in development of industrial opportunities. The nonprofit city-sponsored agency known as the Philadelphia Industrial Development Corp., has decided to support the redevelopment of the old Cramp Shipyard on the Delaware River. It disclosed the 131-year-old shipyard will reopen next July as a modern industrial complex.

The Philadelphia and New York press have acclaimed this effort and presented background information which justifies the action by the Philadelphia Industrial Development Corp. I attach news reports for the benefit of the Members of Congress who may be interested in the rebuilding of our large cities:

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin]

ANOTHER TRY AT CRAMP'S

At a time when the city has been seeking good industrial land so desperately, purchase of the old Cramp Shipyard by the Philadelphia Industrial Development Corp. (PIDC) seems like a "natural."

The Navy has owned the world-famous yard, now 132 years old, since World War II, when it bought and refurbished it at an estimated total of $45 million. A dozen times efforts have been made to utilize the whole property on the Delaware River in Port Richmond without success. Only parts are now in use, leased by the U.S. General Services Administration to small companies.

The advantages of having a cooperative such as PIDC are pointed up sharply by the announcement that the Government will sell the whole yard to PIDC for $1,775,000. PIDC will lease the facility to three local businessmen, who put up the purchase money and will also spend an estimated $10 million to redevelop it into a modern industrial complex. They look optimistically to 2,000 new job opportunities, and eventually to making it tax productive.

Why the site has been a white elephant is somewhat of an economic mystery. It has 55 acres, 110 buildings, a private drydock, 3 miles of railroad track, 6 piers, 3 wet basins and a favorable location on the river.

The naval disarmament pacts of 1921 started the decline of American shipbuilding and Cramp's in particular. During World War II, the Navy built 36 ships at the Kensington yards and repaired many more. Peace, once more, ended the venture.

[From the New York Times]

THREE IN PHILADELPHIA WIN SHIPYARD BID—BUSINESSMEN IN REDEVELOP FACILITIES AT CRAMP

(By William G. Weart)

PHILADELPHIA, January 31.—The Philadelphia Industrial Development Corp. (PIDC) today selected three businessmen from their area to be the redevelopers of the old Cramp Shipyards on the Delaware River here.

The nonprofit, city-sponsored agency made the selection at a special meeting after considering proposals submitted by four groups last November. The successful bidders were:

John Connelly, president and chairman of the board of Crown Cork & Seal Co. and a director of Connelly Containers Corp.; Louis Silverstein, president and a director of Camden Fibre Mills; and Albert J. Grosser, president of an industrial real estate firm bearing his name.

They are to form a new corporation, which will provide the investment caiptal, an estimated total of $10 million, to convert the former shipyard into a modern industrial complex expected to provide 2,000 jobs.

WAY CLEARED FOR PURCHASE

About 25 percent of the facilities at the landmark, where hundreds of naval and private vessels were constructed before the end of World War II, are being used by a variety of concerns with 250 employees.

Selection of the redevelopers clears the way for the PIDC to purchase the 43-acre site, declared surplus by the Navy, from the U.S. General Services Administration for $1,775,000.

The redevelopers will provide the funds for the purchase, but the PIDC will hold title to the property until the 5-year redevelopment project has been completed.

Detailed plans for construction of new buildings, modernization of existing structures and operation of ship repair facilities at the yard, which has a 600-foot drydock, are to be completed within 6 months.

Founded by William Cramp in 1830, the shipyard built 421 ships, including trans-Atlantic liners, between 1890 and the end of World War I. During World War II shipbuilding boomed again at Cramps, with the work force reaching 18,000.

Is a Meeting of World Minds Possible?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the world today is confronted by a choice of alternatives of great magnitude: Peace or war? survival or annihilation?

Possessing the tools of substantial—if not total—destruction of the world, humanity must now decide whether it will peacefully resolve its differences or become atom-splattered blots in the annals of history.

The Communist—fanatically dedicated to world conquest—continues to be the major threat of war.

Recently, a new journal of divergent views on national issues entitled "Yale Political" appeared on the literary horizons of the Nation. For its first issue I was privileged to discuss the outlook for the question, "Is a Meeting of World Minds Possible?"

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS A MEETING OF WORLD MINDS POSSIBLE?

(By Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin)

(NOTE.—Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, is ranking Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. In his article he discusses the prerequisite steps to successful international cooperation.)

In the space-nuclear age, the outlook for peace or, conversely, the prevention of a civilization-destroying war depends upon a meeting of world minds. In international organizations such as the United Nations we seek such a concurrence. How can this objective be best accomplished? I believe that we can achieve this goal through agreement among nations on basic objectives or through a common recognition that nuclear missile war between nations or blocs of nations could be mutually annihilating, if not world destroying.

It is obvious then that progress toward peace can result only during an interim of nonwar within the context of an international agreement or a military standoff. And certainly renewed efforts by the free world to bring to fruition such a "context" shall and should lie in several areas. For one thing, we as a nation should constantly strive to mobilize world opinion against war and aggression. We should reawaken the common interests of humanity in self-preservation, revitalize interests in bettering the conditions of global living, and cultivate all hopes for peace and the prevention of war.

In international areas, there is still a great deal to be done. We must undertake and attempt to gain broad support for cooperative programs in science, health, agriculture, housing, education, sanitation, and various other nonmilitary fields. In so doing, we should open clearer channels of communication and understanding among nations and peoples of every belief. And, in regard to the United Nations, we must continue to en-

courage the establishment of, respect for, and adherence to, international law within which many nations will enjoy the maximum of freedom and the greatest opportunity for true self-determination.

These are the areas within which we can work, continually aspiring to establish that context which will allow of a sincere meeting of world minds, and which will permit those agreements or military stand-offs to which I referred above.

The world, twice in a single quarter century, has experienced tragic holocausts which unavoidably prove that peace could not be established by "wars to end all wars." Recognizing this fact, the leading nations of the world, nations of east and west, met, in 1945, in San Francisco to establish the United Nations, the materialized desire of many peoples for a meeting of international minds.

Generally, the peace-seeking objectives of the United Nations included the creation of much international machinery, apparatus designed to accomplish aims which are strictly in accord with international peace. Collective security measures were contrived to resist armed aggression everywhere. Methods of negotiation, mediation, conciliation, and adjudication were created to insure the peaceful settlement of all international disputes. The United Nations has established machinery for the international control of armaments, all with the objective of eventual disarmament and the abolition of all weapons of mass destruction, such as the atomic and hydrogen bombs. This machinery presupposes, of course, the necessary respect of the world for the principle of international co-operation in order to advance the economic and social well-being of all peoples. It presumes, moreover, a common respect "for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

The United Nations, or any international agency with universal objectives, depends for its support upon member nations which will combine to accomplish its missions. At the present, the United Nations is comprised of one hundred and four nations, peoples which represent widely differing political, social, economic, cultural, and spiritual traditions, and this divergence of mores and modes of living is the problem with which we are currently faced. There too-often exist, in addition, long-standing prejudices, hates, fears, and conflicts of interest, all indigenous to different countries from different parts of the globe.

As political climates change, and as the chains of Communistic and non-Communistic colonialism are loosened, still more peoples will be joining the family of vociferous nations, and perhaps conciliation within the United Nations will become still more difficult.

The meeting of world minds is further challenged by the very existence of Communism, an athestic ideology inimical to peace except under its own limited conditions. By controlling approximately a billion human beings, communism represents a powerful force in the battle for men's minds.

Thus the world is comprised of nations with differing political objectives. It is comprised of peoples with widely varying economic, political, social, and cultural traditions. And one-third of these multiple peoples is under the rule of communism.

What are the chances for a meeting of minds? There is considerable insight in realizing that anything is possible in this wide world and in this life of ours if the minds of mankind will it to be so. But in order for these minds to be willing, there must be an understanding basis upon which minds can meet and rest. How do we get light into a very dark room? By igniting a candle. How do we get light into the minds of humanity? By igniting the candle of illuminating ideas from which men can learn to reason and think—without hate, suspicion, and fear. But can we say that the United Nations will provide an opportunity for this light of which we have spoken? Only the future will provide the response to this inquiry, but we must place our faith in mankind.

The outlook for ultimate success can, however, be improved by the broad policies I have outlined in the opening paragraphs of this article. In addition to these, we should expand our efforts to overcome the voluminous barrage of "Red" propaganda which is detrimental to the pursuit of truth and objectivity so prerequisite to peace on earth. We require a realistic awakening to the need for universal efforts of mankind to join hands in seeking goals essential to human welfare, progress, and the prevention of war.

As Americans we should be proud that the United States provides, historically, the best example of how a heterogeneous people—of different nationalities, of widely varying beliefs, ideas, and ideals—created and adopted a workable and peaceful way of life. And in our pride, we can be pleased by the U.S. successes over a period of 200 years. Certainly we have sought to provide the maximum of freedom for our citizens. freedom within a framework of laws which maintains an organized society. We, as the United Nations, have sought to preserve the fundamental rights of man. In this latter area, our open society includes for each citizen a voice in the Government, freedom of religion, speech, and press. Our laws protect these rights, and our rights are protected from unconstitutional laws. And our Government manifests the doctrine of checks and balances, another safeguard to individual liberties.

But today the whole world has a golden opportunity or perhaps a very last chance to create a similar system if they should so desire. May they, like us, endeavor to ensure the peaceful perpetuity of human existence and, in trying to do this, seek to prevent a horrorific war among major nations. Now is the moment for the world to reserve for all sovereign nations certain fundamental rights, and to remind these nations that they have obligations to the world community of mankind. It is the time for us all to stand up to protect the integrity of peoples and nations from infringements of those universally recognized rights. For this is the hour for individuals of every divergence to cooperate in the name of human betterment and progress.

So I repeat the question: Can there be a meeting of minds, then, to create a world of peace and progress? And my answer is yes, but let us not naively confront the realities of today's divided world. The militant propaganda of communism must be held at bay. And the peoples of the world must awaken to this great challenge, must mobilize in mind, muscle, and resource, and must cooperate in programs for peaceful purposes.

Indeed by a greater stirring of the mighty giant—the thinking human being—a meeting of minds for universally recognized goals may come to fruition. It will be taken then that true progress can be made toward a peaceful world.

Resolution Commemorating Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, many of our citizens whose loyalty to the United States is unquestioned and of whom this Nation can be justly proud have come from nations behind the Iron Curtain now captive by force of the Soviet colonial empire. These men and women are deeply aware of the threat of worldwide communism to freedom-loving people everywhere—some have themselves experienced the hardship and ruthless treatment under Communist masters. Others have an intimate knowledge of life under the hammer and sickle because members of their family, relatives, or friends have experienced that which they themselves have been spared. These people love freedom and desire for their homelands what every person dedicated to freedom desires—the right to self-determination—to be a nation at peace with its neighbors.

It is no secret that the Russian Government is denying millions of people the right to have their own government and to express their own national traditions and aspirations. They do not want war for they have experienced war in all its gruesome aspects. They do desire a firm stand for the cause of freedom and the moral backing of all who believe that man was created to be free.

I had the privilege of spending an afternoon in fellowship with a group of Lithuanian-Americans in Kenosha, Wis., commemorating the 44th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. These people know what it is to be free to worship together; to work hard; to play hard and to accept life in all its valued experiences.

The following resolution was adopted by those present at the gathering in Kenosha, Wis., on February 11, 1962. I include it at this point in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues:

Kenosha's Lithuanian Americans assembled at St. Peter's Pariah Hall, 5108 Seventh Avenue, Kenosha, Wis., on February 11, 1962, to commemorate the 44th anniversary of Lithuania's independence, and on this very important occasion the assembly passed the following resolution:

"Prime Minister Nikita Khrushchev, present dictator of Soviet Russia, at the General Assembly of the United Nations, demanded the free Western nations to stop the policy of colonization and to grant to all nations, which were under the rule of foreign countries, full independence and liberty to govern themselves.

"There was no doubt that this demand stirred up great joy and satisfaction for those nations which were still governed by foreign countries. But, unfortunately, Nikita Khrushchev aimed this demand at those nations which were under the rule of free Western nations. Nikita Khrushchev will not allow the United Nations to make a decision demanding that the resolution introduced in the General Assembly of the United Nations by Soviet Russia would be adopted for all nations which were occupied by Soviet Russia since World War II.

"On June 15, 1940, communistic Russia, with mighty military power, forcibly seized all territory of Lithuania. On August 3, 1940, bolshevistic Russia, with the help of the Red army, forcibly herded Lithuania into the Soviet Socialist Republics and, by this step, completely destroyed Lithuania's independence.

"Therefore, Kenosha's Lithuanian Americans have resolved to appeal to the President of the United States that he appeal to the United Nations for a resolution demanding Soviet Russia to withdraw its military forces, secret police, and other agents from Lithuania and allow the people of Lithuania to choose their own form of government by free

elections, under the supervision of the United Nations.

"If the United States and all free democratic countries should not demand the United Nations to apply the resolution introduced by Soviet Russia in the General Assembly, this would mean an overwhelming victory for communistic Russia and it would help speed up the expansion of communism among free nations of the world. All nations, benefiting by this resolution introduced in the United Nations by Russia, would be grateful to the Soviets for regaining their freedom. But nations now under Russian occupation, if denied the benefits of this resolution, surely would lose all faith and trust in the free democratic world. Nonsupport of this resolution would push these enslaved nations into despair and turn them away from the free western world—the very thing Soviet Russia is trying to accomplish.

"To avoid this tragedy, we Lithuanian Americans, from the bottom of our hearts, beseech the President of the United States to use his influence so that the resolution introduced by Soviet Russia be adopted for Lithuania and all enslaved nations behind the Iron Curtain. We, here assembled, ask Kenosha's Lithuanian American Council to sign this resolution and send a copy to the President of the United States, to the President of the United Nations Assembly, Secretary General, Secretary of State, all countries' delegations, Senators, Congressmen, Governor of Wisconsin, and other top Government officials."

West Virginia's Governor Barron Establishes Advisory Committee on Manpower Utilization and Appoints Outstanding Citizens to Membership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, with the Manpower Development and Training Act passed by the Congress and scheduled for signature by the President tomorrow, I am encouraged by the prospect that hundreds of West Virginians will, through the aid of the new program, be enabled to contribute more fully to our country's productivity and, at the same time, improve their gainful employment status.

In this connection, I am privileged to note that the Governor of West Virginia, the Honorable W. W. Barron, has established an advisory committee on manpower utilization. The personnel of the committee includes outstanding citizens of the State from the fields of public affairs, education, and vocational training, and employer and employee interests.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news article from the Charleston (W. Va.) Daily Mail concerning the establishment of the committee to which I have made reference.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston Daily Mail, Mar. 12, 1962]

BARRON NAMES ADVISERS ON MANPOWER UNIT

Governor Barron established today an Advisory Committee on Manpower Utilization that will study all phases of use of manpower as it affects the State.

"The task of this committee is of paramount importance to our State and could influence the direction of our economy and well-being for many years," Barron observed in appointing 12 men to the committee.

Barron explained that the committee will advise him on manpower utilization matters so as to anticipate and meet manpower problems in advance of the need.

He said the committee's work will entail manpower training under Federal and State programs, certain aspects of the school dropout problem and other fields related to manpower.

Named to the committee were:

Director S. D. McMillen of the State Division of Vocational Education; Clement R. Bassett, director of the State Department of Employment Security; State Labor Commissioner Lawrence Barker; State Labor Commissioner Lawrence Barker; Director F. Ray Power of the State division of vocational rehabilitation; President Miles C. Stanley of the West Virginia Labor Federation, AFL-CIO; Raymond R. Humphreys, secretary-treasurer of United Mine Workers District 17.

David Francis, president of Princess Coal Co., Huntington; W. Q. Smith, of the E. I. du Pont de Nemours Co. at Parkersburg; Richard E. Sperring of the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. at Clarksburg; Wayne T. Brooks of Wheeling Steel Corp., Wheeling; Joe Soto of Charleston, secretary-treasurer of the West Virginia Retailers Association; and Dr. Ernest J. Nesius, dean of the College of Agriculture, Foresty and Home Economics at West Virginia University.

An organizational meeting was set for March 20 at the Capitol.

Automation Makes Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, the effect of automation on employment is discussed by Henry Hazlitt in a column which appeared in the March 5, 1962, issue of Newsweek. Mr. Hazlitt's thesis is that historically automation creates jobs. He says that the unemployment problem with which we are now faced can be traced to the programs of the Federal Government which have caused inflation and excessive wage rates. I believe this timely column should be brought to the attention of Members of Congress and, under unanimous consent, I include it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

AUTOMATION MAKES JOBS

(By Henry Hazlitt)

Ever since technological progress began, men have feared efficiency and machinery as a threat to their jobs. In the industrial Revolution new stocking frames as they were introduced were destroyed by the handicraft workmen (more than 1,000 in a single riot), houses were burned, the inventors were threatened and obliged to flee for their lives. Yet before the end of the 19th century the stocking industry was employing at least a hundred men for every man it employed at the beginning of the century. And so with scores of other industries.

Yet the belief that machines on net balance destroy jobs, no matter how often disproved, never dies. Whenever there is prolonged unemployment, machines get the blame anew. In the depression of 1932, a group called the Technocrats emerged to blame the mass unemployment in that era once more on the machine.

Well, here we go again. A reporter at the press conference on February 14 cited an estimate by the U.S. Labor Department that 1.8 million jobholders are replaced every year by machines. "How urgent," he asked, "do you view this problem—automation?" And the President replied: "It is a fact that we have to find over a 10-year period 25,000 new jobs every week to take care of those who are displaced by machines and those who are coming into the labor market. So that this places a major burden upon our economy * * * I regard it as the major domestic challenge, really, of the sixties—to maintain full employment at a time when automation, of course, is replacing men."

RECORD EMPLOYMENT

Now automation, in its broader sense, is simply the latest name for increased technological progress. To regard this as a major burden or the major challenge is to misunderstand it completely. It is true that machinery or automation can displace specific men from specific jobs, and this creates a problem. But it is not true that mechanization destroys jobs on net balance. Historically, it has always created jobs. In spite of our unemployment, U.S. employment in January exceeded 65 million, the highest for any January in our history.

It is important to understand not only that mechanization, automation, or scientific progress has never reduced the total number of jobs, but just why it does not. First, a huge number of new jobs are created just to make the new automated machines. Secondly, scientific progress turns out innumerable products—telephones, motorcars, planes, air conditioning, radios, television, plastics, synthetics, miracle drugs—that never even existed before. A huge new demand is created. Thirdly, automation is most often adopted because it reduces costs of production. This means that it brings down prices. Then people either buy more of a product or have more money left over to buy other products. More jobs are created.

IT RAISES WAGES

Mass production, in brief, has made possible mass consumption. Mechanization increases production, real wages, and living standards.

When this is not understood, the policies adopted are precisely the opposite of what they should be. Unions no longer smash machines; but they still insist on slowdowns, make-work practices, featherbedding, retention of wholly unneeded workers, and other penalties to discourage mechanization. These policies injure all of us, and workers most of all.

It is not true, as the administration thinks, that the Government must do something to find jobs lost by automation. It is above all not true that it must resort to inflation or to massive new spending to create jobs. What it must undo are the ill-considered laws that have destroyed jobs.

To blame automation for current unemployment is to divert attention from the real cause. That cause is excessive wage rates in certain lines. It is no accident that some of our most serious unemployment is in the coal and steel industries, in which hourly wages have been $3.10 ond $3.26 an hour respectively, compared with an average of $2.34 an hour in all manufacturing. And these job-destroying wage rates are the result, in turn, of the special legal powers and immunities that Government has conferred on the unions.

The Awakening in Forestry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to include therein an editorial taken from the State, Columbia, S.C., Tuesday, February 27, 1962, which paid particular reference to our forestry industry. The editorial was prompted by the sponsorship of the Seaboard Air Line Railway, of a woods demonstration in Cheraw State Park, Chesterfield County, S.C., which is a vital part of the district I am privileged to represent in the Congress.

I wish also to include a concurrent resolution passed by the South Carolina General Assembly expressing its gratitude to the railroad company, other companies, organizations, and officials for the educational and entertaining woods demonstration.

A similar program is being planned at Richmond, Va., through the cooperation of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Virginia, VAUGHAN GARY, for May 8. Members of Congress, along with business and industrial leaders of the eastern seaboard, have been invited to participate in this demonstration.

The resolution and editorial follow:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION EXPRESSING THE APPRECIATION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY TO THE SEABOARD AIR LINE RAILROAD CO. AND OTHER COMPANIES, ORGANIZATIONS, AND OFFICIALS FOR THE EDUCATIONAL AND ENTERTAINING WOODS DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM PRESENTED WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1962, AT CHERAW STATE PARK IN CHESTERFIELD COUNTY

Whereas the members of the general assembly, attachés, and other special guests traveled by special Seaboard Air Line Railroad train from Columbia to Cheraw and back on Wednesday, February 28, 1962, and were treated to a very educational and entertaining woods demonstration program at Cheraw State Park; and

Whereas the Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co., in cooperation with other companies, organizations, and officials, presented this program for the purpose of informing those in attendance on all phases of the great forestry industry from the planting of seedlings to the manufacture of finished wood products; and

Whereas all who attended the program were extremely impressed by the program and the officials who so generously and ably provided the program, transportation, and food and refreshments: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, the senate concurring, That the members of the general assembly hereby express their appreciation for the woods demonstration program held at Cheraw State Park in Chesterfield County on Wednesday, February 28, 1962, for the transportation to and from the program and the food and refreshments to the Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co.; its president, Mr. John W. Smith; its general forestry agent, Mr. Robert N. Hoskins; to Mr. David L. Luke, president, West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co., who was the principal speaker of the program; and to the following organizations who cooperated with the Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co. in making this program possible: Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Bowaters Carolina Corp., Farm and Home Administration, International Paper Co., Koppers Co., Inc., Moore Dry Kiln Co., North Carolina State College School of Forestry, Soil Conservation Service, Sonoco Products Co., South Carolina Commission of Forestry, South Carolina Extension Service, Southern Wood Preserving Co., Taylor-Colquitt Co., Union Bay-Camp Paper Corp., U.S. Forest Service, United States Steel Corp., Vocational Agricultural Departments of Chesterfield and Marlboro Counties, and West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co.; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Mr. John W. Smith, president of Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co.; Mr. Robert N. Hoskins, general forestry agent of Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co., and Mr. David L. Luke, president of West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co.

THE AWAKENING IN FORESTRY

Those who have followed the accepted forestry practices in South Carolina for the last several decades will find in this situation a striking change.

It is noted with considerable interest that David L. Luke, president of the West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co., is to speak at a woods demonstration for Chesterfield and Marlboro Counties at Cheraw State Park, and that this announcement is made by the general forestry agent of the Seaboard Railway, R. N. Hoskins. The program will deal—on the ground—with forest management and utilization of primary forest products in what Mr. Hoskins describes as a "seven-ring circus in the woods."

There was a time when a stand of timber or pulpwood was considered so much money standing on the land and was sold for all it would bring, with no regard to what it might hold in the future—what is now called "sustained yield."

At one time concerned observers were saying that landowners were sacrificing young pines for pulpwood, clear cutting the land in a manner that would turn it into scrub-oak jungles. Many acres of land have been thus butchered from the days of giant longleaf pines, which were felled to the last one and prevented from reproducing by the outcrowding of the oaks.

When the pulp mills first came into the State this seemed to be the prospect. Landowners were accused of being after the "fast buck" and the mills after "raw materials now."

Gradually, thanks to various forces, there came a change. The State commission of forestry did a yeoman job of education. The pulp mills employed foresters. The railroads employed foresters. The Soil Conservation Service and other Federal agencies became active. All moved in on the landowner in the drive to make him take the "dough-tinted" glasses off so that he could see into the future and plan the harvesting of his sawlogs and pulpwood so that he, his children and his grandchildren could reap the benefits.

The tree farm program was started. The keep green movement got underway. All these forces went along their parallel multiple tracks toward the same destination—permanent production of forest products for the future.

Of course, meanwhile, as marginal and submarginal farmland was abandoned to broom sedge and rabbit-hunting fires, landowners were persuaded to set out pine seedlings, so that now the demand for the little trees is so great that it cannot nearly be met.

It might be mentioned in passing that two items in the national drive for reforestation and protection originated in this little South Carolina. One was the little-tree concept, with a picture showing a man's hand protectively curled about a tiny seedling, which has gone all over the Nation. The other is an orienting device by which fires can be accurately located from the tower, correlated with roads and more promptly reached, displacing the old hide-and-seek, hit-and-miss system of trying one road after another.

Of course, the State—and national foresters—one of the world's most dedicated groups of men—were doing their jobs which is their greatest reward. The same is true of the foresters employed by the timber and railroad companies.

And meanwhile the interest in scientific forestry has sent more and more men into the School of Forestry at Clemson College. It is now the largest division of the Clemson School of Agriculture.

But management was practicing what has best been described as "enlightened self-interest," from which all concerned benefit. The timber companies saw that if all the raw materials were cut down overnight their mills, in time, would cough to a stop. The railroads saw—a long time ago—that if goods to be shipped ran out their cars would stand idle.

All worked out best for everyone. In the last few years timber production has gone over the hill and for the first time is keeping pace with use. Yet, foresters know that with the mounting population and ever-increasing building there can be no slacking off.

The show must go on.

What Are You Buying?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the matter of the proposed increase in postage rates has been temporarily disposed of here in the House of Representatives, but the reverberations are still echoing throughout the Nation. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is incumbent for all of us to answer in our own minds, the question that has been asked by one of the most influential newspapers in the Rocky Mountain region, the Grand Junction Daily Sentinel: "What Are You Buying?" The editorial follows:

WHAT ARE YOU BUYING?

There's a postal raise coming. Nothing is going to stop it even though some miracle might delay it briefly. It's coming and the American public is going to fork over around a half billion dollars.

What will these extra millions buy? Not more post offices. Thirty years ago there were 48,700 offices as against 35,000 today. There are no plans to build any more.

More deliveries? No. Although the twice-a-day delivery was cut off to American homes in 1950 the increase in rates won't mean they will be resumed.

More pickup services? No. Mail trucks are already calling less frequently at corner boxes. Some areas have no late night pickups. But there will be no increased service here.

Directory service? Post offices stopped checking directories to handle misdirected or improperly directed mail some time ago. They definitely do not plan to resume this service.

More stations handling money orders and postal savings? No. There were 55,400 facilities handling mail orders 30 years ago. Now there are 44,800. There were 7,500 depositories for postal savings 30 years ago, but now there are only 5,500. No change is contemplated here, either.

A balanced budget? No. An increased pay for postal employees is planned; no plan has been made to take from post office supervision expensive services which have nothing to do with the mail and the new rates don't make junk mail pay its own way. How can we have a balanced budget?

More technological developments to cut down costs of handling? Not for some time if ever. For one thing, experimental speed-up machines, electric transmission of mail and other ideas, will be abandoned. Even $4.5 million couldn't find anything that would work.

So pay your extra postage and forget it. You're not buying a single extra service or cutting your taxes one iota.

New Orleans and the Americas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting into the RECORD the fifth and sixth articles by Reporter Bill Stuckey, of the New Orleans States-Item, on "New Orleans and the Americas." The fifth article in this penetrating series, entitled "Antebellum Filibustering Skeleton in City's Closet," and the sixth article, "Doctors Return Home To Aid People," follow:

[From the New Orleans States-Item, Feb. 3, 1962]

NEW ORLEANS AND THE AMERICAS—ANTEBELLUM FILIBUSTERING SKELETON IN CITY'S CLOSET

(By Bill Stuckey)

Much of Latin America views the city of New Orleans today as something of a grand old lady—admired, of impeccable reputation, fond of dabbling in charities and good works.

But, as in the case of many grand old ladies, there's a skeleton or three way back there in the closet.

New Orlean's most notable skeleton, regarding her long history of contact with Latin America, was a wild-and-woolly, shameless, out-and-out form of imperialism known as filibustering.

The first fillibusters were free-lance soldiers, generally recruited along the New Orleans waterfronts, who specialized in trying to take over Central American nations during the 1840's and 1850's.

Unlike other instances of intervention in Latin affairs over the years, filibustering is something that can't be pinned on Washington. As a general rule, the United States did all it could to stop the operations.

The blame for several of the more spectacular filibustering operations actually lies heavily on certain local leaders in the pre-Civil War South, and on the general public of New Orleans.

Many leaders in New Orleans and the South thought that by supporting the illicit filibusters, new Latin slave States could be added to this Nation.

Consequently, the South and slavery would gain in political strength. They were also lured by the prospects of increasing trade through this port, of seizing a Latin land route which would join the Gulf of Mexico and the Pacific and, in the case of Cuba especially, of cornering the world sugar market.

The era of the filibuster is dusted once-over-lightly in most precollege level history texts today. Hardly anyone knows—some just don't want to remember—much about it. The names of William Walker, of Narciso Lopez, and of Pierre Soule, consequently, aren't found on the tip of the tongue of the New Orleans man in the street.

If nothing else, the story of the filibusters illustrates how New Orleans—now in the era of International House, of good will missions, of student-teacher exchange—has reformed over the years.

Ever hear of President Walker, of Nicaragua?

Walker was a Tennessee boy, supposedly rather quiet and shy, who eventually achieved recognition as king of all the filibusters.

For several years in the 1840's he practiced law in a Canal Street office and when that went sour, became an editor of the long-defunct New Orleans Crescent. Ironically, he wrote editorials there criticizing military adventures by U.S. citizens in Latin America.

Before he left New Orleans for California, Walker lost a sweetheart, supposedly a beautiful deaf girl, during one of the yellow fever epidemics which used to wrack this city. One author offers the romantic suggestion that her death changed Walker from a cool, quiet, and retiring young man into a rampaging, audacious filibustering adventurer.

In California, Walker apparently decided there was a future for a bright young man—with a private army—in Latin America. After an attempt to capture the Mexican state of Sonora failed, Walker began thinking in terms of Nicaragua.

In that steaming Central American republic, there had long been a sort of civil war between the nation's two political parties. One of the parties invited Walker and a band of several hundred wild-eyed soldiers—many of them New Orleans wharf rats—to come to Nicaragua as colonists. They went, order was restored after a few skirmishes and Walker soon became commander in chief of the Nicaraguan army.

Incidentally, the commander of Walker's one-ship navy was a bold and militarily wise New Orleanian named Callendar Irving Faysseaux, who was never defeated while fighting for Walker in the Pacific.

But somewhere along the line Walker antagonized Commodore Vanderbilt, who in those days was doing a thriving business in transporting gold-rush bound Americans from the port of New Orleans to the Pacific across the narrow Nicaraguan land corridor. Suddenly, Walker's Nicaraguan enemies found themselves with financial and military support. Walker marshaling his forces, deposed the puppet president and took the title himself.

During his reign, which continued off and on from about 1856 to 1860, President Walker also made a very interesting friend—Louisiana U.S. Senator Pierre Soule, of New Orleans, brilliant orator, ardent supporter of slavery and a proponent of southern expansion throughout Latin America.

As a result of a Soule visit to Nicaragua, one historian says that President Walker drafted a new Nicaraguan constitution which implicitly restored slavery. Another result: Soule arranged a $500,000 bond issue for Walker, with some of the bonds later purchased by New Orleans financiers.

The career of Walker, who still is the only American ever to become the head of a foreign nation, ended when he was captured by the British (who were aided unofficially by Commodore Vanderbilt), turned over to the violently anti-Walker government of Honduras—and shot.

Senator Soule, aside from his connection with Walker, made quite a record for himself in tampering with Latin territory. After he was named Ambassador to Spain in 1853, he conceived of a plan, roundly criticized in Washington as well as Madrid, whereby the United States could obtain Cuba from Spain.

The plan, which contained all the elements of filibuster diplomacy, was:

To smuggle 10,000 guns into Spain itself, stage a revolution and install a new government which would, of course, agree to sell Cuba to the United States. The plan failed.

It might surprise you to know the present flag of the Cuban Republic was made in New Orleans and first flown in front of 532 Poydras, the office of the old New Orleans Delta.

That was in the days even before Walker and Soule's plan, when the city was ringing with florid speeches, posters, pamphlets, and editorials in favor of a gentleman named Narciso Lopez.

Lopez was an officer in the Spanish Army in Cuba who wanted Cuba established as an independent, proslavery republic. After participating in an abortive uprising against Spanish rule in Cuba in 1848, he fled to the United States to recruit men and money for a Cuban expedition.

Among the persons he asked to head the expedition—who refused promptly—were Jefferson Davis and Gen. Robert E. Lee. He underwent many difficulties in forming his party, and his first expedition to Cuba was stopped by Federal authorities in 1849.

In New Orleans, however, where the idea of adding Cuba as a pro-Southern slave State had wide appeal, he found a warm reception.

L. J. Sigur, editor of the New Orleans Delta, was one of his strong financial backers. Other funds were raised through selling "Republic of Cuba" bonds here at 10 cents on the dollar of their face value.

He succeeded in raising several regiments of troops, one of which was commanded by a sometime New Orleans lawyer named Chatham Roberdeau Wheat.

Lopez' second expedition to Cuba, in May 1850, was repulsed by the Spanish. Many local citizens who were involved, such as Sigur, were subsequently indicted by a Federal grand jury for violating the Federal Neutrality Act and were tried. That they were acquitted in local Federal court is a good illustration of the city's strong Lopez and filibustering sentiments.

In the summer of 1850, mass meetings on behalf of another expedition blossomed throughout the city. Unfortunately, the third expedition of September 1850, again failed; Lopez was captured and publicly strangled in a Havana square.

Prior to the Castro regime, Lopez was considered a Cuban national hero.

The era of the filibuster—although somewhat spectacular—is an isolated incident in New Orleans' long history of Latin American relations which should not be considered out of context.

Keep in mind that years before the filibusters made their brief dent in history, the predecessor of the Tulane University Medical School was founded. Since then, 1834, such institutions won for New Orleans much good will throughout Latin America for their work in combating tropical disease, malaria, and yellow fever there.

[From the New Orleans States-Item, Feb. 5, 1962]

NEW ORLEANS AND THE AMERICAS—DOCTORS RETURN HOME TO AID PEOPLE

(By Bill Stuckey)

An LSU-trained doctor snips lumps of flesh, containing a tropical skin parasite, from the bodies of a group of silent Guatemalan Indians.

Other New Orleanians who are present watch in horror. No anesthetic is used.

But to the Indians, most of whom in this remote section of the Guatemalan highlands do not speak even Spanish, it was just another of the many types of pains they expect from life. They were grateful.

When you consider that the Indians formed the base of support for the pro-Communist regime of Jacobo Arbenz in the early 1950's, the potential importance of this isolated incident becomes clear.

Similar scenes happen daily in the remote interior of Haiti where Dr. William Larimer Mellon, a Tulane medical school graduate, operates a $2 million hospital for natives who previously treated their maladies with voodoo spells.

Throughout Latin American above the equator, New Orleans-trained doctors—applying knowledge gained in New Orleans laboratories—attack the parasites, the cholera and leprosy, the native brands of stomach cancer and heart trouble and the many other afflictions of the Latin masses. The art of the physician, the skill of the researcher extends the influence of New Orleans, and subsequently the United States, to areas where diplomats and trade missions fear to tread.

But New Orleans' medical imminence and opportunities for influence, in the Republics to the south also plays an important role at the opposite end of the social scale.

Local physicians with deep roots in Latin American will tell you that Latin doctors are politically and socially the most influential group in the affairs of their nations. Many have held the highest political offices in their land—and many were educated in New Orleans, spent internships here or were trained by locally trained medical instructors.

And of the thousands of Latin Americans who come to New Orleans each year for medical treatment, many are high government officials.

Dr. William W. Frye, dean of LSU Medical School and former president of the American Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene, will tell you flatly:

"New Orleans is the best known U.S. medical center in Latin America."

Why?

One reason lies in the extent and quality of medical research into tropical parasites by Tulane's tropical medicine department and, more recently, in the LSU counterpart. Dr. Ernest Carroll Faust, of Tulane, who has studied parasites in many Latin countries and whose books are standard parasitology texts, is "the world's greatest living parasitologist," Dr. Frye will tell you.

And Frye himself has taken a leading role in the development of a still experimental drug called dithiazinine, which it is hoped will kill a large variety of parasites.

There is Dr. C. C. Bass, who in the early 1900's became the first man to isolate the malaria parasite in the laboratory. His work and the earliest work of Dr. Joseph Jones, who in the 1880's was the first to identify the parasite, are possibly the major Tulane contributions toward the understanding and treatment of malaria, their colleagues say.

Tulane researchers were among the first to associate the mosquito with malaria and yellow fever, and accordingly, many fever control measures were developed there.

Local hospitals are also well-known in Latin America, due partially to the promotional efforts of International House, other institutions and by individual hospitals.

Another reason for New Orleans' Latin medical fame is through the personal contacts of local doctors with their Latin counterparts. Among such persons is Dr. Alton Ochsner, possibly the best known local surgeon in Latin America, who has spoken many times to medical groups in every Latin republic over a period of some 30 years.

Two recent announcements by the U.S. International Cooperation Administration indicate that local influence in Latin medical affairs, with all the accompanying social ramifications, will greatly expand:

A grant of $2 million was awarded the LSU medical school to establish an international center for medical research and training in Costa Rica, later to include Panama, Nicaragua, El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala, Mexico and the Caribbean countries. This came after LSU completed the initial steps of establishing Costa Rica's first medical school.

A grant of $1,079,000 was awarded Tulane for the formation of a similar research center in Colombia where, in a project of reorganizing the courses of instruction and of training instructors for that country's seven medical schools, Tulane has already been working for 5 years.

In addition to training personnel and stepping up research into illnesses peculiar to the Americas, the programs of both research centers will eventually include setting up expanded public health programs to prevent disease, medical statistical studies such as censuses to determine death rates, and studies into nutritional deficiencies of the impoverished masses.

Tulane will also seek to instill in the Colombian physician a new determination to concentrate on the health and welfare of his own country.

New Orleans began to make itself felt in Latin medicine well over a century ago.

In 1834, the first medical school on the gulf coast was opened here. This was the Medical College of Louisiana, a predecessor of Tulane's medical school. Early in these medical beginnings were research programs into yellow fever, malaria, and cholera—diseases which in the last century were ravaging New Orleans as well as the Latin tropics.

New Orleans was considered the leading medical center of the pre-Civil War South and as such, probably even then had some reputation in the Americas.

One of the first concrete instances of New Orleans' Latin reputation was the "cure" for cholera developed in the 1840's by Dr. Louis H. Lefebre. Under the Lefebre system, the cholera victim would envelop himself in a curtainlike wrapping and inhale the fumes of burning sulphur (which, if it did not cure the disease, at least didn't do much damage to the victim, according to one medical historian).

William D. Postell, director of the Tulane medical library, who once wrote an article on the Lefebre cholera treatment, received a significant reply from a Cuban physician.

The cure—regardless of its merits—was nevertheless extremely popular in Cuba during the 1840's, the Cuban wrote.

But again, most of the efforts of lasting merit were made by the city's medical education institutions.

The appointment of Dr. Stanford E. Chaille, of Tulane, as chairman of the Federal yellow fever study mission to Cuba in 1879 indicates Tulane's position in that field even then. Another member of that commission, then a medical student who acted as Spanish-English interpreter, was also an important factor in spreading the word of local medical brilliance throughout the Americas.

He was Dr. Rudolph Matas, a native of Bonnet Carre, born of Spanish-speaking parents. In the era of the turn of the century, he achieved international fame as a vascular surgeon, and made frequent study and speaking tours throughout Latin America.

He was succeeded as chairman of Tulane's surgery department in 1927 by Dr. Ochsner.

Today, the Ochsner Clinic and Foundation Hospital and Touro Infirmary treat many Latin patients here each year, some of them leaders of their countries.

Among the patients Dr. Ochsner has treated personally are President Ydigoras and ex-President Lemus, of Guatemala, former Argentine Dictator Peron, former Nicaraguan Dictator Somoza and scores of other persons who have wielded power in the Americas.

That merely scratches the surface.

There are many other New Orleans scientists and physicians, working through local schools and hospitals or individually, who have fought quietly to conquer the tyranny of disease which has pillaged Latin America through the centuries.

Inconsistencies of President's Tariff Plan Defeats Its Real Purpose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the real purposes of the President's tariff proposals are emerging not to bring about free trade, but to further extend Federal controls over industry and the people. Cabinet officers appearing as witnesses before the Ways and Means Committee are unable or unwilling to answer questions which would clear up the confusion existing in the minds of many, including the proponents of the bill. For a closer look at what is behind the tariff legislation, I call your attention to this pertinent editorial from the Wall Street Journal:

INSIDE THE TARIFF PACKAGE

We trust no reader of these columns will mistake our position on foreign trade. We have said here repeatedly that this country must open wider the doors of free trade, and we have specifically encouraged the administration's efforts to lower U.S. tariff barriers.

This may require that Congress give considerable latitude to the executive branch to carry out a defined policy, for Congress cannot negotiate every trade agreement or fix the tariff on every item of commerce.

But to recognize this is not to say that Congress should abdicate its own responsibility to define the Nation's trade policies. The plea for lower tariffs ought not to be used to open another door to all kinds of other trade barriers that make tariffs look like the inventions of amateurs. Nor is this plea an excuse for launching another vague, amorphous and almost unlimited Federal relief program.

Yet that is what is being proposed to Congress in the tariff bill introduced by Chairman MILLS of the House Ways and Means Committee at the administration's behest. There are indeed some startling things hidden under that bill's attractive label.

It is not simply that this bill would carry almost to its ultimate the process of allowing the President to cut or even abolish tariffs, without let or hindrance, although this it would do. The President could enter trade agreements at will and then proclaim the reduction by half of any existing tariff; if the agreement is with a Common Market nation, he could completely eliminate tariffs by the stroke of a pen.

The President is also authorized, whenever he thinks some industry needs protecting from foreign imports, to proclaim such increase in, or imposition of, any duty or other import restriction as he wishes. If this loose language means anything, it means that some President could raise tariffs as well as lower them, or impose brand new ones, or—and here apparently without any limit—impose quotas or any other kind of restriction on imports.

In short, this wide grant of power to the President is for protectionism as much as for free trade. With this bill Congress would not be declaring a freer trade policy but simply authorizing the trade policy to be whatever the President of the moment declared it to be, Foreign trade could escape the annoyances of tariffs only to meet the more impenetrable barriers of direct controls.

Yet there is still more wrapped up in this bill. Under the guise of protecting people from the impact of any tariff cuts, the bill authorizes a whole new program of Government assistance to individuals, business firms, industries, and States.

For example, if the "President determines" that they need it, individuals may be paid an adjustment allowance by the Government, as well as retraining costs and moving expenses. No limit is set for the length of time this "adjustment allowance" can be paid, nor is there any clear definition of who is eligible for it.

Business firms, too, "as the President may determine," would be eligible not only for technical assistance but financial assistance in the form of Government guarantees, loans and special tax treatment. Nor are the States forgotten; in return for accepting some restrictions on their own unemployment program, they can set up their own agencies to administer the relief, and be paid by the Federal Government.

The bill states that actions of the President, "in determining eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance, in certifying adjustment proposals, or in making determinations with respect to extraordinary relief, shall be final and conclusive and shall not be subject to review by any court." In short, a blank check for the President to distribute this largess as he will.

The administration is right, we think, in saying that the economic future of this country lies in the direction of freer trade with the world, and we hope Congress will meet its responsibility to see that we move in that direction. But what this bill grants is the power to any President to move in whatever direction he alone chooses. And buried in it also is a veritable Pandora's box of political woes about who gets what from the Nation's Treasury.

The fact that all this comes in the wrappings of free trade doesn't mean that the country ought to buy the merchandise inside the package.

Virgin Islands: Showplace of American Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, some unfavorable publicity has been focused on the beautiful island territory of the Virgin Islands. The publicity would suggest that the matter of every day associations in that beautiful Caribbean area is anything but pleasing to the eye. I submit to my colleagues that the exact opposite is true. Racial discrimination in the Virgin Islands is present in a constantly decreasing proportion, and the civil rights record of that territory is one that many of us could well use as a guidepost. The story of racial tolerance in the Virgin Islands is eloquently told by the Governor of the Virgin Islands, the Honorable Ralph M. Paiewonsky. I submit his statement of March 2, 1962, for inclusion in the RECORD:

STATEMENT BY GOV. RALPH M. PALEWONSKY ON RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Friends, I come to you to clarify, refocus and give proper perspective to recent issues in our community which have been beclouded with emotionalism, doubt, anger, frustration and uncertainty. One of the topics which has been heatedly discussed recently, and which received its share of emotionalism was the Harvey Aluminum project. Unfortunately, this economic development program became entangled with the discussion of racial discrimination. However, I will say no more about the Harvey Aluminum project except to say that the Legislature of the Virgin Islands unanimously ratified this agreement to establish this plant in St. Croix. We must now work together to see that this enterprise be established on a sound basis, with minimum social dislocation, and as promptly as possible, so that we may realize the many benefits which will redound to the people of the Virgin Islands. In view of recent events and the publicity which has followed on their heels, I feel impelled to come before you tonight to discuss the matter of racial discrimination.

As an illustration of how distorted the picture has been drawn, I call your attention to a letter which I received a few days ago from which I quote:

"Does this administration want all white people to leave?"

While this letter was written with tongue-in-cheek attitude it does serve to point up how vital issues may become lost, and how confused some people in our midst may find themselves. For generations Virgin Islanders have welcomed people of all races to come here to live and will continue to do so.

Several months ago a national magazine article appeared pointing out that discrimination existed in the Virgin Islands. An investigation was made which revealed that there did in fact exist residual pockets of public discrimination on the social level, specifically in two or three clubs, and in one or two real estate developments on the island of St. Croix. The legislature passed a civil rights law aimed to eliminate these last vestiges of 18th century thinking. It came as a shock that the handful of people who were involved organized themselves into a willful and vocal minority to circumvent the law, and to maintain and justify their position. In fairness to the well-meaning segment of this group, it should be noted that to the best of my knowledge they are making bona fide attempts to comply with the law, leaving the tenacious, willful, small minority even smaller in number.

Let us reexamine at this point what is accepted by us as the true picture of a Virgin Islander. To us, the Virgin Islander represents a way of life. He is a man of dignity. He is a member of all races and of different religious beliefs. He selects his friends and associates on the basis of human worth and value without regard to race, creed or color. He is the voter. He is the property owner; he is our civic and community leader; he is our legislator; he is our administrator; he is our teacher; he is the farmer; he is the laborer—he is in every walk of life. He is our physician, he is our law-enforcement officer; he is the planner; he is the newspaper, radio and TV owner; he is the businessman—he is of all hues and of all beliefs. He is the majority. He does not apologize to any man for being a Virgin Islander—he is proud of it—to him it is a title of distinction. He was either born in the Virgin Islands or he came here to live among us with the same ideals, principles and dedication to preserve his way of life.

New people who come here to live among us earn this title only after they have proved that they can appreciate, accept and participate in this society of men of goodwill. They are accepted by us, not because they are rich or poor, white or black, Jew or Gentile, Republican or Democrat, but because they are decent human beings. Those who remain outside this happy association are constantly dissatisfied with our Virgin Islands way of life—they are the ones who protest greater self government; they write to their Senators to stop the transfer of Federal property; they protest the passage of civil rights law.

To give the proper perspective let us be reminded that here in the Virgin Islands all our children attend the same schools, public, private and parochial; our people are treated at the same hospitals, clinics, and by the same physicians; our housing facilities are available to all; our churches and temples serve all the people according to their beliefs, and with no other criteria; employment opportunities are available to all on the same basis; all of us vote in accordance with local law; everyone is free to run for public office and to compete for scholarships; public transportation is open to all without restrictions.

The summary of Virgin Islands life overshadows these small pockets of discrimination and places them in proper perspective. That certain social forms of discrimination still exist here is unfortunate, but whenever and wherever they show their ugly heads here in the Virgin Islands they must be dealt with effectively and with dispatch. But let us not destroy the picture of a healthy demonstration of democracy in action of which our every-day living together speaks of so eloquently.

We in the Virgin Islands welcome all to our shores and we are happy to offer them mutuality and equality, but more we cannot give. We are proud of our way of life, not only because we enjoy it, but because we know it is right. Official and other visitors have repeatedly commented on the ease and harmony in which we live. Many have pointed out that this demonstration represents the greatest asset which the Virgin Islands can offer to the United States. We have but to read the newspapers to realize how far advanced we are in the area of human relations and integration. We will preserve this Virgin Islands way of life, not only because it is important to us and to our children, but because it is important to the world.

My administration will maintain strict vigilance to prevent the inception and survival of any and all kinds of discriminatory practices in the Virgin Islands. We will continue to use all persuasive, moral, and legal deterrents at our command to maintain our Virgin Islands way of life.

The Virgin Islands are today an outstanding example of democratic living, and with God's help we shall continue to keep these beautiful islands the showplace of American democracy, not only in name but also in truth and in fact.

Cpl. Ben Newman of the Idaho State Police

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH R. HARDING

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, all of the Upper Snake River Valley in Idaho last week mourned the death of an outstanding law enforcement officer—Ben Newman.

This officer died of a heart attack on March 3 while helping a motorist get his stalled car out of a snow drift. He had been working around the clock to aid motorists on State Highway 33 which had been blocked by drifts from heavy snowstorms.

Every motorist who ever traveled on the Yellowstone Highway and met Ben Newman shares our sadness at his passing. He was a dedicated officer who diligently served the people of our State.

Only a few weeks ago as I visited the flood ravaged areas of eastern Idaho and our helicopter landed at the Rexburg Airport, there was our good friend, Ben, to meet us. It was evident that this officer had been going without sleep to aid the flood victims.

Inasmuch as this great policeman had to return to the God that created him, I believe he would have preferred to go as he did—in the line of duty.

A colleague of Ben Newman's for 14 years and a close personal friend, Sgt. C. H. Roberts, had this to say about him:

Ben was known as a policeman's policeman, a man's man, and a friend of any troubled stranger in need. Everyone who knew him loved him and respected him. You could call on him any time of day or night. He was always happiest when helping somebody else, and he usually was.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to include an outstanding radio editorial tribute paid to this officer by Gene Shumate, owner and manager of radio station KRXK in Rexburg, Idaho:

CPL. BEN NEWMAN

Cpl. Ben Newman of the Idaho State Police died on duty last night, following a heart attack. His commanding officer Lt. Ervin Dunn called that information to the radio station last night. This morning I visited with Lieutenant Dunn at Beeches Corner and received further details.

Ben had worked all night during a blizzard on Highway 33 between Newdale and Tetonia. A Teton County schoolbus was stalled in the middle of the blizzard and a snowplow that was to lead the bus through had broken down. Ben tried to help with the plow and also patrolled to keep other vehicles out of the snowbound stretch. The bus finally was towed clear at 5:30 in the morning. He came home for a few hours' rest but was back on the highway early in the afternoon. Home again for a quick dinner at 6, then back to the highway. When he returned he found a motorist stuck. Putting chains on his police car he pulled the other vehicle to a comparatively bare place on the highway, then started to unchain. The motorist finished the job of taking off the chains when Ben suddenly got into his car. The traveler opened the door of the police car to ask what he should do with the chains and Ben told him he better get in and drive him to Rexburg, that he was pretty sick * * * too sick to drive the car or even operate the two-way radio. The motorist complied with this request and finally found the secret to the radio and called the dispatcher at Beeches Corner and told him Ben was sick and help was needed. The dispatcher in turn contacted Madison County Sheriff Ford Smith, who was on the road in a matter of a few minutes with Dr. Blaine Passey. They met the patrol car and Dr. Passey got inside with Ben, who could still talk and asked for help. He said he thought he had had a heart attack. Dr. Passey commenced medical treatment immediately, but Ben Newman died within a matter of a few minutes.

His body is at the Hansen Funeral Home in Saint Anthony now. Funeral arrangements are indefinite, pending word from a sister in New Jersey and two daughters in California. Probable date will be Wednesday, March 7.

This death has come as a shock to many people. Most of us looked on Ben as an indestructible man. He could and did work the clock around many times, and had done so since coming to Rexburg in October, 1948. His service with the patrol began in Twin Falls in August of 1948.

Sometimes—and it seems rare times—a man and a job meet, and they are suited. Ben Newman was the ideal policeman, I always thought. He liked being a policeman and had a deep sense of responsibility toward his job and the public. He possessed a great amount of physical courage and physical strength. He could rescue a dog from a flooding river or wrestle a drunk to the ground and handcuff him; he could talk convincingly and coherently about highway safety and could drive a car 110 miles an hour to apprehend and clear the highway of a reckless driver.

As a policeman he saw more of the seamy side of life than most of us. Many of his duties were not happy ones, but they were duties and so they were done.

He was a compassionate man and not callous to tragedy and weakness.

He died probably not knowing how much he was appreciated by the public, because most of us do not express our apreciation enough or at the right time.

KRXK received a plaque from the Rexburg Junior Chamber of Commerce last Wednesday, thanking us for the public service we rendered during the recent flood. I am sure the Jaycees join me in saying I wish the plaque had carried Ben Newman's name instead of ours.

Good afternoon, everyone. Thanks for listening.

May the good Lord comfort his lovely wife and his six fine children with understanding and courage at this difficult time.

Air Pollution Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address which I delivered at the annual dinner of the Air Pollution Control Association, Colony Motor Hotel, Cranston, R.I., on October 26, 1961:

ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

I am delighted that your 13th annual observance of Cleaner Air Week gives me a new opportunity to talk to you on one of my favorite subjects, community air pollution. It is a pleasure to know that the New England section of the Air Pollution Control Association has been so active and so productive during the past 3 years.

I had the honor of making a few remarks during your first dinner meeting exactly 3 years ago. Since then, a lot of water has gone over the dam. Or perhaps I should say, a lot of aerial pollutants have poured out of our home and factory chimneys, our power plants and municipal dumps, and the crankcases and tailpipes of our automobiles and trucks and buses. But I also feel that we have made considerable progress during those 3 years in the necessary first steps toward the assessment of the air pollution problem and public recognition of its seriousness, and taken at least a few steps toward its solution.

Year 1958, as well as all of you will recall, was the year of the big National Conference on Air Pollution in Washington. I felt at that time that this conference served an important purpose in clarifying the issues in this field, in delineating some reasonable objectives, and, above all, in awakening the press and the public to a growing environmental problem which affects so importantly the national economy and the public health. I might add that your own continuing sponsorship of Cleaner Air Week similarly contributes to public awareness of this problem. Without public interest and public support, of course, none of us can make any progress at all in our fight for cleaner air.

I think it is probable that there will be another such conference in 1962. I hope so. I know that your organization and many another have urged the Federal Government to take the initiative in this matter. Among other important groups which have made recommendations to that end are the American Municipal Association, the National Association of County Officials, and the Air Pollution Control Department of New York City. I believe that a national conference in 1962 could be of great value in evaluating our progress in this field since 1958, in suggesting new goals or timetables if these are needed, and perhaps in stimulating earlier or more general use of control measures based on methods and equipment which are already available.

Over the past several years I have been deeply concerned with the possibilities for improvement of certain factors in our modern environment which have to do with public health. From the vantage point of my chairmanship of the Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations subcommittee in the House of Representatives, I have had a real opportunity to get acquainted with all our current health problems, including air pollution, in which I have long had a special interest.

As many of you know, my committee called for a detailed report from the Public Health Service on environmental health problems and held extended hearings, during which we took testimony from many outside specialists as well as those in Public Health Service. Incidentally, several distinguished New Englanders were among our witnesses on the subject of air pollution, including Profs. Rolf Eliassen, from MIT, and Ross McFarland and James Whittenberger, from Harvard's School of Public Health.

As a result of these hearings and my further study of the air pollution problem, I am convinced that its solution will require a cooperative, a joint approach, on the part of the Federal Government, the States, and local communities. For none of these can do alone what needs to be done. My committee is taking active steps to make possible in-

creased Federal participation in the collective job, to make sure that at least this one side of a many-sided obligation is met in full. (I know that it hardly needs emphasizing to this well-informed audience that industry too shares importantly in this obligation.) Included in the Federal role, I hope, will be provision for rendering financial as well as technical assistance to States and localities which seek to initiate more effective control programs.

You may be interested in a brief review of some of the things which the Federal Government has already been able to do, under present laws, for New England States and localities.

Both Harvard and Massachusetts Institute of Technology have been conducting air pollution research since 1957 under Public Health Service grants. The PHS Division of Air Pollution has provided technical assistance here in Providence, in Boston, and in Berlin, N.H., and helped to survey the air pollution problems throughout the State of Connecticut.

This summer, as part of a larger research project on atmospheric lead and body lead levels in certain occupational groups, analyses were made of the air in and near Boston's Sumner Tunnel, where especially high concentrations of motor vehicle exhaust emissions were to be expected.

Here in Providence, an intensive 5-week study was initiated last July at the request of my good friend, Genaro Constantino, chief of this city's division of air pollution and mechanical equipment and installations. This study was designed to improve knowledge of air pollution levels here and to help the local agency in developing greater competence in sampling and analyzing atmospheric contaminants.

In addition, the Public Health Service has maintained since 1957 one nonurban and at least one urban station of the national air sampling network in every New England State. Many of these stations have recently begun to sample gaseous as well as solid pollutants.

There is certainly no doubt that New England—and especially southern New England—has a serious and growing air pollution problem. For many of my facts and figures on this point, I am indebted to Bill Megonnell, whom you all know, the regional consultant on air pollution in this area for the Public Health Service.

The northeast is at least 6 times as densely populated as the rest of the country; here are located 45, out of a national total of 188, standard metropolitan areas. And it is people and people's activities which create air pollution.

The Northeastern States consume well over one-third of the light and heavy fuel oils burned in this country, one-quarter of the bituminous coal, and practically all of the anthracite coal. As for manufacturing activity, over 35 percent of the Nation's manufacturing employment is in this 10-State region. (In these figures, New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey are included.)

In many New England communities, emissions from motor vehicles represent a significant proportion of the total air contamination. Another serious aspect of the aid pollution problems here is the disposal of tremendous quantities of municipal, commercial, and industrial refuse. In congested areas, scarcity of land for sanitary landfills has led to common use of the open dump, where refuse is usually burned, so that odors and smoke from these sources are widespread and common.

Many other source categories, of considerable importance to specific communities, could be listed. It is probable that nearly every type of source and kind of contaminant is encountered at some time and place in this section of the country.

So you can be sure that whatever I and my committee in Washington are able to accomplish in the direction of more effective Federal aid for States and localities, it will be needed and applied in ample measure right here in our own New England.

As most of you know, President Kennedy made a most forceful statement on the air pollution issue as a part of his message to Congress earlier this year on natural resources. "Although the total supply of air is vast," he said, "the atmosphere over our growing metropolitan areas—where more than half of the people live—has only limited capacity to dilute and disperse the contaminants now being increasingly discharged from homes, factories, vehicles, and many other sources.' He further stated his intention to foster a more effective Federal program for protection of this vital natural resource.

In my opinion, Secretary Ribicoff, who hails from our neighbor State of Connecticut and is doing a good job in the new administration—has also struck a mighty blow for cleaner air. Not long ago, he challenged the automobile industry to make devices that destroy air-polluting crankcase fumes standard equipment on all motor cars from 1964 on, or face legislation that would make factory installation mandatory.

I feel that I too have been successful in adding one more push to keep this good ball rolling. Representing as I do one of America's great industrial States, I consider myself one of industry's best friends. But it is industry's longrun interests which I seek to serve, because I believe that in the long run, the best interests of industry are identical with those of the workingman and the general public. And I can't help thinking that some branches of industry have been a little shortsighted in this matter of air pollution.

I am thinking particularly, of course, of the automobile industry and the oil industry. Although some of you may have read a condensed version of my comments—since they were widely reported by the newspapers throughout the Nation—I think you will all be interested in what I actually said about these industries on the floor of Congress this spring. If I may, I will repeat a part of it here.

Motor vehicles constitute one of the major sources of air pollution and, unlike many other important pollutant sources, this one is universal throughout the United States. Our cars and trucks go everywhere.

I cannot escape the conclusion that the automobile industry has been dragging its feet in the matter of factory installation of blowby devices. These, as you probably know, are relatively inexpensive devices for controlling emissions from automotive crankcases. While they will not solve the larger problem of exhaust emissions from the tailpipe, they do eliminate from one-fourth to one-third of the motorcar's total contribution to our air pollution problem.

Such devices were factory installed on new cars sold this year in the one State of California and are available—at a higher price, of course—as optional dealer-installed equipment on new American cars in other localities. In view of the mounting evidence that air pollution not only is costly but may also be highly hazardous to human health—and since this new device eliminates a part of it at a low cost—it would have seemed both good business and good public relations for the auto industry to install such a device at the factory on all new cars sold in this country. This, in fact, is what Secretary Ribicoff recently recommended.

Unlike automobiles, oil refineries are not an important part of the air pollution problem in every city, but they certainly are in many cities. In the Los Angeles area, refineries have placed into effect control measures which drastically reduce their potential contribution to Los Angeles smog. What this means, then, is that Los Angeles suffers a minimum of refinery emissions and, in addition, receives new cars with blowby control devices factory installed.

In other parts of the country, however, neither the automobile industry nor the oil industry is cooperating half so well. New Jersey, for example, is one of the many States that receive almost none of the advantages insisted upon in Los Angeles.

New Jersey comes to mind because it has just recently come to my attention that New Jersey's Rutgers University is attempting to develop smog-resistant plants in order to help truck farmers to survive. A single ride at almost any hour of the day on the upper stretches of the New Jersey Turnpike makes it patently clear why Rutgers is interested in plants that can survive smog, and you don't have to be an expert loaded down with instruments to see that both refineries and automobiles play an important role in New Jersey's smog problem.

I should think that these two rich industries—simply in enlightened self-interest, if for no other reason—would do everything they reasonably could do to abate their own contribution to this growing environmental hazard, if only to avert the risk of drastic legislation which might seem to them much less reasonable in its demands.

That was the end of my statement to Congress. I am sure you realize, however, that I do not consider those two great industries—which have contributed so much to our matchless American standard of living—as the sole offender in this area.

Throughout New England there are other industries which have done much less than they might have done in utilizing methods and equipment which are already available to reduce their own air polluting emissions.

Nor is industry the sole offender. The list is a familiar one to you. It includes burning municipal dumps and municipally owned power plants. And dry cleaning establishments and backyard incinerators. And home furnaces improperly adjusted for efficient fuel combustion. And autos and trucks and buses improperly maintained, so that their emissions are bigger and blacker and smellier than they need to be, even without control devices.

Last but not least on our list of offenders are those many States and communities whose offenses are the sins of omission rather than emission; governmental agencies and lawmaking bodies whose control regulations have not kept pace with increasing sources of air pollution and our increasing knowledge of effective abatement measures.

Since I have a little something to do with what happens at the Federal level, perhaps I had better close with my own ideas of what is needed at that level if our real progress during the past 3 years is to be sharply enough accelerated in the next few years to keep pace with our swift industrial and technological growth.

We need—and you have heard this many times—more research on the nature and effects of air pollution, most of all on its health effects. I feel that the Public Health Service has made a good start here, but it had to start from scratch, to set up novel techniques and acquire or develop novel equipment, and to find or train qualified personnel. Moreover, we are dealing here with chronic health effects, with long-term effects, and many of the findings from sound projects initiated during the past few years have yet to be analyzed and interpreted. This kind of research must go on, and should be expanded. Likewise research into more efficient and less expensive methods for abating pollutant emissions at the source.

We need, as I have mentioned, more adequate provision for Federal aid to States

and localities in setting up effective control programs—in technical assistance and in money.

Finally, the Federal Government needs that environmental health center you have been hearing so much about lately. I am wholly convinced of the desirability of this project, which will include as a major segment more adequate facilities for carrying on the Public Health Service's air pollution activities.

Let me try to tell you in closing just how much importance I do attach to the proposed center.

This touches one of my interests which is far larger in scope than even the air pollution problem.

What kind of environment are we going to leave to our children? Our people multiply and crowd together into those endless chains of city-suburbs-city-suburbs-city. Our technology creates new chemicals faster than our scientists can measure their toxicity. Even if we can succeed in putting an end to radioactive fallout before it puts an end to us, the rising flood of old and new pollutants will increasingly soil our air and spoil our water. Our basic supply of potable water is threatened with exhaustion. Our good rich soil is being taken out of cultivation, by the hundreds of squars miles, for multiple-lane highways and parking lots. Even if the bumper-to-bumper traffic of a Sunday afternoon would let us drive somewhere in comfort, where could we find within driving range of our big cities a peaceful countryside?

I am proud of the tremendous progress we Americans have made in science and technology, and I want it to continue. I am even optimistic about it. If we start soon enough on a truly large-scale program to counteract the unwanted byproducts of that progress, then I think we shall have an excellent chance of bequeathing to our children an urban environment which will be worthy of this lucky land and its unsurpassed natural endowments.

The proposed environmental health center is a project conceived in an order of magnitude that is comparable to the bigness of the problems it will seek to solve. Its realization will help us to make faster progress in air pollution control and to make America a healthier and happier place to be alive in.

Little People Crusade for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I have noted with great interest and pleasure the laudatory and encouraging reports in the public press concerning the inspiring letters of friendship program proposed by our able and distinguished colleague, the Honorable PETER W. RODINO, JR., as a result of chance remarks of little 10-year-old Peter Rodino at the dinner table.

Young Peter suggested that Premier Khrushchev might be impressed if many children in America wrote him about the dangers of nuclear fallout to children everywhere from the Russian atmospheric testing. The lad spoke about this to his friends and schoolmates and soon the idea spread, even far beyond the Rodino neighborhood.

Candidly, I am pleased greatly, but not at all surprised that young Peter Rodino should show such extraordinary promise for a boy of his age. Congressman RODINO is one of the outstanding men in the Congress and his charming, gracious wife a most talented woman. They may well be very proud of Peter. I know that I am.

Parent teacher groups, the Boy Scouts and veterans organizations took up the suggestion and encouraged still more children to write. As a natural outgrowth of this spontaneous letter campaign, Congressman RODINO not long after suggested to the President's new Chairman of the people-to-people program, General Eisenhower, that a special little people program be developed to destroy the myth of communism through letters of truth from children in the free world in the cause of peace.

General Eisenhower and other officials of the people-to-people program agreed and Congressman RODINO has been cooperating with them in working out and completing details of the little people movement.

The response to Congressman RODINO's proposal has been prompt and heartening with messages of encouragement and support from many places and from people in all walks of life. I feel sure that our colleague will continue to receive the encouragement and backing he deserves in advancing this new and unique little people program.

The Firing Line: An Authentic Reporter on Subversive Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, the Firing Line, a six-page monthly newsletter devoted to exposing subversive activities in the United States, has been published by the countersubversive section of the National Americanism Commission of the American Legion national organization for the past 11 years. The Firing Line is recognized by authorities on communism and by officials of several investigative, intelligence, and inspection groups of the Federal Government as one of the important publications in the specialized field of reporting on subversive individuals, organizations, and publications within our country's borders.

Resulting from actions taken at recent national conventions of the American Legion, the Firing Line has been mandated to continue to "expose and report upon communistic, socialistic, radical, un-American, one-world government, and related activities and publications, and upon individuals, without fear or favor and let the chips fall where they may."

In addition to timely articles based upon research from unimpeachable source material, each issue of the Firing Line contains a special "Commanding Thoughts" column by American Legion National Commander Charles L. Bacon. This added feature conveys an important message on significant issues of the day as they relate to the field of internal security. I congratulate the American Legion on the publishing of this vitally needed compilation of facts having to do with the Communist conspiracy within our country.

The newsletter follows:

COMMANDING THOUGHTS

(By Charles L. Bacon)

A new word—"polycentrism"—has now been added to the lexicon of cold war terminology. The use of the term is apparently designed to convey the meaning that the world Communist empire is now controlled by more than one central power. The so-called ideological dispute now extant between Moscow and Peiping supposedly exemplifies the basic concept that Moscow is no longer the final arbiter of decisions behind the Iron Curtain. It is obvious that a strong belief in polycentrism could easily lead to the false conclusion that since the world Communist empire is in the throes of an internal contest for power it is less likely to pose, as it did in the pre-Khrushchev days of Joe Stalin, a menace to the remaining free countries of the world.

It is also obvious that this might be precisely the conclusion that leaders of the Communist party wish us to draw. Nothing could be more dangerous to our national security than to adopt such a specious conclusion. While no Western observer can be certain of the exact relationship which presently exists between Soviet Russia and Red China, nevertheless, it is at best, only safe to conclude that differences do exist.

The Chinese Reds on the one hand are insistent upon pursuing an aggressive, dynamic policy of expansion. They seem prepared to accept the risks of such a policy, including the danger of triggering a nuclear war. On the other hand the Russians, with a highly industrialized society, prefer to pursue a more cautious approach to world domination by ostensibly espousing the doctrine of coexistence, while at the same time employing political, ideological, and diplomatic techniques of subversion.

Long experience with Communist methods and with the Communist mind should indicate to us that while there may be disagreement between the two leading Communist powers on the mode of approach, nevertheless, there is accord on the goal which they seek—the imposition of the Communist way of life on the whole world.

Let us not fall prey to artful words. Let us not permit seeming dissension within the enemy camp to lull the United States into a false sense of security. Polycentrism might very well be but another effort, in a long line of efforts, by the Communist dynasty to weaken by deception our internal security.

The American Legion has long been an effective bulwark against the world Communist conspiracy simply because it has never succumbed to illusions, fallen prey to semanticism, nor failed in its expressed vow to expose and lay bare the nature of our declared enemy, which has sworn to "bury us."

I urge you to reject this latest exploration into the realm of possibility, surmise, speculation, and wishful thinking, and to resolve anew that we shall be guided by the tested and proven admonition of Thomas Jefferson: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

CURRENT FACTS AND FIGURES ON THE COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.

The Communist Party, U.S.A. (CPUSA), an alien organization directed and controlled

by international Soviet communism, continues its subversive operations within our Nation's borders to an alarming degree, notwithstanding affirmative action of the Federal Government in prosecuting the party for "willfully and unlawfully" failing to register under section 7 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950. The registration provisions of this act, upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States on June 5, 1961, also require the CPUSA to file a supplementary statement to include a "list of members' names, aliases and addresses; a list of printing presses and reproduction equipment controlled by the party; and a financial accounting of all money received and spent."

Following the example of the CPUSA organization in deliberately ignoring the registration deadline of November 20, 1961, party officers and individual members also failed to register under the act on the required dates, November 30 and December 20, respectively. The CPUSA's flagrant refusal to comply with the law resulted in Federal grand jury proceedings in the District of Columbia. A 12-count indictment on December 1, 1961, charged the party with failing to register as a Communist-action organization under the aforementioned act.

In commenting on the effectiveness of the registration requirement in curtailing party activity "even before return of the indictment," Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy said FBI data revealed the CPUSA "drastically altered its organizational apparatus in anticipation of enforcement of the Subversive Activities Control Act" and "directed its activities primarily toward influencing public sentiment against this act." According to the Attorney General, the "party apparently has cut down the number of its officers, eliminated dues payments in some areas, and greatly reduced the frequency of local meetings. In one area, members were instructed to destroy all membership and financial records and to clean house from cellar to attic. In another area, a regional party organization appears to have been dissolved."

Functioning as the largest single subversive organization in the United States, CPUSA numerical strength is currently estimated between 8,000 and 10,000 hard-core, fanatical revolutionists who have been tested by time and adversity. In spite of its decreasing membership rolls, the party continuously presents a formidable menace to the internal security of the United States. Fluctuating membership has been a characteristic of the CPUSA since its establishment 43 years ago. During 1944 when CPUSA strength reached a peak of 80,000, "it was stronger in numbers than the Soviet Party was at the time it seized power in Russia." Regardless of public admissions by Communist functionaries of shrinking party membership totals, it is important to remember that "for every party member 10 others are ready, willing, and able to do the party's work."

While it is a known fact that CPUSA membership figures alone never reflect actual party strength, the CPUSA has exhibited noticeable influence on the American scene in varying degrees through the years. Limited success in the attainment of its subversive missions has been accomplished by the party in instigating demonstrations and riots and in duping gullible and apathetic Americans through the utilization of an insidious network of front apparatuses. Through the influence of non-Communist organizations and effective support from pseudoliberals, the party has been able to rely on the assistance of groups not tagged as Communist. The dangerousness of CPUSA activities in America must also be evaluated on the basis of its closely knit affiliation with other Communist and Workers Parties organized in 88 countries in the world. Representing a combined membership of nearly 40 million, these Communist Parties have gained absolute control in 17 nations.

It has been reliably reported that "Communist-bloc nations now control approximately one-fourth of the land area of the world and approximately one-third, or one billion, of the inhabitants on the face of the globe. Even in non-Communist nations, there are approximately 4 million Communist Party members dedicated to the overthrow of their existing governments.

CPUSA PUBLICATIONS

An indicator for determining to a limited degree the interest shown in the activities of a particular subversive organization is the number (including circulation figure) of the newspapers and periodicals it regularly publishes. As a publisher of numerous organs with varying circulations, the CPUSA distributed the following 11 key party publications during 1961:

The Worker (weekend and midweek editions), Publishers New Press, Inc., 23 West 26th Street, New York, N.Y.—16,239, average paid circulation; People's World, Pacific Publishing Foundation, Inc., 81 Clementina Street, San Francisco, Calif.—7,696, average paid circulation; Mainstream, Masses & Mainstream, Inc., 832 Broadway, New York, N.Y.—806, average paid circulation; Jewish Currents, Jewish Currents, Inc., 22 East 17th Street, New York, N.Y.—3,262, average paid circulation; Political Affairs, New Century Publishers, Inc., 832 Broadway, New York, N.Y.—1,045, average paid circulation; Party Affairs, National Committee of the CPUSA, 23 West 26th Street, New York, N.Y; Freedomways, Freedomways Associates, Inc., 799 Broadway, New York, N.Y.; Morning Freiheit, 35 East 12th Street, New York, N.Y.; New Horizons for Youth, Youth Publications, Inc., 799 Broadway, New York, N.Y.; New World Review, N.W.R. Publications, Inc., 34 West 15th Street, New York, N.Y.—6,100, average paid circulation; and Science & Society, Science & Society, Inc., 30 East 20th Street, New York, N.Y.

The National Guardian, a subversive tabloid newspaper, has never been cited as a CPUSA publication per se; however, it was listed in a 1956 report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities as a "virtual official propaganda arm of Soviet Russia." Published by Weekly Guardian Associates, Inc., 197 East 4th Street, New York, N.Y., the National Guardian reported in 1961 an average paid circulation of 29,072.

Socialist Workers Party (SWP), a revolutionary organization composed of followers of the late Leon Trotsky, publishes a weekly newspaper entitled "The Militant." Distributed by the Militant Publishing Association of 116 University Place, New York, N.Y., the Militant had an average circulation of 4,776 last year. Pointing out the fact that the SWP is not an affiliate of the CPUSA, the 11th Report (1961) of the California Senate Fact-Finding Subcommittee on Un-American Activities declared the SWP "is founded on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and is important because it seeks to weaken us by subversion and bring about an ultimate Communist domination of the world." The report indicated that the old hostility between the SWP and CPUSA no longer exists by reflex action in certain isolated cases. Stating although the formal membership in the American Communist Party has dwindled, the report disclosed that the CPUSA has now drawn to itself powerful radical groups—of which the Socialist Workers Party is perhaps the most militant and dangerous—into a second united front movement in strict obedience to the directive issued by Khrushchev 5 years ago.

COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA OUTLETS

The party continues to operate two official publishing houses, namely, International Publishers, 381 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y., and New Century Publishers, Inc. (the latter now operating in part as New Era Book & Subscription Agency, Inc.), 832 Broadway, New York, N.Y. Inasmuch as the two publishers function as mail-order businesses, agents for these Communist organizations control printing establishments in several major cities. According to party sources, there is a chain of Workers and Progressive bookshops located in the United States where CPUSA literature can be purchased. Listed among these principal retail outlets are: Jefferson Book Shop, 100 East 16th Street, New York, N.Y.; Modern Book Store, 56 East Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; Progressive Bookshop, 1806 West 7th Street, Los Angeles, Calif.; and International Book Store, 1408 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A recent report of the U.S. Department of Justice stated that the two major outlets for Soviet propaganda in this country are the Four Continent Book Corp., 156 Fifth Avenue, and Imported Publications & Products, 4 West 16th Street, both of New York, N.Y. These distributors, which import and sell a considerable quantity of Soviet bloc material in the United States, are registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act as agents of Mezhdunarodnava Kniga (official U.S.S.R. Organization for the distribution of books, periodicals, newspapers, and other printed matter outside the Soviet Union).

In addition to the above-mentioned CPUSA publishers, "Workers and Progressive" bookshops and principal distributors of Communist bloc propaganda, Crosscurrents Press, Inc., and International Arts and Sciences Press have been supporting the advancement of Soviet imperialism through wide dissemination of numerous pamphlets and a variety of translated material. Large quantities of literature emanating from the two publishers have been distributed gratis by the Soviet Embassy in the United States. Crosscurrents Press, an agent for Mezhdunarodnaya Kniga, reportedly received $21,755 from the Soviet Embassy during the period December 1960–October 1961. It is interesting to note that Crosscurrents Press and International Arts and Sciences Press, both located at 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., are headed by Myron Emanuel Sharpe, alias Mike Sharpe.

During 1954, while Sharpe was chairman of the Ann Arbor (Mich.) Labor Youth League, he was subpenaed to appear before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Sharpe was a very uncooperative witness before this congressional committee and took refuge behind the 1st, 5th, 6th, 9th, and 10th amendments to the Constitution when questioned regarding Communist youth activities and related subjects. Functioning as a youth section of the CPUSA, and successor to the notorious Young Communist League and American Youth for Democracy, the Labor Youth League dissolved in 1957 to avoid registering as a Communist-front organization under a provision of the Subversive Activities Control Act. Sharpe's latest propaganda organ is a relatively new monthly journal called the Soviet Review, published by the International Arts and Sciences Press. The following are members of the journal's editorial and business office staff: Myron E. Sharpe, editor and publisher; Jean Karsavina and Fred Ablin, associate editors; and F. A. Manson, circulation manager.

NEW DISTRIBUTOR OF COMMUNIST LITERATURE

Within the past 7 months, a new organization was formed called World Books of 747 Broadway, New York, N.Y. World Books, which sponsors a discussion group called the Saturday Forum, purports to be a "center of literary cultural exchange, devoted to English translations of important Russian and Chinese documents and books." Numerous advertisements have been placed in the Worker and National Guardian by World Books concerning the availability of a selection of important publications specifically

dealing with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and its recent XXII Congress.

A letterhead of World Books indicated that Philip Frankfeld is an official of the new organization. Frankfeld, who has been closely associated with the CPUSA in various leadership capacities for a number of years, served in party offices in many cities including Chicago, Boston, Pittsburgh, Seattle, and Cleveland. From the mid-1940's to 1950, Frankfeld was chairman of the Communist Party of Maryland-District of Columbia, then known as district 4. A year prior to his imprisonment for conspiring to advocate the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force and violence, Frankfeld was reportedly expelled from the CPUSA, according to the Communist Daily Worker of March 7, 1952.

NEW FRONTS AID DOMESTIC COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES

With the upholding by the Supreme Court on June 5, 1961, of the constitutionality of the registration and disclosure provisions of the Subversive Activities Control Act, together with the Smith Act membership clause, the CPUSA immediately founded a new front organization for the exclusive support of the party's position. Established on or about June 12 as the Citizens Committee for Consitutional Liberties (CCCL), the newly formed group's national office is located in Room 1525, 22 East 17th Street, New York, N.Y. The CCCL was responsible for coordinating and organizing an identified front affair entitled the National Assembly for Democratic Rights, held at St. Nicholas Arena in New York City September 23–24, 1961. Cited as Communist-fronts by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, both the CCCL and its national assembly project were "created, dominated and controlled by members and officials of the Communist Party."

The House committee reported in October 1961 that the CCCL and national assembly "were organized as propaganda devices for the conduct of mass activity in support of the avowed objective of reversal or nonapplication of the Supreme Court decisions of June 5. * * * The long-range objective of the CCCL is to serve as the vehicle for concealed Communist participation in, and direction of, propaganda and agitational activities aimed to nullify the Internal Security and Smith Acts." Among the mass amount of literature circulated by the CCCL, two of the committee's pamphlets are publicly distributed by the aforementioned New Era Book & Subscription Agency, Inc.

Shortly prior to the staging of CCCL's national assembly, both the National Guardian and the Worker published a revealing list of local organizations in support of this Communist-front project, including: Minnesota Committee to Defend the Bill of Rights, 690 14th Avenue, NW., New Brighton, Minn.; Committee for Constitutional Liberties, 942 Market St., San Francisco, Calif.; Constitutional Liberties Information Center, Post Office Box 388, Hollywood, Calif.; Utah Council for Constitutional Liberties, Post Office Box 1112, Salt Lake City, Utah; Wisconsin Committee for Constitutional Freedom, Post Office Box 433, Milwaukee, Wis.; Michigan Committee of the National Assembly for Democratic Rights, 1306 Holden Avenue, Detroit, Mich.; Chicago Committee of the National Assembly for Democratic Rights, 189 West Madison, Chicago, Ill.; Chicago Committee to Defend the Bill of Rights, 189 West Madison, Chicago, Ill.; Ohio Citizens for Constitutional Rights, 14712 Shaw Avenue, East Cleveland, Ohio; Maryland Committee for Democratic Rights, 1526 Winford Road, Baltimore, Md.; Committee in Defense of Constitutional Liberties, 249 South Melville Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; and Representatives of the National Assembly, 1434 Chambers Road, St. Louis, Mo.

A current leaderhead of the Citizens Committee for Constitutional Liberties disclosed that Miriam Friedlander is the group's executive secretary. Interestingly, a 1960 congressional publication listed Miss Friedlander as a member of the national committee of the CPUSA. The treasurer of the CCCL is Dr. Oakley C. Johnson, a founding member of the CPUSA. According to various State and Federal legislative documents, Johnson has been closely associated with the Communist movement in America since its formal inception in Chicago, Illinois, in 1919.

Included in the list of 32 current sponsors of the CCL are many whose names have previously appeared in the Firing Line and in other documented newsletters; namely, Rev. Lee Ball, Ardsley, N.Y.; Elmer Benson, Appleton, Minn.; Rev. Mark Chamberlain, Gresham, Oreg.; John M. Coe, Pensacola, Fla.; Robert W. Dunne, New York, N.Y.; Moe Fishman, New York, N.Y.; Rev. Stephen H. Fritchman, Rim Forest, Calif.; Hugo Gellert, New York, N.Y.; Vincent Hallinan, San Francisco, Calif.; Grace Hutchins, New York, N.Y.; Rockwell Kent, Au Sable Forks, N.Y.; Meridel Le Sueur, Mendota, Minn.; John T. McTernan, Los Angeles, Calif.; Rev. William H. Melish, Brooklyn, N.Y.; Hugh Mulzac, Jamaica, N.Y.; Alex Munsell, New York, N.Y.; George B. Murphy, Jr., Washington, D.C.; Dr. Otto Nathan, New York, N.Y.; Anton Refregier, Woodstock, N.Y.; Prof. Louise Pettibone Smith, Winchester Center, Conn.; Dr. Willard Uphaus, New Haven, Conn.; and Rev. Eliot White, Arlington, Mass.

The U.N. Bond Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of a resolution adopted by the Westfield (N.J.) Women's Republican Club on February 20, which concerns a subject of great importance to all our colleagues, the proposed purchase by our Government of one-half of the special United Nations $200 million bond issue:

THE U.N. BOND ISSUE

Whereas the United States has a huge national indebtedness which keeps growing; and

Whereas the United States has supported the United Nations since its founding, paying costs close to 50 percent; and

Whereas the cause of peace through the United Nations can best be promoted by action and support of a majority of its members, as expressed by willingness to meet their just financial shares; and

Whereas the financial distress of the United Nations is due in great measure to its military operations and fiscally delinquent members; and

Whereas a dangerous precedent would be established with the $200 million bond issue, in that members of the United Nations would thus be encouraged to become slack in assessment payments; and

Whereas the question of special assessments has been referred to the International Court of Justice, and a decision is expected in May 1962: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Westfield Women's Republican Club of Westfield, N.J., That—

1. Congress postpone action on the bond issue until a careful study has been made of the administration of United Nations revenues and its budgetary system.

2. Congress call upon the United Nations representatives to invoke article 19 of the charter, and challenge the right of defaulting members more than 2 years in dues arrears to vote in the General Assembly.

3. Congress await the decision of the International Court of Justice as to members' responsibility to pay special assessments or lose voting privileges.

4. Congress exercise its powers of taxation and appropriations of moneys as specified in the Constitution, rather than the executive branch's further undertaking of financial commitments to the United Nations; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to: The President of the United States, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, the Secretary of State, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Senate Committee on Appriations, House Committee on Appropriations, Ambassador to the United Nations, entire New Jersey congressional delegation.

A Tribute to Colonel Glenn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, it has been observed, and wisely I believe, that one of the most significant effects of Lt. Col. John H. Glenn's triple orbit of the earth has been to stimulate a new buoyancy in the American people, a sharpened sense of pride and confidence in our national capacity.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I take pride in including additional evidence of this spirit as well as a richly deserved tribute to Colonel Glenn in the form of a resolution adopted on March 5 by the Township Committee of the Township of Berkeley Heights—the only Berkeley Heights on earth, by the way—in Union County, N.J.:

A TRIBUTE TO COLONEL GLENN

Whereas Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., has recently performed a historic feat on behalf of the United States of America in orbiting the earth; and

Whereas we Americans and the free world are proud of this accomplishment and desire to give due recognition of this historic event: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Township Committee of the Township of Berkeley Heights in the County of Union and State of New Jersey, in meeting assembled, That we extend to Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., and to the National Aeronautics Space Agency due recognition and utmost praise for the successful accomplishment in the orbiting of the earth three times, placing the United States of America in the foremost position of space exploration; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread on the minutes of this meeting as a lasting memorial of said event; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be sent by the township clerk to Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., and to the National Aeronautics Space Agency so that they may be aware of our admiration and appreciation of this historic event.

Appendix

Brotherhood Week Luncheon of Jewish Teachers Association of New York, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, February 22, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, in the public school system of New York City, in about 1925, the three major religious groups, the Catholic Teachers Association, the Protestant Teachers Association, and the Jewish Teachers Association, joined to help each other solve common problems. This group is known as the Coordinating Community of Teachers of Religious Faiths. A major objective of this group was "to cooperate with the organizations of other faiths for the promotion of good will and understanding." The three organizations have collaborated in numerous activities such as brotherhood and interfaith programs in the city of New York.

All three groups exchange invitations frequently to various professional functions, such as forums, art exhibits, luncheons. They also interchange information regarding their programs, e.g., group insurance, banquet plans, tours, and excursions.

Since its earliest years the Jewish Teachers Association—Morim, to use its Hebrew name—Morim is the Hebrew word for teachers—has annually donated 50 percent of its dues to cultural and educational activities, such as university libraries, the children's ward in a hospital, educational programs on radio or television, the mayor's committee—Mayor Wagner—for scholastic achievement providing scholarship aid to needy high school graduates of all faiths, and research studies on mentally retarded children.

Throughout the years a newspaper, the JTA Bulletin, has been published quarterly. Its first editor was Dr. David J. Swartz, now an assistant superintendent; and its current editor is Irving Rosenblum, principal of one of the city schools. An early issue of the bulletin recounts the program of a forum on our cultural heritage directed by Dr. Herman P. Mantell and conducted at Temple Emanuel, Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

The annual luncheon of the Morim has long been noted as one of the outstanding professional and cultural affairs on the busy calendar of noteworthy events in New York. Traditionally the luncheon has been conducted at the Waldorf-Astoria during Brotherhood Week. The 35th annual luncheon was held this year on Washington's Birthday. The featured speaker was Louis Nizer, attorney, lecturer, and author of "My Life in Court." A gathering of 1,500 responded warmly to the welcoming greeting, "Shalom," of Dr. Herman P. Mantell, president. The program in accordance with protocol opened with the singing of Hatikvah by Commissioner Sylvester Garamella and the "Star-Spangled Banner" led by Mrs. Harriet Popper, accompanied by Mrs. Belle Seretoff. The invocation was delivered by Rabbi Arthur Hertzberg of Temple Emanu-El of Englewood, N.J. The noted guests were then introduced by Past-President Irving Rosenblum. Included among the guests were the Honorable Herbert Zelenko, Congressman from Manhattan; distinguished jurists, Hon. Thomas Aurelio, George Postel, Daniel Gutman, James E. Lo Piccolo, and Morton R. Tolleris; Hon. Louis I. Kaplan, commissioner of investigation; members of the board of education, Hon. Brendan Byrne, Hon. Morris Iushewitz, Judge Samuel R. Pierce, and Hon. Clarence Senior, Comptroller Abraham D. Beame, Associate Superintendents John B. King and Joseph O. Loretan; Superintendents Arthur Hughson, David J. Swartz, Dr. Abram Kanof, president of American Jewish Historical Society; Mrs. Pauline Mantell, First Lady of Morim; President Emil H. Tron, of the Protestant Teachers Association; President Leonard J. Fliedner, of the Catholic Teachers Association; and Jacob Jacowitz, school news editor of the New York World Telegram. The officers for the year were presented: Dr. Herman P. Mantell, president; Harris Shafner, vice president; Michael Leinwand, treasurer; Miss Dorothy Posner, secretary; borough vice presidents Frank Sacks, Jerome Greenblatt, Leonard Marmelstein, Martin S. Dodell, Norman Harris, Editor Irving Rosenblum; Membership Chairman Emanuel M. Ebbin and Harry A. Geller.

The report of the year's activities delivered by Dr. Herman P. Mantell, stressed the cultural, educational and social program for the year—the nonsectarian art exhibit of teachers' paintings and sculpture, interfaith committees, the musicale, forums, dance, teas, summer and holiday excursions, proposed group insurance, convalescent service, and charitable donations.

The legislative program for funds for public education was discussed by City Comptroller Beame, followed by an interlude of folk singing directed by Marc Olf. Following this, Dr. Mantell bestowed the famed AVODAH Award of the association, granted for distinguished service to humanity through Jewry, upon Yeshiva University in recognition of its pioneering years, its ever-expanding service and its glorious vision of the future. The Honorable Charles H. Silver responded for the university. He in turn received a surprise award for his many years of devotion to the welfare of the children and the teachers in the educational system of New York.

Dr. Mantell expressed the gratitude of the association for the untiring efforts and diligent service of Luncheon Chairman Martin S. Dodell and his assistant, Miss Ann Kessler. Following a solo "Bless This House" rendered by Commissioner Garamella, the benediction was pronounced by Rabbi Harold E. Gordon, executive vice president of the New York Board of Rabbis.

With a final Shalom in farewell, President Mantell closed the program for the 35th annual luncheon and extended a reunion invitation for the 36th scheduled for February 12, 1963, at the Waldorf-Astoria.

A distinguished array of speakers has addressed the association at its annual luncheon. Among the noted speakers were M. Maldwin Fertig, Counsel to Govs. F. D. Roosevelt and H. Lehman; Dr. Julius Mark, senior rabbi of Temple Emanu-El of New York; Dr. Abraham Leon Sachar, president of Brandeis University; Benjamin Cohen, Assistant Secretary of U.N.; Dr. David del Sola Pool, Spanish and Portuguese synagogue; Dr. Israel Goldstein, president of World Jewish Congress; Rabbi Robert Gordes, Temple Beth El of Rockaway Park; Rabbi Emanuel Rackman, president of the New York Board of Rabbis; Hon. Semah Cecil Hyman, Consul General of Israel in New York; Rabbi Harold H. Gordon, executive vice president of the New York Board of Rabbis; Dr. Alexander M. Dushkin, dean of School of Education of Hebrew University in Jerusalem; Hon. Irwin D. Davidson, judge of Court of General Sessions of New York.

At the Civil War Centennial luncheon of February 22, 1961, the guest speaker was the noted rabbi and eminent author-historian, Dr. Bertram Wallace Korn of the Congregation Kenneseth Israel in Elkins Park, Philadelphia. An acknowledged authority in the role of Jewry in the Civil War, he held his audience enthralled throughout a well documented exposition of the story of the "Jew in Gray and Blue."

The Role of Law and Lawyers in the Quest for World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on February 14, 1962, Hon. Charles S. Rhyne

delivered an important address at a luncheon held by the American Bar Association for ambassadors from European nations. Mr. Rhyne is a past president of the American Bar Association and now serves as chairman of the association's Special Committee on World Peace Through Law.

Mr. Rhyne's speech is a thoughtful statement of the role which lawyers of all nations can serve in the quest for a world rule of law. In it, he discusses the results of 3 regional international conferences of private lawyers which have already been held, in which the ideas of lawyers from 79 nations have been expressed. A similar conference is to meet in Rome on April 1, 1962. Mr. Rhyne and his associates throughout the world are to be commended and supported in these efforts. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from Mr. Rhyne's speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROLE OF LAW AND LAWYERS IN THE QUEST FOR WORLD PEACE

The key issue of our time is whether men and nations can so unify their efforts against war as to succeed in creating a peace structure that will work. The key to success in that united effort is to found in upon something which men and nations have in common. A review of all the concepts developed by man since the dawn of history does not reveal anything which is more of a common denominator than the rule of law. The best method of fostering continuous growth in cooperation and preventing friction due to interdependence is in fact to set out concrete laws and develop specific legal institutions to govern and guide these contacts and relations so as to avoid disputes and misunderstandings and provide for peaceful resolution of disputes which do arise. We are told constantly by our governmental leaders that the rule of law must replace force as the controlling factor in international relations if world peace is to prevail. None have expressed this view more eloquently than President Kennedy when in his inaugural address he said that mankind's ultimate objective is:

"A new world of law where the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved forever."

We have compiled into a special pamphlet similar statements by the leaders of many of the nations represented here. Yet none of these leaders have spelled out in specific terms just what this means in terms of new law rules and new law agencies and institutions. And there exists no private law association or group today which is cooperating in a permanent organized effort to create the necessary rules of law and institutions to achieve this objective of a world ruled by law. That is why we lawyers have been developing the international program of world peace through law. Aware of the great need for strengthening world law, we are offering our services. However this is a new and vast task when approached on a world basis, and we need your help as men of great experience in international affairs, to define and perform the work that must be done.

We lawyers are perhaps the most conservative of all professions. We are slow to change. We are slow to accept change. There are members of my profession who do not accept the idea that we lawyers should use our talents and known-how in the task of strengthening law in the world community. This is to be expected anytime something new is advanced. Suffice it to say that in spite of some who oppose, our study so far indicates that there is substantial agreement among most of the lawyers of the world that this new task in the context of current history is the gretest challenge, obligation, and opportunity of our profession. These lawyers are pointing out that one cannot expect medical doctors or scientists to do the essential work to create a legal structure strong enough to maintain order internationally in the way the law structure of civilized nations now maintains order within those nations. These leaders of the legal profession are accepting the fact that if this task of building a world of law is to be done lawyers must do it or it will never be done at all.

Please understand that our effort is still in its infancy. We must learn as we go. We do not expect to create a utopia or to provide a miraculous panacea overnight. We expect to devote to this task years and decades of effort which in time will bring concrete results. It has been wisely said that every journey begins with the first step. As a first step we lawyers of all nations must get to know each other and learn how to work together just as have the scientists and other professions.

Let me illustrate how far we have to go by referring to the fact that our National Science Foundation reports that last year more than 500 international gatherings took place in the field of science, while in the legal field there were only five meetings which could be properly classified as international in character and scope. And these five were all on a continental or regional basis—three of them sponsored by the very program of which I speak. No world gathering of the legal profession has ever been held.

If I may be pardoned a personal note, I have visited, with two exceptions, every country represented here. And those visits are among the most heartwarming experiences of my life. Your lawyers have overwhelmed us with their gracious and extensive hospitality. We welcome the privilege of trying to repay in part even though we realize we Americans are often inadequate in comparison with your countrymen. And if I may utter one further personal note, I would like to report my finding that though we lawyers speak many different tongues, come from many races and creeds, and live under many diverse political and governmental structures, we possess a common language in the language of the law which makes us from the moment of introduction very warm friends. Put two lawyers together anywhere on earth (or in space for that matter) and within minutes we are telling of all the difficult cases we have won, and never for one moment mentioning those we have lost. Such is life amongst the law and lawyers the world over. There exist no real barriers to worldwide cooperation among the legal profession.

Three of the international meetings of the legal profession last year—in San Jose, Costa Rica, for the lawyers of the Americas, in Tokyo, Japan, for the lawyers of Asia and Australasia, and in Lagos, Nigeria, for the lawyers of Africa and the Middle East—were held to try to formulate answers to the questions I posed at the outset of these remarks. Lawyers from 79 nations sat around conference tables and expressed their views.

The recommendations in the consensus of San Jose, Tokyo, and Lagos are of tremendous significance when it is realized that they originated with some of the most distinguished lawyers in the world, representative of all elements of the legal profession, and of many different legal systems and traditions. And there are many good reasons to believe the programs they recommend can be successfully carried out. Lawyers have common training and experience in achieving what is possible and practical within the framework of justice. Through this program which is bringing them closer together on a worldwide basis for the first time, lawyers are gaining mutual respect and confidence in their ability to find practical solutions to world law problems. Two of the real accomplishments of these conferences has been the breakdown of ignorance and occasional distrust, and the development of a single-mindedness with which delegates have dedicated themselves to fulfillment of the objectives indicated in the consensuses.

Lawyers are men of great influence in all sectors of national life in nearly all countries. They are statesmen, professors, diplomats, politicians and civic leaders in addition to performing their primary role in the practice of law and administration of justice. They can individually and collectively bring great weight and influence to bear to secure the advancement of international law and legal institutions. Interestingly enough, the great majority of you ambassadors are either members of the legal profession or you have studied law without practicing it as a profession. Let me hasten to say that this program is confined to an effort to strengthen world law and is not a program to train lawyers as diplomats or to interfere in any way in the great function you perform. We will work on things private lawyers can do to strengthen law. We will not work on diplomacy.

I do not come before you today to tell you that the lawyers of the world can now blueprint their function internationally or that they know all the answers. I can tell you that as a result of worldwide correspondence with lawyers in more than 100 nations, and the meetings of the lawyers from 79 nations, certain interesting facts and conclusions can be expressed to you about law in the world and the lawyers of the world, at least on a tentative basis. I will phrase these in summary form as follows:

1. There are approximately 1 million lawyers in the world.

2. There are lawyers in every nation who are among that nation's most articulate and effective leaders not only in legal matters, but also in the formation of public opinion on political, cultural, social and economic matters.

3. Lawyers possess unique peacemaking capacities due to the very nature of their training, experience and the functions they perform in society.

4. These peace capacities of lawyers are well developed and constantly used within nations but they are relatively untapped internationally.

5. There is a universal knowledge of and respect for the rule of law throughout the world.

6. Rules of law and legal institutions (the rule of law process) are universally recognized as man's best peace mechanisms and potentially his mightiest peace resource.

7. In spite of the foregoing, the rule of law is as yet mankind's most unused peace resource, as no one has developed an effective plan to put that resource to work in an organized meaningful man internationally.

8. Any realistic evaluation of international law today must conclude that it is meager and weak, that there are large gaps in its coverage, and that steps must be taken to make it more effective.

9. The international lawmaking process (i.e., universally accepted custom, treaties and conventions) is archaic, cumbersome, slow and inadequate for the needs of the fastmoving, changing world of our day.

10. Lawyers have a unique capacity to modernize and speed up this lawmaking process.

A. They can do this by identifying the treaties now generally acceptable and of worldwide (or regional) application but to which few nations have adhered, and through newly formed, properly and specially educated national committees they can help

persuade their nations to become parties to those existing treaties and conventions which would be beneficial to their nation, thus expanding tremendously the present scope of law in the world community.

B. They can draft new treaties and conventions on subjects of universal concern such as international trade in a long list of commodities, arms control and disarmament, nuclear test ban, and peaceful use of outer space, thus adding their ideas and efforts to those of government experts. Such a plan can help expand knowledge in these fields to more people, thus aiding in the achievement of the universal public comprehension which is an essential foundation for that public acceptance which is a prerequisite to any nation's adherence to the law rules and institutions so badly needed in so many international fields.

11. Lawyers have the capacity to develop plans for reforms which governments must adopt and carry out to increase the usefulness of the all important decision making process internationally in the fields of third party adjudication, arbitration or mediation.

A. Roadblocks to the use of the International Court of Justice can be eliminated.

B. New regional and specialized courts similar to the highly successful European Court of Justice for the Common Market countries can be created.

C. New modern procedures making arbitration and mediation more acceptable can be formulated.

12. Universal acceptance of courts, or other third party decision making internationally, as an ultimate substitute for violence internationally is a long-range goal and difficult of achievement, but lawyers can make a major contribution to peace by so presenting the facts on its value to humanity as contrasted to the power presently available for decision by violence as to lead to the formation of a worldwide public opinion favorable to courts rather than armies to resolve disputes between nations.

13. This study of law as it relates to current world events and developments demonstrates that while the world is trending toward a unified interdependent whole under the thrust of dynamic technological advance, law rules and legal institutions to govern and guide this advance are lagging far behind technological achievement.

14. This program seeks to build world unity from the bottom up through persuading nations to exercise their sovereignty by adherence to practical needed laws and legal institutions rather than attempting to build from the top down by erasure of national boundaries or through a grant of sovereignty to international governmental legislative machinery.

15. The accelerating demand for new and improved law rules and institutions created by the ever-increasing trade, travel, and other contacts internationally provides a powerful impetus to essential progress in world law.

16. The present program is creating a recognition and realization among the members of the legal profession, and the public, of the tremendous need for law in the world community and the law's value as a harness for mankind's ever-growing power to insure its use for man's benefit before it is used for his death.

17. The carrying out of a world law day, a world conference of lawyers, and a world law year have been recommended both to weld the lawyers of the world together in common cooperative endeavor and to focus public attention upon the promise and potential of law internationally.

18. A world law institute is recommended to provide a continuous organization framework and clearinghouse to direct these new cooperative efforts of the legal profession of the world.

So here in this program we have the beginnings of an effort by lawyers from throughout the world to find out how they can work together and what they can accomplish if they do. This push toward a buildup of world law comes at a time when there is the largest buildup in arms in the history of the world. At a time when one reads daily in the press of continued and repeated attacks on such law fostering institutions as the United Nations. Certainly this is a time when every effort is needed to turn the minds of men toward any work that can help create momentum toward world peace. Never in all history has work to end war been more urgent. This lawyer effort is clearly timed to meet the greatest need of the world community.

In no field is there more universality of agreement throughout the world than on the basic principles of law. The idea of law as the best concept under which to maintain order is deeply ingrained in the minds of all men. The sentiment for justice is so natural and so universally possessed by all mankind that it is independent of all forms of government. If justice and power can through law be brought together so that whatever is just may be powerful and whatever is powerful may be just, then and then only will the great goal of a world order providing peace through justice for all men and all nations be achieved.

Mankind's most all-embracing common purpose is world peace. And the common search for world peace offers an awesome, difficult, and perhaps final challenge to mankind in these days of almost limitless power for good and evil. Expanding and strengthening the rule of law until it acquires a capacity to so stabilize world relations as to avoid the dangers in the ups and downs of current international conflicts is a cause common to all humanity. We of the legal profession will seek and find our role in helping to achieve this great goal. Our role obviously lies in efforts to replace force with law as the controlling factor in the world community. Thus will we help make an ancient dream come true—the dream of a world in which disputes among nations will be settled like disputes among men, by law rather than by arms. In the program to build a world of law we will select the law tasks we can do best and try to do them well. We will widen our horizons to enlist the manpower, release the energy, and inspire the talent to make a maximum contribution to the creation of that order through justice under law which will mean a peaceful world.

Forty Years in the Fourth Estate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday evening it will be my pleasure to serve as toastmaster at the annual dinner of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick in Wilkes-Barre. One of the features and highlights of the affair will be the recognition and honor to be bestowed upon Mr. Thomas F. Barry, West Side manager for the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent, who will mark four decades in the newspaper field. On March 11, 1962, the Sunday Independent published a feature and profile of Mr. Barry that I found to be extremely interesting and as part of my remarks today I quote the aforementioned article from the Sunday Independent.

The article follows:

FORTY YEARS IN THE FOURTH ESTATE—TOM BARRY EARNS TRIBUTE FROM FRIENDLY SONS

The Friendly Sons of St. Patrick will honor one of Wyoming Valley's veteran newspapermen who was instrumental in the reorganization of the society at its 17th annual dinner Saturday night at Hotel Sterling.

Thomas F. Barry, West Side manager of the Sunday Independent and a lifelong resident of the West Side, will be cited by the Friendly Sons for his many contributions to the organization and his outstanding work in various endeavors, particularly in the newspaper field.

The Friendly Sons president, John X. J. Callahan, said yesterday, that the organization "is proud to number among its members a newspaper reporter of 40 years who has given unselfishly of his time toward numerous civic groups and various other organizations."

Callahan added that the first banquet after World War II was planned and executed by Barry and said that his eagerness to make it a success formed the groundwork for the start of the present unit of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick.

STARTED IN MINES

Barry's wide experience started as a mineworker, as he followed the steps of his father, John Barry, an experienced miner who came here from Liverpool, England, by way of Rutland, Vt., and married Ellen Sheridan, Luzerne.

Barry attended Sacred Heart Parochial School and Luzerne High School and entered the mines for the first time at the old Raub breaker in his hometown. Later came employment at Haddock's and, in between shifts, Barry managed to turn in some "notes for the Sunday Independent" and add to his education with special night courses at the Wilkes-Barre YMCA.

Barry also qualified as a mine foreman although he never stayed around the mines long enough to fill this role. Alert and observant, Barry found an interest in people, their comings and their goings.

PERSONAL JOURNALISM

He roamed the town of Luzerne, where he was born and reared, for news items, added his touch of personal journalism to happenings in neighboring areas and soon became a regular contributor to the Sunday Independent.

Barry found a fertile field for news on the west side of the Susquehanna River. Newer nationalities moving into the boroughs were noted in Barry's writings.

As he became better acquainted in the towns, Barry moved into the political arena with observations on that scene and soon was recognized as one of the more astute observers of politics. He also served a term as Luzerne Borough councilman to gain practical experience.

HELPED BUSINESS CENTER

He was a prime mover in creating a bustling business area in Luzerne Borough a quarter of a century ago and was honored with the presidency of the Luzerne Businessmen's organization.

With a love for history, he called upon his vast knowledge of community progress to lend numerous paragraphs to historical volumes, including Brewester's "History of Kingston Township."

Married to the former Katherine Kane, Sugar Notch, the couple has four children, Joseph, with Bethlehem Steel, Baltimore; Gerald, with Raker Paints, Kingston; Mrs. Edward Hosey, Plymouth, and Jack, Baltimore.

Cooperative Fishery Research Unit for Colorado State University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, the 86th Congress authorized the establishment of Cooperative Fishery Research Units in conjunction with universities offering fisheries science curricula.

The Department of the Interior, early in 1961, announced it would establish 10 or 12 of these units.

To date, only one has been funded by the Congress.

Several days ago I asked the Senate Appropriations Committee to include $30,000 in the Interior Budget in order to establish a Cooperative Fishery Research Unit at Colorado State University in Fort Collins, Colo.

To my mind there is no more logical, deserving nor qualified institution in the United States to harbor a fishery research facility than Colorado State University.

This university, in 1949, originated the Cooperative Fisheries Research Unit.

The cooperators, until 1953, were the U.S. Government, the State of Colorado, and the university.

In 1953 the Federal Government discontinued its participation.

Now that the Congress has established a Federal cooperative fishery research program, I asked the Senate Appropriations Committee to appropriate funds to restore the cooperative relationship that first started in 1949.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my statement before the Senate Appropriations Committee be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COOPERATIVE FISHERY RESEARCH UNIT FOR COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY

(Statement by Senator CARROLL, of Colorado)

Mr. Chairman, Public Law 686 of the 86th Congress gave the Interior Department the authority to establish fishery research units on a cooperative basis with a State game and fish agency and a university offering a curriculum in fisheries science.

The necessary appropriation for a Cooperative Fishery Research Unit in a State is $30,000.

Only one such unit has been funded by the Congress since President Eisenhower signed the authorizing legislation on September 2, 1960. This unit is in our sister State of Utah. However, early in 1961, the Department of Interior announced its intention to establish as many as 12 of these units.

I appear before you today to ask that you include in the bill before you $30,000 for a Cooperative Fisheries Research Unit to be located at Colorado State University at Fort Collins, Colo.

Mr. Chairman, there is no more logical or deserving location in the country for a research project of this type than Colorado State University. Colorado State University originated this concept in 1949. In that year Colorado State University established what was called "The Colorado Cooperative Fisheries Research Unit," which was operated in conjunction with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Colorado Game and Fish Department.

Federal cooperation in this research project ended in 1953. However the university and the State have continued the program and it is functioning today, ready once again to welcome the Federal Government to participate and avail itself of the vast knowledge and experience accumulated in a 13-year-old program.

If the Department of the Interior moves in any direction on cooperative fishery research, it will be most wasteful not to move first to reestablish its affiliation with Colorado State University, the pioneer in this program.

Dr. William E. Morgan, president of Colorado State University, told me a few days ago that the objectives and functions of his cooperative fisheries research unit are essentially the same as those announced by the Interior Department. As I understand it, the objective of the units proposed in Public Law 86-686 will be to offer improved and expanded training for graduate students in order to provide more and better trained personnel for the management of the Nation's recreational and commercial fisheries resources.

This is precisely what the existing program at Colorado State University is doing.

This program can be immeasurably strengthened by once again joining hands, brains, and resources with the Federal Government.

Dr. Morgan said to me:

"There is a definite need for a vigorous fishery research training program in our part of the United States. The impact of water development projects in Colorado and the surrounding States will present many opportunities for new fishing areas, but associated with these opportunities will be serious fishing problems which will require an expanded fishery research and management effort.

Our existing fisheries unit has a fine record of performance and we view the announced intent of Federal participation in this educational area as an opportunity to expand and strengthen our program in the field of fishery science at Colorado State University.

Colorado State University is one of the few institutions of higher learning offering a degree in fishery science. Our program not only serves the needs of Colorado students but attracts students from nearby States where such courses of training are not available. We need to strengthen and expand our existing program in this area of research.

I ask your committee, Mr. Chairman, to give favorable consideration to my request for designation of $30,000 for Federal participation in the Colorado cooperative fisheries research program. This amount is sufficient, I am told by Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Frank Briggs, to cover costs of salaries, travel costs related to the program, equipment, supplies, and limited funds for student assistance and graduate projects.

If the committee grants this request for $30,000 for cooperation in fishery research with the State of Colorado and Colorado State University, I can assure the committee, Mr. Chairman, that the resulting contributions to fisheries science will be of significance not only to my own State of Colorado, but all the States in the West where sport fishing abounds.

I hope the committee will add this amount to the bill before it.

Government Must Remain Neutral in Labor-Management Disputes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK KOWALSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, Federal subsidy payments to certain air carriers are being misused in a most unjust fashion. In blunt terms, these subsidies are used by air carriers engaged in labor disputes for strikebreaking purposes. I have felt compelled to introduce legislation—H.R. 10697, text of which follows—that will deny Federal subsidies to certain air carriers which do not make every reasonable effort to settle their labor disputes. This bill provides that the Secretary of Labor shall appoint a three-man board which will determine whether such air carrier has made every reasonable effort to settle any dispute with its employees, and whether any payments attributable to the period of a strike should be disallowed because of the failure of the carrier to make such effort. This board would direct the Civil Aeronautics Board to make any such disallowance.

Legislation such as this will set a favorable climate for fruitful negotiations in labor disputes. The avoidance of strikes is the major objective. However, if the Federal Government indiscriminately continues the payment of subsidies to air carriers who do not make reasonable efforts to settle their labor disputes, settlement becomes virtually impossible. The incentive for management to bargain in good faith is lost, and the basic right of labor to bargain collectively is destroyed. The U.S. Government then finds itself in the untenable position of taking sides. No group of employees can hope to settle a dispute with a management that has access to the Federal Treasury to finance its strikebreaking activities.

Since 1947, 65 work stoppages have occurred in the whole U.S. airline industry. The Civil Aeronautics Board in its history of operation has reviewed only two cases and found in both instances that subsidies were used to pay for unnecessary strike losses. The existing mechanism is ill equipped to handle these labor-management disputes.

The U.S. Government must remain neutral in the field of labor disputes. Public policy dictates that management and labor be free to settle their problems without outside interference. This bill and a companion bill, H.R. 10341, which relates to Government procurement contracts, would assure that the taxpayers' dollars that are presently being paid in subsidies to air carriers will be properly used. And it will enable both management and labor to meet their responsibilities to the general public and to each other.

That this particular situation is one of importance, is exemplified by the fact that the President has appointed Dr. Nathan P. Feinsinger as chairman of a Commission on Aviation Matters, to investigate this problem. In addition, the President has appointed Secretary of Labor Goldberg to head a task force to investigate fully this broad and important area.

I would hope that every Member of Congress will critically explore this problem that vitally affects the public interest and the basic rights of the working man. And I urge my colleagues to support legislation that will protect this interest and these rights.

The text of H.R. 10697 follows:

H.R. 10697

A bill to amend the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, relating to carriers by air, in order to deny Federal subsidies to certain air carriers which do not make reasonable efforts to settle labor disputes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 204 of the Railway Labor Act is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately after "SEC. 204.", and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) (1) Each carrier by air which is eligible to receive payments under the second sentence of section 406(c) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 and is engaged in a labor dispute with its employees or with a representative of such employees shall make every reasonalbe effort to settle such labor dispute.

"(2) Whenever there is a labor dispute involving a carrier by air described in paragraph (1) of this subsection, the Secretary of Labor shall appoint a board consisting of three members who shall determine whether such carrier has complied fully with the provisions of subsection (a) and whether any such payments attributable to the period of such labor dispute should be disallowed because of failure to so comply.

"(3) If such board determines that such carrier has not fully complied with paragraph (1) of this subsection and that any of such payments should be disallowed, it shall notify the Civil Aeronautics Board, in writing, of such fact and of the amount of such payments so disallowed, and the Civil Aeronautics Board shall not make any such payments, or, if such payments have been made, shall recover the amount thereof from such carrier."

Early History of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, a very well written and interesting story entitled "Luster for the Lone Star State" appears in the Wednesday, March 7, edition of the Edgefield Advertiser of Edgefield, S.C. This article, written by Nancy C. Mims, contains a very good discussion of the early history of the Republic and State of Texas. It points out particularly that there is a very close alliance between the State of Texas and my home State of South Carolina, and particularly my home county of Edgefield because many of the early founders of Texas came from Edgefield, S.C. The reason for the close relationship these two States have enjoyed is revealed in this article.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LUSTER FOR THE LONE STAR STATE

(By Nancy C. Mims)

With feet firmly planted on an area much larger than any nation in Europe except Soviet Russia. Texans scan their world with tolerance, untinged by awe. The boundaries of the Lone Star State could absorb all of Michigan, Iowa, Illinois, and Indiana. Alone Brewster County, Tex., is able to blot out the entire State of Connecticut, or obliterate five Rhode Islands.

Once a proudly independent republic within the present geographic boundaries of the United States, Texas has flown the flags of Spain, France, Mexico, the Texas Republic, the Confederacy, and Old Glory.

Four hundred years of Lone Star history unrolls in the pageantry of Comanche Indians, Spanish Conquistadores, Franciscan missionaries, cowboys, cattle kings, homesteaders, cotton planters, miners, lumberjacks, oil drillers, shipbuilders, and aircraft manufacturers.

Despite the fact that the romance of their history and vast expanse of distance is transcendant, Texans readily doff their Stetsons in recognition of an outsize footprint planted on their statehood by South Carolina. It is evident in road maps, in parkways, on teeming corners which bear names of city avenues. Current telephone or business directories list names familiar to South Carolina today. It is of unique interest that 18 of the counties of Texas bear names of South Carolinians; while only five perpetuate the deeds of native Texans.

EDGEFIELD AT THE ALAMO

One of freedom's most sacred shrines is the Alamo, birthplace of Texas liberty. In the mission history focuses on Edgefield, S.C.; spotlighting a cenotaph on which visitors see the features of Col. William Barrett Travis, commander of the regulars in the doomed garrison; Col. James Bowie, commander of the volunteers, who made history in the Southwest with his legendary knife, and James Butler Bonham. Also seen is Col. David Crockett, frontiersman and Congressman from Tennessee. With the exception of Colonel Crockett, all these heroes were natives of Edgefield district, South Carolina.

James Butler Bonham and William Barrett Travis as boys had roamed the woodlands of Red Bank, now in Saluda County, and remained life-long friends. A few years their senior, James Bowie was cradled in Logan County, Ky.; as his father, Reason Bowie, native of Edgefield traveled westward with the expanding frontier. The Bowies finally settled in Louisiana. Fate wove the magnificent and suicidal death of these three into one fabric at the fall of the mission of the Alamo in 1836.

William Barrett Travis was born August 9, 1809, within 4 miles of historic Red Bank Church. In 1818 the family moved to south Alabama. Both Bonham and Travis were educated for the bar and practiced law in Alabama. Early in the year 1835 Travis felt the challenge for adventure and distinction in the impending struggle for Texas independence, and accepted the rank of colonel in the Texas Army. James Butler Bonham, stirred by the fire of his boyhood friend, rode from Alabama to Edgefield Courthouse, South Carolina, to take leave of his widowed mother, Sophia Smith Bonham. Assisted by his young brother, Milledge Luke Bonham, James Butler Bonham prepared to ride a buckskin mare to Texas. Milledge Luke Bonham later became a general of the Confederacy and war governor of South Carolina. His residence was the plantation, Darby, on Highway 25 south of Edgefield. The home of their parents was the house on Main Street, now owned by Mr. and Mrs. Clyde Jackson, Jr.

At the Alamo Bonham found Colonel Travis in command of a garrison of 183 men, being associated with Col. James Bowie, who led a company of volunteers; and Col. David Crockett, whose manuscript diary preserved the events of the siege.

DEATH OF JAMES BUTLER BONHAM

Travis sent his friend out of the fort to seek reinforcements. He returned with about 30 men, but seeing that the mission was hopelessly outnumbered by 4,000 Mexicans, he dismissed them. Bonham had given his personal assurance of return to Travis. Disguising himself as a Mexican he rode through the besieging army, but was detected a short distance from the garrison. By a brilliant dash on the buckskin he gained the fort. When the gates swung closed behind him, Bonham jumped from his horse, turned him loose in the court and ran to a north wall where Travis was firing an 8-pound cannon. Nearby, he manned three artillery pieces from platforms built in the old mission church in the Alamo, and finally fell across one of the cannons he was firing.

DEATH OF WILLIAM BARRETT TRAVIS

Colonel Crockett's diary tells that on the fatal day of March 3, 1836, Colonel Travis addressed his men as they stood in parade formation in the courtyard. With the sword he always carried, Travis drew a line in the packed earth, cutting a line between the men and their commanding officer. He could not, he said, impose a death sentence on any man in such a hopeless situation. If any man cared to escape, he was at liberty to do so. The entire file of men moved across the line. David Crockett, of Tennessee, Samuel Holloway, of Philadelphia, James Kenny, of Virginia, Lewis Johnson, of Wales, William Harrison, of Ohio, Toribio Losoyo, of San Antonio, Albert Calvin Grimes, of Georgia, John Hubbard Forsythe, of New York, Robert Evans, of Ireland, Stephen Dennison, of England, George Butler, of Missouri, John McGregor, of Scotland, William Carey, of Virginia, Henry Thomas, of Germany; and all the men from Louisiana, Massachusetts, the Carolinas, Arkansas, Kentucky, Mississippi and Ohio, who had in a hundred different ways followed the trails that led to the Alamo. Col. James Bowie, wasted in illness, and near death, was carried on his cot by comrades across the line.

In the final hours of the siege, Colonel Travis fell mortally wounded from a gun he manned on the rampart, his rifle falling among Mexicans scaling the wall. Travis recovered enough to sit up and resist the saber of an enemy officer attempting to behead him. Both collapsed lifeless as their blades thrust home simultaneously. General Cos, commanding the Mexicans, ordered Travis' servant to identify his master. Then standing over the corpse, he mangled face and limb like a savage Comanche.

DEATH OF JAMES BOWIE

The 13-day defense of the Alamo was at an end. Santa Anna walked through the Alamo and asked to be shown the bodies of Travis, Bowie, Bonham, and Crockett. It had been a costly victory. The 187 Texans who defended the Alamo with their lives, had killed approximately 1,600 Mexicans—almost 10 for 1.

Acrid smoke poured through an open abode doorway. In the center of the room, on a

cot, lay the gaunt body of a man. His right leg was encased in a rude box where a fracture had been set to heal. Lying full length, open eyes seemed to be fixed in challenge on something unseen. From the left hand a pistol hung with hammer down. Another lay partially hidden in the tumbled, bloody blankets. A dripping knife lay on the floor, against the body of the last of nine Mexicans it had slain.

The man on the cot had indeed died fighting. Five bayonets impaled his body. One through the neck pinned him grotesquely to his bed.

"El Capitan Bowie," whispered General Cos. Then his eye fell on a gleam of blade in a mass of blood. "It is his iron knife."

Outside, Mexican soldiers staggered under bodies of Texans; many in buckskins and nondescript border militia uniforms, to a woodrick where the heroes were sprayed with oil and torches.

U.N. Hypocrisy Unmasked

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in order that Members of Congress and others may have a firsthand account of the sordid performance of the United Nations in the Congo, I am submitting for publication today in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a front-page editorial from the March 5, 1962, issue of the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader and an article from the same issue of that newspaper.

The editorial is written by Mr. William Loeb, publisher of the Manchester Union Leader. The article on Katanga and the Congo is written by Miss Philippa Schuyler, daughter of one of the editors of the Pittsburgh Courier, largest Afro-American weekly newspaper in the United States.

As the editorial says:

Miss Schuyler obviously cannot be accused of being prejudiced against Negroes since she is one, herself.

The introductory editorial by Publisher Loeb and the article by Miss Schuyler follow:

HYPOCRISY UNMASKED

We sincerely urge you to read carefully the article starting at the top of the back page today. It is written by Philippa Schuyler, brilliant concert pianist, journalist, author, lecturer and world traveler. Philippa Schuyler knows Africa better than most people know their own hometown.

Miss Schuyler is the daughter of the New York editor of the Pittsburgh Courier, largest Afro-American weekly newspaper in the United States. Readers of the Union Leader often have the pleasure and profit of reading articles by her father, George S. Schuyler. In fact, one of his columns appeared in this newspaper as recently as last Saturday.

Miss Schuyler obviously cannot be accused of being prejudiced against Negroes since she is one, herself. She has the honesty and the courage to report what white reporters, representing papers who are having a love affair with the United Nations, could not or have not dared to report.

Miss Schuyler is also the author of a book entitled "Who Killed the Congo?" which will be published on March 22. The book is based on her intimate studies and travels in the Congo during the last few tragic years. An earlier book, also dealing with her travels, was entitled, "Adventures in Black and White."

Describing the atrocities committed by the United Nations mercenaries in Katanga and other parts of The Congo, Miss Schuyler writes a revealing sentence which shatters the whole tragic nonsense about the Congo. Of these United Nations mercenaries Miss Schuyler says: "They did not come to Katanga for any ideal of Congo or world unity, but only for what they can get out of it."

Yet in New York City and throughout the world and Nation we have pious hypocrites who try to make believe that something really has been accomplished in the Congo as a reason for sucking in more hundreds of millions of dollars from an unsuspecting and trusting public.

Through Miss Schuyler's truth-revealing reports the hypocrisy of the United Nations and its performance in the Congo lies exposed for all to see.

WILLIAM LOEB, *Publisher.*

THE U.N.'S BARBAROUS RECORD

(By Philippa Schuyler)

The true story of 18 months of U.N. occupation in Katanga is a ghastly saga of rape, pillage, atrocity, confusion, treaty violation, and apparent contempt for the entire international code of military ethics.

Why is this? Because the U.N. forces in the Congo have no higher control over them, no sanctions. They operate under diplomatic immunity. They can't be prosecuted for anything they do. If a U.N. soldier commits a crime, no civil court can punish him, no military court does so.

The U.N. forces can and have committed thousands of crimes, large and small all over the Congo, but especially in Katanga where they first arrived in August 1960, promising neutral action there. The majority of the crimes have been personal acts of individual soldiers. Throughout Katanga I have heard incontrovertible evidence of an endless list of raping and looting, committed in particular by Ethiopian soldiers, but by no means solely by them.

Other armies are accompanied by military tribunals. This one is not. If the reader cannot imagine why the U.N. forces should want to be other than honorable, it should be remembered that it is only fairly recently in history that armies have become typically those of citizen-patriots drafted from all walks of life.

At one time, most soldiers were brutal mercenaries who only fought for the prizes of looting and rapine. These were the accepted recompense for their having risked their neckes. In certain backward countries this is still true. It takes continual supervision by military authorities to keep even the soldiers of civilized countries in line.

NO SENTIMENT NEEDED

One should not sentimentalize the U.N. soldiers in Katanga. Improperly supervised, operating under diplomatic immunity, coming in the main from the most brutal sector of the populace of the most backward countries, these U.N. soldiers are simply acting natural to their norm. They are getting all they can for themselves out of their sojourn in a land that means nothing to them, to which they have no emotional attachment. These U.N. soldiers are mercenaries in the true sense. They are fighting a foreign war for money and anything else they can grab. It is to the discredit of the civilized world that it has been willing to turn over the administration of vast areas to such an army. And to allow it the unlimited powers of subjugation, as it did in Katanga recently, can never be justified.

The Ethiopian and Gurkha troops are coarse, tough, incredibly ignorant and brutal professional mercenaries. They did not come to Katanga for any ideal of Congo or world unity, but only for what they can get out of it. It must be remembered that in parts of Ethiopia the custom is still practiced of enemy emasculation. Although Ethiopia is one of the world's oldest Christian nations, its population is only 40 percent Christian, the rest are pagan savages and ruthless Moslems who take pleasure in mutilation. The ruling class of Amharas are many of them cultured aristocrats and good Christians of the highest type. But most Ethiopians are not Amharas.

This makes it easier to understand their conduct in Katanga.

The Gurkhas although Hindu in religion have a large admixture of Mongolian blood and are of the Genghis Khan type, noted since his 12th Century invasion for brutality. Their ancestors were a terror to the British when they first tried to subjugate India. They secretly look down on the compassion of many Hindus and their favorite weapon has always been the curved knife or kukri which they use for every occasion. They have been famous as mercenaries in recent history. These are the two groups of soldiers which have terrorized Katanga.

RAPE AND PILLAGE

During the past December, any Katanga woman they caught out after dark was raped. Pretending to search houses for weapons, they stole and wrecked. Prince Godefroid Munongo, interior minister, had his beautiful house pillaged, his clothes, car, and art objects stolen; a Jewish lawyer who had lived in peace for 40 years in Lubumbashi, Elisabethville, had his collection of rare books, art objects, and tapestries stolen, and what they could not carry off they destroyed. When they were accused and his houseboy identified the soldiers who had committed the robbery, they were not punished, but the houseboy was. He was found soon after with his feet cut off.

The U.N. soldiers work with the Baluba terrorists now. They have permitted them to take over the abandoned houses of Europeans whom they first frightened into fleeing. Soon, the beautiful rooms of the dwellings are filled with filth, their furnishings stolen, and they become the headquarters of drunken bands. This is all done in the name of restoring order in Katanga.

Vice, crime, and conspiracy have overtaken once orderly and civilized Elisabethville. You will find every type of crude adventurer on hand to help pick the bones off the fallen state. Along with them are bevies of prostitutes from every port in Africa eager to entertain the conquering army.

Youth's Role in U.S. Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a national winner in the recent Edward P. Morgan essay contest is Miss Carol Burns of Olympia, Wash.

Miss Burns chose as her topic, "Youth's Role in U.S. Foreign Policy."

Because of the freshness of thought which she brings to this topic and its deep interest to our Nation today, I ask unanimous consent that Miss Burns' essay be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUTH'S ROLE IN U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

The role of youth is innovation; and innovation is essential to a continuously viable political system. A good foreign policy is constantly modified, meeting and anticipating new conditions and circumstances. In some countries, dominated by a self-perpetuating ruling group with a rigid ideology, innocation is virtually impossible without revolution. Many forces in this country, to be sure, resist change—the continuity of congressional leadership, public opinion, which is slow to alter, and especially the pressure of powerful private interest groups. In the United States however there never ceases to be opportunity for modification in policy. Each new administration comes to power with a program founded not upon a tradition, but upon a repudiation of the mistakes of its opponents and predecessors in office; and upon a new slogan for the future. It is only in such a setting that youth can play a significant role in foreign policy.

Youth's role is to challenge existing policies and institutions. The young person should be first of all intelligently critical. As a student, as a young Democrat or young Republican, as an international relations club member, in whatever connection he may turn his attention to foreign policy, the young person should judge according to exacting standards. Despite the skill and insight of the men making foreign policy, there will continue to be errors and there will continue to be a need for unprejudiced criticism.

The young person should be fundamentally idealistic. Not only should he have new ideas, but he should bring new enthusiasm to ideas which have been tried and which have failed. Many men have gone to their graves disillusioned by the failure of a plan for international peace. But such plans will be renewed and it is the task of youth to renew them.

In another way youth plays an important role in foreign policy. He can bring to international relations a direct and personal approach not possible for seasoned diplomats. Through the Peace Corps, through student exchanges and travel programs the young person can establish warm personal relationships with the youth of many lands, relationships which transcend political differences and which genuinely help to lay a basis for international accord. In one sense there is more reality in a warm hand clasp than in all the complexities of international negotiation.

The men who make foreign policy should listen to youth. The opinions of youth are honest and direct, not clouded by past bitterness, not made rigid by the justification of past mistakes. The ideas voiced by young people need not always be correct, but they are a source of insight for the reexamination and modification of policy by men who bring to their task the wisdom and moderation of experience.

Postal Clerks' Travel Allowance Adjustment Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase the maximum travel allowance for postal clerks and substitutes assigned to duty in mobile units.

As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, the 1st session of the 81st Congress enacted Public Law 87-139 to "increase the maximum rates of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business." That law became effective August 14, 1961, and it applied to Federal employees other than those in the postal service for whom the rates of travel allowance are set in the Postal Field Service Pay Act.

Even if enacted into law, my bill would not provide for postal clerks in mobile units the same rates of per diem allowance that are available to other employees of the Federal Government. Although other employees may be paid up to $15, my bill if approved, would increase the amount mobile unit clerks would receive to only $12 per day.

Clerks assigned to mobile units receive $2.25 for each 6 hours that they are away from headquarters following the passage of the first 10 hours. It will be evident to everyone, that this amount of money is not enough to cope with today's high hotel costs and restaurant charges.

The statute covering mobile unit clerks is the act of June 10, 1955, which provides in section 607(b) that such travel allowance may be paid "after the expiration of 10 hours from the time the initial run begins."

If the bill I am introducing were enacted, it would mean that for each 6 hours after the first 10, this highly skilled group of public servants would receive $3 instead of $2.25.

My bill would not alter the requirement that travel allowance may be paid only after the expiration of 10 hours from the time of beginning duty. The continuation of this provision would mean that even if the $15 maximum were to be applied to the mobile unit clerks, they would still receive less than other employees of the Federal Government in travel status.

Present law provides that postal transportation clerks receive travel allowance at the rate of $9 per day. The 10-hour exemption reduces the amount actually received in the first 24 hours to $6.75.

Under my bill the rate would be increased to $12 per day. The 10-hour exemption would then make the actual payment $9 for the first 24-hour period. Other Federal employees may now receive up to $15 for this same length of time.

Believing my bill to be very meritorious and knowing the people in question to be seriously affected by the economic factors involved, I hope the House of Representatives can take early action on my bill this year.

Bent's Old Fort, Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, in the pageant of our Nation's history, no more colorful era exists than that of the taming of the west and southwest in the 19th century. Bent's Old Fort, in my State of Colorado, played a significant part in this drama—as a business, social and military center on the Old Santa Fe Trail for both whites and Indians.

Established as a national historic site in 1960, much fine work has been done toward the preservation and development of Bent's Old Fort. However, the work continues, and in connection with this, I appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee several days ago in support of the National Park Service budget request for Bent's Old Fort.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my statement before the Senate Appropriations Committee he printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BENT'S OLD FORT, COLORADO

(Statement by Senator CARROLL of Colorado)

Mr. Chairman, I appear this morning in support of an appropriation request of $38,148 by the National Park Service for the preservation and development of Bent's Old Fort National Historical Site, which is located on the bank of the Arkansas River near La Junta, in southeastern Colorado.

Bent's Old Fort, for the information of my colleagues who may not yet be aware of its historical significance, is one of the most famous landmarks on the mountain route of the Old Santa Fe Trail.

Built by the three Bent brothers and Ceran St. Vrain, the Canadian fur trapper, in 1832, Bent's Old Fort was both a business and social center as well as a refuge for travelers and a supply depot for Generals Kearney and Price and John C. Fremont in their expeditions and explorations. As such, Bent's Old Fort is a highly significant landmark in our Nation's expansion in the southern plains area and the Southwest in general.

Since coming to the Senate, I have worked hard to see that Bent's Old Fort be made a national historical site, and in 1957 I introduced a bill (S. 2699) to this effect. In 1959, the National Parks Advisory Board completed its study of various historical sites, and favorably reported Bent's Old Fort. In 1960, both Houses of Congress passed legislation (signed into law June 30, 1960) establishing Bent's Old Fort National Historic Site and authorizing appropriations for its development and maintenance. I supported this legislation.

In 1961, the Colorado State Historical Society generously donated the 5.77 acres containing the fort site and access roadway to the Federal Government. It has long been recognized that an additional 170 acres of privately owned land would be necessary to maintain the integrity of the site and provide adequate space for parking and other facilities necessary to the park's operation.

The National Park Service appropriations for fiscal year 1962 included funds for this land acquisition (as well as for rehabilitation and maintenance of the site) and I am informed that negotiations for the purchase of this land should be completed within the next week or 10 days.

Local interest in Bent's Old Fort has been high. For the past several years the La Junta Chamber of Commerce, cooperating with James Grafton Rogers, president of the Colorado State Historical Society, and many Arkansas Valley groups such as the La Junta DAR and individuals, including Mr. James Baldridge, Mr. Milt Andrus, and Mr. Fred Betz, publisher of the Lamar Daily News, have worked toward the improvement of Bent's Old Fort.

Local and State time, energy and resources have contributed much to this project. As was recognized by the appropriations for Bent's Old Fort in the fiscal year 1962 budget, however, local resources could not be tapped indefinitely.

In supporting and urging support of the Bent's Old Fort appropriations for fiscal year 1963 ($38,148), I would remind my colleagues that this is a small price to pay for the preservation of an important part of our American heritage. Western history has been and will, I'm sure, continue to be a very great part of our national culture.

In underscoring this point, I would close with a quote from a Denver Post editorial of May 29, 1960:

"Bent's Old Fort was to the West what Times Square is to New York or Piccadilly Circus is to London. It was the center of a universe. It deserves restoration and preservation."

The Value of St. Patrick in the World of Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, we honor today the name of St. Patrick, the patron saint of Ireland, champion of the faith, and a symbol of hope to all the captive peoples of the world. The story of Patrick is no tale isolated in space and time; no saga of a local hero, nor peculiar to any one people or to any one faith. Indeed, the problems faced by Patrick in the 5th century, A.D., were universal problems, as yet unsolved, and the course he followed hewed a path which all good men of all faiths have sought to follow since the day of his death, more than 14 centuries ago.

Carried into slavery in his youth, Patrick was spirited away to Ireland, from which he was not to escape for 6 long years. In the manner of a man born free, he chafed under his bonds and bided his time, awaiting the opportunity to regain the gift of freedom.

Here we have the story of millions upon millions of persons throughout the world in this very century—robbed of their freedom by those who would impose upon them the chains of communism. Yet they, too, in the manner of St. Patrick, bide their time in anticipation of the freedom that will undoubtedly be theirs again some day.

Escaping his bonds, Patrick fled to France, where he took up missionary work, and in the year A.D. 432, returned to Ireland in the role of bishop to give counsel and advice to those who had enslaved him in his youth.

Again we are reminded of his counterparts of the present era: those who have fled from countries overrun with tyranny, yet who plan to return, at the first opportunity, to rebuild what tyranny has sought to destroy.

From the day he reappeared in Ireland, until the day of his death, nearly 30 years later, Patrick worked incessantly in behalf of the Christian faith, against those who hoped to preserve paganism in the hearts of the Irish people. In the manner of a colossus, St. Patrick swept the field before him, instilling the knowledge of the Lord throughout a land where spiritual darkness had for so long prevailed.

In the period embracing Patrick's lifetime, Ireland was but a conglomeration of municipalities ruled by a score of self-designated kings. To these men Patrick appealed until, one by one, they were all converted to Christianity, and ready to recognize their minor standing in the kingdom of the Lord.

Through fables and folk tales we are told of Patrick's genius and ability, and of the many wondrous things he accomplished, to win the confidence of the people. It is said that he drove the snakes and toads from Ireland, for instance; that in contests with the Druid priests he was known to have performed many miracles; that he was able to confound his enemies by bringing darkness upon them, and that when he died the sun shone steadily for 12 days.

From these accounts, the people of Ireland came to revere St. Patrick as they did no other spiritual force, save that of the Lord, Himself; and with the passage of time they would be required to call upon this force to see them through the bitterest period in their national history.

The period in question was, of course, that of a century ago, when the Irish people were driven, helter-skelter, to the four corners of the world. Yet in fleeing their beloved homeland, they kept within themselves the light instilled by St. Patrick; the confidence that God, in His mercy, will ultimately prevail in all things, and that justice—Eternal justice—must, in the end, triumph.

It was this knowledge, inculcated by the teachings of St. Patrick, that made of him the most noteworthy of all the saints, so far as the Irish people are concerned. It was this that produced the national love for him which has shone for 1,500 years, without once flickering.

Moreover, it is this love and the power of this love that has spread the interest in St. Patrick far and beyond the confines of Ireland, to lands distantly removed from Patrick's scenes of glory and accomplishment.

So, again, we are entitled to compare the past deeds of St. Patrick with those of the peoples and governments who would work in the same directions today. And once more we are justified in saying that the work of the freedom-loving people of the world plays havoc with the plans and designs of the slavemasters, even when the conflicting interests are separated by hundreds and thousands of miles.

For the spirit of freedom is a powerful force which, in itself, is inclined to create miracles, in the manner of St. Patrick. And one of the miracles is to shake and rattle the foundations of tyranny from afar.

There is an old saying that "words move, example draws." It was Patrick's example that proved the sincerity of his words, in the same manner that the sincerity of the free world proves the meaning of its code today.

And as the Druids fell before Patrick, so, by necessity, must the tyrannies of the world today fall before the impact of freedom in the days ahead.

The writings and deeds of St. Patrick show how splendidly he met the test of true greatness. In the face of the most fierce opposition from the pagan Druids, he boldly declared: "regardless of danger, I must spread everywhere the name of God so that after my decease I may leave a banquet to my brethren whom I have baptised in the Lord."

Such was the courage and the will of this saint we honor today—inspiring throughout the free world the greatest admiration, by persons of every nationality.

It is therefore necessary to advise the Irish people that although Patrick remains their patron saint, they must be ready to yield up the right to claim him exclusively for themselves. Indeed, he is far too popular to permit such an arrangement as that.

As the symbolic enemy of slavery, St. Patrick looms larger today than ever before; and, as always, the slavemaster can be expected to tremble at the sound of his name.

Truly, St. Patrick will stand as a hero of mankind, so long as Christianity endures and the fight for human justice prevails.

The Common Market and American Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article by Mr. Eric Johnston in the New York Times magazine of March 11 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

In this article, entitled "America Can't Compete? A Myth," Mr. Johnston shows why U.S. partnership with the Common Market would be really a blessing, not a curse as some would have us believe.

Mr. Johnston is eminently qualified to discuss this subject. He is president of the Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., and a former president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. He has served the Government in various capacities, most often as an adviser on economic policy, during the past 30 years. Mr. Johnston was general chairman of the U.S. Committee for an Atlantic Congress, the Congress being held in London in June 1959, and also served on the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO at the Atlantic Convention held this year in Paris.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA CAN'T COMPETE? A MYTH

(By Eric Johnston)

We face the Common Market, and we know we must act. But we hesitate—trapped by the dangerous myth that U.S. business cannot compete with foreign business. Have we really priced ourselves out of world markets? Can we compete against lower wages abroad? Are foreign imports hurting us? Will tariff reduction destroy us?

To answer these questions, and demolish the myth, let us examine three areas: (1) our ability to compete abroad, (2) our ability to compete with foreign imports at home and (3) our prospects for competition in the future.

First, consider our ability to compete abroad. Where do we now stand?

The United States exports annually more than $20 billion worth of goods, and imports about $15 billion worth. In 1960 we enjoyed a favorable balance of trade with every industrialized nation of the free world. We exported almost twice as much as Great Britain or Western Germany, our closest competitors, and about five times as much as Japan. And no other nation approached our volume of imports.

Western Europe and Japan are probably cited more often than any other parts of the world as areas we should fear. And yet in the first 9 months of 1961 our total exports to Western Europe were 59 percent greater than our total imports from that region, and our exports to Japan were 73 percent greater than our total imports from there.

Do these figures show any inability to compete? Quite the contrary.

But what gives us a right to believe we can stay ahead if we adopt a more liberal trade policy, if we move closer to the Common Market?

The single most important factor is productivity—output per man-hour. It enables us to compete despite lower hourly labor costs overseas.

A study some time ago showed that when the average Japanese worker was earning 22 cents an hour, his American counterpart was receiving $1.95 an hour. But the Japanese worker produced 30 cents' worth of merchandise an hour, while the American produced $3.19 worth an hour.

President Kennedy offered another comparison in his trade message to Congress. He noted that a coal miner in the United States is paid eight times as much an hour, as a Japanese coal miner, but produces 14 times as much coal per hour.

A recent study by the National Industrial Conference Board compared factories in the United States with American-owned plants abroad. It found that productivity in firms operating abroad averaged about four-fifths of that in domestic plants. For Latin America, it was little more than a third of ours; for Australia, slightly less than half. If the study had included wholly foreign-owned firms, our comparative advantage would have been even greater.

Manufacturers gave many reasons for this disparity. A business leader from the stone, clay, and glass industry attributed it to "more modern equipment, better tooling and faster productive pace" in the United States. Others stressed the lack of mechanical skills and industrial experience abroad.

Another major reason for our high productivity is the amount of capital equipment assisting the American worker. The average American worker is supported by about $13,000 worth of capital equipment—in some instances much more.

Compare this with figures abroad. In the United Kingdom and Western Germany the average worker is supported by only about $4,500 worth of capital equipment. In Belgium, $7,500 worth and in India something less than $300 worth.

A second factor in our ability to compete abroad is the cost of materials. In half of the National Industrial Conference Board's observations in every foreign area except the United Kingdom, plant expenditures for materials were more than 15 percent higher than in the United States. And in a full one-third of the firms studied, with the exception of those in Britain and Canada, material costs were more than 45 percent higher.

Often, in assessing production abroad, we tend to overlook the full range of essential materials. We think only of raw materials or natural products. Sometimes these are cheaper overseas. But when it comes to processed materials and component parts such as plastics, artificial fibers, and paper products, we have a distinct advantage.

These materials are less expensive and more readily available here because of the greater size and diversity of our economy. Furthermore, the quality of such materials available abroad is often inferior. As a result, the foreign producer must use larger quantities of some material to meet specifications.

Frequently, also, the lower production volume abroad adds to materials costs. In the milling industry, for example, there is a tremendous waste of metals in the production process. If you produce in large enough volume, it may pay you to sweep up the metal scrapings for reuse. But if your volume is low—as it is abroad—you cannot afford this saving.

Probably the value of our materials-costs advantage can best be seen in the Common Market. There, where labor and overhead are substantially lower, this single factor offsets in large measure the Common Market's advantages in all other areas of cost.

Actually, the wage differential is not such an advantage as is often imagined. Fringe benefits, for instance, are a cost factor often overlooked. In many foreign labor markets they have increased more rapidly than wages. One study showed they constituted 74 percent of hourly cash wages in Italy, 52 percent in France, and 44 percent in West Germany. At the same time, they represented only 21 percent in the United States.

All the fringe benefits familiar to us are covered in these programs abroad. In addition, some European laws call for special payments for length of service, or family allowances based on the number of workers' children.

On the whole, these fringe payments tend to be fixed costs. In periods of economic stress, they prove costly to foreign management.

Furthermore, there is very indication that the wage differential itself is narrowing all the time.

From January 1960, to the end of 1961, our rise in gross hourly earnings was 5 percent, while in Germany and Holland it was 12 percent and in France it was 11 percent. Foreign wages, of course, start at a lower base, but these figures indicate the trend. Certainly, we can expect European labor to insist even more vigorously on its share of Europe's new abundance. And it has strong trade unions to back up its demands.

Consider the trend in Japan, also. A survey of more than 250 big industrial firms there revealed that wages rose almost 10 percent from July 1959 to July 1960. They went up 13 percent in Japan's light electronics firms.

Productivity, materials, a lessening wage disparity—all these things are important. But production costs and manpower are not the only determinants of our ability to compete. Competition does not end at the final stop on an assembly line. Distribution methods, credit terms and sales promotion are all essential, too. In all these fields our ability to compete abroad is impressive.

The second point we must consider is our ability to compete with foreign imports here at home.

For too long we have looked upon imports as job destroyers. Actually, only about one-fourth of the total value of our imports is in lines of economic activity which directly compete with U.S. production. Since these imports represent only a small proportion of our total domestic output, less than one-half of 1 percent of American workers would be damaged by increased imports through tariff reductions.

Contrast this with the fact that the jobs of more than 3 million of our workers depend on our exports. For example, the United States-Japan Trade Council estimates that in 1960 our exports to Japan alone were responsible for about 190,000 American jobs. Nearly 34,000 Texans, more than 20,000 Californians, almost 12,000 Mississippi residents and about 7,000 New Yorkers, among others, directly owed their jobs to our exports to Japan. We stand to lose more jobs through retaliatory tariffs against our exports than we would lose by admitting imports.

We fail to consider that many of our imports are job-creating. Foreign cars, for example, provide jobs in transportation, distribution, retail sales, maintenance and repair.

Yet the myth about the dire effects of import competition persists. It remains with us even though three of our major industries have disproved it: the watch industry, the photographic industry and the automobile industry.

Immediately after World War II, Swiss watches dominated our domestic market. By 1954 imports were so high that the Tariff Commission increased the watch tariff by 50 percent. Domestic sales still declined.

The watch industry saw that it must act to survive. New products and new ways of making watches were developed. New subsidiaries were acquired to broaden the economic bases of the companies. More attractive pricing, better promotion and many other changes were effected.

One firm simplified the design of its new low-priced line of watches so that it contained only 150 parts instead of the 205 in an earlier model. Another company used a new automatic drilling and cutting machine that performed 150 precision operations on the plate of a watch—a technological accomplishment by a domestic industry that hitherto had relied chiefly on Swiss-designed machinery.

From this all-out push came the biggest technological development in watch design of the postwar years—the electric watch. It was completely a product of American research and initiative.

Today, the domestic jeweled-lever watch industry is healthier than it has been in years. And the major advances made along almost all lines promise added dividends for the future.

The photographic industry has always faced stiff foreign competition. In recent years the need for action became evident. Bell & Howell, for example, faced a decision; should it seek tariff protection, or should it attempt to compete more vigorously?

Charles H. Percy, Bell & Howell's president, explained the company's decision in these words: "Foreign competition and high wage rates forced Bell & Howell to find new and better ways of doing things, which in turn broadened Bell & Howell's markets."

Part of the outcome is reflected by some figures on U.S. camera exports. Purchases in the Common Market countries of American-made 8-millimeter movie cameras rose from 5,000 units in 1948 to 140,000 units in 1958, and are expected to jump to 430,000 a year by 1970.

Finally, take the auto industry. The foreign-car influx came in an area of production that had been ignored by American auto producers. When they began to pro-

duce compact cars, foreign sales went down. The fact that Volkswagen sales remain high points up the lesson. One reason is that no American car competes with it directly in size and price.

These examples show that an American industry can compete successfully when it sets out to do so. If it ignores areas of its consumer market, of course, it can expect foreign producers to move in. What is necessary is ingenuity, skill, inventiveness. Industries characterized by technological lag or unimaginative leadership will increasingly find themselves in trouble. Higher tariffs will not make them better able to compete. Nor will tariffs help them to survive. Their salvation rests in their own hands.

We have demonstrated our ability to compete at home and abroad under existing conditions. But profound changes are on the way in international trade patterns. Do they threaten our economy? Shall we still be able to compete?

The answer is clear. The Common Market provides us with a unique opportunity: a change to penetrate a mass market similar to our own.

The collective gross national product of the Common Market nations is rising about 5 percent a year—about double the rate in the United States and Britain. If it continues to grow at that rate, it will reach the level of our economy in 15 to 20 years. Even by 1970, per capita spending in Western Europe is expected to jump 35 percent, for housing and furniture, almost 50 percent for appliances, and about 59 percent for automobiles.

This means that great untapped markets will be opened. A congressional committee studying Europe's market potential recently heard these figures:

In the United States the automobile market is already more or less 100 percent saturated, while in the Common Market it is only 19 percent saturated. The market for television sets here is 89 percent saturated; there, 10 percent saturated. The radio market here is 96 percent saturated; there 20 percent. The refrigerator market here is 98 percent saturated; and 12 percent there. For washing machines, the figures are 91 percent here and 12 percent in the Common Market countries.

The compelling question is how best to seize the opportunity to trade in this world supermarket.

The first step is the administration's new trade program. The President must be given broader tariff-cutting authority if we are to gain access to the thriving European market. The alternative is to be shut out by the common external tariff wall that the Common Market expects to have established by 1966. We have no choice but action now, no matter how painful or inconvenient. And we must look to adjustment assistance—coupled with independent initiative—to repair the initial, temporary damage that occurs.

The second step is up to American business. Only a small percentage of our industries engage in export activities, and many of these have come to take our export surplus for granted. As change comes, they will find a surplus is no longer automatic.

U.S. business will have to launch a concerted, well-planned effort to sell in foreign markets. It will have to toss out old ideas and come up with fresh skills. It will have to start designing for foreign markets right on the drawing board and follow through effectively in every area of merchandising. The export field is not a place to dump leftovers from the domestic market.

As an illustration, the Japanese consumer buys a washing machine that is a small tub with a simple agitator. He buys a refrigerator with a volume of only 2 cubic feet. American manufacturers cannot expect to sell him our automatic washers and our 12-cubic-foot refrigerators.

In short, American business will have to emulate Europe by taking "a brisk shower of competition." In my opinion, we will benefit immeasurably from it.

The only thing that can block us is fear of competition from the world outside. And I repeat: It is a myth that U.S. business cannot compete with foreign business. We are competing successfully abroad. We are competing successfully at home. And we know how to compete in both areas in the future.

Know Your Enemy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, the importance of our knowing what communism is and how it seeks to subvert our free institutions is discussed in an article by George Todt which appeared in the March 4, 1962, issue of the Los Angeles Herald Examiner. I include, under unanimous consent, this excellent article in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

KNOW YOUR ENEMY

(By George Todt)

"Jesters do often prove prophets."—Shakespeare, "King Lear."

"We cannot expect the Americans to jump from capitalism to communism," quoth Nikita Khrushchev several years ago, "but we can assist their elected leaders in giving Americans small doses of socialism—until suddenly they awake to find they have communism."

Was this Red buffoon kidding us? Not on your life. He really put it on the line this time. And he is implementing his policy at every turn. Will it come true before 1973, his deadline?

The correct answer may very well be bound up in apathy and indifference—or lack of it—by the American people.

We need to know the vicious and guileful nature of the enemy with whom we are at war this very moment. It cannot be done unless we are interested enough to know the facts. We must study.

That is why I think suggestions to the effect of teaching the wiles of communism in our schools is a step in the right direction.

This means to analyze the hateful nature of the Communist beast and its neurotic attempt to destroy our free enterprise system—not describe it in glowing terms as "the wave of the future."

Many of our outstanding experts on the Communist menace—including FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover—have insisted that this Red fight is one in which all of the American people must become engaged.

The idea that it is none of the people's business is a new note which has begun to creep—and I do mean creep!—into the equation lately. Suddenly the war against Reds is said to be none of our business. Let "qualified" people handle it, we are now being told.

Who are these experts supposed to be? Not the military, certainly. They have been muzzled where the Reds are concerned today. For these dedicated public servants even to mention communism they first must get approval of Government censors. Otherwise it might be considered "political."

Nor are the people welcome abroad the "Fight Communism" ship any longer. "Just turn over your information to the FBI," we are told. "They will handle it." But what is overlooked is that this fine organization is a fact-collecting body and does not of itself prosecute the Reds.

Much of the mass communications media of the Nation has been playing the specious and nonsensical theme that the fight against Reds is "extremist" when Joe Doakes concerns himself with the matter. This is wrong and morally indefensible. The fight belongs to each and every American citizen.

The free enterprise system has given 6 percent of the world's population which lives in the United States almost 50 percent of the planet's wealth. Who wants to lose our blessings to Socialist mediocrity?

We ought to be as ready to pledge our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor to the defense of the American Republic as were our forefathers of yore. We of today do not lack the needed courage.

But it is admittedly difficult for Citizen Joe Doakes to rally to the cause of patriotism when it is under scurrilous attack in so many quarters in these difficult times.

Love of country and constitutional government is, in all too many cases, being labeled as "extremism" by letters, and their claque has become noisier—and more cunning—than ever before.

This is because they are running scared as of right now.

Let's not fear to defend our great free enterprise system against socialist detractors in any form. This is not the least bit political. It is merely commonsense for Democrats and Republican alike.

Censoring of Speeches of Military Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, an editorial entitled "The Silly Censors," which appeared in the March 15, 1962, edition of the Chicago Daily Tribune, contains a very good discussion of some of the items which have been censored from speeches of military officers. It points out vividly that our foreign policy can be deducted from the marginal comments of the persons who actually did the censoring. The editorial arrives at the only conclusion which is possible after a thorough study of the censorship material.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SILLY CENSORS

The Senate inquiry into the Kennedy administration's muzzling of military leaders, especially those who tried to tell the truth about the Communist threat and other things, isn't over yet. But it already has made some worthwhile discoveries.

It has shown how junior disciples of the New Frontier in the State and Defense Departments, following policies laid down by higher henchmen of the White House, chopped and twisted the words of generals so hard speeches became innocuous, or

placating. It has demonstrated, for all citizens to see, the incredible lack of commonsense exhibited by the censors and their superiors in forcing the "soft approach" toward the enemy upon military men—an approach apparently based upon a be-nice-to-Russia-and-it-will-be-nice-to-us philosophy.

The deletions strongly suggest a powder-puff policy toward communism in the top echelons of the New Frontier. They are emblematic of the persistent pursuit of illusion which has again taken us back to the dreary haggling over nuclear testing at Geneva.

Senator STROM THURMOND, the South Carolina Democrat chiefly responsible for the Senate investigation, has spread across 48 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a detailed account of the manglings committed by the censors, together with the generally inane comments they often penciled on margins of speeches to justify changes and deletions.

In a preface, THURMOND explained why he wanted the story in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: "If this consistent pattern of censorship is indeed in accord with policy, then such a policy should be exposed and changed. It reflects an abysmal ignorance of communism and Communist methods. If it suits the Communist purpose to negotiate * * * they will negotiate even if we spit in their faces. If they do not intend to negotiate, no sweet word from Western officialdom will induce them to negotiate."

But sweetness was what the censors sought—and THURMOND's document shows the lengths they went to achieve it.

In mid-1961, Air Force Secretary Eugene M. Zuckert tried to say in a speech: "Khrushchev's boastful threats are not aimed at the scoreboard. They are aimed at our jugular." These words were deleted by a State Department censor.

About the same time, Lt. Gen. J. F. Carroll of the Air Force wanted to put these words in a speech: "Make no mistake, we are at war right now—a total war of ideas. War becomes total when the price is total: the world itself." Out they went with a penciled comment by the State Department censor: "Too strong."

Lt. Gen. B. A. Schriever in May 1961, prepared a speech in which he mentioned Khrushchev's boast that Russia will "bury" the free world. State's censor let it ride, but reluctantly, with this comment: "He has denied that he meant this literally." A year earlier, Maj. Gen. N. W. Grant had not been so lucky when he tried to say: "* * * the Soviet Union intends to bury us literally, rather than figuratively." His words were blue-penciled by State's hatchet man, who explained: "This is against policy."

When an Air Force bigwig tried to tell an audience that he was convinced Russia would not hesitate to launch a war if it thought it could win, he ran into State Department opposition. Recommending deletion, the censor commented: "State feels Khrushchev does not want general war, and is unwilling to bear the losses such a war would entail, even though he could win it. This passage also discusses war in specific U.S.-U.S.S.R. terms, which we wish to avoid."

Lt. Gen. B. A. Trudeau found in 1961 he couldn't even mention Historian Arnold Toynbee's solemn warning that 19 of 21 notable world civilizations have died from within, not by external conquest. State's censor deleted Trudeau's words, with this explanation: "Toynbee is a highly questionable historian, not likely to impress this audience."

Over and over, as THURMOND's report shows, Kennedy underlings changed the word "war" to milder terms such as "struggle." "Emerge victorious" became "achieve our goals." Statements that the invasion of Castro's Cuba was a fiasco—which it was—disappeared entirely.

But for sheer silliness, no hatchet job equaled that done to another Trudeau speech. At one point, he tried to say: "On such theories socialism thrives." State's pencil wielder knocked out the words, jotting in a marginal comment which should go down in history.

"Some of our best friends are Socialists," he wrote.

Whose Bread I Eat, His Song I Must Sing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, recently my attention was directed by one of my constituents to a portion of a speech made recently by Dr. J. G. McDaniel, president of the Fulton County, Ga., Medical Society.

I feel these remarks are particularly applicable and would be of interest to the Members of Congress because of the never-ending pressure being exerted upon Congress to expand the power and influence of the Federal Government.

Under unanimous consent, I include this article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

"WHOSE BREAD I EAT, HIS SONG I MUST SING"

(By J. G. McDaniel, M.D.)

I remember, as a small boy in knee breeches, going with my father to hear an address given by Hon. Stephen Pace, then Congressman from the old Georgia 12th District. It was on the banks of the Ocmulgee River. There was a barbecue, and citizens, especially farmers from all the counties gathered—this was before the First World War.

It seemed that someone in the Congress had introduced a bill that would give the farmers some money provided they did something. The Congressman vigorously opposed it. I have no idea what it was, because I was watching a dirt dobber making a ball of mud. The Congressman snapped me back to attention, however, when he said: "I'm going to tell you a true story about the wild hogs that once lived about 40 miles down the river.

"Years ago," the Congressman said, "in a great horseshoe bend down the river, there lived a drove of wild hogs. Where they came from no one knew, but they survived floods, fires, freezes, droughts, and hunters. The greatest compliment a man could pay to a dog was to say that he had fought the hogs in Horseshoe Bend and returned alive. Occasionally a pig was killed either by dogs or a gun—a conversation piece for years to come.

"Finally a one-gallused man came by the country store on the river road, and asked the whereabouts of these wild hogs. He drove a one-horse wagon, had an ax, some quilts, a lantern, some corn, and a single-barrel shotgun. He was a slender, slow-moving, patient man—he chewed his tobacco deliberately and spat very seldom.

"Several months later he came back to the same store and asked for help to bring out the wild hogs. He stated that he had them all in a pen over in the swamp."

"Bewildered farmers, dubious hunters and storekeepers all gathered in the heart of Horse-Shoe Bend to view the captive hogs.

"'It was all very simple,' said the one-gallus man. 'First I put out some corn. For 3 weeks they would not eat it. Then some of the young ones grabbed an ear and ran off in the thicket. Soon they were all eating it, then I commenced building a pen around the corn, a little higher each day. When I noticed that they were all waiting for me to bring the corn and had stopped grubbing for acorns and roots, I built the trapdoor. Naturally,' said the patient man, 'they raised quite a ruckus when they seen they was trapped, but I can pen any animal on the face of the earth if I can jist get him to depend on me for a free handout.'"

We have had patient men in our Central Government in Washington for years. They are using our own dollars instead of corn. I still think about the trapdoor and the slender, stooped man who chewed his tobacco deliberately, when he spat and turned to the gathered citizens many years ago and said, "I can pen any animal on the face of the earth if I can jist get him to depend on me for a free handout."

Fish Pesticide Lab for Fort Collins, Colo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, the Department of Interior has asked the Congress for $50,000 to fund a site selection survey for a Fish Pesticide Laboratory.

Several days ago I supported that request in a statement to the Senate Appropriations Committee.

At the same time I suggested the most ideal site for this laboratory: Fort Collins, Colo., the home of Colorado State University, one of the most outstanding academic institutions in the United States in scientific research and education in natural resources and wildlife.

I ask unanimous consent that my statement, describing the advantages of locating this laboratory in Fort Collins, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FISH PESTICIDE LAB FOR FORT COLLINS, COLO.

(Statement by Senator CARROLL, of Colorado)

Mr. Chairman, I appear before you this morning to support an appropriation request for $50,000 by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife for site selection surveys for a new fish pesticide laboratory.

In supporting this appropriation for study of a new laboratory site, I do so with the strong recommendation that the Bureau give full attention to the advantages of locating the laboratory at Fort Collins, Colo.

The Fish Pesticide Laboratory is presently temporarily located in Denver, Colo. It is in makeshift quarters in the Federal Center.

In this connection, the Bureau is asking for $215,000 to maintain and operate the existing temporary lab. I support this requested appropriation also.

But the lab must soon be relocated and it is to that matter that I address myself this morning.

Colorado State University at Fort Collins has, through its president, Dr. William E.

Morgan, already offered to cooperate with the Bureau in selection of a site on or near university property. Dr. Morgan has indicated that, in his opinion, the known site requirements of the Bureau can be admirably met in the Fort Collins area.

I know, for example, that one of the most stringent site requirements is a proper supply of water in quantity, quality, and constancy of temperature.

These water needs can, I am confident, be adequately met at a site near the Bellvue Fish Hatchery, close to Fort Collins. Also, I am advised that sufficient land of a proper type is available near the fish hatchery.

At the same time, the university's own foothills campus, 2 miles west of the academic campus, is also an area ideal for location of a fish pesticide laboratory. This is a growing research campus anchored around a brandnew $1.3 million hydraulics laboratory. Other research being conducted at the foothills campus is as follows: hydrobiology, fisheries management, evaporation retardation, wildlife studies, veterinary science, and forest nursery.

Some of the foregoing research programs are carried out at the giant Bureau of Reclamation Horsetooth Reservoir and at College Lake and other reservoirs, all proximate to the university and the city of Fort Collins. Temperature and water quality studies of the water in Horsetooth Reservoir are in process right now and will soon be made available to the Interior Department.

There are other reasons that make Fort Collins, what to me would seem to be, an irresistibly attractive site for this type of project.

The Colorado Game and Fish Department research laboratories are located on the edge of the Colorado State University campus.

Colorado State University offers a graduate program in fisheries science associated with its department of forest recreation and wildlife conservation.

Add to the foregoing facilities and programs the excellent Colorado State University library and the university's many other research and graduate programs, from pathology to biochemistry and it would seem that no more ideal location than Fort Collins, Colo., could be found for a fish pesticide laboratory.

Thus Mr. Chairman, I support not only the $215,000 requested to keep the temporary fish pesticide laboratory in Colorado functioning, but I also ask that you grant the $50,000 needed for a new site study, and I hope the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife will give most thoughtful consideration to the multiple advantages of the sites now offered nearby in Fort Collins, Colo.; sites that have the benefits of good water, fish hatchery and fish science activities, and proximate access to a university (Colorado State) that has a solid, national reputation in advanced scientific achievements in natural resource and wildlife research programs.

Postal Pay Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, shortly, the Members of Congress will be called upon to enact legislation which will provide fair and just pay increases for our Federal employees. One of my constituents, Mr. Harry Kamish, the editor of the Union Mail has written the following statement which eloquently sets forth the need of our postal workers. I recommend its reading:

AN ADDRESS FOR POSTAL WORKERS

(By Harry Kamish)

A score and 7 days ago, our Nation's leaders brought forth a pay reform proposal, conceived in penury and dedicated to the proposition that all postal workers are not deserving of fair and equal treatment from their employer.

Now we are engaged in a great salary conflict testing whether this proposal can be endured.

We are met in an arena of public discussion where we have come to dedicate a portion of our energies that that employer pay these postal workers a decent living wage to enable them to hold high their heads as employees of the U.S. Government and proudly and faithfully serve the American people.

It is altogether fitting and proper that we do this for ourselves and for them to dispel the threat of unequal treatment and of fallacious theories of comparability.

In a large sense, the dedication of brave men and women working for the Post Office Department, whose struggle for justice and economic equality is the main power against opposing forces, can help determine the grave issues at hand.

Post office workers will note today and longer remember what Congress does here. They will not forget what is said here. They are dedicated to the unfinished work whose cause must nobly be advanced here.

In the great task before us, we must have increased devotion and confidence and highly resolve that unfair plans shall not deny the postal worker the measure of justice he needs now, that efforts on his behalf shall not be in vain and that the Fino bill, H.R. 9662, speaking for the people, shall not perish on the legislative calendar.

Our Nation's Fisheries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD remarks by myself on our Nation's fisheries. I expect to make similar remarks at the convention of the National Fisheries Institute.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR NATION'S FISHERIES

Today's fisheries, like almost everything else in our modern lives, differ greatly from the fisheries of our forefathers. This is true not so much in outward form as in understanding of the resource and in complexity of processing and distribution. Our fisheries are becoming ever more deeply involved in the highly complex and highly competitive world market.

The time has come when the maintenance of our fishing industry depends on the fullest and most cooperative effort at all levels of government and industry. The developing foreign production and planned economic systems differing in every respect from our own almost preclude the go-it-alone approach to fisheries problems.

Speaking as a long-time member of the legislative branch, I want to assure you of our desire to be an active partner with the executive branch and with the industry in a concerted attack on fisheries problems. Our job in the Congress is to pass constructive legislation. The executive branch, through the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, implements that legislation as a part of its many program responsibilities. You, in industry, have the responsibility to guide us in the formulation of legislation and to advise us as to its effectiveness after implementation.

As most of you well know, the fishing industry for many years was to some degree a stepchild, at least as far as the legislative branch of Government was concerned. There was no well-delineated national policy on fisheries. Major legislation with broad application to fisheries problems was almost nonexistent. The fishing industry lacked a real champion in Government similar to those agencies looking out for the interests of other industries.

The first piece of fisheries legislation, the act of March 3, 1887, authorized the Commissioner of Fisheries to "prosecute investigations and inquiries concerning the supply of food fishes of the coasts and lakes of the United States and the determination of protective, prohibitory, or precautionary measures to be adopted." In the nearly six decades that intervened between 1887 and 1954 there was other fisheries legislation enacted into the law of the land but it really wasn't until that year, 1954, with passage of the so-called Saltonstall-Kennedy Act, in which your speaker played an important part, that the fisheries began to receive the broad recognition that they deserved. This act, as I am sure most of you know, provided certain moneys from the duty on imports of fishery products for promotion of the flow of domestically produced fishery products in commerce by conducting a fishery educational service and fishery technological, biological, and related research programs. Innumerable worthwhile programs have been conducted under the terms of this act.

Close on the heels of the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act came the comprehensive Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, a truly monumental piece of fisheries legislation and one on which I am proud to say that I personally did a lot of work during the 2d session of the 83d Congress.

Long prior to the passage of the act of 1956, I was aware of and disurbed by a situation that existed in our relations with other fishery nations. I decided, at that time, that our State Department was not cognizant of the national importance of our industry and as a result we were not properly represented at international meetings. During that time I was present at meetings where our representative could not speak with the same full authority, due to lack of official standing, as did our conferees who usually were of Cabinet status. In company with other Senators—I particularly mention Senator SALTONSTALL—we called upon the State Department and urged that this situation be corrected and that a new position be established in the State Department to represent us with the authority that this vital segment of our industry deserved.

Finally, after many meetings with the Department of State and the passage of too many years, we now have a Special Assistant to the Under Secretary of State for Fisheries and Wildlife in the State Department. Our status at international conferences, due in part I believe to our awareness of the need for more authority for our industry, has been strengthened and improved.

Perhaps the most significant accomplishment of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 was the establishment of a firm national fishery policy. That policy is threefold:

1. To increase and maintain forever, for the people of the United States, a fishery

resource capable of yielding the maximum annual product.

2. To strengthen and maintain a vigorous fishery industry by assuring full and fair access to its raw material and full and fair access to the American market.

3. To do these things in partnership with the States and in full accordance with our international obligation, and without sacrificing the system of free enterprise.

The act of 1956 did many other things as well. It established the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries as a full-fledged Federal agency to deal exclusively with fishery matters. It created a Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife and an Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife, thus elevating the consideration of fisheries problems to the subcabinet level for the first time in history. The act provided for a a loan fund and for transfer of fisheries functions from other Government agencies, notably the Department of Commerce and the Department of Agriculture, to the Department of the Interior. The systematic preparation and distribution of reports to the public, the Congress, and the President was provided for, and the role of fisheries in international affairs was more clearly spelled out.

The record proves the wisdom of the passage of these two important acts. Among other things, they have resulted in the greatly increased exploratory activities which made available the new shrimp fisheries of Alaska, Oregon, and my home State of Washington, the new royal red shrimp and calico scallop concentrations off our southeastern coast, the new standards development program and the industry-financed $400,000 product inspection and certification program in which we all take pride as a giant step forward in quality improvement.

All of these activities, and many more, stem from these two fundamental expressions of congressional intent and of our Government's continuing interest in and supoprt of your industry.

We have, therefore, a common interest and several other recent congressional actions attest to this fact. For example, the passage of the Fair Labor Standards Act, a piece of necessary and humanitarian legislation, posed special problems for the crabmeat industry, inasmuch as economic studies had indicated strongly that the consumer would not accept the increased labor costs in the form of increased prices for crabmeat. The Congress, thereupon, made funds available to permit studies to increase productivity and efficiency of crabmeat plants through more careful production scheduling and through increased automation. I am informed that this program is already bearing fruit in that recommendations for increased efficiency have already been adopted by several processors.

Another example of the increasing interrelations of Government and industry interests occurred during the recent recession in the fish meal industry. The U.S. Delegation to the International Conference in Rome, which meeting was necessary to resolve the problem of speculation and unwise marketing practices, was led by an official of our State Department. The delegation's position was largely conditioned by the national foreign policy and our antimonopoly laws. Consequently, the delegation's freedom of action and decision was very rigidly limited. The great amount of preparative work done and the constructive leadership shown by the executive branch, nevertheless, brought the Conference to conclusion which was eminently satisfactory to the United States. Your Congress, in turn, again acted promptly to assist the industry. Funds were made available for a program to diversify your market outlets and to resolve some of the pressing problems in transportation rate which had developed. I am informed that one such rate problem, through the cooperative efforts of the National Fisheries Institute and the Government, was settled at an annual saving to the industry of $700,000 per year. Surely this is an indication of the effectiveness of enlightened Government-industry cooperation.

We, in Congress, also are closely following the very interesting findings as to the usefulness of fish body oils in the treatment of excessive amounts of cholesterol in the blood, the usefulness of fish protein concentrate as a supplement to the world's inadequate food protein supply, and the very valuable information on the nutritive value of fish as food.

I am sure that you appreciate that congressional interest in the fisheries is not limited to the enactment of specific, basic legislation. There is the appropriation process, too. Congress has shown great interest in oceanography over the past 3 years. Several Government agencies have an interest in the oceans, and the Departments of the Navy, Interior, and Commerce, and special agencies such as National Science Foundation and Atomic Energy Commission, have been supporting programs of oceangraphic research for many years. But until recently these efforts have been far too slight. In 1961, for example, the total Government budget in oceanography was only $60 million. The program proposed for fiscal year 1963 is more than double this amount, and almost half of the increase has been earmarked for the ships and shore-based facilities needed for an accelerated program. Your interests are most directly concerned with the work of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, and I am sure you all understand the prominent part that Don McKernan and his staff are playing. They are stepping up their research on the ocean and its living resources and are deeply engaged in planning and coordinating the Government's program as a whole.

But you have a stake in oceanographic research far greater than the program of this one Bureau. Every piece of research done on the oceans will benefit the fishing industry sooner or later. The Navy supports a very broad series of studies on ocean currents, distribution of dissolved salts, kinds and numbers of marine organisms, composition of bottom sediments, and many other investigations, each of which adds to the basic knowledge necessary to reduce the cost of catching fish and obtain maximum yields from fishery resources. Half a dozen Government agencies are cooperating in financing and operating the National Oceanographic Data Center in Navy's Hydrographic Office. Fishery scientists will draw upon this growing repository of oceanographic data more and more as time goes on, and the results will be to your advantage.

Congress also has passed, or has under consideration, special legislation to broaden the authority of certain agencies where necessary to allow them to play their full part in the national program. Public Law 87-336, enacted last year, expands the functions of the Coast Guard, allowing them for the first time to conduct oceanographic research from their vessels.

The National Science Foundation and Atomic Energy Commission also support broad programs in all aspects of oceanography. Some of these have direct application to fishery problems. Indeed a part of the program at the Biological Laboratory of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries at Beaufort, N.C., is financed with AEC money. The many activities supported by these agencies at universities and private research laboratories add immeasurably to our knowledge of the oceans.

We have some very special problems in the Pacific Northwest. The big dams, so valuable for electric power and irrigation, are obstacles to fish passage. To reach upstream spawning grounds, salmon must somehow pass over these dams; and their progeny must negotiate these barriers successfully if they are to reach the sea. These problems were brought to a head with recent proposals to build high dams in the Columbia River system. We in Congress were able to secure supplemental financing for such an accelerated fish passage research program. This is now underway. It is designed to show by 1964 the direction in which a sound program for both fish and power should go.

Of course, I do not need to tell an audience like this about the effect of foreign fisheries. You know the extent to which our markets have been invaded. You have also heard, I am sure, of the skyrocketing catch of such countries as Japan and Soviet Russia in waters close to American shores. The Japanese catches of American red salmon, the 2 billion pounds of groundfish per year from the Bering Sea, the Russian trawling off Cape Cod, all are cases in point. Here, again, we in Congress have been able to help by providing funds for sharply increased research on the affected fish. Results of this research will strengthen the hand of the United States in negotiations and treaty arrangements with other nations.

Congress is well aware of the catastrophic decline in gulf shrimp production which has caused so much hardship in this area. We recognize that additional knowledge of shrimp biology is bady needed in order that such occurrences may be predicted or avoided. During the current fiscal year funds have been made available for studies in the western gulf. It has been brought to our attention that additional funds are needed, and these requests will be considered by Congress.

Another resource that I know is of interest to many of you is the Atlantic and gulf menhaden. The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries tells me its biologists expect a below-normal menhaden run in 1962. When such fluctuations result from natural conditions of the seas there is not much that we can do about them. Here again, however, increased knowledge and better prediction may ease the strains on the industry.

People of America's breadbasket—the Great Plains of the Midwest—have traditionally not been fisheaters. Far from the coasts, they have in the past been turned against fish by the loss of quality the products suffered before they reached the consumer's hands. Now you have developed new methods which make it possible to bring the products of the oceans and shores great distances with the tang of the sea still in them. Commercial fisheries are also being developed in lakes and reservoirs.

As a Member of the Congress I am particularly proud of a development that started back at the beginning of the 1950's. A Senator secured passage of an appropriation that provided for the first full-scale attack on the predatory sea lamprey of the Great Lakes. In the ensuing years special chemicals and electrical devices have been developed to kill lampreys while leaving food and game fish untouched. The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries tells me that real inroads on the lampreys are beginning. Soon it may be possible to restore the lake trout, prime delicacy of the Great Lakes region until decimated by the lamprey. Other developments in the use of new kinds of fish and the making of new fish products should help introduce the Midwest to the delights of good sea food.

In short, we are moving as rapidly as possible to enlarge the fund of useful knowledge about the seas around us and both inshore and offshore fishery resources. We are training men to do the job, and furnishing financial support as rapidly as possible. Our Government is prepared to meet with those of other nations in solving problems of high-seas fishing. Research teams are moving into regions where food needs exist. The total program cannot solve every problem nor anticipate every contingency, but it can make us stronger than we now are in fishery affairs.

Obviously, we can't stand still. We must move forward. As a member of the lawmaking branch of our Government, I urge you to make your views known when you feel new legislation is needed, or existing laws changed. The purpose of the Congress is to reflect the will of the people. Don't hesitate to let us know what you think.

U.S. School Funds Believed Unneeded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the recent message which came to the House on Federal aid to education, I think it appropriate that the Members consider the opinion of Mr. Maurice H. Stans, former Director of the Budget, in regard to this subject.

The following article by Mr. Stans appeared in the Washington Post of Monday, March 12:

U.S. SCHOOL FUNDS BELIEVED UNNEEDED

(By Maurice H. Stans)

Taxpayers in my old hometown of Shakopee, Minn., in 1959 were confronted with the need of enlarging the school facilities. The educators and architects put before them a proposal to build a new high school at a cost of $1.3 million. The program was defeated in the election almost 4 to 1—but not because the voters were against education or were unwilling or unable to support its necessary costs. They turned it down because they believed the plans were extravagant.

About 6 weeks later, a more economical proposal calling simply for an addition to the existing school building was presented to the taxpayers. By an enthusiastic vote of 5 to 2, they approved a $200,000 bond issue to meet the cost.

In an earlier article I questioned the validity of the statistics being cited to the public in support of Federal aid for elementary and secondary school construction. I suggested that we are entitled to a lot more facts on what individual school districts really need—and what they can and will do about it when inadequate or substandard conditions are pointed out—before committing billions of dollars of Federal money to such a program.

MEETING RESPONSIBILITIES

Since all Americans favor a sound educational system, it might be assumed that the case for Federal support would rest on evidence that the local school districts have failed to provide one that is satisfactory. Yet the facts seem to demonstrate that by and large they are meeting their responsibilities—in their own way, as did the people of Shakopee.

Here are figures from the Office of Education: Over the past decade (of the 1950's) more than 600,000 new classrooms were built, while increased attendance required only 400,000. This means that 200,000 classrooms were made available to replace old ones or to reduce the size of classes. This provided a significant improvement in school conditions.

Since 1956, our communities have been building an average of 70,000 classrooms a year, on their own. In the 4 years between 1956 and 1960, enrollment rose 15 percent, the number of classrooms increased 23 percent, and the number of pupils per classroom declined from 29 to 27.1. And all this without general Federal aid.

And here are some more reported figures: The peak increase in elementary and secondary public schools occurred in the fall of 1953, when student enrollments rose 1.4 million. Since then, the postwar wave has been subsiding, and now the annual increases are about 1 million.

FURTHER SLOWDOWN

From 1965 through 1970, the statisticians tell us, the average growth will be only about 600,000 pupils per year. If our communities continue to build just 50,000 classrooms a year, this will provide enough new facilities to take care of the student growth and give 25,000 classrooms a year to replace old ones or further reduce the average pupil count per classroom.

The contention that States and local communities are unable to meet rising educational costs does not stand up under critical examination. The States and communities in the fifties boosted school revenues 164 percent to meet the mushrooming 43-percent expansion in enrollment. With our economy continuing to grow they should be better able by far to match the lesser needs of the sixties when enrollment will grow by only 20 percent.

A few years ago, the argument was heard that thousands of school districts had reached the ceiling of their bonding limits for school debt and so were prevented from meeting their requirements. Yet a survey by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in December 1959 showed that only 237 of the Nation's more than 40,000 school districts reported that they needed classrooms, were at the limit of their debt capacity, and were unable to obtain State aid. For those few in this category, the Eisenhower-Flemming 1960 proposal of limited long-term aid through loans and grants would have been a full and adequate solution; the Congress ignored it.

TWO LESSONS ILLUSTRATED

The experience of Shakopee illustrates two important lessons. First, planners can engage in flights of fancy when they submit proposed courses of action; only local knowledge of actual requirements can hold this type of wishful waste in check. Second, when the voters are convinced of the need for money and that it will be well spent they will approve and support all reasonable requests made of them. They want their children to be well educated.

Since the turn of the century, increases in school expenditures have far surpassed the growth in any other measuring rod of progress, including gross national product, personal income and personal consumption expenditures. And all except a negligible portion in recent years has been voluntarily paid out of the pockets of local taxpayers.

Certainly the facts do not make a strong case for using vast appropriations of Federal funds at the elementary and secondary school level. To a degree unequaled by any other nation in history, primary and secondary education has been provided in this country to all who have sought it. And it has been done well and at less cost to the taxpayer by the States and local school districts.

Lew H. Galloway, of Wakeeney, Kans.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Md. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, in the fast pace of modern living we often fail to fully appreciate those around us who give of their time and talents to causes that benefit us all.

One who made a great contribution to his community and State was Mr. Lew M. Galloway, of Wakeeney, Kans., a prominent farmer and stockman of western Kansas. Death claimed Mr. Galloway, February 4, 1962, creating a vacuum in his community that will not soon be filled.

Mr. Galloway played an influential role in the affairs of his town, county, and State, and was widely recognized for his accomplishments in the field of agriculture.

An article which appeared in the Western Kansas World of Wakeeney on February 8, 1962, summarizes well, the full life led by this distinguished Kansan, and I include a portion of it in the RECORD at this point:

A breeder of Hereford cattle from his youth, Mr. Galloway had a lifelong interest in and gave of his service to all phases of agriculture and to the life of his community.

His varied activities and interests included 12 years as commissioner of Trego County, 20 years secretary of the Trego County Fair, director of the Kansas Live Stock Association, member of the board of directors of Trego-Gove Federal Land Bank Association, two terms on the State banking board, member of the State board of agriculture for 9 years and its president in 1954. Since its inception in 1951 he served as a member of the board of trustees of Trego-Lemke Memorial Hospital.

In addition to his activities and services to his local community and State, he had an avid interest in politics and for many years was ardent in the support of the Republican Party even to the extent of being known over the State as Mr. Republican of Trego County.

For many years he was an active member of the local United Presbyterian Church, having served repeatedly as one of the board of trustees. He became a member of the Wakeeney Masonic Lodge in early life, later a member of Isis Shrine and a knight templar.

Lew Galloway will be remembered by the local community as by his friends over the State of Kansas for his active interest and participation in all the things that were for their progress and growth.

Richard McArdle, Chief of the Forest Service, Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow Richard McArdle, Chief of the Forest Service, retires after 39 years of distinguished public service. Chief McArdle has brought honor to his profession of forestry. He has set an example of the highest order to those who find in public service an opportunity for service far above the monetary rewards. He has particularly brought honor to his country because he is known throughout the world for his high professional attainment, his personal integrity and leadership, and understanding of sound rela-

tionships between public responsibilities and the opportunities for private development.

During my service in Congress it has been my privilege to continue my deep interest in forestry. This has afforded me an opportunity to know of his effective administration of his responsibilities.

Chief McArdle has richly earned the privilege of retiring from long years of heavy responsibility. We shall miss him. May I extend our warmest best wishes.

The Secretary of Agriculture has appointed a capable career man, Ed Cliff, to succeed Chief McArdle. I commend the Secretary on filling this position from the Forest Service, thus continuing in this high office a man experienced in the problems and opportunities of the Service.

Administration's Tax Aid—Just Adding to Business Burdens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER H. DOMINICK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker, in the New York Herald Tribune published Sunday, March 11, 1962, there appeared an article by Mr. Donald I. Rogers entitled "Administration's Tax Aid: Just Adding to Business Burdens." Mr. Rogers has presented a most thought-provoking analysis of the proposal which will soon be before the House for debate. I commend this excellent analysis to my colleagues and include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ADMINISTRATION'S TAX AID: JUST ADDING TO BUSINESS BURDENS

(By Donald I. Rogers)

Never in history have the citizens of a nation been obliged to carry such an enormous burden of Federal Government on their backs as are the American people. Naturally, neither the business nor the people of such a society can travel as far or as fast as might be the case without such a load.

The administration has recognized that we are not traveling fast enough or far enough by almost any measurement that is applied. Included in the measurements: a depressed rate of economic growth, slower than in all but the most backward countries, and persistent domestic unemployment while other industrial nations are enjoying unprecedented high levels of employment.

Every economist with a $8 slide rule has pointed to America's overburdening, overwhelming, and antiquated tax structure as the culprit. Ah, yes, the administration's leaders conceded, that's what is causing it. Then they promise to fix all this with the 1963 tax bill.

Everyone has had a chance to see all those bold new proposals and every one agrees, even the administrations own economists, that there's nothing in the bill to life the burden that is slowing us down.

While I know that the businessmen who have testified against this bill have been speaking for the interests of business, it also happens that their interests are the interests, in this case, of the people at large—and of the administration itself.

It is also true that the administration says this legislation is designed specifically to allow businessmen to expand, as they dearly love to do.

But the business leaders carefully examine the proposals with which they would have to deal and almost unanimously turned thumbs down. Some of them certainly would realize something of it. But it is totally wrong, they say, and it won't speed up growth; it won't cut unemployment.

Sometime around mid-March the Ways and Means Committee is expected to send this legislation to the House, despite all the testimony it heard against it from people who should know what they're talking about.

This is why, in part, industry wants the House to kill it. If not the House, industry wants the Senate Finance Committee to kill it, or the Senate itself. These are the reasons business feels the bill is so bad that it must be fought all the way:

1. The investment tax credit, amounting to $1.8 billion, is a subsidy and control measure. It seeks to make businessmen invest any available capital as the Government, in its unproved wisdom, thinks should be invested.

The planners, whose know-how has brought our farmers, our airlines, and our railways to their knees, are now going to bless business with the same quality of guidance. No wonder executives blanch.

The weapon is that businesses which followed Government dictates would be taxed less than those which in all good conscience could not. Tax digression and tax discrimination would be increased.

2. Government would have the say on how corporate expense funds could be spent. The compulsion comes from new rules against certain types of spending, which would place tax penalties against companies which use their own best judgment in this matter.

3. American business abroad would be given an unfair tax disadvantage at a time when competition with foreign producers in world markets is keenest.

4. Just when the Internal Revenue Service is installing a taxpayer number and electronics computer system to make sure that untaxed dividends and interest are reported, a heavy burden of withholding taxes on these items at the source would be installed. It is going to be totally unnecessary with the new system.

5. An extra tax bite is slipped into the legislation by assessing full income rates instead of capital gains rates on the sale of personal property or companies.

This plan does nothing for growth. It shifts the burden a little but results in no new capital to invest for growth.

So, businessmen generally want to see Congress defeat this entire tax bill. Only in this way can the road be cleared for real tax rate reform of the kind the Government concedes is unnecessary, and which has been put off every year so that more giantism could be allowed the Government.

If we trail the Western World in economic growth, surely we lead the world in government growth. Little good that does us.

If this bill is killed, Congress could consider the growth and revenue features of the Herlong-Baker income reform legislation with which readers of this column are familiar—and to judge from the mail, about which they are most enthusiastic.

Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Columbus, Ga., Ledger of March 7, 1962, and the Columbus, Ga., Enquirer of March 8, 1962, with reference to Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., who recently addressed the Rotary Club of Columbus:

[From the Columbus (Ga.) Ledger, Mar. 7, 1962]

A POLITICAL LEGEND COMES TO COLUMBUS

We happily welcome James Farley to Columbus today. The former Postmaster General and Democratic national chairman is here to address the Rotary Club.

Jim Farley is a legend in his own time. He has been for nearly three decades. He rose to fame as the man behind the landslide election of Franklin D. Roosevelt as President in 1932. During his time as national chairman, the Democrats wrested away nearly every governorship in the country, and more than two-thirds of the congressional seats.

We're sure that Jim Farley would be the first to admit that he got considerable assistance from a certain "Hoover depression" but his genius was nevertheless a thing of beauty which political students today still hold in awe.

Oddly, he never turned that genius to his own behalf. After breaking with Roosevelt on the third-term issue in 1950, Farley retired to private life. His name has often been mentioned but never called when New York Democrats are looking for candidates.

Now in his seventies Jim Farley still possesses the personal magic that helped his candidate capture the Nation 30 years ago. The mere rumor that he might possibly run for Governor of New York this year is reported to have put the incumbent Republican, Nelson Rockefeller, in a testy and worried mood.

Jim Farley has always been a friend of Georgia. We are sincerely glad to have him visit us again.

[From the Columbus (Ga.) Enquirer, Mar. 8, 1962]

FAVORED BY A VISIT

A big, cheerful man with a grin in his voice came to Columbus Wednesday to speak to a large assemblage of Rotarians and their guests, and although he made no formal address and spoke in rambling fashion of his associations over the last half-century with the great and near-great of our times, his audience was captured by his personality.

James Farley is certainly a legendary figure in our country. For many years a leading figure in the Democratic Party, he was a close associate of Franklin D. Roosevelt and was instrumental in the campaigns of the thirties and forties during which those of his political persuasion dominated national politics. Possessed of a magnetic personality and a flair for personal contact which captivates those who come under its influence, he is assuredly one of the great human beings of our times.

But as fine as these qualities are, we would not say that they are what so impressed his audience Wednesday. For Jim Farley is one of those rare souls who by their very presence in a room seem to fill it with optimism, pride of country, and deep, abiding conviction that Americanism is not only the best philosophy of government and society, but the strongest, and hence cannot lose. And he leaves this impression without waving the flag; without uttering the jingoistic and chauvinistic slogans and phrases which so often characterize the after-dinner speaker.

Farley—heart, mind, and soul—is a politician and a consummate one. But he has the reputation of being one who is unable to compromise with his moral principles. It was partly for this reason that we were moved to print last summer the text of a commencement address he delivered at St. Mary's University at San Antonio, Tex. After describing the present cold war state of the

world, outlining the terrible threat of our times, and rehearsing mistakes and events which led to the present situation, he repeated for his listeners some famous words: "We have nothing to fear but fear itself." He added that no more than the Assyrians can the Communists hold together forever an empire built on fear and terror, and that no device has ever been created which can conquer the soul God gave man. "Let us stand by our principles though the heavens fall," said "Big Jim." "No man and no nation ever compromises an eternal principle; it only succeeds in compromising itself * * * the path of duty is the path of hardship and sacrifice, but it is the only path to both safety and honor * * * those sacred bloody footprints in the snow of Valley Forge [cannot] be eradicated from the sands of time by an uncultivated, barefoot barbarian pounding his shoes on the table at the United Nations * * * if the crisis is great, the American tradition that the crisis will produce the man is true * * *."

Strong, fearless words these, filled with conviction and the power of the American ideal. We need to hear more of them in these troubled, uncertain times, and somehow, Jim Farley seems to personify the faith which moves in them. It was an honor to have him in our community and a pleasure to be exposed to the light which beams from such a man.

Residual Oil Import Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, I made known to my colleagues in the House my reaction to the recent decision of the administration with respect to residual oil import quotas. Among other things, I pointed out that increasing import quotas did not detract from the necessity to do away with the quota system itself.

I am pleased to report that this position has found support in other quarters. The Oil Users Association has made the following statement:

In behalf of over 2 million consumers, the Oil Users Association today responded to an Interior Department ruling which will increase residual oil quotas by 10 percent beginning April 1. In a resolution passed unanimously by the board of directors, the association said:

"*Resolved*, The Oil Users Association cannot accept the recent ruling of the Secretary of the Interior to increase residual oil quotas by 10 percent as a substitute for complete removal of controls. No matter what quantity of residual oil is imported under a restriction program, the inequities of improper distribution and the hardship of higher prices will continue. This in turn results in higher bills of upward of 2 million customers which our members serve along the Atlantic seaboard.

"In response to a request by the administration, a great many conscientious people have spent a great deal of time presenting full and informative statements on every facet of the oil restriction program. These studies have revealed that without any shadow of a doubt the restrictions should be removed entirely, and we respectfully urge the administration to take whatever steps are necessary to remove such restrictions at an early date."

Another point I made was that President Kennedy could show his genuine belief in freer trade by removing barriers to residual oil imports, which he could do now without further authority from Congress. Again, I find this view held by informed observers of this problem. The following editorial appeared in the Oil and Gas Journal of March 5:

IS THE WHITE HOUSE PLAYING POLITICS WITH OIL IMPORTS?

White House action on the residual-fuel-oil control program will provide a tipoff on just how much of a role politics will play in administration decisions on import problems.

Residual-fuel controls, like those on crude-oil imports, are supposed to be based solely on national security needs.

The Office of Emergency Planning has completed a study to determine whether continuation of residual fuel controls is necessary as a security measure. Its report is about ready to be sent to the White House.

If, as some observers suspect, the White House holds up any announcement on residual fuel until Congress takes action some months from now on the President's overall trade proposals, it will be evident that politics rather than national security is being used as the yardstick.

The White House could—and should—avoid this stigma by acting promptly on OEP's recommendation. Otherwise, the national security requirement becomes a farce. Crude-oil controls, too, could become a political club, as could the power that would be granted the President under the entire trade program. This is not a reassuring prospect.

A Bill To Authorize the Coinage of 50-Cent Pieces Commemorating the Orbital Flight of Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege today to introduce in the House of Representatives a bill authorizing the coinage of 50-cent pieces commemorating the orbital flight of Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., a member of the U.S. Marine Corps.

This same bill was introduced in the Senate by the Honorable ALAN BIBLE, of Nevada, and the Honorable STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri.

This House has heard many words spoken by many world and national leaders from its rostrum, but none have been so straightforward and honest as the words of Colonel Glenn when he appeared before a joint session of this Congress.

Patriotism and devotion to this country are not old fashioned. The American people are prepared to stand up and be counted. Communism or any other "ism" had best read the words of Colonel Glenn if they want to know if we Americans will sacrifice to defend our loved ones, our home and our democratic way of life.

Our coins bear the words "In God We Trust." When Colonel Glenn appeared before House Science and Astronautics Committee, he was questioned about his feelings relative to his Maker while in space. The colonel's reply to this question would make the words "In God We Trust" more than appropriate for the coinage this bill authorizes.

I believe the American people want the John Glenn coin, and I hope we can pass this bill in record time.

An Address by the Honorable Joseph S. Farland, Panama City, Panama, January 24, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address given by the Honorable Joseph S. Farland, Ambassador of the United States to the Republic of Panama, upon the occasion of a luncheon meeting of the American Society of Panama City, at Panama City, on January 24, 1962.

Ambassador Farland, one of the ablest and most dedicated of our representatives overseas, spoke eloquently about the goals of the alliance for progress.

Ambassador Farland's address follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY THE HONORABLE AMBASSADOR JOSEPH S. FARLAND AT THE LUNCHEON MEETING OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY ON JANUARY 24, 1962

Gentlemen of the American Society, fortunately, all of us are members of what the noted economist, John K. Galbraith, presently U.S. Ambassador to India, has called the affluent society. And, even more fortunately, we are members of a free democratic society. This happy combination offers us, at this juncture of world affairs, urgent duties, great responsibilities, and unlimited opportunities. Collectively, we who enjoy the many benefits of free Western society, we of the free world, have the financial ability, the freedom of choice, and the desire to bring to our less fortunate fellow men the greatest blessing of true democracy—liberty and social justice for all men.

This concept of liberty, one that embraces all humanity, is basic to our own revolutionary history and has, throughout our national development, guided the thinking and actions of our Presidents and statesmen. Jefferson expressed this idea most clearly and without reservation. He said: "The American Revolution is intended for all mankind." We have remained true to this ideal. The world scene today finds us stanchly defending every man's right to win for himself and his family a better life through peaceful and democratic revolutionary processes. And just as tenaciously, we oppose the enjoyment of this better life by the few, at the expense of the misery of the many.

This selfless universality in the application of our ideals of freedom found its maximum expression in President Franklin D. Roosevelt's four freedoms—freedom of

speech, freedom of worship, freedom from want, and freedom from fear. He postulated these precious freedoms not only for the people of the United States, but, as he repeated over and over, for people everywhere in the world. And in his second inaugural address, he restated our dedication to social justice for all in these words; "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little."

In spite of having given more generously of the fruits of our labor than any other people in recorded history, to friend and foe alike, progress has been slow. But measured by the past we have moved swiftly; measured by the needs of the future we all have much more to do. The world's social and economic problems still loom very large. Teeming millions of our fellow men stagnate in misery, lose their daily battle with hunger, succumb needlessly to disease and wear the heavy chains of ignorance.

Influential and outspoken leaders in Latin America have recognized the continuing role of our healthy revolutionary spirit in stimulating these millions to struggle for the achievement of their long-denied, fast-rising aspirations for a better life. Several weeks ago, Carlos Lacerda, Governor of Brazil's Guanabara State, told the Inter-American Press Association: "The unrest which exists in Latin America, the discontent of its people * * * is nothing but the fruitful result of North American influence. This eagerness to grow, to prosper, to have security and freedom, this unconformity to backwardness and stagnation are genuine products of the inter-American spirit of the beneficial influence of an American revolution in Latin America."

Recognizing our urgent duty to help convert these just aspirations into a goodly share of reality within the lifetime of those of our neighbors who cling precariously to the bottom rung of the economic ladder, we have joined forces with the nations of Latin America in a gigantic cooperative effort to insure a decade of development. We have clasped hands in an alliance for progress that was born at Bogotá and baptized at Punta del Este. Here you see the official symbol of that alliance just authorized by the Organization of American States for use throughout the hemisphere. It is a symbol of hope rekindled in the breast of those who had forgotten how to hope. It is a symbol of freedom, of peace, of work, and of progress. As honorary president of the American Society, I am going to ask your directors to assist me in every possible way to publicize this symbol all over Panama and keep its message of real hope for a better life always alive in those whom the alliance was designed to help.

We must not lose sight of the fact that the alliance is not a uniquely U.S. position, but has been formally created and subscribed to by the majority of our proud sister republics. It represents an invigorating distillation of the best social and economic thinking in this hemisphere. In the declaration to the people of the Americas, the United States offered to make available technical assistance and some $20 billion over the next decade to finance investment in basic social and economic progress. The Latin American nations, for their part, declared their firm intention to dedicate increasingly larger shares of their own resources to economic development and social progress. They also are bound to introduce reforms that will assure full participation of all sectors in the fruits of the alliance for progress. They agreed "to reform tax laws, demanding more from those who have most, to punish tax evasion severely and to redistribute the national income in order to benefit those who are most in need, while at the same time promoting savings and investment and reinvestment of capital." This is an all-important goal, requiring the greatest courage and determination from national leaders and understanding and cooperation from the people who will bear unaccustomed and, at first, uncomfortable tax burdens, which every free, modern society uses to make more equitable and better utilization of the national wealth.

Such an ambitious program on a scope never before imagined creates immediate problems of long-range, integrated economic planning that many of the signatory countries have never seriously attempted in the past. Planning of this kind is a necessary and accepted function in every modern society. In the United States, it is an everyday part of our lives. In many of the less-developed countries, such planning is at best inadequate and at worst nonexistent. It follows then, that since the prime qualifications for assistance under the alliance for progress is demonstrated willingness to undertake self-help measures and reforms, that adoption of a systematic approach to development, budgeting, and programing is fundamental for the success of any nation's long-range program.

Indeed, self-help is not only the key to participation in the alliance, but it is the only really effective stimulant to stagnant economies. The necessity of stimulating the economic sector is essential for, as my Government has heretofore pointed out, "poverty must be recognized as a force of tyranny in itself, economic development is a liberating force. Yet economic development will fail in its purpose if its benefits go primarily to the wealthy elite. Our task, therefore, is not only to bake a bigger economic pie, but to take greater care of how that pie is sliced." The nations involved should not delude themselves into thinking that foreign aid, of itself, will lead them down the path to the desired millennium. This is patently impossible. The enormous, neglected needs of millions of their citizens can never be satisfied by even many times the sum pledged by the United States. But these funds can alleviate the most pressing problems, generating both hope and concrete improvements, while the members of the alliance readjust and reform their economic and social structures to enable more of their own resources to assume the burden of responsibility for their development.

I emphasize again that no amount of aid will save those who do not or will not help themselves. The degree of progress each member of the alliance achieves depends much more on his own total effort than on the amount of technical and financial aid we will provide. Neither growth nor a development program can be imposed on a country. It must express that nation's own will and goals. Nor do we expect any country to remake itself in our image. Open societies can take many forms, and within very broad limits the members of the alliance must be free to set their own goals and to devise their own institutions to achieve those goals.

In my view, there are four major areas of self-help which merit the immediate and continuing attention of the participating governments. They are: The effective mobilization of national resources, the reduction of dependence on external sources, the tapping of the energies and skills of the entire population and the insistence upon honesty in government.

No economy can get the most out of its resources if dishonesty, corruption, and favoritism are a tolerated part of the national scene. I have talked with hundreds of Latin Americans about the many problems which face the nations of this hemisphere. Almost without exception they have stressed the need of vitalizing the concepts of morality and integrity in all walks of life. They have expressed the belief that if a stricter degree of morality were adopted as the public and private posture of all responsible citizenry, then all other national problems would be on the road to solution. It is axiomatic that there can be no decent enlightened nation or civilization without morality and integrity and no lasting integrity apart from God. Those who would treat politics and morality apart will never understand the one or the other. Thus it is imperative that alliance-for-progress funds whether they come from the United States or are generated by a national economy must not be diverted to the pockets of a handful of grasping politicians, while a few crumbs are cast to the many poor who hunger for liberty and justice. All of us must expend every effort to make certain that this time the masses of underprivileged in Latin America are the real beneficiaries. Anything less will only assure the failure of this massive new effort to relieve human misery in this hemisphere.

In this same vein, I must mention another impediment to progress that is blatantly evident throughout Latin America—monopoly. That is monopoly which puts artificially high prices on essential materials, goods and foodstuffs, again in the classic pattern of favoring the few and exploiting the many. Free competition and the normal, unrestricted working of the basic economy law of supply and demand must be allowed to operate in and on sick economies if progress is to come to the Americas.

As an incentive to self-help, the United States can use its aid by responding with financial assistance on a sustained basis, tailored to priority needs, to those countries making serious efforts in self-help. In many instances, it can withhold or limit its aid to countries ignoring or not yet willing to make such efforts. And may I add, for instance, as did former Under Secretary Chester Bowles, during a speech at Mexico City on October 19 past, "that I do not see why my Government or any other capital contributor should be asked for loans or grants to replace runaway indigenous capital that could be kept at home by the same kind of curbs with which the British helped restore the soundness of their economy following World War II." Any government, however, must realize that it can ignore the pressures of the floodtide of "rising expectations" only at its own grave peril and to the detriment of the just aspirations of its citizens.

Here in Panama the government has shown itself to be fully aware of its pressing social and economic problems and comprehensively to have grasped the significance of the alliance for progress calling for staggering efforts and unprecedented changes. Reporting to the assembly on his first year's stewardship as chief executive, President Chiari informed the nation that its destiny was tied to a wholehearted cooperation in the alliance, saying: "* * * Panama attended the Punta del Este conference and participated in the sessions of the alliance for progress, a bold program that President Kennedy has presented to the Latin American peoples as the best way to achieve their economic redemption and their agricultural and industrial development."

"Panama will benefit from that program of economic assistance and my Government feels that the policy of the Kennedy plan is truly the instrument that, judiciously used by Latin American nations, will serve to take them out of the state of underdevelopment in which they find themselves and reach high levels of integral progress."

More recently on January 1 of this new year, President Chiari unequivocally declared that, "The cooperation and effort involved in the alliance for progress do not mean the easy acquisition of free millions in exchange for mute support in the game of international politics. It does mean undertaking internal reforms by self-effort toward

attaining the maximum degree of welfare with equal opportunities for all in democratic societies, adapted to their own desires and needs. These reforms, which coincide with my strongest aspirations and which call for inescapable requirements on our part, will be less grievous for Panama with the funds which the United States has pledged to contribute toward the partial financing of programs and projects meeting the rigid conditions established in the Charter of Punta del Este."

The present administration had barely taken office when it established a National Planning Bureau in the office of the President. It has done an excellent job of preparing a 5-year investment program for social and economic development in consonance with the goals of the alliance for progress. A special Panamanian economic mission recently went to Washington to discuss Panama's development needs and explore how local and U.S. resources could best be used to meet those needs. Although some of the projects they presented needed further study, several were so completely planned that they lent themselves to early implementation. Because of the excellent work of the Planning Bureau, Panama became one of the first recipients of alliance-for-progress financial assistance. The U.S. Government has indicated its readiness, subject to the conclusion of satisfactory project agreements, to provide grants of $9.9 million to Panama. These funds were made available concurrently with Under Secretary Ball's visit to Panama. Agreement finalizing the projects can be expected shortly.

Because of confusing statements in the local press, I want to underscore the fact that this money represents grants and not loans. To give you some idea of the magnitude of this grant, I can say that it represents more than the Panamanian Government has spent in any 1 year on public investment projects with the single exception of 1956. Since it is a grant and not a loan, Panama will not have to budget funds with which to repay normal interest and principal, as on loans it is presently servicing in the public investment sector. The grant is, in essence, recognition of Panama's pledge to make the sacrifices and reform to which she solemnly subscribed at Punta del Este.

As a concrete example of the Panamanian Government's pledge to do what it must, I will quote again from President Chiari's address to the Assembly: He spoke of the thorniest reform of all—taxes: "* * * it is necessary that our fiscal income be increased in an equitable manner, that strict measures be applied to avoid the evasion of taxes and that additional income be obtained from the economic sectors that can support it without seriously affecting their assets."

"The executive branch also feels that the Department of Internal Revenue requires certain norms so that it can effect a better collection and impose severe penalties for those who evade the payment of taxes, serving as a warning for those who consider the evasion of taxes a meritorious ability."

I submit that such a statement demonstrates moral strength and political courage, deserving of emulation by those who bear the ultimate responsibility of making such concepts the law of the land. I would be derelict if I failed to express my wholehearted support of the democratic ideals and humanitarian posture which President Chiari has enunciated on so many occasions since becoming the chief executive of this great country. This I do and wish for him success in effecting, from words to fact, the accomplishment of social and economic reforms, much needs yet to be done. Last Friday I was officially informed that, in the development of self-help measures to assist in these reforms (I quote) "during 1961 the Government of Panama has improved some of its administrative tools, and has prepared and undertaken program, projects and reforms designed to accomplish an accelerated move toward economic and social progress. Nevertheless these measures are still insufficient since tremendous efforts are required to gear administrative machinery, policies and attitudes to the spirit and actions of the decade for progress." In a recent editorial by my good friend George W. Westerman it is suggested that in developing these measures and in order that these "desirable economic and social benefits will come to the people of this country with the least possible delay the Government must enlist the full energies of political leaders, legislators, industrialists, publicists, educators, labor leaders and citizens of good will in a great cooperative effort." This concept most certainly deserves endorsement. The combined labor of all is necessary that this country be able to adhere to the promises made by it in concert with its sister republics at Punta del Este.

Although the definitive obligations of the $9.9 million grant to specific projects depend on further detailed planning, negotiation and approvals by both governments, I can give you, in broad outline, an idea of how the grant funds are to be allocated:

Four million five hundred thousand dollars is to go to public school construction on a public bid, contract basis. Destined mainly for communities hard pressed for school buildings or additional classrooms, the funds will provide for 60 schools or a total of 1,000 classrooms. School supplies and housing for teachers may be provided in some cases.

Two million dollars is destined to continue the work started under the $1 million special assistance grant of last year. This includes $0.5 million for self-help housing, such as that undertaken by the U.S. AID mission in the San Miguelito project, where 20 houses are nearing completion and 40 more are being started. It is interesting to note that the labor donated by the participants is calculated as 30 percent of the value of the finished home. In reality, this constitutes their down payment.

Another $0.5 million will aid expansion of agricultural extension and research programs. Excellent work has already been done in this field and much more must be done to improve the basic contribution of agricultural activities to Panama's total economy. Another $0.5 million will provide for the construction of rural health centers, mostly in the central provinces. One-half million dollars more will provide further training to heavy equipment operators and mechanics who, while learning, construct useful pioneer, and farm-to-market access roads in Darien, Panamá, Coclé, Herrera, Los Santos and Veraguas. The rural school construction program, in which communities themselves supply land and labor, will be supported by the remaining $0.5 million dollars in this $2 million allocation.

The rest of the grant funds will be assigned to the following important surveys that are an integral part of Panama's national economic planning:

Two hundred thousand dollars will support an engineering study of the Coclé del Norte road project, linking Toabré and Salud and opening up the central region of Panama to the Atlantic coast.

One million two hundred thousand dollars will be spent on a cadastral survey of the central and eastern areas of Panama. This will provide a solid base for agrarian reform land titles and future natural resource development.

Five hundred thousand dollars is to be dedicated to hydraulic and mineral resource surveys that are indispensable to national-economic development.

Two hundred thousand dollars is earmarked for a project to produce the plans and specifications for a regional hospital in Aguadulce.

One hundred fifty thousand dollars will finance studies that will promote an accelerated industrial growth in this country. They will provide feasibility information on the types of plants that can economically be installed in Panama. In this connection, I urge the rapid development of the Central American Common Market. Many interested industrialists have told me that while they could not economically install a plant to produce for a market of 1 million people in Panama, they could do so if their market were expanded to include the 12 million people in the entire Central American area. This problem deserves the immediate and serious attention of all the governments concerned. Four countries of Central America have agreed upon a full customs union with internal free trade for substantially all their production. Their bold and decisive action commands admiration. I am confident that it will open the way to accelerated development.

Another $650,000 of grant funds is to be assigned to various studies on a long range, national level to develop major projects for social and economic development. Unless private capital can be obtained, $500,000 of these funds will be reserved to survey the hydroelectric plant project on the Bayano River.

In addition to the $9.9 million grant, the regular ICA program, now known as AID or Agency for International Development will provide another $2.5 million for technical assistance in the many important fields in which the United States has cooperated with Panama for many years. Thus the grand total of grants made available to Panama for 1962 is $12.4 million.

Including these funds for fiscal year 1962, since the end of World War II the total amount of economic assistance to Panama from all agencies, both grants and loans, has been approximately $96 million. You may be interested in the fact that since July 1, 1960 Panama has secured approval of loans and grants totaling approximately $49 million, of which $31.3 million came from the United States. Of this latter part approximately $18.5 million constituted grants.

This is certainly a measure of our determination to help Panama help itself to provide for all its citizens the kind of life that every member of a free democratic society can earn by honest labor, sacrifice, and freedom of choice, and opportunity.

I should like to close my remarks with a quotation from H. G. Wells that is particularly apt to this discussion:

"A federation of all humanity, together with sufficient measure of social justice to ensure health, education, and a rough equality of opportunity, would mean such a release and increase of human energy as to open a new phase in human history."

With our new alliance for progress, we have begun our odyssey into that unknown but certainly better future.

Promises Versus Performance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, this morning's edition of the New York Daily News carries a column headed "Capital Circus," written by Jerry Greene, which I

am glad to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I hope it will be widely read. The differences between promises and performance which it reveals should neither be forgotten nor forgiven:

CAPITAL CIRCUS

(By Jerry Greene)

WASHINGTON, March 14.—Back in those hoary, pre-New Frontier days when the world was not so young—meaning the fall of 1960—the air was filled with political cries that the American people must at all times be told the hard, bitter truth. Most of these contentions echoed from the camp of the Democratic nominee.

Now President Kennedy has painted himself into a corner on this issue. The matter of word-juggling in the play for position in international power politics makes the "whole truth" practice look easier from the outside than it is in actuality.

The President, by no means without precedent, has found it necessary or expedient to hold back a trifle or considerably, as the case may be. Not surprisingly, little has been heard from the Government Operations Subcommittee of Representative JOHN E. MOSS, Democrat, of California, whose mimeograph machines blanketed the capital in the waning days of the Eisenhower administration in a quixotic tilt against secrecy.

But the lack of frankness breeds confusion and uncertainty and trouble for any administration. Two onerous cases are in point: the peculiar disarmament talks in Geneva and, much more seriously, the war in South Vietnam.

Those are the present corners. There have been others, the Cuban invasion for one, and more recently the administration position on the return of U-2 pilot Francis Gary Powers.

The official U-2 story as related by the CIA and released by Senate and House committees raised a few eyebrows when the agency—not Powers—said the destruct charge in the aircraft was intended only to "render inoperable the precision camera and other equipment." The charge was said to be 2½ pounds of TNT. Army engineers say ½ pound of TNT will wreck a railroad switch or cut a rail. Big stuff for a camera.

A little thing, perhaps, but indicative.

On the Geneva front, the President outwardly remains full of hope for some progress; at the same moment the Russians grow nastier about cluttering up the Berlin air corridors with radar jamming chaff.

THE DISARMING PROBLEM OF DISARMAMENT

And there are continual urgent administration statements, such as that of Senator MIKE MANSFIELD of Montana, the Senate majority leader, after a White House conference yesterday, that the United States will move instantly toward disarmament if an agreement can be reached.

There is ever dangling the hope which compounds the confusion.

When Kennedy was a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, a subcommittee headed by Senator HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, spent 3 arduous years probing disarmament prospects. It submitted a 649-page report draped in gloom. The report included testimony of expert witnesses, one of whom estimated it would take 20 to 30 years to get a reasonable disarmament plan into effect, even should one be approved.

This would be no quick and easy matter. Only 10 days ago, Dr. Edward Teller, certainly recognized as one of the most knowledgeable in the nuclear area, warned in his book, "The Legacy of Hiroshima," that the plowshare negotiations are starting at the wrong end.

"Nuclear arms are small, powerful, relatively inexpensive and easily hidden," Teller wrote. "Disarmament, therefore, should not begin with nuclear disarmament."

YOU'RE ENTITLED TO BE CONFUSED

The average taxpaying customer, then, can be excused for wondering what all those people are doing in Geneva—or at least, why the U.S. leadership still talks in terms of a disarmament if the real, honest reason is something else.

The South Vietnam thing is worse. The administration insists that the United States is not at war in South Vietnam. Technically this is true. It is also true that combat elements of American forces are not present as such, to engage in battle designed, directed, and conducted by U.S. commanders. The intent—and the wish and demand of the South Vietnamese—is that the natives do their own shooting.

At today's press conference, Kennedy said it is well known that there are a good many Americans in Vietnam who have not "fallen under a description which is generally used in combat troops." This is not the most precise outline of the situation, at best.

There has been a great flap about press coverage of U.S. activities in South Vietnam.

Restrictions were imposed about how far correspondents could go in accompanying the U.S. troopers who were training, instructing, transporting, and generally guiding South Vietnam soldiers and airmen.

COULD BRING IN THE CHINESE COMMUNISTS

Restrictions were eased somewhat, and immediately this country was flooded with eyeball accounts and heavy headlines about Americans in action. So the clamps came on again; a little more of this stuff would be all the encouragement the Chinese Reds would need to pour down by the thousands.

That there is a lot of action in Vietnam is beyond question. It is freely admitted that the United States has some 4,000 troops there, more coming, and a 4-star general to run the show. If this is to be taken on face value, it's something like watching the chairman of the executive council of the Boy Scouts taking the Beaver Patrol on a hike.

The truth seems to be, so far as it can be found through the folds of our own cloth curtain, that the United States has determined that South Vietnam and probably Thailand are the sites for showdown. This is it. Lose here and southeast Asia is down the drain.

Poems From Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, on the advent of St. Patrick's Day, which, with the exception of Christmas, is more of an international holiday than any other day in our calendar, in these troublous times throughout the world, it gives me great pleasure to note how Ireland, the ancestral home of so many of our fellow citizens, though a small country, is contributing so richly to the literature of the world by the work of its modern and younger poets. Our common literature is enriched by the work of Maureen McGourty, one of the younger poets of Ireland, who resides at present in Dublin, and I consider it a privilege, under leave to extend my remarks, to command some of these beautiful poems to my colleagues at this time:

NOW THAT APRIL'S HERE

Now that April's here
  If thoughts had wings
I'd fly to Ireland
  Where the sweet thrush sings
From dusk 'till dawn,
  And pools of sunlight pass
Like silver ripples
  On the cool, green grass.

Far from this bustle
  And polluted air,
I'd seek an Irish hill
  And follow there,
The primrose paths,
  That wander far below,
To meet the valleys
  Where the clear streams flow.

Now that April's here
  The West wind's breath
Is sweet with violet,
  And the waking earth
A thousand blossoms yields
  On every bough;
The swallows mate and sing
  In Ireland now.

HUMILITY

To think my careless feet have trod
  Such loveliness into the sod,
That I without a word have crushed
  This frail, white beauty in the dust,
Who do not know the peace, content,
  In which a daisy's world is spent,
While God, who holds all cosmic power
  Has stooped to raise this little flower.

FROM A PRISON CELL

Blow, wind from the west
  Through my prison bars,
Bring me the purple night,
  And the crowded stars.

Blow where the hilltops raise
  Their heads to the sky,
Bring me the sea's wild song,
  And the curlew's cry.

Blow for this April day,
  Where linnets sing,
Teach me forgotten songs,
  And the joy of spring.

Blow through the scented trees
  Leaf laden, and then,
When the dusk comes, blow on
  Through the sweet night again.

Come as an oldtime friend,
  Softly, and soon,
Bringing the whole world here
  Into my room.

Swoyerville (Pa.) Woman to Mark 100th Birthday Anniversary on Sunday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, On Sunday, March 18, 1962, Mrs. Elizabeth Reggie, of Swoyerville, Pa., will celebrate her 100th birthday anniversary with an open house. She is indeed a most amazing woman—alert, active and performs her own household duties. As her Representative in Congress, it gives me great pleasure to salute Mrs. Reggie on her uncoming 100th birthday and in further recognition of her birthday I include as part of my remarks the feature article written by Libby Brennan,

society editor, Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent, that appeared in that newspaper on March 11, 1962.

Article follows:

SHE WORKED HARD 100 YEARS

(By Libby Brennan)

The first shot of the Civil War in the United States had been fired only a few weeks before. The news of one of the major tragedies in history never reached the quiet little town in Czechoslovakia where a healthy baby girl was born on March 19, 1862. Life was serene in this little village nestled in the farmlands of a great empire. The daily existence of the peasants was never interrupted by news of the outside world but only by neighbor activities. It was a hard life but not one stained with stress and frustrations.

Elizabeth Reggie grew up in her quaint environment. She never attended school but learned the ardors of manual labors. At the age of 9 she helped her mother construct their home, a project her father had undertaken but died before it was scarcely begun. She also started to work in the fields of the estate of a titled landowner. For every bushel of potatoes she took home, she gave the landlord four. It was hard, backbreaking work, but the type of physical labor that invites good rest. There was a spirit of comradeship in the toil because Elizabeth was surrounded by neighbors who chatted, sang, and laughed while they worked.

The years passed, and soon Elizabeth joined other girls her age who traveled to the neighboring town for dancing on warm Sunday evenings.

MET AT DANCE

While at one of these dances, a young man from the village spotted the browned-eyed gay girl. Though they never even nodded, several weeks later he arrived at her home with a mutual friend. That very evening the young couple exchanged nuptial vows. The year was 1879.

Once established in her new role as housewife and mother, Elizabeth Reggie contemplated following the role her mother, grandmother, and all of her ancestors played—that of a simple farm woman. However, soon her husband showed signs of desiring to go to the "New World," the riches of which began to infiltrate the local gossip centers. Through skimping and saving, enough money was raised to send him in pursuit of his Golden Fleece. It was not until 1908, when Elizabeth, then a woman of 47, joined her husband and brought four of her children with her.

SETTLED IN SWOYERVILLE

The family settled in Swoyerville in a home that her husband built. He was employed in the mines and worked long, hard hours. Tragedy struck in 1911 when Andrew Reggie was killed in the mines.

By this time, Elizabeth's children were reared. She then moved in with her son and daughter-in-law Mr. and Mrs. Andrew Reggie and has remained in this home until today.

Although in a brandnew world, life continued very much in the same manner as she always knew it. There was housekeeping and family duties. Instead of picking potatoes for a landlord, Elizabeth began her own small and very productive garden, feeding her family with the fruits of her labor.

ATTENDS PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

Her only social activity has been her membership in the Stell Presbyterian Church, which even today as she approaches her 100th birthday anniversary she manages to attend on frequent intervals.

Elizabeth Reggie is an alert, alive woman who appears more to be 60 years old rather than 100. She lives with her daughter-in-law and performs her own household duties. She is far from being an invalid.

The day of the centenarian begins about 9 a.m. She dresses herhelf and comes down stairs to either clean a little or even to prepare breakfast. She works about the house until after lunch when she seats herself in the rocker by a sunny window and then rests.

After dinner in the evening, she watches television and is one of Perry Como's biggest fans. She also enjoys watching the "Price Is Right," which her daughter-in-law explains to her. Although she neither speaks nor understands English, she enjoys the television, particularly music.

"Babo" is the affectionate name she is referred to by her family and neighbors. She has very definite ideas about the running of a household and the conduct of young women.

On Sunday, March 18, from 3 to 6 p.m., her family and friends will join in observing her birthday anniversary. An open house will be held at the home, which sits high atop a hill on Owen Street, Swoyerville.

MANY DESCENDANTS

Among the guests that will drop in to wish the lovely woman birthday felicitations will be many of her descendants. She has 17 grandchildren, 19 great-grandchildren, and 7 great-great-grandchildren.

Her two living children are George Reggie and Mrs. Mary Butchko, both of Swoyerville.

The proverbial question of how she managed to live to such a distinguished age would be difficult to answer. A healthy guess would be that she was geared to hard labor from childhood, but that she was also spared the tensions of modern living. She never abused herself and knew always the value of religious devotions and a sense of humor.

Community Art Show

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, America's first definitive handbook on Community Art Show production and organization is being published in Washington today and I believe that this contribution to our society should be marked upon the calendar as a truly significant date in the advance of our society toward greater achievements and as a view toward a better life for all our people.

Every art group, school and public library, art and educational council in this country should have a copy of this publication, for it is significant in two ways. First, it is a symbol of the development of an active movement in this country to bring cultural activities to the people themselves. Second, it will help all who are interested in advancing our culture, to contribute toward our national life in this area. Through it they can find the practical answers to many of the day-to-day problems of cultural development.

For these reasons I should like to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the accompanying reviews and comments that have been made about the publication—and the art show on which it was based—prior to publication.

The coauthors of the book, "Community Art Show Organization Guide and Illustrated Catalog" both have current affiliations and roots in Connecticut. Dorothea C. (Mrs. Roswell) Ward has maintained for many years a residence in Bantam, Conn., and spends her time between there and Washington. Mr. Daniel Millsaps, internationally known artist and designer, and head of Allied Business Consultants here, is connected with Connecticut through his mother who resides in Greenwich. Mr. Millsaps has lived in Washington for more than 10 years. Both Mrs. Ward and Mr. Millsaps have been active in the private redevelopment and restoration of the Capitol Hill area of Washington.

The material follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 4, 1962]

SIDELIGHTS ON ART

(By Mrs. Emily Genauer)

A just-published survey of 21 museums scattered about the country shows their total attendance for 1960 exceeded 21,360,000, representing a 10 percent increase over 1958.

The figures appear in a booklet entitled "Community Art Show, Organization Guide," published by International Publications, Washington, D.C., under the sponsorship of the Capitol Hill Community Council, Inc.

Another interesting figure is that more than $3 billion were spent or donated in 1960 for cultural activities by individual Americans, not counting public funds and business gifts. This is 70 percent more than in 1950.

The purpose of the spiral-bound, paperback book, which is illustrated and on sale at $5, is to show what can be done and is being done in communities throughout the United States to foster popular appreciation of art and artists. Its practical information ranges from methods of raising patronage funds to planning art shows and choosing prize juries.

[From the World, Mar. 7, 1962]

COMMUNITY ART SHOW HANDBOOK

"Community Art Show," by Daniel Millsaps and Dorothea Ward (134 pp. International Publications, $5).

Contents: This guide to the organization of a community art show is the first publication to thoroughly cover this field. It is based on the experiences of the authors in cochairing the first annual open international fine art exhibition held in Washington, D.C. in May 1961, under the sponsorship of the Capitol Hill Community Council. Every phase of that exhibit was eminently successful. More than 1,400 entries were on display from nearly all of the 50 States, Greece, Poland, Belgium, France, and the Virgin Islands, and more than 10,000 persons viewed it.

Authors: Daniel Millsaps, a product of New York's Art Students League, combines a residence with a business office and an art studio on Capitol Hill. His work has been hung in major galleries and exhibits throughout the country. Dorothea Ward never had chaired an exhibit prior to this one. Her fields had been community planning, volunteer training for health departments, Red Cross, Mental Health, and young peoples' groups in music and theatricals. This background was invaluable when used in conjunction with the professional artist background of her cochairman.

Outlook: For communities planning art exhibitions—and several hundred cities are working toward organizing arts councils, according to Fortune magazine—this book is an invaluable guide. Chapters deal with such subjects as "What Makes a Good Volun-

teer Committee"; "Financial Support"; "Judges and Prizes," and there is an appendix devoted to samples of general information sent to all artists, sponsor-patron forms, publicity buildup, letters to editor techniques, and prearranged publicity examples. Typical prize winners in each category of the show are reproduced.

ENDORSEMENTS

Endorsement from Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota: "Publication will benefit all those wishing to know more about current trends in art and for those wishing to help push the highly active movement in this country. The exhibition was gratifying, and public response to it indicates the great interest of the people in this community as well as in the entire country to cultural activities. We believe in putting forward the best of our cultural, artistic and spiritual evidences of strength, as well as those of our physical and military might, so that the world will know more about our national life, realizing that we are not purely materialistic. This art show and the story of its production will be another manifestation of the fact that we are on the right track."

Endorsement from Alden Megrew, head of the Fine Arts Department, University of Colorado and former president, College Art Association from a review written for the Art Journal: "Certainly this book is a 'must' for every art group, public and school library in any town where there is a real interest in art. It is invaluable, not only for learning how to exhibit art, but for showing how, through skillful planning, art can be brought to the attention of large numbers of people. While not the work of any one person, Mrs. Roswell Ward and Daniel Millsaps must be highly commended for the spendidly thorough manner in which they have (with humor and seriousness) arranged the material and suggested a workable set of rules to guide small and large communities in planning how best to present local and collected works of contemporary art to their communities. Where in many small cities and towns one could not necessarily use the formal methods acceptable in larger metropolitan areas, nevertheless the principles involved remain basically the same. Also the same holds true of arts and crafts shows as well as the fine arts. It is to be hoped that this extremely useful guide will receive wide publicity and distribution, for it certainly should act as a stimulating incentive for art groups throughout the Nation to plan bigger and better representative exhibits for their artists."

Endorsement from Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, of Pennsylvania: "I am grateful for the opportunity to tell you how much Mrs. Clark and I enjoyed the Old Market Gallery Art Show. It was a delightful and unique display, and you and your colleagues are to be commended for the fine job you did.

"It was good to learn you are putting out the 'Community Art Show Organization Guide and Illustrated Catalog,' because I am sure that many who had the opportunity to visit the exhibit will want this publication, and those who were not fortunate enough to see the exhibit will want it even more."

Endorsement from Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York: "'The Old Market Gallery Art Show' was a real demonstration of the interest that exists at the grassroots level in artistic and cultural affairs in America today. The catalog and 'Community Art Show Guide' is a welcome reminder of that colorful event. I believe that greater emphasis should be put upon this aspect of our national life, and we should give recognition to artists in all fields. We can do this without interference with the artistic freedom of those who have devoted their lives to the arts."

Questionnaire Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, each year I send out a questionnaire to all addresses and boxholders in my district covering the principal issues that will confront Congress in the coming session.

In January I sent out such a questionnaire receiving back about 11 percent. The results and some of the comments follow:

Questionnaire returns

	Percentage		
	Yes	No	No opinion
1. The administration has requested legislation authorizing the withholding of taxes on dividends and interest by banks and savings institutions. Do you approve?	28	68	4
2. Medical care for the aged will be an important issue in this session. Check the system you favor:			
(a) Compulsory program under the social security system, financed by an increase in social security taxes	16		
(b) Voluntary health insurance for everyone over 65, with Federal assistance where the individual is unable to pay premium	35		
(c) State-administered program of welfare care for medically indigent	49		
3. President Kennedy has requested authority to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, with authority to cut all tariffs drastically. He suggests Federal subsidies to industries injured by imports, and retraining for workers losing their jobs as a consequence. Would you favor this lowering of trade barriers?	23	73	4
4. A 1-cent increase in 1st-class postal rates and approximately 25 percent increase in 2d- and 3d-class rates has been requested by the President. Do you favor?	46	52	2
5. The President has asked that this country buy up to $100 million of the $200 million bond issue which the United Nations finds necessary to meet its obligation in the Congo and elsewhere. Do you approve?	20	74	6
6. The establishment of a Cabinet post of Secretary of Urban Affairs and Housing has been proposed by the administration. Do you favor?	16	79	5
7. Should the foreign aid program be retained at its present level?	30	61	9
8. The administration plans to offer farm legislation providing stricter controls through production and marketing quotas and compulsory land retirement. Do you approve?	21	74	5
9. A $2,600,000 program of Federal assistance for college classroom construction and scholarships will be considered this session. Do you favor?	39	57	4
10. Do you favor—			
(a) continuation and expansion of the Peace Corps?	44	44	12
(b) a nationwide fallout shelter program costing $¾ billion?	19	76	5
(c) providing educational benefits for peacetime veterans?	37	60	3
(d) making labor unions subject to antitrust laws?	86	8	6
(e) increasing the national debt ceiling by $10 billion?	14	84	2
(f) presidential authority to raise and lower income taxes?	9	88	3
(g) admission of Red China to the United Nations?	6	85	9

In 1774 a great British statesman by the name of Edmund Burke described the responsibilities and obligations of both public officials and constituents in these words:

"Certainly, gentlemen, it ought to be the happiness and glory of a representative to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. Their wishes ought to have great weight with him; their opinions high respect; their business unremitted attention. It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasure, his satisfactions, in theirs—and above all, ever, and in all cases, to prefer their interest to his own.

"But his unbiased opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to you, to any man, or to any set of men living. These he does not derive from your pleasure, no, nor from the law and the constitution. They are a trust from Providence, for the abuse of which he is deeply answerable. Your representative owes you, not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays, instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion."

I would add to this, however, that your opinion helps in forming the judgment of your Representatives. I would like to quote from some of the many thoughtful statements:

Spending: "Philanthrophies must be governed by the purse." "Am wondering how long the goose will be able to lay the golden egg." "Come down to earth; don't spend so much money." "Let's not try to spend ourselves rich." "The Nation is as optimistic as a couple of teenagers getting married with no income to support extravagant tastes." "The basic law of chemistry is that you cannot make something from nothing." "When someone gets something for nothing, someone else gets nothing for something."

Taxes: One lady said, "My boss can deduct the money he spends for whisky, but my husband can't deduct the gas he uses to drive to work." Another referred to the "Department of back-door spending and contingent liabilities." Another said, "If communism is going to bury us, we should be stubborn enough not to dig our own grave." Another: "Talk about horse and buggy days, we are allowed only a $600 tax deduction and are trying to raise and educate our children under horse-and-buggy deductions."

Farm program: "I trust you will support the President's program." "I prefer a few rough years to socialism." "Struggle made this country." "Mr. Freeman must have misunderstood the President. The President

said, 'Let's get the country moving,' and Mr. Freedman thought he said, 'Let's get the country moving into town.'" Referring to the farm message, one said, "Would he still be referring to this country as part of the free world?"

Centralization of power: "I thought it was the responsibility of the people through Congress to levy taxes, tariffs and appropriate funds. That's your job; don't give that right of the people away, too." "I am strongly opposed to increasing the power of the President." "Still the power of socialism everywhere." "One world socialism." "Let's not vest any more power and authority in one man." "Any retaining action that will prevent us from becoming completely socialized under the New Frontier would be in the right direction." "It looks like creeping socialism is now walking." One referred to Attorney General Robert Kennedy as "the ambassador of international interference."

Foreign aid: A number said, "Foreign aid should be sharply reduced." Many others said: "No foreign aid to any Communist country." "If we can't stop communism in this country, at least we can stop the spread of their propaganda at taxpayers' expense." "We should know by now we can't buy friends."

Tariffs: "Better admit 5 million workers into this country. They would at least contribute something to our economy. When they compete overseas, they take the jobs of our workers without any contribution to our tax economy." "The Constitution provides that it is the duty of Congress, not the President, to levy tariffs." "If we must defend the free world, these countries should at least be willing to contribute something to their own defense on the products they sell here."

Conservatism: "In all the talk that is being stirred up over conservatism, it should be remembered there is no threat to the Constitution from conservatism, there is no threat to the free enterprise system from conservatism, there is no threat to individual freedom from conservatism, and certainly there is no threat to the next generation from conservatism."

Johnson's Wax: A Symbol of Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the U.S. economy—the greatest, most productive economic system in the world—has been created by the imaginative, adventurous spirit—and yes, the hard work and sweat—of individuals operating within our free enterprise system.

In my home State of Wisconsin, we have an outstanding symbol of American free enterprise: the Johnson's Wax Co.

Founded in 1886, the company, last year, celebrated its 75th anniversary. Established to produce a single product, wood parquet flooring, Johnson's Wax, by enterprising efforts to meet ever-expanding needs of the people, now produces a wide variety of products distributed to and utilized in 162 geographical areas and territories of the world.

In accordance with the best principles of free enterprise, the company's operations also proudly feature: a profit-sharing plan, excellent employee-employer relations, a dedication to producing high quality products, and, particularly, a deep sense of responsibility as a corporate citizen serving not only the people, but a nation.

Recently the Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, in its publication entitled Wisconsin Business, printed a profile on the Johnson's Wax Co. Reflecting the highlights of 75 years of creative, imaginative effort to build a sound, forward-moving business upon high quality products to better serve consumers, I ask unanimous consent to have the profile printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the profile was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHNSON'S WAX: A SYMBOL OF FREE ENTERPRISE

The Frank Lloyd Wright-designed buildings of Johnson's wax provide a profile which not only concerns advanced concepts of architecture, but is also symbolic of the progressive and enlightened business philosophy of the Wisconsin firm which commemorated its 75th anniversary last year.

Samuel C. Johnson had founded the company in 1886 to make wood parquet flooring, but entered the wax field as flooring customers sought advice and help on floor maintenance. This early manifestation of response to public needs brought increasing emphasis on the wax business. The growing company's concentration on wax and wood finishing products was such that in 1917 it went out of the flooring business.

The sustained progress of the company through the years has been a reflection of the corporate character of the firm. Early in its history, this character was developed around four distinct tenets that have earned public respect and confidence.

These have been defined by the company as: (1) To be a forward-looking and imaginative maker of quality products; (2) to be a progressive, fairminded and considerate employer; (3) to be a good neighbor in the community and State, and (4) to serve as a conscientious corporate citizen of the United States seeking, by example, to strengthen free enterprise throughout the world.

EMPLOYEE BENEFITS ADOPTED

These ambitious tenets making up the corporate character were not idly conceived, and they have not been brushed aside by the pressures of practical day-to-day business.

Commenting on the company's enlightened employee relations program, H. F. Johnson, chairman of the company, has stated, "The importance of a high regard for human dignity within the framework of the corporate enterprise has always guided our thinking relative to policies affecting our employees."

Long before industry generally recognized the importance of social security, shorter hours and liberalized employee benefits this company had pioneered progressive employee policies, according to Howard M. Packard, president of the company and first man outside the Johnson family to hold this post.

As examples, Packard cited the fact that as early as 1900 paid vacations were granted. In 1917, the 5-day week and the 8-hour day were adopted. And in the same year, an employee profit-sharing plan was started that has continued to this day.

Under the leadership of H. F. Johnson, the profit-sharing concept has been exported to all parts of the world as the business of this Wisconsin firm has spread to 162 geographical areas and territories. Operation of a cash profit-sharing plan began in 1935 for employees of British Johnson. Profit-sharing programs operate in the company's oversea subsidiaries.

Samuel C. Johnson, the great-grandson of the founder of the company, is now serving as a vice president in the international division. From headquarters in London, he directs the activities of Johnson companies in Europe, Africa, and the Near East.

GLOBAL OPERATIONS GROW

Active in international operations since 1914, when a subsidiary was established in England, the company's ever-growing interest in increasing its global business was demonstrated recently by an expansion of its international organization.

The company now has 17 subsidiaries and 14 manufacturing distributors throughout the free world.

Not content with its leadership role in the wax industry, the firm has in recent years carried out a vigorous program of product diversification to provide a framework for future growth to match past success.

Research and development work, the importance of which was already symbolized by the Wright-designed tower, received even heavier emphasis than in the past as the search for new products became intense.

Despite its eagerness to take advantage of new marketing opportunities, the company was careful to comply with certain self-imposed qualifications in evaluating new products. The most important of these is the requirement that any new product "must possess at least one demonstrable point of superiority." The company has no desire in its diversification to enter fields where it would "merely follow the leader."

Citizens Compliment SBA, FCC, and Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, complaints are common and compliments few for those who have devoted their careers to public service. Within the last few days, three citizens of my constituency have had occasion to compliment various Government officials. I think it proper to make these compliments a matter of record.

On March 8, Mr. John Hutchison wrote me about his contact with the Los Angeles Regional Office of the Small Business Administration. Mr. Hutchison said in part:

Mr. George Rands is the acting head of the department and showed me every courtesy. In fact, I was agreeably surprised to find that every contact I had in their office, from the receptionist to my final conference, was of a most pleasant nature. If this is a sample of Federal bureaucracy, let's have more of it.

Under date of March 9, Mr. Paul Turner wrote me that he had undergone surgery on the U.S. hospital ship *Haven*. His letter said in part:

I found the urologist, Lt. Comdr. D. Wallstreicher, so considerate and such a hard working doctor. He seemed to be around many hours every day, 7 days a week, ever mindful of the fact that his patients needed

his personal attention. Of all the doctors I have seen in the Navy, Dr. Wallstreicher certainly would receive the highest commendation were I his superior. To go on I must also praise the nurses and hospital corpsmen thereon—never during my years of service did I ever meet a more efficient staff.

On the date of March 5, Dr. Ira S. Cohen, assistant professor of political science at Long Beach State College wrote me regarding his contact with the FCC local headquarters at 849 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif. The service he received from that office was excellent. They acted immediately to solve his problems which he stated could have been solved in no other way. In writing me he said he wished me to know of these circumstances so that the excellent work of the office might not be left hidden and unrewarded.

Hon. Sam Rayburn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I am including herewith Nos. 5 and 6 of a series written by Jesse Laventhol on the life of the late beloved Speaker Sam Rayburn:

MR. SAM: No. 5

(By Jesse Laventhol)

Eight Presidents occupied the White House for varying terms and seven Speakers came and went from the day Sam Rayburn first took the oath as a Member of the House of Representatives on March 4, 1913.

"The tenure of the gentleman from Texas spans whole eras in our history," pointed out Democratic Majority Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, on Jan. 3, 1951, when Rayburn broke the record of Henry Clay for incumbency in the speakership. That was 11 years ago. Since then, two new Presidents have occupied the White House.

"Ike" often proudly boasted that he was "born in Sam Rayburn's district."

President John F. Kennedy was among the freshmen Representatives in 1947 who followed the tradition of beating a path to the door of Rayburn, at that time temporarily reduced from Speaker to minority leader of the Republican 80th Congress.

President Kennedy is the reputed source of a story that was widely current in Washington not long after his inauguration.

A telephone caller to the White House was disappointed when he asked to speak to the President and was advised that he was on an official visit to Canada. He asked to speak to Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, who was on an official tour of southeast Asia. The caller then demanded to speak to Secretary of State Dean Rusk. Rusk was in Geneva, Switzerland, at the Conference on a nuclear test ban.

Frustrated, the caller exploded:

"Well, who's keeping store around here, anyway?"

"The same man who's always kept it," retorted the switchboard operator, "Sam Rayburn."

It was a good story that got a lot of laughs. But, also, it was a symbolic acknowledgment that, with all the comings and goings of officialdom, and periodic turnovers in high circles, something of stability and continuity in Government always remained, as long as Mr. Sam was around.

Speaker Rayburn seldom left the Capitol before 7 p.m. At day's end, his work finished, he sought his little hideaway.

When Capitol employees were departing and the lights were going off in most offices, he would walk to an unmarked door in the south corridor and enter a small private office. This was his refuge for reflection, and for relaxation with a few friends over a drink of "bourbon and branch water." The office was sparsely furnished, no more than half a dozen chairs, a desk, a telephone, a bookcase, an old safe, and in more recent years, an automatic ice-cube refrigerator.

A portrait of the speaker, which will now be hung beside those of his predecessors in the Speaker's Lounge, just off the floor of the House, graced one wall of the "Board Room." Along another wall were a replica of the State seal of Texas and flags of the United States and the Lone Star State.

Supreme Court Justices Tom Clark, a fellow Texan, and William O. Douglas, a friend of New Deal days, were occasional visitors, not usually at the same time.

Former President Truman always dropped in when he revisited Washington. He was a regular in what had come to be known as "The Speaker's Board of Education," or "Rayburn's School of Political Science," from his days as Senator from Missouri, and throughout his Vice Presidency, the nomination for which was awarded him by F.D.R. in 1944 when Truman himself favored Rayburn for the place.

It was less than a year after that national convention, and only months after the election that these two friends felt the hand of history in that room on April 12, 1945. The Speaker had just entered. He was expecting Truman and others, who had started gathering, when the telephone rang.

Steve Early, the President's secretary, was calling from the White House. He had called the Vice President's office and was told he was walking from the Senate wing to the Speaker's office. He asked Sam to tell Mr. Truman to come to the White House immediately. When the Vice President arrived, he was given the message and hurried off.

None knew at the moment the portent of that call, but the news was not long delayed in reaching the little room. President Roosevelt was dead at Warm Springs, Ga.

William S. White, correspondent and author, was among the eyewitnesses to this drama. Four years later in the New York Times magazine, he wrote:

"Mr. Rayburn, the Speaker in a Democratic administration that had seemed to many already to be slowly dying in the weight of the years and their bitterness, sat at his desk in the semidarkness. No one thought to turn up the lights.

"His heavy and very nearly immobile face was still in the shadows and the only movement upon it was the small and barely visible traces of tears."

The Speaker always rated F.D.R. as "the greatest humanitarian" to occupy the Presidency.

During an interview by Raymond P. Brandt, chief Washington correspondent of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch in February 1951, the Speaker was asked:

"Did you ever disagree with Roosevelt on the New Deal program?"

"Not publicly," Rayburn replied. "I think his two greatest mistakes were his Supreme Court plan of 1937 and his attempted congressional purge in 1938. Officially, I had nothing to do with either.

"As I said, I am a team player and believe in working within the party organization."

Rayburn showed a fierce pride in the House when he corrected interviewers who asked about Presidents under whom he had served.

"Don't use that word 'under,'" the Speaker tartly warned. "I've never served 'under' anybody. I've served with them."

His pride flared again whenever anyone referred to the Senate as the "Upper Chamber" of the Congress.

There is no lower or upper body the Speaker would point out painstakingly. The House of Representatives and the Senate are equal and coordinate bodies. The Members of both receive the same salary. But he would also point out that the House has exclusive power under the Constitution to originate revenue and appropriation bills.

A suggestion that he would be an ideal candidate for Senator from his home State caused him to explode:

"I would rather be Speaker of the House than 10 Senators."

Actually, his influence in the Senate was much greater than if he were a Member—or 10 Members—because nearly one-third of its membership are former Members of the House, many of them men who sat at the feet of the old master and learned from him.

Mr. Sam never took seriously widespread reports that he was to be Roosevelt's choice as running mate in 1944. Years later he revealed that many political figures had talked to him about the Vice Presidency that year, including the late Frank C. Walker, Postmaster General and chairman of the national committee, and Walker's success that year, Ed Flynn of New York; Ed Pauley, California oilman; Mayor Ed Kelly of Chicago; and Senator Truman himself, who was picked by F.D.R. at that convention and stepped up to the White House after Roosevelt's death.

But Rayburn was a political realist.

"I knew I didn't have a chance," he admitted. "I came from the wrong State and was born at the wrong time. I think, too, that Roosevelt remembered the trouble he had with Garner. The President never spoke to me about it and I didn't take the other talk seriously. And I'm glad I didn't.

"I love this House. It is my life. This is what I always wanted, and I am satisfied."

MR. SAM: No. 6

(By Jesse Laventhol)

Throughout his 48 years on Capitol Hill Sam Rayburn's personality, mode of life, manner, speech and dress—all reflections of a character molded in the rigors of his upbringing—were unchanging.

His solid, almost square frame, gave the impression of granite strength, almost as if hewn from the same rock as the Capitol building itself. In manner and appearance he was the complete antithesis of the popular concept of a politician, more especially as that image was applied to Texans. He exuded an aura of modesty, dignity and reserve—almost somberness.

Sam's virtues received a sort of official White House acknowledgment on January 6, 1943. It was the Speaker's 61st birthday, which he ignored because it was also the opening day of a new (the 78th) Congress.

Sam was busy with opening the session when a call came in the afternoon that President Roosevelt urgently wanted to see the Speaker at 5 p.m.

Thinking the conference probably related to legislative plans, Rayburn asked Majority Leader JOHN MCCORMACK of Massachusetts to accompany him.

However, in the lobby of the executive office the chief usher advised that the President desired to speak to Rayburn alone for a few minutes. Mr. Sam was embarrassed for his associate and grumbled, "Don't understand what this is all about. John and I don't have any secrets from each other."

But he went into the oval room and found the President looking unusually solemn. After all, it was wartime, the Speaker thought, and anything could have happened.

"Sam," the President said, "a number of your friends are concerned about a personal problem of yours."

"What's that?"

"The problem, Sam," responded F.D.R., ever fond of practical jokes, "is your age!"

As if on cue, the door opened and McCormack, Republican Minority Leader Joseph W. Martin, Jr., and a dozen or more other leading Members from both sides of the aisle, came in singing "Happy birthday, dear Speaker." And on behalf of all the President presented the guest with a new Stetson hat.

In the round of joshing that followed, F.D.R. said, "Seriously, Sam, I understand from your friends that this hat is the same size as the one you wore when you first came up from Texas in 1913."

Mr. Sam recalled that Woodrow Wilson once told him that high position in the Government had a different effect upon different men.

"Some grow, others just swell," he quoted the scholarly Princeton professor-president.

Roosevelt opined that Sam was one of those who did not swell—and the vote was unanimous.

Over the years, to the day he left to battle the awful scourge of his final illness, his daily uniform of office was unvarying—dark, well-tailored business suit, white shirt and dark tie—bespeaking restrained good taste. His one concession in younger years, a bow tie, was later discarded for a four-in-hand. Let others, if they would, affect cowboy hats and riding boots in the Halls of the Capitol; not Sam.

It was only when back home on his farm in the ranch country that he donned the bright-checked flannel shirts, 10-gallon hat and old corduroy pants that Texans like to sport.

Rayburn's dignity and honesty won him the long-term respect of scores of Capitol Hill reporters. In most cases, the respect was mutual.

When the death of a teenage daughter struck the home of a newspaperman who occasionally attended Speaker Rayburn's conferences, the bereaved father was surprised to find the Speaker ringing his doorbell next morning.

"I just came by to see what I could do to help," said Mr. Sam.

"I don't think there's anything you can do," blurted the startled parent. "Thank you, but we're just now making all the arrangements."

"Well," asked the Speaker, "have you all had your coffee yet?"

"No, we haven't had time."

"Well," rumbled Rayburn, I can at least make the coffee."

And he proceeded to do so.

Over coffee with the family, the reporter asked:

"Mr. Speaker, aren't you supposed to be having breakfast at the White House this morning?"

"Well," Rayburn admitted, "I was, but I called the President and told him a friend was in trouble and I couldn't come."

Lest an impression be given that Sam Rayburn was perfection personified and always sweetness and light, it must be said that he had his moments of tempestuousness. Although rare, these outbursts were always signaled by a deep flush which started at the neckline and spread to the top of his shiny baldpate.

It happened in the House when the Members became unusually unruly on the floor, and more than once it was accompanied by the breaking of a gavel as the speaker pounded for order.

Or it happened in the privacy of the Speaker's room when he read or heard indirectly of a matter affecting a House Member or Capitol official on which he had not been informed by his staff. The explosion, accompanied by a Texas bluestreak of cusswords, was a sight and a sound to behold—and a terror to the Speaker's hard-pressed aids, who probably never had an opportune moment to give him the information.

He smacked his desk and roared:

"But why didn't you tell me? Why didn't you let me know about it?"

As in most other things, simplicity was the hallmark, too, of the Rayburn speech. Of bombast of flowery phrases he would have none. He never used a big word where a smaller one would serve to convey the same meaning. He avoided formal speeches from a prepared manuscript whenever possible, preferred to talk extemporaneously and just use bare notes of a word or two to cue himself on each point he wanted to stress.

He never employed a publicity man and he detested the practice of men in the public life using ghostwriters:

"A man ought to know what he wants to say and stand up and say it—or else keep his mouth shut."

ADA Rating Shows Republicans Support Conservatism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in order that we may keep the record straight, I would like to include as a part of these remarks the latest rating of the Americans for Democratic Action given to chairmen and ranking members of the committees of the House. This will bring up to date the charts I included in the Record of January 18, 1962:

Liberal-conservative analysis of the committee chairmen and ranking minority members of the standing committees of the U.S. House of Representatives, 1962

Committee	Present Democratic chairman		Potential Republican chairman	
	Name	1961 ADA rating	Name	1961 ADA rating
1. Agriculture	Cooley, North Carolina	56	Hoeven, Iowa	0
2. Appropriations	Cannon, Missouri	56	Taber, New York	0
3. Armed Services	Vinson, Georgia	88	Arends, Illinois	10
4. Banking and Currency	Spence, Kentucky	80	Kilburn, New York	11
5. District of Columbia	McMillan, South Carolina	11	Auchincloss, New Jersey	10
6. Education and Labor	Powell, New York	100	Kearns, Pennsylvania	20
7. Foreign Affairs	Morgan, Pennsylvania	90	Chiperfield, Illinois	0
8. Government Operations	Dawson, Illinois	100	Hoffman, Michigan	0
9. House Administration	Burleson, Texas	10	Schenck, Ohio	0
10. Interior and Insular Affairs	Aspinall, Colorado	80	Saylor, Pennsylvania	40
11. Interstate and Foreign Commerce	Harris, Arkansas	30	Bennett, Michigan	50
12. Judiciary	Celler, New York	100	McCulloch, Ohio	0
13. Merchant Marine and Fisheries	Bonner, North Carolina	50	Tollefson, Washington	60
14. Post Office and Civil Service	Murray, Tennessee	13	Corbett, Pennsylvania	60
15. Public Works	Buckley, New York	100	Auchincloss, New Jersey	10
16. Rules	Smith, Virginia	0	Brown, Ohio	0
17. Science and Astronautics	Miller, California	100	Martin, Massachusetts	44
18. Un-American Activities	Walter, Pennsylvania	80	Scherer, Ohio	0
19. Veterans' Affairs	Teague, Texas	22	Ayres, Ohio	10
20. Ways and Means	Mills, Arkansas	50	Mason, Illinois	0
21. Select Small Business	Patman, Texas	80	McCulloch, Ohio	0
Average		62		16

Liberal-conservative analysis of committee chairmen by party

	Democrats		Republicans	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Liberal	15	71	3	14
Conservative	6	29	18	86
Total	21	100	21	100

Libraries for Rural People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, hearings on the fiscal 1963 appropriation for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are now being held. Included in President Kennedy's budget request for this Department is $7,500,000, the full amount authorized, for grants for public library services under the rural Library Services Act.

A summing up of the accomplishments of this act in its first 5 years well justifies the statement in the report of the House Appropriations Committee in 1961:

For the small amount of Federal funds involved this has been not only one of the most popular, but one of the most worthwhile programs of the Federal Government.

These examples of progress under the act since its inception in 1956 can be cited:

First. Thirty-six million rural people now have new or improved public library service.

Second. Approximately 115 rural counties and more than 120 New England towns have been introduced to library service for the first time.

Third. More than 8 million books and 300 new bookmobiles have been placed at the service of rural communities.

Fourth. The quality of the program has been enhanced by the strengthening of State library agencies, including the addition of some 115 field consultants to carry out the programs under the State plans.

Fifth. Most telling of all, perhaps, is the fact that largely under the stimulation of the Library Services Act, since 1956 State funds for the development of rural public library service have increased approximately 92 percent and local appropriations by some 73 percent. The total cash grants to local libraries from State revenues in 1956 were $4,365,000; in fiscal 1962, they are $16,766,000, nearly four times as much.

Rural people have responded by using their new and improved library services. In my own State of Alabama, the circulation of books and other library materials has increased from over 6 million in 1955–56 to well over 9 million during 1959–60, a 50-percent increase. With more books and other resources at their disposal, citizens of Alabama are demanding longer hours of library service. Local and State support of public libraries in that State has increased by approximately 70 percent.

In Alabama the improved status of libraries has become a cooperative venture between the State library agency and organized groups such as home demonstration clubs, the Alabama Federated Women's Clubs, the American Association of University Women, Pilot International, and others. The junior chamber of commerce's Operation Library played a direct role in the development of five county library programs.

Shifts in population, greater industrialization, positive bids for tourist trade, mechanized farming and dairying, higher standards for education all indicate that Alabama is not in a state of apathy or lassitude. And public libraries and the Alabama Public Library Service, with the stimulation of the Library Services Act, are a part of, and a leader in, this exciting development.

It has been a source of gratification to me to have been associated with both the original passage and the extension in 1960 of the Library Services Act. That President Kennedy recognizes the important contribution of this program to the Nation is clear from the following letter which I received from him at the time when passage of the extension of the act was pending in the House of Representatives:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., August 19, 1960.

Hon. CARL ELLIOTT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CARL: I should like to congratulate you on the magnificent fight you have made to assure the extension of the Library Services Act. I am confident that when the House acts under a suspension of rules on August 22 the bill will be passed.

As you know, I have long had a similar interest in the extension of this act, and supported it both in committee and when it passed the Senate.

When this program was first inaugurated in 1956, some 76 million people in rural communities had little or no library service. By the stimulus provided by this program, in which 49 of the 50 States now participate on a matching basis, library facilities have been available to even the smallest towns. I understand that some 5 million books have been purchased, and 200 bookmobiles have been put in operation. The program is an important asset to our Nation. It helps provide both recreation for our minds and strength and vitality for our human resources.

With every good wish, I am,
Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

The Way To Fight Communism Is With an Understanding of Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Ralph McGill has written an article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of February 18, 1962, entitled "Strong Americanism." He poses some questions which we must all ask ourselves and suggests an answer that surely is the same one we must all arrive at after due consideration.

Mr. McGill's article follows:

STRONG AMERICANISM
(By Ralph McGill)

Intelligence reports have it that the most mixed-up Communists in the world today are the American comrades. About the time they try to rally the downtrodden proletariat to the Red flag, Mr. Khrushchev's son-in-law and daughter arrive in Washington for lunch at the White House. The daughter is photographed at the entrance. She is wearing a full-length mink coat and looks radiant. The expanse of mink had the capital gasping.

At about the same time, Pravda, also showing signs of strain, laboriously reassures its readers that while it is possible to coexist without war, it is not possible to have any ideological armistice.

Indian Communists are losing members because of the aggressive actions of Red Chinese Communists along the border. The Italian Communist Party is in open disagreement. Albania has been dropped by Mr. K. and taken on by Mr. M.

Certainly there is some strain in the Communist world. President Kennedy is wise to explore it.

We might, with profit, halt and regroup and try to decide what it is we are against. There are, for example, the many voices that, in great disarray and not too much coherence, demand that we begin teaching anticommunism.

By communism do they mean Russia?

If so, can we end communism by going to war and winning?

Or, as some see it, is communism a godless society?

If it is merely that, then our task is quite another thing from defeating Russia in an all-out nuclear war. Some describe communism as a "Marxist society" that would destroy our capitalist system and our way of life.

Is our job, then, one of economics? Must we make our own economic structure stronger and enable it to win the trade war? Isn't our task to learn more about the Common Market and do something concrete toward building a real and meaningful Atlantic Community that successfully can bolster Western civilization and its ideals?

Whatever the answer, it is at once clear that most of the shouting is more noise than sense; more emotion than meaning; more an abstraction than a conviction. Armed Communist aggression is a very real and present danger. But the way to defeat it is with a strong, purposeful Americanism.

We cannot possibly teach a person to be against communism unless he understands his own system—his American tradition, principles, and the meaning of a parliamentary system. Much has been made of the fact that some 20-odd of our young men were seduced into accepting communism when captives of the Chinese in Korea. A study has been made of these. It is possible to assert, and sustain by case studies of each, that not a single one had been well instructed in the deeper meaning of his own country.

We have more than 4 million unemployed persons in this Nation today. A little more than a million of these are youngsters. A high percentage of them are school dropouts. One can be almost certain that few, if indeed any of these, understand what we mean by Americanism.

It seriously is being suggested that the cities and States study creating something like the Civilian Conservation Corps of the depression years to train, teach, and make constructive use of the hundreds of thousands of young persons who are not prepared to hold gainful employment, even if they could find it. What, one may wonder, is their concept of Americanism.

There is no need to belabor the point. It seems inescapable that there is just one way we will defeat communism—and that is through strong, comprehending Americanism that flowers in a strong, confident country. That is what we should be teaching. And in doing so, we should make of our country one which is aware of, and responsive to, the needs of its people. The way to beat communism is with Americanism.

Service-Connected Disabled Veterans Come First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has held meetings for the purpose of permitting the national commanders of veterans' or-

ganizations to present their legislative programs for the year. Some of the remarks made by these veterans leaders are especially pertinent to the service-connected compensation bill which has encountered difficulty in getting through the Congress.

Portions of the remarks of the national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, Francis R. Buono, and Mr. Robert Classon and Mr. Dixon Christian, of the Paralyzed Veterans of America, appear below:

Mr. BUONO. As the National Commander of the Disabled American Veterans, I approach this meeting with a sense of grave responsibility. This feeling comes to me as I reflect upon the visits I have made to the grassroots membership of our organization throughout the country. This enabled me to gain an insight into the fears and feelings of frustration in the minds and hearts of so many of our members. My feelings of responsibility are magnified in the knowledge that the more than 209,000 members of our organization actually reflect the problems, feelings and emotions of more than 2 million disabled veterans in this land. My statement this morning is therefore more than just a personal presentation, but rather a reflection of what I have heard, what I've seen, and what I've felt as a result of my own contacts. Much of what I have heard and what I convey to you this morning is the result of the feelings of so very many of our disabled members in their keen disappointment over the events occurring to our compensation increase bill in the closing days of Congress in 1961.

There is more involved than just the matter of an increase. The 50 cents a month or even $20 per month that might have resulted in the passage of the compensation increase bill has become less important than the feeling that the cause of the disabled veteran in this land of ours is less important in the eyes of some than it was during the days immediately after the war. There is more involved here than simply giving lip-service to a group of men and women who were unfortunate enough to have been disabled.

We feel that every single bill must pass on its own merits. If the question we discussed a number of times, Mr. Chairman, comes up again that they (the Senate) intend to use compensation as a—to quote the word of a certain individual—"shirttail," then the "shirttail" will be cut off in a different direction this time. I am sure my people behind me are going to do it. I am not speaking for Frank Buono. I am speaking now for the membership, the grassroots membership.

This has been a result of traveling through 61 cities in 20 States. This is the true feeling of our membership. We feel they cannot understand. We just cannot understand how, when for the first time the administration set aside 60-some-odd million dollars for this specific purpose, we just cannot understand how everyone says they are for it, and we know that the House is for it, but when we polled the Senate, every Member of the Senate said they were for the increase in compensation, but we just cannot understand why this has been handled in this manner.

And now my people are here, they are seeing what is going on, and more important than that, I am not speaking as a personal individual, but this is a result of what my people want. This is what they want me to do, and we are going to be aggressive, we are going to be militant, we are going to poll these people, we are going to place it in our national magazine, and this time the chips are going to fall where they may.

Mr. CLASSON (national president, Paralyzed Veterans of America). We are composed exclusively of veterans who have suffered spinal cord injury or disease and who are thus confined to wheelchairs. In any comparison with other organizations appearing before your committee, we are a very small group. Yet this fact pleases rather than disturbs us. We wish the number of those veterans eligible for our group were even smaller.

Mr. CHRISTIAN (codirector of legislation, Paralyzed Veterans of America). I believe it is unnecessary for me to advance any additional arguments in support of H.R. 879 which has not only won the endorsement of this committee in the previous session but also was passed in the House with the blessing of the Kennedy administration.

With respect to this legislation, PVA merely wishes to make one observation: we share this committee's conviction that any legislative blockade of such urgently-needed legislation in order to resuscitate an unrelated and controversial GI insurance measure is wrong in principle and cruel in essence. Let the insurance measure stand or fall on its own merits. It has no relation whatsoever to our entitlement to higher compensation which has already been too long delayed, and which is of special concern to us because of its liberalization of aid and attendance benefits.

Address by the Honorable George C. McGhee, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, January 31, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address given by the Honorable George C. McGhee, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, before the Associated Business Publications Forum at the Hotel Roosevelt in New York City on January 31, 1962.

Under Secretary McGhee spoke of the President's trade program, the "Key to the Grand Design." This is a most appropriate phrase since it conveys the concept of a true economic policy—one that plans for the future and keys itself to the inevitable. This is what President Kennedy has asked us to look at and to decide upon.

The Under Secretary's remarks follow:

THE PRESIDENT'S TRADE PROGRAM: KEY TO THE GRAND DESIGN

Under Secretary Ball deeply regrets his inability to be with you today. No officer of the Department of State is ever able to give a gilt-edged guarantee of his time, and this is especially true of the Secretary of State and his Under Secretaries.

To some of you it may seem odd that I, the Under Secretary for Political Affairs, should be asked to discuss the background and implications of President Kennedy's proposals for new trade legislation. To others of you, I am sure, this will not seem odd at all. The origins of our present trade problems are political as well as economic. The trade policies of this Nation have both political and economic implications, domestically and internationally.

In fact, the new trade legislation proposed by the President has far-reaching implications of many kinds. The decision on this proposal will deeply affect our domestic economic life for years to come. This decision will also vitally affect almost every aspect of our international relations—political, economic, military, psychological, and so forth. I will try to illustrate these implications later.

A good place to begin, I suppose, is at the beginning—the beginning of the United States of America. One of the most important elements in the decision of the Thirteen Original Colonies to form a federation under the American Constitution was their determination to eliminate artificial trade barriers among the individual colonies and to permit a free flow of trade across State lines.

This determination has been a major factor ever since in maintaining the political unity and integrity of the United States. It has played an even greater role in making the United States the richest and most economically powerful country in the world today.

For the first 150 years of our national history, our international trade was a constant source of controversy in our domestic politics—sometimes the only major source of controversy. At first, the issues were relatively simple. The infant industries, primarily in the Northeast, wanted tariff protection against the competition of the older and more efficient industries of Great Britain and other nations of Western Europe.

The consumers, including some of the industrial producers themselves, wanted to buy goods as cheaply as possible. Most manufactured goods came from abroad. The farmers, especially in the South and West, wanted to sell their surpluses abroad, such as cotton and tobacco. From the administration of Andrew Jackson to the Civil War, the South and West usually controlled our trade and our tariff policies.

After that, the basic issues did not change, but both the political and economic aspects of our tariff policies became much more complicated, because of the reconstruction period, the rapid growth of American industrial power, and our westward expansion. Although some industries and areas were directly affected, it became increasingly difficult for the average citizen to determine where his real interests lay. Today, this difficulty has been compounded many times, partly because of the complexity of American economic life and partly because of the diversification of our international interests.

In our efforts to climb out of the great depression, one of the most important and far-reaching measures adopted was the repeal of the existing restrictive tariff legislation and the adoption of the Trade Act of 1934, sponsored by Secretary of State Cordell Hull. This legislation, which has been extended and improved several times, has served American interests very well. However, even this legislation has now become obsolete for a variety of reasons, including the following:

First, the emergence of the European Common Market and the prospective enlargement of this market by the adherence of the United Kingdom is creating an entirely new trading world. Under present legislation, we are unable to adapt ourselves to this new trading world.

The President does not now have nearly enough bargaining authority to negotiate on behalf of the American people with the expanding Common Market, a market larger than our own in population and potentially larger in purchasing power. Because of our most-favored-nation treaties, the effects of such a negotiation would involve many other

nations. The President also lacks authority to negotiate directly with these other nations—with such rising industrial nations as Japan, with the partly industrial members of the British Commonwealth, with our neighbors in Latin America, and with the lesser developed countries of Asia and Africa.

Present legislation permits the President to reduce tariffs only by a very limited amount, and it also requires him to negotiate such reductions on a reciprocal, item-by-item basis. Many nations do not like to negotiate in this manner, and the new European Common Market will eventually become incapable of negotiating in this manner.

Therefore, unless the President is given broader and more flexible bargaining authority, we will be denied full access to the new trading world. We can continue to restrict imports into this country, but we can do little to provide increased opportunities for American industrial and agricultural exports.

Second, in the period since 1934, the United States has been catapulted from a position of political isolation and relative economic isolation, to a role involving major world political and economic responsibilities.

To give one example, we have assumed responsibility for helping a great many less-developed countries to maintain their political independence and to achieve economic and social advancement. We are spending a great deal of money for this purpose, in various kinds of loans and grants. However, a large part of this money may be wasted unless we are able to help the less-developed countries to establish a mutually beneficial trading relationship with the rest of the world.

It does very little good to provide aid to a country for the purpose of increasing its production of a basic commodity which is already a glut in world markets. It does very little good to help a less-developed country establish new industries unless these countries have a reasonable prospect of selling their surplus industrial products abroad at some future date.

It does very little good to build up a new nation's economy unless that nation has a reasonable assurance of being able to import the goods it will need to sustain its economy. Finally, it does very little good for us to support the political independence of new nations if we are willing to let them become economically dependent upon the Communist bloc.

In all these ways our major role in the world will be undermined unless we are able to develop trade policies that are consistent with that role.

Third, this Nation and other free nations have been engaged for many years in an unprecedented struggle for national survival—a kind of world civil war that is sometimes called the cold war. This struggle has many different facets, and it is easy to concentrate almost exclusively upon one or two facets and to ignore the others.

Thus far, this struggle has involved the threat of devastating military force, as well as the occasional application of limited military force, both overtly and covertly. For the most part, however, the struggle is being fought by a wide variety of nonmilitary techniques—political, economic, diplomatic, psychological, and so forth.

The economic component of this struggle is a very important one. The Sino-Soviet bloc seems determined to make as many free nations as possible, especially the less developed nations, economic dependencies of the Communist empire, through various aid and trade arrangements. The bloc also seems determined to subject the Western industrial world to ruinous competition wherever it can. The bloc is also eager to acquire strategic goods—manufactured goods and raw materials—which it does not possess in adequate quantity or quality.

Finally, of course, the Sino-Soviet rulers are determined to prove to the entire world the superiority and invincibility of the Communist political and economic system, to prove that the industrial nations cannot survive with their systems of political democracy and private enterprise—and to prove that the less developed nations can fulfill their aspirations only by adopting a Communist-type political and economic discipline.

Our present trade legislation does not give the United States the tools needed to meet this multipronged Communist threat. We cannot protect our own national security adequately, nor can we adequately help to protect the independence of other free nations.

I turn now to the last, but not the least, reason why present trade legislation is inadequate. We have a domestic economic interest in accelerating growth, preventing inflation, and maintaining a sound balance in our international payments. A long-term solution to these problems can be achieved only if we are able to develop and maintain the full potential of our trading relationships with Western Europe and the rest of the world. For example, we may need to increase our imports considerably, and it is equally clear that we will need to expand our exports to an even greater extent. We simply cannot do these things under existing trade legislation.

I do not wish to undertake an elaborate description of the President's legislative proposals. In brief, as I have said, they give him much broader and much more flexible bargaining authority. This is to be used in the first instance in developing a trading and general economic partnership with the European Common Market—a partnership of equals. We can then extend the benefits of this partnership to the industrial and lesser developed nations in other parts of the free world.

The legislative proposals also call for much broader and more adequate forms of protection for American businessmen, industrialists, farmers and laborers than are available under present legislation. The President would be empowered to use several different kinds of protection where protection is clearly needed. The experience of the European Common Market has, however, demonstrated that the need for protection is much less than a great many people seem to think. The reduction of artificial barriers to trade helps a great many more people than it hurts.

Even the people it hurts are not hurt nearly so much as they are hurt every year by normal changes in domestic production and marketing methods. The tiny segment of industry, agriculture, and labor that may be seriously injured by increased foreign competition can be temporarily protected by tariff restrictions, can be assisted in adjusting to new economic conditions, or can receive other selective forms of protection.

One of the most important aspects of the President's new trade proposals is that they will permit the U.S. Government to give economic protection wherever this protection is needed without disturbing or stagnating the remainder of the national economy. Our Government will no longer be required to use an atomic bomb to kill a mouse.

The real challenge of the trade program, however, lies in the fact that it provides the keystone to our whole forward national strategy—the grand design of the world we seek to create. This is a concept going beyond the current crises of the cold war.

The adoption of the proposed trade legislation will permit the United States to cooperate in building a solid economic foundation underneath the Atlantic community system, which the Grand Design envisages as the hard core of the security and economic well-being of the entire free world. Together, North America and Western Europe include some half billion people, have about 90 percent of the industrial and technological potential of the free world, and have several times the present gross national product of the entire Communist bloc. The resources of the Atlantic community are essential to defend and build the free world.

The Atlantic community is already a going concern. We already have the 15-member North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which possesses needed military power and has become a useful instrucent of political consultation. We also have the new Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, an institution which has 20 members, including several neutral nations.

The OECD was formed only a few months ago, but it has already proved its usefulness as an instrument for coordinating some of the economic and financial activities of the member governments. It can also help to make available larger amounts of economic and technical assistance to the less developed areas and to insure the more effective utilization of this assistance.

The institutions of the Atlantic community are already strong and can be made much stronger and more useful. However, no institution can be stronger than its foundations. The indispensable foundation of a strong and dynamic Atlantic community is a close trading partnership between the United States of America and the enlarged European Common Market.

Unhappily, however, as we build we must also defend. Only through increased trade can the increased economic growth needed to provide for the defense of the free world be assured. The cost of our nuclear deterrent, the increased buildup of conventional military forces now underway in the NATO, and the continued military assistance to other free-world nations, would, otherwise, become an increasing burden. We cannot, without a large favorable balance of trade, maintain our forces overseas. Without trade with us, nations willing to do so, cannot generate the resources required to buy arms and build up their defenses. Trade is the lifeblood of our national security.

But no matter how strong are their defenses, the Atlantic nations cannot survive as a rich man's club. Cooperation with other free-world nations is also a vital element of our grand design. Increased economic strength and unity in the Atlantic community facilitates that cooperation. It enables us to offer additional help to the other free nations of the world, and thus to strengthen our ties with these nations.

When I speak of other nations, I include such important trading partners as Canada and Japan. I include also the other nations of the British Commonwealth. I include Latin America, with which the United States has special and longstanding ties through the OAS and with which we are embarked on a great Alliance for Progress.

Finally, and very importantly, I include the newly emerging and lesser developed nations of Asia and Africa. Together the industrialized nations of the free world can help them to achieve the ultimate goal which they and we share, which is to enable the less developed nations to retain their independence and to achieve self-sustaining economic growth through their own production and trade, without the need for continued assistance.

Our ultimate political goal is strength and unity in the free world—the creation of what the President has called a community of free world nations. In the long run, unity among free nations cannot be assured by force, by psychological strategy, or even by diplomacy. Unity will ultimately depend upon the development of a real community of interests—involving all of the varied activities and aspirations of man. Trade is the warp and woof of such a community.

Trade is the one most universal common denominator among the pursuits of man. Trade provides strength through independence. The attraction to free world nations

of participation in the trade of the free world, which aggregates $115 billion a year, dwarfs the opportunities offered by the $4 billion trade between the free world and the bloc.

The adoption of the new trade legislation can have a tremendous psychological impact throughout the world. It will demonstrate that the American people are prepared to practice the principles of free competitive enterprise that we have preached for so many years. It will demonstrate that the empirical mixture of public and private enterprise developed by Western societies is superior to totalitarian systems.

It will also demonstrate the ancient fallacies of Communist theory and strategy. The Communists have always maintained that the conflicts among the nations of the so-called capitalist world, and the conflicts among special interests within these nations, will eventually bring Western civilization to a state of disintegration and decadence.

The European Common Market, with its high rate of economic growth, is already confounding the Communist theories. We can join in confounding Communist theory still more. We can prove conclusively that communism is neither desirable nor inevitable. We can prove that it is not even an economic system fathered by Marx and Lenin, but is rather a new form of feudalism dressed up in the psychology of Pavlov and the technology of the Western industrial revolution.

All that I have said adds up to one fact. The enactment of the new trade legislation proposed by President Kennedy will enable the Government and people of the United States to take a powerful new initiative in domestic and international affairs. For many years, under various administrations, the American people have worried about specific and dangerous crises—in China, Korea, Berlin, Hungary, Suez, Lebanon, Cuba, Laos, the Congo, and Vietnam. For years they have demanded the United States seize the initiative.

And this is, however, not always easy to do. The peaceful householder is rarely able to take the initiative against the burglar. But we now have an opportunity. We can and must take advantage of it to seize the initiative. By doing so, we can accomplish a combination of results that will far overshadow the significance of particular crises, and will help us to reduce the number and diminish the proportions of future crises.

I do not want to imply that the new trade legislation will automatically solve the problems of American domestic life, nor all the problems of our international relations. This is not a panacea. It is merely a set of tools. But it is a set of tools that we cannot afford to do without.

We have a world to gain—not for ourselves alone but for the cause of peace and freedom, for the things that gave this Nation birth and nurtured it. Our ultimate goal, as stated by President Wilson when we entered the First World War, is a "universal concert of free peoples that shall encircle the globe and make the world itself at last free." As President Wilson also said on that occasion: "God helping us, we can do no other."

Tony Hinkle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, Butler University, the city of Indianapolis and the entire State of Indiana are particularly proud of Tony Hinkle, basketball, football, baseball coach and athletic director at Butler University.

An alltime athletic great at the University of Chicago, Tony has been at Butler since graduation except for duty during World War I and World War II.

Last week the more than 250 Butler alumni from the Washington area honored Tony during a dinner at the Army-Navy Club. His current edition of the Butler Bulldog basketball team is presently competing in the NCAA championship tournament and defeated Bowling Green this week in their first tourney test.

Tony is generally recognized as one of the finest coaches in America today and has been honored recently by an article in Time magazine. Last week, while in Washington, Tony was interviewed by Mr. Dave Brady of the Washington Post, who subsequently wrote an outstanding article on Coach Hinkle and his great contribution to the youth of Indiana and the Nation.

As the sole Member of Congress who graduated from Butler University, I take pride in the accomplishments of Coach Hinkle and under unanimous consent, include Mr. Brady's engrossing article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[Washington Post, Mar. 11, 1962]

HINKLE, 62, MAN OF ALL SPORTS ON BUTLER CAMPUS

(By Dave Brady)

At 62, Tony Hinkle looks none the worse for having been tossed in the canal near the Butler University football field with the temperature at 20.

"I try to stay young," coach Hinkle said by way of explaining why he has permitted his players to keep up the custom of dumping him overboard after the last practice of the season since 1934.

The Butler alumni of Washington, 250 strong, and 3 Indiana Congressmen, invited Hinkle here the other night to express their appreciation of his 40 years of outstanding success at the university.

It was Hinkle's first visit here since Butler played the George Washington University team of 1939 that produced end Bob Nowasky, who went on to play with the Chicago Bears.

Despite its 1,900 enrollment, 900 boys, Hinkle wonders how small a college Butler is as he takes his basketball team into the Mideast regional playoffs in the National Collegiate Athletic Association tournament at Lexington, Ky., Monday.

Butler plays Bowling Green, ranked No. 7 in the Nation. If Butler gets by that one, No. 3 Kentucky is next, and then No. 1 Ohio State.

Hinkle just came off an unbeaten season in football before turning his attention to basketball. He has a 15-game streak going in football and a 34–2 record for the last 4 seasons, including 3 straight victories over Depauw, coached by Tommy Mont, formerly at Maryland.

Hinkle coaches baseball, too, and is athletic director, a man for all seasons.

"That's the way to work it," he said. "Then if you have a bad season in one sport, maybe you'll make 'em forget it in the next.

"Seriously, I wouldn't know what to do with myself if I coached only one sport. There's on use recruiting for the rest of the year because I don't have enough to offer. I'm afraid that practice didn't do basketball any good in its present troubles.

"I play the hell out of the golf game in the summer. I've stopped trying to be good at it. I just want to relax, exercise, and be outside.

"I've stayed with a 'small' school because it's a challenge. I like it in a city like Indianapolis because you can draw big crowds.

"I like it when I walk down the street and people all say, 'Hi.' As long as 50 percent say 'Hi' instead of something vulgar, I know I'm all right."

Butler pioneered with its big fieldhouse that seats 15,052 in 1928 when Indiana was still the kingpin State in basketball.

Butler had the largest football stadium in the State, seating 35,000, from 1928 until 1934, when Notre Dame erected its 55,000-seat plant.

The big basketball event for Butler, which plays in the Indiana Collegiate Conference with Valparaiso, Evansville, Indiana, State, Depauw, St. Joseph's and Ball State, enrollment 7,000, used to be the Hoosier classic.

Butler would take on Indiana, Notre Dame and Purdue in the classic. When it folded, Butler had won four times, Indiana three, Notre Dame once and Purdue not at all.

"We recruit in Indiana. Draw a circle with a 50-mile radius around Indianapolis and you'll end up with the State high school champion every couple years or so.

"The kids come to us instead of bigger schools like Ball State because of our reputation. They know we play nonconference teams like UCLA, Princeton, and Big Ten Conference clubs.

"In football, we get the boys who may not have the reputations but may be better, mostly from Gary, Calumet, or the coal mining area near Terre Haute. The big schools pass them up because they might not have matured yet. We work with them, and when they mature in a year or so, they are as good as the best. And they're easier to handle.

"We had 5 two-way linesmen who averaged 240 pounds last season. The Minnesota Vikings have signed one of our tackles, Don Benbow, a 255-pounder."

Hinkle, who served in the Army in World War I and in the Navy in World War II, was an end with Fritz Crisler, now athletic director at Michigan, under Coach Amos Alonzo Stagg at the University of Chicago. Hinkle and Crisler were three-sport athletes at Chicago.

Hinkle was the first coach at Great Lakes, before Paul Brown, and defeated Notre Dame.

Asked if he might have stayed at Butler 40 years much in the manner Stagg remained at the University of the Pacific, Hinkle said:

"No, I never tried to imitate him, only his principles. You have to be yourself. Frank Carideo of Notre Dame should have been a great coach but he imitated Knute Rockne, even to rolling a cigar in his mouth.

"But I learned from Coach Stagg. He was experimenting with the cross checking and scissors blocking Green Bay uses today in 1961 when I was a freshman. But he didn't use it until the third game in 1921 and beat Princeton.

"Stagg believed in hard work. It was always run-run-run. If he wasn't satisfied with a practice, he'd halt it, feed us supper in our uniforms and practice again in the evening.

"He studied for the ministry but switched to coaching because he thought he could do just as much good with the boys.

"We would cross the street if we saw him coming. I can't explain it, but it was something between fear and respect, like Jock Sutherland commanded.

"Chicago grads had a C-Man's banquet for Stagg one might and nobody smoked. Even though I'm 62, if he walked in the room tonight I'd put out my cigarette.

"He started more new stuff than any coach I've ever known."

Address by Dr. H. E. Landsberg, Director of Climatology, Weather Bureau, at the National Weather Records Center, Asheville, N.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY A. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on February 27, 1962, a ceremony was held commemorating the 10th anniversary of the National Weather Records Center at Asheville, N.C. Dr. H. E. Landsberg, Director, Climatology, Weather Bureau, Department of Commerce, delivered a short but informative address and I include it here as information to my colleagues:

ADDRESS BY DR. H. E. LANDSBERG, DIRECTOR OF CLIMATOLOGY, WEATHER BUREAU, AT THE NATIONAL WEATHER RECORDS CENTER, ASHEVILLE, N.C.

Mr. Mayor, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, your presence here this morning pleases us greatly. We are celebrating the 10th anniversary of weather records activities here in the Arcade Building. You have been most hospitable neighbors to this growing organization and its people.

Under this name and at this locality, the National Weather Records Center is a young installation. Yet it has ties to the early history of science in this country. Weather has always fascinated people and records of it were even kept in colonial days. Thomas Jefferson was an early advocate of a systematic climatic survey of the country. But neither he nor Dr. James Tilton, the Surgeon General of the Army, who ordered the keeping of weather records at Army posts in 1814, could have foreseen the scope this activity has taken today.

Literally tens of thousands of observations are made each day throughout the land. Many of them first serve for the day-to-day forecasts, but this does not end their usefulness. Accumulated observations from various locations are the raw material for the description of climate. They provide the statistics for planning of activities in which weather plays a role. This touches on almost all efforts of mankind. It encompasses the design of housing, heating, air conditioning, agriculture in all its aspects, water resources management, and air pollution control. It also is essential information for design of weapons, fallout from nuclear explosions, and other aspects of modern warfare.

One of the most direct roots of this Center were agricultural and maritime climatic activities in the midthirties which required analysis of vast amounts of accumulated weather data. These could be handled best by the use of machine methods and an activity for this purpose was set up by the Weather Bureau with the help of the Works Progress Administration in New Orleans. When World War II started, the Armed Forces found themselves in need of information of climatic conditions on a worldwide basis. Our troops had to fight in strange environments from the subarctic to the tropical jungles. We were engaged on three continents, on all oceans, and in the air. Clothing, food, weapons, aircraft were all weather dependent. No major strike or invasion could be planned without taking the weather factor into consideration. The New Orleans facility offered a nucleus to handle some of these problems.

After the war, peaceful as well as defense pursuits still needed climatic analyses. The demands grew to such an extent that the old Army warehouse where the Center was located became inadequate. Asheville offered space and resources, not the least of which were well-educated people.

At this point it may be appropriate to pause a moment and pay tribute to the late first director of this Center, Mr. Leslie Smith, who only recently passed away. He had been associated with these activities from the beginning and handled the transition from New Orleans to Asheville. His enthusiasm and hard work contributed much to the success of this group.

Since the move to this locality, the scope of work has steadily expanded. More and more sophisticated methods of modern electronic data processing have been brought to bear on the problems. And the ultimate is not in sight.

Particular worldwide attention was focused on this installation when it became part of the World Data Center during the International Geophysical Year. Information from all parts of the globe flowed here and a fruitful exchange with many nations ensued. This breached even the political iron curtains.

Internally, this center is a fine example of cooperation among civilian and military agencies in pursuance of common goals.

Of course we would all like to cast an eye toward the future at the end of this first decade. With new data streaming here from all corners, now even including observations from weather satellites, there is more work to be done than ever. New systems of automation are to be expected. Storage and recall of information is one of the most active fields in the data processing area. New methods of analysis are also yet to come. Research and development will remain on the upgrade—it must remain on the upgrade—if we are to keep our place in the modern world. The enviable record that has been established here by the men and women working at this center has made it the mecca of climatologists throughout the world. They come here to learn our methods. Many look to this place for having work performed here. As the reputation grows, so does the workload. We hope this will remain a healthy and steady trend.

Today our people here are glad to display some of their work to you. We hope you will gain some insight into our activities. We hope you will feel with us that the work here contributes to the health and welfare of the Nation.

We thank you for taking time to attend this open house and trust you will like what you see.

The Hungarian Revolution of 1848

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, today, March 15, is the 114th anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution of 1848. It is appropriate and fitting to observe this anniversary in the United States of America where one of the leaders of the revolution, Lajos Kossuth, was enthusiastically welcomed after he fled from his oppressors following the defeat of the Hungarian Army.

When the news of the February revolt in Paris and the mass demonstrations in Vienna on March 13 reached Budapest, a young poet, Sandor Petofi, was inspired to write a paean to Hungarian nationalism. His fellow conspirators—poets, lawyers, law students, and undergraduates—marched to the Landerer Printing House on March 15, 1848, seized the printing press and printed Petofi's national song. They also printed a list of national demands which had long been pressed by Kossuth in his many stirring articles.

The national demands—the March laws—called for responsible government, equality before the law, universal taxation, popular representation, abolition of serfdom, and union with Transylvania. It is a measure of the reactionary character of the Austrian Empire that such long overdue reforms could be achieved only by outbursts of violence. The Emperor was forced to accede to these demands in April 1848.

Unfortunately, the coalition of political factions which united on the March laws fell apart almost immediately. The diverse nationality groups which made up Hungary pressed for their own narrow goals or reverted to conservatism.

In September of 1848 Hungary was invaded by the Austrian Army. Hungary was placed under martial law, and the Hungarian ministry resigned. Kossuth headed up a committee of national defense.

Under the Emperor Francis Joseph a new constitution was adopted which led the Hungarian Parliament to declare itself an independent state. Kossuth was declared Governor, and the Hungarian generals recaptured the capital in May.

However, the Hungarian victory was short lived. The Emperor called upon Czar Nicholas I for help. Hungary was once more invaded—from the west by the Austrians and from the north by the Russians. The Hungarian Army was crushed between the two forces of the enemy and surrendered on August 13, 1849.

The Austrian General Haynau, called the Hyena of Brescia for his atrocities in Italy, executed the Hungarian national leader, Batthyany, and 13 of the Hungarian generals who were afterward known as the martyrs of Arad. The poet Petofi had disappeared in battle. Kossuth escaped to Turkey and later went to England and the United States. Thousands of Hungarians fled the country, finding asylum and happiness in our own Nation.

Impressed into the Austro-Hungarian Empire, ruled by the Emperor of Austria, the Hungarian people kept bright the flame of liberty in their hearts and spirits. Finally, with the defeat of the Central Powers in World War I, the dissolution of the short-lived Empire, and the disappearance of the Hapsburgs, the Hungarian people seized the opportunity for self-expression and formed their own government.

Following World War II, in 1947, the courageous nation was again overwhelmed by outside forces, as the Reds moved in and forced President Tildy out of office. With the revered memory of their forefathers of 108 years before as their inspiration, the Hungarian people again revolted against oppression. But

again they were crushed by the Russian hordes, even as they had been in the previous century. Again the refugees from this conflict fled their country rather than be killed or forced to live in enslavement. And, once more, thousands found refuge in the United States of America.

On this 114th anniversary of their epic struggle for liberty and freedom, I join with my Hungarian friends, American friends of Hungarian ancestry, and lovers of freedom everywhere in the prayer that liberty and peace will again prevail in this nation where though the land has often been, the minds and hearts of those who live there have never been conquered.

Overcentralization: The Late Congressman Hatton W. Sumners' Speech in Boston, Mass., on November 19, 1943, Is as True if Not Even Truer Today as on the Day When It Was Delivered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE CURTIS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the late Congressman Hatton W. Sumners' indictment of an overgrown Federal bureaucracy made in 1943 deserves rereading today. The forthright title of his address was "American Capacity for Self-Government Is Being Destroyed by Bureaucracy." It was delivered before the Second New England Conference, a semi-official gathering of representatives of the people and organizations of the New England States, at Boston, Mass., on November 19, 1943, and was printed in the American Bar Association Journal for January 1944. At the time of the address, Mr. Sumners was chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the U.S. House of Representatives.

The late Congressman Hatton W. Sumners was a son of Texas, and a close friend of the late and beloved Speaker Sam Rayburn. The following remarks about Mr. Sumners, written after Mr. Sam Rayburn's death by a newspaper reporter who had known him in Washington for nearly half a century, from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 18, 1962, page 479, will serve as a background to Mr. Sumners' inspiring address, which is printed below. The remarks about Mr. Sumners were as follows:

Two rookie Texas Representatives, Sam Rayburn, of Bonham, and Hatton W. Sumner, of Dallas, came to Congress together and for years were the closest of friends. Both got good committee assignments—Rayburn on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and Sumners on Judiciary. Both eventually became chairman of their committees.

Rayburn and Sumners took adjoining offices 543 and 542 in the Old House Office Building, which had been built when Uncle Joe Cannon was Speaker. Each had one room, which he shared with a secretary.

In the latter days of the Wilson administration and in the early days of Harding's, Rayburn with Hatton W. Sumners and Marvin Jones, Texas Congressman, and later Silliman Evans, a newspaperman, established bachelor quarters. They hired a famous cook, but Rayburn himself was an accomplished cook, specializing in fried chicken * * *.

Rayburn had been in office as majority leader only a few weeks when Roosevelt sent his bill to enlarge the Supreme Court. Democrats split wide open. Representative Hatton W. Sumners, Rayburn's closest friend and chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, refused to introduce the bill, calling it Court packing. Representative Maury Maverick of San Antonio introduced it.

These few remarks will help us to better appraise and appreciate the man who delivered the address above referred to, as follows:

AMERICAN CAPACITY FOR SELF-GOVERNMENT IS BEING DESTROYED BY BUREAUCRACY

(By Hatton W. Sumners)

I am deeply grateful for the privilege of addressing this gathering of people from the great States which constitute New England. Great is the history of these States; great, the achievement of their people. But we must be convinced that greater than they were, our States must be, and greater our people must be, if we are to preserve free government, and the time is now. That is why I am here. I want to talk to you about it, because you people are the Government. The Government is not in Washington.

A democracy is an association of private people engaged in the common venture of governing themselves—no king, no hereditary nobility—the people are the government.

In our system of government, the States constitute the habitat, and provide the only machinery through which our democracy can function in the discharge of general governmental duties. The Federal organization was never intended to do that job. It cannot do it except as a bureaucracy. After the Revolution, the people wanted one Army, one Navy, one diplomatic corps, one system of coinage, weights and measures, free commerce among themselves, and a relatively small number of other things. So they created the present Federal organization to be their agent, to do for them these few things which these States could not so well do themselves, the States reserving to themselves and their people general governmental duties and powers.

BUREAUCRACY REDUCES STATES TO VASSALS

More and more in later years we have been engaged in the perfectly silly undertaking of trying to make this Federal organization function as the general governmental agency of all the peoples. As a result, we have built up at Washington a governmental colossus, a monstrosity utterly beyond human comprehension or democratic control, regardless of which party or group of officials is in power. By the nature of that sort of government, it is inevitable there shall be extravagance, wastefulness, tyranny. It is inevitable that there shall be more and more government by directives, issued by appointed, not elected, personnel working without supervision.

We have all but reduced the States to the status of governmental vassals. We have gone further and largely dissolved the States by attaching their subdivisions directly to the Federal Treasury through loans and grants. We have made the individual citizens and the businesses in these States directly subject to Federal control by the creation of their financial dependence upon the Federal Treasury. Money which we thought we were getting for nothing we realize now was got by mortgaging the taxpaying power of unborn generations, while at the same time that taxpaying power was also mortgaged to get money to pay the salaries and expenses of the vast army of administrators, directors, and bosses of the people.

STATES MUST REGAIN CONTROL OF THEIR SOURCES OF REVENUE

Let us not deceive ourselves. We are now in the initial stages of what will prove to be another of the great battles between concentrated power and democratic government. In this struggle the States must lead. They must regain control over their sources of revenue which the Federal Government has tapped and is using to subjugate the States and their subdivisions by loans and grants from the Federal Treasury. They must reassert and reestablish their sovereignty as responsible agents of general government. They must do this, not only in order to preserve democratic control in matters of general government, but in order that the governmental business of the Federal organization, freed of the business which belongs to the States, can properly take care of the Federal business. That would bring the total of its business within the comprehension of the elected representatives, so that Federal laws may be enacted by the Federal Congress instead of being enacted as directives by an appointed bureaucratic personnel.

Whoever controls the purse string, controls. No constitutional limitation is effective against that power. It is without limit. We must right about face. We are not only weakening the States, but we are destroying the self-reliance, the courage, the stamina, and the governmental capacity of their people—the most deadly thing that can be done to a democracy. We are doing what the declared enemies of our democracy could not do to the structure of our Government and to the governmental capacity of the people, upon whose capacity to govern our democracy absolutely depends.

CONTROL OF REVENUES IS USED TO CENTRALIZE BUREAUCRATIC POWER

It is axiomatic in our system of government—and I think it is axiomatic everywhere—that he who controls the purse string, controls. This was demonstrated when the House of Commons got hold of the purse string in England. It took a long time, but now the Commons are supreme because they never turned loose the purse string.

We are making a similar demonstration in this country, that whoever controls the purse string, controls; except that it is operating in exactly the opposite direction. The Commons used that control to decentralize power, move it back toward the people. We are using it to centralize power, move it away from the people. They used it to strengthen democracy; we are using it to weaken democracy and strengthen bureaucracy. Of course, the Federal organization is important in the field of its responsibility. That is not what we are now considering. It is the neglect and destruction of our States which we are considering.

In our schools, on patriotic occasions, and in programs of bar associations where our Constitution is discussed, rarely are the States mentioned. In the prayers of ministers, they usually mention the President. They even name the Congress sometimes; but if God is to pay any attention to the States and their officials, He has to do it on His own.

FEDERAL AGENCIES ARE OVEREMPHASIZED IN OUR PRESENT STRUCTURE OF GOVERNMENT

For too long a time we have overemphasized the Federal organization in our scheme of government. In fact, we have been suffering from a bad attack of "federalitis." And yet, it is a historically established fact, and in harmony with reason, that after the formative period of a democratic nation there can be no progress in that system ex-

cept in that direction which moves the power and necessity to govern away from the center, where it concentrated during the formative period, back toward the people into the units of government which they can control.

Fortunately for us, we have the States which are not too large for democratic control. They function in the main through smaller units of government. Their chief officers are chosen by the people. They afford the opportunity and provide the machinery for the operation and development of democratic institutions, and the development of the governmental capacity of the people, who are the governors in a democracy.

NO DEVELOPMENT OF BUREAUCRATIC GOVERNMENT HAS BEEN A GAIN FOR LIBERTY OR LAW

All commentators, insofar as I know, agree that the Habeas Corpus Act, the Magna Carta, the Petition of Rights, and our own Declaration of Independence, mark great epochs in democratic governmental history, because their effect was to decentralize governmental power and move it back toward the people. On the other hand, no great monument can be found along the road which democracy has traveled marking a place where governmental power and responsibility have been moved away from the people, out of the units of government which they can control, toward a central governmental agency. Such a direction of movement is not progress in a democracy.

No period of concentration of governmental power, of bureaucratic development, of government by edict instead of government by laws, will ever be cited by the historians of the future as a time of democratic progress. Except by conquest, no people privileged to govern themselves ever lost that privilege until they had first lost their capacity for self-government.

CAPACITY FOR SELF-GOVERNMENT IS LOST BY NONUSE

Capacity for the independent exercise of the functions of self-government is lost by its nonuse. There must be capacity, and a governmental power must be lodged in a governmental agency which the people can operate. No people who failed to use their capacity for self-government were able to retain it. No people who had lost their capacity to govern themselves were ever able to remain free. People learn to govern by governing. They retain the ability to govern by using it. They lose the ability to govern by not using it. They acquire the greater ability to meet the greater problems of tomorrow only by using today the ability possessed to meet the problems of today.

DEMOCRACY IS IMPERILED BY PRESENT TRENDS

By disregarding these fundamental laws of nature we imperil our democracy. It is the plan of Nature, of God the Big Boss, whether we like it or not. It will be difficult to do this job. Only a great people can do it. It will test the stamina, the patriotism, and the purpose, of the people.

The difficulties of popular government, like all other difficulties, have been provided for the development of people. Nature has no disposition to avoid difficulties for people. It creates them. The development of people is the central objective of nature. Difficulties are the gymnastic paraphernalia provided for that development. We know by our own experience and observation that no individual was ever greater than his difficulties. No victory was ever greater than the battle fought to win it.

The greatest epochs of the world are those in which peoples with a purpose which would not yield, with a courage which sustained them, fought their way through the greatest difficulties of time.

HUMAN HISTORY CONSISTS OF OVERCOMING DIFFICULTIES

The history of the world is but a record of difficulties overcome. Being on top of the hill is not important in the scheme of nature. Had it been so, we would all have been created on the top of the hill. Climbing the hill and gaining the strength from the climbing is what is important, instead of sitting down at the foot of the hill because it is steep and rugged and letting the muscles grow flabby. It is a law, a universal law. The law of the Big Boss. Therein lies the philosophy of self-government. It is the plan of God. He has not put in the hearts of people the yearning to be free and self-governing, and then made the realization of that yearning to depend upon the will and the good disposition of one man or a few men in power. They might be ambitious to be known as great governors of a people instead of useful servants of a great people, the only aspiration a public servant in a democracy has any right to have.

GOVERNMENT CANNOT DO THE JOB FOR FREEMEN

Men are not wise enough to guide by their theories the policies of a great democracy. We cannot do this job if we approach it as Democrats and Republicans. We can do it only as patriotic American citizens, determined that this shall remain one place where people have a chance to be free. Then we can do it.

Progress is slow. Progress is uphill. Progress is difficult. Progress is the road of struggle, but it is the road of strength. Along that road lies the thrill of victory, the fitness to live.

We have been getting mighty soft in America. We have wanted the easy way, the fast way. We have turned to Uncle Sam. When some difficulties have come to our communities, to the smaller units of government, to our States, to challenge us to effort and to reward us with strength for the duties of tomorrow, we have refused the challenge. We have turned our backs upon the opportunity, and have cried out for a supergovernment to come in and do the job for us.

As a result we not only fail to receive the increased capacity to govern which nature gives as a reward to those who use the capacity already possessed, but we lost capacity. Nature takes from us the capacity which we fail to use. It is the law of life.

Let the greatest athlete go to bed and cease to use his muscles; the strength in his muscles will not remain. Let any self-governing people shift their governmental responsibilities away from themselves, and in proportion as they do, the strength to govern departs. When a people yield to a great centralized government to think and plan and care for them from the cradle to the grave, it is not far to the grave for everything which freemen hold dear.

Basically considered, from the disregard of these fundamental facts, great laws of Nature which govern not only in government, but everywhere, which determine sound policy, which limit human discretion, which fix the program for the development and preservation of governmental capacity of the people—from that disregard, basically considered, our major governmental difficulties and dangers have come.

AMERICA NEEDS TO GET AWAY FROM THEORIES

I am not a theorist. I have examined the facts. I have been trained in the school of practical experience. What little sense I have is of the usable sort, I think. I have subjected the judgment just expressed to every test to which experience has taught me to subject judgment before yielding to its guidance. Only in the field of government are people so foolish as to follow the theories of men, accredit men with infallibility, an attribute which belongs only to God.

Our scientific schools, practical schools, schools of medicine, engineering, all of them, are discovering natural laws and training men how to work in harmony with them. Not so in government. It is the one exception.

In a time of great progress in every other field of human effort, government stands alone as the colossal failure of the age. Serious, unemotional people are questioning now whether the children of today will be able to live under a free government, under a democracy, or will live under some form of nondemocratic government. We cannot do to our democracy that which under the operation of the laws of cause and effect is destructive of democracy, and expect ours to survive. Governments are not accidents. They have been provided for in the great economy, and are themselves governed by natural law.

THE LONG STRUGGLE FOR LAW-GOVERNED FREEDOM

We did not write, in a creative sense, our Federal Constitution. Every basic provision of our Federal Constitution had already been incorporated in those of States before the Federal Convention met. The Royal Charters preceded them. That of the little colony of Rhode Island, one of the greatest State papers of all time, was granted in 1663, I believe. Each of the basic provisions of our Constitution had originated out of necessity, and had been tested through centuries by a people peculiarly gifted with the genius of self-government, long before any constitutional conventions undertook the task of written constitutional constructions.

We must rid our minds of the silly, historically incorrect, humanly impossible mythological tales about some supermen having created for us our Constitution and our system of Government. Instead of such tales, which have crowded out the truth, which are as impossible of human accomplishment as the tales of the Grecian gods, we must know the truth about our Constitution. It came from the same source a tree comes from. It is governed, as is the tree, by natural laws which require a people capable of governing and an available governmental machine which they can operate.

The notion of a fundamental, natural law, supreme and dominant in the social and governmental relations of men, had taken firm root in the philosophy of thinkers as far back as Aristotle. Perhaps men have held to that conviction as far back as men have observed correctly and thought clearly and analytically. Cicero distinguished between summa lex, which existed according to his philosophy always before governments or written law, and lex scripta, laws of man's making, which were to be regarded as void if they were contrary to the laws of nature.

In the Middle Ages such great jurists as Baden of France and Suarez of Spain agreed with these views but went further and held that God had planted a consciousness of these laws in the mind and conscience of man, from which one's understanding of natural rights was derived, and held further that a statute which was contrary to natural justice was ipso facto void. Grotius was in general agreement with this philosophy. Coke, Fortescue, and Blackstone agreed. Blackstone held, however, that there was no power to prevent Parliament from violating the supreme law. However, he did not go so far as some of our American commentators have gone who say that the Constitution is what the Supreme Court says it is, or so far as some of the commentators on the British Constitution go who say that the British Constitution may be changed by

the British Parliament. Neither of these statements is correct.

AMERICA'S DUTY IS TO PRESERVE GOVERNMENT BY LAW

There is no power to prevent the British Parliament from enacting a law contrary to the British Constitution, but that violation of the British Constitution does not change the Constitution. It is true that there is no power to prevent an ignorant or venal Supreme Court, if there should come to be such a court, from falsely interpreting or falsely applying the provisions of the Constitution; but the Constitution would remain unchanged. We should merely have to await a happier day when the powers which had been abused and the trusts which had been betrayed would pass to fitter hands.

Your ancestors fired shots which were heard around the world. Their duty was to establish democratic government. It is ours to preserve it. Great is our responsibility. Great is our opportunity.

While our boys are fighting on the battlefields of the world, we must with equal courage, equal patriotism, and equal sacrifice if necessary, reestablish and have for them when they come home, those who do, a democracy worthy of their service and sacrifice. A nation of people, bottle fed and rocked to sleep in the arms of a great Federal bureaucracy, cannot do the job.

A Tribute to St. Patrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, St. Patrick, the patron saint of Ireland, has proven to be as remarkable in death as he was in life. For seldom in history does a man of local prominence and the hero of a single people come to serve as an outstanding symbol to persons of every faith and every clime. Yet this has been the case with St. Patrick, and so it shall be, so long as the qualities he possessed retain the respect of freedom-loving people everywhere.

Enslaved at an early age, St. Patrick escaped his bonds to enter the ministry in France, and when he returned to Ireland, the land of his captivity, he did so in the role of a bishop.

In this capacity he baptized thousands upon thousands of persons, ordained a great many ministers and established the Christian church in a land theretofore dominated by paganism. Moreover, so great was his zeal that Ireland became and stands today as one of the most devout Christian nations of the earth.

No wonder, then, that St. Patrick evolved, in the eyes of the Irish people, into the great symbol of Christian values. It was he, they say, who drove the snakes and toads from Ireland. But far more than that: It was he who brought the light of God to an area where previously there had been no light, but merely superstition.

Nor was that all. He also provided the great example of Christian forebearance, seeking not to punish those who had enslaved him, but to reward them with the kindness of his nature. This he did throughout the full 30 years of his service as bishop in Ireland, notwithstanding the severe treatment he had received there in his youth as a slave.

The example of St. Patrick's love and devotion to the cause of Jesus Christ has won him a fame far outranking that of most other Christian saints, until today his name is known far beyond the confines of Ireland and beyond even the confines of the Christian world.

Indeed, so impressive were his talents as a teacher, philosopher and servant of the Lord, that his day—St. Patrick's Day—is no longer a time for celebration on the part of the Irish people alone. For he has come to be recognized as a universal symbol—the symbol of freedom, education, and the good life; qualities dear to the heart of every member of the civilized world community. The divinity of the principles of St. Patrick renders him one of the outstanding figures in Christian history, today in this era, and tomorrow, in the many eras to come.

Since the 17th of March this year falls on a Saturday, and we shall not be here assembled, I shall take the opportunity and pleasure now of joining with millions of non-Irish people in saluting both St. Patrick and the Irish in tribute to his and their contributions to the improvement of life around us in this and the other Chamber of this building, in another part of the city, across our whole Nation, and in fact everywhere men live on this earth.

Entertainment Deductions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 28, 1962

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the administration tax bill has aroused a storm of interest and concern. Its provisions are manifold, and I have strong convictions and reservations regarding several of them. In some areas it is fair and equitable, but in others it is far from desirable.

I have made my views known on many of the bill's proposals and intend to make my final decision on the legislation only after my full and compelte study of all of its provisions and a careful review of the committee report.

There is one phase of the bill as submitted that has long been of especial concern to me. It affects a highly controversial phase of our tax law that is a perennial issue. I refer to the section dealing with entertainment deductions for business. Admirable as the objective may seem, I firmly believe that these provisions, if enacted, will do more harm than good. They defeat their own basic purpose.

It is my firm conviction, after full evaluation of every aspect of the bill's proposal on expense accounts, that it is inequitable, unworkable, unrealistic, unfair and—in plain language—ridiculous.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I herewith submit the views that I have expressed on this phase of the bill to the Ways and Means Committee during its deliberations on the tax legislation:

Mr. Chairman, the President's proposals to restrict or disallow completely certain types of business entertainment and travel expenses do not represent the best possible means for dealing with expense account abuses. He has proposed that all entertainment expenditures, dues and fees to clubs, and expenditures made in connection with yachts, hunting lodges, etc., be denied as deductions. He would also limit business gifts to $10 per donee per year, limit meals and lodging while traveling to $30 per day, and limit food and beverage outlays on guests to about $7 per guest per day.

I strongly oppose this type of legislation for the following reasons:

1. The Internal Revenue Code presently provides appropriate standards for administrative solution of problems cited as reasons for legislation. In 1960 the Internal Revenue Service announced a threefold program of stricter checking of tax returns to deal with abuses involving entertainment, travel, and similar expenses which included new reporting requirements and stricter checking of business returns. Moreover, the Tax Rate Extension Act of 1960 directs that the Treasury shall make a study of the effectiveness of the new administrative procedures. Since such a study has not as yet been released, at the very least, the President's legislative proposals seem premature.

2. Entertainment is an accepted legitimate business practice and tax legislation should not be used to destroy the practice. For instance, it is one of the major ways to promote business for those businesses that are restrained from advertising by ethical considerations, lawyers, doctors, and other professional persons. It is quite inequitable to use tax legislation to punish a method of doing business simply because some businessmen violate an existing enforcible law.

3. The President's legislative proposals are full of exceptions, interpretations, and examples. Much of the problem will still be left to administrative interpretation. The suggested rules and exceptions will be fertile territory for imaginative tax advisers. Moreover, the amounts specifically stated in the law as allowable for certain deductions do not take into account the differences in costs in certain locations. Nor the differences in the personal living standards of various business people who travel. A prominent business person in New York City obviously has different requirements from a book salesman in Keokuk, Iowa. Basically, in this field a large measure of justice can be achieved only through administrative procedures rather than through blanket legislative action. Abuses of expense accounts may be more properly corrected by proper audits and good administration.

For the above reasons I believe the President's proposals for outlawing and limiting certain categories of expenses as deductions in determining taxable income are unsound. They present drastic and arbitrary provisions that would needlessly hamper business. Present law, if adequately enforced, can easily cure the abuses of a few. The proposals, in sum, are an improper attempt to cure by statute problems which are essentially failures of administration.

Space Effort Spurs U.S. Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged this afternoon to participate in a panel discussion at the annual space-missile conference held at the Sheraton Park Hotel in Washington, where I discussed the impact of the space program on the economy of the country. I cited several interesting examples where space research is already producing results and benefits for everyday living.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of my address at the above conference:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE VICTOR L. ANFUSO, REPRESENTATIVE FROM NEW YORK, AT THE ANNUAL SPACE-MISSILE CONFERENCE, THURSDAY, MARCH 15, 1962, WASHINGTON, D.C.

In his message on the state of the Union, delivered to Congress in January of 1962, President Kennedy said that the objective of our national space program "is to develop—in a new frontier of science, commerce and cooperation—the position of the United States and the free world."

Why is this country going all-out into space? You've heard many reasons given: Scientific knowledge, national defense, international cooperation and prestige. These are good reasons. But there are also bread-and-butter reasons, dollar-and-cents reasons, which we're here to talk about today. Basically, the space program is expected to produce a number of valuable payoffs. It's not only expected to do so, it's doing so right now.

Government spending on space programs acts directly as an economic spur. The Government is already spending billions of dollars on space research and development, billions more on space hardware. These sums are growing rapidly year by year. As you know, they are spread across the whole industrial spectrum from plastics to electronics. In addition to creating new jobs—nearly a million already—and virtually new industries such as cryogenics and solid rocketry, this vast national effort has generated a tidal wave of new technology—many new materials, devices, and processes. In a moment, I will give you a number of striking examples.

The future looks even brighter. New scientific knowledge resulting from research always takes time to become useful. Yet historical experience shows that this is the real payoff, that fundamental new knowledge produces an even greater harvest of benefits than even the most spectacular invention.

Of course, no one can predict all the future applications of new knowledge. General Gavin has told us that the developers of the atomic bomb, less than 20 years ago, were unable to foresee the use of isotopes in medicine, industry, and agriculture. So you will excuse me if I merely suggest some general areas where basic space research seems likely to result in widespread economic benefits.

One such area is power sources—power not only from atoms but from fuel cells, plasma, ions, and solar and photoelectric cells. For instance, 10 towns along the Mason-Dixon line are preparing to experiment, and will light themselves by plasma. Another promising area involves the sources and uses of water, including the extraction of valuable elements from sea water. Still others are noise engineering, computer technology, and solid-state physics. A final example is the study of superconductivity, which holds promise of maintaining high magnetic fields with relatively low power.

Some commentators have suggested that this country is now standing at the threshold of the fourth industrial revolution. There is plenty of evidence to support their belief.

If we look back in time to the beginning of the 18th century and before, we see a technology in which the basic materials were wood and iron, and the sources of power were wind and muscle. The first industrial revolution followed and resulted from the widespread introduction of steel and steam. Then, in the 19th century, better and cheaper steel became available, and electricity and internal-combustion engines came into general use. This may be called the second industrial revolution. A third similar change occurred in World War II and the postwar period with the growing use of synthetics, plastics, and alloys, and the introduction of atomic energy. Today, if we look around us at the new technologies and their applications in transportation, communications, and industry, we find good reason to think that another such major change is in the making.

In the past, each industrial revolution has transformed the world. Each has promoted economic growth and progress by providing new and greater opportunities for investment, enterprise, and employment. We may confidently expect the fourth industrial revolution to produce the same results as its predecessors.

Now let me turn to the space technologies that have already arrived in the sense that we now have, or can soon produce or use, the resulting materials, devices and processes.

Among these, I include the commercial uses of satellites, particularly for long-range communications. Whatever the roles and relations of Government and private industry in this field may turn out to be, there is no doubt of the benefits that will accrue to all the populations of the world. Furthermore, there is good reason to believe that private enterprise will play a major role in operating space systems—not only satellite systems but possibly rocket transport as well. Many people have forgotten the proposal made by the Wiesner report, just over a year ago, that the Government set up a special organization to direct the Federal support of space activities. This proposal envisioned that some important space activities would be conducted by private enterprise. Nothing has happened since to change that basic assumption.

A variety of other processes, materials, and devices resulting from space research are becoming available now, in our own lifetimes. These have already found applications in the home, the factory, the hospital, the marketplace, and on the highway. For example, remote-control television switches enable us to turn a program on or off without moving from our chairs. Pyroceram, a ceramic developed for missile nose cones, is used to make pots and pans that can be taken from the freezer and put immediately on the stove without damage. Many new methods have been applied to metallurgy—one for extruding beryllium, another for making a fluxless aluminum solder, still another for ultrasonic welding of high-temperature metals.

Newly developed tools for doing the work of a wrench or a screw driver are operated with a mere squeeze of the fingers. One of the richest fields of application has been medicine. A drug developed from a missile propellant (hydrazine) is now used to treat mental illness. Two other medical applications are made possible by the greatly reduced size of electronic equipment. One is an "electronic nurse," which monitors heartbeat, temperature, blood pressure and breathing, permits a patient to be watched by remote control, and broadcasts a warning if the patient is in trouble. The other is a Cardiac Pacemaker powered by tiny mercury batteries, which supplies electrical stimulation to keep the heart functioning while the patient leads a normal life. The same electronic techniques can reduce a complete radio to the size of a lump of sugar. These techniques are now applied to a variety of uses, from wrist watches to automobiles.

Perhaps the most dramatic application of space technology to medicine is the use of space suits for victims of strokes and similar afflictions. Space suits were designed to maintain the normal bood circulation of astronauts. Today, they are being used to do the same thing for victims of circulatory disorders. Victims of strokes, such as President Kennedy's father, are often unable to walk or even stand without losing consciousness. But specially adapted space suits can maintain the normal blood pressure of these people, enabling them to sit up, stand or even walk. In the near future, it may not be uncommon to see people walking around in space suits who are not astronauts at all and who until recently would still be bedridden patients.

Hundreds of other examples could be given to show the benefits already produced by the space program for everyday living.

What I have just described are only the first fruits. The full harvest will keep growing, down the length of human history.

Once Again We Are Treading on Dangerous Ground in Allowing the UN to Direct Our Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Dallas Times Herald once again points up the danger this Nation faces in depending upon the United Nations and the World Court. How foolish it is to turn a problem which is the concern of the nations of this hemisphere over to a court headed by a Communist. Are there any who really believe that a body governed by one of the gang would rule against one of the gangsters, in this case Cuba?

The above-mentioned editorial follows:

WORLD COURT DECISION ON CUBA WOULD SET DANGEROUS PRECEDENT

The free world is facing a threat to its right to protect its own freedom.

The threat comes from the possibility that the International Court of Justice may be asked to rule on the legality of action taken by the Organization of American States in adopting sanctions against Cuba at Punta del Este.

The United Nations Security Council has agreed to consider Cuba's request that the matter be referred to the Court.

While there is no certainty that it will agree to submit the matter to the World Court, there still are several dangers in the action:

The Court is bound by no particular law or system of laws. It consists of 15 judges,

headed by a Polish Communist, who could decide the case on the basis of their own political convictions in the event it is submitted to them. A bare majority of the judges voting could issue an advisory opinion that might have the effect of overturning the action of 20 of the 21 nations in the Organization of American States.

This reference to the World Court would set a precedent.

Even if the Court upheld the legality of the OAS and its action, the case might serve to lull freedom-loving people to a position where they would be a target for future action by a Communist-dominated Court.

Such a case might involve the U.S. Guantanamo Naval Base in Cuba, which Fidel Castro has said he expects to take over by legal means.

Even if the World Court rules against Cuba or if the Security Council turns down submission of the matter to the Court, the Reds can use the occasion to delay action against the Cuban regime and use the Security Council or the World Court to air their propaganda on the subject.

The answer of the Security Council, of which the United States is a member, should be a firm "No."

Public Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I am here reporting the findings of my most recent poll of public opinion in my congressional district. This district comprises most all of northern Allegheny County, including three awards of the city of Pittsburgh. It is largely industrial and residential with some coal mining and farming in the areas farthest removed from Pittsburgh.

There are a few thousand more registered Democrats than Republicans in the district and all were given an equal opportunity to reply. For purposes of accurate evaluation it is safe to assume that a somewhat greater number of Republicans than Democrats responded.

The tabulated results in percentage figures follow without any editorial content:

1. Do you favor a Federal program to create public fallout shelters for up to 50 million persons? Yes, 24 percent; no, 76 percent.

2. Would you vote for the United States to buy $100 million worth of U.N. bonds? Yes, 32 percent; no, 68 percent.

3. Do you favor foreign aid for countries behind the Iron Curtain like Poland and Yugoslavia that show some independence from Russia. Yes, 32 percent; no, 68 percent.

4. Should the Peace Corps be expanded? Yes, 46 percent; no, 54 percent.

5. The President desires the power to adjust personal income taxes up or down subject to congressional veto. Should he be given this right? Yes, 26 percent; no, 74 percent.

6. Are you in favor of Federal aid for public schools below the college level? Yes, 38 percent; no, 62 percent.

7. Would you vote for medical care for the aged financed through social security payments? Yes, 56 percent; no, 44 percent.

8. Do you think that the United States should resume atmospheric testing of nuclear devices? Yes, 74 percent; no, 26 percent.

9. Do you believe that we should set up a Federal Department of Urban Affairs and Housing? Yes, 25 percent; no, 75 percent.

10. Do you share the President's opinion that there will be no important inflation in the next few years? Yes, 22 percent; no, 78 percent.

11. Should the President be given further power to lower tariffs? Yes, 41 percent; no, 59 percent.

12. Do you think the President is doing a good job in domestic affairs? Yes, 47 percent; no, 53 percent.

13. Do you think he is doing well in foreign affairs? Yes, 42 percent; no, 58 percent.

14. Should the United States fight if necessary to retain the freedom of West Berlin? Yes, 80 percent; no, 20 percent.

Civil Rights Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK KOWALSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today five bills to curb certain discriminatory practices in voting, education, employment, housing, and the administration of justice.

These bills are identical with S. 2979, S. 2980, S. 2981, S. 2982, and S. 2983 which were introduced on Tuesday by Senators KEATING, JAVITS, CLARK, SCOTT, and HART, respectively, for themselves and other Senators. Senator DOUGLAS is the principal cosponsor of these bills.

These bills are based on legislative recommendations of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, contained in five reports filed by the Commission last fall. The reports of the Commission's 2-year study and investigation present its comprehensive findings and recommendations relating to discrimination in the abovementioned fields because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

The first bill, the Federal Voting Rights Act of 1962, would outlaw practices which are used in some States to deny citizens the right to vote because of their race and color. Under its provisions, such discriminatory devices as the poll tax and property qualifications would be abolished and States employing literacy tests would be required to accept 6 years of formal education as proof of literacy.

The second bill, the Federal Equality of Education Act of 1962, is designed to speed up public school desegregation by requiring school boards that have failed to desegregate to file with the Attorney General within 180 days a plan providing for at least first-step compliance when schools open next fall. It would also provide financial and technical assistance to aid school desegregation and it would restrict Federal aid for segregated public schools and institutions of higher education.

The third bill calls for the establishment of a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity. The Commission would be charged with halting discrimination in Government employment and in employment connected with Government contracts and Federal grants-in-aid. In addition, it would also make it an unfair labor practice for a labor union to discriminate against its members or against applicants for membership because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

In accordance with the Civil Rights Commission recommendations on equal housing opportunity, I have introduced a fourth bill that would provide relocation assistance to families displaced by highway clearance programs.

The fifth bill seeks to curb police brutality and mob violence with policy connivance by holding State and local governments liable under Federal law for the actions of police officers. Another provision is aimed at prohibiting the practice of excluding members of minority groups from serving on juries.

I will at a later date introduce additional legislation based on other of the Commission's recommendations.

Discrimination is a slap in the face of human dignity. It damages the fabric of our entire society. It shadows the lives of millions of Americans. The Civil Rights Commission has suggested a reasonable and proper course of action, and sooner or later Congress will have to grapple with its responsibilities.

I hope and trust that Members of the House will grant these bills the same bipartisan support that so distinguished Tuesday's action in the Senate, and I urge that they may be made law.

Just a Reminder on What We Owe Before We Vote To Spend More

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, as we begin to consider the appropriations bills which, in the end, will amount to some $92 billion, let us pause to remember what our present debt is costing us. The following article by Bascom N. Timmons which appeared in the Dallas Times Herald is timely:

INTEREST ON U.S. NATIONAL DEBT AMOUNTS TO $17,690 A MINUTE

(By Bascom N. Timmons)

WASHINGTON.—This is the time of the year when even seasoned reporters of the national scene and high seniority Members of Congress gasp anew at the vastness of the Federal Government, its bloated budget and multitude of civilian employees.

The month of March sees the big appropriation bills which supply funds to operate the Government begin to roll through Congress. The first of these—Treasury and Post Office—went through the House of Representatives the other day and is now being considered by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

NINETY-THREE BILLION DOLLAR TOTAL

Fourteen are to follow and when the last one completes its legislative journey more

than $93 billion will have been appropriated, which may or may not be more than will be collected in taxes.

Treasury-Post Office covers four agencies which must collect the revenue to help finance the Government. They are the Mint, which produces revenue from minting of coins; the Bureau of Customs, which despite the general lowering of tariffs still brings in revenue exceeding its costs; the Internal Revenue Service and the postal service.

An unusual feature in connection with the Treasury-Post Office bill was that the biggest controversy was over the appropriation of the Internal Revenue Service.

Year after year Internal Revenue Service has asked for additional employees. For years the argument of IRS was: "For every dollar you give us for enforcement, we will bring in $20." Recently IRS has been promising $6 in revenue for every $1 given it for enforcement.

RECORD CITED

But Representative J. VAUGHAN GARY, Democrat of Virginia, Chairman of the Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, told the House:

"Let us look at the actual facts. We have been giving them increased personnel over the years. For fiscal 1961 we gave them 3,000 additional personnel, and what happened? With 511,000 additional audits they collected only $1 million additional in taxes."

The fact that an average of less than $2 more was collected for each additional audit startled the House, but Gary said IRS was not doing even that well in the first two quarters of fiscal year 1962. So the House voted it only 1,600 additional employes instead of the 4,514 it asked, for fiscal year 1963.

INTEREST ON DEBT

Biggest item in the first appropriation bill to clear the House was $9.3 billion for interest on the public debt for fiscal year 1963, or $400 million more than in 1962. (Of this increase about $124 million is a result of the increased amount of the debt and $276 million, is a result of the increase in interest rates.)

"The interest on the Federal debt alone for the fiscal year 1963 is greater than was the entire Federal budget in 1940," GARY told the House. "Every time the minute hand of the clock moves one notch throughout the 24-hour day, $17,690 of the taxpayers' money is being spent for interest alone."

Hail to James A Farley on St. Patrick's Day: "We'll All Be in Step With Jim"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 17, the feast of St. Patrick in all of the Americas Erin's harps shall wake again in rapture from their slumber. In the shadow of the Andes, the specter of Bernardo O'Higins, son of the Irishman, Ambosio, will tread again the trail of Chilean liberation. The seas that wash the continent will be greener and brighter as the memory of a County Wexford man, Comdr. John Barry of the American Navy stirs in sailors' hearts. Across the plains and along the river banks of Missouri, Minnesota, and Illinois the heroic figure of Gen. James Shields will rise again in magnitude. Senator James Shields of Illinois, the same man was born in Altmore in County Tyrone—yes, "Tyrone among the bushes." Well did Illinois count him its illustrious son and place his image in Statuary Hall of the Capitol. No other American has represented three States, in the U.S. Senate, as did General Shields as member, not only from Illinois, but later Minnesota and finally Missouri.

But the frame of reference to great Americans of Gaelic origin rests not solely in the past.

On Saturday, March 17, New York City will observe the 200th anniversary of the commemoration of St. Patrick's feast day in our city. From 1762 to 1962 this day has grown in size and significance until we may properly say that on St. Patrick's day everyone who is Irish is happy and everyone who is happy is Irish. For this celebration unites all New Yorkers regardless of origin. It is fitting on this bicentennial occasion that our grand marshal for the parade up Fifth Avenue wil be one of our State and Nation's finest sons, Hon. James A. Farley, former Postmaster General of the United States. "Big Jim" will lead us well, as he has led our people in fairness, faith in God and country, and the exercise of principles of democracy through every day of his manly life. When we are in step with Jim we move towards greatness and on Saturday next we will all be in step with Jim. From on high the corps of O'Higgins, Shields, and Barry should be well pleased to gaze upon the splendor of 100 marching bands, the spectacle of a million parading and watching along the way, and the flags of faith and freedom proudly flying. And Edmund Burke, Thomas Moore, Daniel O'Connell may well join them in approbation for the marshal of the 1962 St. Patrick's parade will one day stand with them in greatness. Until he does, it is my hope that James A. Farley, businessman, politician, philosopher, and patriot will continue to lead us not only on St. Patrick's Day but through the next decade in active participation in the government of our State and Nation.

End of the Beginning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the February 26, 1962, issue of Aviation Week relative to Col. John Glenn's successful orbit of the earth:

END OF THE BEGINNING

(By Robert Hotz)

The long sweat is over. The successful three-orbit space flight of Lt. Col. John Glenn marks the end of the beginning for the U.S. manned space flight effort. It is a thorough technical vindication for the hard core of National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics veterans who began the research and planning for the Mercury program at NACA's Langley and Ames Laboratory in the summer of 1958, before the National Aeronautics and Space Administration was created the next fall. Many of these same, largely unsung, technical heroes also played key roles in the highly successful supersonic research aircraft program from the X-1 through X-15.

This hard core of former NACA personnel was subjected to enormous pressures from technical kibitzing and political timidity in the 3 years since the first funds were formally allocated to Mercury in the fall of 1958. It took a major amount of quiet and unpublicized courage for them to stick to their technical guns and press onward with the Mercury program in the face of domestic skepticism, indifferent political support, and the sucessful Soviet-manned orbital flights of 1961. They are too numerous to list by name in this space but among those who merit special mention are Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, who bore the brunt of the technical kibitzing and stubbornly resisted the erosion of early political indifference to the program. Bob Gilruth, Walt Williams, Max Faget, Chris Kraft, George Low, and Hartley Soule were other leaders of this technical team who did their work on civil service pay and sold no serial rights to national magazines.

The international adulation now engulfing Astronaut John Glenn is well deserved. He performed flawlessly as a test pilot in man's most ambitious assault on a completely hostile environment. With his courage and skill he presented an image to his fellow Americans of the qualities that made this Nation great. To our friends abroad, like the B-58 crews at the Paris air show last spring, he presented a picture of Americans the way they hope we still are.

But the real significance of this successful triple-orbit manned space flight is the foundation of national scientific, engineering and industrial resources on which it was based. When our political leaders belatedly made a decision to go into space, creating NASA almost a year after the Soviet Sputnik 1 went into orbit, the basic resources to implement this decision already existed in the aircraft industry, in the military services and in the researchers of NACA.

From the Air Force ICBM program came the Atlas booster and its guidance system without which U.S.-manned orbital flights would still loom in a fuzzy future. The successful adaption of what was designed as a military weapon into a reliable space booster (and the Atlas performance as a space booster now has certainly silenced its early maligners) drew on the technical capabilities and experience of Convair's Astronautics Division and USAF Systems Command's Ballistic and Space Systems divisions to fulfill the NASA requirements. From USAF and naval aviation came the bioastronautics capability utilized in Mercury, and also from the military services' long experience in experimental testing of manned flight vehicles came the seven astronauts themselves. From industry—North American's Rocketdyne engines; General Electric's guidance system; Convair's Atlas, McDonnell's capsule and many others—came the technical skills and fabricating facilities to translate the Mercury concept into reliable performing hardware.

Even though John Glenn, as the pilot on this first U.S. orbital mission, was the focal point for public adulation, all of his fellow astronauts played solid support roles and it was far more of a team effort than is generally understood.

It is important for the American public as well as the world at large, and particularly the Soviet Union, to understand that the success of the first U.S. manned orbital space flight is not based on the concept of super-

men supported by rigid political doctrine, but rather on this extensive, sound foundation of national technical resources that can be concentrated on specific objectives by imaginative and alert national leadership to produce results such as the manned space flight program. In retrospect, the record of Mercury from initial funding to first successful manned orbital flight in a trifle over 3 years should be equally impressive to friend and foe.

President John Kennedy and Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON also deserve a share in the Mercury success. Early last year they rejected the advice of their predecessors, who recommended retarding the manned space flight program. Instead they made the basic policy decision to extend manned space flight objectives to the moon and at the same time infused solid and strong support into Mercury. They also ignored some of their best scientific advice in ordering an open door policy of full public view of all Mercury flights, in direct contrast to the Soviet Union's policy of black secrecy.

The result of the international spotlight focused on the U.S. ballistic and manned orbital space flights has given this country its greatest international prestige boost in a decade. It has also blunted the Soviets' advantages of being first and longest with man into orbit by contrasting our candor with their secrecy. It is significant that Mr. Khrushchev is now asking for international space cooperation after scornfully rejecting it until after Colonel Glenn's flight, and Soviet scientists are now hinting to Americans in Moscow that they may allow foreign observers at their next space spectacular. It is certainly much too early to assess the sincerity of these Soviet gestures. But there is no doubt that the glare of international publicity focused on the U.S. space shots is generating an uncomfortable pressure of world opinion against their super secrecy, and is raising a general air skepticism regarding their manned space achievements.

Colonel Glenn's orbital flight marks the end of the difficult beginning of the U.S.-manned space flight program. The road ahead is still murky with risk and the detours of inevitable experimental failure. The cold white light of the moon glows as the next goal.

We think President Kennedy put the U.S. space position in its proper persceptive after Colonel Glenn's flight when he said from the White House rose garden:

"We have a long way to go in this space race. We started late. But this is the new ocean and I believe the United States must sail on it and be in a position second to none."

National Defense Education Act: Implications for Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of the Congress, the following address by Assistant Commissioner Peter P. Muirhead, U.S. Office of Education, before a recent meeting of professional engineers at the University of Akron.

Commissioner Muirhead summarizes in excellent fashion the broad accomplishments to date of the National Defense Education Act, of which it was my privilege to be author in the House of Representatives. He emphasizes how the theory of education for defense has been translated into practice in the administration of this program so as to advance technology, science, and industry.

His address follows:

IMPLICATIONS FOR INDUSTRY IN THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

(Address by Peter P. Muirhead, Assistant Commissioner for Legislative and Program Development, U.S. Office of Education)

It is a very real pleasure to join with you here in this meeting sponsored by the Akron District Society of Professional Engineers and the University of Akron. You have been kind enough to ask me to discuss the programs of the National Defense Education Act in higher education, particularly as they might have some bearing upon their implications for business. I can think of no more pertinent way to introduce such a discussion than to relate it to the needs of education as stated by President Kennedy in his February 6 message on education to the Congress:

"For education is both the foundation and the unifying force of our democratic way of life—it is the mainspring of our economic and social progress—it is the highest expression of achievement in our society, ennobling and enriching human life. In short, it is at the same time the most profitable investment society can make and the richest reward it can confer."

It is a little over 3 years since the passage of this act. Until now much of the discussion of the impact of the act on education has necessarily been speculative. There just hasn't been enough time to gage its impact with any accuracy and, for a valid measure of some of its objectives, we will have to wait a considerable time. But, at this midpoint in the life of the act, we do have a fairly clear idea of its effectiveness in meeting some of the problems it was designed to meet. Perhaps the best measure of both the progress and the critical need of the programs established by the act is to be found in their overwhelming and enthusiastic acceptance by the higher education community.

Since the act was passed, Congress has appropriated over 4 fiscal years $332.4 million for the four higher education programs. When all of these funds have been expended, they will have been used to:

(a) Provide $203 million in loan funds to about 280,000 students attending 1,470 colleges and universities.

(b) Award graduate fellowships to 5,500 graduate students and make grants totaling nearly $30 million to graduate schools to support programs in which the fellows are studying.

(c) Conduct 354 counseling and guidance institutes for the training of 11,700 secondary school counselors and teachers preparing to be counselors.

(d) Provide training in the audiolingual approach to language teaching for approximately 11,500 teachers at some 218 modern foreign language institutes.

(e) Support research and study, amounting to $10.4 million (approximate) for the development of instructional materials for the teaching of modern foreign languages in the schools and colleges.

(f) Assist, through grants totaling $6 million, in the establishment or strengthening of 52 language and area centers for the improvement of instruction in languages not commonly taught in the United States.

(g) Grant about 2,100 modern foreign language fellowships to gradue students preparing to teach languages in college or to use their language competence in public service.

These purely statistical tabulations point to very real achievements during the brief life of the National Defense Education Act. But let me not outrage you with statistics. Let me not, in the short time we have together, attempt to cover the National Defense Education Act in all its aspects. Suffice it to say, at this point, that these achievements have demonstrated beyond doubt, if any existed heretofore, that massive higher education programs in the national interest can be responsibly and effectively administered by our colleges and universities in partnership with, rather than under the direction of, the Federal Government.

The National Defense Education Act has been hailed from many platforms as a historic milestone in the development of higher education—it has been described eloquently by some as an attempt to shore up the leaky brain pipe of education in this country and by others as a great stimulant designed to stir and reinforce a public resolve to bring our educational system into harmony with our times.

But perhaps Congress, in fashioning this far-reaching and perhaps epochal legislation, caught its spirit and potential most cogently. Listen, if you please, to the majestic simplicity of the language of the act: "Congress hereby finds and declares that the security of the Nation requires the fullest development of its young men and women. We must increase our effort to identify and educate more of the talent of our Nation." Then suiting action to the mobility of its purpose, Congress proceeded to construct an act that has as its central motif "Opening the door to college study"—in effect a laudable professional objective that has crucial implications for business; in effect, the most critical education problems facing our Nation today.

I. GUIDANCE INSTITUTE PROGRAM

Recognizing that probably no more than half of our high school students have available to them the services of an adequate counseling program, Congress provided in this act a program for Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes. These institutes are designed to improve and expand counseling services in our secondary schools by providing training opportunities for secondary school guidance counselors and teachers who are planning to go into counseling. I respectfully submit that the success of the National Defense Education Act will be dependent to a very large extent upon how successful we are in doing just that—improving and expanding secondary school counseling services. This, it seems to me, is the very cornerstone of the National Defense Education Act. Only by so doing, will we be able to make a significant inroad upon the distressing situation that results in close to 1 million students failing to graduate from high school each year and more than 100,000 able high school students each year failing to continue with their higher education. Undoubtedly there are a number of factors contributing to this waste of talent. However, it is generally agreed that one of the most important reasons is the lack of sound counseling and guidance programs in the schools. Guidance programs are designed to identify our best students and to encourage and motivate them to do their best.

We have every good hope that from this promising program there may come not only an expansion of guidance-counseling services but that we may be able to develop even better means of identifying able students and of encouraging them to make wise decisions on their future education and careers. Actually, I think the challenge has been most cogently stated by Dr. Conant when he says in effect no radical alteration in the basic pattern of American high schools is necessary in order to improve our public high schools. But that, in his opinion, one general criticism would be in order: "The academically talented student as a rule is not being

sufficiently challenged, does not work hard enough, and his program of academic studies is not of sufficient range."

All of us, I think, will agree that the establishment of the Counseling and Guidance Institutes under this act is both timely and fortunate. To the end that they result in increasing the number of trained counselors in our secondary schools, they undoubtedly will warrant our approbation. But, as this audience, with its understanding of the need for quality improvement will appreciate, the training of additional counselors in and of itself is not enough.

There is an equally urgent need, as the shocking record of high school talent loss and college dropout so clearly indicates, for improved guidance services, particularly in college guidance services.

Specifically, the record would seem to warrant a bolder and more imaginative approach to the problem of identifying and motivating the able high school student. This, it seems to me, provides an exciting challenge for the Counseling and Guidance Institutes established under the National Defense Education Act—a challenge that will be successfully met by the contribution that they are able to make in developing guidance practices and procedures that will result in encouraging more of our able youth to go on to college and—in so equipping them for this experience—that more of them will remain until graduation.

II. STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM

With infinite good wisdom Congress provided a companion program to complement effective college guidance in the schools—a program designed to assist college-ability students in financing the cost of obtaining a college education under exceptionally liberal interest and repayment terms—a program designed to insure that our best would have a chance to do their best.

Perhaps the single most significant development is the astounding acceptance of the program by students, parents, and the higher education community and all that this implies for the future in financing higher education costs. Today over 1,400 colleges and universities, representing all the States and territories, have established national defense student loan programs on their campuses. These colleges enroll more than 2 million pupils or 88 percent of the full-time college enrollment in the country.

It would be an understatement of considerable magnitude to say that the enthusiastic manner in which this program was embraced by the colleges and universities was not wholly expected. The acceptance of the loan or credit concept in helping students to meet the increasing costs of higher education was slow in coming—but it is here now.

But the most dramatic fact of all is that since the program started, a total of about $203 million in Federal student loan funds has been distributed to the participating colleges and that the colleges have already granted thousands of loans to upperclassmen and incoming freshmen and that they expect to assist upwards of 180,000 students during the present college year.

These, then, are the major outlines of the work being done under the guidance and student loan programs of the NDEA. If time were to permit, I would like to share with you the accomplishments under the graduate fellowship program and the language development program of the NDEA. Perhaps there will be an opportunity to do this during the general and panel discussion periods which are scheduled for this afternoon.

I would like, however, to make one more point which I think is crucial to whatever success these programs may have had or ultimately may achieve. And that is this: None of them can accomplish what they have been designed to do without the wholehearted cooperation and acceptance of the academic community. We have had this in full measure.

And I think we have had it, first, because colleges and universities are completely behind the aims of these programs and recognize the need for support in these particular areas; and, second, because a great portion of the burden of responsibility for administering the programs has been wisely placed on the institutions of higher education. We allocate the loan funds to the institution, upon the basis of standards established by college representatives, but the institution determines who is to get the loans and how much it chooses to loan; we approve the graduate programs upon the advice of an advisory committee, but the graduate school develops its own program and nominates the fellows it wishes to study in it; we award contracts for institute, following review by the consultants panel, but their operation and staffing and the selection of enrollees are completely the institution's responsibility.

This, of course, is as it should be, and the measure of the wisdom of Congress in providing for this joint responsibility is found in the success these programs are enjoying. If I may repeat, the NDEA has shown, if additional evidence is needed, that massive educational programs in the national interest can be administered responsibly and effectively by our State agencies and our colleges and universities in partnership with, rather than under the direction of, the Federal Government.

Let me conclude on the same important note that I began by referring again to the President's February 6 message on education to the Congress in which he states that—

"The education of our people is a national investment. It yields tangible returns in economic growth, an improved citizenry and higher standards of living. But even more importantly, free men and women value education as a personal experience and opportunity—as a basic benefit of a free and democratic civilization. It is our responsibility to do whatever needs to be done to make this opportunity available to all and to make it of the highest possible quality."

George C. Eliades

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, my home city of Lowell, Mass., and yes, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, suffered a great loss recently in the death of George C. Eliades, a former chief executive of Lowell. George Eliades came to the United States from his birthplace in Asia Minor when he was 21 years old. He knew the hardships of life in the Old World and recognized his responsibilities as a citizen of his adopted land.

He was a graduate of Boston University Law School and practiced in Lowell for over 35 years. He was the first American citizen of Greek heritage to serve as mayor of any city in the United States.

He served the people in almost every capacity of service. He was president of the Lowell Bar Association and one of its most respected members. His work in the Greek-American community was acknowledged by the King and Queen of Greece when he and Mrs. Eliades were their guests at the royal palace in Athens.

My hometown and my State have suffered a great loss in the death of this distinguished citizen. My heartfelt sympathy goes to his devoted wife and family.

Report on Inter-American Friendship by Mayor Robert L. Searle, of Coral Gables, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Mayor Robert L. Searle, of the city of Coral Gables, Fla., recently returned from a trip to Costa Rica with the doctor-to-doctor program.

In the struggle against the encroachment of communism in Latin America, it is vital that we consider every possible means of strengthening the vitality of people to be free and independent.

Mayor Searle returned from Costa Rica convinced that more can be done by the lower levels of government than has been done by the Federal Government in promoting understanding and progress in Latin America. The following is a report of his recommendations to promote inter-American friendship. I sincerely believe that each of my colleagues should give close consideration to this valuable report:

There is an economic depression in Costa Rica, at the present time, that has been brought about by the reduction of the sugar quota from 33,000 tons to 10,000 tons; this sounds like a small amount of sugar, when one thinks of hundreds of thousands of tons of sugar that are purchased by this country annually. This also seems like an unbelievable situation when you are told that an economic depression is existing in a country because of a reduction in sugar quota; however, approximately 33,000 Costa Rican farmers raise sugar. In the neighboring two countries, Panama and Nicaragua, there are two sugar growers in each country; the President of each of the countries, and another wealthy individual.

The Government of Costa Rica and the people of Costa Rica are as near like the people and the economy of our country as could be possible. The people of Costa Rica are ambitious, clean and proud landowners who only want an opportunity to help themselves. Their homes, farms and cities are as neat as you would want your own to be. These people are all friendly to the United States and look upon the United States as their big brothers. They look to this country for leadership in world affairs, as I am sure has been reflected many times in the Organization of American States and the United Nations. At the present time, they feel that we are not being fair to them or have not taken into consideration the effects of our sugar quota cut upon the economy of their country.

When you consider that each of these 33,000 farmers probably represents a family of five, that each of these farmers will aver-

age one or two employees and that this employee represents a family of five, we find that actually about 300,000 people within the country have been affected by this cut in sugar quota; 300,000 represents approximately 25 percent of the population of the country. These people have experienced a two-thirds reduction in income. How many people in the United States could afford to have their income reduced by two-thirds, and how would each of them react if they felt that another country was responsible for this reduction. I don't believe that we would be as patient as these people have been.

"How good is this information and does this writer know what he is talking about" is probably going through your mind at the moment. To answer these questions, I will have to give you some of my experiences during this trip.

I went to Costa Rica as a guest of the doctor-to-doctor program. This program held several clinics with the doctors of Costa Rica. Not being a medical man, I had time to follow my inquisitive nature and wander about San Jose and the surrounding area. I talked to people in all walks of life, from the smallest to the largest farmer and from the small shopowner to the successful industrialist. I talked to the president of the country, the Honorable Mario Eschandi; to Victor Vargas, minister of industry, and to many other municipal and governmental officials. On most occasions, I met these people informally and unexpectedly, due to the acquaintanceship of several people in San Jose.

I think one of my experiences will be of interest to you related in detail. Shortly after my arrival in San Jose, I was asked if I would like to attend a town celebration and meeting in the city of Atenas, approximately 40 miles across the mountains from San Jose. I asked if it would be in order for me to present a key to the city of Coral Gables to the mayor of Atenas. After several phone calls and several changes in arrangements, I found that I was to be the guest of honor at the town meeting and at 5:30 one afternoon we started to Atenas. The road starts out as a beautiful four-lane highway, narrows to two lanes and then to one lane, down to an almost impassible trail across the mountains. We were greeted at the city limits by a police escort and taken to the townhall. Former President Ulate and I were both guests of honor at a townhall meeting. The room, approximately 15 feet by 18 feet, would only allow the elders of the city to be seated. I was given the seat of honor on a platform, and the mayor and former president were seated at my side. I doubt if any citizen of the United States has ever felt any more humble than I, as I listened to their comments of appreciation and the friendship of the United States and for my consideration in taking time to visit their city. I was told that I was the first American governmental official who had ever visited their city. Needless to say, I will never forget this experience.

After I had presented the key to the city of Coral Gables to their mayor, and also a key to former President Ulate, I asked the people, who by then numbered several hundred outside the town hall, if I could answer any questions for them about the United States. I further told them that any answer that I gave would be my own opinion as a citizen of the United States and to keep in mind that I was one person of 180 million. Again, the subject came up, "Why does the United States treat Costa Rica as a stepchild when everyone in the country has nothing but love and friendship toward the United States?" Again, I heard the stories about the sugar quota. One man jestingly suggested that apparently the only way to have the United States recognize Costa Rican problems was for them to be hostile, since it appeared that the only countries that obtained understanding did so through hostility.

Also, during the discussion, I was asked if the United States would take the lead in stabilizing the world coffee market since they felt that we are the only country that could make any progress along this line.

Following the meeting, we went to a large banquet in the backyard of one of the homes, at which time we were served the delicacies of the country and, also, during which time I had an opportunity to talk to many other people. Late in the evening, we started back across the mountains. I don't think anyone had ever had a richer experience. I felt like I had to bring my experience to the attention of the proper governmental authorities in the United States.

Is this an old story to you, one that you have heard many times? If it is, I hope that you have not heard it about Costa Rica because I would hate to think that you, or the members of our State Department, were aware of the facts that I have presented here and had been unable to recognize a friend in need, such as Costa Rica.

I could tell you many other experiences, and of many other conversations, but please let us do something immediately to keep the friendship of this Latin American country. They don't want money; they want someone to buy their sugar and coffee at a fair price. The standard of living of Costa Rica is probably higher than any other Latin American country. I think we would be far wiser to pay them a little bit more in some cases, if necessary, and keep their friendship and respect than to bow to the whims of the unfriendly.

St. Patrick and the Irish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, two Irishmen shared a cell at Sing Sing, the famous—and equally infamous—prison of the State of New York. They were on death row, and while one of them still hoped for successful appeal of his conviction, the other was scheduled to die very soon. Despite his energetic efforts, the appellant was entirely unable to cheer the doomed man, for the latter was in fear for his soul and in terror of the electric chair. Finally, as the poor fellow was led off to be executed, his cellmate had an inspiration: "More power to you," he called. The humor of this rather grisly joke is due to the combination of two desperate elements of our experience: humanity toward the unfortunate and the grim reality which makes them unfortunate. This is a combination which is particularly Irish, for it is the strength of Irish people that their warmth and charity have never distorted the world around them, while their realism has never destroyed their humanity.

The Irish have ever been conscious of their identity as a people, despite the fact that the size, strength, and location of Ireland has subjected them to difficulties which could easily have been avoided by capitulation. There is a story of three men who were discussing their experiences with racing. "The closest race I ever saw," said one, "was an auto race. Car No. 1 had just been repainted, and it won by the thickness of that coat of paint." The second man claimed to have witnessed a horserace where the winner beat the horse behind him only by sticking out his tongue. But the third man was Irish, and he remarked, "The closest race I ever saw is the Scotch." Any joke of this kind, commonly told by Irishman to Irishman is in part a joke on the Irish. No people has ever been so realistic about its own separateness from the world around it as to accumulate such a body of humor about that very subject. I cannot resist another story about the origin of bagpipes. Any discussion of the invention of so important an item as bagpipes is certain to take up time, and after listening to such a conversation for longer than he could bear, an Irishman spoke up as follows: "Sure, the Irish invented bagpipes and sold them to the Scots for a joke. The Scots just have not seen the joke yet." Of course, the English and French have been as much the subjects of Irish scorn as any other people. "Sir," said the Englishman to the Frenchman, "If I were not English I would indeed be French." "And I, Monsieur," returned the other, "would be English were I not French." "Well as for me," the Irishman said in disgust, "if I were not Irish I would be ashamed."

Now all of this has much more to do with St. Patrick than you might imagine at first. Coherence and solidarity as a people in its own right has always been a characteristic of the Irish. When St. Patrick was born—sometime in the fourth century A.D.—Ireland had a much more complex and well-organized society than is generally credited to it. Seven semi-independent rulers acknowledged the supremacy of the High King, or Ard Ri, who was located at Tara, and shared a common language and a common legal system. Most important, while the culture of the time showed traces of Christian and classical influence, it was basically Irish and completely unique. Ireland was never conquered by the Roman legions and has never really been subdued by anyone else. Its traditions and heritage are rigorously its own and any outside influences have been accepted—even welcome—but never imposed.

The establishment of Irish independence was originally due to its remoteness and to its characteristic of being an island in the sea. Ironically, this ancient strength has been in more recent times, with the streamlining of communications and transportation, a modern weakness. Still, despite their physical isolation and the vulnerability of their shores, the Irish people have maintained that independence of mind and spirit which came more easily to them in the past. That Christianity was the crystallizing force for Irish culture, and that Christianity has been the source of Irish strength and endurance ever since is indubitable. St. Patrick, of course, is therefore responsible for the spine of the Irishman and the backbone of his culture.

The Irish have taken their religion seriously enough, and—more signifi-

cant—have understood it well enough, to make it an important part of their humor. When Cornelius Murphy went up to Heaven, he remarked to St. Peter that the venerable saint had been at his job for a long time. "One million years is but a minute here, and a million dollars but a cent," replied St. Peter. "Well then," said Murphy, "since I'm needin' cash, perhaps you'd lend me a cent." "Sure," answered St. Peter; "just wait a minute."

A good Irishwoman who had lost her sense of God remarked to her neighbor that she no longer felt the touch of the Lord. "Ah," said the neighbor, "if you can only close your eyes and raise your head and pray with your heart, why the good Lord'll reach down with His hand and touch you as He used to." The woman did as she was told until she felt a hand upon her sleeve. She opened her eyes and looked, expecting to see the hand of God—and saw her neighbor withdrawing his own hand with a start. "Oh!" she cried. "That was your hand I felt and not the hand of God!" "Of course," the neighbor replied. "Heaven is a long ways off, and the Lord is not one to waste any motion that He could use for beneficent works. He just took the nearest hand and used that."

That religion is important to Irish humor is indicative of the fact that it plays a role of vast importance in the life of every Irishman. Furthermore, when the spiritual nature of God and of the Saints is well understood, and established as other-worldly, there is no blasphemy in jokes of this kind. Irish religious humor, like humor about the Irish people, is based upon a faith too strong to be shaken by jokes or scorn or the attitudes and actions of others. This rockbound individuality and this unshakable patriotism are qualities well adapted to a country with principles such as ours. The United States has recognized this. The days of "No Irish Need Apply" are long gone from this Nation and today an Irishman with all the noble characteristics of Ireland and the Irish people sits in our own White House. We can bestow no greater tribute upon a people which has retained its national identity while blending at the same time with American tradition and culture.

Our celebration of St. Patrick is a gesture of gratitude and affection toward the Irish people. No other figure is so honored except a few of our very great presidents. The virtues of faith, humanity, and strength are epitomized by St. Patrick and by the Irish people. And there are no finer virtues and none more basic to America or to the very human race itself.

Public Welfare Amendments of 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the public assistance and child welfare titles of the Social Security Act provide a Federal-State partnership in public welfare.

I believe that it is important to recognize that this partnership has been highly successful in promoting the general welfare of all the people.

The public assistance programs were developed during the great depression to meet the massive problem of millions of persons without enough money to buy the necessities of life. Therefore, these programs were designed to evaluate an applicant's financial need and give him the amount of money he needed. The design was good. The Federal-State partnership does meet financial need with flexibility patterned upon conditions in each State.

Today, many of our fellow citizens still need financial help. However, the reasons for this need vary from family to family.

Most persons receiving public assistance today are either young children, aged, or disabled. Others are unemployed because their jobs disappeared because of changes in technology.

To meet the needs of our time, the public assistance program must become a public welfare program. It is necessary to continue money payments but we need to help our most unfortunate fellow citizens become independent of public charity.

This requires services to help families become self-supporting, prevention of dependency by dealing with the causes, incentives to the recipients to improve their condition and to the States to improve their welfare program, rehabilitation of recipients, promotion of individual independence through community work and training programs, and training of public welfare personnel to enable them to reach these goals.

This also requires an expansion and improvement of the traditional Federal-State partnership. Public assistance should become true public welfare. Public and private agencies should work together. Agencies for children, for the handicapped, for the aged, for the socially maladjusted are all needed and the work of all of them has to be organized for maximum efficiency.

H.R. 10606 now being considered by the Congress is designed to accomplish these purposes.

On December 17, 1961, the Honorable Ruth Grigg Horting, Pennsylvania secretary of public welfare, endorsed these changes as proposed by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Abraham Ribicoff.

On February 2, 1962, the Honorable David L. Lawrence, Governor of Pennsylvania, said:

> President Kennedy's compassionate and economically sound welfare program presented to Congress yesterday, emphasizing the rehabilitation and prevention phases of public welfare, deserves wholehearted support.
>
> The President's program with emphasis on rehabilitation to restore dignity and independence to the needy is a direct approach to one of the most critical problems of government, and will greatly help our State program already patterned along the same line.

The Pennsylvania State Board of Public Welfare, under the chairmanship of the Honorable Harry Boyer, also endorsed H.R. 10606 by a resolution adopted on March 1, 1962. The resolution follows:

> Whereas the Pennsylvania Board of Public Welfare recognizes that the basic purpose of public assistance is to help those in financial need through circumstances beyond their control; and
>
> Whereas after many years of public welfare services which consisted largely of money payments, President Kennedy and Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Abraham Ribicoff, have proposed a new approach stressing social, health, preventative and rehabilitative services instead of support alone; and
>
> Whereas the Pennsylvania State Board of Public Welfare recognizes the vital impact and the overwhelming importance of the general objectives of this approach as a major turning point in the humanitarian public welfare program as a means of helping the needy toward rehabilitation instead of merely giving them the money which they need; and
>
> Whereas many of the principles of the Kennedy-Ribicoff program have long been recognized in Pennsylvania, and in fact put into experimental operation with such projects as the family rehabilitation program; and
>
> Whereas legislation in the form of House bill 10606 has been introduced in Congress to enable early action to assure that the public welfare program, while recognizing day-to-day needs, will also emphasize the return of individuals to the highest degree of self-sufficiency of which they are capable: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved*, That the Pennsylvania Board of Public Welfare go on record in support of the principles and objective purposes of House bill No. 10606; and be it further
>
> *Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Pennsylvania's Representatives and Senators in the Congress and to other interested parties.

A Tribute to St. Patrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, there have been only a handful of great teachers in the history of man. And if there is anything to the so-called luck of the Irish, I would say it is mainly that they have had the luck to be taught by two of the greats: Our Lord Jesus Christ and Patrick, the patron saint of Ireland.

The principles, of course, were those of Jesus; the instrument of their teaching: Patrick.

Emerging from slavery in Ireland, Patrick entered the church and, as a bishop, returned to the land of his captivity to serve the Lord and at the same time to serve the Irish, under whom he had suffered slavery.

Here was the first great principle of Jesus, set forth by a loving believer: that to punish those who do wrong is nothing compared to showing them the true light and the path to righteousness. This Patrick was able to do through service to the Irish people, converting them—each and every one—to the cause of Jesus Christ, the Saviour.

In the centuries following the death of Patrick, his followers were able to employ his principles to such an extent as to render Ireland one of the outstanding nations of the earth, in the matter of devotion, courage, and the pursuit of democratic principles. Moreover, St. Patrick imbued in the Irish people a spirit of freedom so all engrossing and so permanent, as to prevent their subjugation by any foreign power. True, they have been required on occasison to yield, temporarily, to the power of superior military force. But so great is the Irish spirit and so firm the resolution of the Irish heart that one fact has been borne out, time and again: that the rulers of Ireland cannot rule according only to their whim; that the people will not stand for it, and will in fact demand a popular government based on principles indorsed by the people as a whole.

This is beyond doubt the result of St. Patrick's work. For just as he could not and would not abide the slaveholding policies of his pagan masters, so his followers today refuse to accept the slightest hint of tyranny.

That is Patrick's legacy to the Irish people; that, and their overall faith in the Christian principles he held so dear.

Recognizing the value of his teaching, in the overall struggle for human decency, the freedom-loving peoples of the earth salute his name today—regardless of their faith, regardless of all, save that here was a man—a saintly man—devoted to justice, to learning, to freedom, and to love.

These are qualities respected wherever the name of God is respected; qualities which have established St. Patrick as one of the greatest of all historical figures in the record of human existence.

Bureaucracy in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, an excellent editorial, appearing in my home paper, the Tacoma News Tribune, on March 8, 1962, points out how bureaucratic the actions of departments of government sometimes are. Two representatives of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reached a decision on pollution in the Puget Sound waters after a quick flight in an airplane over the waters. Normally, it should take months of intensive study and research to reach such a decision.

The editorial follows:

[From the Tacoma (Wash.) News Tribune, Mar. 8, 1962]

AFTER A QUICK LOOK

Seventeen days before Thanksgiving Day of 1959 the Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare took a quick look at a report and asserted that weed killer used in Washington cranberry bogs induced cancer in rats. So rats quit eating cranberries and so did people. A year's industry was killed in this State. Later, it developed that a person would have to eat 15,000 pounds of cranberries in a year to be in any danger, that there was no indication any human ever developed cancer from cranberries, and the United States withdrew its order and began helping growers market the berries.

Since then the Interior Department, after a quick look at the Mount Rainier area, determined that overnight lodging should not be at Paradise where the people want it, and picked a location of its own which proved to be not even within viewing location of the mountain. Now the Federal Government is engaging in a joint survey with the State, but still is determined to beat out Paradise.

But now Health, Education, and Welfare is back at it again. After a quick look at Puget Sound from the air, and without adequate scientific information, it has banged the gavel on Washington State pulp and paper producers, indicating they are polluting the waters, although not proving it, and jeopardizing the jobs of thousands of people in a State which is second in the Nation in pulp production. The industry was prejudged and, after a flagstop visit and hearing, was all but prehanged.

We like to be forewarned about what we eat, where to put a hotel, and where to fish. But we want facts, not a slap-on of controls before a fair hearing and fair tests. Three basic Washington industries are at stake here.

Harry Lofton: A Brave American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, sometimes in the maelstrom of life an individual man's bravery shines out as the glitter of a bright, naked sword.

Harry Lofton, U.S. consul in Quito, Ecuador, is such a man.

His raw courage deserves the highest commendation and reflects favorably upon the high traditions of his office. Under the most severe and trying conditions, he led a rescue party to the volcano, El Sangay, in January to search for two lost Americans.

His actions exhibit the brand of courage which developed the frontier of our great Nation.

Harry Lofton is Marine trained, he was a paratrooper during World War II, and he well understands the meaning of survival.

As his Congressman from the First District in South Carolina, I would like to extend to him my warmest personal regards for a job well done.

As most of my fellow Americans, I have never faced death on a lonely, snow-swept volcano. But should God ever decree such a fate upon me, I only pray He will permit men of Harry Lofton's breed to come to my rescue.

Under leave to extend my remarks to the Appendix of the RECORD, I hereby insert a letter from Robert Kaupp, of Santa Barbara, Calif., who was led to safety by the consul.

MARCH 14, 1962.

L. MENDEL RIVERS,
Congressman from South Carolina,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I should like to take this opportunity of thanking you for placing such men as Harry Lofton as U.S. consul in Quito, Ecuador. He did wonderful work in the rescue expedition to the volcano, El Sangay, in Ecuador, last January.

I was lost on this active volcano for 6 days, and Mr. Lofton led a rescue party which found me. He continued searching for my companion, and reached the top of Sangay seeking our tracks in the snow. Mr. Lofton made an outstanding exhibit of humanitarianism, courage, and plain guts. He was the third party ever to reach the top. He had never climbed before in his life, and was in constant danger of avalanches, swirling sulfur fumes, and visibility of 20 feet.

Such an effort to search for two lost Americans in the wilds of the Ecuadoran Andes certainly deserves great thanks, commendation, and reward. May I extend my warmest congratulations to him and to the South Carolinians who placed him in his position.

Sincerely,

ROBERT KAUPP.

Advances in Medical Research and Hospital Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an address which I delivered at a meeting of the Rhode Island State Operating Room Nurses Association, Our Lady of Fatima Hospital Auditorium, North Providence, R.I., on November 21, 1961:

Coming here to speak to you this evening gives me pleasure in a number of ways. First of all, it wast just a little over a year ago that I took part in the dedication ceremonies of the new surgical pavilion here.

Another gratification is the honor you have bestowed upon me in inviting me to be your speaker. My respect for the nursing profession is a very deep and sincere one, and I am honored when I am given an opportunity to speak to any group of nurses, but most especially to a relatively new, but very vital one, such as yours.

Then there is my continuing pleasure at being of help in any way I can to the health profession because I must admit just a trace of envy of all those who have an opportunity to work directly with the people who need health and medical services. Obviously, it is not possible for all of us who are interested in health and medical research to have such a personal and direct contact with suffering people. Personally, however, I have always derived a great deal of satisfaction in working for national programs that are enabling the health professions to do the greatest job in the history of this country.

In the 21 years that I have served the people of Rhode Island as Representative of the Second District, I have been especially mindful of the total responsibility and trust which has been given to me. For the majority of these 21 years, I have had a second—and equally important—responsibility as chairman of the Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations for the Depart-

ment of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Each year, this committee—among other things—helps to determine the levels of the Federal medical research effort throughout the country. Now this may not strike you, on first hearing of it, as a very exciting assignment. But I can assure you that it is—exciting, demanding, and very satisfying. Here, the health needs of the Nation are studied in the greatest detail, and every effort is made to bring the country's health resources up to the levels wanted and needed by the people.

You and I are fortunate indeed to be working in the fast developing field of health and medical research. It is an exciting field. Our people are living longer. Thirty years ago life expectancy in this country was 59 years, and today it is 60½ years. Fifteen years ago, 5 percent of our people were 65 years old; today the proportion of people in that age group is 8.6 percent. Consequently, the field of geriatrics is relatively new, but it is developing rapidly to take care of this growing segment of our population. I am confident that within the next decade the average remaining lifetime at age 65 will be extended by about 2 years, and will continue to increase as we devote more of our resources to research and to application of the knowledge that emerges from it.

Remarkable progress in combating the killing and crippling diseases has been made in relatively few years, and we are on the brink of many new and thrilling medical discoveries.

Consider some of these recent advances—discoveries that would certainly astonish your predecessors of a generation ago:

Cortisone and other steroids have been developed for treatment of rheumatic disease.

We already have vaccines for the prevention of polio and influenza; and we are very close to similar controls for many upper class respiratory infections and for measles.

Radioisotopes have joined other radiation sources and surgery as a means of treating cancer, and a number of chemical compounds either arrest or ameliorate certain forms of cancer.

Just recently you may have heard of the early success of chemical therapy in conjunction with breast surgery for cancer.

We have seen the development and widespread use of an inexpensive public health measure that can cut tooth decay in half.

A wide array of chemical weapons have been discovered and are being tested in the management of high blood pressure.

Dramatic improvement has been made in surgery for congenital heart malformations and hearts damaged by rheumatic fever.

A test for early diagnosis of a form of cancer in women, permitting treatment before it is too late, has been developed and given wide application.

A whole family of drugs permits startling advances in the management of mental illness.

Many of these advances have come about because of what has happened in this country in the past 15 or 20 years to meet the needs and take advantage of the opportunities for better health through medical research. Made aware of the situation, our citizens have clearly indicated a willingness to pay for research, for the expansion and improvement of health facilities—research laboratories and hospitals, for training more men and women to do research.

As an illustration of the growth of Federal support for biomedical research over the past few years, let me give you a few figures. In 1946, a little over $780,000 was appropriated by the Congress to support 50 research projects. Now, 15 years later, the budget contains almost $336 million for the support of about 12,000 research projects in nearly every nonprofit research center in the country. Take another example. Funds for training men and women in medical research have increased over the last 15 years from a meager $40,000 to almost $148 million in fiscal year 1962. These funds have provided training opportunities—fellowships, traineeships, training grants—for thousands of bright young people who are today making great contributions to our fund of health knowledge and who have the potential for even greater things in the months and years ahead.

With the current and anticipated growth of research manpower, and with the growing numbers of Americans needing varied types of medical care, the need has increased for medical research facilities—hospitals, laboratories, training centers. Consequently, an appropriation of $30 million has been made annually for the past 5 years for the health research facilities construction program. This program has been so successful and has stimulated private efforts to such an extent that the level has been increased to $50 million. As in the past, the allotted sums will be matched by the locally raised funds.

This represents true progress. We in Congress have been working hard to get these levels raised meaningfully. We have been grasping the opportunities, and we feel we have been meeting the needs—but now, today, there is a move on in Washington to cut these funds by $60 million. From what I can determine, this will mean that at least $25 million will be cut from research projects, and the program to develop clinical research centers will suffer to the extent of $15 million. Over $10 million will be held back from the training of research scientists for tomorrow, and more than $7 million will be cut from the National Institutes of Health's own direct operations. This is not progress.

I want the people of my home State to know that I vigorously protested this proposal when I spoke at the Second National Cancer Chemotherapy Conference in Washington recently. In addition, I sent telegrams of protest to the President and to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Abraham Ribicoff.

I have been heartened by the President's personal interest in health and medical research, and I believe he is most serious in his efforts to increase the amount of work being done in biomedical research. I am confident that when the President has full knowledge of the facts, he will take steps to make sure that these funds—which were voted by the Congress only after the most critical appraisal of the needs—will be made available for the benefit of people throughout the Nation.

These are some of my reactions to any proposals for cuts in our outlays for research and related activities. Those of you who bring health services directly to the people have an opportunity to see firsthand the needs for more research, new knowledge, better facilities, and modern equipment. Many of our country's hospitals are over 50 years old, and many suffer from loss of efficiency because of inadequate physical plants. Two percent of our general hospital beds become obsolete each year, representing an annual loss of approximately 9,500 general hospital beds. Added to this, we need 30,000 new beds each year merely to keep pace with our annual population increase.

To bring all of our hospitals up to date at once would probably mean an all-out crash program, leaving behind for a time all of the other types of construction—schools, roads, and so forth—and reducing many other important Federal projects. This, of course, is not possible. But great progress, has been made, nevertheless, as a result of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act of 1946, better known as the Hill-Burton program. This program helps the States to supply their citizens with needed facilities for adequate hospital and medical services, and also assists the States to utilize their existing health services and facilities to better advantage. I would like to take a few moments to bring you up-to-date on this program. As you may know, all types of hospitals, public health centers, diagnostic and treatment centers, rehabilitation facilities, nursing homes, State health laboratories, and nurses' training facilities are eligible for assistance.

The hospital and medical facility program consists of two phases: the survey or planning stage, and the actual construction. Here in Rhode Island the Department of Health is the administrator. When it approves a project, based on a study of community need and development of a statewide plan for such facilities, the institution concerned may apply for Federal funds on a matching basis in support of its construction project. Federal funds may be given as an outright grant or as a long-term loan, depending upon the requirements of the institution requesting them.

By the end of last December 5,390 projects had been undertaken and the estimated cost of these new facilities, or improvements in existing structures, amounted to more than $4½ billion. The Federal share of these funds includes a little more than one-third of the total. These improvements and additions supplied 226,842 beds in 1,496 units. However, though there is a total of more than a million available hospital beds, this number is 1 million short of the need.

In Rhode Island alone, more than $943,000 was allocated for the construction of hospital and medical facilities in the fiscal year ending last June.

Over the past few years, our State has made tremendous progress in establishing itself as something of a health center. I could mention the recent addition here of Our Lady of Fatima, the new Hattie I. Chaffee Nursing Home in East Providence, the Butler Health Center, the rehabilitation facilities at the Rhode Island Hospital, and rehabilitation centers at the State Hospital in Cranston and at the Emma Pendleton Bradley Hospital at Riverside.

These, and more, are examples of how our people here in Rhode Island have been taking advantage of the opportunities to meet the needs for modern facilities to care for its ill and afflicted.

Our scientific investigators in their fight against disease and death, are also attracting support for improvement of health research facilities. For example, Brown University won a grant to construct a psychology research building and a biology research building; the University of Rhode Island received $14,000 for a biology research laboratory; and the Rhode Island Hospital received funds for its cancer research facility.

Rhode Island is in the lead in establishing and developing a most interesting and vital long-term research attack to seek out the causes of cerebral palsy, mental retardation, and other neurological and sensory disorders of infancy and childhood—disorders which afflict 1 in every 16 children born annually in the United States. The investigators hope that the knowledge they gain will make it possible to prevent such disorders, and eventually enable every child to lead a full and useful life.

Expectant mothers, eventually 50,000 of them, will voluntarily take part in this study. During the mother's pregnancy and the child's life from birth until school age, conditions surrounding the child will be recorded, and the children themselves will be observed, examined, and tested. Brown University is 1 of the 16 leading hospitals or medical centers in the country collaborating on this project. I am proud and happy to say that six Rhode Island hospitals and centers are cooperating with the Brown University staff to gather information—Provi-

dence Lying-In, Providence District Nursing Association, the Emma Pendleton Bradley Hospital, the Meeting Street School, the Miriam Hospital, and the Rhode Island Hospital. All of these institutions are working with medical centers throughout the country as well as with the National Institutes of Health. Not only our children here in Rhode Island, but children throughout the Nation will share in the benefits that are certain to emerge from this study. It is more than possible that some of you are contributing data to this vitally important investigation, and I am sure you are aware of the part you are playing in this great undertaking.

Yes, Rhode Island is definitely becoming a center for health and research activities. In fiscal year 1960 there were 43 grants awarded by the National Institutes of Health for research projects in such places as Brown University, the University of Rhode Island, the Emma Pendleton Bradley Hospital, Providence College, the State department of social welfare, and others. The total dollar figure for these grants amounted to almost $1,200,000. The range of investigations covered by these grants is broad—pharmacology, sanitary engineering, sensory diseases, behavioral sciences, cell biology, cancer chemotherapy, hematology, and more—a host of subjects revealing the breadth of interest and the scope of the abilities of our people and our institutions here in the State.

I think you can begin to see, now, why I told you earlier that I consider my committee assignment to be exciting, demanding, and satisfying. To me, there are few greater satisfactions than seeing my efforts translated into better hospitals, better health centers, more scientists studying the causes and treatments of the diseases that threaten us, and better health, strength, and vitality for our great Nation.

If these efforts are to be truly meaningful, I find that I must continually be aware of the needs of the people, of the present state of biomedical research, of hospital facilities and construction, of the opportunities and needs for training, and of many more areas. I find that meetings with groups such as yours are of great value in maintaining my awareness of the attitudes, hopes, and aspirations of those who provide care and comfort for the ill.

Through groups such as yours, I shall continue to search for the best means of meeting the health needs of the people and to carry on the fight to translate these needs into law.

You and I are indeed fortunate. In our individual ways, we have opportunities to improve the health of the people. I know that the progress that you as an organized group have made is only a start for what you can accomplish in the years ahead. In these years, I look forward to a continued association with you as individuals and as a group. I earnestly solicit your advice, your ideas, and your support as they relate to my job; and I can assure you that you have my wholehearted support in behalf of your efforts.

Max Strumpf, Career Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I have learned with much pleasure from the Honorable Stanley O. Styles, able Comptroller of Customs at the Port of New York, of the half century of loyal service of a dedicated public servant, Max Strumpf.

Mr. Strumpf entered the Government service at the customhouse on August 16, 1911, as a messenger boy. He was promoted to the position of clerk in 1917 and advanced to customs liquidator in 1923 and supervisory liquidator in 1949. He was appointed to his present position of Assistant Deputy Comptroller in 1952.

Because of his long experience and wide knowledge, the Bureau of Customs in Washington designated him for special assignments in 1929 to the port of San Francisco, in 1931 to the port of New Orleans, and in 1943 to the port of Laredo. In these districts he assisted the administrative officers in eliminating heavy arrearages in liquidations and was a consultant to establish procedures to expedite the workload.

Mr. Strumpf is a charter member of the National Customs Services Association and the founder of the New York Customhouse Employees Federal Credit Union. He was cited for his efforts in behalf of the U.S. Treasury bond sales program.

A diamond-studded pin for 50 years service was awarded in recognition of his service, presented by Comptroller Styles in the present of his fellow employees on February 28, 1962, at the customhouse.

Mr. Strumpf has lived in the Bronx for over 40 years and presently resides with his wife and family at 1777 Grand Concourse. He is a charter member of the Harvar Society of the U.S. Customs.

The Dedication of the Edward Bratter Memorial Plaque at Columbia University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to be the Representative of the district in which Columbia University is located. Two most significant aspect of the university's program were highlighted at a recent Edward Bratter dedication ceremony there. One is the harmonious association in the pursuit of higher education of American youths of a wide variety of religious faiths. The other is provision for hospitality and guidance for about 2,000 foreign students.

Working together in this unique interfaith project at Columbia are a Protestant minister, a Catholic priest, and a rabbi who are appointed by the university and provided with a special building on the campus. However, their activities are maintained by their own religious groups. In the case of the Jewish counselor the sponsoring group was originally led by the late Justice Benjamin Nathan Cardozo, Judge Irving Lehman, and Arthur Hays Sulzberger. Later other distinguished public-spirited American citizens of Jewish faith served on this board. Among them was a classmate of mine, Edward M. Bratter, an eminent attorney and civic leader. Mr. Bratter's conscientious performance of his professional duties and his unselfish devotion to the advancement of his alma mater and his religion were terminated by his untimely death. His friends and associates arranged to have a plaque in his memory placed in Earl Hall, the interfaith building on the Columbia campus. The dedication of this plaque was accompanied by exercises in which Mr. Bratter's sterling character, warmheartedness, and zeal for the public welfare were clearly delineated.

Pertinent excerpts of remarks at the ceremony follow:

Introduction by Dr. Isidor B. Hoffman, counselor to Jewish students at Columbia University: "This large assembly of Ed Bratter's family and friends and coworkers in good causes have come together for the dedication of this memorial plaque because we loved him and were privileged to be among the host of those he loved and served. We now reverently and affectionately dedicate his plaque which reads: 'In grateful memory of Edward M. Bratter, 1926C, 1928L, ardent Columbia alumnus, devoted to interfaith and Jewish programs, at Earl Hall, February 15, 1962.'

"Edward Bratter played an important role in the advancement of the interfaith and Jewish activities here at Earl Hall. He was a member of the board which sponsored the Jewish counselorship for 20 years, until the day of his death. His keen understanding of its purposes and needs soon won him a place in its inner councils and he served on an informal executive committee together with Arthur Hays Sulzberger, Henry Hendricks, and Abraham M. Davis. He took his duties seriously; every year he would communicate with friends and fellow Columbia alumni requesting the renewal of their financial support which then, as now, was so greatly needed.

"To me personally Ed was a tower of strength, a loyal, dependable friend and helper. He had opinions and judgments of his own, but he was staunch in defense of academic freedom, even for counselors. He resisted pressures whether they came from fraternal orders or from militant partisan religionists. Above all, Ed was a warmhearted, sensitive person; a true human being whose life and works will ever be sacredly cherished in our midst."

Welcome by Mr. George Greenspan: "On behalf of the board of the counselor to Jewish students, I want to welcome all of you here this evening. Your presence is evidence of the high regard you had for the man to whose memory we are paying tribute tonight.

"I met Ed almost 40 years ago. As a matter of fact, I joined in the ritual ceremony that initiated him into our fraternity. In those days the physical aspects of the initiation were, to say the least, rather rigorous, but he bore it all with resigned fortitude.

"Ed was a pleasant, affable fellow, but at the same time, serious minded. He was purposeful and conscientious in all his endeavors. He was no mere dilettante. He applied himself to everything he did with great diligence. We all know of his brilliant record in college and law school. I recall he liked to swim, but this was not enough. He wanted to become quite a good swimmer, and he did. In his life work in law, I know there are others here who can attest to his successful career.

"For many years our paths crossed all too infrequently. However, recently I enjoyed

serving together with him on the advisory board of the counselor for Jewish students. As in all else, he gave so much of himself to this cause.

"I am grateful that I can look back and remember the precious moments that I had the opportunity to spend with Ed Bratter, who was a great guy."

Jerome L. Greene, Esq.: "Ed and I were classmates at Columbia College, members of the class of 1926, so that I met him for the first time as a freshman in 1922. Despite the many years that have passed, I still have in my mind an extraordinarily clear and vivid picture of him as a freshman at Columbia—he was an enthusiastic, eager, energetic, intelligent young man instilled with a burning ambition to achieve the worthwhile goals of life. Even as a freshman, the impact of his personality was unforgettable. It was immediately apparent that he would doubtlessly attain the goals that he had set for himself, and so it was that he was to become an editor of Spectator, an officer of his class, a member of the swimming team, the leader of his fraternity, and a member of Phi Beta Kappa—an outstanding member of his class.

"More important than the honors which were accorded to him and the achievements which he attained during his years at Columbia, Ed gained the admiration of all of us for his qualities of loyalty and devotion to his friends and associates and his attributes of leadership which naturally came about because of the great respect of his classmates for his high standards and ideals.

"After having been graduated from law school, Ed became associated with the firm of Guggenheim, Untermyer & Marshall and after 4 or 5 years, impelled by the desire to achieve success and recognition in his chosen profession, he formed his own law firm with James Marshall as his partner. Some years later it was my good fortune to be invited by Ed to join him in the practice of law. I shall always cherish the days that I spent with him as his partner. Without his leadership his law firm would not have achieved the success that it did, and its continued success today is due to Ed's original efforts.

"Ed did not confine his activities solely to the practice of law, but unselfishly and unstintingly devoted himself to community and philanthropic endeavors. He was to become a member of the school board of the community in which he lived, a member of the board of trustees of the temple, a leader of philanthropic organizations, an active Columbia alumnus and a participant in movements to better interfaith and interracial relationships.

"Ed spent the last day of his life at a dedication ceremony on the Columbia campus. It was most fitting and appropriate that he should spend his last hours in this way. Ed's decease at the height of his career was indeed a tragedy, but all of us should comfort ourselves in the thought that we shall always be inspired by his spirit and his ideals. We hope that the plaque which is being dedicated to his memory this evening shall serve as a reminder to future generations of Columbia students to follow in the tradition of Ed Bratter."

Remarks of Joseph D. Coffee: "Today university administrators hope, indeed almost assume, that most alumni will become active at one or more points in their life in the alumni organization of their college.

"Thirty-five years ago it was rather unique, particularly at Columbia, for a man early in his professional career to assume responsibility as an alumni leader—and then carry it out with satisfaction and results.

"Ed Bratter did, and he continued to do so throughout his life. May I say, though, that it was almost natural for him to do so. His involvement in the affairs of Columbia College started when he was a freshman. Four years later, at graduation, he had built a record of undergraduate accomplishments of an unusual order, a very rare one, then or now. To summarize the most prominent ones let me tell, or remind you, that he was active in his fraternity, Zeta Beta Tau; elected to Phi Beta Kappa; won gold and silver Kings Crowns for extracurricular service; won letters in swimming and water polo; headed numerous class committees; spent 4 years on Spectator, achieving the post of advertising manager; spent 3 years on Columbian, achieving the post of business manager; after 3 years he was named assistant business manager of Blue Book, with all of these important posts arriving at the same time that he was a first-year student in the Columbia Law School.

"As an alumnus, he wore many hats. But I'm sure I'm right in saying that his greatest love was the class of 1926, which he served for over 30 years as vice president, modestly declining theh proffered presidency on more than one occasion.

"He was loved by his classmates and recognized by them as one greatly responsible for making the class of 1926 a giant alumni class. In my 10 years acquaintance with Ed Bratter I know that he never denied a request for service or support from his college.

"His commitment to his college was full, and we who knew him enjoyed his frequent visits to the campus or alumni meetings, although greatly saddened to realize that his death so quickly followed his attendance at a major ground breaking for a new campus building, the fulfillment of which would have been a joy to his heart.

"Our last speaker is Mr. Jaffin, friend and coworker with Ed Bratter at Columbia and in the Jewish community and a member of our board for many years."

Remarks by George M. Jaffin, Esq.: "It can truly be said that to have known Ed was to have loved him. He had a great love for life, for his dear family, for people, for beauty.

"On our many Canadian fishing trips, he talked often of his philosophy of life, and probed deeply for the essential purposes and deep values of existence.

"One of his favorite causes, the interfaith work at Columbia, was originally sponsored by Judge Cardozo and Judge Lehman. Ed worked with intense zeal to help fulfill its objectives. In my opinion, nothing would please him more than to have his friends continue to sponsor and aid this worthy cause.

"No further words of mine could add to the luster of what he has done. Dearly beloved and highly esteemed we will always remember his warmth, his courage, his brilliance, and his love and dedication for everyone and everything fine and good."

Judge Untermyer: "I was privileged to have a long and close friendship with Ed Bratter commencing about 40 years ago and which was followed for several years by his association with the firm of which I was a member. No man was ever more loyal or devoted to his friends and associates. His death was a shock and a loss, not only to me but to all the members of my family who knew him well from early childhood. For myself, I will always remember Ed Bratter and feel honored in his friendship."

Congressman ZELENKO: "As a freshman in the class of 1926, Ed Bratter was the first classmate I met on the subway station at 116th Street and Broadway. As the press reported on the day of his death, he died in my arms on the subway station at 116th Street after we both had attended the laying of the cornerstone at Ferris Booth Hall. I was the last person to be with Ed in his lifetime. He died with a smile which seemed to express a sense of satisfaction that he had been an important cog in the further growth of Columbia."

Closing remarks by Dr. Hoffman: "We now come to the end of these exercises which we trust will have several beneficial results in which Ed would have taken satisfaction. We have expressed our feeling about Ed Bratter and the work here to which he was devoted. We have dedicated this plaque to his memory as an everlasting testimony to his keen perception of the need for enlarging the spiritual dimension of the life of students. We will extend the Edward M. Bratter memorial fund which was recently established with a gift of $5,000 given by his widow, to perpetuate this work especially in the interfaith program for foreign students. Already the law firm with which Ed was associated has contributed $2,600 to add to the fund and some of his friends and family and others who wish to aid us have given amounts ranging from $50 to $1,000. It is our hope that there will be many others who will want to do likewise and thus demonstrate their feeling about him who almost literally, in the words of the Great Emancipator whose birthday we have just celebrated, gave his 'last full measure of devotion' to his Alma Mater."

Brazil's Northeast: A Politically Explosive Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles Keely has recently written a series of articles on the situation in northeast Brazil. Mr. Keely is a capable young newspaperman who has traveled extensively in that critical area. His words convey better than anything I could say the political explosiveness of the poverty and economic oppression that one-third of that huge country's population is experiencing. Following are excerpts from that series:

BRAZIL'S NORTHEAST

University of Recife students sing a song about Brazil, the world's fifth largest nation:

"Brazil was a giant, and the giant was sleeping. One day the giant woke up. To its surprise it found it was only a dwarf."

Nowhere in this South American nation is this song more significant than in the vast nine-State area that composes Brazil's northeast.

Condemned for centuries to subhuman misery, Brazil's northeast has awakened. But it is a rude awakening for the 22 million people who inhabit the northeast's 500,000 square miles. They find themselves caught in a struggle between two young men.

One is a devout admirer of Cuba's Prime Minister Fidel Castro. He has organized the area's huge peasant population into potentially explosive peasant leagues (ligas) which demand better living conditions and threaten violent revolution.

The other, a brilliant economist, has been given free rein by the Government to implement a development plan which he hopes will bring about the same effects peacefully.

TWO MAIN AREAS

Brazil's northeast, more than twice the size of France, is divided into two main areas.

The first is the littoral region. It is a 20-to-30-mile-wide strip along the Atlantic coast. It comprises about 13 percent of the land. Sugar is the principal crop.

The second is the catinga. This is the hinterland. The chief crop is cotton.

The land in the humid littoral, where the main rural and urban population is located, is used poorly. The people it harbors are increasingly dependent on food produced in the catinga, a semiarid region greatly affected by seasonal droughts.

The population growth in the catinga makes that area more and more dependent on an unstable agriculture subject to droughts.

LONG DROUGHTS

Droughts have occurred on an average every 7.3 years since 1559. There have been 55 in all and 14 of them lasted 2 or more years.

Another basic problem is the feudal system of land ownership.

More than half the northeast's land is owned by 2.1 percent of the population. Some states cover more than 400 square miles.

Starving peasants are paid 30 cents a day to cultivate the sugar and cotton. Small boys, many no more than 3 years old, can be seen on the roads carrying pint-sized machetes and loads of sticks or grass on their heads.

Their city cousins fare no better. An elevator operator earns $15 a month; domestic help, between $2 and $10; a secretary, $60, a laborer, $17.

The minimum wage for urban workers is $30, but unemployment is so widespread that employers can cheat and get away with it.

A job opening sign in a factory window will draw a half-mile line of applicants.

Beggars sleep barefoot on every sidewalk.

Horse-drawn and man-pulled wooden carts compete with cars and buses on streets.

The cotton kings and sugar barons who rule the land, want no reform. They are fighting desperately against it.

Theirs is a heritage passed down by Portuguese forefathers 400 years ago.

PERILOUS SITUATION

But they are fighting on two fronts. On one side is the government and its new development agency SUDENE, headed by economist Celso Furtado. Most of SUDENE's reforms are still on the planning board.

And there are the Peasant Leagues, led by State Congressman Francisco Juliao.

The danger-ridden situation in the northeast was mentioned frequently at the recent Punta del Este, Uruguay, Conference on Cuba as observers and diplomats tried to explain Brazil's refusal to support any action against Castro.

The surroundings in the Northeast are desperate. The Communists thrive on desperation.

A CASE STUDY

Joaquim Simoes, like his father and grandfather before him, is a field hand on a gigantic sugar plantation.

But he has something his father and grandfather never had. Someone is interested in Joaquim. The Government of Brazil and the Communists are competing to help him, and to influence him.

Joaquim leaves his wooden shack for work at 5 every morning. With him go two of his six children—Jose, 8, and Julio, 5.

His wife would go to the fields, too; but she is ill.

She stays home with the girls and younger boys.

It is the time of the year when the sugarfields are cleaned for planting. When Joaquim arrives at the field the foreman is measuring off plots of 50 square meters (538 square feet) for each peasant to clean—pulling weeds, clearing rocks and debris. The foreman uses a pole to mark off the plots.

Joaquim knows from experience that the foreman will "jump" with the pole each time he lays it out. He knows the size of his plot will therefore be closer to 75 square meters (807 square feet).

He accepts this from habit.

Joaquim and his sons work from 6 a.m. until 10 a.m. They are given a few beans and rice. They tuck some away for the rest of the family.

At noon they go back, working until 7 in the evening, when they are portioned out a little more food and a handful of dried beef.

Joaquim is entitled to 70 cents for his day's work, but the cost of his food is subtracted. He feels lucky to get 30 cents. Some days he gets nothing.

LITTLE FIDEL

In these primitive, feudal surroundings several years ago Brazil's own "little Fidel" began his agitation of the impoverished peasants.

A lawyer, State Congressman, and small landowner, Francisco Juliao attracted a following with a campaign advertised to protect the workers. In court he argued their cases with the owners of the great landed estates.

It was here, where Joaquim works, that Juliao first organized a Peasant League. In the beginning it had no political overtones.

But in 1960 Juliao went to Havana to see Fidel Castro's revolution. He came home with new ideas. He initiated field offices, won over many professionals and students, and organized "Ligas" throughout the northeast.

LAND REFORM "LIGAS"

Today, it is a revolutionary political movement with strong overtones of Communist "Fidelismo." It is outspokenly devoted to land reform and to proclaiming of virtues of Castro and Red China's Mao Tse-tung.

Peasants contribute 20 cents a month for membership.

It is difficult to fault the Liga platform. The grievances are here. The peasants ask only that they be able to live like human beings.

In Juliao's Ligas today there are some 3,000 hard-core organizers and professionals, according to best estimates. There are tens of thousands of peasants, however, who follow Juliao's line.

In Brazil, these peasants cannot change their lot democratically. Only 15 million out of a nation of 65 million have the vote. Illiterates cannot cast ballots.

Joaquim and his friends know little of communism. But Juliao has made them see that they are among the world's most improverished people.

For years Brazil's governments refused to face up to the problem. In 1958, President Juscelino Kubitschek suppressed an army report on the region. Kubitschek's successor, President Janio Quadros, made it public. The report said:

"It is no longer necessary for us to read the histories of China and India to know the significance and extent of misery. Right here in Brazil there is at this moment a population living on the lowest standard of subnutrition that a people can endure."

Discontent is a fertile area and the Communists are making great strides. The Government is countering with a 5-year development program, but it is encountering vigorous opposition in Congress and from large landowners in the northeast who are profiting from large sugar plantations.

LANDOWNERS IN SPOT

These landowners have threatened retribution if the peasants revolt. The Brazilian Army is committed to the defense of the landowners and has already posted security forces near several potential trouble spots.

Some progressive landowners have attempted to blunt Red propaganda, but without much success. In an effort to fight the Peasant League's Castro-Communist line, one landowner recently showed his workers a U.S. Information Agency film on the Cuban revolution and how Fidel Castro betrayed his countrymen.

"It's a lie," shouted the peasants. They threatened to tear down the screen.

BRAZIL'S ANSWER

If the Communists do not capture Brazil's vast northeast, the credit will belong to an energetic young man with big plans and small funds. He is in a race against time.

Celso Furtado, 41, is the head of Brazil's development program for the northeast. It is called SUDENE (Superintendency of Development of the Northeast.)

Furtado's agency is the first real Government attempt to right the wrongs suffered by the northeast's 22 million people who live in an area larger than 6 of South America's countries.

Furtado and his staff are working around the clock. Sitting behind a 7-foot-long desk piled high with maps, charts, documents, and books, the young economist seems to welcome a respite from work to explain SUDENE's dreams.

FIVE-YEAR PLAN

He outlines a 5-year plan. Two hundred projects are already underway.

"The Brazilian Government has given us 16 billion cruzeiros ($50 million) for 1962," says Furtado. "We would like a lot more.

"For the entire 5-year plan we will receive 132 billion cruzeiros from Brazil and hope to get 103 billion more from foreign sources." (This would total $735 million.)

The financial priorities approved for SUDENE projects are:

1. Electrification.
2. Road construction.
3. Water supply.

Furtado says food shortages are at the root of the northeast's dilemma.

RESETTLEMENT GOAL

"Only by taking a comprehensive view of the food situation can one comprehend the weakness of the northeast's economic system," he says. "The entire region depends on increasingly expensive food and increasingly unstable supplies."

Resettlement is a goal. Furtado told how peasants are moving from arid and semiarid regions toward the humid lands of the State of Maranhao.

"Settlers burn down the forests and start a rudimentary kind of farming. Rice is practically the only cash crop. The tropical soils, deprived of their covering vegetation and put under extensive planting, are rapidly eroded. When the soil is destroyed, people move on to occupy and destroy new land. Those left behind can extract from the exhausted soil hardly enough for survival."

More than 2 million 60-kilo bags of sugar are lost each year in Pernambuco State due to poor equipment and lack of fertilizer.

SUDENE hopes to ease this problem by resettling 1 million people in 5 years.

DONATIONS URGED

SUDENE also hopes to liberate 60,000 hectares (150,000 acres) in the rich Sugar Belt from wealthy landowners whom Furtado claims have more land than they can possibly utilize.

SUDENE has asked landowners to donate land which can be irrigated and colonized. Each peasant family would receive a plot of ground large enough to grow a profitable crop other than sugar.

"Our main problem is money," Furtado explains. "Most of it must come from Brazil.

"But before Brazil can start any agrarian reform the country needs complete administrative and fiscal reform. Brazil loses 50 percent annually on tax collections, 200 billion cruzeiros ($625 million).

"Furtado wants to moralize an immortal government," said a top U.S. official in Rio de Janeiro. "It's a big job."

What Farmers Don't Want

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and an advance copy of an article which will appear in the April 1962 issue of the Farm Journal:

FARM JOURNAL,
Philadelphia, Pa., March 14, 1962.

Hon. CHARLES B. HOEVEN,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: What do farmers themselves want in the way of a farm program—all farmers, regardless of party or farm-organization affiliation?

Farm Journal, the national farm news magazine, asked them in its March issue, and the volume and speed of response were amazing. Four days after the magazine came from the press we had 4,000 ballots back in Philadelphia (and some of this time was taken up by the mail in both directions). Within 6 days we had 11,000. At the end of 2 weeks we were all but buried in more than 50,000 and they're still coming.

Enclosed is the result on 10,000—all we've had time to count so far. We'll go on and count the rest, but we know the figures won't change significantly. We tabulate them by States, by region, by commodity, and by age. All of this will appear as a feature article in our April issue, accompanied by our editorial opinion which you'll find on the back of the folder. All 3 million readers of Farm Journal will get this report next week; we thought you might like an advance look.

As we say in our editorial, polls, especially mail polls, can be faulted in many ways. However, the results of this one were so decisive that even after they are discounted for this reason or that they are still mighty eloquent. We've done farm-policy polls before, in 1959 and 1957. The thing that amazes us is how consistently farmers vote on somewhat similar questions each time. The conclusion can ony be, after awhile, that this is no fluke. Farm Journal itself doesn't agree with the group that says it wants the Government "clear out." This and the No. 2 choice both got a heavy vote. The result that we think is clearest is the emphatic "No" vote on No. 1.

Sincerely,

CARROLL P. STREETER,
Editor, Farm Journal.

HOW YOU VOTED—HOW DOES YOUR CHOICE COMPARE WITH THESE 10,000 READERS WHO VOTED ON THREE DIFFERENT FARM PLANS PRESENTED HERE LAST MONTH?

If those Farm Journal readers who wrote us are typical, the Nation's farmers are overwhelmingly opposed to tighter controls and compulsory quotas on what they raise.

Only 4 percent—4 out of 100—who voted in Farm Journal's March poll favored a compulsory quota program (the main ingredient of the administration's farm plan).

Of our readers responding, 44 percent voted for an expanded voluntary land-retirement program. And 52 percent voted to get the Government clear out.

We were deluged with ballots—50,000 in the first 2 weeks; and still coming. In order to get the results in time for this issue of Farm Journal, we could count only 10,000 ballots. We took these as they arrived, in proportion to the number of subscribers by States.

Altogether, 27 Farm Journal people spent 750 man-hours opening, sorting, and counting these 10,000 ballots. One person, working alone, would need nearly 2 years to handle 50,000 ballots. We will put a crew on it and promptly open and count all ballots and read every letter.

The results from this poll check closely with previous polls by Farm Journal. In 1957, we offered four farm program choices; and in 1959, five. In 1957, 50 percent voted to get the Government out; in 1959, 55 percent voted that way; this year 52 percent.

The 4-percent return for compulsory quotas is the lowest vote for any of the choices over the 3 years.

Among the five Farm Journal editions, eastern readers gave the smallest vote to quotas, and the largest vote to getting the Government clear out. Quotas mustered a bit of support in parts of the western Corn Belt and in Kentucky.

The voluntary land-retirement program did best in the Central States (51 percent) and poorest in the East (32 percent).

Among commodity groups, the land retirement program pulled the most votes among hog raisers—and got the smallest percentage from poultrymen and fruit and vegetable growers.

Poultrymen, who certainly have been in trouble, and for whom the Government is talking about national marketing orders, gave the highest vote for getting the Government out entirely—70 percent. Tobacco growers are least inclined—33 percent—to have the Government step out completely. They've had the most Government (compulsory quotas) of anybody.

Among States, Iowans gave the smallest vote—25 percent—to getting the Government out. This was also true in 1959 when 24 percent of the Iowans voted that way.

Young farmers are more opposed to compulsory quotas than older operators; otherwise, age didn't make much difference.

Age	Quotas	Land retirement	Government out
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
29 and under	2	47	51
30 to 39	4	46	50
40 to 49	4	46	50
50 to 59	5	42	53
60 plus	4	41	55

Many took time to write letters explaining their choices. A large number who wrote were young farmers and small operators who objected to a quota system that would tie them to their present size.

"Quotas wouldn't give a starting farmer a chance; he'd have no prospects of expanding," says Robert Pfeil of South Dakota.

"The big operator would have more of a monopoly than he already has," thinks Noel Sorensen, of Idaho.

Many dairymen complained bitterly about quotas. "I'm a young man who has been struggling along. Now that I have a young dairy started with my sons, they want to tell us we can't farm it, because we didn't have a milk quota for 1961," says Donald Carey, of New York.

Several of those who voted to get the Government out thought that if this were done, the CCC shouldn't dump its surpluses on the market. Others admitted that it might be rough for a time. "I might be the first to go," wrote L. McGinnis, of Alabama, "but somewhere down the line we'd stabilize. I'm willing to bet a lifetime's work that I can knock heads with the hobby farmers and come out on top. I am eager for a try."

Many of those writing in support of compulsory quotas say that it's the only way to get rid of the surplus, and they agree with L. H. Kuhle, of Illinois, that farm programs won't work without controls. "What other business doesn't regiment its production to stay in line with demand?" asks Jay Triplett, of Texas.

HOW THE UNITED STATES VOTED ON THE THREE CHOICES

1. Compulsory Government quotas on what I could sell, or how much land I could farm; stiff penalties, support prices at, or above, present levels.

2. Expanded voluntary land-retirement program to cut crop production; no compulsory quotas or allotments; with supports on crops at a level to stabilize markets but not add to surpluses.

3. Get the Government "clear out"—no controls, no price supports.

State	Compulsory quotas	Land retirement	Government clear out
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Eastern	4	51	45
Connecticut	0	16	84
Delaware	0	45	55
Maine	0	37	63
Maryland	2	35	63
Massachusetts	2	27	71
New Hampshire	0	41	59
New Jersey	6	29	65
New York	3	38	59
Pennsylvania	1	30	69
Rhode Island	11	11	78
Vermont	2	38	60
West Virginia	1	25	74
Central	4	51	45
Illinois	4	50	46
Indiana	1	48	51
Iowa	7	68	25
Kansas	2	47	51
Michigan	2	46	52
Minnesota	7	53	40
Missouri	3	54	43
Nebraska	6	57	37
North Dakota	9	55	36
Ohio	2	37	61
South Dakota	7	48	45
Wisconsin	6	48	46
Southeastern	6	48	46
Alabama	2	47	51
Florida	6	40	54
Georgia	6	50	44
Kentucky	11	59	30
Mississippi	0	52	48
North Carolina	8	46	46
South Carolina	6	47	47
Tennessee	6	51	43
Virginia	4	39	57
Southwestern	3	36	61
Arkansas	2	39	59
Louisiana	2	42	56
New Mexico	0	42	58
Oklahoma	1	40	59
Texas	5	31	64
Western	3	33	64
Arizona	3	8	89
California	3	26	71
Colorado	6	35	59
Idaho	2	43	55
Montana	4	35	61
Nevada	0	10	90
Oregon	2	41	57
Utah	2	49	49
Washington	2	34	64
Wyoming	3	28	69
U.S. total	4	44	52

What different commodity groups want

EASTERN

Kind of farmers [1]	Compulsory quotas		Land retirement		Government clear out	
	United States	Eastern	United States	Eastern	United States	Eastern
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Beef	4	0	42	27	54	73
Dairy	4	3	44	36	52	61
Feed grains	4	1	48	31	48	68
Fruit and vegetables	3	4	31	31	66	65
General	2	0	35	34	63	66
Hogs	4	0	52	25	44	75
Poultry	3	2	27	20	70	78
Sheep	3	0	36	41	61	59
Wheat	4	0	44	39	52	61

CENTRAL

Kind of farmers [1]	Compulsory quotas		Land retirement		Government clear out	
	United States	Eastern	United States	Eastern	United States	Eastern
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Beef	4	4	42	51	54	45
Dairy	4	4	44	48	52	48
Feed grains	4	5	48	52	48	43
Fruit and vegetables	3	4	31	43	66	53
General	2	3	35	48	63	49
Hogs	4	4	52	53	44	43
Poultry	3	3	27	46	70	51
Sheep	3	4	36	40	61	56
Wheat	4	4	44	48	52	48

SOUTHEASTERN

Kind of farmers [1]	Compulsory quotas		Land retirement		Government clear out	
	United States	Southeastern	United States	Southeastern	United States	Southeastern
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Beef	4	4	42	43	54	53
Cotton	5	6	51	57	44	37
Dairy	4	7	44	53	52	40
Feed grains	4	3	48	47	48	50
Fruit and vegetables	3	0	31	24	66	76
General	2	5	35	37	63	58

[1] Main crop or livestock.

SOUTHEASTERN—Continued

Kind of farmers [1]	Compulsory quotas		Land retirement		Government clear out	
	United States	Southeastern	United States	Southeastern	United States	Southeastern
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Hogs	4	6	52	57	44	37
Peanuts	8	5	51	65	41	30
Poultry	3	9	27	31	70	60
Tobacco	13	15	54	56	33	29

SOUTHWESTERN

Kind of farmers [1]	Compulsory quotas		Land retirement		Government clear out	
	United States	Southwestern	United States	Southwestern	United States	Southwestern
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Beef	4	3	42	35	54	62
Cotton	5	4	51	49	44	47
Dairy	4	3	44	48	52	49
Feed grains	4	3	48	31	48	66
General	2	1	35	25	63	74
Hogs	4	2	52	31	44	67
Rice	7	7	33	32	60	61
Sheep	3	0	36	42	61	58
Wheat	4	0	44	40	52	60

WESTERN

Kind of farmers [1]	Compulsory quotas		Land retirement		Government clear out	
	United States	Western	United States	Western	United States	Western
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Beef	4	3	42	32	54	65
Cotton	5	6	51	39	44	55
Dairy	4	3	44	37	52	60
Feed grains	4	1	48	35	48	64
Fruit and vegetables	3	3	31	27	66	70
General	2	1	35	29	63	70
Hogs	4	0	52	27	44	73
Poultry	3	0	27	5	70	95
Sheep	3	0	36	25	61	75
Wheat	4	4	44	42	52	54

Alternative Plan for Raystown Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress will be happy to learn that an alternate recommendation to the proposed multipurpose dam on the Raystown Branch of the Juniata River will cut two-thirds off the cost of the original plan.

The alternate design, as set forth in an editorial in the Johnstown Tribune-Democrat of March 14, will eliminate the costly hydroelectric equipment and provide only the flood control and recreational facilities. Inasmuch as the people of that part of the country prefer to have private industry continue to serve their energy requirements, the revised plan will limit Federal activity to the Government's proper role in reclamation.

Under unanimous consent I wish to insert the editorial "Alternate Plan for Raystown Dam" in the RECORD at this point.

ALTERNATIVE PLAN FOR RAYSTOWN DAM

Louis H. Roddis, Jr., president of the Pennsylvania Electric Co., has presented an alternative plan for a flood control and recreation dam on the Raystown Branch of the Juniata River which deserves the fullest consideration by the board of engineers for rivers and harbors.

This plan not only cuts the cost of the project by some $50 million, but provides at least equal flood control protection and would improve recreational facilities of the area far more than the earlier proposal.

All that would be lost, if it were adopted, is a small amount of hydroelectric power that falls far short of justifying the additional cost. The Penelec studies indicate that the flow of water would permit full power production only 6 percent of the time—that is, for 1 hour and 17 minutes a day.

The dam proposed by Penelec would be farther up the Raystown Branch, leaving untouched hundreds of existing marinas, boat service docks, homes, farms and cottages that would be inundated by the larger dam. The lake that would be created would be about 75 percent as large as that of the more costly project, but it would also be more usable for recreation since its water level would be almost stable between May and September—avoiding mudflats.

This is because with no requirement to produce power, there would be no "drawdown" during the summer months. The reservoir would capture the runoff of the spring rains, providing flood protection, and the water would be available purely for recreation during the season when demand for recreation is at its peak.

We have never been able to understand the spending of a vast amount of money for a small amount of electric power, and for the sake of this power largely destroying the recreational value of the lake by causing a fluctuation of as much as 42 feet in the water level. If the purpose is "cheap" electric power, it can be provided far more cheaply by steam or by lower-cost pumped-storage facilities elsewhere.

The Raystown Branch project requires another look by Federal and State engineers, if it is to make the best use of the potential there for flood control and recreation.

And, since these are the primary purposes in building the dam, it would be a serious mistake to permit an obsession for "public power" to overshadow and perhaps impair the basic utility of this project.

The Agricultural Conservation Program Appropriation for Next Year Should Be $250 Million

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I believe the budget for 1963, which was recently submitted to the Congress is, on the whole, realistic and I support it. However, there is one phase of the agricultural section dealing with the agricultural conservation program to which I would like to take exception.

The President's budget requested an advance authorization for the 1963 agricultural conservation program of $150 million, which represents a reduction of $100 million in the amount which has been available for this vital program during the recent past. Only last week we read of Mr. Khrushchev's disappointment in the Russian farmer's inability to produce sufficient food and fiber to meet the people's needs. In Russia about 50 percent of the workers are engaged in agricultural pursuits. As a consequence, there are not enough workers available to produce the things that make life very pleasant in that country.

The average output per worker in American agriculture has more than doubled in the last quarter century. This is a record of increased efficiency of which we can be very proud and one which can be matched or surpassed in very few places in our entire economy. Our farmworkers are doing their work so efficiently that over 90 percent of our population is available to produce a wide variety of goods and services that make up the American standard of living.

As a boy, I can remember when gullied hillsides, wornout fields and abandoned farms were commonplace in our Nation. If these conditions had been allowed to continue, we would probably find ourselves today in a position similar to that which prevails in Russia where it takes too large a percentage of the available workers to produce the food, fiber, and forestry products needed to keep their population going. Fortunately for us, however, in the mid-thirties the Congress recognized that there was a need to conserve and protect our natural resources of soil, water and woodland and keep them productive for generations to come. To do this, the Congress enacted legislation which created what is known today as the agricultural conservation program. This program has operated as a vital conservation partnership wherein the Government and the farmer join together to perform needed conservation work on the land that is in the national interest, as well as the interest of the farmer.

The agricultural conservation program is based on the very frank acceptance that while needed conservation pays the Nation in the long run, many conservation measures do not offer sufficient and immediate returns to the farmer that are attractive enough to encourage him to get the needed amount of such conservation applied.

The population in the United States is growing at the rate of 1.7 percent per year. In fact, the total U.S. population has more than doubled since 1910 from 90 to 185 million and is expected to exceed 260 million by 1980. At the same time, increasing amounts of our farmland are being used for building new roads, new housing developments, airports and the endless things we see happen around us every day. These developments take more and more farmland out of agricultural production. With a rapidly growing population, a shrinking farm acreage and a need to maintain or to improve our living standards, conservation takes on a very serious aspect for the future. We must maintain our farmland at the highest production level if we are to be assured that future generations of Americans are to have the food, fiber and forestry products needed to live comfortably. This can be done only if the agricultural conservation program and our other fine conservation programs are maintained at substantial levels.

This being the case, I would like to go on record in support of a $250 million advanced authorization for the agricultural conservation program in 1963 in lieu of the $150 million requested in the President's budget.

Address by Harold Jinks, Director, Postmasters and Rural Appointments Division, to the Helena, Ark., Rotary Club, February 28, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, on February 28, the Honorable Harold Jinks, director of the Division of Postmasters and Rural Appointments for the Post Office Department, was the principal speaker at a meeting of the Rotary Club of Helena, Ark., at the time that a gala celebration was being held in Helena and West Helena honoring retiring Postmaster James H. Leighton and the new acting postmaster, Mr. Ray McCarty.

At that time, Mr. Jinks, who is a friend of long standing and a former postmaster at Piggott, Ark., spoke on the Constitution of the United States and the great heritage of freedom which has been bequeathed to American citizens.

It is a pleasure to commend Mr. Jinks' able address to the thoughtful consideration of the Members:

ADDRESS BY HAROLD JINKS, DIRECTOR, POSTMASTERS AND RURAL APPOINTMENTS DIVISION, TO THE HELENA, ARK., ROTARY CLUB, FEBRUARY 28, 1962

Mr. Chairman, members of Rotary and gentlemen, each year we take the time to listen to the Christmas Story. This is a good practice because it makes us realize what Christmas is all about. My remarks today can be compared to the Christmas Story because I am going to talk on the Constitution of the United States, and in doing so call your attention to freedom and all those great institutions of government that are part of our heritage. Just like listening to the Christmas Story once each year, we should listen to remarks about the Constitution also.

George Washington was born in 1732 on February 22; so, recently we celebrated the 230th anniversary of his birth. Many legends, such as cutting down the cherry tree, throwing a silver dollar across the Rappahannock River, and walking out into the snow to pray at Valley Forge, have been associated with this great man. He was the commanding general in our war of deliverance from Great Britain. He was our first President. We have immortalized the cliche "first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen." We honor him by the recognition of his birth with a national holiday. The great seat of Government, our National Capital, was named in his honor, shortly after his death, in 1800. The Washington Monument, that majestic marble spire, is visited by hundreds of thousands of people, from all over the world, each year. Mount Vernon, his home, is a national shrine. Several years ago I visited his grave with a group that included the late beloved Veep, Alben Barkley. This great man from Kentucky stood at the entrance to the grave and with tears streaming down his face, said "There lies the only man who was indispensable in the history of the United States of America."

When the Articles of Confederation were drawn up and adopted in 1781, it was found that the United States were actually thirteen separate little nations. There was no central power to settle disputes—and there were disputes. New York and Connecticut got into a border dispute because the citizens of one State were going over the boundary line and cutting firewood and hauling it back across the State line. The Governor of New Jersey called out the militia to keep the vegetable farmers of Delaware and Maryland from bringing their produce into his State and glutting the market. The biggest row occurred between Virginia and Maryland over the jurisdiction of commerce on the Potomac River. Maryland had been given the river with the establishment of the southern, or the Virginia bank of the Potomac as the Maryland boundary line. Virginia boat, barge, and ship owners were given a rough time by their Maryland neighbors. After a series of meetings in Gadsby's Tavern in Alexandria, a delegation went to Mount Vernon for the purpose of consolidating an approach that would attempt to iron out differences between the several States.

The Mount Vernon Pact was drawn up and an invitation was sent to Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland to attend a meeting in Annapolis. The purpose of this meeting was to attempt to regulate commerce between the States. Maryland refused to attend. The States that did send delegates decided to call a convention in Philadelphia where all the States would be asked to send representatives. Our history books are very definite in recording the fact that the original purpose of the Annapolis convention, and the larger meeting in Philadelphia, was to amend the Articles of Confederation. We can find no record, prior to the gathering of delegates in Philadelphia on May 14, 1787, that the Articles of Confederation would be junked, so to speak, and a different type of government would be formed. We do know that only Rhode Island abstained by refusing to send delegates to the conference. The 12 States that were represented sent a total of 55 delegates. These delegates were all leaders. They represented a complete cross section of

the country from the standpoint of economy and vocation. Lawyers, politicians, planters, merchants, bankers, soldiers, businessmen, physicians and philosophers were there to belabor their opinions. A total of 39 delegates, of the 55 who attended the convention, signed the Constitution when it was completed on September 17, 1787, 4 months and 3 days after the convention began.

When the convention opened, the first order of business was to elect a presiding officer. The election of George Washington, the austere, dignified, and aristocratic Virginian as President of the Convention, was the only unanimous opinion expressed by the delegates during the long, hot summer while the Constitution was being conceived and born.

The preamble sets the tone for the 7 articles of the original Constitution and the 22 amendments that have been adopted. Please listen to this:

"We the People of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, ensure Domestic Tranquility, provide for the common Defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do Ordain and Establish this Constitution for the United States of America * * *" and so it began.

British Prime Minister Gladstone described our Constitution as "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

It has been called the most successful example in history of a legal instrument that has served both as a safeguard of individual freedom and as the strong right arm of national unity. This is the 175th year since it was written and it's still a great living document, meeting the needs of this great, powerful, growing, domestically healthy, technologically advanced, self-governing Republic of 185 million people. Its continuity, its durability, its flexibility, its underlying democratic wisdom, its protection of the rights and the dignity of each and everyone of us, causes all of those who have studied it and observed it to say that there is nothing quite like it anywhere else in the world.

George Washington called it, in 1794, "That precious depository of American happiness, the Constitution of the United States." On another occasion the first President said "The warmest friends and the best supporters the Constitution has, do not contend that it is free from imperfections; but they found them unavoidable, and are sensible; if evil is likely to arise therefrom, the remedy must come hereafter; for in the present moment it is not to be obtained; and, as there is a constitutional door open for it, I think the people, for it is with them to judge, can, as they will have the advantages of experience on their side, decide with as much propriety on the alterations and amendments which are necessary, as ourselves. I do not think we are more inspired, have more wisdom, or possess more virtue, than those who will come after us. The power under the Constitution will always be in the people. It is entrusted for certain defined purposes, and for a certain limited period, to Representatives of their own choosing; and, whenever it is excuted contrary to their interest, or not agreeable to their wishes, their servants can and undoubtedly will be recalled * * *."

Thomas Jefferson, that outspoken champion of the rights and the protection of the individual, thought the Constitution had some good features but needed amending. In a letter to James Madison, his coworker in the cause of human rights and personal dignity, Jefferson said: "I like very much the general idea of framing a government, which should go on of itself, peaceably, without needing continual recurrence to the State legislatures. I like the organization of the Government into legislative, judiciary, and executive. I like the power given the legislature to levy taxes, and for that reason solely, I approve of the greater House being chosen by the people directly. For though I think a House so chosen, will be very far inferior to the present Congress, will be very illy qualified to legislate for the Union, for foreign nations, etc., yet this evil does not weigh against the good, of preserving inviolate the fundamental principles, that the people are not to be taxed but by representatives chosen immediately by themselves. I am captivated by the compromise of the opposite claims of the great and little States, of the latter to equal, and the former to proportional influence. I am much pleased too," Thomas Jefferson further commented, "with the substitution of the method of voting by person, instead of that of voting by States; and I like the negative given to the Executive, conjointly with a third of either House; though I should have liked it better, had the judiciary been associated for that purpose, or invested separately with a similar power. There are other good things of less moment * * *."

And then Jefferson, in his letter to Madison, wrote "I will now tell you what I do not like. First, the omission of a bill of rights, providing clearly, and without the aid of sophism, for freedom of religion, freedom of the press, protection against standing armies, restriction of monopolies, the eternal and unremitting force for the habeas corpus laws, and trials by jury in all matters of fact triable by the laws of the land, and not by the laws of the nations * * *. And say, finally, whether peace is best preserved by giving energy to the government, or information to the people. This last is most certain, and the most legitimate engine of government. Educate and inform the whole mass of the people. Enable them to see that it is their interest to preserve peace and order, and they will preserve them. And it requires no very high degree of education to convince them of this. They are the only sure reliance for the preservation of our liberty. After all, it is my principle that the will of the majority should prevail. If they approve the proposed constitution in all its parts, I shall concur in it cheerfully, in hopes they will amend it, whenever they shall find it works wrong."

Thomas Jefferson wrote the letter to his friend Madison in December 1787, only 3 months after the adjournment of the Convention when the Constitution was written and signed.

The first 10 amendments to the Constitution make up the Bill of Rights that Jefferson had written about. They were adopted at the first session of Congress, and were declared to be in force in December 1791, less than 4 years after Jefferson demanded their enactment. Since the first amendment covers so many rights that we take for granted, perhaps we will have a greater appreciation of Thomas Jefferson and his tremendous influence in getting the Bill of Rights adopted when we consider the fact that he was in Paris as Ambassador to France when the Constitution was written in Philadelphia. The first amendment, although only 45 words in length, gives us five rights that Jefferson called fundamental. * * * Listen to it: Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances. In 1800, while he was campaigning in his successful race against John Adams, Thomas Jefferson said "Our national Constitution, the ark of our safety, and grand palladium of our happiness." His Bill of Rights had been adopted.

When the question of democracy was debated, during the writing of the Constitution, an unusually large number of the delegates were very skeptical and some of them were even hostile. Edmund Randolph, the distinguished looking young Virginian was one of the most vigorous debaters on the dangers of democracy and the need to curb the people. Eldridge Gerry, a very wealthy delegate from Massachusetts, said "The evils we experience flow from the excess of democracy." Rufus King, also from Massachusetts, agreed with him.

The brilliant and wealthy Gouverneur Morris of Pennsylvania said, in opposing democracy, "The people never act from reason alone, but are the dupes of those who have more knowledge."

Alexander Hamilton, who later on was appointed Secretary of the Treasury by President Washington, was very contemptuously outspoken in his hostile fight against democracy. He spoke of "the imprudence of democracy because the people seldom judge or determine right."

The cause of democracy, which we interpret as the cause of the people to run the government, had very few champions when the original Constitution was written in 1787. James Madison, friend and disciple of Jefferson, was one of the few who had implicit faith in the people. He said "The great fabric to be raised would be more stable and durable if it should rest on the solid foundation of the people themselves." Another of the very few champions of democracy was old George Mason, aristocratic Virginia liberal, who observed philosophically that the upper classes had always been selfish and indifferent to human needs, and he warned against going to extremes. "We ought to attend to the rights of every class of people," Mason said. He refused to sign the Constitution when it was finished because it failed to include a bill of rights and, too, because it failed to grant freedom to the slaves. If the latter had been done, we would have been spared the Civil War and I wouldn't suffer the indignity of admitting that my grandfathers took a lickin'.

When the Constitution was written and the 10 amendments, called the Bill of Rights, were added there were only 13 States laying along the Atlantic seaboard. The total population was only 3 million people. There wasn't a foot of cement or asphalt road in the United States. There wasn't a foot of railroad track or a single steamship or automobile, or airplane, or telephone, or radio or television set. After 171 years since the Bill of Rights were added we have seen fit to amend the Constitution only 12 times. Today we have the happiest, best paid, people enjoying the highest standard of living anywhere in the world. The 13 States with the 3 million people have grown to 50 States with over 185 million people. We have more comfortable homes, more automobiles, more surplus food, more TV sets, more radios, more telephones, more airplanes, more bathtubs, more freedom, and more human compassion for the rights of people to live their own lives than any other nation or groups of nations on this spheroid shaped planet that we call the earth.

We have proved that democracy can, has, and will work. We have shown the world that the people of the United States of America, in spite of the great amount of energy given to the Government, continues to be the boss of that Government. We have proved, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that the Bill of Rights, the protector of the individual, is perhaps the noblest and most massive achievement of American democracy.

It seems as though we have had divine guidance in the selection of those people who serve us. Every man that we have elected President of the United States has been a man of honor and a man of loyalty in upholding and protecting the Constitution of the United States. It was my privilege to claim as a close personal friend that

great man with the granite character that we reverently called Mr. Sam. I remember one night, while driving through a blinding rainstorm in southern Oklahoma, Mr. Rayburn was reminiscing about his many years in the House and particularly about the character and the loyalty of the several thousand men that he had served with. This man, one of the most partisan political people that I have ever known, told me that he would have fingers left on one hand if he counted the men that he had served with that he was not positive about their 100 percent loyalty to our form of Government, and to the people that they represented.

Nevertheless, there remain those who are still skeptical of democracy, so each one of us, who are proud of our heritage and believe in the great institutions of personal liberty, as contained in the Bill of Rights, has a solemn obligation to stand up and be counted on every occasion. We know what it means to be an American. During World War II I had the experience of being on each one of the five major continents. I don't have to be instructed to hate some ism that would like to overthrow the system of government that's been my experience to enjoy during my lifetime. It's my humble and sincere belief that the great mass of our people are proud of their heritage. They will live up to all the historical traditions of this country if they are called on to do so. It does disturbe me to read that a Member of Congress, only this month, found just 7 out of the 30 people he interviewed who knew where to find the Bill of Rights. This happened in Washington, D.C. Perhaps that's par in Washington but I'll bet part of the tea in China that the percentage of those who would have known where to find the Bill of Rights would have been higher in my home town—Piggott, Ark.

Thanks very much for allowing me the time to talk about the greatest document of government ever designed by the mind of man. My father was a tenant farmer but to me he was a great man. He was the most thoroughly honest man that I have ever known. He was the hardest working man that I have ever known. He had an intense pride in his heritage. He believed in this great country. He taught his ten children to love the United States of America. He was so rich in a rock-life strength of character that caused him to live a life of respect and loyalty of, and participation in, his Government. I'll never forget something I heard my Dad say one time at a Fourth of July picnic. He heard a choral group sing God Bless America. When they finished the beautiful patriotic lyrics by Irving Berlin, he said "I can't sing a lick but I'm going to learn the words of that song and say them as a fervent prayer of thanksgiving to God for seeing to it that I was born an American." I can add my prayer to his with the hope that it shall ever be and that all of us are thankful to God for our American heritage. And thank you for your very kind attention and indulgence.

Communist Seapower in the Western Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the growing seriousness of Communist aggression in southeast Asia, and much of the Western Pacific, confronts the free world with a profound problem.

The non-Communist nations, in order to resist successfully and ultimately defeat the Red incursions, must understand the strategic implications of the struggle which is now taking place in Asia.

One of the most concise analyses of strategic developments in the Far East appeared as the lead article, in the February 1962 issue of the VFW American Security Reporter. The article, "Communist Seapower in the Western Pacific," by Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, director, National Security and Foreign Affairs of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, clearly sets forth the strategic importance of the growth of Communist seapower in the Pacific and the manner in which this rising Red seapower can affect the conflict taking place in that vital area of the world.

The VFW American Security Reporter is the well-known monthly publication of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. It is published under the direction of Mr. Robert E. Hansen, of Minnesota, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

I believe this article is particularly important in that it discloses the little known, but truly significant growth of the Red Chinese submarine fleet. This submarine force, provided by the Soviet Union, gives greater flexibility to Red sea power in the Orient and compounds the strategic problems facing the anti-Communist nations resisting Red aggression in southeast Asia.

As this article also points out, the growing Communist undersea fleet in the Western Pacific emphasizes the continuing danger to the West in permitting the continuance of the great power vacuum that exists in the Indian Ocean. Should Communist sea power fill that vacuum, such a development would constitute a severe and perhaps irreparable blow to the free world. Because of its timeliness and fundamental importance I believe that this article, "Communist Sea Power in the Western Pacific," will be of special interest to the Members of this House. The article from the VFW American Security Reporter of February 1962, follows:

COMMUNIST SEAPOWER IN THE WESTERN PACIFIC

(By Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, director, National Security and Foreign Affairs, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States)

One of the most important aspects of Communist expansion has been the emergence of the Soviet Union as the second-ranking seapower of the world. Creation of the Red fleet, including what is by far the largest number of submarines in any navy today—probably over 400—is strategically attuned to extension of communism beyond the limits of Eurasia.

It took Russian czarist imperialism about two centuries to move from the Urals eastward to the Pacific. The base of Russian seapower on the Pacific was Vladivostok, the strategically situated harbor which czarist Russia obtained, along with the maritime provinces, through diplomatic sleight of hand, from a dying Manchu dynasty of China. The Soviet Union is the beneficiary of czarist imperialism. Thus the Kremlin strategists have at their disposal Vladivostok, from which seapower can be projected toward southeast Asia and Oceana.

Reports of increasing Communist submarine activity along the southeast peninsula of Asia have particular significance in view of the unrelenting Communist drive down the Laos corridor toward South Vietnam and ultimately the goal of Singapore.

Red submarine activity involves units of a growing Chinese Communist undersea fleet. While this is still relatively small compared to the submarine count of the United States and the Soviet Union, there are, reportedly, enough Chinese Communist submarines to complicate the strategic picture as the West views these events in Asia. Of course, the source of such Chinese submarines, of necessity, must be the Soviet Union. Red China, fighting a so far losing battle for an adequate food supply at home, and well behind the schedule for the great leap forward of industrialization, has not yet reached the point of industrial strength required of a modern, highly technological industry. And so, while the ideologic conquest as to who is the best Communist continues between Mao and Khrushchev, and while some cracks in the monolithic structure of world communism are apparent, there is still a broad base of common interest between the Soviet Union and Red China in furthering their conquest of Asia.

The existence of Chinese Communist submarines adds to the seriousness of the naval situation in western Pacific and southeast Asian waters. The increasing frequency with which units of the Soviet Navy have been making their appearance in this contested area has underlined the danger posed by possible loss of the Singapore base to the West. Now the seriousness is compounded by a small but significant number of Red Chinese submarines.

If, through internal political developments or as a result of the Communist military drive down the southeast Asian peninsula—or as the result of both actions—Singapore should fall to Red control, the U-boats of the Soviet Union and Red China would have access to one of the finest naval bases in the world. Not only would Singapore provide a convenient harbor for shelter and maintenance, but Red submarines operating from that base would be in a favored position in seeking to sever wartime convoy routes through the Straits of Malacca. Also, the southward flow of Russian and Red Chinese naval units to Singapore would eventually mean that Red naval power would flow into the Indian Ocean. There, unfortunately, a vast power vacuum exists as a result of the virtual disappearance of the British Navy in those waters. For almost two centuries it was British seapower that dominated the Indian Ocean. Now that the Royal Navy has virtually abandoned these waters, seapower control of the Indian Ocean is the prize for whatever nation grasps it first.

This points up the danger of Russian and Red Chinese seapower which, in the broad, strategic sense, is on the verge of moving in numbers into the Indian Ocean. These same considerations demonstrate the imperative necessity of the establishment of a U.S. Indian Ocean Fleet.

Lisbon Tries Amends for Past in Angola

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully commend the attention of colleagues to the third article in a series of six by Robert E. Estabrook, of the Wash-

ington Post, who has done an objective report on Portugal and the Portuguese provinces in Africa:

CHANGES HAVE TO COME FAST—LISBON TRIES AMENDS FOR PAST IN ANGOLA

(By Robert H. Estabrook)

LONDON.—Nelly Subtil is the vivacious young wife of the secretary to the Governor of the Uige District of Angola. She lives at Carmona, a small town in the center of some of the killings and counterkillings in the Angolan terrorism last year.

Mrs. Subtil also is in charge of an interracial nursery school and an orphange caring for children whose parents were slain, is a moving spirit in the Red Cross program to furnish clothing to returning African refugees, and is a sort of unofficial greeter of foreign visitors.

She is typical of the Portuguese efforts in Carmona and elsewhere in northwest Angola to make amends for previous deficiencies of policy and practice and to give the Africans a new stake as citizens of a multiracial country.

These efforts are proceeding rapidly, with the construction of new villages, or senzalas, to house 2,000 to 3,000 persons in concentrations large enough to permit more nearly adequate public education and medical care facilities. Social welfare programs are being undertaken even while the army still contends with occasional guerrilla raids.

On the night of last March 15 a wave of terrorism suddenly engulfed northwest Angola. Members of the Bakongo Tribe, which extends across the border into the Congo, broke into fanatical violence.

Africans who had worked peaceably for decades alongside Portuguese plantation operators and managers became virtual fiends, attacking white Europeans and other Africans as well with field knives and similar crude weapons. From 1,000 to 1,500 Africans and Europeans died in the massacres, many of them horribly mutilated.

The response was even more terrifying. White residents whose families had been hacked to pieces reacted in hot blood to kill Africans indiscriminately. It is impossible to obtan reliable figures, but perhaps 10,000 or more Africans met death in the counterattacks before the army was able to restore order.

Why did these things happen?

The reasons are as complex as the contradictions of Portuguese policy in Angola. One cause certainly was resentment by Africans of abuses by Portuguese white traders who had gypped them in financial deals and to whom they were indebted in a sort of peonage.

OTHER PROBABLE CAUSES

Another cause probably was the past requirement that African farmers grow cotton and sell it to the Government at low prices. Still others may have been the contract labor system whereby native chiefs recruited men to work far away from home, and the occasional habit of local administrators of impressing Africans temporarily for work on the roads.

But these grievances had been of long standing, and they do not constitute a satisfactory explanation of the sudden fury. There is much evidence that the terrorism starting March 15 had been organized outside Angola by the Union of the People of Angola, headed by Holden Roberto, an expatriate now living in Leopoldville.

Roberto's original demands had been for a redress of grievances, although subsequently he insisted upon full independence of Angola from Portugal. There is considerable indication that he was and is supported by other countries of west Africa.

Previously, in February, there had been other uprisings, including one at Luanda attributed to the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA), headed by Mario de Andrade, another expatriate who at that time had his headquarters in Conakry, Guinea. Andrade is thought—and by foreign observers as well as Portuguese officials—to have Communist connections and support.

SOME 20 BEATEN TO DEATH

As a result of the Luanda incident, some 20 Africans were beaten to death in a cemetery. Subsequently the American consulate was stoned by a white mob and, apparently because of a misunderstanding, the car of Consul William G. Gibson was thrown into the bay.

Whether the MPLA raid forced the hand of the then more moderate UPA is still in question. At any rate, when the terrorists struck in the north they appealed not only to resentments and to Bakongo tribalism, but also to superstition and religious fetishism. Attackers apparently believed that they were immortal.

What surprised the Portuguese, and subsequently embittered them, is that world attention was focused almost wholly on the response rather than on the initial savagery. The Mau Mau murders nearly a decade ago in Kenya, beginning on a far smaller scale, brought extensive condemnation.

One explanation of the difference probably is the unpopularity of Portugal's dictatorial government and its almost unique ability to repel others by its self-righteous defiance. But another surely is the existence of a faction of world opinion, some of it led by dictators, that condones a sort of racism in reverse and justifies any sort of violence in the name of "liberation."

ARMY PUTS DOWN TERROR

Anyhow, the Portuguese Army (itself multiracial, with many Africans) proceeded methodically to put down the terror. Col. Santos Paiva at Negage, a small town east of Carmona used as a military headquarters, explains that most of northern Angola has now been pacified except for a small area inland from the coastal mountain range where intermittent raids continue.

Others say that a hard core of about 4,000 guerrillas remains to cause difficulties. The army has restored communications and has cutback the grass and brush that make ideal hiding places for guerrillas along the roads. But armored Jeeps still accompany most vehicular movements out of town.

Carmona, Negage, and other towns more directly affected by the hostilities resemble American frontier posts of a century ago. Military patrols and sandbagged buildings and farm homes are reminders of the constant alert. In Carmona, there were only 18 soldiers when the attacks occurred.

There also are many reminders that the brunt of the violence and destruction fell upon the African population. Whole villages of people who had worked with the white settlers were burned and razed. The shells of what once were substantial native homes now stand empty.

REFUGEES RETURNING

Perhaps 180,000 Africans fled the area affected by terrorism, some going farther south in Angola and others going north into the Congo. Many of these have now returned, and other refugees are trickling in. They receive government help in establishing new homes in the senzalas now under construction.

Life has resumed more or less normal proportions on the coffee plantations and grain and cattle farms in northwest Angola. Many are operated by white settlers, although Africans also own and cultivate farms.

African labor is imperative to the success of the larger enterprises. The system is thoroughly paternal, but it is by no means slave labor. Workers are paid reasonable wages by local standards and enjoy many welfare benefits for their families.

The astute Governor of Uige District, Maj. Rebocha Vaz, is very much aware, however, that more must be done. Education, reconstruction and new opportunity are imperative. These will require far more money, perhaps from foreign sources.

MAY SERVE AS PROD

The terrorism, he believes, served in the net as a timely prod. Portugal will have to prove that a multiracial society can benefit all, and change will have to come very fast.

Meanwhile, the efforts at reconciliation continue. One day recently there was a baptism ceremony for orphans at the local Catholic church in Carmona. Gov. Rebocha Vaz, Mrs. Subtil, the local battalion commander and others stood up as foster parents of the tiny Africans whose mothers and fathers had been killed.

Several of the children bore marks of violence. One had a long head scar where he had been struck with a field knife wielded by a terrorist.

At the church, and afterward while cake and other treats were served at the orphanage, the atmosphere was one of unmistakable love and concern for the children. One toddler named Romeo, who wandered back and forth among his new-found family with a broad grin, stole the show.

L.B.J. and Vice Presidency Growing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the role of Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON in national and international affairs continues to be very important and significant. He continues to do an outstanding job for the Nation, occupying an expanding role and serving in ways that are without precedent. I submit herewith a very timely editorial from the Abilene, Tex., Reporter-News, of February 24, 1962:

TIME, POST FIND L.B.J. AND VICE PRESIDENCY GROWING

It is interesting, and presumably a coincidence, that two of the Nation's top weekly magazines this week published stories on Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON.

"The New LYNDON JOHNSON," Saturday Evening Post titled its feature treatment of the Texan.

"The Vice Presidency—L.B.J.'s Changed Role," was the way Time magazine headed its story.

Both deal with the changes in the man and his job in the last 13 months, but the Post further puts emphasis on the prospect of JOHNSON's being the Democratic nominee for the Presidency in 1968.

Time describes "a profound change" in the life and role of L.B.J. in the past 13 months. Two predictions made in 1961 proved false: that he would continue to run the Senate as Vice President, and that President John Kennedy would give JOHNSON little attention.

Instead, JOHNSON presides over, but does not run the Senate, and Kennedy "is tireless in his efforts to keep LYNDON busy and happy," Time says.

Time points out that JOHNSON is the only administration official except White House Aid Ted Sorensen who regularly attends Cabinet meetings, National Security Council sessions, the weekly White House conference

with legislative leaders, and the briefings before Presidential press conferences.

The Post devotes more space and detail to JOHNSON's evolution on the Vice Presidency.

It says the Vice Presidency has provided JOHNSON with an acceptable way to continue his campaign to become President in 1968.

It is found that part of the process has been a gradual change in the man himself, the Post says. The "old" LYNDON—stalker of the cloakroom, brilliant manager of legislation and votes—has given way to the new LYNDON—executive consultant, policy administrator, foreign emissary.

The Post noted that "the upgrading of the Vice Presidency under Eisenhower has been accelerated under Kennedy. Where Nixon made good-will trips abroad, JOHNSON has been granted personal discretion to bargain on foreign missions."

JOHNSON has acted as the President's personal emissary on a number of missions abroad, the most important being the tour of Asia and the critical hurry-up trip to bolster West Berlin morale last August.

The Post closes with the observation that "While JOHNSON waits, he has the confidence of a man who has created new dimensions for his job while protecting himself from its traditional traps."

Time and Post were in basic agreement that the Vice Presidential role has increased under JOHNSON even above what Eisenhower and Nixon brought to it.

That is a valid conclusion, but it is more than that. It is a happy situation for the welfare of the Nation, for in these times of critical nuclear danger and diplomatic stress, the Vice President must be close to the center of knowledge and power should tragedy strike the President. It should not be otherwise.

The United States at the World's Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include herein an editorial which appeared in yesterday's New York Times, entitled "The United States the the World's Fair":

[From the New York Times, Mar. 14, 1962]

THE UNITED STATES AT THE WORLD'S FAIR

President Kennedy asked Congress yesterday for $25 million to build and furnish with exhibits a United States pavilion at the New York World's Fair, which is scheduled to open April 22, 1964. He thus confirmed his earlier promise of support. Now it is up to Congress to do promptly what has been too long delayed: endorse the planning and construction of a showcase that will document before the world our way of life.

It is not easy making a world's fair. But Robert Moses and his organization have dogged confidence in the final success that this enterprise deserves. We are now past the midway point between start of basic planning and the opening day celebration, when an expected 70 million visitors will begin coming through the gates.

The contracts and commitments by nations, by States, by business and industry guarantee an exciting show. It would be unthinkable for the United States to go into this half-heartedly, or fail to provide a pavilion appropriate to the occasion. Time is wasting. There is no excuse for any serious delay on this question in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the New York World's Fair is located in the congressional district I have the honor of representing in Congress, I was naturally very pleased when President Kennedy requested funds of the Congress for the building of a U.S. pavilion and for extensive exhibits. As an endorsement of the request for $25 million for the above-mentioned purposes, I sent similar telegrams to President Kennedy and to Hon. Robert Moses, president of the Fair Corp., offering my cooperation in every way possible in ensuring the outstanding success of this forthcoming fair.

A copy of my telegram to President Kennedy follows:

MARCH 13, 1962.

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

As the Member of Congress in whose district the New York World's Fair will be situated, I am delighted that you have today requested of the Congress $25 million to build a U.S. pavilion and provide extensive exhibits at the fair. There can be no doubt but that the residents of my district, together with the entire country, are tremendously excited about the forthcoming fair. We recognize that not only will we receive a great deal of personal satisfaction in viewing these exhibits, but we also realize that the fair plays an important role in permitting communications, out of normal diplomatic channels, with foreign countries and their peoples—which is all important in furthering the cause of peace. I sincerely hope that you will call upon me to render assistance in the Congress on behalf of this great project.

Congressman BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL.

Tyranny of Minorities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, while pressure groups are not new on the political scene, I think there have been few times in American history when an administration has so obviously tailored its program to appeal to certain groups. None of these groups within themselves is large enough to swing an election, it is true, but in combination they represent a sizable bloc of votes. Minority groups have learned that by joining with other minority groups, their political influence can be multiplied. The New Frontier has encouraged minority groups to work together in support of so-called modern liberal candidates who seem to be willing to support politically every piece of legislation laid before Congress for the benefit of a certain group of people, regardless of the drain on the U.S. Treasury.

Mr. Raymond Moley, in his column in Newsweek magazine, March 19, 1962, puts into perspective the influence of minority groups in our Government. I commend this editorial to the attention of the Members of the House:

TYRANNY OF MINORITIES

(By Raymond Moley)

Perhaps the most treasured and distinctive of American ideals is that of a classless society. The vision of every American is that he is a citizen of a nation in which, by the grace of God, he may by his efforts move his status from a low to high place. He knows too that if his efforts fail or he manages badly or if he chooses ease or dissipation rather than effort, he will move downward.

As everyone knows, there is no equality in capacity, in environment, or in the capricious chances of life. But collective America through its government seeks to maintain and open more widely the gates of opportunity. For there are distinctions, if not classes—distinctions in age, race, occupation, education, and physical and mental capability. These differences have always been present and no doubt always will be. But so long as they were recognized and there was among all Americans a great reservoir of compassion, mutual aid, fairplay, and cooperative effort, such differences were bearable within the context of a classless society.

But as Aristotle put it, man is a "political animal," and in a free political society Americans have developed the political practice of seizing upon these differences for political exploitation. Jefferson's praise of those engaged in agriculture, however sincere, was not only a great sociological truth but a shrewd means of bringing to his support a large segment of the voting strength of the new Nation. So also was Hamilton's famous "Report on Industry and Commerce." But with that report Hamilton originated certain governmental privileges which developed over the years in tariffs and other special advantages to a very powerful group. Ultimately, what were called the interests dominated the Republican Party.

NEW SPECIAL INTERESTS

But in this century there has awakened a sense of unity among many more minorities. In the first place, such groups create their own organizations. Then politicians secure for them special privileges. The emergence of the superservice state with privileges, immunities, and benefits for many groups creates a quite different political society than the classless egalitarian democracy which philosophers have hailed and of which poets have sung. Whenever a group develops power to get from government some advantage, its power grows by what it feeds upon. And political government is ready with more nourishment. I hardly need to name the multitude of such organized groups. Now on the national scene a new interest is growing to maturity which may well rival even the greatest of them all, including organized labor.

It is based upon one of the most natural differences in the world—age. In many states the elderly have been powerful political agencies. This has been especially true in favored havens for retired oldsters. But with the multiplication of survivors over 65, political calculations have envisaged a national group which numbers approximately 17 million.

AN OLD-AGE BLOC

This consideration is basic in the conflict in Congress over medical care for the aged. And the definable population of senior citizens now enjoying social security benefits is made to order and to Government specifications as a broad base of power. But it is a base upon which can be built, as time goes on, many, many more than are now

specifically social security recipients. For as Senator KERR says, once the device of adding free medical care is attached to the OASDI tax, there can be no end to the future additions. In short, once this measure is enacted, the end of private medical care is only a matter of time. No political party can measurably check its subservience to Government. Also the inexorable march of science will continue to lengthen the lifespan, and employment conditions will continually lower the retirement age.

This vast segment of the population will in consequence attain organization at the national level, pressing inexorably for more and more as those who support it with their taxes have less and less surplus to give. Inflation will take charge then.

One more member will join the ranks of what has become in fact a government by, for, and of, minorities.

The Choosing of the Site for the Capital City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, the residents of Bucks County, which is a part of the congressional district which I have the honor to represent, are very proud of the fact that the Borough of Morrisville, in the said county, was very nearly the site picked for the Capital City when such location was chosen shortly after the close of the Revolutionary War.

History has shown that two votes determined that the Capital City should be in the District of Columbia rather than in the said Borough. A very interesting article on this matter appeared in the Levittown Times, Levittown, Pa., on Monday, March 12, 1962. It was written in connection with the impending annual trip of the seniors of Morrisville High School to Washington. Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include herewith the aforesaid article:

THE CAPITAL IN BUCKS—MORRISVILLE MISSED FAME BY TWO VOTES

(By Ben McElveen)

A trip to the Nation's Capital this week might not have been necessary for seniors at Morrisville High School, if fate had been just a little bit kinder. They might well have stayed home at the Capital.

This is the theory explained today by James E. Wood, assistant principal and treasurer of the Bucks County Historical Tours Commission. He is in charge of the seniors' annual trip next Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday to Washington, D.C.

IRONY OF FATE

"Yes," explains Wood, "the class of 1962 might well consider the irony of fate which now sends it on a 3-hour train ride to visit a Capital City, which might well have been the seniors' own hometown."

Except for two votes, history might have been completely different and the Capital might have been located on the Delaware River rather than the Potomac, says Wood.

The story goes back to Revolutionary times. Morrisville's namesake, U.S. Senator Robert Morris, was a powerful influence in early American politics. He had heavily financed the Revolution, and had thrown all his influence and power behind Gen. George Washington.

When the Revolution was won by America, General Washington became the first President. He owed many a favor to Morris. And Robert Morris, a landholder in this area, wanted the new Capital located on the Delaware River, at what is now Morrisville.

A Commission of three was named to select a site for the Capital. At the same time, the new government was having financial problems while getting off on a new foot.

Morris had already used his influence in the selection of the site for the Capital in Morrisville. The Commission, appointed in 1784, was to procure a piece of land, not less than 2 acres and not more than 3. Cost was not to exceed $100,000. It had already selected a hill at Morrisville for the hall of Congress. Now, the M. R. Reiter School sits on this site in Morrisville.

LOSES BY TWO VOTES

General Washington felt that financial arrangements should be made with each of the 13 Original Colonies. The southerns did not want to be heavily taxed, and were against paying off the debt of Northern States.

One afternoon, Thomas Jefferson called an informal meeting of representatives of both the North and South. A vote was taken and the North lost it by two.

The southerns, who did not want the Capital so far north as Pennsylvania, voted to pay for the taxes and in exchange, Washington conceded to locating the Capital on the Potomac in order to win over southern support for his new Government.

MISSES CLAIM

"Morrisville missed its claim to immortal fame by a mere two votes," says Wood.

Thus, next Wednesday at 7:30 a.m., 76 seniors at Morrisville High School will leave by train for Washington. Except for this quirk in fate, they might have remained home.

His Diary's All Dairy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent of March 11, 1962, carried a highly interesting feature article on Mr. Dennis McCarthy, of Forty Fort, written by Mr. Lou Rauscher, a staff writer.

As part of my remarks today, I wish to insert the aforementioned article:

HIS DIARY'S ALL DAIRY—FORTY FORT MAN WENT FROM MILKER TO STATE INSPECTOR WHILE SERVING OVER 50 YEARS IN MILK INDUSTRY

(By Lou Rauscher)

It's been a case of having milk in his blood ever since he can remember. So says Dennis McCarthy, of Virginia Terrace, Forty Fort.

Mr. McCarthy has been associated with the dairy industry, locally and on a national scale, for over a half century. He retired 2 years ago from an auditing job with the Dairymen's League out of New York but he'll admit that he still has a yen for being around milk.

Now 67 and apparently contented as the proverbial you-know-what, Mr. McCarthy is leading a very active retired life. Instead of whiling away his time thinking about yesteryear, he's associated with a local photographer, does some newspaper advertising soliciting on the side and still finds time to be an active Kingston Legion member and vice president in charge of publicity for the Wyoming Commemorative Association.

Those are his major charges—he's also alumni secretary for Penn State University's class of 1923, a political worker of uncommon zest, among numerous other pursuits.

BEGAN IN LARKSVILLE

His interest in the dairy business all began about 57 years ago—in 1905—when he started to work for William Harvey Corby, Jr., on the latter's Larksville Mountain farm.

Salary at that time amounted to $2 per week with room and board and much of the early years were spent on the road with horse and wagon. Customers used to respond to the sound of a familiar—at that time—milk bell.

Milk was carried in eight-quart pails and a metal measuring cup was used to determine quantity. In those days, milk was 8 cents a quart or 13 quarts for $1.

DELIVERIES MADE DAILY

Despite the fact that cans were scrubbed in home-made fashion on the kitchen stove and milk was cooled with spring water, there were few complaints of sour milk. This was mainly because, Mr. McCarthy reports, deliveries were made daily.

After a few summers at the Corby farm, young Dennis got a job with Frank Harter and later Harry Harter of the dairy which still bears their name.

Harter bought milk from the Schooley farm at Harris Hill. The proprietor of that farm was a grandparent of David Schooley, presently an executive of the Boston store.

One of the industry's biggest transitions took place around 1910, Mr. McCarthy relates, with the advent of bottles. Public demand soon did away with the dipping method altogether.

FAMILY DEALERSHIP IN VOGUE

The fad around that time was for many individual or family dealerships. In Wilkes-Barre, for instance, it was a common sight to see long lines of milkmen waiting for their daily shipment by milk car at the Lehigh Valley Railroad station.

Young McCarthy, thoroughly endowed with an interest in the industry, entered Penn State University following a stretch of World War I army service. He graduated in 1923 with a degree in dairy husbandry and this set the stage for his later advancements in the business.

His interest gradually began to swing away from the farming and selling to the regulatory phase of the industry. "Cities were way ahead of the State in recognizing the need for health standards in preparation of milk for market," Mr. McCarthy says.

Gradually pasteurization processing plants came into fashion and the one-horse, raw milk, man was on his way out.

After several tubercular epidemics across the land were traced to milk supplies, Mr. McCarthy notes, the State department of health assumed regulatory powers in 1928. Prior to that the agency was of an advisory nature.

Around this time Mr. McCarthy was a field representative for the Philadelphia Interstate Dairy Council. Later he was promoted to the national council and covered 40 States doing educational work.

WORKED FOR STATE

When the department of health began to take a serious view of milk contamination, McCarthy joined the body under the sponsorship of Senator A. J. Sordoni.

The job wasn't civil service and only lasted until 1937 when McCarthy took a position with the New York Cooperative Association from which he retired in 1960.

He remembers being one of the very first State milk inspectors, being assigned to the

general northeastern Pennsylvania area. During the depression years, he notes, milk was furnished to children of families unable to pay for it.

The price was then 12 cents a quart and primarily through Mr. McCarthy's efforts, this area had the highest wholesale price in the State—much to the satisfaction of the hard-pressed farmer.

REMEMBERS EXPERIMENT HERE

Mr. McCarthy still remembers the experiment on high temperature pasteurization methods conducted at the Kirby Health Center, this city. Edward Pugh, principal health officer at the center, presided over the tests and 164 guinea pigs were used.

"From that experiment came the procedure on preparing milk which the State adopted and has used since, give, or take a few modifications," Mr. McCarthy says.

He has taken retirement into complete stride and finds plenty of opportunities for a 67-year-old gentleman, "if he'll take the time and effort to find them."

Married to the former Margaret C. Maughan of Pittston, Mr. McCarthy also taught school in Edwardsville at one time shortly after finishing at Penn State. The couple has one daughter, Ann, a nurse at St. Mary's Hospital at Troy, N.Y.

Does he have any advice for persons about to retire: "Sure, tell them it's not nearly as hard to take as some of them would have you believe. I really enjoy it."

Some Sound Views on Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the big push which is going to be made for a program of medical care for the aged under social security, I feel that it is pertinent to call attention to the views of two of my constituents from the First Congressional District of Iowa. One of these, Dr. John E. McGee, of Fort Madison, Iowa, views the program from a practitioner's standpoint and makes some excellent observations. Dr. McGee's statement is in the form of a letter to the editor of the Des Moines (Iowa) Register.

The other statement is from a young doctor-to-be, Mr. William K. Hummer, president of the Iowa chapter of the Student American Medical Association. Mr. Hummer has set forth a detailed analysis of the problem and an appraisal of the current efforts to meet this problem. I think that his comments are significant and will be appreciated by all who are concerned about this issue.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert Dr. McGee's letter to the editor and Mr. Hummer's letter to me in the Appendix of the RECORD.

A DOCTOR COMMENDS EDITORIAL

To the EDITOR:

Your March 1 editorial on Kennedy's health program is highly commendable from my point of view. We in the medical profession recognize that there are areas in which health care for the aged can be improved. But we are also sure that the solutions offered by the Kennedy administration in placing health insurance under social security are second rate and will be detrimental to good medical care.

One need only look at the deterioration of the British medical profession and the ineptness of the National Health Service in covering health needs. A top British economist, Prof. John Jewkes, has recently stated that Britons are dissatisfied after years of socialized medicine to the point that they are again seeking private medical care.

In order to meet the problems of health care for the aged, the Kerr-Mills Act was passed. This was a good start because it allows each State to solve its own problems without Federal control.

Administration experts do not think Kerr-Mills and local welfare programs are adequate. With 17 million votes at stake, I'm not surprised.

More recently, Blue Shield has offered a plan that would pay for most medical and surgical expenses for a single person over 65 with an annual income of $2,500 or less at a cost of $3.10 monthly. This has been worked out with the American Medical Association and does not ask or require Government subsidy.

We enjoy the best medical and hospital care in the world. Let's keep it that way by providing low-cost medical care to those who need it and want it, and by administering it on a State and local level. Medical care under social security means a step backward.

JOHN E. MCGEE, M.D.,
Fort Madison Medical Building.
FORT MADISON, IOWA.

STUDENT AMERICAN
MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
Iowa City, Iowa, March 1, 1962.

Hon. FRED SCHWENGEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SCHWENGEL: In my capacity as president of the Iowa chapter of the Student American Medical Association, I represent the great majority of the medical students in the college of medicine. We have been closely watching the action which is being taken on the King-Anderson bill (H.R. 4222). We feel that since we are the youngest segment of the medical profession, the outcome of this proposal concerns us more than any others in our field. We have attempted to study the background and nature of this bill in order that we might reach a logical and intelligent decision on its worth. We, as students, felt that this was the only fair way to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion. The following comments represent the culmination of these studies.

Basically, in considering any piece of legislation, two things must be considered. First, is there a need for this type of legislation? And second, what method will provide the most effective way of carrying out the needed legislation? We have concluded that there is no need for the specific type of program embodied in the King-Anderson bill. In addition, we feel that the method which has been proposed to finance it will prove to be inflationary and excessively costly.

There are approximately 17 million people in this country over the age of 65. The King-Anderson bill would cover approximately 13 million of this group. Many of those who would be covered could readily afford to pay for their own medical care. Moreover, many of those not covered could not afford to pay for such care. We do not believe that there ever could be a need for a law that would encompass so evident a degree of inequity.

One-half of the people over 65 already have some form of health insurance. Recent statistics show that people over the age of 65 are buying health insurance at a rate four times greater than all other age groups combined. Thus, private insurance companies are proving themselves capable of providing adequate, low-cost health insurance to those over 65. These very figures defy the need for Government intervention in the field of health insurance.

And finally, and probably most important, there is no need for a new law to provide medical care to the aged since we already have such a program in effect today. The Kerr-Mills bill was passed in the last days of the Eisenhower administration. This provides medical care for the aged through a program of matching Federal and State funds and is administered locally. It seems unnecessary to have another law to provide medical care for the aged when this law has not even had a chance to prove its effectiveness.

We feel it is evident that there is no need for the King-Anderson bill. And, upon closer study of the bill itself, it is clear that even if there were a need, King-Anderson would not be the best means to fulfill it.

Many Americans have been led to believe that social security is a "tried and tested" insurance program. This is a gross misrepresentation. In the Supreme Court decision in the case of *Fleming* v. *Nestor* (363 U.S. 609, 1960), the Court ruled that "social security must be viewed as a welfare instrument to which legal concepts of 'insurance,' 'property,' 'vested rights,' 'annuities,' etc., can only be applied at serious distortion of language."

The financial status of social security as it exists today is also open to question. In 1956 the benefits owed those on OASI rolls was $486 billion. The amount they would pay in was $194 billion and the trust fund was $23 billion. Thus there was a debt of $486−(194+23) or $269 billion. In 1958, this debt was $289 billion, and in 1960 this debt was $350 billion. This debt, of course, has no real standing such as the national debt because there are no Government bonds to pay it. But, if social security promises are to be met, then it is a debt just as real as the national debt. We submit that the proposed addition of medical care to the aged to a program already so financially overburdened would be unwise. It would result in inflation and tax increases in social security far greater than currently proposed.

We are aware that there are people who are unable to finance at all or in part, their medical care. It is our opinion that these are the people whom we must help. These are the proposals which we feel will provide adequate and equitable medical care to the people of this country who really need it.

First, the Kerr-Mills bill should be given a chance to prove itself. It is working out well in most States where it is now in effect. Funds which are provided by the Federal and State governments could be used to pay the premiums on health insurance policies from private companies which would cover this group.

Second, doctors who treat patients who are unable to pay could be given an income tax deduction for each such patient treated. Physicians throughout the country today willingly and happily treat thousands of patients for little or no consideration. If, in the future, some income tax deduction to doctors for these patients could be allowed, these doctors would receive at least a small recompense and the patients would have, in effect, "paid" for their care.

There comes a point in national affairs when certain issues turn into every individual's responsibility. So far as this question of Government intervention in medicine is concerned, we feel that this point has been reached and passed. We have studied and made the preceding recommendations because we felt we had to. We felt that the time had come when we were obligated to voice our opposition to existing proposals

and make specific recommendations of our own.

I will be in Washington May 8–11 for the national convention of the Student American Medical Association. I would greatly appreciate the chance to discuss these issues with you personally at that time.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM KERBY HUMMER,
President.

The State Department and the Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, time is running out in this session of Congress and if the House is to take an effective step and create a bipartisan Special Committee on Captive Nations, we must do it soon. The tremendous importance and potential effectiveness of such a committee should be apparent to all of us, yet the stumbling block has become the refusal of the State Department to exercise any degree of imagination and understanding in this field.

I insert into the RECORD an article by nationally known Columnist Ralph de Toledano, in which he discusses the enactment of House Resolution 211 introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Incidentally, may I remind the Members of the House that last spring the House Republican Policy Committee unanimously approved the creation of such a special committee, and in the consistent spirit of bipartisanship which has been displayed in this field, I and numerous other Republicans have introduced resolutions in conformance with the intent of House Resolution 211.

The article by Mr. de Toledano is entitled "The State Department and the Captive Nations," which was released on Monday, March 12, 1962:

THE STATE DEPARTMENT AND THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

(By Ralph de Toledano)

For over a year, a bipartisan group of Congressman has been working for the enactment of House Resoltuion 211. This bill calls for the creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. Support for this committee, as a reading of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD since the introduction of House Resoltuion 211 shows, has been widespread.

The special committee, however, remains a dream, largely owing to the efforts of Secretary of State Dean Rusk. The State Department has still not stopped trembling over the anger in the Kremlin when Congress voted a Captive Nations Week. Comrade Nikita Khrushchev was very annoyed and the State Department let it be known that our support of the enslaved nations behind the Iron Curtain was hurting U.S. diplomacy.

When the special committee bill was before the House Rules Committee last August, Mr. Rusk wrote its chairman stating that it "would not be helpful." Why?

"It is of utmost importance," he wrote, "that we approach any consultations with our allies or negotiations with the Soviet Union in an atmosphere which best lends itself to an acceptable settlement. In this context, I believe the establishment of such a committee would likely be a source of contention and might be taken as a pretext for actions by the Soviet Union which would interfere with the resolution of the present crisis concerning Berlin."

Mr. Rusk further warned that it would be undesirable for the U.S. Government to study "the status of such areas as the Ukraine, Armenia, or Georgia Republics" within the Soviet Union which were forcibly incorporated with the U.S.S.R. during the revolution after declaring their independence.

What precisely in the resolution for a Special Committee on the Captive Nations frightens the Secretary of State? Since the Congress must legislate on defense matters and be generally informed on world affairs, it is clearly within its fact-finding function to study the Soviet colonial empire. And this is what the bill calls for.

Very specifically, House Resolution 211 states what no man can quarrel with "basic knowledge and interest alone can serve to explode the current myths on Soviet unity, Soviet national economy, and monolithic military prowess and openly to expose the depths of imperialist totalitarianism and economic colonialism throughout the Red Russian empire, especially inside the so-called Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

The resolution urged that "we commence to win the psycho-political cold war by assembling and forthrightly utilizing all the truths and facts pertaining to the enslaved condition of the peoples" behind the Iron Curtain. It also noted that the captive nations constitute "a primary deterrent against a hot global war and further overt aggression by Moscow's totalitarian imperialism."

This last point is, of course, the core of the resolution and the most valid argument for a special committee. For the Kremlin has been decidely jittery about the so-called satellites since the Polish riots, the Hungarian uprising, and the abortive revolt in East Berlin. Communist propaganda has striven mightly to convince the captive peoples that they can get no help from the United States, that we have written them off. (Our inaction during the Hungarian fighting and our meek acceptance of the Berlin wall have been used by the Kremlin to nail home this point.)

Yet experts such Eugene Lyons, an editor of the Reader's Digest, have repeatedly stressed that the captive peoples are the West's "secret allies," that we must cultivate them, and keep hope of freedom alive among them. The special committee could do just that by giving a forum to the exiled leaders of Eastern Europe, now organized in the Assembly of Captive European Nations. It could be the clearing house for much valuable information which now rattles around in other committees of the Congress or in the executive branch.

The opposition of the State Department and Dean Rusk stems directly from the knowledge of the effectiveness of the phrase "captive nations" behind the Iron Curtain and the false belief that if we continue to pat Comrade Khrushchev on the head he will eventually come to heel. I was in Poland during the 1959 Captive Nations Week and saw at first hand the response of the people to this small gesture in their behalf. I was in the Soviet Union then and heard Khrushchev take every opportunity to deride it.

There is one other factor. The State Department holds the conviction that it alone knows anything about foreign policy, that it alone should have exclusive jurisdiction over it, and that Congress is made up of diplomatic illiterates who should not be allowed to interfere. "The conduct of foreign affairs today is an intricate, subtle, changing and always uncertain task," Under Secretary George Ball said admonishingly to a Senate committee recently in an effort to have them keep hands off. That the Constitution gives the Senate direct responsibility and the House indirect control is of no concern. Mr. Rusk wants to run the whole show himself.

Chicago Assigns Idle to Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, an article appeared in today's New York Times which not only illustrates and emphasizes the importance of education in our retraining efforts but also shows the direct relationship between educational deficiencies and our relief and welfare rolls. I should like to have inserted in the RECORD at this point the news story headlined "Chicago Assigns Idle to Schools."

CHICAGO ASSIGNS IDLE TO SCHOOLS

CHICAGO, March 14.—Raymond W. Hilliard, Cook County public aid director and a former New York Welfare Commissioner, began today a program to send at least 50,000 relief recipients to school within a year.

The mass education effort was designed to reduce the relief burden on the county, dominated by Chicago. Mr. Hilliard said this was the first program of its kind in the United States.

The Chicago school system will provide teachers and facilities. Case workers are to assign the first group of 100 this week.

Mr. Hilliard said that if a relief recipient in the program played truant, his relief payment would be cut off.

"We are taking this drastic step as a means of preventing the perpetuation on relief of future generations," he said.

IGNORANCE INFECTIOUS

"Ignorance is infectious," he went on. "Children in relief families often follow in the footsteps of their parents who have no skill, no education and no prospect for employment. Many parents can't even read their children's report cards."

Mr. Hilliard said that inadequate education was the basic reason people on relief were unable to find work. He said many were "functional illiterates" and others were close to being so.

Of the 285,000 persons getting Cook County relief, 225,000 are either unemployed or affected by the unemployment of someone else, he said.

The go-to-school orders will be issued to 16,000 able-bodied men and 34,000 mothers receiving support for dependent children.

Mr. Hilliard said that more than $16 million spent monthly for relief could be "vastly reduced" if the new program succeeded. He noted that it would cover "dropout" pupils getting relief. But he said that since so many rebelled against school a new program along the line of the youth conservation corps suggested by President Kennedy might well be necessary for them.

LITERACY TRAINING

"It is unthinkable that these young people should be allowed to dictate to society that they shall forever hence be supported at public expense, in idleness on relief, as delinquents in a reform school, or as inmates of a penitentiary," he said.

Most classwork will begin in literary training—learning to read, to write and to use arithmetic.

Those with some education will go to advanced classes until they reach a level qualifying them for employment.

Classes will be designed to train the "pupils" for specific jobs that are available. Courses will range from simple teaching of good housekeeping and how to read labels on cans and medicine bottles to technical work. The relief director said 81 percent of those on relief were Negroes.

RETRAINING TROUBLE SEEN

WASHINGTON, March 14.—Inadequate schooling and illiteracy of many jobless workers may create serious problems for the Federal Government's new manpower retraining program, officials said today.

They said many unemployed persons had been rejected for training under the present Area Redevelopment Act because they could not read or understand manuals used in the courses.

There also has been some apathy about retraining in a few communities, but this has worn off as graduates of the courses have obtained jobs because of their new skills, a spokesman said.

The $425 million retraining program will have courses ranging up to 1 year and will apply throughout the country. The redevelopment program was limited to depressed areas. Maximum training programs last 4 months.

The Case Against Big Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, American misgivings about big government are both historical and practical.

Millions have come to our shores to escape big government's domination of their lives. The Revolt of 1776 was against dictatorship of individual lives by big government.

To keep American Government from getting too big, our Constitution reserves many powers to the people. It also divides powers of government between State and Federal Governments and between legislative, executive and judicial branches of government.

In the United States control over our destiny is in the people. Power and decisions flow from the broad base of a triangle—the people—to the top of the triangle—government.

Millions of private citizens each day make millions of individual decisions, which, when all combined together, determine the economic health and strength of our country.

Not every individual decision is a good one. But experience has shown the good ones cancel out the bad ones with something to spare. Because of this we have grown steadily from 13 srtuggling colonies to a giant nation.

We have proved this politico-economic system works. It keeps us strong all the time.

In contrast, the U.S.S.R. has big government. Power and decisionmaking are at the top of the triangle, out of the people's hands.

If somebody in the Kremlin makes a bad decision, there is nothing to cancel it out. The whole country suffers.

For instance, suppose Moscow bureaucrats miscalculate and set the country's fuel requirements too low. People all over the U.S.S.R. go cold through the winter. Factories cannot produce enough goods. Even the Red army's strength is weakened.

All that is inconvenient in the U.S.S.R., but it is not fatal. Some other country has not sworn to "bury" the U.S.S.R. the moment it becomes weak.

To the United States such a situation would not be merely inconvenient. It would be fatal. Some other country has promised to "bury" the United States should it ever become weakened for any reason.

This is the practical reason why today, just as in 1776, Americans still have good reasons to be wary of big government.

We simply cannot run the risk, inherent in big government, of having some Washington bureaucrat's miscalculation deliver us to the designs of our enemy.

Yet we have needs which push us toward big government. As our society becomes more and more complex, there are more and more things which people either cannot do for themselves or find it increasingly difficult to do for themselves.

At first blush it seems attractive to have the Federal Government do them. But each time it steps into some new area of authority, power in the United States moves a little closer to the top of the triangle.

The challenge of our times is, with patience and understanding, to find ways of meeting these new needs adequately—without involving ourselves in the fatal hazards inherent in big government.

Evangelical Christianity and Public Matters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a sermon delivered by Dr. William D. Livingstone, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of San Diego, Calif., entitled "Evangelical Christianity and Public Matters."

Reverend Livingstone sets forth his defense against the constant attack by the National Council of Churches leveled at any church which dares to criticize the position taken by the National Council of Churches.

I have long felt that the National Council of Churches is doing great damage to the Christian religion in this country by the positions which they have assumed in political and secular matters.

I especially wish to call the attention of the Members of this House to that portion of the sermon which exposes how naive the National Council of Churches was at the New Delhi international meeting where the Russian Orthodox Church was embraced into the World Council of Churches and forthwith began to push the Communist doctrine. Not only is there Communist infiltration in our American churches, but now we have been taken in by the Russian Orthodox Church, which is under the strict control and discipline of the Kremlin.

The sermon follows:

EVANGELICAL CHRISTIANITY AND PUBLIC MATTERS

"Therefore God has highly exalted him and bestowed on him the name which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, in heaven and on earth and under the earth, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father"—Philippians 2: 9–11.

Our text this morning is taken from Paul's letter to the Philippians, the second chapter: "Therefore God has highly exalted him * * *"—Philippians 2: 9–11.

In a number of church publications (see Presbyterian Life, December 1, 1961) as well as in some secular newspapers there was published recently a report of the reply of the general council of our denomination to certain evangelical churches which objected to the National Council of Churches. In Monday Morning, a periodical for Presbyterian ministers, for example, we read: "Exception was taken to efforts to wall off the influence of Christ in our country in a statement released by the General Council of the United Presbyterian Church at its fall meeting in New York City. In a calm and unanimous reply to six churches on the west coast, which criticized Christian statements on nonreligious matters, they asserted that Jesus Christ is Lord of all life. The west coast churches to which the reply was sent are: First Church, Hollywood; First Church, Fillmore, Calif.; Wilshire Church, Los Angeles; South Hollywood Church, Hollywood; First Church, Tacoma, Wash.; and First Church, San Diego, Calif."

Now, I want to discuss the situation with you today. I feel that you as the members of this church have a right to know what this is all about, because you may have seen references to it in various periodicals or newspapers. And also it has a definite bearing on our convictions about Christianity as experience, and specifically our convictions about evangelical Christianity and public matters. With all the seriousness that is within me I wish to say that what we find here is a most unfortunate misunderstanding, and indeed a grievously false interpretation of the stand of our church and of evangelical Christianity in general. We of evangelical Christianity believe the Bible to be the Word of God, and so we believe that "at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, in heaven and on earth and under the earth, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." And therefore we fully accept the dictum that "Jesus Christ is Lord of all life." The extent to which that Lordship is recognized, of course, will be in accordance with the extent to which men are converted to Christ and confess Him as Lord. But right here we need to be careful—to say that "Jesus Christ is Lord of all life" is not to say that the "National Council of Churches is Lord of all life." There is a vast difference between Jesus Christ and the National Council of Churches. And furthermore, to say that Jesus Christ is Lord of all life is not to say that any church

has the right to meddle in civil affairs. I would call your attention to the 31st chapter of the confession of faith, one of the standards of our denomination. In chapter 31, section 4 we read: "Synods and councils are to handle or conclude nothing, but that which is ecclesiastical: and are not to intermeddle with civil affairs which concern the commonwealth, unless by way of humble petition in cases extraordinary; or by way of advice for satisfaction of conscience, if they be thereunto required by the civil magistrate."

Now as I understand this statement the Presbyterian denomination has no business meddling with civil affairs through the National Council of Churches or any other agency. From the point of view of the law of the church this is illegal. And yet our Presbyterian fathers did not feel that that was a denial of the lordship of Christ. The issue is whether a church has a right to make pretensions to temporal power. No matter how good the intentions, it is wrong. And, further, it is the wrong way of extending the influence of Christ. Congressman WALTER JUDD, a former missionary, and well known to all of us, in a speech earlier this year stated the issue very clearly when he said: "I don't want the church working in politics. I don't want political action by ecclesiastical bodies. I do want political action by Christians. It isn't the job of the church to say what you should do. It is the job of the church to change men and send them into society as Christian missionaries and into politics to help change the Government." He goes on to say: "The longer I am in politics the less confidence I have in the pronouncements by ecclesiastical bodies telling Congress what to do. Occasionally it seems to me that ministers would rather come down and testify or pass resolutions than they would to preach because it is more comforting. It gives them a sense of greater importance." If churchmen would pay heed to this counsel they would do well. Then the National Council of Churches, for example, would not be embarrassed by such actions as its Cleveland conference which looked with favor to the seating of Red China in the United Nations, and then met with the sharp rebuff of the U.S. Congress which passed a resolution unanimously opposing the seating of Red China.

Frankly, I feel that the general council of our denomination in its statement implies at least three misunderstandings about evangelical Christianity. The first is that we are trying to limit or "wall off" the influence of Christ. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Actually, no one as much as the evangelical Christian desires and is burdened to extend the influence of Christ into the hearts and lives of men everywhere. Evangelical Christians have a concern for evangelism and missions far greater than that of any other group in the old line denominations. Indeed, the Christian's zeal is in exact proportion to his evangelical faith. To be sure, we do take a dim view of institutionalism, we do take a dim view of ecclesiastical bureaucracy, and we are not particularly interested in worldly power and glory for the organized church, but we are keenly and joyfully concerned for the cause of Christ. We are also concerned that the money given to the church not be wasted on non-Christian matters. That is why I personally believe that the $12 million budget of the National Council of Churches is to a great extent a waste of $12 million.

The second implication is that evangelical Christians have no concern for social justice and the material needs of men. They say, and I quote: "To see that the hungry are fed, the shelterless are housed, and the sick are healed must remain a central concern of the Christian Church." Well, that statement is a waste of ink and paper, as well as an implication that we have no such concern. I can say this for our own church, that we are doing not all that we could do, no doubt, but simply, factually, I do not have time to elaborate, but I do want to mention a few things.

As you know, our board of deacons is efficiently organized under the leadership of Dr. Nauman and is most effective in its ministry of compassion. It is helping many people in many ways, both on an individual basis and in such projects as our blood bank, and the giving of baskets of food at Thanksgiving and Christmas. And one of the main agencies of our board of deacons is our social service department. Thus far this year over 1,000 interviews have been held and over 350 counseling appointments have been given by our social worker and Dr. Nauman, to say nothing of other members of the staff. Over $4,000 worth of food orders and meals and rental assistance, as well as boxes of clothing have been given. And even more important we are constantly helping people in the matter of employment.

And then think of all that the many organizations of our church are doing. Someone was telling me that there are some 47 orphans in Korea alone that are being assisted by people in our church. Or I think of our wonderful women's association and all that it has done and is doing, far more than I could list. Such things as helping an orphanage in Taegu and the hospital in Ganado. And over 1,000 articles were made for the Needlework Guild ingathering. The Ambassadors, the Siyads, the Mariners are assisting two orphanages in Tijuana. Gifts have been sent to the Patton State Hospital. Through Operation Handclasp we have given, as well as helping each month in preparing the material for shipment. And this is to say nothing of our help both materially and personnelwise in other agencies such as the Christian Business Men's Service Center, and the City Rescue Mission, and youth organizations such as Inter-Varsity, and Campus Crusade for Christ, and Young Life, and Youth for Christ, and organizations such as the Gideons.

Then there is our missions program. Aside from general allotments we have given $2,000 for classrooms in our Presbyterian school at Giradot, Colombia, $3,000 for a printing press in Korea, $3,500 for the Mount Zion Conference grounds in Guatemala, $6,000 for the new Presbyterian Seminary in Guatemala, $7,200 for the Fuller Seminary Library, $7,500 for a plane for our missionary in Alaska. And these are but a few items. Again, our session has a social education and action committee which is seeking to bring about a better understanding of the great social problems of our country. And then think of the hours, thousands of hours of service on the part of our individual members in various civic and philanthropic enterprises such as muscular dystrophy, and the American Cancer Society, and the Red Cross, and the YMCA and the YWCA and so forth. How ridiculous to imply that we have no concern for the material and social needs of men, or that we are trying to "wall off the influence of Christ."

The third implication is that we are somehow organically related to the National Council and therefore any complaint must not be registered directly with the general council of our denomination but rather go through a presbytery, a presbytery which they know would never allow any criticism of the National Council or its fellow travelers. But my understanding of the National Council of Churches is that the relationship is a voluntary one. Furthermore, to state a personal opinion which has grown up through years of observation, I feel that basically the National Council of Churches is a group of denominations whose liberal and neo-orthodox ecclesiasts are convinced that they can best promote the cause of liberal and neo-orthodox ecclesiasticism and a world church by pooling their ideas and power. But if it is a voluntary organization then we are free to disagree. If it is a compulsory organization then we ought to be informed of that fact.

Another observation I would like to make is this. The statement reads, "The general council is troubled that you seem to imply that there is some sinister connection to be detected if one advocates anything also favored by the Communist Party." And they cite as examples "peace and nondiscrimination as to race." This, again, is a ridiculous implication. It is pretty safe to say that we are all for peace, and in this church anyway there is no racial discrimination. But it is true that we do find something sinister or else incredibly naive about anything other than violent opposition to the seating of Red China in the United Nations, the abolition of universal military training in times like these, the unilateral suspension of atomic tests by the United States, the dissolution of the House Un-American Activities Committee, criticism of the film "Operation Abolition" which has had the endorsement of Mayor Christopher of San Francisco as well as several ministers who witnessed the San Francisco riots, as well as J. Edgar Hoover himself. Yet, let it be clear, this violent opposition should not take the form of political pressure or ecclesiastical lobbying. Rather, let these convictions be preached from the pulpits on the basis of evangelical Christianity's total opposition to communism and to all that communism stands for.

Further, I cannot help but add that to me it is hypocrisy to mouth the words and the principle "Jesus Christ is Lord of all life" and then deny or refuse to censure those who do deny the virgin birth of our Lord, the miracles of Christ, His physical resurrection, and the absolute and infallible authority of the Scriptures. This is hypocrisy.

And while I am at it (and I am at it) I would like to speak very briefly about the World Council of Churches meeting at New Delhi. Now, of course, it is not easy to get the facts due to the slanted United Press and Associated Press religious reporting or the reporting of magazines like Time magazine. But as you may know, the Russian Orthodox Church which purports to have 50-million members, thereby making it the largest group, has been received into the World Council with only a few voting "no" or abstaining. It is interesting to note that among those who abstained were the Russian Orthodox Church of America and the American Hungarian Reformed Church. Now, I would like you to listen to two excerpts from the San Diego Union of November 21 and 22. On November 21 the admission of the Russian Church was reported. And in that account we read, "Archbishop Nikodim, leader of the 16-member Russian Orthodox delegation, told a press conference his church was completely free of state interference and absolutely independent in its inner life." Now, I wonder, with what you know about communism, do you believe that? I do not. I believe it is a lie. Again, we read, "The Russian prelate said his church would work chiefly inside the council's faith and order commission, which is primarily concerned with questions of doctrine and theology. Conference sources said the Russians probably would steer clear of the council's foreign policy debates."

Now let us read from the article reported the very next day: "The Russian Orthodox Church today called on the World Council of Churches to press for universal disarmament. The appeal came in a message to the council's third general assembly from Patriarch Alexis of Moscow, head of the Russian church, within 24 hours after it had been admitted to the global church body." A plea for universal disarmament. Where have we heard that one before. And from the group

that was going to steer clear of the Council's foreign policy debates. Within 24 hours. And by Alexis, the head of the Russian church whose bitter denunciation of the United States is well known. During the Korean war, for example, in the Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate he wrote: "The Russian Orthodox Church, in my person and that of the most holy synod, cannot remain indifferent to the sufferings of the Korean people and raises its voice in the defense of the truth. It is unable not to express its compassion to the distressed country and (it) protests against American aggression in Korea." He continues, "The Russian Orthodox Church decisively condemns this interference and the inhuman extermination of the peaceful population of Korea taking place by the American Air Force." This is the man who is the head of the Russian church, which is now part of the world council.

Once more, listen to the account from Time magazine, December 1, a magazine which is slanted in favor of the National Council and the World Council. But it does say this: "Some delegates speculated that the 10 ecclesiastical member of the Russian delegation might actually be Reds in robes, but informed opinion (whatever that is) was that the archbishop, bishop, archimandrites and priests were not official agents of communism." But the article goes on to admit, "This was not necessarily so of the six laymen of the Russian team, and suspicion centered on Interpreter V. Zaitsev, who often seemed to be giving directions to the others. Nikodism, the 32-year-old whiz kid of the Russian Church, was thoroughly in command of the situation. With better English than his colleagues, he was a popular and jocular spokesman for the Russian blend of Christianity and what he referred to as 'socialism'." The report concludes by saying, "It became clear last week that Iron Curtain orthodoxy intended to make its membership count. As the assembly split up into the section and committee work that will feed reports and opinions into the plenary sessions the Red orthodoxists turned up with strong ideas in the areas of social action international affairs, and 'faith and order'." My friends, you may draw your own conclusions.

Yes, "Jesus Christ is Lord of all life." Yes, evangelical Christianity does have a concern for public matters. Yes, evangelical Christianity should proclaim the great Biblical principles of social justice. Yes, evangelical Christianity will help "to see that the hungry are fed, the shelterless are housed, and the sick are healed." We are not trying to "wall off the influence of Christ in our country." But since when does the church have to be a pressure group meddling in civil affairs in order to extend a Christian influence? And since when do we have to be soft toward communism in order to exalt the Lordship of Christ? I believe that these are fair questions, and important ones.

O God our Father, we pray that we may have discernment, that we may have courage in times like these. Give us a joy and a forthrightness in our proclamation of the gospel of Christ. Keep us unafraid, for we ask it in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Inside the Tariff Package

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal, Wednesday, March 14, 1962:

INSIDE THE TARIFF PACKAGE

We trust no reader of these columns will mistake our position on foreign trade. We have said here repeatedly that this country must open wider the doors of free trade, and we have specifically encouraged the administration's efforts to lower U.S. tariff barriers.

This may require that Congress give considerable latitude to the executive branch to carry out a defined policy, for Congress cannot negotiate every trade agreement or fix the tariff on every item of commerce.

But to recognize this is not to say that Congress shoud abdicate its own responsibility to define the Nation's trade policies. The plea for lower tariffs ought not to be used to open another door to all kinds of other trade barriers that make tariffs look like the inventions of amateurs. Nor is this plea an excuse for launching another vague, amorphous and almost unlimited Federal relief program.

Yet that is what is being proposed to Congress in the tariff bill introduced by Chairman MILLS of the House Ways and Means Committee at the administration's behest. There are indeed some startling things hidden under that bill's attractive label.

It is not simply that this bill would carry almost to its ultimate the process of allowing the President to cut or even abolish tariffs, without let or hindrance, although this it would do. The President could enter trade agreements at will and then proclaim the reduction by half of any existing tariff; if the agreement is with a Common Market nation, he could completely eliminate tariffs by the stroke of a pen.

The President is also authorized, whenever he thinks some industry needs protecting from foreign imports, "to proclaim such increase in, or imposition of, any duty or other import restriction" as he wishes. If this loose language means anything, it means that some President could raise tariffs as well as lower them, or impose brandnew ones, or—and here apparently without any limit—impose quotas or any other kind of restriction on imports.

In short, this wide grant of power to the President is for protectionism as much as for free trade. With this bill Congress would not be declaring a freer trade policy but simply authorizing the trade policy to be whatever the President of the moment declared it to be. Foreign trade could escape the annoyances of tariffs only to meet the more impenetrable barriers of direct controls.

Yet there is still more wrapped up in this bill. Under the guise of protecting people from the impact of any tariff cuts, the bill authorizes a whole new program of Government assistance to individuals, business firms, industries, and States.

For example, if the "President determines" that they need it, individuals may be paid an adjustment allowance by the Government, as well as retraining costs and moving expenses. No limit is set for the length of time this "adjustment allowance" can be paid, nor is there any clear definition of who is eligible for it.

Business firms, too, as the President may determine, would be eligible not only for technical assistance but financial assistance in the form of Government guarantees, loans, and special tax treatment. Nor are the States forgotten; in return for accepting some restrictions on their own unemployment programs, they can set up their own agencies to administer the "relief," and be paid by the Federal Government.

The bill states that actions of the President, "in determining eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance, in certifying adjustment proposals, or in making determinations with respect to extraordinary relief, shall be final and conclusive and shall not be subject to review by any court." In short, a blank check for the President to distribute this largess as he will.

The administration is right, we think, in saying that the economic future of this country lies in the direction of freer trade with the world, and we hope Congress will meet its responsibility to see that we move in that direction. But what this bill grants is the power to any President to move in whatever direction he alone chooses. And buried in it also is a veritable Pandora's box of political woes about who gets what from the Nation's Treasury.

The fact that all this comes in the wrappings of free trade doesn't mean that the country ought to buy the merchandise inside the package.

The Case of the Federal Pay Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, the American taxpayer is confronted in the approaching months the highest peacetime budget in our history, an unparalleled cost of living, ever-increasing tax rates and the spectacle of unbridled deficit spending at the Federal level.

The administration's request to raise the Federal debt limit $10 billion to an alltime high of $308 billion is a depressing situation.

A request of $1 billion to raise the salaries of 1,600,000 Federal workers also has been presented to the Congress. This pay raise, mislabeled a pay reform, offers tremendous salary boosts to the high grades of employees, but little or no help for the low paid Government workers.

Mr. Ralph de Toledano of King Features Syndicate has written a highly penetrating and significant article dealing with this proposed pay boost.

His views and opinions on the proposal are worthy of examination by every Member of this body and I wish to insert this article in its entirety:

THE CASE OF FEDERAL PAY INCREASES

(By Ralph de Toledano)

The President's request for increases in pay to top-level Federal officials has hardly set the Congress on fire. More than one legislator wonders why this pay boost is necessary, and they are not convinced by Mr. Kennedy's insistence that he wants it in order to keep qualified personnel from leaving Government service. Defense Secretary McNamara is holding on to the people he needs in the armed services, where pay is considerably lower than in the civilian branches of the Government. Why therefore add $1 billion to the Federal deficit?

Th objections to the pay increase plan are best stated by Representative RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH, of Indiana.

"It seems inconsistent," he says, "for the President to seek these raises for Government workers at a time he is demanding that both business and labor restrain themselves from boosting costs and wages."

And he points out that "the plan holds little or no help for the lower-salaried workers in Government," those who would be

presumed to need more money than top-level officials.

Under the President's plan, Mr. ROUDEBUSH asserts, men making $18,000 a year would be raised to $29,000—a very sizable fattening of the pay check in any man's league. He is also worried by "a little noted clause that would lift the limit on the number of high-paying jobs and open the floodgates" to the creation of a new superbureaucracy.

As to the President's argument that the higher wage levels are needed to attract good people to the Government, Mr. ROUDEBUSH answers, "I haven't noticed any mass exodus from Washington by workers in the $10,000 per year class and above."

The gentleman from Indiana has a good point there. A $10,000 increase in pay will not attract a business executive to quit the private sector for Government service. Secretary McNamara did not leave the Ford Motor Co.'s presidency for the salary he is making. He took the defense post because of that combination of duty, pride, and ambition which motivate most men. Having been asked by the President, he accepted because he felt he could do a good job, was needed, and liked the idea of being in the Washington limelight. The same applies to many appointed to lesser posts in the Government.

For others, moreover, Government employment and Government pay represented an improvement in their professional and economic status. Still others were drawn because Washington is a powerful magnet. It is also a fact, ignored by many, that several years in Government service—no matter what the pay—is a good investment. For lawyers, it is usually the door opener to lucrative clients, not because they will be able to peddle influence but simply because the experience is invaluable. A lawyer who knows his way around the labyrinths of the Federal Government has an advantage over equally competent colleagues.

Among those who seek career jobs, the Government offers a safe haven the professional in private life cannot enter. His position is safe, there is a good pension ahead, and the pressures that give so many Americans ulcers do not obtain. By this, I do not mean that men and women in Government goldbrick at their work. But the tempo is slower and life—except for those in the very top echelon—is much more relaxed. They do not make fortunes, but how many people in the private sector do?

Where the pinch is felt, if at all, is among the Federal workers at the other end of the pay scale. Representative ROUDEBUSH, I believe, is right when he says, "Any pay increases approved by Congress should be directed to those in lower pay brackets."

The average voter, who must wrestle with job insecurity and job competition, is not likely to feel too mournful about the plight of high-level Government officials. The $1 billion requested by the President comes out of his pocket, and his impulse is to try to keep the tax collector's fingers out of it as much as possible. Already, the tax bite is heavy, although withholding taxes have somewhat eased the pain by letting the voter forget just how much of his income goes to the Government.

But come April 15, he has a bad jolt when he sees the figures. For example, this is what is taken from a man earning $5,000 a year—a sum higher than the national average:

Federal income tax: $300.
Excise and other taxes hidden in the price of goods: $305.
Social security: $215.
State and local income taxes: $30.
State and local excise taxes: $190.
Property taxes: $205.
Social insurance: $45.

After he has paid off the Federal, State, and local governments, he has $3,710 left for paying his other bills, buying insurance, buying a home, going on a vacation. That's almost a third of his paycheck gone before he has gotten his hands on it. But the only way he will ever get relief is through a sharp reduction of nonessential Federal spending and a balanced budget. No one is holding his breath waiting for these to come about.

The taxpayer's reaction to the President's request—if he stops to think about it—will be that there are many qualified people willing to run the Government at $18,000-a-year salaries. In an election year, Congress will probably bear this in mind.

The Farm Mess: Sailor Sued Over Cotton Crop Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the regimentation now present in our farming community is reaching a ridiculous state. I am sure that we would reach that period of no return if the Kennedy administration farmer control policies are adopted.

The following newspaper article about a young 19-year-old farmer from Arkansas, who apparently exceeded his 5-acre cotton allotment by a fraction of an acre, is a pitiful example of how far this country has gone in attempting to control every facet of the farmer's life. I am chagrined to see in the face of the many inequities that exist in the present program, that the Agriculture Department sees fit to engineer further and more binding controls and restrictions on the farming community.

Do you not think the farmer has had enough? His interest would be better served if we in the Congress started turning back to the farmer a little more self-determination and initiative. The article follows:

UNITED STATES ASKS $52—SAILOR SUED OVER COTTON CROP RULE

A recruit at Naval Training Center found out today how tough it is to solve the Nation's farm program.

Lindsey C. Sawyer, 19, of Portland, Ark., was told the Government is suing him to collect $52.38 as a penalty for overplanting of a cotton allotment.

The Associated Press in Little Rock reported that the Government so far has spent $61.10 to inform him about the suit.

The $61.10 was listed as official expenses for deputy marshals who made two round trips of 300 miles each from Little Rock to Portland to serve court papers on Sawyer.

MOTHER SERVED

On their first trip deputies discovered that Sawyer had enlisted in the Navy January 8. They were sent back to serve papers on his mother, Mrs. Iva Sawyer, yesterday.

"I thought I had that all straightened out before I left," Sawyer said here.

"I planted a fraction of an acre over my 5-acre cotton allotment, but bad weather and the boll weevil ruined the crop and we couldn't pick any cotton," he said.

"IT'S NOT RIGHT"

Sawyer said the penalty would have applied to the yield from his cotton crop, but since he was unable to harvest the crop, he figured there would be no problem.

"I talked to the Government people about this and explained it. If they say I owe them a penalty it is not right," he said.

"It's not worth it to go to court so I might tell my mother to pay it for that reason. If I wanted justice, I wouldn't pay it," he said.

SEEKS NEW TRADE

Sawyer said he joined the Navy because farming was "no good any more" and he wanted to take advantage of the Navy program that will give him electrical training.

Sawyer's father, who died 2 years ago, was in the Navy during World War II. An older brother also served in the Navy until recently. He said they were an influence in his choice.

"I'm just a poor boy and joined the Navy to go to school. I love the Navy. This is the life," Sawyer said.

Voice of Faith and Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on March 11 an event of significance occurred in the city of Long Beach under sponsorship of the religious community of that city including Catholic, Greek Orthodox, Jewish, and Protestant churches. It was the uniting of all Long Beach church choirs into a gigantic song festival appropriately called the voice of faith and brotherhood.

The idea was conceived several years ago by members of the Long Beach B'nai B'rith Lodge as a suitable observance for Brotherhood Week. Some 30 choirs took part in the festival held at the Long Beach municipal auditorium and attended by large numbers of the area's residents. James Weeks, minister of music at the First Congregational Church acted as musical director of the combined choirs, assisted by Rolla Alford, choir director of the First Methodist Church. Chairmen and coordinators for the event were Mr. Gene Lentzner, president of the Long Beach B'nai B'rith Lodge and Rev. Donald C. Cooke, minister of the North Long Beach Methodist Church and chairman of the Human Relations Committee of the Long Beach Council of Churches.

The church choirs participating in this event, together with the names of their choir directors, were the following:

Bay Shore Community Congregational Church, Helene Allen; Bixby Knolls Christian Church, Carole Smith; Calvary Baptist Church, Rocco Leggett; Calvary Presbyterian Church, Ray Chace; Christ Presbyterian Church, Mildred Leaman; Cross Roads Community Church, June Sams; East Side Christian Church, Marion Miller; First Church of the Brethren, Robert Walker; First Congregational Church, James Weeks; First Methodist Church, Rolla Alford; First Presbyterian Church, Frank Pooler; Grace Methodist Church, Phil Haynes; Greek Orthodox Church, Nick Karidokis; Lakewood First Presbyterian Church, Mrs. James Lobbett; Los Altos United Congregational Church, Leon Smith; New Hope Baptist Church, Hazel Henderson; North Long Beach Christian Church, Lloyd Todd; North Long Beach Community Presbyterian Church, Gilbert Philo; North Long Beach Methodist Church, Ted Gardner; Second Presbyterian Church, Martha Smith; Silverado Park Community Methodist Church, Robert Goodwin; Starr King United Presbyterian Church, Wallace Schurr; St. Bartholomew Catholic Church, Henry Keating; St. Cornelius Catholic Church, William Schreeweis; St. Matthews Catholic Church, Gardner Roth; St. Timothy's Episcopal Church—Compton, Edgar Carswell; Temple Israel, Mabel Persons; Temple Sinai, Morris Greeenfield; Trinity Evangelical Lutheran Church, Harold Agal; and Trinity Methodist Church—Lakewood, Robert Thorpe.

Clergymen participating in the voice of faith and brotherhood program were as follows:

Welcome: Rev. Wendell Tredick, minister, First Presbyterian Church.

Invocation: Rev. Nicholas Billiris, pastor, Assumption of the Blessed Virgin, Greek Orthodox.

Scripture: Rabbi Wolli Kaelter.

Offering: Rev. Donald Cooke, minister, North Long Beach Methodist Church.

Benediction: Rev. John B. Fitzgerald, St. Bartholomew Church.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE CURTIS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Boston University News published an editorial last January 9 favoring Federal aid to education. On January 16, 1962, it printed "The Opposing Argument," prepared at the request of the editors.

The editorial of January 9 appears in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page A48. Some of my constituents urge that both sides of the argument should receive equal publicity, and have suggested that "The Opposing Argument" should also be brought before the Members. I include it with these remarks, as follows:

THE OPPOSING ARGUMENT

(By Edwin Duckworth and George Sahady)

It is conceded that American education is in need of financial assistance. However, the type of aid necessary should not be supplied by the Federal Government. We believe that the State governments are able to meet the challenge and that rush Federal aid would not be in line with our democratic ideals.

The idea of Federal aid to education first appeared in 1954 when the Office of Education in a survey reported that there was a shortage of 370,000 classrooms and further predicted that in 1959 the shortage would be 470,000. Instead the classroom shortage of 152,000 in 1959 was reduced to only 134,000 in 1960.

During the past 5 years, 336,000 classrooms have been built although only 212,000 were necessary in that period. In other words, we are presently reducing the classroom shortage as well as keeping up with increasing enrollments at the rate of 25,000 classrooms annually.

If this rate is continued for the next 5 years, classroom construction would exceed the 134,000 needed and at the same time keep pace with enrollment and replacing obsolescent classrooms as they appear.

In 1955, a report was submitted to President Eisenhower on the subject of Federal aid to education by the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations which read in part:

"Research does not sustain the contention that Federal funds are essential to support the elementary and secondary school systems. It is our opinion that the appropriation of relatively small sums to Federal aid to school construction amounting to 10 or 20 percent of the present State and local outlay of almost $2 billion a year, may delay rather than advance school construction. Districts not eligible in one year may hold off their building plans on the chance of being able to buy their schoolhouses at 50 cents on the dollar a year or two later."

SCHOOL DISTRICTS ARE SOLVENT

According to a survey by the Office of Education only one-half of 1 percent of all school districts in the United States have reached the limit of their available bonded indebtedness for school construction. Last year the volume and approval rate of school bonds set new records. Less than 1 percent of the Nation's school districts have used up their resources or reached their borrowing limits.

In the past decade enrollments have increased about 44 percent and it's estimated that in the next decade the increase will be around 22 percent, only one-half of the previous 10 years. The reason for the decline is that war babies will soon complete their educations.

Moreover teachers' salaries are advancing to the level which they should occupy. Over the last 30 years, the increase in salaries of schoolteachers was 106 percent, while local, State and Federal employees received an average increase of 66 percent, according to a report by the Institute for Social Science Research.

School expenditures by the respective States have increased 153 percent in the last decade. In addition, capital outlays for elementary and secondary building sites and equipment are increasing at $3 billion annually.

States can meet the responsibility. Between 1957–69 there will be a need for 55,800 new classrooms each year. We are now constructing 70,000 annually. In a short time the States will meet the shortage.

DISTRICTS ARE NOT POOR

In some States where property taxes are high, as in Massachusetts, the taxpayer would be contributing to schools of States with lower property taxes. School districts are not poor; they need tax revisions and property reevaluations.

An important reason why many districts need financial assistance is due to an internal population shift. The Government is already aiding areas where many Government employees reside through the areas impacted bill. Colleges are in need of money and the Government is already assisting them through loan programs which eventually will be expanded.

The Federal Government with a debt of $300 billion and accrued liabilities amounting to $450 billion is much less able to finance educational expenditures than are States and local governments with a combined debt of $62 billion.

Another aspect of Federal aid to education is the amount of control the Government will have. We must realize that with Federal aid goes Federal control. It is the obligation of Congress to govern expenditures; if it ignores this responsibility, Congress is not performing its constitutional duties.

Local control and enthusiasm for education are the basic essentials if the Nation's educational system is to continue on its present basis. For if the Federal Government grants funds to America's school systems, it will certainly administer the funds and subjects "in the public good."

TIED TO FEDERAL STANDARDS

Federal aid to schools might make more sense if we were tied with wise Federal standards, but this shocks even the Federal aiders. If the government wants to enter education, we can amend the Constitution to delegate the Federal Government to do so.

The late Nicholas Murray Butler, former President of Columbia University wrote:

"Unless the school is both the work and the pride of the community it serves, it is nothing. A school system that grows naturally in response to the needs and ambitions of a hundred thousand different communities will be a better school system than any which can be imposed upon these localities by the aid of grants of Federal money from the Federal treasury, accompanied by Federal inspections, Federal reports, and Federal uniformity."

When the Constitution was drafted in 1787, the States delegated certain powers to the Federal Government and at the same time reserved certain rights for themselves. Education was not one of the areas delegated to Federal control. It still is not and never should be.

Nation Doing Nothing To Halt Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me self-evident that every Member of Congress should be vitally concerned with the possible effects of another spiral of inflation. Mr. Edgar Stolz, finance writer of the Redwood City Tribune, in California, recently prepared the following article which was published in the Redwood City Tribune of Wednesday, March 7, and it illustrates the cumulative effect on this inflationary spiral of action by cities, counties and the Federal Government:

MONEY TALKS—NATION DOING NOTHING TO HALT TIDE OF INFLATION

(By Edgar Stolz)

Historical writers report that King Canute of old stood at the water's edge and ordered the tide to turn back not noticing how wet his feet were getting meanwhile.

Today, we, as a Nation, are doing the same thing in the matter of inflation. While our feet are getting very wet, we are doing nothing constructive to turn the tide.

In the few weeks since January 1, we see the following taking place.

President Kennedy has recommended substantial pay increases for Government employes in the upper brackets and smaller increases in the lower ones.

Food prices in the San Francisco Bay area rose from December to January according to Government reports.

The board of supervisors in San Francisco expects to raise the pay of civil service employees. This would add about $1 million to the $2.4 million already recommended by the Civil Service Commission for about 10,000 employees and San Francisco supervisors are increasing taxi fares 5 cents the first mile and 10 cents for further miles. They are also studying a plan to tax telephone receipts.

California Legislature Analysis Alan Post says fees for college students at the University of California should be increased.

Raise in postage rates is a practical certainty this year with pay increases to postal workers.

The national debt is being raised by Congress by $2 billion making it total $300 billion. By June another stretch-out of $8 billion is predicted.

Our State government reports education costs are now up $84.4 million.

Social welfare is up $54.8 million and a 5-percent raise is going to 129,000 State employees plus an extra 5 percent for highway patrolmen. These will take another $44.9 million.

Governor Brown says there will be no new taxes by the State this year. This is quite natural since 1962 is an election year. But there will be other years with more taxes then, if the present regime remains and probably even if a new crowd gets in.

Auto insurance rates in San Mateo County are being boosted.

In Palo Alto, the city council is preparing to substantially raise building permit fees and, in the same city, treeworkers recently organized and received a pay increase.

Hiller employees in Palo Alto ended a 2-day strike by getting a new wage contract with pay increases.

In 44 States across the Nation, telephone installers received a wage hike last month.

California Packing Corp. recently negotiated union contracts which, it says, will add to new packing costs.

On April 1, 13,000 American workers in the Panama Canal Zone will receive pay hikes ranging from 3 percent to 29 percent.

Cement workers will get an 8 cents an hour increase this spring and cement prices will be increased as much as 15 cents per barrel.

Adhesives for tile, linoleum, and asphalt will be raised most any day.

The State public utilities commission has authorized a 3-percent rate increase for tank truckers hauling petroleum and petroleum products and we are already paying almost half our gasoline costs in taxes.

The big Yale & Towne Co. recently ended a costly 5-month strike at its Philadelphia plant by signing a new 3-year labor contract at higher pay.

The situation is really alarming. Labor costs beget taxes and taxes beget more labor costs and between the two we are slowly but surely undermining our economy and directly, or indirectly, affecting every man, woman, or child in this country. Furthermore, the condition will continue into generations yet unborn unless it is stopped.

Hugh Russell Fraser, in the Daily Commercial News, recently said, "Whatever happens, Rome must not be overlooked. I suggest they make a point to walk through the ruins of that ancient city that was once the capital of the world. Then I suggest they turn to page 6 of their guide book and read as follows: 'The day's work was customarily finished by noon or thereafter—and the rest of the day was spent in pleasure and amusement. More than half the days of the year were holidays. This was Rome the center of the world and the Roman Empire was about to come to an end.' "

Who is to blame? You and I, the voters are the only ones who can put an end to this orgy or inflation, via the ballot box. Elected officials must be forced to see the light before it is too late—and time is running out.

Remarks by Commandant of the Marine Corps to Headquarters Staff and Field Commands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, Gen. David M. Shoup, Commandant of the Marine Corps, is a native of Covington, Ind., which is located in the Sixth Indiana Congressional District. This is the district which it is my privilege to represent in Congress.

Mr. Herbert Lee, Sr., of Decatur, Ga., recently called my attention to the very rousing and patriotic message delivered by General Shoup to members of the Marine Corps throughout the world.

General Shoup's remarks, however, carry a message for all Americans and I hereby offer the Commandant's message to the Marine Corps in its entirety:

REMARKS BY COMMANDANT OF THE MARINE CORPS TO HEADQUARTERS STAFF AND FIELD COMMANDS

INTRODUCTION

To all marines on active duty, our always-ready Reserves, and our dedicated civilian teammates, "Good morning." And a "well done" for your accomplishments in 1961.

While I am quite aware that my previous New Year's remarks are not exactly collectors' items, I have, nevertheless, reread them before preparing my observations for this year.

Results of your efforts show that the target designation has been passing good. Coupled with your superb marksmanship, many of the targets which I pointed out for 1960 and 1961 have the bull's eyes knocked out. For a few—Maggie's drawers. Bad range estimation on my part. For these, we've had our sighters. We're locked on the target now. We'll shoot for record in 1962.

Today I want to give you a few new guideposts, a little polish for the tarnished ones, and a new goal or two.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

Fifty-plus percent might satisfy some requirements. There are those who draw high salaries by batting only .333. But for marines there can be only one goal—100 percent performance. Being a true marine is not simply a job or a career. It is not a science It is an art. You can't qualify on a per diem basis. The essential ingredient is dedication. It is measured by your personal efforts and personal sacrifices. Its rewards are the deep inner self-satisfaction of having a part in the creation of the Marine Corps picture. True dedication means creative effort on this picture before 0800 and after 1630. Let not these important hours be subscribed wholly to your plans for your home, your personal activities or your career after retirement. Seeking personal advantage does not befit a marine. Let selflessness be your treasure. For "Where your treasure is, there is your heart."

Perhaps the most successful generation of marines in the history of our corps has already begun to pass from the active rolls. Every effort must be made to assure that the abundance of their talent and their wealth of experience do not retire with them. Use these marines to the fullest extent while they are still with us. Glean from them the richness of their experiences. Help them to leave behind all the know-how they can. Weapons and techniques may change, but battle-tested professional experience will remain our most important asset.

The rights of man and due process of law are freemen's greatest assets. Yet commanders sometimes appear to use the administrative discharge as an easy way out in the handling of marines where disciplinary action may be indicated. When you start thinking of this method just to avoid difficulties and frustrations—stop short. Change your course to the law. Let the marine have recourse to it.

For my money, I continue to believe that we taxpayers have the right to expect a fair return on our investment in the Marine Corps. This means efficient and proper utilization of our manpower, our money and our materials which all American citizens have provided us. Men times money times material is greater than all else. This should be our operating formula. The equation is $M^3 > \infty$

The shortage of family housing and its impact on the welfare and attitudes of our marines continues to engage my efforts. During the coming year we hope to acquire over a thousand new units. We must make a serious effort to care well for what housing is provided.

Even as the man in the butts can best read the value of the hits on his target, I shall continue to believe that the commander in the field knows what is best for his command at his particular station. Dope the wind on your local range.

I have been especially pleased to note the increasing number of officers and men who have added a religious observance to the usual military and social aspects of the Marine Corps birthday. This is being done by dedicating the preceding Sunday to solemn religious rites as a part of our annual birthday celebration. I solicit your encouragement of this practice.

Each of us should strive to make sure that the Marine Corps will be a little better because we've been marines. Why not make this your aim—a goal you seek? Sure, the stream of marine-green can and will flow on without you as an individual, but you will find a deal of satisfaction if you're sure you've had a real part in keeping our corps on course.

PERSONNEL AND MANPOWER MATTERS

Surely the greatest of God's creations privileged to inhabit this earth is man. That portion within the province and responsibilities of commanders sometimes called manpower-management is without doubt the most important function of command. The degree of success in all else is in direct proportion to our accomplishments in this field. Unhappily, a high degree of success in this is sometimes most difficult to attain. The difficulties multiply fast when we lose sight of our principal burden of obligation—thought and care for the individual marine. Whether you command one or thousands, this is just as true.

Many times I have said that I have no trouble finding people to handle machines. The problem is to find people who can handle people. Concentrate on marines. They'll handle the machines. This problem warrants the undivided attention of all echelons of command and of every individual. Why the individual? Simply because each of us must first learn to command himself before aspiring to command others. Too many take too long to learn this lesson. By the words "With all thy getting, get understanding," surely it was meant—the understanding of boys and girls, men and women, of human beings. Included is the individual marine. Get to understand him. He'll command himself sooner. Help lift your burden.

Do you search the faces of your men every day? Do you know their problems? Are you helping them? The trouble is that all too often those who are in charge of others don't counsel them at the opportune time to properly help them in their personal problems—don't point out their shortcomings and their substandard performances early enough. Sometimes commanders do not personally concern themselves with the individual problems of a man until it is too late. Then they may feel impelled to dump the whole of the red book on them. Some of us with gray hairs of understanding and experience tend to shove too much of this all-important task off onto our juniors. We can all do better. Let's try.

Sometimes some of us forget that helpers follow the standards of their chief. Not only the standards of their big chief, who may be far away, but principally the standards of their smaller chiefs with whom they communicate and whom they observe and obey on a day-to-day basis.

Do everything you can to help our marines to understand the meaning of "caveat emptor." By wise counsel, guide as many as possible to avoid the yoke of debt and mortgage. Spare no aid to relieve them from the distress of financial predicaments, unwisely entered into at exorbitant rates of interest.

TRAINING

So obvious. So often proved in combat. Yet so many times our thinking strays from the age-old truism that proper training is the very foundation of all military success. All hands must know that combat readiness means meticulous attention to detail.

To develop in your men the requisite psychology of willingness to tangle with any enemy, foreign or domestic, to steep them in the hot oil of determination is the ultimate goal of all training. This is the way to win battles.

The platform for military success of every unit, no matter how small, must rest firmly and solidly upon three stanch legs. These are: intelligence, communications, and supply. If one of these be weak our combat potential is correspondingly weakened. We can well afford to pay more attention to the trim of these legs. Proper training and education will do it.

Training is not all sitting in a chair watching films, listening to lectures. Get out into the kinds of geography in which you are likely to have to fight. Get out into the rain, snow, cold, and darkness similar to where you might have to do battle. Get used to the field mice, screech owls, coyotes, and katydids. Pavement-produced progeny don't grow up with these things, you know.

I recently observed a training lecture in progress within a barracks. The platoon of Marines which was listening to their instructor talk about guerrilla tactics looked about as enthusiastic, I thought, as weight-watching women waiting at a skim milk dispenser.

I want to mention economy again in connection with training. Dollars and consumable supplies are not unlimited. This must be of grave concern to all Marines at every level of responsibility. Our motto for training should be to get the most from the least.

INTELLIGENCE

It is gratifying to me to note the increasing and continued command attention being paid to our combat intelligence program.

Dedicated, highly trained Marines, equipped with the finest weapons, supported by flawless logistics and communications systems and commanded by brilliant tacticians, cannot produce optimum results unless the commander has timely and adequate combat intelligence on which to base his decisions.

However, there are too many of us who seem to hope for success in combat while operating in a black-sock atmosphere. This attitude contains a built-in certainty for a degree of success much less than desirable—ofttimes failure.

Then there is the all-important matter of security. We must stress "Do you know who's listening? Do you know to whom you are talking? Do you?"

SUPPLY

Supply is the important business of all ranks—not just the few. Just saying, "That's the supply officer's problem," won't solve the problems. All hands must understand, must assist in supply support effort.

Previously I pointed out that the platform for military success rests upon three legs, and that one of them was supply. That leg we must strengthen. One way to do this is by listening to the man in the field—the daily user of equipment. He is the one who knows what piece of gear breaks down most often. He can tell you why it failed to operate. Many times he will also have a worthwhile suggestion as to how to correct the disability. Let's make it easy for the user to give us this information. Let's listen. We'll have more answers, more solutions, fewer items deadlined.

In this supply business, besides the headaches of proper distribution, the time-old problems of procurement and production countinue to exist. Even reproduction generates many supply problems for the Marine Corps. Better planning can help solve both problems.

Whether the leap to the nuclear age has been from the carrying-pole or the M-1, it matters little. The distance is phenomenal. The reorientation enormous. And right now we're in the middle of the muddle.

Equipping to be a winner, with or without the nuclear assist, is the biggest enigma of the Marine Corps today—perhaps for the decade ahead. This is the greatest challenge for military minds—particularly troublesome for troop commanders and those responsible for materiel planning and procurement. Our coefficent of elasticity must be high, indeed.

MARINE CORPS RESERVE

Year 1962 will be a very important year for our Reserves. We will continue to reorient and to streamline our organizational structure and to update our equipment and supplies for reserve units. There will be more emphasis on mobilization training at home armories. I also intend to have more reserve units integrated with regular units during summer training period. All of this will be sighted toward obtaining the maximum capability for immediate mount-out.

Will it be necessary in these uncertain times to call you to active duty against your will? Just as uncertain. Be ready. Wait. Should this requirement come to pass, I am certain you will come with the will to fight our designated enemies—and the prudence to leave a will behind.

HEADQUARTERS STAFF

My confidence in this staff is confirmed daily. Soon I will pay out more line to you. Burden you more, me less, with the details of headquarters administration. From visits I plan to make to the field, you may expect a stream of reports and observations which will require staffwork here. Be prepared for fast action.

Past plans for reorganization of this headquarters and proposals recently made will be placed into effect this year, but only where such changes will provide a considerable improvement in our capability to more efficiently execute our responsibilities to the

departments and our field commanders. No reorganization just for the sake of reorganizing.

For the coming year, let's spare no effort toward keeping all of our mental, material, and spiritual weapons sighted in and ready to support our Nation's goal of continued liberty and freedom for all people.

We will continue to teach fighting, but not hate.

The bulletin carrying my Christmas message to you may have been canceled on 26 December last, but the universal message, I hope, will live on forever.

A happy, new 1962 to all of you. And keep plowing.

Peter Francisco: American Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, today is Peter Francisco Day in Massachusetts. Since 1955 when Gov. Christian A. Herter first proclaimed March 15 as a fitting occasion to pay tribute to the most famous private soldier of the Revolutionary War, Portuguese-Americans have celebrated the heroic courage, and exemplary citizenship of this outstanding patriot.

I would like to inform my colleagues in the House of the deeds of Peter Francisco because I feel that in his life there is a lesson for all Americans who love their country and who would dedicate themselves to its service.

Peter Francisco was not a native of Virginia nor, indeed, of this country. His origin is obscure but he was apparently the victim of a kidnaping in a foreign land. In 1765, at the age of five or six, he was left, friendless and alone, on the wharf at City Point, now Hopewell, Va., by a ship that immediately sailed away. His dark complexion, his features, and his name seemed to point to Portugal as the land of his origin. His rich clothing—although seaworn and showing hard usage—the silver buckles engraved "P.F." that adorned his shoes, and his courageous bearing and engaging manner encouraged the impression that he was of noble parentage.

It was fortunate for Peter Francisco that, shortly after his arrival, Judge Anthony Winston stopped by City Point on business. Winston was returning home from Williamsburg where he had heard the fiery "Caeser and Brutus" speech of his nephew, Patrick Henry. He was interested in the lad and took a load off the shoulders of the parish authorities by obtaining their readily given permission to take the boy to "Hunting Towers," his home in Buckingham County. There Francisco spent the next 10 years. His formal education seems to have been neglected, but from the discussions of Patrick Henry and other visitors he gained an understanding of the principles of freedom and a zeal for the cause of liberty.

YOUNG PATRIOT

In the fall of 1776, at the age of 16, Francisco enlisted in the 10th Virginia Regiment of Continental troops and joined the army under Washington at Middlebrook. He was a sturdy youth, standing 6 feet 6 inches in height and weighing 260 pounds. He received his baptism of fire with Lafayette at Brandywine. He fought at Germantown and Monmouth. At the storming of Stony Point on the Hudson, he was the first man after Maj. James Gibbons of Richmond to scale the walls of the fort, despite a 9-inch wound in the abdomen. Again, at Powell's Hook, undaunted by a bayonet wound in the thigh, he proceeded into the British lines to kill two grenadiers.

After serving the 3 years for which he had enlisted, he returned to Virginia, but his bold and adventurous spirit and his devotion to the American cause impelled him to return to the army. He enlisted this time in Col. William Mayo's regiment and went with him to serve with Gates in the Carolinas. It is reported that in the Battle of Camden, Francisco, singlehanded moved a 1,100-pound cannon several hundred feet to a new position—the two artillery horses ordinary required to do the job had been killed by British fire. It was in that battle that he saved Colonel Mayo's life and then made possible the colonel's escape. Francisco with a single bayonet thrust, disposed of the British trooper attempting to capture Mayo, then gallantly gave the Britisher's horse to the fleeing colonel.

HEROIC DEEDS

After the defeat of Gates at Camden, Francisco returned to Prince Edward County, but soon reenlisted, equipped himself with a good horse, and joined Captain Watkins' command under Colonel Washington in the South. It is not recorded how many of the British he killed at Guilford Courthouse before he was wounded "from hipsocket to knee," but afterward, "with his terrible broadsword" he dispatched 11 of the enemy. Left for dead on the battlefield, he was later carried by an old man named Robinson to a nearby farmhouse where he was given medical attention and where he recuperated. On the battlefield at Greensboro, N.C., there stands a monument of granite blocks marking the place where "Peter Francisco * * * killed 11 British soldiers with his own broadsword, and although badly wounded by bayonet, made his escape." At Yorktown the military career of Francisco closed. There, serving under Lafayette, his first commander, he witnessed the surernder of Cornwallis.

WIT AND DARING

Francisco's most famous exploit occurred in Amelia County after his return from Guilford Courthouse. He was at Ben Ward's Tavern when the house was suddenly surrounded by nine of Tarleton's troopers. One of them demanded his watch and another his silver knee buckles. When Francisco pretended to acquiesce, the cavalrymen dismounted and one of them stooped to take the buckles off, placing his sword under his arm. Francisco stepped back one pace, seized the sword by the hilt, and gave the trooper a blow across the skull. Just then Tarleton's troops, consisting of about 400 men, came in sight, and Francisco called aloud as if ordering out his own command of men. The British near him were deceived and fled, leaving their horses behind them. Francisco mounted one of the deserted horses and, driving the others before him, escaped down an obscure road, although Tarleton's troopers were dispatched in all directions in search of him.

TESTS AND REWARDS

Francisco's exploits did not go unnoticed by his commanding officers. General Greene gave Peter a beautiful razor appropriately inscribed, and General Washington, himself, gave Private Francisco a magnificent broadsword, which only a man of Francisco's prodigious strength could wield.

The story is told of a burly backwoodsman named Pamphlett who rode all the way from Kentucky to test his strength against that of Francisco. After Francisco threw him over a 4-foot fence and lifted his horse over after him, the amazed Pamphlett mounted his horse and headed back toward Kentucky.

MARRIED THREE TIMES

In 1781 Francisco met and feel in love with Susannah Anderson, but 4 years elapsed before they could secure her family's consent to the marriage and Peter could take the lovely Susannah to Hunting Towers as his bride. Perhaps he never worked harder than during those 4 long years, with the twofold purpose of obtaining an education and acquiring the means of supporting a wife.

Five years after their marriage Susannah died, leaving him with a little son to whom she left a home, Locust Grove, and the Cumberland County lands inherited from her father.

In 1794 Peter married Catherine Fauntleroy Brooks, a devoted friend and relative of Susannah. They had four children and spent 27 happy years together at Locust Grove before she died in 1821. His third marriage, in 1823, was to Mary Beverly Grymes, the widow West, who survived him. Since she disliked the country they moved in 1825 to Richmond, where during the last 6 years of his life Francisco served as sersergeant at arms of the Virginia House of Delegates. His kindness, sincereity, gracious manner, and ever-present wit endeared him to all who knew him.

TRUE AMERICAN

Peter Francisco died in Richmond on January 16, 1831. The house adjourned in respect and joined with the senate, the Governor, and the city council in

attending the funeral. The services were conducted in the hall of the house of delegates by Bishop Channing Moore and burial took place with full military honors in Shockoe Cemetery.

From obscurity to immortality, from penniless waif to prosperous planter and respected public servant, a man honored by his contemporaries and revered by us today, Peter Francisco's story is one which makes all Americans proud.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 139, p. 1937).

Appendix

The West Against Itself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 16, 1962

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, we in the West are acutely concerned with issues which involve considerable conflict. Some historians and social scientists have commented that westerners assume attitudes which are against their own best self-interest. This was the theme of an able speech by Assistant Secretary of Interior John A. Carver, Jr., at a meeting of western historians last fall.

I ask consent to have printed excerpts from this speech in the Appendix with my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WEST AGAINST ITSELF

(Address by Assistant Secretary of the Interior John A. Carver, Jr., at the Conference on the History of Western America in Sante Fe, N. Mex., October 13, 1961)

All of you will recognize the plagiarism in my selection of a title tonight. It was purposeful, and I hope that I may establish my right to speak to the theme Bernard DeVoto developed in those two significant conservation essays he wrote for Harper's 15 years ago.

The web of cultural peculiarity never entirely frees the southerner or the westerner. Bernard DeVoto, the editor of the Easy Chair and of the Saturday Review of Literature, the Harvard don, successful author on that most difficult of all literary themes, "How To Make a Good Martini," could have become as unwestern as Ezra Pound, poet from Hailey, Idaho. Undoubtedly he struggled like Thomas Wolfe or Vardis Fisher to separate himself forever from his own inheritance. But he made peace with his heritage of ecclesiastical family and community conflict, and made the West his great study. The West, which saw very little of his adult life, nevertheless owned him.

He told my friend Dick Neuberger, when they were once in camp on the Lolo above the fierce Lochsa, that if he had the power to select a different incarnation, he would like most of all to have been a member of the Lewis and Clark Expedition. Those men, he felt, even the lowliest among them had enjoyed a profound experience and had lived a life of accomplishment given to few men in modern times.

In death the West owned him permanently. DeVoto arranged to have his ashes scattered at the highest point of the Lolo Trail, in the Bitterroots.

* * * * *

Westerners who reside out of the West often display a curious self-conscious mixture of attitudes. It almost brands us. For example, we're self-conscious or apologetic about any part of higher education we may have acquired in the West (let me say right now, in self-defense, that for some purposes of this talk I exclude California—only I won't say when I do and when I don't). Sometimes we return to our native States and tell people quite bluntly that we think it quite impossible to get a good education there.

Yet when the subject turns that way, we speak up for our region, and wrap ourselves in all the virtues which romantic tradition has labeled as western—rough, tough, plain spoken, kindly, generous, etc.

* * * * *

We knuckle under to the older and more sophisticated centers of society. Ortega Gasset said once that Europe had nothing to learn from America. According to him, American civilization is purely colonial and derivative, as empty as a hollow ball, and as totally lacking in that solid internal structure that makes European civilization a thing of beauty and a joy forever.

* * * * *

There is no need to cite examples, but I never pass up the opportunity to emphasize that the most American of all symbols, the American Indian, represents multiplicity, not unity, of cultures. American exposure to oriental and other Pacific culture, was through the western door. That the migrants found something when they got here besides sage and desert is evidenced by the community property laws that still survive in New Mexico, California, Idaho, and Washington—checkerboarded, as it were, with States whose married women have to look to the less generous common law system.

I've attended several regional political conferences. Such conferences hang together pretty well in the Midwest, and in the South and Northeast. In the West, conflict crops out in every agenda item—upstream versus downstream; industrial versus agricultural; public versus private; water-long versus water-short; high interest versus low interest.

Yet for the purposes of his essays of 15 years ago, Bernard DeVoto assumed a unified regional economy and psychology to document a convincing essay whose title was "The West Against Itself." Neatly and with finality he summed up:

"Economically the West has always been a province of the East and it has always been plundered * * * The East has always held a mortgage on the permanent West, channeling its wealth eastward, maintaining it in a debtor status, and confining its economic function to that of a mercantilist province." (Harper's, January 1947, pp. 1, 2.)

* * * * *

DeVoto's article was written in 1946. In that immediate postwar period he thought the West had its emancipation from the East within its grasp by reason of the acceleration of the region development in World War II. It had then the opportunity to revolutionalize and reintegrate its economic structure, and to seize control over its own economic destiny.

Its big obstacle was one of which it was itself unaware, a basic split in the western psyche—a division in the western mind.

He speaks of the "West's attitude toward the Federal intervention which alone was powerful enough to save western natural resources from total control and quick liquidation by the absentee eastern ownership. For that preservation the West is grateful to the Government. But there was and still is a fundamental defect: Federal intervention has also preserved those resources from locally owned liquidation by the West itself. So, at the very moment when the West is blueprinting an economy which must be based on the sustained, permanent use of its natural resources, it is also conducting an assault on these resources with the simple objective of liquidating them. The dissociation of intelligence could go no further but there it is—and there is the West yesterday, today, and forever."

I set out to put a political dimension into this. The political dimension is implicit in the issue around which he framed his conflict of the West against itself. Were he alive today, I think DeVoto would measure the West's progress toward realizing its potential in political terms. The activities and quality of the politicians as well as the nature of the political issues currently debated would be accepted by him as a fitting basis for comparison.

Mr. DeVoto described various legislative assaults which were being mounted to wrest control of the natural resources of the West from the public, and devote them to the benefit of selfish private interests, numerically insignificant and owned or dominated by the East. The bills he described were hardy perennials, coming up in Congress after Congress, to distribute the Taylor Grazing Act lands directly to the livestock interests; to turn over to the States the public domain and mineral rights, as a preliminary to ultimate transfer to the exploiters; to reclassify national forest lands suitable for grazing as grazing lands, looking to eventual disposition; and the like.

Such legislation no longer pends. Indeed some of the special interests depicted as having such power, and having Congressmen and Senators in their pockets, now feel themselves very much on the defensive, and deserving of sympathy and help—consider the shock to the mining and lumbering and cattle groups of the passage by the Senate of a wilderness bill, 78 to 8.

Far more significant than the happy circumstance of relative absence of special interest legislation is the relative merit of the West's current crop of politicians. I don't mean just those recently elected—when DeVoto wrote the halls of Congress were graced with several great fighters for the public interest, who worked hard for conservation of the resources which belong to all the people.

But if you will let me speak especially about that segment of the West's political representation which is found in the U.S. Senate, I think you will see a really striking change. The election of Dick Neuberger to the Senate in 1954 as much as any one political event signalized the fact that the West's struggle against itself was being resolved in the people's favor.

Dick Neuberger was an historian of the West, and a colleague well known to most of you. I'm glad his election came while Mr. DeVoto was still alive. These two men fought for the same causes with the same tools and with equal skill. Senator Neuberger too has passed on—but modern westerners are on his side and the side of DeVoto: that is to say, on the side of the public interest.

* * * * *

In DeVoto's standard, the westerners present an imposing array, not just for being

on the side of conservation, but for their leadership, their knowledge, their toughness when the fighting gets rough.

It is appropriate that we should be discussing this subject here in New Mexico—for this State is represented in the Senate by one who truly represents the new West—a leader among the "new breed". CLINTON P. ANDERSON has achieved a level of statesmanship which marks him as a giant among all Senators, not alone those of the West. His record as chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee demonstrates an unwavering devotion to regional self-sufficiency and the preservation of its material and spiritual heritage. Senator ANDERSON seeks to achieve the western dream in DeVoto's terms—"the establishment of an economy on the natural resources of the West, developed and integrated to produce a steady, sustained, permanent yield." Yet he suffers from no regional myopia, for he was a stanch defender of the national interest as Secretary of Agriculture and he has struggled with the international implications of nuclear energy.

CLINTON ANDERSON is beginning his third full term. While he has had such illustrious allies as CARL HAYDEN, DENNIS CHAVEZ, WARREN MAGNUSON and WAYNE MORSE during all or much of this period, it was for many years a lonely struggle to uphold the reputation of the West in the liberal tradition. But reinforcements were on the way; MIKE MANSFIELD, SCOOP JACKSON and ALAN BIBLE came early, and more recently the ranks have been filled with the names and deeds of JOHN CARROLL, FRANK CHURCH, BOB BARTLETT, CLAIR ENGLE, LEE METCALF, HOWARD CANNON, GALE MCGEE, TED MOSS and JOE HICKEY. Now MAURINE NEUBERGER carries on with skill and grace the great conservation work so ably begun by her late husband.

I trust I may be forgiven if, in this context, I point with pride to my own junior Senator as symbolizing the new representation of the West and what it stands for. FRANK CHURCH, still years shy of 40, completes a full term next year. He earned his spurs early in a resources fight which would have warmed the heart of Bernard DeVoto and has added new luster each year through similar feats. Recently, he led the Senate brilliantly in its consideration of a bill which brought every vested interest of DeVoto's West into frightening alliance against him. He fought for the West; he did not pit the West against itself.

Whether you may agree or disagree with their politics or with my assessment of any of these men, in Bernard DeVoto's standard of fierce devotion to the public interest and the conservation and management of the public's resources, these Senators collectively and individually measure up to the highest standards of dedicated public service, as great as any group produced by any region at any time in the Republic's history.

As I said before, the region is not unified; the struggles which DeVoto discussed, still go on, with an ebb and flow of partial success and partial failure. But the current uniformly high quality of public service by westerners is new. It is supposed to characterize only the nature and developed East. In the perspective of history, something is proved in this beyond the obviously political—I admitted to a bias at the outset. To my mind, these men and a great many able western Republicans with them, establish a coming of age of the region.

* * * * *

Many reasons could be cited for the trend: better quality of candidates, increased and changing population, influence of communications media and the development of interest groups to contest the control of the old interests. But I think an even more basic ferment is at work and I assume the risk of your professional criticism in a brief development of it here.

I accept in large measure Turner's interpretation of the frontier as an influence in our national development—granting also that other influences were at work. He regarded the frontier as the wellspring of the American character—an ever-moving line which found new stimuli for the enrichment of our democratic institutions. Never stated but implicit in his interpretation is the fact that the frontier society is a marginal one—always just one step ahead of hunger, danger, and the buffeting of nature. Such an environment leaves no time for conservation—land must be cleared even if the forests and prairies must be burned in the process. The abundant land can be used without regard to efficient methods. But now the physical frontier is gone. The remaining public domain survived the onslaught of expansion primarily because it is mountainous, arid, or inaccessible. Maturity has come to our West because the luxury of frontier wastefulness can no longer be tolerated. The sophistication of western statesmen is thus explained in terms that Turner predicted in 1910: "* * * the age of free competition of individuals for the unpossessed resources of the Nation is nearing its end. It is taking less than a generation to write the chapter which began with the disappearance of the line of the frontier—the last chapter in the history of the colonization of the United States, the conclusion to the annals of its pioneer democracy."

Thus the New Frontier is by no means a mere political allusion. It has fundamental meaning for the whole Nation. It means that we can no longer look to a geographical expanse of unappropriated resources for our values and a higher plane of national character. If our society is to remain dynamic and democratic, we must seek our stimuli within ourselves, within the social body which we comprise, and in the new worlds of science which our intelligence creates. The West being closer to the lessons of the old frontier, is in a position to make the major contribution to the philosophy of the new. You are the professional custodians of that responsibility. To discharge it, you must rise to the highest standards of your craft to wring the last full measure of meaning out of our very meaningful traditions.

An Outstanding Young Missourian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUART SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 16, 1962

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, we of Missouri are proud not only of the contributions to industry and science by citizens of our State, but also of the no less important contributions that our citizens have made and are making to the arts.

The astounding accomplishments of a young pianist from University City, Mo., Malcolm Frager, the only American ever to win first prize at both the Queen Elizabeth of Belgium and the Edgar M. Leventritt International competitions, are worthy of the recognition of all Americans.

At the age of 27, Mr. Frager displays the brilliancy of artistry and technique which insure his place among the world's greatest pianists.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles from the Washington Post and Evening Star on his recent recital here at Constitution Hall, which, I am sure all will agree, attest to his high talent, be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRAGER RECITAL SHOWS HIS BRILLIANT ARTISTRY

(By Irving Lowens)

Those on hand to hear Malcolm Frager at Constitution Hall yesterday afternoon—the audience was shockingly sparse—were treated to an awe-inspiring display of keyboard artistry and virtuosity by this brilliant young man from St. Louis.

Mr. Frager by no means arrived in Washington unheralded. He has walked away with virtually every important American prize, including the Leventritt, and 2 years ago won the Queen Elizabeth of Belgium Award—the same one that started Emil Gilels on his career more than two decades ago. Critics have been shouting his praises for years.

But Frager was only kissed on the cheek by a Belgian queen and not by a Russian premier, and this apparently makes the difference between a virtually empty house and a full one. It merely goes to show that, despite our claims to culture, all too many of us are more interested in headhunting celebrities than we are in hearing good musicians.

For there can be no doubt about it—the 27-year-old Frager is one of the most fantastically gifted pianists of modern times. So far as I am concerned, it would be very difficult to find another pianist of his age who is his equal, and none is his superior.

There is an unusual quality about the art of Frager that is difficult to describe. Everything that he plays sounds completely effortless. Nothing in the literature appears to tax his capabilities. As a consequence, one ceases to concentrate on his astounding technique in very short order, and music, not its executant, occupies the spotlight.

I know of no pianist with such obvious ability to overwhelm his listeners with spectacular pyrotechnics who keeps himself so carefully in the background—for Frager, virtuosity is totally subservient to musicianship.

Yesterday's recital was a parade of delights and a complete artistic triumph. Unhackneyed sonatas by Mozart and Beethoven, exquisitely etched, were followed by familiar Chopin played with such jewel-like precision and sensitivity that the E minor "Nocturne" and the B minor "Scherzo" turned out to be profoundly moving experiences. Indeed, I cannot recall a more affecting performance of the "Nocturne" in my years of concert-going—the shape of the piece was perfection itself.

After the intermission, Frager devoted himself to the Prokofiev "Sixth Sonata," and the limpid, Mozart-like clarity he achieved in this difficult work was a wonder.

I could find fault only with the opening Scarlatti group. This was obviously carefully thought out and beautifully projected, but it seemed to me somewhat overromantic in its rather wayward tempi.

All in all, this recital was certainly one of the best of the season and a most auspicious Constitution Hall debut for young Malcolm Frager. No Washington music-lover should miss hearing him the next time he visits our city.

PIANIST FRAGER, AT 27, SHOWS SUPERB CONTROL, GREAT TALENT

(By Paul Hume)

Malcolm Frager is among the youngest pianists to play a Constitution Hall recital. He is also among the best. At 27, Frager is already comfortably past the trying days during which he won the world's two most demanding musical competitions, this coun-

try's Leventritt, and Belgium's Queen Elizabeth.

The music Frager played yesterday afternoon in the big hall all came from the most standard composers. But as the unassuming artist moved from Scarlatti to Mozart, and from Beethoven to Chopin, he displayed, with increasingly impressive stature a control over his art that was impeccable.

For Frager the piano is a means of reproducing the musical thought of great men. He chooses to emphasize the design of music more than its textural characteristics, although his E Minor Chopin "Nocturne" was tender and singing. He played three Scarlatti sonatas that were uniformly of those that transfer well to the piano, not those that demand the harpsichord's changing timbers.

MODEL OF CLARITY

The A minor "Sonata" of Mozart was a model of clarity and perfectly gaged dynamics. One of the most expressive elements in Frager's playing is the way in which he handles a presto scale, whether by Mozart or Prokofiev, faultlessly, at a dynamical level frequently subdued in volume.

Arriving at Beethoven, Frager chose the seldom played "Sonata in F," opus 54, with its opening minuet and troublesome finale. The last time this sonata was heard in Constitution Hall it was played by Sviatoslav Richter, who said afterward that his playing of it had been "dreadful."

While Richter's personal assessment of his own playing was unduly harsh, it is entirely fair to state that Frager handled the big octaves in the minuet's trio, and the scrambled sixths in its closing movement in such a way that he made Beethoven's thought wholly apparent, and avoided any suggestion of strain while doing it. It was a reading that could have stood easily alongside Richter's.

BOLD, EXCITING CHOPIN

The B minor "scherzo" of Chopin was bold, and, from its midpoint on to the end, the most exciting playing of the day, up to that point. The closing pages were in the great manner.

After the intermission, Frager played the "Sixth Sonata" of Prokofiev, which was also on one of Richter's concerts last season. The varying moods of the sonata were superbly expounded in Frager's playing which had greater power, and more intensity than in anything he had played previously. To the leisurely philosophy of Prokofiev's meandering waltz, an ironic movement, he brought as profound a sense of the beauty of the passage as we have ever heard. For its enormous demands, he had, with the appearance of plenty to spare, a flaming technique.

In encores by Scarlatti and Liszt, the impression that Frager is already one of our greatest talents and future hopes was underscored. Had he been honored by Khrushchev rather than by Queen Elizabeth, the hall would no doubt have held five times as many as were actually there. It is strange how strongly we insist in this country that our own top prizes, and that given in Brussels, are not as good as the one they give in Moscow. The shame is ours.

Wisconsin Provides a Shelter for the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 16, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in a wealthy, powerful, and fast progressing Nation, the majority of our citizens enjoy better living standards and greater opportunity than ever before in history.

Unfortunately, however, this is not true for all. For reasons—unknown to us—the "hidden hand of life" sometimes reaches out to impair and cripple limb and flesh, yes, and sometimes spirit. Bearing such afflictions, handicapped individuals face special problems which we, well and healthy, cannot fully understand.

Nevertheless, human compassion impels us to attempt, insofar as it is possible, to ease the burden—physical and spiritual—and, wherever possible, open a door of opportunity.

Today, I want to pay tribute to a community in Wisconsin attempting a splendid effort to help such individuals make their way through life: The "Shelter for Handicapped, Inc." at Eau Claire, Wis. A nonprofit workshop founded to solely to assist the handicapped, the shelter conducts a workshop program for helping, by training, handicapped individuals to develop skills for gainful employment.

Recently, President Robert Southard, has been appealing for assistance to help carry forward this program. The purpose is laudable. The goal is humanitarian. We must, I believe, lend a sympathetic ear to this plea.

I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from Mr. Southard's letter to the President printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN PROVIDES A SHELTER FOR THE HANDICAPPED

During the past several years numerous citizens within our community have been working with handicapped adults from the area. The problem that is being faced is one common throughout the Nation helping the impaired make use of their abilities and desires through a sheltered workshop program.

The Shelter for Handicapped, Inc., in Eau Claire, began nearly 3 years ago and with funds entirely derived from private sources, has grown to the point where 33 handicapped people are employed. The greater majority of these employees have never worked before and without a workshop of this type, would certainly have been considered economic burdens in our community.

One point surpasses the fact that we have this given number of employees. Fourteen other individuals who were previously unemployable, have been trained and developed ability that has enabled them to be placed in gainful employment.

Much publicity has been recently given to the tremendous expenditures on public welfare. Each of us must be cognizant of the fact that definite and positive measures must be taken to help all groups, including the physically and mentally impaired, to become partially or fully self-sustaining. This should be done, not only to decrease the burden on our own community, but to create a dignity among those previously unemployable.

At the present time there seems to be very little help or encouragement from the Federal Government regarding employment of the impaired citizen. Each year, hundreds of thousands of contracts are let or sublet by the Government to private industry.

I would deem it extremely beneficial if a given number of these contracts, consisting of work which could be efficiently and effectively handled by sheltered workshops, be set aside for these establishments.

The majority of workshops operate on a nonprofit, charitable basis, and an effective criteria might easily be established to determine which shops would be eligible for this governmental contract work.

Two Worlds at Geneva

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 16, 1962

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, in today's issue of the New York Times appeared an excellent editorial entitled "Two Worlds at Geneva" concerning the Conference going on at Geneva. The editorial points out that if we were to agree with the plan being advanced by the Russians at Geneva it would only be an invitation to suicide, which the West and the free world cannot and will not accept.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO WORLDS AT GENEVA

The Geneva Disarmament Conference, dealing with what President Kennedy calls "the foremost item on the agenda of humanity," has now before it two rival programs which demonstrate anew the vast gulf that separates East and West. Both sides recognize that we live in an atomic age in which monster weapons threaten mankind with total annihilation. Both sides propose, in principle, total disarmament in three stages under international control as the only way to real worldwide security. But there the similarity ends.

The Western plan, presented by Secretary Rusk as a basis of discussion, is built on both the United Nations disarmament resolutions and the proposals of President Kennedy last September. It calls for step-by-step progress that would preserve the power balance between East and West and would go hand-in-hand with political solutions to ease world tensions and avert new crises, such as the one now rising again in Berlin.

As first steps, Mr. Rusk urges an immediate controlled test ban treaty and a 30 percent cut within 3 years in major world armaments—in particular, nuclear delivery vehicles—an end to production of fissionable material for nuclear arms, prevention of the spread of nuclear arms to other nations, reduction of all armed forces to 2.1 million or less, and measures to prevent surprise attack. All steps would be under effective international control, including aerial inspection and verification of actual disarmament and also of what would be retained or what might be secretly replaced. This control would be applied by a single administrator operating under a multinational commission empowered to enforce its decisions. Further reductions would come in the later stages.

The Soviet program hews closely to Premier Khrushchev's plan for total disarmament in 4 years. It urges, as a first step to be completed in 15 months, the elimination of all nuclear delivery vehicles, prohibition of all nuclear tests by all nations,

withdrawal of foreign forces from foreign soil and dismantling of all foreign bases, nuclear-free zones in Central Europe and reduction of conventional forces to 1.7 million. But it bars all controls of a nuclear test ban, except "national self-control," and admits vague controls only of what is disarmed, not of what is retained or may be secretly replaced. Even those controls would be under a multinational troika committee taking decisions by a two-thirds majority and leaving action to the Security Council, subject to a Soviet veto. Even its peace force would be under a troika command subject to veto by any one of the three commanders.

What this means is that the West would be required at the very start of disarmament to dismantle its present defense structure, withdraw American troops from Europe and destroy the nuclear deterrent that is its best defense against the Eurasian mass armies. The Russians would be able to continue cheating behind the Iron Curtain. That is an invitation to suicide which the West and the free world cannot and will not accept.

The Highest Form of National Thrift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 16, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Christian Science Monitor recently published an editorial entitled "The Highest Form of National Thrift," a thoughtful analysis of the word "thrift" as related to our national resources.

Without necessarily reflecting accord with this evaluation of the President's program, I nevertheless think that it deserves the attention of Congress, and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HIGHEST FORM OF NATIONAL THRIFT

It is one of the ironies of American politics that national conservation is spearheaded not by conservatives but by liberals.

This paradox grows out of a fundamental political decision as to what constitutes national thrift. American conservatives are traditionally associated with thrift; liberals have been firmly tagged spenders. And yet President Kennedy, in his unusually comprehensive message to Congress on conservation, boldly states that the billion-dollar spending programs he proposes are "the highest form of national thrift."

Are they?

Doctrinaire liberals will say yes; doctrinaire conservatives no. But there is good reason to believe that pragmatists of both sides—and, particularly, thoughtful conservatives—will find logic on the side of the President's contention. They will, at least, insofar as his programs do not become a bureaucratic picnic ground—a kind of Parkinson's Park Service.

There is, certainly, fundamental thift to be found in spending now to save assets that will be many times more costly—or gone forever—in a few years.

These are the major parts of the program presented to Congress:

Parks and recreation: National landholdings would be put in order. Unneeded surplus lands would continue to be auctioned off—with proceeds used to buy park land. Congress is asked to lend $500 million over an 8-year period for conservation of recreation lands. The park-using public is to repay this in user taxes.

There will be inevitable local disputes over what are or are not necessary national recreation lands. But few Americans conscious of their national heritage can begrudge saving its most noted outdoor splendors on this budget plan that reverses so dramatically the trend to "Have fun now; pay later."

Water resources: The use of river basin commissions to coordinate State plans, a program long supported by this newspaper, is urged. Congress should examine carefully, however, the extent to which Federal planning may overbalance regional decisions in the detailed legislation submitted later by the administration.

Pollution control is not broadly discussed in the congressional message. But Congress doubtless will be asked for matching funds to encourage river cities to clean sewage. Measures to accomplish this should (1) use court action against lagging cities first, and (2) distribute matching funds under a community means-test formula, not by blanket grants.

Minerals and timber: Private research and development are wisely left to bear the brunt of conservation in these fields. Multiple-use roads are sought in national forest areas so that sensibly controlled exploitation can be combined with public enjoyment.

Youth Conservation Corps: This reincarnation of the depression-era CCC has special appeal at a time when school dropouts, jobless youth, and delinquency are mounting. But a small pilot program should be given a thorough test before any large-scale effort is undertaken. The aim ought to be a domestic Peace Corps rather than a sylvan reform school.

Power: A study of long-range national power needs and means for establishing a national power grid is all that is sought. The Nation's private power concerns should find means to further this research and share in its benefits.

America is still a cornucopia of resources. The pursuit of happiness envisaged in its basic statement of national purpose is undiminished. But abundance and open spaces have to be preserved if the fruits of progress—population and urban sprawl, paved scenery and industrial monotony—are not to make progress itself distasteful to live with.

Saving of resources is all the more urgent as America is converted from a Nation of ranch houses (400 acres) to one of ranch houses (one-fourth acre). Einstein doubted that the modern American is any happier than the Indian whose place he took. The question is moot. But Americans should move wisely now to see that their grandchildren are not left less opportunity for happiness. Such thrift is bipartisan.

The Drama of Aerospace Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 16, 1962

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I have just read a very absorbing and informative speech that the Secretary of the Air Force made on March 6 before the Los Angeles Junior Chamber of Commerce. Secretary Zuckert does an excellent job of reviewing the drama of aerospace development in this country. In his remarks he points out that "space is there to be explored and utilized and we have no choice but to get on with it"—if we are to insure our country against scientific obsolescence and against the hazards of military surprise in space.

I commend the Secretary's speech to the attention of my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HONORABLE EUGENE M. ZUCKERT, SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE, BEFORE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, LOS ANGELES, CALIF., TUESDAY, MARCH 6, 1962

I welcome this opportunity to speak to the Los Angeles Junior Chamber of Commerce today for two reasons.

First, because you are at the center of an area of concentration of the Nation's resources for aerospace development.

Second, because you are not so much the junior segment of the commercial community as you are the leaders who will carry on well into the exciting era ahead for all of us.

I say "exciting" advisedly. I could say terrific. Even Hollywood would have to work hard to find ways to describe the outlook for a future which defies all the adjectives ever applied to the drama of life.

The very speed at which this technological drama is moving is part of the excitement.

California was settled by people who came here by one or the other of the same modes of travel that the ancient Egyptians used and that the Romans used to open their "west."

Staying always on the surface of his earth, man moved by foot, on the back of an animal, on a vehicle pulled by an animal, or on a waterborne vessel propelled by his muscles and the wind. These were the only modes for countless centuries.

Since California was settled, man has learned to use energy other than his own, his animals, or the wind. He developed machines that could propel him on land or water. He improved them rapidly—the next steps were inevitable. He learned to lift himself off the ground and travel through the air, and now above the air.

From Kitty Hawk to Cape Canaveral isn't even enough of a span of life to qualify for social security. Yet we've moved into a new age. Look what has happened within the lifetime of most of the men in this room. It is just 2 months short of 35 years since Charles A. Lindbergh in an overloaded, 220-horsepower monoplane flew off into the fog and rain of the North Atlantic, with no radio, and 33 hours later landed in Paris to give the world the same kind of thrill John Glenn did 2 weeks ago.

The Mercury flights dramatize the opening of the space age. To those who marvel at the feat of sending a man three times around the world in just slightly longer than it takes for the sun's position to move from Maine to San Pedro, a respectful and appropriate reply is, "You ain't seen nothin' yet."

In commenting on the flight of Colonel Glenn, President Kennedy defined our space program in characteristically simple terms when he said the space is a new ocean and we are going to sail on it. He could have added that space is a new era and we intend to live in it.

There is no turning back, or away. Space is there to be explored and utilized, and we have no choice but to get on with it. The reasons are not hard to define. They were clearly summed up in the remarks of Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, Assistant Administrator

of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, when he said:

"The ultimate and practical purpose of these large expenditures is twofold: (1) insurance of the Nation against scientific obsolescence in a time of explosive advances in science and technology; and (2) insurance against the hazards of military surprise in space."

He defined in these two purposes, the peacetime role of NASA in the national space program, and the defense role of the Air Force. The two must advance in harness, and they do.

They are interdependent. One cannot move without the other. Furthermore, the Nation cannot stand for any diversion of the efforts of either toward jurisdictional conflicts which can rob us of the most precious ingredient—time.

The promise of space development is nothing less than thrilling. Even the things we can anticipate now—transoceanic television, new aids to navigation and geodesy, and fantastic aids to weather forecasting—are enough to jar the imagination. But what else?

We simply cannot know what else, but the experience is not new. We can recall that Columbus set sail with a letter of introduction to the Grand Kahn of Cathay, with whom Ferdinand and Isabella sought to establish trade relations of great promise. The high anticipation of the backers of Drake's oil drilling venture in Pennsylvania in 1859 was based on cheaper candles, axle grease, and medicinal oils.

We do know this much else. Man's ability to navigate the ocean of space—which envelopes the whole earth as does the familiar ocean of the air—will change his life on earth.

The byproduct of the development of space technology is already great, and undoubtedly has just started. We have developed new materials, new methods of machine computation, and new thermoelectric devices. Even the instrumentation required for space experiments bear other fruit, they are providing promising electronic techniques of precise and continuous recording of heart action that could open up a new dimension of understanding and treatment of heart diseases.

But these are just part of the almost endless list of fringe benefits. There are more compelling reasons, other than the acknowledged and obvious one of not wanting to be second in a race with the Soviets. The same motivation which caused man to explore his earth and the seas, to seek explanation of what he observed in nature, to understand fire and wind and the processes of life—whatever the motivation or compulsion, it has at last brought us to the point where we can leave earth to explore other planets. First will be the moon.

The spacecraft used to navigate the universal sea will be marvels of engineering. But more than that, they will actually extend the range of man's senses.

From these vessels, man will have a new perspective on his own planet, Earth, as well as on the Moon, and planets such as Venus and Mars.

The wonders of photography and telemetry are such that he can have a mirror in the sky. Man will eventually be able to see every part of his earth all the time and to reach any part of it in a very, very short time. The military implications are clear.

Unfortunately, man's ever-increasing ability to adapt himself to the physical universe in which he lives has outrun his ability to adapt himself to live with his own kind. At the same time that he has learned to free himself from the burden of his physical surroundings, at a time when he can begin to see the possibilities of victory over his ancient enemies of hunger and disease, as well as over the historic barriers of nature, man must still spend heavily of his hard-gained means to guard against having those means, his own knowledge, used against him. This is the burden of national defense. Here is the requirement for military man in space. And here also is the means to preserve the peacebuilding hope of space.

There is a glimmer of hope that space may be a challenge great enough to initiate cooperation between the two great power blocs of the world. The United States has consistently sought such a project, and kept the door open to the Soviets. We have consistently taken the initiative, through the United Nations, to establish a broad international base for peaceful exploitation of space. That is why President Kennedy responded promptly and constructively to Premier Khrushchev's expression of interest in our invitation following the Glenn flight.

The Soviets have made great progress in development of big boosters, obviously great enough to put considerably larger spacecraft into orbit than the MA-6 capsule. The Soviets may have decided that our broad scientific assault on space may be more productive than they thought. Certainly space exploration is so costly, and there is so much to be done, that collaboration would be useful.

Whatever the Soviet reasons and their course, we have sufficient confidence in our own accomplishment and growing capability in space, sufficient confidence in our own ability to defend ourselves and the free world, and sufficient devotion to our own ideals and peaceful national objectives, to be ready to cooperate honestly and openly in any honest, open, and constructive international space project.

These first tentative feelers for cooperation with the Soviets in the space field may prove as futile and unproductive as our massive all-out proposal for atomic cooperation back in 1946. On the other hand, the bit-by-bit approach after nearly 16 years of cold war could be fruitful. Our only course is to play it straight, carefully, with diplomatic firmness, and, as Stonewall Jackson would have said, keep our powder dry.

The very possibility of American-Soviet cooperation in space primarily demonstrates just how important space really is. I said it would change life on earth. It will, I believe, completely add a new dimension to military concepts.

I might say revolutionize but that is not the right word. It would be more accurate to say fulfill, or complete, the military concepts established in Admiral Mahan's great treatises on seapower. His works were the definitive culmination of centuries of naval experience, but they were written during the period before airpower became a major military arm. What he wrote applies to the unlimited ocean of space with far greater emphasis than to the waters of the earth. The nation which dominates the aerospace can dominate the earth, because the aerospace covers 100 percent of the earth.

The overriding importance of the aerospace as a medium of military operations, the infinite extension of the medium of airpower, should jar loose whatever encumbrances of tradition and prejudice might slow our progress. We in the Air Force feel this most sharply. Ours is the primary responsibility to prevent the domination of the aerospace by any power or combination of powers whose interests are inimical to freedom and national independence on earth.

We must be free of any bias in our thinking and planning which would distort our vision or dilute our programs aimed at mastery of the space ocean. We must be free of fetters which can restrain us and hold us back. We are trying to develop the machines and the methods of their utilization which will assure the free peoples of the world—after all these centuries of struggle and suffering—that they are not about to lose freedom on earth as the price of man's conquest of the space beyond his world.

The defense significance and potentials of the aerospace are such that every other military consideration must be subject to adjustment and revision, including the matter of military organization.

To be sure, the strategic employment of missiles held in readiness on the ground and of the fleets of manned aerospace craft above, must always be integrated, subject to single command and control. And of equal certainty, the engines which propel the intercontinental ballistic missiles and the interplanetary spacecraft are so much a part of the same family they can only grow up together.

Today's intercontinental ballistic missiles are, of course, primitive weapons, compared with what will be possible with the development of schemes of maneuvering reentry, aerospace-mobile launching and aerospace-mobile command and control stations. The relative importance of today's static missile system will change greatly as development progresses toward supersonic vehicles which are subject to full and continuous control throughout the aerospace.

The Hound Dog and Skybolt systems point the way, and are the first step toward dynamic aerospace systems which will be free of range limitations, out of the path of a fixed trajectory, and subject to absolute control with flexibility and precision of delivery.

These developments will come with time and hard work, but they will come. How we fit them into the overall pattern of our defenses calls for critical analysis and unbiased decisions. The point is, we must avoid rigidity of organization, be prepared for change, be ready to jettison outmoded concepts, and be quick to adopt new techniques as well as to revise and adapt the old ones.

We have in the Pentagon now, the kind of leadership it takes. Secretary of Defense McNamara understands the dynamics of weapon systems technology. He is quick to grasp the new, but he moves only on the basis of firm and demonstrable gains in military effectiveness.

We in the Air Force must preserve the spirit which brought us to full realization of airpower, which brought the Minuteman to an operational capability less than 2 years after its first flight test, and which will take us to mastery of space. The emerging space role of the Air Force will draw the men who will continue to give the Air Force that spirit and momentum.

In the meantime, we maintain at effective deterrent strength the military forces which will assure the peaceful environment necessary both to the pursuit of our space opportunity and to the practice of our hard won and hard held opportunity to live in freedom and peace on earth.

The bedrock of this deterrent force structure is the combined missile and manned bomber strategic nuclear delivery power. Our net defense posture, however, is being strengthened by new investment in types of forces required to stay the spread of Communist tyranny as it flows under the door and into the corners of the world.

We speak of space as the new challenge of our day. It is that, yes, but it is more precisely a new dimension to the real and continuing challenge of freedom. The struggle for freedom is as old as man. It is a struggle which is now complicated by man's own growth and technological attainments.

It falls to us, to this generation of Americans, as President Kennedy has often reminded us, to be the great defenders of freedom in its most dangerous hour. It will be a heavy burden. It will last a long time. It will cost more than anything else in history, save war.

We must be strong on every front, diplomatic, economic, military, political, moral, cultural, and scientific. We are leaders of the free world by both strength and conviction. We cannot shirk any part of that responsibility. We will serve as we are destined to serve, to the end that freedom shall be preserved and extended.

To this end, in the closing words of the founding document of the Nation, "We pledge our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

Hail to James A. Farley on St. Patrick's Day: "We'll All Be in Step With Jim"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 17, the feast of St. Patrick in all of the Americas, Erin's harps shall wake again in rapture from their slumber. In the shadow of the Andes, the specter of Bernardo O'Higgins, son of the Irishman, Ambrosio, will tread again the trail of Chilean liberation. The seas that wash the continent will be greener and brighter as the memory of a County Wexford man, Comdr. John Barry of the American Navy stirs in sailors' hearts. Across the plains and along the river banks of Missouri, Minnesota, and Illinois the heroic figure of Gen. James Shields will rise again in magnitude. Senator James Shields of Illinois, the same man was born in Altmore in County Tyrone—yes, "Tyrone among the bushes." Well did Illinois count him its illustrious son and place his image in Statuary Hall of the Capitol. No other American has represented three States, in the U.S. Senate, as did General Shields as member, not only from Illinois, but later Minnesota and finally Missouri.

But the frame of reference to great Americans of Gaelic origin rests not solely in the past.

On Saturday, March 17, New York City will observe the 200th anniversary of the commemoration of St. Patrick's feast day in our city. From 1762 to 1962 this day has grown in size and significance until we may properly say that on St. Patrick's day everyone who is Irish is happy and everyone who is happy is Irish. For this celebration unites all New Yorkers regardless of origin. It is fitting on this bicentennial occasion that our grand marshal for the parade up Fifth Avenue will be one of our State and Nation's finest sons, Hon. James A. Farley, former Postmaster General of the United States. "Big Jim" will lead us well, as he has led our people in fairness, faith in God and country, and the exercise of principles of democracy through every day of his manly life. When we are in step with Jim we move toward greatness and on Saturday next we will all be in step with Jim. From on high the corps of O'Higgins, Shields, and Barry should be well pleased to gaze upon the splendor of 100 marching bands, the spectacle of a million parading and watching along the way, and the flags of faith and freedom proudly flying. And Edmund Burke, Thomas Moore, Daniel O'Connell may well join them in approbation for the marshal of the 1962 St. Patrick's parade will one day stand with them in greatness. Until he does, it is my hope that James A. Farley, businessman, politician, philosopher, and patriot will continue to lead us not only on St. Patrick's Day but through the next decade in active participation in the government of our State and Nation.

The Courage of Freemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 16, 1962

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an exceedingly able speech made by the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover on the occasion of receiving the George Washington Award of Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa., on February 22, 1962.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COURAGE OF FREEMEN

(Remarks of J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, upon receiving the George Washington Award of Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa., February 22, 1962)

I am honored to accept the George Washington Award as a manifestation of your confidence in the men and women of the FBI. My associates join me in expressing heartfelt thanks for this recognition.

This hallowed ground upon which we stand today is the most meaningful spot in all America. It is most fittingly the home of the Freedoms Foundation and its vitally important mission. You are stimulating deeper appreciation of our Nation's noble past. Due, in no small measure, to your efforts, thousands of young people in our schools and colleges are developing a better understanding and taking greater pride in the priceless gift of freedom won for us by our early patriots—men of God-given strength and determination who laid the cornerstones for this great Nation.

Today, as never before, America has need for men and women who possess the moral strength and courage of our forefathers—modern-day patriots, with pride in our country and faith in freedom, unafraid to declare to anyone in the world, "I believe in liberty. I believe in justice. I will fight, if need be, to defend the dignity of man."

Too often in recent years, patriotic symbols have been shunted aside. Our national heroes have been maligned, our history distorted. Has it become a disgrace to pledge allegiance to our flag—or to sign a loyalty oath, or pay tribute to our national anthem? Is it shameful to encourage our children to memorize the stirring words of the men of 1776? Is it becoming opprobrious to state "In God we trust" when proclaiming our love of country?

What we desperately need today is patriotism founded on a real understanding of the American ideal—a dedicated belief in our principles of freedom and a determination to perpetuate America's heritage.

The ringing words spoken in 1850 by that great patriot Daniel Webster in the Senate of the United States are as meaningful today as then:

"I was born an American; I will live an American; I shall die an American; and I intend to perform the duties incumbent upon me in that character to the end of my career."

These words epitomize the strength of our Republic—the determination of American patriots from Bunker Hill to the wall of Berlin to uphold and to defend the cause of freedom.

This historic and hallowed site of Valley Forge is a monument to the true spirit of America. On this ground 184 years ago, a battered but unbowed group of patriots, dedicated to an ideal, wrote indelibly with their life's blood a new chapter in the history of freedom. Here was born a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

There must be in America a rebirth of the spirit of Valley Forge. The true strength of our Founding Fathers did not spring from materialistic ambitions—but from the deeper wellsprings of the spirit. For them, no sacrifice was too great in upholding the cause of freedom.

In our Nation today, the proper balance between the rights of the individual and those of society is being undermined by two major elements—communism and organized crime—two powerful and dangerous foes. We will underrate either of these enemies only at extreme peril to all we have and are.

Our Nation's crime problem is growing in both size and intensity. During the past decade, crime has nearly doubled across the United States. It is outpacing our population growth by more than 4 to 1.

Today, in this great land of ours, a vicious crime of violence—a murder, forcible rape or assault to kill—is committed every 3 minutes. There is a robbery every 6 minutes; a burglary every 39 seconds; and 37 cars are stolen every hour.

By far the most shocking aspect of this mounting crime problem is the role played by youth. Among youth, there are some of the most brutal, incorrigible criminals in the Nation.

Nowhere is the tragic failure of American parents more dramatically demonstrated than in police records which show that nearly one-half of the arrests for burglaries and larcenies, and almost two-thirds of the auto theft arrests each year involve persons less than 18 years old.

We are losing the battle when thousands upon thousands of our youth remain morally unfortified against the temptations of a life of crime. And we are hastening national disaster when we tolerate weaknesses in the administration of justice—weaknesses which enable repeated undeserved leniencies to be showered upon vicious young thugs, robbers, rapists and murderers.

Teenagers who consistently defy the law must be held legally accountable for their crimes against society. They, like their adult counterparts, must learn that there is no "privileged class" in America.

The America we live in today must awaken to the danger. A tidal wave of lawless tyranny is now surging forth from the criminal and subversive underworlds. It breaks with abrasive effect against the foundations of our Republic. Our national conscience, our heritage of freedom, the entire cause of decency, are being severely tested by these deadly enemies.

Crime has a partner in forming the common denominator of a breakdown in moral behavior; it is the influenec of godless communism. The forces of communism pervert our Bill of Rights. They hide behind a protective cloak of constitutional privilege while acting to destroy our freedoms.

In the eyes of their Soviet comrades, the Communists in this country have a vital role in the march toward world enslavement. They are, by Nikita Khrushchev's own description, a "valuable" arm of the international conspiracy against God and freedom.

This deadly international conspiracy now rules more than a fourth of the earth's surface and a third of her peoples. Its tentacles reach to the very shores of America where, less than 100 miles from our coast line, the Communist, dagger, clenched in the tight fist of a bearded international bandit, strikes at the heart of a desperate people and endangers the peace of this hemisphere.

In Europe, in Asia, and in our own Western Hemisphere, a steady stream of freedom-loving peoples continues to flee the Communist world of enslavement. Nowhere are we more conscious of voices clamoring to be heard than in Cuba, Hungary, East Germany and other Communist-controlled countries where the embers of freedom continue to burn in the hearts of men, women and children.

At this vital juncture in history, we as Americans face a critical challenge. Khrushchev, Castro and other leaders of the Communist world have staked their futures on the belief that an army of slaves dragging their chains can overtake free Americans, some of whom they see dragging their feet. It is not enough to be against communism. We must shed our complacency and aggressively meet this challenge.

Do our citizens fully appreciate what they are fighting for? This is the key question. This is the theme which you here at Freedoms Foundation have been so valiantly stressing. We are fighting—not to conquer, not to destroy, but to preserve and strengthen the integrity of free government, the dignity of man, the worth of the individual personality. We are fighting for the supremacy of law, for the rights of free speech, free assembly, free press, the right to worship God.

The basic answer to communism is moral. The fight is economic, political, social, psychological, diplomatic, strategic; but, above all, it is spiritual. It is a battle of ideas, of diametrically opposite concepts of man.

When our forefathers came to these shores, they came to develop a new political principle foreign to the lands whence they came. Here, men were to be superior to governments. That is why there can be no compromise with the Communists. They are at war with the entire cause of freedom, and the sooner every American faces this fact, the stronger our position will be.

America has no place for those timid souls who urge "appeasement at any price" nor those who chant the "better Red than dead" slogan. We need men with a capacity for moral indignation, men of faith, men of conviction, men with the God-given strength and determination to uphold the cause of democracy.

Our freedoms were not won by defeatists—fair-weather patriots who crawl into hiding at the first sign of danger. Nor does our strength stem from the pseudoliberals of the extreme left nor the pseudopatriots of the extreme right.

The cause of freedom is not advanced by persons or organizations which make it a fetish to grant our enemies privileges that law-abiding citizens themselves do not enjoy or seek. Nor is the American tradition fostered by those self-professed experts who promote hysteria by distorting the truth and misrepresenting the facts concerning the internal enemies of the United States. We should not minimize the threat and challenge of communism for one moment. But we must guard against the hysterical and irrational approach.

Our strength lies in our firm belief in freedom and a determination to maintain our freedom with sound, informed understanding of American ideals and principles. There still is virtue in the old-fashioned American belief in fighting for ideals, as well as against evils.

In the tradition of the early patriots, we must make our American heritage a living, dynamic, meaningful force. The men of Valley Forge knew why they were fighting. They had faith in an ideal—a faith which warmed their bodies against the bitter cold, which numbed the pain of frostbitten hands and feet, which quelled the gnawing hunger, which buoyed the spirits of an army far outnumbered.

George Washington and his valiant troops fought not for themselves alone, but for generations yet unborn. This too is our task. From our shoulders, the mantle of freedom—worn proudly for all the world to behold—must pass unstained to our children and to our children's children. No generation ever faced a more vital responsibility.

A half century ago, one of our great Presidents, Theodore Roosevelt, warned: "If we stand idly by, if we seek merely swollen, slothful ease, and ignoble peace, if we shrink from the hard contests which men must win at hazard of their lives and at the risk of all that they hold dear, then the bolder and stronger people will pass us by and will win for themselves the domination of the world."

Our Nation was founded by overcoming adversity. From the time of the early patriots—the pioneers, the Civil War, World War I, the great depression, World War II—always there has been a challenge for us to meet and conquer. Greatness won through the challenge of adversity can, however, be lost through inaction and lethargy.

Our challenge lies directly before us. The course is indelibly clear. Ours is a just cause. If we have faith in humanity, if we seek God's Divine guidance, if we summon the courage of our forefathers, our heritage of freedom will be preserved.

History teaches us that we must carefully tend the fires of freedom here at home—for the light of freemen will penetrate the darkness of tyranny wherever it exists in the world, bringing hope and trust in our noble cause.

We must dedicate ourselves to the principle that freedom under God is man's destiny. We must not only live our lives according to this principle but also defend it unto death with the courage of freemen.

Let us live our lives so that we may proclaim to the whole world: Individual freedom is our creed—national freedom is our heritage—world freedom is our goal.

Hiestand College Tuition Bill Boosted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most logical proposals yet made to assist higher education in the United States has come from our respected colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND]. He has introduced legislation providing for a Federal tax deduction of college expenses paid by parents for their children. On March 9 the Long Beach Independent-Press-Telegram commented favorably on this proposal as follows:

AID TO EDUCATION

Representative HIESTAND has introduced a bill to permit parents to deduct college tuition expenses from their income when calculating Federal income taxes.

The Congressman has a point, as any family with college-age youngsters will agree.

There's a great deal of debate about Federal aid to education.

Mr. HIESTAND suggests a form of aid that would receive almost universal approval.

Profit Rise Urged for All Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 16, 1962

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, in the New York Times for March 15, 1962, there was published a news story of a speech given at the University of Chicago by Mr. Leslie B. Worthington, the president of the United States Steel Corp.

The burden of this gentleman's speech was to argue, as the minority has argued in the Joint Economic Committee, in a report recently made, that if America is to maintain its competitive position both at home and abroad in markets generally, it is necessary that more restraint be used in connection with the gains in productivity. They should not all be spent in connection with increased wage rates and fringe benefits. The gains should be divided, to a reasonable extent, at least, working toward reduced prices and the leaving of something for the employer to use for renovation, for modernization, for the extension of plant and for the creation of new job opportunities.

Perhaps the greatest single domestic problem facing our country today is the problem of unemployment. This has been repeatedly pointed out by members of the administration before our committees and in speeches which they make.

I certainly agree unemployment is one of our most serious domestic issues, if not the most serious domestic issue.

Mr. Worthington really has thrown some light on this problem in the speech he made at the University of Chicago. I wish I had a copy of the speech to put in the RECORD, but I do not. The news item from the New York Times gives the important substance of his speech. He referred particularly to "our lessening ability to compete."

He said:

> Behind our lessening ability to compete, behind our balance of payments and related national problems, are our rising costs of production.

He also said:

> Behind our inability to meet low-wage competition from other lands through the advanced technology and improved productive efficiency which was once our course of action, lies a dwindling supply of investment capital. And behind this, lies the squeeze on profits.

The crucial point, Mr. President, is that for our free enterprise system to work, for our Nation's companies to compete at home and in the markets of the world, and for our country to grow, some

portion of the gains we make must be used to keep us growing.

Mr. President, this is a most significant contribution to the economic thought of the day, and I ask unanimous consent that my remarks and this news article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 15, 1962]

HEAD OF UNITED STATES STEEL URGES PROFIT RISE IN ALL INDUSTRY—WORTHINGTON FINDS HIGHER GAIN REQUIRED TO MEET CHALLENGE OF TRADE

(By Austin C. Wehrwein)

CHICAGO, March 14.—American industry must obtain higher profits if the United States is to protect its gold supply and meet its international trade challenges, the president of the United States Steel Corp. said tonight.

Leslie B. Worthington, the corporation's president, gave his views in an economic analysis for a University of Chicago audience.

In Pittsburgh, steel union and industry negotiators held further talks on a basic steel contract. Bargainnig is scheduled to continue Thursday.

Mr. Worthington suggested that the world market situation overshadowed gains in productivity as a collective bargaining yardstick.

At the same time, he devoted much of his talk to productivity, contending that, there is more to measure productivity than the one element of output per man-hour.

He said that productivity gains for the most part had been channeled into higher wages and fringe benefits or to pay higher taxes, instead of into better profits or lower prices or into improving efficiency. "Our situation is one wherein we have been 'costed out of the market,' if I may use such a term," Mr. Worthington said of the domestic economy.

Productivity has been at the heart of the bargaining sessions. The question has been what figure should be assigned to the man-hour output as a measure for union benefits.

In this speech at the annual management conference sponsored by the University of Chicago Graduate School of Business and the alumni of its executive program, Mr. Worthington was making one of his rare public appearances.

He did not mention automation, to which the union attributes declining employment. But alluding to oversea markets lost to foreign competition, he said:

"It has been estimated that in the American steel industry we now have some 40,000 fewer jobs than we would have had, if the relationship between steel exports and imports which existed 4 or 5 years ago were still in effect last year."

He said that American steel wages were $32 a day, compared with $10 in foreign countries.

Mr. Worthington also found a table to turn on the Kennedy administration's assertion that industry had lagged in investment for new plant and equipment.

He noted that the Secretary of Labor said a year ago that it would require up to $90 billion to overcome plant and equipment obsolescence in this country. Yet, Mr. Worthington asserted, the flow of investment capital had been discouraged. He said that corporate profits after taxes, as a percentage of gross national product, had been "squeezed down" from 8 percent in 1950 to 4½ percent in 1960.

PROFIT SQUEEZE SEEN

"Behind our lessening ability to compete, behind our balance-of-payments and related-nation problems, are our rising costs of production," he said. "Behind our inability to meet low-wage competition from other lands through the advanced technology and improved productive efficiency which was once our course of action, lies a dwindling supply of investment capital. And behind this, lies the squeeze on profits.

"The crucial point is that for our free enterprise system to work, for our Nation's companies to compete at home and in the markets of the world and for our country to grow, some portion of the gains we must make must be used to keep us growing.

"A far better course would be to convince more people of one elementary fact: there is more to measuring productivity than the one element of our output per man-hour. True productivity is a reflection of the efficiency with which all resources are used in producing and distributing goods and services. What an employee puts into production in the form of skill, effort and time is a major factor, certainly; but there are others.

"What about the capital investment in more efficient equipment? What about the research which produced better production processes and the knowledge of various types which made available high-quality materials? And what about the 'input' of management which directed and contributed to all of this effort?

"If all of our gains must be used to cover higher employment costs and higher Government costs, then nothing is left to stimulate more investment or consumer demand through better profits and lower prices. Nothing is left to help us grow as a nation, to increase employment opportunities for our increasing population or to meet our international challenges."

S.O.S.: Save Our Streams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 16, 1962

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the lead article in the March issue of the Sport Fishing Institute Bulletin discusses 'Roadbuilding and Fishing."

The article deals with the harmful effect, on fishery resources, of "channelization, inadequate or poorly designed culverts, dredging in the streambeds for gravel to use in road construction and the suspended silt loads resulting from these activities."

According to Oklahoma studies, reports the bulletin:

Fish in clear water gained weight about four times as fast as in muddy water. Muddy water had a marked unfavorable effect on reproduction of certain species. Food production was up to 14 times greater in clear than in muddy waters.

The article also refers kindly to S. 2767, my bill, to require the approval of the Secretary of the Interior to surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates for projects on the Federal-aid highway system, for the purpose of protecting fish, wildlife and recreation resources.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the SFI Bulletin article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROADBUILDING AND FISHING

There has been growing concern in the past decade among conservationists over the increasing threat to fishery resources and dependent fishing posed by expanding road and highway construction programs. The impact has been both direct—through construction activities in the beds of streams and the extensive removal of gravel deposits vital to fish spawning and fishfood production—and indirect, as a result of the effects of suspended silt on spawning success, food production and fish growth. A number of localized biological studies have been conducted and have demonstrated the harmful effects of channelization, inadequate or poorly designed culverts, dredging in the streambeds for gravel to use in road construction, and the suspended silt loads resulting from these activities.

Effects of suspended silt on fish populations are less obvious though nonetheless harmful. An extensive study was made of this problem several years ago in Oklahoma. The differences found in fish growth and reproduction, and production of fishfoods between clear and muddy waters were of great significance. Fish in clear water gained weight about four times as fast as in muddy water. Muddy water had a marked unfavorable effect on reproduction of certain species. Food production was up to 14 times greater in clear than in muddy waters.

We have heard of many past instances in the West where spawning areas of salmon and steelhead have been physically removed or where they have been damaged by pollution resulting from gravel washing operations. In the East and North, many locally famous trout streams have been destroyed by bulldozing. In the South, gravel dredging and washing has done incalculable harm to smallmouth bass especially.

The key question involved concerns relative values. For which purpose is the streambed gravel more valuable—to produce fish or roadbeds? In this connection, California has made an intensive survey of its available spawning beds. It was estimated in 1953 that each spawning salmon, regardless of sex, in the Sacramento Valley was worth about $17.50 in terms of the commercial and sport fishing values produced by its progeny.

The average annual value to the sport and commercial fisheries of the salmon produced by an average of 380,000 spawners in the Sacramento Valley is roughly $6,500,000—more at times. This is a naturally renewable resource—a perpetual source of recreation and food that costs nothing to produce. The capitalized value at a conservative 4-percent-interest rate, is over $160 million.

This tremendous crop of salmon is produced from a small area of gravel distributed in about 200 miles of streams in the Sacramento Valley. On the average nearly 2,000 spawning salmon use each mile of stream during the spawning period. These are small streams. They seldom have as much as 40 acres (usually half or less) of actual spawning gravel per mile of stream. And perhaps some 50 salmon spawn on each acre of gravel, as an estimate. Thus the value of the salmon produced per acre of spawning gravel exceeds $800 (often $1,600 or more) annually.

Very little farmland in the country can consistently produce this kind of a monetary return. Any land that produces an annual crop worth $800 would cost at least $20,000 per acre. But so far as we know, no one is paying this much for land for farming or subdivisions yet, let alone twice that much.

Gravel in a steambed represents fully as tangible an asset to the sport and commercial fishing industry as it does to the construction industry for use in highways. In the past, however, there has been virtually no consideration given to protecting these valuable gravel spawning beds.

The tremendous Federal-State roadbuilding program now underway can be expected to exercise a major influence on fishing for decades to come. Its magnitude is staggering. At the outset of the program, nearly 5 years ago, the U.S. Department of Commerce estimated that over 9.7 billion tons of aggregate would be used for Federal-aid highways through 1970. Unfortunately, unless stringently controlled, much of this incredible amount of gravel would be dug from streambeds, especially in regions where gravel deposits are scarce.

Mr. Bertram D. Tallamy went on record several years ago, in his capacity as Federal Highway Administrator, as being concerned for the esthetic values of road construction. He stated that it costs no more to have a highway divide around a clump of trees or a trout stream than it does to ignore these values and destroy them. While this was an encouraging attitude, it has often proved difficult to convince State highway engineers that recreational considerations may be fully as important as their goal of getting people from one place to another in as short a time as possible. Throughout the country emphasis on limited access highways has already fenced off many streams. Insufficient thought has been given to providing access to streams and parking areas for fishermen and other recreationists.

A recent example of the inflexible thinking exhibited by many highway engineers is the proposed construction of several miles of new high-speed highway through Logan Canyon, Utah. This would have serious adverse effects on the important sport fishery of the Logan River, yet could be ameliorated to a great extent through redesign at an added cost of $325,000. This is opposed by the State engineers. By comparison, fishermen fishing the Logan River are estimated to spend $444,000 annually.

This is by no means a unique situation, occurring all too frequently in many States. It is because of such widespread occurrences, coupled with a full appreciation of the fish and wildlife resources affected, that the International Association of Game, Fish & Conservation Commission adopted a resolution at its 1961 convention calling for forceful action to alleviate the problem. The international association expressed support for any congressional action to make all plans for Federal-aid highways subject to review by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service through amendment to the Federal Coordination Act.

In this vein, we were pleased to note last month that the National Association of County Officials and the American Association of State Highway Officials have formed a 14-man joint State-county highway committee. Some of the announced objectives of the committee—to work on "problems of highway and mass transportation planning, right-of-way acquisition, community planning and zoning, and the problems of relationships of transportation programing to other aspects of community development"—would seem to offer an open door to conservation leaders.

While this is encouraging, we believe that the problem is so urgent and complex that voluntary efforts are not enough. Therefore we were pleased to see that Senator LEE METCALF, of Montana, has introduced a bill (S. 2767) in the Congress that would extend the Coordination Act principles to Federal-aid highway systems. The bill would actually amend the United States Code relating to highways in such a way as to require the approval of the Secretary of the Interior to surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates for projects on the Federal-aid highway system for the purpose of protecting fish, wildlife, and recreation resources. Companion bills (H.R. 10269 and H.R. 10453) were introduced by Congressmen HENRY REUSS, of Wisconsin, and ARNOLD OLSEN, of Montana.

President's Message to the American Association for the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 16, 1962

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a message by the President of the United States addressed to the American Association for the United Nations be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I would like to take this opportunity to salute the American Association for the United Nations for the wonderful job that it is doing to promote a greater understanding in this country of the fine work of the United Nations. The association is performing a most important and valuable service to our country and to the promotion of international understanding.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF A MESSAGE TO THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE UNITED NATIONS FROM THE PRESIDENT, MARCH 12, 1962

The 12th annual conference of national organizations called by the American Association for the United Nations comes as a propitious reminder of the range and depth of this country's support of the United Nations.

Both by its promise and by its actions, the U.N. has justified that support over the years.

The 16th session of the General Assembly ended last month with a matchless record of solid accomplishments.

It rejected emphatically a powerful attack against the integrity of the Secretariat and went on to a series of positive steps which are admirably summarized in the theme of your conference "The U.N. Decade of Development."

In the course of its work the 16th General Assembly adopted a set of guiding principles and agreed to the new approach to general and complete disarmament which will get underway in Geneva on Wednesday. It extended the Charter of the United Nations to outer space and established a new Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space which begins its work next week. It adopted a resolution calling for an expanded and intensified program for economic and social progress in the less developed world in the decade ahead.

We can be proud of our initiatives and of the U.N. response in these three critical areas of disarmament, outer space, and rapid modernization of the emerging nations. If real progress can be made in these three areas, the present decade can be the most exciting and rewarding time in history.

To sustain its present initiative as a force for peace and human progress the U.N., of course, must regain a sound and orderly financial position. The three-point financial plan approved by the General Assembly is the only proposal put forth at the U.N. or elsewhere which will meet the requirements and is the only one which has the approval of the General Assembly. The U.N. bond issue, which is the key part of the financing plan, has become the symbol and substance of support of the United Nations by its members.

Last week Finland and Norway purchased the first of the U.N. bonds. A dozen more nations will follow shortly. The world is now watching to see whether the United States will continue to play its full part in helping the United Nations to make this a decade in which the world moves dramatically toward the peaceful and progressive world foreseen in the charter.

I look forward to meeting with your leaders at the White House tomorrow, and I welcome the evidence offered by your organizations that bipartisan support for the U.N. in its present financial crisis is stronger than ever. Please accept my best wishes for a most productive conference.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

A Catastrophe for Whom, Mr. Rusk?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, Congress is being asked by the President for authority to purchase $100 million of United Nations bonds. There has been, of course, much discussion pro and con as to the advisability of granting such an authorization.

The Cincinnati Enquirer on February 11, 1962, carried a well-reasoned editorial on this matter. It is my feeling that every Member of Congress should have the benefit of this editorial before casting his vote:

A CATASTROPHE FOR WHOM, MR. RUSK?

The assertion by Secretary of State Dean Rusk that it "would spell catastrophe for both the United Nations and the United States" if Congress does not authorize the lending (which is to say giving) of an additional $100 million to the U.N. is precisely the sort of talk that disenchants more and more Americans with the lopsided world organization, because it is so palpably untrue.

It is easy to favor the professed objectives of the United Nations. Indeed, one seems cruel to object to an organization which, as a small phase of its operations, helps children and promotes health. Long, persistent indoctrination through worthwhile civic groups, schools, and churches has made it appear that the choice is between the U.N. and atomic war, between the U.N. and starving children, between the U.N. and world disease.

The pity is that many of the most ardent and most vocal supporters of the U.N. don't know any more about the organization than what they read in the full-page advertisements that ascribe all virtue to the U.N., and call for "180 million ambassadors to the U.N."

The pity is, also, that many people who do know better are supporting the U.N. for a variety of causes quite foreign to the general understanding of it.

As we noted last week, the U.N. presently is on its good behavior—perhaps because a group of petty tyrants, hypocrites, and the like realize that they are in serious jeopardy of losing a good thing—an organization that can dominate world policies at virtually no cost to themselves.

We call publicly upon Secretary of State Rusk to cite precisely in what way it would "spell catastrophe * * * for the United States" if we do not cough up $100 million for bonds that will never be repaid, except by ourselves.

Let's talk facts about this thing.

Regardless of whose fault it is (and in large measure it was our own fault), the United States has no effective voice in the United Nations Security Council on anything displeasing to Soviet Russia. The U.S.S.R. can veto it, and that is that. It has done so on almost 100 issues since the founding of the U.N. It could have, and would have, vetoed any deterrence of the aggression of the Red North Koreans—except that at the moment the U.S.S.R. was absenting itself from the U.N.

So, despite all the millions we've poured into the U.N., we are helpless in the Security Council—unless Russia is absent, or unless Russia is present and says "Yea."

Is there recourse to the General Assembly? Yes; we provide for that, back in the days when it became evident that Russia was exercising a negative rule of the Security Council.

The General Assembly now is the real ruling body of the United Nations. On most questions it can act by majority vote. By two-thirds vote, it can overrule the Security Council on anything.

Fair enough? Well hardly. The man in the street will find it hard to believe (and the speakers before the ladies' clubs seldom mention it) but the United States, with all of its power, all of its population, all of its wealth, all of its achievements, and all of its contributions to the United Nations, has one little seat in the General Assembly. One out of 104. Our vote counts for just as much as, but not one whit more than, Outer Mongolia, or any of the nations at the bottom rung of the ladder of civilization, nations that may not have more than a dozen college graduates, perhaps fewer, and may be ruled by dictators whose whimsey might be amusing if they weren't ganging up to govern the world.

Perhaps all of these nations should have a forum—indeed we would cheerfully support the U.N. to provide them with a forum, so that their voices might be heard outside the trackless wastes, the steaming jungle, the far reaches of the oceans, the tangle of half-clad tribes that compose the world today.

But by what right should they rule the world? Do they possess a greater compassion, a finer morality, more wisdom?

If so, we have not detected it in Nehru, Sukarno, Castro, Nasser, Nkrumah, and Gomulka.

Oh, someone may say, we are being unfair—we have singled out six men whose conduct may not be typical.

In the General Assembly of the United Nations, those six men could outvote the United States, six times over.

Give G. Mennen Williams, a little more time, give the Red Chinese lobby another year or so, and we shall have effective world government, via the United Nations, with the United States and what remain of its allies but a pipsqueak minority.

We wish—we dearly wish—the Secretary of State Rusk would write us a letter correcting our nonsense, if nonsense it be, when we challenge his assertion that it would "spell catastrophe" for the United States if we don't give (or lend) the U.N. another $100 million.

Believe us, the United Nations is not a goldilocks.

We entered it with high hopes, just as we entertained great expectations from Yalta and Potsdam. We regret our disillusionment, but we're not going to remain obsessed with disillusions. We know what happened to us—to our victory, and to the world's chances of enduring peace at previous grand alliances built upon the shifting sands of cooperation with the Communists and their collaborators.

On several notable occasions, we have done the bidding of the United Nations, at great cost to ourselves, and with injury to our allies. We can name several instances where the might—the military might—of the United States has been used by the United Nations. Can Secretary Rusk name one case where Russia's vaunted power has been used in behalf of the United States, or any other Western power, in consequence of a vote in the United Nations?

We remember, better than Secretary Rusk, apparently, when the United States was carrying the burden of the fighting for the United Nations in Korea.

Russia sent MIG's, to be used by the Red Koreans and later the Red Chinese, against the U.N.

India sent one ambulance unit, which promptly was withdrawn when Red China sent hundreds of thousands of "volunteers" hurtling across the Yalu.

That has been all too typical of the working of the U.N. And as far as the bond issue is concerned, the administration and Messrs. Rusk and Stevenson may hypnotize your Congressmen into approving it. But we fiercely begrudge every American tax dollar that goes to pay the U.N. mercenaries, the jets and Gurkhas from India, that were used to create a shambles in the Congo before the situation was restored to something like its original status. Premier Cyrille Adoula created a pleasant impression in Washington last week. So did President Joseph Kasavubu before the U.N. began blundering around in the "vacuum." And let it be noted that the U.N. did nothing—repeat nothing—to hamper the Communist-trained vice premier, Antoine Gizenga, until American and allied public opinion became outraged, and the United Nations ran out of money for military forays.

The bond issue is not a temporary measure. It is an important precedent. And before we indulge the U.N. to the fullest, financially, let us contemplate the fact that we have one of 104 votes in its deliberations, and in the use of that money.

The U.N. can operate as a forum—Khrushchev's shoe and all—but it cannot be a do-all-and-end-all in world affairs until we submit to a world government in which we would be hopelessly outnumbered, and would be willing to drag down our standard of living to pennies a day, and our opportunities to those of our political equals in windswept Outer Mongolia.

S O S: Save Our Streams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on March 2 the New York World Telegram and Sun carried an article, by Ray Ovington, which told of possible destruction of fish and recreation values on the Beaverkill River in New York State, because of superhighway construction.

Based on a letter written to Secretary of the Interior Udall, by Ronald J. Eisen, the article states:

Unfortunately, the New York State Highway Commission's position has been so arbitrary that even though thousands of sportsmen have written to the representatives and the Governor, the commission will not even make public the entire plans for the highway.

The article also refers to the reply Mr. Eisen received, from Charles Stoddard, director of the resources program staff, who called attention to my bill, S. 2767, now before the Committee on Public Works, which would require approval of the Secretary of the Interior to surveys, plans, specifications and estimates for projects on the Federal aid highway systems for the purpose of protecting fish and wildlife and recreational resources.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert Mr. Ovington's article, entitled "Beaverkill's Anglers Encouraged," in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEAVERKILL'S ANGLERS ENCOURAGED

(By Ray Ovington)

A letter written by Ronald J. Eisen to Secretary Stuart Udall, Secretary of the Interior, and an answer from Charles Stoddard of the latter's office is interesting in light of the roadbuilding on the Beaverkill River:

"I am writing you of a specific problem, the Beaverkill River in New York State, an area which in all probability will be destroyed beyond redemption by construction of a superhighway, built mainly with Federal funds.

"The river attracts thousands upon thousands of nature lovers and fishermen to the area each year. It seems to me the engineers without the counsel of the New York State Conservation Department have chosen the route for this highway, which by the most conservative estimates would ruin the river. Undoubtedly a rerouting of the road might be more expensive in dollars. Roads can be rebuilt, but natural resources cannot.

"Unfortunately, the highway commission's position has been so arbitrary that even though thousands of sportsmen have written to their representatives and the Governor, the commission will not even make public the entire plans for the highway. Fortunately several individuals have seen the map of the proposed route and have made public what they have seen.

"Since the Federal Government is paying 90 percent of the cost, I believe it is your responsibility to look into this situation. I will guide you through this area if need be."

And here is the answer from Mr. Stoddard:

"While this department has no jurisdiction over highway matters, either at the Federal level or local, we are concerned over tendencies to ignore or fail to give adequate consideration in highway planning to many important values. On other problems, Secretary Udall has communicated his own interest and concern directly to the Secretary of Commerce, who has the proper jurisdiction.

"I believe you will be interested to know of a bill recently introduced by Senator MECALF, S. 2767, which would require 'the approval of the Secretary of the Interior to surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates for projects on the Federal aid highway systems for the purpose of protecting fish and wildlife and recreational resources.'"

Stripped by Implication, Enticement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of controversy over the administration's proposal to place medical care for the aged under social security. Recently, an editorial appearing in my hometown newspaper, the Sheridan Press, stated very clearly the issues involved. I believe that this editorial merits the careful consideration of all Members of Congress and I am placing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that they may read it:

STRIPPED BY IMPLICATION, ENTICEMENT

The administration's new health measure follows a familiar political plan: provide a broad scope of enticements and the odds are better that you'll get what you really want.

What the administration really wants is medical aid for the aged under the social security system, and its in the package. To prove the odds in favor of what it wants the measure contains these enticements:

Enticement 1. Federal funds for a preschool immunization program to include polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus.

Enticement 2. Federal funds for loans to physicians, dentists, and others who want to set up clinics or other community health facilities.

Enticement 3. Federal grants for medical school construction and scholarships.

Enticement 4. Expansion of the present air pollution control program.

Enticement 5. Aid to States for health services to seasonal farmworkers.

Enticement 6. Funds for a Federal center to study radiation, pollution, and chemical hazards.

Enticement 7. Funds for added research in maternal and child ills.

Enticement 8. Grants on a matching basis to help universities and others build or develop expanded research units.

This is a health package for all ages and all interests. What mother and father would not be at least interested in a preschool immunization program, or a research in maternal and child illness? What doctor or aspiring doctor is not enticed by the promise of help to establish a medical clinic, or by the promise of help to build new medical schools or by the promise of scholarship help.

We do not deny there are needs in these areas, but why must we be stripped naked of responsibility in the process?

When the administration implies that the medical profession and private insurance companies of this Nation are not capable of finding an answer to the medical aid to the aged, and when it implies that the individual is not capable of organizing his own life, then we feel stripped.

When the administration implies that we are to favor medical clinics over the private practitioner, we feel stripped. And when it implies that the medical profession with the assistance of private loan institutions cannot meet the need for clinics, we feel stripped.

When it implies that we are neither responsible or able as citizens to solve air pollution problems, environmental health problems, research problems and child health problems in no other way than through Federal means, then we feel stripped.

In its negative sense, the administration's health measure tells us we as individuals, and as a nation are inadequate to the challenge.

We do not like this nakedness. We think the administration would be much wiser to encourage individual initiative, to encourage the full utilization of all resources of this country to meet the needs of health with as little government paternalism as possible.

Neither do we like the knowledge of being wooed away from our responsibilities by enticement.

Clearly the administration places too little faith in the capabilities of its citizens.

Tribute to James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, one of the topflight newspapermen of my State is Sandor S. Klein, managing editor of the Idaho Daily Statesman. A veteran of the United Press, both in the United States and abroad, "Sandy" came to Idaho with a remarkably varied and extensive background that has provided extremely interesting material for his well-written and well-read column, "Reporter's Notebook." As he has in Idaho, "Sandy" has many friends in Washington, where he was once a member of the press corps.

Recently, Sandy devoted his column to an old friend, James A. Farley. Mr. Farley is an American of whom we can all be proud—and his long service to his friends, his party, and his country deserve every commendation. Recently, "Big Jim" Farley served with distinction on the Citizens Committee for International Development.

Because I believe this column is a well-deserved accolade for a wonderful person, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORTER'S NOTEBOOK

(By Sandor S. Klein)

This column has devoted space in times past to reminiscences of James A. Farley, once the national head of the Democratic Party. Having just received a letter from "Big Jim," a warm, friendly acknowledgement of a Christmas greeting card, I feel impelled to write this additional lore of one of the most noble politicians of this century.

We have exchanged Christmas cards for some 30 years, ever since we first became friends during Franklin D. Roosevelt's initial campaign for the presidency. Jim Farley is not just a holiday-time friend. From time to time and from many places there comes from him a kindly note or a picture postcard with a personal greeting scrawled in his familiar green ink.

During the days when he was directly involved with politics, Farley came in touch with many newsmen. They all became his friends, regardless of their political affilia-

tion. One of these, I recall, was Dennis Tilden Lynch, who was political editor of the New York Herald Tribune when it hewed close to the traditional Republican line. Denny enjoyed needling Farley at press conferences. But they were fast friends. Denny, the reporter who operated with a finely honed blade, had the capacity for separating his professional objectivity from his personal relations. And Farley respected this.

Farley, in his role as Democratic national chairman, was willing to forgive just about any political transgression except the doublecross. He was meticulous in observing his own word and expected nothing less from others. The deepest wound ever inflicted on him was by the man he helped place in the White House—F.D.R. Farley felt that Roosevelt, during his second term, had failed to keep certain political promises and had, in his view, doublecrossed him. Big Jim did the only thing he felt he could do, detach himself from the Roosevelt administration.

During the few years that I served in Washington as a senatorial aid, I frequently heard Republican politicians complain over the failure of the Eisenhower administration to move expeditiously to oust Democratic holdovers in Government posts and they cited Farley's wholesale sweep of Republicans remaining from the Hoover regime. In this sense, Farley was the conventional politician of the Jacksonian "drive the rascals out" school.

But there were some "rascals" he respected. I recall the time that he helped a distraught, jobless Republican win appointment to a Federal job. It was the late Ty Crum, who covered Democratic national campaign headquarters in New York in 1932. Ty later went to Washington as a reporter for Universal News Service. When Hearst combined Universal with his International News Service, Crum was one of several newsmen who were let out. And news jobs were scare in those days.

Crum applied for the position of Public Information Director of the newly created Public Housing Administration but it was soon made clear to him that any Republican lacked the necessary qualifications for it. Friends telephoned Farley and reported Ty's plight to him. Despite their political differences, Farley regarded him as a friend and promised to do something about it in a hurry. Within a matter of days, Crum got the job. Subsequently, he ran for Congress on the Republican ticket in nearby Virginia. The voters of that district were less willing than Farley to overlook his politics and rejected him.

Because of his past preoccupation with bigtime politics, Farley has given the impression of being the product of a biy city, to wit, New York. The fact is Farley is a country boy, both in origin and in sentiment. He was born in Haverstraw, N.Y., a small Hudson River community and lived his early life at nearby Grassy Point, in Rockland County.

Recently, the Rockland County Journal News at Nyack, the county seat, had this to say about "Big Jim":

"No matter where his interests have ever taken him, he always comes back to his old hometown. Whenever possible, he's on the dais of any Haverstraw Elks affair and many's the time an afternoon is spent over Cokes down at Jimmy Cullen's of the restaurant of that name. It is nice to know that though he has visited every State and many countries, Rockland is still on top of his list."

In his letter to me, Farley wrote that he has not been to Boise for a long time but that he hopes to get here again one of these days. It will be nice to once again see this man who could wear the mantle of a politician with such majesty and dignity.

Inside the Tariff Package

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of March 14, 1962:

INSIDE THE TARIFF PACKAGE

We trust no reader of these columns will mistake our position on foreign trade. We have said here repeatedly that this country must open wider the doors of free trade, and we have specifically encouraged the administration's efforts to lower U.S. tariff barriers.

This may require that Congress give considerable latitude to the executive branch to carry out a defined policy, for Congress cannot negotiate every trade agreement or fix the tariff on every item of commerce.

But to recognize this is not to say that Congress should abdicate its own responsibility to define the Nation's trade policies. The plea for lower tariffs ought not to be used to open another door to all kinds of other trade barriers that make tariffs look like the inventions of amateurs. Nor is this plea an excuse for launching another vague, amorphous and almost unlimited Federal "relief" program.

Yet that is what is being proposed to Congress in the tariff bill introduced by Chairman MILLS of the House Ways and Means Committee at the administration's behest. There are indeed some startling things hidden under that bill's attractive label.

It is not simply that this bill would carry almost to its ultimate the process of allowing the President to cut or even abolish tariffs, without let or hindrance, although this it would do. The President could enter trade agreements at will and then proclaim the reduction by half of any existing tariff; if the agreement is with a Common Market nation, he could completely eliminate tariffs by the stroke of a pen.

The President is also authorized, whenever he thinks some industry needs protecting from foreign imports, to proclaim such increase in, or imposition of, any duty or other import restriction as he wishes. If this loose language means anything, it means that some President could raise tariffs as well as lower them, or impose brandnew ones, or—and here apparently without any limit—impose quotas or any other kind of restriction on imports.

In short, this wide grant of power to the President is for protectionism as much as for free trade. With this bill Congress would not be declaring a freer trade policy but simply authorizing the trade policy to be whatever the President of the moment declared it to be. Foreign trade could escape the annoyances of tariffs only to meet the more impenetrable barriers of direct controls.

Yet there is still more wrapped up in this bill. Under the guise of protecting people from the impact of any tariff cuts, the bill authorizies a whole new program of Government assistance to individuals, business firms, industries and States.

For example, if the "President determines" that they need it, individuals may be paid an adjustment allowance by the Government, as well as retraining costs and moving expenses. No limit is set for the length of time this "adjustment allowance" can be paid, nor is there any clear definition of who is eligible for it.

Business firms, too, "as the President may determine," would be eligible not only for technical assistance but financial assistance in the form of Government guarantees, loans and special tax treatment. Nor are the States forgotten; in return for accepting some restrictions on their own unemployment programs, they can set up their own agencies to administer the "relief," and be paid by the Federal Government.

The bill states that actions of the President, "in determining eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance in certifying adjustment proposals, or in making determinations with respect to extraordinary relief, shall be final and conclusive and shall not be subject to review by any court." In short, a blank check for the President to distribute this largess as he will.

The administration is right, we think, in saying that the economic future of this country lies in the direction of freer trade with the world, and we hope Congress will meet its responsibility to see that we move in that direction. But what this bill grants is the power to any President to move in whatever direction he alone chooses. And buried in it also is a veritable Pandora's box of political woes about who gets what from the Nation's Treasury.

The fact that all this comes in the wrappings of free trade doesn't mean that the country ought to buy the merchandise inside the package.

Challenges Confronting Our Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Nation—if it is to meet the great challenges of survival and progress—must, in my judgment; be aware of the threats to our security; understand and appreciate the scope of our strength; retain a confidence in our ability to meet the threats to our survival; and be ready and willing to dedicate the necessary energies and resources not only to meet the challenges to survival but also to fully exploit the great opportunities of this fast advancing age.

In attempting to keep the promises—as well as the threats of this great age in prospective—I reviewed such facts in a weekend broadcast over Wisconsin radio stations. I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of this address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

CHALLENGES CONFRONTING NATION

(Statement by Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin)

Today, we, and the Nation, live in times of crisis, of unparalleled progress, of real challenge, and of great promise.

Living in such a complex age—recently advanced further by a revolutionary breakthrough into space—we need, then, a new perspective and understanding of the influences, conditions, and forces shaping our destiny.

Realistically, we as individuals, of course, need to—and must—give fundamental consideration to our immediate environment: Our jobs, homes, families and efforts to further improve our ways of life.

In a fast-advancing, rapidly changing world, however, there is also a need—in fact

a responsibility—for attempting to understand—and to deal with—the larger-scope challenges that confront us. Our success in dealing with these broader problems may well have a determining effect upon, not only success in handling personal problems—but, indeed, our survival.

What then are these major factors exerting direct, and indirect, influences upon our lives?

PRESERVING THE PEACE

First, let's take a look at the No. 1 challenge—that of preserving the peace, or, conversely—preventing world war III.

Around the globe, the Communists control one-third—or about 1 billion—of the people, and one-fourth of the land of the earth.

Fanatically, the Reds are dedicated to conquering the world. For this purpose, they continue to mobilize the controlled people and resources into a gigantic military machine.

As a leader of the free world, the United States—serving also as a front-line anti-Communist force—finds it necessary to (a) maintain a mighty jet-nuclear-missile space defense; and (b) cooperate with free world allies—in military alliances—to prevent the out-spreading of communism.

Behind such a protective military shield, we are also attempting to create the economic and political conditions and strength to withstand Red aggression, as well as encouraging cooperation necessary for building a world in which wars will not reoccur in each generation, and differences among nations can be settled peacefully.

Fulfilling a dual responsibility as protector of freedom; and promoter of peace, however, this can be accomplished only by maintaining a healthy economy.

ECONOMIC PICTURE

Let's take a look, then, at the economic picture.

Today, the Nation is surging forward with an ever-increasing output of goods and services—predicated to reach an annual rate of $570 billion in 1962.

Despite record levels of production, there are, nevertheless, serious problems. If unresolved, these may handicap our ability, not only to meet the needs of our fast-expanding population, but also to win the economic battle against communism.

Consequently, we must undertake realistic efforts to perpetuate a strong, forward moving, free economy. Among other things, this means a new hard look at foreign and domestic programs.

The future of Western alliances—as well as our own domestic progress—for example, may depend to a substantial degree—upon the adoption of realistic trade policies.

In agriculture, business, industry, and labor many folks—and rightly so—are deeply concerned with the adverse impact which too large a volume of imports of foreign goods—produced at lower operational and labor costs—may have on our domestic economy.

For this reason, I belive that Congress has a responsibility both for: (1) preserving—and effectually exercising—its constitutional authority on tariffs; and (2) writing in safeguards into any new reciprocal trade laws to protect jobs, businesses, and the general economy.

AGRICULTURAL OUTLOOK

On the farm front, also, there are serious challenges. Historically, agriculture, has served as a foundation stone of our economy. Unfortunately, the farmer—in dairying as elsewhere—still sweats and labors under the dual handicap of a production-consumption imbalance; and a cost-price squeeze for the farmer.

Consequently, the Nation—through free enterprise and governmental cooperation—must now find a farm program that will (a) better serve the American public; (b) reduce, as possible, the cost of the price-support program to the taxpayer; and (c) brighten the outlook for the dairy industry—an important segment of our agriculture and national economy.

Too Much Spending, Too Much Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the Redwood City Tribune of Redwood City, Calif., recently published an opinion poll which is one I submitted to them.

I am pleased to insert in the RECORD the editorial of the Tribune giving the results of that poll, together with a number of comments which the individual constituents sent to the paper, together with their completed opinion poll.

TOO MUCH SPENDING, TOO MUCH AUTHORITY

The Federal Government is spending too much money and acquiring too much authority.

These are the two strong opinions of readers answering the questionnaire on national and international affairs which the Tribune published last week in cooperation with Congressman J. ARTHUR YOUNGER.

The response to the questionnaire was regarded as relatively heavy. Nearly 300 persons took the time to mark the Tribune chart and return it. Many of those who answered the questions appended remarks, many of which are published in the "Forum" column on this page.

Generally, the readers were emphatic in their feelings about additional spending. They voted heavily against raising the debt limit, financing medical care for the aged through social security, buying $100 million in bonds to finance the United Nations, Federal aid to education.

They strongly opposed trade with Red bloc nations or giving aid to Communist countries which are independent of the U.S.S.R.

Strongest negative vote came in response to the question as to whether President Kennedy should be granted more authority.

The only question which got a majority "yes" vote was the one asking whether the United States should reduce tariffs to encourage broader world trade.

Many who said they favored Federal aid to education did so with the reservation that they did not feel this should apply to private schools.

The plan to create a new Cabinet office for urban affairs was rejected by a sizable majority.

Some readers took the liberty of commenting on the amount of taxes they were paying, even though that question wasn't asked.

Many cast a unanimous "no" on all nine questions, remarking that they feel the Nation is moving more and more toward a welfare state. Some of these added that they were Democrats. One asked if a straight "no" vote made him a reactionary, and one who voted all "yes" said that since it is obvious this is in conflict with Mr. YOUNGER's own vote record that he could hardly vote for Mr. YOUNGER.

Following is the complete tabulation of votes turned in by Tribune readers:

	Yes	No
1. Do you favor the U.S. purchasing $100 million in bonds to help finance the United Nations?	87	194
2. Do you favor Federal aid to public and private primary and secondary schools?	85	201
3. Do you favor medical care for the aged through social security?	98	185
4. Do you favor the President's request to raise the Federal debt limit over $293 billion?	74	204
5. Do you favor the President's free trade and lower tariff proposals?	148	130
6. Do you favor the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs?	56	222
7. Do you favor foreign aid to Communist nations who have declared themselves independent of the U.S.S.R.?	44	236
8. Do you favor trade with the Red bloc nations?	63	215
9. Would you grant the President's request for authority and new power to regulate income taxes and unemployment benefits without congressional action?	42	240

READERS GIVE THEIR REACTIONS TO QUIZ ON NATIONAL AFFAIRS

GENERAL COMMENTS BY READERS ANSWERING THE POLL ON NATIONAL ISSUES

The President's subsidy provisions for "hurt" industry would (1) increase taxes or boost inflation, (2) eliminate domestic industry in the injured lines, (3) adversely affect other U.S. industry dependent on hurt lines, (4) increase unemployment in those lines, (5) retard a natural shift in the economy to compensate for Europe's new efficiency, and (6) raise havoc in additional bureaucratic claims handling. All of this could be eliminated if the President would eliminate subsidy and slow down the rate of tariff.

I would recommend that we end the big giveaway program and start to let the other nations stand on their own two feet. If we have to give anything away, how about our vast surplus of foodstuffs?

By voting "no" on all nine questions I do not imply that we do not have an honest concern for keeping the less fortunate nations and people in the world. If this is necessary, let's cut the frills elsewhere. We are supposedly an intelligent nation, yet we keep getting closer to a welfare state.

Question 2 should have been in two parts. I do not favor Federal aid to any primary and secondary schools. However, if Federal aid is granted, then private schools should be included.

CONGRESSMAN YOUNGER: The charter of the United Nations should be amended to expel those nations not sharing in the operating costs of the U.N.

If aid is granted to the schools, increasing controls will follow. In 20 years there would be an effort to make every school alike. Each community should determine its school's activity to reflect the local needs and desires.

Our social security program is becoming a wedge to broaden the socialistic trends already too great. The age limits would steadily decrease, the benefits increase.

If, in these relatively peaceful times, the budget cannot be balanced, then the country is being mismanaged.

The present administration has demonstrated sufficient intelligence to handle the free trade proposals * * *.

Urban affairs are not a Federal problem.

Foreign aid should be limited to allies * * * if we have any.

Trade with Red bloc nations should be undertaken only when we stand to benefit more than they do by it.

We need reforms in both areas in question 9. To grant the present administration more power would just foul them up more.

D. W. W.

CONGRESSMAN YOUNGER: While the political climate threatens to engulf us in a fallout of security, welfarism, and big government, it would do well for responsible officials like yourself to be guided constantly by the question of how the passage of each particular bill will affect the individual rights and freedoms of their constituents.

Individual responsibility gives meaning and purpose to life. Without it we are indeed a nation of sheep.

MRS. M. A. MATHIAS.

SAN CARLOS.

Congressman YOUNGER: I should like to make the following comments relative to the quiz:

No. 1. I am certainly against this purchase because the United Nations are not fairly representative of the total world. The people of the United States are represented on the basis of territory and population. It is entirely wrong that small, newly emerged nations have equal vote in General Assembly, and I disagree with the principle of the veto in the Security Council. Unless these things are changed, the United States should not carry the burden.

No. 2. This is a local matter.

No. 3. No. The poor get free care in any case. Most of us should make some provision for our old age, or personal insurance could take care of this.

No. 4. No. The only reason we should ever go into debt is in the case of a national emergency. Everything should be done to liquidate the debt promptly.

No. 5. Yes. We should be consistent. It is our national policy to restrict monopolies by antitrust means, etc.; in other words, to foster competition. This certainly should apply internationally, as well as nationally. Those countries that can do one thing better than others, should not be penalized for being able to do a better job. To stimulate competition is to stimulate free trade.

No. 6. No. The Federal Government is in too many activities now. Cities should be able to take care of their own affairs. If things they want to do are not economically feasible, they should not be attempted.

No. 7. No. Their independence of the U.S.S.R. does not make them our friends. If it came to an issue, they would take sides against us. This applies also to neutrals. It is time for them to stand up and be counted.

No. 8. No. The reason for this is that the Red block nations are deficient and all we are doing is to enable them to overcome their deficiencies and to catch up. If we do not feed them and do not give them the technical wherewithal, it increases their problems.

No. 9. No. It is a basic concept of the American precept of Government that there are three divisions—the legislative, the judicial, and the executive. We have been whittling away too long on certain of these areas and I do not propose to grant one man and his personally selected advisers to preempt the constituted functions of the houses of Congress. Our method is slow, but more often, right.

ALBERT H. THRONDSON.

Woodside.

Congressman YOUNGER: I found the questionnaire in the Tribune quite interesting. I answered the first two questions both "yes" and "no," because on the first I favor it if the other countries contribute a reasonable amount.

On No. 2 I favor Federal aid for public, but not for private schools.

JOHN YAGOTIN.

REDWOOD CITY.

Congressman YOUNGER: Under question 8 I have indicated an affirmative answer, but this should be qualified to apply to certain commodities and products which are already available to the Red bloc from other countries, but not for strategic materials.

On a subject not included in the questionnaire: The taxation of American business abroad, I wish to state that I am opposed to the Treasury Department's recommendation that foreign subsidiaries of U.S. companies be required to pay U.S. taxes on income, whether repatriated or not.

I believe that it is important to the future of the United States that American business abroad be allowed to compete with foreign companies on an equal basis; that is, to be able to operate under the same business rules and tax structure as their competitors.

The proposed bill will seriously hamper our efforts to maintain our present position as a world business power. Let's not consider tax income for the present administration, but rather, the position of our countries 20 years from now.

RALPH W. KANE.

ATHERTON.

Congressman YOUNGER: I am enclosing the questionnaire from the Redwood City Tribune. I have checked all the answers "Yes"—many of them I am in favor of because of my own information and beliefs, the others I am willing to accept Mr. Kennedy's judgment on and am for them because he is. We elected him President because we wanted a different and more active part in world affairs. I think he should be given a chance to carry out some of his ideas.

The only thing I will not support his views on is military spending and nuclear testing. I believe we should and could have disarmament if we really wanted it, and I do not think anything can justify further pollution of the air.

JULIA CRAW.

REDWOOD CITY.

Address by Senator Moss at Arizona Semicentennial Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HAYDEN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a stirring address delivered by the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] at the semicentennial reunion of the Democratic Party in Arizona, at Phoenix, Ariz., on February 14, 1962.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR FRANK E. MOSS, AT SEMICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA, PHOENIX, ARIZ., FEBRUARY 14, 1962

To appear as a speaker at this semicentennial reunion of the Democratic Party in Arizona, and at a gathering which pays tribute to your golden anniversary Congressman and revered dean of the U.S. Senate, CARL HAYDEN, fills me at once with a since of great pride of great humility. As a junior Senator from your sister State of Utah, represent by the 45th star in our national banner, I am honored, indeed, to salute Arizona on the 50th anniversary of the 48th State.

I am in fast company tonight—Senator HAYDEN, Postmaster General Day, former Governor and former Majority Leader McFarland, Congressman UDALL, former Congressmen Harless and Murdock, former Governor Garvey, Mrs. Jones, the charming widow of another former Governor, Mrs. Friend, daughter of Arizona's first Governor, George Hunt, and Bob Jones. In short, the most distinguished Democrats of America, as well as Arizona. It is a birthday party, and an occasion, to remember.

I share with you your satisfaction in being Westerners and Democrats. We are more proud of being western Democrats than almost anything else, except being Americans.

Being Democrats reminds me of my story about Uncle Dinny who stormed into the registrar of voters office and demanded that his party enrollment be changed from Democratic to Republican.

The clerk was amazed because he knew that Dinny had been a Democratic stalwart all of his life.

"Dinny, why are you doing this?" queried the clerk.

Uncle Dinny, who was just purple with rage, fumed: "I just had a terrible argument with me family and I am so damn mad I want to do something drastic to disgrace them."

We good Democrats can understand how he felt.

I share your satisfaction, also, that this 50th anniversary of Arizona statehood, and this resulting semicentennial reunion of the Democratic Party, is taking place at a time when we again have a great Democratic President in the White House—John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Arizona was literally a new frontier 50 years ago when we added the 48th star to our flag, and it is now a vigorous and effective part of the Kennedy New Frontier, even to the extent of contributing one of its most illustrious native sons, Stewart Udall, to the Kennedy Cabinet.

We now have a greater interest in the West and its problems, and a deeper understanding of those problems, than we have had in many years in Washington. This is indeed a year for Westerners and Democrats to celebrate.

Some of our Republican friends seem to have forgotten in this 1 short year that they were ever in control of the executive branch of the Government, and, therefore, responsible for the decisions made. They seem to have wiped out the 8 Eisenhower years, and to have reverted back to the wailing and lamentations they developed to such an art during the previous 20 Democratic years.

This Republican criticism reminds me of the story about the psychiatrist who was testing a little boy brought to him by his mother because she was concerned about his premature preoccupation with little girls.

The psychiatrist placed an ink blot before the little boy.

"Now, Johnny," he said, "what does this look like?"

"Two bees making love," came the prompt reply.

Without comment, the doctor showed the boy another ink blot. "How about this?"

Johnny studied it for a moment. "Two birds making love," he said.

A bit perturbed, the psychiatrist showed him a third and larger ink blot. The child frowned, looked at it closely, and finally declared triumphantly, "Two horses making love."

At this, the doctor lost patience. "Young man," he thundered, "I think you're just a little too concerned with sex."

Johnny turned innocent eyes on the psychiatrist. "Why are you hollering at me?" he complained. "They're your pictures, aren't they?"

The fact is that much of what the Republicans are complaining about results from actions they took themselves.

You know, as I prepared this speech, I felt very much like the school boy who when asked to describe Socrates, wrote:

"Socrates was a Greek who spoke very often to the Athenians. They poisoned him."

This is a festive and gay occasion, and the things I am going to say tonight are serious and thought-provoking, but such were my instructions.

My subject is "The Conscience of a Liberal"—and I can think of no more appropriate place to make such a speech than to a group of Arizona Democrats.

It was with some trepedation that I chose this subject, because the very word liberal is one of the most misunderstood and misused words in our vocabulary today. To some it is synonymous with "radical"—and to these people a radical in government is one who advocates great and sweeping changes with the least possible delay. To others, the word liberal simply means a forward-looking attitude, and a willingness to try new remedies for new or old problems.

Similarly, the word conservative has many connotations. It all depends on what you want to "conserve." The American conservative today, by his own admission, wants to return to the forms and usages of the past, even those of the 18th and 19th centuries. To some this attitude can only be labeled by the word "reactionary."

It is with a clear recognition of this problem of labels, of the fact that the very terms I shall be using are equally as controversial as the ideologies they represent, that I approach this discussion.

Political history in this country has never been shaped by abstract doctrines or theoretical dogmas. Original political theory here, as in the mother country of England, has developed chiefly in time of national trouble when thinking men, seeking to solve urgent problems, have been forced to reexamine basic principles.

For example, when we were hammering out our American democracy, we produced statesmen like Jefferson, Adams, Madison and Hamilton, who were also political philosophers.

Then, the debate between the North and the South in the mid-19th century produced Webster and Calhoun. And the problems of the first half of the 20th century gave us Woodrow Wilson and Robert Taft, two very practical political theorists.

Today, as we try to cope with grave situations both at home and abroad, it has again become evident that we must go back to first principles, and in that light examine the problems of the sixties.

You will note that my discussion of political philosophy is not essentially partisan. Both major political parties have liberals and conservatives in their ranks. Perhaps it would make the choice at the polls easier, if all liberals were lumped together in one party and all conservatives amalgamated firmly in the other one. But I doubt that this day will ever dawn. Republican and Democratic parties are both sturdy institutions which show little interest in being dissected, and reassembled.

The lack of consistent philosophies and clear-cut division on issues in our two major political parties has produced some very strange political bedfellows. Lincoln, a Republican, made Jefferson his touchstone in the 1850's. Bryan, a Democrat, appropriated Lincoln in the 1880's. Theodore Roosevelt bolted the Republicans as a Progressive and found his inspiration in the Federalists who were Jefferson's opponents.

This kind of turnabout is powerful testimony to the ingenuity of our political leaders and the vitality of our American procedures. But despite these individual exceptions, as a party, the Democrats have stood for progress and change to meet modern conditions. The Republicans have clung persistently to the past, and have insisted that new ideas were either socialistic or un-American.

In this discussion, I do not propose to define conservatism and liberalism in neat, one-sentence statements. No dictionary definition could ever be adequate, for one thing, and for another, as I have pointed out, the words mean different things to different people. I shall therefore take the essence of brief statements of faith from two liberals—Democrats, President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Gov. Adlai Stevenson, and two conservatives—Republicans, President Herbert Hoover and Senator GOLDWATER.

The statements cover a 25-year period of time. Each spokesman has combined the results of his practical political experience with an awareness of the implications in his own position, and each is an accepted representative of his philosophy.

First Hoover and Roosevelt who struggled for the Presidency in 1932.

In his volume "Twentieth Century Political Thought," Joseph S. Roucek says of President Hoover:

"Herbert Hoover speaks for many modern American conservatives when he identifies the extension of governmental economic controls with the 'regimentation' characteristic of foreign dictatorships, and when he ascribes our high living standards to the American system of free enterprise, he combines almost all of the favorite conservative themes: We must cling to the Bill of Rights; any necessary alterations must be made only by formal constitutional amendment; governments have an insatiable appetite for power; society cannot remain partly 'regimented' and partly free, and even partial regimentation will eventually destroy democracy. To attempt 'to solve the * * * problem of distribution of a hard won plenty by restrictions * * * will abolish the plenty.' "

Moreover, the conduct of business by government would only give us the "least efficiency." States President Hoover: "It would increase rather than decrease abuse and corruption, stifle initiative and invention, undermine the development of leadership, cripple the mental and spiritual energies of our people, extinguish equality of opportunity, and dry up the spirit of liberty and the forces which make progress."

Let us now hear the liberal case as presented by Franklin Roosevelt:

"One great difference which has characterized this division (between the liberal and the conservative groups) has been that the liberal party—no matter what its particular name was at the time—believed in the wisdom and efficacy of the will of the great majority of the people, as distinguished from the judgment of a small minority of either education or wealth. * * *

"The other great difference between the two parties has been this: The liberal party is a party which believes that, as new conditions and problems arise beyond the power of men and women to meet as individuals, it becomes the duty of the Government itself to find new remedies with which to meet them. The liberal party insists that the Government has the definite duty to use all its power and resources to meet new social problems with new social controls—to insure to the average person the right to his own economic and political life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Now coming 30 years closer to today—

In his book "The Conscience of a Conservative," my distinguished colleague from your State, Senator GOLDWATER, states that the undesirable trends which he finds in our public affairs will be reversed, and I quote:

"When Americans, in hundreds of communities throughout the Nation, decide to put the man in the office who is pledged to enforce the Constitution and restore the Republic. Who will proclaim in a campaign speech:

"'I have little interest in streamlining Government or in making it more efficient, for I mean to reduce its size. I do not undertake to promote welfare, for I propose to extend freedom. My aim is not to pass laws, but to repeal them. It is not to inaugurate new programs, but to cancel old ones that do violence to the Constitution, or that have failed in their purpose, or that impose on the people an unwarranted financial burden. I will not attempt to discover whether legislation is needed before I have first determined whether it is constitutionally permissible. And if I should later be attacked for neglecting my constituents' interests, I shall reply that I was informed their main interest is liberty and that in that cause I am doing the very best I can.' "

Again, Senator GOLDWATER states:

"Thus, for the American conservative, there is no difficulty in identifying the days' overriding political challenge: It is to preserve and extend freedom. As he surveys the various attitudes and institutions and laws that currently prevail in America, many questions will occur to him, but the conservative's first concern will always be: Are we maximizing freedom?"

In May 1956, Adlai E. Stevenson, one of today's most articulate liberals, gave this classic definition of the modern liberal:

"First, he (the liberal) believes in the existence of the future, and believes that it can be made a good future. If he is my age he make often think of the past, and he may think of it with affection and nostalgia. But he rejects the idea that it was either better or simpler than what we face now. In answer to the conservative's classic question, 'Whither are we drifting' the liberal says: 'We cannot drift, we must go.' Although he respects the past, he has no desire to tinker with the clock or turn it back. He does not try to force it ahead. But he does wind the clock.

"He has never seen from on high any slightest indication that heaven itself wishes to return to the good old days—and so he walks ahead, in courage and steadfastness, and with a minimum of backward glances, into the perpetually obscure, the perpetually dangerous, the perpetually unknown future. No wonder he cannot always tell where he is going. In contrast to this, the reactionary can always tell you where he has been, so he has an air of authority. What he doesn't know is that the political house of his fathers, which he perpetually talks about, but hasn't seen for 40 years, has now been condemned or torn down."

Perhaps the most striking difference between the two liberals and the two conservatives I have just quoted lies in their frame of mind. The conservatives constantly implies that the "good old days" and "good old methods" of doing things were better and that most changes and modifications in our way of life in recent years have been to say the least, unfortunate. With this thesis I most emphatically disagree.

My objection does not arise, however, from a purely personal disposition to like the present and look to the future with optimism. It arises from the lessons of history.

I do not propose to call in the Greeks and the Romans to prove my point. I leave them to the conservatives who seem to like

unearthing unsuccessful social experiments, centuries old, which were carried out under conditions as unlike those in modern America as it would be possible to find, to demonstrate that some similar proposal would surely fail in the United States of the 1960's. I will be satisfied to fall back on the history of the United States as a reliable guide for the programs of action we should formulate for today.

Almost from our earliest days our greatest leaders have recognized that we must make use of the instrumentality of government to do what we cannot as individuals do at all, or do so well, for ourselves. It was because it was necessary to do somethings on a National, rather than a State, basis that the Constitution was adopted in the first place.

It was obvious, of course, from the day our Nation was born that the Government had to maintain an Army to provide for the common defense, to coin money, and perform other national services. But whether the Government had any responsibility in transporting the mail, for instance, was another question. Even today some cry "socialism."

But the Continental Congress thought the Government did have that responsibility, and in 1775, probably after considerable debate, the Continental Congress passed a resolution and ordinance establishing post offices and post roads.

By 1801, Alexander Hamilton had recognized that "the improvement of the communications between the different parts of our country is an object well worthy of our national purse" and "to provide roads and bridges is within the direct purview of the Constitution."

By 1808, so many internal problems had reared their heads in the new union of States that Albert Gallatin, then Secretary of the Treasury, presented to the Senate a comprehensive plan for an integrated system of internal improvements including post offices and post roads to be undertaken by the Central Government.

I could continue with an almost year-by-year account of the growth of what is now our Federal highway system. Sufficient it is to say that the problems of the times which individuals could not solve were in each case met with solutions of the times, solutions which were often new and untried. Washington and Jefferson and the other great founders of the Nation were moved by the same spirit so eloquently described by Adlai Stevenson in the statement which I just quoted. Undoubtedly these men thought fondly of the "good old days" before they had to fight a revolutionary war and establish a government on the basis of the new and untried principles of political democracy. And yet they walked ahead "in courage and steadfastness, with a minimum of backward glances into the perpetually unknown future."

Do we ever hear today of the Tory Conservative philosophers, the cling-to-the-old-ways boys who were contemporaries of the activist founders of our country? Can you name one of them? Neither can I, although I vaguely remember from my college history courses that there were such authorities.

In the history of our people's growing use of the Government to advance their welfare, I see something quite different from what the conservatives apparently see. I see a steady advance down through the years in a greater acquisition by all Americans of all of the fundamental values for which the country was founded. Without changing the frame of the Government we set up when we became a Nation, we have added immeasurably through constitutional amendments and statutory acts to the liberty as well as the general welfare of all of our citizens.

In the paragraph from the book by the junior Senator from Arizona which I quoted earlier there is one very striking sentence:

"I do not undertake to promote welfare, for I propose to extend freedom."

What does this mean in literal terms?

My idea of promoting welfare includes, as an essential element, the extension of an individual's freedom.

For example, the Federal banking system set by statute gives me the freedom to conduct financial affairs under sound monetary and credit regulations, a freedom my ancestors did not have. Since in this respect I am guaranteed freedom, and not deprived of it, I certainly feel that this contributes to my welfare.

Perhaps the Senator was referring to the type of freedom our older citizens have had, to manage as best they can to meet their medical expenses in old age. No matter that funds are lacking, each is "free" to suffer want and neglect. But the liberal would hold that Federal concern for their welfare, and statutory action, would assure them of that other type of freedom which I feel is more desirable, freedom from the worry of medical bills and hospital bills for care they must have.

The junior Senator from Arizona has proposed that the Federal Government gradually withdraw entirely from the following programs which he describes as being "outside the constitutional mandate," social welfare programs, public power, agriculture, public housing, urban renewal, and, as he states, from "all other activities that can be better performed by lower levels of government or by private institutions or by individuals."

Only by this method, in his opinion, can American people "start making progress toward regaining their freedom."

If I correctly understand the Senator, what are some of the Government services we would be giving up?

One would certainly be the great system of social security insurance which provides most Americans with a minimum income for their retirement years.

Another, I presume, would be our public health system, including the basic research efforts to attack the cause and find the cure for great killers like heart disease and cancer.

Federal aid to education would undoubtedly be on the list, despite the fact that Federal aid to land-grant colleges was first authorized in 1862, and that since that time there have been many other programs reaffirming our national interest in support of our schools.

As Americans, would the Senator from Arizona have us turn our back on slums and decaying cities, with nothing done about these twin evils unless States or communities are able to aid, or when slum clearance and urban renewal can be financed by private capital?

And agriculture, that important segment of our economy that has consumed so much of the thought of Republican and Democratic administrations since President Hoover initiated his farm board, would it be left to sink or swim depending on the farmer's ability to outguess the weather and the market?

What of our great natural power sites, which are part of the people's God-given heritage of natural resources? In many cases their full and comprehensive development is too big and two costly for private enterprise, or for a local community or areas to develop. To turn over to private enterprise the full responsibility for developing electric energy would be, in some cases, to squander the people's heritage.

As I see it, the conservatives really want to use the laws of 1850 to govern the United States of the 1960's. They relish our automobiles, our television, our jet airplanes, our beautiful cities and our comfortable homes, but they want to be as unregulated as though they still lived on a frontier ranch.

Do they seriously want to repeal our national conservation program, the railroad and trust regulations of the late 19th century, the Farm Assistance Program, the Food and Drug Act and its numerous amendments, our water pollution control program, to use a few examples? How many people can possibly have deluded themselves into believing that the "good old days" before the national Government undertook these services were better than the "good new days" of the present, and the even better days of the future?

I've never been sure just when the "good old days" began or ended but let's take a brief glimpse at the status of the average man—at his educational opportunities, his working conditions, his rights as a citizen, and his living standards, during some of the periods which some of our rugged conservatives like to think of as rosy.

When the Republic was founded there was an aristocracy of wealthy landowners, a few well-to-do shipowners, practically no middle class, and a large mass of tenants, small farmowners, frontiersmen, agricultural field workers and slaves.

Illiteracy was common. Before 1827 there were no tax supported schools of any kind. It was not until the latter half of the 19th century, when the public libraries began to spread across the Nation, when newspapers and periodicals began to achieve mass circulations, and when the chautauqua and lecture platform became popular that there was any real advance in general literacy. Even so, 50 years ago only 1 out of every 17 citizens completed high school.

As far as material wealth was concerned, as late as 1900 only about 71 out of every 1,000 persons had any savings deposits, and only about 42 out of every 1,000 had any ordinary life insurance. Life expectancy for men was about 46 years; for women 48.

Because people were willing to work for anything they could get, the annual average wage in manufacturing in this country in 1909 was only slightly over $500. That would buy more beefsteak or potatoes than $500 would today, but it would not buy decent housing or medical care or education, or enough of anything else.

Is this the golden period of American history to which our conservative friends refer with nostalgia?

It is not easy to contrast living standards in the early 1900's with those of today because the data are clearly not comparable in all cases. There are great differences in dollar values, and many intangibles. However, it is safe to say that the per capita gross national product, based on a constant dollar, has doubled in the last 50 years. This means that in proportion to the population, twice the quantity of goods and services are being consumed today than at the beginning of this century. And the per capta income, estimated in constant dollars, is up from $375 to $2,538. Family income has tripled in just the last 30 years. Despite high taxes we have much more spendable income than ever before.

Total personal savings were only a little over a billion dollars at turn of the century. In 1956 they stood at almost $37 billion. In 1920, life insurance in force in this country added up to about $40 billion. By 1958 the amount was close to $500 billion.

The number of telephones have more than doubled in the last 30 years, and the number of privately owned cars more than tripled.

I could continue for some time to quote statistics to you, people are living much longer, we are losing far fewer babies in their first year, and far fewer women in childbirth, well over half of our citizens are completing high school instead of 1 out of every 17 as was the case in 1900, illiteracy has almost

been wiped out, we are eating more and better, we have more leisure because we don't work as long, and we are using that leisure to travel to faraway places.

Does it not seem as though life is richer and more abundant?

But as you may say many of these gains are purely material. What of the constitutional guarantees of freedom and of political and civil liberties? Have they been eroded down through the years?

In partial answer to this, let me point to the recent decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals overturning the Apalachin convictions. It was, we all agree, a complete frustration of the efforts of the law to deal effectively with those who scorn the law. But it was also a stern and impartial protection of the constitutional rights of the individual.

You all remember the details of the Apalachin case. Twenty men, most of whom had underworld police records, were convicted of conspiracy to conceal the purpose of their conclave at Apalachin, N.Y. They all asserted they were simply "visiting a sick friend." No people familiar with the interlocking directorates of racketeering believed this, it made just as much sense as saying that 63 men with underworld reputations had convened in Apalachin to play tiddlywinks.

Yet the court held "no crime proved, no conviction."

"In America," wrote Judge Charles E. Clark, "we respect the dignity of the individual, and even an unsavory character is not to be imprisoned except on definite proof of specific crime."

Most Americans agreed. It was unfortunate that freedoms broad enough to shield the worthy gave shelter to the unworthy, but when freedom is at stake, the course is clear.

We must not curtail freedom. The United States must, within the framework of the Constitution, sharpen its legal powers to deal successfully with the new techniques of crime.

Contrast the sentiment in America today on the Apalachin case, and the language of the decision on it, with the course of the famous Sacco-Vanzetti case of the 1920's. Two Italian radicals were convicted of murder in a payroll robbery in Massachusetts. The case was full of doubts, "doubts that would not down," Walter Lippmann, then an editorial writer on the New York World, called them. "No man," Mr. Lippmann write, "should be put to death where so much doubt exists."

But the men were executed. There was a genuine division of thought between those who thought radicals ought to be strung up on principle and those who felt the test of a country's civilization was the care with which it protected the rights of minorities. When the execution finally took place, many shivered and wondered if justice had been done, and then went on to something else.

And now turn further back to the Salem witch frenzy. What happened then? A company of girls started to bark like dogs and scream. They were accused of being bewitched. The excitement spread, and the jails filled rapidly with suspects. Fifty-five persons suffered torture, and 20 were executed before the frightful period ended. During the entire time it was actually unsafe to express doubt of a prisoner's guilt.

The days of the Salem witch trials, when no voice was raised to question innocence or guilt, the time of the Sacco-Vanzetti trials, and when despite many doubts of guilt two men were executed, or the Apalachin trial of the 1960's when to guard against trampling on basic guarantees 63 underworld characters were set free, in which era was there more viligant protection of the constitutional rights of a citizen?

My friends, I seriously wonder whether those who would turn back the clock would be satisfied with the type of land in which they would live.

The conservatives continually express deep concern about the cost of moving forward. I, for one, have never believed that the best measure of our national progress is the rate or the quantity of our expenditures. I am proud of the fact that much of our high standard of living is a product of a private enterprise system left free and unfettered, and regulated by law only when restrictions or a referee become necessary to assure maximum freedom to the system or proper protection for the people.

But I cannot agree with the theory that every expansion of government machinery is a restriction of freedom or a long step toward national bankruptcy.

It is true that the demands of our society are taking a considerable percentage of our incomes, a percentage we wish was less. But this does not justify the claim of conservatives that all Government spending is bad, per se, and that all private spending is good, per se.

Obviously when we spend for a new car or a new television set we do it as individuals, while we must join together in Government to spend for a new school. We must, in other words, use government as our instrument to build and operate the school system. But does it make the school less desirable, less necessary, less an adjunct of a free society? Does the new car, in Senator GOLDWATER's phrase "maximize freedom," more than does the school?

"Individual responsibilities" mean meeting individual responsibility to the Commonwealth. It is true that we have other responsibilities. We have responsibilities to our families and our friends. But we have no responsibility more important than that to our fellow man.

Those who emphasize individual responsibility sometimes tend to confuse responsibility with interest, so that a person who follows his personal interest is led to believe that, by so doing, he is being responsible when he is only being selfish.

Conservatives sometimes acknowledge that concerted effort to meet a general problem at the community or State level is desirable, but believe that it becomes "socialism" when the National Government seeks a solution. Is this realistic? In this modern age our mobile populations and swift communications are making more and more problems soluble only at the Federal level. It is no longer possible, for instance, to quarantine ignorance or crime behind city walls or State boundaries. Adult workers poorly educated in their childhood, and criminals bred in their youth in city slums, migrate back and forth across the country to become the problem of any community in which they settle.

There is another point which should be made here, also, in behalf of Federal concern for problems which spill over from one section of the country to another. States and local communities depend largely upon the general property tax for revenue, while the Federal tax system is based to a much greater degree upon the ability to pay. There can be considerable justification therefore for using it to meet all problems which are national in scope.

Too many discussions of Federal spending leave the impression that our taxes are high because of the inordinate expense of programs for health, welfare, conservation, resource development and other domestic improvements. This, of course, is not fair. More than half of Federal tax dollars today are going into major national security items, that is, defense, atomic energy, space exploration and military assistance.

Federal expenditures for domestic needs, for health, welfare, conservation, resource development, housing, commerce and general government are less than one-fourth of our budget and they are at a lower level proportionately than they were 20 years ago.

Today, the debate in America over conservative and liberal philosophies of government is more intense than at almost any other time in recent history. As the apostle of conservatism, my colleague and your junior Senator is one of the main and most able debaters.

I welcome this debate. It is as much a part of our way of life as the Constitution itself. I trust that out of it will come the high resolve and unity of purpose which has seen America through her other times of crises.

I am disturbed, however, by the infusion into the conservative movement, and particularly into the most conservative wing of the Republican Party, of what has come to be known as the "radical right."

I am speaking of the professional anti-Communists, the members of the John Birch Society and similar organizations, who have set themselves up as the only true Americans and who label everyone who disagrees with them as Communists or Communist dupes.

These self-appointed patriots are trying to convince the people that we are weakened by an income tax based on the ability to pay, by a social security system which provides funds for food and lodging for our elderly, and by a minimum wage which assures our most lowly paid the necessities of life.

They try to wreck the integrity of the Supreme Court. They stir up resentment against our participation in the United Nations. They say that the clergy is riddled with Communists. They make an effort to block all foreign aid programs. They vilify foreign-born and minority-group citizens. They chip away at our civil liberties and spread hate and suspicion throughout the Nation.

Former President Eisenhower has labelled some of the charges of the super patriots of the right as "rot." President Kennedy has given them clear warning that the damages of Birchism to our free society in the sixties will not, like the abuses of McCarthyism in the fifties, be borne by the President in silence.

Meanwhile, there are millions of well-meaning but unthinking Americans who are embracing these programs as valid solutions for our deeply complex problems. These people are troubled and frustrated, and the simple solutions offered are something they want desperately to accept.

I do not doubt the sincerity of some of the men and women who are leading the radical right. They believe that by fomenting hate they are doing what is best for America. But there is no question but that they are irresponsible and destructive, and that the sensible men and women of America must understand what is happening, must study it, and must consider what can be done about it. In the thunder from the right there is real danger to the liberties that we cherish so dearly in America, danger which our conservative friends either do not, or will not, recognize.

My friends, as I stated earlier, America is again at a point in its history, and in the history of mankind, when we must examine first principles.

In the past, when we have done so, the liberals have carried the day. I believe they will carry it again in the decade ahead. Once more there has come upon the American scene a strong leader who recognizes the new challenge of liberalism, and has moved into a position of commitment to it. I refer, of course, to our great young President—Jack Kennedy.

There is no question in my mind that President Kennedy is standing firmly in the Wilson-Roosevelt-Truman tradition, and what is an even surer test of the durability of his stance, he has surrounded himself with some of the best and most progressive minds of our age.

Each day Jack Kennedy dedicates himself more firmly to the advancement of the Nation's social welfare and economic security as it centers in the family—higher minimum wages, better housing, improved health services, greater protection for the aged. And each day he demonstrates that he is more strongly committed, both by mind and heart, to strengthening civil liberties and civil rights.

He does not consider himself a liberal simply of the new deal stripe. He feels that the liberalism of the new deal and the fair deal has become so intrinsically a part of the American way of life that it is no longer a subject for controversy. Liberalism, he feels, should be "rethought and renewed."

"What we need now in this Nation most of all is a constant flow of new ideas," he said in his campaign. "* * * We cannot obtain new ideas until we have a government and a public opinion which respect new ideas and the people who have them. * * * Our country has surmounted great crises in the past, not because of our wealth, not because of our rhetoric, not because we had longer cars and whiter ice boxes and bigger television screens than anyone else, but because our ideas were more compelling, and more penetrating and more wise and more enduring."

In the Congress and in the Cabinet, Arizona has given President Kennedy three stalwart liberals, the great young-in-spirit-and-heart dean of the Senate Carl Hayden and the Udall brothers, Stew and Moe. You Democrats should be proud of these liberals and you should be ready, willing, and able to plug a couple of gaps in your delegation, which I won't mention.

My friends, President Kennedy and the other American liberals of 1960 are simply seeking to emulate the spirit of those times in our earlier history when new aims and wholly new processes were developed to meet new needs.

Today, as in the past, the conservatives may hamper and delay some efforts and programs, but I am convinced that the fundamental pressure of the American people will triumph in the end. Public opinion polls show that more than 75 percent of the American people are behind President Kennedy—approve of his fresh new approach and his firm hand on the helm.

You know, the Republican reaction to President Kennedy's immense popularity and to the record he is making reminds me of the story about the farmer and his new hunting dog. When he first got him he took the dog out for a test run. Presently he shot a duck. The dog walked out on top of the water, picked up the duck, and trotted back over the waves. The farmer blinked, rubbed his eyes * * * and tried again, with the same result.

Completely overjoyed, he invited a neighbor to go with him the following day, saying nothing about the dog's talent. True to form, when either man hit a bird the dog would walk on the water and retrieve it.

The neighbor said nothing. Finally, unable to hold in a moment longer the owner hinted: "Some dog, eh?"

The neighbor rubbed his chin reflectively. "Yeah," he mumbled, "good dog, but he can't swim."

I predict that the Kennedy hold on the imaginations of the American people will flourish and grow. He has grasped firmly the fact that the liberal Democratic tradition is the American tradition, and that it enlarges the freedom of choice and opens the way for everybody to build his future to his own wishes.

And so, in conclusion, let me sum up:

The conservative likes to quote from the past to strengthen his position, but in the context of American history, the liberal position emerges as the only rational one. Our history is a record of liberal successes.

The conservative is a traditionalist, the liberal is a pragmatist. The former defends the existing state of affairs, be it good or bad, simply because it exists. He doubts the ability of human beings to apply intelligence to the solutions of social problems, and he seems not to trust his government to successfully carry out any program which might be formulated. This he does in the face of overwhelming evidence and the lessons of history to the contrary.

The liberal, on the other hand, is a practical fellow, who believes that change is inevitable, that it is feasible, and that it is wise. Moreover, he wants to be the instrument for guiding the direction and controlling the forces of the movement in the future. He seeks to achieve effective freedom for the individual. This means freedom to think, and to choose for himself. It means freedom to enjoy with equality the benefits of our modern society in business and in private life.

Modern democracies have demonstrated time and again that they have more inner gristle than other types of government and can outlast them—can bury them, if you please, as long as their citizens have the freedom, the education, and the drive to make democracy work.

In some parts of the world today there are serious doubts that democracy can deal with the complexities of the space age. Democracy, it is said, is too loose, too slow, too inefficient, and too dedicated to personal comfort to move with the speed, the concentration and the daring these times demand.

Can a government that rests on will, and not force, meet the challenge?

The history and the achievements of Americans stand as a monument to the personal responsibility of free men. I am convinced that the adventure in democracy which began in 1776 and has carried a people to the greatest heights in history can be sustained and extended if we can reaffirm in each American a sense of individual obligation to meet the challenge.

We cannot compete in a space age with totalitarianism if the dogmas of yesterday remain frozen in the minds of the people. We can compete only if we maintain open, inquiring minds, a sense of purpose, and the courage and foresight to shift when necessary, as our forefathers did, from well beaten paths to bold new courses into the untried and the unknown.

Would You Sell Your American Freedom for $425?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, if my mail is any indication, American farmers want the Government to get out of their business and to leave them alone. In fact, my mail from both in and outside my district indicates there are others who want to run their own affairs without Government intervention.

I recently received a letter from a constituent, Mr. J. W. Boerhave, of Lynden, Wash. Mr. Boerhave and his sons operate a berry farm and are fully aware of farm problems. He is also aware that the Federal Government is becoming dictatorial in its efforts to solve these problems.

Mr. Speaker, I believe what Mr. Boerhave has to say in his letter is a matter of interest to all Members of Congress, so under leave to extend my remarks I include his letter in the RECORD.

The letter follows:

LYNDEN, WASH., *March 6, 1962.*

Hon. JACK WESTLAND,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WESTLAND: Would you sell your American freedom for $425? That is what some of our Government officials are asking the American farmer to do. It seems almost inconceivable that in our America we have officials who are virtually pointing a loaded gun at us and threatening to pull the trigger if we disagree with their demands. I am referring to H.R. 10010, the administration farm bill.

The cost of the "green belt" around our cities for recreation purposes, which the bill provides for, would be added to an already much criticized farm program.

Heavy fines will be levied for overproduction, of which we often have no control due to weather and other factors. We have the solemn promise of Mr. Freeman that we will be rigidly policed. How can these things happen in our country? What has happened to our Constitution?

If this bill is passed it will invite black market operations. It leaves room for backdoor spending. The farmer will be told how much land he may use, how much he may produce, how much he will be assessed—no one will estimate the cost of policing and enforcing this program. Is this freedom as our forefathers wished us to have?

A great many Americans are becoming increasingly alarmed and I might add, bitter, at the personal power that some of our officials are seeking. Most of our ancestors left their homeland to get away from the very things that are happening here today.

An agricultural dictatorship will not solve the farm problem. It hasn't solved the wheat situation (in more than 20 years of trying). It didn't solve the pork problem, even by killing hogs by the thousands, nor did it solve the potato farmers' troubles. It has not worked in Russia or China. It has only raised taxes and added to the cost of food to the consumer. This is the farmers' problem and not the Government's—the law of supply and demand is a great equalizer and will still work for us as it did in the cattle industry and others that have not been under controls.

We often wonder if there is still hope, or have we taken the one step beyond?

Mr. Cochrane has explained that agriculture should be run as a "public utility" with the farmers given a franchise to produce a predetermined amount of produce.

The future for us, our children and grandchildren, looks extremely dismal, to say the least, when the only thing our Government can promise us is more government, more spending and more taxes.

We sincerely hope that you will use every means at your disposal to keep America a free country—for the people and by the people.

Yours truly,

J. W. BOERHAVE.

Soil and Water Conservation—Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I welcome the opportunity to bring to the

attention of the Senate two resolutions adopted by the Wisconsin Association of Soil and Water Conservation District Supervisors at their annual meeting.

Generally, the resolutions recommend:

First. An adequate appropriation for the Agricultural Research Service in the field of soil and water conservation.

Second. All longtime farm and ranch plans, as proposed in bill H.R. 10010, re the "Food and Agriculture Act of 1962," be carried out through the medium of soil and water conservation districts which have a quarter century of experience in scientific farm planning.

Over the years our District Supervisors have provided hardworking, creative leadership in conservation of our soil and water resources. I ask unanimous consent to have these resolutions, forwarded to me by the newly elected president of the association, S. D. Macomber, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION—SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION RESEARCH

Whereas since 1931 the States of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, and Illinois have been cooperating with the U.S. Department of Agriculture and other agencies in planning and operating a soil and water conservation research program in the Upper Mississippi Valley, and

Whereas this program, located in the Upper Mississippi Valley Soil and Water Conservation Experiment Station near LaCrosse, Wis., has had a profound and beneficial effect on the excellence of soil conservation practices on farms in the soil conservation districts in the four-State area, and

Whereas development of improved farm practices unrelated in conservation as well as changes in social and economic factors urgently require that certain basic research be continued and expanded in the problem area if the soil conservation district programs are to improve and develop commensurate with technological improvements in other segments of our national economy, and

Whereas the published report entitled "Facility Needs—Soil and Water Conservation Research" (S. Doc. 59, 86th Cong., 1st sess.) page 94 states, "The present facilities at LaCrosse, Wis., are already overtaxed and much of the land area is not suited for reuse for experimental purposes. The work at this location should be closed out and a new site obtained for work on soil management and erosion control, pasture and meadow renovation, minimum tillage, plow-plant, and similar practices.", and

Whereas the legislative bodies passed, and the Governor of the State of Wisconsin approved, legislation authorizing the Wisconsin Agricultural Experiment Station to purchase new land for an expanded soil and water conservation research program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Wisconsin Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts recommend that the Congress of the United States provide adequate funds for the relocation of the Upper Mississippi Valley Soil and Water Experiment Station and the strengthening of the soil and water conservation research program in the Upper Mississippi Valley as recommended in priority item 33 of the hearings of the subcommittee on agriculture of the 87th Congress, 1st session. These funds are urgently requested to permit advances in farm methods related to conservation practices such as stripcropping, terracing, soil management, and water management, including run-of-control infiltration, water storage, stream pollution, etc.

RESOLUTION—FARM PLANNING

Whereas President Kennedy has recommended a program of "A"bundance, "B"alance, "C"onservation, "D"evelopment for agriculture; and

Whereas it is suggested that legislation be enacted to include cost sharing under long-term contracts for the conservation and development of soil, water, forests, wildlife, and recreation resources; and

Whereas soil conservation districts throughout the Nation have the legal responsibility for conserving these resources under State laws, and they have effectively developed and carried out a program of scientifically sound conservation planning on a farm-by-farm basis for up to a quarter century; and

Whereas any legislation of the type proposed should fully utilize existing, experienced and proven soil and water conservation districts as a medium for planning activities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Wisconsin Association of Soil and Water Conservation District Supervisors at their 1962 annual meeting held in Green Lake on March 5 and 6, recommend that any long-range farm planning be carried out through nationally established, recognized, and accepted soil and water conservation districts following the scientific approach that has been employed for a quarter century; and be it further

Resolved, That the State association solicit support of the State Soil and Water Conservation Committee for this proposal; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to President Kennedy, Members of the Congress, and the Secretary of Agriculture.

Bananas on Pike's Peak Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, several years back when the Upper Colorado River project was under consideration a series ran in these columns in opposition to the project. The remarks usually concluded with a statement that one or more of the individual units in the overall project made about as much sense as trying to grow bananas on Pike's Peak. Considerable substantiations of the viewpoints expressed then are contained in the following article by Raymond Moley which appeared in the March 12, 1962, issue of Newsweek:

PERSPECTIVE—THE COLORADO LIFELINE

(By Raymond Moley)

Whenever I have crossed the Colorado River near Blythe, Calif., I have entertained reflections on what that slim and calm stream means to so many Americans and some Mexicans. It is neither the largest nor the longest of our rivers. Its origin is 1,200 miles from Blythe in the Colorado Rockies; 200 miles downstream, what is left of it enters the Gulf of California.

There has been a cold war of controversy among the 7 States which, with the river's tributaries, are in the Colorado basin. A first step was taken in making an allocation of its waters through the Colorado River compact, for which Herbert Hoover labored with diligence and diplomatic skill. This compact, approved by Congress in 1929, created the upper basin and the lower basin. The point of division and the measuring of the water was at Lee Ferry, near the Utah-Arizona border. On the basis of an annual volume flow, the upper basin was allocated 7.5 million acre-feet, and the lower basin 8.5 million. By treaty, 1.5 million were guaranteed to Mexico.

My own study of the problems involved began in 1951, when Arizona sought and failed to secure Federal authorization for an immense project to take water from the river and transport it to the area around Phoenix and Tucson. Then Arizona brought suit in the Supreme Court to determine the allocation of lower basin water among California, Arizona, and Nevada. The Court a few years later appointed a special master, former Judge Simon H. Rifkind, to review the case and to make recommendations. The special master held hearings over a period of nearly 3 years and submitted a report in 1960. In January 1961 the argument was heard by the Court, which now has the case under consideration.

SHORTAGE OF WATER

A most important phase of the case is that the estimated volume calculated in the 1920's seems to have been excessive because of the inclusion of 6 very wet years in the record. It now appears that the total volume of Colorado basin water is 2 million acre-feet below the earlier estimate.

California, relying on the earlier estimate of the State's quota of water, has spent vast sums on conduits and other facilities for its distribution to an immense and thirsty population. Arizona also has considerable anticipations. In all the States in the Colorado basin there are huge Federal investments in storage, power, and irrigation projects built or building.

But this fails to deter the agitation of certain States and their representatives in Congress for still more exactions of water which may not be there. There are even two proposed transmountain diversion plans which would take water from west of the Continental Divide to the east.

MORE DIVERSIONS

One of these has been before Congress for several years. It is called the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, which would be built in the Colorado Rockies and take water from the small streams at the source of the river and carry it across and through the mountains to the Arkansas. The estimated cost would be $170 million.

Another is a combination of two plans. One is to take water from the San Juan River, a Colorado tributary, to provide irrigation on the Navajo Reservation in northwestern New Mexico; the other, to build the first portion of a San Juan-Chima diversion to the Rio Grande Valley. The cost of these is estimated at more than $200 million. These would develop new land to produce agricultural commodities. The San Juan-Chima project would also provide water for municipal purposes.

During the years in which I have studied these river problems I have come to the conviction that in the case of all the States in the entire Colorado basin, water is too precious a value to be used for irrigation. This is especially true because of the immense growth of the populations all over the Southwest, and also because we already have a heavy burden of agricultural surpluses. The famous Semitic code of Hammurabi, 40 centuries ago in Babylonia, provided that there should be a priority in the use of water—first, for man and beasts; second, for household use; and third, for the land. Congress might learn something from this precedent.

New York Doctor Serves in India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the work of a New Yorker, Dr. William Caccamise, ophthalmologist on the staff of St. Mary's Hospital in Rochester.

Dr. Caccamise has left his Rochester practice in order to go to India as a volunteer to combat the high rate of blindness and eye disease there. For the next 3 months, Dr. Caccamise will devote his time, his skill, and his services, to the Indians. This is a fine example of the American spirit of generosity and charity which has sought to help less fortunate people around the globe.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article describing Dr. Caccamise's work be printed in the Appendix in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY DOCTOR GOING TO INDIA—HIS PRIVATE WAR

(By John Van Buren)

In his private war to eradicate blindness and eye diseases in India, a Rochester physician will take on this exhausting schedule during the next 3 months:

Get up at 5:30 a.m.

Perform 15 major operations and about twice as many minor ones.

Examine and treat 150 other patients, his 15-hour workday ending at 8:30 p.m.

Dr. William C. Caccamise refers to the effort he faces simply as "an example of what a private individual can do to alleviate suffering in the world."

He will embark on his mission—his third to India—on Friday, and from January 1 to April 1 will conduct a clinic at the Holy Family Hospital at Patna, near Calcutta.

In an interview yesterday, Dr. Caccamise said his visit has been heralded by the Indian Government, newspapers and radio stations, and that more than 10,000 new patients are expected to attend the clinic, some traveling as much as 1,200 miles.

He said the expected number of patients will be more than twice the number he cared for during his last visit to India 3 years ago. At that time he treated about 5,000 persons at his own expense, and his work was hailed throughout India and the Voice of America broadcasted his accomplishments to the world.

This year, Dr. Caccamise said, he will be aided by a number of gifts from pharmaceutical companies and charitable organizations. Catholic Charities of New York City, for example, has provided 25,000 sutures, and several drug and equipment manufacturers have donated considerable quantities of antibiotics, vitamins, and supplies.

Thirteen crates of material were recently shipped to India from Philadelphia, and word has reached him that the supplies have arrived there safely and will be transported to the clinic. The Rochester Eye-Bank and Research Society will provide him with preserved eye materials for use in surgery.

The 38-year-old ophthalmologist, a graduate of Monroe High School and the University of Rochester Medical School, established the clinic in Patna in 1951, naming it in honor of his father, the late Dr. Charles William Caccamise, Sr.

He explains the purpose this way:

"It is the influence of my parents, particularly my father, who inspired me to use any skills and knowledge I might possess to help humanity."

Dr. Caccamise, who lives at 288 Yarmouth Road, will leave his wife, four children and practice behind him on his visit to India. It is too risky, he said, to take his family because of the high incidence of tuberculosis and other infectious diseases around Patna.

He described the high rate of blindess and eye diseases in India "as a tragedy," especially in view of the fact that much of it can be prevented through proper diet and medical care.

Vitamin A deficiency, he explained, is one of the common causes of blindness in India, and to help combat this problem he will take several thousand dollars worth of multiple vitamins. In cases where vitamins and drugs are unsuccessful, he will perform operations, including corneal transplants, aimed at restoring sight.

"It will be a very grueling pace," he said, "but the satisfaction of helping others will be well worth the effort."

Let's Make Hay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oklahoma City Times of March 8, 1962:

LET'S MAKE HAY

President Kennedy has been handed a golden opportunity to make hay for our side by Soviet Premier Khrushchev's failure in agriculture speech this week.

In a 6-hour address Khrushchev listed failure after failure for Communist agriculture, particularly in lagging production in meat, grain and dairy products. He even included his own prize project, the virgin lands east of the Urals.

President Kennedy could win a worldwide propaganda victory by going on the air to challenge Khrushchev:

"Why don't you abandon your collectivist system of agriculture, which is condemned as unworkable by your own words, and turn to our system of privately owned and operated farms, which have set the most amazing production record in history? Why don't you Communists, who are always prating about progress, adopt what has proved to be the most progressive system of agriculture in the world?"

Our President could point out that Khrushchev hinted the solution which might be tried would include greater material incentives to spur production. While the Russian didn't refer to profits, they were implied by this remark:

"It is completely wrong to oppose material incentives to moral ones * * *. The development of moral stimuli and the strengthening of material stimuli are indissolubly linked."

It so happens that Averell Harriman, one of Mr. Kennedy's roving Ambassadors, twitted Khrushchev in a speech in San Francisco. But it got little attention compared to what would accrue worldwide if Kennedy spoke.

Here, then, Mr. President, is a direct appeal from the farm region to you not to let slip this opportunity to underscore the superiority of the free way of doing things.

A Short Look Behind the Recreation Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, M. Frederik Smith, vice president of the Prudential Insurance Co., who has given liberally of his time and talent to forward the interests of parks, recreation and conservation in the Nation, made an excellent speech on the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission report at the American Pulpwood Association convention in New York recently.

Mr. Smith is a member of the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments. He has been a hard-working member of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission during its 3-year undertaking for the Nation. He is well known in conservation circles as the Director of the Council of Conservationists.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the manuscript will make about 2⅔ pages of the RECORD at a cost of $240.

I ask unanimous consent to have his address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD so it will be accessible to any who desire a fine summary and interpretation of the Commission's work.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SHORT LOOK BEHIND THE RECREATION REPORT

By now some of you will have seen the report of the Outdoor Commission, and most of you will have read digests of it. If you have seen it, you know that it has nearly 250 pages, a great many pictures and charts, and a listing, in the back, of 27 supplementary studies, made chiefly by outside contractors, which will be published later, and which provided the raw material for our decisions and recommendations. If you have read the report, you know far more than I can tell you today.

What none of you know, and I hope you may be interested to learn, is what at least one member of the commission feels are the two most important conclusions we reached. Bernie Orell, who is here, might have a different idea of the importance of our conclusions, but I have lived with him now for 3 years in this matter—and I don't think he would. One of the remarkable things about our commission is that despite the varied experience and prejudices and enthusiasms and political differences of the 15 people, Senators and Congressmen and Presidential appointees, who make it up, we are all in general agreement on our ap-

proaches to the problem and on our findings. For once in the long history of commission reports, there was no minority report and no footnote kibitzes. I think one reason for this is because we all determined in the beginning that in answering the questions asked and in fulfilling our assignments from Congress we intended to come up with a report that would be a basis for action and not simply a subject for debate.

In all, we made 30 or more recommendations, and many of these had subrecommendations.

However, I believe the two most important conclusions that we were able to distill from the 5,000 pages of facts and figures we collected are these:

1. That the question that Congress asked us—"How does our supply of facilities and areas compare with the need, and what can we do about it now and during the next 40 years?"—could be answered in any of three ways. In terms of geography, how many acres should be devoted to recreation, when the need triples, as it will by the year 2000; or in terms of dollars, which might be erroneously arrived at by multiplying the current real estate value of present areas by 3, which would prove to be unnecessarily hard on taxpayers; or it could be answered in terms of people, what they do, what they want to do, how far they are willing and able to travel to do it, and how we recommend providing facilities to meet these specific needs in the right places and in the most efficient and economical way.

This last is what we decided to do.

We decided that what was called for was not an acreage-oriented study, not a dollar-oriented study, but a people-oriented study. How many people want to go to the beach, and how many want a wilderness experience? A wilderness adventurer needs an unholy lot of space for his purposes, while the Jones Beach or Coney Island enthusiast manages somehow to get along with what seems to be less than his own displacement in footage, and this is what is really important. But, you may say, if we know what people want to do, and where they want to do it, and how much space it will take to do it in, why then can't we come up with a handy dandy table of acres and dollars? The answer to this leads into our second vital decision:

2. Nothing is easier in Washington than coming up with a staggering dollar figure as the price of averting a crisis. It is a sort of political status symbol. But in view of the increasing economic importance of land for a variety of uses, the commission felt an old-fashioned obligation to make certain that we are getting the best and most efficient use out of our present areas before we plunge headlong into a program of land acquisition; and that when land is acquired, we should be certain that it is in the right places, and managed for its most effective use. This can only be done through detailed studies and specific plans by the 50 States. It can't be done from Washington. We have said in our report that our problem is not too few, but too few effective acres. This is what we meant.

I wish I could climb up on the Empire State Building with a bull horn and shout again and again that meeting the crisis in outdoor recreation space is not simply a matter of spending money and adding geography. People are too quick to assume that the wholesale acquiring of landscape wherever and whenever it can be found is the whole answer to the recreation problem. This is a dangerous and wasteful point of view. One reason is because there is currently such widespread enthusiasm for parks and recreation areas and preservation that opposing land acquisition for these purposes takes on the complexion of crass commercialism and greed, often justifiably, but sometimes it simply short circuits intelligent thinking and planning. Certainly, specific areas must be saved before it is too late, some of our shorelines, for instance, and strategic sites must be made available for recreation; but if the present tide of enthusiasm leads authorities to overdo it, then we may in the end lose even that which we have, and which we have been able to protect only by vigilance and persistence and with a sound backlog of reason and fact.

When it comes to acquiring new land for recreation, the need, as well as bona fide preservation requirements, should dictate acquisition and management policies. Our studies indicate that if you compare the need for acreage to take care of present recreation needs, with the acreage available in our presently established recreation areas—and do this on purely a square footage basis, without regard to who can do what on which acres—you find that we already have ample space available and in use. But don't get up and go home now, because that is not the whole story, not by a long shot.

The fact is that if our present areas were in all the right places, and were managed solely to accommodate the recreation habits of the people who can use them, we would have no crisis. But this isn't the case, so we have too much acreage in some places and far too little in others, and overall there is a substantial problem: a shortage.

What it boils down to, in the last analysis, is that our present recreation acreage grew out of local enthusiasms, emotional urges, opportunistic ventures, political expedience, bequests and gifts, and often, as in the case with national parks and national forests and historic sites, the unequivocal fact that natural phenomena just happen to be where they happen to be, and that is where they've got to stay, whether there is anyone close at hand to use them or not.

We cannot criticize the people who set up the existing recreational areas, even those who may have set up areas unwisely in view of their service to the people who are intended to use them. This was inevitable because, until now, there have been no facts upon which to base any reasonable pattern for either location or use policies.

We didn't know, for example, that far and away the most popular recreation activity in the Nation is pleasure driving in an automobile, which is still inconceivable to anyone living in the East—and which incidentally adds a new dimension to highway planning. Sixty-one percent of the people like joyriding, and at least 10 percent would like to do it more often. Almost as many, 59 percent, like picnics, and this is more understandable. But then you jump down to 36 percent for the next most popular activity, which is swimming and going to the beach.

Roughly a quarter of the people like boating and canoeing and fishing, and 17 permente like hiking, and 12 percent go on bird walks, and an equal number go hunting, about as many go camping, and a growing number are taking to bicycles. These, mind you, are the things people do, they are not the things they dream about. We know what they dream about, too, and these are the fancier things, like horseback riding and scuba diving.

One of the most popular activities, right up close to automobile riding, is walking; and the fascinating thing about walking is that it is indulged in most widely and most enthusiastically by the wealthier and better educated people. I suppose you might conclude from this that when you are wise and rich you have sense enough to walk instead of risking your neck in an automobile on a crowded highway.

We know now what people do, what they want to do, and we know what happens to recreation habits as people get more money and have more leisure, so we have a pretty good idea of what they are going to be doing during the next 40 years or so. We know how far they are willing to travel to do it. Although we can't yet pinpoint it, we know in general what sort of facilities will be required and where, to satisfy local demands. We have a pretty good idea where the available acreage is. We have some idea of how much people are willing to pay to use recreation facilities. We know that in some cases the carrying capacity of the present acreage can be stepped up considerably without in any way impairing or impinging upon the quality of the area involved. In short, there is no longer any excuse for not recognizing the needs for specific recreation areas, nor for wasting land which might well have a higher use, on recreation areas that are unwisely placed or unwisely developed.

We are certain that with the help of the States—and they, rather than the Federal Government, are pivotal in this matter—sufficient space to accommodate recreation needs for the next 40 years can be made available.

To accomplish this, four steps must be taken:

1. Standardized land management practices should be adopted by all land management agencies to assure ample protection to areas that need to be preserved, but at the same time provide the maximum carrying capacity for the areas set aside.

2. Existing Federal and State programs to provide recreation areas, and there are several good ones, should be expanded, modified, and in many cases intensified.

3. A Bureau of Outdoor Recreation should be established in the Federal Government and given the responsibility for coordinating the recreation activities of the more than 20 Federal agencies that have land management responsibilities. This Bureau should also work closely with the States and through the States in establishing a national pattern for recreation areas.

4. A Federal grants-in-aid program to the States is needed to finance planning and to help provide recreation areas, especially near metropolitan areas where presently there is the greatest and fastest growing discrepancy between supply and demand.

STANDARDIZING MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

Certain lands are set aside for certain purposes, and these purposes must be maintained. National parks are created to preserve natural values, and natural values and hordes of people can be disastrously incompatible. A multipurpose philosophy governs national forests, but the highest purpose must be determined and then protected at all costs: and again, hordes of people, or people following certain pursuits, may be incompatible with that highest purpose. These two types of areas alone, parks and forests, comprise more than 90 percent of all Federal lands, although these agencies manage only 5,000 of the total of 24,000 public designated recreation areas in the Nation.

To make the most of these 24,000 areas, whoever manages them, the commission has suggested guidelines for management. On the basis of these guidelines, any area or any part of an area used for recreation and supervised by Federal, State or local agencies, would, in effect, be zoned for specific uses.

Six specific zones are spelled out in detail in our report.

Class 1 is the high density recreation zone. Such areas should be managed to serve as many people as possible in as many ways as practical. Here the prime consideration is not preservation but the provision of facilities. Class 1 just takes care of people.

Class 2 is what we call general outdoor recreation areas. These are subject to man-made developments for a wide variety of specific recreation uses, but these are not mass playgrounds. Such an area might be particularly suitable for special activities, such as skiing or picnicking or camping; but in these areas, we begin to recognize the need

for maintaining a relatively natural setting. Facilities would be planned to conform with the setting. Portions of national and State parks and national forests might be zoned in this class in order to provide a wider range of recreation activities and services, and as a means of shunting such activities to specific places in order to isolate and protect, sometimes even better than is the case at present, the natural environment and unique features existing in the critical parts of the park or forest. Class 2 takes care of many people, but there will be some "keep off the grass" signs.

Class 3 encompasses the natural environmental areas. This classification is transitional between the class 2 areas just described, where natural phenomena are respected, but are not the prime consideration; and the class 5 areas which must remain primitive. Most of the natural areas throughout the country would fall into this class. They generally support grazing, lumbering, or mining, in addition to recreation. These areas are ideal for hiking, hunting, fishing, camping, picnicking, canoeing, and sightseeing. They have a minimum of man-made facilities. There will be more "keep off the grass" signs.

Class 4 are the unique natural areas—areas of remarkable natural wonder, high scenic splendor, or of unusual scientific importance. These areas must be large enough to protect the phenomena involved, which are generally limited and irreplaceable. Preservation is the prime objective. Food, lodging, automobile service, and other facilities may be available nearby, but not in these areas. Swimming, picnicking, motor boating, camping, hunting, and fishing are prohibited. These areas are fragile. There will be plenty of keep off the grass signs.

Class 5 is the primitive area. As the recommendation says: "Primitive areas should be carefully selected and should be managed for the sole and unequivocal purpose of maintaining their primitive characteristics." These are the wilderness areas about which there is so much controversy. We not only believe that areas such as this should be set aside, but that legislation should be provided to guarantee protection over a long span of years. This does not mean that the commission as a group favors the present wilderness legislation, some of us do, and some of us don't. But all of us agree that legislative protection for carefully selected wilderness areas is essential.

While some authorities define wilderness as a very large tract of primitive land, 100,000 acres, for example, the commissioners believe that the nature of such an area, not the size, is the determining factor. The commission is interested in preserving the right of the American people to enjoy wilderness experiences, and we feel that a wilderness experience can be enjoyed by most people in a relatively limited area, providing such an area, by accident or by design, is buffered by some sort of a transitional area that makes it possible to maintain the wilderness quality. This does not mean that the commission is in favor of protecting only small wilderness areas, nor of dividing large wilderness areas into small packages; it simply means that we are in favor, and are enthusiastic, about preserving areas that are large enough for wilderness experience, especially when such areas happen also to be strategically located.

Class 6 encompasses the sites associated with the history, tradition, or cultural heritage of the Nation. These resources do not provide outdoor recreation opportunities in the usual sense, but they are so closely associated with vacation travel that they are included in this classification system. The primary management objective should be to effect such restoration as may be necessary to protect these resources from deterioration, and to interpret their significance to the public. Suitable access and prevention of overuse are equally essential.

In the opinion of the commission, the uniform adoption of this classification system and the freedom to zone within existing areas as well as within future areas, whether they are managed by some level of government or by private groups, will go a long way toward increasing the efficiency of areas set aside for recreation. Efficiency is an awkward word. It sounds incompatible with preservation. It isn't. If we are setting aside a resource for preservation, the more efficiently we preserve it the better. We can preserve it most efficiently and effectively if we have hard and fast rules for the preservation of resources, and a tangible line of demarcation between the specific resource that needs to be preserved, and the surrounding resources that may compatibly be used for suitable recreation purposes.

The commission puts great store by this classification system. We think it will help solve many problems that have plagued the Park Service, the Forest Service, conservationists, Congress, and nearly everyone who has ever been involved in a controversy about reserved areas.

NOW LET'S LOOK AT THE PRESENT PROGRAMS

Many comprehensive programs for the expansion of recreation areas and facilities are now in progress.

At the State level, the most striking is the pioneer work that the State of California has been doing during the past several years. Then there's the recreation area bond issue which New York State passed 2 years ago, setting a pattern which several States have followed. At the Federal level, the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior have stepped up their activities in recreation fields, and have extensive plans for still further expansion. Recent legislation has given open space responsibilities to other departments. Private industry, as you so well know, is also active in this field and should be encouraged to expand their efforts. To this end, the commission has taken note of the various ways in which States have entered into financial arrangements with private landholders to expedite public use of their lands. There is no lack of activity, and no shortage of projected programs.

What is needed at all levels of government is an element of planning coordination, without any effort at subordination, so that some sort of reasonable pattern will emerge. The commission has no desire to discourage agencies in the Federal Government, or at State or local levels, from proceeding with their plans. Present programs should be intensified and expanded as the needs increase; but we hope they will be modified where necessary to prevent overlapping and duplication and the waste of acreage where this might otherwise occur. It is hoped that the material gathered by the commission will be taken into consideration and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation will be consulted and kept informed.

THAT BRINGS US TO THE BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

No genius is required to see the need for a coordinating department within the Federal Government to expedite the development of recreation areas; to encourage the zoning of existing and future areas; to gather information on a nationwide basis as to the progress and placement of recreation areas; to maintain some sort of intelligence as to whether the trends continue to move in the direction that our investigations indicated that they might; and finally that could provide planning assistance and experience for the States.

The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation which we recommend will be controversial for many reasons, one of which is its location in the Department of the Interior. The commission does not see a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in the Department of the Interior as the ideal solution to all the problems with which we are confronted. We found it the only practical solution to most of the problems. Some commissioners preferred a separate agency; but others, particularly the congressional contingent, felt that we had enough agencies, and Congress wouldn't stand for another. They felt that, bureaucracy being what it is; and Parkinson's law being so firmly entrenched in Washington, a separate agency in the end would simply duplicate an important part of the functions of about 20 other agencies and departments without really eliminating anything. Another group of commissioners felt that the ideal solution would be a Department of Natural Resources which would include recreation planning as one of its activities. This, too, was felt to be impractical at this time, although plans for such an agency have been discussed in the New Frontier, and such an agency may in time develop. In this case, it is generally assumed that the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation naturally would be transferred to such an agency.

In the end, we decided that in this best of all possible governments, at this particular time, a bureau for coordination and for assistance should be set up within the Department of the Interior, which already has the responsibility for the most units if not the most acreage, in the recreation field. But the commissioners cannot imagine this bureau functioning successfully with 20 other Federal agencies if it is purely an Interior show; so we suggest an advisory board, which in effect would be a board of directors, consisting of other Secretaries whose departments are most intimately involved in land management. In this way, we hope to minimize the friction that might arise among these departments, and expedite agreement between Secretaries on major policies.

The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation should have no responsibilities in the administration of lands. The Bureau would not set up planning groups in competition with the Park Service nor the Forest Service nor the States—existing planning units generally would continue, although some might be cut back where they have grown beyond their primary responsibilities, and some of these planners might be transferred into the new Bureau. The technical staff of the Bureau, the commission hopes, would be recruited in this way. The Bureau would supplement the work of other agencies and the States when and where this is advisable, and in many cases it would be advisable.

The bureau also would advise Congress on recreation legislation. I say advise advisedly. Since the bureau would be the custodian of the national pattern of recreation areas as it develops, it is to be assumed that the bureau would have an opinion as to the advisability of establishing specific Federal recreation areas by legislation when such legislation is suggested. The bureau would review such projected legislation and let Congress know whether or not, in the opinion of the bureau, the establishment of the area is essential, advisable, important, or compatible with the emerging pattern. It would have no veto power, but it would have an opinion, just as other departments of the Government generally have an opinion on legislation which may bear on their business. Opinions on legislation would be written and submitted to Congress. In controversial cases, opinions to Congress presumably would have the approval or at least the acquiescence of the advisory board. If a report of the bureau failed to get the support of the advisory board, we can be reasonably sure that Congress would find this out, whether or not a formula for such a contingency is prepared.

This bureau could be set up by the Secretary of the Interior, by Executive order of the President, or by legislation. The commission has expressed no opinion as to which way it desires to get the agency born, but I think some of us might worry a little about the eventual effectiveness of a bureau, intended to work with 20 other departments, if it were set up unilaterally by the Secretary of the Interior. We are satisfied to suggest its formation, and outline its duties, and we feel that we have fulfilled our responsibilities when we turn these suggestions over to the Executive and the Congress for action.

GRANTS-IN-AID

As I have said before, and don't mind repeating, the States hold the key to a successful national recreation area program. But most States do not have planning facilities, nor do they have sufficient funds available for improving or adding to present areas. Since we have recommended that a Federal policy be established to encourage ample recreation space as a national resource, it is only reasonable that we should take steps to implement such a policy. For this reason, we have suggested a matching funds program, for both planning and acquisition.

Briefly, the program is this:

We would give the States an opportunity to set up a 5-year program of planning. Seventy-five percent of the cost would be made available during the first year, 50 percent for the second year, and 35 percent for the remaining 3 years.

When the bureau approves State plans, the State would become eligible for Federal aid to the extent of 40 percent of total acquisition costs, except where the plan is an interstate project: then it would be eligible for 50 percent of the costs. We want to encourage interstate action. The maximum amount of money available to each of the 50 States would be determined by giving equal weight to population and area. The Federal grants would be appropriated annually from general Treasury funds. We do not see the money coming from excise taxes because of the complexities and inequitabilities involved.

The commission also envisions the need for a loan program to supplement the grants-in-aid, in the event that matching funds are not available at a crucial time. Such loans to States would carry an interest rate determined by the bureau in cooperation with the Treasury.

I have reviewed here a small, but extremely important part of our report. I am grateful for the opportunity to do this, because I believe the reasons behind our major decisions, which I hope I have indicated here, are at least as significant as the decisions. You will hear and read interpretations of what we did and what our report is intended to do. Only if you know how we approached the problem will you be able to judge the accuracy of what you hear and read.

I have just a short last word. It is lifted in its entirety from the report. It is the whole of the last page of the text. It says:

After 3 years of surveying the needs, we have presented in this report a program that, in our judgment, can assure the benefits of outdoor recreation for all American people now and in the future. It contains recommendations for action along a wide front. Now the task must pass to others.

The next step is for legislative bodies and administrative agencies at all levels of government, for private landowners, and for individuals and their organizations to take action. We urge all to push forward in a nationwide effort to secure the contribution that outdoor recreation can make to the well-being of the Nation and its people.

Senator Everett Dirksen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, the people of my home State of Illinois, Republicans and Democrats, are very proud of our Senator—"Ev" DIRKSEN. We have reason to be. Even those who do not support him, admire and respect him.

We in Illinois certainly appreciate the many things he has done for us. He has served us well. And in the extremely difficult role as minority floor leader, he has served well his party and country, seeking always to advance his party but always placing country before any political considerations.

As minority leader the Senator from Illinois has been a partisan. That is a primary function of a party floor leader. He has also been a man of principle. More uniquely than anyone who has served in the capacity of minority leader, Senator "Ev" DIRKSEN typifies what we mean by the loyal opposition.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks I call your attention to the article entitled "Dirksen's Dilemma," by Robert D. Novak, which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of March 9.

The article follows:

DIRKSEN'S DILEMMA: THE TACTICS THAT WIN HIM SENATE ACCLAIM COST HIM SUPPORT AS NATIONAL GOP LEADER

(By Robert D. Novak)

WASHINGTON.—EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, the velvet-voiced weaver of words from the plains of Illinois, is finding that acclaim within the tight little world of the U.S. Senate often is not echoed in the greater realm of national politics.

For Senator DIRKSEN has come face to face with a recurring phenomenon of American politics: Even the most skilled of congressional floor leaders often have difficulty in performing simultaneously the broader function of national party leader.

As he enters his fourth year in the back-breaking role of Senate Republican leader, Senator DIRKSEN is greeted by these conflicting appraisals, within the Senate and outside it:

He is viewed with infinite respect and affection by his Senate colleagues and seems well on his way toward becoming a Senate institution. Bouquets have been awarded him for smoothing over the deep personal and philosophical animosities among GOP Senators and for protecting the rights of the tiny (36 out of 100 Senators) Republican minority against the overwhelming Democratic majority in the Senate. Fellow Republican Senators, including most of the liberal Republicans who originally opposed his elevation to the job, now view him as irreplaceable. "If something should happen to DIRKSEN, we'd be in one hell of a fix," advises one GOP Senator.

But prominent Republicans in the outside world view Mr. DIRKSEN as an unrelieved political liability. Charging that he has been seduced by the President, party functionaries deplore the Senator's refusal to wage full-scale war against the Kennedy foreign policy. Conservatives claim he temporizes on matters of principle. Liberal Republicans regard him as an obstructionist and standpatter. And the image-conscious new breed of bright young GOP politicians—conservatives, liberals and moderates alike—unanimously view the 66-year-old, tousle-haired Illinoisan as an old fogy who fits perfectly the caricature of the unappealing old guard Republican.

Such striking contrasts in the analyses of a Senate commander are nothing new. During his long tenure as the Senate's Democratic major domo, Vice President JOHNSON was simultaneously venerated as the greatest floor leader in the Senate history and reviled as an appeaser who dulled political issues for the Democrats by collaborating with the Republican Eisenhower administration. Or, suppose the Republicans reenter the White House in 1964 or 1968. Democratic firebrands undoubtedly would regard Montana's Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, the scholarly and conciliatory Democratic floor leader, as an inadequate political chief for a dynamic and crusading party.

A DOUBLE LIFE

The mixture of applause and catcalls now received by Senator DIRKSEN is, in fact, an inevitable result of the double life a congressional leader must lead when his party is not in power. When Mr. Eisenhower was President, there was nothing but praise for Mr. DIRKSEN as a loyal and aggressive Capitol Hill lieutenant for a Republican Chief Executive. But now that the Democrats have recaptured the executive branch, those qualities that make the Illinoisan an effective floor leader—the best the Republicans have had since the late Charles McNary, or Oregon, some 30 years ago in the opinion of one veteran Democrat—detract from his performance as a national party leader.

Consider Mr. DIRKSEN'S remarkable performance in maintaining warm relations with both the left and right wings of the Senate Republicans and restraining them from over-aggression against each other. To achieve this, he has refrained from insisting on a firm party stand on issues where intraparty tensions are intense. When he does try to convert a Republican Senator on a particular bill, he uses soft soap rather than more abrasive materials. "Kill them with kindness," he once told an aid who urged a more forceful tactics against a rebellious GOP lawmaker..

Thus, it is no surprise that Mr. DIRKSEN generally has ignored entreaties from the Republican National Committee that he come up with a Republican alternative to the Kennedy medical care plan. "DIRKSON'S just a roadblock," grumbles a National Committee source. Granted, a Republican medical care plan might be desirable for the party politically. But is Mr. DIRKSEN the man to devise it and champion it? Not even Henry Clay could concoct a scheme in this politically explosive area that would satisfy a JAVITS on the left and a GOLDWATER on the right. If Mr. DIRKSEN were to try to force a compromise down the throats of his Republican Senate colleagues, support from them on other issues might be eroded.

Or, take a closer look at complaints by party officials that Mr. DIRKSEN is soft on Democrats. It is true Senate Democratic leaders cherish the GOP leader's cooperation on such matters as scheduling bills and limiting debate and that the White House is pleased by the mildness of his criticism on foreign policy matters. There is even some evidence that Democrats would show mixed emotions if he were defeated for reelection to the Senate this year and replaced by a more intransigent Republican.

Yet, Mr. DIRKSEN's softness is primarily a matter of self-interest for the Senate's Republicans. Since the Democrats could use their overwhelming majority to make life miserable for the GOP in the Senate, a prudent Republican leader will tend toward conciliation and cooperation rather than uncompromising partisanship. Using this approach, Mr. DIRKSEN has proved far more effective than his immediate predecessors in winning such minor concessions as advance word of the Senate's schedule and some voice in determining that schedule.

These may seem no more than trifling achievements to the outside world. But they have protected Senate Republicans from being caught off balance by unexpected consideration of a major bill. And in today's liberal-dominated Senate where no viable conservative coalition of Republican and Southern Democrats is possible, more dramatic achievements are beyond Mr. DIRKSEN's grasp.

Mr. DIRKSEN does wind up on the winning side occasionally and sometimes to the surprise of the Democratic leadership. Such a DIRKSEN-engineered triumph occurred last summer when the Illinoisan, characteristically employing gentle ridicule rather than biting partisanship, successfully torpedoed a Democratic plan to give cities Federal funds for the purchase of open space for recreational purposes. Terming the scheme "one of the great new dimensions in space," Mr. DIRKSEN called on officials of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to "spell out for us in clear and felicitious (felicitous is one of Mr. DIRKSEN's favorite words) detail how this new venture into space will be made."

RESTRAINTS ON THE LEADER

Apart from his conscious softening of partisanship out of self-interest, this country's unique system of government intimately links Mr. DIRKSEN, as Senate Republican leader, with the Democratic administration in power. The Republican National Committee and rank-and-file GOP Senators can issue broadsides charging that the President has not revealed the scope of U.S. military participation in Vietnam. But this information has been revealed to Mr. DIRKSEN in his leadership capacity; and it is this close contact with the administration that restrains an opposition leader in Congress from the kind of uninhibited attacks that party tacticians might desire.

Moreover, the nature of Senate life itself tends to dilute partisanship. To a GOP party leader off in the hinterlands, the Democrats are the implacable, demoniacal enemy who deserve every attack they receive. But to Senate Republicans, the Democrats are the fellows on the other side of the aisle whom they see each day, join for evening cocktails and in many cases greatly admire.

There are other intangibles of Senate life that poorly equip a floor leader for the task of national party spokesman. The Senate itself is something of a fossilized institution, mirroring American attributes of an earlier day. For example, the Senate remains a refuge for individualists. The organization man who now excels in national politics usually does not prosper in the Senate.

Mr. Dirksen has no ghost writers and few staff researchers. He probably is better versed in the details of more legislation than any other Senator but only at the cost of personally digesting vast amounts of written matter during a workday that often runs from 5:30 a.m. to 10:30 p.m. (with some time out in the evening occasionally to view such television westerns as "Tales of Wells Fargo" or "Bonanza").

A MELLIFLUOUS VOICE

Furthermore, the very characteristics of Mr. Dirksen that make the crew-cut young GOP politicians with their button-down collars shudder are those that endear him to the Senate—the mellifluous voice, the archaic hand gestures, the delight in the meandering anecdote.

In an age when Senate speech-making has descended to the level of the monotonous mumble, the Illinoisan is one of the very few Senators who can hold his audience for long. His deft mixture of sentimentalism, wit and biting sarcasm made his memorable bon voyage speech for Senator John F. Kennedy and Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON in September 1960 something of a Senate classic. This peroration, addressed to Senators Kennedy and JOHNSON, produced the most unusual—for the Senate—reaction of spontaneous applause: "So, au revoir, we shall see you on the home diamond somewhere; and when it is all over, on the morning of November 9, all the healing waters will somehow close over our dissidence and we shall go forward as a solid phalanx once more."

There might seem to be an easily available escape hatch for Mr. DIRKSEN: Let him stick to Congressional affairs exclusively even when his party is out of power and let the political propaganda flow from the national committee. But Mr. DIRKSEN would be the last man to travel that route.

No self-respecting congressional leader and certainly not Mr. DIRKSEN ever would surrender his claim to national party leadership to the party's national chairman. As the elected leader of elected Seantors, Mr. DIRKSEN feels his credentials as a GOP spokesman are in far better order than those of appointed party functionaries.

Hence, Senator DIRKSEN and his House counterpart, Representative CHARLES HALLECK, of Indiana, have resisted the formation of a Republican policy-making council under the aegis of the national committee and a Republican "state of the Union" speech on party goals by National Chairman MILLER. The two congressional leaders have insisted on continuing their weekly joint press conferences, universally called "The Ev and Charley Show," despite rising protests from fellow Republicans that it projects an unpleasant image of the GOP.

Mr. DIRKSEN, then, is the partial author of his own dilemma. If he finds it difficult to function simultaneously in the Senate cockpit and the great stage of national politics, it is a difficulty of his own choosing.

Greenland Fortress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as a student of developments affecting the security of the Western Hemisphere, I have repeatedly emphasized the importance of the Caribbean, which has become a fourth front in which Cuba is a Soviet satellite.

It was, therefore, with the greatest interest that I read, in the January 1962 bulletin of the Foreign Policy Research Institute of South Carolina, a thoughtful article by Anthony Harrigan in which he points out the analogy of Cuba in the Caribbean to Greenland in the Arctic with respect to the defense of the United States. As a preventive measure to safeguard our northern strategic frontier, Greenland, against suffering the same fate as Cuba, Mr. Harrigan urges the purchase of that vast Arctic island from Denmark.

For such acquisition, Mr. Speaker, there is the precedent of the 1917 acquisition through purchase by the United States under treaty of August 1916 of the three former Danish possessions in the Caribbean known as the Virgin Islands. This subject is comprehensively presented in the 1931 volume by the eminent authority on American diplomatic history, Dr. Charles C. Tansill, entitled "The Purchase of the Danish West Indies."

The indicated article by Anthony Harrigan, which is commended for study by all concerned with hemispheric defense, follows:

THE GREENLAND FORTRESS

(By Anthony Harrigan)

If President Kennedy were to purchase Greenland from Denmark, as President Johnson bought Alaska from Russia, the national security of the United States would be advanced almost beyond measure.

For a nation that has acquired much of its territory by outright purchase, acquisition of Greenland should not be considered an extraordinary step. Yet the strategic importance of Greenland and the northern frontier facing the Soviet world is little understood or discussed in the United States. The urgency of the situation in the far north seems to escape the U.S. public.

Danger along the Nation's southern strategic frontier—from Castro's Cuba to the explosive lands of South America—is perfectly well comprehended by scholars and general public alike. But the potentiality and significance of Greenland, a territory considerably larger than Mexico, fails to engage American attention.

Among the minority of Americans with understanding of Greenland's importance are Air Force and Navy personnel with experience in the Arctic. Airmen well understand, for air attack across the pole has been a matter of special concern to the Air Force for some years. And beginning with the first voyage of the nuclear-powered submarine *Nautilus* across the pole from the Pacific to the Atlantic in 1957, U.S. submariners have realized the strategic signficance of the northern frontier. Four years later, with several successful undersea passages accomplished, naval planners fully appreciate the northern regions, the most important of which is Greenland.

By arrangement with Denmark, the United States today operates the ballistic missile early warning radar system (MEWS) at Thule, Greenland. This is the largest radar installation in the world, a system designed to give the United States and Canada 15 minutes warning of the approach of rockets from Russia. One hundred and thirty-eight miles inland from Thule, the U.S. Army has established Camp Century—a city under ice. At this camp, in an area where temperatures are 65 degrees below zero and winds may reach 150 miles per hour, a force of American soldiers is quartered in ice tunnels heated by a portable nuclear reactor.

These U.S. forces and a few detachments at small weather and scientific stations in the Arctic may be the vanguard of many thousands of Americans destined to live, work, and soldier in the far north in the years ahead. Decades ago, Vilhjalmur Stefannson, writing in "The Northern Course of Empire," predicted that the center of civilization would be in the northern regions. Certainly, these regions are destined to play a much larger role in the next decade, a decade when population pressures will force movement of people into new areas.

The question of northern development is a very serious one for the United States inas-

much as the Soviet Union is an Arctic power. Since the time of Stalin, the U.S.S.R. has moved ahead at a rapid rate in settlement of the northern regions.

Six million Russians live north of the 60th parallel, whereas only a few thousand Americans and Canadians have made their homes that far north. Archangel, a city of 300,000, is the largest city in the northern regions of the world. No community in northern Alaska or Canada compares with it in population. It should be noted, too, that Archangel, a city of 300,000, is the largest city in the northern regions of the world. No community in northern Alaska or Canada compares with it in population. It should be noted, too, that Archangel is a major Soviet submarine construction base. Indeed the Soviets are alert to all the opportunities of naval warfare in the far north. Their first nuclear-powered vessel was the 16,000-ton icebreaker *Lenin* designed to keep open Arctic waters. In addition, they are far advanced in Arctic research that has military and naval application.

If Americans are concerned about Cuba, a Communist regime at their national doorstep, how much more they should be concerned for the future of the tremendous land mass of Greenland. Greenland is a potential Cuba of the far north, only a much bigger and more serious threat if in Communist hands.

Denmark is a country of courageous people. But Russian rocket-rattling and nuclear blackmail might well cause it to reduce its commitments to the United States and to ask for withdrawal of U.S. forces and radar stations from Greenland. Indeed the Soviets are capable of drastic moves to dominate this huge empty territory at the top of the world. It would not be surprising if the Soviets were to espouse the now nonexistent "cause" of the 24,000 natives of Greenland and land Arctic-trained guerrillas in a typical national liberation maneuver. This is a type of operation for which Soviet troops have been training over a long period of years. Politico-military practices hitherto reserved for weak countries in the southern hemisphere could be applied in this northern land of frozen tundra.

Leaving aside the possibility of Danish weakness or overt action by the Soviets, it is clear that economic development of the far north will be a feature of the period ahead. The United States already depends upon iron ore from Labrador—ore shipments which would be very much "under the gun" if Greenland were in unfriendly hands and the Soviet practice of leapfrogging were introduced into the Northern Hemisphere. Free world air routes across the Pole, as well as undersea shipping routes—very likely in not many years, also demand security that would be assured by U.S. control of Greenland.

Another factor that should be taken into account is the Arctic Ocean. No oceanic area is more important than this vast stretch of sea and ice. Both the U.S.S.R. and the North American countries realize that their respective security depends on control of this ocean. Whoever has submarine supremacy under it, whoever can deny an enemy access to it, possesses an enormous strategic advantage. Perhaps the most important battles of naval warfare in the future may be fought under this Arctic ice between rocket-armed nuclear submarines. It is imperative, therefore, that the United States take all necessary measures, with utmost dispatch, to control as much of the oceanic rimland as possible—and Greenland is the key area.

The United States, like the Soviet Union, already is an Arctic nation. When Congress approved statehood for Alaska, it made positive the Nation's long-range commitment in the northern regions. Like other underdeveloped regions, the Arctic must be developed—and the United States is the only country with the means. Because Denmark is a small country with very small assets, and because Canada has her hands full with her own economic development, it is logical and necessary that the United States undertake the development of Greenland. In the perspectives of history and science, it is clear that Greenland is the prize of the Arctic—a vast territory of enormous strategic importance and equally great economic potential. With increasing climate control and use of nuclear power, which will eliminate problems of transporting fuel, Greenland's development should be rapid.

Greenland's destiny is not difficult to analyze—either it is controlled and developed by the United States or captured by the Soviet Union. With Greenland inside the Communist empire, the Soviets would have a vast base next door to the North American heartland. It is a national imperative, therefore, that the United States acquire what could become America's Greenland fortress.

Tribute to the Late Paul Butler—Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, our Nation was deeply saddened on December 30, 1961, upon hearing of the death of Paul Butler, a real friend and a distinguished American.

Paul Butler was a native of South Bend, Ind. He was an outstanding person and family man and he was unselfishly devoted to his country and to his party. He was a first-rate lawyer who served as chairman of the Democratic National Committee and later as a member of the Advisory Board of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

On February 9, 1962, the Advisory Board of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation adopted a resolution in tribute to this outstanding public servant.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, that this formal expression of the Board's admiration for Paul Butler and sorrow over his death, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE ADVISORY BOARD, ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Whereas, we, the members of the Advisory Board of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, desire to record our deep sorrow at the death on December 30, 1961, of our esteemed associate, Paul M. Butler, who since September 7, 1961, served by Presidential appointment as a member of the Board; and

Whereas as friends, associates, and coworkers, we came to know Paul M. Butler intimately as a person, a citizen, and a public servant of great ability and devotion to a duty which he regarded as a high public trust: Be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Advisory Board of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, hereby give formal expression of the grievous loss in the death of Paul M. Butler, and do hereby note in the records the passing from this life of a man who was esteemed by his associates, loved by his friends, and respected by all;

Resolved further, That a copy of this resolution be tendered to his family as a humble expression of the Board's heartfelt sympathy in its bereavement.

Wisconsin State Historical Society Museum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in these times of rapid progress, we, as a nation, face the dual task, first, of speeding ahead as rapidly as possible; and, second, of preserving appropriate symbols of present and past accomplishments for our national heritage.

The Wisconsin State Historical Society, for example, is doing a splendid job in maintaining a museum in Madison, Wis. Last year, over 22,000 children and adults viewed the splendid historically significant collections of the museum.

Recently, the La Crosse Tribune published a detailed article on this exhibit. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HISTORY EXHIBITS DREW 22,000 IN 1961

MADISON.—Over 22,000 faces, young and old, peered into the past last year through the museum displays at the Wisconsin State Historical Society in Madison.

Hundreds of children saw movies, heard talks, and exhibited historical relics. Hundreds more, both children and adults, came to open houses and talked with guides dressed as historic characters.

All of these activities are part of the effort of the education department of the Society's museum to bring the past to life for Wisconsinites. During the last 2 years, the program has been expanded under the direction of Joan Morgan, curator of education.

Up to 61 groups a week tour the museum galleries, and seven part-time guides handle the crowds. The galleries survey the history of Wisconsin from prehistoric times to the present and illustrate such topics as the history of the Wisconsin Legislature, Wisconsin Indians, and Wisconsin in the Civil War.

Tour groups during the winter months are composed mostly of Madison area children, but during the spring and fall school groups travel to the society from all parts of the State. Brownies, Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, and Cub packs make the trip.

"All our efforts seem worthwhile when we get letters like this," Miss Morgan said, pulling a card punched with holes from a pile of letters animated with children's drawings.

" 'Thank you very much for showing what was there. All that was there was very beautiful. And thanks for letting me feel the machinegun and the well, and one more machine. The museum things were very nice.' "

The letter was in Braille, transcribed by the teacher, from a little blind girl named Susan.

Miss Morgan originated and now directs a series of children's programs, one in the fall and one in the late winter, given free on Saturday mornings at the society building. Programs in the current series, "Ancient Civilizations," are presented on two levels at the same time—a story hour for preschool and primary school children and a film-lecture program for children from grades three through eight.

Miss Morgan's job is varied. A visitor to her office before Christmas would have found her squatting on a stool, a piece of mangled wool in one hand and her head in the other, glowering at an early spinning wheel.

Her efforts were part of a plan to activate the museum galleries for the Christmas open house, an annual event begun by her in 1960. In order to teach a guide to spin in the life-size log cabin on the first floor, she had to learn herself.

"I haven't mastered it completely, but I'm still working," she says with a grin.

Her efforts, however, were successful, for over 600 persons attending the open house watched the guide practice the spinning craft as it was done in Wisconsin log cabins more than 100 years ago.

Miss Morgan has two more educational programs in the planning stages. A series of gallery talks on five different topics and including films and museum tours will soon be offered to school classes on request. Girl Scouts will soon be able to work at the society museum toward a Girl Scout Museum Aid Badge.

Alternatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, for the last 3 decades the Federal Government has been spending far more money than it has been taking in, although Federal revenues continue to reach new heights almost every year. We have had to increase the legal ceiling on the national debt 10 times in just the last 8 years in order that the Federal Government could pay its bills as they come due.

The national debt is now approaching the $300 billion mark. Interest alone on this debt this year is going to cost the taxpayers $9.4 billion—the second largest item in the entire Federal budget. I have pending in the House legislation (H. Con. Res. 43) authorizing the Federal Government to pay at least 1 percent annually toward retiring the national budget. This legislation is vital. We have paid nothing at all toward the principal of the debt in 26 of the last 31 years.

Obviously we cannot maintain this rate of deficit financing. We must either do an about face, eliminate all unnecessary spending and practice rigid economy—or face the alternatives. This point was covered well in a terse, concise editorial which appeared in the March 8 issue of the Weekly Star, a newspaper published in Fulton County, Ga. There is much food for thought in this editorial, entitled "Alternatives." I hope that it will be heeded. The editorial follows:

ALTERNATIVES

Living within one's income is something of a problem to most of us. But we have to do it—if we want to keep out of the bankruptcy courts—even though it means doing without many things we'd like to have.

It's high time the Federal Government took note of this simple truism.

The Government has lived within its income just 6 times in the last 30 years. It it more than $290 billion in debt—and that debt is an obligation against every man, woman, and child in the country. It works out to more than $1,600 per capita now, and more deficits, which will build the debt higher and higher, are foreseen for the future.

What will the results be? There are several alternatives. We can have higher taxes, or more inflation, or both. Or we can abandon the ruinous welfare state philosophy, and cut nonessential Government spending to the bone.

Withholding of Interest Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I consider the withholding of interest payments to be a grave injustice against many of our senior citizens who have worked and saved in order to support themselves in retirement. I feel that the U.S. Government through its spending policy has created inflation which has stolen 50 percent of the savings of retired persons and I feel it is a further injustice to now withhold interest payments on these depleted savings.

The letter below which was written to the President of the United States states my position in far more eloquent terms than I can employ. I commend this letter to the attention of my colleagues.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am a retired clergyman; I am in my 84th year, my wife in her 76th and is now an invalid in the Henard Hospital of Los Gatos, Calif.

Because our hospital bills, drugs, and doctors' bills now amount to nearly $500 per month our public accountant has given our estimated income tax for 1962 at only $100.

These monthly hospital bills are being paid out of income from securities which by frugal living we have been able to accumulate through our long years of ministry. The strain is hard but by rigid economy we are able to get along—my wife at the hospital and I alone at home.

If your 20 percent withholding tax goes into effect I really don't know how we'll manage. It seems to me a most cruel law for people like ourselves whose moderate income is from securities obtained at great sacrifice. We are told that these withholdings will be refunded at year's end, but while waiting through these 12 months what are we going to do?

I beg you, Mr. President, to think of these things.

Business Support for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bertie Ledger-Advance of February 22, 1962:

BUSINESS SUPPORT FOR EDUCATION

With Chowan College, the Roanoke-Chowan area's only native college, now in the midst of a $900,000 development campaign the portions of the "statement of conviction" signed by top executives of 44 of the Nation's larger and more publicly responsible corporations last December is particularly timely.

The statement was the outgrowth of a business leaders conference sponsored by the council for financial aid to education. It should provide food for thought for most area businessmen in connection with Chowan College—particularly since Roanoke-Chowan businesses have and are likely to continue to get first pick among top students receiving higher education at Chowan.

In a free society those who receive the most should rightly be expected to contribute the most whether it be taxes which support public education or gifts to private education. The Roanoke-Chowan area receives more benefits from having Chowan College in its midst than other areas. It is right to expect that its businessmen and other citizens will do the largest share in helping Chowan continue to serve the area.

The business leaders' statement reads in part:

"In every time of national trial American businessmen have taken positions of leadership. Today, higher education in America is in such a time of trial.

"Higher education is facing during the next decade greatly enlarged student enrollments, the problems of an explosion of knowledge, and the need to meet ever growing demands for ever better educated men and women. Many of these demands are from business itself. These problems involve vastly increased costs which cannot be met out of present income.

"There is no question that our country must have an adequate system of higher education. The question, instead, is, in what amounts and from what sources shall the bill be paid?

"We believe that our diversified, decentralized system of higher education has served this country well and should be preserved. A determined choice today to increase the total support of higher education from voluntary sources will materially help to nourish educational freedom, strength and independence.

"Business and industry, as major beneficiaries of American higher education, should, in their own self-interest, assume a responsibility to contribute their fair share.

"In their own interest, a substantial number of business organizations have already developed thoughtful, generous programs of voluntary aid to education. Many hope to enlarge their present programs. Yet numerous companies do not participate significantly. Many, perhaps the large majority of American enterprises, do not contribute at all.

"In view of these considerations, and in the light of the present urgency, we believe that now is the time for a broader and

deeper participation by the business community in the support of higher education.

"We therefore call upon our colleagues in American business and industry to help spread the base of voluntary support of higher education as a necessary supplement to the extensive support which business now provides to education through taxes."

This Bureau Conserves Its Money To Build a Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, very soon now we will be considering the appropriation for the Department of Agriculture, including the Soil Conservation Service, and I believe the Members will be interested in the following editorial by Jack Pickett from the California Farmer of March 3, 1962, concerning this subject:

THIS BUREAU CONSERVES ITS MONEY TO BUILD A BUREAU

(By Jack Pickett)

As you may recall, the Soil Conservation Service has not been one of our favorite Federal bureaucracies. The reason being that we feel the outfit is vicious at the top level, spends more time building an empire than it does building the soil and is so nasty that it even attacks other Federal agencies if it feels that they are competing for its money.

Now, on the grassroots level, we know the system has many fine men, but even these men are tied to a lot of stupid practices. We have about 55 common farming practices for which the Soil Conservation Service will pay the farmer.

We have long contended that if the taxpaying public ever got on to some of the ridiculous purposes that Soil Conservation thought up to give away $5 million to farmers of California in 1960, the taxpayers would stage a revolt.

Yes, the agricultural conservation program is under the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service and through ACP—does all that confuse you?—well, it is supposed to. They gave away $5 million to 7,160 farmers for an average of $715 per participating farm. The percentage of total farms in the State benefiting is rather small and we would guess that a full investigation might show that more money went to big farms than went to small farms.

In our own mind, we always pictured a place for Soil Conservation in the field of water conservation. The sharing in the cost of building stock dams, etc. On the other hand, we feel that for Soil Conservation to pay a farmer for subsoiling, pay for cover crops, liming, drainage, application of boron, etc., is a ridiculous way to give away Federal funds.

Well, anyway, we fought this battle a while back and only succeeded in making some good friends unhappy, but we boiled over again and when we read the latest news sheet from the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts. This is one of the most vicious propaganda sheets dedicated to the strengthening and enlargement of a Federal bureau that we have ever seen.

The latest news sheet contains the following message which we reprint word for word:

"From 1955 to 1962 the Federal appropriations to the Soil Conservation Service for district operations (the normal district program of technical assistance) increased from $59 million to $82 million. This is a 37 percent increase in appropriations. The normal conclusion would be that we would have about a one-third increase in assistance to districts.

"This is far from actual facts. During this period from 1955 to 1962 there have been several pay increases granted to all employees under civil service, and employees of the Soil Conservation Service are civil service employees. There have been some administrative changes in employees' insurance programs, formerly charged to civil service, but now charged to each agency. These funds were subtracted from those available to districts. Inflation has added considerably to the cost of operations in addition to cost of material, automobiles, rent, services, etc. This has taken a large chunk of the additional appropriations. Raises in grade level of SCS employees have added to the cost of salaries. The sum total of all this means just this:

"By the end of fiscal year 1963, the man-hours of technical assistance available to soil and water conservation districts through district operations will be little above (if any) what it was in 1955. The only increases in available technical assistance will be those associated with Public Law 566 projects and Great Plains contracts."

This direct quote pretty well dramatizes our worst fears about bureaucracy. In this case, they got appropriation increases of $23 million and they kept it out of the hands of the stinking farmers but built it right into the aggrandizement of the bureau.

Relief for W. R. (Bill) Wade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill asking the Congress to approve a $1,039,785.32 check for W. R. Wade of Marysville, Mont. This is an awful lot of money.

But it is exactly the price W. R. (Bill) Wade paid for being an industrious, patriotic, and loyal American.

The story, briefly, is this: In 1941, Bill Wade took a lease on the Drumlummon Gold Mine in Marysville, unwatered it, retimbered it, and got it ready for mining gold ore. At that point, 1 year later, the War Production Board in Washington ordered the mine closed.

The closing order was lifted in July 1945. But now labor and supply costs had doubled and a great number of drifts and tunnels had caved in completely. Much of the previously recoverable ore was ruined by dilution with the caveins of worthless material from the walls.

Bill Wade's losses, broken down, were: $109,893.02, the cost of shutdown and holding mine main entrance open and pumping; $62,662.30, cost of reopening and repair after the War Production Board order was lifted; and $867,230, the lost net profit on ore lost.

The Court of Claims in Montana held that gold mine owners in Wade's position were entitled to recover, but later the Supreme Court reversed the court.

A private bill is now the only way Bill Wade can be compensated, not rewarded, for the terrible price he paid for his industry, patriotism, and loyalty.

Congressman Ed Dooley Recounts Some Early Lessons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to read an interesting article in the Washington Star recently about our colleague the gentleman from New York, ED DOOLEY.

These are trying days for the free world, and it has always seemed to me that ED DOOLEY was a big man for a big job. Of course we all know from the first moment we see ED that he is a big man physically, but beyond that he is big in the service he renders here in Washington. I for one can say that one of the highlights of my service in the House of Representatives has been the opportunity to work with such a dedicated servant of the people.

He comes to Washington well equipped for this job, and I believe we will all agree that he has grown in stature with each year of service.

For those who may not be familiar with ED DOOLEY's background, I now include the Star article of March 16, 1962.

NEW YORK CONGRESSMAN RECALLS GOOD OLD DAYS OF COLLEGE FOOTBALL

(By Lewis F. Atchison)

News that Ogden Reid, former publisher of the New York Herald-Tribune, might oppose him in the Republican primary for New York's 25th District House seat doesn't disturb the incumbent, Representative EDWIN B. DOOLEY. Trading punches with bluebloods is no novelty for him.

"One year we had dinner with the Harvard squad the night before we played," the old Dartmouth quarterback recalled, "and several of their players were introduced as so-and-so the third, so-and-so the second. It made an impression on a kid like me who'd been raised in Brooklyn.

"I thought to myself, 'There are real gentlemen.' On the first play of the game next day one of those 'gentlemen' cracked me on the nose so hard I saw stars. Then we got down to business."

The jovial DOOLEY was the featured speaker today at the Touchdown Club's annual St. Patrick's Day luncheon. At first glance the uninitiated wouldn't take him for a quarterback—one good enough to win a berth on the 1926 coaches' all-America team. He's broad and powerful and looks more like a lineman. His arms are unusually strong.

For exercise DOOLEY used to rip up telephone books—"I could tear them into quarters"—hold 100-pound sacks of grain at arm's-length, do 150 pushups, and, in the summertime, "push cement" on construction jobs.

DOOLEY threw the javelin and put the shot for Dartmouth's track team, was a crack forward in basketball and a topflight infielder. But football was the sport he liked best.

The New York Giants, looking for a hometown boy with boxoffice appeal, offered him $10,000 for 16 games. The Dodgers offered him a baseball contract. He turned down both to go to law school.

With all of the refinements of modern pro football, DOOLEY says the sport doesn't have anything Dartmouth didn't have in his day.

"Jess Hawley had all the stuff they're using today," he said. "He had imagination and was an excellent teacher of fundamentals. We had the rollout pass, the drive-tackle play, and the T. Hawley wasn't as well known as Knute Rockne, but he was magnificent."

Dooley said Dartmouth threw the ball as much under Hawley as the modern Indian teams. He forgot to mention that he also dropkicked fieldgoals and extra points for the Big Green.

There are no such things as dropkicks in politics, but Mr. Reid had better be prepared to block a few anyway.

Let the House Work Its Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, today's edition of the New York Herald Tribune contains a very pertinent editorial relating to the tax legislation we will be taking up shortly. As one of those who supported the expansion of the Rules Committee last year, I resent very much the switching of the majority leadership from its position at that time—namely, that the change in the Rules Committee would permit the House to work its will. In fact, this laudable goal is being permitted only when the majority feels it is convenient to allow it.

I endorse the Tribune editorial wholeheartedly and offer it now for the RECORD in the hope that all Members will read it:

LET THE HOUSE WORK ITS WILL

Often the fate of major legislation turns on procedural questions, and the tax bill is a case in point.

Republicans in Congress are unhappy about, and prepared to make a fight on, three separate provisions of the bill as reported out by the House Ways and Means Committee. As a result, they are pressing the Rules Committee for a modified closed rule—that is, one which would allow separate consideration by the whole House of three specific amendments. Under the regular closed rule, which is ordinarily given tax bills and which the Democratic leadership wants again this time, the opposition is in effect limited to offering a single all-or-nothing substitute.

On most tax bills, there is good reason for such a closed rule: it prevents destructive tinkering with carefully balanced rate structures and the like in the heat of floor debate. But the present case offers no such justification.

The three provisions challenged by the Republicans are unrelated. Each is aimed at a separate problem, and rests on a separate principle. Each has a separate justification and its own good grounds for opposition.

The argument that they have to be lumped together to balance revenue losses against revenue gains is poppycock. The amounts involved are not enough by themselves to cause any budgetary chaos. They are but a small fraction of the revenue increase on which Mr. Kennedy based his prediction of a balanced budget, and are less than the costs of a good many new programs being offered without compensating revenue sources. But their extrabudgetary effects—on the shape of the economy, and the welfare of both individuals and corporations—would be far reaching and substantial.

The three proposed amendments would affect those provisions for an investment credit (Republicans favor a different form which would be cheaper and, many argue, more effective), dividend and interest withholding, and taxation of oversea earnings.

When the Rules Committee enlargement fight was on, in the first days of the Kennedy administration, a lot was said about the importance of letting the House work its will as a vital part of the democratic process. The tax bill offers a test of Democratic sincerity. A closed rule is not justified by the nature of the bill, which has shaped up as a catchall package of unrelated changes in tax policy. Each of the three Republican amendments has strong support, though not every member who supports one supports all three. If the administration majority on the Rules Committee still believes in letting the House work its will, as it professed to a year ago, now is the time to prove it.

Pulp and Paper Industry First With Policy Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the industries of my district and Washington State which will be affected by the proposed Trade Expansion Act of 1962 is the pulp and paper industry. Washington State is the second largest producer of woodpulp in the Nation and 9 of the 15 papermills in the State are situated in my district.

As pointed out in the lead editorial of the March 5, 1962, issue of the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, the pulp and paper industry is the first major American business to issue a statement of policy concerning the proposed act. I hope that other industries and businesses will follow suit.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial summarizes the policy adopted by the pulp and paper industry during its recent convention in New York City. I recommend it to Members of Congress and under leave to extend my remarks include it in the RECORD.

(The editorial follows:)

THE FIRST

The pulp and paper industry is the first major U.S. business to issue a clear statement of policy on the proposed Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

Inasmuch as Washington State is the site of 15 papermills and is No. 2 producer of woodpulp among the 50 States, this is worth comment.

The statement of policy, made public late last week at the 85th annual convention of the industry in Manhattan, is, of course, no airy giveaway of the industry or its markets.

But it does recognize the reality of the European Common Market and the resulting new necessities of commerce—from the point of view of what has become a global industry. The United States imports annually about a billion dollars worth of pulp and paper commodities, and exports about one-half billion dollars worth.

The statement of policy suggests no blank check for the President, but does urge Congress to give him power "to negotiate with the Common Market upon a basis" which would assure pulp and paper "a mutual reduction of tariffs" and would "arrive at identical tariffs, item for item."

It urges realism for itself, yet also faces the realism posed by the European impulse toward the Common Market and the necessity of competing within that market.

At least it is of interest as the first forthright public expression on the subject, in detail, from a leading industry in this country. And executives of Northwest producers had much to do with its formulation.

"Imitation Hams or Imitation Dollars?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the courts have designated Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman's "imitation" ham order as an example of misbranding. The Fort Myers (Fla.) News-Press has drawn a contrast between the "imitation hams" incident and the possibility that the American people are now using "imitation dollars."

The editorial was reprinted March 15 in the Jacksonville (Ill.) Journal-Courier and is so timely that I invite my colleagues to read it.

IMITATION HAMS OR IMITATION DOLLARS?

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman has come a cropper in a quixotic crusade to protect the housewife from what he considered to be "watered" hams. A court threw out an order he had issued against the meat packers. But now if he still wants to protect the housewife he might shift his sights from the meatpackers to the Treasury and see if he can do anything about "watered" dollars.

What happened was that a consumers' magazine raised a big rumpus over an allegation that the meatpackers were watering their hams and selling water at ham prices. So Freeman, against the advice of experts in his Department who knew better, issued an order requiring meatpackers to label as "imitation hams" any that weigh more when marketed than they did before they were cured.

Now, there is some water in cured ham. Modern methods of curing employ a process of pickling hams in a water solution instead of smoking and salting them, and some fluid then remains in the ham. But retailers testified that this has been reflected in lower prices per pound and it is not true that housewives are being charged for water when they buy ham.

The U.S. court of appeals in Washington called Freeman's order "capricious and arbitrary on its face" and invalidated it. "The regulation," said the court, "would have required packers, by this distortion, to violate the statute which forbids misbranding by labeling a genuine ham as an imitation."

But now consider the case of the dollars that the housewife pays for her ham and other groceries. These dollars today buy only about half as much ham and other things as they used to. Therefore, something must be watered, and if it isn't the ham it must be the dollars.

Consequently it seems possible that if Freeman would step over from his Agriculture Department to the Treasury Department and get the people there to label their produce "imitation dollar," a court might have difficulty finding any ground on which to toss that order out. At least it couldn't be attacked on the ground of misbranding.

Now that this editorial has brought the Department of Agriculture and the Treasury Department together, I pine for a transmigration of economic philosophy from the Department of State to the Department of Agriculture.

I wish the confidence in the private enterprise marketplace expressed below by Secretary of State Rusk might have come from the lips of the Secretary of Agriculture:

I shall say one thing more on this subject. Either we believe in capitalism, in the freedom of individual enterprise, or we do not. And we do not if we hold with massive Government intervention to distort and freeze the operation of the market. If we look to Government to rig the game we may as well look to it to play the hands. If we mean to discourage the forces of free enterprise all around the world, I can think of no better way of doing it—without even stirring from our chairs—than to shrink from competition behind unrealistic tariff walls.

This quote is from a speech, February 21, at Charlotte, N.C.

Australia's State-Controlled Lotteries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House Members, another foreign country which has found lotteries most profitable.

Australia has four state-controlled lotteries which brought in gross receipts amounting to over $73 million last year. The net income to these Australian state governments amounted to almost $25 million.

Lottery income earned by all of these Australian states were earmarked for specific charitable purposes, such as hospitals, clothing for the unemployed, mental institutions, and for assisting in the construction of the Sydney Opera House.

The Australians, like most other people, see absolutely nothing wrong with lottery revenues. Why should our Government be less wise in this respect?

Mr. Speaker, if we could only exercise the same kind of wisdom in the United States, we could easily, painlessly, and voluntarily raise over $10 billion a year in additional income which would be used to cut taxes and reduce our gigantic national debt. Why can we not follow the wisdom of our foreign friends?

New Frontier Is Destroying Incentive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, never in the years I have been a Member of Congress have I received so much mail from private citizens protesting the growing interference of the Federal Government in their lives. Farmers, businessmen, laborers, homeowners, accountants, ministers, housewives, and persons in many other occupations too numerous to mention are writing me about their fears for America's future.

Typical of these letters is one from Mr. Charles W. Thompson, of route 1, Model, Tenn. He has 37 acres on Kentucky Lake which he and his family by sacrifice and hard work have been able to develop into a recreation business and from which they earn a modest livelihood. These accomplishments are threatened by the proposed Between the Rivers National Park and leads Mr. Thompson to comment that this is the kind of individual incentive the Government bureaucrats of the New Frontier are destroying.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Thompson's letter in the RECORD:

MODEL, TENN., *March 9, 1962.*

Hon. JACK WESTLAND,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am in the recreation business here on Kentucky Lake. I have only a small tract of land, 37 acres. My family and I started developing this tract when we had to move everything in by boat, later we built 1½ miles of road to the nearest county highway. We lived in this unspoiled wilderness very nearly a year without electricity. We slogged through mud and snow in the winter to the county highway (round trip 3 miles). The children walked this distance to the school bus for a period of 2 months last winter (1 year ago). We had to haul drinking water this same distance until we were able to have our well drilled. We have just now reached the place where we can begin to make a livelihood out of our endeavor.

This is the kind of individual incentive the Government bureaucrats of the New Frontier are destroying.

Now if the proposed Between the Rivers National Park goes through, all of our sacrifice and hardships have gone down the drain and we are set back farther than the place where we started, now we are older and we can never possibly regain this.

We practice conservation the year around, not just on weekends, stopping erosion, sodding waterways, planting ground cover crops, planting pine and other tree seedlings, cutting diseased and dead timber and in many other ways too numerous to mention.

I think we are well qualified to voice our opinion on conservation and national parks. Do you think we went through all of this sacrifice and hardship to despoil the wilderness, to exploit, to pollute the streams? How many Kennedy's, Interior Department heads, TVA heads, and others have lived this way in our modern times to practice conservation and make a livelihood?

Since we are not as fortunate as the born rich, we cannot have a seaside retreat, a mountain retrain, a Florida retreat and expensive airplanes to shuttle us back and forth for our leisure time, like the desk jockey conservationists. Does this mean we should be deprived of our small piece of individual freedom, home, and livelihood to further their zealous ambitions?

If this trend continues, and as of now there is no visible evidence that it won't, at an accelerated pace, we will finally reach the point where there won't be enough difference between our system in this country and the opposing system, to fight over. This couldn't please the enemies of our American way of life more.

A letter to the President appealing for his sincere consideration of the ones directly affected by these policies was quietly ignored, proving that he couldn't possibly care less about the plight of the small businessman, homeowner, and farmer.

This proves that once these bureaucrats set their mind to one of their pet projects, they aren't going to change their minds regardless of how many people are hurt.

I do not seek or want Government help of any kind, I only want to be left alone so I can build my own business and earn my own livelihood in a free enterprise. If the Government bureaucrats continue their expansion into private enterprise and individual ownership this will soon become impossible for anyone in this country. It is a shameful thing, that in these times of outstanding achievements in outer space that our Government should be going backward in the field of freedom here at home.

I am appealing to you legislators to defeat this pell mell confiscation of our land.

Very truly yours,

CHAS. W. THOMPSON.

Bare Shelves in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following, editorial from the Washington Daily News of March 14, 1962, concerning the bare shelves in Communist Cuba:

BARE SHELVES IN CUBA

The Pearl of the Antilles, they used to call Cuba.

Under tropical warmth and humidity, its rich alluvial soil is highly productive in sugar, coffee, bananas, pineapples, coconuts and molasses, in addition to tobacco, textiles, and fibers.

But conditions are no longer normal in Cuba. Though Dictator Castro chooses to blame "imperialism," the fact is Cuba's climate, crop potential, and the basic industriousness of her people are all unchanged. The crippling and throttling obviously have been done by the regime itself in its woeful mismanagement of Cuba's economy.

As a result Castro himself has been forced to announce nationwide food rationing on this lush island. Also in short supply are cooking oils, soap, toothpaste, and detergents.

If the cutoff of United States trade with Cuba has contributed to the crisis, the bearded leader has only himself to blame. For it was he and his Red advisers who decided to cast their lot with the Communist nations, rather than preserve any American ties.

Bare shelves in Cuba are more than shameful—they are a tragic reminder to the whole hemisphere that when communism gains ruling power, it is first the people who feel the ruinous hardships and hunger, in the interest of the Marxist state.

Carbon-Copy Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the March–April 1962 issue of the Military Engineer, the journal of the Society of Military Engineers, was published a thoughtful editorial by Maj. Gen. Robert J. Fleming, Jr., who has recently been appointed as Governor of the Canal Zone. By virtue of that position, he also serves as President of the Panama Canal Company, which is charged with the operation and maintenance of the Panama Canal.

The editorial is accompanied by the following biographical sketch of its author:

Maj. Gen. Robert J. Fleming, Jr., newly nominated Governor of the Panama Canal, was formerly division engineer, southwestern division. He has also served as New England Division Engineer; commander of the Theater Army Support Command, Europe; Philadelphia district engineer; engineer, Army Field Forces; assistant chief of engineers for Military Operations; and chief of the Organization and Training Division, Office, Chief of Engineers. During World War II he was successively chief of staff, Hawaiian Department Service Force, and deputy chief of staff, Central Pacific Area; commander, 1140th Engineer Combat Group; and XXII Corps Engineer. He is a graduate of the U.S. Military Academy and holds the degree of B.S. in mechanical engineering from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. His editorial in this issue is adapted from a speech he made at a recent meeting of the El Paso Post.

The editorial follows:

THE CARBON-COPY CURTAIN

(By Maj. Gen. Robert J. Fleming, Jr.)

There is today an invisible barrier of mores and attitudes of mind that is beginning to curb American initiative and stand in the way of progress. This is the barrier of stereotyped thinking and carbon-copy action which I choose to call the carbon-copy curtain. There are other barriers in the world which place restraints on associations of peoples and on communication of ideas. The Iron Curtain and the Bamboo Curtain are two examples of actions by governments to insulate their people from the realities of life. These externally imposed barriers are restraints on our free action; they endanger our national survival. But also perilous is a restraint we are imposing on ourselves (or allowing some highly vocal Americans to impose on us): the feeling that to be different is to be dangerous. Our carbon-copy curtain is at times a strong inhibitor of initiative, originality, and positiveness.

There are three attitudes of mind that contribute to this barrier—conformity, conservatism, and complacency.

The military and engineering professions offer probably the most fertile fields of any human endeavor for nurturing extremes of conservatism and conformity. In the race to remain progressive and individualistic, the professional soldier and the professional engineer are handicapped by their training and environment, and they carry very heavy weights on a muddy track. Consider the soldier: he is forced to conform to a code of discipline, to wear a uniform, and to have his waking hours ordered. This is not an environment which of itself encourages originality. And all the engineer's training and his working environment are concerned with finite and material facts. This often leads to exclusion of human or social factors. Archimedes' principle is never modified by psychological considerations, and it is doubted that anyone has solved a problem in dynamics with an eye cocked at factors of social significance.

The characteristic "conformity" is defined as "the act or habit of conforming oneself; acquiescence." The key to that definition is "acquiescence," further defined as "quiet submission, passive consent; compliance." The antithesis of a conformist, of course, is a nonconformist, a person who is in some degree rebellious against convention or existing authority. It is not possible sharply to divide people into two categories, conformists and nonconformists. There is a factor of selectivity and degree. Human society requires some conformity from all individuals and imposes penalties against indiscriminate rebellion.

Some people stupidly rebel against everything until they eventually make a fetish of being nonconformists and then become the most rigid conformists to this pattern. Others never learn to evaluate issues and are continually embarking on crusades. History is full of examples of society moving against nonconformists. Some societies have exacted cruel penalties from extreme nonconformists. The penalties are not so dramatic today but they do exist, and the individual who offends too often against society ends up destroying himself through sheer frustration.

That is a gloomy picture of the hazards of nonconformity, but it has its compensations. The great social and political leaders who are remembered with affection or respect have been nonconformists. And people today who make dramatic advances or breakthroughs, no matter what their fields, are those who are to some extent in rebellion against convention. But it seems that there is a growing tendency in America to exalt conformity as a desirable human attribute, to idealize the organization man, to consider teamwork as a prized virtue, and to regard with suspicion any variation from acceptable patterns prescribed by various self-appointed protectors of the public. These three terms, "organization," "teamwork," and "acceptable patterns," all imply rigid conformity. They are things that have to be put up with; they are far from being individual virtues. A soul is individual; it does not appear on the asset sheet of a corporation. No organization ever initiated anything and no team ever inspired affection or provided great leadership. Those things were done by individuals, and they were not done by people rigidly adhering to a set pattern.

The dictionary describes "conservatism" as the "disposition or tendency to be conservative," or "adhering to the existing order of things; disinclined to novelty and alterations, as of institutions or methods; opposed to change, hence often opposed to progress."

A study of history will show that conservatism has seldom initiated any advancement in the human race. The great periods of social, political, and economic advances in America were under Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt. Each brought great changes, violently opposed by the conservatives of his day with the most dire prophecies of doom. But the advances have stayed. On the other hand, the conservative does make two contributions: First, his opposition forces the progressive to sharpen, revise, and broaden his ideas, and second, when the progressive runs out of steam, the conservative is superb at consolidating the gains.

"Complacency" is defined as "self-satisfaction." If one passively suppresses or actively stamps out all tendency to change, and then ignores any individual or idea not conforming to the "code," one eventually hypnotizes himself into a belief that his narrow viewpoint is normal. In a static world this could be a pleasant condition. In a dynamic world it is an invitation to disaster. From this position it is only a short step to active denial of the validity of any other opinions; and only a short step further to fanaticism. And all throughout history, fanaticism has been the scourage of humanity. Everything is so simple to fanatics; everything becomes either black or white, all or nothing.

Of all people, Americans should not have a "carbon-copy curtain" of conformity, conservatism, and complacency. Basically, America is progressive, and the average American seeks progress and change. But because of the American heritage and folklores stemming from the era of the rugged individualist and of the pioneer, we tend to place romanticized values on some conservative and even reactionary ideas. As a nation we are a product of one of the most progressive periods of world history. This country is a product of rebellion. People in general came to America because they rebelled against conditions in the Old World, because they refused to conform to a society which was degrading the individual, and because they had the initiative to take a chance. The people who made this country were not stodgy; they did not waste their energies trying to preserve the status quo; they did not have time to try to be their brother's keeper. And if we, their descendants, now devote our energies to turning back or stopping the clock or viewing with alarm novel ideas or fresh approaches, then we are betraying our heritage.

Today America is engaged in a struggle for survival—in a battle to win men's minds. Principles which have been proven so valid in military operations are equally valid in the economic, the political, the diplomatic, the social, and the psychological operations we are now conducting. So we must keep the initiative, we must have mobility, we must be able to mass, and to economize our forces. And we must be able to exploit surprise. We cannot do this if we stand defensively behind a curtain of stereotyped thinking. And we cannot do it if we are influenced by fanatics.

There are always people in any society who have closed their minds to everything outside their own ever-narrowing viewpoints. These people can become dangerous when they can grab popular causes and use them as a cloak. Their militancy then gives them influence far beyond their worth. And the atmosphere of confusion so created can become a tremendous passive roadblock in the way of positive solutions to our problems. Anything we do to deny freedom of action to those Americans who are now fighting the economic, political, social, and psychological war for our country is a delight to her enemies.

God and Our Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, Dr. John R. Richardson, pastor of the

Westminster Presbyterian Church of Atlanta, Ga., recently delivered a powerful and challenging sermon entitled "God and Our Nation."

In this sermon Dr. Richardson pointed out that all Americans should be deeply concerned about the course that the United States is taking in world affairs. He points also to the "rapid decline" of the moral status of our country.

Dr. Richardson said the prophet Jeremiah and any other prophet would say in the light of the tremendous public debt that we have, which is the largest in the history of the world, it is not the part of wisdom for our country to be draining its resources and giving it in the form of foreign aid to countries which champion a dangerous economic and political philosophy.

Dr. Richardson also found it disturbing, as I do, that wholesale criticism is being leveled against the patriots who are fighting communism in this country. This criticism for the most part comes from those who have done nothing to stop communism.

I commend Dr. Richardson's sermon to the House of Representatives and to all thoughtful people.

The sermon follows:

GOD AND OUR NATION

"I shall speak concerning a nation."—Jeremiah 18: 7.

It is unfortunate that Jeremiah is usually described as the weeping prophet. It is quite true that Jeremiah wept much. But the reason he wept was because he had a sensitive heart and was deeply concerned about the welfare of his nation. His tears were not due to weakness but to his ardent patriotism. Many of his contemporaries did not weep, because their hearts were hardened and grossly indifferent. They simply did not care.

Jeremiah is also described as the prophet who was always fighting losing battles. That description has an element of truth in it. On the surface he seemed to have fought a number of unsuccessful battles. But the battles that he fought were always God's battles, and in the end God wins His battles.

Actually, Jeremiah is one of the outstanding personalities of the Old Testament. He is one of the two mightiest prophets that ever spoke for God. If you know your Old Testament, you will have to agree with me that Isaiah and Jeremiah tower above all the rest of the prophets. Jeremiah was a warm personality. He was a courageous character. He faced the hostility of his day because he was willing to say what God told him to speak.

Jeremiah was God's spokesman to the nation. He made his greatest contribution to his nation by delivering the message God communicated to him. You will find in the book of Jeremiah this statement, "God spoke to him and said, you shall be as my mouth." That was precisely Jeremiah's function in his day. He was as God's mouth. When Jeremiah spoke, he began by saying "Thus saith the Lord." For example in the 27th chapter, verse 4, we read, "Thus shall ye say." God told Jeremiah what to say. In verse 13, Jeremiah said, "As the Lord hath spoken." So we see that the message that Jeremiah had was God's message. We can visualize this prophet there in the courts of the temple, or as he stood on the street corner to deliver the message of God to the people of his nation. He was able to speak with divine authority.

Jeremiah, therefore, was a real prophet, speaking for the living God, to a living nation, dealing with human problems. We say our problems are new and our problems are different. When we make a statement like that it reminds me of the man who said to the country boy, "We have a new moon tonight." The lad responded, "No, sir, it's just the same old moon back again." When we look at the problems we have today, we see that they are human problems and that they are the same old problems back again.

I want to emphasize this fact. Jeremiah was disturbed, greatly disturbed, by what he saw, what he knew, and what he felt. And I want to relate the fact that in like manner as Jeremiah was disturbed in his day, so Christians need to be disturbed in our own day by the things that are transpiring in our own Nation.

I. First of all, Jeremiah was disturbed because his nation did not act wisely or intelligently.

Judah was his nation, and he said that Judah was given to foolish actions. Judah made many unwise alliances. This little nation was caught in the power struggle between surrounding nations. Jeremiah was greatly disurbed because the people were the victims of the unwise decisions and practices on the part of their leaders.

What about our Nation? Are we warranted in feeling today as Jeremiah did when we think of our own country? Should we be disturbed or should we be complacent concerning what is transpiring at the present moment? I want to enumerate a few of the things that I think Jeremiah would be concerned about and about which we should be deeply concerned.

1. The first item is what goes under the title of the "Foreign Aid Program."

This foreign aid program began in 1945 and has continued to the present day. During that time we have spent a little better than $101 billion. Before 1962 comes to a close we are told we shall have spent $106 billion. A large proportion of this money has gone to people who have alien ideologies to the one we hold, and people who are moving in the opposite direction from which they should be moving. I shall be definite about this. We all know that Tito is a leading exponent of the Marxist philosophy. Yugoslavia's Tito is a Communist dictator. But our country has taken from its taxpayers $2.4 billion for Communist Tito and Yugoslavia. Actually, his sympathies are with the Marxist Russians. And Tito is down for more. I think Jeremiah would say that this policy does not indicate a high grade of intelligence.

India's Nehru has received out of this amount $2.8 billion of aid and he is now down for another big slice. And part of this donation was made after his confiscation of Portugal's Goa. Portugal, it should be remembered, is one of our allies.

Out of this amount we have contributed to Communist Poland $900 million. To Egypt's Nasser we have handed $600 million; and to Indonesia's Sukarno, who follows the Communist line, we have turned over $700 million and he is down for more. Dark Africa is coming in also for a large slice and I feel quite sure that Jeremiah or any other prophet would say in the light of the facts of the tremendous debt that we have, which is the largest in the history of the world, it is not the part of wisdom for our country to be draining its resources and giving it to these countries who champion a dangerous economic and political philosophy.

If we had unlimited amounts of money, someone might say we ought to share with them. As a matter of fact, there is no country that has an unlimited amount of money. In an article that came from the secular press just a few days ago we are told that our President is asking Congress for a $8 billion increase in the debt ceiling till June 30, 1963, and a quick $2 billion increase in the debt limit. It is said that if Congress passes both requests, it would bring the debt limit to a record of $308 billion. We are not really giving away our own money, but money that our children and grandchildren will have to provide. This is not fiscal realism.

Recently the Right Honorable Sir David Ormsby Gore, British Ambassador to the United States, was asked whether his government contemplated a more extensive program of foreign aid. Sir David said, "You can't invest a deficit in foreign countries." In sharp contrast to the United States, Britain has adopted a wiser policy. An Indiana editor made this pertinent observation on the British Ambassador's statement: "Our American dollar is no more exempt from immutable economic laws than is the British pound."

2. A second item that would be disturbing to Jeremiah is our interference, and interference in the wrong way, in foreign countries.

We are now at the moment disturbed about Cuba. But, actually, who is responsible for the conditions in Cuba? If any of us have memories of any length at all, we will recall that our State Department cooperated with the movement to get rid of Batista and promote Castro. And the daily papers of Atlanta applauded what the State Department did. There is no question about this. It has well been said that Castro is just one of the Communist dictatorships that can rightly bear the label, "Made in the U.S.A."

If Jeremiah were living today in the United States of America, I am quite sure that he would say that was not a wise thing to do. It was a very stupid thing. It actually turned out to be a very wicked thing.

3. Then there is a third thing that would disturb Jeremiah and it is the wholesale criticism that is being leveled against the patriots who are fighting communism in our day.

We do not claim that these patriots are 100 percent perfect in all of their views or their characters. We all make mistakes. But it is one of the strange things in America that those who are actually trying to destroy communism, which is determined to destroy our own country, are being labeled as troublers in Israel. I think we should keep in mind an observation made by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, that these people who are patriots are not in the Government and running the Government. Those who are in control of the Government are the liberals who are dangerous in many of their views. This is a disturbing fact, that people who are for collaboration with those who would destroy us, and those who do not have a sense of values as they should, are making the policies of our Government. Loyal Americans are the ones who are being criticized today as causing all the trouble in our country. There are some keen minds today who are being disturbed because of this very thing. Just recently, Edith Kermit Roosevelt, descendant from the Theodore Roosevelt line, wrote in her column an article called "The 'Establishment' Controls United States No Matter Who Is in White House." Now that's true. You can look at it in our own country no matter whether the Republicans or the Democrats are in power. The so-called establishment as she describes it, controls policies of our State Department and what's taking place in Washington. Here is what she says: "There is an establishment in the United States. The word 'establishment' is a general term for the power elite in international finance, business, the professions, and government, largely from the Northeast, who wield most of the power regardless of who is in the White House.

"Most people are unaware of the existence of this 'legitimate Mafia,' yet the power of the establishment makes itself felt from the professor who seeks a foundation grant to

the candidate for a Cabinet post or a State Department job. It affects the Nation's policies in almost every area.

"For example, the Council on Foreign Relations, New York City, subsidized by Rockefeller interests since 1927 boasts a membership of at least 90 percent establishment figures.

"The relationship of the Rockefeller-CFR to the establishment is admitted by establishment boosters 'in the know'.

"The directors of the Council on Foreign Relations make up a sort of presidium for that part of the establishment that seeks to control our destiny as a nation."

And then Miss Roosevelt avers, "The establishment says that the best way to fight communism is by a one-world Socialist state governed by 'experts' like themselves. The result has been policies which favor the growth of a super-state, gradual surrender of U.S. sovereignty to the United Nations, and a steady retreat in the face of Communist aggression."

Continuing, she observes, "It is this group in high authority and power in our country who turned over East Berlin, East Germany, and Eastern Europe to the Communists, surrendered China to the Communists, led us to fight a no-win war in Korea, helped Castro establish communism in Cuba, and it is this same establishment who opposes every effort of the Government to expose the workings of Communists in this country. It is this establishment who has opposed the Un-American Activities Committee and sought to abolish the committee in its entirety. It is this establishment who has furnished to the State Department Alger Hiss, the Communist agent who was the chief architect of the United Nations Charter. It is this same establishment that advocates a socialistic state, a one-world government, and a one-race of people. It is this same establishment that is leading the Nation into bankruptcy."

Intelligent people, it seems to me, would recognize that this is one of the best and most penetrating appraisals made of conditions as they now exist in our Nation. Surely we have reason to be greatly disturbed because our country is not living according to an intelligent policy of national life.

II. Jeremiah, in the second place, would be greatly disturbed about the moral status of our Nation because it is on a rapid decline.

On this point, the data is abundant. There is no room for doubt. Moral conditions in our Nation are simply alarming. The hard facts tell us that 1,861,000 major crimes are committed each year here in the United States and that these crimes, according to J. Edgar Hoover, have grown 4 times as fast as our population during the last 5 years.

Now where does all this lead? It leads to self-destruction. But someone may say, "Don't deal in generalities. Let's have specifics." I agree with that suggestion. I am going to mention a few specifics in this moral decline about which we should be tremendously disturbed.

1. The first is the breakdown of our family life and the loss of integrity in the homes of America.

The truth is that homes are collapsing all around us and this is an unmistakable sign of our moral bankruptcy. Here we stand indicted. Henry W. Grady once said that "the home is the mudsill of American civilization." Now we know how important the mudsill or foundation is to the structure of a home. If the home is the mudsill of American civilization, American civilization today is in a most precarious state. In this connection, let me say that as I have visited in American homes, I have observed no real enthusiasm for family worship. There are a lot of people today who think you can make a successful home if you have "a can opener, a card table, and a cocktail shaker." But these things do not make a successful home. Someone said to me not long ago that we have more bars in American homes than we have family altars. I don't know whether that could be proved or disproved, but I think it is very likely the truth. If that is a true statement, God have pity upon a nation where such is the case.

A few years ago I conducted evangelistic services in a town in one of our Southern States. During that meeting I was invited to the home of the mayor. That evening as I went in the home of the mayor, I observed in the living room a bar. Last year I was back in that town and I inquired about the mayor and his family. I was informed that the mayor has now left the town after divorcing his wife. Instead of being a God-fearing man with a family altar in his home and a moral leader of his community, he had a barroom that resulted in a calamity of this sort.

Today many people have an idea that if you live in a well-furnished $35,000, $40,000, or $50,000 home, everything is all right. But you can go in many of these homes, some of the finest right here in Atlanta, and find that they are not all right. Our national vitals are being destroyed by the internal conditions found in many of these so-called fine home.

When I was a boy, we used to sing a song "There's No Place Like Home." It said, "Be it ever so humble, there is no place like home." And that's right, provided it is the right kind of home. Numerous homes are going to pieces because they have no definite aims, no high ambitions, and they are not operating according to God's plan. Small wonder they are failures.

2. Now for a second specific. It is our growing aversion to work.

I don't know what kind of reaction you had when you recently read in the papers that the labor unions are advocating a work program of only 20 hours a week. This is one of the most distressing signs in our national picture. If anyone knows contemporary life he will agree that work today both in its quantity and quality is far from satisfactory.

During my vacation I had some trouble with my car and stopped in a garage to have it repaired. In my conversation with the head mechanic, I asked about the new cars. "Which make is the best?", I inquired. He said, "They're all bad." Then I asked, "How do you account for that?" He said, "Because labor today just doesn't care about the kind of work they put in these cars. Even the brand new ones that come in here are of such poor workmanship, we almost have to make them over."

Now the quantity advocated is 20 hours a week. Of course all of this fits nicely into the program of the welfare state. We ought to realize that this is part of a program that is very dangerous and no nation can ultimately survive a thing of this sort.

God has commanded people to work. He said, "Six days shalt thou labor." We ought not to think of work as some great burden, but every day we ought to thank God for the privilege of working and that we are given health to be used in production of goods. If someone feels that I am a bit harsh at this point, let me say that St. Paul in writing to the Thessalonians said, "If a man doesn't work, he shouldn't eat." I don't think you can make a stronger statement than that.

3. A third specific is the violation of the fourth commandment of the moral law.

The moral law rests upon the highest authority and that's the authority of God. This fourth commandment is a part of God's moral law. We are told that God set apart this day and He blessed it and hallowed it. God calls it in His Word the "holy Sabbath." The word "Sabbath" means "rest." No man originated the Sabbath. No man originated the day that since the resurrection is called the Lord's Day. It is God who brought it into existence. God says on this day, "Suspend work. Rest your mind. Rest your body." Today in many of our cities we find the supermarkets open. People can go 6 days in the week to buy their groceries but they wait until the Lord's Day to commercialize it.

On this day we are commanded, "worship God." It is a solemn duty. God made man for this purpose. If the trend continues in the way it is now going, in the next 10 years about the only day the churches will have a decent attendance will be on a rainy day. I can remember when we used to dread a rainy day because attendance would then be poor. Christian ministers today are witnessing an exodus on what is called "the weekend" to the lakes, and the houses of God are fast becoming empty.

What this shows is that man is disobedient to God's revealed law. I am going to make a statement whether or not you believe it. I am sure the scriptures will confirm it. God blesses a nation that honors and respects His day and God punishes any nation that habitually disregards and violates His day. The old statement, "A Sabbath well spent brings a week of content," is still true, if we spend it as God intended. You will find in your Bible that nonobservance of this day brings a penalty. Sometimes it may be death or sometimes other judgment. Jeremiah said in his day, "You have not given the Sabbath to the land, therefore you shall go into captivity for 70 years." Did it come true? The record is plain.

Do you belong to that group of people today who are enemies of the Sabbath or do you belong to those who are the friends of it, who are trying to conserve it for the glory of the Lord?

4. One more thing I want to say by way of specifics. The increasing consumption of alcohol is something that should disturb every thinking person and every true believer in Christ.

Our age is being described as "the cocktail age." Isaiah says in chapter 5, verse 11, "Woe unto them that rise up early in the morning, that they may follow strong drink." Our civilization here in America is actually being destroyed by strong drink. Our young people at a frightfully young age are engaging in this, largely due to a vast amount of high-priced advertising and the example of their parents. Those who know tell us that we have today in America approximately 7 million chronic alcoholics. There are 50 million more drinkers who have not yet reached the stage of chronic alcoholism. Our country is spending twice as much for liquor as it spends for education, and 20 times as much for this poison as for Christian work. We are fast drinking ourselves into insanity and poverty. This is something to distress and disturb our souls.

Is there something we should do about these things? This 18th chapter of Jeremiah tells us what we should do. I can tell it to you quickly but it will take a lifetime to do it. And what is it? Repent; repent; repent. God says through Jeremiah, "These sins exist, these sins require a penalty, and the only hope for your country is whether it will come to repentance before God."

So many people are unwilling to learn from the past. We go on repeating the same mistakes. That is one reason why history should be our great teacher. But it does not always teach us. We are so blind to truth and slow to learn. The Bible says, "The wages of sin is death," and that is as true as the multiplication table. The Bible says, "The way of the transgressor is hard," and there is nothing more valid. The Bible says, "Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap." That is absolutely true. Put your hand in the fire and it is burned. Fall over a precipice and you will go to the bottom.

Take poison and you will die. Jeremiah said, therefore, it is high time to listen to the voice of God. The voice of God still says to us, "You need to repent." We need to turn from our wicked way.

One of the disturbing things about America today is, there are so many people who are prone to go by what public opinion polls say about something rather than about what the word of God has to say on the subject. The major study to which America today should be devoted is the Holy Bible. But instead, it is the one thing that is being outlawed in our schools. Jeremiah was known as the weeping prophet and I tell you, my friends, when one gets alone with his beating heart and his God, with the word of God before him, such a situation is disturbing enough to cause us to weep.

We are part of this Nation. We have a responsibility in this Nation. We ought to be sure that we are not contributing to the problem but are helping to solve the problem by being obedient to God and His will for our lives. Let us think biblically about the matter of God and the Nation and our personal responsibility to both.

There were those in Judah who thought that nothing could happen to their nation. But history records how the temple built by Solomon was reduced to a jumble of stones and charred wood. The walls raised to defend the city were thrown down. The chosen people of God were carted off into Babylonia by Nebuchadnezzar. When the word of God spoken by Jeremiah was disregarded these were the melancholy results.

It appears that the majority of Americans think that our Nation is so strong that nothing can destroy us or our way of life. Let us not be blinded by this unwarranted optimism. Just as the civilization in Judah came to an end because God's word spoken through Jeremiah went unheeded, so we may be sure that without repentance for our sins we are approaching our end. If a nation's moral fiber is the measure of a nation's strength we are mighty weak. Repentance is God's way to power. It is the old way and it is the sure way.

As American citizens, let us pray:

"Thy love divine hath led us in the past;
In this free land by Thee our lot is cast;
Be Thou our ruler, guardian, guide and stay,
Thy word our law, Thy paths our chosen way."

"God bless our native land,
Firm may she ever stand,
Through storm and night:
When the wild tempests rave,
Ruler of wind and wave,
Do Thou our country save
By Thy great might."

The Faith To Be Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. This is no easy course to follow. It is a warning to every red-blooded American that the liberty and freedom we inherited from our forefathers must be paid for every day—yes, every hour of every day.

Liberty is so easy to lose, almost impossible to regain, and very difficult to hold on to.

We Americans are dedicated to the task of keeping our liberty and freedom, and helping other nations less fortunate than we are to obtain their liberty and freedom, but we cannot, we must not, run the risk of losing our own freedom and liberty while helping others.

We must also realize that all of our enemies are not aliens of other foreign nations. Some of our most dangerous enemies are right here at home, people who do not know, do not care, or do not want to fight for liberty and freedom. To these people, the phrase, "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," means nothing.

The following statement titled "The Faith To Be Free," by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, should be read and studied by all liberty-loving Americans.

THE FAITH TO BE FREE

(By J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation)

During our generation, a new menace, international communism, has arisen to threaten freemen throughout the world. Actually, there is little basic difference between the fascism of Adolf Hitler and the atheistic tyranny practiced behind the Iron Curtain. The Soviet Union and her satellites are a godless dictatorship ruled by warped and twisted minds.

We are at war with the Communists and the sooner every red-blooded American realizes this the safer we will be. Naturally, we want to live in peace, but we do not want peace at any price—we want peace with honor and integrity. And we intend to assure it for the future.

The extent of the menace posed by the philosophy of communism is clearcut and obvious. However, it is absolutely necessary that we attack and oppose it calmly, rationally, and objectively.

We must continue to stiffen our national backbone in dealing with the Communists and their dupes, sympathizers, and apologists. If we relax our guard for one moment, we court national disaster.

The atheistic Communist dictatorship now controls one-fourth of the earth's surface and more than one-third of her peoples. The Communist threat from without must not blind us to the Communist threat from within. The latter is reaching into the very heart of America through its espionage agents and a cunning, defiant, and lawless Communist Party, which is fanatically dedicated to the Marxist cause of world enslavement and destruction of the foundations of our Republic.

The Communist Party in this country has attempted to infiltrate and subvert every segment of our society. The party's efforts have been thwarted in this country by the Government's internal security programs, by investigation, arrest, and prosecution of party functionaries, and by widespread intelligent public opposition to the Communist philosophy.

Recently, the Communist Party in the United States deliberately and flagrantly refused to comply with the U.S. Supreme Court decision which requires it to register as an agent of the Soviet Union with the Attorney General. Thereby, it once again has formally declared itself to be a lawless organization. No longer can its members falsely profess that the party is a legitimate political organization. Nor can its sympathizers and fellow travelers feign innocence of the true nature of the un-American conspiracy which they support.

Unfortunately, we are plagued with some Soviet apologists who, time after time, would have us betray the cause of international freedom and justice by yielding to the Red Fascists in the Kremlin on vital moral issues.

We also have in our midst some timid souls who have so little faith in the strength of democracy that they would have our country yield to international threats and intimidation. I include those persons who urge appeasement at any price and those who chant the "better Red than dead" slogan.

America's emblem is the soaring eagle, not the blind and timid mole. Fear, apologies, defeatism, and cowardice are alien to the thinking of true Americans. As for me, I would rather be dead than Red.

America does not have to apologize to anyone. Certainly not to the arrogant, shoe-pounding Khrushchev and his puppets, nor to those neutrals whose neutrality is but an evidence of moral weakness. We should keep our heads up looking for honorable solutions and selling America, rather than keep our heads down looking for shelters and the compromise of human rights.

Those who follow the road of appeasement do not know the true meaning of freedom. They do not comprehend the misery of Communist enslavement. You will not find their cheap slogans on the lips of the Hungarian refugees, the East German patriots, nor other freedom-loving peoples who have escaped from behind the Iron Curtain.

Nor do you find their apologies in the writings of great American patriots such as: Patrick Henry, who asked the searching question, "Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?"; or Benjamin Franklin, who declared, "They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety"; or Samuel Adams, who reminded us that "The liberties of our country * * * are worth defending at all hazards; and it is our duty to defend them against all attacks. We have received them as a fair inheritance from our worthy ancestors * * * who purchased them for us with toil and danger."

In the fight to preserve our Republic, it is not enough merely to be against crime, crime subversion, or against any of the other enemies which weaken the Nation's strength from within. To stand for the American ideal, to work for the cause of liberty and justice, these give true meaning to life in this great Republic.

If we are to effectively resist the eroding influence of communism, it is imperative that all citizens of this Nation exhibit in more positive ways the value and superiority of our form of government over any foreign ideology.

Let us also work for a revolution, a revolution by the spirit, not by the sword. Let there be vital forces at work in our society and not merely slogans. Let us be for America all the way; but, at the same time, let us not be taken in by those who promote hysteria by the distortion and misrepresentation of the true facts whether they be the proponents of chauvinism of the extreme right or pseudoliberalism of the extreme left.

At another hour of grim challenge a full century ago, Abraham Lincoln urged the American people, "Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it."

We are living in an age of uncertainty, an age of awsome national peril, an age when the struggle between freedom and totalitarian enslavement is drawing toward a climax. We now have need of faith as never before

in our Nation's history. We must revive within ourselves the faith of our forefathers, which enabled them to meet and overcome adversity.

Our Nation holds in trust the last hope of a free civilization. Our dedication to truth, justice, and individual dignity must not be compromised. If we are strong enough, and care enough, and maintain our national integrity, this Nation will survive the terrible threat that presents itself today. With God's help, we will meet the challenge of survival. This is the heritage of America.

Widen Television's Horizons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Communications of the Senate Commerce Committee has held hearings on the important subject of all-channel television legislation. During these hearings many interesting veiwpoints have been developed with regard to television and the best methods of making more usable channels available to the general public.

Commissioner Fred Ford of the Federal Communications Commission has been a leader in the development of all-channel television legislation. Recently he wrote a comprehensive article on the subject which appears in the February 24 issue of Television Guide entitled "Widen Television's Horizons."

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Mr. Ford's article on this important subject.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WIDEN TELEVISION'S HORIZONS—A FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSIONER ARGUES THAT THE ALL-CHANNEL RECEIVER WILL GUARANTEE ADDITIONAL STATIONS

(By Frederick W. Ford)

Would you knowingly buy a radio with which you could tune in only about one-seventh of the stations that the FCC can license to broadcast programs to you. Certainly not, but the chances are that this is exactly the kind of TV set you now own. Only about 8 million or about 15 percent, of the 54 million TV sets in use in the United States can receive all 82 channels on which television stations can be licensed to broadcast programs to the American public. How did this happen and what can we do about it?

In 1948, when only 107 existing television stations were assigned to the 12 very high frequency (VHF) channels, the further licensing of stations was "frozen" pending study of various technical problems that had arisen. The freeze was lifted in 1952 and 70 UHF—ultra high frequency—channels were assigned, in addition to the 12 VHF channels, to complete the 82-channel allocation to the television service.

The FCC provided at that time for a possible 2,053 assignments to stations in 1,291 communities throughout the United States on a VHF-UHF "intermixed" basis. In 1953, only 22 percent of the TV sets produced were capable of receiving UHF as well as VHF stations.

THE VANISHING UHF STATIONS

Because of many factors, including the wider coverage of VHF stations and the technical experience and superiority in the manufacture of VHF sets, advertiser support for UHF stations competing with VHF stations evaporated. Only a handful of UHF stations remain on the air today and the demand for all-channel sets has declined to 6 percent of production at the present time. These stations are mostly educational stations and stations in "deintermixed" areas—that is, areas where all VHF assignments were canceled or changed to UHF assignments in pursuance of an interim policy. As a result, the country has languished under a scarcity of TV stations. This has given rise to monopolistic situations in the midst of plentiful channel assignments. Assignments are waiting for qualified applicants to build stations and bring to the United States an adequate nationwide competitive television system with a choice of program service to the public.

There is no doubt of the need for additional television stations. The deintermixed areas have demonstrated the utility of UHF stations to meet this need. The New York City UHF experiment now underway by the FCC will add further technical knowledge on the usefulness of UHF in canyon-like cities.

The National Association of Educational Broadcasters in a recent nationwide survey has established a need for nearly 1,000 educational television station assignments. Conversion of TV sets in the hands of the public to all-channel sets is essential for this invaluable plan to approach its goal.

Television is unsurpassed in its ability to disseminate instantaneously and simultaneously, pictorially and verbally, conveniently and efficiently, directly into the home or school, our rapidly rising body of knowledge. An educational television system generously supported must be created for this purpose, and most of the channels for it must come from the UHF band.

After extensive study of this problem, I recommended to my colleagues on February 11, 1959, that we sponsor legislation giving us the authority "to prescribe minimum performance capabilities" of television receivers "traded or shipped in interstate commerce for resale to the public," as the solution for this problem. This means requiring manufacturers to make only all-channel receivers for sale to you. At the request of the FCC, bills for this purpose were introduced in Congress in 1960 and again in 1961. Opposition to this legislation comes from some set manufacturers and others.

It is contended by some that the bill is unconstitutional; however, there are many precedents for this type of legislation. The general counsel of the Commission furnished an opinion to the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee after exhaustive analysis which indicates no doubt as to its constitutionality.

AUTHORITY LIMITED TO TV SETS

There are others who contend that the FCC soon will want to regulate how toasters are made. Nothing could be further from the truth. The proposed legislation is drafted very narrowly to limit this authority to TV sets.

Another objection to this legislation is that so many additional stations could not be supported by our economy. It is argued that this would result in poor programing driving out the good. It is my view that just the opposite would occur. If the demands of educators are met, only a little more than 700 assignments for commercial stations would remain. This would fill in the gaps needed for healthy competition commercially and with a world of ideas. Most of these new commercial stations probably would be in areas presently without adequate service. This development would relieve the pressure for more Government concern with networks and programing and tend to preserve the freedom of broadcasters that we all cherish.

An additional argument against the legislation is that UHF is technically inferior to VHF. As a matter of fact, a VHF signal can normally be received at a much greater distance than UHF. If the signal is received, however, a viewer cannot tell which he is watching, just as you cannot tell from listening whether a radio station is 250 or 50,000 watts. In addition, manufacturers have had at least 17 years' experience in making VHF sets, whereas most developmental projects on all-channel sets have been abandoned.

If receiver manufacturers had abandoned the 12-channel receiver in favor of all-channel receivers in 1952, when only 7 million receivers were in the hands of the public in the United States, I venture to say that satisfactory all-channel sets would be in the hands of the public today.

One further argument against giving the Commission the authority to prescribe standards for TV sets is that it would require the public to buy something that is not immediately useful; that is, a TV set capable of receiving 82 channels when so few stations are presently operating on the additional channels. I am told this extra cost would amount to roughly $15 to $25. In every type of broadcast receiver except television, there is a capability of receiving the entire band allocated to that service. Yet none of these sets receives a primary signal on every possible channel or frequency because of the necessary spacing of stations on the same and adjacent channels to avoid interference.

PRESENT SETS WILL NOT BE OBSOLETE

This bill would not antiquate present TV sets. You could continue to use your present set to watch the stations you now see. If a UHF station were to be built in your community you could buy a 70-channel UHF converter today for as little as $20 that would enable you to see it; but if you wanted a new TV set, under this legislation only an all-channel set would be available. In this way, within a few years, at the present rate of TV set production, the public would be equipped to receive all the television stations—educational and commercial—built under authority of the FCC, and a truly nationwide educational and competitive commercial television system could at last be achieved.

Mr. Ford has been a member of the Federal Communications Commission since 1957 and served as its chairman in 1960–61.

H.R. 10079: A Bill To Amend the Immigration and Nationality Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FERNAND J. ST. GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the recent passage of H.R. 10079 by the House of Representatives is significant in that it gives further impetus to legislation which will help to underline four basic American principles:

First, the United States has a traditional regard for individual dignity and self-fulfillment. It follows that this Nation should continue to be concerned with the problems of free people throughout the world whose lives have been disrupted by adverse political or military conditions.

Second, the reestablishment of refugees who cannot return to their native countries for religious, racial, political, or other reasons is closely connected with our objectives to continue the provision for asylum and assistance to the oppressed, to extend hope in the processes of freedom to the victims of communism, and to exemplify the differences which exist between free and captive societies by our sacrifices and actions in behalf of the less fortunate members of humanity.

Third, provision for assistance to free nations who are harboring refugees but whose economy is not sufficiently strong to support the additional strain.

Fourth, aid to programs for international migration of workers to developing countries which are badly in need of manpower, the most valuable asset of the free world.

The new amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act provide continued U.S. membership in and contributions to the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration and for contributions to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. The bill also gives general authorization for programs to assist refugees, escapees, and other persons who the President may feel should be helped in the best interest of this country.

H.R. 10079 provides flexibility in giving assistance to refugees. This assistance may take such forms as grants, loans, or contracts through U.S., international, or private voluntary organizations. Such aid will help to meet the needs of interim care, housing, welfare assistance, training, rehabilitation, job placement, local reestablishment, and oversea resettlement.

Through the efforts of this and other countries, a great deal has been done to ease refugee and migration problems. However, millions of these unfortunate people are still desperately in need of help. As one of the most favored nations of the world, we have a solemn responsibility to show humanitarian concern for the unwilling victims of war and violence throughout the globe. The enactment of this legislation will be a positive step in that direction, but continuing efforts will be needed. History will be the final judge of our success or failure in this important task.

Overselling Everything

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal of March 16, 1962:

OVERSELLING EVERYTHING

James Reston is a reporter with a perceptive eye for the phenomena of Washington and the other day he had some comments on the administration's habit of selling everything as if it were the promise of salvation from fire and brimstone.

The administration, for one example, is unwilling to advocate a lower tariff program simply because it is good economics and sound commonsense. It feels it must appeal to fear, fear of Soviet competition and the collapse of the American economy if the President can't cut the tariffs on widgets. And of course imply that if only Congress will do this, then all will be saved.

Well, these comments had hardly left Mr. Reston's typewriter before President Kennedy was again applying exactly this same technique at his press conference to sell his foreign aid program, one a billion dollars bigger than last year.

"I believe this program," Mr. Kennedy said, "is just as important as our national defense." The underdeveloped countries, especially in Latin America, have staggering problems of poverty and unemployment, he explained. These countries are "right in the line of fire" of the Communists.

"If anyone feels these countries are unimportant," the President said, "or it does not make any difference if Latin America is taken over, or if significant countries are (taken over) by Communists, and if they are not interested in this fight, they should cut it."

So, you see, anyone who suggests a cut in foreign aid is threatening the national security, because a dollar for this is equated with a dollar for guns or atom bombs. Furthermore, if you question any of it that means you think all these countries are "unimportant." You are the kind of person who thinks it "doesn't make any difference" if the Communists take them over. In fact, you are probably "not interested in this fight."

The nonsense of all this, however, is not as bad as the reverse implication that if Congress will just approve this foreign aid bill then these countries will preserve their independence, the poverty and unemployment in these unfortunate places will be cured, and we will assure ourselves victory over communism.

This is not merely nonsense but a very dangerous illusion. It raises hopes beyond any possible chance of fulfillment, as anyone will know who reflects on the billions of foreign aid paid out over 15 years and the state of the world today. In Laos and Vietnam, for example, foreign aid has made hardly a dent in deep-rooted poverty and the security of their independence is today as precarious as ever.

How illusory these oversold promises are becomes especially clear in the reports from Latin America by our Mr. Evans, currently appearing on this page. The poverty and backwardness of some of these countries is throughly documented; so is the danger of Communist infiltration, some of it growing out of that poverty and backwardness. To this extent, the picture painted by Washington is not overdrawn.

Yet it is something else again to pretend that the magic cure is a mammoth injection of U.S. dollars. Or that a dollar spent for foreign aid serves equally to defend us as a dollar spent upon our own defenses. Or that if Congress curtails the administration's program the want of a dollar will be the cause of chaos and communism.

It shouldn't be necessary for us to say, although it probably is, that we are not opposed to foreign aid as such. Fifteen years ago this newspaper supported the program for Greece and Turkey, and encouraged the objectives of the Marshall plan in Europe. There are many ways today in which American aid can be effective both in helping other countries and in promoting our own interests.

It is the "oversell" of the program that is largely responsible for its scandals of waste and corruption abroad and the growing disillusionment with it at home. Worse, these things have combined to diminish its effectiveness. And worst of all, the American people are thus deprived of the sensible discussion that is essential if we are to act wisely in apportioning our efforts and our resources.

All this is as true of the tariff bill or of medical and educational programs, as it is of foreign aid. Perhaps it is good politics for the administration to argue for every road or school appropriation on the ground, in Mr. Reston's phrase, that "failure to build them will mean the triumph of communism for the next hundred years." But exaggerated promises and appeals to fear suggest a poverty of political leadership.

Let's Apply What We Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the problem of water pollution has concerned me for a long time. It is a problem which should be of concern to every Member of the Congress, and every American citizen. Each of us has it as his duty to leave the water in at least as good a condition as it was when he found it; he should leave it in better condition.

During this session I plan to introduce legislation which would envision the completion or near-completion of the watershed program by 1976.

The following editorial from the Izaak Walton magazine of March 1962, is an excellent commentary. Under unanimous consent, I include this editorial, "Let's Apply What We Know," in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S APPLY WHAT WE KNOW

Clean water advocates were heartened when an epidemic of hepatitis traced to eating clams from sewage-polluted Raritan Bay in New Jersey resulted in the U.S. Health Service making a survey of the situation.

If bad news, such as an epidemic, can be considered heartening, then good news now coming from hepatitis experiments conducted at Joliet, Ill., State penitentiary is disheartening. Dr. Joseph D. Boggs has succeeded in isolating the virus and eventual discovery of a vaccine to prevent the disease is now in sight. The disheartening part of this good news is that another evil of stream pollution can be overcome by modern medicine and we stand the danger of slipping back in our overall efforts to prevent pollution which is the basic cause not only of infectious disease but of much other social and economic difficulty.

When authorities padlocked the common water pump in a busy London Square in 1834 because cholera was rampant, the epidemic waned dramatically. Moreover, the world learned that disease can be transmitted by polluted water. That should have been knowledge enough and reason enough to stop polluting water. But man learned later that disease could be stopped—or retarded—by vaccines. So we have continued to pollute water while we look for new vaccines and other means to overcome effects of the pollution.

Something is wrong with a system of learning that does not include the wisdom to profit fully from the knowledge. Since water

contaminated by sewage is considered the most widespread cause of infectious hepatitis, research to eradicate the disease by vaccination—and much other medical research—could be conducted along other lines if we just did what we already know we should do—stop contaminating public waters.

The pursuit of knowledge has now become so specialized that we are not able to avoid duplication in searching for it nor apply all we know after we learn it. This is why we favor the Pesticides Coordination and Control Act and, most recently, the recommendation of the ORRRC that a Government bureau be formed to coordinate and supervise the outdoor recreation effort. New Government bureaus are not bad if their function is to provide wisdom that is lacking in the search for and the use of knowledge. As our knowledge accumulates, we shall need far more coordination and the agencies to accomplish it so our wisdom can keep up with our knowledge. This is already true in conservation and outdoor recreation.

F.S.

A Needed Attack Against False Prophets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the New York World-Telegram and Sun on March 5, 1962.

The opposition of the Roman Catholic Church to communism has long been known and cannot be questioned; that it is equally opposed to any threat to our freedoms has been also well known. Reverend John F. Cronin, assistant director of the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, has spoken out against the "false prophets" of our day who spread fear and dissension throughout our Nation. The church's view deserves wide dissemination.

The editorial follows:

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun, March 5, 1962]

FALSE PROPHETS

The Roman Catholic Church has begun an intensive nationwide effort to warn its members against "false prophets" who magnify and distort the domestic threat of communism and "sow distrust in our Nation at a time when national unity is imperative."

Spearheading the church's educational drive is an 80-page booklet written by the Rev. John F. Cronin, assistant director of the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference and a recognized expert on the Communist movement.

Father Cronin deplores the tendency of extremists—whether sincerely or expediently—to look for Communists under every bed, from liberalism and the United Nations to integration and fluoridation, not to mention mental health programs and organized pornography.

One by one, Father Cronin ticks off the rebuttals to these reckless notions. And, in a particularly gallant gesture, he slaps down irresponsible charges against other faiths, declaring: "Communist influence among the Protestant clergy is virtually nonexistent." And: "The organized Jewish community in the United States is strongly opposed to communism."

Father Cronin by no means writes off the domestic problem of fighting communism, but he is severely critical of the extremists who are at once anti-Communist and isolationist—magnifying the Communist threat at home but unwilling to be bothered countering the greater Communist threat in Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Finally, Father Cronin addresses himself to the question of how the average citizen can fight communism:

"Devote all your strength and energy, in concert with your fellow Americans, to build national unity and moral strength. Practice your religion and make it a vital force in your community. Even in dealing with moral evils, concentrate less on denunciation and more on giving leadership and example. * * * Above all, we must have a broader vision of world needs."

We'd say Father Cronin has done an excellent job of putting the issue in rational perspective, of outlining ways in which Americans can constructively fight communism—instead of negatively and perilously dissipating their energies fighting one another.

The 22d Anniversary of the Valley Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc., at Huntingdon, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday afternoon, March 17, 1962, I spoke at the 22d annual meeting of the Valley Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc., held in the gymnasium of Juniata College at Huntingdon, Pa.

This cooperative, headed by Charles L. Packard, as president, and by John H. Denton, as manager, has approximately 8,000 members in Huntingdon, Blair, and Fulton Counties of Pennsylvania.

There were some 3,000 members at the annual meeting Saturday when I delivered the following address outlining the background of REA and explaining the role of atomic energy in the field of electrification:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE VALLEY RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, HUNTINGDON, PA., MARCH 17, 1962, 2 P.M.

It is a pleasure to be able to accept the kind invitation to address you—the members of the Valley Rural Electric Cooperative—upon the occasion of your 22d annual meeting.

I always enjoy the opportunity to get away from the legislative atmosphere in Washington and mingle with my constituents and neighbors in the central Pennsylvania area.

During my many years in Congress—I have followed the progress of REA in our great Keystone State with much pride because Pennsylvania was truly one of the pioneers in the field of rural electrification.

In 1923 Gov. Gifford Pinchot inaugurated a study of our State's power resources and requirements.

This study was directed by Morris L. Cooke—later to be the first administrator of REA and a native Pennsylvanian—who recommended that "our first concern must be with the small user of electricity—particularly with the farmer."

Farm electrification had advanced at a snail's pace during the 53-year period from 1882—when the first central generating system was put into service—to 1935—when REA was created.

Less than 11 percent of all farms in the United States had electricity in 1935.

Since this time, REA has greatly stimulated the extension of electric service into rural areas.

It is estimated by REA that more than 97 percent of the 3.7 million farms recorded in the latest U.S. census of agriculture now have electric service.

More than half of these farms are served by REA-financed systems reaching out into the most sparsely settled sections of the country.

REA borrowers also serve a great number of nonfarm rural residences—schools, churches, business establishments, and industrial plants in rural areas.

More than 5 million rural consumers in 46 States and 2 territories are now receiving electricity from REA borrowers operating approximately 1.5 million miles of line.

Pennsylvania, at the time REA was created in 1935, was slightly above the rest of the Nation in percent of farms receiving central station electric service, with 23.6 percent of her farms electrified.

The first loan in Pennsylvania was approved in May 1936, and the first REA financed line was placed in operation on May 19, 1937.

Here in Huntingdon your own rural electric cooperative's first loan was approved 23 years ago on March 22, 1939.

Eight months later or on November 29, 1939 the first line was placed in operation.

Tremendous strides have been made by REA over the years.

For example, by July 1, 1951, REA had advanced more than $42.5 million in electric loan funds in Pennsylvania, and the 13 borrower-cooperatives were operating about 17,491 miles of line serving 79,065 farms and other rural consumers.

Of all Pennsylvania's electrified farms it is interesting to note that REA borrowers were serving 25.5 percent.

The valley REA has utilized $4,741,239 in REA loan funds in building 1,438 miles of line—serving 7,856 consumers in Huntingdon county and surrounding area.

It is estimated that an additional 500 consumers will be served when plans presently underway are completed.

The average monthly consumption of electricity on the valley lines has more than doubled in the past 10 years.

Kilowatt hour consumption has increased from 157 kilowatt-hours per month per consumer to 354 kilowatt-hours in 1961.

This indicates—at least in part—that you people are enjoying more of the well deserved so-called modern conveniences in your homes.

REA has proved to be a good investment here.

Pennsylvanians have repaid $18.7 million of the $42.5 million in REA funds advanced to them.

Included in this amount repaid is $1,302,840 which was repaid ahead of schedule.

The Valley Co-op has repaid almost $2 million of its advanced loan of $4,741,239 of which $182,027 of this repayment have been repaid in advance.

The outstanding record of accomplishment by REA cooperatives—in electrifying the rural areas of our State and country is truly worthy of our pride.

This record could not have been accomplished in any other way except through

cooperatives such as the one we have here at Huntingdon.

Rural America waited for 53 years for electricity—but not until REA showed others how the job could be done—could any substantial success be noted.

It is a source of great satisfaction to me—that REA is and has been—a Federal program enjoying genuine bypartisan support.

The REA program as we know it today—has its inception in the bipartisan Rural Electrification Act of 1936—introduced in the U.S. Senate by the late Republican Senator from Nebraska, George Norris, and in the House of Representatives by the late Sam Rayburn, Democrat, of Texas.

The bipartisan nature of REA is further emphasized by an examination of REA gross-loan figures.

Since the founding of the Rural Electric Administration in 1935, $5.4 billion in rural electrification and telephone loans have been approved to REA borrowers.

During the period 1953–60, under the Eisenhower administration, loans amounting to $2.3 billion, or 42 percent of the gross loans were approved.

Thus both political parties have contributed significantly to the success of REA.

In this connection much credit is due also to the REA co-op leaders for refusing to play politics.

The wisdom of this policy is vindicated when the progress under both Republican and Democratic administrations is reviewed.

Speaking frankly, REA plays no political favorites and as a result both parties back REA.

The importance of REA to this country is such that bipartisan support of the program has been and will continue to be of vital necessity to the success of REA.

Senator MORTON of Kentucky, former national chairman of the Republican Party, credited the rural electrification program as being a primary factor in the development of an agricultural system in America—seven times as efficient per man as Russia's farm system.

I heartily concur with Senator MORTON's words.

In the opening of my remarks, I mentioned that our own State of Pennsylanvia was truly one of the pioneers in the field of rural electrification.

It is significant that our State can also take credit for being the site of the world's first atomic power station—located at Shippingport—near Pittsburgh.

This central station nuclear powerplant produces some 60,000 kilowatts of electric energy that is distributed to the consumers in the Pittsburgh area through the power grid of the Duquesne Light Co.

The Shippingport Atomic Power Station—operated jointly by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Duquesne Light Co. is one of 13 civilian atomic reactors now in operation, under construction, or with construction scheduled for the near future.

Among the 13 are REA-supported projects—the Elk River reactor project in Minnesota and the La Crosse reactor project of the Dairyland Wisconsin Cooperative.

In mentioning atomic power, I would like to spend a few minutes in describing its source by pointing to these pieces of ore, taken from mother earth and which contain the energy found in uranium metal.

This 1 pound of uranium can produce as much heat as 1 million pounds of coal—which is equivalent to approximately 10 million kilowatt-hours of electric energy.

To harness the energy stemming from uranium metal, the scientist and the engineer have conceived what is known as a reactor vessel.

With this reactor, heat is developed converting water to steam, which is sent to the turbine from which electric energy is produced.

It must be understood that atomic power is still in its infancy.

It may be as long as 8 to 10 years before this type of power is competitive with conventional power.

To give you some idea of one of the big problems in the atomic power field: In the construction of 1 kilowatt of a conventional powerplant where coal is used it costs $160; while in the atomic powerplant the cost of 1 kilowatt ranges from $280 to $620.

Thus you will note that the construction of coal-fired conventional powerplants from the standpoint of 1 kilowatt of construction is much cheaper at $160 as compared with the minimum cost of $280 for an atomic powerplant.

In the language of the man in the street—1 kilowatt-hour of atomic power costs about 10 mills or about twice as much as conventional electric power.

As previously mentioned—in the matter of 8 to 10 years it is predicted that through technological advancements the cost of 1 kilowatt-hour of atomic power will become competitive with conventional power in certain sections of the United States where the cost of fuel is extremely high.

Living as we do—in an area where coal is mined and made available to the power industry—atomic energy—while not displacing the use of coal—could develop simply as another source of fuel taking its place along side other sources of energy—such as hydropower and coal that can furnish a consumer a kilowatt-hour of electric energy at a minimum cost of 4 mills.

With this brief explanation of atomic power and keeping in mind the REA-supported atomic reactor projects at Elk River, Minn., and Lacrosse, Wisc.—it is an accepted fact that not only is REA supporting research and development in atomic power—but it is destined to play a more prominent role in the utilization and enjoyment of the peaceful benefits of the atom.

In closing—let me stress the fact that the contribution of rural electrification to the great strength of our Nation—is recognized by all Americans and especially those of us who have our roots in rural areas.

Therefore all of us can point with pride to our respective roles in developing the REA program to its current high level of effectiveness—in performing its mission of bringing economic blessings to rural America.

Energy for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. T. RUTHERFORD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I inserted in the RECORD an editorial entitled "What About Energy," printed in the Midland Reporter-Telegram, under the direction of its publisher, Mr. James N. Allison. This editorial related to the problem of the energy industry, and it was the first of two editorials on this subject. Since I feel that every Member of this body should have the opportunity to read these articles, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the second of these editorials from the January 10 issue, entitled "Energy for Freedom":

ENERGY FOR FREEDOM

Energy to assure the freedom of the United States and its citizens; to keep us from slavery, and to prevent disaster must come from within this Nation. The United States of America cannot depend on foreign powers, dictators, or shieks for its energy.

In 1961, the United States imported about 1,900,000 barrels of crude oil and petroleum products a day. As imports increase, the Nation's petroleum industry must carry more and more reserve capacity in order to remain in a position capable of supplying our needs in the event of a national emergency.

Oil now is the principal weapon of the Communists' economic offensive aimed at undermining free world institutions.

Meanwhile, our great and free Nation is allowing its important oil and gas industry to decline to a precarious position. Russian oil is being offered in the world market on terms which effectively eliminate competition.

Petroleum trade associations are trying to arouse Washington officials to the fact. Perhaps the new Permian Basin Petroleum Association, an organization long needed in this vast area, can help get the White House, Defense Department, and other top Federal officers and bureaus to realize what is happening. No legal barrier exists to prevent Russian oil moving into the United States.

Subsidies are not wanted by the great petroleum industry of our Nation. But no one can expect a drop in the American standard of living, the highest in the world, so our Nation can compete in world markets with foreign oil. We must have sources of energy within our borders on which we can depend in peacetime or war.

William J. Murray, Jr., chairman of the Texas Railroad Commission, last fall told a congressional investigating committee "an adequate supply of domestic reserve producing capacity immediately available in a military emergency is absolutely vital to our national welfare."

"Excessive imports will curtail domestic exploration and development and, therefore, imperil national security."

The energy consumption in the United States is greater than any other nation in the world. Murray explains it is six times the per capita average for the rest of the world.

More than 70 percent of the energy used in the United States comes from petroleum. Scientific experts predict petroleum will constitute the dominant source of energy not only for the Nation but the entire world for the remainder of this century.

Will the United States permit the Communists to control the energy of our Nation?

The time has come for the United States to be realistic about its great oil and gas industry and keep it healthy. Certainly, our Nation and its leaders are not going to invite disaster.

A Forward Step in Juvenile Rehabilitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the New York Journal-American published the following editorial on March 2, 1962, which comments on a program recently begun by New York State for the rehabilitation of juvenile offenders.

This program, camps providing schooling, vocational training, and healthy surroundings, is a great forward step in

dealing with the rehabilitation problems faced by our Nation in the juvenile field.

The editorial follows:

WE NEED MORE

This State has taken a magnificent step toward curbing delinquency by opening a rehabilitation camp for troubled youngsters in a Catskill Mountain forest near Rensselaerville.

This pioneering project is designed to guide boys 15 through 17 in the right direction before they become hardened delinquents. Here 60 teenagers whom the courts hold to be on the threshold of delinquency will continue their schooling and receive vocational training while working in healthful surroundings.

This is exactly what this newspaper has been advocating since 1956. We congratulate Governor Rockefeller and the State division for youth on this realistic approach to the whole problem of youth crime. But a camp with a capacity of 60 boys is only a beginning. We must have more such camps—and soon.

We also point out to the Governor that such health camps are the most effective means of providing adequate aftercare for dope addicts who have undergone hospital treatment. Here the addict trying to fight his way back could be quarantined away from the surroundings that led to his addiction.

State Senator Frank J. Pino and Assemblyman Stanley Steingut are sponsoring legislation providing for such camps. We believe the Governor should make this a companion measure to the highly commendable Metcalf-Volker bill to provide hospital facilities for addicts which was passed overwhelmingly by the assembly and now awaits approval in the State senate.

Politics and Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

On March 7, 1962, the House Agriculture Committee rejected a resolution which would have frozen the price supports for milk at the present level. Since that time there has been much discussion over the effects of the vote. I think that it is important for all of us in the House to realize how various dairymen feel on the issue. Because of this, I am inserting in the RECORD the following editorial from the March 14 issue of the Dairy Record, a leading dairy publication.

The editorial follows:

POLITICS AND SUPPORTS

Refusal by the House Agriculture Committee to extend the present $3.40 milk price support for an additional 9 months makes it an almost virtual certainty that Congress is not going to accept the administration's request and that the support price of milk will be cut beginning April 1.

The burning question now is whether Congress will reach a compromise and accept a support price of $3.22, the level at which it was before Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman increased the price 18 cents a year ago, or whether the support price will be permitted to sink to 75 percent of parity which currently would be $3.10 or $3.11.

This whole matter of milk support prices is so bogged down in politics that one wonders what will be the final outcome. It gives us more than a slight attack of nausea to hear politicians of the two parties accuse each other of not keeping faith with the farmers when all are tarred with the same stick. They are not kidding the farmers, for most of them are far ahead of Members of Congress in their thinking and their thinking is that the most important job that the dairy industry has to perform is to sell more products even at the cost of taking lower prices for their milk.

During the campaign of 1960 the Eisenhower administration raised the manufacturing milk price to $3.22 per hundredweight. The political implications were great and President Eisenhower candidly admitted that he would not have approved the increase if a campaign was not in progress.

The Kennedy administration was in office only a few days more than 2 months when Secretary Freeman increased the support price to $3.40 per hundredweight. It will be remembered that there was little pressure on the part of the producers themselves to raise the support price for they were keenly aware then as they are now that dairy products of all kinds were being priced out of the market and any increase in the price of dairy products would hurt consumption.

Undoubtedly the present administration has come to a realization that it was a mistake to increase the support price in March 1961 and wishing to be taken off the hook for the mounting surpluses, it is passing the buck to Congress. Secretary Freeman did not go to Congress when the 18-cent increase was put into effect and neither does he need to petition Congress now to pass the resolution to extend the $3.40 support price to December 31. The supply of milk now is more than adequate; it was more than adequate when Secretary Freeman increased the support price to $3.40.

Secretary Freeman has stated that if Congress does not act to extend the present support price he has no other alternative than to let supports drop to 75 percent of parity beginning April 1. That, of course, is sheer poppycock, and Secretary Freeman knows it.

We find it difficult to convince ourselves that the resolution to extend the support price was not a part of a grand scheme to put pressure on producers to accept the quota program. President Kennedy and Secretary Freeman are not political neophytes and they must have known that the resolution would face rough going in the House Agriculture Committee. They must have had a fairly good idea that the Republicans would reject the resolution on the grounds that the Secretary could extend the $3.40 support price without congressional approval. Insofar as the six southern Democrats who opposed the resolution are concerned, it was almost a lead pipe cinch that they would reject it for they couldn't care less inasmuch as manufacturing milk is not produced in any vast quantity in the South.

So the political dueling goes on. The Democrats charge that the Republicans are to be blamed for killing the resolution and the Republicans make the countercharge that it is up to Secretary Freeman and not to them to pull the administration's chestnuts out of the fire.

At the time that Secretary Benson, under protest, raised the support price and again when Secretary Freeman boosted it further we expressed the opinion that both were bad moves. Nothing has changed that opinion. We believe that a support price of $3.11 will leave the producers in a far better position than they would be under a quota system. True, it unquestionably will work a hardship on many, at least temporarily, but it will help to exand consumption. This of course is predicated on the assumption that there will be a corresponding drop in prices paid to producers of fluid milk.

Rendezvous in Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, in recent months we have heard a good deal about rendezvous as a means of speeding up the timetable for manned lunar landings by American astronauts. Instead of talking in terms of the 1970's, it may be possible to attempt such a manned lunar expedition as early as 1968 or 1969 by means of rendezvous. The following report from the Christian Science Monitor of March 2, 1962, explains briefly and in simple terms what is meant by rendezvous of spacecraft:

TWO WAYS TO THE MOON

(By Neal Stanford)

There are two ways of reaching the moon, and American officials are going to pursue both.

One is to fly direct. The other is to do it in two stages. The latter involves a rendezvous in space, shooting a powerful rocket into orbit and then sending up a spacecraft to join this rocket, with the two then taking off together for the moon.

To the layman the rendezvous technique sounds the more difficult. For the problem of getting two objects in space (traveling roughly five miles per second and in three dimensions) to come together and lock staggers the imagination.

But to space agency officials (the scientists and engineers and astronauts involved), the rendezvous method may create problems but nothing that is not manageable. And it has two present advantages over the direct flight method: it apparently can be done sooner and cheaper.

So the United States is going to pursue both means of reaching the moon. It is pushing the rendezvous method, while continuing to work for direct flights both as an alternative and as a substitute should the rendezvous technique not pan out. In some respects the direct flight technique to the moon and other planets is the more logical, and when space travel way out into the solar system comes of age it may well be the only one used.

To say that the rendezvous method is cheaper and can be done sooner is a relative assertion. Both techniques are going to take years and billions of dollars. But rendezvous is apparently going to take fewer years and fewer billions. (Billions here is used in the American meaning, thousands of millions, not yet in the British usage, millions of millions.)

What is keeping the United States from pushing the direct flight technique is its lack of giant booster power. And this is something that cannot be developed or provided overnight. It takes just so much time, research and development, engineering, construction and testing to make the big boosters needed for direct flight.

It is not that NASA does not know what has to be done and how to do it to get the big boosters, but knowing how to do it and doing it are far from the same thing.

And when talking of big boosters one is not referring to the Atlas with its 360,000 pounds of thrust that hurled Astronaut Glenn into earth orbit. Nor is one referring to the Titan, the biggest rocket the United States now has, or the Saturn, on which it is working, that has more than a million pounds' thrust. When one talks of boosters that can lift three men to the moon direct and bring them back one is talking of a still-to-be-developed Nova rocket having 12 million to 20 million pounds' thrust.

The payload that has to be hurled into space to get a team of astronauts to the moon and bring them back is little understood. But it is close to 400 tons that has to be lifted off the earth with force and speed fast enough to overcome the earth's gravity and send a space team to the moon. More than 90 percent of this is needed just to get the apparatus off the ground and into space. But 30 tons or so of the load is what will land on the moon, including spacecraft and return rocket power and 6 tons of this is what will eventually return to earth in an Apollo spacecraft much as Pilot Glenn did in his much smaller Mercury compartment.

So while the United States pushes ahead with Nova, a fantastic rocket of the future, it is pressing on with the rendezvous technique of lunar flight as the quicker and cheaper method.

Timewise, it appears that the United States could not put men on the moon by direct flight before 1970, if then. But by the rendezvous method it may be able to accomplish this by 1968.

Moneywise, the rendezvous technique may cost only a third of the direct flight program, though both will cost billions, NASA has estimated (and very, very roughly) that it may cost some $6 billion to develop and build the Nova, plus another $10 billion to build the launch facilities and some 100 of these mammoth rockets. This much for the direct method.

NASA experts also figure that it will cost a billion dollars or so to develop the rendezvous technique; another billion to make the Saturn operational and build the launch facilities; plus another $9 billion for 100 launches.

These are vast, almost undigestible figures for most people. But spread over a decade or so the total space exploration porgram or so the total space exploration program comes down to about $3,500 million to $4 billion a year. This is roughly the sum that the United States for some years has been providing for foreign aid. It is part of a national budget now approaching $100 billion.

But space exploration cannot be done cheaply. It might not come quite so high if the Russians were not also in the business. But even without the Russians it would cost about the same, though possibly the same urgency for a quick landing on the moon might not be present.

Like Their Enemies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Robert Allen Sedler, assistant professor of law at St. Louis University has written a letter to the St. Louis Post-Dispatch in which he comments on a series of articles written by William K. Wyant on the rightwing movement.

Professor Sedler writes that despite the variety of arguments among the rightwing organizations, they all have one element in common, a misunderstanding of the nature of the Communist threat.

Communism is an illusion, for it pretends to offer a prospering economy and a happy way of life for a down payment of freedom.

Professor Sedler points out that the main argument of the rightwing organizations is that under communism private capital is not recognized; but these organizations fail to emphasize the initial basis for that argument, a loss of freedom. Thus he feels that communism's main threat is to our political freedom.

I am placing Professor Sedler's letter, as it appears in the March 15 issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to share his ideas with my colleagues.

The letter follows:

LIKE THEIR ENEMIES

After reading the excellent series of articles on the rightwing by William K. Wyant, I am convinced that despite the differences between them, all these organizations have one thing in common—a misunderstanding of the nature of the Communist threat.

They do not realize that the danger of communism is that it represents a species of totalitarianism, just as fascism does, but is more deadly, because it holds out the illusory promise of economic progress to those who are willing to sacrifice their freedom in exchange for that illusion.

The prime basis of their opposition, however, apparently is not because of the totalitarianistic basis of communism, but because under it private capital is not recognized. Hence, a willingness on the part of some groups to substitute the equivalent of an equally totalitarianistic state in order to preserve their view of a capitalistic system, which view accords, incidentally, with that of Karl Marx. We may ask whether these same persons were concerned with the equally cogent threat to the American way of life from fascistic totalitarianism.

The real danger from communism, as from any totalitarianistic system, is that to political freedom, without which none except members of the ruling clique possess any type of freedom. So long as we maintain our system of representative government, of an independent judiciary which safeguards citizens from arbitrary governmental action, and of respect for dissenters and minority groups, we cannot be destroyed by any internal threat.

Mr. Wyant's articles were aimed at informing the public as to the activities and the nature of the rightwing movement. He has performed a valuable public service. Once we understand their view of the nature of the Communist threat, we can more properly evaluate the soundness of their proposals and attacks.

ROBERT ALLEN SEDLER.

The Rare Blood Clubs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, no doubt many of the Members of this body are familiar with some of the good work accomplished by the Knights of Pythias but I would like to call attention to the latest humanitarian efforts of this great fraternal organization.

Under the auspices of the Order of the Knights of Pythias a club for potential donors of rare types of blood has been organized. Through this National Rare Blood Club it will be possible to arrange for donations of 6 rare blood types. The services of potential donors are open to all, whether members of the club or not. The order includes chapters in New York, New Jersey, Washington, and Maryland. More than 2,000 persons have already donated blood through these clubs.

At this point in the RECORD I would like to insert a recent report of the work of these Rare Blood Clubs as well as a message from Secretary Ribicoff commending the Knights of Pythias for their continuing campaign against disease.

The House of Delegates in my own State of Maryland has recognized the importance of this endeavor by the Knights of Pythias and I would like to have House Resolution 33 made a part of the RECORD.

The articles follow:

THE RARE BLOOD CLUBS

Under the auspices of the Order Knights of Pythias, a new kind of minuteman is springing up throughout the United States and Canada.

The minutemen are persons with rare blood types who have banded together under the Pythian banner as a militia of mercy, each one ready at quick notice to donate his blood to anyone in need of that blood type.

Organized by the Pythian-sponsored National Rare Blood Club, the donors already number about 2,100, with new members joining every day.

The importance of this lifesaving project is attested by a continuing flow of letters from surgeons and hospital officials commending the organization for filling a need of the utmost urgency. In the New York City area alone, the National Rare Blood Club had 70 calls from 22 hospitals in the first half of this year. In each case blood donors of the type needed were quickly recruited to save a life. Most of the patients were open heart surgery cases.

IMPETUS FROM SUPREME LODGE

It was in New York City that the Rare Blood Club was founded two years ago. It was then a local activity of the Pythian-affiliated Associated Health Foundation, a humanitarian organization headed by Supreme Chancellor Leonard M. Eisenberg. But the importance of its work was swiftly noted. Last summer the Rare Blood Club took on a broader scope when the supreme lodge issued a resolution encouraging the formation of Pythian Rare Blood chapters by grand lodges and Pythians everywhere.

Since that time a network of chapters has been taking shape as more and more Pythians step forward to lead the way in their own areas. "Our progress has been so great," Brother Eisenberg declared recently, "that one can realistically expect the National Rare Blood Club to spread to every city on the North American Continent.

THE NATIONAL RARE BLOOD CLUB—ITS MEMBERS NOW NUMBER 1,000

The National Rare Blood Club began with an idea, a good one, and a handful of members. Today, only a year and a half after it was initiated, the club has more than 1,000 members through much of North America—and it keeps growing every day.

The National Rare Blood Club has its roots in the Associated Health Foundation, a philanthropic agency supported by an association of Pythian lodges in New York City, and headed by Supreme Chancellor Leonard M. Eisenberg. But the response of donors has been so great, on the part of Pythians and non-Pythians alike, and the idea has caught on in so many places, that Brother Eisenberg now believes it can become worldwide in scope. He declared:

"The National Rare Blood Club epitomizes the very essence of the spirit of brotherhood to which we Pythians are dedicated, and we can all take pride in the enormous success of this particular enterprise. But more important is the fact that the need for this life-giving service has been amply demonstrated, and it is for this reason—for the reason that it serves humanity in such an important way—that we should make every effort to keep this expansion going."

Meanwhile, the club grows * * * and grows.

A NEWSPAPERMAN TELLS WHAT IT MEANS

Just what is the significance of the National Rare Blood Club? And how does it work? Charles F. Justice, a writer for United Press International provided the answer to these questions in a story he did for newspapers across the continent:

"NEW YORK, December 12.—The little girl had to have a heart operation, otherwise she might die. But she had a rare type of blood, one unavailable from the usual sources.

"A few years ago that little girl might have died under such circumstances. But today, thanks to a unique volunteer organization which supplies rare blood types free of charge, 9-year-old Frances Fernandez is alive and doing well.

"Frances underwent open heart surgery November 30 at Flower Fifth Avenue Hospital in Manhattan. Waiting nearby were two members of the National Rare Blood Club (NRBC) who had her type of blood—'ABA' negative, a type so rare only one person in 200 possesses it.

"Also on hand were 15 pints of the same type blood donated by other club members.

"Frances is recuperating today, grafted to the 17 strangers who took time out from such occupations as housewife, truck driver, corporation executive and salesclerk to donate, on their own time and for no pay, their valuable blood.

"However, there is some reward, according to one club official.

"'When you get a note from a little child thanking you for saving her life that's reward enough,' he told United Press International in an interview at NRBC offices at 101 West 31st Street, New York City.

"The case of little Frances Fernandez was not an unusual one for the club.

"'We get about 6 calls a week for rare blood donors,' NRBC President Leonard M. Eisenberg said. These calls are for blood types ranging from the extremely rare 'AB' negative to 'B' positive which only about 11 persons in 100 possess.

"It is not necessary to be a club member to receive the blood, he said.

"Not all of the calls come from the New York area. Some are from far-off cities but the club is ready, if necessary, to rush donors to the spot no matter what the distance.

"'If a life is at stake, and if the blood is unavailable in the area concerned, we will fly them anywhere at our own expense,' Eisenberg said.

"The National Rare Blood Club is a nonprofit volunteer organ of the Associated Health Foundation, Inc. of New York, which itself is a philanthropic outlet for the Knights of Pythias fraternal organization in New York.

"All NRBC officials volunteer their time and receive neither pay nor expense money. Donors likewise are not paid, although the club will pay transportation and other expenses and reimburse them for time lost from their jobs, if necessary.

"Donors must be between the ages of 18 and 59.

"Eisenberg said the club now numbers about 1,000 members with several chapters but hopes by 1962 to grow to 100,000 members.

"It thus far has members in nearly every State of the Union plus Puerto Rico, Canada, and British Honduras and is working to establish chapters on local levels wherever possible.

"'We hope later to expand the club on an international level,' Eisenberg said.

"He said members' responses to calls for blood donations were remarkably good, generally about two-thirds. As to why the response is so good, club official Spencer Hare summed it up by quoting one donor, a truck driver:

"'God gave me this gift of rare blood. Why shouldn't I share it with others? They would share theirs with me.'"

This was just one of many newspaper stories breaking from coast to coast on one of the most dramatic Pythian-supported enterprises ever undertaken. And even more articles may be anticipated as the National Rare Blood Club expands its lifesaving services to wherever the need exists, and the need, unfortunately, exists in almost every hamlet and city.

THE MESSAGE FROM HARTFORD

I wish to congratulate and commend the Knights of Pythias on the resolution adopted by the supreme lodge to engage in an all-out campaign against cystic fibrosis.

This action by your organization will mean hope and encouragement for the thousands of parents whose children are afflicted with this disease.

Your action will mean that substantial aid will be forthcoming for medical research scientists who are seeking to learn the cause of cystic fibrosis and to develop a cure for this killer of children.

VICTORY BY CONCERTED ACTION

For more than half a century, throughout the United States, the joint efforts of medical scientists and organizations of dedicated laymen have proved to be an effective alliance in the continuing campaign against disease.

Recent dramatic successes against such cripplers and killers as polio and tuberculosis show what can be done when there is a will to do it.

It is not in the nature of Americans to throw up their hands and write off any problem as insoluble, no matter how difficult it may be.

True, we do not now know why cystic fibrosis strikes about one child in every 600 born. We do not now know any effective cure for that child.

THE ANSWER MUST COME IN TIME

Past experience with other diseases makes it impossible for us to say that this situation will not obtain indefinitely. The determination of the medical profession to end this disease, with the help of compassionate American men and women, must eventually prevail.

As Governor of Connecticut, I am, of course, proud that a resident of this State, Joseph Friedman, of Bridgeport, played so influential a part in the decision of the Knights of Pythias to undertake a campaign against cystic fibrosis.

It is most appropriate for Connecticut to take a position of leadership in this effort by the Knights of Pythias since Connecticut was the first State in the Nation to recognize, by legislative action, the need to assist those afflicted with cystic fibrosis.

MOST WORTHY ENDEAVOR

Beginning in 1955, the State of Connecticut has made biennial appropriations to help meet the medical expenses of cystic fibrosis victims.

The Knights of Pythias have my very best wishes for success in the most worthy endeavor which they have undertaken.

ABRAHAM RIBICOFF.

WHAT IS CYSTIC FIBROSIS?

The No. 2 killer of children, cystic fibrosis, strikes about one child in every 600 born. This means about 7,000 new cases a year.

About half of these unfortunate youngsters die before they are 5 years old.

At present, cystic fibrosis is a baffling and incurable disease. For some unknown reason, the mucous glands in the lungs and pancreas of an afflicted child produce so much abnormally thick mucus that the lungs and pancreatic ducts become clogged and cannot function properly.

At first the child's breathing is disturbed as the mucus blocks the air passages of his lungs. Then chronic infection sets in. The result, often, is that the lungs can no longer overcome the persistent obstruction and the child perishes.

In the pancreas, the excessive mucus prevents the free flow of pancreatic juices that are vital to the absorption of food and elimination. When the food he eats cannot be digested, the child is doomed.

Although the disease is congenital and hereditary, CF children usually appear healthy at birth. However, within weeks or months they generally develop some or all of the symptoms of cystic fibrosis, presenting the typical picture of a thin, coughing child who is mentally bright but physically apathetic.

One of the main handicaps in fighting the disease is that it is virtually unknown to the public—and few doctors can distinguish it, let alone treat it.

What is needed is an intensive campaign of education and research. This twin project has been undertaken by the National Cystic Fibrosis Foundation.

And it is to support the urgent work of this foundation that the supreme lodge now is calling upon Pythians everywhere to "identify yourselves with this project and help speed the day when victory is won."

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 33 BY THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES, FEBRUARY 27, 1962

House resolution commending the Grand Lodge Knights of Pythias of Maryland, Inc., on their establishing a Rare Blood Club

Whereas the Grand Lodge Knights of Pythias of Maryland, Inc. is participating in a club for donors and recipients of rare types of blood, and is establishing a registry of persons possessing rare types of blood; and

Whereas the services of the club will be open to all Marylanders; and

Whereas through a similar national group sponsored by the Knights of Pythias, it will be possible to arrange for donations to persons out of this State; and

Whereas this is a most laudable and necessary enterprise, truly befiting the stature and moral integrity of the Grand Lodge Knights of Pythias of Maryland, Inc.: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Delegates of the General Assembly of Maryland, That the Grand Lodge Knights of Pythias of Maryland, Inc., be and they are hereby strongly commended for their most excellent endeavor in establishing a Rare Blood Club in the State of Maryland, and that the good wishes of this legislature will be attendant upon their efforts; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house be instructed to send copies of this

resolution to Supreme Chancellor Leonard M. Eisenberg, 119 West 24th Street, New York 11, N.Y.; to Grand Chancellor Dr. Aaron D. Barad, 2522 Oswego Avenue, Baltimore 15, Md.; and to Grand Secretary William H. Waters, Post Office Box 217, Gaithersburg, Md.

Roger Williams, of Woodrow Wilson School, Wins County Civitan Oratorical Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House to this speech by one of my young constituents. It is by Roger Williams, who is 13 years old, and lives at 2721 Bush Boulevard, Birmingham, Ala.

With his speech, Roger won first place in the Jefferson County Civitan oratorical contest. His speech is entitled "Citizens in a Competitive World." The message of this speech is one which all of us cannot be reminded too often, and I include it herewith:

CITIZENS IN A COMPETITIVE WORLD

(By Roger Williams, first-place winner)

Sitting behind the grim, gray walls of the Kremlin are men plotting to overthrow America. Other determined men are meeting at the White House, planning how to lead America safely through these dangerous days. Two groups of men, two ways of life, two forms of government are in deadly competition today. One will win. Which one?

Competition is a way of life. They knew that—those earnest men who strode into the virgin forests of America with their families at their sides. Their ringing axes cut not only clearings for their homes but also new opportunities for their children to live free lives. Those men taught their sons to shoot clean, to plow straight, and to live honestly in their struggle with the wilderness; and they conquered the eastern seaboard and tamed the wilds of America to their needs. Moving westward, stalwart pioneers found that competition continued to be a way of life. They found that the Great Plains offered new obstacles, but that stretching steel tracks spelled new answers to these problems. As little towns flourished under the hot western skies, the men, true to their early training, built homes, then churches, for this Nation prospered "under God," as our motto reads.

Another homely little building soon followed the home and the church, for the people found that a little red schoolhouse was needed to prepare their children for the lives they had to live. They needed to be able to read a little, write a little, and cipher a little, so McGuffey's "First Reader" and the old blue-backed speller became as familiar as the family Bible. In the competitive world of expansion, American citizens held their own and prospered.

Competition is a way of life. When territorial conquest was done and the United States spanned the continent, America turned to the world of invention and discovery. Diseases which paralyzed people with fear were stamped out or controlled by medical miracles. Machinery of all kinds increased productivity in agriculture and industry. Marvels of transportation roll, float, and fly across our Nation. Hi-fi, stereophonic sound, and television are commonplace, and the stamp "Made in America" commands respect on the world market.

The television industry has given us dramatic pictures of life in earlier periods so that one fact is plain. Wherever there are people, there are laws to govern them; and the laws depend on the type Government that country has.

We see western shows of times when citizens were no safer on the streets of their own towns than law enforcement made them; but even then, sometimes it took the backing of every citizen in town to conquer those who meant to destroy it. The same thing happened during the roaring twenties, when lawmen were sometimes corrupted or intimidated by gangsters. Citizens had to support conscientious officers and judges, and to appear in court to testify. In that way, the reign of underworld terror was broken.

Today our Nation is in danger from abroad. Our enemies want to undermine our faith in ourselves and to destroy our way of life. A dictatorship cannot exist where there is competition. It cannot control a country where a man may wear a fringed buckskin jacket, a homespun shirt, a blue one or a white, depending on the man and his needs and desires. In a dictatorship, every man must wear a black shirt, or a brown one or a red, and his life is as regulated as the color of his shirt.

These godless representatives of communism fear our laws and operate in cell groups in order to evade them, but the Central Intelligence Agency and the Federal Bureau of Investigation locate our enemies. They need, however, the cooperation of every citizen in this greatest competition of all—shall the United States exist as a free nation or as a Communist-controlled satellite?

Two groups of men, two ways of life, two forms of Government are in deadly competition today. One will win. Let it be us.

The Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in Wisconsin Endorsed by the Green Bay Press-Gazette

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in Wisconsin moved one step closer to reality when it was included by President Kennedy in his conservation message last month as one of 10 National Park Service projects on which action was urged.

The March 12, 1962, issue of the Green Bay (Wis.) Press-Gazette, one of Wisconsin's leading daily newspapers, has added its important voice to the list of those supporting the ice age national scientific reserve proposal:

WISCONSIN'S ICE AGE PARK

President Kennedy recently asked Congress to approve 10 park, seashore, and other national recreation areas as a part of the National Park system. Included among the 10 was a national ice age scientific reserve in Wisconsin. The President's reference to proposal was brief but it was sufficient to arouse great enthusiasm and wide support among many Wisconsin people. The President said, "I urge favorable action on legislation to create a national ice age scientific reserve, acquisition to be financed through land acquisition fund."

The original proposal for a Wisconsin ice age park came from a Milwaukee attorney, Raymond T. Zillmer who, with others, incorporated the Ice Age Park and Trail Foundation in 1958. It has since been strongly supported by Representative REUSS, Democrat, of Milwaukee, Senator WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, and Representative JOHNSON, Democrat, of Black River Falls. In all probability it will be supported strongly by the entire Wisconsin delegation if it comes to a vote. It is widely recognized that the establishment of a national park in any area has a tremendous influence in attracting visitors. Allen Edmunds, chief of recreational resources in the Philadelphia regional headquarters, says that present plans call for three units in the Wisconsin reserve embracing 53,500 acres of land: One unit would include the northern part of the Kettle Moraine Forest near Plymouth, Wis., and another, the Devils Lake State Park area, a moraine near Bloomer. It is proposed that each unit could have a visitor center with glacier dioramas of exhibits, rocks and plants. Roman Koenings, Madison, superintendent of State forests and parks, believes that national recognition would have a strong impact beyond the fondest expectations in attracting visitors. Visitors to such parks, he says, are the kind that use overnight lodges and eating places and as a result he believes the whole region will benefit.

Present plans call for the Federal Government to share 50 percent of the cost of acquiring additional land and 75 percent of the cost of the visitor centers as well as a part of the cost of manning them. The most important factor will be an advisory board, five members appointed by the Governor and two by the Secretary of the Interior. This is a field in which the Federal Government can properly assist Wisconsin. And the project as outlined is one that cannot fail to have an important and a beneficial impact upon the economy of Wisconsin.

St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, St. Patrick, the patron saint and the apostle of Ireland, is one of the most celebrated and revered church fathers in Christendom, and his birthday, St. Patrick's Day, is the Irish national holiday. His exact birthplace in Britain, called Bannanuenta, has not been definitely identified, and even the year of his birth is not certain, but it is said to fall between 385 and 389. He was brought up as a shepherd, and when he was 16 years old, he was set upon by a band of Irish bandits who had been making a raid on King Niall. They took him and his sheep to Connaught and kept him there in captivity for 6 years. Then he made his escape on a ship used for exporting fierce Irish wolfhounds. He landed on the coast of Gaul—(France)—and eventually made his way to the monastery of Lerins, where for several years he studied the principles of Christianity.

While there he saw in a dream a man named Victorious, bearing many epistles

in his hands. On one of these St. Patrick read the words "The Voice of the Irish," and imagined he heard his people say: "We pray thee, holy youth, come and walk among us as before." This vision inspired him to return to Ireland as a missionary. After preparing for his mission he returned to Ireland to teach his people the new religion.

At first the Irish were ready to stone him for attempting an innovation in the religion of their ancestors. He obtained a hearing, however, and to explain his point he picked a shamrock from the roadside, using the three leaves on one stem to illustrate the principle of the Trinity. This simple comparison so greatly impressed his hearers that they allowed themselves to be baptized there and then. That was the glorious beginning of Christianity in Ireland.

During his long ministry he founded many churches, among them the church and monastery of Armagh, where he spent the latter part of his life and where he died at the age of 72. The Irish, being at heart a deeply religious people, always remember St. Patrick and celebrate St. Patrick's Day with particular enthusiasm and joy.

I would also like to include the excellent editorial which appeared in The Jersey Journal, March 17, 1962, paying tribute to St. Patrick's Day.

The editorial follows:

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

What is it to be Irish?

On 364 days of the year being Irish isn't visibly different from being Scottish, French, Italian, Jewish, Serbian, Dutch, or—yes—even English.

The Irishman pays his bills, complains against his taxes, does his work, listens to his wife like the man of any other race.

But on this one day of the year—holy St. Patrick's Day—the Irishman becomes an Irishman.

And on this day you have to be Irish.

What is it to be Irish?

The other signs, of course, can be seen by all. The Irishman overnight grows a foot taller and stalks the earth like a giant. All traffic signs turn green for him, and if they don't he sees red.

But this air of majesty is only a token evidence of internal change. The men of other races who envy the Irishman his bearing on St. Patrick's Day would envy him for more if they could look inside the Irishman's soul.

What is it to be Irish?

How can you put the wonder of it into words?

If a psychiatrist stretched himself out on his own warm couch after his last customer had gone home, and he dreamed of the man he himself would most like to be—well, he might be perfect, but he'd still be only half an Irishman on St. Patrick's Day.

What is it to be Irish?

It is to have an angel in your mouth, turning your prose to poetry. It is to have the gift of tongues, to know the language of all living things. Does an Irishman pause and turn an ear to a tree? It is because on this day he hears what one sleepy bud says to another as it opens its pale green hands to the warm sun of spring.

What is it to be Irish?

Oh, on this day it is music, not just the coronet in the parading high school band, but the deep, deep music of living, the low, sad rhythms of eternity. The Irishman hears the high song of the turning spheres, the dim lullaby of the worm in its cocoon. All the world is in tune, and he is in step with the tune, the tune that only he can hear.

What is it to be Irish?

It is to live the whole history of his race between a dawn and a dawn—the long wrongs, the bird-swift joys, the endless hurt of his ancestors since the morning of time in a forgotten forest, the knock-of-his heart that is a part of his religion.

What is it to be Irish?

It isn't only the realization that he is descended from kings. It is the realization that he is a king himself, an empire on two feet, striding in power, a strolling continent of awe.

Why on St. Patrick's Day, to be Irish is to know more glory, adventure, magic, victory, exultation, gratitude and gladness than any other man can experience in a lifetime.

What is it to be Irish?

It is to walk in complete mystic understanding with God for 24 wonderful hours.

Minnesota Holstein Breeders Against Proposed Dairy Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, for the information of our colleagues, I wish to insert the following resolutions adopted at the Minnesota Holstein Breeders Convention, held March 2, 1962, at Litchfield, Minn. These resolutions voice the opposition of people in the dairying industry to the system of dairy quotas proposed by the administration:

RESOLUTION

Whereas milk production has increased in the United States during the past year; and

Whereas consumption has decreased a significant amount, resulting in more available supply than the market will absorb at lower consumption; and

Whereas this condition has been brought about partly at least through increased price supports stimulating both production and lower consumption, and

Whereas a Federal program has been suggested in which, if enacted into law, dairymen have only one of two choices, either support prices well above market prices together with a rigid control program in which each producer will be limited to a quota of production somewhere below present levels or to have virtually no support prices, but freedom to produce all he wants; and

Whereas the first of these alternatives will only help to further discourage consumption and add to the present problem; and

Whereas it will further restrict the efficient producers from becoming more efficient; and

Whereas the quotas or permits to produce will be salable and transferable, and thus become a commodity itself; and

Whereas these quotas will be attracted to areas where the producer already has the greater advantage which will attract quotas away from farm areas, such as Minnesota, which already is at a disadvantage as compared to other regions: Be it

Resolved, That the Minnesota Holstein Breeders Association in annual meeting assembled, go on record as favoring uncontrolled production, even though it may mean lower prices for a time, in preference to restrictive quotas and support prices since we are convinced that this would be definitely to the best interests of the dairy producers over a period of time; and be it further

Resolved, That quality standards for all milk produced, be raised to those equivalent to present grade A standards, thus removing from the market lower grades of milk which contribute to low quality dairy products and hamper the use of all dairy products.

This action will help considerably in alleviating the present problem. Copies of this resolution to be sent to the Secretary of Agriculture, Senators, and Members of Congress from Minnesota.

RESOLUTION 7

Whereas as high a quality of milk is being produced in Minnesota as anywhere in the Nation; and

Whereas we have available such milk, for sale outside our State; and

Whereas several markets have discriminatory regulations virtually serving as an embargo against such milk originating in our area: Be it

Resolved, That we endorse all action, legislative and otherwise, that will lead to the elimination of such discriminations and that a Federal regulation be made effective providing that all milk meeting U.S. public health codes may be sold in any market in the Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress, the Governor of this State, and the Secretary of Agriculture.

New Orleans and the Americas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD the seventh article of a nine-part series on "New Orleans and the Americas," by Reporter Bill Stuckey of the New Orleans (La.) States-Item. The seventh article, entitled "Scholars Drawn Together in Research," follows:

NEW ORLEANS AND THE AMERICAS—SCHOLARS DRAWN TOGETHER IN RESEARCH

(By Bill Stuckey)

You've heard of dollar diplomacy and gunboat diplomacy and summit diplomacy?

Sure you have. That's the type of contact between nations that gets all the headlines.

But there is another type of diplomacy, not frequently brought to the attention of the rank and file, which is far more effective and considerably more longlasting.

That's the diplomacy of the ivory tower and the inquiring mind—one of New Orleans' specialties in Latin American relations. The diplomats are the intellectuals and scholars of New Orleans and the Americas, drawn together through cultural and educational exchange, and mutual interest in research.

In research alone—research into all phases into Latin life, science and art—New Orleans has few peers among U.S. cities.

At Tulane's Middle American Research Institute for example, an archeological team now working in Yucatan is filling in vast blanks in the history and culture of the Mayan Indians.

While Europe still languished in the Dark Ages, the Mayans—called the Greeks of the New World by some phrasemakers—had de-

veloped an intricate and beautiful architecture, had surpassed the Egyptians and Babylonians in astronomy, had developed an accurate calendar 1,000 years before the West, and had discovered the elements of modern mathematics.

But their cities in Yucatan, Guatemala and Honduras were cadaverous ruins shrouded in jungle by the time of the Spanish conquest in the 1500's. And archeologists had gained only a few isolated peeks at the thousands of years of Mayan culture—before Dzibilchaltun.

Since 1957, a Middle-American Research Institute expedition has been excavating, studying and restoring the ruins of Dzibilchaltun, a Mayan city lying a few miles north of Merida, Yucatan's capital. The experts say this work could produce some of the most important discoveries of this century in Mayan culture.

Few Mayan cities studied to date have yielded information on more than a few centuries of the Mayan era. Literally centuries had been unaccounted for.

But in Dzibilchaltun, the researchers of the institute have found an archeological record covering more than 2,700 years of Mayan civilization—from the Spanish conquest back to 1,200 B.C., and possibly even further. Its sheer size alone—possibly the largest pre-Colombian city in the New World in area—also indicates it was one of the most important Mayan cities.

But that's only one of the dozens of Latin research projects the institute has undertaken in nearly four decades of existence.

It has $750,000 in grant research projects underway covering almost every phase of the Latin social sciences, past and present. These include an expedition to Honduras to explore for still more Mayan cities, a compilation of the world's definitive study on all Indians of Central America and Mexico, and various inquiries into Latin history, government, arts, economics and anthropology.

In the museum and archives of the institute are more tangible indications of its involvement with Latin culture—ranging from the original copies of the first laws drawn by Hernan Cortez, Mexico's conqueror, to stacks of the personal papers of the king of the filibusters and President of Nicaragua in the 1850's, William Walker.

The institute, appropriate to its name, concentrates on Mexico and Central America. A new Tulane department, however, the language and area center for Latin American studies, will specialize in South American research projects.

And while on the subject of institutes, Tulane has still another one on the burner. It's the newly formed Inter-American Institute for Musical Research, to promote research into and publication of music in the republics to the south, and to encourage graduate study in that field.

Other research in things Latin is underway by individual members of the faculties of the city's major universities. Their projects number into the dozens and range from studies of the effect on surrounding plantlife of ash from the Mexican volcano Paracutin, to surveys of a family of fungus peculiar to the Caribbean, to the most comprehensive survey to date of Latin America's economic resources, to an inquiry into the effects of education on Latin social and economic development.

Tulane professors also have been asked to contribute articles on phases of Latin America's intellectual life to Encyclopedia Brittanica and the Library of Congress Handbook of Latin American Studies, to name just a few publications.

Local institutions have also established several centers of scholarly research in Latin American countries.

Tulane has a geological research facility in Monterrey, Mexico. A newly formed medical research center in Colombia may eventually expand to include studies into sociology and anthropology, and the same sort of research future is predicted for the LSU medical research center in Costa Rica.

New Orleans—Tulane in particular—also has broad facilities for educating U.S. students in Latin study fields.

Its institute of comparative law, for example, has been described as the only university legal department in the country which is oriented toward Latin America. It's one of the few law schools of the hemisphere offering degrees both in Anglo-American common law and Roman civil law, on which Latin American legal codes are based. There's still another "only"—the only Spanish-English law review of this hemisphere is published by the comparative law institute.

Tulane's law faculty looks upon Louisiana as being the ideal meeting ground between the two legal systems, since this State is the only one in the country with a Roman civil law heritage (via the Napoleonic code).

In liberal arts, approximately 40 different courses covering Latin arts and social sciences are offered, with degrees on the graduate level available.

In addition to research, the new Language and Area Center for Latin American Studies will train teachers of Spanish and Portuguese who also have backgrounds in the literature, history, economy and sociology of South American countries. A special graduate program in Brazilian studies will also be offered.

Another local institution, Loyola University, joins with the Universidad Iberoamerica to sponsor a summer Institute of Mexican Studies in Mexico City.

On the private level, the Cordell Hull Foundation, administered by International House, sends two U.S. students a year to universities in Venezuela (and brings a great many more Latin students and teachers to U.S. institutions through scholarships). International House President Dr. Alton Ochsner said the Hull Foundation is the country's only student-teacher exchange group oriented solely toward Latin America.

Locally, individuals and the colleges also have provided various scholarship programs, on a smaller scale, for Latin students.

In the realm of teacher exchange, Tulane has both Latin professors now teaching on its faculty and American faculty members now teaching in several Latin universities.

Aside from scholarships, New Orleans has a long tradition of Latins who have come here to study—in precollege level institutions as well as the universities. A former foreign minister of Costa Rica, for example, was educated at Jesuit High School.

There are approximately 200 Latins now enrolled in local precollege parochial schools; about 130 in Tulane, 17 at LSUNO and 50 at Loyola.

Cultural exchange?

A brief survey of some of the projects here might lead some to think that New Orleans invented the idea.

Playwright's Showcase, for example, a local dramatic group which specializes in performing the plays of unknown authors, plans also to perform works by budding Latin American dramatists. At least one play a year in Spanish is planned once the program gets off the ground.

Dixon Memorial Library at Tulane is the central U.S. collecting point for all books and periodicals published in El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua.

International House will hold a press seminar here in April attended by about 150 editors from throughout Central and South America.

A former New Orleans schoolboy, Thomas J. Williams, was recently honored by International House for founding a nonprofit foundation in Argentina which promotes U.S. cultural exchanges, science, teaching, and philanthropy.

You have to have a program to keep up with the visiting delegations of educators, students, and intellectuals from Latin America who arrive here almost weekly—and to keep up with their local counterparts who depart regularly for Latin America.

That's the role New Orleans plays in Latin America's ivory tower. The role in Latin America's bustling marketplace, in trade and business, will be the subject of tomorrow's article.

Ballet at the Brink

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the American Ballet Co. is America's oldest ballet company, and has become a great national cultural asset. It has developed the largest repertory of any ballet company in the world and has toured more than any other company.

The American Ballet Co. has started a long-range fundraising program in order to develop the potential of the company. It is planned that new American ballets and talent will be developed, that new productions by American composers and choreographers will be produced and that tours of the United States and of Europe will be continued.

One of the best articles on the need of this ballet company for support appeared in an article by Walter Terry of the New York Herald-Tribune on February 11, 1962. In order to bring to the attention of the Congress the work of the American Ballet Theater and the program that it is embarked on, I am placing Mr. Terry's article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

BALLET AT THE BRINK

(By Walter Terry)

Ballet in America is facing its greatest crisis to date. A great company, the American Ballet Theater, founded in 1940, is literally on the brink of dropping out of sight forever. "I don't know whether we'll get through the whole tour or not—we almost folded in Miami and only the generosity of an individual made it possible for us to jump to our next stand—but we shall try, although the odds seem to be against us." Thus did Lucia Chase, codirector with Oliver Smith of the American Ballet Theater, tell the Herald Tribune of the financial predicament facing her company.

And suppose the American Ballet Theater should die? Does it really matter much? Well, it would leave the United States with only one first-rank company of international renown and strong creative approach, the New York City Ballet, with George Balanchine as its artistic director and chief choreographer. Of course, Mr. Balanchine is, perhaps, the most important choreographer of our day, but a single genius cannot represent the whole of American dance.

Oh, yes, there are other American ballet groups, large and small, good and bad, regional and national, such as the senior Ballet Russe de Monte Carlo (which first settled in America in 1933 and is now little more than a road company), the San Francisco Ballet, Ruth Page's Chicago Opera Ballet and the like, but in the opinion of most and certainly, in the eyes of ballet followers abroad,

there are two American ballets, the New York City Ballet (known around the world as the Balanchine company) and the American Ballet Theater. Both must survive (and the New York City Ballet could use financial assistance also, although at the moment its financial straits are not as dire as those faced by Miss Chase) if American ballet is to have artistic balance as well as creative range.

Despite glowing reviews on the current tour and the presence of Maria Tallchief (a top box-office attraction) as the prima ballerina, along with other artists of note, the American Ballet Theater is living from day to day, not even certain that it can pay for the next batch of toe shoes for the girls of the corps. But this is standard procedure. No first-class ballet company can be self-supporting, any more than grand opera can pay its own way, for costs of ballet production and presentation far outstrip income.

But is such an expensive enterprise as ballet worth saving? The U.S. Government, through the Department of State, found the American Ballet Theater of sufficient national worth to send on world tours, under Government auspices and with the Government footing the bills abroad. This company was also selected as the first major American dance troupe to perform in the Soviet Union, an assignment it filled successfully. Yet the same Government which chose to exploit the cultural worth of the American Ballet Theater abroad is helpless to aid in its survival at home.

GOVERNMENT ILLOGIC

Under our wildly illogical (perhaps "schizophrenic" would describe it better) cultural program, we can send dance (and other arts) overseas under the President's Special International Program for Cultural Presentations. There is money allocated for this. But there is no money allocated for the support of the arts within the United States.

Now we come to more than a passing predicament at a time, ironically enough, when the light of understanding is beginning to glow, for our Government now recognizes the fact that the arts of America are of enormous value in bringing us closer to other nations and their cultures. Perhaps it is slowly dawning on those in Government who can take art or leave it alone that almost every country in the world regards the arts as a necessity and not a luxury, as a national resource and not an extravagance.

Soon, however, if we do not support our arts at home, the President and the State Department and the Congress may discover that we have little left to send abroad. Without aid, our performing arts may wither away.

Let us return to the specific and immediate problem of the American Ballet Theater's survival. It must be admitted that Miss Chase is hardly regarded as the world's greatest ballet director. Some in the dance field have even felt that it might be good to let the company die and hope that some one with greater directing talent would pick up the pieces and form a new company. That is just dreaming. The American Ballet Company Theater, faults or no, exists and is functioning.

MOST VARIED REPERTORY

Miss Chase has given generously (rumored into the millions) of her own fortune to keep it going (this she can do no longer) and she has presided over the building of what is surely the most varied repertory in all ballet.

And from the ranks of this company, which had the late Richard Pleasant as its first and most important director, have emerged many of the star dancers and choreographers of our day, for Miss Chase either launched or encouraged or abetted the talents of such luminaries as Jerome Robbins, Michael Kidd, Donald Saddler, Nora, Kaye, Alicia Alonso, Erik Bruhn, and others too numerous to name in addition to calling upon the established artistries of Balanchine, Tudor, de Mille, Ashton, and the like.

The President of the United States and the First Lady have frequently demonstrated their intense interest in the arts of America, the ballet included. The President, indeed, saw fit to employ the prestige of his high office to help end a union crisis at the Metropolitan Opera, thus assuring the public of a 1961–62 season. This move succeeded in averting postponement of a season. What sort of move can the President or others make to avert the death of a company which has served its country well both at home and abroad and which, through its celebrated alumni and alumnae, has influenced the whole spectrum of American theater?

The American ballet theater, penniless but rich in art creations, has earned the right to go on. But does anyone have a survival kit suitable for ballet?

We Are the Link Between the Past and the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following remarks made by the Honorable Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, at the third guidance conference for secondary school counselors at Rollins College, Winter Park, Fla., on February 10, 1962.

One of the most learned and able members of the New Frontier, Mr. Cleveland points out the great opportunity and the sober choice we face.

Mr. Cleveland's remarks follow:

THE MISSING LINK

(Address by the Honorable Harlan Cleveland)

An anthropologist told me the other day that he had discovered the missing link between the anthropoid ape and civilized man. The missing link, he said, is us.

We, the missing link, live at a very specialized moment in mankind's long ascent toward civilized behavior. The moment is unprecedented and unrecoverable. History holds its breath while we decide how to act in the presence of three familiar facts, facts no less fateful because they are familiar:

First, a kindly God has placed in our brains the technical genius to meet before long all the basic physical wants of mankind—in this country and Europe in our lifetime, and in the rest of the world in the lifetime of our children. Without a single new scientific discovery or insight, we know how to limit most of the hunger and disease which have been man's chief preoccupation through the millenia of unremembered time. And so now, or in just a few years' time, the problem is not whether we can produce enough progress for everybody, but what kind of progress we want to produce. It is a much more difficult question, but it will be much more fun to work on.

Second, a God who believes in self-help has placed in our brains the intellectual equipment and social skills necessary to organize people on a scale large enough and complex enough to put our full technical know-how to work in solving the "whether" and choosing the "what."

At the same time, a God with a taste for irony has placed in our hands the power to end it all—or, in the alternative, to make mankind's experiment endless.

Individual men and women have always had the option to decide whether to live or die. But only in our generation have men and women acquired the priceless and frightening power to make this choice for whole societies. The cosmic choices and chances which the social fallout of science makes available to us were just never available before.

We have been prepared for these choices and chances by an uncounted infinity of mutations, by half a million years of human evolution, by only a few millenia of recorded history, by a brief but brilliant development of systematic thought, through Chinese human relations, Greek logic, Indian philosophy, Christian ethics, Western science, and the rest.

From all, of this rich teaching, we know that the choices which face us are ours—yours and mine, as individuals—that there is no shelter from the social fallout of science, that we cannot duck the questions it raises, nor turn them away, nor refer them to higher authority, nor dare we leave them unanswered. What questions? Whether to live or die? Too easy. How to live, and why—these are the hard, inescapable, exhilarating questions of that accidental moment of time in which we, you and I in this hotel ballroom, are privileged to live.

And what a time.

A time of rapid and accelerating change, when opportunity is certain to knock only once, and that fleetingly.

A time of geometric increase in complexity.

A time of growing freedom achieved because of—and not in spite of—our genius for large-scale organization.

A time for a new categorical imperative of peaceful change—"peaceful" because we want to survive, and "change" because we want to live.

II

In this unique moment of history, not unduly distracted by the crossfire from left and right, the Government of the United States is in a mood to make history, not just to watch it go by. Those of us who are in the act can take no special credit for this circumstance; it is the mandatory spirit of a great power in a dangerous world. Because we have the capability to act, we cannot merely hope for peaceful change, but must actively promote it—at home in each country, and abroad among the nations.

It is not my business to advertise what President Kennedy's administration is doing here in our own country to promote peaceful change in race relations, in urban development, in agriculture, in transport, in industrial automation, in education, in labor-management relations, in care of the aged, in adjustment of the economy to ups and downs, and in other ways. Our own society is, of course, not excused from the choice between compulsive violence and peaceful change. And the ultimate strength of our society lies precisely in the fact that our public and private institutions do in fact invent and absorb change with such speed and flexibility as to belie the static words we use to describe them.

Our efforts to promote peaceful change in other lands are most apparent in our new nation-building programs abroad. The new programs of the Agency for International Development are geared to the peaceful change of economic and social systems. They are being programatically related, at last, to the aspirations of people. They are designed for the long pull—which means they have to be as attractive to the next govern-

ment in a country receiving our assistance, as they are to the present one. The alliance for progress for example, is quite literally a project to finance social evolution by peaceful change before it blows up in violent form.

Thus our aid is directed toward democratic programs of land reform, toward progressive taxation, toward better health and housing for the population as a whole—in short toward social evolution. It also is increasingly concerned with helping to build the kind of public institutions which draw their strength, as ours do, from the consent of the governed.

And the operating programs of the United Nations, which we helped fashion and loyally support, are also devoted to the promotion of peaceful change from the static societies of the past to the dynamic societies which the developing nations are all trying, in their own ways, to build. Economic and social change is a complex and mysterious process. We still know very little about the intricate relationship of the financial, trade, technical, educational, political, cultural, and psychological ingredients that must all be folded into a mixture called modernization. But our aim is clear. It is to help build flexible institutions, public and private, which can manage the present wave of change, and create and absorb the next wave and the wave after that, too.

III

When we move from the internal development of new nations to the external rivalries among the older nations, the obstacles to peaceful change are even more obvious. Yet here, too, the only rational choice for an American Government is to encourage change, while working hard to make it peaceful.

Given the technology of nuclear terror, the first requisite of orderly change is to prevent our Soviet rivals from getting ahead, or thinking they can ever get ahead, in the hidden and costly game of nuclear deterrence.

Below the level of nuclear rivalry, the presence of limited local forces is sometimes the essential guarantee of orderly transition. In the Dominican Republic we have assisted in the process of peaceful change from dictatorship to the beginnings of democracy. In South Vietnam we are aiding social reform in the countryside while strengthening resistance to invading guerrilla bands. In Laos we are helping to trade civil war for national unity, and thus turn an arena of big-power rivalry into a neutral nation. In the Middle East, we support an extraordinary range of peacekeeping instruments of the U.N.—a Palestine refugee program, a truce supervision network, and an Emergency Force of 5,100 men in the Gaza strip and along the Israeli-Egyptian frontier. And in the Congo, we helped put the U.N. in to avoid our having to enter central Africa with our own power to counter an active Soviet threat there.

Beneath the radioactivity canopy of mutual deterrence, we need much more machinery for peaceful change among nations.

That is why we are working hard to try to bring about a peaceful transition of the remaining colonial areas to independence—working for change rapid enough to satisfy reasonable aspirations but not so pelimell as to lead to the kind of breakdown that led to the UN rescue operation in the Congo.

That is why we have laid before the U.N.'s new Disarmament Committee, now scheduled to meet in March, a comprehensive plan for disarmament under international control, with a major emphasis on building up international peace-keeping capacity while dismantling national warmaking capacity.

That is why we will lay befor the U.N.'s Outer Space Committee, also scheduled to meet in March, proposals to promote the peaceful and cooperative use of communications and weather-watching satellites.

And that is why we have so insistently urged the use of the machinery of the United Nations—mediators, conciliators, rapporteurs, and U.N. "presences" ranging from 1 unarmed man part-time in Togo to 16,000 armed men full time in the Congo—as alternatives to violence in which we could not escape involvement.

Success From Necessity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Select Committee on Small Business I have been concerned over the past few years on the effect of the chain grocery stores on the independent merchant who has been a strong factor in the economy of most midwestern communities. There is no doubt that the chainstore has introduced new merchandising methods and the independent retailer found that he must make many changes in his method of operation in order to remain competitive. It has been established in Kansas that independent retailers can join together to gain the advantage of large scale buying and have been successful in expanding their business. In some instances so competitive that the chain-store could not successfully compete.

Mr. Ned N. Fleming, Topeka, Kans., president of the Fleming Co., Inc., points out how progressive independents, through ingenuity, faith, and hard work, not only have held their own in the keenly competitive retail food field, but also have improved their position position considerably. He points out that the retailer-wholesaler voluntary and cooperative organizations increased their share of the food business from 29 percent in 1947 to 48 percent in 1960.

A strong champion of free enterprise, Mr. Fleming declares that the food industry's "keen competition led to achievements as no degree of Government controls could have done," and that the food distribution industry has made greater progress in reduction of distribution costs than any other consumer goods industry.

It is my hope that every Member of Congress will carefully read and consider the facts so ably presented by Mr. Fleming. Not only is he a leader in the food industry, but also he gives generously of his time and leadership talent to many education, philanthropic, and civic endeavors in Kansas and the midwestern area. The article follows:

SUCCESS FROM NECESSITY

(By Ned N. Fleming)

In the 1920's the rapid growth in both size and market share of the chainstores, coupled with the advent of the supermarket phenomenon, made it certain that the trend toward this kind of food distribution was a permanent part of our retailing scene.

To some, it also seemed certain that the independent food wholesaler and retailer were doomed. Today the independent food wholesaler and retailer not only have survived this prediction but have retained approximately the same share of the total food dollar they possessed 35 years ago.

The problem presented to the independent segment of the food distribution industry by this bleak outlook demanded imagination, enthusiastic aggressiveness, and ever-increasing efficiency for its successful solution. Meeting the challenge saved part of an industry and the keen competition led to achievements as no degree of government controls could have done. During these years, the incentive provided by our free enterprise system allowed the food distribution industry to make greater progress in the reduction of its distribution costs than has any other consumer goods industry in our country.

A brief review of the circumstances that existed in the late 1920's and of the development history since then provides an interesting background for a look at the position of the independent food distributor, and particularly of the voluntary group system of food distribution, as it is today.

Then, the increasing intensity of chain-store competition carried with it inherent price and selection advantages for the consumer. This great competitive edge made the ingenuity, faith, and aggressiveness of the independent businessman go to work. The independent retailers, each of whom owned his own store, and the independent wholesalers realized that efficient distribution systems had to be formed and that this could only be accomplished by the formation of close-working groups among the wholesalers and the retailers.

CHAIN TECHNIQUES COPIED

It is only proper to add that the independent food distribution system met the challenge by adopting chain policies for procurement, merchandising methods, advertising services, warehousing, store engineering, accounting methods and other managerial services. By doing this, the independent groups began gaining the operating efficiencies that were once regarded as unique with the corporate chain.

At the beginning of the period of change, the entire independent food distribution system was haphazard, expensively operated, and organized according to personal whims rather than efficient plans.

The old wholesale grocer was a buyer and warehouser. His trademark of success was a warehouse bulging with merchandise shrewdly bought at bargain prices. He sent out crews of "hard sell" salesmen to sell the goods to retail grocers at a good markup—at as high a markup as the traffic would bear. When the goods were sold, delivered, and collected for, his interest in the transaction was at an end.

There was no such thing as ordering scheduling in the independent field. In many areas, the retailer could phone in an order at 2 p.m. in the afternoon and if his store wasn't to far away, he could insist that the order be delivered that same afternoon—and the wholesaler did it. And this could be done every day of the week. The retailer spent expensive hours buying and the wholesaler spent expensive hours selling him.

Thirty-five years ago, the records maintained were poor at best. Figures were seldom available for the stores. There were no real operating records or informative, accurate balance sheets. There was nothing on which to build a background of financial progress and solidarity.

The retailers as well as the wholesalers had mediocre or poor locations and, in most cases, poor facilities. The chainstores even then were actively seeking and developing locations without being impeded by competition from any independent retailer. In

fact, the independent soon acquired an inferiority complex that lasted for many years and that made the eventual upsurge even more remarkable.

CREDIT AND INVENTORY PROBLEMS

It was the common practice of all independent wholesalers to extend credit, and though the terms of this credit were usually 2 percent 10 days, net 30 days, in many agricultural areas it turned out that the financing operation was on a crop-to-crop basis since the retailer had to finance much of his customer's business with him. This financing of the receivables of the retailer, and often the financing of the retailer himself, was one of the excessive costs that the corporate chains did not have because they were doing business on a chain basis.

The same story was true regarding inventory turnover. When accounts receivable were carried from a crop-to-crop year, excessive inventory resulted in a turnover of only six to eight times per year. This condition was due primarily to two things. First, wholesalers indulged in inventory speculation which caused excessive inventories. Some of this was due to the fact that harvesting did not follow the sun as it does today. Wholesalers were tempted to speculate on last year's pack prior to the arrival of the new crop. Secondly, we were then in the private label business, including the labels and trademarks all owned by the wholesaler which covered a multitude of food items. In order to assure a constant supply of such foods under these private labels, it was often necessary to do considerable forward buying either between old and new packs or in the event of reduced new packs. These extensive private label lines were an effort on the part of the wholesalers to get away from price comparison with corporate chains who in those days were largely featuring national brands.

THE BEGINNINGS OF TEAMWORK

Gradually, actions were taken to solve the problems—through teamwork born of necessity and developed by desire, faith, and competitive urge. As this partnership of effort was developed through teamwork, the high combined operating costs of the independent food distributor were reduced so that today in many instances the independent retailer and wholesaler will have combined operating percentage costs that are as low or lower than the biggest chain competition.

Perhaps the first step toward wholesaler-retailer cooperation was found in the development of a program of scheduled ordering by the retailer from the wholesaler. This resulted in obvious reduction in the cost of warehouse operation.

The only way of solving the problem of credit was to convert the business of the wholesaler to a cash basis. When this decision was made, the method finally adopted was to have the retailer send a signed check made out to the wholesaler with the amount left blank. This check was sent in with each order. When the order was filled, then the amount was also completed. It was a difficult job to sell—but again, the necessity of cost reduction through this kind of teamwork was evident.

HOW TURNOVER WAS INCREASED

Of course, it was impossible to convert the business overnight to an incomplete check with an order because the retailers who also had receivables from their customers simply couldn't pick those up at one time and, therefore, couldn't put themselves on a cash basis overnight. This problem was finally solved by the wholesaler asking the retailer to close his account with a demand note payable over a period of time. The retailers were encouraged to do the same thing with their customers. These accounts receivables were liquidated quite rapidly. In 1930, it was not uncommon in a well-run company with good credit policies to achieve an annual receivables turnover rate of only nine times, or an accounts receivable outstanding equal to over 40 days of business. At the present time, an accounts receivable turnover figure of 120 times per year is frequently reached.

Today, through careful matching of buying at the wholesale level to sales at the retail level, including the cessation of speculative buying, the inventory of many wholesalers will turnover from 20 to 22 times a year—instead of from 6 to 8 times, the measure of this activity years ago.

Of course, this increase in turnover was born of necessity too. As prices were reduced at the retail level to enable the stores to be competitive with their chain counterparts, the gross profit and net profit of the wholesaler were likewise reduced. When the net profit of the wholesaler dropped from 2½ to 3 percent on sales down to less than 1 percent, it was difficult to convince bankers that even with the lower percentage return the increased turnover produced a much better return on total investment.

Both of these factors led to a much more rapid turnover of the capital employed in a business. From a net worth turnover of around 3 times in the 1920's and early 1930's, this has increased to better than 20 times in recent years.

The wholesaler, himself, has changed markedly. He now must be an aggressive, tough-minded operator. He must be an imaginative, resourceful merchandiser. He must be an experienced technician, a sound planner, and an effective organizer. Above all, his actions must be always retail-oriented.

THE WHOLESALER'S NEW BURDEN

As the wholesaler-retailer teamwork developed, it soon became apparent that, in addition to meeting chainstore competition through improved methods of the physical act of distributing merchandise through the wholesaler to the retailer and thence to the customer, this new wholesaler had to assume new responsibility in other areas. As the working together or division of labor concept was developed, it became obvious that the wholesaler should:

1. Supply affiliated retail members with complete inventory needs, not just dry groceries, but of equal or more importance, the meats, the produce, the frozen foods, the baked goods, the health and beauty aids, and other nonfood items, and all other inventory requirements to the fullest extent. And all of this to be done on dependable delivery schedules with minimum out-of-stock ratios as low or lower than the independent retailers competition.

2. Provide a weekly retail price survey of major retail competition. This could be done more economically by the wholesaler than by a single retailer.

3. Hold store personnel training seminars. Again, this could be done more effectively for a group than for one or a few stores. Working together includes learning together.

4. Post retailers currently on new developments in food retailing anywhere in the country.

5. Perform a retail accounting service to provide retailers with the essential operating information at the lowest possible cost and at the same time give the wholesaler a tool for following through in order to render the retailer maximum assistance with any operational problem in any department of the retail store.

6. Establish a store development department to handle all of the details of any store remodeling or enlarging, and the development and establishment of new facilities. Many wholesalers now have a complete department composed of people who devote all of their time and thought to this important service. This includes a complete engineering department for the design, layout, construction supervision, equipment purchasing, and drafting of plans for either remodelings or new stores. This department also includes location research teams whose job is to study the feasibility of a new location in terms of potential sales.

7. Develop means of financing the expansion of qualified independent retailers. This includes the financing of fixtures and, often, the guaranteeing of leases on locations not otherwise attainable to the retailer on an individual basis.

8. Provide store operation counsel by experienced sales-service personnel with excellent backgrounds in retail operations.

9. Perform group advertising and merchandising functions which can create for a group of retailers a program for more powerful consumer impact and at less expense per store. This combined advertising power is used by many groups to dominate their area.

10. Keep retailers posted on improved labor methods and equipment.

11. Build a reputation with the investment world so that necessary funds in the form of loans, capital, or credit are available for future growth and expansion for the retail member and for any expansion needed at the wholesale level in order to properly serve this growth.

Underlying this division of labor concept is the all-powerful principle of attitude of the wholesaler and the retailer which activates the program into the success it has become.

The wholesalers' attitude must be to think and to work for the growth and success of the retailers, for only as they grow can he grow. This must be done within the bounds of a carefully planned and scheduled program which produces low cost distribution so the retailers can be competitive.

The attitude of the rtailer is that he works wholeheartedly with such wholesaler within this well-defined program of concentration of effort so that basically the same kind of system possessed by his chain competition can be achieved.

A look at the present status of the voluntary group food distribution system will indicate some of the progress made.

As reported by Progressive Grocer, in March 1961, independent stores in 1960 did 61 percent of the total food business while chain stores did 39 percent of the total food business. This does not represent much change from the comparative position 30 years ago.

Comparing 1960 against 1959, all food wholesalers showed a gain of 7.2 percent. Wholesalers sponsoring voluntary groups, however, increased sales 12.7 percent while unaffiliated wholesalers showed a decrease in sales of 4.5 percent.

Comparing 1960 against 1955, voluntary group wholesalers enjoyed an 83 percent gain while cooperative wholesalers gained 78 percent. Unaffiliated wholesalers showed no gain at all. It is interesting to note that in the preceding 5 years sales of all retail food stores increased 34 percent while sales of general line wholesale grocers went up 49 percent.

A drastic change is noted when the figures for 1960 are compared with those of 1947. In 1947, chainstores accounted for 37 percent of the total business and in 1960 they had achieved only a 2-percent increase in their total share. However, wholesalers affiliated either with groups of retailers formed on a voluntary group basis or as a part of a cooperative movement did only 29 percent of the total business in 1947 but enjoyed a sharp increase in the years between, and by 1960 accounted for 48 percent of the total retail food business. Business of unaffiliated wholesalers dropped from 34 percent of the total business in 1947 to only 13 percent by 1960.

THE FRUITS OF PARTNERSHIP

The affiliated independent retailer working with his aggressive successful wholesale

partner has achieved a competitive balance with the chainstores in terms of warehousing facilities, cost of merchandise, modern stores, manufacturers' support and professional store planning.

The partnership is still, perhaps, fighting the low price image of the chains. Also, it is only through resourcefulness and increasingly better public relations that the affiliated groups are able to approach the advantages that the financial resources give to the chain. The edge in merchandising research and stronger advertising programs is also in the chain groups.

THE PRICELESS INCENTIVES

However, the affiliated independent store has some clear advantages over his chain competitor. First, he has the advantage of owner-manager incentives. He can carry a wider variety of items without restriction and his position permits him to establish closer customer relations. He has flexibility of promotions and, within the limits of competition, freedom in retail pricing. He has better opportunity to build sales in existing stores and is in an enviable position in being able to adapt his store and his personality to his community.

Another advantage that this division of ownership and responsibility gives to the wholesaler-retailer team is that both sides enjoy the flexibility of a high ratio of current assets as compared with the chainstore. For example, some wholesale concerns find their current assets to be 75 to 80 or even 82 percent of total assets and these are assets of the most current type—cash, accounts receivable on a fast turnover basis, and an inventory of food products. Roughly speaking, the wholesaler provides approximately one-third of the total capital necessary for the complete activities of both members of the team while the retailers provide about two-thirds of the total. This gives them both a flexibility that the chainstore does not have.

The voluntary group system of food distribution is, in summary, a partnership of function that has created for the food wholesaler and the independent retailer a vehicle capable of spectacular growth because it combines the strengths of group action spurred by the best of all incentives—individual pride, profit, and ownership.

As Farley Sees It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. WALTER, has called to my attention an editorial that appeared in the York (Pa.) Dispatch on Wednesday, March 7, 1962, on our great friend, the Honorable James A. Farley, who served with distinction as Postmaster General and national chairman of the Demorcatic Party during President Franklin Roosevelt's first two terms. On behalf of Mr. WALTER, I include as part of my remarks today the indicated editorial from the York Dispatch. Editorial follows:

AS FARLEY SEES IT

Historians, in reviewing the 20th century, will probably record James A. Farley first as a man of principle, secondly as a Democrat.

The amiable Farley led Franklin D. Roosevelt and his New Deal into the White House as Democratic national chairman.

But Farley, with almost a sure political thing in his pocket, broke with Roosevelt over a third term and retired from the New Deal.

It is interesting to note what a respected man of principle has to say about issues of the day. Here are some comments from his speeches.

On crises: "There are prophets of doom among us who dolefully report that these are times of greatest challenge * * *.

"I cannot bring myself to believe that this generation faces greater challenge than the Continental Army at Valley Forge—freezing in the snow—and with three major cities—Boston, New York, and Philadelphia—in the hands of an invading army * * *."

On democracy: "There has been much confusion in recent years about the meaning of American democracy. The American democracy, it seems to me, was designed as an equilibrium, not an equality. By this, I mean a society of open and free chance for all, by which each can rise according to his talents and his diligence."

On Cuba: "For nearly a century and a half this hemisphere has been kept inviolate of foreign intrusion. * * * What crevice in our armor does Mr. Khrushchev believe he has perceived that makes him think he can penetrate the Western Hemisphere now? The answer, it seems to me, is crystal clear. He relies not on his strength but on our folly; not on his striking force, but on our befunddled breastbeaters, those who apologize for the American civilization—instead of upholding it."

On Communist imperialism: "Let us not pay tribute to the enemy's zeal; that is only half the story of his success. The other half we have contributed through our folly, our childlike ineptitude, and our outright appeasement."

Finally, in the fiery spirit of our forebears, Farley quotes his mother as instructing her family:

"Americans kneel—but only to God."

Oklahoma's Industrial Targets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Oklahoma City Times newspaper on Tuesday, March 6, 1962, concerning Oklahoma's industrial targets:

INDUSTRIAL TARGETS

The best bets for Oklahoma's industrial future seldom have been pinpointed as they were in a recent newsletter by Senator MIKE MONRONEY.

Obviously Oklahoma would welcome any and all industry. But MONRONEY makes this interesting observation about the likliest eventualities:

"Whether I am attending hearings on water projects in Washington or speaking at celebrations in Oklahoma welcoming new industry to the State, one fact stands out this year. Oklahoma's place in the sun is definitely assured in this age of aviation and space, electronics, and petrochemicals."

MONRONEY cites the decision of North American Aviation to rent space at the Douglas Aircraft plant in Tulsa for its Appollo spacecraft project as an example of the trend for Oklahoma in that field.

Incidentally, Senator ROBERT S. KERR recently disclosed that another great industrial corporation besides North American is going to locate a plant in Oklahoma to produce for aerospace and aviation.

The Western Electric plant here is a major example of the possibilities in electronics.

The mention of petrochemicals may surprise some Oklahomans, who tend to think that industry is restricted to such regions as the Texas gulf coast. But experts in the field say southeastern Oklahoma has in abundance the major ingredients for such an industry. Water and coal are two great assets at this point, plus evidence of sufficient reservoirs of natural gas, another raw material necessary for petrochemical manufacturing.

If these particular industries cited by MONRONEY indeed are our best bets, then it stands to reason they should be among our major targets in industrial procurement efforts. MONRONEY comments, "We were late in joining the march of industrial States, but we are arriving strong from this late start."

If we can realize our potentialities in these fields, Oklahoma may be better off in the long run for having bypassed the era of the older types of industry for a move directly into the "growth" industries so much more desirable nowadays.

Women Can Be Astronauts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, I have been very much interested in recent discussions concerning the training of additional astronauts to take on the new and challenging missions which America will undertake in the coming exploration of outer space.

Today the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Hon. James E. Webb, addressed the Women's National Democratic Club. It was significant that Mr. Webb was introduced by Mrs. Philip Hart, the wife of the junior Senator from Michigan, because Mrs. Hart is one of the 12 women in the Nation who passed the same rigorous tests completed by Colonel Glenn and the other Mercury astronauts.

I believe that we should give serious consideration to the inclusion of women among our future astronauts. The arguments have been well stated by Miss Jerrie Cobb, one of the executives of Aero Commander, Inc., in an address last month to the First International Women's Space Symposium in Los Angeles.

The address follows:

SPACE FOR WOMEN?

In this new and exciting space age in which we are now living there is space for women, a place in space for young people like yourselves who will prepare themselves for this greatest of all challenges.

But it is not an easy job, and one must be thoroughly educated, trained, and prepared for this scientifically exacting work. The greatest need will be for scientists, engineers,

mathematicians, doctors, and technicians, and women will work beside men as partners, with mutual respect.

President John F. Kennedy has said: "In our many endeavors for a lasting peace, America's space program has a new and critical importance. The skills and imagination of our young men and women are not only welcome but urgently sought in this vital area. I know they will meet this challenge to them and to the Nation with vigor and resourcefulness."

The space age is here, and the speed at which advances are being made are fantastic. Man remained earthbound for millions of years before he first ventured into space, in primitive balloons, only about 200 years ago.

The Wright brothers made their historic arc into space just 58 years ago. For the first time in history they flew a heavier-than-air machine, only 165 yards on the first try, but they proved the principles which now make it possible for jetliners to span this continent in just 4 hours—jet fighters to fly at more than twice the speed of sound—and the X-15 to fly over 4,000 mph.

Now, less than 3 score years since Orville and Wilbur proved the aerodynamics of flying through this earth's atmosphere, indeed, we are able to leave this atmosphere, and within this decade we will actually land on the moon.

This is a wonderful age we're living in, one we should all be proud to be part of, and to contribute to with the best of our God-given abilities.

Space exploration is the most worthwhile, enduring and rewarding research this country has ever undertaken. As in any great challenge—and there has never been a greater one—it will require the support and help of all of us, and the true pioneers will be you young people who devote yourselves now to serious preparation for space careers. There is a place in space research for each one of you, you need only be prepared.

Having been a professional pilot for many years I felt that I could best contribute to space research in the areas of astronaut testing and training. To prove that women have the capabilities of actively participating in space flight I had the privilege of undergoing three phases of astronaut testing.

The results were affirmative, and a research program was initiated to acquire medical baseline data on a group of qualified women candidates.

During the past 18 months 25 highly experienced women pilots have taken the astronaut physical examination at the Lovelace Foundation in Albuquerque, N. Mex. Out of this group, 12 have passed the same physical, laboratory, X-ray, and physical competence tests given the Mercury astronauts. The results have proven the fact that women are physically and emotionally capable of withstanding the stresses of space flight.

The astronaut examintaion at the Lovelace Foundation consisted of a series of 87 different tests, covering everything from having to swallow 3 feet of rubber hose for a stomach test to having 18 needles stuck into your head to record brainwaves. Other tests required that one drink a pint of radioactive water, 12 ounces of chalklike barium, and 3 ounces of castor oil, not at the same time, I might add.

The participants in this research testing were from a very select group of women pilots meeting the requiremetns of active professional pilot with over 1,000 hours, commercial and instrument licenses, not over 38 years old, average height and weight—and of utmost importance, top physical condition.

I have a few slides taken by Life magazine which will show you some of the tests:

Audiograms, pulmonary functions, lung capacity, total body counter, vertigo, physical competence, neurological, pressure chamber, airborne stress EEG, multiple axis rotation, sensory deprivation.

The last two pictures showed the sensory isolation experiment which is another phase of the astronaut tests which I was priviledged to take. After 2 days of complete psychological and psychiatric testing, including brain wave tests while asleep as well as awake, the subject is submerged in an 8 foot deep tank of warm water. The tank, which they laughingly refer to as the "dog dip") is located in a small airtight room with 8 inch steel walls which makes it soundproof, lightproof, odorproof, humidity-proof and vibration proof.

While undergoing this experiment all of the 5 basic senses are removed as nearly as possible, since there is nothing to see, hear, touch, taste, or smell. Being submerged in water simulates a weightless condition and the water temperature is perfectly controlled to your body temperature, so that you can't even feel the water. It is as much like being totally deaf, blind, and with no sense of touch, taste, or smell as is possible to simulate.

Under the conditions of sensory deprivation the normal reaction is for the subconscious mind to take over and one lapses into uncontrollable hallucinations. An astronaut is going to be pretty much alone in the weightlessness of space with little or no stimulation to keep his senses alert. The ability to remain in touch with reality without lapsing into hallucinations is all important.

I spent 9 hours and 40 minutes in the tank and did not hallucinate, I'm happy to report, but I did sneak a couple of naps.

Doctors and scientists have suggested for several years that women might prove ideally suited for space flight—size and weight are of major importance—and the fact that a woman would require less weight, less food, and less oxygen would make it possible to put a woman in space with less booster thrust, or stay up longer or go up higher, all at a considerable cost reduction even today when it still costs many thousands of dollars to put 1 pound in orbit.

Psychiatrists proved long ago that women were emotionally more stable, required less stimulation, and could endure inactivity, boredom, and isolation better. This becomes increasingly important on farther and deeper space voyages where an astronaut will be subjected to weeks or months of confined isolation.

Other advantages which nature has given to women include less susceptible to radiation, can withstand heat, pain, noise, and vibration better, are less prone to cardiovascular diseases—heart attacks—particularly in the 26–40 age bracket.

Now all this is not to say that women are any better qualified for space. Men certainly have their advantages too, such as in physical strength. I believe that men and women can, and will, work together in space. There should be no competition, for each is uniquely suited in his or her own way for certain space assignments.

Did you look up and see the moon and stars last night? That moon is going to have some visitors in just a few short years and we're all going to be mighty proud we helped 'em get there and back.

Some people say why go to all the trouble and expense of exploring outer space, we're pretty happy with our own little earth right here; and if you want to explore, well, there're still things to be discovered here.

True, that is, but our own little earth is just that, a tiny planet among millions of others. Of the nine planets that orbit our sun we are only fifth in size, and yet, our sun, which is over 100 times bigger than the earth, is only one of the smallest stars in the milky way.

Remember how the milky way looks on a summer night, with millions of stars up there twinkling? It's actually over 200 billion. Our earth isn't even big enough to be the smallest star and scientists tell us there are uncountable other milky ways with billions of more stars which we can't even see.

Compared to the universe, our earth—or for that matter, our entire solar system—is but a speck of infinity, a tiny grain of sand in a vast ocean. But, yet we are a part of the whole. There is a purpose in our creation, and that purpose we will fulfill.

The main goal of our country's space efforts is not adventuresome trips to faraway stars, but a unified effort to discover more about our own planet, to help us live better right here on this earth.

The benefits to be derived from space exploration are as unlimited as space itself. Already there are over 3,000 space-age discoveries now being used in medical, manufacturing, electronic and engineering fields.

By going to the moon and exploring our solar system we will find answers to the age-old questions of: How was our planet created? Why does it survive? Is there life on other planets? What causes and affects our weather?

This one thing we know, there is order in the universe. That one Creator who has made all has endowed all of creation with a purpose. The immenseness of the universe is incomprehensible to us earthlings. Yet we had to go to the stars to prove one of our highest forms of mathematics. Astronomy not only proves the laws of math but affirms the orderly and meaningful creation of the universe. Einstein's theory of relativity reaffirms it.

Socrates gave us that hardest of maxims, know thyself. With the knowledge the Lord is giving us should we not go forward to learn more about, and to really know our earth—and our place and purpose in the universe?

What greater challenge or better reason to prepare yourself for science careers?

The Soviet Union already outnumbers the United States in trained space-age engineers and scientists, and a large percent of them are women. There is no doubt about Russia's plans to use women as cosmonauts too. The Bochum Observatory in Germany has already monitored female voices on the specific frequencies behind the Iron Curtain which the Soviet Union uses to train cosmonauts.

Just a couple of months ago I spoke with Russia's leading space medicine expert, Professor Yzadosky, who told me quite frankly that his country was training female cosmonauts. Earlier this month Soviet spaceman Yuri Gagarin, speaking in Cairo, Egypt, said the time is near when "we would witness representatives of the fair sex in space."

For several years Russian scientists have stated that they would use Mongolian women in space, these are a small, hardy race used to living at high altitudes in the Mongolian mountains with less oxygen.

There is much truth in the statement that "the ideal astronaut would be a midget woman pilot from the Andes mountains with a Ph. D." There was even a poem written about it entitled the "Ballad of the Lonely Space Scientists" which goes:

"Awake all night, I twist and fidget
I long so for a female midget
I'd buy fine minks and expensive candies
For any small lady who's lived in the Andes
(With the provision, of course, that she
could prove she had her Ph. D.)
Years of research may come to naught
For want of this female astronaut
So should you see her any place
Send her to me, and I'll have space."

Besides the many scientifically valid reasons for using women in space flight there is a prestige factor which cannot be overlooked. Whether you believe in space or

not, we are in a space race and Russia has captured every gold medal so far.

They opened the space age October 4, 1957, by firing the first "sputnik" into orbit. Our reaction was mostly one of surprise and disbelief, not that the Soviet Union had accomplished this scientific feat, but that we as a nation of free people, had been bested at the very threshold of the greatest exploration ever undertaken by mankind. The Soviet Union continued to triumph by landing their hammer and sickle on the moon, then photographing the back side of the moon both in 1960.

Determined to impress the world with the scientific accomplishments of communism, the Soviet Union then put the first man in space last year and followed that within a few months with a 25-hour manned space flight, a feat that we couldn't duplicate for another year or more.

And they will not hesitate to capture the next important first of putting a woman in space, but we need not let the peoples of the world read banner headlines saying: "Russians Put First Woman in Space," with a subhead of "Communists Again Prove Superiority in Space."

The United States has the capability and the women to accomplish this scientific first now.

This is just the beginning of the space age, an age we should all be proud to be living in. The race for space will not be a short one nor an easy one, but it is one in which we must all participate.

Let us go forward, then. There is space for women.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of March 17, 1962:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, March 17, 1962)

The Public Welfare Amendments of 1962, brought before the House increased Federal aid for the needy, including the blind, disabled, aged, dependent children, and unmarried mothers. These are matching Federal-State programs. The rule accompanying the bill provided for a closed rule (no amendments) and 4 hours' debate. The proposed changes in the present law included (1) increase the 50–50 matching formula to 75 percent Federal—25 percent State for the aged, blind, and disabled, (2) make permanent the aid to dependent children of unemployed parents, (3) establish community work and training programs, (4) foster care and day care aid for children, (5) increase the number and training of local welfare workers at 100 percent Federal expense, (6) increase the Federal share $25 of first $29 to $29 of first $35 ($140 million cost).

The acclaimed purpose of stressing preventative and rehabilitative measures in welfare help lost out to the same old Federal practice of burying the problem in more Federal money, thereby assuming the job done.

My specific objections were and are these: (1) Further loading down a fiscally imbalanced social security program with additional deficits is foolhardy, jeopardizing the present program, (2) increasing the Federal share to 75 percent accomplishes nothing for the needy, except further deficits and Federal control at State's expense (witness 90 percent Federal share in highways and resulting scandals), (3) Federal Government not only has no "Federal" money but is terribly in debt and must look to the people; so localities taxwise still foot the bill, (4) conformity of State programs (by Federal mandate) is not necessary; indeed diversity and experimentations are tried, tested, and good, even as localities and their needs differ, (5) fiscally there is real danger since the twin accelerations entice us to ruin, first, the "do good" endeavors of politically expedient politicans and pressure groups and, second, the lack of any limit on the Federal Government's powers to spend, borrow and tax, (6) misuse and abuse of these programs are not corrected by expanding the outlay, (7) there is no individual right to public assistance from the Federal Government, (8) church agencies cannot constitutionally take Federal-State money, nor can this violation of the separation of church and state result in any end but absorption and control of the church by Government, (9) Federal training of welfare workers with 100 percent Federal funds will result in total brainwash of workers who will think only of Government services and not private charities.

Both our Judeo-Christian heritage (charity is personal, spiritually motivated and voluntary—not government unit, politically motivated, and compulsory by forced taxation with imprisonment and fines for failure to comply), and our constitutional Republic within a democracy, a form of limited government of checks and balances in a society of free people contradict the present concept and course of Federal-State public assistance, as I see it. This legislation will come back to haunt us if the people and their representatives in government continue to fail to face up to it. The bill passed handily, 319 to 69. The Republicans joined in endeavoring to eliminate the $140 million increase (see proposal change No. 6 above) claiming this was added beyond the budget, with no assurance the money would be passed on by the States to the individuals.

The Revenue Act of 1962, another major bill from the President, handled by Ways and Means Committee, is ready for House debate. The bill would (1) grant an 8-percent investment credit to whatever the Federal Government defines as depreciable, tangible personal property, new and used, (2) withhold 20 percent of all dividends and interest at the source except for those under 18 and those not subject to income tax, (3) increase taxation of American industry abroad, (4) permit as deductions only those business expenses directly related to business, and documented imediately, (5) tax co-ops at either the cooperative or patron level (a single tax, not double as corporate tax), (6) a new tax formula for savings and loan institutions which provides for taxing all earnings, after setting aside a reserve for losses equal either to 3 percent of the net increase in loans, or 60 percent of net income, (7) mutual fire and casualty insurance companies would get a deduction for a loss reserve account equal to 25 percent of underwriting gain, plus 1 percent of incurred losses in an exempt set-aside reserve account and underwriting loss deductible from investment income and special reserve account. At the end of 5 years all but one-half is taken back into income if it has not been used up by losses, (8) business expenses incurred in petitioning government deductible as a business expenses. Republican objection will be primarily against the first three: (1) 108-percent total depreciation makes an 8-percent tax gift and should be replaced by liberalized depreciation, a quicker recovery of cost of depreciable equipment, (2) withholding should not be inaugurated since many will be taxed who do not pay taxes and endless paperwork and detail will result in yearly filing of exemption certificates, enforcement and reporting will be difficult, (3) foreign investment already is taxed abroad by the foreign nations that are developed countries, and where taxes are low in less developed nations it is in the U.S. interest to encourage such profit and expansion, to be taxed further only when brought back to the United States. Basic conflict is obvious with the President's new trade bill seeking to expand, not restrict, U.S. business abroad. The floor fight will be intensified by the "closed rule," not permitting amendments to the bill. The Republicans will endeavor to strike the three provisions of the bill I have mentioned. How inconsistent the administration is may be seen by the "budget busting" spending, followed by this so-called revenue producing measure which loses $500 million or more, while giving certain industries windfalls as investment credits.

The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 is fantastic, a real shocker. The President asks Congress to transfer (for the first time) to him the legislative power over trade and tariffs—so much so that at his discretion (1) 50 percent of the tariffs may be cut on the import of foreign goods on those commodities which the United States, together with the EEC (European Economic Community) total 80 percent of the world export value, (2) remove any tariff that is less than 5 percent, (3) permit the President to subsidize those industries that his tariff reductions hurt by loans, guarantees, free counseling services, etc., and subsidize individual workers laid off by 65 percent of their pay for 78 weeks, plus retraining plus a lump sum of $230, plus moving and relocation expenses. The enacting clause of the bill reads "To promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States through international trade agreements and through adjustment assistance to domestic industry, agriculture and labor, and for other purposes." Here we see the economics of trade are not really considered—only social welfare, the State Department's policies, and national defense, in that order. Estimable as these considerations are, it is obvious we are improperly approaching what basically is an economic matter. Already after but 1 week's hearings of the Secretaries of Commerce, State, Labor, Defense, Interior, Treasury, and Agriculture it is apparent that we are far off course.

These objections have arisen (1) an unconstitutional transfer of power, (2) the Reciprocal Trade Act of 27 years was not reciprocal. The same enforcement problems will face this new bill—so it is not a new bill that is necessary but enforcement of the old bill, (3) GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) under whose international instrumentality our tariffs are reduced or removed has never been authorized by Congress, (4) not freer trade, but erection of other trade barriers than tariff, such as cartels, quotas, licenses, etc. are embodied in this bill, (5) this avowed effort to free-up trade is contradicted by the President's tax proposal to restrict our industry abroad, (6) results in price control, (7) labor has monopolistic position in demanding wage increases which will nullify this bill, (8) economic and diplomatic teaming up with the ECC is actually the intended forerunner of political union—subordinating U.S. sovereignty to a Federation of Western Europe—United States, similar to the Atlantic Union sought by many liberals, (9) the offer of Federal subsidy (a) to industry weakens industry's incentive to productivity, price reduction, and competition, (b) to individuals weakens human beings' initiative and incentive to work and retrain (10) Government contracting for private management con-

sultant agencies to advise specific industries with findings secret from Government is unworkable (of course unconstitutional), (11) no one knows how much of our export market is the result of money we give away so others can buy from us.

Presidential messages are coming thick and fast. (1) Foreign aid: once again the people of this Nation are asked to give away $4,878 million (equal 4.878 billion or $4.878 per minute since Christ was born). How utterly incomprehensible it is—to give away money we are borrowing to damage our currency value abroad, inflate our money at home, and further create the imbalance of payments which is causing a disastrous drain of our gold holdings which undergird our entire economy. The world now holds more of our money redeemable in gold than we have gold and here we give away $4,878 billion, to be added to that imbalance which can be claimed in gold. If the world makes a "run on the bank," that's us, we would economically collapse. This would mean the end of freedom for the world. Why must we continue to follow such madcap fiscal policies? We can, we must put our fiscal affairs in order. (2) Protecting the consumer interest. A catch-all roundup which included food and drug controls and labelling, meat inspection tightening up, patent and trademark rights, and a White House Consumer's Advisory Council, all sound geared to reinforce the old political posture of being "for the people." No where mentioned is the real need—fiscal responsibility, which would (a) prevent inflation, preserve the value of savings for everyone, including our retired people, (b) reduce the debt to relieve ourselves of yearly interest and our children from paying bills we have charged, (c) reduce the tax burden.

Minnesota Holstein Breeders Views on Dairy Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Minnesota dairy producers, among the most successful in the Nation, have definite and construction views on what should be done in the field of dairy legislation. The Minnesota Holstein Breeders Association, at its annual meeting at Litchfield, Minn., March 3, expressed its support for the removal of milk barriers and its opposition to quotas on production. I request that these two resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT MINNESOTA HOLSTEIN BREEDERS CONVENTION, LITCHFIELD, MINN., MARCH 2, 1962

Whereas milk production has increased in the United States during the past year, and

Whereas consumption has decreased a significant amount, resulting in more available supply than the market will absorb at present support prices; and

Whereas this condition has been brought about partly at least through increased price supports stimulating both production and lowering consumption; and

Whereas a Federal program has been suggested in which, if enacted into law, dairymen have only one of two choices, either support prices well above market prices together with a rigid control program in which each producer will be limited to a quota of production somewhere below present levels or to have virtually no support prices, but freedom to produce all he wants; and

Whereas the first of these alternatives will only help to further discourage consumption and add to the present problem; and

Whereas it will further restrict the efficient producers from becoming more efficient; and

Whereas the quotas or permits to produce will be salable and transferable, and thus become a commodity itself; and

Whereas these quotas will be attracted to areas where the producer already has the greater advantage which will attract quotas away from farm areas, such as Minnesota, which already is at a disadvantage as compared to other regions; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Minnesota Holstein Breeders Association in annual meeting assembled, go on record as favoring uncontrolled production, even though it may mean lower prices for a time, in preference to restrictive quotas and support prices since we are convinced that this would be definitely to the best interests of the dairy producers over a period of time; and be it further

Resolved, That quality standards for all milk produced, be raised to those equivalent of presenting Grade A standards, thus removing from the market lower grades of milk which contribute to low quality dairy products, and hamper the use of all dairy products; and be it further

Resolved, That this action will help considerably in alleviating the present problem. Copies of this resolution to be sent to the Secretary of Agriculture, Senators, and Members of Congress from Minnesota.

RESOLUTION No. 7

Whereas as high a quality of milk is being produced in Minnesota as anywhere in the Nation; and

Whereas we have available such milk, for sale outside our State; and

Whereas several markets have discriminatory regulations virtually serving as an embargo against such milk originating in our area: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we endorce all action, legislative and otherwise, that will lead to the elimination of such discriminations and that a Federal regulation be made effective providing that all milk meeting U.S. Public Health codes, may be sold in any market in the Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress, the Governor of this State and the Secretary of Agriculture.

Representative Goodell Sparks Positive GOP Thinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the constructive and effective efforts of my able colleague from New York, Representative CHARLES GOODELL, have been very much in evidence since he came to the House 3 years ago to replace our beloved former colleague, the late Dan Reed. CHARLEY GOODELL's efforts during that short period of time have won him the confidence and respect of his colleagues, and are the subject of the following newspaper article which appeared in the Syracuse, N.Y., Herald-American on March 11, 1962.

HE SPARKS "POSITIVE" GOP THINKING

(By Jules Witcover)

WASHINGTON.—A most unusual one-man legislative effort by New York State's youngest Congressman, Representative CHARLES GOODELL, of Jamestown, is being hailed by Republicans as the best evidence yet they are not simply "agin" everything.

GOODELL, who will be 36 next week and has been in the House less than 3 years, did a heavy rewrite job on the Kennedy manpower retraining bill that won bipartisan support for the measure and assured clear sailing through both House and Senate.

Though he is ranked far down the seniority list on the Education and Labor Committee, eighth on the minority side, GOODELL has carried the ball on a number of earlier legislative hassles, striving to modify Democratic proposals, rather than ignoring them.

In such fields as minimum wage, Federal aid to education, welfare and pension legislation, he has appeared before the House Republican policy committee to help formulate national party policy.

Last year he was one of only two Republicans in the House who served on both policy committee "task forces," on employment and on education. These studies helped formulate GOP policy in the House.

This year, he is one of six House Republican appointed in the new House-Senate joint committee to establish a set of principles to guide the party in this fall's election campaign. For a newcomer, this amounts to phenomenal recognition.

Other Republican Members around the country, seeking guidance on legislation coming before the House or discussed in mail from constitutents, are calling on GOODELL for the word, and he is in increasing demand to speak in the districts of GOP House colleagues.

GOODELL's emergence comes in the nick of time for the New York delegation with Representative JOHN TABER of Auburn, ranking Republican on the Appropriations Committee, retiring this fall.

New York already has one young strong voice in House Republican councils through Republican National Chairman BILL MILLER, who continues as a House member from Lockport. But MILLER is more the politician than pick-and-shovel legislator.

GOODELL is particularly effective because he is a party regular a conservative who can suggest an alternative without raising suspicions among his colleagues.

Political rewards will be hard for the "out" party to claim, no matter how constructive their opposition is. But emergence of younger men like GOODELL, fighting a GOP posture of mere negativism, can revitalize the party itself.

Anna M. Jarvis: Founder of Mother's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following résumé with respect to the history surrounding the founding of Mother's Day by Miss Anna M. Jarvis. I am proud and honored that the city of Grafton is in my

new congressional district. The good people of Grafton are to be commended for their concerted efforts to preserve the Andrews Methodist Church as a national shrine.

The résumé is as follows:

REGARDING MOTHER'S DAY SHRINE, GRAFTON, W. VA., BIRTHPLACE OF MOTHER'S DAY (HISTORICAL) [1]

The origin of Mother's Day dates back to post-Civil War days when Mrs. Ann Reeves Jarvis, the honored mother, in an effort to reunite the family ties that had been broken during this period, organized the mothers of this community and announced a Mother's Friendship Day to be held at Pruntytown, then county seat of Taylor County.

A special invitation was given to every Union and Confederate soldier and their families, and one of our historians recounts that it was an inspiring sight to see the men in gray and blue meet, shake hands, and to hear them say "God bless you, neighbor; let us be friends again."

For more than 20 years Mrs. Jarvis taught in the primary department of the Sunday school of Andrews Church, and during this time she often spoke of the appropriateness of a day to honor the mothers of our country, both the living and the memory of those at rest.

It was this mother who inspired her daughter, Miss Anna M. Jarvis, to promote the idea of Mother's Day.

Andrews Methodist Church of Grafton, W. Va., occupies a very unique and exalted position in relation to Mother's Day as the founder and her mother lived and served this church for many years.

In 1907, 2 years after the passing of her mother, Miss Jarvis invited several of her friends to her home in Philadelphia to spend the second Sunday in May to commemorate the anniversary of her mother's death. On this day she announced her plans for a national observance of Mother's Day, thereby putting her thoughts into action. She immediately acquainted John Wanamaker, the great merchant prince of Philadelphia, with her plan, and was by him greatly encouraged to start the movement. She then wrote to L. L. Loar, superintendent of Andrews Sunday school in Grafton, suggesting that the church celebrate a Mother's Day in honor of her mother. The idea also appealed to Mr. Loar, and on May 10, 1908, the first official Mother's Day service was held in Andrews Methodist Sunday School with an attendance of 407 persons.

INTERNATIONAL MOTHER'S DAY SHRINE ENVISIONED

MARCH 16, 1962.

Everybody loves mother.

For that reason, Mother's Day has become not only a national but an international institution supported by people of every race, creed and color.

The proof is "in the pudding" so to speak. When the drive for funds to create an International Mother's Day Shrine in Grafton, W. Va., was recently launched, contributions and votes began pouring in from New York in the East to California in the West and from oversea points as well.

West Virginia Gov. W. W. Barron has pledged his full support to the Mother's Day Shrine movement.

At the first International Mother's Day Shrine organizational meeting at Andrews Methodist Church, Grafton, W. Va., this month, Governor Barron lauded the initiative of Taylor Countians in spearheading the project.

The Governor stated that the International Mother's Day Shrine would become a major asset to the Mountain State and predicted that the shrine will receive support from persons in all parts of the world as the movement spreads. As first chairman of the shrine's honorary advisory board, Governor Barron has reached into his own pocket for a contribution of $100 to help the financial campaign get underway.

In presenting carnations to Governor and Mrs. Barron, Dr. Bill J. Hill, president of the Grafton chapter of the auxiliary, explained that the carnations in unlimited quantities are available for distribution to contributors to the fund being raised to support the Mother's Day Shrine project.

The International Mother's Day Shrine project envisions the creation of a shrine encompassing the complete city block on which Andrews Church now stands. The shrine will be nondenominational in character and will be supported by auxiliary chapters organized on an international basis.

The origin of Mother's Day dates back to post-Civil War days when Mrs. Anna Reeves Jarvis, the honored mother, in an effort to reunite the family ties that had been broken during this period, organized the mothers of her community and announced a Mother's Friendship Day to be held at Pruntytown, then county seat of Taylor County.

In 1908 Mother's Day itself was founded and established by Miss Anna M. Jarvis, to extend and perpetuate her mother's lifework of the home, community and church. The first official Mother's Day service was held in Andrews Methodist Church in Grafton on May 10, 1908. On this day Miss Jarvis sent 500 white carnations, chosen by her as an emblem of purity to be presented to each son, daughter, and mother.

In May 1914, the second Sunday in May was named as Mother's Day by a congressional resolution, approved by President Woodrow Wilson and proclaimed by William Jennings Bryan as Secretary of State. It was not long after this national recognition that the movement was celebrated in every civilized country in the world.

Andrews Methodist Church, of Grafton, the "Mother church of Mother's Day," is an old-fashioned handmade brick structure of two stories with an auditorium that is lighted by 15 stained glass windows, memorials to members of the congregation. The interior is a combination of black walnut and oak, and the walls are adorned with beautiful oil paintings illustrating Biblical incidents. A bronze plaque marks the outside entrance to the church and was officially dedicated to Miss Anna Jarvis, founder of Mother's Day, May 8, 1938.

[1] Bulletin, Grafton, W. Va., Greater Grafton Area Development Council.

Retirement Plans for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, small businessmen are finding a growing interest in retirement plans partly because the population of the United States is living longer, because of business competition, and because of the personal and business advantages to be gained through the use of such plans.

Many small businessmen may not be aware of the many types of plans available to them, and I believe the following article, "Retirement Plans for Small Business," by Morton R. Gould, will be of interest:

RETIREMENT PLANS FOR SMALL BUSINESS

(By Morton R. Gould)

Many small businessmen want to provide retirement benefits for their employees. These owner-managers are sometimes painfully aware of some of the disadvantages of not having retirement programs—as when one of their bright young workers takes a job with a competitor who offers retirement benefits.

"But retirement programs are too expensive for small companies," many small businessmen tell themselves and their friends.

George Sonsun (name disguised) who has 20 employees is one of them. He found that his company, however, could afford a retirement program.

He started a deferred pension plan that costs far less than he had imagined. The details of it are shown in the table which follows later in this article.

Another owner-manager, Roger Mallory, (name disguised), whose company is similar to Mr. Sonsum's, uses a deferred profit-sharing plan. Details of how it works are shown in the table at the top of page 3.

Tax advantages help these companies to have retirement programs. Those advantages are: (1) An employer's contributions to a retirement plan are tax deductible (deductions are limited by sec. 404 of the Internal Revenue Code); (2) a retirement trust fund is tax exempt (its earnings are too); (3) employees need not include in their gross income the funds the company puts into their retirement program; (4) at retirement age they may get preferential tax treatment.

To gain these advantages a company has to set up a qualified plan.

WHAT IS A QUALIFIED RETIREMENT PLAN?

"Qualified" means the retirement plan has been approved by the Internal Revenue Service for certain tax advantages. Presently an employee benefit plan is available to any person who is neither a sole proprietor nor a partner. However, legislation to make proprietors and partners eligible has been considered. A qualified plan sets up a nonreversionary trust.

The employee draws retirement income from this trust fund. To be eligible for a qualified retirement plan, your company must meet certain requirements. They are: (1) Your plan must be for the exclusive benefit of the employees or their beneficiaries, (2) your plan may not discriminate in favor of employee-stockholders or other highly paid supervisory workers, (3) the funds you contribute may never revert to the company, (4) your plan must be in writing and your employees must know about it, (5) you must intend for the plan to be permanent.

TYPES OF RETIREMENT PLANS

As has been suggested already, you can use either (1) the deferred pension plan, or (2) the deferred profit-sharing plan, or (3) you might use a combination of the two.

These plans give the employee retirement income in addition to his social security benefits. Your tax advantages, as a rule, are about the same in either plan.

Still another plan is the individual deferred compensation plan, but it is not a qualified plan. It allows you to be highly selective in the choice of the employees to be covered. (For further information see: "Management Aid No. 107: Using Deferred Compensation in Small Business," Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C. 1959. Free.)

Deferred pension plan

This plan guarantees the employee a known benefit when he retires. Your annual contribution to the trust depends on the amount of money needed to build up funds to provide this known benefit.

For example, how much money will you have to set aside in the next 35 years to give a 30-year-old employee a lifetime monthly retirement check of $60? This type plan allows you to take care of both young and older employees. Under it you can build the necessary retirement fund in a relatively short time for your older employees.

Usually you determine the retirement benefits with a formula. It can be based on a percentage of the employee's salary (present and future). It can be a flat sum based on years of service. Or it can be a combination of the two. In any event whatever formula used applies to all participants under the plan.

Some companies allow the employee to contribute to the fund also. His contribution usually runs from 1 percent to 5 percent of his wages.

Deferred profit-sharing plan

This plan gets its funds from the company's profits. Each year a certain amount of the profits go into the profit-sharing fund. This amount may vary from year to year or you can set it according to a formula.

Usually an employee's stake in profit sharing is based on his salary range. In the deferred profit-sharing plan, the employee gets his profits at retirement age. You invest his share of the profits each year to build the retirement fund.

This plan does not guarantee the employee any certain amount of dollars in his monthly retirement check.

A deferred profit-sharing plan, as a rule, can do little toward providing substantial retirement income to older employees. However, for young employees this plan may be as good as a deferred pension plan.

HOW DO YOU FINANCE IT?

You have to set up a retirement trust fund whether you use the deferred pension plan (the trust in some group annuity pension plans is handled by the insurance carrier) or the deferred profit-sharing plan. This trust fund receives your contributions, invests them, and pays the retirement benefits. Remember, its earnings are tax free as long as they are plowed back into the trust fund.

You can finance your retirement trust fund in various ways. The three most widely used ways are: (1) a wholly insured plan, (2) an uninsured plan, and (3) a combination plan.

In the insured plan, you buy any one of several forms of retirement income insurance. At retirement age the insuring company will pay the required benefit. In most cases it will also relieve you of most of the administrative burdens. One advantage is that the insurance company guarantees the solvency of the retirement fund. A disadvantage is that the earning potential of your retirement trust fund is limited.

SONSUN CO.'S DEFERRED PENSION PLAN

Sonsun Co. (name disguised) with 20 employees uses a "qualified" deferred pension plan. This retirement plan started with eight eligible employees, including Mr. Sonsun, the owner-manager, and two stockholders. Sonsun's plan uses a formula that will give each employee a monthly retirement check for life. This check will be equal to 1 percent of the employee's average monthly salary multiplied by his years of service at age 65. Sonsun is financing its deferred pension plan by a split fund (a combination of the insured financing method and the uninsured method. The table below shows how both employees and Sonsun Co. benefit from the deferred pension plan.

Sex and age	Monthly salary	Total service at age 65 *Years*		1 percent of salary		Monthly retirement check	Insurance coverage [1]	Sonsuns 1st year contribution
Male, 32	$300	38	×	$3.90	=	$148	$14,820	$534.11
Female, 30	250	38	×	2.50	=	95	9,500	334.22
Male, 34	400	37	×	4.00	=	148	14,820	581.79
Female, 37	350	34	×	3.50	=	119	11,900	561.92
Female, 40	400	37	×	4.00	=	148	14,800	812.37
Male, 35 [2]	400	37	×	4.00	=	148	14,800	608.43
Male, 40 [2]	1,000	32	×	10.00	=	320	32,000	1,672.00
Male, 45 [2]	1,500	38	×	15.00	=	570	57,000	3,932.43
Total								9,037.27
Summary of costs:								
Gross 1st year contribution								9,037.27
1st year dividends on insurance policies								[3] 509.22
Net before taxes								8,528.05
Net after taxes if Sonsun is in 30-percent tax bracket								5,969.64
Net after taxes if Sonsun is in 52-percent tax bracket								4,093.46

[1] Optional.
[2] Stockholder.
[3] Dividends are based on 1961 scale and are not guarantees or estimates for the futrue.

MALLORY PRODUCTS' DEFERRED PROFIT-SHARING PLAN

Mallory Products (name disguised) with 20 employees uses a "qualified" deferred profit-sharing plan. This retirement plan started with 8 eligible employees, including Owner-Manager Mallory and one stockholder. Mr. Mallory's plan does not guarantee an exact amount at retirement because the funds for his plan come from the company's annual profits. He and his employees cannot know how much the retirement trust fund will contain 30 or 35 years from now. However, the table below indicates how Mallory Products' deferred profit-sharing plan would look when the youngest employee retires in 35 years if: (1) employees' salaries stay the same and (2) the company continues to put in the maximum deductible contribution each year.

Sex and age	Annual salary	Insurance coverage [1]	Maximum deductible amount (15 percent annual salary)	Contribution invested at 4 percent to retirement [2]	Total value of fund to participant [3]
Male, 32	$4,680	$10,222	$702	$32,603	$43,945
Female, 30	3,000	7,092	450	23,279	31,439
Male, 34	4,800	9,611	720	30,096	40,222
Female, 37	4,200	7,951	630	22,245	30,064
Female, 40	4,800	8,196	720	21,269	28,699
Male, 35	4,800	9,295	720	28,477	38,047
Male, 40	12,000	19,887	1,800	53,174	71,145
Male, 45	18,000	24,738	2,700	57,544	76,558
Total			8,442		
Summary of costs:					
Gross 1st year contribution			8,442		
1st year dividend on insurance policies			[4] 285		
Net before taxes			8,157		
Net after taxes if Mallory products is in 30-percent tax bracket			5,709		
Net after taxes if Mallory products is in 52-percent tax bracket			3,915		

[1] Optional.
[2] Annual contribution after payment of insurance premium.
[3] Available as lifetime income or as lump sum. Total value of fund at retirement includes cash value of insurance plus dividends plus invested portion of fund.
[4] Dividends are based on 1961 scale and are not guarantees or estimates for the future.

In an uninsured plan (or self-insured plan), you administer your retirement trust fund. You guarantee your employees that the money will be there when their benefits are due. The earning potential of your retirement trust fund is likely to be greater than it would be under an insurance company's conservative portfolio.

The combination plan is a middle road. Often called a split-fund plan, it combines most of the guarantees of an insured plan with the investment principle of the uninsured plan.

WHAT KINDS OF BENEFITS?

Next to the monthly retirement check, some of the other benefits you may want in your retirement plan are: Severance benefits, disability benefits, and survivors benefits (death).

Severance benefits (or vesting) are an employee right to some part of the moneys that the fund has been accumulating for him. Some employers give him all or part of what he has a vested right to. Others choose to give him nothing if he leaves prior to his normal retirement age.

Whether your firm includes severance benefits depends on the type plan you use. It must eventually be provided in a profit-sharing plan. It is optional under a pension plan. If your employees contribute to the plan, they will always have a right to receive their contributions back should they leave. As a practical matter, it is best to start vesting within the first 5 years.

Disability benefits pay the employee if he is disabled before retirement age. Usually he gets less than if he'd stayed on. The exact sum will depend on length of service and his age.

Survivors benefits cost very little to maintain, but do a great deal for employee morale. The family of the deceased employee is guaranteed very nearly his retirement income should he die prior to normal retirement.

A benefit which does not cost you is the tax advantages your employees get at retirement. Briefly, they usually have the advantages of double exemptions and a lower income bracket. These conclusions are based on the assumption that retirement takes place at the age of 65 and when the employee has little income from other sources.

WHAT WILL IT COST?

Your retirement program should be tailored to your company. For instance, what sort of benefits do you want? How many employees are you covering? What ages and so on?

Generally speaking, the cost of your retirement program will be the actual amount necessary to retire each employee until he

dies plus the cost of administering the plan, less any dividends, interest or credits earned.

Remember that you're in a sense, buying something—retirement benefits for your employees. Think of these benefits as an offset to human depreciation. Be aware of benefits as cost items as well as attractive features. Of course, if your employees are mostly young people your annual cost will be cheaper than if the majority is in late middle age. The reason: The younger the group, the longer time you have to create the retirement fund.

Other guidelines that may be helpful when you're trying to determine cost figures are:

1. Ask your consultant for cost estimates based on 20- or 30-year projections.
2. See that you are offered a choice of funding methods to choose from.
3. See that the analysis of your method of financing is backed up by an actuarial statement. Even a small error in calculation can develop into a sizable dollar drain over the years.
4. Know what your maximum contribution will be and under what assumptions.
5. Know what your minimum contribution will be and under what assumptions.
6. Watch out for contribution inflexibility. Even though a deferred pension plan may set a supposedly fixed annual contribution, your plan should allow you the privilege of a smaller annual contribution. This arrangement allows you to protect your business in lean or no profit years.
7. If you have to suspend your annual contribution to a pension plan because of business necessity, remember that sooner or later you'll have to make larger annual contributions to keep the retirement trust fund up.
8. While your annual contribution to a deferred profit sharing plan is no fixed amount of dollars, watch out for debts against the retirement trust fund. In some cases you or the trust will have to pay up even if your company has no profits that year.

GETTING STARTED

One of your first steps in getting a retirement program started is to see a competent pension plan specialist, such as your lawyer, insurance adviser, accountant, or a consultant who specializes in retirement finances. These experts can help you to find answers to questions, such as:

1. Do I have the dollar capability?
2. What benefits do I want to provide and under what circumstances?
3. Do I want to provide benefits for all employees, or particular classes of employees?
4. Which plan will best suit my company?
5. What method of financing will I use?
6. How much flexibility will I have in my annual contributions to the plan?

Public Welfare Amendments of 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1962

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 10606 which the House of Representatives approved this week and which I voted for, is, I believe, one of the significant bills before the Congress this year. In one respect it builds on and improves the present Federal-State public assistance programs which provide payments to the needy aged, blind, and disabled. But in addition it amounts to a new and dynamic approach to the problems of public assistance by encouraging and assisting recipients and their families to achieve self-care and self-support so that they may leave the assistance rolls. The Ways and Means Committee should be applauded for fashioning this excellent bill during a session which finds the committee extremely busy with three other very important administration measures, the tax reform, trade proposals, and medical care for the aged. I feel sure that the Congress will act favorably on this forward-looking public welfare legislation.

First. Increased Federal share in old-age assistance, aid to blind, and aid to disabled. The bill increases the Federal matching share of old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the disabled to twenty-nine thirty-fifths of the first $35 of the State's average monthly payment per recipient. It also increases the maximum for matching to $70 per recipient. If the past is any guide these increases in the Federal support will result in higher State payments to individuals under these programs. In September 1961 in New York there were almost 60,000 recipients benefiting from the federally aided old-age assistance program. There were about 36,000 persons receiving aid to the disabled in our State, and about 3,400 being assisted under the Federal-State aid-to-the-blind program.

While we reflect on the fact that the social security insurance system provides income protection for more of our senior citizens each year, we should remember that the public assistance program continues to be a necessary supplement to the insurance system. In the middle of last year of the 17 million persons in this country 65 and over, there were 1,500,000 needy individuals depending on public assistance payments who had no other public source of income. Thus it is incumbent on the Congress to continue to look at the old-age assistance program to make sure that it is doing its job effectively, in terms of today's cost of living. I am sponsoring legislation in this Congress to "blanket in," under the social security insurance system, all persons who have reached retirement age. But until that legislation commends itself to the Congress we have the continuing responsibility to provide for adequate realistic amounts in our assistance payments. The increased Federal matching in the bill should do this.

Second. Rehabilitation services and training as part of the public assistance programs. The bill would also provide for Federal matching at a rate of 75 percent for the costs of certain services, specified by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, which the States would provide to assistance recipients in order to help these recipients achieve a higher degree of self-care or self-support. Under present law any such services which the States undertake in an effort to reduce dependency on the monthly public assistance check are matched by the Federal Government at a rate of 50 percent, as costs of administration. These provisions of the bill have special relevance to the aid-to-dependent-children program, and would make available social services to assist individual welfare recipients to make use of community resources and to use their own capabilities to resolve the problems which have made them dependent. Where such social services exist, they result in lower caseloads and more effective spending of public assistance payments. In testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means, Secretary Ribicoff gave a striking example of this. In Chicago, an experimental family restoration unit of five top flight caseworkers eliminated 163 families from relief rolls in 7 months—about one-third of their caseloads. And this was by the technique of encouraging and helping the family achieve self-support, the approach which this bill adopts.

Third. Extension of aid to dependent children payments based on parents' unemployment. I should also like to comment specifically on the provision of the bill which would extend for 5 years the federally assisted program of aid to dependent children based on the unemployment of a parent. There is no reason in logic why the aid to dependent children program should omit the family which is needy because of the unemployment of the breadwinner. This program, enacted on a temporary basis last year, has proved its effectiveness. In New York alone, as of December last year, it was bringing financial assistance to 54,000 recipients, 44,000 of whom were children.

CONCLUSION

The bill would also increase Federal funds for child welfare services, provide for the support of day care facilities in the States allowing mothers who want to work to seek gainful employment, would allow the States—with proper safeguards—to incorporate community work programs into the federally aided aid to dependent children program, and would equip the States with additional authority to control aid to dependent children payments and prevent abuses of the program.

I believe that this bill represents a very hopeful and useful set of improvements in our Federal-State public assistance and child welfare services endeavors. As the President put it in his message to the Congress February 2, the emphasis in such programs, "must be directed increasingly toward prevention and rehabilitation—on reducing not only the long-range cost in budgetary terms but the long-range cost in human terms as well."

"Respect for Law," an Address by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy at the University of Georgia School of Law, May 6, 1961, at Athens, Ga.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to insert to

the attention of all who read, an address by the Attorney General of the United States, Hon. Robert F. Kennedy, delivered at the Law Day exercises of the University of Georgia School of Law, held at Athens, Ga., on May 6, 1961.

This significant and timely address by the top law enforcement officer of the United States of America appeared in the American Bar Association Journal for the month of January 1962.

RESPECT FOR LAW

(By Robert F. Kennedy)

In his proclamation urging us to observe Law Day, the President emphasized two thoughts. He pointed out that to remain free the people must "cherish their freedoms, understand the responsibilities they entail, and nurture the will to preserve them." He then went on to point out that "law is the strongest link between man and freedom."

I wonder in how many countries of the world people think of law as the "link between man and freedom." We know that in many, law is the instrument of tyranny, and people think of law as little more than the will of the state, or the party—not of the people.

We know, too, that throughout the long history of mankind, man has had to struggle to create a system of law and of government in which fundamental freedoms would be linked with the enforcement of justice. We know that we cannot live together without rules which tell us what is right and what is wrong, what is permitted and what is prohibited. We know that it is law which enables men to live together, that creates order out of chaos. We know that law is the glue that holds civilization together.

We know that if one man's rights are denied, the rights of all are endangered. In our country the courts have a most important role in safeguarding these rights. The decisions of the courts, however much we might disagree with them, in the final analysis must be followed and respcted. If we disagree with a court decision and, thereafter, irresponsibly assail the court and defy its rulings, we challenge the foundations of our society.

The Supreme Court of Georgia set forth this proposition quite clearly in 1949 in the case of *Crumb* v. *State* (205 Ga. 547–552). The court, referring to the U.S. Supreme Court decisions, said there:

"And whatever may be the individual opinion of the members of this court as to the correctness, soundness, or wisdom of these decisions, it becomes our duty to yield thereto, just as the other courts of this State must accept and be controlled by the decisions and mandates of this court. This being a government by law and not by men, the jury commissioners in their official conduct are bound by the foregoing rulings of the Supreme Court of the United States, notwithstanding any personal opinion, hereditary instinct, natural impulse, or geographical tradition to the contrary."

EVERYDAY MUST BE LAW DAY

Respect for the law—in essence that is the meaning of Law Day—and every day must be Law Day or else our society will collapse.

The challenge which international communism hurls against the rule of law is very great. For the past 2 weeks I have been engaged, for a good part of my time, in working with General Taylor, Admiral Burke and Mr. Dulles, to assess the recent events in Cuba and determine what lessons we can learn for the future.

It already has become crystal clear in our study that as the President has stated so graphically, we must reexamine and reorient our forces of every kind—not just our military forces, but all our techniques and outlook here in the United States. We must come forward with the answer of how a nation, devoted to freedom and individual rights and respect for the law, can stand effectively against an implacable enemy who plays by different rules and knows only the law of the jungle. With the answer to this rests our future—our destiny—as a nation and as a people.

The events of the last few weeks have demonstrated that the time has long since passed when the people of the United States can be apathetic about their belief and respect for the law and about the necessity of placing our own house in order. As we turn to meet our enemy, to look him full in the face, we cannot afford feet of clay or an arm of glass.

Let me speak to you about three major areas of difficulty within the purview of my responsibilities that sap our national strength, that weaken our people, that require our immediate attention.

ORGANIZED CRIME IS A PROBLEM FOR ALL AMERICA

In too many major communities of our country, organized crime has become big business. It knows no State lines. It drains off millions of dollars of our national wealth, infecting legitimate businesses, labor unions and even sports. Tolerating organized crime promotes the cheap philosophy that everything is a racket. It promotes cynicism among adults. It contributes to the confusion of the young and to the increase of juvenile delinquency.

It is not the gangster himself who is of concern. It is what he is doing to our cities, our communities, our moral fiber. Ninety percent of the major racketeers would be out of business by the end of this year if the ordinary citizen, the businessman, the union official and the public authority stood up to be counted and refused to be corrupted.

This is a problem for all America, not just the FBI or the Department of Justice. Unless the basic attitude changes here in this country, the rackets will prosper and grow. Of this I am convinced.

The racketeers, after all, are professional criminals. But, there are the amateurs—men who have law-abiding backgrounds and respectable positions, who, nevertheless, break the law of the land. We have been particularly concerned lately in the Department of Justice about the spread of illegal price-fixing. I would say to you, however, it is merely symptomatic of many other practices commonly accepted in business life.

Our investigations show that in an alarming number of areas of the country businessmen have conspired in secret to fix prices, made collusive deals with union officials, defrauded their customers and even in some instances cheated their own Government.

Our enemies assert that capitalism enslaves the worker and will destroy itself. It is our national faith that the system of competitive enterprise offers the best hope for individual freedom, social development and economic growth.

Thus, every businessman who cheats on his taxes, fixes prices or underpays his labor, every union official who makes a collusive deal, misuses union funds, damages the free enterprise system in the eyes of the world and does a disservice to the millions of honest Americans in all walks of life.

Where we have evidence of violation of laws by the "respectables," we will take action against the individuals involved, as well as against their companies. But in the end, this also is not a situation which can be cured by the Department of Justice. It can only be cured by business and unions themselves.

THE THIRD AREA—CIVIL RIGHTS

The third area is the one that affects us all the most directly—civil rights.

The hardest problems of all in law enforcement are those involving a conflict of law and local customers. History has recorded many occasions when the moral sense of a nation produced judicial decisions, such as the 1954 decision in *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, which required difficult local adjustments.

I have many friends in the U.S. Senate who are southerners. Many of these friendships stem from my work as counsel for the Senate Rackets Committee, headed by Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, for whom I have the greatest admiration and affection.

If these southern friends of mine are representative southerners—and I believe they are—I do not pretend that they believe with me on everything or that I agree with them on everything. But, knowing them as I do, I am convinced of this: southerners have a special respect for candor and plain talk. They certainly don't like hypocrisy. So, in discussing this third major problem, I must tell you candidly what our polices are are going to be in the field of civil rights and why.

First let me say this: the time has long since arrived when loyal Americans must measure the impact of their actions beyond the limits of their own towns or States. For instance, we must be quite aware of the fact the 50 percent of the countries in the United Nations are not white; that around the world, in Africa, South America, and Asia, people whose skins are a different color from ours are on the move to gain their measure of freedom and liberty.

From the Congo to Cuba, from South Vietnam to Algiers, in India, Brazil and Iran, men and women and children are straightening their backs and listening—to the evil promises of Communist tyranny and the honorable promises of Anglo-American liberty. And those people will decide not only their future but how the cause of freedom fares in the world.

In the United Nations we are striving to establish a rule of law instead of a rule of force. In that forum and elsewhere around the world our deeds will speak for us.

In the worldwide struggle, the graduation at this University of Charleyne Hunter and Hamilton Holmes will, without question, aid and assist the fight against Communist political infiltration and guerrilla warfare.

When parents send their children to school this fall in Atlanta, peaceably and in accordance with the rule of law, barefoot Burmese and Congolese will see before their eyes Americans living by the rule of law.

The conflict of views over the original decision in 1954 and our recent move in Prince Edward County is understandable. the decision in 1954 required action of the most difficult, delicate and complex nature, going to the heart of southern institutions. I know a little of this. I live in Virginia. I studied law at the University of Virginia. I have been privileged to know many able southern soldiers, scholars, lawyers, jurists, journalists, and political leaders who have enriched our national life. From them I have drawn some understanding of the South, but my knowledge is nothing to yours.

It is now being said that the Department of Justice is attempting to close all public schools in Virginia because of the Prince Edward situation. This is not true, nor is the Prince Edward suit a threat against local control.

We are maintaining the orders of the courts. We are doing nothing more nor less. If any one of you were in my position you would do likewise for it would be required by your oath of office. You might not want to do it, you might not like to do it, but you would do it.

I cannot believe that anyone can support a principle which prevents more than a thousand of our children in one county from attending public school—especially

when this step was taken to circumvent the orders of the court.

Our position is quite clear. We are upholding the law. Our action does not threaten local control. The Federal Government would not be running the schools in Prince Edward County any more than it is running the University of Georgia or the schools in the State of Massachusetts.

In this case—in all cases—if the orders of the court are circumvented, the Department of Justice will act. We will not stand by or be aloof. We will move.

I happen to believe that the 1954 decision was right. But my belief does not matter—it is the law. Some of you may believe the decision was wrong. That does not matter. It is the law. And we both respect the law. By facing this problem honorably, you have shown to all the world that we Americans are moving forward together—solving this problem—under the rule of law.

An integral part of this is that we make a total effort to guarantee the ballot to every American of voting age—in the North as well as in the South. The right to vote is the easiest of all rights to grant. The spirit of our democracy, the letter of our Constitution and our laws require that there be no further delay in the achievement of full freedom to vote for all. Our system depends upon the fullest participation of all its citizens.

The problem between the white and colored people is a problem for all sections of the United States. As I have said, I believe there has been a great deal of hypocrisy in dealing with it. In fact, I found when I came to the Department of Justice that I need look no further to find evidence of this.

DISCRIMINATION IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

I found that very few Negroes were employed above a custodial level. There were 950 lawyers working in the Department of Justice in Washington and only 10 of them were Negroes. At the same moment the lawyer of the Department of Justice were bringing legal action to end discrimination, that same discrimination was being practiced within the Department itself.

At a recent review for the visiting leader of a new African state, there was only one Negro in the guard of honor. At the Bureau of the Budget, Negroes were used only for custodial work.

The Federal Government is taking steps to correct this.

Financial leaders from the East who deplore discrimination in the South belong to institutions where no Negroes or Jews are allowed and their children attend private schools where no Negro students are enrolled. Union officials criticize southern leaders and yet practice discrimination with their unions. Government officials belong to private clubs in Washington where Negroes including ambassadors are not welcomed even at mealtime.

My firm belief is that if we are to make progress in this area—if we are to be truly great as a Nation—then we must make sure that nobody is denied an opportunity because of race, creed or color. We pledge, by example, to take action in our own backyard—the Department of Justice. We pledge to move to protect the integrity of the courts in the administration of justice. In all this, we ask your help—we need your assistance.

I come to you today and I shall come to you in the years ahead to advocate reason and the rule of law.

It is in this spirit that since taking office I have conferred many times with responsible public officials and civic leaders in the South on specific situations. I shall continue to do so. I don't expect them always to agree with my view of what the law requires, but I believe they share my respect for the law. We are trying to achieve amicable, voluntary solutions without going to court. These discussions have ranged from voting and school cases to incidents of arrest which might lead to violence.

We have sought to be helpful to avert violence and to get voluntary compliance. When our investigations indicate there has been a violation of law, we have asked responsible official to take steps themselves to correct the situation. In some instances this has happened. When it has not, we have had to take legal actions.

These conversations have been devoid of bitterness or hate. They have been carried on with mutual respect, understanding, and good will. National unity is essential and before taking any legal action, we will where appropriate invite the southern leaders to make their views known in these cases.

WE MUST AVOID ANOTHER LITTLE ROCK OR NEW ORLEANS

We, the American people, must avoid another Little Rock or another New Orleans. We cannot afford them. It is not only that such incidents do incalculable harm to the children involved but to the relations among people. It is not only that such convulsions seriously undermine respect for law and order, and cause serious economic and moral damage. Such incidents hurt our country in the eyes of the world. We just can't afford another Little Rock or another New Orleans.

On this generation of Americans falls the full burden of proving to the world that we really mean it when we say all men are created free and are equal before the law. All of us might wish at times that we lived in a more tranquil world, but we don't. And if our times are difficult and perplexing, so are they challenging and filled with opportunity.

To the South, perhaps more than to any other section of the country, has been given the opportunity and the challenge and the responsibility of demonstrating America at its greatest—at its full potential of liberty under law. You may ask, will we enforce the civil rights statutes? The answer is: "Yes, we will."

We also will enforce the antitrust laws, the antiracketeering laws, the laws against kidnaping and robbing Federal banks, and transporting stolen automobiles across State lines, the illicit traffic in narcotics and all the rest. We can and will do no less.

I hold a constitutional office of the U.S. Government, and I shall perform the duty I have sworn to undertake—to enforce the law, in every field of law and every region.

We will not threaten, we will try to help. We will not persecute, we will prosecute. We will not make or interpret the laws. We shall enforce them—vigorously, without regional bias or political slant.

All this we intend to do. But all the high rhetoric on Law Day about the noble mansions of the law and all the high-sounding speeches about liberty and justice, are meaningless unless people—you and I—breathe meaning and force into it. Our liberties depend upon our respect for the law.

On December 13, 1889, Henry W. Grady, of Georgia, said these words to an audience in my home State of Massachusetts:

"This hour little needs the loyalty that is loyal to one section and yet holds the other in enduring suspicion and estrangement. Give us the broad and perfect loyalty that loves and trusts Georgia alike with Massachusetts—that knows no South, no North, no East, no West, but endears with equal and patriotic love every foot of our soil, every State of our Union.

A mighty duty, sir, and a mighty inspiration impels every one of us tonight to lose in patriotic consecration whatever estranges, whatever divides. We, sir, are Americans—and we stand for human liberty."

Ten days later Mr. Grady was dead but his words live today. We stand for human liberty.

The road ahead is full of difficulties and discomforts. But as for me, I welcome the challenge, I welcome the opportunity and I pledge my best effort—all I have in material things and physical strength and spirit—to see that freedom shall advance and that our children will grow old under the rule of law.

Explanation of H.R. 10770, To Extend Coverage of Meat Inspection Act to Intrastate Shipments Into Major Consuming Areas Under Certain Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday I introduced H.R. 10770, a bill to amend the Meat Inspection Act to extend its coverage in certain areas. Many people since then have asked me whether this is an administration measure to carry out the objectives President Kennedy referred to in his message that day on consumer issues. I have explained that my bill is not an official Agriculture Department approach to the problem but rather one I have been working on for sometime on my own. I feel that it could provide a practical solution to the problem the President described—that is, of assuring the wholesomeness of much of that part of our meat supply not now subject to Federal inspection. The President said one-fifth of our meat supply is uninspected. My bill uses as its basic approach the same one which we incorporated 5 years ago into the Poultry Products Inspection Act.

Briefly, the idea is this: Since Federal meat inspection now applies only to meat sold in interstate commerce, we must make it feasible to assure the wholesomeness of meat slaughtered and sold within the States. Presumably the States already do this, but as a practical matter the States do not have the extensive inspection forces required by the Federal Government in carrying out the responsibilities of the Meat Inspection Act. The problem then is to find a constitutional and acceptable manner of giving to Federal inspectors or to inspectors working under Federal inspection standards, the right to inspect purely intrastate commerce—meat slaughtered and sold within a State. At the same time, it would be impractical to try to station a Federal inspector in every butcher shop doing its own slaughtering, or in small abattoirs slaughtering only a few head of cattle a week, or a few pigs, for sale in the immediate village or vicinity. In any event, when meat is produced and processed in a small community for sale in the locality only, we have the best control of all over the quality of that meat—and that is the ability of the customer to know exactly who is to blame for bad meat. The real problem is to assure the quality of the meat sold in the cities and larger towns from

animals slaughtered within the same State. Unless the consumer has been trained to look for the blue stamp showing the meat was slaughtered under U.S. inspection, she may just assume that a cut of meat in the stores was subject to all of the customary safeguards we have come to expect under the Meat Inspection Act of 1907. But a particular cut may have come from a packer operating solely within the State, and not subject to the Federal law. It is this portion of the uninspected meat supply we are concerned about.

PRECEDENT ESTABLISHED IN POULTRY INSPECTION LAW

In the Poultry Products Inspection Act of 1957, we established for the first time statutory authority for Federal inspectors to pass on the wholesomeness of food items produced and sold exclusively within a State. We did it by establishing the concept of major consuming areas where the intrastate supplies are commingled at the point of sale with interstate supplies to such an extent and in such volume that they affect, burden, or obstruct interstate commerce in poultry. The provision was written in primarily to protect the consumer, but also to protect the processors subject to compulsory Federal inspection from unfair competition in their major markets from noninspected poultry.

The machinery in the Poultry Products Inspection Act for designating a major consuming area in which intrastate as well as interstate shipments of poultry would be subject to compulsory Federal inspection is complex—deliberately so. It can not be done merely on whim of the Secretary of Agriculture. Designation of an area must be requested by appropriate State or local officials or agencies acting for consumers, or by an industry group; a public hearing must be conducted on the application; the Secretary must then make a finding on it, and if he grants the application, he still has authority to waive any specific requirements of the act he feels justified under the circumstances. The designation cannot take effect until 6 months after the Secretary makes the designation—which should provide ample time for any appeals. Only then can the Federal Government require inspection of all poultry supplies going into that area from intrastate sources.

H.R. 10770 adopts the same language and the same approach to the meat inspection law.

EXPERIENCE SHOWS NO FEDERAL GRAB FOR POWER

For those who might fear that even this represents a Federal grab for power at the expense of the States, I might point out that the major consuming area provision of the Poultry Products Inspection Act of 1957 has not yet been used in the 5 years the poultry inspection law has been in effect. I have urged that St. Louis make appropriate application for designation, but so far it has not done so. I hope it will. I do not know of any other cities which have applied. However, much if not most of the poultry now sold in our cities which is produced and sold only in intrastate commerce is nevertheless federally inspected poultry under a program permitting processors to pay a fee for the inspection service. It is not compulsory. Many poultry processors, however, have found it is good business to sell only federally inspected poultry, even when inspection is not required and even if they have to pay for the inspection.

Regardless of the machinery we finally work out for extending meat inspection to a large part of the 20 percent of meat supplies now escaping Federal inspection, I agree wholeheartedly with the President in his consumer message last Thursday that the consumer is entitled to this protection. I think H.R. 10770 provides a practical approach, based on a concept already part of our food-inspection laws, but if another method proves more feasible or desirable, I shall certainly support it.

SUGGESTED BY CONTROVERSY OVER "WATERED" HAMS

The idea for H.R. 10770 came to me as a result of the uproar last year over the so-called "watered" hams. Packers shipping in interstate commerce had insisted on the right to add moisture to their processed hams in order to overcome a competitive advantage held by those selling uninspected hams in intrastate commerce. I felt that a fair solution to this dilemma was not to add to the consumer's cost by having to pay for water at ham prices, but rather to try to bring the hams processed and sold only in intrastate commerce under the same regulations applying to hams sold across State lines. I remembered the approach we had used in the Poultry Products Inspection Act in 1957, and asked the House Counsel to draft similar language for amending the meat-inspection law. The President's comments Thursday made the idea seem even better, and so I introduced H.R. 10770 that day.

The text of H.R. 10770 is as follows:

[87th Cong., 2d sess.]

H.R. 10770

In the House of Representatives, March 15, 1962; Mrs. SULLIVAN introduced the following bill, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture:

A bill to amend the Meat Inspection Act to extend its coverage in certain areas

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the portions of the Act of March 4, 1907, which are known as the Meat Inspection Act are hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Upon application by any appropriate State or local official or agency of a substantial portion of any major consuming area, or upon application by an appropriate local meat industry group in such an area, where the Secretary has reason to believe that meat or meat food products are handled or consumed in such volume as to affect, burden, or obstruct the movement of inspected meat or meat food products in interstate or foreign commerce, the Secretary shall conduct a public hearing to ascertain whether or not it will tend to effectuate the purposes of this Act for such area to be subject to this Act. If after public hearing the Secretary finds that meat or meat food products are handled or consumed in such volume as to affect, burden, or obstruct the movement of inspected meat and meat food products in interstate or foreign commerce and that the designation of such area will tend to effectuate the purposes of this Act, he shall by order designate such area and prescribe which of the provisions of this Act shall be applicable thereto and grant such exemptions therefrom as he determines practicable. Such designation shall not become effective until six months after the notice thereof is published in the Federal Register. On and after the effective date of such designation, all meat and meat food products processed, sold, received, or delivered in any such area shall be subject to this Act. As used herein, the term 'this Act' means the provisions of the Act of March 4, 1907, which is known as the Meat Inspection Act."

Llewellyn Rowell Takes Top Honors in Sons of American Revolution Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House to a remarkable speech made by a young constituent of mine, Mr. Llewellyn Rowell, a student at West End High School. He gave the speech in a competition sponsored by the Sons of the American Revolution in Birmingham. He was awarded a cash prize and received one of three first places.

The message of this speech is one of patriotism and love of country, recounting events which are important to us today. I commend this fine speech to all who hate tyranny of any kind and to those who love liberty:

WHICH SPIRIT IS THE AMERICAN ONE—1776 OR 1961?—ONE OF THREE FIRST PLACES

The spirit of 1776 had confidence that courage warmed by patriotism would conquer all. The men of the Revolution were both highly intelligent and well educated, and they well knew that a stupendous task was facing them as they embarked on the great adventure of forming a new nation in a new world. They had courage, those great leaders of the Revolution, and their courage was never greater than when they met on that hot day in Independence Hall in Philadelphia. July 4, 1776, lives forever as the date when, with a firm reliance on the protection and aid of Divine Providence, 56 men pledged to each other their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor. The 13 Colonies united to proclaim to the world their freedom, and they followed up their challenging words with resolute action on the battlefields of the Revolutionary War.

Certainly the goal of the Declaration of Independence was one of the loftiest ever held by freemen: to create a nation—a little world where liberty and justice would prevail for all time. But this was the dream of our Founding Fathers, men from all walks of life, led by lawyers, farmers, doctors, and ministers. There were men like John Adams, who risked all for freedom—and won—Benjamin Franklin, an inventor and philosopher, called the first of all Americans, and Thomas Jefferson, he of the inventions for domestic comfort at Monticello and of the inventions of balanced government for national safety at Philadelphia. This genius, Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence, predicted that America would give "liberty to half the globe" and "that millions who had never seen the Republic would

one day rise up and call it blessed." The New World was to be called into being not by the conquering armies of the Revolutionists—determined to be free—but by the more powerful principles which the men of the Revolution held sacred. Americans would conquer, they believed, by the force of their ideas; they would work a revolution in the minds of men. Tyranny and regimentation could not successfully compete with freedom for the allegiance of mankind; the world must become free. Moreover, by serving as a refuge for oppressed people of the earth—by drawing unto itself the best of suffering humanity, those who loved liberty above all else, America would become a stronghold of democracy and the industry, the virtue and the wisdom of the world would center in these free and independent States.

This was the philosophy of 1776, the ideals which our early immortals held sacred, the fundamental principles upon which auction block they placed their faith; and the men of this Nation bought that faith; they united in high courage and confidence in each other; and they saw it through. So America came into being.

One hundred and eighty-five years later, there have arisen those Americans by name and birthright who shame this heritage which is theirs. There have been cowardly displays of un-Americanism, acts which contrast darkly with the high courage of our Revolutionary fathers. On another hot July day of 1961, a picket line was thrown like a strangling cord around the White House, symbol of American leadership itself, and this line of marchers carried placards proclaiming what they say is the American spirit. These placards said: "Better Red than dead."

"Better Red than dead." Is any fear of atomic attack, is any quailing before military forces, worth such a sentiment? Contrast this slogan, "Better Red than dead," with an earlier one: "We solemnly pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor"—and think.

Are we not allowing cowards to call our Founding Fathers fools? Arise, and in the spirit, the hope, and the courage of those great men who once walked these shores, speak out that American principles, American ideals, and American spirit is not dead. It lives in us.

A Latin American View on the Alliance for Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, a prominent Latin American statesman, Dr. Ezequiel Padilla, former Mexican Minister of Foreign Affairs, recently delivered a very fine address in which he dealt with President Kennedy's alliance-for-progress program. I believe it to be of utmost interest to all of us to know what Latin American leaders think of our efforts to help our neighbors of the Western Hemisphere. For this reason, I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD, the text of Dr. Padilla's address and commend it to the attention of all my colleagues:

THE MOST BEAUTIFUL ADVENTURE OF OUR CENTURY: THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Gentlemen, I consider it a propitious sign for this occasion that today the whole world should also be celebrating the exploits of a hero of America and that of a science which is a patrimony for all humanity.

It is a pleasure for me to address a select group of businessmen who without doubt are prepared to understand in all its magnitude the serious crisis which today confronts our inter-American system. We are living in an era of vertiginous changes, and among these, none causes a greater impression than the reconstruction of Western Europe.

We can all remember those anguished calls for help made by a Europe in ruins right after the war. They lacked everything: food, clothing, coal for winter fuel, shelter. The misfortune of the peoples of Europe appeared to be irremediable; the world considered this as the final act of the sad prophecy made regarding the decadence of Europe.

Suddenly, before the astonished eyes of all nations, Europe surged as a power possessing an amazing prosperity. The Marshall plan, its famous statesmen, an immaculate public administration; and above all, the faith and moral greatness of its people, had saved it. History will gather with admiration the magnificent day-to-day labor of its reconstruction as one of the greatest demonstrations ever made of the grandeur of the human spirit. The European people had been able to suffocate within their hearts all negative human passions, the presence of smoking ruins, the mourning in their homes, the desire for revenge; and they were able to cast their hates and resentments into the pyre where the furies of discord were already being consumed.

This prodigious event is at this moment present before us as an example and an inspiration for the American Continent. For this reason I wish, even if only briefly, to expound here some of its deep-felt repercussions:

Two months ago I found myself visiting the beautiful Hanseatic city of Lubeck, on the shores of the Baltic Sea, frontier to the Iron Curtain countries. The barbed-wire fences were before us. A deep ditch, a strip of raked soil, loose, so as to hold the tracks of fugitives; an enclosure covered with pines from which protruded the towers where the Soviet guards, with arms on their shoulders and carrying field glasses, were scrutinizing the horizon. On the one side were the open spaces of the immense Soviet Empire; on the other side, the plains of Western Europe.

What a marvelous site on which to compare what the two systems disputing the minds of man have been able to construct, starting with nothing, over a period of 17 years. To the east are Kulak farms, almost totally frustrated; man being submitted to the rationing of his clothing and shoes; stores containing products which upon distribution turn out to be scare and of inferior quality; substantial food, but monotonous and without variety. The population lives in dwellings where 10 or more families are bunched together with only one kitchen and a single bathroom. Among the superiorities of the system are the theaters, found even in the small villages, and which exhibit shows and ballets; but the higways are deficient and carry little transportation. Youth is receiving more instruction daily, but is also daily becoming more impatient because of the low standard of living. In order to pacify discontent, Khrushchev has found it necessary to promise for the year 1982, that is to say, within 20 years, a satisfactory standard of living.

But then I looked at the other side: There were fields cultivated up to the last inch; magnificent highways; intense traffic with modern transportation; neat cities demonstrating, as in the country, a remarkable state of prosperity. The stores are overflowing with all those products which make life beautiful; nearly all homes, even to the last farm, are provided with comforts for each family; and nowhere can be seen the stigma of wretchedness. What Khrushchev offers for 1982 is already in existence here. And why such a radical and impressive difference? Because in the East man lives under state coercion; he trembles at the presence of a policeman; the land, which does not belong to him, is his stepmother; he does not cause it to become fertile by his love and free labor. Man feels that he as, the machinery, the cattle and crops all belong to the state, to that monstrous abstraction, in whose name the people and their consciences are enslaved and subjugated. The state is an immense prison with its closed frontiers, and everywhere one feels the reign of terror.

On the other side, Western Europe offers a radical and moving contrast. Man possesses his rights; he enjoys his liberties; he can move about with frontiers open everywhere; he works where he wills; he worships at the church he pleases; within free institutions, bureaucracy considers him to be a man with a dignity of his own; the respect for the use of his rights is to be found everywhere, and this fact gives him the certainty that the state belongs to him and not that he is a slave of the state. For him, the land is truly Mother Earth; he cultivates and enriches it with his love because he knows that it is the foundation of his liberties and of his independent home. Just as in Russia the fatherland is a prison; so in Western Europe, the state is a temple dedicated to liberty. This evidence is daily becoming more accessible thanks to the marvelous progress which has been made in systems of communication and information. For this reason, Communist ideology declines, while liberty advanvces. Liberty and abundance go hand in hand.

Yesterday De Gaulle and Adenauer had a meeting in order to study the conversion of the economic union of Europe into a political union. We would not be surprised to learn soon of the constitution of the United States of Europe. But the movement does not stop here: The statesmen of the free world in the United States, the English Commonwealth, and Western Europe, are commenting upon the most powerful state ever known in human history: the Atlantic state, which would include the first world power, the United States, a large portion of the English Commonwealth, and Western Europe. The NATO is the nucleus where these projects for the construction of the free world are germinating. This is the explanation for the assurance and the confidence with which Western civilization acts today.

And here is one more piece of information of incalculable importance: As a mandate of the universal conscience, the rich and the prosperous feel a moral duty to help those nations who are in the process of being developed. The nations of Asia are unfolding rapidly by means of fabulous investments reaching them from both of these sectors, investments which are even reaching those neutrals, or amphibious, who are standing on one of the corners of history with their right hand out to the United States and the left out to Russia. But I want to speak about that Africa which is receiving preferential treatment from Western Europe. The affirmation can be made that as a consequence of already established treaties, within 5 years the majority of these new African nations who are already at full production will be members of the European Common Market.

And so, this is the time to ask ourselves a question which is disturbing and replete with anxiety: What position is occupied by Latin America within this ensemble of countries feverishly dedicated to the task of creating abundance and extirpating misery? The inter-American system is presently passing through a serious crisis full of suspicious fear and discouragement. We are victims of a vast and powerfully financed conspiracy whose immediate objective is the prevention of the economic integration of America. The fundamental purpose of this conspiracy is to weaken the friendship of the Latin American nations with the United States. In order to

accomplish this, the most farfetched resentments and the most absurd suspicions are being stirred up, with the possible result being that in this world panorama of struggle against poverty and chaos, the Latin American countries may be left behind for a long period of time as the residue and relic of economic backwardness, of poverty and disorder, with all its corresponding disastrous consequences.

At Punta del Este in August of last year, our representatives signed the agreement for the alliance for progress. From a financial point of view, the alliance for progress signifies the contribution by the United States, during a period of 10 years, of $20 billion. This fantastic figure, when put to work, will create a formidable economic expansion which will make our nations capable also of contributing within this same period of 10 years a sum amounting to $10 billion. This expansion will bring about investments of capital from European countries, as well as investments made by credit institutions and private companies from the various parts of the world. In this manner may be explained the statement made by Secretary Dillon to the effect that the total mobilization of capital which will be brought about by the alliance for progress will reach the mythical figure of $100 billion.

The alliance for progress signifies the determination to ward off great detriments to our Latin American economy; these being, of course, the accumulation of production surpluses, and above all, the collapse in price of raw materials basic to Latin American economy. The losses caused by this drop in prices are of such magnitude that, if not corrected, they will nullify all cooperation, no matter how voluminous this might be, including that of the alliance for progress.

This alliance, according to the Punta del Este Charter, is founded on the liberties of the American peoples and on representative democratic institutions. On the other hand, it rests on the determination to create social justice in all its different aspects. It is therefore a revolutionary platform which has been given to the people and not to the dictators.

At Punta del Este, upon affixing his signature to the agreement for the alliance for progress, Secretary of the Treasury Ortiz Mena explained on behalf of the Government of Mexico, "This is America's hour." And in truth, it is the hour of America. The alliance for progress will give to our demoralized youth a faith, a hope, a possibility for constructing their independent homes; and at the same time, will demonstrate our capacity and the intelligence of our generation to prepare the explosive population emerging each year, with a place in the opportunities offered by our countries. Then, who are the ones fighting against such a gigantic and marvelous undertaking?

These are, of course, those dictators who do not wish to allow the progress of liberty and social justice. But above all, these are the Communist conspirators. Khruschev fought for years in every possible manner in an attempt to destroy the economic integration of Europe. Even today, he is still inviting Adenauer to participate in a private meeting. History is trying to repeat itself in our own Latin America. But our countries know that we are not behind the Iron Curtain, as Castro Ruz seemed to think. We form a part of Western civilization; we should therefore act before the breach becomes wider so as to avert this serious crisis of reciprocal distrust.

It is at this point that I wish to refer to the example and the foresight of Europe, for the Bible says, "The country without vision shall perish." On the one side of the balance of destiny are the resentments and distrusts which are as dry leaves, while on the other side is to be found the destiny of future generations.

The Punta del Este Conference, which has been the reason for a seeming separation, was in effect the consecration of the democratic dignity of America. The best praise in this connection was made by President Kennedy and his Secretary of State Rusk when they said: "The Punta del Este Conference was not the Varsovia agreement; it was an assembly of free peoples, not of satellites. The thesis that the Marxist-Leninist doctrine is incompatible with the system of inter-American liberties—as was fittingly set forth by our Secretary Tello—gave a definitive common denominator to our nations at a crucial hour.

Let us go back to fraternity; let us realize that the failure of the alliance for progress would be the greatest disaster which could happen to the continent; it would be to hand over Latin America to the enemy, and to do this without a struggle.. As for our governments and our peoples, they should reject the lies being propagated by Communist conspirators to the effect that the alliance for progress is an imperialistic maneuver. In the free world, imperialism has been banished to the cemetery where slavery and inquisition have already been buried. Those who want to find imperialism must seek for it behind the Iron Curtain. The alliance for progress has the material and moral greatness of the Marshall plan, which has been judged by the greatest statesmen of Europe as a noble and redeeming joint operation.

Let us tell the United States that the people of Mexico have not become ensnared in the conspiracy against the destiny of America; and that the day on which President Kennedy visits this city of Mexico, he shall receive a most spontaneous and formidable manifestation of admiration and of friendship

Let us unite our hearts, tightening ranks with our Government, with President Lopez Mateos, and let us become champions of the most beautiful adventure of our century, the alliance for progress. This is the hour of reconciliation for the peoples of America.

Early Pledges of American Legion Never Forgotten—Never Abandoned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the more than 40 years record of the American Legion of community service and protecting the rights of veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean war is a proud record of accomplishment.

Al Weinberg, chairman of the public relations commission of the American Legion, department of California, a constitutent of mine and a dedicated member of the American Legion, has reviewed some of the pledges of the American Legion in its formative period of organization in Paris following World War I.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including herewith American Legion Comrade Al Weinberg's review of these pledges which was recently published in the Culver City Citizen, which calls to mind the fine service the American Legion has rendered to both the adult and juvenile population of the United States:

EARLY PLEDGES OF AMERICAN LEGION REVIEWED BY AL WEINBERG—PLEDGES NEVER FORGOTTEN; NOT ABANDONED

(By Al Weinberg)

For almost 43 years the American Legion has patterned its program along the lines of community service with several basic factors as its guide.

Those factors were determined during the formative days in Paris even before the founders agreed upon the organization name. They said, in substance, "Never, so long as we live, shall we permit a war-wounded American to suffer the need for proper hospital or medical attention, his widow or family to endure the humiliation of poverty, his orphans to lack the opportunity for adequate education."

That pledge brought about the creation of the Veterans' Administration, now with 170 hospitals and 120,000 war veteran patients; it prompted the GI bill with its provisions for on-the-job training, opportunities for academic training, business loans at nominal interest, terminal leave pay to correspond with similar rights extended nonmilitary personnel during war, preference in civil service to offset time spent in uniform and many other measures of relief and assistance to retool the veteran for peacetime pursuits paralleling the program Government offered industry after the wars. It was as necessary, thought the Legion, to renegotiate the veterans contract as it was to renegotiate that of industry which received billions in structures, machinery, supplies, and finances in the same process.

Meanwhile, programs designed to safeguard the ideals for which the wars were fought were established. More than 4,300 units of Boy Scouts are sponsored by the American Legion nationwide. Almost a half-million high school students throughout the country each year take part in an oratorical contest requiring intensive study of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, the major awards being a $4,000 scholarship for first place, $2,500 for second, and $1,500 for third. More than 1 million boys play baseball each year under sponsorship of American Legion posts, not because the Legion is interested in developing professional baseball players, despite the interesting fact that a large percentage of those professionals received their initial start with Legion teams. Baseball, says the Legion, exposes the youngster to a type of discipline not received at home, in the school or in the church, for when the umpire says, "Three strikes, you're out" there is little chance to have that decision changed.

The alumni of those programs have taken their places in industry, Government, the trades and professions and the entertainment fields of the Nation. Never once has any single participant, to the knowledge of the American Legion, been involved in a treacherous or disloyal act against our Government nor the ideals of America.

In the promotion of these, and other equally absorbing programs, the American Legion has been unselfish. It has never sought nor developed any undertaking solely for the benefit of its own members. Hospitalization and medical attention have been sought for all war veterans—not merely for members of the American Legion. The youth projects were open to all youth, not those of the family of Legionnaires.

The fact that many of the programs have been more recently adopted by other organizations speaks well for the farsightedness of the Legion. For 42 years the American Legion has been telling the public that communism is and has been a serious threat to the national security—and supplied the data to prove it, for free.

The American Legion has never claimed a monopoly on loyalty, nor patriotism, and it is heartening to note that there appears to be an upsurge of nationalism in the land.

This has been a strange paradox because of the noticeable, strong move afoot to encourage nationalism and love of country everywhere else except in the United States.

Love of country is an inborn trait, spawned with birth. It takes training to shake it and but little encouragement to nurture it.

The American Legion believes that the steps of loyalty should be inviolate; that these steps are loyalty to family, home, community, State and Nation; and that they should not be profaned by influences originating offshore.

The Liberal Papers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the criticisms of some of my colleagues on the publication of a group of essays by admittedly distinguished authors, based upon the fear that an expression of views will corrupt American thought and bring about a new "Munich" is perhaps illustrative of the basic thing that is wrong with the Republican Party. They are afraid to trust their fellow Americans. They believe their fellow Americans must only have available one side of a story, and that the right side from the Republican point of view, or the country will rush toward disaster and a "Munich."

Personally, I have faith in the American people. I believe they are better able to make a judgment when they read all views, from the far right, or Birch Society position, to the far left, as well as those views of the so-called middle.

I doubt whether my Republican friends have read the various articles in "The Liberal Papers." It would make them better Americans to do so, even though such articles might not change their rigid opinions. As an individual, I do not agree with many of the views expressed by the authors of "The Liberal Papers." But I am glad to have read them, as I am glad to have listened and read the speeches of such men as Messrs. Buckley, Schwarz, and the distinguished Member of the other body from Arizona.

America has made progress because we have had a free expression of any and all views. From these have come sound decisions, and I am sorry to see my Republican colleagues try to impugn or be uncomplimentary to those who still believe that this method is the best way to preserve our basic American way of life.

In this spirit, I would like to quote from an American who might not be labeled "liberal," but certainly would be considered a good American. An article by John Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, from the American Bar Association Journal of February 1962, entitled "Shall It Be Law or Tyranny?" reads, in part, as follows:

Our fight against communism must be a sane, rational understanding of the facts. Emotional outbursts, extravagant name-calling, gross exaggerations hinder our efforts. We must remember that many non-Communists may legitimately on their own oppose the same laws or take positions on issues of the day which are also held by the Communists. Their opinions—though temporarily coinciding with the party line—do not make them Communists. Not at all. We must be very careful with our facts and not brand as a Communist any individual whose opinion may be different from our own. Freedom of dissent is a great heritage of America which we must treasure.

With such sentiments perhaps not only the Republican leadership, but most good Americans will agree.

The War Against Dope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 4, there was a very interesting program over radio station WABC in New York which dealt with the narcotic problem. As a former judge and as one who has sponsored legislation in Congress to solve this problem and to help its victims, the narcotic addicts, I was extremely interested in the presentation and the views expressed by the participants.

Among the participants on the program were my good friends, Judge Hyman Barshay of the county court in Brooklyn and Assemblyman Stanley Steingut of the 18th Assembly District in Brooklyn. Both of these men have taken a very active interest in the narcotic problem and are doing everything humanly possible to find a solution. They deserve a great deal of credit and recognition for their efforts. Our community of Brooklyn is very proud of the very able leadership of these two men, not only in this particular field, but in many other endeavors for the welfare of the people of Brooklyn.

The program, entitled "The War Against Dope," was narrated by Jack Powers. State Senator Frank J. Pino also participated in it. All of these men, and especially radio station WABC, deserve credit for rendering a great public service in bringing this problem out into the open and arousing public interest. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of the program.

The article follows:

THE WAR AGAINST DOPE

JACK POWERS. During the next 25 minutes you will be taken through the dark side of our society. Sometimes the angle from which we view the people who live in the "no man's land" is distorted. Often it is overplayed and overdramatized. But those who have been caught in the trap impending hopelessness through dope addiction may or may not find a way out. The levels of Dante's Hell are deep, and the road is rocky and there are those who fall back.

ADDICT. I came from a good family * * * was raised * * * they provided me with everything. And yet, I became addicted to narcotics. How—how is this possible?

JACK POWERS. Somehow or other they always try to climb out. But for many the story is the same and the footholds out of the pit sometimes crumble.

Judge BARSHAY. To him my courtroom has become a revolving door. He is in, and he is out. And the process that we are now following is equivalent to bailing out the ocean with a teaspoon.

JACK POWERS. A judge, human being, feels he must stick to the letter of the law; his social conscience and his ability to look someone in the face who is lost; and to sentence him to jail because of society's weakness is one of the hardest things for this man of feeling to do. For after all, the man who wears the judicial robes is a human being too. Like him, in the end, we all pay, and we become heartsick.

MEDICAL EXAMINER FELDMAN. To look at a lifeless body lying on a slab in the morgue, and as you plunge that knife into that body knowing that this thing (that's before you) was a living thing that was able to emote, that was able to generate feeling, that was able to be responsive to an emotion is, to me, one of the biggest crimes that have been manifested upon society.

JACK POWERS. Sometimes when a few human beings have had enough of the social sickness of dope addiction, sometimes when men have grieved enough for the fate of the youngster who falls prey to the needle—that is when a group of men become angry—and the committee is formed to wage the war against dope. This is their story.

(Music—crescendo—background theme.)

JACK POWERS. This is Jack Powers, director of News and Public Affairs, WABC. Tonight, another "Action: New York Documentary." A continuing study and appraisal of the important problems facing our community in today's complex world. The subject one which could very well encompass your life and that of your neighbors. It deals with a most sordid facet of our society. This report does not attempt to condemn, for the sake of punishment, or expose for the sake of sensationalism. But we seek rather to gain the single objective of giving further impetus to the noble effort of a group dedicated to rehabilitation of the otherwise doomed. If one person is helped through this cause then we will have accomplished our purpose. In view of the recent police crackdown on dope which came to public attention last week, WABC felt it necessary to explore the effects of the stream of illicit dope into our city which escaped the cautious eye of our narcotics' agents.

Inspector. CAREY. Members of my command received confidential information back in November of last year that a large shipment was due in this country. And, through various sources of investigation, as you know, and I know, that I would rather not speak of, we were able to.

JACK POWERS. You are listening to the voice of Deputy Chief Inspector Edward Carey, head of the New York Police Narcotics Bureau, telling the story of how one of the largest narcotics caches in history was discovered and confiscated. (Fade Carey up.)

Inspector CAREY. Finally, on January 18, when it was time to close in, we felt the junk had arrived in this country, and we were ready to move on it. At which time, we did, and we raided Patsy Fucca's father's place on 7th Street in Brooklyn, and we came up with 11 kilos of pure heroin, shotguns, machine guns, et cetera. We feel now that we have finally obtained all the heroin that was in that particular shipment. In talking of the money aspect, I don't feel that the Fucca's have the money to back this particular shipment. They are working for someone else higher up. It is almost an impossibility for us to connect the higher-ups

with it, because in this business they merely act as loan sharks.

JACK POWERS. The ruthless men who peddle narcotics stop at nothing to gain ends. But these are only at the bottom of the pyramid. The racketeers at the apex, are the ones who subsist on this filthy traffic.

INSPECTOR CAREY. They put up the money for an operation—they give it to what we call "button men" who are coming up in the rackets. They make the connections, they move the stuff, and within a month or two, they have to return a profit of possibly 200 percent or 300 percent on the original investment made by these loan sharks.

JACK POWERS. No less an evil than the heroin smuggled into our country is the dope pusher who preys on anyone and everyone, including the sick, the invalid, and the young. In our high schools the prey is at hand.

INSPECTOR CAREY. The Youth Board claimed there are 4,000 teenagers in schools who are addicts. We have a very close liasion with the the public schools who have squads, and I have lieutenants and sergeants in charge of those squads. At the opening of this school year, and every September, these men are ordered to, and they do, contact the principal and the custodian of every school in the city of New York and they are given the lieutenants' and sergeants' home telephone numbers so that in any event they want to reach them for any particular reason whatso ever, they will be available to them.

JACK POWERS. The youngster on dope is caught in a trap and then he becomes society's problem. He is sent away after apprehension, but for Inspector Carey, a police officer working overtime and many hard hours, it's not just concern with the nabbing of an addict and putting him away. He wants to find a permanent cure. The image of this policeman has changed. The dragnetter becomes a social crusader. A badge man with an idea, a workable solution.

INSPECTOR CAREY. I feel that they should be sent away for at least a year. No less. And in that way they will be rehabilitated. In other words, I visualize a quonset hut type camp where these men will work at least 4 hours outdoors. Then, another 4 hours of that workday would be for vocational training so that when they do come out they could step into a job. Furthermore, if you could take, as I would like to do, 20,000 to 25,000 addicts off the streets of New York, I would thereby be removing the market for narcotics. Now there isn't a hoodlum alive that will put up money unless he's sure of a return of about 200 percent at least. There isn't any hood that would put up money to go to the expense of smuggling heroin into New York City if his market were stashed away in a camp up-State.

JACK POWERS. Many people are seeking to find the answers for the care and treatment of the addict. How is he put back on the right road? Usually under present circumstances the man who is hooked is like a rat in a maze. The voice you are about to hear is masked—for obvious reasons. His family, his friends, and his employer will never know. He is an addict. His arms are outstretched, not for a fix, but for help.

ADDICT. I have tried to enter the hospital, several hospitals, only to be told they haven't got the facilities, they haven't got the personnel to treat an addict. They told me that they were sorry but I should try somewhere else. Eventually I wound up in the Riker's Island Penitentiary for 30 days where I committed myself as a self-committer and unable to get to narcotics or a seller of narcotics. I went through 30 days with them, they would release you without no followup, without no care, whether you went back to addiction or drugs or the same people you associated with before.

JACK POWERS. Where can this man with the veiled voice turn? Science seeks to get the monkey off his back in new and different ways. We usually think of the cure for dope addiction as the process of padded cells, straitjacket hysteria, but gradual detoxification seems to be a better way.

INSPECTOR CAREY. From my experience, in fact, I was out to Lexington, Ky. here about 2 months ago, and I was assured by the head doctor down there that the worst case of addiction can be detoxified. That is, where the system does not need these drugs. Within 7 to 10 days, by the use of Methadone orally. Therefore, I feel if you give a man 30 days in the hospital, this is ample time for him to build himself up physically and to withdraw from the drugs without any pain whatsoever.

JACK POWERS. The man on dope will stop at nothing to feed his habit. The sting of the first penetration of the needle is a shock, but the virgin arm will feel it nevertheless. It may start with marihuana cigarettes in a school bathroom or in a dark corridor. The sinister habit can only be described by one who felt the first sensation, it's a new world. What is it like? The man with the veiled voice was there.

ADDICT. Well, it's, it's very easily said. 'Cause innocently enough I did come in contact with narcotics and innocently enough I did take an injection, an injection in the skin. They call that a skin pop. Which means that it's faster acting and I'd feel that kick that much more quicker. But as time went on I found that I lost my job, and I began taking money from my parents, telling them different stories, why I needed money. The gamblers were after me. I needed money to pay off the bookmakers. I told them I got in trouble with a girl. I needed money for the girl, just to get money. And the only thing that I was doing was spending it for drugs.

JACK POWERS. For the dope addict seeking to give himself a blast, the nights are long, the days are a harried hunt for horse. Horse is heroin and the end is hurt. Not only hurt for him, but for friends, family, and those close to him. In this case, it was a broken home.

ADDICT. It not only wrecked my home, but my parents became very ill because of my addiction; they were very sick. Every time I had to go away, either for a crime, that I committed to get money for narcotics, or putting myself away in the hospital, I think they felt it much more harder than I did.

JACK POWERS. The dream world of the teenage addict enlivened by deadly drugs becomes a nightmare for society. Assemblyman Stanley Steingut studied the penetration of this menace in the social fabric. There was an awakening among lawmakers. They were appalled at what they found.

Assemblyman STEINGUT. When I was given the figures, I was amazed, and I felt that it was my obligation to get into this fight and get into it immediately. We have been told that there are 5,000 additional addicts every year. And this is amazing, and certainly we should put a stop to it.

JACK POWERS. Many addicts seek a way out. They try to do it by themselves, they're encouraged by the knowledge that someone else cares.

ADDICT. The only thing that I can say is that as long as I know that there are some people interested in us, to show me that they are considerate, and they are worried, to the extent where they will devote some time toward helping me, I will try my best to go along with them and help myself as long as they're willing to help me.

JACK POWERS. Others do care about the man with the veiled voice. Lawmakers, city officials, social and civic leaders took up his cause. They formed a Committee of 500. They approached the problem of dope addiction in the city of New York at the grassroots. They saw the massive outcry against the spread of this vice. The Committee of 500 asked for a million signatures and petitions to be sent to the State legislature. The call was for action. Senator Frank Pino raised the battle standard.

Senator PINO. Our committee was organized recently and was composed of outstanding people within our community. We have started the drive to encourage the support of this committee through every phase of community activity. We have already gained the support of the United Taxi Owner's Guild, of various phases of labor. At the moment there are 12,000 taxicabs in New York City carrying our petitions and having them signed by the public through the taxi driver.

JACK POWERS. The man with the veiled voice reaches out and a city tries to help and reach him too. Sometimes the task is hard.

ADDICT. Before you can cure an addict you must be able to reach him, to try and understand him, to let him know that, that you're willing, and you're sincere in your efforts, and you will devote some time toward helping him—trying to guide him, to show him the difference—instead of letting him destroy his life and those near to him. He wants to be helped. When a person becomes addicted, after a few months every night becomes a night of fear because he must wake up the next day wondering and worrying where he will get the money to buy the drugs. There are so many things that go through an addict's mind, so many things, except how or when will he ever be able to stop.

JACK POWERS. In order to bring this person from the no-man's land, the Committee of 500 enlisted the aid of the workingman. There were many motives for suppressing the spread of narcotics. The web of the net reached out to strangle the innocent. The drivers took a hand; they had reasons for doing it.

CAB DRIVER. About 90 percent of the crimes committed against cab drivers are perpetrated by dope addicts. We feel that the drug addicts themselves need help. This proposed legislation would accomplish all three points. I think that the Committee of 500 should be complimented. I think it's about time the entire populace was aroused as to the menace that confronts all of us that have teenage children.

JACK POWERS. The State of New York has over 21,000 known addicts. This is almost half of the entire national figure. These people account for 35 percent of the crimes in the city of New York alone. But the most appalling fact is this: of those 21,000 junkies, one-sixth are under 21 years of age. This story is well known to the man with the veiled voice.

ADDICT. I've seen 14-, 15-, 15-year-old boys addicted to narcotics. I do know that if they need the drug, they need the medicine, because they will become ill, they will go to any lengths to get it.

JACK POWERS. How young can a narcotics addict be? The youngest you know of.

ADDICT. The youngest I know of? Thirteen years old.

JACK POWERS. What happened?

ADDICT. Well, this young fellow, they take him, whenever the pusher is going to pick up his narcotics for the day's business—they're trying to be a little cautious—he will take this young boy and let him carry the narcotics for him and promise that he will straighten him out with some stuff after he gets to his destination. Sometimes a pusher has to go like from Brooklyn to New York to get his narcotics and bring them back to Brooklyn. And, as I said, he will take this young fellow with him and let him carry the narcotics for him. I guess the reason is that as long as he don't have anything in his possession, he feels pretty safe.

JACK POWERS. This reporter investigated the facts on the spread of narcotics among our schoolchildren. The language books were

cast aside by the boys and girls who ventured into this other world. Teenage degradation made its own vocabulary. The glossary of the pot parties startles the uninitiated. The dictionary of dope, sounds like this?

(Music—crescendo.)

JACK POWERS. Mainliner—one who shoots heroin directly into the large vein.

(Music—crescendo.)

JACK POWERS. Kick—a thrill from dope—or an attempt to break the habit.

(Music—crescendo.)

JACK POWERS. Cotton—the parched dried-out feeling after the drug's effect wears off.

(Music—crescendo.)

JACK POWERS. Fix. A shot of dope.

(Music—crescendo.)

JACK POWERS. Joy pop. The introduction by an occasional sample.

(Music—crescendo. Then background.)

JACK POWERS. This is the dictionary of dope. By the time the words fall into the ears of parents and teacher, then it's too late. Seymour Lackman, a history teacher at Lafayette High School in Brooklyn tells of the tragedy that struck within his own neighborhood.

Mr. LACKMAN. It has come to our attention, that dope pushers have been using innocent teenagers—youngsters of 13, 14, and 15 years old. There is a park situated close to a junior high school in our community and this park has been used by the pushers to get rid of their narcotics by giving them to youngsters. This has come to our attention. Some of my students have told me of cases going back several years where youngsters, teenagers that they have known, have been buying and securing marijuana and of the forms of dope.

JACK POWERS. Judge Hyman Barshay had an inspiration. He saw the hurt, the hardship, and the terror in those who were brought before him. He leads the committee of 500 in a crusade to right a great wrong in society. He sums it all up.

Judge BARSHAY. Our aim is to legislate for the creation of a maximum security hospital for drug addicts. For the creation of health, and vocational training camps. For a coordinated central office. For the registration and fingerprinting and photographing of drug addicts. And that's why I am so grateful to the members of the medical profession, to the clergy, and to all others who have joined our committee, and I pray that all of them lend their prestige—give us their advice—their talent—and guide us in this tremendous war that must be won. And, especially am I indebted to WABC whom we have found is a staunch friend in educating the public, in advising them of the importance of this problem, and I would appreciate your sending letters to that station to prove its worth, encouraging them in their efforts. We have found, up to date, their cooperation, magnificent.

JACK POWERS. Our job does not end here. Until all people of every walk of life join forces in eradicating the problem, this is only the beginning. For this man, there was a turning point. He had to find out the hard way.

ADDICT. I think it was when my mother died this past summer. I was away in prison. And, I received a visit and I was told that my mother had died. And since that happened, and I was eventually released from prison, I am trying my best to make amends to my father and I have been doing it up to now.

JACK POWERS. A son who couldn't attend the funeral of his own mother. Then, there were those who were never able to fight their way out. The scene: a morgue.

Medical Examiner FELDMAN. Well, I've had the unfortunate situation of having to come across people when they were alive, and people when they were dead. People when they were alive under the throes of drug addition, and people when they were dead, lifless, bloodless, lying on a slab and cold. To see a human being repress themselves to a level that is so low and sniveling and groveling in the sand just to reach up for that one bit of relief that they're looking for is, to me, one of the biggest crimes that have been manifested upon society.

JACK POWERS. The full implications of the dope menace in our society may never be known. The imprisoned minds of those who have succumed to the habit may only be freed by an enlightened community. The petitions circulated by the committee of 500 which you may sign, could prevent the next veiled voice from being stilled on a slab.

Research by Larry Murphy; directed by David B. Fein; produced by WABC Public Affairs; the War Against Dope was a new concept in audio-documentation. This is Jack Powers. This is Action: New York.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

REA Appeals to States in Power Industry Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include an article entitled "REA Appeals to States in Power Industry Fight" which appeared in the Peoria Journal Star, March 18, 1962:

REA APPEALS TO STATES IN POWER INDUSTRY FIGHT

(By Ovid A. Martin)

WASHINGTON.—The Government-sponsored rural electrification system is appealing to the States for legislative help in a battle with private power concerns over the right to serve potentially millions of customers.

It is calling upon State legislatures for laws that would protect farm cooperative rural power systems from efforts of some power companies to move into territories developed by the cooperatives.

The Rural Electrification Administration (REA), Government agency, which has loaned $5 billion to more than a thousand rural power cooperatives and power districts, is leading a fight to protect its borrowers against what it calls encroachments of rival private utilities.

The REA has drafted what it calls a model territorial integrity act which it is asking its borrowers and others interested in the cooperative power system to present to legislatures of States where there is no legal protection against the extension of power lines and services of private concerns into areas already served by the farmer systems.

Norman M. Clapp, REA Administrator, said it is his conviction that "territorial protection for rural electric cooperatives in the areas they have developed in good faith can only come through State legislation."

The only States now providing a high degree of protection to existing power systems in the territories originally assigned them, the REA said, are: Arkansas, Idaho, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Vermont, Georgia, Kentucky, Texas, and Wisconsin.

Clapp said that in many areas of the country, the private power concerns have started a new campaign to weaken and destroy the electric cooperatives.

He told interviewers that the rivals of the cooperatives are using a number of tactics. Particularly vulnerable, he said, are the cooperatives which depend upon private concerns for all or a part of their power. In some cases of this kind, he said, the power suppliers are increasing the rates and reducing the amount of power made available to the cooperatives.

The most serious threat, he said, is the effort of some private utilities to take over the more densely populated areas now served by the cooperatives.

"The hope of lower-cost electric service for millions of rural Americans can be destroyed if cooperative rural systems are stripped of their more densely populated areas and deprived of their right to serve the larger industrial and commercial loads that develop in their service territories," Clapp said.

Many of the controversies between farm power cooperatives and their rivals center around new communities, shopping centers, housing developments and industries, which have sprung up in territories of the cooperatives since they developed their systems.

The private power companies contend that such areas are no longer rural and consequently should no longer be served by a rural power supplier.

The REA argues that it would be wrong to take away such blocks of customers. It says the private companies showed little or no interest in such territories when the rural cooperatives moved in. Further, it says, to take away these sources of income would be to wreck the cooperatives.

It will provide funds for building of generation systems and transmission lines, where no adequate and dependable source of power is available and where the rates offered by existing power sources would result in a higher cost of power for the consumer than the cost under a REA-financed generation system.

Private power groups have asked Congress, to enact legislation prohibiting loans under such conditions.

Under the REA Act the Government is not permitted to make loans, to borrowers for building systems to serve towns, villages or boroughs of more than 1,500 population. But there is nothing in the act that would toss out such systems when their towns and villages grow in population.

Clapp said the power cooperatives are not trying to take anything away from the private power concerns.

"The cooperatives are not invading the cities or usurping anyone else's rightful business. They seek only protection for what they have built. They seek legal recognition of the right to remain in service areas they developed as rural areas originally but which have since been caught up in the tide of population growth and municipal expansion."

S O S: Save Our Streams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the December 22, 1961, issue of Life magazine was devoted to our great outdoors. Editorially, Life tells how the modern metropolis is out of harmony with the surrounding countryside.

The editorial deals primarily with problems of land use, urban sprawl, poor planning. It states that:

Our huge Federal highway program, instead of attempting to restore this harmony, is strictly an interurban layout with little concern for its effect on the land and towns between. It illustrates the bad American habit of letting the automobile direct our development, instead of telling the auto where we want to go.

The Federal highway system destroys water resources as it likewise damages land. We do not, under the present system, give due regard to fish, wildlife, and recreation values in planning highway construction.

That is why I have introduced S. 2767, which would require the Secretary of the Interior's approval of Federal-aid highway projects affecting our fish, wildlife, and recreation resources. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert the Life editorial, entitled "Use and Promises of America's Land," in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

USES AND PROMISES OF AMERICA'S LAND

No change in man's condition is more dramatic than his relationship to his sister Nature. He started life on earth worshiping nature, whether as sun, moon or thunderbolt. As he shifted his worship to an unseen Father, man launched his long war on nature with weapons that developed from club to plow to dynamite and rocket. There is no aspect of terrene nature, not even the seas and the poles, which man has not studied to subdue to his purpose, mostly with success.

The American experience with nature is a 450-year capsule of this human story. On the beautiful howling wilderness in which our aborigines found their gods, our settlers, to survive, at once declared war. By 1900 the continent and its wealth were at our mercy. We then declared a truce called conservation, a gesture of penance, prudence, and piety. Now we face a different problem: finding a way to live in stabler harmony with nature. It is a problem of baffling complexity; for the competing claims for the use of our conquered and finite land—for houses, highways, industry, recreation, wildlife, a whole variety of public and private uses—have never seemed so urgent.

"The land was ours before we were the land's," said Poet Robert Frost. To their courageous discoverers the American forests seemed literally inexhaustible as well as hostile. "Cut, burn, plant, destroy, move on"—that was the necessary slogan that peopled this continent. Slowly the process of possessing this land turned us into "her people." The savage pioneers became homesteaders and husbandmen. Not until the Dust Bowl of the 1930's did we learn that soil as well as trees must be treated with respect, but conscience had begun to curb our ferocity even before the end of the Indian wars.

A turning point came by a campfire near Wyoming's Firehole River on September 19, 1870. Ten men who had just explored the Yellowstone had "a rather unusual discussion" of what to do with their incredible find. After lively suggestions for preempting title and exploiting it, Judge Cornelius Hedges of Montana spoke. He did not approve of these plans. The whole region was too magnificent to be privately owned. It should be set apart as a great national park, and the dis-

coverers should try to get this done. Most of them caught the judge's spark. Thus was our national park system born "for the benefit and enjoyment of the people."

A generation later Theodore Roosevelt, with Gifford Pinchot's expert help, made conservation a popular cause and a permanent policy. He did so by dramatizing the battle of public conscience against private exploiters. Today this battle is less relevant. Nobody is against the conservation of our national resources. But neither do the conservationists agree on one meaning for the word, nor is there any single formula, short of the modern catchall ecology, by which man's purposes and nature's can be precisely reconciled. Most conservation laws now stipulate the multiple-use management of public lands—among the several uses (they are not always compatible) being the guardianship of timber, water, power, wildlife, grazing, recreation, and sheer wildness.

The Federal Government already controls the use of 34 percent of the surface of the United States, largely in the arid West and in Alaska. Elsewhere there is a serious shortage of public recreational facilities. If new Federal land purchases are to supply this lack, as proposed in Secretary Udall's new program, the Government could well balance the purchases by sales from its western holdings—preferably to industrial and residential developers (as proposed in H.R. 7788). These western acres (now low priced) are as underpopulated as eastern land is overpopulated (and overpriced). Sell the West and buy the East might be one formula for the new and broader Federal land policy we need.

Sustained-yield management is now commonplace in all big private as well as public forests. Soil conservation, thanks partly to F.D.R., Harold Ickes, and Henry Wallace, is the increasing practice of our farmers. Many States are as conservation minded as the Federal Government and are in better shape than they were a generation ago. The old T.R. type of conservation battle will still go on in local areas. But it is not the major problem that now confronts the American in his relationship to nature.

A predominantly rural people in 1900, we are now predominantly 70 percent urban and suburban.

There is nothing unnatural about cities or suburbs; but the modern metropolitan area represents our greatest unsolved problem of land use. Slum clearance and public housing have not made our cities more livable. The squares that let London breathe, the fountains of Rome, the seaside amenities of Copenhagen seem beyond the imaginative reach of Los Angeles and New York. But these are parenthetical failures. The great problem of the modern metropolis is less within than without. The metropolis itself is out of harmony with the surrounding countryside.

Our huge Federal highway program, instead of attempting to restore this harmony, is strictly an interurban layout with little concern for its effect on the land and towns between. It illustrates the bad American habit of letting the automobile direct our development, instead of telling the auto where we want to go. This habit's most visible result is urban sprawl, perhaps our cruelest misuse of land since our soil mining days.

"Urban sprawl" is not the growth of cities. Instead, as "House and Home" put it, the cities are "distintegrating and spreading the pieces over miles and miles of countryside." It is an affront to esthetics, to human relations, and to nature. It will take far more use of the infant art of "environmental planning" to correct this misuse of land. The new art is hampered by its lack of community support—and frustrated by our old practice of encouraging unproductive speculation by undertaxing unused land).

To make our cities and their outskirts more livable; to enlarge the people's right to clean air and smells and water, sky and space and seasons and parks; and to shorten their travel time both to work and to the woods or the beach—this is the next frontier in the American's long attempt to get himself into a better relationship with nature. He needs nature to help him to a sane idea of the good life. From now on the changes man works on the face of the earth should conform to nature's principles of order and balance as well as to his own desires. Says regional planner Christopher Tunnard, "Man is a learning animal, and nowadays there is no reason to be content with landscapes which are not of a higher level than before."

Cried the angel in Revelation: "Hurt not the earth, neither the sea, nor the trees." For nature is a part of the glorious fullness of God's creation no less than man. In a notable sermon in New Delhi last month, Theologian Joseph Sittler of Chicago exhorted Christians to remember this. Science has enabled man to "move in on the realm of nature and virtually take it over." But in her "pathetic openness to glorious use as to brutal rapacity," our sister nature reminds us of our common parentage and linked destiny.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, it is very encouraging to know that college students are taking a very deep interest in the affairs of our Government. They will be our leaders of tomorrow and they are awakening to the fact that their interests are affected by legislation passed now.

The student senate of the University of Wyoming has recently gone on record, by a vote of 17 to 4, as being opposed to further Federal aid to education. The action of the student body was vetoed by their president and, believing that the action taken by these students of the University of Wyoming is of interest, I am including articles covering the proceedings:

SENATE PASSES BILL—PREXY PLANS VETO

(By Kathy Karpan)

Although the senate overwhelmingly passed a bill which would oppose Federal aid to education, President Brent Eastman announced that he intended to veto the bill.

Senate bill No. 6, sponsored by John Gries, Jack Mueller, and Fred Miller, asked the senate to endorse the activities of the State and local governments.

It stated that there was no need to further supplement aid to education through the help of the Federal Government.

Because this bill contained no evidence of the research which he feels did go into such a resolution, Eastman said he would veto the bill in its present form.

Earlier in the meeting, senate bill No. 4, sponsored by Hugh McFadden and amended by Rex Arney, was defeated. The original bill suggested blanket approval of the stand of Boston University in its stand on Federal aid to education.

The amendment hoped to incorporate the viewpoint of the University of Wyoming as a result of the research done on the question. This amendment was rejected by a 13–6 vote.

When the bill in its original form was presented for approval, no affirmative votes were cast.

Eastman's decision to veto the bill was given during the announcements. His veto, he stressed, was not because of personal feelings. Eastman felt the bill failed to give any credit to the senate's efforts to understand the question.

He said that had the bill in favor of Federal aid to education, passed without giving specific reasons, he would have vetoed it too.

A QUESTIONABLE VETO

DEAR EDITOR: The president of the Student Senate of the University of Wyoming, Brent Eastman, has in effect acted as a "Judas goat" in leading a senate which has given him full and complete support into a slaughter house of contempt and ridicule.

It was Mr. Eastman who has insisted that the senate take a definite stand on the issue of Federal aid to education. But when the senate did take such a stand, through a bill which was well reasoned with thought behind it, Mr. Eastman vetoed this bill on the ground that (he believes very strongly in the opposite view of this bill) on principle, this bill is not detailed enough.

He criticizes the bill because it does not give argumentative reasons, but the bill states that there is no need for Federal action—a negative position which requires no further justification.

This is a fundamental rule of logic as reflected in judicial as well as legislative procedure, a point that Mr. Eastman cannot or will not understand.

If Brent Eastman vetoes this bill for nonpolitical reasons, as he says he does, than he is saying in effect, that the 17 senators who voted for the bill are incompetent.

Even though this vote was precipitated by a motion for the previous question, this motion was well taken and in order since the vote on it was overwhelmingly approved. Further, the last two senate meetings have been devoted to debate and discussion of Federal aid.

The bill clearly and precisely states the views and position of 17 members of the Student Senate of the University of Wyoming.

JOHN GRIES.
JACK MUELLER.
FRED MILLER.

Is the Treasury Withholding on Withholding?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, if the Revenue Act of 1962, H.R. 10650, is enacted into law, the tax complexities of the present tax statute will be greatly compounded for millions of American citizens who have income from dividends and interest. The compounding of these complexities will arise from section 19 of the bill which deals with withholding of income tax at the source on interest and dividends.

A clue to the added complexity that will ensue from the enactment of these withholding proposals is found in the fact that the statutory rules proposed in the bill begin on page 183 thereof and continue through page 229. It must, of course, be realized that these almost 50 pages of complex statutory rules will be followed by an even greater number of pages of regulations to implement the statutory language.

The withholding tax on dividends and interest that is included in this bill will be one of the greatest administrative monstrosities ever inflicted on the Internal Revenue Service and the taxpaying public. Payors of dividends and interest, and the many, many millions of recipients of dividends and interest, and the personnel of the Internal Revenue Service will be forced to wallow through a jungle of difficult and obscure rules.

The income tax structure of the United States is already incredibly complex as anyone brave enough to tackle the job of filling out his own income tax form 1040 each year knows.

To all these existing complexities and burdens the bill proposes to add this perfectly unnecessary withholding tax on dividends and interest.

One of the foremost reasons why this complex withholding system is unnecessary is that the Internal Revenue Service is shifting to the use of the new electronic data-processing machines. The membership of this House is generally familiar with the steady progress of the Internal Revenue Service toward putting every taxpayer's tax accounts on tape and keeping his complete tax history on tape. This conversion of the Internal Revenue Service to automatic data processing is moving rapidly. When it is completed there will be no room on the Federal statute books for a blunderbuss type of collection apparatus like the proposed withholding tax on dividends and interest.

That the new automatic data-processing installations of the Internal Revenue Service can cope with the problem of the underreporting gap on dividends and interest, is shown by a speech made as early as April 1961 by a senior administrative official of the Internal Revenue Service. Speaking to the Tax Institute he said that electronic automatic data-processing equipment gives to the Internal Revenue Service, and I quote: "a tool for a much more effective matching of information documents—particularly forms 1099—with tax returns so as to enable us to tighten up enforcement and thereby reduce very substantially the gap between dividend and interest payments, on the one hand, and the amounts of such income reported on returns."

He further noted this, and I quote:

> One of the important changes needed to make the information system an effective substitute for withholding is to obtain taxpayer account numbers on all forms 1099 and similar documents.

That important change has taken place. In October 1961, H.R. 8876 became law. This act authorizes the use of account numbers for taxpayers. And the Ways and Means Committee report on H.R. 8876 said:

> The bill is designed to improve enforcement and collection of internal revenue taxes by facilitating the expanded use of automatic data processing equipment by the Internal Revenue Service and by enabling the Service to match information returns now filed with tax returns.

In discussing the taxpayer account number bill on the Senate floor, on September 23, 1961, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Finance Committee said:

> This legislation, the Treasury testified, would result in closing loopholes so that those who are now avoiding the payment of taxes would be compelled to pay by operating this new number system through computing machines.

He further said:

> The tax revenue, the Treasury testified, would be increased by $5 billion.

And he added:

> The Treasury has told me it is the largest loophole closing bill that has ever been proposed.

It is, thus, clearly shown that the Internal Revenue Service has the working tools now in its hands to close any gap on the underreporting of dividends and interest: Automatic data processing and the authority to use taxpayer account numbers with this electronic equipment to trace, automaticaly, and under reporting of income.

It is beyond belief that instead of using these presently at hand modern tools to check underreporting of dividends and interest, the Victorian administrative monstrosity of a withholding tax system is also to be imposed as a millstone on the necks of both taxpayers and the Internal Revenue Service. A new relatively inexpensive administrative enforcement tool is to be abandoned, and huge administrative expense burdens are to be imposed on the taxpaying public, on payors of dividends and interest and on the Internal Revenue Service. The accounts and records of all taxpayers and the Internal Revenue Service are to be scrambled. The Service is to be forced to process and clear many, many millions of tax credit claims each year and to process, clear and write checks on many, many millions of refund claims each year.

The administrative waste will be fantastic in scope—just because this administration refuses to use, or even admit the existence of, the tools it now has in hand—electronic automatic data processing and taxpayer account numbers.

This is the same administration that told the Senate Finance Committee, in order to secure the taxpayer account legislation, that that statute would be the biggest loophole closer in history—by tracing quickly under-reported income.

What I have just said will probably be countered with this type of argument:

Our automatic data processing installations are not yet complete and we just started the use of taxpayer account numbers when the new law was passed in the fall of 1961.

But suppose several years do elapse before the Internal Revenue Service has these collection and enforcement tools fully installed, oiled, and operating.

These withholding taxes on dividends and interest are not to begin until January 1, 1963. Income tax returns for the year 1963 are not required to be filed until April 1964. Internal Revenue Service has 3 years from April 1964—that is, until April 1967—to use its electronic machines for the purpose of automatically and almost instantly tracing underreporting of dividends and interest by every taxpayer.

And if it be argued that the machines will not be geared to do this job as to dividend and interest payments in the year 1963, there is a perfect counter to such a position.

Let us assume, to be very extreme, that the machines will not be geared up to automatically and quickly trace underreporting until payments are made in the year 1965. Certainly as to any taxpayer "apprehended" by the machines for the year 1965 for failing to report dividends and interest it is a simple matter to then pick up his 1963 and 1964 returns and check the completeness of his income reporting for those years.

Just the wide public knowledge that taxpayers from now on will have to combat these machines will be an administrative weapon operating in terrorem to force scrupulous care in the reporting of dividends and interest.

Mr. Speaker, here is a very simply way to avoid the multitude of evils of a withholding tax system on dividends and interest—and a very inexpensive way. Why do we not accept it and use it? Why must we further complicate and confuse the life of the American taxpayer? Why must we further complicate and confuse the already very difficult individual income tax return form 1040?

That automatic data processing makes withholding taxes unnecessary is further shown by Commission Caplin's February 16 Dallas speech in which he reported that the ADP installations will all be in and functioning by January 1, 1965:

He said:

> Automatic data processing is being installed at an accelerated rate, and we expect to have all nine service centers operating by January 1, 1965. * * * Early evidence from our pilot Atlanta installations indicates that tax administration has the greatest tool in its history.

The proposed withholding taxes would not be effective until the year 1963—and tax returns for those years are due April 15, 1964. The period for making additional assessments on returns filed in April 1964 does not expire until April 1967.

Two years before that date the ADP—taxpayer account numbers system of IRS—will be functioning on a nationwide basis. The IRS Commissioner has just said this.

In April 1961 Assistant Commissioner—now Deputy Commissioner—of Internal Revenue, Bertrand Harding, stated that automatic data processing plus the use of taxpayer account numbers would give a perfect simple substitute for withholding taxes. He stated:

> One of the important changes needed to make the information system an effective substitute for withholding is to obtain taxpayer account numbers on all forms 1099 and similar documents.

H.R. 8876 enacted in October 1961 authorized the use of taxpayer account

numbers. So IRS now has all the tools it needs to avoid the cumbersome collection method of a withholding tax.

And Commissioner Caplin, as noted above, has just stated that January 1, 1965, the system will operate on a nationwide basis.

The fact that the IRS is developing its automatic data-processing plant is already having its persuasive effect on taxpayers who may have been cavalier in any way on underreporting items of income. It will assuredly catch them on omission of income items like dividends and interest.

The withholding tax provisions in the Revenue Act of 1962 are not the same that were presented by the Treasury last spring. The Treasury was then urging what they called a simplified system which would not require payors to give payees receipts for tax withheld, and would not permit payees to file any exemption certificates with payors.

In particular, the Treasury made the point that the withholding tax system the administration wished to sell would be made unduly complex if payees were permitted to file exemption certificates to claim exemption from the withholding tax.

This original Treasury position in opposition to exemption certificates can be found in the administration statements on pages 11, 39, and 277 of the hearings of the Committeee on Ways and Means. Yet the bill in its present form would provide for several forms of exemption certificates to be used by different types of payees to escape tax withholding. How the payors of dividends and interest and the Revenue Service can possibly keep the administration of this tax, and their records, in any semblance of order with these exemption certificates circulating, is beyond my powers of comprehension.

The only relationship that exists between the payors of interest and dividends and the more than 30 million recipients of dividend and interest income is a mail relationship. Payees are often just strange names on a mailing list.

Under the bill as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, the payees will be entitled to an automatic credit of tax withheld, and entitled—in theory at least—to receive refund checks for tax overwithheld without too much difficulty and redtape delays—if they file refund claims. Payors are made personally liable for the tax to be withheld. Yet in that picture, exemption certificates, without any administrative control whatsoever are to be allowed to circulate.

A payor company which may be a bank paying interest or a corporation paying dividends, to many thousands of people in each case, is supposed to enter into an elaborate correspondence with people who wish to file the new exemption certificate and then separate its payments of interest or dividends between those on which tax is withholdable and those not subject to withholding tax.

The payee who has received a payment under an exemption certificate on which no tax has been withheld is supposed to be honest enough to report that payment in full and not also claim an automatic credit on the ground that 20 percent has been withheld. He can potentially claim both an exemption and a refund because there will be absolutely no Government records showing whether any tax has been withheld. The payee is given a marvelous enticement both to escape the 20-percent tax withholding by his payor and then pick up another 20 percent by claiming an automatic credit, or by filing a claim for refund—both of which the Treasury assures us will be processed practically automatically. I do not believe that taxpayers will deliberately resort to such a dodge but it would seem inevitable that such a result would frequently prevail through innocent act.

It is well known that the payors of interest and dividends in most cases have been forced in recent years to turn the entire payment operation over to modern machinery. Any large paying agent will tell you that machines now available to him can barely take the present traffic, and that if they have to be worked twice to separate exempt from nonexempt payments, the administrative chore becomes almost impossible. The paying agents will also tell you that they have difficulty getting these machines and to the extent that they must secure new equipment just for their present needs they have to wait months or years for it.

Expanded provisions permitting the use of exemption certificates were hastily added by the Committee on Ways and Means on the eve of reporting the bill. Apparently they are intended as a sop to the national clamor from millions of people who are going to be the victims of over-withholding, people who could either owe no tax at all or considerably less than the amount of tax withheld. This involves also the millions and millions of senior citizens in this country who are living on small sums of invested income—usually dividends and interest. Twenty percent of their support money is to be collected and put into the public till and then doled out to them much later in the forms of refunds or credits—at the mercy of the red tape mill of a Federal agency. During the interim they must figure out some other way to meet their rent and food obligations.

The exemption certificate rules in the bill are a poor sop in this regard. They are limited to children under 18 and to persons who are willing to state that they will owe zero Federal income tax. But the vast majority of people who will be affected by over-withholding of tax on dividends and interest are people who have some tax liability. They cannot avoid withholding by making a statement that they will owe no income tax. They are still left to the meat-grinder process of this antiquated tax collection device.

The situation is an absurdity. The limited rules for exemption certificates that have been put into the bill complete the task of making the withholding provisions an administrative monstrosity, and confusing the accounts and records of payors, payees and the Internal Revenue Service. And—these provisions still do not give the broad relief from over-withholding for which their sponsors are aiming. Probably no more than 10 percent, probably as low as 5 percent, of the people on whom there will be over-withholding of tax are completely immune to income tax. The remaining 90 to 95 percent are people who cannot file an exemption certificate and honestly state that they will owe no income tax. As to these people, including the many millions of senior citizens, as to whom tax will be over-withheld, and whose standard of living is to be contracted by this weird tax collection device—they are to be surreunded to the administrative jungle of an antiquated and completely unnecessary tax collection device.

Mr. Speaker, this recitation of facts pertaining to the withholding provisions of H.R. 10650 raises serious questions as to the need for interest and dividend withholding in view of the development in the automatic data processing field. Section 19 of the bill should not become a part of our tax structure.

Negro Cops in 144 Dixie Cities Can't Arrest White Felons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD, the following article from a recent edition of the Detroit Courier. It raises the question: How long will the American people tolerate the far-reaching ill consequences of racial discrimination and segregation upon the welfare of the Nation's entire citizenry?

NEGRO COPS IN 144 DIXIE CITIES CAN'T ARREST WHITE FELONS

CHICAGO.—Not only are Negroes in the Deep South second-class citizens—law-abiding or not—their police officers are also second class.

Of 161 cities where some 857 are employed, in only 17 can they arrest whites in cases little short of outright murder.

Basis for this article is a compilation in the fall issue of the Journal of Negro Education, part of an article by Elliott M. Rudwick, associate professor of sociology at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

Miami, Fla., employing 85 Negroes in the police department, has the greatest number in the Deep South. They patrol Negro areas only, however, and to arrest a white offender, they usually have to call a white patrolman to assist.

New Orleans rates second with a total of 43 Negro policemen. Here, however, they may arrest a white offender under certain circumstances—ostensibly a felony.

The State of Mississippi, with one of the highest ratios of crime in the Nation, in the same report lists three cities employing Negro officers: Greenville, four; Gulfport, two, and Indianola, two.

Figures for the States listed are based on findings of 1959. Negro officers in these cities, however, must call white police to make arrest of non-Negroes.

Houston, Tex., rating near the top of the list in crime incidence on national level, has a total of 33 Negro officers according to the 1959 figures. To arrest a white offender they also must call a white officer to assist in the arrest.

Not mentioned, however, is the fact noted in most law journals, that Negroes in both North and South, for various reasons are highly uncooperative with white police.

"They just won't talk"—even in such cities in the North like Philadelphia, New York and Pittsburgh.

States included in the survey conducted by the Journal, and Current Trends and Events publication are: Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Florida, South Carolina, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Louisiana, Texas, Virginia, and Kentucky.

Greensboro, N.C., has one of the most unique situations in the Nation. Both Negro and white officers call each other to assist in making arrests of persons of other colors.

In no other nation on earth, with the exception of South Africa, does a similar situation exist. A pointed anomaly is in the situation of Miami, Fla., where there is, however, a Negro police magistrate.

Newport News, Norfolk, Hampton, Richmond, and Portsmouth, Va., pose an exception to the rule in the Deep South. Here Negro officers may arrest white offenders.

The whole situation, nonetheless, points out the double standard of justice, which exists in the South as regards Negroes and whites. From the beginning, it appears on face of the survey, in the South a Negro still has no rights which a white man is bound by law to respect.

Not mentioned in the report is the city of Wilmington, Del., where only last spring a Negro was named a police lieutenant, a Howard University law graduate, was named a municipal judge, and a Negro was appointed to the fire department.

The tabulation points out one of the most unique situations in U.S. police action, but the best instance of nongrowth fall on Norfolk, Va.

Other cities having a fair number of colored men and women in their police division are Jacksonville, 27; Tampa, 13; West Palm Beach, 12; Atlanta, 31; Savannah, 16; Louisville, 27; New Orleans, 43; Charlotte, 10; Durham, 11; Winston-Salem, 12; Oklahoma City, 16; Tulsa, 18; Nashville, 19; Galveston, 16; Houston, 33; San Antonio, 12 and Richmond, 21.

Patriot Ledger 125th Anniversary Edition, January 6, 1962, Quincy, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honor for me to call to the attention of the Members of your House a milestone recently achieved by a great newspaper in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The Quincy Patriot Ledger has just celebrated its 125th birthday, and in the many years of its publication, it has served a noble purpose and met an important need for the residents not only of Quincy but of several neighboring communities south of Boston.

The Quincy Patriot Ledger has lived up to the fundamental goals of a newspaper: it has labored diligently to disseminate fairly the news of our communities, our Nation and the world.

While many newspapers throughout the United States of similar circulation have been threatened with failure or have gone under in the last decade, I am happy to report that the Quincy Patriot Ledger is enjoying good health. This is due, I am led to believe, in no small degree, to the fact that the Quincy Patriot Ledger has always tried to be a good newspaper.

Steeped in the history of our land as Quincy and neighboring communities are, the Quincy Patriot Ledger has always demonstrated a keen awareness of the problems America faces. It has never neglected—but rather has spoken out forcibly as well on—the many local issues affecting the lives and welfare of the residents of its communities.

I would like to cite particularly the anniversary issue itself which contained many outstanding articles of lasting significance. There was a history of the South Shore, by Physician-Historian Henry F. Howe, that was truly a masterpiece. It touched on the events of importance in the district from the precolonial days to the present and must have been extremely valuable to high school and college students because it certainly was exciting for those of us whose classroom days are a little bit behind us. It is, of course, obvious that an American cannot be proficient in the knowledge of his own land unless he is familiar with the history of the South Shore communities in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. And, Mr. Speaker, the section in the special edition that was devoted to the press—national and worldwide—would buoy the spirit of any skeptic who feels that the days of true journalism are past. The many articles in that section provided us with a clearer understanding of the problems of the press itself and how the leaders in journalism are striving to surmount them.

International contributors included: John W. K. Dumoga, foreign news editor of the Daily Graphic in Accra, Ghana; Eljas Erkko, publisher of the Helsingen Sanomat, Helsinki, Finland; Dr. Alberto Gainza Paz, proprietor and director of La Prensa, Buenos Aires, Argentina; Frank Moraes, editor of the Bombay Express, Bombay, India; Dr. Urs Schwarz, editor of the Neue Zurcher Zeitung, Zurich, Switzerland, and Donald Tyerman, editor of the Economist, London, England. Edward W. Barrett, dean of Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism; Barry Bingham, president of the Louisville Times and the Louisville Courier-Journal; Melvin Bergheim, program officer of the Governmental Affairs Institute; Herbert Brucker, editorial page editor of the Hartford Courant, and Dr. Vannevar Bush, noted scientist; Erwin D. Canham, editor of the Christian Science Monitor; J. Montgomery Curtis, director of the American Press Institute; Louis Lyons, curator of the Nieman Foundation at Harvard University; Ralph McGill, editor of the Atlantic Constitution, and Michael J. Ogden, executive managing editor of the Providence Journal and the Providence Bulletin.

Two distinguished members of the faculty of Harvard University contributed an entire section on "Planning the South Shore's Future." The findings and recommendations of Profs. Reginald Isaac and Francois C. Vigler will be an immense help to the local, State, and Federal officials who are constantly concerned with the intelligent planning of our public and private services to meet the needs of an expanding and more mobile population.

The Quincy Patriot Ledger knows the history of the South Shore; it knows what must be done in this modern world; and it is prepared to contribute what journalism so ably can contribute to the welfare of our citizens. And so, as it continues its daily service, we wish it success because we realize how vital it is to the retention of our liberties that we have a free and energetic press.

Our Foreign Aid Program—Will It Ever End?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "Our Foreign Aid Program—Will It Ever End?" written by Arthur Edson and appearing in the Sunday, March 18, 1962, edition of the Peoria Journal Star be reprinted in its entirety at this point in the RECORD:

OUR FOREIGN AID PROGRAM—WILL IT EVER END?

(By Arthur Edson)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Spectacular boondoggle or democracy's salvation? The arguments soon will echo once more in the Halls of Congress as legislators debate the administration's request for $5 billion in foreign aid. In advance of this year's hassle, a seasoned Washington observer puts the big picture in perspective.)

WASHINGTON.—In December 1947 Congress was considering a fantastic new scheme: Saving the world by an immense foreign aid program.

Should this country try it? And if it did, should it be for 1 or 4 years?

President Harry S. Truman wanted four.

Carl A. Hatch, then a Democratic Senator from New Mexico and now a Federal judge, showed a real grasp of the political facts of life. Although an administration backer, he said he would settle for a year.

"Once embarked on the program," Hatch said, "no Congress will be willing to turn back on it."

Once again Congress is considering foreign aid—and once again it is proving how correct Hatch's judgment was.

There will be the customary squabbling over how much money is enough, the cus-

tomary recriminations and the customary compromises.

But even its severest critics know that foreign aid is here to stay with no Congress willing to turn its back on it.

It's here to stay, even though more than $90 billion have been poured into it, even though threats of scandal and waste frequently swirl about it, even though its supporters sometimes confess they have misgivings about it.

It's here to stay, because Americans are worried about communism, because we can't think of a better way to combat it, because It's easier to begin a Government program than it is to end it, because, whatever its faults, leaders of both parties feel foreign aid has enough real merit that they are willing to fight for it.

Technically foreign aid began on March 17, 1947, when Truman asked for—and eventually got—$400 million in military aid for Greece and Turkey. But its birth date is usually listed as June 5, 1947.

That's when George C. Marshall in his now famous Harvard speech said that the riddled economy of Europe had to be rebuilt, and that this Nation should help plan and pay for its restoration.

"Our policy is not directed against any country or doctrine," Marshall said, "but against hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos."

After Russia denounced the scheme as another capitalistic plot, the aid program quickly took on an anti-Communist hue. Indeed, its chief selling point to Congress has been that this is the best and the cheapest way to fight communism.

Begun as a program to revive industrialized Europe, it quickly spread to underdeveloped or otherwise needy nations. Soon aid flowed to Asia, to South America, to Africa.

Of the world's 120 or so independent nations, almost all those outside the Iron Curtain, and a few behind it, have received aid in some form.

A Library of Congress survey shows that between July 1, 1945, and June 30, 1961, 22 countries received more than a billion dollars each in grants or loans.

The leaders:

France, $9,431,400,000. United Kingdom, $8,685,600,000. Italy, $5,641,900,000. Korea, $5,029,600,000. West Germany, $4,997,100,000. Formosa, $4,161,100,000. Japan, $3,574 million.

The list ranges on down to such comparatively modest sums as $1,900,000 for Togo and $1,000,000 for Sierra Leone.

Of all the aid proposals, the Marshall plan was by far the most successful.

Dr. William Drees, former Dutch Prime Minister, has said, "It has rarely occurred in history that an entirely new experiment in the way of international relations has enjoyed such demonstrable success as the Marshall plan. It is a symbol of what the effect of real cooperation can be for peaceful purposes in the world."

A British official put it simply, "One of the most generous, magnanimous acts in history."

In this country, which footed the bills, comments were less ecstatic.

One complaint is not that the Marshall plan failed, but rather that it succeeded too well.

We have given European nations so much help, this argument goes, and they have made such a splendid recovery, that now, by combining into a Common Market, they will lick us at our own game in world trade.

Evaluations have varied greatly. Generally the verdict has depended on how one felt about it before starting to make the judgment.

Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Democrat, of Louisiana, a rabid foe, concluded, "Our foreign aid program has been an abyssmal failure."

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, a rabid friend, took soundings and found, "Mutual security is not an idle phrase—it is not a foreign giveaway. It is, I assure you, life and death to us all, and we must continue to support it and fight for it against those who could cut it to ribbons."

You take your choice. Either way you still pay your money, which has now mounted to $500 for every man, woman, and child in the country.

The man who hopes for, but doesn't promise, miracles is Fowler Hamilton, foreign aid administrator, a well-to-do, 50-year-old lawyer from New York City.

Hamilton isn't pessimistic about this Nation's race with the Communists for the affections of those in backward nations.

"I think we have the edge," he said, "not only because of our wealth but because of our powers of organization."

Even after the thorny answers of which country gets what amount of money have been arrived at, many a haunting question persists:

1. Pouring money into a country stabilizes its government. Since the Communists moved in during unsettled times, that's one of the reasons for pouring the money. But this steadies bad governments as effectively as it does good ones.

The uneasy thought persists that some dictators may be in business only because they have been propped up with U.S. aid.

2. There's no point in helping the rich get richer and the poor poorer. The United States is anxious for land and tax reforms, especially in Latin America.

But as Gen. Robert Cutler of the Inter-American Development Bank told Congress: "It is going to take years for Latin America to reform itself. It is a place that has existed for four or five hundred years on this level. No, it's going to take a long time."

3. Congress frets over what all this may do to U.S. economy. Officials of the Agency for International Development, which administers the program, say that as a nation develops its trade increases, and that this country will get its share.

That may be true, but it frightens a Congressman from, say, an area dependent on textiles where business is bad, to learn that this Government has helped another nation build a competitive mill.

4. The country's leaders worry about the trade balance as U.S. dollars and gold slip away, chiefly due to the large number of troops supported abroad. Foreign aid aggravates this, even though it may look worse than it is. Aid officials claim that 80 percent of the money is spent in the United States and that 600,000 jobs depend on foreign aid money.

A discussion of these worries can run on and on. Last year the State Department put out a booklet in an effort to answer the chief complaints and charges.

The replies filled 52 pages.

But nowhere was there an attempt to answer the granddaddy question of them all. How long must this go on?

The reason is simple: Nobody knows.

But the best guess seems to be that for the next 8 years the pressures will be great. Then, it is hoped, other countries will assume more of the burden.

One estimate of how long aid will be given may come as a real shocker.

Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon has guessed it may be for another 30 years.

Resolution by the National Association of Retired Civil Employees, Chapter 449, Council Bluffs, Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am pleased to include the following letter and resolution adopted by the National Association of Retired Civil Employees of Chapter No. 449, Council Bluffs, Iowa.

The requests as set out in this resolution are justified, hence I trust they will be adopted by Congress at an early date.

The letter and resolution follow:

COUNCIL BLUFFS, IOWA,
February 24, 1962.

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: At our regular meeting of chapter No. 449 February 23, I was instructed to write you concerning the resolution that this chapter sent you, and request you to insert it as your extended remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. If this is at all possible, we would appreciate very much if you would do that; we are hoping that some legislation will be enacted for the benefit of the retirees.

With very best regards, I am,
Respectfully,

STANLEY M. REED,
Secretary-Treasurer No. 449.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the civil service retirement pay of retired employees is inadequate to provide the basic needs of a large number of said employees without the aid of additional income; and

Whereas said retirees have received but one 10-percent increase in annuities since 1955 which did not apply to those who retired subsequent to October 1, 1956; and

Whereas any increases in annuities for said retirees is wholly dependent upon the will of the Congress; and

Whereas the members of the above-named organization seek relief in the matter of increased annuities and exemption of retirement pay; and

Whereas a number of bills before the Congress has been referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and to the Committee on Ways and Means which are of concern to said retirees: Therefore be it

Resolved by the members of this chapter assembled at the December 1961 meeting held at Council Bluffs, Iowa, That this resolution, upon adoption thereof, be addressed to certain Members of Congress urging their best efforts to persuade the chairman of said committees to call early hearings on bills hereinafter referred to as follows:

1. H.R. 6444, 87th Congress, 1st session, and all other companion bills.

2. Subject to the enactment of the above-named bill, consideration is urged on H.R. 6855, 87th Congress, 1st session, and all other companion bills.

3. Subject to the enactment of both the above-named bills, consideration is urged on

H.R. 3316, 87th Congress, 1st session, and all other companion bills.

4. H.R. 140, 87th Congress, 1st session, and all other companion bills, bills to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the full amount of any annuity received under the Civil Service Retirement Act shall be excluded from gross income.

Respectfully submitted.

OSCAR P. WILLIAMS,
President.

Dated January 4, 1962.

Attested:

STANLEY M. REED,
Secretary.

Hon. Sam Rayburn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Atlanta Journal and Constitution of November 23, 1961:

MR. SAM: No. 7

(By Jesse Laventhol)

Life in Washington was a constant turmoil which Speaker Sam Rayburn endured with a singular outward calm and patience.

But whenever he could, he stole weekends to go fishing on rivers or lakes on the Eastern Shore of Maryland. He enjoyed a few hours of relaxation in his bachelor apartment where he liked to personally prepare and cook for a few intimate friends his favorite dishes: Texas chili—without beans—or fried chicken or pork shoulder, varying the menu occasionally with scrambled eggs, soup beans, giblet gravy on hot biscuit, collard greens—and always cornbread.

But real surcease from his labors, the complete peace he sought when the pressures were off, Rayburn found only at home on his farm at Bonham Tex.

The white two-story colonial house, midst shrubbery and trees, stands on the western outskirts of the town, about 100 feet off Route 82—a paved highway made possible by Mr. Sam's national program of Federal aid for construction of farm-to-market roads. Fronting 160 acres of farmland, the house has four 20-foot-high pillars supporting a slanting dormer-windowed roof.

LEISURELY DAYS

Two days here, spent in and around the house, partaking leisurely of home fare, reading while lolling on one of the dozen sofas or gently rocking on one of the 14 rocking chairs about the place, were all Mr. Sam needed to be completely rested.

Thus "unwound" from the hurried pace of Washington to the milder tempo of rural life, with mind at east and energy restored, he turned to this other life he loved so deeply, that of a man of the soil.

First he would make a general check of the overall operations of not only the 160 acres at the homestead, but an additional 208 Rayburn acres nearby, and the 900-acre cattle ranch 14 miles northeast of Bonham acquired in the middle 1930's

Thereafter he would get down to specific activity working side by side with his farm hands, or the ranchhands doing the things that needed to be done, whether sawing, chopping or repairing a building.

CONSERVATION PIONEER

Mr. Sam was a most successful farmer and cattle breeder, a pioneer in soil and water conservation, and applied this practical knowledge in a most influential way for the improvement of agriculture generally.

Mr. Sam was one of the first farmers in Texas to change from "plowing a straight furrow" to the soil-and-water-saving method of terrace ridges and contour rows. This way, fast-running water and swift blowing winds were prevented from carrying off too much topsoil.

"I like to make running water walk," Rayburn told the late Valton J. Young, the new farm agent in Burnham County in 1933, as he showed him about his place.

When one of the neighboring farmers said to Sam, "the long and straight rows let us work our land so much easier," he snapped back:

"Yes. Keep running your straight rows up and down the hill and your harvest will be much lighter and easier, too.

BURNED STALKS

Many of these same farmers also raked and burned all their stalks after harvest, leaving their soil naked instead of keeping a protective cover during the long rainy winter to absorb and retain the moisture, as Mr. Sam's did.

"We can't stand to work foul land," they said.

Ultimately, Fannin County fellow farmers came around to Sam's way of thinking, as did most others in Texas which led the country in adopting a soil and water conservation program.

In Mr. Sam's view "a cash crop is only secondary to a successful farm family."

"The first function of a farm," he explained, "is to make the owner's family a good living. This includes a good family food supply grown right on the farm. If a family goes on a farm or ranch to make a livelihood, they usually do that—plus making some money. But if they go on a farm just to make money, they nearly always wind up doing neither."

FOOD APLENTY

Mr. Sam did both. In the thirties, the main cash crop of the 160-acre farm was milk. Others were cotton and corn. But here and on the larger acreage nearby they produced many other items to keep the Rayburn larder always well stocked with plenty of good food.

In the early days on the farm Sam's mother and father were fairly active: mother—described by all who knew her as a wonderful woman and a living dynamo—busy in the kitchen cooking for her appreciative family, father helping his sons whenever he could. The elder Rayburn passed away in 1916 at the age of 79, having lived to see Sam twice reelected to Congress.

Mrs. Rayburn, who latterly permitted a cook to come into her kitchen, always insisted on preparing Sam's favorite dishes for him when he came home from Washington, either on short vacations or at session's close. Until her death in 1926 she even made an occasional trip to the Capital to cook for Sam at his apartment.

As his brothers Tom and Jim—the twins—and Will, retired from active work on the farm which they operated in the Speaker's absences, and later passed away, Sam took a long planned step. He gave up dairy farming, selling his prize Jersey herd, including White Sox, a champion bull whose royal blood was transmitted to generations of the best Jersey male calves in communities for miles around.

"We no longer have the time, labor, and management available to keep our well-developed dairy herd," Sam informed County Agent Young one day in the late thirties. "I recently bought the old Steger Ranch and three small adjoining tracts out on Coffee Mill Creek. After some necessary fencing, pool digging, and barn building, I plan to stock the place with young registered beef animals and then grow into business as I am able and as the grazing capacity of the land will stand."

The largest part of the 900 acres he acquired, in an area known as Ivanhoe, was an abandoned ranch in poor condition.

Obviously, Mr. Sam was no Sunday farmer.

Walking a couple of miles a day or riding his favorite cow pony, Pansy, about the ranch, pitching hay, or cutting wood, Rancher Rayburn enjoyed complete contentment here.

He could stay at the one-story ranchhouse which was built among a grove of oak trees. Its high and wide fireplace, walnut beds to sleep six, electric stove for broiling steaks, and old-fashioned icebox, usually holding watermelons, were all the conveniences a man needed. The old lodge had no telephone and no mail delivery.

This was Shangri-La indeed.

Civilization Comes High

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot of March 4, 1962:

CIVILIZATION COMES HIGH

Taxes, it is said, are the price we pay for civilization. If the old axiom is true, civilization is becoming mighty expensive.

A few days ago we reported on this page a study which indicated the Federal budget, now around $93 billion, may reach $128 billion by 1970. That, however, is only part of the story.

The Tax Foundation, Inc., a nonprofit study group, reports that a really big bulge has come in the cost of financing State and local government.

State government expenditure jumped from $7.1 billion in 1946 to $31.6 billion in 1960. Total public expenditures—State, Federal and local—will amount to $173 billion in 1962. That will be 7½ percent higher than in 1961 and will represent a new total of $3,050 per family or an increase of $200. The average family tax payment has doubled since 1950.

The tax foundation report shows that the average U.S. taxpayer will work 2 hours and 19 minutes out of every 8-hour work day to pay this tax load. Or, to put it another way, it takes nearly a day and a half of a 5-day, 40-hour week before you make any money for yourself.

It does not follow that we, the people, are getting twice as much government—service, that is—for our money that we did in 1950. The inflation factor has caused government costs to skyrocket.

Take, for example, school costs in the State of Michigan. In the school year of 1949–50, the average cost per pupil of operating the public schools was $216.13. In the 1960–61 school year, the figure was $383.68.

What has happened in the schools has taken place in almost every other area of public service. Costs have grown out of proprotion to the actual increase in population and the services performed.

It is obvious that the people can't avoid the cost of civilization. Children must be educated. The national defense must be kept strong. Protective services, such as fire and police, cannot be discarded in order to save money.

It is apparent, however, that there must be careful scrutiny of all government spending, and most particularly at the Federal level where the control by the people is the weakest.

Second, there must be an end to inflation which is responsible for so much of the increase in the price the people pay for State, Federal, and local services.

Civilization should not be permitted to price itself out of the market.

Trade Expansion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, hearings are under way on the so-called trade expansion bill before the Committee on Ways and Means. A large amount of testimony will be taken. When the hearings are completed Members will receive a printed set of the hearings and these will be voluminous. No one will have time to read through all the testimony.

During the past year two subcommittees held extensive hearings bearing on the tariff and trade question. One was conducted by a subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee on the subject of the impact of imports and exports on employment; the other by a subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee. The first one was under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JOHN H. DENT] and the other, under the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HALE BOGGS].

These hearings also produced voluminous testimony. These are not the only voluminous reports that claim our attention. We do not have the time at our disposal to peruse these numerous reports of hearings. It is humanly impossible.

Mr. Speaker, there has come to my hands a single statement that was made before the Boggs subcommittee that I think goes far to summarize the position of those who are concerned over the injury to our economy caused by import competition that takes advantage of the low wages prevailing abroad.

The statement was prepared by O. R. Strackbein, who is chairman of the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy. This organization draws membership not only from industry but also from agriculture and labor. Mr. Strackbein has devoted years to the study of the import problem and has given his attention to many of its aspects. His position is not one of outright or blind protectionism. His organization seeks principally to assure an adequate remedy against serious injury from imports.

In his statement before the Boggs subcommittee he calls attention to the serious problem of unemployment and the need for economic expansion and growth. He relates import competition to this problem in a manner that demands attention. It is not the number of workers who are directly displaced by imports that measures the damaging effects caused by competitive imports. Probably more important if less visible is the retarding effect on growth produced by the shadows cast by imports on the market prospects.

This is a very important aspect of import competition that has too long been neglected. Mr. Strackbein's statement bring to the front what has too long remained hidden in the background.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include his statement.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF O. R. STRACKBEIN, CHAIRMAN, THE NATIONWIDE COMMITTEE ON IMPORT-EXPORT POLICY, BEFORE THE BOGGS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE, DECEMBER 11, 1961

The slow growth of the American economy in recent years has attracted widespread attention not only here but in other countries. Latterly we have been far outdistanced in terms of growth by Japan and Russia, no less than by a number of the European industrial nations, notably the Republic of Germany, Italy, and France.

This lag registered by the United States would be of little moment, and could be dismissed as no more than evidence of the fact that our own assistance to foreign countries permitted these to leap over nearly a generation of research and development and therefore make rapid advances, were it not for the growing residual unemployment that confronts this country even after its recovery from a series of recessions. It has been noted that since the recession of 1948–49 we have been left at the peak of successive recoveries with a larger hard core of people out of work than before.

Some have called this structural as distinguished from cyclical unemployment and have attributed it to changes in consumer taste, shifts of demand, and in some degree to automation and other laborsaving devices.

It is time to examine this American lag with the idea of establishing its genesis and its implications more definitively.

First, we should examine two terms that are often confused. One is productivity and the other is growth.

Sometimes rising productivity is treated as synonymous with growth. Other times growth is equated with an increase in the gross national product, or GNP.

What is often overlooked is the status of employment and its relation to growth and rising productivity.

It should be made clear at the outset that rising productivity may or may not result in either an expanded output or increasing employment. It may indeed under some circumstances lead to a reduction in output, although that may be rare, or to a reduction or a standstill in employment; and that is not rare.

It should also be made clear that rising productivity and growth need not go hand in hand. Growth may be achieved without an increase in productivity by the simple process of hiring additional workers and, if necessary, building new facilities or plants. Generally this presupposes a growing population and a rising demand.

Increased productivity is indeed supposed to lead to growth and expansion, and will usually have this effect unless some counteracting force is at work. Yet, increased consumption per capita will not necessarily result from improved productivity. The demand for some goods is simply so inelastic that consumption will not respond to cost reduction. Examples are sugar, flour, and potatoes. Consumption of sugar per capita remains remarkably stable over a period of years. Our consumption of flour has declined quite appreciably even during the past 10 years, and more so in the past generation. The consumption of potatoes per capita has also declined, but not so sharply.

This is simply to say that there are very important exceptions to the theory that rising productivity per manhour of work necessarily leads to greater consumption per capita. Such a result is to be expected only if costs and prices are reduced and then only if demand is elastic; i.e., responds to a reduction in price, actual or relative, and if some other factor does not stand in the way.

The fact is, of course, that the American system of mass production was indeed based on the theory that higher productivity, by reducing costs and prices, would lead to higher demand. Certainly the Ford Motor Co. demonstrated the pragmatic soundness of the theory and the idea spread to other industries where it also succeeded; but American consumption of flour nevertheless declined from 214 pounds per capita in 1910 to 135 pounds in 1950 and on down to 118 pounds in 1960. This occurred despite the improved technology of flour-milling. The change represented by the decline was structural and prices and costs probably had nothing to do with the trend. The study of dietetics no doubt had a hand; but the greater influence probably lay in the more sedentary life to which the populace gravitated and the belief, false or not, that pervaded the feminine sector of the population, that farinaceous food and girth somehow went hand in hand.

Despite the exceptions, the theory that rising productivity would lead to growth through lesser costs, had sufficient validity to support our mass production system, and may therefore be regarded as well founded. Yet it does not work under all circumstances, and these may be important. This is to say, its operation may be impeded or halted by factors in addition to mere inelasticity of demand. In order to clarify this it will help first to distinguish in concrete terms between rising productivity and growth. This can best be done by an example, drawn from hypothetical assumptions covering the decade of 1950 to 1960.

Assume then that in 1950 a thousand employees produced 5,000 units of output per hour, per day, or some other period of time and that these 5,000 units supplied the total demand. Assume further that by 1960 the productivity of the workers, because of the introduction of labor-saving devices or machinery, had risen 20 percent, so that 800 workers could now turn out the 5,000 units that in 1950 required 1,000 workers. This result, standing by itself, would indicate the reduction of employment by 200 workers.

This result, would, however, not necessarily stand by itself. Our population, for example, expanded 18.4 percent from 1950 to 1960. Assuming the same per capita consumption in 1960 as in 1950, and assuming no other source of supply, the demand at the end of the decade would have risen from 5,000 units to 5,920 units; and it would require 947 workers to produce this expanded output. This would still be 53 workers short of the 1,000 that were employed in 1950. The reason: the rise in productivity (20 per-

cent) was greater than the increase in population (18.4 percent). Had the two increases been exactly equal there would have been neither a loss nor a gain in employment; but there would have been absolute growth, i.e., expanded production.

This growth would have been attributable exclusively to population expansion and while it would have produced no unemployment it would not have absorbed any of the unemployed.

If growth is defined simply as an increase in output it must be clear that growth may go hand in hand with unemployment. Likewise, rising productivity may be accompanied by unemployment. All depends upon the percentage of growth. If in the above example productivity had increased only 10 percent during the decade but demand had remained constant, instead of 947 workers being required to produce the 5,920 units, this output would have required 1,064 workers. Since population expanded more rapidly than productivity rose, more than the original 1,000 workers would be needed to meet the demand. How many more? The answer is 64, if the arithmetic is correct.

Whenever the rise in productivity, i.e., the output per man-hour, outpaces the population expansion, net unemployment will result unless per capita consumption increases, whether in response to price reduction (i.e., elastic demand), advertising or whatnot.

For example, pursuing the above example, if productivity had risen 30 percent during the decade rather than 10 percent or 20 percent, it is clear (1) that it would have outpaced population growth (i.e., the 18.4 percent), and (2) that it would have led to a layoff of 300 workers unless (a) the productivity increase had resulted in lower prices, (b) the lower prices in turn or some other factor had resulted in a rise in per capita demand, and (c) unless the population had grown.

With the 18.4 percent increase in population there would still have been a net reduction in employment, i.e., to the extent the 30 percent productivity increase exceeded the 18.4 percent population rise, unless some of all of the other provisos with respect to rising per capita consumption, had been met. My calculations indicate that with a 30 percent rise in productivity only 829 workers would be required to produce the 5,920 units of production called for by the population increase. This means that unemployment would have risen to 171 workers.

If during this period the 30 percent increase in productivity had led to a price decline and this in turn had led to a 10 percent increase in per capita demand because of lower prices or if some other influence such as advertising had produced this effect, 930 workers would have been required to produce the 5,000 units plus 18.4 percent (population growth) plus the 10 percent increase in per capita consumption. This would still have left a lag of 70 workers below the 1950 level of 1,000 workers.

A further assumption will demonstrate how an improvement in productivity will behave in relation to population growth and employment. If instead of increasing per-capita consumption 10 percent, as assumed just now, the increase of 30 percent in productivity had led to a 12.6 percent increase in per capita consumption during the decade, employment in 1960 would have risen to or remained at the 1950 level of 1,000, assuming the mathematics is correct. Thus, without any increase in employment, growth in terms of output would have been registered. The number of units produced would have risen from 5,000 to 6,500; but employment would have stood still at 1,000, because population growth would have equated exactly the shrinking effect of the productivity increase. It would have been worse but for the per capita demand increase. Having employment brought back to 1,000 after a layoff of 300 would not have helped so far as the absorptive power of this particular production operation was concerned. It would still have lagged 184 behind the population growth.

In some instances per capita consumption in a decade will, of course, be found to rise at a rate that far outstrips the population increase. Civil aircraft shipments, for example, rose from 3,520 aircraft in 1950 to 8,181 in 1960. However, this increase may bear little or no relation to any increase in the productivity of the manufacturers. Principally it denotes a change in mode of transportation. It is to be noted nevertheless that employment in the manufacture of aircraft and parts also rose, going from 282,000 in 1950 to 653,000 in 1960. Oddly enough the rate of increase in number of aircraft and number of workers was almost identical. The number of aircraft produced rose 132 percent during the decade compared with 131 percent increase in employment. However, total airframe weight rose 175 percent, indicating a move toward somewhat heavier aircraft.

The increase in output, which would ordinarily be called growth in this instance was the result of a structural change in demand, since railroad transportation suffered a contraction. The growth in output in number of aircraft, however, was accompanied by an equal growth in employment. Increased productivity was then confined to producing larger aircraft with the same number of workers. Whereas the number of workers rose 131 percent, airframe weight rose 175 percent. This would indicate a productivity increase of 25.1 percent in terms of airframe weight in 10 years. Total horsepower of the heavier craft also increased, going from 134 aircraft rated at 400 horsepower and over to 1,317 of the same class. Here was about a tenfold increase and this indicates where the increase in productivity lay.

In this example, all factors were favorable. Exports, in particular, were at a maximum in 1960 and represented 28 percent of production by quantity but 43 percent by value, accounted for by increased shipments of jet aircraft (3 times as high in value in 1960 as in 1959 but probably nonrecurrent). Air travel has gained broad public acceptance. Speeds have been increased and safety improved. These are factors that were productive of growth quite independently of the usual economic factors of growth such as improved productivity in terms of man-hours of work. The cost of air travel did not decline.

Another industry that has grown in number of employees is that of electrical communications equipment. Unfortunately no statistics on productivity trends are available because of the great variety of products. Employment rose from 351,000 in 1950 to 674,000 in 1960. This was an increase of 90 percent, somewhat lower than in the case of aircraft. Whereas employment in the aircraft industry rose by 371,000 in the decade, and outran the population increase of 18.4 percent by 319,112 workers, the increase in the number of employees in electrical communications from a larger base was only 323,000. This was still far above the population increase and absorbed 258,416 workers beyond that called for by population expansion.

Here, we may again be sure that the growth was not the result of increased productivity but rather of technological development. A new cluster of products, television and electronics, and so forth, came on the scene. The growth was not the same as would come from an increase in the per capita consumption of beef, for example. It was a question of a virgin market for a new type of product. The price, of course, had to be within the reach of the consumers in order to establish a mass market, and that called for a high order of productivity.

There were other industries that added more to employment than the population growth called for during the 1950–60 decade. Machinery, except electrical, was one of these. Employment grew from 1,354,000 in 1950 to 1,637,000 in 1960. This was an increase of 283,000, but overran the population growth by only 33,864. This group included office and store machines, agricultural machinery and tractors, machine tools, and so forth, and was closely related to mechanization of agriculture, office work and even industry.

It would be fair to say that this industry grew in response to a demand for mechanization and automation rather than generating original demand. Also, while it added to employment within its own field it may in some cases have resulted in displacement of workers elsewhere, as on the farm. Nevertheless it could be credited with a plus sign in those instances in which the installations led to lower costs of output and where this in turn led to employment increases beyond population growth.

The manufacture of chemicals and allied products also stayed ahead of population increase in number of workers added. This lead was 67,510 employees. This industry includes many new products, such as plastics, synthetic textiles and biologicals.

These growth industries plus a very few others contributed 1,170,000 workers over and above the 18.4 percent called for by population growth.

Unfortunately this was not sufficient to offset the lags that developed elsewhere during the decade.

The principal lag occurred in agricultural employment. The decline was precipitate, going from 9,926,000 in 1950 to 7,118,000 in 1960. This was an actual drop of 2,808,000 representing a lag behind population expansion of 4,634,000. This slideaway of itself more than buried the additional employees added by growth industries.

In the agricultural field mechanization, the use of fertilizer, pesticides, and improvement of crop varieties, such as hybrid corn, led to a phenomenal increase in productivity, i.e., yield per acre. As already indicated, such vast increase in productivity does not necessarily lead to increased consumption per capita. In some cases prices were supported by the Government so that the lowered cost of production, relatively speaking, was not passed on to the consumer. However, it is highly doubtful that lower prices would have increased the consumption of wheat, potatoes, sugar, fish, et cetera, in any case. In a land where no one or a very few go hungry, the consumption of food is limited by total stomach capacity, variety of food, and specific appetite. If the price is within reason consumption will not respond to price declines. Therefore increased productivity that exceeds population expansion will result in surplus production.

Mechanization and other means of increasing the yield per acre, far from adding to employment, will decimate it. That is what happened in American agriculture. We achieved both surplus production and unemployment as the fruits of a fast rising productivity. This was because of generally inelastic demand for agricultural products.

It seems safe to say that mechanization, automation and other increases in productivity will in all cases, and not only in agriculture, not lead to increasing employment if the demand for the product is inelastic and if the market is already saturated. The people of the United States, for example, have only so many feet. While the rural children still went barefooted during the summer months the possibility of increasing the use of footwear still existed. This could be done by advertising or other forms of propaganda.

Today the market is more nearly saturated. The only hope of expansion would there-

fore lie in more shoes per person, a greater variety of shoes, frequent restyling in order to substitute new shoes for those not yet worn out, or, as an alternative, less durable shoes. All advertising, merchandising, et cetera, must then be satisfied with sharing the market, avoiding losses to competitors, keeping up with the growth in population, or, ultimately, exportation. This is a separate question.

When an industry has reached the point of saturation with respect to supply in relation to demand, it must be obvious that the installation of labor-saving devices can only lead to unemployment or a more or less stationary employment level if the increase in productivity about equals population growth.

Many such industries exist. Salt, men's hats, cigars, flour milling, pork production, shoes, certain industrial chemicals, most of the staples, in fact. There are scores of such products.

Exceptions may always be found in new products. Sometimes, however, the new products only displace preexisting ones and the changeover may but does not necessarily result in a loss of employment. For example, employment in interstate railways dropped from 1,391,000 in 1950 to 894,000 in 1960. This was a loss of 497,000; and still greater if population growth is taken into account. "Other transportation and services" grew from 610,000 to only 690,000.

All transportation, including trucking, buslines and warehousing, declined in employment from 2,765,000 to 2,558,000, representing a net loss of 207,000. This represented a lag of 715,760 behind population growth.

The airplane, while representing a great forward move in transportation, has not increased employment in transportation. It was not expected to do so. In fact, industrial progress is usually measured by the extent to which fewer workers will be needed. If labor displacement were not accomplished, only minor economies could be realized. Also, unless workers were released from employment in one field no new fields could be opened. We gain variety of production by the release of workers from one field to another.

In some instances a wholly new product is developed, such as the motion picture or radio, and gives employment where there was little or none before. What is the potential of such employment? This will depend on many factors. However, if there is popular acceptance, and if the price can be brought within the reach of the popular pocketbook, the growth will be limited only by the number of people who are potential consumers. Whether this potential will be exploited will then depend upon the enterprise of those who develop the product. Under the competition system, it may be guessed that in most instances the product will be pushed to the saturation point in a period of years.

Even if the demand for the product is inelastic, growth can always be experienced until the saturation point is reached. However, once this stage is reached the industry becomes stabilized and may itself become the victim of replacement; but if it does not, its employment potentials will be strictly limited. Likely as not it will not keep apace with population growth.

New products do appear from time to time but their arrival cannot be scheduled. The U.S. Patent Office is open every working day of the week; but fertile inventors are few.

Many products that are already on the market have perhaps not mined the total potential consumer demand. Efforts to do so usually call for a resort to sales promotion including advertising, distribution of samples and much else. If 10 percent of the population consumes the product, why not extend this to 20 or 30 percent? Cigarette makers have had a resounding success in this respect. The number of cigarettes smoked per capita by all persons of 15 years or older increased from 3.84 pounds in 1930 to 5.16 in 1940, on to 9.37 pounds in 1950 and then only to 9.61 pounds in 1960. The number of wage earners employed in 1939 by cigarette manufacturers was 27,426. In 1950, when per capita consumption had virtually doubled compared with 1939, the employment was only 29,000. New machinery had greatly speeded the output.

The increase in cigarette consumption was not attributable to a reduction in the price. Advertising and the pleasant sensation of smoking, together with the habit factor, were in the forefront. Of course, high productivity made the product available to the mass market.

By 1960 when per capita consumption had increased from 9.37 pounds to only 9.61, on the other hand, employment had risen to 38,000. This was an increase of 9,000 in 10 years. The per capita consumption had increased only 0.25 percent, thus justifying the addition of only about 75 employees. Population growth would have justified addition of another 4,336. The actual increase by 9,000, or about 4,600 more than the population expansion called for, was probably attributable to the increase in the manufacture of filter cigarettes, and a process requiring more work per cigarette. Market saturation seems near at hand.

Cigar consumption had a different career. Per capita consumption declined from 1.67 pounds in 1930 to 1.36 pounds in 1940, to 1.18 pounds in 1950, and to 1.03 pounds in 1960. Employment declined from 50,897 in 1939 to 41,000 in 1950 and on to 26,000 in 1960. Nevertheless, despite the decline in per capita consumption, the actual number of cigars produced increased from 5,197,000 in 1939 to 5,468,000 in 1950 and up to 6,917,000 in 1960.

Cigar manufacturing shifted almost completely to machinemade cigars. In 1960 it required half as many workers to produce about 40 percent more cigars. According to the population increase since 1939 employment should have risen approximately 18,000. Instead it declined more than that many. What happened to the comfortable economic theory that higher productivity will lead to lower prices and that lower prices will lead to increasing per capita consumption and that this in turn will lead to rising employment?

If per capita consumption does not rise in response to mechanization or automation either because prices are not lowered or because the demand is inelastic or because the market is saturated or for some other reason, such as import competition, and if the increase in productivity is greater than population increase, net manufacturing unemployment will result unless exports have increased sufficiently to offset the domestic employment contraction. In order to do this exports would ordinarily have to increase sharply because they usually represent only a small part of total production. If, for example, exports are even 10 percent of total output, they would have to double in order to exert a 1-percent effect on employment.

The automotive industry in 1940 employed 634,000 workers. This number rose to 825,000 in 1950 but declined to 781,000 in 1960. Population increase since 1940 has been 35.9 percent, i.e., to 1960. To keep pace with this—not to absorb any unemployed from other sources—the industry should have employed 861,000 by 1960. It fell short by 36,000. Thus while once the automotive industry was one of the leading growth industries it has ceased being so. It cannot be looked to as a source of employment absorption. Rather it is dropping workers despite its past export position.

In 1940 the 634,000 employees produced 4,472,000 automobiles, trucks, and buses. In 1950 workers numbering 825,000 produced 8,003,000 automobiles, trucks, and buses. In 1960, the number of workers was 781,000 and they produced 7,869,000 units.

In 1940 the output per worker was almost exactly 7 units. In 1950 it was just short of 10 units—825,000 workers produced 8,003,000 units. In 1960 it was very slightly over 10—781,000 workers produced 7,869,000 units.

Meanwhile exports of automobiles, trucks, and buses have declined from 252,531 in 1939 to 145,000 in 1960, while imports rose from 21,000 in 1950 to 444,000 in 1960.

Employment in automobile repair shops has risen from 153,576 in 1948 to 255,891 in 1960, showing a net increase of 102,000. This was an increase of 68 percent while the total number of registration of cars, trucks, and buses rose from 40.5 million in 1948 to 73.8 in 1960, an increase of 83 percent. This would indicate an increase in productivity in the repair facilities.

Gasoline service stations employed 246,600 in 1939, going up to 285,954 in 1948 and on up to 465,550 in 1960. This is an example of the expansion in the service trades, and represents the indirect growth and employment that may be provided by rising productivity.

The side effects of increasing mechanization or automation may thus offset some of the job-shrinking effects of displacing workers. Unfortunately during the 1950–60 decade these indirect benefits failed to overcome the total lag produced by worker displacement.

If it were possible to produce all the goods used in the United States in 1 day, all the remainder of employment must concern itself with distribution (transportation, selling, advertising, wholesale, and retail trade), finance, insurance, law, medicine, real estate, entertainment, haircutting, education, military service, etc.

We have been moving in that direction. Some of the shrinkage in employment suffered by various industries from 1950–60 are shown in the table below:

[In thousands]

	Employment		Worker shrinkage
	1950	1960	
Metal mining	97	92	5
Anthracite	75	13	62
Bituminous coal	368	159	258
Dairy products	125	95	30
Grain mill products	116	110	6
Sugar	36	30	6
Confectionery and related products	92	73	19
Beverages	214	210	4
Miscellaneous food products	142	135	7
Tobacco manufactures	103	88	15
Textile mill products	1,292	946	346
Men's and boys' suits and coats	143	114	29
Women's outerwear	369	337	32
Millinery	23	18	5
Lumber and wood products	805	644	161
Petroleum refining	185	182	3
Tires and inner tubes	107	103	4
Rubber footwear	24	22	2
Leather and leather products	392	365	27
Pottery and related products	60	48	12
Structural clay products	78	73	5
Blast furnaces, rolling mills, steelworks	611	569	42
Iron and steel foundries	224	222	2
Nonferrous foundries	77	62	15
Cutlery, hand tools, and hardware	158	133	25
Heating apparatus and plumbers' supplies	138	114	24
Railroad equipment	60	57	3
Watches and clocks	33	28	5
Jewelry, silverware, plated ware	57	46	11
Costume jewelry, buttons, notions	64	60	4
Total	6,268	5,148	1,169

These 30 industries that in 1950 employed over 6 million workers, registered a shrinkage of 1,169,000 employees in 10 years' time. Had they kept in pace with population in-

crease they would have added 1,153,000. Therefore the total lag was 2,322,000.

It is unfortunately not possible to trace the quantitative output of all these industries, to determine the trend of their productivity. This can, however, be done in a few cases:

	Production		Percent increase
	1950	1960	
Footwear, except slippers ... million pairs	464	527	14
Cigarettes ... billions	391	506	29
Men's and boys' suits and coats ... millions	27.1	[1]25.2	−7
Sugar ... million tons	8.3	9.3	12
Tires, passenger cars ... millions	78.6	105.3	34

[1] 1959.

Leather footwear dropped 8,000 in employment during the decade, while output increased some 14 percent. This indicates an appreciable rise in productivity. Men's and boys' suits lost 29,000 workers, or 20 percent, while production dropped only 7 percent, thus also indicating a net rise in productivity amounting to some 12 percent. Sugar produced 12 percent more, while employment declined 16 percent. In the case of automobile tires, employment dropped between 3 and 4 percent while output rose 34 percent.

Bituminous coal production per man-hour increased from an index of 114.5 in 1950 to one of 212.5 in 1960, while employment declined from 368,000 to 159,000, a drop of 209,000. In terms of total production, a decline of 104 million tons was registered, i.e., from 516 million tons in 1950 to 412 million tons in 1960. Exports in 1960 were 37.2 million tons, or less than 10 percent of production. Forty-three percent of the workers in 1960 produced 80 percent as much coal as 100 percent of the workers produced in 1950.

Did this sharp rise in productivity lead to increasing consumption? Obviously it did not. Natural gas, residual fuel oil, diesel oil, etc., prevented it.

What is the worth of a theory that finds itself blocked at every turn? It is like the man who was not there when he was needed.

Our industrial landscape is full of examples where one influence or another has prevented the theory from proving itself in operation.

Oh, it will be said, the expansion of the service trades, professions, and so forth, will take up the slack; but they failed to do so during the 1950–60 decade; and the 1950–60 decade was relatively favorable to our industries so far as foreign competition was concerned. We face a more formidable future. It is true that the service trades, and so forth, added greatly to their payrolls, and increased the number employed from 19.8 million in 1950 to 26.4 million in 1960 or a total of 6.6 million, State and local government accounting for nearly a third of this increase.

Yet, this vast bulge in the nonproductional employment failed to overcome the slack caused by the agricultural, industrial, mining, and transportational lag in employment in relation to population growth.

The deficiency, leaving out the growth in the military service, was 3.64 million. This represents the hard core of structural unemployment that (1) continues to rise, and (2) that does not yield to cyclical prosperity.

What was it then that prevented the rising productivity from begetting the employment that it was supposed to generate?

Was it altogether attributable to inelasticity of demand in a number of the industries in which much of the rising productivity took place, particularly agricultural and staple commodities? No doubt this had much to do with it.

However, not all the employment lag appeared in cases of that kind.

Many of our industries have been confronted by rising and ominous import competition. This has confronted them with decisions with respect to plant renewal and plant expansion or the building of new plants that involved crucial questions of market trends, the possibility of selling a larger output if it were produced, the maintenance of reasonable profit margins in the face of relentless price pressures, and so forth.

The rising trend of imports left little question in many instances of the folly of greater outlays for expanded production. The more practical step when thus confronted would be to reduce costs by introducing labor-saving devices or by pushing automation. In this way the competition might at least be partially stood off. Unfortunately this meant fewer workers, not more, to be employed. Of course, the machinery and equipment manufacturing industry would benefit; but not nearly as much as it would have if a happy market outlook had loomed before the prospective expanders of production.

It is said that these rising imports gave rise to an equal volume of exports. Our exports did expand but some 25 percent of the present volume of exports depends upon governmental subsidies, foreign aid demand, sales for foreign currencies, and similar noncommercial considerations.

At the same time many of our great exporting industries have seen exports decline while the country moved into a net import position with respect to their products: steel, petroleum, typewriters, sewing machines, textiles, cameras, boots and shoes, and, above all, the product of one of our greatest exponents of, and pioneers in, automation; namely, the automobile industry.

The effort to hold export markets also exerts great pressure to introduce greater mechanization and automation.

Very well, but have we not seen that rising productivity creates jobs as well as destroying them? The answer is beyond question: Yes, but—

When imports that have the advantage of modern technology, newly achieved in many instances, carry the further advantage of low wages that, combined with the higher productivity, make for lower unit costs; when imports thus freighted with competitive advantage over our industries, invade our market, they readily take away the rising demand created by an increase in our own productivity. If the demand for this product is inelastic we are driven back in a volume equal to the rising imports. If the demand is elastic we stand still in terms of employment, or nearly so, while imports skim off the cream. In either case our employment suffers.

If the product is a new one, of the kind to which we look for extra employment-absorbing capacity, it takes a very short time today for other countries to develop it and enter our market. Such demand-creation as our industries have performed through advertising, sales promotion, and so forth, is then shared gratuitously with our foreign competitors. The electronic industry is a good example.

It is not always left to foreign producers to bestir themselves. Some of our own patent holders will readily license them, and in some instances establish manufacturing facilities abroad. The number that have already done so easily runs into the hundreds.

The diffusion abroad of our technological achievements was one of the principal postwar economic developments. To help put the efforts into gear we guided thousands of productivity teams through our factories, teaching them production-line techniques, etc.

Other countries have indeed been impressed with our system and have bought it. Witness the EEC (Common Market), the EFTA, and so forth. They have eagerly bought one side of the equation: rising productivity; but not the other, namely, high wages.

Now we are told that we must make accommodations with the Common Market by lowering our tariffs yet more. This is an upside-down judgment indeed. We have reduced the protective effect of our tariff 80 percent in the past 27 years. This was presumably done in exchange for similar reductions abroad.

Europe was long advertised as being a low tariff area to begin with. Now, after 27 years of sharp Yankee bargaining, after the smoke lifts and the dust settles, we are apparently confronted with a high external tariff in order to export into the Common Market.

Either this is a purposely exaggerated aberration or, if indeed we are so confronted, our Yankee reciprocal bargaining was a colossal and shameful failure. Apparently, according to this view, we irresponsibly shot away our bargaining ammunition in the successive tariff conferences that were supposed to reduce world trade barriers and now find that the barriers are still there. This then was a monumental betrayal of the trust placed by this country in the State Department delegations that journeyed so frequently to Europe.

To be sure, there were barriers other than tariffs, to be lowered; but if so they grew up under our eyes and with our advice and consent.

Now American industry is to be used once more in order to accomplish that for which it has previously been placed in jeopardy. We made provision in GATT—the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—for new barriers against us in the form of import quotas, exchange controls, and so forth, to be used by other countries in order to get GATT signed.

Now we are to buy these favors back again. This adds up to such a feast of duplicity or depth of stupidity that it should be rebuked and sharply censured rather than condoned and even used as a preface for more of the same.

As a sop to our industry and those driven out of work by newly stimulated imports, it is now suggested that we tap the Treasury and the taxpayer to relocate those of our industries that cannot compete with low-wage imports, upset the families and household of the workers, retrain the workers in new skills, etc. This is to award to imports the right of eminent domain in this country, and would be much the same as sending out bulldozers to push our industries out of the way if they cannot compete. Compete with what? With 25-cent-an-hour labor in the Far East, 50-, 60-, and 80-cent labor in Europe, using the same machinery in a growing number of cases as we?

What bright academic economist will condemn the coal industry as inefficient when it has improved its productivity nearly 100 percent in the past decade and has the highest output per man-hour in the world by far? Yet it is in jeopardy from imports of residual fuel oil.

Who will condemn American agriculture for its phenomenal increase in productivity in the postwar years and in the past decade even though in so doing it created burdensome surpluses and priced itself on a broad front out of foreign markets—to the extent that 60 percent of our exports of farm products in fiscal year 1960–61 were moved only with governmental assistance?

Shall we say that the benefits of rising productivity have been exaggerated or shall

we see to it that we learn more about the effects of mechanization, automation, etc., and so learn how to reap their benefits while avoiding their pitfalls?

Shall we allow a romantic attachment to the vision of free trade divert our eyes from reality and blind us to the serious obstacles to higher employment that reside in an unregulated form of competition that comes to us from beyond the reach of our minimum wage and maximum hour laws, from beyond the reach of our laws against sordid working conditions and exploitation of labor? The tariff and import quotas are the only substitutes for such laws within our reach.

In the absence of such defenses many of our stable and efficient industries are to be driven into the dismal swamps of public abandonment under the demonstrably false and unfair doctrine that a domestic industry that cannot compete with imports is ipso facto inefficient. This is an abomination the American people should not be asked to swallow.

Address of Hon. Phil Weaver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska, PHIL WEAVER, has for the past 3 years or more been studying the growing threat to the construction industry and the American taxpayers of increased controls in the construction field. These controls are exerted by the Small Business Administration and involve the setting aside of contracts for exclusive bidding by small contractors.

Mr. WEAVER has become known as an outstanding authority on the subject and as such was invited to address the annual convention of the Associated General Contractors of America at Los Angeles, on February 28, 1962. I have received a copy of that address and feel that it is well worth the time it would take for our colleagues to read and analyze. The address follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. PHIL WEAVER OF NEBRASKA

Mr. Chairman, distingushed guests, my colleagues in the House of Representatives who are here today, and members of your organization, it is a real pleasure for me to be present and address this group. As you know, I am from Nebraska and serve on the House Appropriations Committee. It was my privilege last fall during the course of defense subcommittee work, to visit and inspect some of our troop units in Germany as well as some of our other Western European bases. After all, as our committee chairman, GEORGE MAHON, of Texas, says, "We have to know what is being done with the money we handle in various appropriation bills and we want to do what we can toward providing the best possible defense programs for the United States."

In this connection, I'd like to say with pride that the men and women in our defense units are topnotch people. They are dedicated and skilled. You can be absolutely assured our Nation's defense is in good hands, from the privates to the top commanders.

At any rate, while in Berlin, I went over to the eastern sector to visit the Garden of Remembrance. The Russians there have a beautifully setup arena banked with flowers and shrubbery where many Russian soldiers who died in the attack on Berlin are buried. This is to honor their war dead. I was told by a Lieutenant Fitzgerald, who accompanied me, that they knew an American Congressman was coming and were prepared for us. The loudspeaker began to blare out from an adjoining area with a sharp and long tirade in English against the United States, calling us warmongers and worse. After about 10 minutes of this, they put on a musical record of a famous American song, and one which I thought was particularly appropriate since I had just seen the great wall dividing East and West Berlin. The song—"Don't Fence Me In."

Now, I don't want to leave the impression that there is any connection whatsoever between what happened there and what I am going to discuss today. But I was reminded about this incident because I know that you people in the construction industry "don't want to be fenced in" either.

And today I am going to talk to you about a fellow who wants to be big brother to all of you. And in the process, he's going to build a fence around your industry, and one we'll find hard to break down.

This big brother wants to lead you by the hand across the river and into the Promised Land. In this Nirvana of Government subsidy and support, you don't even have to tend the store. Big brother will mind your business for you. Of course you'll pay for it—with more than cash—but it ought to be fun while it lasts.

Other than tax dollars, the only thing big brother wants is your right to grow and expand. You will have to deed over to him your birthright and your heritage. In return you will be assured of Government jobs and you will be shaded from the heat of competition by an umbrella of Government subsidy.

This big brother, patterned after the character of George Orwell's novel, "1984," is the Small Business Administration in Washington. Only this month, SBA issued a new leaflet outlining their plans for you, your industry and your future.

Let's look at what "Big Brother" is offering, and here I quote directly from that leaflet:

"The SBA will guide you in presenting your qualifications to contracting agencies, help you prepare bids and assist you with any questions you may have concerning provisions of contracts or with any problems you may have in obtaining related drawings and specifications. The agency can also guide you in such matters as job scheduling and help you locate qualified subcontractors and sources of materials and equipment."

SBA also says it will provide management services and technical advice if you don't know how to run your construction firm after you get a contract. And if SBA's men fall flat, "Big Brother" is handy with a checkbook to bail you out.

If the Corps of Engineers questions a contractor's responsibility or reliability or ethical standards, he can run to SBA and get a certificate of competency—and a bureaucrat's whim overrules the sound and careful practices of experienced contracting officers.

All this may sound pretty. But let's examine it further.

SBA defines a small construction firm as one independently owned, not dominant in its field and one which did less than $5 million worth of work over a 3-year period on the average.

I'd like to say here that there is no single firm, or group of firms, which dominate construction. There are no Du Ponts in this industry. Not a month goes by but what a big firm loses out on a contract award to a much smaller firm. Every big fellow knows that on every job he is competing not only with other big firms but with every other contractor in the Nation. That's the way this business grew, before SBA imposed its controls, and that's the way it still wants to operate today.

I do not know exactly how SBA got into the act. I have been concerned with this problem since early 1959 and I have found no groundswell of clamor for Federal help from contractors, small or large. SBA by its own admission has polled only 976 of the nearly half million contractors in this country. Only 401 of the 7,300 members of AGC have been polled. This seems a very minute figure upon which to base a Federal control program.

SBA did enter the field, though, in the mid-fifties. Its first effort was canceled by the Comptroller General who still holds to your old-fashioned belief that contracts should be advertised and then let only with open, free and competitive bidding.

But SBA kept working and included repair, maintenance and construction in the 1958 Small Business Act. This, incidentally, was a parenthetical insertion.

SBA then called a hearing to enlarge its authority and issue new regulations. The hearing lasted 20 minutes and only one contractor showed up. The lack of interest was unfortunate but it can be traced to the fact that, up until then, SBA had been talking only in terms of contracts for $50,000 or less. Based on this brief hearing, SBA jumped this figure from $50,000 to $500,000 as automatically being set aside.

At this point, early in 1959, I entered the picture. I protested to the Secreary of Defense and SBA. The Secretary heeded the advice of his construction experts and in July 1959, tossed the program out.

But bureaucrats don't take defeat that easily. They tried again, only this time they approached their hand-picked men who were acting as "small business advisers" to the Secretary.

I have talked with one of these men and I found him totally and blissfully ignorant of construction. He couldn't even understand that there are such items as weather and soil conditions to be considered. I asked this man why, if his program of set-asides was so good, such men as General Itschner and Admiral Peltier were so opposed to it. His reply startled me. He told me simply, "They don't have a social conscience."

Here was a man whose obligation was to help create quickly, effectively and efficiently a strong national defense through military base construction. He also owed the taxpayers at least the courtesy of trying to do this economically. But instead, his main concern was for a social conscience.

With this kind of man to guide him, the Secretary gave in, and in the summer of 1960, set-asides were back. Almost at once some far-fetched thing began to happen.

You know about the Sheppard Air Force Base Hospital, a $4½ million job. A legitimate small contractor bid low, but was knocked out on the basis of technicalities and was declared not responsive because of size. Regardless of the merits of this ruling or whether he was big or small, one grim fact remains—that little bureaucrat's whim cost the American taxpayers—you people here—$165,000, or a waste of 15 percent. There's the Norfolk, Va., dredging case where a big outfit bid $1.09 per cubic yard, but was declared not responsive. A small firm got it, for $2 per cubic yard. That deal cost you $7,280, or a waste of 83 percent.

Despite this kind of evidence, SBA says it just doesn't happen. And yet, based on experience and sound judgment, and years of construction field work, the Corps of Engineers tells me it will cost in excess of 10 percent additional each year. A conservative estimate is that it will cost us $160 million annually.

The very people SBA is supposed to help, find themselves in a pretty weird situation

too. There was one small contractor in Washington, D.C. He bid on a job at Dulles International Airport and won the contract. The award was protested and it took him 90 good-weather days of legal wrangling, and a good deal of expense, to convince SBA he was really small. A week later another award was made to this firm, and again SBA knocked it out. Having just admitted the firm was small, SBA reversed itself, and the net loss to the taxpayers was $192,000.

There was a case in my congressional district in Nebraska. The Stewart Construction Co., of Lincoln, bid low—at about $400,000 on a dam project. The next low bid was $465,000. The second bidder protested and SBA's original ruling was against Stewart. Their grounds were that a man of some means in Lincoln had invested some money in both Stewart and in a big, unrelated company. He was not majority stockholder of either firm. But SBA decided in its infinite wisdom that Stewart was an affiliate of the larger firm. That's like saying that if you invest in Joe Jones' little machine shop down the street and also in General Motors, then Joe and G.M. have become affiliates, and that Joe Jones can no longer qualify as small business.

Stewart finally won. But it took their attorney two expensive trips from Lincoln to Washington and 2 months of good-weather time to fight the case. There has been a resultant and perhaps costly delay in the project.

The SBA hearing on Stewart's appeal was closed to the press. It soon became apparent why this secrecy was invoked. Stewart's lawyer had uncovered the fact that SBA has two sets of rules by which your companies, your industry, and your life are being run. One set is open, published in the Federal Register. The other set is secret and known only to SBA personnel. This secret set of rules, called SBA-400, Policy Manual, was not open for your inspection. In short, you enter the game with only the referee knowing the rules. You don't know whether you've stepped out of bounds or have sent an illegal receiver downfield until after the fact. You can only guess that there are such things as boundaries and illegal receivers. You are bound by a set of secret rules and it's going to cost you a lot of time and money to find out when, where, and how you've violated them.

Not content with this power to control you and your industry, SBA came back last year and won power to interfere between you and your subcontractors. I'm not going to dwell on this, but if you haven't read the new rules and examined the new situation, you are in for a rude shock. I'm sure Bill Dunn and others here will be talking about this problem in much more detail with you during this convention.

I'd like to address myself to one other point. We've already seen that this SBA program is costly and wasteful. We've seen that the people it is supposed to help can find no help from SBA in too many cases. Now we come to another matter. In a press release dated January 31, 1962, SBA states, in part, and I quote:

"It is noted that as of December 31, 1961, only $4,789,000 have been charged off against all business loans made by SBA since the inception of the financial assistance program. This figure represents about one-half of 1 percent of the $909,970,000 disbursed as loans to small business."

What are the real facts, as they affect construction? Well, last summer I asked SBA two questions: How many construction loans they had made, and how many were delinquent in excess of 60 days or were in the process of liquidation. I chose the 60-day delinquency figure on the advice of experts from the General Accounting Office who said that any loan delinquent that long was a bad one.

On September 18, 1961, I received a reply from SBA Administrator John Horne. He enclosed two sets of figures. One sheet showed that as of June 30, 1961, there were 774 construction company loans, totaling $28,366,216. The second set of figures showed that as of June 30, 1961, there were 78 borrowers delinquent in excess of 60 days, another 59 loans in the process of liquidation, for a total of 137 or over 17 percent of all construction business loans made. Total unpaid balance was $4,282,223, or 14 percent of the face value of the original loans. Any commercial bank or bonding company with this kind of record would go broke. Incidentally, there are copies of these figures available for you.

I am wondering if these figures don't provide for us the real clue, the real reason, why SBA is attempting to take control of the construction industry and become big brother to all of you. I believe someone in SBA took a look at the bad balance sheet and decided to do something to hedge these poor-risk loans. They wanted to make sure they looked good to Congress and could continue to build and expand their empire and their power. So they initiated the set-aside program to insure the loans.

I would like to reiterate several points I have touched on today.

First, SBA now is concerned with small contractors. I want you to think a bit about what the future may hold—it may well be that tomorrow SBA will replace this with concern for the teeny-weeny contractors.

Second, SBA is creating for you artificial competition, financed by Government money, supported by Government subsidies, and protected by a new set of Government controls.

In this connection I'd like to point out how easy it would be for anybody to enter the construction field to compete with you under this program. I have a brother in the insurance business in Lincoln. If my brother suddenly decided he'd like to become a construction contractor—believe me, he has no experience in that field—all he has to do is form a corporation, get turned down by the local banks, and then apply to SBA for a loan. He'd be in business.

Third, under this size-ceiling subsidy program, I'd caution you to make no plans for expansion. If you do expand, SBA will make sure you won't get any further Government jobs, and you'll be cut back to size.

The only cure for this is through legislation. There are already bills in both the House and Senate to provide this relief. My suggestion to you is that you write to your Congressman or Senator. If you're in Washington, talk to him about it. If he visits home, buttonhole him. Tell your story. Tell it often. Speak out strongly.

If you don't—if no action is taken, I can assure you, the construction industry is digging its own grave.

Dr. Allene Jeanes Honored by Department of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Allene R. Jeanes, one of the six honorees at the Federal Women's Award dinner, February 27, has no measure of the number of lives saved by the research of which she is a leader. The number surely runs into thousands. Her contribution is dextran, a chemical replacement for blood plasma.

Dr. Jeanes is a chemist in the Northern Utilization Research and Development Division of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Peoria, Ill. She conducts research in carbohydrate chemistry leading to new industrial and medical uses for starches and sugars derived from cereal grains.

The path by which Dr. Jeanes achieved international recognition began in 1943, when she was assigned to study the nature of dextrans, gummy carbohydrates formed in sucrose by bacterial action. She then devised a rapid and reliable technique for identfiying and characterizing dextrans.

In 1950 when this country faced a critical need for blood plasma during the Korean conflict, Dr. Jeanes pointed out that dextrans might be used to replace or extend blood plasma.

She led the research team of 50 bacteriologists, biochemists, and engineers that developed dextran as a blood plasma replacement. The success of the research led to the use of dextran as a replacement for blood plasma in Army medical installations.

Before joining the U.S. Department of Agriculture as a research chemist in 1941, Dr. Jeanes held a fellowship from the corn industries foundation for work in the National Institutes of Health for 2 years. Prior to that she served for 5 years as head of the science department of Athens, Ala., College and for 2 years as instructor in chemistry at the University of Illinois, where she earned her Ph. D. Dr. Jeanes is a native of Waco, Tex., and did her undergraduate work at Baylor University.

In presenting the award to Dr. Jeanes, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman said:

Scientists have been bringing honors to the Department of Agriculture throughout its history.

Dr. Jeanes, we are particularly happy to have your work recognized during the Department's centennial year. It gives us an opportunity to recall that USDA was the first great public agency authorized to use science to gain practical ends. Thus the Department has been a prime force back of the scientific agriculture that has enriched our national economy and contributed to the health and well-being of people around the world.

The Department's responsibility for research on food and other questions of consumer interest has drawn a large number of able women scientists to our laboratories.

Dr. Jeanes, you and other women scientists in the Department, have made it quite clear that the ability to excel in the quest for knowledge is a quality of the individual. Your own record is distinguished by the courage, dedication, and high competence that mark the outstanding scientist in every field.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I am extremely gratified to point up Dr. Jeanes' scientific accomplishments and very proud to claim her as one of my constituents.

Difficulties Facing Cooperatives if So-Called Consent Proposal Is Agreed to by Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Arnold Ackerman, manager of Farmers Union Oil Co., Willmar, Minn., vividly describes in the accompanying letter the difficulties cooperatives would have if the so-called consent proposal is agreed to by the Congress. I hope each and every Member of the Congress will study the following letter from Mr. Ackerman very carefully:

FARMERS UNION OIL CO.,
Willmar, Minn., February 26, 1962.

Hon. H. CARL ANDERSEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDERSEN: According to information which we can gather, it appears that the Ways and Means Committee of the Congress will soon be reporting their revenue bill, which will be including some amendments to tax laws that will be affecting cooperatives.

One of these amendments that we are vitally concerned about is the one where cooperatives are to get a signed consent from their individual patrons, wherein the patron agrees that he will be willing to take into their personal income tax account, their patronage refunds from their cooperatives, which they do not receive in cash. This seems to be a very impractical and unjust amendment for several reasons.

We, here at this cooperative in Willmar, Minn., have approximately 1,300 individual patrons that we prorate a patronage refund to based upon their patronage, and these patrons are scattered over a trade area approximately 50 miles in radius. If we were to attempt to get these individual patrons to sign a "consent," it would require a considerable amount of time, we would have to hire and train some individual that could do this job, as it would be a matter of explaining to each one why this is necessary—I am sure that if I were that individual that was explaining this to the patron-owners, I would be very frank in telling them our position on it, and the work that our Senators and Representatives did on this legislation—it would complicate our bookkeeping and stock records to the point where it would be very costly and time consuming, so that it would be almost impossible to get the job completed to meet other time requirements of prorating and notifying patrons within the time required by regulations.

Other than the mechanics of this amendment, which makes it very impractical and unjust, we would be in violation with our articles and bylaws, where in our bylaws it states that we must treat each patron and stockholder on an equal basis insofar as his patronage refunds and stock retirements are concerned. I do not see where we in the cooperatives nor the Internal Revenue Service, can sit in our respective positions and tell an individual which of his purchases that he has made are expense items, and he must consider in his income tax computations. As an example, No. 1 fuel oil used to heat his family home are not deductible expenses from his income tax computations and, therefore, should not be considered in his income tax payment; however, if he would use this same fuel for his diesel tractor, it would be an expense item that he would consider in his income tax computations. How can we be the judge on this, and pay an income tax for the patrons?

These are a few of the points that we have to consider in analyzing this amendment, which makes it a very impractical, unjust, and ineffective amendment. I am sure that you are much better acquainted with these amendments and how they will affect cooperatives than we are.

We would like to urge you to use your influence and all the means at your command to stop such legislation. Such legislation would greatly impair the effectiveness of a cooperative for its patron owners, which cooperatives have been a great force in building our great State of Minnesota. We plead with you to do everything that you possibly can to stop this unjust legislation.

Sincerely yours,

FARMERS UNION OIL CO.,
ARNOLD ACKERMANN,
Manager.

A Small Cheer for the Consumer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, coming as I do from a farming and ranching area, the State of North Dakota, I was struck by the common sense embodied in the editorial from the March 19, 1962 Wall Street Journal, entitled "A Small Cheer for the Consumer."

There are times when we farmers and ranchers almost feel we are the most unpopular group in the country, especially when we hear repeatedly that because of the high subsidies we enjoy, we force food prices to remain high, and so on, ad finitum. This in spite of the fact that farmers and ranchers—at least most of those I am acquainted with—would be delighted to have the Federal Government remove its controls, rules and regulations from our business.

We, of course, are also consumers. I, therefore, agree wholeheartedly with the last paragraph of the editorial which states:

If we consumers are going to "organize effectively," as the President puts it, maybe we had better do it outside the Federal Government.

Calvin Coolidge made a very wise remark one time about the use of public money when he said:

Nothing is easier than the expenditure of public money. It does not appear to belong to anybody. The temptation is overwhelming to bestow it on somebody.

So please, let us not decide now to subsidize we "consumers."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include with my remarks the aforementioned editorial "A Small Cheer for the Consumer":

A SMALL CHEER FOR THE CONSUMER

We certainly felt like cheering when we saw President Kennedy come out the other day for that most forgotten of men, the consumer.

As he so rightly said, consumers include us all. "They are the largest economic group in the economy, affecting and affected by almost every public and private economic decision. Two-thirds of all spending in the economy is by consumers. But they are the only important group in the economy who are not effectively organized, whose views are often not heard. The Federal Government * * * has a special obligation to be alert to the consumer's needs and to advance the consumer's interests."

Yet, as we read on through the message, a growing sense of disappointment came over us. Somehow the remarks and the recommendations to Congress just didn't live up to the glowing promise of that opening plug.

Sure, some of the ideas sound fine. Everyone will welcome any further Federal cooperation with other groups to help make air and road travel safer.

And maybe all of us consumers need, as the President says we do, still more protection from our own productive drug industry. It is interesting to note, though, that U.S. drugs must already be among the most highly regulated in the world. In many other places you can buy without prescription drugs that require them here, and we haven't heard such foreigners complaining about health hazards. This situation might possibly have something to do with the high cost of American prescription drugs which the President noted, and with the high cost of medical care generally which his administration is so concerned about.

Then, when the President talks about helping the consumer by making it ever easier for anyone to buy a house, no matter what his financial condition, one can't help but wonder: Is that protecting the consumer or encouraging him to be foolish?

Also when Mr. Kennedy indicates he wants to make it tougher for business firms to merge, we aren't sure that is necessarily a boon to consumers. Mergers can, after all, make business more competitive and efficient, to the consumer's advantage in price and quality. Anyway, you'd think the laws and regulations in this area are already oppressive enough.

And so on. But the glaring parts of the President's message are its omissions.

Surely all of us consumers, as consumers, are especially interested in prices, and they certainly are affected by what the President calls public decisions as well as private decisions.

The Federal farm program, which is so costly to the consumer as a taxpayer, also has been keeping prices high at the grocery store. The special monopoly powers of unions, sanctified in Federal law, help make possible the unreasonable wage increases and featherbedding that have boosted prices so much over the years.

Another large and obvious factor in prices is the inflation which the Federal Government has given us off and on for some decades now. Then there are all those taxes, which not only keep price levels lofty but at the same time reduce the consumer's purchasing power. Somehow it seems a message exclusively concerned with improving the lot of the consumer might have mentioned some of these rather basic facts of the consumer's life.

We aren't complaining, you understand. It was nice of the President to take notice of the consumers, and maybe some day he will have more stimulating thoughts about the Federal Government's obligations to all of us.

It's just that if we consumers are going to organize effectively, as the President puts it, maybe we had better do it outside the Federal Government.

Backfire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, very shortly we are going to have before us the administration's new tax bill. As far as I can ascertain, it has not been determined the manner in which this bill will be presented to us for debate. There isn't any question that several areas touched upon in this tax measure are important and do require legislative approval; however, there are a number of provisions in the bill that the Congress would not approve if given a proper opportunity to work its will. I am hopeful that we shall be given that opportunity.

In the event that a gag rule is imposed upon this legislation, and we are forced to take the good with the bad, I cannot in good conscience support this legislation and I shall therefore oppose it.

Occasionally editorials are written which properly reflect the thinking of a Member of Congress and it is particularly gratifying when such editorial is written by a prominent editor in the district that the Congressman represents. I would like to include with my remarks an editorial called "Backfire," written by Mr. Thomas O'Brien Flynn, the distinguished editor of the Wheeling Intelligencer and ask unanimous consent that it be included as part of my remarks.

The editorial follows:

BACKFIRE—IF GAG RULE BARS TAX BILL AMENDMENTS PENALTY MAY BE DEFEAT OF ENTIRE MEASURE

Whether or not Congress will be required to dispose of the administration's new tax bill on an all-or-nothing basis should be determined within the next few days.

The measure, greatly changed from the original version as the result of 9 months of work by the House Ways and Means Committee, was reported out last Monday. The timetable calls for the opening of floor debate next Wednesday, which would require clearance by the Rules Committee not later than Tuesday. Inasmuch as the copy will not be in this Committee's hands before Monday, extraordinarily fast action is called for from a group which sometimes sits on legislation for months. A Tuesday report would be cutting it fine even were the leadership in full control of the Committee and the bill without serious opposition. But the administration holds no such advantage. The division is close and even some of the measure's supporters seem disposed to balk at the ban on floor amendments. Thus the 8–7 margin counted on to get the bill before the House may not materialize unless there is some relaxation of the amendment prohibition.

If the gag rule is modified sufficiently, the way will be cleared for consideration of three Republican amendments. It is because these go to the heart of the bill, and because at least one of them would stand a good chance of approval, that the administration wants the gag applied. The first would delete an interest and dividend withholding provision. Another would drop the section providing more severe tax treatment of the oversea earnings of American subsidiaries. The third would abandon the 8-percent tax credit for newly purchased equipment. In place of this, which opponents consider wholly inadequate, the Republicans would increase depreciation allowances generally.

For the rest, the bill would impose greater restrictions on tax credits for business entertainment expenses, and increase taxes on mutual thrift institutions, cooperatives and mutual fire and casualty companies.

Because of the credit for plant improvements, which could reduce some tax bills by as much as 8 percent, fiscal authorities estimate that, under existing economic conditions, a full year of operation with all of the bill's present provisions in force would result in a revenue loss of between $400 and $500 million.

Whether or not the depreciation allowance contemplated constitutes a sufficient incentive to business initiative, and whether or not the proposed tax increases in the bill are justified as loophole closers are, obviously, debatable questions. For this reason it seems to this newspaper that a no amendment rule is arbitrary. While committee investigation is essential to the legislative process, and while in this instance the work seems to have been painstakingly performed, the will of a small handful of Congressmen should not be imposed on the entire membership on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. Members should be free to offer amendments to any piece of proposed legislation, and the Congress free to adopt or reject them. Denial of this freedom might teach the administration in this instance the hard lesson that a half loaf still is better than no bread.

North Carolina Should Celebrate Its Past

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, during 1963 North Carolina will celebrate a great event in her long and proud history. The people of North Carolina will have occasion to observe the 300th anniversary of the granting by King Charles II of England to the eight Lord Proprietors of Carolina the great Carolina Charter under which liberty was secured to the people of North Carolina.

The Gastonia Gazette of March 15, 1962, carried an excellent article entitled "North Carolina Should Celebrate Its Past." I request that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

NORTH CAROLINA SHOULD CELEBRATE ITS PAST

(By Bob Page III)

"Too often in the past, neighboring States have stolen the thunder on commemorations and celebrations of this type. It is time we began paying appropriate tribute to our past. North Carolina is richer and more interesting in its heritage and history." So declared Governor Sanford as he entertained special guests of the Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commission at a luncheon at the mansion recently.

House Speaker Joe Hunt echoed sisterly sentiments to the Raleigh Civitan Club 2 weeks ago when he said that the people of this State are in danger of developing a psychology that they don't have much of a past to be proud of.

Next year, 1963, is North Carolina's tercentenary year. "So what's a tercentenary?"

NORTH STATE

In the case of the old North State, it's the 300th anniversary of the granting of the Carolina Charter by King Charles II to eight gentlemen historically known as the Lords Proprietors. In granting an area that extended from sea to sea and from Virginia to Florida, Charles was settling some debts to the men that played a major role in restoring him to the British throne in 1660. The charter today is an indispensable link in the chain of records beginning with the Magna Carta that establishes and preserves our political liberties down to the present. It is worth noting that only six other States possess their original charters.

The charter commission, established by the legislature in 1959 is working vigorously in planning the celebration. Statewide the tercentenary theme is being incorporated into 1963 organizational activities, planning by industries, pageants, fairs, travel promotion, public service activities, and, consequently and most significantly, in the minds of North Carolinians.

A proper observance and celebration in 1963 of the granting of the Carolina Charter could be the booster for spreading Tar Heel type, or "Dixie Dynamo" thunder. A short look at the stack of preprinted calendars reveals the upcoming bicentennial of the bicentennial of the American Revolution in the mid-1970's and shortly thereafter, the 400th anniversary (quadricentennial?) of Roanoke Island in 1987.

ORIGINAL

Through a series of civic undertakings and extensive research, North Carolina can now proudly admire its original charter. The document, attractively decortaed with a miniature of Charles II, is housed in a fireproof vault in the State Hall of History. In 1948 the department of archives and history purchased it from a British dealer with donations from private individuals. The interesting sidelight to the purchase involves the actual cost. The dealer originally asked for $10,000. He stipulated that if the charter were bought by and for the State, he would reduce the price by $2,000. Shortly afterwards, the devaluation of the British pound sterling in relation to the dollar made possible the purchase by the department of archives and history for slightly more than $6,000. Over 40,000 visiting schoolchildren view this handsome document each year.

PROJECTS

Directly under the supervision of the charter commission is the procuring, outfitting, and launching of a mobile museum this summer to travel to every community in Tar Heelia. The tractor-trailer outfit would afford many the opportunity to see various displays of the State's colonial era. Also included in special projects of the commission are several special musical compositions, one of which will be premiered by the North Carolina Symphony in the tercentenary year. A commemorative postage stamp request is being considered by the citizens stamp advisory committee. Presently before Congress is a resolution that would establish a Federal North Carolina Tercentenary Celebration Commission, consequently adding national and international flavor to the commemoration. A series of art exhibitions will be staged, notably the one set for March and April 1963, in the North Carolina Museum of Art.

A $3,000 library contest has already been announced by the commission. It is open to all professional writers who have a 3-year residence, either physical or legal, in North Carolina. Rules can be obtained from the charter commission at Box 1881, Raleigh.

A number of scholarly works will be prepared for extensive, detailed study on the period involved, 1663–1763. In addition to financing this project, the commission will

also sponsor the publication and distribution of nine pamphlets to State secondary schools for supplementary use during 1963. Noted historians are currently at work on commissioned topics.

A travel workshop is being planned for late spring or early summer of the current year. This project contemplates bringing together those interested in tourism, in order that knowledgeable persons in the many facets of the industry may learn how to exploit the tercentenary potential.

At the opportune moment, the celebration can be added as frosting on the cake offered to European travelers by the European Mission which departed on February 24. With the forming of the Federal Tercentenary Celebration Commission, several dignitaries of friendly foreign countries involved in the developing of our State will be invited to take part in the tercentenary.

Prominent quotations parallel those statements of Governor Sanford's and Mr. Hunt's that might be kept in mind are: Santayana: "Those who forget the past are condemned to relive it"; Hon. Francis E. Winslow of Rocky Mount, chairman of the Charter Commission: "There were eight of the Lords Proprietors. The history of North Carolina is bound up in the lives of them all. Fascinating and picturesque."

Carl Sandburg: "If America forgets where she came from, if the people lose sight of what brought them along, if she listens to the deniers and mockers * * * then will begin rot and dissolution."

R. D. W. Connor: "A people who have not the pride to record their history will not long have the virtue to make history that is worth recording."

Is More Foreign Aid Better?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in the Sunday Peoria Journal Star of March 18, 1962, Mr. Charles L. Dancey, editor, has a very thought-provoking editorial entitled "Is More Foreign Aid Better?" I don't believe it is, Mr. Speaker, for a variety of reasons and I think some of the arguments Mr. Dancey gives in the negative could very well apply to many of the domestic proposals of the Kennedy administration. Theirs is simply a philosphy of spending more and more as the cure for any ill. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be reprinted at this point in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

IS MORE FOREIGN AID BETTER?

Recently President Kennedy, with a touch of the heavy hand reminiscent of the late Senator Joseph McCarthy, announced that anyone desirous of reducing his foreign aid request by a single dime is "not interested in fighting communism."

This newspaper believes, and has believed for many stormy years, in foreign aid, and we are also willing to take the President's word for the amount needed even though he is doubling that amount.

We are willing to do this because without the detailed information in his hands, we have no way of knowing what the proper amount is.

(Many hearings on foreign aid are, necessarily, secret hearings. We can't broadcast our plans for using these moneys in many cases, nor our reasons for needing them in certain cold-war situations.)

However, the doubled request for foreign aid seems part and parcel of a philosophy of this administration that if something is good more of it is automatically still better.

That is a dangerous and childish philosophy that has become more and more current in the United States and it just is not true.

Everybody, these days, wants to argue on whether a thing is good or bad—and nobody wants to undertake the more painstaking task of figuring out the right dosage that is good and the wrong dosage that is bad.

Yet, this is in reality the basic problem in all our affairs.

The notion that all we need to do is prove something is good in small quantities and bigger quantities are automatically better diverts us from the real task of study and decision.

Try to think of something that is undiluted good, and the more the better. It isn't easy.

In medicine? Life-giving medicines can be deadly poisons given in excess.

In normal human living, in the very basis of human existence—food—starvation or malnutrition is bad and food is good. But too much of it leads to obesity, physical handicaps and an assortment of physical ailments including an increase in the risk of a heart attack.

What about morals and character? Well, determination is good—but there is such a thing as pigheadedness, too. Ambition is good—but only up to a point. It can become an evil thing.

Loyalty to friends is a sterling quality, but we had a President Truman who carried it too far with people who had betrayed his friendship and his trust—which was a public trust.

Courage is good—but not foolhardiness.

Simplicity is good—oversimplification, very dangerous. It leads to great mistakes in planning. On the other hand, a great skill in dealing with complicated matters is good, but the habit of complicating things produces total paralysis of action.

So it goes.

Even with foreign aid. Aside from its effects on our own economy and our own international gold exchange situation, it can harm as well as help. We withheld significant foreign aid to Chiang Kai-shek at a critical time—and lost China with too little.

In Laos, we poured in an excess of aid to that tiny country, disrupted its economy, corrupted its pro-West leaders, and disgusted its masses—and lost Laos.

There is such a thing as too much as well as too little.

It is the task of the President to figure the right amount, and propose it to Congress. It is the task of Congress to figure the right amount considering the President's calculations in the process, and to actually provide it.

That calculation does not involve any automatic "more the better" because waste damages us in the receiving nations, and it certainly does not involve the sincerity or loyalty of critical members as regards the fight against communism.

The President did not use a happy phrase in that instance.

And this is not the first time he has departed from the merits of the case to introduce an emotional or political club wholly aside from those merits.

He did it in relation to the Urban Affairs Department request by throwing into the pot the announcement that he would name a Negro to the post if it was created. That backfired.

We don't want to see a backfire on foreign aid.

The President must have better reasons for this request than are indicated by the "you're not against communism" brass knuckles.

That tactic has been overworked by the other end of the political spectrum. It doesn't wear well in the President's mouth.

In Defense of Testing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, since the President announced his decision to resume atmospheric testing, much has been said. However, I should like to call attention to a letter to the editor of the Washington Post from Richard L. Braun, professor of law, Georgetown University. It is a most logical and commonsense discussion of the problem which deserves consideration. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

IN DEFENSE OF TESTING

The recent letters in this column which have bemoaned the immorality of the President's decision to resume atmospheric testing appear to me so erroneous in their basic assumptions, and so unfortunate in the mistaken impression they may convey to foreign observers as to the relative number among the country generally who support this view, that I cannot resist the challenge of an attempted answer.

The reasoning of those whom I must call proponents of weakness seems based on two grounds: first, that pollution of the atmosphere by future tests is not justified by the need for such testing on our part; and second, that it is immoral and wrong to prepare for war when we should be seeking peace.

As to the first issue, we must balance the danger which will be visited on this country and on humanity from further atmospheric testing, against the dangers of permitting, through our inaction, the Russians or the Chinese to gain nuclear superiority. Certainly many factors must be considered, including the number of people who may be affected by the tests, and the safety of the free world from further aggression and the eventual conquest which might result from our failure to keep abreast of our Communist neighbors.

We must also not discount the very real danger that once it is sure it has nuclear superiority, the Communist bloc may be much more likely to attempt a decisive nuclear attack, which would rain down on the world many times more damage, in fallout alone, than would result from years of supervised testing.

The President, through information and the advice of experts available only to him, is better equipped to understand this problem, and to make this difficult decision, than anyone in the free world. To castigate that decision as immoral, cowardly, or shortsighted is to go the ostrich one better and hide, not only our own heads, but those of our children in the treacherous sands of

wishful thinking about future Sino-Soviet intentions.

Those who persist in the fantasy that, given nuclear-military superiority, the Communists will not use it to their utmost ability to enslave the rest of the world remind me of others who, 25 years ago, claimed that Hitler would be satisfied once he had restored Germany to her pre-World War I status.

The second argument, that it is immoral or stupid or both to continue our diabolical arms race which can only lead to greater weapons of mutual destruction, sounds attractive but again it ignores the world of reality. Unilateral withdrawal from this race by abandonment of nuclear testing would be tantamount to surrender to the force which has openly proclaimed it would destroy the ideals and morality our lives are based on. It might, in short, constitute suicide for the free world.

No great moralist from Christ to Gandhi has gone so far as to extol self-destruction of a race or religion as moral.

On the contrary, self-defense against evil aggression is not only moral, but a duty that we owe to our own times and to our successors on this planet. It also is still the best assurance of avoiding the war the President's critics (as well as the rest of us) so fervently wish to avoid.

Jesus gave His life, but to save mankind, not to surrender to evil. I hope we never so distort His teachings as to place ourselves in a position where surrender to communism is considered our only moral choice.

Still Fewer Farms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram of March 13, 1962:

STILL FEWER FARMS

Farms in the United States declined by about 123,000 last year, the Department of Agriculture reports, and the total number of farms now is down to 3,688,000. In the last 5 years 544,000 farms have disappeared from the American scene. This has come in different ways. Most of the decline resulted from consolidation of smaller farms into larger units as farmers sought to spread production costs over larger acreages. But some farmland went to nonfarm uses, into urban subdivisions, for new highways, and the like.

Last year's decline in the number farms reflects the continuation of a trend going on for a number of years. Today's 3,688,000 farms compare with 6,800,000 in 1935. The number of persons living on farms has declined sharply from a peak of 32 million in 1916 to 15.5 million now.

This decline in number of farms and farm people has accompanied a great technological advance in farming methods. Back at the turn of the century a farmer produced enough for himself and six other persons. Today the average American farmer produces enough for himself and 25 others. As more and more people found they could not earn a satisfactory living on the farm they sought more gainful employment elsewhere.

And while the politicians ignore it, the fact is that the crux of the farm problem is that the movement away from the farms has not been fast enough. Too many people are trying to make a living on farms that are too small and too inefficient to provide a good living for them. One and one-half million farmers—about 40 percent of the total—produce 87 percent of all farm commodities, and they have the capacity to produce 100 percent. The kind of a farm program that may improve income from the 2 million small and costly to operate farms is not needed by, and is unwarranted for, the 1.5 million larger and efficient farms.

It is economic pressure exerted by changes in farm technology that has been bringing about the decline in farm and the farm population. During the Eisenhower administration, Democratic critics cried out that administration policies were driving people off the farms. The decline continues, but the cries no longer are heard. The reason? The former critics are now the policymakers.

Hon. Sam Rayburn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Atlanta Journal of November 24, 1961:

MR. SAM: NO. 8

(By Jesse Laventhol)

Sam Rayburn was proud of his good health beyond the Biblical threescore and ten, and attributed it, among other things to the fact that he spent 9 hours a night in bed.

"I don't sleep all that time," he said, "but when I am stretched out all my insides are relaxed."

Another factor: "I don't worry. When I leave Capitol Hill, I leave my work there."

On the way to work in good weather, he frequently would have his chauffeur drop him about 8 blocks from the Capitol and walk the rest of the way.

"Never been sick in my life," Mr. Sam boasted, "and only been in a hospital once—to have my tonsils out."

At home on the farm, of course, he got plenty of "moderate exercise to keep my body in condition."

On his 79th birthday last January 6, 3 days after the present Congress convened, Speaker Rayburn seemed his usual vigorous self, though the signs of his years were unmistakable; shoulders more stooped, his walk slower.

The year was not far advanced before he began to feel aches in his body. Not sharp pain, just aches. They centered in his back and he dismissed them as merely "that old lumbago."

But despite restful holidays at home during the Easter recess and Memorial Day weekend, the aching sensations recurred, spread to his head. Twice while presiding in the chair, he suffered blackouts, once in June and again in July. Both were very brief but definite. Meantime, he was losing weight.

The last formal function he attended, at the Mayflower Hotel the night of August 22, was a reception for the President and Members of Congress, arranged jointly by the Democratic National Committee and the congressional campaign committees of the House and Senate. Friends who had seen the speaker at a dinner only 3 months before were startled by the contrast in his appearance, and a picture taken of him at the reception was not released.

He was obviously failing. Yet he kept driving himself to push through the new administration's legislative program, particularly the compromise Federal-aid-to-education bill.

Mr. Sam was working too hard. A hurry call was made to Bonham for his personal physician, Dr. Joe A. Risser, who came to Washington and wanted to take his patient back with him. Mr. Sam refused.

But not long after the doctor's visit which was not publicly known, Mr. Sam called Dr. Risser by telephone and said simply: "Joe, I am just sick. I can't go on."

The Speaker signed the brief and formal letter naming Mr. MCCORMACK to preside as Speaker pro tempore and then, on August 29, left Washington never to return.

Mr. Sam learned of the true nature of his illness on September 27 while still at home. Over that weekend, he consented to go to Baylor University Hospital at Dallas, and Dr. Risser made the necessary arrangements.

He entered Baylor on the following Monday, October 2, and 3 days later after a seris of tests, the announcement was made that the Speaker had incurable cancer of the pancreas.

There he was visited by President Kennedy for nearly a half-hour on October 9. They talked politics, avoiding the cause of his illness. Mr. Sam was cheered by this and other visits by other friends, including former President Harry Truman and Vice President JOHNSON.

The Speaker was brought back to Bonham on October 30. His faithful administrative assistant, John W. Holton, who spent sleepless days and nights beside his boss, quoted the Speaker's wish to end his day among "those friends and neighbors who, for so long, have given me a love and a loyalty unsurpassed in any annals."

And there, on the street floor of the little local hospital, while the skies wept and wind swept the last remaining leaves from the trees, the end came early in the morning of November 16.

Never before at any funeral, so far as is known, was there assembled a President, his Vice President, and two immediate former Presidents of the United States.

Their presence signified the gratitude of a whole Nation to a faithful servant, and the passing of "a good man and a just."

Land for Recreation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, some good reasons for going slow in approving new Federal recreational programs are presented in the following editorial from the Daily Journal, Macomb, Ill., dated March 3, 1962:

LAND FOR RECREATION

This is to some extent repetitious because the Federal policy of destroying recreational areas with one hand while seeking to create them with the other was discussed only recently in this column. Perhaps, however, President Kennedy's proposal to spend up to $1 billion for outdoor recreation areas makes additional observations excusable.

As he has done in so many of his spending proposals, Kennedy holds out the promise that his program would pay for itself. He counts on the fees paid by people who use existing Federal parks and outdoor facilities, also the admission and other fees that would be paid by users of the new recreational areas. Unclaimed motor boat fuel tax rebates would also be used.

The income from existing parks and facilities cannot reasonably be credited to this account. This is current income and all of it, and probably more, is needed for maintenance and administration of the areas the country now has. Unclaimed fuel tax funds belong to the Government. They do not represent new income. Use of them cannot be reasonably credited.

The program calls for matching grants to help States develop outdoor programs. One of this country's greatest needs is a constitutional amendment outlawing matching grants.

Federal funds involved in matching grants are more often than not regarded as free money at the State and local levels. Here is something we can get for half price. We don't really need it but it's a bargain. It will help Joe Doaks sell some merchandise or some land he wants to sell, and Joe's a good guy.

The grabbiest States and communities get the most at the expense of States and communities which are conscientious and wise in their spending policies. All could do more for themselves if they had their fair share of the authority to tax to meet their needs. As it is, Washington hogs taxing authority.

Reference was made a few days ago to the Federal practice of spending money to increase tillable acres of farmland while paying farmers to take farmland out of production. Many of the reclaimed acres were once valuable for recreation.

Public power policies have brought about a similar clash in purposes.

Most of the beautiful Ozarks streams have been ruined by power dam construction. They were once sparkling clear and small mouth bass could be taken in abundance on float trips. Floating one of them was a treat for people not interested in fishing.

Tannycomo is an example of the destruction. It is now a huge mud puddle. Silt has collected to create a marine desert. And one of the most beautiful stretches of the White River, a recreational area of tremendous value, is gone.

The Man Who Came to Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, summit meetings usually end with accomplishments approaching the zero mark.

Members of the York, Pa., Junior Chamber of Commerce pioneered a different approach to developing a better understanding between friendly allies and the United States.

This group of young men went "beyond the call of duty" when they made themselves responsible for introducing a foreign dignitary to "grassroots America." They are to be congratulated for this very fine gesture which might be the impetus for similar affairs everywhere.

The following account was published in the Sunday Patriot-News, Harrisburg, Pa., of February 25:

AMBASSADOR'S VISIT TO YORK TURNS INTO 3-DAY VACATION

(By Harry McLaughlin)

YORK.—Members of the York Junior Chamber of Commerce have earned the nickname of "grassroots diplomats."

They hosted for 3 days the Afghanistan Ambassador to the United States.

Mohammed Hashim Maiwandwal, who was considered for United Nations secretary after the death of Dag Hammarskjold, came here to speak at the Jaycees annual dinner Tuesday night but stayed until Thursday afternoon.

ACCEPTS INVITATION

He accepted the invitation of York Jaycees to remain in York for a few days of relaxation away from the busy chores of statesmanship.

"I enjoy from time to time the opportunity to mingle with the American people. I enjoy their friendship and hospitality. I like telling them about my nation and answering their questions about world affairs," the 43-year-old envoy said.

The Afghanistan diplomat said he enjoyed his York visit and had only one disappointment. He had hoped to go to Gettysburg to meet with former President Eisenhower, who currently is on the west coast.

The representative of a nation whose immediate neighbors include Soviet Union, China, Pakistan, and Iran turned down the Jaycees' offers to "see the town, especially its industries, historical sites, etc," but elected to talk with people in the vicinity of Yorktowne Hotel.

He and Jaycees President Hugh Manifold, who laid aside his law duties for a couple of hours Thursday, talked of world problems with this newsman.

That night the Ambassador was the guest of Jaycee Ken Edwards and his wife, Lois, at dinner and later joined Jaycees Donald Orcutt and James Locke in a bridge game at the Edwards home.

The envoy conceded he and his partner, Orcutt, were beaten by the Edwards-Locke pair, and admitted "I goofed a couple of times." Orcutt tactfully offered the information that the Ambassador played well, but he had goofed.

The three American players, however, discovered they knew less about bridge rules than their guest.

A REAL DIPLOMAT

"He had to remind us of rules, but he did it diplomatically. He's a fine bridge player," Edwards noted. The event could be described as one of the year's social scoops.

On Thursday morning, the envoy joined a group of professional men in "coffee corner" of Hotel Yorktowne coffee shop in an informal question-answer period.

Ambassador Maiwandwal had Thursday lunch with Jaycee friends at the Lafayette Club and another coffee round at Yorktowne Hotel before he was driven by automobile to Washington, D.C., in the company of Orcutt. Manifold motored him to York Thursday.

The Ambassador expressed "deep appreciation for the wonderful hospitality of my new York friends and the opportunity to meet with grassroot Americans."

On both mornings of his stay, the Ambassador slept late and checked with his Washington office for important communications.

"I needed a rest from the rigorous duties of my job. It was a refreshing stay here," he acknowledged.

The Alchemy of Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, a year before last I had the pleasure, along with other members of the House Committee on Agriculture, of visiting in South America for the purpose of holding conferences with various Foreign Agricultural Service attachés at several Embassies. During that time we saw firsthand some of the conditions under which our neighbors to the south existed. It became pretty clear also as to some of the reasons why these conditions were so poor. For that reason I was struck by an article appearing in the National Observer of March 18, 1962, entitled "The Alchemy of Change."

We will very soon be faced with another demand for foreign-aid spending. Many of us would like to see some realistic down-to-earth thinking in connection with our foreign-aid program. If this were to take place, perhaps such aid would not be so unpalatable to many American citizens, the Congress included.

I commend to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives the article mentioned above, and under unanimous consent, I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE ALCHEMY OF CHANGE

Anyone traveling among the poorer Latin American nations, and seeing the hard and primitive lives of most of the people, is bound to wish they could somehow be helped. Indeed, helping these nations may be a U.S. national necessity, when you consider what has already happened to Cuba and how much Castroism, communism, and general unrest there is elsewhere in our own hemisphere.

But if U.S. aid is to be effective against hemispheric communism, it seems to us, some basic questions have to be asked. What is it realistic to expect to Latin America? What sort of people and conditions of life are we dealing with? Is the aid program soundly conceived? For our part, we can't escape the feeling that too few people in Washington have even begun to raise these questions, even though a whole new program for Latin America is underway.

A new look actually began in the latter part of the Eisenhower administration, in the wake of Cuba and after years of complaints from the Latin governments themselves that the United States was neglecting them, especially in view of the billions it poured into Europe, Asia, and other areas.

The Kennedy administration has gone much further than its predecessors. Its economic development program, a sort of Latin Marshall plan called the alliance for progress, envisions spending $20 billion, much of it from the U.S. taxpayer, over a 10-year period. President Kennedy announced the program just a year ago; last week he devoted the greater part of his general foreign-aid message to Congress to the importance he places on the alliance.

The planners of the alliance know that it is not really a Marshall plan, because Latin American is not Europe. Much of Europe was shattered in World War II, but beneath

the damage remained the skills painfully acquired over the centuries, the energies and ambitions of the peoples. In Western Europe the infusion of U.S. billions, coupled with sound economic policies there, could produce the mazing comeback we have seen in recent years.

Mindful that Latin America is, in contrast, an underdeveloped area, the alliance officials in Washington operate on a more complex theory. If enough capital investment can be made, enough factories and roads built, enough new schools opened—if, they say, all this and more can be done, then in a decade or so these underdeveloped countries can reach a take-off point. That is the point where they begin to generate much more savings and capital of their own, where the change from a backward to an advanced economy becomes rapid.

Perhaps. Certainly great amounts of money ought to accomplish something, and plainly some Latin lands are already farther along than others. Still, this theory of rapid economic development finds scant support in history, especially in the slow evolution of prosperous North America or prosperous Western Europe. And when you walk among Latin America's poverty-plagued millions today, it is difficult to believe that prosperity can come easily or quickly.

It is not only that the majority of people are poor, that they lack many if not all of the amenities we consider necessities. It is also that many have been beat down, drained of their potential vigor and knowledge and imagination, by their own unkind history of centuries of colonialism and more than a century of dictatorships.

That being so, anyone may question how realistic it is to expect that a decade, or even 10 decades, can transform, say, the Indian of Bolivia's 12,000-foot-high Altiplano—plowing the scrubby earth with a curved stick with a knife tied to the end—into the skilled farmer or craftsman we know in North America and Europe.

For what we are really looking at is a page straight out of Western man's own past; the age of feudalism. It exists today in some Latin American nations, complete with peasants hardly different from medieval serfs, with ruling classes resistant to change even when the fires of revolution are burning around them. If it has taken Western man six or seven centuries, and uncounted woes, to move from feudalism to contemporary institutions, what modern magic is supposed to drastically compress the process for the Latins?

Even in the Latin nations where feudal oligarchies have broken down, the results are not necessarily encouraging. The plain fact is that there are few competent governments in Latin America, which is another fruit of a harsh history. There are too many corrupt governments, inflation-mad governments, opportunistic governments, leftist governments. Too often, even an attempt to follow sound economic policies risks political suicide.

Yet it is to these governments that the alliance will be giving the bulk of its billions; through them it hopes to effect the internal reforms and self-help intended to turn the nations into going concerns no longer vulnerable to Communist intrigue, agitation, subversion or guerrilla warfare. But one must wonder about defeating communism when such fundamental questions as education remain unsolved—when governments like those of Venezuela, Bolivia, and others have not yet managed to clean the Communists out of the universities, the very source of their future leadership.

To raise these questions is not to voice despair. It seems clear, for one important example, that U.S. aid could be more effective if it were consciously aimed more at the development of private enterprise in industry, agriculture and trade than at the support of governments. The evolution of free economic institutions would offer real hope of economic and political development.

Even as it is, it is possible to argue that the alliance is better than doing nothing at all, better than waiting on our island of well-being for the deluge of discontent to engulf us. For, as President Kennedy says, there is a ferment of change at work, for good or ill.

That, however, is exactly the point. If the U.S. Government wants to help the downtrodden millions of Latin Americans and thwart hemispheric communism's threat to U.S. security, it must take care to avoid illusions. Particularly it must realize there are no speedy throughways to prosperity for any people.

Not only money, but hard thinking about hard facts will be required, lest, despite our billions, the alchemy of change works against us and we end up with neither alliance nor progress.

Textile Imports Prompt Economic Dislocation in the State of Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, imports of low-priced goods made by low-wage foreign labor have already prompted economic dislocations in the State of Maine. Among those severely affected in the international trade program is our State's textile industry.

In January, Harold L. Gosselin, assistant to the president of the Bates Manufacturing Co., delivered an address treating of this matter. The Enterprise, one of Maine's foremost weekly newspapers, carried this presentation in its edition of January 18, 1962. Because this address contains some poignant references to the heightened economic confusion that would, in all probability, flow from a further liberalized trade program, I insert Mr. Gosselin's address into the RECORD:

TEXTILE IMPORTS PROMPT ECONOMIC DISLOCATION IN THE STATE OF MAINE

(By H. L. Gosselin)

I have been asked to speak to you this evening about the history of Edwards and its economic contribution to your area. I hope to meet that request, also to review briefly with out the very complex problems now facing the textile industry generally in view of happenings in Washington. I hope also to tell you of some of the things which we in the management of Bates are doing to meet fierce competition, from here at home and from abroad.

In checking over the history of the Edwards mill. I have found that the first structure built on the west side of the Edwards Dam was a sawmill erected in 1838. This mill was destroyed by fire and part of the dam was carried away by a flood a year later. The dam was rebuilt in 1841 and the sawmill in 1842. The first textile building was erected in 1845 after $100,000 was raised in Boston and in Augusta. Through the years that followed Edwards suffered crushing adversities from floods and from lack of profits. In 1882 Jacob Edwards of Boston purchased the property. Expansions followed and Edwards, as you know, became a part of the Bates Manufacturing Co. in 1945.

Today the Edwards division consists of several multistoried buildings and has more than 50,000 spindles spinning yarn for the weaving of all types of flannel fabrics—some for consumer use such as cotton blankets and mattress pads but the large part for industrial uses such as to line shoes, caskets, etc.

FOUR MILLION

The plant provides employment for approximately 1,200 men and women in the Augusta-Gardiner area. Each week Edwards distributes about $80,000 in payrolls or $4 million per year. In addition to this, the company spends several thousands of dollars each month to buy all kinds of supplies and services from business firms in this area, thus helping them to stay in business and make their contribution to Augusta's economic life. We contribute substantially also in the matter of taxes to finance municipal services and just the other day I totaled a few figures and found that, since 1951, Edwards has paid the city of Augusta the sum of $861,718.74 in real estate and personal property taxation.

These contributions to the prosperity and the growth of Augusta we hope will continue for many, many years in the future. It is our wish also that conditions will permit even greater benefits for the community.

NEW PROBLEM

This textile plant, as we know it, has been on the American industrial scene for many years. It has survived, many adversities, floods, fires, etc. Today is faces a completely different kind of problem—more complex than those created by the ravages of nature.

Located in the Northeast—far from its source of raw material—Edwards is the only mill of its type left in New England.

It is faced with these problems, and not necessarily in the order of their seriousness:

1. Geographical location: Augusta is some 2,000 or more miles from the cottonfields. This means that raw cotton has to be transported a great distance and this adds sizably to the cost of doing business.

2. Labor costs: Labor costs here in Augusta are considerably higher than those with which Edwards has to compete. A recent survey by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor revealed that textile workers in the Northeast were getting 12 cents per hour more than their Southern counterparts. This is in wages alone. If you consider—and you must—the cost of the fringe benefits provided our employees, such as free insurance, vacation pay, paid holidays, severance pay, and the like, you must add nearly 15 cents more per hour to the North-South labor cost differential. This means that the people with whom Edwards competes pay at least 25 cents per hour less for the fabric their employees produce than we do.

FRINGES

You will be interested to know that the fringe benefits which Bates provides its employees cost the company the equivalent of 25 cents per hour. According to a recent issue of the textile union magazine, this is 14.4 cents per hour more than the textile industry as a whole.

Now I would like to discuss with you this matter of foreign competition and the policies of the Government as they affect Edwards and the whole industry. You have heard a lot about these but the programs that are now being devised will make the destruction and suffering of the past few years look rather small if the programs we hear about become a reality without legislation to offset the damage.

Before getting into these, a little background would be, I believe, of some help in gaining an understanding of the problems.

BACKGROUND

Immediately after World War II, America undertook to rebuild the economy of foreign

nations and new textile plants began to spring up in various parts of the world, particularly the Far East. The textile mills of America at that time—1947—were exporting a billion and a half yards of cotton cloth, and imports into this country were something like 15 million yards. The industry in America was enjoying good business and the textile communities of the State of Maine were benefiting. Bates alone was employing 7,000 people in the State.

As foreign nations developed their textile industry with the aid of the taxpayers of the United States, the figures and the markets I have just cited began to change. American mills started to lose their export business and imported fabrics appeared in increasing numbers in the retail markets of America.

BUT TODAY

Today American mills are exporting two-thirds less than they were in 1947 and imports have climbed from 15 million yards to the staggering figure of 500 million yards.

One might say, why can't American mills, with their ingenuity and the high styling of their products, compete with foreign mills, even though foreign mills have a much lower labor cost?

The answer is a simple one.

Here in America the Government dictates through its price-support program the amount of money that American mills like Edwards must pay for the cotton they buy. But for foreign mills the price is different—it's 8½ cents per pound lower. For example, when our cotton buyer goes south to buy cotton for Edwards—and he buys a lot—he pays, say 35½ cents per pound. The Japanese buyer, purchasing exactly the same cotton, pays 27 cents. The taxpayers of the United States, including the Edwards mill, pay the difference so the cotton farmer can get his income.

IMPOSSIBLE

When you consider that about 40 percent of the cost of producing a yard of cloth is in the price of raw material, you can readily see the tremendous competitive advantage which our Government gives to foreign textile mills—an advantage, coupled with the low wages of foreign nations, which makes it completely impossible for American industry to compete.

This policy of having two prices for cotton is, in my opinion, most unfair and most unjust. Frankly, it is ridiculous.

Do you know that if Edwards were located just a little over 100 miles north—in Canada—it could also get its cotton 8½ cents per pound cheaper? We have no intention of moving to Canada, but it is a fact that, if the three Bates mills in Maine were in Canada, the company could save on cotton purchasing alone the tidy sum of $4 million per year, because the taxpayers of the United States would subsidize us since we would be considered as foreign mills.

NOTHING YET

I wish I could report to you tonight that the worse has happened insofar as foreign competition is concerned but, unfortunately, the reverse may be true. We're now being told "You ain't seen nothing yet," and some of the happenings in Washington spell nothing but trouble for textiles.

Already we have been hit and quite hard. Last August, the Government increased the subsidy on cotton for foreign mills from 6 cents to the present 8½ cents. At the same time, the Government boosted the support price for cotton and this means that, in 1962, Bates will have to pay some $25 more for each bale of cotton it purchases. We are concerned and seriously so about this. It will mean that our cost of doing business will go up an additional $2 million plus. Some of this, we hope, will be absorbed by higher prices but in numerous lines higher prices are impossible to get. In this business a fraction of a cent oftentimes means the difference between getting or losing an order and competition being what it is, the higher cost mill is the one losing the order or selling at little or no profit.

FREER YET

In addition to the rise in cotton prices, our loss of exports and high imports, we now read that the President will ask Congress this month for authority to lower tariff barriers to make it easier for foreign nations to bring more of their goods into the United States and to create freer trade. High-placed officials have already admitted that this program will mean the sacrifice of some industries and of some communities. They are now talking publicly of the relocation and the retraining of workers displaced by the new program if it is accepted by the Congress. Frankly, I hate to see the day come when the Federal Government and its giant bureaucracy will decide what industry is to be located where and where Mr. or Mrs. Jones will work. This, I'm afraid, is where we may be heading.

At this point, I want to make it crystal-clear that we in the textile industry are not so-called protectionists. It would be national suicide to isolate ourselves from the rest of the world and, if freedom is to survive, America does have a responsibility to do all it can to prevent the spread of communism in Europe and in Asia as well as in South America. Yet, it is evident that this purpose will not be served if we weaken ourselves in the process. For example, the textile industry is considered by military leaders as second to steel in the priority of materials needed for national defense. Yet, it is a fact that we have weakened the textile industry so much that the industry would not be able to meet basic civilian and military needs in the event of a world conflict.

THE RECORD

Since 1947, more than 700 mills have closed their doors, throwing hundreds of thousands of Americans out of work.

Here in New England more than 100,000 jobs have been liquidated and the landscape of many New England cities and towns is dotted with the wrecks of closed textile plants.

Here in Maine, more than 14,000 textile jobs and annual payrolls in excess of $20 million have gone down the drain in the past decade.

In Lewiston, just a few months ago, the Continental Mills, which once employed more than 1,000, closed its doors after having been in business since 1866.

Just a few days ago, a 99-year-old firm—the A. D. Ellis Mills in Massachusetts, closed its doors with the president of that company stating and I quote, "the continuing flow of foreign goods into our market has made it impossible to remain in business."

MAJOR CAUSE

I don't say that foreign competition has been the cause for the closing of all the mills that have shut down. In some cases, geographical location, lack of modernization, and overproduction in the industry have taken a heavy toll. But subsidized foreign competition has been the major cause in recent years. This type of competition has demoralized the price structure for American fabrics and has forced many mills to reduce prices—at times well below cost just to stay in business. And soon these mills found that you can't stay in business if you don't make a profit.

Ladies and gentlemen, in Maine there remain some 13,000 textile jobs and an annual textile payroll in excess of $45 million.

In my opinion, we must work as hard to save these jobs as we would to attract an industry which would employ 13,000.

While we must struggle with the governmental policies I have cited and insist that our communities and our textile workers not be sacrificed on the altar of free trade, we must as communities, as management, and as workers continue our efforts together to safeguard what we have remaining.

BIG JOB

Community leaders and State officials must continue to guard well the State industrial climate so that we will not only protect our existing jobs but attract new and diversified industries which can make good use of Maine's natural resources.

Employees and their union must take a good look at existing economic conditions and realize that the lack of reasonable profits just does not permit higher labor costs in any form at this time.

On our part—management's—I can say that our president and our board of directors are determined to do all in their power to protect the future of Bates and to see Bates grow. In spite of conditions which existed in the textile industry generally in 1961 and the fact that we passed up three consecutive common stock dividends, our management has continued its modernization program and, for this purpose, spent nearly a million dollars in Maine last year.

NEW OUTLETS

We are making also numerous efforts to find new end uses for the products we make, particularly the products of Edwards, and to find new outlets.

We have devised a completely new and dynamic national advertising program to bring the famous Bates name and its products to the attention of millions of more Americans.

We have opened new sales offices and increased our sales staff in an effort to cover markets heretofore not covered by Bates.

We have spent considerable sums to develop and to introduce new bedspreads.

All these things cost money. They take time to devise, to initiate, and to become effective.

With patience and understanding from our plant communities and our employees, we are confident that the day will come when all will benefit.

Rural Electrification: Pattern for Progress and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, the rural electrification program has meant much to agriculture in America. It is furthermore proving to be an important element in our nationwide economy. For every dollar advanced in loans to our REA cooperatives in America, at least $3 or $4 are expended nationwide by farm families for electrical appliances manufactured by private industry.

On March 5, our former colleague Mr. Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, addressed the 20th annual meeting of the association at Atlantic City, N.J. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that what Mr. Ellis had to say that day will be of much interest to each and every Member of Congress. I hope my col-

leagues will read and study this speech very carefully.

The address follows:

LEAD NOW FROM STRENGTH

(Remarks of Clyde T. Ellis, General Manager, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, at 20th annual meeting, Atlantic City, N.J., March 5, 1962)

"Would you realize what revolution is, call it progress; and would you realize what progress is, call it tomorrow."—Victor Hugo.

Your program planning committee selected as this meeting's theme: "Rural Electrification—Pattern for Progress and Peace."

Rural electrification is, indeed, a pattern for progress. And in a very real sense it can now be a pattern for peace, and the quest for peace must be the first concern of all people of this earth.

The rural electrification pattern has been drawn and cut; and from that pattern you in this room have built a magnificent full-scale working model.

The story is told of a man who upon being presented to a curvacious young lady was so stunned that all he could say was "Are you a model?" "No," she replied, "I'm full scale."

Through the vast and lonely reaches of the United States the lights of your full-scale rural electrification model burn in almost 5 million homes and rural establishments.

The unprecedented accomplisments of this program are a testament to your vision, your courage, and your capacity for leadership. This is a job you could not have done alone. But you in this room led, and millions followed.

And a miracle was made.

Now you must lead again—and, this time, lead from the strength of your accomplishment, from the strength of the organizations you have created, and from the strength that is in each of you as an individual leader.

Why is your leadership so vital in these times? Because everything you have done in these past 25 years of the rural electrification program has trained and equipped you for the kind of leadership which these times demand.

You are the major corporate operating group in rural America today, and you are almost universal in the truly rural regions. No one else can or will provide the effective leadership required in certain areas of critical need. You and the time and place have met for the unique role that you alone can perform best.

THE BATTLEFIELDS

Let me emphasize that your program committee in selecting the theme, "Rural Electrification: Pattern for Progress and Peace," didn't mean that the development of rural electrification has been calm and untroubled, or that this program is at peace with everyone just now.

We've had to fight with both fists to even stay alive in this program. And I hope we all realize that our toughest fights are probably still ahead of us. Anyone who doubts this should spend a little time out on the battlefields:

In Idaho, where last month we defeated a sellout attempt;

In Arizona, California, Montana, North Carolina, New Mexico, and Virginia where other sellouts or buyouts are threatening;

In Illinois and Indiana, where power companies are rocking our co-ops with vicious and expensive propaganda designed to turn whole States against us;

In Alabama, Louisiana, and other States, where piracy of our consumers is the order of the day;

In Nevada, where unserved people are crying for power—and the power company that won't serve them is fighting to keep a co-op from being formed. Where the Bureau of Reclamation power is bought up by the State and sold to industry and denied to electric co-ops;

In Texas and Missouri, where co-op efforts to pass legislation to protect their territories has resulted in outrageous propaganda campaigns against the whole program;

In Maryland, where the power companies are fiercely opposing a generation and transmission plant, attempting to turn the State commission and the people against the cooperative;

In Washington, D.C., where the most powerful lobbies seek your demise, where the fight goes on without limit and we have to battle incessantly to protect the program as it now exists and try to help you build something better;

In other areas where there is no peace because our own people are unable to agree among themselves on solutions to their wholesale power supply problems.

No man can take an honest look at the rural electrification program today and say our problems are over, our success is assured, we now can rest awhile.

No, your program planning committee used the word "peace" in our theme in a completely different sense. They used it in a concept that calls for leadership we would never have imagined in this program a few years ago.

I shall return to this later, but first I want to think through with you the demand for your leadership to solve immediate problems in our own areas of activity.

YOU'RE BETTER THAN YOU THINK

For, while we have many problems, we also have the strength and capacity for the leadership required to deal with them in dynamic and imaginative ways.

Your task has not been simply to set poles and string wires over them. What you've done is to learn to think in terms of thousands of people, of millions of dollars, of fresh new ways to do complicated jobs, of management practices, engineering, insurance, public relations, and public affairs. You've found that the old ways wouldn't work so you had to develop new approaches; innovate, take risks and think and worry.

You have a proud record of leadership accomplishment. Our growing strength lies in the quality of leadership this program has developed in thousands of crossroads communities in America, and in the cause for which we fight.

The local director, the local manager, the local employees of our systems, fired with a mission such as ours—this is the stuff strength is built of. These are ingredients of greatness.

The success of this program speaks more eloquently than anything I could say of the high quality of your leadership. You have been able to predict, recognize, and accept and take advantage of change.

This reminds me of the old man with long whiskers, ragged and dejected, sitting on the porch of a little country store down in the Ozarks. A fellow got into conversation with him and commented that he must have seen many changes in his time. "Yes," replied the old fellow, "and I've been agin ever' one of 'em."

Obviously you don't belong to that school or you would not be here.

NEED FOR BIG LEADERSHIP

Ten or fifteen years ago your major role was generally believed to be the advancement of construction as rapidly and efficiently as possible: "Get everyone hooked up and energized."

But now the rural electric system is big business in terms of people, of economics, and of responsible enterprise, in terms of society generally, and still growing bigger. There are bigger problems and bigger opportunities. They require bigger leadership. And you will provide it.

Your job today, as I see it, is to lead from a position of the vast strength and prestige that you have created. Take advantage of where you are and of the organizations you have built.

You can, and you must, lead now on several important fronts.

OUR PROBLEM AREAS

The first of these, of course, is the home front, where our program is under constant attack from those who resent or envy or fear our success.

A year ago whe hoped we were over the hump on sellouts. Then suddenly last fall and again this winter whole rashes of them broke out over the country. I'm glad to note that not one of these new attempts has succeeded, at least to date.

Here and now I say to the power companies that NRECA will fight with all its strength, with whatever resources are required, to defeat any greedy sellouts, buyouts, or killoff effort from this date on anywhere in the United States.

That's your declared policy and we are going to carry it out.

TERRITORIAL INTEGRITY

But we can't gamble on waiting until the chips are down. The territorial problem is serious in almost every State in one or another of its phases—sellouts, piracy, or annexation.

Leadership must be exercised before the critical stage is reached. If you don't have a local TNT advertising program and a local minuteman program, I urge you to consider them.

Whenever possible, rural electrics should attempt to reach agreements with municipally owned electric systems to prevent open warfare which drives apart these two groups who are natural allies—and whose national organizations do work together.

The dual rate, charging us a higher wholesale rate for our larger loads, this and other restrictive clauses demanded by power companies in wholesale power supply contracts must go. When by contract we are prohibited from serving loads that develop in our areas, thus relegating us to the role of third-class utilities, our territories are laid wide open to invasion, because these loads must be served by someone.

Municipal annexation of areas, including often our larger users, with the result that our consumers are taken over by either the franchised commercial supplier or by the municipal plant, is a problem that will grow in intensity with the population explosion. Where attempts at negotiation and agreement are futile, I see no alternative to the passage of fairplay legislation. I congratulate those States which have secured some form of protective laws: Arkansas, Idaho, Kentucky, Georgia, Oklahoma, Vermont, and Wisconsin.

Success in the enactment of such laws requires leadership, teamwork, and effort of the highest order. But the reward is worth the effort.

POWER SUPPLY

As we continue to double our power usage every 5 to 7 years, the problem of wholesale supply grows more critical almost everywhere. It is being compounded by the increasingly hostile attitude of the commercial power companies.

We have three principal sources of power: We buy it from Federal wholesale power projects, we buy it from commercial power companies, or we generate it ourselves, usually through generation and transmission cooperatives (G. & T.'s).

The power companies are attacking on all three fronts. Many of them are making unreasonable demands in the negotiation of new contracts with us. Not only are they imposing more damaging dual rates, they are raising rates to us.

The power companies are fighting congressional authorization and appropriations for new Federal hydro projects and transmission lines with all the money, propaganda, and influence at their command.

And they are drawing a fine bead on our right to generate our own power. They are actively opposing congressional appropriations for our own generation and transmission. And, whenever a sizable loan is announced they launch all-out propaganda campaigns in the newspapers and on radio and TV in the State where the loan originates. Ask anyone in Indiana. They blanket the State with false and misleading statements in brochures and pamphlets. Ask anyone in Illinois or Alabama.

Here is one of the ads with which the Alabama Power Co. is flooding that State in an effort to kill a loan for an additional unit at an existing GT plant.

And now the power companies are even demanding that REA be required to give them all the facts about our generating applications, in advance, so they can begin their crucifixion campaigns earlier. Meanwhile, they hammer away in national magazine advertisements and in their lobbying with Congress on their nonsensical central theme: That only profit-motivated companies should be in the utility business; that they have some sort of divine right to supply all the country's power needs.

All this, however, is probably symptomatic more and more vicious resistance to you as you grow stronger.

If we are stronger and our opportunities are greater, then there must be brighter horizons somewhere. And there are.

One is the evermore effective leadership being displayed by rural electric people. For example, you are now rejecting the more ridiculous restrictive wholesale power supply contracts. You are developing factual and hard hitting public relations programs to counter false propaganda with truth.

The new REA administrator is standing squarely behind his borrowers in your efforts to overcome these attacks upon you. This support is invaluable, and I know that you join me in heartily congratulating Norman Clapp and his fine team on their courage and accomplishments over the past year.

NATURAL RESOURCES PROGRAM

Last year I expressed disappointment that the natural resources program was getting off to such a slow start under the new administration. Now we are happy to see that the President's budget request for the next fiscal year includes some funds to start three relatively small Corps of Engineers' dams with power facilities. They are Little Goose in Washington, Millers Ferry in Alabama and Stockton in Missouri. Not a lot, but something.

By the way, has the Bureau of Reclamation gone out of the dam building business?

I commend Interior Secretary Udall, Assistant Secretary Holum and their colleagues for their fine study which resulted in a recommendation for a high-voltage intertie between the Pacific Northwest and California. I urge them to start construction on the intertie as quickly as possible, and to carry out studies on other interties between the major Federal power-producing regions. These, if built, will mean more and cheaper power.

I commend Secretary Udall and his staff—and I commend all of you—upon the successful drive last year to win the 5-State Upper Colorado River Basin all-Federal transmission line battle. Both Kennedy and the Eisenhower administrations had endorsed the all-Federal system.

Despite the fact that 70 electric co-ops and 80 other preference customers would use all the power, the power companies demanded the privilege to build tollgate segments of the lines in order to control the power. I commend the Congress for rejecting the power companies and appropriating initial funds for an all-Federal system. It was the sole resource development approved in the first year of the Kennedy administration.

It is true that a congressional committee report left the door ajar just a little for the Secretary of Interior to not build some of the lines approved by Congress. But the Congress itself was definite that the lines were to be built.

Now a great calamity has befallen us. A few days ago the Secretary of the Interior announced that, except in Arizona, he had agreed for the power companies to build most of the controversial lines for which we fought and won.

Most of our sole resources victory of last year is gone, because, once the announcement was made that Interior had abandoned the lines, Congress will also.

The Secretary said in his press release that the compromise would result in certain saving by the year 2042. But, mind you, he doesn't have any contracts with the power companies yet. He has only letters of intent from them and they are not binding. And the letters of intent indicate contracts only until 1982 or 1987—not 'til 2042.

We were not permitted to see those letters of intent until after the give-away decision had been made. Their language, written by the power companies, is not designed to protect the preference customers.

Even if and when the Secretary gets contracts, they can never provide for all the eventualities that may arise. Also any contract can be broken, or not lived up to in good faith, things at which the power companies are experts.

If the letters of intent are converted into some sort of contracts, the contracts can still give no assurance that the benefits will reach the consumers on a reasonable basis. The regulatory commissions in all these States, and so-called regulatory commissions are notoriously obedient to power companies, have the authority to reject these wheeling contracts and require the companies to return to their higher cost figures which they presented to Congress last year.

It is still a fact that only an all-Federal transmission system such as your magnificent leadership helped to win in the Congress could guarantee the preference customers that they would ever get the power on the proper terms.

The letters of intent say that some of the controversial lines will be built some years away by Interior, but the companies do not say they will not oppose them. Anyway, only Congress can appropriate for Federal lines, not Interior, and certainly not the power companies.

This transmission partnership arrangement is a multimillion dollar windfall for the commercial companies, allowing them to integrate this hydropower with their steamplants and skim off much of the benefits.

Turning these transmission lines over to the enemy power companies is like turning the chickenhouse over to the fox to guard. In the seven States where efforts are under way to kill off our co-ops and sell them out to power companies, six of the co-ops get their power—either by purchase or wheeling—from the very power companies that are trying to take them over, and one of them is in this area, in Arizona.

The kindest thing I can say about the Secretary's decision, including its timing before contracts are made, is that it was seemingly naive. It was announced on John Glenn Day, the day America won one great victory and gave away another.

If it's any consolation to you from all over the United States who fought so hard for those controversial lines last year, let me say that we are still better off than if we had not made the fight at all.

We still will get, we hope, the noncontroversial lines, and the Arizona line and some other remnants, provided the power companies' position is not now so strengthened and ours so weakened that they can still stop appropriations for all the lines they don't want the Government to build.

When the Secretary of Interior announced this so-called wheeling deal, in lieu of lines approved by Congress, he called it a "pattern of cooperation" and hinted there would be more to come. If you don't want more of the same, now is the time to say so at this meeting.

Since it is impossible for any contracts with the power companies to provide the preference customers, including the electric cooperatives, with the protection which they are assured under the law and since no contracts have been written but only letters of intent by the power companies, I urge the Secretary of the Interior to reconsider his announced acceptance of the power companies' proposals.

In my opinion, our country's national resources program will never really get moving until we have a national resources policy—and a White House Council of Resources Advisers and/or a Department of Resources to see that it is carried out. In the presidential campaign of 1960, Candidate Kennedy advocated a Council of Resources and Conservation, but so far, despite our pushing, nothing has been done about it. The New York Times now advocates editorially the creation of a Department of Natural Resources. This is a concept worthy of careful study.

Your united, dynamic leadership in this whole field of resources can and must set the pace for the Nation. This meeting is the best opportunity in 1962 to begin it.

RURAL AREAS DEVELOPMENT

If the effectiveness of the leadership of you in this room needs any documentation, it can be found in the rural redevelopment programs.

As you know, the area redevelopment legislation you endorsed at Dallas last year passed. The Commerce Department, under its Area Redevelopment Administration (ARA) set up an area redevelopment program. And the Agriculture Department, as you advocated, set up its own rural area development programs. Now the work of a dozen agencies has been expanded. The development programs have become a reality but not well at work yet in my opinion. People who work in these programs say none of this would have come about without your leadership.

ARA, under Bill Batt, is about staffed and ready to accelerate its efforts. Some loans and grants have been made. A few of your communities have benefited already.

We feel the RAD section in REA, under Dick Hausler, is already dynamic and aggressive. We feel Farmers Home Administration is beginning to move, the Small Business Administration and other agencies are beginning to move.

But most of these area development programs are moving too sluggishly.

The necessity of removing the roadblocks still in the path of area development reminds me of the story of the little girl who on Halloween went out on her first "tricks or treats." This is a Methodist story. Her mother fixed her up in an angel costume and she went off down the street.

At one house a man came to the door and asked her what she was.

"I'm an angel, can't you see," the little girl replied.

"What kind of an angel?" he asked.

"I'm a Baptist angel."

Still fascinated, the man picked out the biggest apple he had and dropped it into her open sack.

She looked into the sack, then glanced up pitifully at him and said:

"Broke every damn cookie."

I know it's a Methodist joke because the Baptists wouldn't tell it. You may have to break a few cookies before RAD gets going.

Well, you may still have to help break a lot of cookies to get the area development show on the road full scale.

RURAL AMERICA IN 1962

For years the Department of Agriculture has expended its major time and energy on the perplexing farm production and marketing problems. Meanwhile, millions continued to desert the farms. Our country's nonfarm rural population now exceeds farm people by at least 2 to 1. More than half the people we serve today get more than half of their cash income from other than the land.

It seems certain this trend will continue.

Certainly our country's total population will increase, and hopefully both our domestic and foreign farm markets will increase. Even so, fewer farmers will be needed.

It's time we face the fact that we're going to serve fewer and fewer farms and more and more nonfarmers in our areas in the future. And it's time we and the rest of the country face some other harsh facts about rural America.

The first fact is that when we talk of rural America, both farm and nonfarm, we're still speaking of nearly one-third of the United States' population, 54 million people.

We hear much about city slums and poverty. It is a startling fact that over half of the poverty in this Nation is rural poverty.

We read of the problems of young people in the cities. Listen: There are about 22 million young people under 20 years of age in rural America, and a million more are born there every year. Only 1 out of the 10 of those who come of working age each year can hope to find opportunity on the farm which will net him as much as $1,500 per year. For hundreds of thousands of others, there is no opportunity at all.

And of the rural age group 65 years of age or older, a million and a half have inadequate incomes.

I relate these facts to emphasize that the problems of rural America are just as great as those of urban America and many of them are human problems not directly related to the price of wheat or acreage controls for corn.

Yes, we need urban renewal in the United States, but we also need rural renewal, and we must have it on a far greater scale and on a much broader administrative basis than we have yet in the ARA and RAD programs.

President Kennedy recognized these needs in the farm message he sent to Congress last month. In addition to the present RAD, he called for new legislation to set up a further program of "rural renewal." Under this plan local public rural renewal corporations could receive loans and technical assistance to "aid in developing new uses for land and water, create forest industry parks, assist small farmers in farm consolidation and enlargement, and develop needed public facilities, including outdoor recreation."

Such a program would be a great step forward in the total development of rural America. We have long maintained that there is much more to rural development than the establishment of industry, vital as that is.

Here again you can lead.

In my opinion rural renewal must be carried out by a dynamic rural action agency of some kind.

I am convinced that Secretary Freeman should now establish within Agriculture, an action set-up, which would encompass, among others, REA, FHA, SCS, ASCS, Forest Service—Farmers Co-op Service—all present and future development and renewal programs.

This department-wide organization should be headed by a new Under Secretary of Agriculture with administrative authority to move and to act. I am talking about the power to cut red tape and eliminate the necessity of having to go through so many panels and committees. This is needed to get more speed and results in rural development. This certainly is not to criticize the excellent work of John Baker as Director of Agricultural Credit Services, but to provide opportunity for more coordination and dynamics.

Whatever is done in this area will probably depend largely on your further leadership and support, beginning at this meeting. If you don't provide the leadership in this critical hour for rural America, the job won't be done. You are in key positions and you have the responsibilities of leadership. And those responsibilities can't be shirked or rural America will be plowed under.

And anything which hurts rural America hurts the ability of this Nation to win the cold war with communism.

EXPORTING THE REA IDEA

This suggests another area of leadership responsibility. And it is in this context that the word "peace" is also included in our theme.

There is now wide recognition in the highest circles of Government, including the President and the Administrator of the Agency for International Development—the foreign aid agency—that the REA-cooperative concept can be a valuable arm of American foreign policy for the underdeveloped countries of the world. Congress wrote it into the law.

We spoke of this at the regional meetings last fall, when the new foreign aid program was beginning to take shape.

Just to bring you up to date, the first, inter-American cooperative conference was held in November, in Bogotá, Colombia. Some 30 cooperative representatives from the United States were asked to attend, and did. President R. A. Yarbrough and six others, including myself and NRECA's New Mexico Director R. B. Moore, attended from the rural electrics. The cooperatives of nearly all the countries of the Western Hemisphere and many governments, including our own, were represented.

I wish each of you could have been there, to have heard for yourselves the stories of our Latin American friends. Many times I was reminded of our early rural electric co-op meetings. I wish you could have heard them describe their intense need for assistance in establishing a strong cooperative movement to help their people help themselves to live better and to counter the inroads being made among the masses by the Communists.

I had previously been named to a special State Department team to tour most of the South American countries following the Bogotá conference, to explore the possibilities for cooperative development. I wish you could also have been on that trip, to see and feel for yourselves the things that are happening in those countries and the things that ought to be happening but are not. Many times I saw and relived my own days on the farm in the twenties and thirties.

Revolution is in the air everywhere in Central and South America. The people intend to have something better than worsening poverty and exploitation.

It may be the violent, bloody revolution urged by the Communists, or it may be a peaceful revolution.

The REA pattern offers dramatic proof that people everywhere can improve their lot through democratic processes. This pattern can be a vital part of our efforts to others achieve revolutionary goals without violence.

After all, we in this program are no strangers to revolution. When Marquis Childs wrote his noted book about rural electrification, "The Farmer Takes a Hand," he added this subtitle: "The Electric Power Revolution in Rural America."

What is our interest in this foreign program? Our interest is the American interest. The free world is at a crossroads, and our Government, which has been good to us, is asking us to help—asking you to help. In practical terms, we may be able not only to help our fellow farmers and rural folk of other lands to help themselves, we may be able to help them prevent other Castros from seizing power.

This is indeed a high call to leadership. The country which has done so much for us now asks something very special of us. Very special because only we and our friends in other co-ops have the know-how, the experience and the opportunity to help do what must be done.

So little is asked of us. We are asked for little time. We are asked for no money. We are asked for our know-how and our leadership. We are asked to assist in training leaders in other countries to organize and operate cooperatives. We are asked to locate and provide technicians willing to spend a few months in critical areas to help get this job done. We are asked to help establish co-ops in other lands. Things only we can do best. All costs, of course, will be borne by the AID agency.

I don't know how you feel, but this call for our help makes me proud to be a rural American and proud to be included among you as a leader of the rural electrification program. Proud to be needed in this hour of crisis.

I know many of you feel the same way. Scores of you have written us and the AID agency, offering your talents and your know-how in this great cause.

Our individual decisions to do all we can to help are needed now. We must not wait like the school board did. You may have read recently about the school board that decided to put off until next year a decision on what to do now.

These are the great tasks of leadership decisions which await us: Leadership in meeting the problems of the rural electrification and related Federal wholesale power supply programs; leadership is needed in rural area development and rural renewal—building a climate of community cooperation; leadership in helping the free world meet the challenge of decent living and the threat of communism. Leadership that, like truth eternal, springs from an effort so noble and a cause so just. Or, as the poet has said, "My sword is as a sword of ten, because my cause it just."

This, perhaps, will be the finest test of our belief that Rural Electrification is indeed a "Pattern for Progress and for Peace" as we "Lead Now From Strength."

President's Tactics in Pushing His Program Could Weaken Public Confidence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, an editorial comment from the Wall Street Journal points out the danger of the tactics the

President is following in trying to stampede the American people into adopting all of his proposals through fear. This is not in the best American tradition. It is my belief that given the facts, the intelligence of the American people will assert itself and they will be able to determine those programs which are in the best interest of the Nation.

The editorial follows:

OVERSELLING EVERYTHING

James Reston is a reporter with a perceptive eye for the phenomena of Washington and the other day he had some comments on the administration's habit of selling everything as if it were the promise of salvation from fire and brimstone.

The administration, for one example, is unwilling to advocate a lower tariff program simply because it is good economics and sound commonsense. It feels it must appeal to fear, fear of Soviet competition and the collapse of the American economy if the President can't cut the tariffs on widgets. And of course, imply that if only Congress will do this, then all will be saved.

Well, these comments had hardly left Mr. Reston's typewriter before President Kennedy was again applying exactly this same technique at his press conference to sell his foreign aid program, one a billion dollars bigger than last year.

"I believe this program," Mr. Kennedy said, "is just as important as our national defense." The underdeveloped countries, especially in Latin America, have staggering problems of poverty and unemployment, he explained. These countries are "right in the line of fire" of the Communists.

"If anyone feels these countries are unimportant," the President said, "or it does not make any difference if Latin America is taken over, or if significant countries are (taken over) by Communists, and if they are not interested in this fight, they should cut it."

So, you see, anyone who suggests a cut in foreign aid is threatening the national security, because a dollar for this is equated with a dollar for guns or atom bombs. Furthermore, if you question any of it that means you think all these countries are "unimportant." You are the kind of person who thinks it "doesn't make any difference" if the Communists take them over. In fact, you are probably "not interested in this fight."

The nonsense of all this, however, is not as bad as the reverse implication that if Congress will just approve this foreign-aid bill then these countries will preserve their independence, the poverty and unemployment in these unfortunate places will be cured, and we will assure ourselves victory over communism.

This is not merely nonsense but a very dangerous illusion. It raises hopes beyond any possible chance of fulfillment, as anyone will know who reflects on the billions of foreign aid paid out over 15 years and the state of the world today. In Laos and Vietnam, for example, foreign aid has made hardly a dent in deep-rooted poverty and the security of their independence is today as precarious as ever.

How illusory these over-sold promises are becomes especially clear in the reports from Latin America by our Mr. Evans, currently appearing on this page. The poverty and backwardness of some of these countries is thoroughly documented; so is the danger of Communist infiltration, some of it growing out of that poverty and backwardness. To this extent, the picture painted by Washington is not overdrawn.

Yet it is something else again to pretend that the magic cure is a mammoth injection of U.S. dollars. Or that a dollar spent for foreign aid serves equally to defend us as a dollar spent upon our own defenses. Or that if Congress curtails the administration's program the want of a dollar will be the cause of chaos and communism.

It shouldn't be necessary for us to say, although it probably is, that we are not opposed to foreign aid as such. Fifteen years ago this newspaper supported the program for Greece and Turkey, and encouraged the objectives of the Marshall plan in Europe. There are many ways today in which American aid can be effective both in helping other countries and in promoting our own interests.

It is the oversell of the program that is largely responsible for its scandals of waste and corruption abroad and the growing disillusionment with it at home. Worse, these things have combined to diminish its effectiveness. And worst of all, the American people are thus deprived of the sensible discussion that is essential if we are to act wisely in apportioning our efforts and our resources.

All this is as true of the tariff bill, or of medical and educational programs, as it is of foreign aid. Perhaps it is good politics for the administration to argue for every road or school appropriation on the ground, in Mr. Reston's phrase, that "failure to build them will mean the triumph of communism for the next hundred years." But exaggerated promises and appeals to fear suggest a poverty of political leadership.

The Constitution and Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, without seeking the advice and consent of the Senate, President Kennedy has finalized far-reaching tariff agreements with foreign countries. The President's disregard for the treaty-making provision of the Constitution is discussed in an article by David Lawrence which appeared in the March 13, 1962, issue of the Washington Star. In light of the President's request that the executive branch be given greater authority to formulate trade policy, I think this article should be brought to the attention of Members of Congress. Under unanimous consent, I include it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE CONSTITUTION AND KENNEDY

(By David Lawrence)

What has happened to the Constitution under the Kennedy administration? This question projects itself naturally as a result of the new controversy that is developing over the power of the President to finalize tariff agreements with foreign countries.

Mr. Kennedy seems to think Congress can delegate to him power to make such trade treaties through an enlargement of the present law on reciprocal trade agreements. But the issue is broader than tariffs.

If, for example, Congress can delegate to the Executive the treaty-making power on tariffs without the necessity of ratification by the legislative body, then the power to impose taxes or to change at will existing tax laws can also be handed over to the President. Yet the Constitution specifies that Congress alone shall have power "to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises."

The Constitution also says plainly that the President of the United States shall have power only "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

Within the last few days, however, President Kennedy has ignored the Senate's rights and has merely sent to Congress notification of far-reaching agreements on tariffs reached with the 6 nations of the European Common Market and 18 other countries, including Great Britain.

Never before in American history has such a treaty or agreement with so many countries in the world been withheld from formal submission to the Senate. The document which reported the negotiations to the House and Senate does not even request approval of the pacts. It assumes that the President will get the necessary authority under a modification of the existing reciprocal trade law.

The Executive, of course, inherently possesses certain powers to negotiate treaties with foreign governments on tariffs. This is far different however, from the authority he has been using under the reciprocal trade law, which delegates power to negotiate only within certain limits. It permits, for example, a tariff reduction of 20 percent to be made, but no more, and the President is supposed to report to Congress those instances where his proposals would depart from what are known as "peril points" in industry. It is then up to Congress to specify by law whether it will sanction a departure from these limits.

Mr. Kennedy in his message to Congress on March 7, reporting on the new tariff treaties, says that "our negotiators were grievously short of bargaining power" in the negotiations at Geneva. This is clear proof that the executive branch of the American Government has been, in effect, negotiating a treaty and has not just been carrying out instructions within certain limits, as covered, by the reciprocal trade act passed by Congress in 1958.

The negotiations started in September 1960 but a deadlock ensued. President Kennedy confesses to Congress that he deviated from the instructions or limits contained in the existing law, when he says:

"Accordingly, after months of negotiation and when no other recourse was available to save the situation. I authorized our Geneva delegation to offer new concessions on a number of items at rates below the peril-point findings.

"In taking this step, we avoided the collapse of the Geneva talks and we held open the way to a future of economic cooperation, not separation, between the two common markets, the one in Western Europe, and the other in the United States."

But the President really did have a legal alternative. Had he been adhering to the treaty-making power given him under the Constitution, he could have negotiated a treaty and, after affixing the signature of the United States to it, he could have asked for ratification by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

It may, indeed, be questioned whether, in order to conform to constitutional requirements, the President isn't really obligated to get a two-thirds consent by the Senate anyhow when he makes agreements with 24 countries involving not only tariff duties but various contingent actions, including possible reprisals by the United States against quotas imposed on our trade by other governments.

Should a subject of such transcendent importance—affecting industries throughout the United States—be handled by such a vague process as were the agreements made by the American delegation at Geneva with a total of 24 different countries? Certainly the framers of the Constitution did not intend that the treaty-making power, which requires a two-thirds approval by the Senate, should be bypassed. The President has at-

tempted to exercise the very same authority in a different way. Such a procedure has never been upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States.

If Congress, by a majority of both Houses, can pass a law delegating authority to the Executive to make agreements with foreign governments which are final, then the whole treatymaking power, in which the Senate has hitherto played a coordinate part, falls to the ground. That's why it is being asked: What has happened to the Constitution under the Kennedy administration?

Opposition To Shipping Grain to Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine traveling in the Far East, not knowing of my strong opposition to shipping grain to the Communists, has sent me the following clipping from the Hongkong Standard of March 17, 1962, expressing the hope that I will assist in blocking any food for Red China.

The article follows:

MUDDLED THINKING ON CHINA

The plea by Pearl Buck in the New York Times for the supply of wheat to China is another example of the muddleheaded thinking which has become symptomatic of our times. It is an excellent, foolproof idea from a sentimental point of view, although the Chinese Communists have eschewed all sentimentalism, and have deliberately gloried in turning son against father, brother against brother, and cruelest of all, in so many hundreds of thousands of cases, wives against husbands. What an excellent idea it is, to supply food to a starving people, to act the good Samaritan, to turn the right cheek etc., etc., see Matthew's book.

But nevertheless, in this modern world, it is sentimentality, and sentimentality of the worst sort. In the struggle of the free world against the onslaught of a merciless tyranny, there are more issues than our own throats. If the free world should go under, our children and our children's children will become beasts of burden. I am willing that my children should hunt for bread from a garbage tin (as has happened), but I am not willing that they should become slaves.

Not long ago, in fact only a few years ago, it was the fashion among British journalists and writers like Pearl Buck to hold up Chinese communism as a "moderating influence" on Russian aggrandizement. Paeans were sung on the traditional tolerance of Chinese civilization, quite regardless of the fact that this civilization, bag and baggage, Confucian temple and Taoist shrine, had been trampled to pieces under the brutal heel of the Communists. How far do they still hold to this view? How far are the Chinese Communists a moderating influence on the Kremlin?

The civil structure of Chinese communism is its Achilles' heel. The hordes of illiterate, inexperienced, brutal and ignorant officials, the party sycophants, the bewilderment and stupidities of the average official in Communist China, show only too well how vulnerable that structure is. Yet even now, the United States is being pressed to supply 400 million U.S. dollars worth of food to bolster up that civil structure, which is the mainstay of the military structure.

Some clear-headed thinking is needed instead of the bleats for wheat and oil from these pacifists. If ever there should be a showdown with Chinese communism, that communism will only be overcome by a planned attack on the civil structure rather than on the military structure. Why should the free world deliberately strengthen that civil structure by giving wheat and oil and other necessities?

We can be asked to cut our own throats, but surely not our children's throats which belong to them.

Are We Backing Down?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, even though we are the most powerful Nation in the world—despite missile gaps mentioned in the Presidential campaign of 1960—nevertheless some of our friends doubt that we will stand up to the Russians. I hope this is not the case.

A disturbing article by Marguerite Higgins in yesterday's New York Herald Tribune gives a viewpoint on what the French are thinking:

LAFAYETTE, WE WERE HERE

(By Marguerite Higgins)

"What do I care if the enemy (Russia) can kill me 10 times over, as long as I can kill him once?"

This was stated several weeks ago by General de Gaulle in a speech explaining the reasons why France is pushing ahead with its development not only of atomic bombs, but of the means of delivery.

But the real significance of the De Gaulle quotation is not the obvious light it sheds on Franco-Russian relations but rather—in a far more shadowy area—in the focus it brings to American-French relations.

It does not take a trip to Paris to discover that the split between France and the United States on cold war tactics (the fundamental bonds based on mutual self-interest are not, of course, at issue) is sharp. But what startled this reporter on a recent trip to Paris was the intensity with which French officialdom, which is supposed to be preoccupied with Algeria, is almost equally preoccupied with its differences with the United States. Also startling is the vehemence with which the French proclaim that Washington is out of its mind if it thinks that the end of the troubles in Algeria will free France for closer cooperation with America.

If anything, these French say, France will be less cooperative after Algeria. The end of Algerian troubles will not erase the differences between President de Gaulle and President Kennedy, but in fact will permit the French leader to spend more of his energies in trying to win his end of the argument. The argument centers on President de Gaulle's belief (apparently heightened by such current events as Geneva) that President Kennedy is dangerously wrong in his tactics vis a vis the Rusians by—in the French president's view—responding to threats by seeking conciliation and, no less important, wrong in his tactics toward France.

The main sticking point, of course, is Washington's refusal to assist France with its atomic program now that it has reached a comparatively advanced stage at which even the Soviet Union classes France as an atomic power. The French understood that American legislation forbade giving atomic secrets to an ally even though these secrets were already known to the Soviet enemy. But the French also know that American legislation provides that once a nation has qualified as an atomic power, certain technical assistance can, if the executive branch so desires, be transferred.

Washington's negative response is only slightly less infuriating to President de Gaulle than the reasons advanced for this attitude. Probably the most infuriating of the entire list is the argument that assisting France might be considered provocative by the Russians at a time when the United States is seeking to negotiate a settlement on Berlin.

Said a French official: "Provocative is a word your Harvard intellectuals have seized on to give a high tone to an excuse to do nothing. If you Americans are so fearful of upsetting the Russians that you don't dare pass on technical data to an ally that is already an atomic power, how could we trust you to fight with us if our national interests—in our opinion—were threatened?"

Or, as the French writer, Raymond Aron, has put it: "I am vastly convinced that it is a great illusion in Amerca even among the advisers of the President to admit for 1 minute that the French Government, and tomorrow, the other European governments would accept to leave the monopoly of the atomic force to the United States and the Soviet Union, with just Britain somewhere in between. On that point I am sure that all Frenchmen would agree."

Or as a French general put it: " 'Lafayette, we are here', those words by your General Pershing have thrilled every French schoolboy. But that spirit is gone. You were here. But would you be here again, in time?"

It is more than a matter of war. It is the whole concept of how to avoid war. General de Gaulle believes in being provocative—if it is provocative to refuse to negotiate under any kind of pressure. He believes that the credibility of the West's will to resist Soviet pressure is being seriously undermined by negotiations conducted while, for instance, the Russians are doing their technical best to cause an accident in the Berlin air corridors. He believes that when France has its nuclear capability, the ability to kill Russia once, it will be able to say to Moscow on anything concerning Europe: "Even if Britain and the United States want to compromise, we refuse, and without us, it's no deal."

Postwar U.S. policy was based on the creation of a free, independent Europe centered on France and capable of standing on its own feet. The message from Paris these days is that the Declaration of Independence applies in its relation to Washington as well as Moscow.

U.N. Cost Sharing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an excellent editorial from the

Portland Oregonian on the subject of the proposed purchase by the United States of the United Nations bond issue:

U.N. COST SHARING

If the Soviet Union intends to bury us—the United States—in world economic competition, as Mr. Khrushchev once said, it could begin by paying a fair share of United Nations dues and assessments. The United States pays 32.02 percent of the U.N.'s regular budget and has one vote; the Soviet Union pays—when it gets around to it—14.97 percent of the regular budget and has three votes in the General Assembly.

The Russians are careful not to get more than 2 years behind in their unpaid bill for the regular budget because the penalty is loss of voting in the General Assembly. But it owes the United Nations, $12,774,084 in assessments for the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East and $20,088,253 for the U.N. Congo operations. The World Court has been asked for an advisory opinion as to whether a nation would lose its U.N. vote by refusing to pay such special assessments. Meanwhile, the United States is paying about 50 percent of the Congo bill, which is about $10 million a month.

This newspaper not only is opposed to President Kennedy's request to Congress that the United States buy $100 million of the $200 million U.N. bond issue. It believes the United States should demand a more fair allocation of costs of U.N. activities among the nations, and on a pay-up-or-get-out basis. Congress should bring the question of U.N. financing to a head by rejecting the bond request.

Russia Deals Another Blow Against Religious Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am shocked and dismayed over the latest Soviet move in its current campaign of persecution against Jews in Russia—the denial of matzoth, which prevents the Jewish people from carrying out their traditional Passover observance.

I sent a telegram, today, to Soviet Ambassador Anatoly F. Dobrynin which reads as follows:

According to an article which appeared in the press the Chief Rabbi of Moscow has told his congregation that no matzoth would be available from the state operated bakeries this year. Matzoth is the Jews' traditional unleavened bread; eating of unraised bread during the Passover Festival which commemorates the exodus from Egypt by the Jews and their freedom from slavery is a most important part of the observance and Jews have strictly observed this dietary rule all through history. Jews have baked matzoth privately in Russia but this practice was prohibited by your Government as a form of private enterprise. This latest decision by the Soviet affects one-half million Jews in Moscow alone. I strongly protest this cruel and vicious move by your Government. What lies behind the decision to prevent a people from obtaining the unleavened bread—matzoth—which they must have in connection with their religious observance? Surely, denying the Jewish people such a simple and staple commodity is uncalled for and can only be looked upon as one more harassment and bitter blow inflicted upon the Jews in Russia. One can only assume that the increasing reports of persecution of Jews in the Soviet must be true. I urge that you do what you can to bring about a reversal of the order involved so that the Jews in your country will be permitted to follow their religious traditions and observances.

I sent a copy of my telegram to Secretary of State Rusk and urged that he immediately issue a protest to the Soviet Union, in an effort to prevent this latest blow against religious freedom.

Misguided Liberals Embrace a Philosophy Rooted in Slavery, Not Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following column written by Dr. Robert Morris for the Free Citizen is commended to all those who believe in the greatness of Western civilization which brought mankind out of the dark ages into the sunshine of free society. The liberals of today, so eager to attain their goal of one world, depreciate the accomplishments of Western culture and offer to those who would be free, not bread, but a stone.

The article follows:

AROUND THE WORLD

(By Robert Morris)

I was at a convention recently and heard one of the distinguished speakers say that she found it thrilling that Western civilization was now a minority force in the councils of the world.

This was not a new thought nor was it the first time I heard it expressed. But I find it most distressing that so many important people are accepting this tragic state of reality with resignation. In fact too many are working to accelerate the diminution of this profound force.

Western civilization has brought in its train more blessings to struggling man than any historical force since the beginning of time. It represents the glory of Greece, the grandeur of Rome, the magnificent contribution of Christianity and of the Hebraic tradition, and the technological revolution of enlightened man that has swept poverty, disease and the ills that plague mankind into virtual oblivion. It has also made it possible for most of us to reach lofty heights of spiritual and intellectual accomplishment, and has lifted the chain of bondage from billions of our fellow men.

Yet in the prevailing councils of the world in which our leaders seem to participate with alacrity, there is a sustained campaign to vitalize the influence of Western civilization today.

Africa, Asia, and the underdeveloped areas of the world are thirsting for a force such as this. It is the synthesis of freedom and of liberty and of all their glorious corollaries. Yet, today, Western civilization is being represented as an evil, partisan force and expressly barred from the vacuum being created by the 20th century revolution that has overtaken our generation.

The driving force that is sparking the retreat of Western civilization emanates from the United States, in large measure. The Walter Lippmanns, from their eminent and influential towers, tell us that we should retreat in Africa, retreat in Southeast Asia, retreat in Cuba, and from the other swirling frontiers of the world.

This neisolationism can lead only to a further eclipse of our wonderful civilization. For into the vacuum are rushing the vanguard of the forces of 20th century slavery. They represent the very antithesis of freedom, of spiritual purposes, and even of humanitarian accomplishment. In the sweep of their success we see civil liberties swept away, the grudging gains of racial and religious equality eclipsed and the lofty purpose of man set back for generations.

We should be rededicating ourselves to the profound foundations of Western civilization, its spiritual origin, its religious vitality. We should be working to extend this force to struggling humanity, not with a goal of extending our authority but rather to share what we and our forefathers have enjoyed.

For all of these reasons I find it unnatural that the prevailing forces of our time are acquiescing in and even accelerating the decline of the West. This is not a sweep of history. It is the work of men who seem to have a purpose. It is the great challenge of our time.

Recommendations to the Joint Committee on Republican Principles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the 1962 joint committee on Republican principles is engaged in drafting a general statement reflecting the party's policies on major issues confronting our Nation.

In this connection, the committee invited counsel and advice from Republican Members of the House of Representatives, including myself.

I was happy to respond and it occurs to me that Republican leaders in the State of Washington and the citizens in the First Congressional District, which I represent, have a right to know my personal views. Therefore, I am making my recommendations public.

It will be obvious from the list of suggestions which I have made to the committee, and which follow, that these policies and views of mine differ sharply from the policies and opinions of the present administration and the majority of the Democrats in the Congress. On the other hand, as I have pointed out to the committee, they offer a positive and constructive base on which to formulate alternatives to the Kennedy program under our two-party system:

First. Support a firm foreign policy with respect to the international communistic movement based on winning the cold war.

Second. Support a strong domestic policy within the framework of the Constitution that will protect every American against loss of individual freedom through socialism and the welfare state.

Third. Support a Federal fiscal policy based on no further peacetime increases in the national debt ceiling and including a planned system for reducing the national debt.

Fourth. Support reduction in the size and cost of the Federal Government as against expanding bureaucracy and centralization of Government in Washington, D.C.

Fifth. Support a policy designed to return Federal aid programs to State and local control.

Sixth. Support an embargo on the sale of all strategic goods including agricultural commodities to any nation unless the President determines such nation is not controlled and dominated by the international Communist movement.

Seventh. Support a foreign trade policy which assures effective protection of American industries distressed economically as a result of cheap foreign imports.

Eighth. Support and reaffirm Republican principles of upholding and defending the Constitution of the United States and maintaining representative government in accordance with the principles set forth in the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, and the Bill of Rights.

Ninth. Support the return of constitutional responsibilities and powers to the legislative branch of Government as opposed to the ever-increasing growth of power in the executive branch.

Tenth. Support civil rights as related to discrimination because of race, creed, color, or condition of servitude.

Eleventh. Oppose any new back-door spending financed programs together with a gradual elimination of outstanding obligations of Treasury borrowing from public debt receipts which bypass the constitutional appropriation procedure.

Twelfth. Oppose foreign aid to any nation supplying strategic goods including agricultural products to Sino-Soviet nations including Cuba.

Thirteenth. Oppose foreign aid to any foreign country which unfairly and capriciously seizes property owned by American citizens.

Fourteenth. Oppose Federal subsidies in any Government program not related to national defense.

Fifteenth. Oppose further encroachment of the Federal Government into those areas of responsibility guaranteed to the several States under the Constitution.

Recognition of Red China?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, a very disturbing transfer of our former Ambassador to Nationalist China, the Honorable Everett F. Drumright, has quietly taken place.

We all know of Ambassador Drumright's tremendous moral purpose and steadfastness against Communist wiles during his tour of duty in Nationalist China.

Last year, when I visited Taiwan, a long talk with the Ambassador convinced me that he was doing an excellent job.

In view of the number of agrarian reformers surrounding the President, I hope that President Kennedy will be forthright with the American people and reveal his intentions so that the matter can be debated thoroughly throughout the United States.

The editorial in yesterday's New York Daily News discusses Red China in its true light.

EXIT E. F. DRUMRIGHT

For the last 4 years, Everett F. Drumright has been U.S. Ambassador to Nationalist China—Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek's domain on the island of Formosa (Taiwan).

Mr. Drumright's tour of duty ended March 8, in what Washington called a routine transfer, and the name of his successor has not yet been announced.

The incident is a reminder that various U.S. "liberal" enemies of Generalissimo Chiang (if they aren't something worse) are again trying to steam up sentiment in this country for U.S. recognition of Red China and its admission to the United Nations without objections from Washington.

We're hearing the same old, tired arguments again—about how you can't ignore 650 million people, and we ought to have a listening post in Peiping, and Chiang doesn't represent the real China, and so on and so forth.

There are certain facts concerning Red China which haven't changed in 10 years.

One is that Red China murdered most of the 33,000 U.S. fighting men killed in action in the Korean war. Another is that we are still officially at war with Red China. A third is that mainland China is run by a Communist dictatorship as barbarous as Russia's Stalin dictatorship at worst.

Mao Tze-tung and his fellow Peiping mobsters conduct a continuous hate-America campaign to keep their slaves' minds off their great and growing miseries. Mao and his pals call the United States a "paper tiger" in public, and intrigue in private for the U.S. recognition that would give them world prestige as nothing else would, while driving their slaves to the last extreme of despair.

Huge majorities in both Houses of Congress have gone on record repeatedly as being 100 percent opposed to U.S. recognition of Red China and admission of that savage dictatorship to the U.N. In that, we are convinced, they reflect the sentiment of the great majority of Americans.

URGE CONGRESS TO STAND PAT

In view of the renewed "liberal" agitation for both recognition and admission, we'd suggest another barrage of letters from patriotic Americans to their Senators and Representatives, urging them to stand by Free China (and Free America) and turn the "liberals" down cold on this issue.

Or, if you'd like to do something in addition to writing letters, you might get in touch with the organization that spearheads the continuing campaign to keep our national nose clean as regards trafficking with Mao Tze-tung.

The group referred to is the Committee of One Million, 79 Madison Avenue, suite 909, New York, N.Y.; telephone, Murray Hill 5-0190.

President Proposes To Help Consumers by Putting on More Federal Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, one fact is certain, the Kennedy administration is certainly going to set a record on the number of messages sent to Congress. It seems to be the President's intent to solve all problems by a confusion of words. His language is eloquent, of that there is no doubt, but his reasoning leaves much to be desired. In every proposal President Kennedy has sent to Congress or taken to the people he has asked for more power for himself, an extension of Federal controls over the lives of all Americans, and for more and more and more money. In none of his messages has he suggested that some problems might be solved through faith in the people, through individual initiative, through the get up and go that has always been an American characteristic. His latest appeal to the consumers is no different than all his other messages. As pointed out in the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal, President Kennedy proposes to help consumers by putting more controls on business, more regulations on what individuals may purchase.

The editorial follows:

A SMALL CHEER FOR THE CONSUMER

We certainly felt like cheering when we saw President Kennedy come out the other day for that most forgotten of men, the consumer.

As he so rightly said, consumers include us all. "They are the largest economic group in the economy, affecting and affected by almost every public and private economic decision. Two-thirds of all spending in the economy is by consumers. But they are the only important group in the economy who are not effectively organized, whose views are often not heard. The Federal Government * * * has a special obligation to be alert to the consumer's needs and to advance the consumer's interests."

Yet, as we read on through the message, a growing sense of disappointment came over us. Somehow the remarks and the recommendations to Congress just didn't live up to the glowing promise of that opening plug.

Sure, some of the ideas sound fine. Everyone will welcome any further Federal cooperation with other groups to help make air and road travel safer.

And maybe all of us consumers need, as the President says we do, still more protection from our own productive drug industry. It is interesting to note, though, that U.S. drugs must already be among the most highly regulated in the world. In many other places you can buy without prescription drugs that require them here, and we haven't heard such foreigners complaining about health hazards. This situation might possibly have something to do with the high cost of American prescription drugs which the President noted, and with the high cost of medical care generally which his administration is so concerned about.

Then, when the President talks about helping the consumer by making it ever easier for anyone to "buy" a house, no mat-

ter what his financial condition, one can't help but wonder: Is that protecting the consumer or encouraging him to be foolish?

Also when Mr. Kennedy indicates he wants to make it tougher for business firms to merge, we aren't sure that is necessarily a boon to consumers. Mergers can, after all, make business more competitive and efficient, to the consumer's advantage in price and quality. Anyway, you'd think the laws and regulations in this area are already oppressive enough.

And so on. But the glaring parts of the President's message are its omissions.

Surely all of us consumers, as consumers, are especially interested in prices, and they certainly are affected by what the President calls "public decisions" as well as private decisions.

The Federal farm program, which is so costly to the consumer as a taxpayer, also has been keeping prices high at the grocery store. The special monopoly powers of unions, sanctified in Federal law, help make possible the unreasonable wage increases and featherbedding that have boosted prices so much over the years.

Another large and obvious factor in prices is the inflation which the Federal Government has given us off and on for some decades now. Then there are all those taxes, which not only keep price levels lofty but at the same time reduce the consumer's purchasing power. Somehow it seems a message exclusively concerned with improving the lot of the consumer might have mentioned some of these rather basic facts of the consumer's life.

We aren't complaining, you understand. It was nice of the President to take notice of the consumers, and maybe some day he will have more stimulating thoughts about the Federal Government's obligations to all of us.

It's just that if we consumers are going to "organize effectively," as the President puts it, maybe we had better do it outside the Federal Government.

In Honor of Col. John H. Glenn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem written in honor of Col. John H. Glenn by Miss Marty Hale of Steubenville, Ohio:

The poem follows:

IN HONOR OF COL. JOHN H. GLENN

(By Marty Hale)

He moved among the stars and brushed the fringe
Of Blueness where a fancied heaven lies,
It was his privilege to dare the void
In this first exploration of the skies;
The ageless wonder of God's firmament
Must surely be reflected in his face,
It must have brought him very close to God,
As he soared down the corridors of space.
His was a search for scientific facts,
The duties of his mission he must keep;
Must keep the faith with those who put him there,
His loyalty to them was fixed and deep;
But most of all he kept faith with himself.
There was no thought of fear nor failure there,
His heart was in it, and his hopes were high—
A dedicated soldier of the air.
A world of science would be hard indeed,
Without the softening touch of sentiment,
The soul would shrivel, and the heart would burn,
No task would be inspired with good intent.
And so we wreathe his head in ticker tape,
We must have heroes and we must applaud
This man who triple-spanned the universe—
This man who rode the wind . . . and rode with God.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Byelorussians are one of the smaller and less known of Slavic peoples. This is partly because they have always been intermingled with more numerous and powerful other Slavic peoples, and partly because for centuries they have been subjected to the oppressive yoke of foreigners. For centuries their far more powerful neighbors, the Russians, have done all in their power to subdue them and assimilate them, while trying to represent them to the world as Russians. But history shows that the Byelorussians—the White Russians, or Ruthenians, as they are sometimes called—formed a distinct national group in their homeland, east of Poland and west of Moscow, long before the formation of the modern Russian state. Since that event, early in modern times, Byelorussia became part of the Russian Empire.

The autocracy of czarist Russia could not eliminate the Byelorussians as an ethnic group. The more the Byelorussians were oppressed by their Russian overlords, the more these sturdy people clung to their ethnic and national ideals and longed for the day of their independence. Finally, this came about in 1918, when the czarist regime in Russia was overthrown. On March 25 of that year the Byelorussian National Republic was proclaimed, with its capital at Minsk. The independence of Byelorussia was recognized by the governments of several countries, and it looked as if the new state was on its way to full sovereignty in historic Byelorussia. Unfortunately the independence thus proclaimed did not last long. Russian Communists attacked it early in 1921, the country was overrun by March of that year, and the Byelorussian independence vanished.

Since then more than 10 million Byelorussians are living under the oppressive Soviet totalitarian regime. During all that time they have suffered under indescribable conditions, and have lost nearly all their worldly possessions. But they have not abandoned their ultimate goal for freedom and independence. There in their historic homeland, while working hard under the almost unbearable Soviet system, they ardently look forward to the day of their liberation and freedom. On this 44th anniversary of their independence day let us all hope for the freedom of the Byelorussian people from Communist totalitarian tyranny.

Signs of Communist Activity in Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, a Communist attempt to infiltrate the public schools of the city of Monterrey in northern Mexico is discussed in a column by Henry Goethals which appeared in the February 25, 1962, issue of the Daily Breeze, a newspaper published in Redondo Beach, Calif. Believing the column will be of interest to my colleagues in Congress, under unanimous consent I include it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Daily Breeze, Feb. 25, 1962]

PAN-AMERICAN REPORT—MEXICO SPLIT OVER FREE TEXTBOOKS

(By Henry Goethals)

MEXICO CITY.—Mexico is increasingly split by a growing dispute over Government textbooks for primary schools and the dangers of Communist infiltration of education.

Center of the dispute in recent weeks has been the large industrial city of Monterrey in northern Mexico.

However, it could spread rapidly to other major cities throughout the Republic.

Monterrey citizens are vigorously protesting the Government's free-textbook program for primary school children on the grounds that it imposes one text on the schools—both public and private.

They charged that the one-text idea is totalitarian and potentially extremely dangerous.

Earlier claims that the free textbooks, now being introduced in Monterrey schools for the first time, are Marxist-oriented have been withdrawn.

Concern of the Monterrey citizens, composed largely of parents of school age children, is based on the following: An acute awareness that Communists are making a strong bid to infiltrate Mexico's public education ministry; and fears that, should they succeed, they would exercise direct and frightening control over the minds of Mexico's primary school children.

The dispute has arisen against a background of growing Communist and anti-Communist extremism in Mexico over the last 18 months.

This is due, in part, to rising apprehension of Castro-Communist infiltration in Mexico and the Mexican Government's seeming indecision in defining itself on the Cuban problem.

Smoldering resentment in Monterrey first broke out into the open early in February when a crowd reliably estimated at 150,000 persons—in a city of some 600,000 persons—paraded peacefully in protest of the "one text."

A government counterdemonstration on February 11 drew less than 40,000 persons, many of them "campesinos" or farmers trucked in especially for the occasion.

Spearheading the attack on the one-text program has been the "Union Nacional de

Padres de Familias," a Roman Catholic parents organization with branches in at least 15 of Mexico's 29 states.

In talks with Eduardo Livas Villarreal, governor of the state of Nuevo Leon of which Monterrey is the capital, Union representatives affirmed their full support of free textbooks for Mexico's primary schools, but bitterly opposed the one-text idea.

The governor offered to refer the dispute to federal authorities.

The Monterrey charges have been refuted energetically by such government officials as Martin Luis Guzman, president of the national free textbook commission.

Guzman, a noted Mexican revolutionary and bitingly anticlerical, said the Monterrey campaign is sponsored by both clergy and industrialists "for strictly fiscal reasons."

He said that commercial interests, prejudiced by the government's decision to print and distribute free of charge textbooks for primary school children, are attempting to hit back at federal authorities through such demonstrations as that of February 2.

Guzman said that prior to establishment of the free textbook commission in 1959, "from 75 to 80 percent of Mexican children" could not afford textbooks.

Prior to 1959, he claimed, Mexican commercial houses printed only 800,000 textbooks per year and sold them at prohibitive prices.

In 1962, the textbook commission will print 22 million texts, approximately half of them textbooks and half work manuals.

The commission's 1962 budget is 55 million pesos ($4.4 million).

Guzman, who also publishes the weekly news magazine, Tiempo, charged that "there is no political motivation" in any of the commission books which contain "absolutely no bias."

The commission supplies the free texts only to primary schools which include grades 1 through 6, and not to Mexican high schools.

Protector of Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of Monday, March 19, 1962.

The editorial follows:

PROTECTOR OF FORESTS

Retiring voluntarily from his post as Chief of the U.S. Forest Service, Richard E. McArdle leaves a record of distinguished service as a protector of America's remaining forests. Few men have won such wide recognition, nationally and internationally, for their work in the field of conservation of our natural resources.

Dr. McArdle, in his 10 years as Chief Forester, gave energetic leadership to the causes of improved forest management, forest research, wildlife development, outdoor recreation and related activities. He represented the United States in world conferences on conservation and was a founder of the North American Forestry Commission. He will be sorely missed at the Forest Service. Fortunately, however, he will be succeeded by Edward P. Cliff, a colleague who also has distinguished himself in forest conservation. Chief Forester Cliff, a veteran of 32 years in the Forest Service, is well fitted by training and experience to carry on the work so ably done by Dr. McArdle.

Student Hostility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an excerpt from the President's press conference on February 21 concerning foreign students. There is no better way to eliminate the root causes of foreign student hostility toward the United States than by bringing key student leaders here to see for themselves what America is really like and by sending our best graduate students and professors to foreign universities to interpret our society accurately to their students and faculties.

Since 1949–50 the number of foreign countries served by our exchange programs has nearly trebled, whereas the number of exchange grantees has less than doubled. In short, our exchange program at present budget levels is spread so thin over vast and critically important areas of Africa, Latin America, and Asia that we are failing to grasp exceedingly important opportunities to improve America's position in the world. It would be the height of folly for our Nation not to make the modest extra investment to do the job right. With the Fulbright-Hays Act as our base and with the budget the President has asked for, we can make rapid new gains on this frontier of foreign relations in the next year.

The excerpt follows:

STUDENT HOSTILITY

Question. Mr. President, the Attorney General, your brother, sir, has encountered evidence of a certain amount of hostility from student groups in various countries. Inasmuch as this has happened before with other American visitors in the past administration, have you given any thought to what it is about us that students in particular seem to resent?

Answer. One of the reasons that I was anxious to have the Attorney General make the trip was because of this very rather curious factor, because you would feel that students who are intellectually curious would be attracted by a free society which gives that intellectual curiosity a chance to develop rather than a totalitarian society.

Therefore, as you know, in the Attorney General's schedule on nearly every occasion he has spoken at colleges and universities. So I am sure he will have some views of that. What has also interested me is the stereotype of the United States. It is a view of the United States almost 50 years old. There is no doubt that it is Marxist oriented, and even in those cases where they may not be Communist, there are many explanations for it.

In the first place these were colonial areas. They were held under subjugation in many cases by Western powers. The road to revolt was in many cases because the Communists were most active. They dominated the thinking. I don't think that the students have caught up with the tremendous changes which have taken place in the United States in the last 50 years, or with the fallacies in the Marxist system which have become obvious in the last 20 years.

In addition, I don't think we are able to emphasize those facets of American life which should be most attractive. I said yesterday that the University of California has more Nobel Prize winners than the Soviet Union. They find in this country, and there are 40 or 50 of them, a climate which permits them to function most effectively. And all of the cultural efforts here, all of the intellectual efforts, all our great schools and universities, these are the part of the story we ought to tell.

I think the Attorney General attempted to communicate that, but of course, he is one voice. But he is attempting—as you know—it is better to light a candle than to curse the darkness. I do agree with you that this is one of the most serious and I think in many ways stimulating problems we face—how to tell our story in a way that makes it new and exciting to young students and also have them examine objectively under the light of present circumstances the serious failures of the Marxist system, which can be told from the wall of China. I think that is our job. I think the trip has been worthwhile for that purpose alone.

Texas Young Republicans Remember Heroes of Texas History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution was adopted by the convention of Texas Young Republican Federation in Amarillo, Tex., last Saturday. It is called the Alamo resolution and pays tribute to those gallant heroes of Texas history who are enshrined forever in the hearts of all those who believe in freedom and who are ready to make any sacrifice to preserve it:

Whereas Sam Houston, Will Travis, David Crockett, Jim Bowie, Jim Bonham, and the other heroes of the Texas war for independence did not attend Harvard University, and hence were ignorant of the sociological theories of Myrdal and the economic theories of Keynes; and

Whereas these heroes, being simple frontier folk, did not recognize that there existed unlimited possibilities for negotiations, and were not aware of the many concessions that could have been made which would have averted the war; and

Whereas the early pioneers of Texas were, for the most part, people of modest means and hence did not have the funds necessary to undertake a gigantic program of grants-in-aid aimed at checking the spread of Santa Anna's tyranny; and

Whereas the United Nations had yet to be conceived, and hence these heroes could not avail themselevs of the drama of an emergency meeting of the Security Council; and

Whereas all of these heroes were indoctrinated with the early 19th century theories that freedom was something worth fighting

for, and the best way to thaw a cold war was to place a hot minie ball between the eyes of the aggressor; and

Whereas it possibly never occurred to the Army of Texas that the best way to make an ally of Santa Anna was to furnish him armaments: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Texas Federation of Young Republicans, in view of the numerous extenuating circumstances, forgive the heroes of the Texas war for independence for writing the first page in this dark chapter of American history; and be it further

Resolved, That the Texas Federation of Young Republicans earnestly hope and pray that all Texans—nay, all Americans, for all generations to come—be filled with a sense of pride when they recall the great deeds of the brave men at the siege of the Alamo and the Battle of San Jacinto, and may the battle cry "Remember the Alamo" swell the hearts of freedom-loving people everywhere for all time to come.

Spy Charges Listed Against Air Force Officer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, that our Military Establishment is not immune to Communist infiltration and subversion is pointed out in a news item reporting the court-martial of Air Force Capt. Joseph P. Kauffman, who allegedly gave information to East German agents, which appeared in the March 17, 1962, issue of the Washington Star. I believe this news item is of sufficient importance to be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Under unanimous consent, I ask this be done:

SPY CHARGES LISTED AGAINST AIR FORCE OFFICER

WIESBADEN, GERMANY, March 13.—The U.S. Air Force today disclosed the specific charges on which a court-martial will try Capt. Joesph P. Kauffman, who allegedly gave information to East German agents.

The Air Force accused him of giving information on Air Force installations in Greenland and Japan and disclosing "shortcomings and weaknesses" of Air Force officers stationed in Greenland and Japan.

Captain Kauffman, 43, was brought to the Air Force's European headquarters from Castle Air Force Base in California last December for preliminary investigation, and a decision on whether he should be tried. On March 8, Air Force authorities determined a court-martial would be held, but the trial date has not been set.

DEFECTOR IN CASE

Investigators had disclosed previously that the Kauffman case involved contact with East Germans during a trip to Germany in September 1960. During pretrial hearings, one of the chief witnesses was Guenter Maennel, a former East German intelligence official who defected to the West last June. He apparently supplied the first information leading to Captain Kauffman's arrest.

The first charge on which Captain Kauffman is to be tried accuses him of conspiring with Maennel and two other East German secret service agents to commit "wrongful and unlawful communication to representatives and agents of the so-called (East) German Democratic Republic of information relating to the national defense of the United States, which . . . Kauffman had reason to believe would be used to the injury of the United States and to the advance of foreign nations."

AGENT IN WEST BERLIN

The charge said Captain Kauffman accepted the name and address of a certain Klara Weiss in West Berlin who was to serve as a contact with the East German agents.

A second charge accused Captain Kauffman of making unauthorized trips through East Germany to Berlin in September 1960, and unlawfully revealing to East German agents—who had detained him—information "concerning his personal background and the U.S. Military Establishment." The charge accused him of not reporting to his superior officer the efforts of the East German agents to obtain information.

SUPPLIED INFORMATION

A third charge accused Captain Kauffman of agreeing to "act as an agent of the East German secret service * * * and to obtain and communicate to the said secret service information concerning the U.S. Military Establishment and the background, vices, and weakness of its Air Force officers."

A final charge specified that on September 29, 1960, Captain Kauffman gave Maennel and other East German agents this information:

"A physical description of the U.S. Air Force installations in Greenland and Japan; information concerning the location of Castle Air Force Base, Calif.; information concerning the identity, description, shortcomings, and weaknesses of U.S. Air Force officers assigned to Greenland and Japan; an estimate of personnel strength of the U.S. Air Force in Greenland and in military installations in Japan; information concerning the number and types of military aircraft in a constant state of readiness in Greenland and disclosure of the primary mission of the U.S. Armed Forces in Greenland."

Captain Kauffman, a bachelor born in Rutland, Vt., is a veteran of 19 years' service with the Air Force.

Monument to President Harry S. Truman in Athens—Friendship and Gratitude From Our Great Allies in Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and pleasure to insert the address of the supreme president of the Ahepa Order on the occasion of the biennial national banquet tendered March 19, 1962. I am proud that this fine Hellenic-American organization has chosen for its president for two successive terms, Mr. Nicholas Coffinas, a resident of the Brooklyn community which I am privileged to represent.

The inspiring address of Mr. Coffinas on that occasion is a stirring affirmation of the continuing benefits which have accrued to both great powers as a result of the Truman doctrine.

The address follows:

REMARKS BY SUPREME PRESIDENT NICHOLAS COFFINAS, AHEPA NATIONAL BANQUET, MARCH 19, 1962

It is my pleasant duty as supreme president of the Order of Ahepa to extend to our distinguished guests of honor, the Members of the Congress of the United States of America, our warm and heartfelt greetings on the occasion of our order's 15th biennial banquet.

All of the members of the Ahepa and its auxiliaries welcome in our midst the elected legislators of the world's greatest democracy. As Americans of Greek descent we wish to pay a tribute of deep respect to you distinguished Senators and Congressmen who are with us this evening. As Americans we know that you are the guardians of those eternal principles upon which our country was founded; the principles of freedom, equality, democracy.

When the first settlers who founded our country came to this continent from England to escape persecution they responded to an urge to freedom expressed so eloquently by the poet Aeschylus 25 centuries ago in his play "The Persians" who wrote: "Of no man are they (the Athenians) called the Vassals."

Later when the leaders of the American Revolution sealed the independence achieved by the noble struggle of the American people, they did so by adopting a Constitution which echoes the principles of the ancient Athenian constitution as defined in 429 B.C. by the great orator Pericles who said:

"Our form of government does not enter into rivalry with the institutions of others. We do not copy our neighbors, but are an example to them. It is true that we are called a democracy, for the administration is in the hands of the many and not of the few. But while the law secures equal justice to all alike in their private disputes, the claim of excellence is recognized, and when a citizen is in any way distinguished, he is prefererred to the public service, not as a matter of privilege but as the reward of merit. Neither is poverty a bar, but a man may benefit his country whatever be the obscurity of his condition."

A nation's destiny is determined primarily by the moral fiber of its people, for it takes the highest courage to stand and fight for one's beliefs and convictions. The Americans of Hellenic descent stand mirrored in the image thus portrayed. The record shows that Americans of Greek descent used all of the attributes by which they were endowed to become patriotic and loyal citizens of the United States. As in everything they do, they became intense and complete American patriots. Their patriotism, their social characteristics, and their charitable contributions were best expressed and exemplified by and through the Order of Ahepa.

The Ahepa is a purposeful organization founded to prepare the individual to exercise the rights and duties of American citizenship intelligently, courageously and unselfishly.

The spirit of fraternity has always motivated mankind. It is a powerful force created by men of goodwill to establish a bond for the furtherance of spiritual values. The Order of Ahepa is part of this movement. It has shown a definite trend toward permanence, stability and growth in its goals, dreams and accomplishments. The 40 years since its founding has produced leadership of a high order. It includes close cooperation with our holy church. It includes the fruits of friendship and brotherhood.

However, I wish to reiterate that the major accomplishment in the recorded history of our order is the crystallization of the lofty ideal of all Americans of Greek descent to prove themselves worthy sons and daughters of the United States. This was achieved by our pioneering first generation, through this order on a collective basis which actually

mirrored the hopes and aspirations of each of its members. This brought on a result perhaps unparalleled and certainly unanticipated in all of the long history of the Hellenic people. A common denominator called loyalty and devotion to the United States by its citizens was created of such strength that it has overcome the unique and intense characteristics of individuality which have been the heritage of Hellenes for 6,000 years.

The Order of Ahepa teaches and every true Ahepan believes that the individual daring, inflexible courage, perseverance, artistic and literary excellence and the lofty imagination of the Hellenic race lives today as of yesterday. Sustained and inspired by these virtues they have been able to inspire the world with all that the word Hellenism implies.

It was this idea that inspired the framers of the constitution of the Ahepa to include as one of the objects of the order the idea that we must marshal into active service for America the noblest attributes and highest ideals of true Hellenism. The time for this undertaking is now ripe as we emerge into the new era of the fraternity's greater development and progress, an era which will seek to keep alive Greek culture, customs, and traditions. For the conclusion is inescapable that not only are things Greek compatible and synonymous with the American way of life, but also with the entire modern, free Western World which looks upon the civilization, culture and contributions of ancient Greece with awe, reverence and inspiration. For even in the present day and era, Greece belongs to the free world, for geographically she is on the border between western freedom and eastern tyranny. Without faithful friends and allies it is difficult if not impossible for her to preserve her national independence and territorial integrity for a long time. Her very life and integrity lie in her open alliance with the West and with America in particular. Actually and fortunately the relationship among three of the countries of this alliance, the United States, Canada and Greece is based upon solid and sincere friendship, mutual respect and loyalty to high ideals and common purpose and thus maintain the peace, safeguard the liberty and preserve the security of their peoples. Cooperation among these three countries in the political, economical and cultural fields should be broadened.

Their continued support of NATO should be accentuated, so that the shield for freedom may be made a veritable bulwark and so that democracy may become the vehicle for mankind in every nation.

Throughout the struggles for independence and democratic freedom which marked the 19th century, America stood by Greece's side. In the arduous wars for freedom against totalitarian aggression and despotism in the present century Greece has more than repaid this debt by making sacrifices in behalf of America far exceeding the natural limits of her strength.

I am especially happy to be able to announce publicly tonight that the Greek Government has enthusiastically acceded to a proposal made by the Order of Ahepa to erect a statue of former President Harry S. Truman in the city of Athens, in order that, in Prime Minister Caramanlis' words, "We may show our friendly feeling and our deep gratitude toward the former President of the United States."

Indeed the people of Greece, American men and women of Hellenic descent, who maintain close ties of affection with the country of their origin, and all friends of Greece have every reason to nurture feeling of everlasting gratitude to President Truman for the courageous, farsighted, and generous decision he took in March 1947. In fact, I truly believe that the people of the United States have equal reason to be grateful to him because the security and the interests of the United States as the leader of the free world were protected and advanced by this momentous and historic decision which so radically and dramatically altered the foreign policy of the United States.

Let us remember that at that time Communist forces were bearing down in overwhelming numbers from the Soviet's northern satellites upon a little country reduced to utter starvation and helplessness by 4 years of Nazi occupation, and, without giving them respite to breathe the air of recaptured freedom, were seeking to impose an even more odious and certainly more permanent domination.

At that crucial juncture, let us also remember that President Truman enunciated the famous Truman doctrine. The President said: "The gravity of the situation which confronts the world today necessitates my appearance before a joint session of the Congress. The foreign policy and the national security of this country are involved.

"The United States has received from the Greek Government an urgent appeal for financial and economic assistance. Preliminary reports from the American economic mission now in Greece and reports from the American Ambassador in Greece corroborating the statement of the Greek Government that assistance is imperative if Greece is to survive as a free nation."

With President Truman propounding the general principle that "it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures," the U.S. foreign aid policy was initiated on March 12, 1947. The proclamation of this policy, the Truman doctrine, had been provoked by the situation then obtaining in Greece and in Turkey. The expenditure of $300 million was authorized equally divided between military and economic assistance to Greece.

With unparalleled efficiency and speed supplies poured into Greece. The Greek Army, disarmed by the Nazis, was rapidly furnished with every kind of modern equipment. Morale soared again and the Greeks without the sacrifice of a single American soldier, but with the saving power of American arms, fought their own Korean war to a completely successful conclusion and drove the Communist hordes out of their country.

It was a harsh and bloody war; it lasted three whole years; but even the horrors of the Nazi occupation had not extinguished the love of freedom in the hearts of a starving people. The spirit of Leonidas, Miltiades, and Themistocles was still with them. And now the spirit of America was there to inspire them.

Without American help this miracle could not have been accomplished. It was indeed a grand gesture, that of the greatest democracy in the world extending the hand of salvation to one of the smallest. Yes, the smallest, but the mother of all democracies.

But it was not a gesture alone. It was a brilliant stroke of policy. For by his action in Greece President Truman consolidated the power and position of the United States in the Near and Middle East and save NATO. If Greece had been allowed to succumb to the Communists, Soviet power would have stretched across the Mediterranean. Turkey would have been cut off from the West and her alliance with us would have been rendered worthless. Egypt and the Arab States would have been impressed with Soviet power and intimidated by Soviet proximity. Thus our own national security would have been seriously undermined, and Soviet imperialism and tyranny would have penetrated the Mediterranean and eventually posed a threat to Italy, Spain, and Portugal.

Therefore I submit, that whatever our political views, we Americans all owe a deep debt of gratitude to President Harry S. Truman for his wise and valiant action in Greece.

It is in order to express this gratitude of the Order of Ahepa, an American organization with associations of sentiment, with Greece, that we have decided to erect a statue in a prominent position in Athens to commemorate a great President.

This statue will serve as a symbol to free people everywhere not only for the majestic sweep of the Truman doctrine which committed America to the challenging role it was to play in world affairs, but also unified and gave substance and meaning to the ideological and spiritual values which bind America and Greece and all the nations of the world which seek liberty and democracy.

I deeply regret that it was not possible for Brother Truman to be with us tonight. Our hearts are with him wherever he is.

I am going to conclude with a reference which I consider the most essential ingredient for all people and all nations to possess particularly in these critical days. This can be summed up in two words—patriotism and courage.

We need the same type of patriotism and courage which inspired the Greeks in the dark hours of their defeat by the Axis hordes.

Let us recall in our minds the inspiring fight that Greece put up against the Axis Powers. A little nation prepared to die for liberty rather than to subjugation. Greece was literally starving. As a matter of fact the death rate from starvation in Piraeus in Athens alone exceeded 2,000 a day. Of every 10 children born, only one lived more than 4 weeks.

Yet at night, when British bombers came to raid Piraeus or the great aerodrome at Tatoi, the people of Athens climbed on to their rooftops and cheered. The Axis soldiers fired on them from below. Nobody stirred. Across the rooftops of Athens, the people sang and cheered as British bombs fell. Their spirit was unbroken, and will remain unbroken.

When the Germans entered Athens, a detachment was sent up to the Parthenon so that the swastika could fly over the capital. The young Greek sentry on guard was told to lower the Greek colors. Very slowly he obeyed the order. Then before the Germans could prevent him, he wrapped the Greek flag around his body and flung himself over the parapet on to the roadway hundreds of feet below crying "Liberty, liberty, liberty."

This undaunted spirit of courage and love for freedom has been displayed by the American people throughout our short but great history. It was further enunciated by President Kennedy in his inaugural address, and was so vividly demonstrated by General Eisenhower and the American soldiers when on D-Day they crossed the channel prepared to spill their very blood to preserve liberty and freedom for themselves and their families and the entire world.

Let us be reminded that as the New York Times wrote on June 11, 1941, "hundreds of thousands of Germans have perished or will perish in the snows of Russia because in one tiny corner of Europe, a king and his people said that, come what might, they would never submit." I say let us continue to proclaim to the world that liberty is a priceless heirloom and will be preserved at the very cost of our lives, if necessary. And, in conclusion let us pray that God will grant to all Americans the noblest patriotism and purest courage to the end that we may preserve mankind and the civilization of the world.

The Challenge of Housing and Urban Decay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an address which was delivered at the 31st annual banquet of the National Housing Conference at the Hotel Statler, Washington, D.C., on March 12, 1962, by the Honorable Richard C. Lee, mayor of New Haven, Conn.:

ADDRESS BY MAYOR LEE

To put it mildly, I am honored to be here among you tonight as a guest speaker at this distinguished gathering of members of the National Housing Conference and its guests. You are all interested in better housing—so am I. All of you are interested in the problems of the total city, as am I.

I am especially honored to join with you tonight in this tribute to Congressman RAINS who, for the past 18 years, has served so ably and so well in the House of Reprsentatives.

As mayor of New Haven, and on behalf of the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the American Municipal Association, I have appeared before his subcommittee on a number of occasions during the past 8 years. He has continually demonstrated to me an appreciation for the problems we mayors face in managing the affairs of our cities and in planning and in working for their future. He has backed this concern with vision and leadership from which has emerged legislation designed to help countless thousands of mayors all over America to meet the tremendous problem of running our cities and of planning for their future.

Everyone in this room tonight, I am certain, is aware of the great problems which exist in the city today. Some of you are aware in specific ways of these problems, and some in a general way through facts and charts, through reports and learned books, through tours and conferences, of what the current prophets of doom are calling the slow death of our great urban areas.

I am different from many of you, however, in the manner in which I must face these problems and in the fashion in which I must live with these problems; because it is my assignment as a public official on a municipal level to try to overcome these problems, to solve the peripheral problems which result, and to plan for the future of the central city.

I speak to you tonight, therefore, not as a historian dwelling on the role of the city in history, not as a critic scorning the shortcomings of the city in the present, nor even as a prophet attempting with some degree of accuracy to predict the kind of city which will emerge in the future of America.

I appear in a simple role: a mayor trying to overcome seemingly insurmountable obstacles in making our city a better place in which to live today, and an even better place tomorrow.

I cannot speak of anything but the relative problems of a city, because even at this safe distance—400 miles from New Haven—there are haunting reminders of many personal problems. The woman, for example, alone in the world, with five children to support, who, within the week, came to my house one evening nearly hysterical because of her housing problems.

Despite all of the agencies and all of the social programs, and all the community facilities designed to help her, she had a problem she wanted to talk over, so she came to the mayor's house for help, for advice and assistance. She was one of the many thousands of men, women, and children in this Nation whose plight and whose future were summed up so well many years ago in these words of a great man:

"Any large or small group in any community which lacks the elementary necessities of proper food, of decent housing, of adequate medical attention, of essential education, drags down the speed of the whole country.

"Most of us know in general terms of the slum conditions which exist in many cities * * * of the people who have lived in back eddies remote from the mainstream of life.

"The improvement of their hard lot compels our immediate exertions, not only because of the individual human beings who are suffering today, but also because of the future generations of Americans who will be the descendants of those who are now in need."

The words, as you may have recognized, are those of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. The time was 1934—an important year in a challenging and momentous decade. It was in this period of reappraisal and readjustment that we attempted to restore order and opportunity; freedom and fulfillment; sense and security to a great nation that had grown up too fast and had matured too slowly.

When President Roosevelt made this ringing declaration of humanitarian policy, it was already clear that a major thrust of the New Deal would be directed toward the American city. In the face of the great depression and the misery and suffering that accompanied it, bold programs were launched to stem the tide—programs which today are examples of a free society's strength, in time of crisis.

Today, those of us connected directly or indirectly with this philosophy are carrying on this important work. But rather than to accept the ways of the past as the yardstick of the future, we have acknowledged the shortcomings and the errors of the programs in these areas, and, under the capable leadership of Bob Weaver, these old programs are being refined and improved and better adapted to the problems of this decade of dedication. Bob Weaver has a deep understanding of the human problems of the cities; and, for the first time, the HHFA is making significant progress in solving these problems.

The record of accomplishment in the past is significant:

In public housing, for example, 600,000 families have been relocated from slums to decent housing—a significant achievement, but not nearly enough. What is wrong? Very simply this. Most of this housing was tightly packed into pockets of the city, remote from the mainstream of urban life. In 1962, for the first time, the Public Housing Administration is calling for bold new programs to break up housing projects, to design their buildings on a more humane scale; and, at long last, they are beginning to pay attention to the social and economic problems of the people who live in these projects, to help them adjust to normal life in a normal society.

Since the Federal Housing Administration was founded, millions of families have been helped to obtain good private housing. But, most of the new housing made possible under FHA was built at the expense of the cities. Most of it was suburban tract development where potato fields were turned into monotonous rows of housing. Only today is FHA insurance being extended to meet the more urgent private housing needs of lower income people who live in cities.

Another example will suffice: in urban renewal, nearly 1,000 projects are underway in America backed by almost $2 billion in grants. But only now are we seeing some results in cities like Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Norfolk, and New Haven. And only now is the Urban Renewal Administration asking that renewal pay off not only in terms of new commercial areas or expanding tax base, but in beauty for the city and a better quality of life for its citizens, as well.

I repeat, all of these are magnificent achievements. Despite our performance, however, we have been slow to recognize the tremendous human problems in our cities; and because of the shotgun approach to these problems, our urban areas are in just as much trouble in 1962 as they were 30 years ago in 1932. Perhaps even more.

The population in the cities has continued to increase, the blight in our central cities has continued to spread, and our central cities are the scene of every domestic problem we face: unemployment, juvenile delinquency, poor transportation facilities, civil rights, slums, air and water pollution. You name it—it's an urban problem, and it's the problem, therefore, of city hall.

To done the mantle of the prophet of doom for a moment, I predict that, given current trends, these problems will become much worse in urban America before they begin to get better. They will become even more severe as the exodus continues to the suburbs, and the squeeze tightens on the city's tax dollar.

The city in 1962 is supposed to be creating or building or attracting a middle class to lead it, to provide stability; but, instead, the city more and more becomes the home of those who are least able or least willing to help themselves, to take the rational, progressive and humane steps which might help to turn the tide.

I am an elected representative of people who have given to me on five separate occasions the challenge of doing something about the deep-rooted social and economic problems of an old New England city, typical. I might say, of all the older and major cities of New England.

The facts and the charts and statistics, I repeat, which measure the degree of the urban crisis have great personal meaning to me not only as a five-term mayor, but as a life-long resident of a medium-sized city. I live with these problems and much of my adult life has been spent trying to solve these problems. What are they? A couple of examples:

Statistics issued by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare show that the rate of juvenile crime has doubled since 1950. These, to me, are not statistics. To me, juvenile delinquency is the ransacking of a New Haven school; the smashing of lights installed in a city park; the kind of violence, burglaries, muggings which you read about every day in your daily newspaper.

The slum problem is summarized by the Housing and Home Finance Agency with another statistic: according to the 1960 census, 30 million people in America live in slums. To me, and to mayors like me, the 30 million figure means people who have problems almost beyond the comprehension of the suburban middle class: problems of people living 7 in 1 room, 11 in 2 rooms; families living in housing without plumbing, without electricity, or even minimum ventilation. This 30 million figure means problems of children who are bitter; children who drop out of school; children who, without guidance and equal opportunity, will be the welfare cases, the mentally ill, the unemployed of tomorrow.

Still another statistic: The Senate Banking and Currency Committee says that if we are to house our growing population properly, that by 1970 we must almost double our

current annual housing output. What does this mean to me? Is it just a prediction? It is not.

To me, it is a reality in 1962, because it is a problem that was personalized to me on the very doorstep of my own home within the week. It is a problem which is part of my daily life as mayor.

A final statement before I continue on. The Department of Labor says that the unemployment rate has averaged 6 percent of the total labor force. To me, this means men standing at streetcorners in downtown New Haven without jobs and without the skills to fill the current vacancies. To me, it is the man seeking aid from the welfare department in city hall. To me, too often, it is the man sitting in my front office at 8:30 in the morning, trying to hold together his few remaining shreds of dignity as he pleads for employment—any kind, just to keep his family from the indignities of public charity.

When I see human problems such as these, and grope with them day after day, often times without success; when I see the central city of America still the scene of the unfinished business of our society, I cannot help but wonder why—not just as a mayor, but as an American citizen—despite all of our efforts and achievements we have fallen short of the mark. We simply have not come to grips with this major challenge of our time—the plight of the central city and its people. There are a number of reasons, I know, and I would cite one.

Our urban complexes have experienced tremendous, haphazard growth these past 30 years. As a result, 70 percent of our population today is urban. By the end of the 20th century, 8 out of every 10 Americans will live in urban areas, and, based on present population trends, this increase will not be among what sociologists call the stable middle class. Rather, it will center on first and second generation migrants from rural areas, new to city life, in need of greater opportunity for development and advancement.

The Kennedy administration has become the first to take action in meeting these important needs. New programs are being launched in such areas as youth services, education, mental health, housing, and job retraining. The planning and talent that has gone into this program is significant; the potential of these programs is great.

And yet, despite this progress, I cannot help but wonder whether we fully appreciate how close we are to making a major breakthrough in this area—that for the first time in 30 years of hard work and achievement, we are about to bring to the cities of America the new life and purpose that was first envisioned during the New Deal.

As I see these great programs unfolding, there doesn't seem to be a complete awareness of what the other fellow is doing. One experiment is tried in one city, and something else is tried in another; a private foundation grant goes to a city in California, and the Housing and Home Finance Agency grants an appropriation for an experimental program to a city in Pennsylvania; HEW approves a demonstration grant for something new in New York, while the Department of Labor experiments with a similar program in Michigan.

The end result is a serious dispersal of time and effort—and this is hurting us in our efforts to fully explore the potential of these new programs, and it is hurting those in the cities who should be benefiting from the combined opportunities of these programs.

I feel that the urban problems which you are familiar with—all of you through statistics, and many of you through personal experience—are problems which are too great and too serious to call for anything less than a full-scale concentrated attack by all of the agencies concerned.

What do I mean? Just this: We can solve these problems if we marshall all of our resources. But to solve these problems, we must concentrate and coordinate our programs, and we should begin with such a concentration and such a coordination, in several selected communities in the Nation, simply to prove that it can be done.

Instead of scattering our programs and our ideas, instead of diffusing the funds to underwrite these programs, I feel that a Federal agency such as the Housing and Home Finance Agency or the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should select a few pilot cities—which need help, cities which have already shown a determination and an ability to help themselves—and assist these cities to carry out a total program for both physical and human renewal.

I believe that, in these selected cities, we can test and evaluate and refine these new tools for urban improvement on a demonstration basis; and we will then be able to extend these coordinated efforts to other American cities.

I am not necessarily suggesting additional moneys. I am simply saying that we can pool the demonstration grants available from a number of Government agencies, coordinate these demonstration grants with private fundation grants, and in so doing, create a new enthusiasm and spirit to solve the problems of our central cities. The Ford Foundation already has taken the initiative in helping this type of program available to several cities around the Nation.

With this kind of approach, new horizons appear. With this kind of approach, we can excite urban young people and make them active participants in the renewal of their communities.

The Peace Corps with its new enthusiasm and new spirit has brought new life to our foreign aid program. I do not suggest a domestic Peace Corps; but if we would adopt the Peace Corps principle—small groups of young people working under coordinated supervision in underdeveloped areas—these new ideas, these new techniques, this kind of approach well could have extraordinary impact in solving the problems of our cities.

Think of the potential for just a moment: Young men and young women could be recruited locally, trained in the same manner as they are in the Peace Corps, and, after an orientation in the problems of the cities, assigned depending on their interests and their skills, to work with professionals in the neighborhoods which are problem neighborhoods.

It is conceivable that with this kind of program these young men and young women could work as supervisors in new recreational programs as assistants to group workers, interviewers in relocation offices, assistants in public housing projects and in community center schools as well as in any other area of urban life where their talents could be put to good use.

With such a corps of young people, hundreds of local projects which have either been held up or not yet even considered in the cities of America could be launched. The serious shortage of trained and dedicated personnel could be solved, and, equally important, from this corps might emerge the kind of pioneer talent that in the years ahead well could fill the responsible and necessary roles in public and private life in the solution of the unknown challenge of generations to come.

We in the cities, who must live with the problems of the woman searching for a rent, the cries of the frustrated and oppressed, we believe our fellow citizens will respond to this type of program. We already have begun to lay out a program of action, a program of the specifics, because we know our needs. We don't need anyone from outside to tell us what our problems are. We don't need statistics to underscore what is already our most serious area of concern.

We are willing to undertake the planning and the commitment and the action to show all of the world we can set our urban house in order all by ourselves.

But, our efforts must be expanded, and they must be coordinated. If we can pool our talents and attract new people to our cause, I am confident we can reverse once and for all the urban decline which is the most serious problem we face in America.

Two years ago, in assessing the sense of softness and staleness which afflicted the American people, President Kennedy called upon us to "climb the mountain," to be inspired by the peaks in the distance, to have our energies sharpened by the mountain breezes. He called for the elimination of slums and the expansion of opportunities for all Americans.

That is the challenge before us. The stakes are high—the future of millions of Americans living in hundreds of cities is on the line. For the first time we have the tools, the techniques to offer them the opportunity to break the slum cycle, to make for themselves and their children a better life.

We cannot let this chance pass us by for want of vision, determination, and hard work. Going on our separate ways we will not meet this important challenge for our country. Working together, pooling our talents and resources, deciding right here and now that we will make better cities and better lives—we cannot fail.

The Two Sides of SBIC's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in Dun's Review and Modern Industry for November 1961.

The article points out the many advantages of the opportunities made available to the businessman by the passage of the Small Business Investment Company Act of 1958. The experience of the past 4 years has shown that there are some drawbacks, but the overall picture shows how important and effective this legislation can be.

The article follows:

THE TWO SIDES OF SBIC'S

Congressional conservatives normally can be counted on to fight any legislation likely to increase the role of the Federal Government in business. Liberals are an equally safe bet to oppose most special tax concessions for business. But neither side acted true to form when it came to the Small Business Investment Company Act of 1958. With near unanimity, all shades of congressional opinion got behind the act. On the face of things, this might seem surprising. The legislation both increased Washington's role in business financing and granted tax privileges to businessmen. It thus waved a red flag at both bulls.

Neither side charged, however. For the Small Business Investment Company Act, whatever its faults, was politically safe. It was dedicated to fostering small business—an institution sacred to all shades of democratic opinion.

Specifically, this law was intended to encourage the flow of big capital to small busi-

ness. Big business, the act's sponsors reasoned, could count on its own cash flow plus Wall Street underwriters for all the capital it could possibly need. Small business, on the other hand, had only the banks and commercial moneylenders for short-term capital and no regular sources at all for long-term debt or equity capital. The federally aided Small Business Investment Companies were intended to bridge this gap.

The Small Business Investment Company Act, passed with such high hopes, is now 3 years old. Has it lived up to the hopes of its sponsors? Has it attracted high-bracket risk capital to small business as intended? Has it made it easier for small businesses to start and to expand?

To the question about attracting capital, the answer is a clear and definite "yes." There are currently something like 400 small business investment companies in the United States where there were none only 3 years ago. They command a total capital of around $340 million. So far this year alone something like 223 SBIC's have been launched. Among their sponsors have been such prominent banks as Morgan Guaranty, First National Bank in Chicago, and Marine Midland.

Around 40 of the SBIC's have raised equity capital on the public markets. One of these, San Diego, Calif.'s Electronics Capital Corp. has been a spectacular success in the marketplace; its shares soared from a 1959 offering price of 10 to as high as 63 this year. Even the Rockefellers, those shrewd captains of capital, have started a private SBIC. From all this, it is abundantly clear that SBIC's have a very real attraction for big capital. As a money-raising setup they have been a considerable success.

But what about small business itself? Have the SBIC's solved small business' problem of raising long-term debt and equity money? A "yes" answer here must be very much more qualified than a "yes" answer to the previous set of questions. In fact, it depends in part on your definition of "small" business. Under the Small Business Investment Company Act, the definition is exceedingly broad: small business can have assets up to $5 million, average annual earnings up to $250,000 or net worth up to $2.5 million.

Toward the upper end of this asset range, the SBIC must compete with more conventional financing. Companies with $2.5 million in net worth are not entirely frozen out of conventional Wall Street financing, especially in these days when new offerings find such a ready market.

It is probably in the middle part of the "small" business spectrum that SBIC financing has been most useful. A rather high proportion of SBIC loans and investments made to date are concentrated in the $300,000 to $500,000 area. A much smaller number run from $750,000 to $1 million.

But how about really small business? Here the SBIC's can make some claims. Bridgeport, Conn.'s First Connecticut Corp. reports lending $18,000 to a funeral parlor and also an investment in a local Greek restaurant. Manhattan's big Franklin Corp. (assets: $4.6 million) loaned $45,000 to a coin laundry outfit. Cleveland's Growth Capital Corp. (assets: $9.9 million) put $30,000 into a small hospital supply outfit.

The fact is, however, that such relatively small commitments are the exception rather than the rule. Growth Capital Corp., for example, did make that $30,000 loan. But of its 15 investments as of a recent report, only 4 were under $100,000.

Even this does not tell the whole story about the relative lack of help that SBIC's have given to really small business. The fact is that the proportion of the smaller loans and investments is steadily decreasing. Experience has taught the SBIC's that it costs almost as much to investigate and process a $30,000 loan as a $300,000 one. The smaller ones tend to be unprofitable. Naturally, the SBIC's turn away from them—even when they look otherwise attractive. Even the smaller SBIC's have tended to upgrade the size of their average commitment.

One method they have used for doing so involves a pooling of resources. In this way several small SBIC's handle a relatively large loan together. Around Manhattan, for example, at least one lawyer has built a profitable business out of "finding" suitably large SBIC investments and then farming them out to several SBIC's.

Not only does this practice tend to freeze out the small claimants for SBIC investing, it tends to make SBIC sponsors lazy. Why should they laboriously process and investigate small businesses? All they need do is take a piece of a loan someone else has found for them and then sit back and clip coupons. All this has caused more than one original sponsor of the SBIC legislation to wonder whether the law has really helped the people it was supposed to aid.

Such drawbacks, however, cannot dim the fact that some SBIC's have been extremely profitable. To understand why, it is only necessary to see how the SBIC's are set up. Written into the law are two unbeatable advantages: a high degree of capital leverage; and a very considerable tax concession. To take these features one at a time:

Capital leverage. Theoretically, a small business investment company can leverage its dollars 11 to 1. The rules provide that Uncle Sam's Small Business Administration will match the first $400,000 of equity capital that an SBIC raises. The SBA will then lend another $400,000 to the company.

So far, the original $400,000 is leveraged three times over. But, on top of this, the SBIC is permitted to go out and borrow up to four times its equity capital. That means the minimum-size SBIC ($300,000 capital) could theoretically borrow $1.2 million, which would bring its total capital available for investment to $1.6 million.

In practice, however, the full potential leverage has never been realized. Moneylenders have been reluctant to lend SBICs anythings like four times their equity capital. Even so, leverage of six times the original equity investment is not rare.

Taxes. Here is the real reason for the SBIC's attractiveness for high-bracket investors. Put simply, every dollar an SBIC loses comes out of somebody's regular taxable income; every dollar it makes counts as capital gains. Thus, if a SBIC can break even on its investments, its owners will come out way ahead.

GOOD FOR BANKERS AND LAWYERS

These tax and leverage features are by no means the only advantages offered by the SBIC form of organization. Banks, for example, have formed them not only for their moneymaking possibilities but because they regard them as excellent ways to nurture promising new customers. Conventional moneylenders and professional providers of risk capital have found SBICs an excellent supplement to their operations. A Florida outfit, for example, uses an SBIC to lend capital to speculative builders. Lawyers, especially those of an intrepreneurial bent, have found them handy tools.

Such advantages aside, can the SBICs make money on their own? The odds are that they can. But in most cases it is too early to give a definite answer. Not until last year did the SBICs get going on any very substantial scale. To date there have been only a few losses and a few very spectacular successes. Typically, these successes have tended to be good-sized investments, usually in the electronics or scientific field. For example:

Electronics Capital Corp., run by Electrical Engineer Charles E. Salik, lent $750,000 to Potter Instrument in return for debentures convertible into one-third of Potter's common stock, which is publicly held. Recently, the conversion value of the SBIC's $750,000 investment was around $10 million.

Greater Washington Industrial Investments, based in the Nation's Capital, put a bit less than $1 million into CEIR, a computer services company. At one point, Greater Washington was sitting with a paper profit of almost $8 million on that one investment.

Franklin Corp., run by Herman E. Goodman, a onetime Manhattan textile magnate, lent $350,000 to Astrex, Inc., an electronics distributor. Astrex' common stock rose so high that the warrants Franklin got as part of its loan package gave the SBIC a paper profit at one time of better than $1 million.

ENOUGH BORROWERS?

Still, it is difficult to tell at this point whether such spectacular profits were a result of the inherent advantages of SBICs—or simply a byproduct of the heady boom in science stocks. Nor is it at all certain that the burgeoning number of SBICs will ever find many investments of the Astrex or Potter variety.

Even today, many leading SBICs are very far from fully loaned. In July, according to the well-informed SBIC Evaluation Service, the big Boston Capital Corp. (assets $21.2 million) had less than 20 percent of its money invested. Electro Science Investors, run by Dallas' dynamic James J. Ling, recently had found investments for just over 40 percent of its $15 million—despite the fact that it has been in existence close to 2 years. Buffalo, N.Y.'s big Midland Capital Corp., in similar fashion, had invested just a shade over one-third of its $16 million.

So far, then, indications are that well-run SBIC's may find it harder to find suitable investments than to raise money to put into them. It may turn out to be harder to lend the money out than to take it in. Not that there is any shortage of Americans with what the possessors regard as fine moneymaking opportunities. How many of them will stand the test of rigid fiscal analysis, however, remains to be seen. And some of those that do may well turn out to be too small to fit into the relatively large-scale standards that the SBIC's are trending toward. As for the very best investment risks, many of them may prefer to go to moneylenders rather than dilute their equity with the kind of convertible debenture or warrant deals that the SBIC's usually demand from them.

REACHING TOO FAR?

Under these circumstances, some of the SBIC's may be tempted to reach too far to find investments. They may be tempted by the tax advantages to pour good money after bad in investments that have started to go sour. Some critics think this day may already be at hand. One such is Walter Heller, head of the big factoring and commercial moneylending firm. "There are hosts of SBIC's," says he, "but the vast majority of them can't find enough good companies to lend to. They find that more and more of the well-managed companies don't want to give up equity."

Heller, of course, is hardly an unbiased witness; SBIC's are in direct competition with his company in many fields. Still, his observations have a certain force and point up a fact that some SBIC men will admit privately. For the simple fact is this: a Government-backed and subsidized program like the SBIC's can neither create business opportunities nor turn mediocre management into topnotch management. And in a very realistic sense, it is good management and shrewd entrepreneurial skills that are in short supply, not capital.

Certainly the SBIC law was well-intentioned and has created a promising new investment medium. But to expect too much of it—or to expand it too fast—would be exceedingly unwise.

Release the Reserves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE SILER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, as one of only two Members of the House of Representatives who voted against authorizing the President to call up the Ready Reserve of our Armed Forces to active duty for not more than 12 months, I would like right now to implore our President to release immediately the more than 100,000 men he sent from their homes to military camps a few months ago.

This was done during the so-called Berlin crisis, which no longer exists and which has certainly decreased from whatever former state of threat, if any, it once imposed.

The Berlin wall has long since been built, although we obviously should have torn it down when the first section was constructed. And free access has long since been firmly established between East Berlin and West Berlin. But the added strength of 100,000 American men on active duty never made the slightest difference in that wall nor in that Berlin access we are right now observing each day at the present time over in Germany.

It has been most mystifying to me that we should ever have been so naive and so simple as to entertain any notion that wily old Khrushchev with his full knowledge of our strength and military potential would be affected in the least degree by this childish act of ours in sending another 100,000 men from their homes to a few training camps here in America. Why, Mr. K. already had trained and under arms twice as many as we had when we called the Reserves. And he already had access to five times as many marching men for war purposes as we had then or as we are likely to have in the future. Why are we so simple in dealing with Mr. K.? Why do we not treat him as the very shrewd man of the world that he surely is at all times? If force deters him, and I am sure it does, then why not put our feet on the ground and our thinking within the great school of commonsense and soberly consider that our missiles and our nuclear warheads and our worldwide bases, and only these, will ever retard Mr. K.? An additional 100,000 American men in Reserve camps would no more affect Mr. K. than a popgun would affect our nuclear submarine *Patrick Henry* while armed with its 16 Polaris missiles and plowing through the briny deep. When we were children we were justified in speaking as children and in understanding as children and in thinking as children, but now that we have become full grown men, why do we not put away childish things like the Apostle Paul admonished the Corinthians to do 2,000 years ago?

I can see all these reservists just now in my imagination. They must have been happy in their homes. Their families were all over the place. Their daily routine of vocation, trade or business was following its usual pattern. Life was not perfect or utopian, but just to be at home and free and unregimented—this in itself was somewhat of a Garden of Eden. Then one day this foolish call came and they were suddenly packing up to go and stand in line again for chow, stand in line for washing faces, stand in line for countoffs and so forth. Messhall took the place of that breakfast nook back home where that pretty little wife in a white apron asked if you wanted more coffee. A metal army cot took the place of the real bed you had somewhere in a place called home out on Main Street in Americana, Ky. But most of all, this meaningless and purposeless regimentation of military life took the place of that sweet and priceless freedom of private life you once had back there in the happy precincts of liberty before this call went out to deprive you of a precious 12 months of regular living in independent American citizenship.

Why not now admit our absurd mistake of the past and rectify it tomorrow by sending these men back to their happy homes on Main Street? I guarantee they and I will quickly and gladly get ready for war if war comes and if only commonsense will prevail again soon in the freedom's holy light of our country, undoubtedly the greatest under the shining sun.

Probably the most sensible and wisest vote, with whatever understanding God gave me, I ever cast in Congress was the one I cast on July 31, 1961, against calling up the Reserves.

The vote was 403 to 2. But I am certainly glad I was one of those two in opposition. I fervently hope this administration will now admit and correct its serious mistake, perhaps before breakfast tomorrow morning.

None Greater Than Tom Hennings—A Tribute by the Missouri Law Review

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, many fine tributes have been paid here in the Congress and in the press of our country to the memory of the late Senator Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., of Missouri. Interestingly enough, the significance of his achievements in the Senate of the United States has not diminished with the passing months since his death in 1960. If anything, his stature has grown, as evidenced by the dedication of a recent issue of the Missouri Law Review to him.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch last month printed in its "Mirror of Public Opinion" editorial page section the dedicatory article by Robert L. Howard in the memorial issue of the Missouri Law Review, and I found it so moving that I felt other Members of Congress who knew and admired Tom Hennings would appreciate the opportunity to read it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I would like to quote this paragraph particularly:

Missouri has had the good fortune to have had many able Senators, and several really great ones, in its 141 years of statehood, but none greater than Tom Hennings. Others have possessed aspects of greatness, but perhaps none before him bore the mark of greatness in so many different ways. Senator Hennings was a distinguished lawyer and legal scholar, a liberal statesman and a great champion of human liberty and the rights of all. Said the Rhode Island Pendulum editorially: "There was no greater champion of civil liberties in the United States than Senator Hennings."

Mr. Speaker, I submit at this point the text of the article referred to above, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR HENNINGS

(Robert L. Howard)

This issue of the Missouri Law Review is dedicated to the memory of the late Senator Thomas C. Hennings, Jr. A more appropriate subject of dedication would be most difficult, perhaps impossible, to find.

Missouri has had the good fortune to have had many able Senators, and several really great ones, in its 141 years of statehood, but none greater than Tom Hennings. Others have possessed aspects of greatness, but perhaps none before him bore the mark of greatness in so many different ways. Senator Hennings was a distinguished lawyer and legal scholar, a liberal statesman and a great champion of human liberty and the rights of all. Said the Rhode Island Pendulum editorially: "There was no greater champion of civil liberties in the United States than Senator Hennings."

Senator Hennings' work as chairman of the Rules Committee of the Senate, and of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, marked high points in a distinguished senatorial career. And yet, before these chairmanships had been achieved, he was called by his colleagues for many important and extremely difficult tasks.

It was no accident that Senator Hennings, very early in his first term, was chosen to conduct the investigation into the campaign methods of a fellow Senator, widely considered dangerous to freedom and contrary to the basic principles of our democratic institutions, by which another Senator was defeated for reelection; and again to direct an investigation on a broader scale into the methods and practices of the same fellow Senator, contributing measurably to the latter's ultimate censure by the Senate of the United States. Senator Hennings' recognized wisdom, his skill, his great courage, and his acknowledged fairness early marked him for tasks which other Senators sought to avoid.

Again it was no accident that a year later Senator Hennings assumed the leadership of the group in the Senate that came to the aid of the President and brought about the defeat, by a single vote, of the ill-starred Bricker amendment and thus protected from destruction important and necessary Presidential powers in the field of foreign affairs.

Of this and Senator Hennings' part in it, the New York Times said editorially: "It is good to see courage in a room at a time when many men are timid."

Perhaps Tom Hennings, if he had his choice, would best like to be remembered for his leadership in the attack upon the problems of juvenile delinquency, and his outstanding work as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights,

with his long championship of human liberty and protection for the rights of great and small alike under the Bill of Rights of our Constitution.

Senator MONRONEY characterized him as "one of the greatest constitutional lawyers who ever walked the floor of this Chamber." His basic concepts of constructive liberalism and his background of training and study in constitutional law combined to make him a natural leader in promoting and defending the ideals of freedom and democracy.

Senator Hennings was not without legitimate claim to recognition in the field of legal scholarship outside of his work in the Senate of the United States. His article entitled "Constitutional Law: The People's Right To Know," published in the American Bar Association Journal in July 1959, explaining the constitutional significance of the "Hennings-Moss Act," commonly referred to as the "Freedom of Information Act," which he sponsored, emphasized his long battle against secrecy in Government.

His successful championing of civil rights legislation in 1957, and his effective blocking of the attempt to pass crippling legislation restricting the powers of the U.S. Supreme Court, further attest to the breadth of the field in which he directed his efforts as well as the effectiveness of his outstanding leadership in the Senate.

Few men, either in or out of the U.S. Senate, have been so phenomenally successful on so broad a front and against such tremendous odds. Perhaps no man has come out of such conflict so universally respected by both coworkers and opponents as did Senator Hennings.

It is worthy of special note that many who participated in the memorial services for Senator Hennings found best expression of their profound respect for his courage and deep admiration for his accomplishments on behalf of human liberty by quoting the immortal passage from Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, "The world will little note nor long remember what we say here; but it can never forget what he did here."

Perhaps the most lasting memorial to Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., may not be in monuments or tablets of stone, nor yet in the glowing tributes spoken and written by his admiring contemporaries, but in the dedication to constitutional government, to equal justice for all, and in the fundamentals of human liberty inspired in the minds and hearts of those who come after him by his unmatched career of public service.

How We Can Defeat Communism Without War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a very provocative article from the United Evangelical Action magazine, written by Mr. Donald L. Miller, an officer in the Naval Reserve with whom I had the honor to serve during the Korean war.

The article follows:

HOW WE CAN DEFEAT COMMUNISM WITHOUT WAR

(By Donald L. Miller)

Victories are won by identifying the opponent, understanding his aims, and developing effective countermeasures to defeat him.

Two vital questions were asked last year on the floor of the U.S. Senate. The questioner was Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and here's what he asked:

1. "Can total victory [over communism] be won without war?" and

2. "Even more perplexing than the question of how to win a total victory is the problem of what to do with it once it is won."

Out of more than 20 years' intensive study of Communist objectives, strategies, tactics, and patterns of thought come these direct answers:

1. Total victory can be won without war. In fact, it may be won only by nonmilitary means, and

2. Total victory certainly can present no problems as great as those of the spreading Communist tyranny we face if we fail to win. The puzzling question to most is not what to do with victory, but how to gain it.

The formula for winning any political or military contest is known to leaders of veterans, fraternal, women's, and even youth groups. Political, business, and military leaders know it, too.

You win victories by identifying the opponent, by learning and understanding his aims and mode of attack, and by developing effective countermeasures with which to defeat him.

While the formula is known and is used every day in many contests from presidential campaigns to little league baseball, we have not yet even begun to use it in respect to our Communist opponents.

Our primary opponent is not an ideology—as some would have us believe. It is men and women motivated by an ideology and, in conformity with its doctrines, using any and every means to promote its aims and to destroy its enemies. The primary enemy consists of the 36 million world Communists dedicated to the naked conquest of power in the United States as in every other country.

There is little actual evidence that most Americans yet have even the most general idea of how trained, disciplined, revolutionists in the Communist parties work to disintegrate free institutions, incite one group against the other, and pursue the conquest of political power.

Were just two steps taken—identify the enemy and learn his method of conquest—the means for winning a total victory over Communists would become obvious. Our enemies are not vague ideas with some mysterious appeal to poor people. They are men and women organized to attack and destroy us, largely by nonmilitary means.

If we ever do move this far ahead, we can shift into programs to win a total victory. On the one hand, we can correct current policies which induce the development of Communist power here and abroad. On the other, we can pursue specific nonmilitary programs to disintegrate and defeat the Communist power apparatus.

Let's take some examples.

Foreign aid: You can't give a Cadillac to a boy who can't drive without expecting a wreck. Similarly, you cannot really expect the vast material aid given to peoples in the so-called developing countries to be used wisely or well until they have the knowledge of how to operate a free economy. A common report is that much of our aid is taken by the rich in receiving countries and resold for profit. Thus, we spend billions; the rich in receiving countries become richer, and the poor go to Communist rallies.

If we do not want our aid to help promote communism, the right people should receive it and they should also receive the knowledge of how to grow food, how to create capital, how to build a free, prosperous economy for themselves.

Aid goods we send should be in the form of goods for specific projects. Technicians should go, too, for the purpose of seeing that the materials are used properly. Certainly, giving a poor man $10 makes the giver $10 poorer, and does not enrich the receiver. He spends the money and asks for more.

But give a man the knowledge and excite him to create capital for himself and he can enrich both himself and you. We are not doing this now. We should. Nothing could be more effective in combatting Communist inroads in the underdeveloped countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

Oversea information: For years we have been telling other peoples how rich and successful we are. And this has been bearing fruit—just the kind you would expect from a poor relation if you tell him over and over that you are richer and smarter than he is.

We are reaping the envy of million of people. We are stirring up their feelings that they are just as good as we are and should share in our wealth, even by expropriating it. This attitude—given a helping hand by Communist agitators—is sweeping across Latin America.

Reports of how rich and successful we are help neither ourselves nor others unless we explain how they can become rich and successful, too. Their real need is for information on ways to organize their lives more successfully, to solve everyday problems, to move faster to satisfy their ambitions for prestige, comfort and equality with the more developed peoples.

Developing peoples are looking for answers to problems. If we don't supply them, they will seek answers elsewhere as in Moscow and Peiping. That is exactly what they are doing. They ask us but they get little they can use. So they accept the invitation to visit Moscow or Peiping.

Ideology: Of course, ideology fits into the picture, too. Communist agitators are selling a picture of a society in which all men are equal, and in which—eventually—they will receive what they need and work just as much as they are able. Sounds like the pitch of an oldtime medicine man. Many here ask how you can fight an ideology like Marxism. You do it the same way you discredit the promises of a political opponent. Communism's false promises, its day-to-day lies and deceits must be exposed and answered.

Actually, what the Communists propose is not new at all. In 300 B.C. Aristotle described the current political system the Communists have as one in which "the many have the power in their hands, not as individuals, but collectively."

Khrushchev describes it the same way today. But Aristotle went on to explain that "This sort of democracy * * * grows into a despot * * *. The decrees of the demos (the masses) correspond to the edicts of the tyrant." Aristotle called this the worst possible kind of democracy and one bound to be washed away by man's move toward more individual freedom. This was over 2,000 years ago, mind you.

Captive nations: Ever wonder what holds the Communist bloc of nations together? Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev says it is the unity of the Communist Parties and their single-minded loyalty to the ideas of Lenin (as interpreted by Moscow). His greatest fear is that this unity will be broken as national Communist Parties declare independence from Moscow, or as nationalism is reasserted among peoples conquered and subjected by Communists. Let's split this unity.

One way is through a program that would:

1. Strengthen the feeling of nationalism and yearning for independence among peoples of the captive nations; and

2. Enable the United States to prepare for aiding liberation of the captive peoples at an opportune time in the future. No single program so far has done more to arouse Communist resentment or promise more for eventual victory of the forces of freedom in the future.

Are there any other specific nonmilitary offensive moves we can take now? Yes, many of them: (1) Training nationals of other countries in the techniques of political leadership, in ways to counter Communist agitation and propaganda, how to defeat guerrilla warfare, how to lead their people toward a free society; (2) guiding international trade to pinch rather than to push ahead Communist ambitions; (3) improve or end cultural exchange; (4) using food-for-peace and freedom-from-hunger campaigns to show how free economies are built, not merely as worldwide welfare handouts; and many more.

For some reason, such practical answers to the burning questions asked by Senator Fulbright have been explored only by a few. Such answers as have been tried so far have failed even to halt communism progress. Today we are all but face to face with a decision between peaceful surrender or nuclear war. Unless we come up with practical means for defeating Communist power and soon, the choice between surrender and war is inevitable.

If we fail to find workable answers and put them into practice, the cause of free men will be set back by decades, perhaps by centuries, if we stop feeling self-satisfied when we have asked the questions and seek success in finding the answers, we may look forward toward a world of peace and freedom with justice in our time.

At least let us examine these and other suggested answers on their merits. When nuclear bombs start to fall or Communist mobs roar down the streets pillaging and destroying, it will be too late.

Equal Employment Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Integration in Federally Assisted Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, I was particularly interested in testimony presented by Dr. John Theobald, superintendent of New York City schools. Dr. Theobald, presented an excellent statement on the subject before the ad hoc subcommittee which included an eloquent summary of the challenge which faces our entire society and which is now before this Congress as H.R. 10144, the Federal Equal Employment Opportunity Act. Pertinent excerpts from Dr. Theobald's testimony follow:

Our problems today in the slums are basically the same problems, but the occupants of those slums today in New York City are our Negroes and our Puerto Ricans predominantly. These are the people who are not getting the normal opportunities of income; the normal opportunities of home environment; the normal opportunities for job employment and all the rest. The statistics I am sure you have. I do not have to repeat them for you. One of the big problems I think that we find is that these younsters do not have a desire for education in the sense that we traditionally believe in. This is not surprising because education has meant nothing to these kids up to very recently. There is not much sense in going after a Ph. D. if all you can do is dig ditches after you get it, and while there have been opportunities and while opportunities are increasing rapidly today, there isn't any question that they do not begin to meet the needs in terms of employment opportunities as we stress education.

* * * * *

So there is a tremendous advantage here in exposing these youngsters to the kind of neighborhood school that emphasizes the importance of education. Now I think the biggest problem that lies ahead of us in New Yrk City is something that we will be able to control only insofar as we are citizens rather than just educators, I am talking about the fact that we can do our darndest to convince these youngsters and their families about the importance of education, but unless society does something about seeing to it that there is a job waiting for them predicated only on their ability to do it, then that kind of education isn't going to stick. The next generation isn't going to believe in it.

Spending Ourselves to Destruction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in the short time that President Kennedy has been in office, our national debt has risen to the highest in peacetime history. This is truly a summit.

The articles by Lyle C. Wilson and Henry J. Taylor, in yesterday's Washington Daily News leaves no doubt as to the treacherous path being taken by the fiscally irresponsible Kennedy administration:

DANGER FROM THE DEBT

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

As Congress begins to consider the Kennedy administration's big spending bills it might ask itself a question:

"Is it possible for us to destroy ourselves from within?"

That is: destroy ourselves by overspending?

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, put that question to Congress this month in sadly presenting to the Senate the administration's request for a stopgap, $2 billion increase in the Federal debt limit. The increase was voted, hiking the limit to $300 billion.

The administration shortly will ask for an additional $8 billion increase. If that increase is voted, the record will show that the debt limit has been hiked by $15 billion in the space of a year.

The debt limit has to be increased to enable the Government to borrow more money to pay its bills. The alternatives are either to reduce expenditures within income or to increase tax revenue to cover expenditures. The politicians reject both of these alternatives. This compels the Government to borrow, thereby achieving a steady increase in the national debt.

The bad guys in this deadly circle are not necessarily the politicians, although they are bad enough. The bad guys are the voters of the United States who permit the politicians to believe the people would rather that the Government live beyond than within its means. They aren't bad, really. Just foolish.

These voters seem to believe in free lunch. Any oldtime saloonkeeper could prove that there is no free lunch although it appeared to be free. So it is with many of the Federal benefits and services provided for the people.

These benefits and services appear to be for free. They are paid for, not out of the county, city, or State treasuries but out of the U.S. Treasury in Washington.

It is a fact that the U.S. Treasury pays for these things. But the U.S. Treasury must first get most of the money from taxpayers, the same voters who, back home, are enjoying those free-lunch services and benefits. The Treasury borrows enough money to make up the tax shortage.

The current crop of grandchildren and their grandchildren will repay those borrowed billions when the time comes. They will be mighty unhappy about that.

It is argued that it is not the Federal services and benefits to deluded taxpayers that pile up Government costs. It is argued that the enormous Federal expenditures observed by this generation were required for national defense.

That argument is baloney of the ripest kind. The New Jersey Taxpayers Association did some sharp pencil work on Government spending since 1955. It is a fact that defense spending has gone up. But homefront spending for benefits and services has zoomed. The association reported this: "Budget expenditures for civil benefits and services have moved upward faster (67 percent) than those for defense (30 percent), reflecting burgeoning service and benefit programs."

Senator BYRD's question packs a punch. There have been 24 Federal deficits in the past 30 years. Two more are coming up, back to back.

NO END TO SPENDING?

(By Henry J. Taylor)

In a wrangle over payments that lasted for 27 years, Leonardo da Vinci finally received 1,200 lire for his masterpiece, "Virgin of the Rocks," now in the Louvre. That is $1.94 today. The painting is priceless. The money is worthless. This is inflation.

There are no boundaries to human needs. And any government which proclaims that because we need things we can have them by government spending is dealing in a world of words that have caused incalculable human tragedy. It is the world where solutions are made to sound easy merely by debt and a printing press.

Figures can be tiresome, but we are due a sober accounting. Perhaps a compilation will amaze you, for it has all happened incredibly fast. And, after all, it is our own money, savings, and future that are at stake.

On March 27, 1961, President Kennedy forecast a $2.1 billion deficit in his New Frontier budget.

On May 25 he said the deficit would be $3.6 billion.

On July 25 he revised the red figure again to $5.3 billion.

On January 18, 1962, the President revised his deficit once more to $7 billion.

And now the latest monthly Treasury statement showed an actual deficit of $9.4 billion during the first 7 months of the New Frontier's fiscal year, through January.

Yet even this isn't the whole story. A year ago the legal debt limit was $293 billion. Then on June 27 Treasury Secretary C. Douglas Dillon testified that a temporary statutory debt limit of $298 billions should give us sufficient elbow room for maximum efficiency of operations. Temporary? Efficient? Well, Mr. Dillon was in dreamland. His June estimates of debt levels turned out to be wrong by $5.4 billion in only the first half of the fiscal year.

Within months the President asked for another raise in the debt limit to $300 billion, because the Government still could not

meet its current bills unless Congress complied. And still another boost to $308 billion will be requested before June 30. This is a $15 billion boost in the debt limit within 1 year, and all bound up in the enormous package with the deficits.

The spenders are eating the wrong side of Alice in Wonderland's mushroom and we're headed for an awful ache, which can affect business conditions as well as our solvency. How we can go on like this defies anybody's commonsense. Meanwhile, in real purchasing power we will all grow progressively poorer as the inevitable result of the process.

Nothing this side of war finally creates so much human misery as inflation with its artificial pay and the debauching of national finances. This is how political spending and Government debt torpedo people's savings and their ability to plan for their children and the future. For human problems do not wash away and peoples and nations are not floated over their troubles when a government becomes financially irresponsible. It is simply beyond the power of printed pieces of paper and well-meant words to do the miracle.

Life (and the survival of a nation) always turns out to be harder than that. There's a grim parallel in how the Blum Socialist-Labor government contributed to France's weakness and ignoble defeat in 39 days and how Britain's Labor-Socialist government all but completed the wreckage of England at the war's end.

Where is M. Blum now? Where are the tall foreheads of the British Fabian Socialists who laughed at history?

PROF PREDICTS EXACT DAY UNITED STATES WILL GO BROKE

PHILADELPHIA, March 14.—An economics professor predicted today the United States will go broke on November 18, 1970, exactly at 10:30 a.m.

Dr. Arthur R. Upgren, director of the bureau of economic studies at MacAlester College, St. Paul, Minn., told a meeting of insurance men, bankers, and educators he selected the day and time of America's financial collapse this way:

"In 1929, our financial structure was only 23 percent liquid just before the great bust of that year. The growth of our whole money system in the next 8 years will be such that financial liquidity on November 18, 1970, will again be reduced to 23 percent.

"The hour of 10:30 a.m. is selected because that is the time of day when all checks are presented by banks to each other for payment and the bank clearings take place."

Dr. Upgren's remarks were prepared for the annual spring forum sponsored by the Philadelphia chapter of Chartered Life Underwriters, an insurance group. He said he correctly predicted an economic boom would end on October 7, 1957, at 2:30 p.m., that business would improve strongly starting July 21, 1958, at 8 a.m., and that the 1960–61 recession would end on March 13, 1961, at 8 a.m.

How can his bust forecast for 1970 be avoided?

"Well," said Dr. Upgren, "we have given the country 8 years' notice of a serious problem—the maintenance of proper levels of liquidity for our banks.

"Next, we can hope the country will do something in response to our warning, though the six deep financial collapses we had from 1873 to 1933, do not encourage us.

"But we are doing better. Then, finally, we close on a note of levity, many of us by 1970 shall be retired to Florida and we must leave a few economic problems for our successors to handle."

Emotional Fakery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to an excellent editorial in the Cleveland Plain Dealer pointing out some of the pitfalls in Federal control of hospitals as proposed by President Kennedy's health program.

It seems to me that this editorial forcefully points up the need for voluntary legislation such as my own H.R. 10755 to provide medical care insurance to all elderly Americans. I include the editorial with my remarks.

[From the Plain Dealer, Mar. 2, 1962]

EMOTIONAL FAKERY

The President's renewed pitch for health insurance benefits for the aged through social security must be construed as another attempt for legislation through emotional appeal instead of reason. How, for instance, can a person possibly be against this bill unless he hates old people who are sick and indigent?

He can oppose it because it is not what it pretends to be. It implies strongly that with its passage the problems of old people will be taken care of because their hospital and nursing home expenses will be paid for by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. What hospitals and what nursing homes?

Do you know of any such institutions that are even partly idle, just waiting for business? (Federal hospitals are exempt from the bill.) Do you know that by the articles in the bill, participating hospitals must apply for, and be granted, "provider of services" licenses? Do you know there is not and cannot be short of nationalization of hospitals, any force compelling hospitals or nursing homes to enlist in the program?

Section 1601 of the bill provides than no Federal officer or employee shall have anything to do with supervision or control of medicine or manner of medical services in a hospital or nursing home—but another clause states that determination of costs of services is the privilege of the Federal Government. Do you know that section 1611 states clearly that the Welfare Secretary, alone, determines what each provider of services (hospital) shall receive and when the amount shall be paid?

This is exercise of controls through the back door and typical of the wording of all proposed legislation to date dealing with socialized medicine or hospitalization. The President in this bill suggests boldly there are facilities which do not exist, he denies the success of the Kerr-Mills Act; he ignores the fact that private health and hospital insurance rapidly is doing a more nearly complete job in the area; he refuses to acknowledge his program, not only is impractical but, in the main, adds more power to the central government, more red tape, more bureaucracy, more turning over to Washington the chores which should be done on a community and State level.

Because we do have compassion for all taxpayers as well as the aged and sick, we can honestly oppose this bill. We think it's not what it pretends to be. If it could deliver half of what it promises by implication, you wouldn't be getting it for the suggested price of an additional $13 per year, for you and for your employer, on your social security tax. The bill is just a wedge in the door, another political attempt to convert the business of health into a nationalized product.

For the Consumer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, as the President pointed out in his message last week, the consumers of America "are the only important group in the country who are not effectively organized." There are ways in which this group is protected against the careless or unscrupulous entrepreneur who is always present, though not in large numbers, in any society. There is food and drug inspection. Misleading advertising is policed by the Federal Trade Commission. Many agencies publish a variety of information bulletins for consumers. But these activities, according to the President and others, need greater coordination, and more effectiveness. An editorial in the Newark Evening News, Friday, the 16th, considers the subject in a manner that is worthy of the attention of my colleagues, and I am pleased to bring it before you now:

FOR THE CONSUMER

Consumers are the largest economic group in the Nation; they do two-thirds of all the spending—and, of course, all the voting. Now, a Presidential message has been devoted exclusively to their interests.

In a special message to Congress, President Kennedy noted the Federal Government by nature is the "highest spokesman" for all the people. The fact remains, however, that in the rush for privilege, the consumer often gets trampled upon by the more effectively organized special groups.

Mr. Kennedy's recommendations constitute a four-point bill of rights for the consumer: The right to safety; the right to be informed; the right to choose; and the right to be heard. To promote fuller realization of these rights, the President urged strengthening of existing programs and enactment of new laws. Some of the recommendations are encompassed in new legislation that hasn't been doing too well in Congress.

Stressed in the message was a requirement that new drugs, therapeutic devices, lipstick, and other cosmetics be officially declared safe and effective before they go on the market. Mr. Kennedy has a point when he says that existing laws fail to give people the protection hogs, cattle, and sheep have been getting since 1913.

Other Kennedy proposals were for safer use of highway and air transportation; compelling TV set manufacturers to include the UHF channels for reception of educational programs; wider inspection of meats; truth in packaging; and installment purchase contracts that reveal the true rate of interest.

Parenthetically, it might be noted that on the matter of interest charges on time

payments, New Jersey beat the President to it. As a result of revelations by the News of the unconscionable interest charges often exacted, the legislature in 1960 established a fair schedule of rates and a consumer frauds bureau to enforce them for the protection of New Jersey's buying public.

For the whole Nation, Mr. Kennedy's indorsement of truth in lending enhances the chances of a comparable bill that Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat of Illinois, has been trying to get through Congress for the last 2 years.

Considering the effectiveness on Capitol Hill of special interest lobbyists, the consumer may have to wait for all the benefits catalogued by Mr. Kennedy. But if the President generates enough support in an indifferent Congress for passage of the Douglas bill, it will be a net gain for a class of buyers who need protection most.

Columnists Warn Wild Spending Spree Will Spell Doom for United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in the tangled forest of debt in which we now find ourselves as a Nation, the voices warning of the danger of wild and uncontrolled Federal spending are indeed as of those "crying in the wilderness." I am encouraged to know that there are those who recognize the danger to our Nation and its people if we continue to spend without regard to income. Perhaps, if the responsible citizens persevere there is yet a chance to save this great Republic. The least we can do is to try. For this reason I am glad to include as a part of my remarks two columns from the Washington Daily News on this vital subject. The first is written by Lyle C. Wilson, and the second by Henry J. Taylor:

DANGER FROM THE DEBT

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

As Congress begins to consider the Kennedy administration's big spending bills it might ask itself a question:

"Is it possible for us to destroy ourselves from within?"

That is: destroy ourselves by overspending?

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, put that question to Congress this month in sadly presenting to the Senate the administration's request for a stopgap $2 billion increase in the Federal debt limit. The increase was voted, hiking the limit to $300 billion.

The administration shortly will ask for an additional $8 billion increase. If that increase is voted, the record will show that the debt limit has been hiked by $15 billion in the space of a year.

The debt limit has to be increased to enable the Government to borrow more money to pay its bills. The alternatives are either to reduce expenditures within income or to increase tax revenue to cover expenditures. The politicians reject both of these alternatives. This compels the Government to borrow, thereby achieving a steady increase in the national debt.

The bad guys in this deadly circle are not necessarily the politicians, although they are bad enough. The bad guys are the voters of the United States who permit the politicians to believe the people would rather that the Government live beyond than within its means. They aren't bad, really. Just foolish.

These voters seem to believe in free lunch. Any oldtime saloonkeeper could prove that there is no free lunch although it appeared to be free. So it is with many of the Federal benefits and services provided for the people.

These benefits and services appear to be for free. They are paid for, not out of the county, city, or State treasuries but out of U.S. Treasury in Washington.

It is a fact that the U.S. Treasury pays for these things. But the U.S. Treasury must first get most of the money from taxpayers, the same voters who, back home, are enjoying those free-lunch services and benefits. The Treasury borrows enough money to make up the tax shortage.

The current crop of grandchildren and their grandchildren will repay those borrowed billions when the time comes. They will be mighty unhappy about that.

It is argued that it is not the Federal services and benefits to deluded taxpayers that pile up Government costs. It is argued that the enormous Federal expenditures observed by this generation were required for national defense.

That argument is baloney of the ripest kind. The New Jersey Taxpayers Association did some sharp pencil work on Government spending since 1955. It is a fact that defense spending has gone up. The homefront spending for benefits and services has zoomed. The association reported this: "Budget expenditures for civil benefits and services have moved upward faster (67 percent) than those for defense (30 percent), reflecting burgeoning service and benefit programs."

Senator BYRD's question packs a punch. There have been 24 Federal deficits in the past 30 years. Two more are coming up, back to back.

NO END TO SPENDING?

(By Henry J. Taylor)

In a wrangle over payments that lasted for 27 years, Leonardo da Vinci finally received 1,200 lire for his masterpiece, "Virgin of the Rocks," now in the Louvre. That is $1.94 today. The painting is priceless. The money is worthless. This is inflation.

There are no boundaries to human needs. And any government which proclaims that because we need things we can have them by government spending is dealing in a world of words that have caused incalculable human tragedy. It is the world where solutions are made to sound easy merely by debt and a printing press.

Figures can be tiresome, but we are due a sober accounting. Perhaps a compilation will amaze you, for it has all happened incredibly fast. And, after all, it is our own money, savings and future that are at stake.

On March 27, 1961, President Kennedy forecast a $2.1 billion deficit in his New Frontier budget.

On May 25 he said the deficit would be $3.6 billion.

On July 25 he revised the red figure again to $5.3 billion.

On January 18, 1962, the President revised his deficit once more to $7 billion.

And now the latest monthly Treasury statement showed an actual deficit of $9.4 billion during the first 7 months of the New Frontier's fiscal year, through January.

Yet even this isn't the whole story. A year ago the legal debt limit was $293 billion. Then on June 27 Treasury Secretary C. Douglas Dillon testified that a "temporary statutory debt limit of $298 billion should give ciency of operations." Temporary? Efficient? Well, Mr. Dillon was in dreamland. His June estimates of debt levels turned out to be wrong by $5.4 billion in only the first half of the fiscal year.

Within months the President asked for another raise in the debt limit to $300 billion, because the Government still could not meet its current bills unless Congress complied. And still another boost to $308 billion will be requested before June 30. This is a $15 billion boost in the debt limit within 1 year, and all bound up in the enormous package with the deficits.

The spenders are eating the wrong side of Alice in Wonderland's mushroom and we're headed for an awful ache, which can affect business conditions as well as our solvency. How we can go on like this defies anybody's commonsense. Meanwhile, in real purchasing power we will all grow progressively poorer as the inevitable result of the process.

Nothing this side of war finally creates so much human misery as inflation with its artificial pay and the debauching of national finances. This is how political spending and Government debt torpedo people's savings and their ability to plan for their children and the future. For human problems do not wash away and people and nations are not floated over their troubles when a government becomes financially irresponsible. It is simply beyond the power of printed pieces of paper and well meant words to do the miracle.

Life (and the survival of a nation) always turns out to be harder than that. There's a grim parallel in how the Blum Socialist-Labor government contributed to France's weakness and ignoble defeat in 39 days and how Britain's Labor-Socialist government all but completed the wreckage of England at the war's end.

Where is M. Blum now? Where are the tall foreheads of the British Fabian Socialists who laughed at history?

Muskingum Watershed Conservancy District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, among the many great achievements of the people of Ohio is the Muskingum Watershed Conservancy District which has won world renown as an outstanding conservation effort, providing flood control, reforestation, and recreation in a large area of our State.

Members of Congress traveling west could do no better than to visit in my district and the nearby areas to view at firsthand a large-scale conservation effort that not only is self-supporting but actually pays real property taxes on the lands it owns.

As an example of the kind of work the district undertakes, I am told that 1,400,000 trees will be planted this year in its reforestation program.

The President's recent message on recreation and conservation inspired Mr. Harry Yockey, the able editor of the Dover, Ohio, Daily Reporter, to write an editorial suggesting that the experience

of the Muskingum District and its able manager, Bryce Browning, would be invaluable. I ask leave to include the editorial as part of my remarks:

EDITOR'S COMMENTS

(By Harry Yockey)

I do not know Bryce Browning's politics but I wouldn't hesitate to recommend the Muskingum Watershed Conservany District's secretary-treasurer to President Kennedy as Administrator of his proposed outdoor recreation program.

The genial Dover executive has traveled back and forth across this land, preaching the Muskingum Watershed Conservancy District gospel and he's been host to a great many Canadian and European officials who have come here to gain firsthand information on one of the world's wonders—a 50,000-acre recreation paradise that's self-supported and even pays taxes.

Browning ranks as one of America's outstanding disciples in the avenues of soil and water conservation and recreation. Where would President Kennedy find a more qualified person?

Louis Bromfield, the late Ohio author, voiced one of the best evaluations of the Muskingum Watershed Conservancy District when he said: "The Muskingum Conservancy District is probably the greatest example, up to now, in all civilization of man's understanding of how to develop his natural environment to his greatest good."

Bromfield was referring to the success with which the Muskingum Watershed Conservancy District has taken a great amount of land not suitable for agriculture and developed it into a real playground. And at the same time it not only has substantially cut-down Ohio's flood damage through reforestation and other conservation practices but also has made some previously worthless land tillable.

President Kennedy's recreational proposal, however, warrants a searching look if he intends to spend more tax dollars to finance any part of it.

If land that now is worthless can be utilized for recreation purposes and have the facilities pay their own way, and more, as if the case with the Muskingum Watershed Conservancy District, his projected program would have more merit.

I heard an interesting discussion on this very subject just last Tuesday by a metropolitan business executive who was visiting here. He expressed his viewpoint in connection with regional planning that sets aside certain areas for recreation. What he said 2 days before President Kennedy sent his proposal to Congress hits the Federal nail on the head.

"I am opposed to any regional planning that says, in effect, 'This area must be reserved for recreation,'" he remarked at lunch. "Undoubtedly the area it sets aside will not be spoil banks but exceptionally good land which would be ideal for residential, industrial, or business use."

"I am not opposed to recreation facilities. I think they are fine. I realize, too, that people living in the big cities may not even know what a tree looks like. But I do not believe it is the responsibility of you who live in Dover or New Philadelphia, or anywhere else there may be wide open spaces, to dig down into your tax pocket and foot recreation for big city people.

"You people are living here, for the most part by choice. When you bought your homes you made certain there was enough space to have a backyard fireplace, a picnic table, space to set up a charcoal grill, and room for your children's swings and sliding boards if that's what you wanted. This means all you have to do is step out your backdoor and you have your own recreation area.

"The same is true, in some measure, when you build your schools. Your board of education makes certain there is adequate play area for the students. These, I believe, are some of the very important reasons for your living where you do.

"But now you may be asked to help foot the bill for those same kind of facilities for the people who don't have them, who live in the big cities and who might want to get away from it all for a weekend. Why should you do this? If that's what they want, let them obtain it themselves just as you did."

The Federal Government now exercises its control over 20 percent of America's agricultural land. It tells the farmer, in the main, what he can plant and fines him if he sows more than that.

Now, in making his recreation proposal, President Kennedy would give Uncle Sam control over more of the remaining 80 percent of that land. He estimates it will cost between $800 million and $1 billion in tax dollars to finance the project. He asked an additional $50 million in tax money to assist States and cities acquire land for recreation facilities for urban area residents.

That is the very danger seen by the visiting business executive—the danger of cities reaching out and staking claims to valuable land so folks will have places where they can play volleyball, pitch horseshoes, skip rope, etc. And they could do it—with Uncle Sam's help if Congress accepts President Kennedy's proposal. Even without that help Canton grabbed land between Strasburg and Beach City and tapped the water supply.

No one argues the need for conservation of resources, especially water; better management of timber lands and methods for combating soil erosion and stream and air pollution.

But when it comes to making big Federal outlays for recreation Uncle Sam would do well to use the Muskingum Conservancy District as its foremost model of a self-supported playground, as quite a few foreign countries are doing. And the man who can tell President Kennedy how it should be done is Bryce Browning.

The Attorney General's Trip

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of February 27, 1962, written by William M. Beecher.

Mr. Beecher acquaints us with the very real gains made in international relations by the President's energetic and effective brother.

The article follows:

YOUNGER KENNEDY'S FRANKNESS, INFORMALITY WORRY DIPLOMATS BUT LEAD TO SOME GAINS

(By William M. Beecher)

THE HAGUE, HOLLAND.—"I've got some definite ideas about what we should do, that I'd like to discuss with my brother," says America's nomadic Attorney General, nearing the end of his round-the-world whirl of diplomacy and debate.

Robert Kennedy is not divulging the advice he will be giving John Kennedy. One question intriguing those who have watched him in action is whether he will urge that other roving emissaries and perhaps even State Department professionals adopt some of his own techniques in dealing with foreign folk.

These might be summed up thus:

Shun formal black-tie dinners and gatherings with avowed friends. Get out on the campaign trail, as if it were election time, meeting the people—especially the people who are apathetic or hostile.

Be candid, even tough, on occasion. Insist on a little maturity even in the newborn nations. Don't claim perfection for America, yet avoid a defensive posture; take the offensive in proclaiming the practical advantages of capitalism, of democracy. Hammer the idea that these, not authoritarian collectivism, are the wave of the future.

DIPLOMATS SHAKEN UP

Whatever advice the younger Mr. Kennedy may give to the President, he has at least shaken up a good many foreign service career men by example. One veteran diplomatic observer who watched the Attorney General operate in Indonesia may have been fairly typical of their reaction; he was slightly unnerved by Bobby's performance, yet concluded that at least among some student leaders years of Communist propaganda have been canceled out in a few minutes.

The President's brother has also served as a symbol of American resolution not to retreat under Communist pressure. He seemed moved by the sight of the ugly cinder block East Berlin wall, with its crown of rusting barbed wire, and by the emotion of the West Berliners. He may well carry back to Washington an argument that the United States should give further evidence of a stiff posture in Berlin. In Thailand he gave assurances that the United States will rush aid if any serious trouble should filter across their thousand-mile border with Laos. During a refueling stop at Saigon he vowed that U.S. troops will not leave South Vietnam until the Communists are defeated.

But important as backing up allies may be, it was by no means as touchy as his encounters with "neutralist" sentiment. Professional diplomats held their breath.

When a group of Japanese Socialist leaders, whose party regularly captures about 40 percent of the vote, tried to force him to admit the immorality of nuclear tests, Bobby turned the tables on them. He noted that the United States for months negotiated in good faith with the Soviet Union on a test ban while the Soviets were secretly preparing a large scale series of tests. Even today the United States is willing to enter an agreement if it provides for inspection, he said: "As Socialists dedicated to the welfare of your country I can't understand why you don't support this."

HE ASKS FOR EXAMPLES

He then cited several times the Socialists had parroted Moscow's line criticizing the United States and demanded that they demonstrate their independence by citing three times they had also criticized the Reds in the last 2 years. They would come up with but one example.

"Do you feel a Socialist Party could exist in a system in which the Communist Party was in control? Could you have this kind of roundtable discussion with a Yankee imperialist like me?" he asked the party leaders.

They were silent and embarrassed. Commented the Japan Times: "He showed that the party's professed neutralism is not neutral at all. This debate was instructive and we are left with the conviction that the Japan Socialist Party's hatred of America is a pose founded not on reason but on a desire to fall into line with Moscow and the Communist bloc for party political purposes."

When a small knot of leftist students at Waseda University in Tokyo shouted and

hooted and refused to let him speak, Mr. Kennedy invited their leader to the stage to ask some questions. Instead the youth went into a long harangue against American imperialism, but Bobby patiently held the microphone for his adversary and refused to let the youth be thrown off the stage. Eventually he managed to answer some questions and made a brief speech. That night nearly 200 Waseda students went to the American Embassy to apologize for the actions of the leftists; newspaper and television commentators praised Mr. Kennedy's calm demeanor under fire.

In Japan, in Indonesia, in Thailand, wherever he could get an audience, Bobby reiterated the thesis that democracy as practiced in the United States represents the future; that communism must not offer much of a paradise if it has to maintain itself with tanks in Hungary and fence in its followers with a wall in Berlin.

To a provocative question from a student of the University of Indonesia in Jakarta, Mr. Kennedy gave staccato response:

"We disagree with England. We disagree with France. I suppose a day does not go by that we don't disagree with them. We are going to disagree with Indonesia—and you are going to disagree with us. We should have a foundation of friendship so that every time an incident comes up and we don't do exactly the way you want us to do you don't say to hell with the United States. There's got to be a little more maturity."

Again and again he told Indonesians the United States could not publicly take a position on whether Indonesia has a right to take over West New Guinea from the Dutch. He said the United States could best serve the cause of peace by pushing the two sides together into settlement talks.

When an Indonesian student recalled the old American idea of manifest destiny represented in the slogan "Fifty-Four Forty or Fight" in the Presidential campaign of 1844, and in the War with Mexico, Mr. Kennedy shot from the hip.

The fifty-four forty slogan resulted in no fight; this Northern boundary dispute was settled in amicable talks, he said. As for the Mexican War, "Some Texans might disagree, but I think we were unjustified—I do not think we can be proud of that episode."

These words, uttered a little off handedly, showed the potential danger of Bobby's brand of diplomacy; they did stir the ire of Texans. But his frankness turned a decidedly unenthusiastic Indonesian audience into a loudly admiring throng.

Westerners remarked that the Indonesian student view of the United States and its leaders was terribly unsophisticated and outdated. "They had a picture of a capitalist as being a cartoon-like figure, fat and sleazy, who might be expected to mouth a lot of self-serving ambiguities," said one of them. "Instead they saw a lean, dynamic young man who challenged them to ask questions and answered with candor. The effect was electric."

JAPAN VERSUS JAVA

In his traveling, Bobby talked to hundreds of students, labor leaders, businessmen, politicians, and plain Joes. His barnstorming days were often 12 to 16 hours long, packed with handshaking, chucking babies under the chin, asking questions of farmers, workmen, and housewives. He gave out PT-boat tie clasps left over from the 1960 campaign, and ballpoint pens bearing his name and title.

In Japan, which has a high rate of literacy and numerous newspapers and television sets, this technique seemed most effective; Kennedy activities were front page news for a week and everywhere he went people knew who he was and what he had been doing. It proved less effective at the rice-roots level in Indonesia.

One bright afternoon the Kennedy cavalcade of sedans and a jeep-load of troops pulled into a rural marketplace of central Java. Bobby and his wife, Ethel moved quickly into the crowd smiling and shaking hands. The natives pressed forward gleefully. To an outsider it seemed a very effective good will effort, but an English-speaking Indonesian came up to an American reporter and said: "They think you are Dutch; to them all white men are Dutch. I told them you are Americans and they responded, 'Oh, American-Dutch.'" So the whole incident may have proved merely that untutored Javanese will shake hands with a friendly fellow.

TALKS WITH LEADERS

Along with his well-publicized engagements with populaces, the Attorney General also found time for private talks with key officials in each country visited. He met on three occasions with President Sukarno of Indonesia, for example; the talks were described as "fruitful." Yesterday he was talking with high Netherlands officials. Quite apparently, the aim was to enhance chances for a peaceful solution of the crisis over West New Guinea. A main hurdle has been Indonesian insistence that the Dutch agree in advance that any peace talks will deal only with the time and manner of transferring sovereignty. If that precondition is dropped, it is thought, the Dutch might enter negotiations aimed at some face-saving solution.

There's no question the Attorney General's trip has had some impact on his own views. He was especially impressed, for example, with the energy and capabilities of the Japanese; he is expected to counsel that great care be taken in revamping U.S. trade policies to insure against damage to Japan, America's second largest customer for exports.

If most consequences of the Robert Kennedy expedition are difficult to measure with precision, at least one fact is crystal clear. Bobby has enjoyed it enormously—every bit as much as a rough go of touch football. And it's a safe bet he would be game to do more of the same.

We Have a Stake in World Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following editorial from the March 16 issue of the Faribault Daily News, Faribault, Minn. I believe that it is an excellent discussion of the question of future U.S. trade policy:

WE HAVE A STAKE IN WORLD ECONOMY

Twenty-eight years ago, when the first Reciprocal Trade Act was passed, American exports were less than $2 billion a year. Now they are more than $20 billion. So, clearly, we have a stake in the economic affairs of the world. And it is up to the businessman and farmer of the Midwest to understand this no less than those who reside in great seaports, and watch the arrivals and departures of ships and planes from far lands.

The President's recent message to Congress, urging passage of the Trade Extension Act of 1962, cited some figures that reveal how deeply this country has become involved in international trade, especially in the critical Common Market countries.

We sell to Western Europe more machinery, transportation equipment, chemicals, and coal than our total imports of those commodities from all regions of the world combined.

Thirty percent of our exports, totaling over $4 billion a year in industrial goods and nearly $2 billion in farm products, go to present and prospective members of the European Common Market. Our agricultural trade with Western Europe is 4 to 1 in our favor.

As to exports in general, one of every seven farmworkers produces for export; one of every three workers engaged in manufacturing is employed in establishments that export.

Thus, on the surface, the export picture looks good. But there are catches. Plenty of them. Until recently, economic questions involving this country, Western Europe and the Common Market meant little to the average person, or so he thought. Today, this is changed. In an economic sense, a United States of Europe—call it the Common Market or whatever you wish—is rapidly becoming a reality.

France, Italy, Germany, Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg have in fact become a community of nations for purposes of trade. As a result, for the first time in its history, the United States is up against a kind of competition in the marketplace that is forcing the experts, the economists, and the politicians to make agonizing reappraisals.

If American business is going to compete in this new world of the Common Market, drastic changes on the domestic scene will have to take place. For example, following are some of the twisted situations in national policies and outright contradictions in law as described in a recent issue of Nation's Business:

"1. Present tax statutes limit industries' ability to modernize and compete here and abroad. New proposals to encourage modernization don't go far enough or take the wrong approach. Recommendations for taxing foreign subsidiaries' earnings would discourage trade and could force more spending for foreign aid.

"2. Farm laws subsidize inefficiency and promote overproduction while we urge European farmers to adopt freer market policies and fewer controls.

"3. Federal wage-fixing laws and political policies encourage higher wages and thus higher costs that restrict business from competing in foreign trade. Government-caused unemployment is increasing job losses.

"4. Rising Federal spending that commits as much revenue to welfare and nonmilitary programs as to needed defense makes tax reform difficult."

One of the symptoms of this country's in the international competitive struggle is the trouble we are having with our balance of payments. As defined by Sylvia Porter, financial analyst, "the balance of payments of the United States is simply the record of all our economic dealings with all the rest of the world over a specified period of time." By this measure in 1960, we were on the short end of the stick by some $3.9 billion. Our gold reserves dwindled to the lowest point in decades.

It takes no economist to recognize that one of the greatest dangers in the present situation is the threat to the stability of the dollar. There is no alternative to competing, and competing successfully, in world markets. For as a leading executive of a major American steel company observes, "Basically, confidence in the American dollar means confidence in Americans. * * * It is confidence that factories and buildings will be built, that men will have useful, not merely

time-consuming, jobs; that what is produced will be able to compete in the marketplace."

The United States is discovering that the dream of one world is not perfect, but we have got to learn to live with it.

Some Solid Facts on Imported Residual Fuel Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to look objectively at any question involving an imported product which competes directly and often destructively with an American product.

I am sure that my good friends from New England, who in the March 7 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD quoted liberally from the New England Council on the subject of imported residual oil, would want both the President and the Members of this body to look carefully at all aspects of the import quota controversy.

I am equally sure that they are familiar with the testimony given by the New England council—through its fuels committee chairman, Mr. James S. Couzens—before Subcommittee No. 4 of the House Select Committee on Small Business, the chairman of which is the Honorable TOM STEED, of Oklahoma.

I am not so sure that they are familiar with the detailed and persuasive testimony of the Honorable PAT JENNINGS, our able colleague from Virginia, who appeared before the Steed subcommittee to answer, point by point, the testimony previously given by Mr. Couzens.

Because it is a masterful refutation of many points raised on this issue by the New England Council and others who oppose these quotas, I believe it is in the public interest to insert the full text of Congressman JENNINGS' statement in the RECORD, and am so doing.

It is also noteworthy that Chairman STEED, at the conclusion of Congressman JENNINGS' statement, commented upon the great importance of the New England industrial complex, and further asserted:

> No one yet has been able to make any substantial showing that New England can hope to get this fuel from these foreign sources in time of emergency.

Congressman JENNINGS' testimony follows:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM PAT JENNINGS BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4 OF THE HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE TO CONDUCT STUDY AND INVESTIGATION OF THE PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS COMMENTING ON THE TESTIMONY OF MR. JAMES S. COUZENS, NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL

The testimony of Mr. James S. Couzens, of the New England Council, before this subcommittee on November 22, contains some rather surprising statements, which must be examined more closely if we are to have a clear understanding of the impact of residual oil controls.

Among them:

1. He states that residual oil appeared on the New England scene "to replace bituminous coal for space heating, process steam, and general use by industry" during the twenties and thirties.

Comment. Actually, the real growth in dependence on residual in New England, did not take place until cheap foreign oil began to come in in volume in the late 1940's. In 1946, for instance, New England used only 30 million barrels of residual, which provided 24.6 percent of her competitive energy requirements. This was only about 9 million barrels more than was used in 1935. However, between 1946 and 1960, total residual use increased to 71 million barrels, and in that year it provided 31.1 percent of her competitive energy. Coal, in the meantime, dropped from 54.7 percent of New England's energy source in 1946 to 17.7 percent in 1960. The big increase in that same period came in distillate oils, largely used for home and commercial space heating and which is not subject to the residual import control program. Indeed, a very small amount of distillates is imported at all. Distillates, as a proportion of the competitive fuel source for New England, increased from 20.8 percent in 1946 to 42.4 percent in 1960. In the same period gas increased from a negligible amount to 8.8 percent.

Note. In the same testimony Mr. Couzens refers to the great loss of the home-heating market by coal in New England, just as residual oil appeared on the scene. This would appear to suggest that the two are related. Although opponents of residual controls have frequently attempted to confuse the facts by implying that residual controls affect the home-heating market, the fact is that residual is not used for such purposes and its price has no effect whatever on the cost of home-heating oils. These are distillate oils, which are not imported except in negligible quantities.

2. Mr. Couzens says that the conversion from coal to residual oil "has now progressed to the point where the New England area is almost completely dependent upon residual oil. The economy could not survive without it."

This calls for two comments:

First, if Mr. Couzens' statement is correct, the threat of residual imports to national security has indeed become critical. As he further points out, current residual demands by New England can now be furnished only from foreign-oil sources. Virtually unlimited imports of cheaper foreign residual have steadily dried up domestic production by making it more and more unprofitable. Thus, by his own testimony, it is clear that a substantial portion of New England is now wholly dependent on a fuel source which would be closed in event of national emergency, or political upheaval in major supplying areas. Certainly all those in Government concerned with defense procurement and production planning must carefully note this crucial situation, and bear it in mind when allocating national defense contracts which would have to be completed under conditions which might see a serious disruption of the flow of foreign oil into that area.

Second, although his warning is ample proof of the grave danger the Nation faces in its need to maintain essential production under emergency conditions, it implies that coal and natural gas are no longer important fuels for any of New England's factories and establishments. Actually, of course, residual oil, despite its cheap dumped price, has only usurped the market along the coast. Inland, where residual is impossible or extremely difficult to deliver, New England is still largely dependent on a healthy coal industry for its industrial fuel. In the past, the difficulty of delivery of this heavy sludge-type oil has prevented its widespread use in inland areas. However, new types of specially heated and equipped trucks are now being used to haul it to markets formerly considered immune, and further damage to the coal and railroad industries serving New England is threatened.

3. The statement is made that the New England area "could never go back to coal, and must have increasing quantities of this product (residual) every year as its economy expands" (p. 3).

Comment. This statement is completely indefensible. New England could certainly return to coal as a major fuel source, and we are convinced that it eventually will have to do so. This switch could be made with little impact on fuel costs, and it would surely be to the advantage of New England in the long run since domestic coal is more likely to remain a dependable, low cost and stable fuel for New England in the future than is imported residual oil. Certainly, if domestic coal and oil sources are dried up because of imported residual competition, there would remain no check on residual prices and they could be expected to soar to previously unreached levels.

4. Mr. Couzens challenges the use of the term "dumped" to refer to imported residual and attempts to deny that it is "cheap" in price by contending that it is not cheap at the point of origin (p. 4).

Comment. The price in Venezuela has been maintained, and thus that nation has suffered no cut in its revenue per barrel on residual shipped to the United States, although the posted price there is considerably lower than the U.S. domestic residual price. However, the price for which foreign residual is sold within the United States has varied many times in recent years, practically always being determined by what price is necessary to capture the market, and this usually means, what price is necessary to undercut coal. In the opinion of the domestic fuels industries, who have seen their markets gradually whittled away by this predatory pricing practice, this method of disposing of a foreign product in American trade channels constitutes "dumping." The reference on p. 5 to the cost of shipping residual as against the cost of shipping coal is nothing but an obvious effort to confuse the issue. The only pertinent fact is the price at the point of consumption.

5. Reference is made to table I filed with Mr. Couzens' statement which reports the results of public bidding by 15 public agencies for residual oil in 1960. The conclusion is that there was an increase of 25 cents in posted tank car prices, which affected their prices, from 1959 to 1960, and that changes in the discounts allowed resulted in a weighted average cost increase to these 15 agencies of 48 cents per barrel between 1960 and 1961.

Comment. The statement compares prices between 1959 and 1960, but significantly fails to mention that 1959 was an extremely low price period, being considerably less than the more normal year of 1958, for example. According to the authoritative "Platt's Oil Price Handbook," the average of "lows and highs" for Boston tank car prices in the past 3 years have been:

1958	$2.7138
1959	2.5652
1960	2.6852

Thus, the average posted 1960 prices was 12 cents (rather than 25 cents) higher than 1959, but 3 cents less than 1958.

In all such discussions of prices, however, two basic facts must be kept in mind. First, only the cargo price of imported residual reflects import prices and only an increase at this level, which has not occurred, would be a true reflection of the impact of import controls; and, second, in any comparison of prices in recent years, it must be borne in

mind that prices in 1959, particularly in the late winter and early spring, were abnormally low as a result of the tremendous influx of imports which immediately preceded the adoption of import limitations.

We have no way of knowing the accuracy of the statement that discounts decreased an additional 23 cents, but if they did, there again we find opponents of the oil import program using a price change which is not attributable to the controls to the controls in an effort to discredit them. Changed discounts, delivery costs, profits and other factors making up sales prices used by importers and sellers after the oil has been delivered by tanker to this country have no relationship to the import restrictions. Also, note that this discussion again falls back on what seems to be an obvious attempt to confuse. It refers to a "posted price" increase of 25 cents between 1959 and 1960, then says that the additional changes in discounts result in a weighted average increase in cost of 48 cents between 1960 and 1961. It is not at all clear just what years are being used for comparison.

6. Mr. Couzens again falls back on a comparison of the cost of bunker C fuel oil for foreign ships' bunkering in U.S. ports with the so-called world price (which any oil expert will admit does not exist) in a further attempt to show that the controls have unduly increased U.S. prices (p. 6).

Comment. Previously, a large portion of foreign ships bunkering in U.S. ports came from nonbonded stocks, or what is now the quota controlled areas. Since the control program, however, this has largely shifted, and most international bunkering is being done from bonded stocks, in order to free the nonbonded to compete in the domestic U.S. market. Residual sold for ships bunkering must compete pricewise with residual prices in other ports of call, and prices for crude and other petroleum products. For example, crude prices in the U.S. average about $1 per barrel higher than they do in most foreign markets. Also, bunker C prices in different world ports vary widely, and obviously not because of U.S. import controls. Platt's Oilgram Price Service reported September 28 that recent average f.o.b. prices paid by Japanese buyers of bunker C ranged from $2.20 at Los Angeles and Singapore to $1.30 in the neutral zone,[1] $1.80 in Venezuela and $1.75 in the Persian Gulf. Thus, it is a fallacy to attempt to use the price differential for ships bunkering oil (with the bonded price for foreign ships established by competition between sellers in U.S. and in foreign ports) to prove any conclusions about U.S. prices for residual imported for use as fuel domestically.

7. The figures used to arrive at a purported increase in residual costs to four utilities (p. 7) are really confusing. The statement attempts to show that these utilities, which use about 10 million barrels of residual per year, have had to pay some $4 million more annually for this fuel, to the detriment of their electric customers to whom the added costs are passed on as rate increases, and this higher cost is blamed on controls on imports.

Comment. This is a razzle-dazzle juggling of figures which is, to say the least, misleading. First, Mr. Couzens says that OEP studies clearly show that between the first quarter of 1959, just prior to import controls, and the first quarter of 1961, the cargo price of residual had increased 16 cents per barrel to New England utilities (line 8, page 6). Next, he says that the price for residual "for resale" in New England increased 30 cents a barrel between July 1959 and March 1961 (from $1.97 to $2.27), and, finally, he discusses at length the comparative price for bonded and nonbonded bunker C fuel for ships' bunkering. Here, three different price differentials are quoted: 22½ cents a barrel on posted price basis, 30½ cents from "an investigation of price lists of oil companies," and 41 cents as reported by OEP. Then, by some strange reasoning, Mr. Couzens takes the last quoted figure (which, bear in mind, is for bunker C ship fuel) and applies it to the price of residual oil to four New England utilities, which he had already said were forced to pay 16 cents a barrel more in the first quarter of 1961 than in the same quarter of 1959. On this basis, he concludes that these four utilities paid $4 million more for 10 million barrels of oil. He even translates this reported 41 cents difference in domestic and foreign ships' bunkering oil prices to the total New England residual bill, and concludes that it "places the present penalty on New England for this program in the neighborhood of $28 million annually." Thus is added a new figure to the $10 million, $20 million, and $375 million that have previously been used to "prove" damages to New England from residual import controls. Indeed, there seems to be no end to the variety of figures that they use to prove import control damage. Just this week the United Press quoted my esteemed colleague, Representative THOMAS J. LANE, of Massachusetts, as wiring President Kennedy that present restrictions on residual imports cost New Englanders more than $217 million this year, another new addition to the figure-juggling game.

8. The statement is made that because of restrictions on one fuel, the price of competitive fuels "is bound to react," the inference being that the price of coal to New England has risen sharply. A general coal freight rate increase of 7 cents per ton in 1960 is even cited (last line, page 7 and top of page 8).

Comment. The 7-cent-per-ton increase relative to the price of fuel in New England is, of course, inconsequential, and added less than 1 percent to the cost of coal to New England users.

As a matter of fact, coal prices to New England consumers have been declining during the operation of the residual import control program. A study of fuel costs to utilities along the East Coast, taken from reports to the Federal Power Commission, shows that in every State except one the average price of utility coal declined between 1958 and 1960.

Examples:

State	Price per ton	
	1958	1960
Connecticut	$10.42	$9.71
Massachusetts	10.40	9.55
Rhode Island	11.95	10.18
New Jersey	9.56	9.37
New York	9.95	9.29
North Carolina	8.05	7.23
Florida	8.45	7.41

9. In another attempt to show that the control program has penalized consumers, Mr. Couzens declares that the General Services Administration in Washington "was unable to receive any bids for its fuel requirements for the coming heating season," and that "finally, after great pressure and pleading" they were able to purchase 500,000 barrels at $2.395. Citing a previous purchase of 600,000 barrels at an average cost of $2.16, Mr. Couzens concludes that GSA thus paid a "penalty" of 23 cents a barrel "only because of the import restriction program on residual oil."

Comment. GSA itself presents this picture in a slightly different light. Mr. William Dosse, Chief of the Buying Division of GSA's region 3 in Washington, said Monday (Nov. 27) that GSA had never faced any problem in obtaining the fuel it needed, but that the initial bids asking as high as $2.90 per barrel were considered well out of line and were rejected. On a new request for bids, Mr. Dosse reported, they were able to obtain the 500,000 barrels at a price less than $2.40 per barrel, which GSA considered reasonable, and the contract was signed. It should be noted that this is for oil delivered on a barge level basis, and not on a cargo level, which would be the only one to actually reflect any increase in import prices. The wide variation of domestic prices—which reflect distributor profits, transportation costs and other charges not connected with the price of the residual oil at oversea shipping points or to the cost of shipping—is indicated by the range of bids to GSA, and the fact that the agency was able to purchase its requirements at less than $2.40 per barrel after rejecting original bids of up to $2.90 per barrel.

10. An attempt is made to discount any interest domestic independent crude producers have in maintaining reasonable limits on residual imports. The following three statements, which were, of course, easily available to Mr. Couzens in that they have been previously published, completely contradict any such belief:

Mr. James F. West, president, Texas Independent Producers & Royalty Owners Association:

"Unlimited influx of residual could seriously impair the economics of the entire domestic oil industry and could completely destroy that industry segment which is currently engaged in production of crudes adaptable primarily for residual fuel users."

Mr. George V. Meyers, executive vice president, Standard Oil Co. of Indiana:

"We believe the continued control of residual imports is necessary in the interests of national security. * * * Unrestricted imports would have an adverse effect upon the domestic oil industry."

Mr. Minor S. Jameson, Jr., executive vice president, Independent Petroleum Association of America:

"Reasonable limitations on imports of residual fuel oil serve the interest of national security because unrestricted imports result in * * * reduced funds available for petroleum exploration and development in the United States."

These very clear and convincing comments on the importance of residual import limits to the domestic petroleum industry have been backed up in the strongest manner by a statement presented to this committee just this week by Mr. Alvin C. Hope, president of the Independent Petroleum Association of America. His testimony was subsequently endorsed by Mr. Jack M. Campbell, secretary of the liaison committee of Cooperating Oil & Gas Association, speaking for 17 separate domestic oil and gas associations.

11. Mr. Couzens states residual represents such a small part of the yield from domestic refineries that it is "a little ridiculous" to assign a major role to residual as affecting the price of crude oil.

Comment. Although domestic refineries have greatly reduced the amount of residual oil remaining in a barrel of crude, to about 11 percent on the average, it does not follow that the revenue they receive from that residual is not an important part of their profit situation, or that they would not produce a higher percentage if the market had not been usurped by low-priced foreign residual.

In fact, Representative WALTER ROGERS of Texas, in a speech before the recent session of Congress, stated that there are a great many wells in Texas and Louisiana producing low gravity crude which is suitable primarily for residual fuel and asphalt products.

In a speech on the House floor in August, Representative ROGERS said that a spot check

[1] One of the Middle East countries.

of more than 7,000 wells in Texas showed that approximately one-fourth of them were in this category.

Congressman ROGERS further stated: "Texas crude supplies a significant proportion of the Nation's residual supply, and in 1960 Texas refineries yielded a total of 58.6 million barrels of residual fuel. At the same time, under the liberal residual import restriction now in effect, the import of residual oil into our own district III jumped from 3 million barrels in 1959 to more than 14 million barrels in 1960."

From the producer standpoint, every barrel of imported residual oil displaces a barrel of domestic crude from which it otherwise would have been made, or an equivalent amount of natural gas or coal.

If residual quotas were removed, it could only serve to further reduce the amount of domestic crude produced each year.

12. Mr. Couzens' testimony seems somewhat naive when he says that "the only serious and justifiable complaint the domestic producers have in connection with residual imports is that some of this oil might be used as a refinery stock," and then suggests that the remedy for this is to remove all residual controls.

Comment. If residual legally imported to be used only as fuel is now finding its way into refinery feed stocks, it is difficult indeed to see how taking off all controls and letting in as many million barrels of residual as importers want, with no system of controls whatever, would serve to halt such a practice. Actually, of course, this is the serious area in which complete removal of residual controls would jeopardize the crude control program. Mr. Elmer Bennett, who was Under Secretary of the Interior during the unsuccessful voluntary crude control program which preceded mandatory controls, and during the first 22 months of the present mandatory crude and residual programs, has recently disclosed the difficulties of preventing evasions of the intent of the voluntary crude import program through the use of residual and unfinished oils as refinery stocks.

In a letter responding to a question from Mr. Joseph E. Moody, president of the National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., Mr. Bennett suggested that only a large scale Federal police force inquiring into the day-to-day details of oil refineries and administration could prevent serious diversion of residual to refinery feed stocks if all import controls on the latter were removed. This, of course, would quickly wreck the crude import control program, and would just about wreck the domestic crude producing industry.

"No one doubts that nearly all the members of the oil industry would comply with the letter and the spirit of the program even if important derivatives were exempted, Mr. Bennett declared. "Nevertheless, only one 'bad apple' could taint the entire industry, and vigorous policing would be necessary to avoid such an unfortunate occurrence. I assume that an exemption for residual fuel oil would not apply to such oil imported for refining purposes. Yet who is to see to it that exempted fuel oil is not further processed through domestic refineries? I was advised that there is available evidence that partially refined crudes and reconstituted crudes composed of residuals enriched with lighter ends were imported as exempted materials, such as residual fuel oils, during the period of voluntary controls. The competitive cost advantage of imported oils is so large that one must assume there will be a few who will seek to avoid controls over imported crudes. In fairness to those who comply with the program, I do not see how elaborate policing can be avoided if any major derivative such as residual fuel oil is exempted from import limitations.

"It therefore follows that, in my personal opinion, the success of the oil import control program would be jeopardized if residual fuel oil were exempted therefrom. I further believe that if the program is to be conscientiously administered, any such revision in the program would require substantial policing not now necessary."

13. Mr. Couzens again brings up and discusses at some length the contention of the New England Council that imported residual oil has not harmed the domestic coal industry, and that all the unemployment in the coal fields today is principally due to mechanization of the mines and not to residual imports. In trying to prove this case, he also asserts that residual could have had little effect on coal mine employment since "there has been practically no increase in the use of residual in the last 10 years" (pp. 10–11).

Comment. The total volume of residual used in the United States has changed but little in the past 10 years, but the volume of residual used in region I (the east coast, which is the only area appreciably affected by residual imports) had increased from 208 million barrels in 1948 to 332 million barrels in 1960. Thus, total consumption in this region increased by 124 million barrels during that 12-year period, although consumption in the rest of the country was declining by an almost equal amount. Meantime imports into the east coast were increasing by 160 million barrels a year. It happens that the east coast is the area in which imported residual is so seriously damaging coal, and the above figures on increases during the past 12 years speak for themselves.

As for Mr. Couzens' renewed attempt to blame coal's unemployment problems on mechanization, that has been most effectively answered by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH in recent days. In a letter to the editor of the Saturday Evening Post answering an editorial which showed a surprising lack of knowledge and contained a surprising amount of misinformation on the import control program, Senator RANDOLPH did a masterful job of outlining just how residual imports have contributed materially to coal industry unemployment. The Senator sent a copy of this communication to President Kennedy, incidentally, and in his covering letter urged that no action be taken to eliminate or materially change the quota system as it related to crude and/or residual oil "before competent committees of the Congress have completed studies of these matters now underway."

At this point I would like to quote the following pertinent section on coal mine unemployment from Senator RANDOLPH'S letter to the magazine editor:

"To state or write that unemployment in the coal industry is wholly attributable to automation and does not result at least in part from residual oil import competition and other considerations reflects a failure to take into account all the facts inherent in the problem of unemployment in the coal-producing regions.

"Certainly mechanization of the mines has resulted in the need for fewer workers to produce coal than before mechanical equipment was installed. But it has likewise been a reason why the coal industry has been able to hold its mine site prices relatively firm for the past 10 years and thus remain reasonably competitive.

"But greater productivity would have been balanced by more market demands for coal and total employment would not have been severely affected by mine mechanization had it not been for two principal developments.

"The first stemmed from technological progress which made inevitable the shift from coal to other fuels by railroads, once coal's leading customer, and for space heating in homes, apartments, and institutions. These changes cost the coal industry millions of tons of production and sales and reduced coal mine employment by thousands of jobs. But they would have been offset in large degree if the industry had been able to realize expected new markets from the investment of billions of dollars in modern mechanical equipment to make possible lower production costs per ton of coal. Why did the new markets not materialize? The answer is that there occurred a dumping of competing fuels at cutrate prices in coal's two remaining large and growing markets, namely, the electric utility and general industrial markets.

"One of these competing fuels is natural gas when sold under interruptible contracts for large boiler use at prices usually set just low enough to undercut the delivered price of coal. The other is imported residual oil, similarly dump priced, and thus enabled to capture millions of tons of coal equivalent markets on the east coast and in New England which coal would otherwise supply," Senator RANDOLPH'S letter continued.

"It is an unchallenged fact that every ton of coal replaced would have been produced by an American miner, whatever the rate of productivity at which he worked. To write, as did the editor of the Saturday Evening Post, that 'as is fairly plain to most people, the thing which has cost jobs to miners is automation,' is to avoid other truths and is to indulge in exaggeration and oversimplification.

"Notwithstanding the employment figures quoted in your editorial, the U.S. Bureau of Mines estimates that the total number of men employed in the bituminous coal and lignite mining industry declined from 228,635 in 1957 (when productivity averaged 10.59 tons per man-shift) to 169,400 in 1960 (when productivity increased to 13.25 tons). During this same period, total imports into the United States of foreign residual oil increased from 173 million barrels to 234 million barrels annually, according to Bureau of Mines statistics. I have been unable to find comparable Government reports on the growth of dumped natural gas sales under interruptible contracts. A special study, however, by the American Gas Association of 17 pipeline companies and their customers showed that by 1959 slightly more than 50 percent of all their industrial sales were on an interruptible contract basis."

(The AGA said that such sales totaled 2,645,917 million cubic feet, and this is equal, in total heating value, to approximately 100 million tons of coal.)

"The figures relating to coal mining deal only with direct employment in the mines. They do not include the thousands of men who are employed as a result of the mechanization of mines, namely, the men who must service the equipment above and below ground; those employed by the machinery manufacturers (and here it is interesting to note that the largest payroll in the New England State of New Hampshire is that of a company manufacturing coal mining equipment); the men who mine the iron ore and those who process it into steel; and those in many other industries which supply or depend upon coal.

"Thus, it is not alone a question of employment in West Virginia and other coal mining States; rather, the problem involves a question of employment in virtually all States.

"It seems incredible to me, therefore, that anyone would seek to deny the fact that predatory pricing on the part of (1) the pipeline distributors of natural gas and (2) importers of foreign residual oil has destroyed thousands of jobs in the coal industry. It is unfortunate, unfair, and untrue to charge that all coal mining employment losses have been due to coal mine mechanization alone.

"Consider these facts, too: One ton of coal is equal in heating value, on the average, to 4,162 barrels of residual oil. Thus,

the 234 million barrels of residual oil imported in 1960 were equivalent to 56 million tons of coal, which at the present production level of 13.25 tons per man day, equals the displacement of 4.2 million man-days of labor in the mines.

"It is not understandable how any editor, mathematician, statistician, propagandist, oil importer or anyone else can arrive at any conclusion other than that there is a major foreign intrusion into the fuel markets of the United States, a major part of which could be filled by American coal," Senator RANDOLPH declared.

14. Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to conclude these comments on the testimony of the New England Council with a look at a somewhat startling observation Mr. Couzens makes on page 12. In it, he predicts that the eventual increased coal requirements by electric utilities in other portions of the United States will (and I quote his filed testimony) "will more than offset a complete loss of their entire market on the Eastern seaboard."

Mr. Chairman, I think the real objectives of the New England Council are now quite plain for all to see. They are not just seeking a free access to residual oil; they are actually looking to a "complete loss" of the entire coal market on the eastern seaboard. I find it incredible that the New England Council can honestly believe this catastrophe would work for the best interests of New England. Certainly, with coal eliminated as a competitive fuel and as a price balance to the cost of oil, there would be nothing whatsoever to stabilize fuel prices to New England's consumers, large and small. Not only would New England be completely dependent on foreign oil (which, you will recall, Mr. Couzens testified she is already), but also she would be completely at the mercy of the oil importers for supplies and prices.

Under such conditions, if the international oil companies decided to raise the price of imported residual oil sold in New England to $3 a barrel, $4 a barrel or even more, there would be absolutely nothing New England's fuel consumers could do but pay it or shut down their plants and heating equipment.

Mr. Chairman, the complete loss of the east coast market by the U.S. coal industry could be of benefit to no one except the few big oil importers to whom it would give a stranglehold on the fuel market and on the economy.

If Mr. Couzens really intends to suggest what his statement implies, that coal should be willing to give up its entire east coast market, it raises a real question of for whom does the New England Council speak.

Go—A Tribute in Verse to Col. John H. Glenn, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a copy of my local paper, the Cambridge Chronicle-Sun, March 8 edition. In place of its regular leading editorial appears a tribute in verse to Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., recently honored by the Congress for his history-making trip into outer space. The lines written by one of my neighbors and friends, William H. McMasters, of 448 Broadway, Cambridge 38, Mass., appeal to me and I deem them worthy of a place in our RECORD:

Go

(Lines inspired by John H. Glenn, Jr., of the U.S. Marines)

Into infinity's limitless space;
Into eternity's challenging race;
Into the orbit of gravital flight;
Days within days, night crowding on night:
Into a vacuum rimmed with danger,
This smiling, modest, astronaut ranger
Blasted away on his perilous route,
Cased in a helmeted, queer padded suit,
His lungs inflated with synthetic breath,
His keen mind conditioned to instant death.
But on, on he flew for he must not fail,
He had to return and recount the tale
And validate to the world the story
And face the unwanted, unsought glory.
All, all alone, captain, first mate, and crew;
What a grand lesson to me and to you.
A man who knew neither failure nor fear,
Who loved his country above his career;
Who tackled the job he set out to do
And trusted his God to carry him through.

WILLIAM H. MCMASTERS.

Soviet Religious Persecution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, when I visited the Soviet Union, in 1955, I knew that there was really no freedom of worship. There were few churches in being and the synagogues that I saw were in a state of disrepair.

In today's New York Times there is further evidence that the Soviet dictator will not even allow the manufacture or sale of the traditional Matzoth for the Passover. This is a real tragedy and shows up the Russian system for what it really is.

The article follows:

SOVIET CURBS SALE OF MATZOTH FOR JEWISH PASSOVER FESTIVAL—GOVERNMENT BAKERIES WILL NOT MAKE UNRAISED BREAD THIS YEAR—ORTHODOX EASTER CAKE ALSO MAY BE BANNED

(By Theodore Shabad)

Moscow, March 19.—The chief rabbi of Moscow was reported today to have told his congregation that no matzoth would be available from the state-operated bakeries this year.

The rabbi, Yehuda-Leib Levin, made the announcement last Saturday in the city's central synagogue, according to Jewish sources.

He was reported to have told the congregation that in view of the Government ban on the Jews' traditional unleavened bread, they would not be held to strict observance of dietary rules during the Passover festival, which starts April 18.

The Passover is celebrated by Jews in commemoration of the exodus from Egypt. The celebration involves a family feast on the first evening and abstention from leaven during the 7 days of the festival. The eating of unraised bread during this period is believed to reflect the haste with which the Jews left Egypt.

In the absence of official comment tonight, it could not be determined whether the ban on matzoth baking was directed specifically against the Jewish religion or whether it was part of the general antireligious campaign of the Soviet regime.

There have been reports that the traditional Russian Orthodox Easter cake, known as kulich, will not be available in state-operated bakeries this year. The sale of this cake in bakeries last year was criticized by Soviet newspapers, which charged that a religious item was being sold under the name of "spring cake."

In past years matzoth was available at some Moscow bakeries during the Passover season. Jews also baked matzoth privately for sale, but this practice was prohibited as a form of private enterprise.

About a fourth of the Soviet Union's 2,500,000 Jews live in Moscow. Only a small percentage of elderly people are believed to follow Jewish religious traditions, including the dietary laws. The majority of the Jews in the Soviet capital, according to one Jewish source, would not be aware of the presence or absence of matzoth.

The source commented that, in addition to the specific problem of matzoth, there were no public eating places in Moscow that provided kosher food which is ritually prepared according to Jewish law.

Visiting foreign Jews who adhere to such food laws have found that Intourist, the official Soviet tourist agency, does not arrange for restaurants to prepare kosher food.

Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news release by the Bipartisan Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education, which was formed to add its assistance toward passage of the legislation which I introduced on February 12, 1962. It is with considerable pride that I note the many distinguished people who are members of this committee:

CITIZENS BEGIN DRIVE FOR NEW BIPARTISAN SCHOOL BILL

WASHINGTON, D.C., March 20.—A committee of nationally known citizens has been formed to press for congressional approval this session of bipartisan legislation to help accelerate improvement of public elementary and secondary education.

Establishment of the Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education was announced today by committee chairman George J. Hect, who is publisher of Parents magazine.

"We are encouraged that Democrats and Republicans in the Congress who favor Federal assistance to education are now in a mood to emphasize their areas of agreement rather than differences. One practical result of this new approach is the public education bill (H.R. 10180), developed on a bipartisan basis, and now under consideration by the General Education Subcommit-

tee. The Citizens Committee is hopeful that a bill of this type will be sponsored shortly by many Democrats and Republicans, with broad bipartisan support in Congress when it is called up for debate and action. The Citizens Committee will work for such bipartisan sponsorship and support since in this lies its chief chance of success."

According to Mr. Hecht, the Citizens Committee will work toward passage of legislation along the lines of H.R. 10180 whch would send Federal funds to the States without Federal strings attached, allowing the State and local education agencies to apply the money for what they decide are their most critical areas of educational need. About $488 million would go to the States each year for 3 years, with proportionately larger grants for the poorer States. The bill also authorizes an additional $50 million on a project basis to cities to improve critical urban educational conditions such as those described as "social dynamite" by Dr. James B. Conant in his latest book.

"There have been honest fears about Federal control of education in earlier education proposals," Mr. Hecht said. "However, this new bill should completely allay these fears because it is based on complete respect for the policies of the States as expressed in their constitutions, laws and public policies in education."

The citizens committee plans a nationwide campaign of information and assistance for all individuals and organizations, in and out of government, who are working toward the same objectives. "We want every major civic and educational organization in the country which concerns itself with the improvement of public education to know about the efforts of those Members of Congress who support such a public education bill," explained Mr. Hecht. "We also want them to understand the new approach to Federal aid, and how it would help speed up improvement of their elementary and secondary schools with complete State and local control."

Representative CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, Democrat, of West Virginia, chairman of the General Education Subcommittee, which has responsibility for initiating general school legislation in the House of Representatives, introduced a bill supported by the Citizens Committee.

"Both political parties are solemnly pledged to a program of Federal aid to public elementary and secondary education," Congressman BAILEY said. "President Kennedy, like President Eisenhower before him, sent several special messages to Congress pleading for action on education. Unfortunately, there have always been differing views on the method by which Federal responsibility may best be discharged. We are now in the favorable position of having a bill before our subcommittee which has been developed on a bipartisan basis and offers a new approach and a fresh start. Moreover, the bill keeps control of public education where it belongs—with the States and local authorities. It is reassuring to all of us in Congress that such a distinguished and influential committee of citizens has alined itself with our efforts."

Representative PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR., Republican, of New Jersey, ranking Republican member of the General Education Subcommittee, said: "It is encouraging to have a bipartisan citizens committee add its prestige and strength to our efforts to develop a sound education bill on a bipartisan basis. I have welcomed the recent trend to consider suggestions of Republicans as well as Democrats in working for sound legislation to assist the States. I believe that no major legislation in the field of education can be adequately considered without bipartisan interest, and such legislation cannot be enacted without bipartisan support. The newly formed citizens committee can help in developing such interest and support, both in and out of Congress."

MEMBERS OF THE CITIZENS COMMITTEE (MEMBERS SERVE AS INDIVIDUALS—TITLES ARE FOR IDENTIFICATION)

Chairman: George J. Hecht, publisher, Parents magazine and chairman American Parents Committee, Inc.

William Benton, chairman of the board, Encyclopedia Britannica, former U.S. Senator from Connecticut.

Barry Bingham, editor and publisher, Courier-Journal and Louisville Times.

James B. Conant, president emeritus, Harvard University.

Gardner Cowles, editor and president, Look magazine.

Walt Disney, chairman of the board, Walt Disney Productions.

Arthur S. Flemming, president, University of Oregon, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Marion B. Folsom, director, Eastman Kodak Co., former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Edgar Fuller, executive secretary, Council of Chief State School Officers.

Nelson C. Jackson, associate executive director, National Urban League.

Eric Johnston, president, Motion Picture Association of America, former president, Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

William C. Menninger, M.D., president, the Menninger Foundation.

Austin J. McCaffrey, executive director, American Textbook Publishers Institute, former State commissioner of education, New Hampshire.

Earl J. McGrath, executive officer, institute of Higher Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, former U.S. Commissioner of Education.

M.D. Mobley, executive secretary American Vocational Association.

James S. Peters, board chairman, Bank of Manchester, Ga., and chairman, Georgia State Board of Education.

Walter Reuther, president, International union, United Auto Workers.

Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, public and industrial relations counsel, former Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Theodore C. Sargent, Sylvania Electric products, past president, Massachusetts Association of School Committees.

Harry Scherman, chairman, Book-of-the-Month Club and trustee, Committee on Economic Development.

Howard K. Smith, news analyst, American Broadcasting Co.

Jesse G. Stratton, farmer, member Clinton, Okla., School Board, past president, National School Boards Association.

The committee is represented in Washington by its executive vice chairman, Bernard Locker, 4107 Davenport Street NW., Washington 16, D.C.

Quotas Worse Than Tariffs: A Report From Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the subject of foreign trade is one which is presently in the public eye. President Kennedy has made a recommendation for further powers in this field and hearings on this proposal are now in progress. Earlier, the Foreign Economic Policy Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee held hearings in the general area of trade policy.

During the joint committee hearings, and in the minority report which was prepared by Senator PRESCOTT BUSH, of Connecticut, in which I joined, the Republican side kept pointing to the narrow outlook of the administration in working only in the field of tariffs and ignoring the more restrictive trade barriers, such as quotas, licensing, cartels, and the like. This viewpoint was largely ignored by the press. In the present Ways and Means Committee hearings on the administration bill in the trade field, again the minority has worked to bring attention to these other trade features which we believe are more burdensome to international trade than are tariffs. To some of the press this is needling or carping and not constructive efforts to explore the issues of trade policy.

In the light of this reaction by the press, I was especially happy to see an article from Paris by Mr. Edwin L. Dale, Jr., in the March 14 New York Times. In Western Europe Mr. Dale found the same things being said which the Republicans working with this measure have long been stressing but, fortunately, as foreign news it appears to be news that is fit to print. I am placing Mr. Dale's article in the RECORD to help point out the area in which some real thought needs be given:

EUROPE REVISING VIEW ON TARIFFS—QUOTAS NOW SEEN AS MORE BARRIER TO TRADE FLOW

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

PARIS, March 14.—The view that tariffs have a less important effect on trade than product quotas is gaining ground in Western Europe.

In this theory, the level of tariffs can be of great importance for some individual concerns and industries, but is relatively insignificant for the total flow of trade among nations.

The most dramatic evidence of this general proposition was supplied yesterday by Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg. He said that adoption of the Kennedy program—involving the most sweeping reduction of tariffs in this century—would cost only 90,000 jobs in some 800 companies over the next 5 years.

This amounts to less than two-tenths of 1 percent of the total jobs in the United States. It is about the same as the number of jobs that are lost and found in an ordinary week throughout the U.S. economy. The number of companies affected is less than two one-hundredths of 1 percent of all the businesses in the United States.

IMPORT RISE DOUBTED

"Mr. Goldberg is undoubtedly right," one trade expert here commented today. "What it means, of course, is that your proposed big tariff reduction will not produce any large increase in imports.

"By the same token, neither will a reduction in our European tariffs have any important effect on your exports. In the modern world the importance of tariffs is much more political and psychological than economic."

This general conclusion is borne out by the experience of the last decade in both the United States and Europe.

In the United States, despite thousands of tariff reductions under the reciprocal trade law, the total of imports has remained re-

markably constant at about 3 percent of the gross national product. The import total has risen and fallen with the state of business rather than the level of ttriffs.

In Europe the great lesson of the last decade is that the key to greater trade is removal of quantitative restrictions rather than changes in tariffs. Trade among the Western European nations—already natural trading partners—doubled between 1950 and 1956 without the reduction of a single tariff, all because of the dismantlement of quotas. This was by far the biggest increase in trade in the world. There has been another 50 percent increase since then.

QUOTAS ARE REMOVED

It has been argued that even the great increase in trade among the members of the European Common Market since tariff cutting began 3 years ago is only a continuation of what was already in progress. It has also been spurred by the big increase in imports into France and Italy made possible by the removal of quotas in those two countries—the last two important European countries to maintain them.

For example, imports of automobiles into France tripled last year and imports of refrigerators quadrupled, both without any important change of tariffs. The reason was that imports were possible for the first time.

Those who are increasingly playing down the importance of tariffs in the flow of trade are, on the whole, freetraders. That is, they favor mutual reduction of tariffs wherever possible. They frequently also accept the political importance of a tariff cutting bargain between the two sides of the Atlantic community.

But in strictly economic terms, the evidence in Europe in the postwar period is that tariffs are no longer the main determinant of the flow of trade. A dozen other factors—comparative costs, the general state of demand, delivery dates, new products and designs, shipping rates, internal taxes, state monopolies, import controls, subsidies, credit terms—are considered far more important.

Socialized Medicine in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, the socialistic viewpoint of Wilbur J. Cohen, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, on medical care for the aged, is revealed in an article by Allan K. Briney, M.D., a constituent of mine, which appeared in the January 18, 1962, issue of the Bulletin. This is a publication of the Los Angeles County Medical Association. Mr. Cohen was the main consultant in the formulation of the King-Anderson medicare bill (H.R. 4222) now pending in Congress. I deem it most appropriate that Dr. Briney's article be brought to the attention of Members of Congress. Under unanimous consent, I place the article in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

WILBUR J. COHEN—WOULD-BE CZAR OF AMERICAN MEDICINE?

(By Allen K. Briney, M.D.)

At the White House Conference on Domestic Affairs held in Los Angeles, November 20, 1961, your new vice president, his wife, Evelyn, Robert McVann, M.D., Elise Buehler, M.D., and Mrs. Myron Mucahy (whose husband is an M.D.) were, by coincidence, seated with Wilbur J. Cohen, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. In short order our conversation took on characteristics of a debate or argument revolving around free enterprise versus Government planning and the general welfare clause of the U.S. Constitution. The repartee became so heated at times that Mr. Cohen professed interest in other areas of the room, turning his back to us to avoid discussion unfavorable to his socialistic viewpoint. Although we had no opportunity to document the verbatim discussion by tape recorder, we felt our combined recollections might be of some interest.

Mr. Cohen was pleased when we acknowledged him as the author of, or main consultant, in formulation of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, and the Forand bill, the Kerr-Mills Act, and the King-Anderson (Cohen) bill (H.R. 4222). He indicated that he had also served as consultant on England's National Health Service Act and with the Canadian Government on its health care plans, particularly in Saskatchewan. Mr. Cohen had just returned from a trip to England and said that the system of nationalized medical care there was certainly superior to ours, meeting the needs of the British people with the willing cooperation of the British medical profession. Mr. Cohen contrasted this report to his belief that American doctors are more interested in income than in their patients. He said American doctors make far too much money and should not mind sharing their wealth with the rest of the people, considering that the Government paid a part of the costs of their education by financial aid to schools and colleges, and particularly since free medical care is a right of the people. To the query as to the income level to which a physician should be restricted, Mr. Cohen praised the progressive income tax as a good control and said it should be increased further in the higher levels. Mr. Cohen's attitude was that the Government has the right, if not the duty, to take from those earning more to give to the needs of those earning less, or: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs," the basic tenet of Marxism-Leninism.

Mr. Cohen ridiculed the Kerr-Mills Act (even though he admitted writing it) stating it could not and would not work and was degrading because of the "means" (needs) test. He was emphatic in his support of the King-Anderson (Cohen) bill, tying medical care for the aged to the "insurance" mechanism of social security. Cohen stated this was not socialized medicine at all and would not interfere in the private practice of medicine in any way. This, in spite of our enumeration of the very numerous Government controls written into the bill and, particularly, the inclusion of four specialities of medicine. Also the fact that Secretary Ribicoff is on record as stating that if participating hospitals did not conform, the Government would shut off their funds.

On mention of the very poor record of hospital construction in England after passage of the National Health Act, Mr. Cohen pointed out that while few acute hospital beds have been built, some cottage-type convalescent facilities had been put up since its enactment and that this did not reflect unfavorably upon Government planning as "there had been many difficulties."

The use of Hill-Burton Federal funds for hospital construction in the United States was credited by Mr. Cohen for most of our hospital construction since the war. He failed to recognize that these hospital projects were initiated at local levels by private individuals and groups raising funds from private enterprise which were then matched by Federal and, in some instances, State funds, with most of the control remaining local. Cohen denied that the soaring costs of the British program, compared to original estimates, were due to administrative overhead, abuse by recipients, poor Government planning, or waste. He deprecated the exodus of British physicians to other countries by emphasizing the increasing numbers of doctors coming to England from abroad.

The possible future shortage of physicians in the United States was discussed, particularly with reference to the decreasing number of applicants to medical schools as compared with previous decades. It was our feeling that the fear of socialized medicine and the higher returns and tax advantages in other forms of endeavor were large contributing factors. Mr. Cohen's solution to the problem would be the admission of more women, and greater numbers of what he termed "racially underprivileged," such as Negroes, to medical schools. The former is a source of manpower sadly neglected in this country and one which the Russians have used to great advantage, he said. Mr. Cohen was unwilling to accept Dr. Elise Buehler's facts and personal comments showing that in our American culture women physicians choose to practice for a shorter period of years, shorter hours, and limit their interest to only a few specialties. They are generally more interested in marrying and raising families than in practicing medicine after graduation. Dr. Buehler felt it was no great problem for a qualified woman to get into medical school, but that the returns to the public for such extended and expensive period of training were not as great as if a man had been trained. Mr. Cohen's solution for the prohibitive costs of medical training was, of course, Federal scholarships.

Toward the end of our luncheon, Mr. Cohen became rather bitter, tried to change the subject, and made some snide remarks as to the large number of physicians present, asking if we were given "orders" to attend the conference by the AMA. Mr. Cohen said that when he had worked for the now Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, that Rockefeller had told him that he was "much too conservative," yet many doctors had called him a Socialist. Mr. Cohen said doctors should consider it a privilege to pay high taxes and that it was their religious duty to provide for those less fortunate. When I indicated the obvious inequities of the 16th amendment with its confiscatory aspects in the higher brackets, Mr. Cohen classified me as an "anarchist." When I emphatically stated my belief in capitalism, the market economy, constitutionalism, and individualism, Mr. Cohen argued that I was 200 years behind the times and should move to Canada or Australia if I didn't like the way things were going in the United States. I pointed out that our country was founded because of oppression by tyrants in Europe against the religious beliefs of individuals and against the desire of individuals for freedom from government interference. I emphasized that our Revolution was fought to defend the private property rights of individuals as contrasted with the socialism, feudalism, and nepotism from which our forefathers had fled. I pointed out that everyone in our country had a right to his own opinions, that free speech still existed and that many of the points made by Mr. Cohen in our conversation were espoused by Karl Marx in the "Communist Manifesto."

Later in the afternoon at the meeting chaired by Mr. Cohen on social security amendments and retirement, the Assistant Secretary vociferously defended the social security system and the proposed King-Anderson (Cohen) bill against the challenge as to their actuarial soundness. He said that the social security system was backed by the power of the Government to continue to raise the necessary income to finance the program and that it could count on continued and permanent participation and con-

tinued receipt of funds. He ridiculed questions concerning the "paper" trust fund, the unfunded $200–$300 billion Social Security debt, the fact that Social Security is not insurance but "hope as you pay," providing Government benefits only as long as the working taxpayers are willing to foot the bill. Cohen stated that the AMA refused to print his reply, "The Din of the Equitable" to the "lies and distortions" of the article, "The Coming Din of Inequity," by Ray M. Peterson, vice president and associate actuary of the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States which was published in JAMA, April 8, 1961. The Wall Street Journal published Cohen's article on July 26, 1961, in which Cohen stated Mr. Peterson and the AMA were engaged in an effort to discredit the old-age survivor and disability insurance program and to shake the people's confidence in it.

It seems that it is still open season for the governmentalists to abuse the AMA for any opposition to their generally collectivist views. I doubt that our discussion changed any of Mr. Cohen's ideas, nor were we taken in by his. However, a woman seated next to us at the luncheon, who was neither a doctor nor a doctor's wife, volunteered that while she had no ax to grind, she felt that it was just wonderful that the people from Washington could get to hear views so different from theirs, that such outspokenness had made our country great, that she didn't think it was right for Government officials to label views different from theirs as extremist or anarchist.

It would seem logical to examine in detail the background of Mr. Wilbur J. Cohen, the man with the modern Robin Hood complex. Are his actual motives the furtherance of socialism in the United States, particularly in the social insurance and medical fields? I will try to answer these questions in an article to follow.

An Editor's Concern About Khrushchev Article

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, there recently appeared in This Week magazine an article "My Father-in-Law—Nikita Khrushchev," written by Aleksei Adzhubei, editor in chief of the official Soviet press outlet, Izvestia.

My friend and constituent, Mr. Dick Humphrey, who is associate editor of Progressive Farmer magazine, felt that publication of this article carried with it certain dangers that might not be readily recognized by our fellow Americans. Mr. Humphrey has written a very cogent letter to the editor of This Week magazine and I commend to the attention of my colleagues this letter, dated March 20, 1962, which I insert in the RECORD herewith.

The letter follows:

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.,
March 12, 1962.

Mr. WILLIAM I. NICHOLS,
Editor and Publisher, This Week Magazine, United Newspaper Magazine Corp., New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. NICHOLS: Publication of the article entitled "My Father-in-Law—Nikita Khrushchev" by Aleksei Adzhubei hurt the cause of freedom.

This article, which appeared in the March 4 issue of This Week magazine, was carefully planned by Mr. Adzhubei to mislead the American people. It attempts to whitewash the Soviet Premier and create for him a "new image." Mr. Adzhubei's article came close to making Mr. Khrushchev an angel instead of presenting this chief of communism for what he really is—a murderer, liar, bully, and thief who has clawed his way to the top of the Communist heap over the blood of others.

Unwittingly, this very fine magazine for which I have the highest respect and read regularly, helped the Communist conspiracy tremendously in carrying out the first phase of a three-stage formula that has proven extremely effective for the Communist cause during the last 40 years.

A billion human beings have been subjugated to the godless domination of communism by this deceptive method. Steps in this three-stage formula for communizing the world are briefly: 1, Use a sympathetic approach to soften a people's will to resist; 2, after this deceptive, double-dealing, sympathetic approach (which pretends to have one set of feelings while acting under the sinister influence of another), enables the Communists to gain the upper hand, oppressive restrictions are imposed; and 3, once Reds are in power, enslavement, brutality, and death await those who oppose them.

Mr. Adzhubei—obviously skilled in Communist propaganda techniques, or he would not hold top job as editor of Izvestia—is no doubt laughing up his sleeve and being hailed by his fellow conspirators for his success in getting his misleading story in a U.S. magazine with the circulation that This Week magazine has throughout our Nation.

This brazen attempt by Mr. Adzhubei to picture "a wolf in sheep's clothing" could conceivably cause responsible people to become unwitting instruments of appeasement at a time when a strong stand needs to be taken on the vital issues of Communist aggression.

Mr. Adzhubei's article creates doubt in the minds of people: "Maybe Khrushchev and communism aren't so bad after all. Why get excited about the Communist menace? Certainly a jolly family man, such as the one pictured by Mr. Adzhubei, cannot be a threat to our way of life," people may reason when bombarded by such cleverly designed propaganda.

Slanted articles, such as this one written by a dedicated Communist, should not be published. Their motive is to confuse and wear down the resistance of a people. Such articles are a threat because they provide a negative answer to the question many Americans are now asking, "What can I do to fight communism?"

Since our people need and want answers to the above question, we should shift the power of the press from sugar coating "what is wrong" to being positive "for what is right." Let's inform the American people about the dark, sinister deeds and actions of men such as Nikita Khrushchev who would destroy our freedom and our faith in God.

Neither can we let Mr. Adzhubei's statement that Khrushchev is "the salt of the earth" go unchallenged. Here again is another brazen attempt by son-in-law Adzhubei to picture Nikita Khrushchev as a good, all-compassionate man. Falsely he compares Khrushchev to the Christian of whom Christ said, "* * * is the salt of the earth."

Contrary to Christianity, communism seeks to degrade and debase all human and spiritual values. Communist leaders like Nikita Khrushchev are committed to world domination through a godless dictatorship under which the individual has no rights. "If anyone thinks our smiles mean the abandonment of the teachings of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, he is deceiving himself cruelly. Those who expect this to happen might just as well wait for a shrimp to learn how to whistle," boasts Nikita Khrushchev—today's world's No. 1 public enemy.

Communism and its first apostle in the Kremlin are diametrically opposed to Christian love and the 10 rules that God gave Moses when he led his people to freedom from an Egyptian tyrant some 3,200 years ago.

When given the second degree under the glaring lights of God's basic laws by which man must live if he is to enjoy a peaceful society, Nikita Khrushchev stands stripped of his righteous cloak thrown over him by son-in-law Adzhubei.

Instead of worshipping one God, atheist Khrushchev says there is no God. Instead of loving his neighbor, Mr. Khrushchev ordered the Soviet Army to slaughter Hungarian freedom fighters. Instead of being truthful, Nikita stood amidst the ruins of a shattered Paris summit meeting and declared his hands were pure and clean, that the Soviet Union was not in the spy business. Instead of obeying the commandment not to take Gods name in vain, Mr. "K" during his trip to America sacrilegiously boasted that "God was on his side too." Instead of honoring the commandment not to kill, Mr. Khrushchev helped Stalin carry out the bloody Ukrainian purges. One magazine article reported that Khrushchev personally killed the dreaded Soviet Secret Police Chief Beria so that he could reach his present position of power. Instead of obeying the commandment not to steal—Mr. Khrushchev's accomplishments in the fields of nuclear weapons and space are traced back to stolen documents from the West. Instead of heeding the tenet not to covet, Mr. Khrushchev and the Communist party covet all nations and their riches, not already enslaved in their godless empire.

All men like Nikita Khrushchev will eventually fail because communism has within itself the seeds of its own destruction. When Mr. Khrushchev has finished destroying he will be destroyed. When he is wearied with betraying, he will be betrayed.

Men such as Nikita Khrushchev can never be pictured as something they aren't—not even by their own son-in-law. That is the story we should publish for the American people. I challenge you to do this.

Sincerely yours,

DICK HUMPHREY.

'Tis a Great Day for More Than the Irish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday we celebrated one of the truly festive holidays of the year. And I am sure that most amongst us here did celebrate just the way I did myself. Maybe not to the degree I did, for on Saturday I was an honorary member of a group in which so many of my distinguished colleagues here are regular and permanent members. I know my Irish friends have always said that there are only two kinds of people in the word: those who are Irish, and those who want to be. Those who are have 364 days a year to

celebrate. Those of us who are not have this 1 special day when we can be. On Saturday I was.

The history of the original Irish immigrants to America has been told many times over. Their part in the wars that our Nation has fought, from the Revolution on, is, I think, now well understood, though such was not always the case. Their struggle for acceptance in the community, their dedication to their Nation, their passion for education, their ascent up the ladder of every kind of success—all these are now an appreciated part of our history. But a story appearing in the Newark Star-Ledger, on the day ties in very well the success of this one magnificent group of our citizens with the achievements of our Nation itself. It was written by Irene Corbally Kuhn, with an assist from G.B.S. and two of his recent editors. It is a piece that we should all note, for here indeed is one of the keys to the strength and the glory of America.

SUCCESS OF IRISH PROVES CASE FOR GREATNESS OF UNITED STATES

(By Irene Corbally Kuhn)

In all the American cities which harbor great numbers of the descendants of Irish immigrants, bearers of Celtic names will be celebrating the feast day of Ireland's patron saint today. St. Patrick's Day is a tribute to a sentimental tradition which has been carefully nurtured and preserved. It is not so long ago that the Irish in America were stubbornly fighting their way up from lowly immigrant status to posts of eminence in business, the professions, and the arts, and to positions of power and prestige in politics. In the early days the struggle was complicated by prejudice; those were the days when want ads specified bluntly, "No Irish need apply."

That they managed to overcome all the obstacles of stupid social ostracism and economic discrimination, and become first of all passionately loyal Americans and then materially successful ones, is a tribute to the God-given ability of the Nation, as a nation, to let men rise to their opportunities.

The nature of the Irish is best understood and expressed by an Irishman. Take a stalwart and a genius like George Bernard Shaw.

He was sharper with the Irish than most, and he could afford to be, for he was first and foremost a proud Dublin-born Irishman even though he lived in Ireland for only 20 of his 94 years.

Two New York University professors of English, Dan H. Laurence and David H. Greene, have just edited some of Shaw's previously uncollected writings: The book is titled "The Matter With Ireland" and ranges through all the political and social events from 1886 to 1950.

He speaks of the unpopularity of English and Germans in Ireland at the time and says:

"They assume that the good manners of London and Berlin are good manners in Cork and Kerry. They assume that the Irish laborer is on the alert for their orders and wants them short and clear and crisp.

"But the Irish laborer is not in the highly trained and timesaving attitude at all. He is by no means convinced that it is his destiny or even his business to take orders from anyone. He may be dreaming of being a king, crowned or uncrowned. He may be preoccupied with the subject of Home Rule, or the Church in Ireland, or with dramatic private affairs. Therefore, if you are sufficiently master of the finer shades of manner, you had better convey by your tone an apology for disturbing him. If you are unequal to this, look as if you wanted a porter (or whatever he may be) and, being too bashful to apply to him are on the point of employing somebody else. He will then proffer his services quite anxiously.

"But the Irish, except in the city slums where humanity is degraded everywhere, practically never misunderstood really good manners, and respond to them with remarkable dignity. Only, it must be understood that by good manners I do not mean an obvious determination to be polite to one's inferiors. Treat an Irishman as if he were a duke, and you another, and he will treat you as if you were a king. Patronize him, and he can be surprisingly offensive."

And, if he's a truly spirited Irishman, he'll have his revenge by being a rousing success and then forgetting what he got mad about in the first place.

Latin Nations' Strength Has Wide Effect in New Orleans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to continue the series of stories written by Bill Stuckey in the New Orleans States-Item on New Orleans and the Americas. The eighth article in a nine-part series, entitled "Latin Nations' Strength Has Wide Effect Here," follows:

NEW ORLEANS AND THE AMERICAS—LATIN NATIONS' STRENGTH HAS WIDE EFFECT HERE

(By Bill Stuckey)

Things are usually slow in the remote Latin nation of El Tico-Tico, but this time, things were different.

Within the space of 24 hours, the People's Progressive Peace Party had assassinated President Morales and General Gonzales, scored a complete takeover of the government and army, expropriated all foreign properties, dispatched delegations in quest of Red Chinese and Russian technicians and of trade pacts with Communist bloc nations, and proclaimed everlasting Soviet-Cuban-Tico solidarity.

So what happened in New Orleans?

Well, New Orleans didn't sink into the ocean.

But the local business community was in mighty damp spirits and hundreds of Orleanians who didn't know Latin America from Lapland were washed right out of their jobs.

The El Tico-Tico of this example (hypothetical, of course) symbolizes just one small country of the vast Americas. But if all the El Tico-Ticos were to follow suit, the repercussions in New Orleans would be immeasurably more severe and widespread.

Few New Orleanians are aware of the heavy dependence of the local economy on Latin America, where sizable amounts of locally controlled capital are invested, where many local industries providing thousands of local jobs here get their raw materials, where purchases from hundreds of local businesses mean the difference between profit, loss, and layoff, and where comes much of the ocean shipping which provides the basic foundation of New Orleans' present span of prosperity.

Actually, with the coming of the space rocket industry to New Orleans and the burgeoning increase of investment and trade with other parts of the world, Latin America is not as important as it once was to local economic health. But if all the vast network of economic ties between New Orleans and all the El Tico-Ticos were to end, the city would still have to make some extremely painful financial adjustments.

And so would some of the El Tico-Ticos.

Consider just one aspect of these economic links, such as locally controlled capital invested in the Americas.

Pan American Life Insurance which is headquartered here has something like $80 million invested in Latin government and municipal bonds, utilities, mortgage loans and similar paper holdings, according to that company's Fritz Lindley. These funds, earned from sales of insurance in Latin America, provide capital for the nations, the cities, the industries there. Its sales force also provides jobs for 465 Latin nationals.

The company has some $40 million invested in Venezuela alone, with other substantial holdings in Colombia, Panama, Puerto Rico, Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, the Dominican Republic, and Ecuador.

Another large local investor is Standard Fruit and Steamship Co. During its half century of banana and fruit production, it has invested $40 million, acquired 600,000 acres of land, and now provides more than 9,000 jobs in Central America.

In Honduras, where the company has invested $30 million in cultivation and related items, Standard has built a railroad, operates a dairy and cattle farm for employes, donated a hospital serving all northern Honduras, and has provided electrical power for the entire city of La Ceiba, its chief Latin banana port.

Outside of the banana business, Standard also has an investment of $5 million in two Honduran breweries and a soft-drink plant, $1.2 million in a lard and soap factory, and holds a 25-percent interest in the country's only cement factory.

On a smaller scale, in dollars at least, are the Central American holdings of the local firm of Robinson Lumber Co. Operating through a Nicaraguan corporation, the partnership has some $5 million invested in eight sawmills and related operations in northeast Nicaragua. It is also investing $2.5 million in a chemical factory which will produce turpentine and other naval stores in Puerto Cabeza.

To get a better idea of Robinson's Nicaraguan holdings, however, think in terms of timber rights.

The exact extent of the company's timber rights is not known since the area has never been surveyed, said C. W. Robinson, a partner. But he estimates it could be as much as one-quarter of the entire country of Nicaragua.

The company, which Robinson said has the largest Latin investment of any U.S. lumber operation, also is financially involved on a smaller scale in Honduras, British Honduras, and Guatemala.

Investments of local funds in the Americas, however, touch only a small segment of the New Orleans public. It's through the port, called "New Orleans' biggest industry" by port officials, that business contact with the Latins makes the widest ripple in the local economy.

Two years ago, 70 percent in tonnage of all goods shipped through the port (and 55 percent in dollar value) came from Latin America. Exports to Latin America played a smaller role—15 percent of the tonnage and 27 percent in dollar value.

Most of this trade merely passed through the port. The bulk of these imported Latin products and raw materials were not intended for local users, but for other cities throughout that vast third of the Nation known as the Mississippi Valley. Likewise, most of the exports passing through the port to the Americas originated elsewhere in the valley.

But still, tens of thousands of local jobs are provided and much money from this Latin trade rubs off on the New Orleans economy. Here's how that works:

Oceangoing vessels made about 5,000 arrivals and departures here last year. At least three locally headquartered shipping companies depend heavily on Latin shipping trade, other companies headquartered elsewhere have extensive home ports for their ships here, and more than a dozen companies owned by Latin governments or citizens have regular stops here.

The Mississippi Shipping Co., in a survey based on 1959 activity, figured that each of its Latin route ships stopping here left behind some $174,336 in crew wages, repairs, docking fees, pilot and tug fees, ship stores and supplies, insurance, agency fees, jobs provided for longshoremen, and other considerations. Another locally headquartered line with Latin trade routes, Gulf and South American, arrived at a lower amount—$79,527.

Now figure the sales and other types of taxes collected locally on this money, the amounts spent with local retail establishments.

And there are some extras, Mississippi Shipping, for example, recently spent $30 million for construction of three freighters—at a New Orleans area shipyard. These same shipyards received millions more in repairing Latin-owned vessels or ships engaged in Latin trade.

As a matter of fact, several local shipping lines wouldn't be here if it weren't for Latin American commerce.

Now consider the lowly Central and South American banana.

The gigantic United Fruit Co., headquartered in Boston, has 11 ships of its banana fleet operating out of New Orleans, with 270 sailings and arrivals posted here last year alone. And local Standard Fruit's 11 banana ships posted between 150 and 200 arrivals in the port last year too.

Besides being the Nation's second most important banana port, New Orleans is also second only to New York in coffee imports (with Brazil and other Latin countries providing more than 85 percent of the coffee imported here in 1960). Figured in dollars, there was more coffee imported here last year than any other product—from anywhere.

And it was the coffee people who founded Mississippi Shipping, and who are responsible for that company's ships being known nationally as the "coffee fleet."

That's one aspect of the intricate interlocking of the local economy and Latin trade. Another is the effect of some of these Latin products here.

Coffee? There are six major coffee roasting plants here alone. Men in the coffee trade estimate that at least 2,000 jobs are provided by these installations, by the green coffee warehouses here, and the sales and clerical jobs which accompany them.

Sugar? Even with the loss of Cuba, Latin America is still the largest source of raw sugar. The seven sugar refineries of south Louisiana depend heavily on it.

One local sugar refinery, operated by American Sugar in Chalmette, provides 1,000 jobs alone. And there are satellite sugar industries, such as local manufacturers of sugar-mill machinery for Latin American sugar companies, which provide still more employment.

Sisal, henequen, vegetable fiber? Mexico and Brazil provide about half of the sisal and henequen imported here in 1960. Mexico alone provided three-quarters of other types of raw fiber.

Local rope and twine factories, which in trade circles have helped to earn New Orleans the title of "cordage capital of the world," get at least half of their raw fiber from these Latin sources. The two largest local cordage mills provide a total of about 320 jobs.

Another raw material on which one large local industry is dependent actually comes from a British-American nation, but which lies in the general Latin zone. This is bauxite from Jamaica.

Raw Jamaican bauxite is shipped upriver to Baton Rouge, and later shipped back in a processed form to the Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical plant in Chalmette. Without this bauxite, the local Kaiser installation—which can provide as many as 2,400 jobs—would have to make considerable adjustments in its operations.

Exports to Latin America? These don't have the wide effect locally of the imports mentioned above, but exports to Latin markets can still mean the difference between profit and loss to businesses here.

Locally made items in this Latin export category include furniture, ships, and boats and marine equipment, oilfield equipment, candy, canned or frozen seafood, clothes, bags and boxes, sewing machines, chemicals, and other items.

New Orleans' strategic location in relation to Latin America has resulted in the establishment of dozens of purchasing offices here and of export stations to supply American business operations in the Americas. Among these are the local Sears, Roebuck Latin export office, which provides jobs for 110 local residents, and the newly established Panama Canal Co. supply office, which furnishes all types of goods to U.S. citizens in the Canal Zone.

That's a general idea of New Orleans' financial stake in Latin America.

Specific illustrations of losses local businessmen have suffered in Cuba, and of more subtle threats to local businesses with Latin American ties, will be discussed in tomorrow's article.

Col. Henry H. Cobb, Jr.: Example of Bravery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, from time to time one of our fellow beings demonstrates rare courage in a most inspirational way. That is exactly what my friend and constituent, Col. Henry H. Cobb, Jr., did when he insisted on making his required quarterly jump, as a National Guard paratrooper, even though he had a broken ankle. The story of Colonel Cobb's amazing jump was vividly described in an article in the Birmingham Post-Herald on March 5, 1962, and I am pleased to insert in the RECORD that article:

HOW DOES PARATROOPER WITH BROKEN LEG JUMP?

How does a National Guard paratrooper make his required quarterly jump when he is sidelined with a broken ankle?

Col. Henry H. Cobb, Jr., commanding officer of the 20th Special Forces Group, Army National Guard, solved that problem by jumping into a lake instead of onto ground.

Colonel Cobb broke his ankle 3 months ago in a fall at home. He had made some 20 parachute jumps without accident.

Gen. Henry V. Graham, adjutant general of the Alabama National Guard, praised Colonel Cobb for his ingenuity and bravery in making a weekend jump into water. "It took courage and perservance and was a fine example of real leadership," he said.

Cobb and the Army adviser who works with his unit, Maj. Charles C. Cook, took off Saturday with pilot Capt. John Dunn and Lt. John R. Gay, jump master.

With his brother-in-law positioned below in a boat, Cobb jumped into Lake Martin with Major Cook. John Cleague, Cobb's brother-in-law, immediately picked him up and rushed him to a lakeside cabin. A few minutes to warm and Colonel Cobb was in good shape again, ready to prove that "Where there's will, the Army paratrooper finds a way."

Who Pays for Medical Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Fred Niketh, a constituent of mine, recently wrote a letter to the editor of the Cincinnati Enquirer which was published in the "Readers' Views" column. This well-reasoned letter is one of the finest I have seen dealing with the subject of medical care for the aged and the current legislation. All Members of the House should have the benefit of Mr. Niketh's views before voting on this matter:

VOLUNTARISM HAS GIVEN AMERICA FINEST MEDICAL CARE

To the EDITOR: In a recent letter to the editor, Mr. Short states that "the medical care plan, as proposed by President Kennedy, is fair for everyone." He also stated that the recent Enquirer editorials "have missed altogether the real intent of the proposed law."

Unfortunately, Mr. Short, like many others, has gained the impression that social security is insurance; that it is an annuty; that individuals have an insured status. Little do they realize that it is nothing more than a gross income tax providing a welfare instrument under which those with jobs in their productive years, their employers and persons engaged in self-employment are taxed chiefly to provide the funds for current beneficiaries.

The only right acquired by payment of your social security tax is the right to expect future taxpayers to provide the taxes necessary to pay for your benefits at retirement. The public little realizes that the total liabilities under the social security system amounts to $350 billion with a trust fund of only $20 billion. During the past fiscal year social security benefits paid out amounted to over $11 billion and receipts were over $10 billion. Such a system hardly can be called insurance.

Of concern to all responsible adults is the fact that many of the present workers and their employers will pay only 42 percent of the value of future benefits. The young people entering the system, however, will pay $1.69 for each dollar of future benefits.

When the young people entering the labor market realize that their parents have passed a substantial portion of their social security costs on to them, will there not be a tax revolt by youth against OASI?

It is estimated that there are, or soon will be, 17 million citizens in the 65-and-over category and they are growing in numbers each year due to the medical advances provided by a free and voluntary society. Yet,

the proposed King-Anderson bill will provide these individuals with health coverage with little or no contribution from them at all. Those in the 50-to-65 age bracket can also look forward to a substantial windfall which inevitably must be paid for by taxing our children or through more inflation.

I submit that our generation has been systematically exploiting the young with our concept of deficit financing. This low level of social morality can have enoromus implications in future years.

At least those who propose medical care for the aged through social security, if they are interested in fair play to the children, should work out a step-rate tax rate which lowers the tax burden on those who are going to pay into the OASI fund for many years to come, and at the same time increase the tax load of our generation so that we will not get something for nothing or little at all.

The Kennedy administration estimates that a five-tenths of 1-percent tax on $5,200 earning base would be adequate to finance the King-Anderson benefits. The insurance industry actuaries believe that a tax of 1.66 percent on $5,200 will be necessary. This means that today a worker earning $4,800 who pays $150 a year in the direct social security taxes, with his employer paying an equal amount, will, with the new proposed $5,200 earnings base and the medical benefits added, pay $283.66 by 1968. This is an 89-percent increase in employee taxes in the space of 6 years.

Under our present social security laws, employee and employer taxes combined are now scheduled to reach $444 in 1968 for every employee earning $4,800 or more. With the proposed $5,200 taxable earnings base and the addition of King-Anderson benefits, such taxes would reach at least $567 by 1968—an amount well in excess of 10 perecnt of the new earnings base. Coupled with income taxes, sales taxes, property taxes, etc., over a third of our income will go to the Government.

The Kerr-Mills Act currently gurantees that no senior citizen will go without medical care merely because he has not the means to obtain such care—and this is as it should be. Our voluntary approach has provided this country the highest quality of medical care in the world. Let us not permit the welfare planners to use health care as an approach to the welfare state. And above all, let's stop creating more debt for our children and children's children to carry. If we don't, our so-called retirement benefits will mean very little when our own retirement arrives.

FRED NIKETH.

St. Patrick's Day Address by the Most Reverend Celestine J. Damiano, Camden, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the celebration of St. Patrick's Day, Saturday, March 17, 1962, at a banquet sponsored by the Ancient Order of Hibernians, Division 4, of Camden, N.J., presided over by its president, Jack Ambrose, the archbishop-bishop of the Camden, N.J., diocese, the Most Reverend Celestine J. Damiano, delivered an eloquent address on the life of Patrick and the reason for his great influence and that of the Irish people on the American way of life. Under unanimous consent, I include the archbishop's address in its entirety in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The address follows:

ST. PATRICK'S DAY ADDRESS BY THE MOST REVEREND CELESTINE J. DAMIANO, CAMDEN, N.J.

There are certain traditions that become almost sacred especially when for centuries a whole nation enthusiastically and spontaneously observe them. It is further confirmed when these hallowed traditions are fostered by individuals, and groups wherever they may be. I believe that in every nook of this earth of ours, this day is solemnly and gladly kept because you will find an Irishman there. It has been my privilege to witness these celebrations in many parts of the world. The propagators of this spirit are the sons of Eire especially the thousands of missionaries who roam the earth as their natural home.

We can ask what is the secret of this unique celebration which has many converts as well. Recently, I read in a very important newspaper that the secret lies in the enthusiastic wild spirit symbolized by the playing of the bagpipes. They have really missed the point.

The heart and center of this warm tradition is none other than Patrick the Bishop, Patrick the Saint. He, who followipg the voice of the Irish, converted almost an entire nation to Christianity, and once they had received this special gift shared it with the rest of humanity. This process has been going on for the past 1,500 years.

A most peculiar circumstance is that very little is known of Patrick's birthplace and life. Scholars will debate for a long time his nationality and his life because little has been handed down to posterity. Patrick himself wrote very little, his confession, and a few letters. One can count the words he wrote without much difficulty. He has called himself an unlearned man in his confessions.

Around the same time lived the great St. Augustine, perhaps one of the greatest minds in the church, whose writings are contained in volumes and have been handed down to posterity. A week doesn't go by that a priest, in his daily recitation of the breviary doesn't read something from St. Augustine. And yet, he doesn't have the following of St. Patrick after 1,500 years.

Perhaps the secret lies in this that Augustine wrote on sheepskins whereas Patrick engraved every word in the hearts of his children. They, in turn, handed it down to their children thus forming the sacred tradition. He gave them the truths of faith which has sustained them through untold and indescribable hardships to the present day. Therefore, Patrick left more than books, treatises, learned, and scholarly discussions. He planted the faith in the very hearts of his spiritual children. He wrote not on paper but on human hearts.

There is a bit of the divine plan in St. Patrick's life and work. Recall how few are the words uttered and written in the gospels about Mary and Joseph. Yet, they are remembered and honored as though they had written volumes. Indeed, libraries are full today with books about Mary and Joseph. They were holy instruments in God's plans and as such they have a very important place in history. As we mentioned very little has come down to us in the form of writings in the case of Patrick. And yet today alone millions will honor his memory. Much has been written about him, his work and his children. He, too, had a part in God's plan for the evangelization of the world. The secret lies in the faith he planted in the hearts of his spiritual children. The same faith of the Pope who sent him, the same faith of the apostles whose successor he was in the episcopacy.

The world is a better place because the heirs of the converts of Patrick have shared their heritage with their fellow man.

Let the House Work Its Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, many pious platitudes were pronounced last year during the packing of the Rules Committee. One was that "the House should work its will." Shortly, the omnibus tax bill will be before the House and I am hopeful that the membership will be allowed to vote on separate amendments proposed by the minority.

As has been pointed out in an editorial in yesterday's New York Herald Tribune, the three amendments proposed by the Republicans are unrelated and each is aimed at a separate problem, principle, and justification. Let us hope that the House will not be muzzled in its consideration of the tax bill.

LET THE HOUSE WORK ITS WILL

Often the fate of major legislation turns on procedural questions, and the tax bill is a case in point.

Republicans in Congress are unhappy about, and prepared to make a fight on, three separate provisions of the bill as reported out by the House Ways and Means Committee. As a result, they are pressing the Rules Committee for a modified closed rule—that is, one which would allow separate consideration by the whole House of three specific amendments. Under the regular closed rule, which is ordinarily given tax bills and which the Democratic leadership wants again this time, the opposition is in effect limited to offering a single all-or-nothing substitute.

On most tax bills, there is good reason for such a closed rule: it prevents destructive tinkering with carefully balanced rate structures and the like in the heat of floor debate. But the present case offers no such justification.

The three provisions challenged by the Republicans are unrelated. Each is aimed at a separate problem, and rests on a separate principle. Each has a separate justification and its own good grounds for opposition.

The argument that they have to be lumped together to balance revenue losses against revenue gains is poppycock. The amounts involved are not enough by themselves to cause any budgetary chaos. They are but a small fraction of the revenue increase on which Mr. Kennedy based his prediction of a balanced budget, and are less than the costs of a good many new programs being offered without compensating revenue sources. But their extra-budgetary effects—on the shape of the economy, and the welfare of both individuals and corporations—would be far-reaching and substantial.

The three proposed amendments would affect those provisions for an investment credit (Republicans favor a different form

which would be cheaper and, many argue, more effective), dividend and interest withholding, and taxation of overseas earnings.

When the Rules Committee enlargement fight was on, in the first days of the Kennedy administration, a lot was said about the importance of letting the House work its will as a vital part of the Democratic process. The tax bill offers a test of Democratic sincerity. A closed rule is not justified by the nature of the bill, which has shaped up as a catchall package of unrelated changes in tax policy. Each of the three Republican amendments has strong support, though not every member who supports one supports all three. If the administration majority on the Rules Committee still believes in letting the House work its will, as it professed to a year ago, now is the time to prove it.

The World of Silence Can Be Lonely

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address which I delivered at a meeting of the Rhode Island Speech and Hearing Association in Providence, R.I., on November 28, 1961:

It is a pleasure for me to be here this evening, and I appreciate your kind invitation.

Your careers are dedicated to minimizing the handicaps of impaired speech and hearing faculties. No one knows better than this organization the toll that hearing disorders and speech impairments take in the lives of those who are affected.

I doubt whether it is possible to exaggerate the importance of person-to-person communication. I am sure that I, like most persons, take the primary faculties of speech and hearing for granted. But how important they are:

I obtain information on national and international affairs from many sources, in and out of Congress. To a great extent I hear this information on the floor of the House of Representatives, in the committee rooms, in my office, in conferences, at meetings. In reporting this information to you and to Congress, and in discussing it with scientists, administrators, and experts, I am speaking. It is sobering to wonder whether I could perform my job at all if my hearing or speech were impaired.

There is no question; a world of silence can be lonely and frustrating for the one who cannot hear or speak.

I have been informed that on a nationwide basis, an estimated 8 to 9 million Americans have significant speech and hearing impairments. Of these, 2 million are schoolchildren. Preschool children under 5 years of age and individuals 18 years of age and older make up at least another 6 to 7 million persons with speech and hearing disorders. Some experts believe many more of our citizens might be found to have speech and hearing defects if they were tested for such disorders.

You must be well aware of the handicaps that all these people encounter in attempting to acquire a normal education, in achieving economic security, and in making a comfortable social adjustment. The more I think of how many aspects of day-to-day living depend on speech and hearing, the more I admire and appreciate your work to free the afflicted from the barriers against communication.

Unless I am very mistaken, I believe the average American shares with me the desire to do everything possible to assure the best medical care, treatment, and rehabilitation for all our citizens who may be physically or mentally afflicted. By so doing, we help avert some of the annual loss in human productivity as it contributes to the mainstream of our economy.

Our obligation, however, is not only to promote our Nation's economic well-being but to uphold our American heritage of humanitarian concern for the handicapped. This is a hallmark of our society.

I know that you are most concerned with the Government's programs with which you are intimately familiar. Let me ask you to consider for a moment the other disabilities with which public health planners and administrators must also be concerned so that you will visualize the enormity of the overall problem.

Multiply the disabilities that you see every day in the course of your practice by others associated with systemic diseases, with chronic and malignant diseases, with obscure genetic disorders and accidents at birth, with neurological and mental disorders. Consider the research involved in each area, bearing in mind how complex are the problems and how illusive have been the answers.

Consider the research in chemistry, the mechanical ingenuity, the adaptation of the new discoveries in electronics, radiology, and atomic energy that are marshaled in the battle for better health.

These factors represent, in part, the breadth of the health and medical problems with which we in Congress must cope. Not that we do so alone. We do our best to plan on this broad front in close cooperation with the many able physicians, scientists, educators, technicians, and administrators in the executive branch, especially those in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. We also have the advice of experts who are not in Government service.

In my 21 years as a Member of Congress I have had the privilege for 14 years of serving on the committee, and as chairman of the subcommittee, that plans appropriations for the administration's health programs. These have been the most satisfying years of my life. It is nothing short of thrilling to observe the programs evolve in depth and in increasing number from year to year.

While we have seen few completed medical solutions or cures, we have achieved stirring progress in many fields. Expansion in medical services and some amazing discoveries in medical research in recent decades have given a phenomenal spurt to health levels in the United States.

Scientific techniques have been improved, drugs have been made more effective, diagnostic tests are more certain. Promising leads have been uncovered in the search for cause and cure of some of man's oldest afflictions. To recall only a few: Better diagnostic tests for certain kinds of cancer have been developed, permitting early treatment and cure. Some forms of mental retardation resulting from an inborn metabolic error can now be prevented. A variety of disorders of vision, some causing blindness, including cataract and glaucoma, can be effectively treated and controlled. Retrolental fibroplasia, which once blinded newborn babies, has been almost completely stamped out. A vaccine has been found to cope with one of the oldest scourges, infantile paralysis. Anticoagulant drugs supply techniques for the control of coronary attacks and cerebrovascular accidents or strokes. Epilepsy is yielding to drugs and, in some cases, surgery.

These and many other discoveries and improvements spell progress. What was responsible for this progress? One thing primarily: the growth in research programs of the National Institutes of Health, of other health agencies, and of research and training activities supported in hundreds of institutions throughout the country. As I have noted, research already has paved the way for many conquests of chronic disorders. It remains our key to future progress. New medical knowledge of a revolutionary sort cannot be predicted. Not even the most brilliant of our scientists know when the breakthrough which they long for will occur. It could happen to any investigator, in any laboratory or hospital or clinic, at some unexpected moment. No one can say just when or how, because research progress is a slow and difficult road.

But the greater the number of competent investigators we encourage and the more funds we wisely expend for medical research, the better become our chances to find more solutions that are sorely needed for many of the major chronic ailments.

How then can we afford a slowdown in the research momentum so carefully and painstakingly built up over the years? We cannot. That is why I urge you to join me in telling the people of this State and other States how important it is that nothing interfere with the levels of medical progress already achieved.

We in Congress have been working hard to get these levels raised meaningfully. We have been grasping the opportunities and we feel we have been meeting the needs. But now, today, there is a move on in Washington to cut these funds by $60 million. From what I can determine, this will mean that at least $25 million will have to be cut from research projects and that the program to develop clinical research centers will suffer to the extent of $15 million. Over $10 million will be held back from the training of research scientists for tomorrow, and more than $7 million will be cut from the National Institutes of Health's own direct operations. This is not progress.

If the $60 million cut in the National Institutes of Health's appropriation is not restored, almost $8 million alone will be stripped from the budget of the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness, which has some of the most baffling and complex ills to grapple with, including those affecting speech and hearing. I understand that if the cut is not restored, it will affect the Institute in this way: Five million dollars will be taken from research grants in neurological and sensory disorders, including speech and hearing. Under the ordered slash, almost $60,000 will be trimmed from the Institute's funds for training fellowships and $1 million will have to be cut from its general training programs. Even the Institute's own laboratories in Bethesda will lose almost a quarter of a million ($232,000), to say nothing of a $1½ million which the Institute would lose from its new professional and technical assistance program which was to give emphasis to speech and hearing.

To take away funds from the professional and technical assistance program will limit our ability to go out into the States and set up important demonstration projects. Rhode Islanders are well acquainted with the effectiveness of these public health projects. One of the very first, in diagnostic methods for rheumatic fever, was set up in our State.

I ask you to consider what may be the far-reaching consequences if the neurology institute is deprived of its full appropriation and must therefore curtail its support of research and research training, and the implementation of its technical and professional assistance program. Ultimately, it might prove tremendously important to our friends or relatives, to our children, or to ourselves

if the cut should hinder the rate of progress in medical research or its application.

So I do not think we should complacently accept the announced plan to spend less for medical research. I want the people of my home State to know that I vigorously protested this proposal when I spoke recently at the Second National Cancer Chemotherapy Conference in Washington. Moreover I sent telegrams of protest to the President and to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Abraham Ribicoff.

It is gratifying to know of the President's deep personal interest in health and medical research, and I believe he is most serious in his efforts to increase the amount of work being done in biomedical research. I am confident that when the President has full knowledge of the facts, he will take steps to make sure that these funds—which were voted by the Congress only after the most critical appraisal of the needs—will be made available for the benefit of people throughout the Nation.

These are some of my reactions to any proposals for cuts in our expenditures for medical research and health-related activities. I am sure you have some of your own, and I urge you to write to your Congressmen and Senators. I will be very glad to hear from any of you, as will Congressman St. GERMAIN. Senators PELL and PASTORE will welcome an expression of opinion. I think President Kennedy will also be most receptive to your feelings in the matter.

It is clear that the American people insist on an all-out attack on the major disease problems. They have demonstrated this by their vigorous support of public health programs, especially those of the National Institutes of Health, and by their unstinting contributions to voluntary health agencies. The Congress has recognized this desire of the people by appropriating more funds that will lead to better preventive, diagnostic, and therapeutic measures. It is this will of the people that I feel compelled to serve.

The expansion of medical research is helping in the ultimate conquest of many other major diseases. But with gains in knowledge and improvements in techniques come new and challenging problems of public health to solve. I am considering your field, for example. Some of the once-fatal illnesses that our citizens are now surviving still leave devastating effects that account for serious handicaps in speech and hearing for a large segment of our population. Some infections that medical science can now curb with antibiotics and other drug agents often take their toll in other ways, including deafness. More people are surviving certain forms of stroke, but are robbed of their ability to speak. A reduction in infant mortality has produced an increasing number of children suffering with communication defects.

As in every other branch of public health, we experience the gratification of achievement and the acceptance of new challenge in our programs relating to speech and hearing disorders. Everyone wants to provide the research, treatment, education, training, and rehabilitation that is necessary to give an afflicted person the maximum function of which he is capable. Yet we have not mobilized sufficient resources to widen opportunity for the disabled and the handicapped to the degree needed.

I understand that about 80 percent of those with significant speech or hearing disabilities can be fully educated and rehabilitated. What is needed is the necessary number of qualified specialists. They consist of clinicians, therapists, audiologists, and teachers. We are engaged in developing a legislative program that will supply these specialists as soon as practicable. Moreover, we want to be sure that we shall have an adequate supply of these specialists to take care of any increased number of disabled.

A study undertaken by the American Speech and Hearing Association in cooperation with Federal agencies disclosed that very few schools provide courses for specialists in speech and hearing disorders. Only 239 of the 1,800 colleges and universities queried offer such a program. We now need at least 20,000 speech pathologists and audiologists to effectively diagnose, train and aid in rehabilitating the handicapped. We now have about 10 percent of this number. We must provide the needed personnel.

In the world in which we live, we can afford to leave no child uneducated, no adult vocationally untrained. We must develop and utilize our full human potential right down the line. Our national welfare and our personal good depend on this. We realize, however, that not everyone can be educated or rehabilitated in the same way. Each child, each adult, is a different person from every other child or adult. Each has varying abilities; many have disabilities.

We Americans recognize, more and more, the right of every individual—no matter what his handicap—to achieve as normal, satisfying, and self-sufficient a way of life as possible. This attitude is reflected in our gradually growing programs and activities for those with handicaps, including disturbances of communication.

In this connection, I am glad to report that in this last session of Congress, Public Law 87-276 was enacted which will provide scholarships for persons qualified to train as teachers of the deaf. The scholarships will be made possible by grants-in-aid to nonprofit institutions of higher education whose programs are approved by the Commissioner of Education. Applications for such grants are to be first reviewed by an advisory committee of 12 educators to be appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Congress has made available $1,500,000 a year for 2 years for this program.

It took several years to achieve this much-needed legislation, and I had the honor of sponsoring it originally in the House. The law may not contain everything that could be desired, but it constitutes a very significant beginning of our efforts to obtain adequate educational opportunities for those qualified to be teachers of the deaf. At least it marks another critical point in Federal recognition of the great need for trained teachers in areas of special education.

We know that proper training of the handicapped can produce remarkable benefits. For example, the Veterans' Administration adopted a speech and audiology program 6 years ago. The appreciable improvement in speech and hearing among handicapped veterans has resulted in reduction of compensation payments by about $3 million annually.

The new teachers-of-the-deaf bill does not, I am sorry to say, provide specifically for speech correctionists and audiologists. However, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation and the Children's Bureau have existing training programs for this purpose.

I am vitally interested in the progress of these programs. If they do not show signs of turning out enough trained personnel, I shall sponsor legislation which will accomplish this. True, the need is urgent for specially trained people in many professional health services. But perhaps there is even a more acute need to accelerate the training of specialists who can extend and improve service for children and adults with speech and hearing disorders.

I am aware of differences of opinion among professionals as to whether the emphasis should be put upon developing teachers, or whether we should concentrate first upon developing clinicians. Whatever the merits of each view, I shall do my best to see to it that the means is made available to provide whatever personnel is needed to help speech- and hearing-handicapped children and adults.

One of my aims is to help break the bottleneck in the clinical application of fruitful results of all medical research. As swiftly as new frontiers of knowledge is diagnosis and treatment open up, the people should benefit. Prompt and exacting diagnosis and treatment of infants and children with disturbances of communication must follow on the heals of basic research progress. The right diagnosis and treatment at the right time by trained correctionists might enable many a handicapped child to take his rightful place in a world of sound and hearing.

In the field of speech and hearing, your Government seeks the best ways to detect and treat disability, conduct and support research, publicize knowledge derived from research, train teachers and practitioners in putting new knowledge to work, and establish clinical services that will deliver the benefits of this knowledge to the handicapped person. It would take hours to mention the details of the many programs to accomplish these goals. What I want particularly to emphasize is our responsibility to safeguard against any possible slowdown in these programs, or in the progress of health research generally.

Tonight I have stressed the pride we should feel in the tremendous progress that our Government is making in promoting the health of all the people. Medical research activities are responsible for prolonging life and bringing new hope for millions.

Federal support and encouragement of medical research is proving to be one of the Nation's soundest investments, with continuous dividends in better health and economic welfare.

As some problems are solved, new problems are generated, but this is the inevitable outgrowth of progress. There is no end to progress—only new beginnings. We must constantly move ahead.

Speech and hearing disorders are beginning to come into their own as vital health problems which deserve attention and action. We know we must augment our reservoir of educators and other highly skilled professionals such as yourselves. Without them, we can never hope to strengthen our services to the handicapped millions.

To sustain our gains in health research, to make needed new discoveries possible, and to assure the training of professional talent in many needed areas—these are responsibilities of public trust. Therefore, I am particularly concerned about the reduction of $60 million in the NIH operating funds. It may be rather difficult for the Government budgeteers to explain to those suffering from chronic disabilities such as cancer, heart disease, and neurological and sensory disorders, and to those near and dear to them, why the Government can plan $20 billion space adventures while it cannot afford a relatively small amount for research that may save millions of lives.

When Congress reconvenes in January, I shall do all that I can to see that these funds are used as Congress intended, to make the maximum effort to find solutions to our serious health problems.

With Federal and State leadership, and with the undaunted support of people who form associations such as the Rhode Island Speech and Hearing Association, I am confident we will utilize the opportunities that exist to help the disabled assume their rightful roles in their communities.

All the people in this great land justly aspire to good health. If we are to fulfill their aspirations, we must mobilize our fullest resources in strengthening the Nation's total health effort. Government legislators and administrators, and you as creative, independent groups, share in this obligation. Together, we can succeed.

Housing Conference Honors Congressman Albert Rains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1962

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday I had the opportunity to attend the 31st annual banquet of the National Housing Conference at the Statler Hotel here in Washington.

At this conference were dedicated men and women from all sections of our country who have been leaders in the field of public housing. To these people much credit is due for the progress that was made in wiping out slums and in building decent homes for the citizens of our country.

The highlight of the banquet program was the appreciation expressed by the conference, for our colleague, Hon. ALBERT RAINS, of Alabama, for his leadership in housing and for his tremendous contribution to the people of our country and to the progress of the Nation.

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Housing he has won the admiration and respect of all who are interested in decent homes for American citizens.

A special tribute was paid to Mr. RAINS by Mr. Walter Mills, Jr., executive director of the Greater Gadsden Housing Authority of Gadsden, Ala. The ovation for Congressman RAINS left no doubt that all present shared the same affection as expressed by Mr. Mills, a longtime friend and neighbor of Mr. RAINS.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks, these words of appreciation to Mr. RAINS, as expressed in the banquet program:

A TRIBUTE TO HON. ALBERT RAINS

Congressman ALBERT RAINS, Democrat, of Alabama, is a legislator of whom the Nation can truly be proud. Few men on Capitol Hill have his unique combination of outstanding competence, long experience, parliamentary know-how, and keen grasp of our complicated economic and domestic problems. As a ranking member of the important Banking and Currency Committee he has made an invaluable contribution to the whole framework of legislation with which our Government assists private enterprise in meeting our domestic problems.

On the subject of housing he is, of course, without peer in the House of Representatives. Since 1955 he has been chairman of the Housing Subcommittee which has done an outstanding job of investigating and studying housing problems and in recommending hard-hitting and workable solutions. His subcommittee hearings and reports are noted for their high caliber and fair-minded and constructive approach. His subcommittee has performed an invaluable service in improving and perfecting all of the many Government housing programs and in laying the groundwork for most of the legislative proposals which finally reached successful culmination in the great Housing Act of 1961.

No one would dispute that it was his leadership and his presence as a tower of strength which enabled the monumental and far-reaching 1961 act to survive all of the perils which beset it in the narrowly divided House of Representatives. His masterly handling of the parliamentary maneuvering which foiled the opponents of the bill has become a classic in legislative generalmanship.

The Only Decision That Could Be Made

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following column by the distinguished columnist, Mr. Roscoe Drummond. Mr. Drummond's column appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of March 5, 1962, and speaks eloquently of the difficulty of the decision announced by President Kennedy on Friday, March 2.

The alternatives to testing are presented cogently and allow us to see for ourselves why President Kennedy could not have reached any other decision than the one he announced.

The article follows:

KENNEDY DECISION SEEN ONLY WAY OUT ON TESTING

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—"The most deliberate decision I have ever made" is the way President Kennedy summed up to his White House intimates his aproval of U.S. nuclear testing in the atmosphere as long as Premier Khrushchev spurns an inspectable ban.

But now that he has weighed fully the consequences of the Soviet testing—50 in the last few months—Mr. Kennedy knew that there was no other prudent, no other possible decision he could take in the absence of a test ban.

He explored every argument and avenue to avoid it. He checked out every suggested alternative course of action. He examined with every top security official of the Government—scientific, diplomatic, military, and intelligence—the whole spectrum of views for and against, including anxieties of our allies, neutral opinion, the hazards of fallout and all the honest humanitarian reservations.

It was a reluctant decision but a necessary one. It rested decisively on the central issue of national security.

Mr. Kennedy was reluctant because he much preferred—and still does—an inspectable agreement barring all testing.

For nearly 3 years we have refrained from testing while we negotiated with the Soviet Union to get a test ban. On September 1 last year, the Soviets resumed atmospheric testing in the midst of negotiations. Despite an immediate United States-British plea that they resume the moratorium, the Soviets refused. They proceeded to explode nuclear weapons up to 60 megatons.

I believe that the President's decision to proceed with U.S. testing if the Soviets do not show some prompt and credible evidence that they will accept a test ban with reasonable controls, was necessary for these reasons:

1. The United States simply cannot take the risk, either for its own safety or for that of the free world, to allow its nuclear capability to remain substantially static by not testing while Russia's nuclear capability is pushed forward in power and diversity by testing. A U.S. policy of no testing in the face of Soviet testing—with no inspectable test ban in sight—would be national recklessness.

2. The nuclear weapons scientists and the military are agreed that the new Soviet tests jeopardize the U.S. nuclear deterrent in the area of super-megaton bombs. Soviet military science has been advanced to new ground. We are persuaded that in the area of strategic high-yield warheads, Soviet technology has "qualitatively" gone ahead of ours.

This does not mean that the total "mix" of U.S. defensive military strength is either outdated or surpassed as a result of the latest Soviet tests. That is not what had required Mr. Kennedy to approve new U.S. tests. What decided the President is not just the state of our nucelar military science, but our rate of progress. It became clear that the Soviet rate of progress was jeopardizing U.S. security.

In the 50 explosions, the Soviets subjected their rocket systems to full-scale tests. We have never tested a rocket's reentry into the atmosphere—neither with Minuteman, Polaris, Atlas nor Titan. Thus we have been putting in our stockpile weapons systems which have never been fully tested.

We also need to determine whether a near-miss bomb will cripple a hardened rocket site. We need to find out how much communications and radar detection may be affected by nuclear blasts in the high atmosphere. And we need to prove out the untested Nike-Zeus antimissile missile system.

The President is not giving the military an open-end test program. It has prudent limits. It will stick to the high-priority essentials. And Mr. Kennedy was careful to leave it open to the Soviets to call the whole thing off by agreeing to an inspectable test ban.

No thoughtful person can have any relish for this perilous, costly armaments race. Mr. Kennedy takes no satisfaction in meeting the Soviet testing with testing of our own. I can think of only one thing worse than engaging our will and resources in this arms race. That would be to run away from it, to shut our eyes, to permit the balance of military strength to become an imbalance. That would be worse, that would be the sure way to war—or surrender.

Letter to the Editor From Maurice H. Stans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 1 a recent editorial from the Sacramento Bee which contained certain references to Mr. Maurice Stans, former Director of the Bureau of the Budget. At this time I should like to insert in the RECORD a subsequent letter from Mr. Stans which appeared on the editorial page in the Sacramento Bee of March 14 along with an acknowledgment by that newspaper.

EDITOR OF THE BEE:

SIR: My attention was called to the fact that on February 17 you published an edi-

torial entitled "Ike's Budget Chief Does Switch on Some Topics." Subsequently, this material was entered with prefatory remarks into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Congressman JOHN E. MOSS. The editorial contains four sentences attributed to me as direct quotes.

These statements were never made by me, publicly or privately. I have no idea how or by whom they were created. The editorial mentions a newspaper column that I wrote opposing the 8-percent investment credit for business capital expenditures, but the quoted statements do not appear in that column, nor can they be even remotely inferred from the contents of the column. They, in fact, are entirely contrary to my beliefs.

The four statements attributed to me are as follows:

1. Through rapid depreciation, private power companies have accumulated billions of dollars through interest-free capital.

2. By using the fast writeoff, private power companies have been able to charge consumers for more taxes than they, the utilities, actually pay to the Government.

3. As a result, at least 17 private companies have paid out cash dividends wholly or partially tax free."

4. Three of these (Indiana private utility) companies alone had about as much gift in deferred taxes on December 1, 1960, as the amount of the (REA Indiana) loan—and the latter is not a gift.

Whoever wrote these remarks was entirely ignorant of accounting principles. The statements distort wholly the facts as to the treatment of depreciation by public utilities and the income tax consequences of such depreciation deductions. As regulated companies, the accounting practices of the public utilities must be approved by State and Federal authorities.

The accounting practices employed by the public utilities in dealing with accelerated depreciation and deferred income tax liabilities are consistent with official pronouncements of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. Any reputable certified public accountant will confirm this. If you are in doubt you might want to ask a CPA to give you a copy of the institute's statements on "Allocation of Income Taxes" which are intended to apply to all business corporations, public utilities or other.

The material attributed to me is so incorrect and so obnoxious that I would appreciate it greatly if you would print this letter in prominence on your editorial page. I also think it appropriate that you print a suitable retraction in your editorial column.

MAURICE H. STANS.

LOS ANGELES.

The Bee owes Stans an apology. It checked and discovered the quotes complained about were erroneously attributed to him.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Conservatism: The Pros and Cons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, recently, in Wyoming, a contest was sponsored by the Big Horn County Republican organization for students who desire to write on the subject of conservatism. I am very happy to have received copies of the winning essays sent to me by the Lovell, Wyo., Republican organization. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSERVATION

(By Helen Partridge, Cowley, Wyo.)

Webster's definition of conservatism is "conservative principles; the disposition and tendency to preserve what is established; opposition to change."

Until I was assigned this paper I had never given this particular theme much thought. First of all I'm led to assume, in my reading, that the conservative is the rightest or the rightwing, that when the United States became a nation and adopted the Constitution, that any of us believe was divinely inspired, that we were fundamentally a conservative nation. The proof of this thought are the checks and balances that the leaders of that time saw fit to write into the Constitution.

It is very hard to say just where conservatism stops and liberalism begins. There are so many terms used where public opinion is concerned it is hard to put one's finger on the kind of a platform one would like to stand for.

"If conservatism looks upon the enhancement of man's spiritual nature as the primary concern of political philosophy, and if liberalism regards the satisfaction of the economic wants of the human being as the dominant mission of society" (from BARRY GOLDWATER'S "Conscience of a Conservative," then I believe I am a conservative).

I have always been taught that the full life considers all phases of the human being and that the individual, and not the state, is the important thing in any society. That danger lies in extremes. Perhaps extremes are necessary in rare cases, but carefully thought-out moderation brings a nation nearer its goals. It is easy to see that if we keep on going we may dissolve our republican form of government into a state of socialism and if the powers we are putting into the hands of a few decides to keep on disregarding the Constitution, it may not be very long. This, of course, we can blame on to no one but ourselves. If the American people are ambitious enough we can bring back the freedom we are gradually losing.

Free enterprise could soon be dissolved and I quote again from Mr. GOLDWATER, "A study recently conducted by the Chicago Tribune showed that the Federal Government is now the biggest landowner, property manager, renter, mover and hauler, medical clinician, lender, insurer, mortgage broker, employer, debtor, taxer and spender in all history."

Actually according to the Constitution as the fundamental law in the land the Government of the United States should be interested in these not as a government but as problems of the States. Power as we have been told so many times is a very dangerous thing when put in the hands of a few, especially when the people of the Nation are not concerned with how it is used. A return to conservatism is probably what every thoughtful American would like but I do think that the conservatism that does not recognize any change whatsoever is the kind we should definitely not have.

There are adjustments that must be made as changes occur in the affairs of our Nation and the world, but I believe that the Constitution of the United States as it is written will take care of these changes without losing ourselves in liberalism. Liberalism treats the Constitution of the United States as a kind of political theory to be heeded or ignored, depending on how it fits the plan.

I believe it was formulated to be the fundamental law of the land.

If conservatism is not practiced, civil rights may be a thing of the past. The farmer is already taking orders from the Government as to what he can and cannot do with his land. Labor is dictating the Nation's economy to a very great extent. The tax burden is almost unbearable because of the many State responsibilities the Nation has taken over. The welfare program has become a huge burden because the individuals of the United States will not shoulder their own responsibilities and I suppose we might say why should they if the Government wants to do it.

Conservatism which place these burdens along, they of education, where they belong, in the communities and 50 States of our Union.

One of the greatest questions to be considered is our future with communism. It has been considerable of a worry among the members of my family that we have been too liberal as a nation and not setting our sights on the liberties and privileges that we as Americans should enjoy. We know from the past that appeasement is not the answer and that we will have to work and devote our lives and our fortunes in the defense of liberty and freedom. I am sure that I will be a little more mindful of what is going on in the Government of my country in the future.

THE PROS AND CONS OF CONSERVATISM

(By Grover Shaw, Cowley, Wyo.)

To me conservatism is a temperate, nonradical way of living and thinking. This does not mean a soft, easygoing sort of philosophy. It must bring back the type of America and Americans who were willing to not only die for an ideal but would live for one.

As I look at the conservative point of view these are the things for which they seem to stand:

1. Free enterprise: A man ought to have a right to as much freedom he is able to handle as long as he is not encroaching on the rights of other freemen. The government ought to exist for the help and good of man. When the government becomes so big and so powerful that it is doing all of the deciding and making all of the mistakes, then man exists for the government instead of the government existing for man. If a man wants to sell his milk "dirt cheap" he should have that privilege. When a law is made that puts a minimum price on certain commodities it gives a sure advantage to the bigger outfit.

2. Sound economy: The Government ought not to do anything that private companies and corporations can do for themselves. Even businesses have come to depend on Government subsidies in their socalled independent projects. If our Government is called on to underwrite everyone's losses then there is a premium put on failure. Subsidies tend to lower the quality of the commodity produced. We lose the personal pride that comes from doing something well.

It is wrong for someone to live off the government when he could get work. As long as a person can get work, any kind, at any wage, he should get it rather than draw unemploment compensation. If it is impossible for him to find any kind of a job, the government should provide work instead of giving a handout.

A major problem, shortly before the fall of the Roman Empire, was high taxes. This same problem is facing us today. Each administration increases the national debt. As a result taxes go even higher. Not only our National Government but the American people as a whole are living on credit.

Any extreme, be it either to the left or the right, is dangerous. However, it is possible to get so far, either left or right, that what was originally the center seems like an extreme. The supposed extreme, in this case, would be right.

3. Free speech: America's salvation lies in an informed public. People won't fight for something they don't understand and love. This was proved by American prisoners in Korea. If men like General Walker are not allowed to inform the American people about the nature of communism, we have few defenses against Communist propaganda.

4. Firm, clear foreign policy: You can't lead if you don't know where you are going. Since the Second World War, America has been given the role of world leadership. But no one seems to know, for certain, our foreign policy. At present, it seems to be one of appeasement.

Shortly after the Second World War our Government was warned of Communist activity in China. People in the State Department passed it off simply as an agrarian reform. Today we have Communist China.

During the Korean war, Chinese and Russian planes repeatedly attacked U.N. forces and then dashed back across the Yalu where our planes were not allowed to follow. When our land forces reached the Yalu they were stopped by our own Government. Today the Communists are still at the 38th parallel.

In 1957, Hungary made a valiant effort to throw off communism. They pleaded for U.S. help, but we were afraid we might get ourselves involved in fighting tyranny. As a result, Hungary is still Communist.

In the latter part of 1960, Russia sent planes to deliver supplies to Communist forces in Laos. Counteraction was needed. Because our diplomats were afraid of foreign opinion, they did nothing to stop it. Today Laos is on the verge of Communist takeover.

In the spring of 1961, Cubans made a try to oust their dictator. The invasion was

backed by our Government. Our executive department did a poor job of planning and refused to give military aid. Today Castro is still in power and Cuba is Communist. Why do we allow it to remain so? What happened to our Monroe Doctrine?

The most recent example of indecision and concession is the Berlin wall. The Russians had no legal right to put any barrier between East and West Berlin. At first they strung only a few strands of barbed wire. At this point the United States should have stepped in and destroyed it. They didn't. Today the barrier is a wall. How much longer are we going to be pushed around?

Time is running out. We can't afford these expensive bungles.

5. Testing of nuclear weapons: Conservatism advocates a strong America achieved by stockpiling and testing of nuclear weapons. A strong free world is the only thing that will keep the Communists from starting a war.

The following is the words of Nicholas Murray Butler, "Peace is not an ideal at all. The ideal itself is human liberty, justice, and the honorable conduct of an orderly and humane society. To regard peace as an end in itself and as something to be achieved at all hazards, is in effect, to labor for the indefinite continuance of war."

THE CONSERVATIVE PHILOSOPHY OF GOVERNMENT

(By Phillip Greer, Greybull, Wyo.)

American politics today is a struggle between two different elements, the so-called liberals and conservatives. In general, a liberal stands in favor of various welfare programs designed to materially benefit society. The conservative, on the other hand, is against some or all of these programs on the basis that they restrict the liberty of the individual, that they are unnecessary and wasteful, or that they give the Government power not awarded in the Constitution.

The most important of these objections to welfare programs is that they restrict the liberty of the individual. The fact that certain of the welfare programs may be wasteful is purely a materialistic concern and is not important to the philosophy of conservatism. As such, it will be dismissed without further comment.

The fact that certain welfare programs may be unconstitutional is important to conservative philosophy because the Constitution, as the basis of liberty in America, is also the basis of conservatism in America. However, the objection that a welfare program is unconstitutional only serves to back up our main objection—that it restricts the liberty of the individual. The Constitution is the most efficient protector of the individual we have. This is because the Constitution is the most important limitation on the power of the Federal Government; and the Federal Government places the most restrictions on individual liberty.

It has been the policy of liberals to interpret the Constitution to their own advantage. They have regarded it as an obstacle to their plans for progressive legislation rather than as a safeguard from Government oppression. They have ignored the fact that the Constitution is the law of the land and as such should be followed closely. We do not contend that the Constitution is perfect. It has been improved since it was written, and will doubtless be changed and improved upon again. This is as it should be. It is not right or safe, however, to disobey the Constitution as if it didn't exist.

We can now view the main basis of our objection to the liberal welfare programs: the loss of individual liberty. The liberty of the individual is the basis of American society and must be the basis of any democratic society. The success of a democratic government can be measured by the amount of effective liberty it makes available to the individual. A government must also, of course, provide for the needs which the government must uphold—the needs of the individual and the needs of society. If either of these needs is ignored or overemphasized, an undesirable situation is produced. Too often, the needs of society have been overemphasized and the rights of the individual have been sacrificed.

This is true of the Communist countries. Here the citizen is told what he will do and then forced to do it. There is so little individual liberty that the citizen is little more than a slave.

The needs of society have been overemphasized to a lesser extent in several Western European countries. In England, for example, such programs as compulsory health and accident insurance, medical care, and housing subsidies have been given so much concern that individual needs have been largely overlooked. As a result, taxes have soared and inflation has increased.

Taxes are so high, in fact, that a man is often as well off to live on Government welfare as he would be working. When these conditions exist, many people are sure to take advantage of Government help even though they are perfectly able to take care of themselves. As more people come to rely on Government help, the few who do work must be taxed even more to pay for the increasing cost of running the Government.

The situation just described inevitably impairs the incentive of the individual. After all, if a person can rely on the Government to support him, why should he try to do anything for himself? The answer is that he would gain more satisfaction by accomplishing something himself than by having something handed to him. But few people, even if they realized this, have the ambition to exert themselves unless hunger and want force them to. As the individual has no incentive to work, he ceases to take an interest in bettering himself or others.

The conditions which are prevalent in England and other countries are to be seen more and more in the United States. These conditions have come about through two mistakes which the residents and officials of the United States and other countries have made. The first mistake is to rely upon a powerful, centralized government for solutions to problems which State governments, local governments, and individuals have been unwilling to solve. The idea that placing a problem in the hands of the Federal Government will automatically bring a proper solution is a fallacy indeed. More often, the Federal Government is less able to handle the problem than the local government which is more directly concerned. Besides solving nothing, the policy of depending upon the Federal Government has dangerously enlarged the Government's power and, as I have already stated, has impaired the incentive of the individual.

The second mistake which has been made is that of putting so much emphasis on material prosperity that spiritual well-being is ignored. Economic wellbeing is not a blueprint for happiness. Nor will economic well-being bring dignity or self-respect to an individual. It is through a man's personal accomplishments that he gains these qualities. And it is the Government's duty to see that a man has the opportunity to accomplish what he wants.

The goals and duties of the conservative can now be stated. The conservative wants to extend the greatest possible amount of freedom while at the same time maintaining order and prosperity. Accordingly, the conservative must encourage individuals and organizations to handle problems within their means. He must oppose legislation which tends to place too much power in the hands of the Government. Above all, he must strive to preserve the liberty of the individual citizen.

TWO POINTS OF CONSERVAVTIVE PHILOSOPHY

(By Eloise Cortez, Greybull, Wyo.)

ON INDIVIDUALISM

One of the strongest points of conservative philosophy is a belief in individualism. We Americans can say without a doubt that our freedom is our most precious possession, but individualism is the key to our way of life. The whole purpose of our Government is to make it possible for each of us to lead our own individual lives. Without freedom there is no necessity for democracy, without democracy there can be no true freedom. Individualism is a derivative of freedom, our right to believe in our own thoughts and shape our lives according to our beliefs. This is our privilege to do as we choose, to rise on our own merits, efforts and capabilities. Each private dream in every man's heart can be realized. This is individualism, this is our life.

A false philosophy would assume that the individual exists to aid the welfare of the Government, but the best of social and political philosophies claims no other goal than to assure its individual citizens the right of pursuing their ambitions in their own individual ways. That government which gives its people a maximum of freedom and minimizes the central power promises its people a maximum of happiness and tranquility in a world of fear and insecurity.

ON FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

A favorite argument of the liberal party is that education is a matter of national concern, therefore its financing is a national problem. This, however, is illogical reasoning and can be answered by the more valid conservative statement—although the education of our future citizens is a matter of national interest, it is not a Federal function. The States and localities have always been able to cope with the financial problems concerning education, thus there is no necessity for Federal aid. Should our schools be poor and ill equipped the story might be different but our education system can face any in the world without even the tiniest blush of embarrassment.

Money alone will not solve our problems and in many ways it will only serve to increase our headaches. The old adage "Never bite the hand that feeds you" still holds true. If Federal aid to education is granted the Government will take control of our schools and some part of our precious freedom will be lost. This is an expensive price to pay for money that we don't need with such strings attached. In a country where our liberty is based upon such small freedoms we Americans must ask ourselves if the price of Federal aid to education is worth the results.

Panama Canal in Gravest Peril

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Un-American Activities, in its studies of communistic revolutionary subversion, long ago recognized the danger zone in the Caribbean in which the Panama Canal is the key target. Thus, it is indeed gratifying that the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, consisting of more than 100 patriotic, civic, and fraternal societies from various

parts of the Nation, emphasized this danger at its annual convention on February 1, 1962, in the form of a thought-provoking resolution.

In this connection, I would invite attention to the tremendous contributions to these policy matters by our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD]. His many scholarly and irrefutable statements over a period of years on Caribbean and Isthmian questions are a vast store of reliable information that are indispensable for adequate understanding and should be studied by all agencies concerned with them, both legislative and executive.

In order that the perils now focusing on the Panama Canal may be more widely known, I quote the indicated resolution:

PANAMA CANAL IN GRAVEST PERIL

Whereas the world revolutionary movement known as the international Communist conspiracy, through expertly conducted infiltration and subversion for conquest of the strategic Caribbean area, in which conspiracy the Panama Canal is the key objective, has placed that waterway in the gravest peril; and

Whereas this conspiratorial revolutionary movement, abetted if not openly aided by policymaking elements in the Department of State, has advanced its program of conquest to the point where Cuba and British Guiana cover both flanks of the Atlantic approaches to the Canal, thus transforming the Caribbean into a red danger zone; and

Whereas more than 50 years' experience in the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal in a region of endemic revolution and political instability, has completely established the wisdom of the 1903 treaty provisions for its exclusive sovereign control by the United States in perpetuity as indispensable for safeguarding the vital interests of our country and all free nations; and

Whereas a series of harmful and timid surrenders to successive insatiable demands in Panama, through ineptly conceded treaties, secretly contrived executive agreements and, finally, by Executive order on September 17, 1960, to authorize display of the Panamanian flag over the Zone, issued contrary to the overwhelming vote of the House of Representatives, has seriously weakened our legal position on the Isthmus; and

Whereas since the Suez crisis of 1956, despite many brilliant and irrefutable statements by individual Members in the Congress on all significant angles of Isthmian canal policy, both Houses of the Congress, the Department of State and the President have failed to meet with forthright declarations and actions the mounting challenge to the juridical status of the United States in the Canal Zone; and

Whereas, notwithstanding solemn treaty obligations to maintain and operate the Panama Canal and the serious diplomatic injuries already sustained, the President has acceded to recent Panamanian demands for general treaty revisions that aim not only to weaken further the rights, power, and authority of the United States on the Isthmus but also to set a time for turning over control of the Panama Canal and the Canal Zone to Panama as gifts; and

Whereas increasingly unreasonable and suicidal demands of Panama, which have followed our continued surrenders, constitute in their essence powerful aids to communistic revolutionary inspired efforts for internationalization of the canal, a result which Panama has always strongly opposed; and

Whereas the mass news media in our country and its publicists have generally failed to present the Isthmian question in its stark realties, thereby depriving our people of information of the most vital importance: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies:

1. Condemns the tragic failures on the part of both Houses of the Congress, the Department of State, and the President to safeguard our vital interests with respect to the entire Caribbean area, especially the Panama Canal; and

2. Considers that the responsibility for these derelictions rests primarily with the jurisdictional committees of the Congress, the Department of State, and the President; and

3. Urges both Houses of the Congress to take immediate steps to correct these grave legislative and executive delinquencies by prompt and forthright clarification and reaffirmation of our original and time-proven Isthmian Canal policies under which the Panama Canal was acquired and constructed, and has been maintained, operated, sanitated, and protected; and

4. Urges the loyal news media of our country to delve into the grave perils involved and to alert and inform our people, with demands for prompt and forthright declarations and actions by the legislative and executive departments.

Project Pride

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, recently Gen. Omar N. Bradley, chairman of the board of directors of the Bulova Watch Co., announced a new private program on international assistance. The program is designed to assist physically handicapped men from all over the world by training them in the United States as instructors in watchmaking and precision instrument techniques. Efforts like these are of vital importance, and I am pleased today to call attention to this promising work.

I ask unanimous consent that two news articles from the New York Times on this particular program be printed at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRADLEY TELLS OF SCHOLARSHIPS TO AID DISABLED FROM OVERSEAS

WASHINGTON, March 2.—A program that would provide scholarships to physically handicapped men of foreign countries for training in the United States as instructors in watchmaking and precision instrument techniques was announced here today.

Gen. Omar N. Bradley told a news conference that the Joseph Bulova School of Watchmaking in New York would sponsor the project. He said it would "fill the void for physically handicapped men that lies between rehabilitation and the attainment of gainful and satisfying employment."

General Bradley is chairman of the board of trustees of the school and chairman of the board of the Bulova Watch Co., Inc. He was Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff from 1949 to 1953.

The undertaking is called Program for Rehabilitation Instruction and Development, or Pride. General Bradley declared that "Pride is what we hope to restore to hundreds of men who will benefit from this program."

The World Rehabilitation Fund will cooperate with the Bulova school in directing the program. It will encourage foreign students to return to their native countries and teach others watchmaking and precision instrument techniques.

Students will be nominated by organizations in their own countries, which will provide transportation to New York and a monthly allowance of about $75 for equipment and expenses. All other costs, estimated at $7,500 a student for a 2-year course, will be met by the school.

General Bradley said that students will also be given courses in the English language and American history. These courses will be taught by professors from the Institute of Behavioral and Social Sciences at Adelphi College, in Garden City, Long Island.

Dr. Howard A. Rusk, president of the World Rehabilitation Fund, said that the project was one of the first of its kind outside the United States, Canada, and Europe.

"It is a practical example of how people can overcome national boundaries to work together on common goals," he said. Dr. Rusk is also director of the Institute of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, New York University Medical Center, and an associate editor of the New York Times.

Two students from Israel have already been awarded scholarships. They are now in residence at the Bulova school in New York. Other students are expected to come soon from Hong Kong, Italy, North Africa, and Australia. Later this year the program will be expanded to other countries.

SEVEN PERCENT IN WORLD HANDICAPPED

General Bradley pointed out that "even the most cautious experts estimate that 7 percent of the world's population is severely handicapped."

"That is an army of people larger than the entire 188 million population of the United States," he said.

Bulova school officials feel the training can be of significant value to paraplegics, cardiacs, amputees, polio victims and, in some cases, persons who have suffered from mental illness. They point out that the benefits of the program are psychological as well as practical.

The school was opened in 1945, to provide training for the hundreds of World War II veterans who had sustained paraplegic injuries. It was started by the late Arde Bulova and named after his father, founder and first president of the Bulova Co.

More than 700 physically handicapped men have graduated from the school, most of whom now work as watch repairmen or precision instrument makers. Many own their own businesses.

Two courses are offered by the school: a 9-month precision technician's course and an 18-month watch repair course. Peak enrollment is about 120 students.

REHABILITATION ABROAD

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

At the closing luncheon session on Friday, General of the Army Omar N. Bradley announced a new international program of fellowships to provide disabled persons from other nations with training in the United States as instructors in watchmaking and precision instrument techniques. General Bradley is chairman of the Bulova Watch Co.

EXCHANGE PROGRAM SET

The program, which is called PRIDE (program for rehabilitation instruction and de-

velopment), is the first international exchange program of its kind.

It will be sponsored by the Joseph Bulova School of Watchmaking in cooperation with the World Rehabilitation Fund, International Society for Rehabilitation of the Disabled and Adelphi College, Garden City, Long Island.

Training will be given at the Bulova school, founded by the late Arde Bulova immediately following World War II. The school, which has graduated more than 700 disabed veterans and civilians, is named for Mr. Bulova's father.

General Bradley said initially scholarships will be provided for disabled trainees from Hong Kong, Italy, North Africa, and Australia. Later the program will be extended to other nations. Two students have already arrived from Israel.

The 2-year Arde Bulova Memorial Scholarships to be given the international trainees provide for tuition, room and board, and medical services valued at about $7,500 a student.

The Interdependence of Political, Scientific and Military Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I believe a recent speech by Senator MUSKIE entitled "The Interdependence of Political, Scientific, and Military Planning," should be given further circulation. The Senator has commented on a number of the critical issues in the staffing and organization of the national security policy process following on his work as a member of the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery of the Government Operations Committee. This speech was delivered to a meeting of the Electronics Industries Association seminar on March 13, 1962. I hope that Members of Congress will read Senator MUSKIE's most helpful statement.

I ask unanimous consent to have the speech printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

THE INTERDEPENDENCE OF POLITICAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND MILITARY PLANNING

(Remarks by U.S. Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, Democrat, of Maine, to a luncheon meeting of the Electronics Industries Association seminar on the New Look in Defense Planning, Statler-Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C., March 13, 1962)

Two weeks ago, President Kennedy spoke to the Nation on his decision to resume nuclear weapons testing. No single issue, and no single decision illustrates more clearly the dilemmas confronting the President and his policy advisers in coordinating political, scientific, and military planning. In retrospect the decision appears to have been inevitable. But in the preparation for that decision, nothing could be treated as inevitable except the paramount importance of the security of the free world.

The remarkable feature of that decision was the balance it achieved in giving proper weight to the three factors involved in our overall national security—domestic and foreign policy, scientific advancement, and military planning.

Politically, the President had to recognize the deep emotional biases on both sides of the issue inside the United States. There were those who would have us test, whatever the effects of such tests on health, national and world opinion, or long-term disarmament goals. There were those who would oppose all tests, whatever the effects of such a decision on our defensive capacity and the balance of power. There was a large group without opinions, but with vague and disquieting fears over what might happen if we should resume tests.

As the leader of the free world, the President had to take into account the attitude of our allies and friends and the reaction of the uncommitted nations. We could not have our policies determined by them, but neither, in the contest for men's minds, could we afford to ignore their opinions.

I do not need to detail the scientific and military requirements which enforced the need to resume the tests. This is an age when military technology holds the key to the balance of power, when the scientific advances of today forecast the potential strength of tomorrow, and when the force of weapons threatens broad scale devastation.

Until we have found the political and scientific means of controlling the development, possession, and use of weapons, we cannot avoid our responsibility for maintaining and expanding our defensive and offensive capacity. Our Secretary of State is, this week, testing whether or not such control is possible.

All of this implies a deep and lasting struggle, one in which the free nations and the Communist bloc are deeply involved, and one from which the uncommitted nations are trying desperately to escape. There is no visible end to the struggle. Although it resembles war in so many ways, the cold war does not offer the immediate and decisive choices which make war palatable to some and bearable to others. In the cold war there is the constant threat of intellectual frostbite, frozen attitudes, and apathy. A cold shower braces; but the penetrating cold of a long winter's night threatens to drain the resources of the hardiest among us.

How, in such a protracted struggle does a free society retain its vitality, provide for its defense, and give leadership against an implacable and resourceful foe?

Or, as Senator JACKSON put it in his final statement for the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery: "Can free societies outplan, outperform, outlast—and if need be, outsacrifice—totalitarian systems? Can we recognize fresh problems in a changing world and respond in time with new plans for meeting them?"

In this forum, you are wrestling with the problems of coordinated planning. As manufacturers of electronic devices, you have banded together, in part, "to advance the defense of our country, the growth of our economy, the progress of technology, and all interests of the electronics industry compatible with the public welfare." This is a worthy objective.

It would be presumptuous of me to set myself up as an expert on military and technological planning. Even my service on the Government Operations Committee and the National Policy Machinery Subcommittee does not give me the authority to lecture you on the difficulties of coordinating the scientific and military aspects of our defense planning effort.

What I can do, as one versed in public policy, is to offer you an approach to the problem of coordinating and integrating specialized disciplines, which are increasingly interrelated on a policymaking level, which, in turn, is the domain of nonspecialists.

There are three ways in which we may approach the problem: structure, personnel, and public response.

The first question is that of structure. Do we need to set up special committees or to overhaul our Government in order to get the job done as it should be done?

Whenever freemen encounter a problem they form a committee or an association. This town is filled with committees, associations, organizations, societies, and study groups, in and out of government. Their rise and fall can be plotted and predicted according to the ebb and flow of crises in every field of human endeavor from aeronautical technology to the zoology of Afghanistan.

Such combinations of interested parties are inevitable. In a free society they are desirable. But in government the temptation to form a committee whenever an apparently new problem arises should be treated with great caution and restraint.

As Senator JACKSON said in his final statement on the deliberation of the National Policy Machinery Subcommittee:

"Properly managed, and chaired by officials with responsibility for decision and action, committees can be useful in helping make sure that voices that should be heard are heard. But a very high percentage of committees exact a heavy toll by diluting the authority of individual executives, obscuring responsibility for getting things done, and generally slowing decisionmaking."

Government by committee is no government at all, since it is the antithesis of the action on which forceful and effective government depends.

The other temptation in dealing with changing problems of a democracy in our present age is to engage in radical overhauling of the actual framework and structure of government.

The National Policy Machinery Subcommittee received many suggestions for governmental reorganization, ranging from the constitution of a supercabinet with a First Secretary to the proposed establishment of a Department of Science and Technology. The subcommittee rejected both suggestions, noting that "faulty machinery is rarely the real culprit when our policies are inconsistent or when they lack sustained forward momentum. The underlying cause is normally found elsewhere. It consists in the absence of a clear sense of direction and coherence of policy at the top of the Government." Organization is no substitute for leadership.

The subcommittee rejected the concept of a supercabinet and a First Secretary because, in its opinion, the results of such a reorganization would be to hamper the President in the exercise of his responsibilities. In addition, it would tend to cut him off from his principal policymakers and departmental advisers through the imposition of a new bureaucratic organization on one which in many respects is already swollen.

The plight of the National Security Council, as revealed in the subcommittee study, is instructive. The Council was established originally in 1947 to advise the President "with respect to the integration of domestic, foreign, and military policies relating to the national security so as to enable the military services and the other departments and agencies of the Government to cooperate more effectively in matters involving the national security."

Over the years, the Council developed a dual role, that of the Council itself acting as adviser to the President, and that of the Council system in which the Council staff and a complex interdepartmental committee substructure were designed to undergird the works of the Council. The Council system had become, in other words, an institution, another facet of bureaucracy.

As a result of the growth of the Council as an institution, much of its effectiveness had been diluted. It produced "policy papers," adjusted departmental differences at the staff level rather than defining and sharpening issues, and established a system which had burdened the members of the Council and hindered the implementation of policy.

The National Policy Machinery Subcommittee concluded that the organization of the Council should be loosened, that its function as a relatively small group of top advisers to the President be emphasized, and that the President rely heavily on a flexible staff of personal assistants.

Essentially, this is the approach which President Kennedy has taken. He has been criticised by some as being too "free wheeling" to his approach to the policymaking machinery. His method tends to disrupt and cut across traditional concepts of administrative procedure and neat lines of authority, but his approach does emphasize flexibility, the relentless probing and testing of ideas, the competition of new proposals, and the ultimate responsibility of the President.

President Truman had a sign on his desk: "The buck stops here." This is always true. The danger in establishing too elaborate a staff system around the executive is that the buck will be trimmed beyond recognition before it reaches the President for his decision.

The question of structure and coordination is not limited to the President and his advisers, it extends to the coordination of scientific and military development.

Earlier I alluded to the problem of science and technology and its relationship to the national security. This problem was of great concern to the subcommittee, as it is central to your deliberations as participants in scientific and technological development and productions.

As the subcommittee's January 1960 interim report put it:

"There is growing awareness that scientific, military, and political planning must go forward together. Some argue that our defense planners, particularly at top civilian levels, have as a group not appreciated fully enough the future military implications of crucial technical programs in the developmental state. It is also held that our research and developments effort too often suffers from a lack of adequate guidance concerning weapons systems of maximum utility. As a group, our foreign policy planners have also not concerned themselves enough with the future political consequences of weapon systems in the laboratory state. Similarly, it is argued that our research and development programs would benefit from clearer guidelines concerning projects which might best help further our foreign policy goals.

"How, without straightjacketing technological development, can state and defense furnish those concerned with development more useful guidance concerning the paths of technological exploration which might best enable us to further our overall political and military objectives?"

One of the continuing recommendations for meeting this problem of coordination of scientific effort with foreign policy and military goals is the proposed establishment of a Department of Science and Technology. Such proposals ignore the fact that science is not a definable jurisdiction, it is a tool. Furthermore scientists are professional experts, not necessarily possessing the broad perspective which is required at the level of departmental responsibility, especially if such a department were to encompass the whole realm of science.

In his testimony before the subcommittee, Mr. James Perkins, of the Carnegie Corp., warned:

"We are inclined to translate important special authority into authority in general. A specialist on atomic energy does not necessarily speak with equal authority on infrared devices or jet propulsion. Even less does he speak with authority on problems of strategic deterrence or on the probable outcome of the cold war.

"We are in some danger, it seems to me, of repeating the mistakes of the thirties when the fears of depression produced an overvaluation of the general skills of the economist."

The staff report of the subcommittee further noted that scientists "are not exempt from the human tendency to allow these beliefs to color their technical judgments, and to become ardent pleaders for special causes."

While we recognize the nature of science and the limitations of scientists, we much acknowledge the need for more effective means of advising the President and the Congress on scientific developments and their implications, and of integrating such developments with policy planning. Without adequate understanding there will be no intelligent action.

The President has a Special Assistant for Science and Technology and a Science Advisory Committee. They have been extremely useful to the President as professional experts and advisers within a flexible framework of authority.

The principal shortcomings of the present arrangement are the lack of sufficient staff, particularly for advance planning, and the fact that the President's advisers are not available to testify before Congress. They cannot provide the same service the Budget Bureau Director gives in overall policy briefings and specific testimony on the relationship of individual programs to the overall aims of the administration.

Serious consideration should be, and I understand is being, given to the subcommittee recommendation calling for the establishment of an Office of Science and Technology within the Executive Office of the President. Such an office, adequately staffed, would help the President look ahead in the field of scientific development; it would help coordinate the activities of the various Government agencies; and it would be available as a source of expert advice to the Congress.

In calling for such a staff, we should remember that the chief strength of the existing science arrangement in the President's Office is its flexibility. It would be essential that the new office follow a flexible mode of organization and operation. We are not looking for a new bureaucracy.

Such a step would supplement, but would not supplant, the need for more adequate recognition of scientific planning within the various departments. The administration has made substantial gains in this area, particularly in the Department of Defense through the Division of Defense Research and Engineering.

Ultimately, of course, our success in coordinating scientific development and national policy planning depends upon the recruitment of qualified personnel and the full utilization of the talent we have available to us. This is true not only at the operating level, but also at the policymaking level. Nowhere is the upgrading of personnel more important than in the Department of State.

The studies of the National Policy Machinery Subcommittee emphasized the prime importance of the Office of Secretary of State as the First Secretary to the President. The nature of his contribution will vary acording to his individual talent and the working relationship he is able to establish with the President. But whatever that relationship, the Secretary of State must bear the full burden of leadership across the full range of national security matters, as they relate to foreign policy.

Such leadership cannot be achieved if the Secretary is constantly preoccupied with what Dean Acheson has called the thundering present. This will require constant improvement in and upgrading of the Policy Planning Council, better executive management within the Department, and improved training programs for career personnel. The State Department must make a constant effort to outgrow antiquated concepts of its role, many of which date from the era of 19th century diplomacy.

The State Department's greatest single need remains imaginative and competent executive managements. Every shortcoming in this area cannot help but limit the effectiveness of the Secretary of State.

In addition, the Secretary of State must maintain close cooperation with the Secretary of Defense in foreign policy planning. Here again, we return to the imponderables of personal relationships supported by rational, competent, and imaginative departmental support.

Obviously the two Secretaries cannot achieve such cooperation, without full cooperation and understanding between the operating levels of the two departments. I have been pleased with the development of close rapport between the two departments in the past year. Such cooperation cannot be achieved through the establishment of more interdepartmental committees. Indeed, it may require fewer such organizations.

As in the case of the National Security Council the danger of the interdepartmental committee is that it will adjust all differences out of existence, without giving the Secretaries or the President the clearly defined issues and alternate policy proposals on which to base sound policy decisions.

Clear organization and effective support depend ultimately on good staff. What government needs above all is outstanding public service people. This is where we must concentrate our effort.

Better career training will aid greatly in such an effort. More effective use should be made of the National War College and the Foreign Service Institute in training civilian personnel within the respective departments and in providing educational opportunities for officials from other agencies and departments.

Further assets in the struggle for improved personnel would be easier interagency transfer, job exchange programs, and improved salary scales to help reduce turnover, particularly at upper levels. The problem of recruitment for topflight management personnel would be eased considerably with the updating and reform of our conflict of interest laws. Without violating the objectives of these antiquated statutes we can encourage the participation in public service of able men and women from the ranks of private business.

A revision of the conflict of interest statutes is now before Congress, but many of the critical issues are yet to be resolved. Change is desirable, but the changes we make must represent an improvement over present laws.

From what I have said it must be clear to you that I am offering no simple, well-ordered master plan for policy coordination and execution. This is not because I distrust or reject the concept of experimentation or reorganization in Government structure.

My approach is based on my belief that the structure of Government must adjust to changing requirements, changing as functions change but not changing functions.

The absence of theoretical perfection in structure leads to tension. But tension is the secret of great art. And, government, I submit, is an art.

One of the chief problems in the art of democratic government is that of informing and enlisting the support of the general public for national policy decisions. In our first great effort to make the structure of government conform to the functions it had to perform—the substitution of our Constitution for the Articles of Confederation—the Federalist papers performed yeoman service. Today the President utilizes the press, radio, and television to explain decisions and to exhort citizens.

Similarly, the members of his administration are exposed to the public view, and appear before the Members of Congress to justify the policies, programs, and actions of the administration.

Similarly, the members of his administration are exposed to the public view, and appear before the Members of Congress to justify the policies, programs, and actions of the administration.

The principal concern of the National Policy Machinery Subcommittee was the adequacy of the executive branch in meeting the demands of our age, but in the course of our studies it was evident that Congress has serious internal problems in dealing with the multitude of national policy questions. Congress is fragmented and it is difficult for individual Members and committees to grasp the full implication of national security decisions and programs.

The difficulties individual Members of Congress have in gaining a meaningful understanding of national security questions are mirrored and magnified in their constituents. One hundred years ago the average citizen could understand the ordnances of armies and navies without much strain. Tactics and grand strategy were comprehensible. Even the developments of military technology in World War I were within the grasp of the layman.

But with the development of radar, nuclear weapons, missiles, and spacecraft, to say nothing of the intricacies of biochemical warfare, even the above-average layman has found the scientists and the military programers moving beyond his imagination.

When the weapons are unbelievable, their implications are often incomprehensible. And yet, in a democracy, wise decisions can only be made on the basis of knowledge and understanding. We will gain very little by advancing our weapons technology, even with the best coordination between scientists and military personnel, and between military personnel and foreign policy experts, if Congress and the citizenry are not able to put such developments into the context of national security requirements.

The executive branch, through improved methods of presentation, better budget organization, and greater participation by the Secretaries of State and Defense in hearings before congressional committees, can aid Congress greatly in its responsibilities.

But Congress also must put its house in order. Congress should explore ways and means of coordinating consideration of authorizing legislation in the foreign policy and defense field, the appropriation and tax fields, and the scientific and defense and space fields. Consideration should be given also to the establishment of joint committees, wherever feasible, to oversee the work of our national security agencies and departments. The Joint Economic Committee and the Joint Atomic Energy Committee offer excellent precedent for action in this field

Recently we had a pertinent, although limited, illustration of the inadequacy of the present committee system in dealing with national security questions. When the Senate received the nomination of John McCone to be Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, the nomination was referred to the Armed Services Committee. This was entirely proper, but it did not give the Committee on Foreign Relations an opportunity to examine Mr. McCone on important questions bearing on his Agency's activities as they relate to foreign policy.

The process in Congress, as in the executive branch, is one of constant adjustment to change, recognizing that the structure of our institutions must be modified to free us from the dead hand of the past, but also keeping in mind that the structure must never be allowed to overshadow the men who make and implement our policies. Furthermore, there must be a full and free flow of information from government to the people.

Can a democracy meet this challenge? I think it can. In World War II the totalitarian states assumed they could overwhelm us, but the free nations managed to overcome the greatest odds and inflict a devastating defeat on the Axis war machine. We cannot wait for such a holocaust to stir us to action, but we can continue to reshape our approach to policymaking and coordination as freemen, with an understanding of the dangers we face, but without fear.

In the words of Robert Lovett:

"While the challenges of the moment are most serious in the policymaking sense, I see no reason for black despair or for defeatist doubts as to what our system of government or this country can do. We can do whatever we have to do in order to survive and to meet any form of economic or political competition we are likely to face. All this we can do with one proviso: We must be willing to do our best."

What Is Good for Communists Is Not Good for Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, on December 19, 1961, there was published in the New York Times a full-page advertisement on page 22 thereof, signed by 822 university professors and instructors, in the form of an open letter addressed to President Kennedy and Governor Rockefeller. Its propaganda objective is the discouragement of an effective civil defense program. The open letter in part declares:

We are deeply disturbed by current developments in the field of civil defense. It appears to us that the prodigious energy of our people is being channeled into wrong directions for wrong reasons; and that continuation of this trend may be extremely dangerous to the Nation and to civilization itself. To sum up, we believe that although the present civil defense program, and in particular the construction of fallout shelters, might save a small fraction of the population in a nuclear war, this potential gain is more than offset by the fact that such activity prepares the people for the acceptance of thermonuclear war as an instrument of national policy. We believe that this acceptance would substantially increase the likelihood of war—a war which would be permanently fatal to our democratic society, even if not to all of us.

This sort of nonsense, which urges a unilateral abandonment of a civil defense program, is now increasingly advanced by certain vociferous fuzzy thinkers in an effort to deprive us of our reason, and possibly unwittingly of our liberty. Does one prevent robbery by disarming the policeman?

I insert in the RECORD a news item which appeared in the New York Times, March 20, 1962, titled, "Poland Pressing Atomic Shelters." I might add that the entire Communist world is pressing such a program.

What is the significance of the Communist shelter program? Communists have clearly indicated, in their own words and actions, that the goal is Communist domination of the world, and the establishment of Soviet-style totalitarian dictatorships. It is an avowed policy of aggression.

Are we, who seek peace, to denude ourselves of a reasonable defense in the face of present realities? I would borrow the eloquent words of Adlai Stevenson who, in his speech to the United Nations in opposition to the admission of Red China, said:

Mr. President, to be tolerant we do not have to be naive; to be generous we do not have to be foolhardy; and to be realistic, most certainly we do not have to be carried away by wishful dreams.

Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to think what may occur when the Communists succeed in the completion of their shelter program if we have none.

The article follows:

POLAND PRESSING ATOMIC SHELTERS—OFFICER REVEALS SIGNIFICANT NUMBER HAVE BEEN BUILT

(By Arthur J. Olsen)

WARSAW, March 19.—The chief of the Polish Army's Antiaircraft Defense Command disclosed today that "a significant number" of atomic shelters had been built in Poland in the last 7 years.

The shelter construction was part of a civil defense program in which 400,000 volunteer civilians participated, the officer, Col. Aleksander Cesarski, said in an interview.

His statement, published in the military journal Zolnierz Polski, ridiculed the shelter program in the United States as a profitmaking scheme of promoters.

"But this does not mean that the building of atom shelters has no sense," he added, "On the contrary, the importance of shelters is well appreciated in Poland. Shelter construction is a government matter. And there are, one may say, a significant number of them."

SOVIET VIEW DIFFERENT

Colonel Cesarski's statement appeared to conflict with recent declarations by high Soviet defense officials that shelters would be worthless in a nuclear war.

The colonel said Poland's civil defense program, now 11 years old, had centered until now on large industrial plants. Nearly 500,000 factory workers have been trained in defense against nuclear attacks, he said.

"Civil defense authorities are regularly informing the people on ways to save life and property," Colonel Cesarski added. "A lot can be done in this direction."

The training courses in Poland are operated by the League of Soldiers Friends, a civilian organization, with the assistance of military specialists.

In 1961 the organization gave 24,000 lectures and 36,000 showings of civil defense films, the colonel said. He added that the program would be expanded to bring villages into the training system.

National Chiropractic Association Sponsors National Correct Posture Week, May 1–7

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, experts in the field of health agree that there is a need in this Nation for greater emphasis on physical development and good posture among the children and teenagers of the country.

The recent orbital flights of our astronauts—Shepard, Grissom, and Glenn—brought home to all who followed the proceedings one impressive truth—we need men with good health, sound bodies, and proper physical development and training to participate in these space flights. This part of the training has been given wide publicity and I hope that the message has been absorbed and appreciated by our younger generation, especially.

However, good health is necessary for all people. It is our most important asset. A man without good health is a man stripped of his greatest treasure. Nothing else in life can compensate for this loss.

The habits which are acquired in the formative as well as during the middle years often go a long way in determining the standards of health in our more advanced years.

To retain sound health one must practice good habits, and one of great importance is proper and correct posture. This phase of our everyday physical well-being is for the most part generally neglected. For some reason we tend to think that so long as we continue to take diligent care of the prime requirements for good health, we can ignore the details which make for a happy, healthful life. Correct posture is one of those details and is of importance to proper physical development in our children and continues to play a necessary role throughout life.

Proper training in early childhood can help future adults attain good posture and good health. This fact was stressed by Dr. Ted Forbes, Director of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation for the President's Council on Youth Fitness, in an article in "This Week" magazine recently.

Dr. Forbes stated:

> The relationship between good posture and robust health—poor posture and poor health—is no longer a folk aphorism. It is a well-proven truism. And yet the sad fact is that the kindergartens of the best housed, best fed, and best equipped nation on earth swarm with boys and girls who can't sit, stand, or walk properly.

He advised parents to even begin with their 5-year-old children and to teach them to sit tall, to hold the head high, to keep the abdomen flat, and to exercise regularly and vigorously.

Charles B. (Bud) Wilkinson, consultant to the President on youth fitness, was quoted by Dr. Forbes as saying that 6 out of 10 schoolchildren have flabby muscles, poor posture, and flagging stamina—faults that could have been avoided by proper parental guidance—during the formative years.

As we enter the age of the astronauts, we must reassess our national ability to meet the challenge of conquering space. The nation with the men best fitted for interplanetary exploration will go further than the nation with the best equipment for boosting rockets through the ether. It may well be that the first man to reach the moon is now doing calisthenics in some high school gymnasium, unaware of the role he is to play. We can only hope that he is getting every bit of training that he needs.

However, it is also important to the Nation to develop the general health and the general welfare of our country. It is more important than the development of a few superior physical specimens. This fact has been realized by the National Chiropractic Association for many years, and that association has been promoting good health through good posture by placing special emphasis on the need for standing, walking and sitting properly. The Nation's chiropractors have sponsored National Correct Posture Week for a number of years. This year National Correct Posture Week will be celebrated from May 1 to May 7.

Many of our mayors and Governors have issued special proclamations urging the people to participate in the special educational activities during National Correct Posture Week, and the schools are paying special attention to this worthy program of training for our young people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, of Washington, D.C., who is director of industrial relations of the National Chiropractic Association.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CORRECT POSTURE WEEK

Contributing to national health and welfare by improving individual posture is the sole aim of the National Chiropractic Association when it annually sponsors—from May 1 through May 7—National Correct Posture Week.

This is the time when chiropractors use every means of publicity to draw public attention to this primary aim of chiropractic. They believe, preach, and practice that good posture and good health go together.

In that belief we are in complete agreement with every branch of the healing arts, and we are sincere in our constant efforts to cooperate with all Americans in improving the standards of our national health.

It has been most encouraging to note that many agencies of our Federal Government have been in the vanguard of those advocating correct posture as a definite aid toward sound health and long life.

All recruits are familiar with the basic teachings of our Armed Forces which stress correct posture—not only on the parade ground, but elsewhere. These teachings stress correct posture as a means of physical, mental, and emotional well-being.

Other Federal agencies, too, have long been leaders in this never-ending campaign to keep Americans posture conscious. For instance, the Children's Bureau and the Women's Bureau, of the Department of Labor; the Federal Security Agency; the White House Conference on Child Health are but a few which could be listed.

SPOKESMEN AGREE

It is important to remember that good posture means much more than simply standing straight. Good posture is that position of the body in any activity in which all of its parts are working effectively and with proper balance, ease, and comfort.

On this one point all spokesmen of all branches of human endeavor have agreed for hundreds of years that correct posture is one of the most important paths to good general health.

This viewpoint is shared by medical and chiropractic authorities, public health workers, nurses, psychiatrists, the armed services, pediatricians, and specialists in industrial relations.

TEST YOUR POSTURE

Good posture is a result of holding your body in a balanced position. The easiest way to attain it is to think of an imaginary line running from the tip of the skull through your neck, shoulders, hips, knees, and insteps. When the head is bent forward, the abdomen thrust out, or the back bent, the line of gravity is shifted, and a strain placed on muscles to keep the body from falling.

To test: Stand with back to wall with head, heels, shoulders, and calves of legs touching it, hands by sides. Flatten hollow of back by pressing buttocks down against the wall. Space at back of waist should not be greater than the thickness of your hand.

Stand facing close to wall, palms of hands touching front of thighs. If chest touches wall first, your posture is probably excellent, or at least good; if head touches first, it is only fair; if abdomen touches first, your posture is really bad, and you should see a chiropractor.

STANDING

When you stand straight your head should be balanced and erect. Your shoulders are relaxed and low; your chest is held high. Your lower back should curve to just a slight degree. Your abdomen should be flat. Have your knees straight but not stiff, and feel your weight in the outer borders of your feet.

SITTING

You should sit with your feet flat on the floor. Do not slump in a chair, but keep your back straight and your abdomen flat. As in standing, your head should be erect and well balanced. When you lean forward, lean from the hips, not from the waist.

WALKING

Movement should start at the hips. Your head and upper part of your body should remain at right angles to the ground. Swing your arms freely. Look ahead, never down. Point your toes straight ahead. Knees should be relaxed and free.

OFFICIALS ENDORSE POSTURE WEEK

Without the wholehearted cooperation of the American people, National Correct Posture Week would be a meaningless phrase.

It is the wonderful assistance of schoolteachers and school authorities, of State legislatures, of Governors and mayors, of Members of the U.S. Congress, and of the people themselves that has made National Correct Posture Week an increasingly important observance in the United States.

Every year more and more officials at the city and State level proclaim its observance officially.

The active members of the National Chiropractic Association lead in observance of National Correct Posture Week, because the science of chiropractic is dedicated to the elimination of postural faults which rob human beings of the health they should have.

Goal of U.S. Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, writing in Los Angeles is one of America's rising and fast becoming very popular columnists, George Todt. Mr. Todt writes daily, but one of his most interesting and informative columns that I have seen lately is that which is entitled "What Is U.S. Goal?" I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS U.S. GOAL?

Recently I had a stimulating comparison of viewpoints regarding what U.S. foreign policy ought to be with Congressman Donald Jackson and Prof. Harold Fishman of Los Angeles State College. Both are topflight thinkers.

Fishman has been doing a bang-up job as a down-to-earth commentator at KCOP-13, for which he is receiving much praise in the Los Angeles area.

Jackson is one of the finest—and fightingest—Congressmen that California ever sent to Washington. He retired a couple of years ago, was never defeated. Brilliant, powerful speaker who is tremendously articulate. Has great voter appeal, lives in Santa Monica. Could likely defeat Representative JIMMY ROOSEVELT in neighboring Beveraly Hills if he ever decided to run against him.

AN AUTHORITY

The highly regarded retired Congressman spent 14 years on the House Foreign Affairs Committee and is a real authority.

Professor Fishman has just returned from Germany on a survey he made there at the request of the West German Government.

I consider these two men to be highly qualified experts and there was a great deal for me to learn from both.

I stuck my oar in, too—and the three of us had a ball.

Let me tell you some of our conclusions about American foreign policy.

In the first place, we were not motivated by partisan politics and agreed that we had only one goal: To win for the United States.

But we had to observe that we are not winning now and failed to see how we could because we have no definite policy.

WHAT AUTHORITY?

Who knows what American foreign policy is supposed to be?

Who in authority has ever enunciated it?

Who has put it in writing for us to see—and judge? We agreed unhappily that there is no distinctive American foreign policy of any kind whatsoever—unless we can call reacting to provocative enemy thrusts as they occur on the world stage "policy." But what kind?

Actually, our foreign policy should be vested in American self-interest and serve a predetermined end. It is stupid to be against the Communists one day, support them the next. Or to support one kind of Communist, but be against another kind. What about Tito?

AID BLASTED

Why give the Yugoslav tyrant and fraud 130 F-87 Sabre jet fighters for $10,000 apiece when they cost the American taxpayer one-third of a million dollars—and then find that this Red phony may have surreptitiously dropped off at least some of them to the Cuban Communist rat, Castro, en route home?

We ought to help only those who will do their fair share in return to assist us and our way of life—which is not completely socialist yet.

In this connection we felt that kowtowing to the United Nations at all times even when obviously not in our interest to do so—was a mistake. We took cognizance of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER's recent suggestion that the U.N. had fallen flat on its face, in the light of the Katanga and Goa fiascos.

A MISTAKE

We shrugged off the gigantic role U.N. aficionados hand their sacred cow in the preservation of world peace—and give the lion's share of the credit to another great "world organization" where it actually belongs.

And that is no less than the Strategic Air Command of the U.S. Air Force.

Without SAC, the Reds would have overwhelmed our free world long ago. They would have then disolved the U.N. Let's give SAC credit.

A European's Concern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, the article which follows was taken from the March 27, 1962, number of the National Review which came to my office yesterday. It strikes me as a sincere and vigorous effort to let us "see ourselves as others see us" and as such deserves serious consideration.

The article follows:

A EUROPEAN'S CONCERN

I am a Danish economist with an international background. As a newcomer to the United States, I know that I ought not to meddle too much in American politics. Nevertheless, I feel that the matters at stake are so important that I should not refrain from expressing my views.

Every thinking European is deeply concerned with the present foreign policy of the U.S. Government. Concern has not arisen primarily over Berlin, the Common Market or other strictly European matters. It has arisen far more over Asia, Africa, and Latin America. There is a generalized feeling that those areas, which are closer to European minds than it is generally realized over here, are being driven into the Communist camp by official U.S. policies. Ghana, a few weeks after its recent spectacular consolidation with the Communist camp, has been rewarded with $133 million for its Volta River project. The Katanga, a peaceful and industrious area with a firm anti-Communist stand, has been severely punished. In Latin America, Castro initially assumed power with U.S. support, whereas Trujillo's successors have been abated. In Asia, President Ngo Diem is being told to follow democratic policies which, if carried out, will probably weaken his government to such an extent as to make it an easy prey to communism.

In all lands, there are determined freedom fighters who will resist communism to the utmost against all odds, whether for religious or other reasons. If they are not supported, however, or if they are known to be in danger of being knocked down by the joint forces of the Soviet Union and the United States, their followers will desert them by droves. Few fence-sitters are left over now; most of them have gone Communist, as they must perforce. The remainder soon will, unless there is a sharp reversal of U.S. policies.

Our Will To Win

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I am inserting in the RECORD an advertisement sponsored by Freedom House that appeared in the Washington Post of March 6. The sponsors have offices at 20 West 40th Street, New York City.

This advertisement is entitled "Our Will To Win." It is thought provoking. It is constructive. One may not agree with it in all its specifics. That is understandable. Nonetheless, this truly remarkable document—and I think it should be so characterized—presents an overall concrete program for thought and action in this cold war. It presents an attitude of mind that we might well adopt. Above all else, to win there must first of all be a will to win.

OUR WILL TO WIN

We believe that the American people are ready to unite behind a decision to win the cold war and to support whatever measures are necessary to enforce that decision.

We also believe that the nature and meaning of that decision may be lost in the confusion and the hysteria generated by extremists of the left and the right. Only when the grip of fear is lifted from the expression of the popular will, can this Nation begin to gain the victory it seeks.

The first proposition: There is no alternative to victory in the cold war. We must win in order to survive. If we do not win this struggle forced upon us by the Communists, we will ultimately lose our very lives, because it is intolerable for people who have enjoyed freedom and are committed to its values to accept the prospect of yielding their freedom. It is as vital for free men to unite against Communist tyranny as in the earlier struggle it was crucial to unite against nazism.

The second proposition: To have peace the Nation must be militarily strong. When the free world is the object of aggression, weakness invites war. This is the truth now under assault from the marchers and petitioners for peace whose vision stops with the destruction of our armaments. They think that because their placards proclaim peace their actions insure it. They forget that when their earlier counterparts surrounded Whitehall in 1938, marched in Paris in 1939, and paraded before the White House in 1940, they deterred neither Hitler, Mussolini, nor Tojo. The price of their fear then was a long war and a large toll of lives and treasure.

The third proposition: Those who have buried freedom are the enemy. Until they are forced to resurrect what they have destroyed, the world cannot rest easy. Accommodation to the enslavement of others since 1945 has already brought us to a high danger point. The tensions generated by peoples submerged by Communist power, and hostile to it, have driven the holders of that power to ever-expanding adventures in order to preserve their position. Yet, the handmaiden of pacifism is the delusion that the Communist power is softening or becoming more reasonable and that it can comfortably coexist with free nations determined to preserve their freedom.

The fourth proposition: The enemy has to be met where he attacks. Looking for him in our neighbors' homes will leave his real strength totally unimpaired. The zealots of the Right are no different from those of the Left in their headlong rush to get out of the arenas of conflict into the backwaters where all the alarm is in their own voices. To retreat from the cold war because it costs too much money or means a stronger governmental hand is just as irrational as to retreat because war remains unthinkable for us while wars of liberation are fostered by our enemy.

If these propositions are accepted, Freedom House believes the way is open for a policy of winning the cold war. This policy would recognize the risks, accept them and seek to make them manageable. The goal of that policy is nothing less than peace with freedom everwhere. We believe that only an audacious and ambitious goal can properly energize and guide the actions that must be pursued if freedom is to survive.

WHAT ARE THOSE ACTIONS?

1. Nuclear testing and experimentation. The Soviet massive resumption of atmospheric tests should persuade every rational person that any self-denying ordinance on our part will not deter Moscow from building up its capacity, but will in fact invite and encourage more dangerous provocations. We contend that the responsibility for the timing and form of our own testing rests with the President and his associates. Should their judgment clearly reveal that the national interest and security require atmospheric testing, Freedom House will support their decision. It should also be borne in mind that the proposed action in this area, when based on the available facts and free from fear, may prove the only means of forcing the Soviet Union to negotiate seriously for an effective treaty on nuclear control.

2. The use of American military power. We approve the commitment of our men and equipment to any area where, in the best judgment of the President and his advisers, they are required. We ask that the decisions be made carefully and prudently, but that fear not be allowed to hold us back. The struggle will not be resolved in the nonviolent areas unless the Soviets and their allies find it militarily unprofitable to bring it to the battlefields.

3. The use of American economic power. A range of instruments—such as a liberalized trade policy operating in cooperation with the European Common Market, support for the alliance for progress in this hemisphere, assistance to struggling underdeveloped nations in Africa and Asia—all these must be knitted into one broad program of defense against Communist economic warfare. The criteria for action in each area should simply be: does it serve the cause of freedom?

4. Full use of American ideological power. Communist force has been allowed to flow into vacuums we were unprepared to fill. Every one of those areas lost to the free world was under our guarantee in one way or another. We cannot immediately retrieve every lost horizon, but there is no excuse for failure to put forth our maximum effort. When we negotiate, when we talk—and negotiate and talk we must—let us demand that communism's captives be liberated.

5. Full use of American political power. This country should continue to support the United Nations and do everything possible to keep it from becoming either a Soviet tool or an empty shell. But the U.N. cannot be our only reliance. Our alliances are equally important. To remain loyal both to the U.N. and to our alliances will entail frictions, the most severe of which is the conflict between our desire to see colonial peoples gain their freedom and the responsibility for orderly development in the transfer of the few colonies still held by our allies. Our leaders should continue to press our allies to prepare colonial peoples for self-rule, but we must not be stampeded into crating vacuums of power for the Communists to fill.

6. Maximum strength on the home front. The American people through their elected representatives should provide more funds for an improved and expanded educational system and other essential services which are needed to strengthen our free society. It is also our responsibility to strive for the ideal of equality of opportunity for all Americans without regard to their race, religion, or national origin. Short-term setbacks must be kept from growing into long-term defeats. And impatience with our own shortcomings should not be permitted to divide us or distract our attention from the highest priority—winning the cold war.

If freemen are to prevail, which is the task of our century, they must have more than hopes; they must have a long-range program and the courage which alone can make that program meaningful. The policies we urge can be successfully pursued when they are freed from the mistakes of the past. As Santayana reminds us, those who do not remember the past are condemned to repeat it. Those who understand the past and can face tomorrow without fear will live to enjoy the promise of the future.

This is our faith. These are our views. We urge Americans to ponder and support them.

The Irish Sweepstakes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, while we in Congress continue to refuse to recognize and capitalize on the natural gambling spirit of the American people and while we keep our eyes closed and ignore the tremendous revenue-producing features of a national lottery, millions of dollars continue to leave our shores every year in support of foreign-run lotteries.

This week, Mr. Speaker, the official drawing for the Irish Sweepstakes will take place in Dublin, Ireland. Hundreds of thousands of American citizens across the country will be anxiously awaiting the results which, in some cases, will mean the happy fulfillment of a dream.

Ireland is one of the 50-odd foreign countries where lotteries are legal and proper and where the gambling urge of their inhabitants is tied in with the need for revenue. Last year, the total gross receipts from worldwide sale of Irish Sweepstakes tickets were a record high of $48,976,859—an increase of about $3 million over the year before. I would say that at least $40 million of this amount comes from the good old United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, we can shut off the flow of billions of dollars now siphoned off by the underworld in the United States and by foreign-run lotteries by adopting our own national lottery. A national lottery in this country would bring into the U.S. Treasury $10 billion a year in new revenue which could be used for a tax cut and reduction of our big national debt.

A Businessman's View of America's World Problems—Address by J. B. Bonny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "A Businessman's View of America's World Problems," delivered by Mr. J. B. Bonny, a prominent business man of Idaho, before the Cleveland Committee on Foreign Relations, on January 25, 1962.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BUSINESSMAN'S VIEW OF AMERICA'S WORLD PROBLEMS

Gentlemen, I am signally honored to be invited to speak before this distinguished group this evening. You have many times, I know, listened to far more able speakers, but perhaps none more sincere.

The subject chosen for me by Mr. Pryor is so far reaching and so controversial as to be almost impossible to cover with any adequacy in any reasonable time.

For me to even presume to define America's world problems, much less suggest remedies, is certainly no less than foolhardy but a great challenge nevertheless and for that reason I shall with great humility make an effort.

I stand before you a humble and an angry man.

America today faces a world made up of countries—hostile and holding us in contempt or distrustful, ungrateful, or simply jealous, depending on which side of the Iron and Bamboo Curtains they happen to stand; or whether they have chosen to play a so-called neutralist role which means very simply playing both sides of the street.

Following World War I and later World War II, we found ourselves in the position of having inherited the mantle of world leadership.

The vigors of our system of competitive private enterprise, plus the ideals and beliefs growing out of our own struggles for freedom and for the dignity of the individual, gave us a moral concept of liberty previously almost unknown even in the great democracies of the past.

We emerged from two World Wars not only unscathed but owning most of the world's gold, commanding most of the world's goods, and having the means of production and the ability to use those means beyond the wildest dreams of any country in history.

In short, it appeared that we were in the position of the poker player who having won every pot and broken every opponent must find new players, finance the old ones to continue the game, or quit, and we couldn't ethically in the light of our ideals, quit.

Our generosity, our own belief in the freedom of man, our faith in our own greatness, plus our inexperience and trustfulness in a cynical and jaded world did the rest. We stand today with our gold stores depleted, with our erstwhile friends holding claims on our remaining gold in excess of its total amount, while our own citizens are refused the privilege of even repurchasing that very gold abroad.

Our means of production remain so far comparatively intact but our labor force, led by selfish men of little conscience and great power have enforced demands which already have or soon will destroy our ability to successfully compete in the world's markets.

We deny the American businessman abroad the protection that citizens of other nations with whom he competes are granted by their government; guarantee of credits, protection of investment and tax benefits to name a few. We even deny the American businessman the basic right of protection of life and property abroad to which he is entitled although with few exceptions we continue to tax him the full 52 percent on what he may succeed in making if he is lucky enough to survive.

While we have been committing the errors of giving too freely, too wastefully and often with too little reason our stanchest allies and best friends, themselves the recipients of much of our bounteous largess, have in turn with us been guilty of errors of both commission and omission which have resulted in narrowing the perimeter of the boundaries of the non-Communist world and establishing within those boundaries large areas controlled by new, ineffectual and sometimes venal governments purporting to support the causes of freedom and independence and understanding not a whit of the meaning of either.

Perhaps a few concrete illustrations at this point within the scope of my own experience may not be amiss. Perhaps from these a pattern may appear.

China: In the period immediately following cessation of hostilities in World War II the decision was reached to basically withdraw major military aid to the then existing Government of China and to concentrate any effort in the channels of famine relief and economic assistance. This was done without careful screening of those administering the aid or determining any realistic policy of how and to whom it should be directed.

During this period our company was employed to make studies leading toward the economic rehabilitation of the country, specifically reconstruction of the Chinese railway system, designs for the Yellow River Bridge since constructed by the Communists and design of the proposed Yangtze River Dam. This included the operation of several LST vessels on the coastal areas and the rivers where our people were engaged in these investigations.

In the course of these our people moved freely about the country and frequently came into contact with the advancing Communist invaders as well as the retreating Nationalists. A number of our engineers, so exposed, came to the conclusion that the impending Communist takeover was not, in fact a Communist movement at all—but only an agrarian revolution.

It is not surprising therefore that many Government officials entrusted with the obligation of administering this aid without a clear directive of policy came to the same conclusion and acted accordingly. It soon became apparent, however, that the incoming Communist rulers were, in fact, what the world knows them to be today.

This modern refinement of the ancient Trojan horse certainly indicates that our diplomats should have read the classics.

Those of our people who were evacuated later and who helped evacuate many of the Nationalist Chinese officials now making up the Government in Taiwan soon learned this fact and greatly regretted that our failure to recognize the true situation and failure to furnish both arms and troops in sufficient quantity permitted the vacuum that was China to become the monster of today. However the good will and ability of the American construction staff to get along and make friends was not forgotten and we are today acting as construction supervisors to the Nationalist Chinese Government on a very large dam near Taipei currently being built.

Afghanistan: The power to hurt the self-respect and finally destroy the respect and friendship of a nation or a people by wasteful expenditures and unneeded gifts, accompanied by bad advice, has been shown so clearly in many places that perhaps one illustration will suffice.

In 1948 our company was employed by the Royal Government of Afghanistan to design and construct the first unit of the development of the Helmand River Valley. This is a project to rehabilitate by irrigation and power this once fertile valley virtually abandoned to the blowing desert sands during the years that Afghanistan became the crossroads of invasions by the Mongol hordes, the Persian kings and later the Mogul rulers of India, and the people had become of necessity normads moving their flocks out of whatever trouble presented itself at the moment.

This first program was financed by the Afghan Government using the proceeds of the sale of its unique and much-prized Karakul hides and wool.

Again in 1950 we were asked to take on the second phase of the Helmand Valley program, this time financed under a loan from the Import-Export Bank frugally administered by an engineering representative of the bank, subject to regular periodic audits.

By 1954 however when the third stage of the development was considered the giveaway agencies of our Government had appeared on the scene with specialists several hundred strong. These agencies not only offered to make outright grants for various projects but in the manner of our presently burgeoning Peace Corps insisted on giving the dumfounded and rather disgusted Afghans instruction in all manner of household and community arts including, believe it or not, the art of weaving rugs. Being the possessor of a royal Afghan rug, a gift of His Majesty the King, I am quite sure they needed no training in this art.

However, when time came to negotiate this third phase the appropriate agency since it was making a grant of part of the funds (the remainder being left over from the Eximbank loan) insisted on virtually dictating each item of work to be performed which added, of course, great confusion. In the struggle a most important item, the drainage canals to take off the surplus water and keep the ground from growing sour with alkali were left out and are only now being built by Afghan Government under the direction of, at our suggestion, drainage and land management engineers of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation.

In the meantime we are still in Afghanistan, building airports and currently, with others, a highway which will eventually span the country from the Pakistan border near Quetta through Kandahar to Kabul.

This latter project is, however, temporarily closed down. Something they never have to pay for doesn't mean much to the Afghans anyway and the Russians are giving them things, too.

At the present time the Afghans have concluded they can force our Government to help them seize a rich border territory called Pachtunistan, currently owned by Pakistan, and have currently closed the Pakistan border, incidentally shutting down the highway since supplies come through Karachi. My own guess, however, is they won't get far. The President of Pakistan, Ayab Khan, is a Pathan tribesman himself and takes a dim view of ceding his homeland to a neighbor.

Egypt: In the spring of 1956, after Nasser had seized power from the trembling fingers of a decadent Farouk, had seized the Suez Canal in contravention of a sacred treaty and was making like a strong man, negotiations were still underway for financing of the Aswan Dam, currently 1961, being started on a slow bell by Egyptian contractors using Russian equipment and Russian advisers. Our company was heading up a group of American contractors hoping for the opportunity to bid on the work. Mr. Nasser, in spite of then proposed American financing, made it clear that no American contractors were needed in spite of our assurance that we could save 5 years on the construction time. Under the circumstances we promptly called on our then Ambassador to Egypt, who was and is, in my opinion, a great and dedicated public servant, to complain of the manifestly unfair treatment of American business. In the course of this conversation the Ambassador said "you may not be losing anything—I give you $5 either way that things hit the fan within 6 months." They did. In 3 months almost to the day France and England had invaded, however, first giving the green light to Israel to send in its troops, the only army in that part of the world worthy of the name, in the vanguard of the invasion. You all know what happened. The United States in righteous indignation backed Nasser. The French and British withdrew, and all the world knew that the United States would no longer back armed force to protect rights and property.

I believe the British and French made a mistake in sending in the Israeli troops, other Arab nations could never have forgiven this. But several histories might have been written differently today had we kept our hands off of what was patently none of our business.

Iraq: In 1958 the Kingdom of Iraq was the shining light of Asia. Well governed, fiscally sound, requiring no aid, oil rich and using its oil revenues wisely and well to build schools and hospitals and bridges and dams, roads and port works for the future.

At midnight in July, Kassim an obscure brigadier struck, Americans were killed, American property and rights were threatened. A few days later American troops were landed in Lebanon to quell, at the request of the Government, a political uprising. I saw them. I was in Lebanon at the time and I was proud. I had left Baghdad shortly before the revolution as we were just completing a hundred miles of highway in the country, for which incidentally, we have never been fully paid.

It was apparent that the forces used to land at Beirut could have ousted Kassim and restored the legal Government with no trouble and with the cheers and approval of everyone except possibly Mr. Nasser of Egypt. People in Baghdad are still wondering why they did not. Two years ago General Barzini, the "Mad Mullah of Mosul," exiled during a previous uprising 10 years before, had

returned from his exile. He served as a major general in the Russian Army while away. He is now carrying on a vigorous and growing rebellion in Mosul, he may unseat Kassim—if he does, our failure to stop Kassim when it was easy will be regretted—and Iraq will be Russian.

Algiers: In order to understand the tragic situation in Algiers, a situation which may well cause the downfall of the only sound government in France since World War II, it is necessary to understand something of the situation that developed in Morocco, since the same mistakes were made.

With one exception the situation in both areas was the same. Morocco was a protectorate of France, called in in 1910 by the sultan of the Sherifian Empire to help quell the rebellion led by El Glowie, King of the Berbers. France seized all power, making the sultan at Rabat a puppet ruler. After 4 years of constant fighting El Glowie was conquered in 1914, shortly before World War I. Thereafter, until his abasement to the sultan in 1956, and subsequent death, El Glowie kept the treaty and was France's stanchest supporter.

In Morocco, as in Algiers, the French built highways, railroads, ports, and all manner of public works. It also, as in Algiers, encouraged the Coloni's to move in, buy up the land at ridiculously low prices from the sheiks and Calids and virtually enslave the peasants who had been used to farming the land on an easy going and not too onerous relationship with the former owners.

The principal difference between Algiers and Morocco was, that in the case of Algiers France had in the 19th century incorporated Algiers as an integral part of France and admitted its people to estensibly full rights as citizens of France. The treatment of the people by the French Coloni's was, however, identical.

In 1950 we were selected to head up a group of American contractors to build airbases in Morocco under treaty with the French Government. With the various increments and additions totaling in all over $400 million. We were in Morocco until the end of 1959 and all through the revolution.

When the peasants became restless of the treatment of their French coloni masters, and believe me, few people have been kept on a lower standard of living or more abused, the French military took the utmost in repressive measures. The sultan was exiled to virtual prison in France. French coloni's were murdered nightly by Arabs, coloni's took reprisal in the villages and French Goum African troops were turned loose in the Medinas to loot and pillage, murder and rape.

The same mistake has been made by France in Algiers except that in Algiers the Arabs are French citizens and the result is civil war. If President de Gaulle's policies prevail and peace is secured, with eventual liberation of Algiers, the situation may, for a while at least, be stabilized. If the Coloni and the rebellious French army group prevail there will be revolution. This could well mean the end of the present Republic of France. The repercussions are obvious.

Turkey: It seems in order to comment briefly on the Turkish picture. Between 1954 and 1957 we were engaged in the construction of Seyhan Dam, a large irrigation and power dam on the Mediterranean near Adna. This work was performed for the Turkish Government under a World Bank loan. Adnan Mendares was Prime Minister during this period and never have we received more wholehearted cooperation from any government in an undertaking.

Turkey during this period was attempting to pull itself up by its bootstraps to become a modern western nation. In so doing, commitments were made for roads, railroads, and all manner of improvements which, after spending over half of its annual income for military purposes (plus U.S. military aid), was more than it could swallow.

Repeated and urgent pleas were made by the Mendares government for long-term loans to balance its budget and permit the economy to catch up. These were, in the main, turned down or drastically cut. With the increasing desperation of the Turkish fiscal situation unrest developed and Mendares, I believe, instituted repressive economic and civil measure in desperation.

Mendares was overthrown by an army coup headed by General Gursel(a "Republican"). Mendares, a Democrat in Turkish two-party politics, was, as you no doubt are aware, tried and hanged for his crimes. The present Government while expressing friendship for America currently shows inclination to flirt with Russia and is considering the acceptance of Russian aid.

Had we backed our greatest and most dependable friend at the proper time of real need to the extent we were backing neutralist and unfriendly nations Mendares would not have been hanged and we would not be facing the possible loss of a key dependable friend today.

Latin America: The subject of Latin America is so broad and the problems in each country are so different from the others that many books would be required to even touch the subject.

We have worked in Mexico, Central America and almost all the countries of South America from prior to start of World War II.

We are still working in nine of these countries with good success and with the friendship and cooperation of the people who work for us and those with whom we deal.

It must be remembered that the United States for many years has been looked upon by all the Latin American States as the "colossus of the north," to be feared and hated and for political purposes, at least, to be reviled. The attitude of these countries however has in truth been that while Uncle Sam is dangerous and sometimes unpredictable, he is to quote an old Mexican friend, "our colossus."

American business men first coming to Latin America are "Gringos" or "Norte Americanos" also a swear word when properly pronounced.

However, when in time they prove to be fair, friendly and desirous of reasonably meeting their commitments, the word changes to "Amigo" and no further onus is attached to their American ancestry.

Everyone in Latin America, and certainly most Americans doing business in Latin America knew the Batista regime to be rotten to the core. Our company consistently refrained from taking any work in Cuba under Batista. We and many others were sufficiently aware of Castro's background to fear his Communist leaninga. Our Government must have known. At the time that Castro's revolutionary soldiers kidnaped 28 American sailors we and many others I am sure felt that the United States should send in a division of Marines to restore and maintain order until the completion of fair, free elections and only then pull out.

The occasions justifying this action are too numerous to mention and are occurring daily.

Perhaps the best explanation of the depths to which our prestige has fallen, as a result of our failure to fulfill our obligations to all friendly nations and to the citizens of the United States abroad, is a conversation that took pace in Moscow between a friend of mine, the Governor of one of our States and Mr. Khrushchev some 6 months prior to the Castro takeover in Cuba.

My friend asked Mr. Khrushchev how he could justify the brutal Russian military actions and suppression of the people of Hungary at the time of the revolt.

Mr. Khrushchev's reply was, very simply, "You wouldn't let Cuba go Communist, would you?"

May I say from the experience outlined I believe certain conclusions can be drawn. It is not too late to retrieve our prestige.

It is not too late to become the most respected world power we must be if we are to survive.

There are certain things that can and must be done if the future of America abroad is to be preserved.

1. We must have a sound dollar. This means a balanced budget at home and only those expenditures abroad that can be justified by sound economics.

2. We must maintain the freedom and safety of American citizens abroad. This means that American business should be encouraged to work and invest in the so-called free world countries. American businessmen must be given the same protection in granting credits and in ability to insure return of property, convertibility of exchange and tax credits that competitors of other nations now receive.

3. We must establish a perimeter against Communist Russia and Communist China and their satellites. Within that perimeter we alone, or with our allies, must maintain order, prevent Communist aggression from within or without, and, when necessary, use armed force to maintain decent government until fair elections can be held.

4. We should abolish so-called giveaway programs in their entirety. We should grant fair credits to private industries and governments for development purposes, and to permit American businesses to establish themselves in those countries and to trade with their citizens. Priority to such credits and loans should be given to our friends, with leftist and neutralist nations last.

If these things are done, to me the future of America is bright and America's world problems will at least be on the way to solution.

If it appears from the above that I am a conservative, it is correct. I am.

The Myth of World Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I submit this thought-provoking column written by Lucius Beebe.

It appeared in the Valley Times, of North Hollywood, Calif., on March 9, 1962, and effectively punctures the myth of world opinion. World opinion, all too often, is merely pulled out of a hat in a poor attempt to build up the worth of questionable programs.

The article follows:

THE MYTH OF WORLD OPINION

(By Lucius Beebe)

Prominent in the farrago of completely meaningless ideological jargon to which Americans are these days subjected by pollsters, politicians, and other merchants of mendacity is the myth of world opinion,

a body of sentiment of which the Casper Milquetoasts of the United States are instructed to stand in humble awe while the rest of the world gets a horse laugh at our timorous veneration of something that doesn't exist, and if it did would be of no least material consequence.

Pious frauds in public office, scoundrels in Washington and editorial charlatans with a hanker for significant thinking pontificate about world opinions as though its existence were a demonstrable fact, although the only place it can ever be pinpointed is in news releases by the State Department in this country and Tass in Russia, where world opinion curiously enough follows the party line of the moment with amazing exactitude.

World opinion is invoked by the administration every time it wants to rook the taxpayers out of a few billions in some particularly fantastic swindle as a lever for conning the dolts into going along with underwriting all the current expenses of some tankstop nation whose destinies mean nothing to the United States nor anybody else.

World opinion is invoked by political paltroons and hedgers in this country whenever it is suggested that the United States should actively and effectively resent insult and affront to its sovereignty and dignity abroad or protect its investments from confiscation by the revolutionary practice of thuggee in adjacent banana republics.

TOTAL BARBARISM

World opinion is the bogey constantly raised to intimidate the United States and prevent it from conduct becoming an independent, powerful and resolute nation with rights and privileges of its own in a world that has largely succumbed to total barbarism.

It doesn't stop anybody else, anywhere, at any time from doing precisely whatever opportunism and self-service may suggest. The Russians have ignored world opinion. So have the warloads of India who, while beating their breasts to proclaim the most patent mendacity of our time—that "peace is with us a religion"—were putting the armed snatch on somebody else's territory they happened to covet.

World opinion, according to retailers of this nonextant commodity, was outraged and horrified when the Russians resumed their atomic bombing tests, so the Russians recognized this powerful deterrent to evil by going on to explode the grandfather of all nuclear devices.

World opinion, according to Western sources, had had its narrow congealed by the partition of Berlin and the communization of East Germany, but somehow the news hasn't gotten through to Herr Ulbricht's government.

World opinion obtains nowhere else on earth except in the mind of the intimidated American people whose hanker to be loved instead of feared and respected has brought them very close to the end of the road. It is the myth of world opinion that is evoked to prevent two divisions of U.S. Marines from going to Cuba, hanging the Castro government en masse and restoring order to that distracted island.

MATTER OF MINUTES

It is easy to imagine how much world opinion would stand in the way of the Russians faced with a parallel menace on their own front doorstep. An autonomous island off the coast of Russia being armed by the United States for purposes of military aggression against the Soviets wouldn't last a matter of minutes.

Another place that world opinion, which may be presumed to favor the maintenance of at least the outward aspects of peace, doesn't seem to have penetrated is Red China, where the management frankly says it's getting ready for a war against the West that will make everything to date look like a pillow fight in the girls' dormitory.

Even among our own friends and presumed allies, the British, the French, Belgians, and other civilized nations of Europe, world opinion carries little or no weight when policies concerning the national welfare or security are involved. Informed and realistic people everywhere know that world opinion is for the birds, the bird in this case being the bedraggled American eagle.

In this pass, and since you know and I know and President Kennedy knows that world opinion comes as close to being utterly meaningless and ineffectual as words can approximate, it would be a good thing if it were eliminated from the thinking of the administration at Washington and from the vocabulary of propaganda everywhere. The emperor's clothes in the medieval fairy story were never more visible. Nor more nonextant.

H.R. 4222: Compulsory Health Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, so much misinformation is being fed the American people on what H.R. 4222 will do that it is about time the record was set straight.

When Walter Reuther appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means, last year, testifying on H.R. 4222, he stated that although this bill was not all he wanted, it was "a good beginning" and should be expanded. One need not have a crystal ball to see what will be coming next.

The March 1962 issue of Nation's Business has an excellent editorial on the subject and also a fine title for H.R. 4222:

COMPULSORY HEALTH TAXATION

Before this session ends Congress will undoubtedly have before it a proposal to strengthen Federal drug inspection and standards. The purpose is to protect the consumer from unsafe products, misleading labels, and the sale of habit-forming drugs.

Already before Congress is a bill which would require working people to buy something officially called health insurance for the aged, to be marketed by Social Security.

Congress can demonstrate its interest in consumers by applying to this political potion the sort of tests proposed for drugs.

It will find, to begin with, that it is flagrantly mislabeled.

This mandatory health concoction is certainly not insurance. Those who hope to benefit from it will have no assurance of anything except this Congress' willingness to pass a law. No contract protects them if some future Congress decides to change eligibility rules, alter the benefits, increase the costs or discontinue the plan altogether. Future benefits depend on workers' and employers' willingness to pay social security taxes already scheduled to increase 54 percent by 1968. The new plan would add to that burden.

As for the potion itself, several important ingredients of an effective health plan are lacking. The beneficiary would still pay for physicians' calls at home, office, or in the hospital; for surgery; for dental care; for medicine except when administered in a hospital or nursing home.

Even the ingredients included are watered down. Although social security would supposedly pay for 90 days stay in the hospital, the patient would pay $10 a day for the first 9 days.

The term "aged" is also misleading. No one not under social security or Railroad Retirement is eligible. Nor are those however needy who are less than 65 years old.

As for the habit-forming dangers of this prescription, its friends not only admit them, they boast of them. Former Congressman Aimé Forand, of Rhode Island, who offered the first such measure, has said: "If we can only break through and get our foot inside the door, then we can expand the program after that."

At a time when a half dozen Government agencies are boasting of their efforts to enforce fair competition, one of them might reasonably insist that a Government scheme offered in a field where private companies are selling good insurance tailored to buyers' needs should be labeled for what it is:

Compulsory health taxation.

Mr. Speaker, in last Sunday's New York Herald Tribune, Raymond Moley details some of the results of the King-Anderson bill, if passed. It is most revealing that when he spoke to Aneurin Bevan, the British Socialist, on how he expected to control the British medical profession. Bevan's reply was:

We have got the hospitals, and that means we will control the doctors. They cannot practice without places to practice.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, under the Kennedy bill, will lay down rules and regulations for hospitals. Need I say more? Mr. Moley's article is as follows:

THE CONTROL OF HOSPITALS

(By Raymond Moley)

On a dark, rainy night in February 1950, in Bristol, England, I had a most interesting evening with the Socialist firebrand, Aneurin Bevan. It was during the national election which all but shook the Labor Party from power. Bevan was Minister of Health, in charge of the new national health service.

Along with two other American newspapermen, I met Bevan at his hotel before a political meeting which he was to address and arranged to see him when he returned. We were very anxious to question him about his favorite subject, the national health service.

The meeting which we attended was a very rowdy affair. A tough dockworker in the front of the audience was engaged in a running fire of mutual recrimination with the sturdy speaker. In the course of their exchanges the heckler drew from his mouth a plate of false teeth and waved it at Bevan, who shouted, "I am the Minister of Health and I am going to take those teeth away from you." The man shouted back, "I paid 5 pounds for these and they are my own."

The argument ceased, and Bevan put on display as forceful a demonstration of crowd control and incitement as any demagog I have ever been privileged to hear.

After the meeting we met in the restaurant of the hotel and engaged in 3 hours of discussion of issues. The best remembered comment was his reply to my question about how he intended to get control of the British medical profession. His reply was, "We have got the hospitals, and that means we will control the doctors. They can't practice without places to practice."

This comment came back to me as I read the President's message, delivered 2 weeks ago, explaining his plan for medical care for the aged—a plan embodied in the King-Anderson bill.

The Kennedy-King-Anderson plan is most carefully designed to provide the argument

by its proponents that there is no intention to control or interfere with the free practice of medicine. It is aimed specifically at (a) inpatient hospital services, (b) nursing home services, (c) services in the home of the patient, and (d) outpatient hospital diagnostic service.

While there is the usual language barring control of hospitals or doctors, there are elaborate provisions for supervision and for the making of specifications by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. If these are not controls, it is difficult to find a word that will better suit this procedure.

Because the doctor-hospital relationship is close and indivisible, almost every doctor will be controlled by a Government which controls the hospital which he uses for his patients. He needs beds for the patients whom he hospitalizes—patients of all ages. When those beds are preempted by elderly chronic cases, many of whom do not need hospital care, there will be fewer for his emergencies. Hence, there will be overcrowding, and then the Federal Government will have to spend more to provide additional hospitals or additions to existing ones. This vast outlay will rise as the relative proportion of the OASDI (old-age survivors and disability insurance) recipients will certainly rise over the years ahead.

In dealing with the recipients of the Kennedy-King-Anderson plan, countless doctors will have the strong inducement that now confronts them with workmen's compensation cases. That is to "overtreat and overhospitalize" patients. Consider this in connection with the millions of new people under the proposed plan. Both doctors and hospitals will have larger incomes in the first years of this plan. But they will be paying the bitter price of losing their independence.

Doctors will tell you that much of the hospitalization of the elderly is not because of definable illness. It is simply the deterioration which accompanies old age. Also there is the tendency of those who are idle after a life of active work to fall the victim of worry about bodily ailments. The idle mind turns inward, and if there are no specific aches and pains it becomes easy to imagine them.

The Kennedy-King-Anderson plan starts us on a long and probably endless road, a road which we should avoid now and here.

The Spirit of St. Patrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, throughout the whole world today, wherever the sons and daughters of Erin are, Irish hearts are happy and the world is gay in hailing the great patron saint of the Emerald Isle who brought the Christian God to Ireland.

There is an eternality about St. Patrick, because the influences of supreme faith, undaunted courage, and untiring work for his cause has shone down through the ages with a gleaming fervor that has thrown off shackles and brought unimagined glory and triumphs to the Irish people all over the world.

As the great Irish churchman and scholar, Bishop Philbin said:

St. Patrick's holiness was of no common measure. He not only transformed a people in the course of a few decades; he transformed them with a permanence that has endured until this day.

Such was the influence of his preaching that the faith he imparted to the Irish has ever since remained, not merely as a feature of their character, but as their characteristic feature—intense love of home, appreciation of the supernatural, emphasis on prayer and works of devotion, not only in devotional life, but in literature and folklore.

No other personality has so impressed itself on the Irish people and across all the divisions and controversies that history has imposed on the Irish, St. Patrick remains to this day their single undisputed center of unity.

More perhaps than any other race, the Irish owe their faith to God, not to the gradual influence of many workers and the play of many forces, but to one man. Through and through the Irish are Patrick's children.

St. Patrick braved many challenges and his life was full of hardships. Exiled, enslaved, disowned, condemned to the roughest life, he experienced famine and privation.

He was seized, beaten, and imprisoned and denied even the privilege of writing and speaking.

Such sufferings as Patrick underwent were to become the hallmark of Irish history, whose origin was in unyielding fidelity to faith.

For this offense, throughout the years, the Irish have been robbed of their homes and lands, denied livelihood in their own country, deprived of the protection of the law that is the right of every freeman.

Hardship, poverty, and hunger were inseparable from the profession and practice of the faith; the great famine was only the climax of many like experiences to which the race was subjected in centuries of persecution.

Exile has been a prominent part of Irish history, and it has spread Irish people all over the world, so that now there are vastly more people of the Irish race living abroad than in the homeland.

Through heartbreak and bitterness, the Irish people have cherished their traditions, including their love of native literature even when this love was degraded, suppressed, and denied. Suffering and hardship often have compensating graces, and the fact that the Irish have emerged unshaken in their allegiance notwithstanding agelong cruelties and persecutions, remains one of their greatest glories.

Irishmen and women thank the Lord with overflowing heart for the gift of steadfastness which Patrick gave to the Irish race. It is said that as a consequence of St. Patrick's inspiration Irish scholars kept the lamps of learning and knowledge burning in Europe throughout the Dark Ages. The work of Irish missionaries in the centuries immediately after St. Patrick is perhaps the most famous episode in Irish history but it is not the only one, and it may not have been the greatest, but it lives with us today, as we view this sick, disordered world, beckoning us to stand firm and indomitable in our unflinching determination to preserve our heritage of freedom under God.

We need a St. Patrick today to stir, arouse and restore the faith of millions of people in our own nation and throughout the world who are victims of modern materialism and paganistic philosophies and Godless, dictatorial systems of government. We need the zeal of St. Patrick to protect the precious, free heritage of America in whose defense so many great Irishmen paid the supreme sacrifice.

Here today, in this blessed, free land, we need to summon the strength, the courage and tenacity of purpose of the Irish sages who signed the Declaration of Independence, the Irish heroes of the Revolutionary War and every other war in our history.

We need the voice of another St. Patrick throughout the land and throughout the world sounding a clarion call in the defense of liberty, that men everywhere may be free of the cruel chains which bind them to intolerable tyranny, that true freedom and brotherhood may dwell on this earth and all people may be spared the lash of the tyrant's whip.

This is the spirit of St. Patrick and his noble followers, this is the spirit of the great American patriots who fought to sustain our free institutions. This is the spirit we need in this land today, as we joyously celebrate the birthday of the great patron saint of Ireland.

Let us be thankful for the contributions of his sons and daughters on American soil and throughout the world who have fought and died for liberty.

Let us resolve to carry his banner of faith and courage wherever our great destiny may lead us in the quest of peace, freedom and brotherhood for all men.

The Case for Braceros

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, in the Friday, March 9, 1962, Christian Science Monitor appeared an article portraying a true picture of the plight faced by American farmers who have to rely on the supplemental labor supplied from the Republic of Mexico. This article was written by Helen Henley, farm editor of the Christian Science Monitor. The effect of tightening restrictions and regulation changes upon agricultural producers, and especially small farmers, is discussed by the writer. Also mentioned is what could happen with regard to increased costs of vegetable crops to the consuming public because of a determination at the Washington level to invoke most difficult regulations in administering Public Law 78, the Mexican labor

program. I commend the article to the membership of the House:

THE CASE FOR BRACEROS

(By Helen Henley)

LUBBOCK, TEX.—How long could industry continue to produce if factories were allowed to hire their workers for no more than 6 months out of the year?

How could they function if they had to accept whatever workers were allotted to them, with no chance to choose and no hope of getting back employees trained the previous year?

And what would they do if they were forbidden by law to use their employees to operate machinery?

Regulations as shackling as these now have been thrust on farmers who for years have depended on bracero labor coming across the border from Mexico. Here in the American West and Southwest, farmers struggling with these new problems, added to others already critical, say they see no satisfactory solution. They don't know how they are going to manage.

One man who works closely with farmers said that the new demands on vegetable farmers might double the cost of vegetables to the consumer.

A West Texas farmer who normally operates eight tractors has had to cut down to four, because he can't get workers for all of them.

Another who farms 3,250 acres has said that he may just rent out his land to others and move to Mexico where he can "live in comfort for half of what my land would rent for." And he was not joking.

SOCIAL CONSCIENCE STIRRED

Exploitation of some of the migrants who stand at the lowest rung of the economic ladder recently has stirred the social conscience of Americans and has spurred many remedial efforts. But the issue here is not the treatment of braceros, some of whom are comparatively well off. Some farmers treat their braceros well, cheerfully paying the most trustworthy ones higher wages than the law requires. And farmers are permitted to hire braceros only when they (the farmers) meet certain specifications set by law.

Braceros are Mexicans who, by agreement between the Mexican and American Governments, have long come into the United States, under carefully drawn contracts, to work the crops. The braceros have largely replaced the wetbacks who used to cross the border illegally to work the fields of the West and Southwest. The terms of their employment and living conditions have been carefully spelled out and enforced.

Like it or not, braceros occupy in the agricultural economy of the Southwest a place roughly comparable to that of the slaves in the onetime cotton empire of the Old South. If braceros are removed from American farms without an immediately effective and realistic program to provide qualified American workers to replace them, farmers feel that they face chaos and perhaps even ruin.

REGULATIONS TIGHTENED

New regulations and interpretations applying to bracero labor have, since the first of the year, become so restrictive that farmers feel that their own Government has, in effect, tied their hands behind their backs. This has become a grievous issue.

"I have had a man who has worked for me for 6 years—a bracero," said C. W. Bush, who grows cotton and grain sorghums on some 900 acres near Post, Tex. "He's like my right arm. I could go off and leave him and know he'd do the job. It takes 2 years to get a man broke in like that. Now I am going to lose him on account of the Government's ruling."

Under new interpretations and amendments to Public Law 78, which governs the employment of braceros, farmers may not now hire a bracero for more than 180 days per year. These days need not be consecutive, but even so, "There's no way the 180-day pattern can fit our seasonal needs," declared Leslie Mitchell of Crosbyton, Tex., who farms more than 3,000 acres devoted chiefly to cotton and milo.

"You used to be able to contract with a bracero for 6 months and it could be extended to 18 months," explained Ed Dean, executive secretary of the West Texas Agricultural Employers Group. "A man could go home overnight and then come back for another 18 months. You could recontract for the additional period without paying more than the original $10 contract fee to the Government. Now the fee has gone up to $15, and if recontracting is permitted it calls for an additional $15 fee."

NOT EVEN A RECOMMENDATION

"Now you can't even give a worker a letter of recommendation," said Larry LaDouceur, manager of Community Producers, Inc., Lubbock, Tex. "A worker cannot be taken by name. Anyone wanting to pick a certain bracero would have to find a way to do it under the table."

It used to be possible, he explained, to get back a preferred worker as a "special" but this special program "has been out of the picture for some time."

"I have each year been hiring three braceros for harvest for about 2 or 3 months," put in Clyde Paschall, who has a 320-acre cotton and grain farm at Roundup, Tex. He used two in the trailer to "tromp cotton" and one to drive the tractor. Under current interpretations by the Secretary of Labor, employment of braceros for this work with machinery is prohibited.

Farmers are forbidden to use braceros "for employment to operate or maintain power-driven self-propelled harvesting, planting, or cultivating machinery, except in specific cases when found by the Secretary of Labor necessary for a temporary period to avoid undue hardship."

MACHINE OPERATION DEFINED

According to interpretations issued by the Dallas Bureau of Employment Security, U.S. Department of Labor:

"The operation of a machine includes any activity performed that is essential to the full functioning of the machine. For example, a potato harvester with an elevator truck utilizes a combine operator, four sorters, and three truck drivers. The sorters ride on the combine and pick stones and trash from the potatoes as they pass by on the conveyors. All of these activities are identified with the operation of the machinery and Mexican contract workers cannot be employed in them."

To spell it out further, these instructions continue:

"The mechanical lettuce harvester requires cutters who work ahead of the machine and toss the lettuce heads into the hopper where they are trimmed and sealed into plastic bags by workers on the machine. The cutting and loading activity is one in which Mexican contract workers may be engaged, but the trimming and bagging operations are essential to the operation of the machine, thus Mexican contract workers cannot be used in this activity.

"In other words, any activity that must be performed, other than the manual loading and unloading of the machine in question, is considered a part of the machine operation and is available to domestic workers only. Work performed on the machine is prohibited to Mexican contract workers."

U.S. POLICY INDICATED

The fact that these new restrictions have been added to the basic one long in effect—that no braceros at all may be hired anyway unless no domestic workers are available for the jobs—would lead one to assume that the Department of Labor is closing in to end the bracero program entirely.

"I have told growers that their source of Mexican labor is going to stop, and they had better begin now making preparations to rely on sources other than Mexicans for farm work," Assistant Secretary of Labor Jerry R. Holleman is reported to have told the labor editor of the Los Angeles Examiner last October.

The theory is, of course, that if braceros were not used on farms, there would be that many more jobs for domestic workers. "Last year," the Examiner stated, "320,000 braceros were used on U.S. farms, including 75,100 on California farms; but 'this year the total will be down from 60,000 to 100,000, and the number will continue to drop steadily.'"

But the farmers say that many jobless Americans scorn to do the stoop labor and other difficult jobs performed by braceros.

"If we don't get braceros to hoe, we will hurt," said Mr. Bush, "because these natives don't like that hoeing."

And, as another farmer said, "Many of the natives we would draw from are on relief and getting free groceries—why should they work?"

RESTRICTIONS ROUSE CONCERN

Horace L. Turnbow, a dairyman milking 54 cows on 160 acres about 12 miles northeast of Lubbock, said that he usually averaged two braceros the year-round but that now he has one bracero whose time is about up and one native Negro part-time. "I will probably do as much of the work as I can myself," said Mr. Turnbow, but despite all his good mechanized equipment, he doesn't quite see how he is going to manage. The immediate prospects, he said, "give me quite a few nightmare apprehensions."

Farmers in several areas are loudly protesting the raising of minimum wage rates for braceros. This additional problem did not seem to concern these farmers here, however, as much as did the other restrictions imposed by the Department of Labor. They agreed among themselves that they are willing to pay a good worker more even than the law requires. Their chief worry centers on getting qualified workers.

But the thought was expressed that the recent hearings held in Texas by the Department of Labor were merely a matter of form, though advertised to determine whether "the employment of Mexican nationals in the State of Texas will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed unless the Mexican workers are paid not less than 70 cents per hour, and, when paid at piece rates, at rates which will guarantee earnings equivalent to earnings at the specified hourly rate."

BUREAUCRACY PLAINT

When one farmer commented, "They are putting farmers under people who know absolutely nothing about farming," another chimed in, "Neither do they have any sympathy with our problems."

A spokesman for farmers who employ braceros added: "Nobody would object to paying 70 cents an hour or higher if they could depend on qualified labor. What they object to is having to pay at such a rate to unqualified or unproductive workers. It seems to place on the backs of farmers the responsibility for employing the leftover labor in the country."

Another plaint was: "Everything is left to the Secretary of Labor. We object to this because we don't think one appointed official

of the government should have as much authority over so many people as he has been given or has assumed."

Under the regulations, the Secretary through his regional officials may grant exceptions to the rules to prevent hardship or loss of crops—but farmers, experienced by now in the ways of bureaucracy, fear that action on even urgent requests for exception may come to late to save the crop in question.

In short, this is a time of anxiety and apprehension for farmers in the West and Southwest who do not know where they are going to get adequate labor to plant and harvest their next crops.

LABOR TIE CHARGED

They are disturbed, too, by what they see as indications that Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg and Assistant Secretary Holleman are 'union men." As one Texan put it, "Both come from the ranks of organized labor. We feel that they tend to represent labor alone rather than representing the people of the United States in their entirety."

This spokesman quickly added: "I would not like to leave the impression that we are opposed to labor unions. There is a place for them. But agriculture is different from any other industry.

"We rely on the elements to a great extent, and we are subject to the ravages of those elements. We work on the farm when weather and other conditions permit. There are times during the week when we can't work. Sometimes we have to work on weekends. Farming is not cut and dried like manufacturing. It is entirely different. We don't believe that agriculture could tolerate unionized labor. It just doesn't fit."

Yet, according to the Los Angeles Examiner report on its interview with Mr. Holleman—former head of the Texas AFL-CIO—last October, the Department of Labor "is also considering an affirmative statement of policy aimed at promoting and encouraging collective bargaining not only in industry but in agriculture * * *. Such an 'affirmative statement' by the department could help encourage resumption of the bogged-down organization drive among farmworkers."

Thus farmers, now trying to meet the immediate emergency caused by withdrawal of braceros from fields where they have long worked, are fully aware that even tougher problems may lie ahead.

Government Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am calling to the attention of my colleagues a most important column by Mr. Henry Taylor in the March 19, 1962, edition of the Washington Daily News.

Consider the timetable Mr. Taylor mentions, and it is no wonder that many of us are worried about governmental spending. Just where is the limit?

The article follows:

In a wrangle over payments that lasted for 27 years, Leonardo Da Vinci finally received 1,200 lire for his masterpiece, "Virgin of the Rocks," now in the Louvre. That is $1.94 today. The painting is priceless. The money is worthless. This is inflation.

There are no boundaries to human needs. And any government which proclaims that because we need things we can have them by government spending is dealing in a world of words that have caused incalculable human tragedy. It is the world where solutions are made to sound easy merely by debt and a printing press.

Figures can be tiresome, but we are due a sober accounting. Perhaps a compilation will amaze you, for it has all happened incredibly fast. And, after all, it is our own money, savings, and future that are at stake.

On March 27, 1961, President Kennedy forecast a $2.1 billion deficit in his New Frontier budget.

On May 25 he said the deficit would be $3.6 billion.

On July 25 he revised the red figure again to $5.3 billion.

On January 18, 1962, the President revised his deficit once more to $7 billion.

And now the latest monthly Treasury statement showed an actual deficit of $9.4 billion during the first 7 months of the New Frontier's fiscal year, through January.

Yet even this isn't the whole story. A year ago the legal debt limit was $293 billion. Then on June 27, Treasury Secretary C. Douglas Dillon testified that a "temporary statutory debt limit of $298 billion should give us sufficient elbowroom for maximum efficiency of operations." Temporary? Efficient? Well, Mr. Dillon was in dreamland. His June estimates of debt levels turned out to be wrong by $5.4 billion in only the first half of the fiscal year.

Within months the President asked for another raise in the debt limit to $300 billion, because the Government still could not meet its current bills unless Congress complied. And still another boost to $308 billion will be requested before June 30. This is a $15 billion boost in the debt limit within 1 year, and all bound up in the enormous package with the deficits.

The spenders are eating the wrong side of Alice in Wonderland's mushroom and we're headed for an awful ache, which can affect business conditions as well as our solvency. How we can go on like this defies anybody's common sense. Meanwhile, in real purchasing power we will all grow progressively poorer as the inevitable result of the process.

Nothing this side of war finally creates so much human misery as inflation with its artificial pay and the debauching of national finances. This is how political spending and government debt torpedo people's savings and their ability to plan for their children and the future. For human problems do not wash away and peoples and nations are not floated over their troubles when a government becomes financially irresponsible. It is simply beyond the power of printed pieces of paper and well-meant words to do the miracle.

Life (and the survival of a nation) always turns out to be harder than that. There's a grim parallel in how the Blum Socialist-Labor government contributed to France's weakness and ignoble defeat in 39 days and how Britain's Labor-Socialist government all but completed the wreckage of England at the war's end.

Where is M. Blum now? Where are the tall foreheads of the British Fabian socialists who laughed at history?

Continental Airlines and Its Place in the Air Transportation Industry Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER H. DOMINICK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker, on March 14, 1962, in a speech before the Investment Group of Hartford, Conn., Mr. Robert F. Six, president of Continental Airlines, a good friend of mine and of aviation in general, made an excellent analysis of the measures employed by Continental Airlines in successfully meeting the problems of the airline industry with which the industry and Congress have been wrestling.

I am personally acquainted with Mr. Six and with many of the fine officers and staff of this excellent airline which is based in Denver, Colo., and I believe that the information disclosed by Mr. Six not only will be of special interest to my colleagues, but also may prove very helpful to other members of the air transport industry who are facing similar problems. Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that this very fine address by Mr. Robert F. Six be inserted in the Appendix of today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The address follows:

CONTINENTAL AIRLINES AND ITS PLACE IN THE AIR TRANSPORTATION INDUSTRY TODAY

(A speech by Robert F. Six, president of Continental Airlines, before the Investment Group of Hartford in the Hartford Club, Hartford, Conn., at noon, Wednesday, March 14, 1962)

Gentlemen, I know that you have all been virtually swamped with gloomy stories about the airline industry. Frankly, I'm not here to sing a song of doom for I cannot share in this widespread pessimism.

Jets are the most economical, dependable planes we have ever operated. They have not brought a hopeless future with them, at least not for Continental.

In fact, if you computed each carrier's operating margin since inauguration of its first jet schedule, you would find that Continental's 9.2 percent profit from operations has been the highest in the industry.

Last year while the industry lost $30 million, Continental made more than $1 million. In the 3 years we have been operating pure jets, our gross revenues have totaled $170 million, while our operating profit hit $15 million and our net profit reached $4.5 million. These figures all are substantially above the cumulative totals of the preceding 25 years of our operations.

The future looks even brighter for we have seen definite signs of a traffic upturn since last November. We believe the trunklines together will show more than a 6-percent increase in traffic for the full year, or enough to restore the industry to a profitable basis.

We think that Continental will post a 15- to 20-percent increase in traffic. All our Boeing 720-B's will be in service by July. We'll be operating over our new Texas-Arizona-California route for the full year, compared with only 7 months in 1961. In addition, we will benefit from the general traffic upturn.

Our revenues this year should top $70 million compared with $63 million last year, while our net profit could double the 1961 figure.

It's certainly true that the first three jet years have been difficult ones for the industry. Why did the industry get into trouble? There are three principal reasons. The cost of introducing the jets was extremely heavy. At the same time, air travel failed to sustain even half the annual growth rate existing at the time jets were ordered. And to top it all off, for the first time in its history the industry has been unable to sell its old planes at a profit to help pay the cost of new equipment. There has been and still is overcapacity on some routes, but overcapacity is a result of the failure of air travel to grow at a normal pace and of the industry's inability to sell surplus piston aircraft, many of which still are in service.

There are two answers to the industry's problems—more passengers and lower costs.

Raising fares will solve neither problem. Increased fares can only shrink the air travel market. Aside from a smaller market, I think the airlines would be derelict in their duty to the public if air travel becomes limited to expense-account business and to people with high incomes.

The answer to increased revenues lies in winning more passengers.

We can get more passengers from a number of sources—population growth; inducing people to fly more often; getting people to make trips they would not otherwise have made, and by luring passengers from buses, trains, and the private automobile.

Obviously, only a fraction of the intercity automobile passenger traffic is susceptible to airline wooing. But, a fraction is all we need. A diversion of just 4 percent of this tremendous market that totaled 700 billion passenger miles last year would double present air travel volume.

The only way to generate this extra business is to bring jet travel within the reach of more people, by making the cost of an airline ticket competitive with surface transportation. To conduct this kind of jet economy experiment successfully, the industry must get its costs closer to Continental's level, for the other side of the profit coin is cost control.

For 1961, Continental needed passengers in only 43½ out of every 100 seats to break even, while the industry as a whole had to have 56½ out of every 100 seats filled. Our Boeings had a breakeven passenger load factor of only 36.9 percent, while our jet-powered Viscounts required only 44.6 percent. If the 11 trunklines had been able to lower their combined breakeven load factor by just one point, the industry would have eliminated its loss last year. If the industry had had Continental's low costs, the combined profit would have been approximately $150 million.

This is the first speech I've made in 2 years. I accepted your invitation because I wanted to speak out against one thing that worries me very much, and that is the swelling cry from within the industry to have the Civil Aeronautics Board take over management prerogatives, to add regulation upon regulation. We can't ask the CAB to subsidize our experiments unless we are willing to share our profits with the Government. We can't ask the CAB to regulate our competitors without giving up our freedom, too. We can't expect to remain a dynamic, growing industry if we ask the Government to make our decisions for us.

I simply cannot subscribe to the theory that the airlines are unable to control their own destinies. Through proper management, aggressive sales, a willingness to experiment and to change, I believe individual companies and the industry as a whole will be able to find their way back to higher profit margins.

Before trying to analyze the whys and wherefores of Continental's profits in the jet age, let me briefly trace our history.

Continental began life in 1934 as the Southwest Division of Varney Speed Lines, flying little single-engine Vega aircraft over a 520-mile route from Pueblo, Colo., to Albuquerque, N. Mex. and El Paso, Tex. In the first 15 days the company carried exactly 9 passengers.

I joined Varney in 1936 just in time to learn about the word, "security," as used by bankers. The next year Louis Mueller, who headed the airline, and I had to put our homes as security for three new six-passenger, twin-engine Lockheed 12's.

I know what failure to pay your bills can do. My first job was with Pacific Gas & Electric Co.'s credit department in Stockton, Calif. Every morning I would leave in my model A with a stack of bills and a set of tools. If a farmer couldn't pay his bill, I'd just climb the nearest pole and literally cut off his power. I got fired from that job, though, because my boss found that I was spending my time learning how to fly instead of collecting bills.

Continental grew slowly until 1955, when we were granted a Chicago-Kansas City-Denver-Los Angeles route. Our problem was a simple one. We had gross annual sales of $16 million, total assets of $14 million and a net worth of $5 million. We had just been given the opportunity to compete with three of the Nation's four biggest airlines—United, American and TWA—nonstop between Chicago and Los Angeles. We knew full well that a small airline couldn't compete in the big leagues without the proper equipment, people or money, yet we had to be able to prove to the Civil Aeronautics Board that we could do a creditable job over any routes awarded us.

We went shopping that year and committed ourselves for $13 million for five DC-7B's with which we planned to offer our first competition; $27.5 million for 15 jet-powered Viscount II's, the newest largest model in a famed series; and $23.8 million for four Golden Jet Boeing 707's—a total of more than $64 million.

We secured the necessary capital to acquire the aircraft, ground equipment, facilities and preoperational training through short-term funds obtained largely from banks and from subordinated debentures.

We placed the DC-7Bs in club coach service at a time when our competitors were using the same planes only for first class passengers. We gave coach customers seat selection and full-course hot meals. By providing a topnotch service for a coach fare, we became firmly established over the new route.

Just 13 months later we inaugurated service with the Viscount Mark II, the first use of jet-powered aircraft west of Chicago. These planes rapidly gave us 50 percent of the first-class air travel between Chicago and Denver and between Denver and Los Angeles.

Then in June 1959, we put our golden jet Boeing 707's in nonstop service between Chicago and Los Angeles. We were the third U.S. domestic airline to operate its own jets. This early start let us make market penetrations which would have been extremely difficult if our jet deliveries had come after those of our competitors.

Late in 1960, we successfully completed a $42 million refinancing program, not only securing the company's first long-term funds from institutional lenders, but making possible the purchase of a fifth golden jet Boeing 707.

Last year, we completed the third step in our jet-age plans. We ordered four Boeing 720-B's for delivery this spring. The additional aircraft will be used to expand service over our present jet routes and to extend jet service to other major cities on our system.

The Boeing 720-B program involves a capital outlay of $27,500,000 for aircraft, spare engines, parts, and related ground facilities. To finance the program, we arranged to borrow $20,500,000, of which three-fourths will come from banks and long-term institutional lenders. The balance will come from internal funds.

Delivery of the 720-B's will increase Continental's assets to approximately $100 million—seven times our assets just 7 years ago.

I think our profits over the last 3 years can be traced to several things. We converted Continental into a jet airline with jet-age methods and concepts before the start of jet operations. At the same time, we instituted the tightest cost control program in the industry. Credit also has to be given to our high jet utilization; to the low costs resulting from operation of more than 90 percent of our total capacity with highly efficient jet and jet-powered aircraft, and to flair, salesmanship, and the willingness to innovate.

How did we achieve these things?

First, we reorganized the company into two categories—the planners and the doers. By separating the two functions, we were able to put top men in charge of running the day-to-day operation of the company and at the same time have other key people spending full time planning for the future.

Our planners looked carefully at the problems 120-passenger jets would create at our ticket counters and came up with our "instant boarding" and "on-board ticketing" systems. Today, a continental passenger only has to weigh in his baggage on a special double scale, then walk to the gatehouse and board his Golden Jet, with or without a ticket. On board, a management representative, whom we call a director of passenger services, will collect for excess baggage, sell the passenger a ticket if he doesn't have one or even rewrite his ticket if necessary. The DPS has a special radiotelephone with which he can call ahead to rent a car or make a hotel reservation.

By moving the airport ticket counter to the airplane, we eliminated the long lines other carriers have at their jet counters. By adding a director to the cabin crew, we gave the passengers a management representative to take care of their special needs, freeing our hostesses to devote full time to regular inflight duties.

To speed our ground handling, we made miniatures of the 22 pieces of equipment needed at each jet gate position. Then our people worked with these models until we had a sequence of movement for every piece. As a result, we have the fastest turnaround times in the industry, averaging around 45 minutes. We schedule some turnarounds for as little as 25 minutes. In Denver, passengers are on the ground walking to the terminal within 55 seconds when the plane stops.

In the air, what we sought and what we achieved, was "cockpit discipline." Our training is as thorough and the technical proficiency of our crews as high as that found on any airline in the world. But we go one step further. We make sure that our crews understand the economics of the airline and particularly of jet operation.

Jets cost a tremendous amount of money to operate. In 1961 our Boeing 707's burned an average of 2,148 gallons of fuel per hour, and jet fuel cost us 10¾ cents per gallon. Direct maintenance added $160 to $170 per hour; crew salaries and associated costs, almost $100; insurance, another $50. On top of these expenses, of course, came depreciation, overhead, interest on our debt, and so forth.

With these costs in mind, our crews, dispatchers, and meteorologists precisely select altitudes and airways to take maximum advantage of winds and air traffic control. The pilots know where they're going. They get there in the shortest possible time. They

make precision approaches and landings time after time. Our inflight times over competitive routes run 3 to 4 minutes less than those of our competitors flying similar equipment. The time our jets spend on the ground between terminal and takeoff or landing averages perhaps a minute less. For example, at Los Angeles International Airport there are 5 different places we can turn off the main runway to taxi to our gate positions. With our prescribed landing point 1,000 feet beyond the start of the runway, we can easily make the first turnoff 5,000 feet further on, saving 3 to 4 minutes compared with landing in the middle of the runway and turning off on the final strip.

What do minutes mean?

Not counting depreciation and overhead, it costs us $11.98 for each minute of jet flight; $5.72 for each minute of taxi time. This summer we will be operating in the neighborhood of 72 jet departures each day. If poor planning or operation adds 3 minutes of flight time and 1 minute of taxi time to each of these trips, our annual operating expense will increase by more than $1 million. Conversely, if we plan our flights proficiently and fly them with exactness, the savings can substantially aid our profit picture.

When we first looked at the enormous expense and tremendous earning capacity of jets, we realized that the biggest costs involved would actually result from time out of service. We felt that each Golden Jet should generate from $7 million to $8 million in revenue each year, or up to $22,000 per plane per day, day-in and day-out. Under the then accepted maintenance method, we would have had to plan for each jet to be out of service a minimum of 5 days for every 2,500 flight hours. If we didn't find a new method, it was obvious that we would either have to buy more airplanes, which we couldn't afford just then, or operate fewer schedules than we planned.

When we ordered our Golden Jet Boeing 707's, we insisted that Boeing's engineers design our jets so that anything from a landing gear or control surface to a stabilizer or pressurization system could be changed within 8 hours. Boeing did a wonderful job and we were able to do our jet maintenance from the very beginning on a perpetual or continuous plan. Instead of taking a plane completely out of schedule, each jet goes into our Los Angeles maintenance base every fifth night for a 14-hour period and the work is done on a progressive basis. As a result, we have been able to schedule our jets as much as 15 hours a day, 7 days a week.

The perpetual maintenance system has enabled us to keep our jet earning capacity every day of the year. Our high utilization has made is possible to offer the public more service, to achieve a higher penetration of our competitive markets, to have fewer airplanes and, consequently, lower capital outlays and interest costs, and to spread our overhead expenses over more flight hours.

We also have been successful in keeping our overhead personnel to the practical minimum. Airlines have to have certain numbers of mechanics and pilots, ramp personnel, reservation agents and hostesses. But there's plenty of room for fighting the battle of the bulge in the middle and upper management groups.

Our efforts to keep Continental's management trim and all costs unrelated to the actual operation of the airline to a minimum have been successful. Last year our indirect costs were only 90 percent of our direct operating costs, compared to an industry average of more than 100 percent.

Our overall costs should keep going down. When our new jets are in schedule this summer, we will be operating more than 80 percent of our daily capacity with Boeing 707's and 720-B's—the highest percentage of pure jet operation in the Nation. Virtually 100 percent of our service will be in pure jet or jet-powered aircraft. The result of almost exclusive operation of these low-cost aircraft will be an even lower system breakeven, vastly increasing our profit potential as travel picks up again.

As you gentlemen know, once an airline reaches its breakeven point, the leverage is tremendous. Almost 100 cents of every extra dollar goes directly into operating profit.

The industry still faces many problems. Labor costs continue to rise and not always in relation to productivity. So do costs of spare parts, supplies and services the airlines receive.

Airport charges are rapidly mounting. They threaten to keep right on rising with no relation to airline economics. We believe that major airports can be operated without cost to the taxpayer, but we do not believe that cities should try to operate municipal facilities for a profit. The search for profit by government may fit in a socialistic state, but it certainly has no place in a free economy.

Now the Federal Government has proposed fuel and user taxes equal to almost one-tenth of last year's industry revenues. There would be no argument on our part if this great sum represented our fair share of airway cost, but it doesn't. The proposed charges represent 95 percent of the money desired from the entire aviation community, yet less than one-fourth of all takeoffs, landings, and communications handled by the FAA are those of commercial airlines. In addition, no recognition has been given for the Standby Reserve Fleet of aircraft provided by the commercial airlines for use in a national emergency.

We're concerned with costs which threaten our relatively thin profit margins. We know that any airline which is unable to keep on making a respectable profit may be forced to merge—and on someone else's terms. Mergers could very well be the answer to the problems of some carriers, but merger costs can be extremely high. Until the Civil Aeronautics Board lays down some ground rules, carriers will expend a great deal of energy and money in reaching terms and gaining stockholder approval, only to face a CAB turndown.

In conclusion, I would like to pay tribute to you who represent this country's great insurance companies and banks. As you know, at the end of 1961 insurance companies held some 63 percent and banks some 37 percent of the industry's debt of $1.8 billion. In addition, I know that you have purchased many millions of dollars worth of airport revenue bond issues.

Without these loans there would have been no jet age. Certainly the huge $3 billion fleet expansion could not have been financed through sale of additional airline stock to the public. Gentlemen, if you had not had the courage to make these loans, the airlines would have had only one place to turn for funds—the Federal Government. Such a move would have placed the industry well along the road to nationalization.

Even with your help, the initial 3 years of the jet age have been difficult, but I believe this period has laid the base for a profitable future for Continental and for the industry.

Thank you.

Address by Hon. Oren Harris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House to an address of Hon. OREN HARRIS, chairman, House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, before the Chicago Western Railway Club at their annual executive night's dinner at the grand ballroom, Sherman Hotel, in Chicago, on March 19, 1962.

The message concerns an important component part of our Nation's progress and economy. For this reason, I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD, the text of Congressman HARRIS' address and commend it to the attention of all my colleagues.

The address follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. OREN HARRIS, CHAIRMAN, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, BEFORE THE WESTERN RAILWAY CLUB, CHICAGO, MARCH 19, 1962

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure to be with you again tonight.

I recall most warmly my visit with you here 3 years ago last November. At that time Congress had recently completed its work on the Transportation Act of 1958 and I recall discussing with you three railroad problems which had been developed in the course of our hearings on that legislation dealing with surface transportation, namely, competition, ratemaking principles, and diversification.

Tonight we are just a month away from Lieutenant Colonel Glenn's epochal flight. All of us followed closely his descriptions of what the earth looked like from a great distance. Thus it has seemed appropriate in these times to engage in a look at our Nation's railroads as they might be viewed from afar off.

Several weeks ago in New York, in speaking to the Transportation Association of America, I presented some views relating to the transportation industry as a whole, and expressed the opinion that we had a strong privately owned and privately operate transportation system, and that while I recognized some signs of weakness here and there, the present condition of the transportation industry could not be characterized as being in a crisis. There apparently has been some reaction to this talk, with some still adhering to a position of gloom and doom.

So, since I am here in Chicago before your Western Railway Club where most of our great railroads are represented, I intend tonight to be more specific and to speak more about individual railroads than railroads as a whole.

We have now had 3½ years' experience since the passage of the Transportation Act of 1958 and it is fitting to look at today's picture.

There are several puzzling aspects in the present railroad picture. I should like tonight to discuss two of them—each is provocative and challenging.

The first puzzlement is the very heterogeneous and opposite ways in which individual railroads have come out of the 1960-61 recession. Some railroads now have peak earnings. Others are abysmally bad.

However, in order to analyze correctly the trend in railroad earnings, it is necessary to take into account the effect in the last 10 years of the temporary tax savings resulting from accelerated amortization of emergency facilities. This is so because net railway operating income, the measure used in determining the results of a railroad's operation, includes Federal income taxes as well as operating revenues and expenses.

Since these certificates of accelerated amortization generally were last issued in 1955, their effect in increasing net railway operating income has about run out. Indeed, more than half the railroads serving Chicago already show a deficit in this account, and are paying higher taxes than they otherwise would, and by this year, or by 1963 all railroads will be in this situation. Thus, from this one feature alone, individual railroads would have shown a declining net railway operating income these past few years, even though all other things were equal, and they had identical revenues and expenses each year.

For example, in 1961, the Southern, Seaboard, and Norfolk & Western reported decreases from 1960 in net railway operating income. However, if the effect of these tax savings is eliminated, all three would show an increase. (I do not know, therefore, whether the current accounting treatment is exactly fair to the operating departments of the railroads.) During the past 10 years the temporary tax savings for individual railroads have averaged 10 to 20 percent of railway net operating income, and for many railroads has amounted to as much as 30 percent in a given year.

In going back through annual reports since 1948 of some of the major railroads in the country, I find that if the effect of accelerated tax amortization were eliminated we would have the following situation as to 1961 net railway operating income.

Atlantic Coast Line and Norfolk and Western, highest in these 14 years; Louisville & Nashville, and Union Pacific, highest since 1951 except for 1 year; Missouri Pacific, highest since 1952 except for 1 year; Southern Pacific, highest since 1953 (and perhaps earlier, as Moody's Manual for 1960 may not have given a correct estimate of 1961 tax savings); Frisco, and perhaps the Cottonbelt, highest since 1956; Burlington, Milwaukee, and Illinois Central, highest since 1956 except for 1 year; Wabash, highest since 1957; Southern, highest since 1957 except for 1 year; and Rio Grande, highest since 1958.

On the other hand, the Santa Fe, Chicago & Eastern Illinois, Rock Island, Gulf Mobile and Ohio, and Pennsylvania merely were higher in 1961 than 1960; and the Baltimore & Ohio, Chesapeake and Ohio, Great Western, Great Northern, New York Central, Nickel Plate, and Northern Pacific were the poorest in the past 14 years.

I do not wish to say that this listing has been set forth in any wise to support a proposition that net railway operating income has been adequate these past 14 years whether or not we take into account this temporary tax savings feature, or that net railway operating income should not have grown commensurate with the growth of the country. Nor am I making any argument whether or not the accounting treatment by the railroads and the Interstate Commerce Commission should have been different and like that of other utilities under regulation should have provided for the creation of a reserve to equalize these temporary savings over the years in the future when they act in reverse. Nor has there been any failure by the railroads to disclose to their stockholders what President Marsh of the Santa Fe described in our 1958 hearings as a temporary inflation in earnings that does not represent the true situation.

I simply have offered this list to show that one of the puzzling features in the railroad picture today is that many railroads do not appear to be facing acute crisis, although it is all too clear that some are in trouble and others seem to be hurting.

The second puzzlement I wish to discuss is the condition of the eastern railroads.

For some time, naturally, I have been aware that the eastern railroads were not doing as well as those in the South and West. To some extent I suppose over the years my mind had attributed this to the fact that the East relatively had not been growing as rapidly as the South and the West.

More recently, however, I have had occasion to be brought face to face with the truth at whereas during the forties perhaps the East did not grow as rapidly as the rest of the country, this was not true during the fifties. I became well aware of this fact for as you may know, down in Arkansas, we have been experiencing a little problem of congressional redistricting. There is nothing that so clearly emphasizes to some of us the relatively changing population of the country as the change in the number of seats in the House of Representatives which each State has.

Thus, in the past months I have had reason to become somewhat familiar with the 1960 census which shows a nationwide population increase of 18½ percent over the 1950 census. I could not help noticing the drop in population experienced by our many large cities since the 1950 census. New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit, Washington, Baltimore, Cleveland, Boston, St. Louis, Pittsburgh, Buffalo—every one of these lost population in this decade. On the other hand, Los Angeles, Houston, Milwaukee, Dallas, New Orleans, Memphis, Denver, Atlanta, all grew substantially.

In 1950, there were 18 cities with a population of 500,000 or more. The Pennsylvania Railroad serves 11 of these. Every one lost population. The New York Central serves nine. Every one lost population.

In 1950, there were 32 cities with a population between 200,000 and 500,000, and 56 cities with a population between 100,000 and 200,000. The Pennsylvania served 23 of these. Eleven of these 23 lost population. The New York Central served 22 of these. Nine of these 22 lost population.

In total, the large cities over 100,000 served by each of these railroads lost population although the territory served by each of them grew around 16 percent in population during the decade. The net railway operating for each of these railroads for the years 1959, 1960, and 1961 averaged some 60-percent less than for the 10 previous years 1949, 1950, and 1951.

I commenced to wonder if there might be some correlation between railway earnings and the growth of cities served by the railroads. The territory served by the Southern Railway grew only at a rate of about one-half that of the territory served by the New York Central and the Pennsylvania, but its cities grew some 8½ percent. Southern's net railway operating income increased some 30 percent during the 10 years. The Missouri Pacific territory increased about the same as that of the aforementioned eastern railroads but the cities over 100,000 which it served grew 26 percent and its net railway operating income has remained fairly constant.

The Norfolk & Western and the Chesapeake & Ohio to some degree serve similar territory. The Chesapeake & Ohio's large cities lost population during the decade while the Norfolk & Western increased 17 percent. Net railway operating income of the Chesapeake & Ohio increased only 2 percent while that of the Norfolk & Western increased 78 percent.

The large cities served by the Illinois Central increased only some 2 percent while those of the Louisville & Nashville increased 8 percent. The Illinois Central net railway operating income is off 49 percent while that of the Louisville & Nashville is up slightly. The Southern Pacific and the Santa Fe both experienced great growth in the territories served by them. The large cities served by the Santa Fe increased only 20 percent while those served by the Southern Pacific increased 32 percent. Santa Fe earnings are off more than those of the Southern Pacific during the past 10 years.

I do not wish to state that there is a complete statistical correlation between the growth or decline of the large cities served by a railroad and its net earnings for too many assumptions or adjustments would have to be made relating to such matters as management, traffic composition, length of haul, number of industrial sidings, maintenance of property, et cetera, but it is clear that where the large cities are losing population (whether in the East, here, or in the West such as Chicago, Detroit, St. Louis, Cincinnati, Minneapolis, San Francisco, Oakland, or Portland) railroads are not doing so well.

It would seem that the railroads have a substantial stake in these large cities. It may be that the decline of the city, even though the metropolitan area grows, means loss of traffic to the railroad. This was suggested by an official of the Pennsylvania Railroad in connection with a discussion in 1957–58 of the Philadelphia commuter plan on the ground that its experience was that location of people and industry on the periphery of cities was not equally accompanied by railroad sidings and increased traffic. It may be that the tax situation in these declining cities is much different from that in one which is expanding. From whatever the cause, I would think it behooves railroad management to be most energetic in its attention to its urban centers.

Today we seem to be living in an age of "zations." To all of the "zations," including "centralization," we now are adding "urbanization." There can be no question about the country's trend from rural to urban population. We all are familiar with the tremendous growth of our large metropolitan areas. What apparently is being overlooked, however, is what has been happening to the principal city at the heart of these areas, what are the railroad's interests in this central city compared with its interests in the new cities which are springing up around it?

This is a puzzlement to the legislator who is confronted with the requirements of the modern age, for there seems great dissimilarity in the approach to the problem which is made by individual railroads.

Some seem energetically to be attempting to rebuild and vitalize their cities. I have noted with interest not only what is going on in your city here as to the commuter traffic but such innovations as that of the water taxi which Mr. Heineman is putting on the Chicago River.

Others seem to take the position that this matter should be turned over completely for Federal treatment. Such position is most perplexing in the face of a situation where the cities, their citizens, and those who stand to gain or lose do not seem certain as to what they want to do about their own cities. This uncertainty is reflected in such treatises as those of the Committee for Economic Development which have titles like "Changing Economic Functions of the Central Cities" and "Metropolis Against Itself"; in Robert Moses' recent article in the Atlantic Monthly "Are Cities Dead?"; and in Lewis Mumford's book, "The City of History," to name a few.

Cinderella's character never recovered, one supposes, from the disastrous intervention of her fairy godmother. Having once discovered how far her problems could be solved

by that wand, she, no doubt, stopped trying to solve them herself and adopted the slogan, "Leave it to Grandmother."

I am not yet fully convinced that the time has arrived when the Federal wand should be waved to bail out the railroads from some of these local problems. Certain it is that the data I have given with respect to large city growth and railroad earnings would seem to suggest that a railroad's freight traffic is involved and that the railroad itself has an immense stake in maintaining the city's population and in facilitating transportation to the city from the suburbs.

This year marks the 75th anniversary of the passage of the Interstate Commerce Act. It is fitting that we note this anniversary, for under the regulation provided by this act, as amended, we have maintained in this country a system of railroads which have been privately operated. The tradition of this type of free enterprise seems to me to be worth keeping.

In this orbital age, all of our practices, our institutions, our laws, and our businesses naturally come under the necessity of continuous examination as to how best they serve the public interest. It is the duty of all of us to consider the extent to which regulation needs to be strengthened or relaxed best to meet the public convenience and necessity of our times and of the future.

I have attempted to outline for you tonight some of the perplexities which confront a legislator as he considers today's railroad picture and various legislative proposals. What the eventual answers to these, or to other matters may be, I do not know. I trust, however, that from groups like yourselves there will come the results of thoughtful consideration which will lead to the maintenance of a vital, growing, and adequate national railroad system.

It is encouraging to be here in Chicago where the railroads seems to be keenly alert to the situation. It is good to note the recent rundown in the Traffic World of what officials like Mr. Quinn of the Milwaukee, Mr. Heineman of the Northwestern, Mr. Murphy of the Burlington, our toastmaster, Mr. Johnson of the Rock Island, Mr. Marsh of the Santa Fe, Mr. Budd of the Great Northern, and others are doing to stimulate passenger business. It is good to note also that the Santa Fe now is proposing a petroleum products pipeline on its right-of-way from Anaheim to San Diego. This, like the products line of the Southern Pacific, is progress, even though this kind of progress and utilization of rights-of-way has been a long time coming. I have been tremendously impressed too, by Wayne A. Johnston's recent message to Illinois Central territory showing what his and other railroads have done to improve their efficiency so that today's railroads have "stronger muscles than ever."

So, finally, I close using Mr. Johnston's closing words: "I have always been an optimist about railroading."

Net railway operating income, 1951–60, 1960, and 1961, as reported and as adjusted to deduct temporary tax benefits arising from accelerated amortization of emergency facilities

[In thousands of dollars]

	Net railway operating income reported, 1951–60 average	Temporary tax benefits, 1951–60 average	Net railway operating income adjusted, 1951–60 average	Net railway operating income as reported		Net railway operating income as adjusted	
				1960	1961	1960	1961
New York Central	36,213	5,023	31,190	16,168	493	[1] 16,168	[1] 493
Pennsylvania	49,135	4,728	44,407	4,227	17,833	4,227	[1] 17,833
Baltimore & Ohio	34,648	3,683	30,965	15,107	[2] 17,411	13,387	----------
New York, Chicago & St. Louis	19,758	1,206	18,552	15,285	12,590	13,849	11,923
Wabash	10,751	1,782	8,969	6,006	6,701	5,721	7,568
Chesapeake & Ohio	61,011	8,809	52,202	48,405	37,793	40,605	33,043
Norfolk & Western	50,854	4,400	46,454	66,497	65,484	61,426	62,804
Illinois Central	26,064	2,399	23,665	13,722	16,880	13,018	17,258
Louisville & North	24,566	3,688	20,878	17,745	23,652	18,488	24,827
Gulf Mobile & Ohio	7,727	736	6,931	3,304	4,770	3,515	5,080
Chicago & Eastern Illinois	3,251	621	2,630	304	372	173	1,400
Southern	38,881	3,239	35,652	36,108	35,771	34,228	35,154
Atlantic Coast Line	10,290	2,471	7,819	9,876	10,811	9,141	11,217
Seaboard Air Line	21,055	3,343	17,712	15,463	14,584	14,546	15,410
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy	25,226	3,563	21,663	16,632	18,918	14,846	18,649
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific	18,134	2,194	15,940	8,341	10,191	8,624	10,986
Chicago Great Western	3,806	404	3,402	2,258	1,769	1,908	1,636
Missouri Pacific	34,542	3,359	31,883	30,941	30,964	30,744	32,212
St. Louis Southwestern	10,541	(1)	10,541	10,321	10,413	10,321	10,413
St. Louis-San Francisco	14,601	2,320	12,281	13,085	12,506	10,596	10,992
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe	64,207	6,504	57,703	43,744	49,116	40,826	48,825
Southern Pacific	54,908	10,724	44,184	49,375	53,103	42,944	45,436
Union Pacific	36,480	7,275	29,205	32,835	31,814	31,159	[1] 31,814
Denver & Rio Grande	13,236	842	12,394	12,979	11,129	10,864	11,240
Great Northern	25,477	2,642	22,835	18,435	16,762	17,060	16,242
Northern Pacific	15,949	1,292	14,657	10,116	8,586	9,771	8,387
Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific	15,171	2,044	13,127	9,654	14,113	9,555	14,086

[1] Effect of temporary tax savings not shown in Moody's manuals.

[2] Deficit.

Temporary tax savings arising from accelerated amortization of emergency facilities in excess of recorded book depreciation

[Thousands of dollars]

	1951–60 average	1958	1959	1960	1961 [1]
New York Central	5,079	----------	----------	----------	----------
Pennsylvania	4,744	----------	----------	----------	----------
Baltimore & Ohio	3,683	2,766	2,014	1,720	45
New York Central & St. Louis	1,206	1,835	909	1,436	667
Wabash	1,782	2,111	1,794	295	[2] 867
Chesapeake & Ohio	8,809	9,000	7,916	7,800	4,750
Norfolk & Western	4,400	7,125	5,650	5,071	2,680
Illinois Central	2,399	2,910	1,967	704	[2] 378
Louisville & North	3,688	1,842	80	[2] 743	[2] 1,275
Gulf, Mobile & Ohio	736	275	249	289	[2] 310
Chicago & East Illinois	621	336	146	131	[2] 28
Southern	3,229	3,919	2,493	1,880	617
Atlantic Coast Line	2,471	1,305	234	735	[2] 406
Seaboard Air Line	3,343	2,547	1,777	917	[2] 876
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy	3,563	4,369	2,754	1,786	269
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific	2,194	564	110	[2] 282	[2] 795
Chicago Great Western	404	488	346	350	160
Missouri Pacific	3,359	2,478	2,630	197	[2] 1,248
St. Louis Southwestern	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
St. Louis-San Francisco	2,320	3,526	2,653	2,489	1,514
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe	6,504	6,915	4,244	2,918	291
Southern Pacific	10,724	13,294	9,825	6,431	7,667
Union Pacific	7,275	9,606	5,383	1,676	(3)
Denver & Rio Grande Western	842	1,250	329	115	[2] 113
Great Northern	2,642	3,015	2,174	1,375	520
Northern Pacific	1,292	1,209	478	345	197
Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific	2,044	2,248	786	99	27

[1] Estimated, Moody's Transportation Manual, 1960.

[2] Deficit.

[3] Data not given in Moody's Transportation Manual, 1960.

Comparison of change in population of cities (over 100,000 population in 1950) and territory served and of net railway operating income 1950–60

	Cities over 100,000			Change, 1910–60	Area population change, 1950–60	Adjusted net railway operating income [1]		Change
	Number, 1950	1950 census	1960 census			1949–51	1959–61	
	(Thousands)	(Thousands)	(Thousands)	Percent	Percent	(Thousands)	(Thousands)	Percent
Chicago & Eastern Illinois	3	4,607	4,442	−3.5	13.2	2,959	1,317	−55.5
Baltimore & Ohio	21	15,856	15,413	−2.8	13.0	32,617	7,326	−77.5
Wabash	11	8,482	8,279	−2.4	15.9	9,381	5,760	−38.6
New York Central	32	22,520	22,072	−2.0	16.1	35,672	[2] 13,558	−62.0
Pennsylvania	34	25,673	25,187	−1.9	16.3	50,300	[2] 17,298	−65.6
New York, Chicago & St. Louis	11	7,332	7,198	−1.8	17.9	20,149	14,172	−29.7
Chesapeake & Ohio	12	9,190	9,098	−1.0	12.3	39,388	40,227	+2.1
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy	9	6,724	6,679	−.67	13.5	28,700	16,738	−41.7
Chicago Great Western	7	5,470	5,455	−.27	13.1	3,140	2,250	−28.4
Gulf, Mobile & Ohio	9	6,575	6,682	−1.6	10.9	8,509	4,631	−44.6
Illinois Central	12	7,311	7,496	2.5	12.1	31,000	15,699	−49.4
Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific	11	6,853	7,064	3.1	14.0	15,902	12,169	−23.5
Northern Pacific	7	2,086	2,163	3.7	14.4	17,680	10,750	−39.2
Great Northern	7	2,086	2,163	3.7	14.5	23,517	18,446	−21.6
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific	16	8,477	9,021	6.4	12.1	18,506	10,448	−43.5
Louisville & Washington	13	4,147	4,487	8.2	6.1	20,567	20,794	+1.1
Southern	18	5,670	6,159	8.5	9.1	27,028	35,493	+31.3
Denver & Rio Grande Western	2	598	683	14.2	31.3	9,917	10,993	+10.8
St. Louis Southwestern	6	2,194	2,554	16.4	9.9	[3] 9,900	[3] 10,271	+3.7
Norfolk & Western	3	1,094	1,279	16.9	14.9	34,545	61,550	+78.2
Union Pacific	11	4,747	5,588	17.7	26.0	32,840	31,116	−5.2
St. Louis-San Francisco	10	3,472	4,143	19.3	10.2	13,567	10,800	−20.4
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe	21	10,948	13,188	20.5	27.2	68,989	48,322	−30.0
Central of Georgia	5	1,015	1,241	22.3	10.8	1,591	2,388	+50.0
Missouri Pacific	17	5,278	6,648	26.1	15.6	31,113	31,175	+.2
Atlantic West Line	8	1,658	2,112	27.4	18.4	8,444	9,870	+16.9
Seaboard Air Line	9	2,041	2,606	27.7	28.6	15,240	15,752	+3.3
Southern Pacific	18	6,928	9,122	31.9	36.3	51,443	43,906	−14.6

[1] Adjusted to eliminate effect of temporary tax savings arising from accelerated amortization of emergency facilities.

[2] Unadjusted, deductions for older projects terminated. There may be new projects now being covered.

[3] Unadjusted, data not shown in Moody's manuals.

Action Programs for Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the February 1962 issue of the Monthly Labor Review, Victor R. Fuchs of the Ford Foundation Program in Economic Development and Administration has an interesting article on "Action Programs To Deal With Unemployment." He points out quite clearly the problem that exists as our economy and population move forward and he offers some important ideas for further study, including retraining, which was the backbone of recent legislative action by the Congress. I am placing Mr. Fuchs' comment in the RECORD to share them with my colleagues and with the hope that this will aid the Congress in the important job of meeting the problem of unemployment:

ACTION PROGRAMS TO DEAL WITH UNEMPLOYMENT

(By Victor R. Fuchs)

The point is often made that the rate of growth of the economy was adequate from 1950 to 1955 but was too slow in the second half of the decade, resulting in a large increase in unemployment. The fact is that the economy created more new jobs between 1955 and 1960 than it did between 1950 and 1955. Unemployment grew at the same time because the increase in the labor force was much greater in the second half of the decade than in the first half.

During the next decade, the rate of increase in the labor force will be even more rapid than it was from 1955 to 1960. In order to keep unemployment under 4 million in 1965, it will be necessary to create as many new jobs between 1960 and 1965 as were created in the 10 years 1950–60. This is obviously a big order.

Clarence Long has argued that there is no connection between changes in the labor force and unemployment. He cites figures going back to 1900 to support this position.[1] But Long's analysis ignores the role formerly played by immigration in creating changes in the labor force. Kuznets, Abramovitz, and Easterlin have all suggested that immigration movements are best explained as a response to changes in the demand for labor in the United States. If we accept this, most of Long's data are beside the point. It seems to me that the rapid increase in the labor force that we will experience in the coming years does provide special cause for concern.

The task will be complicated by the dangers of inflation and of balance of payments difficulties. These dangers are likely to place strict limits on our ability to deal with unemployment solely from the demand side. Demand will be important; there is no doubt about that. But my own set of action recommendations tends to stress the supply side.

1. Training and retraining: We urgently need a large-scale training and retraining program which would include provision for basic education as well as technical and vocational skills. Ideally, this program should mark the beginning of widespread recognition that education must be a continuing process. In a world of rapid technological change, retraining and retreading will be the usual and the expected—not limited to emergencies—and will be as important for those with employment as for the man without a job. Neil Chamberlain has recently suggested that workers be permitted to accumulate years of potential educational benefits, just as they now accumulate potential unemployment benefits and retirement rights.[2] He argues that as an alternative to earlier retirement, workers should use these benefits in years of meaningful education spread throughout their working lives. This idea seems worthy of serious study and experimentation.

2. Aid to education: The strengthening of formal public education is essential if the labor force is to be in a position to take advantage of retraining and new employment opportunities decades after they leave school. In order to avoid unemployment in the future, a sharp reduction in the number of high school dropouts should be a major goal.

3. Reform and revitalization of vocational education: This is too large and complex a subject to expand upon in this paper. Many changes are needed. One of the innovations I would like to see is a vast chain of technical schools throughout the Nation, open to youths and adults and reaching down into the high schools and junior high schools, to provide guidance, prestige, and inspiration in fields that require manual as well as mental skills. What more fitting way would there be to celebrate the centennial of the land-grant colleges than for the Federal Government to launch, in cooperation with the States, a new type of technical institute to meet the growing demands of our own economy and those of the underdeveloped nations.

4. Special youth employment opportunities: It is a harsh fact of life that many youths do not derive full benefit from formal education programs and drop out of school. Still others stay through high school graduation only to find that they have no special qualifications for employment. The great tragedy is that their lack of qualifications prevents them from getting what they most desperately need—work experience and on-

[1] "Labor Force and Unemployment in the 1960's," in "Employment and Unemployment: The Problem of the 1960's" (Washington, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1961).

[2] "Automation and Labor Relations," Reed College 50th Anniversary Conference, Portland, Oreg., Nov. 17, 1961.

the-job training. Special programs should be created to permit them to obtain this experience. These programs will require substantial cooperation from employers and organized labor.

5. Expansion and improvement of the U.S. Employment Service: This must be more than a nominal change or an exhortation to do better. More resources are needed to obtain and disseminate information on job opportunities, and there should be a dramatic reorientation of the image projected by the Service to business and the public. I am not urging a public relations gloss, but an effective communications program to inform when basic changes have been made.

6. Worker relocation assistance: The efficient location of industry requires continuous adaptation to changes in technology, tastes, and the availability of natural resources. This is not, however, an argument for laissez faire. We can and should consider ways of assisting affected workers and their families to relocate. We must also help communities deal with the problems raised by large-scale migration.

7. Reduction of racial barriers: One of our greatest challenges and opportunities is to press forward as strenuously as possible for the removal of racial barriers in order that Negroes and other minorities can become as fully productive and as fully employed as their fellow citizens. Jacob Mincer's recent studies of on-the-job training suggests that discrimination in employment may be greater and more harmful to the Negro than is discrimination in formal education.[3]

8. Stimulation of the rate of technological innovation and diffusion: This is one area where the Government can stimulate demand without the dangers that attend the usual demand stimulants. By supporting basic research, and by a vigorous program for the dissemination of technological and organizational discoveries, it may be possible to increase the rate of growth of business and provide a naturally buoyant demand.

Although the above recommendations stress the supply side of the problem, demand is certainly very important. The oft-heard argument that the problems of retraining and relocation could be handled more easily under conditions of strong aggregate demand is undoubtedly true. I am simply suggesting that insufficient attention has been paid to the converse, which is equally valid. It would be much easier to apply a policy of strong aggregate demand if the labor force were more mobile, if the economy were geared to accept and expedite retraining and relocation, and if other limitations on supply were reduced. Under these circumstances, there would be less likelihood of inflationary pressures developing short of full employment, and fear of inflation is one of the major obstacles to curing unemployment.

Economists have been both proficient and prolific in pointing out the inherent difficulties in pursuing full employment and price stability simultaneously. This has been useful, but if we go no further, the critical label, "the dismal science," will be justified. It seems to me that certain action programs will reduce unemployment without upsetting price stability. Many of the measures that I am now urging for an attack on unemployment have been advocated in the past to counter inflation. I conclude with the suggestion that our two opponents, inflation and unemployment, are actually Siamese twins. If we aim our punches carefully, we may floor them both at the same time.

[3] "On the Job Training: Costs, Returns, and Some Implications," Universities—National Bureau Exploratory Conference on Capital Investment in Human Beings, New York City, Dec. 1–2, 1961.

A Mother's Concern for the Future of Her Children in This Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, in a letter to the editor which appeared in the March 1, 1962, issues of the Daily Breeze, a newspaper published in Redondo Beach, Calif., Mrs. Adrienne H. Jarecki stated:

One of the happiest days * * * was the day I registered as a Democrat. One of my saddest days was when I realized that if my vote this year was to count for my country, the United States of America, I would have to reregister as a Republican (I did this and it hurt). I sadly say that my party, the Democratic Party, no longer stands for the things in which I believe.

Mrs. Jarecki came to this conclusion after contemplating the activities of a local Democratic club to which she belonged and of which she was an officer and after reviewing the 1961 platform of the California Democratic Council. In commenting on the California Democratic Council platform, Mrs. Jarecki said:

Shocking, isn't it?

I say, it certainly is. Because I believe many of my colleagues in Congress will be interested in reading Mrs. Jarecki's letter, I include it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

LETTER OF RESIGNATION

EDITOR, DAILY BREEZE:

I am a housewife and mother of five children. I am concerned for their future. Because of this, I have in the past found time to work for my country through the party of my choice, which has been the Democratic Party.

I was an appointed officer in the Women's Auxiliary of Torrance Democrats, Inc., which was to become the Women's Democratic Society of the South Bay in the late part of 1961. I am now recording secretary of that club. I hold this elective office by appointment.

The threat to our democratic society from communism was clarified to me somewhat last year. I was asked to read "Masters of Deceit" by J. Edgar Hoover. I went to get a copy and you can imagine my surprise when I found that it wasn't available at the library, or bookshops. Finally I located a paperback and after reading it, I began to examine with new eyes the things that were happening. I took a new look at the things my friends in the Democratic Party were discussing, and the position they took in relation to our country's sovereignty.

This past week, I attended the regular general membership meeting of our club. We had four guests. The first three to speak were candidates for assemblyman from the 46th Assembly District.

The first man said he was vitally interested in the educational field. He was asked what his position would be in regard to the new and recently accepted textbooks, and how he felt about teachers who repeatedly took the fifth amendment, and were still teaching our children. As I understood his answer, he would support any platform that the party would decide on at a convention to be held after the primary. He himself does not support the texts but if at the convention it was decided to support the texts, then he would go along. As for fifth amendment teachers—He believes in the protection of the fifth amendment, as do I, but he sees no problem in retaining teachers who have used it so often. My personal feelings in this matter are that if someone is so afraid of saying something that would incriminate himself then there must be something to hide.

The second speaker sees no danger in Communist lawyers practicing law under our Constitution. He said that we couldn't prove them Communists and if we could, it is not illegal to be one.

The third speaker of the evening seems to think that he is "electable."

Our fourth guest was a candidate for a local office. His first remarks indicated to me, that he felt invaded by the John Birch Society. This may have been prompted by the questioning of our previous guests. I am not a member of the John Birch Society. It is remarkable to me that anyone who questions the current "liberal" policies, now seems to be given the label of "Bircher." As a matter of fact, a true liberal never labels people, but grants to each individual the right to reach his own conclusions through his own thought processes.

Now, these things, plus many smaller problems with the way the Women's Democratic Society of the South Bay is run, such as the appointment of officers rather than the election of same, have caused me to write this public resignation to my office as recording secretary in the club.

Several years ago when I became 21, I proudly went to register. I registered as a Democrat.

I am now protesting the platform that I accepted one day several years ago. For your information, I am going to state the 12 resolutions that were adopted by the California Democratic Council at their convention in February 1961, at Fresno as their official party platform:

1. Remold the U.N. into a world organization that enacts and interprets and enforces world law upon individuals and governments alike.

2. Demand that the United States disarm even if negotiations to achieve world disarmament fail, even if the U.S.S.R. does not disarm.

3. Include Red China in negotiations to halt nuclear tests.

4. Abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

5. Abolish all loyalty oaths, State and Federal.

6. Oppose all legislation which would inhibit the powers of the U.S. Supreme Court.

7. Outlaw secret congressional committee hearings.

8. Strip the Postmaster General of powers to halt the use of the U.S. mail by the purveyors of pornographic materials.

9. Extend the right to organize and the right to strike to all public employees, firemen, police officers, etc.

10. Extend all-out Federal Aid to education, including funds for teachers salaries.

11. Request the President to review the Morton Sobel treason conviction to secure ultimate justice.

12. Increase economic aid to underdeveloped nations and reduce military assistance abroad.

Shocking, isn't it?

I have not had to reregister since the first, as I have voted in every election and have not moved. One of the happiest days, as I have said before, was the day I registered as a Democrat. One of my saddest days was when I realized that if my vote this year was to count for my country, the United States of America, I would have to re-register as a Republican (I did this, and it hurt)

I sadly say that my party, the Democratic Party, no longer stands for the things in which I believe.

ADRIENNE H. JARECKI.

REDONDO BEACH.

Half Slave and Half Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, that would appear to be the status of the administration's proposal for ownership of a communications satellite corporation.

This Nation became great under the free enterprise system. That means profit which in turn encourages investment which pays for tools, for research development, and expansion. That, in turn, means job security and continuing prosperity.

Government has shown conclusively it cannot operate a business satisfactorily. There are those in the field of communications with proven ability who have demonstrated a capacity for accomplishments. They, and not the Federal Government, should be charged with this responsibility as recommended by the FCC. The half and half, politically inspired, proposal of the administration should not prevail.

In further reference to this, I submit the following editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Hanover (Pa.) Evening Sun:

NEVER CUT A BABY IN HALF

The Federal Communications Commission has called for sanity among the hysterics of who should and shouldn't own a communications satellite corporation.

The corporation should be owned, says the FCC in a public hearing, solely by people who have an interest in it—the common carrier communications companies.

This disagrees with President Kennedy's cut-the-baby-in-half proposal for creating a private corporation under a Government license forbidding it to be dominated by the only people who, by rights, should have anything to say about it—the communications companies.

The President's proposal was political—a politician's compromise between the Government ownership faction in his administration and in Congress and the private enterprise principle that has served the Kennedy family so well. Mr. Kennedy probably would like to go whole hog on private enterprise in this and all other decisions where Government ownership buffs crowd him. But he is first of all a politician and only secondarily the scion of a family that owes more than most to private enterprise.

The mischief in the Presidential proposal for splitting the difference is the possibility of comprising the principle that business belongs to private enterprise, not to politicians. When they moved into the new field of atomic energy, a war was in progress; atomic energy is still primarily a military concern. But they have tried tirelessly to wriggle into other places where they have no right to be—electric power, for example.

A communications satellite system would be a logical development of telephone communication. The Government's only excuse for nibbling into it would be its monopoly of the size of the rockets required to put communications satellites into orbit—and even in that single respect Bell Telephone already has offered to pay the full cost of the rockets for doing the job.

Thanks to the FCC, Congress now has something more sensible to argue about than a choice between a compromise proposal of half state capitalism and half private enterprise and an all-out proposal to socialize satellite communications by setting up public ownership at the outset. It can talk about private enterprise, too. It might even end up talking about turning over the job to the only company that stands ready to accept it—the Bell system.

Le Sueur Pastor Protests Tax Injustice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am receiving ever-increasing number of letters from my Second District of Minnesota protesting the adoption of the King-Anderson bill, providing for a hospital care program for the aged financed through the social security system. One of the more thoughtful comes from the Reverend Keith P. Johnson, pastor of the First Lutheran Church of Le Sueur, Minn. Because the points he raises serve to clarify part of the dilemma this program poses for members of Reverend Johnson's profession, as well as to millions of Americans, I wish to draw his comments to the attention of my colleagues in Congress. I include his letter in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FIRST LUTHERAN CHURCH,
Le Sueur, Minn., March 1962.

Congressman ANCHER NELSEN,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN NELSEN: When I was ordained into the ministry in 1955, I waived exemption and enrolled in the social security program for ministers, under the assumption that Congress meant its word when it adopted an increasing scale of tax rates for ministers, beginning at 3 percent in 1955, and increasing to 6.9 percent in 1968 and after.

I felt I could handle this program, and should, for the sake of my family. So far I have been able to do so, even though I paid almost as much for social security in 1961 as I did Federal income tax.

But now, even though we pastors were pretty well guaranteed that the rates would be those shown us at the time of enrollment, President Kennedy is advocating a medical care program which will add unmercifully to my tax load, and that of all other enrolled pastors. And Congress is showing signs of weakening, in violation of the trust I and many others placed in it when we entered the social security program.

If this plan is adopted, I can foresee the time when I will be paying as much as 10 percent social security tax, plus Federal income tax of 20 percent, plus State income tax, plus county personal property and other local taxes in a total amount which will threaten my family's welfare and my childrens' future. Can Congress permit this to happen to me, and to thousands of others?

Had I known that Congress could break faith on this program, I would never have entered it. Nor would I choose to remain in it for one moment if President Kennedy succeeds in influencing Congress to adopt the medical care program supported by the social security tax. But the unfortunate and unfair part of it is that although Congress is apparently free to break faith with me and thousands of other pastors, we are not free to break faith with Congress. For once enrolled, we are prisoners of the social security tax program from then on, forever denied the privilege of choice. This I knew upon entering the program. But at that time it didn't frighten me, because I trusted the word of Congress; and trusted my own ability to pay the maximum tax of 6.9 percent.

Now, however, I am frightened, because I'm beginning to doubt that Congress can be trusted; and I'm beginning to doubt my ability to pay anything beyond the maximum 6.9 percent. Even that looks small on paper, but it takes a terrifyingly big chunk out of my income.

I beg you, therefore, to help me, and all like me. I implore you to use all the influence you may have upon Members of Congress to defeat the President's program.

And if such a program is needed, I ask you to consider making it one in which all Americans share the cost, by funding it through the Federal income tax. There are thousands of well to do in America today whose financial independence makes it unnecessary for them to even consider their own enrollment in the social security program. They will not have to contribute a cent under the President's plan. The full load, instead, will have to be borne by little men, like me, who desperately need the protection of social security in old age: little men who are having a hard time right now paying for that protection, and who can ill afford an even heavier burden.

How long will the American public continue to believe that the Democratic Party is the party of the common man, the little man, when this holds true, when it is the little man who will be hurt deeply by the President's program, and the big man will get off scot free?

If this program is as American as the President says, then let it be a program for all Americans; let it be paid for by that tax which involves all Americans: the Federal income tax.

Yours in hopeful protest,
Pastor KEITH P. JOHNSON.

Why Doesn't the Air Force Do the Transporting?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting an editorial which appeared in the Columbus, Ohio, Evening Dispatch on Monday, March 19, 1962.

The servicemen of the United States, under orders to travel to areas of assignment, have no choice as to means of transportation. They are ordered, by their superiors, and required to fly about the world in equipment provided by supplemental carriers under contract with the U.S. Government.

It seems to me supplemental carriers should be used for cargo transportation,

however, as pointed out in this excellent editorial, when human lives are involved, the military should meet all safety requirements of commercial airlines and transport troops in U.S. Air Force equipment manned by qualified U.S. Air Force personnel.

The article follows:

WHY DOESN'T AIR FORCE DO THE TRANSPORTING?

The tragic loss of 107 lives, including those of 93 U.S. Army men, when a chartered airliner vanished on a flight to South Vietnam where our country is engaged in military operations against Communist guerrillas, raises the question of why servicemen, being flown to and from posts of duty, are not transported in Air Force planes.

Twice, now, within 4 months, U.S. servicemen have gone to their deaths in chartered commercial planes flying under contract with our Armed Forces. Seventy-four recruits lost their lives on a contract carrier in a crash near Richmond, Va., early this winter.

While there is no guarantee of 100 percent performance by Air Force planes, we do have a huge, well-trained Air Force which operates a military transport service. In view of our increasing global commitments requiring the transport of military men almost constantly to distant places and apparently the need sometimes to speed recruits and draftees to their training points, it would seem that the Air Force should be using its own planes, manned by Air Force personnel and serviced by Air Force technicians, to perform this vital service.

Let the contract carriers fly commercial freight or sell their chartered services to businesses and individuals who can enter into contract freely and after investigation to their satisfaction. Or, certainly, let the Defense Department confine its contract flights to the carrying of material and other freight.

With all our Air Force skill and top-quality equipment, our Government should not be relying on contract flights by nonscheduled route planes to transport either its trained personnel or its recruits.

Only those planes subject to strictest checks and controls should be used to fly our fighting forces, even though the pilots and other crewmembers on the nonschedule routes are generally of a high caliber, with excellent records.

The contract carrier line involved in the most recent disaster is essentially a freight-carrying line, having done some passenger carrying outside the United States. Last July, it began flying passengers for the Military Air Transport Service (MATS), under a 1-year $10.5 million contract, across the Pacific from Travis Air Force Base, Calif., to Tokyo, Guam, and other points in the Far East.

We sincerely hope, and storngly urge, that the Defense Department will take steps to provide the Air Force with its own specially designated fleet of transport planes adequate to meet the full and exacting requirements. Unless it does, it risks being tragically derelict, in our opinion.

Farm Bureau Plan Merits Trial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following editorial from the Rock Island Argus of March 16, 1962:

FARM BUREAU PLAN MERITS TRIAL

The American Farm Bureau Federation's cropland adjustment plan was outlined for the House Agriculture Committee on Tuesday by Charles B. Shuman of Illinois, federation president. The essence of the program is its emphasis on freedom of action.

Farmers would be asked to put acres, including whole farms, into retirement as a means of reducing the Government-owned surplus. The Government would determine the number of acres that the crop situation required and obtain their retirement by offering bids to the growers. Price supports would be reduced and eventually eliminated.

The Kennedy administration's program calls for rigid controls of production. Farmers would have the right to vote on the controls, but with the knowledge that if they failed to approve by a two-thirds vote, the Government would have the power to dump the surplus on the market and break prices.

Opponents of the Government plan call this blackmail. Backers say that since farmers have profited from the Government's effort to control the surplus they have an obligation to cooperate. But a good many farmers have stayed out of the Government program from the outset.

Growers of feed grains still had freedom of choice in 1961. Now, if the Government's plan is approved by Congress and accepted by two-thirds bf the growers (excluding those with a small acreage), all will be bound by it.

The Farm Bureau is waging a battle for freedom of action.

It has been criticized for not trying to remove the rigid controls already in force for cotton and tobacco. As a practical matter, production in these crops lends itself to marketing controls. Corn, on the other hand, is consumed largely on the farm as livestock feed. Politically, the federation had to accept the cotton and tobacco formula in order to get support in Congress from these areas. But corngrowers certainly would not like the prospect of having their production beaten down as has happened in the cotton and tobacco lands.

The Farm Bureau believes in an economy of abundance instead of scarcity. And it believes strongly in free enterprise. Its program is self-eliminating.

Congress should welcome the opportunity to try out the Farm Bureau's proposal for the grain lands and compare the results with those in the rigid control areas.

The Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, the Peace Corps is a little more than 1 year old; however, in that short time progress has been made and the reports received concerning their program have been encouraging.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD an excellent article by Joseph R. L. Sterne, staff correspondent for the Baltimore Sun, concerning the activities of the Peace Corps in Ghana:

THE PEACE CORPS

(By Joseph R. L. Sterne)

Fifty-one Peace Corps secondary schoolteachers in Ghana have earned good marks for their first semester on the job.

So pleased is the Accra government with their work that Washington has been asked to send another 70 teachers to this west African country next fall.

To American officials, who still have their fingers crossed, this request marks an implicit vote of confidence in a program that Ghana first greeted with caution, misgivings and a touch of hostility.

NO PUBLIC APPROVAL

Even today the Government-controlled press is almost completely silent about the Peace Corps and no words of approval have been spoken publicly by ranking officials.

Privately, however, leading Ghanaians say the American volunteers are making a real contribution in an area of desperate need. They would like to hope that Peace Corps teachers will be a fixture in their education schemes for some time to come.

According to rough estimates, 17 of Ghana's 68 secondary schools would not have been able to open last September if Peace Corps men and women had not come on the scene. They took up posts in 31 schools scattered throughout the country, augmenting the teaching staffs by at least 10 percent.

NEEDS 200 NEW INSTRUCTORS

With Ghana pushing ahead on a major expansion program at the secondary level, the teacher shortage will be every bit as severe when the new school year begins. The country could use more than 200 additional instructors and is looking to the Peace Corps to fill one third of this gap.

At this stage in Ghana's educational development, the need for high school teachers is especially acute because thousands of children are pouring out of primary schools where attendance has greatly increased.

Politically, this emphasis on primary education has paid dividends for the government of President Kwame Nkrumah. As a people fighting illiteracy, the Ghanaians have associated the spread of education with independence and the vision of their Osageyfo (or great leader).

But in a country that is trying to industrialize and put its agriculture on a more scientific basis, primary schooling is not enough. The educational pyramid must be widened at the top to produce skilled manpower and teachers by the thousands.

NEW SCHOOLS GOING UP

Because of this necessity, Ghana's Ministry of Education is now putting sharp emphasis on the construction of high schools. In many parts of the country new institutions are being founded and others are expanding on a class-a-year basis.

Unlike the pattern in the United States, practically all of Ghana's public high schools operate on a boarding school plan. Youngsters coming out of primary schools are tested and screened, and the best are chosen for secondary work.

Peace Corps volunteers who arrived here 6 months ago soon found that their duties extended well beyond the classroom. From 6:50 a.m. to 9 p.m., they have to inspect dormitories, keep a close check on the extracurricular activities of their students, and make sure lights-out regulations are obeyed.

OUTSIDE PROJECTS

Despite these long hours, some Peace Corps volunteers in Ghana have taken on extra projects in their communities.

George E. Coyne, 30, of Plainfield, N.J., has started an experimental farm in the isolated village of Sunyani in central Ghana to demonstrate that a greater variety of vegetables can be grown in a tropical climate.

Robert Klein, 32, of New York City, another teacher stationed in the central forest regions, has begun a lending library for the people of a tiny settlement called Sefwa Wiawso.

Alice O'Grady, a biology teacher from Chicago, is giving an adult education course in anatomy for the townsfolk of Dormaa Ahenkro in western Ghana. One of her most avid pupils is the local chief.

A typical Peace Corps operation can be observed at the Yaa Asantewa Girls School just outside Kumasi, where the faculty consists of five Ghanaians, two Britons, and four Americans.

The Peace Corps girls are Ruth Whitney, 23, of Quincy, Ill.; Susan Hastings, 23, of Malibu, Calif.; Carol Waymire, 27, of Santa Rosa, Calif., and Darlene Malcolm, 22, of Belle River, Ill.

STUDENTS SLEEPING ON FLOOR

When they arrived at Yaa Asantewa, a school named after the Ashanti Joan of Arc who led tribal forces against the British, they quickly discovered they had been assigned to a school growing at a pellmell pace.

About 100 of the 280 students were sleeping on the floor, awaiting the arrival of beds, and the faculty was so understaffed that study hours sometimes had to be substituted for periods of normal classroom instruction.

Like many Peace Corps people in Ghana, the foursome at the Yaa Asantewa School have seen a good deal of Ghana and neighboring countries by riding around in "mammy wagons"—those crowded, topheavy, inexpensive passenger trucks emblazoned with such colorful names as "Prepare for tomorrow," "It's true," "Oh yes," and "God is with you."

For West Africans, the sight of white people traveling in "mammy wagons" is unprecedented and impressive. It is one of the ways in which Peace Corps volunteers are practicing good diplomacy by being exuberant, down-to-earth and relatively poor.

American teachers, transported to and from Africa at Uncle Sam's expense, are being paid by the Ghana Government at the local scale of $1,960 a year.

This represents quite a savings for Ghana, which heretofore has had to give all expatriate teachers salaries of at least $3,000 a year and transport them to and from their own countries (usually Britain).

While some foreign teachers and highly educated Ghanaians feel the Peace Corps people coming here are too inexperienced, veteran British civil servants say the United Kingdom is somewhat chagrined for not having thought of the Peace Corps idea first—especially in light of British interest and obligations in Africa.

The silence of the Ghana Government and the Ghana press on the subject of the Peace Corps does not seem to worry Western observers in Accra.

There is a belief here that the Washington ballyboo about the Peace Corps is designed to lure recruits and boost the domestic position of the Kennedy administration—twin objectives that are unnecessary in Africa.

Communist Political Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to include at this point in the RECORD an excerpt from a letter I have received from a constituent who has found himself to be on a mailing list to receive some of the propaganda material the Soviet Union and its satellites are shipping into this country and the U.S. postal service obligingly distributes at the cost of the taxpayers. My constituent received an envelope and brochure which is printed in Latvian. The origin of the brochure is attributed to a certain Committee for Sponsoring Repatriation and Cultural Ties With Countrymen Abroad.

The following is quoted from my constituent's letter of protest:

The contents of the brochure is a vicious, criminally inspired slander. If such material were mailed in the United States the sender would be subject to prosecution and would face a libel suit. The author is attacking six Latvian pastors two of whom reside in Canada and the other four in the United States. All six of them are called bloodthirsty murderers, Gestapo agents and the like using the entire assortment of the established Soviet jargon in names calling. It fits nicely into the whole array of personal attacks on former citizens of the Baltic countries launched after World War II and stepped up recently in an effort to discredit and cast a shadow upon them, to create distrust among immigrants from these countries, and to stir up resentment within American people against them. The reason is obvious—they are live witnesses of the Soviet atrocities committed in their countries against people and their church.

This body, Mr. Speaker, took strong action against the free and subsidized delivery of Communist propaganda at the time it passed the postal rate bill in January, and I was pleased to give my full support to this amendment. I am hopeful action will be finalized without delay.

Statement in Support of the Lead-Zinc Act of 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, there are pending in the Congress several bills intended to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States through a principle of tariffs based on reasonable peril points. My proposal, H.R. 9976, is identical to bills submitted by many of my distinguished colleagues in this Chamber. There is another proposal pending, H.R. 5193, sponsored by the able gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER].

I think it will benefit all of us to have a comparative summary of the possibilities under each proposal prepared by the Emergency Lead-Zinc Committee. The committee has worked long and hard in behalf of the lead-zinc industry and I think its statement is worthy of consideration and will be helpful to my colleagues in their study of the proposals:

EMERGENCY LEAD-ZINC COMMITTEE ANALYSIS OF PENDING PROPOSALS ON LEAD AND ZINC

The provisions of H.R. 9976 are established on: (1) the lead-zinc metal prices required to rebuild and maintain the domestic mining industry, (2) a fair market price to attract customers and encourage increasing consumption, (3) realization that we must have reasonable imports, but also we must have protection from excessive, unneeded supplies that have been placed on our markets during the past 10 years. Our domestic miners must have at least 13½ cents to 14 cents per pound to continue operations. Testimony at Tariff Commission hearings has verified this same price range as reasonable for the consumer. Our United States mines are presently forced to compete with foreign mines that have been encouraged to produce by our own Government, and they do this at foreign costs generally lower than domestic mines can achieve with our high living standards.

Prices on the London Metal Exchange (LME) represent this competition, and since 1958, have reached lows of 8 cents per pound for each metal (lead now at 7.5 cents and zinc at 9 cents). H.R. 9976 provides a permanent tariff of 2 cents per pound on metal for equalizing foreign and domestic costs during times of normal market price levels and a further removable 2 cents per pound when low levels of the London Metal Exchange abnormally affect U.S. prices, causing them to move below 13½ cents per pound. A total of 4 cents tax, composed of a permanent 2-cent tax and a 2-cent removable tax, together with a 1-cent freight and insurance charge, is needed to balance an LME 8-cent price with a required domestic price in the range of 13¼ cents. H.R. 9976 further recognizes that as the supply and demand for metal equalizes, the domestic and foreign prices will rise, excessive imports will not be a threat, and the legislation provides that the extra 2-cent tax is removed, leaving a permanent 2-cent tax that is a normal price differential for United States versus imported lead and zinc (see exhibit I).

H.R. 5193 as now drafted applies the same principles advocated by H.R. 9976 recognizing the need to control excessive lead-zinc imports by an increase in the permanent base tariff rate on lead and zinc, plus an additional removable rate controlled by peril points. However, H.R. 5193 provides less protection than H.R. 9976 approach in (1) proposing much lower tariff rates than are needed for adequate protection, and (2) proposing lower peril points in the case of zinc at which the removable tariff should be effective (see the comparison, exhibit I).

Miners do not consider the 1-cent removable tax of H.R. 5193 a sufficient "policeman" to control excessive imports at low LME prices. The importer would be willing to pay this 1-cent tax to sell his product on U.S. markets forcing the domestic price down at the expense of the domestic miner, who then must close his mines. An example will indicate the lack of protection under this proposal. The London Metal Exchange metal quotations given below represent the price competition currently facing our domestic industry. Several conclusions may be drawn from the following calculations:

Exhibit I

[Cents per pound]

	H.R. 5193		H.R. 9976	
	Lead	Zinc	Lead	Zinc
London Metal Exchange price	7.5	9.0	7.5	9.0
Freight and insurance	.8	.8	.8	.8
Fixed plus removable tax	3.0	2.5	4.0	4.0
Equivalent U.S. price	11.3	12.3	12.3	13.8
Tax applied below	13.5	12.5	13.5	
Tax removed above	14.5	13.5	14.5	

With both the fixed and removable tariff applied, according to provisions of H.R. 5193,

the smelters' combined lead-zinc metal price would be under 24 cents per pound.

This has been the price during 1961 that has kept smelters running but has not and will not reopen domestic mines. The combined price from a similar calculation under the ELZ proposal would approximate 26 cents. However, these prices are in or near the peril-point range—a small percentage reduction in imports would keep domestic prices in the 13½ to 14½ cent price range. The removable 2-cent tariff would be removed. The importer's net price on zinc after normal duty and freight would increase from 9 cents to 11 cents per pound, an improvement of over 20 percent. The increase on lead from 7.5 cents to 11 cents per pound for the importer is almost 50 percent. The financial incentive to limit imports under H.R. 5193 is much less and not sufficiently effective to aid the mining industry.

Miners feel that lead and zinc should have equal tariff treatment and at equal peril points. The cost of mining is similar for both metals. Variations in the relationship of consumer prices of the two metals over the years indicate that a similar market price is logical.

In summary, H.R. 9976 is based on conservative price scales, recognized as minimums required by the domestic mining industry and also based on actual price scales of the imports that have so seriously affected the domestic mines. It should be noted that the proposed permanent tariff rates, are, with one exception (zinc metal at 2 cents per pound), lower than rates originally provided in the Tariff Act of 1930. H.R. 9976 rates are designed for the domestic producer, and at the same time they provide a reasonable price and good metal supply for the consumer. They also recognize the need for some imports to augment our needs and will provide an excellent price to the importer and at fair tariff rates. This is both a logical domestic natural resource policy and a good foreign trade policy.

Comparison of lead-zinc tariff legislation 2d sess. of the 87th Cong.

	H.R. 9976	H.R. 5193
Permanent tax rates:		
Lead metal	2 cents	2 cents.
Lead ores	1.4 cents	1.4 cents.
Zinc metal	2 cents	1.5 cents.
Zinc ores	1.4 cents	1.05 cents.
Removable tax rates:		
Lead metal	2 cents	1.0 cent.
Lead ores	1.4 cents	0.7 cent.
Zinc metal	2 cents	1.0 cent.
Zinc ores	1.4 cents	0.7 cent.
Peril points controlling removable tax:		
Applied below	For both metals, 13½ cents	For lead, 13½ cents.
Removed above	For both metals, 14½ cents	For lead, 14½ cents.
Applied below		For zinc, 12½ cents.
Removed above		For zinc, 13½ cents.
Manufactured products	Permanent increase of 2 cents per pound in addition to present taxes (approximately 1 cent plus). No removable tax provided. (Administration of tax collection too difficult.)	Permanent increase of 1 cent per pound plus additional 1 cent controlled by lead peril points. Permanent increase of 0.8 cent per pound plus additional 1 cent controlled by zinc peril points.

NOTE.—All rates on manufactured products are in addition to present taxes.

Comparison of 1930 statutory rates and present actual rates

[In cents per pound]

	1930 statutory rates	Present reduced rate since June 6, 1951
Lead metal	2¼	1 1/16
Lead ores	1.5	.75
Zinc metal	1.75	.7
Zinc ores	1.5	.6

Old Story on Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot of March 18, 1962:

OLD STORY ON FOREIGN AID

In his plea for $4.8 billion in foreign aid funds, President Kennedy has used all the old, familiar words and phrases about giving the developing nations the strength to resist the inroads of communism.

Claimed as new, although it really isn't, is a pledge to improve administration of the funds sent abroad. Relatively new is the alliance-for-progress concept which is aimed at bringing a social revolution to Latin American.

Present, also, is the inevitable plea that reduction of the requested funds by even the slightest amount will bring great peril to the free world.

In passing it must be said that President Kennedy, who previously has served in both Houses of Congress, undoubtedly has made an allowance in his foreign aid request for "shrinkage" as it goes through the legislative mills. No Chief Executive ever has gotten all he wants for this purpose.

It also can be taken for granted that the Congress, in the end, will make a reasonable allowance for the foreign aid program. It may do so reluctantly because it is weary of appropriating money for this purpose, but it is hard to stop.

As a matter of fact, the foreign aid concept has had pretty good support through the years. No one objects to spending money if it produces results.

What disturbs so many is that the expenditures sometimes seem to be without purpose or results. It often appears that cagey foreign nations actually give the appearance of anti-American and pro-Communist feelings just to reach deeper into Uncle Sam's till. Also there is the distressing fact that foreign aid often involves supporting governments which are anything but democratic in nature. We bolster these regimes without getting through to the people.

The alliance for progress represents a brave attempt to reach the masses who really need help and hope, but the wealthy classes are fighting the idea.

One of these days—not this year—there must be a reappraisal of our foreign aid practices. The Congress undoubtedly feels that President Kennedy deserves a chance to put his promised reforms into effect. If he can show results in the worldwide fight against communism which are commensurate with the costs, everyone will be pleased.

If not, next year, or the year after, look for a drastic cut in the drain on the taxpayers for foreign aid which often does not seem to live up to its promise.

De Gaulle's Achievement—Walking With History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. Roscoe Drummond appeared in the Washington Post of March 21.

Mr. Drummond has given us a fine study and a true history of the character, and a part of the achievements, of General de Gaulle.

When the history of our time is written this French patriot, Charles de Gaulle, will take up many pages and will, in all probability, prove him to have been the great man of his time. He possesses that rare gift, best described in Mr. Drummond's own words: "He is walking with history."

The article follows:

DE GAULLE'S ACHIEVEMENT—WALKING WITH HISTORY

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The architect of the Algerian peace—and of the end to the civil war which has bled France and Algeria alike for 7 years—is Gen. Charles de Gaulle.

So great a feat is the Algerian settlement that some want to call it a miracle.

Unless General de Gaulle is himself a miracle, the Algerian peace is no miracle. It is President de Gaulle's gift to the Republic of France, to all the Algerian people, and to the free world.

It would not have been possible without his vision and his courage and his mystical confidence that most Frenchmen were prepared to march with the tide of history—and not resist it.

It could not have been negotiated without De Gaulle. It could not be implemented without De Gaulle. He is the chosen instrument of history, and the French people chose him at the right time to do the right thing in the only way possible. The Secret Army Organization, that group of the French military which would be willing to bury the Fifth Republic in order to preserve French domination of Algeria a little longer, can add more bloodshed. But I am convinced it is on the losing side.

The vision of De Gaulle is not only saving France, it is saving the whole Western alliance.

For France to have failed to bring peace to Algeria would have split the heart of the

Western defense community. It would have torn France apart and torn NATO apart.

It would have done more. It would have enhanced the power of communism in France; it would have given birth to a Moscow-directed common front with French leftists, which in turn would have begot a Fascist response. French democracy would have been ground in the middle.

De Gaulle has always lived in times when the worst is near at hand. He is continuing to prevent it, and the end is in sight.

It is ironic that General de Gaulle is doing today what he least wishes. If he really could have his own way, he would not be liquidating the French empire. And he would not be a cobuilder of a developing United States of Europe. In the last analysis General de Gaulle is ruled by his reason more than by tradition or instinct. He knows that in doing both of these things he is walking with history—and that if he does not walk, history will march on, leaving him and France behind.

The economic consequences of the West's rapid abandonment of empire since the end of World War II constitutes one of the paradoxes of history. They also constitute an additional disproof of one of Lenin's favorite scientific theories.

Lenin was not alone in his theory; Cecil Rhodes held the same view—that if the imperial powers gave up their vast far-flung colonies, willingly or unwillingly, the mother countries would be ruined, the capitalist system would be unable to survive.

What has happened? The empires of the western powers are gone. And today Britain, France, the Netherlands, West Germany, Italy, are more prosperous than they were at the peak of empire. The capitalist system is stronger than it has ever been. The standard of living of the people enjoying competitive enterprise is higher than it has ever been.

Marx and Lenin have thus been proved wrong again, and victims of Soviet imperialism must hope that the Russian colonists will catch up with reality.

One incentive which may well help persuade the Algerian people to retain their voluntary association with France is the pull of the European Common Market. Algeria needs to be inside the Common Market, where it can reap the economic benefits of intra-European trade.

"If we want our independent Algeria to be financially sound," Information Minister M'hammed Yazid remarked recently, "we had better arrange to get inside it."

This is additional evidence that the European Common Market is a momentous initiative for the free world.

Boy Scout: Robert Lewis Gore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article on Robert Lewis Gore, a Boy Scout residing in College Park, Fairmont, W. Va. I note with great pride that he was selected to represent region 4 at Charter Day ceremonies this coming June and was selected out of 372,414 registered Scouts in 37 councils of the region.

The article follows:

SCOUT WILL ATTEND WASHINGTON MEET—ROBERT GORE TO REPRESENT REGION 4 AT CHARTER DAY CEREMONIES IN JUNE

A local Boy Scout has been named to represent region 4 at Charter Day ceremonies in Washington, D.C., next June 13 to 19, it was announced yesterday by Palmer Vance, Mountaineer Area Council executive.

Robert Lewis Gore, 16, son of Mr. and Mrs. Chris F. Gore of 1224 College Park, is one of 12 boys in the United States to receive the all-expense paid trip to the Nation's Capital. In addition, he will be awarded a $300 educational grant by Reader's Digest Foundation.

The Fairmont senior high school junior will represent Scouts from West Virginia, Kentucky, and Ohio. In a letter from James A. Bean, of Cincinnati, Ohio, chairman of the exploring committee of region 4, Bob was told, "Our committee would like to call your attention to the fact that out of 372,414 registered Scouts in 37 councils of our region, you have been chosen as the outstanding Scout."

In making the announcement yesterday, Vance said that this was the first time in the history of Mountaineer Area Council that a Scout had been named to represent the region in this capacity. Bob was selected to represent the council in regional competition. The runnerup in the council, Robert Seeger of Morgantown, will go to Charleston March 21 to spend the day with Gov. W. W. Barron, Vance said.

Bob, who started as a Cub Scout in 1959, has advanced to Eagle rank and has a palm leaf to his credit. He also earned the God and Country award and is a member of the Order of the Arrow. He is a member of Troop 101 of the First Baptist Church and is junior assistant scoutmaster. He has worked on the staff of Camp Mountaineer as nature director for 3 years.

In 1957, Bob attended the National Jamboree at Valley Forge, Pa. In 1958, he attended the Philmont National Training Center at Cimmarron, N. Mex., in 1960, the Golden Jamboree in Colorado Springs, Colo., and last summer traveled to Israel for the National Jamboree.

In high school, Bob is a member of the Key Club, Choraliers, Masque and Gavel and the junior executive board. Active in the work of the First Baptist Church, Bob is a member of the senior high Baptist Youth Fellowship. He is vice president of the Fairmont BYF and is State chairman of the BYF faith committee.

An accomplished speaker, Bob was selected to report to the Governor on Scouting activities. The local Scout already has been invited to give an account of his upcoming Washington trip at a region 4 meeting in Toledo, Ohio, in October.

Revived by Flood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, the east coast has recently been subjected to a terrific onslaught of wind and water. It did millions of dollars of damage to the shoreline homes and hotels from Virginia to New England.

The path and damage of those storms which strike our shoreline follow no regular pattern. Any coastal community may suffer from these onslaughts. Homes which represent the lifetime earnings of their inhabitants may be washed out in an hour's time.

A recent editorial in the New Bedford Standard-Times points up the need for an insurance plan to protect against abnormal tidal flooding. It traces the history of congressional efforts to authorize such a program.

It is my hope that the President, who played such an active role in the enactment of legislation authorizing such flood insurance, will now recommend to the Congress supplemental appropriations putting the program into effect.

The editorial follows:

REVIVED BY FLOOD

It is, indeed, an ill wind that blows no good.

The devastating northeasterly storm that caused heavy damage on the northeast coast earlier this month has awakened new interest in the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956, which has been gathering dust on the Government shelves for nearly 4 years.

It was the great loss sustained by industries and homeowners in the New Bedford area during the hurricane of August 31, 1954, that focused the attention of this city on the need for insurance against tidewater flooding.

In late 1954 and early 1955, the idea of Federal flood insurance was developed at a series of meetings here in which ways to prevent a repetition of the 1954 disaster were discussed. It was concluded that a Federal insurance program was desirable and necessary, since coverage against flood damage was not available from private insurance companies because of the great risk involved.

The idea born in New Bedford was translated into Senate action in Washington as a result of a spirited campaign by Senators Saltonstall and Kennedy. In late 1955, they sent to each of their Senate colleagues a copy of Federal flood insurance legislation they had coauthored, together with reasons why the bill deserved support. In May 1956, the Senate approved the measure by an overwhelming 61-7 vote.

The House of Representatives also approved the bill, and Congress set up the Federal Flood Indemnity Administration. The plan was that the FFIA would have authority to issue up to $5 billion in flood insurance through Government policies and reinsurance of policies issued by private insurance companies. A tentative rate schedule was worked out calling for fees from $1 to $12 a year per $100 of insurance; maximum insurance to one person or corporation was to be $250,000 and the maximum policy on a private dwelling, $10,000.

The insured would pay 60 percent of the premium, with the Federal Government bearing the remainder of the cost the first 3 years the law is in effect. Subsequently, State and Federal Governments would defray the remainder of the cost equally, 20 percent each.

Programs are futile without money. Considering the appropriation necessary to establish the FFIA, the Senate voted to make $14 million available so that the first policies could be issued to the public. The House said "No," 218 to 186, killing off any chance of starting the effort.

Thus, the legislation is still on the books, the authorization is available, but there is no money to begin the work.

In the wake of this year's storm, the matter was revived at a Presidential press conference a few days ago, when the President was asked if he would consider requesting appropriations to get this program—in

which he demonstrated great initial interest—underway.

Said Mr. Kennedy, "Yes * * * I think the recent storm * * * would indicate the desirability of the bill and the appropriation."

That sounds encouraging. Now let's see if we can get some action.

Hardy Foe of Red Caesars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to place in the RECORD an article by Mr. James M. Johnston, which appeared in the Milwaukee Sentinel of February 3, 1962, entitled "Hardy Foe of Red Caesars."

The article aptly describes the continual struggle in Poland against the Communist ideology led by Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski. Cardinal Wyszynski's tactics are peaceful but effective. I thought this article would prove of interest to my colleagues and, for that reason, commend it to the attention of the membership of this body.

The article follows:

HARDY FOE OF RED CAESARS—WYSZYNSKI'S RESISTENCE PEACEFUL BUT EFFECTIVE

(By James M. Johnston)

"I tell you Caesars that you will bow to your God and you will serve only Him and no one else."

"We are not defending ourselves against the charge that the church is a rebel."

"The way of the church in Poland is difficult. It has here its Calvary."

"At every step we are exposed to the renunciation of God. We are continuously placed in circumstances where it is easier to save oneself by keeping silent or fleeing than to profess belief in God."

Strong words, these, from Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, archbishop of Gniezno and Warsaw and primate of Poland. This nation, which will be 1,000 years old in 1966, has a history of one war after another as Russians from the east, Prussians from the north and other Germans from the west battled for its land.

Today the fight for the mind goes on in Poland, as in many lands. Her field marshal in this ideological battle against Communist ideology is a 63-year-old giant of enduring physique and noble bearing, revered by his countrymen, 95 percent of whom are Roman Catholic. He has been imprisoned, questioned, and harassed, but never harmed, for his death by Communists would probably excite rebellion and bloodshed.

Born in Zuzela, Poland, Stefan Wyszynski (ironically pronounced Vishinsky) studied social sciences and canon law at the University of Lublin. In 1924, he was ordained and became a "labor priest." He joined the underground during the Nazi occupation, organizing secret religious meetings in Lublin and Warsaw. He was elevated to the bishopric of Lublin in 1946 and 2 years later became archbishop of Gniezno and Warsaw and primate of Poland. Just 10 years ago he became a cardinal, but didn't go to Rome to receive his red hat until 1957. He feared the Reds would not let him return to his own see, once he left Poland.

As a fortress in this warfare Cardinal Wyszynski has the shrine of Jasna Gora at Czestochowa, which he calls the "spiritual capital of Poland." The Pauline monastery at Czestochowa has held off many an attack through the centuries because, say devout Catholics, Our Lady of Czestochowa has interceded. In the 17th century an assault on Czestochowa by Swedish armies failed at the hands of monks and rustic soldiers.

As a prince of the church that claims 95 out of every 100 Poles, the cardinal received less than princely treatment during his early years as primate. This was a natural growth of the Communists' running battle with the church. It generated into a hot war in 1949 when Warsaw's Stalinist rulers, fearing that distribution of Catholic relief supplies would make them look bad, seized them to hand out themselves and thus claim credit. It didn't work. The supplies just stopped coming in from abroad.

During a general suppression of the church, Cardinal Wyszynski was arrested in September 1953, on charges of violating a church-state agreement. He was detained in a convent and questioned.

Finally, on October 28, 1956, he was freed, and appeared on the balcony of his palace before a singing, cheering throng of his countrymen. Reverently, he spread his arms and said "Peace be with you." He asked that there be no demonstrations, no disorders, and called for a mature approach to Poland's problems.

Both the church and state were ready for peace, for 1956 had been a stormy year for Eastern Europe's satellites. Cardinal Wyszynski received his freedom just 3 days before Josef Cardinal Mindszenty was released in Hungary, 7 days before the Red tanks finally crushed the Hungarian uprising, 4 months after the bloody Poznan workers' riots, in which 44 were killed and hundreds hurt; 7 days after Polish Communist leaders defied Moscow and elected Wladyslaw Gomulka to leadership and 2 days after the Polish leaders had staved off a threat by Russia to give Poland the same tank treatment she gave Hungary.

In December 1956 the church and state reached an agreement to tolerate each other. Observers said this pact averted civil war.

"We must prefer shrewdness and silence to the violence of Hungary" said the cardinal. "We are a people famous in history for our capacity to die a heroic death. By dying, glory is acquired rapidly. But to live for long years in tribulations is a glory greater than heroism. It is this kind of greater heroism which is needed in our times. Poles already know how to die magnificently. However, Poles must also learn how to suffer magnificently."

Cardinal Wyszynski journeyed to Rome in May 1957, during the lull between tensions. There he received the red cardinal's hat and ring, and Pope Pius XII reaffirmed Catholic opposition to communism.

The lull ended in July 1958. Communist rulers in Poland said the cardinal had had a change of attitude since his visit to the Vatican. They also said a surprise search of the Jasna Gora shrine had yielded religious pamphlets tinged with politics, and therefore illegal. The Polish press stepped up its attacks on the cardinal. His answer was a 12-week program of prayers "in all parochial churches, seminary churches, monastery churches and chapels" as well as at the Jasna Gora shrine.

Before the end of the prayer period Cardinal Wyszynski was on his way to Rome to help elect a new pontiff, following the death of Pope Pius XII, before whom he had knelt in fealty the previous year to receive his red hat. As he arrived at Rome, 1,000 cheering Catholics met him. Some were Polish exiles from communism. Others represented the Warsaw government in Italy.

"Long live the Pope" someone shouted. Said Cardinal Wyszynski to an aid, "I hope they don't think I came here to be elected Pope, because they should know better than that. All I want to do is return to my work as soon as possible."

He did return, with the blessing of the new Pope John XXIII, and a free hand in guiding the faithful behind the Iron Curtain. Tensions punctuated church-state relations throughout the next year. The Reds closed all minor seminaries. Priests and nuns were restricted in travel. The Catholic press and priests' sermons were muzzled. The cardinal himself was shadowed. Source of these measures may have been a religious resurgence in Poland which began as soon as the primate returned from Rome.

In 1960, the Communists continued harrassments, abolishing the feasts of Epiphany and Assumption as civil holidays. Religious teaching of children was suppressed, libraries were purged, seminarians were threatened with military conscription, and an increase in state taxes on church property loomed.

Last March, Gomulka renewed attacks on the church, charging that the Vatican was fighting communism "by means of and at the cost of the Catholic heirarchy in Poland."

It was then that Cardinal Wyszynski admitted the church's rebellious spirit, adding, "The spirit of man is an eternal rebel—rebelling against all falsehoods." A day later he warned that the Red Caesars would bow before God. "Satan is mighty but man will not bow his head before him," he declared. He denied the Vatican was calling the plays, insisted "Poland acts on its own."

After Easter, the regime eased its pressure on Catholicism, declaring its policy will be "neither sharper nor needlessly liberal." A recent announcement that the cardinal plans to visit Rome has been interpreted to mean things are fairly quiet between church and state in Warsaw. In the field of education, for instance, the party decided to settle for formal reports of parish educational activities instead of taking over catechism classes.

The late Pope Pius XII once called the faithful behind the iron curtain "the church of silence." Were he living today, he would admit the phrase no longer fits, in Poland, anyway. And Marxist rulers—the Red "Caesars"—for once, would agree with him.

The Federal Power Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it appears that the change of administration and the appointment of new members to the Federal Power Commission has resulted in little more than new faces presiding over the gouging of the consumers in the Federal Power Commission charged with responsibility of protecting consumers from unreasonable price gouging at the hands of pipelines and producers. It is difficult to assign responsibility within the Federal Power Commission for the latest action, highly reeking of impropriety, by the membership of that agency. The so-called area-pricing decision of the Federal Power Commission was a sufficiently scandalous continuance of the long-established

policies in that body to bring about a loud outcry on the part of consumers over the continued manifest unconcern for the consumer interest, and thorough disregard for sound regulation.

However, the Federal Power Commission has now reached either a new high or a new low in its record of disregard for the consumer. The chairman of the Federal Power Commission announced the appointment of a National Gas Advisory Council to hold its first meeting in Washington March 20 and 21. There is no section in the act establishing the Federal Power Commission authorizing establishment of a National Gas Advsory Council. Moreover, it is interesting to note that many of the backers of the infamous natural gas bills are listed as members of that body. Included in the agenda for the first meeting are a number of subjects vitally affecting gas prices and consumer interests, including: "Is there a basis in the public interest for allowing pipelines a higher rate of return on producing properties than on other properties?" "Is the 12-year supply requirement for pipelines reasonable?" "How does it affect pipelines and consumers?"

Also included prominently in the agenda are the questions:

"What are the effects of take-or-pay clauses on pipeline reserves and finances? Expansion programs?"

"What, if any, modifications are desirable in these clauses?"

"How would modification of take-or-pay clauses aid purchasers, producers, consumers?"

This smacks of ex parte communication on a grand scale sanctioned by the imprimatur of the Federal Power Commission. If the Federal Power Commission is to regulate in the public interest it should buckle down to the solution of its vast backlog of cases and to elimination of its huge reservoir of pipeline rate increases under bond. If that agency will devote itself to its responsibility under law it has more than enough to keep itself occupied.

The Public Welfare Amendments Bill of 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FERNAND J. ST. GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the public welfare amendments bill of 1962 which has passed the House and been sent to the Senate is a sound measure aimed at correcting present welfare abuses and helping people to get off the relief rolls.

This legislation is a 5-year extension of the program to aid dependent families throughout the country. The extensive provisions of the bill which grant aid to both parents in unemployed families, give the States considerable freedom in the expenditure of funds, provide programs for the support of children in foster homes and for day nursery care, afford work opportunities to welfare recipients, and allow the guardians of children of irresponsible parents to receive welfare funds in behalf of such children, will greatly contribute to our national well-being.

The Public Welfare Amendments of 1962 are vitally necessary for a number of reasons. First of all, while the number of needy recipients on old-age assistance has declined—largely due to the increased protection provided by the old-age survivors and disability insurance system—the adequacy of payments to those remaining on the rolls has diminished.

On the other hand, the program for aid to dependent children has shown a substantial increase over the past 22 years. In 1940, 41.6 percent of this type of assistance was given because of the death of a parent, and 30.3 percent was given because of the parent's absence from the home. However, by 1960, these figures had changed positions with 9.6 percent of the funds being used because of the death of a parent, and the large figure of 62.2 percent being expended because of a parent's absence from the home. This change has come about because of the variety and complexity of the social problems affecting many modern families. It takes a great deal more to solve these problems than simply sending a welfare check.

The need for more effective public welfare programs is brought about in great part by reason of hard-core unemployment in some areas which is the result of changes in the economic structure and industrial climate. Also, changes in the agricultural economy which have caused the migration of unskilled farm workers to urban areas have had a pronounced effect.

It is an unfortunate fact that the number of illegitimate births is increasing and that family breakup by reason of divorce, separation, and desertion is also on the rise. It has been shown that these situations can be helped by well-trained, qualified welfare personnel. This fact is further evidence of the value of the public welfare amendments of 1962.

For these and many other reasons, the bill recently passed by the House is sensible, realistic, and forward-looking legislation. It is a conscientious attempt in the direction of dealing more adequately with the great problems which face the United States in assisting all our people to become productive and worthwhile citizens.

John McCuish, Journalist, Politician, Civic Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

(Mr. SHRIVER was granted leave to extend his remarks by inserting an editorial from the Newton Kansan eulogizing the late John B. McCuish, of Newton.)

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret last week that those of us from Kansas learned of the sudden passing of John B. McCuish, of Newton, Kans., at the relatively early age of 55.

I counted John McCuish among my personal friends. He had been active in politics in Kansas for more than a quarter of a century. I respected his counsel and his friendship.

Mr. McCuish loved politics. He started at the precinct level and rose to a number of influential positions in the Republican Party including a brief tenure as Governor of his State. He served as Harvey County Central Committee chairman for several years, and was the first chairman of the Kansas Commission of Revenue and Taxation. He served as treasurer of the Republican State Committee two terms, and was a delegate to the party's national conventions in 1936 and 1948.

One of the early supporters of Dwight Eisenhower for the Presidency, he was director of the Eisenhower for President campaign in Kansas in 1952.

In 1954 Mr. McCuish was elected to serve as Lieutenant Governor of Kansas, and in January 1957, he became Governor for a period of 11 days permitting the then Governor to take a seat on the Kansas Supreme Court.

John McCuish served our Nation during World War II as a combat infantryman in the European theater. Following the war he spent 90 days in Japan on a War Department assignment supervising the establishment of the first weekly newspapers in smaller cities. Its purpose was to spur the growth of democracy in Japan. He was the only American newsman on the mission.

His journalistic talents extended to the publishing of weekly newspapers in Hillsboro, Kans., and his hometown of Newton, Kans.

Mr. McCuish also devoted himself to the many worthy civic causes within his community and State. At the time of his death, he was active in planning the preliminary steps toward building a new library in Newton.

He is survived by his beloved wife and lifetime partner, the former Cora Hedrick.

Under the leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following editorial published in John McCuish's hometown newspaper, the Newton Kansan, upon which he had served as a reporter:

JOHN B. MCCUISH

Harvey County lost the man who had been its top Republican leader for more than three decades with the death early Monday morning of John McCuish.

Mr. McCuish continued to guide the strategy of the GOP in Harvey County even as he became a State political figure and was well along the road to his eventual election to Lieutenant Governor and finally to become Governor for a short period after the resignation of Gov. Fred Hall early in 1957.

Friends say that the Newton man had one of the greatest numbers of acquaintances in and out of political circles as any political figure in the State. He included among those friends and acquaintances not only

persons among the top figures in the State's political life, but also among the ordinary persons in all walks of life.

While he was actively engaged in State politics, he never forgot his hometown.

When worthy projects came to his attention he was ready to go to bat for them, and, on the human side, it can be noted that he also was ready to help Harvey "countians" who sought his aid in solving their problems that arose with governmental units.

He kept up his interest in civic affairs to the last. He had been included during the last few days in the formation of a group that plans to "carry the ball" to secure authorization for a bond issue to finance construction of a new library here.

Home Gone After Storm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, we in Massachusetts have had our full share of hurricanes and floods. We know the damage they can cause. Early this month the east coast received another such visitation.

This time the forces of the elements wreaked almost unprecedented annihilation upon the shorelines of Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, and New Jersey.

I am putting in the RECORD today one personal narrative of this disaster, which I believe most graphically depicts the great storm and the damage it did to one Maryland home. The sensitive telling of this story will recall to many Massachusetts readers memories of the hurricanes of 1938, 1942, and 1954. Those of us who have witnessed the irresistible majesty of the wind and waves as they demolish homes and reshape shorelines will take courage from the character and content of this superb newspaper story.

The article follows:

HOME GONE AFTER STORM—FEAR OF FLYING GLASS MADE GRIFFINS LEAVE BEACH HOUSE

(By Isabel Kinnear Griffin)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Isabel Griffin is the wife of Bulkley Griffin of the Enterprise-Times Washington News Bureau.)

WASHINGTON.—We lost our year-round Delaware beach house to the storm of the century when the ocean, egged on by a strong and continuous northeast wind, reclaimed a 130-foot-wide strip of land and dunes all along the mid-Atlantic coastline.

We are glad that we were there to see the awesome magnificence of the storm in the making, and grateful, too, that feminine fear of flying glass persuaded us to leave before the ocean took over. This was a storm that did everything on a mighty scale.

My New England-born husband, Bulkley, has an ingrown love of the sea, sand, and dunes, a love as ardent in the winter as summer. We were in our beach house Monday, March 5, to oversee the building of an adjoining bulkhead in front of the lot with a beautiful sand dune we were buying. Our house and dunes were protected by a doughty one of 20-foot pilings, 6 feet above ground, 12 below. Surely the grass-covered dune, so soon to be ours, deserved such protection as well.

Monday started in sunshine and gently lapping waves, but began darkening about noon when a sharp wind sprang up. By 6 o'clock it had whipped the ocean into pounding waves and started the shrill singsong we associated with a northeaster, but the weather forecast said "winds will drop." We were sorry the bulkhead wasn't already in; the roistering waves were biting at the foot of the cherished dune. But we settled back to enjoy the tearing wind with its powerful gusts which sent wave crests into spectaculars of water and foam.

Since the winds were to drop, we went to bed expecting sunshine the next day. But the wind didn't stop. About midnight I woke with an uneasy feeling. There was a different feel to the house tremors, not the usual-rhythmic tremors as mighty waves pounded against the bulkhead. It seemed more of a shove and slight jerk. I began to feel tense.

WORSE THAN HURRICANE

But with daylight, March 6, and the waves piling into a breath-taking display of power and majesty we again lost ourselves in wonder and fascination. But that wind had better drop soon, we decided. "This is worse than hurricane winds and waves," we speculated, but still felt filled with splendid excitement and no fear. We had sat out hurricanes in our house; this seemed a little different for some reason.

By 5:30 Tuesday afternoon, with high tide still an hour and a half away, we stood at our second floor, 5-foot picture windows. The horizon was lost in a mass of incoming 30-foot waves—or so it seemed to us—and we looked into nothing but water. We had to look up to see the wave crests. At that moment an extra gust of wind sent water in a tearing, swirl across the entire front of the house. I put my hand on the window. It was vibrating. Scared of flying glass, we decided to leave.

Packing overnight bags, we left, sure we'd back early the next day to appraise the water damage. We felt sure the windows would go. That was the last we ever saw of our house. If it had to go, we were glad it went in such a splendor of driving wind and towering waves. It went in good company—each of the 22 ocean-front sturdy homes at South Bethany yielded to the fascination of the ocean's shattering embrace.

The destruction was complete and utter. Along with the other ocean-front home owners, we now locate our lots by the well pipes sticking five feet or more out of the sand with the ocean tides washing in and out around them.

Recalling the waves and wind, the majesty and power, we know how it could have happened. Others on our beach front are still incredulous. We are the lucky ones.

Oil Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, the United States is the only major nation in the free world that is self-sufficient in petroleum. Adequate domestic oil supplies are vital to national security.

A worldwide surplus of low-cost foreign oil has resulted in increasing U.S. oil imports which threaten national security. Foreign oil comes into the United States at more than $1 per barrel or more than one-third under domestic prices.

As a result, U.S. oil imports have increased in relation to domestic production as shown by the following data from the U.S. Bureau of Mines:

	U.S. crude oil production (thousand barrels daily)	U.S. petroleum imports (thousand barrels daily)			Percent of U.S. production	
		Crude oil and products (excluding residual fuel)	Residual fuel oil	Total	Imports (excluding residual)	Total imports
1946	4,751	255	122	377	5.4	7.9
1956	7,151	991	445	1,436	13.9	20.1
1961	7,178	1,240	650	1,890	17.3	26.3

Mr. Speaker, increasing oil imports, decreasing U.S. exports of oil and oversea purchases of oil by U.S. Armed Forces have resulted in an unfavorable trade balance of about $1.25 billion in oil alone. This accounts for approximately one-third of the $3 to $4 billion adverse balance of payments that poses a critical problem.

Government studies have determined that excessive reliance on imports could result in higher costs or even unavailability of oil to consumers. A vigorous, expanding domestic industry has been, and will continue to be, our best assurance of sufficient oil and gas supplies at reasonable prices.

Since 1956, imports have been restricted—under a voluntary program in 1957 and 1958 and by mandatory Government controls during 1959–61. These restrictions have prevented complete chaos in the domestic industry by slowing down but not arresting the increase in imports.

In the last 5 years, free world countries outside the United States have increased production by more than 4 million barrels a day, or more than 50 percent, while crude production in the United States has remained virtually static.

Increasing imports have been a major factor in the continuing decline of the domestic producing industry. From 1956 to 1961, there was a decrease of more than 30 percent in the number of U.S. exploratory crews, rotary drilling rig activity, and the number of "wildcat" or exploratory wells drilled. Employment in the domestic industry has decreased by about 10 percent. Wages and the cost of materials have increased from 10 to 20 percent while oil prices have been reduced.

Three-fourths of the Nation's total energy requirements are supplied by oil and gas. The value of domestic petroleum production is almost $10 billion per year, exceeding the combined value of all other U.S. minerals. The domestic industry supplied 6 of the 7 billion barrels of oil needed by the United States and its allies to win World War II. The availability of domestic oil was the key factor in preventing war during the 1956–57 Suez crisis.

A substantial reduction in oil imports and a stabilization of imports in relation to domestic production are essential to the general welfare and national security.

The Revision of Pledge of Allegiance: The Work of the Late Congressman Louis C. Rabaut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, my attention has recently been called to a very interesting and informative article which appeared in the Catholic Herald Citizen of Milwaukee, Wis., on March 17, 1962.

The article was written by Father Thomas O'Brien Hanley, S.J. of Marquette University. It deals with the work of our late distinguished colleague from Michigan, Congressman Louis Rabaut, in carrying through the revision of the Pledge of Allegiance. I know of no personal legislative achievement which was closer to Congressman Rabaut's heart than in having inserted the words "under God" in our Pledge of Allegiance.

Father Hanley's article pays a well deserved tribute to the late Congressman Rabaut. It also provides some interesting insights and historical background about the revision of our Pledge of Allegiance. For this reason, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place this article in the RECORD and to commend it to the attention of the membership of the House.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE REVISION INSERTED THE PHRASE "UNDER GOD"

(By Father Thomas O. Hanley, S.J.)

Congressman Louis C. Rabaut, of Michigan, author of the law which revised the phrase "under God," died late in the course of the past year. He was distinguished for a long career in Congress reaching back to 1938 and interrupted by only 2 years out of office during that period.

Insofar as Washington has a mayor, Rabaut like other chairmen of the Committee for the District of Columbia claimed that office. He had also risen in the Appropriations Committee. But his personal satisfaction was especially found in his authorship of the revised pledge bill. His career in this respect throws considerable light along the tortuous way of religion in American life and religion's effect on government.

There is now nothing new in saying that Rabaut advocated religious tolerance.

Nor is it any longer striking to stand up for a religious minority as some of Kennedy's narrow majority felt they did more than a year ago. In another recent instance of tolerance, the Supreme Court said that one Roy Torcaso did not have to sign a declaration that he believed in God in order to be a notary public in Maryland.

Rabaut stood for all of this and is thus counted a liberal. But I find that perhaps unknown to himself and to most of us he stood for something additional in the measure of freedom when he sponsored the pledge revision. Anyone who has read the American Revolutionary Times cannot escape the concern in law that religion itself be protected and not merely the individual.

In a more dynamic sense, Americans as believers in God must be guaranteed the expansive air of freedom by which to express themselves as a religious people. As a complement to the more common understanding of individual religious freedom we thus have the corporate freedom of a religious people.

Public life and civic affairs were open to its influence and religious manifestations on their solemn occasions such as the oath and prayer on taking office have been universal custom and a frequent matter of legislation ever since. As part of the history of a religious people the Rabaut role was a traditional one. He was a representative of the American people as they are, as a religious people.

Only a few months before his death, Mr. Rabaut told the writer how he came to draft and propose the pledge legislation. Affectionately styled by colleagues "the choir boy of Capitol Hill," it was not surprising when he received a request that a revision be made in the pledge to include the phrase, "under God."

Typical of the candor with which he recounted the circumstances of the legislation was his admission that he was not initially responsive to the letter. He willingly attributed the beginnings of the legislation to his secretary, who persistently called the petition to his attention.

With satisfaction he explained that his secretary was a devout Protestant. Rabaut was himself a Catholic. While the petitioner was not a constituent of Rabaut, those who knew the "choir boy of Capitol Hill," could predict that he would appropriately respond when he found a respite from his many committee duties.

Somewhere in these various steps toward the making of a law Rabaut had to make a political judgment. While he may have been a man of religious principle, he had another equally important principle which said that he was a Representative of the American people. How would they feel about this? Would the revision be good for them, all circumstances considered?

Rabaut had every right to have confidence in his political instinct in answering these questions. He had stepped into the House of Representatives in 1938 off the popular ground swell known as the New Deal. He could speak of reelection since then in terms of decades.

Only on one occasion did he appear to misread the popular mind; he lost his House seat for 2 years when he opposed continuation of the House Un-American Activities Committee. He would rather say that his constituents had forgotten themselves than suggest that he should reject long accepted policies because wild accusations had been made against his motives.

He prided himself on how popular the revision proved to be. Certainly congressional voting is indicative of American consensus and Rabaut saw his bill move impressively through Congress and the White House. Protestant support was outstanding.

Mail diagnosis on Capitol Hill is open to quackery, but Rabaut used this evidence as an experienced professional. He found that the volume exceeded that touching on the McCarthy controversy. It was overwhelmingly favorable to his bill.

I am not suggesting that we can write historically and sociologically about the Rabaut bill, at least not comprehensively. My business with Rabaut was gathering material for tomorrow's writing of history. I was concerned, however, with that phenomenon of American democracy whereby a religious people seeks out authentic expression in their elected representatives. Rabaut possessed a willingness to respond to popular will, the power to assess it, and the capacity to lead to a fulfillment of a latent objective of the popular will.

Some American historians, like Congressmen, feel that they understand contemporary American consensus. They need not identify themselves as social scientists but merely accept current history as an organic continuity of the American past. In this light we see that what Rabaut did was done by the first State legislatures before the revolting colonies could speak with a common voice.

Days of public prayer and penance were assigned to aid the country's course "under a kindly providence." Civic ceremonies today are not an exception to this tradition.

We need only recall the prayers of the presidential inauguration and their sensitivity to the religious pluralism of America. (Televiewers remember the sensitive Catholic President making a generous effort at the Orthodox sign of the cross which concludes in reverse fashion to his own.) History, tradition, and custom corroborated Rabaut's estimate of the American consensus and the nature of Americans as a religious people.

By his voting Rabaut would classify as liberal and indeed his willingness to respond to popular consensus, to what Alexander Hamilton abhorred as the wild majority, made him faithful to a tradition of liberalism as read in nondogmatic terms. Rabaut's pledge revision expresses a broad understanding of human freedom's many expressions.

Now the religious aspects of our civic occasions are surely very human and we have never seen fit to stifle the natural inclination of our people so to express themselves in their own likeness.

Religion is of the man, whether his activity is directed at secular objects or sacred. Law may never stifle the man in touching his human activity. It would then lose its wisdom and even its legality. Here we are touching on the little discussed but perennially accepted reality of the freedom of a religious people as a whole.

Secular and agnostic humanism, understood recently by the Supreme Court as the fourth religion, may not be of this consensus, for it generally holds the dogma that religion does not flow through the whole life of a man; that ultimate truths of religion are not the object of humanly intelligible perception; and that civil law must not take account of the whole man but atomize him secularly without responsibility for the ensuing frustration of a people's inclination toward public religious manifestations.

If lawmakers and courts curtail and stifle the tendency of Americans as a religious people to continue to express themselves in the tradition of the Rabaut bill, their position becomes contradictory and illiberal in the light and circumstances of the contemporary religion of secular and agnostic humanism.

For in so acting they are disregarding consensus and enshrining the fourth religion, which, unlike the other three heretofore, will not allow satisfactory public religious manifestations. The Supreme Court has moved closer to this dead end in recent decisions by experimenting with the illusory simplification which says that the purpose of law is secular. It implicitly finds itself denying that the object of law is primarily human. While we may atomize society in

its institutional elements, as separating church from state, we may never do so in the case of man in society. He is the pervasive soul and constant single reference of society and its institutions.

America has with regard to religious public manifestations avoided the oversimplification the absolute secularist offers with its de facto establishment of secular and agnostic humanism as a fourth religion. At the same time we have progressively turned away from an atmosphere of compulsion in such manifestations.

The Quaker oath legislation from early times and the recent Supreme Court decision against compulsory declaration of belief in God by officeholders reflect this spirit.

America has in these ways discovered a middle way leading to historic new ground. Here, in terms of Louis C. Rabaut's bill, a religious people naturally inserts "under God" in their pledge of allegiance. With promising maturity the meaning is left to each individual to find with no dictation from the law nor compulsion from the state. A challenge to intelligence stands ahead in developing restraint and mutual respect amid the rich differences Americans bring to this deeply human expression.

This richness of meaning was found in Louis C. Rabaut and it was in no small part communicated to him in representing America as a religious people.

Foreign Visitors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I believe my colleagues may be interested in learning what some of our foreign visitors think of thier hosts here in the United States. I would like to revise and extend my remarks to include a letter which I have written to the Secretary of State bringing to his attention the accomplishments of my good friend, Mr. John McCormally, executive editor of the Hutchinson News, Hutchinson, Kans., in entertaining foreign visitors. I especially want to call to the attention of this great body the article written by Mr. Oscar S. Villadolid, staff reporter of the Phillippines Herald, after his visit to this country as a member of a SEATO Journalists Project. Mr. Willadolid was entertained by Mr. McCormally and Mr. Jack Harris, publisher of the Hutchinson News. He speaks in glowing terms of Mr. Harris and Mr. McCormally as being the type of Americans who could easily win Asians as friends to our cause. I indeed think these two gentlemen should be commended for their wonderful contribution in serving our Nation.

The letter and article follows:

MARCH 21, 1962.

The Honorable DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
U.S. Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY RUSK: I feel that one of my constituents, Mr. John McCormally, has made quite an outstanding contribution in furthering the cause of international understanding, and I would like to bring to your attention a summary of his achievements.

Mr. McCormally, who is executive editor of the Hutchinson News, of Hutchinson, Kans., has for several years been active as a host to foreign visitors coming here under the various exchange programs.

For most of these visitors, their trip to Hutchinson, which has a population of 38,000, is their only exposure to a smaller American community and to an agricultural area. Not only has Mr. McCormally's work given them a true, memorable picture of real, down-to-earth American life; at the same time it has provided their hosts, the people of my district, a fine opportunity to learn firsthand the personalities, feelings, and thinking of these important foreign visitors.

Having a large family and a moderate income, he does not entertain lavishly, but goes far beyond the perfunctory duties of an official host, in providing genuine American hospitality. His wife Peggy and their seven children play an important role. The guests are always invited to the McCormally home for at least one meal, and while there, have an opportunity to romp with the children, poke through the pantry, and in this informal atmosphere, ask all the intimate questions about grocery bills, family budgets, taxes, worries, and hopes which one must ask in order to learn about people in another land.

Other arrangements include visits with farmers, workers, teachers, students, and glimpses of the community's small industries, retail businesses, and cultural centers.

Mr. McCormally emphasizes that participation in the programs reflects the interests of his employer, Mr. John P. Harris, chairman of the board of Harris newspapers, a widely traveled student of world affairs, and a highly successful editor.

Mr. McCormally is a native Kansan, 39, a Marine veteran of World War II, a former Democratic member of the Kansas Legislature, a former Neiman fellow at Harvard, and has worked his way up from reporter to executive editor of the News in the past 10 years.

I understand that these visitors invariably list Hutchinson, Kans., as a high spot in their American tours. I am attaching a copy of one such report by Mr. Oscar Villadolid, of the Philippines Herald, in which he expresses first his reluctance and even fear at entering the heartland of our big country and then his delight at meeting the McCormally family and having an opportunity to become acquainted with typical, hardworking Americans—people who are vastly different from wealthy, sophisticated tourists who are virtually the only Americans traveling in the Philippines.

I am sure that Mr. McCormally is eager to continue his efforts and that you will be interested in his contributions and in their effects upon the people of my district.

Sincerely yours,

J. FLOYD BREEDING,
Member of Congress.

WINNING THE COLD WAR

(By Oscar S. Villadolid)

America may be dragging her feet in the cold war, but she is definitely making long, deliberate strides in trying to win the hearts of Asians through her $20.8 million cultural and exchange educational programs.

Though little known, sometimes even unheard of, in the awesome East-West power struggle, this battle for the minds of peoples has contributed immensely to a better understanding of America, and what she stands for. Yet, a great many politically minded Americans have, ironically, failed to place more emphasis on the very weapon that can someday make them win the cold war without firing a shot.

How is this? one may ask. What possible benefits can a gigantic cultural and educational exchange program secure that subtle military diplomacy or lavish economic aid cannot?

Not long ago, we winged our way into the American south, deep into the land that has become so well known to Asians as "Little Rock." When we left Washington, D.C., for the "notorious land," we were apprehensive, felt that, perhaps, it was not wise after all to have asked that we see the soft underbelly of the great United States. What was there to see than what had already been printed in Life and Look magazines, pictures of southern "whites" spitting at the faces of helpless "blacks" and inflicting on them physical harm merely because a few innocent colored schoolchildren wanted to take full advantage of an education which they are entitled to under the laws we mused. Being an Asian, and thus colored, there was really nothing much to think about, except of Little Rock all the way.

Looking back, the situation was not as bad, as hopeless and as reprehensible as it appeared 2 months ago. On the contrary, we left the South with the inevitable verdict that the conditions were much better than we had expected them to be. For the first time, we really began to appreciate what a complicated and ticklish problem school integration was in a southern community—too provincial in its prejudices and too raw in its emotions. In deed, there was much to be desired in trying to uplift the standing of the Negroes; but, on the whole, we were impressed by the progress being made in this direction. We left the United States deeply convinced that a hard-working Asian could find his place under the sun in America, too.

This understanding of the true facts in the America South could not have come about without the Fulbrights and the Smith-Mundts, as they are popularly known here. So with an understanding of American life and government one goes home from a trip to the United States highly elated by the experiences of American civilization. One also gathers these impressions: America has a culture distinctly her own, her women are hard working despite all the kitchen aids and mechanical gadgets not available in the distant East, her family ties, with obvious exceptions, are still firm and her religious life strong. The so-called westerners are even hospitable people, and nowhere in the vastness of America did we sample a brand of hospitality as the kind dished out to us by the Texans.

Feeling the pulse of America this way does not only leave a lasting imprint in the minds of those who have been there but they may also help mature their thinking on matters affecting the United States. By no means will they be expected to act like puppets upon their return, subverting their convictions to new found ones, or laying aside their nationalistic aspirations for alien considerations. But, with the proper background of American life and government seen firsthand, they will act with acute deliberation and sobriety on delicate matters affecting the United States and the ideals which she stands for. Undoubtedly, these are tangible acquisitions which could greatly enhance closer and better understanding between Asians and Americans in this era when the peace is being delicately balanced through terror.

Unlike the disinterested group which has cast its lot with the pre-Sputnik type of diplomacy of "might makes right," there are, in the U.S. State Department in Washington, D.C., silent workers who firmly believe that the world's differences could be aptly bridged through cultural and educational exchanges.

With 10 years experience with international exchange programs, these officials have incessantly tried to hammer home the point that military and economic strength

are not the only two weapons that could shape a world of friends. And there can be no disagreement on this. For intellectual and social attainments, the knowledge of which can be spread only through the exchange of opinion-forming individuals, are very important, too, if not as vital as economic and military power.

Even in this part of the world, it is becoming increasingly clear that the two big powers, on whose hands the survival of the world depends, have locked themselves in a titanic struggle for global intellectual leadership. And while they are at it in an increasing and often times disquieting momentum, the rest of the world's peoples—the committed and the uncommitted—are an interested audience.

What exactly is the U.S. State Department's role in this increasingly important playground of cultural and educational exchange programs? How has it fared during the 10 years since it launched the program?

Robert Dollison, one of the many soldiers in America's battle for the minds of peoples throughout the world, has given us a clear picture of the setup: 6,000 persons a year are involved in the program, two-thirds of whom are foreigners getting into the United States from 80 countries. Since the program was launched by the American Congress 10 years ago, 60,000 exchanges had taken place, 40,000 of whom are foreigners and the rest Americans who have gone abroad to various countries of cultural interest to them. These numbers include the two categories of the Department's current exchange activity—the Fulbright program for teachers, lecturers, research scholars and graduate students, and the Smith-Mundt leader specialist program for influential individuals and experts in particular fields.

State Department officials concede that the leader-specialist program, concentrating on the exchange of influential adults, is generally agreed to be a marked success. This is not surprising. For the opinion formers who have gone on 60-day visits to the United States, numbering more than 800, exert a lot of influence in their respective countries. These influential tourists, upon their return home, pour forth their impressions in speeches, books, articles, and personal discussions.

But one thing has been of utmost importance to this program: the recipients had gone to America and returned to their homeland content in the thought that they had been granted complete freedom to make their choice of places to see, to visit, and persons to talk with.

What, perhaps, has contributed greatly to the success of this leader-specialist program is the private sponsor system which could be found in more than 1,000 American communities, from the big cities of New York and Chicago to the rural districts of Tennessee and Kansas. This is one of the surprises of the great United States, where, to the eyes of an outsider, every American is too busy engaged in raising his standard of living to bother with people from the outside. But not every American is engaged in the rat race, a good number of them—businessmen, social workers, farmers, editors, publishers, and so forth—have been giving their precious time to the visitor who has come to the United States for the first time to discover America.

We discovered the real America this way. In Dallas, Tex., after a tiring day touring newspaper offices and TV stations, we were farmed out, by people who took care of our program of activities, into the homes of average Americans. Mr. and Mrs. Ray Johnson, a middle-aged couple with a son in the Armed Forces, took us in that evening. Time flew so fast that before we knew it it was already past midnight. There were still a lot of things to discuss about each other's country, but time was running out, and so were the 60 days for the trip that carried us through Washington, D.C.; New York; Knoxville, Tenn.; New Orleans; Dallas, Tex.; Kansas City; Hutchinson, Kans.; Chicago; Detroit; Buffalo; Niagara Falls; Quincy and Cambridge (Boston); Easton, Pa.; Seattle, Wash.; Minneapolis, Milwaukee, and San Francisco, Calif.

But the most pleasant experience we had in the big, vast United States was not in New York, Washington, D.C., or Chicago, but in a small town in Kansas with the funny name of Hutchinson. We had wanted to visit a small town and sample life in such a community when we made out our itinerary with the help of Mr. Melvin Bergheim, a programing expert of the Governmental Affairs Institute, in Washington, D.C., but little did we realize that it would afford us our most pleasant and memorable experience in America. What made our stay there most pleasant and worthwhile was the kind of hospitality John McCormally, his wife, and their four children afforded us. They are simple people, though John is the managing editor of the town's newspaper, the Hutchinson News (circulation 48,000), and a former Neiman fellow; but there was warmth and sincerity in the way they received us—like old friends separated by miles of ocean. And we got a kick out of eating hamburgers, salad, and French fried potatoes for lunch beside an old fireplace that barely kept the 36° could out of the living room. His publisher, Jack Harris, was swell, too. He was the kind of American, soft spoken and understanding, that, we thought, could win Asians easily on the side of the United States.

Our concept of the typical American, as a sophisticated tourist with too much money to throw away while strutting around the Philippines—an impression shared by many—was effectively disproved by John and Jack and a number of other hardworking Americans we met in the United States. They impressed upon us the fact that a good many Americans are, after all, people, too, who share a genuine feeling with Asians and understand that they, also, have a role to play in shaping the course of the future. Their understanding of us and the problems we face made the world seem like a golf ball.

It was like, in Hutchinson, home in America.

Perhaps, the critics will argue that this is an isolated case; after all, no two individuals, as in nationalities, can be alike. But the widespread popularity in the Philippines of the Smith-Mundt and Fulbright grants seem to belie the critics. With the exception of a numbered few, visits to the United States on these grants have brought about a general feeling of enlightenment among the recipients on delicate subjects which, at one time, had seemed incomprehensible to them. As intellectual enlightenment is understanding, it would, therefore, not be difficult to expect that better and closer understanding between nations would follow.

Doubting Thomases who seem more disposed toward the old-type diplomacy that characterized Britannia when she ruled the waves may well profit the experiences of Filipinos in cultural and educational exchange programs. The results are certainly more tangible, although they may not be proclaimed before the whole world with the same brazenness and intensity of a cannon's roar.

To the "have not" Asians, whose world has just started to emerge from the nightmare of poverty and isolationism, the fight is not by the number of guns, tanks, or planes, but by the amount of bread heaped into the empty breadbaskets of waiting millions. Knowledge, to them, will be the propelling force to achieve this end, not sporadic economic doleouts that oftentimes lead to a false sense of economic security and national stagnation. Of course, this approach to the ailing millions of Asians will entail a long process that will surely hurt the pocketbook, but it will represent more than a gesture of friendship; it is friendship for friendship's sake.

LIST OF RECENT FOREIGN VISITORS TO HUTCHINSON, KANS.

John McCormally, host: June 1957, Mr. Walter Pollak, editor and chief, "Oberoesterreichische Nachrichten," Linz, Austria; March 1958, Messrs. Olivera, Angeles, and Villadolid, Manila, P.I.; July 1958, Ali Khan Mansur, Lahore, Pakistan; October 1958, Ugger Sain, editor, the Hindustan Times, New Delhi, India; November 1958, Takeo Kayama, "Chubu Nippon Shimbuu," Tokyo; January 1959, Aatos Erkko, Finland; April 1959, Ramapillai N. Sivapirakasam, Ceylon; November 1959, Koh Jai-wook and Wohn Kyung-soo, of "Dong a Ilbo," Seoul, Korea.

June, July, 1960, J. A. Kelleher, the Dominion, Wellington, New Zealand; June 1961, Mohamed Isnaeni, Djakarta, member of Parliament and chief editor, Suluh, Indonesia; July 1961 (members of resident correspondent's tour, arranged by Governmental Affairs Institute and financed by the Ford Foundation)—George Celiz, Argentina; Heinz Ohnesorge, Germany; T. V. Parasuram, India; Antonio Barolini, Italy; Euchai Kimura, Japan; Bogdan Chylinski, Poland; Levon Keshishian, United Arab Republic; Miss Evelyn Irons, United Kingdom; Rudolf Stajduhar, Yugoslavia; Bert Van Velsen, the Netherlands; F. Demokan, Turkey.

Drummond Research Turns Up Amazing Imbalance of Committee Staffs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in order to bring the Members up to date on the latest facts concerning the imbalance of committee staffs, I include as a part of these remarks an additional column by Roscoe Drummond who is doing a great service in the cause of good government by this study.

The article follows:

SENATE SCANDAL—IMBALANCE IN STAFFS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

One of the reasons the Republican Party has never really bestirred itself to correct the egregiously one-sided professional staffing of the congressional committees—in which the minority party representative ranges from puny to zero—is that most Republicans in Congress do not know the full facts. They do not realize how bad, how unfair, how crippling the situation is.

It has taken a long time to assemble the documented statistics showing the extreme imbalance between the majority and the minority staffs on the House committees. By the latest count the proportion of experts on the House committees responsible to the Democratic Party compared to those responsible to the Republican Party is 14 to 1.

But what of the Senate? Is it any better? I suspect that if you telephone either of your Senators, they won't be able to tell you. The facts are not readily available; just the opposite. You can check with the Library of Congress, pore over the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or call a dozen different

sources on the Hill—and the facts will not be forthcoming.

They have at last been collected. They show that the imbalance in the professional staffing of the Senate committees is not one whit better than in the House. Committee by committee here are the facts disclosing the size of the staff appointed by and responsible to the Republicans:

Senatorial committee	Majority staff	Minority staff
Aeronautics and Space Sciences	11	1
Agriculture and Forestry	6	1
Appropriations	33	3
Armed Services	25	1
Banking and Currency	17	3
Commerce	27	3
District of Columbia	7	1
Finance	5	1
Foreign Relations	28	0
Government Operations	44	4
Interior and Insular Affairs	17	1
Judiciary	146	11
Labor and Public Welfare	28	4
Post Office and Civil Service	10	1
Public Works	11	2
Rules and Administration	10	1
Small Business	18	0
Aging	19	1
Total	462	39

There you have it. The foregoing figures, which have been prepared with painstaking care by Senator CARL T. CURTIS, Republican, of Nebraska, and his staff and made available to me, include the subcommittees as well as the full committees.

Of the total staff professionals on Senate committees, 462 are appointed by and responsible to the Democratic Party, 39 appointed by and responsible to the Republican Party. Thus while the party balance in the Senate is 2 to 1, the imbalance on the committee staffing is 12 to 1, or 92 percent to 8 percent.

Senator CURTIS' immediate objective is to get the leadership of his own party in the Senate to sit down with the ranking Republican members of the committees to draw up a minimum bill of reform and then find out whether the Senate Democrats will deem it wise to continue to stand against both party pressure and public pressure to correct this imbalance.

Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, Representative BRUCE ALGER, of Texas, and some others are also deeply concerned about the damage this is doing in the House. More Republicans are becoming dissatisfied and more Democrats are becoming aware that they cannot safely resist this reform indefinitely.

The power of Congress is largely exercised through its committees. Woodrow Wilson put it this way:

"Congress in session is Congress on public exhibition, whilst Congress in its committee rooms is Congress at work."

For the minority party not to have fair professional staff representation on the congressional committees is eroding our two-party system. It keeps the minority from the means of doing its job.

And worse, "If" says Senator WINSTON PROUTY, of Vermont, "the committee system—the backbone of our operation—is to have ribs (that is, adequate professional staff) on only one side, do we not abuse the greatest body in the world?"

One or two committees have sought to maintain a professional staff faithfully serving both parties. Little remains of this theory today and it is increasingly clear that the minority party ought to have professional committee staffs appointed by it and responsible to it. It will be worth watching to see how long it takes to get this done.

Socialized Medicine and Disappearing Doctors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, Britain has had socialized medicine for 14 years. What happens to a country under such a system is documented in the following article which appeared in the March 26 issue of U.S. News & World Report. It is an eye opener:

DISAPPEARING DOCTORS: NEW CRISIS IN BRITAIN

LONDON.—Britain, after 14 years of socialized medicine, now is running into a "doctor crisis" that could spell ruin for this country's system of tax-paid medical care.

The crisis stems from the departure of large numbers of young British physicians to practice in other lands. More than 500 are said to be emigrating each year to Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and the United States.

These doctors say they are being driven away by the low incomes, overwork, lack of opportunities to specialize, and bureaucratic redtape that is associated with working for the Government.

This wholesale migration is leaving a medical void which endangers the $2.3 billion-a-year National Health Service and its nationalized hospitals.

To keep the hospitals running, hundreds of foreign doctors are being recruited, mostly from Asian countries where standards of medical training are considered questionable. Nearly half of the intern and resident-physician posts now are filled by about 4,000 non-British doctors, mainly from India and Pakistan. Without them, it's conceded, the health service would collapse.

Among family doctors outside the nationalized hospitals, too, a crisis is building up. A Government blunder 5 years ago reduced the number of medical students admitted to universities on the mistaken assumption that Britain was facing a surplus of physicians.

GLOOMY FORECAST

Fewer students combined with the increasing flight of frustrated young doctors from Britain, now has resulted in a shortage of general practitioners that is to get worse over the next 5 to 10 years.

A decline in the quality of medical care is seen by professional authorities as inevitable in the next few years. They say deterioration already is apparent. Some predict a gradual breakdown of the entire system of socialized medicine unless there are drastic reforms.

For nearly 14 years, socialized medicine seemed to be all but immune from criticism here in Britain. The mass of the British people like the idea of feeless medical care, and resent any proposed change as an attempt to deprive them of their right to these benefits.

A MESS

Now, suddenly, socialized medicine is under heavy attack, not by the British public, but by doctors and independent professional experts. The journal of the British Medical Association has just joined the chorus of critics with this categorical charge: "Medicine in Britain is in a mess."

Why is British medicine under nationalization said to be in "a mess"? Why are hundreds of young doctors deserting socialized medicine to practice in countries free of government control?

The answers that you get from independent authorities are: Working conditions imposed by the government as a monopoly employer of doctors are proving to be more and more intolerable. One result has been a decline in the number of people choosing medicine as a career. Among those who study medicine, a steadily increasing number are refusing to work here.

With British medical schools turning out a total of 1,600 graduates a year, nearly one in every three is leaving this country to escape employment under a system of socialized medicince.

Effects of the "doctor crisis" are felt most acutely in the nationalized hospitals. There, a Government policy of employing "cheap medical labor" has created what one medical economist describes as "a lost generation" of British surgeons and specialists.

STANDARDS LOWERED

Over the past 10 years, to keep down costs, the number of high-income staff jobs—surgeons and specialists in other fields—was reduced. The number of temporary, low-paying junior positions was increased. The result of this policy is that much of the surgery and other work that ordinarily would be done by high-salaried staff specialists is being handled by junior resident physicians.

During the past decade, hundreds of doctors, after completing 12 to 14 years of university and hospital training to qualify as surgeons and specialists, found there were no jobs open for them in British hospitals. They faced the choice: Sacrifice the years of specialized training and go into general practice, or emigrate. A large number chose the latter course.

Another effect of the policy of employing cheap medical labor is that, in recent years, fewer and fewer British medical graduates chose to specialize. So, suddenly, the authorities are discovering that they lack the British surgeons and other specialists needed to staff the nationalized hospitals, even in high-paying positions. These hospitals are being run more and more by junior doctors from India, Pakistan, and other underdeveloped countries who come to this country for a few years of postgraduate training.

Queen Elizabeth's personal physician, Lord Evans, recently told the House of Lords: "Without these people, the health service would not grind slowly to a standstill; it would completely break down."

Most surgeons under 35 years old in Britain today, according to an authoritative source, were born and trained in foreign countries. They are performing 50 percent of all emergency surgery.

In some industrial areas, such as Sheffield, 90 percent of the resident surgeons are young, foreign doctors just completing their training. In 25 of the 74 nationalized hospitals in that area, all of the junior doctors are foreigners—mostly Indians and Pakistanis. Eventually, when they complete their training, these doctors will return to their homelands to practice.

WARNING FROM THE TOP

How is the standard of medical care in Britain's system of nationalized hospitals being affected by this "doctor crisis"? Here is the verdict of Lord Taylor, a Socialist spokesman on medical problems in the House of Lords, in a statement on provincial hospitals that are staffed largely by foreign doctors:

"I cannot honestly recommend you to go into such hospitals as a casualty. In many cases, there is no casualty officer. A house surgeon will have to leave the [operating] theater when he can treat you. His experience will be far less than that of your gen-

eral medical practitioner. When he comes, he will probably not be a British graduate, and he may well have difficulty in understanding what you say. This is at a time when speed and efficiency may be literally lifesaving."

Lord Taylor added that the qualifications of many of these Asian doctors are so inadequate that they require emergency training in such basic procedures as setting up a blood transfusion.

For Britain's 20,000 general practitioners, expert observers say the outlook is even gloomier under socialized medicine than for specialists. Bureaucratic interference with supply and demand is blamed for a serious and steadily worsening shortage of family doctors.

When the decision was made to reduce the number of medical students, it failed to take into account the effect of population growth and a rapid increase in retirement among aging doctors. Result: At a time when the population is expanding, the number of family doctors actually is beginning to decline—a trend which experts say cannot be reversed for at least 6 years.

Therefore, in the years just ahead, there are to be fewer and fewer general practitioners to care for more and more patients. Moreover, under the peculiar financial policy of the National Health Service, these doctors are to get no increase in salary.

A family doctor with 2,000 patients on his list earns approximately $6,700. During the winter, when illness is at a peak, he may see anywhere from 60 to 80 patients a day for treatment, reference to a hospital, or issuance of medical certificates.

PROBLEM OF FIXED FEES

For each patient, the doctor receives a fixed annual payment from the Government, regardless of the amount of medical care he is called upon to provide. Thus, a doctor gets the same annual fee for a healthy youngster, perhaps requiring no attention at all, as for an older person who may require a great deal of care.

Each year, the Government earmarks a specific fund for the payment of general practitioners. Payment is based on the total number of doctors in general practice multiplied by the theoretical average income figure of $7,000. Thus, as the number of doctors dwindles, the size of the fund diminishes.

A young family doctor in London says that this system stifles initiative and undermines medical standards. To earn an adequate income, he explains, a doctor must sign up a large number of patients, and is able to devote only 2 or 3 minutes to each patient calling at his office for attention.

With fewer doctors caring for a bigger population, the pressure is building up even more. That's why hundreds of young doctors have joined the exodus from Britain.

SNOWBALL EFFECT

A general breakdown of the National Health Service in the next few years is seen as a distinct danger by Dr. J. R. Seale, a Harvard-trained medical economist in Britain. Dr. Seale predicts that the growing shortage of doctors and the increasing demands for medical care will produce a snowball effect.

General practitioners, most of whom are burdened with a steadily increasing work load, are being forced to give less and less time to their patients. Dr. Seale foresees that, inevitably, more and more people will seek private medical care outside the National Health Service. A growing number of frustrated doctors, he says, can be expected to go into private practice, either full time or part time.

This will aggravate even more the shortage of family doctors on the Government payroll, and reduce the quality of medical care that National Health Service patients can obtain. Therefore, he concludes, there will be a snowball effect that, in a relatively short time, could cause a breakdown of the system.

Only about 600 of Britain's 22,000 physicians now are outside the National Health Service in private practice. A somewhat larger number have a few private patients in addition to National Health Service patients on their lists.

Some top officials here say that, if Britain were starting today from scratch to tackle the problem of medical care, she would not attempt outright nationalization.

"If we had a chance to do it again" one high-ranking official says, "I think that we would favor some form of compulsory medical insurance, supplemented by tax funds, together with subsidies to hospitals to keep down costs. We would also act to limit the cost of drugs. In short, the state would insure that everyone had access to medical care at a reasonable cost, but without nationalizing the entire system and putting all doctors on the Government payroll."

This official adds that President Kennedy's proposal to provide medical care for the aged through the U.S. Social Security System is the first step toward the kind of system that Britain probably would introduce now if there could be a fresh start.

COSTS: UP AND UP

To keep the National Health Service running in the future, Government officials concede privately, will cost a lot more money than is being spent on it now. The cost for 1962 is estimated at $2.3 billion, of which $1.7 billion comes from Government funds. The balance comes mostly from national insurance payments and local taxation.

In addition to more funds from taxes, officials say, more money undoubtedly will have to come from charges passed on to patients. At present, the only charges are 28 cents for a drug prescription and modest fees for spectacles and dentures.

Some experts believe that the only way the system can be preserved is to move away from the original idea of a completely taxpaid medical service and to begin charging patients a nominal fee for every visit to the doctor and modest fees for hospital care.

DRAG ON PROGRESS?

An expert—but nonofficial—view of the kind of medical system Britain should adopt on the basis of the experience of the past 14 years comes from Dr. D. S. Lees, senior lecturer in economics at the University College of North Staffordshire. Dr. Lees recently completed an intensive study of the National Health Service for the Institute of Economic Affairs. He says:

"While from the point of view of the general health of the community the National Health Service has not in any obvious way failed, it has given rise to problems that are * * * increasing in intensity. On the longer view, the most acute danger of the National Health Service is that it will prevent the emergence of more effective methods of medical care.

"Governments should move away from taxation and free service to private insurance and fees by allowing tax concessions to those who can provide for themselves, and direct assistance to the dwindling minority who cannot."

Whatever is done, one thing is clear in Britain: After 14 years of socialized medicine, a growing number of experts are coming to the conclusion that something is wrong with the system—and they are speaking out for the first time.

The alarm bell has been touched off by the realization that Britain is the only advanced industrial nation that is losing many of its best young physicians through emigration at a time when there is an acute shortage of doctors at home.

Tenth Virginia District Questionnaire Replies Tabulated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a tabulation of the votes I have received from the 10th Congressional District of Virginia in response to a questionnaire.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to the lively and keen interest in governmental and civic affairs among voters in Virginia's 10th Congressional District.

Early in January 1962 I distributed my regular biennial questionnaire to some 70,000 households representing about 150,000 registered voters in that 10th District, which I have had the honor of representing in the Congress since it was created in 1952. It includes Alexandria, Falls Church, and Fairfax city, as well as the counties of Arlington and Fairfax.

Amazingly, about 16,000 of the questionnaires were filled out by the recipients and returned to me. This represents about a 23-percent return, an extremely high rate of return, as my colleagues in the House well know. It demonstrates anew the unusual personal interest felt by 10th District voters in the affairs of their Government, and the valuable awareness they have of the acute problems facing the Nation and their community.

Many thousands of those returning the questionnaires even went to the trouble of expanding their views in letters or in comments appended to the questionnaire forms. Together with their responses to the printed questions, these are extremely valuable to me as their Representative in the House.

The following letter accompanied the questionnaire:

JANUARY 1962.

DEAR NEIGHBOR: Midway of my fifth term as your Representative in Congress, I once again seek your opinion on some of the major issues of the day—governmental issues which undoubtedly will arise during the 2d session of the 87th Congress.

Your advice on previous questionnaires has been extremely helpful in fulfilling my responsibilities as your Member of the House of Representatives. Similarly your views on the questions listed on the following pages will enable me to better serve you during the critical year 1962. I hope you will take time at your earliest convenience to answer the questions and return your response to me.

I want also to remind you of my sincere desire to be of service to you in any of your problems with the Federal Government. A letter to me at the Capitol, or a telephone call to CApitol 4-3121, extension 5136, will bring prompt action on my part whenever you need such assistance.

With every good wish, I am,

Sincerely,

JOEL T. BROYHILL,
Member of Congress.

[In percent]

Question	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
FOREIGN AND DEFENSE			
Should we continue to withhold diplomatic recognition from Communist China and to oppose its admission to the United Nations?	79.9	12.0	8.1
Do you favor aid to:			
1. Poland and Yugoslavia?	26.2	61.3	12.5
2. So-called neutralist countries such as India and Indonesia?	41.6	46.9	11.4
3. NATO, SEATO and other pro-Western nations?	83.3	8.8	7.9
Should we maintain a strong stand in defense of West Berlin even if it means use of force?	89.2	5.9	4.9
Should an effective inspection system be a prerequisite to any international disarmament agreement?	94.3	2.2	3.5
Should we exert every effort to win the race to place the first man on the moon despite the tremendous cost?	38.3	47.6	14.1
FISCAL			
Is achievement of a balanced Federal budget important enough so that Government spending on welfare and other nonessential domestic programs should be curtailed while the international situation requires such huge expenditures for defense?	52.6	37.7	9.7
Do you think Congress should permit direct Treasury loans (back-door financing) to provide money for administration programs and thereby give to the Executive the appropriation power specifically placed in Congress by the Constitution?	13.7	74.9	11.4
Do you favor the following points of the Kennedy administration's proposed tax program:			
1. Withholding on dividend and interest payments?	41.3	45.2	13.5
2. Repeal of the existing 4-percent dividend income credit?	26.2	45.6	28.2
3. Low limits on expense account spending?	67.2	17.6	15.2
4. Provide tax credit for businesses increasing their expansion outlays?	61.1	23.6	15.3
5. Tax mutual insurance companies in substantially the same manner as stock companies?	59.8	18.7	21.5
6. Tax mutual savings and loan associations in substantially the same manner as commercial banks?	62.6	18.3	19.1
PRESIDENTIAL POLICIES			
Do you approve of what President Kennedy has done in these fields:			
1. Foreign affairs?	50.0	33.1	16.9
2. Domestic affairs?	42.9	39.2	17.9
DOMESTIC			
In the light of progress now being made, do you think a Federal aid to education program is advisable, in addition to the impacted areas program?	42.9	49.9	7.2
Should employers and employees be compelled to pay additional taxes to provide medical care for social security annuitants regardless of their need or desire?	28.3	62.9	8.8
Should the postal service pay for itself?	77.5	15.5	6.9
Do you favor creation of an Urban Affairs Department, headed by a Secretary with Cabinet rank, to administer housing and other predominantly city programs?	25.9	61.3	12.8
In view of the President's request that the steel industry hold the line on prices, do you think labor should be requested to forgo substantial wage increases?	82.5	10.5	7.0
Do you think military officers should be free to speak their opinions on political issues?	42.6	48.7	8.7
FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT			
(This section to be answered only by Federal employees)			
It is my intention to work strenuously during the coming year for a percentage pay raise for Federal employees. Should this be accompanied by a similar effort for a thorough revision of the basic Federal employee pay schedules?	78.7	10.7	10.5
Which of these proposed changes in the Federal retirement system do you think deserves the highest priority for consideration by Congress? (Please check only 1.)			
1. Full annuity after 30 years service regardless of age	45.7		
2. Full annuity after 25 years service regardless of age	14.2		
3. Reduction from 60 to 55 of the minimum age limit for early retirement without lowering annuity percentage factors	21.5		
4. Increased annual percentage factors for computation of retirement annuities	18.5		
Aside from the retirement system and a pay raise, which of the following Federal employees legislative proposals do you think deserves the most immediate consideration by the Congress? (Please check only 1.)			
1. Increased promotional opportunities across agency lines	47.2		
2. A 35-hour week	17.4		
3. Increased group life insurance benefits	17.2		
4. Increased group health insurance benefits	18.2		
How would you rate the morale of employees in your agency? (Please check only 1.)			
1. Good	40.9		
2. Medium	36.9		
3. Poor	22.1		

The Liberal Papers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following: In conjunction with my remarks which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on this subject on Monday, March 19, I would like to add the following letter. I presume that without the benefit of the Ev and Charlie show, this gentleman would probably never have heard of "The Liberal Papers."

The letter follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROOSEVELT: I have seen in the papers that the Republicans are going to make a major issue out of "The Liberal Papers" which you edited.

It's very sad when a party can't find anything better to use as an issue than free discussion of some controversial questions. Whatever their opinion is on the issues they shouldn't be against free discussion and debate over these questions. I am glad that there are still Congressmen with enough courage to support consideration of controversial questions. I hope that President Kennedy will support and defend you and you colleagues in your stand.

I mourn for the future of democracy in the United States when a "responsible" party uses slander and emotionalism as part of its campaign.

Keep up the fight for free discussion and the rational consideration of all issues. Good luck.

Yours truly,

JOE WEINER.

CHICAGO, ILL.

Government Moves in Against Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I have heretofore discussed the sewer bond issue of the city of Charleston, W. Va., which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 20, 1961, page 19283.

As a follow through on the demonstration of the Government unfairly competing with private enterprise, I am

citing a column by Donald I. Rogers which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on Tuesday, February 20, 1962.

The article follows:

CFA CHARGE REFUTED

(By Donald I. Rogers)

In mid-November this column called attention to dishonest and deliberate intervention by the Federal Government in the private banking industry in a case involving the sale of $4 million worth of sewer bonds by the city of Charleston, W. Va. Since that time, Sidney Woolner, Commissioner of the Community Facilities Administration, has written to my editor accusing me of omission and distortion of fact and deliberately misleading my readers.

Perhaps further study of the case will show that it is the CFA that has distorted the facts.

Seven investment bankers submitted bids competitively on the Charleston sewer bonds. The lowest bidder was First Boston Corp., with a bid of 3.945 percent.

An engineer employed by the CFA, a subsidiary of the House and Home Finance Administration headed by Robert Weaver, then suggested that Charleston apply for a CFA loan for 3⅜ percent, which is not only lower than the First Boston bid, but lower in fact than the Government can borrow the money.

Outside the questionable ethics involved which permits an agency of Government to sabotage the competitive bidding features of the free enterprise banking system, it means that you and I, wherever we live, will be helping to pay for Charleston's sewer bonds though we may never pull the plug in a Charleston bathtub.

Mr. Woolner (who in his letter to my editor refers to me as "your Mr. Rogers" a pomposity which has always annoyed me, since I am nobody's Mr. Rogers (except God's) stated: "Based on past experience, the city had expected bids of 3 or 3¼ percent. Instead, the lowest bid was 3.9453 percent. The city officials were disturbed by the high cost of accepting this low bid."

He adds, "Charleston city officials calculate that the acceptance of the 3.9453 percent bid would have cost the city $879,000 more than a public facility loan. They knew that public reaction would be unfavorable if they disregarded this opportunity to save money for the city. Hence they decided to reject all bids and to make application for a public facility loan."

Let's look at the past experience of Charleston city officials in which the city had expected bids of "3 or 3¼ percent."

The tabulation below shows the past experience on the two preceding issues of Charleston sewer revenue bonds in 1955 and 1957, amount, the maximum maturity, net interest cost and Moodys Baa Municipal Index at the time (Moody's Baa Index is based on bonds with maturities of about 20 years, compared with the best bid on the 1961 issue:

Issue	Date	Maximum maturity (years)	Net interest cost	Moody's Baa Index
$2,000,000..	Mar. 2, 1955	36	3.04973	3.05
1,000,000..	Mar. 4, 1957	36	3.9847	3.96
4,000,000..	July 31, 1961	39	[1] 3.945	3.93

[1] Best bid.

The interest rate expected by the city would be related to the level of interest rates at the time of sale. Charleston's experience indicated that its sewer revenue bonds sold at a net interest cost very close to the Moody Baa Index.

These facts demonstrate that the city of Charleston, based on past experience, on July 31, 1961, expected a rate in the general range of the Moody Baa Index between 3.9 percent and 4 percent, not 3 percent or 3¼ percent as Mr. Woolner states in his letter to my editor. The best bid received on July 31 of 3.945 percent was in line with past experience of this city on its sewer revenue bonds. Furthermore, the financial adviser for the city was prepared to advise the city to accept that bid until the representative of the CFA let it be known that his agency would provide the loan at a lower rate.

So it seems to me Mr. Woolner is wrong.

Let's take a look at more of his letter to my editor. He says, "The final chapter in this story indicates how far off base were Mr. Rogers' charges against CFA. The application for a public facility loan was approved since it met all the requirements of the law. In accordance with CFA regulations, the bonds were offered to private bidders. The bids were opened on November 20.

"In accordance with CFA's requirements, the first 10 years of maturities were sold privately for 2.93 percent and the second 10-year bloc for 3.621 percent. CFA took only the last 19 years at its 3⅜-percent rate."

Mr. Woolner omitted to mention that the first 20 maturities which subsequently were sold privately aggregated only $485,000 and that the CFA provided the balance of $3,515,000 in a Federal loan.

Most important, Mr. Woolner, in his letter, referred to the interest rate charged on CFA loans, but made no reference to the requirement in the law authorizing the CFA program that no loan shall be made "unless the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available on reasonable terms." The basic criticism of CFA policy which I made in my original column and which I reiterate at this time is that they have established a "reasonable rate" so low that it is completely out of line with current market rates and accordingly make eligible for Federal loans under the program a substantial amount of municipal financing which could readily be provided from other sources at reasonable rates.

A study of all new sales of new issues of municipal bonds during the 6-month period, January through June 1961, involving 2,882 issues aggregating $4.2 billion, indicates that, measured by the present CFA "reasonable" rate, the following amount of financing was done on "unreasonable" terms: 25.2 percent by number of issues or 14.3 percent by value of issues maturing in 1 to 20 years; 42.1 percent by number of issues or 37.8 percent by value of issues maturing in 21 to 25 years; 48 percent by number of issues, or 31.7 percent by value of issues maturing 26 years and over.

Thus clearly the CFA rate, which would consider "unreasonable" such a large percentage of the financing which was actually done last year, is far too low in relation to current market rates. Mr. Woolner concludes his letter: "Your Mr. Rogers is entitled, of course, to take a position in opposition to a program by which the Federal Government helps areas of chronic unemployment in their redevelopment efforts with low-interest loans for public facilities. If this is an issue in the minds of some people, we are glad to have it debated as long as the facts of the matter are fairly presented."

All right, Mr. Woolner. It is an issue in the minds of some people who are not unmindful of the fact that West Virginia's was the first primary to indorse Mr. Kennedy and that perhaps some tribute is due that State. The facts now have been fairly presented. The debate is up to you.

Optimists Honor Teenager of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, our society too often fails to pay tribute to the great majority of American youth so engrossed are we with the tiny minority which fails in the bracket of juvenile delinquent. It gives me pleasure, therefore, and it seems to me to be in the interest of building better citizenship to note here the activity of the Dallas County Optimist Clubs which annually name the teenager of the year. At the same time I join in the tribute to the choice for this year, an outstanding young man from Dallas, Ronnie Kidd. I am especially proud to join in applauding Ronnie's achievement as I am somewhat familiar with the character and fine qualities which have earned him this recognition as he is a fellow student in the high school which my own daughter attends. In my opinion, Ronnie exemplifies the finest qualities of most of the students of Bryan Adams High School in Dallas as well as the other fine schools in our city and, indeed, throughout the Nation. I believe Ronnie Kidd represents the majority of American teenagers and I think it is time we paid more attention to that vast army of young American boys and girls instead of wasting so much time coddling the hoodlums, the misfits, the ragged end who, though few in number, monopolize the columns of our daily press with their misdeeds.

I think the Optimist Clubs may be doing more for the future of America in encouraging the Ronnie Kidds of our country than those whose main concern seems to be that we do not inhibit the outlaws and the misfits.

Under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial:

TEENAGER OF YEAR

Teenagers have come in for both praise and blame in recent years and probably will continue to do so.

At the same time, though, there are civic groups and individuals making every effort to help assure the development of teenagers into good citizens and leaders in their communities.

Last week Ronnie Kidd, a 17-year-old Bryan Adams High School senior, was named Dallas County Teenager of the Year by the Dallas County Optimist Clubs. He received the Troy Post $2,000 college scholarship award at a luncheon, where he was honored along with 11 other 1961 Teenagers of the Month.

It was tough competition. Curtis Lynum, special agent in charge of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in Dallas, outlined these qualities or common denominators of the 12 candidates for the annual honor: Good physical health, emotional security, adequate duties to occupy their time, self-control, broad social horizons, and religious training.

The Teenager of the Year award sponsored by the Optimists is an effort not only to see that teenagers stay out of trouble but also that they have the opportunity—and incentive—to become better citizens in the future.

Address by Hon. James H. J. Tate, Mayor of Philadelphia, Pa., at Induction Ceremony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the city of Philadelphia on February 13 installed a new mayor after the resignation of Mayor Richardson Dilworth, who served our city for a period of 6 years. The chief executive, who resigned to be a candidate for the post of Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, was a great administrator and executive, dedicated to the development of Philadelphia and interested in all the cities of our Nation.

Mayor Dilworth was succeeded by the Honorable James H. J. Tate, president of the city council, who guided the destiny of Philadelphia for many years in the legislative body, so that he raised its present status, in cooperation with the former mayor, to one of the greatest cities in the United States.

Great progress was made after the new charter was adopted, by the Honorable JOSEPH S. CLARK, Jr., the first mayor under the new charter and now the senior Senator from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. He and his successor, Richardson Dilworth, moved the city from complacency to leadership in our country. I know that Mayor Tate will continue the wonderful spirit of progress and will lead our city to even greater heights.

On the morning of his installation Mayor Tate delivered a talk at the induction ceremonies which presents a program designed to bring success and harmony to the people of our great city. Because of its extraordinary content and its brevity, I am including below his remarks so that Members of Congress will have an opportunity to read them:

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES H. J. TATE, MAYOR OF PHILADELPHIA, AT INDUCTION CEREMONY, FEBRUARY 13, 1962

Today is more than a day of change. It is a day of quiet rededication. In a democratic society, a change of leadership is not nearly so dramatic as in a totalitarian society. But it is more significant, because it is voluntary, and because both leaders reached that position by the choice of the people. Having served the people well, one set of devoted hands relinquishes the torch and it is firmly taken by another. The source of power does not change—the objectives do not change. The new leadership must pursue the same common goal—in this case the best interests of all of the people of Philadelphia.

Those interests demand that we—all of us—use this occasion to take stock as it were. We must evaluate the past and plan for the future. We can do both with pride and with confidence.

The proud accomplishments of Philadelphia in the past 10 years rise all around us. They remind us that Philadelphia has, during those years, experienced a tremendous renewal—a virtual renaissance—which has made it the first city of our Nation in both intelligent planning and in energetic accomplishment.

This has come about because we have had a rare combination of outstanding executives, legislators, and administrators in the city government, plus the unique genius of an alert and vigorous citizenry. We see today the fruits of the united efforts of government, labor, industry, finance, education, and every other walk of life. We have made common cause and we in Philadelphia have met the problems of our times.

In this moment of somewhat formal leave-taking from one area of responsibility to another, I pledge, with all of you, that Philadelphia's renaissance shall continue. Our dedication here—yours and mine—must be directed earnestly to an objective of solid growth built upon solid growth—well executed enterprise erected upon well conceived enterprise. Our growth is manifested by an increase alone in our real estate valuation from $3 billion to $4 billion in 10 years. In building and rebuilding with this continued renaissance of this great city, I believe we can go to $6 billion in valuation in the next 10 years.

Upon the solid achievements of the past, we shall project further growth in every possible way. While continuing to expand our material facilities we shall hold fast to those God-given moral and spiritual values, which all of us cherish, the most valued of which is liberty.

We in Philadelphia know much about liberty, for it was here that liberty was born in America. We know full well, therefore, that liberty is the source of our strenth and vitality.

Personally, I can look back with many of you here present and take great satisfaction in what our joint effort has helped to bring into being. You, my colleagues in city council, are among my most valued friends. These good years here with you should prove invaluable in this new position of trust. Here, more than anywhere else, we feel the pulse of the public, and I do not propose to lose that common touch.

Indeed, a mayor cannot be an effective leader of the people unless he knows and understands the people. That knowledge and understanding are the sources of his strength, and the connection to that source—that vital "power cable"—is in a sense that short distance between these chambers, where the people are so faithfully represented, and the mayor's office downstairs where your ordinances for the people's benefit are carried out. I shall use that cable to solicit your support for our program, to come back here to report progress and to keep the old ties continually alive. You'll hear more from me again about our program and our plans.

We cannot, of course, afford the luxury of complacency. Complacency means downfall—the downfall of ideals and the downfall of program. I, therefore, call upon the city council, the executives of city government, public servants in all positions, citizen groups of all kinds, regardless of political party, indeed all of the men and women of Philadelphia, as well as myself, to rededicate ourselves here and now to vigilant and unselfish effort. The usual tendency is to be satisfied with things as they are. This tendency is a strong thing and a dangerous thing. Together, however, in the teamwork of unselfishness, we can rise above this human failing and concentrate on, and I repeat it—solid growth built upon solid growth.

I think all of you know that I depart from these chambers with mixed emotions. In this energetic and wholesome forum, I have spent many a fruitful year—years which will prove not only valuable for their memories, but years that will serve as a spur to redoubled effort. Here in democratic conclave, we have seen clearly both the problem and the prize—the prize of an even greater Philadelphia.

This, as you know, has been the goal of my party, the Democratic Party. We have sought this goal earnestly in the demanding career of public service, a service that jealously demands the best part of a man—his strength, his intelligence, uncounted hours of his best work and, of course, his complete allegiance to his government.

These past 10 years have been good for all of us. The associations made here are the kind that any man would feel privileged to have made and reluctant to leave. The change is made less difficult, however, by the sure knowledge that we shall hopefully continue to work together as a team with understanding and cooperation. As good friends, we know each other's values and faults, too. The city government will, I am sure, be the better because of this good will and understanding cooperation in a common cause.

There seems to be little more to say at the moment. I enter upon this new responsibility in all humility and with good will toward all. I shall try to be the kind of mayor that the wonderful people of Philadelphia deserve. Only God knows what awaits this city which William Penn founded to give men an opportunity to be free, to hold their heads high in honor and to work out for themselves and their families some measure of happiness in this passing world.

All we can do here, and in the office downstairs, is to find the true North of integrity, take up the burdens of office with resolution, and follow the path of righteousness with dignity and devotion to the people's wishes.

In a few moments, I shall leave these chambers which have come to mean so much to me. Before I do, I again pledge myself to unselfish service to the people of Philadelphia and the ideals—the magnificent ideals of their city—your city and my city. I earnestly and sincerely request a similar dedication from all of you—my very good friends. In such a covenant, with God's help, our city's future welfare and progress will be assured.

An Enemy of the People?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith an excellent editorial by Mr. Scott Lamb in Oregon Agriculture.

The editorial follows:

AN ENEMY OF THE PEOPLE?

Secretary Freeman's newest proposals to control agriculture with an iron hand makes one wonder if the efficient production of American agriculture has not landed the farmer in the same category as Ibsen's doctor who protected the villagers and became an enemy of the people for driving away business from the spas.

Agriculture has proved to be tremendously efficient in a world that knows mostly inefficiency, strikes, low production quotas, and starving millions. The Secretary has turned a deaf ear to the farm bureau proposal of voluntary adjustments, which would leave the farmers' freedom intact. Instead he seeks greater Government control at a greater Government cost to bludgeon the farmer into a cowering passiveness in return for a few vastly inflated dollars.

According to an Associated Press story in the February 20 Oregonian, Freeman is quoted as telling the House Agricultural Committee that he proposes jail sentences for farmers who do not keep proper records under the wheat program. This, he said, would strengthen the program. Chairman COOLEY of the House committee said another section of the farm bill would give the Government a "blackjack" to make sure farmers approve the crop control programs.

No word or combination of words is strong enough to denounce such a proposed program. The very suggestion that farmers could be bludgeoned into accepting a dictatorial law subserving them inevitably to peasantry is completely obnoxious. The sly hint government propaganda which implies the administrators will take from the rich and give to the poor should be warning enough to all people in agriculture. The failure of the radical left to acknowledge voluntary programs exist which would do everything the mandatory program would do plus leave freedom intact should alert people to the direction of the social movement.

When an elected government official can talk in terms of "blackjacking" the people into bowing to a conniving program designed to curb efficiency in work and to reduce output as a qualifying factor for reward * * * there is something drastically wrong.

It is a patent fact of history that men have the opportunity to vote for oppression but not for freedom. Once freedom is gone, the road back is paved with blood and deprivation. And it is a patent fact, too, that the solid ground of freedom lies in the hands of the Nation's agriculturalists. To declare them an enemy of the people when they are feeding and clothing the masses of the world is hardly grounds for blackjacking.

Agriculture can and will adjust to production if given the opportunity and the freedom to make decisions affecting their welfare. Political farm programs will never get the job done so long as they are predicated on the use of force and coercion as a guide to prosperity.

Address by the Honorable Matt S. Szymczak Before the Savings Banks Trust Co., January 17, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following remarks of the Honorable Matt S. Szymczak, a consultant to the C. J. Devine Co., of New York, a professorial lecturer in economics at Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., and a former member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Governor Szymczak discussed in detail the factors presently influencing our economy and predicts a bright economic future—a prediction in which I heartily concur.

The speech follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. MATT S. SZYMCZAK

It is a great pleasure to be in your company today. It is also very pleasant to be called upon to talk about matters economic at a time when things are looking up almost everywhere in the economy and there is good reason to expect fair weather to continue for many months to come. A few trouble spots, to be sure, still remain, and no easy or quick solution is in sight: unemployment has finally begun to decline from its level of a little below 7 percent where for so many months it seemed to be helplessly stuck; but at 6.1 percent it is still much higher than what is compatible with a really prosperous economy.

And particularly distressing is the fact that it is concentrated in certain declining industries and trades, and in certain depressed areas where it takes the human form of people out of work for months and years, with so little prospect of betterment until those people can be retrained and integrated into other parts of the economy. Nor is immediate relief in sight for the balance-of-payments problem where the administration has endeavored—rightly, I believe—to gain time, through various foreign exchange measures and arrangements with other countries, in order to set in motion basic long-term improvements in our trade position by encouraging expanded exports, earnings from foreign tourists to the United States, a fairer distribution among Western countries of the defense expenditures abroad and foreign aid to economically developing countries, and so forth.

Once again, there appear to be good grounds to expect that those measures will in due course be successful in decisively improving our payments balance; but in the immediate future I think we must expect to see our improving domestic business spill over into a further rise in imports and a continuing payments deficit, though, we must hope, of less serious proportions. But apart from those two problems, the prospect is pleasing: production continues to rise, retail sales have recently begun to move forward again; but perhaps best of all, this recovery has so far taken the form of a steady, healthy advance with no signs of degenerating into a feverish boom; as a consequence, most business cycle experts now expect many more months of a long and soundly based upward climb and certainly not a quick succession of boom and bust.

But let me turn to the specific topic that is of more direct concern to you: you have asked me to give you my thoughts on the role of savings banks in the decade of the sixties. I will do my best. It scarcely seems necessary to warn you that the best forecasts—like the best laid plans—can go awry; any number of things may happen in the field of politics, economics, technology to affect or even completely change the course of events. Yet, barring a nuclear catastrophe, one is perhaps on safer ground discerning and describing the shape of things to come over the longer run than in predicting cyclical ups and downs over the next 18 months.

Let me start with a flat statement: In the years to come, the importance to the economy of savings banks and indeed of all intermediaries which collect and channel personal savings will enormously increase. Yet it will be a different aspect of the role of savings institutions that will be most important from the viewpoint of the national economy. By facilitating and safeguarding the small man's savings and thus encouraging individual thrift, savings banks have, of course, fulfilled a highly valuable social function for almost 150 years. Equally important over the last 20 years, however, was the economic function which savings institutions fulfilled coincidentally: by encouraging thrift to hold down consumer spending and thus moderate inflationary pressure on an economy extended by the demands of war, reconversion and reconstruction at home and abroad, foreign aid and the cold war. In those 20 years of unavoidable high liquidity, providing funds was not crucial; helping to siphon off purchasing power that otherwise might have further swelled consumer spending was what mattered most.

The basic economic problems of the 40's and 50's, excessive liquidity and often inadequate industrial capacity, appear to be just about solved today; excess liquidity has been progressively mopped up over the past 10 years, and the boom from 1955 to 1957 finally created reserve capacity in most industries. In these altered circumstances, the emphasis in the 60's will, in my opinion, shift to the problem of modernization of plant and equipment, in order to speed up economic growth at home and to make American exports more competitive internationally. In these altered circumstances, there will also be a shift of emphasis in the economic role of savings institutions away from the essentially negative function of siphoning off purchasing power to the more positive function of mobilizing savings to provide the funds for investment in modernization and growth.

That there will be plentiful outlets for any funds which savings banks can provide is thus hardly open to doubt. Whether monetary conditions will be relatively tighter or relatively easier in the months and years before us, the excessive liquidity of the forties and early fifties will, in my opinion, not recur. The demand for loanable funds will be heavy; for in addition to the requirements of industry, the need for new construction, both residential and commercial, must surely grow; in particular, let me remind you that what we used to call the war babies are now entering the labor market and will be forming families at an unprecedented rate; not to mention the many projects of urban renewal. And who can doubt that here savings banks, along with other institutions in the mortgage market, will have a crucial part to play?

No need, then to worry unduly about the use of funds; but will the funds be forthcoming from the millions of savers?

I believe they will; but such belief is, of course, predicated on the expectation that two conditions can be satisfied: that savings banks can attract enough savings in competition with other deposit-creating institutions; and that, on a larger view, savers will see a future in fixed-interest investments. To deal with the first point, it is, of course, impossible to say to what extent depositors in savings banks have in the past been motivated by a sense of loyalty to, and familiarity with, these old-established institutions, and to what extent they have been attracted by the interest rate differential over savings deposits at commercial banks. Something of a test will come now that commercial banks are permitted to offer 4 percent on long-term savings deposits. Nobody can doubt that this interest rate question will be a doubly delicate problem for savings banks as well as savings and loan associations for some time to come. On the one hand, it is difficult to predict how serious is the threat from a 4-percent rate on commercial banks savings deposits.

And on the other hand, the authorities have made it clear that they will endeavor to keep mortgage rates from rising very much; in these circumstances, savings institutions would not want to raise deposit rates very much above present levels even if they should be free to do so. This, it seems to me, will be the problem that needs watching.

There remains the larger question: will savers be prepared in the years to come to invest a substantial part of their funds in fixed-interest bearing assets? The answer will largely depend on successful efforts to prevent price inflation. Inflation tends to discourage investment in bonds and savings deposits in two ways: quite rationally stocks and other appreciating assets are looked upon as a useful hedge against inflation. But a

more subtle influence is at work as well: a long period of inflation creates a mentality of its own and gradually erodes the habit of thrift.

So we are back to one of the overriding economic problems of the past 15 years: can price inflation be brought and kept under control? I do think so; I believe the prospects of finally achieving reasonable price stability look better today than they have for a very long time. You are no doubt familiar with the recent debate as to whether the postwar inflation was due to old-fashioned excess demand or whether we were confronting a rather new phenomenon, cost inflation.

The issue is by no means yet resolved. But much of the evidence would seem to suggest that both factors contributed to the long price rise: Some of the blame must clearly be placed on high wage demands and administered prices; on the other hand, it is also true that these influences gained much of their initial momentum from an environment of unsatisfied consumer demand, high investment requirements, continuing national security needs, all supported by extraordinary liquidity—in brief, a seller's market. It is quite possible that cost inflation would have bedeviled us even in the absence of those pressures of strong aggregate demand; but in that case prices would very likely have increased at a more leisurely pace.

Of course, once inflation got going, the wage-price spiral acquired a momentum of its own; inflationary expectations were set up which in turn induced higher wage demands and steeper price increases than might otherwise have been the case.

What I am trying to say is that inflation became in part a matter of anticipations and thus to some extent self-perpetuating. This vicious circle had to be broken; but it could be effectively broken only after the underlying real pressures—pentup demand, inadequate capacity, excessive liquidity—had been relieved. This, I believe, has now been accomplished. And with these underlying inflationary pressures removed, I expect to see price inflation become ever more moderate, especially if we can now persuade business and labor to exercise self-restraint at this crucial juncture.

Already, wholesale prices have become practically stable, and most economists predict a rise in the cost of living index of no more than 1 percent, for 1962. And just so psychologically, inflation tended to feed on itself, so a progressive slowing down of price inflation, once the public has become fully conscious of it, can be expected to set up its own psychological braking effect.

In this new phase of our postwar economic history, we members of the financial community have a special responsibility. Relative price stability is finally within reach. But other economic clouds have risen over the horizon—concern with the balance of payments, a sluggish rate of growth, and persistent unemployment—likely to be complicated by further progress in automation and the unusually high number of young people entering the labor market, not to mention the impact of the European economic community. In these altered circumstances we need a different and much more complex public policy, a policy carefully poised between the demands of price stability and the need for flexibility to maintain high employment and foster a higher growth rate. Such a policy requires close following of economic and financial trends; it requires high skill in the Federal Reserve, the Treasury and among the other advisers of the President; and last but not least, it also requires full understanding and intelligent support from public opinion.

I want to emphasize the last point in particular, for it could be of crucial importance in the next several months and years. What I am above all concerned with is maximum flexibility—flexibility in our thinking as well as flexibility in the policies and in the policy instruments at the disposal of the authorities. Let me try to illustrate my point at least in part. We are in the habit of looking at the Federal budget—whether it is balanced, in deficit or in surplus—as a shorthand indicator of Government's fiscal policy; and we expect to see the budget balanced, at least in normal times. By insisting on such balance we are enforcing on the Government a useful discipline to keep expenditures from getting out of control.

But we must beware of becoming rigid in our attitudes. For one thing, the Government must be able to use fiscal policy as a countercyclical tool when necessary. Here I agree with the report of the Commission on Money and Credit which last year recommended that "Congress grant to the President limited conditional power to make temporary countercyclical adjustments in the first bracket of the personal income tax," subject to certain qualifications and safeguards.

A balanced budget seems the proper policy for the present state of the economy, barring of course a national emergency and it is right that public opinion should be concerned with at least a rough balance as a means of insuring economy in Government. But let us not fall into the error of inflexibly and mechanically insisting on a balanced budget under any and all circumstances, regardless of boom or recession. A balanced budget should not be looked upon as an end in itself, but as a means to insure economy and a flexible fiscal instrument to deal with economic conditions. Flexibility in fiscal policy is very important to the economy.

There is still another area in which lack of public understanding might hamstring the authorities in their monetary and fiscal policy: as the present economic recovery gathers force, interest rates will tend to rise. But we must not regard official willingness to let interest rates rise steeply in order to restrain potential inflationary pressures as test of their financial probity. Such a simple conditioned reflex would be natural and out of place. For in dealing with cyclical developments, the administration and the Federal Reserve will want to weigh carefully the competing claims of economic growth and of the balance of payments in determining the burden that can be carried by monetary policy; they may well conclude that more weight should be put on fiscal policy while interest rates can safely be permitted to vary only within a narrower range than in recent years.

These and other similar issues will continue to give rise to lively debates. It is here that we members of the financial community have a high responsibility to educate and lead public opinion in understanding the complex task of our monetary and fiscal managers. Failure to lend them our support may well lead to the very evil we fear: renewed inflation. Once before, in the thirties, clinging to orthodox maxims prevented early and effective measures against the depression. After that tragic experience, it was not surprising that fear of mass unemployment became burned into public consciousness. And for that we paid a heavy price: we continued to fear and fight depression long after the danger was past and the opposite problem, inflation, cried out to be dealt with. It took more than a decade of inflation to slowly overcome an almost obsessive preoccupation with full employment policy.

Let us be sure that we do not make the same mistake twice. If we were to cling once more to mechanical and inflexible formulas, we would seriously hamstring the Administration and the Federal Reserve in pursuing a flexible fiscal and monetary policy. Yet such a flexibile policy is more than ever needed to deal with persistent unemployment and sluggish growth. Failure to deal with those very real problems would surely lead to a public reaction, and the pendulum might once again swing to a peroccupation with full employment and really inflationary policies.

My message is really simple: We bankers and other members of the financial community are vitally interested in economic and financial stability. Our monetary and fiscal authorities are engaged in a highly sophisticated operation to achieve that stability. They need public understanding and support. As members of the public in a position to be informed we must give a lead to public opinion. Our professional interest lies there, but more than that, we will be discharging our duty in the public interest, and thus give further assurance that our capitalistic-democratic system not only can but will survive and thrive.

Anniversary of Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday, March 25, as every year on this date, Americans of Byelorussian origin and their kinsmen in other free countries will observe the 44th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. On this eventful day 44 years ago the Byelorussians established a free republic with high hopes that their nation had at last gained its freedom and independence.

Unfortunately, their freedom was shortlived. A short time later it was destroyed by Moscow, and the Byelorussian people became one of the captive nations suffering under the tyrannical yoke of communism. Although the Byelorussian people have known no freedom in more than four decades, the spark of freedom and their desire for independence has never died out.

This quest for freedom must be kept alive and vibrant in the hearts of the Byelorussian people, just as we are endeavoring to keep it alive and give hope to all other captive nations of Eastern Europe. In these dark days of a world yearning for true peace and freedom, it is urgent that all of these peoples must not despair or think that they have been forgotten by the rest of the world. To do so would be suicidal for them and a great loss for the free world.

We must continue to exert all possible pressure and to focus the spotlight of world attention on their desperate situation in order to encourage them and to help them survive their ordeal. In a showdown with communism, there is no doubt in my mind that these captive nations would render a great service to the cause of democracy.

I extend greetings on this day to all Americans of Byelorussian descent and join with them in prayer for the early liberation of their ancestral homeland and their kinsmen who live there.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, once again the anniversary of Byelorussian Independence Day is at hand. March 25 marks the date 44 years ago that this gifted and gallant people, after centuries of work and hope, realized their goal of independence.

Of ancient heritage, the Byelorussians have shared the miseries and misfortunes of other East European peoples. Being relatively less numerous—barely 10 million—than their powerful neighbors, they were long subjected to oppressive rule.

Their modern history is almost totally overshadowed because during nearly all that time their country—east of Poland and west of Moscow—was part of Russia's czarist empire.

But these sturdy descendants of their stout-hearted forebears, always aware of their own history as a nation, were never willing to forgo and forget their distinct identity. They have always yearned for their freedom and independence. For centuries they struggled for their national goal and patiently waited for the opportune moment. At last that moment came in 1918.

The Russian Revolution of 1917 resulted in the overthrow of their rulers and freedom for many subject peoples. With the Communists in control, it is obvious, however, that this freedom was destined to be tragically short-lived.

For the time being, freedom reigned from the Baltics to the Caucasus. Many national groups asserted their freedom and independence. The Byelorussians did this early in 1918, by proclaiming the establishment of the Byelorussian National Republic on March 25, 1918.

It was then hoped that these 10 million Byelorussians, having attained their independence in their historic homeland, would be allowed to enjoy their freedom in peace. Unfortunately that was not to be; they were destined to enjoy peace and freedom for only a short time, and then suffer even more under the tyrannical yoke and blood-stained hands of the Communists.

Early in 1921 Communist forces attacked and overran Byelorussia, putting an end to the Byelorussian National Republic. Since then, for 41 years the country has been part of the U.S.S.R., working for the benefit of its Soviet rulers.

The people, however, have not given up their hope for their freedom. Even in the face of the ruthless tyranny of communism they continue their struggle for liberty. It is the wish of many that these people may one day free themselves from Communist totalitarian tyranny and enjoy the blessings of freedom in their historic homeland.

Intelligence and Leadership—Broadcasting's Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, a recent address by the Honorable Newton N. Minow, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, before the National Association of Broadcasters on March 1, 1962, has elicited considerable favorable comment. I believe my colleagues will find his remarks of interest.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY NEWTON N. MINOW, CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION BEFORE THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS, PUBLIC AFFAIRS/EDITORIALIZING CONFERENCE, SHOREHAM HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 1, 1962

You have honored me greatly by asking me to contribute to this Volume I, Number I Conference on Public Affairs and Editorializing. This could be one of the really important conferences held by the broadcasting industry. For you gentlemen have it within your power—quite literally—to strike a blow for liberty.

I want to talk today about broadcasting's inescapable duty to make its voice ring with intelligence and leadership.

A cardinal article of faith in a free society is, to use the words of Judge Learned Hand, "the dissemination of news from as many different sources, and with as many different facets and colors as is possible."

This was never more true than now, when the world orbits somewhere between global war and global peace. As President Kennedy once said:

"Freedom and security are but opposite sides of the same coin—and the free expression of ideas is not more expendable but far more essential in a period of challenge and crisis. I am not so much concerned about the right of everyone to say anything he pleases as I am about our need as a self-governing people to hear everything relevant * * *

"We need to receive reports from all parts of the world; to know the facts in all agencies of the Government. We need to be able to go everywhere we can get in, and to see things for ourselves. We need to keep our doors open to visitors from around the world. Above all, we must keep our minds open to criticism and to new ideas—to dissent and alternatives—to reconsideration and reflection.

"Only in this way can we as a self-governing people choose wisely and thoughtfully in our task of self-government. And it is only in this way that we can demonstrate once again that freedom is the handmaiden of security—and that the truth will make us free."

President Kennedy said that in 1959. It has even more application in 1962. For these are the days we wake up to find the course of our lives affected by men whose names we can't pronounce, acting in countries that didn't exist the day before yesterday. Now, as never before, we need more news—not less; more voices—not less; more sources of information—not less; more viewpoints and opinions—not less.

Above all, we desperately need insight to find our proper way through the staggering flow of developments which mark our time. In his remarkable book, "The Future as History," Robert Heilbroner identifies our century as the first to be catapulted from the relatively stable sense of the past into the troubling and insecure sense of the future.

Yet it has been wisely observed that mankind's saving grace may be just this: That our technical capacity for mass communications has kept pace with our mastery of the means of mass destruction.

It is up to you, the American broadcaster, to translate the technical capacity for mass communication into actual performance. It is up to you to fulfill the country's need for many voices, many sources of information, and many viewpoints.

The plain and unhappy fact is that our traditional avenues of communication are contracting, not expanding. We are witnessing an odd, and distressing phenomenon. The population is increasing at an explosive rate; the big cities are now metropolitan areas; and suburbs are spreading like ink spilled on a blotter. But, in the eye of this hurricane, the number of metropolitan newspapers which traditionally have served our people is decreasing.

The population and newspaper birthrates are moving in opposite directions—more people, fewer printed sources of information. Some of the most startling social statistics I know are that since 1945 the daily newspaper circulation has increased from 40 million to 60 million while, in the same time period, the number of cities with dailies under competing ownership has decreased from 117 to 60. Today in America there are just slightly more than 1,440 cities with daily newspapers—but there are only 60 cities with competing papers. The others are either one-newspaper towns or cities with several newspapers under the same ownership.

This transformation is not peculiar to the United States, nor is the concern about the shrinkage in the traditional sources of communication confined to this country. Take, for example, this comment printed recently in the London Times literary supplement:

"Today, the public to which information and entertainment are purveyed is increasing even as the number of bodies and individuals who control the organs of distribution is diminishing, so that fewer and fewer persons decide in effect what larger and larger masses shall hear and see and read."

This would be the situation, this would be the shape of the future if there were no broadcasting industry. But when we turn to the newest of the media of communication these are the social statistics we find:

In 1945, there were 965 AM and FM radio stations on the air and 6 television stations. Now there are 4,874 AM and FM radio stations, 543 commercial television stations, and 62 noncommercial television stations. More than that, there is the entire 70-channel UHF television band waiting to be used, and the possibilities of FM radio are only now beginning to bear fruit. And to protect the public interest, we have rules which restrict the number of stations any one individual or group can own, so that we have an effective bar against concentration.

The arrival of radio and television are something almost providential in this age when, as Fred Friendly has observed, "What the American people don't know can kill them."

And I believe it to be a matter of urgent national importance that radio and television reach out increasingly for their greatest potential—for broadcasting opens up a

dimension in communications which the more traditional processes of the printed word cannot achieve.

Today in America more people depend on radio and television for news and the background of the news than on any other medium of communication. No other medium gives us such a compelling sense of participation in the awesome events that mark our every hour. No other medium leaves millions of Americans so intent upon catching every important word. From the very beginning, broadcasting was exciting because it was news. And it arrived on the American scene almost overnight.

In 1917, it took several weeks before some remote areas of the country learned we had declared war. Seven years later, an estimated 10 million listeners heard the returns when Calvin Coolidge was elected.

Just think of the events that broadcasting has made part of our lives—the first inauguration of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the abdication of Edward VIII, the Munich crisis and "peace in our time," the "day that will live in infamy," the Battle of Britain and the voice of Edward R. Murrow, V-E and V-J days, the cold war that turned hot in Korea, the political conventions, the Kefauver and McClellan hearings, the great debates of 1960, and—around the world—the flights of the astronauts. Every American within range of a radio or television set participated intimately in Colonel Glenn's thrilling encounter of human courage, science, and space.

Along with this direct participation in history, we are now the beneficiaries of a complementary development—the documentary program.

Most of the important issues that affect our lives develop over a period of days, and even weeks and months, and they may develop in places all over the country or the world. The job of reporting is inadequate and incomplete until the jigsaw pieces of news are put together. That is the job being done with such distinction in the NBC "White Papers," the "CBS Reports," and the ABC "Closeups." The viewer in the past year has been offered programs with insight into the declining railroad industry, the Peace Corps, segregation, the imminent world water shortage, the state of civil defense, the intricacies of automation, the problem of student dropout in the public schools, and life in Red China.

The underlying issues are often highly controversial. Indeed one definition of "issue" is that it is "a point in question between contending parties"—and it is to the industry's everlasting credit that it has faced some issues head on.

Every broadcaster has gained in stature from these programs—as witness this comment by Jack Gould of the New York Times:

"With journalistic TV the behavior of the industry has virtually attained ideal standards. The management of the networks do not wait for popularity polls to tell them what to do but on their own initiative and judgment exercise exciting leadership. Enlightened sponsors are observing a separation of programing and advertising functions. These creative craftsmen in journalistic TV are receiving their head and wading into controversial issues with growing skill and resourcefulness in the use of word and picture."

You can take great pride in this achievement. Broadcasting has traveled a long distance since that disastrous day in 1935 when Alexander Woollcott's "Town Crier" was tossed off the air because a sponsor complained that Mr. Woollcott had criticized Hitler and Mussolini, and might thus offend some listeners.

Mr. Woollcott was found guilty of editorializing—and now, 27 years later—what broadcaster would not be proud to have similar guilt on his record?

The time has come at this conference to find ways and means to follow this illustrious example.

Radio and television have often demonstrated their power as a source of news and the background of the news.

But that's only half the mission of communications.

If broadcasting is to take its rightful place in the communications firmament—if it is to become a force as well as a service—if it is to accept the responsibilities as well as the protections of the first amendment—then broadcasting should be willing to express a point of view about the news it provides.

You may recall that last May, Governor Collins told the NAB:

"The reason—the only reason—the print media are regarded with the esteem they enjoy is that the best of them do more than transmit information and entertainment; they take sides. They editorialize. They aggressively seek to participate in shaping the society in which they exist. They are not content to be passive observers and mere sterile messengers * * *.

"If radio and TV broadcasters are to achieve full stature, stations must begin editorializing on a widespread basis * * *. Some stations feel they cannot afford to editorialize. In the present climate, I contend they cannot afford not to editorialize."

Governor Collins speaks of the present climate. Let me frankly acknowledge there was a period when the climate was not favorable to editorializing. In 1941, in the Mayflower decision, the industry was told by the FCC that "the broadcaster cannot be an advocate."

The question was opened up again in the late 1940's, leading to the 1949 Report on Editorializing. The Commission decided then that, while a broadcasting station cannot simply be the broadcaster's private mouthpiece, the broadcaster has as much right to express his views as any other member of the public—and is often much better prepared to do so than others.

That was the green light. A small number of stations saw it blinking and took off. Each year a few more gingerly start moving. But the majority still are negative or undecided. One estimate is that today, 13 years after the green light, only about one-third of the broadcasters are exercising either their rights or their courage.

But, even so, we are in the beginning of a movement that has profound implications. Broadcasters are no longer simply purveyors of news and entertainment. They are becoming journalists. It's all new and there are many difficulties. I do not pretend that achieving fairness is a simple matter. Nor do I mislead you by saying that the FCC is not concerned with your meeting of your responsibilities.

The key issue today (as it was in 1949) is the relationship between editorial expression and the affirmative obligation of the licensee to insure a fair and reasonable opportunity for the presentation of opposing views over his facilities.

Since the development of an informed public opinion is our objective, we have consistently held that some allotment of time must be made to news and programs devoted to a discussion of public issues. In such allotment of time, there must be overall fairness through the expression of contrasting views of all responsible elements—with the licensee playing a "conscious and positive role" in achieving a balanced presentation. It is against this background that licensee editorialization serves the public interest. The broadcaster has the opportunity to express his own views as part of an overall presentation of varying opinions on controversial issues.

It is not only the licensee's freedom of speech that we are anxious to protect. It is the right of the public to be informed—and at the same time to maintain radio and television as a medium of freedom of speech and freedom of expression for the people of the Nation as a whole. As the 1949 report states: "The most significant meaning of freedom of the radio is the right of the American people to listen to this great medium of communications free from any governmental dictation as to what they can or cannot hear and free alike from similar restraints by private licensees."

We are in the process of working out in the laboratory of experience the exact application of the "fairness doctrine" to editorializing and the requirement that broadcasters have "an affirmative duty to aid and encourage the broadcast of opposing views."

And there are some general propositions I want to lay before you. The very first is that the men engaged in this enterprise—the broadcasters—are men of responsibility and goodwill. When the FCC grants broadcast licenses, the most basic criterion is the character of the applicant—his integrity. In the almost sacred field of news and public affairs, we do not have to concern ourselves with hidden persuaders or men who would put their convictions up for sale. If we did, the news would have been slanted, the documentaries would have been distorted, and editorializing would be fated for disaster.

You should know that the Commission stands behind you—the broadcaster—and we are not back here to "bushwack" you. We recognize that a station with a strong voice can be a prime target for pressure groups and that the pressure groups may try to put the squeeze on through the FCC. I suggest that the absence of such a pressure group squeeze may indicate that your editorials are milk toast. Complaints prove you are communicating, not toe-dancing with issues.

So if you get a letter from the Commission asking about a complaint, don't panic. Integrity will protect you better from the Federal troops than a regiment of lawyers. If you have a fair and equitable position, then state it and don't be intimidated. You'll find us cheering you on, not heading you off. It is only when you fail to live up to your responsibilities to present the pros and cons of an issue that you invite headaches. There is no lack of formats, methods, and techniques to insure fairness. If the will is there, you'll be fair.

For those of you interested in statistics, you should know that we always inform the station of the filing of a complaint. You should welcome this because this permits a licensee to put on record his side of the story at the time of the event. Second, it permits the Commission to acquire the facts. Third, it often serves as an educational tool by clarifying for the licensee Commission policies and requirements. During 1961, we received about 452 fairness complaints, including claims of news distortion, slanting, bias, etc. During November, December 1961 and January 1962 we received 156 complaints. Over 90 percent of these complaints are disposed of on the basis of the statements filed by licensees as to what they have done or what they propose to do to meet the complaint. The honest and fair broadcaster may have to answer some letters and complaints, but he will never get into serious trouble.

The really difficult cases presented to the Commission usually do not involve station editorials. Rather, they involve stations that thought they were presenting a noncontroversial program, only to learn from the furor that they had touched a raw nerve in the community.

What we need—the FCC and the noneditorializing broadcaster alike—is some way to tap into the hard-won experience of the broadcasters who already have taken a plunge into the sea of controversy.

That's why this conference can be so valuable. We all stand to profit from its de-

liberations. The editorializing pioneers are present and we can learn much from them.

A good example is Dan Kops, the chairman of the NAB's Committee on Editorializing, who started editorializing in 1949—the year of the green light—over WAVZ in New Haven, a city, incidentally, in which the two newspapers are under the same ownership.

Mr. Kops began as a public voice, and about the only public voice in New Haven, campaigning for off-street parking in the downtown area and then for a public housing project. More recently his has been the major public voice supporting New Haven's redevelopment program.

Like all good editors, Mr. Kops has hammered out some theories about broadcast editorials. He believes that stations, when they pick topics for editorials and editorial campaigns, should try and select subjects, such as redevelopment, where the chances of bringing about constructive action are good.

The point about the Kops' operation is that the role of leadership was there, for the taking. Citizens of New Haven have observed that the government agencies and groups seeking to improve the city would have been without a public voice, would have been reduced to whispering rather than broadcasting, if WAVZ had been silent on civic issues.

Then, there is WTVJ, in Miami, believed to be the first television station to offer editorials on a regular basis. If you don't believe in the power of the television to affect public issues, just consider what happened in Miami last summer.

It started on a Wednesday—July 19, 1961—when three of the five city commissioners suddenly, and unexpectedly, voted to fire the city manager, Melvin Reese. Ralph Rennick, WTVJ's vice president in charge of news, was on the air with an editorial even before the city commission had adjourned its session. Among the things he said was: "Apparently Reese was too good for his own good." The city knew where WTVJ stood.

The next day Rennick reported that because of a legal hitch the firing was going to have to be repeated at the next meeting of the city commission, scheduled for the following Tuesday.

On Friday, the station began with an editorial statement to the effect that "Rarely in the history of this city has the public decency and respect for the orderly processes of good government been so outraged." WTVJ then announced that it would carry the Tuesday commission meeting live. Which it did. And the city commission, acting in full view of the citizens of Miami, reversed the dismissal. There is a moral in this story. You can fight city hall * * * and most effectively too * * * with television cameras.

Let's return to radio for a moment and to WMCA in New York. The late Nathan Straus, a leader in the campaign to change the Mayflower rule, began broadcasting regularly scheduled editorials in 1954, and his son, Peter Straus, carries on the tradition.

WMCA has broadcast editorials on subjects ranging from crankcase blowbys to colonialism—and it has added some pioneering innovations. In October 1960, WMCA became the first station to endorse a candidate for President. Last year, the station endorsed candidates of different parties for mayor of New York and Governor of New Jersey.

Most recently, WMCA has started a new kind of editorial campaign which combines legal action with its broadcasting efforts. Tackling the problem of legislative reapportionment, WMCA editorialized against reapportionment legislation in New York State and then filed suit, as a taxpayer, to force the issue into court.

Westinghouse Broadcasting has also pioneered in combining editorializing with community action in Baltimore. This is service to the public interest in the best sense.

Finally, even the briefest catalog of achievements would be inadequate if it did not include WDSU and WDSU-TV in New Orleans, the station that faced the segregation crisis in that city with dignity, firmness, and leadership.

For a period of about 2 years, both before and following the segregation crisis in New Orleans, WDSU broadcast editorials which stood behind law and order. To measure the achievement, let me read this statement by the Louisiana State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights:

"The editorial leadership that did exist in New Orleans during the school crisis was provided by television station WDSU-TV and its companion radio station, WDSU. In about a year and a half these two media have presented more than 50 editorials relating to the complex problems of desegregation. Their editorial position has seemed to be a full acceptance of the concept of editorial responsibility to interpret the facts and to advocate constructive lines of action."

This is broadcasting making its voice ring. This is the new world of communications in which broadcasting both informs and leads public opinion.

But let us consider the situation of the majority of broadcasters who say they are not yet ready to accept "editorial responsibility to interpret the facts and to advocate constructive lines of action."

We accept their judgment, and are sure they are right. Every station that now editorializes in a significant manner emphasizes that the first requirement is a competent staff—at the very least, a good reporter and research man—capable of getting the facts, getting all of them, and getting them right. This is the first requirement, and I'm sure the station that cannot meet it is wise to delay raising its voice. The alternative—and we've seen and heard too much of this—is the station that only pretends to editorialize—the station that's in favor of greener grass, mother love, canoe safety, and milk for children.

While the Federal Communications Commission wants to encourage editorializing, we do not say you must editorialize. Nor, since 1949, do we say you must not editorialize.

But the day is coming when the broadcaster who aspires to stature and influence in his community will have to see, hear and speak about evil. He will not be able to plead that he does not have the staff to find out what's going on in front of his microphone and his lens.

John Crosby once observed: "A TV station that has a mind to harbor an opinion and the courage to utter it just seems more important than a station that won't dare open its mouth."

It certainly is no great secret that journalism at its best contains strong—and often controversial—points of view. The broadcaster who is worried about his ratings might ask himself whether anyone receives more attention than the man embroiled in a heated, honest debate on an issue of public importance.

The broadcaster who has an intense interest in his community must in the very nature of things also have intense opinions about local issues. If he cares about his community, then he must care enough to do something for his community. If he expresses these opinions he is going to command interest and respect. And the fairness tradition of the broadcasting industry, which gives the opposition its chance, enhances rather than diminishes this respect.

If I stress editorializing at the local community level it is because this is where broadcasters are finding the greatest need and it is here they are building the great new tradition.

Indeed, most broadcasters who are editorializing are dedicated to the proposition that they should limit themselves to local issues and events, where they have the facts and feel of the situation.

Certainly a broadcaster would spread his airtime and broadcast talents thin if he began prescribing for all ills, foreign and domestic. But I would raise a question here—and cite an example. Main Street now goes all the way around the world. National and international issues can be as immediately important as local issues. And there is a great, compelling need for breaking the sound barrier between local, national and international events.

On the radio side, WMCA has covered the range of comment—continental and international—and here in Washington we have a television station, WTOP, which has been breaking the barrier. Jack Jurey, WTOP's editor, made a count for last year and found that 60 percent of the daily editorials had been on national and foreign affairs while 40 percent had been comment on events in the Washington metropolitan area.

It is not too early for the advance guard ediorialists to begin thinking about this. A Washington station, of course, has the advantage of being at the heart of the national, and much of the international, news. Yet it is a matter for all of you to consider, weight, and discuss with each other while you are here.

Broadcasting of the kind we describe as public affairs—news, views, and documentaries—will each year become an increasingly important part of our lives, as the public increasingly turns to broadcasting to satisfy its hunger for information.

This is broadcasting's great challenge and opportunity. As traditional means of communication diminish, and as fewer men decide what more and more people will read, we have as the counterbalance a precious resource which is reaching maturity—5,000 new voices enriching the oldest of our country's freedoms, practicing the youngest of our industry's traditions.

We share a deep and abiding faith in the intelligence of the American people. Theirs is the intelligence which, given the facts, invariably reaches a decision in the best interest of our country. Since facts are often clouded and subject to degrees of interpretation, the more voices heard debating these facts, the better. The gradual disappearance of the second editorial voice among the local press threatens the very cornerstone of our democratic process. Only by replacing our opportunities to hear other points of view can we maintain our democratic way of life. Broadcasters, then, have little moral choice in the matter. Though they can legally evade their responsibility to provide second and third choices to their people, morally, they are compelled to answer the compelling need for more information, more opinions, and, of grave import, more courage.

I hope in your conference that you would pay particular attention to so-called unpopular positions. Minority views which are right have the happy faculty of growing to majorities when they are cultivated in the soil of freedom of information and expression.

Toynbee has written that civilizations rise or fall as they respond to challenge. Those which respond with apathy, lethargy, disinterest or cowardice wither away and die; those which respond with courage, strength, and determination expand and grow.

So it must be with your business—with you. You are faced with this challenge to let the people know. If you meet it with courage, integrity, wisdom, then there are no limits to where your stations will grow—and there are no limits to where our free Nation and its democratic traditions will expand.

Failures of Giveaway Program Should Be Studied as Foreign Aid Debate Begins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, once again we are about to begin the great debate, "How Much Should America Give Away This Year in Foreign Aid?" Before we make up our minds that we must vote for everything the President asks in the way of foreign aid funds, it may be well for us to review the history of foreign aid and determine whether or not it is meeting its objectives. As a part of this preliminary study, I call your attention to a well-written editorial on the subject from the Dallas Morning News, and a second on the same subject from the Fort Lauderdale, Fla., News.

The editorials follows:

HERE WE GO AGAIN

[From the Dallas Morning News, Mar. 15, 1962]

Members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee have their work cut out for them in hearings that will get under way immediately to study President Kennedy's foreign-aid program—submitted to Congress Tuesday. Although the President insisted that every dollar is vitally needed to combat threats of communism, chaos and tyranny in other lands, there will be much that can and must be cut out of the program. In the past Congress has seldom been intimidated by administration claims that foreign-aid requests are the bare minimum. We hope it is at least as independent again this year.

The President's total request for fiscal year 1963 is $72.5 million more than he asked for last year. But it is almost a billion dollars more than Congress granted him a year ago for military and economic aid.

What is more important, the request for economic aid is more than a billion dollars more than Congress granted for this purpose a year ago, while the request for military assistance—by far the most productive form of aid—is actually $100 million less.

This greater emphasis which the President and his advisers have decided to place on the less productive economic assistance is offset by only one factor: The administration has finally come around to the view that greater emphasis should be placed on loans which are repayable in dollars than in outright grants of money. The "Buy American" stipulation is also being continued, and the President stated that the aim is to obtain 80-percent return to the United States.

There was no breakdown available in the President's message on amounts of aid requested for individual countries. But it is safe to say that there are probably large requests for aid to Yugoslavia and other Soviet satellite or so-called neutral nations. This we can do without, as Representative BRUCE ALGER, Republican, of Texas, has suggested in a bill which he has introduced to deny all aid to such countries.

Included in the aid program was a request for $3 billion spread over 4 years for the alliance-for-progress program in Latin America. During the past year we have spent over a billion dollars on this program, and what has it achieved? For one thing, more than a third of that money went to Brazil, which has become our biggest headache south of the border in recent months.

As William Giandoni, Latin-American editor for the Copley News Service, has pointed out, "Latin American Communists have benefited most from the alliance for progress in its first year." He reveals that the great propaganda surrounding the program raised the hopes of Latin America's impoverished masses far beyond our ability to solve their problems. Now they are dissatisfied and growing more so, which provides the Reds with a fertile area for agitation.

Moreover, Giandoni says, the alliance's demand for land reforms has benefited the Reds by shaking the confidence of many influential Latins in U.S. policy.

Redistribution of land is not what is needed. A redistribution of people on the land is. In most of Latin America, only a small portion of the land is under cultivation, and millions of acres of rich, virgin soil await the plow.

Even some of the earliest defenders of the foreign-aid program—who once argued that all we had to do was pour money in one end of the tube and, after a few years, democracy and friendship would come out the other—now acknowledge that this just isn't the way things have worked out.

Just a few years ago, a Senator from Massachusetts named John F. Kennedy said about foreign aid that "we ought to know now that mere expenditures bring no lasting results."

[From the Fort Lauderdale News, Mar. 15, 1962]

TAXPAYERS CAN DEMONSTRATE DISLIKE FOR FOREIGN-AID BOOST IN VOTING BOOTHS

Here we go again.

That must have been the feeling of quite a few American taxpayers this week when they read the news that President John F. Kennedy had asked Congress for another $4,878,500,000 in foreign military and economic aid.

This massive amount is nearly a billion dollars more than the President got last year and we rather imagine the extra amount was tacked on to the request in anticipation that Congress, as it usually does, will give the President considerably less than he asked for originally.

As usual, also, the request for more billions to send abroad was accompanied by the direst kind of warning that unless we continue with this fantastic giveaway program the way will be paved for all kinds of upheavals abroad which all U.S. "armies and atoms" could not stem.

Typical, too, was the quick pledge by Democratic congressional leaders, including Senator GEORGE SMATHERS of Florida, to engage in an all-out fight to get the full amount the President requested through the Congress.

This whole business has now been going on so long that the same script could be dusted off and used again every year. Nothing ever seems to improve no matter how much of our tax money we throw around the world. The Communists still make their gains; crooked foreign politicans still line their pockets with our hard-earned money, and an increasing army of Washington bureaucrats and civil service employees still go to sleep at night thinking up new ways to channel even more of our money to friends and foes alike all over the world.

Since the foreign aid program started many years ago under the old Marshall plan banner the United States has pumped more than $90 billion into the economies of scores upon scores of nations. Much of this money is now coming back to haunt us in the form of increased competition from foreign producers. Some has gone into Communist nations under the theory that if we can't wean them away from their Russian masters by our deeds we can buy them with our dollars. It hasn't exactly worked out that way but the giveaway still continues.

This year a new twist has even been added. Latin American nations have long been wanting to feed at the foreign-aid trough in the same grand fashion that European and Asian countries have been lining up.

So, this year, more room has been added at the trough through a grandiose alliance-for-progress program for Latin America under which we plan to spend $3 billion over the next 4 years trying to get Latin American countries to mend their ways and hop on the bandwagon of social progress that has been inflicted upon our own Nation.

It matters little that our own country has the biggest national debt the world has ever seen. It matters little that American taxpayers are struggling under the heaviest tax burdens of all their history. No, we can still go out and borrow more money to give away, and in the process continue to build up the pressures that are eroding away the value of our dollars and bringing us closer to the day when we will have to face up to the specter of bankruptcy.

Commonsense would seem to dictate that somewhere along the line there should be a rational and a sober analysis of just how far we can continue to go in this ridiculous business of giving away our money.

But once underway how do you stop a giveaway without making the beneficiaries of the giveaway mad? And, since nobody in the administration would think of making anybody mad at them these days, the easy remedy that comes to mind is to make the giveaway bigger and thus make more countries happy with us.

In this process the American taxpayer truly becomes the forgotten man. In addition to being asked to pay the soaring costs of supporting his own government, he now has the burden of supporting the governments of a host of foreign countries and if there is anything in our Constitution which justifies taxing American citizens for the support of foreign governments we haven't been able to find it.

But try and get this issue before our august Federal courts. Refuse to pay your taxes and ask to be taken to court and your bank account will be seized. If you had a civil rights case you would have no trouble getting Bobby Kennedy and his pals on your side. But try to contest the right of the Federal Government to take away your money and give it to foreign countries and you might as well go out and whistle in a hurricane for all the good it will do.

In several recent polls of their constituents various Congressmen have found upwards of 98 percent of those replying strongly opposed to a continuation of the foreign aid program at its present level.

But these are only American citizens and they don't seem to count anymore. They are just the people who have to pay for this nonsense and so long as they don't march on Washington and knock some sense into the heads of their elected representatives, so long will they be kicked around and ignored.

We think it is high time that American taxpayers get good and mad about this foreign aid giveaway and the best way to display that anger is to boot out of office right quick like any Congressman who wants to give President Kennedy another $4.8 billion to toss around overseas.

The B-70 Fight and the Item Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the controversy which engaged the House today with respect to the effort of the Armed Services Committee to direct the President to spend an extra $320 million on further development of the B-70 manned bomber, I wish to call the attention of our colleagues to a most pertinent discussion of this issue as it relates to the proposal to empower the President to veto individual items in appropriation bills.

As sponsor of a bill to give the President the item veto power, I was delighted to read the article by the distinguished columnist, Roscoe Drummond, which appeared in the Washington Post for Monday, March 19, which very effectively made the fundamental point that the item veto does not weaken the position of Congress but actually strengthens it.

The value of the item veto is that it permits a particular issue to be resolved on its merits by focusing attention and action on the one issue and by detaching, in effect, the irrelevant question of the remainder of the appropriation bill.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. Drummond's article as a part of my remarks.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, March 19, 1962]

THE B-70 FIGHT—ARGUMENT FOR ITEM VETO POWER

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Fortunately there is no easy or automatic solution to the loggerheads deadlock between the House Armed Services Committee and Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara over whether to spend more money on the improved B-70 bombers.

The Congressmen unanimously say they intend to compel the Pentagon to spend $320 million to speed the production of the new style B-70's which they see as the plane of the future.

President Kennedy and Secretary McNamara say they are not going to be compelled to spend this money, even if appropriated, because they believe the new B-70 is the plane of the past, and will be "obsolete" by the time it is combat-ready in 1967.

I say it is fortunate that there is no easy answer to this dilemma because it is part of the genius of our system of divided governmental powers that, when a stalemate is reached, neither side can easily steamroller the other, and an accommodation has to be made.

The constitutional issue is unresolved. Many Presidents, including Mr. Truman, General Eisenhower, and now Mr. Kennedy, have refused to spend money appropriated by Congress. But now the Armed Services Committee votes to appropriate an extra $320 million for the B-70's; it proposes to "direct" the President to spend it. The intention is to leave the administration no choice.

There is no doubt that Congress has exclusive power "to make the laws"—within constitutional limits—which the President must "execute." But there is a difference between a law and an appropriation. The Constitution empowers Congress "to provide and maintain" the Armed Forces of the country. It does not stipulate that Congress shall exclusively determine what the Armed Forces should be provided with—what kind of bombers, what kind of shoes, what kind of missiles, etc.

Congress can put a ceiling on what can be spent. There is no evident way for it to compel the President to spend to the ceiling.

Even if the President cannot be forced by law to spend more money on the B-70s, he can be influenced by the size of the vote behind the appropriation and by the power of congressional advocacy.

It is at this point I venture a suggestion. It seems to me that the deadlock over spending an increased B-70 appropriation presents a sound argument and an ideal time for Congress to give the President the "item veto."

This is a power which the Governors of most of the big States with large budgets already possess. It is a power which all modern Presidents have asked Congress to give them in the interest of prudent Government financing. It enables a President to veto specific items in an appropriation bill without vetoing the whole bill.

I submit that with respect to the controversial B-70 appropriation the item veto, which is a constructive tool of good government in its own right, would strengthen the hand of Congress.

Congress cannot force the President to spend the B-70 money. It can influence the President to spend it by the power of its own advocacy. To increase is influence it must mobilize and focus its maximum majority visibly and decisively upon the B-70 appropriation.

What better way of doing that than to empower the President to veto this B-70 item and then passing it over his veto by a two-thirds majority?

If Congress cannot muster such a majority, it cannot win the argument. If it will give the President the item veto, in line with a bill introduced by Senator KENNETH KEATING of New York, it will provide itself with the best possible means of dramatizing the B-70 issue.

Over the years the item veto would save more money than Congress is asking the President to spend on the B-70's.

Expansion of Peace Corps Premature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the administration's proposal to increase the size of the Peace Corps, under unanimous consent I include at this point a timely and well-considered editorial of the Seattle Post-Intelligencer which speaks my view that any expansion at this time would be premature.

The editorial follows:

NOT SO FAST

President Kennedy's request that Congress expand the personnel of the Peace Corps—and double its cost—seems to us to be premature. The evidence that it has proved itself in its first year is still too thin.

The legislation proposed by the President would permit the Corps to muster 6,700 in its ranks by June 30, 1963. It now has slightly less than its authorized strength of 2,400 which it expects to reach this June.

Although Congress last year authorized $40 million as the Peace Corps budget, only $30 million was appropriated. For the fiscal year starting this July 1, President Kennedy seeks $63,750,000.

Mr. Kennedy's message declares that the Peace Corps' early "successes have fulfilled expectations." Whose expectations? This program for sending enthusiastic Americans, mostly young, to far places to give help to underdeveloped peoples, has never had the overwhelming approval of the U.S. people which would make a strict accounting of its activities unnecessary.

Congress, we believe, should and will demand a further testing period—much more time—before it lavishes more spending on a fractionally tried scheme.

"The Energy of Patriotism," an Editorial Appearing in the Los Angeles Times on March 11, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I agree, when in his annual message to the U.S. Congress on December 3, 1861, Abraham Lincoln said:

> The struggle of today is not altogether for today—it is for the vast future also * * * let us proceed in the great task which events have devolved upon us.

I humbly adopt this timely expressed sentiment by Abraham Lincoln and respectfully suggest, that it is the positive thinking and action and timely living and emphasis on the positive worthiness and dignity and righteousness for freedom and economy—the total functioning of our constitutional form of government and American way of life, which is far more effective in meeting the cold war and the challenge of international communism than is the negative; the finding fault without informative basis to justify criticism or finding fault with pretty much everything and everybody. So does living the positive rather than the negative patriotism which is powerful against the Communist philosophy.

Under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial from the Los Angeles Times, March 11, 1962:

THE ENERGY OF PATRIOTISM

The inspector general of the California National Guard Reserve has begun an investigation of an overzealous officer's attempt to set up an anti-Communist "spy network." Perhaps the inquiry can also help explain why other Americans persist in wasting their patriotic energy in negative approaches to the Communist menace.

The protracted struggle against communism is surely the most serious and difficult threat to face this Nation since its founding. It is a new kind of total war in which the traditional rules no longer apply and in which every citizen is involved.

It is the kind of conflict that creates public frustration and confusion, which in turn can cause a desire for simple solutions and direct action.

But there are no easy answers in so complifying the issues is worse than no solution plex a test of national survival. Oversimat all. And direct action that is negative and irresponsible inevitably does more harm than good.

In these ways the loyal and well-meaning will aid rather than arrest the tide of communism. As FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has said: "Unfortunately there are those who make the very mistake the Communists are so careful to avoid.

"These persons concentrate on the negative rather than on the positive. They are merely against communism without being for any positive measures to eliminate the social, political and economic frictions which the Communists are so adroit at exploiting."

The same sound counsel was offered by Attorney General Kennedy the other day when he was asked how citizens could best fight the Communists and their conspiracy:

"If all the effort that is expended on them could be turned to positive causes—strengthening our schools, seeing that American history is taught, strengthening local governments, interesting people in politics and in voting—this energy would do very much more good."

If we are to survive, if our freedoms, political systems and economy are to be preserved, the precious energy of patriotism dare not be wasted.

Mr. Hoover reminds us that "both Hitler and Mussolini were against communism. However, it was by what they stood for, not against, that history has judged them."

California Veterans Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, at a recent meeting of the California congressional delegation, the commander of the American Legion, Department of California, Roscoe T. Morse, and the members of his rehabilitation commission discussed the question of the need for additional hospital beds in California to take care of the increasing and expanding veteran population of California due largely to veterans from eastern States moving to California for permanent residence.

Mr. Lewis S. Sloneker, director of the rehabilitation commission of the American Legion, Department of California, read the following statement which reveals the urgent need for additional hospital beds and other facilities in California.

The following is the statement submitted by Lewis S. Sloneker:

STATEMENT TO THE CALIFORNIA CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 26, 1962

(By Lewis S. Sloneker)

Mr. Chairman and Members of the California congressional delegation: We deeply appreciate this opportunity to again meet with you and we bring you greetings from the American Legion, department of California. This is our 16th annual meeting with you, and we wish again as in the past, to discuss some of the major problems affecting war veterans and their dependents in California.

GENERAL

The shortage of hospital beds for sick and disabled veterans who are in need of care, are broke, and have no place to go, is still our major problem. Veterans by the thousands continue to come to California from every other State in the Union to live. A high percentage of them are badly disabled, unemployment, have previously made application to other Veterans' Administration hospitals, but are now applying for hospitalization in California.

During the calendar year 1961 there were 79,655 applicants for hospitalization received by the Veterans' Administration in California, plus 2,890 for domiciliary care, which was over 2,000 more than received during the previous year. In spite of this, there has been a reduction in the number of operating beds from 13,224 to 13,175. Our overcrowded State hospitals are still caring for approximately 5,000 veterans because beds are not available at Veterans' Administration hospitals. On January 31, 1962, there were 2,406 veterans on the waiting lists, including 91 at the California Veterans' Home, plus 434 who were scheduled for admission sometime in the future. They, too, are actually waiting for a bed, making a total of 2,840 veterans declared legally and medically eligible for admission waiting for a bed.

By executive order the Veterans' Administration is operating under a ceiling of 125,000 hospital beds. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has the authority to increase the number of beds in one area by decreasing an equal number elsewhere. He cannot do this without sufficient appropriations to make the necessary changes. We sincerely believe it is long past time when some adjustments should be made by reducing the number of Veterans' Administration hospital beds in some locations where there appears to be a surplus, and increasing by an equal number in locations such as California where there is such a shortage.

Under date of January 31, 1962, the House Veterans' Affairs Committee published reports it received from Veterans' Administration general medical and surgical hospitals as to their utilization of the prebed care (PBC), and completion of bed occupancy program (CBOC), authorized by Public Law 86-639. It is interesting to note that a great many of the hospital directors gave as their reason for not utilizing the prebed care program as being that they had no waiting list. Here are a few examples as to what they had to say in part:

Alexandria, La.: "Our demand for hospital beds has not been so great over the past year as to require a waiting list of any significance."

Batavia, N.Y.: "We do not now and have not had a waiting list."

Big Springs, Tex.: "We do not use prebed care to the fullest extent because we had available beds."

Buffalo, N.Y.: "Since there is no delay in admissions, it has not been felt either necessary or practical to initiate preliminary diagnostic studies."

Cheyenne, Wyo.: "Our patient load has been slightly below our estimates. There has been no waiting list established."

Chicago, Ill. (West Side): "We have had adequate surgical beds available for the admission of veterans at the time they apply for hospitalization without having to place them on the waiting list."

Cleveland, Ohio: "This hospital does not have a waiting list."

Dayton, Ohio: "This station rarely has a waiting list."

Dearborn, Mich.: "There is no waiting list at the present for acute short-term patients."

Denver, Colo.: "We have no waiting list."

Durham, N.C.: "The greatest percent of time we operate the medical and surgical services without a waiting list."

Fayetteville, N.C.: "We do not have a waiting list necessitating a delay in admission."

Fort Bayard, N. Mex.: "This is an isolated station without a waiting list."

Baltimore, Md. (Fort Howard division): "There is no waiting list at Fort Howard and all applicants for hospitalization are being afforded an opportunity for immediate admission."

Fort Wayne, Ind.: "Fairly low patient demand."

Grand Junction, Colo.: "We most always have beds available for immediate admission."

Hot Springs, Ark.: "This station does not have a waiting list."

Jackson, Miss.: "Applicants found to be in need of hospitalization can be admitted with very few exceptions."

Kerrville, Tex.: "We have had little or no waiting list."

Little Rock, Ark.: "Because of available hospital beds a dearth of patients on the waiting list."

Louisville, Ky.: "At no time during the past 12 months has this hospital had a shortage of beds."

Madison, Wis.: "This hospital has had to date no waiting list so that beds have always been available."

Manchester, N.H.: "With no waiting list for medical beds and only rarely occurring list in surgical specialities such as urology."

Miles City, Mont.: "Beds have been available for immediate admission."

Montgomery, Ala.: "We do not have any appreciable waiting list which allows us to admit the needy veteran immediately."

Mountain Home, Tenn.: "Patients have been admitted directly without recourse to a waiting list."

Muskogee, Okla.: "We maintain only a very small waiting list."

Nashville, Tenn.: "Lack of waiting list, permitting admission of patients very early after being seen at admission office or after receipt of 10-P-10 (application)."

Newington, Conn.: "No waiting list."

Omaha, Nebr.: "In past 5 months we did not have a waiting list except for a few days."

Providence, R.I.: "Throughout most of the year we are able to provide hospitalization promptly as needed."

Salt Lake City, Utah: "We have not had a medical and surgical waiting list."

Spokane, Wash.: "The ability to immediately admit both medical and surgical cases as we have no waiting list."

Syracuse, N.Y.: "Waiting list has not posed a problem at this hospital."

Tucson, Ariz.: "We have had no significant waiting list and adequate vacant beds are always available."

Tupper Lake, N.Y.: "Availability of beds for immediate hospitalization."

Washington, D.C.: "Because of bed availability there is no waiting list."

Whipple, Ariz.: "We have no waiting list."

White River Junction, Vt.: "Lack of waiting list."

Wilkes-Barre, Pa.: "Due to the limited waiting list * * * applicants were scheduled as applications were received."

Wilmington, Del.: "Sparcity of medical applications for hospitalization * * * we have had practically no waiting list for the past 3 years."

Wood, Wis.: "We have not developed waiting lists."

These above examples indicate surplus beds. This compared to the situation in California does not provide an equal service for our Nation's war veterans.

For further proof of unequalized hospital care for veterans, we submit a brief comparison between the State of New York and the State of California because of the almost equal veteran population:

	New York	California
Number of general medical and surgical hospitals	9	6
Operating beds	7,116	4,921
Average daily patient load according to budget and allocation of funds	6,192	4,452
Waiting list (general medical and surgical hospitals only) on Dec. 31, 1961	86	276
Patients treated, fiscal year 1961	51,640	43,199

We are not recommending or even advocating that hospital care for needy and deserving veterans be taken away or reduced in any one or more locations just to satisfy our needs in California. We do believe beyond a shadow of a doubt that the facts prove additional hospital beds for veterans are needed in California. However, our veteran population continues to increase and the number of hospital beds continues to be reduced. If the ceiling of 125,000 hospital beds is adequate for our Nation's veterans, adjustment must be made to give California more beds by reducing them elsewhere, or additional beds should be provided by increasing the ceiling.

REPLACEMENT HOSPITAL FOR OAKLAND

As we have so strongly pointed out to you in the past how unjustified it was to replace this 712-bed hospital with a 500-bed hospital which is now under construction, we would like to again urge that something be done. Veteran patients in the East Bay, Sacramento, and San Joaquin Valley area must, for the most part, look to the Veterans' Administration hospitals at Oakland, Livermore, and Fresno, for their care (Livermore hospital's designation was changed from a TB to a general medical and surgical hospital approximately 1 year ago; however, TB cases continue to be about 50 percent of its load). The Oakland Veterans' Administration Hospital admitted a total of 6,742 patients during the calendar year 1961. Four thousand and fifty-six of these were admitted as medical emergencies. Fresno Veterans' Administration Hospital admitted 2,973, and 2,261 of these were admitted as medical emergencies. Livermore hospital admitted only 1,829 and no figures were available as to the number of emergencies; however, most of their patients are long-term care which results in a very slow turnover.

Many of you will recall that in 1954, when we first called it to your attention that something should be done to renovate or completely overhaul or replace the Oakland Veterans' Administration Hospital, you requested us to go back and make a study as to whether it should be completely overhauled or replaced. We came back in 1955 and reported the findings of our study, at which time we recommended that a new 800-bed hospital be built across Alice Street from the present hospital and that it be connected with corridors overhead and underground, and that the present Oakland hospital be moderately renovated and maintained for the administrative offices, physical medicine and rehabilitation, and intermediate care—in other words, to care for the patients who have reached maximum hospital benefits but are in need of nursing and attendant care and have no place to go.

The Director of Civil Defense ruled against this site for constructing a Veterans' Administration hospital. The Veterans' Administration then went out site-hunting, and finally decided on the location at Martinez and announced their plans to construct a 500-bed replacement hospital. We came back to you objecting to this loss of beds. We advised you that there was already a shortage of beds, and our recommendations were that this new replacement hospital be a 1,000-bed hospital with 250 of those beds being set aside for the intermediate (nursing and attendant) care cases. We doubt if there is any other area in the country where better than 75 percent of the total number of patients admitted are medical emergencies.

We strongly recommend that something be done to adequately increase the number of hospital beds at the replacement hospital for Oakland or perhaps even better now that they have gone this far with the construction, that a new 500-bed hospital be constructed in the Sacramento area.

LONG BEACH HOSPITAL

Since our last meeting with you, the Veterans' Administration reactivated approximately 130 hospital beds in the old temporary barracks-type construction which brought the operating capacity back up to 1,600 beds. However, they do not have sufficient funds or sufficient personnel to do the job expected of them. They are short approximately 200 professional personnel. The per diem cost is $23.96 as compared to the Bronx, N.Y., Veterans' Administration Hospital at $28.116, and Hines, Ill., Hospital at $26.568. If they were permitted a more equal per diem cost they would have money available to hire badly needed personnel.

There has been approximately a 6-year delay in bringing this hospital under permanent construction. The first phase of this construction program has been completed which brought an additional 561 beds under permanent construction. This was done through funds appropriated by the 83d Congress. The second phase of this planned construction program to bring approximately 760 additional beds under permanent construction in accordance with the originally approved plans, is already past the emergency state and we urge you to cause the necessary funds to be appropriated and the Veterans' Administration directed to get on with the job.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION REGIONAL OFFICE, LOS ANGELES

We would like to again remind you of the long overdue and urgent need for a building of permanent construction to house the Veterans' Administration regional office in Los Angeles. The largest Veterans' Administration regional office remains housed in an old quonset hut type of temporary construction that was built on Veterans' Administration property for the Douglas engineering division early in World War II. There has been much talk and planning in the past about constructing a new Federal building on Veterans' Administration property in West Los Angeles. It would provide for the housing of a post office, the entire regional office of the Veterans' Administration, and several other Federal agencies. We have been advised that it had the wholehearted approval of the Post Office Department, the General Services Administration, and the Veterans' Administration. Certainly for efficiency and economy the Veterans' Administration needs a new regional office building in Los Angeles. We sincerely hope the Congress will take the necessary action to appropriate funds and direct that such a building be constructed without further delay.

VETERANS' HOME OF CALIFORNIA

It has been the policy of the Federal Government since 1888 to pay a part of the cost for the care of veterans hospitalized and domiciled in State veterans' homes. Federal subsidy in the amount of $2.50 per day per member or patient, or up to 50 percent of the cost, is the amount now being paid by the Government.

As our veterans get older, break down in health, have disabilities that make them unemployable, together with the ever-increasing veteran population, there is urgent need to provide a State veterans' home in southern California. Each veteran cared for in a State veterans' home is relieving the cost and demand upon the Veterans' Administration as they are all eligible for Veterans' Administration care.

While the Congress has recognized Federal responsibility for 74 years by providing Federal aid for the maintenance in part for the care of veterans in State homes, it has not provided any funds for capital outlay. A bill, H.R. 270, introduced during the 1st session of the 87th Congress by Congressman SISK would assist the 33 States in the construction, expansion, remodeling, and alteration of buildings of State and territorial soldiers' homes by providing grants to subsidize in part the capital outlay cost. We urge your wholehearted support of this bill.

NATIONAL CEMETERY

Again we appeal to you to use your best efforts in having the Federal Government provide a national cemetery in the Los Angeles area. There are over a million veterans residing in the area. The number increases by the hour. We do not know of any place in the United States with anywhere near the veteran population that is so far removed from a national cemetery. The Veterans' Administration cemetery in west Los Angeles, where over 45,000 deceased veterans are buried, has very little space for future burials. Veterans who die outside of a Veterans' Administration hospital or domiciliary, unless their hospital care is being paid for by the Veterans' Administration in a hospital within the Los Angeles regional office territory, or their bodies are unclaimed, are not eligible for burial in the Veterans' Administration cemetery. Many next of kin from this area cannot afford transportation to Golden Gate Cemetery at San Bruno, near San Francisco, Calif. At the rate deceased veterans are being buried at Golden Gate Cemetery, it will be only a matter of a very few years when there will be no more space there for burial. This being a fact, some serious consideration should be given to providing another national cemetery in northern California.

CONCLUSION

Charles L. Bacon, national commander of the American Legion, and Robert M. McCurdy (California), chairman of the National Rehabilitation Commission, will appeal before the entire membership of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee tomorrow morning at 10 a.m. at which time they will present our legislative proposals within the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. We sincerely hope and request that each of you obtain copies of their statements, and support the American Legion's very moderate and justified legislation requests concerning veterans' affairs.

The RS–70 Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALPHONZO E. BELL, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, joining with my colleagues who are supporting the RS–70 program, I would like to contribute for placement in the RECORD the following comments which I think are particularly meaningful, from several experts in this field:

THE RICHEST DRAMA

(By Joseph Alsop)

For sheer richness of human and political meaning, this town has not seen anything

quite like the B-70 row for a very, very long time.

The surface facts are familiar enough by now. The Chief of Air Staff, Gen. Curtis LeMay, wants to spend somewhere between $5 and $10 billion on these heavy bombers of the new generation. The House Armed Services Committee, headed by the powerful old "swap fox," Representative CARL VINSON, has taken the unprecedented step of "directing" the Defense Department to give General LeMay what he wants.

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara is grimly determined not to give General LeMay what he wants, because he is convinced that the money will be wasted. The result has been a direct clash between McNamara and LeMay, two of the most formidable personalities to appear in the U.S. Government in the last quarter century.

The clash has produced good stories, as might be expected. At one moment, the Secretary of Defense, who can deploy facts and figures on the scale of the Normandy landings, was trying to overwhelm LeMay with all the facts and figures unfavorable to the B-70. The general, not an easy man to overwhelm, barely removed his famous cigar in order to answer, with firm finality: "I never believe any statistics except my own."

Besides good stories, this clash has also come close to producing exceedingly serious results. It may yet do so, in truth, if the directive of Representative VINSON is not watered down somewhere along the long legislative road. Ten days ago, McNamara was within an ace of asking for LeMay's resignation, even though he has truthfully described the general as "one of the two or three great fighting leaders of this American generation."

Here you might suppose, is drama enough for any governmental episode, but beneath the surface this particular episode has two additional, almost invisible themes which are really more dramatic than the clash itself.

One is the theme, ever recurring in nonfossilized military services, of the conflict of wills involved in changes of doctrine. For instance, cavalrymen ran the U.S. Army, and cavalry doctrine was U.S. Army doctrine, until the retirement in the late thirties of Gen. Malin Craig. Then Franklin Delano Roosevelt, following the advice General Pershing gave the President from his sickbed, reached down among the very junior general to make George C. Marshall Chief of Staff in succession to Craig.

The result was a change in doctrine, ending a long conflict. The ideas of the General Staff officers and the War College-trained men replaced the ideas of the cavalrymen when Roosevelt chose Marshall instead of the cavalry candidate, the forgotten Gen. Hugh Drum.

In the U.S. Navy, the interwar years were marked by an equally ferocious conflict of wills and doctrine. But the battleship admirals surrendered to the carrier admirals only when the *Prince of Wales* and the *Repulse* went down in the Gulf of Siam.

In the Air Force today, by the same token, it is noteworthy that the Air Staff's B-70 brief was prepared with no help even requested from the brilliant Under Secretary, Joseph Charyk, or from the equally brilliant Chief of Research and Development, Gen. Bernard Schriever.

Charyk and Schriever are the missilemen, in the same position today as the carrier admirals in the thirties. General LeMay and the Secretary of the Air Force, Eugene Zuckert, are the big-bomber men, really in the same position as the battleship admirals of the past, although they heartily detest the comparison. Eventually, one may be certain, the old doctrine will give way to the new doctrine; but the process of replacement, as always, is neither easy nor painless.

As for the other subtheme of the B-70 drama, it is even more interesting and surprising. This country has been fortunate to have such Secretaries of Defense as James V. Forrestal and Robert A. Lovett. But we have never had a Secretary of Defense, or any other civilian official in the Pentagon, who has attempted what McNamara is now attempting.

What McNamara is attempting has, in fact, been accomplished only twice in this century, by Lord Haldane in the British War Office and by Elihu Root in the U.S. War Department, in the years before the First World War.

McNamara is attempting nothing less than a thoroughgoing reform, modernization, and rationalization of the huge, sprawling, powerful generally admirable, but always reform-resistant armed services of the United States.

Hence the money that may be wasted is a secondary issue in the B-70 fight. The true issue is McNamara's authority to carry through this vast reform and modernization. The betting is on McNamara, and this is fortunate despite LeMay's great qualities.

ARGUMENT FOR ITEM VETO POWER

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Fortunately there is no easy or automatic solution to the loggerheads deadlock between the House Armed Services Committee and Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara over whether to spend more money on the improved B-70 bombers.

The Congressmen unanimously say they intend to compel the Pentagon to spend $320 million to speed the production of the new style B-70's which they see as the plane of the future.

President Kennedy and Secretary McNamara say they are not going to be compelled to spend this money, even if appropriated, because they believe the new B-70 is the plane of the past, and will be obsolete by the time it is combat ready in 1967.

I say it is fortunate that there is no easy answer to this dilemma because it is part of the genius of our system of divided governmental powers that, when a stalemate is reached, neither side can easily steamroller the other, and an accommodation has to be made.

The constitutional issue is unresolved. Many Presidents, including Mr. Truman, General Eisenhower, and now Mr. Kennedy, have refused to spend money appropriated by Congress. But now the Armed Services Committee votes to appropriate an extra $320 million for the B-70's; it proposes to direct the President to spend it. The intention is to leave the administration no choice.

There is no doubt that Congress has exclusive power to make the laws—within constitutional limits—which the President must execute. But there is a difference between a law and an appropriation. The Constitution empowers Congress to provide and maintain the Armed Forces of the country. It does not stipulate that Congress shall exclusively determine what the Armed Forces should be provided with—what kind of bombers, what kind of shoes, what kind of missiles, etc.

Congress can put a ceiling on what can be spent. There is no evident way for it to compel the President to spend to the ceiling.

Even if the President can not be forced by law to spend more money on the B-70's, he can be influenced by the appropriation and by the power of congressional advocacy.

It is at this point I venture a suggestion. It seems to me that the deadlock over spending an increased B-70 appropriation presents a sound argument and an ideal time for Congress to give the President the item veto.

This is a power which the Governors of most of the big States with large budgets already possess. It is a power which all modern Presidents have asked Congress to give them in the interest of prudent Government financing. It enables a President to veto specific items in an appropriation bill without vetoing the whole bill.

I submit that with respect to the controversial B-70 appropriation, the item veto, which is a constructive tool of good government in its own right, would strengthen the hand of Congress.

Congress cannot force the President to spend the B-70 money. It can influence the President to spend it by the power of its own advocacy. To increase its influence it must mobilize and focus its maximum majority visibly and decisively upon the B-70 appropriation.

What better way of doing that than to empower the President to veto this B-70 item and then passing it over his veto by a two-thirds majority?

If Congress cannot muster such a majority, it cannot win the argument. If it will give the President the item veto, in line with a bill introduced by Senator KENNETH KEATING, of New York, it will provide itself with the best possible means of dramatizing the B-70 issue.

Over the years the item veto would save more money than Congress is asking the President to spend on the B-70's.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 9, 1962]

THE B-70 ISSUE

Differences between the House Armed Services Committee and the administration over appropriations for the B-70 program, involving as they do $491 million in a $13 billion bill, seem not so great as to justify the high temperatures that are running. Neither do they seem to involve necessarily and inescapably the large constitutional questions that have been raised. No doubt some patient negotiating will disclose that positions on this particular program are not irreconcilable and that the Constitution need not become involved.

There are philosophies of military spending about which men are bound to feel deeply. Chairman CARL VINSON, of the House Armed Services Committee, can summon to his case the warning that Lecky issued in his "History of England," when he said:

"One of the most serious dangers of modern popular politics is that gambling spirit which, in order to lower estimates and reduce taxation, leaves the country unprotected, trusting that the chapter of accidents will save it from attack. The reduction of taxes is at once felt and produces an immediate reputation, while expenditure which is intended to guard against remote, contingent, and unseen dangers seldom brings any credit to a statesman."

Still, the size of the program as submitted to the committee is hardly such as to argue strongly that such fears are reasonable. And the administration, for its part, can fall back on "Macaulay," who, in an even more excellent history, warned that "war could not be carried on without large expenditure. But the larger the expenditure which was required for the defense of the Nation, the more important it was that nothing should be squandered."

Whether the disputed item is an example of failure to provide against unseen danger or a squandering of public funds is a matter which experts must decide. The President's hope that an agreement can be worked out does not seem unreasonable in view of the amounts and purposes of the appropriation. Although this year's item is in dispute now, the situation, at least, should be clearer a year from now when the future of the fast, manned bomber will be more discernible.

Perhaps there can be a compromise that would neither preclude development, if at that time it should seem wise, nor commit us to the whole $10 billion weapons system if a year hence it should seem unnecessary.

The constitutional issue raised is an old one. The prevailing relation of legislature and Executive, since the rise of constitutional and parliamentary governments, has been that of penury in the legislative branch and profligacy in the Executive. The lawmakers, historically, have had to restrain monarchs and presidents and prime ministers. The legislators usually have sat in the driver's seat pulling on the reins. In that posture, their power is undeniable, unassailable, and inescapable. When the roles are reversed, legislative power is embarrassed. It is hard to push on the reins. Legislative establishments, in recent decades, have found themselves frequently in this predicament. They are not without remedy. They can always refuse the Executive the appropriations it wants until the Executive promises to make the expenditures the legislature wants. But it is a dangerous and awkward instrument. It is most dangerous when Congress is as interested as the Executive in the rest of the appropriations.

It is such a clumsy device, in fact, that the best way to deal with the issue is to avoid it. The best way to do that seems to be to follow the President's advice and talk about the problem in the committees until agreement can be reached.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 13, 1962]

THE DETERIORATION OF CONGRESS

Chairman VINSON of the House Armed Services Committee says the longstanding B-70 squabble is a constitutional issue, reflecting the deterioration over the years of the congressional role in determining national policy, defense or otherwise.

In that deterioration there is indeed a constitutional question, but we somehow don't think the B-70 has much to do with it. The fate of that supersonic bomber, originally intended to replace existing types, is instead a matter of military and technical judgment, on which Mr. VINSON and Defense Secretary McNamara happen to find themselves in sharp disagreement.

Mr. VINSON and his committee insist that the Defense Department must get the B-70 into production as fast as possible; they are trying to force on the Department money its chief does not want to spend for that purpose. Mr. McNamara, with President Kennedy's support, strongly favors limiting the B-70 program to the building of prototypes, after which it would be decided whether to go into production.

In our opinion, Mr. McNamara makes the better case. Even in a Pentagon bulging with billions—one could say especially there—the money must be carefully allocated. Mr. McNamara questions that the B-70 can be developed as planned; even if it could be, by the time it was in production it might well be outdated by more advanced weapons. The considerable additional billions to put fleets of B-70's in the air some years hence might be better used for better systems.

Should that view prove wrong, the fact remains that somebody has to make the decision now. And personalities aside, commonsense suggests that it should be the Secretary of Defense rather than the chairman of the House committee.

Of course Congress should scrupulously examine the Pentagon's requests, conduct hearings, raise searching questions, make recommendations, including recommendations about weapons systems. In the extreme case that it believes the Nation imperiled by a prevailing military course, it has the power to require extreme remedies.

But it is hard to credit the notion that the Constitution, in authorizing Congress to raise and support armies and make rules for the Armed Forces, meant Congress to dictate every choice of weapons for the military. In practice, for Congress to try to do so is to make chaos of the very arrangement Congress set up—a Defense Department to act as agent of both the Executive's and the Congress' broad military responsibilities. The division of duties seems clear enough.

The deterioration of the congressional role, "defense and otherwise," of which the committee rightly complains, stems from far more deep-seated causes. The tremendous growth in the size and power of the executive branch in just the past few decades is plain for all to see. But who if not the legislative branch conspired in it? And what has that branch been doing about it all the time? How jealously has it guarded its real constitutional responsibilities?

To consider just one, the power of the purse. Congress certainly could have used this power more effectively to decrease waste in the Armed Forces. Instead, when a Defense Secretary comes along with plans to close down military installations no longer needed, there are howls of anguish from those Members whose areas would be affected. In the same way, politics is involved in the B-70 question; full-speed-ahead production would mean juicy contracts in a lot of districts.

On the broader scale Congress seldom rises above similar parochialism. Instead of sternly safeguarding the national interest, Congress customarily accedes to the demands of pressure groups, whether those demands are formulated by the White House or its own Members. All that is not exactly what the Constitution intended by giving Congress the power of the purse.

So, whatever the merits of the opposing arguments about the B-70, let us not confuse them with the deterioration of the congressional role. If Congress wants to halt the usurpation of its powers, it will have to look beyond that technical controversy, and not least into its own behavior.

[From the Los Angeles Harold-Examiner Mar. 10, 1962]

TIME TO GET MOVING

The B-70 bomber controversy, which has been alternately on the back and front of the stove for months, is boiling again. It is a dispute that involves the vital question of the Nation's security, and it has been pulled and hauled around, and back and forth, far too long.

Our position is identical with that of Gen. Curtis LeMay, Air Chief of Staff.

It is that while we have made notable advances in missiles and let's hope will continue to do so, manned bombers will be essential to our deterrent strength for a long time to come. We cannot afford to put our security eggs in one missile basket.

President Kennedy and Defense Secretary McNamara are resisting pressure from the House Armed Services Committee, headed by Representative CARL VINSON, to spend an additional $491 million for stepped-up production of the B-70 program. Three prototypes are in the works—to what degree of progress we do not know—at a cost of $180 million.

The Air Force program calls for 140 of these bombers, at a cost estimated by the President at $10 billion. They could not be operational until 1970 or 1971. The President's argument is that we ought to see how the prototypes work out before going ahead full throttle.

All right, but let's get going as fast as possible, and spend as much money as needed, in getting those prototypes into being. In addition to their security importance, they have also great potential value in the development of America's commercial airliners of the future. Let's stop stalling.

Meanwhile, the B-70 issue has aroused additional controversy as to the rights and duties of Congress as opposed to the executive branch of the Federal Government.

Congressman VINSON has raised this point: "It is eminently clear that the role of Congress in determining national policy, defense or otherwise, has deteriorated over the years."

VINSON added that "Perhaps this is the time and the occasion to reverse the trend." Certainly it is a cause for public concern.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Mar. 14, 1962]

VINSON VERSUS KENNEDY

A subject of much speculation in Washington is the clash of wills between Congressman CARL VINSON, of Georgia, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, and the Kennedy administration over the development of the B-70 supersonic bomber.

The President asked Congress for an appropriation of $180 million to produce three prototypes of the bomber, on which $1 billion already has been spent. The Vinson committee voted to appropriate $491 million for production of the B-70 as a full weapons system, and furthermore, it directed the Secretary of the Air Force to use all of the money for that purpose.

The question is, and it's a constitutional one, can the Congress direct the President to do something he doesn't want to do. The Armed Services Committee believes that it has the power, assuming of course, that the House and the Senate concur in the committee's directive.

"The time has come when we must determine whether the function of the Congress is solely a negative one, in that it can withhold the authority or funds and prevent something from being done, but can't exercise a positive authority, and by affording the means require something to be done," said VINSON.

In seeking to uphold the authority of Congress, VINSON is relying on the constitutional provisions that the Congress shall have the power to provide for the common defense and that the President "shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed."

So what could Congress do in case the President defied a congressional directive? Well, the House might bring impeachment proceedings against the President or the Secretary of the Air Force, or Congress might try to whip the administration into line by refusing to vote appropriations for other matters.

Presidents Truman and Eisenhower both refused to spend money that Congress had appropriated, but in those instances there was no directive from Congress that the money should be spent. There was some grumbling, but no talk of a showdown between the executive and legislative branches of the Government.

Only once was the impeachment remedy invoked. That was in 1868 when President Andrew Johnson discharged Secretary of War Edwin M. Stanton in violation of the Tenure of Office Act, which prohibited the President from dismissing from office, unless the Senate should agree any officer appointed by him with the consent of the Senate. On that occasion the vote to remove the President from office failed by one to get the necessary two-thirds majority in the Senate.

It is not likely that the dispute between Mr. Kennedy and VINSON will reach the extreme of either impeachment or the withholding of necessary appropriations. Although VINSON seems to be in a fighting mood, the President is anxious to avoid a clash and he is confident that further examination will convince Congress that the B-70

bomber would be obsolete by the time it could be brought into full production.

In these days when Congress is responsive to the demands of pressure groups, and when the administration is proposing all kinds of spending to satisfy everybody's supposed needs, it is refreshing to find some resistance to spending whether it comes from the White House or Capitol Hill.

Statement in Support of H.R. 10141 To Eliminate Discriminatory Literacy Tests as a Qualification for Voting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, last week on March 14–15, the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee which is chaired by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] held a hearing on my bill, H.R. 10141.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues my statement in support of this most important legislation:

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 10141 BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE 5 OF THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 15, 1962

Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to have the opportunity to speak in support of my bill H.R. 10141, to protect the right to vote in Federal elections free from arbitrary discrimination by literacy tests or other means.

This is legislation that has been needed for many, many years. In modern America there is no justification whatever for the kind of discrimination practiced in some States of our Nation to effectively prevent citizens of those States from exercising their constitutional privilege and responsibility at the polling booths.

Our society, Mr. Chairman, is one that is based on consent, the citizens give their consent to the various governments of the nation to make decisions affecting their welfare. These governments—local, State, and national—are in turn responsible to the citizens.

This system cannot be said to truly work, however, when the consent to govern is given by only a part of the citizens who are eligible under the Constitution.

Let us reflect for a moment about those citizens who do not vote. We have, first of all, a large number of citizens who cannot be adjudged competent to assume their responsibility in this regard because of their age. These are our children. They are no less affected by the decisions of government, but they do not, and rightly so, participate in the selection of their leaders. We then have the insane and those unfortunate enough to have lost their voting rights because of criminal acts.

This segment of our citizens, then, cannot exercise the right to vote for various good reasons.

What about the rest of our citizens—those over the age of 21 (or 18 in two States) who are not insane and who have not become criminals. As we all know these citizens are guaranteed the right to vote by the Constitution of the United States. Nothing should be allowed to prevent them from exercising that right. Unfortunately, some of them are denied that right by the imposition of discriminatory laws such as those we have under consideration here today.

This bill would protect the right to vote in Federal elections of those of our citizens who have been discriminated against by literacy tests.

There are a large number of citizens who do not come from an English-speaking background and who, therefore, have been excluded from voting; there are other Americans who have been excluded because of the color of their skin on the pretext that they are not literate.

This bill, however, will set an excellent standard by insisting that no one be prevented from voting who has achieved a sixth-grade education.

I cannot think of any more worthy piece of legislation presently before the Congress than this one, Mr. Chairman. Any bill which enfranchises people by removing arbitrary discriminatory provisions in the law deserves our wholehearted support and I trust that we will have the opportunity to act on it in the House in the very near future.

Thank you.

Doctor Bills Important, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there has been far too much confusion and misunderstanding created in the controversy over medical care for the aged. Many older persons are being deluded into support of the administration's proposals when, in effect, the King-Anderson plan is inconsistent with the problems it proposes to cure. I insert into the RECORD a penetrating editorial from the Tuesday, March 20 issue of the Chicago Sun-Times, which explores this subject effectively. The editorial is entitled "Doctor Bills Important, Too."

DOCTOR BILLS IMPORTANT, TOO

A point often overlooked in the debate over the Kennedy administration's program for medical care for the aged is its lack of provision for doctor care for older sick persons. The administration plan, known as the King-Anderson bill, would offer hospitalization to the ailing who are on social security. It is blank on meeting the equally crucial burden of doctor bills when serious illness strikes.

In an effort to fill the void, one of the Nation's leading private insurance plans, the Blue Shield, has formulated a program for comprehensive docto- care for those over 65, without Federal subsidies and at rates within the reach of millions living on low retirement incomes.

We are happy to note that Illinois physicians approved this program Sunday through their State medical society. When the plan is offered to the public about May 1, Illinois physicians and surgeons are committed to providing their services to the aged at the reduced rates under the plan.

Single persons over 65 with incomes under $2,500, and married couples with combined incomes of $4,000, would pay $3.20 per person per month. They would receive anesthesia, and doctor care in hospitals and nursing homes. There would be radiation therapy, X-ray, laboratory, and pathological examinations within certain limits. Those with higher incomes would pay an additional fee set by the physician.

This program strikes us as sound and humane. It gives older citizens an important opportunity to insure themselves against one of the financial calamities of illness. In this area, at least, the traditional American right of free choice would be preserved, and Government bureaucracy would not enter the picture.

Moreover, it is a demonstration that private enterprise can, and will, find some answers to the social problems of the day, given the opportunity. The program is not the complete answer, of course, for there are still those with such low incomes that $3.20 per month would be a sizable outlay.

But it is a step toward meeting a need which everyone agrees must be met, the only question being how to go about it. We hope some attention will be paid to this plan in Congress and that it may serve as a starting point for the writing of a medical care program for all who require one—not one limited simply to older persons on social security, and not one that would impose an additional payroll tax to underwrite the care of millions regardless of need.

County Agent Doubts Farm Aid and Controls Socialistic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, one of the ablest and best county agents I have ever known is Mr. J. W. Stufflebeme, Jr., the County Agricultural Agent of Washington County, Tex. He is forward-looking and understands the problem of the agricultural producer of our area in Texas.

In his Washington County Farm News column, which appeared in the Brenham Banner-Press of Brenham, Tex., on March 14, he discusses the need to have a clear understanding of the agricultural economy under present-day conditions. He points out the need for Government support of agriculture and I think it is one of the best discussions of the subject I have seen.

I call it to the attention of the Members of Congress, and the article is as follows:

COUNTY AGENT DOUBTS FARM AID AND CONTROLS SOCIALISTIC

(By J. W. Stufflebeme, Jr.)

The need for a clear understanding of the economic situation, especially as it pertains to agriculture, is absolutely essential under present-day conditions. I think businessmen as well as farmers should strive to have an open mind on the subject.

As I mentioned a few weeks ago, farmers in the United States represent a potential market of $40 billion. That, among other reasons, is why the problem is of vital importance to business firms.

The Agricultural Economics Department, Texas A. & M. College, supplied information which will be used in this discussion.

It is believed by most observers, those who have an open mind on the matter, that agriculture has been given undue criticism about being "subsidized by the Government." The merits or demerits of subsidies

are not being argued, rather an attempt is being made to set the record straight. I believe that agriculture is no more subsidized than other parts of the economy. Agriculture is, however, guilty of poor public relations. With historic honesty, farmers call aids subsidies. Other groups camouflage their subsidies in high sounding phrases like "construction differentials," "rapid tax amortization," and so forth.

The price support operations, conducted by the Commodity Credit Corporation in behalf of agriculture, are at the core of the subsidy issue. The opposition to this farm program, in and out of Government, may have left an impression on the public mind that a subsidy is something inborn and inherent with agriculture, and entirely foreign to the remainder of the economy.

It is interesting, therefore, to note that CCC farm price support losses from 1933 to January 1, 1958, have cost the taxpayers less than the subsidies to business through postal deficits alone during the 10-year period 1946–1956. Moreover, the losses connected with price supports for farmers have amounted to only a fraction of the cost of business—reconversion payments, including tax amortization, and other financial aids to industry during the past few years.

The CCC farm price support losses from the beginning of the program to January 1, 1958, amounted to a little over $5 billion. Federal expenditures in recent years for business aids and special services include the following: Mail subsidies (1946–56), almost $6 billion; business reconversion payments, over $43 billion; subsidies to maritime organizations (1938–57), $3½ billion; subsidies to airlines (1938–57), over $600 million.

The foregoing shows in excess of $50 billion of subsidy or subsidylike benefits to industry, the greater part of which has occurred since World War II.

A significant part of our industrial establishment operates today on Government defense and other noncompetitive contracts, without normal risks, and with profits assured. Some 50 of the Nation's largest corporations have received $80 billion in Government contracts during the past 5 or 6 years. Such contracts cannot be labeled as subsidies to industry, but they do reflect certain Federal financial support.

It is notable, moreover, that the Government generally obtains the industrial materials for defense under contracts drawn to assure profits to the producers, whereas the food for the Armed Forces is procured generally without reference to profits or losses to farmers.

For the past 150 years American industry has enjoyed a relatively high protective tariff. Yet, during all the history of America, except the last 25 years, the farmer has had little or no protection. He has produced in a protected market and sold in an unprotected market. We all know the result of such a policy for the farmer—the end came in the late twenties and early thirties.

Now, I am not being critical of Government aid to industry. I am sure these subsidies are essential, but we should be fair about the situation and realize that the shoe fits more than one foot.

Extremists may shout that the country is being taken over by the Socialists or Communists. Now, what is a simple definition of socialism? This one will do—the theory system which advocates the vesting of the ownership and control of the means of production, capital, land, etc., in the community as a whole.

Now, let us look at the record. In 1920, only 46 percent of the farmers owned their own farms; in 1930, less than 40 percent were classified as landowners; in 1940, over 50 percent of the farmers owned their farms, and in 1961 over 80 percent of the farmers in Texas were landowners. Does this sound like socialism?

Per capita income for farm and nonfarm population is another guide which should be of interest to all people. In 1934, the average net income per capita of farm population from all sources was only $165; for nonfarm population, this figure in 1934 was $468. In 1944, farm per capita income was $696; nonfarm, $1,328. In 1961, farm per capita income was around $1,000, while the per capita of nonfarm population was well over $2,000. This doesn't sound like socialism either.

We have a country which comprises 6 percent of the world's population and 7 percent of the world's land area. Yet, we have so many advantages that we are the envy of most areas of the world. Personally, I like the United States of America. I wouldn't want to live anywhere else. And, I think our country will continue to improve and offer all of our citizens the opportunity of enjoying a better life for themselves and their children.

Health and Safety on the Road

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an address which I delivered at the Rhode Island Truck Owners Association dinner, Sheraton-Biltmore Hotel, Providence, R.I., on December 6, 1961.

The address follows:

HEALTH AND SAFETY ON THE ROAD

(Remarks of Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY, U.S. Representative, Second Congressional District of Rhode Island, at Rhode Island Truck Owners Association dinner, Sheraton-Biltmore, Providence, R.I., Wednesday, December 6, 1961)

You have been reminded many times, I am sure, that this is the eve of the 20th anniversary of Pearl Harbor Day—the day that President Roosevelt said would go down in history as a day of infamy. In the 4 years between that day and the end of World War II, this Nation lost 275,338 men and women, most of them in the prime of life.

Every year on this date, this great sacrifice is mourned anew, as it should be. Aside from the thousands of personal tragedies that these deaths represented, the loss of the millions of man-hours of high productivity which we sustained was an economic tragedy to the Nation from which we have not yet fully recovered.

In all the wars in American history, including the Korean action, the United States lost about 550,000 of her citizens. In the first 59 years of the present century, we lost 1,335,842 on the streets, roads, and highways. Two and one-half times as many victims as in all the wars in our history were lost to traffic accidents, most of them preventable. Most of these victims, like our war casualties, were in, or had not yet reached, the most productive years of their lives. And year after year, we continue to lose almost 40,000 more, from traffic accidents alone. Is it not time that we began to fight the highway holocaust in the same way that we fight a war, with all of our resources, all of our strength, all of our perseverance and ingenuity?

You gentlemen, representing the truck transport industry of our State, are well aware of the heavy impact of traffic accidents on the economics of your industry. You have, in a sense, a larger stake in the fight against traffic accidents than any other segment of our industry and our population. And to a great extent, many of you have risen to the challenge, by painstaking maintenance of your vehicles, by careful selection and rigorous training of your employees, and by your strong support of better highways, more realistic traffic regulations, and more effective enforcement efforts.

Yet, in spite of constantly improved engineering, education, and enforcement, we continue to kill about the same number of men, women, and children in traffic accidents every year. It is true that the number of vehicles on the roads increases every year, and so does the number of traffic police. Why, in the face of increasing attention and support for the "three E's" of traffic safety, does the traffic-death total remain at a seemingly irreducible, constant figure? Is it possible that the "three E's" alone, as important as they are, are not the total answer to traffic accidents?

I believe that the answer to that question is "Yes." One vital element has been omitted, until very recently, from our analysis of the situation. That element is true, factual, provable knowledge based on sound, scientific research. Especially necessary before we can hope to make a sizable dent in our annual traffic toll, in my opinion, is research on the human aspects of traffic safety.

Just what physical, physiological, and psychological elements are necessary for a person to be a safe driver? Which of these elements tend to make a person unsafe at the wheel of a vehicle? After 60 years and almost 1½ million deaths we still do not know.

In the United States today, 87 million persons are licensed to operate motor vehicles whenever they please on any public road in the Nation. The criteria for licensing vary considerably from State to State, but in one respect at least they are all alike: They are of necessity based largely on assumptions, guesses, and conjectures. Not one State bases the driving privilege on firm knowledge—because none exists.

In hearings before my Committee on Appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare this year it was pointed up that the Surgeon General's report on environmental health had described the activities of official health agencies in the accident prevention field as falling far short of meeting the need for effective measures to reduce the toll taken by accidents particularly among children. Because of this the appropriation bill included an increase of $1 million to permit the Public Health Service to initiate an effective, well-balanced program to mobilize public health resources in the attacks on death and disability due to accidents.

I am glad to be able to report to you that, at long last, at least a start has been made toward providing the many answers we need. Early this year, there was established in the Public Health Service a Division of Accident Prevention which has undertaken to find the answers to traffic safety in the same way that the health and medical sciences have found solutions to many of the great scourges of the past. In the 21 years that I have been privileged to serve as your Representative in Congress, nothing has given me more pride and pleasure than the support I have been able to give to every sound measure for improving the health and safety of the American people. With accidents ranking first among the killers of children, teenagers, and young men and women up to the age of 35, I am convinced that we must give the Public Health Service the kind of support which enabled it to eliminate or reduce many of the losses from communicable and chronic diseases.

Many of our citizens living today will remember that, not so long ago, smallpox, typhoid fever, diphtheria, and other diseases

were considered acts of God which we could do nothing about, just as many of us regard accidental deaths and injuries today. The first thing we must do, if we want to stop killing people on the highway, is to face up to the reality that accidents are caused by people and that they can be stopped—by people. Perhaps the largest roadblock to traffic safety is the myth, voiced by too many of us, that human behavior cannot be changed. If this were true, our ancestors would never have advanced from the caveman stage. It is time that we removed this convenient excuse for doing nothing.

We can change human behavior, but before we attempt to do so we ought to be sure we are changing it on the basis of knowledge, rather than conjecture, no matter how reasonable the conjecture might appear to be. As a major step in that direction, it has been proposed that research facilities be provided for the Public Health Service efforts in accident prevention, similar to those which have enabled the Service to do so much to advance our health and well-being by research into the causes of heart disease, cancer, and other afflictions of humanity.

As a major part of that facility, the development of various types of simulators has been recommended. These would enable the Public Health Service specialists to reproduce exactly the environmental aspects of driving, including the automobile, the road, the signs and lights and other traffic-control devices, and all of the other constantly changing conditions involved. With such tools, the scientists could test drivers of all kinds—the hard-of-hearing, the diabetic, the intoxicated, the elderly, the young, and all the other kinds of people among our 87 million drivers, without exposing them and others to the hazards of this kind of test on the highway itself. Then the scientists could come up with the sound, factual information needed by the motor vehicle administrators, highway engineers, automobile designers, legislatures, law enforcement agencies, and others to make decisions based on actual facts.

Exactly what happens to a truckdriver under the influence of benzedrine? Our doctors have some idea of what it does to him physiologically, but no one now has any real knowledge of what it does to his short-range and medium-range and long-range driving ability. Is there an actual, measurable decrement of ability, and if so, what is it and how does it work? Various jurisdictions are setting up arbitrary levels of alcohol in the blood and saying that a person with such a level is a drunken driver and a person with a lower level is not. Yet the most eminent authorities in the country today disagreed pretty widely on the correct level when they came together at the Public Health Service Conference on Alcohol and Traffic Safety in Pittsburgh, last May. In some States, elderly drivers are being threatened with loss or restriction of their driving privileges on purely arbitrary grounds, because we don't have the information on which to base a sound decision.

With true simulators and other research tools which are now available or which can be developed, we will be able to approach the accident problem in the same rational way in which we have beaten so many other health problems. I pledge to you that I will continue to devote my best efforts to making possible sound progress in all aspects of public health and safety.

Another health area in which you, as truck operators, have both personal and economic interests is the matter of air pollution. This again is an area with which I have had a great opportunity to become acquainted, from the vantage point of my chairmanship of the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations Subcommittee of the House of Representatives. As a result of various hearings which we have held and studies which I have conducted, I have become convinced that the solution of the air pollution problem will require the closest possible cooperation on the part of the Federal Government, the States, and local communities, as well as on the part of the various industries concerned. None of these can do alone what needs to be done. My committee is actively engaged in making possible increased Federal participation in this important work.

My mention of the industrial role in air pollution and its control will come as no surprise to you gentlemen, I am sure. You are undoubtedly more aware than I of the full contribution that the trucking industry is making in the creation and continuation of the problem, and the contribution it should make toward the solution.

There are many new straws in the wind, such as the trend of State legislatures to make blowby equipment mandatory on motor vehicles, and other approaches on which I need not dwell with a group as well informed as this. Certainly it is right and proper for Government to expect, and if necessary to require, that industry will do its utmost to avoid the creation of health problems and to correct those which it creates. At the same time, I am realistic enough to know that a problem which has as many roots as air pollution will not be solved by a single industry working alone. The most we can expect is that you will shoulder a reasonable share of the burden, and this I am sure you will do.

In the same way, the problem cuts across political and geographical boundaries. We expect each affected State and community to contribute its reasonable share to the correction and prevention of air pollution. But, when all of these industrial, State, and local contributions have been made, there will still remain an important part of the problem which only the Federal Government has the resources and the responsibility to undertake. I assure you that I will do my utmost to see that the Federal Government shoulders its fair share of the financial burden, and will continue to provide sound technical guidance and assistance to States, communities, and industries which seek to initiate more effective control programs.

A few weeks ago I had the privilege of addressing the New England Section of the Air Pollution Control Association, here in Providence. In preparing for that meeting, I checked into what the Federal Government has been able to do, under present laws, to assist the New England States and localities. You might be interested in a brief review of these activities, some of which, of course, affect your industry to varying degrees.

Air pollution research, under Public Health Service grants, has been underway at both Harvard and MIT since 1957. This summer, as part of a large research project on atmospheric lead levels and the body lead levels in certain occupational groups, analyses were made of the air in and near Boston's Sumner Tunnel, where especially high concentrations of motor vehicle exhaust emissions were to be expected.

Here in Providence, as well as in Boston and in Berlin, New Hampshire, the PHS Division of Air Pollution has provided technical assistance in a survey of air-pollution conditions. Also in Providence, at the request of my good friend, Genaro Constantino, chief of the city's Division of Air Pollution and Mechanical Equipment and Installations, an intensive 5-week study was conducted last summer to improve knowledge of air pollution levels here and to develop local competence in sampling and analyzing atmospheric contaminants.

Since 1957, the Public Health Service has maintained one nonurban and at least one urban station of the National Air Sampling Network in every State in New England. Many of these stations recently began to sample gaseous pollutants, in addition to the solid contaminants.

One thing is certain, and it has been giving me increasing concern. New England, and especially southern New England, has a serious and growing air pollution problem. On this point, many of my facts and figures have come from Bill Megonnell, whom you all know or should know as the Public Health Service Regional Consultant on Air Pollution in New England. In brief outline form, here is the problem:

The Northeast is at least six times as densely populated as the rest of the Nation. Out of a national total of 188 standard metropolitan areas, 45 are located here. These Northeastern States consume over one-third of the light and heavy fuel oils burned in this country, one-fourth of the bituminous coal, and almost all of the anthracite coal. When we include New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, we find that over 35 percent of the Nation's manufacturing employment is concentrated here.

Specifically concerning you gentlemen, as representatives of the truck transport industry, is the finding that in many New England areas, emissions from motor vehicles constitute a significant proportion of the total air contamination. There are other major contributors, of course, such as the incineration of tremendous quantities of municipal and industrial waste. In a way, it is ironic that you still hear often the expression, "as free as air." Gentlemen, we are rapidly approaching the point where air will no longer be really free, where in fact it will be one of the costliest of our necessities of life, unless we take a realistic look at the situation, assess what must be done, and then proceed to do it as quickly and efficiently as we can. This is nowhere truer than it is right here in New England. This is why you can be sure that my committee and I will do whatever we can to make more effective Federal aid available for the States and communities faced with the potentially frightening problems of contaminated air.

That these problems are receiving close attention at the highest levels of our Government is evident from President Kennedy's message to Congress on our natural resources. "Although the total supply of air is vast," the President said, "the atmosphere over our growing metropolitan areas—where more than half of the people live—has only limited capacity to dilute and disperse the contaminants now being increasingly discharged from homes, factories, vehicles, and many other sources." The President stressed his intention to foster effective Federal programs for protection of this vital resource.

Now, gentlemen, I would like to close on a note of forthright, blunt frankness. I believe that my long record of public service identifies me clearly as a friend of industry. Representing such a highly industrialized State as Rhode Island, I could hardly be otherwise. But it is industry's longrun interests that I prefer to serve, because I feel keenly that industry's best interests, in the long run, are identical with those of the general public. And in this matter of air pollution, I cannot help but think that some segments of industry have been somewhat shortsighted.

Let's consider especially the automobile industry and the oil industry, with both of which your industry is so closely allied. With respect to these industries, I would like to repeat here part of a statement which I made on the floor of Congress last spring:

"Motor vehicles constitute one of the major sources of air pollution and, unlike many other important pollutant sources, this one is universal throughout the United States. Our cars and trucks go everywhere.

"I cannot escape the conclusion that the automobile industry has been dragging its feet in the matter of factory installation of blowby devices. These, as you probably know, are relatively inexpensive devices for controlling emissions from automotive crankcases. While they will not solve the larger problem of exhaust emissions from the tailpipe, they do eliminate from one-fourth to one-third of the motor car's total contribution to our air-pollution problem.

"Such devices were factory installed on new cars sold this year in the one State of California and are available—at a higher price, of course—as optional dealer-installed equipment on new American cars in other localities. In view of the mounting evidence that air pollution not only is costly, but may also be highly hazardous to human health—and since this new device eleminates a part of it at a low cost—it would have seemed both good business and good public relations for the auto industry to install such a device at the factory on all new cars sold in this country. This, in fact, is what Secretary Ribicoff recently recommended.

"Unlike automobiles, oil refineries are not an important part of the air pollution problem in every—certainly, in many cities. In the Los Angeles area, refineries have placed into effect control measures which drastically reduce their potential contribution to Los Angeles smog. What this means, then, is that Los Angeles suffers a minimum of refinery emissions and, in addition, receives new cars with blowby control devices factory installed.

"In other parts of the country, however, neither the automobile industry nor the oil industry is cooperating half so well. New Jersey, for example, is one of the many States that receives almost none of the advantages insisted upon in Los Angeles. New Jersey comes to mind, because it has just recently come to my attention that New Jersey's Rutgers University is attempting to develop smog-resistant plants in order to help truck farmers to survive. A single ride at almost any hour of the day on the upper stretches of the New Jersey Turnpike makes it patently clear why Rutgers is interested in plants that can survive smog, and you don't have to be an expert loaded down with instruments to see that both refineries and automobiles play an important role in New Jersey's smog problem.

"I should think that these two rich industries—simply in enlightened self-interest, if for no other reason, would do everything they reasonably could do to abate their own contribution to this growing environmental hazard, if only to avert the risk of drastic legislation which might seem to them much less reasonable in its demands."

This is how my statement to Congress ran. I would recommend that last point for your special study, because since last spring indications have begun to accumulate to the effect that the public is becoming more alarmed about both public-health problems which I have discussed here—traffic accidents and air pollution—and is beginning to call for legislative action. As a further indication of how these two problems are interconnected in the minds of the people and their governing bodies, I recently saw a single news release from the Public Health Service which referred to two decisions issued by the General Services Administration on the same day, to the effect that both blowby equipment and seatbelt attachments would be required in all motor vehicles purchased by GSA in the future.

We have seen how California adopted its own blowby legislation. Now Wisconsin has made seatbelts—not merely the attachment points, but the belts themselves—mandatory in all 1962 cars sold in the State. This is how the wind is blowing and, in fact, the way it has always blown. When industry fails to meet its moral obligations, sooner or later the people, through their National and State legislative and administrative branches, force industry's hand.

I have always been proud of the way Rhode Island industries have conducted their affairs in the public interest. I am sure that the truck transport industry in this State will continue to meet its obligations to public health and safety. To the extent that Federal assistance, both financial and technical, is needed. I will continue to do my best to see that it becomes available. I have always felt that voluntary cooperation is better than a law and in this I am sure that you and I are in complete agreement. Please let me know when we in Washington can help.

Teenage Drinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, throughout my years in public life one of the most distressing problems with which I have been involved is the tragic and unnecessary story of drinking teenagers and the death, destruction and disfigurement which has resulted.

On previous occasions, I have brought this matter to the attention of our colleagues and pointed out the great harm which is being done to the young people and the law enforcement activities of New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Vermont, and Canada by the refusal of New York State to raise its drinking age from 18 to 21 in conformity with all its neighbors.

Neither morally nor realistically can this situation be dismissed as being New York's responsibility alone. So long as New York provides a drinking haven for the youngsters of other States, then those States have a legitimate complaint. Their own residents are being encouraged to break the law. Their law enforcement agencies are being handicapped in carrying out their obligations. Highway deaths directly resulting from teenagers returning from drinking sessions in New York are increasing. The Governors of Vermont, Connecticut, and New Jersey have been outspoken in their criticism of New York's 18-year-old drinking law.

Because of its interstate implications, Mr. Speaker, I believe our colleagues should be aware of this difficult situation, and I propose to continue to inform the Congress of the need for corrective action.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the March 6 issue of the Daily Journal of Elizabeth, N.J., and an editorial from the Utica (N.Y.) Observer-Dispatch which was reprinted, with appropriate comment, in the March 9 issue of the Courier-News of Plainfield, N.J.:

[From the Elizabeth (N.J.) Daily Journal, Mar. 6, 1962]

TEENAGE TIPPLING PROBLEM GROWS

Hints that the tippling by New Jersey youth in New York is increasing derive substance from data recorded by police who check vehicles returning to the Garden State late on weekend nights. The full evil potential of this practice fortunately has not been felt.

Sale of alcoholic beverages to boys and girls younger than 21 is forbidden in this State; it also is the rule in the other Commonwealths adjoining New York, where the age limit is 18 years. The liquor trade in the Empire State consequently prospers from the drinking tours of young residents of New Jersey.

Various and vigorous protests have been made to Albany, usually with New Jersey acting alone or leading concerted effort for one or more of the States badgered by this inconsistency.

Albany of course regards regulation of internal affairs as its own peculiar business and is not too disturbed by the complaints from Trenton or Hartford or Montpelier. State's rights, the venerable full faith and credit code of the law, and unconcern about what happens within the jurisdiction of the complaining governments feed Albany's apathy.

Technically, however, New York is virtually in the position of maintaining an attractive nuisance, a legal theory it recognizes, by making its bars available to the underage drinkers from other States.

Doubtless it is superfluous to inject an inquiry as to the whereabouts and the attitude of the parents—some are ignorant of it, some are indifferent, and fortunately some are worried.

Public safety is involved in this issue. A youngster rendered unfit to operate a car becomes a hazard in the area where he did his drinking as well as in his own neighborhood. Albany apparently is loathe to concede this.

Checkpoint records of the police in every community adjoining New York show that astounding percentages of teenagers returning at late hours, especially on weekends, have been indulging in liquor.

This presents a moral responsibility difficult for the Empire State to continue to disregard. The legislature listens politely—and sits on its hands—but a slowly growing number of residents of New York are recognizing the trouble it is inflicting upon its neighbors, especially New Jersey. It is time for official cognition of this situation and corrective action.

[From the Plainfield (N.J.) Courier-News, Mar. 9, 1962]

NEW YORK OUT OF STEP

(Many organizations and the press in New York State are in favor of raising the legal drinking age from 18 to 21 in New York. Each time the proposed change is brought up in Albany, a strong lobby succeeds in having the question referred to a committee "for study." Here's an editorial on the subject published March 6 in the Utica Observer-Dispatch, Utica, N.Y.)

That old song about a marching unit being all out of step but Jim came to mind reading the report of the speech of a Syracusan at a meeting of the Oneida County Restaurant & Liquor Dealers Association here Sunday.

The speaker, Thomas E. Connolly, executive director of the Onondaga Health Association, supported the opinion of New York State Legislative Committee witnesses of standing that depriving 18- to 21-year-old youngsters of their legal right to buy alcoholic beverages is a new and perhaps more vicious prohibition.

We can agree with him and Governor Rockefeller that parental influence is too

often abdicated, but when only New York State and Louisiana have 18-year-old floors on legal beverage sales, the indication is strong that we are wrong, not right.

Grand juries in this county and others have often decried sale of alcoholic drinks to teenagers illegally. Raising the age floor should help the honest bartender keep kids out of his place. A 16-year-old doesn't often look 21.

Neither Governor Dempsey, of Connecticut, nor Governor Hughes, of New Jersey, is a bluenosed reformer. But they keep beseeching New York State to raise the legal drinking age to 21 to match theirs. Evidently they have no fear of reaction of youth to their 21-year-old floor. They merely want to prevent harm to their youngsters who come to New York State to drink.

All the expert testimony in the world can't alter the fact New York is out of step with other States on this matter.

The New American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the March edition of the Rotarian, the magazine of Rotary International, I have previously cited as being one of the most significant publications that it has ever been my pleasure to read. Here in 64 pages are some of the most succinct analyses of our Nation, her development and her people that you will find anywhere, even in much more lengthy treatises. At this time I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, and all who read the RECORD, an article appearing in the magazine written by Dexter M. Keezer, tracing the historic rise of the average American worker into what is now our great middle class—the very backbone of our Nation.

Dr. Keezer is presently economic adviser of McGraw-Hill, publishers of Business Week and many other fine business and technical periodicals and books. A graduate of Amherst College who received his doctorate from the Brookings Graduate School of Economics and Government, Dr. Keezer has been a prolific writer, serving both as a journalist and an author of books. He has taught economics at several colleges and universities, and was president of Reed College in Portland, Oreg., from 1934 to 1942. He has held several high positions in the Federal Government, as a railroad labor mediator, in the NRA, on the National War Labor Board, as the Deputy Administrator of OPA and as a member of the U.S. Mission for Economic Affairs to England.

Unfortunately the chart prefacing Dr. Keezer's article cannot be here reproduced, but it shows, in dramatic fashion, that the dollar income pattern of our citizens has jumped from a broad base of less than $3,000 per annum to a reverse pyramid where those with $5,000 per annum and up make up the greatest percentage of our workers. The doctor's article follows:

THE NEW AMERICAN REVOLUTION

(By Dr. Dexter M. Keezer)

Look at the chart [not printed in RECORD] and you will see, in outline form, the story of what has been correctly characterized (by Arthur F. Burns, president of the National Bureau of Economic Research) as "one of the great social revolutions of history"—a revolution "carried out peacefully and gradually."

It is a revolution in the distribution of individual income in the United States which has quite literally turned the pattern of this distribution upside down, to the benefit of those who were down toward the bottom of the individual income scale. As the chart indicates, the profile of the distribution of individual income in the United States in 1929 was shaped like a pyramid, with the broad base created by the large number of individuals who had relatively low incomes.

Now the profile of income distribution in the United States, as indicated by 1961 figures, which are the latest available, is still shaped roughly like a pyramid. But the pyramid has been turned upside down, with the larger numbers of individual income receivers in the upper brackets, and the numbers in the lower income brackets greatly reduced.

This revolutionary increase in the number of individual incomes in the upper income brackets in the United States, it should be emphasized, is not to be accounted for by price inflation, with attendant reduction in the value of the dollar. It is possible, of course, to inflate incomes into the upper brackets, and there has been inflation in the United States since 1929. But the picture of the revolution in income distribution provided by the chart is not explained by inflation. The comparisons of the distribution of income in the 2 years—1929 and 1961—are made in dollars of uniform purchasing power. The revolution involved is a revolution in real income, a revolutionary upgrading of the physical volume of goods and services most Americans can actually buy with the money income they receive.

How is this dramatic upgrading of the relative income of the common man (and woman) in the United States to be accounted for? It is to this question that this article is largely addressed. In all its ramifications the answer to the question reaches into almost every nook and cranny of an economy serving more than 185 million Americans in a myriad of complex and intricately interrelated ways. But the main threats of an explanation are clear enough.

Before 1929, the takeoff date for the chart cited at the outset, the American economy had many great accomplishments to its credit. For example, in spite of meeting the necesssity of producing a large stock of weapons and munitions to be blown up in World War I, the American economy had by 1929 raised the standard of living of the average American by about one-third above that of 1900, and made it the highest in the world. And in the meantime the population had increased from about 76 million to about 122 million. Indeed, the American economy had been performing what the British historian W. K. Hancock has characterized as the "Western miracle"—that of providing a higher and higher standard of living for more and more people.

However, the economic performance of the United States fell short in two particulars of major importance:

1. It did not manage to avoid violent booms and busts and, largely on this account,

2. It did not distribute incomes to individuals evenly enough to prevent a large share of the electorate from feeling that it wasn't getting a fair deal.

There were other aspects of the performance of the American economy which left a lot to be desired. For one thing, natural resources were frequently chewed up wastefully and with striking disregard of esthetic sensibilities. And sometimes something of the same sort happened to men, too.

However, it was a libelous caricature of the American economic performance, as a whole, which portrayed it as run by paunchy barons attired in business suits of dollar-mark design who most enjoyed resting their overloaded heels on the necks of downtrodden masses of workers and consumers. The fact is that, with interruptions caused by economic instability, these masses were, when viewed over a span of years, improving their lot dramatically. But the caricature of the years around the turn of the century is still presented, and accepted, in some parts of the world as the continuing reality.

The susceptibility of the American economy to violent ups and downs, and the popular dissatisfaction with the distribution of income which it accentuated, was disclosed with devastating force by the great depression of the 1930's. It started with the collapse of a speculative financial boom late in 1929, and by 1933 had reached a depth where more than a fourth of the entire American labor force (about 13 million workers) was unemployed, and 9 million individual savings accounts had been wiped out by bank failures.

As the depression gained momentum, a new national administration came to power with what it conceived to be—I am sure correctly—a clear mandate to do something both to reverse its course and prevent its recurrence. This the administration proceeded to try to do in a number of ways which have had abiding effects in shaping the American economy. One way was for the Government to pour funds directly into the economy, both to relieve economic distress and to increase the total amount of economic activity by what was tagged as "pump priming." In doing this the Federal Government spent much more money than it was able to collect in taxes and thus, for the first time in the Nation's history, resorted to deficit financing in peacetime—a practice which, with stabilization of the economy as its avowed aim, has been followed extensively since.

Under a specially constituted agency, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the new Government embarked directly on what over the years has become broad development of the resources of the valley, centered upon the control of its water resources and their use for the generation of electricity, but touching in one way and another the entire economic life of the region. Both in magnitude and in principle, the TVA constituted a new departure in direct governmental development of the resources of a region which, in the words of one competent observer, Dr. Clair Wilcox, of Swarthmore College, "constituted a transformation in the valley that has made it a model which is admired, studied, and copied in the development of backward areas throughout the world."

Both to create greater economic stability through a steadier flow of consumer purchasing power and to mitigate the individual suffering resulting from economic instability, a broad program of unemployment insurance was launched. And insurance to give financial protection in old age was coupled with it. To much the same end—that of promoting stability and minimizing individual hardship—the Federal Government instituted a system of insurance of individual bank deposits, up to an amount of $10,000.

In another range of operations of probably the greatest abiding importance, the Federal Government that came to power in the depth of the Great Depression undertook a major realinement of the economic forces which had shaped the American economy. One key step in this process was the underwriting by the Federal Government of minimum prices of a whole series of basic agricultural

products. Another was the promotion of the organization of wage workers in trade unions. The idea underlying both of these steps was that when acting individually both farmers and wage workers lacked the bargaining strength to command shares of the income produced that would assure both a stable and an equitable flow of purchasing power.

By its underwriting of minimum prices for basic farm products, the Federal Government involved the American farmer, long heralded for his rugged individualism, in a close working partnership. Its promotion of organized labor launched that group on an ascent toward something which many would see approaching supreme political power in the Nation.

Whether the program of the depression-born national administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt, generally tagged the "New Deal," did a passably good job in restoring a satisfactory level of prosperity is a question which will never be answered conclusively. The reason is that before the potentialities of the program could be anything like fully tested, the rush to arm for World War II, with its tremendous demands for production and workers, was on. It is entirely clear, however, that the "New Deal" put in place foundations which fundamentally altered the American economy.

In these foundations the American participation in World War II also made some profound and abiding changes. Its voracious demands for labor not only created full employment, but also brought a large and what has proved to be an abiding increase in the proportion of women in the Nation's labor force. If the prewar proportion of women in the labor force prevailed today, there would not be anywhere near enough workers to fill the jobs now being filled. Under the forced draft of wartime requirements the American economy also grew at a phenomenal rate, an as it came out of the wartime decade it was producing a volume of goods and services half again as large as it was at the beginning.

To pay that part—about half—of the $275 billion cost of the U.S. participation in the war which was met by tax collections, Federal income tax rates were raised to what in the prewar years would have seemed astronomical heights. And the heavy load of expenditures which the Federal Government has carried in the postwar years for the military, foreign economic aid, and expanding Federal services, has perpetuated these very high tax rates, and very large Government budgets.

In the postwar years successive national political administrations of different parties have altered in various ways the foundations of the American economy they found in place. But they have not changed its essential character as an economy which, as basically overhauled to meet the convulsions of the thirties and forties:

1. Gives its individual participants wide freedom of choice in choosing their jobs, which, as a whole, yield them the highest incomes available anywhere.

2. Provides protection against the vicissitudes of unemployment and old age through broadly based programs of unemployment insurance and social security. Public provision for insurance to meet the needs of old age is supplemented by private pension funds with assets of more than $50 billion.

3. To give assurance that their bargaining strength is adequate (some would say far too adequate), encourages the organization of workers in trade unions which currently embrace some 17 million workers.

4. Encourages the organization of farmers to strengthen their bargaining position, and also underwrites, with Government funds, minimum prices for a broad array of farm products.

5. Operates under a highly progressive tax system, with rates ascending with rising individual income to a point where 91 percent of any additional income goes to the tax collector—an arrangement which broadly blocks the accumulation of great fortunes.

A few years ago in India, where I had the extraordinary honor of talking to the Rotary Clubs of Bombay and Calcutta on successive meeting days, I found that even those who had been to the United States had little or no conception of the degree to which—through social security insurance, taxation, and Government policy and expenditures—the American economy is geared to protect the interests of the common man. The chart cited at the outset tells much of the story at a glance.

In India, as well as elsewhere overseas, I encountered a more or less standard pattern of economic thought which conceives of the economy as divided into a "public sector" and a "private sector." Any such classification is more confusing than helpful in analyzing how the American economy works. For, far from having anything like sharply defined public and private sectors, there is a wide range of arrangements involving a great variety and mixture of public and private controls.

In the American economy there are operations which are strictly Government owned and operated—the postal service and the installations of the Tennessee Valley Authority, for example. There are operations which are left quite strictly to private initiative. This is largely true of manufacturing and retail trade. And in between there are many mixtures of public and private control. The transportation and electrical power services are for the most part privately owned, but subject to public regulation of their rates and services. Construction is carried on primarily by private establishments and for the benefit of individual owners, but there are Government guarantees of loans for home-building.

And so it goes through a wide spectrum of arrangements involving both public and private controls to a degree which thoroughly belies the conception of clearly defined public and private sectors. A century ago President Abraham Lincoln advanced the proposition that "the legitimate object of Government is to do for the people what needs to be done, but which they cannot by individual effort do at all or do as well for themselves." Great flexibility in applying this proposition, rather than doctrinaire devotion to rigid conceptions of what properly belongs in the public and private sectors, is surely one of the great strengths of the American economy.

Another of the rather unique strengths of the American economy, in the opinion of this observer, is provided by its so-called antitrust laws which, oddly enough, have been very little emulated elsewhere. The basic idea underlying these laws, the first of which were enacted in 1890, is that when unregulated private enterprise is entrusted with the production of goods and services, fair competition between competing establishments is the essential element of proper performance in the public interest. Consequently, the broad aim of the antitrust laws is to outlaw private monopoly and agreements between what would otherwise be competing firms to impose restraints on competition such as those fixing uniform prices or limiting output.

Business competition in the United States today takes forms far different from those which prevailed when the antitrust laws were first enacted. In some industries only a few industrial giants operate today where there were scores of firms early in the century. But this does not mean that the competition is any less severe. Indeed it is frequently intensified by the great strength acquired by the few survivors in a continuing competitive struggle. Indeed, there is good reason to believe that competition in that range of American business where the antitrust laws buttress the reliance upon fair competition to assure performance in the public interest has never been more intense than it is today.

The competition frequently takes forms that would have been regarded as quite fanciful a few decades ago. One of them is the financial support by business corporations of colleges and universities. This year business firms will make gifts of more than $150 million to these institutions, primarily to help protect their long-range prospects by having a system of higher education adequate to the public and industrial needs of the Nation.

One of the key forces intensifying business and industrial competition in the United States is that provided by the tremendous outlays being made for scientific and industrial research and development. This year American industry will be spending more than $11 billion for research and development, with about half of this amount being initially provided by the Federal Government and largely for research and development related to national defense.

The tremendous boom in research and development which, as the chart indicates, promises to carry total expenditurs for these purposes to almost $24 billion a year by 1970, is spawning a veritable flood of new products, new industrial proceses, and new equipment. This accelerating flood, in turn, is adding a great and, in large part, new dynamic force to the American economy.

Since the 1920's, imposition of heavy taxes on both business and personal income has cut down financial incentives to work and to risk funds on new ventures. Over the same period the benefits provided by social security arrangements, while not providing the financial basis for a comfortable career, have reduced the penalties for not working. As a result, fears have been expressed by some that these arrangements would weaken disastrously what had been great driving forces of the American economy—in the form of large rewards for hard and successful work and heavy penalties for lack of it. However, this has not proved to be the case, and one reason is that great new driving force has been added by the continuing and expanding boom in scientific research and development, or what is sometimes called the industry of invention.

The American economy still has a full quota of problems to solve before it can be suspected of approaching perfection in performing its role of producing more and more material well-being for more and more people. One of its most persistent problems is, ironically enough, created by the very abundance produced by American agriculture. American farmers produce many crops so bountifully that their market prices would be excessively low for the farmers if the Government did not, in a variety of ways, provide support for these prices. A solution of this problem, which would restore to American agriculture a marketing independence comparable to that enjoyed by American manufacturing, has stumped a whole succession of national political administrations of differing political complexions and continues to do so.

Another problem, which is aggravated by the scope and speed of innovation and the improvement of industrial technology in the United States, is that of retraining and relocating workers displaced by this process well enough and fast enough to maintain the maximum feasible level of employment. For example, 75,000 coal miners, largely equipped with massive modern machinery, can produce more coal than 250,000 miners

produced in the 1930's. In the process a vast amount of dirty and dangerous work has been eliminated, but along with it there have been problems of retraining and relocation of displaced workers which remain to be solved. However, for those displaced the problems have been eased by provision for compensation during periods of unemployment.

There are many who feel that the overshadowing problem of the American economy is that government—National, State, and local—has come to play too large a part in operations. A generation ago only about 10 percent of the Nation's total economic activity was channeled through Government; today about 20 percent is so controlled. However, massive requirements of expenditure for national defense, as well as wide public approval of Government support of a great variety of social security and public-welfare arrangements, provide little prospect that the governmental share in the Nation's economic life will soon be returning toward its earlier level. A continuing problem, stemming from the Nation's heavy financial commitments overseas for defense of the West and economic development and aid, is that of maintaining a safe and satisfactory balance of international payments.

In the meantime, the overhauling of the institutional framework of the American economy, some key parts of which have been roughly blocked out in this article, has:

1. Greatly improved the lot of the common man, and by a process of leveling up rather than leveling down.

2. Made violent booms and busts such as those which previously blighted the pre-World War II economy a matter of unhappy history.

3. Not only perpetuated but, over the postwar period as a whole, actually increased the dynamic force which has consistently been the crowning characteristic of American economic life.

And, if the world has the elemental good sense to avoid blowing itself up with hydrogen bombs, the prospect is that this process of upgrading and improvement will continue at a vigorous pace during the decade ahead.

From Cotton Gin to Satellite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the transformation of America from a predominantly agricultural society into the most powerful industrial society ever in existence is one of the epic events in the history of the world. The National Science Foundation recently ascribed to that transformation the achievement of our greatness as a nation:

Our real genius as a nation has been the power to convert scientific knowledge into practical utility.

But as well as quickly learning to improve our own society, we have been as quick to share our knoweldge and its application to the benefit of the entire world. Professor Toynbee has declared:

The 20th century will be remembered as the period when the benefits of civilization will have become available to the whole human race. The idea of the common welfare for all people has come initially from early America.

In the March issue of the Rotarian, to which I have alluded in past days and earlier today, there is an excellent article about the scientific and industrial revolution that has taken place in America. It was written by Arthur J. Snider who has been the science editor of the Chicago Daily News. A past president of the National Association of Science Writers, Mr. Snider has won several awards in the newspaper field, including the National Headliner's Award. He is a graduate of the University of Iowa and has done graduate work at Northwestern University. Mr. Snider's article follows:

FROM COTTON GIN TO SATELLITE

(By Arthur J. Snider)

This is the 20th anniversary year of the achievement of American scientists in unleashing and controlling the energy of the atom, an event ranking with the prehistoric lighting of fire. On December 2, 1942, at 3:25 o'clock in the afternoon, Enrico Fermi ordered the control rods withdrawn from a crude, beehive-shaped atomic furnace. The crescendo clicking of counters told the momentous story: The reaction was self-sustaining. Atomic energy was a reality. It promised to fulfill man's age-old dream of an unlimited source of energy and one day eliminate starvation.

Properly, no one can point to an hour or a day when mankind moved from the era of fossil fuels into the atomic age. Like almost all developments, atomic energy was a culmination of a series of discoveries—by a Frenchman, Henri Becquerel, who in 1895 discovered the phenomenon of radioactivity; by a German, Albert Einstein, who in 1906 published the famous equation that energy equals mass times the velocity of light squared; by a Dane, Niels Bohr, who in 1913 first explained nuclear-energy radiation; by an Englishman, James Chadwick, who in 1932 discovered the neutron; and by several others.

The 42 American scientists assembled in the makeshift laboratory under the University of Chicago football bleachers that cold December afternoon were standing on the shoulders of foreign colleagues who had gone before. But it remained for them to perform the critical experiment and it remained for American technology and industry to bring atomic energy to full fruition on a meaningful scale.

Within the 3 years to follow, the best brains of American scientists and know-how of top industrialists and engineers had set up the most expensive and complex industrial operation the world had ever known in fashioning the war-ending atomic bomb. Never in history had a major development moved with such speed from the laboratory to practicality. It involved mines, ore mills, and mammoth chemical plants. The intricate process of separating radioactive uranium resembled no other ever known before the atomic age. The atom-plant network stretched across the Nation.

It was another example of what the world has come to know as Yankee ingenuity. Whether a discovery has come from abroad or at home, the talent to produce it on a mass scale, to bring it to a state of world usefulness, is characteristically American. Today, nearly every article made in the United States, from safety pins to automobiles, is manufactured by these mass-production methods. With only 6 percent of the world's population, the United States is producing a very important share of the world's goods. It has made available commodities that only the wealthy could otherwise buy. It has transformed a predominantly agricultural society into the most powerful industrial society of all time. It has given demonstrative support to the premise that poverty is not an inescapable burden, but rather an inconvenience that can be done away with.

Appraising the state of American science and technology recently, the National Science Foundation reported: "Our real genius as a nation has been the power to convert scientific knowledge into practical utility." Historian Arnold J. Toynbee elaborated: "The 20th century will be remembered as the period when the benefits of civilization will have become available to the whole human race. The idea of the common welfare for all people has come initially from early America."

The scientific and industrial revolution in the United States is all the more spectacular when it is considered to be the product of little more than 150 years of development. Before that, farming occupied the attention of the Nation. Discovery and manufacturing lagged, because human muscle power could not be spared from the fields. Frederick Gilgour, Yale University historian of science, noted that even as late as 1845, America was credited with only 4.2 percent of the discoveries made in the previous 9 years.

It was not until Eli Whitney developed the cotton gin and particularly the concept of interchangeable parts near the end of the 18th century that the future of U.S. technology was profoundly affected. Charles F. Kettering, a latter-day inventor, called this concept the important key to the Nation's development of mass production. It made possible the installation of an assembly line by Henry Ford which turned out a finished car every 20 seconds.

After Whitney put pieces of wire and wood together to invent the gin that separated the seed from the cotton and made the United States an exporter of cotton, world attention began turning to American creative genius. There followed Robert Fulton's steamboat, Samuel F. B. Morse's telegraph, Elias Howe's sewing machine, Richard Hoe's printing press, Alexander Graham Bell's telephone, Cyrus McCormick's reaper, Thomas Edison's phonograph and incandescent lamp, Edmund Quincy's corn picker, George Westinghouse's air brake, the Wright brothers' airplane, and even such small and utilitarian inventions as King Gillette's safety razor, Whitcomb Judson's zipper, and Walter Hunt's safety pin.

Invention and discovery, coupled with growing industrial might, moved the country into exponential growth. In 1800 the power used to convert U.S. national resources to useful goods was 80 percent supplied by animals, 16 percent by man, and 4 percent by steam engine and water wheel. Today mechanized power contributes more than 96 percent, and man and animals only 4 percent.

One hundred years ago machines supplied about one horsepower for each productive worker. Today they supply 10 horsepower and free the worker for less arduous tasks.

The end of the heroic age of individual invention in the United States came in World War I when the country was compelled to mobilize its scientific talent to meet the needs of the military. Collectivization of invention came to replace in large part the discovery by lone individuals. Edison had foreshadowed this when he workd with other scientists and engineers in a Menlo Park laboratory whose purpose was research. But where Edison worked with not more than 100 people, today some of the Nation's 5,000 industrial laboratories may employ as many as 7,500 men in research and development. The phenomenon of trained physicists, chemists, and engineers working in groups is the growing practice. Corporate invention has advantages in providing a whole new dimension of support, including vast resources, the finest equipment, and technical help. Where the Nation could count only 2,000 engineers and scientists in the time of Edison's first high-voltage light bulb, today there are 700,000. The group system of invention has

paid big dividends in sophisticated discoveries in power, communications, transportation, health, and laborsaving devices.

It has brought DDT and other insecticides, magnetic recording, synthetic fibers, antibiotics, high-temperature alloys, heat-resistant paints, synthetic rubber, transistors, and other miniaturized electronic components. It has helped raise the world's standard of living. It also has made possible complex developments, such as atomic energy, which are beyond the solution of a single genius.

In all the span of recorded history, no greater potential for world benefit has existed than the exploitation of atomic energy—initiated by the United States. Not only are homes and factories now electrified in some American cities with virtually unlimited sources of energy, but also portable, prefabricated nuclear-power reactors are being placed in remote and isolated areas of the world which have in the past been impossible to supply with fuel because of distances and weather conditions. This portends the day when cheap electricity will be produced to irrigate dry soils and turn deserts into fertile agricultural lands and open up regions considered today to be too poor in natural resources.

Power production is only one aspect of the rapid progress being made to harness the atom to man's benefit. The greater success story may lie in radioisotopes, the elements made radioactive in the atomic-fission process.

Dr. Paul C. Aebersold, Director of the Atomic Energy Commission's Office of Isotope Development, says that even if there were no other benefits to accrue from atomic energy, isotopes would justify the money and effort expended.

Isotopes are already having a great impact on progress in agriculture, medicine, and industry. They are helping to increase food production through better fertilizers and elimination of insect pests that destroy crops and stored foods.

Because isotope compounds can be traced through the metabolic system in quantities as small as a billionth of a gram, it is possible to determine how livestock utilizes various fodders, and thus isotopes provide a means of increasing meat production.

Atomic radiation is being used to reduce food spoilage by destroying bacteria and extending shelf life of meats, fish, and poultry. The technique will one day be applied to lands where there is little or no refrigeration.

In medicine, isotopes are providing diagnostic and therapeutic benefits to more than half a million patients a year. Dr. George V. LeRoy, of the University of Chicago, says that in the second quarter of the 20th century, only the sulfa drugs and antibiotics had a more significant influence on the quality of medical care in the United States.

Tens of thousands of patients have been spared the inconvenience of thyroid surgery by drinking a "cocktail" of radioactive iodine. From one-third to two-fifths of patients with advanced cancer of the breasts are benefited by removal or destruction of the pituitary gland through use of radioactive yttrium.

In industry, radioisotopes are used routinely to inspect welds in ships' pipelines. Introduced in minute quantities in various materials, they have proved important in wear studies of motors and lubricants. More than 6,000 gauges using radioisotopes have been bought by industry to measure the thicknesses and densities of such sheet materials as rubber, metal, plastics, and paper as they move along the production line—or in food manufacture to control for example, the amount of sugar that goes into the manufacture of applesauce.

Isotopes also have made possible the world's first automatic weather station which is to begin operating in 1962 in a remote, uninhabited, relatively inaccessible island in the Canadian Arctic, a region long blank on the world weather maps. Powered by isotopes, the equipment in the unmanned station will measure wind speed and direction, temperature, and barometric pressure and routinely transmit the information every 3 hours to stations hundreds of miles away.

The United States has been quick to share its peaceful know-how of atomic energy with the world. Early in the development of atomic energy, President Eisenhower laid his atoms-for-peace program before the United Nations in one of the great addresses of the century. The International Atomic Energy Agency he proposed is a reality. Bilateral agreements have been concluded by the United States with scores of nations on cooperation in civil uses of atomic energy. The United States initiated the first world conference on the peaceful uses of atomic energy and has established international schools of nuclear engineering which have enrolled thousands of scientists from abroad.

Nothing has stirred the imagination of the world as much as the advances into space. Since the beginning of time, man's environment has been confined essentially to the surface of the earth. In the last century the balloon carried the daring to heights of a few miles. On December 17, 1903, the first controlled flight of a few hundred feet by plane led to today's jet that crosses the Atlantic Ocean in six hours and makes the whole world a neighborhood.

Today man has at his disposal the vehicles that make it possible for him to send instruments far out into space and even to venture for short distances himself to explore, discover, and learn. Already a new knowledge of the earth and its atmosphere is being traced in the physical phenomena of dust clouds, electric fields, magnetic fields, and cosmic rays.

American space probes, for example, have discovered the Van Allen belts, the streams of charged particles trapped in spiral motion about the magnetic lines of force and deemed to be significant hazards for future space travel.

Immediate application to man's benefit has come from the American space effort. During the active life of satellites Tiros I and Tiros II, more than 35,000 scenes of clouds covering the earth were photographed from space. Tiros III, carrying a radioisotope power unit, telemetered advance warnings of hurricanes last summer.

For the first time the United States is on the way to making virtually continuous observations of weather characteristics over the entire globe, including polar, oceanic, and desert areas not now producing much weather data.

According to testimony before the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, improvement of only 10 percent in the accuracy of weather predictions would result in savings of hundreds of millions of dollars annually to farmers in crop planning, to builders, shippers, airlines, and the tourist trade, and in flood control. The U.S. Weather Bureau has said the weather satellite is possibly the most significant development in meteorology of all time, more important than the development of the barometer.

On August 12, 1960, President Eisenhower's voice was transmitted 2,400 miles from California to New Jersey via a balloon satellite, Echo I. It was the harbinger of a system that will ultimately expand the channels of communication and bring peoples of the world closer together by way of voice and picture.

The United States is sharing its space knowledge with other countries. Recently, representatives of the meteorological services of 20 nations assembled in Washington, D.C., to learn effective uses of Tiros cloud photographs in their own countries.

Technical guidance and laboratory support also are being made available to countries wishing to orbit individual experiments in satellites in consultation with U.S. scientists.

The advances of medicine in the United States can be measured by the increase in life expectancy from age 40 at the turn of the century to the Biblically allotted threescore and ten at present.

In addition to miracle drugs to attack hitherto fatal pneumonias and other infections there have come a vaccine against crippling poliomyelitis and the promises of vaccines against measles, mumps, and even the common cold. Pills have relieved thousands of diabetics from lifelong slavery to the hypodermic needle. American research has developed hormones to relieve arthritis, tranquilizers to relieve emotional stress, drugs to prevent rheumatic fever, and agents to control epileptic seizures.

Within the last 15 years, surgeons have dared invade the heart, considered for thousands of years to be a sacred untouchable organ. Today more than 20 heart operations are being performed in the United States because of the development of a heart-lung machine that maintains the patient even though his own heart and lungs are disconnected.

Medical assistance is the oldest form of American foreign aid, stretching back more than a century when medical missions traveled overseas. Having engaged in a vigorous malaria-eradication campaign in sectors of the world, the United States is involved now in a concentrated war against tuberculosis through its own programs and as the heaviest contributor to the World Health Organization. More than $100 million has been allocated in this fiscal year of the U.S. budget for health activities in underdeveloped countries.

The United States was instrumental in organizing the International Geophysical Year, the most ambitious and successful cooperative undertaking ever in the history of science. More than 67 nations pooled resources, techniques, and energies to observe the earth and its environment. Between mid-1957 and 1958, scientists recorded earthquakes, obtained new data on cosmic rays, made major discoveries about gravity and magnetism, glaciers, and volcanoes.

As explosive as American science and technology have been in the past, this is but a prologue to the future. The computer age, now unfolding, will bring breathtaking advances. Computers are the brains of automation. Einstein said that "ultimate automation based upon atomic power could make our modern industries look as primitive as the methods of the stone age men look to us now."

If the industrial revolution effectively releases man from being a beast of burden, the computer revolution is releasing him from slavery to dull routine. It already has increased the computational ability of man by a million times. Computers are freeing the human mind for intellectual tasks. In the America ahead, brainpower will be the secret of success.

Foreign Fellowships for Medical Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, an increasing amount of attention is being paid by the public today to person-to-person relationships between our citi-

zens and those of other countries. For this reason I was particularly interested to learn the details of the foreign fellowships program administered by the Association of American Medical Colleges through a grant from Smith Kline & French Laboratories of Philadelphia, and I believe my colleagues will also find this information of interest.

In the 3 years since Smith Kline & French Laboratories originated its program, 92 American medical students have received Smith Kline & French fellowships under which senior medical students visit remote areas of the world for a minimum of 10 weeks of work and study. They learn how medicine is practiced in cultures greatly different from our own; they study diseases not common in the United States, and they gain firsthand experience as to the acute need for medical knowledge in distant lands. In addition, they serve as informal goodwill ambassadors for the United States. The fellowships are, of course, confined to the medical field, for Smith Kline & French Laboratories believe that medicine in all its aspects presents one of the best possible avenues toward increased understanding among nations.

There is no doubt that all concerned benefit immeasurably from this unusual clinical experience.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Results of a Poll, First Congressional District of Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1962

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years I have sent out the questionnaire to the people who reside in the First Congressional District of Arkansas. Out of 8,000 who received the questionnaire, more than 1,500 replies were returned to me, which is approximately 17 percent of the total. The questions asked dealt with current domestic and international issues. In addition to the cooperative interest shown by the recipients of the poll, many newspapers of the district printed the questions by number in their columns. As a result, an additional number of people who were subscribers participated in the project.

One of the most encouraging aspects of the answers received to the 11 questions asked was the small percentage of the people who had "no opinion" on the various questions involved in the survey. I was gratified at the responses to the questions asked, as this indicates that our people are well informed with regard to the vast problems confronting the Nation.

The responsibility of making decisions on legislative questions and issues is solely that of the Member himself. Views and observations of constituents are very valuable in arriving at conclusions and determinations on bills upon which the Member is called upon to vote. The results of the poll follow:

[Percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you favor balancing the budget even though it could mean the elimination of some of the Federal services now provided or being proposed?	83	14	3
2. Do you approve of an all-out effort to be the 1st nation to place a man on the moon although such effort would entail the expenditure of several billion dollars?	26	66	8
3. In order to meet current governmental costs which are mounting, do you favor increasing the debt limit from the present figure of $298,000,000,000 to the proposed figure of $300,000,000,000?	27	68	5
4. Do you favor the building and maintenance of the strongest defenses of any nation in the world?	87	8	5
5. Do you favor the purchase of $100,000,000 of United Nations bonds, the proceeds of which would be used to pay off debts incurred by the United Nations Armed Forces in the Congo?	19	72	9
6. Would you favor buying these U.N. bonds if the failure to do so could or would mean the collapse and liquidation of the world organization?	43	48	9
7. Do you favor and approve the action taken by the U.S. Government to place an embargo on shipments to Cuba?	95	3	2
8. Would you favor a tax bill which would stop up any loopholes in the present tax laws even though it would carry a compromise provision which would tax savings accounts, dividends, and interest?	44	47	9
9. Would you favor an expansion of the food stamp plan from its relatively limited scope to include a much larger part of the country?	26	53	21
10. Do you favor the President's trade agreements program?	44	20	36
11. Do you favor establishment of the Youth Conservation Corps which would be similar to the CCC of the 1930's?	30	59	11

National Transportation Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 22, 1962

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, Hon. William Guy, Governor of the State of North Dakota has conveyed his views to President Kennedy on the national transportation policy. I believe my colleagues will find his remarks of interest. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter from Governor Guy printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Bismarck, March 7, 1962.

Re statement on national transportation policy.

The Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT KENNEDY: In 1962, two major railroads, the Northern Pacific and the Great Northern, are seeking to merge their separate organizations. Many people regard this merger as a private matter between two investor-owned common carriers. To these people, the right of free enterprise to manage its own affairs should prevail and the desires of the stockholders and management should be the overriding consideration as to whether or not these two railroads merge.

If the merger matter is to be decided on this basis, there is no legitimate reason to pursue it further. However, I cannot regard the rail merger proposal with this degree of simplification.

These two vast rail services came about in our pioneer days through a combination of investors, the Federal Government and an aggressive faith in the economic future of the Nation by railroad management. From the beginning, the investors in railroad stock realized that they were owners of a common carrier in which the people of the Nation had enough interest to warrant heavy Federal subsidies in the form of land grants and mail contracts. The Federal Government, acting as an agent for all of the Nation's people, saw such value in the network of heavy transportation rail facilities that it was willing to offer inducements for individual railroads to expand their operations.

The Nation's people have as much or more interest in rail transportation today as they did when the first ties were laid. Competition between modes of transportation has been a stimulus for nationwide economic expansion for decades. This competition makes its greatest contribution when transportation services seek to expand through innovation and improvement of facilities and services. Today we see a situation in which the merging of parallel rail lines would deny the value of competition and would seem to seek to compete, not by innovation and expansion of services, but by retrenchment in facilities and personnel, accompanied by a severe cutback of currently marginal services.

Somewhere in the consideration of common carriers' right to merge should appear the question, "Are people really necessary?" In answering this question, we note that the physical facilities of railroads, including rolling stock, are fixed and immobile. The personnel who work for railroads have a great deal more mobility and could be shifted within the industry or shifted from the industry. Shifting of human resources into or out of industry involves, in many cases, a breakdown and loss of those personal values and satisfactions which are to people a necessary part of a good life. The investment in railroads in the form of stock has high mobility and should receive least consideration from a sociological point of view. In most instances, stock earnings are an auxiliary source of income to people and are not a prime source of income as are wages.

The natural flow of capital to where it is needed will shrink or expand any major enterprise, including railroads. I believe the overriding considerations in judging the advisability of merging common carriers are the effects that it would have on people. There are many, many people affected by rail service.

I have spoken only of the railroad workers, management and stockholders. However, we must also consider all of the people whose livelihood depends upon railroad transportation of raw and finished products. These people work in industries dependent on rail transportation or are consumers of industries dependent on rail transportation. Thousands of families make up the working forces of rail-served industries that are now or someday could be established because of

rail service. I believe that the expansion of industries depending on rail service will continue to increase rather than decrease. I believe that the continual growth in this Nation's population will cause a continued demand for development of hitherto marginal natural resources, and construction of plant sites in areas long held to be at a disadvantage marketwise.

It is unthinkable to me that railroads should use data accumulated under a short span of recent years to justify a merger which would relegate areas now served by mainline rail transportation to secondary lines in the future. Nor do I believe that this Nation's highway system as now constructed, or as it might have to be constructed, should be asked to bear the brunt of increasingly heavy transportation when the rail lines are already established to do the job.

At present the question of monopoly does not appear to greatly affect North Dakota, as the Northern Pacific and the Great Northern lines cross the State at widely separated points. But there are points in North Dakota which, through lack of competition between merged railroads, would find themselves forced to accept reduced services.

The main argument against monopoly would take place in viewing the long haul from the Twin Cities to the west coast. Surely, there is now competition between the railroads which a merger would eliminate. By eliminating the competition for this long-haul service between railroads, we also diminish long-haul competition with trucks. Whenever competition is diminished, the desire to improve, to become more efficient, and to serve the public is greatly diminished.

As North Dakota communities view the proposed merger they ask themselves, "Which main line will be relegated to branch-line status?" Those communities now served by branch lines from the two present main lines are asking themselves, "If the merger takes place and leaves only one main line across North Dakota, which present feeder lines will become unjustified because of the merger, and disappear entirely from the scene?" North Dakota communities are asking themselves, "Which of us will become static or declining communities because of the loss of rail service?" Natural resource developers in North Dakota are looking at the proposed merger and are asking, "Will the restriction of services and facilities set the day of development of such products as lignite coal, salt, uranium, cement and crude oil back to years in the future?" Our agricultural resource development could be set back even further.

Most communities and political subdivisions in North Dakota have been planned from their inception with the two large railroads—the Great Northern and the Northern Pacific—as integral parts of their economy. The loss of services to those communities on that main line relegated to a secondary track under the merger will suffer a wrenching and tearing of their resident railroad labor forces, and among personnel in services established to accommodate the resident railroad labor forces. The schools and other services of the political subdivisions now established will surely suffer a loss in planned tax revenue causing a serious tax burden on the people remaining.

Once again, we return to the question, "Are people really necessary?" Who has the prime interest in the railroads? Is it the railroad investor? Is it the railroad laboring man? Is it railroad management? Is it the people whose industries provide the raw or finished products to be transported by railroad? Is it the people of communities who rely on other people directly affected by railroad income to help support community services? Is it the people of the Nation in its desire to have the strongest transportation system in the interests of national defense? Is it the people of generations yet unborn who will be developing natural resources, plant sites, and communities along railroads in the future? Is it the people who benefit from Government services which rely on railroads as a collector of taxes? This is a very serious question. We must know how people are related to the merger problem.

It would seem to me that the United States cannot afford to have fostered the railroads, and to a great degree benefited by the railroads, and now in 1962 allow the pressure of certain specific interests seeking a merger to override the diffused general interest of all of the people of a State or of the Nation. It would seem that it is now time for the United States to develop a transportation policy which will outline, not on a piecemeal basis but in a program of far-reaching determination, the matter of merging of any competing forms of transportation.

North Dakota's interest is the Nation's interest. I am convinced that the merging of the Great Northern and the Northern Pacific Railroads would have serious long-range consequences to this State, and in solving a problem for a few people would aggravate problems for many more people.

I am specifically recommending that you ask the Congress of the United States to adopt, after serious study, some guidelines within which transportation investors, transportation workmen and the general public will know what our long-range goal is, relative to moving people and goods in the best interests of our Nation in the years ahead. To allow the proposed Northern Pacific-Great Northern Railroad merger without such a national interest study and guidelines would in my estimation be a hasty move which would be very difficult to rectify after the shrinkage of rail transportation services had taken place because of the merger. The Nation appears to be approaching an era of increasing pressure for transportation mergers.

I believe that Congress should act quickly to hold in abeyance all proposals on transportation mergers, particularly those mergers involving parallel or competitive lines. We in this country have a tendency to worship at the altar of apparent efficiency. This worship could be unwise if the attainment of possible efficiency comes from positive sacrifice of the interests of people. In my estimation, people will always be necessary.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM L. GUY,
Governor.

Railroads Vital to Our Economy and Defense—New Frontier Fast Becoming New Tax Tier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IVOR D. FENTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1962

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, if the railroads want to retain the franchises they hold they should increase and improve their services and facilities—these are vital to the Nation's economy and defense. In this the Federal Government should give assistance wherever possible.

Railroads, by forced curtailments today, are becoming almost as extinct in certain areas as countless other private initiative in what was once regarded part of the free enterprise system which made America great.

The New Frontier is fast becoming the new tax tier in destroying private and individual initiative. The oppressive and confiscatory taxes being proposed by the so-called liberal individuals and groups is just more evidence that these self-styled liberals are the same individuals who believe in spending the other fellow's money and then getting it back from the taxpayers with interest.

In fact one self-styled liberal individual who is a candidate for Governor in Pennsylvania has just publicly stated that any individual who promises a tax cut in the State should be arrested for perjury. Yes, these New Frontier boys are fast becoming the new tax tier boys.

Many taxes have and continue to stifle and destroy the business of our American railroads. These railroads are vital to the economy and defense of the Nation. Elimination of certain excise taxes and reduction in individual taxes will create a greater expansion of the Nation's economy in a more sound tax atmosphere and environment. Threatened curtailments and retrenchments will not be necessary in all phases of our national life.

Let us all join in a renewed effort and faith in our country by encouraging free enterprise, and not making necessary such protests as the following which I have just been called upon to make to the Interstate Commerce Commission in the public interest:

MARCH 16, 1962.

Hon. RUPERT L. MURPHY,
Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MURPHY: It has come to my attention that the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. has filed notice with the Interstate Commerce Commission that they will remove service between Harrisburg, Pa., and Buffalo, N.Y., on trains 571 and 570 effective April 15 next.

I know it is not necessary for me to go into detail in opposition to the railroad company's petition for I understand you have already been deluged with countless protests.

A considerable portion of the area served by these two trains is in my district which incidentally has been certified by President Kennedy as an economically distresed area. The President has asked that all Federal departments and agencies cooperate whereever possible in the matter of eliminating economic distress in these areas.

It seems hardly necessary to point out that if the petition of the company to remove these trains is granted it can only add to the economic ills of Pennsylvania, and particularly in an area where the economy is second to only one other area in the Nation as far as unemployment is concerned.

I am informed that the removal of these trains will mean the loss immediately of 24 jobs for mobile unit clerks and approximately 110 railroad personnel.

The service now afforded by these two trains is the only daytime service available for passengers, mail, and express.

However, I am more interested in the overall economic situation because the removal of these two trains from an area which is now almost isolated by train service means that any business or industry contemplating coming into the area will certainly change their plans. Furthermore without adequate rail facilities it can only aggravate the situation to the extent that

people or business and industry now located in the area might move out.

I certainly recommend that the Commission deny the petition of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. to remove trains 571 and 570, and I will appreciate my protest being placed on the official record.

Sincerely yours,

IVOR D. FENTON.

Expansion of Forest Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 22, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, expansion of forest research—of great importance to our wood products industry and the economy generally—is absolutely necessary if we are to best utilize this significant natural resource.

The Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis., today serves as a great center for such research.

Significantly, this work is being done, not just by Federal support, but also through contributions and cooperation by free enterprise.

Consequently, I have urged approval by Congress of funds not only for carrying forward the work of the Laboratory, but also for expanding its facilities.

Reflecting the interest of private enterprise, the proposal for carrying forward and expanding the facilities, has received broad support in Wisconsin and throughout the Nation.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent to have three such endorsements: One by the Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce; the second by the Wisconsin Forestry Advisory Committee; and the third by the Southwest Forest Industries, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the endorsements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN FORESTRY ADVISORY COMMITTEE,
Madison, Wis., March 8, 1962.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The Wisconsin Forestry Advisory Committee supports wholeheartedly both you and Senator STENNIS, of Mississippi, in your efforts to put into motion an accelerated program for forestry research.

Our Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis., has for many years provided excellent leadership in basic forestry research, which has proved of immense value to not only the United States but to many other countries friendly to us.

If this institution is to continue providing such leadership it must be furnished with the most modern, up-to-date specialized scientific plant within our ability to provide.

Furthermore, the present building or plant must be modernized in many ways in order to provide for better working conditions and increased efficiency in basic research.

A new pulp and paper and wood chemistry laboratory must be built at the earliest date possible. The present one has served its initial purpose, but today in its present state is not adequate in providing modern day research requirements. New facilities for wood products research must be kept in pace with our fast changing times.

The forest industries, and especially the pulp and paper industry, in the United States has benefited tremendously as a result of the basic research carried on in the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison.

It can truthfully be said that this Laboratory's basic research on aspen, an overabundant species in the Lake States' forests, has resulted in this species making up 44 percent of all pulpwood species used in 1960. In Wisconsin that same year it amounted to 37 percent of all pulpwood species used. I doubt if anyone can deny that Wisconsin's rank (first) in the pulp and paper industry can be credited in a large measure to the contribution in research made by this Laboratory.

The next important step in basic research on pulpwood species is dense hardwoods. No doubt, here again, the contribution that would be made by this Laboratory could be timely and tremendous if the Congress will only recognize the crying need of additional appropriations for modernization and expansion of the Forest Products Laboratory.

Our committee wishes to go on record supporting an increase in appropriations for the Forest Products Laboratory of Madison, Wis., as follows: $4 million, pulp and paper and wood chemistry; $4 million, new facilities for wood products research; and $2 million, modernization of present building.

We know a priority program can be developed for the modernization of the present building and construction of new facilities, so badly needed today, that will prove satisfactory to all concerned.

Very truly yours,

F. G. KILP,
Chairman, Wisconsin Forestry Advisory Committee.

WISCONSIN STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Madison, Wis., March 16, 1962.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: * * * I have been following very closely the efforts of the laboratory's administration to have their present facilities expanded. I am likewise aware of the efforts being made by certain Members of Congress to either eliminate the recommended appropriation for such expansion or to have an entirely new facility constructed in a well known Southern State. Acceptance of either of these proposals would, in my estimation, be absurd, and I commend you for your vigorous efforts, not only to expand the existing facility at Madison, but in pointing out the great importance of the forest products laboratory to one of the Nation's major product producing industries.

It is unfortunate that too few people recognize not only the need for the wise conservation of our wood resources, but likewise the need of constant research into how man might make maximum use of this God-given material for the benefit of all peoples and all economic groups.

The Wisconsin State chamber, attuned to the advancements, the needs, and the problems of the wood-using industries, wholeheartedly supports your position. We trust that the Congress will see fit to make it possible for the laboratory to have the funds necessary for its promotional and protective research work.

Kindest personal regards.

Cordially,

FRANK A. HAUSHEER,
Executive Vice President.

SOUTHWEST FOREST INDUSTRIES,
Phoenix, Ariz., March 16, 1962.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: As a member of the forest industry, with a particular interest in the lumber producing aspects of that industry, I was very happy to note your vigorous support of the expanded budget for the U.S. Forest Products Laboratory in Madison. As you so ably pointed out to the Senate, the forest industry makes a valuable contribution to the economy of the country and that contribution can only be sustained by constant research that will protect and develop the resources of the country's forests.

* * * * *

It is encouraging to the more than a million people who are part of this industry, and to the hundreds of communities who depend on us, to know that we have such statesmanlike support as yours in this very necessary effort.

I want to express my thanks and also to urge you to continue your fine efforts.

Sincerely yours,

P. E. FRANKFORT.

Do They Take the United States for Fools?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1962

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial from the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press for March 19, 1962, entitled "Do They Take the United States for Fools?"

It seems to me that this editorial sets forth succinctly and effectively the answer to those who have suggested that the United States supply the Chinese Communists with American food:

DO THEY TAKE THE UNITED STATES FOR FOOLS?

The applications filed with the Government by a Seattle, Wash., company for permission to ship 10.5 million tons of wheat and barley to Red China and North Korea don't make sense from any angle. President Kennedy again has indicated that the Chinese Communists haven't asked for American grain. If they haven't asked for it, why should anyone be talking about shipping them American grain?

The answer presumably is that the Communists have made overtures to private American concerns through other than diplomatic channels. We are of the opinion that permitting American grain to be shipped to either the Chinese or North Korean Reds as a private deal would not be in the best interests of this country. Such an arrangement would permit them to go on calling us names, helping to kill Americans in North Vietnam, and opposing in other ways our efforts to further world peace.

Only a misguided sense of benevolence could prompt the United States to agree to the proposed shipments. It undoubtedly is true that the peoples of Red China and North Korea are facing short rations, if not actual starvation. But why? Well, certainly part of the reason is that both countries have been putting too large a share of their wealth and manpower into the production of weapons and the building of armed forces

for use against our friends and allies in the Far East. It would be idiotic to let ourselves be persuaded that because of our traditional policy of alleviating hunger around the world we should provision the Communists in these countries—and do it in such a manner that they could tell the world that they owed us nothing.

Neither the Chinese nor North Korean Communists have made a single conciliatory gesture in our direction. Neither have abated their anti-American propaganda campaign one whit. Neither have given any indication that they want peace with us or any other free people.

To expect us to play the role of all-forgiving humanitarian where they are concerned, in the face of their own unrelenting assault on humanitarian principles, is to regard us as the most naive of all peoples. If our Government should permit the proposed grain shipments we almost certainly would appear ridiculous in the eyes of the entire world—including the Communist portion of it.

Essay Contest on the American Form of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 22, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Active Young Republicans of Sussex County, Del., conducted an essay contest on the American form of government.

The first place winner was Mr. Jon Thiem, Seaford, Del.; second place winner, Miss Rebecca Hearn, Laurel, Del.; third place winner, Miss Karen West, Laurel, Del.

On behalf of my colleague, Mr. BOGGS, and myself, I ask unanimous consent that each of these essays be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

(By Jon Thiem)

It can be safely assumed that today we are the most democratic Nation in the world. Since 1775 the leaders of our country have battled physically and mentally to preserve the principles and ideals in which they believed. Certain documents were written, expressing the beliefs and ideals of our early leaders which were used in the founding, administration, and preservation of our Nation. These papers and their principles of democratic freedom and individual equality have sustained so well the initial power and respect they first received that through the last 180 years their guidance, flexibility, and practicality have permitted our survival as a representative democracy. Three of these most essential documents are the Declaration of Independence—the proclamation of our birth as a nation free from the tyranny and rule of Great Britain; the Articles of Confederation—a paper providing a set of laws for the governing of our Nation and leading us through the American Revolution; and the Constitution of the United States—the set of laws governing and preserving our freedom to this day. In each of these great papers we may be proud to acknowledge that men representing Delaware contributed to their making and defense.

The founding of our Nation and the reasons for this are expressed in the Declaration of Independence. With the principles of Locke and Montesquieu in mind Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence in 1776, being aided only by Benjamin Franklin and John Adams. Its lucid, logical yet eloquent style clearly and forcefully expresses the beliefs of our Founding Fathers during the American Revolution. The Declaration of Independence soon became famous and greatly admired and imitated. It was the guiding spirit of the American Revolution, telling the world the thoughts echoed from the vehemenent, sarcastic tongue of Tom Paine to the conservative speech of John Adams.

The Declaration of Independence reverberated with justice through the words "all men are created equal" and through the matter-of-fact statement that every man has the right to "Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness." That the government should receive its power from the consent of the people is one of the key democratic principles emphasized by the Declaration of Independence. It condemns the "abuses and usurpations" of George III in 18 different paragraphs ranging from George's position against laws benefiting the colonists to his "domestic insurrections against us." Other complaints stemmed from unfair taxation to the forced quartering of British troops in colonial homes. The Declaration of Independence was unanimously approved by the Thirteen Colonies and was praised by such great revolutionary leaders as James Otis, Samuel Adams, Tom Paine, and George Washington. Three representatives from Delaware signed the Declaration of Independence, George Read, Thomas McKean, and the famous Caesar Rodney.

The basic writings of the Declaration of Independence are still respected and copied today. In 1776 we had a new Nation in the midst of a revolution. What it next needed was a governing set of laws.

The year 1776 was thus marked by the drafting of a set of laws to govern our new Nation—the Articles of Confederation. The original draft was made by John Dickinson, of Delaware.

The legislative body, according to the Articles of Confederation, was the central assembly or the Congress of Confederation. Each State had two representatives and nine States were required for the passing of a bill. When the Congress was not in session the Nation was governed by a States committee or a body of 13 men each representing a State. Congress was given under the Articles of Confederation the authority over the post office, the right to borrow funds, the right to coin money, the right to limit State armies, and the power to declare war. Congress was also responsible for national and international relations although generally it did not have enough power to deal with either national or international situations. All of the States were supposed to be friendly, and to defend each other although this was not the case. The Federal Government had virtually no power, thus the States quarreled over laws, criminal cases, commerce, and boundaries. The States were not protected from attack by Indians, invasion, and interference on the high seas. The States, because of a lack of power in Congress, would not pay the debts they owed the Government, thus a comparatively high national debt of $10 million was accumulated.

Essentially, what was happening was that the Articles of Confederation provided for too much freedom and States rights at the expense of disunity and a lack of a nationalistic attitude. Soon the leaders of our Nation began to realize the problem—that the Articles of Confederation were too weak and a new constitution was needed. The Articles of Confederation were appropriate for the Revolutionary War period, very ably leading us through it. A good start had been made toward a system of government through the Articles of Confederation but it was not enough.

At a trade conference in Annapolis, Md., five States agreed that a new constitution was mandatory for a lasting United States of America. Consequently in 1787 the Constitutional Convention was organized with 12 States being represented and George Washington holding the President's chair. During the Convention, which lasted 112 days, the delegates debated in a cold, practical manner on the issues confronting a body in drafting a new constitution. Because of his excellent ideas, leadership, and style of writing, James Madison is known as the Father of the Constitution. During the Convention the debates generally ran smooth and there was much compromising.

Under the proposed Constitution the Government would be divided into three branches—the legislative, judicial and executive with each being separated by a unique system of check and balances. The legislative branch, offered much compromise, was organized such that the House would have its number of delegates determined by the population of each State and the Senate would have two delegates from each State regardless of population. The framers of the Constitution provided laws such that all States would be equal, all citizens would have equal rights, no one regardless of position would be exempt from the authority of the law, the common people could change the Constitution through amendment, and the national Constitution would always be maintained such that it would be stronger than the State constitutions. Although it was a masterpiece in political documentation it was not accepted by all; some men felt that it was too strong for a democracy. Ratification was therefore a tough battle. Samuel Adams, Patrick Henry and James Monroe were against the Constitution's ratification while James Madison, John Jay, and Alexander Hamilton were for it. Finally, however, the Constitution was ratified with the aid of the Federalist, a book written primarily for support of the Constitution. Washington was thus elected President and John Adams was elected Vice President of the United States.

Although there is no mention of political parties in the Constitution, two political parties were formed: the Federalist Party and the Republican Party, of no relation to today's Republican Party. Alexander Hamilton was the head of the Federalist Party which supported strong government, merchantilest views, the industries, big business, and aristocracy. The Republican Party, headed by Thomas Jefferson, supported weak government, low tariffs, the landowners, the commonman, and democratic government. These parties originated as a consequence of the various interpretations of the Constitution and different political theories on how a government should best be administered. Many of the issues of these political parties are still being debated with the Republican Party of today generally taking the Federalist side and the Democratic Party generally taking the Republican side.

After the ratification of our Constitution and the initial battles over its interpretation had ended the United States was on a relatively strong economic and political foundation. The strength of our Nation after this early period, in which the basic ideals of our Nation came into existence, can be illustrated by the fact that we have since withstood a civil war, two wars, and a great depression. The faith of our Founding Fathers in their beliefs as set forth in their docu-

ments has been one of the major and vital factors of our survival as a democratic nation.

U.S. CONSTITUTION

(By Rebecca Hearn)

After the United States won its independence in the Revolutionary War, it faced the great problem of peacetime government. It had to enforce law and order, collect taxes, pay what was then a staggering public debt, and regulate trade.

Men like George Washington and Alexander Hamilton went over the situation with great concern. As early as 1783, they began to discuss the possibility of creating an entirely new national government under a new Constitution, because the Articles of Confederation was not powerful enough. Hamilton directed a series of political maneuvers that resulted in the Confederation Congress calling a convention to meet in Philadelphia on May 14, 1787, for the "sole and express purpose of reviving the Articles of Confederation." The 55 delegates who attended the convention did far more than the Congress had intended them to do.

The Constitution consists of a preamble, 7 articles, and 22 amendments. It establishes a system of separating powers between the National Government and the State government.

The Supreme Court of the United States has the final authority in interpreting the Constitution. It can set aside any law that conflicts with any provision of the Constitution.

The Constitutional Convention was supposed to open on May 14, 1787. But few of the 55 delegates had arrived in Philadelphia by that time. Finally, on May 25, with delegates from seven States present, the convention formally opened in Independence Hall. Twelve States had responded to the call for the convention. Rhode Island refused to send delegates because it feared that the new constitution would remove its power to tax the use of imported supplies by other States.

Of the 55 delegates, 39 stayed to the end and signed the U.S. Constitution on September 17, 1787. William Jackson, the Convention secretary, witnessed their signatures. George Washington served as presiding officer at the sessions. Benjamin Franklin, whom everyone loved, encouraged the members with his mere presence. James Madison won for himself the title "Father of the Constitution" with his speeches and his attempts at compromise.

The task of creating a new constitutional government was not easily accomplished. On several occasions, arguments over one real point of dispute nearly wrecked the convention—how to protect the interest of both the large and the small States.

The large States favored the Virginia plan under which population would determine a States representation in legislature. The small States supported the New Jersey plan under which all States would have equal representation. Roger Sherman of Connecticut proposed the compromise that broke the temporary standstill. His plan provided for equal representation in one House of Congress, and representation in proportion to population in the other House.

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

(By Karen West)

The Declaration of Independence was signed in Independence Hall, Philadelphia, Pa., on July 4, 1776. This is the birthday of our country, a day that should be of great importance to every American citizen. That day 13 small colonies declared their independence from their mother country beginning the United States, a country we now live in, love, and admire.

On June 7, Richard Henry Lee of Virginia made a motion in Continental Congress that, "These United Colonies are and of right ought to be, free and independent States." Thomas Jefferson was given the task of writing and polishing the document in 18 days time. Benjamin Franklin and John Adams helped a great deal by adding their suggestions, after which it was sent to Continental Congress where they added their ideas and cut and changed some other parts of the document. On July 4, 1776, a final document was agreed on and signed, but it was not until 3 or 4 days later that the document was made public and sent to all parts of the country. The beauty of the Declaration and its pure meaning touched the hearts of all men of the 13 colonies. The ideas though were not new. They were the same to a large degree as those used by England in 1688 to justify their revolution against King James II.

There are many times today when we look back at that document, especially the clause that says "All men are created equal," and in the eyes of God a rich man is no better than one who is not so wealthy as he. We read that no man should be another one's servant. We also revere the clause which says "that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." These are given to the people by God. The document goes on to tell the wrong that England had done them and the God-given privileges which England had tried to take away in the event of which the colonies petitioned in most humble terms, but every time the petition was answered by more injury. From time to time Continental Congress had threatened, but their threats fell on deaf ears. Therefore they declared them as all the rest of mankind enemies in war and friends in peace.

They closed the document by saying they were completely separating themselves from British rule. They had full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and to do all other acts and things that free and independent countries may do, mutually pledging to each other their lives, fortunes, and sacred honor.

During war this document has been saved and cherished. In the War of 1812 when the British raided Washington, it was moved from Washington and hidden in Leesburg, Va., until the Capitol of the United States was no longer in danger, and ever since we have preserved this paper. From 1921 to 1952 the document was kept in the Library of Congress. In 1952 it was moved to the National Archives Building in Washington.

We will never forget the men who fought to bring this country independence as we celebrate it every July 4. For those who died so that we might be free, we all, I know, in our own tacit way are more than grateful.

Statement Relating Accomplishments of the Public Health Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1962

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, the United States is now in its 15th consecutive year of freedom from outbreaks of infectious disease introduced from abroad, and we are spared the ravages of smallpox, plague, and cholera, despite the fact that these diseases continue to flare up in other parts of the world. This is due to the alertness and efficiency of the quarantine officials of the Public Health Service, who are stationed at all of our major seaports and air terminals. When you consider the volume and speed of international travel these days and the rapidity with which infections can spread, you begin to realize the debt we owe to these tireless workers of the Public Health Service.

These are just examples. Others could be drawn from a number of fields. The automobiles rolling off the assembly lines this fall, for instance, will be equipped with devices to reduce harmful exhausts because of Public Health Service research and leadership in the control of air pollution. And many of them will have seat belts because of the Service's long-term campaign to reduce automobile accidents.

As a Representative of the State of New Mexico, where a great number of American Indians live, I think I can supply some firsthand information on what the Indian health program of the Public Health Service is accomplishing there. In my opinion, the program is opening up a new and hopeful aspect of life to the Indian people.

Let me give you a few facts about my own area. Apply these on a broader scale and you see a picture of outstanding achievement.

There have been two dramatic improvements since 1955—a drop of 20 percent in the overall death rate, and a drop of 40 percent in the infant death rate. Deaths from tuberculosis, the once-dreaded prime killer of the Indian, have been greatly reduced. Since 1956 only one death from tuberculosis has been reported in Valencia County. Infectious diseases are watched so carefully that there has not been a single major outbreak among my constituents since 1955.

These bare statistics do not convey the enormous educational job of the Indian health program. A field program brings public health nurses directly to Indian homes, and health educators and sanitarians work directly with the people in opening up new vistas of healthful living. The Indians are beginning to work out their health problems and their confidence in Public Health Service personnel is manifesting itself increasingly. This is especially evident in joint efforts to improve home sanitation—a major factor in high infant illness and death.

You can see from these few facts that a notable job is being done by the Service. To get such amazing results in a health area, the Public Health Service must have, it seems, a group of well-qualified, hardworking and purposeful people on the job.

In fact, for his direction of the Indian health program, Dr. James R. Shaw, a longtime career officer of the Public Health Service, was awarded the Gorgas Medal of the Association of Military Surgeons of the United States last November. This medal is presented for distinguished work and outstanding leadership in preventive medicine. It is my very good fortune to know Dr. Shaw personally, and this description aptly fits

his accomplishments in advancing the health of the American Indians.

Hardly a month goes by when we do not read of similar honors going to Public Health Service staff members. Recently, for example, Dr. Sidney Udenfriend, Chief of the Laboratory of Clinical Biochemistry at the National Heart Institute received the Hillebrand prize for 1961, the top honor of the clinical society of Washington.

Last month, Dr. Thelma B. Dunn, of the National Cancer Institute and a world authority on the pathology of cancer, was one of the six recipients of the second annual Federal Women's Award, created to honor career women in the Federal Government.

And shortly before the beginning of this year, President Kennedy presented Dr. Robert Felix, Director of the National Institute of Mental Health, with one of the Rockefeller Public Service Awards for his notable career in Federal health.

The foregoing are only a few examples of awards and honors which have gone to Public Health Service personnel within the past few months. I could cite many, many others.

Mention could also be made of the numerous examples of leadership in the complex of health professions in the United States. To name only two: Dr. Jack Masur, Director of the Public Health Service's Clinical Center, is the current President of the American Hospital Association; and Mrs. Lucile Leone, Chief Nurse Officer of the Public Health Service, serves as President of the National League for Nursing.

The Public Health Service, Mr. Speaker, is deserving of recognition for the work it has done and I think that we can have every confidence that its contributions in the future will be as great.

Tribute to Veterans of the Indian Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 22, 1962

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in view of the great service rendered to this country by the soldiers serving in the Indian wars, I deem it fitting to note an article written by Mr. Paul Hillsamer in conjunction with research done by my office, which appeared in the March 2 issue of the Marion News-Heraid. Such recognition is the least we can do to honor these brave and courageous men.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO VETERANS OF THE INDIAN WARS

The time has come to pay attention and honor of a small number of old, old men including:

Reginald Bradley, 94, 2122 Lakeshore Drive, Oakland, Calif.; Harry Brockman, 88, St. James, Mo.; Issac H. Burgess, 90, 506 West Jefferson Street, Springdale, Ark.; Charles Creek, 99, 63 Spa Road, Annapolis, Md.; Kate Crozier, 100, Box 8, Peach Springs, Ariz.; John Crump, 92, 106 H Street, South Boston, Mass.; John Daw, 93, Red Lake Trading Post, Tonalea, Ariz.; and Charles Dickens, 92 (Fort McDowell), Scottsdale, Ariz.

Howard Fielding, 90 (Little River Station), Miami, Fla.; Walter Harrington, 93, 5622 Tangerine Avenue, Gulfport, Fla.; Alexander Hatcher, 93, 1043 Walker Avenue, Kansas City, Kans.; and Frank Heidelberger, 94 (Veterans Administration Center), Hot Springs, S. Dak.

Walter Potter, 91, 1011 Road 20, San Pablo, Calif.; John Roberts, 93, 206 Peninsular Avenue South, New Symrna Beach, Fla.; William Sutphin, South Boston, Va.; James Smith, 99, 44 Vermont Avenue, Newark, N.J.; and Edwin Wells, 92, 412 East 21st Street, Long Beach, Calif.

And a few others whose names are not immediately available.

Between 1860 and 1898, more than 106,000 American soldiers participated in a variety of bitter "little wars" with Indian tribes of the West and Southwest.

Now that the last of the Civil War veterans have answered the final bugle call, it is appropriate to pay proper recognition to the handful of survivors of these Indian wars.

"Handful" is the proper expression. Unless death has claimed another old campaigner during the past few weeks, there are only 29 of these 106,000 men still living. (The total of 29 was as of Jan. 31, 1962).

All of the 29 draw monthly payments from the Veterans' Administration. These payments range from $101.59 per month to $135.45.

These old heroes of yesterday are scattered over the United States. Four live in Arizona, three each in California, Florida and Missouri, two in Iowa, two in North Dakota and one each in Arkansas, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Jersey, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin.

A few are Negroes. One or two are Indians. They were members of friendly tribes, who fought with the American troops against other Indian tribes on the warpath.

The others are men named Bradley, Dickens, Harrington, etc., as listed above.

The 29 ancient men share two characteristics.

All are veterans of combat with the Indians. All are very very old.

The oldest known surviving veteran of the Indian wars is 100 years old, Kate Crozier of Peach Springs, Ariz. The youngest known survivor is Harry Brockman, 88 of St. James, Mo.

(The word "known" is used because several men have not given permission to list their names, addresses and ages).

The sole Hoosier survivor is in this category.

In addition to these 29 actual veterans of the Indian wars, there are 581 widows of Indian war veterans and 25 children totally incapable of self support on the Veterans' Administration's rolls. These children's age is not considered by the VA in eligiblity for aid. Most of them are past 50 years of age.

The majority of the 29 living veterans feel and show the weight of their years. But a few are reported to be in unusually good health.

Time has cut a terrible swath in their ranks. There were 5,574 living veterans of the Indian wars in 1929 and 1,955 as recently as 1941.

The total dropped to 530 in 1950, 188 in 1955 and 44 in early 1960.

Now they number only 29.

For veterans' benefit purposes the VA considers 1860 as the beginning of the Indian wars. The Pah-Ute Expedition in California in April of that year, was the first engagement of the 48-year period.

The Chippewa disturbances at Leech Lake, Minn., in October 1898 is the last engagement considered an Indian war by the VA.

Several other disturbances after 1898 are considered as local upsets and riots rather than as wars.

The numerous Indian wars between 1850 and 1898 were fought with different tribes in the West and Southwest. Many of these wars, although hard fought and bloody, were relatively isolated engagements and campaigns with little or no connection with one another.

American troops engaged in battle, during this 48-year period, with parts or all of the following Indian tribes west of the Mississippi.

Apache, Arapahoe, Bannock, Cheyenne, Comanche, Chippewa, Kiowa, Lipan, Kickapoo, Navajo, Nez Perce, Piute, Sioux, Snake, and Ute.

Somewhat more than 1,000 American soldiers were killed in action during this period and many more were wounded. There is no proper record of the number of Indians killed and wounded.

The American troops did not win all the battles. Gen. George Custer, it will be remembered, died with his command at the Battle of Little Big Horn.

All the Indian wars of 1860–1889 were not justified. In many cases the U.S. Government was at fault and the Army company and regiments sent into combat were the instruments of the Federal Government's errors of omission and commission.

But that is no reflection on these 29 fine old men. They were soldiers and went where they were ordered and fought against men and bullets and arrows which were just as deadly as the dangers faced by any American in any war, big or small.

They endured the dangers of the forced march, the long campaign, and the bloody field. Their monthly pay was less than most young men today spend on tobacco and candy bars and other little luxuries.

They were American soldiers. They are aged veterans. They deserve national recognition and honor until the last of them, perhaps in 1970, 1973, even 1975, takes the last long trail to the God who first gave him breath.

The least the press of the United States can do, during the next few years, is to note these old men's birthdays and deaths and shrinking numbers.

For they are not only the stuff of which history is made.

Each, in his small way, is history—still living, breathing—and remembering.

American Music

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DALE ALFORD

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1962

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following speech which was delivered by Mrs. W. P. Wilson before the Captain Basil Gaither Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution in Little Rock, Ark., on February 16, 1962.

The speech follows:

AMERICAN MUSIC

I will not attempt to give you a complete history of the development of American music, but some sidelights which I think you will find interesting.

What America has in a century and three-quarters of its life is told, not by its great poets and great composers, but in the people's record expressed in their music. Each period has its own characteristic songs, from the day of the Revolution when patriotism and politics were leading them to the reckless distortion and complete abandonment of the jazz and rock and roll of today.

The Pilgrims who came to America were very stern and austere people, deeply religious, and the only music tolerated was an aid to worship. They brought with them a book of Psalms published in Amsterdam in 1640—no music, just words, taught by rote. Organs were not allowed in the church until about a hundred years later. By law the only instruments allowed were the drum, trumpet, and jew's harp. The children of these pioneers spent most of their time fighting hunger, the Indians, and other Colonists, and even these hymns are forgotten. It was a musicless time.

In 1716, a man named Tom Fleet had a printing shop in Pudding Lane, Devonshire. He married Elizabeth Goose. After their son was born, her mother came to live with them and she spent most of her time singing nursery songs. Mr. Fleet was so impressed by these songs and, being a very enterprising young man, he decided it would be a good thing to publish them. He did, calling them "Mother Goose Songs for Children." He sold them for 2 pennies. This was our first published music.

One of the songs sung during the Revolutionary War was "Yankee Doodle." Its melody went back to Charles I and was introduced to this country by Dr. Shakesburg of the British Army. During the French and Indian War when the British were camped on the shores of the Hudson, the recruits from the provinces came pouring in in strange dress and equipment, some with long coats, some with short coats, some with cropped hair, some with wigs. Their unusual appearance excited mirth among the well-dressed, well-equipped British troops, and their favorite pasttime was to gather in front of the churches and shout "Yankee Doodle" as the congregation sang hymns.

This story is told by John Quincy Adams, our sixth President: After the plenipotentiaries of Great Britain and the United States had nearly finished their treaty at Ghent, they decided to have an entertainment in honor of the occasion. They asked that each country's national air should be performed as part of the program. After some consultations of our representatives, they decided to use "Yankee Doodle." None of them could sing or whistle the tune. Finally, Mr. Clay said, "I have it," and called for his colored servant who had accompanied him, and asked him to whistle the tune. This he did and the chief musician took down the tune, the burgess band played it, with variations, in grand style.

Bands were very scarce during the war and when Washington crossed the Delaware in 1777, and marched 9 miles through the sleet and snow, he not only captured General Raul and the Hessian troops, but the band as well. This was a very happy Christmas present that he took back to Washington, to help celebrate the first anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence. They became a part of the pageant and afterward became good citizens.

In 1746, William Billingsly was born, and he, more than anyone else, brought back singing to the hearts of Americans. He published a songbook called "New England Psalm Singer" and during the war the singing of these songs around campfires at night lightened the hearts of the soldiers. He established singing schools and these became the center of their social life.

In 1812, while watching rockets and shells falling on Fort McHenry, Francis Scott Key was so filled with emotion, he took an envelope from his pocket and wrote the immortal words to "The Star-Spangled Banner." The melody was borrowed from England. Its beauty and worth was not recognized for several generations. In 1931, during the Coolidge administration, it was declared our national anthem.

Music is an outburst of emotion, whether it be love, sorrow, joy, or anger, and nothing tells more of a people than their folksongs. The Negroes of the South gave us our first original melodies. Until this time the tunes had been borrowed from other countries. Some do not consider these songs true American songs, but although the Negroes had been brought from Africa, they had never created the songs akin to the ones sung on plantation life, cottonfields, cabins, and river life and their determined search for God. They are truly our first folksongs.

Our first musical entertainment was the ministrel show, a takeoff on Negroes. Our beloved "Dixie" was written in 1859 by David Emmett from Mount Vernon, Ohio. The last song of the ministrel was called a "Walk-around" and Mr. Emmett wrote it for a "walkaround."

Our most beautiful and best loved songs were written by Stephen Foster. He was born in 1826, the son of an aristocratic family, the youngest of five sons. They were successful in business and had no sympathy or understanding for the dreamer, Stephen. He married Jeannie McDowell, a singer, daughter of a leading physician of Pittsburgh. He was strange and hard to understand. Although he loved his wife very much and wrote many songs to her, his life was a tragedy. He finally went to New York where he died at the age of 38. After the war, immigration took a spurt. Many from England, Scotland, and Ireland, came to our shores. They began to move west to the Allegheny Mountains and the mountains of Kentucky, Tennessee and the Carolinas. They were, of course, very remote and their lonely life is reflected in their folksongs. Cowboy songs, hillbilly songs came the same way, telling of their loves and struggles. Even the desperado songs brought courage to their existence and we have these to add to our folksongs. They brought the square dance with "Skip-to-My-Lou, My Darlin'," and these, as with the singing schools, formed their social life.

In 1822, our first American opera, "Clari" was written by John Howard Payne. Most of this has been forgotten, but the song that still lives is "Home, Sweet Home."

In 1861, one of our most beautiful and patriotic songs came during the Civil War. Mrs. Howe, whose home was in Washington, visited the Union soldiers encamped on the Potomac. While there, she heard the troops marching and singing to the tune of "John Brown's Body" an old camp meeting song. She was impressed by the melody.

"Magnificent," she called it, but felt the words were inadequate. After a cold, long journey back to Washington, she was tired and retired to her bedroom with the song in her mind. In the middle of the night she woke up and wrote the words, calling it, "The Battle Hymn of the Republic." Like "The Star-Spangled Banner," it was not recognized for its worth for some time.

After the war, songs became more sentimental: 1866, "When You and I Were Young, Maggie," 1896, "Home on the Range." All periods of strain and stress find expression in songs. I remember the songs during the Spanish American War in 1896, "What Did Dewey Do to Them" and "My Sweetheart Went Down With the *Maine*."

Ragtime hit its stride in the gay nineties—came from the South. Tinpan Alley was named at this time as the gathering place for musicians. Damrosch and Victor Herbert had the most active part in creating popular music at this time. Then came: 1901, Carrie Jacobs Bond, a woman composer; 1907, Ziegfeld Follies; 1912, Rudolph Friml; 1914, "Memphis Blues," 1917, "God Bless America," at the beginning of World War I, bringing these songs: "Over There", "A Long Way to Tipperary," "Keep the Home Fires Burning"; 1918, Al Jolson; 1924, Irving Berlin, George Gershwin, Jerome Kern; 1935, "Old Spinning Wheel"; "When I Grow Too Old To Dream."

Then came the Second World War.

The songs most reflecting this time was "Praise the Lord and Pass the Ammunition." "When the Light Goes On," "Coming In On a Wing and a Prayer"; 1953 Rodgers and Hammerstein gave the wonderful musicals their beginning: "Oklahoma," "Carousel," "The King and I," "South Pacific."

Most of our popular songs came from these musicals.

No discussion of our American music is complete without considering jazz. It came from Negroes, blues, spirituals, and shouts at revival meetings. A feverish reflection of modern life.

Paul Whiteman deserves the credit for harnessing this crude, sexual monotone sound best, when he gave to it respectability, with his wonderful arrangements and accompaniments. He appealed to Gershwin for help and he wrote the "Rhapsody in Blue," which contains all the jazz beats, but with melodious harmony that has made it a finished musical work.

Rock and roll, many times using old folk songs, is just another form of jazz. This, by the excitement of its rhythm, seems to give definite satisfaction to this uncertain existence of our times. It has a certain amount of personality, and as in the case of jazz, may emerge as a definite contribution to our American music.

We have traced our American musical heritage from the 17th century, giving only sidelights on a few of our best known songs, but we have seen how the popular music is an index to our life. History of the Nation, from the Pilgrim chants, southern ballads, Negro rhythms, we have created a democracy in music which will grow and develop as our democracy grows and develops.

FAA's New Look

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 22, 1962

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I have just read an article in the February issue of the AOPA Pilot that should hearten the private pilots of this country. The article, entitled "Breaking the Medical Barrier," reports a breakthrough in the stone wall that previously confronted some medically disqualified airmen.

My colleagues may recall that before Mr. Halaby took over as Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, I was very much concerned about the arbitrary and capricious practices of that Agency. The case reported in the AOPA Pilot is a clear indication that the Federal Aviation Agency has taken on a new look. I compliment Mr. Halaby, his Agency, and ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BREAKING THE MEDICAL BARRIER

(By Charles P. Miller)

"A. C. Holder of Lovington, N. Mex., again is flying his Tri-Pacer."

At first glance, the above item would appear to be a fugitive from the personal mention column of some community newspaper. One would hardly expect it to be a report of a development of significance to the hundreds of thousands of pilots who hold third-class medical certificates. But it is.

Holder (AOPA 130119) back at the controls of his airplane is symbolic of a change that has taken place in the Federal Aviation Agency's thinking in regard to the permanent grounding of pilots who have suffered certain physical or mental disabilities. He is one of the 15 pilots, previously disqualified because of histories of heart trouble, who were restored to active flying status by FAA Administrator Najeeb E. Halaby upon the recommendation of his Medical Advisory Panel. Holder's case is an example of the experience of one of the 15.

Action of the Medical Advisory Panel, which acts independently of FAA's Medical Service and reports only to the Administrator, may be regarded as a breakthrough in the stone wall which previously confronted some medically disqualified airmen.

New medical standards, put into effect October 15, 1959, require the automatic denial of medical certificates to applicants who have an established history or clinical diagnosis of diabetes mellitus requiring insulin or hypoglycemic drugs for control, myocardial infarctions and certain other coronary heart diseases, a psychotic disorder, chronic alcoholism, epilepsy, "or a disturbance of consciousness without satisfactory medical explanation of the cause."

Back in 1959, the Pilot carried an article (December issue) entitled "Should FAA Ground This Man?" The pilot under discussion was A. C. Holder. The article consisted mainly of a letter written in his behalf by a Lovington attorney to the President of the United States.

Holder suffered a mild myocardial infarction in January 1958 and his third-class medical certificate was canceled later in the year. Subsequently, three doctors examined him and stated that he had recovered completely and could continue his normal activities, including flying, without endangering himself or others. His license was not returned. An appeal was pending before the Civil Aeronautics Board at the time the new regulation went into effect, nullifying the appeal. But Holder had just begun to fight. His attorney placed his case before President Dwight D. Eisenhower and the New Mexico pilot came to Washington later to tell Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY's Senate Aviation Subcommittee of his plight. He and the doctors who examined him felt there was no reason why he should not fly his plane which had become almost indispensable to him in his business operations in New Mexico.

At times Holder was ready to throw in the sponge, but he kept on trying. Last year he took another physical examination, knowing that his application would be denied. After he again was turned down he formally appealed to the Administrator for relief. A favorable recommendation on his case was made by the Medical Advisory Panel.

Last November 24, Holder and his Washington attorney, Merrill Armour, were advised by Administrator Halaby that an exemption had been granted.

"It is with personal pleasure that I enclose your medical certificate and the grant of your petition for exemption," D. D. Thomas, acting for Administrator Halaby, wrote Holder. "As we all know, safety in aviation is of paramount importance, and the cooperation required to achieve safety may necessitate inconvenience or hardship in some individual cases. The medical standards have been drawn with extreme care to reduce such cases to an absolute minimum. However, we recognize that rules written for general application cannot always be applied to the letter and that individual cases may require special consideration. This is why we established the exemption procedures, with favorable results in your case."

(Blanket denial of certificates to pilots falling into different categories is one of the features of the revised medical standards that disturbed many in general aviation. AOPA has urged repeatedly that such cases be considered individually, each upon its own merits.—Editor.)

Under the exemption Holder is required to have a cardiac examination made every 6 months. He also must carry oxygen equipment in his plane at all times, and use it at altitudes of 8,000 feet and above.

How does the New Mexican feel about being in the air again? His restrained comments all add up to one word, "great." However, he does not believe the fight for individual consideration has been won completely. Understandably, he continues to be puzzled over the long period of time required to get the denial reversed in his case.

"AOPA is to be congratulated on its continuous and unrelenting efforts in behalf of private pilots," he told the Pilot. "There were several certificates issued prior to mine.

"It is a real pleasure to be flying again, and certainly this puts a great deal of flexibility into my business. My traveling over the past year, without a plane, equaled 3 months' time, 8 hours a day with a 5-day week. Of course, I felt very strongly about the matter."

He gave the Medical Advisory Panel full credit for the restoration of his flying status and praised Administrator Halaby for acting favorably upon the Panel's recommendations. Halaby, he said, has definitely taken one step forward after FAA's many steps backward during the earlier days of the new medical standards.

"This proves that the earlier disallowance of my certificate was unfounded," he added. "It further points up the fact that all pilots should be increasingly vigilant in guarding their rights, most particularly in the face of the increasing trend toward centralization. I feel that unless the flight surgeon is curtained in his activities the relief from the brittle, unrelenting attitude is merely temporary. Again, I would like to warn all pilots to be increasingly vigilant, to be forever patient, continue to express their views and demand their rights."

Dr. James L. Goddard (AOPA 183573), Civil Air Surgeon and head of FAA's Medical Service, was asked by the Pilot whether the exemptions from the heretofore rigid ban, required by current rules, foreshadowed modification in the near future of part 29 of the Civil Air Regulations, which defines medical standards for pilot certificates.

Goddard said a great deal depended upon what was meant by "in the near future," pointing out that in scientific investigation this might mean a period of several years. He expressed the hope that studies recently made, and those which will follow, will enable the selection of "good risks" among those now denied certificates automatically. This is particularly true of pilots denied certificates because of a history of heart disease. He is hopeful that the study being made at Framingham, Mass., by the Public Health Service of the factors in the development of heart diseases would enable FAA to establish standards which would allow the certification of "good risks" among pilots who might have a history of heart disease.

The Framingham study was started 10 years ago and is still going on. In it, a sample of the community's population, numbering between 5,000 and 6,000 persons between the ages of 30 and 50, are examined biennially.

The Civil Air Surgeon said there is some possibility that pilots suffering from diabetes, which can be controlled by drugs taken orally, might be granted certificates. He said the Medical Service was working closely with the American Diabetes Association in trying to determine whether this could be done safely.

Other research may enable the relaxing of other standards, the Civil Air Surgeon indicated. He expects promising developments from FAA's own research facilities when the new aeromedical center at Oklahoma City gets into full operation. (Incidentally, most of the Medical Service personnel eventually will be transferred to Oklahoma City, Goddard said. Remaining in Washington mainly will be budget and professional guidance people, along with the Civil Air Surgeon's office.)

Both the Administrator's Medical Advisory Panel and the Civil Air Surgeon's Medical Review Board are current in their work, according to FAA officials.

The panel, which is composed of medical experts outside of FAA, considered 110 petitions during the last year. Of this number 15 were granted, 59 denied, 32 deferred for lack of sufficient information to form judgment, one was withdrawn and three remanded to the Civil Air Surgeon, who subsequently issued certificates to the pilots. The 15 certificates granted were all to pilots who had histories of heart trouble; 14 were applicants who had experienced good recovery following myocardial infarction, and one was a case of minimal valvular heart disease. Included among the denials were 29 coronary cases; 9 diabetics, 15 cases of nervous ailments and 6 others for various other physical defects.

The Civil Air Surgeon's Medical Review Board, whose membership consists of specialists in the FAA Medical Service, also is reported to be current with cases appealed to the Civil Air Surgeon. Administrator Halaby, FAA officials say, is insistent that medical appeal cases be handled expeditiously by both of the advisory groups. On December 31, the internal Review Board had 64 cases pending, but this contained no cases upon which the Board could act, Dr. Goddard said. The total included cases that had been scheduled for hearing, and the applicants notified of the date, or those where requested medical information had not been supplied by the pilots involved.

The Medical Board considered 431 appeals during 1961, Dr. Goddard reported. Of this number certificates were granted to 84 pilots, 283 appeals were denied and 64 cases (referred to above) were pending.

Cases handled by the Board are those which have been appealed to the Civil Air Surgeon from medical examiners' rulings, as provided for in the Civil Air Regulations. In the event there is a medical board denial, the applicant for a certificate carries his case to the administrator. Appeals to the administrator then are passed along to the Medical Advisory Panel for review and recommendations. The regulations stipulate that appeals from examiner rulings must be made within 30 days.

Certificate denials may be appealed directly to the Civil Aeronautics Board without going through the FAA channels if the applicant chooses, but this is seldom done. Most pilots feel they should exhaust their opportunities for review within FAA before their cases are put before the CAB.

The Medical Review Board's operations are conducted in a manner designed to give pilots every opportunity to present their cases, the Civil Air Surgeon said.

It meets every Thursday morning at FAA's Washington headquarters. Sessions usually last from 9 a.m. to about 1:30 p.m. with from six to eight cases considered at each meet-

ing. Specialists in different branches of medicine present the cases that fall within their respective fields—FAA's heart specialist presents the heart cases, for instance—and other members of the group listen to the presentation and go over the appellant's medical records. The group as a whole then makes the decision. The agenda for the weekly meeting is set well in advance, and the pilots whose cases are to be considered are notified and invited to appear personally before the Board when their cases are called up for review. Many pilots do make an appearance.

Dr. Goddard said that the presence of the applicant often aids the Board in reaching a decision by presenting facts that might not be readily available in the medical record. Frequently, pilots are given additional medical examinations in Washington to clear up hazy points. Quite often the results are beneficial to the pilot who has been denied a certificate. Several times the Board has found that a pilot's condition had been diagnosed incorrectly. One, who had been denied a certificate because of a medical history of heart trouble, was found not to have such a condition and was restored to flying status.

Transfer of medical information on airmen to an automatic data-processing system was one of the most important developments in the FAA Medical Service during 1961, Dr. Goddard told the Pilot. Through the use of automatic data processing it will be possible to determine, among other things, the frequency with which examinations are required. It might show that examinations might be required by age groups rather than by the types of certificates held. FAA officials believe; or it might even prove that the current system—6 months for air transport ratings, 2 years for private certificates, etc.—is correct after all. Anyway, the Medical Service expects to have the answer next year. The job of transferring the information to data processing will be completed about August 15 of this year.

Another activity the Medical Service gave special attention to last year was light plane accident investigation where fatalities occurred. This is done to determine whether medical factors were involved in the accidents. Dr. Goddard said FAA would like to learn more about the cause of nonfatal accidents; if possible, determine whether the physical condition of the pilots was a factor in the accidents. Designated medical examiners are participating increasingly in accident investigation work, although the brunt of this activity is borne by specialists in forensic pathology in various parts of the country, who were designated by FAA for this purpose.

But to get back to A. C. Holder. Along with this scientific development taking place in FAA's testing of persons who want to fly airplanes, he and the thousands of other pilots, who have experienced some sort of physical disability—or the hundreds of thousands of other active pilots, who could be so affected at any time—hope that the FAA will continue to consider pilots as individuals. A breakthrough was accomplished in 1961, but it was only a start.

Problems of the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1962

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the ever-increasing proportion of the elderly in our population means that there needs to be an increasing accent on age as well as on youth. A hundred years ago, one out of 38 Americans was over 65. In 1900, one out of 25 was over 65. Today 15 million Americans, or one in every 12, are 65 or over. The fact is that advances in medical science have resulted in remarkably lengthening our life expectancy which was about 40 years in 1850, 58 years in 1860, 60 years in 1930, and has since risen as high as between 65 and 70 years for certain groups, particularly white females in our population.

Conditions adversely affecting older people cannot be limited to a specific age group. Discrimination against employment of older workers becomes a serious handicap for some people in their forties. The incidence of chronic disease begins to rise sharply in middle age. Housing problems for the elderly are concerned with persons aged 60 and older. Eligibility for old-age insurance benefits begins at 62 for women and 65 for men. Medical research in the aging process requires study of changes occurring throughout the span of life.

What has been our attitude toward people over 65? Until very recently, it has been one of mere tolerance. Even our little kindnesses and courtesies toward the aged were patronizing and condescending. It was as if they were a separate breed, straining our patience; a disagreeable fact of life to which we learned to resign ourselves. These attitudes became so firmly entrenched that even the aged tended to think of themselves in that way.

We saw to it that those over 65 lost their self-respect; that advancing age loomed as a fearful experience. We told ourselves, told our young, told our old: "By the mere act of accumulating years you have forfeited respect. You cannot earn, you cannot learn." They stood accused of the crime of being old and they believed, with the accusers, that they were guilty.

Do we not pride ourselves upon our escape from barbarism, upon our civilized instincts? Yet, a recent report to the Special Committee on Aging of the U.S. Senate reveals that of 15.3 million persons 65 years and older and who are not in institutions, 55 percent had income less than $1,000 in 1959. What is more, of 6.2 million families where the family head was 65 or over, half had less than $2,900 income. Of 3.6 million aged persons living alone or with nonrelatives, half had less than $1,010.

Relatively few of these aged persons are fully employed. Over four-fifths of all persons over 65 are receiving benefits from the old-age insurance program.

Twenty-nine percent of these elderly persons have no liquid assets such as bank accounts or savings bonds, and 67 percent have less than $2,000.

We see the old people around us emotionally and economically dependent upon the young—lonely, sick, and a burden.

True, we have done a little, but very little. We are making a substantial payment in old-age benefits. But money alone cannot dissipate the problems of old age.

Terribly important among these problems is the problem of medical care. It has been found that chronic disease is more common among aged individuals with family income under $2,000 than for higher income aged groups. In other words, illness appears to be directly related to income. Aged persons go to hospitals more often and stay longer than younger persons. On the average the time spent in a general hospital is more than twice as long for persons 65 and over than for persons under 65. Aged persons see doctors more frequently than do younger persons.

Only 42 percent of retired persons 65 and over have some form of insurance coverage. While aged persons with low incomes are likely to have the greatest difficulty in paying medical and hospital bills, they are least likely to have any insurance protection. And, ironically, the aged in poorer health are less likely to have hospital insurance than their healthier contemporaries.

Another area in which the aged are unjustly treated involves compulsory retirement, an industry doctrine which is based on fallacy. One man of 65 is not another man of 65. He may be physically fit, he may be infirm. Some are truly dead before they die. Others are young and vigorous even up to death. Age of itself proves nothing; the question is what the man is, how he thinks, how he feels, what he can do. How cruel to cast out vigorous, competent workers on the basis of a mere statistic. How many men do we ourselves know who, after compulsory retirement, suddenly lose their grip on life and die within a short time after leaving work?

We must absorb the teaching that life and learning are a continuous process. Then what is now called the tragedy of old age will turn into a time of rich fulfillment.

Look at the men and women of ripe age who have been marked by history—Galileo, Spenser, Verdi—who were creative in their 90th year. Or you can point to such men as Orlando, who at 91 was a member of the Italian Senate, professor at the University of Rome, head of a very successful law firm, and the only survivor of the prime ministers who concluded the Peace of Versailles. Or Churchill or Bernard Baruch and other aged but nevertheless young in mind and spirit. Some of these people I have personally met and been impressed with their vigor and interest in living and in life. Yes, you will point to these and say, "But these are the specially gifted, the chosen few." You will say, "I have not these great gifts" and that "I shall have outlived my usefulness by the time I am 65." But I say to you that one common fact was true of all these men—they had never given up their interest in living and had never doubted their capacity for learning. That is the way of life we can all embrace.

At 73 I refuse to believe that in 2, 3, 5 years I shall suddenly abandon my interests and feel abandoned. My being in Congress has nothing to do with this. I have been in Congress since I was 33, and I find that the enthusiasm for new problems, the excitement of learning,

the stimulation of plays, of opera, and music, and reading, and love for wife and children, continue with the years, and I know that because these are with me I shall never be old.

I like what Dr. Martin Gumpert, author of "You Are Younger Than You Think," said:

It now remains for us to transfer our medical experience, our scientific knowledge, into social attitudes. If we accept the older citizen as an asset to our community instead of a burden, if we restore his dignity and independence, if we listen to his judgment and experience, if we respect his rights and challenge his responsibilities, we may be on our way to fulfill mankind's most arden hope; a mature society governed by wisdom.

Hundreds of bills are introduced in every session of Congress dealing with the many phases of aged and retirement living. Still, little positive legislation results either because of lack of understanding of the immensity of the problems, or failure to accept responsibility. It is vital that we undergo a sharp reorientation in this regard, and give prompt and effective support to programs such as President Kennedy's proposal for medical aid to the aged. Our senior citizens have the right to demand no less than this.

The responsibility for the aged does not, however, rest solely on the Government; it is a responsibility within each home and for each individual. While the State can provide such machinery as low-cost housing, to enable old people to live away from the families, and municipalities can provide social centers, and States can provide institutions, and the Nation can provide old-age monetary assistance, and employers can do away entirely with compulsory retirement and can employ more people in the older age brackets—all this will be incomplete unless and until the attitude of the people toward old people will change with the changing times.

We have taken away the prestige of the old. They are permeated with the feeling that they are on the shelf and gathering dust. The complaint for the major portion of the old folks is justified. There are thousands of jobs that old people can fill. They were successfully reabsorbed in war industries.

There are child-guidance clinics dotting the country. The country is almost barren of old-age guidance. I have only touched on the highlights here and there, but this failure of ours will grow in proportion to the increasing rate of the number of citizens over 65. By 1980 it is estimated we will have a population of over 20 million citizens who have passed their 60th birthday. If we continue in this rut of thinking, we are courting tragedy. This pitiful waste of human resources is one that touches each individual intimately. How many have asked themselves, "What will happen to me when I am 65?" Is it a problem only when it becomes my problem? Youth is a hope and age is a fulfillment. Shall we be so childish that we concentrate only on the hope and never on the fulfillment?

Walt Whitman has talked of the grandeur and exquisiteness of age. How many of us would accept that as true? We cannot, and only because we have failed the aged.

We protect the rights of man.

We protect the rights of children.

Why not recognize the rights of the aged?

Colonel Glenn: Ambassador of Good Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 22, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the successful orbiting of *Friendship 7*, manned by Colonel Glenn, represented—in my judgment—one of the greatest, most historically significant feats in U.S. progress and history.

Launched before the eyes of the world—not secretly behind an iron curtain extending upward to the end of space—the orbit reflects U.S. leadership once again in opening new horizons to free men.

As a nation, however, we—despite effective techniques in domestic salesmanship—regrettably often overlook potentials for creating a good image—and fostering friendship—abroad.

Acknowledging that the successful orbit by Colonel Glenn was primarily a mighty forward step in our program for space exploration, the question has arisen as to whether the flight might be further utilized: not only to highlight this successful feat, in space, but also to foster good will for our country—dedicated to utilizing space for peaceful purposes.

Recently, WITI-TV, of Milwaukee, Wis.—an early station to undertake responsible TV editorializing—televised an editorial urging greater utilization of Colonel Glenn as an "ambassador of good will," as well as a symbol of our space victory.

To present this recommendation for the consideration of Congress—and, as well, I hope the administration—I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLONEL GLENN AS AMBASSADOR OF GOOD WILL

A boost for our oversea prestige, let's proudly show the world Col. John Glenn in person.

Our entire Nation swelled with pride last week when Colonel Glenn made his very successful orbit around the earth.

This week when our astronaut spoke before a joint meeting of Congress, before Supreme Court Justices, ambassadors, and generals, we saw an American that we would like to showcase before the entire world. No one can better display the virility of our space achievements. His intelligence, his personality, his love of country is an inspiration to all of us.

"We're all proud to have been privileged to be part of this effort to represent our country as we have. As our knowledge of the universe in which we live increases, may God grant us the wisdom and guidance to use it wisely."

Space expert? Of course. But, more than that, Colonel Glenn is the kind of individual American we want the world to see and hear. That smile of his, that down-to-earth personable manner will capture the admiration of other countries too. His genuineness will convince people of other nations that our space efforts have a peaceful purpose.

Let's continue to show off Astronaut Glenn. But let's send him around the world to Europe, to South America, to Africa, and other areas. The Russians took their spacemen around, and they excited a few countries. With Glenn we'll not only excite them; we'll win friends and allies; we'll bring respect for the United States to a new high.

Let's send Glenn around the world again, but this time keep him on the ground—close to the people—an ambassador of good will from the United States.

Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1962

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I received a refreshing letter with reference to the problem of medical care for the aged. No one can doubt that our older people face increasing problems in paying their medical bills. It is my fervent hope that the Congress will face this issue and be given various alternate approaches upon which to vote. Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the full text of the letter from my constituent so that all my colleagues may be inspired by it, as I was.

The letter follows:

Hon. CHARLES E. GOODELL.

SIR: I have two reasons for writing to you. First to thank you for my copy of your newsletter of January 17, 1962, also to express my opinion, for what it is worth, on medical aid to or for the aged.

Last September, my wife fell and damaged her arm and shoulder. We could not buy fuel and pay taxes. We have not had work for years. We have a mortgage on what we have and owe First National Bank $500 so no money to see a doctor and she suffered it till January. Then we had to see a doctor, who sent her to Corning Hospital for examination. Three doctors, X-ray laboratory for 2 days, expense of $225.75. They could not help her, so sent her to St. Joseph Hospital at Elmira for 8 days; $300.32 again; 3 doctors $270. Transportation and prescriptions helped to boost the expense since and still they keep sending the bills. I expect, someway, to pay of course. I am trying to remortgage the place for enough to pay all.

Now this experience made me think more of this help through social security and the King bill (H.R. 4222). But compulsory health care, or the so-called socialized medicine, don't answer the question for the old folks. If the United States of America can and does lend money to other countries, why can't they lend help to their own aged folks when they are in need of care and help. Example: When a couple wants to buy or remodel a home, they can get an F.H.A. loan, long-term, easier payments to do so. Now why not a surgery-medical loan

to the aged on long-term, easy payment plan to help these that need real help. Give old age a chance to pay their own way. I am sure the American Medical Association could help with a percent off and would not call this idea socialized medicine. Anyhow it's a strong point. Again, for the newsletter, thanks.

Let Us Have More Confidence in the Individual Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1962

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is about time that we, as Members of Congress, listen more closely to the farmers and their representatives when they express their feelings on the programs which are conjured up to assist them. We in Massachusetts are most fortunate in having an articulate spokesman who is steadfast in his confidence in the individual farmer. Mr. Carleton I. Pickett is the executive secretary of the Massachusetts Farm Bureau Federation, Inc. I feel that his commentary on the administration's 1962 farm program merits the consideration of all of us:

WHO'S ONE-SIDED?

(By Carleton I. Pickett)

The Secretary of Agriculture has at his disposal one of the greatest propaganda machines in American government. He has nationwide press, radio, and television coverage. He has traveled on my money and yours from one end of the Nation to the other, crisscrossing it time and time again. He has an army of professionals in his committees which have networks down into every community of America. He has called out all of them to arouse the Congress to enact a supply-management, farm political bill.

The Secretary has appeared before consumers, distributors, bankers, recreation hobbyists, and has been very persuasive in the most gigantic campaign ever put on in America to lobby a farm bill.

Once in a while it is said that I am one-sided. If it be one sided to be against sin without impartially portraying all the seductive delights of sin—then I am one-sided. If it be necessary to be labeled "against" if you can't be "for" then I am "against" Freeman and the Kennedy farm program because I am "for" farmers and "for" a system that has not failed.

It is time that folks got off of the fence and into the play. The textile industry moans over the cotton situation without lifting a finger to defeat national farm acts which allow such conditions. The taxpayer finds fault with subsidy without bothering to tell it to a Congressman. Farmers toy with the idea that politics can find answers to economics when the record shows it has never worked.

The liberal can spend his days dreaming of land reform, greenbelts, resettlement of marginal farmers, by government, without ever seeing what is going on in the name of land reform in other nations.

Congress is considering the Kennedy farm bill right now. It needs to hear from us. Let Mr. Freeman enjoy his mobilized support and let me be one-sided. Let me be on the side which wants to get Government out of farming. Let me be on the side that isn't afraid of the marektplace. Let me be one-sided in the sure, firm conviction that a government that has to propagandize its citizens on a massive scale cannot be very sure of its facts on the great farm business of America, cannot be very well grounded in the amazing ability of American farmers, cannot have very much faith in the business decisions of our tremendously successful farmers.

Let me be one sided.

My Congressman has got to be one sided when he votes. He has never yet been able to vote "yea" and "nay" on the same rollcall.

P.S.—Mr. Freeman is one sided too. He's on the other side.

Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1962

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, 1962, Americans of Byelorussian descent and Byelorussians all over the free world will commemorate the 44th anniversary of the proclamation of Byelorussian independence.

Byelorussians proudly and justly boast of their long and glorious history. They are among the oldest known Slavic peoples, living in their historic homeland in northeastern Europe. They had formed their own state late in the middle ages, and successfully preserved their freedom until the rise of imperial Russia. Their country was forcibly incorporated into Russia in 1795.

Continuous efforts were made by the Byelorussians to regain their freedom, and finally in 1917, the revolution in Russia offered an opportunity for them to regain their independence.

The All-Byelorussian Congress consisting of 1,872 delegates from all corners of the country, convened in Minsk on December 18, 1917. This Congress became in fact the constituent assembly of Byelorussia and elected the Rada (council) and its presidium as its executive bodies.

On March 25, 1918, the Rada and its executive council proclaimed the independence of Byelorussia.

Unfortunately, the independence of Byelorussia was of short duration, and the country was soon once again the victim of Russian aggression and domination.

In spite of the cruel oppression of Soviet Russia, the people of Byelorussia have continued their valiant struggle to regain their freedom.

On this 44th anniversary of the proclamation of Byelorussian independence, the people of the United States join with Byelorussians throughout the world in the hope that Byelorussia may again gain independence, and in the fervent prayer that the people of Byelorussia will soon attain the freedom for which they have struggled so long.

Speaking for the Grassroots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN KYL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1962

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, recently a large delegation of Farm Bureau members from the State of Iowa visited Washington, D.C. As part of their congressional banquet, statements were made by Mr. Dean Kleckner of Floyd County and John Augustine of Wapello County. These speeches are presented below:

STATEMENT OF DEAN KLECKNER

We farmers are becoming more concerned with each passing day about the change in thinking in this country. This change seems to be embodied in the theory that the individual should be subservient to the masses.

Gentlemen, this idea, if carried to the extreme that is proposed by some, would knock this country off the pinnacle to which we have become accustomed and would put us among the so-so countries of the world. Probably in the process of becoming so-so, however, the so-called farm problem would be solved. Let me elaborate.

Last week when the farmers of the U.S.S.R. were being taken to task for not producing the needs of that country, some people here, with tongue in cheek, suggested that both countries could settle their agricultural problems by having a mass migration of one-half the farmers from each to the other.

The sad thing about a suggestion like this is the fact that many folks here believe that it might be true. They miss the real point that it isn't the farmers, here and there, that give one country abundance and the other scarcity, but the systems involved.

Our system that assumes we perform best when least impeded by government, that we are responsible for our own welfare, that a profit is our incentive for accomplishment—versus their system of state control of welfare and resources. It is probably significant that their Premier recognizes that personal incentives are needed to lift them out of the doldrums.

Why then do we contemplate policies and programs that have proven themselves failures elsewhere?

Many accept such as this because they haven't thought the problem through to a logical conclusion. It doesn't take an extremely brilliant individual to conclude that a check from the U.S. Treasury is something for nothing—it isn't being paid for, especially by me, so why not get more "free" and all power to those who promise it to me.

It seems to be old fashioned to profess allegiance to such American traditions as doing a day's work for a day's pay, and that to shoot for a high gain involves a high risk.

I'm proud of the fact our members do not feel this way. We take a more long-term look at things, analyze the situations as they arise on the basis of what effect will this action have on my children 10 or 20 years from now as well as what the result will be for me next month or next year.

Farm Bureau members wear the tag "individualist" proudly.

The one point that stands out in my mind in visiting with people around our county, especially during the past several months, and I'm sure this is true over all of Iowa, is a basic desire to run their own business. This is very noticeable among the younger farmers.

This group, born in the thirties, has never known a "normal" situation. Their memory probably covers two wars, in the service themselves, a few boom years, and of late, an inflation that is eating the heart out of every dollar.

We have seen our country's industry produce ever bigger and better machines that help us do the job faster, easier, and more efficiently. This in response to a demand created by a profit motive, not by governmental decree.

We have seen our productivity increase to the point where it only takes one farmer to feed himself and 25 others and we realize this is a strength, not a weakness.

And, yet, our biggest fear is that the Government will create a situation, an atmosphere, that will take all the challenge, all the fun, and all the reward out of farming.

This will be done under the guise of helping raise farm income, by conditioning us with large payments of taxpayers' money and then threatening to cut it off if certain conditions aren't met, or perhaps with unwise economic solutions that lose more and more markets, both domestic and foreign.

Farm Bureau members don't want this. We believe that the Government's obligation to her citizens stop when opportunity is made available to everyone—opportunity to develop their God-given talents as they are able. If they can't, they fail. This is the other side of the coin, and it must be there. Very simply, we believe in the free enterprise system.

During most election campaigns, a certain phrase is often picked up, repeated, and sticks in people's minds. Such slogans as "I will go to Korea" and more recently, "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country."

Gentlemen, the answer is out there, among us. We hope you listen.

STATEMENT OF JOHN AUGUSTINE

I will cover three areas in my short statement:

1. We feel Government is attempting to solve too many problems which should be left to local governments. For example, Federal aid to education, Federal housing, urban renewal, etc. I even read where the Federal Government might have gotten in the sewage business in Des Moines. Now I'm quite sure this is a problem of a local nature and one I should be for, since I live on the Des Moines River below Des Moines, but it's still a local problem and should be handled as such.

2. Now let us delve briefly in the area of reciprocal trade. Farm Bureau has supported this measure since its inception and is real happy to support it again and for a number of very good reasons. This is possibly as important a piece of legislation as is currently being considered. This whole area of trade has more than economic connotations. It can have a very significant social effect on many people in many countries. It looms even larger now, at least to me, in view of the European Common Market.

I deem it fortunate for all concerned that our President, Mr. Kennedy, has taken the lead on this one, and we all owe him much for his effort and should help him to the best of our ability, both now and in the future, to get the best legislation possible to further our successes in the field of foreign trade. (If any of my Republican friends want equal time on this, contact our chairman.)

Agriculture is in a position where it could make a real contribution to peace, and for this reason alone we should explore every possibility that presents itself.

3. Farm legislation. I do not wish to appear belligerent, but there are some things that have to be mentioned relative to agricultural legislation. The administration's agricultural supply program (S. 2786) poses many questions in the minds of Farm Bureau members. Has anyone ever heard of any groups, be they producers of food, fiber, or anything else, being asked to make a choice like this one? Wholly unacceptable in its present form.

Insofar as producing for a free market is concerned, it would be fine if all parties involved were to play under the same rule. However, to expect agriculture to compete favorably with other segments of the economy that are either heavily subsidized or otherwise protected, is wholly unreasonable. Farm Bureau would concur that we need permanent type legislation but not this one.

Duelling was made illegal many years ago. But when you were challenged, you were extended the courtesy of a choice of weapons with which to defend yourself. Whereas in this proposal we are offered the option of pulling the economic rug from beneath ourselves or having it done for us. This type of legislation would give as much latitude or maneuverability as a straitjacket. Further it would tend to maintain the status quo and any change of an individual's operation would be very difficult, as much of this proposal is based on the history of the farm, disregarding past land management and this could cause very real hardships.

Now we do not want to be considered in the position of the man who sprayed his orchard, not because he was for apples, but because he was against worms. Nor would we want anyone to think we were or are against Secretary Freeman. We would be first to agree that he is a hard-working man and I'm real happy that he is telling the food story to our urban friends and consumers. Further emphasis could be placed here, inasmuch as most of our population takes food for granted and it is not a simple task to provide the quality and variety of food and fiber that we have available. If it were a simple job and all that was needed was manpower, then somewhere, right now, there would not be a bunch of used commissars sitting around wondering about their future.

Now to mention three salient points in Farm Bureau's cropland retirement program:

1. Conservation reserve: With 22 or 23 million acres in this program, it gives us a real good start toward our objective and we support the extension of same.

2. Voluntary land retirement: Where we could get whole farms, this would enable us to get the good land as well as the less desirable. Also it appeals to part-time farmers as well as men who are nearing retirement. Voluntary retirement of land can be done, we think, in amounts that would be large enough to meet the needed total acreage.

3. We would be amiss if we failed to consider the domestic agriculture policy along with the Reciprocal Trade Act because to do otherwise might jeopardize a future opportunity that might arise and we could find ourselves in the awkward position of being unable to trade before we even got a trade started.

I hope in all of these things we can have three things:

1. The vision to see all that is involved.

2. The wisdom to solve the problems contained therein.

3. The courage to act.

We have absolute faith in the judgments arrived at, through our democratic processes as we have known them, and I hope we can be as big as our opportunities.

Forest Service Budget Appropriations and Their Effect on the Economy

SPEECH

OF

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10802) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, under consent granted by Chairman KIRWAN, of the Interior Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, I would like to take this opportunity to join my colleague from the State of Oregon, Congressman ULLMAN, who so succinctly stated the problem relative to our forest areas and in regard to the appropriations for the Forest Service.

First, I would like to commend and thank and pay tribute to the gentleman from Ohio and the members of his subcommittee who have worked so long and so ably on this entire important appropriation problem, but I would be remiss to my district and remiss to my State where timber is of such importance to the total economy if I did not express regret that the Presidential budget requests have been substantially cut back.

The question has been raised about "the depressed timber market." Like the gentleman from Oregon, I believe it is clear that one of the factors involved in this lumber economy situation is the failure of the Forest Service to program and carry out sales on an adequate basis which cannot be done without adequate congressional appropriations. I am certainly urging that the Members of the Senate in consideration of this bill review these cuts and restore, if at all possible, funds to the Forest Service so that the program may go forward in the most expedient manner and in a manner to benefit our economy.

The entire problem of lumber is complex. It involves many components—forest research, forest management, access roads, and in this latter category I want to express concern at the deletion of the budgetary request of $2 million for these access roads. I do sincerely appreciate the reasoning behind the committee in making their decision, but it seems to me that at this time, with the critical condition of the lumber industry, the program could have been continued for another year, allowing the Forest Service to gain immediate access to timber supplies. I would like also to point out and particularly to call attention to the Senate of the proposed forest research laboratory to be constructed in our own State which is most important to our industry and subsequently to the economy of the district.

So serious has the condition of the forest products industry become that on

March 5 I wrote to the President of the United States urging that at the Executive level this industry look toward solutions which will assist the forest products industry to regain its economic health with a subsequent rise in employment from the low level we now know and reflect in our communities a stability not now there. I am repeating at this time some of those conditions:

In the first place, I think we must remember that the lumber industry has gone into a period of reduction in consumption due to a decrease in housing which in itself may not prove too serious. The industry is one of high labor costs and faces a continuous fight for markets because of other substitute materials. Fluctuations in supply and demand are also greater than many other industries. The Canadian Government, particularly British Columbia, a highly productive lumber area, is dependent on foreign markets. In the last few years the Russians have cut the price of lumber to the United Kingdom and European markets that were traditionally Canadian forcing the British Columbia lumber into U.S. markets. The Russians are expected to take away even more Canadian markets, and British Columbia production is expected to increase so they will take even more of our markets. This would not be serious, except for the Federal restrictions on our producers. These restrictions are substantial and result in a penalty against U.S. producers of 25 percent of the cost of lumber to the consumer. These restrictions are:

(a) Ocean shipping rates—the Jones Act requires our shipments to the eastern markets to go in U.S. ships at rates $10 per thousand board feet higher than Canadian lumber which goes in the most economical tramp steamers available.

(b) The Canadian railroads grant a free layover and diversion service to rail shippers worth about $100 per car. Our railroads recently were forced to stop this free service by the ICC. The Canadians may eventually follow suit but have not yet.

(c) The Canadian Government manipulates the dollar exchange rate by its dealings in foreign currencies so as to maintain the Canadian dollar at a discount. This amounts to a 3- to 4-percent advantage to Canadian lumber.

(d) The British Columbia Government has an even greater monopoly of available timber supply than does the United States. Recognizing the responsibilities of both a government and a monopolist proprietor, the Canadian Government prices its stumpage so as to maintain full employment.

(e) Last summer in our district we had an unusual situation develop relative to the export of large amounts of uncut logs to Japan. The Japanese were able to pay several times over the prices that our mills could offer. There were many claims and counterclaims. There were those who claimed that small and low-grade logs which were not economically milled in the United States were sold. Other smaller mills said they were dependent on this type of log. The result of the sales was that national forest log prices were bid up beyond U.S. mill limits in the few seaport areas open to the Japanese.

(f) The Canadians have tariff restrictions against our lumber imports which we do not have against their lumber coming into the United States. Could there be assistance at the Executive level in equalizing these rates?

On the morning of February 21, I was present at a meeting between representatives of the forest industries from the entire United States with the Secretary of Agriculture. In attendance were Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from widely separated districts, all interested in lumber area economy. Spokesmen for three major lumber-producing regions of the Nation made clear both the gravity of the situation facing the industry and its determination to achieve a satisfactory solution. Secretary Freeman has the report on the entire meeting for his review. Briefly, the proposals presented to him by the industry were:

First. Institute an orderly program of timber sales designed to promote the regular harvest of trees from national forest commercial forest areas, to insure community stability, continuous employment, improved wood products, and a healthy forest industry.

Second. Take cognizance of the monopoly the Government has as the principal seller of timber in large areas, and avoid taking advantage of the dominant position in the setting of rates for timber.

Third. Revise the existing procedure for appealing adverse decisions of the U.S. Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

Fourth. Revise the existing Federal timber sales contract form, to provide a normal buyer and seller relationship.

Members of the lumber delegation went on to point out in the meeting, and I quote from their report:

> That to insure an orderly program of timber sales, the Chief of the Forest Service should annually report to the Secretary of Agriculture such data, for each national forest, as "the allowable cut limit, the volume of timber under contract, the volume that could be sold considering the accumulated overcut or undercut, the volume of timber sold, the estimated average forest growth potential per acre of commercial forest land in the national forest, and the average volume cut per acre over the entire commercial area." This would provide a balance sheet so that Federal performance can be measured against production and conservation standards.
>
> With respect to the monopoly position of the Government as a timber seller.

The delegation noted—

> the economic well-being and future of numerous communities depend on fairly priced raw materials from the national forests.

It highlighted the fact that in many areas where the Government is the principal seller there is no alternative source of supply.

The lumbermen further noted, and again I quote—

> existing procedures for appealing adverse decisions are entirely inadequate, the lumbermen urged that:
>
> A decision that is challenged should be reduced to writing with a recitation of the facts upon which the decision is based.
>
> This writing along with the challenge in writing should be reviewed within the agency at a higher level.
>
> A further appeal at this stage should be to an impartial board or to the courts with a right of hearing and an examination of the evidence.

Various Members of Congress including myself urged that time was of the essence in assisting the economy of the forest products industry. Senator MORSE made a suggestion of a review committee, and I would urge that any such committee have as an integral part of its makeup those who understand thoroughly the timber business.

In closing, I would urge that all facets of the effect of any curtailment of appropriations be considered by the Senate and by my colleagues in the House as legislation appears which could be helpful.

The Facts Prove U.S. School Funds Are Not Needed To Provide a Sound Educational System, Says Maurice H. Stans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1962

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the Washington (D.C.) Post has long been a leading supporter of Federal aid to education. Recently, however, it seems to be suffering from a mild case of split personality on this controversial subject. While its editorial page continues to strongly back Federal aid to education, its business page has carried several articles which conclusively prove that Federal aid to education is not needed. These anti-Federal-aid-to-education articles have been written by Maurice H. Stans, the brilliant Director of the Federal Bureau of the Budget under President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

It would be a fine thing if the editorial writers of the Washington Post could meet Mr. Stans of the business page and go thoroughly into this matter of Federal aid to education. This would be a most interesting meeting and it should certainly produce some splendid educational results.

Under unanimous consent, I include herewith Mr. Stans' article which appeared in the Washington Post of March 12, 1962:

U.S. SCHOOL FUNDS BELIEVED UNNEEDED

(By Maurice H. Stans)

Taxpayers in my old hometown of Shakopee, Minn., in 1959 were confronted with the need of enlarging the school facilities. The educators and architects put before them a proposal to build a new high school at a cost of $1.3 million. The program was defeated in the election almost 4 to 1—but not because the voters were against education or were unwilling or unable to support its necessary costs. They turned it down because they believed the plans were extravagant.

About 6 weeks later, a more economical proposal calling simply for an addition to the existing school building was presented to the taxpayers. By an enthusiastic vote of 5 to 2, they approved a $200,000 bond issue to meet the cost.

In an earlier article I questioned the validity of the statistics being cited to the public in support of Federal aid for elementary and secondary school construction. I suggested that we are entitled to a lot more facts on what individual school districts really need—and what they can and will do about it when inadequate or substandard conditions are pointed out—before committing billions of dollars of Federal money to such a program.

MEETING RESPONSIBILITIES

Since all Americans favor a sound educational system, it might be assumed that the case for Federal support would rest on evidence that the local school districts have failed to provide one that is satisfactory. Yet the facts seem to demonstrate that by and large they are meeting their responsibilities—in their own way, as did the people of Shakopee.

Here are figures from the Office of Education: Over the past decade (of the 1950's) more than 600,000 new classrooms were built, while increased attendance required only 400,000. This means that 200,000 classrooms were made available to replace old ones or to reduce the size of classes. This provided a significant improvement in school conditions.

Since 1956, our communities have been building an average of 70,000 classrooms a years, on their own. In the 4 years between 1956 and 1960, enrollment rose 15 percent, the number of classrooms increased 23 percent, and the number of pupils per classroom declined from 29 to 27.1. And all this without general Federal aid.

And here are some more reported figures: The peak increase in elementary and secondary public schools occurred in the fall of 1953, when student enrollments rose 1.4 million. Since then, the postwar wave has been subsiding, and now the annual increases are about 1 million.

FURTHER SLOWDOWN

From 1965 through 1970, the statisticians tell us, the average growth will be only about 600,000 pupils per year. If our communities continue to build just 50,000 classrooms a year, this will provide enough new facilities to take care of the student growth and give 25,000 classrooms a year to replace old ones or further reduce the average pupil count per classroom.

The contention that States and local communities are unable to meet rising educational costs does not stand up under critical examination. The States and communities in the 1950's boosted school revenues 164 percent to meet the mushrooming 43 percent expansion in enrollment. With our economy continuing to grow they should be better able by far to match the lesser needs of the 1960's when enrollment will grow by only 20 percent.

A few years ago, the argument was heard that thousands of school districts had reached the ceiling of their bonding limits for school debt and so were prevented from meeting their requirements. Yet a survey by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in December 1959 showed that only 237 of the Nation's more than 40,000 school districts reported that they needed classrooms, were at the limit of their debt capacity and were unable to obtain State aid. For those few in this category, the Eisenhower-Flemming 1960 proposal of limited long-term aid through loans and grants would have been a full and adequate solution; the Congress ignored it.

TWO LESSONS ILLUSTRATED

The experience of Shakopee illustrates two important lessons. First, planners can engage in flights of fancy when they submit proposed courses of action; only local knowledge of actual requirements can hold this type of wishful waste in check. Second, when the voters are convinced of the need for money and that it will be well spent they will approve and support all reasonable requests made of them. They want their children to be well educated.

Since the turn of the century, increases in school expenditures have far surpassed the growth in any other measuring rod of progress, including gross national product, personal income, and personal consumption expenditures. And all except a negligible portion in recent years has been voluntarily paid out of the pockets of local taxpayers.

Certainly the facts do not make a strong case for using vast appropriations of Federal funds at the elementary and secondary school level. To a degree unequaled by any other nation in history, primary and secondary education has been provided in this country to all who have sought it. And it has been done well and at less cost to the taxpayer by the States and local school districts.

Increasing Sales of Savings Bonds Through Systematic Programs Such as That Operated by General Motors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1962

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, on February 5, 1962, the Treasury Department announced that during January redemptions of outstanding series E and H savings bonds had exceeded sales of new bonds by $7 million. January was the first month since September 1961, in which bond cash-ins had outweighed sales.

It was pointed out in the press that January was also the first month in which commercial banks could operate under the new governmental rule allowing them to pay up to 4 percent interest on savings deposits. This rate compares with the old ceiling of 3 percent and is slightly above the savings bond rate of 3¾ percent. Treasury officials are reported to be studying the situation to determine whether the increase in savings bond cash-ins is related to the new bank rate on savings deposits. Perhaps efforts should be intensified to encourage business firms to offer payroll deduction savings bond programs. Experience has shown that such programs constitute one of the best ways to sell savings bonds.

One example of an effective program is the savings-stock purchase program launched by General Motors Corp. in 1955. Under this program the purchase of savings bonds by salaried General Motors employees is part of an attractive package which includes acquisition of stock in the corporation. Employees who participate in the program thus obtain a financial stake both in their government and in one of America's foremost private enterprises.

The second distribution under the General Motors program was announced by Frederic G. Donner, chairman, on January 31, 1962. The distribution had a value of nearly $59 million and included savings bonds with a current value of $15,248,000.

In addition to the savings-stock purchase program, General Motors has had since 1941 a payroll deduction plan under which its employees may purchase U.S. Treasury bonds through voluntary deductions from their paychecks.

As of the end of 1961, more than 126,000 General Motors employees were participating in this plan. During 1961, a total of $60,947,000 was deducted from employees' paychecks for the purchase of bonds having a maturity value of $81,261,000. Since the plan was started, through 1961, a total of $1,371,300,000 has been deducted from General Motors employees' paychecks to purchase bonds with a maturity value totaling $1,828,400,000.

In view of what has been happening, I believe that systematic savings programs such as those operated by General Motors should be given wide publicity in order to encourage others to adopt similar plans. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the January 31 announcement by Mr. Donner at this point in the RECORD:

DETROIT.—Distribution today of nearly $59 million in General Motors common stock, Government bonds, and cash to 56,700 salaried employees in the United States who participated in the 1956 savings fund plan under the corporation's savings-stock purchase program was announced by Frederic G. Donner, General Motors chairman.

This year's distribution represents a return of $2.15 for every dollar saved by General Motors salaried employees enrolled in the program in the United States.

The distribution results from $27,380,000 in savings by employees, $13,690,000 contributed by the corporation during 1956 plus interest and dividends earned between January 1, 1956, and December 31, 1961, and appreciation in value of General Motors common stock. Employees received 750,000 shares of General Motors common stock, 158,400 series E bonds of varying denominations with a current value of $15,248,000, and approximately $2,350,000 in cash.

Under the savings-stock purchase program, General Motors contributes $1 for each $2 of employee savings.

"The savings-stock purchase program was established to provide employees with an incentive for regular savings and to give added vitality to the corporation by increasing the number of our employees who own General Motors stock," Mr. Donner said. The distribution, together with the distribution a year ago, has successfully achieved these goals.

"We are gratified that 85 percent of eligible employees are participating in the savings-stock purchase program, saving an average of 8 percent of salary. In the 6¼ years since the program began, GM employees have saved more than $311 million.

As a result of the current distribution, approximately 17,700 General Motors employees became new shareholders in the company.

Eligible employees in the United States may elect to participate in the savings fund plan, under which the current payments are being made, or they may elect to join the retirement thrift plan.

The distribution today was made to participants in the savings fund plan of the "class" of 1956, first full year of the program's operation. A class is formed each year and matures 5 full years after the year of formation.

Employees participating in the 1956 class of the retirement thrift plan had to their credit at the end of 1961 Government securities with a current value of about $1,800,000 and a total of 95,600 shares of General Motors common stock. While these amounts will not become payable until the employee retires or otherwise terminates employment, the employee may withdraw securities purchased with his own savings without affecting his right to receive, when his employment terminates, the securities attributable to General Motors contributions.

Under the savings-stock purchase program, all salaried employees with one or more years of continuous service are eligible to participate on a voluntary basis. They may save up to 10 percent of their base salary, plus cost-of-living allowance.

Half of the employee's savings is invested in Government bonds and half in GM common stock. The corporation's contribution is invested entirely in GM common stock. All dividends are invested in GM common stock and all interest received is invested in Government bonds.

Ode to the Astronaut, John Glenn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 22, 1962

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the exploit of John Glenn has brought about a great feeling of pride among all Americans regardless of status or where they live, and that feeling of pride has manifested itself in many ways. It is manifested in one way through writings by those who can write what they feel. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a poem entitled "Ode to the Astronaut, John Glenn," written by Clint Gray, of West Danville, Vt.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ODE TO THE ASTRONAUT, JOHN GLENN

In the year of sixty-two,
An astronaut in space ship flew,
In orbit three times around the earth,
And the people here today recognize
his worth.

A space hero he will be,
Until time has reached its end,
For he has given much today,
For the good of all free men.

So let us cheer him good and long,
This hero of outer space,
In recognition for what he has given,
To all the human race.

His name will go down in history
With all nation's bravest men.
Now let us say, God bless the name,
Of the astronaut, John Glenn.

CLINT GRAY.

Capability of White Sands Missile Range in Space Vehicle Recovery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1962

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, the advent of manned vehicles capable of lunar and planetary missions is almost upon us, Such vehicles will be very costly and must be recovered if at all possible. A land recovery area, removed as far as possible from population centers and from possible loss in oceans, surely will be an essential part of the spaceflight program to which we are committed. Such an area must be planned as an integral part of the spaceflight program.

The White Sands Missile Range is the only inland, fully instrumented range within the United States. Its competitors either offer an airbase, of very limited area, or an ocean wherein all vehicles can be lost. The WSMR offers an equipped, already developed area of 5,600 square miles, plus 15 years of missile firing and drone recovery, as well as complete airbase support. Although this range is far removed from large population concentrations, yet the functions of the range are served by an extensive network of power, communication, and transportation facilities. The range is crossed by about 1,100 miles of hard-surface road. All necessary physical ingredients are present for further development of this unique land range into the necessary space vehicle landing site.

The people of southern New Mexico and of west Texas, although aware of the hazards, will not oppose this best utilization of the WSMR in the interests of the national space-flight program.

The following briefly stated facts will support the claim that WSMR offers the most effective, least expensive means of providing such a range, in a climate nearly ideal for optical and radar systems. Further supporting information will be made available upon request.

LANDING INSTRUMENTATION

More than $350 million has been spent by agencies of the DOD on development programs at WSMR. The range has supported the firing of more than 15,000 missiles, using about 1,200 precisely located instrument sites.

Locations surveyed to first order accuracy include such optical instrumentation as 159 cinetheodolite sites, 171 telescope sites, 84 ballistic camera sites, 500 fixed camera sites, and such others as 41 radar stations—including 8 FPS-16's—10 telemetry stations, 10 mobile vans, and 210 DOVAP sites.

The present long-range radar, optical, timing, and telemetry systems, with minor modifications, can track and land glide vehicles and other currently approved vehicles.

Data reduction systems complement the range instrumentation and produce the maximum in data quality in minimum time by up-to-date methods and computer systems.

WSMR has more than twice as many tracking instruments, and more than twice as many types of instruments, as any competing land range.

LANDING SPACE AND FACILITIES

About 4,600 square miles surrounding the range can be made an emergency landing area since this area is virtually unoccupied and since much of the present instrumentation could equally well scan such an area.

The Alkali Flats, lying entirely within WSMR, offers over 100 square miles of very hard surface for skid-landings or ballistic drops. Runways up to 15 miles in length are easily possible without obstructions to glidepaths needed for foreseeable vehicles.

The natural surface of the Alkali Flats exceeds the bearing capacity specified for first-class highways. The California bearing ratio ranges from two to four times the California bearing ratio of a coastal dry lake bed, has no yearly flooding, and not only is nonabrasive but acts as a lubricant under pressure.

Special facilities include the Aeromedical Research Laboratory, a track for test of human and animal subjects, a high-speed precision tract 35,000 feet long for guidance system testing, an environmental facility for simulating vibration testing of components under extreme altitude, temperature, and pressure conditions, the central inertial guidance test facility, balloon launch and drop operations for the Air Force, and the multitude of laboratories, shops, computers, and engineering facilities of the Army Missile Test Center.

Educational and recreational assets of the region match the technical experience and competence of the WSMR. Nearby are New Mexico State University, Texas Western College, and a graduate center of the University of New Mexico.

CLIMATE

Visibility is unlimited about 90 percent of each year. A 60-mile visibility is typical. Overcast conditions average about 14 percent of the year.

The air is clear and dry, rainfall averaging less than 7 inches per year, so that corrosion is at a minimum.

Year-round weather is very favorable for landing vehicles at an arbitrary time. Dry air and other atmospheric conditions permit maximum performance of optical instrumentation not obtainable at other ranges.

Tell the Whole Story, Mr. President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1962

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, my mail indicates those who favor medical aid for the aged under social security are not acquainted with all the facts and are badly disillusioned. They have

been led to believe that by the passage of this proposal their medicare problems will be solved by a simple stroke of the Presidential pen. What a rude awakening they will have should the King-Anderson type legislation prevail.

A short but provocative editorial on this subject appeared in the March 14 edition of the York (Pa.) Dispatch and is submitted as an extension of my remarks.

The editorial follows:

HELP THOSE IN NEED

Medical care for the aged under social security is now being merchandised by the medicine men of the New Frontier.

The chief doctor, President Kennedy himself, is taking to the trail. The President has agreed to appear May 20 at a Madison Square Garden rally to muster support for his medical care program.

According to the Associated Press, the President indicated similar rallies will be held the same day in a number of other cities. The President said he believes that with this type of public support behind his program, Congress will enact the medical care plan this session.

It is unfortunate that the medical care debate is receding from the area of reason to the arena of cheering crowds.

Not even the loyal opposition has denied that the aged need help in meeting their medical bills. The question is do all those over 65—or even the great majority—need financial help. And the answer is no.

The President's program basically provides for the payment of hospital bills. It does not pay doctors. Nor does it cover prescription drug purchases.

In other words, the Kennedy plan would give hospital care to many who can afford it, yet deny aid for doctor-drug bills to many who can't stand the costs.

The program is contradictory in itself—offering hospital help to all over 65, and no doctor-drug aid to anyone.

This is the issue which should be debated on the basis of merit.

The fight should be determined by reason, not rallies.

Little-People-to-Little-People Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHELF

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1962

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, it is manifestly clear that Peter, the 10-year-old son of my able colleague, PETER W. RODINO, of New Jersey, has an excellent idea in his desire to spearhead the little-people-to-little-people program in writing letters to Khrushchev to protest the fallout of bombs.

Congressman RODINO is to be commended for his suggestion that this children's crusade be broadened in scope by answering the Communist crusade for world domination with our children's crusade for world education.

If all of us here will assist the children, as they take up the crusade as a personal challenge, working individually and in groups such as Boy and Girl Scouts, and 4-H clubs, I believe it could be an effective weapon in the fight for our cause. The more information disseminated concerning our free way of life, our Founding Fathers, our ideals, our aims and desires, the better it will be for our democratic way of life.

It is an excellent idea, I believe, for our children to correspond with other children in Russia and Communist-dominated countries, as well as parts of the free world, too. The more children of other lands can learn about America through their own counterparts in age and interest, the more understanding they will have about what respect we have for the Russian people, themselves, and how earnestly we desire to live in a peaceful world.

Indoctrinated though the Communist children are, as they grow to adulthood, by the ideology of communism, such a crusade could cause a most significant "breakthrough" in their undertsanding concerning the true aspects of our democratic aims and ideals. This effort on the part of our children is a wonderful idea and certainly merits the support and encouragement of all freedom-loving Americans.

A Republic, if You Can Keep It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1962

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, one young talented student, Miss Alice Brothers, who is a senior at Archer City High School, Texas, was named State winner in the 1962 essay contest sponsored by Texas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution at the State conference held in Corpus Christi, March 7. Miss Brothers was informed that her opening and closing sentences, her sentence construction, continuity, and choice of words helped make her the winner. She was presented with a $75 scholarship to the college of her choice and a medal. The winning essay was one of over 500 submitted from senior high schools over the State of Texas.

I call it to the attention of the Members of Congress, and the article is as follows:

A REPUBLIC, IF YOU CAN KEEP IT

(By Alice Brothers)

One hundred and eighty-five years ago, our forefathers implanted upon our continent a tiny yet priceless seed, the image of a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people." This precious seed was planted in America's soil, made fertile by the blood of those who dared to die that the concept of a republic might be reality rather than a dream. They planted the seed, having only faith to assure them that it would have within itself strength to reach into the sunlight of freedom and that its roots would grow deep to secure nourishment from the soil of individualism and equality.

With the passing of years, our forefather's hopes were fulfilled. The young tree grew and prospered. Yet within its confines gathered a storm of greater intensity than has been known before or since. Our Republic was divided against itself. In the words of Abraham Lincoln, "We shall meanly lose or nobly save the last hope of earth." Our tree's broken branches and fallen leaves covered the ground. But in decaying, they revitalized the soil, and our tree regained its strength. It was bettered and improved by trial.

The once minute seedling is now an immense tree whose leafy canopy shelters homeless, downtrodden, and rejected peoples of the world. Its abundant fruit of freedom nourishes its people, giving them industrious strength and vitality. It produces seeds of its own kind, which have been sown into the hearts of many nations. Yet from without, the blight of communism would isolate us from the sunlight and sever our roots. From within, cancerous diseases of immorality and racial prejudices would cast us into such complacency that if continued, we could not recover. Now, more than ever, "we shall meanly lose or nobly save the last hope on earth." It's our Republic. Can we keep it? We must.

Monetary Policy in a Competitive World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address of the Honorable Alfred Hayes, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, before the 34th annual midwinter meeting of the New York State Bankers Association in New York City, January 22, 1962. Mr. Hayes' address appeared in the Monthly Review of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York in its issue for February 1962.

The address follows:

MONETARY POLICY IN A COMPETITIVE WORLD

(By Alfred Hayes)

The past year has been a complex and difficult one for monetary policy. This in itself is nothing new, but perhaps the set of conditions we faced demonstrated more forcefully than ever that there is no simple set of rules for monetary policy to be followed under all circumstances. Ours is an ever-changing and ever-evolving field—and while there are a few timeless principles, the fast-changing circumstances of our economy mean that for practical purposes we must develop our "art" as we go along. As we start a new year, what can we say of monetary policy's achievements in 1961 and its prospects in 1962?

In regard to achievements, I hope we have learned not to take too much credit for favorable economic developments, just as I hope we may not be asked to shoulder too much of the blame, as has happened occasionally during the past few years, for undesirable economic events. Most of 1961 was a period of impressive recovery and expansion after the business slump of late 1960 and early 1961. It was quite apparent early in the year that not only the vigorous effort of the private economy but also the energetic collaboration of all branches of Government would be required for the Nation to achieve desirable long-term economic growth and adequate use of our human and material resources. While the recession had been mild in terms of the decline from previous peaks, it was not so mild from the standpoint of unused resources. Similarly, while the expansion to date has been quite rapid in regaining and passing previous

peaks in output, unemployment remains at an unsatisfactorily high level. Nevertheless, encouraging progress has been made and a favorable monetary environment has undoubtedly helped.

The Federal Reserve System made this contribution to domestic recovery and growth while confronted at the same time with a serious and persistent balance-of-payments problem. This aspect of our total problem is of relatively recent origin, as the growing productive capacity and competitive strength of the Western European and Japanese economies have exposed us for the first time since World War II to the challenges of an economy open to competition from efficient and vigorous trading partners. And accompanying and magnifying the problem has been the greater ease with which capital funds have flowed among the major countries whose currencies have become convertible.

During 1961 the Federal Reserve System saw to it that banks were amply supplied with reserves. With their total reserves rising by somewhat over 4 percent during the year, the banks were able to expand credit by a near record $15 billion. Demand deposits rose by about 4 percent and time deposits by some 14 percent. Besides being in a position to meet all reasonable demands for bank loans, the banks were able to add substantially to their short-term investments. Thus they are now quite comfortably liquid, although not excessively so.

As for interest rates, there has been a relatively moderate increase during this year of vigorous recovery. Yields on long-term Treasury, corporate, and municipal bonds have increased by something on the order of one-fourth of 1 percent, while short-term Treasury bill rates have risen about one-half of 1 percent, most of this latter increase having occurred in the past couple of months. In all maturities, rates are well below the peaks reached in late 1959.

As we have often pointed out in recent years, the Federal Reserve System has by no means set itself a fixed goal with respect to rates. For the past year and a half or more we have found it necessary, however, because of urgent international considerations, to avoid putting undue downward pressure on short-term rates while providing an easy atmosphere in domestic credit markets. This was the most pressing reason behind the broadening of the System's open market operations in Government securities to include transactions outside the short-term area. But these broader operations had the added merit, on the domestic side, of encouraging increased flows of long-term capital into useful investment channels. By helping to absorb the overhang of Government securities that typically dampens the capital markets in recovery periods, these operations aided in the placement of corporate and municipal debt issues, as well as mortgages. The System's purchases seemed to be especially helpful to banks, enabling them to move out of intermediate-term Governments without being deterred by significant capital losses and into either loans or various shorter term investments while waiting for expected loan demands to materialize. Incidentally, these operations have left the System with a portfolio that is still highly liquid; Federal Reserve holdings of under 1-year maturities were greater at the end of 1961 than a year earlier.

Federal Reserve efforts to encourage a short-term rate structure that would tend to create some drag on the outward flow of capital and increase the attractiveness of dollar investments to foreigners have been strongly reinforced by the Board of Governors' recent action to raise the interest rate ceilings on time and savings deposits. Over a period of time, the higher rates our banks can offer to foreign depositors may be of significant help to our international accounts.

In general, the ability of the System to hold steadily to a policy of ease throughout 1961 was a stabilizing and encouraging element in the improving business outlook. If we look for reasons why we were able to hold to such a policy for such a long time, we find first that, since the banks were not flooded with reserves during the preceding recession, there was no vast amount of slack to be taken up as soon as recovery commenced. The banks were already on a firm enough rein so that we could leave matters pretty much as they were without inviting dangerous excesses.

Secondly, unlike the situation in some earlier postwar recoveries, commodity prices have been largely free from appreciable upward pressure, and indeed the over-all price picture in the current recovery has been quite gratifying. Wholesale price indexes are now slightly lower than a year ago, while average consumer prices are only slightly higher. Doubtless some of the credit for this happy situation should go to the increasing force of public pressure on wage and price policies—but even more important, and partly responsible for the increased public pressure, is the greatly increased vigor of foreign competition in an open economy such as ours. The persuasive power of a potential loss of sales is cogent indeed.

A third reason for our ability to maintain a policy of monetary ease has been the highly effective cooperation of other arms of Government, notably in the areas of fiscal policy and debt management. Far from limiting the scope of monetary policy, close cooperation of this kind enables monetary policy to make full use of its characteristic adaptability and flexibility. When that intimate cooperation has been lacking, or impossible, the scale of the job left to monetary policy has been just too big for it, and the possibilities for quick modification, if the need arose, were severely limited. Federal fiscal policy during the past year has involved a much smaller deficit than in the preceding recovery period of 1958–59, and policy has been headed clearly in the direction of a balanced budget for the coming fiscal year. By avoiding heavy Federal Government borrowing, it has been possible to give greater encouragement to other borrowers without risking excessive credit expansion. Moreover, skillful debt management has helped to resist any downward pressure on short-term rates through concentration of the past year's new cash offerings in the short-term area, while leaving the supply of longer term savings available for corporate, municipal, and mortgage borrowers. At the same time, vigorous use of advance refundings, which did not directly tap new long-term investment funds, has offset both the added cash borrowing in the short area and the shortening of the average maturity of the debt that occurs merely through the passage of time. Debt management also reinforced monetary policy through the placing of a larger proportion of the various Government trust funds' debt holdings in longer term issues.

It is certainly not possible to have any precise idea now what the coming year holds for monetary policy. The business expansion seems to be moving ahead at a healthy pace at the moment, strengthened by an apparently increased willingness on the part of consumers to step up their purchases. This increased willingness, it may be noted, has developed in an environment of essentially stable prices—and by the same token it could be adversely affected by a change in this favorable climate. As regards business spending, while plans for capital outlays in 1962 appear moderate, they may very well be revised upward if retail sales improve further. Corporate profits, another major influence on business spending, seem to be improving rather more quickly than seemed likely a few months ago. Spending by various levels of government is also pushing higher. The unemployment situation, on the other hand, is still a long way from satisfactory.

Naturally, the Federal Reserve will have to provide reserves for further expansion of bank credit and the money supply, although I would not expect these reserves to be provided as abundantly in a buoyant economy as they were in 1961. Further, the extent to which the System makes reserves available would certainly be affected by any reemergence of inflationary pressures reflecting generally excessive demand, or other causes. Future Federal budget policies will also have a distinct bearing on the scope for continued monetary ease. In this connection, the prospect of a balanced Federal budget in fiscal year 1963 is certainly encouraging.

Above all, we shall have to be mindful of balance-of-payments developments, and it is to this topic that I wish to address most of my remaining comments. I must say, first of all, that the latest statistics in this area are on balance disappointing, even though they have some encouraging aspects. On the encouraging side, our international payments showed only a small deficit in the first half of 1961, after excluding the effects of special debt repayments. But this marked improvement over the substantial and persistent deficits of the previous 3 years was partly a fortuitous result of different business-cycle phasing here and abroad; our own imports were held down by recession, while booming conditions abroad boosted the demand for our exports. It is also encouraging that in the most recent half year our exports have performed exceedingly well despite some slowing down of the European boom, but our own imports naturally have risen as our economy gained strength. I am informed, too, that preliminary fourth-quarter data indicate an improvement in our combined trade, Government, and long-term capital accounts as against the third quarter. At the same time, however, there has apparently been a substantially increased outflow of short-term capital, with the result that the overall deficit widened again in the fourth quarter following the substantial deficit that had emerged in the third quarter. While part of the recent worsening—perhaps much of it—appears to reflect temporary, reversible factors, the situation certainly is one that requires the most careful watching, with the Federal Reserve and, I am sure, all other branches of the Government as well prepared to take resolute action if there should be developments ahead that represent more than a temporary setback on the road to our goal of balance-of-payments equilibrium.

Monetary policy clearly must pay increasingly close attention to this problem, and it will be increasingly free to do so as the domestic business situation strengthens. Let me emphasize, however, that there is no simple solution to our international monetary problem. The causes of our balance-of-payments deficits are complex, and there are other vital objectives in the international area that must not be neglected while the balance-of-payments deficit is being corrected. Nor would I want to give the impression that there is any basic or irreconcilable conflict between policies designed to achieve sturdy economic growth at home and those aimed at maintaining a viable international balance. In the short run there will certainly have to be compromises among our objectives from time to time, but over the long pull the same policies are needed to achieve both our internal and external goals.

Indeed, the more competitive world in which we now live, and which makes our day-to-day monetary problems considerably more difficult, is in my judgment already proving itself to be a greatly improved world from the standpoint of our own national

interest. We in the United States are already benefiting, through broader export markets and greater domestic price stability, from increased two-way trade with larger and stronger partners in the free world. We have much to gain from the building of a still broader and freer trading area among the advanced nations—one which should permit more effective mobilization of aid to the less developed countries and, more important, a better market for the raw materials produced by those countries. Without question, to achieve the superior growth rates needed to give the free world its full economic and military strength depends in good measure on a substantial further lowering of national barriers to international trade and investment.

In the face of these considerations it would be inexcusable to seek a solution of our troublesome balance-of-payments problem through such measures as import restrictions, higher tariffs, or exchange controls. Even if balance in our international accounts could be achieved in such a manner (and frankly I believe that retaliatory measures would more than offset potential gains), this would be small return for the inevitable loss in our real income and world position—political and military as well as economic. But if we firmly reject, as we must, solutions of this kind, we must also accept the burdens and responsibilities inherent in the new environment in which we live. We must be willing not merely to recognize foreign competition as an economic fact, but also to make an aggressive effort to compete more effectively in all markets, both with new and improved products and with lower costs. And, regarding the latter, let me say that while the role of monetary policy in helping to hold back inflationary pressures is difficult and unpopular—particularly when those pressures originate elsewhere than in excessive demand—the responsibility is nonetheless one that cannot be shrugged off. Of course, this is not the job of monetary policy alone—nor even of monetary policy primarily; wholehearted cooperation from Government, industry, and labor is a necessity in this area.

Success along these lines, together with more skillful and effective export promotion, will enable us to achieve a trade surplus high enough to take care of our heavy net military outlays abroad, our economic assistance payments, and the outflow of private long-term investment. At the same time, we must make sure that the drains from these latter sources are no larger than necessary. In this connection, I am much heartened by the progress which the Government has already made in arranging for our allies to purchase in this country more of the military equipment for mutual defense. Progress has also been made in achieving a better sharing of the foreign aid burden. In my opinion, more can surely be done along these lines. It might also be worth while to give further study to the question whether our existing tax laws now make it unnecesarily attractive to invest in relatively well-developed foreign countries.

Measures of this kind are of the utmost importance to achieve the basic payments equilibrium that we must have. Of course, even after such an equilibrium is achieved, there will be swings from time to time in response to different business developments in this country and abroad. But to some extent we could expect to see such cyclical swings in trade offset by opposite swings in capital movements, largely short term, which would be influenced by relative levels of interest rates and credit availability here and abroad. In fact, the proper role of our monetary reserves—including our drawing privileges at the International Monetary Fund as well as our gold—is to cushion the effects of such swings in payments.

It follows, too, that the closer we come to equilibrium in our balance of payments, the greater scope we have for adjusting our monetary policy more largely to our domestic needs, relying on various measures of international cooperation to absorb the disequilibrating force of capital flows moving in the wrong direction. The difficulty today is that we do not enjoy a sufficient margin of safety in our balance of payments to give monetary policy the desirable degree of freedom to act without inviting excessive risks. Even a gold stock as large as ours cannot withstand an indefinite stream of losses, nor can we depend on an unlimited willingness of foreign countries to build dollar balances. Hence there is a real need for monetary policy to remain entirely uncommitted and flexible, ready to move if necessary in ways that will help to remedy any significant worsening in our balance-of-payments position.

I would like, finally, to comment on some of the steps taken in the past year which have made 1961 a real milestone in the history of international monetary cooperation. Goaded by the urgent need to minimize the danger of massive speculative forays against one currency or another—a danger greatly increased by the major payments imbalances of several leading industrial countries, including the United States—we have made notable progress in a number of areas. As has often been pointed out, the gold exchange standard has brought great benefits to the postwar world by making possible striking economies in the use of a limited supply of monetary gold. But in building the "banker" role of the key currency countries, which in effect means the United States and Britain, we have also increased the vulnerability of these currencies and countries to wide swings in capital movements.

This vulnerability was strikingly demonstrated by the speculative assault on sterling which followed the German and Dutch revaluations last March. These changes in parities left the foreign exchange markets in a state of shock, so that they were easy prey to speculative rumors of further changes in parities. Within a few days, many hundreds of millions of dollars in various currencies moved across the exchanges, with particularly heavy speculative flows from London to Zurich and Frankfort. At this critical moment, the central banks meeting each month at the Bank for International Settlements in Basle announced that they were cooperating in the exchange markets. As subsequently revealed, this cooperation took the form of short-term loans, ultimately reaching a total of $910 million, to the Bank of England from other European central banks. In this connection, I should like to pay tribute to the decisive and statesmanlike approach taken by the various European central banks involved—particularly the National Bank of Switzerland and the German Bundesbank, which received the bulk of the hot money outflow from London. This so-called "Basle Agreement" which provided emergency credit facilities of a necessarily short-term nature will stand, I hope, as a first big milestone on the road toward creating a truly formidable first line of defense for the world's major currencies.

The lessons of the March revaluations were not lost upon the U.S. Government. Since then much time and effort has been spent in exploring and developing techniques, in cooperation with foreign monetary authorities, to defend the dollar against similar speculative flows of hot money. Those New York banks which are active in the exchange markets will recall that shortly after the German revaluation the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, as agent for the U.S. Treasury, began to provide forward marks. This action, which was undertaken in cooperation with the Bundesbank, was designed to deal with an abnormally high premium on the forward mark and, more generally, to exert a stablizing effect on both the spot and forward markets. At the end of June, more than 1 billion marks of such forward sales were outstanding, but the speculative tide had already begun to recede before the Berlin crisis and, by mid-December, the entire volume of forward contracts had been liquidated at maturity and the market was again operating smoothly with only token intervention. In effect, the German forward mark operation helped to bridge the gap between heavy speculative buying of marks and the subsequent restoration of a more balanced payments position.

Sizable operations have also been carried out in the forward Swiss franc market, where cooperative measures undertaken with the Swiss National Bank have succeeded in reducing the unduly high premium on the forward Swiss franc which had been one of the factors impending outflows of capital from Switzerland. In connection with these operations, the United States Treasury supplemented its holdings of Swiss francs by issuing short-term Treasury obligations denominated in that currency. This technique has proven effective and may well be employed in other situations, if this seems desirable.

At the moment, operations in other European currencies are being given serious consideration and will serve, I hope, to extend still further the perimeter of the first line of central bank defenses against speculative capital movements. Incidentally, I should also like to mention the effective cooperation of various foreign central banks in cushioning exchange market pressures generated by the heavy repatriation of short-term funds to foreign markets for yearend window-dressing purposes. In contrast with the experience of earlier years, such foreign central bank cooperation at the end of 1961 effectively minimized the potentially disturbing effects of these operations upon both market rates and actual reserves.

One important obstacle to a fuller use of such cooperative exchange operations by the United States is that the Treasury's resources for such purposes are quite limited. We may need to consider, therefore, whether the problems in this area may not require that the Federal Reserve System also enter into foreign exchange operations. The last few years have shown that monetary policy does not stop at the water's edge. Short-term capital now can, and does, move across national frontiers in the hundreds of millions of dollars within a span of a few weeks. And indeed, such movements can have marked repercussions on our own money and capital markets in addition to their impact on our gold and exchange reserves.

Effective as they are, measures of immediate counteraction to speculative pressures in the exchange markets clearly have to be backed up by a "second line" of even sturdier defenses since one cannot always count upon an early reversal of such pressures. In this connection the already large lending facilities of the International Monetary Fund are in the process of being augmented further. Through a network of standby credit arrangements, the Fund will be in a position to obtain an additional $6 billion of the world's leading currencies if and when any major crisis endangers the world payments system.

The successful completion of these negotiations by the 10 major industrial countries involved must be a great source of satisfaction to all who are interested in seeing our international monetary mechanism bolstered to withstand any foreseeable contingencies. One may reasonably expect, therefore, that the required legislative approval can be obtained promptly in all countries concerned,

including the United States. Of course it is also to be hoped that the mere existence of these facilities will make it unnecessary to use them.

The progress of the past year has involved, and indeed has required, increasingly close personal contacts, in the financial area, between representatives of this country and those of the leading countries of Europe. I am thinking of the regular attendance of Federal Reserve representatives at the monthly meetings of the BIS in Basle, Federal Reserve participation in U.S. delegations to various working groups of the OECD in Paris, and ever more frequent and cordial bilateral meetings with representatives of the other principal trading nations to exchange information and discuss mutual interests. These frank interchanges have brought us a much deeper understanding of the domestic and international economic problems not only of our trading partners, but also of ourselves, as we have seen our own problems ranged alongside those of other countries. If the momentum of all these moves can be maintained, 1962 should produce further noteworthy gains in this vital area of international cooperation. Yet, I would be remiss if I did not remind you once more, at the end of my remarks, of the continuing reality and urgency of our balance-of-payments problem. While the initial development of close international cooperation can be and has been stimulated through the very strains it is designed to combat, the ultimate responsibility of each nation for its own finances is still recognized both here and abroad.

I am aware that time has allowed me only to touch very lightly some of the high spots of the very broad subject I selected for this talk. But I hope you will agree that we are pursuing goals which all Americans feel are worth seeking, and that the seriousness of the problems we face together in the monetary sphere calls for the patient understanding and cooperation of all elements in our society. If we can work together effectively, as I believe we can, we can have confidence that our economy will measure up to its full potential and that the dollar will retain its key position in the arch through which the trade and investments of the free world move.

Crisis in Great Britain Over Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1962

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, in the last issue of the U.S. News & World Report, an article under the title of "Disappearing Doctors: New Crisis in Britain," appeared which reveals the serious situation existing in Great Britain as a result of socialized medicine which was established by the British Government 14 years ago.

I am including this article with my remarks because of the possibility that the same problems may arise in the United States if the legislation providing medical aid under social security is enacted into law without appropriate safeguards to prevent similar conditions in the medical profession in the United States.

The article follows:

DISAPPEARING DOCTORS: NEW CRISIS IN BRITAIN

LONDON.—Britain, after 14 years of socialized medicine, now is running into a "doctor crisis" that could spell ruin for this country's system of taxpaid medical care.

The crisis stems from the departure of large numbers of young British physicians to practice in other lands. More than 500 are said to be emigrating each year to Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and the United States.

These doctors say they are being driven away by the low incomes, overwork, lack of opportunities to specialize, and bureaucratic redtape that is associated with working for the Government.

This wholesale migration is leaving a medical void which endangers the $2.3-billion-a-year National Health Service and its nationalized hospitals.

To keep the hospitals running, hundreds of foreign doctors are being recruited, mostly from Asian countries where standards of medical training are considered questionable. Nearly half of the intern and resident-physician posts now are filled by about 4,000 non-British doctors, mainly from India and Pakistan. Without them, it's conceded, the health service would collapse.

Among family doctors outside the nationalized hospitals, too, a crisis is building up. A Government blunder 5 years ago reduced the number of medical students admitted to universities on the mistaken assumption that Britain was facing a surplus of physicians.

GLOOMY FORECAST

Fewer students, combined with the increasing flight of frustrated young doctors from Britain, now has resulted in a shortage of general practitioners that is to get worse over the next 5 to 10 years.

A decline in the quality of medical care is seen by professional authorities as inevitable in the next few years. They say deterioration already is apparent. Some predict a gradual breakdown of the entire system of socialized medicine unless there are drastic reforms.

For nearly 14 years, socialized medicine seemed to be all but immune from criticism here in Britain. The mass of the British people like the idea of feeless medical care, and resent any proposed change as an attempt to deprive them of their right to these benefits.

A MESS

Now, suddenly, socialized medicine is under heavy attack, not by the British public, but by doctors and independent professional experts. The journal of the British Medical Association has just joined the chorus of critics with this categorical charge: "Medicine in Britain is in a mess."

Why is British medicine under nationalization said to be in a mess? Why are hundreds of young doctors deserting socialized medicine to practice in countries free of Government control?

The answers that you get from independent authorities are: Working conditions imposed by the Government as a monopoly employer of doctors are proving to be more and more intolerable. One result has been a decline in the number of people choosing medicine as a career. Among those who study medicine, a steadily increasing number are refusing to work here.

With British medical schools turning out a total of 1,600 graduates a year, nearly one in every three is leaving this country to escape employment under a system of socialized medicine.

Effects of the doctor crisis are felt most acutely in the nationalized hospitals. There, a Government policy of employing cheap medical labor has created what one medical economist describes as a lost generation of British surgeons and specialists.

STANDARDS LOWERED

Over the past 10 years, to keep down costs, the number of high-income staff jobs—surgeons and specialists in other fields—was reduced. The number of temporary, low-paying junior positions was increased. The result of this policy is that much of the surgery and other work that ordinarily would be done by high-salaried staff specialists is being handled by junior resident physicians.

During the past decade, hundreds of doctors, after completing 12 to 14 years of university and hospital training to qualify as surgeons and specialists, found there were no jobs open for them in British hospitals. They faced the choice: Sacrifice the years of specialized training and go into general practice, or emigrate. A large number chose the latter course.

Another effect of the policy of employing "cheap medical labor" is that, in recent years, fewer and fewer British medical graduates chose to specialize. So, suddenly, the authorities are discovering that they lack the British surgeons and other specialists needed to staff the nationalized hospitals, even in high-paying positions. These hospitals are being run more and more by junior doctors from India, Pakistan, and other underdeveloped countries who come to this country for a few years of postgraduate training.

Queen Elizabeth's personal physician, Lord Evans, recently told the House of Lords: "Without these people, the health service would not grind slowly to a standstill; it would completely break down."

Most surgeons under 35 years old in Britain today, according to an authoritative source, were born and trained in foreign countries. They are performing 50 percent of all emergency surgery.

In some industrial areas, such as Sheffield, 90 percent of the resident surgeons are young, foreign doctors just completing their training. In 25 of the 74 nationalized hospitals in that area, all of the junior doctors are foreigners—mostly Indians and Pakistanis. Eventually, when they complete their training, these doctors will return to their homelands to practice.

WARNING FROM THE TOP

How is the standard of medical care in Britain's system of nationalized hospitals being affected by this "doctor crisis"? Here is the verdict of Lord Taylor, a Socialist spokesman on medical problems in the House of Lords, in a statement on provincial hospitals that are staffed largely by foreign doctors:

"I cannot honestly recommend you to go into such hospitals as a casualty. In many cases, there is no casualty officer. A house surgeon will have to leave the [operating] theater when he can treat you. His experience will be far less than that of your general medical practitioner. When he comes, he will probably not be a British graduate, and he may well have difficulty in understanding what you say. This is at a time when speed and efficiency may be literally lifesaving."

Lord Taylor added that the qualifications of many of these Asian doctors are so inadequate that they require emergency training in such basic procedures as setting up a blood transfusion.

For Britain's 20,000 general practitioners, expert observers say the outlook is even gloomier under socialized medicine than for specialists. Bureaucratic interference with supply and demand is blamed for a serious and steadily worsening shortage of family doctors.

When the decision was made to reduce the number of medical students, it failed to take into account the effect of population growth and a rapid increase in retirement among aging doctors. Result: At a time when the population is expanding, the number of family doctors actually is beginning to decline—

a trend which experts say cannot be reversed for at least 6 years.

Therefore, in the years just ahead, there are to be fewer and fewer general practitioners to care for more and more patients. Moreover, under the peculiar financial policy of the National Health Service, these doctors are to get no increase in salary.

A family doctor with 2,000 patients on his list earns approximately $6,700. During the winter, when illness is at a peak, he may see anywhere from 60 to 80 patients a day for treatment, reference to a hospital, or issuance of medical certificates.

PROBLEM OF FIXED FEES

For each patient, the doctor receives a fixed annual payment from the Government, regardless of the amount of medical care he is called upon to provide. Thus, a doctor gets the same annual fee for a healthy youngster, perhaps requiring no attention at all, as for an older person who may require a great deal of care.

Each year, the Government earmarks a specific fund for the payment of general practitioners. Payment is based on the total number of doctors in general practice multiplied by the theoretical average income figure of $7,000. Thus, as the number of doctors dwindles, the size of the fund diminishes.

A young family doctor in London says that this system stifles initiative and undermines medical standards. To earn an adequate income, he explains, a doctor must sign up a large number of patients, and is able to devote only two or three minutes to each patient calling at his office for attention.

With fewer doctors caring for a bigger population, the pressure is building up even more. That's why hundreds of young doctors have joined the exodus from Britain.

SNOWBALL EFFECT

A general breakdown of the National Health Service in the next few years is seen as a distinct danger by Dr. J. R. Seale, a Harvard-trained medical economist in Britain. Dr. Seale predicts that the growing shortage of doctors and the increasing demands for medical care will produce "a snowball effect."

General practitioners, most of whom are burdened with a steadily increasing workload, are being forced to give less and less time to their patients. Dr. Seale foresees that, inevitably, more and more people will seek private medical care outside the National Health Service. A growing number of frustrated doctors, he says, can be expected to go into private practice, either full time or part time.

This will aggravate even more the shortage of family doctors on the Government payroll, and reduce the quality of medical care that National Health Service patients can obtain. Therefore, he concludes, there will be a snowball effect that, in a relatively short time, could cause a breakdown of the system.

Only about 600 of Britain's 22,000 physicians now are outside the National Health Service in private practice. A somewhat larger number have a few private patients in addition to National Health Service patients on their lists.

Some top officials here say that, if Britain were starting today from scratch to tackle the problem of medical care, she would not attempt outright nationalization.

"If we had a chance to do it again," one high-ranking official says, "I think that we would favor some form of compulsory medical insurance, supplemented by tax funds together with subsidies to hospitals to keep down costs. We would also act to limit the cost of drugs. In short, the state would insure that everyone had access to medical care at a reasonable cost, but without nationalizing the entire system and putting all doctors on the Government payroll."

This official adds that President Kennedy's proposal to provide medical care for the aged through the U.S. social security system is the first step toward the kind of system that Britain probably would introduce now if there could be a fresh start.

COSTS: UP AND UP

To keep the National Health Service running in the future, Government officials concede privately, will cost a lot more money than is being spent on it now. The cost for 1962 is estimated at $2.3 billion of which $1.7 billion comes from Government funds. The balance comes mostly from national insurance payments and local taxation.

In addition to more funds from taxes, officials say, more money undoubtedly will have to come from charges passed on to patients. At present, the only charges are 28 cents for a drug prescription and modest fees for spectacles and dentures.

Some experts believe that the only way the system can be preserved is to move away from the original idea of a completely tax-paid medical service and to begin charging patients a nominal fee for every visit to the doctor and modest fees for hospital care.

DRAG ON PROGRESS?

An expert—but nonofficial—view of the kind of medical system Britain should adopt on the basis of the experience of the past 14 years comes from Dr. D. S. Lees, senior lecturer in economics at the University College of North Staffordshire. Dr. Lees recently completed an intensive study of the National Health Service for the Institute of Economic Affairs. He says:

"While from the point of view of the general health of the community the National Health Service has not in any obvious way failed, it has given rise to problems that are * * * increasing in intensity. On the longer view, the most acute danger of the National Health Service is that it will prevent the emergence of more effective methods of medical care.

"Governments should move away from taxation and free service to private insurance and fees by allowing tax concessions to those who can provide for themselves, and direct assistance to the dwindling minority who cannot."

Whatever is done, one thing is clear in Britain: After 14 years of socialized medicine, a growing number of experts are coming to the conclusion that something is wrong with the system—and they are speaking out for the first time.

The alarm bell has been touched off by the realization that Britain is the only advanced industrial nation that is losing many of its best young physicians through emigration at a time when there is an acute shortage of doctors at home.

The Waste of a Million Kids a Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEM MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1962

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, there follows the first of three articles written by Judge Mary Conway Kohler and Andre Fontaine on one of America's most disturbing problems—"the kids who leave high school to become drifters, rejects, and outsiders." Judge Kohler, the mother of three, served 15 years on the San Francisco juvenile court. Her study of the waste of one of our most precious resources, the youth of America, documents with insight and warmth the perplexities and unhappiness of our idle youth who are potential "social dynamite."

The article follows:

THE WASTE OF A MILLION KIDS A YEAR

Twenty-one millionaires sat around a table in Kansas City not long ago and, with disbelief and frustration, faced the fact that they couldn't find a job for a boy. These businessmen, each of whom had contacts and resources far beyond the average, had volunteered to take part in a plan, sponsored by Rotary, to help some teenage boys who seemed headed for trouble. Most of the youngsters had no fathers and had not done well in school, although they were of normal intelligence and ability. For many homelife was squalid. Most faced the world with anger and hostility.

The biggest thing these youngsters needed was honest, solid employment, so they could feel like men, could have a few dollars in their pockets and a place in a society that values men by the work they do. But even 21 millionaires could not find the needed employment. Ultimately they had to create jobs for the boys.

The 21 thus learned of one of America's most crippling and least-known failures: We waste more than a million kids a year. As we once wasted natural gas and forests and topsoil, tdoay we waste our most valuable natural resource—the productive power of young brains and muscles, the creative power of young imaginations and emotions. We waste them because we neither keep them in school nor give them jobs.

In 1960, 2,500,000 youngsters reached 18, the age when most are graduated from high school. These were divided, roughly, into thirds: One-third went to college, one-third quit school after graduation, and one-third had already dropped out. Those who went on to higher education have some sort of organized way to move on from school to work, uncertain as it is. The other two-thirds do not. Many of the graduates and a few of the dropouts eventually get jobs and learn some sort of skill, although it takes longer than it should and the work is often less demanding than they're capable of handling. The rest have no skill that can buy them any but the lowest kind of job. They are the wasted ones.

As part of an 18-month study sponsored by the Taconic Foundation, we saw and talked to these kids in big cities all across the land. They are boys and girls—mostly boys—who have finished with school. There are no jobs for them. The Army doesn't take many of them these days; indeed some have been rejected. A very few of them are juvenile delinquents, but the majority are not.

The economic catastrophe of the great depression in the 1930's produced bands of wild boys who swarmed onto freight cars and haunted the highways of the Nation. The product of today's economic upheaval are not wild; they're defeated. They droop on the stoops of tenements, prop up the walls of candy stores and hang around junkyards and jalopy lots, fascinated by the symbol of power that is a car. Some are bitter; anger at anyone who has, or is, more than they, smolders behind their eyes. Most are apathetic, deeply convinced that there's no sense trying to do anything because "it's a square world anyway."

Among them are some of the best minds in the Nation. An Iowa study found that nearly one of 5 dropouts had an IQ of more than 120. Another by Glenn Stice of the Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J., showed that about 50,000 of the dropouts

in any one year were among the Nation's most potentially able students.

Years ago these boys would have landed jobs in grocery stores or sweeping out factories. If they were aggressive and alert they could work up to better jobs and eventually make good careers for themselves. But today most of these entry jobs are closed to them for complicated reasons which will be explained later on. In Detroit, which is fairly typical of America's large cities, such jobs have been decreasing at the rate of 2,000 a year for the past 10 years. Testifying before a congressional committee last spring, Mayor Louis C. Miriani of Detroit said, "From 1955 to 1960 there has been a 55-percent loss of jobs for 16- an 17-year-olds in Detroit."

In Denver, Colo., the employment service of Boys Incorporate interviewed 2,101 boys in 1947 and got jobs for 529. In 1957 this agency saw 13,421 boys and got jobs for 1,261. Thus the demand for jobs had increased nearly 7 times, but the supply had only doubled. The situation is "social dynamite," according to Dr. James B. Conant, author and educator. He cited a recent study in a large city slum where nearly 6 out of every 10 kids between 16 and 21 were out of work. Executive Secretary Grovernor N. Grimes of Detroit's Commission on Children and Youth, said recently that of the youths who aren't educated beyond high school, "almost 60 percent of all boys and 30 percent of all girls face a dismal prospect in the labor market of the next decade unless they receive deliberate and continuous help * * * to bridge the gap between school and work."

The majority of our wasted millions are in the slums of our biggest cities or at the lowest economic levels of our middle-sized cities. But not all. Thousands of them are the products of rural schools. Other thousands come from the suburbs or the large villages on the fringes of metropolitan areas. Essentially they are of three kinds, and probably the best way to separate them is to describe some boys we talked to.

The first is the drifter. He is a normally healthy, normally intelligent boy who doesn't see much point in school. He goes because he has to and often is graduated from high school. He can't get into college and he has no skill to sell an employer nor any drive to learn one. He likes cars. He's a boy like George.

George lived in a middle-class town in New England. His father died before he entered school; his mother worked to support him and was too indulgent with him. Occasionally he was reprimanded for smoking in school or getting into minor scrapes. Each time his mother marched to school and blamed the teacher or the principal—never George. He liked to hunt and fish, and she bought him rods and guns. When he was 15 she got him an old Ford, and he spent a year tearing it down and rebuilding it.

He flunked one subject each year, although his teachers insisted he had average intelligence. He was graduated with his class and, as a reward, was allowed to spend the following summer loafing. That summer he smashed up his car but wasn't seriously injured himself. He got part-time work digging graves in the local cemetery to finance a new one. He was rejected by the Army for asthma, which he'd had since childhood.

For the next 4 years he floated from job to menial job. He helped in a small machine shop, worked for a time for his uncle who owned a fishing boat, but after a while he quit because the hours were too long. He got a temporary job as a clerk in the local employment office and later worked for a time on the highways. At 23 he got married, and after a year or two of that—and a couple of short-term separations—he began to steady down. At last reports he had moved to another State and had an outdoor job which uses perhaps half his potential intelligence and ability. There was, of course, no way of recapturing the 4 wasted years, during which he might have learned a trade.

The second kind is the reject. These boys, too, have normal intelligence and ability, but their parents or society has pushed them out of the mainstream of American young life. Included among them are youngsters who are the targets of our bigotries—the Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Mexicans, and American Indians.

They are kids like Peter, who was found by the Cincinnati police one freezing morning asleep in an unheated parked car. When they thawed him out they learned he hadn't had a meal in 3 days. He was 16; his parents, both alcoholics, had thrown him out. He had quit school some months before, and he didn't know of any place to go.

Or Tim. Tim was picked up in New York City one day, hungry, frightened, knowing no one and penniless. He was 15. He'd grown up on a farm, his parents had been divorced and his mother had remarried. Neither she nor her new husband had time for Tim, so they put him out to work. They gave him enough money to get to the big city—where there were supposed to be jobs—and sent him off.

They are kids like Paul. Paul is a Negro and exceptionally bright. During his 4 years of high school he got few grades less than A. He was an excellent athlete, especially at basketball. He would have gone to college to study engineering but had to support his family. So when he was graduated he wanted to become an apprentice pipefitter. He couldn't because he was a Negro. He became a janitor.

The third, and most difficult, kind is the outsider. Some of these youngsters are emotionally disturbed and have never been treated. Some come from a background so alien that they never stop feeling lost. Some, of normal intelligence, are unable to learn by the methods used in schools these days—for reasons no one fully understands. So most grow up not knowing many of the simplest things a person must know today to get along—like how to read. Some withdraw from the world, some find a place in a gang, some become juvenile delinquents, some simply survive. But none is employable without intelligent and persistent help.

Jim is one such youth. Jim was not a slum kid, although the area he lived in qualified as the "slum" of the wealthy suburb where it was located. Actually it was lower middle class, and his father owned both their house and his own business, a gas station. The school system Jim went through was one of the best in America, yet it failed to reach him from the first grade on.

Probably only psychoanalysis would ever pinpoint what made Jim the way he was, but there were some indications: His father, a big, muscular man, resented him and frequently beat him. His mother alternated between overprotecting him ("My poor baby, what did they do to you?") and scorning him ("You bum, you'll never be any good"). Both parents seemed to prefer his younger brothers and sisters who, incidentally, got along well in school.

Jim was a big, hulking kid of normal intelligence who somehow never learned anything, though he was promoted with his class. As a result, by the time he was 16 and quit school, he was incredibly ignorant. He could read, but only at the second-grade level. He could barely write his name. He couldn't tell time. He didn't know the months of the year. He didn't know whether an inch was bigger than a mile. He couldn't add and subtract. He knew very few words, other than the slang of the gang he belonged to, and wasn't able to talk to people or understand what they said. He was thus almost completely shut off from the world around him—except when he was with his gang.

As men are usually frightened by the unknown, so Jim was terrified by the world. He was afraid of his father. He was afraid of dead people and sick people. He was afraid to go into his own house at night if no one was there, and he often slept in the backyard rather than face the unknown terror. He was afraid of the dark. He was afraid of girls, afraid to ask for a date or go to a dance. He referred to himself as a corner clown, said he had been bad news from the age of 5 on, that he had "no guts," and in a dozen different ways showed that he felt he had no control over the things that happened to him.

The only way he could discharge this weight of fear and self-contempt was to strike out at the world that was so hostile to him. He became the enforcer for his gang: He beat up anybody the leader told him to. He broke into a rich man's house and wrecked it. Indeed, his first reaction to almost any new situation was to swing at somebody—or run away.

In the end, however, Jim was one of the lucky few. He fell into the hands of a remarkable youth worker who lavished thought, effort, and time on him for 3 years and finally got him to the point where he could hold a job.

These are the kinds of kids that our society has no place for. In 1960 there were just over 1 million of these youngsters. Because of our increased birthrate, in 1964 there will be 1,325,000; in 1966, 1,460,000 more—all joining the residue from 1960's million. The U.S. Labor Department estimates that between 1960 and 1970 26 million young workers will enter the labor force; of these, nearly 30 percent, or 7,500,000, will lack a high-school education.

These youngsters make up a huge pool of unskilled manpower precisely at a time when the need for unskilled people is declining in ratio to population. There is an insatiable demand for skilled workers today, and the amount of skill required is getting higher and higher. Professional, white-collar and service-industry jobs are increasing. But the number of unskilled jobs in industry is holding steady. If farm labor is taken into account—and this has always absorbed a number of unskilled workers—the actual number of jobs is decreasing. And, as a result of the baby boom, there are more young people competing for these jobs every year.

These are the dimensions of the crisis we face. How did it come about?

It is obvious why maladjusted kids can't get jobs and obvious that they need special treatment—which most of them are not getting. But why do normal teen-agers have so much trouble getting work? It's partly the fault of their own attitudes, partly of employers' attitudes—and partly due to a variety of circumstances which we shall review in this series of articles.

Not long ago a union leader, who had worked up from a bench himself, was trying to pull strings to get his son back into college after the boy had flunked out. When it was suggested the boy might work in the trade and become a union official himself, the father was horrified: "What, my son be a worker? I'd die first." If parents are teaching their sons that skilled work is beneath their dignity, it's no wonder the youngsters don't prepare for it or do well at it once they get it.

The job market seems to fit girls better than it does boys. One reason is that girls look on a job as something to do until they get married; when they have a baby they usually quit. This makes a higher turnover and thus more job openings. But boys look on a job as a permanent thing. The traditional attitude is that you start at the bottom and work up. So they stick longer, and the resulting lower turnover means fewer openings.

Moreover, many employers are reluctant to hire young men. The only detailed study we know of employers' attitudes toward young workers was made by the Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., of Washington, D.C. Nearly half of all employers said they didn't require any particular educational level, such as high school graduation, and 42 percent insisted they were quite willing to hire youths under 18. Yet only 15 percent had actually hired nongraduates under 18. Obviously there must have been other, more subtle factors at work.

One such factor was employers' ideas of the law. About two-thirds of the employers gave "the law" as the reason they didn't hire younger workers. But when they were questioned, researchers found they really didn't know what the law was. One, for example, said he thought it would help if minors were allowed to work over 40 hours a week, though the study said the law under which that employer operated allowed minors to work 48 hours.

Other firms knew what the law was but thought it unrealistic and reported they would hire more minors if it were changed. For example, if the job of elevator operator were not included in "hazardous occupations," they might hire minors for that; if youths under 21 were allowed to work where liquor is served, several hotel and restaurant people said they'd hire younger men.

Only 17 percent of the employers could see no disadvantages in hiring young workers. Most could see more disadvantages than advantages. Chief among these were that young people were inexperienced, had personality deficiencies and didn't stick to the job.

Several employers said it was too much trouble to go through the involved procedure of work permits; others said there was no use training a boy when he would probably be drafted shortly. Some, whose manufacturing processes included certain hazards, said their insurance rates were higher for young workers. Some said workmen's compensation rates were higher when you had young workers. The U.S. Department of Labor says this isn't so.

This study, along with others, showed that for Negroes jobs are harder to get. But there was wide variation on how much of a hindrance race was; some firms kept no records at all, and the largest companies were more ready than the small to hire nonwhites. On jobs where the worker had to deal with the public, employers cited public prejudices as the reason they couldn't hire Negroes. However, the researchers concluded that practical discrimination was shown most often by the familiar tactic of characterizing some jobs, usually the lowest, as "Negro" jobs—so while these employers did hire Negroes, they did not offer the same chance for advancement that they did to whites.

Department of Labor figures on unemployment consistently show that Negroes are the last hired, the first fired. Only 1 man in 10 in our working force is a Negro, but 1 in 5 of the unemployed is, and once he loses a job, he's out of work longer. Even when Negroes have skills, it's harder for them to get jobs: In Washington, D.C., in 1957, not a single graduate of the electrical-wiring course at the Phelps High School (predominantly Negro) got a job in that work, but 80 percent of the white boys who had taken the same course in another school did.

A recent study by the National Urban League demonstrated how few Negroes can work in the skilled trades. Boston, for example, reported the total number of workers in the building trades was 5,007; the total number of Negroes, 62. In San Francisco the Urban League reported that "outstanding resistance by some unions had made it virtually impossible to place Negroes in certain categories of craft-union skill," and cited the plumbers, Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, steamfitters and operating engineers. The same picture is repeated over and over again across the country, both North and South. And it is repeated also for the Puerto Ricans and Mexicans in our society.

Today the country needs more skills than young workers have, whatever their color. This is because all sections of our economy are becoming more complex as our machines become smarter. It was a cinch to repair a prewar washing machine, but try to fathom the solenoids, relays, and timing devices of a modern automatic. When an untrained youngster, like those among our wasted million, gets his first job, the only thing he can handle is unskilled work or at most what the employment people call semiskilled—such as assembly-line jobs. But these, too, are decreasing; personnel experts in Detroit told us recently that there will never again be as many auto workers as there were in 1953.

Automation, which speeds this process, does not fall only on the workers already employed. In many cases older workers are shifted to other jobs, perhaps given some retraining, but usually kept. But as current workers retire, take other jobs, or move away they are not replaced. Thus, the company cuts its payroll. This process, of course, means that new workers aren't hired—and the new workers are the young.

Said A. H. Raskin, of the New York Times, in a recent article on automation, "Even if the bulk of the shakeout of present jobholders is made through * * * normal turnover, the contraction of work opportunities will bear cruelly on youngsters looking for their first job."

This is clearly shown in a couple of random examples taken from New York City. The financial district is an important part of New York's economy, and many unskilled young men have secured their first job as messengers for the brokerage houses. Recently one odd-lot brokerage house moved into a new building and with it got a brandnew system of pneumatic tubes for inside deliveries. The firm had employed 50 runners, today it employs 100. But it has taken over the work of 11 other firms, each of which had employed 15 runners. So there is a net loss of 115 jobs for messengers in the city. The other example can be stated in one brief sentence: Automatic elevators in New York City have wiped out the jobs of 40,000 operators.

There are big labor shortages in the country, but they're among the high skills. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reported recently, for example, that every graduate engineer needs five well-trained technicians behind him. But the five don't exist. Other shortages are in teachers, social workers, doctors; in engineers, missile and electronic experts; in programers, the men and women who know how to tell the smart new machines what to do; and in dozens of other fields.

In the face of all this difficulty, who helps the high school graduate, or the dropout, get a job?

The first place he turns is to his family and friends—and their ineffectiveness is measured by the high number of unemployed among the young. Beyond that, there are guidance and placement counselors in the high schools, State employment services, private employment agencies and special community programs to help get jobs for youngsters.

Nobody knows how many young people are placed by individual high school counselors, but it is not likely that many are the kinds of boys who make up our wasted million. There aren't enough guidance counselors, many of them aren't fully trained or aren't allowed to devote full time to the work, and they have too much to do: They're supposed to help youngsters choose the proper high school course, the right college, advise them on personal problems, guide them in a choice of vocation and get them jobs. All things considered, it's remarkable they can do as much vocational guidance and placement as they do. But the counselors never get to help those of our wasted million who have dropped out of school, because most drop out by the 10th grade and most vocational guidance is concentrated in the 11th and 12th grades.

Very few private employment agencies have the kind of placement service that is needed by beginning workers.

Probably the most inclusive job counseling and placement service for youngsters is provided by the various State employment agencies. In 1959 these placed job counselors for seniors in 41 percent of the Nation's high schools which, located primarily in large cities, produced 67 percent of all graduates. Generally these counselors are in the schools for a short time each year to process the senior class; in 1959 they had interviews with less than a third of the seniors in the schools covered. This same year 71,500 seniors were placed out of 750,000 who weren't college bound—or less than 1 in 10. Only 9,413 dropouts were placed that year, and 42 percent of these were in the 2 States of California and Pennsylvania, where cooperation between the schools and the employment service was more extensive and started earlier.

State employment services are primarily placement agencies; if a youth needs a good deal of special counseling, most are not set up to provide it. It is to their credit that despite this they have established special youth services in many cities which give intensive guidance and which could be copield by all.

In some States the public employment service has cooperated with various local groups to set up a special youth employment service. In California, for example, 141 communities have such agencies. Here and elsewhere they cover a wide range: Some handle only part-time work, some full-time; some cover only a few youngsters, others are very inclusive. In other parts of the country, community agencies, with no connection with the public employment service, offer various special services of their own. Many of these do excellent work, but there aren't enough to modify the fact that hundreds of thousands of unskilled youngsters can't get jobs.

Responsible people around the country have thrown new bridges across the gulf that separates school from work for youngsters, but they have been footbridges. No hordes can cross them. For the vast majority, for the wasted million each year, the truth is that we have no place.

Next week, in a second article of this series, we shall examine in more detail one of the basic causes of this frightening situation and tell of some hopeful corrective measures that are being taken in a few scattered communities.

Support for Expanded Domestic Sugar Industry Announced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1962

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a report on the action taken at a conference of representatives of sugar-

beet producers yesterday at Denver, Colo., which I believe will be of interest to my colleagues who are concerned with the U.S. sugar program. This conference was called by the Wabash Valley Beet Growers Association, representing 6,000 producers in Indiana and Illinois for the purpose of planning a coordinated effort to get sugar legislation that will allow increased domestic production of sugar. Many Members of Congress and sugar industry representatives from domestic areas were invited to participate.

As reported to me, the resolution adopted at the conference will provide 100 percent of the growth of the market to domestic areas, 75 percent of which would go to sugar beets and 25 percent of which would go to sugarcane. On the assumption that the total growth for next year will be 150,000 tons, this would amount to 112,500 tons annual growth to the beet areas. Seventy-five percent of this, or 85,000 tons would be set aside each year for new growers. Converted to acres, this figure would mean that new growers would be provided about 35,000 acres a year, as compared with the 20,000 acres under the proposed sugar program announced some weeks ago by all segments of the sugar industry.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to report to my colleagues the foregoing provisions of the plan worked out in Denver yesterday, because it shows that the representatives at this conference have worked out a realistic and achievable plan to allow American sugar producers a greater share of our domestic sugar consumption. Many Members of this body and of the other body have expressed their support of American farmers in the sugar program. The Sugar Act must be amended and extended during the present session of the Congress, and I am hopeful that amendments to the act will reflect the necessary expansion of our domestic sugar industry along the lines reported above.

The Lone Researcher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1962

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the March issue of Industrial Research carried an editorial which points out how to conserve one of the country's great natural resources, the lone researcher. I have asked that the editorial be reproduced here so our colleagues in other branches of Government may reap its benefits.

The editorial follows:

SON, THAT WAS THE LONE RESEARCHER

Someday soon, big government, big business, big finance, and big research are going to look around and chorus: "What is the matter with little research?" It will be noted somberly that little research is peaked and poorly, and that something should be done. A President's committee will diagnose, prescribe, and yea, monitor the patient's progress toward national purpose. Then, with loud crowing and flapping of wings, a bold new program will be announced, and little research will be embraced by a new small research administration.

The SRA will offer guidance and good counsel, maintain liaison with a host of other agencies, and build a large concrete maze, on a hill, in Virginia—all to revive that small, but vital segment of the scientific community, the individual scientist. It is credible to assume little research soon would be metamorphosed into a cold war weapon through absorption; or removed entirely from society by administrative drowning, a far more humane fate. Sadly, the individual scientist still is regard as a special cuckoo, a kind of heretic and not an accredited minister of knowledge.

But most of the great ideas, on which the research community was built, came from frontiersmen: lone researchers, or small groups of men. Important inroads through the unknown are not carved out by innovation assembly lines all bound up with red-tape, politics, and current national commitments. If little research is to survive at all, if the human community is to continue to know the benefits of individual genius, then more must be done now to encourage simple, individual exploration and excellence.

Big business must be content to grant Professor Batts a small commission. Big government must stop trying to turn all science and scientists into weapons, counterweapons, and countercounterweapons. Big finance must pay more heed to research quality and less homage to research real estate. But big research can do the most for the lone wolf; not by wooing him to secure, serene surroundings; nor by molding him to a different pattern; but by staying the hell out of little laboratories, whether in a basement or a big university. And little research, to be the champion of knowledge, must stay out of big government, big finance, big business, and big research.

Operation Amigo—Democracy in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Mayor Robert King High, of Miami, Fla., has asked me to relate to the Nation the success story of Operation Amigo. I am indeed honored to be able to speak of this fine operation in understanding to my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, 29 young students from Honduras and Ecuador are presently in Miami, Fla., on Operation Amigo, a program which is an outstanding example of democracy in action.

These students represent the third wave of Latin amigos to visit our country under the sponsorship of the Miami Herald and the Greater Miami schools.

Operation Amigo, which has been commended by world leaders, deserves the fullest attention and support of my colleagues, and I would like to detail the foundation and progress of this outstanding community effort.

Operation Amigo came to life in December 1961 in a small office of one of the country's most outstanding newspapers, the Miami Herald. Operation Amigo is the brainchild of Mr. Don Shoemaker, editor of the Miami Herald, Mr. George Beebe, managing editor of the Herald and Dr. Raul Beraun, a leading Lima attorney and prominent Peruvian civil leader. These three men devised Operation Amigo as a vehicle to offset communism in Latin America to give future Latin American leaders a look at life in a working democracy such as ours.

The program was launched with the Miami Herald sponsoring the program in cooperation with the greater Miami schools under the guidance of an advisory committee. Offers of help immediately poured in from such sources as former Ambassador William D. Fawley; Ultima Hora and Le Prensa, two of Lima, Peru's leading newspapers; from the Lima television station, channel 13; and from Aerolineas Peruanas, S.A.

Edison senior high school was selected as host for the first pilot group of amigos, as Miami Herald President and Publisher John S. Knight donated $1,000 to finance the travel expenses of five amigos from Peru.

John McMullan, Miami Herald assistant managing editor, flew to Lima to organize the first group and help select students. He was swamped with Peruvian youngsters who wanted to see the democratic system of the United States in action. McMullan and a Lima committee carefully selected teenagers who were desirous of uniting a visit to the United States with their future Peruvian responsibilities. It is a tribute to the leaders of Operation Amigo that included in the first group were also youngsters with a hostile misunderstanding of the United States.

In Miami, the community immediately responded to the plan of Operation Amigo. The student government president of Edison senior high school said, "We had more offers of homes for the students to live in than we had actual Amigos."

Within a few short weeks of the organization meeting at the Miami Herald, 48 pioneers in Inter-American understanding were on their way to Miami. The reaction to Operation Amigo among the Inter-American community of nations was thrilling. Government officials, school groups, communities, private citizens all across the American republics asked to participate.

Each group of Amigos spends 2 weeks in the United States participating in Dade County school programs, symphony concerts, picnics and other programs which transcend the language barrier.

The second group of Amigos was hosted at Southwest high school and the present group from Honduras and Ecuador is participating at Curley and Notre Dame, the first Catholic schools to join in this fine hands-across-the-border program.

Five more groups of Latin Amigos are scheduled to come to Florida before May 1st. These groups will be from Guatemala, El Salvador, Costa Rica, Colombia, and Peru.

President Kennedy, speaking of Operation Amigo, has said:

It's a wonderful idea. An excellent example of how individual Americans can play a significant role in hemispheric affairs. We need more help of this kind.

Typical of the reaction from our Latin American friends is a statement from the consul general of Peru, Fernando Pastor:

Operation Amigo will bring together strangers who will become understanding friends.

Operation Amigo, Mr. Speaker, will not be measured by yardstick methods or by dollars and cents, but by a change from revolution to evolutionary democratic governments in the future of Latin America.

An understanding of democracy in action is the goal of Operation Amigo with the vehicle being the hearts and minds of teenagers, both in the United States and in Latin America.

Mr. Speaker, we must not fail our future generations in their desire for friendship, understanding and peace throughout the world. We, as Members of the U.S. Congress, can and should do everything within our power to foster and support the principles of Operation Amigo.

By their own admission, these amigos, the future leaders of Latin America, have acquired a new understanding of life in a democracy. A few of their statements will suffice to illustrate the understanding which the Miami Herald, the schools of Dade County and the people of Dade County are promoting through Operation Amigo. Statements such as, "There is a great difference between a real democracy and a country that just pretends to have democracy. You have the best democracy and the best country." "Americans are not at all like we picture them in Peru, they actually are warm, generous and hospitable." "I was all wrong about the United States."

Mr. Speaker, Operation Amigo is a program designed to bridge the language barrier, to wipe out misinformation and to destroy communism's anti-American lie.

The people who have made this program a success deserve the highest official recognition and all of the support possible to make this program not just an operation of Dade County, Fla., but truly an Operation Amigo of the hemisphere. I call upon my colleagues to lend their support.

Pawnee Buttes, Colo., as Potential Site for a National Park or National Monument for the Great Plains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 22, 1962

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, on March 8, I had printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the correspondence which I have conducted with the Secretary of the Interior concerning the establishment of a national park or national monument at Pawnee Buttes, in northeastern Weld County, Colo.

I said at that time that I feel very strongly that the remaining mixed-prairie or short-grass country deserves a national park or national monument dedicated to its unique natural history and its place in the chronicle of American growth and progress. Pawnee Buttes has been studied by an advisory board, and the National Park Service has it under consideration for such a national park or national monument.

Another point I raised was that community interest in such a national park or national monument has been growing steadily since the subject was broached by me last August. The Rotary Club of Sterling, Colo., has endorsed the idea, and the Greeley, Colo., Tribune has editorialized very favorably. No opposition has been expressed by residents of the area.

This week I have received additional evidence of community support in the form of a resolution from the Sterling, Colo., Chamber of Commerce. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution by the Sterling Chamber of Commerce.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STERLING, COLO., CHAMBER OF COMMERCE RESOLUTION

Whereas there has not been any portion of the Great Plains area of the United States set aside to be preserved in its natural condition;

Whereas, if much longer delayed, additional difficulties will be encountered in obtaining suitable area with sufficient acreage;

Whereas there is in northeastern Weld County, Colo., a logical site containing most of the geological, botanical, and wildlife specimens native to the Great Plains: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of Directors of the Sterling Chamber of Commerce, Sterling, Colo., go on record urging proper authorities to proceed with due process for the establishing of a Great Plains National Monument or Park to include the Pawnee Buttes and surrounding area comprising an area not to exceed 10,000 acres;

That a certified copy of this resolution be sent to the Governor of Colorado; to each of Colorado's Senators and Congressmen; to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Director of national parks.

The 100th Anniversary, a Memoriam, Uriah Phillips Levy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I received a communication from the National Information Bureau for Jewish Life regarding the 100th anniversary of Uriah Phillips Levy. The story of Uriah Phillips Levy is the story of American heroes who accomplished their great deeds because of the religious faith which they possessed. On the 100th anniversary of this early American hero, we take time out to note the episodes of his life so that all who love this country and those who come in hereafter may find inspiration.

The communication from the organization, the National Information Bureau for Jewish Life, follows:

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY, A MEMORIAM, URIAH PHILLIPS LEVY

March 22, 1962, marks the 100th anniversary of the death of Uriah Phillips Levy, patriotic American of the Jewish faith extraordinaire.

He died in New York City and his grave at Cypress Hills Cemetery, Brooklyn, N.Y., is today still one of the most inspiring. Uriah P. Levy provided that on his passing his burial site be dedicated by a monument with his full-scale likeness dressed in the complete regalia of a captain in the U.S. Navy. Levy even detailed the epitaph be inscribed on the stone which reads: "Father of the Law for the Abolition of the Barbarous Practice of Corporal Punishment in the United States."

Levy was born in the "city of brotherly love," Philadelphia on April 22d, 1792. In his early boyhood he was imbued with the salt of the sea in his veins. At only 10 years of age, he ran away to sea. At 12, he began the study of navigation and seamanship at the Naval School in Philadelphia. He took to sea like a duck takes to water. At 18 he was retained as a second mate of a brig and 2 years later, at age of only 20, he held command as captain of a sailing ship. At that youthful age of 20 he also claimed part ownership of a vessel.

His early life on the high seas was filled with bold adventure that any boy or man would envy. Levy was shanghaied into the British Navy during the pre-1812 War period when the Britons were raiding and harassing American seamen. Another time, he drifted for 5 days in an open boat before rescue and once he narrowly escaped death when his crew mutinied against his command.

During the War of 1812, he entered the U.S. Navy and became master of the *Argus* which terrorized British shippers in the European water lanes. His naval career had a temporary hiatus when he was captured by the British and imprisoned for 16 months at Dartmoor.

After the War of 1812; he steadily advanced in naval rank compiling an enviable record chasing slave traders and pirates. In the naval service he experienced at first hand the terrible hardship, cruelty and inhumaneness which the brave men of the sea had to endure. Scurvy was commonplace on the ships, men were caste overboard into the heavy seas from icy rigging and existed for months in hovels and air-polluted forecastles. Navy discipline was maintained, sometimes indiscriminately, with the use of the whiplash, or as it was termed in ship jargon as the cat-o-nine tails.

Levy was made a Navy captain in 1844 and he immediately applied himself to rewriting the enormous "Manual of Internal Rules and Regulations for Men of War." It helped to terminate the vicious practice of flogging in the U.S. Navy.

His elevation to captaincy was not easily acquired. Frequently, Levy charged that anti-Semitic prejudice held back assignments. At one time, he was retired from the service in an effort to relieve the older age men, it was alleged. At official inquiries, he made a famous and eloquent defense and maintained that it was the right of Jews to equal treatment in the Navy, not only for their own sake but also in the interest of the national defense and America's welfare.

In 1859, he was made a commodore and assigned to head the Mediterranean squadron. During World War II, the Navy recognized his contribution to the United States and their branch of the service by naming a destroyer for him.

But, Levy's exploits plying the seas were only a first career. During his timeoff periods between ship voyages; he acquired the home and burial place at Monticello, Va., of President Thomas Jefferson who he greatly admired for his liberal theories on religious freedom. He restored Jefferson's Monticello with original furnishings purchased from far and wide and reclaimed it with its first richness and grandeur.

In his will, Levy left the entire Monticello estate, approximately 2,000 acres and the Jefferson mansion to the people of the United States for the establishment of an agriculture school for education as farmers of the children of deceased Navy officers. To maintain the projected school, Levy willed the substantial income from heavy New York City real estate holdings he had amassed. Levy's will provided that if Congress rejected the offer, it would revert to the State of Virginia. If Virginia declined; the creation of the school was to become an obligation of Sephardic Jewish congregations located in New York, Philadelphia, and Richmond but the school must be nonsectarian.

The will was badly drawn and during a prolonged court fight by his family the property again deteriorated. Eventually, the property was acquired by Jefferson Monroe Levy, a nephew of Levy, who again spent a fortune to restore it. In 1923, the Levy's dream was realized. The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation purchased the property for $500,000 from Levy's nephew to dedicate it as a national shrine. In the summer kitchen on the mansion wall is a plaque outlining the history of the estate and the roles played by Uriah P. Levy and his nephew Jefferson Monroe Levy.

Levy was a member of the Shearith Israel Congregation in New York City and a charter member of the Washington Hebrew Congregation in the District of Columbia.

Uriah P. Levy is to be remembered not as a naval hero but as religious man imbued with a spirit of mercy and compassion for his fellow man.

One World—Not Perfect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as the discussion and controversy surrounding the President's tariff proposals continue to mount, it is well for us to benefit by calm, reasonable, constructive discussions of the subject. With this thought in mind, I insert into the RECORD an editorial entitled "One World—Not Perfect," which appeared in the Thursday, March 15, edition of the Blue Island Sun-Standard, Blue Island, Ill.:

ONE WORLD—NOT PERFECT

Twenty-eight years ago, when the first reciprocal trade act was passed, American exports were less than $2 billion a year. Now they are more than $20 billion. So, clearly, we have a stake in the economic affairs of the world. And it is up to the businessman and farmer of the Midwest to understand this no less than those who reside in great seaports, and watch the arrivals and departures of ships and planes from far lands.

The President's recent message to Congress, urging passage of the Trade Extension Act of 1962, cited some figures that reveal how deeply this country has become involved in international trade, especially in the critical Common Market countries.

We sell to Western Europe more machinery, transportation equipment, chemicals and coal than our total imports of those commodities from all regions of the world combined.

Thirty percent of our exports, totaling over $4 billion a year in industrial goods and nearly $2 billion in farm products, go to present and prospective members of the European Common Market. Our agricultural trade with Western Europe is 4 to 1 in our favor.

As to exports in general, one of every seven farm workers produces for export; one of every three workers engaged in manufacturing is employed in establishments that export.

Thus, on the surface, the export picture looks good. But there are catches. Plenty of them. Until recently, economic questions involving this country, Western Europe, and the Common Market meant little to the average person, or so he thought. Today, this is changed. In an economic sense, a United States of Europe—call it the Common Market or whatever you wish—is rapidly becoming a reality. France, Italy, Germany, Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg have in fact become a community of nations for purposes of trade. As a result, for the first time in its history, the United States is up against a kind of competition in the marketplace that is forcing the experts, the economists, and the politicians to make agonizing reappraisals. If American business is going to compete in this new world of the Common Market, drastic changes on the domestic scene will have to take place. For example, following are some of the twisted situations in national policies and outright contradictions in law as described in a recent issue of Nation's Business:

"1. Present tax statutes limit industries' ability to modernize and compete here and abroad. New proposals to encourage modernization don't go far enough or take the wrong approach. Recommendations for taxing foreign subsidiaries' earnings would discourage trade and could force more spending for foreign aid.

"2. Farm laws subsidize inefficiency and promote overproductioin while we urge European farmers to adopt freer market policies and fewer controls.

"3. Federal wage-fixing laws and political policies encourage higher wages and thus higher costs that restrict business from competing in foreign trade. Government-caused unemployment is increasing job losses.

"4. Rising Federal spending that commits as much revenue to welfare and nonmilitary programs as to needed defense makes tax reform difficult * * *."

One of the symptoms of this country's weakness in the international competitive struggle is the trouble we are having with our balance of payments. As defined by Sylvia Porter, financial analyst, "The balance of payments of the United States is simply the record of all our economic dealings with all the rest of the world over a specified period of time." By this measure in 1960, we were on the short end of the stick by some $3.9 billion. Our gold reserves dwindled to the lowest point in decades.

It takes no economist to recognize that one of the greatest dangers in the present situation is the threat to the stability of the dollar. There is no alternative to competing, and competing successfully, in world markets. For, as a leading executive of a major American steel company observes, "Basically, confidence in the American dollar means confidence in Americans. * * * It is confidence that factories and buildings will be built, that men will have useful—not merely time-consuming jobs; that what is produced will be able to compete in the marketplace * * *."

The United States is discovering that the dream of one world is not perfect—but we have got to learn to live with it.

We Should Abolish These Nuisance Taxes Left Over From World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 1961, I introduced H.R. 814, a bill to repeal the so-called nuisance excise taxes which were enacted as an emergency measure during the Second World War.

Ever since I came to Congress I have exerted efforts in an attempt to have these taxes removed, and I still believe that they should be eliminated. I was interested to receive last month the following letter from the editor in chief of Mademoiselle magazine, and its enclosure, an open letter to the 87th Congress.

While we may not think that the 10 percent excise tax on those so-called luxury items used by American women, such as handbags, jewelry, and cosmetics, are as important as the telephone tax, we must, nevertheless, not forget that the American woman is a necessary adjunct to the American man that we all want them to be as pretty as possible and to spend as little as possible of our hard-earned cash in becoming so. Of course, there is the argument that if we remove these excise taxes, women would then have that much more money to spend on additional items. So much the better.

In a more serious vein, I do believe that it is time for the Congress to repeal these unnecessary taxes.

The above-mentioned correspondence follows:

MADEMOISELLE,
New York, N.Y., February 23, 1962.

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We do hope you will spare a moment of your valuable time to read the attached open letter to Congress requesting repeal of the 10-percent luxury tax. This letter appears in the March issue of Mademoiselle, whose readers represent some 2,205,000 college-educated young women, most of whom are of voting age. True, the style of this forthcoming editorial may sound lighthearted, but this should in no way invalidate the seriousness of our purpose.

We feel that this matter is of great concern to the women of our country, and we would greatly appreciate your thoughtful consideration of it.

Yours very truly,
BETSY TALBOT BLACKWELL,
Editor in Chief.

FEBRUARY 26, 1962.

Miss BETSY TALBOT BLACKWELL,
Editor in Chief, Mademoiselle,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MISS BLACKWELL: This will serve to acknowledge receipt of yours of February 23 concerning the repeal of the 10 percent excise tax.

Ever since I came to Congress, I have been exerting every effort to have all of these "nuisance" taxes eliminated.

I am enclosing a copy of my bill, H.R. 814, which will be of interest to you.

Sincerely yours,
ABRAHAM J. MULTER.

MADEMOISELLE,
New York, N.Y., March 1, 1962.

DEAR CONGRESS: It's 18 years, come April Fools' Day, since a bill was passed putting a 20-percent tax on a number of items (handbags, luggage, furs, jewelry, and cosmetics, in particular) without which no self-respecting American woman would be able to function in public—or private either. The purpose of this luxury tax, as you called it, was to restrict the sale of commodities containing things useful to the war effort. We were glad to cooperate at the time. Such temporary taxes are customary during wars. But instead of lifting it after hostilities were over, you made the luxury tax of World War II a permanent fixture—though you did reduce it to 10 percent in 1954.

Considering a number of facts—that its original purpose no longer exists; that it discriminates not only against certain industries but against the entitre female sex; that the burden of it falls equally on everyone, which makes it a lot tougher on a girl in her first job than on a psychiatrist's wife; and that it's not only unfair but just plain old fashioned to describe things women can't possibly do without as luxuries—we think it's high time you did something about it. Several bills are being proposed this session, we hear, that would remove the levy on some of these so-called luxuries. We hope you'll see your way to passing one of them.

After all, women look and feel and are so much prettier, happier, and nicer with powdered noses, lipsticked lips, and handbags in which to stow away their change purses, cigarettes, Kleenexes, spectacles, penknives, keys, matchboxes, parking tickets, lipsticks, safety pins, and unopened bills. And perfume does seem almost necessary. And as for a bit of mink.

Love,

MLLE.

P.S.—Just one more thing, which doesn't apply to all women, but most certainly does to all those in the fashion industry—about whom we have a lot to say in this issue. If everyone from nurses to policemen can deduct the cost of their uniforms from their income taxes, why can't we? Our uniforms are not a bit less essential (and, alas, much sooner obsolete). If we didn't dress to prove our point, we couldn't keep one of the biggest businesses in America going.

Repairing the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Richard Nixon's statement on the United Nations should be the basis on which President Kennedy's request for financial aid should be considered. It demonstrates clear thinking and a complete understanding of the situation. In reading it, there is just one regret: that this sound position has not yet been taken by the Kennedy administration:

UNPAID BILLS OF 82 MEMBER NATIONS RESPONSIBLE FOR U.N.'S FINANCIAL ILLS

(By Richard M. Nixon)

(Ninth article in a series of 10)

The administration proposal to buy $100 million worth of United Nations bonds is a carelessly designed financial scheme. But the key question is whether the U.N. is worth saving at all. I believe the great majority of Americans, regardless of party, share the hope that the U.N. can eventually become an effective instrument of peace.

However, before Congress approves the purchase of any U.N. bonds, there should be these added safeguards to protect the American people:

First, it should be made absolutely clear that the bond issue will not set a precedent for future U.N. financing.

Second, the true financial need of the U.N. should be carefully determined so that no U.S. money goes for imaginary bills.

Third, above a reasonable level the United States should buy bonds only as other nations also support the bond issue.

Fourth, and most important, the President should take steps to eliminate the real cause of the U.N.'s fiscal chaos—the unpaid bills of 82 out of 104 U.N. members.

The U.N. is financially sick today because many countries refuse to pay their share for operations that they oppose, such as in the Congo and the Middle East. This is like a child saying that if you won't play my game I'll take my marbles and go home. The American people, who have paid nearly half the total cost of the U.N. since its inception, deserve an end to this kind of kid stuff. The President should demand that the U.N. make all assessments mandatory and force the delinquent nations to pay up or get out.

Far from being an anti-U.N. position, this would actually strengthen the United Nations by forcing it to operate on a sound financial basis. Obviously no company could stay in business for long if its buyers refused to honor its bills. The situation is no different with the U.N. The U.N. is a club and morally it should act like a club. In any club a member who is in arrears is posted and loses his right to vote. A club member always has the right to withdraw from the club, but not to refuse payment for duly approved assessments.

But even after the United Nations licks its money problems the organization has obvious defects that must be examined and resolved. The record of last fall's U.N. session was dismal and the administration's attempt to whitewash that record was a great disservice to all who want to see a strong United Nations. Hopes for a lasting peace were set back by the U.N.'s action in favor of nuclear controls without inspection—the Soviet position; by failing to show some backbone when India invaded Goa; by complete silence when the Communists built the wall in East Berlin that enslaved millions; by admitting the Communist puppet state of Outer Mongolia; and by encouraging needless bloodshed in the Congo.

If the U.N. is to reverse this record and become an effective instrument for peace, the administration must recognize that the U.N. is a battleground in the fight between freedom and Communist slavery. Its members are not all men of good will, and lofty words spoken in a lofty forum will not make them men of good will.

In 1945, when the world organization was founded, we had just been through 4 long years of war and the U.N. looked like a glittering way to count heads instead of breaking them. If the Communists had lived up to the high ideals of the U.N. Charter, our hopes for world peace might have been realized. But the Soviet Union set out to make the U.N. a tool for Communist world domination or to destroy the U.N. if it stood in the way.

Yet today there are still Americans, unfortunately some in high Government positions, who do not admit that this has happened and who treat the U.N. exactly as if there was no Communist threat. Clearly the first duty of an American policy on the U.N. must be to correct this fatal misconception. Until our Government brings a new realism to our actions in the U.N., we will continue to be played for a sucker by the Communists.

The primary instrument for Soviet obstruction in the U.N. is the veto. When an action doesn't fit into their design for a Communist world, they use the veto—or else they simply ignore the U.N. as they did when the General Assembly asked them not to explode a 50-megaton bomb. Instead of standing up to the Soviets, we have allowed ourselves to be consistently tricked into allowing them to control the U.N. We got mousetrapped on the Congo vote because we refused to veto a Soviet-backed resolution. It is cold comfort to keep our veto power in the deep freeze when peace is being threatened by our failure to use it. We have a duty to promote peace by every legal means available to us—including the veto.

By failing to block the Communists by veto, we have forced added responsibility onto the U.N. General Assembly, where all nations, regardless of geography, population, or economic development, have the same voice. When the General Assembly votes against our interests, can we then blame it for actions that we could have prevented?

The General Assembly has grown to 104 member-nations, many of whom are no bigger than our smallest State. These newly independent nations have very special problems, which often appear to them to be more important than the battle between freedom and communism. Without belittling their problems, we must convince them that the fight to preserve freedom is also their concern.

The United States, as the leader of the free world, has the duty to make this position absolutely clear to the neutrals. As I wrote in an earlier article, "Let us understand once and for all, there is a difference between freedom and slavery, a difference as old as civilization. We proudly stand for freedom. The Communists brazenly stand for slavery. This is the great moral issue of this century. Men and nations cannot stay on the sidelines where this issue is concerned. They must choose. There can be no moral neutralism."

These new nations must be brought to understand the full meaning of their freedom. They cannot live by a double standard that judges Portuguese aggression in Angola to be reprehensible, but condones Indian aggression in Goa. When the U.N. failed to censure India for invading Goa, the U.N. sanctioned force as a solution to disputes. No matter how just was the Indian claim over Goa, its action was still a clear violation of the U.N. Charter. And Adlai Stevenson's strong words were no substitute for U.N. action.

However, despite the shortsighted actions of some neutrals, despite mounting debts and Soviet vetoes, the U.N. has very real potential as a mechanism for achieving a peace with justice.

I believe that every American supports the principle of the U.N. Charter—the settlement of international disputes by peaceful and just means.

The United Nations is not a utopia, but it is worth saving. It can be a valuable channel of diplomatic communications, an excellent forum for world opinion, a potential vehicle for resolving conflict, and a performer of many good works in such areas as world health, agriculture, economic development, and technical assistance.

We should remember that the U.N. has had some notable successes in the past. It has helped end the Communist guerrilla war in Greece. It helped prevent a major war over Suez. It contributed to peace in the Middle East by helping to stabilize Lebanon.

If the U.N. needs an overhaul, we can see that it is far wiser and cheaper to put the motor back in running condition than to scrap it. We must remember that we have the old model—we don't have a new car. And the U.N. can provide transportation toward peace. How well it runs will depend on how willing we are to make the necessary repairs.

The United States is a Republic—Not a Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1962

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George Todt, a student of government and a columnist on the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, recently reviewed in his column the difference between a democracy and a republic. Because of the research and study Mr. Todt applied to this subject, I am including it herewith with my remarks, and am confident that anyone who reads it will have a better undestanding of the difference between these two forms of government, and especially those who have debated and discussed this subject.

According to the Constitution of the United States, this is a republic—not a democracy—but because of the prevalent use of the word "democracy" many of the people of the United States believe that our form of government is a democracy which is not true according to our Founding Fathers.

The article follows:

WHAT IS A REPUBLIC?

(By George Todt)

"It is of great importance in a republic not only to guard against the oppression of its rulers, but to guard one part of society against the injustice of the other part."—Alexander Hamilton, the Federalist.

Are some of us confused about the difference between a republic and a democracy? What is it, then? Who knows the correct answer? Let's analyze some facts without emotion today.

In order to furnish my readers with light instead of heat, I went back a bit in historical times—just 33 years ago to be exact—and came up with some excerpts from a book officially compiled and issued by the U.S. War Department.

It set forth exact and truthful definitions of a democracy and of a republic, explaining the difference between both.

Under the heading "Citizenship," let's see what TM-2000-25 (published by U.S. War Department, Washington, November 30, 1928) had to say about this by-now-controversial matter:

"Democracy: (118-120).

"A government of masses.

"Authority derived through mass meeting or any other form of direct expression. Results in mobocracy."

NEGATES PROPERTY

"Attitude toward property is Communistic—negating property rights.

"Attitude toward law is that will of the majority shall regulate, whether it be based upon deliberation or governed by passion, prejudice and impulse, without restraint or regard to consequences.

"Results in demagogism, license, agitation, discontent, anarchy.

"Republic: (120-121).

"Authority is derived through the election by the people of public officials best fitted to represent them.

"Attitude toward property is respect for laws and individual rights and a sensible economic procedure.

"Attitude towards law is the administration of justice in accord with fixed principles and established evidence, with a strict regard to consequences."

AVOIDS EXTREMES

"A greater number of citizens and extent of territory may be brought within its compass.

"Avoids the dangerous extreme of either tyranny or mobocracy.

"Results in statesmanship, liberty, reason, justice, contentment and prorgess.

"Is the 'standard form' of government throughout the world.

("A republic is a form of government under a constitution which provides for the election of (1) an executive and (2) a legislative body, who working together in a representative capacity, have all the power of appointment, all power of legislation, all power to raise revenue and appropriate expenditures, and are required to create (3) a judiciary to pass upon the justice and legality of their governmental acts and to recognize (4) certain inherent individual rights.

"'Take away any one or more of those four elements and you are drifting into autocracy. Add one or more to those four elements and you are drifting into democracy."—(Atwood.)

"121. Superior to all others:

"Autocracy declares the divine right of kings; its authority cannot be questioned; its powers are arbitrarily or unjustly administered.

"Democracy is the 'direct' rule of the people and has been repeatedly tried without success.

"Our constitutional Fathers, familiar with the strength and weakness of both autocracy and democracy, with fixed principles definitely in mind, defined a representative republican form of government. They 'made a very marked distinction between a republic and a democracy * * * and said repeatedly and emphatically that they had founded a republic.' "

The quotes above in parentheses inside TM (Training Manual) 2000-25 are from "The Constitution of the United States" by Harry Atwood.

There has been a steady attempt over the past three decades to erode our concept of what a constitutional republic really means to us.

Let's consider the matter factually, not in the light of partisan politics. This has nothing to do with the Democrats.

Every good American should be for our constitutional Republic.

Democrats as much as Republicans, too.

Help for West Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein the attached editorial from Foster's Daily Democrat, published in Dover, N.H., Tuesday, March 20, 1962, entitled "Help for West Berlin."

The article follows:

HELP FOR WEST BERLIN

American business has been told by Gen. Lucius Clay that it could make a substantial contribution toward the ultimate resolution of the Berlin problem. It is his sound belief that business can, if it will, do much to keep that beleagured city strong and viable.

As President Kennedy's emissary to West Berlin points out, months of Russian pressure has seriously affected the spirit of its residents. The city, though outwardly vibrant still, is in danger of disintegration under the Communist pincer movement. Its young people, lacking confidence in West Berlin's future, are emigrating. This island of Western freedom, therefore, is in danger of becoming a shell of its former self, sustained solely through the presence of Western military power.

But General Clay believes that American and West European industry could do a great deal to reverse this debilitating trend. He would have business build new plant and other commercial installations there, thus helping to make it a city with a future. West Berlin also might be made into Europe's foremost industrial training center. If that were done, trainees from all parts of the world would come to live for a while. West Berlin, now psychologically a besieged city, would gain new life.

Up to now, stand-pattism seems to be the best the West can offer the slowly withering metropolis. General Clay's suggestions have the advantage of positive nonmilitary action, something the Russians would find it exceedingly difficult to block. Businessmen of the free world should give the proposal serious thought.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, for centuries the 10 million people of Byelorussia lived under the domination of the Russian czars, and now they are suffering under the totalitarian rule of the Soviet Union. But like so many other peoples in the Soviet Union, they have doggedly refused to be assimilated. This brave and sturdy Slavic people has lived in its historic homeland in the cold northern regions of Russia, between Poland and Moscow, since the beginning of recorded history, long before the rise of modern Russia. Between the czarist autocracy and the Soviet tyrants they have enjoyed only a brief period of freedoom, shortly after the First World War.

When the decrepit Russian autocracy was overthrown towards the end of the First World War, many of the oppressed peoples were freed and proclaimed their independence. When the first Russian Revolution broke out in February 1917, Byelorussian territory fell under the control of the New Provisional Government in Moscow. In March all the existing Byelorussian organizations held a conference calling for the reorganization of the Russian Empire as a federation, with Byelorussia as one of the states with complete autonomy. But when the second revolution in October carried the Bolsheviks into power in Moscow, they esablished a Byelorussian district committee at the Russian Soviet of Deputies of Peasants and Workers. This committee did not have the support of the Byelorussians. The next Byelorussian congress, in December 1917, was surrounded by units of the Red army. But 2 months later the un-

daunted Byelorussians succeeded in clearing their country of Bolsheviks, and on March 25, 1918, they proclaimed their national independence and founded the Byelorussian National Republic. That historic event marked the beginning of free life in Byelorussia and ushered in a new era for its people, fulfilling their ancient dreams that they might one day reestablish a free and independent Byelorussia. Thus March 25, 1918, remains a landmark in Byelorussian history and a date that Byelorussians the world over remember.

During the next 3 years the new and weak state fought valiantly for its very existence, but in the end it was overwhelmed by the sheer brute force of the Red army. Early in 1921 the country was overrun, and the White Russians were unable to continue their efforts to form an independent and indivisible Byelorussian nation. Thus ended the free and independent state of Byelorussia, and thenceforth began the enslavement of the Byelorussian people by the Communists from the Kremlin. For 40 years these peoples have been living under the harsh and relentless yoke of totalitarian communism. Their experience with the ruthless tyranny of their Soviet dictators has left them miserable, yet they still breathe the spirit of freedom and independence, and pray for deliverance from the Kremlin's tyranny. On this 44th anniversary of Byelorussian Independence Day we join them in their prayer.

Another Broken Campaign Pledge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in today's New York Times, Irving Spiegel reports on still another broken pledge of Campaigner Kennedy, who appears to have completely forgotten his promise to work toward Arab-Israeli peace negotiations, if elected President.

The article follows:

ZIONISTS CRITICIZE U.S. PEACE EFFORT—U.N. ALSO SCORED FOR STAND ON ARAB-ISRAELI FRICTION

(By Irving Spiegel)

Zionist leaders criticized both the United Nations and the United States yesterday for what they called the failure of both to take immediate steps to achieve a permanent peace between Israel and the Arab States.

Dr. Emanuel Neumann, a member of the Jewish Agency Executive and former president of the Zionist Organization of America, referred to the border fighting between Israel and Syria. The United States, he said, "does not raise the voice for peace in the Middle East but bows to the demands of Arab intransigents that the very mention to peace be banned."

Dr. Neumann and Rabbi Irving Miller, chairman of the American Zionist Council, spoke at a luncheon meeting of the ZOA at the Shelbourne Hotel. The luncheon was a farewell to Louis Sitkoff, former president of the Long Island Zionist Region, who leaves next week with his family to settle in Israel.

Dr. Neumann cited a campaign speech by President Kennedy before the ZOA convention in August 1960, in which he pledged to initiate moves for Arab-Israel peace negotiations.

Dr. Neumann also criticized the United States for not supporting the resolutions at the General Assembly of the United Nations calling for direct negotiations between the Arab States and Israel.

"For us Americans" he said, "it is still more grievous that our Government did not lend its support to the African initiative but rejected that resolution."

He called the latest incidents in the Israel-Syria frontier "a warning signal."

"Despite the armistice of 1948–49, a state of war still exists while the international community looks on, unwilling or unable to take effective steps to restore actual peace," he said.

Rabbi Miller called for youthful immigration to Israel.

"Aliyah [immigration] need not take the alternative of everything or nothing," he said.

Harold W. Carmely, national chairman of the ZOA administrative council, presided.

St. Patrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein some very stirring articles on the Irish by the very talented writers, John E. O'Malley of the Clinton, Mass., Daily Item and Tom Riley of the Boston Record-American.

These articles are exceptionally well written and are particularly timely on the birthday of the great St. Patrick.

The articles follow:

HIBERNIANS HAILED ON ST. PAT'S DAY

[From the Clinton, Mass., Daily Item]

Hal Boyle, in an article on what it means to be Irish on St. Patrick's Day, wrote as follows: "It is to live the whole history of his race betwen a dawn and a dawn. It isn't only the realization that he is descended from kings. It is the realization that he is a king himself."

To the Irish, and the sons and daughters of the Irish, St. Patrick's Day is a day of pride and of memory. A day on which they recall the glories and the triumphs that were watered by the precious blood of martyrs, by the salty tears of agony, and the corrosion of three centuries of cruel oppression.

In 1870 Clinton had a population of 5,429 and of that number 1,370 were born in Ireland. If we add to that the number of children born of Irish parents in the previous 35 years we could well come up with the fact that half of the people in the early days were of Irish stock.

The Clinton Courant, March 14, 1868, carried this story, "St. Patrick's Day. On next Tuesday occurs this well-known anniversary. A dance will be held in the Clinton Hall by the Hibernian Society." The Hibernian society of Clinton was the eighth organized in this country and the first organized in a small town.

In the following 40 years, division 8, Ancient Order of Hibernians grew by leaps and bounds and, shortly after the turn of the century, claimed a membership of 575 with an auxiliary that surpassed that number.

Because the Irish had a penchant for honoring their dead, when a member of the order passed away the entire membership marched in the funeral procession. Failure of any member to appear on such an occasion brought an assessment of one dollar. When the membership had reached the 400 mark and the number of deaths increased, working a severe hardship on those who were employed in the factories, one-half of the members did the honors in turn.

Every member had to have his gold-braided cap and his gold-fringed regalia. The regalia was reversible, one side being black for funeral processions. It goes without saying that the other side was a bright emerald green. When the division marched over High Street, four abreast, with the front rank crossing Church Street as the rear rank turned out of Union Street it looked mighty impressive.

If you have ever wondered why the Hibernians always called their marching scarf a regalia, you can find the answer in Webster's Dictionary, "the prerogative of a king." As I remember the oldtimers, as they marched over High Street, the prerogative showed in the pride of their bearing.

The AOH was a quasi-patriotic organization, to perpetuate the traditions and glory of the fatherland so, when a member donned his cap and regalia he held his head a bit higher, his shoulders a little further back and his step was a bit quicker.

The first big event of division 8 was a fair in the old town hall shortly after it was built. The fair was conducted January 3, 4, and 6, 1872. The receipts were $1,100 and the net $600. Some of the prize winners were Miss Catherine McLaughlin, Oak Street; Mary Murphy, South Main Street; Bernard McCaffrey, Acre Street; Martin Ruane, Oak Street; Miss Kate Burns, Oak Street; and Ann O'Malley, Acre Street. Later, for more than two generations, the annual Hibernian ball was one of the leading social events of the town.

As Father Hugh Blount wrote:

"They have passed, dear of women, who prayed and labored hard;
Strong old men whose greatest glory was to be the faith's old guard;
God be with them, Irish pilgrims, for their exile was not in vain;
Ah, my brothers, shall we ever look upon their like again."

[From the Boston Record-American]

SHAMROCK REIGNS SUPREME—IT'S ALL ONE IRISH WORLD

If ever there is to be one world it will have to be one Irish world. No other type world has a chance.

Who but the Irish have a day set apart when the whole human race shares the pride of its Gaelic ancestry?

Have you ever heard a Mesopotamian, Brazilian, Indian, Lett or Laplander express the wish that he were German, Scandinavian or Greek? No.

Yet this is the day, March 17, when people regardless of racial origin proclaim to all the world that they are or should be Irish. And they wear the green ties and the shamrocks to prove it.

Who, then, are the Irish? And why does everyone want to be?

Answers would be simple, indeed, had the Garden of Eden been located where well it might have been—deep in the heart of the Emerald Isle. Adam and Eve would have been Irish, then, and this world today would still be a paradise, apple trees to the contrary, notwithstanding.

Alas, 'tis somewhat more complicated now to explain, although readily understandable to anyone with just a whit of the wit of the Irish and a bit of the soul of the poet. Surely, on so great a day as this, there can

be none so bold as to challenge the logic of universal Irish lineage.

Let's begin at the beginning. St. Patrick, whose anniversary puts "the top of the morning" upon this date, is identified in history as the son of Calphurnius, a Roman noble. Does not the fact, then, place the Romans and Italians among the first Irish?

And St. Patrick's birthplace has been fixed as Kilpatrick, near Dumbarton, Scotland. So, of course, the Scotch are Irish, too.

This great saint, whose life story is inscribed in so many human hearts, studied at Tours in Gaul. We submit, s'il vous plait, the French are Irish, also, n'est-ce pas?

The family tree of the present Lord Mayor of Dublin reaches into the tribes of Israel. And Lord Briscoe would be the first to tell you that the Jews are most Irish of all the Irish.

The ancient Chinese, Babylonians, Egyptians and Greeks passed on to the Irish the knowledge of how beer is brewed. That certainly makes them more kin than kith.

So, if the man alongside at today's parade seems to possess some of the nationalistic traints of a Slovak, Carthagenian, Czech, Pole, Sioux or Eskimo, beware any temptation to challenge his right to wear that big green bow on his hat. He doubtless will take delight in displaying for you his fiery Irish temper.

Nothing Irish about the English? Go on with you, now. Theirs is the green with envy. And 275,000 Irish fought for England in World War II.

How about the Soviets? Well, our diplomats report that when Khrushchev wants to act really nice he is like a leprechaun from Leningrad spouting flattery as if the Blarney stone was stuck in his mouth, and wouldn't that be a wonderful idea? And let us not forget the now purged Russian field marshal, with the Irish name, General Timoshenko.

Yankee Irish or Irish Yankees? There were so many, sir, that Gen. George Washington delighted in adopting "Saint Patrick" as a Revolutionary War password, and it was the password of that night in Boston which merged St. Patrick's Day and Evacuation Day.

Four signers of the Declaration of Independence were born in Ireland; five other signers had Irish parents or grandparents. John Dunlap printed the Declaration, and one whole section, listing the wrongs inflicted on the Colonies, was the work of John Sullivan, a Member of the Continental Congress and one of the first agitators for independence. Much of the final draft of the Constitution was written by John Rutledge, whose father was born in Ireland. Robert Morris financed the American Revolution; John Barry was first commodore of the U.S. Navy; and Patrick Henry and Matthew Lyons were our most eloquent Colonial orators. They were some of many illustrious Irish Yankees.

Irish success stories abound in almost every field of human endeavor—politics, wars, diplomacy, law, commerce, medicine, religion, arts and letters and science. But the universal magnetism of the Irish is not to be found in success alone. Every people everywhere possesses vast volumes of success stories of their own.

Wherein, then if not in Irish success, lies this overwhelming appeal that makes everyone wish upon this day that he were Irish?

To oppressed people everywhere, being Irish means having been trained for centuries to battle enslavement, to love liberty, and to champion the democratic way of life regardless of cost in personal sacrifice.

To people who have problems, smiling Irish eyes appear to say: "Come, tell us about it. We can help you solve it. You see, we've been all through these things so many times before."

To those who are afraid, the carefree way of life that the Irish display represents just the courage and faith and hope they need.

To those who do not understand God, the Irish seem to worship and act and pray as though they were the closest to Him.

To those who want to learn how to laugh, the Irish look like the most experienced teachers.

To most people, perhaps the appeal of the Irish lies in their seeming mastery of life through the application of understanding humor; their ability to roll with life's punches and to laugh at its problems; to smile when others would cry; to sing when others would sob.

To the Irish themselves, unfortunately, all this rich evidence of sterling character so radiantly charming to others, has absolutely no meaning whatever. The poet, Marianne Moore, put it this way:

"The Irish say your trouble is their trouble and your joy is their joy. I wish I could believe it. I'm troubled; I'm dissatisfied; I'm Irish."

Ireland: The Land of the Spirit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include the address of His Excellency, the Most Reverend Philip M. Hannan, D.D., auxiliary bishop of Washington, who was the principal speaker at the manquet of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, held at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D.C., on March 17, 1962.

The address follows:

IRELAND: THE LAND OF THE SPIRIT

The story is told of an English diplomat meeting an Irish diplomat. In the course of the conversation, the Englishman said that things were very serious in his country, but not yet desperate. The Irishman replied that therein lay the difference between the two countries because in Ireland the situation was always desperate but never serious.

This attitude, I think, bespeaks the national character of the Irish who know that life does not end in this world and that the life of the spirit is more important than that of the material. Ireland has a mission to the whole world because it is a land of the spirit.

A noted French historian has said that there are "two key faculties of the Irish spirit—the sense of the real and the passionate aspiration toward the ideal." It is this happy combination of the real and the ideal, the practical and the spiritual which have made Ireland the everlasting apostle for the cause of Christ.

It is not necessary to recount the centuries of Irish history which attest this fact. It is more important, I think, to cite how this spirit lives today. When the Prime Minister of Ireland, Mr. J. A. Costello, visited this country in 1956, he thus described the mission of Ireland in these words at the Press Club on March 15 of that year, "Though her own special anxieties are real, Ireland cannot be unconcerned at the fate of the rest of the world. This is so, if for no other reason than that Ireland, and here I speak for the 32 counties of Ireland, is almost exclusively Christian, and what Christian can isolate himself from the pains and sufferings of the rest of the human race in which he is mystically involved and is responsible and from which he even more mystically benefits? We are all children of Adam before even we are Irishmen."

Furthermore, with rare courage he announced at the United Nations what this Christian dedication means in practical terms. In regard to the burning and instant issue of independence for every nation, he cautioned that certain rights transcend political rights "notwithstanding the strong sentiment for self-determination in Ireland, however, I would personally judge that it would be an Irish view that the claim of a right of self-determination by a political group, whose real intention was to swing into the orbit of Communist power, should be resisted. In the order of values the right to worship God comes as the first of the rights of man, before even the political rights which are an achievement of civilization."

The words of the Prime Minister express well the special mission of the Irish toward the great need of the moment, the support of freedom. The Irish have an unbroken tradition of devotion to freedom as the gift of God. This is needed today if the spirit of man is to survive.

Fortunately, by reason of historical research we are able better today to appreciate the contribution of Irish soldiers to the cause of freedom in our country. That contribution comes not simply from the fact that at least a third of the American Army was composed of Irish. It comes particularly from the fact that the Irish largely composed the best regiments of the Army. For instance, one of the two most distinguished regiments of the whole Revolution was Smallwood's Regiment, the Maryland Regiment, of which almost one-half was Irish. Furthermore, the French Army of Count Rochambeau which sealed the victory over Cornwallis and ended the war was composed largely of Irish. The French Army included a whole brigade of Irish troops, consisting of three regiments. Gen. Arthur Dillon, their leader, a deputy in the French National Assembly, reported to his Government, "The Irish troops have always insisted on being the first to march toward the British lines."

More than the Irish willingness to fight for freedom, has been their devotion to fighting in accordance with morality. This trait for which they sacrified so heavily, as at Limerick under the great Patrick Sarsfield lives in this century. Despite the 300 years of tryranny suffered under the English, they still could write in their proclamation of Easter week, 1916, this magnificent appeal to conscience as they rose again for their rights, "We place the cause of the Irish Republic under the protection of the most high God whose blessing we invoke upon our arms, and we pray that no one who serves that cause will dishonor it by cowardice, inhumanity, or rapine." What sorrow would be saved the world if today the nations that aspire to freedom would emulate the Irish regard for morality in the fight for freedom.

More important for us in this country, has been the attitude of the Irish toward freedom in this country. They came here to secure freedom which produced also opportunity, but freedom was first in their minds and hearts. They recognized this as the greatest asset of the country and identified themselves with it. They came and accepted the country as it was, blessing God for their good fortune. They did not come to criticize nor to subvert it nor to remake it according to their social views or to make it into an instrument to foster the national ambitions of Ireland. They came to serve it and to love it.

With that levelheaded practicality that every Irishman has, they knew how to put into perspective the discrimination that they suffered. In fact, they suffered the worst type of discrimination that an impoverished immigrant can, the discrimination in employment, epitomized in the signs NINA (no Irishiman need apply). They knew that this was the work of individual Americans, acting against the splendid principles of America. They knew that the testimony of their own deeds would finally win recognition from the basically sound American conscience. They did not claim help as a martyred minority. They did not demand the support of pressure groups nor legislation nor changes in the country to suit their interests. They did not claim that others were un-American because they would not favor them. They worked and they won recognition on their own merits. They knew that ultimately their contribution in work was the only way to strengthen the country they loved and to make that country love them. They acted in the spirit enunciated by a President of their descent who said, "Ask not what the country can do for you but what can you do for the country."

In these days when our country is being importuned, pressured, almost blackmailed into favoring the national aspirations of many regions and countries, we should recall the example of the Irish in this country. Of course, they favored the independence of Ireland. There was no question about its justice; there was no question about their rights to their land and to their own Government. Naturally, they sought the aid and sympathy of freedom-loving peoples everywhere. But they never wanted Irish independence at the expense of embarrassment or any shred of the independence of this country. The Irish fought for their independence with their own resources, however unequal the contest, without expecting the United States to endanger its own welfare and without expecting or threatening to embroil a great part of the world in trouble to secure their own ends. Once their independence was won, they did not expect the United States to finance them, nor did they ever hint that they would seek a loan or trade from the Reds if we did not help them. Every penny that they borrowed they expected to repay and they repaid it, proud to be free and proud to bear the burdens of a free state. And every American of Irish descent is just as insistent as every Irish citizen that Ireland act as it has, a responsible and self-reliant country. I am not saying that other countries and those of other descent are to be censured for not being able to follow that magnificient example. I am only saying that Irish Americans did and God bless them for the example they gave to the world.

Perhaps one other point should be stressed, the whole-hearted acceptance of the Irish of our Constitution. No Irishman is ever neutral toward a principle. He understands that a principle demands acceptance or rejection. The Irish do not quibble about supporting the Constitution. They support the whole Constitution, not just the fifth amendment. Furthermore, they do not believe in sly and covert attacks on the Constitution and our freedom under the guise of being concerned with the defense of individual traitors, leftists and subverters. We pity criminals. We try to help them. But we don't mistake them for what they are. We know that no country can survive when it mistakes a criminal for a hero, nor that any country can advance except by its practice of virtue which includes the recognition of God as the source of our rights.

The abiding faith of the Irish has enabled them always to prize the greatness of this country. Our country gives us freedom under God to realize our destiny with God. We are willing to defend it with our lives because it recognizes the meaning of human life. That is why the Irish feel that to be loyal to God they must be loyal to this country. Thus we pledge our allegiance to this country: with our hearts to love it; with our strength to sustain it; with our faith to preserve it, the best country in the world and worthy of the best in us. May God bless and preserve it and the Irish forever.

Our Golden Age Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Rubin Morris Hanan, president of the Alabama League of Aging Citizens, Inc., recently delivered a very strong address regarding the needs of our elderly citizens, at the Westminster Presbyterian Church in Montgomery, Ala.

Mr. Hanan, who has built a fine repution as a spokesman for our senior citizens in the State of Alabama, served as a delegate to the White House Conference on Aging. I am pleased to insert herewith copy of Mr. Hanan's address for the benefit of my colleagues and all who read the RECORD.

The address follows:

OUR GOLDEN AGE CITIZENS

Ladies and gentlemen, in the month of May in Alabama we are summoned by proclamations to observe two important holidays. Last Tuesday, we were told to go to the polls and vote for the candidate of your choice and "ring the bells of freedom," and to go to our church or synagogue of your choice to give thanks to the Lord for prolonging the lives of our loved ones.

Election day is an expression of our political faith—our resolve to render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's. The Golden Age Sunday or Sabbath is and of our religious faith—our desires to render unto God the things that are God's. Both observances are deep rooted in a nation under God. On election day we think about the practical side of government, about the democratic process and the advancement of the common welfare and material progress. It is a time for prayer that we may select wise leaders and that they may have God's guidance.

On Golden Age Day we think of the spiritual needs of our senior citizens and pray that we may keep God's commandment to "honor thy father and thy mother" and ask God to give us the wisdom and the courage to meet the needs of the ever-increasing number of older people by developing plans and instituting programs whereby their spiritual needs may be met.

In the past the wealth and morals of this great Nation have been built by these men and women who are now less active. They, therefore, richly deserve a full share of the plenty which they have helped produce. They deserve the chance to live out their lives as useful citizens with an honored place in the community.

Furthermore, America needs the contribution which they may make the future welfare. Too often they lose useful employment through premature forced retirement or ill health.

This is a waste of human resources that America cannot afford in a crisis like this when the Nation needs every ounce of its energy and resources.

First let us look at a brief picture of the problems which our political leaders must face in Alabama. We have 261,143 citizens aged 65 and over. In 1958 one-fifth of our senior citizens had no income at all but were dependent on relatives or friends. The average money income from all sources was about $40 per month. When we realize that is an average figure we know that thousands were barely scraping by on much less. Only in Mississippi was the State average lower than in our State.

Four-fifths of the senior citizens received Federal social security payments averaging about $60 per month or State old-age pensions averaging less than $40.

Since 1958 we are pleased to note that the present administration has improved these conditions. Both social security and old-age pensions have increased but the payments in Alabama still rank near the bottom. Much remains to be done.

It is also gratifying that the present administration has taken steps to begin to relieve the older people and their families of the skyrocketing costs of medical care. At present the 100,000 old-age pensioners are eligible to receive 15 days' hospital care during the year for acute illness and major injury and payment for physicians' visits for 30 days after hospitalization. In addition medical needy persons who are not on the State pension rolls may receive payments over and above the first $50. We have a full-time consultant on State staff to work in development of organizations and services for the aged.

This represents a real step forward. Contrast the picture just a year ago when nursing home care was the sole medical service for State old-age pensioners. Still more needs to be done.

We believe that a system of medical care financed by social security along the lines of the Anderson-King proposals would reach the 150,000 on the social security rolls plus those who are eligible for social security benefits when they retire. This would greatly reduce the number dependent upon the present State program and leave only about 37,000 other senior citizens potentially eligible for State medical assistance. This would release funds to enable Alabama to improve its services to all older groups.

As we see it there is need both for the present State assistance and the social security financed system. They would reenforce one another enabling the State to set up more liberal eligibility requirements for medical assistance.

Governor Patterson expressed it very well by saying: "I believe that health care coming as a right under social security would be preferable to most individuals to even the medical assistance program which includes some means test."

One other health program is worthy of mention. In 1962, 2,078 of Alabama sick and disabled old pensioners were given care in licensed nursing homes (payments for care in licensed skilled nursing homes up to $125 per month; in other nursing homes up to $110). While these homes are licensed by the State, their maintenance and operation is a county responsibility and needs the active support in interest of local groups.

Let us turn now from the political, material needs to the social and spiritual needs of our elder neighbors. In my many years of dealing with the problems of the aged I have seen them isolated and alone praying for the release from their suffering in the night by death; clinging to the hope for somebody's kindness and affection that does not come. They were masters of yesterdays but cast aside today.

I have seen thousands of our Alabama neighbors and friends having to exist on susbtandard health and nutritional levels—

undernourished and poorly housed simply because they are old and their income is not enough to provide them with the needed food and drugs. They have great pride. They refuse to think of themselves as being old, and shy from th term "aged," searching for some more honorable title.

With many the trouble is not that they are growing old but that they have lost their friends and companions and become separated from their family. They are isolated and cut off from the activities of normal life.

This is a relatively new situation for America. The American people have been a young and active people. The United States has survived the greatest hardship with their aid under our democratic form of government. We are the most charitable and hospitable Nation in the world but we are just beginning to realize that our Nation and its communities must make adjustments to this growing proportion of elder citizens. Our approach has been psychologically harsh, politically dangerous, and economically immature. The entire burden of adjustment has been put upon the aging person rather than the community.

We have ample instructions in the secular and sacred literature for concern with this problem. We find references to the "seventy elders of Israel" who with Moses and Joshua were the leaders of their people filling the judicial and advisory position and "the aged man of ripe wisdom must assume his responsible position as elder of the community."

It is part of the American spiritual tradition to believe that the problems which face our society can be solved by understanding and humanity and in these tasks the churches, synagogues and voluntary organizations are needed just as much as Federal and State governments.

We are today the instrument of the God of Love, to make his light shine in the hearts of forgotten people and to make the last years of our fathers and mothers useful to the community and meaningful to themselves.

The Alabama League of Aging Citizens in cooperation with the National Council of Senior Citizens has, this year, launched a program to make life meaningful for our aging citizens. We urge all the communities of America to give their aging citizens better health services, better economic and social opportunities, and better homes to live in, and planned recreation opportunities.

Five years ago, I asked the Governor of Alabama to proclaim the first Sunday and Sabbath in May as Golden Age Day and urge all citizens to observe this day by attending the church or synagogue, wherever possible, and in prayer to ask God to give us the wisdom and courage to meet the needs of our senior citizens. Fifty States are now observing the month of May as a senior citizens month.

These observances manifests the increasing vital concern of the American people with the advancement and welfare of our senior citizens and the resolve to make these the greatest days that they have ever lived. We must thank God that we are allowed—each according to our station—to play a part in making these days memorable in the history of mankind.

I sincerely believe that God has taught us to pray and that prayer is one of the greatest blessings enjoyed by the people of the free world. To me prayer is more than a privilege. It is an absolute necessity if we are to grow in the grace and knowledge of God and of our heritage. Through the years prayer provides for us high ideals and set high moral standards.

At this time I ask God to grant that I may seek not so much to be consoled as to console the needy and sick friends who need my help and advice. I pray that where there is despair I may bring hope for tomorrow; that where there is darkness I may bring light; that where there is sadness I may bring joy.

I do not ask God to be understood but to make me understand and to recognize the needs of my fellow men.

I pray that I may be the instrument of his mercy and compassion to champion the cause of destitute, sick, and neighbors. I thank you.

Foreign Policy Failures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with the growing public awareness of the foreign policy failures or retreats of the past year, it is necessary for us to brush aside the smokescreen of State Department propaganda and discuss the direction and results of our foreign policy. Newspapers and magazines throughout the country are devoting considerable space to this subject, and under unanimous consent, I insert into the RECORD two pertinent stories analyzing this basic subject. These are an article by John Causten Currey in a recent edition of the Oklahoma Oklahoman, and a book review by Edwin McDowell of "America: Listen" by Frank L. Kluckhohn, in a recent edition of the Phoenix Republican:

[From the Oklahoma Oklahoman]

BASIC REFORM IN COMMUNICATION FIRST NEED FOR STATE DEPARTMENT

(By John Causten Currey)

The problem of how our State Department can operate without constant frustration of our national interests by its career-status do-nothing corps is again in the limelight. Several Members of Congress have announced their intention of examining the Department's record, and one sent shudders through the new marble palace in Foggy Bottom by suggesting a complete revamping of the laws which govern the Foreign Service. A former official of the Department, Frank L. Kluckhohn, charges in the current issue of Reader's Digest that "State has demonstrated (1) an unwillingness to face the reality of an enemy bent on our destruction (2) inability to compete." Too many of our Foreign Service officers he states, are "professional pussyfooters who let matters slide while hoping for Khrushchev to begin observing the Golden Rule."

This is strong talk. Coming from a man who has been a State Department official, a Defense advisor (to James Forrestal), a war correspondent and a Washington newsman for the past 30 years or so, it is not easily brushed aside. Kluckhohn makes his case with specific examples of what frustrates able men in the Foreign Service, and calls for immediate reforms.

Reform is the magic word these days. We urge reforms on other nations, cry out for reforms here at home in our schools, our local, State and Federal Governments, our religious institutions, and our business practices. Far too few of these clarion calls are accompanied by some positive suggestion of corrective action to be taken. Too often, the call itself provokes some harebrained publicity seeker to put forth his own radical notion of what should be done. The public, in rejecting such nonsense, loses sight of the fact the original criticism may have been both sound and important. As a result, nothing is done at all.

The Foreign Service officers are the 3628 responsible administrators of our diplomacy. The State Department has around 23,000 employees altogether, and controls other workers in semi-independent agencies. In effect, foreign service officers are the counterparts of the regular officers in the Army, Navy and Air Force. In the Armed Forces, it would be inconceivable that a major policy recommendation from a four-star officer overseas could be pigeonholded by a much lower-ranking officer in the Pentagon, and withheld from his superiors there. Yet precisely this occurs at State, and has for years. There is an obvious need to reform the organizationl pattern that permits such effrontery to flourish.

The whole pattern of communications between our ambassadors abroad and the top, policy setting echelons at State needs to be reformed. No matter how vital the topic, or how refined the transmission system that moves his message to Washington, none of our ambassadors now has any assurance that his words will reach the Secretary or his top assistants. Some excellent men have refused embassy posts because they were aware of this situation.

Until these basic reforms are achieved, no other will do much good. As one disgruntled veteran at State puts it, "these guys will keep trying to win a snowball fight by batting snowflakes at the other side, who will keep right on using ice-covered snowballs."

[From the Phoenix Republican]

CAPITAL NEWSMAN RAISES QUESTION IF KENNEDY CAN MEASURE UP TO JOB

(By Edwin McDowell)

"America: Listen!" by Frank L. Kluckhohn. Monarch Books, Derby, Conn. 155 p.

In the January Reader's Digest, Frank Kluckhohn, 20-year foreign and Washington correspondent for the New York Times and former high-ranking State Department officer, enumerated reasons why he felt our State Department is failing us in the cold war.

In this recent book, author Kluckhohn explains why he believes our present administration has failed us so far.

Drawing upon newspaper articles and his own extensive background, the author paints a dark gray picture of national frustration and conclusion.

Tracing Kennedy's campaign promises to be "a President who acts as well as reacts," to give "1,000 days of exacting presidential leadership" instead of action only during the first 100 days, and "to be a President known as one who not only held back the Communist tide but also advanced the cause of freedom," the author charges that "there is virtually no relationship between the pledges—and the serious charges—leveled in Jack Kennedy's campaign and what has happened since he took office."

The President's proposed legislative program has largely been stymied, he says, and "both Laos and Cuba have shown that (he) is strong on strong statements and weak on action."

Noting that candidate Kennedy spoke often of our missile gap, the reader is reminded that not long after the election Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara suddenly revealed that there was no missile gap.

Similarly, Kennedy charged time and again that U.S. prestige aboard had slipped.

Yet, the author says, after the U.S. fell flat on its face in Cuba, and talked big on Laos before begging ignominously for the right to surrender, Edward R. Murrow, brought in as head of the U.S. Information Agency to restore U.S. prestige aboard, reacted instantly to this collapse of our pres-

tige by announcing that his Department was eliminating prestige polls.

Candidate Kennedy on TV, October 7, 1960, said, "You cannot tell me that anyone who uses beans instead of meat in the United States, and there are 25 million of them according to Mr. Benson, is well fed or adequately fed."

But 6 months later, when the Agriculture Department awarded contracts to package 36 million pounds of pea beans for distribution to needy families, the administration explained they were being distributed "as part of the effort to expand and improve the quality of food for needy persons."

The food value of beans, the author observes, seems to depend on what administration is dispensing them.

But the author is worried less about exaggerated campaign charges than by the President's vacillation in foreign affairs. Today, he says, "there is a smell of appeasement in the Washington air."

Berlin, Cuba, and Laos are the main examples, he says, but others include our half-hearted opposition to a U.N. seat for Red China, our flirtations with Outer Mongolia (which was admitted to the U.N. in a "package deal" after the publication of the book), and our clearing the way for shipping "U.S. Government subsidized food into the Soviet Union and to her Eastern European satellites."

The book contains an excellent summary of the abortive Cuban invasion and contains an interesting reference to one William Wieland, former State Department Director of Middle American Affairs, whose name just last week figured in the charge by a newswoman that he was a security risk.

Kluckhohn says that Wieland had lived years in Cuba under his stepfather's name, Alberto Guillermo Montenegro.

What he does not say is that former Communist Nathaniel Weyl reveals in his book, "Red Star Over Cuba," namely, that during these years, Wieland (or Montenegro) belonged to the terrorist ABC organization.

But Kennedy the politician interests the author every bit as much as Kennedy the President.

The President's 14-year record in Congress, he says, "identifies him with high interest rates or low interest rates; with fixed price supports for farmers or flexible supports; with the Keynes theory of spending and budgetary orthodoxy; with protection and free trade; with bigger armaments and disarmament; with and against oil depletion allowances; with defending Matsu and Quemoy: and, finally, surrendering them."

And this same political schizophrenia—"the drama of a Hamlet, full of inner uncertainties, trying to play Caesar"—carries over into his position as President, the author says.

And it leaves in doubt the question of whether the buoyant, articulate young man from Massachusetts can measure up to the high responsibilities of his office, as the author believes he has not done so far.

Judicial Canons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, in reading a recent Massachusetts edition of the North Eastern Legal Reporter, I came across a very unusual and excellent article entitled "10 Commandments for the New Judge," by the Honorable Edward J. Devitt, chief judge of the U.S. District Court for the District of Minnesota, and it is so well done, so thought provoking, and such a fine summary of basic principles applicable to judicial service that I am prompted to incorporate it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The judicial canons formulated by this very able, distinguished chief judge of the U.S. District Court for the District of Minnesota are not only applicable to the high calling of judge, but could be pertinently extended to Members of Congress or other professional callings in our government, our business, and social structure.

Of course, these canons, being especially written for judges, could well be circulated throughout the judiciary and other professions as well, since they constitute a sort of humanizing code of conduct and attitude, and would bring obvious benefits.

Kindness, fairness, and charity are cardinal virtues, and if they could be applied to the relations between human beings the results would be most salutary.

I believe that Judge Devitt has made an epochal contribution to the elevation of ethics and good standards and I congratulate him upon his fine piece of work which I am sure will long continue to serve as a guide to many of our leaders of the bench and bar and the public service.

The article follows:

TEN COMMANDMENTS FOR THE NEW JUDGE

(By Hon. Edward J. Devitt)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The author, Edward J. Devitt, is chief judge of the U.S. District Court for the District of Minnesota. He is a member of the Committee on Court Administration of the Judicial Conference of the United States, and has frequently been called upon to address judicial conferences and seminars. Recent addresses by Judge Devitt have been on the Federal indeterminate sentence law and improvements in Federal sentencing procedures. Formerly a Member of the U.S. Congress, Judge Devitt served on the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives. In World War II he served in the Intelligence Corps of the U.S. Navy and was discharged with the rank of lieutenant commander. He was awarded the Purple Heart. Prior to his appointment to the U.S. district court his distinguished judicial service included judicial experience as a municipal judge and probate judge of Ramsey County, Minn. His experience at the bar included both private practice and service as an assistant attorney general for the State of Minnesota. Actively serving with community service organizations, Judge Devitt has been commended frequently for his many contributions to both the legal profession and to the community.)

The President of the United States is appointing 73 persons to new Federal judgeships, and with the filling of accumulated vacancies in present offices, we will soon have 104 new U.S. judges. This is the largest number of new appointments ever made by a President of the United States in a single term. It increases our judicial manpower by one-fourth. We need them and we welcome them.

For years the creation of additional judgeships has been urged upon the Congress by the American Bar Association, the Judicial Conference of the United States, the American Judicature Society, and many others. Now we have the new judgeships—even more than we asked for, in fact. No longer can we complain that the backlog of cases—6,200 pending in the district courts for more than 3 years, some 2,000 cases pending more than 5 years—is caused by insufficient manpower. It is our responsibility, new judges and old, to clean up the accumulation of pending cases and to maintain current dockets in every district of the United States so that equal justice for all will be insured by prompt justice to all.

With helpful purpose, I here suggest 10 commandments to guide the new Federal judge in his great responsibility. Although directed principally to the Federal judge, I hope that these observations also may be of assistance to all new judges, and be of interest to members of the bar.

FIRST COMMANDMENT: BE KIND

If we judges could possess but one attribute, it should be a kind and understanding heart. The bench is no place for a cruel or callous man regardless of his other qualities and abilities. There is no burden more onerous to the judge than the imposition of sentence in criminal cases. Would then that he had the wisdom of Solomon. But absent that, and possessing as he does the plenary and awesome power of the Federal magistrate, he can thank God for a kindly heart. An understanding heart was the gift of God asked by the ancient king, and it is that gift above all others for which a judge should pray.

SECOND COMMANDMENT: BE PATIENT

Patience is one of the cardinal virtues, and it should be one of the most important commandments for the judge. The Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain says, "There is much to be said for the view that a kindly and patient man who is not a profound lawyer will make a far better judge * * * than an ill-tempered genius,"[1]

One of my associates says that there are but three fundamental requisites for a good judge. First, he should have patience; second, he should have patience; and third, he should have patience.

We must constantly keep in mind the marked displeasure we felt as practicing lawyers for the judge who wouldn't hear us out. It may well be a waste of time for us to listen to extensive arguments on a point of law upon which we have already made up our mind. But we owe it to the lawyer to let him make his point. It may well be that he can change our mind—at least he is entitled to try.

Do you recall the irritation you felt toward the judge who stuck his nose in your lawsuit? How we all looked askance when he took over the questioning of our witnesses and led them down unwelcome paths, prematurely elicited answers to key questions, and completely disrupted our well-laid plans for the systematic presentation of our case. Minding our own business and permitting the lawyer to mind his is an essential corollary of patience.

The judge should be particularly patient with the young lawyer who comes to court for the first time. The reception we accord him will make a lasting impression, good or bad. We want it to be good.

THIRD COMMANDMENT: BE DIGNIFIED

I don't mean that you must go around with nose on high putting on airs; or that, upon assumption of office, you should change your whole manner of life and circle of friends; or that, with monk-like subjection, you withdraw from the world.

I only mean that you must possess an appreciation of the great prestige of the judicial office and of the respect which is accorded it and its occupant by the American public.

"To the people of his jurisdiction, the judge is the personal embodiment of our

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

American ideal of justice," according to Arch M. Cantrell, former chief counsel of the Internal Revenue Service. He goes on to say that: "People generally, and lawyers as well, want to look up to their judges. They want to admire and respect him for his ability as a judge and for the way he runs his court. The ideal of justice seems to be innate in every American, and part of his nature is to want to look up to, and respect, his court and his judge."[2]

Daniel Webster is quoted as saying that "* * * there is no character on earth more elevated and pure than that of a learned and upright judge and * * * he exerts an influence like the dews of heaven falling without observation."[3]

So long as he knows the public's regard for the judicial office, the conscientious judge will conduct himself fittingly.

FOURTH COMMANDMENT: DON'T TAKE YOURSELF TOO SERIOUSLY

The transition from bar to bench is a big one and making the change with equilibrium is not always the easiest task. We must keep our heads about us. Senior Circuit Judge Harold R. Medina says: "After all is said and done, we cannot deny the fact that a judge is almost of necessity surrounded by people who keep telling him what a wonderful fellow he is. And if he once begins to believe it, he is a lost soul."[4]

Some judges may become so impressed with their importance that they forget the practical facts of their judicial birth. It is a fact that most Federal judges are appointed through the influence or approval of U.S. Senators or other political officals.[5] This is not to detract from their qualifications, especially in recent years when the absence of objections from the American Bar Association is almost a prerequisite to appointment. In practical effect, judicial nominees must now be acceptable to the organized bar. This is a great step forward and the persistent work of the Federal Judiciary Committee of the American Bar Association is largely responsible for this meritorious state of affairs. I doubt if Federal judges ever will be appointed solely on the basis of merit. That would be the millenium. So long as the U.S. Senate has the constitutionally granted authority to "advise and consent" to such appointments, it is unlikely that some politics will not be involved in most of them. But as long as we get qualified Democrats during a Democratic administration and qualified Republicans during a Republican administration, we are doing about as well as can be expected.

But the truth remains that you were appointed to office because, personally or vicariously, you knew the U.S. Senator; and that, I emphasize, is not a sinful thing at all. The point is that it is distinctly unbecoming to later claim that you were chosen solely because of your outstanding ability as a lawyer and leader of the bar, and that you were reluctantly persuaded to give up your lucrative practice and were practically dragged up to the bench. That would be taking yourself too seriously.

The greatest deterrent to taking yourself too seriously in any respect is a wise and observing wife who periodically will say, "Don't get so judgey."

FIFTH COMMANDMENT: REMEMBER THAT A LAZY JUDGE IS A POOR ONE

The road to success on the bench is the same as in any other field of human endeavor. It must be characterized by hard work. Some people, and many lawyers, think that a judgeship is a sinecure—a form of retirement for the hard-working practitioner. That, of course, is not the case.

The truth is that you must learn to be a judge. It takes study and time. Things are completely different from this other side of the bench. In this country, we are coming to appreciate that which legal leaders of the civil law countries have recognized for a long time—that lawyers should be especially trained for the bench. That is why it is important that new judges be relatively young—preferably in their forties, I would say. Then they are young enough to learn the art of judging, and, after learning it, are able to contribute a substantial period of experienced service before reaching normal retirement age.

SIXTH COMMANDMENT: DON'T BE DISMAYED WHEN REVERSED

If you are appointed to the trial bench, the most shocking experience which awaits you is the opening of your morning mail to find the slip opinion of the appellate court in one of your cases, at the bottom of which you see the ominous word "Reversed." First you are shocked, later dismayed, then disappointed. Surely those judges couldn't have made such a mistake. But after you slowly read the opinion of your superiors, containing as it does logic and good reasoning, together with a tactfully included reference to the "learned trial judge's" proper handling of some aspects of the whole case, the experience loses its shock; and when it has happened a few times, you even come to the honest realization that in most instances the court of appeals is justified in reversing you.

Reversal by a superior court now and then keeps us on our toes. It teaches us to be careful and industrious; it curbs our impetuosity and nurtures judicial mindedness. Every so often, however, even these august appellate judges makes mistakes. Thinking they possess a superior wisdom, rather than just a superior commission, they sometimes exceed their error-finding responsibilities, and substitute their judgment and findings for those of the trial court. The law says they can't do this; but they do. We should view their folly with tolerance. Really, there is nothing else we can do.

Here is a word of advice about reversals. Don't keep track of them. The judge who charts a batting average as to his percentage in the court of appeals is likely to become a hesitant and timid judge in the future. Such record-keeping may make him too cautious—so sensitive to committing error that it deprives him of the intellectual courage which should be the hallmark of a good trial judge.

SEVENTH COMMANDMENT: REMEMBER THERE ARE NO UNIMPORTANT CASES

This is another way of saying that you must give the same conscientious attention to every matter that comes before you. We may think cases can be classed as important and unimportant, but the litigants do not feel that way. Their case is very important to them, and it must be to us.

We must not let ennui overcome us. The work of a judge is too important and the results of his action too far reaching. "The judge who becomes accustomed to rendering justice is like the priest who becomes accustomed to saying mass," says Piero Calamandrei, the late Italian lawyer and scholar, whose writings have gained such an appreciative American audience in recent years. He goes on to say that "fortunate indeed is that country priest who, approaching the altar with senile step, feels the same sacred turbulation in his breast which he felt as a young priest at his first mass. And happy is that magistrate who even unto the day of his retirement experiences the same religious exaltation in rendering judgment which made him tremble 50 years before, when as a young praetor he handed down his first decision."[6]

I have come to have a great regard for the importance of this commandment after observing one of my judicial colleagues. He is a veteran of 30 years on the Federal bench, and he gives today the same meticulous care and attention to every case and to every criminal sentencing that he did when he first ascended the bench. I need not add that such a judge has earned, and possesses, the highest judicial reputation.

EIGHTH COMMANDMENT: DON'T IMPOSE LONG SENTENCES

A short sentence will most likely accomplish the same objective. It is primarily the fact of incarceration, not the length of it, which best serves the ends of justice. Long sentences may well overpunish a man and so embitter and discourage him that he loses his desire for rehabilitation.

If you are debating between the wisdom of imposing a prison sentence or placing the defendant on probation, then use probation. There is at least some chance it will work, and if it doesn't, you can quickly revoke it.

Do not seek or encourage a reputation as a "tough judge" or as an "easy" one. Just decide each case on its merits and impose the sentence which your best judgment dictates; then the pattern of your actions will shape the reputation which you properly deserve.

The unjustified disparity in sentences imposed upon different persons for the same class of offense is a glaring weakness in the administration of our Federal criminal system. Disparity can be best minimized or obviated by the general use of the new Federal indeterminate sentencing law by all judges.[7]

This wise law permits the judge to delegate to the board of parole the fixing of the exact termination date of Federal criminal sentences, depending upon the prisoner's progress in rehabilitation. In such matters the hindsight of the parole board is better than the foresight of the sentencing judge.

Some judges mistakenly believe that using this new tool constitutes an abdication of their traditional judicial responsibility. But this is not the case.[8] Most of the States have long had similar laws. It is the modern way to provide for individualized justice. Every new judge is urged to employ the indeterminate-sentence principle in every case where it is applicable.

NINTH COMMANDMENT: DON'T FORGET YOUR COMMONSENSE

It may be that in the first blush of assuming the duties of a Federal judge you will be so engrossed with conflicting statutes, inconsistent decisions, and all kinds of Government rules and regulations, that you will forget all about using one of the principal tools of a good judge, and that is common sense. Really, there is no substitute for it, with all respect to the West Publishing Co. and the splendid lawbooks it publishes. It has been said that "The law is commonsense as modified by the legislature."

"A judge will never go far wrong," said the now deceased Chief Justice Udall of the Arizona Supreme Court, "if he applies this test: Does my proposed action square with good, commonsense?"[9]

You might be able to get by as a judge if you don't know much law, but you just can't make it without commonsense.

TENTH COMMANDMENT: PRAY FOR DIVINE GUIDANCE

If you believe in a Supreme Being, you should pray to Him for guidance. Judges need that help more than anybody else.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] The Right Honorable Viscount Kilmuir of Creich, "Judicial Qualities," 36 New Zealand Law Journal, 112, 114 (1960).

[2] Cantrell, "The Judge as a Leader: The Embodiment of the Ideal of Justice," 45 ABAJ, 339 (April 1959).

[3] As quoted during a memorial service for Justice Marcus Perrin Knowlton in a session of the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts on Mar. 22, 1919, as reported in 231 Mass. 625.

[4] Medina, "Some Reflections on the Judicial Function: A Personal Viewpoint," 39 ABAJ, 107, 108.

[5] For some interesting background on Federal judicial appointments during part of the Truman and Eisenhower administrations, see Miller, "The Selection of the Federal Judiciary," 45 ABAJ, 445.

[6] Piero Calamandrei, "Eulogy of Judges," p. 72, Princeton University Press, 1946.

[7] Public Law 85-752, 72 Stat. 845, 18 U.S.C.A., sec. 4208(a).

[8] Devitt, "Improvements in Federal Sentencing Procedure," 24 F.R.D. 147.

[9] Udall, "The Essential Characteristics of a Judge," Journal of the American Judicature Society, October 1957, p. 69.

Politics: Whose Business?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1962

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the subject of the businessman in politics has received considerable attention recently. Many speakers have made it appear that all businessmen are qualified to enter politics, that indeed all our troubles would be solved if all businessmen became active in politics. In a recent address Robert D. Lilley, vice president of the Western Electric Co., whose office is in my congressional district, put this matter into perspective. He sets forth the thesis that only unusually qualified men, whether their background is business or otherwise, should enter politics today. In the conviction that a consensus will be evolved only when a variety of views on important subjects—and certainly the subject of the qualifications we should expect from men in public life is important—I believe this address should be brought to the attention of Members of Congress and, under unanimous consent, I include it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

POLITICS: WHOSE BUSINESS?

(By R. D. Lilley)

The question posed in the title of my talk tonight was not intended as a rhetorical question. As you are aware, speeches by corporation executives advising their colleagues to enter politics have become quite commonplace recently. Businessmen are fond of warning each other that unless they enter the political arena they will be overwhelmed by the drift to socialism and the growth of big government. Now I have given some thought to this problem, and I don't think the answer is quite so simple as that commonly suggested. In fact, I will be bold enough to say that despite this national campaign to draw businessmen into politics, despite this campaign, I repeat, all businessmen should not go into politics. There are many businessmen who lack the proper qualifications for the political career or who have no proper role to play in politics.

If I may, I'd like to explain this position. Although I may regret it as much as anyone else in this room, I feel that big government is here to stay. I feel this though I know it is popular to complain about big government and to demand, at least by implication, the return of a small, simplified governmental structure. To be quite realistic, this complaint is voiced by each succeeding generation. The fact is that our government has grown as our Nation has grown and as our society has become more complex. Whether we like it or not, I think we should recognize that small government has become a fond memory much the same as farming with a bull tongue plow or stacking hay in the field to be cured. We are only deluding ourselves when we look to the return of the pattern of yesteryear's government. We are deluding ourselves—and losing the respect of those men actively engaged in government. They know, even if we refuse to recognize, that even if it somehow were possible to curtail all those functions of government about which there is some legitimate philosophical question our government still would be large. A vast governmental opration would be needed to administer only our national defense program, even if all other functions were stripped away.

Yet, even though we're aware of this, we businessmen tend habitually to perpetuate the myth about the need for dismantling our huge governmental operation. We do so even though we are aware of the experience of some of our most respected colleagues who have served in the Government—businessmen who served in previous administrations, who entered Government fired with determination to reduce the budget and then had to plead for increased appropriations because they learned the size of their operation could not be reduced if it was to perform the job required of it.

Government today is big because it must be big. It must be big so it can govern the extremely complex industrial society we businessmen have created. It must be big so it can handle the functions we as citizens demand of it. I do not wish to leave the impression that I favor big government. I feel we should work unceasingly to make sure it fulfills the needs of our society. We should be on the alert continually for opportunities to reduce its size, to make sure that every function of government is scrutinized constantly and eliminated as soon as it no longer serves its purpose—even though it involves an agency which helps our particular business, or is a source of income to us. But I repeat that we must recognize the need for big government today and stop whining about it.

To cope with the big Government of ours does not require all businessmen to enter politics. Rather, what we really need in my estimation is only big businessmen in politics. I hasten to add that I don't mean big in the sense of someone associated with a big company or big in the hierarchy of his company. I mean a businessman big in his personal conception of his responsibility to society as well as to his employer.

My thesis, in other words, is that big government imposes the demand that businessmen mature and grow in knowledge and spirit. Such growth is essential if businessmen are going to undertake the very necessary assignment of making sure that our mammoth Federal Government remains responsive to the needs of the governed.

Thus far I have been discussing big men in the abstract. Now it's time to define the type of big businessman who, in my terms, is competent to engage in politics. I conceive of him as a man who is aware of the exceedingly complex forces operating in our world today, who understands, for instance, the rate at which our world is changing. All too few of us understand the scientific revolution now in progress. Alan T. Waterman, Director of the National Science Foundation, recently called attention to "the rate of acceleration in the direction of scientific and technological progress." As a result of this acceleration, it is estimated that our knowledge presently is doubling every 10 years. We businessmen are familiar—or should be—with the technological advances pouring from our laboratories, but too few of us have stopped to relate this phenomenon to the implications this has for the world at large.

C. P. Snow, the eminent British scientist-turned-novelist, has said that "during all human history until this century, the rate of social change has been very slow. So slow, that it would pass unnoticed in one person's lifetime. That is no longer so," he continued. "The rate of change has increased so much that our imagination can't keep up. There is bound to be more social change, affecting more people, in the next decade than in any before. There is bound to be more change, again, in the 1970's."

This accelerating rate of change must be understood by the big man I have envisioned because it is revolutionizing the entire world.

The big man to whom I refer must have a grasp of such developments as the European Common Market, with its enormous implications for the economy of the United States. Few matters in this century have been so important, and few have been less understood. The European Common Market is producing a major economic challenge to the United States. It may hurt some of us temporarily; it will force us all to be more competitive. But ultimately it will serve the welfare of the Western World and of the United States. In time it may yield a political entity equal in stature to that of the United States or the Soviet Union. The relationships we form with it now may influence the course of history. Yet how many of us understand the Common Market? Such an understanding is the possession of that big businessman we need in our Government.

This big man must be able to penetrate some of the prevailing myths of our time—the myth, for instance, of the venal politician who while clapping us on the shoulder with one hand has his other in our pocket and who uses his position to enrich himself. This myth of the corrupt politician has been incorporated in our literature—in novels, in the theater, even in the comic strip. But I submit that in large measure this myth is obsolete today.

The fact is that a new generation of politicians is arising, the majority of them competent and highly motivated. Let me say here that regrettably the old type of politicians still can be found in prominent places. But he and his ilk are on the decline. My claim can be substantiated, I believe, by the fact that in municipalities with populations of 10,000 or more in this country the most popular form of government is the council-manager system, which tends to minimize political agility in favor of administrative competence. As further proof, I cite the spread of the merit system, which places emphasis on competence and professional qualifications among appointive officials. I cite the men in government who work 12, 14, even 16 hours a day as they cope with the plethora of responsibilities assigned to them.

The big man I have projected must be familiar with our contemporary politicians, and be able to speak their language. He must be aware not of the differences that separate them, but of the common interests they share. He must understand that politicians, like businessmen, are interested in a prosperous nation and a peaceful world.

In addition, he must have a deep understanding of the term capitalism. Most of us discuss contemporary capitalism as if it were a stable, unchanging system, without a dynamism of its own. Yet the reality is far different. I would venture the guess that when the history of this century is finally written, the capitalist revolution will be judged to have been far more important

than the Communist revolution. Contemporary capitalism has changed the face of this country, has reduced poverty in the United States to minimal proportions. And what it has achieved domestically it can do on the international scene as well. Yet today's capitalism is not the same as it was in the twenties, in the teens, or in the 19th century.

But it is not my purpose to dwell on these distinctions tonight. Rather, I want to direct attention to the myth in which so many of us in business and among the public at large subscribe.

Characteristically, the big businessmen who have a role to play in government, in politics, will have an understanding of the world in which we live, a comprehension of the forces shaping it, and an ability to perceive reality. Though extremely competent and authoritative they will be big enough to be humble.

What may we expect from such men? I submit that the emergence of such men in the political life of our communities will produce increased esteem for all businessmen—the type of esteem we do not commonly receive today. Such men will have a profound respect for our form of government, and will strive to make sure that our Government, however massive it may be, remains responsive to the needs and wishes of the people. Such men also will serve to elevate the standards that we as a nation impose on those among us who seek elective office.

In addition, men of the kind I have tried to describe will have the ability to cope with the many complex problems facing us today. They will be sensitive to the many implications that international developments hold for our businesses, even the most modest of them tucked away in our smallest communities. They will grasp the importance of even the problems of our home communities; by tackling and meeting the local and State problems they encounter, they will be setting up a counterbalance to the forces that tend to focus all governmental power in Washington, that tend to magnify the size and increase the complexity of our Federal Government.

Moreover, they will help us, as a Nation, develop an expanded interest in and an increased respect for our Federal Government as well for those working in it and elected to it. An expansion of our interest in and our respect for our Government is a vital necessity to day because we shall be unable to cope with our problems if we allow ourselves to become neurotically frightened and suspicious of our Government. Jean Monnet, a founder of the Atlantic Community, has said, "We cannot build our future if we are obsessed with fear of Russia. Let us build our own strength and health not against anyone, but for ourselves so that we will become so strong that no one will dare attack us, and so progressive and prosperous that we set a model for all other people, indeed for the Russians themselves." Men with the stature I have tried to describe will help us meet this mission.

Having said all this, let me make it emphatically clear that I endorse the action course in practical politics offered by the Foremen's Club of Columbus and the democracy in action program sponsored by my company. They have a great value and all of us could profit by taking them. Whether or not all businessmen are qualified to enter politics, all of us are obliged to be effective citizens. Our effectiveness as citizens will be enhanced as we gain an increased understanding of our political structure. These courses offer us that increased understanding. They have an additional function as well. They serve as a training ground for the businessman of stature I have tried to project tonight. Such men do not emerge full blown. They develop gradually; they must be trained by courses such as these. We should seek out men of this potential stature while they are young, we should nurture them and train them for the roles that hopefully they will play in our public life.

Our Nation needs "big" men today, whether they come from the professions, from our schools and colleges, or from the business community. To suggest that everyone is qualified to serve in our Government is to minimize the importance of our Government. I do not think that in calling for increased political participation we mean that. Our Government is of crucial importance to all of us because it is so big and because its mission—the welfare of the free world, indeed, of mankind—is so momentous. To manage our Government for the welfare of all of us, we need a knowledgeable citizenry and men of great stature to lead us through the complex times and the enormous challenges that lay ahead.

Thank you.

Columnists Points Out One Probable Result of President's Trades and Tariffs Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following column written by David Lawrence in the Washington Evening Star on the President's trades and tariffs bill deserve careful consideration by all Members of Congress:

MOVE TO WEAKEN SUPREME COURT

(By David Lawrence)

The Kennedy administration has just made an attempt to weaken the Supreme Court of the United States, which might not have been surprising if it had come from the John Birchers or other so-called extremists.

In a bill written by some of the top advisers of the President, and introduced in Congress, the administration demands that Congress strip the Supreme Court of any power to review the proposed law governing tariff changes and duties and relations with the Common Market in Europe.

Rarely in American history has there been any significant move to get Congress to limit the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States. In 1868, Congress did take away from the Supreme Court appellate jurisdiction under the Habeas Corpus Act of 1867 in an effort to prevent the Court from passing on the constitutionality of reconstruction laws. Shortly thereafter, in a famous case, the Court itself affirmed the right of Congress to make "exceptions" to its appellate jurisdiction.

Today, the power sought by the Kennedy administration is very sweeping, indeed, as it calls for an abolition of the right of any citizen to question the acts of the President in the complex and far-reaching field of tariffs and customs duties which he could impose or remove at will.

Under the proposed law, the President would be authorized to make a variety of determinations on reduction or elimination of duties, on adjustment assistance, extraordinary relief and other matters covered by the terms of the act. Section 404 then says that all these determinations by the President or by any administering agency "shall be final and conclusive and shall not be subject to review by any court."

It has not been revealed just what the framers of the proposed law are afraid of and just why they would deprive the citizen of relief if he is being discriminated against in Government action or if his constitutional rights are being violated. What the proposed section means is that, no matter what the Constitution says about "due process of law," there is no way that an injured citizen can petition a Federal court for the redress of any wrong done him by the Government in a tariff or foreign-trade transaction.

No more sweeping attack on constitutional rights has arisen in recent years. Incidentally, the provision in the bill denying court review would in itself be constitutional if enacted, because article III of the Constitution says:

"In all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, and those to which a State shall be party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. In all other cases before mentioned, the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions, and under such regulations as the Congress shall make."

These "exceptions" enacted by Congress could cover any legislation affecting the rights of individual citizens. Certainly, if the Supreme Court is deprived by law of the right to hear a case, and, indeed, if every lower court is ordered to refuse to hear any petition, a wrong done by an arbitrary act of an executive agency of the Government cannot be corrected through the courts.

Everyone knows that the President himself isn't going to administer the new tariff law, with its multifarious provisions, and that subordinate officials will carry on this work during the 3 or 5 years that Congress may set as the period to be covered. So it really means that Congress will have delegated to the "administering agencies" supreme authority over thousands of businesses and the jobs of their employes, and there will be no means through the courts of achieving justice if the law is improperly administered by the executive.

There is a good deal of mystery as to who wrote the draft of the proposed law, which is called H.R. 9900, and particularly the provision known as section 404. But it is known that Undersecretary of State George W. Ball, a New York lawyer, was at the head of the task force that worked on the whole problem before the bill was transmitted to the House Ways and Means Committee with the request that it be introduced and presented as an administration measure. It may be that in the report filed by Mr. Ball and his associates with the President, analyzing the tariff situation and the need for supreme powers by the President, some reasons were given for depriving the courts of all power to review any action taken under this proposed law. But Mr. Ball's report has never been made public.

Again and again in recent hearings, questions have been asked by members of the House Ways and Means Committee as to who drafted or sponsored the bill's provisions, but the answers have been hazy, or the witnesses have insisted they didn't know.

It seems incredible that an administration which professes to be interested in civil rights would go on record as taking away the rights of millions of citizens to petition Federal courts for relief from injustices which they claim would affect their livelihood. It seems incredible, too, that Congress would ever enact such a law. If it does get through, this would certainly indicate a lack of confidence in our Federal courts or a fear of their impartial decisions.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday, March 25, is the 44th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. This nation, populated by one of the oldest Slavic peoples, remained free and independent for a short 3-year period before it was overrun by the trampling boots of the Soviet Red Army in 1921.

We in the free world should never permit these brave, albeit enslaved, people to think that their plight has been forgotten. Especially at this time of the year, when the Byelorussian counterpart to our July Fourth approaches, it is important that we take time out to note this event.

Ever since 1918 when the Byelorussians became an independent nation following the collapse of czarist domination, the tiny nation has been riding a politically rocky road. Its short-lived independence ended with a Soviet promise of greater things, but what developed was more than four decades of oppression, degradation, and complete denial of self-determination.

Mr. Speaker, as we look briefly at the history of these valiant people, we in the U.S. Congress should take this opportunity to hope and pray that someday—we hope soon—Byelorussia can once again join with other nations of the world as a free and independent member.

As far back as 1914, V. I. Lenin, founder of modern international communism, held out to subject peoples the promise to uphold "the full right to self-determination of all nations." This line has been followed by his Red disciples who have viewed the aspirations of racial and national groups as convenient tinder for lighting the fires of international revolution—but not as factors to be considered in the treatment by the Soviet Government of the peoples under its own domination.

If the Byelorussian people were given the right of self-determination proclaimed by Lenin, I wonder if they would elect to stay within the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics? There is much evidence indicating that they would not.

The Soviet Republic of Byelorussia is inhabited by some 10 million White Russians, different in many respects from their compatriots in other parts of the Soviet Union. The central government has sought by every means to wipe out the differences in language, culture, and tradition which distinguish these peoples from their fellow citizens.

The Soviet Government argued in 1945 that all the Soviet republics should have seats in the United Nations General Assembly. It succeeded in obtaining seats for both the Ukraine and Byelorussia. If they, themselves maintain that Beylorussia is a truly independent, sovereign state—and this is the criterion for a seat in the U.N. General Assembly—then they should allow Byelorussia to be independent. If Byelorussia is not sovereign and independent—and we all know that it is not—then it should not have a seat in the U.N. General Assembly.

We can hope that the self-determination of peoples will some day become a universal reality—in the Soviet Empire as well as in other parts of the world.

Denial of the Right To Petition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, David Lawrence, in yesterday's New York Herald Tribune, discussed a section of H.R. 9900, the President's trade proposal, which will have a sweeping effect upon the constitutional right of any citizen to question the acts of the President:

ATTEMPT SEEN IN TRADE LAW TO WEAKEN SUPREME COURT

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—The Kennedy administration has just made an attempt to weaken the Supreme Court of the United States which might not have been surprising if it had come from the John Birchers or other so-called extremists.

In a bill written by some of the top advisers to the President, and introduced in Congress, the administration demands that Congress strip the Supreme Court of any power to review the proposed law governing tariff changes and duties and relations with the Common Market in Europe.

Rarely in American history has there been any significant move to get Congress to limit the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States. In 1868, Congress did take away from the Supreme Court appellate jurisdiction under the Habeas Corpus Act of 1867 in an effort to prevent the Court from passing on the constitutionality of Reconstruction laws. Shortly thereafter, in a famous case the Court itself affirmed the right of Congress to make exceptions to its appellate jurisdiction.

Today, the power sought by the Kennedy administration is very sweeping indeed, as it calls for an abolition of the right of any citizen to question the acts of the President in the complex and far-reaching field of tariffs and customs duties which he could impose or remove at will.

NOT SUBJECT TO REVIEW

Under the proposed law, the President would be authorized to make a variety of determinations on reduction or elimination of duties, on adjustment assistance, extraordinary relief, and other matters covered by the terms of the act. Section 404 then says that all these determinations by the President or by any administering agency "shall be final and conclusive and shall not be subject to review by any court."

It has not been revealed just what the framers of the proposed law are afraid of and just why they would deprive the citizen of relief if he is being discriminated against in Government action or if his constitutional rights are being violated. What the proposed section means is that, no matter what the Constitution says about due process of law, there is no way that an injured citizen can petition a Federal court for the redress of any wrong done him by the Government in a tariff or foreign-trade transaction.

No more sweeping attack on constitutional rights has arisen in recent years. Incidentally, the provision in the bill denying court review would in itself be constitutional if enacted, because article III of the Constitution says:

"In all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, and those to which a State shall be party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. In all other cases before mentioned, the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions, and under such regulations as the Congress shall make."

These exceptions enacted by Congress could cover any legislation affecting the rights of individual citizens. Certainly if the Supreme Court is deprived by law of the right to hear a case, and, indeed, if every lower court is ordered to refuse to hear any petition, a wrong done by an arbitrary act of an executive agency of the Government cannot be corrected through the courts.

Everyone knows that the President himself isn't going to administer the new tariff law, with its multifarious provisions, and that subordinate officials will carry on this work during the 3 or 5 years that Congress may set as the period to be covered. So it really means that Congress will have delegated to the administering agencies supreme authority over thousands of businesses and the jobs of their employees, and there will be no means through the courts of achieving justice if the law is improperly administered by the Executive.

There is a good deal of mystery as to who wrote the draft of the proposed law, which is called H.R. 9900, and particularly the provision known as section 404. But it is known that Under Secretary of State George W. Ball, a New York lawyer, was at the head of the task force that worked on the whole problem before the bill was transmitted to the House Ways and Means Committee with the request that it be introduced and presented as an administration measure. It may be that in the report filed by Mr. Ball and his associates with the President, analyzing the tariff situation and the need for supreme powers by the President, some reasons were given for depriving the courts of all power to review any action taken under this proposed law. But Mr. Ball's report has never been made public.

Again and again in recent hearings, questions have been asked by members of the House Ways and Means Committee as to who drafted or sponsored the bill's provisions, but the answers have been hazy or the witnesses have insisted they didn't know.

It seems incredible that an administration which professes to be interested in civil rights would go on record as taking away the rights of millions of citizens to petition Federal courts for relief from injustices which they claim would affect their livelihood. It seems incredible, too, that Congress would ever enact such a law. If it does get through, this would certainly indicate a lack of confidence in our Federal courts or a fear of their impartial decisions.

The Conquer Uterine Cancer Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address which I delivered to the

Rhode Island Federation of Women's Club, at Providence, R.I., on December 7, 1961:

THE CONQUER UTERINE CANCER PROGRAM

It is a real pleasure for me to have been asked to address you on this occasion, on the anniversary of Pearl Harbor Day because I believe there is some significance in the campaign you have undertaken which coincides with the singlemindedness of the American people in the task of overcoming our adversary after that sneak attack. This same spirit I find in your expressed desire to face an enemy far more formidable than the one that was faced and defeated after Pearl Harbor. The lives of American women are at stake. Your task is to prevent these deaths by education and persuasion.

The partnership between the General Federation of Women's Clubs and the American Cancer Society in the promotion of health education spans the entire modern era of cancer research and control. That era began in 1937 with the adoption of the National Cancer Institute Act and the launching of the society's first nationwide educational campaign. It was from this partnership that the Women's Field Army emerged to provide a continuous program of education, to dispel ignorance and mystery, and bring about the control of cancer. Because of your efforts to promote the early detection of cancer of the uterus, you are credited with being a major factor in the 50-percent decrease in the death rate from that disease between 1936 and 1959 in spite of a steady rise in the national death rate for cancer as a whole. Much more remains to be done, however, for the sheer magnitude of the problem staggers the imagination.

Since 1945, this dread disease has taken the lives of well over 3½ million Americans, nearly 10 times as many as were lost during World War II. And each year, without respite and without mercy, it tags another quarter of a million human victims for destruction. Nevertheless, the campaign we have waged for so long a period against this disease is beginning to achieve results.

Although cancer today continues to be the second leading cause of death, there has been a steady increase over the past 25 years in the proportion of patients who survive 5 years or longer without evidence of disease. These are the people who may be regarded as cured. A study of this trend which the National Cancer Institute made in cooperation with the Connecticut State Health Department several years ago led to the conclusion that the credit goes mostly to better treatment, although early detection is, of course, extremely important. These improvements have been made not only in surgery and radiation, but also in the new field of drug treatment, or chemotherapy.

The discovery that viruses cause cancer in animals was more over 50 years ago. During more recent years research in this field has shown that many different kinds of cancer in animals are caused by viruses. This has led scientists to assume that it is probably only a matter of time until it can be demonstrated that at least some forms of cancer in man are likewise caused by viruses. Some scientists are strongly of the opinion that now is the time to advance research in this field with vigor, and many investigators are currently engaged in studying human cancers with the methods already so successfully used in work with animals.

In this connection I can say with confidence that we are getting very close to scientific proof that leukemia in human beings is a virus-caused disease. Very recently two investigators at the National Cancer Institute reported that they had extracted viruses from the blood of leukemic rats. When injected into other rats, these viruses caused leukemia sooner and in a higher percentage of animals than viruses recovered from other tissues. The scientists are now using the same technique to see if they can find viruses in the blood of human leukemia victims. If they do, it will be one of the most important findings in the entire history of cancer research.

The implications of studying viruses in relation to human cancer are, I am told, very broad. For one thing, these investigations will greatly help medical science to understand the whole problem of the cause of cancer. For another thing, they are likely to lead to the prevention of at least some types of human cancer through some kind of immunization. In fact, some of the immunization methods recently developed have already made it possible to prevent some tumors in animals.

Research has given us some of the necessary weapons for our arsenal in the battle against cancer. A few of these weapons are imperfect as yet, and only serve to stun the enemy temporarily and postpone the ultimate fate of his victims. Other weapons, however, are potentially able to provide almost total victory against certain forms of the disease.

One such weapon is the "pap" smear. This is an examination, through the microscope, of fluid taken from the body, for the detection of cancer cells among the cells shed naturally by the uterus, or womb. The observance of abnormal cells warns the doctor that cancer may be present. Although cytologic examination cannot be used for the detection of cancer in general, it is the most powerful and most perfect weapon yet developed for conquering uterine cancer which takes the lives of 14,000 American women a year.

The "pap" smear, developed by Dr. George N. Papanicolaou who received generous support for his work from the American Cancer Society, can detect uterine cancer months, and even years, before ordinary symptoms appear. The significance of this lies in the fact that cervical cancer in this preinvasive stage is practically 100 percent curable.

Widespread availability of the "pap" smear test is due largely to the fact that National Cancer Institute scientists spent many years of research to demonstrate its reliability as a practical means of detecting early uterine cancer. This research began with the establishment of a study at Hot Springs, Ark., to evaluate the technique as an aid to diagnosis. In 1951 the project was moved to Memphis, Tenn., to learn whether the method was practical as a case-finding procedure in large populations.

Shortly thereafter, research projects were established in 10 other cities throughout the country, some of them administered directly by the Institute and others operated through grants to universities and medical schools. In each of these situations, the Institute cooperated directly with local health and medical groups and with individual physicians and pathologists.

Results of the Memphis project were fully satisfactory, from the standpoints both of public cooperation and the results obtained from the test. Among the first 108,000 women given the test there were some 800 cases of cancer detected and subsequently diagnosed microscopically. About half of these proved to be intraepithelial carcinoma in situ which has a cure rate approaching 100 percent, and fully 90 percent of them were totally unsuspected. The other 400 cases were invasive cancers in different stages, 30 percent of which were also unsuspected.

About a year later, 33,000 of these 108,000 women received a second cytologic examination. In this group another 83 cases of cancer were detected, of which 72 were preinvasive and 11 invasive. Thus, in terms of rate per thousand, there was a slight decrease for preinvasive cancer, from 3.6 detected on the first examination to 2.2 on the second examination. For invasive cancer, however, there was a sharp drop, from 3.4 on the first examination to 0.3 on the second. In other words, the invasive cancer rate on the second screening was only one-tenth as high as on the first screening.

The National Cancer Institute's vigorous research program in this area has also been aimed at investigating other promising applications of the cytologic technique. For example, Institute scientists, together with the scientists of cooperating non-Government institutions, have been studying the possibility of employing cell examination to detect cancer in other parts of the body such as the lung, the stomach, the large intestine and the urinary tract. In these studies, one of the most promising leads at the present time appears to be from examination of the urine for cells that might indicate the presence of cancer of the bladder.

I have also been informed that one group of Institute scientists has discovered a technique for preparing human whole blood so that it can be examined for cancer cells. The technique appears to promise the possibility for detecting certain kinds of cancer which eluded discovery by other means. It may also be valuable for followups after a cancer operation to reveal whether metastasis, or the spread of cancer to other parts of the body, has occurred.

Methods of enlisting the cooperation of the medical and health professions, and winning public acceptance of the idea, were pursued along with research on the technique itself. Both the American Cancer Society and the Public Health Service have been working hard—and are still working—to introduce the "pap" smear technique in communities throughout the country. Your efforts in this campaign are a part of this whole effort which has been advanced to the point where more than 5 million women are expected to receive the examination this year. But the job is by no means finished. It has hardly gotten a good start.

The happy history of cooperation that has marked the relationship between the American Cancer Society and the General Federation of Women's Clubs made it logical that this partnership should be the instrument chosen to conduct a nationwide drive against uterine cancer. The program was officially launched on April 10 at a reception held at the Federation headquarters in Washington, D.C. On this occasion stimulating addresses were made by Mrs. Ozbirn and the ranking officers of the American Cancer Society. The effort got off to a solid start.

The new conquer uterine cancer program constitutes an extension of the Society's basic 10-point cytology program which was launched some 3 years ago. Since then, in close cooperation with the medical profession, great progress has been made in encourage "pap" smears as part of regular checkups for women. Medical cooperation has also insured a suitable balance between medical resources and laboratory facilities and the increasing demands made upon them as the result of the program.

The main objective of the uterine cancer program is, of course, to induce more women to have "pap" smears regularly. A survey made for the society by the Gallup organization showed that 40 percent of the adult female population—some 23 million women—still did not know about this lifesaving examination. Of women 65 and over—a group that accounts for 20 percent of new cases and 41 percent of the deaths each year—only 31 percent have even heard of the examination, as compared to 71 percent of women aged 35 to 50. This situation would seem particularly pertinent to the suggestion by Dr. John W. Cline, immediate past president of the American Cancer Society, that such federated club member try to persuade another woman,

preferably a nonmember, to have a physical and a "pap" smear.

The conquer uterine cancer program with the General Federation of Women's Clubs is regarded as a 1-year pilot phase of a continuing program to be expanded and extended in future years with other women's groups, and with women not in clubs. A distinguishing feature of the pilot program is that it introduces an element of incentive or even competition on a broad scale in an organized way. For federated clubs, the goal or incentive is to have all or as many members as possible go for a "pap" smear and checkup within the period of a year—as the first step toward a lifelong habit. Clubs with outstanding participation by members will receive certificates of award from the American Cancer Society.

I would like to point out that the coming year is a most appropriate time to bear down on your efforts in this life-saving campaign. Nineteen hundred and sixty-two will mark the 25th annivesary of one of the most important pieces of legislation ever enacted by the Congress. I have reference, of course, to the National Cancer Institute Act of 1937, which was signed into law by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on August 5 of that year.

Several months ago I suggested in a public address that steps be taken, both within and outside the Government, to observe this anniversary in an appropriate manner. I suggested that due note be taken of the progress made against cancer during this quarter-century, and of the task remaining before us for the conquest of this dread disease. I urged that we rededicate ourselves to the furtherance of this unfinished task by all possible means.

I am happy to say that the National Cancer Institute and the American Cancer Society, are cooperating to arrange a number of activities by which 1962 will be observed as cancer progress year. These activities are designed to encourage the scientific community in its research efforts, to give the public complete information about progress against cancer and the problems still to be resolved, and to emphasize the importance of each individual's participation in the total effort for the control of cancer.

The significance of Cancer Progress Year, and of the role of the American Cancer Society and the National Cancer Institute in promoting its observance, is recognized in a proposed joint resolution which I had the pleasure of introducing in the House of Representatives in the closing days of the last session. The House readily adopted the resolution, which requests the President to issue proclamations inviting the participation of the people of the United States, Government and private agencies, and all media of communication, in this important cancer information and education effort. This resolution will be introduced in the Senate when the new congressional session begins in January, and I am certain that it will be adopted as an expression of the continued support in the Congress of this vital movement.

My purpose in mentioning Cancer Progress Year is twofold: First, I want to call your attention to the magnitude and importance of the contribution to medical research, and to the health and welfare of the people of this Nation and the world over, which was made by the Congress in adopting the National Cancer Institute Act of 1937. This legislation, which inaugurated the modern era of medical research, is indeed a milestone on the highroad of human progress. Second, I wish to emphasize the urgency of the challenge that still confronts us for the ultimate conquest of cancer.

As we approach the anniversary of this important act, I hope that the American people fully appreciate the wisdom and foresight shown by the Congress in establishing the National Cancer Institute in the late thirties. It was around that time that infectious diseases were being brought under better control and it was becoming obvious that the chronic and degenerative diseases were going to be the big problem of the future. Even in 1937 heart and circulatory diseases were the leading cause of death in this country, and it was only a year later that cancer moved into second place ahead of influenza and pneumonia. From then on, with the aid of sulfa drugs and later the antibiotics, deaths from infectious diseases steadily declined, and the proportion of our population liable to the threat of chronic diseases in later life began to grow.

The National Cancer Institute was the first unit of our medical research center at the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, Md. It was therefore the nucleus of a whole new concept of responsibility for the conduct and support of medical research on a scale far beyond the resources of private philanthropy or commercial enterprise. These activities include not only research itself, but also the construction and equipping of laboratory buildings and hospitals, the training of scientists, and the development of public health programs for the control of our major killing and crippling diseases.

In taking special note, then, of the anniversary of the National Cancer Institute Act of 1937, we are really recognizing the inauguration of a whole new approach to medical research. As this new pattern has developed over the years, it has mobilized research manpower and facilities throughout this country, and even abroad, for the most thorough and comprehensive attack ever made on the diseases that afflict mankind.

Those who work professionally in the cancer field are confident that the knowledge we possess today, if fully applied to the control of cancer, could quickly improve the ratio of lives saved from 1 in 3 to 1 in 2. But the point here is that right now, the best we can possibly do is to save only half of the people who get cancer, and I am sure we all agree that that is not enough.

What about the other half? What is going to be their fate? The answer can come only from continued research and prompt application of new knowledge gained through research.

In the cell examination test for uterine cancer—the "pap" smear research has given us a very effective weapon against one form of cancer. It is a form of cancer that takes the lives of many women in their most productive years and at a time they are most needed by their families. Thus, the 14,000 fatal cases of uterine cancer a year not only cause suffering and loss of life to the victims themselves, but strike a serious blow to families and communities the country over.

The American Cancer Society and the General Federation of Women's Clubs have undertaken a huge and important task. This is a pilot project, which means that the success achieved with it will greatly influence the pattern of future educational campaigns enlisting the cooperation of other national organizations to carry this vital health message to women throughout the country. There is much at stake here apart from the lifesaving character of the effort itself. There is an opportunity for both the society and the federation to show the country how effectively a project like this can be carried out.

Here in Rhode Island we want to pick up our end of the load and make one of the best showings of any State. We know how to do these things and we do them well. More than that, of course, we are no less concerned with the health and welfare of our people than any other region of the United States.

As I said, there is much at stake here. But there is nothing to risk, and nothing to lose. There is only the opportunity to work hard for an undisputed cause, and to enjoy the rewards of a well-directed effort to stamp out one of the greatest threats to women everywhere—the threat of uterine cancer.

You Can Trust the Communists To Do Whatever Strengthens Their Goal To Conquer the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I hope the President will review numerous statements by Khrushchev and other Soviet leaders on how they plan to use disarmament discussions to weaken the free world before he instructs his negotiators at Geneva to bargain away our military strength. The following editorial from the Dallas Morning News reviews some of these statements and reminds us of the Communist purpose in disarmament talks, to win victory for the Communist conspiracy to rule the world.

The editorial follows:

SOVIET UNION'S STRATEGY

Delegates from the United States are now sitting at the conference table at Geneva with representatives of five Soviet bloc nations, eight "independent" nations and three other nations of the West. Their purpose is to try to work out an agreement which will lead toward nuclear disarmament and a world without war.

No peace-loving person could possibly quarrel with such a lofty goal. The quarrel—one which is entirely justified, the News believes—is not over the goal. It is over the folly of pursuing such a goal at this particular time, given a particular set of circumstances.

Those circumstances are represented by the known, declared purposes of the Soviet Union and its bloc of nations. They are the tactics and the strategy of the Communists, which add up to peace only when and if such peace can be achieved on Communist terms.

The best recent analysis of Soviet strategy was given last June in a 101-page report to the Senate internal security subcommittee by Dr. Stefan T. Possony, a professor of international politics at Georgetown University and an associate at the Foreign Policy Research Institute at the University of Pennsylvania. He has been a student of strategy, military affairs, and communism for more than 20 years, and coauthor, with Dr. Robert Strauz-Hupe and William R. Kintner, of "Forward Strategy for America," published in 1961.

Dr. Possony's report was a comprehensive analysis of current Soviet strategy, as outlined in a major speech by Premier Khrushchev just a year ago and the declaration of Communist Parties of November 1960. His remarks stand as a sharp warning to our delegates at Geneva. We hope they have read them.

Calling the current Soviet strategy "more sophisticated" than it was under Stalin, Dr.

Possony nevertheless points out that Communist goals have not changed.

Last year Khrushchev made it clear that the ultimate aim is still world conquest. Much has been made of the Khrushchev statement that war is no longer inevitable; but, as Dr. Possony points out, Khrushchev made it quite clear a year ago that only by capitulation of the free world can war be avoided.

Overall strategy of the Soviets includes the achievement—partly through negotiations and talk of disarmament—of a military, political, and psychological paralysis of the free world. At the same time, the power of communism—including the military power—is to be increased.

Khrushchev stated the obvious a year ago when he said that the Soviet nations must leave no stone unturned to increase their own military power, but must avoid total military conflict until such time as they have overtaken the West.

"Disarmament slogans," Dr. Possony says, "are used to elicit mass support, to gain sympathizers for communism, to strengthen the Communist movement, and to drive home the idea * * * that a lasting peace can be achieved only after communism has won all over the world."

Talk of disarmament is designed merely to resist and sap the military power of the free world. What Mr. Khrushchev is after is nothing more and nothing less than the unilateral disarmament of the free world.

Let's turn to Mr. Khrushchev's own words: "The struggle for disarmament is an active struggle against imperialism, for restricting its military potentialities." Note that nothing is said about restricting Soviet potentialities. Mr. Khrushchev also says that "the slogan of the struggle for peace does not contradict the slogan of the struggle for communism. These two slogans harmonize with each other."

Dr. Possony stated: "To put it more succinctly: Mr. Khrushchev believes that the elimination of nuclear weapons from free world arsenals would provide the Communists with the 'most favorable prospects' of carrying through the Communist plan of world revolution. It is my considered opinion that he is absolutely justified in this assumption. Unfortunately, this simple truth seems to be almost incomprehensible to many free world statesmen."

Let's hope that it is not incomprehensible to those who are now sitting at the conference table at Geneva.

United Service Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it was an honor and a privilege for me to have had the opportunity to present the USO Salute Certificate to the U.S. Naval Station, Washington, D.C., at a ceremony on March 21 at the USO Club on Lafayette Square. The certificate commended officials of the naval station for their cooperation in advising personnel of USO facilities in Washington, D.C., and was accepted by the station's commanding officer, Capt. H. A. Adams.

All the Members of the Congress are familiar with the outstanding work done by the United Service Organizations during World War II, not only in the United States but in all areas of the world in which our troops were sent. This included in many instances the frontlines in the Pacific as well as remote, isolated bases in the Arctic. Many articles and stories have been written about those who contributed their time and talent to entertainment of our Armed Forces at home and abroad, many of whom are bright stars in the theatrical world. In conjunction with such efforts, the efficient operation and pleasant atmosphere of the clubs is due to the hundreds of thousands of hours contributed by volunteers who shall forever be nameless, those who manned information desks, made coffee, baked cookies, and checked coats. These people are the heart of USO.

It is certainly to be hoped that sufficient interest in USO can enable it to meet the challenge of our enlarged defense effort. I am personally concerned about the fact that the present club located in the old Belasco Theater has been asked to vacate its quarters. To date the General Services Administration has been unable to find an adequate substitute. Efforts must be made in every way possible to see the USO is properly housed and that its basic needs are met.

As the President has said, "keeping the peace is a lonely job." I know of no organization that can do more to assure the kind of morale which must be maintained to preserve the proper picture of the American man under arms to insure the security of his country.

The One-Way Street

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, out of the volumes written in support of our trade policy seldom do we read a practical, understandable, a logical presentation. In most cases, the basis of the argument is theoretical, impractical and in too many cases based upon a juggling of figures arbitrary to the facts.

It is a distinct pleasure that I present a firsthand personal observation of an American whose name I will withhold. I have the original presentation and this is part of a collection of informative reports, testimony and personal observations, both public and private, gathered over the years of study of this serious problem.

I give this message to Congress which if read in conjunction with other presentations in the series of "One-Way Street" speeches of the past few years will show that my premise—that a low cost economy will destroy a high-cost economy in an open market—is borne out by the record both here and abroad.

When this Congress talks about extending the "benefits" of the Reciprocal Trade Acts, yes, even enlarging these "benefits," it should remember the saying by Confucius which is appropriate to this situation: "One bitten by a snake, fears every rope."

LEARNING FROM OTHERS

I have been and am deeply concerned about our country's future. It is not just our patriotic duty to consider national policies—the course of America's future vitally affects every one of us as individuals.

Because of my concern and desire to learn from the behavior and experience of others, my wife and I have made three exploratory or study trips during the past 4 years. First, to Japan, Hong Kong, and the Philippines; next to Russia, Greece, and Turkey and the Outer Seven, which include Britain, the three Scandinavian countries, Austria, Switzerland, and Portugal. Then to the fast-growing Common Market countries of Western Europe—the so-called Inner Six.

We went to Japan in 1957. The Japanese, as you know, with our help have made a marvelous recovery from the ravages of war. The way they work in field and factory is a revelation to the traveler.

In the spring of 1959 we visited Russia. The Russian people's attitude toward visitors was favorable. Travel was not difficult, but I wasn't as much interested in their attitudes toward us as in their attitudes toward their own government and toward work and sacrifice. All seemed to have faith in their government and intense pride in its accomplishments. Everywhere we saw startling contrasts between fantastic achievements and surprising neglects. At first this was not understandable, but it soon became evident that this disciplined nation had concentrated on the things their leadership had considered of first importance—military preparations, guided missiles, steel, aluminum, essential chemicals, machinery—and had deliberately deferred nonessentials—housing, clothing, household equipment, which we consider the comforts of life.

The Russian people crave peace. We need not fear war, but we must take this vast new competitor very seriously. It is a disciplined nation.

When we visited the Common Market countries the following year we saw that entirely different forms of government had equally inspired those people to intensive efforts and great achievements. This was particularly noticeable in West Germany. The people there seemed just as conscientious in their devotion to work as did the Japanese and the Russians. You may say, "The Germans and Japanese have always been industrious peoples." I say, "So have we," but we can't afford to slump now. We should clearly see the danger ahead and strive to avert it before it engulfs us.

We Americans must bestir ourselves anew. We must be prepared to sacrifice some of the froth of present-day life and work together as our forefathers did if we are to succeed in preserving our way of life and maintaining the United States as a leading nation of the world.

Yes, we as individuals must adopt a more disciplined and sacrificial attitude toward life and so must our Government. What I shall say is not critical of any one administration or of any one party, but of a national policy which all administrations have followed with some variation since 1933.

Our Government has tried to persuade nations all around the world to adopt our type of government and our economic philosophies, whether they suited their conditions or not. And in pursuit of those policies we have given away many billions of dollars. We have loaded this cost on the American taxpayer—individuals and companies. All these things have increased our cost of production. In many lines we have priced our-

selves out of foreign markets and can no longer defend our domestic markets. You men and women have seen entire shiploads of glass unloaded on Toledo's docks and sold at cut prices in our immediate home market. Most of this glass was made in modern European factories including those of Russia, Poland, and Czechoslovakia at wages ranging from 55 to 87 cents an hour, including all fringe benefits, whereas those of you who still have jobs are receiving $4.02 an hour, including similar benefits. Some Japanese glass has found its way into mid-American markets but most of it has been dumped on the Pacific and gulf coasts. On this glass the wage disparity is even greater. The Japanese companies have fine, modern factories and produce their glass very cheaply with competent workmen who receive less wages per day than our people do per hour.

Yet during these last 28 years, when increasing numbers of American workmen and American industries badly needed some form of protection, our Government has successively reduced our import duties by 77 percent, and today they are the lowest of any major industrial nation.

While preaching the reduction of trade barriers, Britain and others quietly increased their tariffs on many items. While ours were going down, theirs were going up.

They also maintained drastic import quotas until 1959. Our State Department heralded their abandonment of quotas as an important step in broadening our export opportunities. The truth is that these nations, always protecting their own self-interest, did not abolish import quotas until they were well satisfied that their renewed manufacturing facilities and competent labor, less than one-third the cost of ours, gave them a lower cost of production than their American competitors, so of course restrictions were no longer needed.

Our Secretary of Labor, Mr. Arthur Goldberg, cabled from Japan just a few days ago, "It is disturbing that the seasonally adjusted unemployment rate remains at 6.8 percent." Our Government expects 5½ million unemployed Americans next month, when nearly all of the industrial countries in the world are enjoying prosperity and full employment.

All the experiments which the well-meaning theorists have foisted upon us during three decades have failed to cure this cancerous condition which is sapping our national strength.

Now, just 1 month ago, two fine men, Mr. Christian Herter and Mr. Will Clayton, both of whom I know, urged further moves in the wrong direction. These men, both idealists, but lacking practical experience in competition with the low-labor-cost countries of Europe and Asia, say: "Join the Common Market. It has succeeded. Its rate of growth is double ours."

Yes, it is. But I know, and all of you can ascertain, that the six Common Market countries had comparable wage costs when they joined forces under the Treaty of Rome. They could gradually reduce their protective tariffs without fear of any one nation being undermined by the others.

Great Britain is considering affiliation with the Common Market. Its wage levels are fairly comparable to theirs but the productivity of Britain's labor is somewhat less. This move might work for them. At least it is the lesser of the two evils Britain now faces.

For us, a similar move would be suicidal. Wages in the six countries now in the Common Market average between one-fourth and one-third of ours. Our financial aid and technical assistance have built up their manufacturing facilities to virtual parity, in some industries actually superior to ours.

No, a rich, fat, self-indulgent man cannot wisely tackle another man of three times his strength. He must go through a rigorous course of preparatory training. So must we as a nation.

The inroads of foreign products made by low cost labor are no longer restricted to a few industries. Nearly every American industry is adversely affected.

In May of this year the U.S. Tariff Commission, after an intensive investigation, decided that the American window glass industry was losing money and needed increased tariff protection. They made this decision unanimously, but 5 months have passed and the President has not yet acted on their recommendation, and the situation is critical.

(Since this was written the President has raised the tariff on glass. This is the most encouraging turn of events in many months. We are hopeful of a good reaction from the industry.)

Many American companies have established plants abroad. More are doing so every day. They are thus attempting to protect their stockholders' interests. Our company has not yet made such a move, but our Government's policy may force us to do so in self-preservation.

We know, and our Government should know, that American workingmen and their families cannot move abroad. They are being injured more than anybody else by these unsound trade policies.

Yes, the vicious circle which we have helped to create is entrapping us and our country, of which we have been so justly proud.

Our immediate wand long-range outlooks cause me great concern. What can we do about it? I don't profess to know the only answer, but I will offer some thoughts based upon observations here and abroad.

Our Government has established some import quotas and authorized some tariff increases where the need or the pressure was great. We'll have to do more of this—much more. These are only stopgap remedies but they are vitally important while we are striving as a nation to correct the fundamental inequalities.

Some of our most visionary theorists contend that we cannot protect the vital interests of our American labor and industry, and of our entire economy, in this manner because some of the so-called friendly nation might be offended.

I say nonsense. They have proven themselves far more realistic than we are. The other nations of the world have protected their interests as they saw fit. They are quite willing to play upon our international idealism and take practical advantages of us as long as we stupidly permit it.

When our friends in Britain, France, Latin America, or elsewhere increased the protection of their own industries, we understood and accepted without effective protest. If our Government has the courage to take reasonable steps in protection of our own vital American interests, I am convinced we will find comparable understanding and acceptance by the rest of the world.

If we don't, we face dire consequences. Congressman JOHN H. DENT of Pennsylvania just recently said: "I will hazard a statement that unless we solve our import problems we will be a second-rate Nation, militarily as well as industrial, within the next decade."

Then he added: "And I believe we can—I believe we must—I pray we will face the facts of life squarely and put into our policies the inscription I saw on an ashtray in the office of that great American, the late Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives, which said simply but eloquently, "If it's American, it's worth protecting."

Teenage Drinking—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with my intention to bring to the attention of our colleagues the serious situation caused by New York State's refusal to raise its drinking age from 18 to 21, in keeping with all its neighboring States and with only one other exception every State in the Union, I include as a part of my remarks a series of three news articles from the New York Times, dated March 10, 11, and 18.

While the news reports deal exclusively with Connecticut's difficulties along its border with New York, the situation they describe is common to all five neighbor States.

The articles follow:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 10, 1962]

GOVERNOR DEMPSEY HITS YALE DRINKING PLEA

HARTFORD, March 9.—Gov. John N. Dempsey went before the intercollegiate legislature today and urged defeat of a Yale student lawmaker's bill to lower the State's drinking age to 18. The mock legislative session is being held by students from Connecticut universities and colleges.

The Governor's precedent-setting action came after he had heard of the measure sponsored by Thomas D. Rowe, a 20-year-old Yale sophomore from Ann Arbor, Mich. The student's father is dean of the School of Pharmacy of the University of Michigan.

Governor Dempsey spoke of the "slaughter on the highways" and said the problem of Connecticut's under-21 youths going over to New York State, where the legal drinking age is only 18, to drink had contributed to the accident rate.

"I want to ask you to help me on this," he pleaded, "for no man in government can or need stand alone."

Describing the matter as a "tough problem," he predicted "this battle is going to be won." He said New York would eventually raise its minimum drinking age to 21.

An ovation was given the Governor. But young Rowe told newsmen he would not withdraw the bill. He said he felt the student legislators should have an opportunity to vote on it.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 11, 1962]

LOWER DRINKING AGE BARRED BY STUDENTS

HARTFORD, March 10.—The student house of representatives, in a collegiate mock legislative session, killed today a controversial bill to lower the drinking age to 18 in Connecticut.

The action was opposite to that taken by the student senators yesterday in the 3-day Connecticut intercollegiate legislature, which ended today.

The issue took on added significance yesterday when Gov. John N. Dempsey appeared before the student legislators and asked them to back him in his efforts to get New York State to raise its minimum drinking age from 18 to 21. Mr. Dempsey asked the students to reject the bill.

The mock senate, however, refused to go along with Mr. Dempsey and passed the measure, leaving it up to the house. The representatives rejected the proposal, 98 to 72.

Governor Dempsey told the students that Connecticut youths under 21 travel to New York to purchase drinks and liquor. He said the out-of-State drinking had contributed to Connecticut's accident rate.

The mock legislative session was composed of 266 students from 14 Connecticut colleges and universities.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 18, 1962]

LEGISLATORS JOIN A LIQUOR PATROL—NEW YORK AGE LAW HINDERS CONNECTICUT SAFETY DRIVE

(By Richard H. Parke)

WESTPORT, CONN., March 17.—Three members of a legislative commission saw at firsthand this weekend the efforts of the State police to curb drinking by teenage motorists.

In a 110-mile tour, they watched troopers halt cars coming in from New York State, where the legal age for buying liquor is 18, compared with 21 in Connecticut.

The trip, covering a dozen roadblocks along Connecticut's western border with New York, began at 10 o'clock last night at the Westport Barracks and ended at 2:30 this morning in Canaan. It was one of a series of weekend border checks that began in mid-January on orders from Gov. John N. Dempsey.

Governor Dempsey has been trying to persuade New York authorities to raise its age limit for buying liquor to 21. He has said that three of the first six highway deaths in this State this year involved minors who had purchased liquor in New York.

THE FIRST ROADBLOCK

Those taking part in the inspection trip were the members of a recently formed commission on interstate liquor laws. They were Arthur M. Lewis, of West Hartford, who is State legislative commissioner; State Representative John Cipriano, of North Haven; and State Senator William F. Hickey, of Stamford.

They arrived at the first roadblock, on Route 123 in New Canaan, just as the police had stopped a station wagon with three youngsters returning from nearby Vista, N.Y. Two paper bags containing cans of beer were on a rear seat. The 18-year-old driver, a resident of Stratford, blinked in a flashlight's beam.

"Haven't touched a drop, officer," he said earnestly. "We're on our way to a party."

The officer waved him on with a warning.

SIX YOUTHS STOPPED

At Lakeville, further up the line 6 youths in a battered sedan were also carrying beer. They said they had purchased it at Millerton, a few miles across the New York border. They also insisted they had not been drinking.

"We knew about this roadblock," one said. "Do you think we're crazy?"

Near Kent, another teenage driver readily acknowledged that he had driven with his two companions from Waterbury, Conn., some 25 miles away, to purchase liquor in New York.

The 3-man inspection team ran into a Patterson, N.Y., constable at a lonely crossroads at the Patterson-New Fairfield, Conn., line. The officer, George Grenier, said that the roadblock had taken "some of the spark out of the kids from Connecticut."

"The kids know they have to cut down on their drinking," he said. "We've got six gin mills in my town just over the line and they're not doing the business they used to do."

If the police determine that a teenaged driver has been drinking, he receives a written warning and a letter is sent to his parents. If a teenaged passenger has been drinking, the police write his parents. Youthful motorists considered unfit to drive are arrested. There is no law against the purchase of liquor in New York by Connecticut youths 18 or older.

Statement of Robert L. Pulley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by a distuinguished Floridan and a leading businessman in my district, Mr. Robert L. Pulley, president of Gulf Power Co. of Pensacola. This statement was made before the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee. It brings out effectively many points which should have serious consideration by the Congress and by the administration.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF R. L. PULLEY, PRESIDENT GULF POWER CO., BEFORE THE SENATE AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY COMMITTEE ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1962

Gentlemen, I am very appreciative of this opportunity to appear before your committee.

I am president of the Gulf Power Co. whose general offices are located in Pensacola, Fla. My employment began as an engineer with the company upon its organization in 1925 and has continued for the 37 years of its existence.

My statement today is directed to section 502 of title V of S. 2786. It is my understanding that the effect of this section is to make available to the REA Administrator for future loans, all collections from repayments on outstanding REA loans. The limitations in this section are not clear to me but apparently the Congress can limit the use of such funds. I submit for your consideration that the effect of this section will lead to lessening of congressional control and may eventually lead to a complete revolving fund. I respectfully request that I be allowed to submit for your consideration facts which will indicate that Congress should adopt more controls, not less, governing the expenditures of such funds.

Our company supplies retail electric service to over 101,000 rural and urban customers in the 10 westernmost countries of northwest Florida. No distinction is made between rural and urban customers, both being served at the same applicable rate as approved by Florida Railroad and Public Utilities Commission. Our investigation in generating plants, high voltage transmission lines, substations, distributions systems and other facilities is in excess of 114 millions of dollars. In addition to our retail sales we supply, at wholesale rates below the national average for such service, all the electric power requirements of three REA electric cooperatives through five delivery points and the larger portion of the requirements of one other cooperative through two delivery points.

In 1927 Gulf Power Co. commenced building lines and facilities to serve persons in rural areas and rural communities. As rural electric cooperatives were organized in the area served by our company, beginning in 1939, contracts were executed and our company has supplied all their power requirements. Now after 22 years of supplying the power requirements of the cooperatives at extremely low rates and with 98 percent of the persons in rural areas receiving service, it appears that it is the opinion of REA authorities that investor-owned companies can no longer be depended upon to furnish this service and it is necessary that cooperative generating and transmission systems be constructed to supply these requirements, in the language of the present REA administrator, "Where generating and transmission facilities are necessary to protect the security and effectiveness of REA financed systems."

As existing contracts with the four cooperatives served by us expired by their terms we sought to negotiate new contracts. We were able to negotiate new contracts satisfactory to two cooperatives Escambia River Electric Cooperative and Gulf Coast Electric Cooperative. Although all terms and conditions of the contracts were agreed upon by the contracting parties, the REA Administrator disapproved the agreements and prevented exchange of documents. Thus by his power of the purse strings the Administrator has deprived these two independent Florida corporations of the freedom to contract.

We entered upon negotiations with one of the cooperatives but during these negotiations, the cooperative (Choctawhatchee Electric Cooperative) without advising us, authorized the construction of transmission lines and substations to connect two of their four delivery points with the Alabama Electric Cooperative, a generating and transmission cooperative in south Alabama. Both of these delivery points were connected to Alabama Electric Cooperative by December, 1958.

The 22d annual report of energy purchased by REA borrowers for the fiscal year ending June 1960 shows that Choctawhatchee Electric Cooperative paid Alabama Electric Cooperative 8.9 mills per kilowatt hour for power at these delivery points as contrasted with 6.7 mills per kilowatt hour for power supplied at its other delivery points under the terms and rates in effect under contracts with Gulf Power Co. for all other delivery points served by it. This is quite a price for the consumer members of Choctawhatchee Electric Cooperative to pay for the privilege of being supplied energy generated by a government subsidized electric generating plant.

The fourth cooperative (West Florida Electric Cooperative) has never acknowledged our several communications.

In the November 6, 1961 issue of the Pensacola Journal the announcement of the $20 million loan to Alabama Electric Cooperative for additional generating plant and transmission lines came to our attention. We noticed from this announcement that the appropriation provided for transmission lines for the connection of the systems of the Escambia River Electric Cooperative and the Choctawhatchee Electric Cooperative to the Alabama Electric Cooperative G. & T. system. Also brought to our attention was an editorial in the Alabama Rural Electric News of January 1962, which stated in substance that, even though engineering studies show production costs would be higher, since the Alabama Power Co. intended to oppose State approval of the expenditure for a plant in Alabama that the plant would probably be built at Freeport, Fla., where no State approval was necessary.

Our company has not been advised that such a connection is contemplated nor have we been given an opportunity to compare our rates or conditions of service with those of the Alabama Electric Cooperative. The requirements of the Escambia River Electric Cooperative and Choctawhatchee Electric Cooperative have been supplied by our company for over 20 years and during this period these cooperatives have grown and prospered. The expenditure of public funds for the connection of these two Florida cooperatives' systems to the Alabama Electric Cooperative generating and transmission system will not provide service to a single customer not now receiving service, will not result in a saving to the Federal Government, the taxpayers or the customers of the cooperatives. Such a

connection will remove a source of tax revenue to the Federal and State governments and, as previously mentioned, will increase the cost of power purchased by these cooperatives.

The foregoing examples indicate that it is virtually impossible to effectively negotiate with the local cooperatives due to the application of certain "criteria" with which the REA, through secrecy and availability of public funds, can authorize construction of income-tax exempt facilities to be used in competition with investor-owned taxpaying, regulated electric companies, in violation of purposes and intent of the original act of Congress creating this agency.

In view of these facts I respectfully urge that this committee take steps to tighten the controls on the authority of the REA administrator to make loans for generating and transmission purposes. REA cooperatives have grown and prospered for 26 years in their relationship with investor-owned electric companies. There is no valid reason for the taxpayers of the Nation to loan funds at a 2 percent subsidized interest rate for the construction of unnecessary steam generating plants and transmission lines to "protect the security and effectiveness of the REA financed systems."

I respectfully suggest that any funds which may be utilized by the administrator from the loan account or other sources be restricted as to use for generation and transmission purposes. Such restriction should effectively prohibit the use of public funds where an adequate source of power is available from investor-owned, taxpaying sources which are publicly regulated both as to rates and conditions of service. Further no such loans should be made until after the administrator has given public notice and provided interested parties an opportunity to be heard.

Minshall Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, as has been my custom during the past years, my annual opinion poll will be sent to all of the registered voters in the 23d District within the next few days. Because of the consistently high percentage of returns, I have always found this sampling of public opinion on current issues extremely helpful. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the Minshall poll for the 2d session of the 87th Congress in the RECORD:

Minshall opinion poll

	Yes	No	No opinion
Do you favor—			
1. Federal aid to education to provide for—			
(a) Public school construction?	☐	☐	☐
(b) Teachers' salaries?	☐	☐	☐
(c) Aid to private and parochial schools?	☐	☐	☐
(d) Aid to colleges and universities only?	☐	☐	☐
2. A mandatory program of medical care for the aged under social security?	☐	☐	☐
3. Continuation of the foreign aid program?	☐	☐	☐
4. The President's program to lower U.S. tariffs to compete with the European Common Market?	☐	☐	☐
5. Formation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing?	☐	☐	☐
6. Purchase of $100 million of U.N. bonds for financing special U.N. operations?	☐	☐	☐
7. Continuation of the Peace Corps?	☐	☐	☐
8. The Federal fallout shelter program?	☐	☐	☐
9. Granting the President the power to adjust income tax rates?	☐	☐	☐
10. Tighter Federal controls over TV programing?	☐	☐	☐
11. The administration proposal to increase the national debt limit to $308 billion?	☐	☐	☐
12. Entering into a cooperative space program with Russia?	☐	☐	☐
13. The intervention of U.S. combat forces in Vietnam if present measures prove inadequate?	☐	☐	☐
14. The use of U.S. combat forces to defend Berlin?	☐	☐	☐

When the responses to the poll have been tabulated I shall insert the results in the RECORD.

Administration's Tax Program Adversely Affects American Business Operations Overseas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Kennedy administration on April 20, 1961, urged the Congress to adopt amendments to our Federal tax structure which would impose a very serious and damaging impact on the ability of our free enterprise system to compete in world markets. These proposals would strike at some of the provisions of our tax law which have been in effect for over 40 years and which comprise the ground rules under which the American business flag has been established around the world.

In essence these Treasury proposed tax changes would have increased the tax burdens on American world commerce and would have imposed more stringent rules under which American free enterprise would have to operate in doing international business.

Unfortunately, the majority members of the Committee on Ways and Means have seen fit to approve in large measure the administration's recommendations. These proposals are embodied in H.R. 10650, the Revenue Act of 1962. While this legislation bears a "1962" date, it is significant to note that insofar as the foreign-income provisions are concerned, some of them have retroactive effect as far back as March 1, 1913. The minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means filed separate views in the committee report and one of the points on which the minority members dissented from the majority position was with respect to the changes in the tax rules applicable to income derived from foreign sources.

A shocking aspect of these proposed new tax rules is the willingness expressed in the bill for the United States to unilaterally abrogate treaties with other free world countries. Walter A. Slowinski, Esq., an attorney in Washington, D.C., who appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means last year in opposition to the administration's foreign-income proposals, has recently made a speech before the American Chamber of Commerce in Belgium in which he makes some perceptive and timely observations relative to the foreign-income provisions of the Revenue Act of 1962. As a part of my remarks, I will include the text of Mr. Slowinski's remarks of March 19, 1962, which he presented at Brussels, Belgium.

The speech follows:

REMARKS OF WALTER A. SLOWINSKI, OF BAKER, MCKENZIE & HIGHTOWER, WASHINGTON, D.C., BEFORE THE AMERICAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE IN BELGIUM, AT BRUSSELS ON MARCH 19, 1962

No topic could have been more timely chosen because within the past week a new omnibus tax bill, H.R. 10650, was introduced by Representative WILBUR MILLS, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, which may make your companies wonder why the U.S. Government in past years ever encouraged U.S. private enterprise to invest abroad. H.R. 10650 was reported out by the Ways and Means Committee on Friday, March 16, and copies of the report will be here in our office tomorrow.

All of the great things which have been stated recently by our State Department and Commerce Department about needing the help of U.S. private enterprise in building markets abroad and fighting communism on the economic fronts of less developed countries have apparently not been heard or considered by the Treasury Department in its drive to penalize or discourage foreign investment, past or present. Representative BYRNES of Wisconsin calls it the erection of a new "Berlin Wall" to prevent U.S. business from going into markets to seek its fair share of world commerce. I regret a Treasury Department official could not be here today to explain its tax proposals in its own behalf.

Of the 20 provisions in H.R. 10650, involving general tax changes, 12 of them are directed specifically at the foreign area. By far the most important however, is section 13, involving "controlled foreign corporations." Under this proposal, the income of your subsidiaries in Europe, Latin America, Southeast Asia and Africa, among other places will now be heavily taxed because, in the minds of some Treasury planners and spokesmen, you have specifically chosen to do business abroad for the primary purpose of gaining an unfair tax advantage over your U.S. competitors who did not risk their assets abroad. The price will be a U.S. 52 percent corporate tax on much of the earnings and profits of your subsidiaries anywhere in the world, whether or not they have already committed such earnings for repayment of debt, expansion of new facilities, reinvestment in certain new countries, or other business needs.

So that you may see this more clearly in writing, I shall make available the copies of the Ways and Means press releases dated

February 27 and March 1, as well as the copy of H.R. 10650 and a brief summary of the bill released by the Ways and Means Committee on March 13.

How does the new tax proposed in section 13 operate?

If a foreign corporation's voting stock is more than 50-percent owned directly or indirectly by U.S. persons, such corporation is designated a "controlled foreign corporation." If this the case, than a U.S. person who owns, directly or indirectly, 10 percent of the stock will be taxable on certain income of this controlled foreign corporation, whether or not it is remitted to the shareholders.

What major kinds of income will now be taxed currently to the U.S. corporation which invests abroad in a "controlled foreign corporation"?

(a) All income from U.S. patents, copyrights, and exclusive formulas and processes which means "the amount of gross rentals, royalties, or other income derived from the license, sublicense, sale, exchange, use, or other means of exploitation of patents, copyrights, and exclusive formulas and processes (A) substantially developed, created, or produced in the United States, or (B) acquired from any U.S. person which, directly or indirectly, owns or controls, or is owned or controlled by, or is under common ownership or control with the controlled foreign corporation."

This means all income from the use of such patents, copyrights, and exclusive formulas and processes which were developed in the United States by a related corporation or which were acquired through a related corporation in the United States.

More importantly, this category will also include income from the use of such patent such as from the profit derived from the manufacture and sale of a product on which such patent or formula or process was used.

Example: If a European subsidiary of a U.S. corporation uses an exclusive formula to make a product, even though it purchased that formula outright in an arm's length transaction at its fair market value, a portion of the profit from the sale of that product will be taxable to the U.S. corporation because that formula was developed or created in the United States.

(b) All interest, dividends, rents, and royalties collected by the foreign subsidiary will be currently taxable at 52 percent to the U.S. corporate shareholder.

(c) In addition, all newly defined "base company income" will be taxable currently to the U.S. shareholder if it equals at least 20 percent of the gross income of the foreign corporation. This means "income (whether in the form of profits, commissions, fees or otherwise) derived in connection with the purchase of personal property from any person and its sale to a related person, where, (A) the property which is purchased is manufactured, produced, grown, or extracted outside the country, under the laws of which the controlled foreign corporation is created or organized, and (B) the property is sold for use, consumption, or disposition outside such foreign country."

Example: If a Belgian company (a controlled foreign corporation) purchases property manufactured in the Netherlands by a related corporation and sells it to anyone for use, consumption, or disposition in Luxembourg, the entire income from that sale is foreign base company income subject to full income tax on its shareholders in the United States. (This ignores the realities of your Benelux economic unity.)

In addition, if a Belgian company conducts this type of trading often enough during the year so that more than 80 percent of its income comes from this trading activity, then 100 percent of its income is taxable to the U.S. shareholders.

All rents are to be foreign base company income.

Example: If your Belgian subsidiary builds a plant and leases out some excess space until its own sales and production grow to require that space, any such "rents" are fully taxable to the U.S. shareholders.

The only limited way in H.R. 10650 to avoid this tax penalty on foreign earnings is as follows:

Reinvest that income immediately (within 75 days after the end of the year) in a qualified trade or business. Such trade or business must be owned at least 80 percent by the first controlled foreign corporation and may be an existing corporation or, if newly acquired it must be in a less developed country. Less developed countries will be announced by the President in an Executive order, but they will probably not include any country in Western Europe or Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Hong Kong, Japan or South Africa.

Caution: Under this Treasury provision no more 50–50 joint ventures will be encouraged even in less-developed countries. To obtain any U.S. tax consideration under this bill, at least 80 percent of the second-tier corporation must be owned by the first-tier corporation.

More limitations are included in this bill to restrict or discourage your foreign operations. In section 6 of the bill, there is a new amendment to section 482, to establish new factors or tests under which intercompany pricing will be audited to determine whether more or less income should be allocated between a U.S. corporation and a foreign organization owned or controlled by the same interests. To the extent this intercompany pricing is now at arm's-length this new provision will make no change.

"Arm's-length price" is now defined generally to mean the price at which tangible property generally is or can be sold in transactions in the same areas involving unrelated persons and made under similar conditions of sale.

However, where an allocation is indicated, no allocation of income shall be made to a foreign organization whose assets, personnel and office and other facilities which are not attributable to the United States are grossly inadequate for its activities outside the United States. If any organization fails to supply pricing information to the U.S. Treasury Department, the Treasury may estimate the taxable income and allocate it among the members of the group.

A new rule has been inserted in section 16, to eliminate capital gain treatment on the liquidation of a foreign subsidiary. This is a provision which would become effective immediately with respect to any liquidations after this present bill is enacted—as opposed to the earlier provisions mentioned which would become effective for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1962.

A new rule is added to change unfavorably the basis rules on property being distributed by a foreign subsidiary to its U.S. parent.

A new rule is also added to revise the present foreign personal holding company provisions so that dividends, interest and royalties are immediately taxable to the U.S. shareholder if such dividends, interest, and royalties represent 20 percent or more of its gross income (as opposed to the present 60-percent rule).

I should like to leave you with one final word about the bill. You are aware of the sacredness of our country's word, in its agreements with other countries as opposed to the word of the nonfree world which may be broken at any time. In this bill a new provision has been inserted which is described in the announcement of the committee as follows:

"The committee adopted a provision to the effect that in the event of conflict between a provision of the bill and a treaty, the treaty is overridden."

How will you reconcile this with your relationships here in Europe?

This bill is now before the House Rules Committee to be acted upon tomorrow. The House of Representatives will vote late this week. The Senate Finance Committee has announced 3 weeks of hearings beginning on March 27. To the extent that your companies and your chambers of commerce make your view known, we shall be successful. It is urgent that each of you act immediately to tell your Congressmen what contributions you have made abroad; how this bill will cripple the efforts of private enterprise and run counter to the present trade proposals of the administration in H.R. 9980. Your future and the future of your country's prestige and progress in the free world is in the balance.

City of Lynwood, Los Angeles County, Calif., Is Designated as "All-America City"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present to the attention of your own distinguished self and all the other Members of this great legislative body, and any others who may read, the text of excerpts of official entry of the city of Lynwood, Los Angeles County, in my native State of California, for a 1961 All-America City Award.

You will note therefrom the enumeration of the factors which entered into the city of Lynwood, which is in my great 23d Congressional District, being awarded this deserved recognition in the history of municipalities of our beloved Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that you and everyone of my other colleagues join with me in cordially complimenting and congratulating all the officials and official bodies of the city of Lynwood and all of its citizens, and all of its community civic, fraternal, educational, religious, and every other Lynwood community group whether herein enumerated by me, or not. And, Mr. Speaker, whereas the written document furnished me, and which I have obtained unanimous consent to produce, shows that the entry of the city of Lynwood was cosponsored by the Exchange Club of Lynwood and the Lynwood Community Coordinating Council, I extend to them by sincere compliments upon their foresight, in recognizing that it was entirely probable that because of the great achievements of their home city of Lynwood, said city might well rate very high in competition with other American cities in this good-natured competitive enterprise by the American cities. In like manner, I congratulate the functioning of the Lynwood All-America City Committee, of which Mr. Tom Bancroft

was general chairman and Mr. William Ruth was exchange club chairman. The names of the other said committee members being set forth in the document hereinafter set forth.

It has been my considerable pleasure and high honor to have this city of Lynwood in the great congressional district which I have had the honor of representing during my 16 years of membership in this great legislative body.

The letter and article follows:

LYNWOOD COMMUNITY
COORDINATING COUNCIL,
Lynwood, Calif., March 20, 1962.

Congressman CLYDE DOYLE,
1030 New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DOYLE: The All-America City Committee of Lynwood extends a cordial invitation to you and Mrs. Doyle for our All-America City Day banquet at which the National Municipal League and Look magazine will present the All-America City Award to Lynwood.

Edmund G. Brown, Governor of the State of California, will be featured speaker.

The banquet, on Monday, the 26th of March, begins with presentation of the colors at 7 p.m. in Bateman Hall, Community Service Building, 11331 Ernestine Avenue.

The pleasure of a reply will be appreciated.

Yours most sincerely,

TOM BANCROFT, *Chairman.*

EXCERPTS FROM OFFICIAL ENTRY OF LYNWOOD, CALIF., FOR A 1961 ALL-AMERICA CITY AWARD

(Entry cosponsored by the Exchange Club of Lynwood and the Lynwood Community Coordinating Council)

What have the citizens of this community done to merit an All-America City Award? As a result of a unique and unusual "climate" created by massive citizen effort, the people of Lynwood, Calif., have distinguished themselves in the following areas:

A. Lynwood has been widely acclaimed as the "Freedom Awards City." A continuing program of action in citizenship has resulted in 62 National Freedoms Foundation Awards, a record among communities of comparable size in the Nation.

B. Economies in municipal government have been effected by large numbers of citizens volunteering services on civic committees, commissions, and other advisory groups. We proudly look at a civic center, second to none, as a result of this civic teamwork.

C. Focal point of much of the civic spirit has been the unusually effective Lynwood Coordinating Council. Representing all agencies of the community, the council has stimulated progress tackling numerous major issues, problems and needs for the betterment of the community.

During what period did the citizen action occur? Achievement of this distinguished record began in 1950, has continued to the present.

What prompted the citizen action? In a very real sense the birth of our community spirit emanated from a fervent desire (in 1950) on the part of the citizenry to establish and maintain our own unified school system. Having overcome the obstacles to realization of this autonomy, a new-found spirit of community mindedness brought remarkable achievements in the three areas cited.

Summarize your story. Emphasize the extent of citizen participation, accomplishments, opposition (if any), and stress activity since July 1960. Use dates to show the sequence of events.

Lynwood, Calif., has become widely known as the Freedom Awards City. This unique accolade has come about only through an unusually keen sense of responsibility on the part of Lynwoodites. We are proud of our freedom awards record. Typical of citizen action to bring further honor to our city is the local Exchange Club's initiation of communitywide effort to seek the distinction of being named an All America City.

It would not be possible here to give background information on a total of 62 Freedoms Foundation awards. Representative of this outstanding record is the consistent recognition of our local high school by the national Freedoms Foundation throughout the 1950's. Seven consecutive principal school awards were granted through 1957. Four honorary scrolls for distinguished service were awarded in 1955, 1956, 1958, and 1960. A freedom library award was presented in 1959. A school program pointing to extraordinary citizenship based on preserving our American way of life typifies that found throughout the school system and is enhanced by the example set by active adult groups throughout the community. The most recent freedoms awards (1960) were granted to the high school as indicated, Hosler Junior High School (George Washington Honor Medal), George Washington Elementary School (George Washington Honor medal), Lynwood Community Coordinating Council (George Washington Honor Medal), DAV Auxiliary (freedoms citation), and several individuals.

Through volunteer service on civic committees, commissions, and other advisory groups, Lynwood has established a continuing program of economy in municipal government. As a result, the city has been able to complete its civic center without bond issue or additional taxation. The first building to rise in the civic center area was the youth community center building in 1948. The Lynwood Natatorium (training site for Lynwood's Olympic water polo team) was completed in 1954; the city hall and police building was constructed in 1953; a community services facility was dedicated this year. To give our community better library service the city financed the building of what has now become a branch of the Los Angeles County library system. Only intense civic pride and interest in the welfare of all age group citizens has made this possible.

The following are but a few of the accomplishments coordinated by the Lynwood Community Coordinating Council:

The decade of the 1950's has seen the real maturing of the Lynwood Community Coordinating Council. The number of member organizations in this group has steadily increased yearly. Under its direct leadership (with subsequent sponsorship) active senior and junior youth councils have been founded. Projects undertaken by the youth groups are far too numerous to list. Perhaps the most noteworthy undertakings of the senior youth group, with active adult assistance, have been the formation of a youth employment agency, recognized statewide as a model (1951) and the more recent (1960) initiation of a youth canteen operated for and by the community's youth. The adult council has also originated a professional case conference committee (to study and report conditions which, overcome, will preclude delinquency, to seek aid for individual youths with personality behavior disorders), a senior citizens group (27 members, 1956; 435 members, 1960), a local welfare bureau to lend quick emergency assistance to the needy, a local united charities group whose efforts have largely supported the welfare bureau. The coordinating council, in recent years (1959 to present), has also offered the community a level of educational programing designed to aid the entire citizenry in understanding those broad, and sometimes controversial, issues/problems so that ultimate citizen action might be based on reason rather than emotion. Such programing has included consideration of charities, salacious literature, human relations, newspaper coverage policy re juvenile crime, civil defense.

Was there opposition to the efforts of the citizens or were there specific obstacles to be overcome?

Throughout all this past decade healthy opposition has existed which has ultimately inspired citizens working for a better Lynwood. When opposition prevailed, undaunted citizen groups took a new look at their proposals and their efforts to sell them. Disappointments have thus been turned to constructive reappraisals and have ultimately led to community endorsement of needed and carefully planned programs in education and for general civic facilities and services. The community's Freedoms Awards attest to the perseverance and accomplishments of an active adult and youth citizenry.

Has your community, or any of the organizations or individuals mentioned, won any other awards or received any other recognition originating outside your community as a result of this citizen effort?

In addition to the 62 National Freedoms Foundation Awards accrued during the period under consideration, other outstanding recognitions include:

1. Eisenhower Fellowship for International Study and American Educators Medal awarded to Dr. Donald D. Reber, former superintendent of schools.

2. American Heritage Award to Lynwood Chamber of Commerce in 1952 (based on their part in campagn that raised prevailing 67 percent voter turnout to 92.7 percent).

3. Recognition of Lynwood Coordinating Council by Southern Federation of Coordinating Councils for exemplary programs.

4. Recognition by State Governor for model Youth Employment Agency and youth programs, including the youth canteen.

What major problems remain unresolved in your community? (For example, in city government, racial relations, municipal services, housing, et cetera.) Have constructive steps been taken toward their solution?

Major phases of community needs have been resolved. Citizen groups are developing proposals for beautification and a workable urban renewal program as well as a master plan under the Federal 701 Planning Program and the State of California Planning Act. A Council of Human Relations is currently conducting studies related to juvenile delinquency preventive measures, fair employment practices, race relations, and housing.

LYNWOOD—ALL AMERICA CITY WEEK, MARCH 25–31, 1962

Following is the résumé of the week's activities scheduled to commemorate the honor bestowed on the city of Lynwood as an All America City:

Sunday, March 25: All America City Church Day. Copies of the All America City application have been provided all ministers. Special commendation will be made from the pulpits regarding this achievement.

Monday, March 26: All America City Day. Banquet, 7 p.m., Bateman Hall, price $3 per person. Tickets are available at the Lynwood Chamber of Commerce. Presentation of the All America City flag, city officials, National Guard, National and State distinguished guests, Lynwood High School Band, Hosler Junior High Dixie Dandies will highlight the program. Due to the seating capacity of Bateman Hall, it would be advisable to obtain your tickets early. Deadline for reservations will be March 23.

Tuesday, March 27: All America City Government Day. A special combined school board and city council meeting will be held at 7 p.m. at the board of education building. At this time both bodies will give formal tributes to the All America City achieve-

ment. Formal presentation of the All America City flag to the city council will be made. Youth participation: Youth will be elected to represent all elected and appointed officials of the city and of the school district. In addition school superintendent and principals will have stand-ins.

Wednesday, March 28: All America City Sponsors' Day. The Lynwood Community Coordinating Council as cosponsors will be guests of the Exchange Club, the sponsors.

Thursday, March 29: All America City Press Day. Special edition to be published by the respective newspapers.

Friday, March 30: All America City School Day. Observance to be held in each school by special assemblies. Parade: Time of parade, 7 p.m., consisting of marching units, bands and dignitaries. The 300 city flags will be carried by youth groups.

Saturday, March 31: All America City Family Day. Family picnic will be held in the Lynwood city park—entertainment will be provided by the Lynwood Chamber of Commerce.

AWARDS FOR CITIZEN ACTION

(A description of the All America Cities national awards competition through questions and answers)

What are the All America City Awards? The unique and coveted All America Cities Awards are conferred annually on 11 communities for energetic and resourceful citizen action.

Who sponsors the awards? The competition in its 13th year in 1961 is cosponsored by the National Municipal League and Look magazine. It is open to any community in the United States which has made exceptional progress through the initiative and teamwork of its citizens.

Who is eligible? (1) A city must show outstanding civic achievement of benefit to the community as a whole; (2) it must give evidence that these achievements resulted from citizen action—that is, the initiative and effort of a substantial number of citizens working together to improve their community; (3) any size city or town may enter. Population and resources will be taken fully into account in judging a city's achievements; (4) a city need not be a model community. Dynamic citizen leadership, not perfection, is the criterion. But because an all-America city is looked up to, nationally and internationally, as an example of good citizenship, any critical problems still outstanding might lead to disqualification unless steps have already been taken toward their solution; (5) to qualify for consideration, a city must be formally entered as a contestant by one of its citizens, citizen groups, or public officials.

How are winners selected? A screening committee studies applications from cities throughout the Nation—scores of cities apply each year—to select finalists. The finalists are judged by a jury of 12 distinguished leaders in government, education, business, and civic affairs. Those cities selected for final consideration are invited to send spokesmen to address the jury at the National Conference on Government, held in 1961 in Miami Beach, Fla., November 30 through December 2. Each finalist is allotted a specific time for presenting his case. Preliminary choices are made following the hearings, and after vertification of the evidence, the winners are selected. Dr. George H. Gallup, chairman of the Council of the National Municipal League and director of the American Institute of Public Opinion, served as jury foreman, as he has for the past 10 years.

What does it mean to be a winner? In addition to traditional celebrations and the nationwide publicity for the city, the All-America City honor generally inspires heightened pride in community and even greater civic efforts of general benefit to the community. The award is not regarded as a trophy for a feat accomplished, but rather as a recognition for milestones along the road of community betterment.

Who sponsored the Lynwood entry? The Exchange Club of Lynwood initiated the project and secured the support of representative civic groups (including the city council, chamber of commerce and board of education) and cosponsorship by the Lynwood Coordinating Council. The two sponsor organizations appointed an all-America City Committee of 15 members. They prepared the application, selected spokesmen to present the city's story in person before the awards jury, and planned the celebration activities.

Who are the 1961 finalists? Following are the 22 cities in the Nation from which 11 will be chosen All-America Cities by the National Municipal League and Look magazine. The 22 finalists were selected from scores of applicants.

THE 1961 FINALISTS

Anacortes, Wash.; Asbury Park, N.J.; Erie, Pa.; Falls Church, Va.; Fort Lauderdale, Fla.; Galion, Ohio; Galveston, Tex.; Hartford, Conn.; Independence, Mo.; La Crosse, Wis.; Louisville, Ky.; Lynwood, Calif.; Milton-Freewater, Oreg.; Portsmouth, Ohio; Provo, Utah; Rockville, Md.; Salisbury, N.C.; Santa Clara County, Calif.; Sioux City, Iowa; Topeka, Kans.; Wichita, Kans.; Wilmington, Mass.

One Phrase To Bury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the issue of Federal aid to education has not been met by Congress in this session. The issue of constitutionality has befogged the controversy. Some contend that Federal aid to private schools violates the first amendment to the Constitution which reads:

> Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion.

Constitutional lawyers, historical precedents, and at least 50 programs of Federal aid to church related institutions indicate that Federal financial aid to private schools does not violate constitutional principles.

The issue of Federal aid to education, public and private, cannot be resolved by resort to slogans, shibboleths, or glib phrases. An understanding of the basic issues is necessary. An editorial in the Catholic News of March 10, 1962, which requests that specious phrases should be ignored illuminates in my opinion the basic issue and merits reading. The editorial follows:

ONE PHRASE TO BURY

An obscure bit of congressional testimony on school aid last week calls for some comment because it highlighted so tersely some of the woolly-headed thinking on this issue.

The witness might have been any one of dozens who support discriminatory aid proposals. Actually, the man on the stand was Edgar Fuller, executive secretary of the Council of Chief State School Officers.

He was testifying in favor of the "Pontius Pilate" aid bill—the bill introduced by Congressman BAILEY of West Virginia. That bill would have the Federal Government evade its responsibility for the use of Federal money, and would dump in the States' laps the decision to discriminate against nonpublic-school children.

On what he called the issue of private school aid, Fuller told a House subcommittee his organization favors "private financing of private schools and public financing of public schools."

Fuller's phrasemaking is dangerous, because it sounds so convincing, so logical. But let's question it and see what happens.

First, what is a public school? A definition that briefly describes all the so-called public school systems and differentiates them from other schools is this: a public school is one that is financed by public funds. So Mr. Fuller and his council are guilty of a tidy bit of question begging: "Let the State finance those schools the State finances."

Historically, the basic difference between what is now the public school and the nonpublic school was created by the fact that the State chose to support one type of school with public funds. That choice was made freely by the State.

If the State now has no constitutional right to aid some other type of school, then it had no right in the beginning to aid the type it is aiding, the so-called public school.

Oh, but the difference is the point of religion, you say? No. The so-called public school was a religious institution at the time the State chose to begin aiding it. The history of tax support of schools clearly demonstrates this.

The fact is that New York State, for instance, in the last century chose to aid schools sponsored by the so-called public schools society, and that those schools were distinctly religious—Protestant, if you will—in character.

The fact is that the so-called public schools of today are also distinctly religious in character.

The struggle in public school systems these days is between a role for religion and no role for religion in the school. This is the essence of the questions of bible reading, recitation of prayers, observance of religious holidays, questions which keep cropping up in local controversies and often coming before the courts all over the country.

Where the no-role-for-religion policy has won out, the so-called public school is still governed by a religious judgment. For the judgment that the school will entirely exclude cognizance of religion from its operation is a religious judgment. It is a judgment about man's relationship with God. It is a judgment on not just a very vital, but perhaps the most vital, point of that relationship. It judges that in the training and formation of the child, his relationship with God can (or must) be ignored.

One clear fact is that both "public" schools and parochial schools stand for a form of religious belief. And if that form be that religious belief is of so little importance that it can be ignored in my child's formal education, then the State that supports such a school—and no other type—out of public tax moneys is indeed establishing that form of religious belief in a specific and official way.

It may be nice to evade this point, because it is for many people a difficult point to face. But truth and justice are not determined by convenience.

No, Mr. Fuller, it will not do. Your phrase is a tidy package, conveniently gift wrapped for those who want no aid for 7 million American children. Trouble is, there's nothing inside the package but fog.

Those who believe in full freedom of parental choice in education will not be duped by it. And we trust that those who represent the American people on Capitol Hill won't be taken in, either. Let's not descend to legislation by phrasemaking.

Appendix

Detroit as a Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. HART

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 23, 1962

Mr. HART. Mr. President, at times our concern with unemployment statistics and the very serious problems connected with continuing high levels of unemployment in major industrial centers may obscure otherwise encouraging and important economic facts.

The Detroit News, in an interesting editorial of March 16, presented the encouraging side of our Detroit metropolitan area market and economic well-being. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DETROIT AS A MARKET—SOME FAVORABLE FIGURES

Merchant to banker: "I'd like to open some better grade merchandise stores in Detroit. Will you lend me the capital?"

Banker to merchant: "A factory town like Detroit is no place for stores like that, and half the people there are out of work anyway. Are you out of your mind?"

Conversations like this have more than once taken place back East where much of the Nation's investment money dwells. The distant picture of Detroit as a market, as a place to sink capital, is at best cloudy.

Merchant: "OK, how about a town where spendable income per household—after taxes—is $8,270. Only 1 city in the country's 10 biggest has more buying power per household than that."

Banker: "Sounds better. Tell me more."

Merchant: "Almost 40 percent of the households in this city have a buying income—money to spend—over $7,000 a year, which again ranks it second among the top 10 cities in the Nation. Houston, with all that oil money, doesn't look that good, and neither does Los Angeles, in the 'land of opportunity.' Now, does this town sound like a market for quality merchandise?"

Banker: "Sounds great. Where is it?"

Merchant: "Detroit."

The point of all this is that misconceptions about Detroit and its economy abound in other parts of the country. News about strikes, about unemployment, about other ills, is well known elsewhere. The items are easy to grasp, easy to remember—and easy to misinterpret.

Not so easy to find or understand are the statistics which give a more balanced and realistic picture of Detroit as a market, as an economic unit. And for all we hear nowadays about the wonders of electronic data processing, the painstaking economic analysis which goes into business decisions, the fact remains that the top decisionmakers are still human, subject to all the subjective and imprecise ways of the human mind.

And so distant investors still say, "Invest in Detroit? You're crazy."

The figures we've cited, and many more, are contained in the "Survey of Buying Power," published by the authoritative Sales Management magazine. They are for 1960, the latest available, and hardly the best of years for Detroit.

Yet they show that Detroit, for all its very real problems, has basic strengths as a market—which reflects basic strengths in its economy. The percentage figures on distribution of income, for instance, indicate that Detroit and environs is becoming a town of skilled workmen and professional people, whose incomes are both high and stable, despite the ups and downs of employment among the unskilled.

It means a good market, a quality market, and an economy which will hold up over the long pull.

The doomsayers ready to bury Detroit are selling short not only the city itself, but their own opportunity to prosper with it.

Memorial Services for the Late Governor Earl K. Long, of Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 23, 1962

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in view of the great service rendered to the people of Louisiana by the late Earl K. Long, I deem it fitting to note an address delivered by Mr. Ernest S. Clements, chairman of the Louisiana Public Service Commission, at memorial services held for the late Governor on Labor Day, 1961.

I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY MR. ERNEST S. CLEMENTS, CHAIRMAN OF THE LOUISIANA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION, AT THE MEMORIAL SERVICES HELD AT THE GRAVE OF THE LATE EARL K. LONG, ON LABOR DAY, SEPTEMBER 4, 1961, AT WINNFIELD, LA.

My friends, we assemble today in the beautiful little city of Winnfield, on this hallowed and historic spot, not only to dedicate a statue to the memory of a great man, but also to pay tribute to one of Louisiana's noblest sons.

The people of Louisiana were stunned and shocked when the news spread throughout the State on Labor Day a year ago, that this matchless champion of the rights of the masses, this dauntless and courageous defender of the poor and downtrodden, this incomparable political gladiator had passed on to the Great Beyond.

To fittingly and properly describe this good man, this great humanitarian, the pen should be dipped in the humid colors of the rainbow and the paper dried with the dust from the wings of the butterfly.

Earl Kemp Long was born here on August 26, 1895, and he departed this life on September 5, 1960.

He was first elected Lieutenant Governor of Louisiana in 1936, and in 1939 he became Governor of Louisiana, due to the resignation of the Governor. He was elected to a full 4-year term as Governor in 1948, and was elected Governor in 1956 for another 4-year term. Thus, he was three times Governor of the great State of Louisiana, which he loved so much, serving longer in this office than any other individual. He was also elected Democratic State central committeeman for Winn Parish several times.

Just a few days before his untimely passing, he was elected to the National House of Representatives from the Eighth Congressional District of Louisiana.

While thousands mourned his untimely passing, they were comforted somewhat in the knowledge that he died a winner, and still champion in the political arena of his State.

He was a gerat leader, and he remained a strong and successful political figure, due to the loyalty of his many friends. They were loyal because he was in constant touch with them, and was always ready and willing to assist and aid them whenever possible. He had friends in every nook and corner of the State.

Earl K. Long was a sincere man, and it was universally known that his word was his bond.

He was blessed with a great memory, which was on of his outstanding political assets. Once he met a person, he would remember and recognize him from then on.

Earl K. Long was an humble man, and holding high public office never changed him in the least. He was always the plain, simple man of the people.

Aside from his great interest in politics, he loved farming and stockraising. His greatest form of recreation was hog hunting in the woodlands in and around his home town of Winnfield.

He was intensely interested in the great masses of the people of Louisiana—the farmer, the laboring man, the small businessman, the fine old people, the poor and the needy. To them, he was their champion. He remains even in death their champion, because he never let them down. His fight to give the old people of the State of Louisiand a decent old-age pension was one of the most memorable battles of his long and useful political career.

He was the original advocate of free hot lunches for all of the schoolchildren of the State. This idea soon became popular throughout the State and Nation. The late Franklin D. Roosevelt, then President of the United States, proclaimed it one of the greatest programs he had ever heard of. Many children going to school today are beneficiaries of this great humanitarian achievement.

He was a great believer in charity hospitals, and it was due in large part to his efforts that we have the splendid charity hospitals that we have in Louisiana today.

Earl Long was constantly fighting to provide good roads and bridges for Louisiana, and as a result we have many fine roads and bridges that we otherwise would not have.

Conservation of our natural resources—oil, gas, salt, sulfur, and our wildlife, fish, and game—was always uppermost in the

mind of this good man. He helped provide the money which resulted in the greatest restocking program of wildlife, fish, and game ever undertaken by any State of the American Union. As a result, our hunters and fishermen are enjoying this outdoor pleasure more than ever before, and reaping a greater harvest.

The schoolteachers, as well as everyone else connected with this noble profession, could always look to this man for aid and assistance. He was sympathetic to their problems, and at one time he was instrumental in doubling the pay of schoolteachers, bus drivers, and janitors.

It has often been said that education had no better friend than Earl K. Long.

He was an able lawyer, having worked his way through the Loyola Law School, New Orleans, La.

He was one of the ablest stump speakers this State has ever produced. Great crowds attended his political meetings, for they not only enjoyed listening to him, but knew that he always made good on his political promises.

He was a rugged individualist who tenaciously clung to his political beliefs, and he was not subject to being swayed by anyone.

Earl K. Long was an honest, conscientious, Christian man. Some years before his passing, he united with the First Baptist Church of Baton Rouge, and was a regular attendant at church. One of the finest tributes ever paid him was by his pastor who preached the last service. He said that Earl was kinder and more thoughtful of him than most of his congregation, that he was always doing nice things for him.

He was a kind and generous man, always trying to do something to better the lot of his fellow man. While he was doing these charitable and generous acts, and many they were, he made no public display, and he preferred that there should not be any.

One of his favorite biblical passages was: "Lay not up for yourselves treasures on earth where moth and rust corrupt and eat and thieves break through and steal.

"But lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven where moth and rust cannot corrupt and eat and thieves break through and steal, for where your treasure is there also will your heart be."

Earl K. Long by his many kind, generous, charitable and unselfish acts was laying up for himself treasures in heaven.

He had a ready wit, a keen sense of humor, and enjoyed telling jokes and funny stories while relaxing on his pea-patch farm, as he called it.

During early life, he became a traveling salesman, and called on the trade throughout Louisiana, as well as several other Southern States. He sold shoe polish, oilcans, and other products, and was regarded as highly successful in this field. He made many friends during his travels who were later to become the nucleus of his political organization.

Throughout his political career, he was opposed by the daily newspapers, as well as some of the big corporate interests. This did not deter him. He fought on and battled with great force and determination, and with uncanny political skill. He was a master political organizer, and was aided and assisted throughout his political campaigns by his loyal and faithful wife—Mrs. Blanche Revere Long. She was always in charge of the State headquarters in his political campaigns, and did an outstanding job. His family stood loyally by his side.

As I travel over this State and see the many accomplishments of this great man, I am firmly convinced that history will deal kindly with Earl K. Long.

"When father time shall have mellowed human judgment, as inevitably it will, the name of Earl K. Long will be written in golden letters in the pages of Louisiana's political history, and he will be recorded as one of the greatest and one of the most constructive governors this State ever had."

It is sincerely regretted by many that this man with his wonderful knowledge of government, his broad knowledge of the needs of the people, could not have been spared to serve in the Congress of the United States, to which he had been elected. What a battler in that national legislative body he would have been for the people of the State and Nation.

It can forever be said, without fear of contradiction, that Earl Long never did anything against the interests of poor people. He believed sincerely that everyone in Louisiana, and not a chosen few, was entitled to benefits from the God-given natural resources of our State.

He rests today beneath this granite base, interred in the soil he loved so much, fittingly and peacefully sleeping in that peculiar contentment and knowledge that he had carried out the commandment of the Master of us all who said: "Do unto others as you would have others do unto you."

He was a genuine believer that in the end, the only worthwhile pay in public service is that which comes from a satisfied conscience in the knowledge that you have done your duty as God gives you light regardless of the effect it may have upon political fortunes.

And I know that I voice the sentiments of those assembled here today, when I say: "Green be the turf above you friend of my better days none knew thee but to love thee none named thee but to praise."

Earl K. Long was not a bitter, spiteful, vindicative man. On the contrary, he was one of the most forgiving men I have ever known. Time and again he was urged by some to punish his enemies, but this he never did. He fought hard, but he fought fair. He always preferred to suffer defeat, and several times he did, rather than be ashamed of victory. In political campaigns, he refrained from making promises to the people that could not be kept. Herein lies, in part, the secret of his many political successes.

So, today the great State of Louisiana presents to its people this statue of its only three-time Governor, one of its greatest humanitarians, its indomitable political warrior—and in the years to come his image will stand as a symbol of one who, in truth and in fact, was a great and glorious defender of the rights of the masses of the people.

And as the years pass by and those who disagreed with him forget their differences, and his mistakes are forgotten, his true character, his unusual ability, his great public service will become more outstanding.

And now, my friends, it is my privilege and honor, as a long-time friend of the Long family to accept this statue on behalf of the people of Louisiana.

And I cannot conclude without saying that fate took a good man much, much too soon.

We find comfort, however, in the knowledge that he is "Not dead to us who loved him, not lost, but gone before. He lives with us in memory and will forevermore."

Community Development Workshops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 23, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the progress and security of our country and its people depends upon a strong, dynamic forward moving economy.

Economic progress, however, can be attained only by full utilization of our human and natural resources. Particularly, this objective requires cooperation and leadership among citizens, local governments and free enterprise to creatively tailor plans for the needs of each community.

Recently, the County Officer, an official publication of the National Association of County Officials, published an informative, thought-provoking article entitled "The Community Development Workshops."

Reflecting upon constructive efforts to stimulate progress through workshops attended by community leaders, this represents, in my judgment, a realistic approach to finding solutions for problems of significance, not only to communities, but to the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOPS

(By Philip Warren, Jr.)

Across the length and breadth of the land this past month NACO took its message to the field. In New Orleans, Phoenix, Atlantic City, some 600 county officials interested in the economic well-being of their communities came to hear some 200 speakers, panelists, and experts open up to them the almost unlimited vistas of community development.

There were three such community development workshops, each similar in format, varying only in the speakers themselves and in their local applicability.

A U.S. Senator (Jack Miller, Republican, of Iowa), a Cabinet officer (Commerce Secretary Luther H. Hodges), two Governors (Jimmie Davis, of Louisiana and David L. Lawrence, of Pennsylvania) and a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives (David S. King of Utah), all spoke before the assembled delegates, as well as heads of the four Federal Departments most vitally concerned with community development. Three of NACO's outstanding members made memorable keynote addresses.

NEW ORLEANS KEYNOTE

The tone of the three meetings, almost back to back, was set in New Orleans by keynoter Carson Bain of Guilford County, N.C., a NACO vice president, who spoke for all counties when he said:

"Our interest in community development follows logically along the path of increased county activities in the years since World War II. County government has grown far beyond its traditional involvement in roads, schools, welfare, health, law enforcement, and administration of justice. Look at the list today: water, sewer, garbage collection, street lighting, and other services required by built-up communities.

"Look for a moment at our American county platform, and you get still another perspective of the breadth of county government. There is the attention to metropolitan and urban area problems, and an awareness of the county's role in solving these problems. There is broad interest in roads and highways * * * the development of mass transportation * * * civil defense * * * improvement in public welfare programs, school libraries.

"Thus a workshop on community development is the logical outgrowth of the meetings we have had before."

Defining community development as "the improvement of the economic base of a community * * * to the end that these people can enjoy the good things of life" Bain said the county was the logical unit to plan such development for four reasons:

"First, the county encompasses a logical economic unit.

"Second, it does not make sense to have 2 or 3 or 10 cities, towns, townships or other governmental units (within the same area) competing with one another * * * to attract new industry.

"Third, in the selection of industrial sites, industry leaders often select locations outside of organized communities. They have no place to turn but the county government, and it must be ready to provide services at adequate levels with financing that is fair to all other inhabitants in the county.

"Fourth, the county provides for governmental services that are necessary for industry desiring to locate in the area."

PHOENIX KEYNOTE

King County, Washington, Commissioner Ed Munro, keynoting the Phoenix workshop, summed it up thusly: "The problems of today are essentially * * * of developing an urban society within a relatively short time.

"County commissioners can provide leadership in community development when they realize that the public's understanding of county government changes from that of the graveyard of political ambitions to one of an exciting new development in local responsibility. * * * This challenge is up to us. If we do not rise to it, some other form of government, such as an authority or a metropolitan authority, may move in. The needs of the 1960's are going to be met whether we like it or not.

"What does this require of us? First, understanding. Second, determined action to move ahead. Third, that we occasionally risk our political necks; namely, we must change our image from that of political hacks to that of decisive and understanding politicians."

He called dollars, development, and direction the three basic tools with which county officials have to work to bring about economic development in their communities. He concluded by saying that "county government has been, and should continue to, reevaluate its responsibilities, and reorganize to meet them more effectively."

ATLANTIC CITY KEYNOTE

Milwaukee County's elected executive, John L. Doyne, had this to say as he set the stage for the third and wind-up meeting in Atlantic City:

"Community development should be as important a concern for our [county] officials as are problems of welfare, highways, housing, and airports. It is most timely that this leadership and this effort at the county level begin now." Then he outlined a five-point program for accomplishing the aims of the three workshops, that of bringing stable, long-range, and balanced economic prosperity to each county:

"First, steps should be taken to remove the restrictions imposed by State constitutions and outdated laws. Urban counties must be granted a substantial degree of home rule, with power to create an organizational structure which differs from that of rural counties.

"Secondly," he went on, "county leadership in community development means capital improvement programing, planning, and financing. * * * This means the undertaking of an adequate overall program for the future development of your county for the next 25 and even 50 years.

"Third, county leadership in community development means continual studies in countywide problems.

"Fourth, * * * [it] means regional planning. No longer can county government in the urban areas isolate itself from its county neighbors.

"Fifth, county leadership in community development means intergovernmental cooperation."

RECURRING THEMES

These same themes ran through all keynote addresses, and the panels that followed concentrated on the details of the points brought up by the keynotes—the need for a community economic analysis—inventory-taking—the need for long-range community and capital improvement planning; how to organize community and industrial planning machinery to perfect and carry out the job, and lastly, Federal aids that are available.

In New Orleans, Governor Davis stressed the great economic gains made in recent years of communities in the South, and foresaw an even greater era of economic expansion.

At the same meeting, Iowa Senator JACK MILLER, in a speech later recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, spoke against solutions of the community problems "which tend to make the States mere political subdivisions of the Federal Government.

He won a rousing ovation when he stated categorically, "I do not plan to vote for a Department of Urban Affairs."

THE HEART OF GOVERNMENT

In a heavyweight session in Atlantic City, Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges told county officials that they "are really at the heart of government in America. They are in immediate contact with the community. They know at first hand an area's needs and limitations in a way that State and Federal Governments can never know.

"The top official in one State was quoted as saying, 'For a long time there was a general feeling we could rock along and things would take a turn for the better. Lots of people felt Uncle Sam would bail us out sooner or later. Now there's a genuine realization that no matter how much help we get we've got to do the bulk of the job ourselves." And you people have done nobly doing the job yourselves. Even if the communities never receive a cent of Federal money, they will be able to harvest the benefits that come from having economic blueprints of their region."

The able, soft-spoken Commerce Secretary also had a word to say for the proposed changes in the reciprocal trade act and close trade alliances with the "Common Mart." Said he, "* * * make no mistake, our welfare is tied as surely to our oversea transactions as it is to our domestic economy."

ROLE OF THE STATE

Speaking at lunch the same day, Pennsylvania's chief executive also attempted to define community development before delving into the subject of the State's role in same.

"Community development * * * extends far beyond the mere physical restoration or improvement of an area. It goes beyond physical planning. When we consider the development of a community, we must think in terms of its total enrichment, its schools, highways, hospitals, welfare programs, its programs to attract industry and expand existing business, its law enforcement and probationary programs. In each of these areas, and a host of others, the county and the State share a mutually strong and mutually beneficial interest.

"It is with the total aspect of community development that the State must be concerned."

The State, he went on, must help create and encourage better communities. "It must not try to determine what action the community takes—it must attempt to aid in this determination and to provide the fullest possible assistance once a program has been decided upon."

ECONOMIC EARLY WARNING

The four Federal agencies most closely alined with community development all told their story. Dan Goldy, Deputy Administrator of Area Redevelopment, called for an "economic early warning system" wherein communities could spot shifting change in the economic and employment winds before they occurred. Sidney Woolner, Commissioner of the Community Facilities Administration, spoke of "the ultimate dedication to the quality of human life" through the community environment, the home, the opportunity to work, and earn a decent living and to enjoy the finer things in life, and lastly security in time of distress or old age.

He said his agency was working in these areas with programs that could be of advantage to county governments.

In 10 days of meetings, it became abundantly clear that community development was an all-inclusive program which had to begin in the locality itself, and ultimately was the sum total of a community's ability and desire to provide a better life for its people based on sound planning and responsible political leadership.

In all of this, county government had a leading role and a monumental stake.

Regional Community Development Workshop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HIRAM L. FONG

OF HAWAII

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 23, 1962

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, one of Hawaii's able and distinguished public officials, Supervisor Elroy T. L. Osorio, of the county of Hawaii, recently delivered an excellent address at the Regional Community Development Workshop of the National Association of County Officials in Phoenix, Ariz.

Mr. Osorio described the county's energetic efforts toward greater economic development of our State's largest island. His address is replete with sound and meritorious observations and recommendations which I believe would be of great interest and value to other counties striving for greater economic progress.

I commend Mr. Osorio for his lucid and cogent presentation and ask unanimous consent that the full text be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REGIONAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP

It is with great pleasure that I have accepted the invitation to speak with you this afternoon concerning the Government's part in the economic development and the economic potential of our island of Hawaii. First of all, however, I should like to recognize my colleague, another member of the board of supervisors of the County of Hawaii, Mr. Elias Yadao. Our county recognizes the importance of this conference and has indicated its desire to participate by sending both of us.

We have come here to learn; but, we hope too that what little advice we have to offer may be of some benefit to some of you.

We in the county government have only begun to realize the necessity and importance of county leadership towards economic development. We have always asked ourselves, "What can we do to bring new and more businesses to our big island?" Although our major growth in the State has been confined to Honolulu on the Island of Oahu, we too have wanted to reap some of its benefits. We have now reached the stage where we are doing something about it. We think we may be on the right track.

Up to just a few days ago, the county had an advisory committee known as the Economic Research and Development Commission, which met once a month to discuss ways and means of developing the potential of our county. These commission members made up of the businessman, the farmer, the hotel representative, the labor leader, the government representative, and the housewife who represent the major geographical areas of our county have had to date, numerous meetings with many individuals and organizations from various parts of the county for the purpose of close cooperation and coordination in developing programs. It became almost an impossible job for the members of this nonpaying commission to promote the many ideas and suggestions brought about through their long and somewhat tedious meetings. Only last week, after several months of searching for the right man to head this commission, our county approved a budget of $50,000 and created a full-time staff. This, I believe, is the beginning of our county's leadership toward economic development. While his work will be one of developing the ideas and suggestions collected by the commission, the implementation of projects will determine the results of these long studies.

Our county was designated as a depressed area under the Area Redevelopment Act. As a result of this, the E.R. & D.C. was required to develop our OED program, which has since been approved by ARA in Washington. With this OEDP we now have a "living working document" to quote the words of Mr. Dan Geldy of ARA. We now have direction and our goals are set forth in this OEDP. The point I am trying to making however, is the fact that every community should develop their own OEDP whether they are designated by the Area Redevelopment Act or not. This, we believe would be the first step for county leadership toward economic development.

We believe there will be many other areas in which government can take the lead in developing its economy. One suggestion is perhaps a common one to all of us, that is, encouragement by local tax relief. This is something delightful to talk about, yet difficult to achieve. You have the continuing problem of the old and the new. If you are going to give tax incentive to new industries, the older industries are down your throat asking why they are not given the same benefit. There are obvious problems such as, the tax relief, due to many of our outmoded statutes. For example: In Hawaii we actually have a State real property tax rather than a county real property tax, and the amount of tax relief a county could give would be in our situation very limited. This is an area, however, whereby the county could take the lead in requesting legislative authority to tax with discretion.

With the aid of the State we have come up with an interesting fact book, copies of which can be made available to some of you. This fact book has been compiled by the department of economic development which gives you a pretty up-to-date understanding of our situation. I believe that a fact book is essential to any economic development program.

Another problem common to most of us is a realistic, practical zoning and subdivision ordinance. Zoning is basically called a compromise between what we would like to have and that which is an economic necessity. For example: we would all like to have the advantages of a large city, but would not like to have the dirt and crowding a large city often engenders. We would all like to have the flow of money brought in by large industries, but not the inconvenience of having to provide schools and recreational facilities for any large number of people. Zoning, therefore, must be realistic and should not be so restrictive as to make it impossible for flights of fancy and economic dreams to materialize.

Modern planning and zoning taught us to provide such things as "big lot subdivisions" which enable the best utilization of land, in my opinion. Such an ordinance provision permits maximum utilization of land with desirable open spaces, and at the same time permits continuity of utilities and installation at a much less expense than the usual grid subdivisions which are so often encouraged by less modern zoning and subdivision ordinances which are so often encouraged by less modern zoning and subdivision ordinances. I believe we have to take a second and probably a third look at our zoning and subdivision ordinances, for certainly here is an area where we can either encourage or discourage future developments.

Another area of development potential lies in the so-called "industrial park." Bordering on socialism, perhaps, but nevertheless effective, where the county owns land sufficiently large, adjacent to transportation facilities, and available to private developers with attractive free leasehold periods, can be quite effective.

It is equally important also that we have an understanding of the realistic limitations of our counties. For example: There is no sense in wasting a prospective manufacturer's time if his product is one which cannot essentially make money, giving due consideration to the county's transportation problems, labor problems, land and development construction problems, and the education level of its inhabitants. Your full-time staff should be well versed in such matters.

Your better business bureaus and chambers of commerce should be very carefully educated. Either one can make rash and unvalidated statements which can have a lasting and damaging effect. In addition, your local press should be the biggest booster of the community and should carefully scrutinize its articles prior to printing in order to avoid abusive and derogatory publicity.

Most important, I believe, is the sense of adventure and destiny on the part of the county fathers. They have an excellent opportunity for saying "so what if it has not been done before, why not give it a chance?" The county government should not impede but permit private enterprise to risk its own moneys as well as to allow them access to all of their facts. These are some of the areas in which I believe the county can show directions. Now, about the economic potential of our island, the county of Hawaii.

Earlier I mentioned a county fact booklet. While I believe we have one of the finest pieces of workmanship put together, I will emphasize that there are a few things that words in a rather technical publication cannot adequately express. They are the feelings, the attitudes, the industriousness of people. Such things as the opportunity for all types of sports and recreational facilities, from mountain climbing to water skiing, from skin diving to flying—and remember that the Hilo Airport is closed to traffic less than one-half of 1 percent per year. And the county of Hawaii is big, not large in the sense of your tremendous States here in the West, but big in land area in comparison with all of the other islands making up the State of Hawaii—as a matter of fact containing more than twice as much land area as all of the other islands combined. The climate varies within a space of 70 miles from the driest of cactus-strewn desert to a mountain valley where it rains 250 inches a year regularly. One way to get over the island is to go from sea level at Hilo, the county seat, nearly 8,000 feet up over the saddle road, and then down again to sea level in sunny Kona. In the space of a 2-hour drive of about 85 miles you travel through rain forests, desolate lavafields, dry plateaus, through some of the greatest ranching country in the world and thence to the dry sunny and breezy Kona coast, the setting of some of the most famous hotels in all the world. This is my island. And it is indeed a marvelous place in which to live. The people are toilers. They understand for the most part that it is an honorable thing to work. There is very little in the way of inherited wealth and very few people who either by inclination or resources are able to lounge away their lives. Sugar is the largest employer. And on the island along the well-drained Hamakua coast lie one plantation after another, from the sea for 4 miles toward the mountains and also three huge plantations in Puna and Kau, Kau being the southernmost district of the United States.

This is a storied land. A land which, in the stone age culture, one branch of my ancestors was capable of providing a high standard of living in food and shelter of approximately 400,000 Hawaiians as against the present population of about 60,000. These are people who worked hard and had considerable leisure—people who lived so well that hardly an adult male was under 6 feet in height. People who had the time and the desire to create out of nature beautiful music, wonderful canoes, and a sense of hospitality and aloha that remains to this day the finest example of those words. You know, I'm getting homesick already.

Opportunity is flagrantly visible. We are in the same situation on the island of Hawaii as southern California was 20 years ago. As Phoenix and Tucson were just befor World War II. We need capital badly. There just is not enough to go around with the numerous projects of building and industry which even now are beginning to become visible. The tourist has hardly discovered the island of Hawaii. Most people still think of Oahu or Honolulu as synonymous with Hawaii, still think of Waikiki as representing the feeling and spirit of Hawaii. You who have traveled to our islands know better than this. Waikiki, bless them all, has turned into a fascinating but very un-Hawaiian metropolis, and it is only the outside islands, in my opinion, that resemble in the slightest the advertisements, the culture, and the romance that people anticipate when they think of the word "Hawaii."

Opportunities abound. For example, the extension of the runway of the Hilo Airport will probably be completed by the end of next year in Hilo, yet we do not now have enough hotel rooms within a 30-mile radius to care for even one-half of the passengers expected when the first direct jet flights land. There is only one motel on the entire island and yet the island is so large that it is impossible to see very much of it in even 2 or 3 days of relatively hard driving. We have youth; more than one-half of our total population is under the age of 25 years. It is an apt, trainable, and industrious youth. Our techniques of production and distribution in many ways are outmoded. A number of mainlanders, especially from the western part of the United States, have recently moved in with some know-how and some capital and have amazed us with what comes naturally to them. Construction techniques, until recently, and then to no great extent, are precisely like what our grand-

fathers built. Diversification in agriculture is steadily progressing. Much remains to be done in the field of transportation, although our plantation equipment and field machinery is so superior to that of any other sugar equipment that all the world comes to us for expert knowledge in this field.

The island of Hawaii is the nearest island by far to the United States of any of the Hawaiian Islands. It has immense reserves of land and that land is still inexpensive in comparison with the lands on any other island. Don't forget that more than 60,000 individual lots have been sold primarily to mainland people on the island of Hawaii during the last 3 years during the most spectacular land boom that the island of Hawaii has ever seen. It is still possible to purchase ideal vacation land at $110 to $1,000 per acre. Mr. Carl Adair of this city has just recently purchased 32,000 acres for less than $200 an acre.

We have our problems it is true, but show me any youthful, vigorous, advancing economy that does not. There are a few things, however, besides our climate and attractive living that we can offer. We can offer a true feeling of aloha and acceptance. All you have to do to become assimilated into this wondrous community is to bring with you honorableness, talent and initiative. We need these, we want these, and speaking as a member of the county government, we will assist in every way possible. We hope in every way that anybody who wants to live under the circumstances of freedom, lack of want, and with a view to expansion will visit us, observe for himself, and we feel certain that he will join us to the good of our island and we feel assuredly to his own financial well being.

Outdoor Recreation Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 23, 1962

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, as usual, Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, Mr. Conservation of the United States, opened the North American Wildlife Conference in Denver, Colo., last week.

The president of the Wildlife Management Institute pointed out that the increasing demand for outdoor recreation exceeds the supply, unless there is imaginative land use planning and the intensification of essential programs for forestry, range, wildlife, water, and other resources.

Backed up by the recent report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, he emphasized that while each level of government has a responsibility for these plans and programs, much of the leadership and most of the money must come from the folks at home, for the job is too big and too diverse for either the Federal or State Governments to handle by themselves. In addition to developing the public lands which the administer, Government agencies should stimulate development of private lands for recreation; for in many areas, there is no public land left and costs are prohibitive. Such a program could include incentives to encourage farmers to develop the recreation potential of their lands.

Knowing that my colleagues will be interested in Gabe's remarks, I ask unanimous consent that the address, by the former Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and of its predecessor, the U.S. Biological Survey, appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GETTING ON WITH THE JOB

(By Ira N. Gabrielson)

Outdoor recreation is one of the most imperiled commodities in the natural resources marketplace. Its fate rests largely on the outcome of two of man's more noble aspirations—imaginative land use planning and the intensification of essential programs for forestry, range, wildlife, water, and other resources. To hope that demands for outdoor recreation can be met is to believe that a balance can be struck between housing and commerce and land and water resources.

Coordinated long-range planning and the proper management of renewable natural resources are the keys to outdoor recreation opportunity. Community and regional planning is of little purpose recreationally if there are few expanses of forests, clear streams, or crystal lakes to enjoy. And even the best husbandry of our resources makes little contribution to mass recreation if natural areas are not accessible for a wide range of uses within reasonable limits of time and expense.

Recreation becomes more expensive daily. Prices always soar for commodities of relatively fixed supply and mounting demand. The millions of Americans who are insisting on more recreational opportunities must realize and accept this unyielding economic consideration. The acquisition and dedication of sufficient lands and waters, their development and continuing administration, and the inclusion of recreation in established programs all cost money. Recreation is never free. It always has a dollar value.

Fortunately, we still have a good land and water resources base upon which to construct necessary recreation programs. We must act swiftly, however, and initiate short-range programs to accommodate outdoor sports near metropolitan centers, where deplorable shortages already exist and where problems are becoming extremely acute. We must encourage long-range planning on all levels of private and public endeavor, and promote those essential day-to-day programs of the Federal and State agencies responsible for natural resources management. Stable programs go hand in hand with outdoor recreation objectives.

The excellent report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission shows clearly the obligations and challenges that lie ahead. Its timely recommendations should serve as a rallying point for public information, thinking, and support. This momentum must not be wasted or misdirected. We should not ignore the fact that special commissions, appointed in past years to study major problems, also have submitted good reports. Nothing much was done with their findings, however. Congress and the executive agencies rarely have shown an eagerness to implement commission suggestions. The splendid Paley Commission report is a prime example of this pathetic situation.

Fortunately, some moves already are being made to meet massive recreation demands. Voters in New York, in 1960, authorized a $75 million bond issue for the immediate purchase of all sorts of recreation lands, stream easements, forest pressure in-holdings, and additions, upland hunting and camping areas, boat launching sites, and access strips. That program, solidly endorsed by the State's voters, was prompted by one inescapable fact—suitable recreation lands daily become more scarce and more costly.

The New York program was conceived and accepted because of the absolute necessity to acquire lands now, while they are available. A few people question the wisdom and propriety of securing land now for outdoor recreation without its immediate development. Some State and Federal agencies voice similar apprehension. To my mind, those who share this view fail to grasp the scope of the recreation problem, to recognize the challenge, as it actually exists. Money cannot be deposited if there are no banks. Quality recreation cannot exist without land.

Last year Wisconsin levied a cent-a-package cigarette tax to finance a 10-year, $50 million outdoor recreation program. Its aim is to benefit residents and to capitalize on returns from the tourist trade. You will hear more about that excellent program from Governor Nelson on Wednesday.

New Jersey has a $60 million green acres program, based on a bond issue, also dedicated to immediate action. All three of these going programs provide assistance to local units of government to help acquire and develop recreation facilities.

Other States also seek to move forward. Pennsylvania's Gov. David L. Lawrence has handed the State legislature a program involving a $70 million bond issue. It envisions $40 million for regional parks and reservoirs in 43 recreation-short counties; $20 million for matching grants to regional, county, and municipal authorities for park, recreation, and open spaces acquisitions; and $10 million to the Pennsylvania Game and Fish Commissions to purchase wildlife, fish, and boating areas threatened by imminent destruction.

The Michigan Conservation Commission is studying a cigarette tax proposal similar to Wisconsin's. It is estimated that a penny-a-pack tax would produce from $9 to $10 million annually for a broad program covering the purchase and capital improvement of State parks, forests, fishing sites, and game areas.

California is considering a $100 million bond issue to finance beach and park purchases during the next 5 years. Additional appropriations also are being proposed for construction and improvements at existing State properties.

Recreation problems are not identical in all States. Situations vary widely in accordance with population distribution and the extent and accessibility of private, State, and Federal lands and waters that can be used for recreational purposes. Silence gives no clue to preparedness. We fail to hear the welcome sounds of preparation and action, especially in the coastal and Lake States where there is an urgent need to meet burgeoning demands.

The Federal Government's role in attempting to ease the recreation crisis undoubtedly will follow along conventional lines. A good record is likely to be attained through programs of existing agencies already responsible for the administration of forests, parks, wildlife refuges, water developments, pollution abatement, and the national land reserve. Plans for this are in evidence in Operation Outdoors, Mission 66, and Project Twenty-Twelve.

Good planning also is revealed in policy changes such as the recent revision of the widely denounced rule that has been preventing the acquisition of lands around Federal reservoirs for recreation and fish and wildlife. That old policy was an unbelievable document. It gave a high percentage of the recreation values created by the spending of millions of dollars of public funds

for reservoirs to a handful of people. The new policy, signed by the Interior and Army Departments recently, means that the Federal Government again recognizes the need to obtain sufficient land around new reservoirs, and possibly some old ones, for public access and for present and future requirements for outdoor recreation, fish, and wildlife.

The recreation programs that have been developed by the principal Federal land management agencies have been publicized widely. The public must guard against complacency, however, because no chart of action is final. It must be evaluated and revised periodically in response to new trends and new information. It must receive necessary authorizations and appropriations, two prime requisites that the mere issuance of program outlines will not guarantee.

Another opportunity for extraordinary expansion of recreation rests on the millions of acres of land administered by service agencies of the Department of Defense. That Department has just issued a new directive, in response to a 1960 law, setting forth specific objectives and instructions for all base commanders. It espouses many of the suggestions of conservationists, and holds out the prospect for full cooperation with State and Federal agencies.

The open space program, authorized in the Housing Act of 1961 provides $50 million over a 5-year period for assistance grants to States and local governments for acquiring and preserving open space in urban areas. The President has asked for another $50 million in his natural resources message. As large as its sounds, and as welcome as it is, this is a relatively insignificant start on a monstrously large task. Open space needs in the New York metropolitan region alone are estimated at $1.9 billion based on 1960 prices. The cost of acquiring land in the vicinity of Washington, D.C., to meet the needs of the year 2000 is estimated at $2 billion.

Recreation is diverse, a conglomeration of activities requiring much more than a single plan or program. Vigorous leadership, new ideas, new programs, new authorizations, new appropriations—all are sorely needed.

President Kennedy mentioned a number of them in his recent agricultural message to Congress. He asked for reasonable amendment of basic authorizations which, if implemented, would offer the prospect of lessening rural poverty and improving recreational opportunity. Nearly one-third of our people live in rural areas. More than half of our poverty is found there. About 60 percent of the Nation's farms are producing only 13 percent of the agricultural output. Recreation, the President said, is one way of limiting overproduction and assisting rural economic adjustment.

Conservationists have been asking for a long time why farmers should not be helped to improve their lands for recreation. Public funds have been allocated to farmers for crop-production purposes for years, even in face of surpluses. The Government pays to put land into production that is not needed, and stimulates erosion and loss of soil fertility. Why not initiate constructive programs and help interested farmers improve their incomes by raising the recreation potential of their lands? Why not invest public funds, which have been going into wasteful production, in production of another kind, for recreation? Why not provide an additional incentive, perhaps as a bonus, to participating farmers to assure public access to these recreational developments and to indemnify landowners for wear and possible loss of property? Are these not reasonable uses of public funds?

Agriculture Department experts estimate that 51 million acres now in cropland will not be needed by 1980. Technology and increasing farm productivity enable farmers to feed more people from fewer acres. Conservationists should not dismiss the prospect of getting some of that 51 million acres devoted to recreation.

The administration's viewpoint was voiced by Agriculture Secretary Freeman who earlier this year testified before the House Agriculture Committee on H.R. 10010 which, like companion bill S. 2786, would put the 1962 agricultural program into action. "I might say to you," the Secretary said, "that it does not make sense to use lands to produce something that we do not need, that we have to store and on which we must pay heavy charges to store and to handle. It is highly inefficient and improper and has put us in the position we are in today.

"But as I said our goal is not to idle land. There is today a great unmet need for land for purposes of outdoor recreation, for wildlife habitat, for green spaces around our cities. The ORRRC report * * * indicated that resources for wholesome outdoor recreation is one of our greatest needs for the future * * * Outdoor recreation also brings about many desirable economic benefits. Its provisions enhance community values by creating a better place to live and increasing land values. In some undeveloped areas it can be a mainstay of the economy.

"Activities of watersheds and other agricultural conservation programs should be oriented toward greater recreational benefits to the public."

The administration recommends amendment of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to expand the ACP program. These would include cost sharing agreements under long-term contracts to permit changes in cropping systems and land use for the conservation and development of soil, water, forests, wildlife, and recreation. Another would amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to authorize the use of acquired land for recreational development and wildlife protection. A third would amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, Public Law 556, to permit the Federal Government to share the cost of land acquired by local organizations for recreation and fish and wildlife developments. The Federal Government's inability to do this at present is shown by the fact that not more than 50 of the 1900 reservoirs constructed so far under Public Law 566 are publicly owned and available for recreation.

In his second message to Congress on natural resources, the President outlined a program which he believes will meet still more of the Federal Government's responsibilities. He wants an Outdoor Recreation Advisory Council to represent appropriate Federal departments, and a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in the Department of the Interior to staff the Council and to administer a proposed program of recreation assistance grants to the States.

The cost of the expanded land acquisition program would be financed through a land conservation fund, which would receive receipts from Federal areas user-fees, charges for recreational boating, unclaimed refunds on marine gasoline taxes, and from the sale of surplus Federal nonmilitary lands. "To prevent costly delay in beginning an acquisition program," the President asked Congress to authorize advances from the Treasury not to exceed $500 million over an 8-year period, which would be repaid from the fund.

Congress also was asked to enact legislation establishing a national wilderness system along the lines of S. 174, authored by Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico. Wilderness preservation was called a key element of our conservation program that should have priority consideration. He also asked that Congress give favorable attention to proposals for 10 national parks, sea and lake shores, and similar areas. Purchase of these park lands, he indicated, would be financed through the land acquisition fund, apparently a reference to the previously named land conservation fund.

A disappointing feature about the Presidential message was its failure to mention the tremendous recreation potentials of the national land reserve. The Bureau of Land Management is the Nation's greatest landlord. It administers 180 million acres in the Western States and nearly another 300 million in Alaska. The BLM has no money for a recreation program, and it apparently is not supposed to have any. The House Appropriations Committee eliminated $200,000 from the budget last year that was supposed to initiate a minimum BLM recreation program. The administration went one step further this year and refused to ask for a penny for recreation on all of those millions of acres of public land.

The President's message said that "we must take action to assure that the full potential is realized from the vacant unused areas in the public domain." Conservationists heartily agreed. There is a tremendous opportunity for better management of those lands. Some necessary steps already have been taken and others are planned that will amend or eliminate archaic laws, and give all of the people a greater voice in the management of the lands. The administration should be supported in these efforts to correct the things that always have prevented proper management of the national land reserve. But nowhere in all of the suggestions that have been advanced is there any firm plan to develop the vast, untapped recreational potential of the public domain.

This is an unfortunate and shortsighted situation. Unlike the national parks, national monuments, wildlife refuges and other special-purpose areas, the public domain and the national forests are spread throughout much of the country, convenient to millions of people. These lands also are available for many more kinds of outdoor recreation than can be accommodated at special-purpose reservations. The making of more of the public domain suitable for recreation has the sound objective of dispersing public use, not concentrating it and compounding already impossible situations.

I realize that for publicity purposes it is not as impressive to say that only a few thousands of dollars were made available for campgrounds, picnic areas, sanitary facilities, wildlife habitat, lakes, and stream improvements, and other recreational developments on so many millions of acres of public lands. It always is more appealing to be able to name specific areas that have been acquired and developed.

The fact remains, however, that infinitely more recreation can be provided, to more people at less cost on the national forests, public domain, and military installations than on any other lands administered by the Federal Government. We must not lose sight of the fact that the national parks, national monuments, and wildlife refuges are not playgrounds. That was never their purpose. They were established and developed to protect valuable assets, and to intimate that they are playgrounds, capable of taking care of high volume public recreation without destruction of their primary purpose is to misrepresent the facts. I do not infer that parks and other special-purpose areas should not provide some recreation. They do furnish a lot of enjoyment of certain types. What I mean is, if we are going to realize some of the national recreation objectives that have been outlined, then we better begin to make a more realistic appraisal of the opportunities on the vast areas of land already in public ownership. Of course a few more national parks and special-use areas should be created wherever lands are found that meet the rigid

standards that have been established for such preserves. I seriously doubt, however, that we should be directing all our efforts and money to only those kinds of areas, when so many of the recreation needs will have to be met through enlightened management of the millions of acres of land already in public ownership.

The recreation potentials of the national land reserve and of the national forests should receive the recognition they deserve. The BLM never has been given enough money to finance even the minimum level of operations. That agency has been harassed for years by a diffidence that extends also through the executive and legislative branches of the Government. How many people know that the BLM returns $7 to the U.S. Treasury for every $1 it receives in appropriations? The people have the right to insist that some of this money be reinvested in the national land reserve.

I am generally optimistic about the outlook for outdoor recreation. The incessant clamor for more facilities shows that a tremendous need exists in every part of the Nation. How quickly we respond, and how well these needs are met depends largely upon the willingness of each of us to do his part and to encourage others to do theirs.

The bulk of the people in this country are crowding into the large population centers. The trend still is from rural to urban areas, and it is in and around the metropolitan complexes that the pople must be served.

The opportunities are there, and it is up to the cities, townships, counties, and States to meet the needs. The greatest opportunity for accomplishment lies with the people themselves. The job is too large and diverse for either the Federal or State Governments. The real core of the outdoor recreation effort is the innumerable county groups and local communities all over the Nation. Many are busying themselves with such things as zoning, deferred taxes, conservation easements, bond issues, and special tax levies. Those groups can count on some financial and technical assistance from the State and Federal Governments, but they should make no mistake. The States and the Federal Government never will have enough money and staff to come anywhere near doing the job that must be done. Much of the leadership and most of the money must come from the local citizenry. Those who get their programs going first will get the most help.

Beware Those Who Exploit Fear of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 23, 1962

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a sermon entitled "Beware Those Who Exploit Fear of Communism," delivered by Rev. John P. McConnell, pastor of the Union Presbyterian Church of Laramie, Wyo., on March 4, 1962.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEWARE THOSE WHO EXPLOIT FEAR OF COMMUNISM

(By John P. McConnell, pastor)

(Scripture passages: Matthew 7: 13-23; Isaiah 5: 18-23)

Beware of false prophets * * *. You will know them by their fruits.—Matthew 7: 15, 16.

The eye of a TV camera is a revealing instrument. In its early days it helped break the power of gangsters in our big cities. It helped expose the viciousness of Senator Joseph McCarthy's hold on our American right to think and speak in freedom. Recently it showed the Christian crusade training school in Tulsa, Okla. It pictured the evangelistic fervor of the followers and the manipulation of hysteria by the leaders. One saw hymn-singing, Bible-carrying, church folk who were finding here a single compelling outlet for their emotons. One heard speakers using all the skills of the old-fashioned revivalism in the crudest sense, molding these people to fever pitch. One heard the late Senator McCarthy upheld as a great martyr to the cause of anticommunism with shouts and applause from the audience. Some of us can remember the newsreels from the early days of Mussolini and Hitler with the same manipulation of hysteria, the same playing upon fear of communism which brought those dictators to power. Thus, even though the demonstration in Tulsa represents a very small minority of Americans we cannot take it lightly. To it and to all expressions of fantical anticommunism we can apply the warning from the Sermon on the Mount: "Beware of false prophets * * *. You will know them by their fruits."

During the last few weeks warnings against the fanaticism of the extreme right have come from many sources. The most recent was last week when the National Catholic Welfare Conference sought to expose some of these dangers. Earlier a group of rabbis and pastors in northern California issued a detailed statement pointing to specific charges against those who participated in the Christian anti-Communist crusade. Prior to the appearance of Dr. Fred Schwartz' crusade in Seattle, 21 ministers and rabbis in the Puget Sound area issued a statement setting forth their firm stand against communism but also calling on patriotic Americans "to recognize the threatening likeness between certain anti-Communist movements now in vogue and events which transpired in Germany and Italy incident to the rise of Nazi and Fascist regimes."[1] As a result a number of churches and synagogues were defaced and bulletin boards painted with such words as "Commie sympathizers," "member of the Commie-led World Council of Churches" * * * "By their fruits you shall know them."

The Seattle statement says some very fundamental things: "Times of social turmoil and international tension create fear. Emotions tend to slip the bridle of reason. Lessons of history are forgotten. In consequence, earnest people, desiring to defend America against all subversion, fail to keep faith with the great American principle and discipline: the right to think and speak in freedom. We are living in such times. In fear of Communist infiltration sincere people are willing to follow self-appointed leaders or groups who claim that they alone speak for true Americanism. These people would silence all who differ from them under charges of subversion and treason. They tend to destroy confidence in churches, public schools, colleges and the free press. They cast doubt upon the loyalty of officials in government and many of our proven patriots and statesmen of long standing. Indeed, they label as suspect every person in a post of leadership who does not conform to their view. They leave in their wake festering suspicion, division, bitterness and bigotry. Thus they tend to destroy the free nation they desire to save."[1] "Beware of false prophets * * * by their fruits you will know them." This warning from the Sermon on the Mount is being spelled out by such statements.

The Presbyterian church is a member of the World Presbyterian Alliance. In January the North American council of this alliance issued a warning against the same divisive forces: "In a time plagued by uncertainty, insecurity and dread of nuclear catastrophe, the church must be especially alert lest the forces of fear and self-interest combine to subvert Christian truth and undermine our liberties and institutions. We see in our society the resurgence of extreme reaction in the face of our difficult social and political situation. Such reaction betrays a deep distrust of the processes by which a constitutional democratic society arrives at its decisions. Groups moved by these reactionary forces attack with fearful suspicion the very institutions which preserve our liberties. Their leaders assert that legislative bodies cannot be trusted; that courts cannot be trusted; that churches cannot be trusted; that people cannot be trusted."[2] "Woe to those who call evil good and who call good evil," cried Isaiah: 5: 20.

A part of the fruits by which we are to know the false prophets may well be the financial gain which comes to the superpatriot leader. The oldtime revivalists were often accused of being more interested in money than in souls. The present-time revivalists of the Christian anti-Communist crusade are doing so well by themselves that the whole movement has been called patriotism for profit. The attorney general of California, Stanley Mosk, recently issued the following verified figures on the financial operations of Dr. Fred Schwartz' Christian anti-Communist crusade in Los Angeles. "For the 90 days following June 30, 1961, the so-called crusade took gross receipts in Los Angeles alone in the sum of $311,253. It expended $96,496 in rent, pay to its speakers, advertising, printing, etc., leaving a net profit of $214,757. This is indeed big business—nearly a quarter of a million dollars in 90 days. No one is told, except in generalities, what is happening to the Oakland profits—or the $100,000 taken out of Philadelphia, the $40,000 out of Phoenix, and so on city after city."[3] Nineteen hundred years ago Peter warned against the false prophets of his day saying, "And in their greed they will exploit you with false words" (II Peter 2: 3). Prophetic.

At these meetings there is great pressure to buy the various materials on hand for sale—with the implication that anyone who fails to buy all this material is uninformed and perhaps unpatriotic. The attorney general of California added up the cost of the items displayed and found that "if an individual bought just one of each available tape and one of each book or booklet, it would cost him $689.10."[3]

And what are the fruits of attending one of these crusades. What do the earnest, misguided people, who follow such false prophets get for their money and their time? "They get a denunciation of America for its failures in Cuba and the Congo with no mention of its successes in Western Europe and in many other parts of the world. They get lectures on how Communists are taking over the United States but no mention of

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

the fact that domestic communism has steadily dwindled in the United States in the past 20 years toward a point of extinction."[4] They hear Dr. Schwartz lecture on "Why Millionaires, Ministers of Religion, and College Professors Become Communists." "They get tirades on patriotism by speakers who damn democracy and smear the Presidents of the United States, the Justices of the Supreme Court and loyal American teachers and ministers. They get divided churches, shattered communities, bombed homes, harassed public servants, and a weakened Nation."[4] "Beware of false prophets. * * * You will know them by their fruits."

This week we are entering the Lenten season—the time of preparation for understanding and entering into Jesus death and resurrection. We can begin this morning by recognizing that this very force which exploits fear and fanatical emotion and fervor today was represented 1900 years ago in those who manipulated the crowd to cry "Crucify Him, crucify Him."

But let's not leave this subject with a denunciation of the subversive fanatics who "in their greed exploit you with false words." There are positive programs for combatting communism. There are things which we can do, in addition to opposing the crusaders, the Birchers, and the other extreme rightwingers—positive, constructive things which will help us to face and oppose the Communist enemy which is ours.

For one thing we can study communism in depth rather than superficially as do most of the materials of the super-patriots. J. Edgar Hoover has said, "The way to fight it is to study it, understand it, and discover what can be done about it. This cannot be achieved by dawdling at the spring of knowledge, it can only be accomplished by dipping deeply into thoughtful, reliable, and authoritative sources of information."[5] We can teach it in our schools and colleges. Years ago when Robert Maynard Hutchins was president of the University of Chicago an irate trustee asked him, "Is it true that you still teach communism at the University of Chicago?" He replied, "Yes, and we still teach the diagnosis and treatment of cancer at our medical school."

For another thing we can remain calm in our confidence in the institutions of democracy in our trust in the God of history. To quote J. Edgar Hoover again, "The ingredients for Communist coups in nations which have fallen under its spell always include a populace shaken with fear, hysteria, and confusion. Above all, however, is the danger of irresponsible counteraction by citizens who lend impetus to communism through inept attempts to fight this insidious menace."[5] "We must remember," says the North American Council of the World Presbyterian Alliance, "that the sovereign God is the Lord of history. Panic, frustration, political, and social extremism betray not only a lack of confidence in the structure of our free societies, but also a failure of faith in God."[3]

Again, we can continue loyal and faithful to the U.S. Government and its agencies, recognizing that democracy is the only human institution which has successfully blocked the flow of communism by infiltration. Our 173d General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church last May expressed its confidence in the present stability of the American people, their institutions, and their Government, and their ability to resist both real and imagined threats to subvert them. It commended the FBI for its effective work in exposing and bringing to justice known Communist agents engaged in espionage or sabotage.[6] "The job of curtailing and containing communism is one for legally constituted authorities with the steadfast cooperation of every loyal citizen," said J. Edgar Hoover. "This is neither the time for inaction nor vigilante action. We must unite as a people; we must understand our basic American heritage under law, and we must face the Communist menace with deliberation, quiet courage, and knowledge. These are the qualities which communism shrinks from; these are the qualities against which communism can never succeed."[6]

Finally we can and must be Christians in the full sense of personal commitment and social concern. Our social concern will express itself in support for civil rights, economic justice, the United Nations, and our schools, our courts, our councils of churches. "The first responsibility of the Christian community," writes John Bennett in his classic book, "Christianity and Communism," is not to save any institution from communism but to present its faith by word and life to the people of all conditions and of all lands that they may find for themselves the essential truth about life."[7]

Those who would subvert the Christian gospel to an obsessive public preoccupation with anticommunism weaken and destroy the Christian message and mission to the whole of life. We must address its eternal truths to every life, to every society, to every political order, to every evil, to every good in a daily ministry of redemption. Only so can we accomplish the purpose committed to us by the Lord of History. This purpose cannot be accomplished by the so-called Christian Anti-Communist Crusade, or the John Birch Society, or any of the forces of fear and self-interest which subvert Christian truth and undermine our liberties and institutions. Let us recognize them for what they are—false prophets—and beware. You will know them by their fruits.

---

[1] Quoted in the Christian Century, Feb. 28, 1962, p. 253.

[2] Printed in Monday Morning, Feb. 26, 1962, pp. 9–11.

[3] Quoted in the Christian Century, Feb. 28, 1962, p. 253.

[4] The Christian Century, Feb. 28, 1962, p. 254.

[5] All J. Edgar Hoover quotes from Glenside (Pa.) News, Apr. 13, 1961. Reprinted in Social Progress, December 1961, p. 8.

[6] Quoted in Social Progress, December 1961, pp. 6–7.

[7] Quoted in Christian Century, Nov. 15, 1961, p. 1356.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Pay Raises for Civil Servants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 23, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, over the years, U.S. civil servants—attending to the business of the people—have made a highly significant contribution to our Nation's progress.

For such service, I believe it is important—in fact, absolutely essential—that we maintain adequate pay scales, in accordance with, first, the significance of their contribution to the country and, second, in proper relation to wage levels in nongovernmental areas of the economy.

Currently, there are a variety of proposals pending before Congress to provide pay adjustments for postal-Federal employees.

Recognizing that there is a real need to maintain adequate pay and benefit levels for postal-Federal employees, the Congress will need to separate the realistic from unrealistic proposals; evaluate the real economic needs; determine a fair, justified, and merited level for increasing salaries; and then go ahead with a good piece of legislation.

Unless civil service employees are provided adequate pay, it will be increasingly difficult to maintain—and recruit—the high-quality civil servants essential to carrying on the business of the people.

In recent days I have received a deluge of messages reflecting a variety of justifications for improving pay scales for postal-Federal employees. I ask unanimous consent to have a cross section of these messages printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the messages were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 27, 1962.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I urge you to ask the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to do everything possible to report favorably legislation which will provide pay for Federal employees comparable with the pay of employees in industry. For the good of our country and the morale of Government workers, Federal employees should have a pay increase now. There is a great lag between pay in Government and pay for comparable work outside of Government. Such action should be prompt, effective July 1, 1962, or sooner, or the disparity will worsen.

I've been an engineer at the Forest Products Laboratory, Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, for 20 years. I'm a member of the National Federation of Federal Employees. You can take my word for it, recruitment and retention of capable employees has become more and more difficult. Please consider my request. It represents the sentiments of many loyal workers at Forest Products Laboratory.

Very truly yours,

——— ———.

FEBRUARY 27, 1962.

Hon. ALEXANDER A. WILEY,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We are interested in a salary increase for all civil service employees.

My husband is a grade 7 meat inspector for the Department of Agriculture receiving a "take-home" pay of $168.57 for an 80-hour period. Trying to pay rent, utilities, water, food, clothing, medical fees and medicine each month, keeps us humping. The men put in 12 to 16 hours each day in order to meet obligations. I am an arthritic patient which requires shots each month plus bills from an internal medical physician for a dropsy condition, which makes it impossible for me to seek outside employment to help pay these bills. The men furnish their own uniforms, special shoes, headgear and knives. These must be replaced often as the shoes rot so quickly and the uniforms must be clean, so must be washed so often and in strong solutions, they do not last long either.

Would you please support the H.R. 9531 and the H.R. 6855 bills, or any other bills that will help the civil service employees that come before the House now or in the near future.

You have done a good job as Senator and have been a credit to Wisconsin.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS,
Milwaukee, Wis., February 17, 1962.

Hon. ALEXANDER M. WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: Along with every member of the National Association of Letter Carriers, I am asking for your support for salary legislation as proposed in bill H.R. 9531.

As a veteran of 33 years of service I have seen far too many disappointments from one arm of the Federal service towards another arm, namely from Congress to the civil service employee. It must be recognized by all concerned, that the letter carrier has, for too long a time, "held the line against inflation," "girded his loins," etc., and has been the "whipping boy" for deficits and balanced budgets.

In asking your support for the provisions in bill H.R. 9531, I am sure you will agree that this bill will bring us a more realistic measure of remuneration for the exacting dedication required in performing our daily work.

Long ago, we have given up the idea of "keeping up with the Joneses" on our meager salary. All we now ask is "keeping up with the cost of living."

Thank you for anything you might do furthering our cause and for your many past favors.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

EAST TROY, WIS.
March 5, 1962.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: * * * In comparison to people in delivery and distribution in industry, we mail carriers in the post office are about $1,000 a year behind in average yearly earnings. Is that the way to give Federal employes the advantage of the American standard of living?

I have 26 years in Government service. In 4 years I may be able to retire and go out in industry and make an adequate living, even by selling handkerchiefs.

An affirmative vote for H.R. 9531, the postal salary increase bill, will give many young people in the post office the incentive to stay and try hard to do well in the service. At present not too many young ones are enthusiastic about Government service.

Yours truly,

——— ———.

PRAIRIE DU CHIEN, WIS.,
March 8, 1962.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WILEY: May I request your support in the efforts of postal employees to secure a decent wage increase?

Everyone agrees that we need it.

However, there are various ideas of the amount we need and when we need it. The administration has introduced legislation which would give us a small raise over a 3-year period starting next January. The terms suggested give pitifully small amounts to postal workers while giving huge raises to the higher paid political appointees.

Each of the postal employees has fixed expenses the same as the higher paid officials. Any percentage raise would only aggravate the condition. A flat raise would be better and would better compensate the people who actually do the work.

There have been all sorts of surveys made by committees, most of which end up in no information of value. We who are in the low-income group know what it costs to raise and educate a family and are disgusted with being given the runaround by politicians.

Surveys, form letters, and stalling around until the end of a session to do anything seems to be the usual routine. Last year this resulted in a Presidential veto to a much-needed raise. We needed a raise last year and still need it. There is no need for further study. The time for action is now.

Any support you give to legislation giving us a fair raise now instead of a promise of something in the future will be greatly appreciated and remembered.

Very truly yours,

——— ———.

CAMP DOUGLAS, WIS.,
March 12, 1962.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SENATOR: The members of Branch 5436, National Association of Letter Carriers, Camp Douglas, respectfully solicit your active support of the Morrison bill, H.R. 9531, when it arrives in the Senate.

We feel this bill goes a long way toward correcting the pay and longevity inequities which now exist in the Postal Department. Passage depends on the favorable judgment of our lawmakers in Washington, therefore we ask that you help us at this time.

Very truly yours,

——— ———.

WISCONSIN FEDERATION OF POST OFFICE CLERKS,
Prescott, Wis., March 14, 1962.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senator from Wisconsin,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Please urge members of the Senate Post Office Committee to report out a postal pay bill similar to H.R. 9531 and do everything possible to encourage the Senate to approve such legislation.

We lower paid postal workers need the same amount of a raise as the higher paid people. Costs us the same to live as it does them. The pay reform program also does not give us enough of a raise to anywhere meet the increased cost of living.

Thank you for past favors.

Yours truly,

——— ———.

Hon. ALEXANDER M. WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: I am writing to you for your help in passing H.R. 9531 to help the letter carriers of America out of the deeping hole of debts. With mothers away from the kids working and pop also working a part-time job to make ends meet. With the cost of living going up monthly and especially in a big city. With many vetoes in the past, we Government workers have been falling far behind.

So again I am asking for your help in passing H.R. 9531 to give the letter carriers a living wage.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

FEBRUARY 27, 1962.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I am writing to you for your support of H.R. 9531, dealing with a pay raise for postal employees.

I am told that prior to 1939 postal workers pay was in line with the firemen and policemen of Milwaukee, Wis. Today even the garagemen in the majority of our cities receive pay which is better than the postal worker. I am not stating that their wages are not deserved but rather that these cities have realized what is a decent standard of living.

We, who have given up the right to strike, have placed a great responsibility in the hands of Congress. I am sure you are aware of this responsibility and will do all you can to secure for the postal worker a decent wage.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

MILWAUKEE POST OFFICE CLERKS' UNION.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I have studied and digested the President's proposal for salary adjustments for Federal employees. After spending 3 hours on that bill, it left me with a sour taste in my mouth. Having over 25 years of postal service, I can't comprehend the theory of a new employee having to work 27 years before reaching top grade. In my case, I'll never be able to work long enough to enjoy top pension privileges, under the present system of computing pensions.

One of the President's statements mentioned the high turnover of employees—the statement is true but only among the lower levels. In the 25 years at the Milwaukee post office, I have never witnessed any of our top officials leaving for other fields. The President should be made aware of these facts.

I hope that you will seriously consider the many excellent features of H.R. 9531 and that you will support this piece of legislation. I believe that passage of this bill would certainly solve the problem on the heavy turnover among the lower level employees.

Fraternally,

——— ———.

FEBRUARY 7, 1962.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: It isn't too often that I have occasion to write to you as my Senator from Wisconsin, but I feel it is urgent that I do so at this time. No doubt you have heard many times before of the increasing hardships of the Federal postal employees, and of the difficulty trying to maintain a decent standard of living on current salaries, so I shall say as little as possible in this respect. I am married and the father of three small children, and it just doesn't seem fair that I can't give my children the same advantages that other children can have. The cost of bringing up a family has steadily increased, and with our pay scale, we as postal employees can go just so far.

Because of this I want to ask you to support the Federal pay raise bill, H.R. 9531. I know with your influence you can do so much to help this bill become law, and we would all be so very grateful to you.

Thank you for your time and attention in this matter, and God bless you.

Regards,

——— ———.

TWO RIVERS, WIS.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Once again we, the postal workers, must ask for your help as we have in the past. I am sure that you are well aware of the bill for increase in wage, and time and a half, for subclerks and carriers which will be voted on in the near future—H.R. 9531.

I am sending this letter to you because I feel that we are justified in asking for this pay increase. I, myself, am a career subclerk. This means that I must replace the regular worker when he is sick or on vacation. This includes Saturday and Sunday. In other words my work is 7 days a week. My hours are any time between 6:30 a.m. and 8 p.m. I consider this a fairly long day. This makes it very hard to find time for relaxation.

I like my job and word hard at it. My personal pay is $2.31 per hour. This a far cry from the rate of pay that my plumber, TV man, carpenter, garageman, etc. receive.

Any of these that I have mentioned above will not even come and perform his service for me on a Sunday.

Yet for a much smaller rate of pay, I must spend my weekends working on his mail. This seems to me as being a very good reason for asking for a compensation pay such as time and a half for over an 8-hour day and legal holidays.

I hope that this will help you see some of our problems as we see them. For these reasons I am asking you, our representative, to fight our cause for us.

Any consideration will be gratefully accepted. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

JANUARY 16, 1962.

DEAR MR. WILEY: I am a postal clerk in Appleton, Wis., and am writing to ask your support for, and passage of, the Morrison bill, H.R. 9531, providing for pay increases for postal employees. This increase is direly needed to bring us up near that of private industry, and eliminate most of us from the necessity of working 4 to 6 hours on a second job to barely eke out a living for our families. I realize that President Kennedy has been asking labor to ease off on pay requests, and although I agree, we must be brought up to the other labor's yearly level before the leveling off takes place or we will be way behind the level of other employment. As you men in Congress well know, the cost of living has been constantly rising, but our wages stay at the same low level. Please vote us this raise in pay along with the postage hike this year and we will be forever grateful. Thank you.

——— ———.

CLINTONVILLE, WIS.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: With so many wage increase bills before Congress, I thought you might be interested in knowing the thoughts of postal employees on this subject. I have talked to them and have also heard comments about the various bills from the townspeople. Since you evidently receive many letters from these same people, you have an idea on their line of thinking. The end result seems to be a preconceived opinion (mostly from rumors), without making an effort to obtain pertinent facts.

Our city can be classed as a (one industry) town and I therefore checked with this industry to ascertain what the average increase was in salaries during the past 10 years. Including the 4-cent-per-hour increase they will receive on April 2, 1962, the wages have been increased 52.5 percent since 1952.

The average postal worker (level 4) in our office has received a 30.3-percent increase since 1952.

Because both groups have the same living costs, the postal group feel they must have additional jobs to make ends meet. Of the 18 employees we have, 6 have part-time jobs and the wives of another 6 have full-time jobs. Nationally, with over half a million postal employees, this could mean that there would be 333,000 more part-time or full-time jobs available for the public, if postal employees received sufficient remuneration so they would not need the extra jobs. These figures are the result of the percentage at our office when applied nationally.

The administration's plan to provide comparable salaries for Federal workers with those in private industry, is commendable. Considering this, I do not see any possibility of the Morrison bill passing, because that will minimize the areas of responsibility, which Public Law 68 did such a fine job in trying to establish. The Lesinski bill, H.R. 10210, keeps the ratio intact. The report of the committee appointed by the President, will establish salary levels equivalent to industry, based on responsibilities and take care of inequities. With the strikes at present and the resultant boosts in pay, our employees are hoping that some relief will be forthcoming before the relief proposed for the beginning of 1963.

The foregoing are the thoughts of our employees and I hope they will be of help to you in your deliberations.

With kind regards.

——— ———.

Hon. ALEXANDER M. WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Demanding your attention soon will be H.R. 9531. I have watched, with great interest, the plight of the civil servant—the mailman. For years he and his fellow workers have been asked to stem the tide of inflation—to hold the line—to lessen the ascent of the wage-price spiral. To get and hold their job they have agreed to forgo certain privileges which other men would not dream of giving up—the right to strike being one of them.

Loyal, friendly, trustworthy—men with expanding families and incomes that always run 7 to 9 years behind the norm—men who must be on the job every workday—no days off because it is too hot, or below zero, or because the snow is too deep; these men literally go through "hell and high water" to do their job—and a fine job they do, too.

Your support will be appreciated and remembered.

Yours truly,

——— ———.

P.S.—I am not a postal employee.

MARCH 2, 1962.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I am writing this letter in regard to the Federal employees' pay raise, in particular for postal employees. I am very much for this raise, but not for the percentage raises President Kennedy proposes, but a flat across-the-board raise, the same amount for everyone no matter how high a position they hold. We also want this raise this year not over a period of 3 years.

Enclosed is an article from our local paper which shows what the average man in Waukesha is paid a week. I wish my husband's check came close to this.

I was one of the many who attended the pay raise rally at Madison and I enjoyed your speech very much.

Why do I want such a raise? Well, I have many reasons. Right now my husband is barely making enough to meet our monthly needs. We very seldom have enough to pay our medical bills and to have the car repaired when needed. If it were not for the grandparents and godparents I don't know what our four children would be wearing for clothes, because we cannot buy them.

Family entertainment, the only thing we have is our TV and that isn't going to last much longer. I can very seldom invite guests. Now, I ask you, is this living or just existing?

My husband wants to go out and get a part-time job so we can have some of the little extras other average families have. I won't let him because he would not be able to do his regular job justice and his family would never know they have a father and husband.

I do hope you will do all you can for us who need this raise very much and now.

Congratulations on your many years in office and the wonderful work you are doing.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

FEBRUARY 16, 1962.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Please do all you can in support of the Morrison bill, H.R. 9531. Now is the time postal workers need the raise—especially us while our child is a student in college. The salaries have always been behind private industry and comes a time when a person should be able to set something aside for their needs other than just food and clothing. Our car for one thing is 11 years old already and we need to repair our home too, modest though it is. I thank you for any help you give H.R. 9531.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

The Height of Folly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I wish to include in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Height of Folly," which appeared in the Arizona Republic of March 18, 1962. This editorial brings so clearly into focus the reasons why we should not export grain to Red China, as has been recently requested and is now being considered by the Department of Commerce, that I felt every Member of Congress should have the opportunity to see it.

The editorial follows:

THE HEIGHT OF FOLLY

No government in the world is as belligerently anti-American as that of Communist China. Day in, day out, her state-run radios spew out an endless stream of invective, branding the United States a "paper tiger" and threatening war on the "colonial exploiters."

But despite her mock bravado—she knows the Western World won't launch an attack—Communist China is a land of misery and starvation. Daily streams of refugees pouring into Hong Kong attest to the failure of the "great leap forward" which are Reds are counting on to overtake the West. And even her own officials have admitted China's abject agricultural failure, demonstrating once again that it takes more than bureaucratic regulations and the master's whip to insure a bountiful yield.

In a frantic effort to relieve her widespread agricultural shortages, Red China lately has entered into trade agreements with Western nations, notably Canada. And just the other day it was learned that a Seattle company has applied for permits to export 10.5 million tons of wheat and barley to Red China and North Korea.

We are aware there are some who will favor the proposed grain deal. Indeed, just last year a prominent theologian demanded that we furnish surplus grain to Red China as a measure of our peaceful intentions—just as though we have not continuously demonstrated those peaceful intentions in the face of incessant Communist harassment. We oppose any such deal, and hope the Commerce Department will also. If we bail Red China out of her present difficulties

(caused, we might add, by that country's devotion to Marxist agricultural policies), we will merely strengthen the hand of a brutal, repressive dictatorship which fervently hopes to conquer us. And we will, in effect, sanction past Red Chinese barbarities toward the United States, not the least of which is the imprisonment of American airmen and priests who even today are languishing in Chinese prisons.

Let Red China demonstrate, by positive actions, that she is repentant. Let her take steps to end the repressions and brutality of her Communist regime. And let her hold the free elections that are part of the "democracy" she so vigorously and proudly proclaims. Then, perhaps, the United States can discuss aid or trade agreements. Until then, it would be the height of folly to forget the thousands of American servicemen murdered by Red Chinese troops in Korea just 9 short years ago.

Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the sad fate of the Byelorussian's independence declared on March 25, 1918—shortly after the disintegration of the Russian Empire—and its almost immediate absorption by the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics imposing upon it a fictitious statehood are well known to the nations of the free world. It is a dominated colony of the Russian nation. Their intellectuals have been oppressed and decimated in great numbers. Its peoples have been brainwashed and subjected to continuous Russification by communistic administrative personnel including army and by propagandistic action.

The granting of United Nations status by the Russians is nullified by the prescription that only a Russian can represent the Byelorussians abroad.

Byelorussian publications and literature are suppressed and Russian literature and publications on purely Russian subjects flood the land. Influenced pressure is used to force Byelorussian literature and publications to use Russian subjects such as Lenin, Russian military problems and accomplishment, economic and political problems of the U.S.S.R. and to atheistic actions.

Its religious life is dominated by Russian views, and expressed in the Russian language. There were in 1960 2,614 Greek Orthodox parishes; at present less than 200, the Roman Catholic reduced from 456 to less than 20. Similar conditions prevail as to the Jewish synagogues and Protestant churches and other denominations.

The Government newspapers give prominence to numerous atheistic articles. Atheistic books are printed en masse.

Political terror spreads its fanged seering search even in the court trials of political personages. Wide publicity is given to these proceedings and the resulting death penalties.

Mass deportations of the youth to Siberian forests and virgin farm and mining areas of Russia.

In spite of all these pressures and oppressive measures—these formidable and independent freedom loving people have maintained their religious beliefs and are untouched in their love of democracy institutions and the will of the people to control in governmental affairs.

The Central Committee in Moscow has viewed with serious apprehension the failure and shortcomings of the methods used in propagandizing the Byelorussian people to change their viewpoints on ideology, religion, and nationalism.

The theory of coexistence has not worked. The tensions against the people of the U.S.S.R. and their philosophy of life are ever present.

These brave people are looking to us to roll over their military foes. They are ready to join up in any effort that will restore their country's freedom in government. The oppressed nations seek our support toward their ultimate liberation. The right of self-determination for all nations must not be limited to the Asian and African nations but to those also under the Soviet yoke. The nations of the West have voluntarily or under colony pressure given up control of their colonial lands. Russia has been vehement in her support of these issues on the side of the peoples seeking their independence. Now it is her turn to do likewise for these nations held captive under Soviet domination. The Byelorussian people are celebrating their 44th anniversary of their independence. How long must this unfortunate nation wait to be given her freedom as an independent nation?

The United States is blessed with a leadership that is personified by the epitome of courage, President John Kennedy in his every action has demonstrated a longing eye toward the realization of this goal, the freedom of all captive nations.

Historians in the near future will write down the realization of the hopes of mankind in strong language, descriptive of stern action. Let us pray that the future of mankind be written in an aura of peace. To think otherwise is to foretell the doom of mankind forever.

Radio and Television Network Programing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 23, 1962

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Broadcasters Blew All-Clear Too Soon," written by Lawrence Laurent and published in the Washington Post of March 20, 1962, relating to the subject of radio and television network programing.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROADCASTERS BLEW ALL-CLEAR TOO SOON

(By Lawrence Laurent)

Broadcasters thought they could relax when the recent Federal Communications Commission hearings on network programing came to an end. The executives from the three networks had performed admirably. They had fended off every attack with a combination of wordmanship and resolute predictions of great things to come.

Those broadcasters who did relax got several shocks.

The first shock was completely unexpected. It came, February 28, from Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, Democrat, of Rhode Island, a longtime friend of broadcasting. As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Communications, PASTORE had been an understanding friend to broadcasters when they were being attacked by members of the American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers (ASCAP). It also was PASTORE who had helped relieve broadcasters of some of the burdens of the "equal time" provisions of the Communications Act.

An angry PASTORE addressed the Conference of State Association Presidents of the National Association of Broadcasters and demanded improved performance. He also shattered one of broadcasting's favorite defenses by saying that they should stop yell-"censorship" at every effort to improve broadcasting.

(The shock was so great that the president of the Connecticut association complained to NAB staffers the next day. He argued that the NAB should invite speakers who were going to give us a pat on the back or some constructive criticism. The staffman said he doubted whether the National Association of Broadcasters had the power to censor speeches by Members of the U.S. Senate.)

Yesterday, in Chicago, FCC Commissioner Robert E. Lee began hearings. Lee wants to know if complaints are true that Chicago's local television has been killed by network programs originated in Hollywood and New York. Lee is scheduled to hear from 99 witnesses, only a few of whom are friendly to broadcasting.

In this respect, one should remember that stations exist in each community in order to serve the needs and hopes, the desires and aspirations of each community. It has been noted previously in this space that the FCC's attitude on local programing has become increasingly tough in recent months. From all indications, the FCC will continue to ask each licensed operator to tell how he has determined the needs of his community and what steps he has taken to meet them.

Just before Commissioner Lee's departure for Chicago, the Commission took three important steps. It refused to renew the license of a radio station in Pasadena; revoked the license of a radio station in Golden Meadow, La.; and took final action on new rules to slow down the sale of stations.

The California station was accused of changing its logs to fool the FCC into thinking that program schedules conformed to promises made when the license was issued. The Louisiana station, the FCC decided, was guilty of willful violations of technical rules. The new rule on sales will require an FCC hearing if anyone tries to sell a station he has owned for less than 3 years.

During the third week of the FCC's hearings on networks, a reporter approached one of the Commissioners. The reporter gave his opinion that the FCC had been made to look foolish by the polished, persuasive testimony of the network executives.

The Commissioner only smiled and said softly, "You may be right. But we usually get the last word."

Ahepa Biennial National Banquet Honoring Congress Reminder of Gallant Greek-American Forebearers Who Fought for Greek Independence and Reestablishment of Democracy in 1821

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1962

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, 1821, the Greek War of Independence against Ottoman rule began when Archbishop Germanos of Patras unfurled the national flag of Greece. We will observe the 141st anniversary of Greek independence this coming Sunday.

This past Monday night I had the distinct pleasure of being the honored guest of the Greek-American community in my home city of Springfield at the 15th Ahepa biennial national banquet honoring the Congress of the United States, held at the Sheraton-Park Hotel here in Washington. I was escorted by my good friend, Mr. George W. George, president of Atlis Chapter No. 85, Order of Ahepa, of Springfield. During the banquet tribute was paid to President Truman for initiating his 1947 aid plan to save Greece from poverty, starvation and possibly anarchy following the ravages of World War II.

WHAT AHEPA REALLY MEANS

Mr. Speaker, I think it is only fitting that we should pay tribute this week to the Greek-Americans who have contributed immeasurably to American culture, and to their forebearers who fought hard for the independence of their native soil in 1821. The word "Ahepa" itself explains the organization of Greek-Americans founded on July 26, 1922, at Atlanta, Ga., as follows: A—American, h—hellenic, e—educational, p—progressive, and a—association.

As an organization devoted to 40 years of programs and accomplishments in the fields of American citizenship, educational projects, and charitable endeavors, the Ahepa fraternity takes the opportunity at these national banquets to pay tribute to the Members of Congress for their devoted services to the welfare and progress of the American people and government.

WORDS OF PERICLES PERTINENT TODAY

Let me read to you from the Ahepa banquet pamphlet, with its pertinent and timely quotations from Pericles, the Athenian statesman:

The responsibilities of all men toward their community and country—this land of liberty and freedom—has been an integral part of the precepts of the Ahepa.

The will of the American people, expressed through their representatives in the Congress of the United States, is the will of dedicated freedom—the will to give service to our country—and the will to contribute toward its progress and welfare. The eventual expression of the will and desire of the American people can only be finally determined and proclaimed through the Congress of the United States.

Some 2,500 years ago, Pericles appeared before the people of ancient Athens, setting forth the principles of democracy with these words:

"Because in the administration it hath respect not to the few but to the multitude, our form of government is called a democracy. Wherein there is not only an equality amongst all men in point of law for their private controversies, but in election to public offices we consider neither class nor rank, but each man is preferred according to his virtue or to the esteem in which he is held for some special excellence: nor is anyone put back even through poverty, because of the obscurity of his person, so long as he can do good service to the commonwealth."

Pericles then established the standards of citizenship and conduct by stating:

"And when Athens shall appear great to you, consider then that her glories were purchased by valiant men, and by men that learned their duty; by men that were sensible of dishonor when they came to act; by such men as, though they failed in their attempt yet would not be wanting to the city with their virtue, but made unto it a most honorable contribution."

The words of Pericles, the Athenian statesman, still ring out today, some 25 centuries later, with clear meaning and intent.

And so, at these Ahepa congressional dinners, it is the fraternity's opportunity to pay its respects and to record its recognition to the U.S. Congress, those men who "were sensible of dishonor when they came to act"—who "learned their duty"—and who "made unto it [America] a most honorable contribution."

SPRINGFIELD ATLIS CHAPTER AHEPA RESOLUTION

Mr. Speaker, I, under unanimous consent, include with my remarks at this point a copy of the resolution recently adopted unanimously by Atlis Chapter No. 85, Order of Ahepa, in Springfield, and signed by Mr. George, the president, and Mr. George Klatsas, chapter secretary:

Whereas the Honorable EDWARD P. BOLAND, U.S. Representative of the State of Massachusetts, has labored diligently in the interests of the citizens of the congressional jurisdiction; and

Whereas the Order of Ahepa is conducting its 15th biennial national banquet in the city of Washington, D.C., on Monday, March 19, 1962; and

Whereas the members of the Altis Chapter of the Order of Ahepa, at Springfield, do wish to show their expression for his devotion to duty: Therefore be it

Resolved, That by unanimous declaration this chapter of the Order of Ahepa designate the Honorable EDWARD P. BOLAND as its honor guest at the 15th Ahepa national banquet.

ARCHBISHOP GERMANOS TOUCHED OFF REVOLUTION

Mr. Speaker, 141 years ago when Archbishop Germanos raised the standard of the cross in his monastery at Patras, few people outside Greece realized that the insurrection led by this daring churchman was to see the rebirth of independent Greece after the lapse of some 2,000 years. Yes, for 2,000 years Greeks had lost their freedom and then lived under alien rulers in their homeland. And the life they led under the Ottoman sultans since mid-15th century was almost unbearable. They had tried to free themselves from the oppressive yoke of Ottoman Turks, but they themselves alone were not equal to the task, and for that reason all attempts made prior to 1821 were short of success. But the final attempt made in 1821 proved successful.

The bloody struggle that started in that year lasted more than 6 years. At times the course of the struggle seemed uncertain. Even with considerable outside aid the righteous cause of Greece suffered some serious setbacks. But as Greeks braced themselves in a do-or-die fight, and as the amount of outside aid was on the increase, doubts as to the outcome of the struggle vanished. In October of 1827 when the enemy's fleet was destroyed at the historic naval Battle of Navarino, Greece's oppressors were vanquished and Greek independence assured.

It is simple enough for us today to narrate in a few sentences what the Greek warriors accomplished in the course of a strenuous war lasting almost 7 years. It is easy for us to view those events from the distance and marvel at the brave deeds of those Greeks against their ruthless oppressors. And these few words cannot do them adequate justice. But neither time nor distance can dim the admiration with which we regard everything the Greeks did for the realization of their national dream, for the attainment of their national political independence.

Since 1821 the people of this country have followed the course of Greek history with keen interest; we have been intensely concerned with the safety and security of Greeks in their homeland, and have helped them on more than one occasion to strengthen democracy in this birthplace of democracy. I am indeed glad that we have been able to do this, and on this 141st anniversary of Greek Independence Day we are proud to have Greece as our loyal ally in defense of democracy in the free world.

Teenage Drinking—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include another group of newspaper articles which describe in concrete detail something of the tragedy and the danger associated with teenage drinking in New York State.

I urge our colleagues to read these stories and learn how real and immediate this ever-present danger has become and how terrible the tragedy is when it strikes—as it has, more and more often.

This situation will continue to worsen so long as the responsible officials of the State of New York refuse to see and hear and heed the unanimous pleas of all its neighbors, and take action to raise its legal minimum drinking age from 18 to 21.

If New York State officials will not listen to the voice of reason or respond to the imperatives of neighborliness, then perhaps they will listen to the outraged cries of those who suffer for their delinquency.

The articles from the Newark Evening News of March 20 follow:

[From the Newark Evening News, Mar. 20, 1962]

YOUNG AUTO VICTIMS DRANK IN NEW YORK—TWO KILLED ON WAY HOME

(By John W. Gleeson)

MONSEY, N.Y.—Two Bergen County teenagers killed and three others injured in an automobile crash in this New York community Sunday night had been drinking, Rockland County Coroner Dr. Leo Weishaar said last night.

The accident occurred while the victims were returning from a drinking spot a few miles north of the New York-New Jersey State line. Nine others, riding in two cars, had accompanied them on the trip from the roadhouse, Dr. Weishaar said.

The legal drinking age in New York is 18 in contrast with the 21-year limit in New Jersey.

Dead are Robert Gathright, 18, driver of the car, of 26 Stebbens Street, Hillsdale; and Brian J. Janovich, 19, of 95 Lawrence Street, Westwood.

"There is no doubt they were drinking," Dr. Weishaar said his examination revealed.

Of the three who were injured, the coroner added:

"They had been drinking beer over several hours but they were not intoxicated. They were walking and talking normally."

The survivors, all reported in satisfactory condition at Good Samaritan Hospital, are: George Hogencamp, 17, of 407 Central Avenue, Westwood; Marsha Gordon, 17, of 748 Pine Lake Drive, Washington Township; and Barbara Falla, 17, of 76 Lincoln Boulevard, Emerson.

TO HOLD INQUEST

Dr. Weishaar said an inquest will be held next week in the double fatality. He said he would question the drivers and passengers in two other cars.

Dr. Weishaar said the third car in line, driven by Roland Turner, 17, of Lodi, apparently sideswiped the Gathright car and struck the two dead youths as they lay on the ground.

Turner and his brother, Robert, 19, told the coroner they had been drinking beer at the New York spot in the afternoon and returned later in the evening.

Turner said he and Andrew Stralkus, 19, of Washington Township, left the tavern at 10 p.m., each in his own car, following Gathright's vehicle, according to the coroner.

WAS TRAVELING FAST

As the three autos proceeded in Saddle River Road, Turner and Stralkus said, Gathright passed Stralkus and went ahead at high speed out of their sight.

When the two cars came upon the fatal curve, the two youths said, they saw Gathright's car in a cloud of dust, rammed into the tree. Both claimed Turner's car did not run over the two boys on the road and did not remember hitting the Gathright car.

FLESH, HAIR TRACES

Police, however, said they found paint from the Gathright vehicle on Turner's car and discovered traces of flesh and hair in the treads of the tires on the Turner car.

Turner was charged with driving in New York State without a proper license and was released in $25 bail.

"We stopped for a red light and made a turn and got going," the injured Hogencamp told police. The teenager added that he often went over the State line to a Rockland County tavern.

Hogencamp said he had just been released from the hospital after suffering two broken ribs and some broken teeth when his motorcycle crashed head-on into an automobile in Westwood. He was to report to the U.S. Marine Corps this week.

CRACKDOWN IN MAHWAH

Police Chief Edmund C. Wickham, of Mahwah, through whose community one of the main road arteries between New York and New Jersey passes, said he planned to clamp down on drinking teenagers by conducting checks at all thoroughfares crossing the State line.

"I'm going to have inspections at the roads," Chief Wickham said. "We will check to see if the driver has been drinking and if there is liquor in the car.

"They do the drinking in New York," he added, "but usually we get the trouble. This town covers 27 square miles, but we only have three patrol cars. We have trouble with kids on Route 202 and the Franklin Turnpike," he added.

FOR DEAMER BILL

The chief praised the bill introduced yesterday in the New Jersey Senate by Senator Pierce H. Deamer, Republican, of Bergen, calling for more stringent penalties on youths under 21 who carry liquor in their cars.

"That bill is the right idea," said Wickham. "It would give us something better to work with against this problem."

Two 19-year-old youths in Westwood who knew both the youths killed in Sunday's fatal accident disagreed among themselves as to the best solution to the interstate drinking problem.

"I think they should raise the age in New York," said Bill Morton, of 17 Richmond Avenue, Ridgewood. "They should also spot check the cars coming back from New York. Even in the Navy," he added, "we can't drink on base until we're 21."

Andy Marosvari, of 33 Beech Street, Westwood, said older teenagers drive to New York for pizza or a hamburger and a beer.

"They check your age at most places," he said. "But it's easy to get a phony identification card and change the age or name. I think they should allow you to drink at 18 in New Jersey," Andy said. "Then they won't want to go up there to drink. If a guy's in his hometown, he doesn't have to drive to go drinking and everybody knows how old he is."

[From the Newark Evening News, Mar. 20, 1962]

MAYWOOD BOYS INJURED IN NEW YORK

NORWOOD.—Two Maywood youths, also returning from a Rockland County, N.Y., tavern, were injured here Sunday night, police said, when the car in which they were riding crashed into a utility pole and sheared it off.

The driver, Bryan Rudi, 18, of 100 Orchard Place was reported in good condition in Pascack Valley Hospital. He suffered a possible concussion and abrasions.

William Loeser, 18, of 746 Spring Valley Road, was treated at the hospital for a fractured right index finger and released.

The youths told police they had visited a tavern in Orangeburg, N.Y.

S O S: Save Our Streams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 23, 1962

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, last September the International Association of Game Fish and Conservation Commissioners adopted a resolution urging immediate action, by the Fish and Wildlife Service and Bureau of Public Roads, to alleviate damage caused by construction of highways which "in many instances impedes fish runs, results in detrimental stream realinement, destroys spawning areas, obstructs deer and other big game migration routes."

The international association also resolved that "in the event congressional action is required to accomplish this objective, the association does hereby endorse and urge the necessary amendments to the Coordination Act."

Mr. President, legislative remedy is available through my bill, S. 2767, to amend the Highway Act to require the Secretary of the Interior's approval of Federal-aid highway surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates so as to protect fish, wildlife, and recreation resources.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution of the international association printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 9—APPLICATION OF PRINCIPLES OF COORDINATION ACT TO FEDERAL HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

Whereas the construction of modern highways in many instances impedes fish runs, results in detrimental stream realinement, destroys spawning areas, obstructs deer and other big game migration routes, and otherwise creates damage to fish and wildlife resources; and

Whereas public access to important hunting and fishing areas is not always adequately programed in highway construction plans, especially along sparsely settled areas in public land States; and

Whereas Public Law 732, better known as the Coordination Act, has been determined as not applicable to highway construction by a ruling of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; and

Whereas highway construction is being accelerated and the problem concerning wildlife is still unsolved: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners urges immediate action on the part of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in conjunction with the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads to concur on an action program to alleviate the situation either by protective legislation or through agreement between the two agencies; and now, therefore, be it further

Resolved, That in the event congressional action is required to accomplish this objective, the association does hereby endorse and urge the necessary amendments to the Coordination Act.

Open House To Celebrate 50th Anniversary of Rydberg Implement Co., of Melrose, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 23, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on March 21, Mr. C. A. Rydberg, owner and operator of the Rydberg Implement Co. celebrated his 50th anniversary in business

in Melrose, Wis. During these years, businessman Rydberg has: Made a significant contribution to the community; participated in economic changes and progress; and, as well, made many nonbusiness contributions to bettering life in Melrose.

For such unique services, Mr. Rydberg has been lauded and congratulated by his friends and neighbors.

Recently, the Melrose Chronicle published an article for the occasion entitled "Open House To Celebrate 50th Anniversary of Rydberg Implement Co." Reflecting how a Wisconsin businessman—operating in times of great change—sometimes problematical—has written a real U.S. success story, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPEN HOUSE TO CELEBRATE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF RYDBERG IMPLEMENT CO.

On March 21, 1962, Mr. C. A. Rydberg, owner and operator of the Rydberg Implement Co., will reach a milestone as a businessman in Melrose. The occasion will be his 50th anniversary as a businessman here.

In the year 1912, at the age of 25, Al, as he is known to his many friends, came to Melrose with his wife, the former Gertrude E. Berg, of Beaver Creek, and opened an automotive garage in the old Ed Erickson plumbing shop. This shop was, and still is, located directly behind the present Melrose Chronicle Building and is presently being used as the workshop for Mr. Bert Erickson, a plumber, and son of the late Ed Erickson.

Al and his garage stayed at this location for about 1 year, before moving to a new location, a half block away, the building west of the Chronicle office, now owned by the Gilbertson Chevrolet Co., and used as a storage shed and paint shop.

"The garage business in those days was good," Al says, "except for the winter months of December through April, when cars were put up on blocks, because roads were so bad cars could not travel on them." To make money in these months Al would go around to the farms and saw wood for the farmers.

His garage was the only one in the area in 1915, and according to records Al has kept all these years, there were only 32 cars in the area to service. Some of them were Fords, Buicks, Maxwells, Flanders, RCH (the original Hup), Case Studebakers, Overlands, Detroit, Imperial, Krit, and Paige. If Al's recollection is correct, Oliver O'Hearn, Sr., owned the first car in Melrose, a Ford.

Forrest Farrand, now of Fountain City, was Al's first hired mechanic. A few others were Bill Spors (deceased), and Archie Bolger, now of Madison. They did general repair work on all makes and models, sold tires, batteries, and gas, which cost about 10 cents a gallon at that time. Up until 1914, when they installed a gas pump, gas was sold from two 20-gallon drums.

There being no snowplows at that time, Al and a group of men decided to make one. When it was finished they harnessed eight horses to it and opened the road to Black River Falls. It took 2 days to accomplish this feat. The first day they got as far as Irving.

In 1917, the garage business was supplemented by the addition of the Harvester Implement line. Three years later the International Harvester Implement line was added, and remained that way until in 1928 when the garage business was sold to Mr. John Spaulding of Melrose.

Al moved the implement business to his present location. Later the garage business was sold to its present owner, C. F. Gilbertson, owner of the Gilbertson Chevrolet Co.

During the years since 1920, in the Implement Co., he has been assisted by Frank Wintjen, 1920–28; Will Huber, Sr., 1928–40; Clarence Roseland, 1941–50; John Eckart, 1948–60. Other helping him have been Will Huber, Jr., Addison Ralston, and Walter Miles.

Fifty years is a long time to be in business in one town, but when Al looks back over the years, he says it doesn't seem very long at all. He is now 75 years old, and in very good health. He says if he stays in such good health, he's sure he will make it to his 75th anniversary.

To celebrate his 50 years in business, he is inviting everyone to an open house at his Implement shop on Wednesday, March 21. There will be refreshments, gifts, and door prizes. Each farmer in the area will receive one glove in the mail this week. They can pick up its mate by attending the open house.

During the past 50 years, Al has participated in many community affairs and has served in several offices. He has served on the board of trustees; president of the village, member of the school board and justice of the peace, an office he still holds. He is a charter member of the Melrose Volunteer Fire Department, charter member of the Rotary Club of which he is treasurer at the present time; a member of the Masonic Order, Black River Falls, the Consistory at Eau Claire and Zor Shrine at Madison. He has served on the Red Cross committee and is still serving on the county draft board to which he was appointed August 30, 1948.

Congratulation ads of fellow businessmen appear in this issue, and all join in wishing Al continued success and happiness.

Progress in Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 23, 1962

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, 35 years ago Charles Augustus Lindbergh flew across the Atlantic Ocean alone. The flight captured the world's imagination and ushered in the age of aviation.

A recent column by Jim Bishop, syndicated columnist, whose articles appear regularly in the New York Journal-American and Washington Star compares the log of Lindbergh's flight with the log of one of our present-day pilots, Capt. E. H. Rushton, of Pan American World Airways.

Mr. President, the contrast is dramatic. For instance, 1 hour after being airborne, Lindberg was over Providence, Long Island. During the same period of time, Captain Rushton's log reports that the giant Pan American 707 Clipper was over Nova Scotia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed following my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRESS IN AVIATION

(By Jim Bishop)

Idlewild tower told Pan-American Flight 114 to go. In the jet, Capt. E. H. Rushton, a check pilot, watched the flight commander run his eyes over the multitude of instruments for the last time. They looked at the copilot and the flight engineer. All hands nodded and, in snow, the huge bat with the cyclops eyes shrieked with fright and started down runway 31–L, lifting lazily in the darkness and turning toward Paris.

Captain Rushton kept an informal log. On May 21, 1927, Charles Augustus Lindbergh flew the same route in a Ryan monoplane called the *Spirit of St. Louis*. He, too, kept a log. Lindbergh needed 33½ hours to reach Paris. Captain Rushton did it in 6 hours 27 minutes. Here are the logs, briefed in part:

Lindbergh takeoff: "Plane weighs 2½ tons. Men pushing back of wing as radial engine revs up 25 revolutions per minute low. Cleared wires at Long Island field, turned east at 200 feet altitude. Air speed 105 miles per hour. Use road map of New York State and Connecticut. Plane has no forward visibility, use two-mirror periscope out left-hand window."

Rushton takeoff: "Pan-American Clipper *Cathay* weighs 157 tons with tanks not quite topped off. Light snow, haze. Visibility 2 miles. Jet engines develop 66,000 pounds of thrust, 70 tons of fuel aboard. Accelerate to 300 knots for climb to 29,000 feet. Aboard are 122 passengers, 11 crew. Radar shows 50 miles of Long Island below."

One hour later:

Lindbergh: "Passed Providence 90 minutes out. Course 71° magnetic. Must use 37 course changes for Great Circle route. At Massachusetts, count 20 miles out to sea, then change course again. At end of 37th change, Paris should lie 10 miles ahead."

Rushton: "Over Nova Scotia, lights of Halifax ahead in clear moonlight. Paris Orly beacon is now 5 hours 24 minutes away. Speed 610. Great Circle course will take us north to latitude 55."

Second hour:

Lindbergh: "Cape Cod passed under starboard wing. * * * Altitude 20 feet. Speed 107. Aim for Nova Scotia, 250 miles ahead."

Rushton: "Over Gander, Newfoundland. Four minutes ahead of time. Altitude 33,000. Passengers having dinner. * * * Will build speed to 690 miles per hour."

Third hour:

Lindbergh: "Altitude 50 feet. Airspeed 104. * * * Using 16 gallons per hour."

Rushton: "1,675 miles out of New York. * * * Fuel consumption, 2,300 gallons per hour."

Fourth hour:

Lindbergh: "Nova Scotia ahead."

Rushton: "Position 1,550 miles from Paris. * * * Passengers dozing."

Fifth hour:

Lindbergh: "Over Nova Scotia. * * * What amazing magic is carried in an airplane's wings. New York at breakfast; Nova Scotia at lunch."

Rushton: "Approaching Ireland."

Sixth hour:

Lindbergh: "Still over Nova Scotia."

Rushton: "Sun is coming up fast as we pass London."

Seventh hour:

Lindbergh: "Nova Scotia. Visibility unlimited. Altitude 600 feet."

Rushton: "Passengers debarked. Cleared customs. Time New York to Paris: 6 hours 27 minutes."

Appendix

The Importance of Public Service Careers in a Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 24, 1962

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on February 10, 1962, I had the privilege of hearing an old friend and distinguished public servant deliver a thoughtful and stimulating address on the importance of public service careers in our democracy. The friend was the Honorable Frank M. Coffin, former Congressman from the Second District of Maine, and now Deputy Administrator of the Agency for International Development. The occasion was a testimonial dinner honoring the G.E. college bowl winners from Bates College, Lewiston, Maine.

Mr. Coffin, whose own career as a private citizen and public official has been marked by a rare dedication to the improvement of government, offered to students a challenge to make public service their career; to all his listeners he gave the reminder that "today as never before there is a premium on good government—whether we speak of town selectmen, the superintendent of schools, State legislators, highway supervisors, Congressmen and Senators, game wardens or Foreign Service Officers."

Mr. Coffin's message was such an important one I believe it should be available for thoughtful readers in all parts of the country. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of Mr. Coffin's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY HON. FRANK M. COFFIN AT THE TESTIMONIAL DINNER HONORING THE G.E. COLLEGE BOWL WINNERS FROM BATES COLLEGE, LEWISTON, MAINE, SATURDAY EVENING, FEBRUARY 10, 1962

Few occasions have given me more difficulty in striving for the right theme than this one. To talk solely about the triumph itself is to encourage these combatants to rest on their laurels. And they are too young to be complacent. To preach about the solid virtues of application and perseverence is to labor the obvious, if not insult their intelligence. Finally, this is not the occasion for talking about the missions of foreign policy which are part of my working life, for this evening is for our conquering heroes from Bates and, temporarily at least, from Lewiston and from Maine.

So I have hit upon a compromise between our honored guests and the vineyard in which I presently labor. When I see in young people intelligence, the capacity to work hard and long, and a zest for the exhilerating tortures of the competitive life, I cannot resist putting in an appeal. The intriguing game we are entitled to play when we observe young people emerging as adults endowed with considerable gifts is to speculate about their future. This is much more wholesome than talking about the past of our contemporaries. Now it may well be that the team we honor tonight will turn out to be atomic physicists, engineers for spacecraft, conquerors of the common cold, eminent educators, business tycoons, or, in the case of one of them, a practitioner of the most demanding profession of all—a housewife.

But I would hope that in their thinking about their future, and that of all their bright and competitive colleagues and opponents, they would ask the basic questions: intelligence to what end? work for what objective? competition to what purpose? And as they wrestle with these hard questions I would hope that they would give serious thought to the vast field of the public service.

This is something which few college graduates of my generation would seriously consider or desire or consciously strive for. Today, with vocational guidance being stressed in so many schools and colleges, I suspect that the world of public service is adequately portrayed. Even so, I doubt that its wide spectrum and importance are always portrayed in living color. This past week I was struck by a visit I had from a Maine college boy who came to Washington to talk about a career in government administration. I viewed this as a casual byproduct of a trip to the Nation's Capital. But it was more than that. This boy had hitchhiked from Maine to Washington to talk for a half hour about the prospects of government service as a career. He was not a jobseeker. He was planning his further education. I told him I thought he could not pick a more useful field. And then I wondered how many more hitchhikers there were like him. I hope many, many more.

My approach to this is not the pay scale, the security of civil service, or the fringe benefits. All of these vary among the 50 States and the Federal Government. If one were to approach any career from this point of view, he has grown old too quickly—and he has sold himself short.

The obvious rewards are balanced by hidden burdens. Frustration, ignored achievement, bureaucratic infighting, overwork, thoughtless superiors, insensitive legislators, an inquisitive press, an often unsympathetic public—these are the lot of public servants everywhere in some degree.

My message, therefore, is not that public service is a soft or secure life. When it is that, then it is also a mediocre and dull life. My view is a very simple one. It is that today as never before there is a premium on good Government—whether we speak of town selectmen, the superintendent of schools, State legislators, highway supervisors, Congressmen and Senators, game wardens or Foreign Service officers.

Upon the existence of good Government depend the growth of communities, the prosperity of States, the effective functioning of the Federal-State system, the balanced progress of the Nation's economy, and, most important of all, the steady, wise, and sensitive leadership of this Nation in the vital affairs of the world.

The closer I approach the internal workings of government, the more convinced I am that the effectiveness of government, great or small depends upon the quality of the key man or woman in each area of policy, decision, and operations. An inadequate law or regulation administered by skilled and sensitive people will often do more to decrease suffering or increase happiness than the best of laws carried out by incompetent, mediocre, and unimaginative officials.

Let me give an example. Three years ago I visited the headquarters of the European Economic Community in Brussels. At that time it was largely a collection of citizens from six European countries who had the job of trying to develop common trade, transportation, social and economic policies laid down by the Treaty of Rome. No group of officials had less authority or a smaller legal basis for action. A month ago I revisited Brussels to find the dream of a United States of Europe well along the road to reality. The answer lay in the quality of civil servants. I have not seen anywhere a more capable, dedicated, hard-working, or resourceful group of officials. The atmosphere in Brussels vibrates with hope, dogged determination, and competitiveness. Mediocrity is rarely found.

We cannot legislate mediocrity out of existence. And mediocrity in government is an expensive luxury. In communities and States as elsewhere, it is a shackle on progress. The longrun cost is a pall of defeatism, narrowmindedness, pettiness, and a focus on what has happened, not what can happen. But for this Nation at this period of history mediocrity is not merely expensive; it could be lethal at any one of a number of pressure points. If a key official is weary and forgets to include an important point in a briefing paper for the Secretary of State, an unfortunate chain of events could result. If a cable to an Ambassador overseas is misleading or ambiguous, U.S. policy could take a turn for the worse. If inadequate preparation is made for a public speech, explaining important Government policy, or if a key press release is too long delayed, public understanding suffers. If our tariff negotiators are less than alert, able, and completely informed, our industry or agriculture suffers needlessly.

Government is like an iceberg. Only its top is visible. We think that our policy at the U.N. is made simply by Ambassador Stevenson grabbing the microphone and saying what appears to him as appropriate. But behind every utterance and every vote lies the work of Americans in many embassies abroad, in our Bureau of International Organizations in Washington, in four regional bureaus, in our Agency for International Development, and in our U.N. staff in New York. Every day more cable traffic issues from the Department of State than from all the press services combined. And each cable is generally the product of at least a half dozen key officers. And the quality of the cable depends on the people who draft it.

Up to now I have avoided using the word "bureaucrat" because it raises our hackles. It is not the kind of a word that would challenge an alert and keen young man or woman. We still go by Webster's old definition of a bureaucrat as an "official of a bureau, especially one pursuing a narrow and arbitrary, routine." This is what is wrong. Time has passed this definition by. This Nation, this State, this community—all owe an incalculable debt to its good bureaucrats. There cannot be good government in a complex society without a good bureaucracy.

Unfortunately, the creation of a good bureaucracy, which is merely another way of labeling professionalism in public affairs, has not been a natural byproduct of our own history. Although I am wary of generalizations, I think it safe to suggest that until the December day in 1941 when the myth of American isolation went up in smoke over Pearl Harbor we had rather thought foreign policy was something of extremely small concern to most of us.

Although there were notable exceptions, the demands of foreign policy as we conceived them did not sound any trumpet for the best talent in America. That was chiefly used up in exemplifying the national point of view which was perfectly expressed by Calvin Coolidge when he said that the chief business of this Nation was business. There was simply very little on the American scene to cause the situation to be otherwise.

In Europe and Great Britain, as I have just had excellent opportunity to observe, quite the reverse has been true. Not many of the legacies of the system of nobility have been worth emulating. But it is a fact that the public service under that system was from the beginning a responsibility freely assumed by the class best equipped to do it, although for reasons often solidly rooted in clear self-interest.

The result has been that the public service still stands at the top of the catalog of careers to which the bright young men and women of Europe are attracted. There has been a healthy democratic leavening over the years, as a study of the origins of high civil servants of today would demonstrate, but the tradition of proud public service is centuries old. Despite the innumerable changes in the leadership of France during the postwar years, the country was held together by its elite corps of top civil servants, the "inspecteurs." I have just had dramatic firsthand evidence of this in my talks with the endowed and inspired people who are creating a new Europe. Even in Japan, as I talked with senior officials in the Finance Ministry, four or five young men, hardly more than boys, were sitting in on our talks. When I inquired about them, I learned that they were the public servants of the future, serving their apprenticeship.

All this is of interest to this country only as proof that public service need not offer the tarnished image it has often presented on this side of the Atlantic. Of course, we would not create these high standards by the same means as our European friends even if it were possible to turn back the clock. We must not fail, however, to do the same thing by our own methods and without delaying another generation. I am optimist enough to think that conscious decisions on the part of young people like the Bates "brain team" here are going to give velocity to this movement.

What is a good bureaucrat? He is not necessarily a "he". In my recent visit abroad, I met our top foreign political officer at one of our key embassies. This officer, at the very top of the profession, was a Maine girl from Bethel, Miss Margaret Tibbetts. She is highly regarded throughout our Foreign Service. In London our key aid liaison officer with the British Government is a woman. So is our No. 2 aid liaison official in Paris. Nor is age a requirement. Whether one travels in developed or developing countries, or visits such domestic departments as Commerce, Agriculture, or Interior, or State capitals, county seats, or city halls, he will find young people in their late twenties and thirties in most strategic and responsible positions.

Whether male or female, young or not so young, on foreign or domestic duty, in State, Federal, or local government, the top bureaucrat combines an expertness in his specialty with a breadth of view, an ability to find his way through complicated bureaucratic channels, and an instinct for the possible and important. He also must judge his action in the light of what has happened in the past and what might follow in the future. He knows when to fight hard and when to draw back. He lacks the "visibility" and the freedom of individual action of the legislator, but his life is one of the continued and sensitive use of power. He cannot, even if he would, avoid using power daily. His pace is fast. He must absorb staggering quantities of reading material, attend endless meetings, write countless memos. He is resilient because he has to be. When his superiors or their policies shift, it is up to him to make them work, to breathe life into them. He has to adapt to new tasks, new procedures, new organizations. His is the role that melds the forces of continuity and change.

The top bureaucrat in State or Federal Government is exercising responsibility matched by a private-company manager, vice president, or president. He is paid one-half to one-third what his private counterparts receive. If he is in foreign work, he and his family risk the hazards of disease or inadequate schooling. But he is sustained by the conviction that his life is being spent in a useful and vital work. And this, as we grow older, is increasingly important.

I suppose I have dwelt on the place of our best talent in terms of Federal service in Washington because that is where I am now engaged, I do not wish to be misunderstood on this, for the fact is that excellence of brains and talent is as necessary at every level of the public service. The challenge of making American democracy work, and for work you may substitute survive, falls no less on the city mayor or manager than on a Senator or a Secretary of State, on a planner in the smallest city, or a zoning official in the smallest town, no less than on the drafters of treaties.

The kind of public servant I have described comes from many sources—from agriculture, from business, from the professions, or directly from schools, college, or advanced studies in administration or another specialty. But in his breadth of view, in his interest in his society, in his values and perspective, in his capacity to adapt to changing needs, he is the kind of person which liberal arts colleges like Bates seek to send forth to the world. This kind of contribution to our State and National life will be increasingly critical in the years ahead.

For we are engaged in the supreme competition. I do not refer solely to the competition of which Khrushchev spoke when he said his system would bury us. There is a greater competition. It is a competition between our way of life and all totalitarian ways; between our resources, intelligence, and goodwill, and the poverty, illness, illiteracy, and disorder of one-third of the world. This is a competition which involves us all, citizens and public servants alike, at every level of government. If we bring to this contest the preparation, the spirit, the human, and the steadiness under fire, of those we honor tonight, we should look forward with zest. For this is the world bowl.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, as I have mentioned, Mr. Coffin delivered his address at a testimonial banquet for the G.E. College Bowl winners from Bates College. As an alumnus of that college, and as a member of the board of trustees, I was proud of the remarkable record made by the students who represented Bates in the nationwide television program testing their knowledge, intelligence, and intellectual alacrity.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the March 1962 Bates Bulletin, telling the story of the Bates championship team, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. To this tribute, I add my own words of praise to their coach, Dr. Goldat, the individual members of the team, and to all who have contributed to this success.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAMPIONSHIP G.E. COLLEGE BOWL TEAM BRINGS NATIONWIDE RENOWN TO BATES COLLEGE

"One of the best Christmas presents we could have had." This was the concensus of Bates students, alumni, faculty, and friends following the Christmas Eve championship victory by the Bates General Electric College Bowl team.

Since last June, when a group of Bates students won two victories on the CBS television network just before the program went off the air for the summer, the name of Bates and the fortunes of its team have been followed by several million people from Maine to Hawaii—as they watched the new team of Bates students win again and again in this contest that demanded quick recall of academic information.

Having retired undefeated after five contests in November and December, the Bates students and their coach, Dr. George D. Goldat, were treated as conquering heroes by interested alumni and friends of the college. Gifts from Twin City merchants, dinner invitations, letters and telegrams of congratulations from across the Nation have showered upon the group.

In January the participants were guests of Gov. John H. Reed in the executive mansion for a dinner in honor of the Governor's birthday. Shortly afterward, the Associated Industries of Maine invited the team to its annual meeting in Augusta. Local service clubs and the chamber of commerce feted the group at dinners and in early February a major testimonial banquet was arranged by citizens of Lewiston-Auburn in the Lewiston Armory. Keynote speaker at this event was former Congressman Frank M. Coffin, '40, now Deputy Administrator of the Agency for International Development.

A $1,500 SCHOLARSHIP FOR EACH WIN

This fall's Bates College team on the G.E. College Bowl defeated teams representing Brandeis University, Trinity College, Macalaster College, the University of North Dakota, and Wheaton College, and won for Bates a $1,500 scholarship each time. As a bonus for retiring undefeated, Bates received an additional $1,500 at the close of the fifth program, along with a silver bowl emblematic of the championship.

In winning championship honors, Bates joins a select list of previous five-time winners—Colgate, Rutgers, Hobart and William Smith, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, and Pomona.

BREAKS ALL RECORDS

The final game established a record score for the Maine college, whose 390 points topped the previous record of 360 points established by Johns Hopkins last season.

Last spring, when Bates had opportunity to enter only two contests, the team won over Muhlenberg and George Washington. The interest stimulated by the fine showing of the Bates team prompted the pro-

ducers of the show to invite Bates to take on Brandeis University, which in June of 1960 had retired for the season after one appearance.

The two Bates victories last June plus the five for this fall's championship team made Bates the first college to have appeared seven times on the bowl program, and brought a grand total of $12,000 in scholarship funds—more than any other school had ever won. The Bates-Wheaton championship contest, the last in which Bates appeared, was the 110th match since the program started in January of 1959.

STUDENTS TRAIN FOR THE BOWL CONTESTS

Dr. George D. Goldat, assistant professor of cultural heritage, picked the team after a series of contests on campus. Then the team members trained intensively under Coach Goldat. A board of switches and buzzers was constructed to duplicate the actual game conditions as closely as possible, and the team went through numerous practice sessions as Coach Goldat timed the responses and scored the accuracy of the answers.

To Bates alumni and friends who watched their favorites compete on the nationwide TV network, the faces and personalities of the contestants are familiar.

Captain of the current team, Nicholas Maistrellis, a senior from Peabody, Mass., is a biology major; his interests also extend to philosophy and literature. After he completes his education, which probably will include graduate school, he indicates a career goal of teaching or research.

Casimir J. Kolaski, Jr., a sophomore, is the veteran of both the Bates teams that competed in the College Bowl. From Ridgefield, Conn., he is an English major who hopes to teach eventually. "K. O.," as he is called, is an avid reader; he is interested in philosophy and history and enjoys writing in his "spare" time.

Another sophomore on the team, John Bart, comes to Bates from Northampton, Mass. Also interested in history and philosophy, John is an English major but is undecided on career plans at the moment.

The lone freshman on the team is Jeffrey A. Rouault, of Fayetteville, N.Y. His interest in history and current events is mirrored by a desire to enter study of law, and he participates in the activities of the freshman debate team as well as being a singer in the choral society. Jeff is the team's musical expert; his tastes run from the current pops to all areas of classical music. He, too, is an avid reader.

Alternate on the team was Miss Bernice L. Schulte, a senior from Milford, Conn. A mathematics major, Bernice helped in the team's training by providing competition from her particular knowledge of the physical sciences. Early this fall Bernice was elected to membership in Phi Beta Kappa, one of three students this year to be so honored on the basis of their work through the junior year. By special request of the boys she was on hand to receive the trophy at the close of the final program. Bernice is thinking strongly of graduate school next year with the possibility of entering college teaching.

Export Controls to Communist Nations Needed To Win the Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the American people, I know, were relieved at the announcement on March 23 by Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges of the administration's refusal to allow a private firm to export some $400 million worth of wheat and barley to Red China and North Korea.

Last week President Kennedy had indicated that the International Trading Corp. of Seattle had applied for export licenses covering 6 million metric tons of wheat and barley to Red China and 4½ million metric tons of wheat and barley to North Korea. The President's statement had caused great concern to many of us who have recognized that the economic squeeze on the mainland Chinese consumers is creating a serious political problem for their civil leaders.

It is to be hoped, Mr. Speaker, that the making public of this decision will not lull the American people into a false sense of security, because I do not think it is any secret here in Washington that influential members of our State Department would never have recommended against shipping agricultural products to Red China if the Chinese Government itself had asked us for them. These State Department leaders take the position that it would be a psychological victory for the free world if Communist China asked to buy grain. On the other, our military leadership in the Far East, I understand, strongly opposes supplying Red China with agricultural products and takes the position instead that any such policy would deal a disastrous blow to our prestige with other nations in the Far East including our strong ally, the Philippine Republic. And by the way, just to keep the record clear, let us not overlook the fact that Red China exports substantial amounts of rice and has been doing so of very recent date. The United States should bear that in mind.

As I reminded the House last week, the Export Control Act of 1949 expires on June 30, 1962. It is this act which authorizes the President to use export controls in furtherance of our foreign policy and in the interest of national security. If the Export Act of 1949 is not extended, of course, the only restrictions on the shipment of strategic and nonstrategic goods to foreign countries would be first, under the so-called Battle Act which prohibits arms and goods of a military nature; second, under the Foreign Assistance Act which prohibits assistance under the foreign aid program to any nation unless the President determines such nation is not dominated and controlled by the international Communist movement; and, third, Public Law 480 which restricts delivery of surplus agricultural products to any nation not deemed "friendly."

It has seemed to me quite evident that there are powerful influences in this administration that have been working toward removing all legal impediments to full and free trade of all kinds of goods, strategic and otherwise, with the Sino-Soviet bloc nations. For example, Mr. Speaker, I had thought that when extending Public Law 480 last July, under the so-called Latta amendment, the Congress spelled out its intention that in no manner would the United States either subsidize the export, sale, or make available any subsidized agricultural commodities to any nations that were members of the Communist bloc. I had thought that, by adding the Latta amendment, aid or trade, whichever one wants to call it, with Poland would cease. Prior to the Latta amendment, under Public Law 480, title I, agreements had been signed and agricultural products shipped to Poland which had cost the Commodity Credit Corporation $509 million for which, as I understand, we received the equivalent of $365 million in Polish currency called zlotys which was placed to the credit of the United States in Poland and for which we have no real use, nor for which in my opinion will we ever receive any consideration.

In addition to this, in the form of foreign aid we have given Poland over the years a total of more than $500 million and may I say as a result of this generosity I doubt if the United States has won any friendship, but rather the Polish Government has been dominated and controlled more and more by the U.S.S.R.

As I indicated, Mr. Speaker, I had thought by new language in the Foreign Aid Act and in Public Law 480 that this trade and aid would cease. But on December 15, 1961, the Polish and American Governments signed another agreement calling for $44 million worth of agricultural commodities to be sent to Poland. Meanwhile, this so-called friendly nation had loaned money to Cuba, shipped machinery and food to other Communist bloc countries and, to top that off, or so I have read, shipped actual arms to North Vietnam which possibly right now are being used for killing American boys in that conflagration. Also Poland voted against the United States and with the U.S.S.R. in the United Nations.

In Seattle, when the super-tanker Titan was loading some of this latter grain, as I previously told the House, a little band of public-spirited citizens picketed the terminal to protest this foreign trade policy.

While, as I said, I am relieved at the decision of the Administration in connection with the issuance of licenses to ship grain to Red China, I do wonder as to what the next move will be. What matter that an anti-Communist trade and aid policy of export controls was set forth in the spirit and language of recent legislation. I believe the intent of Congress will continue to be ignored.

Last January there was an article in the New York Times by Felix Belair, Jr. It told of a task force headed by George W. Ball, the same George W. Ball who has since become Under Secretary of State. Secretary Ball has appropriately described that task force as a "loose group of individuals and ideas," but the report of this group, according to the New York Times article, proposed to President Kennedy a virtual scrapping of the existing embargo on export of strategic materials to Soviet bloc nations. The report was quoted as saying that present voluntary machinery for controlling strategic exports to the Soviets has all but broken down.

My point is, Mr. Speaker, that with foreign policy advisors such as Secretary Ball in high office, I cannot help being concerned as to decisions covering exports which the President may reach.

Already the ban on subsidized surplus agricultural products has been lifted. That was done last June. What next?

What will the President do about the extension of the Export Control Act? Will he request that it be extended and will he oppose my proposal for strengthening the language of that act so as to express the will of the Congress that the Sino-Soviet bloc not be opened up for export licensing of strategic agricultural products? How about the present embargo on shipments to Red China and North Korea and North Vietnam and Cuba? Will that ban be lifted?

I wonder. Do we plan coexistence or do we plan to win the cold war?

If the administration decides to allow the sale of grain to Red China, in my opinion the cold war is lost. Under such a policy, we will have assured the success of the Communist system.

As for the Congress, in the face of a possible impending alteration in policy to liberalize our trade policy, I think we must act. We must spell out to the executive branch of government that assistance in the way of any food or fiber, aid or trade, shall not go to any country unless the President determines that such country is not under Communist government. It is not enough to use language as in the Mutural Security Act:

> The President shall continuously assure himself * * * that the furnishing of such assistance is in the interest of national security of the United States.

Nor is it enough to say as in section 101 of Public Law 480 that foreign aid in agricultural commodities must be to a friendly nation.

Under the threat of "loose individuals and ideas," to use the Under Secretary's own language, the Congress must say what it means in words that cannot be misconstrued, and we must not delegate the authority to decide which nations are friendly in this cold war.

Let me emphasize, Mr. Speaker, Secretary Rusk has said Poland is clearly a member of the Soviet bloc and that her government is geographically and economically bound to the U.S.S.R.—yet, under the Export Control Act and Public Law 480, Poland is deemed to be friendly and not under domination and control of the international Communist movement.

Mr. Speaker, the decision last week not to issue licenses to export grain to Red China and North Korea is a respite. Now, Congress must tighten up the law and establish a policy under which the cold war can be won.

S O S: Save Our Streams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 24, 1962

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on March 8 I placed in the Appendix of the RECORD the first part of an essay entitled "Conservation and the Construction of Public Roads." Written by Ernest Swift, it appeared in the March 1 issue of Conservation News, published by the National Wildlife Federation.

PART II

The March 15 issue of Conservation News carries part II of this excellent statement, which cites additional reasons for passage of my bill, S. 2767. The bill would require the Secretary of the Interior's approval of Federal-aid highway projects, surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates which affect fish, wildlife, and recreation values.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD part II of "Conservation and the Construction of Public Roads."

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSERVATION AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC ROADS—PART II

(By Ernest Swift)

The National Wildlife Federation has been receiving numerous calls for help from every corner of the Nation in the matter of road building, and it is time that conservationists unite to help preserve some of America's most cherished possessions before they are bulldozed under or excavated away.

Highways are constructed in the name of progress and "promoting the general welfare." To what extent highways should be given dominance over all other values at all times, however, is highly debatable. It is evident, though, that greater controls need to be exerted on those who would push roads through any and all areas with callous disregard for anyone or anything.

Grass on the other side of the fense always is greener, the truism relates. Thus, travel to faraway places long has had allure for many people. Travel opportunities today are greater than in any previous age, and much of the development is recent.

There was a time when the railroads proudly called themselves the lifeline of the Nation, but that slogan has been deftly pilfered by the Bureau of Public Roads. The romantic days of the railroads are quietly slipping into the pages of history or into museums.

Based on rapidly growing protests, Congressman GLENN CUNNINGHAM, of Nebraska, last August introduced H.R. 8595 to limit powers of the Bureau of Public Roads to condemn rights-of-way through lands dedicated as public parks, including city and municipal, county, and State parks.

Then, in February of this year, Senator LEE METCALF, of Montana, introduced S. 2767 which would protect fish and wildlife and other recreation values by requiring approval of the Secretary of the Interior of project surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates, etc., for Federal aid roads.

These proposals would have far-reaching effects in regulating road construction activities and likely will evoke some plain and fancy protests. Different conservation groups in many States, however, resent the callous disregard given to recreational and esthetic values. In fact, it often seems that parks and refuges and forests hold a fascination for highway planners, possibly because esthetic values are more difficult to prove and protect.

In one of its releases, the Bureau of Public Roads promotes its own importance by stating: "The Interstate System will give new freedom and new speed and safety to the movement of people and goods. The advantages to long-range travel, whether by car, bus, or truck are obvious. Business and vacation travel will take less time. There will be greater comfort and less strain in driving. Deliveries will be faster and truck operation more productive * * * farm products will move quicker and with less damage." Most people accept this as an enticing and sound argument.

Public Law 87-61 of the 87th Congress, the Federal aid highway program, is a rather short but formidable document which, in essence, takes up the slack on road building and has escalator clauses running into 1972. It provides, among other things, for a 41,000-mile System of Interstate and Defense Highways, at a cost of $41 billion. This does not include improving 826,000 miles in the Federal aid network of primary and secondary roads and major urban streets.

The law and news releases imply that the Federal highway program is a pay-as-you-go effort and that road users foot the bill, but it appears that diversion of general tax revenues will be necessary. This means tax moneys from sources other than gas and vehicle taxes.

This is to provide stimulus for employment in the steel, construction, cement, and other industries. Since industry, earthmovers, and labor groups have few political differences when the scent of public money is in the air, their combined power can crush any little two-bit conservation movement to save a park or glen or crystal stream.

Statistics can be likened to a lamppost—it can be used for illumination or to lean against. In analyzing figures from offices of the Bureau of Public Roads, one could suspect the agency is using statistics for both purposes. By 1976, says the Bureau of Public Roads, there will be 113 million motor vehicles traveling 1.2 trillion miles per year. These figures are impressive, but not exhilarating. To produce that many vehicles and the many during intermediate years will no doubt require the strip mining of much low grade ore—because much of the accessible high grade ore is gone—wherein much land and landscape will be destroyed in addition to the many streams which will run foul with waste and spoil.

Present law gives the Federal Government the right to condemn land in any State for use as the right-of-way for a Federal highway. This statute has been tested in court and its constitutionality has been upheld in the U.S. district court in Tennessee in a test involving condemnation of part of a cemetery. Some States do not give their State highway departments the right of eminent domain in condemning public-use lands such as schools, churches, parks, cemeteries, etc. Here the Federal Government steps in at the request of the State highway department and condemns lands and then turns it over to the State for its use. Just how people who hold that States rights are a virtue can salve their consciences to such gerrymandering is hard to fathom. Federal paper and outside money can make a tattered and shabby rag of States rights.

Specific cases? Here are a few:

From the New York Times, January 1, 1962, "Tyranny of Roads": "The most significant construction work being done in America today, for good or ill, does not shoot up into the sky but lies down flat. The modern American speedway, with a maximum curve of three degrees and maximum grade of 3 percent, strides across the landscape like a Martian canal. Occasionally protests arise against the foolish and arbitrary things the designers do. Sometimes they seem to aim deliberately at the beautiful and historic—as when their makers propose to cut through some of the pioneer structures of Sacramento, Calif., or more recently to cripple the building plans of Swarthmore College in Pennsylvania." A proposed highway route would destroy lovely Crum Creek, including land acquired by the college a century ago.

From the Beacon, Philadelphia Conservationists, Inc.: "The New York and New Jersey

open space bond issues and the proposed Pennsylvania bond issue testify to the desire of the public for open space preservation. * * * How can the highway department of Pennsylvania be so ignorant of, or indifferent to, the needs of other State departments and local agencies, and to the open space problem, that it would propose an expressway through the most unique area in a heavily populated region? We are told that highway experts and technologists say it is easier and cheaper to use a natural creek valley than some other route. * * * Maybe it is easier, but are we always going to take the easy way at the cost of sacrificing the larger benefits of a little hard work and hard thinking?"

Antioch College in Ohio was roused to a fighting pitch in 1958 when a release was made that a 300-foot dual highway was planned to intersect a cherished beauty spot owned by the college and called Glen Helen. Friends of Glen Helen mounted a publicity campaign which resulted in rerouting of the highway. The community subsequently was honored by an American Motors conservation award.

Protests to the ruthless autonomy of highway construction springs up from many sources, and in many parts of the Nation. The January 1962 issue of Outdoors in Maryland, a monthly magazine representing 300,000 sportsmen, relates how a proposed relocation of Highway 40 would cut an 8-mile swath through the area's best deer and turkey hunting grounds. In Utah, conservationists are opposing widening and relocation of a highway through beautiful Logan Canyon in the Cache National Forest.

How does highway construction affect fish and wildlife and outdoor recreation? To begin with, the highway itself takes much wildlife habitat (a cloverleaf requires the space of a small farm). Then, between intersections, islands of unmanageable land are created, and the highways cut across migrations of big game animals, and many are killed or stopped by fences. Land is open to erosion which, along with construction, ruins streams for fishing.

Senator METCALF, in material inserted on CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, quotes Walter Everin, director of the Montana wildlife agency: "The highway department has cooperated in saving a few natural stream meanders but only when there was no additional cost involved or the cost was negligible. In at least one instance a highway was routed into a trout stream to avoid the cost of moving a powerline." Everin was quoted as saying: "The highway department maintains that the Bureau of Public Roads will not approve the additional costs involved in saving streams."

Protests also are being registered in Connecticut, West Virginia, and New Hampshire. The International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners is being pressed by its members to enter the arena against irresponsible roadbuilding in game, park, and forest areas.

The question becomes ever more urgent as to when resource management will be viewed with proper perspective and balance. When will the Congress realize how damaging it is to authorize one agency to save and another to destroy? When will Federal bureaus be made to realize they have an overall duty to the Nation in managing resources which transcends some one-cylinder laws under which they operate?

Today the Department of Agriculture, the Army Engineers, and, in some instances, the Bureau of Reclamation, seemingly have no guilt complex in destroying the Nation's waterfowl areas. The Federal Power Commission merrily authorizes high dams which rapidly kill off the finest salmon runs on the continent. Even when a State by referendum vote protests, the Federal courts have overruled wishes of the State—this was done in Washington on the Cowlitz River. Industries and municipalities fill our streams with filth and stench. And, now comes the highway programs to aid and abet in the destruction.

All of these bureaus have been given powers of eminent domain—authorities which would make a dictator jump with glee. Too few words of caution or responsibilities to all resources have been written into authorizing acts creating these agencies.

Too few bureaucrats in position of authority take a broad interest in the whole ecology of nature, or feel that preserving that ecology is part of their jobs—either as a public employee or as a citizen. Regardless of how many resources may be damaged or destroyed, many fanatically follow a narrow and ill-conceived sense of duty to the bitter end.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Address by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy at the Free University of Berlin on February 22, 1962; also a statement by the Attorney General, the Berlin City Hall steps, on the same date.

The addresses follow:

ADDRESS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL ROBERT F. KENNEDY

We meet here tonight on the 230th anniversary of the birth of a distinguished and courageous leader, George Washington, the father of my country, to pay tribute to the memory of a distinguished and courageous leader, Ernst Reuter, the father of freedom in West Berlin.

These two men were widely separate in time and in space. But they shared ideals of courage and freedom, ideals which continue to inspire men across the world. They asserted those ideals in dark and perilous times. And the reverence freemen do to their memories proves the continuity of purpose and faith which makes the history of freedom identical with the history of progress.

George Washington led Americans in the assertion of their independence against colonialism. Ernst Reuter led the citizens of free Berlin in the defense of their independence against totalitarianism. Both men were brave, wise, prudent and steadfast. Both embodied principles greater than themselves. Both, striving for the independence of their fellow citizens, were advancing the cause of freedom everywhere.

Though George Washington's struggle soon came to a successful conclusion, Ernst Reuter's struggle still continues. Because the fight for the independence of free Berlin is a concern of all freemen, Ernst Reuter has become a 20th century symbol of liberty, and his cause enlists the active support of nations like my own, thousands of miles from the Brandenburg Gate.

Let no one mistake the firmness of our commitment to this cause. Our position with regard to Berlin is well known, but, to remove all doubt, let me reaffirm its essential elements today.

We have stood in the past, and we will stand in the future, for the full freedom of the inhabitants of West Berlin and for the continuation of West Berlin's ties with the Federal Republic and the world beyond.

We have stood in the past, and we will stand in the future—for the presence of Allied Forces in West Berlin, as long as they are necessary and as long as you so desire. We will not allow this presence to be diluted or replaced.

We have stood in the past, and we will stand in the future, for uncontrolled access to and from Berlin. We will permit no interference with this access, as we have recently demonstrated with regard to the air corridors.

We have stood in the past, and we will stand in the future, for an active, viable West Berlin. Berlin will not merely exist. It will grow and prosper.

We stand behind all these positions with the full strength of American power. I am glad to have the opportunity today to reaffirm the solemn statement of the President of the United States: "We do not want to fight but we have fought before. We cannot and will not permit the Communists to drive us out of Berlin, gradually or by force."

We do not feel that the maintenance of the integrity of West Berlin threatens any legitimate interests of the Soviet Union, and we remain confident that, in due course, this problem will be resolved through the processes of peaceful negotiation.

We have no question about the destiny of West Berlin. It will neither be snatched from the tree, nor will it wither on the vine. Its future will be greater than its past, and the flowering of this great city will be the most fitting of all memorials to Ernst Reuter.

And we have not forgotten the men and women of East Berlin and East Germany. We know the hardships they endure under a harsh and repressive regime. We look forward to the eventual reunion of Germans in freedom.

When historians consider the significance of the Berlin crises of the mid-20th century, I do not believe that they will record it as an incident in the encirclement of freedom. The true view, in my judgment, will be to see it rather as a major episode in the recession of communism.

I well know that for those in free Berlin, the persistent Communist pressure has been a source of peril and anguish. Yet what has happened in Berlin is that the Soviet Union has reacted to the initiatives of democracy, to you, to pour spirit and to that series of actions, beginning with the Marshall plan, which have brought about the extraordinary political, economic, and cultural renaissance of Western Europe.

The postwar revival of democratic Europe has exerted a magnetic attraction on Communist Europe. On the dark side of the Iron Curtain, despite rigid Communist controls, democratic ideas, democratic techniques, democratic fashions, and democratic ideals are stirring. Among its own intellectuals and its own youth, communism finds itself on the defensive. The flow of influence is now always from west to east, not from east to west; from democracy to communism, not from communism to democracy.

Because the flow of influence goes one way, the flow of people goes the other. This surely is the meaning of the Berlin wall, that ugly mass of concrete, brick, and barbed wire which lies across the heart of your city like a medieval instrument of torture.

For the people of Berlin, the erection of that wall was of course an affront and a source of anguish. But I can report to you from around the world, from my travels through Asia, that the Berlin wall is regarded everywhere as a proof of Communist bankrupty, and a symbol of Communist failure.

Herr Ulbrecht himself has confessed that it was to stop the flight of people—to lock up his workers in the worker's paradise—that the wall was built. For the first time in the history of mankind, a political system has had to construct a barrier to keep its people in, and the whole world recognizes the desperate meaning of this act.

They wall their people in.

We set our people free.

Robert Frost, who read from his poetry at the inauguration of our President, once wrote these lines:

"Before I build a wall I'd ask to know
What I was walling in or walling out
And to whom I was like to give offense,
Something there is that doesn't love a wall,
That wants it down."

What wants this wall down is the whole free spirit of man.

The statistics on the flight of scholars offers us an idea of what communism has done to this free spirit. Since 1958, a total of 1606 scholars, mainly teachers in the humanities and sciences at long-established universities and technical institutes in East Germany, have left the eastern zone and registered in West German reception camps. More than half are members of faculties. One hundred eighteen of them are full-fledged professors, a number equal to the professorial component of East Germany's third largest university, at Halle. In the last 4 years, Halle has lost a total of 147 faculty members, more than the current size of its teaching staff. Humboldt University has lost 275 members of its staff; Leipzig, 199; and so on down the list.

As the chief law officer of the American Government, I am particularly interested to note, too, the flight of many judges and lawyers from East Germany.

The wall is more than a demonstration of Communist failure in the struggle for men's faith and hope. It is equally a desperate effort to stem the tide of unification in democratic Europe. By attempting to isolate West Berlin, the Communists hope to subtract West Berlin from West Germany and then to separate West Germany from Western Europe; and, by subtracting West Germany from Western Europe, they hope to defeat and wreck the great cooperative instrumentalities of the regathering of democratic strength, the Common Market, OCED, and NATO.

I can assure you that the wall will fail as spectacularly in this purpose as it has failed to seal off Communist Europe from the magnetic attraction of democratic Europe.

Ernst Reuter said a dozen years ago, "Here in Berlin all the slogans that rend the air during the East-West struggle take on a real meaning. Here no one needs any professional lectures about democracy, about freedom and all the other nice things that there are in the world. Here one has lived all of that; one lives it every day and every hour."

You live it still in free Berlin, and the ever-increasing strength and purpose and unity of the democracies will vindicate your struggle.

And while today Berlin is divided, as Germany is divided, by the decision of the Communists, you know and I know that in the end all Berlin and all Germany are one. My country shares with you the peaceful but persistent purpose that Germans shall one day find themselves reunited. This is the true path toward lower tensions and to lessened dangers. We shall continue to hope that as policies of repression fail, and as fear of "revenge" prove unfounded, the Soviet

Government, in its own true interest, will come to share this purpose and to cooperate in its realization.

But freedom by itself is not enough.

"Freedom is a good horse," said Matthew Arnold, "but a horse to ride somewhere."

Ernst Reuter knew that what mattered finally was the use to which men put freedom, that what counts is how liberty becomes the means of opportunity and growth and justice.

We do not stand here at Berlin just because we are against communism. We stand here because we have a positive and progressive vision of the possibilities of free society, because we see freedom as the instrumentality of social progress and social justice, because communism itself is but the symptom and the consequence of the fundamental evils, ignorance, disease, hunger and want, and freedom has shown mankind the most effective way to destroy these ancient antagonists.

The free way of life proposes ends, but it does not prescribe means.

It assumes that people, and nations, will often think differently, have the full right to do so, and that diversity is the source of progress. It believes that men advance by discussion, by debate, by trial and by error.

It believes that the best ideas come, not from edict and ideology, but from free inquiry and free experiment; and it regards dissent, not as treason to the state, but as the tested mechanism of social progress.

It knows that diverse nations will find diverse roads to the general goal of political independence and economic growth. It regards the free individual as the source of creativity, and believes that it is the role of the state to serve him, and not his role to serve the state.

I come to Berlin from thousands of miles of travel through Asia. I have seen men and women at work building modern societies so that their people can begin to share in the blessings of science and technology and become full members of the 20th century. Social progress and social justice, in my judgment, are not something apart from freedom; they are the fulfillment of freedom. The obligation of free men is to use their opportunities to improve the welfare of their fellow human beings. This, at least, has been the tradition of democratic freedom in America. And this is what lies behind the great democratic effort under way in the United States known as the New Frontier.

The New Frontier is the contemporary expression of the perennial progressive impulse in American life, the impulse to redress the balance of social power in favor of those whom Andrew Jackson called "the humble members of society." Jefferson and Jackson and Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt and the New Nationalism, Woodrow Wilson and the New Freedom, Franklin Roosevelt and the New Deal, Harry Truman and the Fair Deal, these were earlier episodes in this continuing tradition of militant progressivism.

My country has attained standards of freedom and abundance which are the envy of much of the world. But we do not account this an excuse for complacency or a signal for relaxation. It will be the permanent effort of Americans, and it is the specific purpose of this administration, to keep moving ever forward until we can realize the promise of American life for all our citizens, and make what contribution we can to assist other peoples to win justice and progress and independence for themselves.

One vestige of injustice in my country has been the treatment of fellow citizens of another color. For a hundred years, despite our claims of equality, we had, as you know, a wall of our own, a wall of segregation erected against Negroes. That wall is coming down through the orderly process of enforcing the laws and securing compliance with court decisions, an area of government where my own responsibilities, as Attorney General, are heavy.

The battle against discrimination in interstate transportation has been won; the conquest of segregation in the public schools is making new progress each school year. Throughout the Nation, the conscience of America has awakened to press the fight against discrimination in employment, in housing, in the use of common facilities. We still have far to go, but the progress we have already made has changed the face of America.

We are increasing the pace of our economic growth. We are harnessing the advances of science and technology to produce new abundance at an ever-lessening human cost. We are expanding social programs to eradicate poverty and disease. We are increasing the quality of our educational system. We have raised the level of our minimum wage. Our appropriations for housing today are the largest they have ever been. We are seeking medical care for the old as part of the existing program of social security. We are stimulating cultural effort and honoring artistic achievement.

Every free nation has the capacity to open up its own new frontiers of social welfare and social justice. Communist leaders have sometimes spoken of peaceful competition as to which society serves the people best. That is a competition which free society accepts with relish.

I know of no better controlled experiment for such competition than Germany itself. The people of West Germany and East Germany are culturally and ethnically the same. Both parts of Germany were ravaged by war. Both had the same opportunities in peace. But West Germany elected the free system, and East Germany had communism thrust upon it.

We have only to look about us to see how this competition comes out. Berlin was once a united city. The people of West and East Berlin are the same. There are brothers, cousins, parents and children, some living on one side of the line, some on the other. But since the war the Western sector of the city has been under democratic control and the Eastern under Communist control.

The contrast in progress speaks for itself. West Berlin met the challenge of rehabilitation and rebirth of justice and of freedom; East Berlin has not.

Here in this city lies an answer to the question of competition. It is an answer so overpowering that it has had to be shut from sight by concrete and barbed wire, tanks and machineguns, dogs and guards. The competition has resulted in so disastrous a defeat for communism that the Communists felt they had no alternative but the wall.

We find the same answer all over the world. Few countries were as devastated by the war as was Japan. She alone suffered from nuclear attack. Her great industrial cities, Tokyo and Osaka, were in ruins when she surrendered. No comparable city in China endured comparable destruction. Peking, Shanghai, Canton, Hankow, all were left substantially intact.

Yet today Japan, which I visited 2 weeks ago, has a thriving economy. Her standard of living is higher than that of any nation in the Far East. Her ships roam the far seas, and her airlines fly from Tokyo to New York and London. Communist China, on the other hand, suffers in her fifth year of hunger. The tragic "commune" experiment has collapsed. Industrial production has slowed down. Poverty and disease stalk the land. Even worse, thousands of innocent people have been imprisoned and killed, and the more fortunate have fled to other lands, more than a million to Hong Kong alone.

Communism everywhere has paid the price of rigidity and dogmatism. Freedom has the strength of compassion and flexibility. It has, above all, the strength of intellectual honesty. We do not claim to know all the answers; we make no pretense of infallibility. And we know this to be a sign, not of weakness, but of power.

The proof of the power of freedom lies in the fact that communism has always flinched from competition in the field where it counts most, the competition of ideas.

The flight of scholars and jurists from East Germany shows the fate of intellectual freedom under communism. To this day, nearly half a century after the Russian revolution, one virtually never sees on a Moscow newsstand any book, magazine, or newspaper exported from a democracy except Communist Party publications. Yet one is free in Washington and London and Paris to buy all the copies of Pravda and Izvestia one wants.

When will the Communists be confident enough of their ideas to expose them to the competition of democratic ideas? I was disappointed to note that only a few days ago a Russian leader, while saying that coexistence with democratic social systems was possible, asserted emphatically that coexistence with democratic ideas was "impossible and unthinkable."

It would amount, he said, to Communist ideological disarmament. I would have thought that he might have more faith in the capacity of Communist ideas to survive such competition; but he may well be right in fearing to let communism stand on its own in a free forum.

President Kennedy, since his inauguration, has steadily sought new ways and means of increasing the exchange of ideas with the Soviet Union. This is why he has been ready to arrange interviews and to offer our full courtesies and facilities in return.

We proudly press the challenge. Let the ideas of freedom have the same circulation in Communist states that Communist ideas have in free states. We can have formal peace without such reciprocal competition in the realm of ideas; but until we have full freedom of intellectual exchange, I see no prospect of a genuine and final relaxation of world tension.

For a long time some people have supposed that freedom was the enemy of social and intellectual welfare. A century ago Karl Marx condemned the free economy as cold and heartless, as primarily a mechanism for the degradation of the intellectuals and the exploitation of the workers.

Marx also said that, in borrowing the dialectic, he had stood Hegel on his head. In the century since the Communist manifesto, history has stood Marx on his head. For the free state, contrary to Marx's predictions, has proven its ability to raise mass living standards, even out the distribution of wealth, organize social compassion, advance intellectual endeavor, and produce an ever more equalitarian society.

Marx's condemnation of the heartless laissez faire capitalism of the early 19th century now, by an irony of history, applies with fantastic precision to 20th century communism.

It is communism, not free society, which is dominated by what the Yugoslav Communist Milovan Djilas has called the new class, the class of party bosses and bureaucrats, who acquire not only privileges but an exemption from criticism which would be unimaginable in democratic society. Far from being a classless society, communism is governed by an elite as steadfast in its determination to maintain its prerogatives as any oligarchy known to history.

And it is communism, not free society, which has become the favorite 20th century means of disciplining the masses, repressing consumption and denying the workers the

full produce of their labor. In China today, for example, the state takes away nearly one-third of the agricultural output from the peasant through heavy taxation and compulsory grain purchases below market prices. Far from being a workers' paradise, communism has become the most effective system every devised for exploitation of the working class.

By this historical paradox, it is free society, and not communism, which seems most likely to realize Marx's old hope of the emancipation of man and the achievement of an age of universal abundance.

In his State of the Union address a few weeks ago, President Kennedy quoted Woodrow Wilson, who once said, "I believe in democracy because it releases the energy of every human being." The spirit of the New Frontier is a spirit which constantly pushes toward distant horizons.

It is the spirit of a society committed, not to the past, but to the future—forever striving to give an ancient vision of peace and liberty and justice new fulfillment. It is a spirit which does not linger in the valley but breaks new paths in the hills, a spirit which welcomes innovation and adventure, which faces the unknown, not with fear, but with faith.

Its vitality springs from the limitless strength of the fundamental revolution of our age, the revolution of liberty and justice, the permanent revolution of the free individual. Its power is that it enables men to live, and that it inspires them to die, so that the world of freedom may be secure.

If freedom makes social progress possible, so social progress strengthens and enlarges freedom. The two are inseparable partners in the great adventure of humanity: they are the sources of the worldwide revolutionary movement of our epoch. This movement, of which Ernst Reuter is a contemporary hero, did not begin in the 20th century. It began 2,000 years ago in Judea, and I like to believe that it took its modern form in 1776 in the American colonies.

In some parts of the world today the Communists seek to capture that revolution. But it is always stronger than those who would subvert and betray it. It is stronger in arms, and the determination, if necessary, to use them. And it is stronger because it expresses the deepest instincts of man.

President Kennedy said recently, "Above all else, let us remember, however serious the outlook, however harsh the task, the one great irreversible trend in the history of the world is on the side of liberty." He added, "And we for all time to come are on that side." His speech was addressed to Americans, but I know that he would wish me to apply it here, as he does in his own mind, to all the world.

You know that you do not stand alone. President Kennedy made our position unmistakably clear to the world when he said your freedom "would not be surrendered to force or through appeasement."

And that is the position of our allies as well. As an official and a representative of the U.S. Government, I am proud of that stand and I salute the men who lead you and have so bravely carried on in behalf of our common ideals. And, as an admirer of your courage and your determination, we salute you, the people of Berlin, and we wish you well.

STATEMENT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL ROBERT F. KENNEDY, THE BERLIN CITY HALL STEPS, FEBRUARY 22, 1962

Mr. Mayor, General Clay, and my friends in Berlin, over the past few weeks my wife and I have traveled many thousands of miles across the United States, across the Pacific Ocean, from Japan along the Chinese coast, down to Indonesia, across the Indian Sea, across Pakistan, up through the Middle East, through Italy, and now we arrive in the free city of Berlin. Nothing we have seen has touched us as much as your reception to us here today.

The warmth of your greeting will always remain indelibly in our hearts, and the message it gives is one that I will report back to the American people. For we know that this reception is a sign of your friendship toward the American people, and I want to report to you that it is reciprocated—friendship and affection for the people of Berlin and the admiration of your great courage.

So I am proud to be here in the city of Berlin. This is my third visit to your city. I came here first in 1948 during the Berlin airlift. It was when Berliners and Americans were standing side by side. General Clay and your mayor, Ernst Reuter, were standing shoulder to shoulder when the Communists were attempting to bring the proud city of Berlin to its knees. On that trip I traveled not only to West Berlin but to Communist East Berlin, and the contrast between communism and freedom was there for all to see. And I saw it for myself.

But on my return back here in 1955, I came from a long trip to the Soviet Union and I came here to West Berlin and saw your pleasant streets and gay shops and your fine people. And when I went over to East Berlin again it was like returning to a bad dream. (Loud noise, red balloons dropped Red flags).

The Communists will let the balloons through but they won't let their people through.

I have seen the contrast between this city in the west part and in the Communist part as many hundreds of thousands of people have seen that contrast. And that is why Herr Ulbricht had to erect the wall. Because it was a contrast that he could not tolerate.

That is the true meaning of the wall that lies like a snake across the heart of your city. Mr. Ulbricht and the Communists cannot have the contrast. (Another loud noise; two more Red flags dropped by parachute from small balloons).

That is the only thing that he can do.

He cannot tolerate the contrast between freedom here and communism over there so that everyone can see it. He has to do that. We are aware of the heartbreak and anguish this wall has caused to the people of Berlin. But I would also ask you to look at the other side and see what an impression it has made all across the rest of the globe. Because this wall is an admission of failure by communism, it is an attempt for the first time in the history of mankind to erect a wall not to keep marauders or bandits out, but to keep their people in.

This is understood every place. I was in Indonesia and talked to a young Communist student. And he was saying that the Communists regimes throughout the world were supported by the people. And I asked him: I said, "Well, how can you explain the wall in Berlin?" He blushed for a moment, and he said: "I don't want to get into details."

And this incident has been repeated over and over again in my travels.

If the purpose of the wall was to destroy Berlin, Herr Ulbricht and his cohorts have erred sadly. Berlin is not only going to continue to exist, it's going to grow and grow and grow.

Its ties to West Germany will not be severed. Companies from America and other foreign countries will erect their plants here. Corporations from all over the globe are going to open outlets in this city. West Berlin's brightest pages have yet to be written in the books of history. And Berlin, although on the edge of totalitarianism, will not be attacked, because an armed attack on West Berlin is the same as an armed attack on Chicago, or New York, or London, or Paris.

You are our brothers and we stand by you.

And now I have a message from President Kennedy to you of free Berlin. It is to Mayor Brandt, the Senate and the people of West Berlin.

"I am delighted to send my warmest greetings to the people of West Berlin through my brother, the Attorney General of the United States. His visit to Berlin is one more testimonial to the ties that bind your city and the American people. I am grateful to you for having invited him, and the message which he brings is the message of American solidarity with the free people of West Berlin. The courage and determination of the people of your great city are a constant inspiration to freemen everywhere. Our people and yours have stood firm for freedom in the years that lie behind us; together with other determined peoples we shall sustain both freedom and peace in the years ahead."

Congressional Tax Fight Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the great, proverbial, though unpopular, certainties of life is taxes.

Over the years, there has been a broad range of philosophies about taxes, extending, in extremes, from the theory of attempting to utilize tax money to "spend ourselves into prosperity" to, conversely, utilizing the power of taxation "to destroy."

A sane, realistic tax policy, however, lies somewhere between these extremes. Over the weekend, I was privileged to discuss some of the major aspects of the tax outlook in a broadcast over Wisconsin radio stations. I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY, OF WISCONSIN

As a free people, of course, nobody is happy about taxes. However, we recognize that—despite our dedication to the concept that individuals and free enterprise should bear as large a share of the burdens as possible—there are national requirements of broader scope, for example, defense—than can be handled by citizens or even by local or State governments.

For financing necessary national programs, however, it is absolutely essential that we attempt to assume equitable distribution of the burden of taxes.

Over the years, the complex system of U.S. tax laws, unfortunately, has grown—in hodgepodge fashion—into a long-tentacled revenue collector reaching deep into the pockets of individual and corporate citizens.

Regrettably, tax policy has been based too much upon hand-to-mouth, or perhaps, more accurately year-to-year expediency. Generally, this has involved levying new laws or just changing statutes not on the books; rarely are taxes repealed—even though many exist long beyond their intended time.

The Nation, then, could well benefit, I believe, from creation of a more realistic tax philosophy designed to serve, preserve, and strengthen our free enterprise system,

as well as to meet the long-range needs of the Nation.

Because of these factors, I have introduced a bill, S. 10—now pending before Congress—to create a Hoover-type Tax Commission. The purpose would be to carry out a top-to-bottom reform of our revenue laws. As well, the goal would be to make a study, not only of Federal statute, but also of the way in which these overlap local and State revenue laws.

Unfortunately, Congress has not yet been willing to undertake a broad-scope, thorough, much-needed reevaluation and overhaul of the system.

Consequently, the outlook for the current session is for another leaking-roof-type, patchwork revision.

Currently, there is waiting in the wings of the House of Representatives—extensively revised, but still reflecting many of the features of the administration's recommendations—an omnibus set of proposals relating to: deductions from tax liability for new investments other than building; requirements in determining fair deductions for travel and entertainment; treatment of mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations; provisions pertaining to foreign-earned incomes; and other aspects of the tax system.

Traditionally, tax legislation originates in, and is acted upon first by, the House of Representatives. Consequently we, in the Senate, will need to wait and see how the House applies the surgical knife to the recommendations of the committee.

As things are shaping up, however, the debates promise to be one of the real rough-and-tumble battles of this session.

Although it is still too early then to know exactly what recommendations—in what form—will finally emerge from the Congress, I believe, we need to act according to sound, fundamental principles aimed toward: (1) Equitably meeting the Nation's fiscal needs; (2) assuring fair treatment of our citizens under the law; and (3) spurring, not stunting, economic growth and progress.

Top Champions at Handshaking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an outstanding article by Pasquale Marranzino which appeared in the Rocky Mountain News and I know it will be of great interest to all Members of Congress.

The article follows:

TOP CHAMPIONS AT HANDSHAKING

(By Pasquale Marranzino)

We were talking about the university student at Stoke-on-Kent, England, who claimed the world handshaking title.

Tim Healy, 20, said he had shaken the hands of 9,002 people in 9 hours and 15 minutes. Tim walked the streets in top hat and tails and ended up with swollen hand and the record. Presumably he is still going.

The conversation got around to great Denver handshakers we had known and the title, at least in our day, seemed to settle on the late Wendell Willkie, who chose to take on Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1940 when the latter won a third term.

I remember attending a reception at the Brown Palace Hotel where Willkie was being introduced to the GOP faithful. And in a matter of 3 hours he must have shaken hands with more than 10,000 people—at least, so it seemed.

Old F.D.R. reached more people here but not by handshake. He had a warmth that exuded from wherever he sat and people could feel it without the old handclasp.

His press agent and probably the warmest political figure of this century was, and still is, Jim Farley, whose whole life has been dedicated to remembering people and making sure the memory is engraved by following up a meeting with a personal note. Farley still does this.

On the home grounds, no political figure seems to approach the record set by Ed C. Johnson, who was never beaten in the quest for political office and who became a most influential man in Washington and probably Colorado's all-time, all-star political champion.

Ed still has the magic although he has been retired from active political life for years. Like Farley, he followed up his handshakes with a Spencerian penmanship in green ink. I suppose Bid Ed corresponded with all the folks of every Colorado serviceman in the days of the big war.

It is a courtesy that people remember. No secretary to type of his missives, Ed grabbed his pen and green ink and wrote.

In private life—semi-private life—is the venerable T. Joe Cahill of Cheyenne whose personal acquaintance around the country sets records for this territory.

Our Harry Mellon Rhoads—who has been working for this newspaper 62 years—is his only challenger. Harry has taken more pictures of people than any man in an ordinary life-time could shake hands with.

Some of my predecessors in the game tell me that the late Gov. Oliver Shoup was a champion handshake artist and one of the State's all-time story tellers.

Harry S. Truman, when he came to town, knew many, many people. But he was always too much quicksilver to stay still for a handshake.

Montana Newspapers for Wilderness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I am proud of the manner in which several Montana newspapers have recently explained to their readers the wilderness bill as passed by the Senate, countered arguments raised by opponents and expressed their support for wilderness preservation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three such editorials: "Saving Something for Tomorrow" from the March 11 issue of the Lewistown Daily News, "Democracy of the Mountain Tops," from the Billings Gazette, and "New Montana Wilderness Area" from the February 18 Missoulian.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Lewistown Daily News, Mar. 11, 1962]

SAVING SOMETHING FOR TOMORROW

There has been a great hue and cry over Senate bill 174, the so-called wilderness bill.

Perhaps here in Montana, and in a few other sparsely populated States, there may be some present justification for objection to the bill. But by and large, the Wilderness Act is needed now to insure the preservation of our dwindling recreation natural resource for generations.

The Nation's exploding population—which will someday spread to Montana—has already destroyed a large portion of this most important natural resource.

Each year the acreage dedicated for recreation dwindles away. Great parcels of scenic country have been swallowed up. Our miles of fishing streams are reduced each year * * * our watersheds have been depleted until a serious water shortage has been predicted within 20 years.

We must act today to preserve our natural resources for tomorrow. It is the problem of the people to insure the preservation of wilderness areas for future generations.

Perhaps the reason for many of the objections to the Wilderness Act are based on hearsay.

Highlights of the bill are printed below:

1. What is the purpose of the bill? To establish a national wilderness preservation system for the permanent good of the whole people, before our shrinking wildlands entirely disappear.

The system would be limited to Federal land already withdrawn for recreational use; made up from the following components:

(a) Areas in national forests classified as "wilderness," "wild," or "canoe," on effective date of act.

(b) Areas in national forests classified as "primitive," on effective date of act.

(c) Areas in national parks and monuments, embracing at least 5,000 acres without roads, on effective date of act.

(d) Selected portions of wildlife refuges and game ranges established prior to effective date of act.

3. When and how would these areas become part of the wilderness system? Each of the four categories listed above are treated separately under the bill. Thus:

(a) Wilderness, wild, or canoe areas would become part of the system upon enactment of the bill.

(b) Primitive areas would be temporarily incorporated into the system upon enactment of the bill. However, the Forest Service would review each of these areas, during the 10 years following enactment, to exclude any part found to be more suitable for lumbering, mining, or other commercial use. Those parts having predominant wilderness values would then be recommended by the President to Congress for permanent retention in the system. Either the House or Senate could veto any such recommendations.

(c) Roadless areas within national parks and monuments will be incorporated into the system, during the 10 years following enactment, as recommended by the President to Congress, subject to veto by either House or Senate.

(d) Selected portions of wildlife refuges and game ranges will be incorporated into the system, during the 10 years following enactment, as the President may recommend to Congress, subject to the same congressional veto.

Once the wildnerness system has been established as above provided no new additions may be made to it except by an affirmative act of Congress.

4. What restrictions would apply within the wilderness system? Subject to existing rights there would be no commercial enterprise within the system; no roads; no build-

ings, and no use of motor vehicles; motorboats; or aircraft. However, these restrictions are subject to the following special exceptions:

(a) Aircraft and motorboats may continue to be used, wherever the practice has become established.

(b) Guides, with their pack strings, boats, and camping equipment may continue to furnish their services for recreational purposes.

(c) Within national forest and public domain areas, included within the wilderness system:

1. The grazing of livestock shall continue, wherever well established.

2. The President may authorize, within specific areas, prospecting, mining, reservoirs, water conservation works, transmission lines, and such roads as may be essential to develop and use them, wherever he determines such use will better serve the public interest than its denial.

5. What general exceptions are made by the bill? The bill expressly allows for the following:

(a) Such measures may be taken within the wilderness system as may be necessary in the control of fire, insects, and disease.

(b) The jurisdiction of the States with respect to fish and wildlife in the national forests is left untouched by the bill.

(c) Within national forest and public domain areas in the wilderness system, any activity, including prospecting, for the purpose of gathering information about mineral or water resources, will be lawful, if carried on in a manner not incompatible with the preservation of the wilderness environment.

(d) Application of State water laws within the wilderness system are not affected by the bill.

(e) The jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission to license dam construction is not affected by the bill.

[From the Billings Gazette]

DEMOCRACY OF THE MOUNTAINTOPS

The opposition to establishment of wilderness areas to preserve the pristine characteristics of some of our most beautiful mountain forest lands has brought forth the absurdity that everybody has a right to drive his automobile any place that can be explored ahorseback.

Their reasoning goes like this:

Only the well to do can afford to rent a horse to ride into the back country to fish or take pictures. Therefore it's not fair to the people who can't afford automobiles but still rent a horse. And so, they contend, roads should be built into those remote areas to enable everybody to enjoy the scenery.

It's democracy, they say.

It's ridiculous, we say.

The argument is also advanced that since the present population taxes existing recreation facilities in the national forests, these should be extended, and to do so the wilderness areas should be open for development.

This we challenge on the grounds that we can have thousands of miles more of forest roads and thousands more campsites without getting into the wilderness areas. Moreover, the cost of building roads into country that is accessible only by foot trail or horseback places development of the remote wilderness in the category of improvements too costly to justify their purpose.

This Nation is certainly big enough that it can preserve a few square miles of primitive America here and there for the enjoyment of this and later generations. If we take better care of existing recreation sites, and fully develop the lands available outside the proposed wilderness areas, there will, for many years to come, be plenty of places for motorists to drive to for a weekend of camping and fishing.

[From the Missoulian, Feb. 18, 1962]

NEW MONTANA WILDERNESS AREA

Looking to the future, we see mounting merit in the Forest Service proposal to establish the Anaconda-Pintlar Wilderness Area southwest of Butte.

As our growing population year after year has increasing leisure time, such areas will be visited and appreciated more and more.

The bipartisan national Outdoor and Recreation Resources Review Commission stated this briefly and well a few days ago. It said such "areas satisfy a deep-seated human need occasionally to get far away from the works of man. Prompt and effective action to preserve their unique inspirational, scientific and cultural values on an adequate scale is essential, since once destroyed they can never be restored."

That is the reason for the proposal on which the Forest Service has scheduled a hearing Tuesday in Butte. At that time it will hear arguments for and against the plan to classify as wilderness slightly more than 157,000 acres—approximately 245 square miles—in the Beaverhead, Bitter Root and Deer Lodge national forests. The designation would be a change from the "primitive" classification of 1937.

Present "primitive" land where nonwilderness uses have been established would be excluded.

In exchange, other tracts predominantly wilderness in character would be merged with the remainder of the primitive area to form the Anaconda-Pintlar Wilderness Area.

We owe it particularly to future generations to preserve vast unexploited tracts in their pristine beauty.

That does no violence to commercial timber interests in the many places where they are established, although it does "lock the gate" on some areas where they might ultimately like to go.

The action would place the wilderness area in "deep freeze" for—in the language Congress used in 1872 creating Yellowstone as our first national park—"the enjoyment of the people."

We commend the projection of the Forest Service to do this with the proposed Anaconda-Pintlar Wilderness Area in this section of Montana.

The President's Trade Expansion Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on March 23 my good friend and former college classmate, Robert S. Eckley, presented to the House Ways and Means Committee, testimony on behalf of Caterpillar Tractor Co. relative to the company's position on the President's trade expansion bill. Mr. Eckley is an economist and a businessman. He has taught economics at Harvard University and the University of Kansas, and for the past 8 years he has served as manager of the business research department of Caterpillar Tractor Co. in Peoria, Ill. He told a very enlightening story to the committee in support of the bill, H.R. 9900, which I should like to have reprinted in its entirety at this point in the RECORD. Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include his testimony, as follows:

CATERPILLAR EXPORTS

In recent years, Caterpillar Tractor Co. has been among the top two or three exporters of goods from the United States. Last year almost half of our business was abroad. And 83 percent of our foreign sales were supplied from this country. When considered on a relative basis, exports from the United States are probably much more important to Caterpillar than to any other major U.S. industrial corporation. Much of our domestic employment is dependent on our ability to sell machinery abroad and our suppliers likewise have an indirect but sizable stake in foreign trade. For these reasons, we believe that the company's experience will be of interest in this committee in its consideration of the administration's proposed Trade Expansion Act.

The company's foreign business has expanded rapidly despite the existence of trade restrictions in many parts of the world inhibiting or prohibiting the purchase of our machines. However, the emphasis of U.S. policy in promoting freer trading conditions has been of marked assistance in the enlargement of our foreign markets. When the Trade Agreements Act was first passed in 1934, approximately a quarter of Caterpillar's sales were made abroad. When we offered testimony before this committee in support of the renewal of the Trade Agreements Act in 1955, we reported that over a third of our business depended on foreign customers. Four years ago when we testified, more than 40 percent of our business was overseas. During the last 2 years, the portion has been almost one-half. Twenty-eight years ago we were able to find markets for $6 million worth of machinery in foreign areas. Last year our foreign sales were valued at $336 million. While it is necessary to have an attractive product line to achieve sales gains of this magnitude, it is also necessary to have access to markets. The trade agreements program was essential and conducive to the realization of this opportunity for sales and employment progress.

Let me briefly describe the company, its products, and its markets. We manufacture an extensive line of construction machinery which also finds wide application in agriculture, logging, mining, and materials handling. Our products include crawler tractors and related equipment, tractor shovels, wheel tractor-scraper units, motor graders, and diesel engines. These products are sold in every area of the world outside the Iron Curtain. Sales are not concentrated heavily in any continent or group of industrial nations since machinery of this type is required for the economic development of Latin America, Africa, and Asia. U.S. manufacturing operations are conducted in seven midwestern plants, the largest of which is located in Peoria, Ill., one plant in California, and one in eastern Pennsylvania. The great majority of foreign sales are supplied from these U.S. plants. In addition, during the last decade, the company has established manufacturing facilities abroad to supply markets which for one reason or another could not be supplied entirely from U.S. sources. It now has three manufacturing plants in Great Britain, one in France, one in Australia, and one in Brazil.

Caterpillar currently has 31,000 employees in the United States, of which approximately two-fifths, or around 12,000, work for foreign customers. Present export employment is more than double our total employment in 1934 and almost a tenfold increase in the number of domestic employees dependent on foreign markets since the initial Trade Agreements Act was passed. Moreover, the average Caterpillar employee receives wages and other benefits that are substantially higher than the national average in manufacturing industries, and the stability of employment dependent on

export business has been better than that dependent on domestic sales in recent years.

But our own domestic employment serving export customers denotes only part of the significance of our export business. For while we had a wage and salary bill last year of $229 million, our purchases of materials and services amounted to $371 million, not to mention capital expenditures of $25 million in the United States. Without question the employment of domestic suppliers that are dependent upon our export business exceeds by a considerable margin our own 12,000 employees whose jobs are export oriented. One example may be helpful in illustrating this. Last year we purchased 445,000 tons of steel and steel castings in this country. Direct employment of these firms alone dependent on our export business is estimated to be in the neighborhood of 3,600 workers.

Of more than 5,000 domestic Caterpillar suppliers, there are undoubtedly many who are unaware of the extent of their involvement in foreign business despite our efforts to spread this information. Moreover, trade and service workers indirectly dependent on the export workers at Caterpillar and its suppliers seldom identify their jobs as having any relation to our export business.

THE BENEFITS OF FREER TRADE

The significance of Caterpillar's export business to the legislation under consideration lies in the fact that it illustrates the situation within the heterogeneous collection of firms making up the capital goods industries. In recent years, capital goods, that is, machinery and transport equipment, except automobiles, have made up almost a third of U.S. exports of goods. During the course of the last 50 years, capital goods sales abroad have increased more rapidly than any other major category, greatly augmenting their share of total exports. Similar developments have occurred in the trade patterns of Great Britain and the nations of the European Common Market. Together these countries account for well over 80 percent of free world exports of capital goods. Thus, international trade in these industries is tremendously important (amounting to more than $26 billion annually in recent years) and Americans have succeeded in doing very well at it. And notwithstanding the determined efforts of nations to protect their own industries, the advantages of foreign trade in capital goods have been sufficiently compelling to overcome many of the artificial barriers. Today the industrial nations sell roughly comparable magnitudes of capital equipment to each other and to the primary commodity exporting countries. This development emphasizes that the industrial nations are good customers of each other's machinery industries and that great economic advantages arise from trade in capital goods.

It is axiomatic but true that if we wish to sell abroad we must in turn be prepared to buy goods and services from foreigners. As businessmen we have learned to watch for changes in the export earnings of the primary producing countries as the earliest indication of either improvement or deterioration of our sales prospects in those areas. Economic developments in the last 5 years have not favored the export earnings of many nations in Latin America, Africa, and Asia and our business there in turn has not expanded as rapidly as elsewhere. In contrast, in Western Europe where economic growth has been more rapid and where we Americans have indulged ourselves in French gloves, British bicycles, German automobiles, and cultural tours, Caterpillar sales have mounted rewardingly. If we are to enjoy the many advantages of expanded sales in these markets, which include increased domestic employment at higher than average wages, higher profits, as well as the cost saving advantages of larger scale operations through the inclusion of export volume, then we must offer the same benefits to our trading allies abroad.

Since the world community of free nations can achieve the greatest measure of economic welfare by claiming the benefits of industrial specialization through the free exchange of goods, it follows that our prosperity is diminished by restrictions on the flow of goods. Similarly, U.S. tariffs or import controls limiting foreign access to our own domestic market reduce the total volume of world trade and our share of export business as well. But restrictions have a second deleterious effect particularly significant at a time when we are concerned about our balance of payments position. U.S. tariffs and quantitative import controls raise American costs and prices and make export sales more difficult than they would otherwise be. Any trade restriction which causes our machinery to be more costly limits our ability to sell abroad in increasingly competitive markets. Whatever increases the cost of a tractor—whether it be zinc in bearings and pistons, alloys used to toughen track shoes, or merely the lubricating oil in the crankcase—reduces our ability to merchandise it abroad. I mention these particular components because each has been subject to some sort of import restriction, each by itself seems trivial, but when combined with all of the other small artificial cost increments adds up to a real, if indeterminate, cost increase. Insofar as the proposed Trade Expansion Act would lead to negotiated reciprocal tariff cuts, it would be accompanied by the possibility of cost reductions for the U.S. exporter like Caterpillar as well as import competition for domestic producers.

Turning now to the potential benefits of the pending bill through the lowering of trade barriers abroad, I can say from experience that the U.S. construction machinery industry can be helped materially in its quest for foreign markets by the opportunity for reduced restrictions against our goods as they enter foreign markets. New and expanded negotiating power is indeed needed, as I hope these remarks will emphasize. Last year Canada raised its tariff on imported wheel tractor shovels from 7½ to 22½ percent. Prior to the initial implementation of the European Common Market in 1959, we did not encounter any tariffs on wheel tractor exports to West Germany, Belgium, or the Netherlands, and only small duties on crawler tractors. Now we face an eventual 20-percent tariff on wheel and crawler tractors entering any part of the Common Market, which will hurt U.S. exports to four of the member countries. On the other hand, this average rate will constitute a substantial reduction of restrictions in the high duty members of the Community, France and Italy, where tariffs and import controls have virtually prohibited imports of medium-sized crawlers throughout the postwar period. However, the improvement may not be enough, especially since European manufacturers have been able to beat American prices in these models.

The hope for further tariff concessions as a result of negotiations was illustrated early this year when, under the authority of the expiring Trade Agreements Act, the United States obtained a 20-percent reduction in the external tariff of the Common Market countries. The proposed bill would hold out the possibility of eventual elimination of European tariffs on construction machinery. As we now appraise the situation, this will be necessary if we are to hold an effective competitive position in these markets with goods exported from the United States.

Let me hasten to assert that we in no way regret the newly emerging unity of the free nations of Western Europe. Rather we applaud their progress during the last decade, their efforts to rationalize their economic and political order, and the prospects these steps hold for strengthening the free world. These developments only emphasize the need for the United States to recognize the new conditions that exist and to devise an approach to trade negotiations that will lead the entire free world in the direction of more liberal trading relationships. In this way we can hope to promote the expansion in our export trade required by our balance-of-payments situation. Through freer trade we will have an opportunity to meet the increasing foreign competition on equal terms which we are confident will result in a sharing of mutual benefits by all.

EXPORTS OR FOREIGN OPERATIONS

A final reason for seeking to stimulate exports through the proposed legislation is that if a firm cannot supply a foreign market by exporting from the United States, the alternatives are rather drastic and definitive. Either it withdraws entirely from the market, leaving it to others, or it establishes a foreign subsidiary, engages in a join venture, or licenses a foreign firm to manufacture its products. Since there is considerable confusion surrounding these alternatives, I shall comment on them briefly as they have confronted Caterpillar. Our first foreign manufacturing operation was established in Great Britain in the early 1950's. At that time sterling was not freely convertible into dollars (and we did not know when, if ever, it would be), protected British competitors were mushrooming, and the British Government was even sponsoring the development of a crawler tractor by one of its large engineering firms. We decided to retain as much business as we could and have succeeded in doing so, first by making replacement parts to keep our large prewar population of tractors running, then equipment for use with tractors, and finally a limited line of complete tractors. Import restrictions and nationalistic economic policies similarly motivated our establishment of smaller manufacturing facilities in Australia, Brazil, and France. All of these countries have large and growing markets for construction machinery which we simply could not reach from the United States.

Subsequently, Caterpillar has exported a larger volume of machinery to each of these countries from the United States after engaging in local manufacture than it did before. This is partly due to the rapid growth of demand, the fact that we cannot economically make a complete line in any foreign country, the use of U.S. components, and, not least, the subsequent relaxation of import controls on our machines. We understand that this has been a common experience among other American firms, although we would not argue that it can be generalized. The point is that in a complex machinery business all-or-nothing situations do not arise overnight. Moreover, I would be less than candid if I did not indicate that the expansion of American manufacturing operations abroad in our industry probably has some distance to go as a result of present conditions. The rapid growth of demand for construction machinery in Europe combined with the creation of the Common Market, possible European manufacturing cost advantages, and the growth of foreign competition, make the likelihood of an expansion of the industry there very high.

That is why it is so important for the United States to recognize the new situation and to foster conditions conducive to the expansion of U.S. exports. Exports obviously provide domestic employment, generate tax revenues in the United States, and convey other benefits not obtainable through foreign manufacturing operations. We would prefer to export U.S. manufactured goods if it is at all feasible to supply foreign markets

in this way. It has been erroneously contended by some that U.S. manufacturers are intentionally exporting American jobs. This accusation is contradicted by the circumstances involving Caterpillar Tractor Co. During the last 5 years we have had excess capacity in the United States and have periodically had substantial numbers of trained employees on layoff. Were it possible to serve inaccessible foreign markets with these resources, we would gladly and profitably have done so. The alternative has involved the costly conversion of design drawings to other systems of measurement, additional capital outlays, the tedious process of hiring and training foreign workers often in unfamiliar languages lacking technical vocabularies, reliance on suppliers of unknown dependability and quality, and years of high costs and little or no profits. Resort to this mode of operation is not chosen lightly or without exhausting the last vestige of hope that we can continue to export from this country.

However, in those markets that cannot be reached completely by U.S. exports, whether because of import restrictions or cost and price advantages, we can salvage some profits and often a substantial volume of U.S. exports by establishing foreign operations. In cases where this is necessary, the understanding and support of American policymakers is essential. In this connection, we regret the action of this committee in approving in essence the proposal of the Treasury Department which will tax unremitted profits of foreign subsidiaries reinvested in foreign operations. Treasury officials urged that taxes be equalized when earned (as they now are when remitted) on domestic and foreign operations of American enterprises so that there would be no greater inducement to invest abroad, other things being equal. But other things are not equal—abroad we face foreign competitors not subject to high U.S. tax rates and foreign governments devoted to nationalistic economic policies. The proposed Trade Expansion Act is a more potent means of fostering American opportunities, by offering foreign nations an inducement to relinquish their protectionist policies.

RECOMMENDED PASSAGE OF TRADE EXPANSION BILL (H.R. 9900)

We endorse without qualification the trade expansion features of the bill under discussion, included in title II of the bill. It is on this phase of the bill which we think our experience as an exporter best qualifies us to speak. It is our sincere belief, buttressed by such studies as the one published last year by the Brookings Institution, that the need for adjustment assistance occasioned by import displacement will be very limited. However, if in the judgment of this committee the adjustment assistance sections of the bill are necessary both to alleviate distress and to allay fears of foreign competition, then we think they are a reasonable price to pay for the benefits obtainable through the trade expansion features of the bill. We do, however, harbor reservations about provisions (1) for the payment of higher unemployment compensation resulting from trade adjustment as opposed to domestic recession and (2) for the substitution of Federal for State unemployment compensation standards.

In summary, we believe that Caterpillar Tractor Co. provides a dramatic example of the gains obtainable through the promotion of exports. Because of its unusual dependence on export volume, we are able to portray numerically a portion of the jobs arising through serving foreign markets. We know that much employment indirectly dependent on export sales is not so identified by the firms or persons involved. We find this true in Peoria among those in professional, trade, and other service activities. Although this committee has been presented with reasonably accurate estimates of aggregate export employment in the United States, we suspect that much of this aggregate is unrecognized by the firms involved. We hope that we may properly speak then, not only for ourselves, but for all of the other Americans whose welfare would be enhanced by this measure in urging your favorable consideration of the many beneficial aspects of the pending bill.

The New Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on Sunday, March 11, 1962, the Mutual Broadcasting System had as participants on its show "What's the Issue?" the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] and Mr. Clarence Miles, for many years manager of the legislative department of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. The question discussed on this occasion was the tax bill pending in the House of Representatives.

I ask unanimous consent that a transcript of that discussion by these gentlemen be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript of discussion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"WHAT'S THE ISSUE?" PROGRAM, MARCH 11, 1962

Mr. RICE. Good afternoon. This is Terry Rice, general manager for legislative action of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. The Constitution of the United States guarantees to the citizens of this country certain rights which men have always respected as the mark of free people. Among these important rights are freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and the freedom to petition the Government for a redress of grievances. Specifically, these four freedoms are spelled out in the first amendment to the Constitution—the first part of the Bill of Rights, passed shortly after the Constitution was adopted. Perhaps the most important of all of these is the right to petition the Government—to speak out and tell Congress what you think. It seems strange that it should be necessary to reaffirm this right with new legislation, but that is exactly what is happening today. Because Government has grown so large, many of the rules by which we live are made by the regulatory agencies, rather than the Congress. The right to speak out has been threatened by the Treasury Department's Internal Revenue Service in a ruling dealing with tax deductions for organizations.

The House Ways and Means Committee is about to report to the House of Representatives in Washington a so-called tax credit bill.

This bill contains many proposals that, if enacted into law, would affect our citizens in many different ways.

Today we want to discuss just one of these proposals, the one that involves your "right to speak out," the one that involves what has been called censorship by taxation.

To bring about an understanding of this issue, I have with me Mr. Clarence Miles, for many years manager of the Legislative Department of the National Chamber, and Senator VANCE HARTKE, of Indiana. The Senator is the author of remedial legislation, S. 467, and a member of the Senate Finance Committee which will review and revise whatever legislation is passed by the House.

Mr. Miles, suppose you start us off by defining the issue for us.

Mr. MILES. In making out a tax return, a business or an individual may deduct what is known as ordinary and necessary expenses. Until recently this has included the expense of appearing before local, State, and National legislative bodies. It has included dues paid to unions, to business organizations, to trade associations, and it has included the cost of educational campaigns on public issues, the solutions of which might mean life or death to a business and the jobs it provides.

But in 1959 the Internal Revenue Service issued a regulation (which has the effect of law) that funds spent for the promotion or defeat of legislation were not deductible as business expenses, and that dues paid organizations were not deductible in full, if a substantial part of the organizations' activities were in the legislative field.

Believing that this regulation amounted to coercion, if not actual curtailment of free speech, some 14 or 15 Members of the Congress introduced remedial legislation in 1960. Included among those sponsoring such measures were Representative HALE BOGGS and Senator HARTKE, whose proposals were quite similar.

The Ways and Means Committee, by unanimous vote, approved the Boggs bill in 1960, but too late for action on the floor. The new tax credit bill attempts to deal with the problem but in a very limited way.

Mr. RICE. I'm sure we all agree that the right of free speech is most sacred. And I believe most legislators welcome public discussion of issues, and they welcome communications even from those with whom they disagree. Why do you say that the current bill is too limited?

Mr. MILES. Well, the so-called Watts amendment to the tax credit bill would change the Internal Revenue Code to allow deductions for expenses related to appearances before and communications with both legislators and legislative bodies. But it would specifically disallow deductions for attempts to influence the general public. Here is where you get coercion, for unless a company through advertising or written communications or public meetings can talk to its employees, its stockholders, and its customers with respect to the impact of law on the company's operations, it may well be legislated out of business.

Mr. RICE. Senator HARTKE, since tax legislation originates in the House, I assume the Senate has not yet had an opportunity to consider this matter. Senator KERR, another member of the Senate Finance Committee, is cosponsor of your bill. Your bill is very brief and easily understood. Won't you give us your views on the problem and tell us something of your plans when the tax bill reaches your committee?

Senator HARTKE. Basically, Mr. Rice, the bill which I have introduced provides that the Internal Revenue Service decision shall be modified to the extent that an individual or a corporation or a trade association can legitimately deduct as expenses those portions of his expenditures which are necessary to provide a decent hearing or decent expression to the legislative body itself. The thing about it is that we are talking here about a term which sometimes has a bad connotation with a lot of people. It is called lobbying. Sometimes politics has a bad connotation to people but the idea of lobbying in its bad aspects means briefly that you have certain people who abuse the privilege that is given to them to talk to their legislative bodies, to their city councils, or even to

their State government. The possible abuse of a privilege which is guaranteed to us by the Constitution should be no reason for not enacting a proper law. Now as Mr. Miles has said, there is no question the Treasury position has been based on a law. Whether we agree with the interpretation of the Treasury Department or not is now immaterial because until the law is changed it is going to stand. Second, I think the need for the change is unquestioned at the moment among those people who understand the basic issue of the right to petition your Congress. Now, the real item left is how are we going to do it. As was indicated again by Mr. Miles, passage of the bill in the House Ways and Means Committee last year was too late for action in the Congress. To me the present tax credit bill includes a provision which is too mild. Well, maybe I shouldn't say too mild. At least, it doesn't go far enough to correct the Treasury interpretation.

Mr. MILES. It doesn't get to the heart of the problem.

Mr. HARTKE. It doesn't really solve the problem at all. Let me say this. A lot of people say, well, this is a chamber of commerce program. Why should the chamber of commerce have special privileges? Well, I suppose basically there are three main issues before the Congress in general terms this year. That is the question of the common market, and what are we going to do about reciprocal trade. Now you people in the chamber know that there is a good possibility that if we reduce all tariffs, drastically and immediately, that some businesses will just go by the wayside. Under the Treasury interpretation at the present time, companies which tried to educate the people of the United States to what could happen to their businesses, in effect destroy them even if they have been in existence for a hundred years, would not have an item for deduction on their taxes.

Mr. MILES. And yet it's crucial to their very existence.

Senator HARTKE. As crucial as a law suit which would be brought if they had somebody sue them for any type of action whatsoever. If they hire a lawyer—I am a lawyer and I am not opposed to them hiring lawyers—if they hire a lawyer and go to the legal expense of trying to defend themselves in a law suit, the Treasury Department would permit them to deduct this as a business expense.

Mr. MILES. Or if they came down here to appear before the Tariff Commission.

Senator HARTKE. Yes.

Mr. MILES. That would be deductible.

Senator HARTKE. But let's point this out. Many people have found that in legislation you need public support. Unless you can get public support, the legislatures frequently, not intentionally, and I am one of those, but frequently do not give the proper attention or the type of attention which an item should have. Even the United Nations; now let me give you an example there. The organizations within the United Nations have found, that they need public support for organization frequently to help them. So we have a private agency to devote most of their time and their money to promoting the United Nations. So you see its not just alone for those people in business that this is intended but also for the people who are in related activities. Another item here. I have a bill, for example, in which I want to accelerate the program to find a cure for cancer, and if some business corporation decides that this is a worthwhile project and they wanted to educate the people on it and put out newspaper ads to try to accelerate the way to find a cure for cancer, this still wouldn't be a legitimate deduction under the present ruling of the Internal Revenue Department.

Mr. RICE. You are also a champion of changes in the statutory depreciation rates and this is certainly a subject that we need public understanding of and information about and education on if there is ever going to be the kind of legislation you have advocated.

Senator HARTKE. Yes. Now here again we are back to something which is one of the three main issues: the trade bill, depreciation or tax reform, and medical care for the aged. These are called the three big issues in the Congress.

Mr. RICE. The big three.

Senator HARTKE. They're the big three. And the point of it is you cannot develop this legislation unless you are willing to give to everyone the right to have full expression of their views. Basically, that's all this bill does. It gives you your right to speak out and have the public understand what you are talking about and try to influence the legislatures, not for something bad but for something good. Let me take again, Mr. Rice, this depreciation. We are probably the most out-of-date country in the world, although we are a modern industrial nation, and in our depreciation rates and schedules we are probably the most antiquated of the lot, and we are trying to keep up with these other countries with their developing economies with a horse and buggy type depreciation law. And yet, I am not opposed to the tax credit plan which has been submitted by the President and approved by the House Ways and Means Committee. I just don't think it goes far enough.

But unless we can educate the people, and this is going to have to be done by trade organizations and groups who have a direct interest, you are not going to get a real change in the depreciation laws as they are on the books today.

Mr. RICE. I was interested in reading the depreciation bills. They talk about declining balance, the sum of the year digits, the straight line. I think this is something the man on the street back in Indiana and elsewhere would have a little bit of trouble grasping if we didn't go to the trouble of trying to inform him about what these things mean and how they relate to job creation and the kind of growth that we want and the President wants.

Senator HARTKE. This is the very point. I think, though, that we have to come back basically to this problem of recognizing that in a country such as ours these rights are important. The Bill of Rights was passed for a very simple reason. We had seen a type of country before that in which we did not have our right to speak our piece before the king, and we had the Boston massacre, only five people killed, but it set off a whole Nation. Really, it created a whole new Nation. And the first thing that the people insisted on was the Bill of Rights, and I think here it is very important for us to remember that the first of these Bill of Rights was the right to petition. The right to petition your representatives who are going to enact the laws, and basically this right can be taken away from us if for all intents and purposes the only people who are left to do it are those in the Government. After all, the Government has its own lobby and it is the biggest lobby in the world today. These various departments and agencies, and again I hope and think that in most cases they are doing what they think is right and good, are lobbying the legislatures to go ahead and do it. Now, this law does not apply to them because there is no question of tax deduction involved for the Government itself.

Mr. MILES. Shouldn't we also, though, Senator, make the point that this applies to local governments and State governments just as well. We are talking a good deal today about growth. Well, one phase of growth, of course, is industrial development. Here is a city that wants to do something. That means they are going to have to open up a new area, it means new streets, new sewers, new school buildings and that all adds up, of course, to a bond issue. Now customarily, the average city facing that situation, raises a jackpot or a campaign fund. The purpose is to inform the public and win the public over to a program, a bond issue, that will permit this growth and the creation of new jobs. Now as I understand it, under the Internal Revenue regulation, any such funds put into that campaign are not deductible. If that is true, obviously, that is going to put quite a damper on that kind of effort toward growth, is it not?

Senator HARTKE. Yes, I think you make a very valid point Mr. Miles. Basically, people do not like to pay taxes. We all know this, and they don't want to pay taxes for a bond issue and this is what is involved. In other words, in a bond issue they are trying to sell the securities of a government or government subdivision and ultimately the people are going to have to pay for it. Now, what they want to know, and people are pretty intelligent ordinarily, what they want to know is, what are they going to pay for? Now this is what you are talking about in educating these people through use of this jackpot. But if, say, the labor union in town was having difficulty in finding work for its employees and suppose they went up to the mayor and they said, "Now, Mayor, we are interested in helping you. What can we do to be of some help?" The mayor will say, the first thing, "Get behind my program here to sell this bond issue," or any other matter which they are trying to do in the local government. And they say, "Well, as far as we are concerned we are an organization, we have dues, but we can't use our dues for this because of the Treasury ruling." Now this may be a close question of interpretation but this is the difficulty with the present law. The Internal Revenue Service can make a determination that these are not deductible items; that these are not legitimate business expenses or legitimate expenses of trade associations.

Mr. RICE. Would I be correct, Senator HARTKE, in assuming that, based on what you said about the House bill, that you still feel the language of your bill would be preferable to what is in the tax bill and you intend to press for that type of language in the Senate version of this legislation?

Senator HARTKE. Basically, as you said, Yes, that is right. But basically, as you said, Mr. Rice, what I propose to do is not difficult to understand. It does change the law, well, it changes this interpretation of the law as made by the Internal Revenue Service. I would hope, and I feel, that the Finance Committee would entertain such a change. We must recognize that the House last time, under the Ways and Means Committee, as Mr. Miles said, passed this without a dissenting vote and you know it is difficult in this Congress to pass anything without a dissenting vote. But without a dissenting vote in the Ways and Means Committee, so there is real good support on the House side. And I believe that either the language of my bill or similar language can be adopted and should be, and frankly, I intend to do everything I can to do my part to make sure that the change is made.

Mr. MILES. The Ways and Means Committee, incidentally, in reporting out the bill said this: "If an expenditure is ordinary and necessary to the conduct of the taxpayers trade or business, and is lawful, it is unfair for the deduction to be disallowed just because the expense is incurred to influence legislation." A friend of mine in discussing this the other day was indicating that in addition to unions and business people, our

agricultural community is very much concerned. He talked about the cattlemen out in the Great Plains and the intermountain area, to whom, of course, water is very important and if there was to be a change made, for example, in the Taylor Grazing Act, which is an all-controlling factor for them, obviously, it is a necessary and ordinary business expense for them to try to do something about it.

Mr. RICE. Senator HARTKE, it is being said, I believe, by some folks, that this Internal Revenue Service regulation works a particular hardship on small businesses. Do you feel this way about it?

Senator HARTKE. Yes, very definitely, because the small businesses have a special problem that others do not have. A large corporation or a large organization, will be able to absorb such expenses. A small business——

Mr. MILES. And many of them are represented right here in Washington, too, in Federal legislation.

Senator HARTKE. Individually with their individual representatives, I mean. Their Washington representatives. But a small businessman, he's down there and he says, "My, I am going to the wall and this is really going to drive me out of business; now I need some help." Well, the trade associations were set up for this very purpose. That is, a group of small businesses bind themselves together for a special purpose and one of their purposes is to make sure that this giant Government that we have—and it is probably going to at least stay as big as it is—will hear their voice. Now, under the present regulation, again, if this trade organization or trade association, does most of its activities in the field of trying to speak for the little businessman in the legislative field, this item is not a business deduction, and yet any man knows that this is as legitimate an expense of a business as really a person could ever have.

Mr. RICE. We've talked here about the legislative activities of associations of businesses. Mr. Miles, why is it that legislation has become so important to the businessman and to the coporation and to the small company?

Mr. MILES. Well, as the Senator has just said, our Government, our Federal Government has grown so large that a business cannot operate without considering what the Government is doing. Bear in mind that Uncle Sam collects 52 percent of the earnings of the corporation. He collects up to 91 percent of the individual's earnings. And so the Government is in the field of taxation, in the field of labor management, of education, and foreign trade and these other issues we have been talking about here today. And those all impinge on the ability of a business to earn money, to return dividends, and provide employment.

Mr. RICE. Senator HARTKE, if this bill that is now before the House, should pass in that form, do you believe there would be some problem of equitable administration of that type of legislation?

Senator HARTKE. Very definitely so, Mr. Rice, because under the present law and even under this proposal as set by the House, each individual internal revenue agent within his district would be allowed and permitted to make his own interpretation and his own decision as to what was actually a legitimate deduction. Now this is not right, because if I live in Indiana I should be treated in the same manner as a person living in California, Florida, or New York. And this is what we want, equality under the law. No one wants any special advantage for himself. But he would like to be treated fairly and I don't think this could or would occur and our history shows that there would be different interpretations in different parts of the country.

Mr. MILES. It's a question of defining what is a substantial amount of legislative activity and it's a question of differentiating, it seems to me, between influencing the public or actually communicating with your own stockholders or employees.

Mr. RICE. I understand that the legislation in the House will be introduced probably this Friday. The bill has been agreed upon and they will start on it in the House about the 20th. This means that it will get over here about the end of this month. Do you foresee any extensive delays of any kind in the Senate Finance Committee consideration of this? Do you have any thoughts on that point, sir?

Senator HARTKE. Very definitely not. At the recent executive meeting, Chairman HARRY BYRD of Virginia stated that he wanted to have extensive and very conclusive hearings upon this matter but he wanted to do it as soon as possible and I know the committee intends to act just as soon as the bill comes to the Senate.

Mr. RICE. And this would probably follow consideration of the debt hearings, and those on the financial status of the country that the Senator has already announced.

Senator HARTKE. Yes, but these hearings on the debt will probably begin before the bill which we are discussing now will get to the Senate itself.

Mr. RICE. Our thanks to Senator VANCE HARTKE, of Indiana, and to Clarence Miles, legislative consultant to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. If you would like to know more about protecting your constitutional right to petition your Government, write for the free pamphlet, "Your Right To Speak Out," published and distributed by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. Just write to "What's the Issue?" Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D.C., and your copy will be mailed to you promptly.

Proposed Sugar Legislation and the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, this session of Congress will soon face the serious responsibility of adopting sugar legislation. Among the offshore producers whose position in relation to the United States must be regarded with understanding and sympathy is the Republic of the Philippines. All of the dependable information which is available on the subject of Philippine sugar production and the relationship of Philippine suppliers with the United States is therefore important to us.

In this connection, I respectfully request that there be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in full an interesting and authoritative speech delivered in New York on March 20, 1962, by the Honorable Jose E. Romero.

Mr. Romero recently retired as Secretary of Education in the Cabinet of the President of the Philippines. He has in the past been associated with Philippine representatives in negotiations with the United States and with the rest of the world on the subject of sugar. He served as Ambassador of his country in Great Britain and was a member at various times of both the House of Representatives and the Senate of the Philippines. He is now acting as executive secretary-treasurer of the Philippine Sugar Association. Mr. Romero's statement makes an important contribution to the study of sugar legislation that is currently in process, and it follows:

PHILIPPINES VIEWS ON REPORTED U.S. SUGAR LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

(Remarks of Hon. Jose E. Romero, executive secretary-treasurer, Philippine Sugar Association, at a luncheon sponsored by the New York Sugar Club, Tuesday, March 20, 1962)

The Philippines has a big stake in the sugar legislation to be considered in the present session of the U.S. Congress. With the plans for your own producers, the beet and the cane producers, the mainland, the Puerto Rican, Hawaiian, and the Virgin Islands producers, your refiners, your plan for proportional payments, et cetera, we are not concerned nor would it be proper for us to express any views thereon. However, insofar as sugar purchases are made an instrument of your foreign policy, our government and our industry will make themselves heard. With whatever plans may be proposed as to foreign participation in your sugar market, we are deeply concerned. At present, with Cuba out of the U.S. sugar market, we are your largest foreign supplier of sugar. Also, we are probably the only foreign supplier whose exclusive export outlet is the United States, so that American sugar policy could make or unmake our sugar industry. It is true we have a nominal quota of 25,000 tons in the world free market and an additional optional quota of 20,000 tons, but we have not been filling this quota, and the only time we did fill this quota, it was on a barter basis, because due to import controls in the Philippines the goods that we got in exchange were highly valued and in that way the sales were made possible.

Then again, we do have a special relationship with the United States in trade matters and especially as it concerns sugar. In order to understand the nature of this special relationship, it may be useful to make a brief review of our historical trade ties with this country, with especial reference to sugar.

Even before American occupation, the United States was our principal export market. Over the 10-year period 1880–89 we exported to the United States an average of 200,000 tons, representing 58 percent of our total sugar exports. These exports dwindled in the next decade because of our revolutions, first against Spain, and then against the United States.

For 7 years after the restoration of peace and the establishment of civil government, our trade with the United States was on a nonpreferential basis. However, the U.S. Congress generously granted a rebate of 25 percent of its import duties on Philippine sugar. In 1909 the U.S. Congress which then had exclusive authority to act upon tariff laws for the Philippines approved free trade between the two countries. There was considerable opposition in the Philippines to the establishment of free trade between the two countries. Our leaders realized that this arrangement would foster economic growth in our country, but at the time the people's obsession was for political independence, and it was feared that the Philippines would become so dependent on the U.S. market that if, later on, trade preferences were withdrawn from an independent

Filipino Nation, very serious problems of readjustment would arise, making it difficult to establish a stable, independent government. Also, the Payne-Aldrich law, which established free trade, permitted the shipment without limitation of American products to the Philippines but limited Philippine exports of sugar to the United States to 300,000 tons. This was one of those irritants that gave further impetus to the movement for independence.

Let it be said for the American sense of fairplay that in 1913 this wrong was righted in the Tariff Act of 1913. Congressman Underwood who coauthored the law, said on that occasion:

"We may leave the limit where it is * * * but we would leave it where it is to the shame of every American citizen. We could not honestly face those dependent people who give us free trade in their markets if we close our doors here * * *. Because we do not want to stand and face that world in such a position as that and say (to the Filipinos) that under our law we command you to open the door, so that American goods can flow into your country, because we have the power to do it, and then turn around and say to them that on the thing they can import, practically, into our country and make a market for, we will close our doors and prevent them from developing their trade—I say that no trueborn American citizen who faces the question fairly and squarely and understands the situation will consent to that."

Under the stimulus of free trade there was a great expansion of sugar production in the Philippines and in crop year 1933–34 we produced a record crop of 1,652,500 tons. It was then that the Jones-Costigan Act establishing sugar quotas for offshore supply areas were established. Sugar production in the Philippines under the new dispensation was reduced to 754,721 tons from the figure I have just cited, representing a reduction of 54 percent. In comparison U.S. beet sugar production was reduced by 29 percent, Puerto Rican production was reduced by 30 percent, Hawaiian by 9 percent, U.S. cane sugar production was increased by 7 percent and Cuban production by 12 percent. The Philippines, therefore, made the greatest sacrifice among sugar suppliers to the U.S. market to make the sugar limitation act possible. At this time we were still a dependency of the United States. Sugarcane fields were burned to reduce production, but of course compensation was paid for this loss, and perhaps other suppliers also had to destroy some part of their crops.

In the Sugar Act of 1937 we were allotted a share of the U.S. market of 15.41 percent. However, at that time the Philippines had achieved commonwealth status and under the trade agreement entered into between the two countries the Philippines' duty-free quota was fixed at 850,000 tons. Any quantity of sugar beyond this amount exported by the Philippines to the United States had to pay full duty. At that time the duty was so high and the price of sugar in the world market so low that the Philippines could fill only its duty-free quota, and the Philippines gave up a total of 659,176 short tons from 1937 to the outbreak of the war in 1941 in this manner. Besides, as a matter all U.S. goods entering the Philippines duty on any export to the United States while all U.S. goods entered the Philippines duty-free. In the meantime in the International Sugar Council, with the approval, and even encouragement, of the U.S. Government, we renounced any quota in the world free market as long as we had our guaranteed quota in the United States.

Then the war came. The Philippine sugar industry was almost totally destroyed. It took us almost 13 years after the commencement of hostilities to rebuild our industry to a point where we could fill our quota in the U.S. market. Probably because of this and the fact that we had not been filling our duty-paid quota before the war, the new postwar trade agreement between the two countries made the quota of 850,000 tons an absolute quota. This was opposed by the U.S. State Department, itself, which had always been opposed to absolute quotas. We could not share in any increase in the U.S. sugar consumption, and the expansion of the U.S. market. Our share of this market was reduced from 15.41 percent established by the Sugar Act of 1937 to about 10 percent. It took a good deal of campaigning to escape from this straitjacket. Under the revised United States-Philippine trade agreement in 1955, the U.S. Congress was finally authorized to increase the basic sugar quota of the Philippines at its discretion. However, not until the Cuban quota was taken away from that country, under the amendments to the act in 1960, were we allotted 15 percent of the Cuban quota.

This year it seems that after 25 years of the operation of the U.S. sugar quota system very important changes are being considered. As far as the foreign suppliers are concerned, the features that will seriously affect them are the announced plans for the global quota system and the recapture of the price premium paid in the United States.

From where we stand, it is rather difficult to understand why a program which has worked so well for 25 years both for the suppliers and the consumers is to be radically changed. The U.S. sugar program is one of the few farm programs that have really worked. It is true that the United States pays a price premium on sugar but it is guaranteed an adequate supply at all times at reasonable and well-arabilized prices not subject to violent fluctuations, and sugar is still the cheapest food in this country or anywhere else. One gets more calories for his money in sugar than in practically any other food. It would seem to us that the success of your program was amply demonstrated in the Korean crisis in 1950 and again in the Suez crisis in 1958 when prices in the world free market rose higher than those prevailing in the United States where prices remained stabilized. The quota allotment is not only a right conferred upon the supplier, it also imposes an obligation on the supplier to deliver the goods and in this manner, with adequate supplies guaranteed, stabilization of prices is achieved.

Under the concept of global quotas for the U.S. market we assume that our quota guaranteed by trade agreements between our two countries will not be affected so that this policy is not of particular concern to us. We are, however, deeply concerned about announced plans for recapturing the price premium. With the insignificant exceptions that I have already noted, we export our sugar only to the United States, and therefore our costs of production are geared to the prices paid in this market. Other foreign suppliers sell as much if not more than the amount they sell here to the world free market, and obviously have had to adjust their costs of production accordingly. We even renounced our quota in the world free market with the approval, and even encouragement, of the U.S. Government because we have this guaranteed market. We have to ship our sugar much greater distances than any other supplier. It takes about 45 days to ship sugar from the Philippines to the east coast where we have to market the product. As already noted, the Philippine sugar industry was almost totally destroyed during the war and we could not fill our quota in this market until 8 years ago. The industry had to make heavy capital investments to rebuild itself, and the future of our sugar industry is very uncertain after the termination of our preferential trade agreement in 1974.

We have heard it said that the price differential between the world free market and the United States market thus recaptured may be returned as foreign aid. It would seem to us that experience has demonstrated that governments and their bureaucracies are not best calculated to make the wisest use of this money for the economic advancement of the people. Much more can be done to encourage industry by adequately rewarding the producer for his labors and his investments than by handouts to governments. Statistics have shown that generous as your whole foreign aid program has been, aid has been more effective when it has gone directly to encourage expanded production, and in fact in these cases, the aid has been only a small percentage of the increased production with its concomitant improvement in the general well-being, and increase of labor opportunities. The developing nations are only now awakening to the opportunities offered by free enterprise and if you withdraw from them what they would consider to be the just reward of their labors and their enterprise, there may well be a slowing down instead of a hastening of the economic development of these areas.

The Philippines is not only the showcase of democracy in Southeast Asia, it is also the showcase of the superiority of the system of free enterprise over the Communist and socialist systems as a means of improving the standards of living of the people. In a statement before the National Conference on International Social and Economic Development on December 1, 1961, Secretary of State Rusk said the following:

"Now, foreign aid is almost a junior partner of our trade policy, in moving toward a growing, expanding, developing world. It would make no sense whatever for us to ask our taxpayers to come up with substantial amounts of money for foreign aid if we and other principal trading nations were to adopt trade policies which would frustrate and undermine the possibilities of development.

"The drop of a few cents in a primary commodity can, for example, in a particular country, wipe out by several times any effect of American aid to that particular country.

"The amount of American aid being applied is a very small fraction, indeed, to the productive systems upon which development must depend. Our contribution is marginal in quantity. We hope that it can be critical in quality. But trading opportunities will determine in fact the practical possibilities of moving into a new decade of development throughout the world."

The sugar industry is one of the mainstays of Philippine economy. Only the coconut industry compares with the sugar industry in importance in our export trade, accounting for about 25 percent of our total exports and our foreign exchange receipts. The industry directly or indirectly accounts for about the same percentage of the revenues collected by our Government. Sugar is produced in the Philippines by 35,000 small planters whose land holdings average about 75 acres. The big sugar hacienda is the exception rather than the rule.

Sugar lands are not owned by the sugar mills as is the case in some countries. Many of these land holdings are not economical units and account in large measure for the high cost of production. If the returns of the sugar farmers were to be thus drastically reduced, this could mean the sudden elimination of the small uneconomical units and their merger into larger plantations. This would not only mean a departure from the desirable goal of dividing the land among as great a number of people as possible, but it would also create great social unrest and discontent. This could also mean the withdrawal of the marginal lands from the production of sugar. This may happen eventu-

ally, but if the process is not brought about gradually and is brought about suddenly, as would happen by reducing the price to the farmers by one-half, a very serious situation would arise. It so happens that the center of agrarian discontent in the Philippines is where most of these marginal sugar lands are situated.

I notice that your Congress has tentatively approved a foreign aid bill to the extent of nearly $5 billion. The expected collections by the U.S. Government from the recapture of the price premium is so small in comparison, it is hard to understand why a very dangerous experiment has to be conducted with this, so far, successful program.

In the case of the Philippines, if we were to get world prices for our sugar, there would be no reason for us to market our produce in the United States where we have to ship it halfway around the world and where it takes 45 days to get the sugar here. While it is true that we were selling sugar in this market even before we had preferential trade relations, that was at the time when standards of living in our part of the world were so low that the people there could not even afford to buy this necessary food. When people do not have enough for everything, they first buy protein foods, bodybuilding foods, like fish and rice, but as their situation improves they also begin buying carbohydrates which is the energy giving substance. There has been a considerable improvement in the standards of living of the peoples of Asia during the last few decades.

The elimination of this very important item in our trade would mean one less link in the close relations existing between our two countries. There is nothing like mutually beneficial trade to bring two nations together. It is interesting to notice that although we have the closest cultural, historical, and religious ties with the Latin American countries for example, and we also have geographical and racial ties with our neighbors in Asia, our ties with the United States are even closer, largely due to our mutually beneficial trade.

It has also sometimes been said that the plan to recapture the price premium would compel the Philippines to make the necessary adjustments to prepare itself for nonpreferential trade with the United States. The need for such a program of adjustment is understood in my country. I happened to be one of the members of the Philippine panel on the so-called Joint (Filipino-American) Preparatory Committee on Philippine Affairs which precisely had the task of making recommendations toward this end. The recommendations of this committee were adopted by the U.S. Congress under the so-called Tydings-Koscialski Act of 1938 and accepted by the Philippines. In substance the program there outlined was adopted in the subsequent amendments of our trade agreements after our independence. This program provided for a period of 20 years to make the necessary readjustments. It had originally been planned to bring this readjustment about by gradually increasing duties starting with 5 percent and increasing by 5 percent every year of the rate of the tariff on foreign imports into the United States. When the gradually increasing duties were about to be put into effect, World War II broke out, and after the war, free trade had to be extended for another 8 years because of the need to rebuild the economy of the country and to rehabilitate the sugar industry. The point that I want to underline is that both sides understood that it would take at least 20 years under normal times for the sugar industry of the Philippines to attain a position of nonpreference in this market, and the plan to recapture the price premium would try to realize almost overnight what, after careful study by the experts of both countries, it was decided would require 20 years to achieve.

I hope that very careful consideration will be given to all the ramifications of the problem of changing basic U.S. sugar policy, not only on the people of this country, but on other friendly peoples supplying the basic production to this market. There is certainly much more to this problem than appears on the surface, and we are sure that nothing will be done that will disrupt the national economy of the Philippines, which we are wont to call the showcase of the democratic way of life in Asia, or disturb the very happy relations between our two countries.

S O S: Save Our Streams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, "it is as dangerous to leave roads purely to the engineers as it is to leave war to the generals."

This comment appeared in a recent New York Times editorial, reprinted March 18 in the Salt Lake Tribune.

The comment is part of the Times' perceptive comment on the damage to landscape by road construction.

The Times' editorial is further evidence of the need for legislation such as I propose in S. 2767. It would require the approval of the Secretary of the Interior to surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates for projects on the Federal-aid highway systems, for the purpose of protecting fish, wildlife, and recreation resources.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Times' editorial, "Tyranny of Super-Roads."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TYRANNY OF SUPERROADS

People in eastern Westchester and southern Putnam Counties are having road trouble. The engineers propose to develop an expressway running north from Stamford and heading into Route 22 north of Brewster. It will be a wonderful road if the assumption is that all that is necessary is to move motor vehicles through the countryside in large numbers and at high speed.

The immediate debate is whether it will be better to ruin a wildlife sanctuary on the west side of Byram Lake or another one on the east side. We advocate ruining neither; but one will doubtless be ruined and in a short time persons going north on No. 22 will find it simpler to do so. They will be in too much of a hurry to think about sanctuaries, for either wild or human life.

The issue of highway destructiveness keeps coming up all over the United States. With the Federal Government paying 90 percent of the cost of the road and the State only 10 percent, it seems to cost—although this is an illusion—very little to wreck a lot of landscape. The great superroads come down across the country like roaring torrents and are almost as hard to divert or stop. Most persons think a road is a good thing, regardless of its location or its effect on the scenery. It is certainly a necessary thing—but the question is, do the new roads have to destroy as much as we let them destroy? Obviously not.

It is as dangerous to leave roads purely to the engineers as it is to leave war to the generals. It is time that the motoring and stationary public took a greater interest in the Nation's road policy. There is room for compromise between the really urgent requirements of transportation and the need to save a little natural beauty and a little serenity for the generations to come.

Results of Questionnaire Mailed by Hon. John F. Baldwin, Jr., of California, to Residents of the California Sixth District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, 5 weeks ago I mailed a questionnaire to every family of registered voters in the California Sixth Congressional District. The response to this questionnaire was so large that my office was swamped for weeks with returned completed questionnaires and accompanying correspondence. Many constituents not only answered the questionnaire, but wrote detailed comments on the back of the questionnaire, or attached supplementary letters. I have spent many hours personally reading all these comments, and they have been most helpful. I am firmly convinced that a Congressman can better represent his constituents if he knows the views of all of those constituents on important issues pending before Congress, than if he does not know them.

The tabulation of the questionnaire is summarized below:

1. Do you think legislation should be passed to authorize payments in kind, i.e., grocery, rent, and clothing orders, in lieu of cash payments to aid-to-needy-children recipients whenever it is felt that this will reduce the likelihood of misuse of the funds by the parent involved? Yes, 88.38 percent; no, 7.32 percent; undecided, 4.30 percent.

2. The United Nations has been incurring a deficit in operating its military police force in the Congo because Soviet Russia and all other Communist nations, as well as France, Belgium, Great Britain, Italy, Nationalist China, and certain other members have been unwilling to pay their portions of the assessments for this military police force. The United Nations has decided to issue $200 million in bonds to make up this deficit. It has been proposed that the United States purchase $100 million of these bonds. Are you in favor of this proposal? Yes, 32.11 percent; no, 54.39 percent; undecided, 13.5 percent.

3. Would you favor legislation to give the President power to negotiate with the Common Market countries of Western Europe to obtain a mutual reduction in tariffs between the Common Market countries and the United States? Yes, 56.54 percent; no, 27.28 percent; undecided, 16.18 percent.

4. Do you think this country should sell surplus military planes to Communist Yugoslavia? Yes, 11.52 percent; no, 80.51 percent; undecided, 7.97 percent.

5. Do you think that U.S. foreign aid to neutral countries should be reduced if they repeatedly vote against us in the United Na-

tions? Yes, 75.46 percent; no, 17.37 percent; undecided, 7.17 percent.

6. Would you be in favor of having the United States declare a complete trade embargo against Cuba? Yes, 84.45 percent; no, 8.98 percent; undecided, 6.57 percent.

7. Do you feel that members of the armed services should be barred from speaking to military and civilian groups on the dangers of communism? Yes, 16.32 percent; no, 75.42 percent; undecided, 8.26 percent.

8. Eight years ago Congress enacted legislation to exclude the first $50 of dividend income from taxation on individual income tax returns and to grant a 4-percent tax credit on dividend income above $50. The purpose of this law was to partially reduce the double taxation of dividends, as corporations already pay a corporate income tax of 52 percent before they pay any dividends to shareholders. A proposal is pending before Congress to repeal this $50 dividend exclusion and 4-percent dividend tax credit. Do you feel this exclusion and credit should be repealed? Yes, 16.99 percent; no, 65 percent; undecided, 18.01 percent.

9. A bill is pending before Congress which would expand the social security program to provide for the payment of hospital and nursing home bills for those who are retired under social security. The increased cost would be covered by increasing the social security withholding tax by an additional one-fourth of 1 percent on both employers and employees. Do you favor this legislation? Yes, 65.04 percent; no, 27.66 percent; undecided, 7.30 percent.

10. Would you be in favor of legislation to establish the Point Reyes National Seashore in Marin County? Yes, 60.88 percent; no, 18.82 percent; undecided, 20.30 percent.

11. The President has proposed that the Federal Government participate, on a matching basis, in the construction of fallout shelters under schools and hospitals. Would you favor this proposal? Yes, 36.11 percent; no, 49.35 percent; undecided, 14.54 percent.

12. Do you think that it should be the Federal Government's responsibility to provide financial aid to local rapid transit districts. Yes, 15.04 percent; no, 74.29 percent; undecided, 10.67 percent.

The Interstate Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, in the decade to come I am sure history will treat the 41,000-mile Interstate Highway program as one of the outstanding governmental achievements of our particular time.

As a member of the Senate Public Works Committee, who participated in the launching of this ambitious program, I find the progress being made a source of great satisfaction.

In recent months, however, there have been disquieting reports of corruption or mishandling of Federal highway funds in a few States.

I suppose it is a fact of life, however unfortunate, that there will be some such instances in a program of this magnitude with billions of dollars involved.

Those responsible for misuse of these funds should be rooted out as quickly as possible.

However, the publicity and attention given these cases of graft and corruption may tend to give the impression that the entire interstate program is shot through with thievery and malpractice.

This is equally unfortunate and unfair, since the great majority of State highway departments are administering the programs properly and efficiently.

One such State, I am proud to say, is my own State of Michigan.

It has, in recent years, been a consistent national leader in highway construction generally and in the administration of its share of the interstate system construction.

And it has maintained this leadership free from corruption and scandal.

Michigan's enviable record recently was spotlighted nationally in an article written by A. D. Underwood and distributed by the United Press International.

Because our experience in Michigan could well be used as a model nationally, I ask unanimous consent that the UPI article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INTERSTATE HIGHWAY PROGRAM

(By A. D. Underwood)

LANSING, MICH.—In these times when the phrase "highway robbery" has come to have bitter meaning in many parts of the Nation, one notable exception stands out.

Michigan is just tieing the last bit of blue ribbon on a billion dollar highway building program and is about to plunge into a second 5-year plan for improving State roads.

For 2 years the Wolverine State has led the Nation in construction of Interstate System freeways, in 1961 awarding contracts on 182 miles.

In 1961 Michigan ranked third in the Nation in total dollar volume of all highway construction projects by awarding contracts totaling $212.9 million. Only California with $344 million and New York with $338.2 million did more.

This vast construction has been carried out without scandal. In fact a 2-year probe of the Michigan Highway Department by a legislative investigating committee bent on finding the "corruption that must be there" collapse in frustration.

Presiding over the program is the Nation's only elected State highway commissioner, John C. Mackie.

"We are spending public money. We are making public policy. Our work, therefore, should always be carried on with a full respect for the public's right to know what we are doing, and why we are doing it," Mackie said recently.

"We are determining for a long time to come where people will live, where they will work, where they will spend their money, where they will go to school. Our work directly affects the lives and welfare of whole communities—we exercise this power as a public trust."

Mackie's insistence on the public's right to know what is going on as ribbons of pavement snaked across the State from east to west and from south to north has paid off.

While such neighboring States as Indiana have been caught up in a webb of graft involving the highway program, Michigan voters have stamped a hearty endorsement on Mackie and his 5-year plans.

Mackie, a Democrat, was recently elected to his second 4-year term by a whopping majority of a quarter million votes. In the campaign he received the wholehearted backing of a number of avowed Republican newspapers.

Mackie campaigned on the theme that good roads mean more profits for business, more safety for the motorist, and a better State because of both. His opponent attacked the validity of announcing a 5-year plan in advance and the method of financing by bonding future earmarked gasoline and weight taxes.

The commissioner admits that citizens of towns and villages bypassed by the expanding freeways aren't always happy.

"It takes them a while to realize the benefits but within a year traffic starts to pick up, business becomes normal and generally begins to increase," he said. "Then the value of what we are doing becomes apparent to them."

With the paving of a 17-mile stretch of highway in Michigan's Upper Peninsula, Mackie is completing the first part of a three-part program to polish up the State's reputation for good roads.

Now every foot of the 9,400 miles of State highways is paved. This was phase one of improvement of the farm-to-market system.

Another and more spectacular area is the construction of the Federal Interstate System in Michigan. The State has 801 miles of divided, four-lane, controlled access freeway open for business, more than any other State, and construction continues.

The third part of the program is construction of State-connecting highways linking the interstate freeways. For the most part these are also four-lane limited access roads.

By the end of this summer Michigan will have more than 1,000 miles of freeway in operation, stretching from the southwest corner of the State to Detroit and from the Ohio border on the south up through the middle of the State into the Upper Peninsula.

Near the Canadian border at Sault Ste. Marie, a new international bridge will open next fall which will complete the nonstop route from Indiana and Ohio, across the world's longest suspension bridge at the Straits of Mackinac, into Canada.

It is already possible to drive from the heart of Detroit to the Indiana border on Interstate 94 without stopping. When the Indiana connections are completed this route will cover more than 250 miles into downtown Chicago.

These broad, spectacular highways often cut through areas where there were no roads. They will shortly link every major city in the State's Lower Peninsula. During the next 5 years, the Upper Peninsula will be receiving the same treatment.

By 1967, the Department will have supervised the construction of more than $2 billion in new highways in addition to improvements to existing routes.

Mackie credits his information program and the fact that the public is told of all highway operations with allowing the program to proceed without the corruption that has smeared some other States.

A rigid inspection policy involving pretesting materials and spot sampling of paving, fencing, reinforcements, guard rails, and everything else is carried out in the open.

A little blue book setting out strict rules for conduct and dealings with contractors by State employees is the inspector's "bible."

"The inspector should be a man of integrity," says the book, which also stresses that the good fellow seldom makes a good inspector. Employees are warned against accepting favors from contractors and even against becoming too friendly with men on the job.

Inspectors are told never to order changes but to suggest or request them, then report

to their superiors. "Any changes suggested by the inspector should be for the benefit of the work, and any requests made solely for reasons of 'showing off' authority must be avoided."

The penalty for ignoring the policies set forth in the blue book is immediate dismissal.

Highway Department officials have praised the newspapers for their part in publicizing the program and keeping it on schedule.

Howard E. Hill of the Department recently told a meeting of the American Association of State Highway Officials in Denver, Colo., that the contract award schedule published by newspapers was a key to retaining the program on schedule.

"Out of our first 5-year program, we will slide on about $40 million of the $1.25 billion in awards," Hill said. "About $20 million of this is for jobs on which the local governmental units' cooperation has not been obtained. The remainder is slippage which will mean we will be about 6 months behind on completion of specific jobs."

"Prequalification of contractors has been a strong aid in getting jobs open to traffic," Hill said. "If a contractor is not performing satisfactorily, we will not permit him to bid additional work. We have taken the largest contractors and suppliers off our bidding list until their performance on going jobs indicated satisfactory progress."

Michigan's Gov. John B. Swainson had praise for the 4,500 State highway department employees at a recent engineer's conference here.

"By your performance, you have given the lie to those who say State employees don't earn their day's pay," he said.

"During the past 4 years the size of Michigan's highway program has more than doubled. This means that the workload of many employees has increased tremendously since the highway department payroll has certainly not doubled.

"Our highway construction program—the biggest public works program in Michigan history—has been carried out in the best traditions of service to all of the people.

"It has been carried out without a single touch of scandal.

"Roadbuilding is a barometer of progress and with the finest highways in the Nation, Michigan's economic future is assured."

Incentive Payments on Domestic Gold Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, our rapidly dwindling gold reserve in this country has been the subject of much discussion in recent months. I am one of those who feel that we can do something about this matter, and that is to produce more gold. I have introduced a bill providing for incentive payments of $35 an ounce for newly mined domestic gold. This would be in addition to the $35 an ounce paid by the Treasury Department, making a total payment to the producer of $70 an ounce. Similar bills have been introduced in the House by Mr. JOHNSON, of California, Mr. RIVERS, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. BERRY, Mrs. PFOST, Mr. HAGEN, of California, Mr. BARING, and Mr. ULLMAN.

I represent a gold mining district. At one time the Cripple Creek and Victor area in Colorado was one of the leading gold producing areas of the country. We now find all of the mines closed, as well as the Golden Cycle Mill, which refined the gold produced in that district. These gold mines cannot operate on $35 an ounce gold. Their costs of production have more than trebled since this price was set in 1934, and they had no alternative but to close. This is most unfortunate just at a time when the shortage of gold is becoming more acute each day.

Mr. Lawrence Sullivan, Coordinator of Information in the House, has prepared an excellent statement on our gold situation, which I am happy to include as part of my remarks:

CONGRESS CONSIDERING INCENTIVE PAYMENTS ON U.S. GOLD PRODUCTION

(By Lawrence Sullivan)

Congress now is considering a frontal attack on the problem of U.S. gold production and our bothersome international balance-of-payments difficulties.

Both the House and Senate have before them specific bills to authorize incentive payments up to $35 an ounce to all producers of new gold anywhere in the United States, its territories, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

After the incentive payment, the new gold then would be sold to the Treasury at $35 an ounce, to bolster our international bullion reserves.

The maximum payment to gold miners under the proposed legislation would be $70 an ounce, but the incentive payment could be changed periodically, at the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior.

The stimulus to gold mining, now almost prostrate under prohibitive production costs, would call thousands of miners back to the pits throughout the Western States.

The Senate bill (S.J. Res. 44) was introduced by Senator CLAIR ENGLE, Democrat, of California, with the cosponsorship of Senator FRANCIS CASE, Republican, of South Dakota; and Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, Republican, of California. The companion House bill (H.R. 6804) was offered by Representative J. EDGAR CHENOWETH, Republican, of Colorado.

Hearings already have been held by the mining subcommittees in both Houses.

Senator JOHN A. CARROLL, Democrat, of Colorado, is chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Mining and Minerals.

"The hearings were called to try to find a way to help solve one of the most pressing problems of our times," Senator CARROLL said in opening the Senate hearings this week.

"I refer, of course to our diminishing reserves of gold, while at the same time our highly productive gold mines within our own country have been and are continuing to close down. With gold mines shut down at the same time that U.S. gold reserves are dwindling and being threatened by the continuing flow of dollars to foreign lands, one sure way to help the gold shortage is to get more gold out of the ground."

The new program is opposed by the Treasury Department, the State Department, and the Department of the Interior, which would administer the proposed incentive payments.

The gold incentive payment is calculated simply to cover higher mining costs since the gold price was frozen by law in 1934 at $35 an ounce.

The current bill would not change the monetary value of gold, but would offer an incentive payment to domestic producers only.

Senator ENGLE's resolution provides in section 3:

"Nothing contained herein shall be construed to repeal, supercede, or modify existing provisions of law relating to the monetary system of the United States."

The incentive payments would be limited to a 5-year period from the effective date of the proposed legislation.

The Senate bill is described formally as a "joint resolution to encourage the discovery, development, and production of domestic gold."

Many U.S. gold mines have been closed down continuously since World War II, when orders from the War Production Board forbade the manufacture of gold mining machinery for domestic use. Since the war, most of our new gold mining equipment has been sold abroad.

Mining costs today are generally about three times the production costs of 1934, when the gold was officially priced at $35 an ounce.

"As a result of the foregoing conditions more than 95 percent of the gold mines scattered throughout the United States have been forced to close," the Senate resolution reads.

The preamble of the Senate resolution also recalls that "the gold reserves of the U.S. Government have been depleted by approximately $5 billion during the past 3 years, bringing such reserves to a dangerous level."

"Action should be taken without further delay" this text continues, "to stimulate the production of domestic gold and to rebuild the gold reserves of the Government to a safer level."

The Secretary of the Interior would be authorized to make incentive payments only upon satifactory evidence of sale of the new gold to the Treasury.

"The amount of any such payment shall be determined by the Secretary, but in no case shall such amount exceed $35 an ounce."

All incentive payments would stop automatically when U.S. Treasury reserves of gold against hit $23 billion.

Total U.S. gold production in 1961 is officially reported at $53 million for the year, a drop of 9 percent from 1960 production, 23 percent under 1953, and the lowest since 1946.

Total world production of gold (exclusive of the Iron Curtain countries) was $1.2 billion, with South Africa accounting for almost three-fourths of the total, or $802 million for the year.

Russia's gold output for 1961 is unknown, but is variously estimated in mining circles at something between $350 million and $600 million for the year.

The only hard figure available to world bankers is that Russia shipped into the United Kingdom a total of $194 million of gold in settlement of her international accounts during the first 11 months of 1961. This compared with a total of $105 million from Russia during the entire year 1960. For the period 1957–59 Russian gold shipments to the United Kingdom averaged $250 million a year. Russian gold reserves are estimated at roughly $5 billion today.

Total U.S. gold production in 1960 was $48,600,000, and in that year we used $105 million of gold in our own industrial arts. In no year since 1958 has the United States produced sufficient gold at home to cover current consumption in the domestic arts and industries.

During the 8 years 1954–61 inclusive, the U.S. balance-of-payments account showed a cumulative loss of $16.6 billion, or a little more than a $2 billion a year.

Not all of these accounts have been settled by gold shipments, but in this period our total gold reserves declined by more than $6 billion.

The Treasury statement of March 6, 1962 shows net U.S. gold sales for 1961 at $820 million for the year.

Congressional advocates of the gold incentive payments to domestic miners predicted 2 or 3 years of stimulated gold production would greatly strengthen the credit posture not only of the United States but of the International Monetary Fund, and the banking structure of the entire world.

Maryland Day, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the traditions of a free people are not only a part of their treasure, but also a significant portion of their armor. The citizens of Maryland are rich in having inherited such vigorous and valuable traditions.

The first Marylanders set foot in the colony on March 25, 1634. They brought with them the practice of freedom of conscience, enjoined upon them by their Proprietor, the second Lord Baltimore. For 15 years this practice was so faithfully followed that it became feasible to consider the radical step of enacting the principle into law as an Act of Toleration. While this may seem to be anything but radical to the 20th century, it was a bold, pioneering experiment for the 17th.

Thus, within 15 years of the first founding of Maryland, freedom of conscience was guaranteed by law. In the intervening three centuries the guarantee has not always been honored, but the principle has endured.

Today, Maryland, as well as the others of the United States, is faced with challenges to her traditions of individual liberty and public responsibility. If we are to meet these challenges successfully, we shall have to match the best of our own courage, integrity, and ability with the finest of the principles which we have inherited from a great American past.

Because the Act of Toleration of Maryland is an integral part of that past, I am appending a part of the original text.

The article follows:

MARYLAND DAY, 1962

(The following portion of the Toleration Act has been transcribed from the Assembly journal now at the Hall of Records in Annapolis. Most 17th century forms of capitalization, punctuation, and spelling have been retained)

And whe[reas] the inforceing of the conscience in matters of Religion hath frequently fallen out to bee of Dangerous consequence in those common wealthes where it hath beene practised, And for the more quiett and peaceable governem^t of this Province and the better to pserve mutuall love and amity amongst the Inhabitants thereof Be it therefore also by the Lo: Pr[o]prietary with the advise and consent of this Assembly Ordeyned & enacted (except as in this psent Act is before Declared and sett forth) That noe person or psons whatsoever within this Province or the Islands Ports Harbors Creeks or Havens therevnto belonging professing to believe in Jesus Christ shall from henceforth bee any waies troubled molested or discountefiaced for or in respect of his or her religion nor in the free exercise thereof within this Province or the Islands therevnto belonging nor any way compelled to the beleife or exercise of any other Religion against his or her consent, soe as they bee not vnfaithfull to the Lord Proprietary or molest or conspire against the civill Governem^t established or to bee established in this Province vnder him or his heires And that all & every pson and psons that shall presume contrary to this Act and the true intent and meaning thereof directly or indirectly either in person or estate willfully to wrong disturbe trouble or molest any person Whatsoever within this Province professing to believe in Jesus Christ for or in respect of his or her religion or the free exercise thereof within this Province other than is provided for in this Act, that such pson or psons soe offending shalbe compelled to pay treble damages to the party soe wronged or molested, and for every such offence shall alsoe forfeit 20^s. sterling in money or the value thereof half thereof for the vse of the Lo: Proprietary and his heires Lords and Proprietaries of this province, and the other half for the vse of the party soew ronged or molested as aforesaid, Or if the ptie soe offending as aforesaid shall refuse or bee vnable to recompense the party soe wronged or to satisfy such ffyne or forfeiture then such Offender shalbe severely punished by publick whipping & imprisonm^t during the pleasure of the Lord Proprietary or his Leivetenāt or cheife Governor of this province for the tyme being without baile or maineprise And bee it further alsoe Enacted by the authority and consent aforesaid That the Sheriff or other Officer or Officers from time to time to bee appointed & authorized for that purpose of the County Towne or precinct where every particular offence in this psent Act conteyned shall happen at any time to bee comitted and wherevppon there is hereby a fforfeiture ffyne or penalty imposed shall from tyme to time distraine and seise the goods and estate of each such pson soe offending as aforesaid against this pson Act or any pt thereof and sell the same or any part thereof for the full satisfaccōn of such forfeiture ffine or penalty as aforesaid Restoring vnto the ptie soe offending the Remainder of Overplus of the said goods or estate after such satisfaccōn soe made as aforesaid.

The fireeman have assented. Tho: Hatton. Enacted by the Governor Willm Stone.

New Uses for Farmer's Product, Not New Uses for Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, in his newsletter last week Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, had a very interesting report to the people of his State on new uses for farmer's product rather than new uses for farmer.

Certainly it is time that positive action were taken in solving the farm problem that arises from foreign imports, and so forth. Senator MUNDT has set forth some positive action that can and should be taken if we are to prevent the need of moving to the city the 2,000 farm families the President has recommended should be moved off the land.

The newsletter is as follows:

NEW USES FOR FARMER'S PRODUCT, NOT NEW USES FOR FARMER

The farm problem has been diagnosed in some circles as "too many farmers and too many bushels." What's to be done? Cutback and cutdown—cutback additional production and cutdown more farmers? As I view the problems of agriculture, the most discouraging factor is the continued emphasis in the direction of curtailing and controlling the farmer and his production. This is a negative approach; it cannot be accepted, for there is a plus side to agriculture and it is here we should bend our efforts, to the development—on a huge scale—of new uses and new markets for our bountiful agricultural industry.

It's time we devoted our attention in a big way toward doing something other than stuffing away in a storage bin what the farmer produces. Our scientists stand at the doorway to developing a great new era for agriculture. Agricultural Research Service, in a recent report to our Senate Appropriations Committee, said: "There is increasing emphasis on developing large-volume industrial uses for agriculture materials. These new and improved products—extending across the entire horizon of food, feed, and industrial uses—are developed to meet specific needs for domestic markets and of foreign consumers. Successful utilization research enhances the use value and competitive position of American farm products."

In its two decades of operation, U.S. Department of Agriculture utilization research has added over $2.5 billion of value to farm commodities at a cost of less than $200 million—representing an excellent benefit-to-cost ratio of 15 to 1. During the past 5 years utilization research enhanced agricultural commodities $1.75 billion, which is 70 percent of the total gain made in the two decades of this program.

Dr. Byron T. Shaw, administrator of the Agricultural Research Service, hit what I consider the nub of the problem—a lack of funds to provide a truly adequate program. He said no increase has been provided in funds earmarked for utilization research and of the some $56 million for research, only $18,793,000 is provided for utilization research, new uses and new products. An additional $2,600,000 is provided for human nutrition and consumer uses research, providing a total of $21 million which is but a drop in the bucket when searching for a solution to a problem which requires an annual outlay of more than $6 billion.

Utilization research as an answer to our farm problem is not a fantasy. In the past fiscal year 124 research projects were terminated. Of these, exactly half—a marvelous percentage of success in scientific research—attained the desired objectives. Twenty-nine more achieved partial attainment. Only three were found unpromising. While these 124 projects were terminated another 125 were started, 62 researching possible industrial uses of farm products, 49 devoted to potential food uses, and the remaining 14 to possible feed uses.

Accomplishments of utilization research in fiscal 1961 included development of a new food from whole grain wheat; a new process in tanning of sole leather using dialdehyde starch which is a new chemical derivative of cereal grain; discovery of new flour from wheat and new starch products from cereal

which can be incorporated as an integral part of paper and other pulp products; adaption by three manufacturers of an ARS process for commercial use of a water-soluble gum produced by bacterial fermentation of corn sugar; a rapid chemical process development which greatly simplifies wool feltmaking; and development of potentially new crops such as ironweed seed which has a potential use in plastics. These are but a few of the examples demonstrating what can be done.

Congress is now considering a farm program which to my mind cannot achieve success for the farmer because instead of being directed to find new uses for the farmer's product, it is aimed at finding a new use for the farmer. Instead of directing efforts to the costly task of relocating farmers, a greater service is to unleash the great productive capacity of our minds and move extensively and swiftly into the field of utilization research. It can be the key to a prosperous agriculture offering a future on the farm as well as off the farm for all America.

Soviet Union Intolerance of its Jewish Population

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, a new wave of anti-Semitism has swept the Soviet Union. Soviet intolerance of Jewish people is reported in the January 20, 1962, issue of the New York Herald Tribune. Under unanimous consent, I include the Tribune report in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I believe it will be of interest to all Members of Congress.

A NEW RUSSIAN ATTACK—SPIES IN SYNAGOGUES

(NOTE.—"Pogrom" is a Russian word. Mentioning it sends a chill of apprehension through world Jewry. In the Soviet Union, Jews are in the grip of a new wave of anti-Semitism. This was first disclosed in the New York Herald Tribune on November 6. But the Soviet crunch against the Jews continues. In Moscow the regime accused the Israeli Embassy of being a hotbed of espionage for the United States. For good measure, the Russians charged that Jews they arrested were in league with the Embassy and with our Central Intelligence Agency.)

Jews of the Soviet Union in particular and Israel in general were the target of a new crackdown which broke menacingly in Moscow yesterday.

The main accusation was espionage—a terrifying charge in the Communist world.

And to make the Soviet case more binding, the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency was rung in as the cloak-and-dagger linkup to alleged plots and treason.

The emphasis—stone cold and calculated—was on the Jews living in the Soviet Union.

The accuser was Trud, the official Soviet trade union newspaper.

It bluntly charged that Joshua Pratt, first secretary of the Israeli Embassy in Moscow, headed a spy ring that recruited agents among Soviet Jewish citizens. It also said the espionage was carried out with the knowledge of the Israeli Government and on orders of the U.S. Government.

Trud accused Mr. Pratt of passing out espionage literature in synagogues, and of distributing Israeli propaganda at the Jewish New Year's reception last September.

Mr. Pratt was out of Moscow, but the Israeli Embassy said no official action had been taken against him. It added there had been no Soviet request that he leave the country.

The web of accusations, spun by Trud, said Mr. Pratt, "would one day disseminate religious literature containing espionage instructions" and, "while indoctrinating his victims he whispered to them that the materials were needed not only by himself but by his friends."

The newspaper also disclosed officially for the first time that Mr. Pratt and other diplomats at the Israeli Embassy were the foreign agents referred to at the trial of three Leningrad Jewish leaders last October.

Gedalia E. Pechersky, 60, widely known in the Soviet Union as a Jewish leader, was sentenced to 12 years in prison, and E. S. Dymkin and N. A. Kaganov, both in their late 70's, got 7 years each on charges of "consorting with foreign agents."

The newspaper said the three men admitted making tape recordings "containing slander of Soviet present-day reality which they especially prepared in order to hand over to their masters who intended to use them for anti-Soviet propaganda."

The Trud article was the first time the Leningrad trial had been linked to Israel, Soviet sources said, at the time, that Yakov Sharett, diplomat son of former Israeli Prime Minister Moshe Sharett, had been implicated. Mr. Sharett was expelled on charges of espionage, which were denied by Israel.

The Trud article depicted Israel as a vital U.S. satellite.

"Being completely dependent economically and politically on the U.S. imperialists, the Israel Zionists have completely subjected their foreign and internal policy to the interest of their transatlantic masters," it said.

Tribute to Hon. Clare Hoffman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege and pleasure to submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a splendid editorial from the Chicago Tribune of March 17, 1962, concerning our colleague, the Honorable CLARE E. HOFFMAN.

It is a well earned tribute to a Member of the House of Representatives whose place in the affairs and activities of this body no other man will fill.

As the Chicago Tribune says:

The Nation owes him a vote of thanks.

The editorial follows:

A TRUE CONSERVATIVE

Announcement has been made that CLARE E. HOFFMAN, who has represented Michigan's Fourth District in Congress for 27 years, will retire at the end of the present session. He is 86 years old and has been ill since he suffered a stroke last November.

Mr. HOFFMAN was a conservative before it became popular to be a conservative. There were times in the days of the Roosevelt New Deal delusions when he seemed to be the only Member of Congress who was willing and able to protest.

In his last newsletter to his constituents, written last November, he said that it had always been his aim in Congress "to protect our national independence and sovereignty, preserve our form of government, and keep inviolate the freedom of our people."

The Nation owes him thanks.

Aid for Students by Means of Tax Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, this editorial appeared in the March 18 issue of the Quincy Herald-Whig, Quincy, Ill., and the desirability of permitting parents to deduct all reasonable expenses of their children attending college.

I invite my colleagues to read this excellent summary:

AID FOR STUDENTS

In rejecting the President's plan for Federal scholarships for college students, the House of Representatives followed the pattern it established in 1958 by voting down a similar plan. The Senate has been more receptive.

The scholarship plan, even if approved, would face a serious problem of administration. Private colleges would seek control over the scholarships. There might be a fratricidal war between the institutions of higher education.

But the claim of some House Members that Federal scholarships would destroy students' initiative has been abundantly disproven. Many top leaders in all fields went through school on private scholarships without apparent injury to their will to achieve. All officers in the armed services who were graduated from the service academies not only had their education entirely subsidized by Government but were paid salaries during all their college period excepting the first semester.

There is another possible plan for giving important help to college students without Federal scholarships or direct subsidies. It would amount to much less than the proposed $1,000 a year per student. The parents who maintain children in college could be given tax exemption for all reasonable college expenses. Currently, they are permitted only the standard $600 per year exemption, which falls far short of the minimum cost of college.

The college tax exemption plan probably would mean an annual saving of at least $400 per student, an impressive sum for families struggling to educate youngsters.

In the long run, the Federal Government should profit by this type of investment in the future. Statistics indicate that the college-trained boy will earn at least $100,000 more than the noncollege boy in an average working life. This would mean eventual additional Federal revenue of at least $20,000. In some cases it would be much more and in some much less, but it would be a high return on a Federal investment, in current tax loss, of perhaps $1,600.

If parents have sufficient faith in the future of the country to spend large sums in educating their children, surely the Congress should have no less.

Guide to the Congressional Record Reprint of the Response of Congressman Cecil R. King to the Testimony of the American Medical Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, on March 5 I submitted for inclusion in the RECORD my response to the American Medical Association's testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means on my bill, H.R. 4222, to provide health insurance for the aged under the social security system.

There was such a widespread interest in the analysis of the AMA position and the record of its previous actions with respect to progressive legislative proposals contained in this speech that I had to have several thousand reprints made to meet the demands that came to my office.

Further evidence of the intense interest in this matter is revealed in the reports of countless meetings all over the country where the issue of health care for older citizens is being discussed. It has been suggested to me that it would be helpful in these discussions if a guide to my remarks be also published in the RECORD and be made available to those who have asked, and I am sure will continue to ask, for the reprints.

Accordingly, I have prepared such a guide and would like permission for it to be inserted in the Appendix.

The article follows:

	Page	Column
Introduction	1	1
AMA has long history of opposition to Government and voluntary programs to advance public welfare	1	2
Opposition to social security	1 6	2 3
Opposition to social security benefits to disabled	1	2
Opposition to elimination of means test in crippled children's program	1	2
Early opposition to voluntary health insurance	1	2
Opposition to Federal grants-in-aid	1	3
AMA testimony filled with misrepresentations	2	2, 3
Analysis of AMA allegations	2	2
I. Should Government act to promote the general welfare where the individual cannot pay his own way?	2	3
Such a theory would mean end of OASDI, workmen's compensation, unemployment compensation, FHA, Federal deposit insurance, etc	2	3
II. Does H.R. 4222 mean Government control of medicine?	2	3
No evidence of regimentation in other areas where Government acts to safeguard health	3	1
American Hospital Association supports bill's provision regarding hospital eligibility to participate	3	1, 2
No evidence that Government "controls what it subsidizes"	3	2
Payment for services based on widely accepted concept of "reasonable cost"	3 4	2, 3 1
Necessity for medical staff bylaws accepted by hospitals and physicians	3	2
Requirement that nursing homes provide 24-hour nursing service desirable to exclude domiciliary care	3	3
AMA argument regarding Government control is scare technique	3	3
Physicians' services covered by H.R. 4222 only if furnished as part of hospital services	3	3
Would hospitals be overutilized?	4	1
Hospital admissions under physician control	4	1, 2
Hospital utilization committees recommended by AHA	4	2
Is the use of deductibles illogical?	4	2
Most aged can afford to pay deductible, but not huge hospital bills	4	2
III. Is H.R. 4222 based on false premise?	4	3
Is H.R. 4222 based on premise that "the sociological problems of older people can be solved through legislation"?	5	1
No. H.R. 4222 advanced as part of solution to problem of financing health care of aged	5	1
Is H.R. 4222 based on premise that "most, if not all of the aged, are in poor health"?	5	1
No. H.R. 4222 based on fact that older people have greater need of hospitalization than younger people	5	1
Is H.R. 4222 based on premise that "most, if not all of the aged, are verging on bankruptcy"?	5	2
No. H.R. 4222 based on fact that most of aged cannot meet costs of long hospitalization	5	2, 3
Appeal to relatives not an acceptable alternative to health insurance	5	3
Is it a false premise that "a permanent program is essential" to the solution of the "problem of the aged in financing their health costs"	6	1
Premise is true. The problem of the aged in financing health costs will, in the absence of Federal action, get worse	6	1
Is it a false premise that "voluntary health insurance * * * and existing law will not do the job that needs doing?"	6	2
Premise is true. These mechanisms alone will not do the entire job	6	2
IV. Will H.R. 4222 lead to socialized medicine?	6	3
Program would not furnish any medical services but would only help people finance costs of their health care	6	3
Bill preserves individual freedom for physicians, hospital and nursing home administrators, and the aged	7	1
Bill is in keeping with basic principles of the social security system	7	2
V. Would health insurance through social security "lower the quality of medical care available to older people"?	7	3
No evidence that Government plan would produce different results from Blue Cross	7	3
H.R. 4222 couples concern for costs with concern for standards	7 8	3 1
VI. Are cost estimates for H.R. 4222 unsound?	8	1
Factual comments on cost estimates by Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration	14	1
VII. Would H.R. 4222 have an adverse effect on the social security system?	8	1
Social security system is financially sound; future income will support future disbursement	8	2
Providing health benefits to present beneficiaries who will not have contributed directly toward health benefits is in the tradition set by Congress—as social security has been improved, immediate protection has been provided to all covered by the program	8	3
In passing original Social Security Act, Congress intended that benefits should go beyond subsistence levels	8	3
Social security is social insurance	9	1
Exclusion of present beneficiaries from coverage would have little effect on costs	9	1
VIII. Would H.R. 4222 damage voluntary community efforts?	9	2
The enactment of H.R. 4222 would relieve private charitable agencies of many burdens and would enable them to devote more of their resources to the varied needs of the community	9	3
IX. Would H.R. 4222 adversely affect what the medical profession is now doing to meet the health problems of older Americans?	9	3
The bill would not affect these activities	9	3
H.R. 4222 would assist in expanding the availability of needed physical facilities by enabling the aged to pay for the health care they receive	9	3
X. Would public and private welfare programs be adversely affected by health insurance under social security?	10	2
There is no conflict between existing welfare programs and health insurance under social security, just as there is now no conflict between old-age assistance and OASDI	10	2
A Federal program can reflect the needs of local communities but is not bound by the limited resources of low-income States	10	2
Social insurance is preferable to public assistance because it does not require people to exhaust their resources before they can get help	10	3
Social insurance is preferable to public assistance because it does not require people to subject themselves to examination of their and their children's financial circumstances	10	3
XI. Can private insurance finance the health needs of the aged?	11	1
Private insurance cannot provide adequate insurance for the aged without passing the financial burden to younger subscribers or charging higher rates for the aged than they can afford to pay	11	2
Specific figures on the adequacy of presently available insurance for the aged	11	------
With coverage of basic costs under social security the aged could buy additional protection from private insurance; private insurance would prosper as a result	12	1
XII. Does the existing MAA (Kerr-Mills) program provide an effective answer to the problem of financing the health needs of the aged?	12	2
As long as those of the aged needing medical care must prove financial need before receiving help, there is a strong deterrent to seeking timely care	12	3
What a person can get under MAA depends on State eligibility requirements and on what the State can afford	12	3
Many States have no programs because their financial situation makes new welfare programs impossible	12	3
H.R. 4222 and MAA are not alternatives—they are both necessary	13	2
To assure that withtheir limited resources States will provide adequate MAA programs the primary role in financing basic health care for the aged must be borne by social security	13	3
Summary	13	3
The AMA does not speak for the American people when it says that everyone gets the health care that he needs, that there is no loss of dignity when an individual applies for charity, that the aged are financially well off, and when it urges that a plan that would enable Americans to pay for their health care in old age should be dismissed because the aged can get charity	13	3

Development of Air Force RS–70 Weapons System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, during recent discussions of the proposed production program for the Mach-3 RS–70, considerable attention was given to matters which were extremely important but which had no direct bearing on the value of the plane itself. Now that these extraneous issues have been resolved, we should all take an undivided look at the merits of the RS–70 and, consequently, I recommend that all interested parties read Mr. Watson's article on the subject in the Baltimore Sunday Sun of March 25, 1962.

Mr. Watson is one of the Nation's foremost military experts, and it is my opinion that his views on the RS–70 are among the best which have been presented to put the entire program into the proper perspective. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Watson's article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUE DIMS KEY ASPECT OF RS–70 FIGHT

(By Mark S. Watson)

WASHINGTON, March 24.—In the RS–70 dispute that was halted amicably (and temporarily) by the midweek compact between President Kennedy and the House Armed Services Committee's imperturbable chairman, Representative VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia, one side has been overemphasized.

That is, the largest public stress has been upon the fact that the committee revised the wording of its report, so that instead of "directing" Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense, to spend the full $491 million on the all-round development of the Air Force's RS–70 weapons system, the measure "authorizes" that expenditure.

"RESTUDY" PLEDGED

Thereby a serious constitutional battle was averted, which is a result welcome to both sides.

The rest of the compact, however, is important. The President assured Congress that there will be a "restudy" of the RS–70 project. It will be useful to point out a few items that the "restudy" is likely to bring to public attention (and large areas of governmental attention) for the first time.

In numerous past controversies in which the Air Force has been involved, that service's side of the case has not suffered from Air Force officers' diffidence about publicly presenting some highly partisan claims by one means or another.

SUPPORT SIGNIFICANT

This time, and probably because of Gen. Curtis E. LeMay's stern sense of discipline with which none of his subordinates is disposed to tangle, the Air Force has made its case strictly in accordance with proper practice—that is, not in public but under questioning by the congressional committee.

It is significant, therefore, that Vinson and his committee unanimously have supported the RS–70 project, and still do.

It is a studious, experienced, and industrious committee, employing a competent staff of assistants, and it has a profound knowledge of its subject, which explains its persistence in supporting the RS–70 even against the President's publicly stated views and in spite of the extremely persuasive public statements of McNamara.

The difficulties of the RS–70 (in this respect comparable to the Army's difficulties in winning full support for its Zeus anti-ICBM missile) lie largely in the fact that it is a very advanced venture in science and technology.

SOME FAMILIAR ARGUMENTS

It is so far advanced that, unless one studies its specific aims as well as the present state of the arts it will employ, it can be dismissed as "too far out" for practical purposes.

The familiar arguments raised against the project include these:

1. That the plane itself, employing a principle of "riding" the shockwaves at high speed, instead of pounding through them, and thus reaching a cruising (as well as a top) speed three times faster than sound, is still vulnerable to enemy attack. The answer is that vulnerability is a matter of degree, applicable to every other instrument—even for the Polaris submarine, with a very high degree of safety, there is no pretense of absolute invulnerability.

2. That by 1967 the RS–70's missions will be better performed by missiles (yet to be developed). The answer: few veterans of the air agree that the manned-plane can so soon be fully replaced by the unmanned missile, and there is a growing suspicion that it never can be.

3. That the Air Force planning itself is proved uncertain, in that it has abandoned the former B–70 program (chiefly a bomber) and substituted the much more complex RS–70, for reconnaissance and almost simultaneous strike. The answer is a swift agreement with the "change," but a reminder that between the first plan and the completion of every revolutionary weapon there are many changes, and should be.

DESIGN GREATLY CHANGED

Thus, the B–52 design started out as a subsonic, prop-driven plane weighing 320,000 pounds; it wound up as a swift jet plane weighing 506,000 pounds. The early design of its predecessor, the B–36, would have been for an overlarge, slow, low-altitude plane.

As to the still earlier B–17, if in 1934 the complaint about vulnerability of so large a plane had been listened to, there would have been no development of it in time for its triumph in World War II. But even its final designs erred, having no top turret or tail turret, and it was supplemental redesign that corrected these and other faults.

4. That the proposed side-view radar of the RS–70 presumably has the same purpose as the Army's side-view radar, which is for full reconnaissance, taking a complete picture of the enemy terrain; experts at the base laboratory, carefully study it for targets, and finally send out bombardment missions; the whole process takes hours. The reasonable point has been made that, from a plane traveling 440 feet a second, there is no remote chance to telescope all this activity into a matter of seconds.

RADAR-TYPE MAPS USED

But the answer, long in the hands of the House committee, is quite simple. The proposed side-view radar of the RS–70 is not this at all. Rather than make a full original reconnaissance, it seeks only to identify variations from a previous known reconnaissance.

In very simple terms, a radar-type map is prepared from known landscape features; those features are fully known from existing maps and corrected from travelers' reports of new plants built, say, near the bend of a river 10 miles below town X. Or the correction might even come from a photograph made by a U–2 plane.

This newly constructed and approximately exact radar-map is drawn to correspond exactly with the proposed route of an RS–70 plane equipped with a side-view radar flying at, say, 70,000 feet. Now, when the plane proceeds on its scheduled route its new radar-look would be electronically imposed on the prepared map.

What it would show is not a whole picture at all, but only a variation from the prepared map, and the character of the variation. And this much can be done, by existing technology, all but instantaneously.

Try this out in analogy. If a man driving at lively speed up Fifth Avenue on an Easter midday should try to spot the prettiest girl among the thousands on parade, he could have no chance of sure success.

RED HAT, WHITE FEATHER

But if he knew in advance that exactly at the southeast corner of 42d Street there was to be a tall girl wearing a red hat with a white feather, he would have no trouble at all in seeing that she either was there or was not there.

That is about what the side-view radar of the RS–70 is suposed to do. And, in a somewhat more technical and military manner, that is what the electronic industry says it already is prepared to produce.

But whereas the existing side-view reconnaissance covers an area visible from 50,000 feet, traveling at subsonic speed, and has a probable error in "discrimination" of perhaps a mile, the new "magic" must operate at 70,000 feet, moving at 2,000 miles an hour, and have an error measurable not in miles, or yards, but actually in feet. With an error of, say 50 feet, even a nonnuclear, missile will destroy a target of importance.

Yet the technologists whose missilery feats of the past decade have dazzled the layman, say it can be done. Time, they say, is not a problem. They have such radar maps now, and the Air Force uses them.

A blunt criticism must be made of parts of the Pentagon's official (and highly persuasive) presentation of its case against the RS–70.

That presentation observed that "in contrast to most other military requirements [this] requirement lends itself rather well to reasonably precise calculation." Yet of the five factors then mentioned, three appear to employ conjecture rather than precision. And, if into the very best of computer devices a single faulty piece of information is fed, the result is error. A man making a slight mistake in manipulating a perfect slide rule can come out with a majestic error, which in a less scientific process would probably have been detected in time. This may apply to the critics "reasonably precise calculation."

For example: The familiar calculation of the "circular error probability" of a nuclear missile's impact. It still is calculation, not certainty. The efficiency of hardening the base is speculative, particularly the possible remoteness of effect on electronic equipment. For a missile with nuclear warhead has never been fired and expectations of what will happen are still only expectations.

It may prove that the Pentagon's hostile judgment, made by men with a minimum of experience in the military technologies, has been based in many cases upon a cocksure attitude that too often is a deplorable accompaniment to truly superior intellects.

EXPERIENCE STRESSED

Among the inexperienced there is too little appreciation of the invaluable potency of experience, and of the occasional precision of intuition which inexplicably appears among inventors and researchers. Nobody could prove Neumann right in his surmise that the

thermonuclear warhead would be adaptable to a missile. Yet from it came the Atlas.

One must also deplore the Pentagon civilians' reference to the Air Force's failure to produce a new program on demand. For the layman is not aware of what a program is in these matters. It is not simply a snappy idea.

Typically it is a book of mathematical calculations of every aspect of an unborn plane, checked and rechecked, painstakingly revised time and again to cope with a new factor that the methodical study of all aspects may have unexpectedly revealed. Every item in the complex radar, every transistor in the communications set, every bolt, every nut in the structure is listed, and "costed" by the production experts.

WEIGHTY PROGRAM

The program, so-called, is a book weighing perhaps 8 or 10 pounds. That it cannot be produced on demand is quite true; the new program for the RS-70 may be on hand, under the severe current pressure, only by mid-April.

What will be its aim? In the absence of any help whatever from the Air Force, thanks to General LeMay's refusal to let his subordinates lift a finger to propagandize the public one can make only a well-based surmise.

The President's January 19 program, it will be remembered, noted $80 million for expenditure in the current fiscal year and proposed $171 million for the 1963 fiscal year. The immediate aim was three "shell" prototypes of the B-70 airframe and engine, and development work looking toward the true RS-70 weapons system. This whole weapons system is the aircraft plus the side-view radar, plus the data processing into visual form, plus the data link computer, plus the electronic communications, the electronic countermeasures, the Doppler system (computing range by speed plus sound), the bomb navigation system, etc.

The administration's proposed $171 million would look toward all that, but too slowly in Air Force judgment. The Air Force did not concur. When pointedly asked why by Congress, its chief explained why. But it was recognized that getting everything at once was a financial impossibility, and the Air Force then was asked to suggest a middle ground—a minimum that would be militarily acceptable.

The National Lottery of Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, even Czechoslovakia has a national lottery. This is one of the few Communist nations to operate a lottery—most Communist regimes dislike gambling inasmuch as it is yet another manifestation of the human individualism that they are trying to eradicate.

Czechoslovakia's lottery has proved very productive as far as profits are concerned. In 1961, the gross intake was $54,420,000 leaving the government a profit of over $27 million.

The Czechoslovakian government may not like gambling per se—or the individualism that it implies—but it can and does recognize a moneymaking project when it sees one.

Mr. Speaker, we can be just as smart as all of the other countries that accept and capitalize on the human urge to gamble. We can, through a national lottery in the United States bring into the coffers of our Treasury over $10 billion a year in needed additional funds. Only a national lottery can provide us with added moneys to give a tax cut to our hard-pressed taxpayers and start reducing our national debt.

Fairplay for a Minority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, this editorial from the Harrisburg Patriot of March 21, deals with a situation which is a growing menace. We speak of the "loyal opposition." We know it is necessary in a democracy. But how can it be effective if it has no tools with which to work? How can it produce effective proposals without staff members to do the research work for the committee minorities?

The minority should be able to select its own staff in proper proportion to the House membership. The minority of each committee should have the right to hire and fire its own employees without consultation or approval by the majority.

The editorial follows:

FAIR PLAY FOR A MINORITY

[From the Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot of Mar. 21, 1962]

The Republican Members of Congress have every right to complain about the lack of GOP members on the professional staffs of the committees and subcommittees that make the congressional wheels go round.

This problem of the minority party in the House and Senate was highlighted in a recent study by Senator CARL T. CURTIS, Nebraska Republican.

It showed that the GOP has 36 percent of the Senate membership but only 7 percent of Senate committee staff jobs. In flat numbers, that's 462 Democrats and 39 Republican staff members.

Last year's House study found a similar situation. The GOP has 40 percent of the House membership but only 6 percent of the staff positions.

The concern of Senator CURTIS and a growing group of other Republicans is not with who hands out the jobs. It's far more practical and basic than that. Because the majority party controls all committees, the chairmen are all of one party. And these chairmen control the staff appointments. This tends to shortchange the minority party on staff experts its members can call upon for help and advice in drafting amendments and alternative legislation to administration programs.

If two-party government is to be as effective as possible, Senator CURTIS and his colleagues should be supported by the GOP leadership in their plea for reforms on committee staff appointments. Democrats should support some reasonable form of change, too. There is no guarantee that they will stay in control of both Houses of Congress forever.

The real work of Congress is done in the committees and not on the floor of the House and Senate. Congress does itself and the Nation a disservice when it hampers the minority party in effectively and responsibly discharging its opposition role.

Mr. Speaker, in addition I am including an article by Roscoe Drummond, which appeared in the Harrisburg Evening News of March 16, 1962.

The article follows:

[From the Harrisburg (Pa.) Evening News of Mar. 16, 1962]

GOP IN A BUCKET—SENATE STAFF LINEUP AS BAD AS THE HOUSE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

One of the reasons the Republican Party never has really bestirred itself to correct the onesided professional staffing of the congressional committees—in which the minority party representation ranges from puny to zero—is that most Republicans in Congress do not know the full facts. They do not realize how bad, how unfair, how crippling the situation is.

It has taken a long time to assemble the documented statistics showing the extreme imbalance between the majority and the minority of experts on the House committees. By the latest count, the proportion of experts on the House committees responsible to the Democratic Party compared to those responsible to the Republican Party is 14 to 1.

But what of the Senate? Is it any better? I suspect that if you telephone either of your Senators they won't be able to tell you. The facts are not readily available. Just the opposite. You can check with the Library of Congress, pore over the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or call a dozen different sources on the Hill—and the facts will not be forthcoming.

They have at last been collected. They show the imbalance in the professional staffing of the Senate committees is not one whit better than in the House. Committee by committee, here are the facts disclosing the size of the staff appointed by and responsible to the Republicans:

Senatorial committee	Majority staff	Minority staff
Aeronautics and Science	11	1
Agriculture and Forestry	6	1
Appropriations	33	3
Armed Services	25	1
Banking and Currency	17	3
Commerce	27	3
District of Columbia	7	1
Finance	5	1
Foreign Relations	28	0
Government Operations	44	4
Interior and Insular Affairs	17	1
Judiciary	146	11
Labor and Public Welfare	28	4
Post Office and Civil Service	10	1
Public Works	11	2
Rules and Administration	10	1
Small Business	18	0
Aging	19	1
Total	462	39

There you have it. The foregoing figures, which have been prepared with painstaking care of Senator CARL T. CURTIS, Republican, of Nebraska, and his staff, include the subcommittees as well as the full comittees.

Of the total staff professionals on Senate committees, 462 are appointed by and responsible to the Democratic Party, 39 appointed by and responsible to the Republican Party. Thus while the party balance in the Senate is 2 to 1, the imbalance on the committee staffing is 12 to 1, or 92 to 8 percent.

The immediate objective of Senator CURTIS is to get the leadership of his own party in the Senate to sit down with the ranking Republican members of the comittees to draw up a minimum bill of reform and then find out whether the Senate Democrats will deem it wise to continue to stand against

both party pressure and public pressure to corrcet this imbalance. Representative THOMAS CURTIS, of Missouri, Representative BRUCE ALGER, of Texas, and some others are also deeply concerned about the damage this is doing in the House. More Republicans are becoming dissatisfied and more Democrats are becoming aware that they cannot safely resist this reform indefinitely.

The power of Congress is largely exercised through its committees. Woodrow Wilson put it this way:

"Congress in session is Congress on public exhibition, whilst Congres in its committee rooms is Congress at work."

For the minority party not have fair professional staff representation on the congressional committees is eroding our two-party system. It keeps the minority from the means of doing its job.

And worse.

"If," says Senator WINSTON PROUTY, of Vermont, "the committee system—the backbone of our operations—is to have ribs (that is, adequate professional staff) on only one side, do we not abuse the greatest body in the world?"

One or two committees have sought to maintain a professional staff faithfully serving both parties. Little remains of this theory today, and it is increasingly clear that the minority party ought to have professional committee staffs appointed by it and responsible to it. It will be worth watching to see how long it takes to get this done.

Dancey on Freedom of the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles Dancey, editor of the Peoria Journal Star, recently returned from a meeting of the Sociedad's directors and committees in San Juan. The Sociedad is made up of some 700 editors and publishers from throughout the hemisphere.

Three editorials written by Mr. Dancey on the role of the press in the Americas follow the prefacing article; all of which appear in successive issues of the Peoria Journal Star.

I wish to include the article and editorials at this point:

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, Mar. 18, 1962]

JOURNAL STAR EDITOR JOINS FREEDOM OF PRESS FIGHT IN AMERICAS

The American hemisphere is part of the free world. But not all of its nations enjoy all of the freedoms common in the United States.

One inter-American organization is working hard to improve freedom in one field—freedom of the press.

That organization is the Sociedad Interamericana de Prensa—or Inter-American Press Association.

Charles L. Dancey, Journal Star editor, is just back from a meeting of the Sociedad's directors and committees in San Juan, P.R.

Dancey belongs to the Sociedad and is on its awards committee.

He is writing a series of articles about the Sociedad's work and some of the problems facing hemisphere nations. The articles will run in the Journal Star this week.

The Sociedad's role is unique, Dancey has found. It has more than the traditional press association intersts of production problems and improving the quality of news coverage.

"It's main business," Dancey says, "turns out to be fighting for freedom of the press, which is constantly being threatened in one country or another."

The Sociedad is almost a semiofficial body, in that it commands respect and attention from hemisphere governments.

At its annual convention in New York last October, the Sociedad considered the case of a Mexican newspaper which had been closed by the state government "for its own protection."

The Sociedad intervened directly with the head of the Mexican Government and by November the paper was back in operation.

Recently it investigated the case of an Argentine radio station which had been shut down by President Arturo Frondizi's supposedly liberal regime. The administration claimed a "legal technicality" was to blame. The Sociedad rejected this explanation and protested the closing. Today the station is back on the air.

Dancey said the Sociedad moves swiftly to prove reports of infringement on press freedom. It sends members directly to the scene to investigate.

The Sociedad's work is especially important now as the Latin American nations enter a cruical period of development, with the pressures of land reform, leftist agitation, and the need to make democratic government work.

"There are two big problems," he says. "Many of the governments don't understand the role of the press in a free society. And neither do some members of the press there."

The Sociedad has people in the Dominican Republic now, trying to help establish an independent and effective press there as that nation struggles to establish democratic rule after 30 years of Rafael Trujillo's dictatorship.

The Sociedad is useful to an American editor, Dancey feels, because it offers a sounding board for the sentiment of the Latin American nations.

The organization closely parallels that of the Organization of American States (OAS), both in representation and outlook. The OAS's changing attitude toward Fidel Castro and Cuba, climaxed by the diplomatic actions at Punta del Este, was paralleled—in fact, preceded—by a similar attitude among Sociedad members, Dancey says.

That the OAS itself considers the press group important and influential is attested by the fact that the OAS secretary general sat in on the Sociedad meeting Dancey attended.

About 10 years old, the Sociedad is made up of some 700 editors and publishers from throughout the hemisphere.

Dancey's articles will start tomorrow in the Journal Star.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, Mar. 19, 1962]

NEWSPAPERS GUARD FREEDOM THROUGH VAST ORGANIZATION

(By Charles L. Dancey)

A newspaper is ransacked by a "mob" led by prominent politicians and then occupied and held for months by "state police" in Mexico.

A radio station is shut down by Government action in Argentina.

A newsman is assassinated in Baja California.

The new government takes over the old Trujillo press in Santo Domingo—and then runs the newspapers by its own "trustees" instead of returning them to their original anti-Trujillo owners.

Fidel Castro takes over the press in Cuba and engineer similar grabs by various means in other countries.

Who does anything effective about these things?

Well, the Mexican newspaper is back on the street. The Argentine radio station is back on the air.

The confessed killers of the reporter in Baja, Calif., are finally in jail. The new Dominican Government has returned newspapers to proper owners and does not interfere with the opposition press—and has rushed into courts one case of confused ownership. And newspapers throughout Latin America have been given the details of Castro tactics and intentions for their protection in future attempts and maneuvers, contributing to Castro's condemnation by the countries of the Americas through the OAS.

In each of these cases, the action body which intervened directly was an association of newspapers bigger in its representation than the Organization of American States—which recently condemned Castro under Secretary Rusk's urging, and plays a major role in the alliance for progress for developing Latin America.

It is bigger, in that all Latin American, Central American, Caribbean, and North American countries have representation. This includes Canada which has never joined the regional OAS (organized under the United Nations) plus the British Commonwealth islands of the Indies—soon to become independent.

It is called the Sociedad Interamericana de Prensa (Inter-American press association) and one of its chief functions is direct intervention at the highest level of government to protest "aggression against the freedom of the press." Such protest is backed up by the reaction of hundreds of newspapers throughout the hemisphere. It has been remarkably effective.

All the cases noted above occurred in recent months and were reported or pursued at the recent meeting of officers in Puerto Rico.

Sometimes it takes longer.

When Alberto Gainza Paz, famous head of the famous La Prensa, Buenos Aires, was forced into exile by Dictator Peron, the Sociedad condemned Peron for such aggression—at a time when nobody as yet was condemning Peron (least of all the U.S. Government).

Years passed during which an alerted hemispheric press hammered home the truth about Juan Peron until he fell from favor with his neighboring countries, with his own people, and even with the U.S. Government, and was finally ousted.

Alberto Gainza Paz returned to direct his newspaper in a climate of free expression. He is a director of the Sociedad, today.

German E. (pronounced Hairmon) Ornes lost his newspaper El Caribe to Trujillo in 1953, and when the new government of Santo Domingo ousted the Trujillo clan they took over El Caribe and ran it themselves. They were in no hurry to give it back.

The Sociedad went directly to the Council of State, and El Caribe has just been restored to German Ornes and the council has made pledges of press freedom in the Dominican Republic.

I know of no newspaper association engaged in worthier work than this.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, Mar. 20, 1962]

PRESS OF HEMISPHERE FIRST TO HIT CASTRO

(By Charles L. Dancey)

The United States turned on Peron, turned on Batista, then on Trujillo rather late in

the game, and U.S. attacks on Castro have been blunted in the early stages as a result.

But the newspapers of the American nations, through the Sociedad Interamericana de Prensa, led the condemnation and the attacks on all these dictators throughout the Americas for their "aggression against press freedom."

Thus, when the Sociedad condemned Castro, the action had great meaning throughout Latin America. The action was neither pro-American nor anti-Communist as such. It was a completely positive action on behalf of freedom.

When 17 Yanks and 23 Latin Americans (plus a Canadian and Jamaican) met in San Juan, Puerto Rico, this month, Cuban refugees picketed the meeting place with huge signs, hand lettered, saying "Thank you" and other messages of encouragement to the Sociedad. As we met, they marched outside sing: "America, the Beautiful."

(Remember, that everywhere else, "America" means both North and South America, and we are all "Americans."

(Our Latin friends, and the Canadians for that matter, do not care to be excluded while we in the United States preempt exclusive claim to the title of "American." That is good and healthy. It can be a great symbol of unity.)

The Sociedad was the first international organization with such broad representation in Latin America to vote condemnation of Fidel Castro and his Cuban regime. It was not done capriciously.

The action came after careful documentation of Castro's repression of freedom of speech and press in Cuba and also documentation of his directives to partisans in other Latin American countries for assaults against the free press—both verbal and physical * * * as well as the building of "cadres" to take over a government propaganda press in the event of a Communist takeover.

The hesitancy against this action appeared in much the same places as it later appeared when Secretary of State Dean Rusk proposed such condemnation to the Organization of American States.

The charges and documentation, and the action of the Sociedad, were duly forwarded to the OAS—and their action was in fact followed by that organization.

At Puerto Rico, the board of the Sociedad while again acting isolated of aggression against freedom throughout the Americas, proclaimed Fidel Castro as "Enemy No. 1" of press freedom in the hemisphere, and agreed to keep all members informed of his latest tactics and maneuvers against the press of the hemisphere * * * so that all can be prepared to defend themselves effectively.

These past actions, and the great activity of the Sociedad right now in the Dominican Republic to restore a free press there are doubtless part of the reason why Jose Antonio Mora, secretary-general of the Organization of American States, asked to sit in on the session in Puerto Rico and for continued close cooperation between our press organization and that international body.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, Mar. 21, 1962]

DEVIOUS METHODS TO STRANGLE PRESS CONSTANTLY FOUGHT BY NEWS GUARDIAN

(By Charles L. Dancey)

Aside from the problem of outright suppression of a free press by a government, there are other means of attack. There is direct censorship, and there are more devious means of aggression against freedom.

The Sociedad Interamericana de Prensa, representing newspapers throughout the Americas, has had a great deal of experience with these many devices, is alert to them, and fights them consistently.

The sociedad is watching the situation in Mexico, for example, where the Government under sweeping economic controls has included control of newsprint. In effect, no Mexican newspaper can buy newsprint directly. They must buy it from the Government.

As yet, there is no direct evidence that this has been used either to silence or to browbeat opposition newspapers, but it is certainly a situation of "Heavy, heavy hangs over your head" which will affect the policies of the less courageous.

Mexico may pose another problem in the future as that Government is purchasing and operating more and more businesses. At the point the Mexican Government directly operates a majority of business in that country, newspapers simply will not have any independent source of income. Their income will be entirely dominated by the one great power—Government—and freedom of the press will quietly die on the vine.

The simple fact is that under broad socialist government, freedom of the press, like many other basic freedoms, is dead by default. There is no soil left in which it can grow. Too many of the natural requirements of genuine democracy have been forfeited.

The sociedad also has its weather eye on Bolivia where freedom of the press has already suffered severe blows from a leftist government, dominated by the big tin industry union. The Government operates the tin industry at massive losses, a breakdown in production, and in a disaster economy in spite of U.S. subsidies.

The sociedad has identified Jose Fellman Velarde, new Foreign Minister of Bolivia, as a former agent of Fidel Castro's propaganda instrument, the Prensa Latina * * * also believed to be the man who ordered the destruction of the newspaper Los Tiempos in Bolivia.

Castro methods of attacking the free press, demonstrated both by actual events and by documentary evidence spirited out of Cuban Government files by a Cuban diplomat who escaped, include verbal attacks on the honesty and reliability of newspapers generally. Castro's instructions are to pick them to pieces with criticisms large and small.

Another demonstrated Castro method has been to literally blackmail employees into seizure of the newspaper from the owners, physically (telling them it will otherwise be destroyed, and they'll be out of work). (Castro himself used this method, and other governments have imitated it.) After such seizure, the government then grabs the paper to administer the dispute and preserve order—and the government then runs the newspaper under an appointed manager as a government organ.

Some of the proposed policies of the U.S. Government, which might give any administration a stranglehold on the press of the country are also under constant scrutiny by the sociedad.

This organization is a powerful force for freedom in the Western Hemisphere, and not just in Latin America.

Canada's nationalistic policies in providing special taxes on outside publications containing advertising directed at Canadians is under heavy fire, and many Latin Americans regard Canada as especially nationalistic and arrogant.

In the sociedad, there is much more feeling and sensitivity about Canada and Canadian attitudes toward Latin America than about the United States.

"The Ugly Canadian" is more of an image by far.

Eradication of Foot and Mouth Disease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution approved and adopted by the Kansas Veterinary Medical Association on a subject of vital importance which I believe will be of interest to Members of Congress and others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE

"Whereas foot and mouth disease is one of the most highly infectious of all diseases of cloven-hoofed animals and we have been extremely fortunate in keeping our domestic livestock free of this most contagious and costly disease; and

"Whereas the President of the United States had a scientific mission investigate the present status of foot and mouth disease in Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay, and the Island of Tierra del Fuego with the possibility of reducing the restrictions placed upon animals and meats from these areas; and

"Whereas laws passed by the Congress of the United States and enforced by the Secretary of Agriculture are designed to prevent the introduction of foot and mouth disease from these countries; and

"Whereas foot and mouth disease has been introduced into the United States on nine different occasions, into Mexico at least once, and Canada once, and further, two of the outbreaks in the United States were fairly definitely traced to meats originating in South American countries; and

"Whereas the costs to this country of eradicating the Mexican and the United States outbreaks have run into many millions of dollars; and

"Whereas should the disease be introduced and become established due to unsuccessful attempts to eradicate it, this country would be burdened with one of the most costly and serious diseases known to man, as well as quarantines and embargoes invoked by other countries: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the Kansas Veterinary Medical Association requests the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture to continue to prohibit the importation of cloven-hoofed animals and fresh meats thereof from countries where foot and mouth disease or rinderpest exist and, further, that no portion of such country, such as the Island of Tierra del Fuego, be regarded as free from these diseases and that, further, the Secretary not permit any relaxation in the present requirements imposed on animals and meats from the countries referred to until it has been definitely proven beyond any doubt that there could be no hazard to the livestock of this country; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary of this association to the Secretary of Agriculture and to the congressional delegates of the State of Kansas."

This resolution was submitted by the disease control committee of the Kansas Veterinary Medical Association to the executive board of said association, in regular meeting in Wichita, Kans., on March 16, 1962, and approval and adoption of said resolution was

requested by the aforesaid committee. The resolution, as submitted, was approved and adopted by the executive board and it was ordered that the resolution should be entered into and become a part of the minutes of the aforementioned meeting and that the executive secretary of the Kansas Veterinary Medical Association submit said resolution to all necessary and proper authorities, same being hereby done on March 17, 1962.

JOHN D. KIRKLAND,
Executive Secretary, Kansas Veterinary Medical Association.

Tough for Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a timely editorial which appeared in the April 1962 issue of Successful Farming, published in Iowa. This magazine is one of the Nation's leading farm journals, and Dick Hansen, who wrote the editorial, is one of the leading farm editorial writers in the country:

TOUGH FOR FARMERS

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman and President John F. Kennedy propose to make things tough for farmers. They have asked Congress to give them the power to force farmers to decide between: (1) A tightly controlled and regimented agricultural economy where all farmers would get almost enough for a decent living if they bowed subserviently to Washington's orders; or (2) pulling the rug from under the agricultural economy, threatening to eliminate supports, and even help break the market by dumping the Government's holdings of wheat and feed grains.

This is hardly a happy choice. The alternatives need not be that brutal. Few farmers want either extreme.

Once we start on the road to controls of the kind envisioned by Freeman and Willard Cochrane, his economic adviser, we can't back out. Control one product in agriculture and farmers switch to something else. Then you have to control that "something else" until you've got everything nailed down. With agriculture hobbled and inefficient, surplus production can be reduced. But what a price to pay.

How about a choice somewhere in the middle? Look at it this way. Aside from occasional gluts of turkeys (brought on partly by the Secretary of Agriculture talking about quotas so turkey raisers start building a high base) and similar self-correcting maladjustments, the two biggest problems in surplus production are: Too much feed grains, and too much of some kinds of wheat. Why clobber the whole agricultural economy to solve two problems?

How can we solve these two surplus problems? I think one method would be to take whole farms out of production on a voluntary basis in the areas where surpluses are being created. This removes land, labor, capital, and management from surplus production—not just land as in the emergency feed-grain and wheat programs.

With overproduction brought into line, market prices will go up and we need rely less on supports. Dairy production and consumption were in balance when supports were at $3.06. Most grain prices were starting to move above support rates during some parts of the year at the end of the Benson era. Farm prices were ready to move up on a firm base of consumer demand.

Now, of course, the dairy adjustment has to be made all over again because supports were increased to $3.40. Production went up in logical response to the bid for more milk, and consumption went down in consumers' logical reaction to higher prices—further complicated by the cholesterol and radioactive scares.

To conclude: We don't need an omnipotent and ever-growing Government bureaucracy in agriculture. But we do need the Government's help in cutting back on our two chronic surplus problems. Let's add a third choice—this moderate program that helps agriculture adjust, but which leaves farmers free to produce lots of healthful food for the Nation at a profit and at prices that encourage consumers to eat high on the hog.

Kangaroo Trial Threatens Job Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, in January the Federal Government, at the request of the Governor of Washington State, intervened in the pollution problem that faces the pulp and paper industry of my district.

The concurrent action of the State and Federal Governments has in the opinion of many created a climate which will tend to keep prospective industries from situating in the State. This action came after a 2-day hearing, which Mr. Ross Cunningham in the March 18, 1962, issue of the Seattle Times points out has been termed a "kangaroo trial."

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include Mr. Cunningham's article in the RECORD and recommend it to all Members of Congress.

PLIGHT OF PULP INDUSTRY COULD RESTRICT STATE'S JOB GROWTH

(By Ross Cunningham)

Among the expected results from the Seattle World's Fair will be an increase in the State's population and perhaps an increase in employment opportunities. If we receive the population increase without a commensurate growth in employment opportunities, the State is likely to find itself in a peck of new troubles.

It is axiomatic that government costs increase at a multiple greater than the rate of population growth. So the more new people who settle in an area, the greater are the per capita tax rates they and longer time residents are obliged to pay. And if job opportunities do not open up commensurate with population growth, the taxation disparity is only one of the unpleasant results.

Thus, the efforts which have been carried out over a considerable period by such officials as Governor Rosellini and Mayor Clinton to attract new business and industrial enterprise become even more critical in the months ahead.

The critical nature of the need for growth in employment opportunities is cited here as a preface to a point that sometimes seems to be minimized by public officials in their quests for new industries.

If existing industries in the State are to be subjected to what they consider to be oppressive tactics by either State or local units of government, the situation is likely to be a deterrent to other forms of industry which may give consideration to locating here.

A prime example is the controversy between the pulp and associated-products industry, which is the State's fifth largest, with the State pollution control commission.

The controversy is volatile politically involving recreational groups as well as the oyster and other industries. It likewise is a highly technical controversy which does not lend itself to judgments by laymen.

Yet scientific technicians advising the State and the pulp industry differ, which certainly should have given the pollution commission pause until competent, disinterested scientists had determined who may be right or wrong before ordering the mills to make expenditures estimated at $75 million.

The outcome of the controversy is of immediate concern to tens of thousands of persons, employees of the mills and their communities such as Everett, Port Angeles, and Anacortes. These and other sections of the State heavily dependent upon the pulp industry will become deep pockets of depression if, as speculated upon in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Congressman JACK WESTLAND—the mills should become obliged to curtail operations or close down.

The responsibility of the pollution commission is entirely understandable. Who isn't against pollution? One can hardly believe that the pulp industry isn't interested in meeting the problem, especially since it has invested millions in solutions over a long period of time.

The industry, however, contends, and with affirmation from neutral sources, that the pollution commission abruptly altered the standards under which the industry was operating, and then followed up quickly with orders for compliance, and without a fair hearing.

The hearing on the question held recently in Olympia, with the Federal Government participating, properly has been called a kangaroo trial where minds of the officials concerned obviously were made up in advance.

A mandate to invest huge sums in equipment when scientists disagree over whether a useful purpose would be served would bring any industry, however large, to a point of decision on its future in the State. And this would be especially true at a time when the national administration is trying to broaden American markets to foreign competition.

One can assume that the bind applied to the pulp industry will not escape the attention of industrialists who may visit here during Century 21, perhaps to look over the possibilities of locating plants in the State.

Among the many and complex factors examined by location-seeking industries, the general political climate is one given consideration. An industry wants to know, in addition to how welcome it may be at the beginning, how it is likely to be treated over the long pull.

The best indicator on this is how existing industries in the State are being treated. The treatment of the pulp industry seems like waving a red stay-away flag.

The Changing Character of Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Constantine Brown

appeared in the Evening Star of March 24.

Mr. Brown brings something to our attention that has long troubled many, but apparently leaves the Congress quite calm.

The preservation of a nation's monuments and cities, with their own individuality, even when they are not especially esthetic or valuable, has a place of great importance in a country's history.

President Truman may be going a little far—he sometimes does—when he says that Washington is being turned into a city of cracker boxes and chicken coops. But maybe that is no worse than filling all our cities with imitations of the Seagram and Lever buildings on Park Avenue in New York City:

THE CHANGING CHARACTER OF CITIES

(By Constantine Brown)

ROME.—A recent item in the press quoted former President Harry Truman as exclaiming that Washington has turned into a city of cracker boxes and chicken coops. But Mr. Truman, like everybody else, takes the destruction of the character and beauty of our cities and towns like the weather—everybody talks but nobody does anything about it.

While American politicians, contractors and community planners are busy bulldozing our old architecture and replacing it with cracker boxes and chicken coops, the governments in Europe are doing the opposite and have been for many years.

In Rome, any building built before the 19th century becomes a historic monument and as such automatically falls under the supervision of the Commission of Arts. Neither ancient houses nor ancient trees are are expendable for the sake of expanding highways or erecting lucrative apartments and office buildings.

Should you live in a historic monument and desire to add a bathroom or repair a window or fireplace, you must go to the commission and it will make the plans to carry out your desires, select experienced workmen—and eventually get the work done. All you have to do is pay the bill.

Likewise, trees are spared. Not long ago a small plot of ground which contained an ancient and beautiful tree was used as the site for a two-story building for shops and a restaurant off the fashionable Via Veneto. Today passersby are astonished to see the tree trunk in the center of a store display window and above its spreading branches shade the restaurant's outdoor terrace.

Greatest hazard for buildings is "Roma Vecchia" (Old Rome), much of which is buried beneath new Rome. Many a builder has invested a great deal of money in excavating for a new building only to come upon buried homes, relics or streets 2,000 or more years old. When this happens all work must stop and the city takes over the property which it will eventually excavate.

Traffic congestion becomes worse each year in Rome, but no Roman would even contemplate the destruction of some of its ancient walls, which are in the way, in order to solve the problem.

The city of Paris recently announced its intention of restoring two great slum areas to their former grandeur and beauty. They are called Les Marrais (the marshes). These buildings, once the palaces of the nobles in the days of Henry IV and Louis XIII are now inhabited by the very poor, and are falling into decay. The Paris city fathers have decided to restore them. But the facades must be kept intact and the interiors are to be modernized, but in keeping with their period.

However, this work is not to begin until places are found for their present tenants to move with as little disruption to their lives as possible. The news pictures and stories published in Paris newspapers reminded this reporter of the once beautiful southeast section of Washington, much of which has become slums, though the architecture of the Federal houses remains beautiful. Thousands of colored families lived there peacefully, many of them having well established, small businesses in the area. But the buildings fell beneath bulldozers without consideration for where the families were to go and how they were to earn a living. After some 5 years, only a few blocks have been rebuilt with houses and apartment of no architectural distinction.

It is a wonder that modern-day architects do not devote more time to studying the ancients, not only for their art but for strong construction. Here in Rome a recent rainstorm overflowed the Tiber and a 30-year-old bridge crumbled. All traffic had to be diverted to a nearby ancient bridge which has stood since Caesar's time.

And, speaking of architecture, your reporter had come to the conclusion he disliked all new trends in buildings until he came to Rome. In the outer edges of the new Rome the modern apartment houses are neither monotonous nor ugly. And since every apartment has a balcony the building have many flowerboxes which in summer provide a riot of color.

The only place one sees the ugliness of modern squares is the once slum area which has become Olympic Village. Vast jerry-built apartments were erected quickly to house the Olympic athletes during the 1960 games. These remain, along with the stadium and its parking lots.

The new campaign to attract European tourists to the United States is getting no help from American builders—private or governmental. Tourists want to see the American character as it was when our early history was being made. Once visitors have seen our skyscrapers and our beautiful country from the Atlantic to the Pacific they have seen all. Our cities are becoming lookalikes.

Tourists who travel through Europe (Italy had 19 million last year) find so much to see that many make repeated trips. It is doubtful that this will be so with the European tourist to the United States. For half the price of crossing the Atlantic he can see the ancient cities of this continent, all of which have had special care in preserving their historic architecture.

The Internal Revenue Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to revise and extend my remarks this date, I enclose herewith true extracts from a constituent's letter.

I think it is of interest to the entire House that we are prescribing rules for small business favors on the one hand and perhaps limiting or destroying initiative through our tax gathering agencies and proclivities on the other. In big Government today it is not uncommon to hear reports to the people from SBA and other agencies boasting of the number of loans, investment companies, and small business assists, in certain areas or nationally on the one hand; and never once referring to the stifling oppression of incentive, risks and the free marketplace on the other by the tax gathers.

It occurs to me that the Congress should be concerned about what may happen when the machines and mechanical brains we recently voted for the IRS in Martinsburg, W. Va.; take over the functions of men and agents in the remote recesses of whose hearts we presume eventually to find some modicum of human kindness.

Again, I repeat, Mr. Speaker, the left hand should know what the right hand doeth, and if not centralized Government, is in fact, too big.

The letter follows:

DEAR "DOC": I have been away for the last 5 weeks, and during my time away the Internal Revenue people came in and have had several meetings with * * * in regard to our 1958, 1959, and 1960 tax years.

Back in 1958 and 1959 we spent 6 or 7 months in negotiations with the Internal Revenue people for the years 1955, 1956, and 1957, which cost us considerable money since we had to go in and reanalyze all tooling, all equipment, and all buildings. An examiner by the name of * * * examined the year's returns of 1955, 1956, and 1957. His superior out of * * * came down to * * * I don't know how many times—and met with us, along with our auditors and our legal department, and we established depreciation on all of the equipment and our buildings. We refiled for 1958, based upon the depreciation figures we had worked out with them, and we carried our 1959 and 1960 business on the same basis. Now, they are back in wanting to change the "whole ball of wax," disallowing certain expenses to the company and charging them to us as income; as well as some intercompany transactions whereby the taxes exceed 100 percent, if they are done on the basis that they now want to do them on.

Based on the discussions that * * * has had with * * *, who now is the examiner, he has now lost all interest in further development of the enterprise that I have been working in all of my life, and I can see my son and partner's point. He says it is his opinion that if we are to be treated this way because we are a closed corporation then we would be better off to cut our business down to where we would make a living that is in keeping with our needs and wishes, and let somebody else worry for what there is to be made out of it.

Of course, I feel strongly toward further development of the company, based upon the hope I have that some day some, if not all, of my four grandsons will follow in my footsteps, as well as my son's.

I do not know whether there is anything that can be done, and I am not asking you to try to help. I feel that it is a very touchy thing, but I did want you to know what the Internal Revenue Department of this district is doing to some of our young executives by crucifying them from time to time. It has been a constant battle ever since the Internal Revenue people started examining; and not 1 year has passed since we have had a tax law that my company, as well as myself, has not been examined, although I do know that there are many people whom I have heard remark that they had never been examined.

I believe you know that I have always been a straightforward man, done my part for my country and my community, have always been willing to give of my time and money, and have tried to live a life that is

beyond question as far as honesty is concerned; but they have attacked almost literally everything we have done. We have done this after seeking advice from our auditors and our legal advisers, as well as the Internal Revenue people themselves, and then they come in and change, or attempt to change, the whole setup. I believe you can understand our feelings.

Yours,

——— ———,
President.

Doctor Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, the enclosed editorial from the Washington Evening Star of March 2, 1962, emphasizes a program which really is essential at once.

Whether we have the Kerr-Mills Act or medical care under social security, neither will function unless there are sufficient doctors and technicians to provide the required medical care. If we are to have the needed doctors and technicians, then we must take measures to start educating them. It takes a long time for a doctor or dentist to complete his professional education. Even if we start at once, our present shortage of doctors and dentists cannot be remedied for at least 4 or 5 years.

In view of the long period of study required and the amount of money needed for graduate school expenses, I agree with the Star's editorial that this is one instance where loans to students would be not only justified but highly desirable.

The editorial follows:

DOCTOR SHORTAGE

One provision of the Kennedy health program which fully deserves action by Congress—and which, despite widespread support, has not received it—is the program of Federal grants to assist in the construction of new medical-school and dental-school facilities.

As the President pointed out in his recent health message to Congress, only six schools of medicine have opened in the last 10 years, and the number of graduates has risen over that period a scant 15 percent. One result, of course, has been a shortage of doctors. But even to maintain the present ratio of physicians and dentists to the total population, according to Mr. Kennedy, will require the graduation of 50 percent more doctors and 90 percent more dentists by 1970. And to accomplish this, he estimates, at least 20 additional medical schools and 20 new dental schools will need to be built.

These are formidable statistics, which augur serious trouble unless something in the nature of a crash program is begun soon to expand teaching facilities. His proposal for matching grants, paying for two-thirds of the cost of facilities in some instances and half in others, has the support of the American Medical Association, which opposes Federal action in virtually all other medical matters. This is an indication of the need.

Nor did President Kenndy exaggerate in stressing the need, as a corollary, for financial assistance to increase the supply of medical students. We believe he was wrong, however, in throwing cold water on loan programs as one of these forms of aid. Perhaps for those worthy students in extreme need, some kind of Federal scholarship program should be enacted. But the fact that many doctors may have incurred debts as large as $5,000 during their 4 years in medical school does not in our judgment justify the conclusion of the President that "obviously further loans and further debts are not the answer." Indeed, the commendable new student-loan program initiated by the AMA, under which doctors would be able to repay the debt after they enter practice, is the sort of approach which offers a great deal of promise, and which deserves, along with other forms of aid, to be encouraged.

Bold and Positive Leadership Is Only Way To Halt Communist Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, as a substitute for bold and positive leadership we are being urged by the administration spokesmen to engage in endless negotiation with the Communists, to prolong peace talks, to debate in the United Nations, and all the while ignoring the constant aggression of the Reds and their stooges around the world. In the following editorial from the U.S. News & World Report, David Lawrence clearly points out the danger of such a fallacious theory. He might have gone one step further and pointed out this same fallacious theory applies to our support of the United Nations when it is almost in the complete control of the Soviet Union and those willing to sacrifice all principle to curry favor with the Communist leaders. If continued talk with the Soviet Union without any attempt to halt the imperialist aggression in which that country engages in a fallacious theory, so is continued membership by the United States in the United Nations where sovereignty is jeopardized on the false premise that it is in the interest of peace to "talk to let off steam." There is only one answer for victory for the free world and that is bold and positive leadership to halt Communist aggression everywhere in the world.

The editorial follows:

IGNORING AGGRESSION

(By David Lawrence)

"Negotiation" with the Soviet Union on disarmament is today an exercise in futility.

We have placed our reliance on a fallacious theory that talk plus talk always equals agreement.

It is we who have broadcast the idea that talk is a necessary alternative to war—as if mere talk prevents war—even as the enemy continues deliberately to harass us in Berlin.

Again and again in international crises the aggressor has had a big advantage. He bullies and threatens, and—if he has a wobbly adversary, as in 1939—the end result can be the war that nobody wants.

What is disconcerting at this time is the American Government's position of seeming helplessness in any negotiations with the Soviets.

But are we without instruments of pressure or leverage? We need a leadership strategy which can checkmate the Communists. It must be based on our willingness to speak the plain truth to the Soviet people—to tell them why they are in grave danger of destruction by their own government. It must be derived from our economic power, which we must unhesitatingly announce that we will use if necessary.

It is disheartening to learn from congressional hearings about how the State Department "muzzles" our military men and cautions them not to offend the Soviets by making public speeches about the dangers of communism. What a philosophy of despair.

It is even more disheartening to discover that the voice of our country—in everyday messages to the Russian people over the radio—is a mixture of timidity and self-imposed restraint. Too often the language of polite diplomacy is being used rather than the forceful words which should be addressed directly and without fear to the people behind the Iron Curtain. We claim to be firm, but we seem to be afraid to articulate our firmness directly to the Communists.

We are not being realistic. We are not using two powerful weapons—first, appeals in unequivocal terms to the Russian people and, second, an economic quarantine of the Soviet bloc.

But, it is said, all this is risky. Yet we seem to be willing to risk even military war in far-off South Vietnam. We have announced that we will try to keep the Communists in check in that area. Why do we fail then to come to the rescue of the starving millions in Cuba—only 90 miles away—who are being oppressed by the Communist established regime in Havana?

It doubtless will be argued that in South Vietnam our military forces are present by invitation of the existing Government. But we have justifiable reasons, too, for intervening in Cuba—the Monroe Doctrine and the basic principles of international law.

Although we have military forces in and around Berlin, our rights there are being constantly jeopardized. Have the Soviets been clearly warned that we shall resist, not with more talk but with military force, any violations of our rights in the air corridors between Berlin and West Germany?

Our excessive caution is the result of nuclear blackmail. We have allowed ourselves to be propagandized into an obsession about the alleged dangers of nuclear tests. Under the spell of the nuclear scare, we permitted a wall to be constructed on the ground through the city of Berlin. Shall we now permit an air wall to keep us out of the overhead routes to and from Berlin?

What do the current negotiations really mean? Obviously we do not intend to destroy a stockpile of nuclear weapons, and neither do the Soviets. The talk is constantly about arms reduction or limitation. But we know—and the Soviets know—that no mutual trust exists between us today on which any really effective armament agreement can be based.

We know also that nuclear war is out of the question for either side.

We must, therefore, use conventional leverage. We must advise the Soviets that we cannot tolerate their actual aggressions. Since they are unwilling to permit international inspection and to accept a foolproof system of detection so that surprise attack can really be avoided, there is no alternative for us but to adopt a policy of self-protection. This an economic quarantine alone can give us.

Have we made any plans for an economic blockade of the Communist nations? Have we notified the Soviet Government that we

intend to cut off all intercourse with the Soviet bloc if there is any further manifestation of hostility toward us? The United States cannot continue to be entangled in the stratagems of the Communists—the multiplicity of conferences and proposals that are so fruitless in the big debate on "disarmament."

Unless we take steps to use the leverage we possess, we cannot expect the enemy to "listen to reason." Unhappily, we give the impression today that we are without any leverage. Such an impression ought to be immediately removed. We cannot any longer ignore aggression.

Naked Federal Power Being Exerted on Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial that appeared in the Columbus Dispatch, Sunday March 25, 1962.

Congressman CLARENCE BROWN, the dean of the Ohio Republican delegation brought this subject to the floor of the House on Thursday, March 22, 1962:

NAKED FEDERAL POWER BEING EXERTED ON OHIO

In an effort to override Ohio law and force the Board of Review of the Ohio Bureau of Unemployment Compensation to follow a procedure dictated by the U.S. Department of Labor, contrary to Ohio law, the Federal Government is threatening to withhold $17 million in essential administrative funds necessary to operate unemployment compensation in Ohio after March 31.

The $17 million due Ohio from the Federal Government has been paid to the Federal Government by Ohio employers and belongs here.

If the money is not paid, the payment of unemployment benefits to men and women out of work in Ohio will come to a standstill.

The point at issue is a couple of rules governing hearings before the Ohio Board of Review. The Ohio law on the subject is specific. The Franklin County court of common pleas, which has jurisdiction in interpreting the law in such matters, has held that the Ohio law must be followed. The Labor Department nevertheless is insisting on having its way, the Ohio law notwithstanding.

Representative SAMUEL L. DEVINE, of Columbus, has stated the basic issue succinctly. He said: "This is a living monument to the myth that Federal money does not bring Federal control."

We might append the footnote that the "Federal money," like all "Federal money," comes from the people—in this instance it is money paid into the Federal Government by Ohio employers.

When the dispute on hearing rules, which has been running for several months, was decided in common pleas court last October, Judge Robert M. Draper, upholding the stand of the Ohio Board of Review, commented as follows in his written decision:

"No branch of Government has a right to force its will on another sovereign branch of the Government by the threat of withholding funds which rightfully belong to that branch for public purpose.

"Once we have started subrogating law to political or financial pressure, we have entered the realm of chaos from which there is no return, but complete annihilation of our way of life. In America no person and no organization is above the law."

On the question of Ohio law governing hearings before the board of review, Judge Draper said:

"This court cannot see that the statutes of Ohio deprive any party of any rights, or that they need to be changed to make them function more easily.

"Government only survives when all the branches thereof mutually respect and recognize the sphere of all other branches and does not try to dominate, or control them."

In Congress last week, Representative CLARENCE J. BROWN of Ohio stated that the U.S. Labor Department has refused to wait until the Ohio General Assembly meets to consider a possible change in the Ohio law before shutting off its distribution of the $17 million due Ohio.

When asked why he thought Ohio was being pressured by the Federal Government, Representative BROWN said: "Probably when you get to the bottom of this you will find some two-bit bureaucrat behind it."

Yes, "two-bit bureaucrats" too often make decisions affecting the lives and welfare of people in all walks of life in the United States.

But isn't that the underlying trend being vigorously advanced by the present administration? The trend has been in evidence for a number of years during several administrations, but never has it been pushed as it is being pushed today.

The President has proposed a centralization of urban affairs in a department in Washington which would be able to exert on the cities just the sort of influence the Labor Department in the present instance is attempting to use on the government of the State of Ohio. Congress has squelched the proposed department of public affairs for the time being.

The Federal bureaucracy is pushing for Federal aid to education on various levels, including the public schools. While it denies that this would mean Federal control of education, it is obvious that local education could be controlled through the giving or withholding of Federal funds in just such a manner as it gives or withholds in the matter of unemployment compensation.

Federal bureaucracy involves the power to punish. That power is now being wielded as a club over the heads of Ohio in the unemployment compensation matter.

If the Labor Department goes ahead with its plans, States rights in Ohio will be defied and thousands of persons entitled to unemployment benefits will have to go without the benefit checks which are due them in the weeks and months ahead. Never was naked desire to wield Federal power more plainly exposed.

Medical Care Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the administration has launched a new propaganda drive on behalf of its medical care proposal under social security. One newspaper in southwest Missouri has aptly referred to this scheme as political medicine rather than health medicine. Under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I call to the attention of the Members of the House the following editorial which appeared in the March 13 issue of the Joplin Globe:

MEDICAL CARE POLITICS

By the admission of partisan leaders themselves, according to published reports from Washington, the medical aid issue is rated as the top political issue at home in this election year. This tends to confirm the charge by the American Medical Association that what the administration is after is "political medicine" rather than health medicine.

If true, this is a disgraceful situation. What should medical care for the old, the young or anyone else who is ill have to do with partisan politics? The problem, whatever its scope, ought to be met realistically solely on the basis of need, and not on the basis of political demagoguery and expediency or emotional appeal.

In all of the mountains of publicity that have come out on the controversial issue, we haven't seen anything authentic to pinpoint actual need. We do know that there are some 18 million persons in the United States over 65, and that around 15 million of them are eligible for social security benefits. Health insurance companies tell us the majority carry their own private health insurance, and of course many people past 65 are financially able to meet their own medical requirements.

Nothing we have seen tells us how many elderly people there are in need of medical care who are unable to pay for it. There are many, no doubt about it. On the other hand, all States and most counties and cities have some medical care programs for the indigent, however inadequate. We know also that one-half of the States thus far have elected to come under the Kerr-Mills medical care plan enacted by Congress in 1960, which undertakes to tackle the problem on the basis of need, with Federal aid up to 80 percent administered through the States.

Yet, in the face of all of this, and apparently without knowing what percentage of the elderly actually need help, the Kennedy administration proposes to blanket the Nation under a federalized health care program for the elderly through social security.

This opens a new field of welfare taxation. And, based on past experience, it will be only a starter. Succeeding Congresses will again "broaden the base" of medical coverage, with higher and higher social security taxes on everyone who earns. This tax already is scheduled to reach almost 10 percent of payrolls before the end of this decade.

How much will the traffic bear? A recent Social Security Administration bulletin said the cost of public welfare at all levels of Government increased from $34.79 per capita in 1928–29 to $284.53 per capita in 1959–60. Is this new venture into public medical care really the way the American people want the problem solved? Either way, you had better tell your Congressman because the political pressure is on.

Kentucky Sets Up State Arts Council and a State Theater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Commonwealth of Kentucky deserves great credit for its en-

lightened attitude toward the arts. This attitude has been amply demonstrated in the past by the wonderful support given by the people of Kentucky—both as private citizens and through their State and local governments—to the great Louisville symphony orchestra, and it has been dramatically reaffirmed recently by the creation there of a State theater and a State council of performing arts. I am pleased to offer for the RECORD an article from the March 16, 1962, issue of Back Stage describing the functions of the Kentucky council and State theater more fully. I am also pleased to note that the attitude of the people of Kentucky has been faithfully reflected by their Representatives in Congress, who, almost without exception, have gone on record as favoring the creation of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts. Kentucky is rightfully proud of its cultural heritage and has taken steps to preserve and enhance it. It seems to me that we, acting in the interests of all Americans, should do no less to preserve our national heritage. The creation of a Federal Advisory Council would be a historic step in this direction.

The article follows:

KENTUCKY SETS UP STATE ARTS COUNCIL AND A STATE THEATER

The Kentucky Council of Performing Arts, formed to help local communities produce centennial dramas, pageants, and festivals, was given official status last week by executive order of Gov. Bert Combs.

The council, which will be headquartered at the Pioneer Playhouse, Danville, Ky., plans to promote productions in Kentucky and to strive for full recognition of Kentucky artists, said Eben Henson, of Danville, president of the organization.

"The Council of Performing Arts will advise on the future production of all plays or pageants designed to publicize the State and will act as a clearinghouse and information bureau for local groups," Henson said. The council will keep a file of writers, composers, directors, and actors who might be available to work on productions.

Other members of the council are John Jacob Niles, Lexington ballad singer and writer; Miss Jean Thomas, of the Ashland Folk Festival; John Lair, a writer for the Renfro Valley stage show; John Cauble, Bardstown, business manager for "The Stephen Foster Story"; Preston Slusher, Pineville, producer of "The Book of Job"; Joe Creason, Louisville, writer; and Paul Hadley, Frankfort, director of the Arts and Crafts Division of the Kentucky Department of Economic Development.

Henson, producer of Pioneer Playhouse in Danville, told Back Stage, "Our purpose is to provide counsel to Kentucky groups planning commemorative pageants, festivals, celebrations, and other theatrical attractions. We will bring the producers of existing performances together for mutual sharing of ideas, talent, and promotional opportunity and provide access to the Kentucky talent reservoir which may be unknown to those civic leaders who provide the leadership for such events.

"We hope to attract more Kentuckians into the performing arts and attract adequate public support for the recognition and continued support of drama in our local communities."

Governor Combs issued the following proclamation on the council:

"In an effort to provide the best available Kentucky talent to the communities of Kentucky wishing to receive aid in the creation and production of various forms of dramatic entertainment, I hereby designate the Kentucky Council of Performing Arts, Danville, Ky., as a Commonwealth agency directly concerned with the creation and performance of dramatic productions, festivals, centennials, expositions, and similar entertainment activities.

"Inquiries from within and without the Commonwealth relating to such activities should be directed to this agency."

A separate bill was signed by the Governor for a revolving fund of $240,000 to promote the arts and crafts of Kentucky and to aid the tourist industry of the State. Some of the funds will probably be allotted to the theater.

LEGISLATURE APPROVES KENTUCKY STATE THEATER

An act establishing a State theater of Kentucky was approved in both houses of the legislature. The Kentucky senate approved it 27 to 0 on March 2 and the house passed it 83 to 0 on March 12. The bill read:

"Whereas the Pioneer School of Drama, Inc., known as the Pioneer Playhouse, is a nonprofit, educational school of drama located at Danville, Ky.; and

"Whereas the Pioneer Playhouse has devoted itself to advancing a statewide interest in the dramatic arts; and

"Whereas the Pioneer Playhouse has presented dramatic productions in the various State parks without compensation and sometimes at a loss; and

"Whereas the Commonwealth of Kentucky has benefited from the services of the Pioneer Playhouse because the growth of drama has helped to increase and promote tourist trade;

"Therefore be it enacted by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

"SECTION 1. The Pioneer School of Drama, Inc., known as the Pioneer Playhouse throughout the whole of these United States, is hereby designated and declared to be the State Theater of Kentucky. The State theater, so designated and declared, may be engaged to present public plays and performances at any and all of the State parks throughout the Commonwealth, may create and present public plays and performances throughout the Commonwealth, and may meet with regional groups to help develop ideas in drama, pageants, and centennials, help in tourist promotion, create a playwright's center and art colony, and offer accreditation of college credits through the State colleges and university, upon and with the approval of the State department of education.

"SEC. 2. (1) The State theater may charge tuition for attending the school of drama and may charge the public admission for attending the plays and performances, and this shall be the primary income of the State theater.

"(2) The commissioner of parks is authorized to enter into such contracts and make such guarantees to the State theater for the presentment of their plays in State parks as shall be approved by the department of finance.

"(3) The income so received shall be used by the State theater to meet the cost of expenses of the productions and the operation of the school, the depreciation or replacement of equipment, and reasonable compensation to the officers and employees of the State theater.

"SEC. 3. The commissioner of parks is authorized to accept gifts, donations, bequests, and scholarships for the use and benefit of the State theater.

"SEC. 4. Nothing in this act shall be construed as prohibiting the State theater from:

"(1) Receiving gifts, donations, bequests, and scholarships directly from a benefactor;

"(2) Receiving a direct appropriation from the general assembly; or

"(3) Presenting public plays and performances at places other than the various State parks."

Calling a Halt on March Toward Policed Farming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Paul Johnson, of the Prairie Farmer magazine, has come up with a pretty objective appraisal of the administration's latest farm proposal. Since many Members may not be aware of the threat legislation of this type poses to the farmer as the master of his own business, under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Johnson's statement in the RECORD. The statement follows:

PROPOSED LAWS NO ANSWER TO OUR FARM DILEMMA

(By Paul C. Johnson)

I've been studying the new administration-backed farm bills which have appeared in Congress as COOLEY's H.R. 10010 and ELLENDER's S. 2786. I think it's time to call a halt on this march toward policed farming. Prairie Farmer has tried to be helpful to the administration efforts to deal with farm problems. We have explained the feed grain law and given encouragement to the principle of crop adjustment embodied in this law. At the same time, we have been frank in saying that this program can't go on indefinitely.

But the proposed laws are not the answer. They have about them the smell of coercion. They propose to apply compulsory quotas to dairy products, feed grains, and other products. These quotas are backed with confiscation of property, fines, and jail sentences. Yes, there's provision to vote, but the vote is limited to certain producers and the choices offered the voter are both bad. There's provision in the law to dump Government surplus if the voters make the wrong choice. There's only a pitiful 25 acres of escape at the bottom for farmers with small acreages.

If these proposals become law we may be past the point of no return. They had better be killed now. So unlimber your pencils and tell your Congressmen and Senators what you think.

Farming has its problems, but they are not so desperate that we should prescribe this kind of medicine. It has been said that we must do something to cut the cost. I agree. It is also said that we have tried everything and nothing has worked. I do not agree.

Here are things we haven't done. We haven't inaugurated serious, forward-looking programs to get poor lands out of farming into forest, water conservation and recreational areas, with all levels of government as well as individuals participating.

We haven't really done a job of cropland adjustment. We abandoned the soil bank conservation reserve just as we were learning how to use it by putting retired acres on a bid basis. We never did get around to limiting supports to a base portion of the crop and letting the big farmers go on their own beyond this base.

We haven't exhausted the possibilities of moving food abroad to hungry peoples. Nor have we done anything about concentrating the high-quality foods such as dairy and meat products and putting them away to be used only in event of atomic attack.

We haven't gotten it through our heads that if we expect Government supports at profit levels we are asking for complete Government management. If profitable farming

is guaranteed, capital and people will rush in to swamp us. The only workable supports are those kept below average market levels and which function only in cutting the very lowest dips off the price cycle.

I am still confident that if we do some of these things and do them properly we can save money on farm programing and we can keep surpluses in check until the demand from an increasing population will come into reasonable balance with supply.

Kennedy Breaks His Pledge on Appointment of Judges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Harrisburg Evening News points up a situation which has been a source of sadness and worry to many during the past 14 months.

KENNEDY BREAKS HIS PLEDGE ON APPOINTMENT OF JUDGES

When President Kennedy moved into the White House a year ago last January, our Federal court system was just about even up in the political affiliation of its judges.

This had come to pass in the wake of a lineup of politically onesided appointments by President Eisenhower. In his 8 years in office, Mr. Eisenhower appointed 175 Republicans and 11 Democrats to the lifetime tenure Federal judiciary. As lopsided as this was, it still left the Federal judiciary in reasonable political parity. After all, Mr. Eisenhower was the first Republican President in 20 years. Democrat Harry S. Truman before him had named 118 Democrats and 12 Republicans, and Democrat Franklin Delano Roosevelt had appointed 217 Democrats and only 8 Republicans.

Mr. Eisenhower, Mr. Truman, and Mr. Roosevelt, it can be clearly seen, gave only lipservice to the principle that justice must not be tinged with partisan politics. All of them used the lush Federal judgeships for political patronage.

At least, it must be noted in passing, Mr. Eisenhower publicly offered to divide newly created Federal judgeships (73 of them finally came to pass for Mr. Kennedy) among the two major parties, thus maintaining the political balance then prevailing.

As a candidate, Mr. Kennedy took sharp note of the traditional practice of political appointments in one of his more elevated campaign speeches. He pledged to do much better. A judge should be beholden to no one, he said, and political considerations should not be determining. He pledged to name only those "of unquestioned ability—the best men available."

At long last, President Kennedy has named a Republican to the Federal bench, Indiana Judge Jesse E. Eschbach. Earlier, he resubmitted the names of three Republicans, serving on recess appointments of President Eisenhower, and he named one New York City liberal. This is out of a total of 92 appointments submitted to the Senate to date by the President.

That eloquent pledge for nonpartisanship and appointment of only "the best man available" has a mightly hollow ring as it echoes down the months since the 1960 campaign.

Worse than this Kennedy emphasis on political patronage, 7 of his 92 appointees have been called not qualified by the American Bar Association, and an additional 23 are right on the borderline of a "qualified" rating. "The best man available"—indeed.

The President's record on Pennsylvania appointees is solidly party line. He has named seven Democrats to these lifetime Federal judgeships in Pennsylvania districts, one of whom (Louis Rosenberg of Pittsburgh) is awaiting Senate confirmation. It has been reported that when the Justice Department put forward the name of a Pennsylvania Republican for one of the vacancies, State Democratic organization leaders went through the ceiling, and the White House was bluntly informed that Kennedy didn't get a Democratic majority in this Commonwealth to make it possible for him to give Republicans lifetime jobs.

Three vacancies remain to be filled in Pennsylvania among 39 overall.

The Deputy Attorney General, Byron R. (Whizzer) White, conceded recently to the American Bar Association that selection of Federal judges in the Kennedy administration remains "a political process in the best sense of the word."

That isn't what Candidate Kennedy said it should be. That isn't what he pledged to do. If he ever says anything more on this score, the least President Kennedy can do is concede his partisan approach to the Federal court vacancies. To pretend that it is anything else would be unadulterated hypocrisy.

Treasury Foreign Tax Proposals Hurt America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR A. KNOX

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, one aspect of the Treasury Department's tax recommendations contained in H.R. 10650 which has not received adequate attention is the fact that by depriving U.S. industry of the opportunity to function effectively in world commerce we are enhancing the demand for increased U.S. foreign aid on a government to government basis.

The foreign income provisions of H.R. 10650 would impose a significantly greater tax burden on American industry operating overseas. This tax burden would weaken the competitive position of our private enterprise system, would detract from the growth opportunities available to American companies engaging in world commerce, and would aid and abet the efforts of the Communist international movement to expand its world activities. These dangers and undesirable consequences were pointed out in the minority views filed in the committee report on the Revenue Act of 1962 and were further developed in the additional views of my committee colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, THOMAS B. CURTIS.

Mr. Speaker, as we apparently approach the time for House debate on this revenue measure, it is important that the membership of the House be knowledgeable and informed on all the relevant factors so that we act in a way that will contribute to the strengthening of our Nation and that will further the well-being of our citizens.

I am impressed with the fact that the foreign income proposals contained in H.R. 10650 would not serve to strengthen our Nation and would not contribute to the well-being of our citizens. I am convinced that the foreign income provisions of this legislation would so damage the American position in world commerce that we would find our export markets contracting and our international prestige dwindling. These undesirable consequences would occur at increased cost to our American taxpayers. To the extent that the oversea endeavors of our free enterprise system are thwarted, we will encounter the demand for increased foreign aid channeled through our Federal Government and paid to other governments. Experience in international relations has demonstrated that government-to-government aid is neither as efficient nor as effective as so-called people-to-people aid that is possible through the commercial undertakings of private enterprise operation in world markets.

The importance of encouraging rather than hindering the international endeavors of our private enterprise system is referred to in an article in the Wall Street Journal for March 22 captioned "Latin Aid Alternative," by Mr. Joseph E. Evans. The writer points out in his article how the Communists and the free world countries are increasing their Latin American activities in competition with U.S. endeavors in these areas. The developments alluded to in this Wall Street Journal article are cause for genuine concern and suggest the lack of wisdom for going forward with any tax measures which would make it more difficult for American business to contribute to the fulfillment of our Nation's international commitments and obligations.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I will include the article from the Wall Street Journal to which I have referred:

LATIN AID ALTERNATIVE

(By Joseph E. Evans)

CARACAS, VENEZUELA.—Could U.S. aid under the alliance-for-progress program for Latin America be made more effective?

The answer, in the opinion of at least some businessmen in South America and even some U.S. officials, is clearly "yes." They do not argue that there should be no aid; if the United States has responsibilities in the world and faces Communist dangers, it can find plenty of them right here on this continent, which has so far received but a fraction of the scores of billions the U.S. Government has dispensed in more distant places. And perhaps the heavy injections now planned for a country like Bolivia through the 10-year, $20 billion alliance, for which the U.S. taxpayer is to foot a large part of the bill, will bring a degree of economic betterment.

The argument, rather, is that the type of aid may not be best suited for attaining

U.S. objectives. Too much of it is government-to-government aid, such as for state enterprises in Bolivia. This has the political disadvantage of tying us to a particular government rather than to the people of the country. It also has the disadvantage, both economic and political, of not fostering a vigorous growth of local private enterprise. If that is not done, whence can come genuine economic development and sound political institutions?

The defense of government-to-government aid goes something like this: It is idle to suppose that the nationalized Bolivian tin mines, for instance, are going to be returned to private hands; yet they plainly need help in that nation's economic interest. Similarly, Bolivia desperately needs more roads; if they are going to be built, the Government will have to build them with our help.

SOME AID FOR FIRMS

Moreover, it's noted that the private "sector" is not entirely neglected. Shaping up in Bolivia is a new industrial development bank, with aid from the Development Loan Fund; it would make loans to private firms. Help is also planned for the smaller Bolivian mines that are still privately owned.

Still, these efforts are modest compared to the bulk of government-to-government aid. And some people voice the suspicion that an important reason for the emphasis on the latter is simply that it is easier for our Government to deal with other governments, rather than undertake the difficult and complex business of getting aid to people. How, in fact, could this be done?

A pretty good model can be seen in something an American private enterprise is doing on its own here in Venezuela. Creole Petroleum Corp. last year set up a company called Creole Investment Corp. for the specific purpose of expanding Venezuelan private enterprise and so creating new jobs and building real economic growth.

Stressing manufacturing and agriculture, Creole Investment buys a percentage of the capital stock of an existing firm that wants to expand or do new things, or buys stock to help form a new company. In each case it limits its investment to less than 50 percent of the stock, so that the company will be Venezuelan controlled.

Requests have come from each State in Venezuela. Among the projects approved are a 45-percent interest in a company that makes starch from yucca; a 40 percent interest in a factory to produce cotton yarn to sell to textile mills; an investment to help launch a small candymaking plant; an interest in a truck farm high in the Andes.

With the U.S. Government committed to spend a great deal of money on the alliance for progress, it may be asked why it could not also do this sort of thing in Latin America—either on its own or by encouraging and aiding U.S. investors to do it.

POLITICAL BYPRODUCT

There is a political byproduct of this type of investment, or so it strikes this observer anyway. Many Venezuelans don't understand that U.S. investment has largely put the country on the map and made it in some respects the most advanced nation on the continent, though the economy is in a state of semistagnation at the moment. Instead they see the numerous U.S. company names and perhaps wonder if Venezuela is, after all, a U.S. economic colony, as the Communists endlessly say it is.

But in the case of Creole-type investment, the new or expanded enterprise is plainly Venezuelan, and there is much less danger of seeming to flaunt U.S. industrial riches or economic "domination." And if the investments are sound, everybody gains.

In any event, if we are to talk seriously of progress in South America, and especially of thwarting the Communist drive, it would seem there should be more cooperation between the U.S. Government and the U.S. investing and trading communities. Without for a moment forgetting profits, businesses have to realize that, whether they want it or not, they are deeply involved in U.S. political purposes in these places. The Government, for its part, could do more to enlist the vast resources of business for those purposes.

As it is, it sometimes looks as though Government and business were entirely separate entities pursuing their separate ways; yet each is vitally interested in building up these countries. Obviously the Government cannot and should not try to tell businesses where to invest or trade. But in the absence of greater cooperation, the United States can get into some rather unpromising situations.

In the case of Bolivia, for example, the U.S. Government itself is not completely coordinated. According to people in La Paz, the Government's Export-Import Bank is reluctant to make loans in Bolivia, even while the Government's aid managers are stepping up the U.S. help as rapidly as they can to around $40 million a year.

Meantime U.S. trade in Bolivia is running into stiff competition. The Czech Communists, for example, are mounting trade drives, selling Skoda trucks among other things and using the money to promote communism in Bolivia. An economically more serious challenge comes from our friends and allies, the Japanese and West Germans. All these traders offer credits, which many U.S. companies prefer not to do in Bolivia. In the view of some experts, U.S. trade is heading for a sharp decline.

Just what the answer is would be hard to say. But there seems something basically wrong with the picture of the U.S. Government spending all these millions, and yet not doing a great deal more to promote the U.S. investment and trade and the local private enterprise which are the very pillars of any future progress.

Nor is the general business area the only one in which aid could be applied privately. There are all kinds of private activities in these parts, some of them small in scope, which might produce a better return on our money than huge donations to governments.

Talk to Manuel Galdo, administrative manager of Gustavo Vollmer's Central El Palmar, a fine modern sugar refinery between Caracas and Maracay; he will tell you about the Fe y algria (faith and joy) movement. Organized in 1955 by businessmen and educators, it is designed to bring education to children, youths and adults of the neediest groups of Venezuela. It is already giving free education to 10,000 children who would otherwise get none. And you may be sure those children will not be ready subjects for Communist agents if and when they get to the Red-infiltrated university.

Then there is the Anglo-American School in the Bolivian mining town of Oruro. Started privately 21 years ago, it now exists on tuition, donations and a subsidy from the U.S. Government through the Inter-American School Services. The school has an American director and 3 American teachers on the faculty of 42, teaching a total of 920 kindergarten, primary and secondary grade children.

Why aren't there more such schools in Latin America? That is to say, schools which understand the necessity of instilling the ideals and practices of Western civilization and the free society.

And if one is thinking in terms of getting things moving in South America, especially moving against communism, it is impossible to overlook the Catholic Church, in an area overwhelmingly Catholic, although there are many fine Protestant institutions as well. Catholic missionaries, to take one aspect, unquestionably do many useful things besides the actual shepherding of souls.

The Maryknollers in Bolivia, for example, have set up a credit union and producers cooperative to handle brazil nuts in the jungles of the Beni region. Along with it are coming schools and a hospital, all adding up to a marked material improvement for a semisavage people. Individual priests have also taken the initiative in organizing other co-ops.

Such Catholic groups are also bringing education to the illiterate. The Maryknollers have radio classes for the Indians on Bolivia's 12,000-foot-high Altiplano; they loan the Indians battery-powered radios to receive the instructions. The Indians are taught to speak Spanish, which most of them do not know though it is the official language of their country; in addition, they learn reading, writing, arithmetic, religion, and things they need in making a living, like the use of fertilizer.

A PRIVATE PEACE CORPS

The Beni cooperative did receive a small point 4 loan, but generally the U.S. Government is somewhat chary of channeling aid through such religious groups, and some groups are not eager to have Government aid. All this may be because of assumed political touchiness in the United States. But looking at the matter coldly and realistically, it doesn't seem altogether sensible to fail to employ fully the resources of catholicism, any more than of business, in the fight against communism. In the view of some, we should use all available weapons.

For still another kind of private activity, there is ACCION, which started in Venezuela last September. Supported by private U.S. and Venezuelan firms and individuals, it might be called a private Peace Corps. It consists of a group of young American men and women who have volunteered to work in 20 community development projects; the hope is to try to contribute to the strengthening of democratic attitudes and institutions through projects which will develop community spirit.

Who knows—perhaps Government aid to such ventures would be politically more astute than the Peace Corps itself, plainly labeled as it is as a formal agency of the U.S. Government.

What these various activities indicate, in any case, is that it is not true that the Government is somehow compelled to operate a foreign aid program primarily through loans and grants to other governments. Indeed, a visitor might conclude that the Kennedy administration's elaborate alliance for progress, with the best Washington will in the world, may not be ideally geared to dealing with the Communist threat. The problems of anticommunistic, genuinely democratic progress may simply be beyond the reach of government-to-government aid.

The Indiana Dunes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, support for S. 1797, the bill introduced by six other Senators and by me to save the Indiana Dunes by authorizing the creation of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore has mounted rapidly since the Senate hearings which concluded February 28.

President Kennedy's recommendation in his message to the Congress of March

1 that legislation be enacted to create a national lakeshore area in northern Indiana also has brought out additional interest on the part of citizens, groups of all kinds, and the press.

I have already brought to the attention of the Senate a number of the editorials in support of S. 1797 which have appeared recently in the great newspapers of the Nation, but I think my colleagues will enjoy and be interested in examples of the further support we are getting from the pages of the press.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a series of fine articles on the saving of the dunes.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Mar. 10, 1962]

SAVING DUNES AS PLAYGROUND WILL BE TOUGH, GRAFFIS SAYS

(By Herb Graffis)

FORT MYERS BEACH, FLA.—As one who has seen hundreds of sandlot baseball diamonds and prairie football fields vanish in and around Chicago, I thought the scheme to destroy the Dunes inevitably would succeed.

Substituting a steel mill and a huge harbor for a wonderland of rolling sandhills and the shrubs and trees and infinitely beautiful lake shore seems like a horrible trade, but us ordinary American chumps have had other priceless natural resources stolen, so losing the Dunes wouldn't be unusual.

The odds against saving the Dunes looked far too steep for me to want to bet. As an entry were big corporation money, stealthy politicians, and greedy real estate promoters. On the other side were the poor suckers who would like to retain a magnificent natural playground. That looked to be no contest.

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, introduced a bill to save 9 of the 12 miles of Dunes shoreline as a national park and wildlife preserve. The hogs howled against that. They wanted all the Dunes.

But, skip the comic relief interjected into a serious session at Washington, and take a quick look at the attempt to halt a slump that started when I was a lad around Chicago. Then we started losing places to play even though we had less time to play and had to spend more time for work than is the schedule today.

Now, with work hours getting shorter and playgrounds getting fewer there is a pressing problem of getting more outdoor recreation area. Recently President Kennedy received a report from the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission that pointed to the urgent necessity of such action as that of preserving the Dunes for the public. Need for keeping the Dunes as a playground for the Chicago area is underlined by Chicago's bad showing of recreational territory compared to that of New York, despite Cook County's Forest Preserve areas.

For years Chicago and its suburbs steadily have been losing ground for fun outdoors. When I started writing sports Chicago newspapers carried two solid pages 1 day a week of kid sandlot baseball team box scores. "Dutch" Froelich, Chick Ogden, Tony Dvorak, Vince Shay and I, one night last summer, recalled more than 120 prairie football teams playing in Chicago.

The fancy play plants at the public parks, playgrounds, and high schools and little league teams in and around Chicago this year probably represent 10,000 times the money invested in all the Chicago and suburban athletic fields before World War I and about 1 percent of the area of those earlier sports pastures.

At Lake Shore Drive for a couple of blocks north and south of Addison Street (before the northern tip of Lincoln Park was sucked out of the lake) there were three baseball-football playgrounds made and used by the boys and young men.

The one at Addison was the best. It had what was called a grandstand along the third-base line. Most of the kid prairie playgrounds had two or three rows of seats made of lumber borrowed from construction stocks of buildings being erected in the neighborhood. The men doing the building didn't seem to mind as long as the borrowing wasn't too frequent or flagrant.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 11, 1962]

KENNEDY STAND SPURS INDIANA DUNES GROUP—BUT ARMY ENGINEER REPORT ENCOURAGES FOES OF PARKLAND

(By Donald Janson)

GARY, IND., March 7.—Conservationists expressed confidence this week that the "battle of the dunes" that has raged in northwestern Indiana for nearly half a century had taken an important turn in their favor.

They based their revived hopes on President Kennedy's recommendation last week that the last of the State's pristine Lake Michigan sand dunes be preserved in a national park.

"This is the first time a President has ever taken a stand for it," Mrs. James H. Buell of nearby Ogden Dunes said. She is president of a save-the-dunes council of citizens in the area who organized in 1952 to fight industrial encroachment.

On the other hand, steel interests and leading Indiana politicians who want to carve a deepwater harbor amid the dunes are jubilant over a new report by the Corps of Army Engineers upholding the feasibility of the project.

The corps recommended February harbor be built at Burns Ditch in the heart of Indiana's remaining 4 miles of untrammeled duneland, as proposed by the Indiana Port Commission.

Indiana officials, led by Governor Matthew E. Welsh, a Democrat, and the minority leader of the House of Representatives, Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, a Republican, say the $68 million public harbor would provide revenue and employment. The Gary Chamber of Commerce says it would attract new shipping and industry, including two fully integrated steel mills, and a net population increase for the area of half a million persons within 10 to 15 years.

SITE OF HARBOR DESCRIBED

The harbor would be built between property owned by the Bethlehem and Midwest Steel Corps. Both would be expected to construct part of the facilities. Indiana is seeking a $25 million Federal appropriation for construction of breakwaters. The State would finance construction of onshore docking facilities by bond issues.

Opponents, lead by Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, charge that the harbor would blot out scenic shores needed for recreation by the 7 million urban dwellers in the expanding metropolitan complex from Gary to Milwaukee.

Opponents of a harbor at Burns Ditch propose the expansion, instead, of existing harbors at Michigan City or East Chicago, Whiting, Hammond. They testified during a hearing of the Senate Public Lands Subcommittee last week that the engineers had studied only the dunes site in detail.

The corps, in its report, conceded this.

"Detailed study way limited to the proposed site at Burns waterways," the report said, "since the location selected is the only one which would satisfy the requirements of the State of Indiana and the Midwest Steel Corp. The State of Indiana as represented by the Governor and the Indiana Port Commission are sponsoring the harbor at the proposed site."

POLUTION IS FEARED

Mr. DOUGLAS and 250,000 signers of petitions to conserve the dunes contend that any new industrial development east of Burns Ditch would pollute the air and water around remaining Indiana duneland.

The hearings were held on a Douglas bill to preserve up to 9,000 acres of dune land for a national lakeshore. This would be in addition to an existing 2,200-acre State park now jammed with Chicagoans every sunny summer weekend.

Conservationists expect a favorable vote on the Douglas bill in the Senate this session, but they are not optimistic about House action because of Mr. HALLECK's strong opposition.

Mr. DOUGLAS said in an interview in Chicago this week, however, that "If they don't let us have the park I will fight them to the death on the harbor appropriation."

He said the need to save the shifting, sloping beaches in a day of burgeoning population and dwindling natural recreational areas had become a regional and national concern rather than purely a State matter.

He opposes a pending compromise bill, offered by Senator VANCE HARTKE, Democrat, of Indiana, that would provide for a 5,000-acre park, including the State park. It would not include the key Bethlehem tract, the area's prime example of dunes that "wander" as much as 60 feet under the lash of winds blowing down the bore of the Lake Michigan.

Opponents of the Burns Ditch Harbor contend that it would benefit principally the two steel companies. Bethelem has not started building on its land, but Midwest opened a fabricating plant nearly a year ago. An earlier Engineers Corps report said that 97 percent of the benefit from a harbor at Burns Ditch would inure to Midwest.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 10, 1962]

THE INDIANA DUNES—LAST CHANCE

If enough of the citizens of Indiana demand that what is left of the Indiana Dunes be saved, Governor Welsh and the Army engineers may yet see their way clear to give serious study, instead of a brushoff, to alternate sites for the harbor that would destroy this great recreational resource on the southeast shore of Lake Michigan.

The dunes and the 4½ miles of unspoiled beach for which they form a scenic and fascinating backdrop have been aptly described by Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, as "the best available recreation space for * * * the industrial metropolitan complex which stretches across 3 State lines from Gary to Milwaukee." Destruction of the dunes is a high price to pay for a harbor site that would benefit primarily two steel companies, not to mention the price of some $25 million estimated as the taxpayers' share of the dredging and construction costs.

The steel mills and port facilities can be placed in areas already industrialized, either to the west in Lake County or to the east in Michigan City, and the State of Indiana would still reap the economic benefits. The dunes cannot be moved. They can and will be removed—forever—unless the pending bill to create an Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore is passed.

Bureaucracy Is on the March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, bureaucracy is on the march. The Department

of Agriculture is again "plowing under" not only the individual farmer and individual initiative, but is "plowing under" community initiative and rights and privileges.

In Montana, the federally appointed Montana State ASC Committee suspended from office the three-member Glacier County ASC Committee. The following is a portion of a news release in the Cut Bank Pioneer Press dated March 15, 1962, describing a protest to this action by the farmers of Glacier County:

Approximately 160 farmers from Glacier County and all along the Hi-Line area converged Tuesday morning on the Glacier County ASC office in Cut Bank in protest to the firing of their county committee.

The orderly group packed the offices to an overflow capacity throughout the entire morning.

The reason for this spontaneous gathering of farmers at the local ASC office was to protest the State ASC committee's action in suspending the local county committee.

After the firing of the Glacier County ASC chairman, Kyle Momberg, vice chairman Glenn Lindberg and regular member Bill Held, the State group sent their three men to supposedly take control of this county.

Their three men who were sent here to enforce alleged orders of the State and Federal Agricultural Department were Doyle Kennedy, a special investigator with the Department of Agriculture from San Francisco; R. Selvege and Dale Nerlin of the State ASC office. This group has moved in and taken over the duties of the county group. They claimed later (after questioning) that they were only here to assist the new committee, who were sworn into office this morning.

When Kennedy arrived at the ASC office building at 8:30 he was greeted at the door by several farm women. At that time the women were standing by the door, and he stated to them: "Do you realize the seriousness of interfering with Government business?" To this question the women did not reply.

When such a large group of farmers, both men and women, converged on the office this morning, Kennedy became quite worried and called the county sheriff's office, the local police, and also had the U.S. marshal's office called for police protection and assistance. It was mentioned that the National Guard was to be called. No one knew why, unless a guilty complex prevailed among the State ASC committee. The crowd that had gathered was very orderly throughout the entire morning.

Just before the beginning of the meeting, Kennedy, Selvege, and Nerlin were asked to produce their credentials and authority for taking over the county ASC office. Their credientials proved their identity but showed no authority for taking over our county office.

Mr. Speaker, South Dakota is following the same pattern, and the State ASC chairman has taken the law in his own hands. When the local people in Campbell County attempted to determine in which city they wanted their county ASC office, the State office moved in at night and stole the records, moving them to another city in the county.

Following is a letter explaining the South Dakota situation:

MOUND CITY, S. DAK.,
March 12, 1962.

Hon. E. Y. BERRY,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BERRY: The controversy over the location of the ASC office in Campbell County the past several months has about reached the point where we law-abiding citizens feel something must be done to avert such catastrophies, and we are appealing to you, Representative BERRY, for help.

When officials, like that of the State ASC at Huron, S. Dak., plot against the county ASC leaders and the farmers, and then rush in like a thief in the night, and do such a drastic act as was done Friday morning—and get by with it, we stop and ask this question, "What has happened to the rights of our law-abiding and taxpaying citizens? Where is the respect for court orders?"

We feel this act is also a very bad impression upon our youth, to whom we have been trying to teach the importance of good citizenship, honesty, loyalty to laws, and integrity. From this point of view, I am speaking through my experience with youth, having been an elementary schoolteacher for 25 years.

Many of us feel that communism is creeping in amongst us, and to whom can we turn but to our South Dakota Senators and Representatives for help to keep them out.

Thank you kindly for your attention.

Sincerely yours,
Mr. and Mrs. ARTHUR H. LARSON.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, agriculture is not only moving the farmer, but is moving his local ASC offices as well.

Asia: Front of Danger, Frontier of Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on March 12 of this year, Vice President Emmanuel Pelaez of the Philippine Republic, delivered a memorable and informative address at the conference of U.S. Ambassadors and other U.S. officials at Camp John Hay, Baguio City.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the address will make 2¼ pages of the RECORD at a cost of $202.50.

I ask unanimous consent not withstanding the cost that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

While in Manila some 18 months ago, I had the privilege of meeting and visiting with Emmanuel Pelaez, then a candidate for the Vice Presidency to which he has subsequently been elected. I also had the privilege of coming to know President Macapagal on that visit to Manila. The free world is fortunate indeed to have before it the example of the Philippines where Asians have demonstrated their ability and capacity for self-government and where there has been a succession of able leaders chosen in free elections demonstrating the self-restraint and respect for law by which administrations in a free society change from one party in power to another and from one leader to another in conformity with constitutional concepts.

All Americans salute the people and the political leaders of the Philippines for their achievements in mastering the art of self-government and their determination to resist either the blandishments or the bribes or bully tactics of the Communists.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASIA: FRONT OF DANGER, FRONTIER OF OPPORTUNITY

(By Vice President Emmanuel Pelaez)

(Following is the full text of the speech delivered by Vice President Emmanuel Pelaez, concurrently secretary of foreign affairs, at Conference of U.S. Ambassadors and other U.S. officials at Camp John Hay, Baguio City, Monday, March 12:)

Ambassador Bowles, Secretary Harriman, distinguished Ambassadors and other U.S. officials, ladies and gentlemen:

It is a privilege to have been asked to address this Conference, and a pleasure to be here with you. I understand this is the third Asian regional meeting you are holding, preceded by conferences in 1959 and 1960. This series of conferences, which brings together not only the U.S. chiefs of mission in this part of the world but also their collaborators from other U.S. agencies, is as much a reassuring event to your friends as it must be unwelcome to your ill-wishers. Its significance is emphasized by the fact that your highest officials in Washington charged with formulating and executing U.S. policy in Asia, such as Ambassador Bowles and Secretary Harriman, have traveled a gerat distance to preside here.

We Filipinos are particularly pleased that you are meeting here in our city of Baguio. Not only is this a gracious compliment to our summer capital, but your meeting here gives us a chance to exchange views, compare notes, and determine how we can help each other more effectively in solving our mutual and regional problems and in promoting our mutual and regional aims. It is in this spirit of mutual assistance that I speak to you now and will listen to you in turn.

Why are these regional operations conferences so welcome to your friends?

Firstly, they serve as a vehicle, I should think, for insuring continuity and coordination of U.S. policy and operations in Asia. This is important, since Asia is today the most highly combustible region in the world and your response to every spark of crisis must be quick, effective and coordinated. In this age of total diplomacy, to borrow a phrase of Ambassador Bowles, it is essential not only that your right hand should know what the left is doing; it is just as important that both hands should know how to work together.

Secondly, these conferences reassure your friends of America's continuing concern and involvement in the affairs of Asia. This is timely, since some voices of withdrawal and disengagement, defeatism, and fear are abroad again in your land. Happily, the most responsible leaders of the United States from all voices, and it appears they have been subdued.

Thirdly, these conferences, give evidence, we would like to believe, that Asia will no longer be just an afterthought in American foreign policy, as it was in World War II. We remember, not without a tinge of regret, that the liberation of Asia—our own liberation here in the Philippines—had to wait upon the superior priority of the European theater. Nowadays, of course, the intercontinental range of missiles, the blinding speed of supersonic aircraft, and the impartial draft of rains and winds carrying radioactive fallout around the world have erased boundaries of theaters of war. It is no longer within one's discretion to fight a world war in installments. The next world war will be instant war all around the globe.

It is not mere theoretics about the next world war, however, that should compel the

United States to give equal if not greater attention to Asia. The indelible lessons of experience, the realities of the present and the probabilities of the future combine to build an impressive case for such attention. Asia is today the frontline of greatest danger—and the frontier of greatest opportunity for the free world.

Let us learn from the hard lessons of experience. The biggest war you have fought thus far, since the end of World War II, was waged here in Asia, in Korea. Nearly 55,000 American boys lost their lives in that war, and more than 103,000 were wounded. We, too, offered our youth on that battlefield.

Let us weigh the dangers of the present. In the straits of Formosa the waters are intermittently whipped by the gales of crisis. In Laos the free world's position is precarious: the best it can hope for is a draw. In Vietnam, the United States is deeply and extensively committed to help South Vietnam fight the biggest and most dangerous brush-fire war in the world today. No one knows, at the moment, where and how the situation in Vietnam will end. And besides these more overt challenges, everywhere else in Asia Communist subversion and infiltration continue unabated, on a round-the-clock basis, taxing us to equally round-the-clock vigilance and alertness.

Now let us assess the probabilities: What are the prospects of war or peace in Asia?

All of you know that World War III, which will be the final war, could begin in Asia with as much, if not greater probability than anywhese else. This is because Asia is brittle, sensitive, combustible—the slightest spark could set it aflame. And Asia is so explosive because it is in ferment, it is unsettled, it is tossing violently in the turbulence of revolution and change.

The withdrawal of the West has created power vacuums which in some places have been fully filled without pain and difficulty, in others have been trespassed by the Communists, and in still other countries those vacuums are now cockpits of conflict in which feuding internal factions or democratic elements versus the Communist are fighting for survival and dominance.

Old patterns of society and old traditions, most of them erected on the discredited foundations of colonialism, are being torn down and demolished, to give way to new forms and structures. Some of the new societies, such as ours here in the Philippines, are patterned after the familiar institutions of classical democracy. Some incline to socialism. Others are experimenting with new combinations, and still others have been forced by necessity to give precedence to the imperatives of security over everything else, with not always ideal results.

Asia, as you know and as you can see, is a battleground where the combatants are not always clearly identified, the battlelines are not always clearly drawn, and the ground rules, if there are any, are seldom mutually agreed upon. There are few precedents and guidelines from the past by which to chart the present and the future. It is this uncertainty, this guesswork that give Asia its peculiar smell of danger. In the West, with its set ways, rigid patterns, and its predictable reactions, crises and ultimatums are unmistakably labeled and acknowledged as such. For instance, there is no ambiguity about the stakes and alternatives involved in the Berlin ultimatum. Asia is different: The answers are not always as simple. Korea began as a police action and ended as a major war, only one nuclear explosion and one privileged boundary line removed from world war. In Vietnam, you have inched yourselves to a position of irrevocable commitment. And what is happening in Laos defies unraveling.

Overlaying this swirling region of transition and change, casting its malevolent shadow upon it, is the dark reality and the forbidding menace of Communist China. Whether in Korea or in Vietnam or in Laos, the motive power behind the aggression has been Chinese Communist expansionism. It is this mixture of the expansionist and predatory appetite of Communist China tempted by the uncertainly, naivete and backwardness of Asia that poses the greatest danger of world war III, or of a succession of small wars that could sap the vitality and strength of the free world, including the United States, as fatally as a global war.

This then is the challenge facing the United States and its allies: an Asia in turmoil, an Asia in the process of change wrenching itself from its traditional colonial moorings, an Asia embattled by Communist incursions, an Asia that stands in the shadows of a ruthless expansionist Communist China. It is a formidable challenge that will require formidable, even superhuman, efforts to overcome.

The first requirement to meet such a challenge in Asia is strength, great deterrent strength. It is the one universal language that the Communists understand. To fulfill such a requirement, the United States must provide the hard core of the free world's deterrent strength in this area. Your allies here in Asia will continue to need you as much as you will continue to need us. This mutual need, one can foresee, will become even more imperative when the day comes, as the scientists say it will inevitably come, that Communist China puts together its first nuclear bomb.

You have installed bases along the Asian perimeter as a defensive shield against Communist military aggression. You have forged mutual defense treaties with many nations in Asia, including us. You have signed military assistance pacts. You are a member of SEATO. These are the foundations of the hard core of strength that I have spoken of. They must be supplemented by the support and cooperation of your Asian allies.

In this regard, the Philippines is determined and prepared to do its part. We are ever ready to honor our treaty obligations. However, I would be less than candid with you if I were to say that we have always been perfectly satisfied with our bases treaty with the United States, or with the performance of SEATO. As to the bases treaty, we have started negotiations with you aimed at the revision and elimination of treaty provisions which we deem incompatible with Philippine dignity and sovereignty, and at the removal of possible causes of misunderstanding or irritants in the day-to-day operation of the bases. These we want done not only for the sake of our own national interest but for the sake, precisely, of strengthening our defensive alliance—for a partnership between nations can be strong and durable only when it is based on equality and mutual respect. I am happy to inform you that since we started negotiations for the revision of the bases agreement in 1956 much progress has been made toward greater understanding between us. I hope that with your able Ambassador to the Philippines, Mr. William Stevenson, we can complete the task in reasonably good time.

In fulfillment of our treaty commitments with you under our mutual defense arrangements, the Philippines will not relax its efforts to maintain adequate armed forces to resist aggression. Speaking of possible aggression, particularly against the Philippines, some years ago some doubt was expressed in certain official circles of this country on whether or not the United States would forthwith come to the aid of the Philippines should the latter be attacked, on the ground that the wording of the Philippines-United States Mutual Defense Pact did not so provide in express terms. To allay these fears, in 1956, the then Secretary of State John Foster Dulles assured the Philippine Government in a diplomatic note that any armed attack on the Philippines would instantly bring America's military forces to its aid. Subsequently, in June of 1960, President Eisenhower pledged, in the final communique of his visit to the Philippines, that "any armed attack against the Philippines would involve an attack against the U.S. forces stationed there and against the United States and would instantly be repelled."

The Philippines has placed its trust on those solemn commitments given to it, in its view, not by the individuals who made them, or the political party or administration they represented, but by the Government of the United States of America. We are confident that in this there can be no disagreement between us.

SEATO has, on the whole, been useful, but this is not to say there is no room for improvement. The Philippines has not always been happy with the quality of SEATO's response to individual situations that have arisen in Asia. We are vitally interested in correcting its shortcomings, and we propose to try to do so at the first opportunity. Certainly, the usefulness SEATO has served in holding back further Communist encroachments in this area should prevail upon its members to settle their differences in favor of the larger advantage of preserving and strengthening this defensive shield. I am confident our differences in SEATO can be straightened out as amicably as our differences with the United States, in the frankness and spirit of accommodations of family councils.

The second requirement that the free world must face to strengthen its defenses in Asia is to understand the nature of the challenge and the threat and employ the proper strategy and tactics, personnel and equipment to meet them. As I have pointed out, the Communist challenge wears many faces in Asia—sometimes that of aggression, other times those of infiltration or subversion or guerrilla warfare. The free world must know how to deal with every type of attack. Your friends are encouraged that you have acquired greater awareness and appreciation of the specific need, particularly in the Asian environment and terrain, to train yourselves and your allies in the new science of limited, brush-fire wars. In this regard perhaps the free world could learn and benefit from the Philippine experience, since we fought and won such a war in our own country. The late President Ramon Magsaysay, as our then secretary of national defense, applied a strategy of combining all-out force against Communist diehards with all-out friendship for the population which put to rout a Communist rebellion as serious as any that has ever threatened any country in Asia.

My friends, I have just reviewed the free world's defensive response to the Communist challenge in Asia—the frontline of greatest danger for the free world. This alliance must maintain sufficient deterrent strength to discourage and deter the Communists from aggressive adventures, or to make sure that, if madness should seize them and they strike, they will suffer equal if not more destructive retaliation. In the military domain, the free world is of course restricted to a defensive policy, because aggression or, to use a contemporary euphemism, "preventive war" is out of the question as far as it is concerned. It is opposed to everything we stand for and believe in. To confine one's self to the defensive is, however, a frustrating, sterile, stagnant strategy. What if the enemy, instead of risking a

head-on challenge, decides to erode the free world's strength in a series of small guerrilla wars, and in subtle operations of subversion and infiltration? What of the nonmilitary aspects of the contest, the aspects aimed at the needs of men, their hopes, their aspirations, their dreams? The aspects which deal with poverty, disease, and human misery?

It is in this other battleground, in this Asia that is "the frontier of greatest opportunity" for those who would build a new world of social justice and freedom where, I believe ultimate victory or defeat will be decided. The free world's armed defenses are adequate, and will be adequate, to maintain a stalemate or a balance of terror, thus obviating any armed challenge. The conflict will shift, as it has already shifted, to the question of which system and which faith can feed with satisfaction the bodies and the minds and the souls of Asians. Which system is the wave of the future? Which can appease the revolution of rising expectations that has changed and convulsed Asia?

On this frontier we can and we must take the offensive. Asia's magnificent obsession is to catch up with the 20th century, its heartache is that it still is mired in the afflictions of the 19th century and other centuries past. It is poor and backward, fettered by illiteracy and ignorance, debilitated by disease, frustrated by chronic underproductivity and plagued by unemployment. It has not stepped out of the carabao age. The opportunity awaiting us is to prove to every Asian that our system of freedom not only ennobles and enriches the human spirit but will also give him a job, feed his body, clothe his back, place a roof over his head, educate his children and provide him with reasonable leisure. We must show that democracy offers the healthiest environment for economic development and progress. We must convince him it is the system that stands for growth and experimentation and expansion, that it is dynamic and not static, and it is forward-looking and is not bogged down in the past.

In the effort to move into the 20th century the main impetus and initiative must come, of course, from the Asian nations themselves. We are not asking other countries to do our work for us—we shall do it ourselves. But the problems confronting us are so formidable and so deeply entrenched in the neglect and exploitation of centuries that we must admit we cannot do everything by our efforts alone. We need and we must have the help and cooperation of the West and we expect the West to help and cooperate with us. Not only will that serve the interest of the West itself, but a sense of historical justice should impel it to put back a little of so much that it has taken away.

The United States may justifiably take pride in the generous amount of aid it has poured into the world since the end of the war. It reflects political sophistication, and a good heart, I know, and I sympathize with you, that it has not always brought you the blessings vouchsafed for those who give, but by and large the results should gratify you. On the opposite side of the counter, we in the Philippines are encouraged by vital and mutually favorable changes that have been prescribed in your policy governing foreign aid. We believe with you that aid will be more effective if it is backed by long-range financial commitments and geared to long-range plans. The use of aid in fits and starts cannot possibly produce long-term benefits. And we can appreciate your new determination to manage aid "in a hardheaded way" to repeat the phrase of Secretary Rusk. We agree that aid to be most effective must be utilized in an environment of ample political rights and social reforms and its benefits must filter down to the base of the country, the masses.

Here in our country, President Macapagal has submitted an integrated 5-year socioeconomic program which, among other things, provides for maximum utilization of American aid. It is a program designed, in his own words, "to bring prosperity to all and a better life for the common man." We are thankful for the contribution of American aid. I hope, however, that in your eagerness to be helpful you have not overlooked being just. Our people are disappointed by the continued failure of the additional war damage bill to pass your Congress. As the New York Times said: "Philippine patience is justifiably wearing thin. What seems a small matter in this country is a serious cause of national irritation in the Philippines. An aid appropriation is not involved. The most committed and friendly ally of the United States in Asia is simply asking for a sum that we have promised and that is long overdue." We hope for fair treatment for our industries and exports. We have claims pending with the U.S. Government which, if approved, would add badly needed foreign exchange to our development efforts. We look upon America's traditional sense of fairness to prevail in these matters.

Besides aid, Asia's other needs are capital and technical know-how. President Macapagal and his administration are anxious to have our Congress approve a foreign investments law that will clearly define in which fields American and other foreign capital is welcome, provide incentives for its coming and assure it of fair treatment and security. Without disparaging others, I am proud to say that in the Philippines you have one of the most stable political and economic societies into which foreign capital may venture. With the influx of foreign capital and additionally the extension to us of credits, we hope to modernize our agriculture and to accelerate our industrialization, which are among the main objectives of President Macapagal's program. Like the rest of Asia, we shall be happy to receive technical aid and learn technical know-how wherever we can get it, on this side of the curtain. To survive in this rapidly changing world, Asia has to modernize and industrialize.

My friends, the opportunities in Asia are so limitless because the problems are so staggering. There is no magic formula, no shortcut, no easy way out in this deadly struggle to contain Communist expansionism which is our negative objective, and achieve the positive aim of spreading freedom, dignifying the individual and raising the standards and scope of life in Asia. To contain the Communist threat physically, we have confronted it with a ring of military bases. To stop the Communist threat permanently, we must contain the conditions on which communism thrives and surround it with bases of prosperity peopled by freemen living in comfort, dignity, and spiritual strength. Lenin once said that once Europe and Asia have been overrun by communism, the United States will fall like an overripe fruit. Happily the Communists have been stopped in Europe—in Asia the struggle still hangs in the balance. If we stop them in Asia too, the battle will have turned and we can bring the struggle to their grounds, challenging their captive millions to compare the vigor, resiliency and efficacy of democracy with the sterility and hopelessness of their faith. The Berlin wall is eloquent proof of which way they will go, given the chance to compare.

We shall need patience and perseverance, courage and fortitude, imagination and boldness. Great wealth and tremendous resources will have to be expended. In your country, the voices of defeatism I have referred to will tempt and taunt you, deriding your sacrifices and preaching the gospel of selfishness and self-gratification. I am confident that you will resist. As a gifted writer has said, "There is no evidence in history that men who face challenges in fear and reaction survive to win great rewards. The trial of soul we face today is to outdream the Communist visionaries, outwork the Communist fanatics, and outdare the voices of defeatism and discouragement within our own society."

And in the final analysis, the cooperative effort to dignify man, secure his freedom and enrich his spirit is something we must do not merely to win a struggle but for a higher reason, because it is right. Even if Marx and Lenin had never been born and communism had never reared its head and the cold war had never begun, it would still be the inescapable obligation of well-placed men to help their less fortunate fellow man, well-placed nations to help less fortunate nations, because all of mankind is one brotherhood and the unjust deprivation of every human being is an affront to the intelligence, and a denial of the inherent sense of compassion, of all men. No one has been more unjustly deprived, and no one better deserves encouragement and help, than Asian man. Markham could well have been writing of him—"bowed by the weight of centuries * * * dead to rapture and despair, a thing that grieves not and that never hopes, stolid and stunned * * * betrayed, plundered, profaned and disinherited * * * distorted and soul-quencht."

Ours now is the opportunity and the duty—and God give us the wisdom and strength not to falter—to "straighten up this shape; touch it again with immortality; give back the upward looking and the light; rebuild in it the music and the dream; make right the immemorial infamies, perfidious wrongs, immedicable woes."

I thank you.

Postal Rate Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 22, Mr. William E. Branen of Burlington, Wis., vice president of the Wisconsin Press Association, appeared before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Mr. Branen was accompanied by Mr. Walter Gleason, publisher of the Clintonville, Wis., Tribune, and Mr. K. L. Larson, publisher of the Kiel, Wis., Tri-County Record.

The statement of Mr. Branen on behalf of the Wisconsin Press Association is indeed outstanding. I would like to call it to the attention of every Member of the House in the hope that adequate amendments can be adopted to the discriminatory postal rate bill which was passed by the House of Representatives.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM E. BRANEN, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE WISCONSIN PRESS ASSOCIATION, BEFORE SENATE POST OFFICE COMMITTEE, MARCH 22, 1962

My name is William E. Branen. I am a copublisher of the Burlington Standard-Press, a weekly newspaper published in Racine County in the State of Wisconsin.

The Wisconsin Press Association, the oldest press association in the United States (established in 1853), is a trade organization of weekly and semiweekly newspapers. It has an enrollment of 234 members, out of the total of 275 community newspapers pub-

lished in the State of Wisconsin. I would like to emphasize that unlike many of the State press associations appearing before you, ours is an exclusive weekly and semiweekly organization. There are no daily newspaper members in our group.

The following resolution was unanimously adopted by our board of directors and subsequently supported wholeheartedly by a huge majority of our members in a mail vote last week. At last count, we had 130 yes votes on the resolution as compared to 4 no votes against the resolution. Here is that resolution:

"*Resolved*, That H.R. 7927 be vigorously opposed; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the 'free in county' mailing privilege be eliminated; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the 'in county' category also include at the 1-cent-per-pound rate (minimum one-eighth cent per copy) all newspapers distributed to patrons served by the post office of original mailing or neighboring post offices where no postal department transportation is involved. The zone rates based on advertising content and weight to continue under present formula."

We are definitely opposed to the House bill, H.R. 7927, now before you. We believe that a surcharge of 1 cent per copy on a weekly newspaper would be discriminatory because it would make the same charge on a newspaper carried across a county line as would be charged a metropolitan newspaper or a large magazine being transported thousands of miles.

The adoption of the resolution as recited here is not new for the Wisconsin Press Association. A similar resolution was adopted by the board of directors about 6 years ago. At that time, we had some strong objection to the adoption of the resolution by some of our members and we asked them to check with their local post office to determine exactly what "free in county" meant to their newspaper enterprise each week.

A majority of those then contacted our office again to inform us that they didn't realize what few benefits their newspaper derived from "free in county" mailing and that they agreed that "free in county" should be eliminated. Our publishers are convinced that "free in county" is most dicriminatory in that a newspaper's postal rates are set according to its geographical location within the county.

We have supplied each member of the committee with a map of Wisconsin showing the location of the community newspapers. You will note that a majority of those newspapers are on county lines or near a county line while only a very few are centrally located.

The chart which was prepared in the office of the Wisconsin Press Association pictures the complete cost of the second-class postal charge for each of 32 community newspapers for 1 week. We asked the newspapers to supply us with a copy of their post office form 3542 so that we might have the number of copies being mailed in the county, outside the county, and to various zones for 1 week. These charges were totaled as to the cost for "incounty" mailing, zone mailing, and the number of copies mailed free within the county. We multiplied the cost for 1 week by 52 to determine the annual cost. However, it must be pointed out that the annual cost could vary depending on the weight and advertising content of the other 51 issues. We believe the annual figure to be quite accurate although it could vary in that the issues surveyed might be larger or smaller than the average put out each week.

You will note that the weekly cost as tabulated in the eighth column of the chart is approximately one-half of what the weekly cost would be under H.R. 7927, which is the fifth column in the tabulation enclosed by borderlines. In some instances the weekly cost would double, in other cases it is tripled, and in some cases even quadrupled. As you will note there are some 200-percent increases listed if H.R. 7927 becomes law.

To point out the discriminatory aspects of our present postal law, we would like to call attention to the annual postage paid by the Oregon Observer with 978 circulation. It pays a total postage bill of $60.84 per year. The Wonewoc Reporter, with almost identical circulation, 972, a newspaper which for this particular issue weighed three-tenths of a pound less per copy than did the Oregon Observer, paid a postage bill which is more than twice that of the Oregon newspaper, or $135.20 per year. It so happens that Oregon's area of coverage is within the county while Wonewoc is on the county line.

Please note again on the chart that the Medford Star News which is a county seat newspaper, centrally located, mailed 5,200 copies for $1,123.72 per year whereas the Oconomowoc Enterprise pays $40 per year more for 1,400 less copies. Here again Medford is centrally located and Oconomowoc is on a county line.

Our association is convinced that "free in county" is wrong because it is based on the the geographical location of the newspaper. To add a percentage increase and continue this discrimination would be wrong, in our opinion, and to add a surcharge in addition to the present inequitable rate would be much worse. We will still have the same basic problem of the discriminatory effect of "free in county" mailing. We believe it is time that the "free in county" privilege be eliminated. Our survey of 32 newspapers (we have given you a map showing where the 32 newspapers are located and they were picked completely at random) does show that "free in county" is indefensible. Our survey further shows that the cost to the 32 listed publishers if "free in county" is eliminated would be $32.95 or an average of $1 per week. It would vary from the $3.86 extra cost to the Medford Star News down to nothing for the South Milwaukee Voice-Journal which has no "free in county" circulation at all. "Free in county" is a misnomer. It does not apply in any post office which has a letter carrier service. It is therefore actually limited to the small post office that offers only post office box service and to the rural routes extending from that same post office. If a post office has letter carrier service, then there is no "free in county" mailing privilege from that post office or its rural routes.

The third part of our resolution proposes that the 1-cent-per-pound "in county" rate be extended to include all of the newspapers distributed from the post office of original mailing. In other words, if the 1-cent-per-pound rate is continued, it would apply to all newspapers mailed within the county and be extended to newspapers going across county lines, if they are distributed from the office of original mailing. We have several instances in Wisconsin where the county line extends right down Main Street and it is possible for a newspaper to be physically located in one county and yet have 70 percent of its circulation across the street in another county. Therefore, we believe that the 1-cent-per-pound category should include all of the newspaper mailing which is distributed from the point of original mailing. We also believe that if a newspaper has a town across a county line which he serves at his own expense by trucking the newspapers to that post office, that that rate should be the same as the "in county" rate.

We believe that there is good logic in the "incounty" rate being less than the zone rate because there is a minimum of postal handling involved.

We do not intend to infer that the first and second zone rate for second class mail should continue at 3 cents per pound, depending upon the advertising content. Under our present postal rates for second-class mail, the average Wisconsin community newspaper pays about 2¾ cents per pound for most of its newspaper mailing with a minimum of ½ cent per copy. Let me repeat, we do not say that the first- and second-class zone rate should be 3 cents per pound. Perhaps it should be 4 cents per pound. However, we do firmly believe that the "in-county" rate (extended to include all newspapers delivered from the post office of the original mailing) should be one-third of the zone rate because there is only one-third as much handling.

We discussed the elimination of the "in-county" rate altogether. However, our decision to ask that "incounty" rates be maintained is based on the knowledge that in many of our lesser populated areas, there is only one newspaper in the county and it may serve an area with a radius of anywhere from 30 to 100 miles. Therefore, we believe that it is important that the "in-county" rate be maintained because many of the lesser populated areas are now served by but one community newspaper which is their only means of receiving governmental news, particularly at the county level.

There appears to be a misconception that community newspapers pay no postage at all; that the newspapers are carried free by the Government. Note the first red column in our chart and you will find that 4 of the 32 newspapers listed, are now paying more than $1,000 postage per year and that 3 pay more than $870 per year postage.

If we may refer to the chart again, our final three red columns will give you our estimate of the cost per week per newspaper if "free in county" is eliminated and the 1-cent-per-pound rate used. We also list the annual postal cost if "free in county" is eliminated, and a final column giving the percentage of increase. As expected, the newspapers with the greatest percentage of increase are those which have the greatest number of free-in-county copies under our present second-class postal rates. We believe that the proposal which we present would be an honest and equitable method of computing second-class postal rates for community newspapers. Our chart does not show what the effect would be if the 1-cent per pound is extended to all newspapers distributed from the post office of original mailing. It would be difficult to affix this cost unless one was sure what rural routes extended from each community. However, again we believe that because only one handling of the mail is involved, the extended in-county rate to newspapers from the post office of original mailing is justifiable.

We are convinced that if there is a subsidy it is to the reader and not to the newspaper because postage rates certainly are reflected in the subscription price.

Recent testimony before this committee revealed opposition to the House adopted amendment which extended free-in-country and in-county rates to newspapers published but not printed within that county. That amendment was the only portion of H.R. 7927 that we were in agreement with. In this day and age of modernized printshops, new offset methods and a rather acute shortage of printers and operators, the blunt truth is that whether or not a community continues to have a newspaper may depend on whether or not the publisher can take advantage of modern production methods and have his newspaper printed in a commercial shop or in an adjoining newspaper shop which may or may not be in an adjoining county.

The important factor is whether or not the newspaper survives. It should not be penalized because it does not have $16,000 for a new Linotype machine or $50,000 for a new modern press.

It might be well to point out at this time that in 1934 Wisconsin had 342 weekly newspapers. Today that number has decreased to 275 newspapers and I would guess that the percentage is pretty much the same in every State in the Union. One of the chief factors in the decline of the community newspaper is the high production costs and the shortage of skilled labor for the small community printshop. I would venture that in another 10 years Wisconsin may be down to 250 newspapers. To insist that a newspaper be printed locally before it is eligible for in-county mailing rates will hasten the decline.

Soviet Theme: People With No God—Deprived of a Soul

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine article by my constituent, James H. Brady, author of Washington Newsletter, a business and trade publication, on the general subject of the awakening of Americans to the basic threats of Communist Russia.

Mr. Brady's article follows:

SOVIET THEME: PEOPLE WITH NO GOD—DEPRIVED OF A SOUL

WASHINGTON.—Government observers are taking a closer look at the basic aims of Communist Russia. A planned economy under full state control is their major mission. Economic destruction seems to be the Soviet goal.

The U.S.S.R. wants to win a cold war without fighting or spilling the blood of their people. By these means the Soviet bloc seeks to "convert" the United States and all free peoples across the globe to socialism.

Actual fighting will continue in isolated parts of the world. The Russians are expected to make every effort to avoid an all-out war. They want to destroy us on an economic front. A full-scale war would be strictly an accident.

How do the Soviets operate under their planned economy and mechanical environment? Most of the millions behind the Iron Curtain do not know the difference between state socialism and freedom. Within the Russian orbit is a slave state unequaled in world history.

Control of the Communist peoples by their leaders is nothing more than a "brainwashing" process. The Soviets teach people to have no God—and deprive them of their own souls. In rare cases where churches are permitted an elaborate antireligious museum is placed directly across the street.

During the past few months I have studied special reports made by military intelligence, State Department staffers and others, which deal with the Soviet technique. Their system is a rough "slave-state deal" so terrible to be beyond belief.

Short of the battlefield the Russians want to carry their so-called revolution to a successful conclusion within the decade. Moscow directs the entire program.

Economic confusion causing an instability of the American dollar is a Soviet aim. Their agents operate in almost every city in the United States, according to the FBI. Some of those cooperating with the Commies are just loud-mouthed fellow travelers. Others are devoted secret agents working strictly for Russia.

Many Congressmen wonder how the free-world market theory fostered by President Kennedy will effect our relations with Communist bloc nations. Our dollars are at a premium abroad and in high demand by foreign traders. Is there a chance the Russians will participate in drawing away our dollar reserve? Economists believe we must pitch in and get our share of world trade to maintain jobs here and preserve a stability in our economy.

Never in history has Washington given so much study to the basic thinking behind the Marx-Lenin teachings. If the Soviets fail by conversion they may be forced into a war for conquest. A fighting war is said to be recommended by some of the old-line Commies in Moscow and Communist China.

"Capitalism" is a word used by our enemies as propaganda. The phrase "free enterprise in America" is not even in their vocabulary. We need a new word for American democracy—perhaps the word "consumerism." Free citizens of the United States own more goods, receive more services and invest more capital in enterprises than any other people in the world. We are the No. 1 consumer and earner nation on this planet.

Congress plans to take a new look at our policies to combat the Soviet technique. Our overall foreign policies and assistance programs are being investigated. President Kennedy is doing some of his own investigating and making many changes for the better.

Former President Herbert Hoover recently said we are now in the world battle between "faith in a supreme being and materialistic agnosticism." Removal of the faith in God and the very soul of men is the Soviet purpose.

Our strength lies in our understanding of the Communist mission. We know their promotion of atheist thought, their plan to destroy our economy, and their effort to conquer from within. We are catching them in their act and this spells failure to the Communist bloc.

We are hopeful that the Russians do not overplan. We might suddenly decide to go to the core of the problem—and carry the cold war confusion directly to Red Square in Moscow where it all belongs.

Science Leader in House: George Paul Miller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of March 23, 1962, carried a short biography of the new chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, Hon. GEORGE P. MILLER of California. Chairman MILLER has proved to be a vigorous and enthusiastic leader. He is keenly aware of the role science and technology are playing in shaping America's future political, economic, and social development. Under his leadership, the House Space Committee will become the first group in Congress to study the broad scientific problems facing this Nation.

Under leave granted, therefore, I include Mr. MILLER's biography and an accompanying article in the Appendix of the RECORD as testimony of Chairman MILLER's interest and concern about the future of American science and technology:

SCIENCE LEADER IN HOUSE: GEORGE PAUL MILLER

WASHINGTON, March 22.—On the wall of GEORGE PAUL MILLER's fifth story office in the Old House Office Building is an aerial photograph of the San Francisco area where he was born 72 years ago. The picture is a sentimental reminder to a reminiscent Congressman of a varied life that has included careers as a civil engineer, travel agent, street sweeper, fish and game official, State legislator, and U.S. Representative, in that order.

To the new chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, the picture is also a bothersome reminder of problems confronting him as a legislator—problems including the future of the San Francisco area and of the Nation in the future.

As he notes, in another few decades, some 14 million persons are expected to be crowded into the area—a population growth that prompts him to ask:

"How are you going to feed and clothe all those people there and in similar metropolitan areas throughout the Nation without some breakthroughs in science?"

His concern helps explain why he is now attempting to redirect his committee away from its emphasis on space exploration into becoming the scientific observer and policysetter of Congress.

AN UNUSUAL MEETING

One of the first steps was taken today when a panel of distinguished scientists was assembled before the committee for a discussion—unusual in the annals of Congress—that ranged from the possibility of life on other planets to the impact of Federal research grants on universities.

Mr. MILLER accepts the race to the moon as inevitable and necessary. But more important than being first to the moon, in his opinion, are the scientific knowledge that will flow from space technology and the resulting technical advances here on earth.

His emphasis on the scientific importance of space exploration reflects his proudly mentioned educational background as a civil engineer. As one of the few engineers in Congress, he likes to needle his lawyer colleagues in the House with the comment:

"You guys think in circles; I am one of the few guys around here who has been trained to think in straight lines."

Mr. MILLER is the son of a Sacramento River dredger captain. He received his civil engineering degree from St. Mary's College near his boyhood home of San Francisco in 1912. The next decade he divided between practice as an engineer and World War I service as a first lieutenant in the field artillery.

TURNED TO STREETSWEEPING

In the 1920's, he switched over to running a travel agency, an enterprise that failed in the depression. Thrown on relief, he was forced to sweep streets in Alameda, Calif., to receive relief allotments. The streetsweeping interlude led him into politics.

He served two terms in the California State Assembly from 1937 to 1941, and then became executive secretary of the California Division of Fish and Game.

In 1944 he was elected as U.S. Representative from the Eighth Congressional District in Alameda County and has been successively reelected ever since.

In Congress he gained a reputation as a quiet-spoken legislator who voted a moderate liberal line and was more interested in committee work and the problems of his constituents than in seeking publicity.

By virtue of his membership on the Armed Services Committee he was assigned to a special House committee that set up the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the House Space Committee. With the death last fall of Overton Brooks of Louisiana, he moved over a seat to become chairman of the committee.

HELPED OCEANOGRAPHY

Previously he served as chairman of the Oceanography Subcommittee of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

While in that post, through persuasion and testimony, he was able to convince the scientific community of oceanographers that it should bring in industry to help in the expanding program of oceanographic research.

Colleagues describe Mr. MILLER as an easy-going, storytelling person with a quick, perceptive, analytical mind. A somewhat cautious person, he dislikes controversy, but can be a skilled politician in averting or settling an argument.

Despite his 72 years, Mr. MILLER is a spry man who likes to take jaunts in the Washington countryside and hikes in the Sierras of California. Some 7 years he broke the sonic barrier aboard a Navy jet fighter.

Mr. MILLER was married in 1927 to the former Esther Perkins, who had come from Overton, Neb., to be a personnel manager in a San Francisco department store. They have one daughter, Mrs. Ann Miller Muir, of San Lorenzo, Calif., and two grandchildren.

SCIENTISTS AND CONGRESS PONDER IF LIFE EXISTS IN OTHER WORLDS

(By John W. Finney)

WASHINGTON, March 22.—In the dimly lit caucus room of the House of Representatives today, a committee of Congress and a group of scientists discussed whether life exists in other worlds.

The scientists told the Congressmen that life might well have developed on far distant planets. But they were pessimistic, for political reasons, about ever establishing radio contact.

They were pessimistic because they doubt that legislators on other planets, any more than on this earth, would put up the money to build the costly transmitter needed to send messages to other worlds.

A serious discussion of such a subject would have caused laughter and ridicule a few years ago. The subject is one that scientists prefer to talk about only in private to avoid public scorn. Thus today's discussion pointed up a significant transformation taking place in consideration in Congress of scientific problems.

Under the leadership of its new chairman, Representative GEORGE P. MILLER, of California, the House Committee on Science and Astronautics is being transformed in scope and purpose into the first group in Congress to consider the broad scientific problems confronting the Nation.

The result is to fill what has been regarded within the executive branch and the scientific community as the major gap in the present organization of the Government to handle scientific problems and policies.

For congressional hearings, the committee today had an unusual slate of witnesses—12 of the Nation's outstanding scientists who make up the committee's advisory panel on science and technology. There was a foreign scientist, Sir Bernard Lovell, director of the Jodrell Bank Experimental Station in England.

It was Dr. Lovell, along with Dr. Harrison S. Brown, a geochemist at the California Institute of Technology, who discussed, in answer to committee members' questions, the possibility of life in other worlds.

From an astronomical point of view, Dr. Lovell said, there is a real possibility because at least 4 percent of the billions of stars in the universe must have planets capable of sustaining organic development.

A BIOLOGICAL PROBLEM

The question at this point, he said, is primarily biological. One positive clue was obtained recently, he pointed out, with the discovery of biochemical substances in some meteorites. Further evidence to answer the question, he said, will be obtained when searches are carried out for biological life on nearby Mars and Venus.

Dr. Lovell said, however, it would not be worthwhile to listen for messages for other worlds on a sporadic basis, such as was done in 1960 by scientists at the National Radio Astronomy Observatory in Green Bank, W. Va.

To do the job properly, he said, will require a number of finely instrumented radio-telescopes developed to attack the problem on a long-term basis. He then expressed doubt that any nation would be willing to take on a project so expensive and so speculative.

Perhaps if disarmament is achieved, he said, it will then be possible to divert some of the military radar "dishes" to listening for messages from other planets.

Dr. Brown described the possibility of extraterrestial life as "one of the most important, exciting questions confronting us."

CALLS LIFE ABUNDANT

His own personal bet, he said, is that life is "a very abundant commodity in our universe." But the chance of receiving signals from these other worlds, he said, depends largely upon how they have behaved and whether they have appropriated money to attempt to establish contact.

"Here I become somewhat gloomy," he said, "when I think about other legislatures in other worlds voting money for powerful transmitters to send signals that may or may not be heard in a few million years."

Dr. Brown used this example.

"The task that confronts us now," he said, "is how can we make the proper decisions in the legislative branch."

Behind this comment was the fact that jurisdiction over scientific problems is now fragment to illustrate his basic theme that "one of the most important tasks confronting us is how, in the democratic system, to make the correct decisions on problems involving technical and scientific considerations."

PART OF ANSWER FOUND

In recent years, he said, a "generally satisfactory" answer to this problem has been developed within the executive branch with the activation of the President's Science Advisory Committee, the creation of the Office of Scientific Adviser to the President and establishment of the Federal Council on Science and Technology to coordinate among several congressional committees, with no one committee exercising an overall policy review. It is this latter role that the House Science and Astronautics Committee, originally set up primarily to handle the space program, is now trying to fulfill.

Address by Ambassador of Portugal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I respectfully commend to the attention of my colleagues an address given recently by Senhor Pedro Theotonio Pereira, Ambassador of Portugal to the United States.

The speech came on the anniversary of one of the most savage affronts against humanity in recent times, the March 15 terrorism in northern Angola. Men, women, and children were butchered by those who now label the massacres a "political necessity."

Ambassador Pereira's remarks are most pertinent and should be given careful consideration by those concerned with the foreign-inspired outbreaks of violence in Africa, where such bloodletting is often the prelude to a Communist takeover effort:

REMARKS BY SENHOR PEDRO THEOTONIO PEREIRA, PORTUGUESE AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES, AT THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, MARCH 15, 1962

There are occasions in the life of a nation when its official representative, facing an audience of newsmen, must be blunt.

This is such an occasion for my country, and I propose to be nothing but honest and blunt, even at the risk of failing to gain popularity. In these crucial days, the Portuguese cannot afford the luxury of popularity contests—at which they were never very good anyway. But we have been true to the fundamental values of our Western civilization and our Christian faith—a sin for which we have often been called stubborn and a nuisance. We have been true to the principle of dignity, whether in individual or international relations, a sin for which our critics have at times called us awkward and myopic. We have been true to the ideal that proven friendships and alliances should not be sacrificed to dubious political expediencies—a sin for which some of our friends and others have called us on the carpet in the United Nations. Foremost, we have been uncompromisingly anti-Communist—a sin for which we have paid dearly in the forum of the United Nations and in some segments of the press in this country.

Today's date has a painful meaning for the Portuguese, one more reason why in my brief remarks to you I will be very direct. It was on the morning of March 15, 1961, exactly 1 year today, that bands of terrorists, trained and indoctrinated on foreign soil, led by political agitators and murderers, crossed the borders of northern Angola from the former Belgian Congo to perform one of the most gruesome deeds in the history of mankind. For the next 48 hours—and subsequently in other instances whenever they found helpless victims—the terrorists descended upon farms and villages of unsuspecting settlers. The attackers tortured, maimed, raped, and murdered without mercy. No human being caught by the terrorists was spared; not even the babies in their cribs. This is indeed a tale of horrors, but one which is fully documented by the surviving witnesses who managed to escape miraculously, or were left for dead amid the human debris; a tale which is fully documented by photographs taken by the first rescue teams arriving on the scene; a tale which has been confirmed once and again by the very killers who boasted about it.

As recently as last July, the self-acknowledged leader of the terrorist organization UPA, with headquarters in Leopoldville, in an interview published in the well-known Paris newspaper Le Monde, took full credit for these horrors, pleading to the Western mind to understand the political necessity for these massacres. In that interview the terrorist leaders went so far as to brag about the particularly gruesome incident which took place in the village of Lovo. There the marauders rounded up the white inhabitants of the village—men, women, and children—took them to the local sawmill, and cut them lengthwise in the mechanical saw.

This unbelievable savagery was, then, in the minds of the UPA leaders, a political necessity. Why? I shall go into it presently.

This terrorist leader, Holden Roberto, is the same man who, a few weeks ago, was touring the United States under the sponsorship of a private organization called the American Committee on Africa. Thanks to his sponsors in this country, this man has been dignified in segments of the press as a distinguished political leader, and he was invited to speak at several American universities, including two university estabments in Washington.

You might ask me now: How does the sheer absurdity of this pampering of a cold-blooded terrorist leader, like Holden Roberto, affect the people in Angola whose dear ones were tortured, mutilated, and slaughtered by his orders? I will tell you, and you will forgive me if the parallel I am going to draw is too undiplomatic. If Public Enemy No. 1 of the United States should have been invited by the Academy of Sciences of Lisbon to lecture at Portugese universities—need I say more?

But, of course, I am full aware that this true, naked premise is not acceptable to very many persons in responsible circles, because they tend to judge a given issue, not on the pertinent facts and merits or demerits of it, but on the overall ideological panorama into which they choose to fit the issue. In other words—if I may be allowed an oversimplification—assuming that one dislikes the regime in Lisbon and the personalities in the Government, one feels justified in supporting the killers of innocent men, women, and children, of both the white and black races, in northern Angola. And, again assuming that one believes that anything with on odor of colonialism is bad and everything with an anticolonialist slogan is good, then one feels justified in ignoring the facts of a particular situation and throwing one's weight against the victim, even though the victim is a loyal friend and ally. Carrying this reasoning a little further, one could justify armed bank robbery by building up an ideological case against bankers.

Incidentally, a similar philosophical premise was established by the Government of the Indian Union, with the enthusiastic support of the Soviets and other Communist countries, to justify the brutal aggression and military conquest of tiny, defenseless Goa.

God help us all—not just the Portuguese—if this trend is allowed to go unchecked.

If the inevitability of some trends is unavoidable, then other steady trends of the last two decades might also be inevitable; namely, the trend to communism in many parts of the world. Are we about to offer our children an amplified version of the old saying about death and taxes * * * specifically, that taxes, communism, and death are inevitable?

Portugal is perhaps too small a nation to dare question such a trend. But we question it. We do not accept it. What's more, we are fighting against it.

This is why I took the liberty of coming here, without any doubletalk, to tell you, my American friends, about the international design of destruction behind the terrorist offensive launched last year against northern Angola—terrorist waves which the international agitators are openly advertising anew for the near future, again against northern Angola, and possibly against northern Mozambique.

What then are the true factors behind this foreign-inspired and foreign-led terrorist offensive against the Portuguese oversea territories? Let us take one by one.

Foremost in the minds of the architects of extreme radical African nationalism is the intent to create a climate of race hatred. I make this statement advisedly, and I repeat it: to create a climate of race hatred. The basic philosophy of black racism, as a weapon to destroy the Western man and Western influence in the African continent, is clearly shown in the political pronouncements of the late leader, Patrice Lumumba, as well as in the doctrines often expressed by other radical African leaders.

Why do the Portuguese oversea territories represent such an obstacle to the political design of extreme radical African nationalism? It is such an obstacle precisely because Angola, for example, offers the evidence that a multiracial society can exist and prosper in the African continent. Thus, an Angolan nationalistic movement had to be invented abroad, because a genuine one did not exist within Angola itself; the harmony which for generations has existed between both races had to be broken; thus the coldly planned atrocities and massacres which, inevitably, would cause an angry reaction from the population and security measures from the government.

Above all, in the minds of the architects of destruction of the Portuguese oversea community, whether their plans of subversion were drafted in Leopoldville, Conakry, Accra, Casablanca, Tunis, or Moscow, the Portuguese concept and working of a multiracial society extant in Angola, where the color bar has never existed, this multiracial concept of a society had to be destroyed. Why? Simply this: because if you are a political demagog, an extremist, or a racist, you attempt to poison the mind and the body of your neighbor before you set out to conquer him from the outside.

Manifestly, from the viewpoint of the terrorist leaders, and of their mentors and supporters in the merciless game of subversion, it was inconceivable to let Angola live and prosper in tranquillity and peace while the weapon of political chaos was brought to the Congo. It was inconceivable for them to let the white, the black, and the mulatto work and live happily side by side when the strategy of extreme nationalism in many of the new African States demanded the destruction of Western man and Western influence in the African continent—a premise made easy by the simple device of lumping everything bad and good about European colonization into a single, objectionable word, "colonialism."

To accomplish the program of discrediting and destroying the Portuguese oversea community, a new and sinister dictionary of political semantics was invented, for use not only as propaganda, but also, and particularly, for the benefit of the anti-Portuguese coalition of Communist and Afro-Asian countries at the United Nations. This new concept of political semantics reversed most of the traditional notions to which we were used years ago. I must sadly admit that the reversal of the meaning of the words at the U.N. forum did not pose much of a problem to its proponents, because the victim selected, Portugal, is a rather small country. A rather small country with the stupid and stubborn habits of sticking to its convictions, of minding its own business, of working hard and living frugally, without taking recourse to international charity. I say that it did not pose much of a problem—except perhaps to the conscience of some—because in our days of global thinking, inevitable trends, high-sounding slogans, and me-tooism, a small nation and people, proud of their past, working hard to stay solvent in the present, and minding their own business, such a nation and people are a kind of anachronism—in a manner of speaking, out of the social list.

Then let us look at the framework of the new political semantics as applied to Portugal, particularly at the United Nations and in certain segments of the communication media which seem to believe that, to be a true liberal, you must be absolutely intolerant of anything or anyone who is not quite as liberal as you are. Therefore:

A coldly planned invasion of terrorists from one territory to another, with the purpose of torturing and murdering innocent civilians indiscriminately, becomes, in this macabre game of words, "a genuine, nationalist uprising." The savage murderers, who were either paid or doped to perform the unbelievable atrocities of last March, are called "rebels" and "patriots."

The action of the security forces dispatched to the scene to punish the criminals and restore peace to the area is called "brutal repression," and the concert of voices at the U.N. passes self-righteous resolutions urging Portugal to stop its efforts to restore law and order and peace in its own territories.

A lawful and prosperous Angola is painted as "a menace to international peace," whereas the armed conflict between the U.N. troops and the defenders of Katanga is pictured as a promotion of peace. The Leopoldville-based terrorist organization U.P.A. (ignored by 99 percent of the Angolan natives) and its hired killers are described sanctimoniously as fighters for the self-determination of Angola (although the majority of the terrorists have no links whatever with Angola).

In this picture of confusion that our enemies so diligently try to present, the perspective of the fundamentals of the matter appears to be lost. Certainly one of the most important fundamentals is the fact that the wave of terrorism which victimized a section of northern Angola (about 5 percent of the whole territory) was crushed; that life is returning to normal in the area, and that the population which fled the terrorist wave has returned, or is returning, to the villages. The work of rehabilitation done by the security forces in the zone has deserved the highest praise from the International Red Cross and from all the foreign correspondents (including a number of Americans) who visited the area recently. Yet, we are led to believe by the intensely partisan propaganda from foreign subversive sources (often finding willing echo among our friends and allies) that the whole of Angola is in ferment and revolt—a preposterous idea for anyone who knows that immense territory, twice the size of Texas. If it were in ferment, with the relatively small security forces concentrated on the region bordering the Congo, it would be impossible for me to stand here and say to you: The doors are open; go there and find out for yourselves. Indeed, quite a number of objective American newsmen have been there in the last few months. What they found did not correspond in the least to the picture which they had been given in advance by the anti-Portuguese propaganda.

But evidently our enemies are not interested in peace or pacification. They try incessantly from the outside to stir up feelings of racial hatred and to keep them aflame. Thus they brazenly announce new waves of terrorism to come, not only in Angola, but also in Mozambique, and they advertise the fact that some of their terrorist bands are being trained in the hills of Tunisia by Algerian experts on terrorism. They also feel that, for as long as they manage to have the U.N. taking up the discussion on Angola, they have not only a wonderful platform for the dissemination of their propaganda lies, but it lends the terrorists and their atrocities an air of legitimacy.

Incidentally, in this distorted image of Angola which our enemies have been able to present to the American public through the complicity of some private organizations, such as the notorious American Committee on Africa, and helped along by the naivete of others, one frequently sees this shocking picture: Any falsehood about Angola, coming from an anonymous source outside Angola, is referred to as a revelation. But the facts related from within the territory, and confirmed by foreign observers and jour-

nalists who have been there, are classified as "Portuguese propaganda."

Another favorite anti-Portuguese slogan is to the effect that we have erased the word "self-determination" from our political dictionary. Again, we fall into the confusing game of words played by our enemies and detractors. We never said, either at the United Nations or outside of it, that we oppose self-determination. The former Portuguese colony of Brazil—as it exists today as the greatest nation of South America—is an eloquent example of our policy of colonization and the promotion of multiracial societies. What we have said in the past, and we shall maintain it in the future, is that self-determination must be a process of political evolution from within, exclusively of the competence of the people concerned. We shall not accept foreign domination, communism, or chaos in our territories, dictated as it has been from abroad, even though disguised under the veil of respectability of a U.N. resolution drafted by the automatic Afro-Asian majority. The people of Angola—all of them Portuguese citizens with the right of self-expression through franchise—are the ones to eventually decide their political future. But they shall not be enslaved by foreign terrorists who are ever prepared to kill, in Angola or elsewhere, the name of liberation.

But let us return to the distorted image systematically presented by our enemies. They often speak of Angola as a kind of lost child in the woods. Thus, many foreign correspondents when they visit Angola do not recognize the place—until they are shown and told what the Portuguese have done with the virgin land they found centuries ago. They find in Luanda the most modern and attractive city on the entire west coast of Africa; they find many other smaller cities of which any new country would be proud. They find thriving industries; a very active and prosperous life in all fields of agriculture and trade. They find well-dressed Negroes, with responsible government and business positions, living on the same social level with the whites. They find very modern schools where the attendance runs across color line. They find modern hospitals and other health institutions at par or better than what they find in the most advanced African countries, etc., etc.

Yet, if one were to judge from the distorted image popularized by our detractors, the Portuguese must have the monopoly of all the world's imperfections. Much to our dismay, the distorted image of Angola, and of the Portuguese policy in general, has grown in this country to a point where at times we fail to recognize the place ourselves. It is as though a nightmare crept up to the minds of the fanatic and the intolerant idealist; in that nightmare, everything Portuguese appears to them in bizarre colors and shapes. And when impartial observers and correspondents go there to see everything they want to see, and come out with a picture so different from the image created by the visionaries of evil, what happens? In many instances it appears to increase still the determination of our enemies to make the slogan louder than the truth; to make the falsehood more impressive than the fact; to make the stereotyped picture of colonial Africa overshadow the very particular case of Portuguese Africa.

This is, I am afraid, part of the price one pays for being different. In a sense, it is thought, we cannot be right—no matter how right we might actually be—if the world, without even looking closely at the issue, shouts at us that we are wrong.

Evidently we have our faults; we have made our mistakes; we have at times failed to accomplish what we have set out to accomplish. But we have tried always to profit from past mistakes, and our oversea policy and structure have been in the process of evolution. The far-reaching reforms of last summer are clear evidence of that. But what state, what nation, what people can claim infallibility in the course of their development? Certainly not our most vehement detractors, for they are, if anything, further away from perfection than we are, because they would never admit their mistakes.

We have never claimed that we have the monopoly of wisdom, but, on the other hand, we are equally certain that our critics do not have that monopoly either. To our credit, we have, to say the very least, the best intentions and the will to work hard and to make sacrifices. Most of our critics have neither the good intentions nor the will to make sacrifices, unless it is at someone else's expense.

I realize that I have already exceeded the desirable time devoted to my remarks. I also realize that, in trying to convey to you the true perspective of the situation in Angola, and our view of the distorted image often presented in this country, I have failed, for lack of time, to go into questions in detail. I hope, however, that during the question-and-answer period, I may be able to clarify some other points.

Thank you.

Address by Hon. Douglas Dillon on the Occasion of the Dedication of the New Federal Building, Richmond, Va., March 21, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, dedication ceremonies for a new Federal office building—the largest single office structure in Richmond, Va.—were held March 21, 1962, in the capital of the Commonwealth of Virginia. Not only does this gleaming new edifice bring together some 1,500 employees from 18 heretofore widely scattered agencies of the Federal Government, but it also represents a sizable step forward in the city's civic center project. It was my pleasure to be present at the dedication along with Secretary of Treasury Douglas Dillon and Internal Revenue Commissioner Mortimer Caplin and to introduce the Secretary, who delivered the dedicatory address. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert in the RECORD a text of Secretary Dillon's fine talk.

I am delighted to be here in the capital of Virginia on a very pleasant mission—the dedication of this beautiful new Federal building.

Ten Federal departments and agencies will do business here, but the Treasury Department—primarily the Internal Revenue Service—will occupy approximately two-thirds of it.

It was Congressman GARY who first invited me to be with you here today. I have had the pleasure of working closely with him on appropriations matters for the past 5 years, and I can tell you without hesitation that, in VAUGHAN GARY, you have one of the truly outstanding Members of the House, a man whose influence for good is felt far beyond his particular committee assignments.

Congressman GARY tells me that he attended high school right here in this area, so it must have many memories for him. He has also told me about the fine civic center which I understand will be developed around this spot. It is always pleasant to see a city—especially such a fine city as this—moving ahead.

This building is a symbol of that progress, and of another kind of progress as well—the steady improvement in administration of our tax system. In this country, tax collecting has been developed in the tradition of freemen who understand both their common responsibilities and their individual rights. No other country relies to such an extent on the self-assessment system. No other country has such a fine record of compliance as we have in America. Last year, for instance a total of $91 billion was collected through self-assessment and only $3 billion came from direct enforcement efforts.

This has come about because we realized long ago that undue coercion has no place in a free society. We have developed a professional organization of men and women trained in the law, in accounting, in modern processing techniques, and in the various other facets of tax administration. These people are trained to enforce the law and no more.

The development of this kind of professionalism is a continuing process. I have been pleased to note that, within the last year, important new programs have been added to further raise our standards. Among these have been increased emphasis on quality in audits, thoroughness in investigation, and methodical search for causes and cures of such problems as delinquent accounts and returns.

The Internal Revenue Service has also pioneered in the use of automatic data processing in tax administration. This new system has already begun to function in the seven southeastern States and will be expanded during the next few years to all the other areas of the country. Recently, the new National Computer Center of the Internal Revenue Service was opened in Martinsburg, W. Va. There magnetic tapes, bearing taxpayer data from all over the country, will be electronically compared and recorded. This represents a truly historic advance in recordkekeping, in selecting returns for further examination, and in detecting delinquencies. To the taxpayer it means greater efficiency, and greater confidence that the burden of taxation will be shared fairly by all taxpayers.

The excellent rate of tax payments under our self-assessment system reflects the high confidence that the public places in the fairness and efficiency of the Internal Revenue Service, as well as the general realization that our taxes support programs essential to the safety and welfare of all the people of the United States.

We must, however, continue to improve our tax system. We will continue to need not only competent and dedicated administrators, but modernization and simplification of the tax laws themselves. This is a long-range task and we cannot expect to accomplish it all at once. For the present, we are gratified by the consideration being given in the Congress to President Kennedy's tax recommendations—particularly the proposal for an incentive credit for businesses which invest in new machines and equipment. This—together with the overall revision of depreciation schedules we are now in process of carrying out—well help American business increase its productive efficiency, expand its sales against foreign competition, and provide more jobs. Along with our other tax proposals, this program will contribute to domestic economic growth and to stemming our gold drain by increasing our exports.

This tax policy emphasis on domestic investment is an important part of our over-

all economic policy. Increasing our investment in productive equipment is an important reason for having a balanced Federal budget, to assure that Government borrowing does not interfere with the flow of funds for such use. It is also behind our monetary policy of relative ease, to assure that business can borrow funds in adequate amounts at reasonable rates for increased investment. Such investment, by encouraging business to modernize equipment, and increase efficiency, is, we believe the soundest way of increasing our domestic growth rate and eliminating our balance-of-payments deficits.

The rest of our current tax program centers around measures to improve the fairness and effectiveness of the tax laws, including withholding on dividends and interest, elimination of abuses of expense accounts, repeal of the dividend exclusion and credit, removal of special advantages to investment abroad, and removal of the tax preferences that are no longer justified for mutual fire and casualty insurance companies, mutual savings banks, and savings and loan associations.

With these improvements, and with the overall reform in our tax laws which President Kennedy has called for—and which we intend to submit to the Congress later this year—we can look forward to further progress.

That progress will continue, until the present complicated maze of tax law has been simplified as much as possible; until existing inequities have been eliminated, and until tax policy has been made a more positive stimulus to our Nation's economic growth. All this must be done within a framework of courteous, efficient, and effective administration with one overriding principle—absolute fairness to every single taxpayer.

Portugal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully commend the attention of my colleagues to the fourth and fifth installments of a series of six articles on Portugal and her African provinces by Robert Estabrook of the Washington Post. I will conclude this series with the insertion of the final article in tomorrow's RECORD:

FEVERISH EFFORTS TO CATCH UP—PORTUGAL'S CLAIM OF PROGRESS IN AFRICA STUMBLES OVER PAST LAPSES IN EDUCATION

(By Robert H. Estabrook)

LONDON.—Inadequate education is the Achilles heel of Portugal in her attempts to justify her case in the African provinces of Angola and Mozambique. Vastly expanded education, in turn, can be the saving grace in a good-faith effort to build a multiracial Portuguese Commonwealth.

Figures of past performance are pathetic. After more than four centuries of Portuguese presence in what is regarded as an historic mission to spread civilization, the African population of these two territories is still overwhelmingly illiterate. For that matter, literacy in metropolitan Portugal is only about 60 percent.

In Angola, which has a population of about 5 million, 95 percent of it African, there were only about 100,000 children in school in 1960. This amounts to 17.8 percent of the school-age population.

Mozambique, with a population of 6 million, also 95 percent African, has a somewhat better record—perhaps in part because teacher salaries are 50 percent higher than in metropolian Portugal. About half a million children, perhaps 60 percent of the school-age population, are in school. Some 430,000 of them, however, attend adaptation or preprimary schools where the principal activity is learning Portuguese.

There is now feverish activity in both provinces to build new schools and recruit additional teachers, and the intention quickly to expand education cannot be doubted. But the effect of long years of inattention cannot be overcome instantly.

The number of lyceus, or high schools, in the two areas can be counted almost on one's fingers and toes. There is not a single institution of higher learning in either province.

There are, of course, some reasons for this poor statistical showing. Adequate education is peculiarly a feature of concentrations of population; and despite the existence of modern cities and towns, most of Angola and Mozambique is still sparsely settled rural and bush country.

Although most education in the cities and towns is in public, state-operated schools, in the interior it has been largely in the hands of religious missions.

The plain fact is that until recently there has not been much official emphasis upon education. Africans who have pursued schooling sometimes have found it difficult to get decent jobs in competition with less educated white immigrants. Sometimes they even think it better to pretend that they are untutored.

It is difficult and sometimes impossible for Africans to obtain visas for university study in other countries. A few do succeed in going on to universities in Portugal with the help of government or municipal scholarships. They are well treated and there is no apparent racial discrimination. But very few indeed return to Angola and Mozambique.

Although Portuguese administrators would deny the observation, it probably is fair to say that there has been a latent suspicion of educated Africans. This suspicion broke into the open after the terrorism erupted last year in northwest Angola.

In turn the suspicion fell upon the missionaries. Holden Roberto, the leader of the insurgent Union of the People of Angola, is the product of a Methodist school. American Methodists and British Baptists, especially, are accused of fomenting revolutionary tendencies among the Africans.

The scrutiny did not exclusively concern Protestants. Eight Catholic priests, including a senior African monsignor, have been arrested in Angola, and the Catholic Church has been told, in effect, to support the government.

As a consequence of episodes in which four Methodist students were helped out of Angola to seek political asylum and others fled from Portugal into Spain and France, several American Methodist missionaries were arrested and expelled. One British missionary was jailed for almost 3 months and was subjected to relentless interrogation.

There are some quite harrowing tales of what happened to native pastors. They were arrested by the scores, spirited away from their families and imprisoned without trial—often on no more than a remote suspicion that they might be connected with the independence movement.

Many Portuguese officials view the Protestant missionaries as inherently revolutionary; indeed, one Cabinet minister in Lisbon implied that Baptists were linked with communism because there is a Baptist pastor in Moscow.

Whatever the failings of the past and the arbitrary procedures of the present, education is now very much a matter of prime attention. The new Governor General of Angola, Gen. Venancio Deslandes, listed education as the top priority in a development program announced last October following formal compilation of the military campaign against the terrorists.

Accordingly, Angolan officials hope optimistically to have 60 percent of the school-age children actually in school by 1965. They have to contend not merely with the lack of teachers and buildings, but also with African mores. Many students drop out of school, not for want of encouragement, but because of family pressures to get jobs.

Major emphasis in both provinces is placed upon the adaptation schools where Africans learn Portuguese before proceeding to the 4-year primary schools. African teachers, themselves graduates of primary schools, are being recruited to go into the Angolan bush as instructors.

There is a comparable effort to expand intermediate education in 5- and 7-year lyceus and in technical schools.

At Nova Lisboa, an interior city of Angola, large numbers of African students work side by side with white students in a technical school perfecting highly intricate tools and doing complicated carpentry. The pattern is repeated elsewhere, and the number of Africans participating is increasing markedly.

Although neither province now has a university, recently Dr. Adriano Moreira, the Minister of Oversea Affairs in Lisbon, announced plans to build institutions of higher learning in both Angola and Mozambique.

Thus, notwithstanding the laggardness of the past, the Portuguese are now expanding education in earnest, seemingly convinced not only that they must make up time, but also that educational opportunity offers the only way to bring into being their objective of a community of Portuguese citizens with equal rights.

But more education also will bring other problems. Educated Africans surely will demand increasing political and economic opportunities of the sort now often unavailable to them.

PORTUGUESE AFRICA LIFE IS STRATIFIED

(By Robert H. Estabrook)

LONDON.—One of Portugal's proudest boasts in her African provinces of Angola and Mozambique is that there is no color bar there and that a genuinely multiracial society is emerging with equal rights for all.

Is this boast a camouflage for the perpetuation of colonial rule, as other African nations charge? Or are the Portuguese attempting to work out a solution whereby the African and white populations can live harmoniously together? The answer is, it depends.

For more than 400 years the Portuguese have been in both territories. Their handiwork is in little enclaves and replicas of Portugal: the cities look more modern, but they contain primarily European institutions imposed upon a population 95 percent African. Life is highly stratified.

EUROPEANS HOLD WEALTH

The great bulk of the wealth in both provinces is in the hands of Europeans. The large ranches and plantations, most of the businesses and shops, the transportation systems, the hotels are run by white residents.

Yet the Portuguese, of all the European colonizers, probably have been the least sensitive to color. There have been, and are, many mixed marriages, there is a substantial mulatto population. And Portuguese citizens of many hues from Goa, Macao, the Cape Verde Islands and other territories are in high offices.

There is no legal segregation. In theory color makes no difference in jobs, housing and so on. An African is free to rise according to his ability, or so the line goes. The discrimination that exists is largely economic.

JOBLESS AFRICANS

This particular problem is aggravated by new immigrants from Portugal who are encouraged to settle in Angola and Mozambique (the government hopes that many of the soldiers brought to Angola will marry and remain there). Newcomers, sometimes with less education than the Africans, exert a social and economic squeeze.

Thus despite the absence of legalized discrimination it often is difficult for Africans to get good jobs. There are no African taxi or bus drivers in Luanca; some hotel staffs are white because Africans are considered "unreliable"; and white immigrants are even invading the ranks of the newsboys, heretofore African. Pressures increase when there is white unemployment.

But if the Africans are primarily in menial jobs, farming or manual labor, the reason is not always white economic pressure. Local mores also have something to do with it.

WORK IS FOR WOMEN

For centuries it has been customary for African men to work only long enough to pay for food and clothing for their families. Africans working on plantations habitually take 6 months off each year to go back and live with their tribes.

Among the uneducated and unassimilated Africans there still is something of a tradition that work is for women.

European-style houses do not always appeal to Africans. On some plantations neat and comfortable plastered houses have been provided; but the Africans complain that cement floors are damp and the houses hot. They prefer to build their own mud and thatch huts.

In Monzambique the city of Lourenco Marques attempted to build modern homes for some of the African residents. According to Government officials many Africans chose to remain in their own quarters fenced off on the fringes of town, with refuse and sanitary collections made by the city.

EXCEPTIONS TO RULE

Only a few thousand Africans in both Provinces have become civilisados and have adopted European ways. It does not automatically follow, however, that obstacles have been imposed. Some Africans, even with education, prefer to avoid taxes and other obligations by declining to list themselves as assimilated.

Perhaps there is an element of rationalization and paternalism in such explanations of the stereotyped African. But there are plenty of exceptions to the stereotype to indicate that some do benefit from opportunity.

In the shops of the Benguela Railway at Nova Lisboa, Angola, African crane drivers, lathe operators, and welders perform the most complicated technical jobs, often at higher pay than their white coworkers. Many are studying for better jobs.

There are African mayors and members of city councils in several Angolan towns, and there are Africans prominent in customs and other civil service jobs. Some shops are operated by Africans. The few African professional men earn substantially more money than most of the white population.

Angolan hospitals are nonsegregated, and the presence of Africans, Goans, and Cape Verdians among the doctors attests the absence of color prejudice. The previous Governor General of Angola was a Cape Verdian.

One of the chronic complaints has been that of "forced labor"; accusations made by Ghana are now before the International Labor Organization. Unquestionably there have been abuses by Portuguese white traders and by local governors. Africans resented the requirement that they work 6 months in every year.

The impression persists, however, that these abuses are largely in the past. The question now is whether the system of contract labor, whereby Africans are recruited by outside employers or by tribal chiefs to work far away from home, is really voluntary.

MINES ADD SELF-ESTEEM

Portuguese officials say that African men like to work in the South African mines because this is considered a badge of manhood. When they return, with some of their salary saved, their social position is enhanced and they can buy wives. The government supposedly supervises recruiting to guard against coercion.

Theoretically Africans who went to north Angola to help with reconstruction after the terrorism there were volunteers. Missionaries assert that promises made to the volunteers were not fulfilled; but there is no indication of other mistreatment.

Nevertheless Governor General Venancio Deslandes in Luanda is aware of the complaints against long-distance recruiting. He hopes gradually to eliminate it as economic development proceeds.

FEAR OF SECURITY POLICE

Where the protests have more validity is in the Portuguese suspicions of educated Africans, particularly after the terrorism began. There is widespread fear of PIDE, the security police. Africans who talk independence or "get out of line" have been known to suddenly disappear.

Unquestionably some white settlers constituted themselves vigilantes after the terrorism, and Africans suspected of complicity were murdered in several areas.

But higher government officials tried quickly to damp down such activities especially the racial aspect. Even critics believe that many administrators try hard to be fair.

There is undeniably a large number of political prisoners; General Deslandes acknowledges between 11,000 and 12,000 from the terrorism in the north who are gradually being paroled or reoriented.

Deslandes also concedes that many Africans have been held without trial. This was an emergency measure occasioned by the guerrilla war. He hopes to bring all prisoners soon to trial.

INTERNAL INDIANS

In a separate category are the Indians interned after the loss of Goa. Indians constitute a shopkeeping middle class in both provinces; in Mozambique there are some 12,000 Indians and Pakistanis.

When the Government attempted to round up the Indians, however, it found that many had British passports; others were already Portuguese citizens. Of some 1,000 Indians in the Mozambique city of Beira only about 150 were interned.

Behind the official rejection of outside criticism, last September the Government in Lisbon instituted sweeping political reforms in the African provinces. Henceforth all persons, African or white are Portuguese citizens.

An African may elect to follow either public or tribal law. He may obtain the political franchise (and it exists to a limited degree in local affairs despite the dictatorship in Lisbon) by showing proof of literacy or paying income taxes.

Simultaneously other restrictions were abolished. Africans no longer will need to carry workbooks to be signed by white employers when working on other than their own land. Henceforth there will be standard identity cards for all.

These reforms have not all been put fully into effect, and there are still many contradictions in the Portuguese multiracial policy.

Indian Fishing Off Reservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced House Joint Resolution 657, which would clarify the rights of the States to enforce State game laws in cases where Indians fish outside their reservations.

Although I believe the States have this right, there seems to be a sense of confusion among officials in my own State of Washington concerning this matter. This has led to resentment on the part of many sportsmen who are not Indians and has caused a few Indians to take advantage of a situation caused by lack of law enforcement.

I say a few Indians, Mr. Speaker, because I believe the majority of my Indian constituents want to abide by good conservation practices and will abide by the law. Many have expressed this to me in conversation and in letters.

Mr. Speaker, the serious nature of the problem is implied in an editorial that appeared in the Bellingham, Wash., Herald on March 18, 1962. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

FEDERAL BILL MAY HELP CLARIFY STEELHEAD STATUS

Since the State appears to be stymied in attempting to protect steelhead runs and since Indian leaders seem about as flexible on this issue as a Russian at a disarmament conference, Congressman JACK WESTLAND's solution may be the logical one.

WESTLAND thinks present law permits the State to regulate off-reservation Indian fishing for conservation purposes, but since State game personnel and law enforcement officials aren't sure of their ground, the Congressman has introduced a bill defining the intent of Congress. It would spell out Federal recognition of the rights of States to regulate fishing off reservation areas.

It has seemed to us too bad that present-day Indians, who long ago should have been assimilated into the population, feel they have to cling fast to treaties signed more than a century ago. We recognize that they do have special rights, as long as the reservation way of life is what they want, but we can see no moral justification for Indians using ambiguous treaty language to claim rights on nonreservation streams that are denied to other citizens.

It is unfortunate that this problem, which has raised so much controversy between sportsmen and game officials on the one hand and Indians on the other, cannot be settled voluntarily and within the boundaries of the State. But Federal treaties are involved and it is better for Congress to clarify the issue than for angry men to attempt to impose their wills the hard way.

Teenage Drinking—IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose news reports from New Jersey papers indicating the renewed determination with which officials of New Jersey and other States which share a common border with New York are approaching officials of the State of New York in an effort to persuade them to raise the legal drinking age from 18 to 21.

The articles appeared in the Courier-News, of Plainfield, on March 21, the Daily Journal, of Elizabeth, on March 22, and the Newark Evening News on March 22:

[From the Plainfield (N.J.) Courier-News, Mar. 21, 1962]

NEW JERSEY TO RENEW PLEA TO NEW YORK ON DRINKING

TRENTON.—New Jersey will make a renewed appeal to New York to raise its minimum drinking age from 18 to 21, Governor Hughes said yesterday.

He said he will join Governors Lawrence of Pennsylvania and Dempsey of Connecticut in petitioning New York's Governor Rockefeller to make New York's law conform to New Jersey's minimum drinking age of 21.

TEENAGERS KILLED

He discussed the problem at a news conference in response to questions about recent fatal automobile accidents involving New Jersey teenagers returning from bars just across the border in New York.

Hughes disclosed that Acting Motor Vehicle Director Ned J. Parsekian has been working for 10 days on the redrafting of an appeal to New York.

The document, Hughes said, will show how New Jersey has sought to reduce teenage liquor buying at all three levels of State government.

He noted that the courts have laid down new and strong precedents making taverns and nightclubs responsible as third parties in damage suits involving customers.

Legislative efforts are continued to make implied consent for scientific drunken driving tests part of every motorist's driving privilege.

LICENSES LIFTED

In addition, he said, the State alcoholic beverage commission has hit hard at taverns serving drinks to minors and has not hesitated to suspend licenses.

Hughes said he is "sympathetic" toward the purpose of a bill introduced Monday by Senator Pierce H. Deamer, Jr., Republican, Bergen, designed to strike at teenage drinking.

The bill would empower magistrates to suspend or revoke the driver's license of anyone under 21 caught with alcoholic beverages in his car. The bill has the approval of Parsekian's MV division.

[From the Elizabeth (N.J.) Daily Journal, Mar. 22, 1962]

NEW JERSEY TO PRESS NEW YORK ON TEEN LIQUOR LAW

TRENTON.—New Jersey officials announced plans today for a new two-State appeal to New York to raise its legal drinking age this year, even if it requires a special session of the New York Legislature.

Ned J. Parsekian, New Jersey's acting motor vehicle director, said he will fly to Harrisburg, Pa., later today to get Gov. David L. Lawrence's signature on a petition seeking the change in New York law. Gov. Richard J. Hughes of New Jersey has already signed the petition.

Parsekian said he has an appointment with Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller in New York City at 11:30 a.m. tomorrow to present the petition.

The States surrounding New York have been putting on increasing pressure for the law change. New York allows drinking at 18, while all of its neighbors forbid anyone under 21 from drinking at bars.

In recent weeks, border counties in New Jersey have had several fatal accidents attributed to teenagers returning from New York drinking sprees.

New York legislative leaders have said there is no chance of changing the law at the 1962 session, which ends next week.

Parsekian said the petition to Rockefeller will ask for action at this session, or at a special session later this year.

"Governor Hughes does not believe we can afford to wait another year," Parsekian said.

Parsekian said he would not give details of the petition, but said it would include statistics indicating the seriousness of the problem in border counties.

Although New York has taken no action on similar appeals from New Jersey for years, Parsekian said he was not pessimistic.

"For one thing, now there is a lot more public awareness of the problem," he said.

Parsekian said Gov. John Dempsey, of Connecticut, agreed with the new appeal, but did not join in because he had led the fight in an earlier joint effort and felt his view was clear.

TERMED OUT THIS YEAR

TROY, N.Y.—Assembly Speaker Joseph F. Carlino last night said no action would be taken by the legislature this year on a proposal to raise the minimum drinking age in New York State from 18 to 21.

Carlino said in an interview that the joint legislative committee on intoxicating liquors was studying recodification of the State's alcoholic beverage control laws and that the minimum legal drinking age was part of that study.

He said the committee was expected to make recommendations to the 1963 legislature and that no action would be taken before the recommendations have been received.

[From the Newark (N.J.) News, Mar. 22, 1962]

TWO GOVERNORS PUSH DRINKING AGE FIGHT

TRENTON.—Governor Hughes and Governor Lawrence of Pennsylvania will jointly petition Governor Rockefeller tomorrow for a special session of the New York Legislature to raise the New York drinking age limit from 18 to 21.

The disclosure was made here today by Acting Motor Vehicle Director Ned J. Parsekian, who said he will deliver their petition to Rockefeller at 11:30 a.m. tomorrow at the New York Governor's Manhattan office, 22 West 55th Street.

Parsekian said he will fly to Harrisburg, Pa., this afternoon to present the petition to Lawrence for his signature. Lawrence already has agreed to sign, he said.

PENNSYLVANIA PROBLEM

In Harrisburg, Lawrence's executive secretary, Warren Giesey, said Hughes initiated the petition idea but that Lawrence "readily" joins it. The Pennsylvania Governor will go from Pittsburgh today to meet Parsekian in the State capital and sign the petition, Giesey said.

Pennsylvania's problem is not so great as New Jersey's, he declared, because its counties that border New York are not heavily populated. "But our law enforcement people nevertheless tell us it is still a real problem," said Giesey.

Giesey said Pennsylvania is convinced the solution lies in uniformity of the drinking age in all States.

Parsekian refused to release details of the petition until it is presented to Rockefeller. However, he did say it would contain data to support the New Jersey and Pennsylvania contention that the lower New York drinking age lures teenagers, usually in cars, to New York drinking spots and makes them a driving menace on the road home.

Two Bergen County teenagers were killed in a car crash Sunday night while on their way home from a tavern in Tallman, N.Y. These fatalities brought to nine the number of youngsters known to have died in highway accidents under similar circumstances since last September.

Parsekian stressed today that New Jersey studies in counties bordering New York "make it clear that teenagers are going over the border to drink, that they have a higher accident rate than other drivers and that most of their accidents take place in the early morning."

New York has repeatedly turned down similar appeals that it raise its drinking age. Parsekian said it now is the only State of the 50 to permit hard liquor to be served to those under 21.

Parsekian said he is "more optimistic" about the chances for remedial action in Albany this year "because of growing public awareness of the problem."

The special session is being sought, he said, because the New York Legislature is due to shut down for the year March 31, and there is little chance for any action during the regular session. If the Albany legislators agree to take up the question immediately, he said, there would be no need for a special session.

In this connection, Assemblyman Joseph Carlino, speaker of the New York house, said today he is certain that no action on the drinking law will be taken at the current session of the legislature.

"This matter is under the consideration of a committee headed by Senator John Marchi of Staten Island," Carlino said. "The committee will not report until the next session. The legislature certainly will not act until it has this report."

CONNECTICUT INTERESTED

Parsekian said that Gov. John N. Dempsey of Connecticut, although not formally joining the petition, has informed Hughes he supports its aim. Dempsey led the move in the recent New England Governors' Conference that resulted in a demand on New York to raise its drinking age, the director said.

Three New England States—Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Vermont, all with drinking ages of 21—share a common border with New York.

The Conservative Groundswell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, last Friday every Member of the House received a vial from a Texas taxpayer. In the

vial is a note, saying, "and this is the grassroots of America."

While these are actual roots of the grass and could not be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would insert a grassroots editorial from the Buffalo (S. Dak.) Times-Herald, one of the very good newspapers of western South Dakota, which contains grassroots thinking. It is as follows:

THE CONSERVATIVE GROUNDSWELL

Polls taken in a number of States, including the poll taken by Congressman E. Y. BERRY in western South Dakota, indicate that a strong movement is evident in many areas to return to a more conservative attitude in government at the local, State and National level. The swing of the pendulum is inevitable as more and more people realize that the policy of expanding Central Government has fostered a disregard for fiscal responsibility that is in effect mortgaging the birthright of generations to come.

A spend, tax, borrow, spiral has taken us to an astronomical level of debt which threatens the future of our country. Unless the trend is reversed, the United States faces a future of very shaky position among the nations of the world.

Although the propaganda currently being used against Americans who advocate more conservative handling of the Nation's private wealth and a return to constitutional Government often describes them as radicals in various stages of lunacy, nothing could be much further from the fact. The backbone of the conservative movement is made up of men who have started at the bottom of the economic ladder, and through their own initiative and thrift, taking advantage of the free enterprise system, have worked their way to positions of public confidence and in some cases, to financial affluence. They are men who have known hard times and debt. They have met payrolls and have produced goods. They know that wealth comes only through work and production. They know that Washington has nothing to give to the people but that which it has first taken from them. They know the odds against filling an inside straight. They realize the improbability of making successful treaties or contracts with people who have no regard for word or promise.

These men recognize the Christian morality of contracting no debts without reasonable assurance and intention of paying off. They realize that further borrowing is not the moral way to repay the debts. They believe that government of the people, by the people, and for the people functions best at the local level where elected officials are accessible and use of tax money is directly accountable to the folks who furnish it.

In times of world strife like the present, the conservatives believe that after necessary funds are provided to defend our country and keep it strong in the world, a tighter rein should be kept on less essential functions of Federal Government, and responsibility for many of these functions returned home.

Most of these men have read the Communist manifesto and are fully aware that the Communist movement includes subversion and economic warfare. They are capable of remembering the Alger Hiss case and remembering it as part of the Communist plan for world conquest.

The conservatives, although much maligned in the newspapers and magazines today, are a growing force in America, and are sound and influential members of both political parties. They are not all crowd-swaying speechmakers, but are a strong force working for the return to constitutionally responsible Government in the United States, and a return to recognition of the individual rather than the great mass of people.

Iowa Farm Bureau Members Look at Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, each year the Iowa congressional delegation has the privilege of meeting with Iowa Farm Bureau representatives from all of the counties in Iowa. They come to Washington to give us their views not only on farm legislation but on the other issues with which we are wrestling in Congress. I, for one, have found these conferences stimulating and enlightening, and have benefited from this neutral exchange of views.

As an example of what is discussed, I direct the attention of the Members of the remarks of Mr. John Augustine of Wapello County, Iowa, who spoke at the banquet for the Iowa delegation this year. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Augustine's statement in the Appendix of the RECORD:

Mr. Chairman, Senator HICKENLOOPER, Iowa Congressman, fellow Farm Bureau members; I will cover three areas in my short statement:

1. We feel Government is attempting to solve too many problems which should be left to local governments. For example: Federal aid to education, Federal housing, urban renewal, etc. I even read where the Federal Government might have gotten in the sewage business in Des Moines. Now I'm quite sure this is a problem of a local nature and one I should be for, since I live on the Des Moines River below Des Moines, but it's still a local problem and should be handled as such.

2. Now let us delve briefly in the area of reciprocal trade. Farm Bureau has supported this measure since its inception and is real happy to support it again and for a number of very good reasons. This is possibly as important a piece of legislation as is currently being considered. This whole area of trade has more than economic connotations. It can have a very significant social effect on many people in many countries. It looms even larger now, at least to me, in view of the European Common Market.

I deem it fortunate for all concerned that our President, Mr. Kennedy, has taken the lead on this one and we all owe him much for his effort and should help him to the best of our ability, both now and in the future, to get the best legislation possible to further our successes in the field of foreign trade. (If any of my Republican friends want equal time on this, contact our chairman.)

Agriculture is in a position where it could make a real contribution to peace and for this reason alone we should explore every possibility that presents itself.

3. Farm legislation: I do not wish to appear belligerent, but there are some things that have to be mentioned relative to agricultural legislation. The administration's agricultural supply program S. 2786 poses many questions in the minds of Farm Bureau members. Has anyone ever heard of any groups, be they producers of food, fiber or anything else, being asked to make a choice like this one? Wholly unacceptable in its present form.

Insofar as producing for a free market is concerned, it would be fine if all parties involved were to play under the same rule. However, to expect agriculture to compete favorably with other segments of the economy that are either heavily subsidized or otherwise protected, is wholly unreasonable. Farm Bureau would concur that we need permanent type legislation but not this one.

Dueling was made illegal many years ago. But when you were challenged, you were extended the courtesy of a choice of weapons with which to defend yourself. Whereas in this proposal we are offered the option of pulling the economic rug from beneath ourselves or having it done for us. This type of legislation would give as much latitude or maneuverability as a straitjacket. Further it would tend to maintain the status quo and any change of an individual's operation would be very difficult, as much of this proposal is based on the history of the farm, disregarding past land management and this could cause very real hardships.

Now we do not want to be considered in the position of the man who sprayed his orchard, not because he was for apples, but because he was against worms. Nor would we want anyone to think we were or are against Secretary Freeman. We would be first to agree that he is a hard-working man and I'm real happy that he is telling the food story to our urban friends and consumers. Further emphasis could be placed here, inasmuch as most of our population takes food for granted and it is not a simple task to provide the quality and variety of food and fiber that we have available. If it were a simple job and all that was needed was manpower, then somewhere, right now, there would not be a bunch of used commissars sitting around wondering about their future.

Now to mention three salient points in Farm Bureau's cropland retirement program:

1. Conservation reserve: With 22 or 23 million acres in this program, it gives us a real good start toward our objective and we support the extension of same.

2. Voluntary land retirement: Where we could get whole farms, this would enable us to get the good land as well as the less desirable. Also it appeals to part-time farmers as well as men who are nearing retirement. Voluntary retirement of land can be done, we think, in amounts that would be large enough to meet the needed total acreage.

3. We would be remiss if we failed to consider the domestic agriculture policy along with the Reciprocal Trade Act because to do otherwise might jeopardize a future opportunity that might arise and we could find ourselves in the awkward position of being unable to trade before we even got a trade started.

I hope in all of these things we can have three things:

1. The vision to see all that is involved.

2. The wisdom to solve the problems contained therein.

3. The courage to act.

We have absolute faith in the judgments arrived at, through our democratic processes as we have known them, and I hope we can be as big as our opportunities.

Bipartisan Support for Federal Aid to Education Without Federal Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Washington (D.C.) Post, under date of March 25, 1962:

PROMOTING EDUCATION

In spite of all the defeatism within the administration regarding Federal aid to education, a committee of citizens—a most distinguished committee—has been established to press for congressional approval, in this session of Congress, of bipartisan legislation for assistance to public elementary and secondary schools. Creation of the committee is heartening. It represents a characteristically American response to a pressing community need. The genius of American growth has been, in large measure, this disposition on the part of eminent citizens to seize the initiative, without waiting for governmental leadership, and to press for action which the Government is too timorous or too torpid to undertake.

The new committee, under the chairmanship of George J. Hecht, publisher of Parents' magazine, includes two former Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare, Arthur Flemming, and Marion Folsom; a former president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Eric Johnston; and one of the most respected of American educators, James B. Conant, president emeritus of Harvard University. Seeking bipartisan support for its goal, the committee has chosen to mobilize public opinion behind the simplest and least controversial Federal aid formula, the bill introduced by Representative CLEVELAND M. BAILEY. This bill would obviate any danger of Federal control of the public schools by leaving it entirely to the State and local education agencies to use Federal funds for whatever they themselves decide are their most critical areas of educational need.

The Citizens Committee plans a nationwide campaign of information and assistance for all individuals and organizations, in and out of government, who are working toward the same objectives. Such a campaign is, we think, the indispensable means for bringing about congressional action. If parent-teachers' associations, women's clubs, American Legion posts, local chambers of commerce, and boards of trade all over the land can be made to understand the desperate condition of the American public school system, they will create a clamor for Federal aid to which Congress will have to respond.

We wish the Citizens Committee a short life and a vigorous one. It is undertaking an invaluable educational function.

Tax Investment Credit of Revenue Act of 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting comments on the operation of the investment credit in the tax bill which will be considered this week. Perhaps it would be more appropriate to say that my remarks comment on how the investment credit does not operate as some people would lead us to believe it does.

Mr. Speaker, in the past several weeks I have been examining the provisions of H.R. 10650, the Revenue Act of 1962. I have reached the conclusion that the enactment of this bill will do much to strengthen our economic position and create greater equity in our tax system. With regard to the investment credit, I would like to try to clear up a few points as to its operation.

Some members have raised a number of questions about the investment credit, particularly in its application to used property. It has been incorrectly said that the credit would be allowed for the purchase of a going business and that this could lead to big companies being given an incentive to gobble up their smaller competitors. It was also suggested that companies could obtain the credit by periodically swapping property.

Both of these concerns are without foundation. Under the bill, the investment credit for used, as opposed to new, property is allowed only on a limited basis commensurate with the needs of small business. The limit is $50,000 per year. This limited credit for purchases of used property will aid small businesses which are in a position to upgrade their equipment by purchasing better used equipment, but which do not have the financial resources to purchase expensive new equipment. Even within this limit, however, the bill contains a number of safeguards to prevent possible abuses.

If any large company wants to purchase a going business, it can so do by purchasing the stock or the assets of the business. If it purchases the stock, no investment credit would be allowed. Even if it purchased the assets directly, credit would be allowed only as to 7 percent—under the proposed amendment of the Committee on Ways and Means—of $50,000 of the assets purchased, or $3,500. Since the amount of the credit depends to some degree on the remaining life of the assets, this $3,500 credit would be even smaller if any of the assets had remaining lives of less than 8 years.

It is obvious that no large company which makes a decision to purchase a going business will decide to do so on the basis of a possible investment credit which would amount to $3,500 at most. This is doubly true when it is realized that this same large company could purchase an equal amount of new assets and obtain a credit equal to 7 percent of the entire investment, not limited to $50,000. The incentive to the large company under the credit is to purchase new machinery and equipment, not to try to absorb small businesses. The limited credit for used property, on the other hand, will serve its function by encouraging upgrading of equipment by small businesses.

As to the charge that businesses will be able to swap used properties periodically, I would like to point out that there are a number of safeguards in the bill which would prevent the allowance of the credit in this type of case. First, in the case of a direct swap of used property the credit is granted only as to the excess cash paid. Thus, in a direct swap of properties with no cash involved, no credit would be allowed. The bill further provides that even in the case of an indirect replacement of property through a third party, a similar rule is to apply. If a business sells old equipment and purchases similar equipment from a third party, it will obtain a credit only to the extent that the acquisition of the newer used property constitutes an upgrading. If it is just a swap, that is, if the newly acquired used property has the same value as the old property disposed of, no credit will be allowed. Second, the bill provides that no credit will be allowed for used property if the party acquiring it has ever used it before. Thus, a taxpayer cannot obtain a credit by trading in property and later getting the same property back. Third, the bill does not allow a used property credit for purchases of used property from related persons such as where one corporation in an affiliated group purchases property from another member of the group.

It is my view that the investment credit will become an important and permanent provision in our tax structure. Year in and year out, it will increase the profitability of new investments, will add to the funds available to businesses for reinvestment, and will shorten the period over which the major part of any investment is recouped. It will strengthen the present recovery by stimulating expenditures on investment which, in turn, will generate demand for consumer goods. It will lead to fuller employment and greater utilization of our industrial capacity. In the years ahead, it will both increase our productive capacity and the efficiency with which our economy uses its resources. This will mean higher income, better products, and a continued improvement in our competitive position abroad.

The Ty Cobb Baseball Shrine: Honor to the "Georgia Peach"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, Ty Cobb, the incomparable master of batting and base running, the holder of multifarious records in the rough and tumble days of our most famous national sport of baseball, died in his native State of Georgia last July. He was a man's man, a young boy's ideal, and the exemplar of the fierce competitive spirit that has made America great. He achieved great things and when his days of sport were done, he used his hard-earned and wisely invested funds to benefit his fellow man. It is highly commendable and fitting that his memory and spirit should be perpetuated and the leading citizens of his home town and county, Royston, Franklin County, Ga., should seek to enshrine his memory and services in a lasting memorial. The following proposal for a baseball shrine at Royston, commemorative of Ty Cobb, under sponsorship of the Royston Chamber of Commerce, is respectfully called to the attention of the Members of the

House of Representatives as a most worthy memorial:

THE STORY OF TY COBB, THE "GEORGIA PEACH"

The life story of baseball's greatest individual, Tyrus Raymond Cobb, his colorful, exciting and useful life, blazed baseball's most brilliant career in the major leagues. The original "Georgia Peach," as he was called, is claimed to be the greatest competitor ever to wear the spikes. In his 24 years of major league baseball, Cobb's magic bat, his base running, base stealing, his fielding etched more records than any player to flash across the baseball scene since the big major leagues began operating in 1876. Not even the great Babe Ruth or any of the modern day players could approach this matchless Georgian in writing superlatives in the archives of baseball. Cobb hung up more than 90 major league records in his baseball career.

Baseball would not have reached its great proportions if it were not for the struggling spirit of men like Cobb. A book could be written of Cobb's baseball achievements. The immortal diamond star was the greatest the world has ever known.

Tyrus was born December 18, 1886, at Narrows, Banks County, Ga. At 6 he moved with his parents to Royston where his family remained and Ty received his schooling. Ty's father, Prof. Hershel Cobb, was a scholar and statesman. He became Franklin County school superintendent and later a Georgia State senator.

Full in years and with a baseball record that will probably never be equaled, Ty Cobb completed man's assigned mortal cycle after stamping his name not only in the record books of baseball but in the hearts of many people. He died on July 17, 1961, past the age of 74.

Ty Cobb's desire and determination to help his fellow man is a great inspiration to all of us. In 1950 he contributed $100,000 to the erection of the $230,000 Cobb Memorial Hospital at Royston. In 1953 he created the Cobb Educational Foundation to provide college scholarships to enable deserving young men and women, without sufficient financial resources, to attend college and other higher educational professional fields.

Now his hometown desires to honor this Hercules of the diamond. We feel that Ty Cobb's spirit, his records, his pictures, his trophies and all memorabilia should be preserved for future generations. We feel this is a most worthy and historic undertaking for a great American and for the most spirited competitor in the world of sports.

Gov. S. Ernest Vandiver, of Georgia, created the Ty Cobb Baseball Memorial Commission as an instrumentality of the State of Georgia. On October 24, 1961, at the Capitol City Club in Atlanta, these commissioners were sworn in. Following the luncheon there was an organizational meeting. Officers of the commission, chairman, vice chairman, secretary, and treasurer were elected. The elected chairman, Stewart D. Brown, Jr., M.D., of Royston, appointed the different committees and their chairmen to begin their work. L. Reeder Tucker, Royston, is vice chairman. Tenth District Congressman ROBERT G. STEPHENS, Jr., attended and pledged full support to the worthy program.

The Ty Cobb baseball shrine will be located in Royston on U.S. Highway 29 across the highway from the Cobb Memorial Hospital. This tract of land was recently purchased by the city of Royston and the deed to the property has been presented to the Ty Cobb Baseball Memorial Commission for the sole purpose of the erection of this shrine. The location is ideal. There will be a life-size bronze statue of Mr. Cobb and a flagpole in front of the shrine. The shrine museum building itself will be of Georgia granite, marble, and steel construction. There will be a rotunda in the center of the building with marble columns supporting a lofty ceiling with alcoves displaying Ty Cobb's most treasured trophies and memorabilia. One wing of this building will contain Ty's pictures, his records, his plaques, his trophies, uniform, bats, gloves, shoes, and other personal effects. Here in all solemnity and dignity will be displayed the life story and development of this empire builder in the world of sports and how he revolutionized the game of baseball, how he made the game faster and more appealing. The other downstairs wing will contain a business office, concession stand, and stand for souvenirs. Upstairs, there will be a large room for meeting purposes.

A fundraising campaign will begin to obtain the $550,000 needed to erect the Ty Cobb Baseball Shrine. The Ty Cobb Baseball Memorial Commission has the authority to accept donations, grants, and subsidies for the shrine.

The erection of this shrine is a historical memorial to baseball's unmatched immortal, Tyrus Raymond Cobb. No individual or individuals will receive any profits from this shrine. If at some future date there should be any monetary profits, then these profits will, necessarily, by the charter and bylaws, go to the Cobb Memorial Hospital, or the Cobb Educational Foundation, or to churches or some similar nonprofit organization.

No athlete was ever truly great without a host of loyal fans. This shrine we are building will keep alive forever the name and fame of the Georgia Peach, Ty Cobb.

Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, 1962, Americans of Greek descent celebrated the national holiday of a people who first conceived and advocated the idea of independence, the Greeks. Yet this very same people had the misfortune of being deprived of their independence for more than 2,000 years. For many centuries Greeks suffered under alien rulers and determined to work and fight for their independence, no matter how long it would take. It is surely one of the supreme ironies of Western civilization that the country to which we all owe our cultural origin was not able to enjoy the fruits of freedom, after Greek philosophers had so arduously pointed out the nature of these fruits to mankind.

This is one of the reasons why the rebirth of a free and independent Greece 141 years ago was a memorable occasion, especially for the Greek people, and also for the entire Western World. The Greeks suffered particularly under the Ottoman Empire, when for four centuries they suffered more than ever before in their long and memorable history. The Ottoman Turks never treated the Greeks as citizens, but regarded them simply as mere servants to be exploited. In the fateful year of 1827 the Greek people achieved a glorious victory and set themselves free from the Sultan's bondage. On this 141st anniversary of Greek Independence, I am proud to join with my fellow Americans of Greek descent and the entire Western World in congratulating the indomitable Greek people.

Our Billions Still Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles:

[From the Palladium-Item and Sun-Telegram, Mar. 18, 1962]

OUR BILLIONS STILL GO

Once upon a time there was an Army general named George Marshall who, after the Second World War, devised the idea of helping the devastated countries of Europe with tax dollars from the United States.

He said that at the most the amount of money to be distributed would not exceed about $17 billion. The program was to continue for about 4 years.

Long ago General Marshall departed this life and our conservative estimate also has been a casualty.

It is estimated that at least $90 billion of our money has gone to foreign countries and the flood of our dollars is at the top, although there seems to be no sound way of being assured that the end is near.

Now the dollars do not go to restoring foreign cities badly hurt by the war. The dollars go in increasing numbers under such labels as "mutual aid," and more lately as "anti-Communist" dollars, meaning helping other nations from succumbing to Communist pressure.

During a hearing a few days ago we were told that Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara testified that while some of the countries we now are supporting are more prosperous than the United States, we must continue because we have made commitments to those countries, and we cannot well give them less than promised.

The spenders in Washington and those who enjoy handling the billions are not alarmed because our gold reserves are down and our balance is off in our trading with foreign countries.

We wonder who really is getting rimmed under this endless program and who is living high because of our lavish handouts.

[From the Muncie Star, Mar. 19, 1962]

RIGHTWING EXTREMISTS

Let's try to put the controversy over rightwing extremists into proper perspective. Granted, some extremist groups and individuals have wrapped the conservative mantle around them and are parading under the rightwing banner, just as extremist groups for years have paraded under the leftwing banner. Furthermore, there can be no doubt that the irresponsible statements of certain individuals, no matter how well intentioned, have damaged the conservative cause. But is this surprising? It was none other than George Bernard Shaw (a leftwing extremist, by the way) who observed that revolutionary movements—and anti-Communists feel that theirs is a revolutionary movement—attract both the best and worst elements of society.

The question the leftwing should ask itself, it seems to us, is why the anti-Communist cause (which liberals indiscriminately call the radical right) has proliferated, and why, for the first time, much of the Nation is aroused. Might not this have something to do with the bitter liberal insistence that Oppenheimer and Lattimore were innocent-sacrifical lambs? Might it not have something to do with the dozens of Communists who infiltrated high Government offices during the war years and depended on their liberal admirers to protect them? Might it not be, in the words of a prominent liberal, that while some liberals were willing to acknowledge Alger Hiss' guilt, they never were willing to forgive Whittaker Chambers? And could it not be that these budding rightwingers are amazed how quickly liberals rise to the defense of persons—any persons—accused of being Communists, yet feel no compunction about labeling anti-Communists as Fascists? And that they are bewildered that in a time of national peril, liberals work not to smoke out whatever hidden Communists may still be influencing our opinions or our policy, but work instead for the abolition of those congressional committees charged with weeding subversives from our midst?

And who, during our century, assured us, first, that the Russian revolution marked the beginning of Heaven on earth; and later—at the height of the Moscow purges—that communism was the enlightened wave of the future; that, during World War II (even after Russia's invasion of Finland, Poland, et al.), the Communists were our democratic allies; that Mao Tse-tung's Reds were merely agrarian reformers; that with Stalin's death ,the Soviet Union was becoming less aggressive (haven't you noticed?); that Fidel Castro was the George Washington of Cuba; that even today, the Soviets truly want peace (doesn't their willingness to share in outer space exploration prove it)? And who right now is peddling the line that in the not-too-distant future, the United States and Russia will join in a common defense against Red China?

In each case, the answer is "the liberals." It is their myopia, their allegiance to collectivism, which has helped feed the insatiable appetite of communism (and is still doing so in Laos and British Guiana). And it is they who have used the big lie to smear the reputations of those who tried to warn us of the Red danger.

True, none of this is reason enough for anti-Communists to equate liberalism with communism, or attribute every cold war defeat to hidden Communists in the State Department, or give credence to the "conspiratorial view of history." But, reason or not, it does explain why those feelings exist. And, if nothing else, it should make liberals stop long enough to ask themselves just where they have led this Nation, and where they want it to go. Maybe then they will call off their attacks on anti-Communists, and will join in the fight against the common enemy.

Pacific Northwest Weather

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an excellent defense by Don Roberts, of the Hillsboro Argus (Oreg.), of the much misrepresented and sometimes unjustly maligned Pacific Northwest weather:

INSIDE LOOKING OUT

(By Don Roberts)

Basking in the sun this February week, watching the trees bud and the crocuses bloom, we wondered how Oregon inherited its reputation as a rainy country.

While southern California was digging out of mud and the Dakotas were counting their 30 inches of snow, Hillsboro stores were leaving their doors open to let the sunshine in.

What's this about rain in Oregon? is a fair question—trouble is, we natives talk ourselves into believing this is the wettest place on earth.

It is worth mentioning, therefore, that no less than 20 States—plus the District of Columbia—report heavier precipitation per year than the average of 39.91 inches at Oregon's official station in Portland.

These are Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Mississippi, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia.

Wettest of all is Mobile, Ala., with average rainfall of 67.57 inches.

Moreover, 39 of 44 weather stations throughout the country record higher average and velocities than Portland.

So let's quit downgrading ourselves, and get out in the sun.

Teenage Drinking—V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, no responsible official of New Jersey, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, or Vermont—the five States which are New York State's closest neighbors—will ever agree that what New York does about its teenage drinking law is exclusively the business of New York.

Those of us who share a common border with New York know from long and bitter experience what devastation New York's 18-year-old drinking law has brought on the youth of our own States.

In order to indicate some of the problems involved and some of the extraordinary steps to which law enforcement officials in Connecticut and New Jersey have been forced to resort in an effort to enforce their own laws in the face of New York's intransigeance, I include as a part of my remarks several articles and editorials, from the Newark Star-Ledger, the Newark Evening News, and the Christian Science Monitor:

[From the Newark Star-Ledger, Mar. 22, 1962]

ROADBLOCK PLAN STUDIED FOR TEEN DRINKING DRIVERS

(By Robert Waldron)

Bergen County authorities began weighing the possibility of a roadblock system along their northern frontier to curb the driving habits of Jersey teenagers returning from legal drinking safaris to New York.

Juvenile border crossing to tipple in New York, where the legal age is 18, is being blamed for an alarming death and injury toll along the highways of the border counties in both States.

The proposed roadblock system, admit authorities, is not a permanent cure.

OUTSIDE CURE

"The cure lies outside the State," said First Assistant Prosecutor Frank Cuccio, of Bergen. He was referring to a new drive on New York by neighboring States to have it raise its drinking age to 21.

But sentiment is mounting among police departments along the New York-New Jersey line for some interim concerted effort, like the proposed roadblock system.

"If they set it up, you may be sure that everyone is going to cooperate," said Ramsey Police Chief Robert Doremus.

"If the teenagers are alert to the fact that police are constantly checking, it may have it's deterrent effect on their driving habits," said Alpine Police Chief William T. Cacase.

Bergen County Chief of Detectives James W. Stewart said that it was not a question of whether such a roadblock system would be set up.

"It's when," he said. Stewart is also the president of the Bergen County Police Chiefs Association—the organization through which the prosecutor's office would work in lining up the necessary cooperation.

Cuccio said yesterday, that he would have something to say on the roadblock idea "soon."

"No comment now, we're still evaluating it," he said.

SEEK INFORMATION

Cuccio's aides, meanwhile were reaching out for information from several police departments on how effective roadblocks have been in the past.

Roadblocks cannot prevent the youths from driving into New York, police point out. But they can check on their driving habits or whether they are bringing alcohol back with them, when they return. Therein lies the deterrent.

Northvale Police Chief Thomas D. Sposa noted yesterday that when his small department—three men, plus himself—established checkpoints astride the principal routes back from New York, the teenage traffic shifted to another town.

"They alternate," he said.

The answer, according to police, is a leakproof system.

Cuccio declined to say whether he had contacted New York police to seek their cooperation.

[From the Newark Star-Ledger, Mar. 23, 1962]

DRINK-BENT TEENS FACE ROAD CHECK

Police along Bergen County's northern border will be braced today for the beginning of the weekend teenage rush across the State line into New York for legal beer.

"We always tell the boys to press a little harder at these times," commented Northvale Police Chief Thomas D. Sposa.

As of last night there was no coordinated checkpoint system along the highways leading across the New Jersey-New York border.

CHECKS VALUE

Bergen County's first assistant prosecutor, Frank Cuccio, is evaluating the effectiveness of such a system.

But general orders to patrols by departments along the line will call for special vigilance against erratic driving by teenagers, or transportation of contraband liquor and beer back across the border by returning parties.

At the same time, Acting Motor Vehicle Director Ned J. Parsekian was expected to circulate a petition among the Governors of two other States bordering on New York.

The petition, to be presented to Governor Rockefeller, will ask that New York hike its minimum drinking age to conform to its neighbors.

AGE LIMIT

Both Pennsylvania and Connecticut, like New Jersey, have a legal minimum drinking age of 21. New York's age-18 minimum is being blamed for attracting youths from neighbor States across the line, leading to a surge of highway fatalities and injuries.

The latest furor over the drinking age differential was touched off when two Bergen County youths were killed while returning from a drinking party in New York's Rockland County, Sunday night.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 19, 1962]

TEENS DRIVE TO NEW YORK TO DRINK

WESTPORT, CONN.—A three-man legislative commission toured State police check points along the Connecticut-New York border recently and said it was surprised at the flow of teenage traffic across the line.

"The youngsters readily admitted they were going to New York to drink," said State senator William F. Hickey, Jr., of Stanford, a member of the commission.

The check points were put into operation by State police recently to curb drunken driving by teenagers and others who have crossed into New York to take advantage of that State's lower consumption age and later drinking hours.

Joining with Mr. Hickey on the tour were State representative John P. Cipriano, of North Haven, and legislative commissioner Arthur M. Lewis, of West Hartford.

They began the tour here at 9 p.m. and drove with Capt. Jesse Foley, head of the western district of the State police traffic division, as far north as Canaan, ending the trip about 3 a.m.

They stopped at eight State police check points and talked with both officers and motorists.

"We asked the boys and girls whether they were going to New York to drink and they readily told us," Mr. Hickey said. "Of course, there is no way of stopping them under present law."

The minimum drinking age in Connecticut is 21. In New York it's 18. Gov. John N. Dempsey has repeatedly asked New York to raise its drinking age.

Mr. Hickey said the spot checks were proving effective, but said they would have to be supplemented with legislative recommendations.

He said the commission was considering a proposal to the general assembly to make possession of liquor by a youngster illegal. He said many youngsters buy liquor in New York and then drive with it back to Connecticut.

He also said Connecticut might consider making direct appeals to towns in New York along the border for stiffer "dram shop" laws, holding the seller responsible if a youngster is subsequently involved in an accident because of drinking.

State police said they issued 15 warnings to motorists under 21 for driving after drinking.

[From the Newark Evening News, Mar. 12, 1962]

TEEN DRINK CURB—TOUGHER VEHICLE LAW READIED

(By John W. Gleeson)

HACKENSACKEN.—Senator Pierce H. Deamer, Jr., Republican of Bergen, will introduce legislation this week to stiffen penalties for young motorists who combine drinking and driving.

The legislature is slated to reconvene next Monday after an adjournment of several weeks for State budget hearings.

The Deamer bill would amend the present statute to give municipal magistrates authority to revoke driving privileges of motorists under 21 years of age who consume or knowingly possess alcoholic beverages while in a motor vehicle.

The bill would also subject to the same penalty any youth, other than the driver, who is a passenger in, and responsible for, the motor vehicle at the time of the offense.

The present motor vehicle laws subject a youth under 21 to a fine of $50 or imprisonment for 30 days, or both, if he is found guilty of the offense. Under the revised statute the local magistrate could impose any or all of the penalties at his discretion.

Deamer said he feels the proposed legislation would help reduce the number of traffic accidents involving automobiles driven by young people who drive across the New York State line in order to take advantage of that State's lower drinking age, which is 18.

Deamer said he hoped New York would raise its minimum drinking age to 21, but efforts by New Jersey legislators to this end have proved fruitless.

"Until such time as New York officials can be prevailed upon to change the law in that State," Deamer said, "I think New Jersey legislators must do all in their power to deter young people from jeopardizing their lives and the lives of others by driving out of the State just to take advantage of the availability of alcoholic beverages."

Deamer and Republican Assemblywoman Marion West Higgins of Bergen County have offered concurrent resolutions in both houses of the legislature to revive the commission created in 1960 to study the problem of minors purchasing alcoholic beverages. The resolution has been passed by the assembly and will come up for action in the senate next Monday.

[From the Newark News, Mar. 13, 1962]

DUAL PURPOSE

Legislation to stiffen penalties for teenage drinking drivers in New Jersey, to be sponsored by Senator Deamer, of Bergen, should serve a dual purpose.

It will help cope with the unfortunate consequences of New York's irresponsibility in permitting liquor sales to 18-year-olds. And it will help meet New York criticism that neighboring States do not adequately enforce their own 21-year minimum.

Senator Deamer's program will include a provision authorizing magistrates to revoke driving privileges of motorists under 21 who consume or knowingly possess alcoholic beverages while in a motor vehicle. This could be imposed in addition to existing penalties of a $50 fine or 30 days imprisonment, or both.

In the determinedly unambulant teenage set, loss of the driving privilege is a fate almost worse than death.

Senator Deamer's object is to reduce the possibility of accidents involving teenagers returning from drinking expeditions in New York. But it would also promote enforcement within the State, by making it riskier for youths to attempt deception about their age.

The responsibility of bartenders and liquor store owners to guard against illegal sales would be undiminished, but the responsibility of teenagers for their own misconduct would be widened, which seems a very good idea.

[From the Newark Star-Ledger, Mar. 23, 1962]

VALUABLE WEAPON

While it doesn't go to the heart of the problem of New Jersey teenagers going to New York to drink, legislation introduced by Senator Pierce H. Deamer, of Bergen, would be a valuable weapon in trying to control one aspect of the problem.

The Deamer bill would give magistrates the power to revoke or suspend the driving license of an under-21 driver nabbed with alcoholic beverages in his car. The legislation is aimed at those teenagers who drive to New York, where alcoholic beverages can be sold legally to anyone over 18, and bring back beer or liquor. In New Jersey, alcoholic beverages cannot be sold legally to anyone under 21.

There is no doubt that one of the severest penalties that can be inflicted on a teenage driver is loss of his driving privileges. As Deamer points out, "It seems some kids are more interested in not losing their licenses than in saving their lives."

In this they are not so different from their elders, according to some recent studies. It has been shown that appeals to drivers to save lives have been less effective than the threat of the loss of their licenses. That's why mandatory license revocation laws for serious driving offenses have been enacted in several States, including New Jersey.

It is, therefore, entirely consistent with recent policy to enact the legislation suggested by Deamer. As we already have indicated, this legislation would not attack the principal problem—which involves teenagers driving to drinking spots in New York. But it would help clip one of the offshoots and would aid law enforcement officers in trying to deal with one portion of the teenage driving and drinking problem.

Control by Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I include the following article from the Jeffersonian Democrat of March 22, 1962:

CONTROL BY GOVERNMENT

Are you concerned about your Federal Government? Are you concerned about the fact that it is spending beyond its means, going deeper into debt every day? Do you realize that your Federal Government is gaining more and more control over your life and the business that supports you? If anything right now ought to be clear to the American people, it is the fact that the Federal Government increasingly grabs power that belongs to individuals and to individual business. Washington runs the country—and the 2,500 bureaus, agencies, and commissions run Washington. Yes, bureaucracy is running rampant.

Americans may well view with alarm the steady and enormous growth in power of our Federal Government and the powerful bureaucracy which threatens our individual freedom. Remember this: When a bureau gets more power, it takes away from Congress the job of passing laws when it exerts that power. It takes away from courts the powers of litigating your grievances. A powerful bureau set up to regulate the airlines, broadcasting industry, or any other area, becomes lawmaker, judge, and enforcer unless it is checked by safeguards and unless the courts of the land remain jealous of their jurisdiction.

That is where you, your boss, and your job come in. If the Federal Government is going to run everything in the country through arbitrary rulings and directions of bureaus, then you have no freedom. Your boss has none. Your job eventually will be

gone. We need to be concerned about the dangers of an all-powerful Central Government.

We need less control by Government planners in regulating business and labor, to allow creativeness of the productive community that it may operate on legitimate profit motives such as attracting new capital, developing new markets, creating new jobs, and thus serving the real needs of the people. While the spirit of risking much to gain much built this country, the something-for-nothing attitude is destroying the traditional American spirit of initiative and aggressiveness.

Britain's Experience With Socialized Medicine Should Serve as a Warning to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the proponents of socialized medicine in the United States are fond of pointing to the experience in Great Britain. The following article from the U.S. News & World Report details what is happening to British medicine under socialism. Let us hope we take warning before it is too late and we adopt legislation here which will wreck the finest medical care enjoyed by any people in the world:

DISAPPEARING DOCTORS: NEW CRISIS IN BRITAIN

LONDON.—Britain, after 14 years of socialized medicine, now is running into a "doctor crisis" that could spell ruin for this country's system of tax-paid medical care.

The crisis stems from the departure of large numbers of young British physicians to practice in other lands. More than 500 are said to be emigrating each year to Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and the United States.

These doctors say they are being driven away by the low incomes, overwork, lack of opportunities to specialize, and bureaucratic redtape that is associated with working for the Government.

This wholesale migration is leaving a medical void which endangers the $2.3-billion-a-year National Health Service and its nationalized hospitals.

To keep the hospitals running, hundreds of foreign doctors are being recruited, mostly from Asian countries where standards of medical training are considered questionable. Nearly half of the intern and resident-physician posts now are filled by about 4,000 non-British doctors, mainly from India and Pakistan. Without them, it's conceded, the health service would collapse.

Among family doctors outside the nationalized hospitals, too, a crisis is building up. A Government blunder 5 years ago reduced the number of medical students admitted to universities on the mistaken assumption that Britain was facing a surplus of physicians.

GLOOMY FORECAST

Fewer students combined with the increasing flight of frustrated young doctors from Britain, now has resulted in a shortage of general practitioners that is to get worse over the next 5 to 10 years.

A decline in the quality of medical care is seen by professional authorities as inevitable in the next few years. They say deterioration already is apparent. Some predict a gradual breakdown of the entire system of socialized medicine unless there are drastic reforms.

For nearly 14 years, socialized medicine seemed to be all but immune from criticism here in Britain. The mass of the British people like the idea of feeless medical care, and resent any proposed change as an attempt to deprive them of their right to these benefits.

A MESS

Now, suddenly, socialized medicine is under heavy attack, not by the British public, but by doctors and independent professional experts. The journal of the British Medical Association has just joined the chorus of critics with this categorical charge: "Medicine in Britain is in a mess."

Why is British medicine under nationalization said to be in a mess? Why are hundreds of young doctors deserting socialized medicine to practice in countries free of Government control?

The answers that you get from independent authorities are: Working conditions imposed by the Government as a monopoly employer of doctors are proving to be more and more intolerable. One result has been a decline in the number of people choosing medicine as a career. Among those who study medicine, a steadily increasing number are refusing to work here.

With British medical schools turning out a total of 1,600 graduates a year, nearly one in every three is leaving this country to escape employment under a system of socialized medicine.

Effects of the doctor crisis are felt most acutely in the nationalized hospitals. There, a Government policy of employing "cheap medical labor" has created what one medical economist describes as "a lost generation" of British surgeons and specialists.

STANDARDS LOWERED

Over the past 10 years, to keep down costs, the number of high-income staff jobs—surgeons and specialists in other fields—was reduced. The number of temporary, low-paying junior positions was increased. The result of this policy is that much of the surgery and other work that ordinarily would be done by high-salaried staff specialists is being handled by junior resident physicians.

During the past decade, hundreds of doctors, after completing 12 to 14 years of university and hospital training to qualify as surgeons and specialists, found there were no jobs open for them in British hospitals. They faced the choice: sacrifice the years of specialized training and go into general practice, or emigrate. A large number chose the latter course.

Another effect of the policy of employing cheap medical labor is that, in recent years, fewer and fewer British medical graduates chose to specialize. So, suddenly, the authorities are discovering that they lack the British surgeons and other specialists needed to staff the nationalized hospitals, even in high-paying positions. These hospitals are being run more and more by junior doctors from India, Pakistan and other underdeveloped countries who come to this country for a few years of postgraduate training.

Queen Elizabeth's personal physicial, Lord Evans, recently told the House of Lords: "Without these people, the health service would not grind slowly to a standstill; it would completely break down."

Most surgeons under 35 years old in Britain today, according to an authoritative source, were born and trained in foreign countries. They are performing 50 percent of all emergency surgery.

In some industial areas, such as Sheffield, 90 percent of the resident surgeons are young foreign doctors just completing their training. In 25 of the 74 nationalized hospitals in that area, all of the junior doctors are foreigners—mostly Indians and Pakistanis. Eventually, when they complete their training, these doctors will return to their homelands to practice.

WARNING FROM THE TOP

How is the standard of medical care in Britain's system of nationalized hospitals being affected by this doctor crisis? Here is the verdict of Lord Taylor, a Socialist spokesman on medical problems in the House of Lords, in a statement on provincial hospitals that are staffed largely by foreign doctors:

"I cannot honestly recommend you to go into such hospitals as a casualty. In many cases, there is no casualty officer. A house surgeon will have to leave the [operating] theater when he can treat you. His experience will be far less than that of your general medical practitioner. When he comes, he will probably not be a British graduate, and he may well have difficulty in understanding what you say. This is at a time when speed and efficiency may be literally lifesaving."

Lord Taylor added that the qualifications of many of these Asian doctors are so inadequate that they require emergency training in such basic procedures as setting up a blood transfusion.

For Britain's 20,000 general practitioners, expert observers say the outlook is even gloomier under socialized medicine than for specialists. Bureaucratic interference with supply and demand is blamed for a serious and steadily worsening shortage of family doctors.

When the decision was made to reduce the number of medical students, it failed to take into account the effect of population growth and a rapid increase in retirement among aging doctors. Result: At a time when the population is expanding, the number of family doctors actually is beginning to decline—a trend which experts say cannot be reversed for at least 6 years.

Therefore, in the years just ahead, there are to be fewer and fewer general practitioners to care for more and more patients. Moreover, under the peculiar financial policy of the National Health Service, these doctors are to get no increase in salary.

A family doctor with 2,000 patients on his list earns approximately $6,700. During the winter, when illness is at a peak, he may see anywhere from 60 to 80 patients a day for treatment, reference to a hospital, or issuance of medical certificates.

PROBLEM OF FIXED FEES

For each patient, the doctor receives a fixed annual payment from the Government, regardless of the amount of medical care he is called upon to provide. Thus, a doctor gets the same annual fee for a healthy youngster, perhaps requiring no attention at all, as for an older person who may require a great deal of care.

Each year, the Government earmarks a specific fund for the payment of general practitioners. Payment is based on the total number of doctors in general practice multiplied by the theoretical average income figure of $7,000. Thus, as the number of doctors dwindles, the size of the fund diminishes.

A young family doctor in London says that this system stifles initiative and undermines medical standards. To earn an adequate income, he explains, a doctor must sign up a large number of patients, and is able to devote only 2 or 3 minutes to each patient calling at his office for attention.

With fewer doctors caring for a bigger population, the pressure is building up even more. That's why hundreds of young doctors have joined the exodus from Britain.

SNOWBALL EFFECT

A general breakdown of the National Health Service in the next few years is seen

as a distinct danger by Dr. J. R. Seale, a Harvard-trained medical economist in Britain. Dr. Seale predicts that the growing shortage of doctors and the increasing demands for medical care will produce a snowball effect.

General practitioners, most of whom are burdened with a steadily increasing workload, are being forced to give less and less time to their patients. Dr. Seale foresees that, inevitably, more and more people will seek private medical care outside the National Health Service. A growing number of frustrated doctors, he says, can be expected to go into private practice, either full time or part time.

This will aggravate even more the shortage of family doctors on the Government payroll, and reduce the quality of medical care that NHS patients can obtain. Therefore, he concludes, there will be a snowball effect that, in a relatively short time, could cause a breakdown of the system.

Only about 600 of Britain's 22,000 physicians now are outside the National Health Service in private practice. A somewhat larger number have a few private patients in addition to NHS patients on their lists.

Some top officials here say that, if Britain were starting today from scratch to tackle the problem of medical care, she would not attempt outright nationalization.

"If we had a chance to do it again," one high-ranking official says, "I think that we would favor some form of compulsory medical insurance, supplemented by tax funds together with subsidies to hospitals to keep down costs. We would also act to limit the cost of drugs. In short, the state would insure that everyone had access to medical care at a reasonable cost, but without nationalizing the entire system and putting all doctors on the Government payroll."

This official adds that President Kennedy's proposal to provide medical care for the aged through the U.S. social security system is the first step toward the kind of system that Britain probably would introduce now if there could be a fresh start.

COSTS: UP AND UP

To keep the National Health Service running in the future, Government officials concede privately, will cost a lot more money than is being spent on it now. The cost for 1962 is estimated at $2.3 billion, of which $1.7 billion comes from Government funds. The balance comes mostly from national insurance payments and local taxation.

In addition to more funds from taxes, officials say, more money undoubtedly will have to come from charges passed on to patients. At present, the only charges are 28 cents for a drug prescription and modest fees for spectacles and dentures.

Some experts believe that the only way the system can be preserved is to move away from the original idea of a completely tax-paid medical service and to begin charging patients a nominal fee for every visit to the doctor and modest fees for hospital care.

DRAG ON PROGRESS

An expert but nonofficial view of the kind of medical system Britain should adopt on the basis of the experience of the past 14 years comes from Dr. D. S. Lees, senior lecturer in economics at the University College of North Staffordshire. Dr. Lees recently completed an intensive study of the National Health Service for the Institute of Economic Affairs. He says:

"While from the point of view of the general health of the community the National Health Service has not in any obvious way failed, it has given rise to problems that are * * * increasing in intensity. On the longer view, the most acute danger of the National Health Service is that it will prevent the emergency of more effective methods of medical care * * *.

"Governments should move away from taxation and free service to private insurance and fees by allowing tax concessions to those who can provide for themselves, and direct assistance to the dwindling minority who cannot."

Whatever is done, one thing is clear in Britain: After 14 years of socialized medicine, a growing number of experts are coming to the conclusion that something is wrong with the system, and they are speaking out for the first time.

The alarm bell has been touched off by the realization that Britain is the only advanced industrial nation that is losing many of its best young physicians through emigration at a time when there is an acute shortage of doctors at home.

Mills Holds Ground on Principle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Edmond Le Breton, Associated Press staff writer, entitled "Mills Holds Ground on Principle."

As a Republican member of the Ways and Means Committee, I have many areas of disagreement with the position taken by Chairman MILLS, but I share many areas of agreement with him. I have profound respect for his ability, his knowledge, and his gracious personality in presenting his views, and it is a pleasure to insert into the RECORD the above referred to article:

MILLS HOLDS GROUND ON PRINCIPLE

(By Edmond Le Breton)

It's no secret that President Kennedy's plan for medical care for the aged through social security faces trouble—and a major hurdle is right at the starting gate.

Standing squarely across its path is Representative WILBUR D. MILLS, the possessor of one of the pleasantest sets of manners and one of the hardest political heads in Congress.

Mr. MILLS, the Arkansas Democrat who is chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, doesn't particularly like being known as the major obstacle to the favorite domestic project of the Democratic administration.

He feels he is being credited with even more than his share of the responsibility for the difficulties it faces.

But neither does he like the health care plan, which would increase the Federal social security tax to pay for hospital and nursing home benefits for the retired aged.

Moreover, Mr. MILLS is convinced, the voters don't like it in Kensett, Ark., where he was born in 1909, nor in the rest of the 13-county district he has represented since 1939.

A DRIVE FOR THE BILL

The White House has now launched a massive grassroots drive for the bill and Mr. Kennedy is taking an active, public part. Opponents also have stepped up their efforts in Washington and elsewhere.

So the pressure on the urbane chairman of the Ways and Means Committee has mounted and there has been a steady trickle of rumors that some of the committee members who consistently voted against the tying together of social security and health care are weakening in their opposition; and few rumors mention Mr. MILLS himself, suggesting some compromise version could be framed which he might support.

But he has told friends he has seen nothing yet that would make him change his position of personal opposition. And he insists the much more restricted legislation he helped put together 2 years ago for care of needy old folks has not yet had a fair chance to show its potential.

Soft voiced, courteous, rather youthful looking, Mr. MILLS could sit for the composite portrait of that recognizable and important type—the southerner who has made good in Congress.

Another attribute, a sharp and well-trained mind, shows up at tax legislation hearings, which frequently are technical enough to drive a layman to distraction. More than one witness has stopped with his mouth open as the chairman cited from memory an obscure subprovision, complete with figures and legislative history.

EXPLAINING IMPASSE

If Mr. MILLS were the kind of southern lawmaker who instinctively and invariably takes the conservative side of any issue, it would be easier to explain the impasse that has developed between the two mannerly, intelligent Democratic political professionals, the President and the chairman of the powerful House committee.

Mr. MILLS' record is not one sided. For example, when the Eisenhower administration proposed special tax treatment of dividend income, Mr. MILLS, then a minority member of the Ways and Means Committee, voted and spoke against the change.

Yet, when Mr. Kennedy asked Congress last year to reverse that action and once again tax dividends like other income, the issue was never even raised in the committee, of which Mr. MILLS by then was chairman.

Mr. MILLS is known to think there is no prospect the House will vote to abolish the deduction and tax credit which recipients of dividends now enjoy.

RAYBURN'S KUDO

And he is known to regard as a compliment a remark attributed to the late Speaker Rayburn "that under Mr. MILLS' leadership the Ways and Means Committee always worked out tax bills that Congress could agree to."

It is possible, although not certain, that the House would pass a social security health bill if the Ways and Means Committee endorsed such a measure. Proponents claim they already have the votes and stand to get more—if only the bill would come to the floor in the regular way.

Presumably, this is part of what Mr. Kennedy wanted to tell Mr. MILLS when he asked the chairman to drop by the White House for a private chat in January. The conference was one of the first the President set up after returning to Washington to get ready for the congressional session.

Mr. MILLS slipped in and out of the White House, eluding reporters. Neither participant has told the world about that conversation.

NO STRATAGEMS

But it is safe to say it was pleasant and frank. On the tough issue of reciprocal trade expansion, there was general agreement. On the health care bill, points of view were expressed—not without humor—and the discussions ended on a "well, that's that" note.

Mr. MILLS later said publicly, to nobody's surprise, that he will not support the health bill, but that he will not use parliamentary stratagems to block consideration of it by his committee once the trade bill is out of its way.

With Mr. MILL's active support, the health bill might or might not be approved by the predominantly conservative committee. Some members oppose social security on principle. Others, including the chairman, have expressed fears that incorporating a

whole new program into the system would lead ultimately to an unbearably high payroll tax.

The all-out effort being made by proponents of social security, back in the White House and elsewhere, keeps alive the possibility the Ways and Means Committee may yet come up with a majority vote approving it. Of all possibilities, this would give the measure its best chance in the House.

If the committee does not so launch it, the backers are left with a choice of awkward moves. The most likely is a discharge petition by which, if a majority of the House signs up, the bill can be brought to the floor without committee action. Discharge petitions rarely succeed in the House. Sometimes, however, they generate enough pressure so that the legislation is helped on its way—then or later.

Whatever happens, pressure is sure to mount on Mr. MILLS, and on the position he has taken—one he would undoubtedly term realistic, if he would discuss it at all.

"You've got to remember," one of his associates said, "WILBUR may look very conservative up here, but in his district people call him up and say, 'WILBUR, don't you go too far along with that crowd, now.'

"He thinks his people are probably 2 or 3 to 1 against enlarging social security to pay hospital bills.

A tireless campaigner, Mr. MILLS certinly should know the district where he was born and reared. The town banker's son, he went to Hendrix College in Conway, Ark., then to the Harvard Law School. He came home to a job in the bank and a hometown bride. But he soon left banking for politics, the county bench and Congress.

In about 3 years, on his second try, he got the assignment to the Ways and Means Committee. * * * He was for a time considered prime Speaker material.

Somewhere along the line, perhaps because of the widening northern-southern Democratic cleavage that resulted from the 1954 school segregation decision and its dramatic aftermath in Little Rock, Mr. MILLS seems to have lost his footing on the ladder that might have reached the speakership. He has no mean consolation prize, however, as chairman of Congress' No. 1 committee, in terms of traditional prestige, and perhaps of power, too.

But no congressional promotions free Mr. MILLS from the special intricacies of Arkansas politics. Redistricting of the State to adjust for the loss of two seats threatened him with tough opposition for the first time in years.

This threat has now evaporated, but Mr. MILLS loses no opportunities between the grinding meeting schedules he sets for his committee to go back to Arkansas and shake hands with constituents old and especially new.

There is always the district. And if the general conservative bent of the district seems to have hardened during the long bitterness since 1954—well, this is the kind of thing a realist takes into account.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, Byelorussians are one of the numerous and ethnically distinct peoples in today's Soviet empire. They are racially related to the Russians and other Slavic peoples, but have always possessed distinct national character of their own which they have retained and jealously preserved. In their historic homeland, east of Poland, and west of Moscow with its center in the famous city of Minsk, they had constituted a nation-state and lived there long before the rose of modern Russia. Then, as Russians began their expansionist policy, Byelorussians were one of the first victims of this expansion. Early in the 16th century Byelorussia became part of the Russian Empire and remained as such until the breakup of the czarist Russian Empire in 1917. During these centuries of subjugation to Russian rule, Byelorussians successfully maintained their national identity, and kept alive their love for freedom. They struggled hard to regain their independence, and they had their chance in 1918.

When the Bolshevik revolution of 1917 in Russia destroyed the czarist empire, then all non-Russian national groups there asserted their freedom and proclaimed their national independence. The Byelorussians did this in 1918, and established the Byelorussian National Republic on March 25 of that year. Then some 10 million Byelorussians joined hands in rebuilding their war-ravaged country. But before they had much time to do this, they found themselves face to face with their implacable enemy, the Communist Russians. Early in 1921 Byelorussia was attacked by the Red Army, overrun, and then made part of the Soviet Union. Thus in a little less than 3 years independent Byelorussia vanished, and today it lives only in the minds and hearts of patriotic Byelorussians suffering under Soviet dictatorship. For more than 40 years these people have been living under one of the worst tyrannies known to men, but even under such heart-rending and soul-scorching circumstances Byelorussians have not given up their hope for freedom. Let us all hope that they attain their goal and live in peace in their homeland.

Comments on "Why Me?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following comments on the pamphlet "Why Me?" were sent to me by a constituent who is at present serving in the Reserve and is a lawyer by profession.

What is said by Mr. Krahulik, is, to me, important because it seems eminently factual; and is written by a young man who has never asked to be deferred or released from the service. The comments follow:

COMMENTS ON "WHY ME?"

The first paragraph of the Army's pamphlet, "Why Me?" immediately raises the question of why our Active Forces were not up to strength. It discusses the "increasing tension elsewhere" as a reason for the recent buildup of our forces. Have we not had such tensions all along? Why the sudden panic over the cold war situation? Statement made that the called-up men had a "willingness to serve" cannot be factually substantiated. The constant griping and the letters to newspapers and Congressmen evidence a contrary attitude on the part of the activated reservists and National Guardsmen.

Page 2 of "Why Me?" protests that the United States "does not propose to surrender," and then discusses the fact that trained Reserve and National Guard units were needed. However, it has become apparent through newspaper accounts that many of these recalled units were not trained, having had poor instruction at Reserve meetings and inadequate training at summer camps. Many will state that the Active Reserve meetings and summer camps are a waste of time. These units are usually poorly equipped as well. The equipment and clothing shortages which faced these men when they arrived at their designated posts raises another question not answered by "Why Me?"

Page 3 admits again that our forces were inadequate, but offers no explanation of why this condition existed. Can one really believe that the call-up of approximately 156,000 reservists and National Guardsmen demonstrated anything to the Communist leaders? Their reaction was to erect the Berlin wall which has led many people to believe that Berlin is doomed to wither on the vine. The second paragraph on page 3 would rather have us believe that the activation "has helped Berlin to stand intact."

Pages 6 and 10 deal with the draft calls, which reportedly are lower now because the Army is at its necessary strength. Why should the draft be decreased when, in fact, it should be increased in order to release the reservists and National Guardsmen, most of whom have already served their country, some having served 2 and 3 years on active duty. Men with 2 or 3 years active duty, which time, when coupled with Active Reserve time, totals 5 years as of October 1, 1961, are now to be released. The press reports these men were called by error. "Why Me?" makes no reference to them.

Page 4 assumes that the called-up units were trained and ready to perform their function. One unit was redesignated from an "infantry" to a "transportation unit" in 1959 and had no real experience in their new assignment when reactivated. This would not appear to be a very careful selection of a unit to recall. (See p. 5.)

The many letters to newspapers and Congressmen all contradict the "intensive training" statement set forth on the same page. Reports are that the training is inadequate, with the men spending most of their time standing around or performing routine Army chores. Under the guise of training, men are sent into woods to dig foxholes and forced to remain there all day, even in inclement weather, their MOS apparently forgotten.

Page 6 raises the question again of why the units were not at full strength. Why couldn't the law have been amended to permit a merger of such units or transfers from one to another? This could have been accomplished at the time Congress authorized the callup. This page of the pamphlet is far from being accurate because men taken from the Reserve pool were often trained in one specialty, but recalled to perform another type of duty about which they knew nothing. There are numerous examples of this practice. The answer appears to be that the service called men according to their MOS (military occupation specialty). Some were apparently called because they possessed the needed MOS even if it was their secondary MOS. One cannot believe that a

careful check was made of each man to see if he ever actually performed the job for which he was being recalled. This created a very serious morale problem, particularly among the so-called fillers, most of whom are men who are married, have children, a mortgaged home, and other financial obligations. Many are professional people who have just started in their fields. For these the callup created disruption and hardship.

Page 6 also indicates that to recall RFA personnel as fillers was "fair play." Although in fairness these men should be recalled before those with 2 or 3 years Active Army service, they did not enter the RFA program with the understanding that they would be recalled whenever a Communist-inspired crisis developed. Many of the RFA personnel are professional people who start their careers much later in life than other youths and hope to shorten a too long conscriptive service. This is one reason many of the men recalled in units, or as fillers, are over the age of 25.

With regard to the basis exemption from the callup as set forth in page 8, it is hard to believe that it was possible to really consider the applications for deferment which were reportedly voluminous. How could so many cases of hardship have been denied relief? Men were recalled who had wives and children, math and science teachers and attorneys in control occupations had to report with their units or as fillers. It is understandable that these individuals would be resentful as there are many youths who it is said escape the draft completely because they are married and are fathers.

It is generally agreed that crises will be with us for an indefinite period. It would appear wise to correlate the Reserve program with the increasing age of the reservists in mind. At a certain age (25–28 years) the reservist should automatically be placed on standby status. The Active Army and draft could be geared to replace those so designated. Such would be a fairer program for professional people who are either drafted or enter the RFA units at advanced ages. Whenever possible the individual should be placed in areas for which he is best qualified by job training or education. Not to do so would seem to be a great waste of talent. Undoubtedly such a process would benefit our country as well as the individual and would result in a highly skilled and effective Reserve.

I believe consideration might be given to placing all reservists and National Guardsmen on standby status. If it is desirable to maintain a larger Active Army to meet cold war crises then this should be done through the draft. In my opinion it is unfair to expect a few men to remain constantly on the alert for a possible recall over lengthy periods of time while others escape this completely.

Respectfully submitted.

Sp4c. EMIL R. KRAHULIK.

Castro in Costa Rica

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, for a long time I have warned about the spread of Castroism in Latin America. Early last year, even before the announcement of the alliance for progress, I had talked to my friends throughout Latin America relative to the spread of Castro's brand of communism.

There is much to be done. I include herewith an article recently published by Father Didacus M. Saunders, O.F.M. Conventual, about the work of one Catholic priest in Costa Rico. This illustrates what can be done by one dedicated person:

CASTRO IN COSTA RICA

(By Father Didacus M. Saunders, O.F.M. Conventual)

Father Eduardo Aguirre is a Cuban exile. Fidel Castro forced him to leave his homeland soon after the Communist takeover. Father Aguirre's church on the outskirts of Havana was desecrated, the tabernacle rifled, the ciborium riddled with machinegun fire, the hosts scattered throughout the church.

Castro had it in for Father Aguirre. Even before the revolution, this courageous priest was among the first publicly to denounce Castro as a Communist. That is why Father Aguirre is now an exile in Costa Rica. And that is why Father Aguirre attacks Castro and his Communists in Costa Rica with the healthy zeal of a hungry tiger.

Last summer, Father Aguirre came down to help us. Our conventual Franciscan missions of Quepos, Golfito, Palmar Sur, Puerto Cortez, and San Vito are in the very center of Communist activity in Costa Rica. Father Aguirre spoke to the students of the vocational school, to the children of three primary schools, to a teacher's conference. He lectured daily for 1 hour over Radio Golfito. He talked to 2,000 Costa Ricans assembled in Golfito's football stadium. He visited and spoke to workers in 27 banana farms of the United Fruit Co., in the Coto and Laurel districts of our territory. With the help of 25 boys from the vocational school, we distributed more than 50,000 circulars and booklets to our people. This literature answered the vicious slanders that the Communists had spread about the church and laid bare the false promises which the Castroites had made to the banana workers.

What was the impact of this counteroffensive? In our central mission, Golfito (population 11,000), the people were intensely interested in what Father Aguirre told them. They were hungry for the truth about present conditions in Cuba. They wanted to know why a country like Cuba—which is supposed to be Catholic—fell so easily into the Communist trap. Most important: Many realized for the first time that the Commies could take away their own liberty and freedom—and in the very near future.

The president of the municipality of Golfito at this time was Alphonsus Rodriguez Mora, a professed member of Fidel Castro's freedom fighters and of FUTRA, the Communist labor union. He has since gone to Cuba and has been forbidden to return by the Costo Rican Government.

From Golfito we carried our private war inland to Coto and Laurel. Here Castro's men had done their work exceedingly well. We had asked the workers to meet with us at the clubhouse of Coto farm 54. When we arrived, the clubhouse was empty. We jumped back into our jeep and drove straight to the local quadrangle. There we saw about a hundred men milling about restlessly in the road. We asked them why they had not come to the United Fruit Co.'s clubhouse to hear Father Aguirre. They unanimously replied that they were Communists and were not interested in anything we had to say.

Then one of the bolder men spoke up and shouted, "What right does a priest have to speak to us in the street? The place for a priest to speak is in church to the women and children. You priests are Yankee gringos and all Yankees are imperialists. You are not interested in helping us. Why don't we have representation with our employer? We are underpaid, we can't own our own homes, we are poor, we are hungry. We want freedom, liberty, a right to organize and the right to own our own property like the workers in Cuba. Why don't you Yankees go home? Why don't we have a Costa Rican priest? Why don't we have our own church here and Mass every Sunday?"

This was exactly the kind of battle Father Aguirre was spoiling for. He grabbed his transistor powered megaphone and jumped up on top of the jeep. The first question he fired back was: "How can you tell me what rights the workers have in Cuba when you have never been there?" By this time about 300 men had gathered around. The substance of what Father Aguirre then said was this:

I am not a Yankee. But if I were a citizen of the United States, I would be proud to be an American. I have not come to you as a representative of the United Fruit Co. I have not come to listen to your complaints and settle all your problems with false promises and lies as the Communists do. I am a native of Cuba and a Catholic priest. I speak to you in the name of Christ and His Church. I was the pastor of a large parish in Havana before Fidel Castro—your friend—expelled me from my homeland. I am here to tell you what the Castroites, the Communists, have done to your Catholic Church in Cuba and just what rights and how much liberty and freedom the people in Cuba actually have today under their so-called saviour and liberator, Fidel Castro.

If there is freedom in Cuba today under Fidel Castro, if the workers have the right to own their property, receive high wages, have more leisure time and are free to use it as they wish, have the right to worship freely and speak publicly for what they believe to be right, just, and good—you tell me why more than 300,000 Cubans have fled their homes, without passports, without their personal belongings, and many without their families? Why have they left the native soil, the land where they were born and raised, the soil in which their loved ones are buried? Why have so many fled into exile if all the farmland has been equally divided and if everybody is free to worship as he pleases? [By now the workers were stunned into silence, their mouths hanging open, no one daring to raise an objection or ask a question.]

The Catholic Church and communism do not have the same principles and do not work for the same ends. This is what Juan Rafael Solis Barboza and other Communist agitators tell you in your homes and over the radio. It is false. It is not true. If they have the same purposes, why has Castro thrown out all the priests, Brothers, and Sisters from Cuba and confiscated all church property? Why has he wiped out Catholic education in Cuba? Why has he desecrated churches by using them as houses of prostitution, dance halls, and cantinas for his militiamen? Why has he profaned the Blessed Sacrament and the sacred vessels of your Catholic religion?

Right now, Castro is setting up a national church in Cuba. He calls it the Catholic Church, but it is not in union with Rome, nor does it teach the doctrines of Christ, who founded your Catholic Church. This trick follows the same procedure attempted by the Communists in China. He has even dressed up party members in cassocks and paid them to play the part of priests in order to lead the simple and ignorant into a docile acceptance of his Communist rule.

What about the rights and privileges of the Cuban workers? You may work 7 or 8 hours a day. In Cuba the ordinary man must work 10 to 12 hours a day. During work, and many times after work, he is forced to attend Communist indoctrination classes, or train in the militia.

Women have equal rights with men. That means they do not have to care for their children, because they are taken away from their parents when they are 6 months old. Women have equal rights. That means they also work long hours in the fields with the men and carry rifles. They are allowed to see their husbands a few hours on Sunday. Is this liberty? Is this freedom?

Thousands of men, women, and children are starving in Cuba today. The Communists here have told you there will be plenty for everybody after the revolution. Castro cannot keep his promises in his own country. He takes the greater share of the crops and livestock from the farmers and does not leave them enough to live on.

Every day Russia is sending tanks, planes, and guns to Cuba. Castro's militia is well trained. Why? First to keep the workers down and under control, second to spearhead the Communist infiltration of all Latin American countries.

To whom can the Cuban worker bring his objections now? What rights does he have? If he disagrees with Castro or criticizes him, friends report him and he is liquidated. His crime?—impeding the progress of the state. If he is not shot by the firing squad, he is thrown into the already bulging, unsanitary, rat-infested prisons to die of starvation or disease.

This is what the Communists—those friendly, well-spoken men who visit you every day and give you literature to read—are really promising you. I have received no money to come here and tell you these things. I have come to your beautiful country to take refuge under the free democratic government you now enjoy. You must preserve this freedom. You must challenge the Communists and their lies.

We visited your homes about an hour and a half ago to distribute our literature. You were all eating. You are the best paid laborers in all of Costa Rico. You have the right to disagree with your employers, to discuss among yourselves government policies you may not agree with. You have no fear of being reported and shot. You can go to mass on Sunday and receive the life-giving sacraments of the church. You can go and do what you want when you have finished work. Do you want to lose these privileges? Let us rather die than sell our souls to Communist slavery.

One week later, 2,000 workers in the Laurel district of our mission territory threatened an armed strike against the United Fruit Co. Their demands: A 5-day week and a 6-hour day. The strike was masterminded by FUTRA and the strategy was to throw the entire Pacific coast of Costa Rica into economic turmoil. Under adverse conditions, the glittering promises of the Communists would appear all the more attractive to the banana workers, most of whom are illiterate.

An apparently legitimate petition was presented to the officials of United Fruit. The petition claimed 60 percent of the workers were in favor of striking. A check quickly turned up information that the vast majority did not want a strike at all. Their signatures had been obtained under false pretenses. They had been told that the petition was for a new bus route for schoolchildren, construction of a school in their particular area, improvement of a road, etc., etc. Most agreed that they were happy with their jobs, wages, and living conditions. At this point, the threat of a strike suddenly evaporated.

The fact of the matter is that United Fruit employees are the best paid laborers in Costa Rica. The minimum wage is 15.60 colones for an 8-hour day and the actual average daily wage is between 22 and 24 colones. By contrast, the peon on the large, privately owned coffee plantations may receive as low as 5 colones for a 10-hour day. The United Fruit Co. also provides free hospitalization and medical care for workers and their families, housing complete with free electricity and running water. Schools and recreational facilities are provided for the children.

Although there is still a lot of room for improvement in the school system and in housing conditions, the good things that the company has accomplished for the economy of Costa Rica far outweigh any deficiencies. But the Communists seize on these deficiencies and play them up as exploitation by a foreign enterprise. By repeating their tired slogans over and over again like a broken record, the Commies hope to dupe the ignorant and win them over to their side.

Archbishop Carlos Rodriguez, of San José, has given us a 3-kilowatt radio transmitter. We intend to set up this station at San Vito and use it to combat the Communist broadcasts beamed at our people from Radio Havana. If we can get enough financial backing, we will increase the power of our radio station so that we can fight Castro on his own ground with greater effectiveness.

Lat year Britain's Intelligence Digest reported the master plan for the Communist take-over of Latin America. The first stage would be revolutionary war based on guerrilla action. February is a good month for revolution in Costa Rica. The coffee harvest will be in, jobs fewer, workers idle. The danger is very real.

Statement in Support of H.R. 834

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following statement submitted by me to the Select Subcommittee on Labor in support of my bill H.R. 834, equal pay for equal work for women, for inclusion in the permanent record of the subcommittee's hearings being held today:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, DEMOCRAT, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 834, MARCH 26, 1962

Mr. Chairman, it is indeed a pleasure and an honor to testify before your subcommittee. As a member of the New York delegation, I, of course, follow the activities of my fellow members with keen interest and especially those of the gentleman from Manhattan, who so ably presides over this committee.

I am here today to speak in support of H.R. 834, my bill to provide equal pay for equal work for women. I doubt, Mr. Chairman, that we will find many of our colleagues opposing this principle, since the American woman has proven herself to be man's equal in the quality and quantity of work she can produce.

It is surprising to some, however, to discover that in spite of this equality in production there is still discrimination practiced against women in terms of pay for that production. While the American labor movement has been active in securing equal pay for equal work for its feminine members, there are many hundreds of thousands of women who, because of the nature of their employment, do not belong to labor unions and cannot thus avail themselves of the advantages of a powerful bargainer for their rights in this regard.

H.R. 834 would express the findings of the Congress that since wage differentials do exist in industry based purely on the sex of the employee, labor disputes result; living standards are depressed for both sexes; it increases the difficulty of maintaining and supporting a family where, for one reason or another, the husband has become unavailable as a breadwinner. The studies of this problem have also shown that wage discrimination of any kind prevents complete utilization of our labor resources. The kinds of discrimination I am talking about are discrimination because of race, religion, creed, national origin, age, and, the one we have under particular consideration here today, sex. All of these discriminations exist in American business today and affect one or another group of our citizens.

I believe that it is the duty of the Congress to do everything in its power to secure the elimination of these economic injustices and I believe that the enactment of H.R. 834 would go a long way toward accomplishing this goal with regard to wage discrimination because of the sex of the employee. I urge your subcommittee, Mr. Chairman, to report out this bill at the earliest possible time so that the House may consider its obvious merits and work its will.

Thank you.

The Science and Astronautics Committee Assumes a New Role on Capitol Hill Under the Leadership of Chairman George P. Miller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to commend to the attention of my colleagues the following articles from the New York Times for Friday, March 23, 1962—one by the Times' able reporter, John W. Finney, describing some of the ways in which the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, of which I am happy to be a member, is taking the lead in establishing legislative jurisdiction over scientific problems, and the other a very fine thumbnail sketch of Chairman MILLER:

SCIENTISTS AND CONGRESS PONDER IF LIFE EXISTS IN OTHER WORLDS

(By John W. Finney)

WASHINGTON, March 22.—In the dimly lit caucus room of the House of Representatives today, a committee of Congress and a group of scientists discussed whether life exists in other worlds.

The scientists told the Congressmen that life might well have developed on far distant planets. But they were pessimistic, for political reasons, about ever establishing radio contact.

They were pessimistic because they doubt that legislators on other planets, any more than on this earth, would put up the money to build the costly transmitters needed to send messages to other worlds.

Among those heard were Sir Bernard Lovell, director of the Jodrell Bank Experimental Station in Britain, and Dr. Harrison S. Brown, geochemist at the California Institute of Technology.

A serious discussion of such a subject would have caused laughter and ridicule a few years ago. The subject is one that scien-

tists prefer to talk about only in private to avoid public scorn. Thus today's discussion pointed up a significant transformation taking place in Congress' consideration of scientific problems.

Under the leadership of its new chairman, Representative GEORGE P. MILLER, Democrat, of California, the House Committee on Science and Astronautics is being transformed in scope and purpose into the first group in Congress to consider the broad scientific problems confronting the Nation.

The result is to fill what has been regarded within the executive branch and the scientific community as the major gap in the present organization of the Government to handle scientific problems and policies.

For congressional hearings, the committee today included an unusual slate of witnesses—12 of the Nation's outstanding scientists who make up the committee's advisory panel on science and technology.

From an astronomical point of view, Dr. Lovell said, there is a real possibility of life in other worlds, because at least 4 percent of the billions of stars in the universe must have planets capable of sustaining organic development.

A BIOLOGICAL PROBLEM

The question at this point, he said, is primarily biological. One positive clue was obtained recently, he pointed out, with the discovery of biochemical substances in some meteorites. Further evidence to answer the question, he said, will be obtained when searches are carried out for biological life on nearby Mars and Venus.

Dr. Lovell said, however, it would not be worthwhile to listen for messages from other worlds on a sporadic basis, such as was done in 1960 by scientists at the National Radio Astronomy Observatory in Green Bank, W. Va.

To do the job properly, he said, will require a number of finely instrumented radiotelescopes developed to attack the problem on a long-term basis. He then expressed doubt that any nation would be willing to take on a project so expansive and so speculative.

Perhaps if disarmament is achieved, he said, it will then be possible to divert some of the military radar dishes to listening for messages from other planets.

Dr. Brown described the possibility of extraterrestial life as one of the most important, exciting questions confronting us.

His own personal bet, he said, is that life is a very abundant commodity in our universe. But the chance of receiving signals from these other worlds, he said, depends largely upon how they have behaved and whether they have appropriated money to attempt to establish contact.

"Here I become somewhat gloomy," he said, "when I think about other legislatures in other worlds voting money for powerful transmitters to send signals that may or may not be heard in a few million years."

Dr. Brown used this example to illustrate his basic theme that "one of the most important tasks confronting us is how, in the democratic system, to make the correct decisions on problems involving technical and scientific considerations."

"The task that confronts us now," he said, "is how can we make the proper decisions in the legislative branch."

PART OF ANSWER FOUND

In recent years, he shid, a "generally satisfactory" answer to this problem has been developed within the executive branch with the activation of the President's Science Advisory Committee, the creation of the office of scientific adviser to the President and establishment of the Federal Council on Science and Technology to coordinate Government research programs.

Behind this comment was the fact that jurisdiction over scientific problems is now fragmented among several congressional committees, with no one committee exercising an overall policy review. It is this latter role that the House Science and Astronautics Committee, originally set up primarily to handle the space program, is now trying to fulfill.

SCIENCE LEADER IN HOUSE: GEORGE PAUL MILLER

WASHINGTON, March 22.—On the wall of GEORGE PAUL MILLER's fifth story office in the old House Office Building is an aerial photograph of the San Francisco area where he was born 72 years ago. The picture is a sentimental reminder to a reminiscent Concareers as a civil engineer, travel agent, gressman of a varied life that has included streetsweeper, fish and game official, State legislator, and U.S. Representative, in that order.

To the new chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, the picture is also a bothersome reminder of problems confronting him as a legislator—problems including the future of the San Francisco area and of the Nation in the future.

As he notes, in another few decades, some 14 million persons are expected to be crowded into the area—a population growth that prompts him to ask:

"How are you going to feed and clothe all those people there and in similar metropolitan areas throughout the Nation without some breakthroughs in science?"

His concern helps explain why he is now attempting to redirect his committee away from its emphasis on space exploration into becoming the scientific observer and policysetter of Congress.

AN UNUSUAL MEETING

One of the first steps was taken today when a panel of distinguished scientists was assembled before the committee for a discussion—unusual in the annals of Congress—that ranged from the possibility of life on other planets to the impact of Federal research grants on universities.

Mr. MILLER accepts the race to the moon as inevitable and necessary. But more important than being first to the moon, in his opinion, are the scientific knowledge that will flow from space technology and the resulting technical advances here on earth.

His emphasis on the scientific importance of space exploration reflects his proudly mentioned educational background as a civil engineer. As one of the few engineers in Congress, he likes to needle his lawyer colleagues in the House with the comment:

"You guys think in circles; I am one of the few guys around here who has been trained to think in straight lines."

Mr. MILLER is the son of a Sacramento River dredger captain. He received his civil engineering degree from St. Mary's College near his boyhood home of San Francisco in 1912. The next decade he divided between practice as an engineer and World War I service as a first lieutenant in the field artillery.

TURNED TO STREET SWEEPING

In the 1920's, he switched over to running a travel agency, an enterprise that failed in the depression. Thrown on relief, he was forced to sweep streets in Alameda, Calif., to receive relief allotments. The streetsweeping interlude led him into politics.

He served two terms in the California State Assembly from 1937 to 1941 and then became executive secretary of the California Division of Fish and Game.

In 1944 he was elected as U.S. Representative from the Eighth Congressional District in Alameda County and has been successively reelected ever since.

In Congress, he gained a reputation as a quiet spoken legislator who voted a moderate liberal line and was more interested in committee work and the problems of his constituents than in seeking publicity.

By virtue of his membership on the Armed Services Committee he was assigned to a special House committee that set up the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the House space committee. With the death last fall of Overton Brooks, of Louisiana, he moved over a seat to become chairman of the committee.

HELPED OCEANOGRAPHY

Previously he served as chairman of the Oceanography subcommittee of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

While in that post, through persuasion and testimony, he was able to convince the scientific community of oceanographers that it should bring in industry to help in the expanding program of oceanographic research.

Colleagues describe Mr. MILLER as an easygoing, story-telling person with a quick, perceptive, analytical mind. A somewhat cautious person, he dislikes controversy, but can be a skilled politician in averting or settling an argument.

Despite his 72 years, Mr. MILLER is a spry man who likes to take jaunts in the Washington countryside and hikes in the Sierras of California. Some 7 years ago he broke the sonic barrier abroad a Navy jet fighter.

Mr. MILLER was married in 1927 to the former Esther Perkins, who had come from Overton, Nebr., to be a personnel manager in a San Francisco department store. They have one daughter, Mrs. Ann Miller Muir of San Lorenzo, Calif, and two grandchildren.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of March 24, 1962:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, March 24, 1962)

The Revenue Act of 1962 has been approved for floor debate by the Rules Committee. The Democrat majority of Rules (10 Democrats to 5 Republicans) decreed a closed rule for floor debate, that is, no amendments permitted. Earlier, all of the 10 Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee had instructed their leader, BYRNES, of Wisconsin, to request the Rules Committee to grant the Republican members the right to offer three amendments for debate and vote on the floor of the House during consideration of the bill. The 15 Democrats of the Ways and Means Committee were against this request and the Democrats of the Rules Committee supported them. So it is that the three amendments (see last week's newsletter) will not be considered separately. These amendments would strike out: (1) Investment credit and substitute liberalized depreciation, (2) the withholding of interest and dividends at the source, (3) the foreign investment increased tax. It is interesting to note again, so unknown to most people, the

real reason for packing the Rules Committee. This gives the Democrats, the liberals, the ability to control floor debate, as to time, rules of procedures, and amendment. Coincidentally, the throttling of House debate encourages, if not assures, a poor legislative result.

Then a last-minute change to the tax bill was forced through Ways and Means Committee, in an effort to sweeten the bill so more Members would support it. The changes are: (1) Reduce the investment credit from 8 to 7 percent (reclaiming $190 million for the Treasury), (2) reduce utilities from 4 percent (they were getting 50 percent of the 8 percent) to 3 percent (reclaiming $75 million for the Treasury), and (3) reducing the first $100,000 level to $25,000 for computation purposes and the 50 percent of all amounts beyond the first $25,000 to 25 percent (reclaiming $360 million). These total a recovery of $625 million of the original $1.8 billion loss in an effort to balance what was expected to be a total tax bill that would lose $500 to $600 million annually to the Treasury. There is still some doubt as to the fiscal balance. Republicans voted against the bill, or voted present, expressing disapproval of the haste and lack of documentary information to support what appeared to be solely a political move to gain House support. No one can dispute sensibly our uncertainty as a committee over what we are doing, without hearings or departmental study. Such action is certain to damage the prestige of the Ways and Means Committee, and prevents the House from acting with knowledge and responsibility in the final outcome of the bill.

The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 in the second week of hearings before the Ways and Means Committee has produced a wide divergence of viewpoint. Basic differences center around: (1) Confidence versus disbelief in the State Department's handling of an economic matter in foreign policy by decisions; (2) more versus less trade with Communist bloc nations, including the amendments of the Battle Act and Buy American Act; (3) our negotiators are versus are not able to produce better tariff concessions in view of present and past imbalances where United States has lowered tariffs and others have not made similar concessions (indeed have impaired other trade controls); (4) the bill will versus will not result in freer trade in view of foreign licensing, quotas, cartels, turnover and road taxes, registration, even to existing embargos (Italy, for example) as a result of 27 years of so-called reciprocal trade; (5) subsidies are versus are not the Federal role. For my part, I find it hard to believe that the proponent witnesses have read and understood the bill. The tremendous power grant to the President and the unlimited promise of subsidy to industry and unemployed workers is extremely dangerous. This one bill can change the United States into a Government-regulated business community. The willingness of some businessmen to accept this subsidy bill because of the anticipated foreign business advantages is all too evident—it's a question of whose ox is gored. Oddly, the parade of businesses testifying of their demise in the face of foreign competition, can thank themselves to a degree because they have been unwilling to take part in stemming the socialistic tide in other areas than their pocketbook. The oil industry is still not understood by the public, hence, by some Members of Congress. If the people do not learn that foreign imports, because cheaper, can close down this domestic industry, leaving us defenseless in times of national emergency, we are in grave peril. We must keep up our ability to pump oil out of the ground.

The Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill of 1962 itemizes the expenditure of $73 million more than last year for a total of $795.8 million. Members of Congress can also, if necessary, proclaim a saving; it is $62 million less than requested by the administration in the budget.

The authorization for appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels involved a total of $13 billion ($13,000 million), and 403 to 0. The question of congressional or Executive control over armaments for national defense was the controversy and the B-70 the focal point. The future need for the manned bomber is debatable, but no one should question the need, it seems to me, until missiles can entirely do the job. Even then, there may be a need. We do not know. I am for the manned bomber until there is no further doubt about any weapons gap. The larger question centers around the jurisdiction of weaponry and planning. The Constitution states, article I, section 8, relating to the powers of Congress, grants the legislative branch these authorities: "To raise and support armies; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the Government and regulations of the land and naval forces." So, under the Constitution the power to plan rests with Congress. The President as Commander in Chief, commands or manages, but does not develop plans and programing.

Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, among peoples that have dominated the course of human history over the milleniums the Greeks hold a distinctly high place. These superbly gifted and extraordinarily gallant people have contributed more, perhaps, to Western civilization than any other people. That is never seriously questioned. In the arts and sciences, and also in literature as well as in spiritual values, the modern world owes an immense debt to the Greeks. But Greek genius also bequeathed us an idea that has become our most highly prized and priceless possession—the idea of freedom and independence. This most cherished human possession stems directly from the Greeks of the fifth century before Christ.

But the idea of freedom that was born in that distant land was crushed there for almost 2,000 years. Against their more powerful and numerous foes the Greek people could not hold their own, and so for centuries they suffered under alien rulers in their homeland. In particular, from the very beginning of modern times until early in the 19th century they lived under the oppressive regime of the Ottoman Turks. On innumerable occasions they revolted against their alien overloads, but they could not succeed in their attempt to free themselves until they were effectively aided by their friends abroad. On March 25, 1821, they again rose in rebellion, and after waging a long war against their ruthless enemy for more than 6 years, their freedom was assured by the destruction of the Ottoman fleet in the historic naval battle of Navarino.

Today, on the 141st anniversary of Greek Independence Day, the whole free world rejoices in the fact that these gallant people regained their freedom and have been enabled to retain it in the course of their turbulent history.

Extremists Who Endanger Our Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the real threat to the freedom and liberty of the American people comes from the extremists surrounding the President who would subvert our Constitution in their zeal for power. The following editorial by David Lawrence in U.S. News & World Report points up what is happening to us through White House demands which would violate the Constitution:

THE REAL EXTREMISTS

(By David Lawrence)

We hear a good deal nowadays about "extremists"—those who brand as Communists other persons who are not Communists. Name calling, however, while deplorable, doesn't do as much harm to the American people as a whole as do the "extremists" in public office who would disregard the Constitution.

For there is a trend today toward circumvention of the Constitution. Scarcely a month goes by that some new legislative measure or Executive order isn't proposed which seeks to get around the Constitution.

The argument recently espoused in all seriousness as an alibi by some people inside and outside Government is that amending the Constitution is a laborious and slow process. The point is made that times have changed and that some of the doctrines of past decades in the field of law have become obsolete.

Oddly enough, that's exactly the excuse Nikita Khrushchev gives for abrogating the allied agreements made in 1945 to insure unrestricted access to Berlin. He says these agreements are outmoded.

Is it right for one party to an agreement to declare arbitrarily that he will no longer abide by its terms because he decides it is obsolete?

The people of the Thirteen Original States, by a compact with each other, gave up certain rights and delegated them to a central government. All powers not enumerated in the Constitution as having been delegated to the Federal Government were specifically reserved to the States respectively, or to the people. This is the language of the 10th amendment. Why is this agreement so persistently violated?

If the people at any time wish to change the Constitution, it can be amended by a two-thirds vote of Congress followed by acts of ratification by three-fourths of the States.

But we hear today that this is too cumbersome a method and that it takes too much time. Yet some amendments have gone through from congressional action to State ratification in less than a year.

The truth is that where there is substantial opposition to an amendment, it naturally isn't approved.

Unfortunately, our record as a nation is not clean. The 14th amendment was not legally inserted in the Constitution. The same Southern States which were considered eligible members of the Union when—after the Civil War was over—they ratified the 13th amendment abolishing slavery were then punished by Congress for refusing to ratify the 14th amendment. Ratification was accomplished by legislative coercion of the States by Congress and at the point of the bayonet by Armed Forces stationed in the State legislatures. Yet this same 14th amendment is the basis of most of the Executive orders on civil rights today. The Supreme Court has never consented to pass upon the validity of the method used to ratify the 14th amendment, though the Court has accepted cases challenging the validity of other amendments.

Recently a new trend toward usurpation of power has arisen. It seeks by Executive order, or by the passage of new laws, to thwart or ignore the plainly written provisions of the Constitution.

President Kennedy sent a bill to Congress a few weeks ago proposing a far-reaching change in the handling of tariffs. The Executive would fix the duties and commodity quotas—a power granted by the Constitution only to Congress. The bill, now before the House Ways and Means Committee, provides, moreover, that Presidential determinations "shall be final and conclusive and shall not be subject to review by any court."

Why should the people be deprived of judicial review when they are the victims of illegality in the application of trade laws?

Also the Kennedy administration has just signed treaties with 24 countries on trade relations, but does not intend to submit these agreements to the Senate for ratification by a two-thirds vote.

Executive orders have been issued, moreover, in civil rights matters, on many of which Congress itself has refused to pass laws. Thus, by Executive order, purchase contracts for goods or services can be withheld by the Government from any business which refuses to accept the Government's dictation as to the number of employees of a particular color that the contractor or subcontractor may hire.

It certainly is a form of extremism to substitute Executive orders for the laws of Congress.

Extremism is bred by extremism. We would have less trouble with the malcontents in our midst if the spirit and letter of the Constitution were observed.

If the method of amending the document is too cumbersome, let the people by the constitutional method change it. But let's face the fact that new extremists have arisen who believe that the Executive order can circumvent the Constitution if the stated objective merely has popular appeal. This is government by emotion—by extremism. It is not government by a written Constitution.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, since we were not in session yesterday, Sunday, the 25th, we are commemorating today the 44th anniversary of Byelorussian Independence Day. In 1917 the Russian Revolution overthrew a decrepit and detested czarist regime in Russia, thus freeing all the downtrodden nationalities of the Russian Empire. The people of Byelorussia, often known as White Russians, are an ancient people, whose history dates back much further than that of the Great Russians. Yet they have long been ruled from Moscow, although they never gave up their distinctive White Russian traits, their sense of national destiny, or their respect for their own heritage. When the moment which they had long awaited arrived in 1918, and freedom reigned from the Baltic to the Caucasus, the Byelorussians proclaimed their independence from Russia and announced the establishment of the Byelorussian National Republic on March 25, 1918. The 10 million Byelorussians hoped that, having thus attained sovereign independence in their historic homeland, they would be allowed to enjoy the fruits of their victory in peace.

But, as happened in so many other cases, this long-subjugated people was not destined to remain free. Early in 1921, before the Byelorussians could consolidate their victory or strengthen their new national government, the Soviet Red army conquered the country. Such was the end of this ill-fated state, and for the last 40 years the brave White Russians have suffered under the tyrannical rule of their Soviet masters.

The Communist-managed agricutural system has deprived the people of the food and products that should be theirs. Byelorussian youths have been deported to the Asia and Arctic regions of the Soviet, so that Byelorussia is drained of the young, patriotic citizens who can carry on their heritage of freedom. But like the other people of Eastern Europe, Byelorussians have refused to give up their ideals of national idependence and self-determination. And, at the proper time, they will again open the fight for their freedom.

I am sure all throughout the free world will join with me today in the prayer that the Byelorussian people will soon be liberated from the slavery of the past 40 years.

Success of Common Market Is Surprise Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt that the success of the prospering European Economic Community—the Common Market as this union is popularly referred to—has made a tremendous impression not only on the Members of this Congress, but also on all American businessmen and workers who have read of this Community's terrific success since its formation in 1957. The Common Market's success certainly has made itself felt among the leaders of Metropolitan New Orleans in all fields—government, business, industry, and education. Since long before the city of New Orleans became part of the United States in the Louisiana Purchase of 1803, it has been one of the great ports in North America. Today, it is our country's second port next to New York, and the free flow of goods over its wharves is the city's very lifeblood. That New Orleans is the gateway to the Americas and the door to the entire Mississippi Valley, is revealed by the great flood of imports and exports which annually pass across her docks. In the past 2 years, a total of more than 25 million tons of waterborne foreign trade, with a value of almost $3.5 billion, has moved in and out of the port of New Orleans.

For these reasons and many more, most of the leaders in business and industry and government in my community have always supported freer trade between our country and the nations of the free world, and I am confident that they continue to do so in order to meet the changing conditions of our world and to enhance the economic growth and prosperity of our New Orleans area for all of our citizens.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert into the RECORD the first of two articles on the proposed new trade program for our country in the light of the growing and prosperous Common Market in Europe. This article by Reporter Bob Friendly was written for the New Orleans (La.) States-Item and is entitled "Success of Common Market Is Surprise Here." The first article follows:

SUCCESS OF COMMON MARKET IS SURPRISE HERE

(By Bob Friendly)

The New Orleans business community is greatly surprised and impressed with the success of the European Common Market.

There is a little fear of it here, too.

And a feebly admitted dearth of knowledge on the subject despite the kindled concern.

Will an economically unified Europe cut back on its purchase of American products?

Should the United States reduce its import tariffs in return for the lowering of barriers against our exports by the Common Market nations?

Will U.S. business be hurt by Common Market products if we do agree to freer trade?

Those questions have gained emphasis since the continental trade bloc eased into the second great phase of its development this winter and the Kennedy administration began pushing for tariff cuts.

The tariff move comes at this time because the 1934 Reciprocal Trade Act is due to expire in the summer. The reciprocal agreement is the law that permits negotiating of mutual tariff cuts with other nations in the hope of expanding trade.

Heretofore, the reciprocal agreement was renewed each time the expiration date rolled around. But President Kennedy feels the need of more sweeping tariff-cutting powers to meet the challenge of the Common Market.

The administration's liberalized reciprocal law began its long march down the trail of congressional processes last week.

The Common Market's second phase, which the trade bloc entered January 1, is one in which economic decisions will be decided by majority vote of the six member nations. Previously, agreements had to be reached on the basis of a unanimous vote, a tremendous hurdle that is now past.

The market is known officially as the European Economic Community, and it had its inception in 1957. The idea was to create a larger market for domestic industries by eliminating all tariff barriers within the Community, just as the United States did when it merged the States into a nation.

"Trade blocs permit a higher degree of specialization," explained Dr. Hugh B. Carnes, professor of foreign trade at Tulane University.

The agriculture areas can devote themselves to automation and expanded production, knowing they have a large market area, unobstructed by international boundaries. The same goes for heavy industry.

Dr. Carnes noted that the United States already is near the optimum in specialization and would be little benefited by participation as a member of a trade bloc.

The nations of the Common Market—West Germany, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg—now have a common currency standard and a common labor pool.

One franc is worth 1 mark. One mark is the same value as 1 lira. The combined capital can go anywhere in the Economic Community that it is needed for specialization and industrial development.

Workers in countries with unemployment may migrate freely to one of the nations where employment opportunities are better, just as is done between States in the American Union.

The Common Market nations established a gradual schedule for the elimination of tariffs between them, later speeding it up when it actually went easier than expected.

The six now have reduced internal tariffs 40 percent and will, if all goes well, eliminate them entirely by 1966. At the same time a common tariff is being placed on goods brought into the market from outside.

This is where U.S. exporters become concerned. If the Common Market becomes highly specialized and reasonably self-sufficient, what will happen to the heavy U.S. exports to Europe, when there is a tariff barrier against American products?

The Common Market economy has boomed even though the alliance is in its early stages. The gross national product, or value of all the goods and services produced, is rising within the Common Mart at the rate of 5 percent a year. That is about double the rate of growth of the United States or Britain.

The rapid advance of the economic community forced Britain, aloof at first, to seek admission.

"The Common Market is obviously an enormous success," said Darwin S. Fenner, vice president of Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, stockbrokers.

"Ten years ago we wouldn't have believed this possible. It is one of the marvels of the decade and probably will lead to long prosperity—in Europe."

Others here echoed the sentiments.

Many U.S. educators have made studies to see which American commodities are likely to be most affected adversely by the Common Market.

A Columbia University professor says not more than 20 percent of the U.S. exports to Europe will be hurt. He names machinery, finished chemicals and petroleum products.

A Michigan State University study lists the following as likely to feel the effects seriously:

Canned meat, crude chemicals from coal, petroleum and gas, petrochemicals, textiles, glass and pottery, iron, steel, zinc, tin, scientific instruments, medical instruments, and optical instruments.

To preserve our exports to a Common Market that will be developing most of its own products, steps must be taken to keep the tariff barriers low.

In any agreement of this nature, the United States must lower some of its own import tariffs, opening the door even further to competition with American industry from low-cost foreign products.

That is the basic problem. The Kennedy administration proposal is this:

1. That Congress grant authority to the President to totally eliminate over the next 5 years tariffs on products where the United States and Common Market "together account for more than 80 percent of world trade."

2. That Congress grant the President the privilege of reducing other tariffs by 50 percent on reciprocal terms. This involves deeper tariff cuts than the old Reciprocal Trade Act and permits the reduction on whole categories of goods rather than individual items.

3. That Government aid be made available to firms hurt by imports. The help would go to modernization of facilities and training in new jobs for displaced workers.

4. The peril point and escape clause provisions of the previous reciprocal acts would be modified. The peril point, set up the U.S. Tariff Commission as a floor on tariffs, would be eliminated, but the Commission still would warn the President when imports start to hurt. The escape clause would be kept but made harder to invoke.

New Orleans and Louisiana businessmen are doing a lot of soul searching in an effort to decide just how this affects them.

Joseph W. Simon, Jr., president of the Chamber of Commerce of the New Orleans area, commented, "As a port city, this all means a heckuva lot more to us than to—say—Davenport, Iowa."

Presiding Bishop of Episcopal Church Calls for Humanitarian Concern for Needs of People in Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, recently the Right Reverend Arthur Lichtenberger issued a statement cautioning against a general criticism of people on public relief rolls.

His most timely reminder of the Christian responsibility for the total welfare of people I believe deserves to be widely read:

PRESIDING BISHOP OF EPISCOPAL CHURCH CALLS FOR HUMANITARIAN CONCERN FOR NEEDS OF PEOPLE IN TROUBLE

NEW YORK.—The presiding bishop of the Episcopal Church warned today against general criticism of people on public relief rolls.

Obviously opposing an attitude spread by much-publicized recent controversies over public welfare recipients, the Right Reverend Arthur Lichtenberger points out its dangers in a statement for a special issue of the Episcopal publication, Churchways. The February number deals with the church's mission to people of special need.

"The total welfare of people is a basic concern of the Christian religion," begins Bishop Lichtenberger, continuing:

"By word and deed the ministry of Jesus was largely given to the personal and social needs of people in trouble. The Christian Church has always developed services for the poor and the afflicted. Christians today join with others in supporting a wide range of voluntary social services.

"The development of public welfare programs in the United States is a recognition of this Christian and humanitarian concern for human needs. American democracy is best served when broad social welfare programs function under both Government and voluntary auspices.

"Public welfare services are matters of justice and should be available to those in need, unrestricted by residence, citizenship, or circumstances of birth. The vast public welfare programs must be under constant supervision and evaluation by public officials and representatives of the people to assure that they meet the changing needs of handicapped people. But we must take great care that the necessary evaluation of programs and their administration does not transpose itself into general criticism of the recipients—the aged, the blind, the sick, children under 18 years of age, and others who cannot defend themselves.

"I hope that Episcopalians will join with all men of good will in being alert to the welfare needs of people in their communities, and in supporting the welfare services available to them. This is one way of loving thy neighbor as thyself in our present world."

Address by the Honorable Frank A. Southard, Jr., U.S. Executive Director, International Monetary Fund, January 29, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address by the Honorable Frank A. Southard, Jr., the U.S. Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund.

Mr. Southard made this address in Houston, Tex., at the dedication of the World Trade Center in that city and presents a clear and incisive account of America's stake in world trade. The Congress has been asked to investigate President Kennedy's proposed trade adjustment policy and I would urge our colleagues to read Mr. Southard's discussion while considering the President's proposal.

The address follows:

AMERICA'S STAKE IN WORLD TRADE

(By Frank A. Southard, Jr.)

On this occasion when Houston is dedicating its splendid and beautiful World Trade Building I feel privileged to be a participant. This magnificent civic enterprise will stand as a dramatic evidence of your conviction that America has a vital stake in world trade. Your history and experience make it proper that you should engage in this enterprise. You have great ports, with Houston in the forefront; you are accustomed to seeing the flags of many nations flying from the ships in your harbors; your industries are geared to world markets; and your banks know how to finance exports and imports. Indeed, there are in this hall

men who are better qualified than I to talk to you about world trade. I can only assume that in the business of arranging for public speakers just as in merchandising, an imported article sometimes attracts the consumers.

Why do nations trade with each other? Back in the 17th century there was a school of thought called mercantilism which gave a simple answer to that question. The answer was that a nation trades in order to get gold or treasure. An English merchant named Thomas Mun wrote a little book in 1630 called "England's Treasure by Forraign Trade" which drives home this idea. Possibly it is not too surprising that this doctrine should have emerged in England with such emphasis. England was not a producer of gold and silver, and people came quickly to understand that the surest way to bring about an inflow of precious metals was to have an excess of exports over imports.

But by the 18th century economists like Adam Smith began to give a different answer to the question. Their answer is that countries export in order to get desirable goods and services in return. This may seem to contradict much present-day emphasis on exports. We do give great importance to our export trade—and for reasons which I will explain later, rightly so. But we must from time to time remind ourselves of the simple truth that countries export in order to be able to import what they need or want. A country which wanted no goods and services from the rest of the world because it produced everything better and cheaper at home, would not export at all—except, as Thomas Mun would advise, to bring home gold. Even if exporting solely to get gold seemed to make sense, a self-sufficient country couldn't export very long, because the capacity or willingness of other countries to pay gold would at some point be exhausted.

Once we begin to think about foreign trade as the exchange of what we can spare for what we want, typical illustrations come to mind. For example, we exchange manufactured goods with Latin America in return for coffee, cacao, bananas, and other tropical products which we cannot produce at home. Much more complex exchanges of goods and services between countries are no less advantageous. Trade is related to demand and, in a money economy, as economists put it, demand is a function of income. This means that trade between poor people or trade between poor nations never amounts to very much. It is not surprising but it is often forgotten that the most complex, the largest, and in the aggregate the most profitable trade takes place between prosperous industrial countries. This, indeed, is the reason for our vital interest in the Common Market of Europe—as Mr. William Clayton has so cogently explained.

The history of foreign trade is filled to the brim with romance and adventure, with excitement and peril. And that history vividly reminds us that foreign traders have always been searchers for the goods which people want. When the Phoenicians and the Greeks sailed their frail ships out into the far reaches of the Mediterranean and even into the Atlantic they did not venture "beyond the sunset and the baths of all the western stars" simply in order to find a market for Phoenician dyes and Greek pottery. Not at all; they were hunting for things, known or unknown, which could be sold back home. During the centuries when Venice was the richest and most powerful city in the Western World, it was the channel through which the wonderful goods of the Orient reached the slowly growing markets of Western Europe. The courageous mariners who pushed their way farther and farther along the coast of Africa until finally they rounded the Cape of Good Hope, were hunting for an ocean route to the East so that the costs and dangers of caravans across Asia could be avoided. And when Columbus made his first landfall on the island in the West Indies which he named San Salvador he thought he had reached Cipangu and Cathay and could capture the precious flow of spices and silks for Spain.

True enough, Eldorado was also the goal of men's dreams and once the Old World found that this was indeed a New World and not the Orient, the search for gold and silver was unrelenting and merciless. But fortunately there was no gold along the coast of North America, and this rich land became a source of things which Europe could use—things like indigo and tobacco and cotton and timber—and foreign trade grew and prospered in colonial days.

The United States from the earliest years of our independence has been a great trading Nation. Our clipper ships set records on every route, and the names of our products were seen on signs in cities all over the world. Today our foreign trade is gigantic and the United States is the leading trading country. In 1960, when world exports (excluding the Sino-Soviet bloc) amounted to $113 billion, our exports were almost $20 billion. The next two exporting countries were Western Germany with $11 billion and the United Kingdom with $10 billion. On the import side we also were first, with $16 billion in imports (on a c.i.f. basis) compared with $13 billion for the United Kingdom and $10 billion for Germany.

This tremendous export and import trade amounts to 7 percent of our gross national product. Our exports alone in 1960 were almost 9 percent of the total value of all the movable goods which we produced. In 1961 our nonmilitary exports were at a record high and may for the first time have exceeded $20 billion. Our imports in 1961 were running at about $14½ billion f.o.b., and our export surplus thus amounted to roughly $5.5 billion which in the past 12 years was exceeded only in the Suez-crisis year of 1957.

Western Europe is our best market, taking more than a third of all of our nonmilitary exports. But Canada is our largest single market, followed by the United Kingdom and Japan; and the 20 Republics to the south always have been and still are major buyers of American goods. Almost a fourth of our total exports are products of American agriculture. Over one-fifth consists of machinery, over 10 percent of various metals and manufactures of metal, and about 14 percent comprises transportation equipment. The list of American industries which send much of their output to foreign markets is long indeed. If we take a look at agriculture we find that in 1960 19 percent of the condensed, evaporated, and dried milk was exported, 33 percent of all fats and oils (including 50 percent of the cottonseed oil and 43 percent of the soybean products), 28 percent of the barley, 59 percent of the rice, 45 percent of the wheat, over 10 percent of the citrus fruit, 23 percent of the dried fruit, 28 percent of the leaf tobacco, and 49 percent of the raw cotton. If we look at industry there were equally striking figures in 1960. Twenty-six percent of our lubricants went abroad and 35 percent of our sulfur; 10 percent of our tin plate was exported, 19 percent of our aluminum, 26 percent of our copper, 22 percent of our metal-cutting machine tools, 45 percent of our construction graders, 15 percent of our agricultural machinery, 19 percent of our trucks and buses, 20 percent of our DDT production, and 26 percent of our carbon black. We exported aircraft and parts in 1960 with a value of $1.3 billion; indeed, a good third of the output of our aircraft industry is exported.

Our imports, as we might expect, follow closely the ups and downs of our national production, because about 40 percent consists of raw and semiprocessed materials for which our needs are high in prosperity and low in recession. In 1959, for example, total imports exceeded $15 billion whereas at the bottom of the recent recession they dropped substantially below $14 billion at an annual rate. Another 20 to 25 percent of our imports are foodstuffs and the remainder are finished manufactures. Western Europe is not only the best market for our goods but also the largest source of our imports. Canada, however, is the largest single supplier of our imports just as it is our largest single export market. From Latin America in 1960 our imports amounted to $3½ billion, and our imports from Japan reached $1.1 billion, though we exported an even larger value of goods to Japan.

What are some of the articles making up this vast inflow of commodities? Coffee alone exceeds a billion dollars a year and sugar half a billion. Raw materials for the textile industry and woodpulp for our papermills are major items. Petroleum imports are large, amounting to about a billion and a half dollars a year. Iron ore is important as are bauxite and copper. In 1960 we imported almost $1½ billion of machinery and vehicles; but, reflecting the tremendous spread and strength of American industry, our exports of those products exceeded $6 billion. In chemicals the interchange is equally striking, our imports amounting to $350 million and our exports to $1.7 billion; and in iron and steel mill products we imported $560 million and exported $611 million.

World trade is a vital part of our economy. It is the source of valuable, desirable, and essential goods which we need and want; it provides a market for $20 billion of the goods we produce; it is the basis of our merchant marine, and of much of the activities of our great banks, our freight forwarders, and our insurers. Our seaports and the railroads and trucking companies serving them owe much of their business to foreign trade. But our stake in world trade is even more essential to our national well-being than can be measured by those agricultural, industrial, commercial, and financial considerations. If it cannot be said of us, as it can of some other industrial countries, that we must export or die, it can nonetheless be said that on the success of our exporters depends our ability to maintain our farflung defense lines, our financial leadership, world confidence in our currency, and our capacity to help the underdeveloped countries of the world to build a more prosperous society. All of this rests on our foreign trade.

Still, it may be asked, Why do we need to do more than we are doing? We are exporting much more than we are importing. In 1961, with exports of about $20 billion and imports of about $14½ billion, we had an export surplus of about $5½ billion. Indeed, if we take goods and nonmilitary services together, our surplus was $7.8 billion. Yet in the face of this near record performance, high officials of our Government emphasize almost daily how important it is for us to maintain our power to compete in world markets and to increase our exports to even higher levels. Accolades will be given to companies which are successful in the struggle for business around the world.

Why is this? If we are already exporting much more than enough to pay for the things we need, aren't we doing enough? The answer is that we are not; that we must do still more to sell our goods in the markets of the world. There are two reasons why this is so. First, our high trade surplus in 1960 and 1961 reflects boom conditions abroad (especially in Europe) at a time when the United States was going through a recession. As our economy moves again into higher gear, our imports rise faster than our ex-

ports. This means that we must be able to generate large trade surpluses at times such as the last half of 1961 and 1962, when we may easily add $1 billion to our import total. Second, the trade in goods is only one, even though the largest, element in our total transactions with the rest of the world. There are other important items. There are the services we buy from foreigners and sell to foreigners such as freight, insurance, and banking. There are the expenditures of our tourists abroad and of foreign tourists in this country. There are the remittances which foreigners or immigrants in this country make to their families and friends abroad. There is the flow of capital both into and out of our country and there is the aid which we give to less developed countries and the money we spend abroad for defense. All of these transactions are added up in our balance of payments. The credits in this balance are the amounts we earn by selling goods and services and the commercial capital which flows in, and the debits are the amounts we pay for goods and services and outflow of capital, our oversea expenditures for defense and our outlays for foreign aid.

What we must have is a reasonable balance or equilibrium in the total of these credits and debits arising from our international transactions. We must have it if we are to play our proper political, financial, economic, and military role in the world, and if the dollar is to command world confidence. If we do not succeed in achieving and maintaining a reasonable equilibrium between our total receipts and our total payments, we will run into trouble. On the one hand, if we were to have a large surplus of credits over debits (which, to be sure, we have not had for many years) the rest of the world would have to settle this surplus by using up its gold and dollar reserves. As the reserves of the rest of the world declined, the stability of the international system would be threatened. If, on the other hand, year after year we run a persistent and large deficit in our balance of payments, we lose gold or foreigners have to hold dollars in increasing amounts or both of these things occur. There is a limit both to the amount of gold which we can afford to lose and to the amount of dollars which foreigners would be willing to hold. Neither of these limits is easy to define, but what we do know is that at some point we must achieve a reasonable equilibrium between total debits and total credits.

There is the closest kind of connection between our balance of payments and our stake in world trade. The United States has a free, private, profitmaking economy. Our producers export goods because it is profitable to do so and our businessmen import goods because the economy as a whole wants and needs them and because they can be sold or used profitably. But in the larger context of our international accounts, our merchandise trade, both exports and imports, overshadows all other transactions and provides the margin of earnings over payments which enables us to achieve the equilibrium in our balance of payments which is so essential. This is why our Government puts such stress on the need to expand exports; and it is why we must and do have such acute national interest in what is happening in the Comomn Market of Europe as well as in the other markets of the world.

Our balance of payments has its complexities, and I will not impose on your time and your attention to read off all of the figures which unless seen and studied can become so confusing. But I will give the trend in our international payments and explain the interrelationships of the big items. The United States is the most powerful country in the world, and no Americans are any more conscious of this than are Texans. What we do or don't do has more impact than the activity or inactivity of any other country. There are three big and important types of activities which the United States carries on in the world, and which in the aggregate calls for expenditures each year of $7 to $8 billion. One of these consists of our oversea military expenditures, which amount to about $3 billion each year. This chiefly represents what we spend in foreign countries for materials and supplies to maintain our troops and what is spent by the troops themselves. Our defense lines do not stop at our shores; they run far beyond the seas. We need do no more than recall names in the headlines such as Berlin and Korea and Vietnam in order to understand why these expenditures are being made and must be made. Second, our business enterprises and our private financial institutions make long-term investments abroad each year amounting to $2 or $2½ billion. These investments may be in factories or oil wells or plantations or they may consist of commercial loans to foreign borrowers or purchases of foreign securities. They reflect the worldwide interests of our tremendous enterprise system and they reflect also the power of our money markets in world affairs. Third, our Government directly or through international institutions makes loans and grants to the several-score underdeveloped countries in the world which are striving to build up their economies so that some day they may more closely match the success of our own in providing a prosperous life for the masses of their people. These loans and grants have recently been running at a level above $3 billion a year, although as I shall explain, much of this is tied to expenditure within the United States.

For our great country to carry out its destiny, these international transactions for defense, for investment, and for aid are inescapable, and they will continue to be very large. But the question which I am raising is what these transactions have to do with our stake in world trade or, indeed, what they have to do with foreign trade at all.

What happens when we take our dollars—as much as $8 billion of them each year—and invest them overseas or spend them abroad for military purposes or make loans and grants with them to dozens of foreign countries each of which has its own currency? Fortunately, a considerable part of these transfers are taken care of directly through the export of goods and services. In talking to the 1962 Savings Bond Conference in Washington a few days ago, Secretary Dillon explained that about two-thirds of all foreign aid is expended right in the United States for American-made equipment, materials, and services. This means that in 1960, of total loans and grants by the Government of about $3.4 billion, $2.2 billion was directly reflected in our exports of goods and services. That is, the debit arising from the loan or grant was directly offset by the credit arising from the export of goods or services. Secretary Dillon also said that we hope to cut the balance-of-payments impact of foreign economic aid still further, and get it down to one-fifth.

But some part, and in the case of military expenditures and private investment, a considerable part, of these big transfers has to be made through the foreign exchanges. This means that large amounts of dollars come into the possession of foreign financial institutions, some of them commercial banks and some of them central banks or treasuries. Now, if the United States at the same time is earning considerably more from its exports of goods and services than it is spending for its imports of goods and services, those excess dollars which foreigners acquire because of our military expenditures and private investment or public loans and grants not tied to U.S. procurement will be used to settle what foreigners owe for goods and services purchased in the United States. Let us assume some simple figures. Suppose that the U.S. surplus on account of goods and services was $8 billion in a given year and let us suppose that our net deficit due to oversea military expenditures, private investment, and foreign aid was also $8 billion. We would then have a basic balance in our international accounts and there would be no difficulty at all unless there was an outflow of short-term capital. We would then be unlikely to lose gold, nor would foreigners increase their dollar holdings.

From this simple example let me generalize. The United States must earn enough by the sale of goods and services abroad and from the income of its oversea investments to pay for the goods and services it buys and to provide a surplus to cover its net transfers into foreign currencies on account of such important things as military expenditures, new private long-term investments overseas, and untied Government loans and grants to underdeveloped countries. If the surplus we generate by selling more goods and services than we buy is not large enough to balance out our net payments arising from those other transactions, then we run a deficit in our international accounts. This deficit can be aggravated if at the same time there is a net outflow of short-term money from the United States, possibly because of greater availability of capital in our financial markets, or because interest rates were higher abroad, or because of speculative movements of capital.

What would happen then? What happens if we run a big deficit in our international accounts? As a matter of fact, and I am sure many of you in this audience know this, we have been running a deficit for a good many years and in 1958, 1959, and 1960 the deficit was big, reaching a total of more than $11 billion. The answer is that we lose gold, or foreign countries accumulate larger and larger amounts of short-term dollar holdings in the United States, or both things occur. In the 11 years through 1960 we lost almost $7 billion in gold and foreign countries increased their liquid dollar holdings on official and private account by something like $12½ billion.

As long as we have enough gold or as long as foreigners are willing to go on holding larger and larger amounts of dollars in the form of deposits and short-term securities, we can run a deficit in our balance of payments year after year. But very evidently neither of those two conditions can exist indefinitely. Large though our gold reserve still is, at almost $17 billion, we cannot allow it to decline indefinitely without running the risk that our capacity to maintain the parity of the dollar will be called into question. Nor can we expect to build on top of that gold reserve an indefinitely increasing amount of foreign-held dollars, which already amounts to $20 billion.

The dollar is a key currency; along with sterling it is one of the two key currencies of the Western World and it is the more important. Foreign individuals and banks, and foreign central banks and treasuries hold very large amounts of dollars—$20 billion in liquid forms, as I just stated, plus large longer term dollar investments. They do this willingly, because dollar holdings are useful as working balances and because reserves can be conveniently held in dollars. But foreigners' willingness to hold dollars depends on their confidence in the dollar. That confidence in turn is in very large part dependent on our capacity, taking 1 year with another, to achieve and maintain a reasonable equilibrium in our balance of payments.

In his state of the Union message to the Congress earlier this month President Kennedy gave strong emphasis to this essential objective. He also said that through our

firm efforts and with the cooperation of other countries we should be able to achieve this objective. The record of the past 2 years gives room for real encouragement. The basic deficit in our balance of payments—that is, the deficit arising from all recorded transactions except short-term capital movements—amounts in 1959 to $4.3 billion. In 1960 it was less than half, $1.9 billion. In 1961 preliminary estimates are that the basic deficit was only about $500 million, if we include some prepayments of debt, especially by Germany. The most important reason for this improvement was the increase in our surplus of nonmilitary exports from $1 billion in 1959 to $4.7 billion in 1960 and to an estimated $5.4 billion in 1961. Adding the short-term capital movements, including transactions for which no accounting is yet available, in order to arrive at our overall balance of payments position, the overall deficit which in 1959 and 1960 averaged about $3.8 billion is estimated in 1961 to have been something less than $2.5 billion, again including prepayment of debt by Germany and some other countries.

This is progress but it is not yet success. Again to quote the President's message, "The problem is not yet solved. * * * Our goal must be a reasonable equilibrium in our balance of payments. * * * If we are to pay for our commitments abroad we must expand our exports. Our businessmen must be export conscious and export competitive. Our tax policies must spur modernization of plants, [and] our wage and price gains must be consistent with productivity. * * *" The challenge before us is vital, and our stake in world trade has an importance beyond exaggeration. On the strength of our export industries depends not only their own prosperity. On it depends our capacity to buy what we need from the rest of the world, and our ability to carry out our far-flung activities along the frontline of the defense and economic progress of the free world. Nor can we allow our recent good export performance to lull us into somnolence. The other industrial countries are formidable and successful competitors. In fact, our share in world exports has slipped from about 20 percent in 1951 to 18 percent in the 1960. Indeed, even in 1961 of 10 industrial countries only the United States failed to show an increase in the export of manufactured goods.

Sobriety in fiscal affairs, firmness in monetary policy, and commonsense in wage settlements are essential if we are to maintain the dollar as a sound currency which the free world is willing to hold. Our industry and our agriculture must strive to achieve and exert the creative and dynamic leadership in technology which will make possible a still larger flow of goods of high quality and low price into export channels.

Those are the basic policies and fundamental actions on which our success in world markets will depend. But in addition the Government has a threefold program of action to support our export effort and to achieve and sustain a reasonable equilibrium in our balance of payments.

First, we are taking steps to reduce, restrain, or offset our oversea expenditures. This is being done in several ways. Through economies and cooperative arrangements with some of our allies, we hope to reduce our oversea military expenditures. All of the agencies of the Government concerned with oversea aid are directing an increasing amount of procurement to sources within the United States so as to decrease even further the impact of foreign aid on our balance of payments. Efforts are also being made to lessen any special inducements to U.S. investment in the other industrialized countries.

Second, the Government has planned and put into force a many-sided program to promote exports. The Export-Import Bank and various insurance companies have developed an export credit insurance program on a basis never before available. The Government is more intensively collecting information on export opportunities in various markets and there is a much more active program to exhibit American goods throughout the world. Proposals have been made for changes in regulations relating to depreciation and investment credits as a means of encouraging the modernization of plant which would help to strengthen the competitive capacity of our industry.

Third, some action has been taken and other action is being planned to open foreign markets more widely to American goods. Using the authority which the trade agreements legislation provides, the Government has been engaged in prolonged negotiations with the countries which are contracting parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (known as the GATT), and especially the six European countries in the Common Market. These negotiations have been successful in giving our exporters somewhat better opportunities. But we have virtually exhausted the possibility for further progress in trade negotiation by this item-by-item procedure, which fails to take account of new developments and present-day conditions in world markets, especially in the other industrial countries.

The European Economic Community has already begun to make its mark on world affairs with its rapid development toward a common market and economic union. The United Kingdom's current negotiation for membership makes imminent the possibility of a united Europe which will be our equal in size, wealth, and economic power. The creation of a single, large economic area in Europe, similar to that of the United States, is one of the most important events of this century, at once a challenge and an opportunity. These two large markets, the United States and Western Europe, jointly produce almost 90 percent of the free world's industrial goods and export almost 90 percent of the industrial goods that move in world trade.

It is clear that what we and Europe do in our economic relations with one another, and the policies we and they jointly adopt with regard to the other free and friendly countries will profoundly influence the economic shape of the free world. It is not to be wondered, therefore, that the President is giving such emphasis to the need for a vigorous recasting of our commercial policy. We must have the means to negotiate with the countries of Europe the terms on which our exports will continue to have access to their markets—the most rapidly expanding markets in the world. We must also be able to create conditions in which we and Europe together may provide a positive pole of attraction for the less-developed and developing countries of the world. Our success in this venture will do much to secure and increase our stake in world trade, to maintain world confidence in our currency, and to preserve and protect our international economic, political, and military position. This is the challenge in 1962.

New Orleans and the Americas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting into the RECORD the ninth and last article in a series on "New Orleans and the Americas," written by reporter Bill Stuckey, of the New Orleans (La.) States-Item. The final article, entitled "Antics of Fidel Castro Proved Harmful to City Economically," follows:

NEW ORLEANS AND THE AMERICAS—ANTICS OF FIDEL CASTRO PROVED HARMFUL TO CITY ECONOMICALLY

(By Bill Stuckey)

Cuba—so far away from home, and yet so close to your bank balance.

Or, the jobs, the income, and the taxes for the local government which Castro took away from New Orleans.

Example:

At the western tip of Cuba in the spring of 1960,, the Castro regime seized a nickel and cobalt ore plant built at a cost of $75 million by Freeport Nickel.

At the same time, a refinery where this ore was to be shipped and processed, located 20 miles downriver from New Orleans, shut its doors. More than 500 New Orleans area residents, representing a potential annual payroll of $3.5 million, were out of jobs.

Also out the window was some $9 million, most of which the company would have spent in this area annually for refinery supplies and services.

Example:

At least six shipping lines which operated regular passenger and freight service between the port of New Orleans and Cuba were forced to suspend this lucrative trade.

These were the West Indian Fruit and Steamship Co., which ferried railroad cars to Cuba; United Fruit and Standard Fruit, and the Cubamar, Garcia, and Mayan Lines. Locally headquartered Standard Fruit also lost a $1 million wharf in Cuba.

Effect?

Vessels for these shipping companies made dozens of stops in this port before Castro. So did many other ships carrying sugar—which made Cuba the biggest source of imports shipped through New Orleans in 1960 and before.

One locally headquartered shipping company with Latin trade routes, Gulf and South America, estimates that on every stop in this port, each of its ships accounts for an average of $79,000 in jobs for longshoremen, crew wages spent here, buying fuel and supplies, repairs and maintenance, docking, and pilot fees and many other considerations.

Another company deep in the Latin trade, Mississippi Shipping Co., hit a higher figure—$174,000.

Regardless of which figure you use, such money goes a long way toward keeping many secondary local businesses alive. It also produces sales taxes and other taxes which the city uses to finance streets, police and fire protection and dozens of other municipal services.

Example:

The Robinson Lumber Co., also local, had a $350,000 shipment of Spanish cedar ready to transport to Cuba. Castro decided no deal.

Possibility:

At present, there are approximately 1,000 Cuban refugees in New Orleans. As yet, this has not created much extra competition for jobs.

But if Congress names New Orleans a major Federal refugee center, many of the 80,000 refugees now in Miami might migrate here and unwittingly cause economic confusion.

The complete damage which the Red takeover in Cuba caused here hasn't yet been calculated in entirety. It didn't begin to wreck the local economy, but it caused a mighty painful scratch.

In some ways, however, New Orleans was lucky.

The Boston headquarters of United Fruit Co., for example, claims losses of $38 to $40

million caused by Castro's seizure of its Cuban sugar operation. That sugar, however, was refined in the East, not here. And the overall company loss didn't have much effect on the local United Fruit Division, where more than 300 salaried personnel and almost 650 hourly workers are employed.

This was also true for Colonial Sugar's 600-employee refinery in Grammercy, and American Sugar's 1,000-employee refinery in Chalmette. Their parent companies suffered huge Cuban losses, but the shock waves weren't felt by local employees.

And while some confusion was caused during the Government's search for new world sources of raw sugar for south Louisiana's seven sugar refineries, the Cuban source has long since been replaced.

One local company, according to how you look at it, might even have come out ahead.

Pan-American Life Insurance, which has $80 million invested in various Latin countries, lost a $10 million investment in Cuba according to that company's Fritz Lindley. But the company also had financial obligations in Cuba of about $25 million—and Castro got that, too.

That's the sort of thing which happens locally when trade and business ties between New Orleans and a Latin American country are cut off abruptly.

But there are other types of disturbances, not quite so spectacular as a Communist putsch, perhaps, which can also generate repercussions here.

Some of these more subtle dangers come from surprising sources.

The local export station for Sears, Roebuck & Co., for example, reports that new import restrictions have cut down the amount of goods usually shipped from New Orleans to Colombia and Brazil.

Even the Nation's greatest Latin aid program yet, the $20 billion alliance for progress, can have serious local side effects (which will most likely be overcome by the good effect on local trade).

C. W. Robinson, of the Robinson Lumber Co., said his company has invested $5 million since 1939 in Nicaragua, where it has timber rights to an estimated one-quarter of that entire country.

But to receive U.S. alliance aid, Nicaragua, like all other Latin nations, must effect certain reforms in its tax collection structure and collection program.

Robinson said Nicaragua is reforming its tax structure by planning a new tax on exports, which could go as high as 40 percent of the value of the product exported. Such a tax would force the company to stop its Nicaraguan operation, he said.

Not the least of the forces which could disrupt New Orleans-Latin trade is the current fight by other friendly nations—and from scores of U.S. cities—to get a share of the trade with the Americas for themselves.

Paul Vogel, international trade director of International House, said that foreign trade interests in various U.S. cities "are increasingly successful" in getting help from local and State governments in snaring larger shares of this trade. For example, he said that the Governor of South Carolina has made recent trips to Latin America solely to promote the port of Charleston.

There are certain Latin nations in which New Orleans has a particularly heavy stake—particularly as sources of imports which keep many local processing industries in operation and of two-way trade which generates local shipping business.

Based on dollar value of 1960 imports through this port, imports which directly support large local processing operations, here are those countries:

Brazil, Colombia, Mexico and Guatemala, coffee; Mexico and Brazil, sisal, henequen, and vegetable fiber; Honduras, Ecuador, and the Dominican Republic, bananas; and Jamaica, bauxite.

That political disturbances and other events which might have local economic repercussions will occur in all of these countries doesn't seem too probable now. But they didn't seem probable in Cuba either several years ago.

In New Orleans, it was trade which established the first contact between this community and Latin nations. As that increased, many Latins came here to live and, according to research done at Tulane University, many found New Orleans more compatible than any other U.S. city. Since World War II, International House, other agencies and individuals have worked to broaden local Latin ties to include scientific, educational and intellectual factors—all of which have presumably circled back to increase the volume of trade.

It adds up to a link of understanding surpassed by few, if any, U.S. cities.

But would this local reservoir of understanding for things Latin prevent other Cubas? That could be the question of the decade for New Orleans.

Citizenship Education in Our Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased, indeed, to insert an address before the Woman's Press Club of New York City, made on January 20, 1962, by Dr. R. Gordon Hoxie, provost, C. W. Post College of Long Island University.

My reason for inserting this in the RECORD is not only that it is an excellent address but that it points up many important factors that must be considered vital in the fields of education today.

Secondly, it is also indicative of the stature of Dean Hoxie who, I am pleased to say, is a personal friend of mine. He is the kind of man we need as a leader in the field of education today.

The address follows:

CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION IN OUR TIME

(Address before the Woman's Press Club of New York City, Hotel Statler-Hilton, January 20, 1962, by Dr. R. Gordon Hoxie, provost, C. W. Post College of Long Island University)

Miss Couch, Miss Rothenberg, distinguished guests, members of the Woman's Press Club of New York City, and friends, your thoughtful invitation for me to participate with you in this inspiring program, "Education for Citizenship," was accepted with enthusiasm. Where could one speak to this topic, so vital to our times, with opportunity for more intelligent communication?

The very symbol of your organization—and its motto: "Light, Liberty, Unity"—have bespoken since 1889 of the spirit of your group and its splendid deeds.

In my remarks this afternoon, I should like to treat particularly of political, economic, social, and moral aspects of citizenship education and treat the subject in its broadest implications; i.e., a continuing process from earliest childhood through maturity and advanced years. In its formalized aspects I should like to speak particularly of the high school and the collegiate level, bearing in mind that in a larger sense a principal goal of all education is better citizenship. Nonetheless, I shall treat particularly of the social science curriculum. As for methodology and media, I shall here include not only textbooks and other standard teaching materials but also mass media, and most particularly the press. In all of this I promise to be brief.

Ours is a decade of awesome challenge. It may well be that historians will look back on the period 1962–72 as among the most decisive eras in history. The very survival of our principles and our way of life are at stake in this severe testing period between democratic and totalitarian forces. There is involved both man's relationship with the State and with his fellow man. There is further involved the temptations of seeking a halfway house of compromise—which in reality would be no compromise but rather the relinquishment of our basic principles.

It has been brought acutely home that our citizenry is not adequately informed as to the nature of the conflict, the implications and issues, and the means of their resolution. On the one hand, there is lack of understanding of the principles essential for the preservation of freedom. On the other, there is a grouping of well-meaning individuals seemingly unable to translate their individual concern into united action through the democratic process.

What we do know is that we are engaged in a protracted struggle testing our social, moral, and spiritual fiber as well as our political and economic institutions. What we further know is that ours is a Republic, a representative form of government, in which the citizens determine within broad limits the trend, scope, and nature of the policies our Government will take during this testing period. This individual participation on our side, so lacking in the totalitarian camp, can be made either a tremendous asset or a dangerous liability. The key to it all is this business of citizenship education. The people's voice will be heard, either on the basis of ignorance and prejudice, or on the basis of knowledge and understanding. You of the press and we of formal education—and I say "formal" advisedly since I consider you of the press very much a part of, not a part from, education—have an especial role in insuring that this vox populi be one of knowledge and understanding. As the founder of the University of Virginia, Thomas Jefferson, expressed it:

"I know of no safe repository for the ultimate powers of society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them but to increase their discretion by education."

It was heartening to see you start out your program today with the pledge of allegiance to the U.S. flag. I am glad that you do not agree with the young Redding, Conn., high school editor who this past week declared that to be a patriotic American "is to be a blindly stupid individual." I hope this young lady soon changes her mind about patriotism having outlived its usefulness—or that she is no longer an editor.

But if this young lady is only a minor disquieting note, there are other more ominous danger signs in political apathy, waste, corruption, and crime which cannot go unheeded. The Federal Bureau of Investigation says that crime now costs us at the record rate of $20 billion per year. Contrast this with the 175 years of our colonial period when there was, relatively, practically no crime. The distinguished American colonial historian, James Truslow Adams, declares that "In the entire colonial period crimes against person or property were so rare that, in spite of the lonely roads through the woods, I found only one case of highway robbery." Contrast this with the daily muggings now on the streets of New York. Now you may say that this is a question of law and order, but it is also a

matter of citizenship education, of education of the good citizen.

If we needed a danger signal in the ideological war with communism it came shockingly home to us in the large number of American prisoners in the Korean war who cooperated with the Communists. Subsequent study revealed a direct correlation between those who cooperated and their lack of education, particularly in history and political science. They knew pathetically little of the inspiring history of the Nation they were fighting for, and they fell easy victims to Communist teachers.

On the positive side, however, democracy has a tremendous potential with a foundation stone of sound political education. By its very essence it relies on reason as against prejudice, and by knowledge it routs ignorance, fear, and superstition. It believes that freedom and human dignity nurture learning and the pursuit of truth and that the truth shall make men free.

If this be the case, and I am convinced that it is, then how do we evoke the best education for citizenship. Looking back historically we know that the most remarkable schools for citizenship and, indeed, statesmanship were our nine little liberal arts colleges of our colonial period. Here the Founding Fathers were schooled with effectiveness of speech, of disputation, of language, of communication. From Harvard came the Adamses, from Kings (Columbia) Jay and Hamilton, from the college of New Jersey (Princeton) Madison, and from William & Mary came Jefferson. They were all schooled in the classics, in the old Roman sense of virtue and principle. In his famous speech on "Conciliation" in the British Parliament, Edmund Burke spoke of this, and the Earl of Chatham likewise in Parliament observed that a nation had been borne when the Colonies developed leaders capable of writing state papers of the highest order. In a nation whose total population was less than that of Manhattan Island today, there was a group of statesmen rarely paralleled in history.

Significant as was formal education there was also the fact that political leaders were honored as statesmen, not despised as politicians. The times attracted the best talent to political life. We may well ask if we have lost our talent for evoking the best. Youth in all ages is motivated by challenge and inspiration. Do we provide that challenge and inspiration? Our attitude toward the profession of politics is hardly conducive of evoking the best. If this is because of unsavory conditions, let us eliminate the conditions and restore political careers to their historic honored position. I particularly applaud the new Robert A. Taft Institute of Government with its goals of political education aiming both at an intelligent, interested electorate and a sense, if you will, of noblesse oblige in officeholding and public service at all levels.

Turning briefly from the political to the economic area, may I emphasize that our responsibilities as citizens require an understanding of economics and of our private enterprise economy. In our everyday lives and in issues of government, indeed, in the conflict with communism, economic issues, problems, and systems are in central focus.

And where do our high schools and colleges stand in this matter of political and economic education—and in the other areas of the social studies curriculum, including history and sociology? Regrettably there is virtually no articulation between high school and college teaching in these fields. Each has its own professional groups working on curriculum and methodology—and rarely doth the twain meet. The fact that there are virtually no economics courses in high school means, for example, that the introduction to that subject as a basic discipline must come in college.

Quite candidly I question the adequacy of the training of most high school social studies teachers. They comprise an able, dedicated group, but the system of State teacher certification requirements prevailing throughout most of the United States negates the individual's potentialities. There is too much dependence and emphasis on professional education courtesy on how to teach, rather than subject matter what to teach. The colleges and univesrities offering social studies teacher programs are in large part at fault for simply falling in line with State teacher certification requirements rather than demanding adequate training in the individual disciplines.

Moreover, the high school textbooks and teaching materials, including those in American history, can be considerably strengthened by eminent college and university scholars working with able secondary school teachers. Aid should also be given the social studies teachers who are literally flooded with a mass of special pamphlets and materials. Which are scholarly and sound? Which are superficial and misleading? Here is another area of working together by the colleges and secondary schools which would be helpful.

What characterizes the learning in our secondary schools? In general, the students are not really brought to learn to think for themselves about the problems our Nation faces. They are spoon-fed and given the value judgments of the teachers and/or textbooks rather than the objective, analytical approach which best prepares a citizenry in a free society.

On the university; i.e., the post college or graduate level, there is a significant need for continuing intelligent, objective research on the nature of government and the role of the individual in society, also on the historical roots of our institutions, their present status, and future prospects.

With such an attractive audience as we have here today one could scarcely forget the power of the press. Here in these United States our 1,800 dailies have a circulation of nearly 59 million, our 569 Sunday papers have a circulation of over 47 million, and we have nearly 9,000 weeklies. Yet it must be confessed that we are not a well read public. By habit, most of us always read the same paper and thereby get only one editorial view. You probably all know the famous test on the power of persuasion conducted with about 200 students at the University of Iowa. All presumably were reading the same paper, but one-half got an edition with editorials praising a foreign prime minister—and the other half opposing. The result: 98 percent of those reading the favorable editorial issue lined up on his side, while 86 percent of those reading the unfavorable began to oppose him.

Many people get into the habit of criticizing the mass media for failure to give people enough public information. What they forget is that the public is provided with more than it uses. One is reminded of the story of the farmer who told an agricultural department man who wanted to give him a new course: "Why, I ain't farmin' now as good as I know how." The reader has a responsibility toward the news, just as the reporter does and should become more sophisticated in his evaluations.

What I wish the critics would do is help our journalists increase their educational opportunities. Members of the press should be accorded more opportunity for study and travel, free from the pressure of copy deadlines, in order to deepen their backgrounds as well as their skills for reportorial and editorial activity. This study and travel might include not only residence in our universities but also travel and discussion with pertinent groups both at home and abroad. I particularly commend the Woman's Press Club of New York City in this regard for their support now for 41 years of scholarships to the Pulitzer Graduate School of Journalism at Columbia University, a school founded to provide educational depth as well as journalistic skills.

Finally, may I turn to the social and moral sphere of citizenship education and the especial responsibilities and opportunities which confront us. If we begin the business of citizenship education in the colleges or even in the high schools it is too late. For it is in the home, the church, and the elementary school that attitudes and outlooks, moral standards and principles are being molded from earliest formative years. Further, as both the Rockefeller Brothers Report and James Conant have recently pointed out, the schools have a most difficult task in seeking to inculcate healthy ideals and outlooks with youth from problem homes and blighted areas.

Today millions of people throughout the world yearn for a sense of neighborliness, for a strengthening of basic institutions. And herein lies our great opportunity to make our own institutions an evermore inspiring model for other peoples and to extend the helping hand in strengthening theirs. As the late Dr. James Rowland Angell, of Yale University, expressed it, "There is no ethical development more important than the sharpening and enrichment of this conception of neighborly obligation." Here the women of the press have a special role and talent. You have an especial ability and means of stimulating moral insight and sympathy, of rekindling the pioneer spirit of living as a good neighbor, and of actively working to secure for all the necessaries for a full and happy life.

Most of you here today are engaged in the art of communications. You have displayed talent and brilliance in helping build our free enterprise system, our philanthropy, and our services. I am confident that you will carry forward your citizenship education responsibilities in the largest sense by helping break down prejudices and misunderstanding about our way of life.

At home and abroad ours are foes ranging from would-be friends who misunderstand us to Communists who seek to destroy us. Yet I submit that right makes might and that truth is on our side. The American story of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, stemming from the Greco-Hebraic roots of our culture, is a part of the most engaging continuing revolution in human history. It is the true liberal on the march. Let us make clear that story. Never was the opportunity for our women of the press greater or the need more urgently compelling.

Thank you.

Nationwide Record of Heart Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address which I delivered to the Heart Association of Maryland at the Emerson Hotel, Baltimore, Md., on January 31, 1962:

REMARKS OF HONORABLE JOHN E. FOGARTY, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE, SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND AT LUNCHEON MEETING OF HEART ASSOCIATION OF MARYLAND AT EMERSON HOTEL, BALTIMORE, MD., WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 31, 1962

It is a pleasure to be here as you launch the 1962 heart fund drive, because you are embarking upon work that will mean the saving of lives from heart disease.

It is also a privilege to share my thoughts with you about this teamwork for health, because I count myself as one of you, helping to advance the fight against heart disease. In my home State of Rhode Island, I have long been a member of our heart association. I have followed the course and progress also of our parent body, the American Heart Association. Therefore, as a colleague, I know that you can take justifiable pride in your organization, its goals, and its performances.

Let me say here, emphatically, that I hold the heart association itself is essential to victory against heart disease. The job is not one that can otherwise be done. Government cannot do it alone, nor can the medical and health professions. But the partnership of the heart association, medicine, official agencies, research institutions, and other interests can conquer heart disease.

That we can move ahead to the virtual conquest of heart disease in our century is more than a vague hope. It is a strong probability. This is the opinion of authorities in science and medicine. But they base their optimism upon a sobering fact: we cannot win unless we continue and strengthen our endeavors until they represent the utmost in an all-out attack. This we have not yet done. Among many others, however, I am confident that we can do it.

Why do those of us who have closely engaged the enemy of disease for years feel that such success is possible?

It is because of the successes of recent years. Progress has been made on many fronts. Skirmishes and battles have been fought against heart disease and more and more are being won year by year.

Let us glance at these victories and see some of the fruits of the cooperative efforts against heart disease in which the heart association has played a vital role.

Advances have been made against the greatest of heart killers: hardening of the arteries, which leads to coronary attacks and strokes. Progress in the treatment and management of coronary disease is now resulting in the restoration of many thousands of its victims to rewarding economic and social employment. Surgery now can help relieve some kinds of coronary and arteriosclerotic heart disease; clot-blocked arteries can be cleared or replaced, for instance, and even a sizable number of victims of deadly strokes can be saved by dramatic new operations. Drugs to strengthen the heart and prevent further blood clotting are helping many heart victims and are getting better all the time.

Hypertension—or high blood pressure—is also one of the major problems in the complex of diseases of the heart and blood vessels which we familiarly call heart disease. There was very little that could be done a few years ago to help the majority of high blood pressure sufferers. Although there is as yet no specific preventive or cure, progress in treatment to date has been heartening. Surgery, psychotherapy, and diets have been used with beneficial effects in certain patients. But, the most striking advances have been in drug therapy. Today, scores of drugs of varying types and potencies are available. While none is ideal, these drugs, singly or in combinations, can lessen the severity of hypertension in most patients and control it to some degree in others.

Rheumatic fever and rheumatic heart diseases are another component of the heart disease complex against which practical advances have been made. The programs of heart associations working with others in rheumatic fever—rheumatic heart disease prevention and control are paying off. Our physicians have the techniques and the therapeutic agents, such as the antibiotics, to prevent the recurrent attacks of rheumatic fever which may eventuate in rheumatic heart disease. They also can prevent initial attacks by prompt, adequate treatment of the strep infections which precede first onslaughts of rheumatic fever. Even when rheumatic heart disease does result, modern surgery can often alleviate or correct the heart valve damage it does.

In congenital heart disease, great strides have also been made, as you well know here in Maryland where your physicians and scientists have been eminent in this field. The earliest heart operations were just coming into use only a few years ago. But since then one congenital heart defect after another has yielded to the diagnostician's and surgeon's skills. Now babies and children with malformations that would end their lives early, or limit them through life, can be saved and helped.

All of this work, against all the kinds of heart disease, in which you share, means that thousands of heart patients, once doomed to invalidism or early death, are today leading useful and productive lives. This has come about because of burgeoning research, the application of its new knowledge, and education of people about heart disease, which the Heart Association and its partners have supported.

Now, what has made possible the nationwide record of heart progress? More progress has been won in the past decade and a half than in all previous history. What brought this about?

About 15 years ago—certainly a notable period in the history of the fight against heart disease—the members of the American Heart Association, then a professional society of cardiologists, reorganized itself. As you know, they increased their professional functions to include research, education, and community services. They also brought into being a public and voluntary structure, with active, working members from all walks of life, that relied on the people for direct support and that began to help mobilize America's heart resources on a nationwide scale.

About the same time, in response to an overwhelming need and with the strong support of American Heart Association leaders, both political parties in Congress joined in unanimous passage of the National Heart Act, a bill which created the National Heart Institute. The Institute was thus established as one of the Pubilc Health Service's National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, Md., and is, I think, an institution in which your State can take pride and in which many of your citizens work.

Over the years, as chairman of the House of Representatives committee in charge of appropriations for health, education, and welfare, I have watched, encouraged, and worked for the continued growth of these two splendid and complementary organizations—the American Heart Association and National Heart Institute. It has been a source of no little pleasure to me to observe that this partnership of a voluntary group and an agency of the Federal Government has been followed in practice and spirit ever since the beginning.

On the part of the Heart Association, I know, the relationship has been one of cooperation in the finest and fullest sense. The same is true on the part of the Heart Institute. The total heart program of the Public Health Service has always been administered, both in organization and operation, as the Federal Government's participation in a collaboritive undertaking against heart disease, joining the partnership of all interest in the cardiovascular field.

We in Congress, who have shared and led in congressional actions for health, are aware, you may be sure, of the essentiality of this partnership and of the significance of the Heart Association as well as of the official agency.

The participation of the Heart Association has been indispensable to progress and will continue to be so. The official agencies, on the other hand, are also essential, just as are the medical and health professions. As I look toward the future, I visualize this strong combination of resources as absolutely necessary to maximum progress.

Now let me turn to other points that should also be emphasized. One is the need for the voluntary effort and the heart fund. Sometimes we hear questions, sincere but based on incomplete information, as to whether needs are not already being adequately met. Aren't there enough funds, someone may ask, from the Federal heart appropriations? Why should I give to the Heart Association? Do people want to continue contributing?

Let me say that I believe people do want to support the fight against heart disease and all disease. They want an all-out attack by their Government, the health and medical profession, and their voluntary agencies. I believe that people are willing to help the Heart Fund and eager to speed the conquest of heart disease.

Let me also say that funds put into the attack by either the Heart Association or the Heart Institute have not been too much, or even enough, to do the job that must be done.

Let me stress, furthermore, that the voluntary effort is both necessary and important. It provides maximum opportunity for the individual to give freely to the area of his choice. It obviates the hazards that lie in complete dependency upon programs derived from tax funds. It encourages and helps guide the endeavors of others. It is an effective partner for other groups, both public and private, lay and professional, which compromise our resources for health.

The heart association holds the chance for individual participation, for service in a very direct and personal sense. Those who work on behalf of the heart association and those who contribute do so of their own free will and so help maintain a characteristically American tradition that is a prime source of our national strength.

The heart association can adapt quickly to the changing needs and dimensions of the complex problem of heart disease. It can be rapidly responsive, for example, to new challenges for special kinds of community health services to help heart patients. Its whole history has been one of meeting just such challenges.

You will also, I feel sure, meet the challenge that brings you together today. It is no small challenge, in face of the job against heart disease that remains to be done.

When we consider what resources we must have to finish that job, there are two main points it is well to have in mind. One is the size and nature of the problem of heart disease. The other is the solid opportunities for greater progress and the substantial, unmet needs in research and education and community services.

The great strides we have made in recent years in mobilizing resources and support, both private and public, are large only when viewed in terms of our past neglect of this disease enemy. They do not appear so nearly large when we view them in terms of the host of unsolved problems and the opportunities we can and should seize.

The very nature and size of heart disease is perhaps overlooked at times. Yet the im-

pact of heart disease is a challenge to every man, woman, and child. It forms a constant threat of death, disability, heavy economic loss, or disruption and ruin to families, homes, and careers.

The No. 1 killer, heart disease causes well over half of all deaths in the United States each year.

The total number of heart deaths is still increasing. In 1940 there were 538,000 deaths from heart disease. In 1950 there were 745,000 deaths. In 1961 there were over 900,000 heart deaths.

At least 10,100,000 persons are afflicted with heart disease, according to the National Health Survey of the Govenrment. Over half of these persons are in the age group 25–64.

The economic costs of heart disease are vast: In 1960, compensation and pension payments to veterans disabled by heart disease amounted to $464,000. The cost of lost productivity in 1958 of persons in the labor force disabled by heart disease has been estimated at $1,210 million.

The costs and toll of heart disease will increase further unless we make greater progress toward its conquest. Are there real opportunities to achieve such progress? I hold that the answer is a resounding "yes."

This is true in research. We have won no really major victory, for example, against hardening of the arteries nor high blood pressure. We have won skirmishes and battles. We have not yet won the war. Thousands have been helped, but hundreds of thousands have not, and cannot be on the basis of today's knowledge. Many scientists feel, however, that there are so many research areas of opportunity today in hardening of the arteries that, given adequate manpower, facilities, and funds, the answer needed for victory can be uncovered.

In the field of education, both for the public and for research scientists, physicians, and health workers, much remains to be done. The area of training shows needs, for example, to increase research manpower and that of the health professions. Ways and means also need to be developed to improve the transmission of knowledge among scientists and to those who apply useful knowledge as it comes from research. Much more can be done in public education, too. The heart story has not yet been fully told to everyone.

The area of community services also provides challenging opportunities. Far more can be done in this field. Here alone lies more than sufficient evidence of the need for heart funds and new and increased activities. Services to patients in cooperation with their physicians, as in the provision of home care and home nursing programs, are an opportunity of great challenge and need.

As you take stock of the size and nature of the enemy, heart disease, then, and the needs and opportunities for progress against it, you will find solid ground for the conviction that you are embarking upon a most important endeavor for a truly worthwhile cause.

In closing, let me wish you every success and say again that I view the future as one bright with promise for progress. I could not hold this view without an equally strong feeling that the combined forces of the heart association, the medical and health professions, research institutions, and the official agencies will continue and grow as the essential partnership which will win victory over heart disease.

Repeal of Provision of Retired Annuitants' Health Benefits Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the cutoff dates and arbitrary provisions of laws which we enact to help large groups of individuals almost always bring heartbreak and hardship to those who almost—but not quite—qualify, or who are disqualified because of some minor technicality. Sometimes it is relatively easy to correct these inequities; sometimes it cannot be done without setting new arbitrary standards which in turn cause heartbreak and hardship to those who, again, just miss coverage by a narrow margin.

My attention has been called to a provision of the health benefits program now in effect for retired Federal employees which makes ineligible those who retired more than a month before becoming eligible for an immediate annuity. The concept behind that provision of the law was to prevent the benefits from going to former Federal employees who left Federal service in order to take jobs elsewhere, but who are nevertheless still eligible for deferred annuities at retirement age.

Last week I directed a letter to the Honorable TOM MURRAY, chairman of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, outlining the kind of hardship which was called to my attention and urging prompt action on one of the bills now pending before the committee to correct this inequity. The chairman has advised me in addition to H.R. 3027 by Representative JAMES C. DAVIS, there is also a bill by Representative JAMES H. MORRISON, chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Service, H.R. 9265. Chairman MURRAY advises me that the executive department has been asked to file a report on these bills.

Mr. Speaker, I know there is widespread interest among the Members of Congress in this kind of problem and therefore, I submit a copy of my letter to Chairman MURRAY for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 22, 1962.

Hon. TOM MURRAY,
Chairman, Post Office and Civil Service Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: One of the most successful (and appreciated) programs we have enacted for the retired Federal annuitants is the health insurance program. I have heard from numerous constituents who are enrolled under the program and who are very happy it was enacted. Often, when writing to retired annuitants on other matters, I inquire about the operations of the program as it affects them and they are usually very enthusiastic. So, obviously it has been a fine program.

Occasionally, as in any good program of government, arbitrary provisions cause hardship to individuals who, for one reason or another, almost—but not quite—come within the program's coverage. I am thinking now of a particular case involving a woman with 27 years and 21 days of service who retired 2 years before becoming eligible for an immediate annuity, and thus was found ineligible for the health insurance program, which requires that retirement must take place no longer than a month before becoming eligible for an immediate annuity. I inquired about this provision at Civil Service and was told that it was intended to cover primarily those Federal employees who leave the Government in order to take other employment. I see where there would be merit in excluding those who worked only briefly for the Federal Government and then years later applied for deferred annuities. However, in the kind of case in which I ran into in this situation, the annuitant is certainly entitled to more consideration than a casual employee who quit the Federal service for other work.

My constituent, after her 27 years of service, retired in 1949, at age 60, following a death in the family which caused her great grief. Her circumstances at the time were such that she felt she could afford the 2-year wait until her annuity started. But, as so often happens, her financial situation changed. The denial of health benefits is, therefore, a real hardship for her.

I know that we do not legislate on the basis of single instances but I also know that there must be many retired annuitants who are deserving of health insurance benefits but ineligible because, for various reasons, they retired more than a month before receiving an immediate annuity. Since H.R. 3027 would overcome the provision of the present law excluding health insurance benefits for such people, may I strongly urge early action by your committee on this legislation?

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
LEONOR K. SULLIVAN.

Three Students in Los Angeles County Write Essays on "Why We Salute Our American Flag"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of the unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present to the attention of your own distinguished self and to my distinguished colleagues the text of three brief essays on the subject, "Why We Salute Our American Flag." These in the order herewith submitted are written by Sharon Powell, by Judy Spigner, and by Beverly Nickerson under date of March 19, 1962. These loyal young American

citizens are all students at the 92d Street School in the great 23d Congressional District, Los Angeles County, Calif., and these essays will be entered on behalf of such school in the American Legion essay program.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you and all my colleagues congratulate these students and the 92d Street School and also very cordially the American Legion.

WHY WE SALUTE OUR AMERICAN FLAG

(By Sharon Powell)

When we salute our American flag we do more than just salute. We think about the words, "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America," which means we pledge our loyalty. We think of the many people who have given their lives for our country. Had they not sacrificed their lives our flag would not fly. We would not be free to strive for happiness as is said in the Declaration of Independence. We salute the flag because we are Americans and are proud to be Americans. The flag stands for our country. So then, the flag belongs to each citizen of our country. Being part of the country, in a way, means our flag is also part of everyone, and best of all part of me.

WHY WE SALUTE OUR AMERICAN FLAG

(By Judy Spigner)

One day when I was riding in the car with my mother, we passed the school. I saw the flag flowing beautifully, right where I was I wanted to salute the flag.

I sat there thinking about the past, when Washington wanted a flag for his country. You know we have a great flag, every one of the stars on the flag represents something. One of the stars represents the word peace, and I hope we have peace just as long as we live. Another one of those great stars means freedom. Another one of the flag means cotton mills can't you just think how the farmers work in their fields trying to make food for our families aren't you glad that Betsy Ross made the flag so that we would have something to live under, something to salute, something to thank God for. I just don't think that Washington wanted a flag for his country I think he wanted a flag for his people to live under. When I look at the flag I am not only thinking about Washington but about the world today and tomorrow and tomorrow.

I am glad to salute the American flag because it is a flag of peace, and I hope you are glad to salute the flag. Now I really know some reason why I salute the American flag.

WHY WE SALUTE OUR AMERICAN FLAG

(By Beverly Nickerson)

As I was walking by a police station one day, I saw a beautiful American flag, flying over it, suddenly I stopped. I wondered why do we salute our American flag.

I was thinking, we salute our American flag for great reasons. We salute this great flag that flew over George Washington's head because it tells us something. It tell us that many men died for it. The stars that are on it tells us how many States there are. It's not just stars and stripes it reminds us of cotton mills, plantation, farmers, workers, and other great things. As I sat there and wondered I thought we salute this great flag because our fathers and grandfathers stood up for it, killed for it, and some of them even died for it. Looking at this great flag makes me think why is it flying over these buildings. There flying over these buildings because these buildings are important. I thought, I am glad they have never bombed our flag here like they did long ago in other wars, although the flag still stood there. We should appreciate this beautiful red, white and blue flag flying over our heads. Each time I see it I salute it no matter where I am.

This beautiful flag now has 50 stars and 13 stripes representing all of our 50 States. I am proud of this flag growing more and more stars.

Teenage Drinking—VI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, nine New Jersey teenagers have been killed and many others injured since last September. All were on their way back to New Jersey after drinking in New York. They were drinking in New York because that State refuses to cooperate with its neighbors, insists on allowing 18-year-olds to drink hard liquor, and persists in offering an endless string of drinking havens for out-of-State young people around its borders.

Recently, however, many New Yorkers have come to realize the moral and physical dangers which New York State's policy involves. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the March 21 issue of the Newark Evening News and an editorial from the March 22 issue of the same distinguished paper, and I call the attention of our colleagues to the reaction they describe on the part of well-informed New Yorkers:

[From the Newark (N.J.) News, Mar. 21, 1962]

NINE RECENT TEEN FATALITIES SPUR DRINKING AGE ATTACK—NEW YORK OFFICIAL SEES ACTION NEEDED

(By John W. Gleeson)

A conviction that New York State will have to raise its legal drinking age to 21 to conform to the legal limit in five neighboring States was voiced yesterday by Morton B. Silberman, Rockland County, N.Y., district attorney.

It was in Silberman's county, at Monsey, that two Bergen County teenagers were killed and three others injured Sunday night in a highway crash. The victims had been drinking, according to police.

According to Bergen County officials, seven other teenagers have died since last September on roads in Bergen and Rockland counties. All were returning to New Jersey from New York drinking spots, authorities say.

"New York is going to have to increase the minimum age whether it likes it or not," Silberman asserted.

"Our problem is not only with New Jersey," the district attorney added. "We've got four other States that border New York and that also have the 21-year minimum age for drinking."

MUST BE UNIFORM

"I don't think New Jersey is ever going to lower the limit," Silberman said. "And as far as I'm concerned, there has to be a uniform age. We're not going to get any lowering of ages, so New York will have to raise the age to get uniformity.

"I think the biggest problem is in getting the New York Legislature to adopt the higher age," he said. "New York has only 12 or 13 counties, of 62 in the State, that border on other States. Union, Middlesex, and Hudson Counties in New Jersey have the same problem with Manhattan and Staten Island that Rockland and Bergen Counties face," Silberman said.

MOST AREN'T BOTHERED

"Most counties in New York," Silberman added, "don't have the problem. Up in Cayuga, for instance, they've had an 18-year-old minimum age since prohibition was repealed and they think the law is working just fine.

"As to the morality of the age when kids should start drinking," Silberman said, "there are good arguments on both sides. But we can't be concerned about that at this point. New York is going to have to increase the minimum age, whether it likes it or not."

The Governor of another neighboring State, Connecticut, is scheduled to discuss the interstate drinking problems with New York officials. John N. Dempsey has been concerned by the report that three of the first six deaths in Connecticut this year involved teenagers who were returning from drinking spots in New York. Dempsey has been attempting to organize a march on Albany, by the Governors of the States that border New York.

James W. Stewart, chief of Bergen County detectives, said he has been living the problem for years.

"We had roadblocks up and held spot checks on the main roads to New York some years ago," Stewart recalled. "And I guess we'll have to do it again. These kids go up there and get bounced from one bar to another," he added, "and they get tanked up and on the way back they get involved in crazy driving. Some of them are bound to get killed.

"You've got to figure that the parents are responsible to a very great extent," he continued. "They have no control over their kids any more. If they can't control them, how do they expect anyone else to?"

Stewart said he was compiling information on accidents involving teenagers who had been drinking in New York for Assemblywoman Marian West Higgins from Bergen County, a member of the legislative committee studying a bill offered Monday by Senator Pierce H. Deamer, Republican, of Bergen. The Deamer bill would give magistrates the power to suspend or revoke the driver's license of any person under 21 caught with alcoholic beverages in his car. Deamer said the bill is aimed at the interstate drinking problem.

Daniel T. Duff, principal of Northern Valley Regional High School, Old Tappan, said his school was in the midst of the area of greatest temptation for teenage drivers.

"Youths who are nonattendants at the school mix with the schoolchildren and they all take off for New York," he said.

Meanwhile, as legislators and public officials of the two States wrestle with the problem, magistrates in two Bergen County communities meted out penalties Monday night to three teenagers who had become involved in lawbreaking while returning from New York taverns.

In Park Ridge, Magistrate Robert O. Bentley sentenced an 18-year-old youth to a 30-day suspended jail term for trying to steal an automobile on his way home from New York.

In Closter, Magistrate Francis L. Boyle picked up the license of a 17-year-old youth for reckless driving while returning from an evening of drinking in New York. The magistrate also revoked the license of an 18-year-old youth and fined him $210 on charges of drunk driving and driving without a registration. The boy told the court he had consumed only two cans of beer while driving the car.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening Times, Mar. 22, 1962]

ALBANY'S FAILURE

At last a voice of reason has been heard officially in New York on the subject of teenage drinking. It is the voice of Morton B. Silberman, who as district attorney of Rockland County, across the line from Bergen, speaks with direct knowledge of its tragic effects.

"As a practical matter," says Mr. Silberman, "we're not going to get any lowering of ages (by neighbor States), so New York will have to raise the age to get uniformity."

It is the disparity in minimum drinking ages—18 in New York, 21 in New Jersey and its neighbor States—that causes trouble. That is what makes the trip to a New York bar an adventure. The sense of exhilaration, sparked by beer and whisky, turns the ride home into a race. And the winner all too often is death.

The statistical correlation between teenage drinking and tragedy cannot be effaced. Of Connecticut's six fatalities this year, three have been teenagers returning from New York drinking spots. Since last September, nine youths have died on roads in Bergen and Rockland Counties while returning from similar alcoholic excursions.

Parental guidance and control cannot alone prevent this heartbreaking waste of young lives. Corrective legislation is needed, a fact which New York's Legislature continues, samefully and callously, to ignore.

Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, Greece has long been regarded as the foundation of Western civilization and the Greek people its architects. The genius of Greece has bequeathed us with the idea of freedom, the first of man's priceless possessions.

The Greeks prized freedom even more highly than we do today, but, unfortunately, they were not always in position to defend it against its powerful and uncompromising foes. So, some 2,000 years ago when Greece was overrun, the Greek people lost their freedom and became subjects to alien rulers in their homeland. In the course of centuries these rulers changed, but the lot of the Greeks did not change much; instead, under the oppressive Ottoman Turks, they suffered more. They were subjected to inhuman treatments, and at times they were massacred by the thousands. During these centuries of suffering the Greek people struggled hard to regain their freedom, but all their efforts ended in failure, until the revolt led by Archbishop Germanos in 1821.

That historic revolt began on March 25 of that year, and after waging war against the forces of their ruthless and far more powerful enemy for more than 6 years, they won their independence with the aid of their friends.

The act of Western powers, their determination to bring about the liberation of Greece, remains as one of the brightest spots in 18th-century diplomacy and war. It is also to the credit of Europe, and also of course of this country, that since then all lovers of freedom have been intensely concerned with the fate of the Greek people.

Early in World War II there were no friends able to come to their aid; but the valiant Greek people were sufficient unto themselves—at least for a while. They resisted and repulsed the invading armies of the Fascist Mussolini. But the sheer numbers and equipment of Hitler's hordes at last overran the gallant nation.

After World War II, when the Red terror flowed down through the Balkans, it seemed that Greece must fall as all her neighbors fell. She did not, however, and today remains as a bastion of liberty and a devoted, outspoken ally in our struggle against the Communists.

Last week, just a few days before this great anniversary of liberty, it was announced that the American Hellenic Education Progressive Association would dedicate a memorial to former President Truman in Athens. For the significance of this act, and for a succinct summary of the struggle made by our good friends and brave in the past years, I would like to read a piece by the distinguished news commentator, Ray Henle, which was the closing story on the outstanding network news broadcast "Three-Star Extra" on Friday, the 22d:

You may have heard the announcement in Washington this week, by the Greek Order of Ahepa, that a statue of former President Truman is to be erected in Athens.

This action is an expression of Greek gratitude for the U.S. aid given Greece, under the Truman Doctrine, when the Communists were hammering at the gates of Athens, shortly after World War Two. Certainly every American who pays taxes to pay for foreign aid can experience a warm glow at the thought that the relatively small amount of aid given to Greece in those hectic days still is remembered.

Perhaps it would be equally appropriate if we Americans erected in Washington, a statue commemorating the determination of the Greeks to be free. They are free by virtue of the same courage that threw back the armies of Mussolini and then went down fighting before the advancing armies of Hitler. That courage rose again in the late 1940's to throw back the Communists, moving in from Yugoslavia.

We did not save the Greeks from communism. They saved themselves. A little nation with almost nothing left but courage took advantage of our aid and made the first successful stand against Russia's push for world empire.

In these frustrating days, when small-time international politicians are willing to barter their nations' freedom for a bag of rubbles, isn't it heartening to know that we still have on our side the race from which so much of our civilization stems? And when we tote up the cost of our foreign aid, we can put in the positive column the amount we spent in Greece.

If we should decide to erect a statue honoring the Greeks, we might send duplicates to some other capitals of the world, as a reminder of what is expected of freemen. New Delhi, Vientiane, and Rio de Janiero should come high on the list.

Yesterday was the actual anniversary, but since we were not then here, I know Americans of all nationalities, and all lovers of freedom throughout the world will join with me today in saluting the 141st anniversary of the modern independence of the land where independence was born.

Hire the Handicapped Committee, Southeast District, 23d Congressional District, Los Angeles County, Conducts Annual Essay Contest for 1962—Two Winning Essays Set Forth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to call to your own distinguished attention, and that of all the other Members of this great legislative body, a letter from the secretary of the Veterans' Employment Committee and Employ the Physically Handicapped Committee of the southeast district, in the great 23d Congressional District, which I represent, together with the two winning essays which Secretary Quigg referred to in his letter to me dated March 22, 1962.

This committee for many years has done, and continues to do, a vigorous, vigilant, constructive work and service to hundreds of physically handicapped. I am sure you and every Member of this legislative forum joins with me in extending to the committee compliments and appreciation:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT,
Compton, Calif., March 22, 1962.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Attached are copies of the winning essays submitted in the annual Hire the Handicapped essay contest for 1962.

If you can again arrange for their inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, we are sure it will help sustain interest in this program. Announcement before school assemblies that this had been done by you in the past created quite a pronounced stir of interest.

Your cooperation with this committee in many ways in the past has been appreciated. Thank you for your efforts in this very worthwhile cause.

DANIEL J. QUIGG,
Secretary.

THE ROLE OF THE COMMUNITY IN THE EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED

(By Ellen Wurtz)

When you open a Bible to the beginning, you find the story of the creation. Here you will find the statement, "and God created man." It does not say that some shall be treated better than others; it means that all are equal, not only all colors and creeds but the strong and handicapped as well. God created man, so why should we, as human beings refuse to show consideration to our fellow beings just because their bodies are not as physically fit as ours?

By "refusing to show consideration," I refer to the failure to give the handicapped equal opportunities for employment which prevents them from living a normal life in their community. Just because a man may be missing an arm or a leg does not mean he is so different from us that we should cast him aside. It is the community's responsibility to see that these individuals are given jobs and a chance to show their talents and abilities.

The handicapped person may not be as skilled in certain fields as a normal person, but if given a chance there is undoubtedly something he can do quite well.

Many look at the handicapped as freaks. The normal person should respect the handicapped and be willing to hire them. They are very courageous people to go on in life and fight all of the griefs and hardships they are bound to face because they are less fortunate than we are. Really, how many of us would have the courage to go on, and try to work under some of the conditions existing for the handicapped?

When you hire a handicapped person, you are hiring someone who will generally do his best. They have obstacles to overcome, but they have the spirit, once hired, to try and usually will succeed.

Why is it, people hesitate to hire the handicapped? Is it because they are ashamed to be working with them? Are they afraid that people might scorn them for hiring people who are different? Or is it because they are afraid they might see just how well these people can work and feel sorry that they had not hired them sooner? If you stop to think that an accident could cause you to become handicapped, you find it very important that the handicapped be hired, because you would definitely want a job. There is really not much excuse for not hiring the less fortunate when they are capable.

As for those who think these people are different, are they really so different? No matter what their handicap may be they are still human beings with human feelings, ideas, and beliefs and should be treated as such.

If the community would hire more handicapped people, it would show that it is not a city in which the disabled are not given consideration. Instead it would be a place where all human beings are given equal opportunities to work and thereby do their part for their country.

THE ROLE OF THE COMMUNITY IN THE EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED

(By Geri Mason)

The blind, the deaf, the crippled—these are the handicapped; these are the people whose lives have been tragically altered because of bodily defects. Far too often they are looked upon as liabilities to the community, or, in many cases, cast aside and labeled "Useless." The application of this term is not only unjust, it is untrue. The handicapped, with proper training, can be of great benefit to the community. With the aid of dedicated organizations, the handicapped can be made to lead useful, productive lives.

The physically handicapped usually manage to compensate for their bodily defects by concentrating upon the development of one major skill. For example, the blind are usually found to have a highly developed sense of touch or hearing. The deaf and deaf-mute develop keen eyesight. Those crippled by the loss or paralysis of an arm or leg develop skill in another limb.

Throughout history, many handicapped persons have become famous for their great contributions to the world. The Greek poet Homer was blind. John Milton wrote nearly all his best poems after he lost his sight. Thomas P. Gore, who was blind from boyhood, became an outstanding figure in the U.S. Senate. Joseph Pulitzer, the famous American journalist, was blind for many years before his death. Helen Keller, a victim of a serious illness before she was 2 years old, was left without sight or hearing, yet she rose above her disabilities to become the woman who helped thousands of handicapped persons to live fuller lives. The great Franklin D. Roosevelt was a victim of infantile paralysis.

With the inspiration of people such as these, many organizations have been established for the welfare of the handicapped. Their common goal is the betterment of the lives of handicapped people by giving them a reason to live.

The U.S. Employment Service, working with various State agencies, tries to find jobs suitable to the needs of handicapped persons. These agencies made their greatest progress in the United States during World War II. Before the war, most employers wouldn't think of hiring a handicapped person; but because of the labor shortage during the war, they were forced to change their minds. In many cases, handicapped workers proved to be better in certain jobs than physically normal persons. Because of their highly developed sense of touch, the blind proved useful in working with small, precision tools. The deaf were able to work without strain in noisy factories.

Goodwill Industries of America, Inc., has made perhaps the greatest advancement toward the establishment of security and well-being among the handicapped in this country. Among its provisions are training, employment, and rehabilitation services for handicapped people. One-hundred twenty American cities now have Goodwill Industries. Under conscientious and skillful supervision, handicapped persons are trained to repair and recondition clothing and household articles given to the Industries. The repaired articles are then sold to the public. Another service of Goodwill Indutries is the offering of work to handicapped persons on jobs contracted from private businesses. These rehabilitation services are dependent upon available resources and community needs.

Another organization, located in Los Angeles, Calif., is the Blind Workshop. This establishment hires blind persons to make all types of brooms and mops, which are, in turn, sold to the public.

Occupational therapy, the method of aiding and speeding the recovery of handicapped people by means of interesting occupations or pastimes, has realized the free and fuller life that is the dream of every handicapped person. In many hospitals for the handicapped, certain skills and crafts are taught which may later aid the victim vocationally. Examples of skills taught are weaving, printing, bookbinding, pottery making, and gardening.

It is through organizations such as these that the handicapped are able to find their places in the world. However, the community should not just sit back praising the work of these organizations. The help of each individual is needed. Even the smallest contribution of old clothing or furniture will be appreciated, since it will give one more job to one more handicapped person. The community should be ready and willing to accept the handicapped as fellow human beings, and it should be ready to help them. Employers, when faced with a handicapped person seeking a job, will do well to keep this one thing in mind: the handicapped person, as an employee, will be a skillful and willing worker. He will hold his job in high esteem, because to him this job will mean security and hope; it will give him an incentive to live.

John Lavezzorio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the city of Chicago lost one of its favorite sons on the recent death of the gifted business executive, John Lavezzorio. He was most active in civic and philanthropic programs. As an influential leader in the Italian group, he reflected the warm personality of the downtown native neighborhood youth. John was born in the Loop and the Lavezzorios attended the Jones Grammar School located at Plymouth and Harrison Streets. At every opportunity he spoke with feeling of his grammar school days and the schoolmates of his early youth. He was proud of being a "first warder."

His dad, Michael Lavezzorio, was one of the pioneer fruit merchants in business here. At one time he became a business partner of Emilio Langi on South Dearborn Street and later moved to South State Street. The partnership fared badly and Michael returned to his special field, the fruit business. In this line of business Michael Lavezzorio excelled and prospered—he was considered a man of affluence in the community.

John, who had been active in his father Michael's pursuits, struggled through the depression years to augment the family fortune. Later he entered the employ of his relatives—the Gallo family—a very astute couple who operated a successful candy factory.

This proved to be the critical step of his early career. He learned the business from every angle, from the most menial job to the highest position in the firm. Every employee in all departments of the plant looked upon him as an intimate friend. As he filled semi-executive positions to the presidency of the firm, these friendships spelled loyalty and success. As president of the company he was really the head of a large family. He was always considerate of the employees. Their personal troubles and problems became his personal obligations to solve. His brothers and sister likewise became active in the business.

John had a business knack to push sales, improve manufacturing methods, improve and simplify the mechanics and producing process. His research department improved the quality of his product; devised new methods of manufacture to reduce costs and save time; discovered new formulas for producing different flavors and kinds of candy attractive to the discerning consumer; also many different confections of peanut and other nut varieties of candies tickled the public palate thus increasing sales.

He was inventive and progressive in everything connected with the manufacture of candy. His was the last word in new candy specialties on the national

market. For all this his company became the best known brands throughout the consumers market.

He rewarded handsomely those experts in his employ who helped make possible these innovations in the candy industry.

John was the first one to contribute to a worthy cause. He was a careful man in his beneficence—but the charities that he sponsored were those that benefited mankind most such as the Mother Cabrini and Henrotin Hospitals, the Italian Old Peoples Home, the Servite Fathers and countless subscriptions and funds to worthwhile charities.

As a recipient of the greatest possible honor given by the church—a Knight of St. Gregory, conferred by Pope St. John XXIII on January 17, 1960—John Lavezzorio was justly rewarded for his life's work in the Catholic cause.

On that occasion I was proud to send him the following telegram:

JANUARY 16, 1960.

Mr. JOHN LAVEZZORIO,
Assumption Church,
Chicago, Ill.:

Your entire life sparkles with service to your fellow men. This signal honor, through his holiness, Pope John, reflects recognition for your lifetime service to the faith. We are proud of your constancy in religion and the great support you have given to service the needs of the Catholic Church.

Congratulations and God bless you.

ROLAND V. LIBONATI,
Congressman, Seventh District, Illinois.

It is with a deep sense of humility that we who remain, recall to memory the fine qualities and worthwhile contributions to humanity made by others who have answered the last call for departure from our midst. To those who knew him, John Lavezzorio personified the true example of a Catholic gentleman. He loved his fellow man and contributed much toward the alleviation of the ills of mankind. The void he has left will serve well to remind his friends to remember him in their prayers.

The Members of the Illinois delegation in the Congress send their heartfelt condolences to his widow, Mamie; his sister, Margaret DiCosola; and his brothers, Walter and Leonard, on their great loss. May the Almighty rest his soul in everlasting grace.

COSMOPOLITAN BANK OFFICIAL DIES IN FLORIDA—LAVEZZORIO IS STRICKEN AT 70 IN SARATOGA

John Lavezzorio, 70, Chicago banker, business man, philanthropist, and a Knight of St. Gregory, a papal honor, died Wednesday night in Saratoga, Fla., where he was recuperating from a recent heart attack, it was learned yesterday.

Mr. Lavezzorio, who lived at 5329 North Lakewood Avenue, was born in Chicago. He was chairman of the board of the Cosmopolitan National Bank, 801 North Clark Street, and chairman of the Peanut Specialty Co., a candy manufacturing firm at 400 West Superior Street.

HOSPITAL, CHURCH TRUSTEE

He also was vice president and a trustee of Henrotin Hospital, and a trustee of Assumption Church, 313 West Illinois Street.

He was invested as a Knight of St. Gregory on January 17, 1960, by the Most Reverend Alphonse M. Monta, superior general of the Servite Order, to which Mr. Lavezzorio had contributed substantial funds. The honor was conferred by Pope John XXIII.

He became a director of Cosmopolitan in 1938, and chairman in January, 1959.

STAYING WITH SISTER

He was staying with a sister, Mrs. Margaret DiCosola, of Saratoga. Also surviving are his widow, Mamie, and two brothers, Walter and Leonard.

Chicago services are being arranged.

J. M. LAVEZZORIO DIES IN FLORIDA; CHICAGO BANKER

John M. Lavezzorio, 70, chairman of the board of the Cosmopolitan National Bank, 801 North Clark, died Wednesday night while visiting a sister in Sarasota, Fla.

Mr. Lavezzorio, of 5329 North Lakewood, had been a director of the bank since 1938 and board chairman for the past 3 years.

He was also chairman of the board of the Peanut Specialties Co., 400 West Superior. He was a vice president and trustee of Henrotin Hospital, and trustee of Assumption Church, 313 West Illinois.

He was a lay member of the Order of Servites and had been invested as a Knight of St. Gregory January 17, 1960, for his work in behalf of the American Province of St. Joseph of the Servite Fathers and for civic services.

He is survived by the widow, Mamie; a sister, Mrs. Margaret DiCosola, and two brothers, Leonard M. and Walter.

Soviet Fishing Fleet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HASTINGS KEITH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend to the attention of my colleagues an editorial from the Cape Cod Standard-Times, "Soviet Fishing Fleet," which notes that the giant Russian fishing trawlers working in force near our coasts are reaping more than fish as their harvest.

These boats are not only taking millions of dollars worth of fish from our traditional fishing grounds, they are engaged in military espionage and could prove a very real threat to our national security.

This editorial, from a leading newspaper in my district, reflects a growing public concern:

SOVIET FISHING FLEET

The Kremlin is after more than the fish which are caught by Russian fishing boats in such waters as those off Cape Cod, Reader's Digest reports.

An article in the magazine said that the U.S. Navy has found large radioactive devices, unmistakably Russian, on the ocean floor off the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. The markers were described as position sites for missile-firing submarines to line up on before blasting at 43 of America's 50 largest cities.

The radioactive guideposts were planted by some of the Red fishing trawlers that ply the waters off the U.S. shoreline as part of "the Soviets' little-known 'wet war.'"

The magazine also reported that Russian fishing boats are recording the motor and other mechanical sounds of Allied submarines and warships. The article continued that the propulsion machinery of each vessel gives off sound waves as individual as a fingerprint. These sounds are tape recorded and then furnished to units of the Russian Navy.

There has been a suspicion for some time that it was more than food fish which brought the Russian vessels into waters so close to the North American Continent.

The Armed Forces are keeping an eye on the Red visitors; Americans will hope that it is a most alert eye. The Russian Communists have a long and clear record for not saying what they mean as well as not meaning what they say.

They're after "fish." The United States must be certain that the Communists do not make its citizens "poor fish."

Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the 141st anniversary of Greek independence. I had the honor to represent the distinguished mayor of the city of Philadelphia, the Honorable James H. J. Tate, in the ceremonies in observance of Greek Independence Day at the Bellevue-Stratford. I also represented the Philadelphia congressional delegation at the request of the distinguished chairman, the Honorable William J. Green, Jr. The ceremonies were attended by the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the Honorable David L. Lawrence, and the Greek general consul, Dr. Basil Vitsaxis.

The following is the short talk I presented in recognition of the valiant achievement of the Greek people:

Ladies and gentlemen, I am happy to have this opportunity to say a few words about the 141st anniversary of Greek independence. In these perilous times, people in public life such as myself tend to spend less time than they would like pursuing cultural interests, and an occasion such as this is a good reminder to all of us that a substantial part of what we call the Western cultural heritage is of Greek origin. It is one of the strange ironies of history that the people whose philosophers expounded the glories of freedom and thought deeply about the nature of man and the state should themselves have been unable, for more than 2,000 years, to enjoy the fruits of freedom or govern themselves with leaders of their own choosing.

That is why the rebirth of a free and independent Greece 140 years ago was a matter of worldwide significance. The Greeks, suffering under alien rulers, and their determination to work and fight for their independence, earned them the admiration and affection of many millions of people in other lands, who were overjoyed to see the rise of modern Greece as a free and sovereign state. The Greek revolt lasted 7 long years, and for a time it appeared that the Ottoman Turks would succeed in putting it down. When the disciplined Egyptian Army came to the aid of the Ottoman Empire, the position of the Greek patriots appeared almost hopeless. Internal dissensions, partly of a religious nature, added to the obstacles in the way of Greek independence. But finally the great European powers decided that an independent Greece was in their own interest, and the appearance of several European fleets in the Greek harbors, combined

with other changes in the European diplomatic situation, aided the cause of Greek independence.

Thus the Greeks completed the long and arduous path from the city-state of the pre-Christian era to the national state of the 19th century. Never again would they be treated as servants by a foreign ruler, an unbearable stigma which they had endured at the hands of the Turks for nearly 400 years.

Today we can visit Greece and observe the Greek reaction to a whole chain of modern social and economic problems. For example, many Greeks feel that their participation in the European Economic Community will improve the economic situation of the country. In addition to economic cooperation with Europe, they are extending their electrical resources, for lack of electricity is still a problem in many small towns. Greece is trying to achieve a balance between the standard of living of urban centers and rural areas. Even while examining a great number of modern problems, the visitor to Greece is reminded of the country's historic past, a past which is symbolized in the stark sentinel of the Acropolis looking out over the modern city of Athens. On this 141st anniversary of Greek independence, I take pleasure in saluting the Greek people and their invaluable achievements, ancient and modern.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* — 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N.J*
Albert, Carl, *Okla* — 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N.C*
Alford, Dale, *Ark*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn* — 4501 Conn. Ave.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*
Andrews, George W., *Ala* — 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N.Y*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill* — 4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo* — The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Auchincloss, James C., *N.J* — 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*
Barrett, William A., *Pa*
Barry, Robert R., *N.Y* — 3019 Normanstone Drive
Bass, Perkins, *N.H*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*
Bates, William H., *Mass*
Battin, James F., *Mont* — 217 Slade Run Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Becker, Frank J., *N.Y*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*
Beermann, Ralph F., *Nebr*
Belcher, Page, *Okla*
Bell, Alphonzo E., Jr., *Calif*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla* — 1314 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Bennett, John B., *Mich* — 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak* — 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo* — 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* — 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N.C* — Calvert-Woodley
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio* — 4301 Mass. Ave.
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala* — The Washington
Brademas, John, *Ind*
Bray, William G., *Ind*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md*
Bromwell, James E., *Iowa*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio* — Alban Towers
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*
Bruce, Donald C., *Ind*
Buckley, Charles A., *N.Y*
Burke, Frank W., *Ky*
Burke, James A., *Mass*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex* — 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Byrne, James A., *Pa*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis* — 1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N.J*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*
Casey, Bob, *Tex*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y* — The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill* — 1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* — 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*
Clark, Frank M., *Pa* — 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif* — 1028 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*
Colmer, William M., *Miss*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass*
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio* — 5540 Colfax Ave., Alexandria, Va.
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C* — 2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*
Corman, James C., *Calif*
Cramer, William C., *Fla* — 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr* — 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass* — 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn* — 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga*
Davis, John W., *Ga*
Dawson, William L., *Ill*
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*
Dent, John H., *Pa*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*
Derounian, Steven B., *N.Y*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio* — 800 4th St. SW.
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*
Dingell, John D., *Mich*
Dole, Robert, *Kans* — 2816 N. Jefferson Arlington, Va.
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N.Y*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C*
Dowdy, John, *Tex*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif* — 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y* — 1719 New House Office Building
Durno, Edwin R., *Oreg*
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn* — 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa* — 3725 Macomb St.
Findley, Paul, *Ill*
Finnegan, Edward R., *Ill*
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex* — Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa* — The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*
Fogarty, John E., *R.I* — 1235 New House Office Building
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich* — 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*
Fountain, L. H., *N.C* — The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* — The Congressional
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N.J.* — 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*
Fulton, James G., *Pa*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*
Garland, Peter A., *Maine*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*
Glenn, Milton W., *N.J* — Capitol Park Apts., 800 4th St. SW.
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex* — 200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y* — 3842 Macomb St.
Goodling, George A., *Pa*
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George, *Ala* — 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*
Haley, James A., *Fla*
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind* — 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*
Harding, Ralph R., *Idaho*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*
Harris, Oren, *Ark* — 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*
Harrison, William Henry, *Wyo.*
Harsha, William H., Jr., *Ohio*
Harvey, James, *Mich*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio* — 1323 Barger Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N.Y*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La* — 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*
Hemphill, Robert W., *S.C*
Henderson, David N., *N.C*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa* — 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich* — 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*
Horan, Walt, *Wash*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*
Jarman, John, *Okla*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa* — 2120 16th St.
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*
Johansen, August E., *Mich*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo* — 1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn* — 3063 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.* — Albemarle House, 4501 Conn. Ave.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass* — 5906 Harwick Rd.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y* — The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N.Y*
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex* — 4807 Newport
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*
King, Cecil R., *Calif*
King, David S., *Utah*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N.C*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn*
Kunkel, John C., *Pa*
Kyl, John, *Iowa*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass*

Langen, Odin, *Minn*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md*
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*
Lennon, Alton, *N.C*
Lesinski, John, *Mich*
Libonati, Roland V., *Ill*
Lindsay, John V., *N.Y*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*
Loser, J. Carlton, *Tenn* — The Congressional
McCormack, John W., *Mass* — The Washington
McCulloch, William M., *Ohio* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
McDonough, Gordon L., *Calif.*
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*
McFall, John J., *Calif* — 507 Robinson Ct., Alexandria, Va.
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine.* — 1001 3d St. SW., Apt. N-306
McMillan, John L., *S.C*
McSween, Harold B., *La*
McVey, Walter L., *Kans*
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
MacGregor, Clark, *Minn*
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind*
Magnuson, Don, *Wash*
Mahon, George H., *Tex* — Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif*
Marshall, Fred, *Minn*
Martin, Dave, *Nebr*
Martin, Joseph W., Jr., *Mass.* — Sheraton-Park
Mason, Noah M., *Ill*
Mathias, Charles McC., Jr., *Md.*
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
May, Catherine, *Wash*
Meader, George, *Mich* — 3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N.H*
Michel, Robert H., *Ill*
Miller, Clem, *Calif*
Miller, George P., *Calif*
Miller, William E., *N.Y* — 6605 Radnor Rd., Bethesda, Md.
Milliken, William H., Jr., *Pa.*
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark* — 2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio* — 8120 Kerry Lane, Chevy Chase, Md.
Moeller, Walter H., *Ohio*
Monagan, John S., *Conn*
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.* — 5403 Surrey St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Moore, Arch A., Jr., *W. Va*
Moorehead, Tom V., *Ohio*
Moorhead, William S., *Pa*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa*
Morris, Thomas G., *N. Mex.* — 527 Shadeland Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Morrison, James H., *La* — 4301 Mass. Ave.
Morse, F. Bradford, *Mass*
Mosher, Charles A., *Ohio*
Moss, John E., *Calif* — 204 Jefferson St., Alexandria, Va.
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo*
Multer, Abraham J., *N.Y*
Murphy, William T., *Ill*
Murray, Tom, *Tenn*
Natcher, William H., *Ky*
Nedzi, Lucien N., *Mich*
Nelsen, Ancher, *Minn*
Nix, Robert N. C., *Pa*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg*
Norrell, Catherine D., *Ark*
Nygaard, Hjalmar C., *N. Dak.*
O'Brien, Leo W., *N.Y*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill* — The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill* — The Congressional
O'Hara, James G., *Mich*
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Olsen, Arnold, *Mont*
O'Neill, Thos. P., Jr., *Mass*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N.J*
Ostertag, Harold C., *N.Y* — 2480 16th St.
Passman, Otto E., *La*
Patman, Wright, *Tex* — 114 Schotts Ct, NE.
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky*
Peterson, M. Blaine, *Utah*
Pfost, Gracie (Mrs.), *Idaho*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass*
Pike, Otis G., *N.Y*
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga*
Pillion, John R., *N.Y*
Pirnie, Alexander, *N.Y*
Poage, W. R., *Tex* — 228 2d St. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va*
Powell, Adam C., *N.Y*
Price, Melvin, *Ill*
Pucinski, Roman C., *Ill*
Purcell, Graham, *Tex*
Quie, Albert H., *Minn*
Rains, Albert, *Ala*
Randall, Wm. J., *Mo*
Ray, John H., *N.Y*
Reece, Louise G., *Tenn*
Reifel, Ben, *S. Dak*
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis* — 6448 Brooks Lane
Rhodes, George M., *Pa* — 5603 24th Ave. SE., Hillcrest Hgts., Wash. 21, D.C.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N.Y* — 3210 Wis. Ave.
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S.C*
Rivers, Ralph J., *Alaska*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala* — 6102 Cromwell Dr.
Roberts, Ray, *Tex*
Robison, Howard W., *N.Y*
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N.J*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo*
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla* — Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex*
Rooney, John J., *N.Y*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif*
Rosenthal, Benjamin S., *N.Y.*
Rostenkowski, Dan, *Ill*
Roudebush, Richard L., *Ind.*
Roush, J. Edward, *Ind*
Rousselot, John H., *Calif*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex*
Ryan, Harold M., *Mich*
Ryan, William Fitts, *N.Y*
St. George, Katharine (Mrs.), *N.Y.*
St. Germain, Fernand J., *R.I.*
Santangelo, Alfred E., *N.Y*
Saund, D. S. (Judge), *Calif*
Saylor, John P., *Pa*
Schadeberg, Henry C., *Wis*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio* — 2601 Woodley Pl.
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*
Schneebeli, Herman T., *Pa*
Schweiker, Richard S., *Pa*
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa*
Scott, Ralph J., *N.C*
Scranton, William W., *Pa* — 3038 N St.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.* — 1213 Lily Dhu Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Shelley, John F., *Calif*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif*
Shipley, George E., *Ill*
Short, Don L., *N. Dak*
Shriver, Garner E., *Kans*
Sibal, Abner W., *Conn*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky*
Sisk, B. F., *Calif* — 129 6th St. NE.
Slack, John M., Jr., *W. Va* — 800 4th St. SW.
Smith, Frank E., *Miss*
Smith, H. Allen, *Calif*
Smith, Howard W., *Va* — 204 W. Walnut St., Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Neal, *Iowa*
Spence, Brent, *Ky* — Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill*
Stafford, Robert T., *Vt*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va*
Steed, Tom, *Okla*
Stephens, Robert G., Jr., *Ga.*
Stratton, Samuel S., *N.Y*
Stubblefield, Frank A., *Ky*
Sullivan, Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.), *Mo.*
Taber, John, *N.Y*
Taylor, Roy A., *N.C*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex* — 6015 Mass. Ave.
Thomas, Albert, *Tex* — 2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex* — 3301 Mass. Ave.
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N.J*
Thompson, T. A., *La* — 1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, Vernon W., *Wis*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex*
Toll, Herman, *Pa*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash*
Trimble, James W., *Ark*
Tuck, William M., *Va*
Tupper, Stanley R., *Maine*
Udall, Morris K., *Ariz*
Ullman, Al, *Oreg*
Utt, James B., *Calif*
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa* — Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Vinson, Carl, *Ga* — 4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Waggonner, Joe D., Jr., *La*
Wallhauser, George M., *N.J*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa*
Watts, John C., *Ky*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr* — 9405 Pin Oak Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Weis, Jessica McC., *N.Y*
Westland, Jack, *Wash*
Whalley, J. Irving, *Pa*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N.Y*
Whitener, Basil L., *N.C*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss* — 5804 Nebraska Ave.
Wickersham, Victor, *Okla*
Widnall, William B., *N.J*
Williams, John Bell, *Miss* — 1001 26th Rd. S., Arlington, Va.
Willis, Edwin E., *La*
Wilson, Bob, *Calif*
Wilson, Earl, *Ind*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss*
Wright, Jim, *Tex*
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill*
Young, John, *Tex*
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif* — 4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N.Y*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P.R* — 2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 3119 N. Harrison St., Arlington 7, Va.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES

SENATE

John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 1100 6th St. SW., Apt. S-115-W.
Herbert N. Budlong, 5007 Waggaman Circle, McLean, Va.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 216 Normandy Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Julian R. Serles, Jr., 4225 North 31st St., Arlington, Va.
Joseph J. Sweeney, 3832 Porter St.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 701 North Harrison St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Pl., Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

Roy L. Whitman, 6101 16th St. NW.
F. S Milberg, 3 Pooks Hill Rd., Bethesda, Md.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Cleveland Tucker, 2508 Executive Ave., Falls Church, Va.
Sidney W. Williston (clerk), 1830 Longford Dr., Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 U Place SE.
James W. Lea (assistant clerk), 5055 Dixon St., Oxon Run Hills, Md.

Ed

IN

ur
Ap
lis
of
to
liv
Se
so

w
as
Er

th
th
of
se
De

st
is
th

th
th
ci
lia
he

ha
er
po
le
de
ha

U
fo
de
th
se

n
a
U
in
re

la
fo
s
la
th
in
a

P

a
f
U
e

Appendix

Editorial Comment on Address by Senator Jackson, of Washington, Concerning United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Burlington, Vt., Free Press of March 22, 1962. The editorial relates to the excellent speech which was delivered recently by the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] relative to the United Nations.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDITORIAL COMMENT ON ADDRESS BY SENATOR JACKSON, OF WASHINGTON, CONCERNING UNITED NATIONS

The Kennedy administration's reliance on the United Nations was sharply criticized this week by U.S. Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, of Washington. A New Frontiersman himself, JACKSON is former chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

The Senator's criticism is timely and constructive. Perhaps it will shake the administration loose from its strange deference for the United Nations and world opinion.

Sometimes the United States acts "as though we could somehow subcontract to the U.N. the responsibility for national decisionmaking," JACKSON declared. Such reliance on the U.N. is unwarranted, unhealthy, and rather puzzling.

JACKSON said that U.S. decisionmaking has been unduly influenced by U.N. considerations; the development of sound national policies has been hampered; the country's leaders have been unnecessarily overburdened; and the U.S. delegation at the U.N. has acquired a distorted importance.

The Senator was especially critical of our U.N. delegation's role in the broad area of foreign policy. "The precedent set by President Eisenhower in this matter, and continued by this (Kennedy) administration, seems unfortunate," he said.

"The Ambassador to the United Nations is not a second Secretary of State," JACKSON added. Indeed, there is no reason why our U.N. delegation should "play a larger role in the decisionmaking process" than U.S. representatives in major world capitals.

U.N. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson and Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for U.N. Affairs, will not take kindly to JACKSON's words. Stevenson, in particular, has a large ego to satisfy (he has direct access to the President and frequently sits in on Cabinet meetings, and he thinks of himself as a second Secretary of State).

JACKSON topped his critique with this penetrating comment:

"The truth is, though we have not often spoken it in recent years, that the best hope for peace with justice does not lie in the United Nations. Indeed, the truth is almost exactly the reverse.

"The best hope for the United Nations lies in the maintenance of peace (and) peace depends on the power and unity of the Atlantic community and on the skill of our direct diplomacy."

In short, the United Nations is only one avenue of American foreign policy, and by no means the most important one. It should be put in its proper place.

We trust that JACKSON's message is received and understood in the inner councils of the New Frontier.

Teacher Certification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, new proposals for Federal action to spur quality improvement in education have been sent to the Congress by the President. Before we go off on this new tangent, we should fully understand the dramatic changes which have recently been taking place in our State education systems. We are all concerned with the improvement of education in this country. Quality education requires quality teachers. Since 1959, this whole field has been in ferment. I am placing at the conclusion of my remarks an exciting article about the changes that have been taking place in teacher certification throughout the country. I call particular attention to the following significant points made in the article:

First. Certification must be "the legal undergirding of sound preparatory programs" for teachers, leaving higher education institutions "in solid charge of the quality of their own offerings."

Second. Single purpose teachers colleges are rapidly giving way to general colleges. In the past 2 years, 48 teachers colleges have converted into general colleges.

Third. Requirements that teachers obtain solid courses in subject matter are going up, while requirements for superficial or professional courses are going down.

Fourth. States are increasingly granting reciprocity to teachers moving from other States.

This excellent article by T. M. Stinnett, which appeared in the Saturday Review of March 17, 1962, follows in its entirety:

A VAST OVERHAUL OF TEACHER CERTIFICATION

(By T. M. Stinnett)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Public schoolteachers are licensed by the various States and, in most States, public funds may not be used to pay the salaries of teachers not so certified. The purpose of the law is to prevent incompetent or inadequately prepared people from teaching, but in recent years charges have been heard that the regulations are keeping some well-educated people out of the profession while admitting others who have the necessary professional preparation but are deficient in liberal education. Part of the controversy centers upon the value of the required professional courses for teachers. The great majority of professional educators, including school administrators, consider such courses essential for elementary and secondary teachers, but some of the critics of certification laws consider them trivial. Another criticism has been that requirements in specific academic subject matter are much too low. Minimum requirements were kept low in order to make it possible for teachers in small high schools to teach several different subjects; the result has been that it was possible in some States for a high school teacher to teach English, mathematics, science, or history with a background of only three or four rather elementary college courses in the subject. But regulations and laws can be changed and are being changed. In this article T. M. Stinnett presents evidence that most of the criticism of certification practices is based upon history rather than on current regulations. Dr. Stinnett is assistant executive secretary for professional development and welfare of the NEA. This article is based on data prepared for the 1961 edition of "A Manual on Certification Requirements for School Personnel in the United States," a biennial publication of the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, by W. Earl Armstrong and T. M. Stinnett.)

State requirements for the licensing of teachers, a favorite target of the critics of education in recent years, are undergoing a vast overhaul. In each 2-year period since 1951 some changes were reported but these were modest and even-paced. By comparison the changes since 1959 constitute an avalanche.

A total of 29 States have reported significant revisions of certification requirements during the past 2 years and eight States have completely revised their certification structures. Substantially more subject matter in the teaching fields is now required for high school teachers. The total minimum of college work required for certification has been increased while the proportion of the time devoted to education courses has steadily declined. For elementary teachers the median now required in professional education by the various States is down to 21 semester hours while the median required for high school teachers is 18—only about 1 semester of the required 4-year course.

Of the 52 certification units (50 States plus the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico), 51 now require a bachelor's degree for high school teachers and 44 require it for elementary teachers. Three States require 5 years of preparation for high school teachers and several others require that a 5th year of college work be completed during the period of initial certification.

The significance of this upgrading is great. Some observers have been inclined to shrug it off as simply the addition of more education courses but this notion is not sustained by the facts. The added work is preponderantly in the content area.

There has also been improved provision for the movement of teachers across State lines.

Although teachers have always been highly mobile, the diversity of requirements among States has subjected migrating teachers to many irritating and often picayunish restrictions. A decade ago a score of States required a special course (typically State history and constitution) which could be secured only in an in-State institution. Eleven States still have such requirements but five of these will permit proficiency examinations in lieu of the formal courses. Efforts are being made to bring about reciprocity in teacher certification to make it easier for teachers to move from State to State. Two regional compacts, now involving 18 States, and accreditation by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, now accepted by 27 States, provide the basis for reciprocity agreements.

The use of examinations in teacher certification is showing a resurgence. A total of 18 States report the use of examinations in some aspects of the certification process. For the most part, States are using proficiency examinations either to waive required courses, or to permit already certified teachers to qualify for additional teaching fields, but several are making use of qualifying examinations. The District of Columbia, Florida, and South Carolina use examinations (on top of college degrees) to qualify for initial certification. West Virginia uses the National Teachers Examination for liberal arts graduates to qualify for provisional certification.

What is the explanation of this revolution? Obviously many forces have been at work. The critics have had some effect but the criticisms often were so distorted that they slowed rather than accelerated the change. The furor over education resulting from the sputniks was a factor and recognition that new conditions demand educational services at greatly stepped up levels was another. No one can say what the predominant motivation was. As a guess, it would appear that all these factors influenced an unrecedented concert of effort throughout the educational world to upgrade the caliber of teaching and curricula in the public schools. Why were the fruits of all these influences so long in becoming evident in certification procedures? Again, as a surmise, it appears that for the first time changes in teacher education called the tune in certification changes. And, if this guess is an accurate one, this shift may be as significant as the new certification requirements. In the past, State certification prescriptions generally have dominated, directed, and forced changes in the curriculum for the preparation of teachers. The 1961 manual reflects a reversal—the changes, for the most part, seem to have resulted from the impact of new curriculum patterns.

This is all to the good. Certification should be the legal undergirding of sound preparatory programs, not the determiner of these programs. Only with this approach can higher education institutions be in solid charge of the quality of their own offerings, and able to resist untoward pressures from professional groups to fragment their offerings.

Some of the changes in certification may have been accelerated by the transformation of single-purpose teachers colleges to general State colleges which began to gather momentum a decade ago and reached a new peak in the 1959–61 period. A total of 48 degree-granting public teachers colleges became general colleges during these years. Public teachers colleges remain in only 15 States and the District of Columbia and they now povide not more than 10 percent of the annual production of new teachers.

The imminent demise of the single-purpose teachers colleges provokes some intriguing and speculative questions about the future. Will the education of teachers receive the attention it deserves from the multiple-purpose institutions or will they make the more prestigious occupations their chief concerns? Who or what will be the new whipping boy for the alleged weaknesses of teachers in the academic disciplines? Have we already gone too far in the reduction of professional content in the preparation of teachers? The question may be raised, too, whether when teaching reaches the minimum of a 5-year preservice requirement, a trend already well underway, the same vigorous efforts will be made to eliminate or restrict the professional requirements to some piddling magnitude.

Forecasting the future is a tenuous undertaking, but based on the developments of the last decade, the following predictions may be more than mere guessing:

1. There will be a gradual evolution toward the 5-year requirement for beginning teachers, both elementary and secondary. The big unanswered problem regarding the mandated fifth year is the nature of the content.

2. There will be widespread search for more effective means of identifying qualified applicants for certification. Among the possible approaches are qualifying and proficiency examinations, supervised internships, and the use of apprentice certification during a probational period.

3. The trend toward simplification of certification prescriptions and procedures will be intensified, with requirements being stated in general terms rather than in designation of specified courses. There will be a drastic reduction in the number of different kinds of certificates, and a similar reduction in the number of functions certification is now attempting to serve.

4. It seems clear that the profession will gain substantial control over both the licensing process and the revocation of licensure. Already 11 States by law vest varying degrees of authority in professional boards and there is substantial evidence that this number will grow. In 36 additional States extralegal advisory bodies have been established.

A typical teacher's certificate: "State department of education, permanent certificate: Be it known that Varrie Young, having satisfied the minimum requirements prescribed by the State department of education, is hereby granted this certificate, valid for service in a public secondary school, as a teacher of English and social studies. In witness whereof, the education department, under its seal grants this certificate No. 1432978.

"HY R. STANDARDS,
"Chief, Teacher Certification Division.
"I. M. LEADER,
"Superintendent of Public Instruction."

EXAMPLES OF CHANGES IN CERTIFICATION LAWS

Florida: Last month Florida initiated a controversial regulation which requires all new teachers to pass a national examination before they are certificated. Candidates may choose either the national teachers examination or the graduate record exam, but are required to make a stated minimum score. (Temporary certificates may be secured without the exam.)

In addition, beginning next fall, teachers will have to take one of the two examinations in order to qualify for competency awards (merit salary payments), continuing contracts, or advance in rank. A score equal to that required of beginning teachers will be necessary for teachers seeking an advance in rank or a continuing contract. A substantially higher score will be demanded of those applying for merit awards.

California: New standards for teachers will go into effect on July 1, 1963. After that date all new elementary school teachers will have to complete 5 years of college and university study, but they will be allowed to take the fifth year after starting to teach. Secondary school teachers will be required to complete 5 years of preparation before beginning to teach.

All teachers will be required to complete a subject-matter major and a subject-matter minor, one of which must be in an academic subject.

Junior college teachers who have earned a master's or a doctor's degree will be allowed to teach without training in professional education, but the standard requirement of 24 semester-hours of professional study must be completed within 3 years.

In contrast to common practice in the past, high school teachers will no longer be allowed to teach subjects outside their major or minor fields of concentration. Exceptions will be made only upon formal resolution of the local school board.

Texas: Next fall all new elementary and secondary school teachers in Texas must have completed 51 semester-hours of general education in the liberal arts departments of their colleges. Present regulations require only 45 hours.

All high school teachers will be required to specialize in one academic field for 48 semester-hours, or in two teaching fields for 24 hours each. Present requirements demand 24 hours in a major field and 18 hours in a minor.

Elementary school teachers must have completed work in two areas of concentration under one of two plans: (1) 18 semester-hours in one subject and 18 in a combination of subjects, on (2) 24 semester-hours in one subject and 12 in a combination of subjects.

Professional education course requirements for both elementary and secondary school teachers will be reduced from 24 to 18 semester-hours, including 6 hours of student teaching.

Tribute To Dr. Mildred B. Moss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, each year Croft Publications selects a few men and women as principal of the year. This year Dr. Mildred B. Moss, principal of Metuchen's Washington School was chosen.

This is a high honor to be paid to one of New Jersey's school principals. The children in her school, the citizens of the borough of Metuchen and the State of New Jersey can rejoice in this award to a "gifted, sympathetic, capable, inspired teacher." I wish to add my compliments to Dr. Moss and the borough for this fine achievement.

The Daily Home News of New Brunswick, N.J. on March 9, 1962, wrote a fine tribute to Dr. Moss which I ask for unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRINCIPAL OF YEAR AWARD TO DR. MOSS

The Metuchen school system has won new honors with the selection of Dr. Mildred B.

Moss, principal of the borough's Washington school, as one of six elementary school principals in the Nation to receive a leadership award as Principal of the Year.

The award, from Croft Publications, to Dr. Moss comes close on the heels of a similar award to high school principal William J. Nunan in the borough last year.

Dr. Moss is known to generations of Metuchen people as teacher and principal, she having come to Washington School in 1926 as a teacher and moved up to principal in 1954.

Dr. Moss is one of the most active of women, in her job as principal, on the staff of the Rutgers Graduate School of Education, in health and civic activities in her home borough, in many professional associations, in PTA.

Even more important, perhaps, to her selection as a principal of the year is the high regard parents, her school associates and the young people she has helped educate hold for Dr. Moss. She has been friend, helper, leader to hundreds and hundreds. Her associates describe her as "gifted, sympathetic, capable, inspired." Had they not been perhaps a little self-conscious about opening their hearts to public view many of them might have said, "beloved."

The President's Proposed $600 Million Capital Improvements Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I noted with a great deal of interest a message the President sent yesterday to the chairmen of the House and Senate Public Works Committees.

In his message to these gentlemen, the President proposed a $600 million capital improvements program in those sections of the country which have failed to show substantial progress in solving their dire problems of chronic unemployment.

The President outlined a number of reasons for the need for this plan, and among them are exodus of industry, displacements of labor by technological change, influx of jobseekers, changing weapons requirements in military procurement.

Each of these reasons is certainly a contributing factor to our unemployment rate in Michigan which is still above 9 percent, and the Detroit metropolitan area in particular where the rate is closer to 10 percent.

But I wonder if the administration has given enough thought to this problem in its proposal? Is a massive public works program going to permanently help the situation?

Part of the reason we have high unemployment in Michigan is the fact that our major industry in the State is being discriminated against by the Federal excise tax on new car purchases. This 10-percent tax is pricing a great many potential auto customers out of the market, and this discrimination is hurting many thousands of people directly in the auto industry and indirectly in steel, rubber, glass, tool and diemaking, machine tools and a host of other industries scattered from one corner of our Nation to the other. If the administration really wants to do something about chronic unemployment in Michigan, the first thing it should do is get rid of the automobile excise tax.

The effect would be immediate, dramatic and would help solve a problem for good in an area now heavily hit by chronic unemployment.

What happens to these workers when the Federal Government decides to stop this glorified WPA? These workers will once again be without jobs, without skills and without any hope for the future.

Further, anyone connected with public works north of the Mason-Dixon line knows that construction work is at best a 6- to 8-month program. You cannot build new roads in the snow, and workers cannot even get a shovel into the ground when it freezes up in the winter in many sections of our Nation. Will these people have to go on relief during the winter months?

What the chronically unemployed need is a chance to receive adequate training in skills, trades and services which will give them employment in the future as well as just tomorrow. The Congress has already passed legislation to provide this help. Further, we need an end to discriminatory taxes such as the auto excise tax which is pricing cars out of the reach of many of our citizens and is helping to cause thousands of layoffs in the auto industry and those industries which do business with the automobile industry.

A half billion dollars worth of boondoggles is not going to solve a thing. This economic aspirin might hide the symptoms of chronic unemployment for a short time, but it will prevent an accurate diagnosis of this problem so that it can be permanently cured.

Those who are without jobs want a chance, but this bill will not give them a chance. When your head aches from want; you do not need an aspirin. You need food, clothing, shelter and hope.

Elimination of the 10-percent auto excise tax, coupled with the Manpower Training Act which is now the law of the land, would mean training, skills, and hope for the future.

Those without jobs do not want to be shovelpushers on a modified Federal dole. They want work, self-respect, a trade and a future.

National Power Resources Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on March 5 Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall addressed the annual convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in Atlantic City, N.J. Secretary Udall chose this appropriate occasion to deliver a most significant statement on national power resources development.

I believe Secretary Udall's eloquent and thoughtful remarks are deserving of widespread and studious attention.

Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Secretary's speech be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR STEWART L. UDALL AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, ATLANTIC CITY, N.J., MARCH 5, 1962

Nearly 25 years ago, a reporter for one of our large eastern newspapers wrote for the Nation magazine this bitter commentary: "REA stands * * * as one of Franklin D. Roosevelt's worst failures."

Today the REA program stands as one of F.D.R.'s great successes—indeed, as one of America's great successes.

Your accomplishments in bringing electricity to the land are a triumph for all America—farm families and mainstreet merchants, factory presidents and factory workers, city and rural dwellers—all have benefited in a better life, higher production, more sales and profits, a broader tax base.

I congratulate you on your past successes, and applaud your effectiveness in making so many of our citizens aware of the long-term value of our resource conservation programs to the whole Nation.

We of the Kennedy administration believe wholeheartedly in the cooperative principles that are the heart of your program—and an indispensable part of our free-enterprise system.

This is a propitious occasion to restate the goals of the Kennedy administration's power resource development program—and to relate this program to the national economic policies of the President.

The first premise of that policy is that America must have a dynamic, highly efficient economy if it is to bear the burdens of world leadership and keep our economy growing.

As a nation, we cannot afford a second-best resource policy. We must constantly increase our labor productivity, more fully use our wood, and water and minerals—squeeze more kilowatts out of our hydroelectric dams. We must continue to develop low-cost energy which will enable us to trade abroad and compete more successfully in the markets of the world.

It is our Nation that must do these things—not just labor or capital, not just public power or private power. The challenge we face will determine whether a free people can outwork and outproduce a regimented society—whether we succeed in making science and technology the servant of mankind.

How does our national power policy relate to these higher economic objectives of our country? In the field of electricity, alone, the best estimates are that our Nation during the next 20 years must invest $100 billion in new electric generating plants and transmission facilities to meet the ever-increasing demands for electric energy for homes, farms, and industries.

We are at a "new frontier" in electricity. Giant new generators are being built with 1,000,000 kilowatts capacity. They are most efficient and less costly to operate than smaller units. One of these giants can alone produce enough power to supply the city of Washington, D.C.

Twenty years ago the economic limit on electrical transmission was 200 miles. Today transmission lines of quadrupled capacity can transport electric energy 2,000 miles. Like the giant generators, the big extra-high-voltage transmission lines cost less and are more efficient.

Think what this means for electric consumers everywhere—Yukon River power in Seattle and, by displacement, into Los Angeles; mine-mouth power from West Virginia coal fields in New York and Boston, and from Dakota lignite beds into Chicago and Detroit; power flowing east and west to take advantage of time diversity; power flowing north and south for seasonal diversity; and integration of hydro and steam systems; in short, more and cheaper electricity for everybody.

Think not of the job that has been done. Think of the job yet to be done. To achieve the maximum efficiency of its electrical production facilities, our Nation needs fully integrated electrical systems, large interconnections between systems and regions, and interchanges of power. To achieve this objective we must marshal the full resources of the Federal Government, the public agencies, and the private utilities. As President Kennedy said in his special message on resources a year ago:

"It is not a task which should or can be done by the Federal Government alone. Only through the fullest participation and cooperation of State and local governments and private industry can it be done wisely and effectively."

The President also said:

"The role of the Federal Government in supplying an important segment of this power is now long established and must continue. We will meet our responsibilities in this field."

A year ago, also, the Kennedy administration's basic power policy was announced, and it can be summed up in a single sentence: America must have the best—the most efficient—electric system in the world. Nothing less will do.

The Kennedy policy statement reaffirmed five basic principles, first enunciated by the Department of the Interior in 1946. All are embodied in acts of Congress. They are:

1. Federal dams shall include facilities for generating electrical energy wherever feasible.

2. Preference in power sales shall be given to public agencies and cooperatives.

3. Power disposal shall be for the particular benefit of domestic and rural consumers.

4. Power shall be sold at the lowest possible rates consistent with sound business principles.

5. Power disposal shall be such as to encourage widespread use and to prevent monopolization.

A year has gone by. The record will show that we have moved vigorously toward our goal of developing in America the finest electrical system in the world.

The task force I named last year to study an extra high voltage common carrier interconnection between the Pacific Northwest and Pacific Southwest has completed its work. The report is a technological landmark. It shows great public benefits accruing to both regions when these interconnections are built. It points up the high promise of extra high voltage direct current transmission for these—and other—regions. The President's budget includes planning funds for this vital interconnection.

We are progressing with the study of other major interconnections between regions served by the Department's power marketing agencies. These include studies of possible interties between the Bureau of Reclamation's Missouri River system and the Southwestern Power Administration in the midlands, and between the Missouri River system and the Bonneville Power Administration in the Northwest.

The Federal Power Commission appointed by President Kennedy has announced an even broader study, on a national basis, of the methods by which extra high voltage interconnections can help us meet our growing power needs. We expect these studies to show the substantial economies that can be achieved through EHV interconnections because of the difference in hydrology between rivers and because of diversities in load patterns between regions—economies of gas, oil, coal, steel, copper, aluminum, forest products, and labor—economies which will total hundreds of millions of dollars.

Let's take a look around the Nation to see, specifically where we are going. Let's look at the Missouri Basin, the Pacific Northwest, Washington, D.C., and the upper Colorado.

In the eastern division of the Missouri Basin marketing area public preference customers face a critical power supply problem. One of our first decisions a year ago extended the supplemental power program through the fall of 1965. This decision saved rural electric cooperatives millions of dollars and provided more than 4 years' leadtime which will enable us to develop long-range answers.

Working closely with preference customers of this region we have developed a plan that permits all of the cooperatives in that area to pool their future requirements. It will utilize the existing Federal transmission system and assure necessary additions to the system through a pool arrangement. This plan will make it possible for cooperatives to construct a 200,000-kilowatt generating unit on the lignite fields of North Dakota.

Two months ago, 14 utilities offered an exchange agreement to firm up 650,000 kilowatts of additional power for the Bureau of Reclamation in the Missouri Basin. This plan, too, is receiving our careful attention. You well may ask why this offer was made in 1962 and not in 1959—when the cooperatives stood "backed into a corner" following the December 10, 1959, meeting in Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

In the Pacific Northwest, we have negotiated a pioneering electrical coordination agreement with a dozen public agencies and private utilities. In effect, it provides that 65 hydroelectric plants and 13 steamplants under diverse ownership, having total installed capacity of 11,800,000 kilowatts, be operated as though they were all owned by a single entity. This coordination produces an extra million of more kilowatts of firm power that would be wasted if each utility operated its hydroplants independently.

We are examining the potentials of pumped-back storage. Pumped-back storage is another "new frontier" in the field of power production and marketing. It uses cheap offpeak energy to pump water to high elevations for later release to generate hydroelectricity at hours of the day when the consumption of electricty reaches its peak. The result is great saving in plant investment for generating capacity.

As Secretary of the Interior, I chair a committee in Washington that includes the Secretaries of Agriculture, Army, and Health, Education, and Welfare which was appointed by the President to review Budget Circular A-47.

A-47 contains the standards for feasibility for Federal projects. The President holds the view that these standards are too restrictive. Our committee will shortly present to the President for his approval new criteria for project development and evaluation. It will permit future feasibility studies to reflect true land and water resource values, and recognize both direct and indirect benefits.

It has been in the news, and let me report the facts to you on the upper Colorado transmission lines decision.

This struggle began a year ago when our first budget included funds to begin construction of the project's transmission lines. The project has three major power-producing units—Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, and Glen Canyon. These huge dams had to be tied together with backbone transmission lines, and their power output had to be carried to major load centers.

The private power companies in the basin were quite content to have the Federal Government build the unprofitable segment of the backbone lines. They wanted to build the rest. And they wanted to control the system and fix the price for use of the lines and obviously—if Congress denied us funds—they would "negotiate," but strictly on their terms.

So the issue went to Congress—and with your strong help we persuaded the lawmakers that their offers were unreasonable and that Federal construction was a much better solution. Congress gave us the funds but directed us to negotiate with the companies for terms that would enable us to adhere to our marketing principles and serve the best interests of all parties.

We conducted the negotiation from strength, and the integrated system will require $151 million of Federal funds for construction, instead of $178 million; preference users are fully protected, all of the people of the Colorado Basin are ahead—and the whole region will have one of the best integrated, most efficient power system in the Nation.

Let me enumerate the results we were able to achieve as a result of our victory last September:

Full protection of the rights of public-preference customers, including five additional delivery points for preference users provided by the private utilities at no extra cost; substantial savings to the project basin fund, including savings of $77 million to farmers—many of whom are also users of preference power; an integrated system that will be more efficient and will save millions annually to all of the people of the region; a heavier grid through interchanges and interconnections than was possible under a go-it-alone all-Federal plan; acceptance of the common carrier principle by the private companies; monopoly control of transmission was prevented; and a stronger interconnection with the Missouri Basin system was established.

This plan will mean maximum efficiency in the use of total plant capacity in the region at the lowest possible rates. This is in the national interest, and therefore in the interest of everyone. Here we have succeeded in getting the private utilities to provide service at the lowest possible cost through the competition of public agencies.

The Department of the Interior has responsibilities to the Congress and to the Nation as a whole. We want the American utility industry, public and private, to achieve new technological breakthrough, new savings through cooperation—and, above all, lower rates for those who are the ultimate consumers—the American people.

We cannot afford to be doctrinaire in our approach. In certain situations we will insist, as we have in the past, on wheeling arrangements over Federal lines to prevent costly duplication of lines by private utilities. In fact, it may more often be in the public interest that private utilities wheel over Federal lines than vice versa. In the Pacific Northwest, for example, the Bonneville Power Administration just recently has worked out a 50-year wheeling arrangement with two major private utilities to wheel Wanapum Dam power to the companies' load centers. This led to the companies' canceling their plans for duplicating Federal transmission lines, saving unnecessary capital investment estimated at more than $15 million.

Earlier I said President Kennedy wants America to have the world's best electric system. I am aware that for 8 years many

of you here led a lonely fight for common carrier lines, regional interconnections, extra high voltage transmission, large economic generating facilities, and the proper combinations of hydro and steam—each a necessary ingredient of the world's most efficient electric system.

Now your Government supports these same goals and we invite all segments of this vital industry to work together so that we can reach these objectives.

I regret to say that some private utility spokesmen still consider the Government an intruder in the field of power generation and transmission. Some of these men led a blind and wasteful—and successful—fight against the Hanford reactor last summer. However, the truth of the matter is that the American people—all of them—lost that contest.

Some leaders in the private utility sector, however, have recognized that the Federal Government and other public agencies do have a proper place in the sun—and legitimate interests to protect. These utilities, particularly those in the Pacific Northwest, have joined in power pooling and in coordination agreements with the end result that all ratepayers and all generating entities—public and private—have benefited.

I am optimistic enough to believe that in the years ahead more of the private utilities will choose the mutual gains of cooperation over the waste to themselves and to the Nation that results from blind opposition. But I am not naive enough to believe this will happen without some prodding from the Congress, from the administration and from organizations such as the NRECA.

If our plans are sound, if we can bargain from strength, public power will achieve its legitimate goals, private power will thrive, and the Nation will move forward.

The national interest requires that we have the world's best electric system. We have the resources, the technical competence, the management skills. In the past if we have been bested it has been by those nations that have moved beyond doctrinaire disputes to the better day when all interests work together to accomplish the most efficient use of material and resources and to achieve the cheapest power for consumers.

I challenge the entire electric industry to a new competition. Who can do the best for the power user? Call it what you will—cooperation, competition, coordination, or just plain commonsense—this approach offers the best hope for all concerned. Competition between strong public and strong private leadership will best assure that we reach the highest goals of national growth and national productivity.

It would encourage the private companies and public agencies to prove by superior performance their right to the public responsibilities entrusted to them.

It would recognize that private utilities do not have all of the traditional features of free enterprises. They are not like the corner grocery store or the smalltown garage or even the industrial giants of the Nation, which employ risk capital to sell products in a highly competitive marketplace. They are regulated public monopolies charged with public duties.

It would recognize the proper and fundamental role of the Federal Government in developing those resources that belong to all the people.

Finally, it would recognize that we usually get things done by using a little give and take, that we can advance the interests of all the groups—and of the Nation as a whole—by a spirit, if I may coin a phrase, of "competitive cooperation."

With such an approach, all utilities can bend their full energies and talents toward improved service, improved technology, fuller integration, and lower rates.

There may be some who will reject this call—some who would rather cling to the old trenches and old slogans—but if enough are willing to try, the costly Chinese Wall that separates public and private power will be pierced with interconnecting transmission lines, and America will be the stronger for it.

A Business-Aid Bill That Wouldn't Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUISE G. REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mrs. REECE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from my hometown paper, the Johnson City, Tenn., Press-Chronicle, of March 17, 1962, entitled, "A Business-Aid Bill That Wouldn't Aid."

The editorial follows:

A BUSINESS-AID BILL THAT WOULDN'T AID

Economic growth means good business, and the administration's tax bill soon to come before the Congress, is advertised as a measure to spur economic growth. The fact that most businessmen and their organizations oppose the bill should raise considerable doubt that the measure will fulfill its promise.

Businessmen object that the 8-percent investment credit proposal is in reality a "subsidy and control" measure. With an eye on what has happened to farmers and to individual industries suzsidized and controlled by the Government, they want no part of it. They would prefer realistic tax reform and tightening up on Federal spending.

They also point out that expansion of economic activity requires capital. All present capital is in use. The tax bill provides no new source of capital at all. In fact, the investment subsidies allowed to some businesses would have to be made up by all businesses, because the bill contains several devices to require all businesses to increase their tax payments.

One such provision changes the treatment of business expenses. The Internal Revenue Service already has the power to disallow any claimed expenses which it does not deem legitimate, and that power is used. So the new bill would merely make it possible to claim taxes on expenses that always have been proper.

American business would be stunted, too, by the provision which would allow the Government to tax the earnings of foreign branches before they are returned as profits to this country. One Congressman described this idea as simply informing American companies they must give up hope of winning for our country a share of growing world markets in the face of foreign competition.

Killing this bill would not mean, of course, that no taxes would be collected in the coming year. It would mean that Congress would then have an opportunity to consider a tax bill that will assure the economic growth which is the stated objective of the administration.

Such a bill exists—the Herlong-Baker tax measure, now in the Ways and Means Committee. This bill would make a start right away on income tax rate reform, releasing the new capital without which economic growth will continue to be unsatisfactory.

The Basic Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, whenever Congress debates some piece of misnamed civil rights legislation, contrived political and emotional arguments always obscure the basic issue. Washington Star columnist Gould Lincoln put the matter in its true prespective in his column of Saturday, March 24, in which he expressed the principle at stake as follows:

Shall the Constitution be amended as provided in that document or shall it be changed by Congress and court opinion?

That is a question, Mr. President, which all Members of Congress should ponder searchingly and I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lincoln's article setting it forth be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONSTITUTION AND POLITICS

(By Gould Lincoln)

The Constitution of the United States, between Congress and the Supreme Court, has been battered in recent years to an increasing degree. Bloc voting in Congress and strained constructions in the Supreme Court have been the weapons. Matters that have been left to the States in the past—excluded from the powers specifically placed in the hands of the Federal Government by the terms of the Constitution—have been taken from the States. The Federal Government is reaching out more and more to control public education, both through laws enacted by Congress and through decisions by the highest court. And now the Congress is wrestling with proposals to compel States to eliminate poll taxes in 5 States, and literacy tests in 19 States, as prerequisites for voting.

In the Senate, the effort so far has been to deal with the poll tax issue through an amendment to the Constitution. And the effort has made so little progress, due to filibustering tactics on the part of many of the Senators from the South—the five States which still maintain poll taxes are Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, Texas, and Virginia—that some of the most liberal Senators on both sides of the Chamber are now planning to offer a legislative bill as a substitute for the constitutional amendment. Amendments to the Constitution and legislation to do away with or confine literacy tests for voting qualifications are in the committee stage.

THE COURT'S ROLE

The proponents of legislation are the "hurry-uppers"—those who do not wish the issues to go through the process of winning two-thirds vote approval in both Houses of Congress and ratification later by three-fourths of the States of the Union. They are those who believe that the Supreme Court as now constituted would uphold the constitutionality of the laws passed by Congress doing away with poll taxes and literacy tests; that the Court would find it possible to stretch the so-called welfare clause of the Constitution to cover the ground.

The Supreme Court, by its 1954 decision, tore away the right of a State to control its public school system and established the right of the Federal Government to compel racial integration. The Court so far has not asserted the right of the Federal Government to dictate to the States the qualifications of their voters. Only constitutional amendments, properly adopted, have dealt with the questions of voting qualifications, first insisting there should be no denial of the right to vote because of race or prior condition of servitude, and, second, that women should be granted sufferage.

In all other particulars, such as age, property, taxes, and literacy, the decisions have been left to the States. The pressure for Federal laws dealing with voting qualifications in the States comes now from the NAACP, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the same people whose court cases against State laws resulted in the Supreme Court's 1954 reversal of earlier opinions of the highest Court in regard to the public schools. And it is backed up by the desires of many of the legislators who hope to receive the support of Negro voters in their own States and districts.

The proposal for a constitutional amendment outlawing the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting is sponsored by a Southern Senator, Senator HOLLAND, of Florida. It is not yet before the Senate, although it has led to 8 long days of debate. Assurance has been given that it will be offered as an amendment to a bill to preserve the home of Alexander Hamilton in New York as a national monument. First, it is necessary to vote to take up the Hamilton bill. If a real filibuster develops, anti-poll-tax supporters will offer their legislative bill in an effort to supplant the constitutional amendment. And so it goes.

GROUPS RAP AMENDMENT

Along with the NAACP, the Americans for Democratic Action, the American Jewish Congress, the Anti-Defamation League, the International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, and several other organizations have issued a statement attacking the Holland constitutional amendment to banish the poll tax. They contend that: "It is a travesty to call a constitutional amendment a civil rights measure when Congress has the constitutional power to abolish the poll tax by legislation, as the Attorney General (Robert F. Kennedy) has testified." Mr. Kennedy's statement, however, doesn't coincide with the view of many constitutional lawyers and authorities and Members of Congress.

The States which have literacy tests of one kind or another—also subject of attack by the same forces—are not confined to the South by any means. They are Alabama, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Missiasippi, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, Virginia, Washington, and Wyoming. It's another kettle of fish entirely. Some of these States have tests which meet certain problems. In New York, for example, thousands of Puerto Ricans, citizens of the United States because of our ownership of the island, were not allowed to vote because they could not read a simple paragraph in the English language, although they can read and write in Spanish. The Kennedy administration—and Democratic Mayor Wagner of New York—are interested in this Puerto Rican vote, which is a major reason for the antiliteracy test drive today. In some southern States literacy tests have been used to prevent Negroes from voting, the Civil Rights Commission has reported, in defiance of the 14th and 15th amendments to the Constitution.

Nevertheless, the question remains: Shall the Constitution be amended as provided in that document or shall it be changed by Congress and court opinion? An important question.

Foreign Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, there is before the Congress, President Kennedy's proposals for revision of our trade policies and this is among the most important pieces of legislation we will be considering.

On March 7, the Prince Georges County League of Women Voters conducted an open meeting at Bladensburg High School at which three speakers spoke on "Three Views of Trade." The league is a unique organization because it reaches its position on local, State, and National matters only after an extended period of study and debate which proceeds up through each of its units. This well-informed woman's organization performs three useful public service functions. It holds open meetings such as the one it just held on trade policies. It distributes information on both sides of issues so that the public may be informed. It encourages citizens to register and vote.

The league is a nonpartisan organization dedicated to the strengthening of the democratic process. I wish to salute the good work it has done and to commend the women of the league for the useful advice they have often furnished me. When I receive material or views from members of the league, I know that it has been carefully compiled and that I can rely on its accuracy. This is of great value. When I find that I can agree with their position, I am equipped with material on both sides of the question, and when on occasion I cannot agree with their position, I know that I must contend with a firm and dedicated, but never spiteful, opposition.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an analysis of the President's trade proposals by Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Richard N. Gardner, as presented to the League of Women Voters of Prince Georges County on March 7.

Mr. Gardner's remarks follow.

FOREIGN TRADE

The United States requires a wholly new instrument of trade policy to meet the challenge of competitive coexistence. Major reductions in our tariff structure are now necessary to stimulate our economic growth, check domestic inflation, increase our competitiveness in world markets, provide new benefits to the American consumer, counter the economic offensive of the Communist bloc, and bind the free world together in an open and nondiscriminatory trading community.

The last necessity is of overriding importance. Recent years have brought radical changes in free world trading patterns. We have already witnessed the creation of the six-nation European economic community. As a result of negotiations now underway, we may witness the enlargement of this community into a Common Market of Europe consisting of over 300 million people. Some 90 percent of free world trade in industrial goods would then be concentrated in two great trading areas, the European trading market and the United States. At the same time regional markets may be developed in other parts of the free world. To protect the interests of all free world countries and promote the cause of free world unity, it is essential that the external barriers of these regional groupings be kept as low as possible. This can only happen if the United States, as the foremost trading country in the free world, is prepared to take the lead in a new program of expanding trade.

The present trade agreements act is an inadequate instrument for the achievement of these purposes. With its emphasis on selective item by item tariff negotiations and its present peril point and escape clauses, its usefulness as a vehicle for expanding trade has been exhausted.

The new trade expansion act of 1962 represents progress beyond the present law in the following major respects:

1. The new bill provides a much greater degree of tariff cutting authority to the President. First, it grants authority to reduce duties in relation to any other country by 50 percent. Second, it grants special authority to reduce tariffs by more than 50 percent or to eliminate them completely on categories of goods in which the United States and the Common Market together account for 80 percent or more of world exports. Third, it permits reductions and eliminations of duties on tropical agricultural goods exported by the less developed countries not produced in significant quantities in the United States. Fourth, it permits elimination of low tariffs now at 5 percent or less.

2. In place of the existing method of selective bargaining on an item basis the new law authorizes negotiation on an across-the-board basis, that is, on broad categories of commodities. This is essential to enable the United States to negotiate meaningfully with the Common Market countries which are already applying the across-the-board approach.

3. Under existing peril point and escape clause provisions, tariff protection is granted to prevent serious injury. As interpreted by the Tariff Commission, this means that tariff increases can be granted or tariff decreases forestalled simply because imports enjoy a larger share of a growing American market—even though American producers suffer no absolute losses in employment, profits, or sale. Restrictions may also be authorized where imports cause losses in one division of a multiproduct business, even though the business can avoid injury by shifting to the production of its other products. Under the new law, the circumstance which may occasion protection is not serious injury as presently defined but rather the occurrence on a widespread basis in an industry of significant idling of productive facilities, persistent inability to operate at a profit, and unemployment.

4. Under the existing peril point provision, the Tariff Commission make specific findings as to the limit beyond which tariff reductions cannot go without causing or threatening serious injury. Under the new law, we have a peril provision without a point, in other words, the Commission is merely asked to advise on the economic effect of

tariff reductions but not on the limit to which those reductions should go.

5. Tariff increases under the existing escape clause are as a practical matter indefinite in duration. Under the new legislation, they expire after 4 years unless the President makes a new finding. To put it very simply, under existing law the burden of proof is on the importer to show that tariff relief is no longer needed, while under the new law the burden is on the domestic industry to show that it is still needed.

6. Under the existing law, the main instrument for dealing with import competition is greater protection. Under the new law, the main instrument is adjustment assistance to firms and workers. Protection is available only as extraordinary relief after a showing that an industry has made reasonable efforts to adjust and that the adjustment assistance provided to firms and workers has not substantially mitigated the condition of idle facilities, inability to operate at a profit, and unemployment.

We live today in a revolutionary age. New forces—political, economic, scientific—are reshaping the world around us in ways that our forefathers could not have dreamed. These changes can bring dangers or opportunities for the United States, depending on whether we have the will and the intelligence to adapt our policies in response to them.

The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 is a courageous response to a radically altered world trade situation. By enacting it we can give the lie to Communist prophecies of Western disintegration and give new vitality to the cause of economic and political freedom around the world.

Lipservice to Free Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, from the very first suggestion that we work with the Common Market, I have leaned favorably toward that idea. If we will do the things necessary to improve our own economy such as balancing our budgets, bringing a halt to the wage price spiral, liberalizing the depreciation allowance to a greater extent than the President now wants, bringing under control the outflow of gold and encouraging rather than discouraging American business, the cooperation with the Common Market will be to our advantage. However when I discover that the President is now playing politics with this issue for the sake of votes, I begin to wonder if the principle of free trade dominates this effort or have they fallen to the principles of more votes.

One of America's distinguished business publications, Barrons, wonders about this also and does it in a way which should be called to this body's attention so I ask that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ESCAPE FROM PRINCIPLE—WASHINGTON IS MERELY PAYING LIPSERVICE TO FREE TRADE

To his many admirers among the fourth estate, especially those who have read Machiavelli's "The Prince," John F. Kennedy ranks as one of the greatest living masters of the politician's art. They have watched approvingly as the President, in bland disregard of his campaign promises, proceeded to load the Federal bench with Democrats, qualified and unqualified alike. They have applauded the adroitness with which his party, while failing to establish a new department of urban affairs, simultaneously succeeded in making a clever pitch for the Negro vote come November. Above all, they have been fascinated by the skillful way in which the White House, in the effort to advance the cause of its foreign trade bill, has been jockeying for votes. Last Monday to this end it ordered a sharp increase in the tariffs on woolen carpets and glass, the bulk of which comes from Belgium. Thereby, in the apt words of an observer, it won the support of 12 States at the expense of only 1 small ally.

To the practical politician, who places nosecounts and rollcalls above principle, the price undoubtedly was right. At the moment, however, it no longer looks like a bargain. To the surprise of Washington, which tends to underrate its friends as persistently as it overrates its foes, the move has whipped up a storm of anger in Brussels and other European capitals. The Belgian Government, indeed, not only has lodged a formal protest against what it regards as a clear-cut act of bad faith, but also it may refuse to ratify the new round of reciprocal tariff concessions negotiated between the United States and the Common Market.

Last week's inspired stroke of pragmatism, moreover, may lead to painful political consequences at home. Whatever ground it has gained in the handful of favored states, it is bound to harden the opposition elsewhere. For coming on the heels of equally cynical tactics in textiles, the latest episode reflects scant credit on the standards—or, rather, the lack of them—which the administration, in the conduct of foreign trade policy, has chosen to pursue. It must surely raise grave doubts about the wisdom of expanding, as provisions in the pending measure would do, the already broad powers of the Executive in this strategic sphere. Free trade is a noble slogan and a worthy national goal. However, it cannot cloak with sanctity a bad piece of legislation.

Despite its appealing title—"A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States through international trade agreements and through adjustment assistance to domestic industry, agriculture, and labor, and for other purposes"—H.R. 9900 happens to fall into this category. In so stating, Barron's, which can cite an unbroken record of editorial opposition to protectionism and all its works, is well aware that in some respects the measure is on the side of the angels. We have no quarrel with its efforts to weaken the weasel-worded perilpoint provisions and escape clauses of the law now on the books, or to replenish the President's nearly exhausted authority to negotiate lower tariffs. On these scores the bill by and large is seeking to carry on in the honorable traditions of Cordell Hull.

Unfortunately, however, its authors have not been content with the rich legacy of the reciprocal trade agreements. On the contrary, in an excess of zeal they have sought to endow the executive branch with a vast store of new authority. For example, as the Wall Street Journal pointed out the other day, in the guise of cushioning the impact of tariff cuts, the legislation would create a new program of Federal assistance, under which, following a White House decree, private citizens, companies, industries, or States would qualify for adjustment allowances of apparently unlimited duration and amount. The bill, furthermore, provides that all Presidential determinations shall be final and conclusive and shall not be subject to review by any court. Most startling of all, in a section titled "Extraordinary relief," it empowers the President both to raise existing tariffs at his own discretion, and to levy new ones on duty-free goods up to half of their value. He also may impose any "other import restrictions * * * as he may determine to be in the national interest."

Here, of course, is the granddaddy of all escape clauses, couched in language vague enough to permit the President to do virtually anything he pleases in the realm of foreign trade. In the most prudent of hands such untrammelled authority would be risky. In the hands of the incumbent, who tends to identify the national interest with that of his party, the results could be well-nigh disastrous. On this score, it might be noted, some ominous precedents already have been set. Thus, as a Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Kennedy properly denounced import quotas on crude and residual fuel oil as rank discrimination against one part of the country, as well as an intolerable burden upon U.S. industry generally. However, to judge by his failure to remedy the abuse, circumstances evidently alter cases.

Again, in an effort to soften opposition to its pending trade bill, the administration has gone to extraordinary lengths to discourage the import of textiles, notably from Hong Kong. Ten days ago, with unprecedented harshness, it slapped an embargo on six cargoes of cotton goods which, it claims, were shipped here in defiance of so-called voluntary quotas. For its pains the White House thereby may corral a few reluctant Southern votes. At the same time, however, it has dealt a hard blow to the prosperity of one of the few places in all Asia which manages to thrive by its own efforts.

Against political expediency, the foregoing suggests, the national interest doesn't stand a Chinaman's chance. The point was underscored last Monday, when the White House, invoking the escape clause, ordered increases ranging up to 100 percent in the duties on woolen carpets and glass. As noted, it hopes to win friends and influence people in about a dozen strategic states, a result which it may or may not have achieved. It has surely succeeded in making enemies in other parts of the world, notably in Belgium, which sells one-fourth of its sheet glass and nearly half of its carpet production to the United States. What has outraged the Belgians is not merely the stiffness of the levies, but also their obnoxious timing. In Geneva, after all, this country recently concluded a new reciprocal trade pact with the European Economic Community, of which Belgium is a charter member. To spring higher imposts on the EEC right now strikes many Europeans as sharp practice, if not an outright breach of faith. As a consequence, the fate of the Geneva agreement, which must be ratified by the various parliaments, is now in doubt. At the least, the U.S. maneuver, far from furthering the cause of Western unity, has done it a grave disservice.

In the realm of foreign trade, then, as in so many other areas of policymaking, the Kennedy administration has fallen short of the mark. Why it has failed so signally must be left to the judgment of some fu-

ture, more dispassionate historian. To this observer, however, its weakness lies in what others persist in regarding as a major source of strength, namely, the willingness to sacrifice anything for votes. Political expediency—or pragmatism, as it is called nowadays—has been known to win elections. Good government, however, must rest on something more enduring.

State Department Needs Whitener's Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on March 21, 1962, I introduced a bill in the House of Representatives to enable the Secretary of State to make such changes in the higher ranking personnel of the Department of State as he deems advisable. My measure, H.R. 10859, has been referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The Gastonia Gazette, Gastonia, N.C., carried in its issue for March 23, 1962, an editorial entitled "State Department Needs WHITENER's Bill." The editorial is a very fine explanation of the purpose of my bill, and with the thought that my colleagues in the House might find it interesting I request that the editorial be carried in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

STATE DEPARTMENT NEEDS WHITENER'S BILL

Congressman BASIL WHITENER has introduced a bill in the House that would strip high-echelon State Department policymakers of their civil service status.

The bill empowers the Secretary of State to hire and fire high-ranking personnel in the State Department.

The bill would not affect State Department employees who are not concerned with policymaking or administrative officers whose salary is less than $8,000 annually.

One of the biggest gripes about Washington these days is the State Department. Time after time, this country has been caught on the defensive when it seemed that we should have been carrying the ball.

Our foreign policy has been sporadic, erratic, and uneven.

Why?

Congressman WHITENER's bill seems to get at the core of some of the trouble.

There are 14,000 people employed by the State Department. On the whole, no doubt they are able and efficient workers. They come to work, do their job, and go home. These are the drones. These are the workers. These are the "less-than-$8,000"-a-year employees about whom WHITENER was speaking.

The problem that WHITENER would erase is that created by the hangers-on from one administration to another, those policymakers who possibly disagree violently with present administration thinking but who remain on their jobs because of civil service rules.

This business of dealing with foreign countries has become so complex and so demanding that no longer should we play a 20th-century game by 18th-century rules and with 19th-century players.

Dean Rusk, in our opinion, is one of the more capable Secretaries of State that this country has had in recent years. He is intelligent, hard working, conscientious, and able to sum up the most complex problems in less than 4 minutes.

He is not accustomed to the redtape and the engulfing web of official channels through which business must pass before moving from start to finish.

Stewart Alsop, writing in the March 3 issue of the Saturday Evening Post, said: "Even the most trifling matters must be cleared and concurred in to the point of sheer nonsense.

"Not long ago, a couple of influential businessmen wrote the Secretary of State a polite note to the effect that they had been well taken care of by one of the European embassies. The note was referred to the 'country desk' of the country concerned.

"There are now six career officers on that desk. A few years ago, there was one. The lowliest of the six drafted the obvious polite reply, which made its way up to the officer in charge. The draft then went up to the Office of European Affairs where it was concurred in and passed on to the Office of Congressional Relations and the Office of Educational and Cultural Affairs for more initialing. Days later, it arrived back at the Secretary's office. By this time, the Secretary had left for abroad. One of his secretaries, a bright girl, tore up the now massive bundle, wrote the businessmen a polite note and signed it herself. Meanwhile, uncounted man-hours had been wasted."

It is evident from testimony given the House by WHITENER and from the general transaction of State Department business as we have seen it that the system used now denies to men with final responsibility the clear, sharp choices they need to make.

The State Department should be one of the most efficient machines of our Federal bureaucracy. Yet, the sludge within makes it a cumbersome and outmoded vehicle that moves in most cases with the speed of a snail.

We believe that the civil service system is good in most instances, but in this case where top policy is decided a man should be hired or fired according to his ability and according to his response.

His superiors immediately above him would know more about this than the impersonal, all-engulfing machine known as civil service.

We believe that Mr. WHITENER's bill is one of the best introduced in the House in recent weeks. If passed, it could do untold good for this country.

We would recommend heartily its passage.

Need for Preservation of Open Spaces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on March 8 of this year I placed in the Appendix of the RECORD my approval of the Tocks Island project which has been recommended as part of the $591 million Delaware Park plan. At that time I urged that "my colleagues on this distinguished body will approve the detailed plans of the Tock Island project which the administration will submit to us in the very near future." The Camden Courier Post of March 12 wrote an editorial bringing out another aspect of this proposed project and I wish to bring this to the attention of my colleagues. The Courier Post points out that this project which is designed to meet increased demands for water, and control the Delaware's floods as far south as Burlington, N.J., will in fact meet another growing need: the preservation of open spaces. Their editorial I think presents another cogent argument for the eventual passage of this bill and I therefore ask for unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Courier Post's editorial entitled, "More Green Acres."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE GREEN ACRES

In addition to the bright promise that New Jersey's green acres plan holds, much is expected to be gained in the way of recreation areas through the water resources projects of the recently created Delaware River Basin Commission.

It has been urged by the Greater Philadelphia movement among others, to build a 25,000-acre recreation area along the Delaware upstream from the water gap in conjunction with the proposed $90 million Tocks Island Reservoir. The latter is part of a series of reservoirs, including eight major dams and minor storage areas, which the Commission, set up by the four area States and the Federal Government, will construct.

Land acquisition for the Tocks Island Reservoir is to begin soon and will include 60,000 acres ringing the 33-mile-long lake that the projected dam would create. Much of this would be available as a potential public playground.

Thus a project designed to meet increased demands for water and control of the Delaware's floods as far south as Burlington, is expanded to meet another growing need—the preservation of open spaces.

Spending Can Be Worse Than Useless

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Los Angeles Times which appeared on March 16, 1962, urging caution in dispersing foreign aid to the alliance for progress:

SPENDING CAN BE WORSE THAN USELESS

Much is being made of reports that the oligarchs and feudal families of Latin America are not helping to implement economic reforms necessary to the alliance for progress.

However, it would be well not to confuse privileged groups resisting diminution of privilege with those who object to facets of the alliance for progress from a sense of fiscal responsibility.

Informed observers in both North and South America see that the program can be an inflationary, graft-ridden fiasco.

Merely pumping huge sums of money into Latin American countries from the U.S. Treasury does not constitute progress. Nor will it alleviate the poverty and marginal living standards which are the culture medium for communism.

Responsible Latins warn that to turn vast funds over to their politicians without agreed controls is simply asking for an era of graft.

They urge that construction under the program be channeled to private contractors, subject to both careful audits and performance bonds. This seems only prudent, but it is also wise from the standpoint of basic policy.

The United States is the primary advocate of free enterprise as a way of life. Certainly the aid programs we finance in large part should aid at fostering free enterprise, rather than state enterprise. It is inconsistent to preach one and subsidize the other.

Moreover, our postwar experience in handing fat checks to foreign governments under the several aid plans has not been entirely happy. The sudden inflow of U.S. funds has sometimes created inflation that lowered living standards instead of improving the lot of the people we sought to help. This has been particularly true in Asia, where corrupt politicos compounded the harm.

Senate probes have turned up not a few instances of actual harm done with the best intentions.

Latins who know are simply urging that we take minimal precautions to see that the alliance for progress does not become a political gravy train, repeating the damage we have done to existing economies elsewhere without alleviating the social ills we sought to erase.

We would be wise to listen.

Dr. McArdle's Distinguished Career as Chief of the U.S. Forest Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I have the honor and the pleasure to offer for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a fine eulogy to a great public servant, Dr. Richard E. McArdle, who retired this month as Chief of the U.S. Forest Service.

Dr. McArdle served the Federal Government for 39 years. I have know him well. I learned early in my legislative career to respect his work and his decisions, whether I agreed with them or not.

The National Lumber Manufacturers Association gave a retirement luncheon for Dick McArdle on March 15. The executive vice president of that association, Mr. Mortimer B. Doyle, eloquently expressed the feelings of many of us in his address, which I ask unanimous consent be printed in part in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Dick McArdle, in whose honor we meet today, won the many friends and the high regard he enjoys today by hard work, by preparing himself for the heavy burdens he has borne as Chief of the Forest Service. Dick has achieved his distinctive calm through competence. He achieved competence through scholarship, experience, capitalization upon the many challenges which have come his way in a lifetime devoted to forestry.

It is impossible to highlight the career of a man who has won so much respect and so many honors during it.

I learned just a few minutes ago that Dick McArdle has the longest continuous unbroken service as Chief of the Forest Service. One-quarter of his career in the Forest Service itself has been served as its Chief, and for that he should deserve a special hand.

He has served with distinction in every major geographic region of the country and in the three major areas of Forest Service responsibility: management of the national forests, forest research, and State and private relations.

I think perhaps the best measure of a man's contributions to his nation are the recognitions given him by grateful institutions and a grateful government. Let me simply read the honors which have come to Dick McArdle.

He holds honorary degrees from the University of Michigan, his alma mater, and from Syracuse University. He has received the Distinguished Service Award of the Department of Agriculture; the American Forestry Association's Distinguished Service Award for Conservation; the Career Service Award of the National Civil Service League; the New York State College of Forestry Gold Medal for Distinguished Service; the Award for Merit of the Public Personnel Association; the President's Gold Medal for Distinguished Federal Civilian Service; the Rockefeller Public Service Award; and the Silver Buffalo of the Boy Scouts of America.

Recognized and esteemed internationally, he has represented the United States in world conferences and proceedings, has held posts in United Nations organizations, and was a founder of the North American Forestry Commission.

His international reputation and leadership were firmly established in 1960 when, as chairman of the organizing committee of the Fifth World Forestry Congress and head of the U.S. delegation, he was elected president of that Congress.

The Government of Mexico has honored him with the Order of Merit for Forestry of Miguel Angel de Quevedo.

This is the kind of man whose services the U.S. Government is losing through retirement. But it is a retirement, we think, which has been richly earned through a career which will always be an inspiration to young foresters starting out, whether in public or private service.

Dick, the presence of these friends today is evidence of the warm affection all of us in the Congress, in the Forest Service, in other Government activities, and in industry, feel for you. We have valued your friendship, your dedicated service, and your genuine interest in the matters we have explored with you for the betterment of forestry in the United States.

Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in a recent syndicated column, the Honorable Philip A. Ray, former Under Secretary of Commerce, called attention to the fact that America and the principles of representative democracy and free enterprise are losing ground in South America. This is, of course, of the greatest importance to our country and it is important that the attention of America be turned to this situation. I am placing this article in the Appendix of the RECORD to help draw attention to it:

LEFTWARD HO IN LATIN AMERICA

(By Philip A. Ray)

In this first year of the Kennedy administration, the attention of North Americans has been centered on Latin America to an extent never before attained.

It all began with the "alianza para progreso," a Latin America phrase meaning alliance for progress, under which the United States would contribute $20 billion of taxpayers' money to Latin American development over the next 10 years. In part an outgrowth of the Act of Bogotá of the year before, the alliance nevertheless was launched as a fresh attack on Latin America's deepening economic problems. It promised far more money and sought new social reforms in the way of the redistribution of private farms and higher local income taxes.

The administration easily gained congressional approval of this increased foreign aid, although Congress did insist upon a plank—largely without means of implementation, however—to encourage the flow of private (i.e., nongovernmental) investment capital to Latin America.

Now, a year later, how do things stand? Is Latin America stabilizing? Is our stock on the upgrade? How fares our private investment capital in Latin America these days? Unfortunately, the answers are dark and melancholy.

MOVING LEFTWARD

In the political arena, Latin America appears to have moved steadily toward the extreme left this past year, closer and closer to the beartrap of communism:

In Brazil, left-singing Joao Goulart came winging home from Red China in a hurry to assume the vacated Presidency of troubled Brazil, the largest of our southern neighbors.

In Ecuador, intransigent President Velasco Ibarra, left the country and far leftist Arosemena took power after a confused struggle between divided elements of the Ecuadorian military. He publicly espouses the Castro cause.

In the tiny British colony of Guiana, now semi-independent, the Communists came to power at the polls. Apparently, our aid will continue.

At Punta del Este in Uruguay in July, at a hemispheric meeting to iron out details of the Alliance, a team of U.S. aiders led by Secretary of the Treasury Dillon, a transmigrant from the Eisenhower administration, was unable to put across an anti-Communist resolution over Communist opposition spearheaded by Cuba's Che Guevara.

Again at Punta del Este, last month, the so-called Soft Six—Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Bolivia, and Ecuador—abstained from voting upon the principal resolution which would have excluded the present government of Cuba from participation in the Inter-American system. Seventy percent of all Latin Americans live in the Soft Six countries.

SHOVE FROM UNCLE SAM

This leftward movement has been given an occasional leftward push by the United States itself. The chief enhancement came from the solidification of communism in Cuba resulting from the tragic fiasco at the Bay of Pigs last April. This failure, while stirring up old sentiments against intervention in Latin America, deeply discouraged the anti-Communists. Its major effect was to polarize the far left with the Communists.

Our seeming tolerance of communism was given an added if inadvertent emphasis in

President Kennedy's famous interview in November with the Moscow newspaper Izvestia, in which he said:

"Mr. Jagan, who was recently elected Prime Minister in British Guiana, is a Marxist, but the United States doesn't object because choice was made by an honest election, which he won. If the people of any country choose to follow a Communist system in a free election, after a fair opportunity for a number of views to be presented, the United States would accept that."

Time was when we used to worry most about Communists riding to power out of the hills. The story of Mao Tse-tung in China and Castro in Cuba must be stirring stories for Red children. Is this to be replaced by mundane Communist victories at the polls?

Peace Corps Fulfills Urgent Need in Bettering National Understanding—Edward P. Morgan, News Analyst, Gives Compelling Comment on Its Record—Richard L. Lyons Is Quoted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Peace Corps has helped to restore, in many underdeveloped sections of the world, the vision of America as a nation committed to the improvement of life and enhancement of opportunity for all people.

The Congress undoubtedly will approve substantial funds for continuing and developing Peace Corps operations, based on the success which the program has enjoyed. As an original cosponsor of the Senate legislation to establish this group of young "ambassadors," I have been particularly gratified to find that their reception abroad has been one of sincere warmth and gratitude.

In a February 25, 1962, article by its capable staff writer, Richard L. Lyons, the Washington Post said that:

> If customer satisfaction is the test of a product, the Peace Corps * * * currently rates as one of the shining successes of the New Frontier.

Indeed, the response from abroad has been heart warming. In every nation where they are located, our Peace Corps personnel are drawing high praise and being lauded for significant achievements. Their accomplishments have been such that the requests for additional personnel exceed availability as other nations ask for their own Peace Corps missions. Surely, this is an eloquent tribute to the high intelligence and moral capacity of Corps volunteers.

I am sure that the viewers-listeners of the Washington area were impressed by Director R. Sargent Shriver's splendid report on the Peace Corps when he was interviewed as a guest on the Mark Evans television show March 18.

And, on March 16, those of us who listened to the news broadcast of the noted commentator, Edward P. Morgan, heard him add his incisive words of praise.

Mr. Morgan, widely acclaimed and much respected as a news analyst, currently is heard over approximately 213 stations of the American Broadcasting Co. network. He has a rich background in the news reporting field and has frequently been the recipient of meritorious service awards, including the coveted George Foster Peabody Radio News Award, in 1957.

The Peace Corps is to be congratulated for having been recognized, by reason of its capable and useful service, and for having been the recipient of Mr. Morgan's commendation.

Mr. President, I invite the attention of Members to Mr. Morgan's March 16 commentary and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the commentary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Just 1 year old this month, the Peace Corps is by far the bounciest and most promising baby yet spawned on the New Frontier. So astonishing and widely recognized is its initial success that when Director Sargent Shriver went up to Congress on Tuesday to ask for more money the House Foreign Affairs Committee, with praise and without ado, okayed everything he requested and tentatively approved what amounts to a doubling of Peace Corps funds to $63,750,000 and a doubling of its authorized volunteers to 10,000 by August 1963. The Senate was not so quick with its carte blanche and what Shriver finally gets will probably be somewhat less than he wanted but barring catastrophe, the Peace Corps is here to stay.

It is difficult not to become excited about its potential. A year ago it sounded to skeptics like an operation on cloud nine, highly impracticable and loaded with dangers of international incidents involving soft young American innocents equipped with rose-colored glasses and no experience. But except for a mild misunderstanding over a wistfully sincere postcard from Nigeria the record is almost unblemished. With what must be called a touch of genius and a truckload of determination, Shriver and his small staff have recruited a corps with such a blend of tender idealism and tough practicality that it fairly quivers with esprit and ingenuity. It is as if they had tapped some new source of energy, like the discovery of radium.

The Peace Corps is not some magic potion which will banish famine, fear, or war in a trice. But it could and may cause a fundamental change in American ideas about the world and the world's ideas about us. From this reorientation, great things could flow. What is happening is the harnessing of youth's boundless energies and hopes, which have been there all the time, and, before they are pressed into old brittle patterns, letting their freshness play through the purposefulness of teaching and learning in genuine, earthy contacts from people to people. It is working so well that 60 countries have asked for volunteers—Nigeria wants 350 more teachers; U.S. communities with volunteers abroad are getting new ideas back in direct communications from them. Secretary of State Rusk is so impressed that he has indicated, unofficially, that here may be a tremendously valuable new manpower pool for future foreign service officers.

Case histories read like fiction. A girl from Iowa went to the southern Philippines, built a handloom, taught boys and girls to weave fibers of discarded sugar cane stalks, made paintbrushes out of grass, produced colors from natural dyes of jungle plants and now has a productive art class.

A boy from California invented a way to improve the processing of rice in Pakistan. Another volunteer in a Pakistani village so revolutionized its irrigation system that the government whisked him to an agricultural academy to teach the method.

In Colombia, a Peace Corps man, short of steel, used bamboo to reinforce concrete. It worked so well it's now an acceptable, and cheaper, building material.

A southern Negro agronomist in his thirties, Korean veteran with bronze star and purple heart, is helping solve soil problems in Sierra Leone, in West Africa. So is a young Republican wheat farmer from Montana. With its nonpartisan appeal of purposefulness, the Corps has attracted a remarkable number of young Republicans, sometimes over the strenuous objections of their parents who then became converts, in spirit, themselves. Asked why he joined, the Montana farmer replied, "I was just sitting there watching the world go by and worrying and this was the first time anybody had asked me to help."

In Ghana, while Washington and Nkrumah were arguing over money for the Volta River project, the all-Negro faculties of four secondary schools elected four white Peace Corpsmen as their headmasters.

Sometimes whole concepts are uprooted and replaced. The son of a southern county sheriff is working side by side with his best friend in an engineering project in Africa and that newfound best friend is a Negro.

Gradually, painfully, U.S. community concepts are changing, growing. Letters from members of the Peace Corps dispatches about them, homecoming visits by them to hundreds of communities eager to share their human experiences may nudge this process ahead.

But where this revolutionary technique of the simple approach may have its most direct effect is neither on Main Street nor in the jungles of Tanganyika but in the State Department. Diplomats with ivy league degrees are not going to be displaced en masse by raw-boned striplings from the Peace Corps but there is something to be said for the ambassadorial qualifications of the latter when they include a knowledge of the language and a knowledge of the country based on a 2-year hitch in the backlands grappling with primitive but basic problems on ground a chief of mission probably never trod.

Measures are now being discussed by which men and women of the Peace Corps may join the foreign service as a permanent career. If it works out, diplomacy may receive the greatest shot in the arm since the abolition of wigs and kneebreeches.

This is Edward Morgan saying good night from Washington.

Federal Relief Is Trade Bill Hook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial on the President's request for more power, from the Spokesman-Review, of Spokane, Wash., March 18, 1962:

FEDERAL RELIEF IS TRADE BILL HOOK

One of the highly questionable provisions of the Kennedy administration's trade expansion bill (H.R. 9900), which is now the subject of hearings by the House Ways and Means Committee, calls for adjustment assistance.

This is a new highflown phrase for Federal relief payments. They would come in various forms to individuals, to specific firms and to whole industries at the discretion of the President.

The proposed relief payments to American interests which would be injured, because of the lifting or lowering of tariffs, constitute a hook or snare in the administration's attempt to make the complex trade proposals acceptable to the Congress and to a majority of the people.

Mr. Kennedy and his top advisers and administrators are trying to win from Congress some new grants of power for the Presidency. They want wide authority, now vested in Congress, to direct our foreign trade policies and to make new concessions in the encouragement of international commerce. They also want, in an allied field, new authority to make Federal relief grants.

The Kennedy bill actually states that the actions of the President "in determining eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance * * * or in making determinations with respect to extraordinary relief shall be final and conclusive and shall not be subject to review by any court."

This is an astounding power which Mr. Kennedy is seeking from Congress. Whatever the merits of his case for increasing foreign trade with friendly nations abroad, no President should get the sort of blank check for Federal relief that Mr. Kennedy wants in this proposed new Trade Agreement Act.

The National Guard and Disaster Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we are still assessing the total extent of damage caused by the recent storm and floods in New Jersey and other areas of the Atlantic coastline. We are also assessing the contributions made by official agencies, by individuals, and by groups such as the Red Cross.

Mr. Warren Kennet, veteran reporter on military affairs for the Newark, N.J., Evening News has given us a valuable account of the action taken by more than 350 Army National Guardsmen in New Jersey alone. Some of these men worked for 18 hours at a time; they helped evacuate 3,000 men, women, and children from one area. Food and medical supplies were transported, and other services were performed.

Maj. Gen. James Cantwell, chief of staff of the New Jersey Department of Defense, has good reason to be proud of the performance of the men, and so does every citizen of New Jersey. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Kennet's article, which gives a vivid picture of the National Guard at work during time of disaster, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

350 NATIONAL GUARDSMEN USED IN DISASTER RELIEF

(By Warren H. Kennet)

During the $100 million storm along the New Jersey shore the State civil defense department, with the aid of the Army National Guard, evacuated thousands of stranded residents and provided disaster relief for more than a week.

Protection of life and property and the preservation of peace, order and public safety in the States is one of the missions of the National Guard and Maj. Gen. Donald W. McGowan of Trenton, Chief of the National Guard Bureau in the Pentagon, brought this phase of activity into sharp focus in his fiscal year 1961 report to the Congress just released.

More than 350 Army National Guardsmen were ordered into the disaster areas by Maj. Gen. James F. Cantwell, chief of staff of the New Jersey Department of Defense. Operating under the State director of civil defense, they used 174 wheeled vehicles and dozen track-laying armored personnel carriers to bring out of the danger areas more than 7,000 residents, the report shows.

FIRST REAL TEST

It was the first real civilian disaster test for the New Jersey guardsmen since long before World War II but by working as long as 18 hours at a stretch they were able to cut down loss of life and bring food and water supplies to those in need.

When the first calls for assistance came to the Department of Defense, winds up to 60 and 70 miles an hour were whipping the coast line and tides, estimated at 6 feet above flood level, were smashing towering waves on boardwalks and bulkheads.

Cantwell conferred with State Civil Defense Director Thomas S. Digman, and a course of action was set up. The first guardsmen to go into emergency duty were from units of the 112th Field Artillery in the Cape May and Atlantic City disaster areas.

UNITS CALLED

Permanent duty personnel of these units joined by volunteer guardsmen and coordinated by local civil defense, evacuated people and maintained security and fire watches. Elements of Camden's Combat Command A, commanded by Col. William C. Doyle, of Burlington, and composed of guardsmen from Vineland, Bridgeton, Woodbury, Salem, Haddonfield, Mount Holly, and Burlington, also were sent to the stricken areas.

These were backed up in successive days by men from the 50th Armored Division Artillery and the 4th Rocket-Howitzer Battalion from Trenton, the 103d Armor of New Brunswick and Woodbridge, the 5th Reconnaissance Squadron of Westfield, Combat Command B of Orange, Combat Command C of Paterson, the 102d Armored (Essex Troop) Cavalry Regiment of Newark and West Orange.

Also the 2d Howitzer Battalion of Morristown, the 2d Tank Battalion of Red Bank, and the 250th Quartermaster Battalion of Long Branch and Sea Girt. Elements of the 119th Tactical Fighter Squadron of the New Jersey Air Guard and the 141st TFS of McGuire AFB on active duty for the Berlin crisis also sent men.

THREE THOUSAND EVACUATED

The guardsmen evacuated approximately 3,000 men, women, and children from Wildwood, West and North Wildwood, Stone Harbor, Avalon, Sea Isle City, Ocean City, and Strathmere. This included the evacuation of Mercy Hospital in Sea Isle City. Working 48 hours straight the 5th Howitzer Battalion of the 112th Field Artillery evacuated 1,500 persons from the damaged areas of Atlantic City.

High tides in Delaware Bay forced 250 residents of Fortescue and Bivalve to evacuate. They were brought out by men of the 1st and 2d Rifle Battalions of the 114th Infantry and taken in 2½-ton trucks to the Bridgeton Armory where they were provided cots, bedding and food by the Red Cross.

SAVE FIREMEN

Critical medical, food and water supplies were transported by the guard over broken and flooded roads, impassable to all but heavy cross-country trucks with fording capabilities, and tracked armor vehicles.

At one point 10 firemen in Ocean City fighting a fire in the railroad station and an adjacent warehouse were waist deep in water and finally were in danger of drowning.

Lt. David W. Bicknell of Somers Point, commanding officer of Battery C, 6th Howitzer Battalion of the 112th Field Artillery, went to the rescue with an M37 Self Propelled Artillery vehicle and brought them out after battling through 6 feet of water. Bicknell has been cited by the mayor of Ocean City for his act.

Col. Edward B. Thorpe, commander of the 50th Armored Division Trains, with three other guardsmen entered a burning house on Bay Avenue, Long Beach Island, and brought out 81-year-old Ivin H. Bauer. They had been patrolling the area when they saw Mrs. Bauer and she told them her invalid husband was trapped in their burning home.

OTHER SERVICES ON JOB

Navy and Coast Guardsmen with helicopters and small boats also aided in the rescue operations. Navy helicopters picked up evacuees and flew them to Ship Bottom from where they were moved to the mainland and safety by the guardsmen.

General Cantwell and his operations officer, Col. William R. Sharp, made frequent aerial trips along the disaster area for personal inspections and to direct further operations of the guard.

Must We Regulate Patriotism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am submitting an excellent column from Chicago's American, of January 1, 1962.

Writer Dorothy Roe certainly started off the New Year on the right foot. Now, during all the debate on the question of patriotism, it might be well to heed her words.

The column follows:

WHY MUST WE REGULATE PATRIOTISM?

(By Dorothy Roe)

As an American, I would like our President to define just what degree of patriotism is now considered proper.

When are you a superpatriot, a subpatriot, or a traitor? What are the symptoms of extreme patriotism, which he condemns, and how does one go about being just a fair-to-middling patriot, which seems to be the currently approved attitude?

How can a national hero of the stature of former President Eisenhower soberly warn the country against superpatriots? What goes on here, anyway?

Being a somewhat old-fashioned type, I was raised in the belief that patriotism is a fine thing, and that it was not only admirable but expected that any citizen should be ready to give his life for his country.

Now it appears from the public pronouncements of our leaders that it's just as bad to be too patriotic as it is to be too treasonable.

If we accept this strange new reasoning, we must conclude that it is all right to be mildly patriotic or mildly traitorous, just so we carry no belief to extremes.

This half-hearted doctrine actually is being preached with a straight face as the new American ideal for our children to follow. If edited by today's pundits, Patrick Henry's famous cry, "Give me liberty or give me death," would have come out something like this: "Give me liberty if convenient, but please don't think I'm opposed to slavery."

George Washington, following the current line, might have counseled his troops at Valley Forge thus: "Courage men, but not too much. Win if you can, but don't offend the enemy."

I must admit that I am bemused, bothered, and bewildered by a national policy which apparently recommends that we be just a little patriotic around the edges, but ready to retreat hurriedly if criticized.

I have been laboring under the belief that America was founded by passionate patriots, and that every great advance in the history of mankind was accomplished only by complete dedication to an ideal.

Just how would a football team fare, if the coach said: "Get out there and fight, boys, but don't let anyone know which side you're on."

Somehow I can't believe that either President Kennedy or ex-President Eisenhower can be serious when they warn Americans not to be too patriotic. Perhaps each was maneuvered into statements he did not really mean. But if such men can be tricked into words that belie the fundamental principles of liberty, who can be expected to stand firm?

Personally I believe the integrity and commonsense of the American people will prove the ultimate bulwark against such muddled policies.

U.N. Bonds Are Peace Investment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, a recent editorial in the San Francisco Chronicle reports that the public gives signs of being well out in front in supporting the U.N. bond issue. I was pleased to read this. I hope that it will carry some weight in Congress when the matter comes up for a vote. As the Chronicle observes, "Peace has its price."

I ask unanimous consent that the March 11 editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.N. BONDS ARE PEACE INVESTMENT

The public gives signs of being well out in front of Congress in its support of the United Nations. This positive attitude extends also to the proposal that the United States buy $100 million of U.N. bonds to underwrite U.N. peace-keeping operations in the Congo and the Middle East.

Various polls show opinion favorable to the bonds. Why Congress fails to get the message from the public we don't know. Yet the prospect is that the Republicans and some Democrats in the Senate are determined to fight the bond purchase. Its chances in the House are even less bright.

A $200 million fund to pay for the continuation of U.N. peace force is necessary. The General Assembly authorized the bond issue and the United States made a commitment through its delegation to take a share of it. Congress, of course, has the power, through its control of appropriations, to break that commitment. But this would be a tragic blow at the U.N.

And for what good reason? The bonds for which the United States is to subscribe would become a primary obligation of the United Nations, repayable out of the annual dues of the member nations. By this means the Soviet Union and other noncontributors to the Congo and Gaza strip operations would be obliged to pony up their rightful share of the burden.

In the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last week, the $100 million bond-purchase plan narrowly survived on an 8-to-7 vote. It now appears that the Senate's 36 Republicans will favor a substitute plan, possibly the Aiken-Hickenlooper scheme for a straight 2-year emergency loan. The difficulty with this is that it would require getting the General Assembly back into session to authorize it.

Peace has its price. The Senate should be realistic and vote to pay it.

Mr. George T. Daughters and Miss Mary H. Dirigo Honored by Federal Business Association of Detroit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, too often we in Congress and the Nation as a whole take for granted the efforts of those who serve us.

Last week, the Federal Business Association of Detroit honored two of our loyal Federal workers for their valuable contributions at its 10th annual award luncheon.

Named "outstanding Federal administrator the year 1961" was Mr. George T. Daughters, who is director of the Detroit District of the Food and Drug Administration. Mr. Daughters went to work for the FDA in 1927, shortly after his graduation from Whitman College and has worked continuously for FDA since then, except for 3 years in the military service during World War II as a captain. He earned four battle stars and later served as health officer in the Army of Occupation in Germany.

Mr. Daughters began in San Francisco as a chemist and served with the agency in a number of cities until he was selected as district director at the Detroit office.

Chosen as "Federal Employee of the year 1961" was Miss Mary H. Dirigo, who is office staff foreman in the Maintenance Service Division of the Post Office Department in Detroit. She began her Federal service career as a temporary stenographer with the Treasury Department, but that temporary position became a lifetime career of service.

Miss Dirigo has been rated "outstanding" by four different division heads and she has shown great ability and has earned the respect and admiration of her fellow employees.

Investigation of Job Discrimination by Reason of Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, as I noted on the floor, I have today introduced a resolution providing that the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House of Representatives or a duly constituted subcommittee thereof be authorized and directed to study and investigate personnel policies and practices in the Federal service which deny Federal employment to individuals because of age and which tend to discriminate against our older civil service employees.

I think we should be mindful that almost 800,000 of our 2.4 million employees are 50 or older. Of the total Government work force, an estimated 27 percent are 50 and over and 9 percent are 60 and over. In the overwhelming majority of these cases the employees are longtime career workers in whom our Nation has a large financial investment and whose contributions to the efficient and effective operation of our Government cannot be overstated.

I am aware that the Civil Service Commission has issued a policy statement with respect to the utilization of the services of older workers in the Federal Government. However, this policy is not an affirmative declaration nor does it prevent discrimination against the older employees in many parts of our Government service. The heads of a few departments and agencies such as the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have issued instructions to their subordinates requiring that positive steps be taken to make certain that there is no discrimination against the older worker in connection with job opportunities.

It is unfortunate that the affirmative policies of these two Departments and agencies do not extend to the Government as a whole.

I am aware of present law which provides that:

No part of any appropriation in any Act on or after June 27, 1956, shall be used to pay the compensation of any officers or employees who establish a requirement of maximum age for entrance into positions in the competitive civil service: *Provided*, That no person who has reached his seventieth birthday shall be appointed in the competitive civil service on other than a temporary basis.

While this prohibition appears effective on its face, nevertheless, I am informed that there are many violations of the spirit and intent of this provision of law. While it may be true that in the vast majority of civil service examinations, there is no age limit, as a practical matter appointing officers exercise their appointing prerogatives and in effect deny employment to many well-qualified persons who are above 45 solely because of age.

The introduction of my resolution should not be construed as a criticism of our Government's present policies with respect to the older worker. The purpose of my resolution is to provide authority for our committee to study and to explore ways and means as to how we may carry out a more affirmative Federal program to recognize and to utilize the experience, services, talents and abilities of our older citizens both in and out of Government.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not take up the time of my colleagues by discussing instances in which our older people have been denied Federal employment or have been separated in reductions in force through no fault of their own and who are unable to know how to proceed to secure other Government positions. There are a number of these cases and they occur frequently as our Government programs and activities are changed and reorganized. It is unfortunate and grossly unfair, as well as a disservice to the people of our Nation, to permit the vast human resources, represented by our qualified and experienced older people to remain unutilized in these critical years.

The Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Peace Corps is nearly 1 year old and in that time it has attracted a great deal of comment. The Newark Evening News of March 5 has written one of the most perceptive editorials that I have read on the subject. They state that the "Peace Corps appears to be one of these rare investments in low-budget diplomacy that is paying substantial dividends." Other well-informed commentors of our political scene have expressed the same feeling. I commend the Newark Evening News for their insight and their plea for caution in the expansion of the Corps. "Wholesale expansion" could destroy the very foundations of the Corps, which matches people of high abilities with jobs that have exacting standards.

I ask for unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial "So Far So Good."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SO FAR SO GOOD

The Peace Corps appears to be one of those rare investments in low-budget diplomacy that is paying substantial dividends. Even if Congress doubles its appropriations, as requested by President Kennedy, the Corps will be training or fielding 6,700 workers for less than $64 million a year. On the basis of the first year's results, that's a bargain.

Effectiveness of the experiment can be measured by the fact that all 12 countries that received volunteers have requested more. Ghana, which the Soviet Union has taken great pains to subvert, wants 70 additional schoolteachers for a total of 121. That in itself is quite a testimonial.

Aside from the good will represented abroad, there is future value for this country in the experience corpsmen are gaining among other peoples. Our schools certainly can benefit from their services when they return.

Wholesale expansion of the Peace Corps could be self-defeating since its success depends on careful matching of skills and dispositions to requirements in strange places. But so long as it holds to the high standards set by its present directorship, it deserves every encouragement.

Thousands Added When Cuts Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the March 16 Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review, about the increasing number of Federal employees:

THOUSANDS ADDED WHEN CUTS NEEDED

Reliable reports from Washington have indicated that Federal civilian jobs have been increased by more than 70,000 during President Kennedy's first year in office and that his expansionist plans call for the hiring of about 100,000 additional jobholders during the coming fiscal year.

These figures are significant in view of Senator HENRY M. JACKSON's statement this week that "our Government has too many people in it doing work that does not really need doing."

Mr. JACKSON also told a National Civil Service League audience that "more people make for more layering, more clearances and concurrences, and more trespasses on the time of officials working on important problems.

"The size of many Government offices has swelled beyond any real requirement. Some offices would operate more efficiently with one-third or one-half as many people."

What Mr. JACKSON says agrees with the findings of the Hoover Commission on governmental reorganization of some years ago. He is not stating anything particularly new in this respect. What is surprising is the fact that the Kennedy administration is adding thousands of Federal positions to the payroll at a time when there is need for total reductions.

Mr. Kennedy himself campaigned with a promise to reduce the size of the White House staff. He made sport of Mr. Eisenhower's need for a big crew in the executive office of the President. Since he has occupied that office, Mr. Kennedy has jumped the White House staff from 416 to 439 persons—to say nothing of the hundreds of other jobs he has created in department agencies to serve the top echelons of the New Frontier bureaucracy.

And if Senators like JACKSON become urgently concerned about overstaffing and overlapping they can find ways to withhold or curtail appropriations for Federal offices which could operate more efficiently with one-third or one-half as many people.

Proposed New Tariff Act With Reference to Pacific Northwest Lumber Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD a somewhat condensed statement of my testimony on the proposed new tariff bill, H.R. 9900, which is presently being considered by the House Committee on Ways and Means. This testimony has particular reference to the Pacific Northwest lumber industry which is suffering from Canadian lumber imports.

I have long believed that the exchange of surplus goods between nations is common gain and I fully support the objectives of the administration's proposal, but I would oppose any provision which represented more abdication on the part of the legislative branch of its constitutional power and responsibility. Likewise, to interject Government planning and direction with subsidies to recompense domestic industry for injury on account of tariff reductions, in my opinion would be unwise. Nor should the retraining of employees be treated as separate from other vocational legislation already on the statute books.

Limiting myself then to lumber and lumber products, I should like to say first that we have a sick lumber industry in my State of Washington and other Northwest States. The causes of this condition are many and frankly the matter of tariffs is only one.

The statement follows:

Canadians through the British Empire preference have taken over a once substantial customer of Great Britain and, meanwhile, on account of lower costs now enjoy the bulk of the U.S. Atlantic market. The crippling effects of this low-cost foreign competition are due, as I said, to many factors. This constantly increasing competition has been so serious that quotas and/or higher tariffs have been studied although admittedly both are fraught with complications involving our whole trade relationship with Canada.

In the great forested areas of the Northwest, 60 percent of our working people are dependent upon the forest products industry for their livelihood.

My own State of Washington is one of the major lumber-producing States of our Nation, specializing in softwood production.

Practically all of our softwood lumber imports are from Canada. In 1961, Canadian lumber imports were substantially in excess of the entire production of Washington State. Since practically all of our softwood imports are from Canada, these imports are directly competitive wtih the lumber produced in my State.

It is for this reason that the people in my part of the country are extremely disturbed by the fact that during the past year approximately 4 billion board feet of Canadian lumber has found its way across the border into our markets. This is an increase of more than 70 percent in the past 10 years, and almost a 900-percent increase since 1935.

The tremendous increase in Canadian imports has naturally depressed the economy of the Northwest, where it is roughly estimated that some 300,000 people have been adversely affected. Almost all of the distressed labor areas in the Northwest are those which are dependent on a prosperous lumber economy.

During the past few years, approximately 100 lumber mills, both large and small, in the Douglas fir region alone have ceased operations, attributing their closing down mainly to this large influx of Canadian lumber imports.

In this same region, over 600 million board feet of lumber production was lost during the past year by U.S. lumber mills. This amounts to a loss of 66 million man-hours, or 8,325,000 workdays, which have been denied the labor force in our Northwest lumber region. This is certainly a critical loss to the Northwest communities which are dependent on the forest products industries for their survival.

About 30,657 Washingtonians are employed in sawmilling, logging, and planing, the activities directly affected by foreign cost differentials. This figure was about 15,000 higher a decade ago. Total woodworking employment in Washington is about 65,000 and the whole of the woodworking industry, of course, feels the impact of the favored treatment afforded Canadian competitors.

As long as the Pacific Northwest forest products industry operates under handicaps, unemployment can be expected to remain acute in many western Washington communities.

The American lumber industry cannot meet Canadian competition for, besides the many advantages granted Canadian lumber producers by their Government, the Canadians have lower wage rates, lower shipping rates, and advantageous rail shipping privileges which give them a favored competition position over American producers.

Personally, as I said earlier, I greatly fear compensatory legislation to assist industrial plants adversely affected by imports to transfer productive facilities into other types of business activity. This method could cause a wave of overproduction in areas not presently harmed by foreign competition. It could lead to Government planning and control. It could lead to political maneuvering.

Rather, I would urge substituting international agreements as the chief instrument to prevent disruption of an industry before rather than after the damage is done.

I would support a form of "disaster insurance" so that after the Tariff Commission finds injury to domestic industry and employment, the President could elect, and so report to the Congress, to enter into an international agreement with the country concerned with respect to exports to the United States for the purpose of eliminating the disruption caused by such imports. The Tariff Commission could make recommendations as to any limit and quantity and type of goods to be imported to stabilize the domestic market. The President could be authorized to seek an agreement unless the Congress opposes it by concurrent resolution.

If a satisfactory international agreement, for any reason, cannot be reached, then I would favor requiring the Tariff Commission to recommend duty and quota adjustments which would be mandatory on the President.

This latter provision would give the President a strong position on which to negotiate a voluntary international agreement.

In conclusion, let me say I was heartened to learn that the domestic lumber industry has taken an affirmative step to amicably resolve its import problems with Canada. A press release which came to my attention last Friday indicates that the industry has proposed a novel approach to the Canadian import problem. Under the industry's proposal, present United States and Canadian softwood lumber tariffs would be repealed, permitting duty-free entry of shipments to each country until total imports equaled 10 percent of the annual domestic consumption. A duty of 10 percent would then be imposed on the value of each import shipment in excess of 10 percent of total domestic consumption. I firmly believe that this proposal is worthy of the consideration of Congress and the President.

This problem is so urgent in the Northwest that relief from unfair Canadian competition must be immediately provided, if the economy of our domestic lumber regions is to be preserved.

Another Salute to Majority Leader Carl Albert, of Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the Saturday Evening Post of this week contains a well-written and highly readable salute to a distinguished colleague who is serving with great distinction as our majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma, CARL ALBERT.

Every Oklahoman is proud of the high honor extended to our State and its distinguished native son by his selection as leader by the Democratic Members of the House, and we are pleased by the Post's friendly recognition of Congressman ALBERT's outstanding record and qualities of leadership.

Because of his growing national stature and the widespread interest of Americans everywhere in Congressman ALBERT's background and character, I have obtained permission to place John M. Virden's excellent article in the RECORD.

The article follows:

LITTLE GIANT FROM BUG TUSSLE

(By John M. Virden)

Congressman CARL ALBERT walked briskly into his picture-lined office on Capitol Hill shortly after noon on January 10 of this year, and almost fell through a huge floral map of Oklahoma. This fragrant message of congratulations to the newly elected majority leader was fashioned from 2,000 white chrysanthemums, bordered in mistletoe (State flower). It had been delivered while Albert was in the well of the House being installed in the No. 2 position in the leadership of the Democratic Party in the House of Representatives.

When the stumpy, readheaded politician regained his balance, he plucked off a telegram that came with this wall of blooms. It read: "Congratualtions, CARL. We know how far you have come."

CARL ALBERT has indeed come a long way, starting from an ugly little country schoolhouse called by the improbable name of Bug Tussle. It was almost exactly 45 years from the day he first made up his mind to be a Congressman until he was sworn in as floor leader of his party in the House.

Like almost everything else that has happened to ALBERT, the majority leader's job was gained the hard way.

The death of Speaker Sam Rayburn last November threw the Democrats into disarray. A group from the ultraliberal wing of the party seemed to reason the House leadership was up for grabs.

Front runner in the move to unhorse acting Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK and acting Majority Leader ALBERT—or both—was Representative RICHARD BOLLING, from Kansas City, Mo., a member of the powerful Rules Committee. BOLLING is an articulate intellectual liberal who left the classroom to run for Congress in 1948, and has been there since.

BOLLING's first pitch, a cautious one, was at the Speaker's chair, under the mistaken assumption that President Kennedy would lend support to head off the almost certain election of fellow Bostonian MCCORMACK to the powerful position. When the President firmly declined to interfere, the Missourian went after the majority leadership.

Long friendly to both BOLLING and ALBERT, the Chief Executive again refused to lift a finger to influence the outcome of the leadership fight. But former President Harry S. Truman, who resides in BOLLING's district, gave his blessing to Bolling's effort. The Americans for Democratic Action (ADA) flocked around him. They were joined by stray Democrats of like views, and some who simply wanted a change in the moderate leadership. It is impossible to say how many Members backed BOLLING; anywhere from 80 to 115 were claimed at one time or another as sure votes.

In newspapers and on television BOLLING made a case for himself, depicting ALBERT as lacking sufficient drive to push the Administration's $92,500 million program through the legislative mill. He gave a number of interviews and appeared on a national television panel program. On the other hand, ALBERT worked quietly from his small, cluttered office in the old post office building in McAlester, Okla., making no splash in the press, or on television. A few days after Mr. Rayburn's funeral, ALBERT sent telegrams and letters and made phone calls to every Democratic House Member saying simply that he was a candidate for majority leader and asking their support. When the replies came back, ALBERT had the required 131 votes in the bag, with some to spare.

Six days before the party caucus, DICK BOLLING quit the contest with the pathetic remark, "I haven't got a chance." He was right. His support had withered as the countdown neared.

The beginning of ALBERT's political ambitions came one January day in 1917. Representative Charles D. Carter, a five-eights Chickasaw Indian who had been Congressman from Oklahoma's far-eastern district since statehood, came to Bug Tussle, made a speech and handed out some packets of seed to the kids.

"I suppose you'd have had to hear Charley Carter speak to understand this," ALBERT says. "He had snow-white hair, and that gift of the American Indian for oratory. I made up my mind I was going to be a Congressman just like Mr. Carter." Thirty years later ALBERT was elected Congressman from the same district Charley Carter had represented.

When ALBERT, all 5-feet-4 and 130 pounds of him, in a blue-serge suit, strode down the aisle of the House for the first time, he was an immensely proud young man. As he approached his assigned seat, a veteran Republican Member, mistaking him for a page, beckoned to him. The Congressman-elect stuck out his hand in his best campaign manner, and the older solon laid a sheaf

of papers in it, saying, "Son, take these over to my office."

Without a word ALBERT carried the documents over to the House Office Building, then ran back to the Capitol in time to answer "present" when the clerk called his name, preparatory to the swearing-in ceremony of the 80th Congress.

From the ludicrous initiation Congressman ALBERT might have been put down among the numerous one-gallus characters the 46th State has elected to office since its admission to the Union on November 16, 1907. True, he was born in a log cabin, May 10, 1908, and he walked the usual 2 miles to a country school until he finished the first 8 grades. Also, in the best political traditions, he grubstaked himself to an education by doing menial chores. But right there—unless you count the fact that CARL ALBERT is as disarmingly friendly as a limber-tailed hound pup—all similarity between him and the run-of-the-cotton-patch type of politician stops. Far from being a smooth-politicking rube, ALBERT can list three college degrees after his name, two of them from Oxford. He had traveled widely in Europe, North Africa, and the Pacific area before he came to Congress.

Democrats in Congress sometimes refer to his as "the Little Giant from Little Dixie" and compare him to Abe Lincoln's political rival, Stephen A. Douglas. But down in "Lapland"—where Arkansas and Texas "lap" over into Oklahoma—the voters in his district are more likely to call him "the Little Giant from Bug Tussle."

ALBERT's district is made up of a tier of 13 counties in Oklahoma's southeast corner. In it live 227,692 people—farmers, ranchers, oilfield workers, lumberjacks, sawmill hands, small tradesmen and the like. Most of the members of the Choctaw Indian Tribe live in that area. Bounded on the north by the meandering and beautiful Arkansas River, it stretches down to the brick-colored Red River. There it faces Sam Rayburn's old domain on the Texas side.

It is a rough piece of Oklahoma, any way you look at it, and the poorest. Per capita income in Pushmataha—called "Shove" by the natives—County is about $700 per year, or roughly one-third the national average. As a banker at Antlers put it, "This is one of the few places where old-age pensioners belong to the country-club set." Income is a little lower in nearby Johnston County, but a good deal higher in more industrialized Pittsburg and Carter Counties.

The rugged Kiamichi and Winding Stair Mountains cover almost half the district. This is open range land where thousands of cattle roam at will, and seem to prefer bedding down in the middle of the public roads. If you hit one, you have bought yourself a cow. Cattle have the right-of-way even when they are sound asleep. One grizzled old rancher near Tuskahoma told this reporter, "What I like about this country is that I can drive my cattle from here to Mena, Ark. (64 miles), and never have to get off my horse and open a damn wire gate."

Millions of acres of virgin timber and second-growth pine forests flourish in these wild mountains, supporting the biggest single industry in that section of the State, the giant Dierks Lumber Co. There is little love lost between the lumber combine and the small ranchers who pasture their herds in the forest leased to or owned by the Dierks Co.

How many wildcat stills have operated in these mountains the Internal Revenue Service won't even guess. Now that legal liquor has come to traditionally dry Oklahoma, the number of moonshiners is smaller, but there is still a ready market for their corn whisky, called "3 hours in the fence corner," guaranteed to make a man "feel single and see double in 20 minutes flat."

Bug Tussle is only a white clapboard, two-room rural schoolhouse, 6 miles due north of McAlester. It is set in an acre of lumpy Bermuda grass and boasts a storm cellar big enough to hold the entire student body. Bug Tussle has changed little in the past 50 years. From 1915 to 1923 CARL was usually in the classroom at Bug Tussle when he was not in a cotton patch 1 mile north. His 8 years in the country school fashioned his personality somewhat more than did the 7 years he spent in universities. ALBERT has never lost the demeanor of the gifted country boy who walked to school dreaming of going to Congress, and some day rising to be a power in the land.

Ernie and Leona (Scott) Albert had five children—four sons and a daughter, all living. CARL is the eldest. Mrs. Albert, a gentle woman with an iron will, who encouraged her children to be somebody in this world, was a bedridden invalid for several years before her death in 1936. Ernie Albert lived to see his eldest son sworn in as a Congressman in 1947.

In 1923 the Alberts left the farm and moved into a small house on the edge of McAlester so the eldest son could attend high school. Ernie Albert went to work full time in the coal mines. CARL's bookish habits soon put him on the school's honor roll. After classes he did odd jobs, practiced debate speeches, and developed a thundering oratorical style. He was president of the student assembly by his senior year.

In 1927 he and Louis Dakil, now an Oklahoma doctor, won the national high school debating team championship. Later ALBERT placed third in the national oratorical contest sponsored by the Associated Press. His subject: "The Constitution of the United States." The prize was a 3-month trip to Europe. In England he saw the tall spires of Oxford and set his heart on going there.

Ernie Albert, tenant farmer turned coal miner, told his ambitious son that if he meant to get a college education, he would have to do it on his own. When young ALBERT enrolled in the University of Oklahoma that autumn he had $10 left after paying his fees. By sundown he had a job that provided room and board. During his 4 years at the university, ALBERT was a waiter, a sodajerk, a drycleaning solicitor, and a tutor.

In his fresh man year CARL latched on to more money than he had ever seen before—$1,500 as first prize in the national collegiate oratorical contest—and made the university debating team. With a speech on world peace he won the national collegiate oratory title in 1929. He joined Kappa Alpha social fraternity, and plunged into student politics as leader of the antiadministration party. The young man from Bug Tussle was moving fast.

ALBERT's college speech teacher recalls "his absolutely unshakable mental poise." But a fraternity brother at Oklahoma says his knack of making the short, hard words hit like a flail came from much practice, rather than born genius. He drilled himself under the Canadian River bridge some miles south of the campus. A friend would go along with him, usually at night, to listen and to heckle him. As ALBERT practiced by blasting his speeches across the dry sandbar, his companion would mutter rebuttals, yank his necktie, unlace his shoes or throw sand at him.

On graduation day at the University of Oklahoma in July 1931, CARL ALBERT was president of the university student council, wore a Phi Beta Kappa key and had been selected as a Rhodes scholar. The late Dr. William B. Bizzell, then president, called him "the brightest mind that ever passed through this university." Those spires of Oxford were visible from Norman, Okla., that day.

On the ship passage to England, Albert met two other bright young Rhodes scholars—Dean Rusk, now Secretary of State, and Fowler Hamilton, now Director of the International Development Administration.

During his years at Oxford, ALBERT used the long English weekends and his vacations to tour Britain, the Continent, North Africa and the Middle East. In the House of Commons he listened for hours to the deliberations and speeches of the British lawmakers.

The nadir of the depression lay on Oklahoma in 1934. A parching drought had turned half the State into a vast dust bowl and had driven thousands from the State. That year CARL ALBERT came home from Oxford, flat broke. His English law degrees didn't impress prospective employers. There were many well-educated young men on WPA or in CCC camps.

His ambition to run for Congress gnawed at him, but there was the matter of money to finance a campaign. So ALBERT took the first job he could get, as an office clerk in Oklahoma City. Two years later he switched over to the legal staff of an oil company and stayed in that job until 1941, when he volunteered for the U.S. Army, and went to Camp Polk, La., as a private in the 3d Armored Division. He spent 9 months in the ranks before the commanding general decided the diminutive lawyer might do something other than wrangle heavy tanks, and recommended him for a direct commission. There followed a fast brushup on military law at the Army's Judge Advocate General School.

ALBERT reported to the Pentagon, wearing shiny new captain's bars, early in 1942.

"So he'p me, there wasn't another unmarried man in that whole office," says pretty Mary (Harmon) Albert, "but I saw CARL's two-oh-one file before he arrived. When he walked in to report, I tol' the other girls, 'Now, you stan' back and stop droolin' 'cause this one is mine, he's jus' mah size.' "

Mary Harmon, of Columbia, S.C., was then 21, stood 5 feet, wore a size 7 dress and was a Pentagon clerk. In no time she had captivated the captain.

On August 20, 1942, Miss Mary Harmon and Capt. CARL B. (for BERT, a name he loathes) ALBERT were married in the old Lutheran Church of the Reformation at Columbia. They had a year together in crowded, frantic wartime Washington before he went off to the war in the Pacific. Mary returned to South Carolina to finish college.

Thirty-three months later Lieutenant Colonel ALBERT came home again with a fine fruit salad of medal and campaign ribbons stitched over his left breast pocket. He had a small wad of money saved from his pay, and a deep desire to go home and run for Congress.

Two older lawyers told ALBERT to move in with them and they would toss him a few cases until he could get started. But he had not tried many cases when the late Congressman, Paul Stewart, decided his health would not stand another campaign. When Stewart withdrew in 1946, ALBERT jumped into the race.

There were six Democratic hopefuls in the primary. For one of the few times in his life, ALBERT was knocked back on his heels. Bill Steger of Durant bested him by more than 3,000 ballots. But no one had a clear majority, and the two recently discharged war veterans battled it out in a runoff. ALBERT beat Steger by 391 votes. Later that fall he waltzed over his Republican opponent. In 1948 he beat his Democratic rivals by a comfortable margin and won the general election by 6 to 1. In 1950 he enjoyed a politician's dream—no opposition.

Then came 1952, and ALBERT's primary battle was a real shindy. There he faced State Senator Kirksey Nix, a big, popular, blue-jawed lawyer, handsome as a race horse.

"For a while I had Bug Tussle's pride treed right on top of his well-worn stump," says NIX, now a judge of the Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals. "But in the last 2 weeks of the campaign he laid the lash of that Biblical oratory on me. I don't see why folks call that guy 'little.' He's just wound up real tight. When he talks, he commences to unwind, and before he shuts up, he's 10 feet tall."

Election-night tallies gave ALBERT every county. The elections of 1954, 1956, 1958, and 1960 were easy ones for ALBERT. Though he always campaigned as though he were running against a dozen men, he had only token opposition or none at all.

A few days after his reelection in 1954, Speaker Sam Rayburn told ALBERT he had been picked as the Democratic whip of the House, a position he was to hold for the next 7 years.

When the venerable Mr. Sam was asked why the little-known ALBERT was picked for a key slot in the party organization, he said, "There's nothing peculiar about it. * * * CARL has tact and energy, intelligence, education, and a sense of responsibility. And mind you, sir, these things don't always go together. I've been watching House Members since Woodrow Wilson's administration and I can tell big timber from small brush."

The term "whip" is a misnomer when applied to CARL ALBERT. ALBERT's forte is persuasion, and the uncanny ability to "sense the temper" of the House in much the same way Mr. Rayburn could. One longtime colleague says that ALBERT is "close to being another Sam Rayburn, but with more hair and an Oxford education."

The new majority leader of the House is not likely to be mistaken for a page now. For one thing, he is about 30 pounds heavier than he was in 1947. Short, compact, he has a big head that looks as though it might have been stuck on as an afterthought. He has a long upper lip and a hard jaw which give him a perpetually solemn look one Washington wag described, with more candor than kindness, as the mien of a worried teddy bear.

Politically he is harder to classify. Generally he is a progressive-moderate, a middle-roader who fights for anything he believes will help farmers, cattlemen, or public schools. Labor, veterans, and the Department of Defense count him as a dependable and able friend on the Hill. Those who have worked closely with him say ALBERT is probably the congressional champ at resisting pressure groups.

"Maybe I'm not original in my beliefs," ALBERT says, "but a public servant must have a mind and will of his own, or he'll wind up little more than an errand boy. Hear all sides, sure, but he must do what he feels is right—even when it does not jibe with popular demand. If I felt otherwise, I'd be ashamed of myself and would get out of politics."

On Washington's feverish cocktail circuit the Alberts are almost strangers, attending only the must functions and a few of the soirees at the embassies. Though he neither drinks nor smokes and is a slow hand with the small chatter, ALBERT enjoys these gatherings because they allow him to practice his Spanish and French.

Most of the time he works 6 days out of 7 on Capitol Hill, but tries to get home in time for a leisurely dinner with Mary and their two children. Their daughter Mary Frances is 14 and David Ernest is a bouncy lad of 7.

In Washington the Alberts live in a rented brick house at 4614 Reno Road. They own a small frame home at 827 East Osage Street in McAlester and live there during the months Congress is not in session. In Washington or in McAlester, Sundays are strictly reserved for church and the family. No politics. After services at the Methodist church, there is dinner at home. Sunday afternoons and evenings are devoted to "whatever Mary and the children want to do."

CARL ALBERT is too much of a practical politician to make calculated guesses about his future, other than to say that is up to the people of the Third Oklahoma District. His affection for "this House" is evident to anybody who talks to him for even a few minutes. There is no doubt that he is exactly where he wants to be, and he expects to stay there.

An enthusiastic friend of CARL who has known him since they were boys told this reporter: "CARL's time was bound to come. Far too many cowboys, plowboys, and prairie yodelers and several other kinds of political freaks get elected to high office. Maybe his popularity year after year and now his election as majority leader in the House indicate a trend toward higher quality men in the important places in the Government. The good Lord knows I hope so."

Danger on the Left

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Harry J. Baker, 1412 West Main Street, Crawfordsville, Ind., has brought to my attention a very significant article printed recently in the Saturday Evening Post.

This article by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, outlines the very obvious and imminent danger to our country from the radicals of the left who are presently secured in many high places of importance in our Government.

With consent, I present Senator GOLDWATER's article in its entirety.

The article follows:

DANGER ON THE LEFT

(By Senator BARRY GOLDWATER)

The real danger to our country in these days of crisis does not come from the right side of the political spectrum, but from a direction more closely alined with Communist objectives. It does not come from military commanders, like Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker, who want to make sure their troops and the American people are informed of the true nature of our enemy, but from forces which would deny such instruction. It does not come from patriotic Americans who wish to remain vigilant to the threat of internal communism and to Socialist trends, but from people who would blunt that vigilance.

Today a great many military officers, organizations and individuals have been alerted by events. They have been taught by shocking experience. They have been goaded by official indifference to the true dangers which face us in a particularly perilous time.

To argue that our troops do not need ideological information is a waste of time when such an argument is presented to military commanders who remember the disgraceful spectacle of American soldiers embracing communism in Korea. It is pointless to insist that there is no threat from domestic Communists when the audience is made up of people who remember the damage done by the atomic spy rings—the Alger Hisses, the Dexter Whites, the Rosenbergs, the Fuchs, the Sobels and the Greenglasses. It goes against the American grain to be told there is no internal threat from communism while FBI Chief J. Edgar Hoover and others in positions to know tell us otherwise.

No, I believe the great threat, the real danger to our Nation, to our way of life and to the cause of freedom throughout the world comes from the leftists in our midst who even today counsel a "soft" attitude toward communism, both at home and abroad.

I believe it comes from the muddle-headed "do-gooders," from the intellectual theorists, from the appeasers and the "accommodators," from the professional collaborationists and pacifists. It comes from organizations like the Americans for Democratic Action, whose 1961 policy statement reads like a brief for Red China and Castro's Cuba, and the American Civil Liberties Union, which would like Americans to think that the Senate Internal Security Committee and the House Un-American Activities Committee are more dangerous than Soviet espionage agents.

I feel we have here both a right and a duty to question the influence wielded by the radical leftist ADA in the councils of the U.S. Government. According to newspaper accounts, this strange organization has no less than 37 members in key policymaking positions of the New Frontier—despite the fact that its nationwide membership is less than 50,000. As Robert T. Hartmann, writing in the Los Angeles Times, puts it:

"When any 14-year-old organization numbering no more than 50,000 citizens, with a budget of less than $200,000 a year, regarded as an albatross by many Democrats and as anathema by most Republicans, holding no I. O. U. from the presidential winner for his nomination—when such an organization can staff a new administration with 3 White House aids, 3 Cabinet officers, and 31 key administrators in vital areas of finance, labor, civil rights, public works, power, housing, and foreign policy, it is worth looking into."

And looking into this organization, we find that in 1961 it called for total disarmament under United Nations controls, the inclusion of Red China in nuclear talks, an immediate start on negotiations for U.S. recognition of Red China and the latter country's admission to the United Nations as "China" with a Security Council veto, and a plebiscite on Formosan independence or reunion with Red China. We also find that ADA advocates removal of all U.S. trade and passport barriers with Red China, wants less stress on military aid for free Asia, urges a neutral Laos as part of a buffer zone.

People who suggest such actions would let us lose the global struggle by default. It is the leftists in our midst who rigorously oppose any use of force, or any show of strength in a conflict where our antagonist understands only the element of power. These leftists support an intense internationalist propaganda line which downgrades American patriotism as something smacking of "isolationism" and foreign-policy adolescence. We are told by none other than Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, that the victories of our early history—the victories won by determined, hardbitten men against stupendous odds, were products of our "reckless youth" when we were favored by an "improbable run of luck." We also are told by Senator FULBRIGHT that we must "come of age" in the world and devote our time to "civilizing international relations" rather than striving for victory over an enemy bent on the destruction of the United States and the enslavement of the entire world.

On the left also are the forces which, in the interest of "accommodation," suggest that we junk our opposition to the admission of Red China to the United Nations, that we

forswear our policy of "massive retaliation"—the only shield we have in practical terms against annihilation by the forces of international communism.

It is the leftists who argue against the development of a national purpose of victory over the forces of international communism. It is the leftists who have saddled us with an outmoded, weak-kneed foreign policy which has proved to the tune of almost $100 billion that the promotion of social and economic reform on a worldwide basis is not a realistic means of stemming the Communist tide.

This indictment is not mine alone. To reinforce it I quote an enlightened liberal, writing in a liberal magazine. His name is Eric Sevareid, and this is what he had to say in an article titled "The Facts of Life" which appeared recently in Reporter magazine:

They [the Communists] must love the large school of American liberals who assume that any given country, however barren and illiterate, however profound its background of violence and chieftainship, is capable not only of economic modernization but of parliamentary democracy.

"They must love the liberals with social worker mentalities who do not grasp that illiteracy, low wages, concentrated landownership, and so on are not social problems but integral parts of a system of life and therefore enormously resistant to quick change by anything less than the totalitarian disciplines the same liberals abhor."

Mr. Sevareid warns his liberal-leftist friends that frightened people in desperate countries want to be on the winning side in the current East-West struggle, not necessarily on the moral side. And he tells them that the United States must start fighting and winning, regardless of reproving editorials in the Manchester Guardian and "no matter what the temporary backlash of world opinion may be."

There can be no denying that all of the winds of appeasement blow from the left. On that side of the political spectrum reside the voices which interminably counsel negotiation in nonnegotiable situations where discussion would only lead to the sacrifice of our own or our allies' strategic interests.

It was the spokesman on the left who hailed the rise of Castro in Cuba and obscured his early Communist dedication. They have also been in the forefront of those who today claim that any direct action in Cuba would offend opinion in other Latin American countries. Never mind a Communist bastion only 90 miles off our southern coast, they contend, because this is preferable to hurting somebody's feelings. And, of course, the left wing in American politics certainly sparked the ridiculous and ill-fated effort to submit to Castro's prisoner-tractor deal.

One of the traps the leftist minded have led us into in foreign relations is the development of an official preoccupation with so-called neutral nations. Only in the light of the Soviet Union's resumption of nuclear testing and the failure of the neutral nations, while meeting in Belgrade, to do anything but bring pressure on the West are we beginning to wake up. The Soviets have long understood that the first step in turning a country toward communism is to turn it against the West. Thus, typically the first stage of a Communist takeover is to neutralize, while in fact turning the country into an active advocate and adherent of Soviet policy.

The Kremlin's goal is the isolation and capture not of Ghana but of the United States—and this purpose may be served very well indeed by countries that masquerade under a "neutralist" mask, yet actually are dependable auxiliaries of the Soviet Foreign Office. What difference does it make if a neutralist chieftain is not a disciplined Communist so long as his public policies and intrigues help to accelerate Soviet ascendancy?

Another favorite misconception of the American leftists is an exaggerated belief in the existence and power of world opinion—which never seems to call Russia to any stern account for her transgressions, but which constantly puts pressure on us to ease international tension. Leftists apply this world-opinion concept to everything the United States does or proposes, despite the fact that the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) reports that 70 percent of the world's population lives without knowing what is going on either at home or abroad. In their preoccupation the leftists fail to recognize the fact that the Communists themselves—our devoted enemies—formulate a large part of what passes as world opinion.

There are many reasons why this deference to world opinion is harmful to American interests. First, it is self-defeating, because the very respect we covet is denied to us the moment we ask for it. The would-be beneficiaries of our concessions construe them as weaknesses and want more. Second, a long history of trying to prove good faith when it had never really been open to question has the paradoxical effect of raising doubts about our good faith. When we with our record enter into a propaganda contest with the Kremlin and its record, when we try to match Soviet professions of love of freedom and peace, and hatred for armaments and colonialism, we invite the world to look upon us—as it looks upon the Soviets—as propagandists with something to hide. Thus we find ourselves forced to make a new plea before the bar of world opinion every time Pravda opens its mouth.

In another area it was the leftists who argued hardest for the United States to continue the nuclear-test ban long after there was more than a reasonable doubt that the Soviets had ever honored it and long after it was evident that the Soviets would end the ban the minute it became advantageous for them to do so. How much damage this did to our security and the cause of freedom throughout the world we can only guess.

On the domestic front the leftists have moved us so far along the road to economic socialism that high taxes and inflation are threatening our ability to resist the accelerated advances of Communists. The drive for more and more Central Government control over the lives, affairs, and liberty of the American people is eating away at the individuality, the determination, industry and incentive upon which our greatness as a nation was built.

This process of erosion is a tremendous threat to the cause of freedom because a sound economy is fundamental to our strength in all other spheres—especially the military. Government control and paternalism such as we have seen in agriculture go to the taproots of our national character. Our strength becomes so sapped that we lose sight of our national heritage and go groping around for new national goals. I suggest that we don't need new national goals. We have one which was written for us by Thomas Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence: "Life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." This is the supreme goal of all Americans. And it endures as a goal because its achievement takes constant effort.

There can be no doubt that American leftists are out to replace the judgment of the individual with the judgment of the state. Almost every bit of legislation they espouse in the domestic field contains dangers of more power for the bureaucrats. It has become clear that, whether we like it or not, central control—which I think of as socialism—will be the result of these efforts. American leftists are squeamish about being called socialists, but that is the term we come to as we recognize what the results of their efforts will be. As collectivists, they have changed their strategy but not their objective—the subordination of the individual to the state. They have found that socialism can be achieved through welfarism as well as through nationalization.

Government interference—a principal tool of leftists—has reduced our States to mere vassals of Washington and has eaten into our free-enterprise economy. We have reached the point where our economic supremacy is threatened and our ability to keep abreast of world developments is challenged.

The leftists, with their dedication to irresponsible fiscal policies and deficit spending, stand in the way of a balanced budget, always holding forth new and bigger programs for increased spending of taxpayers' dollars. It makes no difference that these programs are invariably sought in the name of "welfare" and "humanitarianism" and always propelled by shouts of "crisis" and "emergency." They all entail spending far beyond our capacity to pay and they all will become part of the final economic reckoning.

These leftist spending programs are playing right into the hands of the Kremlin leaders who long have argued that they could "bleed America white." Higher taxes and more inflation are precisely what Khrushchev and his advisers want for the United States—and the leftwing forces in this country are rushing to provide them. The leftists clamor for the expenditure of additional billions for Federal aid to education, Federal aid to the aged, Federal aid to depressed areas, Federal aid to anything and everything. But there is no mention of what these vast new programs will cost in terms of our ability to resist aggression or mount even a limited war if we should be forced to do so. I suggest that it will make no difference if we are the best-educated, the best-housed, best-clothed, and best-fed people in the world, if our economic underpinnings are compromised. The military realities of today are such that our capacity to fight is directly related to our ability to produce, and our ability to produce rests on the performance of a sound economy.

Thus, through advocating a soft policy on the international front, American leftists comprise the genuine danger to our country at this critical period in history. They have sown the seeds of appeasement abroad and fundamental weakness at home. They have shown themselves to be incapable, philosophically, and practically, of coming to grips with militant, ruthlessly aggresive communism. They prefer to bury their heads in the sand or, like Don Quixote, spend their time jousting with windmills they call the racial right rather than come face to face with the issues which will determine the destiny of America and the future of the world.

New Jersey and Urban Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we who supported a reorganization plan for a Department of Urban Affairs on a national level are always heartened when we see indications of State action on the same problem. A Federal Cabinet-level post of this sort

would not compete with State agencies for the same purpose; in fact, they would establish new avenues of communication.

In New Jersey—the most urbanized State in the Union—Governor Hughes promised even before election that he would establish a State department of urban and suburban affairs. He is now awaiting the findings of experts on the best way to organize and offer such a proposal to our State legislature.

His purposes were described well by Raymond H. Male, New Jersey Commissioner of Labor and Industry, in a recent talk. Mr. Male pointed out that many municipalities within New Jersey are already working on methods for cooperative action on regional problems. A new State agency would help those municipalities take even more vigorous and comprehensive action to solve their own problems. An article in the Newark Evening News of March 6 describes Mr. Male's talk. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MALE ADDRESSES STUDENTS—URBAN AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT SEEN IN STATE BEFORE UNITED STATES

TEANECK.—New Jersey may have a department of urban and suburban affairs before the Federal Government is able to establish one, Raymond Male, New Jersey commissioner of labor and industry, predicted last night.

Speaking as guest lecturer at a class in American government at Fairleigh Dickinson University's campus here, Male said a task force is now meeting daily to formulate legislation for the new department, pledged by the Democratic platform in last year's gubernatorial election. Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat of California, is class instructor.

Male said the task force, under chairmanship of Mrs. Katherine Elkus White, former mayor of Red Bank, is now at work formulating legislation to be presented to the next session of the legislature. A similar bill to set up a Federal Department of Urban Affairs with Cabinet rank was recently defeated in Congress.

HUDSON COUNTY IN NEED

"It would have been helpful to have such a department on the Federal level," Male said, "to work with us as the Department of Labor does so well. What the State seeks," he added, "is a small agency to focus the public view on the problems that cross over governmental lines and cannot be solved by local areas alone."

In answer to a question from the audience, Male agreed that Hudson County was one of the areas that needs redevelopment and which suffered a blow when the Federal Department of Urban Affairs was defeated.

Male pointed to three areas—transportation, housing, and unemployment—in which Hudson County shares with the country at large a need for planning and aid.

RAILROAD PROBLEM

"The county historically has been the hub of a great rail network," Male said. "The railroads in the United States are in trouble and so Hudson is in trouble. The housing problem in Hudson," he said, "is the same as in Essex or Camden or Philadelphia. Unemployed workers in Hudson who had a skill and worked for one employer for 20 years suddenly found the factory abandoned and the machines melted down for scrap.

"But what do you do with the people?" Male asked. "You don't melt them down into scrap and you can't delegate them to permanent public assistance. Hudson is feeling the pain that every urban area feels," Male added, "but it is feeling it in spades."

In a general discussion of welfare, Male criticized James Mitchell, Newburgh, N.Y., city manager, for creating what he called an unbalanced picture of welfare problems.

"Nowhere in New Jersey are there great numbers of people just lounging around," Male said. "If there is tonight one able-bodied man enjoying public assistance I want to see him.

"JOBS UNAVAILABLE

"We have long had in this State," Male said, "a program in which State employment officers work with county and local welfare boards in finding men and women on the relief rolls capable of performing jobs.

"We made a study of 100 people on the relief rolls in Camden," Male added, "and made every effort through county and local relief agencies and with the cooperation of business and professional men to find them jobs. After this great effort we could only find jobs for two of them.

"The fact is," Male said "that when a man is at this level and needs assistance he is often unemployable. He may be physically or mentally sick, or a narcotics addict or blind. This Mitchell thing stings men who have been conscientiously trying to do a good job. Tarring them with a broad brush is unconscionable," Male added.

Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, March 26, 1962, I was one of several Members of Congress from Pennsylvania who appeared before the hearing conducted by the Army Engineers in Rockwell Hall, of Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, to testify in opposition to the construction of the proposed Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal.

The following remarks summarize my opposition to the construction of the canal and point to the hardships it would cause in my State:

REMARKS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT HEARINGS IN PITTSBURGH, PA., BEFORE THE ARMY ENGINEERS, MARCH 26, 1962, IN OPPOSITION TO THE PROPOSED LAKE ERIE-OHIO RIVER CANAL

Mr. Chairman, as a Representative in Congress from central Pennsylvania, I have given the proposed Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal project serious thought over a period of years. It is evident, from its sponsorship and despite brazen efforts to show a national interest in its construction, that the project would confer its chief benefits upon steel plants domiciled in the State of Ohio and, to a lesser extent, on coal producers in West Virginia and Kentucky. To be more specific and quite frank, it is the Youngstown steel-producing area which would be the chief beneficiary.

The question basically before the Corps of Engineers and, ultimately, for Congress to decide is, then, whether the general taxpayers' money, in an amount very substantially more than $1 billion in construction costs, not to mention subsequent maintenance and operation costs, should be used to subsidize these steel producers by handing them a toll-free waterway.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania opposes this canal project not only as an economically wasteful and uncalled for dispensation of favors but also as a facility which is calculated to do injury to the Commonwealth as a whole.

The conclusion that the effects of this waterway would be harmful to Pennsylvania came out of an objective and broad analysis made for the State planning board in a report rendered to it on December 1, 1957, by the well-regarded consulting firm of Ford, Bacon & Davis. (The survey on which the report was based included study at first hand of the physical factors involved, interviews with affected shippers and other interests, and checking with barge operators.)

As the Corps of Engineers doubtless is familiar with this report, I can be brief in stating its findings insofar as they relate to the effects of the waterway on the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and particularly on the western half thereof. I will intermingle a few comments of my own.

The end result of the project would be, first, to worsen the position of Pennsylvania coal producers. Their mines require more man-hours per ton of coal produced and their daily output per mine is much below the level of competing mines in other States. Cost conditions therefore limit very greatly their ability to use the proposed waterway. On the other hand, mines located in other States could make additional inroads on markets which western and central Pennsylvania mines now enjoy, if they had available to them the artificially low freight rates which the canal would induce in the absence of tolls.

While it appears that the Pittsburgh and Youngstown districts would share proportionately in reduced transportation costs, Youngstown would derive the double advantage of location nearer to Great Lakes markets and of being able to compete on equal terms with Pittsburgh producers for markets in the South and West now served by barge from Pittsburgh mills. Central Pennsylvania also would suffer from the easier penetration of Ohio building materials into the western part of the State.

I am disturbed also by the encouragement which the waterway would give to foreign producers of steel and other products manufactured in Pennsylvania.

It is not difficult to understand why our heavy industries place great importance on railroad transportation, nor why this in turn means that the railroads are vital to the economy of the Commonwealth. The railroads, faced with the competition of a subsidized competitor, would put up such a fight as they could to retain traffic. The end result would be, of course, loss of some traffic and corresponding reductions of earnings. The further result would be a deterioration of service and a loss of railroad jobs. This impairment of service would hurt smaller shippers unable to use the waterway by reason of the location of their plants and of bargelot minimums beyond their capacities to ship. They also would suffer, along with other shippers, through having to pay the higher rates which the railroads would have to place on the traffic remaining to them.

We must not lose sight of the effects of the proposed waterway on persons who need to hold onto their jobs.

Pennsylvania, especially western Pennsylvania, already is dotted with areas designated by the U.S. Department of Labor as areas of substantial unemployment. It takes a page and a half of the Department's "February 1962 Supplement to Area Labor Market Trends" just to list these areas. There are 41 such areas, varying in size, in the Commonwealth. Of the 41, 7 are of major proportions, and thus designated as areas of substantial and persistent unemployment. One such is the Altoona area, hurt by the general difficulties of the railroads and by changes from coal-burning to diesel locomotives.

There are the Scranton and Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton areas, hurt by the decline in the use of anthracite coal. There are the Johnstown (Cambria and Somerset Counties) and the Pittsburgh areas (Allegheny, Beaver, Washington, and Westmoreland Counties) which suffer from a combination of conditions traceable to difficulties in steel and coal and in other industries.

The remaining two "areas of substantial and persistent unemployment" are Erie (Erie County) and Philadelphia (five counties in Pennsylvania and three in New Jersey. I notice, however, that the Youngstown-Warren area is not plagued by these problems nor described in this manner by official sources.

Figures for January 1962 show the following: Altoona, with 5,000 unemployed, had an unemployment ratio of 10.8; for Scranton the figures were 13,700 and 13.8; for Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton, 17,100 and 13.3; for Johnstown, 17,000 and 18.0 percent; for Pittsburgh, 95,600 and 10.3; and for Erie, 10,500 and 10.7. These rates are unconscionably high and very deplorable. Yet some of them would be boosted much higher if the canal were in operation today. It is highly improbable that the Commonwealth or these areas could attract new industries in sufficient volume to enable absorption of the losses the canal would impose. The evidence, in fact, is quite to the contrary.

In the State as a whole, population increased 7.8 percent for 1950 to 1960, but in the entire country the increase was 18.5 percent. The total number of employees in manufacturing establishments fell from 1,472,000 in 1954 to 1,400,000 in 1958. Mineral production (coal, cement, and stone) declined in dollar value from $1.2 billion in 1950 to $0.86 billion in 1959. These statistics show clearly that Pennsylvania is suffering. Much of the trouble is traceable to areas which would be most directly hurt by the proposed waterway. Their troubles then would be compounded. The ability of these areas and of the Commonwealth generally to attract industries is not as great as we might wish.

The adverse feeling of the Commonwealth toward the proposed waterway is expressed in the underscored language of a resolution adopted by its senate on July 10, 1961, which is attached as exhibit A to my testimony.

In view of the foregoing, it seems entirely reasonable for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to oppose construction of this toll-free, tax-absorbing waterway for the benefit of special interests in other States and to the disadvantage of its own citizens. There is more than State parochialism involved here. The national economy lacks the resources to indulge in a fanciful but very costly waterway project. The end result will be a higher total cost of transportation, despite possible retrenchments in railroad facilities, and lower standards of service by, on the one hand, a slow, seasonally closed waterway and, on the other, a deterioration of railroad service. Railroad men will suffer further losses of jobs and railroad stockholders must absorb additional losses. The strengthen of the Nation's defense position will be weakened by this new burden on the transportation system and on the taxpayers and by the deterioration of railroad facilities and service.

It is, in fact, difficult for me to see how businessmen can expect to force this highly dubious project down the throats of the people of the United States. Dogged persistence is admirable in many circumstances, but here we have a persistence which reflects a narrow viewpoint and a poor regard for the intelligence of the American people.

EXHIBIT A

Senate resolution requesting the revaluation of the State planning board's report on the Lake Erie & Ohio River Canal

In 1957 the State Planning Board of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania conducted a study to determine the practicability of a barge or ship canal connecting Lake Erie and the Ohio River and the effect of such a canal on the future economic status and of the areas it would serve and affect including in particular the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. It was the conclusion of said study, made by the engineering firm of Ford, Bacon & Davis and approved by said board that the construction of such a canal was not practicable and that its effect would be prejudicial and adverse to the economic and other interests of this Commonwealth and its citizens.

During the past 75 years the Federal Government has made a number of studies contemplating the construction of such a canal and during this present year it appears that proponents of the canal are seeking an allocation of funds by the Federal Government to pay for another such study, looking to the construction of a canal by the Beaver-Mahoning route.

In order that the Governor of the Commonwealth, the general assembly, the interested State departments and the public may be properly apprised of the impact and effects of such a canal upon the economy of western Pennsylvania and of our Commonwealth as a whole, it is essential that the aforementioned study made by the State planning board in 1957 be revaluated, it appearing that we shall thereby be enabled to determine on rational grounds our position in relation to said project: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the senate hereby requests that the study and report upon the projected Lake Erie & Ohio River Canal made for and under directions of the State planning board by the engineering firm of Ford, Bacon & Davis in 1957 and thereafter approved by said board be revaluated so as to restate the relevant facts and figures as of the year 1961; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the State planning board and to the Governor.

The World of Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently a distinguished Minnesotan, Dr. L. V. Berkner, president of the Graduate Research Center of the Southwest, and a consultant to the President's Science Advisory Committee, delivered a brilliant and provocative address entitled "The World of Tomorrow."

In Dr. Berkner's address he projected ahead the power of our current society to meet the problems which clearly are developing for the future. He forcefully and eloquently demonstrated that we are passing through a technological revolution as fundamental to western civilization as the industrial revolution, which had such a profound effect upon the whole world.

I commend this address to the attention of my colleagues, and to every American.

I ask unanimous consent that the address entitled "The World of Tomorrow," delivered by Dr. L. V. Berkner at Minneapolis, Minn., March 9, 1962, be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WORLD OF TOMORROW

(Remarks by L. V. Berkner at the Governor's Electronics Day dinner, Minneapolis, Minn., March 9, 1962)

"When in the course of human events it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve * * *" and so in its opening words, our Declaration of Independence founds our United States on the idea of change to meet the changing conditions of civilization. To look backward, to understand why change has occurred requires no special prescience—we all have 20–20 hindsight. For we can recognize the changes of the past, and distinguish the forces that compelled those changes.

But to look ahead into the future is another thing. Can we distinguish those forces which will compel change in the future; can we foretell something of the character of the change that must occur as a result of those major forces now operative on our society? Certainly, to the community that can distinguish those forces, that can evaluate correctly the social changes they will produce and can act to take advantage of changes confidently foreseen, will go the substantial rewards of the future.

The great philosopher, Alfred North Whitehead, makes this point very clearly when he comments:

"The art of progress is to preserve order amid change, and to preserve change amid order. The more prolonged the halt of some unrelieved system of order, the greater the crash of the dead society."

The preeminence and power of our American constitutional system of free enterprise has risen with ever-increasing vitality out of the wisdom of our founders who recognized that perpetuation of strength requires orderly adjustment to change. To remain live, a society must perceive and assess the development of the future if it is to acquire its rewards.

This great State fo Minnesota, in which I grew up as a boy and was educated at its wonderful university, has always stood as one of the Nation's intellectual leaders. Your official history notes:

"Education was stressed from the start, both by the territorial legislature which in its first session evolved a system of free public schools and in 1851 passed an act to incorporate the University of Minnesota and by religious bodies who in 1854 and 1857 respectively—established Hamline University and St. John's University."

Today, this State is counted as 1 of the first 10, with its 70 Ph.D.'s graduated per million population. Early in its history, its solid European stock with real hardship but with great wisdom insisted on this sound and adequate educational system, and so its population has inherited an unsurpassed educational basis from its pioneers on which its future is deeply rooted.

Quite naturally, the early history of the State grew out of its agriculture and the development of its natural resources. This is the usual beginning of every new territory. Because of the special richness of these resources the people of Minnesota could rely easily upon them for more than a century.

Yet sooner or later a radical change in this economic and social dependence on resources was inevitable. Now two impelling factors have appeared that now force this change.

The first factor is the rapid growth of American population. With the benefits of medical research, our populations are now doubling each 40 years. Yet the efficiency of exploitation of our agricultural and mineral resources is improving so rapidly that these resources require few additional hands for their production. Consequently, all of the added population is migrating to the cities where gainful employment must be provided. Therefore industry must be found if the State is to retain its economic health.

The second factor is the appearance of a radically new scientific base on which much of the new industry of the future will be founded. So to acquire this new industry, the State must have access to this new scientific base and the consequent new technology that has been thrust upon us in the past decade.

We must awaken to the realities of today when Minnesota finds itself on the threshold of a change from a predominantly rural to a predominantly urbanized community. For the die is cast by the events of our time; the forces to produce this change are at work. Nothing on earth can stop the change. The only question is whether, as a consequence of this change, Minnesota will capture new opportunity and thereby remain as a healthy, wealthy community of happy and prosperous individuals.

So tonight I will talk about the technological revolution—to try to identify its forces in the passing history of our time, to evaluate the social stresses produced and the consequent change to be experienced, and to endeavor to foresee the measures required for a community to acquire the rewards that the technological revolution of our time can confer.

Of course, we all have studied the industrial revolution of the 19th century. We recall that this arose primarily out of the invention of the steam engine by James Watt and the manufacturing industry that grew as a consequence. The origins of the industrial revolution rest in the Renaissance, and it flows clearly from the discoveries in mechanics by Galileo and Newton, in chemistry by Dalton, Priestley and Levoisier, and in science and mathematics generally by a host of their contemporaries and successors. We know now that the key to the industrial revolution was the development of an exact science—that is the description of nature by defining simple causes or precedent actions and precisely delineating their inevitable natural consequences. By applying that knowledge technically, our 19th century forebears vastly improved the efficiency and quality of existing manufacturing and construction methods so that their innovations quickly drove out the older industry of the villages by sheer efficiency and function. Quite suddenly, in a generation or so, the modern form of industry replaced the village forms of production in the home, thereby revolutionizing man's living habits and creating an entirely new economic, cultural and political life.

In the retrospect of history, the events of the industrial revolution unfold with irrepressible certainty:

First, the new thought of the Renaissance; second, the new science of the 17th and 18th centuries with its emergent technology; and, finally, the new efficiency of manufacture which swiftly swept away traditional village production by its sheer efficiency and functions.

Could the men of that time recognize the inevitability of events?

Some certainly did—to one extent or another. The philosophies of Hobbes and Locke, of Pascal and Boyle, of Voltaire and Montesquieu, of Rousseau, Franklin and Jefferson, all endeavored to visualize the magnitude of the forces at work, the consequences to follow, and the form of social adaptation required. The best of their ideas and even their words appear in our American Constitution. Certainly all philosophers since that time from Adam Smith through Kant, Hegel and Marx have dealt with the problem in a variety of ways, leading to the sharp ideological differences in the world today.

But other men of those times too recognized the character of the forces that were remolding the society of the 18th and 19th centuries. These were the industrial leaders who were turning the ideas of technology into cheaper and better products for man's general welfare. These were men like the members of the Lunar Society of Birmingham—Josiah Wedgewood, Matthew Boulton, James Watt, John Roebuck, John Wilkinson, Joseph Priestley—scientists, engineers and businessmen who met to interpret the meaning of the new science and technology in terms of new industrial processes and products. Out of their comprehension of the real meaning of events, emerged new industrial complexes that have come down to us today. Their vision and imagination captured centuries of greatness and well being for the English.

I believe these lessons of history have very great pertinence for us today. In the last decade or two—let's say, since the midcentury, a mere 10 years ago—we find ourselves at the beginning of a new technological revolution. This is a revolution that is as profound as the industrial revolution of two centuries ago.

Well, you may say, is not our technological age a mere quickening of the old industrial revolution? I think not. The development of the atomic bomb and of nuclear energy, of space activity, of today's communication and automatic control, have emerged from a series of recent scientific and technological discoveries of very radical form, changes that have very powerful and profound implications for the future. Let us trace the developments that have started this new technological explosion.

At the turn of the century our science, though useful, was limited in its ability to understand, interpret, and predict natural events. Certainly it has provided rules or laws to do more efficiently the things man had learned to do before. Certainly it had elaborated the molecular structure of matter, and had shown us how to produce and control electrical power. Certainly it had guided our creation of elementary machines, and primitive electric communications. But in a real sense, these were merely superficial developments of the more obvious and elemental manifestations of nature. We simply did not understand the deeper organizations of nature—how it was basically composed, how it behaved fundamentally. Therefore, the ultimate development of the industrial revolution was sharply bounded by the mere mathematization and efficient organization of what man had already learned to do over the ages.

But with the unfolding of the 20th century came a remarkable series of scientific discoveries. In 1905, Einstein created the relativistic mechanics which revealed the true four-dimensional character of our universe and predicted the identity of mass and energy. In the same year he showed from the photoelectric effect that energy is not continuous but comes in tiny but discrete packages, just as matter is subdivided into elemental atoms and electrons. In 1911 Rutherford discovered the atomic nucleus, and in 1913 Bohr described the atom as a nucleus encompassed by electrons held in fixed orbits or shells. In 1924 Heisenberg formulated the principle of uncertainty, when for the first time science learned of the limits beyond which cause and effect were no longer meaningful. In 1926 De Broglie formulated, and then Schroedinger and Dirac elaborated, the wave-mechanics which could describe the behavior of matter with mathematical precision.

In 1932, Chadwick discovered the neutron, and in 1939 Hahn and Strassmann produced atomic fission whereby mass was converted into energy, thereby fulfilling Einstein's earlier prediction. Step by step, in a mere 35 years, a whole new concept of the physics of nature emerged. This was a different and more powerful physics that not only encompassed the classical physics, but also gave a completely new and very deep insight into nature.

Where before we described nature in a limited mathematical form, we must now describe matter by a Fermi statistics and fields by a Bose statistics in our more precise conception of physical reality.

I must mention here one other development—the formulation of information theory by Claude Shannon in 1948—a mere 14 years ago. In this, man acquired the knowledge and methods to build the modern computer in a completely logical way. And so he acquired the means by which to employ his new and abstruse physics quite readily in practice. Thus by the midcentury, man was at the threshold of the new revolution in technology whose beginning we are now witnessing.

So the present technological revolution is very different in character from the old industrial revolution. It is based on a completely new insight into nature, and the new ability to uncover otherwise hidden natural phenomena and to manipulate natural processes that were heretofore inconceivable. We can confidently predict that this new technological revolution now rising from a radically modified science will have, inevitably, a most profound effect on our industry, our daily living, and our future society. Like the members of the Lunar Society, we must strive to understand it and take those measures which can turn it to our greatest benefit.

As forerunners of the change to come we have already seen the emergence of nuclear energy with all its problems, and of the commencement of space travel with all its implications. This is but the beginning. We are on the threshold of a world with quite new and far more effective materials for every sort of application. Our concepts of structure are due for radical changes. With forthcoming communications and data systems, we can foresee far more efficient organization and control of industrial processes. New forms of industrial complexes will arise which are as different from the present as were 19th-century factories from the village workshop.

As an example, I remind you that in the not so old technology, to generate electric power, our best approach was to adapt the ancient axle to rotate some copper conductors in a magnetic field. With such primitive methods—and so they are in the light of 20th-century science—the conversion efficiency of heat to electricity is perhaps 35 percent. With the technology emergent from our new science we foresee direct conversion of heat to electricity without moving parts and with far higher efficiency. Thus, the spreading efficiency of the new technology will rapidly replace older inefficient methods by new, more efficient, and more functional industrial methods. Just as the village methods of production were displaced in the industrial revolution, so the practical technology of the past is destined to be replaced quickly by the technological processes of today. This is the new and powerful force that has appeared in our social organization.

To capture and control the potential of this new technology, to create new industry from it, to direct it for our benefit, we must

have men who understand and can manipulate it intelligently. Obviously, the ideas underlying the technology of today are abstruse and highly mathematical in nature. So to comprehend these ideas, and to manipulate the technology borne of them intelligently, we require men of very advanced education in substantial numbers. This does not mean a mere 4-year college education, for the ideas involved are at the very boundaries of knowledge. The education required is really advanced. Command of the new technology and of the science from which it is derived requires postgraduate education to the doctor's degree and beyond—not less than 8 years beyond the high school diploma. While men of lesser training can be usefully employed in its processes, the creation of new industry, new products and devices, new methods and applications from the new technology arises from the creative and imaginative insights of scientific and technological leaders who have access to the very limits of knowledge.

So I believe we can identify graduate education at the doctoral level as the key to the command of the new technology. Those communities that can produce and retain men of advanced education will have access to and control of the new technology from which the industry and wealth of the future will flow. In the last decade we have seen new industries spring up by the dozen around the intellectual centers of Harvard, MIT, and companion institutions in Boston, around the University of California at Berkeley, around Stanford at Palo Alto in the San Francisco Bay area, and around UCLA and Cal Tech in Los Angeles. In a mere decade, the interaction between the graduate school and industrial growth and community welfare has grown very strong. So today we find that the welfare and wealth of the community has become critically dependent upon adequate sources of brainpower from which flow the industrial opportunities and wealth of the future.

But beyond the problem of community welfare is the problem of national survival. We must recognize that in this world struggle against communism, military force is at a standoff. Military power, if kept effective, can prevent military aggression, but by itself cannot win the struggle when fought on other levels. So the Soviets ask, "If we can't lick them on the battlefield, where else might we win." They turn naturally to the powerful new technology to capture its power for their side. This is the real significance of sputnik and is progeny. The battlefield is not the only list at which nations can be overwhelmed—with military stalemate, the battle has gone to the intellectual level.

After a careful study sponsored by our Federal Government, the expert in Soviet education, Dr. deWitt, finds that this year the U.S.S.R. will graduate 190,000 in science and engineering, as contrasted to 90,000 in the United States. About the same ratio holds at the graduate level. How long can we stay ahead in light of this performance?

So our whole population must be given the opportunity to contribute to the full extent of our intellectual capability. Instead of thrashing around noisily, we can better focus our effort on keeping our technological superiority which has been challenged by sputnik and all it symbolizes—a superiority that is essential to winning the battle where it really counts. This means that every section of the country must contribute its part to the advanced education of its people. The dangers inherent in the intellectual battle are especially critical, for the new science makes possible not only industrial superiority but also extraordinary technological breakthroughs that might have grave military significance.

Thus we find that, to serve the new needs of the community and of the Nation, extensive training at the doctoral level of university training has suddenly become imperative. Where before the doctoral degree was a kind of intellectual curiosity in the community, now we recognize that the doctor of learning becomes imperative for the economic health of the community. For to produce the new industry required for expanding populations, we need men who, from their command of ideas at the boundaries of knowledge, can devise that industry, and the products and services that can be so useful for man's welfare and benefit, and can provide him with gainful employment.

Clearly, those populations which are served by adequate graduate facilities have the edge on the others in this age when technology gives supremacy. With a good graduate school nearby, the student has two or three times the probability of reaching his doctor's degree. With a good graduate school nearby the advanced industry of tomorrow has several times the probability of locating in the community.

So today, as a consequence of the technological revolution, new centers of power are destined to appear. These centers of community power will arise in those areas where institutions of graduate education can provide the brainpower required to generate advanced industry, and the consequent community strength and wealth, employment, and happiness that flows from it.

From these centers of educational strength and technological power must inevitably flow a new form of colonialism. Just as the industrial revolution produced a colonialism stemming from the centers of manufacture, so the technological revolution of today will produce a new colonial dependence on the community sources of brainpower from which the new sources of economic control will inevitably arise.

These, then, are the forces at work that must inevitably shape our future. I would summarize them in eight steps:

1. A saturation in numbers that can gainfully be employed in agriculture and exploitation of natural resources.
2. An exploding population.
3. Transformation of our community from predominantly rural to predominantly urban with the added population settling in the major cities.
4. A demand for industrial opportunity to gainfully employ the excess population, whereby they can produce new products, services, and opportunities for the benefit and welfare of all.
5. The coincidence of this social transformation with a technological revolution that provides a new, more efficient, more functional origin for industry in the realm of the most advanced scientific ideas of our time.
6. A new technological power from our new science that is rapidly rendering obsolescent our old practical technology so that to capture new industry we must broadly command the most obstruse thought of our time.
7. A consequent dependence of the community on graduate education whose opportunities must now be enlarged to provide men who in sufficient numbers can command the new technology on our behalf.
8. The inevitable rise of a new and more general form of colonialism stemming from the centers of brainpower which have had the foresight to capture the new technology for their benefit.

We cannot block these forces that shape the future; we can only work with them to turn them to our benefit.

What then must be done? Certainly the task is not simple—yet some elements are clear;

First, we must rise to strengthen and enlarge our opportunities for graduate education. Certainly, we must find, attract, motivate, and educate those men who can lead us to the new industry wherever they may be. Certainly this means an enlarged opportunity for advanced education in science and engineering. But equally, I believe, it means opportunity in economics, the social sciences, and the other areas of human interest and thought so our whole community can face this new challenge.

Second, it means that the capital of the future will be more in men and ideas, and the technological dexterity which they represent and less in mere factories and machines. Our financial leaders must to an ever-increasing extent bet on men and their skills to capture the industry of the future. The auxiliary machinery is simply incidental. Minnesota has had a long history of losing its intellectual leaders to other regions. While Minnesota remained dependent on its natural resources, this was of little consequence to its economic health. But this day is passing. The need is that leaders of business and finance marshal their resources to create the opportunity for your intellectual giants right here at home. Thus you can capture the leadership of this new technology for the welfare, wealth, and happiness of your own people. Already some of your great companies have recognized this change and have brought the new technology here. But this spirit of greatness must be spread at an ever-increasing rate.

In closing, may I tell you how much it means to me each time I return to my homeland. The ties of youth can never be completley severed. I am proud to have sprung from a great people who have the unbroken tradition of rising to every challenge. Already you have an incomparable and renowned system of universities and colleges which are the envy of most of your country. Already you have a developing industry that is rising to the new opportunities that are offered by the technology of our time. In these days of revolutionary change I know that you men of Minnesota can respond with the qualities of wisdom of our forebears who built this great land for our wealth and happiness, for our safety and welfare—that Minnesota will ever remain "The Star of the North."

Controls of U.S. Doctors Seen Through Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Raymond Moley on the dangers of the President's medical aid bill, from the San Diego Union of March 17, 1962:

CONTROL OF U.S. DOCTORS SEEN THROUGH HOSPITALS

(By Raymond Moley)

On a dark, rainy night in February 1950 in Bristol, England, I had a most interesting evening with the Socialist firebrand, Aneurin Bevan. It was during the national election which all but shook the Labor Party from power. Bevan was minister of health, in charge of the new National Health Service.

Along with two other American newspapermen, I met Bevan at his hotel before a political meeting which he was to address.

The meeting was a rowdy affair. A tough dockworker in the front of the audience was engaged in a running fire of mutual recrimination with the sturdy speaker. In the course of their exchanges the heckler

drew from his mouth a plate of false teeth and waved it at Bevan, who shouted, "I am the Minister of Health and I am going to take those teeth away from you." The man shouted back, "I paid 5 pounds for these and they are my own."

After the meeting we engaged in 3 hours of discussion of issues. The best remembered comment was his reply to my question about how he intended to get control of the British medical profession. His reply was, "We have got the hospitals, and that means we will control the doctors. They can't practice without places to practice."

This comment came back to me as I read the President's message, delivered 2 weeks ago, explaining his plan for medical care for the aged—a plan embodied in the King-Anderson bill.

The Kennedy-King-Anderson plan is most carefully designed to provide the argument by its proponents that there is no intention to control or interfere with the free practice of medicine. It is aimed specifically at (a) inpatient hospital services, (b) nursing home services, (c) services in the home of the patient, and (d) outpatient hospital diagnostic service.

While there is the usual language barring control of hospitals or doctors, there are elaborate provisions for supervision and for the making of specifications by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. If these are not controls, it is difficult to find a word that will better suit this procedure.

Because the doctor-hospital relationship is close and indivisible, almost every doctor will be controlled by a government which controls the hospital which he uses for his patients. He needs beds for the patients whom he hospitalizes—patients of all ages. When those beds are preempted by elderly chronic cases, many of whom do not need hospital care, there will be fewer for his emergencies. Hence, there will be overcrowding, and then the Federal Government will have to spend more to provide additional hospitals or additions to existing ones.

In dealing with the recipients of the Kennedy-King-Anderson plan, countless doctors will have the strong inducement that now confronts them with workmen's compensation cases. That is to overtreat and overhospitalize patients. Consider this in connection with the millions of new people under the proposed plan. Both doctors and hospitals will have larger incomes in the first years of this plan. But they will be paying the bitter price of losing their independence.

Doctors will tell you that much of the hospitalization of the elderly is not because of definable illness. It is simply the deteriorization which accompanies old age. Also there is the tendency of those who are idle after a life of active work to fall the victim of worry about bodily ailments. The idle mind turns inward, and if there are no specific aches and pains it becomes easy to imagine them.

The Kennedy-King-Anderson plan starts us on a long and probably endless road, a road which we should avoid now and here.

Glove Industry Import Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a resolution recently adopted by the National Association of Glove Manufacturers, Inc., concerning the import problems of the glove industry under the proposed changes in our reciprocal trade policies. I commend the resolution to the attention of my colleagues with the hope that Congress will carefully consider the recommendations outlined in the resolution for the protection of our own vital American industries:

RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF GLOVE MANUFACTURERS, INC.

The glove industry in the United States has long recognized that international trade is essential to our economic growth and is an aid in raising living standards among the nations of the world. It is cognizant of the fact that it must bear its share of the import burden, even though we may have a surplus in this country.

The glove industry is well experienced in both international and domestic trading and is today concerned by the changes that are taking place in world trade patterns.

The universal spread of modern mass production methods is no longer an advantage to any one country. The result in productivity, measured in man-hours, has been equalized throughout the world and has eliminated any possible advantage we may have enjoyed. This gain, now enjoyed by all foreign sources, plus the disparity in lower living costs, has intensified the competition in our American markets.

The results have been loss of job opportunities, elimination of growth potential, and reduction of profit margins.

The proposed changes in our trade policies are of grave concern to us. Under today's trade policies, our glove markets are open to the world, while most are closed to us. Our present tariff rates have not eliminated trade, but, on the contrary, have encouraged international trade; and downward adjustment could only serve as a medium for further reducing the limited volume of the industry, seriously injuring national security, and causing economic injury to an industry that shares its markets with all countries of the world.

Accordingly, we would recommend the following:

1. Develop an authoritative direction in which world trade must move to create growth and rising standards of living in foreign countries. At the same time, do not permit growth impairment of our domestic industry by excessive concentration of imports in specific segments of our economy.

2. The industrial and military strength of the glove industry for defense security should be maintained.

3. World trade objectives can be self-defeated and injurious when pursued at the expense of the U.S. economy or that of any other nation. Low-cost producing countries can readily get a foothold in our markets, to the detriment of all other countries.

A low-cost producing country gets encouragement to maintain this position when it gets easy access to another market; and this retards social and economic development in the country, defeating exactly what our new trade program is intended to accomplish.

4. The burden of absorbing imports should be equitably determined among all industries.

5. Determine an orderly trade program, with definite control of excessive imports, to prevent the true objectives of international trade from being abused.

6. Industries which absorb imports and have no export market should be given special consideration.

7. The President should transmit to the Congress any trade agreement entered into under this act, and same should not become effective until approved by this body.

8. The most-favored-nation principle should not be generalized to favor any country which discriminates against any U.S. product or engages in other actions that amount to the same thing, such as special internal taxes on our products, unrealistic quotas, and so forth. Where such discrimination does exist, the President must order a suspension of benefits.

Liberalization of Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the early days of this Congress, the House voted by a narrow margin, and let me say at the outset that I voted as a part of this narrow margin, to increase the size of the House Rules Committee. Many at that time were claiming that the committee was a legislative bottleneck, a claim unfounded in the realities of the situation and one whose phoniness I have discussed before. The rallying cry at that time was "Let the House work its will."

This rallying cry is now heard again, an echo of earlier days which is returning to haunt many of those whose motives in the liberalization of the Rules Committee must now be tested again. We have a chance to see if this liberalization was truly meant or only a hollow claim. I refer, of course, to the forthcoming tax bill debate and the rule under which it will be debated.

The issues in this are well stated in an editorial, "Let the House Work Its Will," in the March 19 New York Herald Tribune. I believe this issue deserves the serious attention of all Members of this body:

LET THE HOUSE WORK ITS WILL

Often the fate of major legislation turns on procedural questions, and the tax bill is a case in point.

Republicans in Congress are unhappy about, and prepared to make a fight on, three separate provisions of the bill as reported out by the House Ways and Means Committee. As a result, they are pressing the Rules Committee for a modified closed rule—that is, one which would allow separate consideration by the whole House of three specific amendments. Under the regular closed rule, which is ordinarily given tax bills and which the Democratic leadership wants again this time, the opposition is in effect limited to offering a single all-or-nothing substitute.

On most tax bills, there is good reason for such a closed rule: it prevents destructive tinkering with carefully balanced rate structures and the like in the heat of floor debate. But the present case offers no such justification.

The three provisions challenged by the Republicans are unrelated. Each is aimed at a separate problem, and rests on a separate principle. Each has a separate justification and its own good grounds for opposition.

The argument that they have to be lumped together to balance revenue losses against

revenue gains is poppycock. The amounts involved are not enough by themselves to cause any budgetary chaos. They are but a small fraction of the revenue increase on which Mr. Kennedy based his prediction of a balanced budget, and are less than the costs of a good many new programs being offered without compensating revenue sources. But their extrabudgetary effects—on the shape of the economy, and the welfare of both individuals and corporations—would be far reaching and substantial.

The three proposed amendments would affect those provisions for an investment credit (Republicans favor a different form which would be cheaper and, many argue, more effective), dividend and interest withholding, and taxation of oversea earnings.

When the Rules Committee enlargement fight was on, in the first days of the Kennedy administration, a lot was said about the importance of letting the House work its will as a vital part of the democratic process. The tax bill offers a test of Democratic sincerity. A closed rule is not justified by the nature of the bill, which has shaped up as a catchall package of unrelated changes in tax policy. Each of the three Republican amendments, has strong support, though not every Member who supports one supports all three. If the administration majority on the Rules Committee still believes in letting the House work its will, as it professed to a year ago, now is the time to prove it.

Straight Talk From a New York Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSICA McC. WEIS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, occasionally there comes across my desk a letter so well written that I wish immediately that it could be read by every Member of Congress and by everyone who is concerned about the direction in which our Government is moving.

There follows such a letter. It was written by a farmer in my district about the Kennedy-Freeman farm bill and the general trend today toward Government control of every segment of our economy. It is a simple, straightforward statement of basic convictions which are all too rare in this country today. I commend it to the attention of every Member of Congress and every reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Under leave previously granted I include it at this point in the RECORD:

NELSON W. FURMAN & SON,
Savannah, N.Y., March 13, 1962.

The Honorable JESSICA WEIS,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. WEIS: As I sit down to write this letter the door closes behind my wife, headed for our local PTA meeting. I can't help but wonder if my children will have the same prerogative, to attend such a meeting and bring out any grievance before a receptive, openminded group of teachers and parents. Or, will they be subjected to the rules and regulations of a socialized, inefficient centralized Government? Dozens of times a week I am deeply concerned by news of more taxes, higher public servants' salaries ($5,000 jumps), cries of, "Help me, I can't make a good enough living," and giveaways, where we always lose more of our basic rights and freedoms in return for a few dollars.

Now we, as farmers, are confronted with a program that is supposedly the answer to the farm surplus, means of cheaper food for the consumer, higher income for the farmer and the answer in general to the heavy burden of the inefficient grower. That grower could be me, but don't worry, that is where that famous American know-how takes over. I will raise something else and if that fails I would and should be perfectly willing to take a job in industry. There will always be room someplace for a man with initiative, something some are sadly lacking when they cry for Government help. I do not honestly believe that the farmers asking for Government help are considering the best interests of our country and countrymen above their own personal greed.

I would like to congratulate you on your record in serving our district so far. At the same time I would solicit your efforts in every possible way to defeat the administration's farm bill.

Respectfully,

CLYDE M. FURMAN.

Cuba Readies Four IRBM Bases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Allen-Scott report on the buildup of Cuban IRBM bases, which appeared in the San Diego Union, March 19, 1962:

THE ALLEN-SCOTT REPORT: CUBA READIES FOUR IRBM BASES

Soviet technicians have completed work in Cuba on four bases suitable for launching intermediate range ballistic missiles against the United States. These secret rocket installations are located near the cities of Holguin, Camaguey, Matanzas, and Pinar del Rio—all within a 90- to 175-mile range of the Florida coast.

The completion of these rocket bases is reported in an intelligence estimate now being circulated at the highest level of the Kennedy administration.

The report spread an almost visible chill through the Defense Department with its conclusion that these bases are ready for the installation of operational IRBM's.

Under construction since Fidel Castro took over in January 1959, these bases now consist of cement launching areas, control blockhouses, and missile and fuel storage areas.

There is one unconfirmed report that Soviet IRBM's already have been installed at the Holguin base in Oriente Province. However, U.S. intelligence agencies have been unable to confirm this report from the Cuban underground.

The unloading of two 60-foot missiles at the Holguin base late in January was reported by a member of the Cuban underground. Numerous U-2 reconnaissance flights over the base by U.S. pilots failed to produce photographs of the missiles. But the flights did confirm information about the base which the same underground informant had provided.

Other information about the Cuban bases that has been confirmed includes a report that Gen. Enrique Lister, former Spanish Republican Army general, is in charge of the four bases.

It was also learned that General Lister, schooled at Russia's Frunze Military Academy, has control of all secret police work in Cuba. He handles the issuing of Soviet-bloc arms to Cuba's civilian militia, and the training of Cuban military officers assigned to the missile bases.

The completion of these missile bases poses a real threat to the security of the United States, according to a study by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. These military advisers take the blunt position that the United States must take military action, if necessary, to keep Castro from installing operational IRBM's that close to the United States.

This alarming Joint Chiefs of Staff warning has so far brought no affirmative response from President Kennedy. He has refrained from acting on the ground that the United States still lacks hard intelligence that any actual missiles are at these bases.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff takes the position that if missiles are not in underground storage areas, they will be stationed at the bases as soon as Premier Khrushchev believes it is to Russia's advantage to do so.

In addition to their missile base warning, the Joint Chiefs of Staff has sent the White House a third report that Russia has supplied Cuba with poison gas.

The latest information comes from two Cuban army defectors who told U.S. intelligence agents that they helped unload Czech-made gas shells from a Soviet ship.

The first report came from a reliable informant in Havana. He furnished the name of the Soviet ship and the date on which the poison gas arrived in Cuba.

The second report was furnished by a Cuban defector. He witnessed the spraying of a liquid-type gas on a small group of anti-Castro freedom fighters in the mountains of central Cuba.

Discrepancy in Salaries as Between College Teachers and Football Coaches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we are in an age of changing values, an age of uncertainty, and an age of searching. In this era it would appear logical that we would place a high value upon our teachers—those who are endowed with the abilities and the desire to train our youth in order to help them in their quest to shoulder the burdens and responsibilities of the future. It seems that we have placed a high economic value upon those in coaching but not those engaged in classroom activity. According to the Daily Journal, Elizabeth, N.J., of March 6, "College teachers still are paid less than football coaches." They add that only increased alumni support of private institutions and increased taxpayer support of public institutions can help colleges overcome such financial difficulties. Wendell Phillipps over 100 years ago said:

The duty of the scholar is to help those less favored in life and to educate the mass of the people.

I fear that we will fail in this if the colleges continue to lose scholars they cannot afford.

I ask for unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Daily Journal's editorial on this important subject.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COACHING BETTER THAN TEACHING

College teachers still are paid less than football coaches. That complaint arises, not from the coaches, but from the National Education Association, which discovers that the median for all college instructors climbed only to $7,486 in the latest survey.

Collegiate payrolls have a median of $5,582 for those classed as instructors; assistant and associate professors do slightly better, and full professors attain an average of $10,256.

Those figures are mainly symbols. A minority in each grouping is paid less, but the other end of the scale is much richer. The highest pay is in the Far West; the lowest in the Southeast.

For some reason the NEA withheld inquiry into the salaries for coaches. Their generally better remuneration may be attributed to the publicity and glamor they impart to a school and the higher mortality inflicted by graduate anger over a losing season.

The run-of-the-mine collegiate salary appears to be only nominally better than in public schools—although presumably better training, adaptability and education are considered.

The NEA findings bear an obvious relationship to the wail of many colleges that they are afflicted by competition with better endowed schools, with industry, sometimes even with the Government.

No readymade remedy is visible. Most of the colleges are paying as well as their treasuries and resources dictate. They consequently are dependent upon the men and women genuinely interested in teaching careers and content with the soft aura of the campus atmosphere. Too few of that type, who also qualify by today's higher precepts, are available. Only the alumni and the taxpayers can overcome the financial impediment to retaining the others who yield to the lure of higher pay in other fields.

Welfare and Pension Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the March 17, 1962, Milwaukee Journal on the amazing growth of welfare and pension funds:

WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS

The amazing growth of welfare and pension funds in American business and industry continues. The value of these funds in safeguarding workers and their families in the event of illness and hospitalization, retirement and death is incalculable.

The Department of Labor recently announced that 145,000 active plans had filed reports under the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act as of last July 1. Collectively, they provided some 436,000 benefits.

More than 116,000 of the plans were in the welfare category; 29,000 were pension and retirement plans. Major welfare benefits were hospitalization (in 75,000 plans), surgical care (in 73,000) and life insurance (in 69,000).

Who runs these funds, in which close to $60 billion is now estimated to be invested? The reports show that employers or employer groups manage 89 percent and contribute to their financing. They bear the entire cost of 44 percent. Nearly half of the plans cover workers engaged in manufacturing, 18 percent cover workers in wholesale and retail trade, and 9 percent cover those in service fields.

Unending Battle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, the recent castastrophic storm that devastated so many sections of our seacoast has underscored the need for cooperative action in the common defense against future natural disasters.

The Governor of New Jersey has suggested a conference of the Governors of the Atlantic Coast States, and I am in agreement that, as a beginning point to meet the problem, this is a constructive suggestion.

The Newark, N.J., Star-Ledger editorialized on March 25, 1962, on this important subject and, under leave to extend my remarks, I include it herewith:

UNENDING BATTLE

Governor Hughes' suggestion for a conference of the Governors of the Atlantic Coast States deserves wide support. The Governor made the suggestion in conferring with President Kennedy on problems connected with rehabilitating the storm-battered shore.

The prime purpose of Governor Hughes' visit with the President apparently was to bolster the appeal already made for Federal assistance in the current emergency, and also to stress the urgency of the need.

The urgency arises from two factors. One is the rapidly approaching resort season, which is important to the economy of the entire State. The other is the defenseless position of the shore because of the condition of the natural barriers.

High tides a few nights ago gave the shore a scare. Fortunately, the tides were not high enough to cause major damage. But with the natural protection gone, the shoreline is vulnerable—and may not be so fortunate in the next storm.

While New Jersey suffered particularly heavy damage earlier this month, the problem is not unique with New Jersey. The shoreline is a continuous sweep from Florida to Maine, and storms do not observe State lines. Protection of the shoreline—one of the most valuable natural assets—is of interstate concern.

That's why Governor Hughes' suggestion for an interstate conference could lead to an important step forward in the never-ending fight to conserve the shoreline. And the never-ending aspect to the problem should be stressed. For the winds and the tides are unyielding.

If we are to conserve the natural asset in the shoreline, our battle must be never-ending and must be joined by all the States of the Atlantic coast. There is an immediate problem resulting from damage caused by the recent storm. There also is an emergency of more lasting duration in building up the shore defenses.

We Need Real Insurance Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, the need for implementation of the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956 by an appropriation of funds, and the activation of the program is now apparent. Millions of dollars of damage to private and public property could have been recoverable by insurance if the act had been supplemented by an appropriation and State participation.

The program calls for Federal insurance against loss resulting from damage to or destruction of real or personal property—including property owned by any State or local government—due to flood by tidal wave, wave wash, or other abnormally high tidal water, or the water component of any hurricane or other severe storm. The insurance would be sold at reasonable costs designed to achieve marketability, and the Federal Government and States would share in premium cost by paying the difference between the reasonable cost—to the property owner—and the scheduled estimated rates which would be fixed by the Administrator as adequate to produce sufficient proceeds to cover all losses over a period of years. The insurance policies issued under the act would be issued only with respect to property in those States, which participate with the Federal Government in the payment of premium plan.

It is my opinion that this flood insurance would have been sufficiently attractive premiumwise to have been carried by a property owner along with fire and windstorm insurance. Had this program been in effect, and had the disaster area States joined therein, the millions of dollar losses of thousands of persons would have been covered by insurance. It is unfortunate that we pass laws that remain ineffective due to a lack of appropriated funds. If the law was of sufficient merit to have passed both Houses and signed by the President, it should be worth an investment of funds to activate it.

I submit that with this law—Public Law 1016, 84th Congress—on the books, it is now the duty of the Administration to formulate the proscribed program under the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency as called for under the act, and to request a sufficient appropriation from the Congress so that the States can enter into a compact and the citizens have the benefit of this flood insurance before the approaching hurricane season.

An editorial appearing in a recent issue of the Cape May (N.J.) Star and

Wave is a very clear and concise statement of the present situation in the whole disaster area of New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina. I submit it herewith:

WE NEED REAL INSURANCE PROTECTION

As it has so frequently through the years, the widespread destruction and property damage left in the wake of the coastal storm and floods has pointed up the need for some type of expanded or more comprehensive insurance coverage to protect public and private property owners from staggering—oftentimes insurmountable—financial losses.

While perhaps the policies and technical interpretations of so-called comprehensive insurance coverage had been established previously in other sections and following other disasters, in the Cape May area most property owners first came to grips with the hard, cold facts of fine print in their insurance policies shortly after the hurricane in September 1944.

Thousands of property owners along the coast who suffered damage as a result of the storm were shocked to discover that what they believed was complete insurance coverage to protect them from virtually any type of financial loss stemming from damage to their properties had a built-in exclusion clause so far as wave and flood damage was concerned.

After subsequent storms insurance companies generally joined to present a solid front in strengthening the interpretation that theretofore had been on a hit-or-miss basis with some companies paying damage claims resulting from storm tides and floods, others achieving some sort of compromise with universally irate csutomers and others stanchly refusing to budge an inch in their interpretation of the fine print.

Nearly 18 years after the situation became generally apparent in this area there's little argument left, although invariably those who suffer damage go through very much the same routine, storm after storm.

With an estimated 40,000 potential claims in the south Jersey area alone following the tragic storm of a fortnight ago, spokesmen for a major organization of insurance companies headed off much redtape and correspondence with a pronouncement in general terms that damage caused by wind in most cases was covered, that caused by wave or tidal action in most cases was not, that automobiles damaged by floodwaters generally were covered while houses sustaining similar damage from the identical cause were not.

To forestall the hue and cry from many thousands who have paid stiff premiums over the years thinking they were buying the most complete insurance protection possible, other spokesmen for groups of insurance companies spelled out their position very explicitly. They pointed out that the water damage exclusion cause had been built in almost all policies for the very practical reason that the only ones who might buy flood insurance were those who were located near water and consequently felt they might someday sustain flood damage. With a considerable degree of risk and a somewhat restricted market, the insurance companies simply bowed out of the flood insurance business before they got hurt.

At the moment, we understand, there are only one or two companies in the world that write flood insurance and on such policies the rates are so high as to be generally prohibitive and quite impractical.

This brings us to the nub of the problem again and again and again as it has after almost every storm involving abnormal tides: What can a property owner living near the seashore do to protect himself from severe financial loss?

At the moment there appears to be almost nothing he can do. However, as in the wake of other storms and floods, there has been some discussion in the past week or so about setting up of Federal flood insurance or substantial Federal subsidies to commercial insurance companies to permit more practical rates for flood insurance without jeopardizing the financial soundness of the companies.

There are many who take the position that such a course would be a further step toward socialism, governmental paternalism, and cradle-to-the-grave security programs, and well it might be.

There are many (living inland, we hasten to add) who contend that those who live beside water must expect to get wet occasionally and should not look to someone else to help them after trouble starts.

But as seashore people, many of whom have lived within sight and sound of the ocean for generations, who earn our livelihoods directly or indirectly because of our location and have built our entire lives on and about coastal pursuits of fishing, boating, vacation resorts, etc., we believe that somehow a solution must be worked out.

Personally we believe that as long as vast sums of Federal money are being spent and squandered all over the world, as much as may be necessary should be allocated to a practical system of flood insurance, adequate beach protection, and flood control programs.

From the standpoint of operating recreational areas and playgrounds for a large percentage of the American public, we believe that we in coastal areas make a definite contribution to the health, welfare, and physical well-being of the Nation's greatest natural resource—its people.

We believe this is as important and as necessary—far more important and necessary—for the best interests of a strong, healthy, and vigorous nation as our long-standing policies of trying to buy military allies and support for our political and ideological principles in all far-flung corners of the world. We're for helping our fellow men any way we can, but we're also for helping ourselves and having some of our fellow men help us when it becomes necessary.

Record of Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, the enclosed editorial from the Tiffin, Ohio, Advertiser-Tribune is a timely comment on the operation of the National Defense Education Act. It points out again, how plans which look good as theories do not always show up satisfactorily when put to the practical test:

RECORD OF FAILURE

When there's a problem someone always suggests that what is needed is Federal money. These days, usually the Federal money is forthcoming. Too seldom do we look back to see whether the problem was solved that way or not.

Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who is four-square behind Federal aid to education proposals, inadvertently has proved that Federal money doesn't necessarily solve the problems at which it is directed.

Mr. Ribicoff has released a study made by his department showing that enrollment of engineer students in the Nation's colleges has declined for the third year in a row.

This is an educational problem of the first magnitude, because a modern nation stands or falls on its engineering talent. Engineers are among the main planners of our economic growth, and the chief organizers of our defenses.

But it was not lack of Federal money that caused the decline in enrollment.

In 1958 after sputnik gave Americans the willies, Congress passed the Defense Education Act, specifically to step up the training of engineers and scientists. In fiscal 1959, $150 million was spent for the purpose. The next year, $187 million was spent. And this year the amount has risen to $211 million.

But these are the very years in which Mr. Ribicoff now reports that enrollment of engineers has declined.

Both the House and Senate now have passed bills to step up Federal aid to institutions of higher learning by hundreds of millions of dollars. The bills differ, so they will go to a conference committee to be compromised—if the House Rules Committee approves.

It is to be hoped that the costly experience of the Defense Education Act will make its impression on the Rules Committee, and the Federal Government will go no further into the field of education—a field in which it is not qualified to operate, and has not constitutional authority to operate.

Only Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Walter Trohan on the President's foreign policies and actions. From the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review, March 18, 1962:

ONLY HOPE

(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy last week paved the way to a summit meeting late in May or early in June by softening his position and dropping his insistence against high level talks without definite progress toward disarmament and nuclear inspection.

Undoubtedly, the American President yielded once again to British insistence on talks by the chiefs of government. Prime Minister Macmillan and Mr. Kennedy have chosen to ignore the admonition of Henry Fielding, the great 18th century jurist-novelist:

"Never trust the man who has reason to suspect that you know he has injured you."

Russian Premier Khrushchev not only suspects but knows that the non-Communist nations have a formidable array of injuries in aggressions and broken promises, but he is confident that he can get Western leaders, except possibly President de Gaulle of France, to the conference table almost any time he wishes. If they will not act, he is sure they must talk.

Disarmament conferences and summitry have been so stale, flat, and unprofitable as to puzzle the average American. The high-level and high-powered talks have been going on for years without any appreciable progress toward peace or any real thaw in the cold war.

President Kennedy and Secretary of State Rusk, like President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Herter before them, have been most pessimistic about the possibilities of progress, but they go if only to keep hope alive.

Hope has become the key word in any presidential discussion of foreign policy. The President cannot express certainty, so he expresses hope that some good will come from many of his policies and actions.

The talks on the ministerial level in recent years have been doomed to failure from the beginning, because the chief Russian negotiator, Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko, has no more latitude than a man in a steel straitjacket.

However, the United States is responsive to pressures that Russia can ignore. The United States is responsive to the wishes of its allies, where Russia dictates to its alliance of slave states.

Further, the United States is sensitive to world opinion. The Kennedy administration did not want to load Russian propaganda guns with the charge that the United States wrecked any approach to disarmament.

Khrushchev tried to transform the 17-nation disarmament huddle into a 17-power summit session. The Kennedy administration resisted this scheme, and properly so, because there was no progress to justify sitting down at the chiefs-of-government level to consider disarmament.

It might seem like a case of a summit eventually, so why not now, but it is nonetheless important to define position in diplomacy.

By rejecting Khrushchev's proposal, the United States highlighted once again the fact that Russia is opposed to workable disarmament. Then, by conceding, the United States demonstrates its willingness to work and talk about disarmament at any level.

While it all seems silly, and is silly, it is because the nuances of diplomacy are foreign to the American temperament, which is for the straightforward approach. Russia prefers the road of devious deceit.

The difference in temperament has doomed a long succession of negotiations to failure and a hopeful generation of Americans to disappointment, but we can expect such talks to go on and on and on.

Just a Snooper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the March 18, 1962, Chicago Tribune on the treatment of one of our foreign aid auditors:

JUST A SNOOPER

Jerry Jackis used to be a foreign aid auditor. Now he's out of a job. He looked in the wrong place. When his duties took him to Phnom Penh, the capital of Cambodia, he observed with curiosity that the Russians were building a hospital as a foreign aid contribution of their own. Mr. Jackis decided to take a closer look.

He found that the Russians were using American foreign aid cement and asphalt in their construction, and also had availed themselves of an American foreign aid bulldozer. We supplied the materials; they took the credit.

Mr. Jackis reported to the aid dispensers in Cambodia, was rebuked, sent home with a report to Washington that his work was unsatisfactory, was demoted to odd-jobs man in a foreign aid warehouse, and finally fired by the Kennedy administration.

Marlin Haas, the superior who gave Mr. Jackis the bum's rush from Cambodia has had his salary increased from $12,000 to $13,000 and blandly conceded before the House Government Operations Subcommittee on Aid Spending that he is in line for a new promotion. He thought it fine that the Russians should use American gift materials to build a hospital, as that helped the Cambodian economy, which was the object of our aid program there.

You don't get ahead on the New Frontier if you stir up embarrassment, for, as Mr. Kennedy knows, foreign aid is always and necessarily wonderful, and it always and necessarily helps turn back communism.

Importance of Agricultural Conservation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY A. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege this morning to point out to the Agricultural Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee the importance of the agricultural conservation program to farmers of my congressional district and I would like to insert my remarks here as information to my colleagues.

The appropriation for the agricultural conservation program administered by the ASC last year was $250 million as it has been for several years. However, the appropriation recommended for next year is only $150 million.

It is urgent and important that this conservation program be continued at its present level and that our farmers not be called upon to take a 40-percent cut or any cut in funds available at county ASC offices for cost-sharing conservation practices. Two hundred and fifty million dollars represents only 3.9 percent of the sum requested by the Agriculture Department for next year's operations. Yet in my district it reaches more farm people than any other phase of the entire agriculture program. I request the House Appropriations Committee to restore the ACP appropriation to $250 million.

Continuation of the ACP program on at least the same level as in recent years is probably more vital to the farmers of western North Carolina and throughout the 200-odd countries of the southern Appalachian area than in other sections of the country. With our very small farms, heavy rural population, steep fields, and limited land resources, it is most important that every encouragement and assistance be given that will help to conserve and restore the productivity of these farms. Failure to do so can only mean a continued and chronic low-income situation such as we already have.

Much progress has been made in healing the gullies, stopping the washes, eliminating the broomsedge and planting trees on the steep slopes in western North Carolina. Any curtailment in these efforts will be a step backward for the area.

There are many benefits that can be attributed directly to the ACP program in the western North Carolina mountain area which I represent. Cost sharing for needed conservation practices has resulted in increased acres of vegetative cover crop on our steep land, tree planting, and the improvement and maintenance of permanent cover for soil and watershed protection. Experience has proven that some assistance, such as cost sharing through ACP, must be provided if conservation practices are to be carried out in the small mountain farms.

In 1961, 13,660 farms in my congressional district participated in the agricultural conservation program. This represented 67 percent of the total farms and the average payment per farm participating was $46.

The following table shows the record of participation and payment in the counties of the district which I represent. This information is presented in order to show that this program is reaching the rank and file of small farmers:

	Total number farms	Participating farms	ACP payments
Buncombe	4,514	3,049	$143,558
Cherokee	2,022	1,081	47,172
Clay	896	702	34,777
Graham	882	673	20,131
Haywood	3,016	1,995	103,360
Henderson	2,060	1,939	85,646
Jackson	2,607	1,297	55,690
Macon	2,317	1,514	69,612
Swain	969	515	20,463
Transylvania	958	895	34,937
Total	20,241	13,660	615,346

As a second proposition, the recommended appropriation for soil conservation is approximately the same this year as it was last year. I believe that some reasonable increase should be provided to cover the increase in cost of operation. If the appropriation is not increased some services will have to be limited or discontinued. We cannot afford to go backward in our efforts to conserve the soil and water resources that are so essential to the well-being of this Nation.

Today we find greatly increased public interest and awareness of the importance of conserving and properly managing our water resources. There is ample evidence that water supplies will be a major factor in determining the future growth and prosperity of many areas. This is in addition to the remendous problem of flood control and loss of topsoil through runoff. There is really only one place where these problems can be tackled effectively, and that is back on the farms where many of the water problems start.

It is the responsibility of this generation to pass on to future generations the natural resources that will insure the basic necessities of life. The soil conservation program, as administered through the soil conservation districts

and the Soil Conservation Service, gives the essential encouragement and guidance in this direction.

The farmer's economic status does not permit him to bear the entire cost of conservation. Conservation is a matter of concern to all segments of our population.

It is important that we realize that protection and improvement of our soil and water resources is a national responsibility and is of concern to all American citizens.

With this in mind, I request that the ACP appropriation be restored to $250 million and that a reasonable increase be added to the soil conservation appropriation.

Guilt by Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in a time in which, unfortunately, discussion of political issues and the reporting of this discussion runs to breadth rather than depth, the chances for success of the unfair debater are enhanced. One manner in which this success can be achieved is through the use of generalizations categorizing something as a thing it certainly is not, saying that an apple is an acorn because both grow on trees. More thorough analysis, seeking distinctions rather than slogans, would be beneficial to the successful operation of our representative democracy, resting as it does upon a thinking electorate.

The St. Louis Globe-Democrat, in its lead editorial on March 19 looked at this question as it relates to the attempts by some to find a common right extremism in the various and varying conservative individuals and groups which have appeared on the national scene. I believe this editorial has an important message and I would commend it to my colleagues and the country.

The editorial follows:

THE SUBTLE SMEAR

During the turbulent days of McCarthyism in the early 1950's, one of the most frequent denunciations leveled against the Red-baiting Senator was the charge of guilt by association. Liberals made this a bugling battle cry.

Now the liberal establishment is using much the same tactics to discredit the new surge of conservatism.

The last few months has witnessed a flood of magazine and newspaper articles explaining, ridiculing, condemning rightist movements as crackpot and dangerous. Some of this spate can be justified. A grassroots resurgence of conservatives is news.

But the way most of these stories are handled is not justified, either by integrity in journalism or political discussion. They are frequently slanted to cast obloquy or derision on the whole conservative movement.

A close reading of most such stories shows a remarkable similarity. They give a good deal of space to controversial, far-out organizations like the John Birch Society, some of whose top-echelon pronouncements have been fantastic, but whose membership includes many well-balanced folk who simply do not like the way things are going for America.

Full treatment is given, with mocking overtones, to Billy Hargis' crusade out of Tulsa, the Kent Courtneys' Conservative Society of America in New Orleans, Gen. Edwin Walker, and certain lunatic minutiae like the American Nazi Party.

But always high on the list of far rightist disclosures is Dr. Fred Schwarz and his Christian Anti-Communist Crusade. The sin of Dr. Schwarz seems to be merely that he is a dedicated foe of communism. This man is about as radical as Cal Coolidge. He indulges in no political polemics.

Inevitably the discussion hauls in the name—cautiously but deliberately—of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, a conservative realist, not by farthest stretch of the imagination a radical. Also Senator JOHN TOWER of Texas, toughly conservative but as solidly balanced as foundations of the Alamo.

Then mention will be made of William F. Buckley, Jr., the articulate torch of modern conservatism, who himself has taken the Birch Society apart with rapier rhetoric. Yet he goes in the potpourri.

All are lumped together, in what often assumes to be an objective profile of militant conservatism—but what usually emerges a subtle slur upon the whole conservative phenomenon.

Sound and responsible, especially effective conservative leaders are thus tarred in a melange of "radical rightists"—a slick job of inferring guilt by association.

To tie the package neatly, scarcely one of these articles fails to build in allusions to McCarthyism.

Virtually no discussion of extremists involve mention of the Americans for Democratic Action or other radical leftwingers.

And yet precisely this influence, the far-left paladins in Federal Government, are responsible for the ground swell of so-called conservatism—which in reality demands but a return to the political liberalism of Jefferson and Madison, even Voltaire.

Many of the new conservative groups orient their activities on fighting communism. Not simply internal communism, as some liberals contend, but Red, godless imperialism in its world threat, as well as in domestic subversion.

No intelligent person can condone extremism of right or left. But the growth of conservatives and their rising voice cannot be subtly ticked off as evidence of a frenetic fringe.

Their taproots are nurtured by a revolt at the success of world communism and the continuing retreat of the United States in Cuba, Laos, Berlin—where we are steadily being pushed out by Russia.

Not only avowed conservatives are worried and distraught over what is in fact a turntail foreign policy for all its courageous talk and bold veneer.

The Nation's rank and file are fearful, knowing accommodation and demarche eventually can only mean defeat.

Foot and Mouth Disease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to revise and extend my remarks to include a resolution which has been forwarded to me by Mr. John D. Kirkland, executive secretary, Kansas Veterinary Medical Association, Herington, Kans., entitled "Foot and Mouth Disease," requesting the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture to continue to prohibit the importation of cloven-hoofed animals and fresh meats thereof from countries where foot and mouth disease exists. I think this is a highly important subject and deserving of consideration upon the part of this great legislative body:

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

"Whereas foot-and-mouth disease is one of the most highly infectious of all diseases of cloven-hoofed animals and we have been extremely fortunate in keeping our domestic livestock free of this most contagious and costly disease; and

"Whereas the President of the United States had a scientific mission investigate the present status of foot-and-mouth disease in Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay, and the Island of Tierra del Fuego with the possibility of reducing the restrictions placed upon animals and meats from these areas; and

"Whereas laws passed by the Congress of the United States and enforced by the Secretary of Agriculture are designed to prevent the introduction of foot-and-mouth disease from these countries; and

"Whereas foot-and-mouth disease has been introduced into the United States on nine different occasions, into Mexico at least once and Canada once, and further, two of the outbreaks in the United States were fairly definitely traced to meats originating in South American countries; and

"Whereas the costs to this country of eradicating the Mexican and the United States outbreaks have run into many millions of dollars; and

"Whereas should the disease be introduced and become established due to unsuccessful attempts to eradicate it, this country would be burdened with one of the most costly and serious diseases known to man, as well as quarantines and embargoes invoked by other countries: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Kansas Veterinary Medical Association requests the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture to continue to prohibit the importation of cloven-hoofed animals and fresh meats thereof from countries where foot-and-mouth disease or rinderpest exist and, further, that no portion of such country, such as the Island of Tierra del Fuego, be regarded as free from these diseases and that, further, the Secretary not permit any relaxation in the present requirements imposed on animals and meats from the countries referred to until it has been definitely proven beyond any doubt that there could be no hazard to the livestock of this country; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary of this association to the Secretary of Agriculture and to the congressional delegates of the State of Kansas."

This resolution was submitted by the disease control committee of the Kansas Veterinary Medical Association to the executive board of said association, in regular meeting in Wichita, Kans., on March 16, 1962, and approval and adoption of said resolution was requested by the aforesaid committee. The resolution, as submitted, was approved and adopted by the executive board and it was ordered that the resolution should be entered into and become a part of the minutes of the aforementioned meeting and that the executive secretary of the Kansas Veterinary

Medical Association submit said resolution to all necessary and proper authorities, same being hereby done on March 17, 1962.

JOHN D. KIRKLAND,
Executive Secretary, Kansas Veterinary Medical Association.

Religion Speaks to Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a very interesting and informative pamphlet has recently come to my attention. It is published by the United Steelworkers of America and contains messages reflecting the points of view of the three great religions of our country toward the union movement and the American workingman. Statements by Rabbi Eugene J. Lipman, director, Commission on Social Action, Reformed Judaism; the Very Reverend Monsignor George C. Higgins, director, Social Action Department, National Catholic Welfare Conference; and Rev. Cameron P. Hall, director, Department, Church, and Economic Life, National Council of Churches, encourage the labor union movement and stress the concern of religion for the continued well-being of all of our citizens.

I commend this pamphlet to the attention of our colleagues:

RELIGION SPEAKS TO LABOR

(By Rabbi Eugene J. Lipman)

The teachings of Judaism are universal even as God and His laws are universal. God demands of all men that we try to obey His law in our every act. Man's uniqueness, as child of God, lies in his capacity to pull himself upward toward God through deeds of righteousness.

The teachers of Judaism never identified goodness with a life of leisure. Judaism has always emphasized that work is dignified and good. The Talmud tells us: "Labor lends dignity to man," and "Love labor and hate lordship." The ancient Jewish teachers had no respect for the idle rich:

"Sweet is the sleep of the laboring man,
Whether he eat little or much;
But the satiety of the rich
Will not suffer him to sleep."
—Ecclesiastes 5: 12.

Exploitation of the laborer has always been condemned by prophetic Jewish voices. Jeremiah epitomized the Jewish view with these words:

"Woe unto him that buildeth his house with unrighteousness
And his chambers by injustice;
That useth his neighbor's service without wages,
And giveth him hot his hire."
—Jeremiah 22: 13.

A whole series of laws developed over the centuries to protect workers' rights in every possible way. At the same time, the Jewish community anticipated the welfare state by more than 15 centuries as it evolved, under religious inspiration, a complete network of social, welfare, medical, and other communal, tax-supported institutions to provide security for everyone, regardless of income status.

Because of these fundamental principles and traditions, American Judaism, through its religious institutions, has consistently upheld the rights of workers to organize for their economic betterment. It is just 50 years since the Central Conference of American Rabbis issued an historic declaration of ethical principles, for "the attainment of which the followers of our faith should strive." These include: more equitable distribution of profits, minimum wage, 8-hour day, government regulation of working conditions, abolition of child labor, workmen's compensation, health insurance, public employment offices, right to collective bargaining, mediation and conciliation, government housing for workers. And this was 1918.

These principles and their logical extensions have been reaffirmed regularly since by all three branches of American Judaism.

Jewish religious institutions have spoken out clearly on specific legislative issues involving the rights and responsibilities of organized labor. Resolutions supporting the Wagner Act and demanding repeal of Taft-Hartley have been passed by rabbinical and congregational groups. But Jewish leaders and organizations have not limited our speaking to labor to words alone. Religious compulsions have made deeds inevitable. Several dozen rabbis have served as mediators and arbitrators in labor disputes. Many Jewish religious teachers have worked closely with local and national unions in every phase of labor activities—from organizing to the picket line, from internal labor education to labor-management council leadership.

On the other hand, we have not hesitated to criticize any act of labor which was, in our view, violative of religious and ethical principles. No religious voice could refrain from speaking out in condemnation of certain acts of violence or racketeering, or exploitation of individual workers by unions, of interunion rivalry and warfare. We shall continue to criticize injustice and weaknesses in labor's structure and activities even as we do in management activities. We shall also continue to support vigorously every gain made within labor and in labor-management relations in the direction of democracy and statesmanship and mutual respect.

Jewish religious leaders, through our organizations, have recognized long-since inherent evils in the so-called right-to-work law. We have not hesitated to label it "a fraud." What it really means is the spurious and unobtainable right of an individual to stand alone, to represent himself, without the indispensable strength which can come only through union organization in a highly industrialized society. We feel that the establishment of a union shop is not a matter for compulsory legislation, but for negotiation between statesmanlike labor and statesmanlike management. We shall continue to fight against right-to-work laws in every State in which their enactment by legislatures is called for.

Judaism, in the oneness of all men even as God is one, denies categorically that labor and management are locked in inevitable and never-ending warfare. We have rejoiced as larger and larger segments of America's labor and management leaders have learned that Judeo-Christian ethical principles in this regard are sound and practical bases for business relationships. We look with concern at those few labor and management leaders who continue automatically to assume bad faith and venality in the other.

We shall continue to speak to labor and to management alike, to teach our faith until it shall have fulfilled itself and all men everywhere shall live in security and in harmony under God.

RELIGION SPEAKS TO LABOR

(By Very Rev. Msgr. George G. Higgins)

Washington, D.C., like any other national capital, is a city of many statues and public monuments erected in honor of the Nation's famous citizens. Two of these monuments are a little off the beaten track, as it were, and are not as well known as they ought to be even to the permanent residents of the city. I refer to the statue of the founding father of the American Federation of Labor, Samuel Gompers, on lower Massachusetts Avenue—just a few blocks away from the headquarters of the national AFL-CIO, and the statue of the late Cardinal Gibbons, of Baltimore, on the terrace in front of the Shrine of the Sacred Heart on 16th Street, NW.

Interestingly enough, these two great Americans were contemporaries, and while there is no record, as far as we know, that Mr. Gompers and the cardinal ever met personally, there is a striking parallel between their thinking on the American labor problem.

Let me come at this parallel in a rather round-about way by referring first of all to the history of the labor movement on the Continent of Europe. For many generations and for a variety of historical reasons which the average American is totally unaware of there has been a cleavage in Europe between the labor movement and the church. Many of the dominant labor unions of the Continent have been Marxist unions in the fullest sense of the word—collectivist in their economics and all too often vigorously anticlerical and antireligious in their philosophy. As a result many sincere Christians, Catholics and non-Catholics alike—but Catholics in particular—found it difficult, if not impossible, to participate in these unions for fear of compromising the very essentials of their religion. Consequently they felt it necessary in several countries to establish so-called Christian unions in which they might be good trade unionist and practicing Christians and Catholics at one and the same time.

The tragic history of this unfortunate conflict between Marxism and Christianity and between Socialist and Christian unions need not detain us here. The important thing to bear in mind, however, is the fact that this tragic conflict between religion and labor—thanks be to God—has never existed in the United States of America. There has always been a very cordial relationship between organized labor and organized religion in America—so much so that European labor representatives coming to our country for the first time almost invariably single out this fact as being, from their point of view at least, one of the most striking characteristics of our national tradition.

The reasons for this wholesome relationship between religion and labor in the United States are too numerous to mention, but it would probably be accurate to say that if any two individuals, in the early days at least, were more responsible for it than others, these two were Cardinal Gibbons and Samuel Gompers. I shall try to tell you very briefly why I think this is so.

In the first place, there was a critical moment in our history when it was touch-and-go as to whether or not the church would be able to give its complete support to the American labor movement. The old Knights of Labor, the principal federation of labor at that time, was accused by some Americans, including a few religious leaders, of being a "secret" society in the antireligious sense of the word, and consequently attempts were made to influence the church to rule it out of bounds for Catholics. This could have happened. If it had, we, too, would have experienced, to a certain extent at least, a cleavage between religion and la-

bor, with unfortunate results which are unpleasant even to think about at the present time. It could have happened, but it didn't, thanks in very large measure to the native wisdom and sound judgment of Cardinal Gibbons, who at that time was the recognized spokesman for the bishops of America.

The cardinal had carefully considered all the arguments against the Knights of Labor and had found them unconvincing, and he said so very plainly and very persuasively in a famous memorandum which he personally submitted to the Holy See. The cardinal knew the working people of America very intimately; he sympathized instinctively with their struggle for social justice and trusted them implicitly. Fortunately his prudent counsel prevailed, and from that day to this, to make a long story short, there has never been the slightest friction between organized labor and organized religion in America—a fact for which all of us ought to be eternally grateful to Almighty God.

The cardinal's memorandum on the Knights of Labor is one of the neglected classics in the history of labor and the history of religion in America. Certainly it is required reading for anyone who would hope to understand our traditions and our distinctively American way of life. Perhaps the following sentences from the memorandum will suggest the flavor of the cardinal's thinking:

"Since it is acknowledged by all that the great questions of the future are * * * the social questions, the questions which concern the improvement of the condition of the great masses of the people, and especially of the working people, it is evidently of supreme importance that the church should always be found on the side of humanity, of justice toward the multitudes who compose the body of the human family. * * * In our country, especially, this is the inevitable program of the future, and the position which the church must hold toward the solution is sufficiently obvious."

The church, he continues, must bestow her "maternal blessing * * * upon every legitimate means for improving the condition of the people." Thus did the cardinal defend the cause of American labor and thus did he contribute, more effectively than he could have foreseen, to the future welfare of labor and religion and the Nation as a whole.

We turn now to Samuel Gompers, who died in 1924. Once again, in the career of Gompers, there was a critical moment when the tide could have turned rather suddenly and involved our country in a rather tragic conflict between religion and labor. Gompers, as we have already indicated, was the founding father of the A. F. of L., which took the place of the old Knights of Labor in the eighties and remained throughout the lifetime of Gompers and for a dozen years thereafter the one and only important federation of labor in America. Later on, it shared the field for a number of years with the Congress of Industrial Organizations, which, in its own way, made an equally important contribution to the welfare of American workers and to the cause of social justice. Parenthetically, it might be noted here that the fact that the AFL and CIO have, at long last, healed their breach and are now joined together in a united labor movement is a cause for rejoicing.

At the outset of his career Gompers had a very important decision to make. He had to decide whether the American labor movement should be a Socialist movement or a totally new kind of labor movement—an American movement—neutral in the very best sense of the word, but guided by the light of Judaeo-Christian social ethics. It was a tug of war, but Gompers like his contemporary, the great Cardinal Gibbons, was a man of commonsense and good practical judgment. He abandoned the Socialist philosophy which he had studied so intensively as an immigrant cigarmaker from the slums of London and established his new federation as a neutral, nonsocialist organization—with wholesome results which are now the envy of many European labor representatives, who privately at least will tell you that they are sick and tired of the wornout slogans of the class struggle in their respective countries.

Gompers has left us no single document, as far as I know, which summarizes his thinking on the question of religion and labor, but the A.F. of L. during his lifetime and probably under his personal guidance and direction, did publish an official Labor Day statement which parallels, as we have already suggested, the famous memorandum of Cardinal Gibbons. I quote from it very briefly, again to suggest the flavor of the Gompers point of view:

"The labor movement fixes as its goal nothing less than the complete richness of life, without limitation of any kind, the attainment of the complete human ideal, in all its economic, ethical and spiritual implications. Through the inspiration of our labor movement, the Sunday preceding Labor Day has come into general observance as Labor Sunday. On this day it is fitting to give thought to the aspirations of labor and to find in what way the soul of labor may give thought and expression to its longings. Because of its aims and aspirations here set forth, we hold it fitting that all churches draw close to their altars the soul of labor on the coming Labor Sunday and that the men and women of labor everywhere make special efforts to cooperate with the churches and to secure the cooperation of the churches with them in order that there may be in the churches everywhere on that day a great unison of expression in behalf of a higher, nobler life for the masses of our people.

Count that nation fortunate indeed which finds a cardinal of the church bestowing his blessing upon the labor movement and upon "every legitimate means for improving the conditions of the people," and which at the same time finds the president and founding father of a great labor federation publicly urging "the men and women of labor * * * to cooperate with the churches * * * in behalf of a higher, nobler life for the masses of our people."

All of this has been a very long introduction to a very simple conclusion. The conclusion is that the United States has a labor movement which, in spite of many faults and imperfections, is basically sound and wholesome—perhaps the greatest and the most constructive labor movement in the world. It is a movement which has more than amply justified the support which the church has consistently given it over the years. A movement which deserves the backing of all right thinking citizens in all walks of life. A movement which is not perfect, of course, any more than any other human institution is perfect, but one in which religious-minded men and women—Protestants, Catholics and Jews—can be and actually are good trade unionists, not in spite of their religion, but precisely because they are fervent in the practice of their faith and are guided, not completely of course but to a very large extent, by the social teaching of religion.

A thousand years from now historians may very well conclude that this very cordial relationship between religion and labor—between the churches and the synagogue on the one hand and the trade union movement on the other—was one of our greatest national accomplishments. If so, they will also have to conclude that Cardinal Gibbons and Samuel Gompers were two of our greatest citizens—even though their statues go unnoticed today by so many of those who casually pass them on the avenues of the Nation's Capital.

Needless to add, however, neither Cardinal Gibbons nor Samuel Gompers, if they were alive today, would want us to waste very much of our time looking backwards or congratulating ourselves complacently on our past accomplishments. They would be the first to remind us that the past is but the prologue to the future and that the only purpose in looking backwards now and then is to assist us in planning more intelligently and more resolutely for the future.

Organized labor has come a long way since Cardinal Gibbons died in Baltimore in 1921 and since Gompers was called to his reward at the conclusion of the El Paso convention of the A.F. of L. in 1924.

The time has come, then, for labor to face up courageously to its tremendous responsibilities. Organization is indispensable, not alone for the protection of basic rights and freedoms, but, even more important, for the positive promotion of full production and full employment in a system of economic democracy permeated with social justice. But there are also certain dangers in organization which none of us can afford to underestimate. There is the great danger that economic organizations, particularly as they become strong and influential, will concentrate on their own interests and forget about their primary obligation to promote the common good or the general welfare. There is the danger, too, that the members of large organizations will be tempted to resort to a double standard of morality and that they will permit or even encourage their organizations to engage in selfish practices which they themselves as individuals would never think of engaging in in private life. Suffice it to say, in the words of a recent pastoral letter by the bishops of Australia, who are justly famous for their progressive social thinking, that "no man may trade his conscience to any secular organization," and that "if lying, dishonesty, and incitement to hatred are morally wrong in private relationships, they are even more wrongful when employed in the course of public affairs."

I am not suggesting that the American labor movement, in general, has been guilty of abusing its influence and power. By and large, your record has been very good. But none of us is perfect, nor is any organization beyond reproach or confirmed, as it were, in virtue. I would merely recommend, therefore, that you meditate seriously on your social responsibilities, asking God to keep your great organization ever mindful of the ethical standards set for it by those two great American leaders, Samuel Gompers and Cardinal Gibbons, and ever faithful to your mission on behalf of social justice.

RELIGION AND LABOR IN DIALOG

(By Cameron P. Hall)

The relation of religion and labor in this country is more than one of coexistence. It is a living relationship. Both are an accepted part of the life of the community and Nation in which each shares and to which each contributes.

Much of what each says is often listened to by the other. Beyond that, more on the personal than on the official level, there is a living relationship in dialog or conversation. Let us listen in, as it were, to this dialog as it takes place in a variety of ways.

I

First off, then, let us listen as labor speaks directly to religion. This naturally happens only rarely, but it did happen way back in 1909. At that time the executive board of the AFL said something very important to the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ. It was in the form of an official

communication. In it the AFL suggested that "the Sunday before Labor Day in September be officially designated as 'Labor Sunday,' and that the churches of America be requested to devote some part of this day as a presentation of the labor question." The AFL communication went on further to agree "that the various central and local labor bodies be requested to cooperate in every legitimate way with the ministers who thus observe Labor Sunday, seeking with them to secure as large an audience of working men and women as possible."

Few requests which labor has addressed to anyone has ever received a more prompt, wholehearted, and historymaking response. The reply of the churches was one of action. In 1910 the first Labor Sunday was officially designated by the Federal Council of Churches; and a few years later another "first" took place—the Labor Sunday message which since 1917 has been issued annually without a break by the Church Council.

II

Second, now listen as religion speaks directly to labor. This also, for obvious reasons, seldom happens; more likely the church speaks to its own members about labor: its need and interests and rights and responsibilities. But in December 1957 the churches did send on their part an official communication. It happened that the General Assembly of the National Council of Churches met in St. Louis at the same time the second convention of the AFL–CIO was meeting in Atlantic City. The National Council of Churches, constituted of 34 denominations with 37 million individual members, seized this opportunity to send to President George Meany the following telegram: "We send to you our greetings and our encouragement especially in the facing of the serious and complicated problems of ridding your organization of various corrupt and racketeering elements that seek to benefit by association with decent labor unions. We commend you and others of the AFL–CIO for the valiant battle you are waging for decency. We pray for your success in this struggle for better ethical practices." This telegram was signed by the president of the National Council of Churches, Dr. Eugene Carson Blake.

III

Third, let us listen as the church speaks about labor, primarily to its own people, vast numbers of whom, of course, are in labor itself. The churches thus speak often through their official representatives, many of whom are lay people meeting in deliberative assemblies, and reaching a meeting of minds through the democratic process.

The subject of what the church says is of direct and immediate concern to labor. Let us take one subject as an example. Nothing is more basic to labor than its right to organize and to bargain collectively. Here is what the churches, first through the federal council since 1908 and later through the National Council of Churches since 1950, have been saying about this great ethical and social issue.

Year 1908: "We deem it the duty of all Christian people to concern themselves directly with certain practical industrial problems. To us it seems that the churches must stand: For equal rights and complete justice for all men in all stations of life."

Year 1912: "The churches stand for: * * * the right of employees and employers alike to organize."

Year 1932: "The churches should stand for: 8. The right of employees and employers alike to organize for collective bargaining and social action; protection of both in the exercise of this right; the obligation of both to work for the common good."

Year 1940: "Resolved that the Federal Council [of Churches] record its conviction that not only has labor a right to organize but also that it is socially desirable that it do so, because of the need for collective action in the maintenance of standards of living."

Year 1948: "The churches have been right in giving encouragement to the development of the labor movement, both as an instrument for the securing of greater economic justice and as a source of both dignity and morale of the workers."

Year 1958: "We recognize the right of both employers and employees to organize for collective bargaining, and in connection with employees we believe it is generally desirable to do so."

But the voice of the churches is heard not alone as a solo of the National Council of Churches, strong and rich as its tones may be; their speaking to their members about the vital concerns of labor is also in chorus. For religion speaks about labor also in the voices of the official bodies of the several denominations. To pick a bare three of these almost at random. The Methodists: with their social creed proclaimed in 1909, and made a permanent part of their discipline. The Presbyterians: with their still standard report on "The Church and Industrial Relations"—a comprehensive, affirmative, and forward looking report prepared over a 2 year period and formally approved by their highest official body. The Southern Baptists—but let them speak for themselves: "We recognize the right of labor to organize and to engage in collective bargaining to the end that labor may have a fair and living wage, such as will provide not only the necessities of life, but for recreation, pleasure, and culture."

Only because of the limitations of space have I singled out what religion has said about the rights of labor; as you would expect, I am sure, a similar report could have been built upon the responsibilities of labor—responsibilities to its members, to the public good, and to world peace.

But the voice of the church speaking about what matters deeply to those in labor rises out of the grass roots of the churches. Not one or a few but many names stand out whose voices have been heard and listened to, far beyond the confines of organized religion. In the last century one thinks of Dr. Washington Gladden, Congregational minister in Columbus, Ohio, and Binghamton, N.Y. In the early decades of this century the voice of religion spoke through Dr. Walter Rauschenbush, of New York City and Rochester. Later on there was Bishop Francis J. McConnell, of New York, a leader in both word and deed; and in these days mention may be made of Bishop Bromley Oxnam, another Methodist bishop, formerly of New York and now of Washington, D.C.

IV

Fourth, let us now hear these two—religion and labor—speaking separately, to be sure, and yet in an essential unison, because they are talking about matters of mutual concern. The words which they use and the phrasing which they employ are often different; so also are the frame of reference and the emphasis. But beneath these differences is a shared concern about what makes up the good life—the good life for the individual, for the community, for the Nation, and for the world itself.

I am thinking, for example, about a conviction long shared by both religion and labor, namely, the need for the provision for education in this Nation. The churches long antedated the labor movement in this continent, and from the start church people exerted themselves on behalf of educational facilities; this drive continued and later came to include support for general public education. In regard to labor, it is a matter of historical record that active support for public education was one of the earliest public positions which the labor movement took.

Jumping ahead to the present century, the annual Labor Sunday message—this year's will be No. 41—can serve a good index. They give the range and character of the social concerns and goals of the churches over these many decades. I thumbed through some of them recently, and came upon subjects such as the following: social security; race relations; unemployment; international organization; economic and industrial democracy; civil liberties; farmers and urban workers; and the role of government.

Now this body of church thought and concern about what freedom and justice and brotherhood under God requires of the American people has been characteristic not alone of protestantism, but of judaism and Roman catholicism as well. In fact, of nearly all of organized religion in this country. But also, these same social goals and emphases have been held and advocated widely—although by no means universally—throughout American life, especially by labor groups, first by the AFL and later by the CIO as well. But neither of us—religion or labor—would want to claim a monopoly on these social goals, either singly or together. But that does not take away one bit from the important truth about both of us which I am emphasizing. In terms of social aspirations, objectives, and policies, religion and labor have been speaking strikingly in unison—not to each other but with voices that blend.

Fifth, and lastly, religion and labor in this country speak with each other. That is, they are in conversation with each other. It is as simple and as real as this: People of religious faith and affiliation are also leaders and members of labor. Putting this fact about us another way; Many leaders and members of organized labor are also men and women of deep religious conviction and strong religious affiliation—Protestants, Roman Catholics and Jews. For in these United States these two—religion and labor—have never been ideologically apart or institutionally in conflict. True, there has been and continues to be too much misunderstanding and at times mistrust toward one another—things which both religion and labor can do something about. But the fact is that they are in dialog, meeting face to face in a living relationship. As one example of this dialog, in our National Council of Churches, we have had a vice president who holds a commanding position in labor, our general board has had and now has laymen who are in the headquarters staff of the AFL–CIO; and others have sat as members of several of our policymaking bodies.

But this living relationship between religion and labor, of which dialog is a symbol, occurs, of course, most widely and most fruitfully in our local communities. There members of local churches and union locals are so largely the same people. In that living dialog there is indeed strength for both, religion—Protestant, Roman Catholic, and Jewish—and labor.

New York Republican Women Hail Glenn Space Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSICA McC. WEIS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, recently the Federation of Women's Republican

Clubs of New York State addressed a special telegram to Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., commending him on his magnificent space effort.

Under leave previously granted, I should like to include this telegram at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Following is the telegram sent to Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr.:

We congratulate you on your great feat of orbiting into space, culminating a program started some 3 years ago under our great leader President Eisenhower. Your spiritual approach, humility, and strength in your achievement is an inspiration to all of us.

FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S REPUBLICAN CLUBS OF NEW YORK STATE, INC.

The Republican Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter by the Honorable MELVIN R. LAIRD, of Wisconsin, which appeared in the Baltimore Sun:

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

SIR: The recent column in your paper by Thomas O'Neill entitled "Search for a Face," contained many perceptive comments on the problems of a minority party in the American political system and on the current problems of the Republican Party in particular. In some respects, however, it failed to recognize a significant difference between the Republican and Democratic Parties and failed to present a balanced appraisal of the 1962 Joint Committee on Republican Principles.

The differences of opinion within the Republican Party are neither so basic nor so broad as those in the Democratic Party. Representatives of the Republican Party can, as a consequence, draft a statement which all responsible party leaders will accept without sidestepping specifics "in favor of ringing declarations for home and mother." Republicans can draft a meaningful declaration of party principles which will be accepted both by the congressional and the noncongressional representatives of the party. Believing that agreement can be secured among Republicans on a meaningful declaration, the Joint Committee on Republican Principles is now undertaking its work.

There are two major reasons for the establishment of this committee. One of them was mentioned by Mr. O'Neill, "a public impression" that the Republican Party "is for nothing and against everything." Such an impression no doubt is widely held. It is held because of the slick monopolization of the news by the administration and because of the failure of Republicans to affirm with a clear, persistent, and united voice the positive and constructive program which they are seeking to advance in the Congress. For example, the Republicans last year had a constructive alternative to the administration's depressed areas bill, but relatively few Americans were even aware of the Republican proposal. Republicans in the Congress have offered constructive proposals in the major problem areas with which the Congress will be dealing this year. An example last week was the Republican manpower and training proposal. But again, the existence of these Republican proposals is almost unknown.

The joint committee has a job, then, of dispelling the so-called negative image of the Republican Party by enunciating the principles on which the Republican legislative proposals, which have already been offered to the Congress, are based. The enunciation of such principles, we would hope, would encourage the future development of other specific proposals in the fields of public policy in which they are now lacking.

The second reason for the establishment of the joint committee is the need for investigation of the effect of changed circumstances on the application of Republican principles. The world of 1962 is different in many important respects from the world of 1960, which provided the setting in which the last official statement of Republican policy was formulated. Since 1960, for example, we have been plagued by an intolerably high level of unemployment. Since 1960 negotiations over a nuclear test ban have clearly failed; the Soviet Union has resumed testing, and we have tardily decided to do the same. Since 1960 significant and disturbing changes have taken place in our relations with our European allies.

In the light of such changes as these, a careful rethinking of party policy is in order for both major parties.

More than a decade ago, a distinguished committee of the American Political Science Association recommended that the major parties draft a declaration of policy in the off-years as well as in the years in which Presidential elections are held. This was good advice at the time at which the recommendation was made. The swift and dramatic changes which have occurred in the course of the past 2 years make an effort of this kind even more useful and necessary today.

I am sure that neither Mr. O'Neill nor the Sun—both noted for fairness and objectivity—would prejudge the effort which the 1962 Joint Committee on Republican Principles is making. Your objectivity was most apparent in your Friday news story covering the Republican leadership meeting. The Sun's report was the only account read by me in which Representative HALLECK's remarks concerning the adoption of the Republican minority's manpower and training substitute program received prominent recognition.

The committee is engaged in a work of importance to the entire Nation, and I know the American press will give the finished product an unbiased appraisal.

MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Member of Congress.

The Byelorussian Democratic Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, 44 years ago on March 25 a group of dedicated political leaders met in Minsk and drew up a proclamation. Their proclamation of independence, like the American Declaration of Independence, listed the abuses of the imperialist mother country. The grievances of the Byelorussian people were perhaps more fundamental in nature than those which led to the outbreak of the American Revolution. Religious persecution, suppression of the critical national press, prohibition of the native language, and finally a disastrous foreign policy which made the nation a battleground in a futile savage war—these were the conditions against which the Byelorussians revolted.

The revolution took place during that incredibly confused period of World War I when the czarist army fell apart and the Soviet Army sprang into being. At that time the Byelorussians were divided among pro-Soviet and anti-Soviet political groups. An infantry regiment of the old imperial army composed of Byelorussians attempted to regroup as the national Byelorussian Army. It established contacts with Ukrainian and Tartar undergrounds. However, the Soviet forces discovered the plot, arrested the leaders, and removed the infantry regiment from Minsk. Still anti-Soviet forces continued to organize and sent delegates to the Brest-Litovsk negotiations to protest against the partition of Byelorussia. Their protests were not in vain, for the question of Byelorussia was ignored in the treaty provisions. The Red army left Minsk after the treaty was signed and two Governments were formed—one in Minsk, the other in Vilna. Realizing that compromise was necessary, representatives of the two Governments met on March 25, 1918, and proclaimed a single free and independent nation. The Byelorussian Democratic Republic endured for 3 years before it was crushed by the superior Soviet Army. Today we are proud to remember those remarkable men who fought for their independence in spite of overwhelming opposition.

The Withy Husseys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, a cardinal characteristic of Maine people is an ability to keep their heads above water in the turbulent currents of life that swirl about them.

Today we use a wide assortment of terms to reveal this characteristic of resourcefulness, but once upon a time almost complete reliance fell upon the term "withy."

I insert into the RECORD an article making special reference to the term "withy" as it once had application to a typical Maine family, this article being an extract from "Maine Developments," a publication issued by the Maine Department of Economic Development.

The article follows:

THE WITHY HUSSEYS

There's a spritely old word not used so much nowadays, which is a pity. It's withy. Time was when, if you wanted to describe a person as being alert, wiry and agile you said that he was withy, and thereby created a picture of grace in streamlined motion.

Withiness can be mental as well as physical. It was a characteristic of early Maine people, and it runs in many families even today. You'll find it especially among the older commercial and manufacturing families. Their companies have survived through the years, because withiness was one of the family characteristics.

One of the withiest families in business in Maine today is the Hussey family of North Berwick.

IN OLDEN TIMES

Once upon a time, long, long ago, one of the Husseys designed a plow that would turn a furrow better than any other plow in existence. The point was iron and the share was iron, which was a big improvement over the wooden plows of the day not only because the iron would last longer, but because iron could be cast into the proper curve, and this is why it laid over a furrow so much better than a wooden plow.

Mr. Hussey set up a small foundry and manufactory in North Berwick and the Hussey plow became famous.

In those days farmers had plenty of time and they made their plows and most of their other tools, of wood. Metal was scarce and it was expensive, and it was used principally as a fastener and a cutting or wearing surface for wooden tools. And so Mr. Hussey made cast iron points and shares for the farmers to attach to the wooden plows they made in their own shops. This was a very long time ago, indeed.

It looked as if Mr. Hussey had a product that never, never would go out of style, because there always would be farmers and farmers always would need plows. The Hussey family, in other words, "had it made," or so it did appear.

CHANGES, CHANGES, CHANGES

But there came a day when farmers ceased to be content with part-wood tools. And somebody invented steel, which was better than cast iron in many respects, but could not be produced in a little foundry such as the one in North Berwick.

Then a new company away out in Chicago or some such place began making whole plows of steel, and other agricultural machinery, too, so that all the farmer had to do was mortgage his place and buy whatever he wanted already made, without bothering to whittle out any wooden parts himself. This was handy for the farmers and a boon to the bankers. But it raised the very devil with the Hussey plow business.

Manufacturers have faced this situation since arrows replaced slingshots as weapons of defense. The withy conformed to the changing time, and survived.

The withy Husseys survived.

They did it by developing new products to replace the ones that had become outdated, just as all manufacturers do who have the will to survive. They went into the structural steel business and fabricated a variety of items, each popular in its own day, such as flagpoles, fire escapes and—more lately—bleacher seats for outdoor and indoor use and private docking and landing facilities and swimming floats and diving boards and things.

MEMORIAL TO WITHINESS

And so in North Berwick today, within sight of where the Hussey Foundry stood 100 and more years ago, stands the structural steel fa bricating plant of the Hussey Manufacturing Co., Inc., a monument to the withiness of the Husseys.

There is every indication that this monument will stand there for some time to come.

Recently 11 employees of the company completed an 6-week extension course in structural steel design at the University of New Hampshire, to increase the technical skill and know-how of the engineering and sales staff.

L. E. Willey, a Hussey vice president, said, "This course should improve our ability to utilize the latest design theories in the fabricated structural steel industry and thus serve our customers in this area more efficiently."

What he meant was: "It will keep the company withy."

Gross, Regrettable Error

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to shocking statements made recently at a meeting in Phoenix, Ariz., of "The Anticommunism Movement of Arizona."

The group sponsored a taped speech by R. Carter Pittman, of Georgia, who said, among other things:

The only difference between the Congolese and American Negro is that the Congolese eat more white people than those in America.

And:

School integration is the scientific hoax of the century, perpetrated through Communist influences.

A new and vigorous newspaper in Phoenix, the Arizona Journal, spotlighted the meeting and Mr. Pittman's speech. Now the TACMOA has offered a public apology for presenting the Pittman diatribe. The incident leads the Journal to wonder where next the ultra-right will lead us.

Here is what the Journal says in an editorial of March 19:

GROSS, REGRETTABLE ERROR

John W. Norveil, president of "The Anti-Communism Movement of Arizona," has issued a public apology on behalf of his organization for the anti-Negro speech which was delivered via tape recording at a supposed "anti-Communist" meeting in Phoenix last week.

Mr. Norveil says the use of the speech by segregationist R. Carter Pittman of Georgia was "a gross and regrettable error."

The full text of Mr. Norveil's statement was published on this page in Sunday's Journal.

TACMOA has apologized, and expressed its repudiation of the racist propaganda of R. Carter Pittman. This is fine, but it does little to explain what's going on.

Just how does a vicious anti-Negro speech find its way onto the program of an "anti-Communist" meeting in the auditorium of a respectable Phoenix department store?

Who decides what is going to be taken up at TACMOA meetings?

TACMOA's board of directors, through Mr. Norveil, has repudiated the ridiculous Pittman line about white superiority and a "Communist conspiracy to bring about integration in American schools." This would indicate that the board did not know what was in the speech before it was played. Otherwise, why would it be used?

However, at least one member of the board certainly did know.

Mrs. Norma Rothpletz, vice president of TACMOA, not only knew what was on the tape but she heard the Pittman speech when it was originally delivered in Tulsa.

The Arizona Journal knew in advance what Pittman was going to "say in his recorded remarks." The New York Times had carried an account of his speech when it was given in Tulsa.

The journal advised Bob Goldwater, president of the Goldwater's store, of the content of the Pittman speech the day before the TACMOA meeting.

The scheduled meeting was allowed to go on.

Mr. Goldwater has informed TACMOA that it will have to take future meetings elsewhere.

The lesson to be learned here is quite clear.

TACMOA, with all its high-flown purposes to "awaken the American people to the menace of communism," has been caught in a position of utter irresponsibility.

It is hard to predict what weird avenues of "anticommunism" such an organization might take us down next.

Health Care for Older Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, health care insurance for our older citizens has become one of the most dramatic domestic issues now before the country because the need is urgent and increasing steadily. Today the number of Americans who are 65 and over totals 16.6 million; in less than a decade the total will reach 20 million. The great advances in medical science and health care are reflected in the number of people who reach the retirement age of 65 and especially the increasing numbers in the 75-to-85-year-age groups.

I feel that I share with millions of Americans the determination that such a bill shall be enacted at this session of the Congress. That legislation must receive high priority and I have therefore tried to work out an approach which I deeply believe is the solution to the deadlock that stands in the way of a satisfactory program of health care for the aging.

The merits of my proposal and the administration's plan are competently weighed by Arthur S. Flemming, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in the Eisenhower administration, and currently president of Oregon University, in a magazine article which as my mail indicates is attracting attention all over the country. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD his article entitled "Care for the Aged—and This Nonsense About 'Socialized Medicine'" which appeared in Good Housekeeping magazine, April 1962.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARE FOR THE AGED—AND THIS NONSENSE ABOUT "SOCIALIZED MEDICINE"

(By Arthur S. Flemming)

Just what do we owe our senior citizens? I think we would all agree that we owe them our continued love and a full measure

of privacy—but, in more practical terms, we also owe them a chance to live out their lives free from the fear—or worse, the reality—of the crippling costs of a major, catastrophic illness.

How this can be accomplished is one of the most urgent problems of our times and, specifically, of the present session of Congress.

Why is the issue so important? Take the case of Mr. A.

He is 69 years old. His total annual income is $960, and he has no health or medical insurance.

In 1958, 1959, and 1960, his medical expenses averaged $177 a year—a heavy enough burden. In 1961 he had a heart attack, and his medical expenditures rose to $750—an impossible one.

Although Mr. A deprived himself of many of the necessities of life to meet his medical bills, he was hardly able to pay all of them. So, to help him, his son and daughter-in-law were forced to withdraw $600 from the savings earmarked for the education of their children.

Mr. A is typical of the majority of our senior citizens. Approximately 10 million of the more than 16 million people aged 65 and over have incomes of $1,000 or less, or about $3 a day. Three-fourths of this group have incomes of less than $2,000 a year. It is true that some have husbands or wives with incomes of their own. As a group, however, they have pitifully limited resources. About half have some kind of health or medical insurance. But very few can afford policies that protect them against the costs of major or long-term illnesses.

When such illnesses occur, and when their own or their family's resources are not sufficient to meet them, they are forced on relief.

Recently the National Association of Blue Shield Plans and the American Medical Association announced a nationwide program to pay the full cost of medical and surgical services for single persons 65 and over whose annual income is $2,500 or less and for couples whose income is $4,000 or less. But as Abraham A. Ribicoff, present Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, points out, this private program (which would cost about $3 a month per person) fails to answer the principal problem—hospital care of the aged.

Millions of older people, and tens of millions of their sons and daughters, are demanding an end now to this intolerable situation. Most of them feel that the Government should take the lead in establishing a system that will insure the aged against a large percentage of their medical and hospital bills. They believe that everyone who benefits from such a system should also contribute to it.

I firmly agree with them.

At present there are two bills before Congress proposing such a system. One is the official administration plan supported by President Kennedy. The other, which I believe is the sounder, is backed by Senator JACOB JAVITS, of New York.

The subject of medical care for the aged has been made to sound very complicated. It has been further confused by the irresponsible charges of the American Medical Association, which also opposed the introduction of social security in the 1930's, that the Kennedy administration's proposal amounts to socialized medicine.

Actually, the issues are very simple. Here are the basic differences between the administration and Javits plans.

The administration plan (King-Anderson bill, H.R. 4222) would be open to persons 65 or older who are covered by either the social security or railroad retirement systems. It would pay some of the costs of hospital and nursing home care, diagnostic services, and the services of such persons as visiting nurses and technicians. It would be financed entirely through the social security system.

The Javits plan (S. 2664) would be open to all persons 65 or older who are retired. In addition to paying some of the costs of hospital or nursing home care, laboratory tests, and other auxiliary services, it would pay some of the cost of medical care in the home or physician's office. This plan would be financed partly through social security, partly through general Government revenues.

I believe Senator JAVITS' proposal is the better because:

It covers an additional 2 to 4 million senior citizens who are not under social security or railroad retirement.

The plan would be administered by the States, rather than the Federal Government. (However, the States would have to conform to minimum Federal standards.)

By making some provision for the costs of preventive medical care in the home or physician's office, the plan could be expected to reduce major illnesses and their heavy costs.

Older people could choose between insurance that would pay the initial costs of any illness and insurance that would help pay costs of a major or long-term illness.

Those who preferred to take out individual or group health insurance policies from private companies or prepayment organizations like Blue Cross or Blue Shield instead of participating in the Government plan would be given help in making the premium payments.

Though I am concerned about the omission of these provisions in the Kennedy administration plan, I realize that reasonable people can differ about the merits of the two bills. If Congress debates them on their merits, I am sure a sound plan will emerge.

What would such a plan mean to Mr. A? If it had been in effect at the time he had his heart attack, for which he was hospitalized for 20 days, it would have provided him with from $500 to $600 to pay his total costs of $750. Mr. A, and the millions of those like him, would no longer have to become a burden to their families, or be added to the Nation's relief rolls.

Why, then, does the American Medical Association oppose such a plan? And why is the form their opposition has taken not only unsound but shockingly unfair?

The AMA contends that the needs of the aged in the medical-care field can be met by legislation already in existence—the Kerr-Mills law. This law makes provision for Government help for emergencies after they arise. As such, and in lieu of something better, it is a good law, and I supported it when I was Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. This is what it does:

It provides additional Federal funds for the medical-care provisions of the Federal-State old-age assistance program. This program uses public funds to help support elderly people whose incomes are below the minimum levels specified by their respective States.

It provides for a Federal-State program to care for the needs of senior citizens whose income is too high to permit them to qualify for the old-age assistance program, but too low, in the judgment of their respective States, to enable them to meet their medical bills.

Many of our older citizens, however, do not want to wait for a medical emergency to arise and then be completely dependent on Government. Nor do their sons and daughters—in their parents' behalf now, in their own later, when they themselves are old. They want insurance against emergencies. This the Kerr-Mills law does not provide. It is misleading, therefore—and insulting—for the AMA to claim that this public assistance law is the final answer to the costs of medical care for older people.

Even worse, however, are the AMA's efforts to discredit the administration proposal (this compulsory health-care program) by labeling it "socialized medicine." In paid advertisements in newspapers and magazines, the AMA has alleged that "* * * when the Federal Government enters the privacy of the examination room—controling both standards of practice and choice of practitioner—the cost includes loss of freedom—your doctor's freedom to treat you in an individual way; your freedom to choose your own doctor. When the doctor is socialized, his patient is socialized as well."

This is irresponsible nonsense. It is simply not the truth.

Under socialized medicine, all hospitals and health facilities would be owned and operated by the Government. All doctors, nurses and other health workers would be on salaries paid by the Government and would be under direct Government supervision.

The administration proposal includes a specific prohibition against Government interference in the practice of medicine. The patient chooses his own doctor, his own hospital or nursing home. He pays the doctor himself, regardless of where his services are performed. For hospital and other services, he would simply be provided with the means of paying a part of the costs.

The same freedom of choice is offered by the Javits plan.

There is thus no basis whatever for the AMA's charges. By persisting in labeling as socialized medicine something that is not socialized medicine, the AMA does a disservice to the Nation. It weakens, rather than strengthens, the possibility of defeating proposals that can legitimately be placed in that category. Carying "Wolf, wolf" when there is no wolf is always a mistake.

The AMA's charges are simply an effort to block intelligent discussion of a major issue by arousing unjustified fears, and, as such, are not worthy of argument.

Instead, let's focus our attention on the merits of the administration and Javits proposals, or any other plan that would insure our senior citizens against the economic hazards of illness.

Since these medical care proposals, if passed, will have a positive impact, sooner or later, on almost every American family's welfare, it might be wise for you to try to learn more about them. For information on the administration plan, write to Mr. William L. Mitchell, Commissioner of Social Security, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C. For information on the Javits plan, address the Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS, the U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C. Three women's organizations that are already taking a particular interest in the medical care bills are the American Nurses Association, the National Council of Jewish Women, and the YWCA.

Make up your own mind about them—and then make your views known by writing to your Congressman.

May the best plan win.

United States Trots Down the Fabian Road

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following column by Henry J. Taylor from the Dallas Times-Herald of March 19, 1962, on the danger of the Kennedy fiscal policy:

UNITED STATES TROTS DOWN THE FABIAN ROAD

(By Henry J. Taylor)

In a wrangle over payments that lasted for 27 years, Leonardo da Vinci finally received 1,200 lire for his masterpiece, "Virgin of the Rocks," now in the Louvre. That is $1.94 today. The painting is priceless. The money is worthless. This is inflation.

There are no boundaries to human needs. And any government which proclaims that because we need things we can have them by government spending is dealing in a world of words that have caused incalculable human tragedy. It is the world where solutions are made to sound easy merely by debt and a printing press. Figures can be tiresome, but we are due a sober accounting. Perhaps a compilation will amaze you, for it has all happened incredibly fast. And, after all, it is our money, savings and future that are at stake.

DEFICIT INCREASES

On March 27, 1961, President Kennedy forecast a $2.1 billion deficit in his New Frontier budget. On May 25 he said the deficit would be $3.6 billion. On July 25 he revised the red figure again to $5.3 billion. On January 18, 1962, the President revised his deficit once more to $7 billion. And now the latest monthly Treasury statement showed an actual deficit of $9.4 billion during the first 7 months of the New Frontier's fiscal year, through January.

Yet even this isn't the whole story. A year ago the legal debt limit was $293 billion. Then on June 27 Treasury Secretary C. Douglas Dillon testified that a "temporary statutory debt limit of $298 billion should give us sufficient elbow room for maximum efficiency of operations." Temporary? Efficient? Well, Mr. Dillon was in dreamland. His June estimates of debt levels turned out to be wrong by $5.4 billion in only the first half of the fiscal year.

FIFTEEN BILLION DOLLAR BOOST

Within months the President asked for another raise in the debt limit to $300 billion, because the Government still could not meet its current bills unless Congress complied. And still another boost to $308 billion will be requested before June 30. This is a $15 billion boost in the debt limit within 1 year, and all bound up in the enormous package with the deficit.

The spenders are eating the wrong side of Alice in Wonderland's mushroom and we're headed for an awful ache, which can affect business conditions as well as our solvency. How we can go on like this defies anybody's commonsense. Meanwhile, in real purchasing power we will all grow progressively poorer as the inevitable result of the process.

Nothing this side of war finally creates so much human misery as inflation with its artificial pay and the debauching of national finances. This is how political spending and Government debt torpedo people's savings and their ability to plan for their children and the future. For human problems do not wash away and peoples and nations are not floated over their troubles when a government becomes financially irresponsible. It is simply beyond the power of printed pieces of paper and well-meant words to do the miracle.

GRIM PARALLEL

Life (and the survival of a nation) always turns out to be harder than that. There's a grim parellel in how the Blum Socialist-Labor government contributed to France's weakness and ignoble defeat in 39 days and how Britain's Labor-Socialist government all but completed the wreckage of England at the war's end.

Where is Blum now? Nobody knows. Where are the tall foreheads of the British Fabian Socialists who laughed at history? Nobody knows.

But this much we do know: The White House professors and the President himself are trotting down this Fabian Socialist road undeterred by history's sign to "Stop, Look and Listen." Similar results can happen here, and are happening, and unless Congress forgets politics and calls a halt our long-term security against the Soviet Union cannot be guaranteed.

Is it any wonder that Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, is calling for a full-scale investigation of our financial condition? Valiant Senator BYRD and his committee deserve a nationwide roar of approval and support.

Richard Earle Davis, One of American Legion Founders, Praises Nation's War Dead in Poem on Legion's 43d Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Richard Earle Davis is an attorney in Morgantown, W. Va., who has devoted much of his life to energetic community service. He is an American Legion founder, and has subsequently served that worthy organization in numerous capacities, currently as judge advocate of its department of West Virginia.

I have been requested by Clyde Selby, commander, Monongalia Post No. 2, to include in the Appendix a poem, delivered by Mr. Davis in his speech honoring the 43d anniversary of the American Legion.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In Flanders Fields the poppies blow
Between the crosses, row on row,
That mark the dead; and in the sky
Astronauts now do bravely fly
To raise our patriotic spirits high
When they get the signal "go."
In Arlington in dreamless sleep
Other heroes eternal vigil keep
Within their marble biers; above the sod
Lie those unknown but to God.
There too the larks still bravely singing fly
And serenade the dead who proudly lie.
So rest in peace you heroes all
Who bravely heard your country's call.
Other hands now hold the torch your failing hands let go
To sleep in Flanders Fields—where poppies grow.
Now with the torch of Freedom you held so high
Old Glory's stars now orbit in the sky.
As Legionnaires we pledge to you
We'll keep your memory fresh and true.
Whether in Flanders Fields or Korea you may lie
We shall not break faith with you who die
In Freedoms cause; but will fight it through
To preserve our country or sleep with you.

RICHARD EARLE DAVIS.

Extremists, Right and Left

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the question of political extremism has been with us from the founding of our Republic. Today it is couched in new terms, but the cast of characters is about the same. Recently, in my home State of California, the question of just who is extreme has come to the fore. I think there has been a misrepresentation in this regard.

Therefore, I would like to call this body's attention to some very sage comment on the subject of extremism printed in a recent issue of a prominent newspaper in my district, the San Fernando Valley Times today. In my view, this responsible newspaper has drawn a distinction that needed drawing very badly.

The article follows:

EXTREMISTS, RIGHT AND LEFT

Labels are often used carelessly by both sides in the current debate over political extremism in this country.

One example of such carelessness is the effort by some politicians to equate the rightwing extremism of the John Birch Society with the supposed leftwing extremism of the Americans for Democratic Action.

Former Vice President Nixon is the latest to make this comparison in a recent look at the political spectrum in this country.

Yet is this a fair comparison?

Those who read the writings of Robert Welch, founder of the John Birch Society, quickly conclude that Welch favors a totalitarian society of the right with himself as the leader.

Nixon pointed out Welch's words are those of a would-be dictator, and "they leave members no choice but to agree with Welch and what he stands for or to quit the society."

But what about the ADA? Should it be regarded as an extremist organization that is as far from democracy on the left as the John Birch Society is on the right?

We do not think the two organizations are comparable. The ADA is itself strongly anti-Communist. It was anti-Communist when it was formed in 1948 to oppose the Progressive Party and the Progressive presidential candidate, Henry A. Wallace, and it still is anti-Communist.

Back in 1948, the ADA stood strongly in favor of two anti-Communist programs proposed by President Harry S. Truman and widely supported in the country, the Marshall plan and American aid to Greece. The ADA since then consistently has supported American foreign aid programs and consistently has opposed communism.

It is true, of course, that the ADA does include New Dealers, Fair Dealers, New Frontiersmen, and assorted other liberals. It is true, too, that it backs social reforms, many of which are opposed by middle-of-the-roaders and conservatives. Thus it is easy for rightwingers who equate liberalism with socialism, and socialism with communism, to claim that the ADA is as extreme in its leftwing philosophy as the John Birch Society is in its rightwing philosophy.

But there is a significant difference frequently overlooked: The ADA is in favor of working within the present democratic system in the United States and it seeks social reform through democratic processes The

same respect for democratic process cannot be claimed for a rightwing organization headed by a man whose public pronouncements indicate he would like to be an American dictator.

Who, then, are the leftwing extremists in the United States? They are the Communists themselves and those in Communist-front organizations which support the Communists' aims and goals.

The Communists and their mouthpieces on the extreme left thus become the totalitarian counterparts of the Birchers on the extreme right.

Land Reform in Iran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, more and more entrenched regimes these days are learning that internal reforms are the best means of diverting the worldwide "revolution of rising expectations" into peaceful and constructive channels. Nowhere are timely reforms more necessary than in the semifeudal kingdom of Iran. Iran has undergone many political vicissitudes in recent years, and its present Government falls considerably short of the democratic ideal. But the Shah seems aware that conditions in his countryside are breeding grounds of discontent. One day this discontent might not only topple his regime, but open up Iran to domination by its northern neighbor, the Soviet Union.

For this reason I wish to commend the Shah, his courageous prime minister, and his minister of agriculture for the land reform law of January 15, which seeks to break the stranglehold of the feudal landlords while establishing a class of rural freeholders and strengthening peasant cooperatives. As an example of the impact of this measure, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD an article by Dana Adams Schmidt of the New York Times.

Granted the Shah's program might have its defects. It may be another instance of too little too late. It raises serious questions as to the feasibility of massive land reform in an underdeveloped country where restrictions on the flight of capital are less than totally effective. Nevertheless, it is a beginning, and I wish that many of our friends and allies around the world would take the Shah's example to heart.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHAH OF IRAN GOES TO DIVIDE AZERBAIJAN FARMS—HE TRAVELS TO NORTHWEST TO GIVE LANDS TO PEASANTS; LANDLORDS WILL BE REPAID UNDER REFORM PROGRAM

(By Dana Adams Schmidt)

TEHERAN, IRAN, March 12.—The Shah of Iran will lead an assault tomorrow against a principal bastion of Iranian feudalism.

Accompanied by Cabinet Ministers, diplomats, and hundreds of officials, he will travel by train overnight 350 miles northwest to the Province of Maragheh in Azerbaijan. In the morning he will begin giving the landlords' land to the peasants.

This procedure, in the next 2 months, will make 5,000 Turkish-speaking peasants in the area into freeholders. The peasants will pay the Government for the land in installments instead of paying rent to the landlords, who have been denounced by the Minister of Agriculture, Hassan Arsanian, as "the most wicked of Iran."

By starting this project, Shah Mohammed Riza Pahlevi, who has given almost all of his own farmlands to the peasants, indicates that he expects to eliminate landlords as the country's greatest economic and political force. At the same time he begins to establish the peasant freeholders as a great force of the future.

Under the land-reform law, enacted January 15, landlords must give up all their holdings in excess of one village. The landlords will be compensated over 10 years, receiving 10 times the annual income of the lands they lost. Peasants, gathered into cooperatives, will pay for the land over 15 years.

The system of allowing each landlord to retain one village and its lands was adopted after land-reform technicians found that the old boundaries were too vague to permit a system based on a maximum acreage.

Under the system that was adopted, each peasant is to remain on whatever piece of land he is now working, whether large, medium or small, but he will pay the Government, not the landlord. Officials of the new cooperatives will substitute for the landloards as providers of seed, fertilizer, and advice.

Critics of the Government like the spokesman for the national front, Keshavarz Sadr—the only national front leader not now in jail—call the entire project a fraud. They contend it masks the Government's real intention to protect the interests of the landlords.

They say the Government lacks the technicians to make more than a gesture toward land reform and lacks the means to pay the landlords. In any case, they add, the land-reform law is unconstitutional because it has not been approved by Parliament.

But the peppery Minister of Agriculture says the whole job will be done in 2 years. After Maragneh and the adjoining provinces in Azerbaijan, he plans to start land reform in a province to the south, then continue on.

"When the freeholders realize the advantages they have gained," Mr. Arsanian said, "I don't think the remaining landlords will find peasants willing to work with them. I think the landlords will have to sell out entirely."

Whitener Has Good Approach to State Department Maze

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the Shelby Daily Star, of Shelby, N.C., carried in its March 26, 1962, issue a very good editorial in connection with the bill I have introduced to give the Secretary of State greater authority in selecting personnel for his Department.

With the belief that my colleagues in the Congress will find the editorial to be most interesting I request that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

WHITENER HAS GOOD APPROACH TO STATE DEPARTMENT MAZE

Representative BASIL WHITENER has introduced a bill which would give the Secretary of State broad powers to make personnel changes within his department.

It would remove the jobs of all employes above the $8,000 salary level from the provisions of Civil Service, and would allow the secretary to hire and fire such employes at his discretion.

We have no idea how this bill will be received by Congress, but to us it represents a courageous approach toward solving the problem that a growing and immovable bureaucracy has created in one area of our Federal Government.

WHITENER, speaking on his bill, said:

"We live in an era of rapidly shifting and changing political, economic, and social trends. The Secretary of State should have within his Department people who reflect his views on all international problems.

"I do not believe it is fair for a Secretary of State to be criticized for decisions made by a bureaucracy that has existed within the Department for many years and over which he, as the responsible officer, has no effective means of control.

"Hundreds of State Department officials are carried over from one administration to the other, and although they may not be in agreement with certain policy decisions of the Secretary of State, there is not much the Secretary can do about it."

Does this not get to the crux of the problem?

Almost without exception competent observers, even including former Secretary of State Dean Acheson, consider the Department overstaffed, inefficient, and unable to present the necessary diplomatic flexibility required by today's fast changing scene.

One national writer expressed the opinion that the State Department could be reduced in size by one-half and actually improve efficiency.

He pointed out that even simple policy papers usually must be handled by dozens of junior grade officials before finally reaching the completed stage. It sometimes takes days and even weeks to get State Department officials to express an opinion about an issue.

We believe with our Congressman that the key to the problem is bureaucratic stagnation. Even if Dean Rusk wanted to undertake a mammoth housecleaning as has been suggested by Dean Acheson and others, he would soon find himself entangled with so many civil service actions that he would have time for little else.

Many have publicly stated that the situation is hopeless, that there is no way to break the bureaucratic stranglehold now choking efficiency in our foreign service.

We do not hold this view. What Congress has done it can undo. Representative WHITENER has introduced legislation that could lead to the major and sweeping changes needed to give this Nation a new face on the New Frontier.

Every citizen should join WHITENER in his efforts and one good way to do so would be to send him letters of support and encourage others to do likewise.

Ours is in the mail.

Reds Want Safety, Help To Destroy Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following editorial by Frank Langston, editor of the Dallas Times-Herald which appeared March 20, 1962, on the Communists' method of hiding behind the Constitution while attempting to destroy it.

The editorial follows:

REDS WANT SAFETY, HELP TO DESTROY US

(By Frank Langston)

Who relies on the Constitution nowadays?

The Communist Party—that's who.

And who is it that urges a broad front of all left and progressive forces, both Communist and non-Communist, to fight for peace and democracy?

That's right—the Communist Party.

Don't take my word for it. Look at the statements of the top Communist leaders in the United States. They're available—if you take the trouble to find them—and to read them after you find them.

But remember this: When the Communists refer to peace, they're talking about peace on Communist terms. And by democracy they mean government of the people under communism. Progressive elements in their jargon are socialistic elements.

The Communists in the United States, facing action by the Federal Government, are attempting to use the Constitution as a shield for their activities aimed at destroying that same Constitution.

They have fought a long and, until recently successful battle in the courts. Now, facing a crackdown after a ruling against them by the Supreme Court, they say the action is unconstitutional.

Gus Hall, general secretary, and Benjamin J. Davis, national secretary of the American Communist Party, were arrested last week following indictment for refusing to register the party with the Government under the Subversive Activities Control Act.

CLAIM LIBERTIES THREATENED

The Communist Party promptly issued a statement saying the arrests were "a blow to the political liberties of all Americans." And their attorney said the party takes the position that the law under which they were indicted is unconstitutional—even though the Supreme Court already had upheld it.

Last summer Gus Hall issued a long statement to the Communist Party members, in which he said that "in the opinion of the Communist Party, there can be no question but that the threat from the extreme right is serious."

Threat to whom? Hall did not say. Presumably, since he addressed his remarks to the Communist Party, he meant the threat is to the Communist cause.

He said the U.S. Government is faced with the necessity of ending the cold war and seeking "some sort of an accommodation to the socialistic and national revolutionary world, which would mean a turn to a policy of peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition" or of trying to "contain and reverse world trends by all means, including so-called limited war and the ultimate nuclear war."

REDS WANT UNITED FRONT

And how does the Communist Party expect to meet "the threat from the extreme right and an administration moving in a reactionary direction?"

Not alone, of course. It needs help—from other Americans.

"It is necessary to work for the widest united front of all labor, Negro, peace, and progressive forces in the country, embracing democratic elements of all political views, in a struggle against big business reaction and war danger," Hall wrote. "It is essential to organize a counteroffensive against big business attacks on the people."

And just what will be required for this?

"Above all, it requires a common outlook and united front activity in all fields by the left and progressive forces, Communist and non-Communist," Hall said. "Without the unity of such forces in the ranks of labor, among the Negro people, in the youth movement and among the fighters for peace and democracy, the promising popular movements now arising will remain disjointed and apart, prey to the mounting attacks of reaction."

These words may sound good, until they are analyzed as to their meaning in the Communist doubletalk. Then they take on a different meaning.

LAW ABIDING WHEN CONVENIENT

Hall, who once served a prison sentence for conspiracy to teach and overthrow the Government by force and violence, believes in the Constitution and due process of law only when it serves the Communist Party. In the present case, he said, "we have refused to accept this judgment, whether it comes from the High Court or elsewhere."

He wants a lot of help from a lot of people, but he wants them to gloss over communism in providing it.

"The left and progressive forces cannot permit themselves to be split on the Communist issue, if there is to be unity and common action," he said. "Refusal to work with Communists for defense of peace and democracy and for the people's needs is the first step, in splitting the people's forces."

What Hall and the other Communist leaders want is shelter of the Constitution till they can destroy that Constitution, civil and political, rights till such rights can be destroyed, and the help of well-meaning but Red-guided people of all sorts to help them accomplish the task.

Intransigent Foe of Totalitarianism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, March 29, 1962, marks the 70th birthday anniversary of a truly courageous prince of the Roman Catholic Church.

Born in Austria-Hungary of prominent rustic parents, Jozsef Pehm put aside the farming chores of his youth to embark on a priestly career. Shortly after his ordination he was sent to teach religion to high school students. There at Zalaegerszeg in 1919 he encountered the enmity of Bela Kun who inaugurated the first Communist reign of terror. Undaunted, Father Pehm published two weekly newspapers in a tireless effort to discredit Kun's poisonous doctrine. The young priest was thrown into prison and later exiled, but the influence of his writings together with popular unrest limited the Kun regime to a duration of a few months.

Next to confront the dedicated clergyman was the rise of fascism. Father Pehm, a Hungarian by choice as well as lineage, cast off his surname and chose one that identified him squarely against nazism and all its tenets.

Pope Pius XI appointed him a monsignor in 1937 and Pope Pius XII elevated the prelate to the rank of bishop during the same month of March in 1944 that the Nazis invaded Hungary. Outspoken against the persecution of Jews, the Bishop of Veszprem was imprisoned on a charge of treason and was not liberated until April 1945.

Within 18 months the one-time farm boy became archbishop of Esztergom and cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church.

The Communists were quick to launch a campaign against the primate, characterizing him as reactionary and anti-Semitic, when in fact his only crime was his steadfast opposition to Communist doctrine, particularly their atheistic indoctrination of schoolchildren. Arrest was inevitable and on the day following Christmas 1948 he was apprehended and charged with plotting against the government, spying, treason, and black-market dealings in currency. Haggard and unlike himself, the helpless victim of Soviet brainwash, he was convicted of the crimes for which he was tried. His sentence of life imprisonment was revoked on October 30, 1956. From that day forward the American Legation in Budapest has been his sanctuary. The bishop removed from his flock prays daily for a lasting reunion with them.

Mr. Speaker, in behalf of freedom-loving peoples everywhere it is a cherished privilege to salute Jozsef Cardinal Mindszenty, intransigent foe of totalitarianism.

The Late Chandler Bullock, of Worcester, Mass.—The Ideal American Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, the people of my home city of Worcester, Mass., were deeply saddened when it was learned that on the previous night one of our most distinguished citizens, Mr. Chandler Bullock, had passed away at the age of 89.

Mr. Bullock achieved national distinction as a legal authority in the insurance field and served as president of the State Mutual Life Assurance Co. of America for 15 years.

He was an outspoken, but eminently just, champion and defender of private enterprise in its truest American tradition.

A great many honors were bestowed upon him for his business leadership. However, it was his unselfish and unceasing interest and participation in the civic progress and cultural development of our community that mostly generated the substantial esteem and affection in which he was universally held by our citizens.

No task for the advancement of our community welfare was too small to engage his interest. His cheerful and willing sacrifices of time, energy, and resources for the benefit of his fellow citizens are a legend in our city.

Mr. Bullock was a true Christian and genuine American gentleman and Worcester is a better place because he lived among us.

Our deepest sympathy is extended to his gracious wife and family in their sorrow, while we pray divine providence to bestow the highest blessings upon his great soul in everlasting peace.

I am pleased to include, at this point, a pertinent editorial about this great man that appeared in the March 25, 1962, issue of the Worcester Sunday Telegram, and the article follows:

CHANDLER BULLOCK

The community has suffered a great loss in the death of Chandler Bullock. His life, his interests, his character, and his generous devotion to our civic welfare represented the spirit of Worcester at its very best.

As a business leader of great talent and energy, he was one of those men who have contributed most significantly to the building of our city. But he did more, for he was an important contributor, also, to the spirit which has made Worcester so much more than a mere municipality.

He gave generously of himself in the politics of the city and the State, and his leadership in Republican Party affairs was aimed always toward inspiring a better quality in the fabric of our Government.

But Worcester is also indebted to Chandler Bullock for the generosity with which he shared his intellectual enthusiasms. His continuing devotion to the arts became almost a legend. He had figured most importantly in Worcester's cultural life. He helped impressively in giving us the drama, the music, and the distinguished museum which means so much to all of us.

He had a lively interest in sports. He loved good conversation. He was a man of wit and thought and friendship. He carried a sense of obligation to a community which his family, before him, had done so much to create. And he was eager for every opportunity to make his home city better.

The failing eyesight of his later years might have given him ample reason for withdrawing to the quiet privacy of age. Yet Chandler Bullock refused to be handicapped. His continuing participation in the life of the community was a stout and vigorous example of a brave man's love for his ideals, his city, and his fellow men.

It was Worcester's great good fortune to have such a citizen as Chandler Bullock.

Health Care Needs in Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Robert Fisher, of Battle Creek, Mich., recently brought to my attention an effort which he is making in his home community to test the great demand, allegedly based upon a pressing need, for the enactment of a health care program under social security. The Battle Creek Enquirer and News, on March 2, made editorial comment on a statement by Michigan's Democratic Governor, decrying his politically inspired attack on the Kerr-Mills Act.

Dr. Fisher wrote to the Enquirer and News probing into the operation of the Kerr-Mills Act in Michigan and asking for those who needed medical care, and could not receive it through regularly established channels to give him the information on their cases so that a better understanding of the real need might be found. I, too, have urged those who write me and talk to me about the King-Anderson bill in terms of the great need in individual cases to cite these cases to me so we can see if there is not, perhaps, some already operative program of aid under which these needs, which are real, might be met. Some cases in this area have been traced down and it has been found that it is not a matter of there being no program but rather a question of a breakdown in its administration or ignorance of its existence that has prevented it from meeting the situation adequately.

I am placing the Enquirer and News' editorial, Dr. Fisher's letter to that paper, and a letter which the doctor has written to report on the total lack of responses in the first stretch of his open request in the RECORD. I think it is a meaningful commentary on the question of the need for further legislation in the health care field:

[From the Battle Creek (Mich.) Enquirer and News, Mar. 2, 1962]

SWAINSON PLAYS POLITICS, BUT NOT TOO EXPERTLY

Gov. John B. Swainson plays the game of politics with great enthusiasm, but he can hardly be accused of being a smart politician. His denunciation of the Kerr-Mills medical care program for the aging is utterly ridiculous and patently indicates that he either doesn't know what he's talking about or that he is deliberately dispensing misleading information.

The Governor's timing of his statement only calls for brief comment before passing on to the more important implications of what he said. If the Kerr-Mills program has been such a colossal failure during its year of operation in Michigan—as Governor Swainson has charged—then why did not the Governor have something to say about it earlier? The public may rest assured that the Governor held his fire until he thought it would have the best effect politically. He released his criticism to coincide with President Kennedy's call for a socialized medical care plan that would supersede the Kerr-Mills law.

Governor Swainson's stated reasons why the Kerr-Mills Act has failed deserve, however, extremely close scrutiny. He cites the fact that Michigan has more than 638,000 citizens past age 65 and said that it was estimated that at least 60,000 of these would be eligible for assistance in the first year of operation under the Kerr-Mills program. But he argues that fewer than 12,000 of these 60,000 eligible senior citizens have applied for help. To the Governor, such relatively light participation indicates failure of the program; to thinking citizenry, it might prove that the bulk of our aging population is still able to meet its own needs.

Under the Kerr-Mills Act, the Federal Government grants funds to the States on the basis of per capita income and the services of each State decides to provide the aging. The States themselves fix the standards of eligibility, and in the case of Michigan, the legislature decreed that single persons with an annual income of more than $1,500 and married couples with an income of more than $2,500 would be ineligible for Kerr-Mills assistance. This requirement has also been assailed by Governor Swainson, who would like to either raise the eligibility figures or eliminate them entirely.

The fallacy of Governor Swainson's statement is so clean cut and apparent that it betrays his real intention—to cater to the votes of the State's elderly population. Certainly if all of the 60,000 eligible senior citizens truly needeed public assistance, many more than 12,000 would have requested it. And on the other hand, it is entirely possible that the 80 percent who have not applied have not yet required medical care. If this be true, it would seem to discredit those who have contended that the aging present a more serious medical problem than do younger people.

Governor Swainson obviously has tried to help the Kennedy medical care program. Instead, he has cast grave doubt upon its merits by exposing figures that contradict its supporters, who contend that everyone past 65, regardless of personal economic circumstances, should have and must have Federal medical care. The Governor hasn't handled this matter adeptly at all, which might be a fortunate situation, at that.

The Governor has simply proved, by using Michigan as an illustration, that neither the administration nor Congress really knows enough about the problem yet to advance any legislation beyond the Kerr-Mills Act.

[From the Battle Creek (Mich.) Enquirer and News, Mar. 6, 1962]

OUR READERS COMMENT ON MEDICAL CARE

EDITOR, ENQUIRER AND NEWS:

Anent your editorial of March 2 in which you state that fewer than 12,000 of Michigan's 638,000 citizens past age 65 have applied for medical care under Public Law 86-778 (Kerr-Mills); two other instances supporting your contention that adequate facilities are already available come to mind.

The Legislature of the State of Utah appropriated $1,250,000 for the biennium 1961-62 for Kerr-Mills implementation. For the first 6 months in 1961 there were a total of 582 cases at a cost of $26,323.

The Indiana State Medical Society recently did a 30-day survey of that State's 445,510 residents age 65-plus. Of this number, 300,560 owned their homes, and 367,000 were covered by health and accident insurance or veterans' benefits. During this survey 4,357 of these citizens were hospitalized. Eighty-four of them—1.93 percent—could not pay or make arrangements to pay their hospital bill. The comment was made "to generalize about a group of 16 million persons is exploitation."

Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri, in a discussion with Secretary Ribicoff last year, is reported to have remarked, "I have asked publicly many times for information about any older person who was not getting adequate health care. Because it is my judgment that although we can improve our system, there is no one who is not getting the care, or who could not get it.

"The AFL-CIO in my community conducted a post-card campaign saying, 'I am an older person; I am in need' or 'I know of someone who is.' I replied to each individually and said, 'Give me your name so I can find out what is going wrong in our system.' Mr. Secretary, I received only one reply. I honestly do not believe such a situation exists."

I agree with Congressman CURTIS that there is no real need for such legislation as H.R. 4222 (King-Anderson) tieing medical care to social security and with Secretary Ribicoff that this bill "is the item with the most political sex appeal—with an impact even on children—they have a sense of obligation to father and mother." I would like to be sure Congressman CURTIS and I are correct.

Will readers knowing of a case they believe unable to get medical care have the patient sign his authorization to disclose the information and mail the identifying data to me at the address below? I will in-

vestigate and report by number and disposition to this newspaper and Congressman CURTIS.

ROBERT E. FISHER, M.D.

MARCH 17, 1962.

THE EDITOR,
Battle Creek Enquirer and News,
Battle Creek, Mich.

DEAR SIR: You were kind enough to print (March 6) a letter I wrote regarding the possibility that we have in our area persons unable to obtain needed medical care. I would still welcome information regarding such persons and will not close the record on this issue until April 3. However, my first report is short: not a single reader has informed me of anyone who is believed to be unable to obtain needed medical care. While this does not prove that no such persons exist, it does support the opinions of those who believe that the proposed King-Anderson bill (H.R. 4222) should not be permitted to become law.

ROBERT E. FISHER, M.D.

Confidence and Judgment Will Win the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Joseph R. Slevin, national economics editor of the New York Herald Tribune, which appeared in the March 25, 1962, issue of that paper.

Mr. Slevin's interview with the international economist Per Jacobsson illustrate Mr. Jacobsson's confidence in the international financial situation. Such confidence coming from such a man is something to be taken seriously.

The article follows:

JACOBSSON'S MAGIC BLEND FOR MONEY MARKETS—STRONG OPTIMISM AND UNCANNY JUDGMENT

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

WASHINGTON.—The turbulent world currency markets have calmed down in recent weeks and International Fund Managing Director Per Jacobsson believes that a fundamental turn for the better may be at hand.

Mr. Jacobsson is a wise, hearty and notoriously optimistic Swede, who long ago decided that limbs are for climbing out on, but his judgments have proven uncannily accurate. Many economists derided Mr. Jacobsson in September 1959 when he flatly declared the postwar inflationary surge had ended, but prices have been relatively steady ever since.

And it was the 68-year-old international civil servant who led, pushed and coaxed France into the post-Suez economic and financial program that transformed Europe's softest major industrial country into one of the strongest.

QUIET MOVEMENTS

"This may be just the lull between two storms, but I wonder," Mr. Jacobsson said in an interview. "It is quite conceivable it is the first sign of a more permanent improvement. Recently there have been fairly large currency movements in the exchange markets; but they have been relatively quiet and there have been very few rumors.

"I don't want to sound too optimistic. One must not be complacent about these matters.

"Confidence is a plant of slow growth. It took a long time after the revaluation of the deutsche mark and the Dutch guilder a year ago to restore confidence in the exchange markets. But, at the moment, it seems that some results have been attained."

When investors become jittery they traditionally have sent their money to Switzerland for safekeeping even though they get no interest from Swiss banks, but Mr. Jacobsson said a "strange thing" has been happening lately. Investors have been taking money out of Switzerland, he said.

The IMF Director pulled his chair closer, and leaned forward. "If there is greater confidence, people do not want to keep their money in accounts in which there is no interest," he emphasized.

WITH LEAGUE 9 YEARS

Mr. Jacobsson became an official of the Swedish Ministry of Finance in July 1917, "a long time ago." He joined the economic and financial section of the League of Nations Secretariat in 1920, spent 9 years with the league, worked briefly for the Swedish Government and for Krueger & Toll, then spent 25 years at the Bank of International Settlements in Basle before becoming Managing Director of the IMF in 1956.

"So I've only really been in this business for over 40 years," Mr. Jacobsson said. "I was 68 on the 5th of February. I am 5 days older than Macmillan and 8 weeks older than Khrushchev. It's beginning to be a long time."

Mr. Jacobsson said the international situation must be watched constantly because conditions do not remain static.

"I have seen so many shifts in my lifetime," he said. "At the end of World War I, people spoke of peace forever. In the twenties, they spoke of prosperity forever. Then, in the depression, they spoke of cheap money forever. After World War II, they spoke of the dollar shortage forever. It's all gone to the wind.

"So I have my doubts when people speak of anything 'forever.' We live in a changing world."

Mr. Jacobsson said one change for the better has been a definite improvement in the weak U.S. balance of payments position in the last year.

EUROPE'S RATES DIP

There is less disposition to send money from the United States to Europe, for interest rates are tending lower there and the Government is supporting short-term rates here, he said.

"Another reason is that wage increases in Europe have been much higher than in this country. The Germans say their wages increased an average 10 percent last year and they revalued their currency 5 percent. That makes, internationally, an increase of 15 percent. In France 9 percent, in Switzerland people give different figures—6 to 9 percent.

"In the United States, the official rise for the hourly wage was something like 2.7 percent. This does not mean there are not still important differences between the United States and Europe, but what changes there have been, have been toward better equilibrium.

Could there be another sustained inflationary upsurge in the free world?

"I don't know how to do it," Mr. Jacobsson replied. "With present supplies and capacity, I don't know where it will come from. There is so much competition that prices are not likely to rise. These problems are international now. Everybody has to be more careful."

Building Slowly But Solidly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, much too often we, in the Congress, are being bombarded with messages from the executive branch of Government for immediate legislation deemed necessary to solve some great crisis. We are led to believe that all our past efforts in the advancement of our Nation to its present heights have actually been failure.

Fortunately for us, the commonsense that American continually exhibit at the grassroots level protect us from the impractical, ill-conceived brainstorms of the present toplevel bureaucratic strata. I ask leave to insert into the RECORD at this point an editorial in the La Grange Citizen of March 22, which in its philosophical evaluation merits our thought.

The editorial follows:

BUILDING SLOWLY BUT SOLIDLY

Rome was not built in a day, nor can the United States be built to perfection overnight.

And how slowly dawns the realization that much of American society's latter-day superstructure must be stripped away from the fundamental plans drawn by the founders of the Republic.

And how very few of us have awakened to the danger threatened by these alluringly attractive yet flimsy tacked-on additions to the basic structure of our free system.

These thoughts derive from our attempt to evaluate the lecture series about "Regimentation or Freedom", which concluded a 6-week run Monday night at the Coulter Post American Legion home in La Grange.

All in all, several hundred citizens heard all or part of the series, which both reviewed and interpreted history, with special emphasis on pointing out the ways by which a free society may drift unconcernedly toward brutal totalitarianism.

The series, sponsored by several leading civic and patriotic groups, was irreproachably conducted. The very excellence of the material and its fair, reasonable presentation causes this writer to regret deeply that more of these persons who make a hobby of criticizing what they are fond of calling (often erroneously) "extremist" activity on the right did not attend.

We are more disheartened than amused by the folly of those who mistakenly think of themselves as liberals and say, "I don't need to go to one of those 'seminars' to tell you what I think of them."

Those persons who did make the effort to find out for themselves on six cold Monday evenings were well rewarded for their sacrifice. Most of them left the final session with both a resolve to accept and discharge the responsibilities implicit in the freedom they enjoy, and an active desire to encourage other men, women, and children to expose themselves to similar stimuli.

Compared to the magnitude of the perils that threaten America and its heritage of freedom, the number of active, constructively concerned citizens seems a pitifully small handful.

But we draw encouragement from knowledge that the handful today is far greater than it was only several years ago. Its growth, accompanied by a slow but general

awakening, is certainly attributable in large measure to such responsible programs as that just concluded here.

It will take a lot more effort and a lot more time before we can even come close to building a perfectly structured free society. But the rebuilding has begun and continues, little by little.

Progress itself is usually dull, seemingly insignificant. Only the end results are spectacular.

Constitutional Government Threatened by President Kennedy's Grab for Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, unless the average American citizen keeps a scorecard he may not realize how far down the road to dictatorship we have already traveled in just a little over a year of the Kennedy administration. No Chief Executive in history has been so careless with the Constitution. The following editorial from the Dallas Morning News recounts some of the powers the President has taken upon himself without even bothering to ask Congress. In addition to the power he already has, he continues to pressure Congress for more authority to bypass the legislative branch which, if the trend continues, will subvert the Constitution entirely and government of law will be no more.

PRESIDENT'S POWER

Never before in U.S. history have so many attempts been made by a President to increase powers of the executive branch at the expense of Congress. In his first 15 months in office, President Kennedy has outdone F.D.R. in efforts to violate the spirit as well as the letter of the Constitution with regard to the historic separation of powers.

Among many other items, the President has recently asked Congress to grant him powers which the Constitution gave Congress and denied to the Chief Executive in three major areas: (1) Massive public works authority, (2) tax rate manipulation, and (3) tariff adjustment.

In asking Congress for these powers, however, the President is going about the matter legitimately. If Congress sees in such requests a violation of the separation of powers or other dangerous consequences, it is up to the Congress to block such requests—and no harm is done.

But it is an entirely different matter when the President assumes powers which he does not have without going to Congress to ask for them. This is a great danger, and one which has rapidly grown worse since Mr. Kennedy took office in January 1961.

An equally dangerous encroachment on the rights of Congress is the President's refusal to carry out laws which have been duly passed. This, too, has been on the rise lately.

Here are a few recent examples of how Mr. Kennedy and his executive branch have been both assuming powers they do not have and failing to execute the law of the land:

The B-70 program—refusal to spend funds Congress has directed the Defense Department to spend.

Battle Act—failure to cut off foreign-aid moneys to nations trading with members of the Communist bloc, as required by this act.

Ball report—refusal to open State Department files to Congress showing U.S. trade with Red nations, and to give Congress a copy of this report which urges an increase of such trade.

Peace Corps—initially set up without congressional approval, recently increased in size and funds without authorization from Congress.

Military muzzling—denial of information pertaining to censorship.

Cambodia aid—refusal to explain how U.S. funds were used to build part of a Soviet project, deletion of names of those involved when report was given.

Vietnam—failure to explain U.S. involvement to Congress.

Tariff negotiations—exceeding limits of congressional instructions and failure to ask for Senate ratification in treaty signed with 24 nations.

Red propaganda — lifting ban against propaganda in U.S. mails without authorization from Congress, refusal to reinstate ban after House of Representatives voted to restore it.

The list grows longer every day. In some of these cases—such as the military censorship issue—the President is within his rights to deny Congress certain information, but only by the use of Executive privilege. In such cases, however, the President has simply defied Congress before employing this rare measure.

In other matters, the President could veto acts of Congress—for this is also his privilege. In such cases Congress has an opportunity to override a veto.

But the President cannot flatly refuse to enforce acts which Congress has passed and he (or an earlier Chief Executive) has signed into law. To do so would be to break his oath of office and to commit an offense punishable by impeachment.

It is argued frequently that precedent is on the President's side in many of these matters, that other Presidents have assumed these same powers.

This is not true. The Supreme Court consistently has denied most of these encroachments on the constitutional powers of Congress, and frequently has spoken out against efforts to bypass Congress.

Even in cases where there are precedents, however, Executive encroachment of congressional power does not become correct. Two wrongs have never made a right. The Supreme Court also has held that even when Congress has allowed its powers to lapse or to be transferred to the Executive it has not lost those powers. Such powers—if they have been granted to Congress by the Constitution—are always there and may at any time be reclaimed.

Defender of the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the tide of encroaching communism is eroding at the foundation of our priceless heritage of constitutional government.

The far leftwing elements of our beloved Nation seek to destroy the breakwaters and allow our constitutional rights to be swept away on the sea of socialism.

Our country is beset by many perils in these times. Capable leadership is always needed to steer our Nation home to a safe harbor. In an address March 17 before the Charleston, S.C., Chapter of the Hibernians, my distinguished friend, Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia, cited the noble example, the unsurpassed courage, and the valor of the leaders of the armies of the Confederacy as an example of men believing in their constitutional rights and willing to die—if necessary—to spell out these rights.

Senator ROBERTSON'S remarks speak for themselves. I believe they are so important to believers in constitutional government they should be made available through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I hereby submit his address:

REMARKS OF SENATOR A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, OF VIRGINIA, AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE CHARLESTON, S.C., CHAPTER OF HIBERNIANS, CHARLESTON, S.C., MARCH 17, 1962

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, and fellow Americans, it is a high honor, a coveted privilege to address the members of a fraternal order which can boast of a proud history of more than a century and a half—an order dedicated to the service of mankind and the second greatest commandment "Love thy neighbor as thyself." And in these trying times when the future of our Republic is threatened by the anti-God ideology of communism from abroad and a marked trend toward the welfare state at home, it is a source of real inspiration to me to address a group that has never wavered in its support of States rights and a system of private enterprise within the framework of American constitutional liberty.

Nothing has given me greater satisfaction throughout my service in the Congress of the United States than the privilege I have enjoyed of knowing and serving with the splendid men who, during that period, have represented the great State of South Carolina and who fully shared my belief in States rights and my love and admiration of what we in Virginia still call the Old South. Unfortunately, time will not permit me to mention in detail all of my distinguished friends from South Carolina, first in the House and then in the Senate, but I do wish to mention my service in the House with the outstanding Representative from this District, MENDEL RIVERS, who has made an outstanding contribution not only to the development of the splendid Charleston Navy Yard but to the defense posture of our entire Nation.

As many of you will recall, I served on the Senate Banking and Currency Committee under the chairmanship of that distinguished southern gentleman and outstanding statesman, Burnet Rhett Maybank. "First in war, first in peace, first in the hearts of his countrymen." We all loved Burnie Maybank. And, during more recent years, I have enjoyed my service in the Senate with your two outstanding Senators, OLIN JOHNSTON and STROM THURMOND. We have stood shoulder to shoulder in opposition to iniquitous civil rights bills and how it has delighted my heart to see the gallant THURMOND as morally brave on the Senate floor as he was physically brave on the battlefield, cross swords with those who wittingly, or unwittingly, would abandon the restraints of constitutional government and take us headlong down the road to statism.

While we in Virginia are proud of the fact that through his matchless oratory Patrick Henry was privileged to be the sparkplug of

our fight for freedom we shall never forget the outstanding contribution of our sister State of South Carolina, through Edward Rutledge and three others, to the formulation and promulgation of the Declaration of Independence, nor the contribution of John Rutledge, two distinguished members of the Pinckney family and Pierce Butler, to the formation of a more perfect Union under the greatest instrument ever struck off by the hand and purpose of man. We in Virginia still cherish the remark of your great Charles Pinckney at your State convention in May 1788 that ratified the Philadelphia Constitution, when referring to the sovereign States that were to form the new Union, he said: "On them rests the general fabric; on their foundation is this magnificent structure of freedom erected, each depending upon, supporting, and protecting the other; nor so intimate is the connection, can the one be removed without prostrating the other in ruin; like the head and the body, separate them and they die."

I am sure it is not necessary for me to remind you that believers of States rights in South Carolina shared the doubts of the believers of States rights in Virginia that the rights of the States and the people thereof were not adequately protected by the Constitution as framed in Philadelphia and consequently the ratifying conventions of both States insisted on clarifying and protective amendments. Your ratifying convention adopted a resolution which said: "This convention doth also declare, that no section or paragraph of the said Constitution warrants a construction that the States do not retain every power not expressly relinquished by them, and vested in the general government of the Union."

That same sentiment was reiterated by one of the Nation's greatest statesmen, John C. Calhoun, who said on the floor of the Senate on February 4, 1836: "That the States which form our Federal Union are sovereign and independent communities, bound together by a constitutional compact, and are possessed of all the powers belonging to distinct and separate States, excepting such as are delegated to be exercised by the General Government, is assumed as unquestionable. The compace itself expressly provides that all powers not delegated are reserved to to the States and the people * * *."

Incidentally, Virginia asks the privilege of sharing South Carolina's pride in Calhoun because his maternal grandfather John Caldwell, was a Presbyterian preacher in the valley of Virginia, where I live. He brought to that area a group of Scotch-Irish immigrants who were in search of both religious and political freedom. Thank God they passed on to generations yet unborn their passionate devotion to those fundamental principles.

In urging the States to ratify the Philadelphia Constitution, Alexander Hamilton, as well as James Madison, insisted that the Federal Government to be created under the Constitution would be a government of sovereign States which had no more powers than those delegated to it. But, to make assurance doubly sure, Madison proposed safeguarding amendments, including the 10th amendment, which spelled out the fact that the sovereign States and the people thereof had reserved all powers not delegated to the Federal Government. There was nothing written into the Federal Constitution which denied to any member State the right to withdraw from the Union if it saw fit to do so. There was no power given the President of the United States to call for troops to make war against States which had exercised their constitutional right to withdraw from the Union. It was not in the stars for the Union to be permanently divided; it was not God's purpose that the South should prevail upon the battlefield, but it was certainly a part of divine destiny that the South should demonstrate to the world the meaning of loyalty to a fundamental principle of government; to prove the the truth of Jeff's statement "nothing is unchangeable but the inherent and unalienable right of man"; and it was certainly God's purpose that great military leaders such as Hampton and Bee of South Carolina, and Lee and Jackson of Virginia, should set for all succeeding generations an example of nobility of purpose and irrefragable courage. Since you of course, are familiar with the great leaders which your State furnished to the Confederate cause, I am sure you will grant to me the liberty of referring to the contribution made to the Confederate cause by two leaders who lived in my hometown of Lexington—Lee and Jackson.

Each of them achieved fame in his lifetime, and, what is better, a "home in the minds of men."

Lee, of course, is recognized as one of the great military leaders of all time. This outstanding soldier, who led the Army of northern Virginia during the long, hard war years, had been asked originally, as the Nation divided itself into two armed camps, to take command of the Federal forces, a clear indication of the regard in which he was held.

Jackson's military genius alone would have assured his greatness. His tactics have been studied—and used—by soldiers of many armies. Historians of both World Wars find examples of victories which were won by the employment of Jackson's turning movement. The great English soldier, Field Marshal Wolseley properly said: "The fame of Stonewall Jackson is no longer the exclusive property of Virginia and the South; it has become the birthright of every man privileged to call himself an American."

But these two Virginians achieved more than recognition for their deeds; they attained true greatness that is not based upon physical strength, political power, mental brilliancy, or accumulated wealth, but rather upon the type of sacrificial service that a man renders to his day and generation. Their test of unselfish love and devotion to duty goes beyond the political idealism of Pericles' tribute to the young men of Athens when he said: "So they gave their bodies to the commonwealth and received, each for his own memory, praise that will never die, and with it the grandest of all sepulchers, not that in which their mortal bones are laid, but a home in the minds, of men, where their glory remains fresh to stir to speech or action as the occasion comes by. For the whole earth is the sepulcher of famous men; and their story is not graven only on stone over their native earth, but lives on far away, without visible symbol, woven into the stuff of other men's lives * * *."

By their devotion to duty, their idealism and their sterling moral character, the story of Lee and Jackson has become a cherished tradition of the South, "woven" (as Pericles said) "into the stuff of other men's lives."

Let us look briefly at each of these Virginians who remain shining examples of the dedicated life that all of us should strive to emulate.

There never was a nobler man in all recorded history than Robert E. Lee and none who has left a greater imprint upon succeeding generations.

Yet, shortly before his death, Lee, in his great humility, indicated he felt he had done nothing worth while, saying, "Life is gliding away and I have nothing to show for mine. I pray I may be spared to accomplish something for the benefit of mankind and the honor of God." There is at least one historian who still lists Lee as a failure simply because he was the commander in chief of an army that suffered total defeat and the leader of a cause which that historian listed as a lost cause. But most historians, including the great Virginian, Douglas Southall Freeman, and the people generally of the entire Nation endorse the opinion of Lee expressed by Senator Ben Hill, of Georgia, when he said: "He was a foe without hate, a friend without treachery, a soldier without vices, and a victim without murmuring. He was a public officer without vices, a private citizen without wrong, a neighbor without reproach, a Christian without hypocrisy, and a man without guilt. He was Caesar without his ambition, Napoleon without his selfishness, and Washington without his reward. He was as obedient to authority as a servant and royal in authority as a king. He was as gentle as a woman in life, pure as a virgin in thought, watchful as a Roman vestal, submissive to law as Socrates, and grand in battle as Achilles."

Military experts throughout the world now rank Lee as one of the greatest military leaders of the English-speaking peoples and second only to him, Thomas J. "Stonewall" Jackson, the great lieutenant on whom Lee so heavily relied. In the quiet and reserved VMI professor, in the consecrated Presbyterian deacon, who each Sunday morning taught a class of Negro slaves, no one in Lexington could visualize the military genius later to be displayed by Jackson in his famous valley campaign. Even his own soldiers at first misunderstood him. They thought him harsh, even cruel; but as their experience increased they recognized the wisdom of his severity and when they looked upon that kindly face, grave and determined as it was, they realized how closely his firmness was allied to tenderness. No one could, like him, unless it was Napolean, establish and maintain discipline worthy of the best in the Anglo-Saxon nature, which had honor for its principle and glory for its reward. From him his soldiers and the people of his Southland learned the self-denial, which is the root of all religion, the self-control which is the root of all manliness. It was this discipline which enabled the first brigade to turn the tide of battle at Bull Run, or first Manassas. McDowell's men were carrying all before them and by an impetuous rush had carried Henry Hill which was a commanding point in the very center of the Confederate lines and the key of the battleground. Bee, Bartow, Evans, and Hampton were driven in and Jackson alone stood fast. General Bee, with his hat off, his sword in hand, covered with dust and his horse foaming, dashed up to Jackson and said: "General, they are beating us back." "Then, sir, we shall give them the bayonet," said Jackson, as his thin lips closed like a vise. Bee, inspired by Jackson's confidence, galloped back to his broken lines and shouted: "Look, there is Jackson, standing like a stone wall. Rally behind the Virginians."

Jackson gave his life for the cause and as a professional soldier who had suffered a major defeat it would have been easier for Lee to have done likewise because it will be recalled that he said shortly before he surrendered at Appomattox: "How easily I could be rid of this and be at rest. I have only to ride along the line and all will be over. But it is our duty to live. What will become of the women and children of the South if we are not here to protect them?" It was in that devotion to duty to protect the women and children of the South and to train the youth of the South to repair the ravages of a fraternal war that Lee made his greatest contribution not only to his day and generation but to all succeeding generations.

After Appomattox, Lee was without funds or income. His property had been confiscated and his family was in need. An insurance company offered him its presidency at an annual salary of $75,000. His answer reflects the character and integrity of the man. He said: "I have nothing to give the insurance business but my name, and my name is not for sale."

Instead of seeking personal gain or trying to justify past conduct, he turned his attention to the education of the youth of the Nation. Lee accepted the presidency of what was then a small, struggling school—Washington College in Lexington, Va., now Washington and Lee University. There he met the challenge of his remaining years by guiding, inspiring, and training the future hope of the Nation, its youth. His own example was their best lesson, and remains the best lesson for the youth of today.

We live in a period when the heritage of constitutional liberty in which both North and South believed, although they were divided on how it should be preserved, is threatened anew by so-called liberals at home, who would take us down the road to socialism, and by Communists abroad who threaten to impose their will by force upon a free world. For the preservation at home of those priceless principles of political and economic freedom that were born of the brain and purchased with the blood of our Founding Fathers, we have never had a greater need to be reminded of the example set us by the noble leaders of our Confederacy.

It will be 101 years ago next July since the gallant Gen. Bernard Bee of Charleston referred to Jackson as a stone wall. Bee fell on the bloody field of First Manassas but the memory of his famous battle cry lives on, woven into the stuff of other men's lives. It is my hope, it is my earnest prayer that if we of the present Virginia generation will make a fight for the preservation of States rights and American constitutional liberty worthy of the memory of Stonewall Jackson, there will be heard again the rallying cry of all lovers of constitutional government: "Rally behind the Virginians."

Free Trade Means Insolvency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statement made by Mr. Carl H. Wilken, director of research of the National Foundation for Economic Stability, before the House Committee on Ways and Means during consideration of legislation designed to extend the so-called reciprocal trade act.

This statement shows clearly why the legislation proposed by the Kennedy administration should not be enacted. It demonstrates that the United States cannot embark on a policy and program of free trade.

The statement follows:

FREE TRADE MEANS INSOLVENCY

(By Carl H. Wilken)

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee on Ways and Means, my name is Carl H. Wilken, director of research of the National Foundation for Economic Stability, incorporated in 1959 for the purpose of making an initial and continuing study of the record of our economy as a whole and its various segments.

This study covers the period 1929 through 1961 in regard to both our domestic and foreign trade. Our purpose in appearing before the committee is to provide the result and benefit of our studies.

In the past few months we have made a comparison of the income of private enterprise, made up of 9,200,000 business units, with wages, salaries and the net interest component of our national income which reflects the capital costs involved in our cycle of production and distribution. This study is specific for the period 1946–61.

Following World War II, in 1946–50 our economy adjusted its production and price level to incorporate the increase in industrial wages from 66 cents an hour in 1940 to $1.329 an hour as the average in the 5-year period. We also incorporated the increase in capital costs involved in a debt expansion from $216 billion (public and private) to an average of a little over $500 billion in 1946–50.

The income of the United States at any point is the result of two factors. First, our total production of goods and services and, second, the price at which it is sold. In 1946–50 our total production times our price level gave us an average income of $212.4 billion. The different segments of our economy were in approximately the same balance as the average from 1929 up to this period.

Our economy in 1946–50, for all practical purposes, was solvent. The Federal budget was not only in balance but averaged a surplus. The expansion of the private debt, a normal occurrence as some people invest their savings and borrow additional funds from the savings of others, was in approximate balance with actual profits and savings.

Our comparison of the income of private enterprise with wages and salaries and capital costs is, in reality, a profit and loss statement for private enterprise and, in turn, becomes a profit and loss statement for the United States as a whole.

In the 11 years 1951 to 1961 wages and salaries and interest, which must be met out of the operations of private enterprise, increased 129 percent. The income of private enterprise to be in balance with wages, salaries, and capital costs should have increased 129 percent. But, the record reveals that the income of private enterprise increased only 32 percent.

The prices of other than farm products, which private enterprise has to buy, in 1961 were 32 percent higher than in 1946–50, and it should be obvious that the combined income of the 9,200,000 business units would not buy any more production than in 1946–50.

The cumulative shortage of income for private enterprise in the 11 years 1951–61 as compared to wages, salaries, and interest totaled approximately $375 billion. Because private enterprise is an integral part of the economy as a whole, this shortage could not be included in our national income.

To offset this shortage of loss in national income, we added $514 billion to the total debt (public and private) from the end of 1950 to the end of 1961. This amount of debt expansion was not sufficient to entirely offset our operating loss, and we had three recessions which cut back production worth $250 billion, and we lost this income. But we did have the resources, the labor force, and the capital investment to produce this additional amount of goods.

The point I wish to drive home is that in the past 11 years the United States has operated at a terrific loss.

In 1961 the shortage of private enterprise approximated $53.5 billion. In order to meet our 1961 wages, salaries, and interest we should have produced goods and services with $487 billion. However, our national income was only $430 billion. The difference of $57 billion was our operating loss for the economy as a whole.

To prevent even gerater losses in 1961 we added $55 billion to the total debt (public and private), or approximately $15 billion more than in 1960. The overall result was an increase of $13.1 billion in national income from 1960 to 1961. Approximately 82.5 percent of this increase was from wages, salaries, and interest, which increased the relative shortage of private enterprise.

In 1961 we reached a level wherein 1 percent of our price level involves approximately $5 billion. Also, 1 percent of our total production involves $5 billion. Therefore, if for some reason our price level drops 1 percent we will lose $5 billion. Should this take place, we would have to reduce our production 1 percent, and this would force us to lose another $5 billion.

To illustrate this specifically, in the period 1929–33 our consumer price level dropped 25 percent, with the result that in 1933 we were losing 55 percent of the income in 1929. A similar happening today would cut back our national income from $430 to $192 billion.

I would like to point out that at present we have five times as many dollars of income and five times as many dollars of debt involved as compared to 1929. For that reason, we must be very cautious of the price level and production in the United States if we wish to avoid a repetition of the 1929–33 depression.

In 1961, we should have had either 13 percent more production or 13 percent higher price level to earn the income required to meet 1961 wages, salaries, and interest.

CAUSE OF THE OPERATING LOSS

In the period following 1946–50 we did not make any move toward high tariffs, which many blamed for the recession from 1929–41. The operating loss following 1946–50 was caused by a drop in commodity prices, which was also the cause of the depression from 1929 to 1933.

In 1946–50 the price of farm products at wholesale was 99.5 percent of the level of other than farm products at wholesale. The direct result was that the income of rural America, primarily dependent upon the value of its farm production, was in balance with wages, salaries, and interest cost, which determined the price of things rural America had to buy.

I would like to point out further that as a direct result of the average of $212.4 billion of national income in the United States in 1946–50, this buying power kept the price of commodities for the entire world at the level required by the United States to meet its payrolls and capital costs. In other words, we were paying a comparable price for imports in line with the price which other countries had to pay for our exports.

In 1951 the Office of Price Stabilization established price ceilings on consumer goods with a ruling that industry should operate on 85 percent of normal operating profits. This brought about a price squeeze in which industry, in trying to earn a normal profit, bid down the price of commodities.

Of far greater importance was the fact that Great Britain in 1949 devaluated the pound from $4.05 to $2.80, or approximately 30 percent. This had the effect of reducing world commodity prices 30 percent in terms of our prices, and, in addition, reduced the buying power of other nations dependent upon commodities for income with which to buy American products.

As a result of these two factors, in 1961 the price of farm products in the United States was 88 percent of 1947–49 as 100, and the price of other than farm products was 127.7 percent, reflecting a price balance between rural America and industrial America of 68 percent.

In 1961 we were losing 32 percent of the market we needed in rural areas to keep the income of private enterprise in balance with 1961 wages, salaries, and interest. In addition, the drop in the price in world areas cut back the buying power of other countries, and today they are receiving about 65 cents to buy $1 worth of goods from the United States.

Stated bluntly, we lack 35 percent of the domestic market and 35 percent of the foreign market needed to meet current wages and capital costs. We find ourselves in a position of having to increase the mortgage against the United States to buy our domestic production and provide funds to maintain our current level of exports through foreign aid, etc. We have only 6 percent of the world's population, and cannot continue very long to operate as we have been operating in the past 11 years.

The record of what has happened since 1946–50 and what happened in 1929–33 proves that the real barrier to trade is not tariffs but the price of principal commodities which determine the income of the United States and all other countries. Tariffs are the result of price fluctuations. Under the operation of our trade agreements since 1935, whenever countries ran short of income due to a drop in the price of goods they had to sell, they were forced to shut off imports which they could not pay for.

In the period from 1946 to the present we have had a realistic approach to our trade with other countries through our sugar agreement. Under it, we are paying the domestic producer more than twice the world price, recognizing the need for a price which is in balance with American costs. In addition, we are paying countries from whom we buy approximately 50 percent of the sugar we need approximately twice the world price, recognizing the fact that if they are to buy our products they must have an income comparable to the price they pay us for our exports.

If we should repeal this legislation, we would lose income in the United States as our price moves down to the world level, and other countries would lose income with which to buy our products. In other words, we will lose both domestic and foreign markets.

I would like to point out what has happened from 1929 to the present. I will relate total exports to wages, salaries and interest in 1929, again in 1940, in 1946–50, and in 1961.

In 1929, total wages and interest were $57.5 billion as compared to a national income of $87.8 billion. In 1929, total exports were $5,240 million. In other words, they ratioed 9.1 percent to wages and interest.

In 1935 we enacted the Trade Agreements Act and proceeded to reduce tariffs to expand our foreign trade. In 1940, total wages and interest were $56.6 billion while the national income was $81.6 billion. Our total exports were $4,021 million, or $1,219 million less than in 1929, and in a ratio to wages and interest of 7.1 percent. In 1941, our exports recovered to 1929 totals, as our price level also came back to 1929 levels.

In 1946–50 our income was in balance with wages and interest. Total wages and interest had moved up to $140.8 billion and the national income averaged $212.4 billion. Total exports were an average of $11,829 million or 8.3 percent of wages and interest.

In 1950, following the devaluation of the British pound, our exports dropped over $2 billion below the 1948 level, and our imports of farm products in the fiscal year 1950–51 exceeded our exports by $1.7 billion, thus contributing to the break in farm prices in 1951.

In 1961, total wages and interest had moved up to $322.9 billion with a national income of $430 billion, and total exports were $19.8 billion. This total was in ratio to wages and interest of approximately 6.1 percent as compared to 8.3 percent in 1946–50. This represents a decline of about 27 percent from 1946–50, reflecting the drop in buying power of other countries. I would like to point out that in order to maintain the $19.8 billion of exports, about 25 percent of the total was financed with foreign aid and other measures.

Tariff reduction, without a recovery of commodity prices in the United States and the rest of the world, will increase the loss in both domestic and foreign markets as our price level and the level of world prices move downward toward 1942 levels in balance with the wage scale in Western Europe and in balance with an industrial wage of $0.853 an hour in the United States in 1942.

This would force a repetition of the economic collapse of 1929–33. The Ways and Means Committee has the responsibility of initiating legislation which levies taxes required to balance the budget.

To illustra the effect of what has happened since 1946–50 to our fiscal policies, I will use a single factor, corporate profits before taxes. In 1961, to balance with 1961 wages and interest, corporate profits before taxes should have totaled $69 billion. Instead, they actually had $46 billion, or a shortage of $23 billion. One-half this shortage was lost by the Federal Treasury in the form of corporate taxes. The other half was lost by corporations which reduced their profits after taxes by $12.5 billion which should have been available for use in paying dividends and furnishing new capital for expansion.

If we wish to have a solvent economy, our first step should be to restore farm prices and other raw materials to the same balance with wages and interest that existed in 1946–50, and protect these prices with whatever measures are necessary. Second, we should pay other countries a price for their exports to us which is comparable to, or in balance with, the price they have to pay for our exports, as we are successfully doing in the case of sugar.

Third, with this as an example, we should provide the leadership to bring world commodity prices up to the American level which we need in order to have a solvent economy. Without such steps, the other countries with current commodity prices cannot earn the income to buy our products, nor can they earn the new capital needed for expansion.

We cannot have a solvent United States, as a foundation on which to help the rest of the world, by moving down to a price level which means a depression in the United States and an increase in the poverty and underdevelopment in 50 percent of the rest of the world.

Action Was Unwise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Dallas Morning News, March 16, 1962, commenting on the Ways and Means Committee of the House proposing a withholding tax on dividends:

ACTION WAS UNWISE

Democrats in control of the House Committee on Ways and Means acted unwisely in voting for a 20-percent withholding tax on dividends and interest. Last year the committee approved a similar withholding of 16⅔ percent, but it was not enacted.

The levy constitutes double taxation, since the same income already has been taxed in the 52-percent Federal levy on corporation profits. The stockholders pay again on what they receive as dividends. But to withhold this tax at the source, and that on interest, would put an enormous burden of extra bookkeeping on corporations and banks, which already must withhold income and social security taxes on wages.

This measure also would complicate the making out of individual income tax returns, including those of thousands of elderly persons who receive income from dividends and interest. It would complicate the work of the tax service and impose new bookkeeping more costly than the small losses now suffered from the neglect of a few taxpayers to list such income. Often the 20-percent deduction would make it necessary for the Government to make refunds.

The House should reject the committee recommendations.

Testimony of Robert F. Hannum Before the House of Representatives Ways and Means Committee, Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, in my hometown there is an outstanding manufacturer of fine glass. The Fostoria Glass Co. and its employees have developed an enviable reputation for the quality of their work.

Over the years they have been adversely affected by the trade policy of our Nation, and the president of the Fostoria Co., Mr. Robert F. Hannum, made strong representations to the Ways and Means Committee of the House, in opposition to H.R. 9900.

I wholeheartedly concur with Mr. Hannum's testimony and under unanimous consent, I include it in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF ROBERT F. HANNUM BEFORE THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

My name is Robert F. Hannum, president of the Fostoria Glass Co., Moundsville, W. Va. It is difficult to properly express my opposition to H.R. 9900 in the 5 minutes that have been allotted me. There are many reasons for my opposition that I would like to cover, but the time limitations make it impossible, so I am going to limit myself to one area of opposition.

Should H.R. 9900 be passed in its present form it would cause an increase in glassware imports that would be ruinous to the domestic hand glass industry. I feel certain that our industry together with Common Market countries account for 80 percent or more of the aggregated world export value of hand glassware and therefore H.R. 9900 would authorize the President to eliminate all of the present tariff. I would, therefore, like to discuss some of the economic facts of life of the American hand glass industry and to point out its particular vulnerability to the action that would follow if this bill was enacted.

It is common knowledge that American wage rates are much higher than foreign rates. The U.S. Department of Commerce

in 1959 published the following comparison of average hourly wage rates in manufacturing industries:

	Per hour
United States	$2.68
West Germany	.78
United Kingdom	.77
Belgium	.74
France	.71
Italy	.61
Netherlands	.57

The European rates thus range from only 20 to 30 percent of the U.S. wages.

It becomes a matter of simple economics that with this tremendously higher wage cost an American manufacturer can be competitive with foreign firms only by achieving lower costs in other areas. This is usually accomplished by mass production by highly developed mechanized methods—sometimes by almost complete automation.

Unfortunately, in our case, handmade glassware is a craft type of production and cannot be mechanized. No manufacturer, domestic or foreign, has been able to mechanize the actual forming of a glass article of high quality. Automatic machine factories have spent millions of dollars developing and improving their product but such production to date is known in the trade as institutional glassware—common restaurant or bar glassware is an example. It is a very good product for its price and serves the segment of the public that buy it very well, but it does not have the quality appearance of handmade table glassware.

In 1956 I was in Europe and visited some 20 hand tableware factories in Norway, Sweden, Denmark, France, Germany, and England. Their manufacturing methods and processes are quite similar to ours in this country. They manufacture a high quality product by hand methods just as we do. In our discussions, they spoke of the same problems American glass manufacturers discuss and they fear competition too from countries where wages are lower, namely the Iron Curtain countries and Japan. In their case, as in our domestic companies, labor costs average about 65 percent of the sales dollar.

Our company and I'm sure all domestic hand manufacturers have used all conceivable means to reduce labor costs to a minimum. We have a cooperative labor force and they have been very reasonable in allowing us to use modern methods. Ninety-five percent of our people work on time studied standards. Our office, maintenance, yard gang, power, boilermen, etc., work under a merit rating incentive plan. We have a carefully maintained quality control system. While, as I have said, no quality manufacturer has been able to mechanize the hand skills of the actual forming of a piece of glassware, we do use conveyors and many other types of labor-saving devices extensively throughout the plant. We have a good laboratory, a capable engineering staff, and we often engage outside consultants in our constant search for improvements that will reduce costs.

But no amount of improvements will ever offset foreign competitive wages that are only 20 to 30 percent of our domestic rates. mestic rates.

We must have a reasonable amount of tariff protection if we are to survive. The American hand glass industry is worth saving. Not only are jobs and American capital at stake but also very valuable hand skills that in every national emergency have proved to be essential. Many important items used in our national defense such as certain types of radar and electronic tubes, signal glasses, and airport lighting are made by hand because, while essential, they are not used in quantities which justify mechanization. Equally important, practically all new technical glass items must be made by hand until they are perfected and until their increased use provides sufficient volume to permit mechanization. If hand manufacturers are forced out of business by legislation such as contemplated by H.R. 9900, I predict that the time will come when the Nation will rue the day that it turned this production over to the Common Market and to the so-called favored nations countries.

Naturally we are going to fight to stay in business. We are an old industry—in fact, the first industry in America, for the Jamestown Colony started a glass factory in 1608. We do not ask for a competitive advantage. We merely want enough tariff protection to give us a chance to hold on to that part of the domestic market that we are now serving. I can't help but say that if the executive branch of our Government would use the same efforts it is using to push this bill to halt inflation so that wage and other costs could be stabilized, we would be greatly encouraged to continue to search for ways to offset this existing great difference in foreign and domestic wage costs.

Therefore, I respectfully request that your committee reject this bill. We fear its provisions, not only because it provides for lowering or possibly eliminating our tariffs, but also because it transfers control of tariff policy from the Congress to the executive branch of the Government.

California Defense Dollars Go National

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1962

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, seven of the larger California defense contractors recently reported to the California Defense Industries Committee of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce procurement data covering the national pattern of their relations with suppliers and vendors for articles, materials, and services.

This compilation of the data is on an annual basis for the various corporate fiscal patterns ending in the 1960–61 period, the most recently available data in each case. Each reporting corporation carries on an intensive procurement and contracting program aimed at the widest possible participation nationally, and in each case a main facet of the total program is the determination that small business receive an equitable opportunity to compete for subcontracts for articles, materials, and services of all kinds.

California defense contractors are doing business in 49 States with all kinds of enterprises from the local hardware store to the giants of industry. Truly, California defense dollars go national.

The seven reporting California defense contractors listed $2,720,791,614 in dollars expended in 49 States and the District of Columbia to suppliers and vendors of articles, materials, and services.

Principal States receiving the impact of the California national procurement effort are:

	Percent	Amount
New York	12.12	$330,098,183
Ohio	7.93	215,788,964
New Jersey	6.52	177,297,193
Massachusetts	3.77	102,470,052
Pennsylvania	2.35	63,854,936

In reporting for this study the companies that reported small business data revealed: 29.56 percent of procurement dollar to small business; 70.44 percent of procurement dollar to large business; (15.9 percent national average to small business).

The accompanying table is a percentage breakdown by State of the total procurements reported expended in each State.

California defense dollars go national—50-State breakdown

	California dollars	Percent of total [1]
Alabama	$1,135,433	0.042
Alaska	17,139	.0006
Arizona	19,744,092	.73
Arkansas	72,477	.003
California	1,362,707,587	50.08
Colorado	12,061,219	.44
Connecticut	55,659,726	2.05
Delaware	2,049,384	.08
Florida	13,753,954	.50
Georgia	17,844,691	.66
Hawaii	692,575	.025
Idaho	525,000	.02
Illinois	49,562,013	1.82
Indiana	27,818 171	1.02
Iowa	10,708,289	.39
Kansas	16,742,162	.62
Kentucky	89,892	.003
Louisiana	244,701	.009
Maine	319,056	.012
Maryland	9,214,004	.34
Massachusetts	102,470,052	3.77
Michigan	26,765,743	.98
Minnesota	14,230,738	.52
Mississippi	145,360	.005
Missouri	30,123,502	.11
Montana	874	0
Nebraska	1,334,518	.05
Nevada	371,295	.014
New Hampshire	1,791,188	.066
New Jersey	177,297,193	6.52
New Mexico	293,375	.108
New York	330,098,183	12.12
North Carolina	649,392	.239
Ohio	215,788,964	7.93
Oklahoma	2,269,633	.083
Oregon	6,175,790	.227
Pennsylvania	63,854,936	2.35
Rhode Island	4,326,528	.159
South Carolina	4,667,023	.172
South Dakota	11,747	0
Tennessee	27,775,545	1.02
Texas	99,461,019	2.19
Utah	372,116	.14
Vermont	610,907	.022
Virginia	20,072,727	.738
Washington	13,251,410	.487
Washington, D.C.	1,636,503	.06
West Virginia	424,326	.16
Wisconsin	12,854,446	.472
Wyoming	705,016	.026
Total	2,720,791,614	(1)

[1] Will not total 100 percent because of rounding.

Allis-Chalmers Discusses Foreign Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1962

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., of Milwaukee, one of the Nation's leading manufacturers of heavy industrial, construction, and electrical equipment, has just issued an excellent pamphlet containing questions and answers on foreign trade. While the company prepared the pamphlet primarily for its employees, its balanced, objective analysis will assist many others better to understand the importance of trade for this country.

The article follows:

ALLIS-CHALMERS DISCUSSES FOREIGN TRADE

Question. What is Allis-Chalmers' philosophy on international trade? Does the company favor high protective tariffs or free trade?

Answer. A company with worldwide markets and interests like Allis-Chalmers could not possibly support a completely protectionist attitude. Remember, Allis-Chalmers' dollar volume of sales abroad last year was about equal to the total company sales in 1940.

Question. If Allis-Chalmers doesn't believe in high tariffs and strong protection, why was such a fuss raised about the big hydraulic turbine order which was awarded to a competitor who proposed to buy about 47 percent of the items in this contract from a foreign source?

Answer. That was a special case in which we believed the intent of the so-called "Buy American Act" was being misconstrued. The law says, applied to purchases by certain Government agenices, that the content of the order must be substantially all produced in this country and then it was interpreted that "substantially all" meant just over 50 percent. We didn't think substantially all ought to mean merely 51 percent—we believe the term implies that a much higher percentage should be produced in this country.

Question. Were there other considerations involved in this case?

Answer. Yes, we had the idea that the yardstick for measuring the proportion of foreign content ought to reflect the hours of labor used in the manufacture, rather than the value; otherwise, the low labor cost foreign producer gains a further advantage. In this instance, it turned out that while the foreign dollar content of the order appeared to be only 47 percent, the actual labor and material portion was much larger. But, as you know, we lost the argument and the order.

Question. By the way, unless the interpretation of the "Buy American Act" is changed, on future proposals will Allis-Chalmers feel that it must procure components overseas, perhaps up to 49 percent, to be competitive?

Answer. Probably. After all, we're better off to keep 51 percent or more of the work in our shops, for our own people, than to lose the whole job.

Question. What do you think of the "Buy American Act" generally?

Answer. We believe in the principle. When public funds are to be spent for goods, they should be spent in the same market which produces the funds (taxes).

GOVERNMENT'S POSITION

Question. What has been our Government policy toward free trade the past two decades?

Answer. Our Government has favored a policy of free trade since the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was passed in 1934. Since that time we have endeavored to lower tariffs on our imports and at the same time we have negotiated to reduce discriminatory tariffs of other countries against our exports. Our Government has long recognized that we are no longer self-sufficient but require imports of many raw materials and critical metals. In fact, two-thirds of our total imports are vitally needed for our economy to function.

Question. Are there other considerations besides those of economic needs?

Answer. Yes. It is also essential that our Nation trade in order to market our surpluses. We are what is known as a "have" nation which means that we produce more fiber, food, and cetrain other commodities than we can consume. For example, 14 percent of our total agricultural production is exported and we would like to export more because our surpluses are still great. Therefore, we must trade.

Question. What about America's trade with less developed countries?

Answer. The United States, being the leader of the free world, must trade with these newly emerging nations. Unless economic ties are established, we risk losing these small countries to the Soviet bloc, not only tradewise, but politically as well.

TARIFFS

Question. Why are we hearing so much about free trade and tariff revision at the present time?

Answer. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act expires June 30 of this year. We must either reenact the present law, or accept the President's new trade program which calls for unprecedented power to reduce tariff rates, or arrive at some compromise. It is this question that is now being vigorously debated in Congress.

Question. Why do we have tariffs, anyway?

Answer. Tariffs were originally placed on imports to help industry in our youthful country to get established. An equally important purpose was to raise revenue for our Government. For many years prior to World War I, tariff collections accounted for nearly half of the Treasury's annual revenue. More recently, the revenue angle has decreased in relative importance, but tariffs are still used to give protection to American industries who are having problems in competing with foreign goods.

Question. Do tariffs vary widely?

Answer. Yes. For example, a small crawler tractor can be imported into this country free of any duty, but England has a 20-percent duty. Another example is passenger motor cars where the import duty in the United States is 6½ percent, but in Italy there is a 33-percent tariff. In addition to variations in the tariff rates, there are, of course, many other restrictions that countries impose, such as import licenses and quotas which limit the quantity of any product that can be sent into a country, and various other discriminatory practices.

Question. If tariffs vary widely, how are we going to get free trade?

Answer. The trading nations of the world will have to negotiate for a mutual lowering of tariffs toward the point of duty-free trade. For example, since World War II, the United States has lowered its tariffs by 70 percent until now we are one of the lower tariff countries in the world. Our country must bargain hard to get other nations to do likewise and lower their tariffs and import restrictions.

PRESIDENT'S REQUEST FOR TARIFF POWERS

Question. What powers has the President requested?

Answer. President Kennedy wants the power to eliminate all duties of 5 percent or less, eliminate tariff barriers between the United States and the Common Market on those items in which we and the Common Market together supply 80 percent of the world trade, and reduce up to 50 percent duties on other goods. This would give the President broader authority in the tariff bargaining field than has ever been accorded by the Congress up until now.

Question. Why does the President want these additional powers?

Answer. President Kennedy believes that with these additional powers to negotiate broad scale reduction, the United States will be placed in a better bargaining position to obtain concessions from the Common Market countries. By so bargaining mutual reductions, he believes that our goods will move more freely into the Common Market area and thus expand our exports.

COMMON MARKET

Question. What is meant by the Common Market?

Answer. The Common Market is a group of six nations in Europe (Belgium, France, West Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands) that decided to unite economically for purposes of trade. These six nations have agreed to eliminate tariffs among themselves over a period of 12 years and to use a common tariff against outsiders.

Question. Why should we be so concerned about the Common Market?

Answer. Because the six nations (and probably England and others eventually will join) represent a market potential comparable) to the United States with enormous purchasing power that offers great opportunities for exports from this country. Consequently, it is important that a common tariff wall not be placed around those nations that would prevent our goods from entering.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Question. Are there other reasons why the President wants to reduce our tariffs besides being in a position to negotiate with the Common Market?

Answer. Yes. The President believes that a greater reduction in our tariffs in order to gain tariff concessions from foreign countries will not only expand our exports but will improve our balance of payments deficit, which has become critical.

Question. What is the balance of payments?

Answer. Balance of payments is an accounting method for expressing in summary form the net dollar surplus or deficit resulting from all our international transactions, including foreign investments, private and Government grants, expenditures of the U.S. military forces overseas, and many other items in addition to purchases and sales of goods and services. In other words, it is an economic barometer reflecting the changes occurring in our international transactions.

Question. What do you mean by a deficit in the balance of payments?

Answer. A deficit occurs in our balance of payments when our total receipts or income from these international transactions fall short of our total payments. For the past 12 years our total balance of payments has been almost continually in deficit. This means that more U.S. dollars are leaving our shores than are returning. The past several years this deficit has increased to a critical point.

Question. How does the balance of payments relate to trade?

Answer. The trade balance, representing the amount we export versus the amount we import, is an important part of the balance of payments account. We have had a surplus of exports over imports since World War II, but this surplus has not been sufficient in recent years to offset our expenditures for foreign aid and military assistance.

Question. What does the balance of payments deficit mean to us?

Answer. When our deficit in the balance of payments reaches a critical point, as it has these past several years, people in foreign countries who have gained our dollars begin to question the soundness of U.S. currency and decide they would rather have gold. As a result, we must give them our gold to satisfy their demands which depletes our gold reserves. As our gold reserves are reduced, this further deteriorates confidence in the United States and the value of the dollar. This chain of events has repercussions not only in world markets but it affects our own economy. So it is important that this present deficit be corrected and we stop the flight of gold.

Question. What can we do to cure the balance-of-payments deficit and the gold flight?

Answer. The greatest hope for the solution of this problem lies in increasing our export surpluses sufficiently to make up for the amounts that we spend on our foreign economic and political aid programs. We should scrutinize our foreign aid and our

military assistance programs in order to reduce the outflow of dollars. This can be partially accomplished by supplying American goods and services rather than dollars to foreign countries in any necessary foreign aid programs.

AMERICA'S ABILITY TO COMPETE

Question. If increased exports seems to offer the best solution, how can this be accomplished?

Answer. We have already indicated that a reduction of foreign tariffs would help. But to get such reductions we will have to lower our own tariffs. Hence, as we gradually approach free trade in the world, only one solution will remain open to us. In order that industry can increase exports under conditions of free trade, it must be able to compete in international markets. Prices the American manufacturer charges for his products must be made low enough so that the housewife or industrial purchaser in France, for example, will buy the U.S. item in preference to the same product made in another country. To have our prices competitive, it's necessary that any inequalities of competition be lessened and, if possible, eliminated so as to allow the free forces of the market to operate without disadvantage to any of the traders.

Question. What do you mean by inequalities of competition?

Answer. The American manufacturer must compete against wide differences in wage rates. For example, in the United States, Allis-Chambers' average hourly cash wage (not including fringe benefits of about 75 cents per hour) is $2.81. In Japan, the rate is 35 cents and in Italy 59 cents. This differential in years past could be overcome by our innovation, technical know-how, and mass production techniques. With the growth of the industrialized countries in Europe and the Orient, these factors are no longer a U.S. advantage but are shared with these other countries. Hence, the wage differential is critically important.

Question. Do you believe that free trade will drive down U.S. labor rates?

Answer. No. In the long run, it is more likely that foreign labor costs will tend to increase to our level. Remember, if the Common Market is to have mass production, it will have to have more consumption. This means that, just as has gradually occurred in our country, increased productivity will eventually reflect itself in increased wages in order to keep the economy of the Common Market at a high level of production. This development, however, will undoubtedly take many years and in the meantime the wage differential will be a grave problem for us.

Question. Are there other inequalities beside the wage differential?

Answer. Yes. In England, for example, the depreciation that can be written off in the first 3 years on a piece of equipment is 75 percent while in the United States it is only 35 percent. This comparison is based on a piece of equipment with a given 15-year life. This inequality allows the English manufacturer to replace his equipment with more modern machines at a considerably faster rate than in the United States. This, of course, has a direct bearing on costs when competing in the international marketplace.

Question. Do other countries have more adequate credit insurance programs?

Answer. Yes. Foreign countries, many of whom have had to trade to live, have had credit risk insurance programs for many years for their exporters. Also the exporter in these foreign countries has been insured against convertibility losses and political risks as well. Again, these are inequalities of competition which now loom very important to the American manufacturer when selling in competition with foreign industries.

Question. Can these inequalities be lessened?

Answer. Yes. For example, it's important that the gap between the wage rates in this country and foreign countries doesn't grow wider. If we are to have a wage increase, it should be accompanied by a corresponding increase in productivity, or we will have an inflationary price rise or a reduction in profit that will make it all the more difficult to compete.

Question. If these inequalities could be lessened or eliminated, would U.S. industry be in a better position to compete?

Answer. Industry for the most part would welcome the challenge to compete if these inequalities were lessened or removed. Our country's economic growth has been due in large measure to industry's competing in open and free markets.

PRESIDENT'S PROPOSALS

Question. Does President Kennedy's program contain proposals for removal of these inequalities?

Answer. To some extent. It is a little early to determine how some of the programs, such as the credit insurance proposal, will operate. Offhand, a much larger and more aggressive scheme may be indicated. A new depreciation allowance schedule is supposed to be forthcoming that will make American industry equal in this respect to its foreign counterpart. It is essential that the new proposals be practical and workable since foreign manufacturing has had these programs operating for some time and utilizes them to a definite advantage in competing against U.S. goods.

Question. Are these proposals sufficient to increase our competitiveness and maintain our economic base?

Answer. Not entirely. If the inequalities are lessened, we still have to determine the best methods of reducing tariffs and negotiating for the elimination of other discriminatory practices. Whether wholesale lowering of tariffs is necessary, and whether the President should negotiate on a broad scale basis rather than item-by-item are open to question.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Question. Do you mean there are other methods that should be considered?

Answer. Yes. International free trade is still a theory because of the many factors which inhibit the smooth operation of a completely free and open international market. The Common Market countries learned this lesson forcefully in planning their mutual tariff reductions. They faced problems of cartels, the difficulties of movement of labor, problems of exchange, etc. Our Nation should learn from this experience and move toward free trade by an orderly and gradual plan. Furthermore, the Common Market, while extremely important, is not the world. Large areas of the world are not yet committed to a free trade theory.

Question. Are there some products on which traffic could be reduced drastically?

Answer. Yes. Tariffs on a number of product lines that are low labor mass production items, such as consumer durables, could be reduced to zero, say, within a 5-year span, as is requested by the President. But there are other industries to which this cannot apply.

Question. What about high-cost industries?

Answer. There are some industries that are by nature high-cost industries, not because of inefficiency but due to high labor content in their products. Such items as heavy power equipment, for example, are custom built and mass production economies cannot be achieved. For these there should be a timetable by which the tariff reductions would be scheduled to take place over a sufficiently long period to enable such industries to make needed adjustments. This idea has been adopted internally by the nations belonging to the Common Market. Their tariff schedule calls for a 12-year adjustment period before they reach zero. The differences in labor rates among these countries are much less than the differences between their labor rates and ours. Hence, an even longer adjustment period is indicated for our country.

Question. Is it necessary to protect national defense industries?

Answer. Yes. This group of industries essential to our national defense must be completely protected. It is essential that we select those that are needed in time of emergency and place them in a completely separate category. Any other course would force the companies in these industries to turn to other products. Once their plants and labor forces were converted, their special tools and equipment dismantled, and their labor forces retrained or dispersed, our country would be helpless in case of an emergency. This cannot be allowed to happen.

Question. What kinds of products would be included in these protected national defense industries?

Answer. Industries such as shipbuilding, locomotives, aircraft, generating and other heavy power machinery, railroad cars, machine tools and some others should be put on a "reserved" list. This in no way compromises our general free trade objective. It is just a sensible national security approach and one that is practiced in other countries. For example, one of the Common Market countries is now building a steam turbine industry, protecting it by seeing that all such products will be manufactured in that country and none can be imported.

Question. Will it be necessary to subsidize industries and workers that might be hurt by tariff reduction?

Answer. It is hoped that industries hurt by increased foreign competition will be able to adjust in an orderly process without the necessity for any subsidies or adjustment aid. It would be far better for a company to adjust its production facilities and product lines in due course providing they understand that they will be working against a specific timetable when tariffs on their particular products will be reduced or eliminated. This is why the long time schedule is urged for high labor cost industries.

PLANTS OVERSEAS

Question. What is the effect of building plants overseas?

Answer. Private investment overseas does two things. First, it actually helps the balance of payments problem by providing dollar earnings that are returned to this country. Secondly, it gives American industry a greater opportunity to compete and to further expand in new markets throughout the world. Further, these foreign subsidiaries will oftentimes provide the necessary risk capital for ventures in less developed countries where some of our greatest potential markets lie. Seldom will a company risk a new enterprise in such a less developed area without first having gained experience by operating in one of the foreign industrialized countries. It is important that we avoid any changes in taxation policy which would discourage or limit the full development of this phase of international commerce.

Question. Incidentally, we hear that when plants are built overseas, this is the same as exporting jobs to foreign countries. Is this true?

Answer. Not necessarily. Plants are built in foreign countries primarily to have access to markets that are normally closed to outsiders. The experience of companies having overseas plants has been that in many cases domestic business has improved because of the entrance into new markets, the increase in semifinished and parts business, and the accessibility of foreign technology and research.

SUMMARY

Question. How could you summarize Allis-Chalmers' position on foreign trade?

Answer. We believe in the basic philosophy of free trade. We recognize the changing world conditions and the necessity for new bargaining methods, probably involving U.S. tariff cuts, to gain foreign tariff cuts. We further believe that our Nation should approach these changing times with a practical realization that policies adopted should provide for an orderly process of change. In the case of some industries, wholesale tariff cuts would be possible. In other high cost industries, a reasonable time schedule for reduction should be placed in effect, much as the Common Market has done, to allow these industries to reorient themselves. Certain industries essential to national security should be completely protected. Finally, we believe that certain inequalities of competition must be lessened or removed to allow American industry to compete in the international marketplace on a more equitable basis than at present.

New York Scholar Translates Dead Sea Scrolls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I should like to honor the fine work completed by Dr. Sanders, on sabbatical leave from the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School in Rochester, N.Y., in translating to English the first of five Hebrew psalms recently discovered in a Dead Sea scroll. The 5 psalms are among 44 Hebrew psalms, the rest of which are familiar, preserved on a scroll which dates back to the first century. This scroll contains the only large book of psalms found, that dates back so far.

Dr. Sanders was appointed to study the finds by an international team headed by the Reverend Roland de Vauz, director of the French School of Archaeology and president of the board of the Palestine museum. The work on the scroll was done at the Palestine Archaeological Museum, which owns the documents. An article by Dr. Sanders, describing his work, will be published in the spring by the American Schools of Oriental Research at Yale University.

It is a great honor to be chosen to participate in studies of the undiscovered and early history of an area of the world, where Eastern and Western cultures meet. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include an article from the New York Times in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEBREW VERSES ARE PUT INTO ENGLISH BY U.S. SCHOLAR

JERUSALEM (JORDANIAN SECTOR), March 3.—Authorities made available today the first English translation of one of five psalms recently discovered in a Dead Sea scroll.

The 5 are among 44 Hebrew psalms, the rest of which are familiar, preserved on a goatskin scroll. The scroll dates to the first century and is the only large psalter found that dates back so far.

The scroll, discovered with other parchments in an archive in a cave in 1956, was recently unrolled, studied and deciphered at the Palestine Archeological Museum. The delicate task was performed by J. A. Sanders, professor of Old Testament at the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School in Rochester, N.Y.

The scroll, considered to be the most significant discovery since the first Dead Sea scrolls were uncovered in 1947, is well preserved, except for decay in the bottom third, caused by dampness.

Like the 1947 finds, the 1956 discovery was made by a Bedouin among the ranks of reddish-yellow cliffs that rise 150 feet in the vicinity of Ras Teshka on the Dead Sea. The caves in which the scrolls were found are known as the Qumran caves, after Wadi Qumran, a gully that runs from the Judean desert through the cliffs to the Dead Sea.

An ascetic sect known as the Essenes lived and worked in the complex of caves, producing their scrolls in a scriptorium equipped with plaster desks, benches, and inkwells.

It is believed that in about A.D. 68, the sect got word of the approach of the 10th Roman Legion and hid its treasures so well they were not found for nearly 1,900 years.

The cave that yielded the scroll of psalms, cave 11, also contained fragments of Hebrew texts of Ezekiel and Leviticus, and a free translation of parts of Job into Aramaic, a Semitic language commonly used at the time of the Essenes.

APPOINTED TO TASK

Professor Sanders, on sabbatical leave, was appointed to study the finds from cave 11 by an international team headed by the Reverend Roland de Vaux, director of the French School of Archeology and president of the board of the Palestine Museum, which owns the documents.

For his translation into English—a tentative one—Dr. Sanders chose the longest and, in his opinion, the most beautiful of the five newly discovered psalms—"an apostrophe to Zion." The psalm is complete. It escaped the damage from seeping rain that affected other psalms.

Another "new" psalm is a personal confession of faith. Two are in praise of God. The fifth, which Dr. Sanders said could not strictly be classified as a psalm, is in prose and describes the compositions of David. It reports that David wrote 2,050 psalms, or musical compositions, and sets forth the kind of temple service for which they were intended.

THREE OTHERS STAND OUT

Three other psalms stand out for, although they had previously been known, they had not been known in Hebrew.

One, sometimes designated the 151st—the conventional Bible contains 150 psalms—was previously known only in Greek, Latin, and Syriac, an eastern Aramaic dialect. The two others, which explain the theology of the Qumran sect, were previously known only in Syriac.

Dr. Sanders began the delicate task of unrolling the scroll at 10:30 a.m. on November 10, and finished it at 2:18 p.m. on November 20. In his words, "All it required was a penknife and guts, plus a humidifier."

The humidifier, a glass cover over a wet sponge, served well enough for the smaller pieces of the scroll, but the last section was large and troublesome. It was stuck together with a pitchlike substance, and resisted the professor's penknife.

At Father de Vaux's suggestion, Dr. Sanders then turned his workroom into a steamroom by boiling water on a stove.

The professor said the date of the scroll was A.D. 30 to 50. This he established through the handwriting styles, which varied from period to period.

An article by Dr. Sanders describing his work will be published this spring by the American Schools of Oriental Research at Yale University. A complete study will follow within 2 years in the Oxford University Press series, "Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan."

Publication rights were purchased from the Government of Jordan by the American Schools through a gift from Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Bechtel of San Francisco.

QUESTION RAISED

The newly found psalms raised a question to a Biblical scholar here: Are they Essene or older psalms that the Essenes preserved?

A first impression of the provisional English translation was given by Dr. Frank Cross. He said, "It sounds like a sectarian composition and not like an archaic psalm."

The psalm was read over the telephone to Dr. Cross, a Biblical scholar who teaches at the Harvard University Divinity School. Dr. Cross, an authority on the Dead Sea scrolls, said that conclusive judgments would have to wait on closer examination.

Low Blows Won't Help Medical Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, among the major metropolitan newspapers of the country, the Chicago Sun-Times has been especially concerned with the debate raging here in Washington over the administration's proposals for medical care through social security. It is therefore natural that it should, editorially, appraise the recent statements of Democratic National Chairman John M. Bailey, who is using this issue as a completely partisan political weapon.

I personally have been intrigued that the major spokesman on the subject in New Frontier ranks seems to be the party chairman rather than the host of House Members, Senators, and Cabinet officers who at least have a more direct relationship to the legislative situation.

The editorial which I insert into the RECORD at this point entitled "Low Blows Won't Help Medical Care" effectively penetrates and analyzes Chairman Bailey's latest oratorical contribution to the American scene:

LOW BLOWS WON'T HELP MEDICAL CARE

By now the Nation is familiar with the crudities of Democratic Chairman John M. Bailey in his support of the administration's medical care plan for the aged through social security. His latest outburst—linking the American Medical Association with the John Birch Society—is sheer demagoguery.

The AMA is opposed to the administration's program and is waging a strong fight against it. This is the right of any interested group of Americans on questions of pending legislation.

Labor, trade associations, specific industries, and professional organizations of many kinds carry on continuing campaigns to support or oppose measures before Congress.

The AMA has plenty of company in its battle against the administration's plan. Opinions on the question are sharply divided. The Sun-Times is one of many newspapers opposed to the type of Federal program which has been proposed. Is Bailey charging all opponents with being Birchers?

In its campaign, conducted with complete propriety, the AMA has recognized the humanitarian need for providing for ailing older persons. The organization has joined in formulating alternative plans which offer care for those that need such help without imposing the Government bureaucracy on the millions of others who do not want or need it.

It ill becomes any responsible national figure to reward these efforts with a smear such as Bailey was guilty of when he said in a speech that the American people "are starting to regard the AMA * * * as an ally of the John Birch Society in a surgical mask."

An unrelated remark elsewhere in the country by former President Truman about the Birch Society demonstrates just how vicious this attack was. The former President, expressing the viewpoint of many, termed the Birch Society "nothing more than the Ku Klux Klan without nightgowns."

Is this what Bailey meant to call the Nation's medical profession because it happens to be on the opposite side from his party on a national issue? Bailey's statement was too much even for the Democratic leader in the Senate. Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, who was present during the Democratic chairman's tirade, hastened to tell newsmen afterward that the AMA has as much right to express itself as any other group, thereby disassociating himself from the attack. Indeed, the entire membership of the Democratic National Committee and leaders of the administration should follow MANSFIELD's lead and lose no time in repudiating Bailey.

Some time ago Bailey coldly appraised medical care for the aged as the most attractive issue in this year's election. This was because of the votes he said administration candidates would gain from supporting the measure whether or not it passed.

Now he has made unmistakably clear his determination to play ward politics with a question involving human sympathy and the need of the less fortunate. It is not only a crude and shabby approach, it is a disservice to the administration for which he speaks and to the democratic process as well.

Let the Record Be the Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, there has been widespread editorial comment on the proposal made by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], and myself, to require that spoken remarks on the floor of the House be printed in different typeface from that used for written material that is revised and extended in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD without being actually spoken.

I should like to insert in the RECORD three editorials that recently appeared on this subject from the Columbia (Mo.) Tribune, the La Grande (Oreg.) Observer, and the Charlotte (N.C.) Observer.

[From the Columbia (Mo.) Tribune, Mar. 1, 1962]

LET THE RECORD BE A RECORD

NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE.—Reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which we often do for pleasure as well as for business, can sometime turn into a lively detective game: the trick is to pick out what really was said on the floor (of which the RECORD purports to be a verbatim record) from what some enterprising legislator would like us to think he said.

The two Houses have somewhat different rules for inclusion of unspoken matter, but both provide devices by which speeches that are not actually delivered can be included, and by which things actually said can be altered, added to or deleted before printing.

Properly used, these can be valuable devices. They permit errors to be corrected and ambiguities clarified; they also allow inclusion of significant statements or helpful supplementary material without taking up Congress' time with oral delivery.

But they are too often abused.

In the House, New York's Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY has joined Missouri's THOMAS B. CURTIS in sponsoring a change that would curb much of the abuse without restricting the proper use. It would simply provide that anything not said on the floor of the House be printed in a recognizably different typeface. This is a reform we have encouraged in the past, and we still would like to see it made—and to see the Senate do likewise.

The RECORD, after all, is an official document of considerate public and historic significance. It shouldn't be used to fool the people.

[From the La Grande (Oreg.) Observer, Feb. 12, 1962]

CONGRESS MUST FIND THE HEAVIER EVIL

Anyone who thinks that the age of miracles has passed would do well to spend some time contemplating the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Seldom a day goes by that this tax-supported publication doesn't work a miracle or two, and not just the common garden variety of miraculous.

Its miraculous powers make it possible for Members of Congress to be in two places at the same time.

For example, a Congressman can, through courtesy of the RECORD, deliver a speech on the floor of the House of Representatives at the same time that he is patronizing the $2 window at Bowie race course.

I am not suggesting, of course, that some of our lawgivers like to bet the horses. This is only a theoretical case.

It would serve just as well to say that the hypothetical Congressman was catnapping in his office, or pacifying a constituent, or off somewhere on a junket.

The trick of being two places at once is accomplished by means of a House rule which permits Members to "revise and extend" in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks they make, or don't make, on the House floor.

In other words, written statements and speeches are printed in the RECORD side-by-side with those uttered orally on the House floor. In cold type, it's hard to tell which are which.

This system provides two major benefits: (1) a speechmaker is spared the task of speaking his speech, and (2) others are spared the task of hearing it.

Some House Members, however, look upon the custom of ghost speaking as being somewhat deceptive. Two of them, Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri, and Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, Republican, of New York, have proposed to change the rules that would preclude double images.

Under their proposal, spoken speeches would be printed in the RECORD in a different typeface from written speeches that are merely handed to the Clerk for publication.

LINDSAY explained this would provide readers of the RECORD with a more accurate reflection of what actually takes place on the House floor.

Furthermore, he said, it could have a collateral effect of cutting down absenteeism among House Members.

Such indeed might be the case, but there also would undoubtedly be a corresponding increase in the oratorical output in the Chamber.

The question the House must decide, then, is whether a little more honesty would be worth all the extra earbending.

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) Observer, Feb. 6, 1962]

JUST FOR THE RECORD'S SAKE

The honorables who sit in the U.S. Congress enjoy a privilege denied to lesser mortals who reside elsewhere than in the Kremlin: They can edit history.

Both the Senators and Representatives have the right to edit the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which is supposed to be a verbatim record of what is said on the floors of both Houses.

Some may envy the lawmakers their ability to correct errors, and to employ hindsight in erasing what the moving finger has written, but most folks rank the practice with free mail and oversea junkets to inspect El Lido as a perquisite of office and ignore it.

The insertion of undelivered speeches, recipes for plum pudding, yea, and newspaper editorials, into the daily, voluminous RECORD is accepted procedure and one which costs the taxpayer a tidy sum each year.

Periodically, some cost-conscious Congressman has tried to transform the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that its function will more nearly fit its title. All to no avail. The RECORD, with all its garrulity and chaff, has been kept as was.

Now Congressmen JOHN LINDSAY, of New York, and THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, are trying a new tack. They propose that everything that isn't said on the floor of the House be printed in a different typeface than that used for the actual proceedings.

This eminently sensible proposal would keep the record and RECORD straight. The speeches could be printed in regular type, the recipes and editorial fulminations in italic, for example.

It will be interesting to follow the progress of the Lindsay-Curtis proposal. If the past is a guide, it will be ditched. The Congressmen always have seemed as intent on keeping the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD unchanged as they have been insistent on cluttering it with useless trivia that detracts from the dignity of an important journal.

Empty, Stereotyped Liberalism Repels Thoughtful Young People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following column by William S. White on the fallacy of labeling young people as conservatives. It was carried in the March 19, 1962, issue of the Dallas Times-Herald:

EMPTY, STEREOTYPED LIBERALISM REPELS THOUGHTFUL YOUNG PEOPLE

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—The great enigma of the college campuses—the highly advertised rise of a new conservatism among the young—has got the politicians in both parties running madly about in all directions. They are trying to detect which way the wind is really blowing and whose fences are really falling and why.

This correspondent modestly suggests that the politicians, and political scientists, too, are operating on the wrong premises in a search for the wrong kind of information.

In the first place, labels such as "conservative" and "liberal" have absolutely no fixed meaning, and, therefore, no real meaning. One man's conservative is another man's liberal. The whole affair is like trying to determine how high is up or how cold is cold.

WORDS MEANINGLESS

In the second place, the more one looks into these political rallies of the young and the more he exposes himself to college seminars, the more certain he is of one thing: The young are not really interested in words like "conservative." Unlike their presumably smarter elders, they know such words don't mean anything anyhow.

They are interested in something they can measure—men, as distinguished from abstract ideologies. And most of all they are interested in truly responsible public men. With characteristic irreverence, they simply don't accept certain political attitudes or wildly love certain politicians simply because this had long been the collegiate thing to do.

They do not describe themselves as "conservative" for any dislike of the genuinely liberal approach—which is an approach open-minded enough to see that the problems of present and future are larger than of the past but which does not at the same time demand the instant repeal of all the past.

IDEAS REJECTED

These are the kinds of liberalism in public officials—found mostly in the Senate and House—to which the young are saying goodbye:

That liberalism which endlessly catches minority-group votes in the North by Southbaiting—and by invariable refusal to consider moderate and reasonable racial reforms while perpetually demagoguing for the unwise, the unfair and the unattainable.

That liberalism which automatically cries out for an end to our nuclear testing, no matter how much testing the Soviet Union may undertake.

That liberalism which will eagerly support any multisyllabic program, whatever its substance or merit or lack of merit, once it is labeled as "forward looking" and once the bad "southerners" and "old-line Republicans" can be identified as against it.

EMPTY GESTURES

That liberalism which is constantly preoccupied with making large, grand and empty gestures; with "getting in there and fighting"; with adolescent slogans like "no compromise"—in an art, politics, which itself is compromise.

No, it is not conservatism—whatever that is—which attracts the young. Rather, the thinking young are being repelled by an absurd, a self-righteous and a demonstrably irresponsible form of "liberalism" which, by the young at least, is happily being seen at last for the farce it is.

The Answer to Soviet Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, HALE BOGGS, has written a most interesting article for the Courier, a student publication of Georgetown University. His subject is the European Economic Community and how this Common Market may be used as a tool of trade to combat communism. I commend the article to your attention.

The article follows:

THE ANSWER TO SOVIET COMMUNISM

(By the Honorable HALE BOGGS, Representative from Louisiana)

Just a short 17 years ago, the most devastating war in the history of mankind, World War II, ended, and the nations of Western Europe which had been the battlefield in this terrible conflict lay prostrate. The economy of these countries had been bled white, and it appeared for a time as though Europe had been dealt a mortal blow from which she would never recover.

To save Western Europe from collapse the United States came to her rescue with the famous Marshall plan, conceived by the late Secretary of State George Marshall and former Under Secretary of State William Clayton and implemented under the administration of President Truman. This massive program to rebuild and revitalize the sagging economy of free Europe was launched in 1948, and there is no doubt but that it provided the initial bulwark to prevent Western Europe from being overrun by Soviet communism and to build the strong Western alliance which exists today.

In the preamble to this Marshall plan—which Senator FULBRIGHT and I had drafted—our country urged the creation of a united Europe as the best way to halt the advances of communism and bring peace and prosperity to those countries so long divided by extreme nationalism and its resultant jealousy, suspicion, hatred, and ultimately war.

As you know from history, the core of the disunion in Europe was to be found in the constant conflict between France and Germany, whose peoples nurtured a distrust and hatred begun in the Napoleonic Wars, swelled by the Franco-Prussian War of 1870 and World War I, and carried forth into World War II.

But today this mutual distrust, this longstanding hatred, is disappearing in the face of the growing and prospering European Economic Community, more popularly termed "the Common Market." France and West Germany are two of the six nations (the others are Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg) now in the process of establishing a full economic community by virtue of the Treaty of Rome which went into effect January 1, 1958. During a transition period of 12 to 15 years, the Common Market countries are removing all tariffs, quotas, and other trade barriers within the Community by gradual stages; erecting a uniform external tariff for the EEC toward the outside world; negotiating all trade agreements as a unit; eliminating restrictions on the movement of labor, services, capital, and business enterprises within the Community; coordinating monetary and fiscal policies to foster more favorable balance of payments, higher employment and better price stability in each member country, and providing a fund for financing a kind of trade adjustment program to meet the effects of liberalizing trade within the EEC, and other economic and social improvements.

Jean Monnet, chairman of the action committee for a United States of Europe and father, first, of the European Coal and Steel Community and then of the Common Market itself, told me in our meeting last fall in Paris:

"Nothing can halt the forward progress of the Common Market now; it has gone so far already that none of the present 'Six' would want to take the blame for ending the Community, or even for obstructing or slowing its advance toward economic union, and I hope ultimately to political unification."

In his opinion, Monnet said, a united Western Europe in economic association with the United States would end the Soviet Union's chances of dominating the world.

I share his optimism for many reasons, and I believe that this emerging and viable European Community, in partnership with our country, provides the free world with its greatest opportunity since the end of World War II to halt the advance of communism.

Further, the greatest impetus to strengthening Western unity is Great Britain's epochmaking decision to apply for membership in the Common Market. Britain's proposed giant step is even more heartening to me because her decision is based not so much on selfish motives, but rather on her sincere desire to further unify the West to meet the incessant economic aggression of the Soviet Union and Red China.

In addition to Britain's proposed entry into the EEC, Denmark and Ireland have applied for membership, and Norway is expected to do so shortly. If these nations go into the Common Market, this Community would embrace more than 260 million people, as compared to 215 million in Russia and 185 million in the United States. Further, if Austria, Sweden, and Switzerland are permitted to join as associate members as Greece has done, then the EEC would have some 300 million people in 1 vast common market.

In the past 4 years since the Treaty of Rome became effective, the Common Market as a unit has enjoyed an average annual growth rate almost twice that of the United States and nearly 3 times that of the United Kingdom. Since 1958 the EEC's annual growth rate has averaged 5.5 percent, while our country's has been about 3.3 percent, the United Kingdom 2.6 percent, and that of the rival European Free Trade Association, of which Britain is still a member, 3 percent. (The European Free Trade Association—or EFTA for short—was established in early 1960 as a rival economic grouping to the Common Market. Britain was the leader in its formation, and six other Western European countries joined as members.)

The highlight of the EEC's growth has been its industrial production which in 1960 jumped by a record 12 percent over 1959, and in 1961 climbed another 7 percent over 1960. Furthermore, the Common Market countries are now realizing the fruits engendered by the gradual elimination of all trade barriers between them on industrial products (now reduced by 40 percent below the mean levels of 4 years ago); the existence of a "common market" among the several States of our country for almost 175 years is one of the great contributing factors to the tremendous growth and prosperity which this Nation has enjoyed. In the 3-year period, 1958–60, internal trade in the ECC rose by 50 percent; in 1960 alone, this internation trade grew by 25 percent. Further, since 1958, the Common Market's trade with third-party countries has expanded by 25 percent.

By virtue of their January agreement on a common agricultural policy—attained in January after weeks of hard negotiation—the EEC countries have entered the second stage of the three-stage transition period to full union by 1970, or at the latest 1973. By entering the second 4-year stage, the Common Market "Six" have crossed "the point of no return" and now irrevocable ties are being set in motion which make disolution of the Community almost impossible.

For this reason the United States must act this year in order to be able to negotiate with the European Community on an equal and practical basis and to form a closer economic association with free Europe.

In my opinion, the first necessary step in this direction is for the Congress to provide the President with the positive authority to negotiate with the Common Market, reciprocal reduction on tariffs and other trade barriers on an across-the-board basis; that is, by whole categories of products instead of item by item as is the only manner now provided to the President by the current Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. As you know, the current law—first enacted in 1934 and renewed in varying forms 11 times since then—will expire on June 30 and the Congress must act on trade legislation before that date.

The limited, item-by-item negotiation authority in the present law was exhausted by last month's reciprocal tariff cut agreement between our country and the European Community. At present, the Common Market nations are reducing their internal trade barriers via a speeded-up timetable, and we must not delay in giving the President the power he needs to enhance our country's prosperity and fortify the West.

The House Ways and Means Committee, of which I am a member, has the responsibility of acting on President Kennedy's proposals for broader trade legislation, of renewing the current act as it is, or if it pleases, taking no action at all. In his special message to the Congress on trade, the President outlined for us and the Nation his proposals for a 5-year trade expansion law; and the general provisions in the administration bill seem realistic and practical, without being extreme, and at the same time, include proper safeguards for our domestic industries and workers through an adjustment assistance program. Hearings on new trade legislation before my committee are expected to begin in March, and I shall strive for the enactment of a meaningful trade law which will permit the United States to bargain equally with the Common Market, and also open up vast new mass markets in Western Europe for our exports and for those of other nations of the free world.

I am most optimistic that the Congress will enact a positive trade program. I believe that support for broader trade legislation is growing not only in Congress but also with the American people. As evidence of this growing support in many segments of business, industry, and labor, officials of such major organizations as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Committee for a National Trade Policy, the Committee for Economic Development, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the AFL–CIO, and others testified vigorously before the Joint House-Senate Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy (of which I am chairman) on the benefits of freer trade and the need for broad trade legislation. At my subcommittee hearings in December, these experts from business, industry, and labor and from the academic world were joined by high Government officials who urged our country to take a "giant step" by forming a trade partnership with the European Community. Among the latter officials were Under Secretary of State George Ball; two former Secretaries of State, Christian Herter and Dean Acheson, and former Under Secretary of State Clayton.

The Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy issued a report based on testimony at the hearings and on material in 10 study papers which were prepared by leading experts from all foreign policy fields for the subcommittee. Our report calls for providing President Kennedy with "much greater authority" to negotiate broad reciprocal tariff reductions with the Common Market. It points out that "a simple renewal of the Trade Agreements Act * * * will not suit the needs of our foreign economic policy in the 1960's."

Just what would be the consequences of inaction by our country on trade legislation? What would happen if the Congress took no action at all or merely renewed for a year or two the present trade act?

First and foremost, trade could become a decisive issue within the Atlantic community; our allies in Europe would grow apart from us and rival free world trading blocs would compete in a destructive manner, instead of cooperating for their mutual benefit. The West would become more vulnerable to the economic challenge of the Communist bloc.

If such a development were allowed to occur, our exports to Western Europe and possibly to other parts of the world would decline, and then our balance-of-payments position would be weakened still further. If our export sales could not be increased or at least maintained at present levels, the security of the United States would be imperiled because we would be forced to retreat from some of our oversea commitments to maintain troops abroad and to continue the mutual security (foreign aid) program.

By taking no action on our trade policies, our country's exporters would lose their access to this growing European market; then the EEC probably would adopt a "protectionist" posture toward us, thus shutting the United States out of this expanding market all together.

Our subcommittee report notes: "The American export stake in Western Europe in 1960 alone amounted to more than $6 billion ($4 billion in industrial goods and almost $2 billion in agricultural products). If nothing is done to lower the external tariff around the Common Market, American industry may have difficulty maintaining this stake, much less expanding it."

In his state of the Union address January 11, President Kennedy stated "* * * our balance of trade * * * to Europe, the Common Market, in farm products, is nearly 3 or 4 to 1 in our favor, amounting to one of the best earners of dollars in our balance-of-payments structure, and without entrance to this market, without the ability to enter it, our farm surpluses will pile up in the Middle West * * * [and] in the South * * *."

In his trade message, the President noted that both the American farmer and worker will benefit from the expansion of exports. "One out of every seven farmworkers produces for export," he stated, and "one out of every three workers engaged in manufacturing is employed in establishments that export," he added.

A lowering of U.S. tariffs, it is true, will increase imports in competition with some of our domestic industries; but in the long run, such action would stimulate our economic growth and prosperity through the increase of our exports into more markets. A reduction in our trade barriers would boost the strong industries of our economy to revitalize their technological processes and modernize their plant and equipment in order to increase productivity and improve efficiency. Lower tariffs would stimulate the expansion of the most efficient businesses and industries (which also pay the highest wages), and cause the less efficient ones to contract. The unemployment produced as a result of increased imports from Europe and other nations, will be, I think, of limited duration and can be reduced through some form of adjustment assistance.

On the effect of American imports, the President pointed out in his trade message that "about 60 percent of the goods we import do not compete with the goods we produce—either because they are not produced in this country, or are not produced in any significant quantity." He declared "there are many more American jobs dependent upon exports than could possibly be adversely affected by increased imports."

In seeking reciprocal tariff reductions with the European community, the United States should also try to secure access for the developing areas and nations and their products into the Common Market. Particularly the tropical products of Latin America, India, and other nations, and the industrialized goods of Japan, should have greater access to our markets and those of Western Europe. I believe it is up to us and the EEC countries to provide a steadily increasing access for their products; if we fail to do so, then there is a real probability that some of these people would embrace communism as the best road for rapid economic development. As President Kennedy noted in his trade message: "Soviet bloc trade with 41 non-Communist countries in the less-developed areas of the globe has more than tripled in recent years; and bloc trade missions are busy in nearly every continent attempting to penetrate, encircle and divide the free world." Certainly, with our country's initiation of the alliance-for-progress program in Latin America, we should work to prevent any market discrimination against her tropical products while those of former French colonies in Africa already are enjoying the benefits of an associate membership in the European community.

Another major advantage which I think the United States can obtain through providing freer access to our markets for the developing nations is to improve the effectiveness of our foreign aid to them. If our foreign aid is more effective, then the economies of these nations will improve, and we should be able to reduce our aid to them. Furthermore, in a closer trade association with the Common Market, the United States should be able to transfer the responsibility for some of this financial assistance to our allies in Europe. They are now in a better position to assume an equitable share in this mutual security program.

The U.S. responsibilities as leader of the free world are such that we cannot afford to withdraw behind high tariff walls: Not only would such a course be harmful to our own economic growth and prosperity, but also it would weaken the West and provide the Soviet Union and Communist bloc with the opportunity to force more peoples into slavery.

As President Kennedy declared in his trade policy speech before the National Association of Manufacturers in New York City, "economic isolation and political leadership are wholly incompatible."

In the words of former Secretary of State Dean Acheson, in testifying before my subcommittee, "We really have no other choice."

In closing I would quote from the President's state of the Union address:

"Members of the Congress, the United States did not rise to greatness by waiting for others to lead. This Nation is the world's foremost manufacturer, farmer, banker, consumer, and exporter. The Common Market is moving ahead at an economic growth rate twice ours. The Communist economic offensive is underway. The opportunity is ours—the initiative is up to us—and I believe that 1962 is the time."

I am confident that Congress will take the initiative this year and enact a meaningful trade law for the benefit of free men everywhere.

European Children Are Exposed to the Greatest Classics of Our Western Cultural Heritage While American Children Are Exposed to Harmful Movies and Television Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, attention is being directed these days to what Ivan knows that Johnny does not. There is even a best seller on the subject, titled "What Ivan Knows That Johnny Doesn't," by Arthur Trace.

Ivan and European children are exposed from their earliest days to the finest cultural expressions, to the greatest classics of our Western cultural heritage, to the opera, the theater, and to great art in all fields.

Little Johnny, on the other hand, sees the Three Stooges, and all kinds of trash on the TV programs at home, and when he goes to the movies he is not any better off.

Attorney General Robert Kennedy and FCC Chairman Newton Minow have spoken of the correlation between some of the "vast wasteland" TV programs and juvenile delinquency.

Recently an article in Parade magazine said that juvenile delinquency in Switzerland was lowest because children in that country could not attend certain movies until 18.

Recently Senator KENNETH B. KEATING introduced a joint resolution designating the month of June as Children's Music and Arts Festival Month. He said at the time that—

> For the past 2 years the Afro Arts Cultural Center in New York City, in cooperation with the New York City Department of Parks, the borough president of Manhattan's office, the board of education and the youth council of the police department's 28th precinct, has sponsored a children's music festival in New York City.
>
> The Afro Arts Cultural Center is working to improve the cultural patterns of the people of New York City. The center has also endeavored to create a better understanding among all people of the world. In seeking to promote the theme that "the world belongs to children," the Afro Arts Cultural Center has had the support of many leading citizens of New York. It is hoped that the seed which this organization has planted in New York will spread to other States and to nations around the world. Through music and art the cultural spirits of all people can be united in an effort to promote better world understanding.

Mrs. Arthur J. Goldberg, wife of Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg, is seeking to mobilize parents and other volunteers including artists and art patrons in the Nation's Capital in an effort to enhance the cultural life of this great Capital City. She has been greatly encouraged by School Superintendent Carl F. Hansen. The enthusiastic cooperation she has received from museums, universities, recreation leaders, art organizations, and musicians prompted her to say recently that—

> Perhaps the time might be ripe for another project to raise the level of cultural awareness throughout the city—and a good place to begin is in the schools.

Others are working in this area too.

Milton W. King, president of the National Symphony Orchestra Association of the Nation's Capital, recently pointed out that:

> Last year, over 100,000 youngsters throughout the Washington area attended 70 concerts given especially for them. Young people visiting Washington in the spring enjoy the experience of attending the "Music for Young America" 5-week concert series. For most of them, it is their first exposure to a symphony orchestra, and for many, the doors are opened to a whole new world. These concerts are given free through the generosity of one of our board members.

Mrs. Herbert May is to be highly commended for making these splendid concerts available to these young Americans.

The National Symphony Orchestra has come to symbolize an important part of the musical life of the country. In foreign countries, the National Symphony Orchestra has been enthusiastically received as a missionary of good will from the United States.

In the opera field, the Washington Civic Opera Association's free production of a fully staged version of "Hansel and Gretel," sponsored by the District of Columbia Recreation Department, was literally overrun, with many hundreds of young people turned away. A second performance was made possible through the generosity of the AFL-CIO Retail Clerks International, and its able president, James Suffridge. Their contribution of $1,000 made it possible for the schoolchildren of the District of Columbia to attend this opera during the Christmas holidays. Certainly, Mrs. Arthur J. Goldberg and Dr. Carl Hansen could well make use of the free, high-quality opera programs of the Washington Civic Opera Association to enrich the cultural life of the city's schoolchildren.

Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy has been quoted in the newspapers as saying:

> I want to commend Secretary Stewart L. Udall for the efforts he is making to bring culture to Washington. He is having some difficulty.

Secretary of Interior Udall is certainly to be complimented for his sponsorship of a series of distinguished cultural evenings at the new State Department Auditorium. This is especially important because it is being observed not only by the American people, but by people overseas who have long been subjected to the well-financed propaganda of the Soviet Union that describes Americans as crass materialists.

However, this wholly praiseworthy series of cultural evenings at the State Department is restricted to "very important guests" who must wear black ties and tuxedoes and be well known to the society pages. Of course, most Americans do not get invitations to these events, and certainly few students in the District's public schools are invited to attend these high-level, cultural evenings. Indeed, there is a great deal of unemployment and underemployment at this time and many American families are not able to afford cultural events of such high standards.

It would be commendable of Secretary of Interior Udall to present these great artists free at the Carter Barron Amphitheater, which is under his jurisdiction, and make them available to the non-black-tie-and-tuxedo crowd, to the students, to the unemployed and the underemployed, and to the underprivileged of the Nation's Capital who, whatever their economic situation is, and whatever their wardrobe situation may be, that is, even though they may have holes in the soles of their shoes like Gov. Adlai Stevenson, are still interested in our Nation's culture.

Dr. Frederick Fall, music director of the Washington Civic Opera, recently said that:

> Great attention is being directed these days to what Ivan knows that Johnny doesn't—what Ivan reads that Johnny doesn't—what must be emphasized, however, is what Ivan hears and sees that Johnny doesn't.
>
> Johnny, through the media of radio, television and the comics, is fed for his most important educational period the lowest common denominator of cultural pap. Without any serious conditioning in the arts, the public is then polled to determine their standard of taste. And, finally, the results of the poll are fed back to them, only intensifying their conviction that cultural standards are of the lowest common denominator.
>
> On the other hand, Ivan and the European child are exposed from the earliest possible moment to the finest quality art output of western culture and at the same time are prevented by parental and community discipline from being exposed to movie and television fare of inferior or harmful quality.

I include an article from the Washington (D.C.) Post of March 11, 1962, and a statement by Dr. Frederick Fall:

MRS. GOLDBERG URGES SCHOOL ART VOLUNTEERS

(By Carole Bowie)

> Local artists and art lovers working as volunteers in the public schools could enhance the cultural life of the whole city.
>
> That was the idea Dorothy Goldberg, wife of Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg, took to school officials last week. The men she talked with—including School Superintendent Carl F. Hansen—thought it was a good one.
>
> They encouraged Mrs. Goldberg, working with a group of citizens who call themselves the friends of public school art, to go ahead with plans to enlist parents, artists and other volunteers to help school officials in efforts to improve school cultural programs.
>
> AIMED AT DELINQUENCY
>
> They would work through the Urban Service Corps, organized last spring to provide volunteer workers to assist schools in a variety of projects aimed at combating juvenile delinquency.
>
> Mrs. Goldberg said her visit to Hansen was inspired by "extraordinary community cooperation" extended by museums, universities, recreation centers, artists' societies and "art volunteers," to another new program aimed at introducing foreign diplomats to Washington cultural life.

"Their enthusiastic cooperation indicates that perhaps the time might be ripe for another project to raise the level of cultural awareness throughout the city—and a good place to begin is in the schools," said Dorothy Goldberg, who herself is an artist.

Professional volunteers, she said, might serve in an artists and musicians bureau to provide lectures and performances in schools. Others might sponsor concerts and talks by visiting artists.

SPONSORED EXHIBITS

Art volunteers could also organize special art exhibits, such as one presented last year at Western High School through the Associated Artists Gallery, sponsor an "art mobile," and escort children and their parents on trips to galleries.

"We are also exploring ways for volunteers to assist art teachers so they could give more of their time to the teaching of art," Mrs. Goldberg said.

Mrs. Goldberg views the new project not as a "big splash" but as one demanding much work of many people. "Anything involving the public schools must be undertaken with careful deliberation and the counsel of professional educators," she said.

Before drawing final plans and recruiting volunteers, Mrs. Goldberg and the friends of public school art plan a public seminar to discuss what can be done to help children take full advantage of "the rich cultural life provided by this community's wonderful museums and institutions."

"It is our hope," Mrs. Goldberg said, "that this seminar will be the beginning for creating a climate of rapport and mutual help among parents, artists, art educators, and museum staffs and teachers for the benefit of our schools."

STATEMENT BY DR. FREDERICK FALL, MUSIC DIRECTOR, WASHINGTON CIVIC OPERA

Great attention is being directed these days to what Ivan knows that Johnny doesn't—what Ivan reads that Johnny doesn't—and on why Swiss schools, for example, are better than ours, etc.

What must be emphasized, however, is what Ivan hears and sees that Johnny doesn't.

Johnny, through the media of radio, television and the comics, is fed for his most important educational period the lowest common denominator of cultural pap. Without any serious conditioning in the arts, the public is then polled to determine their standard of taste. And finally, the results of the poll are fed back to them, only intensifying their conviction that cultural standards are of the lowest common denominator.

On the other hand, Ivan and the European child are exposed from the earliest possible moment to the finest quality art output of western culture and at the same time are prevented by parental and community discipline from being exposed to movie and television fare of inferior or harmful quality.

Johnny is forced to remain a child culturally by being fed baby food long after he has outgrown that form of educational nourishment. And, most unfortunately, even the baby food often contains many of the harmful ingredients of our adult culture. As a result, seldom is Johnny prepared to participate in the mature culture which is his heritage. He is rarely, if at all, exposed to the mature fruits of our western tradition and thus is, at best, ill prepared to take his place in the stream of our culture. He is addicted to baby food.

Last December, the Washington Civic Opera Association's free production of a fully staged version of Humperdinck's opera, "Hansel and Gretel," sung in English with full orchestra on a high professional level, was literally overrun, with many hundreds turned away, even though the majority of the Jonnies and their parents had had no oportunity previously to discover in its original operatic form this classic of our cultural tradition.

This indication among many others is sufficient to know that there is a great hunger for adult cultural fare. The grade-school children were entranced throughout the entire performance, eyes glued to the stage and ears cocked to the music, even though the opera is not just a simple nursery tale, but a full-length, 2-hour grand opera in the highest cultural tradition.

To many of these children who were lucky enough to see and hear this production it was a unique experience which they will never forget, and, more like it might well spell the difference between serious citizens with a cultural interest in western culture and juvenile delinquents ready to develop into adult delinquents.

Mrs. Arthur Goldberg as well as School Superintendent Carl Hansen have shown great interest of late in alerting our community to the necessity of raising the level of art education in our schools and in the community as a whole. The idea is, in essence, that to instill high cultural standards in the youth of the community is to create one of the most effective weapons against delinquency and the crime rate.

Attorney General Robert Kennedy and Newton Minow, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, see a correlation between the rising tide of juvenile delinquency and the television programs which our children are fed to the exclusion of more challenging and culturally uplifting fare.

In this connection we should like to call to attention the fact Mr. Suffridge of the Retail Clerks' Association and the union he represents have already provided a concrete example of the type of cultural leadership needed when they sponsored a repeat performance of "Hansel and Gretel" last year with a contribution of $1,000 from the union's funds. This alone made possible the second performance which was mobbed as the first one was.

We are asking from the Congress the cultural leadership and the necessary financial assistance to make these higher quality and more mature cultural values available to every schoolchild in Washington. The aim of the Washington Civic Opera Association is the presentation of the highest quality educational and cultural opportunity for the students and adult citizens of Washington.

Trade Expansion Act of 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege today of listening to a number of opponents testify before the House Ways and Means Committee on H.R. 9900, the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. A number of these people are constituents of mine or have a direct interest in the glass and pottery facilities in my district. Each, in his own respective way, contributes to the opposing story.

I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks, the statement of Mrs. Mildred Homko, who is secretary-treasurer of the Glass Workers' Protective Leagues of Indiana, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia.

Mrs. Homko directed her testimony to title III of the bill, the adjustment assistance to workers, and she looks with suspicion upon this section of the bill.

I am pleased to have my colleagues study the views of one who may very well be affected by the result if the President's trade bill becomes law.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF MRS. MILDRED HOMKO, IN BEHALF OF THE GLASS WORKERS' PROTECTIVE LEAGUES OF INDIANA, OHIO, PENNSYLVANIA AND WEST VIRGINIA, TO THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE ON H.R. 9900, TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 27, 1962.

My name is Mrs. Mildred Homko. I am secretary-treasurer of the Ohio Glass Workers' Protective League and am representing the Glass Workers' Protective Leagues of Indiana, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia, before this committee.

My testimony is in opposition to H.R. 9900 in general, but will be directed to Title III: Adjustment Assistance to Workers.

The title "adjustment assistance" has a very laudable and commendable sound, it is in truth a phrase calculated to cover—not to heal—the wounds already inflicted upon the workers of America by unfair foreign imports, as well as the additional thousands who would be hurt by the passage of H.R. 9900.

In reality, however, the reemployment of a retrained worker is just theory, not fact. It is nothing more than wishful thinking. Thousands of jobless already dispossessed by the unfair foreign imports permitted under present wholly inadequate tariff policies, have not been hired by other industries. That is not theory, that is fact. Now we are being asked to compound this injustice to American workers by further opening the floodgates of cheap imports.

While the development of new industry is desirable, experience has proven that such new industries very rarely, if ever, employ persons over 40 years of age, and the prescreening and aptitude tests required by most companies are such that individuals 45 to 55 years of age with limited education are eliminated.

Let me cite to you the example of the Cambridge Glass Co. in Ohio, who at their peak employed 700 persons. Typical age at this plant when they were forced to close their doors because of cheap imports was 45 to 55 years; the majority of the employees had over 20 years' service with the company.

A new industry, Radio Corp. of America, located a plant in Cambridge. Of the hundreds left jobless by the shutdown of the Cambridge Glass Co., only about 20 former glassworkers were hired by RCA at their new plant. This is not a unique situation—it is the rule rather than the exception.

Government agencies, whether they be State or Federal, consider a person over 50 years of age too old for retraining, and even if this policy was changed, industry will not hire persons in this age group. I have seen unemployed men in my own community of Bellaire, Ohio, having 20 or 25 years' experience as a machineman, mechanic or some other skill, turned away by a new employer in favor of a younger unskilled worker. Training and skill were not considered.

What will happen to my community when the 750 or 800 jobs in the glass industry are forfeited to the Common Market? Proponents of the Common Market say we shall be retrained and transported to other geographic locations and hired into other industries, although no specific information about this mythical Utopia is available. What industries? Where? How many years before they materialize?

We cannot subscribe to the theory that workers and their families must be up-

rooted and transplanted like vegetables, forced to give up their homes, put aside their dreams for a higher education for their children, lose their dignity in the unemployment and relief lines, to perpetuate a foreign policy that caters to the desires of other nations at the expense of the American workers.

Proponents of the Common Market tell us we must throw open the doors to foreign imports in order to win or keep the friendship of other countries. I would like to have the figures on the billions of dollars given to countries who eventually, if I may use the vernacular, "spit in our eye" when it suited their purpose. It has been a theory of mine in private life that friendship which must be bought is no bargain regardless of the price, and I feel the same to be true of governments. Our Government's giveaway policy in order to placate foreign governments is nothing more than payment of political blackmail. Our American Republic would be better served by strengthening our own economy in order that we may once more speak with forceful authority and not hasten to compromise our principles and our way of life to please others.

The American worker is a proud and industrious indiivdual who would prefer to work for his living rather than to have it doled out to him by a government agency.

In my humble opinion only one thing would be accomplished by the passage of H.R. 9900—we shall have the best trained, most highly skilled unemployment lines in the world.

I sincerely hope you will give due consideration to the matters I have presented and wish to thank you for the opportunity to speak in behalf of the glassworkers of Indiana, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia.

An American Employer's Appraisal of the International Labor Organization (ILO)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the least known international agencies to which the United States subscribes a large financial support is one of the most controversial international agencies in which we collaborate and participate. I refer to the International Labor Organization—the ILO. The ILO's budget has now reached $13,600,000 and the United States, with four votes, pays 25 percent or $3,400,000 versus the subscription of 15 percent for the combined 10 Soviet bloc countries with 40 votes.

Among the American business leaders, there is a sharply divided opinion about the ILO. In 1961 the NAM withdrew from participation in the ILO while the U.S. chamber continued its collaboration pending a continuous review of future ILO developments. Management is one of the three membership parties to this tripartite world organization of labor-management and government.

I would like to place in the RECORD an appraisal and evaluation of the ILO by a management spokesman who has personally participated in ILO activities over the period 1948–62.

The author of this article, Richard P. Doherty, is an economist, labor relations expert, author and broadcasting executive. He has a background of labor relations experience dating back to the mid-1930's; he was vice president and director of TV-radio labor relations of the National Association of Broadcasters, 1946–54; he was an industry member of the tripartite National Wage Stabilization Board, 1951–53. He has been the author—or coauthor—of books and articles on economics, business and labor relations subjects.

I believe that this article presents a fair and studied appraisal of the ILO from the American management viewpoint. This article also contains some interesting observations regarding the international responsibilities and challenges which face American management leaders as a result of world economic-social and political trends:

AN AMERICAN EMPLOYER'S APPRAISAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION (ILO)

(By Richard P. Doherty)

The future ideological character of Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and South America—and much of Europe—will fundamentally reflect the will of the masses of people in these areas.

Well organized minority groups may temporarily direct the economic-social and political trends of these nations but the underlying and long-range character of these nations will reflect mass movements and philosophies. A strong, free labor development will be one of the primary instruments which shapes and directs this mass movement. Private enterprise, per se, won't defeat communism in most of these nations. By the same token, there will be no free labor movement in those nations where free private enterprise is destroyed or rendered ineffective. Constructive collaboration between free labor and free management will be required to generate a strong, free labor movement in the lesser developed nations of the world. A free labor movement will be nurtured by a progressive free enterprise environment which produces ecoonmic and productivity advancement.

If an international labor-management organization did not exist, one should be created by well meaning and far visioned labor and management leaders. However, such a world organization does exist and has existed since 1919. It is the International Labor Organization—ILO—with headquarters in Geneva, Switzerland.

Despite the fact that the ILO has become a highly controversial world organization, the vast majority of Americans have never heard of the ILO and know nothing of its policies, activities or its alleged benefits and weaknesses.

Even the name, International Labor Organization, is misleading. The ILO is not a labor organization but an international organization which concerns itself with world labor problems, labor legislation, labor-management relations, standards of working conditions and related matters.

The ILO—originally established in 1919 by the Treaty of Versailles—is a specialized agency associated with the U.N. It is one of the oldest international agencies which has continuously functioned in the area of collaborative world action. Its current membership numbers 101 nations. Included therein is a bloc of 10 Communist nations, headed by the U.S.S.R.

This international agency is unique in that if functions on a tripartite basis with each member nation represented by government, employer and worker representatives.

The United States has been a member nation of the ILO since 1934. Tripartite delegates and representatives are appointed by the U.S. Government upon nomination of the principal labor and employer organization in the Nation. The AFL–CIO nominates labor representatives. The State and Labor Departments jointly select government delegates and representatives. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce first accepted ILO participation in 1934; the NAM added its participation in 1945. Through these business organizations, American "management" representatives have been nominated.

U.S. employer collaboration with the ILO, under the aegis of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and NAM, was founded upon the following policy position of both organizations:

"The aspirations of the people of the world for a better life, higher living standards and cultures, command the support of all men of good will. We believe that those worthy aims are best achieved through voluntary cooperation by freemen which results in more production of goods, services, and guarantees the preservation of the freedom and dignity of the individual."

Within the framework of this broad policy, leading U.S. employer executives have participated in conferences and ILO activities, seeking to contribute ideas and guidance from the practical record of American experience and knowledge, toward the goal of improved working conditions and living standards throughout the world. The fundamental approach which has motivated U.S. employer activities has been the conviction that freedom of the individual in a free market society constitutes the keystone of human advance and economic progress for all peoples.

In 1961, the National Association of Manufacturers withdrew its participation in the ILO while the U.S. Chamber of Commerce continued to participate. The NAM withdrawal was predicated upon the basic policy decision that the ILO was no longer a genuine tripartite body and that the organization's activities had become inimical to the preservation of private enterprise. The NAM policy decision continues to be under review, pending a further examination of future ILO activities.

On the contrary, U.S. Chamber of Commerce leaders, though fully appreciating many undesirable and adverse trends in ILO action and operation, concluded that employer participation was justified so long as the U.S. Government remained a member and provided that employer participation could contribute constructively toward the support of private enterprise as a world force. However, chamber leaders recognize the fact that certain ILO policies and trends could well produce circumstances under which employer participation would become untenable, even farcical.

Therefore, a divided opinion currently exists, among American business leaders over the justification of U.S. management representation in the ILO.

The faults in ILO rest not in its lofty goals and objections but in its inherent operational character and, in the opinion of some persons, in its philosophical orientation.

The strength and weakness of the ILO rest with its tripartite composition. As a tripartite organization, the ILO is a three-legged stool or chair. Its stability rests upon the equal support of each leg—labor, management, and government. Without effective tripartite participation, the ILO would become another international state-dominated agency.

The tripartite structure of the ILO makes it unique among today's world organizations. Practically all world agencies are composed of governments even though some of them may utilize the advisory services of labor and/or management experts or observers.

Within the ILO, labor and management possess equal and full voting power and the combined labor and management vote equals the total government representation. ILO conferences bring together top labor and management leaders and leading governmental officials, from nations around the world. The ILO, therefore, is the only world forum where labor and management and governments may exchange viewpoints and conceivably gain mutual understanding. This is the vitality and basic validity of the ILO.

The ILO constitutes the only world forum where free employers and free labor may jointly—on a regular basis—contribute their efforts, philosophies and record of achievement toward the solution of labor relations problems. At the same time, the ILO forums offer free labor and free management the recurring opportunity to influence responsible governmental leaders on labor legislation and effective standards of internal labor relations practices.

However, the real challenge before the ILO is to make its tripartitism work effectively toward the improvement of world labor-management relations and not to use the tripartite process as a mechanism for statism.

Tripartitism is a sound process for some labor-management problems; it is a totally unsound process for others.

Philosophically, tripartitism is a workable modus operandi in the field of labor-management affairs only as related to broad principles underlying public policy. Tripartitism is unsound as applied to the solution of specified problems which concern day-to-day employment and working arrangements between labor and management in given business undertakings. These latter problems are basically bipartite and belong on the collective bargaining table if free labor and free management are to survive.

Within the American scheme of collective bargaining, neither labor nor management wants the Government sitting at the bargaining table as the arbitrary judge throughout the process of contract negotiations.

Tripartitism often becomes a devious mechanism to secure public approbation for governmental policy on labor-management problems.

The theory of tripartitism is most righteous—to wit: Labor and management have certain areas of conflict which relate to, or invade upon, public interest; therefore, get labor and management to sit down with representatives of the public (Government officials or governmentally appointed agents) so that mutual solutions may be obtained which will blend the interests of the worker and the employer with the all-embracing interest of the public.

If the public or governmental members of a tripartite group are philosophically, emotionally and sociologically inclined toward either labor or management, the majority of final decisions will favor that particular group. The offended party will have a just right to believe that the cards are stacked against him. While the winning side basks in the pleasure of victory, the losing side writes strong dissenting opinions against the majority vote, seeks satisfaction in a philosophy of "we put up a good fight even though we lost" and criticizes the public, or Government representatives, for their partiality.

Frankly, American and other free enterprise employers have a valid right to regard the tripartitism of the ILO as frequently being stacked against management and private enterprise ownership.

A look at the record of ILO results indicates a pronounced prolabor tendency by the Government representatives—unless one assumes that the business representatives have been overwhelmingly wrong in their judgment while the labor and Government representatives have been overwhelmingly correct.

From 1948 to 1961, inclusive, the ILO conferences had a total of 205 recorded votes on a variety of items—conventions, recommendations, resolutions and proposals. In 110 cases, there was unanimity among the 3 parties. On the remaining 95 votes, labor and government voted jointly and together against management on 79 issues. Apparently, employer representatives could receive support from government delegates mainly on issues which were also favored by labor.

The U.S. record, for 1948–61, shows 92 record votes on which U.S. management, labor and Government representatives went along together; 69 instances of labor-government coalition against the U.S. employer's vote; 15 cases of a three-way split and only 25 instances where the U.S. Government representatives voted with U.S. management against the position taken by U.S. labor.

Employers can't but be discouraged about tripartitism which leans so heavily in one direction.

U.S. management experience, at the ILO, indicates that the organization all too often uses its tripartite composition to resolve issues which properly belong within the realm of national legislation or upon the collective bargaining table. Where the issues are concerned with overall labor-management philosophy, or with broad policy matters, the ILO tripartitism has worked with considerable success. However, the ILO has, too frequently, regarded itself as the mechanism to solve specific labor-management problems (on a world basis) or has injected specific yardsticks or standards within a broad policy issue. On such matters, labor and management have taken a strict bargaining table attitude and the government delegates have, practically always, gone along with labor.

Two good examples are afforded by the annual 1961 Conference. One topic dealt with the broad policy issue of "Equality of Treatment of Nonnationals and Nationals Under Social Security Legislation." The result was a unanimously endorsed document by labor, management, and government delegates. A second topic dealt with "Hours of Work." There was unanimity, among the three groups, on the basic principle that every nation should strive toward a progressive reduction in the hours of work. However, labor insisted that a specific 40-hour-per-week yardstick be added to the policy. At this point, most employers, for the first time, dissented.

Despite the common prolabor bias of the majority of ILO governmental delegates, the tripartite process of the organization does afford employers with a forum for their views and philosophical concepts. Great accomplishments may not be made by private enterprise employers but extreme and drastic socialistic trends, within the world labor movement and government action, are tempered and frequently prevented because of management presentations.

The ILO tripartitism also provides the much needed opportunity of private enterprise employers to educate government, labor, and business leaders of the new and underdeveloped nations of Africa. Herein rests one of the major challenges to the future of the ILO. If the organization can be effective in developing and preserving private enterprise and a free labor movement among the African and other lesser developed nations, the participation of the United States of America will be fully justified. This is a basic challenge to the future of the ILO.

Though latent since World War II, it is only since 1954 that the problem of the participation of Communist countries in the ILO has become acute. It was in this year (1954) that the U.S.S.R., by virtue of its membership in the U.N., decided to rejoin the ILO after 15 years absence and to unite under its leadership the few isolated Communist countries represented at the time in the ILO. Other Communist countries which had previously ignored the ILO then followed suit. By 1956 a powerful united bloc of 10 Communist countries existed within the ILO, speaking with one voice at all times and avowedly dedicated to the overthrow of the organized political and economic systems and institutions of the free world and to the dissemination of communism via the ILO forum.

The issue which Communist membership involves is a simple and fundamental one: The ILO, under the terms of its constitution, is a tripartite organization, in which member countries are represented by delegations representing government, employers, and workers—each free to express its views frankly and to act and vote without any control or hindrance from its government. The monolithic and totalitarian structure of Communist countries makes it impossible for the nongovernment members of Communist delegations—the so-called employers and the so-called workers from these countries—to express any policy other than that of their governments or to vote in any way other than in strict accordance with their government's instructions. Lacking that essential independence and freedom from their governments, without which tripartitism cannot exist, the designation of "employer" and "worker" representatives from the Communist countries in the ILO is a complete farce and a total negation of the tripartite principle. The Communist tripartite representatives cannot be considered as anything other than official government spokesmen.

The only thing which has prevented ILO tripartitism from becoming a fictional sham, and falling apart, has been the minority voting status of the Communist delegates and representatives. Also, the non-Communist labor bloc, in the ILO, has strongly opposed Communist tactics and proposals.

There are those who are convinced that the ILO will never change its basic approach to labor problems; that the ILO will always recognize itself as a protagonist for world socialism; that the ILO does not truly accept the underlying premise that private enterprise is a sound economic institution; that the ILO will continue to render only lip service to private enterprise while crusading for a society embraced by governmental direction and domination; that employer participation in the ILO can be but a token, defensive action against the overweighted support of labor by the governmental delegates and representatives; that the ILO will not refrain from documentation which trespasses upon the political concepts of many of its various member nations.

Maybe these persons are correct in their appraisal of the ILO. If so, employers are preparing their own deathbed by continued participation.

There are those employers—not alone in the United States—who subscribe to the conceptual principle of the ILO but who are repelled by the operating practices of the organization. Some of these persons see the lofty aims of this tripartite body as merely a mechanism for public acceptance of activities which promote statism at the expense of private enterprise.

Personally, I believe that the tendency of the ILO has been prolabor and antiprivate enterprise but I also believe that a more objective and constructive process is possible through statesmanship and courageous leadership at the top ILO executive levels; that the ILO can find new bearings toward the goal of genuine labor-management services. Time—and the record—will tell.

Emerging as the single most crucial ILO development is the massive threat repre-

sented by monolithic communism. The U.S.S.R.—leading the Communist bloc of 10 nations—not only seeks to dominate the ILO, but is, today, abusing the ILO platform in order to wage massive propaganda against the Western free world and to introduce political issues into virtually all ILO action; and to woo the uncommitted, underdeveloped and emerging nations.

This is a backdrop against which the ILO functions today. These events have brought many changes in the ILO and in the attitude of the ILO dealing with its rapidly multiplying areas of activity—many of which go far beyond its competence and its proper jurisdiction. These developments have brought problems which, in a very substantial degree, have altered the concepts underlying the ILO as a tripartite organization dedicated to the fundamental principle of freedom of association and freedom of the individual.

The ILO today is vastly different from what it was in its early days. The current problems facing the ILO are magnified and complicated many times over by conflicts in ideologies; cold war propaganda; the subversion of the ILO platform by political maneuvering; the shifting balance of power from the Western World to the Communist bloc and possibly to the Afro-Asian bloc.

All these problems are far reaching in their implications. They bear directly on the central principles which are of utmost concern to U.S. employers.

The rank and file of persons of the United States, and in every other nation, know little, or nothing, about the ILO. Millions of persons throughout the world possess only the scantiest and most superficial information about the Organization.

The solution to this problem is not, per se, an enlarged public relations and publicity campaign. The mere spreading of public information about the ILO will not make the accomplishments more real, more tangible. However, a positive record of accomplishment and of services rendered will focus world attention on the ILO and will create public knowledge. It is axiomatic that public relations do not create the service of an organization. Assuming a good record of service achievement, public relations can then create improved public knowledge and acceptance.

One of the primary inadequacies of public understanding about the ILO rests with its chronically distorted emphasis upon conventions which haven't met with acceptance by the bulk of its members and with the Organization's failure to concern itself with many of the basic and challenging problems within the area of labor-management relations. Moreover, certain government and labor groups seem always to engineer conferences and committee agenda items in the direction of subject matter which doesn't properly lend itself to international treaties or which properly belong on the collective bargaining table or which is designed to establish ideological positions without concrete regard to improved labor conditions.

With the many real and big labor-management problems which confront the world, how can one expect the public to get enthused about proposed treaty conventions dealing with "rest periods for white-collar workers?"

The ILO should leave such matters to collective bargaining negotiations or to appropriate national legislative solution and turn to topics which adequately justify the attention of the experienced top world labor, management and governmental delegates who gather for ILO conferences.

One of the most serious defects in ILO functioning is that most conferences become ensnared with world politics while political considerations have often dominated solutions to practical labor problems. First, practically all plenary session speeches are completely colored by political overtones. Second, even the most prosaic labor problem becomes involved in issues which reflect political connotations. Third, every ILO conference eventually involves strategic maneuvering for political position by the Communists, Socialists, organized labor and, for that matter, most governmental delegates and representatives and, often, by employer representatives.

Ideological politics dominate ILO conferences. All too frequently, genuine labor problems do not receive objective attention because ideological politics command center stage attention. ILO conferences often are concerned with influencing men's minds rather than correcting their economic-social problems.

Viewed objectively, the ILO has contributed virtually nothing to the internal labor-management problems of America. Actually, the ILO has produced certain documents and conventions, which have been contrary to American labor-management practices and principles. Nevertheless, the ILO has played an effective role in shaping the labor-management relations and labor-social welfare of many lesser developed nations.

When the American employer participates in ILO activities—or when he attempts to assess the ILO—he must not regard it as an agency which will improve labor-management relations in the United States. Actually, he should not appraise the ILO in this light.

By American standards, much ILO action has given succor to the leftwing Socialist forces of the world. However, let us not forget that these same forces have fought and contained communism in France, Italy, Austria, various latin American countries, and other nations.

Moreover, the American employer must learn to appraise world economic, social, and political trends according to the problems and standards of other nations and not solely by American standards. Different nations and peoples have concepts of democracy and freedom which, in various aspects, are not equivalent to the American models. Yet, within many of these areas, free enterprise will develop and advance if the free labor leaders rebuke communism and radical socialism.

All Americans have a stake in the economic progress of other nations. Without economic advancement and higher standards of living, most of the nations of Asia, Africa, South America—and even Europe—will become more receptive to the influence and propaganda of communism and radical socialism. Any such widespread, world trend will cause marked changes in the American social order and impair American economic growth.

If private enterprise (including American employers) were absent from the ILO, the Communists would definitely take over the control of that organization. They have never accomplished this goal because the United States is there, along with employer associates from England, Australia, Canada, France, Italy, Ireland, India, Sweden, West Germany, Japan and other nations. Moreover, the free labor movement has been substantially more effective by virtue of ILO employer participation. Despite certain philosophical and tactical differences between free employers and free labor union representatives, these two elements have generally collaborated on basic principles or have, via their negotiated differences, tempered the action of governmental representatives at the ILO.

If American employers desert the other private enterprise employers of the world, total ILO employer participation will be seriously weakened.

For fully two decades, the voice of American employer delegates and representatives has been clearly articulate and influential in all ILO deliberations. True, social welfare state documents have been enacted but American employer influence has generally brought realistic compromises and moderated ILO action.

For example, the American employer's fight against ILO conventions has, since 1953, markedly reduced the enactment of conventions (proposed treaties).

In the 1961 ILO Conference, Richard Wagner (president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and U.S. employer delegate to the ILO) spread his influence throughout the conference and gained respect from the majority of delegates and representatives. He was a key spokesman against communism and radical economic thinking. He was a most respected management advocate of private enterprise among the new African nations. Mr. Wagner did not dominate the 1961 ILO Conference but he did build international respect for the American employer and he helped to erect an effective barrier against Communist control of ILO action.

We, the American management advocates, must not only believe in the soundness of free enterprise but must constantly preach its benefits for the public interest and welfare of all nations. We cannot isolate ourselves and talk only to ourselves. We must be apostles abroad—not just at home—even in semihostile environments.

If we, American management, refuse to participate in ILO conferences and activities, we shall lose an important world forum for education and understanding. Opposition, even hostility, should never deter our efforts to secure converts and to support allies for free enterprise and free collective bargaining.

What American businessmen must appreciate is that they cannot shape other nations according to the American image and standards. U.S. management representatives cannot tell people, in new and older nations, to "do it the American way." But, they can preach and teach sound economic principles and they can bring a knowledge and record of human achievement based on production and productivity.

Likewise, American labor is a tower of strength at the ILO. Our U.S. labor delegates and representatives are not only a credit to the Nation but stanch spokesmen for the American way of life. As a group, they are unswervingly anti-Communist.

Continued participation of management in the ILO should not be construed as employer endorsement of all the Organization's actions and processes. Most employers, certainly most American employers, believe that they have a legitimate right to be critical of many things which the ILO does—and the way it does them.

The majority of American employers, who understand the ILO, prefer to believe that continued participation is necessary if the forces of free enterprise and free labor are to play a role in shaping the economic and social progress of mankind. This participation is not given out of fear nor desperation but in the sincere hope that the ILO will design its future course as a world agency for progress, with freedom, within the framework of free enterprise and free collective bargaining.

However, employer participation and support—certainly among American employers—is not to be construed as a permanent commitments regardless of the future ideological drift and operational practices of the ILO.

BLUEPRINT FOR A MORE EFFECTIVE ILO

It is difficult to be completely impartial and objective in one's appraisal of an international organization which concerns itself with complex social and economic problems.

Unquestionably, there are some persons who favor the ILO as it now functions and who regard the agency as highly constructive in its actions.

However, management generally—in other nations and especially in the United States of America—is convinced that the ILO could become a substantially more effective world instrumentality. As one of the three parties to this tripartite Organization, management's voice deserves consideration. Without management's membership participation, the ILO would, perforce, become an entirely different kind of international influence. Without management's participation, labor representatives would become submerged by governmental direction.

I, personally, have no authority to speak for all management; nor even for the overall U.S. segment of management. Yet, as a U.S. management representative to ILO conferences since 1948, I believe that I do possess a reasonably studied and experienced knowledge of the faults of ILO from a management viewpoint. Upon this background of ILO experience, I am convinced that the building of a more effective ILO relates largely to five factors.

1. Minimize world legislative enactments: An ILO convention is intrinsically a world legislative fiat, a world treaty. An official U.N. publication on "The Convention on Genocide" (1952:1.31) says a "Convention in international law is an agreement between sovereign nations. It is not just a resolution or an expression of opinion. It is a legal compact which pledges every signatory country to accept certain obligations. Broadly speaking, it is a treaty between many nations."

Rather consistently, the ILO has placed primary and major emphasis on conventions as a device to achieve its objectives. Practically always, certain elements seek to turn almost every agenda item into a convention, regardless of the limited or general character of the item.

U.S. employers traditionally have been opposed to the view that international conventions are the most effective and appropriate means for raising labor standards.

U.S. employers object to the convention device because conventions do not and cannot in themselves raise living standards, but too frequently act as obstacles to that goal by imposing upon ratifying nations the obligation to legislate standards that are often neither economically feasible nor practicable; conventions are often misguiding by creating the illusion that legislation in itself raises the standard of living and that this can be done without regard to economic growth or productivity increase; conventions, dealing with matters which basically are of internal concern to nations, are an unwarranted invasion of a country's sovereignty.

Unless ILO conventions serve as "action instruments" (or treaties), they are essentially academic pieces of paper.

Some protagonists for ILO conventions argue that they are necessary guides to national legislation and set up desired objectives of social and economic achievement. If this is the purpose, a convention is not the instrument. The proper guide would be a report or comprehensive recommendation for internal action.

Conventions are carefully drawn at ILO conferences with the clear intent that they will become the law of each member country. Member nations must adopt them, in toto, or not at all. Everyone who has participated in a conference concerned with drafting an ILO convention is well aware of the detailed attention given to form, to text and legislative format. There is no procedure designated to guide nations in their thinking; this is the drafting of a law which, in precise form, is designed for precise incorporation within the legislative fabric of each and every member country.

Once a convention has been adopted by the ILO, pressure is brought to secure ratification by all member nations, whether or not they supported or voted against the convention. Stanch ILO protagonists maintain that there is a moral obligation for member states to ratify conventions and, failing to do so, a member should "be called before the bar of public opinion" to explain fully the reasons for not ratifying.

If ILO conventions dealt exclusively with matters which were genuinely international in scope; if such conventions squarely pertained to problems on which there were substantial international agreement that world economic welfare could only be served by international law; if such conventions were restricted to labor-management problems which could not be solved by the internal laws of each soverign government; if conventions were not used for items which properly belong on the collective bargaining table, there would be a justifiable case for ILO convention procedure.

A substantial degree of hypocrisy relates to ILO conventions.

A convention is a custommade law to fit all the customers. The record proves devastatingly that the vast majority of these custommade conventions just don't meet the approval of the ILO clients. Ironically, the majority of countries which have voted in favor of these ILO laws, or treaties, don't adopt them when presented for home ratification. Yet, ILO goes on manufacturing laws which aren't accepted by the majority of its own members.

Few, if any, ILO conventions have any practical value, or adaptability, to the American scene. Despite this fact, American Government and labor representatives, in the majority of cases, vote for conventions (or treaties) which they know will not be approved by the United States.

Out of the 115 conventions enacted by the ILO, thus far, I am convinced that only 39 have to do with matters appropriate for international consideration, while 76 dealt with labor-management subjects concerning the domestic affairs of member nations.

The U.S. Government representatives, from the time we joined the ILO in 1934 through 1961, have voted in favor of 59 conventions. Out of that total, the United States has ratified seven, mainly dealing with maritime matters.

There are, today, certain U.S. governmental leaders who propose that the United States should ratify a larger number of ILO conventions. This attitude is frivolous if the purpose is to "improve the record of U.S. adoption of ILO conventions" whether or not the conventions have practical significance (and concrete application) to our internal labor-management problems. The vast majority of ILO conventions is not of this category as applied to the United States. Moreover, many ILO conventions contain one or more provisions which are contrary to our Federal or State labor legislation or to the established American pattern of labor-management relations. Many U.S. governmental representatives would be more honest, and realistic, if they sought to minimize ILO convention action rather than advocate "improving the American record (appearance) of American convention ratification."

The greatest irony is in the fact that many of the lesser developed nations plus Russia and the Communist bloc nations have the overall best record of convention ratification. Yet, few persons at the ILO truly believe that these nations put these ratified conventions into effect. For the Communist tripartite bloc, ILO conventions are chiefly a device to propogandize among working people of the world; they are not blueprints for Communist public welfare action at home.

There is only one candid and practical solution: ILO should minimize the writing of conventions except on labor-management matters which are strictly international in scope. This process would have real meaning if conventions were subjected to positive voting procedure based upon a majority of favorable votes from each of the three tripartite groups at the ILO. Moreover, each nation must possess the machinery to scrutinize these proposed conventions before adoption proceedings incorporate them within the legislative and legal fabric of the nation. It is untenable that an ILO convention could supersede any provisions of the laws enacted by the Congress of the United States or the States without the formality of legislative hearings. The same principle would be true for many nations.

There are many Americans, and also informed persons in other nations, who contend that the ILO should discontinue fully its convention actions. I, personally, am not a member of this group. I am of the opinion that conventions have a proper, but restricted and limited, place in ILO action. The ILO should restrict and limit its conventions to labor subjects which are fully appropriate for treaty accord among nations and where the specific labor problem flows over national boundaries.

2. Maximize guidance through free forums discussions: When intelligent and qualified persons, possessing wide varieties of practical experience, gather for a discussion on specific problems of mutual concern there is a grand opportunity to produce guidance to everyone and to every nation on these problems. The leaders who attend these conferences go back home with an enlightened concept; they are better leaders in their respective countries; their governments secure valuable blueprints for practical internal action.

The ILO is failing in its solemn obligation to the people of the world by not magnifying itself as the one world forum where free labor and free management may openly discuss broad problems of mutual concern.

Don't think for a minute that ILO meetings fail to bring forth plenty of free discussion—they most certainly do. However, it is primarily collective-bargaining-table discussion or politicoideological discussion. Maneuvering for a convention, or defensively protecting itself against a convention, both labor and management—of practical necessity—approach ILO meetings in a negotiating frame of mind. The climate of ILO conventions can create no other atmosphere. Proposals and counterproposals are composed with bargaining-table objectives and, frequently, with political overtones.

On the other hand, when the question of legislative (convention) fiat is removed and when the parties intend clearly to exchange experiences and to prepare only reports and recommendations, the atmosphere is conducive to free exchange of ideas and to substantial collaboration toward end product agreement. If the ILO truly desires to guide labor and management and governments and to assist these three parties in the resolution of their domestic affairs, it will minimize its convention (treaty) efforts and maximize its efforts in the area of world guidance via reports and recommendations and through constructive technical assistance.

3. Redirected staff activities: The member countries are themselves the ILO. Each member country possesses a tripartite ownership of ILO. Thus, the staff (office) of ILO is not the central organ of ILO to which the tripartite national representation is called upon to render obedience and support. Nor should the staff be privileged to serve the interests of any one of the tripartite groups comprising the ILO or to lean toward any one party.

Prior to each conference, the staff must necessarily prepare documentary reports for the conferees. In practically all cases, the staff produces "preliminary" conventions and/or recommendations upon which conferences are supposed to act. All too frequently, the ILO staff assumes the compe-

tency of deciding, prior to a conference, the content material and the expected action of the tripartite conferees—based upon an advanced survey of the facts involved and the attitudes of government members.

The pretailored conventions, recommendations, and resolutions, prepared by the staff constitute one of the major obstacles to successful ILO meetings. Presumably, these instruments merely embody the position of various "governments" which are canvassed by the staff. However, there are at least three serious flaws in the process.

In the first place, the staff receives its advice only from the government members of the tripartite team in each member nation. The opinions expressed by the respective governmental agencies may or may not represent the joint consensus of thinking of labor and/or management. In the majority of cases, the government position does not reflect the ideas of employers and is not concurred in the employer leaders. In many instances, even in the United States, the Government position is not screened with responsible employer spokesmen.

The underlying ILO motivation was probably expressed by a staff member who (privately) explained that: "essentially we (staff) must be guided by government reactions; employer representatives are primarily concerned with private property and management prerogatives; labor leaders are primarily interested in the growth and political expediency of the union movement and, in many countries, don't really know (or care) what is basically good for the workers; in the final analysis, only governments can adopt ILO documents and it would be fruitless to produce documents which didn't satisfy governments."

During my years of contact with ILO, I have never known of an office tailored convention or recommendation which, in basic details, met approval from even a fair sized segment of the employer delegates (from all member nations) in attendance at the various meetings. Yet, this is supposed to be an organization which reflects tripartite viewpoints.

On many subjects, it would be wise to substitute the spade work of a small committee of experts (tripartite) for the work of the staff. The net results would be far more effective documents for full conference deliberation. This was done in 1950 with regard to "vocational training" and the excellent benefits were clearly indicated by the constructive end product and the total man-hours saved in conference negotiations.

The second fault with staff procedure is the strong prolabor bias with which it colors virtually every document and report which serves as the basis for conference discussion. Almost universally, employer representatives from every member nation complain of this predominant characteristic of office reports. Yet, this is a tripartite organization and the staff is supposed to serve—fairly and impartially—the interests of all three parties. Every report prepared by the staff prior to the initial discussion of any subject should be limited strictly to the objective presentation of basic, underlying information and without inferential slants toward any viewpoint—labor, management, and government.

The third misdirected activity of the ILO staff is found in the manner by which it generally shepherds its own causes and proposals. Time and time again, it seems as though the delegates, especially employer delegates, are captives of staff maneuvering. Having drafted certain conventions, recommendations or resolutions, the staff effectively lobbies and works for their adoption. The behind-the-scene efforts of the staff are obvious to every delegate who is not totally blind or deaf, nor naive.

These staff activities of the ILO must be redirected so that the staff becomes the servant of the parent body, the tripartite groups which constitute the ILO. Impartiality and genuine objectivity must be the guiding standard for the staff, regardless of personal philosophies. Reports which present unvarnished and complete information should not be beyond the ability nor below the dignity of a good working staff.

I have hopes that top executive leadership of ILO will successfully dictate a solution to these problems; that the operating staff will, like Caesar's wife, be "above suspicion" regarding employer and worker and government interests.

4. Constructive technical assistance: Here is a field of ILO activities which offers real proof that the organization can render concrete benefits to the people of the world, especially in the lesser developed nations. Generally conventions, and sometimes recommendations, are but lofty scraps of paper, suitable for political window dressing. However, technical assistance is concrete aid borne of mature experience; it is the helping hand of both labor and management extended to countries which need assistance in their climb up the ladder of economic progress.

The ILO is admirably equipped, through its tripartite structure, to support expert guidance on labor-management problems but only if sound operational practices are followed.

There are four guiding signposts which must be used to direct all technical assistance projects of the ILO if this agency is to perform constructive services. These signposts read:

Labor-management project: The ILO should restrict its technical assistance to projects clearly within the purview of labor-management problems. There is always a danger that technical assistance will get involved with sociopolitical affairs with emphasis on statism.

Trained and competent experts: It is axiomatic that technical assistance can never be any better than the competency of the experts rendering the assistance. No matter how valid and desirable the project may be, the participating nation and the ILO always suffer from incompetent or politically oriented experts. If adequate qualified and objective field personnel is not available, a technical assistance project should not be undertaken. The ILO office has a grave responsibility to select only qualified experts who have a job to do rather than a political cause for which to crusade.

The United States has been at fault in the field of ILO technical assistance. Unfortunately, we have not been able to produce adequate quantities of skilled experts when requests have been made by the ILO.

Vast numbers of American employers criticize the ILO but don't try to cooperate in the one ILO activity, i.e., technical assistance, where American management has the most to offer. Here is a great opportunity to advance the cause of private enterprise and the principles of productivity without propaganda efforts.

Our challenge is to provide competent technical assistance to ILO programs. There is no better leave of absence with retained seniority and benefit rights for a worker, supervisor or executive, than ILO technical assistance. It is high time that U.S. industry recognizes that survival in a confused world requires this kind of cooperation.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce is the logical clearance house for ILO technical assistance by American employers.

Joint tripartite agreement: Within the ILO there should be a regularly functioning "tripartite" body which directs technical assistance; such a tripartite procedure would avoid the possible dangers of misdirected office decisions regarding certain technical assistance projects.

Project needed and wanted: Technical assistance projects must originate only with the needs and wishes of an individual nation and not emerge from the instigation of the ILO. The ILO should be ready to render assistance to nations which prove that they want and need it and where there is a justifiable evidence that labor-management collaboration will be forthcoming—and that both management and labor want the job done.

5. Tripartite autonomy in group representation: Every ILO member nation sends delegates and representatives of employers, labor and government to ILO conferences and meetings.

The membership of Communist nations has seriously impaired this tripartite representation. It is perfectly absurd for the ILO to admit and accept specified persons, from Communist countries, as employer delegates and representatives. Likewise, it is fiction to recognize Communist "Labor" representatives as genuine spokesmen for the labor movement.

Each individual group—employer, labor and government—should possess the autonomous right to pass upon the legitimacy of respective representation within its given group.

By rule, action and procedure of the ILO recognizes all delegates and representatives, by specified tripartite category, submitted by the respective accredited government of each member nation.

If tripartism is to work and function effectively, employers, labor and government must possess the autonomous right to determine, as an individual group, which persons properly represent its respective tripartite category.

Normally, in internal affairs, labor is brutally frank in accepting or rejecting official "labor" spokesmen. By the same token, management possesses logical standards to determine representation of management. Even governments set up criteria by which "official" governmental representatives are evaluated when there is a conflict of governmental representation.

The ILO has taken the easy way out by simply recognizing the official status of labor, management and government delegates and representatives accredited by any given member nation in good standing.

The ILO naturally doesn't possess any authority over any one of its tripartite constituents. Therefore, each of the three supporting groups should—and must—possess autonomy as to which delegates and representatives are recognized and acceptable "members of the team".

ILO tripartism will disintegrate if autonomous group self-determination is not made effective.

CONCLUSION

Americans have become increasingly aware of international conflicts between concepts of life. The conflict between communism and democracy stares us in the face. Because we can recognize this clash of ideologies, we are not afraid to meet the challenge.

What bothers and perplexes many Americans is the growing realization that many people and nations, counted on our side in the struggle against communism, possess concepts of life which are in contrast with the American way of life. These, too, are free people who believe in democratic principles of freedom. Yet, their economic-social-political modus operandi often seems to be contrary to ours and sometimes even antagonistic to our national welfare.

Isolationism is long since dead for America. Our national present and future are woven into the complex economic and social fabric of internationalism. Within this interdependent internationalism, we have new found responsibilities and obligations; new challenges and new opportunities for national growth. Yet, as we blend our interests with the interests of other lands and races, we must never dissipate our own economic strength nor undermine the institutions

which generate our national growth and culture.

The ILO can and should be a major international force which stimulates and guides nations toward progressively higher standards of living and higher levels of human welfare.

American management should continue to participate in ILO activities so long as the organization fully recognizes, and supports, the distinguishable rights and contributions of free enterprise, free labor and democratic government. If the ILO strays away from genuine tripartitism or becomes a device to advance statism, employers should not contribute their cooperative participation.

U.S. employers—and the U.S. Government—should regard ILO membership and participation as a "renewable lease or option" rather than a firm contract. The obligation rests upon the ILO to deliver a record of achievement and accept a philosophy of operation which is compatible with free enterprise, free labor and democratic government. Statism and the embracing welfare state are not consonant with the constitutional tripartitism of the ILO.

The free enterprise interests of the world need the collaboration and support of American businessmen. If we fail them, by isolationist retrenchment, the free enterprise system of the world will give way to the socialized system of statism.

Millions of persons live in the so-called lesser developed nations. Their best hope for social and economic progress rests with the sound development of free enterprise. Through the ILO, this free enterprise economy could be supported and implemented.

A free labor movement will encompass the mass public movement of Africa, Asia, the Middle East, most of South America and the Orient. There will not be a free labor movement in these vast areas of the world unless free enterprise exists and thrives.

These are highly important considerations for American management which appraises its ILO participation against its irritations and frustrations with ILO results and processes.

In my considered opinion, American management should continue to participate in ILO activities because it cannot afford to be absent. There is also a positive side to our management participation. If we are competently represented, free enterprise will possess an articulate spokesman and, from our experience, we may contribute toward an international understanding of world economic and social advancement under democratic freedom and based upon productivity achievements.

However, our continued ILO participation must assume the crusader role of redesigning the organization's attitudes and modus operandi. We cannot continue to contribute to a world agency if that agency minimizes free enterprise and espouses a socialist society, nor if it falls under the domination of the Comunist bloc.

One last consideration: there can be no free labor in a nation where free enterprise does not exist. Unless labor subscribes to, and supports, free enterprise, it will become engulfed and dominated by governmental decision and policy. In a socialized or communized society, unionism is a controlled tool of the government.

Teenage Drinking—VII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the full and disheartening story of the effects of New York State's 18-year-old drinking law on the youth of its neighbor State, New Jersey, is told in two news stories which appeared in recent issues of the Newark Evening News.

The first story reports in detail the petition delivered last week by the State of New Jersey, with the concurrence of the State of Pennsylvania, to the Governor of New York. The details are shocking and heartbreaking as they reveal the tragedy that has struck countless New Jersey families whose youth have been lured across the border by the ease with which young people can obtain hard liquor—liquor denied them by virtually every other State in the United States.

The interstate implications are obvious, Mr. Speaker, and I urge our colleagues to consider them seriously.

The second story, based on actual interviews with teenagers, demonstrates that New York's drinking age law not only allows 18-year-olds to drink but also provides a means for the corruption of children of 14 and 15 years. This is the truly upsetting factor. While it is true that young people of 19 or 20 can sometimes succeed in obtaining liquor in States with a 21-year-old drinking age law by falsifying their ages, this "slippage" for obvious reasons cannot extend to the 15- or 16-year-old. By no stretch of the imagination are children of this age capable of handling liquor without inviting disastrous results. And these results are not exclusively the rising tide of traffic fatalities stemming from drinking in New York. The far greater consequences, often intangible and private in nature, are essentially moral and psychological.

Mr. Speaker, my interest in this problem has been an active one since before 1955, when I introduced the first resolution in the New Jersey State Assembly calling on New York to raise its drinking age to conform with those of all its neighbors. In 1955, too, I testified personally before a legislative committee in Albany in an unsuccessful effort to provoke action by New York. And I have continued to manifest my interest at every subsequent opportunity.

As a result of my experience, I am convinced that New York authorities will not act until the public outcry, both inside and outside New York, reaches such a resounding level that responsible officials can no longer refuse to listen.

I urge our colleagues to make themselves heard—and listened to.

The articles follow:

DRINKING AGE PLEA CITES TEEN DEATHS—TWO STATES ASK NEW YORK CURBS

(By John J. Farmer)

NEW YORK.—A joint New Jersey-Pennsylvania petition calling on this State to raise its drinking age from 18 to 21 "on grounds of simple humanity" was to be delivered here today to Governor Rockefeller.

The petition, signed by Governor Hughes of New Jersey and Governor Lawrence of Pennsylvania, was to be presented to Rockefeller in his Manhattan office by New Jersey's Acting Motor Vehicle Director Ned J. Parsekian.

It asks for prompt action to raise this State's drinking age before the Albany Legislature shuts down for the year March 31, or a special session later to deal exclusively with the teen drinking and driving problem.

The petition, drawn by New Jersey officials and joined in by Lawrence, cites the fact that New York alone of the 50 States permits "the sale of hard liquor to minors."

TRANSCENDS BORDERS

"It is not New Jersey's intention to enter into the domestic affairs of a sister State," the petition continues. "However, because of geographical proximity, New York's 18-year-old drinking age has had an impact that transcends State boundaries.

"New Jersey families have been visited by death and serious injury as a result of young people driving across the New York State border to obtain drinks at taverns there.

"Our files are replete with heartbreaking accounts of youths whose lives have been snuffed out or whose bodies have been maimed as a result of driving while their judgment had been impaired from alcoholic beverages obtained in New York."

The petition concludes with the request, "On grounds of simple humanity, recognizing the economic and legislative factors involved and with all appropriate respect" for action to "equalize the New York legal drinking age with those of sister States."

REPORT DUE

Assembly Speaker Joseph Carlino, a Long Island Republican, has said there will be no action on the drinking age this session. A committee headed by Senator John J. Marchi, of Staten Island, is due to report next session, he said, and no legislative action is contemplated before the report.

Attached to the petition today as substantiation of its charges are traffic surveys made by prosecutor's offices in Hudson and Bergen Counties in New Jersey, a report on drinking age limits in other States, a 1959 New Jersey Supreme Court decision holding tavern keepers civilly liable where teenagers who have been served are involved in accidents, and a grisly collection of fatal auto accident photos involving the under-21 set.

These and other reports, the petition added, establish "the causal relationship between the availability of alcoholic beverages to teenagers * * * in New York and accident-causing deaths and serious injuries in substantial numbers in New Jersey."

Prominence in an attached report by Parsekian is given to a pair of recent accidents, one December 24, 1960, which took the lives of two teenagers in West Milford, and another last August 26 in which one teenage driver was killed in West Milford.

WERE DRINKING IN NEW YORK

In both cases, Parsekian said, it was determined that the victims had been drinking in nearby New York roadhouses.

Hughes, himself, singled out in the petition the death of two teenage Bergen County, N.J., boys in a crackup while returning from a drinking session Sunday in Rockland County, N.Y.

Debris-littered photos of all three accidents are among the exhibits, along with news reports from the Newark Evening News and the Bergen Evening Record.

The exhibits from the Hudson and Bergen County prosecutor's offices attest to the fact that a high percentage of teenagers stopped at road checks admitted drinking in New York.

BRIDGE CHECK

One from Edward Pesin, Hudson County traffic safety coordinator, reported that 93 percent of the teenagers checked at the three bridges linking Staten Island with Bayonne, Elizabeth, and Perth Amboy in New Jersey on two evenings "admitted to having consumed alcoholic beverages at various bars and taverns on the island." The checks, he said, were made the nights of March 2 and 3, on a Friday and Saturday.

Three days later, Pesin said, two persons died in a head-on collision on the New Jersey side of the Goethals Bridge with a teenage driver who earlier had been drinking in Staten Island.

"The conclusion is inescapable," Pesin wrote, "that teenagers from New Jersey travel by motor vehicle in relatively large numbers to Staten Island specifically for the purpose of taking advantage of the lower drinking age of 18."

The findings of Bergen County Prosecutor Guy W. Calissi were much the same. He said West Saddle River Road "had been known as 'beer can alley' to New Jersey teenagers who travel same to New York drinking spots."

SURVEY IN 1956

Bergen County's only survey was made during a 3-hour period near midnight in 1956, Calissi said, and showed 68 vehicles of 138 stopped contained teenagers who admitted coming from or heading to New York drinking spots.

"Some of these teenagers were under 18," said Calissi.

Parsekian's report dealt mainly with New York's unique drinking age. In every other State, he said, "the general rule is to disallow sales (of hard liquor) to persons under the age of 21."

Louisiana, South Carolina, Wisconsin, and Idaho permit the sale only of beer to those under 21 and North Carolina and the District of Columbia permit the sale of light wine and beer, Parsekian said.

Ohio, Virginia, Colorado, Kansas, South Dakota, and Oklahoma permit the sale of only a very mild alcoholic content beer to those under 21, he added.

Yesterday, Parsekian flew to Harrisburg to get Lawrence's signature on the petition. The Pennsylvania Governor attached the following statement:

"I am concerned with the serious impact New York's 18-year drinking age has had on teenagers and parents of this State. I hereby join the petition of New Jersey requesting that New York take immediate steps to raise the drinking age to 21 in keeping with its sister States."

Lawrence added that his State has a 300-mile common border with New York and that there is no question the lower age limit in New York has a bearing on Pennsylvania highway accidents.

Parsekian said yesterday that "increasing public awareness" of the problem offers some reason for optimism despite New York's refusal over the years to raise the age.

He cited the recent action of the New England Governor's Conference in asking New York to comply with the age 21 minimum. Governor Dempsey of Connecticut has indicated he supports the aims of the New Jersey-Pennsylvania petition, Parsekian said.

Connecticut, Vermont, and Massachusetts also share common borders with New York and each has a 21-year drinking minimum.

THEN DRINKERS GET EARLY START

(By John W. Gleeson)

"I've been served beer there without identification since I was 15," said the crewcut Bergen County High School student describing a popular drinking spot in Rockland County, N.Y.

"There are places that ask for a draft card," the youth said, "but you can always borrow one from a buddy and all they usually ask is your birth date."

The youngster was describing the ease with which New Jersey teenagers are able to buy alcoholic beverages just across the New York line where the legal age is only 18.

WORD GETS AROUND

"As soon as someone finds a place that will serve kids under 18," the youth said, "the word gets around and the place is jammed. There are fewer now than there were a few years ago," he added, "but there are still enough."

"Older guys will usually do a favor for you and go in and buy a couple of six-packs for kids under," the teenager said.

"If we're throwing a big party here we get an older guy to buy the beer. It saves us a trip to New York.

WAS EMBARRASSING

"Borrowing another guy's draft card is pretty common," the boy said. "I was caught once when I did it," he recalled. "The description was the same, but when he asked me where I was born I told him the wrong place. It was pretty embarrassing."

The youth indicated on his draft card a shaded area just above the line where the date of birth and registration numbers are typed.

"These new cards have those little stars there," he explained, "and if you erase the date it shows because you erase the dots, too."

On the back of the draft card was printed a reminder:

"Any person who alters, forges, or in any manner changes this certificate may be fined not to exceed $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than 5 years or both."

"Nobody, ever gets caught for that, though," the youth said.

Col. Oscar Gray, chief legal officer of the New Jersey Selective Service Headquarters, Newark, said the draft cards were revised in June 1960 to include the shaded portion.

REASON FOR CHANGE

"One of the major reasons for the change in 1960 was to make it more difficult to alter the numbers," Gray said. "The alteration of cards is a nationwide problem. In the Bergen area," he added, "we have a definite need for the new card because the kids cross the border to buy liquor.

"A year or two ago we had quite a run of this business," Gray said. "Quite a few altered cards were picked up by police along the New York border and at the New Jersey shore. They are sent to the U.S. attorney's office and he decides whether or not to prosecute."

Gray said the penalty is the same for using another person's card for false identification as for forging a new birth date.

The high school teenager, however, gave the impression that violations are commonplace.

"If you change the age on your card or give it to a buddy," he said, "the draft board will send you a new card but it is marked 'duplicate.' You can only do that once, though."

LICENSES EASIER

"Guys can also change their driver's licenses," the youngster said. "That's much easier than the new draft cards. Mostly girls do that or guys who need double identification."

He explained that some taverns ask for another means of identification to back up the draft card.

Another, more youthful looking youngster said he had just turned 18 last Monday.

"But they've been serving me up there since I was 15, with or without a draft card. That's the age when most kids start going up, when they're sophomores in high school. I go up every Friday night," he said, "and during the summer we usually drive up two or three times a day.

"Kids under 18 can be served without a draft card at five or six places at Greenwood Lake that I can think of," the youth said. "Up there they would serve a 10 year old."

MAGIC NUMBER

"Three weeks ago," he recalled, "we were just sitting in a place drinking some beer and we figured out that about 5 of the 60 kids in there drinking were over 18."

Another youngster said he had never gone to New York to drink.

"But I was 18 just a few days ago," he added, "and everybody has been asking me 'when are you going up to drink?' That's the magic number, 18. It's like a joke," he said.

"I guess these guys have to go up there to prove they are big shots or something or just to see what it's like," the youth said. "I know there is a lot of exchanging of draft cards."

Smalltown Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article from the Bulletin of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith for February 1962.

Adolph Rosenberg, the author, is editor of the Southern Israelite and tells us a story in the finest American tradition. It is an object lesson in how a small town dealt with intolerance.

All too often we real only about what goes wrong in a community. It is well to take note of the good things that fail to make headlines.

The article follows:

SMALLTOWN STORY

(By Adolph Rosenberg)

(For almost 50 years, Nathan Cohen had the respect and friendship of his neighbors in Alma, Ga. Then he ran for mayor—and found out about his town's anti-Semitic quotient.)

Until he became the target for an anti-Semitic campaign, everything that had happened to Nathan Cohen, of Alma, Ga., had been in the classic American tradition.

He had come to the United States from Poland as a boy. Traveling steerage, he had been robbed of his purse as he slept. The ship's captain gave him a silver dollar to cheer him up; other passengers contributed too, to start him out in the New World. He arrived in Georgia in 1913—at the age of 13—and first lived in Nichols, where he had three half-brothers, before going on to Alma, 11 miles away. He attended school for a short while, then went to work. With a horse and wagon, he set out as a peddler, going from house to house, farm to farm, throughout southeast Georgia. The loggers and sawmill workers of Okefenokee Swamp came to know him well. In time, he saved enough money to go into business and settle down; he founded and ran the department store in Alma.

After World War I, he brought his mother and two sisters over from Poland. He had not forgotten his early shipboard experience. He was determined that they come first class and escape the ignominy of steerage. And they did.

He married a girl from Savannah, the former Beckie Chernoff, who has since died. They had three children: Ronnie, who is now a young lawyer; Stephen, now a predental student at the University of Georgia; and Gerald, the oldest, who took over Mr. Cohen's department store when he retired recently.

But simple retirement could not satisfy a man who had worked so hard for so many

years. Mr. Cohen had, at one time or another, a variety of other business interests. He still has a 125-acre farm, producing tobacco and beef cattle as well as vegetables and eggs. But this is more of a hobby than an occupation for him. For some years, friends had been urging him to run for local office. In 1961, he agreed to run for mayor of Alma.

As the race began in September, Nathan Cohen, now a slight, slim man just past 60, began to campaign quietly in the fashion of small towns in Georgia's rural area. You don't hold giant political rallies here; there aren't enough people for that in a town of 4,000. And no repeated appearances over radio and television. There is the country weekly, the Alma Times edited by John Graham. Mr. Graham helped Mr. Cohen out. You might have called him Mr. Cohen's campaign manager though the setup was not as formal as that.

Mostly, smalltown campaigning means seeing your neighbors and, instead of just talking about the crops and time of day, you bring up the subject of politics and get around to asking for support. (In Alma, you usually get around to seeing many of your friends in the course of the day. In a campaign, you just step up the number you see.)

Mr. Cohen went out methodically visiting each of the 900 homes in Alma. Often, the people he called on got the jump on him with "Mr. Cohen, you don't have to talk politics to me. I remember when you helped my uncle buy his farm."

Or, "I remember when you helped out when mama was sick."

Mr. Cohen did not mind the strain of visiting many homes. He was not at all a stranger to house-to-house canvassing.

Suddenly, this warm, friendly atmosphere was shattered.

Late one night, during a weekend, an anti-Semitic hate sheet was distributed throughout Alma. There is no need to go into its contents; vicious slanders of Jews have been repeated often enough. But this type of virulence had never entered Alma's limits before. It was, apparently, a stock-in-trade piece of prejudice; it was not printed specifically for the Alma election campaign and did not refer to Mr. Cohen's candidacy. But there was no mistaking its import: that Nathan Cohen's Jewishness disqualified him—and any of his faith—from the halls of government and civic leadership.

Mr. Cohen waited to see what affect the hate sheet would have on his chances for election. More important, he wanted to know what this abrupt introduction of anti-Semitism meant to Alma—and to his neighbors and friends.

He did not have to wait long. The next morning, the Cohen store and home were deluged by phone calls from people expressing sorrow and regret—even outrage—over the distribution of the anti-Semitic piece.

Soon after, community groups—clubs, churches, and others—spoke out. Before the election on October 18, Christian friends of Mr. Cohen published a fact sheet of their own, giving the reply to the hate material. It included a series of letters and testimonials headed:

"Here's What Alma Citizens Think About Dirty Political Tricks Brought Up In Desperate Effort To Defeat Nathan Cohen."

John F. Mullis, a retired businessman, said that the midnight hate sheet represented a "new low in morality," that the man who produced it was not fit to enter his church, knowing "that the founder of Christianity was Jesus Christ, a Jew."

Former Councilman Frank Byrd wrote: "This trash is printed by the thousands and may be purchased by anyone who has the cash to pay for it. You can buy stuff on the subjects of anti-Jew, anti-Russian, anti-Chinese, etc., or even anti-American if you want to." Referring to the distribution of the anti-Semitic material, he said that "we of Alma read and hear of subversion and sabotage in other places and we never realize that we have the same things happening right here * * *. Our city government has enough troubles without any saboteurs or subversive elements."

The Citizens League for Better Government made mention of the fact that "Mr. Cohen was directly responsible for getting Alma's only factory into operation where today it employs nearly 200 women workers."

Another group pointed out that Mr. Cohen had purchased a wagonload of brick and given it to help build the Alma Baptist Church.

Others reminded the people of Alma that Mr. Cohen had been one of those who joined the fight to save U.S. Highway No. 1 for them when it might have been rerouted to another part of the State. Still another recalled that Mr. Cohen had been selected by Alma's Lions Club as Citizen of the Year in 1959.

And so it went. Mr. Cohen's opponent later denied that he had anything to do with the distribution of the hate sheet which had so outraged the conscience of Alma's townspeople. Mr. Cohen's friends made clear that the issue in the Alma election was never Mr. Cohen's religion. Instead, it was his ability to give leadership, guidance, and counsel; his regard and dedication to the community he had chosen for his home; his ability to meet future challenges to Alma.

This, apparently, was what virtually all the people of Alma felt on election day. Never in the town's history had so many people gone to the polls. Of 1,171 men and women who voted, an overwhelming 955 chose Nathan Cohen. His opponent got 184; 32 people did not vote for mayor.

Mr. Cohen's total led the field of five new city councilmen, all chosen on a slate of action to cope with Alma's stricken tax and business conditions. He and the council swept in with him took office in January 1962.

The immigrant boy from Poland is now the respected mayor of the small Georgia town. He has had much experience through the years. He plans to use all of it, and all his energy, at being the finest mayor Alma ever had. He knows he'll have much cooperation from his friends and townsfolk. "We have some of the best people in the world here," he says.

Pottery Workers Oppose H.R. 9900

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the First Congressional District of West Virginia, which I have had the high honor of representing for the past 6 years in the National Congress, is made up of a number of large pottery facilities. As a matter of fact, the largest producer of earthenware is located in my congressional district.

Long in the forefront in their battle against the foreign trade policy of our Nation has been the International Brotherhood of Operative Potters. They have been diligent in their efforts to provide their membership some relief from the low-cost imported wares that robbed them of their livelihood.

Today, before the House Ways and Means Committee, Mr. E. L. Wheatley, president of the International Brotherhood of Operative Potters, made a stern statement in opposition to H.R. 9900, and I concur in the clear and concise manner that this presentation was made to the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I include with my remarks, the statement of Mr. Wheatley in order that my colleagues may fully understand the thinking of the pottery workers in my district with respect to the international monstrosity of a trade bill we have before us.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF E. L. WHEATLEY, PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF OPERATIVE POTTERS, BEFORE THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, MARCH 27, 1962

The International Brotherhood of Operative Potters speaks for the vast majority of workers in potteries that make household and restaurant china and earthenware. We also have membership in tilemaking, vitrified china bathroom fixtures and refractories establishments.

Pottery products have long been imported and imports have caused great difficulty to the domestic industry. This difficulty can be laid at the feet of the low wages that prevail in the competing countries. Our potteries are no less efficient than their foreign counterparts; but pottery making is an operation in which labor represents a high portion of the cost of production. Therefore we have little or no mechanical advantage over foreign producers.

In the pottery industry labor wages amount to over 60 percent of the total costs while material costs are relatively less. This means that employment in the industry is higher per dollar of output than in the more highly mechanized industries. Today this is a consideration that should not be dismissed too lightly. Employment has become a matter of national concern. It is estimated that automation is causing the displacement of 25,000 workers in the Nation per day. We should be thankful that we still have some industries that are not casting workers on the unemloyment rolls so rapidly.

The pottery industry has also suffered from displacement of workers but this has come principally from import competition rather than from automation. This competition, of course, causes pressure for mechanization in order to reduce costs; but no automatic pottery making machine has yet been produced. If rapid mechanization did occur unemployment would become worse because in the present state of the world and the rapid spread of technology overseas it would be only a short time before Japan and other countries would install the same machinery and we would soon lose our advantage. If more pottery were consumed because of lower prices cheaper imports rather than we would fill the demand.

Higher productivity is a desirable goal but it does not guarantee a competitive advantage because our own companies are free to go abroad and manufacture there or to license foreign manufacturers. The result is that the lower foreign wages maintain their competitive advantage. Without adequate tariffs or import quotas the domestic market becomes fair game to any foreign manufacturer who keeps up with or achieves mechanical or technological parity with American producers. It is then that his low wage payments take effect.

Having the same or nearly the same output per hour as the American manufacturer the foreign producer reaps a great advantage by paying wages that may be only a third or a

fourth or as low as an eighth of our pay, including fringe benefits.

American potteries are principally located in towns or small cities and very often represent the economic mainstay of the community. If calamity befalls the industry it also falls on the community and causes hardship and privation far beyond the factory doors. It affects the local business and professions and visits a blight on them as surely as a natural calamity and one that lasts longer.

H.R. 9900 proposes Federal aid under these circumstances. It would pay two-thirds of the accustomed wages to displaced workers and retrain them and in some cases relocate them.

Mr. Chairman, you will pardon me if I say that this proposal gets a sour reception from our membership. They are as patriotic as any other Americans and are ready to make sacrifices in behalf of the country's security and defeating our enemies. They are not ready to make these sacrifices in behalf of State Department theorists and professors who have never put a day of work in a factory in their lives or, if they did, got out of it as quickly as possible.

The pottery workers do not understand and will not understand and cannot be expected to understand why they should be consigned to the ranks of the unemployed and probably onto the ash heap as a matter of conscious policy, when the supposed benefits of the trade bill are bitterly disputed. The question is highly controversial and this means that numerous people do not agree with the objectives of the bill.

How can anyone expect the probable victims of the bill, workers who are peacefully and gainfully employed; who are law-abiding citizens who have supported their Government and who cheerfully meet their obligations as citizens—I ask, how can anyone reasonably expect that these people will look with favor on such a bill as this, a bill that would put their livelihood, their family lives, and their future in jeopardy?

They regard it as a monstrous proposal that reflects a callous bureaucratic reach for power over the lives of people in a behalf of a doctrine that many regard as unsound in the first place.

The hundreds or thousands of dinnerware and chinaware potters who are now loafing because of potteries that closed, left business or went bankrupt, and those now working in plants that have a high rate of partial unemployment, have a high average age. Our organization's records show that potters' average age is over 50 years in the dinnerware and chinaware industry.

The average potter knows what to expect when he starts looking for new employment in another industry at such a high age level. He cannot conceive of a Federal training plan accepting him as an applicant or for special retraining to prepare him for any but low paid service operations at the minimum wage levels. Many ceramic plants are located in hilly country where clay is mined and far enough removed from any potential training centers that transportation allowances alone could be as high as their income, if such allowances were made.

This bill comes as a shock to those of us who are familiar with the long line of promises and assurances given by Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower to the effect that the trade program was not to put industry out of business or cause serious injury. These promises were supported by various Secretaries of State who served from 1934 to 1960, beginning with Cordell Hull.

We remember that much was made of the care that was being exercised by the State Department and other governmental agencies to see to it that tariffs were not to be reduced to a point where injury would take place. To assure this the peril point legislation was adopted.

It was also said repeatedly that if serious injury did occur the escape clause was available as a remedy. This was written into law in 1951.

It is true that the administration of the escape clause has been a severe disappointment. Only 13 cases out of about 130 have ever succeeded in getting a remedy in the form of a higher duty.

Now it is proposed to drop the peril point provision out of the law and to cut the heart out of the escape clause. This, I say, is a shocking proposal and should not prevail. What we need is a stronger rather than a gutted escape clause. The Government should move to redeem its pledge rather than to brush it unceremoniously aside. This is no way to build respect for our Government or to promote faith in its good will.

It is a mistake to think that the people who support the Government can be so easily fooled. We know when we are being taken for a ride and we do not appreciate it.

This bill would very soon result in a solid ceiling over wages. It stands to reason that if tariffs are lowered still more industry will find that import competition will give it a powerful weapon against any further increases. We are being asked to walk into a stone wall of collective bargaining. Should we agree to this we would be silenced in future wage conferences.

I know that the pottery industry itself is opposed to this bill and in this we stand shoulder to shoulder. We do not want to see a ceiling erected over their heads any more than they want to see one put over us.

Mr. Chairman, and Members of Congress, in making this presentation of objections to the proposals for trade expansion there is no intent to imply that we are against foreign trade. I have supported the past Federal administrations on foreign aid to assist people and other nations throughout the world. I respect the present administration headed by our President and have supported his election and practically all of his proposed legislation with this one specific exception of H.R. 9900.

I am opposed to the U.S. Congress delegating or giving away any of the established authority under the United States of America's Constitution to anyone.

Mr. Chairman, we are opposed unalterably to the enactment of H.R. 9900. We do not want a passport to the junkpile and we want a remedy against injury from imports that rely on low wages for their competitive advantage.

Bartlett's Unfamiliar Quotations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article in Human Events by Victor Lasky commenting on the administration's attempts to revise events for the history books:

BARTLETT'S UNFAMILIAR QUOTATIONS

(By Victor Lasky)

Is the White House engaged in rewriting history in order to make President John F. Kennedy look good? Are the New Frontier's image makers now imitating their counterparts in the Kremlin to make their boy look good?

Specifically, did the White House remold the facts of what actually transpired at the now famous presidential luncheon tendered in late October to a group of Texas editors and publishers?

This was the luncheon at which E.M. "Ted" Dealey, publisher of the Dallas Morning News, told President Kennedy to his face that he and his administration appeared to be "weak sisters."

The luncheon was one of a series at which President Kennedy has been entertaining statewide groups of publishers and editors. Presumably, the luncheons enable Kennedy to provide his guests with an off-the-record lowdown on foreign affairs. In return, the President hopes to be filled in on grassroots sentiment. For, as he put it, he feels isolated in the White House and wants to know what the people are thinking.

And what with wine, French cuisine, and Presidential witticisms, the luncheons have generally been pleasant little social affairs. About all that was missing were strolling violinists.

Then Mr. Dealey showed up, on invitation, of course. And when asked his opinion, he pulled out a 500-word statement which he began to read.

"The general opinion of the grassroots thinking in this country is that you and your administration are weak sisters," Mr. Dealey intoned. "Particularly is this true in Texas right now."

The President's face flushed. His smile disappeared. The other guests cringed in embarrassment. But Mr. Dealey continued reading.

The American people, he told J.F.K., were "aroused and rightly so" about Khrushchev and were opposed to symptoms of aid and comfort flowing his way from Washington. "They do not want to see this Nation make any concessions to Russia," he said.

Then, in a remark which has since been misinterpreted by liberal viewers-with-alarm, Mr. Dealey said that "we need a man on horseback to lead this Nation," a phrase not used in its usual depiction of dictatorship, but implying the need for leadership "from strength, not from weakness," as befits a great nation far more powerful than the U.S.S.R.

Continuing to address the President, Mr. Dealey added that "many people in Texas and the Southwest think that you are riding Caroline's tricycle."

The statement, in Dealey's words, "caused sort of a ruckus."

"But," as he told newsmen right after the luncheon, "the President assured me that he was not mad."

All Mr. Kennedy did, in fact, was to turn to his press secretary, Pierre Salinger, and say half jestingly, "Don't subscribe to [Mr. Dealey's] paper. I'm tired of reading its editorials."

"But I have to read them," Salinger replied.

Only later, on reflection, did J.F.K. get mad. For the Dealey statement, which has bluntly summed up what a lot of people were thinking, had definitely tarnished the Kennedy "image."

Something had to be done.

Charles Bartlett, Washington correspondent of the Chattanooga Times, was called in. A long-time confidante of the President, Mr. Bartlett had, in fact, introduced Mr. Kennedy to Mrs. Kennedy. He is always turning up as the guest of the President at such places as Hyannis Port, Mass.

At any rate, Bartlett was provided with an exclusive fill-in on what President Kennedy supposedly said when he told of Ted Dealey. Bartlett, who was not present at the luncheon, used exact quotations even though no one is supposed to quote the President at these affairs.

Thus, 10 days after the unique luncheon, Bartlett's story was published on the front page of the Chattanooga paper, a sister paper of the New York Times. According to his

story "the President's reply, a spontaneous expression of his basic philosophy, has been partially reconstructed from the recollections of some of those who were present."

According to Bartlett, the President, after being challenged for the first time at his own table, replied in a low voice that everyone is entitled to his own opinions in this country and that this was a healthy thing.

"But the difference between you and me, Mr. Dealey," Bartlett quoted Kennedy as saying, "is that I was elected President of this country and you were not and I have the responsibility for the lives of 180 million Americans, which you have not."

Then Kennedy was quoted as remarking that men tend to like the idea of war until they have tasted it, but that they quickly get enough of it. "Wars are easier to talk about than they are to fight," the President was further quoted as saying. "I'm just as tough as you are, Mr. Dealey. And I didn't get elected by arriving at soft judgments."

These were indeed Presidential remarks designed for the history books. And, needless to say, they obtained wider currency than the statement which had prompted them. For example, the New York Times, which had ignored the Dealey statement, published a full account of the Bartlett story.

But the big question is: When did the President make his forthright reply to Mr. Dealey?

Mr. Dealey has absolutely no recollection of the President uttering any of the remarks attributed to him by Bartlett. And Mr. Dealey is a pretty good reporter, having spent 46 years in the newspaper business.

"I think that the whole story was cooked up by the administration and by Bartlett stating what Kennedy wanted to say to me in rebuttal to my statement, but which he did not say at the time," Mr. Dealey informed this writer.

"I think the other 18 Texas publishers who were present at the luncheon will back me up in saying that President Kennedy did not make any such remarks as attributed to him by Mr. Bartlett."

Though aware of the close relations between the President and Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Dealey believes that the episode demonstrates "pretty sorry newspapering."

Perhaps it demonstrates something more important: the lengths to which the Kennedy administration will go in order to keep the "image" of the President untarnished.

Happy Birthday, Bloomfield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday you and my distinguished colleagues on both sides of the aisle were gracious enough to join with me in observing the sesquicentennial of one of the communities I am fortunate enough to have within the congressional district I represent. It was with a warm and full sense of pride and gratitude that I presented the engrossed copy of House Resolution 567 to the officials of the town of Bloomfield the following evening, last Thursday, on the occasion of the beginning of the anniversary.

The affair was well covered by the press, and among the various pieces written about it was a fine editorial that appeared in Saturday's Newark Evening News. I would like permission to incorporate the editorial into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time.

The editorial follows:

These are proud days for Bloomfield, now that the town's 150th birthday party is officially underway. Washington has sent congratulations and the Governor came up from Trenton to present his greeting in person.

Prospects for so long and prosperous an existence were not particularly bright when Bloomfield snipped off pieces of neighboring communities and had the legislature declare it a town. The upheavals of the Revolutionary War were not yet smoothed, and the War of 1812 still echoed.

To what, then, does this community attribute having attained this ripe age? We think the answer may be found in the town's sesquicentennial slogan: "Bloomfield: Pride in Its Past—Faith in Its Future."

Indiana's Stake in Foreign Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I wish to include in the RECORD excerpts from an address of Matthew E. Welsh, Governor of Indiana, before the Governor's Conference on Indiana's stake in foreign trade. His remarks concern President Kennedy's proposals to meet the challenge of the European Common Market to our own oversea markets. He points out it is necessary for the United States and Western Europe to maintain strong political and economic alliances; alliances that can be strengthened by adopting President Kennedy's proposals for meeting the challenges of the new world of trade.

His address follows:

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR WELSH

The changing world around us produces economic as well as military dangers. It likewise opens opportunities for the growth of trade in the world, just as it presents the real possibility for a great expansion of the areas of freedom.

But these opportunities are not open to those who fear the challenge of the future or who fail to read and to understand the significance of the economic changes sweeping free Europe and the revolution of rising aspirations that has enflamed the underdeveloped areas of the earth.

We in America now have the economic as well as the political choice of riding the crest of the wave of history, or we can drift rudderless and be buffeted by the winds of change.

Our political partners in freedom on the European Continent have learned well from us the lessons of mass production and the economics of free trade among neighboring states. We taught them and helped finance them. In doing this we created not only a stronger ally in the struggle for freedom, but also a stronger competitor for developing markets of Europe and throughout the world.

The reconstruction of the industrial potential of Europe was fertilized and nurtured by the United States as a bulwark against the westward spread of the infection of communism. And this was successful, for the Red plague has not moved a foot further westward in Europe since America threw its economic power and genius into the struggle on the Continent.

We encouraged the closer political alinement of Western European nations and the gradual removal of barriers to free trade among the free nations. The phenomenal rate of growth of the European Common Market is a result of the accelerated lowering of the walls against the free movement of labor, goods, and capital among these nations.

This seedling so carefully planted by the United States, and so zealously guarded and tended by our military and economic guarantees is now reaching young maturity. It is soon to be joined by other European nations. And freedom is stronger as a result. We have done our work well. But we have helped create a new economic world that presents us with the need for new rules, new techniques, and new trade arrangements.

President Kennedy has proposed to the Congress a means for meeting this challenge to our oversea markets. He has proposed a specific means whereby U.S. negotiators can seek, with hardheaded Yankee bargaining, the best possible trade terms for our products abroad. Without these favorable trading terms many of our exports will be unable to scale formidable tariff barriers around once rich markets for our oversea shipments.

In essence the President proposes that we equip our trade negotiators with the authority to obtain the most favorable terms for American goods entering world markets. He asks this change in our trade policy for two reasons:

First, without the new authority to bargain effectively with the European Common Market, other developing regional trade groups, and individual nations, we can suffer a severe loss in oversea markets.

And secondly, with this authority to secure for our country continued favorable entry into foreign markets, we can greatly expand our trade opportunities.

There is no standing still in a world of change. We meet the challenge of the time and forge ahead, or we fail to meet it and lag behind. And the price of failure is more than a loss of markets, it is a weakening of the forces of freedom.

New markets, expanding old markets, and an accelerating growth of the American economy will result if Americans can have the opportunity to compete in the trading world unencumbered by artificial barriers and discriminatory tariffs. I have confidence that as the world's best farmers and the world's experts in mass production and mass marketing we can compete successfully and profitably. Or put somewhat differently, anything they can do, we can do better.

At the same time, it is recognized that some firms may not be able to complete without readjustments in products, in production methods or in marketing practices. The President has proposed that these firms and their employees be protected during the time these readjustments can be made.

In some instances these companies, unable to meet competition from overseas, are inefficient and hanging on to life only because of a subsidy from the American consumer in higher prices. In other instances, nearness to raw materials, the combination of wages, raw material costs, and production methods give foreign firms an advantage that cannot be overcome readily.

The President's proposed trade bill includes specific aids for firms, workers, and even entire industries in the very rare instances in which this latter need would occur.

For firms suffering difficulties from foreign competition the President has proposed technical assistance, various forms of financial

aid, and tax relief in the form of special carryback of operating losses.

For workers he has proposed readjustment allowances in the form of compensation for partial or complete unemployment, retraining for other types of employment, and relocation allowances to assist families in moving to areas where employment may be available.

For the rare case in which an industry is hurt by competition from abroad, the President would be authorized to increase protective tariffs for a period of years to permit readjustment without severe economic hardship.

This then is President Kennedy's proposal for meeting the challenges of the new world of trade opening up to us, without creating economic hardship at home. As a practical matter our choice is whether we will enter this expanding world of trade as a leader confident of our ability to compete, or as a follower being dragged kicking and moaning into the economic future.

We stand now on the threshold of a new trading world, one with which the prosperity and growth of Indiana and the Nation are intimately connected. We can choose to step confidently over this threshold as the economic leader of the world. Or we can hold back fearful that we cannot measure up to tomorrow and its problems.

We in Indiana know our business. Hoosiers are among the world's best farmers, most skilled industrial workers, and masters of production and marketing. We are tight-fisted bargainers and traders and we know our way through the financial markets of the world. We know we can do better than hold our own.

President Kennedy has pointed the way for America to compete successfully in this new trading world we face, a way we can compete equitably and fairly, without our path blocked by artificial barriers raised against us. Personally and as Governor of Indiana I strongly and enthusiastically endorse the President's program for expanding world trade.

Ultrahigh Frequency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement I made before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on Ultrahigh Frequency, March 5, 1962:

The hearings being held by this distinguished committee on a series of bills concerned with all channel receiving sets as well as the issue of deintermixture looking toward all UHF areas are timely and important, indeed. These measures bring into sharp focus the question of whether the ultrahigh frequency portion of the spectrum, a major resource that remains largely untapped, can be used to solve the now chronic impasse in visual broadcasting: the inability of the Federal Communications Commission over the years to employ its vast power in the area of television channel allocations to provide a truly nationwide and competitive system of television broadcasting with adequate outlets serving community needs in all parts of the country.

It is this demonstrable failure in the exercise of regulatory authority that prompted me to introduce H.R. 10385, which provides for an orderly transition from VHF transmission to all UHF transmission over a 6-year period. I shall review briefly the salient features of this legislative proposal, including its relation to the other bills which the committee has under consideration.

In these hearings, the committee has again heard authoritative testimony about the critical shortcomings in the service provided by the current pattern of allocations and assignments in the Nation's television markets. However, the task at hand is no longer to catalog the symptoms or to diagnose the illness that afflicts the industry; rather the problem is to prescribe an effective and workable remedy while there is yet time—and time is, in my view, rapidly running out.

The perspective of the past 10 years gives small comfort to those who urge that the country can continue to afford the luxury of experimenting first with one set of half measures and then another, if the first approach is found wanting. Experience has taught that, in this dynamic field, the point of no return lies dangerously close to the threshold of experiment. What is projected as a test or trial too frequently turns into a commitment that is irrevocable because of the substantial interests and irresistible pressures that have been fostered. Mistakes are peculiarly costly, and all but irremediable.

I have a great respect for the able Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, but I must take issue with him when, in recent testimony before this committee, he takes the position that "if years from now we find we don't have a competitive service for the country then this"—conversion to all UHF—"is one solution that I am sure we have to consider." I am convinced that any attempt to consider this or any other far-reaching solution some years from now would be an academic exercise in futility. The issue will have been foreclosed.

This conclusion is, in my judgment, compelled by an analysis of the present state of affairs, in the light of the significant television history of the past decade. Let me touch briefly upon the highlights in terms of facts and figures about which there is little disagreement.

Recall the familiar consequences of the Federal Communications Commission's 1952 error in intermixing UHF broadcasting with VHF saturated areas. No single decision in the history of the Commission has proven so catastrophic, according to Commissioner Robert E. Lee. By forcing UHF stations which were then authorized for the first time to commence comercial broadcasting, to compete with VHF stations that had become solidly entrenched during the prior 4-year "freeze" on station applications, the Commission virtually doomed this new method of broadcasting at its inception. The error was soon recognized, but as this committee has good reason to know, the Commission is still wrestling with the problem today. Obviously, the reason for the Commission's longstanding failure to provide an effective remedy was its desire to avoid dislocating profitable VHF stations, in whose shadow UHF stations could not survive.

Some 5 years ago, the House Antitrust Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, had this to say in its report issued after a full dress inquiry into monopoly problems in the television broadcasting industry:

"Although from the beginning the Commission laid down clear perspectives for a nationwide and competitive system and declared the wide use of the ultrahigh frequencies to be essential, for many years it not only failed to encourage the development of UHF broadcasting but, on the contrary, its every action and inaction—the 4-year freeze, the deadly intermixture provisions of the 1952 report and order, the failure to stimulate all-channel set manufacture, and the vacillation with respect to deintermixture—further strengthened and entrenched VHF. The result is that in so-called intermixed areas, where UHF stations must compete with established VHF stations, they face an almost insuperable disadvantage.

"The Commission has recently embarked on a long-range program looking to the possibility of shifting all or a major portion of television broadcasting to UHF, and also on an interim program of selective deintermixture on an area-by-area basis. The committee believes that the Commission can, and must, remove this fundamental obstacle to the realization of congressional objectives for the broadcasting industry."

After taking cognizance of the alarming mortality rate suffered by UHF stations in the years following the inception of the Commission's 1952 allocation plan and the enormous capital losses entailed in these station failures, the subcommittee concluded:

"The disappearance of UHF broadcasting would mean more than financial loss to station licensees. It would frustrate the achievement of a nationwide and competitive television system for the foreseeable future. First, it would mean that the objective of diverse, multiple-program sources in as many communities as possible would have to be abandoned. For if television is limited to VHF there are simply too few available frequencies. Most American communities would have to give up the idea of ultimately having their own local television stations for the discussion of local problems, the dissemination of local news, and the development of local talent.

"Second, the failure of UHF television would sound the death knell of educational television. Development of this new dimension in education clearly depends upon the survival of UHF.

"Third, the loss of UHF would mean still further concentration of power in the television industry by making it impossible for more than two truly nationwide networks to flourish.[1] The inadequacy of VHF alone to supply sufficient outlets for a fully developed system, which the Commission has repeatedly reaffirmed, is graphically illustrated by the VHF assignments made in the allocation plan."

Consider that 5 years, marked by surging economic and population growth, have elapsed since these recommendations were advanced. Now, consider the progress report submitted in June of 1961 by the Federal Communications Commission in response to the Antitrust Subcommittee's request to be apprised of actions that have been and are being taken by the FCC to carry out the subcommittee's recommendations. The distinguished Chairman, Newton N. Minow, then but recently appointed, testified on this score:

"In recent years, as it has become clearly evident that UHF could not compete effectively in areas where there were multiple VHF services, the Commission has devoted a considerable portion of its time and efforts to solution of the allocations problem. One by one we have been forced to narrow the alternative approaches. It is impossible, for example, to have a competitive television system adequate for the Nation's growing needs in the commercial and educational fields within the confines of 12 VHF channels. It becomes more evident as time goes by that, unless demand for UHF can be revived, our television sytem will have no room in which to grow.

"The Commission is keenly aware of the problems such limitation creates. The existence of monopolistic markets with one or two VHF stations; the lack of sufficient competitive outlets for a third network; inability to provide for the needs of an addi-

---

[1] Since this report, a third nationwide network has entered the field with vigor.

tional network or the major nonnetwork program suppliers; the lack of outlets for local community expression; and scarcity of facilities for educational needs in the larger markets—these are serious indications of the shortcomings of a restricted television system."

I raise no question as to the good faith or good intentions of the Chairman of the FCC when he affirms that the Commission will continue to press for full UHF utilization and is hopeful that the future expansion in television broadcasting will, in time, move into the UHF band. However, apart from a reaffirmation of worthy objectives, the Commission's status report is no more than a point-by-point reiteration of the Antitrust Subcommittee's analysis and call to action which was issued in June of 1957. To emphasize in the year 1961 that the Commission is keenly aware of the problems involved is to suggest at the same time that little encouraging progress had been made toward their solution in the critical years gone by. I draw this parallel not to belabor past omissions or errors, but to underscore their clear lesson with respect to the future.

In practical terms, what does a present-day inventory of the state of UHF broadcasting show? As this committee has been informed, some 100 UHF licensees in all have failed and gone off the air. The staggering losses incurred in both money and effort stand as an object lesson to others who would be tempted to risk their capital in such a venture. In 83 areas where one or more UHF stations once operated, their signals are silent. Of these areas, 25 are now without any local station, including such cities as Allentown, Pa., Atlantic City, N.J., and Battle Creek, Mich. And as Commissioner Lee has informed this committee, in view of their competitive inequality, only in a few limited markets where VHF is curtailed or nonexistent is their any expectancy that the UHF stations can continue to operate much longer.

Sixteen hundred out of over 2,200 television channel assignments made by the FCC remain unused. Significantly, over 1,400 of these are in the UHF band. Indeed, only about 100 out of a total of over 1,500 UHF channel assignments—or about 7 percent—are currently in use, and 18 of these are educational television stations. It is estimated, moreover, that of the some 55 million television sets now in use, only 9 million are equipped to receive UHF as well as VHF broadcasts. It should be added in this connection, that only 6 percent of the new sets produced in 1961 were equipped for UHF reception as compared with 20 percent of the new receivers manufactured in the year 1953.

This overall picture has not been visibly brightened by the results thus far of the Commission's pursuit of selective deintermixture. Suffice it to say that this program—and I do not minimize its inherent difficulties—has in the past been attended by regulatory vacillation, procedural snarls, and intense opposition in certain quarters. Since 1957, three areas in the entire Nation have emerged on an all UHF basis as the results of deintermixture, while eight major cases are presently lodged with the Commission. While our Antitrust Subcommittee unanimously endorsed a more vigorous deintermixture approach as a step in the right direction (at that time, the subcommittee had no other choice), this technique clearly holds no great promise as a long-range solution nor does the Commission itself regard it in this light.

In the same vein, I have, along with the other members of our Antitrust Subcommittee, long been on record as an advocate of legislation to promote all-channel receiving sets, a measure which recently received the endorsement of the President in his message on "Protecting Consumer Interests." Certainly the FCC should be authorized to prescribe the performance characteristics of all new television receivers shipped in interstate commerce to assure that they can receive both VHF and UHF signals. Granted, however, that the removal of receiving set incompatibility would have constituted a long stride forward in the early days of UHF operation, today it will only lessen the heavy odds against UHF broadcasting. I note that the Chairman of the FCC, in advocating passage of the all-channel bill, told the committee that its enactment would encourage UHF broadcasting and that time would start to run in its favor. However, Chairman Minow went on to warn:

"We do not mean to imply that passage of the all-channel legislation will necessarily insure survival of all UHF stations now struggling against VHF competition. The question of whether a particular UHF station will survive will doubtless depend on a great many circumstances, particularly the economic viability of the station at the present time."

This brings me to my central thesis. We must, in my judgment, face up to the inescapable fact that television today stands at the crossroads, where the choice is either to maintain the present allocation system and thus permanently freeze the status quo of 12 VHF channels—with the monopoly dangers and stifling of local expression inherent in such stricture—or to shift to all UHF under a plan designed to minimize the transitional strain so that some 70 UHF channels may be utilized in the broader public interest. Here there is no easy middle ground—as was the case when this country launched its missile and space program when there was still enough leadtime to meet the Soviet threat.

I believe further that, in view of the negative position in this matter of a majority of the FCC, Congress must grasp the nettle. Our action or inaction on this issue in the coming months may go far toward fixing the pattern of the industry for a long time to come.

To meet what I conceive to be no less than a crisis in the use of the radio spectrum, one of our invaluable natural resources, my bill provides for an orderly and gradual transition from VHF broadcasting to the UHF band. While I am not wedded to the language of H.R. 10385, I believe that it does constitute a sound approach, worthy of the most careful and intensive study by this committee and by the Congress.

Under my bill the FCC would grant no more VHF channel license assignments, and would promptly assign and grant a UHF frequency channel to each existing holder of a VHF license. Licensees would be authorized immediately to broadcast simultaneously over both bands. However, after 2 years or after the expiration of a licensee's present broadcast license, whichever occurs later, he would be required to broadcast on both the VHF and UHF frequencies. Finally, at the expiration of 6 years all VHF broadcasting would cease. The Commission would be required, as far as possible, to restrict new assignments to the lower 40 channels in the UHF band, which are known to provide the best UHF reception.

Beyond this, the Commission would be duty bound to inform the public at large that no existing receiving set would become obsolete by virtue of this enactment within 6 years, but that at the expiration of that period VHF broadcasting would cease.

H.R. 10385 would minimize the cost of reconversion for the television viewing public, whose VHF sets would remain operational for 6 years, the average life expectancy of a receiving set. It would also minimize the reconversion burden on broadcasters, by giving them a 6-year period in which to convert to the UHF band. In this connection, the feasibility of a tandem or dual operation on both VHF and UHF frequencies by the same station has been successfully demonstrated by a licensee in Fresno, Calif., who advantageously operated in this fashion for a period of 3 months under FCC authorization prior to converting to all UHF.

I need hardly remind this committee that if the VHF band is vacated by the commercial broadcasters, it can be quickly absorbed by a host of other pressing and vital needs. The mobile radio services, as Commissioner Lee emphasized in his testimony, are being more and more tightly jammed into a narrow segment of the spectrum. This congestion, of course, makes for serious interference and disruption. An itemization of only a few of the nonbroadcast services, which require accommodation, shows at a glance their importance to the public welfare and economy: medical and biological telemetering; police and fire protection; and communication in such industries as forestry, heavy construction, and electric and gas utilities.

I think it fair to say that according to the present consensus in expert circles, UHF broadcasting has come of age from a technical point of view. Because practical telecasting began in the VHF band, the technology of VHF broadcasting was bound to outstrip that of the younger UHF service in development. There is, however, good reason to believe that the gap is being, and will be, closed.

To begin with, from the standpoint of the viewing audience there is little to choose between the propagation characteristics of the two methods of telecasting. In fact the Chairman of the FCC has, in the course of these hearings, stated that the Commission engineers regard UHF transmission as superior to VHF in some respects. The UHF picture on the receiving set is described as crisper or clearer because there is less man-made electrical interference and cosmic noise in the UHF band; also, UHF telecasts are relatively free of disturbance by airplane flutter. Beyond this, there is less difficulty with ghosts in the UHF picture, because it is easier to construct highly directional receiving antenna for UHF frequencies.

As this committee knows, a unique and highly ingenious experiment is now going forward under FCC auspices in the complex surrounding Manhattan in New York City, calculated to obtain a precise comparison between the reception quality of UHF and VHF signals in a city cut through by artificial canyons like New York. To this end, a high-power UHF station, under the management of the city of New York, is broadcasting from a specially constructed antenna on the Empire State Building. The UHF programs transmitted for a part of the day duplicate those telecast by the VHF stations operating from the same tower.

The returns thus far from viewer surveys that appear to be a model of objectivity, show that there is no significant difference between the VHF and UHF signals within a 25-mile radius of the Empire State Building. Of added interest is the fact that privately employed technicians who have been making a like comparison of the two signals in what is perhaps the worst propagation area in the entire country—the lower two-thirds of Manhattan—have come forward with the same findings. These encouraging results, I might point out, not only affect my own district in Brooklyn, but I am told that good UHF reception has also been reported from the Holland Tunnel, in the event anyone wishes to set up housekeeping there.

Furthermore, while I do not wish to pursue the matter at length here, perhaps too much has been made of the fact that the VHF signal has a greater range than UHF. As Commissioner Lee has pointed out, "contrary to popular conception, this difference does not result in greater service," but rather "this increased range carries with it the potential of increased interference be-

tween stations." Again, according to Commissioner Lee, with appropriate antenna heights and radiating systems, UHF stations would be able to serve viewers out to 44 miles, a range which compares favorably with the same quality of service rendered by VHF stations in many areas and augurs well against any loss in service.

Nor is the present estimate of UHF performance characteristics confined to the abstract or experimental realm. Successful UHF operations are familiar on a day-to-day basis to the citizen of such cities as Fort Wayne, South Bend and Elkhart, Ind.; Peoria, Ill.; Wilkes-Barre and Scranton, Pa.; Lima, Zanesville and Youngstown, Ohio; Fresno, Calif.; Springfield-Holyoke, Mass.; Yakima, Wash.; Lexington, Ky.; and Elmira, N.Y.

So much for the technical side. On the human side, it is always the easier course to postpone a critical decision that will provoke resistance in some quarters, particularly when this procrastination can be rationalized as mere judicious postponement. But as veteran members of the FCC have good reason to know, the passage of time without solution aggravates the ultimate impact of changes in regulatory direction.

The acceleration of our economic expansion, consumer demands, population boom, and extra leisure time, which marks the decade of the sixties, has resulted in the expenditure of over a billion and a half dollars annually on advertising through the medium of television. What the increase will be in this figure a few years hence, I leave to the speculation of the market analysts. One thing, however, is certain. Unless a plan to convert to a UHF system—such as the graduated one I have outlined—is adopted reasonably soon, the entrenched elements that will unalterably oppose any switcs from a VHF system will be well-nigh immovable.

In summing up, I refer you to the following statement:

"The failure of our television system stems from the failure of UHF broadcasting to develop as had been expected. Moreover, it is clear that unless it is to be the decision of the country to settle for the present limited systems, we have no place to go except into the development of the 70 UHF channels which are practically lying fallow."

These are not my words but those of the present Chairman of the FCC.

I am aware of no disagreement on the part of any of the Commissioners that the FCC has exhausted and found unavailing several alternative solutions seeking additional outlets by expanding the number of VHF channels allocated for television broadcasting. To take one example, the Department of Defense has announced that it could not, in the national interest, relinquish any of its VHF space. In short, the door to VHF expansion is closed.

But the vista of the broad UHF band is open. Clear statutory authority to convert to an all-UHF system at any time is possessed by the FCC. However, six of the seven Commissioners have gone on record against adopting this solution for the present. It can, therefore, only be availed of through congressional mandate. I commend this course of action and the features of my bill to this committee. The time for decision is now.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1962

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, Byelorussians form a distinct ethnic group in the large body of Slavic peoples. Their long and turbulent history shows that they formed a national group of their own in their homeland, east of Poland and west of Moscow, centuries before the rise of the modern Russian state. Then, early in modern times, Byelorussia was made part of Russia, but the Russian regime could not eliminate the Byelorussians as an ethnic group. The more their oppressors tried to absorb them into the large Russian nation, the more Byelorussians clung to their national ideals, and longed for the day of their freedom. This came about in 1918, after the overthrow of the czarist regime in Russia.

On March 25 of 1918, Byelorussians asserted their freedom and proclaimed their independence by establishing the Byelorussian National Republic. The new republic was then recognized by the governments of several countries; thus the new state attained sovereignty in historic Byelorussia. Unfortunately the independence thus proclaimed did not last long. The Red army attacked and overran the country early in 1921, putting an end to the Byelorussian National Republic. Since then the country has been part of the Soviet Union, and some 10 million Byelorussians have been sealed off from the free world. Just as their ancestors longed for their freedom while suffering under Russian czars, so these stouthearted Byelorussians are longing for their freedom while enduring the almost unbearable yoke of Communist totalitarian tyranny. Let us hope and pray that they attain their national goal: their freedom in their historic homeland.

"Wetlands for Wildlife" Leads the Fight To Preserve Our Domestic Waterfowl Population

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, unless action is taken soon, our historic national heritage of wild ducks and geese will follow the passenger pigeon into extinction. The action of which I speak is an extensive program of wetland acquisition to save the potholes in which the waterfowl breed. Unfortunately, at present the limited Federal program of wetland acquisition is endangered by a competing Federal program subsidizing drainage in the pothole region.

All conservation-minded citizens were pleased to learn of the recent formation of a new group—"Wetlands for Wildlife"—which is attempting to preserve wetlands by the private purchase of appropriate land. I include in the RECORD an article by Oliver E. Kuechle from the March 2, 1962, Milwaukee Journal—a paper long a leader in the fight for conservation—which explains this fine new organization.

The article follows:

WET LANDS GROW FROM JUST A PUDDLE

A small group of men met at lunch here just a year ago. Their aim: to organize outdoorsmen of all types in a drive to raise money for the purchase of wet lands—a haven for wildlife. Out of the meeting came the organization Wetlands for Wildlife. The effort was purely local. Since then it has spread throughout the State. And at the moment, it is in the early stages of becoming nationwide.

A lot of questions are being asked about Wetlands for Wildlife, which is natural. The movement is so new. Here are the more common ones and their answers, explaining in detail the purposes, aims, needs and operation of the movement.

BUY LAND

Question. What is the purpose of Wetlands for Wildlife?

Answer. To preserve wet lands by buying land, which will be transferred to Federal or State agencies for management and maintenance; to provide breeding, raising and growing areas for waterfowl, birds, fish, deer, and furbearing animals, flowers, trees, shrubs, and aquatic vegetation.

Question. Why save wet lands?

Answer. Suitable wet lands, acre for acre, are the most productive and beneficial type of habitat for wildlife. They store ground water, retain surface water, provide stabilization of runoff, create natural firebreaks, provide excellent wildlife refuges.

Question. Is an organization of this type needed?

Answer. Yes. There is no other movement of this type in the United States. Wet lands are being exploited and destroyed at many times the rate they are being acquired for wildlife use.

NOT ALONE

Question. Can't State and Federal Government agencies carry out the program alone?

Answer. Past history has shown that they canont. Maintenance cost to keep wet lands is much greater than the cost of acquisition. Most of the funds allocated by Federal and State sources is used in maintenance, little for acquisition.

Question. What do State and Federal agencies think of this movement?

Answer. Both have provided staff members as advisers. Frank Briggs, Under Secretary of the Department of the Interior, personally appeared at the kickoff meeting of this program.

Question. Where do membership moneys go?

Answer. All membership funds are used solely for the acquisition of wetlands.

Question. Then how does Wetlands for Wildlife get funds to operate?

Answer. Through a separate operating fund supplied by its trustees and through special donations from industry, individuals and foundations.

NONPROFIT

Question. Is the organization nonprofit?

Answer. Yes. It is registered with the State of Wisconsin as a nonprofit corporation.

Question. Are donations tax deductible?

Answer. Yes.

Question. What has the organization done thus far?

Answer. It has acquired land in the Vernon marsh (Waukesha County), recruited members in 118 cities and 17 States and has established a charter system to aid its expansion.

Question. How does the organization know what and where to purchase?

Answer. After a study by the group's land acquisition committee along with State and Federal game experts, a project is selected. It is then presented to the board of directors for approval.

Question. Who owns the land after it has been purchased?

Answer. The land becomes public domain and is governed and managed by State or Federal agencies.

ALL WELCOME

Question. Who may become members?

Answer. Corporations, individuals, foundations and other organizations.

Question. How much is membership?

Answer. The minimum donation is $3.

Question. Are there other chapters outside of Milwaukee County?

Answer. Yes. If you are interested in joining or organizing a chapter, write: Wetlands for Wildlife, Inc., 3500 North Holton Street, Milwaukee.

Teenage Drinking—VIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, as a further indication of the seriousness of the teenage drinking problem resulting from New York State's refusal to cooperate with its neighboring States in reaching agreement on a common legal drinking age, I include, as a part of my remarks, three editorials: from the March 21 Newark Evening News; the March 22 issue of the Advocate, the official newspaper of the Roman Catholic archdiocese of Newark; and the March 22 Newark Star-Ledger:

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, Mar. 21, 1962]

HOW MANY MORE?

Fourteen boys and girls piled into two cars and rode from Bergen County to a New York roadhouse for several hours of beer drinking. Returning, one of the cars took a turn at high speed and crashed into a tree. Two are dead, three are in the hospital. Five homes are filled with sorrow and anxiety.

Here is added proof, if proof were needed, of the dangerous temptation created by Albany's stubborn refusal to raise New York's minimum drinking age to the level of other States. Furthermore, New York doesn't even enforce its own 18-year minimum. At least one of the injured was only 17.

No one understands the consequences of this lethal policy better than the police of a town like Mahwah, astride main interstate arteries and close to the border.

"They do the drinking in New York," says Mahwah's chief of police, Edmund C. Wickham, "but usually we get the trouble."

To protect itself from irresponsibility across the State line and from the careless or callous saloonkeeper and liquor dealer at home, New Jersey must strengthen its own laws against juveniles who drink and drive. Senator Deamer, of Bergen, has introduced legislation increasing penalties for teenage drivers found drinking or with alcoholic beverages in their cars.

The latest tragedy should assure the Deamer bill prompt attention in New Jersey's legislature. But how many more youngsters must die before New York's Legislature acts?

[From the Advocate, Mar. 22, 1962]

OLD PROBLEM—NO SOLUTION

For a number of years a cold war has been in progress between the States of New York and New Jersey over the sensitive question of selling hard liquor to minors. In New Jersey the minimum drinking age is 21—in New York it is 18.

For a while there was some hope that the New York Legislature would take action and raise the age limit to 21, as we have it in New Jersey. However, this hope was shattered when the following news story was released in Albany last month: "New York State's controversial minimum drinking age law will remain unchanged for at least another year, despite pressure from other States and church groups."

Practically every New Jersey town that borders on New York in the metropolitan area, and is easily accessible by bridge, ferry, or tunnel, faces the same difficulty: Young people cross over to the neighboring State, purchase what would be contraband in their own State drink to excess, and frequently become involved in criminal violence or accidents that sometimes prove fatal.

The following tells its own grim story: "Jersey City police say that five youths involved in the grisly auto accident which took the lives of two of them, had been drinking at Staten Island bars. All five were under 21." That such conditions can exist and persist is positive and indisputable testimony to the indifference and complacency of th average citizens in matters like this where the entire community is affected.

If the son of a prominent citizen in one of our New Jersey towns became implicated in some scandal, brought on by the purchase of contraband liquor, we would probably hear a shout of indignation rising to the high heavens: "Why do we permit such things to happen? If the people of New Jersey showed sufficient interest and used the power and influence that are in their grasp, we could soon put an end to this shameful situation. What kind of people are being elected to our legislatures?"

And it is quite probable that this same irate citizen has known for a long time that these conditions existed. But so long as it did not affect his family, he never raised his voice or used his influence to get some positive action. Before he and his family suffered personally he was just as disinterested as the rest of his apathetic fellow citizens.

Here is the almost unbelievable "solution" by someone who is suffering from an unhealthy, unworthy, and degrading complex: "If teenagers between 18 and 21 feel they must drink, then New Jersey should lower its drinking age to 18. Would not a mother or father feel safer if their 18-year-old son were in the corner tavern than in a strange bar where unfamiliarity breeds fights?"

If this is typical of the moral support and encouragement that we are receiving from the general public, then God help us.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Star-Ledger, Mar. 22, 1962]

END THE DIFFERENTIAL

New Jersey should adopt a sober attitude in approaching the problem of Jersey teenagers who drive across the New York border to quaff beer in our neighboring State.

The problem arises from the fact that the legal drinking age in New Jersey is 21, while New York has set the age at 18.

This is a serious problem, and for many years New Jersey has protested the differential and tried to get New York to raise its minimum drinking age. Connecticut, where the same problem exists, has joined in these efforts and has, as a matter of fact, now taken the lead in demanding that New York conform to the legal limits in Connecticut and New Jersey.

New York, now as in the past, shows more of an inclination to slough off the demands than to kow-tow to them.

However, the demands from New Jersey have become more insistent in recent days, due largely to the fact that two teenagers were killed on the road last weekend returning from a New York spot where they were served beer.

And law-enforcement authorities in Bergen County are preparing to set up roadblocks this weekend in an effort to keep Jersey teenagers from beer-drinking parties over the border in New York.

There are many aspects to the problem, and it would serve no useful purpose to try and oversimplify it.

For instance, the beer drinking problem cannot be divorced from the question of the driving age. For, in all cases, cars were involved—and perhaps even to a more important extent than beer.

And the notion that New Jersey youth is carousing about on beer shindigs every weekend doesn't exactly fit the facts.

We have a great deal of confidence in teenagers. And particularly in New Jersey teenagers, since we are closer to them than to other teenagers.

We think that, by and large, the generation now in its teens is a pretty levelheaded and admirable lot. And we say that even taking into account such annoyances as rock 'n roll.

Sometimes their natural exuberance may have to be restrained a bit. But this, we seem to recall, has been a problem that hardly is unique with the current crop.

We think, too, that teenagers in New York are basically no different from teenagers in New Jersey or in Connecticut. Certainly, we will not concede that New Jersey teenagers are any less mature or responsible than New York teenagers.

And this brings us back to the issue of the minimum drinking age. If we admit that basically there is no difference between New Jersey and New York teenagers, there is no sense to an age differential.

The question to be decided, then, is simply this: What is the proper minimum drinking age? Is it 21? Is it 18? Or is it 19 or 20?

This is the question that should be answered. And the answer should stand for New Jersey, for New York and for Connecticut.

We would like to suggest that New Jersey might have more success in dealing with the drinking age differential problem if approached with that thought in mind.

This newspaper long has suggested that the three States join in standardizing the drinking age, after tristate conferences to work out the proper age.

New York is not likely to be receptive to demands that it adopt another State's decision. New York might, however, be more receptive to an invitation to have experts from the three States join in trying to arrive at a satisfactory answer to the main question: What is the proper minimum drinking age?

World Trade Is a Necessity for Indiana Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, coming before the Congress in the near future will be President Kennedy's request for new authority to adjust tariffs. Mr. Glenn Sample, vice president of the Indiana Farm Bureau, recently had printed an article in the Wabash Plain Dealer in which he points out many

basic economic reasons why the Congress must give the President the authority to adjust tariffs which he requests.

Under unanimous consent, I insert Mr. Sample's article from the Wabash (Ind.) Plain Dealer of March 26, 1962:

WORLD TRADE IS A NECESSITY FOR INDIANA FARMERS

(By Glenn Sample)

You have been reading and seeing a lot in recent weeks about the European Common Market and President Kennedy's request of Congress for new authority to adjust tariffs.

The question is: What does all of this tariff and foreign country developments have to do with me as an Indiana farmer?

In short: plenty. About $590 of the annual income of each Indiana farm person comes from the sale of our farm products in export markets, according to most recent figures. Of course, this figure is much higher per Indiana farm.

This sizable chunk of our farm income is now threatened, unless our Government is able to bargain effectively with our foreign nation customers to keep or expand our export markets. Presently there are two major factors affecting our ability to maintain or increase the annual $590 per farm person income:

1. Six European nations, each with good records for importing our farm products, have decided to form a common market, eliminating nearly all trade barriers between themselves and forming a common trade policy for all their imports and exports. They are: West Germany, France, Belgium, Italy, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands. Other nations now want in the group, including the United Kingdom, Ireland, and Greece.

2. Our own reciprocal trade agreements legislation, enacted a few years ago, by the slim margin of only one vote in one house of Congress, will automatically expire on June 30. With the developments now taking place in Europe as well as elsewhere, this legislation is obsolete or inadequate to handle current foreign trade challenges.

Realizing the tremendous stake farmers have in maintaining and even expanding our export markets, the farm bureau is vitally interested in supporting the Congress and the President to get the necessary legislation that will help our Government to do the job of effective bargaining on tariff and related foreign trade matters.

Gov. Matthew Welsh, recognizing what foreign trade means to agriculture, industry, and labor in Indiana, invited the State leaders of these economic groups to accompany him to Washington in December. There we met with the top Cabinet Secretaries of State, Treasury, Labor, Commerce, and Agriculture, as well as with persons of top rank at the White House, to get a clear picture of the significance of foreign trade to our country as well as to each of our economic groups.

The Governor held a special 2-day conference in Indianapolis, bringing the story of foreign trade and Indiana's economic health directly to 200 invited leaders of agriculture, labor, and industry. There is so much of our future at stake in this issue that you can be sure you will hear and see much more about the problem in the months ahead.

This whole export market problem could be the subject of vital interest at every township Farm Bureau meeting during the next 2 or 3 months. Several township and county farm bureaus have already scheduled such meetings.

Here are some important considerations:

1. The six-nation Common Market area has 168 million people, compared with our 178 million, but the United Kingdom when it joins will add another 52 million persons. Currently, these six nations are buying $2.6 billion of USDA products and selling us $2.3 billion. We are their biggest customer and they are our largest customer, when combined.

2. Presently, the United States exports about $20 billion of goods, including about $5 billion in U.S. farm products. The total U.S. imports amounts to about $5 billion. The difference of a gain of $15 billion must be maintained if America is to have the economic strength to maintain her military establishments about the world for our defense and carry out our foreign commitments. Whenever this trade gain becomes smaller, then the United States begins to lose her gold reserve and inflation threatens our economy.

3. We need foreign trade in America not only to help our own rate of economic growth, but also to help our friendly allies to grow strong. With strong allies, America's economic aid can be reduced, as we get help in assisting less developed nations that are always being tempted by the Communists.

4. As farmers, we would be in very bad posture with all of our present surplus, should we suddenly lose our export markets, reducing Indiana's agricultural income by more than $150 million and our net income by many millions. The farm products of 1 of every 6 acres actually are sold abroad.

5. Also, as farmers, we have an interest in the imports, some of which are farm supplies that help us to keep down our production costs.

Of course, there is much more to relate on this large and complicated subject. This is one piece of legislation, perhaps carrying the greatest economic opportunity for farmers of any that Congress will consider this year, that Farm Bureau can support because it is in line with policies that farmers believe will expand our markets and help the country, too.

Unless the Government has the authority to bargain effectively on whole groups of commodities and products, as to tariffs, then we stand to lose our markets to other nations.

America is the largest single farm exporting nation in the world. Historically, our record shows our farmers have always produced for an export market. The question is, Will we be able to continue to do so? It is not a problem—rather, it is a necessity.

Hon. Charles L. South Expresses Views on Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from my good friend, Hon. Charles L. South, a former colleague from Coleman, Tex., who now lives at Austin, Tex., in regard to some of the aspects of pending tax legislation.

Mr. South is a man of unusual wisdom and foresight. He is a student of economics and government and keeps in close touch with business trends. I believe his views will be of interest.

Mr. South served with distinction in the House of Represntatives during the 74th through the 77th Congresses. Excerpts from Mr. South's letter follow:

I feel that withholding tax on interest and dividends would be the means of subjecting millions of dollars to taxation that now escapes and for that reason I favor it. We sometimes seem to forget that when X dollars must be raised and any group fails to pay its share that the rest of us must pay our share and theirs, too. Once a record was made of these holdings the taxpayer would hesitate to fail to report the balance, and if he did fail, it would be much easier to find the error.

As to the repeal of the law allowing some consideration on dividends, on the ground that the corporation from which the dividends were received has already paid the tax, I find myself somewhat neutral. That is, a valid argument can be made on either side. While it would mean a good deal to me personally, I feel that I can live with either plan adopted.

Now of more importance, I feel that it would be manifestly unjust to repeal the long term capital gains tax provision. As you know, England, Canada, and many other countries do not tax capital gains at all, long-term capital gains tax provision. As serious doubts that the Government would collect as much revenue should the provision be repealed. I know from personal experience there would be much less trading done, should it be repealed. So I would suggest that there are two valid reasons for leaving that provision intact. It is fair and just to the taxpayer, and it would likely result in little, if any more revenue, and might well result in a loss of such revenue.

Proposed New Trade Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to my colleagues the second of two articles on the proposed new trade program for our country, which, if not enacted, could result in great harm to the port of New Orleans, my home city. Reporter Bob Friedly of the New Orleans (La.) States-Item has written these two stories for his newspaper, and has secured the opinions of many of New Orleans's leading citizens on this vital subject of a new trade policy for the United States. This second article of two, entitled "High Tariff Walls Will Affect Port," follows:

THE COMMON MARKET—HIGH TARIFF WALLS WILL AFFECT PORT

(By Bob Friedly)

High tariff walls around the European Common Market would have a disastrous effect on one-third of the trade through the port of New Orleans.

Among the American products likely to suffer from the growing self-sufficiency of the six-nation economic bloc are petroleum products and petrochemicals, a serious threat to Louisiana and the lower Mississippi Valley.

"If they should erect barriers against us it could wipe out most trade," Port Director W. J. Amoss said. "It could affect our grain business particularly."

Grain is the backbone of the port of New Orleans. The port handles more for export than any other in the world.

Amoss said about one-third of the total trade through New Orleans is with Europe. New Orleans business with the six nations of the Common Market amounted to $407 million in 1960, according to U.S. Department of Commerce (1961 figures have not been released).

The expected entry of Britain in the Common Market would place at $511 million the annual business handled through New Orleans. That amounts to fully one-third of all port trade.

Petroleum and chemical officials here plead ignorance as to the severity of the effect on petrochemicals and petroleum product exports forecast in some quarters.

Henri Wolbrette, executive director of the Louisiana Chemical Association, commented, "There has been no industrywide position on this thing. It is being given serious study but mostly in New York or some place where the home offices are."

But William G. Helis, chairman of the State mineral board and an independent oil operator, leaves no doubt he is heavily in favor of President Kennedy's plan to ease the threat to exports through tariff cuts.

"The whole ball of wax is this—we want to see what is best for industry in general. If industry prospers, the fuel requirement grows and it helps us," he explained.

Helis said further that lower tariffs will keep the European market open for U.S. oil exports. He is not worried about a corresponding increase of oil imports from abroad. A Department of Commerce ruling sent him promised no change in the import quotas that limit the inbound flow.

As yet, there is no Common Market effect noticeable on New Orleans exports to Europe, according to two local bank executives who handle credit on foreign business.

"There has been no appreciable amount of chance," noted Emile W. Amardeil, foreign vice president of the Whitney National Bank, E. G. Jane, National Bank of Commerce foreign vice president, agreed.

But Amardeil added, "It is in the cards that there will be. Some finished goods are bound to be lost."

Stanford University, in a study, said 1963–64 is when the Common Market effects will hit hardest in this country.

New Orleans Congressman HALE BOGGS is in the forefront of the Kennedy administration push to obtain more tariff-cutting powers for the President.

If we don't meet the challenge of the Common Market this way, he said, the effects would be disastrous, "the worst mistake the United States ever made."

"There may be some domestic businesses hurt by import competition," he observed, "but there will be many more if we don't accommodate the Common Market."

There will be loud outcries from any business firms that begin to feel pressure, it is certain.

Dr. Hugh B. Carnes, professor of foreign trade at Tulane University, pointed out:

"You can build an argument that the Common Market will make better customers out of the Europeans because in an expanding economy people buy more, but you'll have a hard time convincing the U.S. businessman.

"He's not interested in overall economies. He's interested in his own product."

The professor added that economically he did not see how it would be possible to avoid negotiating with the Common Market on tariff cuts.

Labor too is supporting reciprocal reduction of tariffs with the Common Market nations.

The AFL–CIO, at its fourth constitutional convention in Bal Harbour, Fla., last December, resolved, "We need a new law and a new approach to the opportunities, problems, and challenges of international trade," and specified that "The President should be given broad authority to negotiate across-the-board tariff reductions."

A. P. Stoddard, president of the Central Labor Council of New Orleans and vicinity, AFL–CIO, observed:

"The rank and file man who makes hats is upset about imported hats. But basically labor is in favor of reciprocal trade. We've got to have imports to have exports. And our exports make up a far greater portion of our trade than imports."

Labor has another concern in the matter.

American manufacturers already are building plants in the Common Market countries so they can compete freely in the market area. Wholesale flight of American plants to Europe costs American labor jobs.

"Labor here is not going to like it, but it is the fault of high wages," said Darwin S. Fenner, vice president of Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner, and Smith, brokerage house.

Except for the loss of labor, the building of plants in Europe by American firms will not hurt the U.S. economy, Fenner said. The dollars will be coming back to this country in the way of profits, he said.

To the question of the need for tariff cut, Fenner asserted: "Yes, definitely."

Dr. Alton Ochsner, president of International House, takes a swipe at continually rising U.S. wages, which he said placed the Nation at a disadvantage in competing with Europe even without the added threat of the Common Market.

"Labor is going to have to buckle down. That is part of our competition problem. I'm certainly in favor of labor getting everything it needs. But I'm a physician. This is a moral thing to me. There is too much leisure and that is bad for everything," Dr. Ochsner said.

Fenner added one hopeful note on that subject. Labor costs in Europe are rising faster than ours as the result of Common Market prosperity, he said, and this may one day place the United States on a better competitive level.

Department store President Isidore Newman II said he is very much in favor of tariff cuts.

"It opens the world's markets to us and it will help us export a lot of goods. If we work against it, it will destroy our exports to Europe," he said.

Business Analyst Robert W. Eisasser feels the danger of a strong Common Market is being exaggerated.

"This doesn't mean we should be complacent and not be aware of the potential," he said. "But it won't all happen tomorrow. The effects will be gradual, over a period of 5 to 10 years."

"I can't—at least myself—be too apprehensive at present. To fear them is to think they will show economic hostility to us, erecting barriers against us.

"If they put up barriers it would be as disadvantageous to them as to us. What would happen to our purchase of all these Common Market goods their expanded economy will be producing? I don't think they will be economically hostile."

He envisions a super common market of the United States, Europe, and Canada as a great boon to the free world.

Both Fenner and Eisasser said that Federal aid through tax advantages, special rapid depreciation and awarding of Government contracts may be necessary to help U.S. firms injured by imports—but tariffs must be cut.

Fenner summed up: "The Common Market might be one of the greatest forces for peace. Many wars have been fought between those European countries. If Europe prospers it is good for us. Our aid around the world could be greatly reduced with help from a healthy Europe."

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Historian Says Congressional Record Interpretation of His Article on Supreme Court School Decision Is Distortion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks I have noted articles inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which seek to establish that a so-called startling confession of a historian reveals that the Supreme Court decision on school desegregation was based on the presentation of contrived or distorted historical facts by NAACP lawyers and their consultants.

I wrote to the historian concerned to inquire of him his views on the presentation and interpretation of his article as it appeared in publications and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I present for the RECORD Dr. Alfred H. Kelly's response to my inquiries.

The letter follows:

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY,
DETROIT, MICH.,
February 13, 1962.

The Honorable CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DIGGS: Thank you for sending the excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to me. The article as it appeared in U.S. News & World Report and as it was picked up by Congressman ALGER was a distortion of what I said and wrote. It was printed first in the Star and then in the U.S. News without permission from me and, in the instance of the Star, they falsely assured the press bureau of the AHA that they had permission to print. The version which appeared both in the U.S. News and in the Star is a carefully edited version intended, I am sure, to serve certain rather obvious purposes.

My paper was a paper intended to present some of the problems a professional historian faces when he assists people who are engaged in the practice of law. Legal briefs, as you know, are not history. Neither side in the desegregation cases submitted history to the court. Instead, each side submitted what may be called law office history, the best face they could put on the matter from their point of view. The NAACP did this and so did the other side.

As a professional historian, I engaged in no falsification of history. I prepared a paper which pointed out perfectly honestly some of the difficulties the NAACP had to face in its interpretation. Later, I helped work out a counter-interpretation which, as I said, had a great deal of merit in it. In the preparation of the brief, I helped to make sure that the NAACP version did not contain specific historical errors and falsities. Of course, it was not history in the ordinary sense of the word, no brief for a court ever is. In this sense of the word, the brief submitted by John W. Davis and his associates is law office history, the same kind.

Enclosed is a full copy of the speech as I gave it. Had I known it was to be published in an irresponsible fashion, I most assuredly would have edited it to eliminate those sentences which have lent themselves to the kind of propaganda distortion which has occurred.

Sincerely,

ALFRED H. KELLY.

Working Dairy Farmer Versus Hobby Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a young man from my State, Keith Gardner, of Granton, Wis., recently made an excellent point in a speech he delivered in a Future Farmers of America speaking contest.

The title of his talk was "A New Outlook for the Farm Problem." In it Keith describes the serious competition that legitimate family farmers are experiencing from large so-called hobby farms, run by corporations or individuals who like the rural way of life, but who feel no compulsion to operate their farms at a fair profit.

Indeed, many of these hobby farmers are disappointed when they show a profit—since it deprives them of a tax loss in their income tax calculations.

This kind of noneconomic competition, not based on the spur of genuine, profit-seeking in the marketplace, makes it impossible for the family farmer to make a decent living. It is destructive competition of the kind that occurs from time-to-time in certain industries, when giant firms use their vast financial resources to drive out smaller competitors by cutting prices. In the case of the hobby farmer there need not be such a motivation. But the end result is the same.

I congratulate Keith Gardner for his excellent speech. And I ask unanimous consent that the first part of it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW OUTLOOK FOR OUR FARM PROBLEM

(By Keith Gardner)

What would happen if anyone who could afford a hair clipper and a razor was allowed to start a barber shop?

Two results are almost certain: (1) The price of haircuts would go down; (2) regular licensed barbers would go out of business. The same pattern would follow in other professions * * * teachers * * * lawyers * * * doctors.

Of course this couldn't happen as our Government has rigid laws. Protection is given those individuals who have invested in preparation in their particular field. No one can dispute the need of this protection. These professions are necessary to the growth and well-being of our country. So, too, the family-size farm is indispensible to our country's best interest.

Today, overproduction, farm surplus, and depressed farm income are causing grave concern to the economy of our Nation. Parity, soil banks, crop programs—these have not been the answer. Very real threats of across-the-board reduced production and controlled productivity from our lawmakers seem the threat of the day. "Guaranteed peasantry," to borrow a phrase, would fairly well sum the results of the programs so far suggested.

How can the family-size farm be saved and overproduction be curbed?

Protection from unfair competition from two sources would be a big step in the right direction.

The first—unfair competition from the big hobby farms—farms kept by corporations or by individuals who have made fame and fortune in other walks of life ranging from candy companies, advertising companies, movie actors, ex-Presidents, lawyers, doctors, or what have you? I am not saying anyone is breaking the law, but the farms are run on a large scale and are used for relaxation purposes and income tax evasion. Few farm with the thought of profit in mind; nevertheless, they are placing sizable amounts of farm products on an already glutted market while the owners make their major profits in their protected professions. Farms should be saved for the family-type farmers.

The Basic Floor in Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, there has just come to my hands volume I, No. 1 of the Middletown Teacher, published by the Middletown Federation of Teachers in the city and town of Middletown in my district, and which it is planned to issue bimonthly.

An editorial which appears in the debut issue of the Middletown Teacher discusses Federal aid to education, and quotes the late great Senator Robert A. Taft of Ohio, from a statement which he made in 1946, when he said "education is primarily a State function—but in the field of education the Federal Government, as in the field of health, relief, and medical care, has a secondary interest or obligation to see that there is a basic floor under those essential services for all adults and children in the United States."

The editorial is of more than local interest, it seems to me, and I ask, therefore, that it be published in full in the RECORD at this point.

The editorial follows:

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Several weeks ago, President Kennedy presented his educational program to Congress. Observing that our educational system produced some of the best educated in the world, the President pointed to some of the shortcomings and problems which demand immediate attention.

1. Within our elementary and secondary schools are 1.6 million teachers, 20 percent of these are not fully certified or have failed to complete 4 years of college.

2. High school students are dropping out at the alarming rate of 1 million yearly; 40 percent of those who enter college never graduate.

3. By 1970, facilities for 14 million more elementary, secondary and college students must be provided, or to put it another way, present facilities must be increased 30 percent.

4. Four hundred thousand seniors who graduated in the upper half of their class last June did not enter college. Half of these were in the upper 30 percent of their class. Most did not enter because of financial problems.

5. College education has increased in cost almost 90 percent since 1950. The President estimated that the cost of higher education today is $1,750 yearly per student, or $7,000 for a full 4-year program.

6. There are 8 million Americans today who have less than 5 years of school. One-third of these can't read or write.

These are some of the problems President Kennedy highlighted in his message to Congress. He called for a $5.7 billion, 5-year plan which was divided into two programs. One program would use $2.1 billion for college classroom construction and scholarships for needy and worthy students. The second would use $2.1 billion to raise elementary and secondary teachers' salaries and for the construction of public schools.

Other phases of Kennedy's program deal with increasing the number of doctors and dentists, more education for migrant children, teaching the illiterate how to read, and helping teachers get advanced training.

The basic question to be resolved is whether the Federal Government should help the schools today and to what extent. From the passage of the land ordinance in 1785, the Federal Government has actively sought to help education, and has done so without interference on a local or State level.

It is quite apparent, as the foregoing facts show, that much is wrong with our educational system, and much could be ameliorated with adequate finance.

Many poor States are spending as much proportionately as the rich States and yet children in these States are getting an inferior education.

We cannot agree with Senator DODD and his position as clearly stated elsewhere in this paper, when he voted against Federal aid to education because Connecticut would pay far more in taxes than she would get back in grants and assistance. This ignores the moral and public responsibility which all of us have to educate not only our own children but the Nation's children as well.

As Robert Taft put in back in 1946, "Education is primarily a State function—but in the field of education the Federal Government, as in the field of health, relief, and medical care, has a secondary interest or obligation to see that there is a basic floor under those essential services for all adults and children in the United States."

The "basic floor" is what we must strive for in America today. We owe this to the children of every State.

As President Kennedy wrote in his message to Congress:

"The education of our people is a national investment. It yields tangible returns in economic growth, an improved citizenry and higher standards of living. But even more importantly, free men and women value education as a personal experience and opportunity—as a basic benefit of a free and democratic civilization. It is our responsibility to do whatever needs to be done to make this opportunity available to all and to make it of the highest possible quality."

Alabama Firm Enters Partnership With Common Market Firm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I have long been a proponent of establishing good trade relationships with nations overseas. Because of this I am extremely proud that an Alabama firm has worked out a partnership arrangement with a firm in Europe's Common Market.

I refer to Dorsey Trailers of Elba, Ala. Dorsey is the third largest truck-trailer manufacturer in the Nation. It was founded in 1911. The plant in Elba today employs more than 750 people. A total of 113 U.S. distributors and 30 oversea distributors handle Dorsey products.

I am most pleased that Dorsey Trailers has joined in a partnership arrangement with Les Establissements Arbel, of France, and Waggonfabrik Talbot, of Germany. These companies will manufacture Dorsey trailers in Europe from exclusive Dorsey design. Trailers will be sold in the Common Market by a joint company, Dorsey Europe, under the Dorsey trademark. I feel that this Alabama company is making a real contribution to the establishment of better trade relationships overseas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a New York Times news item describing some of the economic advantages of this arrangement dated February 5, 1961, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the item was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUCKING GROWS IN WEST EUROPE—WIDE USE OF U.S.-DESIGNED TRAILER VEHICLES SEEN IN HIGHWAY DEVELOPMENTS

(By Bernard Stengren)

A sharp increase of freight shipment by truck in Europe, and an even greater increase anticipated in the next decade, has led an American trailer manufacturer to enter the continental market.

As a result, American-designed, European-built semitrailers and full trailers will soon be appearing on the modern superhighways already built or now under construction on the Continent.

Sample trailers of various designs, including refrigerated or "reefer" vans in which the Europeans are particularly interested, have already been shipped from this country.

The shipper was the Dorsey Corp., the American manufacturer. It has formed Dorsey Europe, a Swiss corporation, in an arangement with Les Establissements Arbel, of France, and Waggonfabrik Talbot, of Germany.

INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS

Arbel and Talbot will make the vans and they will be marketed by Dorsey Europe. At the moment, however, designs cannot be completed because the European Economic Community Common Market is about to establish size and weight standards for trucks and trailers in the countries of the group. These are France, West Germany, Belgium, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and Italy.

These standards are expected to call for vehicles somewhat smaller than those generally used in over-the-road operations in the United States.

European makers turn out excellent trucks. But trailers, particularly the semis whose front ends are supported by the tractor units that hold them have not been one of the strong points. Reginald Armour, president of Dorsey Corp., said Arbel and Talbot had initiated the talks that led to the formation of Dorsey Europe, because of his company's long experience with trailer manufacture.

Two indexes of the potential for sales of trucks and trailers were cited by Dorsey officials.

HIGHWAYS BECOMING AVAILABLE

Registrations of trucks in France have risen from 1,191,000 in 1954 to 1,549,000 in 1959. It is estimated that 70 percent of the trucks in use are obsolete. In West Germany, there are now 711,000 trucks on the road, compared with 663,000 6 years ago. About 355,000 of these are obsolete.

The second index is that 1,100 miles of superhighway are under construction in Europe, and another 8,600 miles are planned for completion by 1980. At present there are 2,813 miles of modern highway, including 1,600 in West Germany.

"I predict that within 5 years our European operation will account for about one-third of our total sales," Mr. Armour said.

Lipstick Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Detroit News on Tuesday, March 13, 1962:

We'll call him Mr. A. He lived in a place we'll call M. He had an idea. There was a shortage of lipsticks, and, being a gallant and enterprising fellow, Mr. A decided he'd better do something for womanhood.

So he cleared out his basement and set up a few workbenches. He found all the materials he wanted available in a factory in another city. So he arranged with the factory manager and the chief engineer to take some of the surplus off their hands.

The factory manager was an enterprising fellow also. He got many of his workmen to make lipstick cases in their spare time in their own homes and slip them off to the place called M where Mr. A was doing a thriving business filling a public need.

A fellow like Mr. A should go a long way. But he isn't. His name wasn't Mr. A. It

was Nikolai Kotlyar. The place he lived in was Moscow. Moscow is where the secret police don't use lipstick. They caught poor Nikolai, brought him before the judges, and the sentence was: execution.

That's the trouble with displaying enterprise in a land where the state is supposed to have a monopoly of brains and initiative—and poor women are supposed to smack their pale lips in delight about it all.

President Kennedy's Message on Extended Powers for the Federal Trade Commission, To Protect Consumers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Strange Way To Protect the Consumer," which was published on March 22 in the Wall Street Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STRANGE WAY TO PROTECT THE CONSUMER

In his message to Congress on protecting the consumer interest, President Kennedy reiterated his recommendations made some time ago that the Federal Trade Commission be given more extended powers.

The FTC "should be empowered to issue temporary cease-and-desist orders," he said, "against the continuance of unfair competitive practices while cases concerned with permanent relief from such practices are pending before the Commission. Under the present law, smaller competitors may be driven into bankruptcy or forced to accept merger on adverse terms long before present remedies become effective, thus reducing the competitive safeguards vital for the consumer. * * *"

Now this has a reasonable sound. But let's take a look at the "present remedies" which, it is implied, are insufficient. If the FTC believes that a business is engaging in unfair competitive practices, today it must take its evidence to court and persuade a judge that it has a case before a restraining order can be issued directing the business to stop doing whatever the FTC asserts it ought not be doing. The accused business has, of course, access to all the established avenues of appeal.

But the administration would change that procedure. Indeed, there is already an administration-sponsored bill in Congress that would give the FTC the powers asked by Mr. Kennedy in his message. It would permit the FTC to issue a restraining order against a business any time the FTC believed such action would be to "the interest of the public" or "would prevent irreparable harm."

Action, be it noted, would be taken on the agency's own volition, outside of the Federal court system. And the business need not be considered by the FTC to have violated any Federal law to have a restraining order issued against it.

Thus the FTC would have authority to bring charges against the allegedly offending business, to act as prosecutor, to decide questions of fact and law, and to hand down a verdict. The justice—or injustice—of the FTC's injunction could not be appealed.

Under the guise of protecting the consumer, the administration is here seeking to give, for the first time, powers of injunction to an administrative agency. And it seems unconcerned that in so doing it would be trampling underfoot the most elementary rights of the businessman and enmeshing him in still more regulatory redtape. This seems a strange way to protect the consumer.

A Swiss Looks at U.S. Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Evening Star of March 27, 1962:

A SWISS LOOKS AT U.S. SPENDING—TROUBLE PREDICTED UNLESS AMERICA ENDS GOLD OUTFLOW AND GOOD SAMARITAN ROLE

ZURICH.—This reporter takes relatively frequent trips to Switzerland not only because of the solid, untainted information available about the Western and Eastern Worlds, but also because it is relaxing to visit a country which practices the purest democracy.

In Switzerland there are no politicians; no VIP's who claim special privileges. It is refreshing to find Swiss officialdom from the top man in the canton to the traffic policeman or Federal customs inspector considering themselves servants of the people, not miniature autocrats.

Here family life remains the foundation and backbone of the social structure with the father as supreme authority. Here the children rise when papa enters the room and saying of grace at meals is the rule not the exception. This is a country of slightly more than 5 million inhabitants who are fanatically nationalistic and united, although there are three distinct nationalities speaking three different languages.

All of Europe and America are in turmoil over nuclear weapons. Men and women have been picketing the White House or gathering in Trafalgar Square and other parts of Britain demanding unilateral nuclear disarmament despite Premier Khrushchev's frequent threats. But in Switzerland, the Federal Government is being petitioned to proceed with the creation of its own atomic power to provide the national army (400,000 strong) with nuclear heads for their artillery and small arms.

This is a rich, prosperous and intensely capitalistic nation. It lacks almost every kind of raw material. But hard work compensates for this. The yearly per capita income of $1,294 is the highest in Europe. Yet despite the many prosperous industries there are no rich families such as we find in the United States, Britain, France and especially in Italy. But at the same time there is no poverty, either.

The top salary of the president of the biggest bank is about $20,000 a year. The heads of big industries may sometimes earn as much as $50,000 a year and anybody with such an earned income is considered a millionaire. Taxes on earned income are small for the high brackets and practically nonexistent for medium or small incomes.

By necessity, the head of the big industrial and banking corporations are the best informed in the world. Their existence depends on making few mistakes, and mistakes can be avoided by realistic appraisals of world conditions. It is for this reason that I like to sound out my Swiss friends about the shape of things to come.

I have yet to find a single Swiss banker or businessman who does not have a warm feeling for the United States. But at the same time they more realistically appraise our future than most of our own economists or partisan politicians. And their estimates present a gloomy outlook for the future. A "direktol" of one of the greatest banking institutions in this country set forth his misgivings on America's future financial structure.

"You are still the richest country in the world," he said, "not only in raw materials but in inventive genius, know-how and daring. But at the rate of your expenditures for domestic progress, defense, and particularly your indiscriminate desire to help the rest of the world—regardless of its deserts—you will not be able to continue to discharge this self-imposed obligation without serious consequences. The gold outflow should be a real warning.

"Your rate of taxation—direct, indirect, and invisible—has not yet reached the saturation point, but you are not far from it. Since it is obvious that all your political men are pledged to the continuation of this role of the world's Good Samaritan, I cannot see the end of these expenditures. Even in the highly problematic circumstances that there may be a lessening of the arms race, you will be compelled by drastic economic necessities to divert the billions you are spending on defense to social works. This means the burdens of taxation will continue.

"The outflow of gold is continuing at a more alarming pace than the average American citizen and even your lawmakers realize. In order to provide the huge amounts needed for social engineering and increased help to the underdeveloped countries which would follow the highly unlikely slowing down of the arms race, you will have to increase the taxation of every American—from factory worker to the man living on modest retirement and the coupon clipper

"Despite your present efforts, it will be difficult for you to regain your position in the world markets because of the high and increasing cost of production. You will continue, of course, your democratic form of Government, but don't forget history. There have been many instances when the tax collector has become more of an oppressor of the people than the secret police in a dictatorship. In order to gather the necessary funds to continue your gigantic self-imposed task from cradle to grave the income tax collector will become more arbitrary and increasingly consider the taxpayer as a lemon which must be squeezed to the last drop. And in the long run, this will cause you serious trouble."

The United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD what I think is a sane, prudent, and rational editorial with respect to the United Nations.

Regrettably at this time people seem to be going off in all directions with respect

to the United Nations. As this editorial so eloquently points out it is a little ridiculous to consider the United Nations as a "monstrous Communist plot to conquer the world; nor is it mankind's best and only hope for peace."

It has made some mistakes—many of them—and it will continue to make some in the future. However, the point we have to consider now is whether it is to our advantage to have a vigorous United Nations.

The very fact that the Communists seek to bring about the extinction of the United Nations seems to me to be a rather persuasive argument as to the reasons why we should at least continue it for some time in the future.

I thoroughly agree, as has already been expressed, that we should not permit the United Nations to dictate our U.S. foreign policy, nor should our foreign policy be determined or governed by the wishes of our representatives to the United Nations, which I am certain is not now the case.

In any event, I think this is a fine editorial and I hope Members of the Congress will read it.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMONSENSE AND THE U.N.

An envelope bearing an unusual sticker turned up in yesterday morning's mail. It was attractively printed in red, white and blue, and it read, in part: "Fight Comm-UNism."

The arrival of this letter in the same mail delivery as Columnist David Lawrence's excellent article for today led to a few thoughts about the United Nations.

The U.N. is not a monstrous, Communist plot to conquer the world—nor is it mankind's best, or only, hope for peace.

It is a propaganda hall. It is a debating club which has admitted too many members. It is used, whenever possible, by the Communist conspiracy as a shield behind which to hide foul intentions.

But it also is a forum for diplomacy. It is a gathering place where at least some disputes between member-nations can be threshed out and eased, if not settled. It provides, at the very least, an opportunity for representatives of the world's nations to meet (privately or in debate) to attempt to come to terms with each other and to tackle joint projects in a cooperative manner. And, because of its location in the free United States of America, it can be a showcase for democracy.

FAR FROM PERFECT

It has made mistakes, as in the Congo and in votes that have rushed dependent territories to premature independence. It is far from perfect, and the Communist-bloc nations have made progress in their long campaign to subvert it and bend it to the will of Soviet foreign policy. It suffers from a lack of authority to halt tyrannical aggression, yet it cannot safely be given greater authority so long as many of the neutral nations lean toward Moscow.

Yet the U.N., this imperfect body of strain and conflict, is better than no world organization at all. And it is far, far better than a U.N. without the United States.

Why? Because if the United States were to pull out of the U.N. and send it packing from these shores, the withdrawal would not destroy the organization. Premier Khrushchev and his puppets would gladly pick up the check—and the reins.

The United States and our stanch allies could establish another cooperative organization, but the creation of two rival bodies could only strengthen our enemies—for they would inherit, posing as protectors, what we had cast aside.

Let us look at the U.N., therefore, through eyes that are clouded neither by the pink haze of hysterical fear of communism nor by the roseate hue of unbridled optimism.

Let us apply commonsense to what we hear and think about the U.N.

Let some of us take it down from the pedestal of utopian dreams; let others of us raise it from the depths of Red hell to which we have consigned it.

Carleton Putnam's Race and Reason

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I offer for inclusion in the RECORD the following report, which is an incisive commentary by a Louisianian on, as Mr. Putnam calls it, "a Yankee view" on race and reason. This book has had some circulation in Congress and it has been interesting to note that the circulators are those who have through the years unremittingly espoused the dead cause into which Mr. Putnam seeks to inject new life.

No one denies that there are individuals in the North and individuals in the South who have no intention of permitting their endorsement of the principles of white supremacy to be disturbed by reason, national concepts, or preponderance of scientific evidence. But as Dr. Sullivan's letter illustrates, we can be grateful as American people that our best reason, our highest spiritual and moral concepts, our liberty will not merely survive but will know ultimate full triumph because enlightened mankind is in the majority, dwelling everywhere, and will not be dismayed and silenced.

The report follows:

(NOTE.—Carleton Putnam's book, "Race and Reason: A Yankee View," has been widely circulated in the South. The following commentary by Dr. William P. Sullivan, assistant professor of English, McNeese State College, Lake Charles, La., is reproduced without change from the Southwest Louisiana Register, published in Lafayette, La. Other reports on this subject are: Report L-8 (Aug. 1959): a reproduction of a statement on the subject of race and intelligence by 18 of the country's leading psychologists and anthropologists; and report L-29 (Dec. 1961); a reproduction of a resolution passed by the American Anthropological Association reaffirming its position on race.)

DEAR EDITOR: Carleton Putnam's "Race and Reason: A Yankee View" (Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1961) deserves some comment because the State Board of Education has purchased 5,000 copies for distribution to Louisiana schools. The wisdom of this action is questionable, for the book is fundamentally evasive.

Putnam's overt purpose is to embolden the anthropologists of the south to combat the "pseudo-scientific hoax" of "modern equalitarian anthropology." His vision of timid southern anthropologists, fearful of revealing the truth, cowering in their studies, are too much for Putnam. He knows that the Negro is inferior to the White Anglo-Saxon Protestant (WASP) and to anyone else, too. He knows because the "character-intelligence index"—a wobbly term he may have invented—"forms the only possible index of the capacity for civilization as Western Europeans know it," and the Negro has never had a decent civilization.

Putnam's qualifications for revising a science to conform to a political platform (better known as Lysenkoism) appear to be a degree in "science" from Princeton, the ability to round up 4 men with science degrees more formidable than his own who disapprove of the trend of modern social science, and an unusual confidence in the authority of his own opinion. He is, for example, able to write, with the trump of finality, "I say it with sadness, for every argument he advanced I was obliged to refute." To give either the argument or the attempted refutation does not seem to him necessary.

Putnam attacks prominent anthropologists because they have, he feels, conspired to conceal the inferiority of the Negro. Not being WASP's, men from central and southern European races like Boas and Herskovits are bent on proving their equality with the majority group, thus elevating themselves and the Negro in theory. Putnam proves how irrational, emotional, or arrogant these anthropologists and other conspirators are by saying they are and he has letters from them (not quoted) which show this. He gives the impression of a wide-ranging, daring scholarship:

"Either from their silences or their comments, I had or sensed the thinking of Kluckhohn and Handlin of Harvard, Murdock of Yale, Herskovites of Northwestern, and Fosdick of Union Theological Seminary. There were dozens of others from Richard Nixon to Eleanor Roosevelt, from Nelson Rockefeller to Billy Graham, from Allan Nevins to Ralph McGill."

He attacks northern newspapers for not printing his letters and some (he names eight on one occasion) for not accepting a full-page ad; this he deems a conspiracy against the truth. He writes to the Attorney General, the President, the Supreme Court, and so forth (during the Eisenhower administration). Failure to reply is taken as proof of their silence before his rational superiority. Everywhere he looks, like a peacock in a room full of mirrors, Putnam finds confirmation of his superior posture.

He answers any question, his tone and the makeup of the book suggests; he takes on all comers. Here is how he handles one question:

"But would Christ have discriminated according to race? Was it not always with Him a matter of individual worth? Of course, I have never maintained anything to the contrary. In all matters involving dealings between individuals, where the question of intermarrying is not involved, I think individual worth alone should be the criterion. But there is nothing un-Christian in facing the fact that, as individuals differ in merit, so averages differ among races in those attributes involving specific cultures. Judgments as to the average have to be made accordingly. I must repeat that there are few perfect systems in this world, we have to deal with practical realities, and when we are confronted with a situation where a race must be considered as a race, there is no alternative to building the system around the average. The minor handicap to the exceptional individual, if such there be, is negligible compared to the damage that would result to a society as a whole."

His answer to this question goes on and on, to the treating of Negroes as a group. From this excerpt, however, anyone can see the contradiction between, "Of course, I have never maintained anything to the contrary," and his contrary willingness to sacrifice the

individual. He answers another question by obviously ignoring the commandment to love your neighbor; perhaps the story of the Good Samaritan (of that despised race of men) has been revised in his Bible. First thing you know, those Samaritans will be wanting to marry our daughters.

Apart from the queasiness of his response to the Christian questions, the essential contradiction within this book lies in the pretended openness and thoroughness of debate and the actual suppression of opposing facts and opinions, even when immediately relevant. A striking instance of this suppression turned up during a check of Putnam's references to articles by Frank McGurk, a Villanova University psychologist who has a Ph. D. from Catholic University.

In "A Scientists' Report on Race Differences" (U.S. News & World Report, Sept. 21, 1956), Dr. McGurk explained how his tests showed the Negro to be inferior to the white. This professional article was answered in kind in the Harvard Educational Review (Spring, 1958) by William McCord and Nicholas J. Demerath III, who concluded:

"In our sample of 612 northern urban boys, we found no significant differences in intelligence between Negroes and whites. Not surprisingly however, we found that intelligence is significantly related to socioeconomic status, parental education and general home atmosphere. * * * Even if most Negroes were not as intelligent as most whites, this fact would not deprive them of the rights granted by the American Constitution."

Putnam omitted any mention of McCord's and Demerath's article, even though he printed the second McGurk reference, "Negro versus White Intelligence—An Answer," (Harvard Educational Review for Winter, 1959), which cannot be understood without reading the attack which it purports to answer. In this method of reasoning Putnam omits the opponent's answer and asserts that the opponent is demolished. Like a champion of old returning alive from combat with a dragon, the existing Putnam is to be taken as proof that the enemy is defeated.

WILLIAM P. SULLIVAN.

LAKE CHARLES, LA.

The 1961 Report on Activities in Nicolet National Forest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Nation's national forests represent one of the major features of our natural outdoor heritage. By good, sound management and utilization practices, these forests will continue to be a major asset and resource to the country.

Recently, I was privileged to receive from Mr. K. P. Butterfield, forest supervisor, of Rhinelander, Wis., a report on 1961 activities in the Nicolet National Forest in Wisconsin. Reflecting constructive efforts to utilize this national forest for wood, wildlife, recreation, and other purposes, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the report printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S NEW IN THE NICOLET NATIONAL FOREST, 1961

This is the fifth year that we have issued a statement designed to keep you posted on some of our accomplishments. These annual reports have been helpful to us by showing up our weaknesses and strengths. I hope they have been interesting and informative to you. This year we are emphasizing some of the new things we have done.

A NEW SYMBOL

The design on the cover depicts the multiple use tree. The trunk stands for the Nation and the people who benefit from national forest resources. The unbroken line links the resources together and connects all of them with the public. Line continuity spells multiple use as it has been, is, and will be practiced on all national forests.

A NEW PROGRAM

The Visitor Information Service was started in 1961. Each year an estimated 300,000 people visit the Nicolet National Forest. About 33,000 of them stay long enough to camp a few days. Most of the rest of them stay at resorts or at privately owned homes and use the national forest for outdoor activities. Under our visitor information service program, we hope to provide ways and means of making the Nicolet more enjoyable by providing areas where people can see some of the phenomena of nature and see more of the activities of the forest.

We have already developed the Butternut Lake Forest Trail. Here you can park your car and take a leisurely stroll through the forest along a mile-long trail, where there are explanatory labels to help you to better understand what you see. Although it was not opened until late in August, it has already been visited by some 1,000 people.

By July 1, 1962, we will have a 7 mile auto tour completed. This will have 11 small parking areas where you can drive off the road and observe some of the natural stands of timber and see some of the cultural work that is being done to grow a future crop of timber and to maintain a bountiful supply of game. We also will have a few short foot trails for those who wish to walk along a well-signed route where more of the wonders of nature and the cultural work of man can be seen. We hope to be able to make a few conducted tours of some of these areas next summer.

NEW CAMPGROUNDS

New campground development is underway. Road construction has started for the development of a new campground at Spectacle Lake in the town of Phelps. A new road system is almost completed at Morgan Lake in the town of Fence. The camp and picnic ground at Boot Lake in the town of Doty has had a complete facelifting. There are now 12 additional camping spots for campers, a better access for boats, and a better parking area for picnickers. We have done a similar job on Pine Lake in the town of Hiles, although on a somewhat smaller scale. Also in the town of Hiles, 22 new camp spots have been constructed on Franklin Lake. This makes a total of 90 camping units in this area. Three years ago there were only 22 units here. By the time the next camping season starts, the town of Armstrong Creek will have 15 new camp units and a new picnic area on Laura-Gordon Lakes.

SOME NEW RECORDS WERE SET

Sixty thousand cords of pulpwood were harvested, the greatest amount in the history of the forest. More campers were accommodated than ever before—over 39,000. Nearly three-fourths of a million seedlings were planted in the largest planting program since 1949.

We nearly had another record—one we are not so proud of. Last Memorial Day some one was careless and set a fire in a plantation on the Lakewood District. When it was all over, 550 acres were burned, including 381 acres of a fine 23-year-old plantation. This was the largest fire on the Nicolet since 1953.

NEW JOBS

Last summer our payroll reached a peak of 161 persons compared to 106 the year before. The 161 people live in areas approximately as follows:

City of Rhinelander	24
Florence County	21
Forest County	53
Oconto County	25
Oneida County	4
Vilas County	34

In addition several jobs let to contract permitted the employment of many men. Contract work for 1961 was more than double the 1960 program.

Some statistics on our other activities may be found in the attached table:

Some facts about the Nicolet National Forest, 1961

General information:	
Gross area of forest ... acres	941,799
Net national forest ownership ... acres	640,528
Area protected from fire ... acres	940,553
Number of developed recreation areas	28
Fishing streams ... miles	840
Lakes (number—207) ... acres	34,614
Yearlong employees	58
Seasonal employees	103
Area planted to date ... acres	70,983
Accomplishments during the year:	
Number of forest fires controlled	30
Timber sold (pulpwood) ... cords	66,170
Timber sold (sawtimber) ... M b.f.	5,115
Timber harvested (pulpwood) ... cords	60,000
Timber harvested (sawtimber) ... M b.f.	2,400
Tree planting ... acres	902
Timber stand improvement ... acres	7,018
Insect and disease control ... acres	2,154
Roads maintained ... miles	416
Roads constructed ... do	4
Total national forest receipts	$157,400.00
Receipts per acre	$0.25
Receipts returned to counties for local schools and roads:	
Florence	$4,980
Forest	20,610
Langlade	1,908
Oconto	8,386
Oneida	618
Vilas	2,839
Total	39,341

Results of Madeline Drake's Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I have said before in this cham-

ber that there is a resurgence of interest among the young people of America in their Government. I find a keen interest on the part of schoolchildren of all ages in the mechanics of government, a desire to know who the elected and appointed officials are and what they do, and a general interest in the field of politics. I think this is wonderful and I know that this interest on the part of young people is going to make this country a better place in which to live as they grow older.

An example of this awareness is the following material prepared by a 13-year-old eighth grader in San Diego, Calif.

Mary Madeline Drake has a real interest in the mechanics of government as evidenced by the questionnaire she prepared and distributed to over 500 people. Her results are informative. One of her conclusions is disconcerting. You will note she states her survey shows that three out of five people are not interested in matters pertaining to politics. I join with her when she says that every effort must be made by all of us to create more interest in this area.

May I submit the following letter dated March 14, 1962, from Madeline Drake and the completed questionnaire.

The letter follows:

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,
March 14, 1962.

Hon. Congressman BOB WILSON.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for sending me your photograph and your answers to the questionnaire which I used in my school science project. I thought that you might be interested in the results of my survey. First of all, I, along with nine other students from St. Charles Academy, was selected to represent our school at Our Lady of Peace High School for our diocese. Of the 10 selected from our school, 1 boy won first prize in the senior division, 2 boys (joint project) won second prize in the senior division, and 1 girl won first prize in the junior division. I received a certificate of participation. The three chosen from our school will represent our school at the Greater Science Fair at Balboa Park in April. Needless to say, my questionnaire created quite a controversy.

I conducted my survey amongst the parents of the students of my school, and of the residents along both sides of Moraga Avenue. Also, I sent questionnaires to a select group of leaders in our Government. From this select group, only Pat Brown and yourself have replied as of to date. Part Brown sent his photograph but did not answer the questionnaire.

Five hundred questionnaires distributed; 213 returned; 6 people not home; 6 people too busy; 301 people not interested; 106 men answered; 81 women answered.

Question No. 1. Yes, 129; no, 56; no answer, 28.

Question No. 2. Yes, 89; no, 88; no answer, 36.

Question No. 3. Yes, 94; no, 70; no answer, 49.

It was a most interesting experience. I picked this subject because I think that political science affects people more than any other type of science. Without freedom of political science, man would not be able to express his views on science itself, or anything else for that matter. Therefore, man, and/or science, wouldn't be able to progress without political aid.

This science first appeared as a separate study in the 400's B.C. when Greek philosophers advocated that politics was the most useful and honorable of all professions.

My thanks again to you, sir, for your generous consideration. My respects and compliments to you and your colleagues.

With best wishes, I am,

MARY MADELINE DRAKE.
Age 13, Grade 8.

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE

My name is Madeline Drake. I am conducting a survey for my school science (political) project. Would you be so kind as to help me by answering the following questions:

1. Do you agree that the formula for winning the national election is to win the big-city vote by appealing to the powerful voting blocs that are concentrated in the cities? Yes, 129; no, 56; no answer, 28.

2. If so, does this mean that future legislation must be favorable to city folks, such as Kennedy's proposed creation of the Department of Urban Affairs? Yes, 89; no, 88; no answer, 36.

3. Do you think that the free ride of the farmers is slowly coming to an end? Yes, 94; no, 70; no answer, 49.

Comments. My survey indicates that three out of five people are not interested in matters pertaining to politics. Every effort must be made by all of us to create more interest in this area.

I would be a happy and proud little girl if any part of my data became a matter of record.

Respectfully,

MARY MADELINE DRAKE.

Portugal and Her Oversea Provinces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HASTINGS KEITH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, a year ago this month the civilized world was shocked by brutal crimes against humanity in northern Angola. This butchery was passed off in much of the world press as "a native uprising." The attempt of the Portuguese administration to restore order was called repression.

Portugal is a longtime enemy of communism and one of our most loyal NATO allies. The current campaign against Portugal not only threatens this alliance and jeopardizes our right to use strategically important air bases in the Azores, it has in many instances been a slander on the people of Portugal and the hundreds of thousands of Americans of Portuguese descent.

Speaking in behalf of many of these Americans, the Portuguese-American Civic League of Massachusetts has written the President and our Ambassador to the United Nations protesting the effort to discredit Portugal. This letter conveys the sentiments of a large number of our citizens and is worthy of the attention and consideration of Congress.

The letter follows:

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MR. PRESIDENT: At a meeting of the Portuguese-American Civic League of Massachusetts, held in Lawrence, Mass., on Sunday, January 28, 1962, a motion was passed that a letter be sent to you, Mr. President, with a copy to our United Nations representative, Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, conveying the sentiments of the members of the Portuguese-American Civic League of Massachusetts with regard to the action of the United States of America relating to Portugal and her oversea provinces.

We, as U.S. citizens of Portuguese descent, are very much perturbed with the happenings at the United Nations with regard to Portugal and her overseas provinces. There seems to be a concerted effort to discredit Portugal, an old ally of the United States and a member of the NATO alliance. As a friend of the United States, Portugal has provided us with a very important air force base in the Azores and the strongest transmitters for Radio Free Europe in Lisbon. Obviously, Portugal is of extreme importance to the West from the standpoint of land mass, both in Europe and Africa.

Portugal is one of the few countries of the world which has outlawed the Communist Party, and at the same time, a consistent, ardent champion of the West and the Christian world. No one can deny the fact that the goal of the Communists is world conquest and her immediate plan is the complete domination of Africa. If Communist-inspired propaganda can drive a wedge between these two Western countries, the United States defense position obviously is weakened, and the Soviet bloc position is obviously strengthened.

We are, therefore, especially disturbed at the vote of the United States in the United Nations General Assembly and Security Council which sided with the Soviet Union. We sincerely request that the United States reconsider its record of voting against Portugal in favor of some very questionable motives of these new African nations and the Soviet Union, who at the moment are demanding action that would include sanctions against Portugal which would be disastrous to our NATO alliance.

The members of the Portuguese-American Civic League want to thank you for your attention and consideration, and we pray that God may continue to bless this great country of ours and its leaders.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL SILVA,
President.
JEFFREY VASCONCELOS,
Corresponding Secretary.

Distorting America's Agricultural Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, the fine American farm community has long been the whipping boy for both the Federal bureaucrat and the public news media. The American farmer has had his ability questioned and degraded in political campaigns for over three decades. I believe it is time we recognized our farmer for what he is; a hard-working, self-sufficient member of society. He has the demonstrated ability and ambition to produce more and better products than any other farmers in history and in the world today.

I believe it is time we compliment him instead of insulting him. I believe it is time we stopped trying to put him in

the position of a pawn to be manipulated on the chessboard of political opportunism.

Very shortly this body will be debating agricultural legislation. I believe it is more than coincidence that on March 13 of this year the National Broadcasting Co. would present a feature entitled "The Land." This feature was another of the distortions of the total success of the American farmer. It is typical of the insulting—to the farmer—propaganda personified by the infamous "Wisconsin Story" which was shown at the Democratic National Convention in 1960.

The farmers of my proud State of Wisconsin, and the Nation are to be congratulated, not insulted. Their abilities are to be praised, not degraded. Their success should be a source of national pride, not shame.

Such odiferous pieces as mentioned above serve only to aid our international enemies in their abiding desire to destroy our Nation's hard-earned reputation as the home of successful freedom.

The letter I now insert was written by a young agricultural leader from my congressional district, Dr. Robert R. Spitzer, of Burlington, Wis. Last year Dr. Spitzer toured Europe and Russia on an agricultural exchange mission. The points made in his fine letter to the president of NBC are based upon firsthand information garnered both here and abroad. I respectfully submit that letter for the consideration of my colleagues.

The letter follows:

MARCH 22, 1962.

PRESIDENT, NATIONAL BROADCASTING CO.,
30 Rockefeller Plaza,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: This letter is sent with all sincerity in hopes that we might help to further a cause that I know you believe in.

The Tuesday evening, March 13, NBC feature on "The Land," in my opinion, was a gross distortion of the true, overall agriculture picture.

While there were elements of truth and fact, this film is exactly the type of film that will make excellent showing in those countries that are trying to convince their people that American agriculture is a gross flop, is bankrupt, and that collective or communistic agriculture is the answer.

This process of farms becoming larger, investments greater and fewer people required has continued for over 100 years. But this same competition and evolution has given America the greatest agriculture in the whole world. While fewer people are required to man our farms, more people are required in the agriculture businesses—research, education, conservation, communication. More than 15,000 jobs a year are waiting for ag college graduates and many times this number of jobs in our American industry for the ambitious, willing-to-work farmer or farm boy. The ambitious and the enterprising has had tremendous opportunity in our free society.

It was not the small farm that built America; it was the free farm that built America and the work of the small farmer and the big farmer in a free society. One American farmer produces good food for 26 people. One Russian farmer produces a mediocre diet for three people. Forty-five percent of their people are tied to the soil and there is still hunger.

In Russia this past summer and in England, people stopped me with this question: "Is it true that American agriculture is nearly bankrupt, is a failure and is one big dust bowl?" To my amazement, I learned that they were getting this distortion from news stories and some American-produced television and movie films. One of the films was an excerpt used at the Democratic convention in 1960. Communism was using this film to sell the virtues of collective farming and government domination of agriculture and overall business.

The NBC film produced on Tuesday night, March 13, seems to me to present a one-sided, unfair picture of American farmers and American agriculture. In the wrong hands it could contribute to the cause of our enemy and help to destroy the principles that helped build our free agriculture and a free America. The overall impression was far from the highly successful agriculture that blesses this land.

I have great respect for you and your organization, but I am puzzled why men in key positions are featuring the negative and appear to be getting us ready for more socialism and government domination. Grassroots America doesn't want government domination of everything. Government domination didn't build this country.

As we struggle to improve, we had better look at the doughnut rather than the hole. If not, we will destroy the system that has made America what it is today. Since when was it the promise of our Government to provide people with a guarantee that their town won't change or that they will be guaranteed a job, an income or a profit? In changing times and where supply and demand and competition rule, we must be ready to work harder, to compete, to succeed or to fail. Government guarantees or trying to hold on to yesterday are not the answer.

I salute you for your good programs, but I was extremely disappointed on your portrayal of American agriculture. I hope you will accept this letter in the friendly spirit in which I write it and that it is of help to you. I am willing to come to your city to present some facts on American agriculture that haven't been told.

Sincerely,

DR. ROBERT R. SPITZER.

P.S.—I have sent a duplicate of this letter to Mr. Chet Huntley.

Anacortes: All America City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, Look magazine and the National Municipal League has presented All America City Awards to 11 communities of various sizes throughout the Nation. One of these cities, Anacortes, Wash., is situated in my district.

There were more than 80 cities which applied for the awards and after careful screening by a panel of experts 22 finalists were selected to present their cases to the All America Cities jury. Mr. Speaker, it was more than good fortune which placed these 11 cities in the winner's circle.

Today the April 10 ,1962, issue of Look magazines will appear on the newsstand. This issue tells of the accomplishments of the 11 All America Cities. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include in the RECORD Look magazine's remarks concerning Anacortes:

"We feel we have a piece of God's little acre here," says Dr. Eugene Strom, the 39-year-old dentist who is mayor of Anacortes. But the actual size of the "piece of acre" is the city's biggest problem. In 1891, Anacortes was conceived as the future "New York of the Pacific coast." When the railroad business failed to develop, many settlers moved on, and Anacortes was left with an area equal to that of Miami Beach, Fla., today. In 1953, the city began a drive to attract industry. It started with a study of community problems. In 1957, a council-manager charter was adopted. Today, there are four new schools, added facilities at older schools and a storm-drainage system, designed by volunteer engineers. Paving has started on 52 miles of unpaved streets, and a new hospital is being built.

Storm Trooper Tactics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, recently the press gave widespread coverage to the "storm trooper" tactics employed by the Department of Internal Revenue against the small town of Fordyce, Ark.

I do not know whether the Members of this body have given serious consideration to the implications of the "IRS Vendetta." However, let me quote from the Declaration of Independence:

He has erected a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance.

This charge was directed against the King of England. Today it might well be directed against an agency of the U.S. Government.

I ask the Members of this body to think how such an inquisition as was carried out in the town of Fordyce, Ark., might be used by this powerful arm of Government to harass any community, or State, which was not acting in accord with the wishes of Big Brother.

The action of the Internal Revenue Service was not based on the authority of any elected official. It was carried out under the tremendous authority that has been vested in appointive officials who are immune to citizen appeal, the bureaucrats we cannot fire, the implementers, or the regulators—that is, those who write regulations alleged to interpret the intent of the law.

As a result of this "raid," business in Fordyce declined by 50 percent, according to the chamber of commerce.

Nor was the "raid" based on any particular evidence indicating that the citizens had been remiss in the payment of their taxes. It was a reminder that authority exists under present law, which permits an agency of Government to "send swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance." This is prior judgment on those not even suspect.

Under leave to extend and revise my remarks, the following article is inserted from the March 16 issue of the Joplin Globe:

TAX AGENT INVASION ENDS AT FORDYCE, ARK.

FORDYCE, ARK.—A task force of tax agents will move out of this southern Arkansas town Friday, leaving the 3,890 residents undecided about which is worse—death or taxes.

About 30 Internal Revenue Service men moved into the basement of the post office March 5 and began calling in taxpayers for audits of their returns.

The result was a 50-percent slump in business, the chamber of commerce said, and a mass case of nerves for the people of Fordyce and Dallas County, of which it is the county seat.

"The people aren't mad, they're hurt," said Kelsey Caplinger, who operated a men's clothing store. His tax return was checked and a fire loss was disallowed, but no penalty was assessed.

The IRS wouldn't say how many returns it checked, but Mayor Thomas Wynne, who also is an attorney and tax consultant, estimated the number at 1,000. The population of Dallas County is 10,522.

Fordyce's economy depends on the Fordyce Lumber Co., which employs about 700 men in turning the vast pine forests of southern Arkansas into lumber.

Some lumbermen have been allowed to deduct the cost of their gloves, Wynne said, and others have not.

Wynne is puzzled about his own business. "I'm licensed to practice in tax court," he said. "I've been doing returns for 10 years and things that I've always done are not being accepted."

The IRS said the survey was "an experimental thing, an effort to see if the operation could be made more useful and efficient."

But it's not what they did, said the mayor, it's the way that they did it. "One woman was called for a week in advance, and she worried and worried," he said. "Then when she got there, all they did was ask her if she had filed a tax return."

The town's weekly newspaper, the Fordyce News Advocate, criticized the IRS move. "This is a new experience for the people," wrote Editor Bill Whitehead in a front-page editorial. "They simply don't know what to expect."

Consequently, buying has stopped, and merchants say this month's business is ruined.

Withholding Tax on Dividends Strikes at Needy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in a few days now we will be called on to consider legislation reported out by the Ways and Means Committee that will affect nearly every American in every walk of life.

One section of the tax bill deals with withholding tax on dividends. It has been shown that many citizens, particularly those in the senior age group will be in a position where they will be unable to seek a waiver of the withholding provision.

Under unanimous consent I wish to submit herewith a letter from one of my constituents which is a case in point. Whether the income is $1,200, $1,500, or $2,000 a year from dividends serious problems can result if every penny and dollar due them is not received regularly.

Withholding of these dividends can materially affect the welfare of many senior citizens.

I submit herewith a letter dated March 9, 1962, from Mrs. Mildred Maddocks.

LA JOLLA, CALIF.,
March 9, 1962.

Hon. ROBERT WILSON,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WILSON: The dividend tax, coming up, is one of the most unfair taxes ever proposed by our Government. I hope, and pray, that you will vote against it. I dislike complaining and personal disclosures, however, I feel it might be helpful to thousands of people in the same position I find myself. I shall be 70 years old in September, and have worked most of my adult life, investing my savings in common stocks which bring me in just enough, with social security, for me to live on. My income from these stocks is under $1,200 per year. However, I pay no tax. Withholding any part of my dividend is bound to impose a severe hardship even though I can file for a refund. I need it all as soon as it is issued. My health is such that I am under a doctor's care regularly. Can one ask them to wait, because our Government sees fit to confiscate what is rightfully ours? Please do your best to kill this unfair legislation. I thank you, and wish you all luck.

Sincerely,

MILDRED MADDOKS.

The National Lottery of Denmark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the Members of this House the benevolent influence of the national lottery of Denmark.

Denmark, like the other countries where government controlled and operated lotteries are legal and proper, has reduced gambling to an orderly minimum by complete state control. They have no underworld problem and illegal betting is not the source of difficulty to the police as it is here in America.

The gross annual receipts of the Danish national lottery came to over $6 million last year and the profits to the Government were applied to the general fund of the treasury.

Mr. Speaker, we can derive a tremendous revenue here in the United States if we copied a page from the Denmark story. A national lottery in this country can bring into our coffers over $10 billion a year in new income which can help lower our income taxes and reduce our national debt.

Why cannot we follow the wisdom of our foreign friends?

Prudence in Tariffs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the March 1962 issue of the New Guard, the magazine of the conservative Young Americans for Freedom, included an editorial commenting on the current discussions on the trade proposal in which it made reference to a proposal which I offered during the 1955 considerations of extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. This proposal was offered in the Ways and Means Committee as an amendment to the extension bill and, although it was not under consideration on the floor, I commented on the idea in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 18, 1955. I am happy that the New Guard saw fit to bring this point once again into focus as a part of the tariff discussions.

The editorial follows:

PLEA FOR PRUDENCE

The President's request for far-reaching authority to negotiate with Common Market nations with the purpose of reducing tariff barriers and giving a boost to our precarious trade balance has been hailed by some conservatives. Indeed, the principle of free trade is one in which many conservatives believe inherently, just as they regard a free market economy as vital to progress in this country. And the fact that in 4 years, the Common Market nations of France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg, soon to be joined by Great Britain, have been able to challenge the U.S. economic superiority, has prompted many to support the President's request with few reservations.

President Kennedy is saying that we ought to reduce most of our tariff barriers so that we can "assure access of the products of our farms and factories to the world's largest markets outside our own." At the same time, accelerated trade between the nations of Western Europe and the United States is seen as presenting a strong economic defense against world communism.

Well and good. Certainly increased exports of agricultural products and manufactured goods will benefit the dangerously low balance of payments, serve to reinforce a lagging economy at home and increase international confidence in the U.S. dollar. But what of the effect of a substantial increase in imports at a time when many depressed industries are hardest hit by foreign-made products? Many businessmen and labor leaders have rightly pointed out that they cannot hope to compete with the low wage rates in countries such as Japan. Strong protectionists therefore will fight the President's request and hold out for an even higher tariff barrier.

We believe there is an area of just compromise where American exports can be increased, and some tariffs lowered, while domestic labor and business will be increased. It is the same reasonable approach which must be taken with farm subsidies: much as we dislike them, we cannot abolish them altogether without adequate safeguards.

We would call attention to a most interesting proposal made by Congressman TOM CURTIS when the reciprocal trade agreement was debated in 1958. He argued that foreign exporters should be required to match on a prorated basis American

wage scales in similar industries. "No one benefits from 'sweatshop' labor whether the sweatshop be in our country or in some country abroad," CURTIS said. He observed that the only way to increase foreign trade was to encourage foreign countries to build their own domestic markets through paying adequate wages.

The President has not yet intimated how he will use this new power to negotiate tariffs. Handling the trade problem is a delicate matter, and we cannot be sure that the President will always exercise prudence and restraint in negotiating tariffs with unlimited authority in his grasp.

The history of U.S. tariff policy had been one of substantially high tariffs until 1934, when F.D.R. requested and got the temporary power to lower tariffs within limits. That power still resides with the Executive. Until that time, the power to levy tariffs was constitutionally in the hands of Congress. When Congress delegated its authority to the Tariff Commission, the purpose at that time was merely to relieve legislators of the burden of studying the effect of foreign imports on every commodity from bicycles to mattresses, with the idea that the Commission was to make recommendations to be approved by Congress. Eventually, Congress lost much more of its tariff authority through the Executive agreement known as the General Agreement on Tariff and Trade (GATT) made by President Truman at Geneva in 1948.

Essentially, then, we feel Congress should guard most carefully its last vestiges of authority in the matter of foreign trade policy, for the history of increased Presidential power in this field, as in all others, teaches us that authority once surrendered to the Executive is never returned to the representatives of the people. Congress should proceed cautiously and prudently to work out a suitable program for expanding international trade, keeping in mind the equal welfare of American business and labor.

Working and Not Working on the Railroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the deficit in the railroad unemployment insurance fund has been of real concern to the members of our Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for some years. The fund, in order to meet its obligations, has borrowed from the railroad retirement account and now owes some $257 million in addition to some $30 million owed to the U.S. Treasury.

In addition, the railroad retirement fund has been running at a deficit for many years and Congress has not increased the tax to cure this deficit either in connection with the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act or in connection with the U.S. Railroad Retirement Act.

These deficits must be cured by congressional action.

The attached article by Nancy Ford taken from the magazine Modern Railroads of March 1962 points up the problem which these two funds are facing.

The article follows:

WORKING AND NOT WORKING ON THE RAILROAD

(By Nancy Ford)

On January 9, 1960, Melvin R., a railroad clerk with a total of 27 months' service and total earnings of $5,120, voluntarily quit his job. He moved around the country, collecting some $2,100 in railroad unemployment insurance benefits between February 9 and December 5, 1960.

Frank P., an electrician's helper, was discharged for nonpayment of union dues. He drew $937 in that year and $1,016 in the second year before benefits were exhausted—a total of $1,953—because he "didn't believe in joining any union."

George E., a freight handler, worked 14 months, earned $3,290. He was discharged November 22, 1957 (police record—"strong-arm robbery"). He drew unemployment insurance benefits of $810 between November 25, 1957, and April 26, 1958; $1,105 between July 2, 1958, and January 1, 1959; $213 for retroactive benefits under liberalizing 1959 amendments to the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; extended benefits of $640 between February 2 and May 10, 1959—a total of $2,768.

Marjorie E., worked 12 months in 1956, earning $3,886; 11 months in 1957, earning $3,511; 3 months in 1958, earning $884. She last "worked on the railroad" May 3, 1958. For her first child, born December 17, 1957, she received maternity benefits based on 1956 earnings, of $1,040; for her second child, born February 3, 1959, 9 months after last railroad employment, her maternity benefits, based on 1957 earnings, were $1,235. For her third child, born April 28, 1960, 24 months after last railroad employment, she received benefits, based on 1958 earnings, of $884. Total paid for this (would you call it planned parenthood?) was $3,159.

Isolated cases, you say? Not necessarily. Consider these facts: Under all State laws, employees may not obtain State unemployment benefits for voluntarily quitting a job. In many States disqualification is for the entire period of unemployment; and 17 States cancel or reduce benefit rights.

On the other hand, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act—supported by railroad contributions only, none from employees—provides only a 30-day disqualification.

In the 6 fiscal years ending June 30, 1961, a total of $35.1 million was paid to 55,900 persons who simply quit their jobs.

All State laws provide for disqualification of employees discharged for misconduct. Fifteen provide for disqualification for disciplinary suspension. The RUIA has no disqualification.

But railroad unemployment benefits paid in these categories in the 6-year period ending June 30, 1961, break down this way: $28.4 million to 39,600 persons who were discharged for misconduct; $6 million to 13,500 suspended.

One one State—Rhode Island—provides maternity benefits, with employees only contributing, and even there, they are regular sickness benefits limited to a total of 12 weeks.

In the same 6 fiscal years, railroad maternity benefits of $21.6 million were paid in approximately 22,000 cases; hundreds of these mothers also drew unemployment or sickness benefits in the same year.

Only 4 States pay sickness benefit, and all require employee contributions. Railroad sickness benefits are financed solely by the railroads.

In the 6 years ended June 30, 1961, railroad sickness benefits of $333.9 million were paid to 800,000 beneficiaries.

Still with me? With few exceptions, all State laws deny benefits to employees engaged in labor disputes. But the RUIA denies benefits only where the strike is in violation of provisions of the Railway Labor Act or established rules of the labor organizations.

Railroad workers on strike or unable to perform their duties because of picket lines have collected over $18 million since January 1, 1955. The tieup by a handful of men of the New York Harbor area a year ago cost the RUI a cool million dollars.

The protracted steel strike in 1959 cost the RUI fund $29 million in benefits to rail workers furloughed because of the sharp drop in freight loadings. There is certainly no quarrel with this. But the fund had to pay 253 steel workers $153,325 in benefits because they had worked on a railroad in 1958.

In this same 6-year period, a total of $75 million in unemployment and sickness benefits was paid to 145,000 persons, age 65 and over, who, potentially at least, were entitled to annuities under the Railroad Retirement Act.

These payments, says Thomas M. Healy, management member of the U.S. Railroad Retirement Board, resulted from employees deferring the effective dates of annuities until comparatively larger unemployment or sickness benefits had been exhausted.

It is inequities like these that have helped push the railroad unemployment system into serious financial trouble.

The unemployment insurance account owes the railroad retirement account, including accrued interest, some $257 million. (It also owes the U.S. Treasury $30 million which was borrowed, interest-free, to pay for the cost of temporarily extending unemployment benefits to inactive railroad workers with less than 10 years of service. This loan is being repaid by railroads through an increase of 0.25 percent in contributions starting January 1 of this year.)

About 6 years ago, there was a $350 million credit in the RUI account. But a number of factors switched the account to the deficit track:

Railroad freight volume has been slipping, and the last three recessions, plus the 1959 steel strike and others, haven't helped. Naturally, railroad employment has also slipped to approximately 830,000—50 percent below 1946. In 1959—when benefits were liberalized and made retrocative to include January 1, 1958—the force numbered 949,000. Obviously, when employment drops, benefits go up. Besides, the 1959 amendments are estimated to have cost some $242 million, including inequities then permitted to remain in the act.

Assuming that employment will average as much as 850,000 and taxable payroll is $4.3 billion a year, the deficit projected for June 30, 1966, will be a thumping $300 million.

Mr. Healy believes this deficit could be largely cured by these simple actions: Remove inequities in the RUI Act of the type described, which have cost the railroads about $20 million a year. Let employees share equally in financing sickness benefits, which have averaged over $55 million per year.

There's more trouble: The railroad retirement fund is also running a deficit—$77 million a year—despite accelerating taxes on both employer and employee. The reason: over-generous liberalization in the face of declining railroad employment and taxable payroll.

Again, Mr. Healy believes this red ink could be largely erased by (1) increasing the

interest paid by the Treasury on the balance in the retirement account (some $4 billion) from the 3 percent now provided by law to 3.5 percent; and (2) through payment by the Government of some $142 million due for military service credits.

Surely the most starry-eyed liberal will agree that gambling with the solvency of social insurance funds is a dangerous business. Congress should plug every loophole in these.

Communist Blueprint Latin America Takeover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, the Tablet is a Catholic Weekly published in Brooklyn and has wide circulation, particularly in the northeastern part of the country. In its issue of January 20 it presented an article regarding Communist plans for action in Latin America which I am glad to be able to place in the RECORD today. My reasons for submitting the article to the readers of the RECORD and recommending that it have careful study will be apparent to all who read it. It will not attempt to restate them here. The article follows:

COMMUNIST BLUEPRINT LATIN AMERICA TAKEOVER

(By Aloysius J. Owen, S.J.)

(NOTE.—The following article by a formerly pro-Castro Jesuit in South America was translated by Rev. Aloysius J. Owen, S.J., of the faculty of modern language at Fordham University. Father Owen, who has studied at institutions in Bogotá, Colombia, and Havana, as well as the University of Vienna and the Sorbonne, Paris, was chairman of the department of languages at Brooklyn Prep from 1941–47. He was in a similar capacity at Lemoyne College, Syracuse, for two years, then served as chairman of its industrial relations department from 1949–61, when he came to Fordham.)

In order to understand the Communist blueprint for taking over Latin America, we must start with the meeting held in Moscow, November-December, 1960, which issued the Declaration of December, 1960. This declaration, among other things, stated:

"Our era, which is marked by the transition from capitalism to socialism, is one of conflict between two opposing social systems. It is an age of Socialist revolution and national liberation, of the breakdown of imperialism and the abolition of colonialism. It is a period of the transition by more and more peoples to the Socialist way, the epoch of the triumph of communism on a worldwide scale."

This is the basic significance of this meeting of the Communist leaders from 82 countries: It is the resurrection of the Comintern, and thus marks the beginning of a new historical stage. This importance is underlined by the fact that only two leaders were absent: Palmiro Togliatti, head of the Italian Communist Party, and Mao Tse-tung, head of the Chinese Communist Party. Their absence, however, brings no comfort to the fond hopes of our liberals since, as we shall see, it was motivated by purely tactical differences of opinion between Moscow and the Italian and Chinese leaders.

REASONS FOR SOVIET SUMMIT

There were several reasons for the calling of this meeting, some of them publicized, others concealed.

The admitted reasons were the failure of the summit in Paris; Khrushchev's lack of success during his second visit to the United States to bring about the resignation of the U.N. General Secretary and his replacement by the troika; tactical disagreement between Moscow and Peiping due to Mao's insistence that Asia be labeled a soft zone, that is, one where expansion would be attempted without risk of war, and his rejection of Khrushchev's defensive coexistence policy which he regarded as retarding the worldwdie advance of communism; the need to restore unity in the Communist world, to reevaluate the character of the age, and to lay down a strategy and tactic consonant with the actuality and the broad objectives decided upon.

Unpublicized reasons were the recognition of an atmosphere of general stagnation; the envisioning of the possibility of a sharp switch in American foreign policy under the new administration; the fear that the African Continent, due to its backwardness and the weakness of its nationalist movements and its Communist Parties, might well be, with the exception of the Congo and Angola, an obstacle rather than a powerful ally in the struggle against the white man and against the West; the consideration that it was quite likely that Asia might no longer be soft because of the unknown equation of the Kennedy administration and that any attempt at expansion might have serious repercussions on communism in that area; recognition of the fact that in Europe, because of NATO and the attitude of the workers, any frontal attack would be out of the question, the more so that the risk of a general conflict was to be avoided; and finally, the realization of the logistical impossibility of effectively aiding Fidel Castro and his revolution which made it imperative to concentrate on the Latin American Continent, not only because of existing opportunities there but also because of its importance in the struggle against the United States.

The principal conclusions reached at the Moscow meeting were that the Moscow-Peiping rift was to be soft-pedaled since it could not be healed due to the adherence to the Peiping viewpoint of Albania and some of the Latin American Communist Parties; that Togliatti's thesis be accepted, that is, that parliamentarianism be utilized as a road to power because of the admitted strgenth of the Italian Communist Party and popular aversion to violence on a national scale; Spain be labeled a "hard" zone on account of the lessons learned from the Moroccan experience which resulted in General Franco's mobilizing 60,000 troops, hundreds of planes and tanks and numerous warships, inducing the new king of Morocco to renounce for the moment his offensive; Portugal be regarded as vulnerable due to the situation in Angola, possessions so distant and so difficult to defend by herself, and, further, since Portugal might be softened by attempts to overthrow the Salazar government and thus bring about a new political situation menacing Spain and the whole defensive system of the western Mediterranean and of Western Europe.

At the meeting it was also decided to intensify the campaign to discredit the Franco regime with the possibility of influencing France, England and the United States to change their policy.

It was suggested such a campaign might find sympathy in certain liberal quarters in the United States, particularly in the State Department, due to the well-known "soft" attitude of Stevenson, as evidenced by his statements on Red China and Angola. It was decided, too, that violence should be stepped up in Angola, full support given to Hispano-Portuguese democrats, and that a smear campaign be started against Salazar—all this to be done under the slogan of democracy rather than that of communism. This was the lesson learned from the tactics so effectively employed in Cuba and which were now to be extended to the Communist movement in general and to the Latin American continent in particular.

Great emphasis was placed on the tactic to be followed. There should be no attacks on the clergy, with, of course, some exceptions. The Christian Democrats would be conned into joining the general campaign. The liberal clergy should be enrolled. The Basque Separatists and front men of the Second Republic such as Indalecio Prieto and Martinez Barrios should be reemployed. The tactics used in the Cuban revolution were stressed, tactics whereby the bourgeoisie and the liberal clergy, albeit unwittingly, were the first collaborators.

Communist action is to be centered on Latin America rather than on Europe and Africa. This was the most important decision made at the meeting. Communist strategists held, and in this both Moscow and Peiping concurred, that it is on this continent that the greatest gains can be made. This judgment is confirmed by what happened in Cuba.

FERTILE GROUND FOR UPRISINGS

The reasons adduced by the Communists for this strategy are:

1. Latin America is potentially a focal point for civil wars and revolutions because of its backwardness and the poverty of its people.

2. Its democracies are weak. Dictatorships of the past have been replaced by self-seeking, corrupt oligarchies which are bereft of any inspiration or ideals, or any drive for social justice. As a result there is discontent among the masses, disillusionment with democracy, and an undercurrent of violence that the least spark might set off.

3. Latin America affords excellent opportunities for fomenting anti-Americanism which is already widespread for well-known reasons. There are many capitalist enterprises, most of them of North American provenance, which exploit men and resources. This gives rise to further feelings of hatred and breeds extremely aggressive nationalist movements.

4. The Latin American press is enslaved by capitalism and incapable of carrying on an effective campaign at once against Communist infiltration as well as against the deficiencies of the democrats who have paralyzed the nationalist revolutions after they started.

5. Throughout Latin America there has grown up an intelligensia quite skeptical of democracy and more and more attracted to communism.

6. In Latin America there is no democratic, continentwide labor movement, one that is at the same time anti-Communist and fights the abuses of capitalism.

7. Latin America is infested with governmental and party leaders who out of fear of being smeared as reactionaries and due to their reliance on mass support become easy marks for the Communists, who push them to the extreme left, especially in economic matters. As a result, national strength is divided and political unrest and economic paralysis aggravate working conditions and lower the already low levels of living of the masses.

8. Communist psychological warfare has succeeded in creating a psychosis, the complex, the conviction that the triumph of communism over moribund capitalism is historically inevitable.

9. The conquest of Cuba by Fidel Castro and the Communists has made a tremendous impression on the masses and on mi-

norities. No effective counteroffensive has been undertaken against it and the only reason why the impact has not been greater is that Castro-Communists have made their own mistakes.

RESULTS OF TAKEOVER

What, then, would be the result of a Communist takeover of the whole or a part of Latin America? First, the United States would be deprived of important strategic war materials; second, the existence of a hostile continent would force it to withdraw its advanced defenses and thus weaken the general defense of the West; third, the vast moats of the oceans which have always formed part of the defensive system of the United States would lose much of their value; fourth, the encirclement of the United States would be virtually complete, with a resultant sensational change in world strategy. "The second great revolution, the simultaneous uprising of the former colonies of Spain and Portugal, today dependencies of Yankee imperialism."

Did the Communists realize in the first few months the full import of the Castro revolution? Apparently not. The first to appreciate the significance for communism that Castro would win and consolidate his government in Cuba was the author of the above statement, Lombardo Toledano. It was he that called upon the masses in Mexico to broaden the present movement and bring it to its triumph from Cuba to Mexico. It was this that made the Communists realize what a golden opportunity Cuba presented: Cuba that was but a scarce 90 miles away from the enemy, the United States.

It was then that Moscow, which had been undermining Cuba for decades, realized the full meaning of Castro and his Cuba, and converted his revolution into what it had converted Spain in the thirties. From this moment on the Communists set out to make Cuba a base from which the continent could be taken over.

OPERATION AMERICA IN GEAR

Then it was that the Cuban revolution, which began as a national uprising against the tyranny of Batista, took on a new look: externally acquiring the character of an anti-imperialist revolution; internally, that of a democratic-bourgeois revolution in full course with a tendency imposed by the Communists toward its ultimate fulfillment; namely, a Socialist revolution.

Cuba has become a continental problem. In the Moscow declaration Cuba merits special mention. "The victory of the peoples' revolution in Cuba has become a splendid example for the peoples of Latin America. All Socialist countries and the international working class and the Communist movement consider it a duty to assist morally and materially those peoples who are striving to free themselves from imperialist and colonial tyrannies."

Obviously, in the general plan for world communism, Latin America by way of Cuba is one of the most important objectives. And Communist strategists regard this objective as capable of attainment within a relatively short period of time.

No longer do the local Communists in Cuba and in the other countries on the continent control their decisions. Moscow has become the brain center of Operation America. Long-term plans have already been drawn up by its technicians for both political and military strategy. Operation America is now the most important objective for world communism.

Now we shall see in detail the blueprint for Latin America. Areas of the world are categorized by the Communist technicians "hard" or "soft," based upon ease or difficulty of infiltration. In Latin America the following zones are labeled "soft": Mexico, Central America, Colombia, Peru. This is by no means an exhaustive list, but its main import is that it covers an area extending from the border of the United States to the ABC powers of the continent.

TARGET: MEXICO

Mexico, with its prestige as a great Hispano-American power, would be decisive for the communization of all Latin America. Communist experts believe that all the conditions favorable to success are to be found in Mexico. They are well aware that these conditions are to be taken advantage of judiciously, lest failure here jeopardize the overall plan. The Mexican phase of Operation America has been approved by both Moscow and Peiping, a further confirmation that the Latin American democracies and misguided liberals among us will be able to find little hope in a rift between Mao and Khrushchev.

The Communist offensive is to be conducted according to plan. A massive drive is to be inaugurated to convince the Mexican masses that their leaders have sold out the Mexican revolution to Yankee imperialism on the economic level. The line to be inculcated is that just as after the glorious revolutions of reform and the struggle against Maximilian, all efforts to overthrow the tyranny of the Dictator Porfirio Diaz failed, so too the revolution has been perverted into capitalist conservatism and handed over to Yankee imperialism since the days of the regime of Avila Camacho.

The line is stressed that as in the period of the Porfirian dictatorship, so too at present there have been great developments in the national economy but not sufficient for the needs of the masses nor consonant with the possibilities of the nation. There still exist backwardness and poverty alongside the most luxurious residential sections in America, as well as the richest presidents and ex-presidents in the world.

The Revolutionary Party is to be portrayed as the political arm of an antidemocratic, corrupt oligarchy. An intensive campaign is to be launched to free Siqueiros and Vallejo, the former to be hailed as a great artist, the latter as a great labor leader. The charge is to be reiterated that the revolution has been betrayed, that the constitution has been violated by permitting the resurgence of the clergy.

Efforts are to be intensified among the student faction by personal contacts and by the dissemination of political and scientific literature sent to Mexico and by the dispatch of selected students to the political and terroristic training centers in Havana. The Cuban revolution is to be held before their eyes as an example and as a contrast to that of Mexico. Cuba has done more in 2 years than Mexico has done in 50 to create an authentic revolutionary socialistic state.

The time limit for this project, Operation America, has been set at 3 years. However, the Moscow directors needed a leader to organize the revolutionary process. The need was especially pressing since neither Betancourt of Venezuela, nor Figueres of Costa Rica, nor Haya de la Torre of Peru showed the slightest indication of willingness to be unconditional cats paws of Moscow. This fact and the urgent necessity to initiate the project resulted in the decision to hold the conference for National Sovereignty, Economic Emancipation, and Peace."

At this conference immediate tasks were assigned and the principal leaders instructed. Most important of all, the leader of the Second Continental Revolution was chosen. Despite strong opposition, Gen. Lazaro Cardenas was chosen as the great man. He was handpicked by Moscow, an admirable choice, for he is a legendary figure for a great many Mexicans and especially so for the rest of Latin America.

There was launched at this conference, too, a smear campaign against President Lopez Mateos of Mexico, Betancourt of Venezuela, Figueres of Costa Rica, and Haya de la Torre of Peru, a campaign that had begun before the conference as is evidenced by an article from the Mexican press. Says Rico, one of the editors of Siempre: "Under the banner of Cardenas, under the mantle of his greatness, Ibero-America will unite in Mexico to win the battle of Cuba."

RED PLANKS

The fundamental planks of the platform drawn up at this conference by Cardenas, Vilma Espin de Castro, Heriberto Jara and a small group of experts were as follows: (1) Make the Common Market the slogan of the peoples of Latin America, (2) step up the anti-Yankee campaign throughout Latin America and take advantage of the mistakes made by the United States in its Latin American relations, (3) strive for solidarity with Cuba and organize emergency brigades to fight in her behalf, (4) advocate the expansion of commerce with the Soviet bloc, (5) urge the admission of Red China into the United Nations, (6) reinforce exposed party leaders with cadres brought in from the Leninist schools in Havana and organize the illegal underground operations of the party, (7) promote solidarity among the various parties by political and financial support, (8) keep close contact with Brazil where, if matters follow their present course, there are excellent prospects of success, (9) study the plan and implement the program of action drawn up at Havana in October 1960, (10) establish a new Central Union for Latin America and set up a constituent congress for this purpose to be located either in Havana or in Montevideo.

According to the general plan laid down by Moscow, it is advisable to create and exploit new personalities and martyrs especially youth from the working class or of university background.

Although the clerical accomplices of imperialism, in particular Falangist priests and missionaries, are to be attacked, it is emphasized that exception be made as to some priests as well as the Christian Democrats, in keeping with the experience of Cuba, in order to hide the real nature of the revolution with which they are collaborating.

The general plan envisages the possibility that Cuba will be lost through an invasion supported by the United States. This of course was designed before the fiasco of the Bay of Pigs invasion.

PRESCRIPTION FOR REVOLT

If there is failure of the Cuban revolution due to U.S. intervention, the blueprint details the acceleration of the stages to be followed relying on other Latin American bases for the communization of the continent.

The plan foresees, too, that even if Castro should be overthrown, it would only be at great cost of life and that this could motivate an extensive campaign to mobilize public opinion throughout Latin America against the brutality of the Colossus of the North.

In the event that a pro-Communist revolution should break out on the continent, then as quickly as possible the following procedure should be adopted: (1) Destroy all capitalist economic and industrial institutions even at the cost of the resultant disorder and confusion, (2) abolish the professional army and replace it with a peoples' militia controlled by the party, (3) banish the church and wipe out the spiritual influence of the clergy, avoiding at the same time fanatical reaction by setting up a national clergy which will soon become the tool of the revolution, (4) introduce as soon as possible the Soviet school system utilizing the specialists already trained for this purpose in Moscow, Prague, and Havana, (5) multiply the cells in labor unions and provoke strikes and other conflicts to divide the working class and weaken the influence of their present leaders, (6) at the opportune moment, extend the Cuban type of terrorist action to all countries on the continent

utilizing the specialists now being trained in Havana under the direction of the Spaniard Bayor and others already recruited from Mexico.

This extensive plan of subversion by the Communists and their fellow travelers is liberally financed by the Soviet Union, Red China and the satellites. Cuba is the distribution center.

In addition to huge expenditures for propaganda, large sums have been earmarked for suborning officials, the press and periodicals. Agents are to infiltrate the staffs of periodicals, broadcasting stations, radio and television studios, in order to insert tendentious material on suitable occasions.

Cells are to be created in all media of communications. In every business enterprise cells are to be formed that will permit control of the operations and serve as a source of information. Party members are instructed to worm their way into confidential positions such as private secretaries, archivists, etc. The base of the party is to be broadened by the formation of new cells which will foment strikes and widespread sabotage at a given moment. Particular attention is to be paid to railroad workers, truckdrivers, telephone, electrical workers and longshoremen. The food, entertainment and surgical industries are to be infiltrated in order to bring about the utmost confusion and disorder as a prelude to any general uprising. Illegal strategy is to be combined with legal in order to prevent party activity from being disrupted by governmental repression.

Peripheral tactics are to be adopted; i.e., action must begin in the provinces rather than in the capitals, since in the provinces the power of the State is less and the news of the uprising will receive greater publicity. The uprisings are not to be simultaneous but rather staged so that the masses will gradually become accustomed to violence and the government will not be so alarmed as to take repressive measures. Strikes, sabotage and riots are the three basic means to be utilized in the prerevolutionary phase. Of course, all the techniques of the old Comintern as well as the new lessons learned from the Cuban revolution are to be employed.

All of Latin America is regarded as "soft" for this type of action, especially because of the ineffectiveness of governmental organization and widespread venality on the part of officials. It is held to be of the utmost importance that combat groups be organized which will function as the nucleus for guerrilla movements or for the so-called peoples' militia.

Activists are strictly warned that the signal for the general offensive is to be given by Moscow and Moscow alone, lest miscalculations lead to premature action which might jeopardize the general plan and alert the government to take repressive measures.

SET UP FALSE LEADERS

Ostensibly the direction of the parties will be entrusted to old-time militant Communists already well-known and whose detention will not harm the activity of the party. This will disconcert the police and impart to the public the impression that the party is beyond the reach of the government.

The actual directory will comprise the following: for Argentina, Vitorio Codovola; for Cuba, Lazaro Pena, Blas Roca, Carlos Rafael Rodrigues and Juan Marinello; for Chile, Elias Lafferte, Cesar Godoy and Antonio Marchan; for Mexico, Lombardo Toledano and Antonio Garcia; for Uruguay, Rodney Arizmendi and Enrique Pastorino.

They will have as auxiliaries in each country various front organizations. The actual direction, however, will come from Moscow. Its agents come and go utilizing the diplomatic services and working with impunity in the embassies of Russia, Poland, and Czechoslovakia.

Soviet embassies in Cuba and Mexico are headquarters of the conspiracy against Latin America. In Cuba the ambassador is assisted by the Spaniards Herminio Almendros and Jose Luis Garcia and by the specialist on religion, Nicholas Estrougay, as by Che Guevara and Raoul Castro. The Mexican conspirators are as yet unidentified although it is suspected that among them are the Spanish writer Luis Suarez, Cesar Pelareu and some supposed ex-Communists.

In addition to the above mentioned diplomatic channels, there is a system of contacts that becomes more effective and extensive day by day. From Mexico to Argentina there is a network of clandestine radio transmitters. In southern Mexico in particular there are several that link Cuba and Central America. Messages are received in code by public broadcasting stations and then are rebroadcast throughout the continent. Commercial stations, too, are used and coded messages inserted into seemingly innocent advertisements.

Numerous agents travel between Cuba and Mexico and Central America by ship and plane but often, too, by small, fast craft which ply the waters between Cuba and Yucatan and Guatemala. In Havana there is a training school for agents and a shop where documents and passports are forged under the expert direction of Russian specialists. Latin American currencies are counterfeited and at a given signal will flood the continent bringing about financial panic and popular uprisings.

These same agents regularly smuggle subversive literature into Latin America and the Mexican border is an avenue for spreading Communist propaganda and an underground railway for Communist contacts with the centers of espionage in North America.

CONSPIRACY WELL UNDERWAY

Evidently a great Communist conspiracy is well underway throughout the Western Hemisphere, and particularly throughout Latin America. The Castro-Cuban formula is being followed and improved upon. Not a single nation or territory in the hemisphere from Canada to Tierra del Fuego is immune, not only independent nations but also such areas as the Guianas, Trinidad, Martinique, Puerto Rico, etc.

This vast conspiracy is directed by brains of the highest order centered in Moscow, and led by fanatical idealists who have profited by 40 years of experience in fomenting and winning revolutions. They have at their command practically limitless financial subsidies. Behind them is the vast economic power of the Soviet Union with its immense resources, its increasing prestige, especially among the so-called neutrals and the former colonial areas, and its constant gains against the West.

Politically, it has succeeded in extending communism over half the world; scientifically, it has won acclaim by its spectacular achievements in space with its sputnik and its first spacemen.

This Communist peril is not a phrase for political propaganda, of Red baiting, as so often charged by our blind, so-called liberals who have obtained a monopoly of the American press. It is an actuality.

Communism is now on the march not only in Europe, not only in Asia, not only in Africa but most important for the United States, on our doorstep in Cuba and throughout the Latin American continent which will bring about a series of revolutions and civil wars devastating the good neighbor for years to come and enslaving our brothers to the south, ideologically and economically, to Soviet Russia and to Red China, unless Americans awaken to the danger.

Story of How Convair Saved Atlas Retold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Drew Pearson column on the plans to scrub the Atlas, and how Convair saved the project, from the San Diego Evening Tribune:

STORY OF HOW CONVAIR SAVED ATLAS RETOLD

(By Drew Pearson)

WASHINGTON.—A lot of people were behind the success of Lt. Col. John Glenn, Jr., as he, himself, so often reminded the American people. Among these unsung heroes on the sidelines, perhaps none deserve more credit for putting Project Mercury into orbit than a big businessman, Floyd Odlum, and a little-known Belgian engineer, Karel J. Bossart.

Odlum, who had purchased Consolidated Vultee, better known as Convair, sank $20 million of the firm's money into perfecting the giant Atlas at a time when the Defense Department had washed its hands of the project and when Odlum's directors were demanding that he show profits instead of losses.

However, he and Bossart were convinced that it was the space weapon of the future. They kept on working. Had it not been for their determination and Convair's money, Glenn would not have made his historic flight at the time he did.

Actually the Atlas, or the MX-774 as it was then called, got started in 1945, the year the war ended, as the brainchild of Bossart, working for Convair. On April 22, 1946, $1.4 million was allotted by the Pentagon to develop the Atlas, but in 1947, with economy in the air and the United States reducing its armed strength, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, then Chief of Staff, okayed cutting off funds.

The Pentagon's project engineer, Albert Lombard, objected and wrote an interoffice memo that the new missile "must receive backing financially on a scale somewhat of the magnitude of the German [rocket] activities at Peenemunde."

Despite this, the Atlas was killed. However, both Odlum and Bossart refused to give in. And the inside story of the struggle inside the Pentagon to keep the giant rocket alive was told by this writer and Jack Anderson in the book "USA—Second-Class Power?" in 1958, as follows:

"Bossart built a miniature Atlas and shipped it to Washington for a final appeal to the generals. Convair's Washington representative, Richard Swanson, worked hard to get the brass lined up for a meeting. For some reason the model of the Atlas was delayed and didn't arrive until 1:50 p.m., 10 minutes before the Air Force brass were scheduled to arrive.

"'Get that crate open' ordered Swanson anxiously. But the crate had been put together with long screws driven into the wood by machine. The model was almost as secure as in a bank vault. For an hour, as the generals fumed and fretted, workmen, stripped to the waist, struggled to pry the crate open. When at last they succeeded, they found the missile had been broken during their battle with the box. The impatient generals snorted and walked out.

"Thus Convair lost the reprieve for the Atlas, not for lack of a nail, but because of too many screws.

"In desperation, Bossart turned to his boss, Floyd Odlum, who nodded his balding, freckled head. 'Keep the project going,' he ordered. So Convair dipped into its own treasury while the generals poured out money on the Snark, a nonballistic, air-breathing weapon which proved to be relatively obsolete before it became operational.

"Floyd Odlum, chairman of Convair, came in for a lot of criticism from the Navy when he built the giant B-36, which in 1946 was the biggest long-range bomber ever produced. The admirals charged—unfairly—that he had got the contract because of his friendship with STUART SYMINGTON, then Assistant Secretary of War. This criticism got plenty of headlines.

"But getting no headlines, in fact kept secret until this day, is the fact that Odlum spent around $20 million of Convair's own money to construct the Atlas and that this expenditure materially helped the long-range development of an intercontinental ballistic missile.

"By 1951, however, Convair's directors were pressing Odlum to run a red ink line through the entire Atlas project. It was costing too much money. So Swanson was sent back to the Pentagon to see what he could do. He managed to corner Lt. Gen. Don Putt, the Air Force's research chief.

"Putt listened grim faced as Swanson explained that Convair directors felt the firm was scraping the bottom of its cash register. Without authority from superiors, the general promised to turn over $500,000 of his research funds to Convair to save the Atlas from extinction. 'I have just found half a million dollars,' he said, 'in the bottom of the drawer.'

"The tribulations of the Atlas were not over by any means. Although its life was saved, it had to survive on the most meager of diets. Convair invested more of its own money in the construction of the huge Atlas plant in San Diego at the same time the Air Force was providing free plants for Boeing to build bombers. Bombers would soon be out of date. Missiles were the weapons of the future. But it was much easier at that time to get appropriations for conventional bombers than for unconventional missiles."

Glenn has reported to Pentagon officials that the honky-tonk atmosphere of Cape Canaveral is a poor environment for America's space program. He criticized the striptease joints and betting parlors that have sprung up around the cape. However, the entire space program will soon move to Houston—thanks to Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON, head of the space agency, who wants to put everything in Texas. The seven astronauts have worked together as such a close and congenial team that they object to being separated. Space Administrator James Webb wants to separate them in order to train other astronauts, but they are protesting. The space agency has assigned a fulltime secretary to Glenn's home to help him answer those bagfulls of fan mail.

Indian Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. BATTIN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 20 appeared a statement concerning Indian affairs. This article was read by Mr. Bob Yellowtail of the Crow Indian Tribe. Mr. Yellowtail's answer to these charges is as follows:

Much furor and fuss over the termination of the Indians from their trust status and the complete abolishment of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, has been urged over the years in the press and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This was not done by the Indians themselves, but by non-Indians, and the purposes, personal or otherwise, are not clearly known.

Past congressional investigations, bills for abolishment, and recommendations are referred to in the hopes of influencing Members of Congress who do not know many of the implications and resulting complications if such action is taken by Congress. It is also in the further hope of squashing future requests for appropriations to carry on the work of the Bureau for the Indians. Recent issues of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD state the latest blasts of such people. In reference to H.R. 108, announcing the policy of Congress in this matter, it is spoken of as a sacred piece of legislation that has been stifled by Indian Bureau adherents.

Every question has two sides. The proponents of termination of the trust status of all Indians, and the abolishment of the Indian Bureau, have repeatedly stated their case to the press and before both Houses of of Congress. Those holding negative views have, for some reason, withheld their replies and fire, and in no way have they been as vocal. It is submitted that they, too, have their right to be heard, and it is the purpose of this statement to do so in the hopes that the true picture of this much-discussed question, with all of its implications, might be made available to the Congress. It is essential to know what will happen if the proponents of this question win. If this does occur, what will happen? We have two examples of what has happened when a tribe has been terminated and the trust is thrust upon an unready people. Two tribes, the Klamath and the Menominee were terminated as the proponents wished and following is an account of what happened.

In the case of the Klamaths of Oregon, the lands, timber, and other natural resources of this tribe were individualized and fee ownership of such was turned over to members of the tribe who had demanded the termination. This was 2 years ago. In most cases, the lands, per capita payments amounting to several thousands per person, and the per capita shares of the timber have all been squandered and dissipated and the recipients of this action are now subjects for public welfare and assistance. It is a case where the Government and States must now step forth to take up and assume the expense tab.

In the Menominee case, their representatives to the big Chicago Indian convention last summer were quarreling among themselves publicly before the convention and each faction accused the other of being responsible for the economic, social, and other plights that were brought upon them by their termination actions. Their tirades were bitter and confirmed the fact that economic chaos results when termination is forced upon Indians who, by reason of inadequate education and a lack of the necessary business experience, cannot survive in the highly competitive economic order that we all struggle in today. It becomes increasingly more difficult to hammer and eke out an existence and living for ourselves and those dependent upon us for their food, shelter, and clothing. It is to help prepare the Indians for this life-and-death struggle against the economic forces of the business world of our country that the Indian Bureau was established. Those who urgently press the Congress for termination apparently take no thought of the fact that the Indians, whose theories and ideologies of life and laws of nature are the exact opposite of the white man, have a long way to go before they are ready for the white man's way of life. Under every circumstance, they need to be taught and led, step by step and with much patience, along the white man's path of life. Often, too much eagerness is exhibited and, based upon political or other expediencies, quick termination is urged upon the Congress by those who don't know or for ulterior or personal reasons. The Congress should weigh such requests in the light of the certain negative results, and what has just happened to the Klamaths and Menominees, the future economic well-being of the tribes to be terminated. The Governments pays in social security and other benefits if it makes a mistake.

Will those responsible for writing the long letter placed in the RECORD by Congressman Bow, of Ohio, be ready with cash from their own pockets to assist those of the Menominee and Klamath Tribes and any others who will follow when they are terminated and in financial and economic distress? Of course not. They will be far away in comfortable financial circumstances, paying no attention whatsoever to Indians suffering the results of their urging the termination of people wholly unprepared to assume the financial and other economic burdens suddenly thrust upon them. Will those men, whoever they are, who have been urging termination of the trust for all Indians, and the immediate abolishment of the Indian Bureau, guarantee:

1. The continued education of the Indians to a point of self-sufficiency?

2. Their economic rehabilitation to the point of self-sufficiency?

3. Their equal respect and equal administration of justice and protection before the courts?

4. Their equal opportunity to work and earn a livelihood in the labor markets and with the labor unions who control the right to work in our country?

5. That when terminated, they will live in peace socially, politically, and be free from all discrimination because of or on account of race?

6. That when terminated, they will always receive social justice as being the first Americans?

7. That they will not be discriminated against in public eating places in towns near their homes and elsewhere?

8. That they will not be discriminated against in public amusement places?

9. That they will not be discriminated against in public rooming houses?

10. That they will not be discriminated against on account of race in banks or other State or Federal loaning institutions?

11. That they will not be discriminated against in State public schools and classrooms on account of race?

12. That on account of race they will not be discriminated against in public hospitals?

These are some of the questions following in the wake of termination and those urging termination should be ready to meet them on behalf of those they have terminated, and to justify the resulting expense in social security benefits and other benefits that will follow.

Indian reservations are the lands and homes of tribes; they love them and should not be forced to leave against their will. If the land base is sufficient, they can live in peace and happiness on it. This they cannot do anywhere else in the United States as every acre of land is now owned by the whites.

Indian reservations can be made a heaven for them, where many discriminations do not exist, if the administration in power selects officers trusted with control and management. These officers must have the milk of human kindness flowing through their veins and will administer the power and trust en-

trusted in them to rule in accordance with the Bill of Rights, the Constitution, and the golden rule. They must also pay especial attention and effort to the education and economic rehabilitation of the Indians, and take advantage of the commercial opportunities offered by the respective reservations instead of letting them out to non-Indians as has been the rule. They must also treat the Indians with courtesy as American citizens entitled to every right and privilege claimed by other Americans. It is respectfully submitted that under such a rule, the Indians will speedily assume their proper places in the body politic of our country and be contributing individuals. This is the ultimate aim of Government and should not be denied the Indians.

Department of Urban Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIBORNE PELL

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech by a prominent American builder and urban redeveloper, James H. Scheuer. Mr. Scheuer is well known in this Capital City as a pioneer in the redevelopment of Southwest Washington. What is more important, Mr. Scheuer is a student of the common problems all American urban areas face today. The spectacle of urban encroachment into nearby suburban areas and the open land surrounding them is a complicated problem for the urban districts of my own State of Rhode Island and for cities all across the United States of America.

The defeat by Congress of the proposal for a Department of Urban Affairs at the Cabinet level postpones a solution to many urban problems. It is therefore even more important that we become fully informed about these problems. As president of the Renewal and Development Corp. in New York City, and a pioneer redeveloper of urban areas, James H. Scheuer is eminently qualified to tell the story.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY JAMES H. SCHEUER, PRESIDENT OF RENEWAL AND DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, NEW YORK, N.Y., BEFORE THE WOMAN'S NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 15, 1962

Ladies and gentlemen it is a privilege to talk to you today about the mounting problems of America's urban areas. I know that this audience is particularly aware of today's issues and that I may speak frankly and fully about our cities and their rapid encroachment on nearby suburban areas. This encroachment, as many of you are aware, is creating new slums for the future.

Such new slums in suburbia can only be prevented by facing up to a number of today's urban problems.

Our population growth is pushing out in all directions, and bringing with it the tragic wreckage of our most scarce and precious national asset—open land.

At the present time we have no overall planning, no philosophy in the development of a community.

The uncharted growth is producing miles upon miles of boxtops with barbecue pits attached, parking lots but no trees. This is clear testimony that growth without planning leads to the creation of unsound, sterile communities. These are slums of the future which we are creating by neglecting the present problem.

We were disappointed that the Congress did not see fit to create this year a Department of Urban Affairs at the Cabinet level. Although Congress has delayed, the growth of urban problems do not. A Department of Urban Affairs is urgently needed for the following reasons: To provide essential planning and coordination, technical assistance, financial assistance, counsel on the sensitive human problems involved and education in the communities themselves to help them work out their own destiny.

Today two-thirds of our people are living in cities and yet the U.S. Congress and the State legislatures are dominated by rural representatives who speak and vote on behalf of rural families.

Neighboring Maryland and Virginia are classic examples of State legislators predominantly representative of rural counties, and their recent defeat of measures which called for fair reapportionment make it all the more important that a Federal Urban Affairs Department be established at the Cabinet level.

Today 5 million farm families enjoy the services of the Department of Agriculture's expenditures of $5 billion a year or at the rate of $1,000 per farm family.

The Agriculture Department has mapped every acre in the 3,000 counties across the country. We know the annual changes in crops and planting, the types of soil, the water table. But we have no current records on the land use in our cities, no figures on acreage in industrial and commercial development in the metropolitan areas.

We do know, from census data, that some 30 million people each year move from their homes. Five million of these move from county to county. Five million move from State to State. Every standard metropolitan area outside the South has grown in population.

Involved in this movement is a changing pattern of race relations as the core of cities grow in their nonwhite population and the surrounding areas become a white ring arqund the city. Whole new patterns of race relations have developed and will continue to develop requiring special attention. Because many political entities are involved, an agency specializing in urban affairs to coordinate and deal with these situations is essential if we are to reach a solution.

Newcomers are the lifeblood of the community. For example, New York City today could not function without the contribution being made by Negro and Puerto Rican migrants who fill necessary jobs in such basic industries of New York as the hotel, restaurant, and garment industries, in light manufacturing, hospitals and many other service facilities. These are the jobs formerly filled by Eastern European immigrants of an earlier era.

However, the newcomer, no matter whether he be a Puerto Rican in New York, a Kentucky mountaineer in Cincinnati, a Mexican in Los Angeles, an American Indian in Denver, Colo., or a southern Negro in Chicago, each of these individuals and groups reflects and makes more visible the basic problem into which they move.

It is a fallacy to say that the Puerto Rican in New York City created the slums any more than did the southern Negro in Chicago. He may have helped to intensify the city slums, not because he is Puerto Rican, or Negro, but because he is a member of a low-income group working in the service area which the city needs, but at the same time unable to find low-cost housing because it does not exist.

Too often in too many communities the oldtimers look upon the newcomers not as a reflection of the basic problems which already exist in their communities, but rather as the creator of the problems. While the newcomer may intensify community tensions and problems, the oldtimers must face up to the fact that the basic problem was there to begin with.

The National Housing Conference, meeting in Washington this past weekend on the silver anniversary of the Housing Act of 1937, has urged that we take inventory of our progress and speed up the pace to achieve the goal as spelled out in the Housing Act written 25 years ago.

There are still too many slums in our cities. And our exploding metropolitan areas are going about their merry way with no planning for adequate community facilities, efficient mass transportation, land surveys and provision for open space, health and education institutions to meet the growing needs.

These are national problems, not just local problems, that affect city families as well as suburban families.

Who can draw a boundary between the District of Columbia and Silver Spring in neighboring Montgomery County, Md., for example, when the problems of the families on both sides of the boundary are the same?

No problem illustrates this more clearly than the problem of transportation. With whole new communities mushrooming along the borders of our cities, there is also the problem of schools, of hospitals, of highways, of parks, of all of the community facilities essential to our standard of living.

It is obvious that no one Federal department can coordinate the multiple problems involved, nor was this the purpose of the President's program. But such a Department of Urban Affairs at the Federal level can offer guidance and financing to meet the needs in community facilities and service.

Both cities and suburbs face this financial problem. The purchasing power of the middle income family, the stable economic force which over the decades has supported our great cities, has been steadily migrating to the suburbs, creating a finincial problem for the city it leaves and creating a financial problem of building new facilities in the suburbs without the imposition of a back-breaking tax structure on newly emerging suburban communities.

We cannot and would not stop this explosive development and growth. But we can assure that it be constructively planned growth representing the kind of philosophy in the community we want to create.

We need the Department of Urban Affairs to speak on the Cabinet level, to give the technical services to meet the sensitive human relations problems, the enormous problems of financing.

Since 1939 the Federal tax take has increase 13 times while the tax income of cities and States has gone up only 3½ times.

The Federal Government has enjoyed four times the increase in taxes over the cities and States. It would seem blatantly dishonest to say that the cities can meet their own needs, unless the Federal Government returns some of the tax revenue it collects.

We must stop talking about the things we don't like about our cities and our hit-and-miss developments in the suburbs, and do something about them. A voice in the President's Cabinet is essential to work with all of the many agencies which play a role in this national problem.

A nationwide educational program on the need for such a Cabinet post, I am convinced, will be productive.

Freedom Now Impractical for Portuguese Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully commend the attention of my colleagues to the concluding article in a series by Robert Estabrook of the Washington Post on Portugal and its African provinces.

Reviewing the available comment on the Angolan situation in the last year, this series stands out from the great bulk of other reports because of its candid objectivity. Mr. Estabrook has not hesitated to criticize Portugal where criticism was in his opinion due, but, more importantly, he has disspelled the popular myth that the bloody terrorism was some sort of spontaneous native revolt against the administration.

FREEDOM NOW IMPRACTICAL FOR PORTUGUESE AFRICA

(By Robert H. Estabrook)

(NOTE.—This is the last of six articles by the editor of the editorial page of the Washington Post, who has just completed a trip to Lisbon and the Portuguese provinces in Africa.)

LONDON.—Despite the picture of stony defiance that Portugal presents to the world, Portuguese policy in the African provinces of Angola and Mozambique has in fact changed markedly. There is intensive effort to expand education and economic opportunity.

The objective, through sometimes not precisely stated, is the evolution of commonwealth status, with equal rights in a multiracial society, and a kind of modified self-determination in a larger political unity with Portugal.

Obviously it is unwise to draw eternal judgments on the basis of brief visits to Angola and Mozambique, but certain other conclusions also stand out:

1. Portugal is often her own worst enemy in world councils. She reacts neurotically to criticism out of a combination of immense pride, a sense of historical mission, and a belief that conditions in Angola and Mozambique are her own affair. She also feels misunderstood.

A hot war went on for some months last year in northwest Angola, with insensate terrorism triggering a brutal response. World criticism focused upon the response but not upon the initial butchery of Africans as well as white residents.

Portugal's refusal to admit United Nations observers stemmed from her belief that to do this would prejudice her contention that the conflict was an internal matter because Angola is legally part of Portugal. Portuguese officials nevertheless appear to tailor their policies in some degree to meet criticism in the U.N.

2. A multiracial society with equal rights for the Africans has not developed so comprehensively as the Portuguese claim, but there is a chance that it will. It seems to offer the best hope of amicable, psychologically satisfying relationships between Africans and Europeans.

COMPARISON WITH BRAZIL

Portuguese theory is full of romantic comparisons with Brazil as a monument to Portuguese colonization and as containing the sort of mixed culture sought for Africa. This nostalgic pride overlooks the fact that Brazilian development took place without an overwhelmingly large indigenous population. It also happened a century and a half ago, before the advent of modern communications and critical world opinion.

Life in Angola and Mozambique is still highly stratified despite the absence of any legal color bar, and most of the larger economic activity is in the hands of white residents. Unquestionably there was exploitation, and there was little effort to bring Africans abreast of the white population even though they have long had the right to become assimilated.

REFORMS UNDERTAKEN

Even today there is widespread African fear of PIDE, the security police. Portuguese suspicions bore heavily against educated Africans after the terrorism, and there were many arrests for presumed nationalist activity. This highhanded treatment appears to be gradually tapering off.

Recently Portugal has undertaken broad reforms to abolish indignities against the Africans, to give them new status as Portuguese citizens, and to afford them more nearly equal working conditions and opportunities. These reforms will take time, and there are still holdovers of colonial rule such as the habit of addressing Africans in the familiar "thou" form. But change is in the air.

A major factor in the emergence of a multiracial framework is the presence of half a million white residents—200,000 in Angola and 300,000 in Mozambique. Some of these are new immigrants, but many descend from families in Africa for generations.

NO BASE FOR INDEPENDENCE

These numbers of white settlers are larger than found anywhere in Africa south of the Sahara except in the Union of South Africa and the Rhodesias. And the white settlers also have rights which they will not abrogate willingly.

The problem of accommodation thus bears very little resemblance to that in the new countries of west or east Africa, which contain few or no white citizens. It is more similar to problems in Kenya, Southern Rhodesia, and South Africa.

3. Independence is not now practicable for Angola or Mozambique even if it should be considered desirable. Neither country is any better prepared in terms of a trained and educated African population than was the Belgian Congo. And the Western World could hardly stand another Congo crisis.

What the African population thinks and wants is very difficult for an outsider to determine, even when conversing in Portuguese. Africans have learned to be reticent. In Angola an attitude of sadness and apprehension is noticeable, perhaps because of the terrorism and subsequent repression; in Mozambique the tensions have not yet appeared.

The Union of the People of Angola, headed by an expatriate Angolan now in Leopoldville. Holden Roberto purports to speak for the Africans in demanding eventual independence. The UPA, however, is blamed for the terrorism last year, and how this has affected African thinking cannot be fully known.

Then there is the white population to consider. The white settlers, although they consider themselves Portuguese, regard Angola and Mozambique as their own countries. Occasionally white residents voice sentiments for independence of the provinces—but what they mean is independence under white rule.

There is some feeling of community with Southern Rhodesia and South Africa, although there is criticism of the racial policies of the latter. In Lisbon there is talk of a last-ditch stand to save civilization in Africa, and of a possible defense alliance among Angola, Mozambique, Katanga, Southern Rhodesia, and South Africa.

White residents of Angola and Mozambique would be perfectly capable of mounting a local war, like that of the colons in Algeria, in order to maintain their hold if the hope of a multiracial society should fail. Alternatively, they could adopt a scorched earth tactic.

In these respects the discussion in the U.N. of independence for Angola and Mozambique has an air of unreality. But Portuguese officials have long since begun to talk about autodetermination for the provinces within a Portuguese Commonwealth. Self-government could lead to independence under another name.

4. Portuguese policies will have to change even further if the allegiance of Africans in Angola and Mozambique is to be retained in multiracial commonwealths. In this respect world scrutiny probably serves a useful purpose.

Criticism of Portuguese Prime Minister Salazar is emphatic and often uninhibited in both provinces. Angola and Mozambique voted strongly for Gen. Humberto Delgado, and against the successful government candidate, Rear Adm. Americo Tomas, in the 1958 presidential election.

LISBON'S POWER RESENTED

What especially galls people in the oversea provinces, apart from the absence of effective political opposition in the Portuguese dictatorship, is the centralization of power in Lisbon. In particular they resent the inadequate capital expenditures occasioned by Salazar's austerity and reverence for the balanced budget.

There are still reminders of colonialism in the financial treatment of Angola and Mozambique, each of which surpasses Portugal in riches. Each has a separate discounted currency, notwithstanding the claim that they are integral parts of Portugal.

CAPITAL NEEDED

Both provinces obviously need tremendous infusions of capital if they are to develop quickly. But there simply is not enough capital in Portugal; and some Portuguese financiers want to get their whole investment back in a year or so. Meanwhile Salazar is suspicious of foreign capital, and fears are raised that it might attempt to take over the provinces.

Acceptance of substantial outside technical assistance, loans or investment may have to await a happier political climate. The Government in Lisbon still is busily seeking scapegoats for its troubles.

From all this it may be deduced that the evolution of more political rights in Angola itself will depend upon such evolution in Portugal proper. The younger administrators are wise enough to know this, but the immediate outlook under the dictatorship is not encouraging.

Thus the net picture of Portuguese relations with Angola and Mozambique is one of contradictions of aim and performance—of failings and abuses, of reforms and ameliorations, of promises and hope. The evolution as the Portuguese say they want it to be is preferable, at least to this observer, on the basis of what seems realistically possible, to either black nationalism that would exclude the Europeans or apartheid that would discriminate against the Africans.

We are not an evil people, said one Government official in Lisbon plaintively, in pleading for an objective assessment. This seems abundantly true, and some Portuguese are working hard to accommodate themselves to change. But the world will not stand still waiting for Portugal to prove her intentions.

U.S. Career Officials Play Safe, Drag Heels.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column in the Los Angeles Times by Constantine Brown on the do-nothing attitude of our diplomatic corps:

U.S. CAREER OFFICIALS PLAY SAFE, DRAG HEELS

(By Constantine Brown)

America's diplomatic representatives abroad give the impression that they are just bureaucrats whose principal interest is in keeping their jobs by the simple method of doing nothing.

This reporter has watched the lack of initiative of our heads of missions in circumstances where personal action and use of the prestige of their high office could have better served America's interest than a do-nothing attitude.

By and large, the chiefs of mission and their ranking subordinates are patriotic men who know the meaning of the word "principle" and could display their initiative were it not for the fact they are afraid to stick their necks out.

In the last few years, especially in the Kennedy administration, career officers have been appointed to embassies which in the past were reserved only for campaign contributors. The Ivy Leaguers in the White House have reserved the posts in New Delhi, Tokyo, and Belgrade for their choice candidates. Ivy League men Kenneth Galbraith, Edwin Reischauer, and George Kennan got these appointments and they are also policymakers.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk was given a free hand for the other posts, which include Bonn and Rome—in the past reserved for heavy contributors in cash or campaign battles.

He appointed Foreign Service officers with wide experience not only in the foreign field but also in the State Department, where they had an excellent opportunity to observe the inner workings of our diplomatic machinery. The majority of them entered the Foreign Service after very exacting examination. These chiefs and deputy chiefs of missions have a thorough knowledge of world affairs. Many are capable of displaying their initiative and some could even be described as imaginative diplomats.

Yet most of them are failing to show any of these qualities in their respective jobs. Why? The answer is difficult to find.

Our foreign policies are not only in flux but are handled officially by the White House and the State Department and unofficially by faceless personalities in both policymaking quarters. The career ambassadors who have served in Washington know well that within the White House there are advisers to the President who enjoy listening to the Chief Executive's stanch speeches but know that they do not reflect policies. They know it is in their power to change Mr. Kennedy's mind.

They know that within the State Department, Secretary Rusk is the policymaker. But they also know that reports from abroad reach him in distilled form and the distilling is done by chiefs of desks, Assistant Secretaries, and policy planners located on what used to be called the fourth floor of the Department.

It was there, for instance, that the reports from our Ambassadors in Cuba before Batista's exit underwent a distillation which induced our then Secretary Herter to decide that Castro was a reformer and not a Communist.

It was in those distilleries that the decision was taken to hasten the overthrow of Syngman Rhee; it is there today, this reporter is reliably informed, that efforts are being made to dispose of Portugal's benevolent dictator Salazar and, if possible, Spain's Franco.

The career chiefs of mission are, after all, human. Many have no private income and must live on their salary and hope to remain long enough in service to enjoy a pension, which goes as high as $17,000 a year for those reaching the rank of permanent ambassador.

After having served their stints in hardship posts they are loath to go to the Congo, Guinea, or Burma, which is their lot if they incure the displeasure of Washington. Any display of their capabilities and initiatives they know could embroil them in the clashes of politics.

An Address by Former Governor Nutter of Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. BATTIN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, on January 25, 1962, the former Governor of Montana, Mr. Don Nutter, was killed in an airplane crash. One of his last speeches was preserved on radio tape and is one which I feel should be read and studied by every American who is interested in freedom and our way of life. The following is a full text of his remarks:

AN ADDRESS BY FORMER GOVERNOR NUTTER, OF MONTANA

Historically, this country down through the years has had two major political parties. Today, there exists within each of the two major parties a difference in political philosophy. We have the so-called conservative Republican and the modern Republican; the conservative Jackson-Jefferson Democrat and the liberal leftwing Democrat.

We use the terms "liberal" and "conservative." The so-called liberals charge the ultraconservatives with being "neo-Fascists." The conservatives equate the ultraliberals with Socialists or Communists. Extremism on one side has bred extremism on the other.

It is time we, the American people, get down to the basic differences in political philosophy. There are those in this country, and I am one of them, who believe in the Constitution of the United States, and in the fundamental concepts of individual freedom and liberty. And—if you please—the free enterprise system in a competitive society.

There are those who believe that our form of constitutional government is a failure and that it should be supplanted by one completely foreign to those concepts of our Founding Fathers; one which is paternalistic to the end that individual freedom, liberty, free enterprise, and competition will be destroyed and be replaced with regulation, control, domination, and ultimately, with totalitarianism.

The Constitution of the United States is the greatest document on government ever promulgated or written by man. The evils which plague this country today are those which have arisen out of a violation of the intent of that document.

We have heard the charge that our Constitution is outmoded; that it is not flexible enough to provide good government in a changing world. The obvious answer to that charge is that this Nation has been undergoing great changes since its birth.

Provision is made for progress in our basic law by amendment. Our supreme law provides that the people and their elected Representatives shall vote changes by amendment. In some instances, in violation of this principle, we have seen our Supreme Court warp the intent and the meaning of the written law. We have seen that Court violate our supreme law by legislating, thus depriving the Congress and the people of a guaranteed right.

To those who are critical of our constitutional form of government, I would say this: Under that Constitution we became the greatest Nation on earth. We have the highest standard of living on earth. Our system of education is unequaled by any nation. We enjoy more of the good things of life than any people anywhere.

Our Government is our individual freedom and free enterprise system. Our freedom and our free enterprise system is our Government.

The Constitution is our legal guarantee of freedom to practice free enterprise. Destroy our Constitution and you destroy individual freedom and our free enterprise system. Destroy individual freedom and free enterprise and you destroy our form of government.

This is the greatest nation on earth. We attained this position because of a constitutional form of government which provided for individual liberty and freedom and allowed us to grow and develop under free enterprise and competition.

Do you realize that there are people in foreign lands who would lie down and die if they could just live a portion of their lifetime in these United States of America?

Yet, with all that we have, and all that we are, there are those among us who would have us believe that some other form of government is better; that socialism in its ultimate degree, communism, has something to offer; that the time has come for us to abandon our constitutional Government and accept in its place a one-world utopia.

On a recent conference on the problem of feeding the people of the world, those in attendance were told that free enterprise would fail to do the job; that it had not and could not work internationally; that we should have a world food budget, a world money budget for food; that we should shed our nationalism for internationalism.

What did that speaker think would work? Communism or socialism? Has he forgotten that farmers and ranchers in this country, under free enterprise, have fed hungry people the world over? Has he forgotten that we fed millions of people in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics? Has he closed his eyes to the perennial famines in Communist Red China?

He belittles the accomplishment of our system, but I would have him know that if he and his ADA friends would remove the shackles from American agriculture our farmers and our ranchers would meet any challenge.

He spoke of a world money budget for food. He condemns free enterprise, but he would use the product of that system—money—to attain his objective. He believes in a world welfare state and asks us to abandon our nationalism.

With a wave of his hand, he would destroy the gains of American industry and business.

He would wipe out the accomplishments of American labor. He would destroy the incentive in American agriculture.

If he thinks so little of free enterprise, how does he explain the rise of West Germany, from a defeated and crushed country—a rubble if you please, to a position of economic strength and wealth? Possibly he does not know that the West Germans turned their backs on the socialistic program recommended by some of the ADA planners and elected to follow the course of individual freedom and competition.

The philosophy of this one-world idealist was, and is, totally lacking in the element of realism. So, also, are those who knowingly or unwittingly sell the Communist line, reluctant to open their eyes to true facts.

If communism is so good, why did the East Germans build a wall of concrete and barbed wire? To keep the West Germans out? Not at all. The wall was built to keep the enslaved East Germans under the yoke of communism.

If communism is such a success, why are unnumbered hundreds of thousands of people on the China mainland living in misery and dying of starvation?

Of those who preach the spineless doctrine of "I'd rather be Red than dead," I would ask: Would the hundreds of East Germans who have crashed the wall in flight to freedom at the risk of their lives rather be Red than dead? Would the Poles, the East Germans, the Hungarians who fought against Red tanks with their bare hands, rather be Red than dead?

What does all this mean to you and me? Just this: Through selfishness, greed, complacency, and apathy, we can cancel out all the sacrifices made by us, by our fathers and by our forefathers. Through failure to exercise our constitutional rights and perform our duties to protect this Nation, we can and will drift away from our great heritage.

Khrushchev once said, "We can't expect the American people to jump from capitalism to communism, but we can assist their elected leaders in giving them small doses of socialism until one day they awaken to find they have communism."

You and I must recognize communism for what it really is. A godless ideology which preys upon human misery but offers no cure for it. That communism is a failure is evidenced by human suffering in every Communist country without exception.

That communism is our mortal enemy is evidenced by Lenin who said, "We will take Eastern Europe," which they have done, "then we will organize the hordes of Asia," which they are doing, "and we'll surround the United States. That last bastion of capitalism we won't have to take, it will fall into our outstretched hands like overripe fruit."

What can you and I do? We can elect to public office, not men who would sell their souls to perpetuate themselves in office, but men and women who have faith in this country and in its future under individual freedom, liberty, and free enterprise.

We can take an active interest in good American Government. We can, and must, abandon apathy and complacency. We can, and must, fight for our constitutional way of life.

We must become fully informed of the accomplishments and failures of the U.N. In my opinion, the failures of that organization far outweigh the gains.

As Governor of Montana, I refused to proclaim United Nations Day in Montana because the U.N. has become little more than a forum for our enemies. It failed to act in the Hungarian blood bath. It failed to act on the wall in Berlin. It failed to condemn the enslavement of millions of people. It failed to condemn Russian nuclear testing. But it did not fail to force a pro-Western Katangan government under a pro-Communist Central Congolese state.

In the interest of world peace and freedom from misery, I will support any organization of nations dedicated to Christian principles and promoting freedom and liberty for all people, everywhere. The U.N. has failed this test. I did proclaim October 23 as United States Day in Montana.

Some months ago, I clipped a Warner-Swasey advertisement which reads in part as follows:

"This could be America's greater hour, but it will be a dismal failure, a shameful disgrace, unless every American—every American—shoulders his full share of self-respecting responsibility. There is no they—it is you, and me. There is no Washington to decide—you are Washington. There is no government to shoulder the responsibility—it is yours. On your action, your courage, your unselfishness, and mine, will depend great success or dismal failure. On you, may well depend America itself."

Ladies and gentlemen, do we believe in the type of government which came to us as our great heritage? Or, do we believe some other form of government is better? This is the real issue. Let us not lose sight of it in name calling; in quibbling over definitions.

This is God's country. May God help us to save America.

Probable Results of Feed Grain Program for 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, although Francis A. Kutish, an agricultural economist at Iowa State University has made several studies of great importance, several of which I have set forth in the RECORD from time to time, I think his recent analysis of the cost and operation of the 1961 feed grain program in 1961 and his analysis of its effect on acreage and probable results for 1962 are among the most important contributions to understanding matters of wide interest in agricultural legislation. The analysis of the effect on farm income, acreage, and probable 1962 results is below:

PROBABLE RESULTS OF FEED GRAIN PROGRAM FOR 1962

EFFECT ON FARM INCOME

Net farm income was $12.7 billion in 1961, compared with $11.7 billion in 1960—mainly due to the benefits of the feed grain program and high crop yields. Government payments for retiring corn and grain sorghum acres to conservation uses made up $765 million of the $1 billion increase in net farm income.

Corn is being sold from CCC holdings to make those payments. Through January 26, 1962, the USDA had sold 500 million bushels of grain (grain sorghum, barley, corn, and oats) in redemption of rights represented by pooled certificates with a value of $496 million. Much of the corn in Iowa was sold at $0.90 to $1 per bushel. If the corn had not been sold, the CCC was already obligated to pay 13.5 cents per bushel storage cost for each additional year that the corn was kept—plus interest on the money invested in the corn. At the early January 1962, rate of $0.95 per bushel for corn, 808 million bushels of corn equivalent will be marketed out of CCC stocks to meet the certificates plus 6.7 million bushels of corn equivalent for utilization. Thus, farmers received the Government payments rather than the grain storage people.

Without the feed grain program, net farm income would have been lower. Farmers would have received a lower price for the excess feed grains taken over by the CCC. The 585.71 million bushels of corn equivalent (16.4 million tons) which would have been added to CCC inventory would have required a cash outlay of $620.9 million (figures at $1.06 per bushel) by the CCC, plus interest and storage cost each year that the CCC owned the feed grains.

HIGHER LIVESTOCK PRICES

In figuring costs and returns on the program, we should not forget one of the main objectives—to prevent an oversupply of livestock and in turn low livestock prices. In the absence of the 1961 feed grain program, very likely more hogs would have been produced in 1961–62 and both hogs and cattle would have been fed to heavier weights. Marketing more pounds of meat per animal adds to meat supplies just as does an increase in numbers of animals marketed.

Increased hog marketing weights, coupled with an estimated increase of 6 percent in numbers of hogs produced, would have meant lower hog prices. Using a price elasticity of demand of −.4, this increased hog output would have reduced average hog prices about 15 percent—or probably from $2 to $2.50 lower than they actually will be.

The increased supply of pork would have competed with beef; cattle also would have been fed to heavier weights. The combination would have lowered average cattle prices an estimated $.75 per hundredweight. The increased egg output would have meant somewhat lower egg prices. The combined reduction in livestock income probably would have been around $450 million.

Without controls on 1961 production contained in the 1961 feed grain program, the CCC would have been obligated to greatly increase its spendings for extra storage facilities to handle the big takeover this fall. A large increase in feed grain surpluses would have undoubtedly brought pressures from city Congressmen to abandon farm programs—or to go to much stricter supply-management controls which are politically unacceptable to many at the present time.

The feed grain program has bought time—perhaps 1 or 2 years—in which to further perfect a longer run program to reduce production to current needs.

EFFECT OF FEED GRAIN PROGRAMS ON CONSUMERS

The 1961 feed grain program has not increased the price of food to consumers. Livestock production per person is slightly higher than a year ago. So the supply of food products was not reduced by the program.

Had there been no program, the production of meat would have been somewhat larger (we estimate about 6 percent more pork). This would have meant bout 2½ cents per pound lower retail prices on pork than what probably will prevail in 1962 and about 1¼ cents a pound lower retail beef prices—or about 23 cents a week lower spending for meat for an average family of four persons—at the expense of about half a billion dollars lower farm income.

FUTURE PROSPECTS

The corn yields per acre for the United States have increased as follows: 1950–59 average, 44.1; 1960, 54.5; 1961, 61.8, a 7.3-bushel increase over 1960.

This leads to the conclusion that the feed grain program with higher price supports limited to fewer acres did provide an incentive for a faster rate of adoption of yield increasing practices.

In Iowa, total mixed fertilizer sales were down 4.4 percent, but sales of nitrogenous materials used mainly for corn were up 41 percent causing total use to be up 5 percent. Considering the fact that nearly 3 million acres (23 percent) of the cornland was diverted to conservation use as a result of the feed grain program, the use per acre is up quite substantially. Not all of this fertilizer was used on corn, however. Some of the fertilized land was later diverted to soybeans by farmers in order to comply with the restriction on corn acreage. Had the support price on corn not been raised 14 cents a bushel over the 1960 level, the pressure to increase fertilizer use would not have been as great—and the yields not risen as much over 1960 levels.

A 1960 study of 315 farms randomly selected from all the counties in Iowa showed that 51.27 percent of the cornland was fertilized in the 1959 crop year. Much of the land that was fertilized was not fertilized to the optimum[1] recommendation. A 1958–61 corn yield study of 16 counties showed an increase in nearly every county of the stalks per acre. The average ear weights per stalk indicates the effect of the stand level on corn yields. In most cases, yields could have been increased from 5 to 15 bushels by increasing stands to the optimum.[2]

A study of nine counties in Iowa selected to represent the different farming type areas showed that over 65 percent of the farms have from 1 to 149 crops acres. Government programs have been based on land acreages. Pressure for expansion of farm size is likely to continue for several years. The participation in the feed grain program was as follows:

Size of farm (crop acres)	Owner-operator (percent)	Tenant-operator (percent)	Total (percent)
1 to 149	47.3	54.3	51.0
150 to 179	58.9	64.6	62.6
180 and over	63.2	73.4	70.0

Participation was affected by tillable crop acres and tenure. More farmers who were tenants participated than owner-operators and more operators of large farms participated than operators of small farms.

The 1961 feed grain program halted the buildup of feed grain stocks. It will result in some longtime savings in Government farm program costs. Some of the other benefits of the feed grain program include improved prices coming from revised support process. Some result from an apparent slowdown in the expansion of hog production. Other benefits stem from the Government payments on the retired corn-sorghum acres.

The Government payment corresponds to the net payment that it is possible to earn from growing crops on the land. The farm operator has to spread his fixed costs over fewer acres; the tenant has to pay most of the variable costs, which could be one reason for the high tenant participation. Another reason for high tenant participation is that the landlords on a crop share lease wanted the higher loan prices for their grain. Adoption of improved crop management practices, encouraged by the program, means lower unit production costs and higher average operator and net returns per acre, per man, and per farm.

FUTURE INTERREGIONAL IMPLICATIONS

If the feed grain program continues the next few years to operate to hold feed prices at current prices, no great change in interregional livestock production and price relationships can be expected.

If CCC resale policy on grain is operated to permit a price level about 10 cents below loan level—or about 10 cents higher than the level prevailing this year—the effect would be to raise feed costs to all livestock producers. But on a percentage basis, the increase in costs would be greater in corn surplus areas than in deficit areas.

If the current feed grain program results in a price level for feed grains equal to about 10 cents a bushel below the loan level, this means that prices in the surplus areas may be increased about 11 percent while prices in the deficit areas would be increased about 8.5 percent. The feed price increase in the surplus area as a result of the program will be 30 percent greater than in the deficit areas. Hog production, beef cattle fattening, and other livestock enterprises probably would be cut back more proportionately in the corn surplus areas than in the deficit areas the next few years.

Given a chance for the livestock production to adjust to the higher prices of feed grain that would prevail over a program of restricting feed grain supplies for a few years, total livestock production would be held in check and cash receipts from livestock products would increase. As a result, the value of all feed supplies, hay, and pasture as well as feed grains would increase.

Farmers who purchase feeder cattle, calves, or hogs for finishing purposes realize a more or less average return over a period of years which pays for their feed in other costs in finishing the animals. Less than 15 percent of the feed grains are utilized for fattening beef cattle. For this reason changes in the prices of grain fattened beef cattle are largely passed on to producers of feeder cattle by competitive market forces. Feeders find that the price of feed grains are largely determined by the demand from hog producers, dairymen, and poultrymen. With supplies of all meat animals, poultry, and dairy products held in check by a continuing feed grain program, beef cattle prices would be higher than they would in the absence of such a feed grain program. Cattle feeders soon would bid up the price of feeder animals as a result in the increased price for finished cattle.

Longer time benefits of a feed grain restriction program thus would be shared by all producers of livestock feeds and by all producers of livestock except by livestock feeders such as cattle feeders or commercial egg producers who buy all their animals and all their feeds. However, these latter groups would not be affected adversely by feed grain restriction programs once the initial period of adjustment to the higher prices has been made. To the extent that livestock prices were raised, food costs to consumers likewise would increase.

PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS OF 1962 PROGRAM PROBABLE RESULTS

In mid-February, the signup for the 1962 feed grain program had just barely been started. It is too early to tell definitely how it would progress and finally turn out.

Under these conditions the following assumptions about the extent of participation are made: Oats—same production as in 1961; grain sorghums—same participation as in 1961; barley—30 percent reduction in acreage harvested due to the feed grain program with the yield up from a national average of 30.3 bushels to 32.5 bushels per acre due to the feed grain program; corn—two assumptions—the first, same acreage harvested by participators with 0.5 million acres more grown by noncooperators, and the second assumption, 10 percent less participation in the feed grain program and 0.75 million acres more by noncooperators. Corn yields 2.3 bushels an acre less than in 1961, due to less favorable weather conditions.

With the first assumption on corn (the same participation as in 1961), the 1962 production of feed grains would be 137 million tons. With the second assumption, the production would be 137.4 million tons. As a comparison, the 1961 production was 140.6 million tons.

Corn is the big factor in the feed grain production. And if yields slip a bit, due to less favorable weather in 1962, and with barley included, there is a good chance that the production of feed grains will be no larger than in 1961 and probably smaller.

Thus, as of February 15, the prospect is for 4 to 7 million tons further reduction in feed grain stocks by October 1, 1963—particularly if hog production continues to rise slowly and thus increase feed grain utilization in the coming feeding year.

As the signup for the 1962 program progresses, it will be necessary to update these calculations on 1962 prospects.

PROJECTION TO 1965

The major problem in projecting 1965 prospects under a continued feed grain program concerns what yields to expect. Since 1956 we have had some kind of a farm program in effect which reduced the land in cultivation. The soil bank removed land under the acreage reserve program in 1956, 1957, and 1958. Land has been removed ever since 1956 under the conservation reserve program. And the 1961 and 1962 feed grain programs have removed land from cultivation.

Obviously, all of these programs have had some effect on yields by removing poorer quality land. This in turn has affected the average yield per acre. Land selection factor also is interrelated with the response from weather, technology, increased fertilizer use, and the like—in other words, due to land selection, the average response from improved tehcnology and weather may be greater.

If one assumes: (1) a trend increase of 1.44 bushels of corn per acre in yield since 1956 (i.e., one-half of the increase in yield per acre from 1956 to 1961); (2) a continued program effect of 2.5 bushels per acre from the operation of the program; and (3) normal weather—the projected corn yield for 1965 would be 62.9 bushels per acre.

Another approach is that taken by George Brandow.[3] He assumed the net upward corn yield trend of 1.67 bushels per acre since 1950, attributed largely to technological advance, after adjusting yields for the effects of acreage reduction since 1956. This gave Brandow a projected normal weather yield of 65.1 bushels per acre in 1965.

Thompson[4] evaluated the weather factors in the production of corn for Iowa, Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, and Missouri. These States accounted for 47.5 percent of the corn acreage in the United States in 1961. His study indicated that the feed grain program increased yields by about 2.3 bushels per acre in 1961 over what they would have been in the absence of the program. He calculated a trend yield increase for these five States of 0.81 bushels per acre. Converting this to a national basis, gives a projected 1965 corn yield, with normal weather, under the present program of 55.5 bushels per acre.

[1] U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, vol. 1, pt. 16, Iowa.

[2] Iowa Agricultural Experiment Station Extension Service and Soil Conservation Service, corn yield study (project 1377).

[3] "Future Price and Income Effects of Current Agricultural Policies," George Brandow, Pennsylvania State University. Nov. 29, 1961.

[4] Iowa State University Center for Agriculture and Economic Adjustment, "Dynamics of Land use." Iowa State University Press, 1961.

TABLE 4.—*Projected feed grain production in 1965 at 3 levels of corn yields*

Corn yield per acre	Acres feed grains harvested (million)	Carryout stocks at end of year (million tons)	1965 crop year		
			Production (million tons)	Utilization (million tons)	Change in stocks (million tons)
62.9	107	36.5	146.5	155	−8.5
65.1	107	46.0	150.0	155	−5.0
55.5	107	4.0	134.0	155	−19.0

Table 4 summarizes the variation in feed grain production projected for 1965 at the three levels of corn yields. The acreage of feed grain is assumed to remain at the 1961 level and that 2.2 million acres of barley will be diverted.

Utilization of feed grain in 1965 is projected at 155 million tons; this will result in a quantity of livestock production that will move into market channels with the assistance of domestic consump. on subsidy programs in effect in 1961 at farm prices for livestock approximately equal to those in 1960 and slightly lower poultry and egg prices than in 1960.[5]

The effect of yields on storage stocks in 1965 can be readily seen in table 4. Under the projection of high corn yields, carryout stocks at the end of the 1965 crop year would be down to 46 million tons. Under the medium yield projection, stocks would be down to 36.5 million tons. But under the low yield projection, stocks would be down to about 40 million tons by the end of the 1963 crop year.

CONCLUSION

It is apparent that the most important factor in the next few years is what happens to crop yields—this depends upon weather and the uptrend due to adoption of new technology. Given normal weather, it would appear that a continuation of the present feed grain program would result in much better balanced carryout stocks of feed grains by 1965. By the mid-1960's (sooner if weather is given greater weight in appraising the 1961 bumper crop yields) it should be possible to reduce the amount of acreage diverted because it will be no longer necessary to reduce the amount of feed grain carryover stocks. This would permit an expansion in 1966 feed grain acreage equivalent to somewhere from 3 to over 12 million tons—depending upon the trend in yields that actually is prevailing.

However, the level of production projected by Brandow would be gaining on utilization by the mid-1960's. And by the late 1960's stocks would again begin to accumulate if trends projected by him were to continue.

[5] Op. cit., p. 17, Brandow.

The Future Homemakers of America Deserve Our Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, this year National Future Homemakers of America Week will be observed from April 1 through 7, and I am glad to have this opportunity to commend the over 500,000 young women and their able leaders who are members of this outstanding organization. I believe they fully deserve our support and recognition because these young ladies are not only contributing greatly to personal, family, and community living today, but are conscientiously preparing themselves for the vital role they will play in the future of this country.

The Future Homemakers of America is an incorporated, nonprofit national organization composed of students studying homemaking in junior and senior high schools. Any girl who is taking or has taken a homemaking course in school is eligible for membership. The U.S. Office of Education and the American Home Economics Association serve as cosponsors, and cooperating groups are home economics sections of the National Education Association and American Vocational Association.

The Commonwealth of Kentucky was the first State to charter the Future Homemakers of America, and in the Second Congressional District of Kentucky, which I have the honor to represent, local FHA chapters are extremely active and well organized. Their influence on the community is felt in innumerable ways, and not only do these young women benefit personally by their FHA membership, but the lives of their future husbands and children will be enriched by the valuable instruction they are now receiving. These girls are ably assisted in their endeavors by their home economics teachers and other interested women who appreciate and understand the importance of training them in the fine art of homemaking.

Not only in the Second District, but throughout the State of Kentucky, FHA'ers are very active and a good illustration of this is a State project entitled "Clean Up, Don't Litter Up." This project contributes to the national project, "Youth Can Do." One hundred and ninety-seven chapters have participated by sponsoring locker clean-up projects, helping clean up parks, and distributing 8,850 red plastic litter bags stamped with the FHA emblem and chapter name. Also, 3,609 individual FHA'ers have carried out such related projects as: having family work-together days, keeping homes and yards clean, removing trash, doing special house-cleaning projects, and painting the interior of their homes. The Kentucky FHA chapters have been commended by the State citizens' beautification committee for "outstanding accomplishments to make Kentucky a cleaner, greener land." To me, this is a very fine example of one of the many ways in which members of the Future Homemakers of America contribute to the betterment of their family and community life.

The proposed national program of work for 1962–65 for the Future Homemakers of America deserves our consideration as I believe it expresses exceedingly well the high ideals and objectives of this organization. The overall goal is "to help individuals improve personal, family, and community living," and the four national objectives are: first, discovering myself and my worth to others; second, contributing to the joys and satisfactions of family living; third, strengthening my education for future roles; and, fourth, launching good citizenship through homemaking. This program crystallizes in a national program of work the aims, ambitions, and desires of the Future Homemakers of America to be good citizens now and successful homemakers in the future.

The very foundation of our Christian civilization is based on the family unit, and it is the wives and mothers of America who have the responsibility for providing the cohesive and stabilizing influence so necessary to the continuance of an integrated family life. The training our young women are now receiving in their FHA work will enable them to assume with dignity, warmth, intelligence, and understanding the all-important role of homemaker. They will bring to the future homes of America the truth and love, faith and security that must be present in each home if we are to successfully preserve the ideals of Western civilization against the materialistic forces at work in the world today.

Mr. Speaker, the closing words of the FHA creed are:

> We are the Futume Homemakers of America. We face the future with warm courage and high hope.

It is a pleasure at this time to commend the FHA'ers all over our country who are doing such an outstanding job of preparing themselves for the vital position of homemaker, and I think we can face the future with high hope knowing that our homes will be in good and capable hands.

John L. Lewis Succeeds George H. Love as Coal Policy Conference Board Chairman—Emergency Planning Director McDermott Delivers Significant Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, today it was my privilege to have attended, with my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and my colleagues from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], a significant luncheon held in Washington in connection with the third annual meeting of the National Coal Policy Conference.

Speaker for the occasion was the Honorable Edward A. McDermott, Acting Director of the Office of Emergency Planning in the executive department of our Federal Government.

George H. Love, chairman of the board of Consolidation Coal Co. and chairman of the board of Chrysler Corp., who has served as chairman of the board of the National Coal Policy Conference since its founding 3 years

ago, presided at the ceremonies incident to the luncheon.

Earlier in the day, John L. Lewis, president emeritus of the United Mine Workers of America, who, as president of UMWA, was one of the cofounders of the National Coal Policy Conference with Mr. Love, was elected NCPC board chairman to succeed the latter, also a cofounder. The National Coal Policy Conference is, as Members of Congress generally know, an organization which draws component membership from the leadership of coal producers, the United Mine Workers of America, the coal-carrying railroads, electric power utilities, and coal mine equipment manufacturers.

The election of Mr. Lewis to head the board of directors of NCPC marks his return to a more active role in coal policy matters. However, even though he retired as president of the UMWA on January 14, 1960, after almost 40 years as the executive head of that splendid labor movement, Mr. Lewis has continued his vital interest in its affairs as its president emeritus and likewise has continued to serve as a member of the board of the National Coal Policy Conference.

The history of labor-management relations in the coal industry is replete with incidents of the conflicts which occurred with John L. Lewis and George H. Love representing contending forces at the bargaining table during union-producer negotiations.

However, it is indicative of the nature of the men and the qualities of their statesmanship that both Mr. Lewis and Mr. Love, after years of involvement in the problems of negotiating for their interests, came to realize that the future of the coal industry necessitated more amicable cooperation between labor and management.

That cooperation is best manifested in the formation and the functioning of the National Coal Policy Conference with these two outstanding men as the principal cofounders. It is indeed fitting that Mr. Lewis should have succeeded Mr. Love to the NCPC board chairmanship.

At today's luncheon, NCPC President Joseph E. Moody, on behalf of the membership, expressed in word and by gift the officers' and members' appreciation for the very real services performed by Mr. Love during his 3-year tenure.

I desire also to acknowledge with gratitude the splendid cooperation I have received from the National Coal Policy Conference under the leadership of Mr. Love and Mr. Moody, and to express also appreciation for the helpfulness of the competent staff supporting their efforts. Being a Member of the Congress from a State with a vital interest in the health and progress of the coal industry and the West Virginians who toil in that industry, I seek always to work diligently for improvement in their status. In these efforts, the officers and members of the National Coal Policy Conference have provided vital information and competent counsel.

But, Mr. President, the National Coal Policy Conference is much more than a one-industry self-interest organization. It has provided invaluable, enlightened, and patriotic leadership in the movement for the national fuels and energy study now one of the missions of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It is a strong proponent, as is the Senator now addressing you, of a vitally needed national fuels and energy policy.

And the conference, under the leadership of Mr. Love and Mr. Moody, has consistently sought to bring the energy fuels groups together in a common endeavor to support a continuation of the quota system under the oil imports control program. Their efforts in this connection have been forthright, honorable, and intelligently performed and they are sincere in their belief that six healthy domestic fuels industries are absolutely essential to the total economy and the national security. I am privileged to share these viewpoints and to support their efforts in what we believe to be the best national interest.

Mr. President, the address delivered at today's NCPC luncheon by Acting Director McDermott of the Office of Emergency Planning included noteworthy and appropriate reference to these matters which are under study by that office and other departments of the executive branch. But Mr. McDermott's speech was, in fact, a much broader and more comprehensive review of emergency planning activities and functions than those which relate alone to fuels considerations. I commend him for his lucid and forceful message and I request unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, and I hope that it will have the diligent attention of Senators and many, many of our fellow citizens which it properly deserves.

There being no objection, the message was inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD as follows:

ADDRESS BY EDWARD A. MCDERMOTT, ACTING DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING, BEFORE THE NATIONAL COAL POLICY CONFERENCE, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 28

It is a privilege and a pleasure to speak to members of the National Coal Policy Conference.

As representatives of labor and management in the coal industry, of the utility and power companies that use coal, of the transportation industry that carries it, and of the companies that make mining equipment, you hold a point of view that is neither shortsighted nor narrow. You recognize and work for a common interest and rightfully regard the coal industry as an indispensable national asset in peace and war.

Of course a point of view is shaped by one's own problems and aims. This we call "enlightened self-interest." When the late Robert Benchley was a student at Harvard he was confronted by an examination asking that he discuss an international fisheries dispute related to trawl territories from the point of view of the two countries involved. Lacking any information, Mr. Benchley's answer began: "I know nothing about the point of view of either country so I shall discuss the question from the point of view of the fish."

As Director of the Office for Emergency Planning, I speak to you in the best interest of the American people and I know something about your point of view.

As chairman of the Interdepartmental Committee on the Soft Coal Industry, I know something of your objectives and your problems, and I have come to appreciate the importance of a vital and healthy coal industry. In this regard, let me say that the National Coal Policy Conference, both in concept and constructive action, reflects a philosophy that exemplifies free enterprise at its best.

I was never among the shortsighted observers who thought the coal industry was dying and defeated. An industry which could more than double its production per man-day in a few years is not ready to be counted out.

The climate of cooperation engendered by the National Coal Policy Conference has not only yielded new uses and markets for coal, it has fostered a solidarity seldom attained in the industrial world.

It took foresight, courage, and patience to face up to the technological, social, and human problems which afflicted your industry. Yours is the kind of enlightened enterprise which must be emulated by other segments of our economy if we are to sustain our national growth in the critical years ahead.

I do not imply that this conference can remedy all the difficulties of the industry overnight, but you have proven the value of the industrywide approach.

Certainly the serious unemployment problem must never go unnoticed. To some degree, the disheartening hardship of prolonged idleness has been alleviated by Government food-stamp programs and other relief measures. But these are not long-range solutions. We must attack the problem at its roots. In this regard, President Kennedy recently sign a bill providing for a nationwide retraining program. It applies to men and women who, through no fault of their own, have been unable to find work. This measure should be of immense benefit to the coal industry.

Another measure now being studied by the Congress should give impetus to the coal industry. A week ago President Kennedy sent to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House a proposed bill to facilitate the construction of pipelines to transport coal slurry in interstate commerce. This new method of transportation already has been tested successfully. If the rights-of-way can be obtained through this legislation, we shall have greatly reduced the long-range cost of transporting coal from the mines to the consumer.

In stressing the importance of such legislation, President Kennedy declared: "The coal resurces of our Nation constitute one of our greatest assets. They launched our industrial development and they provide a great reservoir of energy. They can be a stimulus to our economic growth."

In many ways the history of the coal industry parallels the history of emergency planning. In both instances a "cultural lag" occurred, in which we failed to recognize and respond vigorously to the scientific and industrial realities of our time.

A decade ago it was possible to develop a sound emergency planning structure through Federal programs and policies. Today, we must make equal efforts on the State and local level. I shall discuss this problem later. Actually, the Office of Emergency Planning inherited mobilization functions dating back to World War I, when the National Government first gained valuable experience in this field. This experience formed the basis of our Nation's successful mobilization efforts in World War II, and was further enlarged during the Korean crisis.

In brief, the Office of Emergency Planning is responsible for the mobilization and management of the Nation's resources in the interest of national security.

Among other things, this includes measures to wage economic offensive in concert with friendly nations, national plans and facilities to preserve the Federal structure under any emergency, Federal natural disaster relief actions, a function which kept us

extremely busy in the last few weeks, and a broad advisory role to the President in the field of tariffs, import quotas, and other economic areas with a direct bearing on the national security.

Understandably, this latter responsibility is of direct concern to the National Coal Policy Conference. The key to the role of Office of Emergency Planning is found in the phrase "bearing on the national security."

Simply stated, OEP is concerned with economic strength as it relates to our capability in the cold war, possible limited war, or, in the extreme case, an attack upon this Nation with nuclear weapons.

This does not mean that economic strength is not an important end in itself. On the contrary, if the two criteria are not identical they are, at the very least, closely related. Nevertheless, the distinction must be drawn between the two.

In the Soviet Union, for example, heavy industry, defense, research and development have a much higher claim on manpower, equipment, facilities and materials than in the United States. Conversely, the production of consumer goods is given a much lower priority in Soviet planning. The Soviets have consistently channeled 35 to 40 percent of their smaller gross national product into investment and defense in comparison with 15 to 20 percent for these requirements in the United States.

I do not suggest that we imitate their methods, lower our standard of living, or change our basic economic structure. It is to our credit—and a glaring weakness of totalitarian planning—that we can satisfy both consumer needs and national security requirements at one and the same time. Fortunately, we do not have to choose between the two.

But let us never forget that an inherently weaker economy can sustain a formidable military establishment for some time, if geared to do so. We had ample and agonizing evidence of this in the early days of World War II. Happily, we were able to fight a "holding action" and our industrial complex proved its ability to convert to war time requirements in an amazingly short period.

However, our economy today is more complex. We are not likely to have a breathing spell. Most of all our mainland is vulnerable to attack.

Thus we face an unprecedented need for advance planning and automatic responses to any threat.

In this respect, the Office of Emergency Planning works with the Department of Interior to assure adequate supplies of all fuels in the interest of the national security. We have spelled out the responsibilities, functions, and organization of all levels of government and industry for emergency management and operations of our fuel industries.

The working relationship between OEP and the Department of the Interior became even stronger on February 16, when President Kennedy signed nine Executive orders assigning important emergency preparedness functions to Cabinet and independent agencies. These executive orders have the effect of upgrading the entire emergency planning function. To quote the order it directs that agencies "develop a state of readiness with respect to all conditions of national emergency, including attack upon the United States."

This statement gives you an idea of the new urgency placed upon these efforts by the President.

The President has charged me, as Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, with the responsibility to advise and assist him in determining policy for and coordinating the performance of these functions with the total national preparedness program.

Under this Executive order, the Secretary of the Interior prepares national emergency plans for fuels. Our studies indicate that the availability of fuels in an emergency would be critical to the recovery and rehabilitation of the entire country. At the President's direction, my office maintains a constant surveillance of a mandatory oil import program instituted 3 years ago when an unreasonably high level of imports appeared to be discouraging expansion of our domestic industry. We make a monthly survey of residual oil prices on the east coast. A comprehensive summary of this survey is issued each month.

In addition, we are now conducting a study to determine the effect, from the standpoint of national security, of imports of residual fuel oil to be used as fuel. During this investigation we have received and carefully examined extensive material from numerous organizations, including the National Coal Association. The Secretaries of all Departments with an interest in this question have been consulted. We will shortly submit our findings to the President and a decision should be forthcoming very soon.

President Kennedy has also directed that we undertake a much broader study of national petroleum requirements and supplies relative to national security. As a framework for this investigation, the President said "the study will take into account not only the welfare of the domestic petroleum industries, but also the need to promote the Nation's economic growth in the face of rapid technological and world changes."

This study is now being carried forward by an interagency Petroleum Study Committee under my chairmanship. It consists of Cabinet-level representatives from the Departments of State, Treasury, Defense, Justice, Interior, Commerce, and Labor. Our conclusions and recommendations should be ready this summer. In all of these matters I can assure you that no consideration is overlooked. We strive to reach objective and balanced judgments based solely on the needs of national security.

Until now, my remarks have centered on areas of direct interest to this audience. But when we talk about the stresses and strains of cold war or possible limited war, we are thinking in terms of the world's most complex economy, presently generating an average gross national product of about $560 billion annually. Within another 3 years this will have increased to $625 billion a year.

More than 4 million businesses are concerned with this economy, producing about 8 million items. About 67 million persons are employed in these businesses, with an additional 4 million farmers making up our agricultural economy. It is the most productive and fruitful economy on this globe. Freedom to experiment, and risk and profit are its hallmarks. Nevertheless the problems of making this free enterprise system work for the common good are difficult enough under conditions of cold war or possible limited conflict.

But try to imagine our economy hit by a massive nuclear attack, as a result of which a substantial percentage of our productive capacity is either disrupted or destroyed.

Imagine our Federal Government temporarily unable to regulate or administer, or to automatically and instantly respond. Assume that islands of survival would exist among the heavily damaged areas or the partly damaged areas close to them, and that these would include wholly undamaged but demoralized communities.

What would be the alternative to conventional operations and classic procedures?

It is at this juncture that emergency planning has made a sharp break with the past. If this country is to deal with post-attack economic problems and controls it will have to rely heavily on State and local machinery. Our destiny as a nation will be determined by the contributions which States and local communities can make to survival and recovery from nuclear assault.

In brief, the States must prepare to:

1. Continue the services and the functions of constitutional government under any conditions.

2. Manage and provide essential resources including food, fuel, power, transportation, and communications services.

3. Stabilize the economy and control and preserve the monetary and credit systems.

Two months ago the Office of Emergency Planning sent a letter to the Governors of every State outlining the specific actions which were recommended. As a starter, every Governor has been asked to appoint an emergency planning director and to establish an emergency resources planning committee drawn from government and civic leadership. They will advise the Governor in evaluating the resource readiness of the State, and in identifying deficient areas and those steps needed to correct these weaknesses.

Concurrently, area offices of OEP have been instructed to offer all possible assistance and guidelines to the States.

These actions are being followed up by a series of eight area conferences, three of which already have been held. Assembled at these meetings are the government and nongovernment leaders of the several States comprising each planning area. These are the men and women who will form the nucleus of task forces in the major resources areas.

From top staff people of OEP they receive briefings on each aspect of what is called the comprehensive program for survival of Government and management of resources. Additionally, specialists from other Federal agencies, at national and regional level, are available for discussion in depth of specific problems and procedures.

These meetings constitute the first full-scale assault on the complex tasks of local emergency planning. While we anticipated good results, the conferences held so far have exceeded our expectations. First, they provide a forum to explain and suggest how States may adapt a considerable backlog of Federal experience to their unique requirements. But equally important, they give local leaders an opportunity to ask questions, and they are very thoughtful and penetrating questions indeed. More often than not, we have answers, but when we don't have answers we've learned something. In other words we are getting to the heart of local emergency planning for the first time. We expect a period of trial and error; we expect to uncover mistakes and to run into unusual situations not encountered in the past. Above all, we are aiming for a nationwide capability to respond automatically and effectively in any emergency thrust upon us.

I hope many of you will participate in this local planning as it begins to emerge in your respective communities.

It is one more obligation of the citizen-leader in this age of atomic arithmetic, missiles and rockets.

You will note that I stress the citizen-leader rather than the individual citizen. Civil defense is truly a task dependent upon concrete actions on the part of each American citizen. The Office of Emergency Planning does not look for a passive citizenry by any means; public support is needed here too. But the functions of emergency planning are, to a much larger degree, rooted in group action, by governments, industry, civic and trade organizations. We need public comprehension as much as companion programs in civil defense, but the crucial test will be one of leadership. It is the leaders on every level of our society that must supply the vision and vigor, enthu-

siasm and energy, and a sense of direction, purpose and dedication to emergency planning.

Clearly, the national interest makes this new endeavor necessary. In a world in which nothing is certain except yesterday, and nothing more uncertain than tomorrow, we must be ready to move quickly and purposefully to meet human needs, conserve resources, restore productive facilities and reestablish a functioning society capable of controlling its own destiny, a society capable of perpetuating the priceless heritage of freedom which is ours.

Postal Rate Bill Serious as It Affects Small Newspapers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, without giving Members of the House a chance to vote on the postal rate increase bill it passed the House. In this bill are some very serious increases that may well end the publication of many weeklies and small dailies.

I think the House should take another good look at this rate increase bill. Its effect on weeklies and dailies is way out of line compared to increases for large dailies and magazines.

Mr. Speaker, to prove my point, I, under unanimous consent, include certain editorials and articles from the Milwaukee Sentinel:

WEEKLIES URGE END TO FREE MAIL

MADISON, March 24.—Publishers of Wisconsin's weekly and semiweekly newspapers have voted by a topheavy margin of 130 to 4 to recommend that Congress abolish the free-in-county mailing privilege extended to newspapers.

The poll was taken by mail by the Wisconsin Press Association.

POSTAL RATE BILL

The proposal to do away with free mailing of a portion of local newspapers was recommended by the association's board of directors recently in connection with the postal rate increase bill already passed by the House.

Under the House bill a surcharge of 1 cent per copy would be charged on each newspaper mailed outside the county of publication.

An association survey revealed this provision alone would amount to a postage cost increase ranging from 38 to 200 percent for Wisconsin community papers.

A detailed study of mailing costs of 32 papers shows 23 would be subject to postage boosts of 108 to 200 percent. The association board unanimously approved a resolution opposing this measure.

LAW MISUNDERSTOOD

Association action in proposing the elimination of free-in-county mailing was prompted by the fact that this provision of the mailing laws is commonly misunderstood and newspapers are subject to much unfounded criticism as being recipients of a substantial postal subsidy.

Actually, only a small proportion of newspapers mailed are eligible to be handled free; several of the newspapers in the association survey have no papers that are mailed free.

The resolution approved by Wisconsin Press Association members voices opposition to the postal rate bill already passed by the House (H.R. 7927), proposes elimination of the free-in-county mailing privileges, and proposes that papers presently mailed free be charged for at rates equal to those charged for other newspapers mailed in the county of publication.

POSTAL PERIL

Two recent news stories in the Sentinel revealed the shocking inequity of the postal rate bill passed by the House of Representatives and now before the Post Office Committee of the U.S. Senate.

The bill would add 1 cent to the cost of mailing each copy of a newspaper or magazine outside the county of publication, regardless of the weight of the publication or the distance of the mailing.

Second-class postal rates now are 1 cent per pound inside the county, 2½ cents per pound outside the county, with a minimum of one-eighth of a cent per copy inside the county; one-half cent outside. For the more distant zones, there are additional charges per pound based on the proportion of advertising to editorial matter.

For a small weekly or daily paper mailed across a county line, the proposed postal "surcharge" would amount to a 200-percent increase in mailing costs.

For a large Sunday newspaper or heavy magazine mailed a long distance, the 1-cent surcharge might amount to an increase of less than 5 percent in total mailing cost.

Here in Wisconsin, some newspapers depend very heavily on out-of-county mailing; others do most of their mailing within their own county, where no postal increase is proposed; still others do very little mailing.

Thus the Eau Claire Leader and Telegram, with nearly half of its circulation going outside of Eau Claire County by mail, would have an increase in annual mailing costs of $36,000, more than doubling its present costs. The Racine Journal-Times, on the other hand, with slightly more circulation than the Eau Claire daily, would have its mailing costs raised by only about $750.

Some of Wisconsin's small weekly papers would have their mailing costs increased by 200 percent; others would scarcely feel the postal increase.

If it is necessary to raise postal rates, they should be raised so that the burden falls fairly and evenly on all users of the mails.

The present bill is erratic and discriminatory. It would endanger the very existence of some newspapers and magazines, especially the smaller ones.

In these fast-moving and perilous times, we cannot afford to restrict in any way the free flow of news, information, and opinion.

POSTAL HIKE WOULD HURT WEEKLIES

MADISON, March 14.—A heavy and discriminatory financial burden will be placed on many Wisconsin weekly newspapers if Congress passes the House-approved postal rate increase bill.

A survey just completed by the Wisconsin Press Association reveals that 31 of its member papers will suffer increases in postal costs ranging from 38 percent to 200 percent.

Carl A. Zielke, association secretary, explained at his Madison headquarters that the bill would levy a one cent per piece surcharge on second class mail (magazines and newspapers) in addition to the present basic rate of 2½ cents per pound for all mail going outside the county of publication.

Within the county of publication, the mail is either delivered free or at a reduced rate of 1 cent per pound.

The bill, now being heard by a Senate committee, makes no change in the in-county rates, Zielke said. Thus it unfairly penalizes those publications which, by accident of geographical location near a county line, has many subscribers in an adjoining county, where the higher rate applies.

At present a small weekly paper, weighing a fifth of a pound or less, can be mailed outside the county for one-half cent. The bill, backed by the Postoffice Department would raise this charge to 1½ cents, an increase of 200 percent.

Zielke also pointed out that the 1 cent per piece surcharge would apply regardless of the size or weight of the magazine or newspaper.

Thus the percentage increase for small publications would be far greater than for large publications.

Percentage increases in total mailing costs for 31 papers were reported by Zielke as follows:

	Percent
Algoma Record Herald	109
Bloomer Advance	125
Brodhead Independent-Register	149
Cadott Sentinel	184
Cashton Record	200
Clintonville Tribune-Gazette	67
Cuba City Tri-County Press	69
Delavan Enterprise	80
Dodgeville Chronicle	108
Elkhorn Independent	91
Ellsworth Pierce County Herald	183
Frederic Inter-County Leader	107
Grantsburg Journal of Burnett County	200
Hartford Times-Press	88
Iron River Pioneer	200
Jefferson Banner	111
Mauston Juneau County Chronicle	145
Medford Star News	86
New Glarus Post	197
Oconomowoc Enterprise	38
Oregon Observer	166
Orfordville Journal	168
Park Falls Herald	95
Phillips Bee	116
Pittsville Record	186
Rice Lake Chronotype	62
South Milwaukee Voice Journal	48
Tomahawk Leader	138
Westby Times	177
Wittenberg Christian Home	191
Wonewoc Reporter	196

In addition to the erratic and discriminatory impact of the proposed rate hike on weekly papers, Zielke said many daily papers with large mail circulations outside their own counties would be hard hit.

MAIL HIKE WOULD HURT GOOD PRESS

(By Bob Considine)

NEW YORK, March 21.—The greatest triumph of evil literature over good would be the passage of the bill, now before the Senate, which would put into the law the postal hike approved by the House of Representatives.

If the bill is passed it will hurt the full decent spectrum of the printed American word, including the words that appear in this paper.

But it is not this paper that particularly concerns us today. It is—if the bill is passed—not only the imminent death of a lot of first-class publications, but the survival of cheap, harmful periodicals that cannot use the mails yet smear the Nation's newsstands.

On the surface, H.R. 7927, the mail charge boost, looks good. By raising first-class rates from 4 to 5 cents for letters the Federal Government would be enriched $410 million.

The 1-cent lift on second-class postage, mainly used by magazines and newspapers, would bring in another $53 million. By boosting the cost of sending business and other circulars, in third-class mail, the ante would be upped by another $108 million. Certain other lifts would bring the grand total to $690 million.

Sounds great. The Post Office Department now loses $850 million a year. So with the

hike, we blow only $160 million next year. Right?

Wrong.

The President has promised pay increases to post office employees that would take care of the difference, and if it didn't take care of the difference the death of hosts of periodicals now walking a taut rope, but still paying their postal bills, would maintain (or worsen) the deficit.

Damon Runyon used to say, as the group stood outside Campbell's Funeral Parlor after stashing one of the clan, "They're hitting all around us." It is eminently true of magazines in this country.

The aforementioned $53 million postage increase on second-class mail happens to be a larger sum than the gross annual profit of the whole magazine industry last year.

Think of the magazines that have died in recent years. But think, too, of those which would be forced to close tomorrow if the bill passes.

Hardest hit, perhaps, would be religious periodicals.

Robert Fenton, assistant publisher of the Catholic Digest, has some trenchant thoughts on the subject:

"There are many religious publications that pay a nonprofit postal rate. Catholic Digest does not enjoy a nonprofit rate, but even these nonprofit publications are in a precarious position.

"Their sources of income are extremely limited—many of them are dependent upon contributions from religious groups. So that while their postal costs are lower they are also expected to be raised * * *. They, too, will face a disastrous problem.

"The ironic part of this whole question is that these increased postal rates will not bring the post office more revenue, but less. If some publications are forced out of business, they won't use the post office at all.

"Those that can struggle through will probably reduce their circulation and therefore give the post office less first-, second-, and third-class business."

POSTAL HIKE BLOW TO STATE PRESS

Postal rate increases for second class mail, as approved by the House of Representatives and now before the U.S. Senate, would be a crushing blow to some of Wisconsin's daily newspapers; to others it would be a minor matter.

These facts were revealed in a spot check of seven dailies in widely separated parts of the State.

The postal rate bill, backed by the Post Office Department, would levy an additional charge of 1 cent per copy on newspapers and magazines going outside the county of publication. No change is proposed in the present low rate for newspapers delivered inside the county.

DISTANCE NO FACTOR

Several publishers pointed out that the 1-cent-a-copy surcharge would add just as much to the cost of mailing a small paper a half mile across a county line as it would to the cost of mailing a bulky Sunday newspaper across the continent.

Some newspapers, like the Waukesha Freeman and the Racine Journal-Times, would scarcely feel the added mailing cost, since their circulation is almost entirely within their own counties.

Harry R. LePoidevin, general manager of the Racine daily, said that only a couple of hundred copies are mailed outside Racine County, out of a total circulation of nearly 35,000. The added mailing cost would be about $750 a year.

A 116-PERCENT INCREASE

On the other hand, the Eau Claire Leader and Telegram, with somewhat smaller circulation than the Racine Journal-Times, would have its annual mailing costs boosted from $31,000 to $67,000—an increase of 116 percent. The city of Eau Claire is mostly in Eau Claire County but partly in Chippewa County.

Nearly half of the Eau Claire daily's circulation goes by mail to nearly 13,000 subscribers in 13 counties, according to Willard Tomashek, circulation manager.

The Waukesha Freeman and the Watertown Times constitute another example of the sharp contrast in burdens the postal bill would place on different papers largely because of their geographical locations.

Gilbert H. Koenig, general manager of the Freeman, said only 546 papers go outside Waukesha County by mail. The 1-cent-per-copy surcharge would mean only about $1,700 in additional mailing costs annually.

But the Watertown Times, with approximately half the total circulation of the Freeman, mails 1,417 copies outside Jefferson County. Watertown is partly in Jefferson County, partly in Dodge. The Times plant is in Jefferson County.

John D. Clifford, publisher of the Times, said the paper's postage bill last year was $2,630. The proposed 1-cent surcharge would cost an additional $4,436 per year, an increase of 170 percent in mailing costs.

HIKE COST $9,000

The Appleton Post-Crescent, with 2,494 papers mailed into surrounding counties, chiefly Calumet, Waupaca, and Winnebago, would have additional mailing costs of slightly over $9,000 a year. This would be an increase of nearly 100 percent over present costs, according to Erben E. Krueger, circulation manager.

An even greater financial burden would be placed on the Marshfield News-Herald, although its total circulation is less than one-third that of the Appleton paper.

ADDITIONAL $11,931

One-third of the News-Herald's circulation is delivered by mail outside Wood County, according to Mrs. A. Tollefson, circulation manager.

Added mailing costs under the postal bill would be $11,931 annually. Marshfield is close to the Marathon County line and not far from Clark County.

The La Crosse Tribune, with heavy mail circulation in surrounding Wisconsin counties and across the Mississippi River in Minnesota and Iowa, would have its annual mailing costs increased by 125 percent. This, the paper told its readers, would come on top of an 89-percent increase in second-class postal rates in the past 10 years.

Analysis of 1961 Feed Grain Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, Congress passed a 1-year feed grain program to be effective last year and extended it so it will also be effective this year. Although the facts are now in showing that income to farmers went up sharply, there has been much disagreement and discussion concerning the amount of savings to the taxpayers.

A study has been made by agricultural economists and a detailed analysis of the operation of the program in 1961 has been made by Francis A. Kutish, an outstanding economist at Iowa State University at Ames, Iowa. This analysis indicates the savings to the taxpayers was probably in excess of the $500 million predicted. This analysis is so thorough, and I think it should be of wide interest, that it should be available to all in libraries through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The analysis of the 1961 operation of the program and its cost is set forth below:

ANALYSIS OF 1961 FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

(By Francis A. Kutish)

FOREWORD

This paper compares the results of the 1961 feed grain program with the program that was in operation in 1960 and it projects what results might be expected if the feed grain program were to be continued into the mid-1960's under the assumptions of average weather, no change in participation and three levels of crop yields. No comparison is made with other alternative programs.

SUMMARY

For the first time in 9 years, feed grain utilization in 1961–62 will exceed feed grain production. The first step has been taken in the orderly reduction of our bulging feed grain surpluses and in the halt in the downtrend in farm income. In fact, farm income was raised about a billion dollars in 1961.

Feed grain stocks on October 1, 1962, will be about 6.7 million tons less than on October 1, 1961, after climbing steadily since 1952. In the absence of the 1961 feed grain program, and assuming that the March 1 acreage planting intentions of farmers would have been carried out, the estimated feed grain production would have outrun feed utilization by about 16 million tons. This addition to stocks very likely would have precipitated a crisis that might well have endangered the entire farm program.

Cost of the feed grain program to the Government depends upon the final salvage value of the 16 million tons of grain estimated that would have been taken over in the absence of the 1961 feed grain program. Storage costs on this corn would have amounted to about $1.10 per bushel. If the final salvage value of the corn that would have been taken over in the absence of the program is assumed to equal the current sale price of certificate corn, the net savings to the taxpayers from the 1961 feed grain program would be about $123 million. If the salvage value were essentially the corn's worth for industrial alcohol, the net savings to the taxpayers would be about $504 million. If the additional corn had no salvage value (and some argue, at the high levels of stocks prevailing, this is the case) then the eventual net savings of the program would be about $942 million.

Since the payments of $782 million to farmers was roughly equal to the cost of storing the corn that would have been taken over in the absence of the program, this represents a transfer of income to farmers from those who would have stored the corn. In addition, both hog and cattle prices would have been lower in the absence of the program.

The program had little effect upon consumers. Supplies of food are essentially the same as in 1960–61. And consumer food prices are not likely to change much. In the absence of the program the estimated lower price of meat growing out of the increased livestock production and lower livestock prices that would have prevailed would have reduced consumer weekly spending less than 25 cents for a family of four. Meanwhile, hog and cattle producers would have had sharply lower incomes, about $300 million less to cattlemen.

ANALYSIS OF 1961 FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

The 1961 feed grain program retired 25.2 million acres. In addition, 26.4 million acres still were retired to the conservation reserve

for a total of 51.6 million acres. The 1,146,-924 farms (42 percent of all farms growing corn and grain sorghum) participating in the feed grain program accounted for about 55 percent of the 1959–60 adjusted corn base acreage. The 1961 corn crop was 80.6 percent of the 1959–60 average. Farmers had to reduce corn acreage at least 20 percent to participate in the food grain program. So the conclusion is that the corn acreage was increased on the farms not participating in the feed grain program—preliminary estimates indicate about 6 to 7 million acres. Since the program was voluntary, farmers not participating could increase their acreage of corn and grain sorghum if they desired.

On many farms, the 1961 feed grain program operated to reduce corn and oats acreage and increase soybean plantings. A farmer, for example, who in 1959–60 had 100 acres in corn, 30 in soybeans, and 30 in oats, could participate by cutting his corn acreage to 80 acres, increasing his soybeans to 50 acres and by not harvesting 20 of his 30 acres of oats.

Thus the program actually also reduced oat acreage, even though oats was not directly under control. The 1961 harvested oat acreage was 1.3 million acres less than 1960.

The 1961 feed grain crop was estimated as of December 1, 1961, at 140.6 million tons—or 14 million tons, about 10 percent below the record 1960 crop. The total acreage of feed grains harvested in 1961 was estimated at 106.6 million acres, 21 million or 16.5 percent less than in 1960.

Feed grain yield per acre reached a new record high in 1961. Average yield per acre of the four feed grains (corn, oats, barley and grain sorghum) has gone up about 50 percent over the past 10 years, principally due to sharp uptrends in corn and grain sorghum yields. The average of 1.31 tons per acre in 1961 was a new record high.

Including the record carryover of 84.7 million tons into 1961–62, and estimating 0.5 million tons for imports, the supply of feed grains for 1961–62 totaled 255.8 million tons, 4.3 million tons less than in 1960–61.

Assuming total utilization will be close to the level of the past 2 years, about 6.7 million tons will be withdrawn from carryover to meet the 1961–62 requirements. This will reduce the total carryover on October 1, 1962, to around 78 million tons.[1]

The USDA has changed the basis for determining the price that CCC corn can be redeemed. In the past, the local retail price was compared to warehouse bids at the major markets (Omaha, Chicago, St. Louis, Kansas City) and the highest figure was selected. Now a backed-off terminal price can be used.

Example:	Per bushel
Quotation at major market	$1.05
Weighing and inspecting	−.0175
Freight from central Iowa	−.21
Total	0.8225

This would mean that farmers could redeem their certificates based on normal production multiplied by the county loan rate ($1.14 for Story County, Iowa) for corn based on 82¼ cents per bushel.

GOVERNMENT COSTS OF THE FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

About $782 million was paid to growers for reducing their 1961 plantings. This is a more obvious Government expenditure than the money ($675 million) used to take over 637 million bushels of corn under the 1960 program.

When grain is taken over by the Government, storage and handling costs and losses from spoilage mount up fast. The USDA estimates that each bushel of corn taken over by the Government eventually costs the Government $1.10 for storage, handling charges and interest on investment.[2] Then there is the loss on final sale 6 to 8 years later.

The feed grain program was aimed at cutting down on the storage costs that go on and on and the final loss on eventual sale or disposal. The savings will be spread out over the next 6 to 8 years. Such savings are much less tangible than the money paid to farmers this year.

Thus, the true cost and savings from the 1961 feed grain program must be measured in terms of a comparison with what probably would have happened, had there been no feed grain control program in effect in 1961.

FEED GRAIN PROGRAM INFLUENCE ON CROP ACREAGE

In our analysis of the effects of the feed grain program, the estimated feed grain production and estimated utilization of feed concentrates was compared to what probably would have been produced and utilized with the previous price support programs at 65 percent of parity and no production controls. The following procedure was used to estimate what would have been produced in 1961 in the absence of the feed grain program and had the old program been in effect.

1. The March 1, 1961, planting intentions were used.

2. The percentage of planted acreage of feed grain crops harvested for grain was assumed to be the same as in the 1960 crop year.

3. The December 1, 1961, estimate of crop yields was used, except for corn. The corn yields were decreased 2.5 bushels per acre from the estimated 1961 yields to compensate for land selection, increased fertilizer use and timeliness of operation, based on a survey of extension personnel, farmers, and commercial farm managers in five Midwest States.

TABLE 1.—*Changes in planted acreages*

Crop	Average 1950–59 (1,000 acres)	1960 (1,000 acres)	Prospective 1961 [1] (1,000 acres)	Actual 1961 (1,000 acres)	1961 as a percentage of— Average 1950–59	1960	Prospective 1961 [1]	Average 1959–60
All corn	80,429	81,711	82,405	66,965	83.3	82.0	81.3	
1959–60 average	83,050							80.6
Oats	42,765	31,538	32,480	32,521	76.0	103.1	100.1	
Barley	13,835	15,614	15,427	15,800	114.2	101.1	102.4	
Sorghum	19,048	19,588	18,822	14,366	75.4	73.3	76.3	
Total, 4 feed grains	156,077	148,451	149,134	129,652	83.1	87.3	86.9	

[1] Mar. 1, 1961, planting intentions, figures taken from March 1961, Crop Production, USDA.

The following assumptions were made to arrive at a hypothetical utilization of feed concentrates:

1. Total animal units for 1961–62 were assumed to be larger—a 5-percent increase in the 1961 fall pig crop and a 7-percent increase in the 1962 spring pig crop over the previous years; same number of cattle, dairy cows, and broilers, slightly fewer turkeys, and slightly more hens and chickens. The net increase would consume about 3.6 million tons additional feed grains.

2. Concentrates fed per animal units, 0.90 ton—up slightly from estimated 1961–62 rate due to the lower price of feed grains than is prevailing this year.

3. An increase of 0.1 million ton was allowed for cattle.

4. An increase of 0.5 million ton in sxport due to lower price.

TABLE 2.—*Feed concentrate balance, United States, year beginning Oct. 1*

[All figures in million tons]

Source and use	Average, 1955–59	1960–61	Estimated, 1961–62	1961–62 without feed grain program (our estimate)
Supply:				
Carryover stocks, Oct. 1	51.6	74.6	84.7	84.7
Production	133.2	155.6	140.6	166.9
Imports of feed grains	.7	.4	.5	.6
Wheat and rye fed	1.9	1.7	1.7	1.7
Byproducts feeds fed	25.8	27.8	28.3	30.0
Total supply	213.2	260.1	255.8	283.9
Utilization, October-September:				
Concentrates fed	131.0	150.1	152.3	156.6
Seed, food, and industry	12.7	13.0	13.0	13.1
Exports	10.2	12.3	13.0	13.5
Total utilization	153.9	175.4	178.3	183.2
Utilization adjusted to crop-year basis	154.5	174.7	177.8	182.8
Carryover at end of crop year	58.7	84.7	78.0	101.1
Change in carryover			−6.7	+16.4
Estimated difference in feed grain stocks due to 1961 feed grain program				23.1

It is estimated that the feed grain program will reduce the feed grain carryover on October 1, 1962, by 4 million tons after a 9-year period of steadily increasing carryover stocks. Our analysis indicates that we would have had an increase in carryover on October 1, 1962, of 20.4 million tons over the stocks of October 1, 1961, without the program.

[1] Crop Reporting Board, "Crop Production, 1961 Annual Summary," U.S. Department of Agriculture, Dec. 15, 1961.

[2] USDA Release, 28-21-61, Sept. 1, 1961.

TABLE 3.—*Estimated 1961 crop production in absence of feed grain program*

Crop	Prospective 1961 (1,000 acres)	Percent harvested for grain 1960	Harvested acres 1961	1961 projected yield per acre	Bushels	Pounds per bushel	1,000 pounds	Tons
Corn	82,405	87.7	72,269.2	59.3	4,285,564	56	239,991,156	119,995,578
Oats	32,480	84.5	27,445.6	42.1	1,155,460	32	36,974,712	18,487,356
Barley	15,427	89.3	13,776.3	30.3	417,422	48	20,036,268	10,018,134
Grain sorghum	18,822	79.6	14,982.3	43.8	656,225	56	36,748,615	18,374,307
Total of 4 feed grains								166,875,375

The difference in the projected 1961 carryover of feed grains in the absence of the program and the estimated 1961 actual carryover is 23.1 million tons. This is equivalent to 825 million bushels of corn. At a cost of approximately $824 million ($782 million payments plus $42 million for administration costs) the cost of reduction in crops was about $1 per bushel of corn equivalent, or 1 bushel corn equivalent reduction in crops for each dollar cost.

Some of the information gained in administration of the feed grain program will be of value in future years and livestock prices are higher because of the smaller feed output.

The final cost of the feed grain program as compared with the cost of a "no controls" program would depend on the eventual recovery value of grain which would have been acquired in CCC inventory. In any exact sense, no one can say what this would have been. The CCC realized an average of $0.992 bushel for 500 million bushels of corn sold to meet certificate demands through January 26, 1962. Based on past experience, the USDA estimates that 50 percent of the acquisition value (53 cents per bushel in this example) to be a generous allowance.

Alcohol made from corn can compete with alcohol from other sources as an industrial solvent and raw material if corn is valued in the area of 40 to 60 cents per bushel. Some people argue that it would be impossible to use this much industrial alcohol. In the final analysis they say that adding 586 million bushels of corn to present stocks would mean that this extra corn would have virtually no salvage value at such high levels of stocks. The actual price lies somewhere within this range of no salvage value to $0.992 per bushel.

A comparison of the cost of the feed grain program with the cost of a "no controls" program using this range of recovery prices is as follows:

Cost of "no controls" program

[All figures are in millions of dollars]

Cost of acquiring 585.71 million bushels of corn equivalent (16.4 million tons) at $1.06 per bushel	620.8
Cost of storage, handling, transportation and interest on 825 million bushels at $1.10 per bushel	907.5
Total costs of "no controls" program	1,528.3
COST OF FEED GRAIN PROGRAM	
Payments to farmers	782.0
Administrative costs	42.0
Total cost of feed grain program	824.0
I. EVENTUAL RECOVERY VALUE AT $0.992 PER BUSHEL	
Total cost of "no controls" program	1,528.3
Recovery value at $0.99 per bushel on 585.71 million bushels	581.0
Total net revenue	947.3
Less feed grain program costs	824.0
Eventual savings due to the feed grain program	123.3

Cost of "no controls" program—Continued

II. EVENTUAL RECOVERY VALUE AT $0.53 PER BUSHEL	
Cost of acquiring 585.71 million bushels corn equivalent at $1.06	620.8
Cost of storage, handling, transportation, and interest at $1.10 on 825 million bushels	907.5
Total	1,528.3
Less recovery value at $0.53 per bushel on 585.71 million bushels	310.4
Total net revenue	1,217.9
Less feed grain program costs	824.0
Total	393.9
Plus grain in inventory value of 239.29 million bushels corn equivalent sold at $0.992 instead of $0.53	110.6
Eventual savings due to the feed grain program	504.5
III. EVENTUAL RECOVERY AT ZERO VALUE	
Cost of acquiring 585.71 million bushels corn equivalent at $1.06	620.8
Cost of storage, handling, transportation, and interest at $1.10	907.5
Total	1,528.3
Less feed grain program costs	824.0
Total	704.3
Plus gain in inventory value on 239.29 million bushels corn, equivalent sold at $0.992 rather than zero value	237.4
Eventual savings due to the feed grain program	941.7

This analysis shows an eventual saving in Government expenditure of somewhere between $123 million and $942 million as a result of the feed grain program.

These are the effects of the feed grain program on Government costs. There also are other effects on farmers' incomes.

America's Real Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John Swearingen, president of the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, recently addressed the Rotary Club of Los Angeles and pointed out in his remarks the real vitality and strength of the American society, its free enterprise system. The effect of the proliferation of regulations in the economic sector of our society must be viewed in the context of keeping the free enterprise system working at its best. As Mr. Swearingen notes, there are valid areas for regulation, but there are some areas within which the regulatory procedures harm rather than promote economic activity. I believe Mr. Swearingen opens some areas profitable to explore. His speech follows:

REGULATION OF AMERICAN BUSINESS

(By John E. Swearingen)

I count it a great privilege to be here today to address this outstanding group of California business and professional men. What I propose to do with this opportunity is to tell you what amounts to a modern-day ghost story, and it would probably be wise at the outset to make it clear that I am not by trade a storyteller.

As my introduction indicated, I am an officer of Standard Oil Co. (Indiana). You may be interested to know that we have over 1,500 stockholders here in Los Angeles and that the State of California ranks fourth in the country in terms of the number of individuals owning an interest in our company.

Moreover, as many of you are aware, our refining and marketing affiliate—the American Oil Co.—plans shortly to enlarge distribution of its products here on the west coast. One of the reasons I was particularly interested in your invitation to appear at this time is that we want to get to know you better and to have you get to know us better.

My credentials, then, are predominantly those of a businessman. At the same time, as I shall attempt to demonstrate to you, our company has had enough first-hand experience with the ghosts to which I referred to enable us to testify that they do in truth exist and that their existence needs to be more widely recognized.

Many of you have by now probably deduced that the spectres in question are the manifold and proliferating regulatory agencies of the Federal Government, whose existence was not contemplated by our Constitution and whose all-pervasive powers and activities go largely unrealized today by the average citizen.

Too many of our people are going more or less blithely through life under the misapprehension that the country is being governed pretty much according to the original ground rules. I am not at all sure that a little knowledge in this instance is merely dangerous. It could prove to be fatal.

Those who think that the Federal Government is made up primarily of an executive and a legislative branch, with an independent judiciary standing by as an impartial arbitrator, have lost touch with reality. Such people dwell in wonderland. And while the wonderland may have unquestioned origins in the concepts under which this Nation was wisely created, it is nevertheless a land of fantasy in terms of the facts of life in 1962.

What has actually happened is that, starting in 1887 with the creation of the first Federal regulatory commission—the Interstate Commerce Commission—we have witnessed the step-by-step development of a fourth branch of government. Today it embraces over 60 independent Federal agencies with approximately 400 thousand employees and a total annual budget of around $10 billion. Should any of you wish to examine this intricate structure in more detail, I refer you to the U.S. Government Organization Manual, which devotes 236 pages to the subject.

The results of this mushrooming process are in many ways astounding. We have arrived at the unhappy point at which the Cyclopean eye of some almighty regulatory agency is upon us when we buy or sell, ship or receive, hire or fire, grow or manufacture, save or spend, drink or diet, profit or lose, talk or listen.

Furthermore, as you in this audience are aware, many of these regulatory agencies

exercise unusual powers in that they first promulgate regulations which have the force and effect of law, then enforce them, and later adjudicate them.

Still another facet of this complex regulatory process that deserves mention is that the commissioners of the various agencies who exercise such control over our economic and social system are nonelective officials, many of whom while theoretically responsible to the Congress are in large measure of fact responsible to no one in particular.

To complicate the situation further, many of the people who actually prepare the regulations, enforce and adjudicate them are lower level staff personnel whose role and deliberations in decisionmaking are almost impossible to determine. Yet their philosophy and judgments are reflected in conclusions affecting the daily lives of all of us.

When we add to this already seething cauldron the frequent lack of clearly defined areas of jurisdiction between various regulatory bodies, we arrive at a final mixture of widespread confusion as to precisely what a businessman or a corporation properly can or should do, as to what body has legitimate authority to make and enforce decisions regarding such conduct, and as to where one can effectively turn for appeal from a questioned ruling.

Earlier I stated that my own company has had sufficient firsthand experience in this process to give us a certain status as experts on what the results of such a system can be. Let me give you just one example of what can happen in the business area.

This problem originated in the 1930's, at a time when competition was especially rugged, and our competitors began trying to win over some of our best wholesale customers in Detroit by offering them a lower price on gasoline for resale. When several of our most important wholesalers actually started to buy from competitors, our company finally agreed to meet this threat by matching part or all of the reductions our competitors had offered. The result was a complaint from the Federal Trade Commission, issued on a chilly November day in 1940, that our action constituted unfair discrimination and amounted to an unlawful injury to competition. As the Commission saw it, either we should not have reduced the price to these particular wholesalers or we should have reduced it to everyone in the area to whom we were selling—including all retailers.

We pointed out that neither of these two courses was at all reasonable. Unless we met the competitive price, we would have lost these jobbers as customers, and they would have received the lower price anyway. On the other hand, had we lowered prices to everyone, marketing in Detroit would have become uneconomic. The company would have lost money, and, what's more, our general price level in Detroit might have been so low that we could conceivably have been charged with trying to destroy competition there.

The case finally got to the Supreme Court, which ruled on it in 1951, agreeing with our contention that meeting competition in good faith is an absolute defense to a charge of price discrimination. Eleven years may strike you as a long time to wait to find out whether a common business practice is or is not permissible, but this was only phase 1.

In the second round of litigation, the FTC then sought to demonstrate that we had not acted in good faith in meeting our competitors' price. Once again, we started the climb up the ladder to the Supreme Court, which once again decided in our favor, but not until early in 1958. In our judgment, the net effect was to preserve a competitive system for American business, but it took 17 costly and trying years of litigation to do it. And, to preserve our right to compete, we had to fight off a Federal agency originally established to insure the continuance of effective competition.

Now my purpose in going back over this chapter in history is not to indict the Federal Trade Commission. I am willing to assume that it was attempting to carry out its responsibilities in this situation as it saw them, paradoxical as this seemed to us.

I give you this case history only as an example of the extent to which we are all wandering in a regulatory maze. If we had realized at the time we reduced our price to a handful of gasoline wholesalers in Detroit that this defensive action would lead straight to nearly two decades of litigation, I suspect we might have weighed the matter in a somewhat different light—although I doubt we would have altered our actions, which we considered fully justified.

Nevertheless, I submit that this is the kind of thing that can give any responsible businessman nightmares at high noon. In our instance, the continuing threat to our ability to compete also threatened the interests of our thousands of stockholders and employees.

And lest any of you be tempted to assume that this is the extreme to which an individual or a corporation is likely to be forced, let me give you my sorrowful assurance that it is little more than a taste of what lies ahead unless the course of events can somehow be changed.

This is not merely an idle opinion. There is presently before the Congress a proposal to grant to the Federal Trade Commission new powers even more far reaching than any seen thus far. In effect, this proposal would empower the Commission to issue a cease-and-desist order at the outset of a complaint, compelling an individual or a corporation to discontinue any practice questioned by the Commission. Such an order against our company in 1940 would have left us under a serious competitive disadvantage in a major market for 17 years, pending ultimate vindication.

I could with ease spend the rest of the day here presenting other examples involving only the petroleum industry. There is the interesting tragedy of errors involving another Federal agency—the Federal Power Commission—and the natural gas segment of our industry. Here the situation has become so complicated that the Commission stated at the end of 1960 that it would not reach a current status in its independent producer rate cases until the year 2043—assuming its staff were to be tripled.

In the meantime, many gas producers are understandingly reluctant to commit their supplies for periods of up to 20 years or more into the future without knowing the price they will ultimately receive for their product. This uncertainty has led, among other things, to increasing sales of natural gas for industrial use within the producing States, since the pricing authority of the Federal Power Commission is limited to sales of gas moving into interstate commerce. Whatever else can be said of this development, it hardly appears to be in the long-term interest of the many residential users of natural gas outside the producing States.

But while I have talked only of some of the problems facing my own industry, please remember that they are being duplicated at an increasing rate in every area of enterprise in the country. No undertaking can escape them. The railroads have had their share since the turn of the century, under the Interstate Commerce Commission—and many are near bankruptcy. As commercial aviation developed, a mounting number of activities of the airlines have fallen under the jurisdiction of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Aviation Agency. We are all familiar with current difficulties involving the relatively new television industry and the Federal Communications Commission. There is no need to run down the interminable list. It is sufficient to say that it would be difficult to envision any form of enterprise, including those yet unborn, which can now or could in the future escape the regulatory yoke. If existing agencies should somehow be found to lack authority, I have no doubt that new ones will be promptly created. Neither is there any need to belabor the point that this relentless extension of Federal control presents a problem of serious dimensions.

Please keep in mind also that my remarks have been confined largely to a single area of controls over business activity—that of the Federal regulatory bodies. While I have singled out this area because the extent of its influence is so little comprehended by the public, it is well to remember that still other regulations and controls emanate steadily from other sources in Washington, while many of these bodies again have their counterparts at the State level.

Well what, you may ask, is the moral of this dismal tale? I am not certain that I am fully qualified to answer that question. Obviously the situation is studded with morals of various sorts, depending on your viewpoint. We have at issue the steady erosion of individual liberties, the increasing substitution of bureaucratic planning for individual decisions in the marketplace. The whole direction in which the world's leading democratic country is moving seems to be involved. It is not easy to say whether the problem is basically one of the theory of government, of economics, of philosophy, or of morality. How much regulation of our private affairs is needed? How much is justified? How much can we undergo without drastically altering some of our oldest concepts about a free society?

Instead of attempting to answer questions of this complexity, let me rather conclude with a purely pragmatic observation or two in light of the present position of the United States in the world community. I think it is by now no news to any of us that we are in the midst of a gigantic economic struggle with the Soviet Union. In so many words, Khrushchev has declared economic war upon us, and through this means expects to win the world for communism without the need for direct armed conflict.

Still another factor to be reckoned with is the emerging European Common Market, from which America can expect increasing competition in international trade, the answer to which can only lie in the direction of still greater efficiency and productivity within our own economy.

Meanwhile, American business is being looked to as the prime mover in the development of a gross national product of at least $570 billion to develop enough tax revenue to pay the Government's bills in the next fiscal year.

Unless the pronounced trend toward more and more regulation of more and more matters involved in the daily conduct of business can be halted, it is questionable whether American business can retain the necessary freedom of decision and action to meet the challenges which lie directly ahead. If we sit by and permit the increasing encirclement of business by bureaucratic regulation, we cannot in all commonsense continue to expect the fruits of a vitally needed expanding economy.

As a nation we are at this moment faced with tremendous responsibilities, both to our own people and to the entire free world beyond. They can never be met without the creative contributions of a dynamic economic sector, yet we stand in danger of witnessing American business being little by little painted into a corner so small that it leaves hardly enough room in which to turn around. To state it another way, what we're doing is applying pointless regulatory brakes to busi-

ness in many important ways when we should be trying to step on the gas.

Please understand that I am not condemning all Government regulation of private affairs as such. I think we would all agree that regulation is proper when the need is clear, the effect determinable, and the people consent. We are nearing the point, however, where these essentials are fast disappearing. We are surrounded by seemingly numberless regulations of debatable need, uncertain effect, and arbitrary origin. As for the element of public consent to this process, the public hardly comprehends what is taking place.

Here, perhaps, lies the greatest danger—the danger that individual initiative will become swamped by Government edict before enough people awake to the threat.

In the words of John Stuart Mill, "A state which dwarfs its men, in order that they may be more docile instruments in its hands—even for beneficial purposes—will find that with small men no great thing can really be accomplished."

The Great Packaging Scandal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, for centuries we have known about the "heavy thumb" and the resultant fraud on the consumer, the amount depending on the size and weight of the thumb used. Legislation has long been on the books to alleviate this practice.

Today a new and much more deceptive practice has arisen to plague the consumer—packaging. We live in the age of package marketing. Practically every retail commodity sold today is prepackaged. This is good. It helps to insure sanitary healthful products. But it is also bad. It deceives the buyer in a way the "heavy thumb" never could.

The multitude of products on the market now is greater than ever before, in as many sizes, weights, shapes and packages as man can conjure. Attractive, neat, colorful, informative packaging is good advertising: good for the seller and good for the buyer. However, attractive, neat, colorful, uninformative packaging can only be good for the seller. Superlarge boxes, two-thirds full; weight descriptions in minuscule fractions; and a multitude of other subtle and confusing snares are deceptive marketing practices and nothing but a fraud upon the consumer.

The following article from the Changing Times vividly presents the problem that must be alleviated:

THE GREAT PACKAGING SCANDAL—SUPERMARKETS HAVE BECOME A FRUSTRATING NO MAN'S LAND WHERE THE CUSTOMER IS TRAPPED BY DECEPTIVE LABELS, SHORT MEASURES, PRICES ALMOST IMPOSSIBLE TO COMPARE

Walk down the aisles of a modern supermarket and you are bound to be impressed by the neat array of invitingly packaged products. They're so easy to buy—merely pluck them off the shelf. But before you do just that on your next shopping trip, remember this: On many a grocery shelf lies a trap for the unwary customer. All too often what appears to be the best buy is actually the worst. And it's getting so that it takes plenty of mathematical skill and a keen eye to tell the difference between the two.

The revolution in food merchandising has undoubtedly brought many benefits. No longer, for example, does the housewife wait while a grocer measures out food from a sack or barrel exposed to dirt and vermin. Also, many of the foods she once had to prepare at home can now be bought ready to eat.

Yet the same packaging techniques that add so much to everyday convenience have created confusing new problems for the shopper and new ways of hoodwinking him.

THE HEAVY THUMB

In your grandparents' day, the villain of the grocery store was the shopkeeper who slyly increased the weight of his products by putting his thumb on the scale. But at least your grandmother was able to see what he was up to. The package in a grocery today is likely to have been turned out by a big manufacturing company hundreds or thousands of miles away. The clerk in the store frequently knows as little about it as you do. The facts about what's inside, what the product is made of and what it will do come from the label and advertising.

Of course, most products are honestly labeled—they have to be under the law. But even on such a simple thing as net contents, inspecting officials report that labeling and advertising are becoming less straightforward and more confusing.

The U.S. Food and Drug Administration last year seized a shipment of "new Light Spry," made by Lever Brothers Co., a "new" product, described on the label as being produced by a "revolutionary" process that "actually whips out calories." Each cupful, the company said, had 226 fewer calories than any other shortening.

This may have been literally true, but, as the FDA pointed out, the reason was that Lever Bros. had puffed up its shortening with more nitrogen gas than before. A given amount of the melted new product had as many calories as did the "old" Spry.

The Government also charged that the company was misleading the public on weight. The new Spry was packed in the old-sized 1- and 3-pound cans. However, it took less of the puffed-up new Spry to fill the cans. Instead of 1 pound, you were getting 14 ounces, and there were only 2 pounds, 10 ounces in the 3-pound tin. The new weights were correctly marked, but the Government felt a buyer was not likely to be aware of the difference.

Lever Bros. has since changed the labels, dropping the calorie claim and displaying the new weights more prominently.

THE FRUSTRATED SHOPPER

The Spry affair is not an isolated case, by any means. These and similar practices are outraging people all over the country.

The chorus of complaints has swelled to the point where the FDA recently began a new campaign against what it calls "economic cheats," and the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Committee set up a special subcommittee, headed by Senator PHILIP A. HART, to investigate deceptive packaging practices.

What's at issue is not always outright chicanery. Equally troubling, and more difficult to deal with, are those practices that confuse you and make it almost impossible to arrive at a sound choice. Look at some of the typical obstacles a buyer faces:

Fractional weights: Time was when we could expect goods to come in more or less standard weights—a pound, a half pound, and so on. Weight and price comparisons were relatively easy to figure. If a half pound cost 25 cents, a pound of the same product would cost about 50 cents—probably a little less because of the discount for buying a greater quantity.

More and more products are now being packaged, however, in hard-to-handle fractions. What is the cost per ounce, for example, of a 2¼-ounce package priced at 25 cents? It takes time to figure out. And suppose a competitive product has 2.6 ounces in packages marked 3 for 81 cents.

Size extravaganza: Manufacturers and their advertising men are having a heyday dreaming up impressive descriptions. Have you recently seen any product marked "small size"? Not likely. Everything is "large," "big," "king" and what-have-you. Unfortunately, there is often no uniformity among companies making the same product on what actually constitutes bigness. Here—to take only one instance—are four brands of brushless shaving cream, in tubes, shopped by Changing Times. All were marked "giant," but take a look at the weights: Gillette, 5 ounces; Colgate, 4.83 ounces; Barbasol, 4.5 ounces; Burma Shave, 4.02 ounces.

Barbasol, incidentally, appears to have achieved a record of some sort in its description of one size (containing 7.5 ounces) as "mammoth."

The situation is no better when you get to shaving cream packed in jars, all of which tend to look very much alike in size on a drugstore shelf: Kranks, "1 full pound"; Mollé, 16 ounces; Burma Shave, 14 ounces; Barbasol, 11 ounces.

The term "full" seems to be becoming more popular in the advertising lexicon of sizes, although no one has quite figured out how much "fuller" a pound can be than 16 ounces.

Are the bigger sizes a better buy? Usually you do obtain a lower unit price by buying in quantity. But not always. Ironically, Senator HART's subcommittee need not have gone far for convincing evidence of how buyers can be misled on this point. In the New Senate Office Building there are two vending machines, side by side, from which you can buy a certain brand of crackers. One delivers a 5-cent package; the other, a 10-cent package. Logically, you should receive twice as many crackers in the 10-cent package. Actually, you get only 50 percent more.

Hidden price increases: Packaging provides manufacturers with a means of raising prices so inconspicuously that only a really careful shopper can detect what has happened. How? Simply by reducing the contents of the package and keeping the old price. Would you notice whether that little line of small type stating the net contents had been changed if the total price were the same? If this key fact would escape you, count yourself in as part of a majority.

"Few buyers take the trouble to read and compare quantity declarations," according to J. L. Littlefield, head of Michigan's Foods and Standards Division.

You may encounter, too—as did one irate midwestern woman whose case was reported to the Hart committee—weight changes that can be used to exaggerate the true amount of an advertised price reduction. This woman regularly bought an item that sold at 83 cents for a 14-ounce jar. Then one day the label carried the pleasant news, printed on a bright background, that the price had been cut 25 percent. The new price was 67 cents, which, she realized, was not 25 percent lower no matter how it was figured. But that was not all. The new jar held only 12 ounces instead of 14 ounces.

Taking into account the loss in weight, the new price should have been 53 cents had the company lived up to its claim of a 25-percent price saving. Actually, the cost per ounce of the new jar was 6 percent lower—not bad, of course, but nowhere near what was promised.

GIMMICKS AND MORE GIMMICKS

These artful manipulations with weights, sizes and prices represent only some of the major problems afflicting the buyer. You can add many others to the list. For example:

"Free" premiums that are not free at all. The Miami, Fla., Division of Trade Standards checked a deal of this type advertised by a detergent manufacturer. The division found that the price per pound of the detergent with the premium inside the box was more than 75 percent higher than the price per pound before the premium was included.

"Slack-filled" packages that give you the illusion you're buying a larger quantity than you actually receive.

Hard-to-find and hard-to-read statements of net weight on labels.

Beyond the ability of the average person to detect are those cases in which the company, intentionally or unintentionally, puts less in the package than the declared weight on the label.

This is far more prevalent than many would suspect. During the first 30 days of its new enforcement campaign, the FDA announced seizures of 99 shipments of various types of products. Virtually, all were charged with short weight. The others were seized for improper labels.

Many people would find surprising the number of big-name companies caught in the enforcement net. The seizures include shipments made by Quaker Oats, Standard Brands, Continental Baking, McCormick & Co., and Tetley Tea.

George P. Larrick, who has served as Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration since 1954, now frankly admits that "the problem is bigger than I thought it was."

THE SHELF-SPACE BATTLE

Why have abuses in the packaging field grown to such proportions?

There are some firms, probably not too many, with a cavalier indifference not only to the rights of the consumer but to the law as well. The Government has found "butter cake" in which fat was substituted for butter, Swiss cheese with artificial holes cut in it to conceal its inferiority, and many products in which artificial flavors (not named on the label) have been substituted for natural flavors.

Some of the infractions uncovered by the Government may reflect "honest" errors—say a filling machine that isn't working properly, or technical difficulties in controlling shrinkage or settling in a product that may stay on the shell for an extended period.

However, behind many of the stratagems that anger shoppers lies an intense battle among manufacturers for shelf space at the grocery store and supermarket. Count all of the different items in the average supermarket—all the brands, sizes, flavors, and so forth—and you will reach a total of about 6,000. Over 4,000 will be dry grocery products—things that are particularly adaptable to prepacking. Companies have to fight to get their products put up for sale, and they fight to get as much shelf space as possible, for it's the package that acts as the salesman.

The larger the package, the bigger the billboard effect on the shopper strolling down the aisle. Many cereals, for example, are now sold in tall, broad but very thin packages to provide more ad space on the container.

The supermarket battle also helps explain the common practice of "packaging to price." Housewives regularly scanning food shelves associate a product with a certain price range. No longer obliged to ask the grocer for a pound of this or that, they relate the price to a certain sized container. Manufacturers fear they will lose sales to competitors should they, for example, offer a larger quantity in a slightly larger package at a higher price. The buyer, they reason, won't bother to look at the net contents and will bypass their brands as a poor buy.

If the manufacturer decides for any reason to raise prices, it may be more prudent from his point of view to give a little less in the same or slightly modified package at the price the customer is accustomed to paying.

WHERE'S THE LAW

Many a housewife tripped up by a sales gimmick inevitably wonders why the Government doesn't do more to protect her. State and local officials do some enforcement work—depending on local regulations and enforcement standards. But, as one State official put it, "there is every indication that the problems are getting out of hand."

Until very recently, the FDA couldn't give much attention to this field because it lacked the money and staff. Top priority necessarily went to guarding against violations of other pure food and drug regulations that affect public health. Mr. Larrick hopes that his cleanup campaign against violations affecting the consumer's pocket will discourage wayward manufacturers. And he also contemplates setting up new food standards to complement those established in past years. These standards prescribe what a product must contain so that imitations or inferior preparations can't be passed off as the real thing. In order to be called jelly, for example, the preparation must be made of not less than 45 parts fruit or fruit ingredients to each 55 parts of sugar.

Consumers and consumer groups, however, are asking for new regulations that would: standardize weights for packages; restrict or ban use of fractions; require that weights be printed more prominently on packages and labels; limit the number of package sizes; make it compulsory for companies to put quality grades on their products. (The present U.S. Department of Agriculture grading system is voluntary.)

HOW CAN YOU PROTECT YOURSELF?

The food industry does not take too kindly to the idea of additional Government regulation of their affairs, and legislation along these lines is not something to be expected in the immediate future. What can you do in the meanwhile to protect yourself?

Obviously, you couldn't spot some of these sharp practices unless you walked around with a slide rule and a staff of experts. But you can make it a practice to read labels and packages thoroughly.

Equally important is to complain when you do encounter confusing or suspicious practices. Passive customers are the best ally of the freewheeling or shady manufacturer.

You can protest to the store manager, the manufacturer, officials who administer your local weights and measures laws, and directly to the Food and Drug Administration, Washington, D.C. "We want to hear people's complaints," says Commissioner Larrick.

Study of Real Property Acquisition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, late last session, the Committee on Public Works created a Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition to make a comprehensive study of the acquisition of real property for Federal and federally aided programs. I am privileged to serve as ranking minority member of the subcommittee.

Many organizations and associations, in addition to State and Federal agencies, have pledged their wholehearted support of this study, and with their aid I am sure that the subcommittee will produce a complete and valuable report. It is with pleasure that I call the attention of my colleagues to a very fine editorial which appeared in the December issue of "Right of Way," the official publication of the American Right of Way Association.

The editorial follows:

JUST COMPENSATION—A STEP FORWARD

The Committee on Public Works of the U.S. House of Representatives has established a new select subcommittee to make a study of real property acquisition by Federal, State, and local governments for Federal and federally aided programs. We applaud this action.

There has been growing attention and concern in recent years over the question of adequacy of payments to persons affected by public improvements under traditional eminent domain concepts. It is evident that there are sharp differences of opinion among many sincere and dedicated people as to whether existing laws and practices and rules of compensation developed by the courts, and their application, do, in fact, provide compensation which is "just," both to the property owner and to the taxpayers.

It is well recognized that courts sometimes engage in judicial legislation, juries effect compromises, appraisers strain the appraisal process, and negotiators and those authorized to approve settlements, on occasion, depart from the traditional market value concepts of just compensation, all in the name of serving "basic justice."

Perhaps this is not startling in the light of the vast increase in the amount of real property being acquired for the many and varied kinds of public improvements, and the increasing difficulty in measuring the value of property taken. Still, this is not justice; it is giving preferential treatment to some without equal protection to all. If our present laws and procedures, or their implementation, are inadequate or unfair, they should be changed. On the other hand, if they provide a proper measure of compensation they should be applied uniformly.

The Congress and many State legislatures have been urged to correct alleged inadequacies in existing law. The differing viewpoints on what constitutes just compensation and an analysis of the many changes which have been proposed in recent years are developed in the thought provoking article "Legislative Changes and Trends Affecting Compensation in Eminent Domain" in the August issue of Right of Way.

In practically every instance the proposed or enacted legislation has been piecemeal and was designed to meet a specific problem. Such an approach is inefficient and wasteful of time, money and effort; it ignores the desirability of consistency in governmental activity and of reasonable uniformity in treatment of all the people, and it results in varying amounts being paid to property owners depending upon which agency of government happens to take the property or for which Federal or Federal-aid program it is being acquired. Furthermore, the isolation of only one of the many elements of value, damages, expenses, and benefits which make up the total picture of losses suffered and compensation received, is neither fair to property owners nor to the taxpayers, for it cannot be viewed in proper perspective alone.

The new subcommittee has a signal opportunity to perform an invaluable public service. This will be the first time that an

important study of this character has ever been undertaken, and what it does may have a lasting impact upon Federal and State legislation and upon the expenditure of public funds by all levels of government.

The subcommittee is headed by the Honorable CLIFFORD DAVIS of Tennessee who has served with distinction as a Member of the House of Representatives since 1940. Congressman DAVIS is a lawyer and a former judge of his home city of Memphis. He is chairman of the Flood Control Subcommittee and a member of the Roads Subcommittee, Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee, and Watershed Development Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, and in these capacities has acquired a keen understanding of Federal and federally aided real property acquisition programs. Congressman DAVIS addressed the American Association of State Highway Officials at its annual meeting in Denver on October 9, 1961, and everyone present was impressed with his sincerity of purpose. These statements, made at that meeting, are especially significant:

"This subcommittee is bipartisan, with five Democratic and four Republican members." (CLIFFORD DAVIS, Democrat, of Tennessee, ROBERT E. JONES, Democrat, of Alabama, ED EDMONDSON, Democrat, of Oklahoma, FRANK W. BURKE, Democrat, of Kentucky, HAROLD T. JOHNSON, Democrat, of California, HOWARD W. ROBISON, Republican, of New York, WALTER L. MCVEY, Republican, of Kansas, WILLIAM H. HARSHA, Jr., Republican, of Ohio, JOHN C. KUNKEL, Republican, of Pennsylvania.) "We are charged with the responsibility of making an impartial, nonpolitical, objective, and comprehensive study to determine if existing laws, practices, and procedures in the acquisition and evaluation of real property acquired for Federal and federally assisted programs are unfair either to property owners because of inadequate payments or to the taxpayers because of overpayments.

"The Committee on Public Works believes there is real need for a comprehensive and impartial study of the acquisition of property for Federal and Federally assisted erty for Federal and federally assisted programs. We do not believe it should be assumed that property owners generally are not adequately compensated.

"It is true that property owners are not paid for some kinds of damages, losses, and expenses which may be related to the taking of their property and the construction and use of public improvements.

"It is also known that the amounts awarded by courts are often substantially more than the amounts of negotiated settlements for comparable properties. It is also recognized that under the laws and practices of many States, the public does not receive credit for all benefits accruing to property owners' remaining properties from public improvements.

"We are undertaking this study with open minds and without any preconceived opinions as to what our findings and recommendations will be. The valuation and acquisition of real property is highly technical and complex, and we are well aware of the controversial nature of the subject matter, particularly so since fundamental differences of opinion give rise to thousands of litigated condemnation cases each year.

"The subcommittee is determined to make a thorough and impartial study, and to produce an objective report with sound recommendations, together with legislative proposals if appropriate."

The Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition has undertaken a challenging assignment, and we commend the chairman on his statement of objectives.

Item 6, of the code of ethics of the American Right of Way Association requires us "to accept our full share of responsibility in constructive public service to community, State and Nation." We therefore pledge to the chairman, members, and staff of the subcommittee our enthusiastic support and cooperation. We urge every member of the association to share his experience with the subcommittee; to bring to its attention any information and ideas which may help it to arrive at an objective and considered judgment; to point out problem areas and suggest possible solutions; and to respond promptly and cheerfully if called upon for assistance. In this way, we will meet our responsibility to the right-of-way profession and the public.

State GOP Assembly Carries Much "Water"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, recently, the California Republican assembly met in State convention in Berkeley, Calif., to endorse candidates for the constitutional offices for the State of California that will be considered by the voters during the November election this year.

The Morning News, a newspaper in my congressional district, has analyzed the results of the GOP assembly's action and as will be noted from the editorial, certain inconsistencies have seemingly developed in the party that is trying to unseat an outstanding Democratic Governor, Edmund G. Brown.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I am inserting this editorial in the RECORD and I believe it will give us all pause for thought on the question of how consistent is the stand of the Republican assembly when considered in the light of the realities of our time.

The editorial follows:

STATE GOP ASSEMBLY CARRIES MUCH "WATER"

It looks as if the California Republican Assembly, admittedly the most important endorsing body in the GOP, is going to carry water on both shoulders, or at least make a valiant attempt to do so.

For this weekend, while it went on record with something of a denunciation for Robert Welch, the candyman who would be king, for having attacked former President Eisenhower as "a dedicated conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy," it at the same time went against a resolution that "membership in the Birch Society under * * * Welch's leadership is totally incompatible with the principles of the Republican Party."

Net effect of this action is to pose to the public the question of just what it is that the California Republican Assembly meant to do.

Did it, for example, really mean that it feels the "Kandy Kid" was wrong in his attack on Eisenhower? Or does it mean simply that the leadership of the GOP feels that its particular brand of practical politics must be brought into play?

The more one thinks about it, the more certain it seems that the latter must be the case.

For if the Republican bigwigs were really serious in the resolution against Welch, then they would just have to be for a resolution that would recognize membership in the Birch Society as "totally incompatible with the principles of the Republican Party."

Why? The reason is plain to those who know what membership in the Birch Society means. What that means is nothing more than a subscription to what good old Welch says. For he is the bull John Bircher, the only one in the outfit who can speak with authority. As with Adolf Hitler, or Stalin, or the cardboard Caesar, Benito Mussolini, what he says goes or out go those who disagree. Of course, here in the United States when they go out of the society, they don't go into a prison camp. Not yet. But that is only for the reason that the John Birchers have not yet come to power. However when they do. * * *

But to get back to the California Republican assembly and its peculiar action in this matter.

Just what do the Republicans mean when they say they are against a resolution stating that membership in the Birch Society "under Welch's leadership is totally incompatible with the principles of the Republican Party."

How is such a stand consistent with one of practical politics?

The only rational answer is that so many of the Republicans are members of the John Birch Society that the leaders of the GOP feel that the party cannot afford to be too hard on the society. Otherwise it would find itself, already the decidedly secondary party in California, even more secondary still.

And so, in a desperate move to keep all the votes it can, it is perfectly willing to compromise its principles by not coming out flat footedly and unequivocally against the society when it is under the leadership of the very man it has censured for having said a grossly insulting and scandalous thing about the only Republican leader to reach the White House since Herbert Hoover.

For the Republicans to win the Governorship of California it is essential that whoever their standard bearer turns out to be—Nixon or Shell—he must win the support of a large number of Democrats, scores of thousands of them.

No doubt there are some few Democrats who favor John Birchers, but if so there are mighty few. Bircherism is a disease that afflicts mainly those of another turn of mind than that which votes the Democratic ticket in California.

And so we feel confident that the Republicans, in having attempted to keep the rank and file of the John Birchers satisfied and in the shadow of the elephant, have, by that same token, made it doubly difficult for any but the most dissident Democrat to join up with them in the coming gubernatorial election.

More Conservation Funds Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. PAT JENNINGS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, my colleague on the House Agriculture Committee, the Honorable RALPH R. HARDING, of Idaho, yesterday appeared before the Agriculture Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee in support of additional funds for conservation activity in the coming fiscal year. His statement reflects my interest and concern over the need for adequate funding of our important conservation programs.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include his statement made to the subcommittee.

Serving with Representative HARDING on the Agriculture Committee has given me firsthand knowledge of his interest in the farmers of the Nation and in our conservation practices. He is dedicated to the maintenance of a sound farm economy, and he knows well that proven conservation programs contribute not only to the future of our farmers, but to every citizen benefiting from alleviation of soil and water problems.

I have had expressions of concern from my constituents over the future of our conservation programs. Therefore, I share the sentiments expressed by Representative HARDING and commend his statement to the attention of my colleagues, as follows:

MORE CONSERVATION FUNDS NEEDED

(By the Honorable RALPH R. HARDING, of Idaho)

Thank you for this opportunity to appear before the Agriculture Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee to express my concern over the amount of the funds included in the budget of the Department of Agriculture for conservation.

There are three areas which I would particularly urge your subcommittee to survey closely in this regard.

First, I hope you share my disappointment over the fact that no additional funds have been requested to increase the level of technical people available for soil conservation districts. This not only leaves new soil conservation districts out on a limb, of which there are five in Idaho, but limits the activities of the older districts, most of which now have inadequate technical assistance.

The amount included in the fiscal 1962 budget for assistance to soil conservation districts was $89,636,000. For fiscal 1963 it is $90,725,000. While it would appear that there is an additional $1,089,000 available to aid districts in handling the increasing number of requests for assistance they are receiving from the Nation's farmers and ranchers, actually this amount is for $900,000 to accelerate soil surveys and $189,000 to expand snow surveys.

I want to make it clear I strongly favor these additional funds for the soil and snow surveys but regret the failure to include funds for stepping up soil conservation efforts generally.

Of the $900,000 included for soil surveys my State of Idaho would receive $22,200.

As you know, these soil surveys must be made on the land of each soil conservation district cooperator before his conservation plan can be developed. Farm and ranch planning needs each year in Idaho have exceeded the acreage of standard soil surveys being mapped by some 50,000 to 100,000 acres. No modern soil surveys have been published in Idaho, though three are now underway.

In view of the fact that it is estimated it would require 40 years to complete standard soil surveys on all agricultural land in Idaho at the 1961 rate I endorse most enthusiastically the inclusion of the $900,000 in the budget for this purpose nationally.

The snow survey and water forecasting operation of the Department of Agriculture is an extremely important tool for countless people and groups throughout Idaho and the West generally.

Since most of the water for agriculture, industry, municipalities, and power in the Western States comes from snow that falls in the mountains, streamflow forecasts, well in advance of the planting season, give farmers and ranchers a chance to adjust their schedules in accordance with the available water supply. Economic losses would have been far greater if these forecasts were not available.

Of the $189,000 included for snow surveys, my State would be the top participant, receiving $46,632.

I am advised by conservation officials in my State that they now have 164 staff members working with Idaho farmers and that an additional 84 staff members are desperately needed—72 technicians and 12 clerical persons—if soil conservation services are to be stepped up at all.

Typical of the reports of need I have received is this statement from the secretary and treasurer of the Blaine Soil Conservation District at Hailey, Idaho, C. W. Gardner, who writes:

"To meet and sustain the demand here, it would take five technicians, including a part-time stenographer. Approximately the equivalent of three men are alloted to our district leaving us short of help by two men. If we could get one more man, it would make a great difference to our program. We have talked to supervisors of other soil conservation districts and find they have the same shortage of technical help as we do."

What meeting this demand for assistance means to Idaho farmers is well illustrated by this paragraph from a recent letter which came to my office from a Twin Falls, Idaho, farmer and rancher, Ellis Fuller, who states:

"The technical assistance provided in the past to farmers and ranchers in our Twin Falls Soil Conservation District by this agency has in my opinion been the deciding factor of whether or not many of us are still in the farming business since we have just gone through three of the shortest water years on record."

Also, I am advised that several new responsibilities have been assigned to soil conservation districts, including civil defense, radiological monitoring, technical service to ACP and rural development which are taking valuable time away from regular demands made upon personnel of the SCS offices.

I support the recommendation of the Idaho Association of Soil Conservation Districts, which is that 1½ men be added to each district over the next 3 years. It is estimated this would cost around $4,000 per district on an annual basis. For Idaho this means an increase in the soil conservation budget of $220,000 for fiscal 1963 and $600,000 for the 3-year period. It is my understanding the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts also supports this.

Second, I hope you share my concern over the fact that the national authorization for agricultural conservation program assistance for aiding the farmers in bearing the cost of applying certain soil and water conservation measures has been reduced by $100 million—from $250 million in fiscal 1962 to $150 million for fiscal 1963.

Idaho's allocation of funds under this program had been $1,821,000 for 1962. This investment and Idaho farmers' and ranchers' investments through ACP totals some $3,500,000.

This reduction would mean that Idaho's allocation would be only a little more than half of what it has been—or less than $1 million.

In our State, with the third largest irrigated acreage in the United States, any reduction in the funds spent for water conservation, which makes up by far the largest part of ACP activity in Idaho, cannot be taken lightly.

Certainly present effort in water conservation should at least be maintained if budget considerations prevent any strengthening of our efforts in this regard.

Third, in 1960 the Congress appropriated $850,000 to construct soil and water conservation research facilities in the Snake River Valley area at Kimberly, Idaho, to serve as headquarters for expanded research so badly needed in this area.

Only through this expanded research effort can permanent answers to the many water supply and management drainage, salinity and alkali, erosion, tilage, and other soil and water problems be obtained.

I understand that plans for these facilities will soon be completed, that construction will be started early this summer, and the buildings will be completed and ready to occupy in the spring of 1963. However, I am disturbed to learn that the fiscal 1963 budget provides no operating funds with which to buy needed equipment and to initiate staffing. It seems only logical that funds should be provided in the coming fiscal year so that at least some of the equipment can be purchased, arrangements for experimental land made, and staff assembled late in the year.

Therefore, I would recommend that up to $300,000 be provided this year and the balance of the $600,000 proposed increase be added next year to operate this program. This would permit purchase of the most essential equipment, leasing or otherwise arranging for land, recruitment of the staff so that an active program can be underway as soon as the construction is completed.

In view of the fact that 81 percent of the needed soil and water conservation work is yet to be done in Idaho, I am gratified by President Kennedy's recognition of conservation needs as illustrated by his special message to the Congress on this subject February 28 as well as his stated plan to convene a White House Conference on "Conservation" this year.

As the President said in that message on conservation, "Much progress has been made * * * but nearly three-fourths of private crop and rangelands still need improved conservation practices. Joint action to conserve this basic resource—the land—must be continued and intensified for the benefit of future generations."

I would certainly agree with this and the President's further statement that any funds spent for conservation are "the highest form of national thrift" and that "actions deferred are frequently opportunities lost."

I strongly urge your approval of the three budget changes I have recommended—more technical assistance, adequate ACP help and funds for more quickly utilizing the Snake River Valley soil and water conservation research facilities.

S O S: Save Our Streams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the July–August 1960, issue of Colorado Outdoors contains an excellent article entitled "Highways Versus Streams." It tells how shortsighted highway and road construction can ruin a fishing stream. The article is written by A. F. C. Greene, fishery management biologist for region 2 of the U.S. Forest Service. He formerly directed the Wyoming State Game and Fish Commission.

The facts in this article show the urgency for passage of Senate bill 2767. This bill would require approval by the Secretary of Interior of surveys, plans,

specifications, and estimates for Federal-aid highway projects, to protect fish, wildlife, and recreation resources.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Greene's article, "Highways Versus Streams" printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGHWAYS VERSUS STREAMS

(By A. F. C. Greene)

Four o'clock. The metallic screech of the air whistle quavered above the roar of compressor engines, the chatter of jackhammers and brought silence to the valley. Workmen in hard hats, dusty shirts, and jeans abandoned their tools and machines on the rocky surface that would soon be a smooth, wide highway.

Sam, a lean, bronzed highway engineer, shouldered his transit and turned his mind to the riffles and pools of the stream not far down the valley. He was puzzled. When he first came up to do preliminary surveying and stake the limits of all the work now being done, he had caught his limit of fish and had thrown back half of them in 2 delightful hours. The previous Sunday he had caught only two small fish in 6 hours.

Bob, a tanned, heavily muscled "cat skinner" who had just eased his tractor onto level ground, lowered the dozer, switched off the engine and hailed, "Hey, Sam, wanna go fishin' down there where you said you caught all those big ones?"

Sam was all for it. He was anxious to prove that he really took his limit in a couple of hours. There were several hours of daylight left.

Two hours and much ribbing later, Sam had to admit, "I must have got all of them. But this is where I saw dozens of trout—right in those pools. The riffles up there were just about as good. There haven't been many fishermen up here since we started moving dirt. Where are all those fish now?"

Bob shrugged as he cast his fly over near the boulders on the far shore. "I suppose the game and fish department dumped a few leftover fish in there. Fishin' ain't like it was when I was a kid. Too many fishermen, I guess."

They returned to the trailer camp with one fish between them and not a very big one at that.

Still insisting there should be a lot of fish left in the creek, Sam suggested they try again Sunday. And Sunday found them working carefully along the stream, using every technique and lure that had brought them any luck in the past. Fishing was better about a mile downstream, but not as good as it had been when Sam first fished it. Then they came to where the stream had been rechanneled for the new road and they had no luck at all. So they moved back up again.

Taking time out for lunch at 1 o'clock, they sprawled in the shadow of a spruce and debated their reasons for their poor luck. As they finished their sandwiches a game and fish department car stopped at the edge of the detour above them.

"There's a guy I'm going to tell off," muttered Bob. "A game warden. Wait till I ask him if anybody's ever caught the limit around here."

"Having any luck?" the wildlife conservation officer asked, after introducing himself as Lee Randolph.

"I've got my limit, if two scrawny fish are the limit." There was more than a trace of sarcasm in Bob's voice. "Your department's predictions were right; we're catching fewer and fewer fish."

"It looks like I took the last big fish out of this creek a few weeks ago," Sam chimed in. "We've put in 5 hours here and got two fish apiece."

"Get them near here?" asked the WCO.

"No, down about a mile. I made some good catches out of there a few weeks ago," Sam admitted.

"You fellows live around here?"

"Temporarily," answered Bob. "We're building this road." He waved his hand in the direction of the big jagged scar where the road was being carved out of the hillside.

"Then maybe I can show you who might be partially to blame for the decline in fishing along this stream. Since you've finished your lunch, let's take a walk along the creek. You made your best catches down there where there's a combination of pools and riffles, didn't you?" he asked Sam.

"That's right. And I saw a lot of them down at the bottom of those pools," Sam replied.

They were beside the water now. "See any fish at the bottom of the pool now?" asked Lee.

"It's not as clear as it was when I saw the——"

"And look at those rocks and vegetation," Lee interrupted. "Look at the coating of silt on them. That's why you can't get any fish or even see any. Last year this was a good spot. We planted a lot of fish along here and there was a lot of natural reproduction and fishing was good. Let's walk upstream a way."

At a spot where the new road would cross the stream, Lee paused and commented, "It looks like you have killed your own good fishing."

"What do you mean?" The question popped out of both Sam and Bob.

"That fine earth, the silt, that was dozed into the streambed here drove your fish out. That stuff clogs the gills on fish and depletes the oxygen content of the water. It can knock out years of stream improvement in a few weeks. It covers gravel bars where fish find food and where their eggs incubate and it covers plants that grow in the water providing shelter for water insects. Silt also kills waterplant life by cutting off the sunlight which is needed for growth."

Sam and Bob could see the black and brown earth leaching out of the material that had been dozed into the stream. "That's the darndest thing," mused Bob, "one of the reasons we are building this road is to carry tourists and local people into the hills to fish and while we are doing it, we're killing off the fish. I'll be—"

"It's been going on for years," said Lee. "Look at that part of the stream," he pointed to a channel several hundred yards upstream, "have you caught any fish there?"

"Not a one," replied Sam.

"That channel was cut by a construction outfit 5 years ago when they rechanneled the stream for the new roadbed," said Lee. "Maybe they could have used culverts instead of a diversion channel when the bridge was built. If the channel had to be dug, some boulders or rock dams would provide shelter and resting areas for fish. And look at the cut bank and shoulders of that road—"

"I get it," Bob cut in, "that steep cut bank and earth shoulders spill silt into the channel every time it rains or snow melts. But what can be done about it?"

"I've seen things done about it," said Sam. "On one contract the instructions called for seeding grass along the shoulders. Then an asphalt emulsion was sprayed over it. It's not the kind that's used on roads. The grass grows right through it and the asphalt holds the earth in place until the grass roots take over. Grass cuts down on maintenance costs, because it stabilizes the roadbed permanently."

"Contractors are doing more of that all the time," said Lee. "It sure helps the fishermen by preventing all that silt from running into the stream and killing the fish."

"I see something else that could be improved," said Bob. "That culvert high on the bank is flushing silt into the stream. If it had been placed so the outlet would be near the toe of the fill and some masonry had been put in at the outlet, that wouldn't have happened."

"That's right," Sam agreed, "a little more serious planning would have eliminated that. We engineers will have to start thinking about more than a road, a starting point and a destination. To serve people with more time to enjoy the outdoors we'll have to think about these places for recreational use."

"I can see where Lee is right. Some rock or log dams to create pools and riffles would have made that channel a fair one to fish in by now."

"That would help," said Lee, "but more than that is needed. Some vegetation along the banks to keep the water cool and provide shade and hiding places for the fish is also important. A 50–50 combination of pools and riffles and vegetation along the banks make up a perfect trout stream."

"Roadbuilders are not the only cause of headaches for you people, are they?" asked Bob.

"Not at all," Lee affirmed, "I can show you a place about 10 miles from here where a cleansweep logging operation wiped out some excellent fishing water. Erosion not only ruined the fishing, it ruined the slopes for reforestation, too.

"I was reading just the other day about 150 miles of good trout stream in Minnesota being reduced to only 60 miles in 20 years. Erosion did it. And fishing isn't very good in the remaining 60 miles. Reckless farming practices can ruin fishing and hunting areas, too. We don't like to see these things happen. We have a hard enough time keeping up with the increasing numbers of fishermen and hunters without having to bear the blame for things done by loggers, farmers and construction companies that help ruin fishing and hunting."

"When you walked down from your car a while ago, I was sure ready to tell you off," said Bob, "but now I see where that big tractor of mine helped keep me from catching a good mess of fish before lunch."

"You've really given me something to think about, too," Sam added. "I'll bet half our crew, maybe more, likes to fish and here we've been ruining our own good fishing. It's time we were doing something about it. I'm going to take some time out this evening and make a check list of things you've been telling us and things I've been thinking about. Maybe it can be used as a guide to preserve land, water, and fishing for the benefit of everyone."

One Bank's Urban Renewal Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, in the February 1962 issue of the publication Illinois Banker, there appeared a very interesting article regarding a do-it-yourself-type urban renewal, which would be paid for by private enterprise at no cost to the Government.

The participants deserve a great deal of credit and recognition for their efforts, and under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of the article.

The article follows:

UNIQUE URBAN RENEWAL PLAN REVITALIZES AILING SHOPPING AREA

A neighborhood shopping area which 3 years ago had "the pall of sure death on its brow" has today become one of the brightest and most prosperous shopping areas in the world.

More importantly, observers say the community's spectacular recovery may well point the way for other cities faced with revitalizing their downtown areas.

The community, known as Englewood and located on Chicago's south side, had more than the average city's normal share of problems. Not only were numerous suburban shopping centers and the downtown Loop draining away its previous flow of shoppers and dollars, but the continual downhill pattern was having a demoralizing effect upon many merchants and property owners.

One merchant summed it up: "I've been in business here a long time, but the whole section is getting to be like an automobile I once had. It was a good car—until after a while it gave so much trouble I wanted to just walk off and leave it."

And "walk off" is what a lot of business people did. For example, when a large department store at the main intersection in the heart of Englewood had the building condemned following a fire, the owner chose to use the insurance coverage to move elsewhere.

For 6 years the vacant corner was thus left to serve as a reminder that "the world's largest neighborhood shopping area" also possessed one of the world's largest community problems.

Finally in 1958 it appeared the entire community was beginning to want to walk off and get away from itself.

NEW LEADERSHIP

Ironically, the man who was most instrumental in reversing the downward trend to oblivion is a soft-spoken Georgia-born bank president who arrived in Englewood just in time to see the community reach its lowest ebb.

The banker, W. Norbert Engles, had been assigned to take over as president of the Chicago City Bank & Trust Co.—largest bank on the southside and located in the center of a sagging shopping area.

Actually he had not been recruited from another bank, but rather from the Small Business Administration in Washington. His conspicuously successful background in working with independent business enterprises throughout the country, convinced the owners of Chicago City Bank & Trust (bought in 1958 by Diversa, Inc.) that Mr. Engles could do a better job than anyone else in strengthening the bank's position.

But his job, as Mr. Engle saw it, was to first spearhead a campaign to strengthen the community itself.

When Mr. Engles had been in his new position less than 6 months, he was asked to breathe new life into the 40-year-old Englewood Businessmen's Association.

The results of his efforts, as president of both the bank and the association, are now a matter of record and arithmetic.

Not only was the "trend to oblivion" halted, but the curve of gross business volume gradually climbed to show a 25-percent improvement for the first 2 years (from $80 million in 1958 to more than $100 million in 1960). And advance figures indicate the curve has reached an even steeper pitch upward for 1961.

SECRET OF SUCCESS

According to Mr. Engles, the most important step in the entire campaign was that of creating a new kind of hope and determination in the community.

In short, it was a problem of selling businessmen on the idea of joining forces and helping themselves with a sort of do-it-yourself urban renewal program.

Evidence of his association's work is everywhere. As an example:

The vacant corner where the department store had stood was immediately recognized as a kind of "monument to failure." Certainly this vacant property, valued at $500,000 but serving as hardly more than a place to display circus and campaign posters, was not a suitable hub for his association's wheel of progress.

Efforts were made to inspire enough confidence in outside investors to build a profitable structure on the vacant corner. When there were no takers, Mr. Engles took the most logical (and most difficult) approach.

FORMS "VIGILANTES"

He formed a "vigilantes" group called the Englewood Community Corp., and set out to sell debentures and shares of stock to merchants and businessmen throughout the area. He did not sell the idea of earning a quick profit; (indeed, the investors were guaranteed only a 2-percent return). Instead he sold the concept of investing in the community.

After several months of intensive selling, the corporation had raised $425,000 toward the $725,000 that was needed. For the other $300,000 Engles went before his own board of directors and asked for a loan. The collateral offered? Not the profit from a new building across the street. The mortgage rather was on the bright future of a revitalized community.

Today, the modern building has been completed and is profitably leased to the Walgreen drug chain.

MERCHANTS BUY LIGHTS

Another typical victory for Mr. Engles and his businessmen's committee was through a tedious but effective merchant-to-merchant campaign to "throw some real light on the community."

Old-fashioned lightpoles have now been removed from the streets and replaced with such modern facilities that it now is credited with being "one of the brightest spots in the world."

Significantly, the merchants and property owners themselves are paying the entire cost of the installation, maintenance, and additional power of the new lighting system.

This feat was achieved by approaching each merchant and stressing the vital importance of the appearance of the area, even at night.

With each streetlight installation costing $2,000 and electric power estimated at $50 per month for each installation, the merchants nonetheless enthusiastically supported the program.

Total cost for the new lighting system was $500,000.

Recently, when the new system was ready, Mr. Engles and many thousands of Englewood citizens gathered at the central intersection to hear messages of congratulations from Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, and Chicago's Mayor Richard J. Daley.

Both dignitaries praised the committee and the community as a whole for having staged a spectacular recovery and thus setting a pattern for other troubled shopping communities throughout the country.

JOB NOT OVER

Admittedly, the job is not over; but Mr. Engles and the other businessmen of Englewood are confident the hardest part is behind them.

Businessmen in Englewood realize that the banker from Georgia by no means accomplished the revitalization alone, yet they are eager to point him out as the man who provided the leadership and fortitude that sparked the spectacular recovery program.

J.F.K. "No Win" Policy: Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am certain my colleagues, who are as concerned as I am over our handling of the Berlin crisis, will be interested in the following article by David Binder, which appeared in the March 15 issue of The Reporter magazine. Entitled, "Are We Really Standing Firm on Berlin?", the article reveals how the State Department and the Kennedy administration imposed a "no win" policy on the handling of the Berlin situation, leaving Gen. Lucius Clay with no command, no authority, no course of aggressive action.

This is a prestige-shattering episode in our conduct of foreign policy. It is as much a defeat as a losing military maneuver in battle. It is a manifestation of the vacillation which emanates from our Department of State. It reveals the Kennedy administration's inability to cope with the State Department, to establish and hold to a strong international policy.

Text of the article is as follows:

ARE WE REALLY STANDING FIRM IN BERLIN?

(By David Binder)

There are few Western and no Communist officials in Berlin inclined to believe that, up to now, there has been any real danger of total war in the Allied-Communist dispute over the isolated city. The moves and countermoves that have taken place may have involved the use of tanks and guns, but they have been of a political rather than a military character. Certainly the Communists, who do not take risks lightly, were convinced of this when they built the wall and reinforced it during August and September. On the Western side, only the French Government appears to have refused to take the Russian threats at face value, and President de Gaulle has consistently opposed negotiation or concessions on the issue. Allied officials on the scene who minimize the risk of war consider that the dangers of miscalculation which could lead to a nuclear holocaust are practically nil. They point out that blockading of the land access routes and the substantial interference with Allied flights in the air corridors are by now familiar to both sides. Since the wall, the Communists have intensified their interference with land access and most recently have made probes in the air corridors. Obviously they have not miscalculated, for the Allied response has been confined to frequent "stiff protests" and only an occasional countermeasure.

In fact, there is every reason to believe that Premier Khrushchev and Walter Ulbricht, the East German Communist leader, do not take much stock in the declarations about "defending Berlin" and maintaining

"Allied rights" that have been periodically intoned in Washington and London. Rather they have moved ahead on what appears to be an accelerated schedule in an offensive against West Berlin, an offensive designed ultimately to create what they call "the free demilitarized city of West Berlin"—perhaps even to swallow it.

This is what worries many responsible American observers in Berlin. They feel now that the Allied policy pattern of vacillation, retreat, and begging for negotiations has created an ever-increasing potential of miscalculation. Where they saw no real risk of war before, they now see Berlin heading for a period when the peril of war becomes acute precisely because Allied policies are habitually stated in ringing phrases without convincing followup. On the other hand, the Communists have been spoiled by success and are steadily moving forward, taking one bite after another as long as they can get away with it.

The Communists have repeatedly proclaimed their aims and so have the Allies. But until now only the Communists have acted according to their stated principles—by remaining intransigent in negotiation and by pushing continuously against the Western position. Allied deeds have not measured up to Allied words, and the Berliners know it as well as the Russians. President Kennedy said the West would fight to protect the access routes. But since the erection of the wall the Communists have repeatedly held up trains and trucks, and they have reduced the number of rail exit points on the West Berlin periphery from 5 to 1. In none of these instances did the West take firm action. When the East German regime put up tank barriers across the Friedrichstrasse, the lone crossing point for foreigners between East and West Berlin, a reporter asked a West Berliner what he thought the Americans would do in retaliation. "Maybe they'll go on a hunger strike," said the Berliner, in a capsule statement of the city's disappointment with Allied policy. From their distant capitals the Allies have pleaded for acceptance of the status quo in Berlin, failing to recognize that there is no status quo. Instead there is a state of flux, murky and unfathomable.

GENERAL WITHOUT A COMMAND

It was to cope with this state of affairs that the President appointed Gen. Lucius D. Clay his personal representative in Berlin. In making the appointment he expressed his "unusual confidence" in the man who had been most responsible for the Berlin airlift. The retired general was given the powers to "report, recommend, and advise" on Berlin—that is, to exchange views with the Allied commandants and then to report his views to Mr. Kennedy.

When Clay arrived on September 19, he found a rapidly deteriorating situation: the wall growing higher and thicker and the allies backing away from the assertion of their rights. A man of action and a man used to command, the general took charge. Two days later he flew to the tiny enclave of Steinstücken, a piece of West Berlin located a half mile inside East German territory, to underscore American intentions to hold on. A day later he ordered the resumption of military police patrols on the Autobahn, a practice that had been dropped 9 years earlier in the face of Soviet harassment.

Then, only 7 days after Clay arrived, Gen. Bruce Clarke, commander of U.S. Forces in Europe, flew to Berlin to tell Clay he could not use the Army to counteract the Communists without clearing each action through headquarters in Heidelberg. Though Clay was hobbled, he could still move. He gained support from our Ambassador at Bonn, Walter C. Dowling, who has always been close to him, and from the American commandant, Maj. Gen. Albert E. Watson, who showed his willingness to follow a policy of an eye for an eye against the Communists.

The next test came when East German border guards attempted to impose identity controls on American State Department officials entering East Berlin. Clay and Watson answered by forcing entry of these civilians with military police escorts armed with bayonets. Then they sent a tank unit to the Friedrichstrasse. Their aim was to make the Soviets display their responsibility under the four-power statute for such controls on the sector border. American and Soviet tanks faced each other muzzle to muzzle on the Friedrichstrasse on October 27. A day later Washington ordered the American tanks to pull back. Had the risk of war seemed too great? Clay answered that shooting would have been most unlikely in such an unmilitary deployment of armor. The general's initiatives were reversed not by the Kremlin but by the State Department. Within a week the Department ordered a sharp cut in visits of U.S. personnel to East Berlin, visits undertaken to stress the validity of the four-power status. And on October 30 the military police patrols on the autobahn were also stopped.

But the State Department was not through with its efforts to trim General Clay's authority. Nor was the Army. Clay was in Washington for the mid-November meetings between Chancellor Adenauer and President Kennedy. At that time Secretary of State Rusk met privately with West German Foreign Minister Gerhard Schroeder to draw up a new "contractual basis" for relations between the Bonn government and West Berlin as a potential concession to the Russians. Clay's name was added to the protocol of the Rusk-Schroeder meeting as having attended. He learned of this 10 days later and naturally was not pleased. Here was a vital policy change affecting the future of Berlin and he was not even advised, much less consulted.

In the middle of December, Army headquarters in Heidelberg transmitted a message to General Watson, the Berlin commandant, advising him that his "discretionary powers" in dealing with incidents in Berlin had been substantially reduced. Henceforth, Watson was to clear his actions through Heidelberg and NATO headquarters in Paris. Clay felt the Watson order was indirectly a blow at his authority, and for this reason he flew to Washington on January 5 to confer with President Kennedy and Secretary Rusk. A good bit of the story was leaked to the press by Clay's opponents in the State Department before he ever got to the Capital. Apparently the general obtained little satisfaction from the consultations, and he returned to Berlin with no new powers.

Meanwhile, British diplomats, anxious to press a policy of negotiation with the Russians, came up with a plan for restoring contacts between the Soviet commandant and the three Western commandants in Berlin, contacts that had been broken at Christmastime when the Communists made it impossible for American officials to visit their Soviet counterparts without being subjected to the border controls of the East German police. At that time Clay and Watson gained approval in Washington for the ban they had imposed on the Soviet commandant, preventing him from entering the American sector as a reprisal for the Communist actions. In an about-face, on January 23 the State Department adopted the British plan for reestablishing Allied-Russian communications. General Clay objected to no avail. So far the British plan has borne no fruit for the Allies.

General Clay knew in 1961, as he knew in 1948, that the only way to stem the Communist tide was to act promptly and forcefully. He acted, doubtless overstepping the bounds of his original authority. But his measures, undermined by officials in Washington and Western Europe, were turned into half measures which resulted in defeat and reverses. In the process it seems he also lost much of the "unusual confidence" placed in him by the President last August. At the same time, the trepidation of the President and the State Department over Berlin and their refusal to back Clay in decisive moments has seriously damaged the credibility of Allied determination to defend the city.

THE SOVIET GOALS

The Communist aim is obviously to obtain recognition of the Ulbricht regime from the allies and to bring to an end their military presence in Berlin. Recent East German and Soviet policy declarations show clearly that the Communists intend to reduce the allied presence in West Berlin from a de jure to a de facto basis. Simultaneously they intend to raise the East German Communist Government from de facto status to a de jure status as controller and arbiter of West Berlin's future. The decisive drive began with the building of the wall. The steady erosion of remaining allied rights in Berlin went on from there.

Curiously, there was a sudden reversal of the Communist agenda last October 17, when Premier Khrushchev called off his December 31 deadline for the signing of a German peace treaty "with or without the Western Powers." Allied willingness to negotiate over Berlin was the reason, he said. But the barrenness of the Thompson-Gromyko talks proves that Khrushchev was not truly interested in negotiation—not when he could make physical gains in Berlin. Directly after the 22d Soviet Communist Party Congress, Khrushchev opened the new diplomatic offensive on Berlin. On November 9, he called in the West German Ambassador, Hans Kroll, and presented him with an alluring prospect of a Berlin settlement predicated on a few seemingly slight West German concessions.

During November, the East German regime shifted gears and began making overtures to the detested Bonn government—a "minimal program" for a "modus vivendi" between the two Germanys, as the ailing Premier Otto Grotewohl described it in a letter to Chancellor Adenauer on November 30. Ulbricht made similar bids in his speech to the plenary session of his Socialist Unity Party's central committee. The Soviet Union went even further with an aide memoire to the Bonn government on December 27 in which it tried to tempt the West German Government with prospects of large trade markets.

Since then the Russians have dropped broad hints that they would like Premier Khrushchev to visit Bonn this spring for consultations on Berlin and related matters. While Adenauer has turned a deaf ear to these bids, his coalition partners, the Free Democrats, have openly supported the idea of a rapprochement. So has the British Foreign Office.

The object of the new Communist strategy is the same as the old: a "free city of West Berlin" and a sovereign East German state around it. However, prior to October 17 the Soviet Union and East Germany intended first to create a "legal" document, the peace treaty, which would provide a "juridical" tool against the allied position in Berlin. Step by step they intended to create the situation spelled out in the peace treaty—the free city and the sovereign Ulbricht state. Then they reversed the process. They called off the peace-treaty deadline and began to create the new "legal" situation step by step. Eventually the peace treaty would merely ratify a fait accompli.

The recent buzzing incidents in the air corridors could be viewed as an example of this tactic. By flying in the corridors, the Russians seek to establish the precedent of Communist presence. Later the buzzing job can be transferred to the East Germans.

Qualified allied observers believe the Communist goal is to lure West Germany out of its Berlin involvement long enough to lay effective siege to the allies' access rights. The advantage of this would be to break the Western front and to limit the scale of Western reprisals. The most telling countermeasure at this stage would be the termination of the intersone trade agreement, which provides East Germany with a number of West German goods but is of little economic value to the Federal Republic. The threat of terminating intersonal trade was effective a year ago, enabling the West to wring concessions from the East Germans.

But if the Communists were to succeed in "neutralizing" West Germany for a time, potential counter measures by the West would be on a severely limited scale, and the attrition of allied rights could be brought to its conclusion. Under such conditions the "definition" of the Western commitments to Berlin would be even less clear than it is today, and the Communists would feel free to make further incursions.

In drawing this conclusion, the American authorities (including a few members of the State Department) who are most pessimistic about Berlin feel that the only way to head off such a development is to act immediately and convincingly to show the Communists where we stand on Berlin. Mere statements of principle, no matter how finely worded, are not enough, they say. We must stand by such statements and demonstrate that we are willing to act to defend every part and parcel of the Berlin position, allied and West German, be it air traffic, canal tolls, truck passage, or movement of civilians on trains.

Experience has shown that the surest way to convince the Communists of Western resolve is not by formal protests, solemn declarations, or threats of using the bomb, but by quick countermeasures against harassment and infringements of rights. It was to carry through these policies that General Clay went to Berlin.

For Relief Where Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Public Works is currently holding hearings on the President's requested standby capital improvements legislation and his later proposal for a more limited and selective immediate acceleration of capital improvements programs.

The Washington Evening Star in an editorial dated March 28 commented favorably on the President's proposals as follows:

FOR RELIEF WHERE NEEDED

On the conditions specified by President Kennedy, the administration's proposed $600 million capital improvements program could give a worthwhile short-term lift to communities where economic recovery has lagged and unemployment has remained distressingly high. The testing of its real effectiveness in this regard would depend, of course, on the care with which the localities and projects are chosen—with an obvious requirement that need and merit, rather than vote getting, should be the determining factors.

Mr. Kennedy has spelled out the standards in his letters to the House and Senate Public Works Committees. They are, first of all, that the funds would go only to those localities already designated as redevelopment areas or to those where substantial unemployment (more than 6 percent) has prevailed for at least a year. Redevelopment areas are those where exodus of industry or displacement of labor through technological changes or other factors suggests that a permanent shift in economic interests will be needed to restore prosperity. This long-term help is being sought through the Area Redevelopment Act of last year, with the pending program designed to give interim relief.

As further safeguards in this program, the President specified that only projects that can be started soon and completed within 12 months will qualify, and that they must meet an essential public need and contribute significantly to reduction of unemployment. As examples, he mentioned water and sewer system improvements and modernization of hospitals, airfields, or other public facilities. Secretary of Labor Goldberg already has testified that there will be no leaf-raking projects and that at least 95 percent of the work will be done by workers in the employment of private contractors rather than on public payrolls. Allocation of the funds will be made by existing Government agencies.

With congressional and State elections coming up this fall, it is not surprising that administration critics already have pinned a "pork barrel" label on this program. And it could, of course, have some influence on the November voting, although there will be relatively little time remaining even if Congress authorizes the program and appropriates the funds promptly. At the same time, it is indisputable that the overall national recovery has bypassed many communities and has left untouched a large number of long-term unemployed. An investment of $600 million in their welfare, and in worthwhile public improvements, pending efforts at a permanent solution of this economic problem, seems justifiable.

Governor Lawrence on Greek Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 25, 1962, the Greek Orthodox community of Philadelphia commemorated the 141st anniversary of Greek independence. The occasion was marked by services at Independence Hall, and in the evening important presentations were made to a very large attendance in the main ballroom of the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel by leaders of the community and of the Commonwealth.

The principal address was delivered by the Governor of Pennsylvania, the Honorable David L. Lawrence. In his talk Governor Lawrence paid tribute to Greece, which laid the foundations for the concept of democratic government which we Americans practice today. He indicated that the contributions of Greece to the cause of human liberty have been great and lasting. The Governor's speech was so interesting that I have attached a complete copy of same to these remarks so that it can be read by all Members of Congress.

The speech follows:

REMARKS OF GOV. DAVID L. LAWRENCE AT GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY CELEBRATION, BELLEVUE-STRATFORD HOTEL, PHILADELPHIA, PA., SUNDAY, MARCH 25, 1962

It gives me great pleasure to join with you this evening in this celebration of Greek independence.

Our two nations have been united in the cause of freedom for many years. But the bonds of our common philosophies extend backward across the length of time to a point before the birth of Christ—when the first flame of democracy was first lighted in the hills of ancient Athens.

The modern independent Greek nation, as we know and respect it now, has existed only 141 years. Yet it was 23 centuries ago that Aristotle set down a basic theory of free, democratic government when he said:

"If liberty and equality * * * are chiefly to be found in a democracy, they will be best attained when all persons alike share in the government to the utmost."

It is this basic concept that has set our own country aside and given America the strength to capture and hold the hope and imagination of man.

For America is, truly, a Nation whose strength depends upon the active concern of all its people, not just a few, not a privileged class, not the elite or the chosen few, but the collective voice of its own citizens.

When others look at us, it is not strange that they should feel, occasionally, that democracy is, as Plato once said, "full of variety and disorder."

The truth is that we do very often disagree, and disagree strongly, in our opinion of what should be done and what means should be used to achieve our goals. We are a Nation of many kinds of people, many shades of political and social opinion and a never-ending variety of individual beliefs and interests.

But this, in itself, is a large part of the strong fiber that weaves through the fabric of freedom, giving it the power to endure and sustain itself.

America's ability to debate and disagree on public matters, in the full view of its own people and the world, is exceeded only by our national ability, as citizens, to mobilize our efforts and meet whatever challenge the world may present to us.

Throughout our history this has been the case—and it shall continue to be.

We may differ among ourselves, south and north, east and west, labor and management, public and private officials, but we do not allow our differences to overcome our better sense or our devotion to the central cause of liberty.

It is this same vitality, this same urgency of purpose and unity of spirit that have characterized the free people of Greece since they won their hard-fought battle for liberty in 1821. We should pause, for a moment, I think, to recall the long, dark years of that struggle.

To a student of military strategy, the War of Greek Independence might not serve as a model, but to those who search the face of history for an image of man's dignity and his determination of spirit can find no better example. The war of 1821 was not only by men in uniform, but by hundreds of thousands of loyal men, women, and children who were passionately devoted to the idea of liberty and were willing to sacrifice for it.

In the last analysis, however, the true value of freedom lies less in being free than in making freedom work for humanity.

There can be no liberty without responsibility, for the mere fact that freedom exists carries with it an overwhelming obligation to ourselves and our neighbors.

As Greece and America have grown to maturity, both of our nations have recognized their responsibilities to their own people and to mankind.

We are not content to accept liberty smugly, to go about our business enjoying freedom and taking it for granted. If liberty is preserved, once it is won, it must be through the careful, constant day-by-day pursuit of the responsibilities of a free people.

Those responsibilities are many.

We must maintain forces adequate to defend the physical boundaries of our Nation. We must aid our friends in the effort to protect themselves.

We must preserve our heritage, for a nation without respect for its past has no pride in its present or hope for its future.

We must conserve our natural resources, for the land and the water that nourishes it are the lifeblood of human progress.

We must conserve our human resources, for the minds of our children hold the key to the future and the light to give direction to this country and its people.

I want to speak with you, tonight, about our own State and the way in which we have met these responsibilities in recent years.

I believe our progress has been significant. Pennsylvania, today, stands on the threshold of a great new period of providence and prosperity.

Although we have suffered severe economic troubles in the past, we have begun, now, to build to a new position of strength and security.

We were once almost entirely dependent upon basic industry for the employment of our workers and the support of our economic growth. Within the past 6 years—with the substantial help of the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority, an official arm of the State department of commerce, we have succeeded in diversifying Pennsylvania's industrial complex.

Today, new plants are manufacturing chemicals for the nuclear age, pioneering in the research that leads to new products and new employment, turning out the finest electronic equipment and marketing much of the Nation's wearing apparel.

We are replacing the closed mineshafts in our hard and soft coal regions with new factories, bringing new jobs to communities that once might have become ghost towns.

In this effort, there has been the same unity of purpose and determination of spirit that has characterized every single sociological advance in our history.

We have made astounding progress in many other fields, also. At this moment in our history we are building more highways than at any other time—modern highways that are engineered for safety to save the lives of those who use them. We are moving forward in our programs to care for the mentally ill and improve public health, in our determined effort to protect the rights of Pennsylvania citizens to fair and equal treatment in education, housing and employment, without regard for race, color or religious belief.

We have begun to remove the blight of slums and rundown business districts from our urban communities, both the large cities and the smaller urban communities that form the greater nucleus of our growth in these modern times.

We have embarked upon a program of improvement for our public schools and we are, at long last, beginning to pay attention to the needs of higher education. We have gone back to the essential philosophy of Plato, once again, for Pennsylvania agrees that "the direction in which education starts a man will determine his future life."

Pennsylvania's people can be proud of the record their government has established in recent years. They take pride in the fact that this year—for the first time since the end of World War II—our State has been restored to a position of fiscal responsibility, with a budget honestly in balance and a $177 million deficit wiped from the ledger.

Each of these things—and all of them combined—represent the way in which a free people in a free society must operate to meet the responsibilities of freedom.

It is not enough to have freedom, to be able to believe as we choose or speak out when we have something to say or take action to remedy a situation we do not like. To be of value, freedom must work for those who enjoy it, and this is the essence of our efforts to educate all children equally, to provide care for those who cannot care for themselves, to conserve the creative energy of our people.

In the long march of progress in this State, the American-Greek community has played a vital role. Its leaders have joined, willingly and proudly, in the effort of local citizens and State government to meet the challenges of our time.

I am deeply grateful to have this opportunity to join you this evening as we pay homage to a great and enduring example of the triumph of the human spirit over tyranny.

When Archbishop Germanos raised the flag of the Greek nation against Ottoman rule on this day 141 years ago, he and those who followed him struck a blow for universal freedom as well as for liberty in their own proud and historic land.

Since that time, the contributions of Greece to the cause of human liberty have been great and lasting.

The world owes much to Greece and her people. From ancient Greece have come the world's earliest and greatest concepts of science and art and literature.

In the troublesome, often tragic, flow of history, the plays of Greek writers have served as the cornerstone of theatrical tradition.

We are tied together by bonds of respect and lasting affection.

As Americans, we are indebted to Greece for the concept of democratic government.

As human beings, enjoying the hard-won liberty handed down to us by others, we are indebted to each other and to all mankind.

The debt we owe to the past can be paid only to the future. It will be paid, with pride and gratitude, in all that we do to insure a better life for our children and the generations that come after.

I am confident that we can meet that responsibility—that we will meet it—for we know that we must.

This celebration stands as a symbol of the unity and devotion the American Greek community holds in its heart for the fundamental ideals of democracy.

Whether we speak, now, of Germanos of Patras or honor the men of the American War for Independence; whether we praise the glory of the past or the famous men who made it; whether we bow our heads in memory of those who died to keep us free or lift our voices in song in praise of the Almighty, let us remember this:

We pay tribute to the grandeur of the past when we unite and pledge ourselves to the challenge of the future.

Let us have that unity, now. Let us move forward, together, toward a new sense of purpose and direction.

With God's blessing and His guidance, we shall triumph in the days ahead.

Income Per Capita in 1962 Will Be $2,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Joseph R. Slevin, national economics editor of the New York Herald Tribune, which appeared in that paper on March 19, 1962.

The $2,000 figure is a landmark in the history of this country; no other nation comes close to this in per capita income. Some of our citizens, of course, have incomes much higher than $2,000; too many still have incomes lower than $2,000. It is an achievement typical of our Nation, however, and we should be proud of it.

The article follows:

MAGIC MILESTONE: BIGGER PAYROLLS FOR ALL IN UNITED STATES

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

The living standards of the American people are surging past a magic milestone this year. It's a $2,000 milestone, for that is the amount of after-tax income that the prosperous U.S. economy will turn out for every man, woman, and child in the country.

Some will get much more than $2,000 and many will get much less but living standards are rising across the board. It will be a rare American who will not be better off at the end of 1962 than he was at the beginning.

Factory workers' earnings are going up. They are working longer hours and are collecting higher hourly wages to boot.

The salaries of junior executives and their bosses are climbing. So are the incomes of farmers, independent businessmen, doctors, lawyers, and other professional men.

Dividends are rising because corporations are earning record-breaking profits and are paying out larger sums to their shareholders.

Interest payments are going up, too. Banks and other institutions are offering more generous returns on savings.

How rich is the average citizen in this wealthiest of all countries?

He's a third richer than the average Canadian, his nearest competitor, and he's 10 times richer than his Mexican neighbor to the South.

An American is almost twice as rich as a New Zealander or a Swiss, and roughly twice as wealthy as a Swede, an Australian or a citizen of Luxembourg.

He has a little more than double the income of a Britisher, a Belgian, a Frenchman, or a Dane; three times the income of a Dutchman or a Czech (the wealthiest of the Iron Curtain citizens); and three and a half times the income of a Russian, a Finn, a Venezuelan, or an Israeli.

The Africans and the Asians are the poorest of all. Their average incomes range down from $300 in Singapore, to $200 in Japan, and to less than $100 a year for each person in India, Pakistan, Kenya, Nigeria, and other countries.

The average American's income never had gone above $2,000 before this year. It came close last year when it hit $1,960 after totaling $1,947 in 1960, and $1,905 in 1959.

Judged by the number of dollars alone, the income of the average American has doubled in the last 17 years. It crossed the $1,000 mark in 1944, and one way of looking at it would be to say that the United States has prospered more in these 17 years than in all of its previous history.

But that would be misleading on a number of counts—most notably because of inflation.

The $1,061 that an American received in 1944 was paid in more valuable dollars than the ones he collects today. He would have to take home $1,725 in 1962 to live as well as he lived on $1,061 17 years ago.

The real take-home pay of the average American has doubled in modern times, however. His real income came to about $1,000 during the mid-1920's and it slipped back there again during the depressed early 1930's.

The experts are betting that this year's upsurge in dollar incomes will be accompanied by a sharp rise in real buying power.

Prices are edging higher but they are going up much more slowly than incomes. The average American will be able to pay the higher prices out of his substantially increased income and still have more money to spend and to save than he had last year.

H.R. 9900: A New Trade Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I made before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives on March 27, 1962, with respect to H.R. 9900 the proposed new trade policy presently being considered by that committee:

REMARKS OF HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, OF WEST VIRGINIA, BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS ON H.R. 9900, PROVIDING A NEW TRADE POLICY TUESDAY, MARCH 27, 1962

Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee, this is not the first time I have faced your group to plead the cause of industry and job security. I can, I hope, envision the same cordiality and courtesy that have been extended to me on my previous appearance to discuss major provisions of our international trade policy, with particular reference to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Acts of 1934 as amended.

I want to reiterate today what I have always said in addressing your committee on this subject, and I quote, "I do not oppose the idea of reciprocal trade agreements. What I do ask is that greater safeguards be thrown around basic American industries to assure a fair profit return on investments in our industries and to protect the jobs of working men and women in these United States, and particularly in my State of West Virginia."

I am quite aware, Mr. Chairman, that the world situation today is quite different from what it was in 1934 when the late Secretary of State Cordell Hull proposed reciprocal trade agreements legislation in an effort to revive international trade.

May I remind the committee that the policy statement by the Congress preceding the passage of the original Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in 1934 stated quite clearly that the legislation was being enacted to revive world trade and to create additional jobs for working men and women within these United States.

The present trade agreements, as renewed and extended since 1934, which will expire on June 30 of this year, have fallen far short of the objectives set forth by the Congress, particularly in the field of creating new job opportunities for American workers.

Mr. Chairman, I appear today somewhat in the role of Amicus curiae. By this, I mean a friend of the committee, who has a full knowledge of the heavy responsibilities facing you in shaping legislating that will permit us, as a Nation, to play a proper role as leader of the free nations and, at the same time, safeguard the interests of American citizens.

You, Mr. Chairman, and the senior members of this committee, will easily recall my activities in the field of reciprocal trades and international agreements. You will also recall that I sponsored in the 82d Congress, in 1951, the escape clause provisions contained in section 7 of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. I had then, and still have, considerable pride in what I did.

May I add, Mr. Chairman, that the faults of our present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act are not chargeable to what the act contains, but rather to maladministration of the peril point and escape clause provisions of the act.

Proper administration of the act from 1951 to the present date might have obviated the necessity for the formation of a new approach to world trade policies, as contained in H.R. 9900, which is aimed at stabilizing our own economy and the economies of our sister nations, members of the General Agreement on Trades and Tariff.

The provisions of H.R. 9900 virtually wipe out the peril point and escape clause provisions, except as these safeguards are applied to that group of basic American industries that could not be protected under the provisions contained in H.R. 9900. I refer here, to loans to industries and reimbursement of lost wages to workers.

To me there are certain fundamental principles in our tariff and trade legislation that must not only be preserved but made more effective if we are to get the maximum benefit from it. We cannot have the most extensive trade if the domestic economy is not preserved at its highest level. A lagging U.S. economy becomes a poorer market for other countries. It is a well-established fact that we both import less and export less when our economy is in a recession or when it is not going full blast.

The character of our trade legislation has a great deal to do with the tone of our economy. Even if our imports and our exports are each less than 4 percent of our total national product, the effects produced by certain competitive imports reach far beyond anything suggested by their volume.

It was this latter fact that was recognized by Presidents Roosevelt and Truman and echoed by President Eisenhower, when they adopted and adhered in principle to the policy that the trade program was not to injure or jeopardize our industry. Such good as would come from the expansion of trade was not to be in the nature of helping one segment of our economy, namely, the exporters and importers, at the expense of othter segments, such s manufacturing, mining and farming. It was not thought to be good public policy to help one group if it could only be done to the injury of other groups that are entitled to the equal protection of the law.

The value of the trade program was to be found in the expansion of trade on a fair competitive basis. Otherwise the undesired effects of injury of domestic industry would be inevitable.

Therefore tariffs were to be reduced with the greatest of care. This precautionary approach was greatly stressed by Secretary of State Cordell Hull and his subordinates, no less than by his successors and by our various Presidents. In 1949 the peril point was adopted by the Congress. This simply put into statutory form the policy that had been so widely proclaimed.

In other words, before we entered into any trade agreements we asked the Tariff Commission to set guidelines for the President to follow. In that manner the Congress kept its hands on the tariff-cutting powers of the President.

The peril-point approach, of course, is nothing final because no one can foresee just what effect a tariff reduction will have before it is actually made. Also, the President under the law was permitted to breach the peril point. In the latest trade agreement this was done in over 60 items.

More important than the peril point is the escape clause. It backstops not only the peril point but also provides for a remedy when injury occurs that was not foreseen by the Tariff Commission. The escape clause is the best instrument to carry out the principle of no injury to domestic industry.

While it is the best instrument and while it has been in effect nearly 11 years it has not been effective because of the manner of its administration.

The remedy to this lies in strengthening of the clause rather than eliminating it or setting it so far back that it would seldom be invoked and only then as a last resort and without guidelines established by Congress. This is provided for in section 305 of the bill.

The present bill, if I read it right, would set aside the no-injury principle in behalf of adjustment assistance. Under those circumstances, there would, of course, be no place for the peril-point findings since it would be expected that reduced tariffs would injure our industries. Once this injury had gone far enough, adjustment assistance could be extended to the workers and to the industry.

The idea would be that enactment of the bill would stimulate exports sufficiently to offset or more than offset the unemployment caused by increased imports.

Mr. Chairman, the big question that we face in unemployment is one that in my judgment cannot be solved or even greatly mitigated by stimulating our exports.

The number of workers employed in export activities of all kinds, all the way from production through shipping, has been greatly exaggerated. There is a simple way of measuring this without too much of a margin of error. We can apply to export activities its proportionate share of the gross national product which is well above $500 billion today, around $540 billion, in fact. We can relate employment in export activities including all indirect employment attributable to it, to the total employment required to produce the total national product and come out with a fairly reliable answer.

If 67 million workers in all occupations and trade are employed to produce a gross national product of over $500 billion, how many workers would be required to produce $20 billion of exports? In 1961 our exports were roughly $20 billion. Let us put the gross national product at a flat $500 billion.

This means that exports were 4 percent of the gross national product. This in turn would mean that 4 percent of the 67 million employed workers would cover all the workers for which exports could possibly be responsible, including their share of bankers, teachers, insurance writers, real estate operators, brokers, wholesale and retail clerks, Federal, State and local governmental workers, and so forth.

This total would be 2,680,000 workers employed as a result of our exports. This is less than the more than 4 million unemployed today.

Should tariff reductions lead to an export increase of $5 billion in a few years' time,

employment would rise by 670,000. If this could be done in 3 years, we would gain some 230,000 per year.

Put this alongside of the net increase in the number of workers each year of more than a million and alongside of the million or more who are estimated to be displaced by automation each year and we find exports at the most optimistic level not making much of a dent.

If we have to reduce our tariffs still more in order to gain this $5 billion increase in our exports we will increase competitive imports by some similar volume. These imports, coming into increasing competition with our own producers, would not only displace many of our presently employed workers but, by creating unfavorable market conditions, would prevent or greatly discourage expansion of the industries that would be hit. The retarding effect on employment might be greater than the actual displacement of workers.

There have been flat statements that exports would expand employment much more than imports would hurt. This is not sustained by commonsense or experience. Imports usually consist of goods that have a lot of labor in them, such as glassware and pottery. Our exports are mostly products that have less labor; so the very opposite would be true. Imports upset more employment dollar for dollar than exports can create.

It is generally recognized that we badly need more growth and development in this country in order to keep up our employment. We will not get this growth and expansion if more and more industries are confronted with ever sharper import competition. Instead of expanding here, these industries, when they can, will expand overseas. Instead of employing more people here they would employ workers in other countries.

It does not look to me that trading cuts in our own tariffs for tariff cuts by the European Common Market or by Japan can do anything but put us at a great disadvantage.

The competitive advantage already lies on their side. It will gravitate still more in their favor the more we cut our tariff. From 1950 to 1960 our imports from the six Common Market countries increased 300 percent. Our exports increased only 112 percent. It is true that our exports are still higher than our imports from them, but the trend is running rapidly in the other direction. A heavy part of our exports to them consists of machinery, and it is not hard to forecast what that means.

A (United States) community which depends on jobs which depend on export sales of what the jobs produce is more vulnerable to depression via unemployment of its workers than one where the jobs are generated by national (domestic) consumption of what the jobs produce.

We are already a low tariff country. Our tariff protection is only 20 percent of what it was when we started reducing it. We are rapidly losing our technological advantage over the other industrial countries. This is easy enough to understand because of the great amount of modern machinery that has been installed overseas in the past 10 or 12 years. Productivity has risen rapidly there and will continue to do so as those countries continue their mechanization. This in turn will give greater competitive effect to their lower wages.

I do not believe that we have yet had the full brunt of competition from either Europe or Japan. Their exporting capacity is still rising. Europe has been so busy internally that they have used much of their productive capacity to supply their home demand. This will be changed as they catch up. They are creating a mass market that we will be less and less able to penetrate and stripping off our own tariffs will not make us more competitive. It would only make us more vulnerable than we are already.

It is claimed that we must give the State Department more bargaining power. I do not feel that they have used well the bargaining power they have had in the past 28 years. Otherwise why are we now faced with obstructive tariffs in Europe after these many years of so-called shrewd Yankee bargaining? Evidently there has been nothing like an 80-percent tariff reduction by the Common Market countries, such as we have made. This is not all. Some of the worst barriers that we encounter abroad are not tariffs but quotas or other import restrictions. For example, a few years ago, we were exporting well over 50 million tons of coal a year. We are now down to a little more than 35 million tons. West Germany has applied an import quota.

It is not an exorbitant tariff that is stopping us but a quota. The same sort of restriction rather than the tariff stop or restricts our exports of other products. Automobiles are a good example. One of our Ford or Chevrolet cars sells in Europe at around double the price in this country, not because of an excessive tariff but because of other burdens, such as internal taxes. What good would it do to bargain for a tariff cut on our cars? It would help very little.

We have been trading horses for rabbits these many years in the trade program. It has become a habit. Now the proposal is to cut tariffs in wide swaths, or by categories. This is the precise opposite of what was preached at the beginning and right along in this trade program. The greatest care was to be used. Evidently this was not carried out but that was the avowed policy. If we desert this policy now we could end up by having our tariff at ground level while other countries would still keep us out wherever it suited them.

I cannot have confidence in the State Department's bargaining powers. They are altogether too prone to reduce our tariffs because they think that is what they want to do in any case; and they evidently have not been very anxious to exact much in return. That is why I think that Congress should continue to exercise the constitutional authority to regulate our commerce and in fact to bring back to Congress some of the authority that has been leeched away by the State Department.

I would like to offer to this committee certain provisions that should go into the bill under any condition. This will include a shorter period of extension, one not to exceed 3 years; because Congress will otherwise not have another chance at legislation before 1967 and that is too long a time to wait. Times are changing rapidly and we should remain more liquid or fluid in order to meet necessary changes.

Above all, we should have an escape clause that would do what was so repeatedly avowed as policy. Prevention of injury to our industry by imports will not hurt our trade anymore than the establishment of fair competition has hurt domestic business and trade. It has helped rather than crippled our economic activity. The same would be true with import competition. For once we should try it.

We should have pretrade agreement hearings to preserve the proper caution, and while precise peril-point findings may not be necessary, the Tariff Commission should be able to lay down guidelines for the State Department.

The authorization should be for much less than 50 percent tariff reduction. We have already cut to the quick in too many cases. The free trade proposals except with respect to tropical woods should be set aside. We must not forget that the removal of tariffs on imports from the Common Market would apply to imports from all other countries except the Communist orbit. Japan would give the Europeans a run for their money in the American market. Between them, our competing industries would be reduced to rubble.

We should by all odds retain and strengthen the escape clause. This is the most important of all. It would be better to remedy injury in this fashion than to add to our redevelopment burdens.

Under the provisions of chapter 3, section 221, of H.R. 9900, the President will be given authority to give special attention to certain of our basic industries that cannot be properly protected by the proposals contained in the new act for loans to rehabilitate and modernize certain industries and a subsidy, referred to as compensatory wages, that will be paid to displaced workers. This means that the protection afforded by the peril point and escape clause in the present Tariff Act would not be applicable to industries in general, but only to this small group that H.R. 9900 proposes to help in the way of loans and compensatory wage payments.

It would appear from the provisions of H.R. 9900 that the President would have sole authority to reduce existing rates up to 50 percent without the necessity of a hearing before the Tariff Commission under the "escape clause" to prove injury.

Under the provisions of H.R. 9900, certain articles that are now subject to duty could be removed from the dutiable list and placed on the free list. In fact, the proponents of the legislation produced a list of some 27 articles that might well be placed on the free list. Here, I would like to pose a question, the answer to which might assist the committee in redrafting this proposal. Should coal and coke, as suggested, be placed on the free list, I am quite anxious to find out if the present duty contained in the Reciprocal Trade Agreement between the United States and the Dominion of Canada, which fixes an import duty of 50 cents a ton on American coal will be invalidated.

In this connection, may I call to the attention of the committee that 7 years ago, the United States was exporting 15 million tons of soft coal to West Germany to fuel its modern industrial establishments. Four years ago, the West German Republic, without consulting the United States, and without consulting the General Agreement on Trades and Tariffs, to which both West Germany and the United States are parties, placed an import duty of $4.76 a ton on shipments of U.S. coal to West Germany. American imports of soft coal into West Germany immediately dropped to less than 5 million tons because American producers of coal could not produce the coal, and pay the ocean freight and this $4.76 import duty, causing the loss of our exports of approximately 10 million tons of coal.

The West German Republic immediately imposed an import quota, limiting shipments of U.S. soft coal to 4,400,000 tons annually. This has since been increased to 5 million tons, but the import duty has increased to $5 per ton. What I would like to know is if articles of coal and coke are placed on the free list, will that invalidate the present German quota of 5 million tons that may be admitted free of the $5 per ton import duty?

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 9900, now before your committee for consideration, contains no provision that I have been able to locate that would remove these roadblocks to a free flow of commerce between our Government and that of the governments of West Germany and Canada.

Among one or two other suggestions I shall make later in my brief, I think the committee should write clarification language to correct this situation. I do this because the major objective of this proposed new legislation is to increase American ex-

ports. This cannot be done unless other negotiating nations on articles on the free list remove every vestige of their impediments to the free flow of articles in commerce.

The administration's position, contained in the following comments from the Department of State, appears to be one of further negotiations with Canada and West Germany. These negotiations will lead nowhere unless definite provisions are contained in whatever reciprocal agreement has been worked out with these two nations.

One is forced to the conclusion that no agreement has been reached, and that these restrictions will continue and will be a major roadblock to the objectives of the proponents of the new trade agreement which is predicated on vastly increasing our exports.

The State Department informs me that in 1961 U.S. exports of coal totaled:

Type	Quantity	Value	Percent of domestic production
	Tons		
Bituminous	34,974,050	$312,069,000	8.7
Anthracite	1,546,488	22,353,000	8.7
Coke	445,232	8,211,000	.9

"Our imports, in contrast, were insignificant, amounting to 164,259 tons of bituminous, 792 tons of anthracite, and 126,518 tons of coke. And virtually all of these entered areas along the Canadian border which are not readily reached from coal centers in the United States. Our total trade in coal with Canada was substantially in our favor with exports exceeding imports by more than 900,000 tons of anthracite, and 11 million tons of bituminous.

"Eighty-four percent of our coal exports in 1961 went to five countries: Canada, Japan, Italy, West Germany, and the Netherlands. Exports to Japan have shown a particularly favorable development in recent years (exports of bituminous have more than doubled since 1958 and reached a record level of 6.6 million tons in 1961). Canada, West Germany, and the Netherlands maintain restrictions of various kinds on the importation of coal, and European producers, faced with the loss of their railroad market, have been demanding a national fuels policy to regulate competition. Pressures in Western Europe to limit coal imports are not likely to diminish. To hold and to expand this export market will require persistent effort, backed by usable bargaining authority.

"Among the measures already taken to assist exports are:

"1. Removal of trade barriers:

"Representations have been made on a continuing basis over the last 3 years at levels as high as the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs. As a result of these representations, the quota for imports of American coal into Germany was increased by 600,000 tons a year effective January 1, 1961. Missions in Brussels and Luxembourg are following closely proposals for a unified energy policy in Western Europe and are under standing instructions to make known our strong opposition to the development of a restrictive policy inimical to our export interests.

"2. Federal procurement:

"In 1961 the Department of Defense began buying American coal for use by U.S. troops in Germany.

"In the future, the U.S. Government will continue to seek the reduction of barriers to the export of U.S. coal. It will continue its efforts to eliminate quantitative limitations against U.S. exports as well as to press for the reduction of tariff barriers."

I am deeply grateful that the President has seen fit to approve a unanimous decision of the Tariff Commission, after a hearing to prove injury in the field of sheet, crown, and cylindrical glass articles. This decision will be quite beneficial to the unemployment situation in West Virginia where glass is our second most important product. It is also proof that the escape clause is workable where formal hearings to prove injury are proven to the satisfaction of our present bipartisan U.S. Tariff Commission.

There are other facets of the glass industry—and I refer to handmade and blown glass tableware articles—which received a sharp reduction of import duties under the recent negotiations concluded at Geneva. My concern, Mr. Chairman, is predicated on the fact that I have seven plants producing this type of glassware located in my congressional district. The reduction in these import duties came about through authority granted to former President Eisenhower in the extension of the Trade Agreements Act of 1958 to make reductions of 5 percent a year for the years of 1958 to 1962. What assurance does this type of glass industry have that under the new authority granted to the President under the provisions of H.R. 9900 that they will not face a further 50 percent reduction in these import duties which would leave them with little or no protection and could well destroy the oldest industry in the history of America.

Another important factor in our West Virginia economy is the pottery industry. In fact, one of the installations in my State is the world's largest pottery producer. I refer to the Homer Laughlin China Co. at Newell, W. Va. There are four additional plants producing this article of glassware located in West Virginia. Careful study of the proposed new legislation, H.R. 9900, would indicate that this industry will not be further harmed by our tariff policies and that import duty rates will remain stationary. In fact, it might be benefited through the negotiations at Geneva, which reduced the import duty on Kaolin clay, one of the basic ingredients in the manufacture of chinaware and vitreous china products.

In recent days the President has overridden the unanimous decision of the Tariff Commission on hearings to prove injury in the ceramic tile industry. I have one plant in my congressional district producing this type of tile products where several hundred people are employed. Their present employment is 60 percent of their normal capacity, which means that a sizable number of workers, in fact 40 percent of their normal employment, have been displaced. This, Mr. Chairman, is one more proof of why West Virginia's economy is in sorry condition.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to discuss the problems concerned in our proposed new trade policy. May I express the hope that the members of the committee will give careful consideration to the points I have made. I am leaving with the members of your committee, in mimeographed form, some of the proposed changes that would provide greater safeguards and still give the President the additional authority he needs in negotiating new and adjusting existing trade agreements.

Farm Bureau's Sane Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, on March 13, the American Farm Bureau Federation, through its president, Charles B. Shuman, presented its views on general farm legislation before the House Agriculture Committee.

One might ask: What of it? What is extraordinary about the presentation of testimony on farm legislation by a farm organization? Is it not as routine as the convening of the House or the Senate?

But this was not an ordinary presentation. It had great significance as follows:

First. It illustrates the steady rise in influence in Washington and elsewhere of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the farm organization which believes in free enterprise for agriculture.

Second. Conversely, it illustrates the defeat of the administration's supply-management concept, which means Government control of all agriculture in production and marketing, and so forth; and the decline in influence of the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman.

Third. It emphasizes the complete bankruptcy of farm policy based on controls.

Bear in mind that the American Farm Bureau Federation has consistently and effectively opposed the supply-management approach of Orville Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture. Just before this session of Congress, an administration spokesman assailed farm bureau and Mr. Shuman in a statement. The Democrats control the Agriculture Committee 21 to 14. Apparently some of the Democrats on the committee, are committed to the supply-management concept.

How does it happen then that farm bureau, the leading farm organization opposing the administration's farm policy, is called upon to tell what it thinks should be done about the farm problem?

Well, as I have indicated, the administration is getting nowhere fast. Last session the Congress turned down Mr. Freeman's bid for complete power in the farm field, via the so-called omnibus farm bill. This year the Secretary has come forward with other control proposals which also are in a dismal state. Recently, as you know, both the House and Senate Agriculture Committees turned down the Secretary's effort to maintain dairy price supports at $3.40 per hundredweight. Last year Secretary Freeman arbitrarily raised dairy price supports from $3.22 to $3.40. Since then half a billion dollars worth of dairy surpluses have accumulated in Government hands.

Fourteen members of the House committee asked that the farm bureau, which has some very sensible farm proposals pending, be called upon for testimony. Hopefully some of the Democratic members of the committee will also realize that the Democratic farm policies are just about bankrupt and that a fresh, more sensible approach is badly needed.

For several years now the farm bureau has been insisting that the Government should get out of agriculture as soon as possible, and in particular the bureau has opposed plans to run every farm and farmer from Washington.

Every day that passes illustrates the wisdom of the farm bureau approach. It is a great organization, and all of us

should be grateful to the men who lead it and to its members for its influence on the American scene.

The Sickness of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by the distinguished columnist Walter Lippmann which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of March 27, 1962.

Mr. Lippmann's always lucid analysis clarifies the nature of the U.N.'s difficulties and reminds us what we must do to cure it.

The article follows:

THE SICKNESS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

(By Walter Lippmann)

Recently, the U.N. has come under sharp criticism from some of its old supporters, notably Senator AIKEN and Senator JACKSON. Their criticism comes at a time when the U.N. itself may be said to be successful but insolvent, to be achieving a great purpose but bankrupting itself in the process. The U.N. is on the way to being successful in its most difficult experiment, which has been to pacify the Congo and prevent a confrontation of the great powers. It is insolvent because a group of nations, and particularly the Soviet Union and France, are refusing to pay their share of the cost of the experiment.

In this condition of affairs the Senate is about to debate and vote on the proposal to fund the deficit and provide working capital to keep the U.N. afloat during the next year or so.

With Senator AIKEN, who is the chief critic of the bond plan, there can be no dispute when he says that "the sickness of the U.N. is not financial sickness alone * * * it can be cured only by drastic action at an early date—action which will continue the U.N. as a truly multilateral organization and not permit it to become constantly dependent upon the beneficence of the United States."

This is the precise reason why the bond plan was put forth by our officials and it is the crucial reason why so many of us favor the plan. For there is no other plan before us which deals directly with the problem of making all the members of the U.N. pay their share of operations like the Congo and Palestine, and ending the grossly corrupting fact that we now pay nearly 50 percent of the cost of these operations. For although we would loan one-half of the money, we will bear only one-third of the cost of bond retirement.

"The sickness of the U.N." is that some members are refusing to pay their assessments, other members cannot pay them, and others are a mixed bag of countries who want to pay, cannot pay, and are waiting to see. As of February 28, 1962, the U.N. was owed $77 million on assessments for Palestine and the Congo. The chief countries refusing to pay were the Soviet Union and the East European satellites, France, Belgium, and Cuba. Their total delinquency was $56 million, of which $44 million were owed by the Communist bloc, about $10 million by France and Belgium, and about one-half million by Cuba. Besides this, nearly $8 million were in default by Nationalist China, not because it refuses to pay but because it cannot.

This accounts for over 80 percent of the deficit. The problem of curing the sickness of the U.N. is to find ways of compelling, inducing, and enabling all members to pay their share. The more I have studied this problem with its massive documentation, the more I am convinced that if there is any solution, the bond plan will meet the problem.

How will it solve the problem? The plan is based on the assumption that during the summer the World Court will declare in an advisory opinion (which has been requested by a two-thirds vote of the General Assembly) that assessments to pay for operations like Palestine and the Congo are—within article 17 of the charter—"expenses of the organization" which "shall be borne by the members as apportioned by the General Assembly." Senator AIKEN, I might say at once, is one of those who confidently believes that this will be the ruling of the World Court. If it is not the ruling, then all bets are off and there is no way now in sight by which the special operations of the U.N. can be financed.

If, however, it is the ruling, then article 19 of the charter begins to bite: A member "shall have no vote in the General Assembly if the amount of its arrears equals or exceeds the amount of the contributions due from it for the preceding 2 full years." Unless the U.N. figures are wrong, this will mean, we believe, that if the Soviet Union continues to refuse to pay, it will in 1964 be disqualified to vote in the General Assembly.

There have been some misunderstandings in the Senate on this crucial point. For example, Senator KEATING, of New York, asked, "If the Soviet Union * * * should decide that it will not pay its assessed portion of these operations, would (it) not lose its right to vote until the period of many, many years had passed," perhaps, said Senator KEATING, "10 or 20 or 30 years."

Senator AIKEN's answer that this was indeed the case was not correct, unless he assumed an unfavorable Court decision. In 1963 the sum of the Soviet Union's past 2 years' assessments will be nearly $50 million, and if it rejects the expected ruling of the World Court, it will be $46 million in arrears. Its margin of safety will be down to $3.6 million. In the following year, 1964, the Soviet Union's assessments for the past 2 years will be down to $37 million. But its delinquency will be $46 million, and it will be $9 million to the bad, even if it pays its full regular budget assessment. Under the charter the Soviet Union will lose its vote in the General Assembly.

This is the compulsion behind the U.N. bond plan. There is also a moral compulsion. Some of the deliberate delinquents, for example, France, argue that the General Assembly has no legal power to raise money for operations like the Congo. Presumably, if the World Court decides against the French contention, France as a law-abiding country will pay up.

What the Soviet Union will do is anybody's guess.

Last, but not least, the bond plan makes it easy for every member to participate. It does this by keeping the interest low and making the bonds payable over a long time. This is the way, if there is a way, to make the U.N. that "truly multilateral Organization," which Senator AIKEN wants it to be.

Finally, it has been said, that we ought not to lend money to the U.N. at 2 percent when the money our Government borrows costs 4 percent. The answer to this is that frequently when we have felt that the national interest was involved, we have loaned money at 2 percent.

Immediately after World War II we loaned the British $4 billion at 2 percent. The lend-lease settlements were on the basis of 2 percent. In the Marshall plan we loaned money at 2.5 percent. Our development loans through the Development Loan Fund and the foreign aid organizations are at low or no interest. So it all comes down to the question of whether it is desirable to keep the U.N. in business as an organization able to deal with certain kinds of threats to the peace of the world.

The True Needs of Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the difficulties of our foreign assistance program has been our failure to formulate and understand our objectives. Part of this failure has been due to a lack of comprehension of the true needs of the people of the countries with whom we deal.

No group is better informed about the needs of the people of the countries in which they serve than the members of the Catholic Foreign Mission Society of America, known as the Maryknoll Fathers. One of the outstanding members of this order, who is presently working in Peru, is Father William R. McCarthy who, I am proud to say, is a native of Waterbury, Conn.

Father McCarthy has written a penetrating article called "The True Needs of Latin America." It appeared in the March 1962 issue of the Maryknoll magazine. Because I feel that this article will help us in our consideration and administration of the U.S. foreign assistance program, I append it here with the following remarks:

THE TRUE NEEDS OF LATIN AMERICA—RAISING POOR LIVING STANDARDS CAN STIMULATE ECONOMIC GROWTH

(By William R. McCarthy, M.M.)

During the visit of Mr. Adlai Stevenson to South America last year, I enjoyed the privilege of having his official party come to my parish of Ciudad de Dios, in Lima. This parish has more than 10,000 people, many of whom are extremely poor.

Mr. Stevenson showed particular interest in social and economic conditions. Three mothers emphasized the fundamental problem, when I asked them about their children and the employment of their husbands.

The first woman said that she has five children, and her husband was out of work. The second and third each has six children, and their husbands also were without work.

Poverty is South America's greatest problem. It is the root of the plight of most families. To expect them to solve their predicament, by their endeavors, is to ask them to lift themselves by their bootstraps.

The people of Latin America need help; they need it badly, and they need it now. For the cause of peace, and in the spirit of Christian love and friendship, we must not delay. Justice demands that we help them to help themselves. Human beings cannot exist decently half free and half alive. Only the force of necessity to eat and live could impel Latin Americans to accept the godless slavery of communism.

The countries of South America have shown that they do not want either com-

munism or slavery. During the past 20 years, they have cast out almost every dictator. The South American people love freedom. However, to be meaningful, freedom must be economic as well as political. Christ spoke of the more abundant life. Enlivened by the spirit of freedom and justice, we must find ways to help God-fearing people to share in the world's God-given abundance.

In too many ways, conditions in my parish are typical of a great part of Latin America. Lima is a city of about 1.2 million people. Officials estimate that one-fourth of that number are living at levels below human standards. There are other similar pockets of poverty throughout the country.

Because of the climate and lack of food, because of crowded and unsanitary living conditions, Lima has one of the highest rates of tuberculosis found among the major cities of the world. This was the first problem I faced when I arrived in the parish of Ciudad de Dios, which is located in the poorest section of Lima.

A government doctor told me that he knew of at least 200 people in the area who suffered from tuberculosis. Through the cooperation of the minister of public health, and members of a community health team from the United States, we found more than 6,000 people with the disease. Then we began to treat them. At the same time, we also provided poor families with powdered milk, rice, wheat, and corn flour from the surplus food supplies made available by the United States.

When the antituberculosis campaign began in the parish, I urgently recommended that a national campaign be undertaken. I further envisioned the forming of international health teams—American, German, French, English, Italian, for example—to coordinate and cooperate in the matter of public health wherever needed. This, of course, has not been done, but I still believe that it would be fairly easy to set in motion, would be comparatively inexpensive, and would stimulate a great amount of good will.

Fortunately for our parish, we were aided by a doctor who had conducted a similar campaign in cooperation with a local committee, in one of the outlying districts of the city. We inspected the doctor's plans and methods, and noted with considerable interest a street map on which pins indicated houses where people were under treatment for tuberculosis.

When the doctor was asked about one large cluster of pins, he pulled a case history from the file. The report explained that 34 people lived in 7 rooms of 1 house. Ten of these people had active tuberculosis. Their income for food was the equivalent of 12 cents for each person daily. This would purchase two eggs.

The sick poor in Lima and throughout Latin America do not have adequate food, medicine, medical attention, or hospitals. It gives one a pitiful, helpless feeling, to know that people are starving to death while, at the same time, in other parts of the world there is a surplus of food.

Anyone associated with such needy people, even for only a short time, comes to sense their evergrowing unrest and discontent. To them, even a false promise, of the Communist type, incites hope.

What can the United States and its people do to help, on a national and a personal level? Probably the main goal should be to stimulate economic growth. Growth is a measure of economic life, and that life here is dormant.

The poor are potentially a powerful market. America, from pole to pole, from Alaska to Argentina, presents a picture of one continuous land mass with 400 million people. To raise the living standards of the poorest, most needy people, would promote the welfare of all. In Latin America, the opportunities for growth and improvement, in the following fields, are practically unlimited:

Electricity: In the modern age of atomic energy, it is ironic that many people do not have electricity. Still, a great number of people throughout South America must live without lights. Electricity would not only help enlighten their lives; it would also raise living standards by encouraging the establishment of small local workshops.

Water and sewerage: These are essential needs for all people—yet many Latin Americans are without adequate facilities. In Lima, for example, not far from the center of the city is a densely populated area known as Mendocita. There live 5,000 people, served by only four water outlets. They have no sewers, no electricity.

Small industries: Every avenue should be explored as a means of putting more people to work. This is No. 1 on the "must" list. Through gainful employment, a man can maintain his self-respect and independence. Small industries could help provide employment, although how many, what kind, and how fast they can be established must be determined. One thing is certain: labor is available in Latin America.

Slum areas: These afford a tremendous opportunity to do something constructive immediately and effectively. With the know-how demonstrated by slum clearances in New York and Buenos Aires, engineers could plan and develop simple, inexpensive, sanitary dwellings. Building those dwellings would provide gainful employment for great numbers of men who are now without work.

Roads: Most countries of Latin America suffer from a lack of communications. Roads help to make jobs available for many workers. They also open new markets and promote the development of sparsely populated areas.

Food: Handing out food is not a permanent way to help needy people. Recipients are thereby encouraged to seek more. Employment, an opportunity to earn one's living, is more helpful.

St. Vincent de Paul once expressed a similar idea vividly, when he told his missioners: "You are the servants of the poor, always smiling, and in good humor. They are your masters, terribly sensitive and exacting, as you'll see. But the uglier and dirtier they are, and the more unjust and bitter, the more you must give them of your love. It is only because of your love that the poor will forgive you the bread that you give them."

Advanced knowledge of irrigation, plowing, planting, and fertilizing, plus improved seed, should be made available to all retarded countries. Also, modern methods of raising cattle and other farm animals should be introduced. Agricultural improvement would bring fast and beneficial results while having a positive effect by raising living standards.

Education: High illiteracy rates in many countries of South America are notorious. The whole plan of education should be reviewed and evaluated objectively. Congested areas need low-cost schools. Besides using present teachers more effectively, an active campaign could be launched to enlist high school students from the upper grades to help in this program on a part-time basis.

Credit Cooperatives: These should be encouraged and supported. Many more should be established on the parish level. However, vast numbers of South Americans are so poor that a membership in a credit cooperative is as far beyond their means as a savings account at the First National Bank.

The Cost of Living: Recent increases in the prices of bread, eggs, milk, and meat affect family budgets, causing the number of poor people to grow, as jobs become scarcer and the cost of living rises.

A local product known as quinua is somewhat like barley. It is considered a poor man's staple and used by the Indians. During the past year, the price of this basic food has doubled.

Beans are another popular food that is often cooked with rice. However, more and more families now eat only rice, since the price of beans rose from 16 to 32 cents a pound recently. Eggs cost 6 cents apiece. A good day's pay is about 2 dollars, so only a few families can afford the luxury of a balanced diet.

Health: To build, staff, and maintain hospitals, for the tremendous number of sick persons, involves costly and complicated problems. As a practical measure, qualified social workers could be trained to care for the sick poor in their ramshackle homes. Dispensaries might be established to provide free medicines for destitute cases.

In the long run, large drug companies would profit from free grants of medicines for these needs. Manufacturers of medicines might even be urged to accept the burden of supplying personnel for such a program.

Teachers of English: Practically all South Americans want to learn English. In my parish in Lima, a group of about 60 illiterate housewives now study reading and writing Spanish three times a week. Even they have asked for a class in English.

At university level, at high school level, and in many cases at elementary school level, students have an ardent desire to learn English. Expanding the present exchange program would bring mutual benefits: more teachers of English for Latin America, more teachers of Spanish and Portuguese for the United States.

Large corporations with financial interests in South America should support this program strongly. A common language is a common bond of friendship and understanding.

Recreation: Parks and playgrounds are urgently needed, particularly in congested areas. Building them would put men to work; using them would take boys and girls off the streets.

Sports: Basketball teams, especially the Globe Trotters, have proved to be good-will "ambassadors" in Latin America. During the past year a great deal of interest and surprise was aroused by the International Baseball Tournament, in which Peru, Chile, Brazil, Venezuela, and other countries participated. Some 5,000 people attended the final game in Lima.

Major league teams from the United States have frequently made postseason trips to Japan. Similar barnstorming tours throughout Latin America could tighten the ties of friendship that bind the countries of the Western Hemisphere together.

Entertainment: In the matter of cultural exchange, Latin Americans enjoy symphonic music and fine plays. This type of entertainment could be supplemented by selected motion pictures, with Spanish subtitles, supplied for low-cost distribution. Radio and television receivers also are necessary, for education as well as entertainment. Ideally, some way should be found to make sets available to families who cannot afford to purchase one.

The needs of the people of Latin America are vast—and almost unimaginable. Likewise, so are the opportunities for raising living standards and improving education.

When I was about to leave Lima for the United States, the principal of a girls' school asked me to bring back some secondhand sewing machines and some cloth for her poor children. The principal of a boys' school requested some secondhand musical instruments, so that he could organize a school band. The doctor at the public health center asked for a small, chest X-ray machine, to enable him to examine patients suspected of having tuberculosis.

Finally, a woman came to my house, opened her purse, and pulled out a 10-sole bill, the equivalent of 40 cents. With that sacrifice, she asked me to buy a doll for her daughter.

My 16 years with the people of South America convinced me that their needs are great and many. The number of poor people grows while the chains of poverty become more binding, and the cost of living continually increases. They need our friendly consideration and cooperation.

Up to now, many things have been going from bad to worse in Latin America. It is time for us to dig in and really go to work to help improve conditions. We owe it to ourselves. We owe it to our friends and neighbors. We owe it to posterity, to make a better world in which the people of the Americas may live in happiness and peace.

Our Fair Labor Standards and Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Mr. Edward E. Kennedy, research director of District 50, United Mine Workers of America on March 13, 1962, before the Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association, held at the Roosevelt Hotel in New York City, New York:

OUR FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AND FOREIGN TRADE POLICY

(Address of Edward E. Kennedy, research director of District 50, United Mine Workers of America, before the Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association, Roosevelt Hotel, New York City, March 13, 1962.)

We are pleased that your association has invited a representative of District 50, United Mine Workers of America, to address your meeting of the Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association on this occasion.

I am taking this opportunity to review the position of our union in opposition to the so-called reciprocal trade program and its proposed expansion.

The opposition of our union and that of our parent organization, the United Mine Workers of America, dates back to the inception of the reciprocal trade program when Congress first abdicated its constitutional authority over foreign trade matters and delegated this power to the executive branch of the Government.

This delegation of power was for all practical purposes a delegation of legislative authority to gradually reduce, and apparently to ultimately remove, most of the economic safeguards surrounding our American standard of living, our greatest of industrial nations and the largest single market in the world.

In the past two decades, we have rapidly reduced our tariff rates. They are now more than 75 percent below 1930 levels and average a little more than 10 percent on all dutiable items. These reductions have been made under the Trade Agreements Act. The proposals now before Congress call for further across-the-board tariff cuts in another major step toward complete free trade.

However, the wage rates, wage standards, and conditions of employment of workers in foreign countries are evidently not realistically taken into account in arranging for and negotiating trade agreements with our so-called trading partners.

There are, of course, other considerations which seem to be brushed aside in such arrangements. I have particular reference to our extensive program of foreign aid in the form of outright grants and long-term loans and our military spending abroad. During the period 1950 through 1960, these three items alone have amounted to a total of $56,947 million, or an average for these 11 years of about $5,177 million annually. This is in addition to the transfer of private capital to foreign countries totaling $23,232 million or an average of $2,112 million for this same period.

In the main, the foreign countries which would benefit most from a further reduction or elimination of tariff rates have been the chief beneficiaries of our foreign grants, loans, military spending, and transfers of private capital.

Over the years, these grants and credits have been largely on a government-to-government basis, which has helped these governments to balance their fiscal budgets, grant tax concessions to industry for new plants, equipment, machinery, and modernization programs. Our aid to these foreign countries contains no suggestion or requirement that any of this aid be used to improve wage levels, standards of living, and purchasing power of the wage earners of the countries so aided.

The ever-growing volume of competitive imports, principally from Europe and Asia, and from some South American countries, is being produced under wage standards and working conditions that would not be tolerated under our domestic laws or under our system of free collective bargaining.

To illustrate this point with respect to hourly wage only—in manufacturing, our average hourly rate for adult males is $2.38; in the United Kingdom, it is 94 cents; in West Germany, 68 cents; in Italy, 39 cents; and in Japan, 30 cents.

Women workers in many of these countries receive less than the males and teenagers even less. Here, women workers performing the same work receive the same rates of pay as males and child labor is prohibited.

The argument is advanced, of course, that in these low-wage countries employers provide fringe benefits, such as housing and other allowances not common in America, that increase the real hourly wage rate and their cost of production. We have substantial fringe benefits which improve the standard of living of our workers and become apart of our employers' cost of production, but the great disparity still remains.

In January 1962, the U.S. Department of Labor reports that "for the year as a whole [1961], the jobless total averaged 4,800,000 compared with 3,900,000 in 1960." The report goes on to say: "Both the level and rate of unemployment in 1961 [6.7 percent average] were the highest in 20 years except for 1958."

During the decade of the sixties, the number of new workers who will enter our labor force—after subtracting those who will retire—is expected to average 1,350,000 a year. This is 50 percent more than the 900,000 who came into our labor force annually during the 1950's.

We have the problem here at home of providing gainful employment, at fair wages, for not only the nearly 4,800,000 workers now unemployed but, in addition, new job opportunities for the new additions to our nonagricultural labor force at the rate of some 1,350,000 a year for the remainder of this decade. This will require a more rapid growth of our domestic economy, expansion of our domestic manufacturing plant facilities and a corresponding expansion of employment of our workers at fair wages and a further expansion of purchasing power on a broad basis among the mass of our people.

If, instead, the proposed Trade Expansion Act of 1962 is enacted into law, the current and long-term effect is designed to eliminate the remaining safeguards of tariff rates, open the floodgates and invite the world to flood our markets with low-priced products, of a thousand varieties, produced by cheap labor and in many cases by politically enslaved labor.

One does not have to be astute to realize that such a foreign trade policy in its very design will progressively increase unemployment to levels dangerously approaching those of the 1930's.

This is a war of economic attrition that is proposed to be waged against the American worker.

It is proposed that additional millions of jobs of American workers be exported to Europe, Asia, South America and no small number of them behind the Iron Curtain.

The "trade adjustment assistance" provisions of the proposal before Congress is nothing more than a fancy name for "temporary ambulance service" for the casualties of this economic war of attrition, providing they can prove foreign trade connected disabilities.

Imported competing merchandise intended to replace our own production is to enter our market free of duties or excises. The producers of such imported merchandise pay no corporate tax to the United States. The foreign workers, whose jobs we are to export to them, pay no income tax to the U.S. Treasury. Neither the foreign producers of such imported merchandise nor the workers engaged in such production will be spending their money in our markets.

This war of economic attrition to which we refer is an economic invasion and destruction of our American markets and jobs by the low-wage producers of foreign nations. It is also a war of economic attrition on the internal revenues of the United States.

We exported some $19.5 billion worth of merchandise in 1960, with lesser amounts in prior years. The advocates of free trade and supporters of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 make quite a point of "domestic employment attributable to U.S. exports in 1960."

The Department of Labor has made a study and published a bulletin under the above title. This study indicates that some 3,100,000 jobs were attributable, directly, and indirectly, to producing, transporting, and marketing our exported merchandise in 1960.

No such study, if one is being made, has been published to indicate the number of jobs that are lost by reason of the imports of competing merchandise. However, our imports of merchandise amounted to $15 billion in 1960, with lesser amounts in prior years.

The U.S. chemical industry is but one of several major industries in the United States feeling the impact of foreign competition. This industry has over 12,500 plant locations and give direct employment to well over 800,000 people. Imports of chemicals and related products amounted to a total of $275 million in 1957, $282 million in 1958, $347 million in 1959, $353 million in 1960 and about $390 million in 1961. This is an increase of about 38 percent since 1958 and 42 percent since 1957.

In 1959, the chemical and allied products industry employed some 719,000 people with a payroll of $4,234 million. Of this number of employees, about 470,000 were production workers receiving annual wages in excess of $2,406 million. This industry and these employees pay hundreds of millions of dollars in Federal, State, and local taxes and spend their money at home to support our Government and our domestic economy. Competing imports bear none of these burdens.

This applies with equal force to 14 or 15 other major industrial groups which will

be adversely affected by the impact of a flood of competing imports from the low-wage countries of the world if the proposed free trade program is enacted into law.

It is important at this point that we take a brief look at our overall balance-of-payments position in relation to the rest of the world. To state it easily in round numbers, we send abroad some $19.5 billion worth of merchandise while importing some $15 billion worth. At the same time, we are sending or spending abroad some $8 billion in economic and military aid, plus transfers of private capital. This left a net deficit in our balance of international payments for the year 1960 of $3,500 million.

With the exception of the year 1957, the United States has had a deficit in its balance of international payments in every year since 1949. For the whole 11-year period, 1950–60, the cumulative net deficit was $21 billion or an average of nearly $2 billion a year. The present concern with the balance of payments is related to the fact that half of this total deficit was experienced in the most recent 3 years, 1958–60.

One important factor in this balance-of-payments deficit picture is the transfer of private capital to establish manufacturing plants abroad. There may have been and may still be incentives to employ this method to reach a market behind certain trade barriers. There may also be tax advantages abroad as well as on unrepatriated earnings and perhaps the lure of cheap labor.

I have pictured the overall balance-of-payments picture to indicate that Uncle Sam is operating in its relations with the rest of the world at a very heavy annual loss.

Any intelligent analysis of our balance of international payments picture for the past dozen years forces the conclusion that free trade and increased imports is the one element in our foreign relations which we cannot afford. There may be other factors that we can ill afford, but to permit the export of our jobs by a flood of the low-wage products of foreign nations would inexorably put the United States and our economy in double jeopardy.

It is not enough that our principal trading partners enjoy a well-balanced fiscal budget, a prosperous business community, and employment opportunities for their workers; they must also rapidly improve the wages and living standards of their wage earners if they or we expect them to be effective in countering the economic and political penetration of international communism.

If the wage earners of any one of these munistic propaganda, infiltration, and revocountries remain vulnerable to the comlutionary techniques, that government's balanced budget, prosperous business community, and even military armor offer little or no protection against the Communist technique of exploiting an exploited people to serve their own ends; that is, sweep everything and everybody into the orbit of international communism. A classical example lies 90 miles off our shore—Cuba.

In the United States, our wage and hour law, known as the Fair Labor Standards Act, is the basic instrument we use to regulate fair competition in interstate and foreign commerce. The principles used here are minimum hourly rates, maximum hours per week, with penalty rates, on overtime hours, and minimum standards with respect to other working conditions such as child labor, etc., to regulate our domestic commerce on a fair basis of competition.

We have, incidently, employed the same principle under the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act. In this case, the act gives effect to collectively bargained wage rates and are determined as being the prevailing rates of pay in the industry bidding on public contracts.

District 50, United Mine Workers of America, has opposed reductions on tariff rates on competing industrial imports over the past decade in appearances before the Tariff Commission, the Committee on Reciprocity Information, and the President's Foreign Trade Policy Committee.

These appearances concerned a number of different industries, including the chemical industry, where employees represented by our union have been seriously affected by complete loss of their jobs and in others a sharp curtailment in employment due to low-priced imports produced by cheap labor abroad.

In these appearances, and otherwise, we have advocated that a fair labor standards policy be incorporated into our foreign trade policy.

Rather than have trade for trades sake—rather than have "free trade" instead of fair trade, we think that the Congress should establish reasonable standards under which competing imports enter our markets. Standards sufficiently well-defined so that competing imports will not undermine our domestic wage standards, our American standard of living, our employment opportunities, our domestic production enterprises and the internal revenue of the United States.

The Congress of the United States fixes the minimum fair labor standards as the basis of regulating commerce between and among the States. These standards automatically apply to export sales in foreign commerce. The power and duty of Congress is not limited to one side of the street in the regulation of foreign commerce.

We think that Congress has the power and the duty to regulate the incoming commerce on the other side of the street, that is—foreign manufacturers or producers who wish to sell their competing merchandise in our market be required to meet the minimum fair labor standards with respect to both child labor and minimum hourly rates of pay that are, by law, required of our domestic producers.

In addition, our Government must be in a position to impose long-term import quotas or other effective import restrictions on certain types of cheap industrial imports. I have particular reference here to the increasing quantities of waste oil—residual oil—pouring into our country along the Atlantic seaboard. Residual oil imports are costing the jobs of about 30,000 coal miners—are causing the shutdown of American coal mines whose continued operation are essential to the national security. The coal industry and those allied with it are suffering irreparable damage from residual oil imports, which is hitting hardest in the key industrial areas of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Kentucky, Illinois, and Virginia where unemployment and business stagnation already exists.

The Government of the United States has the same responsibility, we think, to protect the United States and its people from an economic invasion and destruction of American markets and jobs from the low-wage products of foreign nations as it has to protect the political and territorial integrity of the United States from invasion by the armed forces of a foreign power.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

SCRANTON, PA.,
March 14, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

A copy of the following telegram sent to Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH: "The Ukrainian Workingmen's Association, a fraternal benefit society with 25,000 members in the United States, strongly appeals to you to consider favorably House Resolution 211, calling for the establishment of a Permanent Committee on the Captive Nations; this committee, besides serving as an information center on the activities in the captive nations, would be able to enlighten the free world on the state of affairs behind the Iron Curtain and assist the U.S. Government in formulating its policies with respect to the captive nations. We urge you, CONGRESSMAN SMITH, to consider this resolution favorably and aid these nations to escape Soviet slavery and despotism."

Executive committee: Anthony Batiuk, president; Theodore Mynyk, supreme secretary; and Edward Popil, financial secretary-treasurer.

MARCH 16, 1962.

The Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: The association of which I am the chairman, have deeply been convinced of the necessity and urgency of establishing a permanent Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. We think of the committee as of important instrument in planning and carrying out the sound American policies in regard to the peoples enslaved within the Soviet colonial empire. In our opinion the committee would serve as a reservoir of data and information on the area, which is one of the most critical in the present world.

Our association is of the opinion that the U.S. policy frequently erred in this area in the past and is erring at present. The now widely known letter to you by the Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Rusk, equalling Ukraine, Georgia, and Armenia to "traditional" parts of an "historical" entity, has displayed a standard approach of Western policymakers to the situation in Eastern Europe. The renaissance of the national idea in this area as well as continuous troubles of the Kremlin with the so-called bourgeois nationalisms have consistently been silenced by this school of thinking, and consequently ignored by the American press despite the evidence of trends in world development, which put nationalism and national communism in the fore of the current political history. And, therefore, at the time when colonial powers are breaking in parts, when more and more colonies the world over attain independence and sovereignty, when in the socialist bloc itself demands for a greater individual and national freedom and independence become louder from day to day, some architects of Western policy consider their most important task to preserve the unity of Moscow's colonial empire and its domination of scores of nations. There is not a slightest doubt that a permanent Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives through its profound research in the problems of Central and Eastern Europe would be able to correct the existing situation and to point out at the forces representing the weakest link in the present structure of the Socialist bloc. The nub of this issue is that we need to be informed about the facts and truth of the liberation struggle of the captive nations, and that a permanent Committee on the Captive Nations may certainly answer these needs.

I remain, dear Congressman SMITH,

Very truly yours,

MYKOLA LEBED,
President, Prolog.

SOUTH MIAMI, FLA.,
March 14, 1962.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I would appreciate you letting me know if reprints are available of the speech that you inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that appeared on page 3253 of the March 7 edition. The title was, "History of Communist Aggression Lessons To Be Learned," by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

I would appreciate you sending me any other information you may have pertaining to captive nations resolution (H. Res. 211) as I am interested in distributing these to my friends.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY E. BEZOLD.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA,
Watervliet, N.Y.

The Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: Our organization, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America in Watervliet, N.Y., appeals to you to consider favorably the resolution (H. Res. 211) calling for the establishment of a permanent Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. We are sure that such a committee is long overdue. One of the greatest problems confronting our Nation today is the Soviet Union, a prisonhouse of many captive and enslaved nations and peoples. These nations, ever eager and wanting to escape Soviet Russian slavery and despotism, constitute perennial weaknesses of the Soviet Union. Therefore, it is to our advantage to know these weaknesses, and work to multiply them.

We strongly oppose the views of Mr. Dean Rusk, our Secretary of State, who expressed the opposition of the Department of State to such a committee. His arguments, in effect, display a lack of solid information and knowledge of the true situation behind the Iron Curtain, especially in Ukraine.

A Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would serve as a reservoir of information and data on the various captive nations in the U.S.S.R., which information could be made available to the U.S. Government and its various agencies. Its main function, however, would be to inform the American people and the world at large on the state of affairs behind the Iron Curtain and assist the U.S. Government in formulating its policies with respect to the captive nations enslaved in the Soviet Russian Communist empire.

We strongly urge you, Mr. Congressman, to consider favorably House Resolution 211 in your House Rules Committee.

Thank you.

JOHN ROMAMLION,
Chairman.
WASYL WASYLKIW,
Secretary.

MARCH 12, 1962.

DEAR PENNSYLVANIAN: I know you are familiar with conditions in the captive nations.

Please, could I obtain through you data pertaining to life in current Lithuania?

Lithuania is the land of my birth and boyhood, when czarist Russia held sway there.

If you please, and thank you, Congressman FLOOD.

Faithfully,

GEORGE EDELMAN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE, INC.,
New Brunswick, N.J., March 11, 1962.

The Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, branch in New Brunswick, appeals to you with reference to the resolution (H. Res. 211) calling for the establishment of a permanent Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. We are sure that such a committee is long overdue.

To retain her own freedom, America must get to know the true nature of the adversary. A permanent committee which would train its sights on the Soviet Union and its hapless imprisoned inmates cannot but dispel the longstanding, costly ignorance and misconceptions that have been of incalculable propagandistic aid to the Russians. The work of such a committee will sharpen the focus of our foreign policy, on the one hand; and, on the other, it will serve to boost the morale of the captive nations, the Soviet Achilles' heel, and our potential allies.

A Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would serve as a reservoir of information and data on the various captive nations in the U.S.S.R., which information could be made available to the U.S. Government and its agencies. Its main function, however, would be to inform the American people and the world at large on the state of affairs behind the Iron Curtain and assist the U.S. Government in formulating its policies with respect to the captive nations enslaved in the Soviet Russian Communist empire.

We strongly urge you, Mr. Congressman, to consider favorably House Resolution 211 in your House Rules Committee. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

JAROSLAW OSHCHUDLAK,
Chairman.

Farms Important to Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Orville Freeman, made another fine speech urging equality to our Nation's farmers. He addressed the Sales Executive Club in New York City at the Roosevelt Hotel in his continued determination to see that businessmen understand the importance of farm prosperity to business and the great job of food production farmers have accomplished for all consumers. In addition to outlining the facts of the farm situation and its relationship to our national economy, he makes a plea for businessmen to understand the complex problem facing our farmers.

It seems to me that Secretary Freeman has done a very thorough job in explaining to the city dwellers in New York that while there are fewer than 15 million persons actually living on farms today—or only about 8 percent of our country's population, nevertheless, when you add the 40 million who live in small towns and serve and supply small communities together with those who process, transport, and merchandise the products of agriculture and the 6 million people who provide supplies farmers use, the agricultural population comes nearer to 40 percent rather than 8 percent, and 40 percent is quite a substantial part of our total population.

The Secretary told the sales executives the farmer needs their understanding and support and as a very important customer of theirs deserves it. We are indeed fortunate to have a Secretary of Agriculture at last who defends farmers and points out their contribution to our national welfare.

Secretary Freeman's address follows:

FARMS IMPORTANT TO CITIES

(Address by Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman)

I am most appreciative of this opportunity to talk to one of the country's most influential business groups—and particularly at a time of impending crisis in our national agricultural policy.

You are involved in this crisis—not only as citizens, but as businessmen. The American farmer stands today at a major crossroads, and you—believe me—stand there with him.

A turn in the wrong direction at this critical juncture would have drastic repercussions, not only on the farmers, not only on rural America, not only on small business, but on big business as well—they would all be hit where it would hurt. The impact would be felt through the whole economy. The consequence for agriculture, for the family farm system that has proved the most efficient in the world, could be catastrophic.

If I sound like a prophet of doom, let me hasten to say that I have every confidence that the Congress, in the next few weeks, will point our agricultural policy down the road recommended by the President—a straight road leading to the heart of the agricultural problem. If we are unwilling

to face up to hard decisions now, we will find ourselves meandering around in a morass of costly, futile half measures that will lead us nowhere, except possibly to disaster.

In the next few minutes I want to describe the choices now open to us and tell you why the decision is as much a matter of concern to you people of the Nation's business as it is to the people of the Nation's farms.

Agriculture's basic problem is one that no business could tolerate and survive. In plainest terms, it is overproduction. Our agricultural plant, for a variety of reasons including an astounding surge in farm technology, is turning out more than we can possibly absorb, now or in the foreseeable future, domestically, and for export. The inevitable consequence is a glutted market for prime commodities, depressed farm prices, and inadequate return to the producer.

In our free enterprise economy, it is a fact of life that continued excess supply drives prices down below the cost of production. Every businessman lives with this fact every day in the operation of his business.

It requires no more than the exercise of commonsense, therefore, to perceive that the remedy for the present situation in agriculture is to adjust production to demand. But it requires a rather penetrating look at the peculiarities of agricultural economics to perceive why this is easier said than done.

Our agriculture consists of nearly 4 million farms. Of these, 1.5 million produce 87 percent of the total output. These are the commercial farms—the marvelously efficient family farms that roll out the bulk of our excess production year after year. The other 2.2 million farms, producing less than 13 percent of the total output, present a different kind of problem—one that can only be solved by a careful process of readjustment between people and resources.

The crux of the problem of oversupply is thus the astonishing and increasing productivity of 1½ million commercial farms. This is where a meaningful downward adjustment of output must be made.

I believe the efficient farmer in this country is prepared to make this adjustment. He is a businessman, after all, as keenly aware as anyone else of the depressing effect of oversupply. The critical question is the question of method: How can the needed adjustment be brought about with the greatest degree of certainty and the least degree of interference in the farmer's business?

The method proposed in the administration's food and agriculture program for the sixties is based essentially on the proposition that the producers of surplus commodities should have an opportunity to impose effective methods of supply management upon themselves through the time-honored democratic instrument of the ballot. Thus if a two-thirds majority of the producers of wheat or feed grains or dairy products voted in referendum to accept marketing quotas, all of the producers of that commodity would be obliged to comply.

There is nothing startlingly new in this idea—it represents the extension to other commodities of the system of supply management successfully employed for years by the producers of cotton, rice, peanuts, and tobacco.

It also represents a realistic and long-overdue acknowledgment of the fact that cuts in farm price supports do not mean cuts in total production. If the experience of the fifties taught us anything, it should have taught us that.

We entered 1952 with a Government stockpile of $2.5 billion worth of farm produce—not an unreasonable supply for emergencies and market stability. By the end of 1960—after 8 years of no supply management and progressively lower price supports, mistakenly calculated to discourage production, the surplus inventory in Government hands had jumped to $9 billion worth of foodstuffs that costs us a billion dollars a year to handle and store.

This is the choice then, that faces us today at what I believe to be a critical crossroads of farm policy.

On the one hand, a direct and purposeful system of agricultural self-discipline, exercised through democratic processes, which offers definite assurance of results in terms of lower total output, a fair standard of farm income, and reduced costs to the taxpayer. This alternative calls for effective supply management with price supports adequate to assure the farmer of a reasonable and stable return for his investment, labor and skill.

On the other hand, the choice is a policy that lets the farmer "go it alone" as best he can, producing without any attempt to adjust supply and without price supports for his product. Given 3½ million farmers all "going it alone," the result—as documented by four recent independent studies by State universities and committees of Congress—would be a disastrous drop in farm income, the threat of bankruptcy for thousands of farmers and the very real danger of a searing farm depression, with consequences for the national economy that I hesitate to contemplate.

Now let me go back to my statement that the businessman is standing with the farmer at the present crossroads in agricultural policy. What is his stake in the decisions that must be made?

We have a way of talking about farm interest and city interests as if the two communities were a million light-years apart.

When the businessman thinks of the farm, it is apt to be in terms of an irritating and expensive situation that concerns an insignificant 8 percent of the population, somewhere "out there."

This is an illusion I wish we could dispel.

It is easy to underestimate the farm population. There are fewer than 15 million people living on farms today—about 8 percent of the country's population—or about the same as the population of the New York metropolitan area.

Would anyone suggest that the New York area is not vitally important to the national economy? The influence of this metropolis is felt from one end of the country to the other and around the globe.

In the same way the importance of agriculture to the economy is far greater than the farm population alone would indicate. Remember that farmers and their families are only one part of the agricultural population. There are another 40 million people who make up our rural population, and a large number of them are the smalltown families who service and supply the farm communities.

Ten million people have jobs storing, transporting, processing, and merchandising the products of agriculture.

Six million people have jobs providing the supplies farmers use.

Add them all up—the farmers, the smalltown shopkeepers and bankers, the truckers, processors, wholesalers and retailers—and the agricultural population is far closer to 40 percent than to 8 percent of the Nation.

Forty percent of the population is a lot of customers. Whatever affects their pocketbooks, shows up in your order books. When their business is good, your business will be better. When a customer that big has a problem, business has a problem.

The farmer stands just as tall when you measure him as a producer, too. In fact, he leads all others as the biggest single industry in the Nation.

The investment in agriculture was over 200 billion in 1961. That's about three-fourths of the value of current assets for all corporations in the country. It is three-fifths of the market value of all corporation stocks on the New York Stock Exchange.

That is big business indeed.

The investment in agriculture represents $21,300 for each farmworker. In manufacturing it is less than $16,000 for each worker.

Every bale of cotton on its way to the gin, every bushel of grain delivered to an elevator, every head of cattle shipped out of the feed lot, sets in motion a process that means not only more food and fiber for the country, but incomes throughout the marketing system.

Farmers sent more than $20 billion worth of food to the domestic market in 1961. By the time we paid for it, it was worth another $40 billion—twice again as much. About half of that money was wages for the men and women who process, store, ship, and finally sell our food to us in the store. This marketing bill was income to the trucking and rail companies that hauled the food. It was profits for the companies handling farm foods. And they in turn, bought containers and fuel, paid rents, interests, and taxes, until the dollars that started on the farm had been multiplied over and over throughout the economy.

Selling to the farmer is measured in billions of dollars. When he buys—he buys a lot.

Last year, for instance, the farmer grossed nearly $40 billion—$35 billion from his crops and livestock. He paid nearly $27 billion for everything he needed to run his business.

The farmer puts out about $2.5 billion a year for the purchase of trucks and tractors and other machines and equipment. About $1 billion is spent by the primary iron and steel industry for equipment and new plants.

He spends $3.4 billion for fuel, lubricants, and maintenance for his equipment. Farming uses more petroleum than any other single industry.

And to keep his farm going, the farmer uses 27 billion kilowatts of electricity, enough to run Baltimore, Chicago, Boston, Detroit, Houston, and Washington, D.C. for a year.

And while you think about the farmer, don't overlook his wife. She's spending money, too—about $12.7 billion of realized net income last year—for household repairs, and clothes for the family; for television sets, radios, refrigerators, and stoves. Carpets were out in farmhouses too, and they were replaced, along with chairs and lamps. Nylons and lipstick, soap and toothpaste are all as necessary on the farm as they are in the city. A good part of the money went for food too.

It would be hard to find a more important customer and business partner than the farm family.

All of which is to say that a thriving productive agricultural economy touches every aspect of our lives. It provides us with food and fiber at bargain rates, helping to free more of the national income for other consumer goods—the products you want to sell.

The grocery bill is a good example; just after the war, the family grocery bill was about a fourth of the average take-home pay. Today it is less than a fifth, although retail food prices have gone up. They would be a lot higher if it weren't for the fact that the farmer is now getting 13 percent less than he did a decade ago for his part of the typical "market basket" of food.

But this boon to the food buyer means less return to the food producer. The most recent figures show that the annual farm income is $965 per person—and about a third of that comes from nonfarm work and other nonfarm sources.

The rest of us average $2,216.

Incomes of farm families are lower today, compared with those of nonfarm families, than they have been since just before the war.

The American farmer cannot be expected to continue to invest his capital, labor, and skill, for a material reward so far below the national average.

Nor can any other segment of the economy afford to look on with indifference when the agricultural economy is depressed.

Higher incomes for farmers will mean more purchases by farmers—more equipment and machinery; more fuel, oil, and other petroleum products; more pesticides, containers, and other production materials; more money on the same furniture, clothing, cars, and other goods that the city dweller buys.

As businessmen and sales executives your stake in the impending decisions on agricultural policy is a very large one indeed. The farmer needs your understanding and support. As an important customer he deserves it.

His technological skill, which lies at the base of a mammoth industry and assures the Nation's abundance, has earned it.

I sincerely hope you will give it to him.

West Point: Its Heritage and Its Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, recently Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau addressed the West Point Society in New York City on the subject of his alma mater.

This address was particularly notable because it probably represents one of the last times that this distinguished military leader will address the West Point Society while still on active duty. General Trudeau is due to retire very shortly but the words uttered on the occasion of the New York meeting will live in the memories of those who heard him and those who read the message as a tribute to his achievements.

General Trudeau has been a loyal soldier and an outstanding Chief of Research and Development for the Department of the Army. His tenacity in pursuing a scientific system which will produce an antisatellite missile will long be remembered and I am certain all Americans can be grateful for this effort to bolster the military security of our country.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to insert for the RECORD his address, entitled "West Point: Its Heritage and Its Future":

WEST POINT: ITS HERITAGE AND ITS FUTURE

(By Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau)

General Crittenberger, General Bryan, Colonel Boone, distinguished guests, fellow West Pointers, we find ourselves gathered this March night, as many of us have in some or many preceding years, to honor the founding of our beloved alma mater, the U.S. Military Academy, West Point; this time the 160th anniversary in her long and distinguished history as the world's outstanding military school.

On the sound foundation given to her sons, in that long gray line that has gone on before us, has been built much of the history, the traditions, the structure, and the power of the greatest Nation on earth—the United States of America.

This was not accomplished without bitter struggle and bloody sacrifice, nor by West Point alone, but, in all the convulsions of our country's growth—and the most violent of these, of course, are wars—our forebears and comrades with character, courage, and knowledge have played a major role in providing or directing the brains and the brawn which, with God's help, have raised our standards ever higher in our forward march as the leader of the free world.

There have been times, and probably will be others, when each of us has questioned the importance of our individual or collective role to serve as a real bulwark to our national policy in peace but there has never been and never will be a time when a son of West Point or any true American can question our vital role in war.

Though our numbers have been small, our impact on the military policies, operations, and history of the United States and our allies can never be overestimated. From the pulpit to the Presidency, we have made, and are making, our civil contribution to the spiritual and physical development of our Nation.

The spirit of West Point is the soul of the Army, diluted if you will, but still of stouter and finer stuff than if that spirit instilled at West Point and nurtured by the courage and sacrifice of her sons on hundreds of battlefields were nonexistent. With less than 1 percent of the Army and Air Force Officers in World War II, the graduates of West Point, proportionately, shed twice as much blood as the entire officer corps and three times as much as the entire American Armed Forces. If that quality of leadership resulted from the caste system, our country needs more of it.

In the jungles of Southeast Asia, American and indigenous forces, led by our fellow West Pointers, Harkins '27 and McGarr '28, are struggling to prevent a further Communist surge southward.

All over the world, in more than 50 countries, from the Greenland ice cap to the steaming jungles of the Congo, our comrades today are advancing our cause and our destiny as truly as those of a century ago.

On or above the bleak Korean hills that stand as silent symbols of our Nation's last military effort, over 100 sons of senior West Point graduates won the Purple Heart and many made the supreme sacrifice, some before they had completed even 1 year of commissioned service. If that is indicative of the way the affairs of the so-called West Point Protective Association are conducted, we ought to be a highly regarded organization as we have few, if any, competitors.

I certainly do not mean to imply that there is, or need be, any association to protect the honored name of West Point. Our contributions on hundreds of bloody fields of battle constitute the timeless, unshatterable monument to which our countrymen, in overwhelming majority, pay silent tribute. We do need a concert of purpose and determination, however, as the hard core, trained and dedicated to the Nation's defense since our youth, in order to support and advance a better understanding of the requirements of our entire Military Establishment—Regular, Guard, and Reserve—and, in order to meet the growing challenge of Soviet imperialism to the very survival of our Nation and the remaining free world.

At times, we are likely to forget our purpose and our heritage amid the discomforts, family separations, and frustrations of present-day service and we need to reflect at least once a year, or preferably more, on our purpose and our objective in this life. We need to review the meaning of those things we were taught to hold dear and even more precious than life itself during those formative years on the Hudson—before life's disillusionments appeared and our perspective became blurred in the untamed and barbaric streaming of history—coupled with the human problems each of us encounters day by day and year by year.

The peaceful world of the twenties, thirties, or even the late forties or fifties, if you will, was only a momentary interlude in the unending clash of power interests and in the seething struggle of mankind to rise beyond the feudal barriers of slavery, want brutality.

The fact that the forces of evil are more ominously arrayed against us than ever before, has awakened our more thoughtful leaders to the nature of this terrible challenge, but, for the most part, the sheep still graze peacefully in lush pastures and complacency reigns supreme. The tinge of dawn marking the reawakening of America is just on the horizon and we must stand to arms, at first light, as we have done on many battlefields, lest the enemy attack leaves this resurgence stillborn.

We, West Pointers, are among the leaders of America. We dare not abrogate this great privilege and responsibility and sink to the level of mere followers. We must work toward the end that our leaders will finally alert the sheep and forestall the attack of the wolfpack. In our own limited way, we can each make a positive contribution toward this goal.

The impact of the actions, attitudes and words of some of us affects many thousands of our countrymen as well as men and soldiers of other nations. By word and deed we have a great responsibility—not only to increase their military proficiency, but to make them also, leaders—shepherds, not sheep (with respect to both our foreign and domestic problems) so that with a more alert citizenry, the mighty voice of America can lead the way out of the 20th century wilderness in which we find ourselves. Our attitude and astuteness in national affairs is important every waking moment of our lives.

Only by courage, tenacity, and sacrifice, can this be done. The officer who succumbs to, or is dulled by, the frequent or daily frustrations he encounters, will also fail when the battle turns against him. As long as we live, we must attack and counterattack—we must storm the battlements before us until final victory is won. There is no room for compromise, complacency or coexistence with the evils now facing us today. We must massage our muscles and toughen our moral fiber if we are to defend the belt of the heavyweight champion of the world—or we will lose by weakness, if not by default.

Perhaps I am wrong in overestimating this complete dedication to "duty, honor, country"—the spirit of West Point—as the guiding force for the leaders of America. Perhaps a consuming envy of someone else's income or profits or comforts or prestige is permissible in the oath we took. But not in my code. Perhaps we should "let George do it" but where—and who—is George, and what is he doing about it? There is still a monumental and hazardous job to be done, despite the Casper Milquetoasts, business-as-usual boys and Fabian Socialists who would say otherwise. We must not be trapped between the sons of fear and the prophets of doom. Somewhere in this world of blinding speed and atomic power, America needs the hard core of professional men in all services, dedicated not only to military readiness, but also to the advancement of American ideals and ideas—and American accomplishments and aspirations. In this small but priceless coterie of leaders—military and civilian—the sons of West Point have never had a more vital role to play than now—and for as long as the youngest of you shall live.

We live in an era in which change is more rapid and meaningful than in any period during the last 500 years. This situation is typified not only by the dramatic fading of the boundaries of empires—but even by ventures beyond the longstanding frontiers of space. There is hardly a field in the physical sciences, the social sciences, or the humanities that is not changing. Every day and in every way, we see evidence of this explosive growth of knowledge and it challenges our imagination, our ability, and our judgment to utilize it wisely.

Perhaps overshadowing all these advances is the fact that nations have at long last achieved the awesome power to destroy each other. Today a single missile can equal in destructive power all the devastation created during World War II. There is great fear in some parts of our land that this terrible power will, by design or miscalculation, break loose and wreak havoc upon nations and peoples. In this life there are few certainties but one of them is that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty; and surely a second is that determination and readiness to meet such a challenge is the key to survival.

We are engaged in a titanic struggle for the hearts and minds of men. In things material and military, the competition is very real because both sides possess vast power. In the struggle for the spirit and the mind, however, we have decisive power if we will but apply it. From the time of Adam and Eve until now, mankind has recognized and revered the power and omnipotence of a Supreme Being, call Him what you will. Whatever our religion, and almost without exception, the sons of West Point are deeply imbued with this conviction. Now we are faced by a godless conspiracy emanating from Moscow and Peiping, where belief in the power of the Almighty is called an opiate of the people—in order to force them to accept slavery amicably. The masters of iniquity know as Nero did—that the human spirit welded to a faith in God above—cannot be conquered. They know that faith is a stimulant and not an opiate and that the miserable ideology they seek to advance cannot succeed in the face of dynamic and determined spiritual advancement.

These changing times require constant reevaluation of the characteristics, training, and qualifications of our graduates—but, first and foremost is the overriding need for development of leadership; including those priceless ingredients of character, honor, integrity, loyalty, devotion to duty, and tenacity of purpose—that must always be the trademark of a West Point graduate. I would rather see the Academy abandoned—than to see it changed to a degree that would discard our priceless code and our proven system to instill those precious attributes that really constitute the cornerstone of its greatness.

The new curriculum reflects the added demands today to meet the scientific and technological requirements of tomorrow, but not at the sacrifice of broad education and training. It is fostering concurrently, both physical betterment and spiritual enlightenment. Our athletic teams and academic standards are among the tops in the Nation and we expect them to go higher. The constant example set by our graduates in their personal conduct and in maintaining moral ascendancy over their subordinates and associates, and as outstanding citizens, is reassuring in this godless world of materialism, cowardice, and compromise.

Today's West Pointer is being trained for the space age just as surely as those before him in "the long gray line" mastered the embryo science of engineering during the surge of our Nation to the shores of the Pacific. Once again, this background and experience in the scientific and technological fields, must contribute to the stature and posture of our country—and this time the stakes are higher, the contest more grim and the outcome still uncertain.

We are also facing a great moral challenge within as well as a vicious Communist threat. This challenge forces us to draw on our deepest sources of courage and responsibility—while part of our society is blinded by the illusion of soft living, easy money and self interest. To counter this appalling situation—this paradox—will strain the moral fiber of every dedicated patriot, soldier, and American.

The powerful material forces arrayed in this struggle, while of vital importance, are still secondary; for this worldwide battle will be won or lost, primarily on the windswept crags of the spirit—in the hearts and minds of men.

True, the competition is very real in the economic and military realms because both sides possess vast power, but the best defense of all that we hold dear—is to keep freedom's fires burning more brightly in those three immutable pillars of our Western civilization—the home, the church, and the school—and only an awakened people can do so.

In ever strengthening and vitalizing these institutions, we must redouble our efforts to differentiate between our standard of living and our way of life.

Today, though less than 200 years old as a nation, we stand as the patriarch of all freedom-loving peoples everywhere. This is why we must lead; this is what we have to protect. If democracy is only the triumph of mediocrity, we are doomed. We must not tarry in the mirage of material comforts when there are bolder and brighter horizons worthy of our struggle.

We must never, never forget that the real capstone of all strength lies in firm advancement of the spiritual values that have made America the leading nation on this earth—that infatuation with things material can destroy us—that the true strength of freemen and nations everywhere comes from faith in a supreme being—dedication to a just cause, and the courage to live, or if necessary, to die for it.

Thus, the heavy mantle of free world leadership, now resting precariously on our shoulders, will drape itself more securely and more gracefully about us if we not only guard it against the ominous pressures of today, but guide our Nation to an enlightened and happier tomorrow. As West Pointers and citizens—our job is to get out and do our part. The need for courage on the battlefield was never greater than that needed here and now—in the mortal combat in which we are locked to the finish.

We must replace fear with faith, complacency with courage, patronage with patriotism, and selfishness with sacrifice.

We must not allow our Army, our Government or our Nation to be perverted by those who would try to lull us to sleep—who would try to make us lay down as the lamb with the wolf—and expect to wake up in the morning. The survival of Western democracy cannot risk such a catastrophe as looms ahead in the fog between now and the turn of the century. There is little comfort and even less security in the appalling ignorance of Communist and Socialist intentions and capabilities so frequently exhibited today. Our potential enemy's capabilities are unbelievably great and are growing greater in both the military and economic fields.

That vital challenge of tomorrow is our greatest opportunity today—the opportunity to so advance, so build, so defend, and so cherish this land of ours—that in the far distant future, America will still be enshrined and sustained as the leader of freemen in the hearts and hopes of all the people of this world—and to this end, the sons of West Point must do their full share.

The kind of national spirit, dedication, and courage that we must have today was clearly demonstrated to the Connecticut State Legislature back in the 18th century—and is truly symbolic of our code. Those were still times of deep-rooted superstitions and beliefs about all of the forces of nature. When the sun darkened from a total eclipse of the moon, the good citizens of Hartford thought the Day of Judgment was at hand. The legislature was in session that day and the members, some of them panic stricken, began to rush about excitedly. The speaker of the house stilled the commotion and rapped for order. Then the old man raised his voice above the babble and said: "This darkness does not matter unless it means the end of the world. And if the world is indeed ending, I choose to meet my Maker while doing my duty. Therefore, I ask that candles may be brought, so that this house can continue its business."

This is the last time I will be looking on this scene while on active duty and I will soon be joining many of you who have already laid aside the accoutrements of battle, but I am sure that maturity and years make us continually more objective in our appraisal of our country's potential as well as of her problems. We may not be as wise as Aristotle or Thomas Aquinas, but we can project an image of courage and love of country that cannot be contested by any group. Many have dared greatly. Some have been victors. Some have known the bitterness of defeat. Some have died knowing neither—but as our great Teddy Roosevelt once said:

"The credit belongs to the man who is actually in the arena; who knows the great enthusiasms, the great devotions, and spends himself in a worthy cause; who, at best, knows in the end the triumph of high achievement—and who, at the worst, if he fails, fails while daring greatly; so that his place shall never be with those cold and timid souls who know neither victory nor defeat."

Liberty is a precious thing. It was bought with the blood of our fathers, and preserved by you and me and many of our sons within our lifetime. The signers who pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor on July 4, 1776, and the hundreds of thousands who gave their lives for America on this century's battlefields would look down on us with shame if they thought we would fail them now—or ever. We won't.

Let us resolve therefore, to stress again and expand the image of West Point for great leadership that has made our training systems and our battlefield proficiency on the ground and in the air, the nemesis of our enemies as well as the envy of our allies. With steel in our hearts, and an awareness in our brains and souls, of our tremendous collective responsibility to West Point, to our Armed Forces, and to our country, let us also resolve anew to burnish bright those great principles of duty, honor, country with which we were imbued in those precious years on the Hudson, so that whenever, however, and wherever we depart this world, it can be said, "Well done, go thou in peace."

Tax-Exempt Foundations—A Source of Philanthropy and an Escape From Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced a bill to re-

move the income tax exemptions granted to foundations to the extent that they do not distribute their investment income. The income tax shall not apply to more than 40 percent of the undistributed investment income and shall be at the rates payable by the ordinary taxpayer. My bill continues the exemption granted to religious and educational foundations under the tax laws.

The purpose of my bill is to see to it that the foundations carry out their philanthropic, charitable, scientific, and welfare purposes, and to stop the accumulation of billions of tax-exempt dollars which are not being used for charitable purposes, but are being used for private purposes and in unfair business competition. If the foundations do not distribute their investment income for the purposes for which they were organized, then the foundations, in my opinion, must pay taxes on the undistributed investment income. My bill will bring into the general treasury of the United States several hundred million dollars annually.

The Ways and Means Committee is considering the major tax refund tax bill, H.R. 10650. This tax bill is designed to have all taxpayers assume their share of the cost of the operation of Government, the defense of our Nation, and the carrying out of our social measures. The administration tax reform measure seeks to provide incentives to expand our economy and the rate of growth. The tax reform measure is closing many tax loopholes. It seeks to withhold a 20-percent tax on income paid by corporation dividends and on savings banks deposits. It is requiring the insurance companies, the casualty companies, and the mutual companies to pay taxes. It is requiring foreign corporations owned by U.S. citizens to pay on their earnings, and it requires that excessive reserves should also be subject to tax although not distributed.

The history of foundations is phenomenal and apparently it is leading to abuse and circumvention of payment of taxes. Over $12 billion of the Nation's wealth has been drawn from our economy for tax purposes. The growth of tax exempt foundations within the past few years has been extraordinarily phenomenal. From 1952 to 1960 the number of tax exempt foundations has increased from 12,295 to 45,124, an increase of 367 percent. This means that 45,000 taxpayers with $12 billion of assets and an annual income estimated at $100 million a year are enjoying tax exemptions. These foundations receive this tax exemption because we believe that they should use this income and the donations which they receive for charitable, scientific, philanthropic educational and welfare purposes, but the history of the operations of the foundations indicates that they do not use more than 60 percent of their funds for such purposes. Some foundations carry out their purposes diligently and meticulously. Some foundations, while enjoying tax advantages, participate in commercial enterprises and possess business advantages over their competitors by reason of these tax exemptions.

According to an authority and specialist in this field, the pattern among large foundations appears to make grants at between 3 to 3½ percent of the total assets, while the assets accumulate at an undetermined and varying higher rate. I would like to set forth three classic examples of the growth of these foundations within the past 7 years, what they are giving in grants, and to what extent their assets have increased.

While the great Rockefeller Foundation made grants in 1959 in the tremendous sum of $22,599,735, a truly sizable sum, its assets increased from $318,229,000 to $647,694,858, an increase of $329,464,858. This increase of approximately $330 million was tax exempt. Have you pondered as to how much in taxes which the Rockefeller foundation legally avoided in 6 years did the small taxpayer have to pick up? The Ford Foundation was extremely generous in 1959 and made grants to the extent of $110,132,848, but its assets increased from $520,232,000 to $3,316 million, an increase of $2,795,768,000. This means that approximately $2,750 million which was not distributed and which was not used for charitable, scientific or welfare services legally escaped taxation in 6 years. The John A. Hartford Foundation, which was chartered in my city, New York, in 1953, had approximately $3 million of assets. In 1959 its assets exceeded $413 million, an increase of $410 million. In 1958 it made grants of $3,945,813. This means that $393 million of income legally avoided taxes, not only in the State of New York, but also in the Federal Government.

I believe that these undistributed funds should be subject to taxes, just as the income of the ordinary taxpayer is subject to taxes.

Inasmuch as we want all people, corporations, domestic and foreign, to carry the cost of Government, and inasmuch as we recognize the laudible purposes of foundations, we should grant them tax exemptions only to the extent that they carry out their purposes; but when they do not carry out their purposes and accumulate their funds which are being used for other purposes and which are derived from their investments and business enterprises, these undistributed funds should be subject to income taxes just as the income tax that you or I or any other taxpayer might be called upon to pay.

Withholding Tax on Interest and Dividends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable debate today on H.R. 10650, the tax revision bill. The proposed 20-percent withholding tax on dividends and interest income provision is among the most controversial and, in my opinion, most objectionable features of this bill. If adopted, this provision would impose unnecessary hardships on both the savings institutions and the investors and savers.

Yesterday, I received a very thoughtful letter on this subject, which presents an excellent analysis of the objections to the proposal. It was written by a bank official in my district, Charles H. Randall, Jr., trust officer of the Plymouth National Bank of Plymouth, Mass.

I commend this letter to the attention and consideration of my colleagues.

PLYMOUTH, MASS., *March 26, 1962.*

The Honorable HASTINGS KEITH,
House Office Building
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. KEITH: I am writing to urge you strongly to vote against the proposed withholding tax on dividends and interest. My objections are twofold: the resulting hardship on the small depositor and investor; the resulting hardship on the banks and the corporations.

There are millions of persons who have little or no real knowledge of the intricacies of the present complicated Federal income tax laws. In spite of complete publicity many will never recover withheld taxes. There are the elderly people who have no net taxable income and will never be required to file an income tax return who will suddenly be confronted with the perplexing problem of filing exemption certificates or filing tax returns that are in effect claims for refund of taxes withheld. Likewise, there are the parents who have started savings accounts or purchased a few securities for their minor children. The children who have no taxable income will be forced to file tax returns or exemption certificates. Even if exemption certificates may be filed by minors, corporations and banks will be responsible for elimination of exemption as minors come of age.

The burdens which fall upon the banks and corporations will be even more onerous. First, they will lose goodwill. Just as labor now regards "take home" pay as their true earnings, stockholders and depositors will come to regard their net dividends and interest as their true earnings on investments and savings. The banks will be blamed by depositors for their failure to provide greater income. Much ill will as well as suspicion will be created as banks are required to withhold from owners of U.S. market securities a portion of each interest coupon presented for deposit or cash. Secondly, corporations and banks will be subjected to greatly increased costs. I am particularly aware of the problems which will be created for the corporate trustee. They will be more pronounced for the less experienced individual trustee. Trustees will have to establish new systems of accounting in order to account for the true income of beneficiaries. If securities are held in a nominee account in which some taxpayers have filed exemption certificates and others have not it will be impossible to separate income and allot it to the proper account without double records and much additional clerical help. Trustee's fees based upon income will have to be adjusted and this is not possible under legislation in some States.

Withholding of the tax on dividends and interest will result in the filing of millions of additional returns; there will be more erroneous returns filed because of the complexity of "grossing up" true income; there will be many more refund payments. The result will be a greatly increased expense to the Government in administration of the tax law.

The Government now has the information necessary to collect these taxes without withholding. For years every corporation

has supplied the Treasury Department with a detailed report on the payment of dividends. All interest payments of $600 or more have also been reported. With the electronic equipment which the Treasury plans to install, the Treasury will be able to check against individual returns or the lack of such returns without placing upon private industry the uncompensated burden of collecting taxes.

I feel that it is in the best interest of our country that this proposed legislation be defeated, and I ask your best efforts in achieving this result.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES H. RANDALL, Jr.,
Trust Officer.

Report on a Study Mission Abroad on Export Credit Insurance Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times last Sunday carried an interesting and informative article on page 1 of the business section on the subject of the new export credit insurance program just placed in operation last month as a joint venture of the Export-Import Bank and numerous American private insurance firms. More than 600 applications have already been filed under it and 128 have been approved. This program was established under temporary authority granted for 1 year by a bill which we enacted into law last year on recommendation of the Committee on Banking and Currency. More than 60 insurance firms are participating.

As a member of the subcommittee which originally considered the enabling legislation, and which will have jurisdiction again in this session in recommending whether to continue, expand, or abandon the experimental program of credit risk guarantees, I had the great privilege of making a factfinding trip for the committee last October which took me around the world and into many of the countries which are operating either privately run or Government-run credit risk insurance programs for their exporters.

This trip convinced me that American manufacturing firms can and should compete for more markets overseas; and, with a good credit risk insurance program available to them to underwrite credit defaults, there is no reason why they cannot increase exports substantially.

After my return to St. Louis last November, I discussed this issue in appearances before numerous groups of interested citizens—the League of Women Voters, a group of college alumnae, a women's group action organization, and the Foreign Credit Chapter of the St. Louis Association of Credit Management, among others.

To the credit men, as a prelude to a panel discussion later in the evening with officials of the Export-Import Bank participating, I presented some of the technical aspects of the issue and said this:

Frankly, I do not know whether it will be practical—whether it will work—to have private insurers underwriting some of the credit risks for American exporters and having the Government agency (Export-Import Bank) underwrite the political risks. That's the way we have set it up. We will give it a try. It is worth trying. After all, we have long experience here in the United States in having private enterprise and Government work cooperatively on programs which private enterprise alone could not handle—or which, for reasons of public policy, should not become private monopolies. Capitalism is not a bad word in the United States compared to many other countries, particularly, since our kind of capitalism is so much different from the kind of capitalism which has existed in so many other countries.

But on my recent trip, interviewing many officials of export insurance agencies—both Government operated and privately operated—I was told over and over that credit insurance must be comprehensive in coverage, in order to be reasonable enough in price to be practical. If the private insurers can pick and choose as to risks, and make the Government agency carry all the high risk coverage, I just don't know what the outcome will be. We'll try it and see. Also, there may be reasons to worry over the banking institutions getting into the insurance business, because—again—experience abroad has indicated that these two operations, that is, export credit and export risk insurance, are not necessarily complementary functions in a single institution, and may, in some instances, be antagonistic.

In any event, as we go into this more seriously, as we will probably have to in order to assure American firms a better share of foreign markets, then we may have to think in terms of encouraging comprehensive credit insurance coverage on all exports of a particular firm on a long-term basis, not just on shipments going into countries considered unstable politically, or economically, or both.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the talk I gave to the League of Women Voters of St. Louis on my return from my around the world trip last November, being less technical, would be of wider general interest and constitutes, I believe, a worthwhile form of report on the value of such factfinding assignments. I therefore submit it for inclusion in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT ON A STUDY MISSION ABROAD ON EXPORT CREDIT INSURANCE PROGRAMS

(Speech by Hon. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, Member of Congress, to the St. Louis League of Women Voters, Nov. 16, 1961, St. Louis, Mo.)

When Mrs. Pinkus' invitation reached me in Athens to attend and speak at today's luncheon meeting, I sent word back immediately that I would be delighted to accept, and for several reasons including some highly personal ones.

First of all, I felt that the information I was obtaining in my interviews with government officials in the countries I was visiting would be of immense interest to the members of the League of Women Voters, for no organization has been more devoted to the cause of effective international relationships than the league.

And, on the more personal level, I have always been proud of my own longstanding membership in this organization, because I think the league, you women, have done more over the years than any other group of Americans to demonstrate the validity of women suffrage, now 41 years old.

If every American woman took as strong and as effective an interest in politics, in the political process, as do a high proportion of the members of the League of Women Voters, I believe that most of today's pressing internal problems would long since have been solved.

We will, of course, never achieve perfection in our political affairs any more than we can achieve perfection in any human endeavors and relationships. But much as we appreciate our freedom as a people, and much as we pride ourselves on the achievements of our way of life, I think we women in this room would be the last to say that what we now have is good enough.

On the other hand, thanks to women like you and thanks to the causes in which you believe and for which you work so hard, the United States, with all of its faults as a practicing democracy, is a mighty wonderful place to come home to after an extended trip abroad.

We have far too much poverty here in the United States, but the worst of our poverty is luxury compared to some of the common sights I saw in India, or in parts of Iran, or in the slums of Hong Kong.

We have illiteracy even today in our country, and too much ignorance of sanitation and hygiene and personal and family care, and of these things we are ashamed—but, as a people, we care, and are trying to solve those problems. In too many of the areas of the world, however, no one apparently cares. There is a kind of social anarchy which seems to stifle the individual conscience in the face of widespread abject misery.

Rags and tatters, sickness and malnutrition, neglect and despair, ignorance and apathy, and overwhelming unrest needs crowd in upon your heart and make you want to cry over the seeming hopelessness of it all. And yet it is not hopeless. For one thing, we cannot permit hopelessness to conquer—and in all of these areas there is ever-greater recognition by national leaders and local officials of the eye in which help can be obtained and can be put to use.

As a Member of Congress who has, in 9 years, voted for billions of American aid for peoples abroad, I have always known that American aid by itself cannot overcome the accumulated deficits of centuries in meeting the needs of undeveloped and underdeveloped nations. At the same time, it is evident, after a trip to some of these areas, that while often appearing to be futile, the aid is not money down a rathole. But we find we must run like everything just to keep even with where we are, to prevent deterioration in already desperate economic situations. The aid we provided for industrial expansion or for communications or for other great leaps from primitive to modern productive methods has been making a dent—a big dent—but the most effective aid we can give is in the education of the children.

Habits of thinking which date back not only hundreds but even thousands of years must be changed in the course of a generation or, at most, in the course of a lifetime, if we are to achieve any really significant improvement in the living conditions of millions of people in impoverished lands. Patience in the face of adversity, resignation in the face of extreme suffering and hardship, and fortitude in the face of natural disaster are spiritual virtues all of us recognize and applaud. But when these attitudes become a way of life—as they have for the masses in many areas over many centuries—there is little chance for inspiring them to take arms against their sea of troubles—mountainous seas of incredible troubles—and by opposing, end them. The problem for enlightened leaders of such countries is to train the children who will be tomorrow's adults to want to change con-

ditions which, while clearly intolerable, are nevertheless tolerated. Of course, there is some political danger in this—political dynamite—for no one can really be sure what changes will then be sought—and in what manner. Fortunately for the principles in which we believe, our help is avidly being sought in this educational process. Let's make sure we take full advantage of this ideological advantage.

The interest in America, the desire for more American teachers and for American teaching methods, and the admiration for our political processes were widespread and sincere, and reassuring, in most of the have-not areas I visited. So let us not be deterred from continuing our efforts in such areas, just because we cannot achieve miracles overnight. The Middle East, for instance, and parts of Asia, will require not overnight miracles but hard, long, consistent efforts over many years to show any real improvement; in the meantime, however, we are only keeping even at most.

My impressions on these points were sidelights of my trip, for I was not on a factfinding tour of impoverished areas of the world for purposes of evaluating foreign aid. However, I think every Member of Congress should be required, as a part of the job, to go abroad periodically, to at least some of the underdeveloped areas for a personal look into conditions we are trying to help improve. Such trips are often ridiculed as taxpayer-financed pleasure junkets. Actually, we can pay for such trips without dipping into the Federal Treasury for dollars by using counterpart funds—foreign currencies which we own in the billions and which we cannot use for purely American purposes except in comparatively minute quantities. These are funds we have accumulated chiefly from the so-called sale of surplus foods, and are usable by this Nation, for only limited purposes, primarily for grant or loan bank to the same countries which issued the blocked currencies. Members of Congress must account for every drachma or kroner or mark or yen or lira or other unit of counterpart currency which we draw and spend on these trips and of course only our necessary official travel expenses, hotels, meals, and transportation are covered. Any personal expenditures we make with counterpart funds, and there is, of course, a strong urge to buy all sorts of things, must be repaid by us into the Treasury in dollars, so actually, our official trips abroad bring into the Treasury at least some dollars which wouldn't otherwise be there. But that's hardly a reason to go.

For certainly those are not fun trips. They are hard work. Spending a few days in a series of countries is hectic—almost frantic. Your digestion is in constant turmoil. I virtually gave up eating. Travel connections have a habit of going awry; my luggage was torn to shreds. I had the feeling that each time I picked up my suitcase, that my lingerie and makeup were going to spill all over the airport terminal or hotel lobby. Restaurant meals everywhere were terribly expensive and hotel rooms were often outrageously overpriced. It just burns me up to pay the equivalent of $31.50, say, for an ordinary hotel room and the equivalent of $7 or $8 for an ordinary meal, as we had to do, for instance, in Vienna. Surprisingly enough, most of the restaurants we patronized appeared to be crowded with local people and not tourists, and I just wonder how they can manage such expenses unless there is a two-price system we weren't aware of.

But I am far off my subject. As I started to say, I was not on a foreign aid factfinding tour, although I think every Member of Congress, regardless of the jibes we get about plush junketing in some of the newspapers, should be required during every 2-year term to visit at least several countries receiving foreign aid and study the problems our officials face. Only then can we legislate intelligently on the measures we must decide in the international field.

But my trip was for another purpose. It was to assess some of the programs now operated by foreign countries for aiding their industries to compete for international trade. As we all know, foreign trade is the lifeblood of nearly every one of our allied nations and, in fact, of virtually every nation. We in the United States have been tremendously fortunate ever since 1939 and the start of World War II in Europe in having huge markets anxious to buy our goods. Foreign sales representatives became order takers and not salesmen; furthermore, we came to assume that a perpetual huge balance of trade in our favor is some sort of American constitutional right. Now we are awakening to some new and sobering facts of international trade. And the realization comes at a time when our quarter-century-old Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is about to expire again, and when the longstanding bitter opposition to this act is preparing to renew the attack with increased ferocity.

I think I should make one thing clear at this point, before this audience, on the reciprocal trade issue. I have always supported the program, as I know the league has. However, we must all recognize that some areas of this country and some industries in this country, and their employees, have suffered serious financial setbacks from vast increases in imports manufactured under substandard working conditions. So it is not enough for us to wave the banners of free trade and denounce as narrow and selfish those American interests which complain that they are adversely affected by imports. It makes a difference whose ox is gored, whose job is hurt, whose business is affected by imports. We must recognize, therefore, that when a tariff concession to another country causes economic hardship to an industry or locality in our country, machinery has to be worked out to give American businesses and American workers adversely affected a fighting chance to survive and adjust, so that the burden of our enlightened foreign trade policy does not rest unfairly on just a few Americans, comparatively speaking.

But that approach is far different from the attitude of some groups in this country which want to build a trade wall around us against any imports which compete in any way at all with American products. Sometimes it takes the stiff competition of imports to goad and push American firms into more efficient, more effective production methods. In this competition the consumer benefits, and all America benefits.

Too, as our Cabinet members stressed during the recent historic trade conferences in Japan, the balance of trade is still far in our favor—by two-to-one in Japan, for instance. Certainly, we cannot expect to sell abroad if we do not buy from those who buy from us.

At the same time, it is becoming increasingly obvious that American business cannot expect to hold on to present foreign markets and expand into new ones unless we gear our efforts to the changed international situation. A dozen years ago, Western Europe was in tatters; but now, thanks to the Marshall plan, and other forms of help we provided, plus the incredibly hard work of the peoples of these countries, Western Europe is a booming economy. Whereas once we had to supply them with most of their basic industrial needs, today these countries are competing with us everywhere in the free world. To hear some of our businessmen complain about this situation, one would think it was a tragedy, a boomerang, for the United States. Actually, this situation represents one of the greatest sources of allied strength in our efforts to assure the survival of freedom. And let's never allow anyone to forget it.

We pushed the so-called Inner Six nations into forming the Common Market and helped it to take hold; now, with Great Britain seeking admission to this phenomenally successful experiment almost with hat in hand, and with the other countries of the previous Outer Seven also seeking either full or associate membership in the Common Market, we are facing a brand new foreign trade picture. Now what do we do? Do we approach the problem realistically, and work out trade relationships which will further unite the free world, or do we crawl into a shell of economic isolation and abandon our 25-year-old liberalized trade policies? I have no easy solution to meet this challenge. I don't think there is one. But I do know this: that the coming session of Congress will be torn asunder with the intensity of the debate on all phases of this issue; for the time being, at least, it may be all we can do to secure an extension of the expiring Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act until more study can be given to practical means for adjusting our foreign trade policy to the new realities. But even that will be a major legislative battle.

It is good to have as much discussion and debate on this issue as possible, and as widespread public participation in that debate as possible. The high tariff people have been working diligently for years to rebuild the old walls, or to prevent further lowering of the present restrictions. On the other side are some who say remove all restrictions. Both groups have an advantage in this coming fight in that they know exactly what they are for and what they are against; the moderates, on the other hand, are squeezed from both sides and must come forward with solutions which are not only reasonable and effective but which in a democracy, are politically achievable.

Some of you may think it is not really such a hard problem for us in the Congress. I always enjoy hearing from league members who write to me in support of reciprocal trade; sometimes, however, while a league member is writing to me in favor of the act's continuation and expansion, her husband is writing from the office or plant on his company stationery urging exactly the opposite; the decisions we must make are not easy ones.

If more American firms entered foreign markets, it would be easier to work out reciprocal trade arrangements. Their value would be better understood. But, aside from the new complications in the foreign trade picture resulting from the Common Market developments, American business firms have many deep-seated problems in expanding foreign sales. I mentioned the fact that we are not yet foreign-sales conscious—most medium-sized and smaller firms in this country have not been active in international trade for a variety of reasons, and the bigger firms which have been in the field have often demonstrated a disinterest in expanding their markets. Time after time I heard on my trip that inquiries from foreign businessmen to American firms for price quotations have gone unanswered; that when an order is reluctantly accepted it is delayed in delivery; that when finally delivered the shipment is often improperly packaged for the climatic conditions experienced.

Certainly we know how to crate and ship any piece of equipment anywhere in the world—our Armed Forces do it all the time and do it well. This information is available to American business. Yet I heard of a shipment of machinery which arrived in such rusted and corroded condition that it practically had to be rebuilt to be of any use.

In Hong Kong, I heard a fantastic story, but unfortunately a true one, involving an inquiry written on a rather unattractive

piece of stationery by a local businessman who wanted a price quotation from an American manufacturer. Now I know, as a Member of Congress, that when anyone writes to me it makes no difference at all what the condition of the letter or postcard or writing might be—that message is important to the person who sent it. And I try to answer it accordingly. But the American firm involved in this episode—I shall not name it because I am sure it is not alone in this mistake—ignored the inquiry because it wasn't nicely typed on good stationery and came from someone the front office had never heard of. After a reasonable interval with no response from America, the foreign businessman tried a German firm. Someone there was willing to decipher the messy letter. The upshot was that a $19 million order which could have gone to a U.S. firm went to a German firm instead. He didn't have to lose that order.

We have experts in the trade needs of every country in our various American embassies abroad. They told me, in most of the countries I visited, that they see few American businessmen seeking orders—and willing to do real selling to get them. Yet these countries are in the market for a vast variety of things we can make just as well as, or better than, other exporting countries and which we could sell competitively. Furthermore, there is machinery, particularly through our Export-Import Bank, for the financing of a wide variety of American products needed by friendly nations.

It was in an effort to encourage more American firms to get into this field—and thus assure more American jobs—that I joined this year in a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency to recommend congressional passage of a new program of credit insurance on American exports. The bill was signed by President Kennedy and is now law. Under it, private insurance and lending institutions, in cooperation with the Export-Import Bank, can provide insurance to American exporters to guarantee them against credit defaults on foreign sales; the Export-Import Bank, meanwhile, will underwrite the political risks of expropriation, nationalization, currency blockage, and so on. At least 19 other nations have extensive programs of this nature—some governmental, some private, but all closely alined to national policy determinations. For use—except for the political risk guarantee—it is a new and experimental thing—put on the books on a trial basis just for 1 year. Next year, we shall take it up again.

It was in preparation for next year's hearings and deliberations on this issue that I was asked to look into the operations of some of the 19 other plans—in Austria, Western Germany, Greece, Turkey, Iran, India, Thailand, Hong Kong, and Japan. I wish I had covered fewer countries and each at greater length. Three or four days is enough to get the basic information—to talk to the appropriate officials, both theirs and ours, but it is not enough time to adjust one's body clock and digestive system, when hopping from country to country. Nevertheless, it was fruitful in terms of information and technical advice. But it was often rugged.

There were several of us from the Banking and Currency Committee on the trip, including one other woman, Congresswoman MARTHA GRIFFITHS, of Michigan, who has one of the most incisive minds in the Congress and can quickly grasp and broadly develop through appropriate questions the basic facts in any technical legal or financial issue. Although I outrank her on the committee, I had to go some to hold up my end of it as the senior member of the group. In any event, the foreign trade officials in one after another of the countries we visited—although assuring us that women had full political rights in their countries—nevertheless indicated to us they were surprised and impressed that not one but two women were members of an American congressional fact-finding mission on a technical issue, and that a woman was the senior ranking member of the mission. While this was flattering to us individually, it brought home to us the fact that even today, almost everywhere, women in public life, even when they hold positions of importance, have to prove over and over again that their sex is not a bar to doing their jobs.

Many impressions press in upon me in thinking back over the trip, it will take me some time to sort them all out and put them in proper perspective. Of all of the places I visited, Hong Kong made the deepest impression. Of course, the Taj Mahal was breathtaking, and so was the 4-hour automobile trip through India's back-country roads to get to it, that was breathtaking for other reasons—chokingly hot and dusty and bumpy through miles of wretched misery. West Germany, on the other hand, was busy, prosperous, active, earnest, worried over Berlin. Austria was expensive; Greece placid and beautiful and tremendously pro-American; Turkey has been going through an internal convulsion which recently saw the execution of its previous leadership. Iran was hot and arid and with widespread poverty ingrained through thousands of years and yet with tremendous natural resources. Incidentally, some of its areas produce some of the most beautiful fruits I have ever seen—I can't give you any information on how they taste, however—I wasn't eating by that point in the trip. India, as you know, teems with humanity and much of it in the cities is homeless—it is no wonder that the life expectancy of an Indian at birth is 32 years. Thailand was as picturesque as could be but one is held at arm's length—the officials we talked to were correct and courteous and most pleasant but the warmth we found in, say Greece, was not present here. The Japanese also, were the soul of courtesy, and most informative for the purposes of our study mission, and also quite insistent about Japan's need to increase exports to the United States with an implied warning behind it that Japan always has a readymade customer at its back door.

Now isn't it ridiculous of me to try to summarize in a sentence or in less than a sentence * * * in a phrase * * * the situations in these countries which are so very important to us? I apologize for it. I shouldn't have attempted that. The only reason I did so was because I had mentioned that Hong Kong made the deepest impression, and it didn't seem right to ignore all of the other countries I visited.

Hong Kong made a deep impression primarily because it is the Berlin of the East, right on the border of Red China, within sight of the guns of the border patrols, and within sight of Red China's farms which feed Hong Kong. It was a creepy feeling to know much of the food we were being served undoubtedly came from across the border. It was not conducive to a good appetite, assuming I would have had one anyway.

I drove close enough to see some of Red China's farms, being worked, I imagine, by people not getting enough to eat. Communist China, as you have read, has been gripped with food shortages. Yet thousands of tons of Red China's desperately scarce foodstuffs go to Hong Kong to earn foreign exchange. Then a lot of that same food goes back to Red China, in the form of gift packages sent to starving relatives in the interior from escapees safe in Hong Kong, refugees now going without enough food in order to be able to afford to send some to their relatives back home. This was a most heart-rending lesson in Communist economics, human suffering just does not count at all.

Hong Kong provides, I believe, the most spectacular nighttime view I have ever seen. The lighted harbor is just beautiful. The lights twinkling up the mountain from the storybook harbor form a fairyland of scenic delight. The darkness, of course, covers all of the ugliness, all of the poverty and misery, all of the teeming chaos.

St. Louis may not be so spectacularly beautiful at night, at least, not yet. But oh, how beautiful it is, day or night, to these eyes. And how nice to come home to, after an extended trip abroad, or an extended session of Congress in Washington.

Thank you for inviting me to share some of my impressions with you. As you continue to work hard on the issues of foreign trade and international relationships—please be assured that what you stand for, what you work for, is terribly important. It is important to our country, yes; it is even more important to millions upon millions of disadvantaged and hungry and illiterate and disease-racked and miserable human beings who could not dare to hope for a better life for their children, if not for themselves, were it not for the fact that there are so many decent people like you working to do something about it. Thank you.

It Is Time To Act on a Federal Mutual Savings Bank Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of March 27, 1962.

The situation, described by Donald I. Rogers, is a clear example of why my bill H.R. 9122, to authorize Federal mutual savings banks, should be enacted into law.

The article follows:

SAVINGS BANK DEPOSIT BILL—HEADING FOR ALBANY AMBUSH

(By Donald I. Rogers)

Sometime this week the New York State Senate will get a bill handed up from the assembly, which would grant permission to the mutual savings banks in New York State to accept deposits from any one individual up to $20,000. At the time this was written it was said in Albany that there was little chance that the senate would pass the measure.

To the uninitiated it might seem strange that the State's legislature might authorize a boost in the limit on the size of deposits in the State's savings banks, and stranger still, that the senate, supposedly intent on legislating laws that are in the best interest of all New Yorkers, would veto such a reasonable measure.

Yet, that's the way things are in New York State, where the mutual savings banks are absolute playthings of the State legislature and where the State banking department is seemingly opinionless on most matters affecting the survival of the institutions where hundreds of thousands of New Yorkers have found safe and profitable refuge for hundreds of millions of dollars.

The limit now imposed by the State legislature is $10,000; that's the total amount of deposit a mutual savings bank can accept from any one individual. There is no limit

whatsoever on commercial banks (the trust companies and national banks) or on chartered savings and loans associations, which are the normal competitors with the mutual savings banks for the savings of the State's thriftier citizens.

As it went to the Assembly originally, the bill called for an increase in authorization from $10,000 to $25,000, but the Assembly from some forlorn sense of the need to compromise, reduced the figure to $20,000. The savings bankers didn't object too strenuously, for this increase, reduced though it was, would have been a great boom.

Now it appears that unless the Senate changes it mind, there will be no increase in authorized deposits at all.

It is said in Albany that the upstate senators do not favor the increase. No explanation is given as to why these senators prefer to allow a competitive advantage to accrue to commercial banks and savings and loan associations while they deliberately throttle the activities of the State controlled mutual savings banks.

In truth, not one single objection to increasing the deposits was raised either in the assembly or in the senate. As matters stand, the senate is simply going to vote against the bill and not bother to give the public any explanation.

The State superintendent of banks has turned a deaf ear to the pleas of the mutual savings banks to raise their dividend rates on deposits so they might pay a higher return to their depositors. Thus they are held to a rate of 3¾ percent on money that is on deposit for the first year and 4 percent thereafter.

Commercial banks and savings and loan associations, which have no such supervision by the State, are paying 4 percent on money on deposit after 1 year.

It would seem, as a result of conditions that prevail because of decisions by the State banking department and the State legislature, that there is a deliberate effort in Albany to aid the commercial banks and the savings and loan associations at the expense of the mutual savings banks. If this is not so, why is there the resistance to innovations that would place the savings banks on a competitive footing?

The mutual savings banks are profitless institutions. The officers are paid salaries which by most banking standards are pitifully small. All earnings go either to the depositors or into the investment portfolio or into necessary reserves.

Without reciting statistics, it can be said that the mutual savings banks of New York State, besides providing safe and profitable refuge for savings, have invested billions of dollars in private housing, apartments, and commercial properties in the State and additional billions in the public bonds which have permitted the construction of highways, ports, schools, hospitals and public facilities of many types.

There is no valid reason why they should be singled out for discrimination, no reason that is, that would stand the public scrutiny.

Someone did mention when the bill was being discussed in the assembly that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation insures deposits only up to $10,000. But this is true also of deposits in commercial banks. Moreover, no savings bank depositor has lost any money in New York State since 1909.

Coupled with this is the fact that in Washington the House Ways and Means Committee is ready to report out its tax legislation increasing the taxes on mutual savings banks, which are profitless, to make them "competitive" with commercial banks. This is another body blow to thrift and to these particularly vulnerable thrift institutions.

The average citizen of average means who feels the need to put aside a few dollars in savings must feel, these days, that Government, both in this State capital and in the Nation's Capital, is opposed to the idea and is trying by law to discourage thrift in America.

Even if this is not true of the two branches of Government, it's working out that way.

Prolog to Freedom—James Francis Byrnes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therewith an address to countless thousands of South Carolinians on March 25, 1962, by our own illustrious James Francis Byrnes on the occasion of the 400th anniversary of the landing of the Huguenots on the coast of South Carolina at Beaufort.

"Not since the morning stars sang together," has a man traversed the political scene of South Carolina like James F. Byrnes. He has held every office within the gift of a grateful South Carolina. To this day, he could be elected to any office over which the people possess the power. More than these, with the exception of the Presidency, he has held the highest positions within the gift of the Republic. He has been Congressman, Senator, Assistant President, Supreme Court Justice, and Secretary of State. Were it not for the accident of his birth and his region, he would have been the President of the United States. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad commentary and a miserable one that a white man of southern birth cannot hold national office in the United States of America—every knowledgeable American understands that Texas is in the Southwest—not the South.

To my people, he is the sum total of the political philosophies of the ancient Romans and Greeks. Many South Carolinians have sat at his feet like St. Paul at the feet of Gamaliel. His political and statesmanship acumen has surpassed that of all other South Carolinians since John C. Calhoun. Mr. Speaker, James Francis Byrnes has a rare and enviable possession. He knows the pulse beat of America. More than this, Mr. Speaker, he knows what is good for America. After all, we cannot control the world. Without America, Mr. Speaker, you and I would be consigned to a sad and mournful dust. This country must survive—NATO, the United Nations, to the contrary notwithstanding. We regard this man as the modern John C. Calhoun. I assume that all Americans know that John C. Calhoun was part and parcel of the most amazing triumvirate ever to grace the American political scene, Calhoun, Webster, and Clay and in his remarkable and priceless book, "Profiles in Courage," our President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, referred to these men as holding the political spotlight of the American scene for over 30 years.

Mr. Speaker, there never has been a greater American than James Francis Byrnes.

The address follows:

PROLOG TO FREEDOM

(By James F. Byrnes)

It is appropriate that the people of Beaufort should commemorate the landing of Ribaut and his party of Huguenots on Parris Island 400 years ago. People who have no pride in their past will seldom have a future of which they can justly be proud.

Courage is a human trait that has never failed to win the plaudits of the people. The universality of the appreciation of this characteristic was evidenced recently when Col. John Glenn made his famous flight. Millions of people in the United States and throughout the world either watched on television or listened to the radio as this remarkable flight was recorded. For the 4 hours during which Glenn was in orbit, the people in their homes, offices, factories, and on the farms, kept in touch with the constant reports of the progress being made. More men, women, and children spontaneously prayed for his safe return than ever before had joined in prayer for any event in history.

Less spectacular, but nonetheless courageous, was the journey made by Jean Ribaut and his colleagues when they left their homes in France to land upon the shores of Beaufort County. These men also went into the great unknown: the uncharted seas of the world.

Some few of the 30 men who constituted Ribaut's party may have come solely because of love of adventure, and a few others probably were inspired to serve their country by extending its territorial possessions. However, most of them were inspired to make the trip because of the unfortunate war in France between Catholics and Protestants. Ribaut's party was really the first to land in this new world seeking freedom and not for the purpose of exploitation and profit.

Obviously Ribaut did not plan for his party to establish a permanent settlement. There were no women in the party and the supplies brought with them were so scant that it was clear there was no plan for a permanent settlement.

The courage of these pioneers is disclosed in the record of their activities. When they landed on Parris Island they were successful in making friends with the Indians they first met, but they had no way of knowing how they would fare at the hands of other Indian tribes they were certain to encounter as they explored adjacent territory. Nor did they know what would be the attitude of the Spaniards who previously had landed in what was then known as Florida, and included what is now Georgia and South Carolina. The Spaniards who had landed in the vicinity of St. Augustine were known to be seeking and claiming new territory for their Queen.

Thrilling is the story in Ribaut's report to Admiral Coligny, that when he decided to return to France and called for volunteers among his colleagues to remain on Parris Island where they had built a fort, a large majority of them volunteered to remain. Truly that was an exhibition of courage because those volunteers knew of the dangers ahead, not only from hostile Indians but from lack of supplies, which finally resulted in the death of the entire party.

During the years that followed, many Huguenots came to make their homes in Charleston and in other sections of our State. These were people of intelligence, energy, courage and thrift. They contributed much to the development of South Carolina and were honored by their neigh-

bors. Evidence of this will be found all over the State. In Charleston there is Legare Street; in Columbia, a street you will call Huger, but which the colored people and some of the white people, miscall Huger. And in Spartanburg there is a Ribaut Street, named in honor of the man whose landing here we commemorate today. These French settlers contributed to our progress in South Carolina and also contributed to the friendship that has existed between the people of the United States and France for all these years.

In 1698 the Lords Proprietors granted to Landgrave Daniell thousands of acres, including Parris Island. Daniell conveyed the island to a man named Archer, who conveyed it to Alexander Parris. It was after him the island was named. Parris was correctly spelled with two "r's" until 1917. At that time I was in Congress and with the assistance of Senator Tillman, induced the Government to purchase all of the island. The next year when the request of the Navy Department for funds was received, Paris was spelled with one "r." Some wiseman in the Navy Department decided we did not know how to spell. It took me until 1919 to convince the Department that the island was named after Alexander Parris and not the capital of France.

France was only one of several Governments contributing to the settlement and development of the American colonies. All of these, including Great Britain, undoubtedly contributed to the development of civilization here and throughout the world.

Now the Soviets have succeeded in arousing among the peoples of Africa, Asia, and to some extent, South America, a feeling of hostility toward any Western European Government that aided an undeveloped country. To the Soviets, they are all cruel, greedy imperialists, and they have become the "whipping boys" of the United Nations.

We have always expressed approval of the policy of self-determination but that approval has been based upon the belief that the people seeking to establish independent governments have demonstrated ability to establish and maintain governments. That cannot be said of the African tribes in the Congo, who caused the United Nations to make war against the anticommunistic province of Katanga, a war that is being supported by the United States.

One cannot discuss our foreign affairs without commenting upon the present trend of the United Nations. It is not now the organization we sponsored in 1945. Originally, it was composed only of states that had declared war against the Axis Powers in defense of freedom and were regarded as peace-loving states. At the time of its creation there were only 50 member states. Gradually the number has been increased until today it is more than doubled.

Of the 104 members, 34 are Afro-Asian states. Most of these were established within the last few years, and few of them have had any preparation for participation in the solemn decisions of world affairs. Each new African state, regardless of how small its population, has a vote in the Assembly equal to that of the United States. The Afro-Asian bloc, plus the Soviet bloc, now dominate the organization which we largely support.

The United Nations is changed not only in the character of the membership, but in its purposes. The charter, in the first chapter, declares: "The purpose of the Organization is to maintain international peace and security."

Because this is its primary purpose, thoughtful people of the world were shocked last December when Prime Minister Nehru, of India, who for years has posed as the apostle of peace, caused his military forces to invade Portugal's Goa, and by force of arms conquered this little province. For his action he should have received an award for superlative hypocrisy.

It is despicable that while preaching peace, Nehru was planning, in violation of India's solemn obligation to the United Nations, to take by force from Portugal territory which had been hers for more than 450 years.

If there had been any excuse for his statement that he was merely liberating territory taken from India 450 years ago—even before Ribaut landed here—then with equal plausibility could the American Indians now claim possession of the lands taken from them 400 years ago.

It must be said that Nehru's representative was frank in his defiant statement to the United Nations General Assembly, that India would have her way, "charter or no charter, Council or no Council." He got away with it.

When it was sought to have the U.N. condemn this outrageous aggression by the hypocritical Nehru, the Soviets vetoed the resolution of condemnation in the Security Council. When our Ambassador, Mr. Stevenson, considered submitting to the General Assembly the question of overriding the veto, he found he could obtain only about 35 votes when he would need twice that number.

The action of the United Nations in failing to even condemn this aggression by India now provokes in the minds of many Americans, the question: "Has the Organization become useless?"

In South Africa where the white inhabitants have been consistently anti-Communist and pro-American, the Government's position as to segregation aroused the antagonism of the Afro-Asian bloc in the U.N. and they sponsored a resolution which was adopted, denouncing the Government of South Africa for its attitude. It was supported by the United States.

If the group now in control of the United Nations causes the Organization to intervene in the internal affairs of South Africa, what is there to prevent the same group from causing the United Nations to intervene in South Carolina?

The United Nations has another problem—it faces bankruptcy. Since its establishment, the United States has paid approximately 40 percent of all its expenses. The deficit of approximately $160 million is due to money spent for the purpose of making war in the Congo and the Gaza strip, and assessments for these expenditures have not been paid by many members. Of this deficit of $160 million, the Soviets and their satellites owe approximately $50 million.

To pay this deficit and continue the war against Katanga, the United Nations has issued $200 million of bonds and asks that the United States buy one-half of them.

These bonds will pay 2 percent interest. Today the United States is paying 4 percent for money it borrows. President Kennedy recommends the investment and says "It is sound for the United Nations and its members." It may be sound for United Nations, but certainly it is not sound for the United States.

The President, after telling the Congress this was a sound plan said: "These bonds will be repaid with interest at the rate of approximately $10 million a year, as part of the regular assessment. Every nation—including the Soviet Union—will thus be required to pay its fair share or lose its vote."

The President was misinformed. The best evidence that the deficit is not part of the ordinary expenses for which there is an annual assessment is that in December 1961 the U.N. itself, submitted to the International Court the question as to whether expenses such as those incurred in the Gaza strip affair and in the Congo war could be charged to the normal budget. That question has not been answered.

Even if the International Court decides that these war expenditures can be charged to the normal budget, the Soviet Union and other governments having refused to contribute to the war in the Congo will refuse to pay any assessment for that war. No court can force them to pay it. The Afro-Asian bloc, having no money and being entirely willing to let the United States pay all expenses of the U.N., will not buy any bonds. A majority of the states having refused to pay, they certainly will not vote to deny the Soviet Union the right to vote because of nonpayment.

As I recently stated at Jackson, Miss. I hope the people will ask the Senator and the Congressman favoring the purchase of the bonds, whether he would purchase a thousand-dollar bond with his personal money. If he would not, certainly he should not vote to spend the tax money of the people to make such an investment.

The President is now asking that we appropriate nearly $5 billion for foreign aid. This type of aid was started just after World War II in order to help friendly governments to recover from war conditions. Most of these countries are now prospering but we continue to give billions annually compared with this $5 billion, the $100 million of bonds is relatively a small matter, and I am complaining—not of the amount of money—but the establishment of another precedent. If we now buy $100 million of U.N. bonds to pay one-half of the deficit, the United Nations may hereafter engage in another war and call upon us to pay half the costs. I do not want the United States to pay an amount equal to that paid by the other 103 states.

The problems now confronting the U.N. make it wise for us to take stock of our position. The United Nations is not what it was or what it was intended to be. The member nations are not united for a common purpose. We know that the Soviet bloc is not interested in the maintenance of international peace. On the contrary, it is the greatest threat to peace. Peace is not the primary purpose of the Afro-Asian states. They are inspired by their hatred of the so-called colonial powers, who are our friends. If to win the support of the various African tribes, now established as states, we constantly antagonize our proven friends, we cannot expect their continued friendship.

We cannot expect all of our allies to conduct their internal affairs as we think they should. The difficulties we experience in handling our own domestic problems should cause us to realize we cannot solve all the problems of all the peoples of the world.

We must realize that the United Nations cannot prevent a war between major powers; that its chief contribution to the cause of peace is as a forum of debate which may clarify international issues.

If the United Nations is to survive, we must emphasize the provision of the charter that prohibits the organization from interfering in the domestic affairs of a state.

We must place less reliance upon this organization and more reliance upon NATO and other regional groups of our allies, pledged to the preservation of our freedom.

We must put first things first. As long as there exists the threat of the Soviets to dominate the world, we must postpone expenditures for projects that may be desirable but are not urgent, and we must devote our money, our time and our talents to increasing our military strength so as to insure our freedom.

Appendix

The Gentleman Giant From Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, a wonderful article about a wonderful man, Hon. CARL ALBERT our great Democratic majority leader—the gentleman from Oklahoma—whom we all admire and greatly respect appears in the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

The article about our distinguished colleague, the majority leader, entitled "The Little Giant From Bug Tussle" is very worthwhile reading and depicts CARL ALBERT as the positive, effective Congressman and leader of the majority that he is of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, this article certainly deserves wide distribution and all should have the opportunity to read this excellent story about the gentleman giant from Oklahoma.

Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent that this article be reprinted in the RECORD.

The article follows:

LITTLE GIANT FROM BUG TUSSLE

(By John M. Virden)

Congressman CARL ALBERT walked briskly into his picture-lined office on Capitol Hill shortly after noon on January 10 of this year, and almost fell through a huge floral map of Oklahoma. This fragrant message of congratulations to the newly elected majority leader was fashioned from 2,000 white chrysanthemums, bordered in mistletoe (State flower). It had been delivered while ALBERT was in the well of the House being installed in the No. 2 position in the leadership of the Democratic Party in the House of Representatives.

When the stumpy, redheaded politician regained his balance, he plucked off a telegram that came with this wall of blooms.

It read: Congratulations, CARL. We know how far you have come.

CARL ALBERT has indeed come a long way, starting from an ugly little country schoolhouse called by the improbable name of Bug Tussle. It was almost exactly 45 years from the day he first made up his mind to be a Congressman until he was sworn in as floor leader of his party in the House.

Like almost everything else that has happened to ALBERT, the majority leader's job was gained the hard way.

The death of Speaker Sam Rayburn last November threw the Democrats into disarray. A group from the ultraliberal wing of the party seemed to reason the House leadership was up for grabs.

Front runner in the move to unhorse acting Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK and acting Majority Leader ALBERT—or both—was Representative RICHARD BOLLING, from Kansas City, Mo., a member of the powerful Rules Committee. BOLLING is an articulate intellectual liberal who left the classroom to run for Congress in 1948, and has been there since.

BOLLING's first pitch, a cautious one, was at the Speaker's chair, under the mistaken assumption that President Kennedy would lend support to head off the almost certain election of fellow Bostonian MCCORMACK to the powerful position. When the President firmly declined to interfere, the Missourian went after the majority leadership.

Long friendly to both BOLLING and ALBERT, the Chief Executive again refused to lift a finger to influence the outcome of the leadership fight. But former President Harry S. Truman, who resides in BOLLING's district, gave his blessing to BOLLING's effort. The Americans for Democratic Action (ADA) flocked around him. They were joined by stray Democrats of like views, and some who simply wanted a change in the "moderate" leadership. It is impossible to say how many Members backed BOLLING; anywhere from 80 to 115 were claimed at one time or another as sure votes.

In newspapers and on television BOLLING made a case for himself, depicting ALBERT as lacking sufficient drive to push the administration's $92.5 billion program through the legislative mill. He gave a number of interviews and appeared on a national television panel program. On the other hand, ALBERT worked quietly from his small, cluttered office in the Old Post Office Building in McAlester, Okla., making no splash in the press, or on television. A few days after Mr. Rayburn's funeral, ALBERT sent telegrams and letters and made phone calls to every Democratic House Member saying simply that he was a candidate for majority leader and asking their support. When the replies came back, ALBERT had the required 131 votes in the bag, with some to spare.

Six days before the party caucus, DICK BOLLING quit the contest with the pathetic remark, "I haven't got a chance." He was right. His support had withered as the countdown neared.

The beginning of ALBERT's political ambitions came one January day in 1917. Representative Charles D. Carter, a five-eighths Chickasaw Indian who had been Congressman from Oklahoma's far eastern district since statehood, came to Bug Tussle, made a speech and handed out some packets of seed to the kids.

"I suppose you'd have had to hear Charley Carter speak to understand this," ALBERT says. "He had snow-white hair, and that gift of the American Indian for oratory. I made up my mind I was going to be a Congressman just like Mr. Carter." Thirty years later ALBERT was elected Congressman from the same district Charley Carter had represented.

When ALBERT, all 5-feet-4 and 130 pounds of him, in a blue serge suit, strode down the aisle of the House for the first time, he was an immensely proud young man. As he approached his assigned seat, a veteran Republican Member, mistaking him for a page, beckoned to him. The Congressman-elect stuck out this hand in his best campaign manner, and the older solon laid a sheaf of paper in it, saying, "Son, take these over to my office."

Without a word ALBERT carried the documents over to the House Office Building, then ran back to the Capitol in time to answer "present" when the Clerk called his name, preparatory to the swearing-in ceremony of the 80th Congress.

From that ludicrous initiation Congressman ALBERT might have been put down among the numerous one-gallus characters the 46th State has elected to office since its admission to the Union on November 16, 1907. True, he was born in a log cabin, May 10, 1908, and he walked the usual 2 miles to a country school until he finished the first eight grades. Also, in the best political traditions, he grubstaked himself to an education by doing menial chores. But right there—unless you count the fact that CARL ALBERT is as disarmingly friendly as a limber-tailed hound pup—all similarity between him and the run-of-the-cotton-patch type of politician stops. Far from being a smooth-politicking rube, ALBERT can list three college degrees after his name, two of them from Oxford. He had traveled widely in Europe, North Africa, and the Pacific area before he came to Congress.

Democrats in Congress sometimes refer to him as "the Little Giant from Little Dixie" and compare him to Abe Lincoln's political rival, Stephen A. Douglas. But down in "Lapland"—where Arkansas and Texas "lap" over into Oklahoma—the voters in his district are more likely to call him "the Little Giant from Bug Tussle."

ALBERT's district is made up of a tier of 13 counties in Oklahoma's southeast corner. In it live 227,692 people—farmers, ranchers, oilfield workers, lumberjacks, sawmill hands, small tradesmen, and the like. Most of the members of the Choctaw Indian tribe live in that area. Bounded on the north by the meandering and beautiful Arkansas River, it stretches down to the brick-colored Red River. There it faces Sam Rayburn's old domain on the Texas side.

It is a rough piece of Oklahoma, any way you look at it, and the poorest. Per capita income in Pushmataha—called "Shove" by the natives—County is about $700 per year, or roughly one-third the national average. As a banker at Antlers put it, "This is one of the few places where old-age pensioners belong to the country-club set." Income is a little lower in nearby Johnston County, but a good deal higher in more industrialized Pittsburg and Carter Counties.

The rugged Kiamichi and Winding Stair Mountains cover almost half the district. This is open-range land where thousands of cattle roam at will, and seem to prefer bedding down in the middle of the public roads. If you hit one, you have bought yourself a cow. Cattle have the right-of-way even when they are sound asleep. One grizzled old rancher near Tuskahoma told this reporter, "What I like about this country is that I can drive my cattle from here to Mena, Ark. (64 miles), and never have to get off my horse and open a damn wire gate."

Millions of acres of virgin timber and second-growth pine forests flourish in these wild mountains, supporting the biggest single industry in that section of the State, the giant Dierks Lumber Co. There is little love lost between the lumber combine and the small ranchers who pasture their herds in the forest leased to or owned by the Dierks Co.

How many wildcat stills have operated in these mountains the Internal Revenue Service won't even guess. Now that legal liquor has come to traditionally dry Oklahoma, the number of moonshiners is smaller, but there is still a ready market for their corn whisky, called "three hours in the fence corner," guaranteed to make a man "feel single and see double in 20 minutes flat."

Bug Tussle is only a white clapboard, two-room rural schoolhouse, 6 miles due north of McAlester. It is set in an acre of lumpy

Bermuda grass and boasts a storm cellar big enough to hold the entire student body. Bug Tussle has changed little in the past 50 years. From 1915 to 1923 CARL was usually in the classroom at Bug Tussle when he was not in a cotton patch 1 mile north. His 8 years in the country school fashioned his personality somewhat more than did the 7 years he spent in universities. ALBERT has never lost the demeanor of the gifted country boy who walked to school dreaming of going to Congress, and some day rising to be a power in the land.

Ernie and Leona (Scott) Albert had five children—four sons and a daughter, all living. CARL is the eldest. Mrs. Albert, a gentle woman with an iron will, who encouraged her children "to be somebody in this world," was a bedridden invalid for several years before her death in 1936. Ernie Albert lived to see his eldest son sworn in as a Congressman in 1947.

In 1923 the Alberts left the farm and moved into a small house on the edge of McAlester so the eldest son could attend high school. Ernie Albert went to work full time in the coal mines. CARL'S bookish habits soon put him on the school's honor roll. After classes he did odd jobs, practiced debate speeches and developed a thundering oratorical style. He was president of the student assembly by his senior year.

In 1927 he and Louis Dakil, now an Oklahoma doctor, won the national high-school debating team championship. Later ALBERT placed third in the National Oratorical Contest sponsored by the Associated Press. His subject: the Constitution of the United States. The prize was a 3-month trip to Europe. In England he saw the tall spires of Oxford and set his heart on going there.

Ernie Albert, tenant farmer turned coal miner, told his ambitious son that if he meant to get a college education, he would have to do it on his own. When young ALBERT enrolled in the University of Oklahoma that autumn he had $10 left after paying his fees. By sundown he had a job that provided room and board. During his 4 years at the university, ALBERT was a waiter, a soda jerker, a drycleaning solicitor and a tutor.

In his freshman year CARL latched on to more money than he had ever seen before—$1,500 as first prize in the National Collegiate Oratorical Contest—and made the university debating team. With a speech on "World Peace" he won the national collegiate oratory title in 1929. He joined Kappa Alpha social fraternity, and plunged into student politics as leader of the Anti-administration Party. The young man from Bug Tussle was moving fast.

ALBERT'S college speech teacher recalls "his absolutely unshakable mental poise." But a fraternity brother at Oklahoma says his knack of making the short, hard words hit like a flail came from much practice, rather than born genius. He drilled himself under the Canadian River bridge some miles south of the campus. A friend would go along with him, usually at night, to listen and to heckle him. As ALBERT practiced by blasting his speeches across the dry sandbar, his companion would mutter rebuttals, yank his necktie, unlace his shoes or throw sand at him.

On graduation day at the University of Oklahoma in June 1931, CARL ALBERT was president of the university student council, wore a Phi Beta Kappa key and had been selected as a Rhodes scholar. The late Dr. William B. Bizzell, then president, called him "the brightest mind that ever passed through this university." Those spires of Oxford were visible from Norman, Okla., that day.

On the ship passage to England, ALBERT met two other bright young Rhodes scholars—Dean Rusk, now Secretary of State, and Fowler Hamilton, now Director of the International Development Administration.

During his years at Oxford, ALBERT used the long English weekends and his vacations to tour Britain, the Continent, North Africa and the Middle East. In the House of Commons he listened for hours to the deliberations and speeches of the British lawmakers.

The nadir of the depression lay on Oklahoma in 1934. A parching drought had turned half the State into a vast dust bowl and had driven thousands from the State. That year CARL ALBERT came home from Oxford, flat broke. His English law degrees didn't impress prospective employers. There were many well-educated young men on WPA or in CCC camps.

His ambition to run for Congress gnawed at him, but there was the matter of money to finance a campaign. So ALBERT took the first job he could get, as an office clerk in Oklahoma City. Two years later he switched over to the legal staff of an oil company and stayed in that job until 1941, when he volunteered for the U.S. Army, and went to Camp Polk, La., as a private in the 3d Armored Division. He spent 9 months in the ranks before the commanding general decided the diminutive lawyer might do something other than wrangle heavy tanks, and recommended him for a direct commission. There followed a fast brushup on military law at the Army's Judge Advocate General's School.

ALBERT reported to the Pentagon, wearing shiny new captain's bars, early in 1942.

"So he'p me, there wasn't another unmarried man in that whole office," says pretty Mary (Harmon) Albert, "but I saw CARL'S two-oh-one file before he arrived. When he walked in to report, I tol' the other girls, 'Now, you stan' back and stop droolin' 'cause this one is mine, he's jus' mah size.' "

Mary Harmon of Columbia, S.C., was then 21, she stood 5 feet, wore a size 7 dress and was a Pentagon clerk. In no time she had captivated the captain.

On August 20, 1942, Miss Mary Harmon and Capt. CARL B. (for Bert, a name he loathes) ALBERT were married in the old Lutheran Church of the Reformation at Columbia. They had a year together in crowded, frantic wartime Washington before he went off to the war in the Pacific. Mary returned to South Carolina to finish college.

Thirty-three months later Lieutenant Colonel ALBERT came home again with a fine fruit salad of medal and campaign ribbons stitched over his left breast pocket. He had a small wad of money saved from his pay, and a deep desire to go home and run for Congress.

Two older lawyers told ALBERT to move in with them and they would toss him a few cases until he could get started. But he had not tried many cases when the late Congressman Paul Stewart decided his health would not stand another campaign. When Stewart withdrew in 1946, ALBERT jumped into the race.

There were six Democratic hopefuls in the primary. For one of the few times in his life, ALBERT was knocked back on his heels. Bill Steger of Durant bested him by more than 3,000 ballots. But no one had a clear majority, and the two recently discharged war veterans battled it out in a runoff. ALBERT beat Steger by 391 votes. Later that fall he waltzed over his Republican opponent. In 1948 he beat his Democratic rivals by a comfortable margin and won the general election by six-to-one. In 1950 he enjoyed a politician's dream—no opposition.

Then came 1952, and ALBERT'S primary battle was a real shindy. There he faced State Senator Kirksey NIX, a big, popular, blue-jawed lawyer, handsome as a race horse.

"For a while I had Bug Tussle's pride treed right on top of his well-worn stump," says NIX, now a judge of the Oklahoma Court of Criminal Appeals. "But in the last 2 weeks of the campaign he laid the lash of that Biblical oratory on me. I don't see why folks call that guy little. He's just wound up real tight. When he talks, he commences to unwind, and before he shuts up, he's 10 feet tall."

Election night tallies gave ALBERT every county. The elections of 1954, 1956, 1958, and 1960 were easy ones for ALBERT. Though he always campaigned as though he were running against a dozen men, he had only token opposition or none at all.

A few days after his reelection in 1954, Speaker Sam Rayburn told ALBERT he had been picked as the Democratic whip of the House, a position he was to hold for the next 7 years.

When the venerable Mister Sam was asked why the little-known ALBERT was picked for a key slot in the party organization, he said: "There's nothing peculiar about it. * * * CARL has tact and energy, intelligence, education, and a sense of responsibility. And mind you, sir, these things don't always go together. I've been watching House Members since the Woodrow Wilson administration and I can tell big timber from small brush."

The term "whip" is a misnomer when applied to CARL ALBERT. ALBERT'S forte is persuasion, and the uncanny ability to "sense the temper" of the House in much the same way Mr. Rayburn could. One longtime colleague says that ALBERT is "close to being another Sam Rayburn, but with more hair and an Oxford education."

The new majority leader of the House is not likely to be mistaken for a page now. For one thing, he is about 30 pounds heavier than he was in 1947. Short, compact, he has a big head that looks as though it might have been stuck on as an afterthought. He has a long upper lip and a hard jaw which give him a perpetually solemn look one Washington wag described, with more candor than kindness, as the mien of a worried teddy bear.

Politically he is harder to classify. Generally he is a progressive-moderate, a middle-roader who fights for anything he believes will help farmers, cattlemen, or public schools. Labor, veterans, and the Department of Defense count him as a dependable and able friend on the Hill. Those who have worked closely with him say ALBERT is probably the congressional champ at resisting pressure groups.

"Maybe I'm not original in my beliefs," ALBERT says, "but a public servant must have a mind and will of his own, or he'll wind up little more than an errand boy. Hear all sides, sure, but he must do what he feels is right—even when it does not jibe with popular demand. If I felt otherwise, I'd be ashamed of myself and would get out of politics."

On Washington's feverish cocktail circuit the Alberts are almost strangers, attending only the must functions and a few of the soirees at the embassies. Though he neither drinks nor smokes and is a slow hand with the small chatter, ALBERT enjoys these gatherings because they allow him to practice his Spanish and French.

Most of the time he works 6 days out of 7 on Capitol Hill, but tries to get home in time for a leisurely dinner with Mary and their two children. Their daughter Mary Frances is 14 and David Ernest is a bouncy lad of 7.

In Washington the ALBERTS live in a rented brick house at 4614 Reno Road. They own a small frame home at 827 East Osage Street in McAlester and live there during the months Congress is not in session. In Washington or in McAlester, Sundays are strictly reserved for church and the family.

No politics. After services at the Methodist church, there is dinner at home. Sunday afternoons and evenings are devoted to "whatever Mary and the children want to do."

CARL ALBERT is too much of a practical politician to make calculated guesses about his future, other than to say that is up to the people of the Third Oklahoma District. His affection for "this House" is evident to anybody who talks to him for even a few minutes. There is no doubt that he is exactly where he wants to be, and he expects to stay there.

An enthusiastic friend of CARL who has known him since they were boys told this reporter: "CARL'S time was bound to come. Far too many cowboys, plowboys, and prairie yodelers nad several other kinds of political freaks get elected to high office. Maybe his popularity year after year and now his election as majority leader in the House indicate a trend toward higher quality men in the important places in the Government. The good Lord knows I hope so."

President Kennedy's Impulsive Leap Into the Slurry Surrey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S IMPULSIVE LEAP INTO THE SLURRY SURREY

President Kennedy joined Governor Barron in the slurry surrey last week and suggested that Congress should consider the proposition of extending the right of eminent domain to coal pipeline companies.

We can only guess at the maneuvering, political or otherwise, which resulted in Mr. Kennedy's unprecedented touting of a new industry whose feasibility is still to be demonstrated and whose ultimate success may be scored at the expense of industries already established.

However, we suspect that the administration's immediate purpose may be to impress or intimidate State legislatures which have not yet granted eminent domain privileges (that is, the right to condemn property) to coal pipeline companies.

The Virginia Legislature killed a coal pipeline bill just a few days ago. West Virginia's Legislature, of course, had already granted pipelines the right to apply for recognition as common carriers before the State public service commission. If and when the PSC satisfies itself that the proposed pipeline is to be a common carrier, the rights needed to complete the project would be granted.

The Legislature of Delaware had a pipeline bill before it at its last session but took no action. Pennsylvania and other States which might have to be crossed by the proposed line have still to be considered.

It is true, as Mr. Kennedy implied, that oil and gas pipeline companies may condemn property for their lines under Federal law as they proceed from State to State.

Theoretically, these lines are supposed to serve the public use, both from the standpoint of independent gas and oil producers and from the standpoint of the consuming public. But a number of gas and oil lines actually serve only private producers.

They get around the public service angle by charging rates which are comparable with rail and barge schedules. Their subsidiary producing companies have to pay the same rate, but since it is merely a matter of transferring money from one pocket to the other, they do not object.

In the case of the projected coal pipeline companies, the public service angle, and the consumer market question (only a very few consumers could burn slurry) are complicated further by the patent rights now owned by Consolidation Coal Co. Even if these patents are made available to competing companies at the same rate Consol charges the subsidiary in which it is financially interested—a rate sufficient to keep a virtual monopoly on the new industry—the parent company profits from the transaction.

There is another consideration to which President Kennedy apparently gave little or no thought.

Railroads are restricted by the so-called commodities clause which effectively prevents them from getting into competition with shippers who are obliged to use their facilities. Thus a railroad company cannot engage in the coal business—the prohibition being based on the assumption that it would have an unfair advantage over other coal producers.

For it could forego the profit on either the production or the transportation of the coal and still show a profit on the other part of the operation.

But oil and gas pipeline companies are specifically exempt from operation of the commodities clause. Many of them are financially interested in the companies whose products they transport and some, as we have noted, are actually private lines transporting only the products they or their subsidiaries supply.

From this brief study of the intricate comparisons that can be made between gas and oil pipeline operations and slurry operations, the casualness of Mr. Kennedy's leap to the coal pipeline bandwagon appears to have been more impulsive than considered.

Congress should give the proposal careful study, and while it is about it, the whole field of pipeline transportation might well be investigated. To the extent that it is possible, pipelines built on rights-of-way obtained through the Federal grants in the field of eminent domain should measure up to requirements that they actually do serve the public and are truly common carriers.

It seems odd that Mr. Kennedy, with all the domestic and international problems he is shouldering, should take such an active part in an industrial controversy. But if, as some observers say, he is obsessed with the idea of concentrating more and more power in the hands of the Federal Government, this is just one more move to accomplish that end.

There will be resentment, too, at this latest attempt to curtail the prerogatives hitherto reserved—with the exceptions mentioned—to the individual States.

The National Lottery of France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the national lottery of France should be of particular interest to the Members of this House. Critics of the idea of a national lottery often try to say that such a plan would not produce tremendous profits. It has been claimed that only a small percentage of the gross receipts would find their way into the Treasury. The French lottery, however, disproves this belief.

In France, almost one-third of the gross receipts of their national lottery are retained as profit by the government. In 1961, gross receipts amounted to $140 million. This was over $6 million more than a year before. The profit to the government was $45 million, here, again, almost $3 million more than the previous year. Quite a tidy sum the French Government applied to their general budget.

Mr. Speaker, here in the United States billions of dollars are gambled annually, and most of it illegally. Only through a national lottery can we legally tap this tremendous source of revenue. Our own national lottery can easily pump into our Federal Treasury over $10 billion a year in aditional revenue which can be used to relieve the heavy tax burden of our taxpayers and also help reduce our big national debt.

Expensive Viewpoint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I have been, for a number of years, vitally interested in the situation in Vietnam briefly described below. Repeatedly Members of Congress have discussed the problem of Vietnam's water supply with the proper officials and all of us were repeatedly told that the program to dig wells must be abandoned in favor of a plan to use surface water. This we were told, without regard to sanitation problems, ease of sabotage, and excessive costs. Likewise, the fact that the American company that had been operating there for 30 years had available on the spot all necessary equipment and know-how was of no consequence.

Herein is found one of the reasons why some of us are going to vote to substantially cut the foreign aid program.

The article follows:

EXPENSIVE VIEWPOINT

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Much waste in our foreign aid arises from its friction with American free enterprise abroad, and springs, in turn, from an expensive viewpoint that has us over a barrel.

Through many years we have been giveaway minded and that is what has cost us so much. This viewpoint creates compromises with wisdom, efficiency, and good policy in order to be sure we spend and spend. Hot denials each year are unimpressive. The record stands: We find a hundred places to start and no place to stop in the projects that have little merit beyond the circulation of dollars.

Generally speaking, it is in this area that our money runs into conflict with free enterprise overseas because in many places free enterprise could do the job if the only test were the need for beneficial facilities.

A current example lifts its head in Saigon. Vietnam needs much foreign aid from us and is getting it. But the one thing they

do not need in Saigon is water—fine, clear water. It is, in fact, one of the best areas in Asia for ground water, and the wonderful supply comes from deep wells.

Americans pioneered in this about 30 years ago. There has been no difficulty between the American enterprise and the Vietnamese and as more wells were needed, as a present, they have been sunk without 10 cents' expense to American taxpayers. In fact, in recent years the Vietnamese have made a profit of about $500,000 from these waterworks.

Now along comes our foreign aid—and the pressure arising from our being giveaway minded. We Americans are financing a highway extending out of Saigon. This road itself is controversial but, as so often happens, it has now grown into a water pipeline project as well. Our money is proposed to tap river water, purify it, and build another waterworks in Saigon at our taxpayers' expense.

Even the engineering features are debatable. The deep wells were drilled originally to cope with outbreaks of cholera and have proved effective. Surface water would demand constant treatment against the very dangers the wells were drilled to avoid.

In addition, handling the surface water would be vastly more expensive. Some studies forecast the operating loss as high as a million dollars a year.

The giveaway urge partly accounts for our failure to adopt a strong policy against expropriation of American enterprises abroad and relate our foreign aid to the integrity of the receivers in respect to American property, as in the case of good neighbor Brazil.

Surely, our neighbor policy should work both ways.

Our Government made a protest when this neighbor seized the I.T. & T. subsidiary in the same week that Brazil received $2.7 million from the alliance-for-progress kitty and is slated to get another $237 million at once. The reply of the Governor of Rio Grande do Sul, Leonel Brizola, indicates how far we have gone toward knocking down our own fences by the pressure to see that somehow or other our dollars were spent. "This is a surprising and unusual reaction," said Senor Brizola, "which shows that the U.S. authorities are seeking to give protection to private enterprise."

Thus it is that we try to satisfy the national interest of too many other countries without firmly considering and protecting our own country. Again and again we feel the devil twisting our tail and pretend it is the angels smiling on us. This is weakness on our part and must always fail. For other nations forgive many things in foreign affairs, but they do not forgive weakness.

Planning Young for Getting Old

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents in Daytona Beach, Mr. J. Don McDaniel, has not let retirement affect either his physical activity or his keen opinions on the passing scene. Mr. McDaniel has sent me this message:

When I was a young fellow in the Army, 1916, I heard someone say:

"It takes just as much energy to wish as it does to plan," so I climbed down off my bar stool and started to plan.

It has been fun * * * and by such planning I have managed to keep the wolf from having pups on my doorstep and have escaped the welfare rolls. Today most of the people on the welfare rolls spent most of their younger life on a bar stool.

A Tribute to Our Nuns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the most respected persons in every community are those who are devoting their lives to the service of God.

The humblest of His missionaries are the nuns: members of the various religious orders for women who sanctify their daily lives with prayer and imitate the example of Christ who spent himself in doing good for mankind.

There are many people in the secular world, absorbed in the pursuit of success and personal gratification, who have no idea concerning the labor of love that characterizes these self-sacrificing Sisters.

But wherever there are people in need; from youngsters in school, to the sick, the aged and the despairing; there you will find a nun who, through the healing grace of divine love, finds joy in helping others.

Lord, what will You have me do? Thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven.

The Sister-Servants of the Holy Ghost of Perpetual Adoration alternate prayer and work.

The Sisters of Bon Secours do nursing work in homes and hospitals, care for crippled children, the aged and the chronically ill and conduct schools for professional and practical nursing.

The Xavier Mission Sisters help win souls for Christ in Japan and India.

The Medical Mission Sisters care for the sick and suffering in India, Pakistan, Africa, Venezuela, and Vietnam.

The Sisters of the Good Shepherd care for confused and rejected girls with problems, giving them warm acceptance, love, security, and guidance.

The Sisters of Charity serve in colleges, schools, hospitals, child-care homes, and missions.

The Daughters of St. Paul bring God's word to souls everywhere through the press, motion picture, radio and television.

We in Massachusetts have a better knowledge of the work done by the Sisters of Notre Dame and the other teaching orders that staff the many parochial schools in this area.

It is impossible for me to name and thus give equal honor to all of the religious communities for women. The composite day of a typical nun starts with sanctification through prayer, adoring Him in contemplation, and thence to her duties as an expert teacher, who is a sweet mother to schoolchildren, opening their minds to His wonders, teaching them to sing His praises, teaching His word by print. She is a lovable daughter to the aged, a tender nurse to the afflicted, seeking to help His poor and needy.

Everyone who knows of their pure lives and good deeds, looks up to these servants of God.

There is no better way to express our appreciation of them than by bringing to the attention of the public the poem, "A Nun," written by Joseph P. Laruffa, which appeared in the March 11, 1962, issue of Our Sunday Visitor, the national Catholic Action weekly. It is my privilege to insert this tribute in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

A NUN

(By Joseph P. Laruffa)

A nun is a gallant lady;
A dedicated woman;
A spouse consecrated to Christ;
A person cherished and loved by all.

To students in schools and colleges,
A nun is an expert teacher;
To the physically and mentally ill, a tender nurse;
To the aged, a lovable daughter;
To orphans and the homeless, a sweet mother;
To all—a nun is a devoted sister.

The nun has left her mother and father,
And her sisters and brothers,
That she may be a sister to all men and women.

The nun has left the world and consecrated herself to Christ,
That she may be of service to all,
And win the world for Him.

They are all doing their very best to win immortal souls for Jesus Christ,
And their greatest thrill and happiness is:
He very affectionately calls each nun,
"My Spouse" and "My Sister."

A Distinguished Guest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week a great American, former President Truman, visited the city of Buffalo. He inaugurated a series of public lectures of the William H. Fitzpatrick Chair of Political Science at Canisius College in Buffalo. Also, an honorary degree of doctor of laws was conferred upon Mr. Truman by the college.

A very fitting editorial appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y., on March 27, 1962, in regard to Mr. Truman's visit which I would like to include herein.

The editorial follows:

A DISTINGUISHED GUEST

It was a remarkable visit by a remarkable American. Former President Truman at 77 is still a man of youthful bounce, energy and preoccupation with history and events. And blunt and outspoken as always.

His stay in Buffalo was brief but eventful. He reminisced with good and old friends like Paul E. Fitzpatrick, former Democratic State chairman. He bantered with the press. He exchanged greetings with passersby during a brisk early morning walk along Delaware

Avenue. He spoke to and with college students. The highpoint was his lecture at Canisius College, which awarded him an honorary degree.

Through it all Mr. Truman's vigor and forthright sense of patriotism came through with familiar force. He was especially impressive in talking about the Constitution and the many-sided role of the President. He told of his particular joy in visiting school youngsters and trying to help them understand how, as adults, "they can continue the greatest republic in the world."

We will not say that we have always agreed with Mr. Truman. But, like Canisius College and the entire community, we were honored and invigorated to have this distinguished American in our midst. We hope he comes to town again soon.

Evaluation of the Civilian Conservation Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's economic recovery during recent months has not provided jobs for millions of Americans. Unemployment has become an especially tragic fact of life for our young people who, lacking in experience and proper training, are unable to compete effectively in a labor market requiring increasingly higher skills.

At the same time, Americans have been showing an increased appreciation of the natural resources of our land. Greatly expanded efforts at conserving these abundant resources for future generations are being demanded by the public.

Fortunately, history offers a practical method of coping with the problems of inadequate use of our human resources and improper use of our natural resources. Of course, I am referring to the Civilian Conservation Corps, the very successful experiment of the 1930's. Legislation currently is pending before the Congress to establish a Youth Conservation Corps which would be very similar in nature and purpose to the old CCC. In the House H.R. 10682 is now awaiting action by the Rules Committee. This, in my opinion, is a unique opportunity to apply tested techniques in dealing with important problems facing the country.

In considering this legislation, I should like to commend to my colleagues the following evaluation of the Civilian Conservation Corps:

EVALUATION OF THE CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

The United States still is reaping vast benefits from a notable experiment of the depression, the Civilian Conservation Corps. Irreplaceable natural resources were saved by the CCC during the 1930's for present and future generations. Also, more than 2 million young Americans were provided with useful employment and invaluable job-training and thereby kept out of probable soup lines and possible ventures into delinquency.

Many American citizens undoubtedly are better citizens today because of their experience with the CCC and American natural resources certainly are more abundant due to the highly successful conservation efforts of the Corps.

The CCC met with the general approval of the Nation with little relation to economic or political philosophy. When the idea was revived by the Kennedy administration in 1961 it was still being referred to as the least criticized of all the agencies of the Roosevelt era.

HISTORY

The CCC was authorized by Congress in the spring of 1933, and the first camp was opened in Virginia within 30 days. The period of most intensive activity was from 1935 through 1938. By the end of fiscal 1942 liquidation was virtually complete (1, 2).[1]

Once established, the CCC idea gained the overwhelming support of the Nation, and by 1935 almost every county within the United States had made a request for the establishment of one or more camps. During most of the 8-year span of its existence there were CCC camps in 48 States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

EXTENT OF ACTIVITIES

The total number of enrollees given employment from the beginning up to June 1941, was 2,545,000, distributed among 1,500 camps. There were 150 principal types of work experience, of which the most important were forest protection, reforestation, soil conservation, recreational development, range rehabilitation, flood control, aid to wildlife, reclamation and emergency rescue work. The total yearly cost of each enrollee in the CCC from 1935 to the close of activities was $1,000 per man. This figure, about 10 percent higher during the first 2 years principally due to the cost of land acquisition, covers all costs including those necessary to carry out conservation projects (3).

In brief, CCC enrollees planted nearly 3 billion trees, built 1 milion miles of roads and trails, constructed over 85,000 miles of telephone lines, erected 4,000 fire towers, and 100,000 bridges and buildings. More than 4 million acres of forest land were improved as protection against fire. The accompanying table (4) gives a detailed accounting of accomplishments. The value of this work on public lands alone has been estimated by forestry and park officials at $1,500 million.

Type of job or project classification

	New work	Maintenance
Structural improvements:		
Bridges (vehicle) number	38,550.0	9,510.0
Buildings (equipment and supply storage houses) number	3,359.0	1,812.0
CCC camps:		
Latrines and toilets number	12,086.0	4,405.0
Lookout houses do	1,187.0	928.0
Lookout towers do	3,116.0	1,884.0
Shelters do	2,290.0	508.0
Impounding and large diversion dams number	7,622.0	3,405.0
Fences rods	28,717,304.5	7,119,518.9
Telephone lines miles	88,883.5	271,615.3
Transportation improvements:		
Airplane landing fields number	80.0	88.0
Truck trails or minor roads miles	126,230.5	580,995.5
Erosion control, treatment of gullies:		
Check dams:		
Permanent number	318,076.0	31,080.0
Temporary do	6,341,147.0	148,791.0
Seeding and sodding square yards	478,499,555.0	22,332,119.0
Tree planting gully square yards	464,830,313.0	125,862,616.0
Forest culture:		
Field planting or seeding (trees) acres	2,355,587.5	288,213.0
Forest stand improvement acres	4,094,003.0	16,755.0

[1] Reference to "Sources of Quoted Materials" on final page indicated by numbers.

Type of job or project classification—Con.

	New work	Maintenance
Forest protection:		
Fighting forest fires man-days	6,450,403.1	
Tree and plant disease control acres	7,955,707.8	718,059.7
Trees, insect pest control acres	13,090,701.0	178,973.3
Landscape and recreation:		
Public campground development acres	52,319.6	49,457.5
Other activities: Timber estimating acres	35,495,621.7	65,170.9

The effectiveness of the CCC in forest fire protection has been emphasized by foresters in both Eastern and Western States. Soon after the liquidation of the corps, State forestry officials in West Virginia reported that the reduction in CCC firefighting efforts resulted in a 20-percent increase in acres burned in areas having camps the previous year. The State foresters in Kentucky, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Connecticut made similar reports (11). In 1940 the CCC camps contributed 174,788 man-days fighting fires.

Most of the standard CCC camps in the continental United States were distributed between the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture. In the former, the National Park Service had from 80 to 90 percent of the camps, and in the latter the major portion were assigned to the Forest Service. During the peak activity, Agriculture had from three to four times the number of camps as Interior; as of October 1, 1935, the ratio was 1,751 to 489 (1).

EDUCATION IN THE CCC

Supplementary to the emergency conservation work of the CCC an educational program was established. In the formative days of the corps there was coolness and even hostility to any educational activity other than the work experience program, but after a number of false starts a firm program was established. Through trial and error it was found that an academic type of school program did not conform to the needs or the desires of most enrollees. The final result was a program of vocational training, work experience, training in leisure time activities, health education, physical activities and Red Cross training. The latter became a requirement early during the CCC and the others were added later.

On the academic level, criticized by some of the public school sector, the CCC taught 80,000 functional illiterates to read. It taught all enrollees skills in the use of tools, machinery, heavy equipment, office procedures, and others, in accordance with the assignment given. All had work experience in resources conservation. At the close of CCC activities some enrollees had been promoted to supervisory positions in camps.

Academic subjects, within the meaning of the CCC organization, were literacy, language usage, arithmetic, social studies, science, citizenship, conservation, health and hygiene, and occupations. Of these subjects, the final four accounted for about 75 percent of the total enrollment in the corps areas which were carefully studied (4).

The most widely taught vocational subjects were farm management, clerical training, typing, radio code, care and use of tools, carpentry, concrete construction, machine operation, road construction, cooking and baking, forestry, motor vehicle mechanics, blacksmithing, arc welding, acetylene welding, surveying, vehicle operation, woodworking, and photography. In one large corps area studied in detail, typing, cooking and baking, carpentry, and motor vehicle mechanics and operation were chosen by more than half of all enrollees (4).

Avocational skills were taught to a large percentage of the enrollees. Music and

dramatic activities were the most popular in this field.

EFFECTS ON ENROLLERS

Through all the literature assessing the value of the CCC to the Nation and to the former enrollees themselves, there is ample evidence of an astounding impact. It is difficult to find criticism of the purposes, and considering the fact that it was created during a period of political controversy, there is no significant complaint regarding its mode of operation. Twenty years after the demise of the CCC a great residue of good will became apparent as soon as a similar type of organization was proposed by President Kennedy.

One weakness in the CCC, for which others share responsibility, but often admitted by friends of the organization, was the lack of coordination between the corps and the community to which the boys returned. The CCC did not seem to give enough instruction in jobseeking before enrollees were discharged, and it lacked the means to follow up. Few communities at that time had the necessary counseling and guidance services now widely available through the the U.S. Employment Service, to assist in job placement activities. Since 2 years was the maximum term of enrollment, those discharged during the earlier years of the corps returned to their communities before the impact of the defense buildup prior to World War II. Many of these remained jobless for some time.

SOME EVALUATIONS

Most of the studies on the net effect of the CCC on the enrollees and ex-enrollees may appear subjective. In several of the reports consulted evaluations appear more like informed opinions, but they are the result of thoughtful study and merit attention. One made in 1936, and therefore at a time of severe unemployment covers a sampling of 6,500 youths from the Greater Cleveland area who had been discharged from the corps. Trained social workers from Western Reserve University interviewed 272 former enrollees. Irrespective of their reasons for leaving camp, 80 percent had been unemployed prior to enrollment but after returning home 70 percent had obtained jobs. Of those who obtained work more than 50 percent were working full time and approximately 20 percent were in WPA or National Youth Administration part-time projects. Exact data were presented to show that in the case of those who held full-time jobs both before and after enrollment in the CCC, weekly pay had increased by more than $3 and the length of workweek had dropped approximately 4 hours. Most were working more than 40 hours weekly, but the 40-hour standard was still not accepted at this time in many areas. Sixty percent of the group came from foreign-born white parents more than half of whom were of Slavic origin. In 40 percent of the cases the youth lived with one parent or none (5).

ADJUSTMENT TO COMMUNITIES

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, a total of 327,431 enrollees returned to their home communities. During 4 months of this period discharges ranged from 41,000 to 70,000 monthly, representing a sizable impact on many communities. The way in which these young men adjusted to their surroundings, in those instances where figures are available, is of importance in making an objective evaluation of the CCC. A study made for the American Council on Education presents a very creditable impression, gathered from extensive interviews of 419 former enrollees plus the comments of family members, friends, neighbors, and employers. In the case of 30 percent of the boys interviewed the CCC experience did not seem to be significant, but only a very few indicated any dislike for the organization. Most of this group said the CCC were "all right." With the remaining group the attitude expressed ranged from friendly to very enthusiastic.

Of those who had left the CCC, 71 percent indicated desire to enroll again.

Of those still in the CCC, 81 percent expressed intention to enroll again.

Of the entire 419, 69 percent considered themselves better for the experience.

Of those who thought the CCC had had little effect on them, parents and friends generally disagreed (6).

Social workers, judges, parole officers, youth organizers, and many others familiar with the work of the CCC appeared before the Congress in 1961 to urge the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps or similar type of organization. Many of the witnesses spoke from personal knowledge of the effects of the CCC on underprivileged, homeless, or unemployed youth in a much less highly urbanized society than exists today.

RELATION TO JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Intruding into the testimony of the majority of those urging the legislation was the pervasive problem of juvenile delinquency. Some of the witnesses had devoted a lifetime to work among underprivileged and often delinquent young people. It was the unanimous opinion of those who had observed the effects of the CCC that it had been invaluable in reducing or preventing delinquency. An overwhelming number of youth workers were of the opinion that it was imperative that potential delinquents be removed from the environment that has contributed so much to their difficulties if they are to acquire any degree of social responsibility and self-respect. The prevailing opinion of those appearing before the congressional committee favored the camp idea and a new environment.

A recent study in Minnesota, comparing delinquent youths who participated in a forestry camp with a matched group remaining in a more conventional correctional institution, reports significantly greater improvement among the campers.

WORK RECORD

In seeking work after returning home, the CCC became an opening wedge because of the generally good impression the organization had made throughout the Nation. One large eastern company which had established a preference system for CCC "alumni" reported that 90 percent of those hired proved to be good workers. The New York State Board of Education reported that CCC men generally had a high reputation, with 70 percent of those hired being successful in their work. Approval came from Piper Aircraft Co., Thompson Products, Inc., of Cleveland, Ohio, the National Standard Parts Association, Detroit, Mich., and Marshall Field & Co. of Chicago. The Lockheed Aircraft Corp. agreed to cooperate in training CCC enrollees who passed their preliminary employment test (6).

The American Council on Education study further reports that out of a total of 224 men who left camps in one area, 18 percent were employed within 1 month, 60 percent within 1–5 months, and 77 percent of the total within 1 year (6).

ADAPTABILITY OF CCC

The retooling of the American economy after the opening of hostilities in Europe in 1939 materially altered the emphasis within the CCC; it then rapidly became both a training ground for workers in the war industries, and a direct participant in war production through the rehabilitation of military camps, military construction and other activities. The flexibility shown at this period has been mentioned as an argument for a permanent CCC-type organization. It proved that its method of organization, training and operation was highly flexible and well adapted to quick conversion to emergency functions when needed, and capable of similar rapid conversion to its regular duties in the area of resources conservation.

EFFECT ON MILITARY SERVICE

Many young men were toughened before entering military service because of their tour in the CCC. The mayor of Portland, Oreg., stated that during his World War II duty as a Navy officer he believed that former CCC boys in his command were more mature and adjusted than boys without this training. Selective Service officials share this view.

MILITARY INFLUENCE IN THE CCC

During the final years of the CCC the military emphasis was one feature disturbing to friends of the corps. A report on the corps in 1942 expressed objection to the influence of the military and stated that it was considered too authoritarian for a democratic organization engaged in conservation work (7).

HEALTH

On the healthful quality of CCC experience there seems to be complete agreement. The effect of outdoor living, good food, clean living quarters, and medical care, both in camp and in nearby medical facilities when required, have not been questioned. Surveys conducted by the War Department on a large number of enrollees selected from the entire area of operation showed an average net gain in weight of from 8 to 12 pounds per man after 6 months' duty. During the period 1933–35 the average death rate was 2.87 per thousand, in contrast with a rate of 8.07 among unselected men of a similar age group (American Experience Table of Mortality) (2).

YOUTH WORK EXPERIENCE

Strong support for the CCC developed as a byproduct of the dispute between the professional educators and those responsible for the educational activities within the corps. In 1939 President Franklin D. Roosevelt ordered a merger of the CCC and the National Youth Administration and their transfer to the newly formed Federal Security Agency. The previous year Congress had approved the use of NYA funds for the training of needy young persons no longer in school but who were unable to obtain employment. When the combined agency began to engage in educational activities at the very time agitation was developing to make the CCC a permanent body, a division developed between the CCC–NYA and certain public school organizations having close ties with the U.S. Office of Education, also a part of the Federal Security Agency. Leading the battle was the Educational Policies Commission which, briefly stated, recommended that all educational activities of the CCC–NYA be discontinued and transferred to local control, the Federal Government to continue to provide the necessary funds. (Some of the arguments used by the Educational Policies Commission in 1941 are similar to those used by the opponents of Federal aid to education in 1961.) Prof. Charles Hubbard Judd of the University of Chicago, long one of the leaders among American educators, administered the critics a stern rebuke for "suffering from intellectual myopia" and calling them persons who "fail to get any view of the vast social horizon which lies beyond their immediate selfish interests" (9). Prof. Paul Terry of the University of Alabama, a leader in the South, reminded his colleagues that since the establishment of the first Latin grammar school in 1635 there has been nothing to prevent educators from developing a work experience program for community youth, but that until regular educational forces demonstrate their ability to do as well or better than the CCC that this program should remain a Federal activity (10).

CONSERVATION ACTIVITIES

Viewed broadly there is overwhelming opinion that the CCC was a success. It

demonstrated to the Nation that a large number of men can be put to work on useful, permanent projects on short notice and that the corps could change its course of operation quickly when emergency directs. The CCC gave Federal and State conservation officials their greatest opportunity to serve the Nation in an entire generation. The benefits from the $30 per month allotment paid each enrollee, much of which was sent home, benefited many others, including some who were destitute. During the first 2 years alone more than 1 million young men received employment from which 3,200,000 others benefited. The total amount paid to enrollees for the entire service period of the CCC, 1933–41, amounted to $202,686,581 and these benefits were estimated to have been shared by approximately 8 million persons.

Officials of the National Park Service and the Forest Service stated that at the end of the first 2 years of operation the CCC had advanced the development of forestry and park facilities by from 10 to 20 years. The value of this to the Nation was estimated at $426,500,000 for the period 1933–35. Business recovery was stimulated during this time through the expenditure of $390 million for manufactured articles, automotive and construction equipment, food, clothing and many other items.

PRAISE AND CRITICISM OF THE CCC

A close scrutiny of a mountain of literature on the CCC discloses very little unfavorable comment. The contention between the professional educators and the CCC–NYA educational program was in no sense an attack on the basic idea but was rather a jurisdictional dispute in which the motives of certain critics do not appear to have been totally unselfish.

Examination of the congressional hearings in 1961 relating to S. 404 and H.R. 7536 (87th Cong., 1st sess.) uncovers little criticism of the CCC or that part of the proposed legislation providing for establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps. During these hearings witnesses time and time again harked back to the CCC to prove the desirability and practicality of the YCC proposal.

Although the bill, H.R. 8354, favorably reported by the House Education and Labor Committee provided only for pilot YCC projects, this was obviously done in the hope that future expansion of the program would be possible. Taking note of the great praise for the CCC it had heard, the committee expressed the view that it could not state "too emphatically that the successful Civilian Conservation Corps experience in giving valuable work-training experience and counseling to youth while at the same time adding to the national wealth through conservation and natural resource development justifies a much more extensive program" (12).

In summation, the basic approach and techniques of the CCC have been tested and found to be sound. However, since the corps was abandoned a tremendous backlog of conservation work has accumulated. We are continuing to fall behind at an alarming rate in reforestation, reseeding of rangelands, improvement and protection of watersheds, and other soil and moisture conservation measures essential to the protection and sound development of our natural resources.

The current proposal to establish a Youth Conservation Corps presents a unique opportunity to deal with important national needs. It is not often that government is provided with tried and tested, but at the same time, bold and imaginative approaches to solving major problems. The Civilian Conservation Corps provides such an example and its obvious benefits should be welcomed without further delay.

SOURCES OF QUOTED MATERIAL

1. Wirth, Conrad L., "The Civilian Conservation Corps Program of the U.S. Department of the Interior." A report to the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, Washington, D.C., 1945.

2. Fechner, Robert L., "Summary Report of the Director of the Emergency Conservation Work." (1935–35) GPO, Washington, D.C., 1935.

3. Monthly Labor Review, "Eight Years of Civilian Conservation Corps Operations, 1933–41." Series No. 1323, June 1941.

4. Couch, Paul E., "Educational Emphasis in CCC Camps of the Seventh Corps Area." Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind., doctoral thesis, in Library of Congress.

5. Walker, Helen M., "The CCC Through the Eyes of 272 Boys." Western Reserve University Press, Cleveland, Ohio (unnumbered publication), 1938.

6. Holland, Kenneth, and Frank E. Hill, "Youth in the CCC Camps." American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1942.

7. Senate Document 216, "Civilian Conservation Corps.," 77th Congress, 2d session.

8. Wirth, Conrad L., "Final Report on CCC Activities in Department of the Interior." Typewritten manuscript to the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, 1944.

9. Senate Document 216, op. cit.

10. Senate Document 216, op. cit.

11. Senate Report No. 976, Calendar 959. Youth Conservation Corps and Youth Public Service Program, 87th Congress, 1st session.

12. House of Representatives Report 833, 87th Congress, 1st session, p. 6.

He Sat in High Places

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. T. RUTHERFORD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, recently a seventh-grade student of San Jacinto Junior High School, Midland, Tex., Cindy Brown, submitted a prize-winning essay, to the Daughters of the American Revolution Essay Contest, concerning the life of James Pinckney Henderson of Texas. I would like to add my congratulations to Cindy Brown, and I want to share this delightful essay with my colleagues.

The essay follows:

HE SAT IN HIGH PLACES

"But whosoever will be great among you shall be your minister; and whosoever of you will be the chiefest, shall be servant of all." (Mark 10: 43a–44).

A study of the life of James Pinckney Henderson reveals that he served the people of Texas in many ways, and thus he earned for himself the honor of sitting in high places.

March really did go out like a lion in the year 1808, for on March 31 a powerful leader among men was born to Lawson and Elizabeth Henderson in Lincolnton, N.C. He was to receive much of his basic education at Lincoln Academy, the University of North Carolina, and the old Chapel Hill College.

Being from a family of distinguished lawyers, statesmen, orators and soldiers, it was natural that James Pinckney would study law. Accordingly, Henderson was admitted to the bar in 1829, at the age of 21.

In that era, as in our own, young men were called to serve country, so in 1830 our hero was appointed aide-de-camp and major in the North Carolina militia. Later he was elected colonel of a regiment.

Our geographic scene of interest changed in 1835 to Canton, Miss., where the Henderson family moved, and it was here that James Pinckney heard news of the Texas revolution. Immediately he began securing enlistments for the Texas service.

The year 1836 is one proud Texans will never forget. It was an important date to Henderson, also, who arrived at Velasco, Tex., on June 3, 1836, to be commissioned by David G. Burnet as brigadier general, and then sent by the government to recruit for the army of the republic.

Returning to North Carolina, this dedicated patriot organized a company in that State and sent the men to Texas at his own expense to help in the Texas bid for freedom. When he returned to Texas in November 1836, he was appointed attorney general in the cabinet of Sam Houston and in December 1836, succeeded Stephen F. Austin as Secretary of State. Serving in the cabinet, also, of this young republic were: Henry Smith, Secretary of Treasury; Thomas Rusk, Secretary of War; S. R. Fisher, Secretary of the Navy; and Robert Bors, Postmaster General.

The year was 1837—and Henderson was appointed to serve the wild, untamed areas of Texas as Minister to England and France, being commissioned particularly to secure recognition and treaties of amity and commerce. Turning the same energy and creative effort to securing trade agreements that he had used to help fight the battle for freedom against Mexico, these agreements were secured, as was the ultimate recognition of Texas independence by these two world powers.

The term "bachelor republic" had been tagged on Texas due to the number of unmarried men who sat in the "high places." However, this trend began to change when the marriages of a number of well-known figures became public news. Sam Houston, J. P. Henderson, and Senator Oliver Jones of Austin County (all of whom were bachelors) traded their personal freedom for the advantages of warm hearths and well-cooked food. While in France, Henderson met Frances Cox, who was from Philadelphia, and they were married in "jolly old London town" in October 1839.

What thrilling experiences this rugged individualist had enjoyed during the years since his military career began in 1830, back in North Carolina. In 1840 the bride and groom returned to Texas, to set up a law office in San Augustine, but political duties called again in 1844, when he was sent to Washington, D.C., to work with Isaac Van Zandt in negotiating for a treaty to annex Texas to the United States. On April 12, 1844, the treaty was signed, but was rejected by the U.S. Senate on June 8, 1844. Henderson, over his protest, was ordered home by President of the Republic, Sam Houston.

Henderson was a member of the Constitutional Convention of Texas in 1845 and was elected to serve as first Governor of Texas in November 1845. He took office in February 1846. With the declaration of the Mexican War and the organization of the Texas Volunteers, the Governor asked permission of the legislature to take personal command of the troops in the field. He led the 2d Texas Regiment at the battle of Monterrey and was appointed a commissioner to negotiate for the surrender of the city. Later he was appointed a major general in the U.S. Army.

After the conclusion of the war, Henderson resumed his duties as Governor, but refused to run for a second term. He returned to San Augustine, to practice his beloved law in 1847, only to be elected by the Texas Legislature to fill the post of U.S. Senator, vacated by Thomas J. Rusk. Henderson served the Senate post from November 9, 1857, until his death June 4, 1858, at the age of 50.

Death came early in life to this adventurous spirit, who had led all the citizens of Texas in the same humble spirit he served a fighting group from North Carolina, who helped to make Texas independence a reality.

He was buried in the Congressional Cemetery, Washington, D.C., but in 1930 his remains were reinterred in the State Cemetery, Austin, Tex., where it is fitting that a monument stands in honor of this man who served his State so long and so well.

James Pinckney Henderson died representing, in his personal, political, professional as well as moral character and conduct, the best qualities of that intellectual aristocracy that gave splendor and grace to the civilization of the "Old South."

Yes, he sat in "high places," but always as "* * * minister," for surely he was the "* * * servant of all."

Too Close for Comfort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Journal of Commerce and Commercial:

TOO CLOSE FOR COMFORT

In asking that Congress provide the eminent domain authority necessary to permit construction of a pipeline to carry coal slurry from West Virginia to the eastern seaboard, President Kennedy gave the reasonable explanation that pipeline transportation of this type could stimulate not only the economy of West Virginia, which has needed stimulation for some time, but of other areas similarly fixed.

He could have added that it may also spell death to a few railroads that are now struggling desperately just to stay alive, but perhaps he had reason for not doing so. A nation that applies power breaks to technological advance in the interests of preserving the domestic status quo will not long maintain its position, in times like these, even though it may not sink from sight altogether.

It must make the most of all its resources which means, so far as transportation is concerned, its highway networks, its waterways and its airlines and ocean shipping. This is precisely what the United States has done and is doing and, we hope, will continue to do. But it must be realized that this policy is bound to have some very serious consequence. Impending for some time, these are now too close for comfort.

It was not the Connecticut Turnpike alone that brought the New Haven to its present sorry state. Nor was it due alone to other highways that the rails lost so much of their merchandise freight, or alone to the waterways that they lost much bulk freight, or alone to the Federal aviation aids that they lost much of their passenger traffic. Similarly, if slurry pipelines are built and a few more railroads go into bankruptcy, the blame cannot be laid on the pipelines alone.

But if it is one thing to grant the essentiality and even the inevitability of the development of these alternative types of transport, it is quite another to ignore the cumulative effect of all these programs on the railroad industry. Airlines and bargelines do not compete; truckers don't compete with bargelines, or, to any serious degree with pipelines or with airlines either. But all of them compete with railroads and most of them compete severely.

Throughout the greater part of the industrial northeast the burden thrown on the railroads not by one, but a combination of all the aids given by Federal and State authorities to other forms of transport has reached crushing proportions. One class I railroad is not only bankrupt, but in so deep there are serious doubts it can emerge unless it abandons many of its traditional services and hands over some others to a public authority. Others are in serious trouble. Nor is the situation temporary. Even in the face of a moderate business upturn, some of these carriers are still losing ground.

No responsible official that we know of is advocating at this point that American railroads be nationalized. This is all to the good, but it does not obscure the fact that present policies are pushing many northeastern railroads into a situation in which there may be no other alternative but a piece-by-piece Federal takeover.

So we would caution the administration and Congress against taking any further steps to develop alternate types of transportation until the consequences of these actions in terms of the railroad industry are fully assayed and positive steps are taken to deal with them.

In a week or so, President Kennedy will probably send Congress the transportation message that has been held under lock and key so long. It will be followed, we are sure, by the usual exchange of arguments as to the merit of its individual sections, but its success or failure must be measured chiefly in terms of whether or not it really faces up to the railroad crisis.

While it would be unfair to highway, water and air carriers to ask that their development be held up in the interests of saving the railroads, it would be equally unfair to ask that the rails continue to shoulder the burdens heaped on them by Federal aids to their competitors unless they are given relief in other directions. It won't be enough to consider the merits of rate policies alone, or to determine that the public interest might best be served by a moratorium on rail mergers, no matter how persuasive the reasoning may be in each individual instance.

The time has come when the situation must be treated as one very big and urgent problem—not as a collection of individual issues. We say "it has come" because today there may still be an alternative to further disasters and the onset of creeping nationalization. Tomorrow there may not be. And tomorrow is very close indeed.

Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday marked the 141st anniversary of Greek Independence Day.

Many peoples associate their origin with certain heroes who have saved them from extinction, or who have performed some epic deed which has been of vital importance to the preservation of the nation. The history and mythology of the ancient Greeks are full of such heroes—some of them real, some only imaginary and fanciful, products of gifted imaginative writers. But these ancient figures, representing the spirit of freedom and other noble ideals, were among the first symbols of the Western idea of freedom. From Greek history the idea had entered the broad stream of Western civilization. Thus our debt to the Greeks is immense, and that is one of the numerous reasons why the celebration of Greek Independence Day is of momentous significance today.

After enjoying the best of the ancient world, and after giving birth to the noblest of human ideals, that of freedom, the glory of Greece passed into history, and in the 15th century the Greek people came under the sway of the Ottoman Turks. Then for about 400 years they were subjected to the sultan's alien and unwanted rule. During those years it was not possible for the Greeks, without effective outside aid, to free themselves. But early in the 19th century they had their chance, seized upon it, proclaimed their independence on March 25, 1821, waged a long and uphill fight against their oppressors, and finally regained their national independence. Since then Greece has been independent and the Greeks free. And throughout these 141 years they have guarded their freedom with uncommon jealousy. At times when they were waging wars against terrific odds, and the friends of Greece were not in position to aid them, they went through agonizing ordeals. They were on the verge of loosing their freedom to the Communists soon after the last war. I am happy to say that then we were able to help them to retain their freedom and independence.

On this 141st anniversary of their independence day we wish the people of Greece peace and prosperity. The great dedication that the Greeks have demonstrated to the principles of democracy have been an inspiration to freedom-loving people throughout the world.

The large community of Americans of Greek descent has made a tremendous contribution toward strengthening the fibers of democracy here in the United States.

It is fitting that we pay tribute to Greek Independence Day and find in this tribute continued inspiration for the preservation of democracy in our own Nation.

To Spend Tax Dollars for St. Lawrence Seaway Promotion Would Add Injury to the Nation's Competitive Ocean Ports and the Nation's Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the St. Lawrence Seaway has been in operation for three navigational seasons and is preparing for a fourth. Considering that it was one of the most controversial and dubious proposals ever to come before the Congress, and considering espe-

cially the self-liquidating requirements specified by Congress in the enabling law, let us check to see whether or to what extent the project is measuring up to the rosy picture painted by its sponsors.

Those of us who opposed construction of the seaway did so on grounds that the projected volume of traffic was grossly exaggerated while the estimated cost of construction was unrealistically low, that the level of tolls initially agreed upon would not recover the cost, including depreciation and interest, and that the seaway would, therefore, become a burden on taxpayers contrary to the law and the assurances of its sponsors.

We also contended that it would largely benefit and be used by vessels of foreign registry to the detriment of American shipping, that it would divert large tonnages from established eastern and gulf ports, and that it would work further serious hardships on other established forms of transportation, especially railroads, upon which the Nation must rely the year round, both in peace and war, for most of its transportation needs.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that on the basis of experience in the first three navigational seasons, the results may be even more serious than we envisioned.

Consider first the matter of cost.

The Corps of Engineers in June 1953 set a figure of $88 million as the U.S. share of construction cost. On this basis, and the need for additional funds to provide for working capital and interest charges during construction, Congress appropriated a total of $105 million. Subsequently, an estimated $21 million of the U.S. cost, covering construction of the Point Rockaway lock and dam, was transferred to Canada, leaving approximately $67 million as the total estimated cost to the United States.

Four years later, in 1957, we were told by the Administrator of the Seaway Corporation that the original cost figures were "not realistic," which I may say came as no surprise to those who opposed it. Accordingly, we were asked to increase the appropriation to $140 million, which was done. Then we were told by the General Accounting Office that the fully reckoned cost of U.S. participation was not $67 million, but $146.5 million, or more than double the Corps of Engineers 1953 estimate. The seaway thus becomes another in the long, almost unbroken, list of waterway improvement projects which the Corps of Engineers has vastly and inexcusably underestimated as to cost.

Take the anticipated level of seaway traffic.

For 1959, the first year of navigation, we were told that the seaway could be counted upon to move a total of 25 million tons; the Welland Canal, a total of 40 million tons. The actual figures of 20,579,461 tons for the seaway and 27,435,491 tons for Welland were, respectively, 17.7 percent and 31.4 percent below the amounts predicted.

In 1960, when the seaway was expected to handle 29 million tons and the Welland Canal 43 million tons, the actual tonnage figures of 20,310,346 for the seaway and 29,249,698 for Welland were, respectively, 30 percent and 32 percent short of the mark.

Now we are told that the results for 1961 were equally disappointing: 23,355,921 tons actually handled on the seaway as against 33 million tons predicted, and 30,675,297 tons actual on Welland as against 46 million tons predicted.

Take the level of tolls, which according to the law, were to make the seaway self-supporting and reimburse the Government for the entire cost, including interest and depreciation, over a period of 50 years.

In 1959, the seaway produced toll revenue amounting to $10,049,179, or over $3 million short of the $13.1 million predicted in that year. Welland revenues totaled only $1,227,531 as against $2,060,000 predicted. In 1960, when seaway revenues were expected to total $15,196,000, the actual take was only $10,130,318, leaving a deficit of over $5 million. Revenue from the Welland in 1960 totaled $1,326,498 as against $2,215,000 predicted.

Revenue figures for 1961 are not yet reported, but in the light of the disappointing results trafficwise in that year, there is little reason to hope that the revenue picture will be better.

In part, of course, the mounting deficits are attributable to the failure of the seaway to attain the promised volume of traffic. In other part, however, they result from still another miscalculation by seaway advocates, involving the composition of traffic.

Bulk cargoes moving over the seaway in 1960 comprised 88.9 percent of total seaway traffic, whereas in setting the level of tolls, they were estimated at only 80 percent. The rate on bulk cargo is only 40 cents a ton as compared with a rate of $1.25 a ton for general cargo, which amounted to only a little more than half the predicted volume in that year.

At present levels, therefore, it is clear that the tolls are producing far less revenue than predicted and far less than is needed to make the seaway self-sustaining. Moreover, the gulf separating promises and performance, which is growing wider every year, can only mean that the present toll structure, if continued, will prove even less adequate for the future. Thus, in violation of the law and the now discredited assurances of advocates, the seaway threatens to become another heavy burden on the already overburdened taxpayer.

Let us consider now the warning of opponents that the seaway would largely be used by vessels of foreign registry to the detriment of American shipping.

In 1960, transits of the St. Lawrence River, both upbound and downbound, totaled 6,869. Of that number, only 438, or 6.4 percent, were by ships registered to the United States. This was 117 fewer U.S. transits than in 1959, the first year of operation.

Statistics for the 1961 season are not yet reported. But it is known that one major American shipping concern, despite heavy subsidies from the Government, has drastically curtailed service through the seaway and admitted that it "pulled a boner" in entering the trade in the first place.

At a hearing before the Federal Maritime Board in June, 1960, a representative of Grace Lines testified that no matter how long Grace remains in seaway service, it will "not make money." Acknowledging what he called "basic errors" in planning, the Grace representative told the Board with refreshing candor: "We should have looked at a map" to note the vastly larger distance, by water, through the seaway to the Caribbean, as opposed to direct rail from Midwest points to the Atlantic coast. This, he said, has minimized any all-water advantages to the Caribbean.

A favorite claim of seaway enthusiasts is that it can accommodate 90 percent of the world's merchant marine. But they do not add that, as a practical matter, most American vessels, in order to use the St. Lawrence, must load only at about half their capacity or less, whereas capacity loading is necessary if U.S. vessels are to have any chance of overcoming the advantage of substantially lower labor costs enjoyed by their foreign competitors. Even the Liberty and Victory ships of World War II, when fully loaded, exceed the 25-foot safe maximum permitted by the seaway. It is clear, therefore, that the seaway primarily benefits and is largely used by foreign shipping to the further detriment of our own embattled and heavily subsidized merchant marine.

As to established east and gulf coast ports, and other competitive agencies of transportation, the effect of the seaway is being felt in the form of substantial traffic diversion. If the seaway is benefiting port cities on the Great Lakes, it is clearly detrimental to ports such as New York, Philadelphia, Hampton Roads, New Orleans, and Galveston, as well as to the railroads with which the seaway is in competition.

Great concern over the future of the Philadelphia port and ports along the eastern seaboard was manifested recently by the Greater Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce when it announced its opposition to the attempt of Secretary of Commerce Hodges to obtain funds to promote the St. Lawrence Seaway which is declared to be "lagging after only 3 years of use."

The impact of the St. Lawrence Seaway on the Philadelphia deepwater port, which extends from Trenton to Wilmington on the Delaware and its tributaries, is having serious effect on the Philadelphia port through the diversion of shipping, according to an editorial in the March 24, 1962, issue of the Philadelphia Bulletin. The editorial stresses the fact that Philadelphia's port is the largest in the Nation in terms of water borne foreign cargo, and over 100 million tons of all kinds of cargo valued at $3 billion passes through it in a year. It is revealed the port's activities are responsible directly for 96,300 jobs and a payroll of $512 million, not to mention the 350,000 jobs that benefit indirectly in the allied service businesses. From a tax standpoint, it is stated that revenues amount to $133 million, plus another $60 million in customs collections. In plain words, every ton of cargo passing through the Philadelphia port gen-

erates an estimated $12 that circulates throughout the area's economy.

The dire financial condition of the entire railroad industry, particularly in the East where the competition of the seaway is felt most severely, is well known. The Erie-Lackawanna Railroad suffered last year a deficit of approximately $26 million, and the Baltimore & Ohio lost $31 million. Yet these and other railroads, competitive with the seaway, are expected to provide standby service during the 4- to 5-month period each year when the seaway becomes an iceway and cannot be used for navigation.

In short, it has become increasingly clear that those who opposed construction of the seaway have been vindicated in that position, while the proponents have been proved wrong. This fact, however, has apparently not dampened the ardor of seaway advocates, for the same interests are back at the old stand asking the Congress to pour good money after bad. On the one hand, they are asking the allocation of additional tax dollars to make what we are told are needed "improvements" and to promote use of the facility by recalcitrant shippers and shipping companies. On the other hand, it is said by some that the way to increase use of the seaway is to lower the tolls or wipe them out entirely. Next, I predict we shall hear pleadings to repeal or amend the law providing for self-liquidation of the seaway out of tolls.

The proposal to spend tax dollars for seaway promotion would compound the injury both to competitive ocean ports and to railroads, who would be forced to help foot the bill for a campaign designed to divert still additional traffic from them. It would place the Federal Government in the unbecoming and unwelcome role of advocating the use of certain ports at the expense of others—a position historically avoided for the best of cause.

The responsibility of the Federal Government is to all citizens, all communities, and all sections of the country in equal measure, and it is unthinkable that any of its resources should be used to advance the interests of some to the detriment of others. Seaway promotion is not now and never will be a proper function of the Department of Commerce or of any other agency of the Federal Government, and the spending of either tax dollars or toll revenue for that purpose should be expressly prohibited. In the absence of specific authorization by the Congress, which I sincerely hope and trust will not be forthcoming, the Comptroller General should make it his business to see that not a single dollar of tax or toll revenue is used for seaway promotion.

The clamor for reduction or elimination of tolls is in many respects the unkindest cut of all. When seeking congressional approval and funds for construction of the seaway, a spokesman for the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association assured us that it would yield conservatively $27,875,000 a year in revenues, an amount which, he said, would be "twice as much as necessary" to make the project pay for itself.

However, even before the seaway was completed, and before a single ship or a single ton of freight had moved over it, this same advocate, speaking this time for prospective seaway users, completely reversed his position. With the seaway assured, he stated before a congressional committee that "any attempt to set tolls at a level which would theoretically yield such revenues—as would be required to make the seaway self-sustaining—will defeat the purpose of the seaway, as it will drive traffic to alternate competitive routes, and that the revenues from the remaining traffic will be far from enough to meet these increased charges."

Experience in the 3 years since the seaway was opened to navigation seems to bear out the latter evaluation of the project as an unsound economic undertaking. But one wonders why this advocate waited until the seaway was virtually a reality before making his true views known.

In this connection, we should not overlook that the costs required to be returned under the law do not include even larger related costs of work such as deepening the connecting lake channels and the dozens of lake harbors to enable them to handle oceangoing ships. Dredging the connecting lake channels alone to the required depth of 27 feet has been estimated to cost a minimum of $150 million, while the necessary harbor work will add hundreds of millions of dollars more. It is enough that users of the St. Lawrence will have the benefit of these publicly provided facilities free of charge, without saddling on taxpayers the cost of the St. Lawrence itself.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that to follow further the advice of those who have led us into this costly economic blunder would be sheer folly and gross abdication of our responsibility to the Nation as a whole. Not one additional penny should be poured down the St. Lawrence River drain, and certainly we should not be so naive as to entertain seriously the ridiculous notion of trying to bail it out by allocating millions of tax dollars for seaway promotion.

I further suggest that we resolutely hold the line against all attempts to reduce or eliminate seaway tolls, which would serve only to shift an even larger share of the burden to taxpayers and to saddle the already hard-pressed railroads with still another subsidized competitor. Let us now recognize the St. Lawrence Seaway for the "white elephant" that it is. But let us not compound the error by following further the misguided advice of those responsible for the present sorry mess.

Hon. John W. Murphy

SPEECH

OF

HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret the passing of Federal Judge John W. Murphy, of Scranton, Pa., who was a distinguished and effective Member of the House of Representatives in the 78th and 79th Congresses. He was a close friend of my husband during their service here together, and I came to like and respect him highly. He was truly a gentleman, a fine person. Congressman Granahan and I always enjoyed being with Mr. and Mrs. Murphy.

Few men have won such recognition as an outstanding Member of Congress in such a short period of time as the late Judge Murphy did when he served here for less than two full terms. His work on the Joint Committee to Investigate the Pearl Harbor Attack won him the admiration of everyone familiar with his painstaking research and remarkable memory for detail in playing such an important role in that investigation. He was delighted at the opportunity to serve as a Federal judge, since law and the concept of justice under our Constitution were of such exciting interest to him, but I know that his decision to leave the Congress made many of his friends and colleagues a bit sad, knowing that he had the ability to become a truly great Member of this body.

I take this opportunity to express to the judge's fine family my sincere and heartfelt condolences. Judge Murphy was an outstanding citizen of our State, a man of integrity and decency.

Strikebreaking at the Taxpayer's Expense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK KOWALSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, the rights of America's working men and women are being eroded away by the bureaucracies of our Government, by policies that jeopardize the national defense and condone a shocking waste of the taxpayer's money.

On February 21 of this year I introduced a bill (H.R. 10341) to promote the national defense, to eliminate waste and to protect the rights of American workers.

This bill would prohibit payment by the Federal Government of strike costs arising from a lawful labor dispute, except in those cases when the President and/or the Secretary of Defense personally determine that such payment is in the national interest.

I am informed that hearings will be held in the next few weeks, so I take this opportunity to present the background and the compelling reasons for this legislation.

In this imperfect world, if man is to be something more than a commodity, the final economic security of the workers rests in their collective power to bargain with the managers who use and profit from their skills. The law of the land sanctifies this right.

But as a segment of our Government assumes an ever-increasing role as a consumer of industrial products and user of contracted services, the conflict between the rights of the individual and the policies of government becomes ever more severe. This conflict comes to focus in your industry.

In the aircraft industry, 90 percent of everything produced is sold to the Government. Many of the machines, plants and production facilities are furnished by the Government. Government supplies are often furnished and payments are advanced to facilitate financing. The equity of the stockholders in this industry is extremely low. The Government is both the investor and the consumer.

It is perhaps a natural development in this industry that the Government should come to play a partisan role, a role favoring production and priorities in any dispute between labor and management. It is this partisan role of government that challenges labor's basic right to collective bargaining. This is an unwarranted and unnecessary conflict.

Many of the problems labor faces are multiplied because of the ability of the employer to bring the vast resources of government into play against unions and, in that way, cause the American taxpayer to work in behalf of the employer against his own best interests.

Large segments of organized labor pay a terrific price for the strife that defense procurement policy encourages.

To give you an idea of the price tag I would like to cite the case history of the United Aircraft Corp. strike in Connecticut and the role of the Government in that dispute.

The United Aircraft Corp. has nine plants in Connecticut and one at West Palm Beach, Fla. At the time of the strike, the workers in these plants were represented by four lodges of the International Association of Machinists, and two locals of the United Auto Workers. The IAM and the UAW, during last 1959 and early 1960, engaged in negotiations with the UAC concerning grievances, procedures, seniority, and union security. Pay was not an issue. As months went by, negotiations deteriorated. The UAW locals went out on strike June 7, 1960, and the IAM lodges struck the next day, June 8. The strike was not successful. The UAW and IAM were forced to accept negotiated strike agreements and everything was over August 8, 1960. The strike had lasted 2 months.

This strike was no different than many others where labor lost—the workers had to eat crow. But at the Pratt & Whitney plant in East Hartford, and the Hamilton Standard plant at Windsor Locks, the crow was especially distasteful. At Hamilton Standard, out of 11 elected union officers, only 3 were called back to work. Out of seven shop committeemen, only two were recalled, and little better than half of the strikers were recalled in the 4-month period agreed upon for rehiring members of the union.

At Pratt & Whitney hundreds of workers were not recalled and only about half the elected union officials were returned to work. Many of those recalled lost seniority rights, and some had to accept cuts in pay up to 65 cents an hour.

On January 1, 1961, the terminal date for rehiring union members, hundreds were still out of work. Yet, the plant was running with very heavy overtime. To add insult to injury, the company, immediately after the January 1 terminal date, went into a hiring program and rehired many of the strikers as new employees. Many of these men and women suffered losses of up to 30 years' seniority, cuts in hourly pay, labor grades, and shift changes. As a result, some 500 workers filed unfair labor charges against the United Aircraft Corp. These charges are still pending.

The unions for years had suspected that in a labor dispute with a defense contractor, the Government always paid the lion's share of the cost of the strike. No one knew this for certain and no one knew the components of these strike costs.

Having become acquainted with the capabilities of the General Accounting Office when I was in the Army, I asked this agency of Congress to investigate the Pratt & Whitney and the Hamilton Standard strikes to see how much the Government is being asked to pay for these strikes.

In June 1961 I received the report on the Pratt & Whitney strike, signed by Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General of the United States.

The Comptroller General's report analyzed five major components of the cost of these strikes. There are no doubt other components, but the Comptroller General identified the following: Costs for the recruitment of replacements, overtime premiums, production labor variance, the training of replacements and spoiled work. All of these costs increased substantially during and after the strike over the targets agreed upon by the Navy and Pratt & Whitney. Overtime alone increased by $2 million.

Let me summarize the Comptroller General's report in his own words:

> Pratt & Whitney's proposed final prices for engines and spare parts produced under fixed-price incentive contracts during 1960 exceeded the target prices negotiated by about $10.8 million. In an advisory audit report to the Bureau of Naval Weapons with respect to these price proposals, the Navy Area Audit Office estimated that on an overall basis, Pratt & Whitney's final prices included strike costs of about $10 million. Under the incentive provisions of the contracts, Pratt & Whitney's share of such strike costs would be about $2.5 million and the Government would bear the remainder, or about $7.5 million.

According to the Comptroller General's report on the strike at Hamilton Standard, the taxpayer is being asked to pay strike costs of $1.5 million.

In other words, the United Aircraft Corp. has asked the Government to lay out $9 million to subsidize the cost of strikebreaking in its East Hartford, Windsor Locks, and North Haven plants in Connecticut. How much UAC is asking for strike costs in its other plants is still an open question.

Following the Comptroller General's report, I tried to find out how the Navy and the Department of Defense would react to this multi-million-dollar price tag. It would take the rest of the morning to describe to you the evasions, and the deceptions, and the labyrinth of obstructionism that I encountered in trying to get an answer to my question.

Finally I got the answer. In January, at a meeting in my office with representatives of the Departments of Labor, Defense, and the General Accounting Office, a Mr. Pilson, speaking for Defense, said that under established policy, the Navy, during the period of the strike, authorized management to expend additional funds for overtime premiums, recruitment, production variance, training, and excessive spoiled work. This authorization permitted expenditures above target prices. Under this policy, Mr. Pilson said, strike costs uncovered by the General Accounting Office will be paid by the Government. Furthermore, he volunteered that "a prudent contractor anticipating a labor dispute would include certain contingencies in his target prices and the Government would pay these costs."

There you have it. It is the clearly stated policy of the Department of Defense that if there is a labor dispute in a defense plant, the Government is on the side of management, and the taxpayer—that includes the men on strike—will be expected to pay the major part of the cost of the strike. When a union bargaining agent sits at the bargaining table the gun pointed at his head is paid for by the Government.

This is the case history of one dispute. What is the situation in other disputes? How many millions of dollars has the taxpayer paid to break lawful strikes? I cannot tell you, but believe me, it is a lot.

During the fiscal year 1961, the Defense Department awarded $24.3 billion worth of prime contracts. Of this amount 100 companies received $17.3 billion worth of prime contracts. There were seven major strikes in these latter companies—strikes involving $3.5 billion worth of defense contracts. It is very difficult to estimate how much these strikes cost the taxpayer, but if the Pratt & Whitney costs are used as a yardstick, then potentially these strikes could have cost the taxpayers at least $50 million.

But defense plants are not the only areas where the Government is a potential partisan in a labor-management dispute. The pilots of Southern Airways can testify with chapter and verse how the Government has worked against their interests in the current airline strike through subsidizing the pay of replacements. In my bill, H.R. 10697, I attempt to come to terms with this problem.

As the Government enters into other areas of our economy, for example, subsidies to railroads and other services, the power of unions to bargain effectively will be seriously curtailed. And as this trend continues, the rights of the individual and his bargaining organization will be subordinated to and finally destroyed by the demands of Government. Some say this is necessary. I do not agree.

The Government policymakers, inspectors, and contracting officers say that the overriding consideration is produc-

tion and service. They argue that the national interest comes first. I do not believe the bureaucrats in Defense are competent to judge what is in the national interest. This can only be decided at the highest administration and congressional level.

One thing is certain—the present defense procurement policy is a cry from our national interest.

Present policy promises to subsidize on management's behalf the failure of labor negotiations, and it thus destroys much of management's incentive to bargain in good faith. Present defense policy not only encourages strikes, it not only prolongs strikes, but as a result it curtails production when production is vitally needed. It wastes millions of the taxpayers' dollars that could be used for essential social and educational programs. It seriously erodes the power of collective bargaining and adds to our staggering unemployment. And it causes untold damage to the lives and the futures of thousands of working men and women and their families.

These problems are complex and do not yield to easy solutions. They will not be solved by 1 bill or by 100 bills, but we can begin.

We can begin the search for a new policy, a policy that will take the Government out of its partisan role and to assign it a more constructive, a more flexible, a more human role, a policy that is truly in the national interest.

In developing this new policy, the Government must address itself to certain urgent tasks. The Government must use more intelligent planning to level out the enormous fluctuations in the feast-or-famine defense industry. It must work to expose the myth that it has helped to create, the myth that says wage demands are inflationary. It must accept its responsibility to the workers who suffer from the fluctuations and shifts in defense needs by granting severance or relocation pay to the workers displaced. It must retrain the men whose skills have become obsolete in fast-changing defense technology. It must scrutinize its policy of heavy overtime allowances in labor surplus areas. And it must, through the NLRB, police rehiring policies following a strike.

I would further suggest that there is a pressing need for a standing committee, composed of representatives from labor, management, Congress, the administration, and interested segments of the public, to investigate the role of the Government as a consumer and to help develop this new and constructive policy.

To conclude, I am convinced that if Government were assigned a more positive and human role, management would discover in itself and in labor a new spirit of cooperation at the bargaining table, strikes would be few and shorter, overall production and employment would increase at a saving of millions to the taxpayers. Finally, the working men and women of America would achieve greater union security and greater economic justice.

Man is the most important concern of government. As great as America is, we can have a better life.

The text of H.R. 10341 is as follows:

[87th Cong., 2d sess.]

H.R. 10341

In the House of Representatives, February 21, 1962; Mr. KOWALSKI introduced the following bill, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

A bill to amend the Act of June 30, 1936, the Walsh-Healey Act, to disallow certain items of excessive costs incurred by contractors and directly attributable to the employment of individuals to replace employees engaged in a strike against such contractor.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act of June 30, 1936, as amended (41 U.S.C. 35), is amended by redesignating paragraphs (a) through (e) thereof as paragraphs (1) through (5), respectively; by inserting "(a)" immediately before "in any contract made and entered into by an executive department"; and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) In all contracts for procurement of personal property made and entered into by any agency of the United States (other than contracts for procurement on a fixed-fee basis), there shall not be included as an allowable item of cost any costs incurred by the contractor which are directly attributable to the employment of individuals to replace employees engaged in a strike against the contractor, including but not limited to costs of excessive spoilage of material, costs of training replacements, costs incurred in advertising for and employing replacements, and costs of overtime payments paid to such replacements which are in excess of those reasonably to be expected to have been paid the employees replaced.

"(c) No contract for procurement of personal property shall be made and entered into by any agency of the United States on a fixed-fee basis unless the contractor warrants that he has not included in the computation of the contract price any amounts for costs expected to be incurred by him and directly attributable to the employment of individuals to replace employees engaged in a strike against the contractor, including but not limited to costs of excessive spoilage of material, costs of training replacements, costs incurred in advertising for and employing replacements, and costs of overtime payments paid to such replacements which are in excess of those reasonably to be expected to have been paid the employees replaced.

"(d) The President, personally, or the Secretary of Defense, personally, may waive the application of subsection (b) or (c) of this section in the case of any contract entered into pursuant to chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, or title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 where he determines that the national security so requires."

Apportionment Ruling Assailed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Evening Star of March 28, 1962:

APPORTIONMENT RULING ASSAILED—SUPREME COURT DECISION VIEWED AS REWRITING OF THE CONSTITUTION

Men who have long tried to hold the Supreme Court in special veneration cannot now deny that it is rewriting the Constitution and meddling in politics to suit the wishes of some—but only some—of nine unelected men.

This is the central, the true and tragic, meaning of the new divided court decision claiming for the Federal judiciary the unexampled power to make its own determination as to whether seats in State legislatures are rationally apportioned as between urban and rural areas.

This extraordinary ruling to their enduring credit was ably and memorably opposed by the two best legal minds on the bench, Justices Felix Frankfurter and John Marshall Harlan. On its face it is a good thing. For it is undeniable that rural voters in many States have been given disproportionate voices in their legislatures by redistricting formulas which penalize city voters.

Thus, no doubt there will be dancing in the streets of the metropolitan centers—indeed, in the metropolitan centers in which this column now appears. But those who are celebrating this presumed fall of rural dominance would do well to take a second thought and a second look below the surface.

For something else is falling, too—the Constitution of the United States as we have known it. It is being altered not by Congress and people—the only constitutional way for its alteration—but rather by a momentary majority of a court which seems fatally determined to change the whole social and political fabric of this country—on its own writ and mandate.

It may well be that such changes should be made. But they cannot rightfully be made merely and solely by a handful of men—six men in this case—whose thirst for reform has caused them to falter in a high mission. This is the high mission of a cool, detached, impersonal justice which is the only true distinction of the loftiest court in all the world.

Losing this, the Court in the end will lose, itself. And this is the greatest tragedy of all.

"Well," it will be said, "if the rural people have in fact gained undue power and the legislatures themselves won't do anything about it, why shouldn't the Supreme Court step in?"

The ultimate answer is that the Court should not "step in" simply because it has no right under the Constitution to do so, a fact which until now it has repeatedly recognized over the long course of nearly two centuries.

And the practical answer is that the people themselves must work out their own difficulties here, however long and hard the task, if we are to maintain the Constitution of the United States. A bleak prospect? Yes. But listen to Justice Frankfurter, a great judge who a generation ago was the very symbol of "radicalism" to certain excited conservatives but who has now proved himself a towering guardian of that best of all conservatism, which is constitutionalism:

"There is not under our Constitution a judicial remedy for every political mischief. In a democratic society like ours relief must come through an aroused public conscience that sears the conscience of the people's representatives."

Not a thousand rotten boroughs in the legislatures can justify what is now happening. For the Supreme Court is being made the agent of a determined political drive by urban interests to reverse the balance of po-

litical power and so make urban voter hereafter master over rural voter.

There is nothing evil in this drive; there is no criticism in this column of the motives or actions of those who thrust this case before the Court. The business of advocates is to advocate. But the business of the Supreme Court is to judge and decide, not what is good for country and people but what the Constitution and laws are—not what they should be.

America Can't Compete?—A Myth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, Eric Johnston, businessman, former president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and Government adviser on economic policy and in other capacities during the past 30 years, has written what I think is one of the most comprehensive and easy to digest analysis of the foreign trade issue I have come across to date. Because of the intense interest in this issue among industry, business, workers, the general public, and in Congress, I would like to include this analysis in the RECORD that it might be shared more broadly. It was published by the New York Times magazine in its March 11, 1962, edition:

AMERICA CAN'T COMPETE?—A MYTH

(By Eric Johnston)

We face the Common Market, and we know we must act. But we hesitate—trapped by the dangerous myth that U.S. business cannot compete with foreign business. Have we really priced ourselves out of world markets? Can we compete against lower wages abroad? Are foreign imports hurting us? Will tariff reduction destroy us?

To answer these questions, and demolish the myth, let us examine three areas: (1) Our ability to compete abroad, (2) our ability to compete with foreign imports at home, and (3) our prospects for competition in the future.

First, consider our ability to compete abroad. Where do we now stand?

The United States exports annually more than $20 billion worth of goods, and imports about $15 billion worth. In 1960 we enjoyed a favorable balance of trade with every industrialized nation of the free world. We exported almost twice as much as Great Britain or Western Germany, our closest competitors, and about five times as much as Japan. And no other nation approached our volume of imports.

Western Europe and Japan are probably cited more often than any other parts of the world as areas we should fear. And yet in the first 9 months of 1961 our total exports to Western Europe were 59 percent greater than our total imports from that region, and our exports to Japan were 73 percent greater than our total imports from there.

Do these figures show any inability to compete? Quite the contrary.

But what gives us a right to believe we can stay ahead if we adopt a more liberal trade policy, if we move closer to the Common Market?

The single most important factor is productivity—output per man-hour. It enables us to compete despite lower hourly labor costs overseas.

A study some time ago showed that when the average Japanese worker was earning 22 cents an hour, his American counterpart was receiving $1.95 an hour. But the Japanese worker produced 30 cents' worth of merchandise an hour, while the American produced $3.19 worth an hour.

President Kennedy offered another comparison in his trade message to Congress. He noted that a coal miner in the United States is paid 8 times as much an hour, as a Japanese coal miner, but produces 14 times as much coal per hour.

A recent study by the National Industrial Conference Board compared factories in the United States with American-owned plants abroad. It found that productivity in firms operating abroad averaged about four-fifths of that in domestic plants. For Latin America, it was little more than a third of ours; for Australia, slightly less than half. If the study had included wholly foreign-owned firms, our comparative advantage would have been even greater.

Manufacturers gave many reasons for this disparity. A business leader from the stone, clay and glass industry attributed it to "more modern equipment, better tooling and faster productive pace" in the United States. Others stressed the lack of mechanical skills and industrial experience abroad.

Another major reason for our high productivity is the amount of capital equipment assisting the American worker. The average American worker is supported by about $13,000 worth of capital equipment—in some instances much more.

Compare this with figures abroad. In the United Kingdom and Western Germany the average worker is supported by only about $4,500 worth of capital equipment. In Belguim, $7,500 worth, and in India something less than $300 worth.

A second factor in our ability to compete abroad is the cost of materials. In half of the National Industrial Conference Board observations in every foreign area except the United Kingdom, plant expenditures for materials were more than 15 percent higher than in the United States. And in a full one-third of the firms studied, with the exception of those in Britain and Canada, material costs were more than 45 percent higher.

Often, in assessing production abroad, we tend to overlook the full range of essential materials. We think only of raw materials or natural products. Sometimes these are cheaper overseas. But when it comes to processed materials and component parts such as plastics, artificial fibers, and paper products, we have a distinct advantage.

These materials are less expensive and more readily available here because of the greater size and diversity of our economy. Furthermore, the quality of such materials available abroad is often inferior. As a result, the foreign producer must use larger quantities of some materials to meet specifications.

Frequently, also, the lower production volume abroad adds to materials costs. In the milling industry, for example, there is a tremendous waste of metals in the production process. If you produce in large enough volume, it may pay you to sweep up the metal scrapings for reuse. But if your volume is low—as it is abroad—you cannot afford this saving.

Probably the value of our materials-costs advantage can best be seen in the Common Market. There, where labor and overhead are substantially lower, this single factor offsets in large measure the Common Market's advantages in all other areas of cost.

Actually, the wage differential is not such an advantage as is often imagined. Fringe benefits, for instance, are a cost factor often overlooked. In many foreign labor markets they have increased more rapidly than wages. One study showed they constituted 74 percent of hourly cash wages in Italy, 52 percent in France, and 44 percent in West Germany. At the same time, they represented only 21 percent in the United States.

All the fringe benefits familiar to us are covered in these programs abroad. In addition, some European laws call for special payments for length of service, or family allowances based on the number of workers' children.

On the whole, these fringe payments tend to be fixed costs. In periods of economic stress, they prove costly to foreign management.

Furthermore, there is every indication that the wage differential itself is narrowing all the time.

From January 1960 to the end of 1961 our rise in gross hourly earnings was 5 percent, while in Germany and Holland it was 12 percent and in France it was 11 percent. Foreign wages, of course, start at a lower base, but these figures indicate the trend. Certainly, we can expect European labor to insist ever more vigorously on its share of Europe's new abundance. And it has strong trade unions to back up its demands.

Consider the trend in Japan, also. A survey of more than 250 big industrial firms there revealed that wages rose almost 10 percent from July 1959 to July 1960. They went up 13 percent in Japan's light electronics firms.

Productivity, materials, a lessening wage disparity—all these things are important. But production costs and manpower are not the only determinants of our ability to compete. Competition does not end at the final stop on an assembly line. Distribution methods, credit terms, and sales promotion are all essential, too. In all these fields our ability to compete abroad is impressive.

The second point we must consider is our ability to compete with foreign imports here at home.

For too long we have looked upon imports as job-destroyers. Actually, only about one-fourth of the total value of our imports is in lines of economic activity which directly compete with U.S. production. Since these imports represent only a small proportion of our total domestic output, less than one-half of 1 percent of American workers would be damaged by increased imports through tariff reductions.

Contrast this with the fact that the jobs of more than 3 million of our workers depend on our exports. For example, the United States-Japan Trade Council estimates that in 1960 our exports to Japan alone were responsible for about 190,000 American jobs. Nearly 34,000 Texans, more than 20,000 Californians, almost 12,000 Mississippi residents, and about 7,000 New Yorkers, among others, directly owed their jobs to our exports to Japan. We stand to lose more jobs through retaliatory tariffs against our exports than we would lose by admitting imports.

We fail to consider that many of our imports are job creating. Foreign cars, for example, provide jobs in transportation, distribution, retail sales, maintenance, and repair.

Yet the myth about the dire effects of import competition persists. It remains with us even though three of our major industries have disproved it: the watch industry, the photographic industry and the automobile industry.

Immediately after World War II, Swiss watches dominated our domestic market. By 1954 imports were so high that the Tariff Commission increased the watch tariff by 50 percent. Domestic sales still declined.

The watch industry saw that it must act to survive. New products and new ways of making watches were developed. New subsidiaries were acquired to broaden the economic bases of the companies. More attrac-

tive pricing, better promotion, and many other changes were effected.

One firm simplified the design of its new low-priced line of watches so that it contained only 150 parts instead of the 205 in an earlier model. Another company used a new automatic drilling and cutting machine that performed 150 precision operations on the plate of a watch—a technological accomplishment by a domestic industry that hitherto had relied chiefly on Swiss-designed machinery.

From this all-out push came the biggest technological development in watch design of the postwar years—the electric watch. It was completely a product of American research and initiative.

Today, the domestic jeweled-lever watch industry is healthier than it has been in years. And the major advances made along almost all lines promise added dividends for the future.

The photographic industry has always faced stiff foreign competition. In recent years the need for action became evident. Bell & Howell, for example, faced a decision: Should it seek tariff protection, or should it attempt to compete more vigorously.

Charles H. Percy, Bell & Howell's president, explained the company's decision in these words: "Foreign competition and high wage rates forced Bell & Howell to find new and better ways of doing things, which in turn broadened Bell & Howell's markets."

Part of the outcome is reflected by some figures on U.S. camera exports. Purchases in the Common Market countries of American-made 8-millimeter movie cameras rose from 5,000 units in 1948 to 140,000 units in 1958, and are expected to jump to 430,000 a year by 1970.

Finally, take the auto industry. The foreign car influx came in an area of production that had been ignored by American auto producers. When they began to produce compact cars, foreign sales went down. The fact that Volkswagen sales remain high points up the lesson. One reason is that no American car competes with it directly in size and price.

These examples show that an American industry can compete successfully when it sets out to do so. If it ignores areas of its consumer market, of course it can expect foreign producers to move in. What is necessary is ingenuity, skill, inventiveness. Industries characterized by technological lag or unimaginative leadership will increasingly find themselves in trouble. Higher tariffs will not make them better able to compete. Nor will tariffs help them to survive. Their salvation rests in their own hands.

We have demonstrated our ability to compete at home and abroad under existing conditions. But profound changes are on the way in international trade patterns. Do they threaten our economy? Shall we still be able to compete?

The answer is clear. The Common Market provides us with a unique opportunity; a chance to penetrate a mass market similar to our own.

The collective gross national product of the Common Market nations is rising about 5 percent a year—about double the rate in the United States and Britain. If it continues to grow at that rate, it will reach the level of our economy in 15 to 20 years. Even by 1970, per capita spending in Western Europe is expected to jump 35 percent, for housing and furniture, almost 50 percent for appliances, and about 59 percent for automobiles.

This means that great untapped markets will be opened. A congressional committee studying Europe's market potential recently heard these figures:

In the United States the automobile market is already more or less 100 percent saturated, while in the Common Market it is only 19 percent saturated. The market for television sets here is 89 percent saturated; there, 10 percent saturated. The radio market here is 96 percent saturated; there 20 percent. The refrigerator market here is 98 percent saturated; and 12 percent there. For washing machines, the figures are 91 percent here and 12 percent in the Common Market countries.

The compelling question is how best to seize the opportunity to trade in this world supermarket.

The first step is the administration's new trade program. The President must be given broader tariff-cutting authority if we are to gain access to the thriving European market. The alternative is to be shut out by the common external tariff wall that the Common Market expects to have established by 1966. We have no choice but action now, no matter how painful or inconvenient. And we must look to adjustment assistance—coupled with independent initiative—to repair the initial, temporary damage that occurs.

The second step is up to American business. Only a small percentage of our industries engage in export activities, and many of these have come to take our export surplus for granted. As change comes, they will find a surplus is no longer automatic.

United States business will have to launch a concerted, well-planned effort to sell in foreign markets. It will have to toss out old ideas and come up with fresh skills. It will have to start designing for foreign markets right on the drawing board and follow through effectively in every area of merchandising. The export field is not a place to dump leftovers from the domestic market.

As an illustration, the Japanese consumer buys a washing machine that is a small tub with a simple agitator. He buys a refrigerator with a volume of only 2 cubic feet. American manufacturers cannot expect to sell him our automatic washers and our 12-cubic-foot refrigerators.

In short, American business will have to emulate Europe by taking "a brisk shower of competition." In my opinion, we will benefit immeasurably from it.

The only thing that can block us is fear of competition from the world outside. And I repeat: it is a myth that United States business cannot compete with foreign business. We are competing successfully abroad. We are competing successfully at home. And we know how to compete in both areas in the future.

Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news release of the Bipartisan Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education under date of March 28, 1962. I particularly call to the attention of my colleagues in the House the very distinguished people who are members of this bipartisan committee.

CITIZENS ASK CONGRESS FOR BIPARTISAN LEGISLATION

WASHINGTON, D.C., March 28.—The Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid to Public Elementary and Secondary Education today called upon the Congress to take the initiative in developing legislation to assist the States in speeding up necessary improvements in public education.

In a letter received today by all Members of the House of Representatives, the citizens committee declared: "The members of this committee—no less than the Members of the U.S. Congress—have differed sharply in the past as to the proper role of the Federal Government in the financing of education. As individuals, we remain less than unanimous on particular details. Despite such differences, however, we have joined together in establishing this committee to support a bipartisan approach to education legislation because we are convinced that our Nation has reached a moment of history when such unity is urgently needed in the national interest."

The type of legislation preferred by the citizens committee is along the lines of the bill prepared on a bipartisan basis and introduced by Representative CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, Democrat, of West Virginia, chairman of the House Subcommittee on General Education. This bill features lack of Federal control, State and local determination of the use of funds, and economical administrative arrangements that would probably require no additional State or Federal employees.

The program of the citizens committee includes presentations by State education officials to show how the Federal funds would supplement State funds in financing better education. State Commissioners of Education Warren G. Hill, of Maine, and A. W. Ford, of Arkansas, appeared before the subcommittee today.

"This bill obviates Federal control," said Commissioner Hill, "which is an important consideration along Main Street. It is not complicated or obscure. It is readily understandable and its objectives are clear. Popular support will follow understanding, and this should not be difficult to obtain. If enacted, this bill will provide badly needed assistance to education."

Commissioner A. W. Ford, of Arkansas, also testified in favor of the bill. He explained that "the Federal funds would lift the level of education in the poorest school districts throughout the State. It would also provide additional Federal funds for improving library facilities, purchase of equipment and supplies, payment of outstanding indebtedness for school construction, and other critical needs. The new approach is by far the best proposal yet offered Congress in the field of general financial assistance to elementary and secondary education."

Members of the Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education, are as follows. Members serve as individuals, titles are for identification:

Chairman: George J. Hecht, publisher, Parents' magazine; and chairman, American Parents Committee, Inc.

Executive vice chairman: Bernard Locker, Washington, D.C.

William Benton, chairman of the board, Encyclopaedia Britannica, former U.S. Senator from Connecticut.

Barry Bingham, editor and publisher, Courier-Journal and Louisville Times.

James B. Conant, president emeritus, Harvard University.

Gardner Cowles, editor and president, Look magazine.

Lawrence G. Derthick, former superintendent of schools of Chattanooga, Tenn., and former U.S. Commissioner of Education.

Walt Disney, chairman of the board, Walt Disney Productions.

Arthur S. Flemming, president, University of Oregon, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Marion B. Folsom, director, Eastman Kodak Co., former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Edgar Fuller, executive secretary, Council of Chief State School Officers.

Nelson C. Jackson, associate executive director, National Urban League.

Eric Johnston, president, Motion Picture Association of America, former president, Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

Austin J. McCaffrey, executive director, American Textbook Publishers Institute, former State Commissioner of Education of New Hampshire.

Earl J. McGrath, executive officer, Institute of Higher Education, Teacher's College, Columbia University, former U.S. Commissioner of Education.

William C. Menninger, M.D., president, the Menninger Foundation.

M. D. Mobley, executive secretary, American Vocational Association.

James S. Peters, board chairman, Bank of Manchester, Georgia, and chairman, Georgia State Board of Education.

Walter P. Reuther, president, International Union, United Automobile Workers.

Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, public and industrial relations counsel, former Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Harry Scherman, chairman, Book of the Month Club, and trustee, Committee on Economic Development.

Howard K. Smith, news analyst, American Broadcasting Co.

Jesse G. Stratton, farmer, member, Clinton, Okla., School Board, former president National School Boards Association.

H.R. 10904: Appropriations for Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, 1963

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10904) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this bill with a sense of satisfaction and of pride in the Congress. In a very large sense, this bill goes closer to every American home, is more intimately entwined with the heartthrobs in every American family, than any other legislative measure that has come or will come before us at this session of the Congress. There is no wiser expenditure of the public moneys than that covered by the appropriations for the health, education, and welfare of the American people.

How many lives have been saved, how many lives have been prolonged, how much grief has been spared the loved ones in family circles can only be estimated. But I do know, and I take pride in the fact, that largely owing to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and the dedicated members of his subcommittee this Nation of ours has the greatest and all-inclusive program of medical research in all the recorded history of mankind.

This program opens the door to a future in which no longer the dread diseases of cancer, heart, and other afflictions, now beyond the power of medicine and surgery to reach, will hang over every home, no one knowing when or where they will strike. Today some 20 percent of the electors of the United States are 65 years of age or older. This compares with an average span of life of 30 or 40 years in many countries.

It is most heartening to me, and I am sure to all my fellow Americans, that at a time in the history of the world when we are throwing billions of dollars into armaments and the instruments of human destruction we are financing on a scale heretofore unapproached a program to save and to prolong the lives of our people and to give to all mankind the benefits of our research.

Mr. Chairman, I venture the prediction that long after the names of many great statesmen, who in their spheres have rendered herculean service, have been forgotten the name of JOHN FOGARTY will remain, an inspiration to oncoming generations. He is one of the very, very few men in all our political history who refused a seat in the U.S. Senate, offered him on a silver platter. JOHN FOGARTY elected to remain in this body because of his devoted dedication to the task for humanity that providence had entrusted to him. The stature of JOHN FOGARTY towers among us in this historic Chamber where so many of the Nation's great have grappled as giants with the problems of their times and have achieved eternal glory.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is an appropriate time to mention a volume that recently has come from the press, entitled "Patient Care Facilities; Construction Needs and Hill-Burton Accomplishments." The volume, published by the American Hospital Association, 640 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, is the result of a research project financed by the National Institute of Health—grant W-43—and the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. The authors are Dr. Alan E. Trelgar and Don Chill, respectively director and assistant director of the research, representing years of intensive study. I am happy to say that Mr. Chill is a former constituent of mine, a worthy son of parents who long have been outstanding leaders in the Hyde Park community in Chicago and have contributed mightily to civic advancement. His mother, Rella Chill, has been among my most faithful friends and towers of strength in seven campaigns in the Second District of Illinois.

The Burton-Hill Hospital Survey and Construction Act was signed by President Truman on August 13, 1946. It initiated a remarkable public policy that enabled the Federal Government, in cooperation with State and local governments and nonprofit groups in the health field, to make grants for the construction of hospitals and related facilities that can serve the entire population. The Burton-Hill Act was a great forward-moving accomplishment of the Congress in the administration of President Truman.

I recommend to my colleagues interested in the subject the reading of this study of Dr. Trelgar and Mr. Chill, representing as I have said several years of searching quest for the facts and contained in a volume of 231 pages. Some of the conclusions reached by the authors may be controversial, but controversy when argued on both sides with sincerity and factual presentment is wholesome, and in this America of ours the issue finally is resolved in the good commonsense of the American people. The work of Dr. Trelgar and Mr. Chill is, as far as I know, the most complete study ever made of the operation of the Burton-Hill Act in the 16 years of its glorious history.

Peter Francisco, Hercules of Revolution, Symbolized Great Portuguese Traditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Anthony Cama of Lynn, Mass., which appeared in the Lynn Sunday Post on March 11, 1962:

PETER FRANCISCO, HERCULES OF REVOLUTION, SYMBOLIZED GREAT PORTUGUESE TRADITIONS

(By Anthony Cama of the Italian Center, Lynn)

PETER FRANCISCO: HEROIC PORTUGUESE PATRIOT OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

A Hercules; a man of brawn,
He fought to keep our country free.
With Washington he swung his sword
To conquer England's tyranny.

He was a Portuguese by birth
And lived his life as bonded slave—
Until he found the New World's earth
Could be the free land for the brave.

Francisco came to love this land
And he knew what was right from wrong.
He gave his heart and gave his hand
To fill America with song.

Francisco, all of Portugal, is bright
With echoes of your deeds and fame.
You fought to save our freedom's light.
We praise and glorify your name.

—ANTHONY CAMA.

Although Portugal is not today a great world power, this tiny warm nation was one to be reckoned with in the 15th and 16th centuries.

Those were the magnificent exciting days of exploration, and Portuguese sailors were pioneers in searching for and finding many priceless new sea routes. Henry the Navigator, a great luminary in the struggle for the New World, encouraged exploration and colonization. Portuguese ships were the first to sail around Africa to reach India, and Portuguese ships were the first to reach Brazil.

From beautiful Lisbon, the home port of important oceanic voyagers of discovery, sailed tiny craft which led the way to India, the Isles of Spice, the rivers of Brazil.

INVASIONS

Portugal was first settled by the Phoenicians and Carthaginians and then invaded by the Greeks and later by the Romans. The Romans were conquered by the Goths in the fifth century, and the Goths, in turn, went down to defeat before the invading Moors in the eighth century. Late in the 11th century the Moors were mastered by the Christian peoples under Ferdinand of Spain, for Portugal was a part of Spain.

In 1095 Henry of Burgundy was made Count of Portugal. Henry's son, Alfonse I, wrested independence from Spain in the 12th century and became the first King of Portugal. The country reached its glorious peak in the 15th and 16th centuries with proud and wonderful explorations.

Great credit is due Christopher Columbus, the immortal Italian discoverer of America, but the fabulous route to India was found by Vasco da Gama as he proudly carried the flag of Portugal. Da Gama, who came from a noble Portuguese family, went to sea as a boy. During that fantastic age of navigation and daring exploits, he heard the call of faraway lands.

REACHED INDIA

In 1947, 5 years after Columbus' first voyage, the King of Portugal commissioned Da Gama to explore a route to India by way of the Cape of Good Hope, which Bartholomeu Dias had rounded several years earlier. Da Gama made the voyage, reached India, and returned to tell of the marvelous land, its mysteries, and its exotic spices and riches. Given the rank of a noble, Da Gama returned to India and in the year of his death became its viceroy.

Henry the Navigator is Portugal's greatest pride, and all the world owes a great debt to this third surviving son of King John the Great. Henry early grew to love the sea and sought to enhance the power of his beloved land by exploration and discovery. He founded a school of navigation, bringing the finest astronomers and mathematicians to Sagres, where his observatory was located.

He soon established Portugal as the leader in Atlantic navigation. His mariners, inspired and daring, went forth to find the Azores, Canaries, and Madeira Islands as well as to map and explore the coast of Africa. The discoveries brought fame and riches to Portugal.

INSPIRATION

Henry did not live to see his greatest dream come true—the discovery of the route to India. But his fearless vision and inspiration were the fountainheads of Vasco da Gama's success for the glory of Portugal.

It is, therefore, most proper that the pages of the Lynn Sunday Post bring this small but glorious story to the attention of the public. Our great Nation has made strides via the many contributions of citizens of other countries. Our philosophy of freedom and our immense modern progress and achievement are the result of the sacrifices and effort of men and women born in the crucibles of the anguish and sufferings of other lands.

This writer and the editors of the Sunday Post are aware of the tremendous responsibility which a newspaper has to bring to the people's attention the names and deeds of outstanding men and women of foreign lands who fought and died that this soil could be the haven of all persecuted and freedom-hungry peoples.

The golden age of Portuguese history is full of great names and events. Batholomew Dias rounded the Cape of Good Hope. St. Francis Xavier and the poet, Luis de Camoens, lived in Goa, the Portuguese colony in India.

TRIBUTE

On Thursday, Gov. John A. Volpe will issue a tribute to honor Peter Francisco, a boy of Portuguese origin who settled in Virginia as a bond servant.

When he enlisted at 16 in the Continental Army, he won his freedom. During the struggles of the Revolution his patriotism and physical strength were so extraordinary that they earned him the title of "Hercules of the Revolution." With is 6-foot broadsword, made for him by order of General Washington, he slew 11 men in one battle and in another engagement captured, single-handed, a cannon weighing 1,100 pounds, lifted it, and turned it on the fleeing enemy.

After the Revolution he served the State of Vorginia as sergeant at arms in the house of delegates and was always industrious and temperate and a champion of the weak and the unprotected.

The Sunday Post and this writer are proud to present these facts to the public. We honor and salute this great American patriot of Portuguese descent, Peter Francisco.

Jefferson: "The American Revolution Is Intended for All Mankind"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on February 3, 1962, along with the reform Democratic Clubs of New York's 20th Congressional District, I sponsored our second annual community conference—a forum on U.S. foreign policy. Many distinguished experts, including government officials and professors, participated in this nonpartisan all day conference which was attended by some 750 residents of Manhattan's West Side. I want again to congratulate Miss Gertrude Miller, the conference director, and all those who worked so hard with her to make it such a success. The participating clubs were: The Riverside Democrats, F.D.R.-Woodrow Wilson Democrats, West Side Democratic Club, Reform Independent Democrats, Ansonia Independent Democrats, New Chelsea Club, J.F.K.-Midtown Democrats.

Among the speakers was Gilbert Jonas, who reviewed the development of our foreign policy in southeast Asia. He stressed the importance of political reforms in South Vietnam. He urged "positive intervention on the side of change" to bring about internal freedom and social and economic progress in that strife-torn region. I commend his thought-provoking remarks to the attention of my colleagues:

THE GENESIS OF U.S. POLICY IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

(By Gilbert Jonas)

America's diplomatic experience in southeast Asia is relatively recent. Prior to World War II, no foreign policy existed. With the exception of Thailand, every country in the region was ruled by European colonialists or the United States. The postwar decade was marked by a sudden transition to independence. Beginning with the Philippines in 1946 and Burma in 1948, the remaining countries—Indonesia, Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, and Malaya—were granted national freedom. Only a few enclaves of traditional colonialism remain today.

Except for the American fulfillment of its pledge to the Philippines, none of the colonial powers withdrew from their possessions willingly. However, the march of history, accelerated by Japan's conquest of the European rulers and by the general decline of European power during the war, had forced their departures. The British demonstrated the greatest realism by peacefully leaving Burma, which they had never wanted for itself anyway, and later also Malaya, after guaranteeing a target date for independence and then crushing the Communist insurrection.

In almost every southeast Asian country, the transition was marked by some degree of violence performed by the nationalists to oust their white rulers, who usually responded in kind. The two most bitter and painful experiences were the 9-year Indochinese War, which contained the added element of the Communist-Western struggle, and the 4-year war in Indonesia. Arrayed against the nationalists in these encounters were the most stubborn colonialists, the French and Dutch respectively.

Despite any achievements, the colonial experience left deep scars and a residue of Asian hatred for Europeans, white men in general, and the capitalist system which supposedly made imperialism inevitable. The postindependence period almost always produced extreme nationalism, nativism, a predilection for some form of socialism, and a web of problems based on archaic social systems overwhelmed by rising expectations. The revolutionary momentum which produced national independence rarely stopped there—its ultimate objectives were to eliminate poverty, disease, ignorance, injustice, and the pervasive feeling of second-class status. The formula was some combination of modernization and industrialization in a nationalist context. On rare occasions, internal liberty accompanied the new order.

From 1945 onward the United States became increasingly identified with the colonial policies of its European NATO allies. Before that our experience in Pacific Ocean Asia had been largely limited to China and Japan. The fall of China produced a national trauma from which we have never fully recovered. Although we did press for the independence of India and Burma and actually provided the crucial pressure on the Dutch in 1949 for Indonesia's liberation, our policies on other colonial issues—in Africa as well as Asia—were at best ambiguous and inconsistent, thereby failing to persuade the new Asian nations that we adhered to our traditional anticolonialism.

For example, America financed the French military commitment for NATO (about $1 million daily) which roughly equaled the French expenditure in the Indochinese war for almost a decade. Without this aid, the French would have bankrupted their economy and, Asians argued, given up the war far sooner. We never succeeded in persuading the French to grant true independence to legitimate Indochinese, rather than the fraudulent formulas based on a corrupt and effete Emperor, Bao Dai. As a result, the Communists provided the only political alternative, rallying popular support and eventually defeating the French Expeditionary Corps at Dienbienphu in 1954. Rightly or wrongly, the cause of the Communist-controlled Viet Minh was extremely popular among Asians of almost all political views, even the non-Communist Vietnamese. America's association with France, however, convinced many Asian nationalists that, despite our ringing declarations, our sympathies and policies were colonialist in deed.

On the other hand, the Communists fostered insurrections in the Philippines, Malaya, Burma, Indonesia, Laos, and Vietnam.

The Communist rebellions were not limited to so-called reactionary or pro-West regimes. For example, soon after Sukarno took the helm of the newly freed Indonesian Republic, he was challenged by a critical revolt led by Stalinists. U Nu's neutral regime in Burma fought a continual armed struggle against separate politico-military forces of Stalinists and Trotskyites, as well as against Chinese Communist and Chinese Nationalist troops. No state in the region has been spared by the Communists. Subversion, terror, and violence initiated by Communists have been periodically revealed by neutralist Cambodia and pro-West Thailand. The Socialist government of Singapore has recently been threatened by its old supporters, a collection of left trade unionists and Communists.

In this context, American policy has evolved slowly, sporadically, and inconsistently. It has given the appearance of little thought and less comprehension. In the 1950's, largely under Mr. Dulles' guidance but also as a carryover from Mr. Acheson, it developed a posture based on one overriding premise: that our primary interest in Southeast Asia was to contain the Communist tide by any means whatsoever—the more direct, the better. This policy was initiated in other parts of the world by Mr. Acheson and carried to its illogical extremes by Mr. Dulles. It resulted in at least six fallacious and self-defeating policy approaches which probably caused America greater long-term harm.

First, our policymakers determined that the United States must choose between its NATO allies and the long-term interests of the southeast Asian nations. It was argued that implicitly an option for the latter would weaken or destroy the NATO alliance. Thus, we supported the vestiges of European colionialism as the lesser evil and as the better immediate defense against Communist expansion than real independence was thought to offer.

Second, American policy accorded a preponderant emphasis on military means to defend Asia. Our aid to Taiwan, Korea, and Vietnam since the early fifties has accounted for more than three-fourths of all American aid to Asia east of India. For the most part, this was military aid. Only in recent years have we turned from modest technical assistance to somewhat more ambitious developmental aid.

Third, and as an outgrowth of the previous policy, we granted support to any regime which declared its loyalty to our stated objectives. Too often these regimes were so stagnant, feudal, unresponsive to the material aspirations of the people, and/or oppressive, that we not only aided the Communists in achieving their objectives but, by identifying ourselves with unpopular rulers, also destroyed a great measure of American prestige and popularity in the region.

Fourth, our statesmen frequently articulated and translated into policy an official abhorrence for neutralism. Mr. Dulles himself labeled neutralism "immoral". The fact that American policy in the first century of the Republic was itself premeditatedly neutralist escaped his memory. And, of course, in recent years our declared neutrality on certain colonial questions led many Asians to question how categorical was Mr. Dulles' imperative. The consequence of this narrow approach was a general hostility to or suspicion of American objectives in the neutralist nations as well as among nongovernmental sectors of the alined countries. Indonesia and Burma actually rejected American offers of aid, the latter expelling our point 4 mission.

Fifth, American policy insisted upon alinement through bilateral pacts and SEATO, the premise being that whosoever signed on the dotted line was a reliable friend and actually contributed to the non-Communist strength of the region. Recent events have demonstrated the fallacy of both expectations.

Finally, by confusing the struggle between communism and democracy as one between economic systems, we often tended to insist on free enterprise formula for the use of our aid. This either proved inapplicable to new Asian nations or frightened off possible recipients who believed we were anxious to reestablish traditional colonialism in a new package.

As we entered the sixties under a new administration, some of the past policy errors now seem apparent to almost every responsible party. The right and propriety of neutralism is no longer questioned in the highest policymaking levels, despite our disenchantment with the Belgrade Conference. We are in some aid programs changing the proportion of aid to favor economic and social development. We are no longer insisting on formal allegiance or alliance. SEATO is largely a dead horse—albeit one which never really left the starting gate. President Kennedy appears less interested in exporting free enterprise, more tolerant of State-owned or State-run ventures receiving our aid, and far more pragmatic rather than doctrinaire in economic policies. (One cannot be as confident of some of his subordinates.)

However, in two major, perhaps crucial, ways we have not yet changed. First, we allowed our British and French allies in SEATO to determine our course of action in Laos last April. After a ringing Presidential declaration that we would defend Laos in March, a few weeks later at the SEATO meeting in Bangkok, we accepted the ultimatum of the European powers who refused to join any armed venture in Laos. In opposition to the British and French (the same foreign ministries which were subverting our liberal Congo policy) our Asian allies—Thailand, Philippines, Malaya, Pakistan, South Vietnam, and even Australia and New Zealand—pleaded forcefully for a tough stand and offered troops. The net result, from my own firsthand observation, was a growing conviction that the United States is withdrawing from the region and, when the chips are down, will not defend any southeast Asian nation, neutralist or alined, from an aggressor. Paradoxically, it was the colonially oriented diplomats, representing nations no longer protecting vital interests in the region, who persuaded us to default. In my view, Britain and France feared that a Western commitment in southeast Asia would seriously detract from the Western capacity to protect their more vital interests in the Middle East and Africa. But their vital interests, outside of Europe, have rarely been synonymous with those of the United States.

Second, we still pursue the bird-in-hand approach to Southeast Asian regimes, even where their popularity is clearly negligible and their policies increasingly oppressive. President Kennedy's major test came last November and December in South Vietnam where a 2-year Communist guerrilla war has substantially weakened the Diem regime. Diem's response to this challenge was primarily military, coupled with further suppression of all non-Communist dissidents. His local administrators had become increasingly harsh in their relations with the peasantry. The peasants had been squeezed between two forms of terror, the victims of double taxation, double conscription, twin reprisal. But the Communists to a large degree have persuaded the peasantry that they will win and that they are the only political alternative. The lesson from Mao to Guevara is clear enough; counter guerrilla warfare requires political methods and alternatives, as well as military and economic ones. When Diem proved intractable, we threatened to cut off aid until he instituted the requisite political changes. Tragically, however, we permitted Diem to call our bluff after he promised reforms in the military and economic areas. The non-Communist Vietnamese who can no longer support Diem were in effect undercut. As a result, every day that passes without the necessary political reforms brings a Communist victory closer in South Vietnam. This failure to stand by our demand for political reform as a basic condition for American aid will jeopardize the Kennedy-aid program not only in Southeast Asia but in Latin America and Africa as well.

I submit that American protection of the national integrity of all southeast Asian nations, including the neutralists, is a legitimate objective of foreign policy. It is consistent with our interests and our traditional ideals. Protecting freedom, even with armed might, is as liberal as the fight for civil rights at home. But the general criterion for such a commitment should be the regime's capacity to survive and its willingness to mobilize all its talents and resources for this end. Survivability is not simply a military question. Nor is it a matter of political and economic institutions alone. It involves popular participation and support, economic and social progress, planning, and adequate psychological measures, because the primary threat to national independence in southeast Asia is through subversion and guerrilla warfare, not from conventional conflict. The United States must insist on all the necessary changes, including the political, as a condition of our aid. Otherwise, we must be prepared to withdraw our aid from a specific country until a better alternative appears.

At home, our Asian policy faces two great dangers. From the extremes—right and left—we receive the usual cacaphony of slogans and oversimplifications to problems which have no easy answer, perhaps no answer at all. This can force a highly sensitive political vehicle such as the present administration to precipitous acts, ranging from overcommitment to withdrawal.

The other danger is more intellectual and the inspiration more responsible. I refer to the Walter Lippmann thesis that we must limit our commitments because our capacities are limited—a truism with which intelligent men cannot disagree. However, Mr. Lippmann argues further that southeast Asia is beyond our capacity to defend, ergo, it is a natural sphere of influence for China. Unfortunately, this view seems to be shared by such eminent legislators as Senators FULBRIGHT and MANSFIELD. The ultimate consequence of such a policy is the Chinese conquest of southeast Asia and subsequently India. We cannot, in my view, accept this alternative without returning to a fortress America policy (expanded to include Western Europe) which is as obsolete as the bow and arrow.

Our only alternative, I believe, is positive intervention on the side of change. We need a restoration of our own revolutionary spirit. As Jefferson said: "The American Revolution is intended for all mankind." Social and economic progress, the growth of internal freedom and national independence are all goals consistent with American national interests. They are also the most effective, perhaps the only, antidotes to communism. As Chester Bowles recently observed: "Our objectives must be clearly stated: It is in the creation of viable societies in which true freedom of choice becomes increasingly possible. And again let us take heart in the thought that no free nation in which social and economic progress is taking place has ever of its own independent choice accepted Communist rule."

Self-Government for District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Senate District Committee has indicated it will soon hold hearings on President Kennedy's home rule bill (S. 2342) which provides for a locally elected mayor and seven-man city council for the District of Columbia. Senator MORSE has a bill pending, S. 287, and there are bills pending in the House by Congressman SCHWENGEL (H.R. 7198), Congressman AUCHINCLOSS (H.R. 5465), Congressman YATES (H.R. 49), Congressman MULTER (H.R. 830), and Congressman ASHLEY (H.R. 3151). In the 86th Congress the House considered four different bills and the Senate passed S. 1681, which did not pass in the House. Year after year the time of Congress and the time of the Senate District Committee and the House District Committee is consumed with lengthy testimony by interested witnesses in long hearings on various home rule bills. Not only is a great deal of time consumed in these hearings, but it imposes an unreasonably large expense on Congress to devote so much effort to this one subject year after year. Local self-government for the District of Columbia was tried for over 70 years, and ultimately abandoned because of its continual failure. In 1802 Washington had a mayor appointed by the President and a city council elected by the people. In 1812 the city council was permitted to elect a mayor. From 1820 until 1871 the mayor was elected by the people every 2 years. In a recent book by James H. Whyte, entitled "The Uncivil War," which is very favorably written from the standpoint of the District of Columbia, there is an account of the last mayor's election in Washington in 1869, which ultimately resulted in Congress doing away with the mayor system of government. The writer says "the Washington municipal election of 1869 was also a bloody one." A riot developed, stones were thrown by a mob, and the police were obliged to fire into the crowd to disperse it, killing one person and wounding a score of others.

The incumbent mayor claimed that the election laws fraudulent, and refused to turn over the office to his elected successor. Finally, the new mayor had to break in the door. Under the last mayor the city of Washington fell into a financial crisis, and even the furniture in the mayor's office was seized after a court judgment had been granted to a local firm on a bill for furnishing goods to the District government. The Senate District Committee investigated the city government, and found it was overdrawn at the bank and had $100,000 in dishonored checks. The salaries of teachers, police, laborers, and employees of the fire and other departments were in arrears and there was no money to pay them. In 1871 Congress abolished all the existing forms of the mayor-type of government, and consolidated the entire District of Columbia into a territorial form of government, consisting of a Governor appointed by the President, and a legislative assembly, consisting of a council of 11 members appointed by the President, and a House of Delegates of 22 members elected by the local citizens. This type of government was unable to solve the tremendous financial problems of the District, and was finally abolished by Congress in 1874 when the District once more was tottering on the brink of the financial abyss.

Things have changed a great deal since 1874. However, the fact remains that the District of Columbia is an unique place, founded solely for the purpose of being the permanent home of the National Government. The residents here now have a right to vote for President and Vice President under the 23d amendment to the Federal Constitution. Like other Americans, they should be able to elect the officials who make the laws that regulate their lives in some form of local self-government. But the national interest does not permit us in Congress to return to the mayor-type of government which was such a failure in the 1870's. Therefore, it does not seem in the national interest to devote time in each session of Congress to long hearings on the merits of proposed mayor and city council forms of government similar to those discredited by the historic records. The local residents in the District of Columbia have a great concern with local self-government. The rest of the people of the United States have a concern with the District of Columbia as the seat of the National Government. I am introducing a bill today to authorize a joint select committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives to inquire into a proper form of local self-government for the District of Columbia. Such a committee, rather than concerning itself with the specific provisions of a specific bill, will invite witnesses and political scientists from all over the United States to address themselves to the proposition of whether or not the national interest can be adequately protected under any form of local self-government, while at the same time allowing District of Columbia residents to exercise the basic right of electing the people who make the laws. Both the Republican and Democratic national platforms call for self-government for the District of Columbia, as well as national representation. I am hopeful that the best minds in the field of government addressed to this specific problem can suggest to us in Congress some way to protect the national interest and at the same time accommodate the natural desires of the local residents of the District. A joint select committee of the kind I am asking Congress to establish will be able to inquire into this entire problem objectively and free from the pressures which naturally arise in connection with a specific bill. When that committee makes its report to Congress, we will have some guidelines to help us in our deliberations on whether or not local self-government is feasible for the District of Columbia, and, if so, what form it should take.

U.S. Overseas Airline Suspended by Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, on several previous occasions I have taken the floor of the House of Representatives to explain the dismay that many of us share concerning the operating practices of the supplemental airline industry. This type of airline performs under what is in fact, a dual standard enforced by the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Aviation Agency. Other airlines are required to maintain certificates of public necessity and convenience as are the supplements. Operating under this authority, most carriers must maintain minimum standards of safety and fiscal responsibility. It has been my contention from the beginning that the CAB and the FAA—either by oversight—or lack of vigilance and diligence to their responsibility under Public Law 86-861—which expired on March 14, 1962—have not been requiring proper maintenance of these factors as it applies to supplemental airlines. I believe I showed this very adequately in a special orders on September 18, 1961 and March 13, 1962.

I believe the article which appeared in the Washington Daily News under date of March 29, 1962, by Mr. Jack Steele, Scripps-Howard staff writer, once again provides a clear-cut example of this contention. The military has properly discontinued the use of this supplemental service of the U.S. Overseas Airlines for, first, "discrepancies," second, "marginal safety record," third, "unsatisfactory performance," fourth "confusing and contradictory financial information."

My question to be put before my colleagues in the House is that if this information has been so apparent to the military—where has the CAB and the FAA been in finding out this information?

The performance records and financial reports are and have been available to the CAB and the FAA respectively and they must now clearly explain why in their judgment these agencies should be different from the military.

The article follows:

U.S. OVERSEAS AIRLINE SUSPENDED BY AIR FORCE

(By Jack Steele)

The Air Force disclosed today it has suspended U.S. Oversea Airlines—one of the Nation's largest nonskeds—from transporting military passengers both in this country and overseas.

The Air Force said its Military Air Transport Service (MATS) had "withdrawn approval" of the line for "discrepancies" in its operations—including a "marginal safety record."

It also accused the so-called "supplemental" airline of "unsatisfactory performance" and of having submitted to MATS "confusing and contradictory financial information."

ORDER

Without MATS approval, nonscheduled airlines are barred from carrying military passengers under an order issued by Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara after 74 Army recruits were killed in a crash of a nonsked plane near Richmond, Va., last November.

U.S. Overseas, based at Cape May, N.J., has operated a worldwide air service for both civilians and military personnel. Its regular routes include runs to Hawaii, Okinawa, Puerto Rico, coast to coast, and to Florida.

Its president, Dr. Ralph Cox, a former Pittsburgh dentist, heatedly denied the MATS charges.

He said U.S. Overseas had a "good record" and had flown more than 2 billion passenger-miles since 1946 without a fatal accident.

PREDICTION

Dr. Cox predicted his airline would regain MATS clearance in a few days after correcting what he called a few minor and technical flaws.

But the suspension already has kicked up a major fuss in Congress, where House-Senate conferees are deadlocked over legislation to extend the life of the non-skeds.

Dr. Cox and other U.S. Overseas representatives had been among the most active lobbyists for a bill that would continue the authority of non-skeds to operate individually ticketed service for both military and civilian passengers.

BEHIND DOORS

Senator THRUSTON B. MORTON, Republican, of Kentucky, told the conferees at a closed-door session yesterday of the suspension of U.S. Overseas. He declared U.S. Overseas was the only major non-sked which depends heavily on individually ticketed flights for revenue.

Other conferees said later Dr. Cox or his representatives had either written them or called at their offices to urge them to vote for a bill which would continue this controversial authority.

House conferees refused to budge yesterday from the House-passed bill which would ban individually ticketed flights by non-skeds. The Senate conferees split four to four on this issue. The conferees broke up without agreement and without setting a time to meet again.

Dr. Cox told Scripps-Howard newspapers his airline's business was divided about equally between charter and individually ticketed flights. He said its civilian flights were continuing despite the MATS ban.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

MARCH 19, 1962.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Enclosed you will find a copy of a letter that was sent to Chairman Mr. SMITH.

Sincerely yours,

MARIA ROSOLA.

MARCH 19, 1962.

The Honorable K. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We American students of Little Flower High School in Philadelphia, uphold the Ukrainian-born students of our school, who ask you Mr. Chairman to support the resolution of House Resolution 211 on creation of Special House Committee on Captive Nations.

Yours truly,

Maria Rosola, Eleanor Rocchi, Mary Ann Sain, Helene Roman, Mary Sabal, Frances Santomo, Mary Salzmann, Regina Roble, Dorothy L. Schad, Kathleen J. Scannell, Phyllis Scialanca, Veronica Grabowski, Elizabeth Chandler, Kathleen Pettinger, Nora Gleason, Rosemary Marrafino, Mary Jane Stoltz, Mary Lou Dover, Cath. Jane Danvers, Theresa Clark, Patricia Lowry, Martha Mamchyn, Marian Welhan, Linda Shedzielewcki, Kathleen Wadas, Savelina Landivar, Marie Heltzinger, Rose Marie Nowrzipusk, Mary Hettel, Sharon Foley, Jean Schiano, Yaroslawa Rosola, Sophia Rosola, Bellan Koebanoush.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
March 10, 1962.

Mr. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Congressman,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed is a copy of the letter sent to Congressman HUGH L. CAREY. We thank you for your kind and very important work on behalf of the Captive Nations and wish you success.

Sincerely yours,

STEPHEN CYMBALA.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.
March 10, 1962.

Hon. Congressman HUGH L. CAREY,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Being your voters from the 12th Congressional District in Brooklyn, N.Y., we kindly request that you heartily support the resolution about the "Captive Nations Committee" in the House of Representatives. Such a committee will perform invaluable informational work to our people and our Government and also serve to focus worldwide attention on the writhing millions yearning to be free from the yoke of Moscow's colonial empire. The committee would produce recommendations of greatest value to our vital national interest.

Thank you in advance for the valuable help in this case.

Sincerely yours,

STEPHEN CYMBALA.
EUGENIA M. CYMBALA.
CATHARINA CODUS.

SYRACUSE, N.Y.,
March 10, 1962.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed is a copy of a letter to the Honorable Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH, regarding his support for the establishment of a permanent Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

MYRON SYDOROWYCH,
Chairman.

I. ROMANIUK,
Secretary.

MARCH 10, 1962.

The Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The members of the Syracuse branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America very strongly support the establishment of a permanent Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. Therefore, our request to you, sir, is to give your favorable consideration and full support to the resolution (H. Res. 211) asking for the establishment of such a committee. The captive nations are a weakest and most vital point in the structure of the Soviet Russia's empire and these captive nations should be given every possible attention in our effort to halt the Red menace from spreading and eventually to help them to return to the family of free nations.

We cannot comprehend how could the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Rusk, oppose the establishment of this committee and how little knowledge of the central and east European political background has been shown by the State Department dealing with eastern and central European affairs when the Secretary of State expressed his opinion that certain captive nations are traditional parts of the Soviet Union and that the establishment of such a committee would place the U.S. Government in the undesirable position of advocating the dismemberment of a historical state of Soviet Union? This statement definitely shows a lack of knowledge of the political situation in the Soviet Union.

The establishment of such a committee will greatly help not only the State Department but also the other Government agencies in formulation of their policies in dealing with the Communist menace.

Our request to you, sir, is to help the establishment of a permanent Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives to become a reality.

Thank you.

MYRON SYDOROWYCH,
Chairman.

I. ROMANIUK,
Secretary.

MARCH 11, 1962.

The Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH,
Rules Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR JUDGE SMITH: The resolution creating Captive Nations Week received unanimous approval when it was passed, but is likely to be ignored or forgotten under the present administration. We need the new and much more important approach offered in Mr. FLOOD's House Resolution 211 to establish a special Committee on the Captive Nations.

Considering our own danger of finding ourselves in that captive category, public awareness of all it has meant elsewhere is essential. This is the year of decision: do we keep our freedom, by great effort, or lose it through ignorance and fear?

Please approve House Resolution 211 and get it out on the floor of the House without delay. I think it is a great bill.

Sincerely yours,

ROMAINE L. POINDEXTER.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
February 28, 1961.

The Honorable D. J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Have heard reports that you are attempting to set up a House Committee on Captive Nations. I would be most interested in doing anything in my power to help you in your endeavor. This committee plus Representative PILLION's resolution, House Resolution 447, are certainly the first and most important steps to a real positive approach in our war with communism.

If I may be of assistance, I would appreciate a reply.

Very truly yours,

MRS. J. RONALD JOHNSON.

Amplified Views on Angola

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post recently sent its editorial page editor, Robert H. Estabrook, into Angola to investigate conditions in this Portuguese West African province. Mr. Estabrook wrote an excellent series of articles which my colleague, the Honorable HASTINGS KEITH, of Massachusetts, introduced into the RECORD. I compliment Mr. KEITH for bringing Mr. Estabrook's observations to the attention of the Congress. To make the RECORD complete on Mr. Estabrook's comments on Angola, which is so often misrepresented by spokesmen for various groups in the United States, I, under unanimous consent, include a telegram sent by Mr. Estabrook to Newsweek magazine:

Your condensation of my notes about Angola (International, Feb. 26), taken alone, inadvertently gave an unbalanced impression of conditions there.

In amplification, it should be pointed out that the conclusion of my series in the Washington Post was that despite many past abuses and present shortcomings Portuguese administrators now really are trying quickly to make amends. Reforms instituted last September to give Africans equal rights could make a big difference.

The time is indeed very short, and recognition of this has not yet percolated through to all officials in Lisbon. But, after the Congo experience, the demands for immediate independence for Angola appear unrealistic in view of the state of education and training among Africans. There also is a sizable white minority to consider.

What the Portuguese say they want to achieve—"autodetermination" in a multiracial commonwealth—seems to me preferable to any practicable alternative I can see.

ROBERT H. ESTABROOK.

LONDON, ENGLAND.

Reapportionment of Legislative Districts by Federal Edict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, article III section 2, of the U.S. Constitution, confers upon the U.S. Congress exclusive right to define and regulate the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the United States. The same section of our Constitution confers upon Congress the exclusive power to establish and maintain Federal courts inferior to the Supreme Court.

I have introduced a bill, H.R. 10992, having for its purpose, defining the jurisdiction of the U.S. Supreme Court and all Federal courts inferior thereto, in certain instances. The bill reads as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That neither the Supreme Court of the United States, nor any Federal court inferior thereto, shall have jurisdiction, either original or appellate, to change, modify, direct, or set aside any apportionment or reapportionment of legislative districts adopted by the law-making bodies of the respective States.

The Supreme Court decision in the Tennessee apportionment case—Baker against Carr, decided March 26, 1962—marks a new and shocking interference by the Federal judiciary with the right of the sovereign States to conduct their domestic affairs. Going far beyond any alleged denial of franchise because of race, color, religion, or sex, reversing a uniform course of prior judicial decisions, the Court asserts a novel judicial power under which the Federal courts are encouraged to intervene in what are essentially political questions, heretofore uniformly entrusted to the States. This unfortunate decision does not arise out of any issue dividing the North and the South. It must prove as obnoxious to Michigan as to Louisiana; to California as to Virginia. As an instrument for destroying the delicate balance of State-Federal relationships, it is unique and unprecedented, even for a court well-known for its disregard of the rights of the States.

The decision in the Tennessee apportionment case is a wide departure from the wise policy of judicial restraint. It strikes destructively at the Federal Union obtained by the Constitution.

The Court has assumed for the Federal judiciary, power to review the acts of a State legislature respecting the apportionment or reapportionment of the State into legislative districts. This assumption of jurisdiction necessarily implies the assumption of power to direct by judicial edict any such apportionment or reapportionment in a manner agreeable to the views of the Federal courts rather than to those of the legislature or the people of the respective States. In order to reach this conclusion the court reversed and set at naught a long line of decisions of the Supreme Court holding that it had no such power as it now assumes to exercise.

The time has now come when we must recognize that the Supreme Court is using, and for a long time has used, the nebulous provisions of section 1 of the 14th amendment to nullify explicit provisions of the Constitution. Not regarding the provisions of article 1, section 8 of the Constitution, to wit: "Congress shall have power to make all laws which may be necessary and proper for carrying into execution all powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or any department or offices thereof," the Supreme Court has not only placed interpretation on the powers delegated to the Central Government by section 1 of the 14th amendment, but it has by judicial fiat sought to carry such interpretation into execution in plain defiance of the explicit mandate of the Constitution.

Section 5 of the 14th amendment, far from obviating the above provision of article 1, section 8, undertakes to preserve to Congress all powers regarding the enforcement of the provisions of the 14th amendment, by the following language:

Congress shall have power, by appropriate legislation, to enforce the provisions of this article.

If the Supreme Court can usurp the powers of Congress with respect to enforcing the provisions of the 14th amendment, why can it not usurp the powers exclusively delegated to Congress by article 1, section 8. The language of delegation is exactly the same, that is to say:

Congress shall have power.

From a reading of the decisions of the Supreme Court during recent years, without recourse to the Constitution and the amendments thereto, one must conclude that the 10th amendment had been deleted from the Constitution. In case this amendment has been forgotten it reads:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

For many years the Supreme Court has been encroaching upon the powers of the States, without so much as mentioning the 10th amendment, the great bastion established by the Constitution to preserve the States.

The Congress must begin to consider whether a disposition is not developing through the vast powers assumed by the Supreme Court and the Executive to crush Congress between the upper and nether millstones of the overwhelming powers of the judicial and executive departments.

The bill does not deprive any aggrieved person or set of persons of a forum to which they may go for redress in this class of cases. The courts of the respective States have ample powers which they may and do frequently exercise.

Congress has a clear duty to undo the mischief of the Tennessee decision through exercise of its power to withdraw the jurisdiction which the Federal courts have now assumed in such cases. The bill which I have introduced does just that.

If our distinctive way of life which all patriotic Americans love and cherish is to survive, an end must be made forthwith to these Federal incursions into the rights of the States and localities.

Congress has the power to lay the hand of restraint upon the Federal judiciary and stop these judicial indiscretions and abuses. I hope it has the will.

False Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM V. MOOREHEAD

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable disappointment that we learned of the decision of the U.S. Marine Corps to discontinue its Reserve unit in Zanesville, Ohio, on April 1. We understand this unit, the 77th Rifle Company, is being discontinued "in the interests of economy."

This unit has been judged an outstanding one in the performance of its training mission and we have been proud that the Marine Corps was represented in southeastern Ohio. We question this decision to deactivate the unit for the reasons offered. I believe the following editorial in the March 21 edition of the Zanesville Times Recorder expresses widespread sentiment about this action and poses broader policy questions that I wish to bring to the attention of the Congress:

FALSE ECONOMY?

The decision to close down the Marine Corps Reserve unit in Zanesville is to be regretted.

It means that the young men of southeastern Ohio will be denied the opportunity to enlist in the Marine Reserve unless they are willing to travel long distances to the larger cities.

It means that the community will lose a military organization that has compiled an excellent record of public service and combat readiness during the past 9 years.

The official announcement said the move was being made in the "interests of economy." It is also apparently a part of a nationwide plan to reorganize the Marine Reserve that was recently revealed by unofficial but authoritative military publications.

But is it true economy to close the ranks to the men who live in the smaller cities and towns across the Nation, as the new plan apparently calls for?

We can name one smalltown fighting man who has become probably the most famous Marine of all time: Astronaut John H. Glenn.

Is it true economy to save a few dollars when another branch of the Federal Government is willing to spend a million dollars to find out why a baby monkey loves its mother?

Storm Damage on the South Jersey Coast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, by now we all are familiar with the terrible storm results, which have been visited upon the Atlantic seaboard during the week of March 5. Immediately upon being advised of the storm on Wednesday, March 7, I made my way to my Second Congressional District, which includes the coastal bay area of Atlantic, Cape May, and Cumberland Counties in New Jersey. I traveled and inspected the coast all the way from Brigantine to Cape May Point, and up into the Delaware Bay. The damage and loss which I saw is beyond description. It remains now to rebuild, repair, and replace, and this cannot be done without great help from the Federal Government, which I am pleased to say is in process.

The storm had not completely abated before the Corps of Engineers was checking the damage done to the shoreline, and under the direction of the Office of Emergency Planning commenced immediate operations to protect several areas from ocean breakthroughs to the bay by erecting barriers and fill. The Corps of Engineers is to be commended for the splendid cooperation extended in this early emergency even before overall inspection and planning was possible.

My purpose at this point is to commend the great work and cooperation given to the Office of Civil Defense and Disaster Control in each of the three counties by the U.S. Coast Guard and the New Jersey National Guard. The men I came in contact with were from the U.S. Coast Guard Receiving Center at Cape May, the Coast Guard stations along the coastal area, the National Guard units from all over New Jersey including the federalized 91st Air Squadron out of Pomona in Atlantic County. Each of the Coast Guard installations, which I visited was severely damaged, and the personnel had great difficulty in continuing in service, and yet they were able to meet every call which was made by the Office of Civil Defense and municipal agencies in the saving of lives, and protecting the welfare to the greatest extent possible through the storm period. The National Guard and air corps units did rescue work with their halftracks and jeeps and stood guard and patrol duty against looters. The civil defense could not have carried out its plan of action without their help. As specific examples of their work, I desire to place in the RECORD at this point two letters from Leland A. Stanford, County Coordinator of the Office of Civil Defense and Disaster Control of Cape May County to Rear Adm. William Shields, commanding officer of the U.S. Coast Guard Receiving Center at Cape May, and to Maj. Gen. James F. Cantwell, Department of Defense, Trenton, N.J., two officers who deserve special commendation for their personal service, advice, and organizing ability once given their assignment and task by Leland Stanford, the very capable county coordinator.

The two letters follow:

COUNTY OF CAPE MAY OFFICE OF CIVIL DEFENSE AND DISASTER CONTROL,

March 20, 1962.

Rear Adm. WILLIAM SHIELDS,
Commanding Officer, U.S. Coast Guard Receiving Center, Cape May, N.J.

DEAR ADMIRAL SHIELDS: May I take this means of expressing the appreciation of all of us in civil defense, as well as that of the many citizens of Cape May County, who owe so much to the splendid cooperation and actions of the men of your command, both at the receiving center and at moorings. The actions of the U.S. Coast Guard during the recent disaster exemplify in full the highest traditions of your service and will long be remembered by all of those who benefitted.

I would request, sir, that you commend the crew of the 30-foot motor sailor from Sea Isle City who made such a valiant attempt to pick up the oxygen from the National Guard unit at Avalon for transfer to Mercy Hospital and who made the trip under the most adverse and hazardous conditions during the peak storm hours. At the same time, sir, I would request that you express in particular the appreciation of those of us in Civil Defense to Messrs. Leckrone and Chesley, who maintained direct liaison with the county civil defense organization on that longest day in Cape May County history, as well as to the fine men in the communications section who maintained contact with the Coast Guard mother plane handling the helicopter evacuation from Sea Isle City. I do not have any idea as to the names of the men involved in the helicopter operation, their base, branch of service, or their commanding officers, and accordingly would appreciate your good offices in extending to them the gratitude and appreciation so deeply felt, not only by ourselves in civil defense but by so many of our citizens.

The entire participation of the U.S. Coast Guard and its various components in support and assistance of the people of Cape May County has most certainly earned for the men of your command a warm spot in the hearts of the citizens of our county and has added to their stature as "good neighbors" to our entire community.

I am further taking the liberty of sending a copy of this letter to Congressman MILTON GLENN, of this congressional district.

Sincerely yours,

LELAND A. STANFORD,
County Coordinator.

COUNTY OF CAPE MAY OFFICE OF CIVIL DEFENSE AND DISASTER CONTROL,

March 20, 1962.

Maj. Gen. JAMES F. CANTWELL,
Department of Defense,
Armory, Armory Drive,
Trenton 10, N.J.

DEAR GENERAL CANTWELL: On behalf of the people of Cape May County, of those of us in civil defense, and all others who worked together for the general welfare, may I extend through you to the National Guard units in our county and those volunteers from other units who came in support of the disaster action, our deepest appreciation.

Unfortunately I have no record of the individual activity on the part of the volunteer members of the guard units participating, but I would like to report to you that there were some men in the unit stationed at Caje May Courthouse who made a valiant effort to deliver oxygen to Mercy Hospital in Sea Isle City under the most impossible circumstances and who, when faced with defeat by the elements, would not surrender but kept on trying, only to have final victory turned from their grasp by the tides as they attempted to make contact with the Coast Guard at Avalon.

Again, General, I do not have the names of the men who took part in this action, but I assume the officers in the Cape May County unit must have a record and, in my humble opinion, they deserve some form of commendation for their efforts.

In addition, sir, may I express the appreciation of myself and members of the county civil defense staff for the most excellent cooperation, understanding and support of Capt. Eugene T. Doyle, Army Advisor, 5th Howitzer Battalion, 112th Artillery, who headquartered with us at the county control center and who worked around the clock throughout the entire period. Captain Doyle's actions were in the highest tradition of the Army, and his cooperation and advice and coordination of military facilities was of such nature that I take this means to draw his services to the people of Cape May County to your attention.

It is not my intention to draw attention to the individuals who worked with us, but I might in passing also point out that Sgt. William Bing also performed in the highest traditions of the Army, as I am sure did those officers and men who worked with him at the armory and in the field. I can say with certainty that guardsmen and units involved here in Cape May County during the disaster have added to the fine reputation of the New Jersey National Guard, and have placed them on a pedestal of public esteem to which they have long been entitled and on which they now stand securely.

Again, sir, through you may I express the heartfelt appreciation of all of us for the sacrifice and assistance rendered by the many volunteers who served during this period of tension and disaster. I am, further, taking the liberty of sending a copy of this letter to Gov. Richard Hughes.

Sincerely yours,

LELAND A. STANFORD,
County Coordinator.

I have pointed out in a letter of commendation to Admiral Richmond, Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, and to Governor Hughes, commander in chief of the New Jersey Department of Defense, that with the splendid coordination of their units with the Office of Civil Defense and Disaster Control not a life was lost in south Jersey during the entire period, and many rescues were made by Coast Guard boats and helicopters and National Guard halftracks, helicopters and jeeps throughout the area. This is, indeed, a fine record and is in keeping with the Coast Guard motto "Semper Paratus."

The Issue Isn't Tariffs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. SCRANTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker, in meeting the economic competition from Western Europe, our Nation is now concentrating on proposals for changes in tariff policy. Tariff policy is only one factor in facing this competition.

Hand in hand with consideration of such changes, there should be determination and action to hold down or eliminate inflation, to effect balanced budgets, stop gold outflow, and improve our balance-of-payments situation.

A most provocative letter on this subject from a distinguished member of the faculty of Bucknell University was printed in a recent issue of the Wall Street Journal.

The letter follows in toto:

THE ISSUE ISN'T TARIFFS

For an economist who, with the majority of his colleagues, has year in and year out preached the doctrine of free trade, patiently explained the theory of comparative advantage, and exposed the fallacies of the protectionists, it is a peculiarly ungrateful task to have to say nay to the President's proposals for tariff reform. And yet it is urgently necessary that this be said before, in the general euphoria surrounding this venture, we are led to take a step which could end in national disaster.

Let it be said at the outset that tariff reduction is good, and for all those excellent reasons set forth in innumerable textbooks. But tariff reduction is at present only one of the adjustments the United States needs to make if it is to survive, economically, in changed world surroundings.

Far more important than tariff reform is reform of our internal economy, away from the collectivist-inflationary policies of the Keynesian orthodoxy and back to the principles of a genuinely competitive market economy, to fiscal and monetary discipline in the public and private sectors.

It is one of the ironies of history that the United States, which reached the zenith of its economic power without benefit of Keynesianism, should be clinging doggedly in its hour of distress to economic shibboleths which were the ruination of our neighbors in Europe and which they have long since abandoned. Unless we too abandon these stale and unprofitable doctrines we cannot meet the serious economic challenge which these neighbors—in the Common Market and out of it—are now presenting to us.

There is as yet, unfortunately, little evidence that U.S. policymakers have awakened to the fact that the United States is no longer a free agent in the international economy; that it is no longer able to do what it wants internally, letting the world take the hindmost.

At bottom, the problem facing the Nation is not whether the movement for tariff reform (good in itself) will succeed, but whether domestic inflationary pressures—created by perpetually rising wages and Federal deficits—will be reduced or, optimally, eliminated altogether. If such pressures are not contained, excess demand at home (which is the initial form inflation takes) may be expected to consume exportable resources, thus slowing exports, and to suck in larger quantities of imports. Reduction of tariffs under such circumstances will merely have the effect of accelerating these unfavorable movements in the trade balance.

But let the protectionists, those manipulators of the power of Government for selfish advantage, not take comfort in these observations. Only about 30 percent ($5 billion worth) of U.S. imports are directly competitive with American-produced goods. Consequently, the damage to American industry and to American job opportunities from marked increases in imports may not be as severe overall as is sometimes feared (though it is doubtless true that import-caused dislocations in specific industries and in individual firms could be considerable). There can be little doubt, in any case, of the ultimate value of subjecting domestic industry to the fresh winds of foreign competition. Economic stagnation breeds under the mantle of protectionism.

While it is likely, though not certain, that we shall be able to take the long-run structural consequences of increased imports in stride, this is definitely not the case with respect to the short-run balance of payments effects of increased imports. It is these effects which demand attention as never before.

Now it is argued that against the possible structural dislocations (unemployment) and the worsening of the balance-of-payments deficit which increased imports would bring about, must be set the presumed rise in exports which the lowering of other countries' tariffs (under a system of mutually negotiated tariff reductions) would induce. But it is precisely here that we find the rub: Will the mere lowering of other countries' tariffs bring about an increase in U.S. exports? Or are there other factors—domestic inflationary pressures, to name one—which would hold back U.S. export growth?

No responsible economist has ever argued for the abolition of all tariffs overnight since the ensuing short-run dislocations in patterns of consumption, production and employment could send the economy into a severe tailspin, internally. Moreover, in the present conjuncture, such action could bankrupt us externally as well. But it is the inflationists in our midst and the growth-at-any-cost advocates who make the laudable venture in even gradual tariff reduction so risky.

The issue is not tariff reform or no tariff reform. It is whether we should have tariff reform with, or tariff reform without internal fiscal, monetary and economic reforms. The American people need to be alerted to the administration's deceitful attempt to befuddle the issues in noble rhetoric: To have it believed that tariffs can be lowered (with impunity) while at the same time the Nation continues its present inflationary course—Federal budget deficits and the coddling of labor bosses—unaltered. The one word which seems not to be present in the vocabulary of the New Frontier is "priorities." Everything is demanded, and promised, at once: From a landing on the moon, medicare for the aged, Federal aid for the colleges, foreign aid for India, shorter work weeks with higher pay, more subsidies for everybody.

According to the sophisticated reasoning of some, unless we Americans join the Common Market, we shall perish economically. Join it, by lowering our tariffs, and we shall be saved. This is not true. None of the nations now members of the Common Market were made economically virtuous by reason of their membership in that economic entity. They were virtuous, or returned to virtue

(witness the case of France) prior to and as a condition of such membership. Nor can the United States expect to succeed, inside or outside of the Common Market, unless it mends its domestic ways.

The battle for tariff reform is the wrong battle being fought on the wrong battlefield.

PATRICK M. BOARMAN,
Associate Professor of Economics, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa.

Do Colleges Need Federal Funds?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the March 16 issue of the Wall Street Journal, Edmund K. Faltermayer discussed the issue of Federal funds for colleges, and provides information suggesting that colleges can get along without Federal aid.

The article follows:

FUNDS FOR COLLEGES—MANY EDUCATORS SAY THEY CAN GET ALONG WITHOUT NEW FEDERAL AID—IF THEY MUST

(By Edmund K. Faltermayer)

Can the Nation's colleges and universities accommodate the near doubling of enrollments expected during the 1960's without Federal aid?

The colleges, now overwhelmingly in favor of legislation that would put Uncle Sam in the business of directly assisting colleges for the first time, say they can't meet the oncoming enrollment "crisis" without construction grants from Washington. Heeding these pleas, the lawmakers will probably approve some sort of aid this year, if differences in separate bills passed by the House and the Senate can be ironed out. The more generous House version would provide $180 million a year in matching construction grants.

Nevertheless, a glance at a few figures reveals that the colleges may be underestimating their ability to raise more money from private sources. Consider these straws in the wind:

Smith College announced last month that it has met the $10,030,000 goal of its current 2-year development program 4 months ahead of schedule.

MIT'S MONEY FROM BUSINESS

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, well along in its $66 million second century drive, disclosed recently that corporations alone have given or pledged $15 million—the largest amount ever given by business to an institution of higher education in a single fund drive.

Such successes are by no means limited to well-known or "rich" institutions. Mammoth New York University, largely a "subway" institution with many students from low-income families, has received $86.4 million in gifts during the last 6 years, thanks in part to energetic fundraising efforts.

Altogether, private giving to colleges and universities is now running at a rate well over $1 billion a year, or double the total as recently as 6 years ago. Some authorities put the current annual figure as high as $1.3 billion. Together with earnings from endowment funds provided by past donors, private gifts account for about one-fifth of the $7.5 billion the colleges currently spend each year for operations and for capital expansion.

Significantly, the colleges somehow managed, without direct Federal grants of the type now proposed, to increase their spending on new academic buildings, dormitories and teaching equipment to an estimated $1.3 billion last year compared with only $700 million 6 years ago. True, one-fourth of the current figure represents dormitories and dining halls financed with low-interest Federal loans under a decade-old program. But these moneys must be paid back to Washington, unlike the matching grants now advocated.

SPENDING RISE FORECAST

The upsurge in private giving, impressive as it is, is hardly cause for complacency, educators argue. For one thing, they say, the colleges' current rate of capital spending must be boosted even higher, to around $2 billion a year, to provide the estimated $19 billion of new facilities needed by 1970.

More operating funds will be needed, too, they add. The pressure to accept more students as children born in the postwar baby boom reach college age, plus the need to raise faculty salaries, will boost the colleges' operating costs to $17.4 billion in the 1970–71 academic year, according to latest estimates by the U.S. Office of Education. Together with capital expansion, the total higher education budget is expected to soar to about $19.5 billion, nearly three times the total in 1960–61. The number of students in the 1970–71 year is forecast at about 7 million, up from last year's 3.6 million.

Much of the added money, to be sure, will come from State and Federal Governments even if the present Congress passes no aid-to-higher-education bill. Together, State appropriations for State universities and indirect Federal support in the form of research grants and funds for other special-purpose projects, provided almost half of last year's total college budget of $7.5 billion.

Assuming no change in legislation, this proportion may decline somewhat. But this decline probably will be offset by further increases in fees charged students, which now provide somewhat more than one-fifth of the money. Already averaging $2,400 a year in private colleges, or 37 percent above the average 10 years ago, these fees are expected to be boosted another 48 percent by 1970.

Nevertheless, assuming no direct Federal aid of the type now being considered by Congress, private giving in the 1970–71 academic year would have to be nearly three times the 1960–61 level, to enable colleges to bridge the financial gap.

Is such an increase possible?

On the optimistic side is Dr. Frank H. Sparks, former president of Wabash College and now president of the Council for Financial Aid to Education, a nonprofit organization which fosters corporate giving to colleges. "I think the record of increased voluntary support of education has been tremendously impressive," says Dr. Sparks. "I don't think we have anything like explored the dimensions of voluntary support."

On the pessimistic side is the American Council on Education, which officially represents most of the Nation's colleges and universities. "After traditional sources of income, including student tuition and fees, have been stretched to the limit," the council has warned in a policy statement, "there will still be a large gap that can be filled only by greater support from the Federal Government."

The potential for voluntary support may perhaps be gaged by looking at forecasts for total philanthropic giving. Currently, Americans donate well over $8 billion a year to all causes—churches, charities, schools, and colleges—according to the American Association of Fund-Raising Counsel. The total doubled between 1950 and 1960, and thus rose somewhat faster than the country's gross national product. Churches get the biggest share, or 51 percent, and the second largest chunk, or 16 percent, goes to education—most of it higher education.

Right now total giving amounts to 1.6 percent of the country's gross national product, compared with 1.4 percent a decade ago. Most economists predict the country's gross national product will rise to at least $800 billion by 1970. Assuming no rise in the 1.6 percent giving rate, this would mean about $12.6 billion for philanthropy. But the total may be much larger if, as some fundraisers expect, generosity continues to increase along with affluence.

WHERE FUNDS COME FROM

The philanthropic money, then, will probably be there. Whether donors will apportion enough of it to colleges is another question. Some light on this can be obtained by looking at where the money comes from now. Currently, according to the Council for Financial Aid to Education, about 25 percent of college gifts come from alumni, 25 percent from wealthy individuals who didn't attend the recipient institution, 15 percent from business, 15 percent from foundations, 10 percent from religious denominations and the remaining 10 percent from miscellaneous sources.

Leaving aside miscellaneous sources, college officials expect a continued slow decline in the proportion of gifts coming from religious denominations. They also expect slower growth in foundation giving, following a sharp spurt in recent years.

Business giving to education, mostly to colleges, has skyrocketed in the postwar period, to an estimated $178 million in 1960, according to the CFAE. That's four times the total in 1950 and 30 percent higher than business donations as recently as 1958. While impressive, the current figure works out to only one-third of 1 percent of total pretax corporate profits, fundraisers say. A "fair share," they argue, would be the 1 percent now given by some pace-setting corporations.

Gifts from nonalumni individuals are a major questionmark. The success of recent fund drives indicates there's still plenty of such money around, but it's not certain that such gifts will grow apace in the next 9 years. A similar questionmark hangs over rich alumni. But far the most promising area for growth, fundraisers say, is the not-so-rich alumni whom many colleges now approach regularly in annual giving campaigns. Currently, such annual giving accounts for only one-third of total anumni donations.

Nevertheless, a survey by the American Alumni Council gives some idea of the untapped potential. Based on gifts in 1960 to 804 institutions with 9.7 million living alumni, the study shows that only two-thirds of the alumni were contacted in annual giving drives, and of those contacted only 21.2 percent gave.

PRINCETON'S SCORE

Ernest T. Stewart, executive director of the AAC, thinks most colleges could easily raise that 21.2 percent figure to something approaching the 72 percent scored by Princeton.

Encouraging as it is, the giving picture nevertheless is spotty, college aids say. About half of the money donated by business is earmarked for specific purposes such as scholarships or research. Only half is the sort of unrestricted money colleges are clamoring for, though this percentage is growing. Foundations, like corporations, have been reluctant to give money for capital expansion, though they have been more liberal of late in aiding development funds.

Rural Electric Cooperative Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I submit for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by Mr. John R. Pentecost, general manager of the Choctawhatchee Electric Cooperative, Inc., De Funiak Springs, Fla., presented to the House Committee on Agriculture. Mr. Pentecost for a number of years has very ably directed the affairs of the Choctawhatchee Electric Cooperative and has in addition distinguished himself by civic service to his town and county.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF JOHN R. PENTECOST, GENERAL MANAGER, CHOCTAWHATCHEE ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC., TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Gentlemen, I deeply appreciate the opportunity to file the following statement with your committee.

I am general manager of the Choctawhatchee Electric Cooperative, Inc., whose general offices are located in De Funiak Springs, Fla., with district offices operated at Baker and Freeport, Fla. I have held my present position since September 1, 1946.

My statements are directed in reply to the statements made by Mr. R. L. Pulley, president, Gulf Power Co., before your committee in March of this year in opposition to adequate funds for rural electric cooperative loans for generation and transmission. I will endeavor to show why such funds are needed contrary to the statements made by Mr. Pulley.

Our cooperative supplies rural electric service to over 5,500 consumers in parts of four counties in northwest Florida. During the course of my employment the number of consumers has increased over 450 percent with power requirements during the same period increasing over 2,000 percent. Also, during this same period we have managed to reduce our various rate schedules eight times. The average cost per kilowatt-hour to our consumers has declined from 2.36 cents in 1957 to 2.22 cents in 1961. Electric service is available at the same rate to any rural citizen who may request such service without any construction charges whatsoever; however, as late as 1948, Gulf Power Co., in areas immediately adjacent to corporate limits of De Funiak Springs refused service to citizens without electric service unless such potential consumers paid upward to $500 construction charges, and as late as 1958 refused service to certain rural citizens. Consequently, even though electric service is available to most of the citizens of northwest Florida, we must ascertain that electric power will continue to be available in quantities required for the future years. To make this fact a reality adequate power must be generated and transmitted without undue restrictions. Such can only be done with ample funds for generation and transmission. Electric power requirements in our service area is doubling every 6 years. We must also fully consider the competitive factor. As an example, in States with no rural electric cooperatives, the cost per kilowatt-hour is almost double that charged in northwest Florida. These States, without competition, have water power and ample coal supplies for fuel.

Our cooperative, prior to 1958, purchased all its power requirements from Gulf Power Co. at four delivery points. However, on December 9, 1957, we became alarmed as we noted the following statement in the press made by an official of that company when questioned by a reporter regarding wholesale rates charged rural electric cooperatives in northwest Florida by Gulf Power Co. "The ridiculously low wholesale rates are noncompensatory."

A similar statement is contained in order 2553 issued by Florida Railroad & Public Utilities Commission on January 1, 1958 relating to rates of Gulf Power Co. On March 17, 1958, this same officer delivered to me in my office at DeFuniak Springs a letter canceling all contracts at all delivery points upon expiration of their respective terms. Our first delivery point affected was at Laurel Hill, Fla., and the date being September 20, 1958 and the second at Baker, Fla., on December 10, 1958. I felt it my responsibility to obtain sources of power for our some 2,000 consumers in these delivery areas. The matter was discussed with Alabama Electric Cooperative, a generation and transmission cooperative, with headquarters in nearby Andalusia, Ala. In May 1958, an agreement was made whereby power facilities would be made available at the two affected locations, providing, Gulf Power Co. failed to submit a satisfactory proposal in lieu of the canceled contracts. However, on July 3, 1958, we received by messenger a new proposal from Gulf Power Co. which would increase the average rate at Laurel Hill from 7.586 mills per kilowatt-hour to 9.978 mills per kilowatt-hour and at Baker from 7.435 mills per kilowatt-hour to 9.874 mills per kilowatt-hour. In addition to the increase of over 35 percent, the general conditions of the proposed new contract was one of the most vicious documents I have ever had the occasion to read. Since our first contract expired in September and this being July, there was nothing further we could do except request service from Alabama Electric Cooperative, which we did. On September 2, 1958, Gulf Power Co. attempted to rescind their letter of cancellation which we received March 17, 1958 but we had already contracted with Alabama Electric Cooperative and required facilities were under construction. At this time similar incidents were taking place in Alabama and Mississippi in areas served by sister companies of Gulf Power Co. (Gulf is a wholly owned subsidiary of the Southern Co.) Perhaps they felt we were ready for the "kill."

In 1961 we paid an average cost of 8.11 mills per kilowatt-hour for our power requirements at Baker to Alabama Electric Cooperative compared to 9.874 mills per kilowatt-hour to Gulf Power Co., had we accepted their proposal received July 3, 1958, thus realizing a savings of over 21 percent. Also, in 1961 we paid for same service at Laurel Hill 8.55 mills to Alabama Electric Cooperative compared to 9.978 mills to Gulf Power Co. and again realizing a savings of over 16 percent. In addition to the savings in our power costs we receive regulated voltage and favorable contract instead of restrictions Gulf Power Co. attempted to place on us. There have been cases where we did not feel that service from Gulf Power Co. was adequate. As an example, we suffered a power interruption at one of their delivery points in excess of 30 hours and at times at other delivery points we would encounter voltage deficiency as much as 20 percent, which, of course, was not usable by our consumers.

Since 1958 we have attempted to get favorable contracts and rates from Gulf Power Co., for our two remaining delivery points. On October 25, 1960, we received their last proposal and on May 22, 1961 advised them of our objections. We did not receive any further proposal and asked Alabama Electric Cooperative to include the two remaining delivery points in their loan request to the Rural Electrification Administration which was approved by the Administrator on November 1, 1961. Our cooperative through members of our staff, have always made the analysis of Gulf Power Co.'s proposals without the application of any criteria, recommendations, or suggestions from personnel of the Rural Electrification Administration. Gulf Power Co., in short, simply has not submitted a proposal that we feel is in our best interest.

Our cooperative pays approximately 20 cents of each revenue dollar in taxes, interest on our REA loans, and capital credit refunds to our members each year. Prior to 1959, Gulf Power Co. received rapid tax amortization certificates for accelerated depreciation amounting to $12,300 which, over a 33⅓-year period, will amount to a subsidy of $18,400,000; however, prior to 1959 the total electric REA loans in northwest Florida amounted to only $11,009,557, repayable over a period of 35 years.

Our cooperative, prior to 1947 when Alabama Electric Cooperative's first generation loan was approved, paid Gulf Power Co. in excess of 1 percent per kilowatt-hour. Even if we had a firm unrestricted contract with Gulf Power Co. for 6.7 mills per kilowatt-hour the rate we now pay Alabama Electric Cooperative would be comparable due to their providing all transmission lines, substations, voltage regulators, and payment of capital credits for their excess margins.

In making our analysis of Gulf Power Co.'s 6.7-mill rate at 50-percent loan factor we find that this charge is slightly over 1 mill less than their cost. Consequently, we contend that no Federal income tax would be payable or due for this portion of their income. On the other hand, in all probability, they would take a tax credit for the deficit. In addition to their $18,400,000 subsidy heretofore mentioned and their apparent tax credit of deficit for sales to rural electric cooperatives, there is a measure in this session of the Congress to allow them an additional tax credit of 4 percent on the purchase and installation of certain equipment. The question would arise, Who is subsidized?

In view of these facts I urgently request your committee to continue to authorize the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration to make loans for generation and transmission of electric power for rural America in order that our rural electric cooperatives may continue to prosper and protect the security of loans previously made since the enactment of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936. No person, even an "investor-owned, taxpaying electric company" is entitled to hold a monopoly on such a commodity as electricity which is so vital to the life and happiness of the citizens of our Nation.

Tribute to the Little-People-to-Little-People Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate my good friend and colleague, Congressman PETER RODINO, of New Jersey, on his recent presentation of the very meritorious proposal on the little-people-to-little-people program and to express my admiration for his enterprising 10-year-old son, Peter. I refer to young

Peter's efforts in initiating a program to encourage letterwriting among the children of this country for the purpose of informing the children of the world on the true meaning of Americanism.

The overall aim of this children's crusade is to promote the exchange of ideas to acquaint the youngsters of other nations about the United States and by so doing contribute to the understanding of the fundamental ideas of all facets of our American way of life.

I admire the spirit of these young people in giving such serious thought to the problems of the times and for their recognition of this unique opportunity to increase the knowledge and respect of other youngsters throughout the world by a friendly exchange of letters and thereby offer a contribution to the good will and mutual understanding so essential for the eventual achievement of world peace and security.

Various groups—veterans, labor, civic, and parent-teacher groups—all have given their support to this children's crusade.

Assuredly, this is a program that is deserving of our encouragement and support.

Hon. John W. Murphy

SPEECH

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep sadness I learned of the passing of our good friend and former colleague, Judge John W. Murphy, of Scranton, Pa.

Judge Murphy was elected to the 78th and 79th Congresses, serving from January 1943 until he resigned July 17, 1946, to become Judge of the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania.

I counted John as my good friend whose lines of friendship extended to all elements of our social life. He was a man who contributed much to the life of the area in which he lived and the State he represented. While serving in the Congress he won the respect and admiration of the Members on both sides of the aisle.

He was a very kind and friendly man with the highest concept of citizenship; a firm believer in our American way of life with deep faith in the principles and ideals of our Government. It can be said that he was an outstanding citizen and a great American.

In all his actions John moved with ease and courtesy and respected in others the qualities he possessed himself—sincerity of conviction and frankness of expression.

So today it is with a feeling of sadness that we who were privileged to serve with him in the House record his passing. I shall remember him for the many acts of kindness that indicated his friendship and good will toward me and the Members of the House.

I extend to his family my deep and sincere sympathy.

A Pilot Project for the Reduction of Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, some communities are making strong efforts to combat and reduce delinquency. Philadelphia is an outstanding example of a city engaged in such effort.

I include a report of a pilot project for the reduction of delinquency, which I am sure will be of great interest to Members of Congress.

A PILOT PROJECT FOR THE REDUCTION OF DELINQUENCY

"Can I come back to work for you for free?" the 17-year-old asked.

"What's the problem, Bill?" the representative of the youth conservation corps wanted to know.

The problem: few employers hire young, untrained, high school dropouts. The larger problem: "hard to serve" families, a perplexing group for Philadelphia's welfare program, contribute a high percentage of delinquent and potentially delinquent young people to the community.

In 1959 organizational and functional changes in the Philadelphia Department of Public Welfare brought the creation of the youth conservation services division. A pilot project, the youth conservation corps, was set up to develop better citizens among the 14 to 17 age group.

The project aims at helping young boys to acquire sound work habits and attitudes, develop a sense of responsibility and self-discipline, become participating members of a group, and help themselves and their families by earning money and using it wisely.

The project is financed by the city treasury through appropriation to the department of public welfare. In 1962, $200,000 is budgeted for the corps.

A VOLUNTARY PROGRAM

The youth conservation services division, the juvenile division of the county court, the board of education, and other agencies, public and private, recommend candidates. Economic need and ability to profit from the experience determine choices. The corps excludes youngsters with severe problems where adjustment is improbable or those likely to demoralize others in the program.

The pilot plan provided for 50 boys; a private donation permitted an increase to 60. The 1962 plan calls for 300 boys in summer and 100 in the spring and fall school semesters.

Each teenager may take part in the corps for only about 7 months (a school semester and a summer); the limitation permits more boys to participate. Through the end of 1961, 838 boys had joined, but all did not complete the program.

WORK AND SCHOOL

Working in the city parks, the boys tackle such projects as clearing brush and parasitic plants, removing stumps, cutting dead trees, and building drainage ditches—jobs which, for lack of funds or the press of other duties, are not performed by regular park employees. City departments supply work tools and technical guidance. District 33 of the AFL-CIO Municipal Employees' Union has cooperated with the program since its beginning.

In bad weather, corps members work in city buildings and institutions and in the subway concourse. In summer, the boys work a 40-hour week; in winter, 20 hours. The schools schedule morning classes and release the youngsters at noon, giving credit for corps work.

Corps crews are not paid wages but do receive compensation in the form of weekly awards of 30 cents, 40 cents, or 60 cents an hour. The corps has set standards for individual awards: quality of performance, application to tasks, discipline, attitude toward leaders and fellow workers. The corps tries to interest the boys in using the money wisely and makes periodic checks to see how they are doing.

A group leader supervises 10 or 12 boys. Leaders control group activities and try to teach the value of kindly discipline. At lunch and rest periods, they lead group counseling sessions and encourage the boys to air their problems. Severe problems are reported to caseworkers, who then make home visits to assist the entire family.

A UNIQUE PLAN

The Youth Conservation Commission, a citizens' advisory board, guides the corps program.

The department of public welfare indicates that the corps is a unique plan among American municipalities. The department's youth conservation services division operates a variety of programs:

The community services section specializes in youth problems, including health, education, social development.

The field operations section provides intensive casework service to children and their families.

A vocational and social training program for boys and girls, age 14 to 17, is in the planning stage. (The corps is limited to boys.)

A community organization section is striving to establish neighborhood adult leadership in an effort to bring adult influence to groups of youngsters.

A gang control program is being carried out on a contract basis with the crime prevention association.

EVALUATION BASIS

Few qualitative measures have been developed to evaluate delinquency prevention programs. However, the department of public welfare reports that many boys make better adjustments to school after corps experience, and some dropouts return to school. Many develop a feeling of responsibility and accomplishment and become better citizens. The boys themselves are reported to have a high regard for the corps.

While the citizens of Philadelphia are doubtless willing to pay any reasonable cost for programs that will halt juvenile delinquency, they will, when enough time has elapsed, want to know whether performance matches the current promise of success.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, 1918, during the turmoil of revolutionary Russia, the people of Byelorussia succeeded in clearing their land of Bolsheviks and declared their national independence. The establishment of the Byelorussian National Republic was a courageous and defiant act which fulfilled an ambitious dream that had been harbored in the hearts of the Byelorussian people through many years of frus-

trating oppression. It was an ambitious dream destined to an early end.

From the very first moment of its creation this nation of 10 million understood the price that must be paid to remain free. Weak but valiant, they fought with all their power against the surge of the Red army, but they were helpless against such force. Within 3 years the Byelorussian National Republic was absorbed into the new Soviet Union.

There is little else that can be said about the fate of Byelorussia, but their tragedy teaches many lessons. To the millions of Byelorussians, March 25 is an occasion to recall their country and their dream of independence. To all others, March 25 is an occasion to salute a valiant people and their ambitious dream.

Central Ohio Public Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including in the Appendix of the RECORD my periodic newsletter dated March 28, 1962.

This newsletter gives the results of a public opinion poll reflecting the views of some of the people from the central Ohio area.

Twenty thousand questionnaires were mailed and 6,318 persons answered. This again demonstrates the keen interest of Ohioans in the affairs of this National Government.

DEAR FRIEND: The temperature is increasing here in Washington, not only with the arrival of spring and cherry-blossoms budding, but in the legislative halls as more bills emerge from the committees for debate and vote.

By the time you receive this second newsletter of 1962, the controversial omnibus tax bill should be disposed of by the House. This legislation has been considered for weeks in the Ways and Means Committee, and now the Rules Committee has granted a closed or "gag" rule which means there will be 8 hours debate, but no amendments are permitted.

This "gag" rule could very well spell doom for this proposal because there are at least three areas, including the 20 percent withholding tax on dividends, interest, and savings, which should be reexamined. (On this latter subject, I have received nearly 3,000 letters in the last 3 weeks, and only 7, thus far, favor this provision.) In its present form, I intend to vote against this bill.

Spending continues to dominate the thinking in Washington. It looks like this fiscal year will end June 30 with a deficit approaching $10 billion. In case there is any doubt, deficit means your Government is spending a great deal more than it is taking away from you in taxes; this is often called "fiscal irresponsibility" and properly so. There are several ways to solve this problem: Raise taxes, or, reduce expenditures. I am sure the latter course is much more appealing to you as you have so often expressed in your letters to me for over 3 years.

After the Revenue Act of 1962 is concluded this week, we will have the routine appropriation requests, together with many of the bills proposed by the President. The foreign aid bill will request nearly $5 billion, but the final amount is purely speculative at this time.

Reciprocal trade and related tariff matters have been in hearing since March 12, again before the Committee on Ways and Means. With the European Common Market, the trade policies of this country must be closely reviewed to determine what is in the best interest of the wage earners, business, and the whole economy of our Nation. There is also the important underlying issue of a further transfer of power from the legislative to the executive branch of the Government. Without question, this is the most important legislation facing this session of the 87th Congress.

Further, the much publicized medical care legislation is pending before the Ways and Means Committee. Much has been claimed relative to the benefits senior citizens will receive under the King-Anderson bill (H.R. 4222). In fact, there will be a Cecil B. De Mille-type extravaganza produced in Madison Square Garden, N.Y., May 20, by the promoters of the compulsory social security-type program. Everyone is certainly entitled to express his opinion as to the merits of any proposed legislation; and, in order that there be no misunderstanding of the King-Anderson bill, you should know it does not pay for physicians' services at home, office, or in hospital; it does not pay surgeons' bills; it does not pay for dental care; it does not pay for drugs and medicines outside of hospital or nursing home; it does not provide your exclusive choice of diagnostic physicians; it does not provide any benefits for over 4 million senior citizens who are not receiving benefits under social security. It does provide hospital and nursing home care, but the recipient must pay a minimum of $20 and a maximum of $90 on the basis of $10 a day for each of the first 9 days.

The return of questionnaires on the public opinion poll which accompanied the January 17 newsletter was another demonstration of the keen interest central Ohio people have in the affairs of their Government—the response of 31.6 percent, which is well above the congressional average. Many of you have requested the results of the poll which I am happy to set forth below:

1. Medical, hospital, and nursing benefits for senior citizens compulsory social security system: Yes, 21.4 percent; no, 70.5 percent; undecided, 8.1 percent.

2. Federal aid to education on public school level: Yes, 18.5 percent; no, 77.1 percent; undecided, 4.4 percent. Private or parochial school level: Yes, 5.1 percent; no, 92.1 percent; undecided, 2.8 percent. College level: Yes, 23.7 percent; no, 67.4 percent; undecided, 8.9 percent.

3. Authorize President to purchase $100 million in United Nations bonds: Yes, 10.8 percent; no, 81.6 percent; undecided, 7.6 percent.

4. Increase in postal rates of 25 percent to meet Post Office deficits: Yes, 49.7 percent; no, 41.6 percent; undecided, 8.7 percent. (Passed House, now in Senate.)

5. Free mailing of Russian propaganda as matter of reciprocity: Yes, 3.6 percent; no, 93.6 percent; undecided, 2.8 percent. (Rejected in House, now in Senate.)

6. Foreign aid to Communist controlled or satellite countries: Yes, 3 percent; no, 94.2 percent; undecided, 2.8 percent. Neutral countries: Yes, 30.9 percent; no, 56.5 percent; undecided, 12.6 percent. NATO countries: Yes, 62.5 percent; no, 25.2 percent; undecided, 12.3 percent.

7. Create Department of Urban Affairs and Housing: Yes, 9 percent; no, 80.9 percent; undecided, 10.1 percent. (Rejected by House by vote of 264–150.)

8. Relaxation of tariffs and trade restrictions: Yes, 24.8 percent; no, 56.1 percent; undecided, 19.1 percent.

9. Shipping exports such as surplus foods, ball bearings, jet aircraft, locomotives, etc., to Communist controlled or satellite countries: Yes, 3.3 percent; no, 94.7 percent; undecided, 2 percent.

10. Continued nuclear testing by U.S. Government: Yes, 85.7 percent; no, 8.3 percent; undecided, 6 percent.

The following persons from our area have visited our Washington office since our last newsletter: John E. Compson, Mrs. Evaline Grant, Mrs. J. S. Summer, Mary Louise Briscoe, Herbert G. Davis, Cameron E. Williams, Ruth Hill, Lucille Walston, Evan E. Williams, William S. and Richard Rambo, Mr. and Mrs. Harry Hofheimer and sons Steve, Craig, and John, Enoch R. Rust, Howard P. Chester, R. F. Dreyer, A. E. Dewey, Mr. and Mrs. George A. Roberts, Fred Presutti, Daniel H. Dunbar, Tim A. Wilder, George W. Rowe, Victor E. Vaile III, Richard S. Mann, Jim Burtch, Thomas Palmer, Melinda Kuntz, W. M. O'Neill, Jr., O. E. Anderson, Mr. and Mrs. Earl L. Hamilton, Martha Bush Park, Mr. and Mrs. Ernest W. Moser, Atlee J. Reeb, Mr. and Mrs. George D. Sriner, Bernard and Fred Davidorf, H. O. Parker, John W. Baker, John E. Senn, Richard I. Eidson, Joe Linville, Clyde Mann, Herschel White, Mr. and Mrs. Andrew J. White, Jr., Julie Kraft.

Mike Lewis, Byron Miesse, John Hines, Scott P. Burns, Dr. and Mrs. James J. Hughes, Pat Hone, Alan Norris, Richard H. Hamilton, Mr. and Mrs. Raymond A. Jacobs, Lynn W. Turner, Nancy L. Wesney, T. Ed. Waller, Marcus Long, Phil O'Day, F. M. Smetz, Jack Welch, William W. Stansbury, Guy Morrison, Ray E. Armstrong, Carl M. Poston, Jr., Dean W. Simeral, Stan Andrews, Mr. and Mrs. Harry Linebaugh and Harriet, F. W. Boulger, George Hahn, C. P. Sullivan, E. Padgette, F. W. Armstrong, Cynthia and Judith Yenkin, Vera L. Reynolds Tedrick, Susie M. Greenidge, Gary L. Jones, L. S. Rinehart, H. Joel Teaford, Mrs. James B. Campbell and Joan, Mr. and Mrs. Richard K. Hood, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph De Vennish and Joe, Julio, and Suzie, Mrs. J. C. Reddington and Bill, David D. White, John Moses, Donald H. Williams, Carter and Mrs. P. S. Jastram Whitney, Gilbert Coddington, William E. Grabiel, Robert H. Foster, Mr. and Mrs. Monroe Courtright, Robert E. Marshall, Floyd W. Will, Jerry L. Snowden, George W. Roloson, George U. Sanderson, W. Perry Rawn, Jack Cummins, Dwight W. Motis, Jack Teller, Charles E. Laird, Bert Ebright, E. F. Evans, Ralph Connell, William H. Haskett, Jack Cornish, E. Paul Howard, Paul S. Glawa, Lee Cook, Lindsay Evans, J. F. Harner, D. R. Foltz, W. L. Walker, C. W. Watts, J. W. Lehman, W. B. Marshall, R. G. Parkinson, Herbert T. Olpp, J. Merle Brill, William E. James, W. V. Ashton, Richard E. Morris, Walter B. Harpule, Jack E. Gordon, Richard C. Arnold, M. G. Kearns, and J. D. Solt.

Sincerely,

SAMUEL L. DEVINE,
Member of Congress.

Bill of Rights Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, December 15 of last year—Bill of Rights Day—marked the 170th anniversary of the Ratification of our American Bill of

Rights. In keeping with the great tradition of observing the anniversary of this historic ratification, a special ceremony was held at city hall in New York City under the auspices of the Bill of Rights Day Association.

Presiding at the exercises was the Honorable Edward D. Re, chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, who brought from Washington, on this memorable occasion, the personal good wishes and congratulations of President John F. Kennedy. The 1961 Bill of Rights Day citations—awarded annually to outstanding businessmen, public servants, and leaders of our community for their devoted services in all walks of life—were this year given to Hon. Adlai E. Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations; Hon. Paul R. Screvane, deputy mayor of New York City; Dr. Harry D. Gideonse, president of Brooklyn College; and Mr. Raymond C. Deering, executive vice president of Hanover Trust Co. In the absence of Mayor Robert F. Wagner, Chairman Re presented these recipients and awarded them the Bill of Rights Day citations.

Mr. Speaker, the statements of each of these men on the meaning and importance of the Bill of Rights are particularly noteworthy. For, by their personal accomplishments, they themselves constitute a living tribute to, and an examplification of, the highest ideals of personal, civic, and political liberty enshrined in our Bill of Rights.

It is in the spirit of Dr. Re's remarks calling for the attention of all Americans to the remarkable handiwork of the framers of our Constitution that made possible our American way of life, that I wish to offer these remarks to the people of our Nation. I am happy to join in the spirit of Bill of Rights Day by bringing to the attention of my colleagues and fellow Americans the tribute to our Bill of Rights by each of these outstanding Americans.

Mr. Speaker, the proceedings of the ceremony are as follows:

REMARKS OF HON. EDWARD D. RE, CHAIRMAN, FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION OF THE UNITED STATES ON THE OCCASION OF THE AMERICAN BILL OF RIGHTS DAY OBSERVANCE, CITY HALL, NEW YORK CITY, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1961

This ceremony, in recognition of the 170th anniversary of the ratification of our Bill of Rights, is an occasion for profound thanksgiving to Almighty God and to the patriotic men whose wisdom and foresight gave to America a legacy of liberty and freedom. It is in this spirit that we, as Americans, do well to give public expression of our gratitude to the framers of our Constitution for their remarkable handiwork that has made possible our American way of life founded upon the solid bedrock of equality and justice for all.

It is indeed appropriate and necessary that we are reminded in this solemn manner of the priceless heritage that they thereby made possible for themselves and for all future generations. And when the origins of this heritage, and the freedoms that it assures, are obscured by the passing of time or attitudes of indifference and dispassion, a ceremony commemorating the ratification of the Bill of Rights assumes special importance and significance.

THE MEANING OF THE BILL OF RIGHTS

It is befitting to be reminded that it is the Bill of Rights that forms the foundation of our civil and political liberties and is the supreme law of the land which guarantees the personal freedoms of all Americans, regardless of one's station in life, religion, or the accidents of race, color, or national origin. It serves a valuable purpose to recall that it is the Bill of Rights that furnishes the moral influence and the legal authority for the equality of treatment and equality of opportunity enjoyed by all Americans.

It is therefore fitting that the anniversary of the ratification of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, our Bill of Rights, should be remembered by the Nation that for 170 years has reaped the immeasurable blessings of life and liberty that are enshrined in that charter: freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, and the free right to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Those who have long enjoyed these freedoms must never forget that men have gained them only after great struggle, and have died to preserve them. We who have seen these rights and privileges lost in other continents and countries can now better appreciate their true meaning and the emptiness of life without them.

By these realizations we are strengthened in the unalterable determination that in America such rights and privileges will never be lost, curtailed, or weakened.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE BILL OF RIGHTS AWARDS

The American Bill of Rights Day Association is today extremely proud of the distinguished recipients of the Bill of Rights Award for the year 1961. In honoring the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson, this country's Ambassador to the United Nations, for his public record as statesman and leader which stands as a monument of achievement and dedication to the principles enshrined in the Bill of Rights—in paying tribute to the Honorable Paul R. Screvane, deputy mayor of New York City, for his understanding and devotion to the ideals expressed in the Bill of Rights in both public and private life—in citing Dr. Harry D. Gideonse, the president of Brooklyn College, for his dedication to our way of life and our system of public higher education which has developed the great municipal college in Brooklyn, and greatly advanced the cause of education in the State and the Nation—in honoring Mr. Raymond C. Deering, executive vice president of Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co., for his contribution as an outstanding banker, financier, and philanthropist—the American Bill of Rights Day Association has singled out outstanding Americans whose achievements in their respective fields symbolize true Americanism and illustrate the greatness that may be achieved in a free society founded upon our Bill of Rights.

THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

It is also significant that this Bill of Rights day celebration by the people of New York City follows the 13th anniversary of the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by the United Nations General Assembly. This great declaration also stands as a permanent testimonial to the undying quest of all mankind for civil, political, and personal liberty. And to us assembled here today, it is indeed a humbling thought to realize that this universal declaration—embodying the ultimate ideals and goals of all mankind—is itself founded upon our own Bill of Rights and our own Declaration of Independence. The legacy of our Bill of Rights thus deserves not only our debt of gratitude, but that of all mankind.

May we therefore depart from this solemn ceremony with the renewed determination to strive to extend to all people the freedoms and liberties that we have secured for ourselves. Only thus may it be said that we are truly worthy of the benefits that we reap from the past—and the responsibilities that we owe to the future.

THE BILL OF RIGHTS DAY MESSAGE OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Distinguished guests, honored recipients, ladies and gentlemen, and fellow Americans, it is my honor at this time to read the message of the President of the United States and to extend the President's congratulations to the award recipients. The President's message reads as follows:

"Twenty years ago President Roosevelt proclaimed the first Bill of Rights Day to remind us of our heritage of freedom and our charter of liberty.

"In our complex and difficult world today it is more important than ever to keep in mind this document of democracy.

"To the schoolchild, the words of the Bill of Rights only begin to have meaning—his concept of our country is just growing. To the lawyer, each phrase has its elaborate history of constitutional development and refinement. But to most of us, the Bill of Rights means freedom. It is a document whose four corners hold the ideas by which we live and for which many have given their lives.

"It is particularly fitting that the Bill of Rights Day Association has selected this day to honor a group of distinguished Americans. Please extend my congratulations to Governor Stevenson, Paul Screvane, Dr. Harry Gideonse, and Raymond Deering."

PRESENTATION OF THE RECIPIENTS OF THE BILL OF RIGHTS DAY AWARDS

Ladies and gentlemen, at this time it would be my great privilege and pleasure to introduce to you the mayor of the city of New York. Traditionally it has been Mayor Wagner who has made the presentation of the awards to the respective recipients. This year the mayor cannot be with us and therefore I normally would have had the equally great pleasure of introducing the deputy mayor who, as we all know, presently enjoys the additional title of president-elect of the city council. But as it develops, the deputy mayor, Mr. Screvane, is also one of the recipients of this year's Bill of Rights Awards. Therefore, it will be my added privilege to present to this audience the recipients of this year's Bill of Rights Awards and to read the citations.

I will therefore ask Governor Stevenson to kindly rise while I read the citation that is printed on this award:

CITATION, 1961 BILL OF RIGHTS DAY AWARD TO HON. ADLAI E. STEVENSON, U.S. AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED NATIONS

"The Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, whose wide interest and wholehearted participation in the civic and political life of the community, State and Nation have helped make our country a better place in which to live; whose understanding and devotion to ideals expressed in the Bill of Rights as exemplified in his public life have won for him the everlasting appreciation of all Americans; whose public record as Governor and Ambassador is a monument of achievement and dedication to the principles enshrined in the Bill of Rights; whose keen awareness of the true responsibilities of Government have made possible a better appreciation of the American way of life in the interest of world peace and understanding."

Ladies and gentlemen, the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson.

Governor STEVENSON. Professor Re, Mr. Screvane, Dr. Gideonse, and Mr. Deering, ladies and gentlemen, I count this a very great honor that you have done me this

morning. I am also profoundly flattered by the inscription on this citation that you have just read. I take great pride and satisfaction that you consider me worthy of such sentiments. It is not, however, this citation alone which is my principal satisfaction today. It is the fact that here in New York, and throughout the country as well, Americans are once again observing the anniversary of one of the most precious jewels in our country's crown. Our farms and our factories may give us our living, but the Bill of Rights gives us our life. So I am happy to join with you today, not only in observance but also in a rededication. To me, any celebration of the Bill of Rights is an occasion for pledging ourselves anew to the principles which it affirms. For the true glory, I suspect, of our Bill of Rights and our Constitution is not in the words that were written 170 years ago, but in the deeds—the sometimes difficult deeds—that we perform under its mandate, today and every day. Thank you, Dr. Re.

CITATION, 1961 BILL OF RIGHTS DAY AWARD TO HON. PAUL R. SCREVANE, DEPUTY MAYOR OF NEW YORK CITY

Dr. RE. Thank you very much, Governor Stevenson. I wonder if I may call upon Deputy Mayor Paul R. Screvane to rise while I read the citation inscribed on his award:

"Hon. Paul R. Screvane, deputy mayor of New York, whose wide interest and wholehearted contributions to the civic and government life of our city have helped make New York City a better place in which to live; whose awareness of the responsibilities of government has resulted in numerous improvements and betterments for the common welfare; whose understanding and devotion to the ideals expressed in the Bill of Rights as exemplified in his public and private life have won for him the everlasting appreciation of all Americans in general and all New Yorkers in particular."

Ladies and gentlemen, the Honorable Paul R. Screvane.

Deputy Mayor SCREVANE. Thank you very much, Professor Re. Ambassador Stevenson, Dr. Gideonse, Mr. Deering, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am especially honored to receive this citation today in this beautiful room here in city hall, a building which is part of the heritage of our great city of New York. This is a work of art. Ambassador Stevenson earlier, when he was in my office, prayed the day doesn't come when the bulldozers might take care of this magnificent structure.

We look upon the Bill of Rights as our most precious gift, one which sets the framework for the freedoms we enjoy here today. As we preserve all of the great works of our country—written words, structures—I think this is the opportunity, on a day such as this, to rededicate ourselves and to fight with everything at our command, to see that these cherished rights are preserved here, in our own beloved United States, and, insofar as is humanly possible, are granted to all the peoples of the world. Certainly, it is appropriate, at this time, as we view the international scene and we see nation after nation in which these fundamental rights have been destroyed, to reaffirm our faith in our country and, as the Ambassador said, to rededicate ourselves, so that our country will never suffer the same fate as those imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain. This can only come about by the sincere and dedicated effort of our American people. We must start, very obviously, with our children in the schools.

I am honored, I am delighted to be singled out to receive this citation today and to participate in these magnificent ceremonies. I want especially to thank our talented singer who rendered the national anthem and our great department of sanitation for the wonderful music they have provided today. Thank you very much.

CITATION, 1961 BILL OF RIGHTS DAY AWARD TO DR. HARRY D. GIDEONSE, PRESIDENT OF THE BROOKLYN COLLEGE

Dr. RE. Thank you very much, Deputy Mayor Screvane. Will Dr. Harry D. Gideonese please rise while I read the citation inscribed on this award:

"Dr. Harry D. Gideonse, president of the Brooklyn College, whose leadership, wide interest and wholehearted participation in the civic and cultural life of the city of New York and of the Nation have helped make our community and Nation a better place in which to live; whose dedication to the American way of life and to our system of public higher education helped to develop the very best talents of all students in a great municipal college in the Borough of Brooklyn; whose awareness of the responsibility of government in the field of higher education has helped to fulfill America's promise of equality of opportunity to all; whose qualities of heart and mind and dedication to the principles of equality and justice for all have earned for him the gratitude of all Americans."

Ladies and gentlemen, President Gideonse of Brooklyn College.

Dr. GIDEONSE. Mr. Chairman, honored guests, I came here to listen and not to speak. The Bill of Rights is the most important part of the Constitution. To men like Thomas Jefferson its addition to the Constitution was a condition of his willingness to accept the Constitution itself. Jefferson and those who thought and felt the way he did, were somewhat frightened at the possibility of democratic government becoming despotic. Jefferson used to speak of unqualified democracy as majoritarian despotism, and he wanted a Bill of Rights to insure that the sheet anchor of individual freedom would be part of the Constitution itself.

The Constitution should say, as it does in the Bill of Rights, that there are certain, to the individual, sacred freedoms concerning which the majority was not even to discuss the possibility of legislative control of the minority. This is the document that we are honoring here today and I am very happy with the Deputy Mayor's comparison with the architecture of this building. The Bill of Rights is—like the building—something that has come as the development of a tradition over time, every word in it clarified by controversy, by political and legal struggle, by sacrifice even of life in the process of clarifying what it means to us today.

De Tocqueville once said "freedom is my passion." Freedom has been a passion to me all of my life and I am very happy to see in this citation a recognition of the work of a team of colleagues in building an institution that is, I hope, today a tower of strength because we have succeeded in making a reality of the equality of opportunity that is the foundation of all the aspirations of the citizens of a free society.

Thank you, sir.

CITATION, 1961 BILL OF RIGHTS DAY AWARD TO MR. RAYMOND C. DEERING, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, MANUFACTURERS HANOVER TRUST CO.

Dr. RE. Thank you very much, President Gideonse. May I ask Mr. Raymond C. Deering to rise while I read his citation:

"Mr. Raymond C. Deering, executive vice president, Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co., whose wholehearted and dedicated interest in community affairs has earned for him the appreciation and gratitude of the people of the city of New York; whose administrative and managerial skills and talents have helped develop a great banking institution in the city of New York for the benefit of the entire community; whose keen awareness of the needs of his fellow man has caused him to give of himself to such an extent that he truly deserves the recognition due an outstanding banker and philanthropist."

Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Raymond C. Deering.

Mr. DEERING. Thank you, Professor Re. Mr. Ambassador, Mr. Screvane, Dr. Gideonse, ladies and gentlemen, it is indeed a high honor to receive this citation. Although at first banking may seem somewhat remote from the Bill of Rights, our American system of free enterprise, of which our free, competitive banking system is an essential part, could not exist without the fundamental guarantees of individual liberty provided by the 10 original amendments to our Constitution. If anyone is not aware of the importance of the Bill of Rights, let him read the press reports about life behind the Iron Curtain where the individual has no rights, and about the thousands of people who risk their lives to escape to freedom. To be sure, there is banking in those countries, but it isn't our kind of banking, because it isn't free enterprise. Free enterprise has made our Nation great, and will keep it great as long as the Bill of Rights endures. Thank you.

Dr. RE. Thank you very much, Mr. Deering. Ladies and gentlemen, it is my honor at this time to call upon Rabbi Elihu Michelson of the Jewish Welfare Board, to deliver the benediction. Rabbi Michelson.

BENEDICTION ON THE OCCASION OF THE BILL OF RIGHTS DAY CEREMONY, DELIVERED BY RABBI ELIHU MICHELSON OF THE JEWISH WELFARE BOARD

RABBI MICHELSON. O God, and God of our fathers, we ask Thy blessing upon those of us gathered here, upon our city, State and Nation. May this great country ever promote Thy kingdom on earth, may it be a mighty advocate of justice, freedom, and peace among men. All men created in Thine image thereby have innate worth and dignity. Make us sensitive to their rights as Thy children. So may we be worthy of Thy blessing now and in the long years which are to come, so may we help bring glory to Thy name, until the time when nation shall not lift up sword against nation neither learn war any more. Let us all say amen.

CONCLUDING STATEMENT OF DR. EDWARD D. RE

Dr. RE. Ladies and gentlemen, this concludes the ceremony. However, I would like to thank not only all of the distinguished ladies and gentlemen that have come here—some from Washington, others from near and some from far—but also the teachers from our public schools and our private schools that brought so many of their pupils here. I am very grateful for the cooperation that the association receives annually and I would like to thank once again Captain Rossini for having given so much of himself in having made this ceremony possible. Ladies and gentlemen, our final thanks are to Commissioner Frank J. Lucia and to Mr. John M. Celebre through whose good offices we are permitted to hear this beautiful music. Ladies and gentlemen, thank you very, very much.

Negroes Who Helped Space Flight Succeed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, when Col. John Glenn was launched into space that historic day in February, the American people were one in their prayers for him

and his family and their profound appreciation of his own and his family's self-sacrifice and devotion to country. When his safe return to ship as the first American astronaut into orbit was announced, thanksgiving and joy knew no color, race, or creed bounds. But not only this feat made Colonel Glenn the national hero he has become. The manner in which he bore this triumph and shared it with his coworkers across the land and the full American people will—I know we agree—inspire national pride and international admiration for generations.

I thought again of this as I read the following article from a recent edition of Jet magazine. It is good to be reminded, as Colonel Glenn has reminded us, of the contribution of "the crosscut of Americana" not alone to this historic event but to the totality of American life and achievement:

MANY NEGROES HELPED

(By Larry Still)

As Marine Lt. Col. John Glenn whirled around the world last week, he carried with him the prayers, hopes and efforts of millions of Americans of all races and creeds, including scores of Negroes who helped launch the first American astronaut into orbit.

Like a live hero stepping from the pages of a science fiction novel, Lieutenant Colonel Glenn returned to earth before the cheers of millions and the greetings of President Kennedy to proudly declare: "We have stressed the team effort in Project Mercury. It goes across the board, I think. Sort of a crosscut of Americana of industry and military and civil service and Government workers, contractors * * *."

An on-the-spot survey by Jet revealed that among this "crosscut of Americana" were Negroes who played key roles from building the Mercury capsule to putting it into orbit and tracking it around the globe. Stationed at the National Aeronautical Space Administration Headquarters at Langley Field, Va., McDonnell Aircraft in St. Louis, where the Mercury capsule was built, the launching site at Cape Canaveral, and at Kano, Nigeria, one of the 23 tracking stations, where more than a dozen Negro experts who worked on every phase of the multimillion-dollar project from the planning stages to Glenn's successful flight.

At NASA headquarters in Langley Field, mathematician Katherine Johnson and Ted Scopinsky were credited with developing the formula used to track and recover Glenn during the first U.S. orbital flight. According to the formula worked out by Mrs. Johnson and Scopinsky, for the flight, space experts could tell exactly when and where Glenn would pass over the 23 tracking stations around the earth. Negro technicians were also on duty at Langley and Cape Canaveral and on the high seas as part of the Armed Forces aiding Project Mercury.

Although scientists have long been engaged in research on the Atlas rocket which shot the Mercury capsule into orbit, active work on Project Mercury began with the awarding of a $180 million contract for the integrated McDonnell Aircraft Corp., to build the space capsule. A check with the Convair Aircraft Division of the General Dynamics Corp. in Pomona, Calif., revealed that a number of Negro scientists also worked on the Atlas rocket but the company refused to identify them because of the classified nature of their work.

At McDonnell, officials readily listed electrical engineer James Langston as one of the designers of the Mercury capsule. Langston, a 38-year-old graduate of the De Vry School of Electronics in Chicago, was a member of the electronics team assigned to work out the telemetry instrumentation system by which Glenn kept in touch with the space tracking stations on earth. The $8,500-a-year engineer was assigned to the project Mercury in 1958.

Working with Langston were technical writers Leonard Beale, who prepared instructions on the capsule, and layout draftsman Harold Thames, who helped design the housing unit for the retroactive rockets used to reduce the rocket's speed from 17,500 to 2,000 miles an hour and angle it out of its orbital path for reentry into the earth's atmosphere.

Also helping to build the Mercury capsule at McDonnell were associate chemical engineers Joseph Swafford, Nathaniel Crump and Clinton Rayford, who tested the hydrogen peroxide fuels and fiber materials used in the craft. One of the fibers tested was the plastic shield, which had to withstand extreme temperatures when the spaceship reentered the atmosphere.

Electrical engineer Tom Gentry was formerly assigned to Project Mercury as a member of the firm's vast engineering campus, where hundreds of electronics graduates are trained. Technician William Pynter also worked in the hospital-like "white room," where the capsule was assembled. Approximately 10 Negroes were among the 1,500 of McDonnell's 22,000 Project Mercury workers.

McDonnell officials admit that Negro employees were welcomed at the plant as a result of the Government fair-employment contracts written into all defense orders.

Even with the increasing use of Negroes in the space program, the top Negro remains the 52-year-old space surgeon, Col. Vance H. Marchbanks, who monitored earlier suborbital flights with astronauts Glenn and Virgil Grissom. Marchbanks, a veteran flight surgeon, headed a medical team at Kano, Nigeria, which checked Glenn's pulse, heartbeat and medical reaction as he sped overhead.

It was like Dr. Marchbanks having a stethoscope 200 miles long to check on Glenn's body as the astronaut sped around the globe at 17,500 miles an hour. It was over Kano that Astronaut Glenn first looked out the windows to see the earth below and where he "ate" his first food on the trip—a tube of apple juice and some malted milk pills.

Foreign Oil Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the very able and distinguished Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, Mr. Edward A. McDermott, assured the National Coal Policy Conference that his Office is maintaining a constant surveillance of the mandatory oil import control program. While I can appreciate that Mr. McDermott's position in this regard is confined to the national security aspects of imports and their effect on domestic fuel capacities, I think it important that the OEP acquaint itself with the full impact of residual oil imports on America's coal mining companies.

Many mines in West Virginia are working only 2 or 3 days a week; governmental studies would therefore be inclined to assume that these mines would be ready for full production in the event of an emergency. The fact is that some of the mines not working regularly may be close to the breaking point and could go out of business on extremely short notice. Perhaps the quickest way for Mr. McDermott to familiarize himself with these implications of the national fuels problem would be to note carefully the statement presented to the House Ways and Means Committee last week by the Honorable Thomas Kennedy, president of the United Mine Workers of America. Mr. Kennedy, using statistics that were compiled in the bitter experience of mine closures and layoffs that have plagued coal-producing States for a decade and a half, warned that the recent increase in residual oil import quotas is another step toward what he called the eventual destruction of the coal industry in America.

It is a dangerous and disheartening thing to witness the gradual but rapidly accelerating disintegration of the coal industry and the States that depend upon that industry for a livelihood—

Mr. Kennedy said.

Mr. Speaker, under prevailing conditions, international oil interests are literally dictating how much employment will be available in West Virginia's mining areas. As shown in Mr. Kennedy's testimony, these imports are expropriating—or confiscating—3 million man-days of work for coal miners annually. When losses to railroads and other affected industries and businesses are added to the damage that foreign oil has inflicted on the coal industry, the impact on West Virginia's overall economy is staggering. Since 1947, when the first danger signs of the deadly effects of foreign oil on the American economy first were cited over the Atlantic coastline, a total of 2,172,227,000 barrels of residual oil entered U.S. markets. That figure includes shipments through last December 31 and does not include the more than 60 million barrels that have already arrived at our ports thus far this year. In those 15 years, the floods from foreign refineries into east coast fuel markets amounted to more than one-half a billion tons of coal in energy equivalent. A very high percentage of that coal would have been mined in West Virginia, the Nation's foremost coal-producing State and principal supplier to New England and the other seaboard fuel markets.

Now that the Ways and Means Committee has heard Mr. Kennedy's story of distress directly attributable to residual oil imports, I hope that the new trade bill will contain guaranteed protection for the economy of coal-producing States. A reduction in imports is imperative so far as West Virginia is concerned.

I commend to your attention the remarks of Mr. Kennedy before the Ways and Means Committee. They will be included when the report is ready and I trust that my colleagues will be watching out for it. His prepared statement, which was made available to a number of Members of the House and Senate, was an excellent presentation in itself,

yet he contributed so much other information extemporaneously that the entire testimony should be studied carefully. I am sure that the office of Mr. McDermott can also profit handsomely from Mr. Kennedy's remarks. In gaining this information, the Office of Emergency Planning will be much better equipped to carry out its stipulated duties with regard to protecting the ability of the United States to provide the increased energy that will be necessary in any emergency.

A New WPA?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, many of us were inclined to look skeptically at President Kennedy's proposal to spend $600 million in a public works program supposedly to help areas of economic distress. Although the objective is worthy, we felt that the proposal for this public works program would not accomplish it. It would more likely merely squander money on short term projects and be of no lasting benefit to the community involved nor to the Nation generally.

An editorial from today's Washington Post voices such skepticism with great clarity. Certainly the editorial policy of this newspaper has generally been friendly to the Kennedy administration and to the objectives of economic stimulation through Government intervention. Consequently its criticisms of the President's proposal are all the more significant:

A NEW WPA?

The President's recommendation for a $600 million public works program correctly diagnoses the need for a stimulus to speed the lagging recovery. His therapy is far more dubious.

The high estimates of gross national product in 1962 put out by the administration have been questionable from the beginning. Events since January have made them more questionable, and the administration seems about to recognize this. Hence the President proposes to spend a total of $600 million, of which $25 million would go out in fiscal year 1962, if the Congress acts promptly, $350 million in fiscal year 1963, $225 million early in fiscal 1964. The money is to be spent on capital projects that can be quickly initiated or accelerated and that can be completed within 12 months after startup. It is to be spent in 958 areas comprising 38 percent of the population.

A program of this sort has the earmarks of economic ineffectiveness and political mischief. The immediate stimulation in any case would be small—witness that only $25 million would be spent in the next 3 months in the uncertain case that the Congress acts promptly. The money would be spread very widely, over 38 percent of the population, which works out at an average of $8.60 per head in those areas. It will not be concentrated on the real trouble spots. To select projects by the criterion that they can be terminated within 12 months means to rule out from the start any new major construction and many other high priority projects. What this comes down to is a new WPA, with priority on getting out the money and only secondary regard for what is produced by it.

The political overtones of the proposal are plainly audible. A wide range of localities, far beyond the areas of greatest need, is made eligible because that is the way to bring on board the necessary number of legislators. This means also that the administrator, whoever he may be, will have wide latitude in selecting locations. Much money will be wasted doing low priority things to get done a few with high priority. Projects based on such criteria of "need," moreover, give little hope of ever coming to a logical end. Permanent pork barrel for the administration is the most likely end of the story.

The economy needs stimulation, but not so desperately that time could not be spared to look for a better way of applying it. Activity continues to go up, after all, and is expected to keep going up. The Nation can afford to do this in a way to get the most for its money. In fact, given the urgent need to raise productivity, it cannot afford to do it any other way. The administration can justify a tax cut that would enlarge the now badly mutilated investment tax credit for new equipment. It can justify public works expenditures for well selected public investment that will increase output in later years. Compared with these alternatives, the WPA approach is the least attractive. Almost 30 years after the invention of that institution, the administration should be able to think of something better.

National Gallery of Art Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of the House, I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the excellent program for the month of April 1962 which has been prepared by the National Gallery of Art.

The Director of the National Gallery, John Walker, as well as his fine associates, have put together a highly interesting and cultural program which I am glad to call to the attention of the Congress and the American people.

The arrival of spring in Washington brings visitors from all over our Nation, and the American people are fortunate in having such an excellent home of culture and art to visit. We in Congress should also take a few moments from our busy lives to see and admire the beauty and creations of man and nature. The National Gallery of Art has, in its April program, created a worthwhile adventure into man's cultural and artistic gifts.

The program follows:

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

MONDAY, MARCH 26, THROUGH SUNDAY, APRIL 1

Painting of the week: Dali. "The Sacrament of the Last Supper" (Chester Dale collection), gallery 60-B, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: Small Renaissance bronzes. Central lobby, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture, 11th annual series, A. W. Mellon lectures in the fine arts: "William Blake and Traditional Mythology: The Nether-World of Alchemy." Guest speaker, Kathleen Raine, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Burnham-Schweitzer duo, East Garden Court, 8.

MONDAY, APRIL 2, THROUGH SUNDAY, APRIL 8

Painting of the week: Rembrandt. Self-portrait (Mellon collection), gallery 48, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: The old and new in Raphael's art. Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture, 11th annual series, A. W. Mellon lectures in the fine arts: "William Blake and Traditional Mythology: Prophet Against Science." Guest speaker, Kathleen Raine, lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: LaSalle String Quartet, East Garden Court 8.

All concerts, with intermission talks by members of the National Gallery staff, are broadcast by station WGM-AM (570) and FM (103.5) in stereophonic sound.

MONDAY, APRIL 9, THROUGH SUNDAY, APRIL 15

Painting of the week: Modigliani, "Woman With Red Hair" (Chester Dale collection), gallery 62, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: The Old and New in Rubens' Art. Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: Benjamin West, guest speaker; Richard Hirsch, director, Allentown Art Museum, Allentown, Pa., lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Wallfisch Duo, East Garden Court, 8.

MONDAY, APRIL 16, THROUGH SUNDAY, APRIL 22

Scultpure of the week: Donatello, "The David of the Casa Martelli" (Widener collection), gallery 11, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: The Old and New in Reynolds' Art, Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: The Pre-Raphaelite Artists; guest speaker: John Woodward, keeper, Museum and Art Gallery, Birmingham, England, Lecture Hall, 4.

Sunday concert: National Gallery Orchestra, Richard Bales, conductor; Joan Weiner, pianist; East Garden Court, 8.

Inquiries concerning the Gallery's educational services should be addressed to the Educational Office, Republic 7-4215, extension 272.

MONDAY, APRIL 23, THROUGH SUNDAY, APRIL 29

Painting of the week: Strigel. "Saint Mary Salome and Her Family" (Samuel H. Kress collection) gallery 35A, Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6:30.

Tour of the week: The old and new in Cézanne's art. Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday, 1; Sunday, 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday lecture: "Whistler." Guest speaker, Dennis Farr, assistant keeper, the Tate Gallery, London, England; lecture hall, 4.

Sunday concert: Symphonic Singers of Erie. Obed L. Grender, director; East Garden Court, 8.

Gallery hours: Weekdays, 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Sundays, 2 p.m. to 10 p.m. Admission is free to the gallery and to all programs scheduled.

Permanent collection: Paintings and sculpture comprising the Mellon, Samuel H.

Kress, Widener, and Chester Dale collections, with gifts from other donors, are located on the main floor. The Widener collection of decorative arts is on the ground floor.

Continuing exhibition: English drawings and water colors from British collections, sponsored by the English-Speaking Unions of the United States and the British Commonwealth, and from the collection of Mr. and Mrs. Paul Mellon. Central gallery, G-7 through G-13; through April 1.

Recent publications: "English Drawings and Water Colors." Exhibition catalog 7½ inches by 10 inches, 44 pages, with 20 black-and-white illustrations. Introduction by Jonathan Mayne and John Woodward. Price $1.50 postpaid. "English Drawings and Water Colors From the Collection of Mr. and Mrs. Paul Mellon." Exhibition catalog 7½ inches by 10 inches, 48 pages, with 28 black-and-white illustrations. Price $1.50 postpaid.

Eleventh annual series, A. W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts: On April 1 and April 8, Miss Kathleen Raine, English poet, will complete her series of six lectures on "William Blake and Traditional Mythology."

LecTour: A radio lecture device is installed in 30 exhibition galleries. Talks, running continuously, cover most of the periods of art represented by the collections. A visitor may rent a small receiving set for 25 cents to use in hearing these LecTour broadcasts.

Cafeteria: Open to the public Mondays through Saturdays, 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. Sundays, 4 p.m. to 7 p.m.

What the Federal Trade Commission Expects of the Appliance Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks by Daniel J. Murphy, Director, Bureau of Deceptive Practices, Federal Trade Commission in Washington:

WHAT THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION EXPECTS OF THE APPLIANCE INDUSTRY

(By Daniel J. Murphy, Director, Bureau of Deceptive Practices, Federal Trade Commission, Washington, D.C., Before Institute of Appliance Manufacturers, Netherland Hilton Hotel, Cincinnati, Ohio, March 5, 1962.)

May I express my appreciation for your invitation to take part in this—the 13th annual meeting of the Institute of Appliance Manufacturers.

Although your present organization was formed in 1933, it really goes back to 1872, as the successor to the International Association of Stove Manufacturers.

It certainly is a temptation to dwell for a moment upon challenges of product changes that have taken place since about a century ago.

The challenge of product changes in your own industry, from stoves to appliances, denotes a tremendous progress. A century ago, the stove, with its dual capacity for cooking and heating, was the primary and basic household equipment. The mechanical and automatic appliances known and used today were mere figments of the imagination.

Your organization has recognized and assumed its responsible role in this complex march of progress. What does the Federal Trade Commission expect of the appliance industry? The Federal Trade Commission expects that this progress in the appliance industry will continue to grow and that your trade association and its members will be ever mindful of their responsibilities and opportunities.

The success of any trade association is in great measure dependent upon the experience and skill of its staff. May I compliment you upon your staff—particularly upon the persuasiveness of your executive secretary who not only is responsible for my presence here, but who also selected my subjects.

II

One of the principal subjects[1] suggested for discussion is the "manufacturer's list price." Whether it is called "manufacturer's list price" or "maker's list price" or "manufacturer's suggested retail price," there is no material distinction. Certainly there is no distinction between a list price and a suggested list price. All of these phrases are held to represent a product's usual and customary retail price in the trade area where the representations are made.

Within the scope of our discussion, there is nothing illegal per se in the mere issuance of a list price or a manufacturer's list price. It only becomes illegal by the use made of such phrases by either the manufacturers or the distributor in advertising directed to the consumer. The test is not the intent of the advertiser, but the understanding of the consumer. The question to be asked and answered is, Does the advertising have the capacity to deceive?

It is not even necessary to show that any consumer has, in fact, been deceived by the dealer's use of the suggested list price. The Commission has the right to look at the retailer's advertisements which employ the list prices in juxtaposition with the lower offering price and in the light of any other relevant evidence and by exercising statutory expertise decide whether the practice of supplying such prices has the capacity and tendency to deceive.

The Commission and the courts have many times considered this problem.

In a series of tire cases[2] the Commission prohibited the use of list prices by manufacturers, in advertising directed to the consumers, unless they are bona fide, regular selling prices of tires and tubes, advertised and offered for sale, as established by the usual and customary sales in the normal course of trade.

The Commission recently stated in a decision a few weeks ago (Jan. 19, 1962):[3]

"* * * The representation 'Mfr's. Sug. List' creates the impression that there is a usual and customary retail price for the product in the trade area, and that that price is the specified 'Mfr's. Sug. list' price."

The soundness of this interpretation is settled law.[4] The Commission continued:

"* * * Substantial probative evidence in the record here shows that the products in question were being widely sold in the trade area at a variety of retail prices significantly lower than the higher comparative prices advertised by respondents. It is clear from the record that the instances in which certain retailers sold at or above the manufacturer's suggested prices were exceptions rather than the general rule. The hearing examiner found to this effect and we agree."

III

If an advertisement contains two prices, one higher, which is in reality the manufacturer's suggested price, but unaccompanied by any descriptive language, it is held that such higher price is the price at which the advertiser sold the merchandise in the recent, regular course of business. In other words, the higher price was the "was" price, and the lower selling price the "is" price.

The Commission made the following findings in the George's case:[5]

"The use, without designation as such, of the manufacturer's suggested retail price, in advertising in juxtaposition with a lower price represents and tends to lead readers of such advertising to believe that the higher price is the price at which the merchandise is usually and customarily sold by the advertiser in the recent regular course of business and that a saving will be made of the difference between the two prices."

IV

I have been asked what about the recent decision by the hearing examiner in the Regina case.[6] This matter is on appeal to the Commission, and I do not intend to discuss its merits. However, I can briefly refer to certain facts found by the hearing examiner in his initial decision. The respondent manufacturer furnished its distributors and retailers with list prices or suggested manufacturer's list prices for its vacuum cleaners and floor polishers, which prices were found to be in excess of the usual and customary retail prices for such products in many trade areas, and that the respondent manufacturer had this knowledge.

Notwithstanding, the hearing examiner issued an order that appears to condone the practice of issuing and circulating fictitious list prices if a reservation or caveat is included therewith that such prices are not represented as actual selling prices but are supplied only for identification purposes. The attorney supporting the complaint has appealed from the decision on ground that it is contrary to Commission and court precedents.

V

Preticketed prices by manufacturers have many times been considered by the Commission and the courts. It is my opinion that there is no material difference in principle between a list price and a preticketed price. In the former, the list price is usually in the advertising, and in the latter the price is usually on the product or on the packages. The kind and quality of evidence necessary in both cases are the same.

May I refer to a very recent decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit decided last November 1961.[7] The court stated:

"The Commission does not contend that for the manufacturer to place tickets on its products before delivering them to retailers indicating the retail purchase price, a practice known as 'preticketing', is illegal or deceptive per se. But the Commission does maintain, and Baltimore agrees, that manufacturers who preticket their products fictitiously are guilty of engaging in an unfair trade practice in violation of the act. * * * And more to the point, it has recently been held in *Clinton Watch Co.*, v. *F.T.C.*, 291 F. (2) 838, that preticketing merchandise at fictitious and excessive prices, was an activity proscribed by the act in order to protect the interest of the public".

The court continued:

"* * * Petitioners are engaged in the manufacture of watches which are sold in in-

[1] Any opinions herein expressed are personal and not official.

[2] The Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., et al., docket 3983; the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., et al., docket 3984; the B. F. Goodrich Co., docket 3985; 33 F.T.C. 282, et seq., Montgomery Ward & Co., Inc., docket 8200.

[3] George's Radio and Television Co., Inc., et al., docket 8134.

[4] Clinton Watch Co. v. F.T.C., 291 F. 2d 838 (7th Cir. 1961); The Baltimore Luggage Co., et al. v. F.T.C. (4th Cir. Nov. 7, 1961), Docket 7683.

[5] Supra.

[6] The Regina Corp. et al., docket 8323.

[7] The Baltimore Luggage Company, et al., supra.

terstate commerce to wholesale, mail-order houses, to discount houses, and to retailers. A price tag is attached to each watch at the factory, reflecting a price substantially in excess of the normal and usual retail price. Ultimate purchasers of petitioners' products testified that they bought the watches at substantially lower prices than those indicated on the attached tickets. Preticketing at fictitious and excessive prices must be deemed to have the tendency of deceiving the public as to the savings afforded by the purchase of a product thus tagged as well as to the value of the product acquired. Petitioners' practice places a means of misleading the public into the hands of those who ultimately deal with the consumer. Notwithstanding the prevalence of these practices and the familiarity therewith among the members of the trade, these activities are proscribed to protect the interest of the public. *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Winsted Hosiery Co.*, 1922, 258 U.S. 483, 949, 42 Sp. Ct. 384, 66 L. Ed. 729.

"Misrepresentation as to the retail value of merchandise by means of an attached, fictitious price and deception as to savings afforded by the purchase of the product at a substantially lower price than that indicated thereon constitute unfair methods of competition. *Niresk Industries, Inc.* v. *Federal Trade Commission*, 7 Cir., 1960, 278 F. 2d 337, 340, certiorari denied 364 U.S. 883, 81 S. Ct. 173, 5 L. Ed. 2d 104; *Harsam Distributors, Inc.* v. *Federal Trade Commission*, 2 Cir., 1959, 263 F. 2d 396, 397."

VI

The decision in the Baltimore Luggage case is also important for its rejection of Baltimore's principal contention, namely, that the Commission "must prove by substantial evidence, that the usual and regular price at which Baltimore's product is sold at retail throughout the country is substantially less than the preticketed price."

The evidence showed that Baltimore sold its luggage to 1276 retail customers in cities located in 46 States and the District of Columbia. Of this number, 382 retailers in approximately 12 States sold this luggage at retail at substantially less than the preticketed prices. Sales to these 387 retail dealers represented 37.5 percent of Baltimore's total dollar volume sales. The court, in rejecting this contention, stated:

"The Commission may proscribe a deceptive practice, on the part of a manufacturer, which is widespread, but need not show it is universal."

The court further stated:

"It is to be noted that the Commission's order does not proscribe Baltimore's practice of preticketing: the order only requires Baltimore to cease and desist from preticketing its merchandise with a retail price 'when such amount is in excess of the price at which said merchandise is usually and regularly sold at retail in the trade area or areas where the representations are made.'"

VII

The Baltimore Luggage case is further important because of its ruling in regard to a common and repeated justification for preticketing, namely, the reference to the Automobile Information Disclosure Act.[8] The court cited at length from the congressional history of this act and ruled:

"While this act does require a species of preticketing, it is not a statute of general application, but applies solely and specifically to the sale of new automobiles, and was intended to protect the public from fraudulent practices engaged in primarily by retail automobile dealers.

"The act does indicate that preticketing per se is not illegal, but the Commission does not so contend. There is nothing in this act to indicate that fictitious or deceptive preticketing has congressional approval."

[8] Public Law 85-506, July 7, 1958, 72 Stat. 325, 15 U.S.C.A. 1231-1233.

VIII

The Commission has proceeded many times against misrepresentations of the terms "manufacturer's" and "wholesaler's." It has been found that many of the firms engaged in these practices are actually retailers selling to consumers and they do little or no manufacturing or wholesale selling to retailers. The theory of these cases is that the purchasing public regards a manufacturer or a wholesaler as one selling at a price lower than the price at which the retailer sells and that the consumer-purchaser, by buying direct from the manufacturer or wholesaler, obtains a lower price. When such is not the fact, the consumer-purchaser is deceived. The courts have agreed with the Commission's position.[9]

There are four States—Michigan, Minnesota, Oklahoma, and Tennessee—that have specific statutes prohibiting the use of words such as "wholesaler," "manufacturer," or similar designations unless the seller is engaged in the represented trade.

There is a second possible violation of laws administered by the Commission in this type of representation. If firms so engaged are actually retailers who represent themselves to manufacturers to be wholesalers and thereby induce an additional discount, they may be in violation of section 2(f) of the Robinson-Patman amendment to the Clayton Act. By so misrepresenting their trade status, they may be inducing a discriminatory price to which they are not entitled.

IX

You have inquired concerning trade practice conference proceedings, whether these proceedings are to be initiated by industry or primarily by the Federal Trade Commission.

In the past most of the trade practice proceedings for industries have been instituted pursuant to applications therefor received from trade associations and other representative groups in the particular industry. Several have been initiated on the Commission's own motion, and I anticipate that there will be more of these in the future. During the past year there have been more than the usual number of informal discussions with industry groups, and many of these will probably culminate in formal applications. Whether on application or on the Commission's own motion, the test will be whether something substantially worthwhile from the standpoint of better law observance can be expected as a result of the undertaking.

The trade practice conference program has proven to be a means of effecting a high degree of self-discipline, in addition to performing a great educational service. Implicit in the plan is recognition that the great majority of American businessmen are honest and desire to, and will, conduct their business practices and behavior in consonance with applicable legal requirements when such requirements have been made clear and understandable. Trade practice conferences have contributed greatly toward cutting the cost of law enforcement.

I emphasize, however, that the plan is adjunctive to mandatory procedures available for use by the Commission, and does not replace or limit such procedures. The mandatory proceedings will continue to be used when deemed necessary or more appropriate.

X

May I conclude. In June 1961, the Secretary of Commerce appointed the Business Ethics Advisory Council to aid the American business community in hastening the attainment of high ethical standards and the improvement of its ethical performance.

[9] *L. & C. Mayer Co., Inc.*, v. *F.T.C.*, 2 S. & D. 460, 463, 97 F. 2d 365.

On January 16, 1962, the Council reported to President Kennedy at the White House and presented a statement of business ethics and a call for action as well as a number of questions for businessmen, all designed to inspire adherence by all men and women in business to those high ethical standards that derive from our heritage and traditions.

Some of the questions for businessmen included the following:

"Have we taken appropriate steps to keep our advertising and sales representations truthful and fair? Are these steps effective?

"How often do we review our advertising, literature, labels, and packaging? Do they give our customers a fair understanding of the true quality, quantity, price, and function of our products? Does our service as well as our product measure up to our basic obligations and our representations?"

Here is a definite challenge to business.

May I quote from the statement of President Kennedy:

"I have reviewed with Secretary Hodges the report and progress you have made in the development of a program to stimulate and assist business leaders and trade association groups in attaining high ethical standards, and I am delighted.

"But your statement of principles can only be a beginning. In the last analysis, high ethical standards can be achieved only through voluntary effort. The principles you have outlined will establish guideposts, give direction and help whole industries and companies to initiate codes and standards.

"I am confident that American business will respond, but in addition to helping businessmen, your work should assist the general public to achieve a broader understanding of these problems, for ethics is a matter of concern to us all.

"The free world watches us closely for leadership in this field, the uncommitted nations seek examples of the free enterprise system in operation, and the Communist nations are looking for vulnerable points of attack. I know that you will bear all this in mind."

The Mexican Farm Labor Importation Program—Review and Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, during my service on the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the House Committee on Appropriations, I have investigated the problem of Mexican farm labor on American farms. I have observed the housing in which they live and the conditions under which they work. There is a large area for improvement. Recently I came across a law review article by T. Richard Spradlin, associate editor of the George Washington Law Review. This article reviews the legislation which Congress was called upon to pass upon in 1961, poses the issues involved in the legislation, and is a well-documented treatise of the law, the background, and the solution. I believe that the readers would find the law review article regarding the Mexican farm labor importation program of immense interest.

The article follows:

THE MEXICAN FARM LABOR IMPORTATION PROGRAM—REVIEW AND REFORM

On May 11, 1961, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 2010 by a vote of 231 yeas to 157 nays, 45 Members not voting. This bill would have extended Pubic Law 78 for 2 years, incorporating no reforms at all. During House debate, Representative COAD offered amendments to incorporate the administration's reforms, but his efforts were defeated. The bill then went to the Senate, where hearings were held by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on June 12 and 13, 1961.

On July 25, the committee reported a compromise bill in the nature of a substitute for H.R. 2010. This bill was to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to:

(1) incorporate in the law an existing appropriation act requirement that employers reimburse the United States, up to a $15 maximum for each worker, for all expenses of the program, except salaries and expenses of personnel engaged in compliance activities;

(2) add "working conditions" to section 503(3) so that it would prohibit Mexican workers from being made available in any area unless reasonable efforts had been made to attract domestic workers at "wages, standard hours of work, and working conditions" comparable to those offered to Mexican workers;

(3) prohibit the furnishing to, or retention by, any employer of any Mexican—

(i) for employment in other than temporary or seasonal occupations or to operate or maintain power-driven machinery, except in specific cases to avoid hardship; and

(ii) unless the employer pays both domestic and Mexican workers not less than the prevailing wage paid in the area to domestic workers engaged in similar work;

(4) prohibit the furnishing of Mexican workers for some processing activities; and

(5) extend the program for 2 years, until December 31, 1963.

The committee rejected without comment the provision of S. 1945 which would have given the Secretary of Labor the power to limit the number of Mexicans hired in an area when found necessary to insure competition in the labor market. This provision would have written into the act specific language strengthening the Secretary's hand in carrying out his duty to prevent adverse effect.

The administration's wage amendment was rejected by the committee as a "rather haphazard method of providing for a constantly self-escalating minimum wage for agricultural workers. Evidently, the opponents of reform had done a good job of selling this idea. In place of the administration's wage amendment, the committee proposed a compromise which would not allow an employer to hire Mexican workers unless the employer offered and paid to both domestic and foreign workers not less than the prevailing wage paid in the area to domestic workers engaged in similar work.

On its face, such language might seem to have substance. A careful reading of it reveals quite the contrary. This language in fact would have added little or nothing to improve the existing situation. The key word in the provision is "area." In many areas, as already noted, the prevailing wage is far below the State and National averages. The committee's language would have done nothing to correct the situation in those areas discussed in part I of this study in which domestic wages are as low as 30 cents an hour for field work.

During Senate debate on the committee bill, Senator MCCARTHY introduced his own compromise wage amendment which had the support of the administration. The amendment read:

"(a) No worker recruited under this title shall be made available to any employer or permitted to remain in the employ of any employer unless the employer offers and pays to such workers [sic] wages at least equivalent to 90 per centum of the average farm wage in the State in which the area of employment is located, or 90 per centum of the national farm wage average, whichever is the lesser.

"(b) The determination of the average farm wage in a State and the national farm wage average required in (a) above shall be made by the Secretary of Labor, after consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture. In making these determinations, the Secretary of Labor shall consider, among other relevant factors, the applicable average farm wage rate per hour for workers who do not receive board and room, or such other appropriate information and data as may be available."

Senator MCCARTHY's wage amendment is much different from the original administration wage amendment contained in S. 1945. The modifications were apparently made in an attempt to avoid the charge advanced successfully in the Senate Agriculture Committee that the administration's wage amendment was an attempt to establish a minimum wage for agriculture. Senator MCCARTHY's amendment applied only to Mexican nationals brought into this country under Public Law 78; it had no direct application to domestic agricultural workers. It required simply that Mexican workers would have to be paid 90 percent of the average hourly farm wage rate in the State or Nation, whichever is lower.

The 90-percent level was adopted so as to take into account the fact that average hourly wage rate determinations by the Department of Agriculture include some skilled work. It was also to reflect the fringe benefits which are given to the Mexicans under the international agreement.

Senator MCCARTHY stated two main purposes behind his amendment: first, to provide better wages for the Mexican workers in some areas where they were receiving less than the State and National average wages; second, and most significant to the reform efforts, to make it more expensive to hire Mexican workers, and as a consequence provide a greater incentive for employers to recruit domestic workers for the jobs. The Senator gave this explanation:

"Of course, the amendment is intended to have some indirect effect on the farm labor market. If it were without indirect effect, there would be little purpose in it. It is intended to set a sufficiently high standard so that growers will be motivated to attempt some recruitment of domestic workers. It will have the effect of encouraging growers to offer more attractive conditions to domestic workers, unless, of course, there is no shortage, and in that case, growers may continue to secure domestic workers for 30, 40, and 50 cents per hour without any effect whatsoever from this amendment.

On September 11, Senator MCCARTHY's wage amendment was adopted by the Senate.

S. 1945 would have prohibited the employment of Mexican nationals recruited under the program unless the employer had made reasonable efforts to attract workers not only at comparable wages and hours, but also at comparable terms and conditions of employment. The Senate Agriculture Committee felt that this would result in a very complex and difficult situation. Instead, the committee proposed to amend H.R. 2010 to provide that employers must offer to domestic workers "working conditions," rather than "terms and conditions of employment," comparable to those offered to Mexican workers. Working conditions were defined by the committee as the physical conditions under which the work is performed, such as those concerned with sanitation and safety, but not terms of employment such as housing, transportation, subsistence, insurance, and work guarantees.

Senator KEATING introduced an amendment during the Senate debate to reinstate the requirement that comparable terms and conditions of employment would have to be offered to domestic workers before Mexicans could be hired. His amendment defined terms and conditions of employment as:

(1) Workmen's compensation or insurance against occupational hazards reasonably comparable to those afforded to Mexican workers;

(2) Guarantee of the opportunity to work during at least three-quarters of the workdays in the agreed term of employment;

(3) Provision for basic subsistence when the opportunity to work is not available for extended periods; and

(4) Provision for transportation (for the worker only) from the place of recruitment and return, or reimbursement of the cost, in the ratio that the number of weeks worked bears to the total agreed term of employment and not to exceed a maximum of $3 per week of employment.

This amendment, in spite of the safeguards allowing employers to prorate the reimbursement of transportation costs, was defeated in the Senate by a vote of 35 yeas to 49 nays, 16 Senators not voting. Opponents of the amendment based their opposition on a premise that Mexican workers come into the country under contract with an obligation to serve out the contract period, while domestic workers are free to leave a job at will. This is a very weak premise. It appears, first of all, to assume that domestic workers are less reliable than Mexican workers. It also ignores completely the obvious fact that domestic workers in their "freedom," are free to contract with employers, and once having done so are as bound legally to the performance of the contract as the Mexicans. Adoption of the Keating amendment might have encouraged the making of formal contracts between domestic workers and employers, a thing much to be desired. The only possible rationalization which can be made for the argument advanced by the opponents of the Keating amendment is that threat of deportation hangs over a Mexican if he breaks his contract. This can be an attractive argument for anyone inclined to seize upon it, but its attractiveness is not a measure of its value. The threat of deportation is not what keeps Mexican workers on their jobs. The thing which keeps them at work is the same thing which brought them to this country. They stay on their jobs because they need to work to support themselves and their families. No one can be heard to say that this is a need peculiar to Mexican workers.

The Senate Agriculture Committee accepted the administration's proposal to limit employment of Mexican nationals to seasonal occupations, except when necessary to avoid hardship. It was said that the purpose of the program was to supplement the domestic labor force in peak periods, such as harvesttime, when crops could be lost due to a lack of workers. The committee noted that the program was not intended to provide Mexican workers for year-round jobs which can be filled by domestic workers.

Also accepted in principle by the committee was the proposal to forbid the employment of Mexican workers in jobs involving the operation of power-driven machinery, except when necessary to avoid hardship. The committee, however, felt that the language in S. 1945 might be construed to prohibit employment in which the worker neither operated nor maintained the machinery, but merely loaded it or did some other manual task in connection with it. The committee language, therefore, prohibited the recruitment of Mexican workers for employment to operate or maintain power-driven machinery * * * rather than for employment "involving the operation of" such machinery. About the only thing which can be said concerning the adoption of this language is that it demonstrates a

regrettable lack of faith in the exercise of administrative discretion.

Having been amended by the McCarthy wage amendment, H.R. 2010, as reported by the Senate Agriculture Committee, was passed by the Senate.

The Senate insisted on its amendments, and requested a conference on the bill. Appointed as conferees were Senators ELLENDER, JOHNSTON, HOLLAND, JORDAN, AIKEN, YOUNG of North Dakota, and HICKENLOOPER. The House agreed to a conference and appointed as its conferees Representatives POAGE, GATHINGS, ABBITT, BELCHER, and TEAGUE.

The conference committee did not take long to reach a decision. It agreed to the Senate amendments with two major changes: (1) elimination of the McCarthy wage amendment; (2) modification of the provision relating to the use of Mexican workers in operating or maintaining power-driven machinery.

As for the wage amendment, Senator JORDAN claimed that the House conferees were adamant in refusing to accept such a provision. He said the Senate conferees could do nothing but accede to the House conferees' demands that the wage amendment be stricken. There was, nevertheless, a feeling on the part of some Members of the Senate that there had been a giveaway in the conference. First of all, the Senate conferees were hardly the ones to make a moral issue out of the wage amendment. Only one of the seven Senate conferees, Senator AIKEN, had voted for the wage amendment. This amendment was clearly the most significant provision in the Senate bill, but its author, Senator MCCARTHY, was not appointed to the conference.

The theoretical rule, according to the Senate Manual, is that the conferees of the Senate are appointed by the Presiding Officer, but in this case the conferees appear to have been selected by Senator ELLENDER, the Chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, an outspoken opponent of the wage amendment. Senator DOUGLAS explained the selection of conferees in this manner:

"* * * The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] sent the list to the desk, and it was read off by the clerk as though it came from the Presiding Officer. I think we might as well face that fact."

The Senate Manual provides with reference to the selection of the membership of conference committees that "Of course the majority party and the prevailing opinion have the majority of the managers." In this case, the prevailing opinion was represented by one of seven managers.

It cannot even be claimed that the conferees were selected on the basis of seniority, the honored way of all life in the U.S. Senate. While seniority was followed in the selection of three conferees, Senator PROXMIRE, who supported the wage amendment, was passed over, and Senator JORDAN, who opposed it, was selected in his place.

The deliberations in conference can best be described as expeditious. Senator MCCARTHY made this comment following the return of the conferees:

"I do not know how long the conferees were in conference. I have been told that it was a matter of 27 minutes, portal to portal. I do not believe that is the way to operate. At least, when we go to conference, we ought to walk slowly on the way to the conference, and very slowly on the way back, so at least 1 hour would elapse from the time we sent the conferees to negotiate for a settlement and the time they came back to the Senate to tell us that they could not do anything against the firm stand of the House of Representatives."

The conference committee modified the provision relating to the use of Mexicans in operating or maintaining power-driven machinery so that this provision would apply only to power-driven, self-propelled harvesting, planting, or cultivating machinery. The conference report contained an explanatiton that the new version of this amendment would not prohibit the incidental handling of such machinery or employment merely involving power-operated machinery, such as the placing of produce on trucks, or the placing of hand-cut produce on vegetable harvesters, nor would it prohibit workers employed for other appropriate purposes from incidental, emergency maintenance work.

While this language would appear to embody some fragment of the original administration proposal, it surely does not contain a significant amount. Injecting the requirement that the power-driven machinery must be self-propelled and used for harvesting, planting, or cultivating before the provision is applicable is unnecessarily restrictive. Furthermore, the ingenuity of man should be able to come up with some fascinating interpretations of what is meant by "incidental handling" of power-driven machinery. Other difficulties will arise from the fact that the phrase in the conference report indicating that Mexicans still can be recruited for "employment merely involving power-operated machinery" is almost identical to the original provision in S. 1945 which would have forbidden "employment involving the operation of power-driven machinery."

The conference report was adopted in the House on September 16 by voice vote, and with a minimum amount of discussion. Things were not to be so easy for the report in the Senate. There was a prolonged debate stretching over 3 days, and covering some 94 pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. During this debate, the proponents of reform discussed the entire program. They reviewed the history, the operation, the adverse effect, and the proposed improvements of the act. There was even talk of letting the program die on its scheduled expiration date, December 31, 1961, thereby forcing the Congress to start all over again on the issue in the second session of the 87th Congress. Evident in the debate was a growing resentment on the part of some Senators of the take-it-or-leave-it attitude of the House of Representatives on this and other issues during the closing weeks of the session.

The matter was finally decided on September 23 when the Senate adopted the conference report by a vote of 41 yeas to 31 nays, 28 Senators not voting. The President signed the bill, albeit reluctantly, on October 3, 1961.

PUBLIC LAW 78 AND MEXICAN-AMERICAN RELATIONS

There is no doubt that Public Law 78 is highly valuable to Mexico. The most obvious benefit to that country is the large amount of dollars which the program contributes to her economy. Mexico has a significant trade deficit with the United States, and without the dollars obtained through the bracero program, this trade deficit would be much more serious.

In addition to easing Mexico's balance-of-payment problems, the program also serves to alleviate conditions of unemployment and underemployment in that country. Mexico's current population of 34.6 million people is reportedly one of the fastest growing in the world. It has been estimated that over 10 percent of the total rural population of Mexico is directly dependent in varying degrees on bracero income.

Dr. Richard H. Hancock, testifying at the House hearings, cited the Mexican economist Señora Ifigenia Navarrete for the facts that the average monthly earnings of the 20 percent of Mexican families, comprising that country's lowest income group, declined from $22 per month in 1950 to $19.80 per month in 1957. This decline was accentuated greatly by inflation. Surveying the conditions in the State of Chihuahua in 1958, Dr. Hancock found that the increase in the cost of living was much greater than the increase in rural wages. He found that rural wages had increased 350 percent since 1943, but that the cost of living increased 570 percent based on staple commodities. He submitted with his statement statistics showing that in 1956 more money was derived from braceros than from any other activity in the State of Chihuahua except mining, cotton, and beef cattle.

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, made the following comment concerning the program:

"This is an important program to Mexico. It is her second most important source of American dollars. Mexico is one of our best customers, and in 1960 our exports to that country were $807 million compared to imports of $443 million. Our continued favorable balance of trade with Mexico indicates the importance to American business of maintaining this program.

"Aside from the economic importance of this program to Mexico, there are also important intangible benefits which accrue to both that country and ours. The program has been very effective in improving understanding between the peoples of our countries."

Public Law 78 has been referred to by some as, in effect, a point 4 program for Mexico. While the benefits derived from it by Mexico are gratifying, to describe it as a point 4 program is entirely misleading. This law was not enacted as a part of our foreign aid policy. It was enacted to provide a source of needed supplemental farm labor. The fact that the dollars taken home by the Mexican nationals contribute to that country's economy does not constitute a valid argument for allowing the program to operate in a manner which adversely affects a large segment of our own labor market. One can hardly expect the hired American farmworker to carry the ultimate burden of providing foreign aid to Mexico.

Melville Osborne, Office in Charge, Mexican Affairs, Department of State, testified before the Gathings subcommittee that the Mexican Government has always considered the program of Public Law 78 as temporary, and he indicated that national pride would prevent any change in this outlook. From the viewpoint of Mexico the program can only be interpreted as a reflection on the employment opportunities that exist in that country for men in the prime of their life. Mr. Osborne further testified that the Government of Mexico has repeatedly expressed its wish that Mexican workers not be employed in the United States to the detriment of our own interests. This is written into the International Agreement.

In spite of the benefits which accrue to Mexico, there are many indications that she is not pleased with the operation of Public Law 78. Senor Calderon Puig, Mexico's delegate to the 1955 meeting of the International Labor Organization in Geneva, indicated that Mexican public opinion was not entirely satisfied with the conditions under which Mexican citizens worked in the United States. That same feeling seems to exist today. The first Mexican-American Interparliamentary Conference was held early in February of 1961 in Guadalajara, capital of the State of Jalisco. Representative SAUND, vice chairman of the U.S. delegation, reported that the Mexican representatives were disturbed about the way the program was being operated. Senator MCCARTHY, also a delegate to the conference, verified this concern on the part of the Mexican delegates.

The method by which the program has been operated is not the only source of concern to the Mexican Government. The economics of the program work two ways. Foreign workers may be used under Public Law 78 for any crop which our Secretary of Agriculture deems to be essential. The Secretary has yet to declare any commodities nonessential, even those which are in

surplus supply and are being subsidized by the Federal Government. It is said that more than 60 percent of all Mexicans employed at the peak season work in crops which are in surplus supply. One of these surplus crops is cotton. Mexican cotton producers have complained of the dumping of United States cotton on the world market. The following is a quotation from an article, "Balance of Trade Problems," in the March 1960, issue of Comercio Exterior de Mexico, a monthly publication of Mexico's Banco Nacional de Comercio Exterior:

"The situation (imbalance of Mexican foreign trade) is further aggravated by certain cases of open disregard for the vital interests of the Mexican economy, exemplified by the U.S. cotton dumping on the international markets. In spite of being such an important outlet for U.S. producers, Mexico does not receive fair treatment from her northern neighbór."

Surely, Mexican cotton producers, bankers, and Government officials are aware that much of the cotton which they complain the United States is dumping on the world market is produced with the labor of Mexican workers.

The claim has been made that Public Law 78 is an effective "antiwetback" measure. The thrust of this claim is that if the program were eliminated, or curtailed in degree, there would be a proportionate increase in the number of illegal entrants from Mexico. During the House hearings, Representative TEAGUE referred to the fact that in 1954, of the 1,075,168 illegal entrants from Mexico, apprehended in the United States, some 362,857 were found working in agriculture. He first pointed out that this was roughly the same number of Mexicans today working under Public Law 78, and then, taking note of the small number of illegal entrants according to present statistics (there were only 4,855 illegal entrants in 1960), he implied that the reason was Public Law 78.

Any such logic proves too much. It ignores the fact that Public Law 78 was enacted in 1951, and that between 1951 and 1954 the number of illegal entrants rose from 500,628 to 1,075,168. In other words, during the first 3 years of operation of Public Law 78, the number of illegal entrants doubled. While no one would deny that the existence of this program naturally encourages Mexican workers desiring employment in the United States to take the legal route, the claim that any reduction in the number of Mexicans coming in under Public Law 78 would cause a proportionate increase in illegal entrants is more a threat than an argument. The answer to the illegal entrant problem, should it ever recur, would be the one which, according to Irvin F. Shrode, Assistant Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, stemmed the tide in 1954—"careful planning and efficient execution of a well-organized program, using available resources." To state it quite simply, it would be to enforce the immigration laws.

The necessary conclusion with regard to this labor program and Mexican-American relations is that its continuance for the present is important to Mexico. This conclusion has no substantial bearing, though, on the reforms advanced by the administration. It is important to remember that the administration has not suggested the repeal of Public Law 78, but rather a constructive method of reform to end the adverse effect of the program on our own domestic agricultural workers, and to improve the program overall. In view of the Mexican Government's assertion that her citizens should not be hired in the United States to the detriment of our own interests, there should be little damaging effect on Mexican-American relations due to the implementation of reforms, even if this should result in a cutback in the number of Mexicans entering the United States.

PROSPECTS FOR THE FUTURE

Having considered the reforms requested by the administration and the limited changes obtained in the statute, we may now proceed to consider briefly what attempts at reform will be made in the future.

Shortly before the Senate adopted the McCarthy wage amendment, Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIED made a statement which contained an indication of things to come. After referring to the Secretary of Labor's authority under the law to prevent adverse effect, the majority leader stated that the Secretary was nonetheless advocating that specific congressional standards be written into the law to end the litigation and other pressures which have hindered efforts to exercise this authority. Then came this comment:

"If this amendment is not adopted, let there be no future criticism of the Secretary of Labor if he prescribes similar tests administratively. The Secretary of Labor has advised the Congress that he has found clear indications of adverse effect and will feel constrained in carrying out his statutory responsibilities to take steps beyond those already taken."

In view of the subsequent deletion of the wage amendment by the conference committee, the majority leader's remarks take on even more significance.

Special attention should be given to the statement made by President Kennedy when he reluctantly signed H.R. 2010:

"Present law, however, provides broad authority to regulate the conditions under which Mexican workers are to be employed. In particular, existing law authorizes, and indeed, requires, the Secretary of Labor to permit the employment of Mexican workers only when he can determine that their admission will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers. This comprehensive, general authority was not changed by H.R. 2010 and its availability was clearly recognized during the legislative consideration of the bill.

"The adverse effect of the Mexican farm labor program as it has operated in recent years on the wage and employment conditions of domestic workers is clear and is cumulative in its impact. We cannot afford to disregard it. We do not condone it. Therefore I sign this bill with the assurance that the Secretary of Labor will, by every means at his disposal, use the authority vested in him under the law to prescribe the standards and to make the determinations essential for the protection of the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers."

All of this constitutes a commitment to take vigorous administrative action to remedy the adverse effect which Public Law 78 has had upon domestic workers. The lengthy debates in Congress have clarified the issues as never before in the act's history. A strong record has been made by the administration and the proponents of reform and popular support for reform has grown. Growers who opposed significant changes in the statute can now look forward to the full application of the Secretary of Labor's authority under the law. According to Assistant Secretary Holleman:

"[Y]ou can expect, for example, that in those States where the hourly wage rate paid Mexican labor has remained unchanged for 10 years at only 50 cents per hour—in those States you can expect that the Mexican contract rate next year will be at a significantly higher figure. I do not promise that the Department will use exactly the formula proposed in Senator MCCARTHY's bill; but I can provide assurance that the Department will prescribe and apply objective wage standards which will remedy much of the wage adverse effect which has occurred and which has been, as the President noted, 'cumulative in its impact.' In effect [there has been] Presidential assurance of this as well as Department of Labor assurance."

Before closing this study on the operation and reform of Public Law 78, it should be noted that Congress now has before it a package of 11 bills introduced by Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, and designed to improve the lot of all domestic migratory workers. Particularly significant insofar as the scope of this study is concerned is S. 1129.

This bill would authorize the Secretary of Labor to furnish transportation, food, and housing, as well as necessary medical care to domestic agricultural workers and their families while in transit to or from places of employment. For these services, the employers participating in the program would have to reimburse the United States in an amount not to exceed $15 for each job filled, with the understanding that replacement workers would be supplied to an employer without cost if any workers failed to fulfill their work agreements.

Workers would be guaranteed that—

(1) The agreement would specify the term or period of employment;

(2) The wage rate would not be less than the prevailing hourly wage rate paid local workers for similar work;

(3) Wages would not be paid less often than biweekly;

(4) in the case of an out-of-area worker, not less than 160 hours of employment in each 4-week period would be offered;

(5) housing and sanitation facilities furnished by the employer would conform to minimum standards prescribed by the Secretary of Labor;

(6) there would be furnished by the employer, at no cost to the worker, workmen's compensation insurance, or comparable occupational health and accident protection.

To protect the job opportunities of local workers, S. 1129 would provide that farmworkers could not be moved into an area unless the Secretary of Labor certified that sufficient local workers were not available; that employment of migrant workers would not affect adversely the wages and working conditions of local agricultural workers similarly employed; and that reasonable efforts had been made by employers to attract and retain local workers for such employment at wages, hours, and working conditions comparable to those offered out-of-area workers.

In carrying out the provisions of the act, the Secretary of Labor would be authorized to undertake special studies and conduct experimental, pilot, and demonstration projects as he determined had promise of leading to fuller utilization of underemployed rural Americans and meeting the labor requirements of employers. These studies and projects could include special job training, counseling, resettlement, overnight transient camps, community exchange services, and special placement services. The Secretary could expend up to $200,000 annually in carrying out these studies and projects.

The program which would be set up by S. 1129 would be voluntary. Employers of farmworkers would not be compelled to make use of it, but the significant thing is that they would be obligated to use the program before becoming eligible to employ foreign workers.

CONCLUSION

The stage has been set. The reform efforts have brought about not only certain revisions in the basic statute, but also a commitment on the part of the administration to improve the regulations under the basic statute and to strive for adoption of a comprehensive plan for stabilizing the domestic farm labor market. Today, as never before, there are forces at work determined to eliminate the privation, hardship, and misery which for so long have plagued our migrant agricultural workers. The goal is within reach. It must be achieved.

Our Stand on the Tariff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, since the House is now sending on to the Senate its version of the 1962 tax reform bill, the next measure to come before us might well be the President's tariff program.

It would be well for us to analyze the debates that sincere supporters of free trade are having relative to the President's request for unlimited power in tariff activities. I submit for the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Stand on the Tariff" from the Wednesday, March 28, issue of the Chicago Tribune:

OUR STAND ON THE TARIFF

Governor Kerner has invited the editor of the Tribune to accompany him to Washington next week and join him in testifying before the House Ways and Means Committee in favor of Mr. Kennedy's Trade Expansion Act.

"I regret," the Governor's telegram said, "we will be unable to pay your expenses for the trip. However, we have arranged to charter a plane. Round-trip fare will be approximately $70."

We should hardly have expected the State to pay for this lobbying trip even if its finances were in better shape. But instead of spending $70 of our own money, we shall simply restate the views which we have previously expressed—in a form which will cost the Governor, or anyone else interested, only 7 cents:

We supported the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in 1958 and we are still in favor of reducing tariffs, provided other countries will make comparable concessions to our exporters.

We think that lower tariffs will stimulate healthy world trade and will offer consumers everywhere the best quality available at the lowest price. We believe that Illinois in particular stands to benefit from expanded trade because Illinois companies export more than they import.

We think that a limited amount of negotiating power must be given to the executive branch of the Government to enable it to carry on profitable discussions with other countries, and in general we agree that negotiations carried on by categories of goods makes more sense than by individual items.

But we don't think that the situation calls for the virtual free hand which the White House seeks in the trade expansion act—a free hand, incidentally, to raise tariffs as well as to lower them.

We don't know why the President should be authorized at his own discretion to embark on new spending programs to help industries and labor groups that are hurt by expanding imports.

We don't think that eliminating tariffs alone is going to result in a truly freer trade as long as tariffs are replaced—as they often are these days—by quotas and other restrictions.

And above all we don't subscribe to the notion that the President is better able to execute the will of the people than their elected representatives in Congress, to whom the Constitution entrusts responsibility in these matters. If Congress has its failings, they are on the side of caution rather than recklessness.

Do U.S. Ships Under Foreign Flags Help Our Nation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following statement of Paul Hall, president, Seafarers International Union, and president, AFL-CIO Maritime Trades Department, in opposition to foreign flag flying by U.S. ships.

Mr. Hall—an eloquent spokesman against these runaways—presents cogent arguments in support of his point of view. His statement appeared in the February 1962 issue of the Seafarers Log. In my opinion, it destroys the opposition.

Mr. Hall's statement follows:

DO U.S. SHIPS UNDER FOREIGN FLAGS HELP OUR NATION?

(By Paul Hall)

For several years, particularly since the end of the Korean war, the foreign commerce of the United States has been drifting out of the hands of the American people and the American Government. This has happened because of the development of the runaway ship device.

What is a runaway ship? Let's make a comparison. Just suppose that a district was set up in the United States in which U.S. laws did not apply. Imagine that one of our automobile manufacturers set up a factory in that district. He then went to any part of the world where cheap labor was available and imported workers. These workers would receive the same rates of pay as prevail in their native lands, from $40 to $100 a month.

Since U.S. laws would not apply to the district, the United States would not collect any taxes from the earnings of the company. In fact, the company wouldn't pay taxes to anybody.

This, in a nutshell, is the runaway ship operation. The owners of runaway ships are in U.S. business. In most instances, they carry the raw materials upon which our great industries depend, for example: iron ore for such companies as U.S. Steel; aluminum ore for major outfits such as Alcoa and Reynolds; oil for Standard Oil, Gulf and Texaco; bananas for United Fruit; gypsum, manganese, copper, tin, coffee—almost every essential for everyday living. But these ships, which operate in American trade for the benefit of American industry, are registered under runaway flags. There are 1,600 of them in all, almost one-third of them owned by Americans. Most of the rest are chartered to these giant American compaines.

What is a runaway flag? Liberia is the most prominent example. To register a ship under the runaway flag of Liberia, the owner simply fills out some papers, pays a registration fee of $1.20 per net ton on his ship, and annual dues of $200 a year. From that point on, he pays taxes to nobody. His ship never goes to Liberia. He does not hire Liberian crews. He is not supervised in any way by the Liberian authorities. He is not making a genuine foreign investment. He has simply purchased a tax loophole. Before he had that piece of paper, he had to pay 52 percent of his earnings to the United States. Afterwards, he keeps the 52 percent. The money, if properly handled, in the form of interest-free loans, capital gains disbursements or investments overseas, never has to come back to the United States subject to income or corporation taxes.

How much is this tax saving? On a single tanker voyage from the Persian Gulf, the value of the oil cargo will be increased by $180,000 or more, depending on the vessel's size. An oil company, by transferring all of the gain to its runaway subsidiary in the form of a transportation fee, can avoid all of the 52 percent Federal tax, in this instance some $93,000.

Are wages a factor? Sure, the runaway operator saves heavily on wages also. But the wage savings are often "chicken feed" compared to the tax item. On that same tanker voyage, the operator saves about $18,000 in crew costs by recruiting a foreign crew. His tax savings are five times as great. The proof of the pudding is that British companies also use runaway flags, and in their instance, the wage savings are negligible.

Putting money issues aside, how does this practice affect our national security? The giant corporations which profit from the runaway device claim that these vessels are under "effective control" in times of emergency. But during the maritime negotiations last summer they claimed that these ships would transfer away from Liberia if U.S. maritime unions organized them. They declared flatly that the United States would then lose control of these vessels. An occasion for such a transfer is the chance to get a contract carrying Russian oil. When the Russians pay more than Jersey Standard, then the Russians have "effective control."

Many of the independent runaway operators (those not directly linked to an oil company) such as the Niarchos interests, have long-term contracts with the Soviet Union. They simply register ships under another flag for this purpose. The Russians use this shipping to invade traditional American markets and weaken our economy. For many years now, Panamanian and Liberian-flag ships have traded with Communist China, though this is contrary to American policy.

The operation of runaway ships is old-fashioned dollar imperialism in its purest form. Crewmembers operate in American trade on behalf of American companies, yet they do not get American wages. They know they are being exploited as a cheap labor pool. Our union affiliates, who have been in touch with many of these workers, can testify to the terrific resentment these men feel toward the American companies which exploit them.

Certainly, maritime unions would be less than candid if they pretended they didn't have a personal stake in this situation. This practice has deprived seamen and maritime workers of thousands of jobs. But the Nation as a whole also has a stake. None of the rationalization which the runaway operators can come up with can cover up the fact that they have weakened the economy and security of the United States.

Community College Would Fill a Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, as a strong supporter of the community college movement and as the sponsor of H.R. 16, which would provide a program of Federal matching assistance to the States in the development of their public community colleges, I am pleased at the

fact that interest in these institutions continues to grow. In my own State of Oregon plans are being made for the establishment of a number of new community colleges. One of these has been proposed for the Blue Mountain district in Morrow and Umatilla Counties. The Heppner Gazette-Times, a weekly in that area, recently commented editorially on these plans. I want to call the attention of my colleagues to the following excerpt from that editorial because it summarizes well some of the important advantages of community colleges, advantages which apply in the larger picture as well as in the case of this particular locality.

The editorial follows:

COMMUNITY COLLEGE WOULD FILL A NEED

Reaction to the formation of a community college for the Blue Mountain district (Morrow and Umatilla Counties) was highly favorable at the recent public hearing in Pendleton, and at this point it appears that all is going smoothly toward the formation of the college.

The community college, designed not only for vocational and technical training but also for those who wish to transfer to another institution after 2 years, would seem to offer an opportunity for post-high-school education for many who would otherwise not get to go. It would fill a need for those included toward the crafts—electricians, metalworkers, mechanics, plumbers—as well as those who want to become oriented to the college method before they decide whether they wish to point toward a profession.

Community colleges would give at least part of the answer in relieving the burden on the nine existing institutions because they would take many who otherwise would even more crowd the facilities on the jam-packed campuses. This should reflect back to the taxpayer who wouldn't be called upon so much to add new facilities at the major institutions.

Proximity of the students to the community college would be a big relief to the parents' pocketbooks, too. It would be feasible for carloads to commute from Morrow County points to Pendleton, saving the cost of living away from home. This again opens the door for more to reap the advantage of continued schooling.

At least at first, the Blue Mountain community college would be a noncampus type. Its instructors would be available, we understand, to come out to Heppner, for instance, to teach a class weekly if the demand developed for it.

At this point in the proceedings it appears that the community college would be a good bargain for the public, not only from the standpoint of actual cost but also in benefits through education and for opening new vistas to the youth who ordinarily would receive no training beyond high school. Those who have not been abreast of the plans should try to become informed on it between now and the June election date.

Health Services for the Aged Under Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR A. KNOX

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable mail coming into my office regarding medical care for the aged under a compulsory approach within the framework of the Social Security Act. Some of the letters state that because of living on a limited income individuals do not have funds to pay doctor's bills and for the medicine that is prescribed by physicians, and with the enactment of the King-Anderson bill such services would be provided. Because of this apparent misunderstanding of the administration's proposed medical care program I devoted the contents of my March News Report to a description of the major provisions of this legislation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of my report.

The report follows:

HEALTH SERVICES FOR THE AGED UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

I have received considerable correspondence expressing either a pro or con view with respect to the proposal to provide medical care for the aged under a compulsory approach within the framework of the Social Security Act. Much of this mail indicates a misunderstanding of what the Kennedy administration's proposal on this subject would and would not do in the way of covering medical needs. For this reason I will devote the contents of this report to a description of the major provisions of the administration-proposed King-Anderson bill which would provide a limited compulsory health care program.

WHO WOULD BE ELIGIBLE

Only persons who have reached the age of 65 and are entitled to monthly social security benefits would be eligible for services under the program. There are nearly 4 million persons over 65 who are not eligible for social security benefits and who therefore could not receive medical care under the administration's plan.

WHAT MEDICAL SERVICES WOULD BE PROVIDED

Inpatient hospital services would be provided up to 90 days. This would include bed, board, drugs, and other supplies and services customarily furnished by the hospital. The patient would pay a deductible amount of $10 a day for each of the first 9 days with a minimum deductible of $20 and a maximum deductible of $90.

Nursing home services would be provided up to 180 days, which would be available after a patient had been transferred from a hospital. The services provided by the nursing home would include bed, board, nursing services, drugs and other services and which are customarily provided by such homes.

Home health services would be provided for up to 240 visits during a calendar year, which would be furnished by or through a public or nonprofit agency under a plan prescribed by a doctor, including nursing care, physical, occupational, and speech therapy, medical supplies (other than drugs) and appliances for temporary use, and certain part-time or intermittent home services.

Outpatient hospital diagnostic services which are customarily furnished by or through the hospital to its outpatients for diagnostic study would be provided with the patient paying $20 for each hospital outpatient diagnostic study.

WHAT MEDICAL SERVICES WOULD NOT BE PROVIDED

The plan would not pay doctor's fees except to the limited extent they may be covered as part of a hospital's services. The services that a patient's private doctor provides would not be covered. The patient would pay physician and surgeon fees. Calls to a doctor's office and house calls made by a doctor would be paid by the patient.

No drugs would be paid for unless they are provided as part of the hospital or nursing home services, which would mean that the prescription of a doctor would still have to be paid for by an individual. No private duty nursing services are provided.

There is no coverage for services provided by mental or tuberculosis hospitals.

In essence what the proposal adds up to is the payment of the cost of hospital care and substitutes for hospital care within the limits prescribed.

FINANCING

The social security taxes now imposed with respect to an employee would be increased under the administration proposal by one-fourth of 1 percent, and three-eights of 1 percent for the self-employed. The taxable earnings base upon which one contributes to the social security fund now would be increased from $4,800 to $5,200 a year. An employee making $100 or more a week at the present time pays $150 in social security taxes this year, and under the present law this will increase to $174 next year and reach a maximum of $222 in 1968—with the employer paying like amounts. Under the medical care plan, the social security tax for both the employee and employer would rise to $201.50 next year and reach a maximum of $253.50 for each in 1968. The combined employer-employee rate of social security tax under the President's proposal would reach a total of 9¾ percent of payroll on January 1, 1968, without any further liberalization in the social security program beyond that proposed in the bill. The adequacy of even this financing arrangement has been contested by some actuarial experts.

Apportionment Ruling Assailed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Evening Star of March 28, 1962, William S. White in his column discussed the apportionment ruling handed down by the Supreme Court of the United States this week.

Mr. White's commentary was most interesting to me, and I am sure that it will be to all of our colleagues. I, therefore, under unanimous consent, include it in the Appendix of the RECORD today.

APPORTIONMENT RULING ASSAILED

(By William S. White)

Men who have long tried to hold the Supreme Court in special veneration cannot now deny that it is rewriting the Constitution and meddling in politics to suit the wishes of some—but only some—of nine unelected men.

This is the central, the true and tragic, meaning of the new divided court decision claiming for the Federal judiciary the unexampled power to make its own determination as to whether seats in State legislatures are "rationally" apportioned as between urban and rural areas.

This extraordinary ruling to their enduring credit was ably and memorably opposed by the two best legal minds on the bench, Justices Felix Frankfurter and John Marshall Harlan. On its face it is a "good" thing. For it is undeniable that rural voters in many States have been given disproportionate voices in their legislatures by redistricting formulas which penalize city voters.

Thus, no doubt there will be dancing in the streets of the metropolitan centers—indeed, in the metropolitan centers in which

this column now appears. But those who are celebrating this presumed fall of "rural dominance" would do well to take a second thought and a second look below the surface.

For something else is falling, too—the Constitution of the United States as we have known it. It is being altered not by Congress and people—the only constitutional way for its alteration—but rather by a momentary majority of a court which seems fatally determined to change the whole social and political fabric of this country—on its own writ and mandate.

It may well be that such changes should be made. But they cannot rightfully be made merely and solely by a handful of men—six men in this case—whose thirst for reform has caused them to falter in a high mission. This is the high mission of a cool, detached, impersonal justice which is the only true distinction of the loftiest court in all the world.

Losing this, the Court in the end will lose, itself. And this is the greatest tragedy of all.

"Well," it will be said, "if the rural people have in fact gained undue power and the legislatures themselves won't do anything about it, when shouldn't the Supreme Court step in?"

The ultimate answer is that the Court should not step in simply because it has no right under the Constitution to do so, a fact which until now it has repeatedly recognized over the long course of nearly two centuries.

And the practical answer is that the people themselves must work out their own difficulties here, however long and hard the task, if we are to maintain the Constitution of the United States. A bleak prospect? Yes. But listen to Justice Frankfurter, a great judge who a generation ago was the very symbol of "radicalism" to certain excited conservatives but who has now proved himself a towering guardian of that best of all conservatism, which is constitutionalism:

"There is not under our Constitution a judicial remedy for every political mischief. In a democratic society like ours relief must come through an aroused public conscience that sears the conscience of the people's representatives."

Not a thousand rotten boroughs in the legislatures can justify what is now happening. For the Supreme Court is being made the agent of a determined political drive by urban interests to reverse the balance of political power and so make urban voter hereafter overmaster rural voter.

There is nothing evil in this drive; there is no criticism in this column of the motives or actions of those who thrust this case before the Court. The business of advocates is to advocate. But the business of the Supreme Court is to judge and decide, not what is good for the country and people but what the Constitution and laws are—not what they should be.

Swiss Banker Looks at U.S. Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished American columnist, Constantine Brown, reports in the March 27 issue of the Washington Evening Star on his conversation with a director of one of the greatest banking institutions in Switzerland.

According to Mr. Brown, this banker and other Swiss businessmen with whom he has talked predict real trouble ahead for the United States unless we stop playing the role of the world's Good Samaritan and unless there is an end to the outflow of gold.

It is a warning which should be heeded by Members of the Congress and by officials of the Kennedy administration. I commend Mr. Brown's column to the attention of my colleagues:

A SWISS LOOKS AT U.S. SPENDING

(By Constantine Brown)

ZURICH.—This reporter takes relatively frequent trips to Switzerland not only because of the solid, untainted information available about the Western and Eastern Worlds, but also because it is relaxing to visit a country which practices the purest democracy.

In Switzerland there are no politicians; no VIP's who claim special privileges. It is refreshing to find Swiss officialdom from the top man in the canton to the traffic policeman or Federal customs inspector considering themselves servants of the people, not miniature autocrats.

Here family life remains the foundation and backbone of the social structure with the father as supreme authority. Here the children rise when papa enters the room and saying of grace at meals is the rule not the exception. This is a country of slightly more than 5 million inhabitants who are fanatically nationalistic and united, although there are three distinct nationalities speaking three different languages.

All of Europe and America are in turmoil over nuclear weapons. Men and women have been picketing the White House or gathering in Trafalgar Square and other parts of Britain demanding unilateral nuclear disarmament despite Premier Khrushchev's frequent threats. But in Switzerland, the Federal Government is being petitioned to proceed with the creation of its own atomic power to provide the national army (400,000 strong) with nuclear heads for their artillery and small arms.

This is a rich, prosperous and intensely capitalistic nation. It lacks almost every kind of raw material. But hard work compensates for this. The yearly per capita income of $1,294 is the highest in Europe. Yet despite the many prosperous industries there are no rich families such as we find in the United States, Britain, France, and especially in Italy. But at the same time there is no poverty, either.

The top salary of the president of the biggest bank is about $20,000 a year. The heads of big industries may sometimes earn as much as $50,000 a year and anybody with such an earned income is considered a millionaire. Taxes on earned income are small for the "high brackets" and practically nonexistent for medium or small incomes.

By necessity, the head of the big industrial and banking corporations are the best informed in the world. Their existence depends on making few mistakes, and mistakes can be avoided by realistic appraisals of world conditions. It is for this reason that I like to sound out my Swiss friends about the shape of things to come.

I have yet to find a single Swiss banker or businessman who does not have a warm feeling for the United States. But at the same time they more realistically appraise our future than most of our own economists or partisan politicians. And their estimates present a gloomy outlook for the future. A director of one of the greatest banking institutions in this country set forth his misgivings on America's future financial structure.

"You are still the richest country in the world," he said, "not only in raw materials but in inventive genius, know-how and daring. But at the rate of your expenditures for domestic progress, defense and particularly your indiscriminate desire to help the rest of the world—regardless of its desserts—you will not be able to continue to discharge this self-imposed obligation without serious consequences. The gold outflow should be a real warning.

"Your rate of taxation—direct, indirect and invisible—has not yet reached the saturation point, but you are not far from it. Since it is obvious that all your political men are pledged to the continuation of this role of the world's Good Samaritan, I cannot see the end of these expenditures. Even in the highly problematic circumstances that there may be a lessening of the arms race, you will be compelled by drastic economic necessities to divert the billions you are spending on defense to social works. This means the burdens of taxation will continue.

"The outflow of gold is continuing at a more alarming pace than the average American citizen and even your lawmakers realize. In order to provide the huge amounts needed for social engineering and increased help to the underdeveloped countries which would follow the highly unlikely slowing down of the arms race, you will have to increase the taxation of every American—from factory worker to the man living on modest retirement and the coupon clipper.

"Despite your present efforts it will be difficult for you to regain your position in the world markets because of the high and increasing cost of production. You will continue, of course, your democratic form of government, but don't forget history. There have been many instances when the tax collector has become more of an oppressor of the people than the secret police in a dictatorship. In order to gather the necessary funds to continue your gigantic self-imposed task from cradle to grave the income tax collector will become more arbitrary and increasingly consider the taxpayer as a lemon which must be squeezed to the last drop. And in the long run, this will cause you serious trouble."

Medicare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio script under date of March 28, 1962, as a legislative proposal of the utmost importance to the people of the new First Congressional District which I am proud to represent. Each week in my radio report to my constituents I discuss items which I believe to be of prime interest to them. This week I spoke on an item in the President's legislative program; the so-called medicare bill, H.R. 4222.

The article follows:

MEDICARE

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, today I would like to discuss with you one of the most important items of the President's legislative program: the so-called medicare bill, H.R. 4222. It is also known as the King-Anderson bill.

Every day I get letters from my district for and against health insurance for the aged under social security. Often they refer to the King-Anderson bill—which contains the President's proposal and is before the Ways and Means Committee of the House. This mail indicates that most people just haven't been told the facts about this proposal, so I would like to discuss today the need for such a plan, what the King-Anderson bill provides, who would be covered by

it, and how the program would be financed.

There are 17 million people in this country over 65. Almost 173,000 of them are in West Virginia. As a group they have low incomes. As a group they have the most illnesses and the highest hospital and medical costs. Their ability to get, pay for and keep private insurance is less than for any other segment of the population. Older people postpone getting the medical care they need because they just don't have the money to pay for it. When a catastrophic illness does strike, it often wipes out the old persons' savings, takes his home if he has one, and drains the finances of his children and other relatives. No wonder the dread of being sick is such a worry to the older folks.

Better ways of helping the aged pay the cost of health care have to be found. There is almost complete agreement on that point. The disagreement comes on what method will be used. The present administration believes, and I agree with them, that the soundest, most inclusive and most efficient method is to establish a prepaid form of insurance under the social security system. This is what the King-Anderson bill would do.

I think we should make it clear from the beginning. The bill would not provide any care at all. It would simply provide a way of paying for care. The benefits spelled out in the bill are these:

First, it would provide up to 90 days of inpatient hospital service for each illness. This would be subject to a deductible amount—to be paid by the patient—of $10 a day up to 9 days (the minimum deductible would be $20 and the maximum $90).

Second, it would pay for up to 180 days of care in a skilled nursing home after transfer from the hospital. This would be subject to a maximum of 150 "units of service" with one "unit" equal to 1 day of hospital care and 2 days of skilled nursing home care. For example, if a patient used up all of his 90 days at a hospital he would be eligible for only 120 days of nursing home care.

Third, it would pay the cost of as many diagnostic services as might be required subject to a $20 deductible for each diagnostic study.

Fourth, it would provide up to 240 home health care visits a year. This includes intermittent care and therapy under a plan established by a physician.

Now it is obvious that the benefits I have just named will not include all the costs of illness, but it will take care of the brunt of them. Statistics show that it is the hospital costs that hurt, they make up 70 percent of the medical expenditures of older people.

Persons eligible for benefits would be all those 65 and over who are eligible for payments under social security and the railroad retirement law. Approximately 144,000 people in West Virginia would be immediately covered because that is the number now in the social security system. Such eligible persons have been blanketed in under all previous amendments to the social security law.

The plan would be self-financing and self-supporting. Workers in covered employment would have their payroll deduction increased by one-fourth of 1 percent on the first $5,200 of earnings instead of on the first $4,800 as is now the case. Self-employed persons would contribute three-eights of 1 percent.

Some of my letters refer to the Kerr-Mills program and say, "Let's stick to that." Well, as some of you know, last year West Virginia made a valiant effort to meet the medical care needs of our older people through the Kerr-Mills program. With the Federal Government putting up 80 percent of the cost, we found we could not afford an adequate MAA plan for our aged. So the program went on the rocks for awhile. Then the State legislature retrenched to a more limited coverage. We still don't know how we are going to come out financially. We do know that in December only 8,157 persons received MAA payments and the average payment was $41.37. I believe we will still need a Kerr-Mills program even if we do establish health insurance under social security. We will need it because we will have to take care of those who are truly "medically indigent" and who will not be eligible under the new plan. Since 83 percent of those 65 and over in West Virginia are covered by social security, we would expect the number to need MAA under Kerr-Mills to be comparatively small.

Some of my correspondents berate the Kennedy proposal as "socialized medicine." Frankly, I think this is nothing but a scare-word slogan adopted by those who want to defeat the bill. The bill would provide social insurance to help retired people to pay some of the costs of health care just as their present social security check helps them to pay for a roof over their heads and bread and butter.

I see nothing in the King-Anderson bill that would affect the physician-patient relationship. I see nothing which would interfere with the doctor's choice of the hospital to which he would send the patient. I like the fact that the old person can receive payments when he needs care. He wouldn't have to prove poverty or exhaust hard earned savings. He would simply collect the benefits which he helped pay for during his wage-earning period and which are his by statutory right. What could be more fair or more American?

Someone's Hand in Your Pocket?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the Canton Repository has contributed a description of the proposed withholding on interests and dividends that reaches the heart of the matter in language everyone can understand. I include the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

SOMEONE'S HAND IN YOUR POCKET?

Congressmen are being bombarded with objections to a proposal for withholding 20 percent of dividends and interest on bank savings.

Some say it's the most violent reaction they've ever experienced. If it isn't, it should be.

This is an atrocious scheme.

The most atrocious thing about it is the reason it was proposed. It came out of the warped minds of those people in Washington who think they are being liberal when they go to work on other people's money with a scoop shovel.

When these liberals were driven by necessity into offering business enterprise an incentive—$8 in tax relief for every $100 spent for tools and equipment—they tried to get even by slapping a 20-percent withholding tax on dividends and interest, to be levied at the source.

They conceded the gimmick would be a nightmare for the Internal Revenue Service to administer.

They conceded it would be a pain in the computers for corporations and banks.

They had to admit they had loused it up with so many slippery complications it would take years to untangle it in the courts.

They even had to admit it would be grossly unfair to the majority of dividend drawers and bank depositors because the Government would be collecting money it would have to pay back to people who owed no taxes.

And, to those who knew the ins and outs of money legerdemain, the liberals had to confess something more damaging than any of the rest—that the gimmick would give the people who owed depositors and stockholders interest and dividends the use of this money free while the Government was awaiting the time to collect it from them. It was an out-and-out gouge of the little man for the benefit of the corporations, the banks and, of all people, the liberals.

There is no shortage of reasons to be sore about this scheme to take away a fifth of what is owed before it's paid and to turn it over to the people responsible for paying it for safekeeping at no interest until the Government collects it.

This is as infuriating as finding a strange hand in your pocket when you reach for your change.

The withholding tax on wages was bad enough, but it had the virtue of being the only way the Government could collect a broad-based personal income tax.

A withholding tax on dividends and interests would be intolerable. It is a spite proposal.

For once the liberals—with other people's money—ought to withdraw into the Washington woodwork and settle for revenue only. No spitework, no fancy Dan reform, no sweet revenge, no financial manipulation, just a bill to get the revenue feathers off the geese without killing them.

The Road to Appeasement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the last week has seen a nationwide debate commence concerning the publication of "The Liberal Papers," expressing the views of leading liberal Democrat Congressmen and key officials and other individuals, whose ideas are being rapidly accepted by the administration.

I believe this widespread national interest is healthy and necessary in this instance, and we should all be grateful to the freedom of the press that we so rightfully cherish in our country, and the tremendous interest in which columnists throughout the country are giving this subject. I submit for the RECORD two articles by Correspondent Ralph De Toledano which are penetrating discussions of the liberal philosophy as applied to our foreign policy. The title "The Road to Appeasement," is especially appropriate:

THE ROAD TO APPEASEMENT—I

(By Ralph De Toledano)

That there should be a multiplicity of views on U.S. foreign policy is not only to be expected but desirable as well. But it is a matter of concern when 12 Democratic Congressmen, working closely with 23 other colleagues, present as the liberal position a statement of what that policy should be, simultaneously analyzing the world situation in terms that fail to meet the issues and must lead to appeasement of the Soviet Union.

These views, formulated in a little volume entitled "The Liberal Papers," were brought together by 35 House Democrats and written by men in key positions in Government—

the Rand Corp. (financed by the Air Force) and the National Security Council, to name but two. The House Republican Policy Committee has excerpted significant passages from the book and characterizes them as expressing "views which most Americans would find naive and dangerous to our security."

This may be a partisan approach, and the Republican group hastens to add that the excerpts are not meant to summarize the book. But the Republicans underscore the fact that the views expressed "are important because they are held by persons to whom an influential segment of the Democratic Party looks for guidance." That "The Liberal Papers" frankly states that it represents a position "far to the 'left' of well-known Democratic Senators such as (HUBERT) HUMPHREY" emphasizes the extremism of the book. It should also be noted that Representative HENRY REUSS, a member of the "liberal project" that initiated the collection, has since dissociated himself from it.

The general tone of these papers is summarized in an opening chapter by David Riesman and Michael MacCoby: "As the cold war continues, it becomes increasingly difficult for decent Americans, humane enough to prefer peace to egocentric national honor, to be outspokenly and genuinely anti-Communist." By extension, the decent and humane person cannot subscribe to anti-Communist convictions—a judgment that leaves the majority of Americans on the side of indecency and inhumanity.

A second chapter characterizes as a "myopic view" the theory that the Soviet Union is responsible for the failure to establish a just and honorable peace. The author of this chapter, James Warburg, also argues that "from the Western point of view, West Berlin is of no particular value"—economically, strategically—except for "a moral liability" not backed by law "to protect its 2.3 million inhabitants from being overrun by communism." Mr. Warburg also contends that the United States "should liberalize its restrictive trade policy vis-a-vis the Soviet Union." Any further liberalization would mean that the United States ship strategic military goods to the Communists, strengthening them in their aggressive actions against the West.

Mr. Warburg, speaking for his Democratic congressional sponsors, goes beyond the demand that the United States recognize Red China. He wants this country to bypass the Free Chinese government in Taiwan, negotiating directly with the Communist Chinese for a surrender of the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu (and the Pescadores). The first step to this end, he holds, would be our "recognizing Peiping's unquestionably valid claim" to these islands, now held by the Free Chinese.

At the same time, he believes that the United States should cut off military aid to "any country whose rearmament evokes countervailing rearmament by another," and he cites as an example Israel and the Arab States. The Arab state posing the greatest threat to Israel is Egypt, and she is receiving arms and munitions in a steady stream from the Soviet Union. By cutting off both countries, the United States would be rendering Israel helpless, thereby guaranteeing an Arab attack on the country and its subsequent destruction.

A chapter by Vera Micheles Dean offers some significant comment. Mrs. Dean, it should be remembered, has often advocated a "soft" line toward communism, finding hitherto unknown virtues in the Soviet system and the captive nations. "The United States might make a powerful impression on countries in (southeast Asia)," she now recommends, "by declaring that it would be ready to give aid to Communist China * * * once Peiping has been admitted to represent China in the United Nations."

In a chapter on nuclear deterrents, Arthur Waskow turns the facts on their ears by stating: "It is often argued against the chances of effective disarmament that the West cannot 'trust' the Soviets to keep their agreements * * * the irony of the cold war is that we think of the Communists as irrational for having started it, and yet trust them to act in a rational manner in prosecuting it." Mr. Waskow, of course, forgets history: Namely that the Soviets have yet to live up to an international treaty or obligation. But beyond that, what student of communism thinks that the Soviets were "irrational" in starting the cold war. On the contrary, the cold war was simply the implementation of very rational (though evil) Communist doctrine.

But, as one of the contributors writes, Americans see everything in terms of good and evil. And he cites as an example: "Cuba is seen as a Communist outpost (when there is probably nothing more Communist about Castro Cuba than there is democratic about Franco Spain)."

It is this kind of logic and fuzzy thinking which permeates this Democratic liberal project. And it is this self-delusion in high places which has impelled Republican Representative JOHN RHODES to urge President Kennedy to repudiate these congressional doctrinaires.

THE ROAD TO APPEASEMENT—II

(By Ralph De Toledano)

"Disillusionment with many of the seemingly mindless policies" of the Truman, Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations have led Representative James Roosevelt and 11 of his Democratic colleagues in the House to organize the liberal project.

The result, a paperback entitled "The Liberal Papers," outlines a foreign policy based on the belief that if we give in to the Communists on every issue, they will learn to love us. It also assumes that the United States is almost, if not as much, responsible as the Soviet Union for the cold war. It finds excuses for most acts of Communist aggression, including the rape of Tibet and the Red Chinese invasion of neutralist India.

A few years back, the publication of this little book, endorsed by some 35 Democratic Congressmen, would have caused a furor. Many of the anti-Communists here, who are described by implication in "The Liberal Papers" as inhuman and indecent, have either weakened or hold the timid belief that to be branded as "hard" means death at the polls.

However, the policy stated in this new book is the longest journey down the road to appeasement yet enunciated by responsible American leaders.

Most interesting of the papers, from the viewpoint of American security, is the one written by Charles Osgood, a consultant to the Institute for Defense Analysis when it was working for the State Department's disarmament administration. It is Mr. Osgood's position that he would have "to side with Lord Russell" and the statement that it is better to be Red than dead. He also believes that those who take a suspicious look at the Soviet Union are people "with little minds seeking simple consistencies in a complex world." That the liberal philosopher Sidney Hook strongly disagrees with him becomes a case of "big minds operating under intense emotion" and succumbing to a "bogy-man approach."

Mr. Osgood, and presumably the several dozen Democratic legislators sponsoring him, believe that the only solution to cold war problems is a unilateral one—that the United States must act as if the Communists were motivated by the same goals and drives as Americans. If America merely gave in to Soviet demands without any quid pro quo, the Communists "would probably welcome a way out of this mess as much as we would." This is an argument frequently made by Nikita Khrushchev, but every time we have accepted it at face value, as in the moratorium on nuclear testing, we have been done in the eye.

The Osgood plan for world peace, like most of the Democratic proposals in the little volume, is dominated by the idea that recognition of Red China would solve all East-West problems. But in its insistence on unilateral action, it goes far beyond anything yet proposed. On a hypothetical basis, Mr. Osgood catalogs the actions the United States should take alone and without guarantee of Soviet reciprocation:

"Make public all medical information * * * concerning man in space."

End "all discriminatory [sic] trade and travel restrictions" with the Red Chinese.

Inaugurate a "unilateral test ban * * * indefinitely."

Move to seat Communist China in the United Nations.

"Publicly denuclearize one of our oversea bases in Japan" and invite "U.N. and Russian inspection."

"Invite the Soviets to 'plug in'" on the DEW line. (This is our advance warning system in the arctic.)

Reduce NATO forces in Germany.

Quemoy and Matsu to be "demilitarized and turned over to proper authorities from the [Communist] mainland."

"Move the substitution of Communist China for Nationalist China in the Security Council."

"Open this country to inspection and monitoring by authorized U.N. teams."

What will this achieve? Mr. Osgood states blandly that one of the "advantages" of unilateral action is that "agreements on what is equable are not required—each side merely monitors its own unilateral action in terms of its perception of prior reciprocation."

This is an interesting concept. But do Mr. Osgood and his Democratic congressional sponsors recall the early postwar period? Then, in an era of good feeling toward the Soviet Union, the United States unilaterally disarmed, scrapping the world's most powerful armed forces. The Soviets, on the contrary, continued to maintain a vast land army and to build their submarine fleet. As a result, when the Communists unilaterally invaded South Korea, the United States was caught without sufficient might to hurl them back. It took years of fighting and the loss of many lives before even a stalemate could be reached.

Trust the Communists is the thesis of "The Liberal Papers." But our troubles in Berlin, in Germany, in the satellite nations, and in China are all due to the naive trust the State Department and our leaders put in Stalin. The trusting souls of today are asking us to repeat the tragic history of the past two decades, offering only the hope that Khrushchev is somehow different. Appeasement and blindness caused World War II. What has changed since then?

Lightning on the Left

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks I wish to insert my "Report from Washington"

dealing with the issue of "Lightning on the Left":

While a great deal of attention has been focused on the so-called thunder on the right, the nation has received very little information regarding the lightning on the left.

Consider the recent publication of a book by Doubleday entitled "The Liberal Papers." Written by 12 Democrat Congressmen, here are a few of the foreign policy recommendations advanced by its authors:

Recognition of Red China and her admission to the U.N.; Recognition of Red China's claim to Formosa and the Pescadores; financial aid for Red China; Expulsion of West Germany, Italy, Scandinavia, and France from NATO; shutdown of American missile bases in Europe; Invitation to Russia to plug is on a bidirectional DEW line (our radar warning network against nuclear attack).

The Communists, in their wildest dreams, never hoped for such concessions.

Still another quote from "The Liberal Papers":

"As the cold war continues, it becomes increasingly difficult for decent Americans, humane enough to prefer peace to an egocentric national honor, to be outspokenly and genuinely anti-Communist."

The sponsors of these incredible views include Chester Bowles, Presidential foreign policy adviser; Mr. Wolf and Mr. Johnson, who are officials of AID (Agency for International Development); and Marcus Raskin, an employee of the National Security Council, our highest level strategic planning agency.

Still another example of lightning on the left can be found in the recent policy position by the Americans for Democratic Action:

"The administration should press forward with its proposed agreement banning atmospheric tests without inspection. Inspection at this time should not be made a condition of agreement."

It seems the ADA has forgotten that we did participate in such an agreement with Russia, and that they brazenly broke this agreement last October with over 40 nuclear blasts including a 58-megaton superbomb.

The ADA policy is far to the left of the instructions given to the disarmament negotiating team new representing this administration at Geneva. These instructions make inspection an absolute essential for any further nuclear test bans, and are basically sound.

Some of the other ADA policies call for: recognition of Communist China and its admission to the U.N.; shipment of surplus foods to Red China and a removal of trade barriers with that country; and a hands-off policy toward Cuba.

ADA has vigorously opposed all aid to Spain while in the same policy statement it has supported aid, including military equipment, to Tito's Yugoslavia.

ADA has condemned what it called the imperialist policies of the Netherlands and called for a cutoff of aid to the Dutch, but it has remained strangely silent about Indian aggression against Goa, Communist aggression against South Vietnam and Indonesia.

None of the persons associated with "Thunder on the Right" hold any positions of executive responsibility in Government, and those in the "irresponsible fringe" are hardly in a position to effect national policy.

On the other hand, the 35 ADA'ers in key administrative positions includes: Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., Presidential administrative assistant and a former national ADA chairman; Chester Bowles, Special Adviser to the President on Foreign Policy; G. Mennen "Soapy" Williams, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs; Philip H. Coombs, Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs; Jonathan B. Bingham, U.S. Representative on the U.N. Trusteeship Council; J. Kenneth Galbraith, U.S. Ambassador to India; James Loeb, U.S. Ambassador to Peru; Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; Orville Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture; Theodore C. Sorenson, Special Counsel to the President; and Arthur Goldberg, Secretary of Labor.

The policy's advocated by the ADA and "the Liberal Papers" are reflected daily in important Administration decisions.

Consider for example our virtual withdrawal from Laos, our 7-month delay in resumption of nuclear tests following the Russian test series of last October, sharply increased trade with the Communist bloc during the past year, continued foreign aid to such countries as Poland and Yugoslavia, our failure to act decisively following Brazil's confiscation of American property a month ago, the action of the President last April lifting regulations to curtail free mail delivery of Communist propaganda, substantial American contributions to various U.N. agencies which furnish direct financial and technical assistance to Communist countries including Cuba, our U.N. vote against Portugal with the possible repercussions against our use of the vital air base in the Azores, and so on * * * ad infinitum.

Certainly rightists are not always right and should exercise more responsibility than has been evidenced on some occasions in the past, but they are not in power or in position to damage good government. Has the time not come when the Washington press corps should awaken to the lightning on the left?

The U.S. Bond Plan Will Make All U.N. Members Pay Their Fair Share of Its Operations and Should Be Supported

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, it is my deep conviction that the U.S. bond plan should be strongly supported, since it will make all U.N. members pay their fair share of its operations.

I include as part of my remarks an article by Walter Lippmann on the subject of "The Sickness of the U.N."

The article follows:

THE SICKNESS OF THE U.N.

(By Walter Lippmann)

Recently, the U.N. has come under sharp criticism from some of its old supporters, notably Senator AIKEN and Senator JACKSON. Their criticism comes at a time when the U.N. itself may be said to be successful but insolvent, to be achieving a great purpose but bankrupting itself in the process. The U.N. is on the way to being successful in its most difficult experiment, which has been to pacify the Congo and prevent a confrontation of the great powers. It is insolvent because a group of nations, and particularly the Soviet Union and France, are refusing to pay their share of the costs of the experiment.

In this condition of affairs the Senate is about to debate and vote on the proposal to fund the deficit and provide working capital to keep the U.N. afloat during the next year or so.

With Senator AIKEN, who is the chief critic of the bond plan, there can be no dispute when he says that "the sickness of the U.N. is not financial sickness alone. * * * It can be cured only by drastic action at an early date action which will continue the U.N. as a truly multilateral organization and not permit it to become constantly dependent upon the beneficence of the United States."

This is the precise reason why the bond plan was put forth by our officials and it is the crucial reason why so many of us favor the plan. For there is no other plan before us which deals directly with the problem of making all the members of the U.N. pay their share of operations like the Congo and Palestine, and ending the grossly corrupting fact that we now pay nearly 50 percent of the cost of these operations. For although we would loan one-half of the money, we will bear only one-third of the cost of bond retirement.

"The sickness of the U.N." is that some members are refusing to pay their assessments, other members cannot pay them, and others are a mixed bag of countries who want to pay, cannot pay, and are waiting to see. As of February 28, 1962, the U.N. was owed $77 million on assessments for Palestine and the Congo. The chief countries refusing to pay were the Soviet Union and the East European satellites, France, Belgium and Cuba. There total delinquency was $56 million, of which $44 million were owed by the Communist bloc, and about $10 million by France and Belgium, and about one-half million by Cuba. Besides this, nearly $8 million were in default by Nationalist China, not because it refuses to pay but because it cannot pay.

This accounts for over 80 percent of the deficit. The problem of curing the sickness of the U.N. is to find ways of compelling, inducing and enabling all members to pay their share. The more I have studied this problem with its massive documentation, the more I am convinced that if there is any solution, the bond plan will meet the problem.

How will it solve the problem? The plan is based on the assumption that during the summer the world court will declare in an advisory opinion (which has been requested by a two-thirds vote of the General Assembly) that assessments to pay for operations like Palestine and the Congo are * * * within article 17 of the charter * * * "expenses of the organization" which "shall be borne by the members as apportioned by the General Assembly." Senator AIKEN, I might say at once, is one of those who confidently believe that this will be the ruling of the world court. If it is not the ruling, then all bets are off and there is no way now in sight by which the special operations of the U.N. can be financed.

If, however, it is the ruling, then article 19 of the charter begins to bite; a member "shall have no vote in the General Assembly if the amount of its arrears equals or exceeds the amount of the contributions due from it for the preceding 2 full years." Unless the U.N. figures are wrong, this will mean, we believe, that if the Soviet Union continues to refuse to pay, it will in 1964 be disqualified to vote in the General Assembly.

There has been some misunderstanding in the Senate on this crucial point. For example, Senator KEATING of New York asked "if the Soviet Union * * * should decide that it will not pay its assessed portion of these operations, would (it) not lose its right to vote until the period of many, many years had passed," perhaps, said Senator KEATING, "10 or 20 or 30 years."

Senator AIKEN's answer that this was indeed the case was not correct—unless he assumed an unfavorable court decision. In 1963 the sum of the Soviet Union's past 2 years' assessments will be nearly $50 million

and if it rejects the expected ruling of the World Court, it will be $46 million in arreas. Its margin of safety will be down to $3.6 million. In the following year, 1964, the Soviet Union's assessments for the past 2 years will be down to $37 million. But its delinquency will be $46 million and it will be $9 million to the bad, even if it pays its full regular budget assessment. Under the charter the Soviet Union will lose its vote in the General Assembly.

This is the compulsion behind the U.N. bond plan. There is also a moral compulsion. Some of the deliberate delinquents, for example France, argue that the General Assembly has no legal power to raise money for operations like the Congo. Presumably, if the World Court decides against the French contention, France as a law-abiding country will pay up.

What the Soviet Union will do is anybody's guess.

Last, but not least, the bond plan makes it easy for every member to participate. It does this by keeping the interest low and making the bond payable over a long time. This is the way, if there is a way, to make the U.N. that "truly multilateral organization," which Senator AIKEN wants it to be.

Finally, it has been said that we ought not to lend money to the U.N. at 2 percent when the money our Government borrows costs 4 percent. The answer to this is that frequently when we have felt that the national interest was involved, we have lent money at 2 percent.

Immediately after World War II we loaned the British $4 billion at 2 percent. The Lend-Lease settlements were on the basis of 2 percent. In the Marshall plan we loaned money at 2.5 percent. Our development loans through the Development Loan Fund and the foreign aid organization are at "low or no interest." So it all comes down to the question of whether it is desirable to keep the U.N. in business as an organization able to deal with certain kinds of threats to the peace of the world.

Sovereign Privileges as to Payment of Interest on the Part of the Federal Government Is Contrary to Commonsense and Public Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Solomon Dimond which appeared in the January 1962 issue of the Commercial Law Review.

Mr. Dimond's point is very well taken. I am studying his proposal that congressional action should be taken to correct the inequities inherent in the described situation and I shall introduce legislation on the matter in the near future.

The article follows:

SOVEREIGN PRIVILEGES AS TO INTEREST

(By Solomon Dimond)

Relatively recently the rhetorical question was asked as to "whether the special advantage which the Government has insofar as 'interest' is concerned is not a vestigial remnant of an out-moded doctrine of sovereign immunity?" What was noteworthy about the question was that it was being asked by the Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals.[1] Certainly the recognition by a quasi-judicial governmental instrumentality of the need to abandon this sovereign privilege points up the desirability for legislative review of the subject.

The law is well settled that a debt owed the United States bears interest even though there is no statute or contract so providing.[2] In the absence of contract or statute, courts have determined what is a fair interest rate. For example, 4-percent interest per annum was allowed as a fair rate of interest on Government claims for the renegotiation of contracts[3] and 6-perecnt interest per annum was allowed on the excess costs to the Government resulting from a breach of contract.[4]

There have been a few recent cases in which courts have limited the Government's right to recover interest based upon equitable considerations. In one situation,[5] the Government was not permitted to recover interest on a tax claim which it had interposed by way of set off. The court held that the Government's failure to pay its contract obligation had prevented the contractor from paying his tax obligations. While the result would appear to be equitable, it would be more logical if both the contractor and the Government were entitled to recover interest on their respective claims. In another situation, the court held that there was no legal duty to repay moneys received from the Government until the recipient knew or should have known that the payments were unauthorized. In that instance, interest was allowed from the date of judgment and not from the date payment was received by the individual or the date on which the Government had demanded repayment.[6]

The law is equally well settled that on grounds of public policy interest against the United States cannot be recovered in the absence of express statutory or contractual provisions therefor, except where there is a "taking" within the purview of the fifth amendment to the Constitution.[7] Where there is a "taking", by judicial precedent, interest is allowed at 4 percent per annum as part of just compensation.

During World War II, legislation was enacted providing for the payment of interest at 2½ percent per annum on allowable contract termination claims as part of fair compensation.[8] Currently, when Government contracts are canceled for the convenience of the Government, and moneys are concededly due to the contractor, the Government does not pay any interest on the moneys it owes the contractor. Although the regulations authorize the making of partial payments, the partial payments are a matter of administrative discretion which are not subject to review, as a matter of right.

The discretionary power given to the Government to make partial payments of termination claims and its sovereign privilege to withhold moneys due without any corresponding obligation to pay interest is sometimes used by Government personnel as a pressure tactic in an effort to force the acceptance of otherwise unaceptable adjustments of disputed claims. It is easy to see how this power to withhold making payments which are due can be used as a basis of economic duress, particularly since there is no penalty for its use.[9]

The present trend of the law seeks to place the Government on the same plane as a private party when it enters the marketplace. Sovereign privileges should be confined to those situations in which the national interest requires the general sacrifice of one or more classes of its citizens. However, when the transaction with the sovereign merely involves an individual contract entered into on the basis of mutuality there is no justification for the governmental privilege as to interest. When the contractor is at fault, the Government demands interest; when the Government is at fault, it claims sovereign privilege. The obligation to pay interest should be a common highway with the same rules of the road for all who traverse it.

The problem is not new or novel. There have been a number of requisition statutes which require the Government to pay 75 percent of the amount determined by the Government to constitute fair value and permit the claimant to sue for the fair value of his property requisitioned by the Government. While these statutes give some measure of relief, the basic injustice still remains. Only by congressional action can the Government eliminate this inequitable advantage which it has. Commonsense justifies it, public policy requires it and justice demands it.

[1] *Appeal of Tuason Construction Co., Inc.*, ASBCA No. 5106, 59-1 BCA 2266.

[2] *Riegel Textile Corp., etc.* v. *United States*, — C.Cls. —, No. 224-56, decided Jan. 20, 1960.

[3] *Eversharp, Inc.* v. *United States*, 129 C.Cls. 772.

[4] *United States* v. *Singer*, — F. Supp. — (S.D.N.Y., 1960).

[5] *Wire, Inc.* v. *United States*, 143 C.Cls. 688.

[6] *United States* v. *Zenith Godley Co.*, 180 F. Supp. 611.

[7] *Miami Tribe of Oklahoma* v. *United States*, 281 F. 2d 202.

[8] Contract Settlement Act of 1944. While this statute is still on the books, it has been the position of the Department of the Army that it does not govern contracts entered into after Nov. 1, 1947.

[9] Economic duress is not considered a basis to set aside an agreement, if the party who exercised the duress had the right to take the action which he threatened to take.

The Tragic Situation in Cuba Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, in Cuba today communism is not flourishing but the people are perishing.

I commend to the attention of the House an article in the Montreal, Canada, Star of March 26, written under a Kingston, Jamaica, dateline by Mr. Gerald Clark, associate editor of the Star.

This article, which, with the permission of the House, I shall place in the Appendix of the RECORD, depicts the absolutely deplorable and shocking situation that has developed under the heel of communism just 90 miles off our American shores. The people of that once proud island republic are on the verge of starvation and chaos.

Mr. Speaker, when each Member of this body has read this article, written by a newspaperman fresh from Cuba, I am certain every one of us will utter a prayer that the bloody hold of communism be broken there, that there be an end to agony, and that we shall renew

and resume our fellowship and partnership in progress with our good neighbors who are a proud and splendid people.

The article follows:

UNREST SPREADS—FOOD CRISIS PUSHES CUBA TOWARD CHAOS

(By Gerald Clark)

KINGSTON, JAMAICA, March 26.—If you have ever seen anyone die of cancer you will understand what is happening to Cuba. I left there Saturday, dumbstruck at the shattering disintegration that has taken place since my last visit just a year ago.

In 1961 some people in Havana grumbled and cursed the steady ingrowing of communism. But at least they looked healthy and ate well.

In 1962 the grumbling has taken on ominous proportions, with women battling in market places for food for their children.

All of Cuba is hungry and has just emerged from its first week of rationing with hardly a hope that there will be any improvement.

An entire nation is on the edge of starvation and complete economic collapse.

So desperately short of cash is Castro's government that it has not been able to place an order in Canada, on which it has relied for some essentials since the U.S. embargo, for 4 months.

DRY TOAST, BLACK COFFEE

I stayed at Havana's finest hotel, the Riviera, reserved mainly for diplomats and others whom the government wants to impress. And yet my breakfast was limited to dry toast and black coffee. Butter has not been seen for several weeks, and milk is reserved for children under the age of seven.

In 8 days I had one egg. On nightly tours of the best restaurants I was lucky occasionally to find a small slice of stewing beef; otherwise my meals consisted of spaghetti or black beans. Getting enough to eat is a constant preoccupation even for a foreign visitor. For Cubans it has become a matter of life or death.

Women line up outside grocery stores and markets at midnight, waiting for the doors to open at 7 a.m. When I visited markets at 8 a.m. entire supplies had vanished. Women walked away clutching a parcel of three or four onions, two, or three bananas and—if they got there early enough—three quarters of a pound of meat to last the week. The only remaining foodstuffs I saw in a half dozen shops were tins of tomato puree and bottles of tomato ketchup.

On Friday in one marketplace women gathered to collect the 2 pounds of chicken that had been promised them. When butchers started to hack the chickens and to apportion individual wings and legs the women rebelled, swarming over the counters and snatching what they could. Milicianas—part-time female soldiers in blue shirts and khaki skirts—broke up the riot, and arrested 10 of the housewives.

There have been several other instances in the past week of women angrily demanding their rations. In each case, militiamen stood back, leaving the job of controlling the mobs to militiawomen. The atmosphere is delicate and dangerous, and a stray shot fired by a man against a woman could set off wild, spontaneous demonstrations. The milicianas, though equipped with ugly submachine guns, curb their fellow women with fire hoses and fists.

The battle of Cuba today, therefore, is a battle between women. Whether it flares into something more violent and far reaching is difficult to foresee.

A year ago I wrote that any invasion of Cuba would be met with stiff resistance because many people were loyal to Castro; this was confirmed, disastrously for Cuban exiles, a few weeks later.

Today I would not make such a prediction because the situation has changed drastically. Castro still has a rigid core of fanatic supporters, particularly among the teenagers who are being steadily indoctrinated. He also has an effective secret police, who even took to following me in Havana. He can boast of at least 300,000 armed militia men and women. But their loyalty is less certain; they themselves are ill fed.

The main force in Cuba, however, is the big flexible mass of people who last year wavered in their enthusiasm but did not join the vociferous group of anti-Castroites in open condemnation. So long as their stomachs were full there was relative contentment and the remarks were restrained.

OPEN RESENTMENT

But now hunger has brought on bitter and open resentful comments even by people who a few months ago classified themselves as supporters of the revolution. One man said to me: "I want some boots."

"Boots?" I said "How many pairs—one, two?"

"No, 70,000 pairs." "Seventy thousand pairs?" I echoed. "Don't you know you can be put in jail for black marketeering?"

"No," said the man. "Bring them back filled with marines."

This was not entirely facetious humor. Cubans realize that the United States would hesitate to participate itself in an active invasion without at least a technical excuse. But what would happen, they ask, if desperate women really started massive rioting and looting, and a whole series of contagious mob scenes took place? What would happen if one outburst after another had to be suppressed by gunfire and a slaughter of women? And then if a clandestine radio appealed, "in the name of the Cuban people," for American intervention?

It is not entirely certain that the Russians now would retaliate. There is evidence that even the Russians are uneasy about the sharp downward turn in Cuba's economy and the burden it is likely to prove. Members of the Eastern bloc—especially East Germans—astonished me by their frankness in saying that the Cuban revolution is a failure and should be written off.

GERMAN DISGUSTED

An East German electronics engineer, in Havana to fit equipment in a Cuban freighter, told me "I am disgusted with these people. They do not want to work, and they expect us to take sugar for our efforts. There is a limit to the amount of sugar Germany needs. We would like some money instead."

A Yugoslav said flatly: "You can say that Cuba is near collapse."

And even more significantly a Cuban Communist, referring to the desperate food shortage, said quietly: "The United States has won this round."

The fact that people do not work is not due wholly to Cuban indolence. It is a measure of the growing campaign of passive resistance. A doctor related how he agreed to examine a group of young campesinas, farm girls brought to Havana for a course in motor mechanics. "When they show up in the morning," he told his nurse, "I will not be there. Their leader will fume and rant and say I am a counterrevolutionary. Simply tell the girls that I could not come to the office because I had to go to the market to line up for meat for my family."

More direct resistance is lacking. A year ago I heard in Havana at least a half dozen bomb explosions a night; this time I heard none. Secret police swept up 50,000 Cubans, among them the leaders of the active underground, after last April's invasion attempt.

EMOTIONAL RESISTANCE

But the resistance has taken another, emotional form. Anonymous women telephone people at random and say "My children are hungry. Give me some food and pass on this message." And soon, like the old-style chain letters, the insidious message circulates.

What went wrong, from Castro's point of view? For one thing—judging from the remarkably candid speeches last week by both Castro and his chief planner, Che Guevara—it is clear that Cubans themselves miscalculated their capacities; they simply could not deliver their planned economy in time.

Aside from the U.S. embargo, Cuba has been hard hit by the exodus of some 200,000 men and women, many of them skilled technicians and managers. The KLM plane on which I flew to Kingston to file this uncensored cable was filled not with wealthy refugees but with engineers, truck drivers and other humble people and their families.

NO RUSSIAN AID

For another thing, the Soviet Union has failed to make good its promises or, put another way, refuses to subsidize Cuba blindly. Like the East Germans, the Russians want payment beyond sugar. When I was in Havana a year ago Che Cuevara told me how 60 factories, provided by the Eastern bloc, were due to be completed in a matter of months. In actuality, only three insignificant factories have been built—a Hungarian tomato cannery, an East German biscuit bakery, and a Czech pencil factory. There is no sign of any others under construction.

Economically, Cuba is virtually on its last legs. Some stockpiles of materials in U.S.-built factories still existed as recently as the turn of the year, but almost all are now used up. Such consumer goods as the Russians and Chinese did send in—watches, radios, flashlights—have not been replenished. It is, of course, reasonable to assume that Cubans can be made to go on without watches and flashlights. And, in fact, the government has now reversed itself and said that industrialization can wait, that the emphasis must be on agriculture production, especially sugar for payment of debts.

But agriculture itself has faltered. After last year's bumper crop of nearly 6,500,000 tons this year's sugar production is unlikely to exceed 4 million tons, partly the result of drought, partly the indifference of professional cane cutters and last year's unscientific cutting by amateurs recruited in the cities.

QUICK CASH

Other foodstuffs are sold abroad for quick cash. Canada last week received a planeload of Cuban tomatoes despite a general decline of all farm items. This is the height of the harvest season, and yet city people are reduced to a diet of malanga, a kind of sweet potato that at one time only the most impoverished ate. And malanga is on ration—and so is rice—6 pounds a month per person—a sample in the Cuban menu. Allotment of butter is two ounces a month. Fish, though in theory doled out at the rate of a half pound fortnightly, is seldom available.

So short are supplies that a reverse trend is noticeable. In Britain during World War II city dwellers sometimes had their rations (much bigger, incidentally, than the present Cuban rations) supplemented by food gifts from friends in the countryside. But those Cuban farmers who have not been resettled in collectives must sell everything to a government agency; a farmer faces a year's imprisonment if he kills a hog for his own use. Today people in Havana, when they can get their hands on rice, send packets to relatives in the rural areas. Roadblocks have been set up by the militia to eliminate this illicit traffic. Even greater hunger will be felt when the harvest is over.

RUSSIAN ROLE

Why has Russia not done more, why has she not shipped over masses of food to con-

solidate what would appear to be a heaven-sent opportunity for her—a foothold in Latin America? Western diplomats discount the theory that Russia hasn't the food to spare; feeding another 6 or 7 million people would not be an overwhelming burden, especially if the stakes are high. There are probably other reasons behind the present crisis. The food shortage became acute only in the last 2 or 3 weeks, and it is possible that the Russians were misled by earlier optimistic forecasts of Castro and his colleagues. But the more likely reason is this: The Russians feel that if Cubans really intend to have socialism they must suffer a bit more. There is open resentment by Soviet bloc technicians against the spirit of traditional Cuban play which still prevails (last week Havana completed its annual and costly carnival). There is also a final realization that Cubans enjoyed a far higher standard of living than any East Europeans.

The theory now is that the Russians will let Cuban hunger pains grow more acute, and then will send in supplies so they can earn Cuban gratitude; in other words they will not let Cubans starve to death. But this presupposes a precise psychological moment for aid, and the lid may well blow off beforehand.

In the meantime, some typically ill-conceived events are taking place. Cuba has not been able to find the dollars to land a single order in Canada since November 26. However, last week, as part of a back order, a chartered Canadian plane flew into Havana with a load of cholera serum for hogs. But diabetic patients die every day because there is no insulin in the entire island.

Hon. David J. Arnold

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. David J. Arnold, a distinguished citizen of Georgia, passed away suddenly this morning.

Our State has lost an outstanding businessman, banker, political leader, and I have sustained the loss of a lifelong, loyal, and devoted friend.

Mr. Arnold was a man possessed of a dynamic personality as well as the very highest character and integrity.

He was a public minded, progressive businessman, successful in banking and related businesses.

He was president of the Commercial Bank & Trust Co. of Griffin, Ga., a strong and progressive financial institution.

Mr. Arnold was born in Hampton, Henry County, Ga., June 26, 1897. He graduated from Hampton High School in 1913 and from the Riverside Military Academy in 1914. He graduated from the Georgia School of Technology with a B.S. degree in electrical engineering in 1918, and afterward attended the U.S. Military Academy.

Mr. Arnold was a member of the Baptist Church and the Sigma Alpha Epsilon Fraternity .

In 1929–31 he represented Henry County in the House of Representatives of Georgia. He was a member of the Georgia Constitutional Commission of 1945 which revised and delivered the present Constitution of Georgia.

In 1933 he moved to Griffin, Ga., where he made his home until his death.

In 1942 he was elected to the State senate from the 26th senatorial district which, at that time, comprised the counties of Spalding, Butts and Fayette. In 1944 he was elected to the House of Representatives from Spalding County. He was a member of the State Democratic executive committee, and was a member and a former Chairman of the Fourth District Democratic Executive Committee.

On February 24, 1922, in McDonough, Ga., he married Miss Ethel Miriam Sloane, who with their daughter, Miss Miriam Arnold—Mrs. William Newman—survive him.

David J. Arnold was the son of Dr. Robert Johnson Arnold, a prominent physician of Henry County, Ga., who was himself a representative in the General Assembly of Georgia, from Henry County, in 1913–17, and Nellie Curry Arnold.

His sister, Mrs. Frances Arnold Brown, is the widow of Hon. Paul Brown, late a representative of the 10th District of Georgia.

He is also survived by a brother, Robert O. Arnold of Covington, Ga., a prominent textile manufacturer, businessman, former mayor of Athens, Ga., and presently chairman of the board of regents of the university system of Georgia.

David Arnold, throughout his life, was an able, courageous and strong individual who, through his ability and his influence, played a major role in the life of his community and his State. His influence was an influence for good and our community and our State are better places because of the impact of his activity and of his life.

He will be missed and mourned by his family, his friends, and the community of which he was a part.

Mrs. Flynt and our children join me in extending to Mrs. Arnold and daughter, Mrs. Newman, and Mr. Arnold's brother and sister, our heartfelt sympathy in their bereavement.

The Sea of Galilee: A Democratic Institution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, it was my distinct privilege to be present at Jonesboro, Ark., on November 30, 1961, when Dr. L. H. McDaniel, of Tyronza, Ark., delivered an outstanding address to the Craighead County Women's Democratic Club. The subject was "The Sea of Galilee: A Democratic Institution." Dr. McDaniel has practiced medicine in the city of Tyronza, Ark., for more than 40 years. He has administered to the rich and poor alike. Although he enjoys a lucrative practice, his services are available to patients even though they are unable to pay him.

In recent years, Dr. McDaniel has sponsored a national medical meeting in his home city of Tyronza, which has drawn renowned leaders in various fields of endeavor, including the medical profession, from throughout the United States. At the last such meeting held about 3 years ago, more than 3,500 people attended. Another such national event is being arranged by Dr. McDaniel durin the month of October 1962.

He has been honored signally by those who know him best. He has served as State commander of the American Legion, district governor of Rotary International, board of trustees of Erskine College in South Carolina, president of the Arkansas Medical Association, and many other honors that could be enumerated, including being a delegate to the Democratic National Convention in 1960.

The full text of his address follows:

THE SEA OF GALILEE: A DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTION

My friends, after hearing that delightful introduction, I feel that I have the same sentiment as did the cow toward the milkman on the bitter cold morning, "Thanks for the warm hand." I feel certain after this address that you will never say that your beloved program chairman deserves the epitaph that was found on the tombstone of a maiden lady in our section which read, "She played her game through—no runs, no hits, no errors." Your illustrious chairman has made several runs, many hits, and now she is making her first error, and a grievous error, I assure you, in choosing me to make this Democratic women's address to such a group of charm, intelligence, grace, and sincerity. I assure you that my appearance here tonight ranks high among the honors of my lifetime.

I will ask you to pardon me for referring to my notes at times if that becomes necessary. I am again reminded what a father, who was an experienced speaker, told his son afterward, when the latter was almost obliged to read his speech. He said, "Son, there were only three things wrong with your speech. You read it, you read it poorly, and it wasn't worth reading to begin with." How brutally frank a father can be.

Recently I learned that whenever the President of the United States invited anyone to take breakfast or even confer with him, there is no such thing as a refusal; for the invitation amounts to a "command performance." I wish to accept my beloved friend's invitation tonight as a command performance.

Will you forgive me for being sentimental long enough to give you my tribute to a friend and I ask you to ponder each and every word. I give it to you as follows:

Oh, the joy, the unexplainable joy of feeling safe with a person, having neither to weigh words nor measure thoughts
But pour them all right out, knowing that a faithful heart will take all, grain and chaff alike, keep those that are worth keeping
And with the breath of love and friendship blow the rest away.

My friends, use that test and weed out the sheep from the goats as far as the true, sincere friends are concerned, and incidentally, Madam Program Chairman, I had a young lady quote me a poem a few days ago that gave me a boost after I had been regretfully

accusing myself of being an old has-been. I quote:

"I'd rather be a could-be
If I couldn't be an are
For a could-be is a may-be
With a chance of reaching par.

"I'd rather be a has-been
Than a might-have-been by far
For a might-have-been has never been
And a has-been was once an are."

I must quote you a poem that to me has the faith, ideals, and purposes of our Democratic Party in every line and thought. I quote:

"If nobody cheered, and nobody smiled,
And nobody helped you along,
And each, every moment looked after himself
And the good things all went to the strong.

"If nobody cared just a little for you,
And nobody thought about me,
And we all stood alone in the battle of life,
What a dreary old world this would be.

"Life is sweet because of the friends we have made
And the things which in common we share,
We want to live on, not because of ourselves,
But because of the people who care.

"It's giving and doing for somebody else.
On this all life's splendor depends,
And when the joy of the world is all added up,
It is found in the service of friends."

Yes, service to the individual, the masses, the underprivileged and the downtrodden; yes, comfort and inspiration for the lowly and exalted alike—that is democracy in action, democracy at its best.

Indigenous to human nature is the desire for supremacy. Irrespective of station or attainment this inborn nature will reveal itself. In early man, inclined to cudgel and browbeat, in barbarous races who ill treat and whiplash, in monster kings who subjugate and oppress, in octopuslike tradesmen who strangle and devour: this instinct appears. In baby fingers which desire all in reach, in boyhood eagerness which demands always the best, in manhood's grip which seizes all it can, in shriveled hands which release reluctantly at death the accumulations of a life: we see at work this inner craving. Nor shall we say that desire for supremacy is unworthy. In the divine order of things and events, human beings are appointed to parenthood, to kingship and to leadership. I think we are safe in saying that the Democratic Party, as well as the Republican, constantly strives to merit the leadership that our Nation bestows on the party in power. These appointments to places of authority, power and leadership, however, were never made by the Great Architect of the universe in order to afford occasions of domineering but rather opportunities of service, not benefit to the classes but the masses. The divine estimate of true greatness rests upon the individual or a nation who realizes in his life, whether of king or slave, powerful political leader or humble private in the ranks, the call to service and heeds it. The man or woman, may I become specific and say the American citizen who has not seen in his life the challenge to serve the world, "service above self" as the Rotarians so aptly put it, has missed the high calling.

My dear friends, there are two seas in Palestine. One is fresh, with fish in it. Splashes of green dot the shoreline where children play. The River Jordan fills this sea with sparkling water from the hills. Men build their houses near it, birds their nests. From the Sea of Galilee, the River Jordan flows south into another sea. Here the air hangs heavy over the waters that neither man or beast will drink. There is no splash of fish, no refreshing greenery, no children's laughter. To avoid the Dead Sea, travelers choose another route unless their business is urgent. There is a reason why these two neighboring seas, both supplied with the same water of the River Jordan, differ as they do. The Sea of Galilee, and it is not farfetched to call it a democratic institution, receives but does not keep the waters of the River Jordan. For every drop that flows into it, another drop flows out. The giving and receiving is in equal measure. The Dead Sea—and how much it symbolizes the Republican Party concept—is shrewd, hoarding its water jealously. Every drop it gets, it keeps. The Sea of Galilee gives and lives. The Dead Sea gives nothing. The Republican Party, I assure you, is not wholly evil, for any party that lists Dr. Durwood Hall of Missouri, Dr. Walter Judd of Minnesota, and the late Dr. Elmer Hess from Pennsylvania, and that illustrious Winthrop Rockefeller, our beloved adopted son of Arkansas who is speaking at this very moment to the Republican women of Jonesboro, has a tremendous potential for good. Yes, it truly is like I told you a moment ago:

It's giving and doing for someone else
On this all life's splendor depends
And when the joy of the world is all added up
It is found in the serving of friends.

That to me is my interpretation of democracy.

I went over some of the following attempts at wit with my wife before coming. I told her that I did not think they were half bad. She told me: "No, they are not half bad, they are all bad." How a wife does resemble an umpire. "You're never safe when you're out," which only reminded me that the trouble with today's smart children is that they don't smart in the right place.

One of our Tyronza ministers, Rev. Earle Edwards, whom many of you know and love as do we, recently asked a young man whose father's funeral service he was preparing, to tell him the last words of his father. The son replied: "He didn't have any, mother stayed with him to the end."

A new Sunday school teacher at the Tyronza Methodist Church was questioning the pupils to ascertain their knowledge of the scriptures and asked a little 5-year-old girl: "Who was Noah?" No reply. "Who was Moses?" No reply. "Who was Peter?" Her reply: "Teacher, wasn't he some kind of a wabbit?"

An Arkansas Medical College freshman in the first weekly quiz in anatomy wrote as the answer to the question, "What is anatomy?" "Anatomy is something that everybody has only it looks better on girls." You will note that each one is trying to come up with the right answer and after all is said and done, aren't we all. We Democrats are constantly trying to come up with the right answer.

And I couldn't help but think of a little incident that happened in my hometown of Tyronza a few years ago. My dear late friend, Fred Eden, operated a stock barn and as the tractor replaced the mule he dealt more with milk cows and cattle. The Methodists were holding a meeting and Fred told the Methodist steward on the opening day that he had a fine calf he would sell that week and contribute to the expenses of the meeting. The last night of the meeting came and Fred had not gotten around to selling the fine calf. In the middle of the last song when he was dozing, he suddenly awoke and hurried himself out of the church. After services his wife rounded him up and rebuked him about his action and his reply was, "Everything was all right till they started singing that song about "the calf has not been sold.'" His wife said, "How crazy you are, they were singing, 'The half has not been told.'" Well the half has not been told about some of the wonderful things that lie in store for America under the dynamic inspiration of our leaders throughout America as well as Washington.

My friends, as our beloved America progresses further and further along the pathway of civilization and culture, as our shores are becoming each day more of a haven to a liberty-seeking world, as the stories of opportunities for success that are captured each day in the business, economic and educational attainments of our land, it is natural that we should look back with a more sincere pride on the heroes of our bygone days and try to gain a clearer insight into the vision, reasoning, philosophy and sturdy honesty of that group who founded our Republic and made it's government a successful reality in the family of nations.

Surely it is just as imperative that we now look back sanely and logically and avoid as many of the mistakes as possible that are inevitable in the birth, growth and mature conduct of any young nation. That is why our forefathers wisely insisted that eternal vigilance to be the price of liberty, to have a periodic soul-searching as to the reason of unfulfilled dreams in government in the past, to lay plans for the logical course to pursue at that particular time in the light of new conditions that have arisen and to envision new ideas for the growth, prosperity and tranquility of our Nation.

In this day of increasingly more vexing world problems, political unrest, unbridled nationalism, lust for power and domination, strange and sataanic ideologies, it is all the more vital that America not only thinks calm but acts calm. Our political membership offers through the Democratic Party, the party of many of our forefathers, the party that over the years has been dedicated to the bloom and full blossom of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, its greatest rendezvous with destiny in bringing forth dedicated leaders who will not be stampeded nor frightened by the turn of international events. We believe we have the neighbor, yes a neighbor to every city and hamlet in our 50 States, the leader, the inspiring quarterback, the statesman who invites and gets cooperation from his associates by gentle persuasiveness rather than bluster, a patriot above sectionalism, and a young man of vision, tact and decision most eminently fitted to solve the problems that are not around the corner but staring us right in the face and God bless the little Jacqueline at his side.

May this following vision and this even shorter prayer constitute the afterglow of my remarks.

My vision: The Democratic Party has a rendezvous with destiny, a destiny of peace, progress, and world brotherhood.

My prayer: With Thy help, dear God, our party and our America shall not fail that rendezvous.

How I love to shut my eyes and think of our leadership at Washington as a well-knit football team trying to win this great game in which we are all so involved. You may call this game the cold war if you wish. If we win this one there will be no hot war, no playoff of a tie. There is our quarterback—our matchless President calling the signals—ever looking for a weak place in our opponents line to probe or a place in our own line that is showing unexpected strength and a spot where might arise the winning touchdown. The Air Corps and our military might are the ends—ready to dart out and complete the long pass that means ultimate victory. The two halfbacks, my dear ladies, are represented by labor and industry. Now the one carries the ball while the other runs interference and on the next

play it may be that the procedure is reversed. And that fullback who is backing up the line is that group of stalwart statesmen watching over every play, ready to close the hole in the line should one arise, and my friends, this patriotic fullback services his country regardless of party affiliation or expected financial or political benefits. I mean statesmen like JOHN MCCLELLAN and BILL FULBRIGHT, TOOK GATHINGS, DALE ALFORD, WILBUR MILLS, OREN HARRIS, Judge JAMES TRIMBLE, Mrs. CATHERINE NORRELL, WALTER JUDD, DURWARD HALL, CLIFF DAVIS. I call their names because I know them best but they are there from every State in the Union and I do not mean to overlook our 50 Governors and their State legislatures. Then the alert center who is in the spot where he can detect every sudden place of weakness is none other but our beloved J. Edgar Hoover and his FBI, from his first assistant to his lowliest file clerk. The guards are made up of those thousands of unsung workers like Brooks Hays, etc., who serve their country 24 hours a day in the hundreds of vital jobs that are so necessary to the well-being of our Republic and whose loyalty will ever guard our errand of peace, prosperity, and international brotherhood from forgetfulness. Surely our religious leaders like Billy Graham, Norman Vincent Peale, and Ralph Sockman belong to that group, that groups whose zeal for the religious life of America is so vital to our eternal salvation and also our destiny as a republic. The tackles of this unbeatable team is made up of the American youth of today, the John Glenns, the Alan Shepards, the Wernher von Brauns, fearless, earnest, and dedicated. Possibly I should single out our West Point, our Annapolis, and our Air Force Academy and the other service and patriotic organizations, our youth in the Army and also our youth in the classroom. That, my dear ladies, is my "All-American" team. Nay, it is more, it is my "all-time, all-world team of destiny." The winner and still the champion.

You know my friends, in each address I take 2 minutes for public relations efforts and here goes that 2 minutes. I think that if I refer you to the scriptures, Matthew: Chapters: 5, 6, 7, that I will be assured that you, on reading, will receive the greatest public relations address ever made in any language. May I be specific and say, "The Sermon on the Mount," which if earnestly pondered and obeyed contains enough public relations to make every transaction a lasting source of satisfaction to all concerned, enough advice to make every family's home a heaven on earth, enough brotherhood to spur every nation to beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks, enough law to make disputes among men and groups of men as outmoded as human slavery, enough rules of human conduct that would make human transgression only a bitter memory, enough guides in economic transactions that disputes would never arise to what's mine or thine in a veritable utopia on earth "where each in his separate star would draw the thing as he sees it for the God as things as they are." I believe that the public relations for this group tonight and any and every group anytime, anywhere, could best be served by assuring you that, after all, the rule to insure happy and enduring public relations is that Golden Rule of human conduct: "Do ye also unto others, as you would have them do unto you."

You know, my friends, somehow when I get a little philosophical and I do every time that I realize that the first requirement of communism is atheism, I can't help but remember those little questions and answers from the cathechism that every Presbyterian lad has to recite perfectly before being admitted to the adult class. I repeat the first three rapidly and leave the other 110 to your imagination. "Man's chief duty is to obey God and enjoy Him forever, and the scriptures principally teach what man is to believe concerning God, and what duty God requires of man and God is a spirit, infinite, eternal and unchangeable in His being wisdom, power, holiness, goodness, justice and truth." Communism asks you, me, everyone to give up those ideals and those principles. That I refuse to do and I hope every red-blooded American living feels as I do. That is my 2-minute address on public relations.

Mrs. McDaniel and I had the rare good fortune of attending the convention of Rotary International in Lucerne, Switzerland, about 4 years ago along with a 21-day plane and bus tour of many of the cities of Europe. We will give you rapidly our crowning experience of the trip.

The last night we spent in Weisbaden, the present American Airbase in West Germany, we were honored with a musical recital by the high school glee club dressed in their native costumes. We were most favorably impressed by the people of West Germany. How a people so lovely, so industrious, so frugal, so fundamental, could have ever been so basely deceived by Adolph Hitler we cannot understand. And when those 21 boys and girls who made up the glee club were exchanging musical greetings with us I could not help but remember that only a little more than 12 years before—that very night—our Air Force was raining death and destruction on those very children, 17 out of 21 having lost a father or brother in World War II and at the close of the recital our Rotary group of 74 gave them a few American numbers including "Let Me Call You Sweetheart" and to have those German children singing the same song back to us in their native German and as our closing numbers we sang "Dixie" and "God Bless America" and those children echoed it right back to us in German.

My dear friends of our mutual democratic faith, this one experience was by far the highlight of our Rotary tour. I thought I found more Christianity, more forgiveness and more "Sermon on the Mount" that night than I have ever seen before.

An illustrious, patriotic and thoroughly sane American, whose name slips my mind, has truthfully said that some German out of the 5 million slain in World War II might have discovered the cure for cancer. Some American might have worked out a philosophy to make men brothers. Some Russian who sleeps in an unmarked grave might have come forth with a vision that would have made men beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks. Some English lad might have announced a system of agriculture that would make two blades of grass grow where only one has grown before. Some Roman boy who was pushed into "the folly of the ages" by a designing Mussolini might have been another Raphael or another Michaelangelo. Some French boy eternally humiliated and ignominiously betrayed by a cowardly national administration might have been another Lafayette. The Democratic Party is always dedicated to peace, a peace with honor and its benevolent principles try so hard to avoid all provocations of distrust and hatred and belligerency.

The money that is spent annually for war debts and for war preparation—called national security—would clear every acre of land in the world that ought to be cleared, would drain every marsh and swamp, would water every desert, would fertilize every wornout acre, and convert the whole earth into continuous series of fruitful fields and green meadows, would build beautiful villages, towns, and cities along comfortable highways and would provide free transportation along these highways.

The money that is spent annually for past wars, present national security, and future preparation and we dare not to spend it, would endow enough schools, academies, and colleges to educate the whole human race free of cost to the recipients of the education: would build churches and public halls and community centers for every community in the Nation and furnish them with libraries adequate to the needs of a billion human beings. If man would beat his swords into plowshares and his spears into pruning hooks, the wilderness and solitary place would be glad and the desert would rejoice and blossom as the rose. America's hills would be like Carmel and Sharon of long ago, and our valleys would be as "the garden of God."

The First World War cost the lives of 9,998,771 men. The loss of life from the decline in the birth rate and the increase in the death rate is estimated by the Danish Research Society to have been even greater than the direct cost of 9,988,771 men.

The cost of the Second World War was at least twice as great in men and money. It is estimated that World War II cost $19 million per hour. If the ideals of the Golden Rule could have prevailed there wouldn't have been either World War I or II. Ladies and friends, I assure you that your Democratic Party and mine strives for a world of unlimited opportunity, freedom from strife and fear, a veritable Utopia on earth, "where the war drums throb no longer and the battle flags are furled. In the parliament of man, the federation of the world. There the commonsense of most shall hold a fretful realm in awe, and the kindly earth shall slumber, lapt in universal law."

Let me tell you another story, a true story and not a beautiful product of the imagination, for truth is always stranger than fiction, and then I will be through. A group of American tourists in Dublin, Ireland, passed three workers, each at a rockpile, scattered along the roadside a block apart. Incidentally, my friends speaking of Ireland reminds me that our good President's grandfather came from Catholic southern Ireland while my grandfather, a minister of the Scotch Presbyterian faith came from Protestant North Ireland. The President and I you understand—just a couple of good Irish boys trying to get along. In order to make a happy conversation our tourist friend said to the first man, "My good man, what are you doing?" Without looking up, and murmuring, Pat said, "Breaking rock." As he approached the second man, the tourist again plied his question, and the answer from Mike was that he was working for the equivalent of a dollar a day. As he approached the third man, who seemed to be watching his rock, rolling it over in his hands and measuring distances as he worked, the tourist said, "My good man, what are you doing?" And this laborer replied, "Building a cathedral to the glory of God." How I would like to ponder over that true story and realize that the noble man or woman who is ever alert to serve his fellowman is constantly building a cathedral to the glory of God. So in closing I must pay my tribute to you Democratic women:

"If with pleasure you are viewing any work
someone is doing,
Tell him now!
Don't withhold your approbation
Until the preacher makes oration
And he lies with snowy lilies on his brow.
For no matter how you shout it,
He will never know about it:
He'll not know how many teardrops you
have shed.
So, if you think some praise is due him,
Now is the time to slip it to him,
For he cannot read his tombstone when he's
dead."

Now to our Democratic women. Where do we men get our inspiration? From the fact that some business deal has gone over well,

from the fact that we think our income will be sufficient to meet our obligations, from the fact that we hold positions of honor in our church, lodge, or civic organizations? Not at all. Our inspiration has come from the sweet faces and yet sweeter smiles of our wives and sweethearts. Many days for us have been dark and gloomy but wives and sweethearts, you have turned the gloom into brightness and made light to shine through darkness.

Wife, sweetheart. And every Democratic woman is a wife or sweetheart. What a volume in a word, an ocean in a tear, heaven in a glance, a whirlwind in a sigh, a millennium in a touch. Wives and sweethearts, you spur his ambition, you chasten his spirit, you enrich and ennoble the purpose of his life. Sometimes you mock him; always you lure him. And when he has found you and won you he faces the future with steadier gaze and treads again the path of life with feet that shall not falter nor lose the way. Yes, every wife and sweetheart has a rendezvous with destiny, a destiny that only womanhood can perfect that will help the sullen clouds of international hatred, suspicion, and greed to be wafted away by the gentle breezes of international peace, world wide brotherhood and mutual helpfulness and then the poets dream will be a living reality—"There the commonsense of most will hold a fretful realm in awe and the kindly earth shall slumber lapt in universal law."

Good night and God bless each and every one of you Democratic ladies.

Little-People-to-Little-People Letters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and colleague, PETER RODINO, has a son Peter III, who has a unique movement called little-people to little-people. Peter III has written letters to President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev. As part of my remarks, I would like to include the two thoughtful letters Peter III wrote. I believe that this unique approach to better understanding between young people can make an excellent contribution toward better understanding among their elders. Soon the leaders of this generation will pass from the scene and the generation of young Peter will be called upon to bear the responsibility of our Nation's future and for freedom's future everywhere.

They face great challenges but equally great are their opportunities. They study now of Columbus who ventured beyond the ocean, but in Peter's lifetime men will be exploring what lies beyond the stars.

Peter's early realization that most problems can be solved by better understanding and better communication gives us all hope. He is to be complimented and encouraged.

NEWARK, N.J., *March 4, 1961.*

DEAR MR. KHRUSHCHEV: I'm the same boy who wrote you the letter to stop exploding bombs. My friends and other children wrote to you too. You said you want peace but you didn't even answer.

Now, I think I have another idea that will help the people of the world. It's this. Little children here in America should write to little children in Russian and all over the world. This way we will tell the children in Russia and the other children about America and how we like people and really want to help them and the children from Russia and all over will write to us about their country and what they do. We will become friends that way and I think will help the world find peace.

So, even if you don't want to answer my other letter will you please send me the names and addresses of some children. Then I will write to them or you can let them know about me and the children can write themselves. I have told my friends and other children all over to write letters too. I wrote to President Kennedy and I'm sure he thinks this is a good idea because he wants peace.

I hope you will answer.

Sincerely,

PETER RODINO III.

NEWARK, N.J., *March 4, 1962.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I was in Washington on your inauguration. I remember what you said in your speech. You said don't ask your country to do something for you, but for you to do something for my country, and I'm trying to do something for my country.

This is it.

I'm asking other children like me to write to other little children in Russia and all over the world. We can tell them about America, and what we do, and how we want to help people. In this way the children in other countries will like us and be our friends. In this way I think this will help the world find peace.

I know you're a very busy man but I wanted to tell you this so you would tell me what you think.

You are doing a great job. And may God bless you.

Sincerely,

PETER RODINO III

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

TV for Adults

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, ever since the day that FCC Chairman Newton Minow referred to television as a "vast wasteland," one congressional committee after another has been holding hearings on how to improve television.

With these hearings in mind, it is particularly refreshing to find a commercial television station doing an outstanding job in the public affairs field. And, I am happy to report that the station is in Missouri–St. Louis, to be specific—KMOX–TV, owned and operated by the Columbia Broadcasting System.

On March 18, 1962, the New York Times carried an article by Joan Barthel on how this television station is teaching adults to read and write. The program on KMOX–TV has served as a model for other stations to follow.

I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times article of March 18, 1962, be printed in the RECORD in its entirety.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 18, 1962]

LEARN TO READ: TV FOR ADULTS

(By Joan Barthel)

The concept of television studio as classroom is no longer a novelty. Nowadays the home screen serves up instruction on the subshell structure of the atom and the graphing of equations. It helps, of course, if the viewer already has an advanced degree or two. Those who do not can still learn to sing a French song or to drive a car.

Just when it would appear that TV teaching has become routine, though, a television station here has celebrated the second anniversary of an educational venture that is anything but routine. For at a time when most adult TV classes deal with status subjects such as physics and calculus, KMOX–TV teaches grownups to read and write.

Six mornings a week, all year round, KMOX–TV presents a series of adult educational programs called "P.S. 4," after the station's channel number. "Learn To Read" is a twice-weekly part of this experiment in what KMOX–TV calls grassroots education.

William L. Tybura, the principal of an elementary school, conducts the program, working with "an easel and ad libs." Though the skills taught are basic ones, Mr. Tybura, an experienced teacher of literacy classes and remedial reading, is careful not to talk down to his students.

Letter sounds are illustrated with such sophistications as "There has been a strange change in the way Ann speaks to Jake these days." A good deal of poetry is used, not only for inspirational purposes, but also to demonstrate how poets worked with syllables, just as the viewer must.

"Learn To Read" is televised on an 18-month basis. The average nonreading adult usually can progress in that time to a sixth-grade reading level, but Mr. Tybura emphasizes that this will not be accomplished solely through TV watching, and he has prepared supplementary aids, which are sent without charge from the KMOX–TV mail room to anyone requesting them. More than 1,200 items of self-help material have gone out, and Mr. Tybura admits to feeling "buoyant" about it all.

SERVICE

He is not the only one who feels that way. Philip J. Hickey, superintendent of instruction for the St. Louis public schools, is enthusiastic, for he sees a direct relationship between adult illiteracy and the achievements of schools.

School officials have worked so closely with KMOX–TV since the programs were in the planning stage that the announcement of the premiere of "P.S. 4" in early 1960 was made jointly by Mr. Hickey and Gene Wilkey, general manager of the station.

For its part, KMOX–TV is gratified because it feels it is serving the needs of the community—the St. Louis area numbers nearly 73,000 adult illiterates. The station's contribution is all the more significant because it is not an educational facility, but a commercial channel owned by the Columbia Broadcasting System.

Since "Learn To Read" was inaugurated, the enormous usefulness of television in combating the national problem of the nearly 8 million Americans classified as "functional illiterates" has come to be recognized on more than a one-city scale. Another commercial station that has assumed the role of reading instructor to adults is WFIL–TV in Philadelphia, whose "Operation Alphabet" began in January of last year.

Response was so enthusiastic that the program is back on the air this year, and a grant from the Annenberg School of Communications of the University of Pennsylvania has enabled WFIL–TV to offer the tapes at no charge to other TV stations.

It would seem from all this that perhaps the unfortunate "either-or" relationship that has existed between television and reading is being replaced by profitable cooperation.

A further indication of this cooperation is an experiment begun by KMOX–TV last fall, a television reading service described by Fred Heywood, director of information services, simply as "an attempt to get people reading again."

Each month KMOX–TV supplies a list of worthwhile network and local programs—entertainment shows and feature films as well as the exclusively educational—to a committee of local educators and librarians, which responds with a list of books logically tied in with the programs.

The station prints the lists—more than 6,000 a month—and distributes them to libraries and to schools. At the last count, 850 public, private, and parochial schools were participating.

KMOX–TV's many educational activities—"P.S. 4," the reading service, and other offbeat ventures, including a weekly televised lecture on "Communism and Freedom" in cooperation with St. Louis University—were described by Parker Wheatley, the station's director of public affairs, as attempts "to change a substantial portion of TV from an entertainment to an entertaining educational experience" and "to raise the educational levels of the community." While it is not particularly unusual for a television station to make such statements, it is somewhat less usual for a local station to realize its objectives in so many tangible ways.

Western Electronics Orders Go National

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1962

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, this year, the West will account for more than one-fourth of all electronic manufacturing in the United States. In so doing, it will continue to provide the technological leadership that has enabled this Nation to far surpass all others in the development and application of electronic science to modern living.

Many large and significant military contracts are being fulfilled by electronic companies in the Western States. The number of military awards that have been made in this region are evidence of the West's technological capabilities and of the western firms' outstanding performance in quality, price, and delivery dependability.

An estimated 215,000 people were directly employed in electronics in the Western States at the beginning of this year. Many thousands more have jobs in allied industries that are dependent upon electronics.

But the significance of electronic activity in such States as California, Oregon, Washington, and Arizona is felt by factories and business firms clear across the continent. For western companies buy materials, components, and equipment for production of military end-use items in the West from 49 States. Moreover, the buying throughout the United States is done not just by one or a few western companies, but by many.

For example, more than 90 percent of electronic companies in the West buy materials in the State of New York. More than 80 percent do procurement in Illinois, Massachusetts, and New Jersey. Well over half of the western firms buy in such States as Pennsylvania and Michigan, which have widely publicized depressed areas.

Evidence of widespread procurement by western companies was obtained in a special survey conducted in March 1962, by the Western Electronic Manufacturers Association—WEMA. All WEMA member companies, some 325 in number, received questionnaires requesting them

to specify the States in which they purchase materials, components, or equipment for the production of military end-use items. A total of 156 companies—mostly in California—responded. The survey participants ranged from very small companies to the largest electronic complexes in the West.

It is highly significant that 6 out of every 7 participating companies are small business firms—fewer than 500 employees—by Government definition. Thus, the survey results are not distorted by the widespread buying of a few large companies. Rather, the results show that States across the Nation benefit from the procurement practices of many western companies.

Shown below, by State, is the percentage of western electronic companies purchasing materials, supplies, and equipment for military end-use items in each individual State:

Percent of companies purchasing in each State

Rank of State:	
New York	92.31
Illinois	85.26
Massachusetts	82.05
New Jersey	82.05
Pennsylvania	77.56
Connecticut	69.87
Ohio	66.67
Indiana	61.54
Michigan	55.77
Texas	53.85
Arizona	42.95
Wisconsin	39.74
Oregon	39.74
Minnesota	38.46
New Hampshire	35.26
Washington	35.26
Colorado	33.33
Maryland	31.41
Rhode Island	29.49
Missouri	28.85
North Carolina	25.00
Florida	23.72
Delaware	22.44
Nebraska	22.44
Kentucky	21.15
Kansas	19.87
Vermont	19.87
Tennessee	19.23
Virginia	18.59
Iowa	17.95
Maine	16.03
South Carolina	14.74
Oklahoma	12.82
West Virginia	12.18
Utah	10.90
Georgia	8.97
Alabama	8.33
Mississippi	7.69
Louisiana	7.05
Wyoming	7.05
New Mexico	7.05
Nevada	5.13
Arkansas	2.56
North Dakota	2.56
Idaho	2.56
South Dakota	1.92
Hawaii	1.28
Alaska	.64
Montana	-----

On a regional basis WEMA's figures show 52 percent of its firms place orders in the west north-central region, 58 percent in the west south-central region, 94 percent in the east-north-central region, 34 percent in the east south-central region, 56 percent in the south Atlantic region, 97 percent in the middle Atlantic region and 88 percent in the New England region.

Often overlooked in the maze of industry statistics is the real reason for the West's leadership in electronics—the technology capability that has been developed by western firms. Since 1957, total employment in electronics in the West has increased 75 percent—from 123,200 to 215,000. In this same 5-year period, the number of graduate engineers in electronics in the West has gone up 100 percent—from 17,000 to 34,000. Nearly one of every six employees in electronic manufacturing firms in the West today has at least one degree in engineering.

A recent survey of WEMA member companies has shown that western electronic companies invest from each sales dollar five times as much in research and development as the average manufacturing firm in the United States. Electronic manufacturers in the West reported that in 1961 they invested 8.5 percent of sales in research and development. This compares to only 1.7 percent for all U.S. manufacturing industries.

In summary, the West has been pacing electronic growth in the United States and will continue to do so because the companies in the Western States have built up a tremendous technological capability that is unequaled anywhere. By investing heavily in research and development—and by exercising sound technical management—they expect to increase their share of the steadily expanding U.S. electronic market.

Freedom—Why?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, Mr. Lowell Schmidt of Huron, S. Dak., who is the senior vice president of Sertoma International has delivered a very excellent address on why we have freedom in America today and why we have a continuing pursuit of freedom in other sections of the world by oppressed people.

Mr. Schmidt in his outstanding address points out some of the pitfalls which face all of us if we do not remain alert to the dangers confronting our continuing efforts to remain free. Mr. Schmidt points out that we must remember that our Declaration of Independence is universal and provides that all men everywhere are created equal.

Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that this speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM—WHY

(By Lowell Schmidt)

When Saul of Tarsus set out on his journey to Damascus, the whole of the known world lay in bondage. There was one state and it was Rome. There was one master for it all, and he was Tiberius Caesar. Everywhere there was civil order, for the arm of the Roman law was long. Everywhere there was stability, in government and in society, for the centurions saw that it was so.

But everywhere there was something else, too. There was oppression, for those who were not the friends of Tiberius Caesar. The tax gatherer took the grain from the fields and the flax from the spindle to feed the legions or fill the hungry treasury from which divine Caesar furnished the circus rather than bread. There was the executioner to quiet those whom Caesar disliked. What was man for but to serve Caesar? There was persecution of men who dared think differently, or read strange manuscripts or whose tribes came not from Rome. Most of all, there was everywhere a contempt for human life. What was one man more or less in a crowded world?

But then a light came into the world and a Man from Galilee defied Caesar and offered a new kingdom in which each man could walk upright and bow to none but his God. The light shone brightly along the road to Damascus but Paul of Tarsus was sore afraid. He feared that other Caesars, other prophets, might one day persuade men that man was nothing but a slave and men might yield their birthright for pottage and walk no more in freedom. So Paul spoke these words: "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage."

In the year 1776 the governments of the whole world were totalitarian—some a little less than others. The kings claimed to rule by divine right. Even England, the home of Magna Carta, was so oppressive that the American colonies revolted in spite of England's great military power. Canada to our north was controlled by the British; the country west of the Mississippi River and to our south, Florida, Mexico and across to California was governed by Spain, as also was most of Central and South America.

The United States, a new little country of 3 million people, was surrounded by totalitarian governments. In spite of this, the principles of liberty and self-government were spreading throughout the world. The French soon threw off the yoke of their king—reforms in England and most of the European countries—Mexico, South and Central America freed themselves from Spain.

Thomas Jefferson wrote to John Adams to 1821: "The flames kindled on the 4th of July 1776, have spread over too much of the globe to be extinguished by the feeble engines of despotism."

Until 1914 when World War I broke out, personal liberty and self-government were spreading throughout the world. The democracy in these United States was a beacon light for the oppressed people everywhere.

But democracy was sadly neglected—it lasted 6 months in Russia, 14 years in Germany. We lacked vigilance, indulged in "progressive education," buried American history and our principles of government under a mass of social studies. We allowed termites of disloyal citizens within and subversive propaganda from without to cloud our vision. Appeasement in high places and the lies and power of the Fascists, Nazis, and Communists led inevitably to World War II. Mussolini and Hitler were eliminated, the evil they had turned loose in the world was not.

We recognized Russia, helped her in World War II and afterward, and allowed too many Americans to flaunt subversive conduct. Stalin and communism consequently survived and began gobbling up nations that embraced freedom and self-government between World Wars.

We are now again back to the totalitarian atmosphere of 1776, and facing the greatest dangers since we became a nation.

There was a time when our way of life in America was simpler and easier, when human values seemed more nearly black and white, when the currents of national pride ran more strongly than they do now.

As a kid growing up on the prairies of South Dakota some 50 years ago, I often listened to the yarns of the old sodbusters as they sat around the hot stove in my father's farm implement store on a winter's evening. They were leathery old pioneers who had lived through drought and blizzard and the devastation of several grasshopper years. They had subsisted on very little and in the end had taken that raw plains country by the scruff of the neck and turned it into a rather gracious and smiling land. They or their fathers had braved a long sea voyage to come to a land that they knew only as a land of promise. They well knew what they had left and, even more keenly, what they had found. My grandparents were part of this sturdy group that drove from Wisconsin to South Dakota in a covered wagon, determined to prove the Government was wrong in betting a quarter section of homestead land that they would not survive the first winter.

Some of these men were veterans of the Civil War. They had a deep and justifiable pride in what they were accomplishing but above all, they possessed an abiding faith in the future of America.

In those day the 4th of July orators called America "the land of opportunity" and "the greatest country on earth" and we believed them. In our homes, our schools, and our churches, we were taught pride in our country, and on holidays the bands played and the flags waved. It never occurred to anyone that all this was unsophisticated or corny.

In this brief half century we have had to grow up and take our place among the nations of the world. It is painful and confusing. Leaders of neutralist nations come to this country, lecture us on our faults—and at the same time ask for—yes, virtually demand, financial assistance.

We are told by people who don't really know us, and who don't know what America is like, and seem to care less, that we are all materialists.

In some cases we deserve censure on our actions. What worries me is the effect this niggling criticism from abroad is having on our national attitude of mind. The seeds of doubt, doubt of ourselves, are too strong within us. There is no reason to be apologetic about America. All nations have made mistakes and none of them can match the decent idealism which we have always brought to world affairs. We have unselfishly poured out our manpower and our treasure in an attempt to shore up freedom and human decency.

As new, hungry, insecure nations grow through their adolescence into maturity, in the family of nations—49 born since the end of World War II—we must learn to understand them. Some of the things they do may shock us, but somehow we must learn to get along with them. The dreams of man finally shape the world, no matter his color or his home. The world is changing. Nations and peoples that we have ignored dare too to dream with us the four great dreams of men and they are:

(1) A world at peace; (2) a decent standard of living; (3) independence and self-government; and (4) human dignity.

In the dream of peace, Communists have made headway toward dominating the minds of men. Peace has always been in men's minds but now it is becoming urgent. Wars now can have no winners. People are really thinking about peace, and they are ready to follow anyone who promises them peace. The Communists capitalize on this, trying to picture Khrushchev as a man of peace. The bulk of the world's people care little whether the world is capitalist or Communist—they just want on the side they think will bring them the kind of world they want to live in. One-third of the world has not yet made up its mind, and it can swing the balance of power. The Communists identify only themselves with peace, and the capitalists with war. They fail to tell the world, and somehow we must find a way to tell them, that only law and order brings peace. Order requires law, the rule of law and not of man. We have replaced law and order for shootings between families, then between communities, then between States. We have the last big step to go, to bring it between nations. The kind of peace promised by the Communists is the peace of a jail. Not one nation has chosen to go behind the Iron Curtain of its own volition. Each has been dragged in by revolution and a wall built to try to keep them there. There are no passports out, no clamor to get in.

The dreams of a decent standard of living has stemmed from the shrinking of the modern world. The 1 billion people who go to bed hungry each night no longer think everybody else is hungry too. In various ways they know that in some lands there is abundance.

No one can deny that Americans are awakening to the pressing need for a greater understanding of and appreciation of our heritage of freedom. Those who can or will do anything about it are few. We in Sertoma are proud to have had a freedom program for a number of years. You have seen evidences of it all around you during this week and particularly today. We are continuing to give students in selected grades of our schools copies of the Declaration of Independence and tell them the story of freedom.

In December it was my privilege to represent Sertoma International at Valley Forge, Pa. Former President Eisenhower dedicated the cornerstone of a Freedoms Center being built by Freedom's Foundation. For some years, Sertoma clubs have helped sponsor this fine, capable organization which is in the forefront of those devoted to preserving our heritage of freedom and our way of life. We believe most Americans would like to share in building this freedom shrine and Sertoma clubs urged this participation during Freedom Week. Your dollar will help build a library and research buildings to house collection and dissemination of freedom information and studies. When completed, it will be open to all men who would learn more of freedom. In particular, it will be used by foreign exchange students for a 1-week indoctrination in the American way of life. Facilities will be provided to handle at least 400 such students each month.

Those who participate in this project will be joining other distinguished Americans, for Dwight D. Eisenhower is honorary chairman, and Herbert Hoover is honorary president. The many other outstanding Americans serving this organization prove its high character and dedicated purpose.

The difference between life behind the Iron Curtain and our way of life is essentially freedom. Freedom of choice, freedom to decide where to live and where to work. Friends who have visited in East Germany and Moscow all tell of sad faces and dejection—yes, the freedom to laugh and the freedom to use cream in a cup of coffee, or to drink it black.

We can't do everything at once, but we can do something at once.

We hear much today of the phrase, "Better Red than dead." Have we adopted a middle of the road course of "half dead and half Red"?

You bet liberty and freedom have a price. It is listed at the end of the Declaration of Indpendence: "and for the support of this declaration, with firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

There can be no question of "Why Freedom?" The only question is, What can we do about it?

There is no place in America for part-time patriots. Communism is no simple threat. It is a sinister and deadly conspiracy which can be conquered only by an alert, informed citizenry, dedicated to the preservation of the principles on which America was founded.

A logical approach in our schools may well be to bring the student's mind to focus on the Iron Curtain and then ask them, and ask them again and again, to continue to search for the answer, Why do the Communists need this curtain?

It is not patriotism but blind nationalism that we must forestall. American patriotism has always been rooted in principles larger than America. The whole point of the Declaration of Independence is its universality—that all men, not just Americans, are endowed by their Creator with equal and inalienable rights. In all our great wars we have sought self-determination and an end to war. Our patriotism not only permits us to love both the Russians and the Chinese, but our consistent dedication to the brotherhood of man demands it. We abhor only the tyrants who enslave. I believe we have it in us to dream and to achieve, to be gallant and proud, to stand up and be counted; to really be Americans.

Is the Press in Trouble?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ran across the following article by William O'Toole in the Columbian magazine, and want to call it to the attention of the Members.

Because of the obvious bias and prejudice on the part of the major part of the press in the trade legislation (H.R. 9900), I had about lost my sense of balance in trying to get a reasonable amount of press for my committee's long and hard program of hearings on the impact of imports on U.S. employment.

I am happy to see that an expert says things from which a public official backs away.

I have had any number of reporters, covering our hearings, tell me that he wrote the "stuff" but it was wastebasketed by the editors or publishers.

The sad part is that because of the selfishness of the press media, that owns its newsprint supply out of the States and the influence of foreign based American profiteers and exploiters, the American economy in serious danger.

Perhaps a few more Members of the House will stop before being overly influenced by the once proud free Ameri-

can press, which, according to the O'Toole article, are becoming "mere commercial enterprises."

Maybe this explains their support for the new trade program which is nothing but a commercial enterprise in spite of the scare headlines and the bleeding heart editorials:

IS THE PRESS IN TROUBLE?

(By William O'Toole)

The number of newspapers purchased by Americans is at an alltime high: 85 million copies, daily average. Yet, since the end of World War II, newspapers have been disappearing or merging at a steady rate. The incident of Los Angeles is only too sadly typical. Although it is experiencing a population increase of fantastic proportions, Los Angeles started the new year of 1962 with a 50 percent drop in its number of daily newspapers. Where there had been four, suddenly there were only two newspapers in the mushrooming City of the Angels.

On CBS each week, 15 minutes of valuable television time is set aside for Charles Collingwood or some guest to point out whatever errors of commission or omission the press may have made during the previous 7 days. Mr. Collingwood never seems to be at a loss for material.

Traditionally the tosser of brickbats at what is phony and false in society, the press now finds itself in the new position of being on the receiving end.

What caused a profession that ranked high for integrity to come under attack and shrivel up the way American journalism has? If it were just a 15-minute program of criticism on TV (plus the occasional, explosive and emotional attacks on the press by Jack Paar when he had his late night show) then serious concern might not be warranted. But there have been criticisms from inside the press as well as outside. The trade papers of journalism are not as backslapping as they used to be. Even at such mutual-admiration-society gatherings of the past * * * the publishers' conventions * * * no attempt is made to deny that the press is in trouble.

"Newspapers should serve a deeper purpose than most of them do."

This is from no outside source of criticism. It is a statement made by Mark F. Ethridge, publisher of the Louisville Courier-Journal and Times. He made it in a pamphlet called "The Press" which was issued recently by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, an agency of the Fund for the Republic, which was set up by the Ford Foundation.

Mr. Ethridge also wrote in the pamphlet that, instead of explaining the issues of the world, there seemed to be a trend for newspapers to become mere commercial enterprises.

"Some publishers think it doesn't make much difference what a paper says as long as the balance sheet is all right," Mr. Ethridge wrote. "Well, it makes a great deal of difference what the paper says; it does to me and I think it should to the American people."

Anticipating the journalistic tragedy in Los Angeles, Mr. Ethridge wrote that there was a tendency among many papers to cut costs or dissolve rather than improve quality to meet the problems of steadily rising costs and increased competition from television for advertising revenues.

"This is distressing to me because I think that if newspapers are to survive they are going to survive because they are vital factors in the life of our society and the lives of our readers," he said.

Unfortunately, most newspaper publishers would rather entertain their readers than be a vital factor. Contests are used to sell newspapers as much as competence in reporting. This dependence for survival on the entertaining gimmick that holds out hope for financial riches to a reader soon drifts to other departments of the newspaper; so much so that the late Prof. Jacob Sher, of Northwestern's School of Journalism, said in obvious distress:

"Newspaper work has become more and more frustrating to the intelligent person."

While the publisher is focusing on his balance sheets, the balance of good reporting is tipped in the favor of sensationalism. It doesn't take long for a reporter to learn that his success in today's journalism may depend on his coming up with a "story" first and the truth second. A recent classic example of this type of slipshod reporting (and editing) was the incident last December in a Florida night club.

It was reported to the Associated Press that Jacqueline Kennedy had been seen doing the "twist" in a night club there. It later turned out that it was someone who looked like the President's wife. Yet, the press has become so used to printing something and checking later (if at all) that this error was flashed all over the country and appeared in print in so many newspapers that Benjamin M. McKelway, president of the Associated Press, had to telegraph an official apology to President Kennedy and request that the apology be printed in all newspapers which carried the original dispatch.

President Kennedy was naturally infuriated by the false report getting into print, especially at a time when his father was critically ill in a hospital. With this factor in mind, especially, it is almost inconceivable that an editor would allow such an item to pass without thorough, prior checking. But it is not so surprising in the light of the sad state of the press. Others who have been similar victims of hasty reportage, have cynically observed that if the item had not been about the President's wife but some lesser known personage, they would have been lucky to get an acknowledgment of the error, much less an apology.

This haphazard, casual attitude for what is true has a subtle effect on journalists, beyond their selecting the sensational at the expense of truth. It creates an attitude of cynical disregard for the worth of truth. Jacques Barzun has already noted this trend among today's newspapermen. In his book, "The House of Intellect," he wrote:

"When it comes to truth, they are derisive, suspicious, faintly hostile."

A good example of this was the revelation, in 1955, by a United Nations Commission that over 10 million people lived in conditions of slavery inside the Soviet Union. As far as the American newspaper-reading public was concerned, this was the first they heard of it.

Yet, 5 years before, a Western correspondent returned from an assignment inside the Soviet Union where he had learned of this fact, even to the exactly same figure of 10 million. When his own news service doubted the veracity of his story and refused to handle it, he gave it to three European-stationed, American foreign correspondents. But they, too, refused to "buy" it.

And so, for 5 years, the free world was generally ignorant of an important fact of Soviet life. These doubting journalists were bearing out the validity of Barzun's observation, quoted above. In their distrust of truth, the press may be approaching that point of which Socrates wrote in his "Parable of the Cave":

"The truth would be literally nothing but the shadows of the images."

Junior Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial and an article which appeared recently in two distinguished newspapers of New Jersey in support of the junior college program. The Senate on February 6 approved a higher education bill including my proposals for a program of assistance for public community colleges. The House of Representatives a week earlier approved its own higher education bill, and both measures have been before the House Rules Committee for several weeks for authority to send them to conference. I am concerned about the delay in getting this legislation on the books and getting the plans and construction started so that many bright young men and women can achieve their goal of college training.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the South Somerset (N.J.) News, Mar. 29, 1962]

NEW RECRUITS FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES

Since 1957, U.S. Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE has been conducting what has been almost a one-man campaign to gain recognition for the need for more junior colleges in the Nation. Although thwarted on many occasions by the intricacies of Congress, he never has diminished his efforts to gain legislation for a program that has been recommended by two Presidential commissions and many educators.

Because the senior Senator from New Jersey has persisted in this great cause, the College Academic Facilities and Scholarship Act, as offered by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, includes an amendment "providing grant assistance to the States upon a matching basis for the construction of public community colleges."

How effectively Senator CASE worked for his cause is probably best illustrated by the fact that two members of the committee submitted a lengthy minority opinion opposing the bulk of the bill—while giving wholehearted support to the Case amendment.

The Senate minority here was no less a formidable team of conservatives than BARRY GOLDWATER of Arizona and JOHN G. TOWER of Texas, and they oppose "further extension of the Federal Government into the field of education * * * because there is insufficient evidence to indicate any crying need for the aid the committee bill would provide."

But on the subject of community colleges, Senators GOLDWATER and TOWER were in the cheering section. Here is how they cheered:

"Although we are firmly opposed to any intervention by the Federal Government at any level of the educational process, we recognize that there is one area of higher education where expansion is desirable. There is a genuine shortage of so-called junior colleges providing the equivalent of the first 2 years of college and designed primarily to

serve the needs of many of the young people of a particular local community, young people who either cannot afford or do not wish to complete a 4-year college course and who prefer to remain at home while attending college.

"It seems to us that it is here that emphasis should be placed at present. The rate of college student dropout is quite large and most colleges find the enrollment in third and fourth year students substantially smaller than among freshmen and sophomores. Nevertheless, despite the knowledge that such large dropouts must inevitably occur, the regular 4-year colleges must provide facilities, academic, dormitory, instructional, and administrative, for these students who will never complete the 4-year course. If more junior colleges were established, dormitory needs generally would decline sharply, and the need for the other type of facilities would be substantially reduced in the 4-year colleges. Because if these junior colleges existed in adequate number and in the appropriate communities, many of the young people in those communities who go away to college would remain at home and attend the local junior college.

"Thus, although, as we have said, we oppose every form of Federal aid to education (Federal funds for federally impacted school districts are not aid but merely an equivalent of payments in lieu of taxes), we find far more justification for the provisions in the committee bill authorizing financial aid for the construction of public community colleges than we do for any other part of the bill. These provisions for aid in establishing additional junior colleges were offered in committee as amendments by Senator CASE of New Jersey, approved by the committee, and included as a separate title in the bill as reported. If we are confronted with the necessity for supporting some form of Federal aid for higher education but given a choice as to what form such aid should take, we would unreservedly favor aid exclusively for the building of more junior colleges along the lines provided in the committee bill as proposed by Senator CASE."

Senator CASE's devotion to the cause of junior colleges gains new strength from the support that has come from such important conservative leaders. Senators GOLDWATER and TOWER are not men easily swayed from their position on Federal aid for schools.

With New Jersey almost ready to sanction the construction and operation of county junior colleges, the State providing some of the funds, congressional approval of the new Federal education act would give tremendous impetus to the junior college program. New Jersey needs junior colleges, and we believe Somerset County needs one.

[From the Hackensack (N.J.) Bergen Evening Record, Mar. 17, 1952]

JUNIOR COLLEGES: CAN THEY DO THE JOB?

(By Charles H. Harrison)

Rutgers University turned away 220 qualified applicants last year.

New Jersey's college-age population will increase 53 percent in this decade.

The U.S. Department of Labor predicts the demand for skilled technicians will be great in the future.

In reply to a questionnaire, 15,000 New Jersey high school juniors and seniors said they would definitely attend a public 2-year college if one were available.

The problems indicated by the facts challenge our best solutions. One of these best solutions is the construction of 2-year colleges in as many New Jersey counties as show the need.

Legislation now before the State assembly and Senate would enable construction of 2-year colleges where a county has certified the need and the voters of that county have expressed their approval. Construction would be financed through the State and county; operating expenses would be shared equally by the State, the county, and the students, although a county could pay more than a third if it chose.

A 2-year college could serve more than one county. An eight-member board of trustees would run the college, the county superintendent of schools being one member and the other seven members being bipartisan appointees of the director of the board of freeholders.

The 2-year college serves several important functions. The curriculum of a county college, according to Dr. Guy V. Ferrell, director of community and 2-year college education for the State department of education, would be tailored to meet the particular needs of the area served by the college.

For instance, Bergen has a fine vocational and technical high school and the largest percentage of high school graduates going on to a 4-year academic college education in the State. Consequently, the curriculum of a Bergen college might lean more toward academic subjects than technical instruction.

Other counties in the State may have no vocational and technical high school, but may have a great demand for skilled technicians either in industry or on the farm. A 2-year college might serve such an area best by heavy concentration in the curriculum on technical training.

In Bergen, then, many students might be using the 2-year college as a place to start, intending to transfer to a 4-year college to complete their education. The county college is of tremendous value in this instance. The big jam in the 4-year college is in the freshman and sophomore years, but many drop out before their junior and senior years. Thus, a student coming out of the 2-year college would be more likely to find room at the 4-year college than if he had tried to enroll at the 4-year college in the beginning.

Also, the student with minimum funds can live at home those 2 years in the county college, probably pay less in tuition than he would at the 4-year college, and save for the more expensive junior and senior years. Without the county college, such a youngster might never get to college. He's losing out and so is the Nation relying on his brainpower.

According to a recent study of 68 junior colleges in several States, 33 percent of those entering transferred to 4-year colleges. Of the other 67 percent, many terminated their education, either in technical or academic fields, after the 2 years. Others left before the 2 years were up.

Some persons argue that dropout is high at 2-year colleges. The State department of education makes this point: "There are several explanations of the situation. One is that many entering students have definite short-term personal or vocational goals which are satisfied in less than the 2-year period.

"Also, some students transfer to 4-year colleges before completing the 2-year period. A sizable number of students completes the 2 years in the 2-year college, but does not choose to satisfy the graduation requirements."

The 2-year college, of course, offers wonderful opportunities for adult education in the area on the college level. Some may say that the 4-year college can provide this service through extension centers, but the University of California's Center for the Study of Higher Education quite accurately points out that the extension center is simply not geared to offer the variety of courses a self-contained 2-year college can.

There are persons who contend that some courses at the 2-year college could be taken in any good high school. In some cases this may be true. But, as Dr. Ferrell explains, any 4-year college offers a number of beginning courses in such subjects as language, science, accounting, or economics since the freshman may not have had any previous instruction in these areas. This practice will, of course, prevail in the county college, particularly in technical courses. They are few high schools, for instance, which prepare a student in the field of electronics. The county college, therefore, must start the student from scratch. For those students in technical courses who have had preparation at a vocational and technical high school, the county college would advance them to a higher level in the subject.

The State department of education estimates construction of a 2-year community college serving 300 students would cost $900,000, shared by the State and county. The tuition would vary according to the course offerings of the college, but a comprehensive academic and technical education given at a 2-year college in a neighboring State costs $600 a student.

In New Jersey, the cost per student would be shared equally by the State, county, and student, with the student on the basis of $600 paying approximately $200 a year. Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, Republican, of New Jersey, has introduced an amendment to a Federal aid bill, which would provide $50 million a year for 5 years to aid States in county 2-year college construction.

It is unfair to state 42 percent of the Nation's junior colleges are not accredited and allow the public to infer that the colleges are unfit for accreditation. For instance, the Middle States Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges, the accreditation agency in this area, does not accredit until after a junior college graduates is first class.

Since most 2-year colleges are new, many have not been accredited for this reason. This is not to say their curriculum is below standard. Of the 20 community colleges in New York State, 8 have been accredited; of the remaining 12, 7 have just graduated or have yet to graduate their first class.

Eighty-six-Million-Dollar Assist to U.S. Gold Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, an $86 million assist to the U.S. gold problem is possible as the result of new Public Law 480 agreements which utilize a new feature of the law. The assist could have been almost three times as big had U.S. negotiators insisted that the feature be utilized in other new agreements.

Public Law 480 is the authority under which millions of tons of U.S. surplus farm commodities are "sold" abroad. In these transactions the United States acquires foreign currencies which can be spent only for specified local uses.

The amendment, which I sponsored last year, added "exchange for tourist dollars" to the list of currency uses which can be specified in new agreements.

Since then, nine nations have completed agreements utilizing the amendment, which means that $86,588,000 in local currencies will be available to exchange for tourist dollars. These nations

are Turkey, United Arab Republic (Egypt), Greece, Syrian Arab Republic, Bolivia, Iran, Guinea, Morocco and Brazil.

Tourists visiting these countries will be able to exchange dollars for local currencies at the American embassy or consulate. To the extent they do so, the U.S. balance-of-payments and gold crisis will be relieved.

Thirteen nations on the receiving end of new agreements refused to accept the tourist-dollar provision. They are Pakistan, Finland, Indonesia, Iceland, Sudan, China (Taiwan), Congo, Philippines, Poland, Vietnam, Yugoslavia, Tunisia and Korea.

These food sales agreements are virtually donations. Thirteen countries evidently want our gifts and our tourist dollars, but are not really concerned about helping us meet our gold problem.

Nations utilizing the tourist-dollar provision:

[In millions]

Country	Total value of surplus food sales agreements	Portion available for specified uses, including tourist-dollars exchange
Turkey	$119.90	$23.90
United Arab Republic (Egypt)	123.74	24.70
Greece	10.20	3.50
Syrian Arab Republic	9.00	1.80
Bolivia	1.60	.28
Iran	9.00	2.15
Guinea	7.50	1.80
Morocco	14.20	3.55
Brazil	58.60	14.60
Total	413.74	86.58

Nations refusing to utilize the tourist-dollar provision:

[In millions]

Country	Total value of surplus food sales agreements	Portion available for specified uses
Pakistan	$634.15	$53.60
Finland	1.80	1.10
Indonesia	111.50	13.00
Iceland	1.80	.40
Sudan	4.60	1.10
China (Taiwan)	11.85	2.20
Congo	7.50	.07
Philippines	21.75	5.40
Poland	44.60	44.60
Vietnam	15.15	1.50
Yugoslavia	45.00	4.50
Tunisia	5.70	.80
Korea	40.80	4.00
Total	946.20	132.27

Savings in Defense Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, in the interest of the Nation's taxpayers, it is essential that we get a dollar's worth of defense for every dollar spent.

Elimination of waste and duplication in defense procurement can help to achieve this goal.

For this reason, Secretary McNamara's order establishing a single Defense Supply Agency deserves the plaudits of all taxpayers. Estimates by the Hoover Commission indicate an eventual savings of $2 billion annually may be achieved by this means of eliminating overlapping or duplication in the provision of common supplies and services to our military services.

For years, Congress, top Government officials, and others—such as the Hoover Commission—have been trying to get the Armed Forces to integrate their procurement and supply activities. The intent of the Congress as a whole in this regard has been expressed in law, as for example, in the O'Mahoney amendment to the 1952 Defense Appropriations Act, and more completely in the McCormack-Curtis amendment to the Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1958. Any lingering doubts as to whether Congress had provided the Secretary of Defense with the authority to unify military supply and service functions were certainly removed by this law.

In addition, the reports of numerous congressional committees, as early as 1952 and as late as 1961, have stressed the concern of Congress with the numerous and admitted examples of waste and duplication over the years in defense procurement. In many cases these reports capped their findings and conclusions by calling upon the Department of Defense to take immediate and vigorous steps to integrate its procurement, supply and service activities, in order to provide maximum utilization of the defense dollar.

As a member of both the Armed Services Committee and the Joint Economic Committee, I have had a continuing interest, and in some instances a personal part, in urging action by the Department of Defense to eliminate overlapping and duplication of the military supply functions.

Apparently the efforts of Congress in this direction have not been entirely in vain, although at some stages it appeared that they were. From small beginnings, and with admitted setbacks, we have, however, moved step by step in the right direction.

Starting with the Defense Cataloging and Standardization Act of 1952, the establishment of a single Federal catalog was finally realized. As a result, all of the military departments now use the same name and same number for the same item. Before, they had 8 different systems for classifying items of supply and 21 different numbering systems.

Then, starting in 1956, came the so-called single manager assignments, under which one military service was responsible for the procurement and distribution of a given category of common supplies for all military services. By 1960, single managers had been established in eight areas of common supplies and two areas of common services.

In 1958, another important action was taken with the establishment of the Armed Forces Supply Support Center. This action brought together in one organization and under one management the Federal catalog program and the Defense standardization program, and thus centralized cataloging operation, the screening of excess supplies, and other programs for common utilization of supplies.

Now, finally, we have established, by Secretary McNamara's order, a single Defense Supply Agency, under which it is possible to provide common supplies and services to all of our military forces, without overlapping or duplication.

While this agency establishes the framework for carrying out the long-expressed intent of the Congress to integrate military-supply functions, we must not assume that the job of Congress in this regard is finished. We must support the Secretary in implementing the agency's operation if we are to attain the full objective of efficient supply support to the operating forces, while materially reducing the cost to the taxpayer.

In this connection, I cannot but view with alarm recent reports in the press which reflect some misunderstanding—apparently, even on the part of a few Members of Congress—as to the Defense Supply Agency, and the belief that it is adding to existing supply organizations. The exact opposite is true—for what it does is not add to, but integrate, unify, or pull together the multiple supply and service activities of the military departments.

The merits of integrating the common supply and service activities of the military departments and the establishment of a single Defense Supply Agency to accomplish this have not gone unnoticed by the press or the taxpayer, nor has the fact that Congress has long expressed this as its will. For example, This Week, a Sunday newspaper supplement with a circulation in the neighborhood of 15 million, published in its March 11 issue a special article on the Defense Supply Agency.

Furthermore, I think the point is most fluently made in an editorial published recently in the Waterbury American, in my own State of Connecticut. The editorial indicates that the ladies of America understand where a dollar can be saved in our defense spending, and that they will be looking over our shoulders, to be sure these savings are effected.

I ask unanimous consent to have both the article and the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From This Week magazine, Mar. 11, 1962]

THE THIS WEEK STORY THAT SAVED YOU MONEY

(By Neil MacNeil)

A year ago we published recommendations from the Hoover Commissions to save taxpayers $3 billion. Look what's already happened.

A year ago This Week published an article of mine entitled, "Memo to Congress: A Readymade Plan To Save $3 Billion for U.S. Taxpayers." That plan was based on eight important recommendations of the Hoover Commissions that still awaited action. The article pointed the way for the new Congress

and the incoming Kennedy administration to offer better government at less cost.

Former President Hoover and his associates on the commissions were impressed and gratified by the response to the article. Reactions in Congress, the Pentagon, in other departments, and comments from individuals and organizations in all parts of the United States were favorable and encouraging. Since its publication we have had major results.

On August 31 Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara announced that he was implementing the most vital of those eight recommendations. He took advantage of provisions of the McCormack-Curtis amendment to the Defense Reorganization Act of 1958 to set up a Defense Supply Agency to procure, manage, and distribute the supplies and services which the Armed Forces use in common.

EVERYTHING BUT WEAPONS

In the fiscal year 1963 the Supply Agency will manage an inventory of $2.6 billion, make sales to the Armed Forces of $3 billion, conduct procurement of $2.8 billion and provide 1,200,000 different items. On January 1 it became responsible for subsistence, textiles, clothing, medical supplies, petroleum, construction supplies, traffic management, and surplus. On April 1 it takes over industrial supplies and on July 1 automotive supplies. It does not deal with weapons. This is only the beginning. Secretary McNamara estimates that if budgets for the Department continue to exceed $50 billion, ultimately the Supply Agency may manage 3 million different items with a valuation of about $21 billion. Meanwhile, he asserts, inventory can be reduced by $2 to $4 billion. Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, who keeps a sharp eye on Defense, estimates that the agency will provide for us taxpayers an immediate annual savings of $250 million. Experts of the Hoover Commissions estimate that, when fully operative, the annual savings will exceed $2 billion.

THE FIGHT GOES ON

How the new Agency can save money has already been shown by its head, Lt. Gen. A. T. McNamara. He recently reported annual savings of $961,000 on just two items, $846,000 by standardization of combat boots, and $115,000 on women's exercise clothing. This Week magazine may be proud of its role in reducing waste and trimming national expenses.

The fight is not over, however. Senator DOUGLAS, among others, warns that great pressure may be exerted on Congress to limit the Agency's operations. Large economies cannot be realized without being felt. Soon several large establishments will be closed. Loud protests may be expected from vested interests, and from the armed services themselves.

I hope that every taxpayer will support the Agency's fight for savings and efficiency, and make that support known to the Congress of the United States.

[From the Waterbury (Conn.) American, Mar. 5, 1962]

TO THE LADIES

While President Kennedy has appointed a special commission to investigate equality for women in the United States, at least one group of women has already set about proving that they are equal to anything that might come along.

We refer to the Council of Women Citizens, which makes its headquarters in Chicago.

The ladies have seized upon a statement by Defense Secretary Robert McNamara that he intends to see that the taxpayers get "a dollar of defense for every dollar spent." They like it.

So they are embarked upon a campaign to back to the hilt a new Defense Supply Agency which become operational on January 1 of this year.

Why should they be concerned? Well, it has come to the council's attention that certain groups within our economy look with disfavor upon the new Agency—such as some members of the Armed Forces who oppose any change in present purchasing methods, and contractors who have done very well in dealing with separate supply systems.

The purpose of the Defense Supply Agency is to provide common supplies and services to all our military forces—Army, Air Force, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard. Common supplies include those things which are used by two or more services—such as food, clothing, textiles, medical supplies, construction materials, petroleum, general, industrial and automotive supplies.

Why is such an Agency necessary? Well, as the ladies from Chicago point out, in the past the Army has been buying its own supplies, the Navy its own, the Air Force its own, and so forth. Often one service was buying the same supplies that another service was selling at a fraction of the original cost—a case of the right hand not knowing what the left hand was doing.

The Defense Supply Agency is expected to put an end to this sort of thing.

As the ladies say, present purchasing policies among the armed services would be akin to a wife buying her own light bulbs, the children buying their own and the husband doing the same thing.

And what are the girls doing about it? Why they're sending out folders with post cards bearing a prepared message to Congressmen and Senators. All their feminine correspondents have to do is address the cards, put a stamp on them and drop them in a mailbox.

The purpose of this campaign? To let the Senators and Representatives know that the ladies are 100 percent behind Secretary McNamara and that they expect their official representatives to be behind him, too.

Now how can you argue with the idea that you want "a dollar of defense for every dollar spent"?

To the ladies—bless 'em. Maybe they can do what no one else has been able to do up to this point.

Missile Gap Never Existed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, another evidence of the nonexistence of the supposed missile gap which played such a prominent part in the 1960 Presidential election campaign is the following item recently published in the Long Beach Independent Press-Telegram:

MISSILE GAP NEVER EXISTED, STATE DEPARTMENT CONCEDES

(NOTE.—Harry Karns, editorial page editor, is in Washington as invited guest at a State Department briefing. Below is his report of the first session of this significant conference between Government officials and the press.).

(By Harry Karns)

WASHINGTON.—The missile gap, so prominent in the 1960 Presidential campaign, never existed—or, if it did, was insignificant.

Under the ground rules of the State Department foreign policy briefing conference, I am permitted to pass this opinion on to the public. But I cannot identify the high official who expressed it.

Every speaker thus far at the conference has exuded confidence in America's military and political position. This optimism is greater than that expressed last fall at a similar briefing I attended in San Francisco. And it is in marked contrast to the expressions of alarm 2 years ago.

The remarks about the missile gap occurred in this way:

The official had stated, "we are stronger than the U.S.S.R. in the ability to engage in nuclear warfare. They know they could not survive even if they struck first.

"To maintain our leadership—our nuclear advtange—sometimes requires politically unpopular decisions."

He referred, obviously, to such a decision as the resumption of nuclear tests.

"Our strategic Air Force," the speaker continued, "and our planning and control of that force are better than the Soviets."

"We are ahead in the missile field."

After the speaker finished his formal talk, a reporter stood up and bluntly asked:

"Did the missile gap ever exist?"

The speaker replied:

"There was disagreement within the Government itself as to the number of Soviet missiles. Some thought Russia had a larger number than we had. But also it could be said that the Russians on their part had a bomber gap, a carrier gap, and a Polaris gap. In view of this, the term "missile gap" becomes relatively meaningless.

"At no time has the total military capability of the U.S.S.R. exceeded ours."

Berlin Crisis—United Nations Bond Issue—Atomic Testing in the Atmosphere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, a person cannot pick up a newspaper these days without reading about the Berlin crisis, the United Nations bond issue, atomic testing in the atmosphere—any one or all three at the same time.

The administration seems to be the first to understand that our solutions are far from perfect; yet the suggested solutions are far better than the alternatives we face.

The Sikeston Standard, a progressive newspaper in southeast Missouri covers this subject very well in an editorial that appeared March 27, 1962.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Many specific administration foreign and defense policies evidently are judged even by their makers and defenders as markedly imperfect in their service to the total national need.

Though perhaps without particular intent, President Kennedy in answering press conference questions underscores again and

again what might be termed the partial undesirability of several key policies. He candidly ticks off their flaws.

Yet in virtually every instance he concludes that these policies must be pursued because the alternative is worse.

Some principal examples he stresses:

This country prepares to resume atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons.

Since this means contamination of the air, Kennedy says no security for humanity can come from such feats. But he believes the danger to human beings might be even greater if we were, through inaction, to allow the Soviet Union to develop a nuclear antimissile missile which could nullify our deterrent power.

The United States keeps pursuing largely fruitless talks with the Russians over Berlin because, in the President's view, to halt them would be to announce the failure of negotiation in a perilous trouble spot.

The administration backs U.S. purchase of $100 million in U.N. bonds because, even though other nations are not bearing their share of U.N. expense, our refusal to carry this burden would see the "cause of freedom collapse in a whole variety of ways."

By the same token, the President says, we continue heavy outlays of foreign assistance to Asia, Africa, and Latin America despite the fact we are economically strained by this effort. The alternative—little or no aid—would in his judgment open wide areas of the globe to the advance of communism.

In an ideal world, everybody would pay his U.N. bills, our Western European friends would contribute mightily to boosting the undeveloped nations, the Russians would talk turkey on Berlin and would not prepare secretly for crucial nuclear tests in the atmosphere.

But since these circumstances do not exist, we have to deal with the frustrating realities.

Still, those who believe they have better plans must either show persuasively how they would avoid dire alternatives—or try the nearly impossible task of suggesting that the alternatives posed by the Communist threat are not so grave as they seem.

What the Farmers Really Want

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, there has been much controversy over the years about what the role of the Federal Government should be in relation to the agricultural community of this Nation. No one pretends to have the full and complete answer. However, the Farm Journal has polled the farmers who read that publication and have come up with some most interesting results. To shed some further light on the subject, the Farm Journal states that it has found what the farmers do not want.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial and article from the April 1962 issue of the Farm Journal:

WHAT FARMERS DON'T WANT—HERE'S A MESSAGE FROM THE COUNTRY

Farmers may disagree about what they do want in the way of a farm policy, but they're mighty clear about what they don't want. They don't want compulsory Government quotas. They don't want the Government running the farms of the country. They don't want the Secretary of Agriculture telling them how much, or how little, they can raise and sell without being whacked by a Government penalty. And they've just spoken in a way that should leave nobody in Washington in any doubt about it.

A mail poll, such as Farm Journal has just conducted, can be faulted in many ways. Some will say the choices weren't worded fairly, some that farmers voted without fully realizing the consequences of what they were voting for, some that the "undecided" were not represented in the voting. All of these things might be fairly argued. But discount the results as you will—they are still so decisive as to be eloquent.

Farm Journal makes no claim that such a poll shows anything with exactitude. We do say that it is a highly significant straw in the wind to show the direction of farm thinking. We believe it most certainly does that. Furthermore it cuts across all party and organizational lines. If we were a Congressman, a Senator, a Secretary of Agriculture or a President, we would pay serious attention to it.

The size and speed of the vote were astounding. In 1957, a similar poll eventually pulled 4,000 votes. In our 1959 poll we got about 11,000 ballots, over a 6-week period. This time the vote fairly blew the door down. Within 4 days after the magazine rolled off the presses, we had 4,000 ballots back. Within 6 days the total had swelled to over 10,000. At the end of 2 weeks we were swamped with approximately 50,000. Evidently many farmers felt strongly and welcomed the chance to tell the world where they stood.

Farm Journal doesn't happen to agree with the 52 percent who want the "Government clear out." We agree with Mr. Freeman that the Government has to help control supply, but disagree vigorously with him over method. We hold that any farmer who takes Government support has an obligation to help. But we believe all this can be done primarily by a voluntary land retirement program, which will cost little (if any) more than Government compulsion and which will leave farmers—not the Government—in control of farming.

We'll send the results of the poll to all of the people in Washington mentioned above. We wouldn't think they would have any difficulty in getting the message.

HOW YOU VOTED—HOW DOES YOUR CHOICE COMPARE WITH THESE 10,000 READERS WHO VOTED ON THREE DIFFERENT FARM PLANS PRESENTED HERE LAST MONTH?

If those Farm Journal readers who wrote us are typical, the Nation's farmers are overwhelmingly opposed to tighter controls and compulsory quotas on what they raise.

Only 4 percent—4 out of 100—who voted in Farm Journal's March poll favored a compulsory quota program (the main ingredient of the administration's farm plan).

Of our readers responding, 44 percent voted for an expanded voluntary land-retirement program. And 52 percent voted to get the Government clear out.

We were deluged with ballots—50,000 in the first 2 weeks; and still coming. In order to get the results in time for this issue of Farm Journal, we could count only 10,000 ballots. We took these as they arrived, in proportion to the number of subscribers by States.

Altogether, 27 Farm Journal people spent 750 man-hours opening, sorting, and counting these 10,000 ballots. One person, working alone, would need nearly 2 years to handle 50,000 ballots. We will put a crew on it and promptly open and count all ballots and read every letter.

The results from this poll check closely with previous polls by Farm Journal. In 1957 we offered four farm program choices; and in 1959, five. In 1957, 50 percent voted to get the Government out; in 1959, 55 percent voted that way; this year 52 percent.

The 4-percent return for compulsory quotas is the lowest vote for any of the choices over the 3 years.

Among the five Farm Journal editions, eastern readers gave the smallest vote to quotas, and the largest vote to getting the Government clear out. Quotas mustered a bit of support in parts of the western Corn Belt and in Kentucky.

The voluntary land-retirement program did best in the Central States—51 percent—poorest in the East—32 percent.

Among commodity groups, the land-retirement program pulled the most votes among hog raisers—and got the smallest percentage from poultrymen and fruit and vegetable growers.

Poultrymen, who certainly have been in trouble, and for whom the Government is talking about national marketing orders, gave the highest vote for getting the Government out entirely—70 percent. Tobacco growers are least inclined—33 percent—to have the Government step out completely. They've had the most Government (compulsory quotas) of anybody.

Among States, Iowans gave the smallest vote—25 percent—to getting the Government out. This was also true in 1959 when 24 percent of the Iowans voted that way.

Young farmers are more opposed to compulsory quotas than older operators; otherwise, age didn't make much difference.

[Percent]

Age	Quotas	Land retirement	Government out
29 and under	2	47	51
30 to 39	4	46	50
40 to 49	4	46	50
50 to 59	5	42	53
60 plus	4	41	55

Many took time to write letters explaining their choices. A large number who wrote were young farmers and small operators who objected to a quota system that would tie them to their present size.

"Quotas wouldn't give a starting farmer a chance; he'd have no prospects of expanding," says Robert Pfeil, of South Dakota.

"The big operator would have more of a monopoly than he already has," thinks Noel Sorensen, of Idaho.

Many dairymen complained bitterly about quotas. "I'm a young man who has been struggling alone. Now that I have a young dairy started with my sons, they want to tell us we can't farm it because we didn't have a milk quota for 1961," says Donald Carey, of New York.

Several of those who voted to get the Government out thought that if this were done the CCC shouldn't dump its surpluses on the market. Others admitted that it might be rough for a time. "I might be the first to go," wrote L. McGinnis of Alabama, "but somewhere down the line we'd stabilize. I'm willing to bet a lifetime's work that I can knock heads with the hobby farmers and come out on top. I am eager for a try."

Many of those writing in support of compulsory quotas say that it's the only way to get rid of the surplus, and they agree with L. H. Kuhle, of Illinois, that farm programs won't work without controls. "What other business doesn't regiment its production to stay in line with demand?" asks Jay Triplett, of Texas.

How the United States voted on the three choices

	Percent
1. Compulsory Government quotas on what I could sell, or how much land I could farm; stiff penalties, support prices at, or above, present levels	4
2. Expanded voluntary land-retirement program to cut crop production; no compulsory quotas or allotments; with supports on crops at a level to stabilize markets but not add to surpluses	44
3. Get the Government clear out—no controls, no price supports	52

[Percent]

	Compulsory quotas	Land retirement	Government clearout
Eastern	2	32	66
Connecticut	0	16	84
Delaware	0	45	55
Maine	0	37	63
Maryland	2	35	63
Massachusetts	2	27	71
New Hampshire	0	41	59
New Jersey	6	29	65
New York	3	38	59
Pennsylvania	1	30	69
Rhode Island	11	11	78
Vermont	2	38	60
West Virginia	1	25	74
Central	4	51	45
Illinois	4	50	46
Indiana	1	48	51
Iowa	7	68	25
Kansas	2	47	51
Michigan	2	46	52
Minnesota	7	53	40
Missouri	3	54	43
Nebraska	6	57	37
North Dakota	9	55	36
Ohio	2	37	61
South Dakota	7	48	45
Wisconsin	6	48	46

[Percent]

	Compulsory quotas	Land retirement	Government clearout
Southeastern	6	48	46
Alabama	2	47	51
Florida	6	40	54
Georgia	6	50	44
Kentucky	11	59	30
Mississippi	0	52	48
North Carolina	8	46	46
South Carolina	6	47	47
Tennessee	6	51	43
Virginia	4	39	57
Southwestern	3	36	61
Arkansas	2	39	59
Louisiana	2	42	56
New Mexico	0	42	58
Oklahoma	1	40	59
Texas	5	31	64
Western	3	33	64
Arizona	3	8	89
California	3	26	71
Colorado	6	35	59
Idaho	2	43	55
Montana	4	35	61
Nevada	0	10	90
Oregon	2	41	57
Utah	2	49	49
Washington	2	34	64
Wyoming	3	28	69
U.S. total	4	44	52

What different commodity groups want

[Percent]

EASTERN

Kind of farmers [1]	Compulsory quotas		Land retirement		Government clearout	
	United States	Eastern	United States	Eastern	United States	Eastern
Beef	4	0	42	27	54	73
Dairy	4	3	44	36	52	61
Feed grains	4	1	48	31	48	68
Fruits and vegetables	3	4	31	31	66	65
General	2	0	35	34	63	66
Hogs	4	0	52	25	44	75
Poultry	3	2	27	20	70	78
Sheep	3	0	36	41	61	59
Wheat	4	0	44	39	52	61

CENTRAL

Kind of farmers [1]	Compulsory quotas		Land retirement		Government clearout	
	United States	Central	United States	Central	United States	Central
Beef	4	4	42	51	54	45
Dairy	4	4	44	48	52	48
Feed grains	4	5	48	52	48	43
Fruits and vegetables	3	4	31	43	66	53
General	2	3	35	48	63	49
Hogs	4	4	52	53	44	43
Poultry	3	3	27	46	70	51
Sheep	3	4	36	40	61	56
Wheat	4	4	44	48	52	48

SOUTHEASTERN

Kind of farmers [1]	Compulsory quotas		Land retirement		Government clearout	
	United States	Southeastern	United States	Southeastern	United States	Southeastern
Beef	4	4	42	43	54	53
Cotton	5	6	51	57	44	37
Dairy	4	7	44	53	52	40
Feed grains	4	3	48	47	48	50
Fruits and vegetables	3	0	31	24	66	76
General	2	5	35	37	63	58

[1] Main crop or livestock.

SOUTHEASTERN

Kind of farmers [1]	Compulsory quotas		Land retirement		Government clearout	
	United States	Southeastern	United States	Southeastern	United States	Southeastern
Hogs	4	6	52	57	44	37
Peanuts	8	5	51	65	41	30
Poultry	3	9	27	31	70	60
Tobacco	13	15	54	56	33	29

SOUTHWESTERN

Kind of farmers [1]	Compulsory quotas		Land retirement		Government clearout	
	United States	Southwest	United States	Southwest	United States	Southwest
Beef	4	3	42	35	54	62
Cotton	5	4	51	49	44	47
Dairy	4	3	44	48	52	49
Feed grains	4	3	48	31	48	66
General	2	1	35	25	63	74
Hogs	4	2	52	31	44	67
Rice	7	7	33	32	60	61
Sheep	3	0	36	42	61	58
Wheat	4	0	44	40	52	60

WESTERN

Kind of farmers [1]	Compulsory quotas		Land retirement		Government clearout	
	United States	Western	United States	Western	United States	Western
Beef	4	3	42	32	54	65
Cotton	5	6	51	39	44	55
Dairy	4	3	44	37	52	60
Feed grains	4	1	48	35	48	64
Fruits and vegetables	3	3	31	27	66	70
General	2	1	35	29	63	70
Hogs	4	0	52	27	44	73
Poultry	3	0	27	5	70	95
Sheep	3	0	36	25	61	75
Wheat	4	4	44	42	52	54

Tariff Revision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, following these remarks, an editorial entitled "Not Pin Money," which was published in the Waterbury American, of Waterbury, Conn.; and also an editorial entitled "The Wrong Trade Battle," which was published on March 29 in the Wall Street Journal.

I specifically direct the attention of the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the following paragraph in the Wall Street Journal editorial:

This country has got to move toward freer trade, for the simple reason that in its own interest it cannot do otherwise. But the crux of the matter is not tariffs. What is imperative is that we get our own house in order, our labor policies, our fiscal policies, our monetary policies. If we don't do that then the battle will, as Dr. Boarman says, have been fought upon the wrong field.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Waterbury (Conn.) American, Mar. 28, 1962]

NOT PIN MONEY

Certainly there is no unanimity of opinion within American industry as to the merits of President Kennedy's tariff proposals.

But all this talk of tariff revisions, with all its high-sounding phrases, tends to evaporate into nothingness when certain industries are confronted with the hard facts that proposed tariff revisions would have adverse effects on their own operations.

For a concrete example of this industrial concern, we in the Naugatuck Valley don't have to travel far. All we have to do is take a look at the straight-pin industry. Five out of six straight-pin manufacturers in the United States are located in Connecticut—and four of those five are located in the Naugatuck Valley, i.e.:

Oakville Co. Division, Scovill Manufacturing Co.; Dorset-Rex, Inc., Thomaston; the Union Pin Co., Winsted; and the Star Pin Co.: Derby.

A month ago, the U.S. Tariff Commission found that the domestic pin industry had been injured by foreign competition and recommended—by a 4-to-2 vote—that the import duty on straight pins be increased from 20 percent to 35 percent ad valorem.

Under the escape clause in the present tariff act, the Commission's recommendations can only be made effective by Presidential approval; and there can hardly be much doubt that Presidential approval will not be readily forthcoming under present conditions.

That, however, doesn't change the fact that Naugatuck Valley industries are entitled to some consideration when it comes to tariff matters.

It is all very well to indulge in high-sounding phrases and talk about the benefits to the overall national economy when discussing grandiose proposals about tariff changes. But individual problems cannot be easily divorced from the overall picture, or passed off lightly.

Naugatuck Valley residents cannot—or should not—be expected to view lightly tariff changes which will undercut established industries in their own bailiwick. These industries are entitled to consideration of their interests.

And it is not a matter alone of management interests. What is involved in the whole picture includes jobs as well as stockholder investments. Within the past 10 years, foreign-made pins have taken over 30 percent of the domestic market. Unless some relief is forthcoming from Washington, they will continue to take over an even larger percentage of the market, for the simple reason that we cannot compete with foreign producers whose costs are but a fraction of our own.

The Tariff Commission has made a recommendation. We believe the President should approve it. For we are not talking about "pin money" in the colloquial sense. We are talking about people and jobs.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 29, 1962]

THE WRONG TRADE BATTLE

This morning we publish two letters expressing views which have been pretty much drowned out by the barrage laid down for the administration's tariff bill. Both of them ought to be heard.

We do not, of course, share all the views of Mr. Bruce Simpson. Essentially he is making a protectionist argument; it seems clear from his letter that he thinks tariffs can make us more prosperous by keeping out foreign goods, and he prefers them higher rather than lower.

Nonetheless, Mr. Simpson raises some pointed questions about the Common Market, which in Washington's habitual fashion is being overvalued and oversold beyond its merits and promises, both of which are great. What he has to say about the unprecedented presidential power in this bill is quite appropriate. And he is right in warning against the easy notion that we are "really going to solve" our balance-of-payments problems by just tinkering with our tariffs.

It is to this point that Dr. Boarman of Bucknell particularly addresses himself in his letter. Dr. Boarman, like ourselves, believes in the virtues of free trade. He knows that a true lowering of trade barriers is a stimulus to growth and prosperity, and therefore to the American advantage.

But Dr. Boarman is reminding us that tariffs are but one among many barriers, and that even all the tangible barriers together—including direct controls—are not the real obstacle. Therefore, merely lowering the tariff barriers might be catastrophic.

A tariff simply raises a price differential between a foreign product and a domestic one. It is therefore a barrier that can be leaped if the cost of the American product is so high as to offset the price differential. This isn't so with direct controls. What, then, is the gain for freer trade when a tariff is eliminated entirely and replaced with a rigid import quota?

Worse: What is the gain for anything, free trade or American prosperity, to remove all of the nominal barriers such as tariffs or quotas if there confronts American producers an even greater barrier to selling competitively against foreign producers? No barrier is so insurmountable for American industry as a cost of production forced high by domestic monetary and labor policies.

This being so, those who complain that a sudden lowering of tariffs will cause an injurious inflow of foreign goods, with painful pressure on our short-term balance of payments, have a point not to be dismissed. They have reason, too, to question whether the vaunted increase in American exports would actually take place even if by some miracle the Common Market lowered all its tariffs by a like amount.

Producers in an economy still under inflationary pressure will not find it easy to compete with producers in countries, such as most of Europe today, where inflation has been halted. A tariff is at most but one factor in the total cost of a product delivered to a customer.

It is not difficult to see what would happen in practice from a deep reduction in general U.S. tariffs if our inflationary domestic policies remain unchanged. Tariffs might be reduced, but the political pressure from the resultant upheaval would give birth to direct controls—"temporarily," of course, and as relief measures. If you doubt this, look at what has actually happened in the case of textiles.

If anyone supposes this to be an argument for protectionism, he is quite mistaken. To retain protectionist policies in the hope they will let us safely continue domestic inflationary policies is the worst sort of illusion. To do so would steadily widen the gulf between the United States and the rest of the industrialized Western World. We would daily have more difficulty in resisting the pressures of cheaper foreign products, more difficulty in selling U.S.-made products abroad. All our problems, including those of our balance of payments, would be compounded.

This country has got to move toward freer trade, for the simple reason that in its own interests it cannot do otherwise. But the crux of the matter is not tariffs. What is imperative is that we get our own house in order, our labor policies, our fiscal policies, our monetary policies. If we don't do that then the battle will, as Dr. Boarman says, have been fought upon the wrong field.

Titan II: A Giant Step for Uncle Sam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, on March 16 the first test flight of the Titan II intercontinental ballistic missile was hailed as an unqualified success by all the experts.

The giant Titan II, which develops thrust totaling 530,000 pounds, soared 5,000 miles down the Atlantic test range from Cape Canaveral on its maiden flight.

It is America's most powerful missile. Its successful development opens the way to a broad range of uses and refinements for both military and civilian space use.

My State of Colorado has special reason for pride in this accomplishment. Titan II, a product of the Martin-Marietta Corp., was conceived, designed, developed, and produced at the Martin plant a few miles from Denver.

To help put this accomplishment in perspective, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Denver Post of March 29 titled "Titan II: A Giant Step for Uncle Sam."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Denver Post, Mar. 29, 1962]

TITAN II: A GIANT STEP FOR UNCLE SAM

We who live in and near Denver, where the Titan missiles are built by Martin, sometimes miss the real meaning of a truly significant shot at Cape Canaveral. We "can't see the woods for the trees."

All over the country, alert reporters and editors have been hailing the recent, first-shot success of the Titan II. By way of example, Time magazine calls it "a radically new missile that moves the United States a giant step forward in space and nuclear effectiveness."

It certainly would be a grave mistake for anyone—in Denver or elsewhere on earth—to dismiss the initial, on-the-button 5,000-mile shot of Titan II as just another test.

Titan II isn't just another. It's a brand-new kind of liquid-fuel rocket, freed of most of the hampering limitations and liabilities that beset the Titan I.

The new Martin missile contains no liquid oxygen. So it needs no super-refrigeration at nearly 300° below zero Fahrenheit.

Like the solid-fuel Minuteman, it will be stored in underground silos covered to resist attack, but after the command for action it can be fired in a few minutes. Gone is the long-drawn-out process of fueling with liquid oxygen and kerosene. Titan II is chemically fueled with two liquids that can be stored for long periods at ordinary temperatures right in the missile's own tanks. No last-minute transfusions are required.

Another big missile worry is eliminated in Titan II. Its twin liquids are nitrogen tetroxide and UDMH (short for unsymmetrical dimethylhydrazine, if you must know). These fuels are hypergolic—meaning they start burning the minute they get together. No separate ignition is needed.

Thanks to its greater thrust and its lack of heavy valves and thick walls, Titan II should be able to carry a 3-ton payload. It should pack a thermonuclear bomb punch equal to that of some 10 million tons of TNT. With strap-on boosters, it should be a major means of launching Project Gemini (the twins).

The fact that this Denver-built advancement in national defense took off exactly on schedule and flew a flawless course to target is no accident. The manufacturers and all who aid them know what they're doing and how to do it.

Program for Space Communications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, in recent months a great deal has been spoken and written concerning space communications.

In January, Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, prepared a thoughtful and interesting paper showing some of the potentials and problems in this most important field which appeared in the January 1962 issue of Astronautics magazine.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article entitled "Program Planning for Space Communications" printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRAM PLANNING FOR SPACE COMMUNICATIONS

(By U.S. Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON)

Gen. David Sarnoff in an address last summer at Montreaux made this profound observation:

"Ten years hence, it is conceivable that a billion people in virtually every nation on earth will be watching the same program, at the same time, and in color, with simultaneous translation techniques making it understandable to all."

The scientific miracle that will make this possible is the communications satellite.

Today there is no doubt that such a worldwide service is technically feasible, although much needs to be done to bring it to reality.

A question that haunts many of us in Washington—and many outside of Washington, I am sure—is what nation will achieve an effective globe-circling satellite communications system first.

When a billion people are able to watch the same television program, a program relayed to them from the sky, from what nation will this program originate? What way of life will that program present? Who will control its content?

Something like this was in the mind of Mr. Arthur C. Clarke, British-born scientist who, in 1945, first proposed the use of artificial satellites for radio and television transmission, when several years ago he wrote a committee of Congress as follows:

"Living as I do in the Far East (Colombo, Ceylon), I am constantly reminded of the struggle between the Western World and the U.S.S.R. for the uncommitted millions of Asia. The printed word plays only a small part in this battle for the minds of largely illiterate populations, and even radio is limited in range and impact. But when line-of-sight transmissions become possible from satellites overhead, the propaganda effect may be decisive. * * * When we consider the effect of TV upon our own ostensibly educated public, the impact upon the peoples of Asia and Africa may be overwhelming. It may well determine whether Russian or English is the main language of the future."

Only two nations today have the rocket capacity to place in orbit communications satellites. They are the United States and Soviet Russia. A few years from now many other nations may have developed such capacity. But at present the contest is between our own country and the leader of the Communist bloc, between two nations with wholly conflicting ideologies.

The United States now is moving rapidly ahead in the development of communications satellites. This year we are expected to begin initial tests of four satellite communications systems. These are, as most readers of Astronautics know:

Project Relay, utilizing a medium altitude satellite being developed by the Radio Corp. of America under contract for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration;

Project Telstar, also a medium altitude satellite, a cooperative enterprise of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., and NASA;

Project Advent, a Department of Defense high-altitude system; and

Project Syncom, also a high-altitude satellite proposed by NASA.

The first two would be placed in orbit several thousand miles above the earth and scientists estimate that from 20 to 30 would be required for global radio or television coverage.

The last two would be synchronous satellites which, at 22,300 feet above the earth's surface, would have a speed identical to that of the earth's rotation and thus would appear to be in a fixed position in space. Three of these suitably placed could provide world-around coverage and each could, by line-of-sight transmission, transmit directly to one-third of the globe.

All of the above would be active repeater satellites capable of receiving, amplifying, and transmitting radio singals as do the present overland microwave repeaters.

What action Soviet Russia may be taking to place communications satellites in operation is not known to me, but it is known that Russian scientists have been writing and talking at length about such systems for several years.

In 1960, Aleksandr Mesmeyanov, then president of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R., announced: "Soviet science is working on plans to utilize satellites for meteorological and radio services."

Mesmeyanov's successor, as president of the academy, Academician M. V. Keldysh, stated in June of last year that a priority "of highest importance" was being given to such satellites, and added:

"The use of communications and satellites and of satellites for relay services would revolutionize communications and television services."

Not long after this Prof. Ari Shternfeld, Soviet winner of an international prize in astronautics, proposed a high-altitude synchronous communication satellite system somewhat similar to our Defense Department's Advent and NASA's Syncom, and, for that matter, to the satellite suggested by Mr. Clarke in 1945.

Conceivably, many nations will in time have communications and other satellites of varying types in varying orbits, but all will be dependent for operation, control, and utility on frequency bands of the same electromagnetic spectrum.

The potential of all satellites—our satellites, Russia's satellites, other nations' satellites—will be conditioned by these unalterable scientific truths:

1. There is only one electromagnetic spectrum.
2. The spectrum is finite and uniformly distributed throughout the universe.
3. It is in the public domain.
4. It already is distressingly crowded.
5. That portion of the spectrum adapted to communications, and known as the radio spectrum, is presently considered limited in range to from 10 kilocycles per second to 40,000 megacycles per second.
6. All telecommunications services, both present and potential, must use frequencies of some segments of this spectrum and in a manner that does not interfere with other services.
7. The electromagnetic spectrum has been divided by international agreement into numerous bands reserved for different types of communications services.
8. One hundred and eight nations, members of the International Telecommunications Union, a specialized agency of the United Nations, participate in allocating bands and frequencies. Only 12 bands have been reserved for space communications, and these solely for research purposes and shared equally by all nations.
9. Somewhere within the spectrum, member nations of the ITU will have to find additional frequency bands if the contemplated satellite communications systems are to fulfill their purpose and potential.
10. For this reason, ITU has tentatively scheduled an extraordinary administrative radio conference for the latter part of 1963.

Many committees of the Congress have been aware of the importance of this conference. The Senate Committee on Commerce, of which I am chairman, has held extensive hearings with a view to determining

how well our Government is prepared for this conference and will resume these hearings early in the second session.

The Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, of which I am a member, is examining the problem and its many implications. The Select Committee on Small Business also has looked into it.

Federal Communications Commissioner T. A. M. Craven has told Congress:

"An operable space communication system is necessarily dependent upon the availability of radiofrequencies. Communications satellites as presently conceived will require large amounts of spectrum space, which already is a very scarce resource. * * * The forthcoming International Radio Conference called for the latter part of 1963 is perhaps the most important communications conference of all times."

Dr. Elmer W. Engstrom, senior executive vice president of the Radio Corp. of America, added this note:

"We must keep in mind a very important international problem. This is the need for satisfactory agreements covering the allocation of frequencies to avoid harmful interference. No worldwide satellite communications system will be feasible without such agreements."

Scientists of 12 nations, at a 5-day conference on science and world affairs, held last September at Stowe, Vt., agreed unanimously to a joint statement which read in part: "We recommend the orderly assignment and use of radio frequencies in space."

Soviet Russia's delegation to this conference was exceeded in numbers only by that of the United States.

At Paris in late October, the 39-nation newly created International Oceanographic Commission of UNESCO, unanimously adopted resolutions "recognizing that existing frequencies in the radio communications spectrum are almost completely absorbed," and establishing a special committee to study requirements for transmitting data between satellite and ocean stations. Again Russia had the second largest delegation in attendance.

Since the 1st session of the 87th Congress, with its numerous inquiries into the status of space communications, ended, there is evidence of increasing study of frequency needs within the executive branch. Government agencies giving active attention to the problem include the National Aeronautics and Space Council, Office of Emergency Planning, Interdepartmental Radio Advisory Committee, and the Federal Communications Commission.

A paper titled "Preliminary Views of the U.S.A. for Frequency Allocations for Space Radio Communications" has been prepared and may be considered a preparatory paper for the 1963 conference.

The paper noted that "the matter of congestion in the high frequency spectrum has concerned members of the ITU for many years," and suggests that 2,975 megacycles per second of spectrum space be allocated to meet foreseeable requirements of satellite communications until about 1970. These bands would be dispersed between 3,700 and 8,400 megacycles.

Six uses of space radio communications are listed as follows:

a. Aeronautical mobile.
b. Broadcasting.
c. Meteorological.
d. Navigation.
e. Space research—guidance, control and associated communications, including tracking and telemetering.
f. Communications relay (both active and passive).

"Broadcasting," defined as transmissions intended for direct reception by the general public, is given but one scant paragraph in the 43-page document, which by its nature is largely technical.

The authors note that "it is probable that communication satellites will be used to relay aural and television broadcast programs."

"However," they add, "the likelihood that the general public will be receiving such transmissions directly from satellites in the near future seems remote. Special receiving stations on the earth's surface may be established to relay programs over conventional communications systems to the broadcasting stations which already serve the general public."

This is an interesting document as far as it goes, but I find no mention of a need for weighing or projecting the international and sociological implications of worldwide radio and television services through the use of communications satellites.

President Kennedy in his statement of July 24, 1961, seems to me to have gone far beyond the departmental paper on preliminary views when he said:

"I am anxious that development of this new technology to bring the fartherest corner of the globe within reach by voice and visual communication, fairly and equitably available for use, proceed with all possible promptness."

Assuming that this is done, assuming that allocations are made available at the 1963 ITU conference that will make such worldwide voice and visual service possible, what uses do the nonmilitary agencies and departments of our Government propose to make of this new and advanced technology which, in the words of the president of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. will "revolutionize communications and television services."

This question should be answered specifically by our Government agencies, and answered soon. I know of but one agency that, to date, has put in writing its prospective channel requirements in connection with a satellite communication system. That is the U.S. Information Agency.

With reference to television requirements USIA has reported as follows:

"Since it is not now possible to transmit television broadcasts on existing point-to-point high frequency radio and cable circuits, communication satellites provide the possibility of a great new advance in international telecasting. We anticipate the following television program circuit requirements for point-to-point feeds with subsequent relay by local or regional stations:

"Television program channels required (video bandwidth):

Washington to—	*Number of circuits*
Latin America	1
Near East	1
Far East	1
Southeast Asia	1
South Asia	1
West Europe (Eurovision)	1
Africa	1
Total	7

"Channel requirements on the satellite system for radio are given as follows:

Washington to—	*Number of circuits*
England and North Europe	1
Germany and West Europe	1
Greece and Near East	1
Ceylon and South Asia	1
Philippines and Southeast Asia	1
Okinawa and Far East	1
Liberia and Africa	1
Latin America	1
Total	8"

As I stated in my remarks prepared for the American Rocket Society's "Space Flight Report to the Nation" in New York City last October, it is my opinion that all nonmilitary departments of our Government should poll their knowledge of potential peaceful applications of satellite communications and prepare short-rang and long-range programs within their department fields which could serve as guides to the overall planning group.

In this way the executive branch and Congress could arrive at a projection of future frequency requirements, a projection based on efficient and profitable uses of space communications.

Accordingly, I have written to each of the following departments and agencies requesting their views and comments on this proposal:

Department of Agriculture and Foreign Agricultural Service; Office of Education and Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Department of State and International Cooperation Administration; U.S. Weather Bureau; Bureau of Foreign Commerce; Bureau of Commercial Fisheries; Post Office Department; National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Federal Communications Commission.

Each of these agencies, in my opinion, could make valuable contributions to world understanding and development by utilizing worldwide broadcasting whenever feasible and when suitable frequencies are made available.

Everywhere in the world peoples, regardless of their stage of advancement, will welcome visual instruction on how to decrease mortality, particularly infant mortality, by the adoption of simple health measures.

Everywhere they will welcome programs on how to increase their food production.

Everywhere they will welcome early warnings of violent storms or floods.

Everywhere they will welcome news telecasts of events and the personages shaping them in other parts of the world.

In many areas they will welcome information on markets and sources of supply.

Peoples everywhere, in brief, welcome knowledge, views and information.

The communications satellite, as I stated in my New York remarks, can be the most valuable manmade instrument of good will and understanding in the history of the world. And this, I am firmly convinced, is the greatest use that the United States can conceivably make of the tremendous investment in brains and treasure that has gone into our enormous space program.

Reclamation Program in the 17 Western States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to the President of the United States and signed by the Governors of 17 Western States.

The letter follows:

MARCH 28, 1962.

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We in the reclamation West are deeply gratified by your recognition of the urgency of developing and conserving the natural resources of our Nation. The fact that we must proceed now with the development of water for beneficial

purposes to conserve and make the best use of all of the natural resources of our States is expressed with force and clarity in these words from your recent message relative to our conservation program:

"This administration adheres to the policy enunciated in my natural resources message of last year that our available water supply will be used to provide maximum benefits for all purposes—hydroelectric power, irrigation and reclamation, navigation, recreation and wildlife, and municipal and industrial water supply. These diverse uses and our future needs require thoughtful preservation and full development of our national water resources.

"The leadtime is long in the development of water resources. Years are required to plan and build sound projects. Time should not be lost on those projects which have already been transmitted to the Congress for authorization.

"In the work of conservation, time should be made our friend, not our adversary. Actions deferred are frequently opportunities lost, and, in terms of financial outlay, dollars invested today will yield great benefits in the years to come."

We fully subscribe to your policy that our available water supply will be used to provide maximum benefits for all purposes. Such development of the water resources of the 17 Western States is essential if this region is to make the fullest possible contribution to the economy of the United States and the defense of the free world.

Reclamation is necessarily an integral part of such development. Down through the years reclamation has had the support of every Congress, both major political parties, and every President since 1902, when Theodore Roosevelt signed the original act. Projects conceived and planned under one administration have been authorized and constructed under another.

The reclamation program was authorized to develop the arid and semiarid lands of the Western States and to create homes and opportunities. That program has been an outstanding success. It has created a self-supporting economy which will be an asset to the West and to the Nation for generations to come. It has created new wealth that otherwise would not exist, has broadened the tax base, and has provided a dependable market for manufactured products from other areas, thus stimulating business and commerce. It has made the desert "blossom as the rose."

Except along the west coast, virtually every major population or industrial center west of the 100th meridian has as its foundation an irrigation or reclamation project. When reclamation projects are constructed, homes are built and thriving communities are soon established. First there are villages and then cities, which soon become highway and railroad junctions. Thus, metropolitan areas are developed, markets are created and the transportation, water and human resources which are needed to develop the timber, mineral, recreational, and other resources of the region are provided.

The reclamation program is oriented toward the full economic development of the West. It is not exclusively a food and fiber program. The Bureau of Reclamation program has evolved until today it includes every phase of multipurpose development including irrigation, flood control, municipal and industrial water, hydroelectric power, fish and wildlife propagation, recreation and other purposes. It is important that reclamation be included in current multipurpose, basinwide, development programs and not deferred for future development.

Reclamation is one of the few Federal programs that repays its costs. It pays through the repayments by water and power users. It pays through increased income taxes. On many projects the income taxes alone, over a few years time, have exceeded the cost of the project.

There appears to be a popular misconception that reclamation contributes to the Nation's agricultural surplus. Actually, most of the sums appropriated for irrigation works are used to supply irrigation water to lands now in dryfarming and lands under irrigation with an insufficient water supply. Reclamation projects produce only an insignificant percentage of the crops now in surplus. Reclamation project lands grow only 1.5 percent of all the wheat produced in the United States, less than three-fourths of 1 percent of the total corn crop, only about 1 percent of the grain sorghum, and no tobacco. Logic indicates that these very small percentages are not the source of our surplus problem. Furthermore, in many areas, and especially in wheat growing areas, when a reclamation project is developed, farmlands almost invariably are taken out of wheat and put into other crops that are not in surplus.

Western irrigation is largely responsible for improving the diet of the American people. Today, thanks to irrigation, we have an abundance of green vegetables and fresh fruits, not only during the summer but throughout the entire year. The 17 Western States provide 84 percent of the Nation's supply of broccoli, 63 percent of our asparagus, 82 percent of our cantaloup, 60 percent of our celery, 79 percent of our carrots, 93 percent of our lettuce, and all of our olives, dates, figs, nectarines, and lemons. Without irrigation, our food consumption pattern would be vastly different and considerably less wholesome.

Population growth in the Western States is much higher than the national average, and all known forecasts indicate this trend will continue. This will require intensive development of the limited water resources of the West, to meet the many diversified requirements outlined in your own statement, quoted at the beginning of this letter. As you yourself have pointed out, such development entails a long leadtime and it is imperative that our multipurpose reclamation program keep moving ahead in order to be prepared for tomorrow's critical demands for water.

The 60-year-old reclamation program has contributed tremendously to the strength and the economy of the Nation. Without the 100 or more reclamation projects scattered throughout the 17 Western States, the arid and semiarid West would still be largely a desolate, barren waste and of little value to the Nation, either in times of peace or war.

We appreciate the splendid support which is being given to reclamation by you and your administration, as well as by the present Congress. We are especially gratified that you have again endorsed the reclamation program in your message in which you supported several projects now being considered by the Congress and in which you point out that, "Federal planning efforts have been intensified and studies and recommendations for authorization of additional water developments accelerated. These plans and recommendations will be submitted to the Congress as they are completed." We are hopeful indeed that these projects may continue to move forward in an orderly manner so that the West and the Nation may benefit by their development.

A copy of this letter is being sent to the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, President of the Senate, and to the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives, with the thought that its contents should be made available to the Members of the Congress.

Respectfully yours,

Paul Fannin, Governor of Arizona; Steve McNichols, Governor of Colorado; John Anderson, Jr., Governor of Kansas; Frank B. Morrison, Governor of Nebraska; Edwin L. Mechem, Governor of New Mexico; J. Howard Edmondson, Governor of Oklahoma; Archie Gubbrud, Governor of South Dakota; George D. Clyde, Governor of Utah; Edmund G. Brown, Governor of California; Robert E. Smylie, Governor of Idaho; Tim Babcock, Governor of Montana; Grant Sawyer, Governor of Nevada; William L. Guy, Governor of North Dakota; Mark O. Hatfield, Governor of Oregon; Price Daniel, Governor of Texas; Albert D. Rossellini, Governor of Washington; Jack R. Gage, Governor of Wyoming.[1]

[1] Governor Gage signs this letter with the understanding that: (1) Feasibility of projects be based on irrefutable and real need; (2) self-liquidation be made a fact, not a contention made possible by amortization over illegal periods of time; and (3) urgency be tempered with logic.

Mrs. Kennedy's Trip to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a recent column by the noted columnist, Mr. George Sokolsky, relating to the trip of Mrs. Kennedy deserves the attention of the Senate. George Sokolsky answers any critic of the trip of our First Lady.

I ask unanimous consent that this splendid column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JACKIE IDEAL AMERICAN FOR MOST VITAL TRIP

One task at which the United States has not been too successful has been worldwide propaganda.

Until Khrushchev's boastings and blusterings shocked the world, the Russians had it much their own way, and peoples in distress even when aided by the United States, turned to the greener pastures of the Kremlin for hope and improvement. Soviet Russia, the most imperialist of nations, gives the impression of being the advocate of angelic peace, whereas the United States, which would not even blow up the Bay of Pigs, has become the votary of war.

It has been shocking to our people that we, who can make bubble gum palatable and who can glorify cosmetics until the natural bloom of a woman's face or the beauty of her hair is lost under pounds of falsifiers, do not know how to tell the truth about ourselves effectively.

The Indian trip of Mrs. John F. Kennedy, the President's wife, has proved something very important. It has established that all the world loves beauty, particularly in the

natural flowering of a young woman, that good manners and gentleness and proper address are attractive wherever one sees it. It may or may not be useful to influence neutral governments, but it is always advantageous to be beloved by great masses of people. If we can afford to do anything, we can afford to send this particular President's wife, who speaks many languages and who is so flexible in her relations with strange people, to many countries.

We have been painted to all the world as crass materialists; yet we have here the best, or if that citation is given to La Scala, the second best, opera house in all the world; we have more and better museums; more and better symphonies; and so one goes on, but these accomplishments are hardly noted. Mrs. Kennedy is an artist and when she goes among artistic people she can hold her own and she does not give the impression of having lived a crude materialitsic life.

I have read the criticisms of her trip and they make two general points.

1. It costs money.

2. Why send the President's wife? Why not send someone from the State Department or from Congress?

As to the money, what this trip costs is peanuts compared to what we spend on propaganda for our country that hardly scratches the surface; the impression Jackie is making seems to cut deep, because she does what the people of India like to have their visitors do. And whatever she does, is done gracefully.

As to why the President's wife should be sent, the answer is that she fits the job. Lots of folks, including myself, often have had much to say about Eleanor Roosevelt because we did not like her politics, but in her day, she managed to win the good will of a great mass abroad.

Opposes Trade Expansion Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the fisheries of the Pacific Northwest and Alaska face increasing competition from Japan and the Soviet Union. While our own production has failed to increase, foreign production is on an upward swing.

There are a number of reasons, one of which is the fact that our fishermen practice conservation methods in an effort to preserve fish and shellfish for future harvest. Their foreign competitors, on the other hand, do not practice many of the conservation measures necessary to preserve our fisheries. This is particularly true in the high seas salmon fisheries.

Mr. Speaker, there are many in the fishing industry who are concerned with the posssible adverse effects upon the U.S. fishing industry if H.R. 9900, the proposed Trade Expansion Act, becomes law. This act, they believe, will add to the problems that confront the industry by giving further advantages to foreign competitors.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include a statement, a resolution and a letter prepared by the Association of Pacific Fisheries in the RECORD.

The articles follow:

STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF ASSOCIATION OF PACIFIC FISHERIES IN OPPOSITION TO H.R. 9900

1. The Association of Pacific Fisheries, organized in 1914, is a nonprofit trade association representing producers of 95 percent of the canned salmon pack of Alaska, Washington, and Oregon. There are approximately 25,000 direct employees. The wholesale value of the pack in 1961 was $120,238,769.

2. Fishing is one of the oldest and most respected industries. Great as is its monetary value, its importance to the welfare of the people of this country goes far beyond that. It involves the production of food of such an essential character that our people should not risk becoming dependent on importations from abroad. It develops real seamen, men of boldness and hardihood who do not wish to become dependent upon Government subsidies even if this were practical, which we doubt. The industry not only gives direct employment to thousands of fishermen and cannery workers, but to shipbuilding and other plants essential to a well-balanced economy.

3. The fisheries of this country have become subject to increasingly severe competition from foreign nations so that while our own production has failed to increase, that of Japan and the Soviet have increased enormously and unless there is protection from the lower production costs of Japan which are aided by disregard of American standards of conservation regulation, and the Government-financed operations of the Soviet, which are indifferent to costs, various branches of fisheries are in trouble.

4. What is said is particularly applicable to the salmon industry of the Pacific coast States of Alaska, Washington, Oregon, and the northern part of California. This is especially serious for Alaska where the value of fish production, primarily salmon, has exceeded that of all other industries put together, and from an Alaskan income standpoint has only been exceeded by Government financed defense expenditures in recent years.

5. The Pacific coast salmon industry directly confronts the two most aggressive fishery nations in the world, Japan and the Soviet, and is even in competition with Canadian production at lower costs. At the same time our fishermen are subject to rigid governmental regulations as to time, place, and methods of fishing. The types and sizes of fishing gear are restricted by such regulations and because high seas salmon fishing is believed to be inconsistent with effective conservation it is prohibited to our fishermen, yet Japanese do practically all their salmon fishing in the open ocean, much of it on American-spawned salmon, with nets thousands of feet long and with monofilament nylon web, the use of which is forbidden American fishermen.

6. In July 1951, the ad valorem duty on the importation of canned salmon was, as a result of negotiations, reduced from 25 to 15 percent. This was a severe blow to the industry and any further reduction in duty would encourage the Japanese that much harder to fish in the open ocean on American-born salmon and market their salmon pack in the United States, the result of which would be disastrous to our fishermen and industry. Even with the 15-percent duty Japanese canned salmon are being imported into this country.

7. By the proposed bill, regardless of what it is entitled, Congress would be abnegating its powers and duty to deal with the matter of tariff, and turning its proper functions over to negotiators, whoever they might be. Experience shows that seldom, if ever, regardless of protestations to the contrary, do either fisheries or other industries have adequate representation in such negotiations. Our industry has always looked to Congress itself as the people's representatives to give the people concerned the hearings that they are entitled to when their interests are to be affected.

8. The industry believes that there should be no delegation of the power of Congress to deal with tariffs, but certainly if this should be done adequate peril point and escape clauses should be included in whatever bill is passed. We are opposed to the bill in its present form which we consider bad for the fishing industry.

9. Attached hereto is a copy of resolution adopted at Seattle, Wash., March 5, 1962, by representatives of the American fishing industry; also a concurring letter dated March 21, 1962, by the secretary of the Alaska Fishermen's Union, the oldest fishing union on the Pacific coast.

10. We request that this statement, the resolution of March 5, 1962, and the letter of March 21, 1962, from the secretary of Alaska Fishermen's Union be made a part of the printed record.

Respectfully submitted.

ASSOCIATION OF PACIFIC FISHERIES,
By HERALD A. O'NEILL,
Executive Secretary.

MARCH 22, 1962.

RESOLUTION OF REPRESENTATIVES OF AMERICAN FISHING INDUSTRY

Be it resolved by representatives of the American fishing industry including spokesmen of fishermen, labor, and processors of the U.S. crab, halibut, groundfish, oysters, salmon, shrimp, and tuna industries meeting on the 5th day of March 1962, at the request of the Association of Pacific Fisheries, That every group and organization interested in the future welfare of the American fishing industry give urgent and thorough consideration to the possible adverse effects and results upon the various segments of the U.S. fishing industry of H.R. 9900, known as the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and similar or identical bills; and be it further

Resolved, That it be known that this consensus and action is based on the strong belief on behalf of many responsible members of the American fishing industry that this act, as written, can cause severe hardship and in some cases complete destruction to various segments of the U.S. fishing industry which is so important to the general public welfare both as a valuable source of protein food and means of employment.

MARCH 21, 1962.

Congressman WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: The Alaska Fishermen's Union concurs with the statement of opposition submitted by the Association of Pacific Fisheries to your committee.

Our main concern is that under the terms of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement, the proposals embodied in H.R. 9900 (Trade Expansion Act of 1962) will remove the minimum protection tariffs on fishery products which are now in existence and will place the American fishing industry in a position where it cannot compete with foreign fishery imports.

The United States has been reduced to fifth place in world production of fish. Japan, Communist China, Peru, and Russia are ahead of us. The following table, setting forth the catches of fish in millions of pounds by the five leading fishing countries, clearly illustrates the quick recent growth of their production, at the expense of our own fishing industry:

	1960
Japan	12,952
China (mainland)	11,067
United States	6,384
U.S.S.R.	6,076
Peru	4,409
	1959
Japan	13,651
China (mainland)	11,067
Peru	7,785
U.S.S.R.	6,724
United States	6,166

The employment of fishermen has declined from a total of 161,463 in 1950 to 128,985 in 1959, with corresponding decreases in employment for allied workers within the industry. The downward trend is continuing. While the consumption of fish in the United States has increased by about 40 percent during the last 10 years, our production remains at the same level it was 10 years ago.

The United States is unable to hold its own because of lack of adequate protection, either by tariffs or quotas. To reduce such scant protection as we now have would serve only one purpose, that of speeding up destruction for the fishing industry. As pointed out in the statement of the Association of Pacific Fisheries, any lowering of tariffs on fishery production would only be an incentive for Japan and Russia to increase their fishing efforts off the Pacific coast to a point where they would most seriously deplete and even destroy those fishery resources for all time

Congress should be aware that in discussing fisheries, we are not talking only about dollars and cents, but what is really important is that we are talking about conservation of a food resource which is a necessity to the well-being of the American people.

We join with the Association of Pacific Fisheries in opposing any lowering of tariffs on fishery products and ask that the problem of maintenance and conserving of the U.S. fishery resources not be considered on the basis of foreign policy but that it be considered on its own merits, so that this invaluable food may always be available and in good supply for the American people.

H.R. 9900 is probably one of the most important bills to come before the Congress in this session and it no doubt will have far-reaching effects on the future.

We hope that Congress, in its wisdom, will carefully consider all aspects of the problem before it, and in particular, conservation of the fishery resource which is seriously involved in this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

ALASKA FISHERMEN'S UNION,
GEORGE JOHANSEN,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Let's Look at the Facts About Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, a great deal of heat, but only a limited amount of light, is being disseminated this year about the President's plan of medical care for the aged.

Amid all the tumult and the shouting the average citizen seldom gets an opportunity to study the issues involved in a calm, dispassionate way. The result, I fear, may be a general, emotional confusion about conflicting claims and arguments on this very important subject.

Leverett Chapin, associate editor of the Denver Post, and in my opinion one of the finest reporters in this Nation, recently outlined the facts and the arguments pro and con the medicare question in a special article in the March 21 editions of his newspaper.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article by Mr. Chapin entitled, "Kennedy Lines Up Support for Medical Battle."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENNEDY LINES UP SUPPORT FOR MEDICAL BATTLE

(By Leverett Chapin)

The medical battle of the century is about to start in Washington. At issue is President Kennedy's demand for a revolutionary plan to add hospital and nursing care insurance to the already existing social security and railroad retirement programs for the aged.

"Democracy must do what it can to relieve human misery," backers of the President are saying.

"Stop socialism," is the rallying cry of the determined opponents.

Known as the King-Anderson bill, the ambitious Kennedy plan would cost an estimated $1.2 billion the first year.

Eligible for the newly available medicare at the outset would be 14,750,000 oldsters, comprising 82 percent of all men and women in the country 65 years of age or over.

For most of them the benefits would be virtually "free" since they are already retired and are no longer paying into the social security and railroad retirement funds.

As additional workers covered by social security or railroad retirement reached 65, they, their spouses, if 65 or over, and in some instances their parents would become eligible. Workers would not have to give up their employment to qualify.

Under the plan, oldsters taken seriously ill would be entitled to a combination of services in hospitals, nursing homes and in their own homes which would amount to year-round care, if necessary.

Doctors' fees and a few other charges would not be covered.

While retirement and disability benefits under social security and the railroad act depend on the amount the worker has paid during his years of employment, medicare benefits, according to the Kennedy proposal, would be the same for all eligibles.

Costs of the program would start January 1, 1963, when the wage base upon which employees and their employers pay social security taxes would be increased from a maximum of $4,800 a year to $5,200.

Then on January 1, 1964, employees and employers would begin paying an extra one-fourth of 1 percent on annual wages of up to $5,200, but only $4,800 in the case of railroad workers. Self-employed workers would pay three-eighths of 1 percent on earnings up to $5,200.

A side effect of raising the social security wage base would be to increase retirement and disability benefits for workers making more than $4,800 a year and for their dependents.

For example, maximum retirement benefits for workers would rise from the present limit of $127 a month to $134. Payments to wives, widows, and parents would increase correspondingly.

Designed primarily to protect older persons from heavy financial burdens caused by illness, the Kennedy medicare plan, according to its advocates, would also strengthen the Nation's overall health program. They say it would:

Stimulate the founding and construction of more nursing homes and perhaps the building of new hospitals. (Official figures indicate the country needs 500,000 more beds in nursing homes alone.)

Reduce welfare costs for the care of the aged which, in Colorado, have already outrun the State constitutional limit of $10 million a year. (About 20,000 of the 50,000 old-age pensioners in Colorado could get medicare from social security instead of welfare if the King-Anderson bill became law.)

Hold down Blue Cross costs for persons under the age of 65 by taking oldsters off membership lists.

Encourage local public and nonprofit agencies to enlarge their programs of sending visiting nurses and therapists into the homes of the sick, thus relieving the loads on already overcrowded hospitals.

The Kennedy administration is counting on the King-Anderson bill, which is patterned after a bill the President sponsored when he was in the Senate, to be one of the most popular measures it has presented to Congress.

Its backers believe its enactment would be a great assist to most Democratic candidates in the 1962 election. Failure to pass it, they say, would put foes of the bill on the defensive when they come face-to-face with voters next fall.

A campaign to awaken grassroots support for medicare is already rolling, supported, among others, by labor and various groups of older citizens.

The problem of the administration at the moment is to get the bill out of the House Ways and Means Committee, where it has been stalled for 6 months by unfriendly forces.

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, coauthor of the measure with Representative CECIL R. KING, Democrat, of California, says votes are available in the House to pass it if it can be brought to the floor.

He is also hopeful over chances for passage by the Senate.

In charge of the administration's push for medicare is the Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Wilbur J. Cohen, a former Universiay of Michigan professor.

He and the others are campaigning on these points:

The number of elderly persons is growing steadily and will increase 44 percent, from 17 million to 25 million, by 1980.

Three-fourths of all elderly persons have some chronic disorder.

The average hospital stay of patients over 65 is two or three times as long as the average stay of younger patients.

Hospital charges per day have risen 243 percent since 1946, and will go still higher.

The ability of oldsters to pay for their own health care out of pocket is seriously limited by the fact their average income is only half that of the younger segment of the population.

While half of all persons over 65 have some hospital insurance, only 30 percent have insurance which will pay as much as three-fourths of their hospital costs and the ones with no insurance are those least able to pay.

Most opponents of the King-Anderson bill do not quarrel too seriously with these premises. Instead, they find fault with the proposed method for meeting medicare needs.

They raise numerous questions.

How extensive should a health plan for the aged be?

Should it be "voluntary" or "compulsory"?

Should it be financed like insurance by payments before a person reaches 65 or by fees collected from the oldsters themselves with, perhaps, the help of some Government subsidy?

One group of opponents argues the country already has, in the Kerr-Mills Act, passed in 1960, the framework for an adequate medicare plan if the States would get busy and make use of the law.

Kerr-Mills provided Federal grants to the States for two purposes. One was to help States finance health programs for persons receiving old-age assistance. (Under this program Colorado receives approximately $7.50 a month each for pensioners over 65 who are not in institutions.)

The other was to help States establish medicare for elderly persons whose incomes are too high to permit them to qualify for old-age assistance.

Here States are permitted to write their own tickets. They can decide what income groups above the assistance level should have medicare and how much medicare they should have.

Depending on the wealth of the individual State, the Federal Government pays, without limit, 50 to 80 percent of the cost of this second program, provided the State pays the balance.

Champions of Kerr-Mills see evidence that the States, given sufficient time, will provide medicare for enough oldsters who have only moderate incomes to make medicare by way of the Kennedy social security-railroad retirement route unnecessary.

With this view Assistant Secretary Cohen of HEW and others take strong exception. They do not object to the Kerr-Mills Act but say it won't do the job because States won't provide enough money to bear their share of the cost of a thoroughgoing program.

"Twenty-three States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands have now adopted medicare plans under Kerr-Mills for persons above the public assistance level," Cohen told the Denver Post.

"However, in December, the last month for which figures are available, only 72,000 persons received help under these plans, two-thirds of them were in only 2 States, Massachusetts and New York, and half the recipients were persons who had been transferred from old-age assistance.

"In other words, only a few persons who were not already receiving help have benefited from this part of the Kerr-Mills program so far."

Colorado is among the 27 States which have not set up Kerr-Mills medicare plans for oldsters above the assistance level.

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York, has a medicare plan, endorsed by some of his more liberal Republican colleagues, which is a rival to the King-Anderson bill.

It would cost an estimated $450 million a year as compared with the initial cost of $1.2 billion a year for the Kennedy plan. Participation by oldsters would be voluntary.

The elderly subscriber would pay a fee ranging from $9 to $12.80 a year and his State and the Federal Government would bear the balance of the cost, up to a maximum of $128 per year per subscriber.

The subscriber would have his choice of three plans: (1) for preventative, diagnostic, and short-term medicare; (2) for long-term illnesses or (3) for the purchase of private health insurance coverage.

While the Javits plan would not provide as much hospital and nursing care as the Kennedy plan, it would include some benefits, such as some doctors' fees, which are not included in the administration's King-Anderson proposal.

Principal foe of the Kennedy forces is the American Medical Association.

Opposed to any Government interference with the medical profession, AMA is now reconciled to the idea of Kerr-Mills medicare but sees the Kennedy plan to link medicare with social security as an opening move to "socialize" and bring under Federal control all health services for people of all ages.

It is Federal control that alarms AMA and it is the element of local State control in the Kerr-Mills plan which has finally made it acceptable to doctors.

AMA suspects that the passage of the King-Anderson bill would be followed by proposals to force compulsory insurance covering doctors' fees on the elderly. From there it would be only a step to extend both hospital and medical fee insurance to the entire population.

The AMA is not impressed by statements of the Kennedy forces that the King-Anderson bill would in no way interfere with the doctor-patient relationship or the free choice by oldsters of physicians and hospitals.

To forestall the extension of social security to cover doctors' fees, AMA is working on a plan to offer a "bargain rate" Blue Shield plan, at about $3 a month per person, for those 65 years of age or over.

Meanwhile, the American Hospital Association, which represents 5,500 of the country's 7,000 hospitals, is advocating a Blue Cross hospital insurance plan as an alternative to the King-Anderson bill.

It would be available on a voluntary basis to all persons over 65 and the Federal Government would help pay the bill. The amount of Government aid in each case would depend on the income of the person taking out the insurance, with the Government paying the full cost for the lowest income group.

AHA wants to keep the administration of any hospital care plan out of the hands of the Government but, after some hesistation, it has finally decided it would be all right to permit the Government contributions to Blue Cross to be made through social security instead of the general Federal treasury.

AMA, AHA, Blue Cross and other private insurance organizations wield powerful influence in Washington. They can be counted upon to oppose the King-Anderson bill every step of the way and the Kennedy administration—win, lose or draw—will know it has been in a rough fight by the time the medicare issue is finally settled.

MAIN FORM OF THE KENNEDY MEDICARE PLAN

Here are principal features of the Kennedy medicare plan for the aged as contained in the King-Anderson bill now before Congress:

Eligibles—All persons 65 years of age or over who are covered by social security or the Railroad Retirement Act, including wives, widows, and parents of workers. (To qualify for medicare workers 65 or over would not have to quit their jobs.)

Benefits—Hospitalization: A maximum of 90 days' care in a two-, three-, or four-bed room in each benefit period. A new benefit period would start when the patient had not been a patient in either a hospital or a nursing home for 3 months. All regular hospital charges, including those for anesthetics, and so forth, would be paid by medicare except that the patient would pay $10 a day for the first 9 days and would pay for extra services, as for a private room or private nurse.

Nursing home service: Available for a maximum of 180 days but to be eligible for nursing home care the patient would have to be transferred from a hospital.

(In each benefit period an insured patient would be entitled to a maximum of 150 units of combined hospital and nursing home care with each day in a hospital counting as one unit and each day in a nursing home counting as one-half unit. Thus, if the patient was in a hospital for the maximum insured period of 90 days, he would still be entitled to 60 units of care, or 120 days, in a nursing home.)

Home health service: Medicare would pay for a maximum of 240 visits in any calendar year to the patient's home by nurses and therapists employed by public or nonprofit agencies, such as the visiting nurses service.

Outpatient Hospital Diagnostic Services: Medicare would pay all but the first $20 of charges for each diagnostic study.

Not covered—Doctors' and surgeons' fees and drugs other than those furnished by hospitals to inpatients.

Effective dates—Hospital, visiting home health service and diagnostic service would start October 1, 1963.

Nursing home service would become available July 1, 1964.

Costs—Beginning January 1, 1963, employees and employers would pay social security taxes on earnings of up to $5,200 a year instead of the present limit of $4,800.

Beginning January 1, 1964, social security taxes on employees and employers would be increased by one-quarter of 1 percent each (three-eighths of 1 percent for self-employed). The same increase would apply to railroad retirement contributions.

On total pay of $4,000 a year, the cost would be $10 a year each for the employee and the employer.

The maximum cost on pay of $5,200 a year would be $27 a year each for the employee and the employer, of which $16.90 would go for medicare and $10.10 would go to increase retirement or disability benefits.

Other benefits—Since retirement and disability benefits under social security depend on the amount of a worker's earnings, the increase in the base rate from $4,800 to $5,200 a year would increase these benefits for higher paid workers and their families. For example, the present maximum retirement benefit for a worker of $127 a month would be increased to $134.

The Little-People-to-People Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my colleague, the Honorable PETER W. RODINO, JR., of New Jersey, for his excellent remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 15 on the need for a little-people-to-people program. The letter to Premier Khrushchev from Congressman RODINO's 10-year-old son Peter may be the start of a great children's crusade for world peace.

When President Eisenhower addressed the White House Conference convoked in 1956 to establish the people-to-people program, he stated:

> If we are going to take advantage of the assumption that all people want peace, then the problem is for people to get together and to leap governments—if necessary, to evade governments—to work out not only one method but thousands of methods by which people can gradually learn a little bit more of each other. It must have the active support of thousands of independent private groups and institutions and millions of individual Americans acting through person-to-person communication in foreign lands.

Although the people-to-people program was designed to mobilize all our human resources, children—one of America's greatest resources—have been virtually overlooked. Our junior citizens, if properly educated and organized, can do much to build bridges of understanding between America and the world. Our young people should be both seen and heard. From my experience as a father of four children, I have great faith that the young Peters of America will someday build an international chain of communication for the free expression of ideas and ideologies among children of the world.

Appendix

Why I Know There Is a God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD an article from the April 1 issue of Parade magazine. This is a simple and convincing sermon by our great national hero, Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., our first astronaut to orbit the earth three times in a space capsule. Our scientific discoveries are further proof of the existence of God.

The article follows:

AN INSPIRING MESSAGE FROM ASTRONAUT JOHN GLENN: "WHY I KNOW THERE IS A GOD"

(Not long ago, Protestant churches all over the United States marked Laymen's Sunday, on which parishioners conduct the worship service for the day. In the Little Falls United Presbyterian Church of Arlington, Va., the guest preacher was a very famous church member—John H. Glenn, Jr. Here, for Parade readers, are excerpts from Astronaut Glenn's sermon.)

"Why do you waste your time going to church?"

I was asked this question at one time by a fellow pilot in a Marine fighter squadron on Guam. This fellow's name was Sam, and Sam made no bones about the fact that he had been in church exactly twice in his life. One time was when he was baptized, and the other time was when his wife insisted on being married in church.

Well, by various devious means, we got Sam into church for the third time on Guam. I'm sorry to say this doesn't have a happy ending as far as Sam's becoming a practicing Christian. But the question posed by Sam—why do we waste our time going to church?—might be one for all of us to back off and answer once in a while.

Another way of asking the same question is probably to say, "Why do we believe in God?" I think it follows that if we believe in God, we probably will wind up in church. Is there a power greater than we are? Is there really a God that we worship, or are we just wasting our time? Have you ever doubted there really is a God?

I certainly have many times, and I admit it freely. I think perhaps this is part of our growth pattern in Christian life—that we do doubt sometimes. We may doubt that there is a God, and we search our minds for signs that we really believe and that we should believe in Him. Through such questioning of ourselves, I think we may be better Christians.

When I was selected for the space program, one of the first things we were given was a booklet. This booklet is a space handbook put out by the Government Printing Office, and it contains a lot of information about our space program. But there was one paragraph that concerned the hugeness and enormity of the universe that impressed me very much.

There is only one technical fact that you have to know to be able to understand this particular paragraph. You have to understand what a light year is, a light year of distance.

Probably you remember that light travels at about 186,000 miles per second, about 7 times around the earth every second. Now if you start that light ray out straight and let it continue on out for a year's time, then that distance is a light year of distance.

Let me quote now on the subject of how big our universe is: "When we recall that our galaxy is some 100,000 light years in diameter, the sun being an insignificant star some 30,000 light years from galactic center, circling in an orbit of its own every 200 million years as the galaxy rotates, we realize that even trying to visualize the tremendous scale of the universe beyond the solar system is difficult, let alone trying to attempt physical exploration and communications. Nor is the interstellar space of the galaxy the end, for beyond are the millions of other galaxies, all apparently rushing from one another at fantastic speeds. The limits of the telescopically observable universe extend at least 2 billion light years from us in all directions."

This shows us a little bit about how big our universe really is. It's tremendous. Still, we come back from something of this size to what we know of atomic structure, the smallest particles we know of. They, too, have a great similarity to our solar system and to the universe in that they have electrons rotating about a nucleus in regular patterns.

Now what's the point I am making? It's the orderliness of the whole universe about us from the smallest atomic structure to the greatest thing we can visualize: galaxies millions of light years across, all traveling in exact prescribed orbits in relation to one another.

Could this all have just happened? Was this an accident that someone tossed up a bunch of flotsam and jetsam, and it suddenly started making these orbits all of its own accord? I can't believe that's really true. I think this was a definite plan. This is one big thing in space that shows me there is a God, some Power that put all this into orbit and keeps it there. It wasn't just an accident.

Let's go on to compare some of our Project Mercury speeds to some of these things we've been talking about. We get to thinking sometimes that we're pretty good in this project and that we're really going out with some tremendous speeds. But when you think about the tremendous areas of space and speed, our efforts from earth here really are pretty puny. We will get up to about 18,000 miles an hour in orbit, which is about 5 miles per second. This is pretty fast by our earthly standards. We'll be at an altitude of a little over a hundred miles. But thinking in terms of what's already going on in space, this is really a pretty puny human effort.

We are used to dealings in scientific terms in all the measurements that are taken in science. But you can't reach out and say, "I would like to be a 110-volt Christian, and I am only a 5-volt Christian this morning. I'll have to go get pumped up some place."

You can't measure God in that way. We can't see, feel, smell, or touch our religious power. It's an intangible something.

The same thing is true if we are getting ready to test a new airplane. It may have the most powerful engine in the world. It can have the finest aerodynamic design. It can go the fastest. But for the airplane to fulfill its mission, what do we have to do? We have to give it a direction. And how do we do this? We do this by reference to our compass in the airplane.

Now the force that runs the compass, you can't see, feel, touch, taste, smell. It defies all of our senses. But how do we know it's there? We know it's there because we see the results. We can look on an instrument here in the cockpit, and we can see that our compass is pointing a certain direction. And we have faith that the force making that compass work will continue to work. All of us who fly have staked our lives literally thousands of times on the fact that this compass will give us the proper reading and will guide us where we should go.

The same thing is true of the Christian principles in our lives. If we will let them guide us, our senses don't have to pick them up. We see the results of it in our lives and in the lives of other people. So we know it's there. There's no doubt about it. We see the results of it. We're going to believe in God and the teachings of Christ. But what was this man Christ like whom we're going to follow?

He's revealed to us in the Bible. As far as physical characteristics go, we don't know too much about Him. My impression of Christ physically is not the popular impression, I'm afraid. Somehow the idea of Christ the weakling, Christ, the one on whom everybody heaped abuse, has never been an appealing one.

The emaciated Christ we see in the pictures is not my idea of Christ. I think He was a real man's man. I think He's someone we'd all be proud to follow. I read an article in which some place in the Bible said that Christ led His disciples from one spot to another spot in a day's time. They had measured this distance, and it turned out this was some 32 miles, I believe it was, in a day's time. How many of us could start out this morning and walk 32 miles by tomorrow morning, leading a group of men? I doubt if I could do it. I think Christ was a real man's man. He was someone really to follow.

This is borne out to a degree, too, in one of my favorite passages. The Jewish Passover was approaching, and Jesus made the journey up to Jerusalem. In the temple, He discovered cattle and sheep dealers, and pigeon sellers, as well as money changers sitting at their tables. So He made a rough whip out of rope and drove the whole lot of them, sheep and cattle as well, out of the temple. He sent the coins of the money changers flying and turned their tables upside down.

The important thing is not the physical strength that Jesus used in this example. The important thing is that Jesus had His beliefs, and He had the courage of His convictions to act upon them, to live by them. He believed, and He acted. These guidelines guided Christ in His everyday life when He was here on earth. The guidelines He used are available to us today, and they are just as timeless today as they were in Jesus' time.

These guidelines apply just as much to one business as they do to another. But the choice is ours. We are the ones who have to make the choice. God hasn't said, "You will do this." We have been placed here as free agents to decide whether we will or will not live by these guidelines. The choice is ours.

The Stars and Stripes—A Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a tribute to "Our Flag" written by Mrs. Rudolph M. Bowman, of Burbank, Calif.

Mrs. Bowman says the American people "must realize the exalted ideals for which the flag stands, and so intensify their pride in saluting the colors."

Mrs. Bowman's tribute follows:

OUR FLAG: THE STARS AND STRIPES

What the flag means to me.

The field of blue represents the courage displayed by our fighting men, under any and all conditions, in every kind of war, and the fidelity, loyalty and faith of all patriotic Americans.

The stars, representing the States, are the cities, towns, villages, and farms, the homes and loved ones that we defended and fought for, and signify our united determination to protect our great freedoms with our utmost strength.

The red stripes stand for the price we all paid, the blood spilt, the broken bodies and handicaps, the privation and griefs of our homefolk, and the loss of our buddies and comrades who paid the supreme sacrifice.

The white stripes represent our high ideals as inspired by our Almighty God, and our purity of intent to all mankind to uphold the dignity of man in his struggle to achieve freedom and a democratic way of life.

That's our flag, and what a beautiful flag; may we speak with God of it.

INVOCATION

Almighty God, Father of all mankind, we come before Thee with devout and sincere thanks in our hearts that Thou hast blessed us with this wonderful homeland over which flies our Star-Spangled Banner, the great emblem that signifies to all the world the high ideals and great precepts for which we stand.

We pray Thee now, Oh Lord, to inspire us with the knowledge, wisdom, and genius to convert all nations to a democratic and free way of life, so that we may achieve a real brotherhood of man upon earth, and so create a happy road to Thee for all men to follow.

We pray Thee to show us the way to silence the thunderous voices of ungodly leaders over the world who would destroy the freedom and dignity of men.

We pray Thee to inspire and guide us in the control and use of the all-powerful sword of atomic lightning Thou has placed in our hands, so that we may use it only to bring peace and good will on earth, and thankfulness and reverence for Thee among all men.

We pray Thee to inspire and guide our leaders in public life that they may be firm and strong in their actions dealing with antagonistic and subversive nations, and honest, sincere, and forthright in planning the welfare of our people.

We pray Thee to inspire and guide our leaders in science and mechanics so that our knowledge of their inexhaustible and limitless possibilities may accrue to the welfare of our people by eradicating disease and improving our way of life.

We pray Thee to inspire all teachers of religious faiths to accept the tenet that all faiths that teach of Thee are good, that all are roads leading to Thy presence, and thus to a universal brotherhood of man.

And, our Heavenly Father, we pray that our Stars and Stripes, under Thee shall be blessed with the power and influence to bring good to all the world, and that we may be inspired to share our bountiful blessings with the hungry, ailing, and ignorant unfortunates of the world, thus meriting Thy continued blessings. Amen.

State Should Solve Pollution Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have introduced into the RECORD statements concerning the problems caused by the Federal Government intervening in the pollution problems of my State of Washington.

The people of my State and my district do not want pollution and are willing to do their part in preventing it. But they are unwilling to see their pulp and paper mills closed because someone from the Federal Government without adequate proof states that Puget Sound waters are contaminated. I have received many letters protesting the action of the State Governor in calling in the Federal Government and protesting the results of this action.

Typical of these letters, Mr. Speaker, is one from Mr. William A. Blakey, of Port Angeles, Wash. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include his letter in the RECORD.

PORT ANGELES, WASH., *March 26, 1962.*

Hon. JACK WESTLAND,
Congressman, Second District,
State of Washington.

DEAR SIR: Having read your very intelligent letter in reference to being an intervenor on behalf of pulp and papermill pollution, State of Washington, I think your attitude toward the democratic solution to this problem is going to be a big help, and think you are very well informed about the undemocratic way the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has acted in this case.

You have asked for any suggestions to help. I will try and explain why I do not believe the sulfite liquor that is placed in this area of State waters is detrimental to marine life.

Having lived in Port Angeles since the year 1919, I have fished in these waters yearly and have been successful every year as far as catching fish are concerned.

In these so-called polluted waters, in my judgment, there is no harm done to the fish life. There are thousands of small crab (rock crab) that abound in our spit area, Ediz Hook. They can be found on shoreline anytime under rocks or any piece of shore wood, or bark that they hide under. They are not the commercial crab, but they exist in these so-called polluted waters, they are small one-fourth inch to 3 inches in diameter and live and spawn in this area.

You can catch bottom fish in these waters by the hundreds, such as ling cod, kelp cod, bass, red snapper, sand dabs, sole, and halibut. Anchovies were here last October and they were in schools by the thousands. These fish were so thick we used to herring net to get them, and I filled a 5-pound pail in 2 minutes. We use them for salmon bait.

These fish were raked for bait for a couple of months. We as fishermen in these waters cannot see how the sulfite liquor is harmful.

This school of anchovies was probably 60 yards long and 30 feet wide, probably 6 to 8 feet deep solid fish.

These fish stayed in this area close to the fiberboard papermill outfall. The liquor was visible as it shows a dark color in water, but these fish were never killed as they would come up if so. The water is not very deep, only about 6 to 10 feet, about 100 feet from the outfall of this mill.

Had I seen any dead fish I certainly would change my viewpoint on this matter.

These anchovies moved away now and then along shoreline, probably 200 to 300 yards, but they remained, all of October, November, and December before finally migrating outside the harbor.

The salmon fishing has been the best in years in this harbor, and many were caught, as they feed on the herring and anchovies that come here.

I have caught many salmon this last fall in the harbor along with many of my friends. The King salmon, or Blackmouth as we call the immature fish, were caught 10 to 25 pounds. Today I saw a friend come in with three salmon, 15 pounds, 12 pounds, 10 pounds, and others were caught in these so-called polluted waters.

I note these salmon are as fresh and fighting as any later on in the summer.

As you know, salmon carry a parasite on them now and then. These little parasites are called sea lice and each salmon will carry three or four of these. They will cling to the flesh close to the tail fin and if the waters were so bad to marine life, these sea lice could not live. If you try to remove them they will cling very tight.

The waters in our harbor do not injure our outboard motors as I have never had any trouble with mine for years, and have had two motors the last 10 years.

I would not like to swim in the harbor waters, too cold, even though there were no pulpmills. I would not like to swim where the sewage of 12,000 people is released.

So you can see the mills do no harm to the waters as far as the use of it for recreation purposes.

My opinion for the downfall of the salmon runs is too much fishing such as commercial and sports fishing. I have seen the salmon runs drop every year, King and Silver salmon. My honest judgment is the mills are not the cause. Nature and man cannot produce them fast enough for the demand.

Every fall our harbor has many fish eating ducks such as mergansers and a diving duck I call hell diver. They will circle a school of herring and dive and these little fish come together in a ball, and I have seen a complete school of herring the size of a wash tub consumed in 20 minutes.

This last November there was a school of these diving ducks with at least 300 in an area of a half block and they will take any small fish that comes in their path, be it small salmon fry or herring.

Let's not blame all the loss of fish to the pulpmills.

Yes, Mr. WESTLAND, there is some sulphite liquor placed in our waters, but these local mills are being called upon to do something that will probably effect their operation to a point they will do some curtailing that will effect the economy of this community.

I do believe the State of Washington could solve this problem, if there is one, to the benefit of all pulp mills and not to call upon the U.S. Government. Your help is needed as you have all the facts and seem fair as a helper to the cause of justice.

Thank you, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM A. BLAKEY.

Revenue Act of 1962

SPEECH

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10650) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit for investment in certain depreciable property, to eliminate certain defects and inequities, and for other purposes.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the tax bill before the House, H.R. 10650, is poor legislation in various vital respects which if enacted could adversely affect the interest and welfare of large segments of the public and our economy.

Certain sections in this tax measure embody needed tax revision and reform that should help toward achieving an improved tax structure, but these in my opinion are far outweighed by the inadvisable sections of the bill.

It is unfortunate that a tax measure with controversial and far-reaching tax provisions such as H.R. 10650 contains comes before us under a closed rule. The bill departs drastically from existing tax philosophy in significant ways and I believe the membership of the House should be given a chance to pass on these aspects of the bill separately. This consideration is not given under the gag rule.

One of the specific sections of H.R. 10650 with which I am not in agreement is the provision for withholding of 20 percent of interest and dividend by the Federal Government. This provision can very adversely affect large groups of people who rely on income from interest and dividends for their livelihood. Many of these are not taxpayers at all in the sense that they would be owing these amounts in taxes under the present system. I have received much mail from residents of the district I represent who advise they will be severely handicapped under interest and dividend withholding.

The withholding of tax could result in significant overwithholding because of the fact that many citizens could not be aware of the fact that interest and dividends had been withheld, many would not know how much had been withheld, and many for one reason or another would fail to claim refunds due or would not submit exemption certificates.

We have heard several times since H.R. 10650 has been under consideration that this provision would be an administrative monstrosity. With that I thoroughly concur.

Another extremely questionable provision of the bill is the proposal to provide a 7-percent investment credit on the purchase of depreciable property. The very amount of the credit, 7 percent, appears to have been nervously and haphazardly arrived at after much last-minute scrambling to settle on some figure which it is thought would help bring about a so-called balanced tax bill revenuewise, which could be displayed to the House as good because it is "balanced." This interest credit gimmick would amount to an outright subsidy to certain areas of our business economy which would be denied to others. Indications are that in many cases the investment credit approach would amount simply to a tax windfall.

Additionally, an unfortunate aspect of this provision is that the Congress in effect forgoes the opportunity to make really sound and lasting gains toward achieving economic incentives through providing adequate depreciation allowances.

In addition to some of its obvious, serious drawbacks, the investment credit approach—so appealing apparently to those intent on shifting ever-increasing authority over our economy and our citizens to an all-powerful Central Government—could establish an unfortunate precedent for future tax tampering and regulation of our economy. What is to prevent legislation from being requested next year, or the next, raising or lowering the 7-percent figure? Or revising its application, according to the goals of Government planners? Before long the Congress could be confronted with the proposal that a set figure for credits for a specified purpose is far too rigid and that flexibility is needed to enable the President to raise or lower the investment credit rate adequately to take care of the needs of the economy. The investment credit plan opens the door for just this type of action in the future, another example of a surrender to centralized government of authority delegated by the Constitution to Congress.

Sections of the bill pertaining to tax on foreign income could seriously interfere with the ability of American firms to compete in foreign markets and generally in international commerce. As has been brought out, the proposal in the bill for taxing of unrealized foreign income moves directly opposite to the 1960 foreign investment tax incentive bill. Despite the many months consumed on tax hearings little opportunity has been afforded for adequate study of certain sections of the bill pertaining to foreign income taxation.

I shall vote for the motion to recommit H.R. 10650 with instructions to delete these sections of the bill, and in the event this motion is not accepted by the House, will vote in opposition to passage.

An American Looks at Nationalism in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the contents of a column published recently in a Texas newspaper. The article, entitled "Antidote to Nationalism in Latin America", was written by my good friend Fred Allen Orleans of San Antonio, who has an excellent knowledge of Latin American affairs. His ideas on the subject are most interesting and I commend the article to all my colleagues.

The article follows:

ANTIDOTE TO NATIONALISM IN LATIN AMERICA

(By Fred Allan Orleans)

Latin America desperately needs a great increase in the tempo of foreign investments, but these investments are currently discouraged by strong nationalistic feelings which the Communists have so cleverly developed and expanded. Unfortunately, the nationalistic trends have resulted in destructive forms of attack on foreign enterprises which can only be coped with through soundly conceived and well organized public relations programs by American companies in the countries in which they are operating. A complete study of anti-American manifestations and nationalistic feeling, coupled with a well-directed course of action, can lead to the basic solutions necessary. Recent studies in some countries affected indicate that the feeling of the general public is that the foreign companies are exploiting their countries and that the parent companies in the United States control the U.S. Government. Nationalistic feeling has been found to be strongest among students and the opinion of students is a very strong factor in helping to establish the thinking patterns of other sectors of the population. The solution to the problems which are brought about through intensive nationalism in Latin American countries, is not an easy one and requires intensive positive and constructive propaganda to offset the adverse propaganda originating from extreme nationalists against U.S. interests as well as to determine the best methods of eliminating or minimizing those practices which Latin Americans resent most in foreign companies operating in their countries. The propaganda program should include extensive publicizing of the aid being given to the Latin American countries by the United States, stressing it is not the money of the Government, but that of the American taxpayer, including the average individual as well as corporations. In addition, it would be a wise move to widely publicize the deficiencies in the Russian economic system as well as their political philosophy in general. If the people of more Latin American countries became aware of the fact that the people were eating horsemeat in Russia; living eight to a room; had few modern conveniences; had no food in China, and were hungry and dissatisfied in all the countries of East Europe which the Russians dominate, and in general, that conditions and living standards in Communist nations were inferior in many instances to those in many countries of Latin America, there would be no desire to emulate the Communist systems which have produced considerable propaganda and little else.

With reference to the elimination of the practices which the Latin Americans resent most in foreign companies operating in their countries, the training and utilization of the natives of the countries for high administrative positions will go a long way to eliminate much of the resentments and misunderstanding which have developed. The program which has been instituted by Sears, Roebuck in Latin America presents an excellent example of what industry can do.

One of the strongest answers to the loud clamor of the nationalist in every Latin American country is joint ventures and the wide sale of stock to the public which results in the industry in question no longer being a controlled subsidiary of a foreign company, but a local industry.

This deprives the nationalists of a very powerful weapon in their attempts to discourage foreign investments in their countries.

The U.S. Government is trying to change its image in the eyes of the people of the Americas by stressing our revolutionary past and that the United States is the end product of the revolution. At this time, it is most important, that we also stress what made our revolution a success; namely, private enterprise. The greatness of America is a direct result of the individual and collective efforts of the people of this country who had the will and the incentive to make it great.

Ethnic Ticket Balancing Weakens the Nation's Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an address which I delivered at an open meeting of Theta chapter of Delta Epsilon Sigma, national Catholic scholastic honor society, at Providence College, Providence, R.I., on April 2, 1962:

Reverend fathers, lay members of the faculty, members of Theta Chapter of Delta Epsilon Sigma, friends and guests of Providence College, your invitation to speak here this evening and the citation which you have so generously given to me are both distinctions which I wish to acknowledge with sincere gratitude. And I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate those students of Providence College who have won the right to be chosen members of this society, which is dedicated to the promotion and recognition of scholastic excellence. As you are leaders in your college work, I am sure that you will help to fill the increasing need for leadership and men of ability in the complex world in which you will pursue your future careers.

It has been well said that "mountains culminate in peaks, but nations culminate in men." Without those who combine talent and hard work in order to reach their goals, no great nation could keep its position in the world for very long. This has always been true, but it is even more so in these days of rapid change and recurrent crisis. Shortly before his death, Pope Pius XI said to a friend: "The crisis we are experiencing is unique in history. It is no longer permitted to anyone to be mediocre." Certainly these wise words of a great and holy man should be taken to heart by everyone who is concerned with the future of freedom and the preservation of peace. Everyone in America has a special obligation to try to make the most of his abilities so that the whole country can raise the standards of its performance in the competition with communism.

We all can admire the spirit, the discipline, and the wonderful talents of men like our astronauts. But it is not enough for a few outstanding Americans to set their eyes on the goals of space travel. A landing on the moon, important as that is, cannot solve the question of the future destiny of freedom.

I seem to recall that after Columbus discovered America, the world had most of its old problems still unsolved. The historians present might wish to correct me on this point, but I think that they would probably agree that experience tends to prove that great explorations and revolutionary technical advances raise quite as many problems as they solve. Progress always has its price, and its price is getting higher all the time.

We in America have always believed, however, that the price of progress is well worth paying. And I am not just talking about dollars and cents. My long association with Federal support for medical research has, of course, made me well aware of the fact that we cannot push forward the frontiers of knowledge in any area without large expenditures of money. I have, on a few occasions, wished that this simple fact could be more widely appreciated. But even more important is the need for widespread popular understanding of how vital it is for our country to press forward in every area of national life. Scientific progress should be marked by an accompanying advance in the social, economic, and cultural fields.

This progress cannot be made on the basis of false or outmoded standards of judgment. Back in the Middle Ages it was, for example, believed that a man had a right to certain positions of power and privilege simply because he had been fortunate enough to be born in a family which had held a role of leadership for countless generations. The mere accident of birth generally determined the individual's opportunities in life. This false notion was rejected by our Founding Fathers and the principles of equal opportunity set forth by Jefferson were adopted as the American ideal. Yet, Abraham Lincoln in 1859 found it necessary to write the following words:

"The principles of Jefferson are the principles and axioms of free society. And yet they are denied and evaded with no small show of success. One dashingly calls them 'glittering generalities.' * * * And others insidiously argue that they apply to 'superior races.' These expressions * * * are identical in object and effect—the supplanting the principles of free government, and restoring those of classification, caste, and legitimacy. * * * We must repulse them, or they will subjugate us."

Lincoln had in mind the evil of slavery. That issue was settled by the Civil War, and I believe that we are now making good progress in making full civil rights a reality as well as an ideal for all Americans. Yet, the evil of group prejudices has by no means disappeared. In some areas it has, in fact, been increased as a direct result of the struggle for full civil rights. And although the election of President Kennedy showed that religious intolerance does not have the power which it once wielded, we are still a long way from being free from every form of bigotry. Far too many Americans still judge a man's worth by the color of his skin or by his religious preferences.

It is not, however, with these very obvious kinds of group prejudices that I am concerned in speaking to you this evening about the way that false or outmoded standards of judgment can harm the forward movement of our country today. Instead, I would like to spend a few minutes to discuss with you the discriminatory test of ancestry which has come to be applied to candidates for positions of public responsibility, not only here in Rhode Island but in other large metropolitan areas as well.

Commenting on the Republican ticket in last year's New York City elections, the Times had this to say:

"Once again it is crystal clear that religious and 'national' ticket balancing played a major part in determining the selections. We are sick and tired, and we believe the voters in this city are sick and tired, of party leaders paying as much attention to religious or ethnic background as to ability, and often more."

I believe that there are a great many people who would share these feelings. The truth is that what the Times referred to as national ticket balancing should become a thing of the past, because the conditions which originally caused it have largely ceased to exist.

The story of the United States, up until very recent times, was one of a series of waves of immigration. Here in Rhode Island the first settlers were mostly from the British Isles. Later, especially in the years between 1837 and 1857, most of the immigrants came from Ireland, and they played their part in building the Blackstone Canal and the railroads. Soon they also found a place in the local textile industry, where they were joined by many French Canadians.

Late in the last century, our State witnessed a rising tide of immigration from many parts of Europe, but in the years between 1890 and 1920 the greatest number came from Italy.

Each new wave of immigrants always experienced some discrimination. All were looked down upon by those who thought of themselves as the original Americans—a title which really belonged to the Indians. It is not hard for anyone to see how group thinking and group feeling grew up here. Housing was generally segregated along national lines, so that one section would be called an Irish neighborhood, while another was supposed to belong to the French, the Italians, or the Portuguese. The so-called old Yankee families had little or no social contact with other groups. Until 1928, when Rhode Island's property restriction on the right to vote was repealed, most of the political power in this State was in the hands of the descendents of the earlier English settlers. They controlled much of the economic and professional life as well.

All this, however, is largely history. I am sure that many who may be in this audience tonight are grandsons, or possibly the great-grandsons, of people who, because of their own experience of immigration, still naturally thought of themselves as representative of some distinct national group. But I am quite certain that no one in this room gives much thought to such group differences as once so clearly divided the immigrants from one another and from the descendents of the earliest settlers. The process of assimilation has created a country which is on its way to achieving a deeper fundamental unity of all groups.

The average American voter of today reflects this process of assimilation. Educated in our free society, he is not inclined to think of himself as a member of a special ethnic group. There are, unfortunately, those who suffer discrimination because of race or color. They are most certainly justified in their group efforts to win their due rights. But the descendants of the vast majority of the immigrants to America no longer need or desire special forms of ethnic representation in government.

Consequently, it is true to say that a political ticket that is balanced in terms of ethnic differences is as out of date as the horse-drawn fire engines that once rumbled over the cobble stones of our cities.

In the past in Rhode Island, as elsewhere, immigrant groups gained equality of opportunity for their children by using the power of their numbers to gain group representation. Political leaders recognized that this was necessary. Out of the various ethnic groups in Rhode Island there have come many distinguished men who, by their own accomplishments, helped their groups to gain their rightful place in the life of the community. Public service was an important path by means of which each wave of immigrants achieved their goals. It can be said that ethnic group activity in politics has done its work so well that it has now become unnecessary.

A group-bound mind is, in fact, a real handicap to a man who seeks to understand today's changing times. For over a hundred

years, America was in many ways dependent upon Britain and Western Europe, not only for manpower but for ideas. Many who came here for a new life still depended upon their European cultural heritage. This is no longer true, for America now is not only more politically advanced than any other country of comparable size, but it is also recognized as the defender of Western civilization. Free men look to a united America as the leader in the struggle against communism. In that role which history has assigned us to play, we can simply not afford to allow ourselves to be divided into competitive ethnic groups, whose very reason for being belongs to the past.

James Madison spoke prophetically when he said, "Our country, if it does justice to itself, will be the workshop of liberty to the civilized world, and do more than any other for the uncivilized." Madison's words, projected into the 20th century, have a most appropriate application. We stand before the world as the standard of what men can hope to achieve together under democratic government. New nations in Africa and Asia may well see in our Federal Republic the answer to their own problems of unity in diversity.

Standing in the spotlight of free world leadership, and teaching the doctrine of equality of opportunity for all, we cannot afford to permit ourselves to be swayed by ethnic considerations in choosing men for positions of public responsibility. Equality of opportunity for public service demands that our political parties, our voters, and those who have the authority to appoint officeholders should not be swayed by group prejudices and group pressures. The test of fitness for public service in a democracy is the merit and proven ability of the individual candidate. To pose the test of membership in some ethnic group is, in effect, to deny the individual his right as a citizen to be considered on his own merits.

In an age when organizational and group activities are as important as they are today, a democracy needs to remind itself of the importance of the individual and of his rights to opportunity for personal advancement as an individual. We in America have always believed that a man should be able to rise by his own efforts to a position of leadership in our society. This is still our faith. As Dr. Henry M. Wriston put it: "Democracy is the political aspect of the assertion of the supreme importance of the individual. Once the individual is put at the center, the acceptance of tyranny and the readiness to exploit the poor and ignorant have been made impossible." In a democracy, each man has the right to be judged on his individual character and ability without regard to the question of who his ancestors may have been.

We are fast approaching the time when the great majority will recognize this truth. In another generation, the old group feelings of the great era of immigration will have largely disappeared. This does not mean, of course, that cultural societies dedicated to preserving the special contributions which the various national groups have brought to America should disappear. It would be a great misfortune if this should happen. Our country is a far richer place to live in because of the music, the literature, the customs, the art, and the ideals which have been brought here from many parts of the world.

Individual Americans have every right to be interested in the cultural heritage which their forefathers brought to this country. Those organizations which are dedicated to preserving the memory of the early colonists and the many places of historical interest such as we have here in Rhode Island are performing a valuable service. Equally important are the fraternal and social clubs that concern themselves with the special traditional interests and activities of the many ethnic groups that have made their historic contribution to the progress of this Nation.

No country that lacks knowledge and respect for its past can possibly understand the path it must take into the future. A nation without a sense of history is like a man with the disease called amnesia: he cannot tell where he is going because he does not know where he has been. The loss of memory means the loss of personal identity. Consequently, a nation whose people are not mindful of their history is a nation that really does not know what it is or what it should stand for in the world.

But a nation cannot live on memories. We cannot expect our ancestors to solve our problems for us. In choosing those who are to frame public policies for our own times, the question of who their grandfathers were is, therefore, not relevant as a contemporary issue.

The audience gathered here tonight undoubtedly contains a large proportion of young men who have real potentialities for public leadership. I feel confident that they will not wish to be judged as candidates of an ethnic group. As members of a national scholastic honor society they already belong to what is an all-American team. In professional or public life they will want to keep it that way.

And those of us in public life today who believe, as I do, that no candidate should be either chosen or rejected on the basis of his ancestry are looking to the educated youth of America for help. I do not believe in sitting around and waiting for history to take care of the problem. I believe that we can do something about it right now. We can speak up and say that so-called national ticket balancing does not truly represent the kind of community we want for ourselves and our children. We can and should object when appointments to public office are clearly made on the basis of ethnic pressures from well-established groups. And at the same time we can lend our support to the effort to bring full equality of opportunity to those groups in our society that are still the clear victims of discrimination.

It is vital for us to do so, for social mobility—or the opportunity to advance on the basis of personal accomplishment—is the lifeblood of our free society. As Woodrow Wilson said, real democracy "releases the energies of every human being." When those energies are misdirected or blocked by ethnic group classification, the strength of the whole Nation is diminished.

This has always been recognized in one way or another by our greatest national leaders. They have likewise understood that what George Washington called "inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachment for others" should, as he said, "be excluded" from American life. In his speech of retirement from public life in 1796, Washington reminded his fellow-countrymen of this basic truth: "citizens by birth or choice, or a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you, in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. * * * You have in a common cause fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess are the work of joint councils, and joint efforts of common dangers, sufferings, and successes."

I believe that today, even more than in Washington's time, this great and richly complex Nation needs to concentrate its affections in the name of American. Our common cause and our common danger as the leaders of free men in the nuclear age are considerations which must make us speed up the process by which ethnic group competition in public life will disappear and become entirely a thing of the past.

Tax Bill Adds New Roadblocks for Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of March 21, 1962:

ADMINISTRATION TAX BILL ADDS NEW ROADBLOCKS FOR INDUSTRY

WASHINGTON.—A House vote is imminent on the Kennedy proposal to impose unwise tax restrictions upon industry and unnecessary and complicated bookkeeping requirements upon individuals.

The legislation is vigorously opposed by industry in the national interest.

It is impossible to overestimate the importance of the forthcoming House vote to the Nation's economic future.

One of the most obnoxious aspects of the Kennedy program is the requirement that 20 percent of dividend and interest income be withheld and turned over to the Government.

If the millions of persons who would be affected by this requirement were aware of the enormous and complicated recordkeeping involved there would be a tidal wave of protests rushing to Capitol Hill.

This unnecessary burden and inconvenience would tend to discourage investment in American business enterprises—and thereby restrict the growth of the Nation's economy.

Withholding of interest and investment income would deprive individuals of the full use of their funds and would constitute an arbitrary and unjustified frustration of the thrift objective.

The confusion arising from making income tax reporting more complicated by such a withholding provision, would, it is safe to say, surpass anything yet experienced by the Internal Revenue Service.

The regulations in the huge 240-page tax bill are especially complicated with respect to withholding. The measure is described as an administrative impossibility—directly contrary to administration promises to simplify the tax laws.

The administration is waging an all-out campaign to impose this withholding burden on individuals—and on corporations and financial institutions.

Why this campaign is being conducted with such vigor is the subject of much speculation in Washington. For the objective sought—making sure that taxes are paid on interest and investment income—will be achieved by the automatic data processing and taxpayer account number systems being adopted by the Internal Revenue Service.

These will provide a quick check on whether anyone is evading interest and investment income taxes—without the harassing recordkeeping now sought to be imposed.

Other industry-opposed provisions in the administration tax bill would:

1. Impose more stringent rules on deductibility of business expenses—thereby substituting the judgment of Government bureaucrats for that of experienced business executives as to what are ordinary and necessary business expenditures.

2. Requires complex and unworkable changes in the method of taxing business income earned abroad—which would make competition by American companies in the world market more difficult.

3. Provide a $1,800 million credit for investment in new machinery and equipment—which constitutes a discriminatory subsidy and control device for manipulating the economy according to the ideas of the New Frontiersmen.

These provisions—plus others—have been recommended to the House by the Ways and Means Committee.

Under rigid House parliamentary procedure, opponents of the measure are likely to seek amendments.

House Republicans are planning an attempt to substitute liberalized depreciation and an inventory reserve for the investment credit—as well as eliminating of withholdings on dividends and interest—and elimination of the worst of the foreign business income provisions.

Whether or not this move succeeds depends on the amount of support received from conservative Democrats.

Industry strongly advocates enacting of the Herlong-Baker bill which, among other things, would lower personal and corporation income taxes to a maximum of 47 percent by a series of five annual reductions.

This legislation would be expected to provide essential investment capital and, in the long run, more tax revenue than would be lost temporarily by lowering the rates.

Challenging Task

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the problem of our unemployed youth is an ever-growing one, and is one whose importance has only recently been recognized. Last week, in Newark, N.J., a pilot program—one of two in the country—was launched wherein this probem will be studied and, we hope, ways found to solve it. Commenting on the importance of this pilot program to Newark and indeed the whole Nation was an excellent editorial in the Newark Star-Ledger, Friday, March 30. Because of the significance of the program, I call it to the attention of my colleagues at this time, through this editorial:

Federal officials have picked Newark as one of two cities in the Nation for tests of ambitious new manpower programs.

The distinction accorded to Newark is not exactly an unmixed honor. The role of model city has fallen to Newark largely because Newark has serious unsolved problems.

By studying Newark's conditions, Federal officials hope to come with programs that could be used as patterns for the rest of the Nation.

The goal is to find ways of coping with the growing problem of unemployed youth.

This is a special type of unemployment, far different from that caused by layoffs of seasoned workmen or skilled mechanics.

The young people at whom the Newark project is aimed are neither seasoned nor skilled. Nor can they be thought of as just temporarily out of work. Many have never held a job. Many, it is feared, will remain permanently unemployed—unless new answers are devised to change their situation.

It's not clear what can be done. These young people—estimated to number 5,000 in Newark and more than a million across the Nation—form a new class of outsiders. Many have dropped out of high school without equipping themselves to earn a living, and they have no services to offer in the labor market. They are the group recently described by a leading educator as a source of "social dynamite."

One obvious approach would be from the angle of school dropouts. In Essex County alone, 3,000 teenagers quit school each year, and many of them undoubtedly slide rapidly into consistent unemployment.

Improvements in that area would provide gains for the future, but there would still be the existing large jobless group who have already left school.

For them, the answers seem less obvious. Some of the proposals, such as a suggestion that the youths could work as playground supervisors, hardly seem to get to the root of the trouble. Others, such as a plan for an urban labor army, look mainly like rehashes of centuries-old public works projects.

In short, a challenging task is ahead for the staff of this experiment. One bright note is that, since the project will be run through the State labor department, Newark and communities throughout New Jersey will be in a special position to take quick and full advantage of any answers that are found.

Tax Withholding on Interest and Dividends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, Thursday the House of Representatives passed a bill, H.R. 10650, that would impose stringent hardships on savings institutions, investors and all individuals who have savings accounts, large or small. Today the Senate started hearings on this proposal. Therefore, it is not too late for proponents to give serious reconsideration to their stand and to recognize that the more objectionable provisions of the bill would not be in the best interests of the public or the national economy.

One of the important industries that would be adversely affected by this bill, if it is passed, is the insurance industry. The following letter, written by O. Kelley Anderson, president of New England Mutual Life Insurance Co., illustrates why:

NEW ENGLAND MUTUAL
LIFE INSURANCE CO.,
Boston, Mass., March 23, 1962.

The Honorable HASTINGS KEITH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HASTINGS: I am asking you to oppose strongly H.R. 10650, the proposed Revenue Act of 1962, providing for the withholding of Federal income tax on interest and dividends.

This proposed legislation requires the withholding of Federal income tax on interest and dividends and permits individuals to file exemption certificates annually with payors of these amounts, thus requiring the payor to make individual exceptions.

The computation of withholding on interest and the processing of exemption certificates in individual cases would impose burdens almost impossible to administer on the New England Mutual Life Insurance Co., as well as other Massachusetts life insurance companies.

The New England Mutual Life Insurance Co. has 942,000 individual policy contracts, as well as some 50,000 certificates under which we are paying proceeds of matured insurance and annuity contracts. Under most of these certificates payments on which interest would have to be withheld are made monthly.

The complexity of withholding in a life insurance company is such that some policyholders would be in doubt as to whether or not any tax had been withheld. The majority of the withheld taxes would be so small that the expense involved in withholding would be greater than the tax. The computation of this company's Federal income tax permits no deduction for such expenses.

We strongly urge your opposition to this legislation as placing a direct burden on the policyholders in the life insurance industry which is not commensurate with the benefits derived by the Government.

Sincerely yours,

KELLEY ANDERSON.

Golden Eagle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, as cosponsor of the Senate Resolution 105 for the protection of the golden eagle, I am very much concerned over the need to preserve the magnificent creature. This legislation would also contribute toward the survival of our national bird—the bald eagle, which is easily confused with the golden eagle.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent and descriptive article about the golden eagle from National Parks magazine of March 1962.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A VICTIM OF THE BOUNTY HUNTER IS THE GOLDEN EAGLE: KING OF THE BIRD WORLD

(By John J. Stophlet)

Far above Arizona's Dragoon Mountains, a golden eagle appears. I watch enthralled as the great eagle of the west, on 7-foot spread of wings, planes out across the valley. He moves with grace and beauty, his huge wings trapping the warm convection currents rising from the earth, enabling him to keep aloft with little effort. The eagle scans the earth below with sharp, telescopic eyes, searching for prey. The bronze hackles on his head gleam in the sunlight. He is a correlated mass of hollow bones, muscle, tendons, nerves, and feathers in a beautiful, living machine—a marvel of aerodynamics. In the ensuing weeks—spent on a ranch in the shadow of the Dragoons—I had ample opportunity to observe and marvel at a crea-

ture which has rightly been called the "king of birds."

The scene shifts to west Texas. A magnificent golden eagle soars in wide circles above the desert. To the south, shimmering in the heat waves, rise the rugged peaks of the Chisos Mountains. A green strip of vegetation belts the sinuous Rio Grande as it crooks into the Big Bend. Across an invisible line near the mountains, there is sanctuary for golden eagles and all other wildlife in the Big Bend National Park. But, outside of this invisible line, golden eagles are "fair game."

A mile away, two men climb aboard a small airplane. The motor starts, lifting the plane above the yucca and mesquite flats, to roar into the sky. The man sitting beside the pilot is "riding shotgun"—the weapon across his knees, cocked and ready. In a matter of minutes the eagle is sighted and they close in for the kill. The eagle sees the monster approaching and attempts to flee—but eagles are no match for airplanes. There is a blast from the gun. The great wings crumple; blood stains the glossy feathers; the "eagle eye" is glazed. The king is dead.

This tragedy has been enacted for years by the bounty hunters above the plains and mountains of Texas as well as other places in the West. The bounty hunters kill eagles for a profit, collecting twice—once on a bounty paid by the ranchers, and again by selling the skins and feathers to the Indian artifacts industry for conversion into "Indian headdresses" for the tourist trade. The ranchers of west Texas have an organization known as The Big Bend Eagle Club, in which they hire hunters to shoot eagles. One hunter boasted he had killed about 12,000 in 20 years. How many of these might have been immature bald eagles? One hunter hired by the club averages about 1,000 eagles a year; and beginning in 1945, he slaughtered 8,300 in about 7 years. How many thousands have been killed since then? In one 4-hour aerial eagle hunt, 16 of the big birds were destroyed.

The commercialized slaughter of the golden eagle is strongly reminiscent of the wholesale destruction wrought against the American bison—or the passenger pigeon—by the market hunters of times past. No animal—from the polar bear in Alaska to the golden eagle of the Texas plains—can long withstand the concerted and deadly hunting from airplanes that is taking place today. It is a war of extermination against an interesting and valuable member of the wildlife community.

GOLDEN EAGLE IN HISTORY

The golden eagle is circumpolar in distribution, breeding in the Northern Hemisphere in Europe, Asia, and America. In the long history of mankind the eagle has been the symbol of bold strength and courageous character. The bird appeared on the seal of the King of Ur, in doubleheaded form in Hittite art, on certain coins of the Mohammedans, and on the flags of Turkoman princes. These eagle symbols were probably derived from forms similar to our native golden eagles as closely allied species are found in the Old World. To the early Greeks the eagle was the messenger of Zeus, and the only bird that dwelt in heaven—a fancy based, perhaps, on the high-flying habits of these great birds. A silver eagle standing on a spear, symbol of power and sovereignty, was placed on military standards and carried into battle by the legions of Rome.

In the Scottish Highlands, where golden eagles have nested since time immemorial, the bird is now completely protected, with severe penalties for its destruction. One of Britain's finest naturalists, Seton Gordon, who has spent a lifetime studying the golden eagle, has described its home in the Outer Hebrides in his delightful book, "The Golden Eagle: King of Birds." A particularly poignant passage is the following: "One Hebridean haunt of the golden eagle is a deep glen in the island of Harris. A high rock, often dark and grim in driving rain, rises sheer from a loch lonely and unfrequented, and on a small ledge high on this rock the eyrie is placed. The glen is little more than a hundred feet above the Atlantic yet the impression given is of much greater height, for the scenery is grand and Alpine in character. The eagles, as they rise in spirals high above their nesting rock, must in clear weather see the cone of Boreray of St. Kilda on the far Atlantic horizon; they must see the ocean swell break in white spray against the rocky shore of Gasker, nursery of the gray seal. In early summer they must see the snowfields on the Cuillin of Skye across the Minch, faint and nebulous in the far distance. They must often see herds of red deer grazing on the green, grassy slopes beneath them, and note the white forms of the black-faced sheep which also find pasture here."

SELDOM SEEN IN EAST

In the eastern United States the golden eagle is rare, despite the fact that Maurice Broun, during 12 autumns at Pennsylvania's Hawk Mountain Sanctuary, saw 651 of these birds migrating south along the Kittatinny ridge. There is little information on the bird in the East, either past or present. Golden eagles is still nested in 2 or 3 counties in Maine in 1949. A few pairs are reported breeding in the Appalachians, and the last known nesting in Tennessee's Cumberland Mountains was in 1932.

Dr. Walter R. Spofford, who has studied the golden eagle in the East for more than 20 years, writes in a recent letter: "Since no nests in the northern Appalachians were known from about 1880 until about 1951, it might be thought that they are coming back. But the places I have found are all long occupied, and I believe there have been a few remnant pairs for half a century, and I can't really say there is reason to believe they are coming back as yet. There is more reason to believe they are decreasing, because the wilderness is itself disappearing so fast." So we see that isolation is essential to the welfare of the birds. But to really see the bird in its glory, one must go to the wilderness areas of the Far West.

The home range of the golden eagle in the vastness of the West is usually confined to the wildest mountain ranges. He rides the wind above the wild canyons of the Guadalupes to the shining peaks of the Tetons, and north to the wilderness of Denali. The nesting territory defended by a pair of eagles is large, approximately 20 to 60 square miles in extent. The average area is about the size of a township, 36 square miles.

The nests are usually built on cliffs with a far-reaching view of the countryside, but are also frequently built in trees. The aeries are immense structures composed of large sticks with a lining of grasses, weeds, and lichens. In the humid Pacific coast redwood belt, the nests are more warmly lined with rabbit fur, soft mosses, and eagle down. In California, nests have been found more than 90 feet up in giant pines and redwoods. Sparrow hawks and western kingbirds sometimes take up housekeeping in the lower parts of the eagle's nest. Although the eggs are usually two, sets of one are common, three are rare, and a set of four has been recorded. Incubation requires 43 days. The nestlings are covered with white down at birth, and remain in the nest from 9 to 11 weeks. There is evidence that the golden eagle does not nest every year; consequently it is a slow breeder, and deserves a full measure of protection.

Of the food of the golden eagle much has been written. Some 60 kinds of animals—from deer and antelope to mice, birds, frogs, and even insects—are taken. Attacks on full-grown deer and antelope by a combined force of two or three eagles seem to be rare indeed—the consensus being that the animals attacked were probably either sick or in an otherwise weakened condition. The fact is that rabbits and rodents—the abundant and available prey of the West—form the staple diet of the great bird. Small mammals are usually caught by chasing them into the open and pouncing on them.

COORDINATED HUNTING EFFORT

Arthur Cleveland Bend, in "Life Histories of North American Birds of Prey," quotes a Mr. Willard, who witnessed another interesting method of capture. "In company with some friends one day, I watched a pair of these eagles hunting jackrabbits. They swooped down and drove the rabbits to cover under a mesquite bush. Then one alighted close by and began to walk toward the rabbit. He was so frightened he dashed from his shelter only to be snatched up by the other eagle which had been hovering close overhead." Porcupines fall prey to the bird at times. One eagle was found dead as a result of an encounter with one of these mammals, stuck full of quills.

In the earlier days of the West, when prairie-dog towns extended from horizon to horizon in certain places, golden eagles had good hunting. More recently, a pair of eagles nesting near one such "dog town," and feeding two young, consumed more than 600 prairie dogs in a period of 4 months. Thus we see the service these birds may perform for both farmer and rancher; they are one of nature's important checkreins on this prolific little rodent.

There is an interesting story of an eagle's "Shangri-la" high in the mountains of Alberta Province, in Canada, known for centuries to the Indians of the region as the Valley of the Eagles. In the caverns of a sheer rockface golden eagles are said to have built their nests and have formed a colony. If the story is true, this is a most unusual performance, because normally these eagles are solitary birds. Because of deep winter snows, the area is inaccessible until late in the season. One day in August, so the story runs, a man saw 21 golden eagles near the cliff. One may hope that the birds will continue to nest and rear young in their wilderness fastness, secure against destruction by man and his machines.

For the golden eagle is a persecuted bird. It is trapped, shot and poisoned throughout the West. It has a price on its golden head. It is when the golden eagle attacks domestic stock of the ranchers that it gets into trouble. There is no doubt that the bird has acquired a taste for lamb, but this has been much exaggerated. The eagle's situation is complicated by local conditions such as lambing time, the unavailability of rodents and carrion as food, and many other factors. Eagles that kill stock can be controlled by the proper authorities but these do not include every nimrod in the country. Today, the golden eagle is being gunned down from airplanes in the name of "sport," and under the pretext that all eagles are guilty of killing stock.

Fortunately for the eagle, there is a ground swell against such "sporting" practices and human prejudices. It is gathering momentum fast, and I feel sure it will eventually bring victory to the golden eagle in its fight for survival. Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, of Texas, has already introduced a Senate joint resolution for Federal protection of the golden eagle. It is significant that this legislation has been introduced by a Texan. One would not expect it from this quarter were the eagle such a threat to the livestock industry as some would have us believe.

HUNTERS CONFUSE SPECIES

One good argument for complete protection of the golden eagle is the fact that, up to the third year of life of the bald eagle, the two birds are practically indistinguishable in the immature stage even by experts. It is not until the fourth year that the bald eagle acquires the white head and tail. Undoubtedly many immature "baldies" are killed in cases of mistaken identity.

Why do we want to save the golden eagle? One of America's greatest naturalists, Dr. Olaus J. Murie, has stated the answer eloquently: "The fact that we have through the centuries recognized the qualities, the living beauty, of a bird sufficiently to engrave its image on the emblems of our sovereignties, places us high in the animal kingdom. A species that can produce a Shakespeare, Rembrandt, Beethoven, Gandhi, and Lincoln should not fail to enrich itself by reaching a friendly hand toward another species in difficulty. There is a stake in this particular instance not only the fate of a great bird, but also the human capacity to tolerate, to appreciate, and to enjoy."

Today, there are many thousands of people who would go far to observe an eagle of any kind. And they have the right to expect the great golden eagle of the West—the living embodiment of freedom—to remain a part of the rich wildlife heritage of this country. They would agree with wise King Solomon that among the many things "too wonderful to understand" is "the way of an eagle in the air."

Tax Bill

SPEECH

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R.10650) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit for investment in certain depreciable property to eliminate certain defects and inequities, and for other purposes.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, heavy, oppressive taxation is without question reducing our high American standards of living and discouraging those attributes of initative and incentive that lie at the very foundation of our great, free enterprise system.

The pending bill does not presume to furnish real substantial relief for the harassed and taxridden American people. The burning need of the hour is a thorough and basic overhauling and general revision of an archaic, obsolete, unrealistic and incompatible tax system that stems virtually from the horse-and-buggy days and has little reference or applicability to the complex, highly industrialized and mechanized economic society in which we live.

The bill hardly moves in the direction of valid, necessary fundamental tax reform, although I understand such sweeping legislation, long overdue, will be proposed to the Congress, probably before the end of the session. This bill is admittedly piecemeal, comprising vexatious, cumbersome, contradictory and administratively complicated and complicating provisions.

I will not analyze the bill in its entirety at this time. But I will touch very briefly upon some of its provisions I deem to be open to some question as valid, permanent tax legislation.

First. The application of the withholding principle to interest and dividends is bound to be confusing and meddlesome and it falls seriously short of revenue-producing potentials.

Millions of honest, hard-working, industrious taxpayers, many banks, corporations and other thrift and savings institutions would be visited with inconvenience, expense and delay, in some cases causing worry and perhaps hardship.

Since many of the people affected are of the rank and file, who must rely in many cases upon interest and dividends for the support of themselves and families, this provision simply adds another vexation to many others that stem from current tax procedures.

There are many people involved who are already paying their due taxes with scrupulous regularity and honesty even as they are heavily burdened by current taxes. The vexations arising from this provision cannot be solely justified by the relatively meager returns they promise.

Second. Investment tax credits would be helpful to business, but in my opinion it would be far more helpful to provide more realistic depreciation features and fast writeoffs. This field is extremely complex and must be approached with utmost care and most skillful and exacting legislative draftsmanship.

Third. Taxation of foreign income. This provision strikes me as being inconsistent and contradictory of present foreign aid and development programs as well as proposed trade policies. On the one hand, Congress passed laws giving special tax incentives to American business entrepreneurs operating in foreign countries; by this bill, Congress imposes additional onerous taxes upon American businessmen doing business overseas, limits or cancels the tax deferral provisions and makes it impossible for these concerns without crippling, oppressive taxes to utilize profits made abroad in their domestic operations here at home.

Thus, one large internationally known concern employing about 1,000 people in my district is virtually completely barred from using its oversea profits to expand, repair, or otherwise improve their holdings, property, working equipment, capital, and labor improvement operations in my district, so vital to the livelihood of many of my constituents. This kind of economics and this kind of taxation is hard for me to comprehend.

There are other objections and shortcomings of the bill I will not enumerate. Notwithstanding contrary views, it could result in a deficit budget; it gives handouts and windfalls to a favored few; it does not provide adequate writeoffs; it is contradictory in its terms and levies; it does not give the broad tax relief the American people urgently need.

I believe Congress and the committee should take another careful look at the tax picture and come forth with a bill that will relieve our people and businessmen of heavy burdens, strengthen the economy, spur prosperity, increase jobs and employment, insure a balanced budget, and promote prosperity in the country and help dollar imbalances.

In this way the President's overall economic plan for forward-moving, dynamic progress in business, standards of living, and improved prosperity for all the people can be substantially encouraged and advanced. I hope and urge that this course may be adopted.

Notwithstanding the fact that I favor something far more comprehensive and that I am very much opposed to some of the specific provisions of the bill, I am reluctant to vote to block a plan, inadequate in some respects as I feel it is, designed by the President and his advisers and the very able, distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, my friend, Mr. MILLS, and his fine committee, with the view to checking loopholes, providing substantial business incentives by way of tax credits, and aiming at a balanced budget and fiscal stability.

These are considerations which, however untimely some of the specific provisions of the bill may be, must be carefully weighed.

Moreover, the bill goes to the other body where we are assured it will be considered further and perhaps revised in those particular instances that need revision most, and I hope that this may be done.

I also urge, as I have done for some time past now, that the administration at an early date present its proposals for general tax revision, because if anything needs to be done in this country to improve economic health and to relieve business and the people of serious burdens, it is to make drastic sweeping tax reforms that will bring our tax system up to date and eliminate many inequities and injustices that have crept into it throughout the years, not only as a result of basic concepts long since outmoded, but also because of numerous unrelated and uncoordinated piecemeal amendments and changes that have been incorporated into our basic tax laws.

ENACTED ALMOST 50 YEARS AGO

The preservation of the American free enterprise system must always be in our minds. Viewing the steady decline in small business, it is easy to understand that we must provide more incentives, as well as more encouragement, for Americans who are engaged in, or who would like to be engaged in, business operations of their own.

Of these encouragements, proper tax treatment would surely be most effective if it is wisely and judiciously combined, according a larger and fairer share of Government procurement to small business, so that it successfully may compete and survive in the midst of the cyclonic changes that are sweeping through our economic system.

It is not only small business alone that needs to be helped. Big business must also receive fair, appropriate tax consideration that will make due allowances for its financing needs and for plowing more of its profits into the constructive channels of expansion and moderniza-

tion and growth that must be enjoyed by all business—small and big—if our free enterprise system is to thrive and grow to meet the demands and needs of modern life.

Certainly, there can be no more important aim of a well-conceived tax system than that of lightening the burdens of the people who toil—the workers, the farmers, the skilled craftsmen, the artists, the whitecollar workers, the professional classes and all members of the great masses of our people and middle-class citizens who have such a great stake in American prosperity and who are entitled to enjoy the fruits of their labors, their skills, their hard work, their initiative and creative abilities.

It is a formidable challenge, to be sure, to revise the tax system in ways that will bring the results we hope for in the big, complex economic society which is growing and developing so rapidly. But I firmly believe that there is in this Congress the bold, imaginative leadership, knowledge, ability and experience to undertake this great, necessary work to join with the President, and the executive agencies of the Federal Government in preparing and hammering out an overall, comprehensive tax measure that will raise the huge revenues we need these days and, at the same time, insure fairness, equity, justice, and decent consideration for our taxpayers and our people.

Since we have received assurances that this task will be undertaken at an early date, it is my hope that the shortcomings of the present bill may be resolved and corrected in a broad tax bill that will be adjusted to the times, to the problems and to the complexities of modern life. Nineteen of 21 sections of the bill are not generally objectionable to the Members of the House. Under the parliamentary situation that now obtains adequate corrective action is fraught with real difficulty. Although I am not satisfied with some provisions, under the circumstances I do not desire to obstruct a measure which we are assured by the President and the committee is necessary to balance the budget and make desirable changes in the tax system. But I hope that general tax revision will soon be tackled and adopted in the interest of equity and justice for the people and the strengthening of the economic system.

American Jewish Historical Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday and today the city of Philadelphia is host to the 70th Annual Convention of the American Jewish Historical Society. Philadelphians will play a prominent role in this convention. Besides marking the anniversary of the society's founding in Philadelphia, the meeting will celebrate the centennial of the Jewish chaplaincy in this country.

I attach to these remarks the lead editorial which appeared in the March 30 issue of the Jewish Exponent, commending the event, and I am sure that all the Members of the Congress will join in this excellent commendation.

MAKING HISTORY

We join the community in welcoming to our city the American Jewish Historical Society, which holds its 70th anniversary program here Sunday and Monday. It is fitting and proper that Philadelphia be the meeting place for this distinguished body, which has taken as its task the collection and preservation of historic Jewish documents and artifacts. It is also appropriate that the society meet in Philadelphia, for it was founded here in 1892. American Jewry can trace many of its historic moments to this city.

Tying in with its own anniversary is the centennial of Jewish chaplaincy service in America's Armed Forces. To help commemorate this significant event, the Chief of the U.S. Army Air Force Chaplains, Maj. Gen. Terence P. Finnegan, will speak at Sunday evening's banquet at the Benjamin Franklin Hotel.

The program committee and the sponsors of this momentous event have worked hard to arrange an outstanding program, and they are to be commended for their efforts. The fruits of their labor and the cultural benefits to be derived from it will undoubtedly enrich the entire community. There is no greater contribution than to recall the truly monumental role American Jewry has played in the history of our country. As time goes by, we grow increasingly aware of our place in American history—and from this inspiration, add new prestige and vigor to this land of freedom.

We salute the American Jewish Historical Society on this milestone and share with everyone the hope that its meeting here will be most successful and illuminating.

A Look at Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following: Recently I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a letter to the editor of the Des Moines (Iowa) Register from Dr. John E. McGee of Ft. Madison, Iowa. Dr. McGee made some excellent points in his letter on why we should not adopt a plan for medical care for the aged under social security.

This letter to the editor brought forth a reply from a reader in defense of British National Health Service. Because I feel that Dr. McGee's response to the reader's letter points out some things which all of us should keep in mind about the success (or lack of same) of the British National Health Service, I ask that his letter appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

FORT MADISON, IOWA, *March 25, 1962.*

To the EDITOR:

In reply to A. R. Mackintosh's letter of March 16 defending the British National Health Service in supplying British health needs, let's look at the facts.

Since 1947, very few hospitals have been built in England because the resources of the Socialist government have gone into other channels. Two-thirds of their hospitals were built before the Boer War. Waiting lists for beds are unbelievable. Cooper in the London Sunday Times (Nov. 19, 1961) gives these figures as the number of patients waiting for each bed: Middlesex Hospital 16, United Cambridge Hospitals 22, St. Mary's in Manchester 26. Some patients have been waiting as long as 6 years for surgery. The situation may get worse since it takes 3 years from planning to construction initiation because of Government redtape.

The younger doctors are leaving England in wholesale quantities. Veysey of the London staff of the Chicago Tribune (Nov. 19, 1961) states that 600 British doctors—one-third the annual output of all medical schools in the country—have been leaving Britain and socialized medicine annually for the last 5 years. The National Health Service would soon collapse if all the oversea doctors from India, Jamaica, and Pakistan decided to go home since they staff many of the hospitals to fill the gaps. Lord Taylor in a speech last December before the House of Lords admits this "a pretty ghastly awful picture." Perhaps Reader Mackintosh is out of touch with his home situation, but it's apparent that the British health program is far from rosy and will degenerate with time.

I think it is significant that the amount of private health insurance is increasing rather than decreasing under British socialized medicine. People want personal care even though taxed to pay for the huge cost (1961 estimates $2.5 billion) of socialized medicine. And it isn't limited to the wealthy few. Colm Brogan, a British journalist, states that the number of private insured has risen by more than 1,000 percent.

In the United States, voluntary health insurance has removed much of the need for Government medicine and is constantly striving to meet changing health requirements of the population. Give the private plans a chance. Let's learn our lesson from the British mistakes and continue to have good health.

Truly yours,

JOHN E. MCGEE, M.D.

Soviet Credibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, many persons, I am sure, have given serious thought to the question of how trustworthy the U.S.S.R. would be should the United States enter into a joint United States-Soviet cooperative space project.

I am very much concerned about this matter and know that many Americans hold this same view.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an item from the March 28, 1962, Los Angeles Times dealing with this very question.

The item is a column by Mr. Robert T. Hartmann, chief of the Times Washington bureau entitled, "Space Deals With Reds May Leave Us Up in Air."

In it is discussed an analysis that has been made of published Soviet space photographs which raises serious doubt as to their validity.

Mr. Hartmann, in my view, assesses very well the significance of this evidence.

The article follows:

SPACE DEALS WITH REDS MAY LEAVE US UP IN AIR

(By Robert T. Hartmann)

President Kennedy evidently feels some optimism over the prospects of United States-Soviet cooperation in peaceful exploration of outer space.

Premier Khrushchev agreed to talk some more about it a week ago, and at Berkeley, last Friday, Mr. Kennedy spoke hopefully of leaving the dogmas and hatred of the cold war 250,000 miles behind.

"Experience has taught us that an agreement to negotiate does not always mean a negotiated agreement," the President warned his audience of Californians, who have a big stake in the space business.

I have before me a hitherto-unpublished analysis which suggests that caution on the part of the United States should go even further.

Supposing Khrushchev is willing to pool some scientific space data (although the Soviet record of cooperation on such simple information as weather reports when we were allies in World War II is not very encouraging), will we be able to believe what he chooses to share?

This document, the source of which I am unable to reveal but which has been authenticated by officials whom I consider extremely reliable, reviews what actually has been made public by the Soviet Union on the space flights of cosmonauts Gagarin and Titov. It points out:

"All Soviet launchings and recoveries of space vehicles have been surrounded with a cloak of secrecy, with official announcements coming only after successful completions. Even these are vague and do not necessarily correspond to stories published by the Soviets themselves on various details of a given space effort. There are numerous conflicts between the statements made by Gagarin and those prepared by various Soviet correspondents."

With special attention to published photographs in the Soviet press and technical publications, all of which are of course under strict Government control, this analysis purports to establish:

1. A photograph printed in Izvestia on April 14, 1961, carried a caption describing it as one of Gagarin aboard a bus on his way to the launching site, already wearing his space helmet. Other Russians are seen in the background and a bus window and electric fan are clearly visible. But the same shot, with everything else retouched out, appeared in a Soviet book "Utro Kosmicheskoy Ery" (Dawn of the Cosmic Age) as one of "Gagarin in Vostok's cabin" and inferentially ready to blast off.

2. In the same Moscow-printed volume, what is described as the Soviet booster propelling Gagarin into orbit is identified as actually an intermediate range ballistic missile (IRBM) identical to those displayed in Red Square at the October revolution parade in 1961, and not of sufficient power to launch a man-in-space capsule.

3. News photographs of Titov and Gagarin showing them apparently ascending the elevator of a huge gantry crane to enter their capsules bear a suspicious resemblance to the set of a Moscow movie studio in which a space picture entitled "To the Stars" was made for propaganda purposes.

I do not myself have the technical competence to evaluate the findings of this report, but I have seen the matched photographs and the fakery of Soviet propagandists with news pictures is notorious.

Of course, there are no competing newspapers or other media inside the U.S.S.R. to expose such frauds and, when they are exposed in the free world, most Soviet citizens never hear of it.

The point is, however, that the Soviets will have to establish a better record of credibility before any agreement to exchange even the simplest scientific data will be worth anything. They could supply accurate and verifiable data for a long time and then introduce an error which might spell the humiliating failure of the U.S. portion of some future space venture.

If I were one of the U.S. astronauts, I would be very leery of entrusting my life to the reliability of any Russian data until there is enough confidence developed between the two worlds to justify it.

And I hope none of these brave Americans have to be lost in space to prove what should be obvious to everyone at the outset of this new probe of the mysteries of the Communist mind.

The Real "Extremists"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, there are those who believe the Constitution is out of date and who would have it circumvented by legislative or executive action. As David Lawrence points out in his column which appeared in the April 2, 1962, issue of U.S. News & World Report, these are the real extremists. I think Members of Congress will find Mr. Lawrence's article most provocative and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE REAL "EXTREMISTS"

(By David Lawrence)

We hear a good deal nowadays about extremists—those who brand as Communists other persons who are not Communists. Name calling, however, while deplorable, doesn't do as much harm to the American people as a whole as do the extremists in public office who would disregard the Constitution.

For there is a trend today toward circumvention of the Constitution. Scarcely a month goes by that some new legislative measure or executive order isn't proposed which seeks to get around the Constitution.

The argument recently espoused in all seriousness as an alibi by some people inside and outside Government is that amending the Constitution is a laborious and slow process. The point is made that times have changed and that some of the doctrines of past decades in the field of law have become obsolete.

Oddly enough, that's exactly the excuse Nikita Khrushchev gives for abrogating the allied agreements made in 1945 to insure unrestricted access to Berlin. He says these agreements are outmoded.

Is it right for one party to an agreement to declare arbitrarily that he will no longer abide by its terms because he decides it is obsolete?

The people of the Thirteen Original States, by a compact with each other, gave up certain rights and delegated them to a central government. All powers not enumerated in the Constitution as having been delegated to the Federal Government were specifically "reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." This is the language of the 10th amendment. Why is this agreement so persistently violated?

If the people at any time wish to change the Constitution, it can be amended by a two-thirds vote of Congress followed by acts of ratification by three-fourths of the States.

But we hear today that this is too cumbersome a method and that it takes too much time. Yet some amendments have gone through from congressional action to State ratification in less than a year.

The truth is that where there is substantial opposition to an amendment, it naturally isn't approved.

Unfortunately, our record as a nation is not clean. The 14th amendment was not legally inserted in the Constitution. The same Southern States which were considered eligible members of the Union when—after the Civil War was over—they ratified the 13th amendment abolishing slavery were then punished by Congress for refusing to ratify the 14th amendment. Ratification was accomplished by legislative coercion of the States by Congress and at the point of the bayonet by Armed Forces stationed in the State legislatures. Yet this same 14th amendment is the basis of most of the Executive orders on civil rights today. The Supreme Court has never consented to pass upon the validity of the method used to ratify the 14th amendment, though the court has accepted cases challenging the validity of other amendments.

Recently a new trend toward usurpation of power has arisen. It seeks by Executive order, or by the passage of new laws, to thwart or ignore the plainly written provisions of the Constitution.

President Kennedy sent a bill to Congress a few weeks ago proposing a far-reaching change in the handling of tariffs. The Executive would fix the duties and commodity quotas—a power granted by the Constitution only to Congress. The bill, now before the House Ways and Means Committee, provides, moreover, that Presidential determinations "shall be final and conclusive and shall not be subject to review by any court."

Why should the people be deprived of judicial review when they are the victims of illegality in the application of trade laws?

Also the Kennedy administration has just signed treaties with 24 countries on trade relations, but does not intend to submit these agreements to the Senate for ratification by a two-thirds vote.

Executive orders have been issued, moreover, in "civil rights" matters, on many of which Congress itself has refused to pass laws. Thus, by Executive order, purchase contracts for goods or services can be withheld by the Government from any business which refuses to accept the Government's dictation as to the number of employees of a particular color that the contractor or subcontractor may hire.

It certainly is a form of "extremism" to substitute Executive orders for the laws of Congress.

Extremism is bred by extremism. We would have less trouble with the malcontents in our midst if the spirit and letter of the Constitution were observed.

If the method of amending the document is to cumbersome, let the people, by the constitutional method, change it. But let's face the fact that new "extremists" have arisen who believe that the Executive order can circumvent the Constitution if the stated

objective merely has "popular appeal." This is government by emotion—by extremism. It is not government by a written constitution.

The New Nuclear Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I am placing in the RECORD a very fine speech delivered by Vice Adm. J. S. Thach, commander of the U.S. Navy Antisubmarine Warfare Force of the U.S. Pacific Fleet.

This speech was delivered before the National Security Industrial Association, Los Angeles, Calif., on March 16.

I commend this speech to your careful reading and reflection. It will give you an insight into the ramifications of one phase of our defense not generally known. We are prone to emphasize what damage we can inflict on the enemy, and sometimes overlook what we are actually doing to prevent the enemy from inflicting damage on us. Admiral Thach calls attention to this important part of our national defense effort.

The speech follows:

THE NEW NUCLEAR THREAT

Scientific progress in the 20th century has unfolded unlimited opportunities. Unfortunately, this same scientific progress creates many new problems in defending our Nation.

While 72 satellites spin in outer space, other tangible and compelling problems are posed here on earth. One is the critical challenge we face in the liquid space of the world's oceans—the challenge of modern, missile-carrying, nuclear submarines.

This new submarine is a spectacular product of 20th century scientific achievement. The ballistic missile is another. But the marriage of these two presents pressing security problems. The threat of the nuclear-powered submarine and its megaton-tipped missiles brings us together today for our discussion of antisubmarine warfare. I feel it is a great privilege to discuss antisubmarine warfare with such a distinguished group, even though my message may be somewhat sobering.

Seeking a solution to the mounting submarine menace is a responsibility we share. The country counts on our industry-Navy team to solve this national security problem.

The modern nuclear submarine in U.S. hands is one of the best deterrents dollars can buy. But the modern nuclear submarine, paid for in rubles, will pose an unprecedented threat.

Americans point with pride to the perfection of Polaris. I am certainly sold on the system. It is by far the best ever produced. And yet, I wonder if the general public is entirely aware of the strategic impact of such an offensive system when it is in the hands of an enemy.

The burden of education is ours. The responsibility to solve this dilemma of the deep is also ours.

To envisage the magnitude of our problem, we must know the nature of this nuclear beast.

The nuclear submarine can deliver fantastic devastation. A single Polaris submarine packs more power than all of the bombs dropped by both sides in the last great war.

The nuclear, a true submersible, steams at swift speeds. It cruises concealed with almost unlimited mobility. It moves with uninhibited stealth under seven-tenths of the earth's surface. Capable of submerged sailing for months at a time, the nuclear almost defies detection.

Its high speed, submerged navigation is highlighted, but its slow, silent treading on missile-launching station poses the real detection dilemma.

I marvel at this masterpiece of offensive ingenuity. Though I may admire the masterpiece—as an ASW operational commander, my task is to defeat such a system in enemy hands. The compelling challenge found on this other side of the modern nuclear coin has imposed upon us an entirely new mission. It indicates an immediate drive for rapid progress in the art of ASW, and many more, modern mobile forces.

At the outset the nuclear submarine posed a direct and vastly expanded challenge to future control of the seas. Subsequently, it sailed into the strategic arena as the first mobile projector of ballistic power.

At that moment, every single city and fixed installation on the earth became vulnerable to surprise submarine attack. Conversely, detection became much more complex. The other day I did a little arithmetic—based on its high speed alone, the nuclear is at least 44 times as hard to find as a conventional submarine. Of course, there are other factors which compound the difficulty of detection.

Recent estimates of Soviet nuclear progress have accentuated the need to get on with our effort. I have been asked if the Communists have nuclear submarines. I think it is safe to assume the Soviets now have operational nuclears in both oceans. But, if anyone feels that they do not have them now, all he has to do is turn the pages of a calendar. They will have them. So, the question is somewhat academic.

Soviet nuclears may soon contest allied control of the seas and threaten our cities, our fixed missile sites, and airbases. This factor is of paramount importance, for the free world relies on American industrial potential and free use of the seas for victory.

The free world is an oceanic confederation. The seas are the broad highways that bind the strength of our alliance, and the ships that ply these routes are the sinews of free world solidarity and strength; perhaps this is the real reson why we remain free. At any rate, I can say unequivocally that the challenge to the oceanic confederation's control of the sea is direct; it can be decisive.

Adm. George Anderson, our Chief of Naval Operations, has stated many times, "This new threat dictates a new dimension in national naval readiness."

Now, what does this new dimension demand in antisubmarine warfare? I say that seven significant steps are needed now—more than ever—to meet the challenge of the new nuclear threat—in time.

First, in fact foremost, is detection. To find a submarine, any submarine, is a tough task. To find a nuclear is much tougher. Speed, depth, length of submergence, and quietness at slow speed—all contribute to this factor.

The submarine's specialty is the short-range punch. He naturally prefers to fire a missile at relatively short range in order to achieve surprise. This doesn't alert the defenses—as range decreases, accuracy increases, and furthermore, it costs less. The Soviets understand this, and that is why they are pushing so hard to mount missiles on their submarines. And so, it is important that the threat of the short-range submarine missile be understood—and properly provided for in our defense effort.

The thing that seems to disturb most Americans today is the fear that we may be surprised by an attack with long-range missiles fired from distant Soviet bases. It is estimated that a 15-minute early warning could be provided against such an attack.

However, if the missiles are carried in submarines, one does not have to back up halfway around the world to release this megaton-tipped weapon. In this case the warning time, if any, would be measured in seconds.

Consistent progress in finding submarines has been made by our sonar systems. But I have always felt that we cannot count on sound systems alone to provide definite clews on prowling submarines in time to take forceful action. We have made, perhaps, 200 or 300 percent improvement, but I think 900 percent may be required.

Resolute and radical research is vital. Multiple-pronged approaches are essential. The ultimate solution to our antisubmarine warfare problem needs the best talent from our colleges and private research laboratories as well as Government labs, and the organized industrial ability already in action. A bargain basement type of effort won't produce the detection devices we need in the depths of the ocean. We must get on with our comprehensive program. Nonsonic methods—which are sometimes referred to humorously as the "unsound system"—should be explored with the same scale of scientific effort as sonar.

No avenue of investigation can be overlooked—photography, infra-red, radar, satellite scanning, magnetics, hydro-dynamics, human engineering, wake scrutiny, and all the others—you name it—we need it!

Whether the nuclear is in a swift, steep dive or slowly and silently treading his missile-launching station, antisubmarine warfare action depends on the ability to detect with certainty. You may produce the best weapon in the world for antisubmarine warfare, but unless we can find the submarine it is useless.

Next we need quick classification—as a second significant step.

Classification is the key to fast reaction. The sounds of snapping shrimp, mating whales, the boing, the carpenter fish and all the other red herring, as well as the submarines, are needed in a mechanical memory. The voices and stirrings of the underseas jungle must all be fingerprinted and stored in our computers to quickly classify the clue that can trigger the kill.

I am confident we can solve the classification problem. In the past, we have relied too heavily on our detection sensors to classify. What we need are separate, modern classification systems that can quickly and positively identify the contact for us. Computers can contribute. We would hope that something as simple as the quick flash of a red light could tell us we have a valid contact.

Certainly then, the second significant step is to create an accurate and rapid classification capability in the fleet.

The satellites in outer space give promise of a positive contribution to our third need in antisubmarine warfare—rapid and reliable communications.

Modern methods are needed to maintain uninterrupted contact with our antisubmarine warfare forces.

A firm communication link is a must if we are to take full advantage of the capabilities of our own nuclears operating at deep submergence. Command of the concerted team action depends on reliable communications.

We have placed a high priority on the development of a liquid space communications system.

Here, I ask you, as the industrial leaders of our ASW partnership, can you give me the positive, secure, and rapid communications we need to control all of our forces—surface, air, and the deep, submerged submarines?

The fact that communications can be an "Achilles heel" of our tridimensional ASW action has made modern communications the third significant step we must climb on our ladder to success.

The enemy submarine, operating under a thermal layer, can intercept all kinds of sounds on his side of the layer. But, by the same token, his lack of vision, except when he takes a peek with his periscope, makes him more susceptible to deceptive action—and therein lies our fourth step for security.

Deception devices can confuse the submarine commander. When we can force him to take a look to clarify his tactical situation, he loses one of his most precious possessions—concealment. He becomes vulnerable. More likely to make a mistake.

Decoys can contribute toward his making this mistake—for example, going fast when he should go slow—showing his periscope or radar antenna above the surface when he should be deep and quiet—diving deep when he should be pressing his offensive advantage. Deceptive devices can add to his confusion in the watery depths and darkness of the seas. A variety of deceptive devices is required to give the ASW team a tactical advantage over a trying and tenuous target. Imagination and ingenuity are significant elements of this chess game of the seas.

Industry, intrigued with the shell-game approach, is developing a few promising deceptive devices. But, we need many more and I ask that you give this business of ASW deception a real healthy twist—on our fourth rung of the readiness ladder.

In order to provide sustained mobility, the fifth step envisions nuclear propulsion for our ASW forces.

The most revolutionary scientific and technical advances of the century are incorporated in our Polaris system. These same scientific advances must be anticipated on the "other side of the Polaris coin."

Our antisumbarine warfare forces must be ready to cope with the Polaris in Communist hands. The quantum jump in submarine offensive capabilities compels the same scale of scientific advances in the antisubmarine warfare forces. The task of tackling the target of tomorrow will require the best our country can produce.

Conventional surface ships can no longer outmaneuver a submarine—in fact, the submerged submarine is now faster. Nuclear power has shifted the tactical advantage. Similarly, the strategic advantage of sustained mobility will be lost unless nuclear power is provided for the antisubmarine warfare forces.

The challenge in nuclear power gravitates around the development of relatively inexpensive reactors. Here industry can certainly help. This cannot be a closed corporation approach. Experiments covering every possible avenue of progress should be made.

Our country leads the world in nuclear power. Nuclear power is our greatest single strategic advantage. We must make the most of this significant lead.

So, to mount our fifth significant step to security, we need nuclear power across the board—in our surface ships (the antisubmarine warfare carriers and destroyers), as well as in our submarines.

Now our sixth step is speed. Nuclear submersibles are moving swifter and deeper. If we would be successful, today and tomorrow, our antisubmarine warfare team tactics must be geared to the same tempo of operations. Our vehicles must move faster, and the concerted action commanded more rapidly.

Efficient functioning of sensors at high speed must be kept in mind as we build additional speed into our surface forces. Hydrofoil and ground effects machines are in their infancy, but must set the pace to get more speed into surface ships. All elements of the fleet must be geared to the fast pace set by the new nuclears. Airborne and surface sensors must keep pace. Our future antisubmarine warfare forces must have high search rates and travel fast when necessary to close the swift moving submarine. Speed, as the sixth significant step, is needed to take our tridimensional team into high gear.

The seventh step is versatility. To meet the new naval mission of defending the continent from attack through the oceans by nuclear submarines, versatile ASW vehicles are needed. That is not to say that we no longer need specialized surveillance forces and systems for our ASW mission. They are still urgently needed in numbers, for offshore action and for protection of an amphibious objective area, and covering the large areas of ocean off our coast and near our cities. These will always be needed to back up the major power base carrying out the forward strategy prompted in today's troubled world.

In the last great war, when a primary air threat was posed, dual-purpose guns were developed. They provided the versatile element in the compact, shipboard systems. When more modern means were required to cope with jet attackers, the missile was perfected.

The new dimension of threat now emerging underseas necessitates development of multipurpose systems. Triple-purpose missile launchers must find a place in our mobile forces at sea. As in football, a triple-threat teammate is needed to beat our way back into the stadium in our struggle with the modern submerged nuclear.

There is another compelling factor that leads us to versatile seapower. As we build an offensive power has to meet the nuclear threat of tomorrow, we recognize the possibility of all-out nuclear war and that readiness is required for and against nuclear action—but we also recognize that our forces must be capable of careful, discriminate action. This places a premium on versatile forces that can function effectively throughout the entire spectrum of warfare. That is why the balanced striking power of our carrier task forces—our deployed 6th and 7th Fleets—plays such an important role in our national readiness today?

The same modern versatility which our antisubmarine warfare forces require to eliminate a submarine threat is also needed to provide on-the-spot readiness in limited war. Antisubmarine warfare forces have already dramatically demonstrated their capability to contribute in limited action. These are not facets of an armchair strategy—they are validated by recent actions. Our seapower must remain versatile, so our country can continue to call upon it to stabilize situations quickly in the frontlines of freedom.

The antisubmarine warfare forces protect our deployed fleets against a submarine threat, whether Soviet or satellite. They can move in to reenforce the naval task forces on the spot if we continue to build the best versatility into their systems. It is for this reason that I ask you, as the producers of the hardware we need, to think in terms of versatile systems in your contribution to our success at sea.

These, then, are the broad areas where antisubmarine warfare advances must be made if we are to meet the challenge of the new nuclear submarine threat. I call them the seven significant steps for urgent ASW progress. I present them to you as an incentive for accelerated industrial ASW effort, and I'm sure you will agree that they offer unlimited opportunities for everyone in developing the required ASW readiness.

American scientific, industrial, congressional and defense teamwork has enabled us to track those 72 satellites in outer space with great precision.

What I want to ask you gentlemen today is—can we count on a comparable performance in the depths of liquid space? Can you produce the modern means to cope with the submerged foe so we can face the challenge from the oceans of the earth? The threat is real and our survival may be at stake. This, gentlemen, is my challenge to you—as the producers of progress in our country.

Republicans, Look to Your Staffs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, because of the general interest in the subject matter, I should like to include an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune on April 1, 1962, entitled "Republicans, Look to Your Staffs":

REPUBLICANS, LOOK TO YOUR STAFFS

In Congress, staffs are the bread of life. And though Republicans have been going mighty hungry, very few have been doing anything about it.

Increasing the size of minority staffs on House and Senate committees might seem a minor item of Federal housekeeping, but it cuts to the heart of the effective functioning of Congress.

What makes staffing important is the role committees play in legislation. This is where the real work of Congress is done, and it is on committee staffs that individual Congressmen have to place primary reliance for help in their legislative work. Not only are committee staff members specialists in their respective legislative fields, which the employees in a Congressman's own office are usually not, but the Congressman's office is largely tied up with the mechanics of representing his constituency. When it comes to working out the intricacies of, say, a trade or tax bill, the Congressman needs ready access to experts on trade or tax legislation.

As Roscoe Drummond has been pointing out repeatedly in his columns, the Republicans are grossly underrepresented on the committee staffs. Most staffs have only one, two or three staff members—sometimes none—appointed by and responsible to the minority members.

The same committee may have 10 or 20, or more, appointed by and responsible to the majority. Much of their work is technical and nonpartisan in nature, but a lot of it is not. Some committee chairmen organize their staffs on a professional, nonpartisan basis—but others use them in a highly partisan manner, to the Republicans' distinct disadvantage.

To work as it should, two-party government needs two parties each equipped to develop its own independent legislative program. It is here that the need for a strong minority staff—with which monority members can enjoy a confidential relationship—is most urgent.

It wasn't so bad when one party controlled Congress and the other the White House, so that Republicans had access to the machinery of the executive departments. But

now that the Democrats control both branches, the Republicans are not even out in right field. They're out of the park, beyond the fence.

The minority staff of two on the House Education and Labor Committee, for example, is hardly a match for the 40-odd answerable to Chairman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, plus the combined bureaucracies of the Departments of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Democrats in Congress, liking the way their bread is buttered, have been understandably cool to pleas for bigger minority staffs. But the Republicans themselves have been apathetic. A few—notably Senator CARL CURTIS and Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS—have fought for fairer representation, and now a few more are joining in. But it's going to take a more concerted push than the Republicans have yet made to get the kind of minority staffs an opposition party needs—not only in its own interest, but in that of effective two-party government and sound legislative procedure.

U.S. Seapower and the American Destiny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, through the use of our seapower, the United States must see to it that our allies are not phychologically overwhelmed by terror campaigns organized in the Communist camp.

Our Navy, standing offshore at a friendly port, provides a measure of security for a threatened people that is truly astonishing.

The fleet is a visible symbol of U.S. might which can be a tremendous psychological force to keep up the spirits of those living in the shadow of the Communist yoke.

Its unique advantage is that the fleet does not necessarily have to move into a country to make its influence felt. As our Navy proved its strength in past conflicts, so it now must be able to effect victories in the cold war.

In an article in the Foreign Policy Bulletin, Anthony Harrigan, associate editor of the News and Courier, at Charleston, S.C., has compiled a thought-provoking article on seapower and its role in influencing our destiny. Under leave to extend my remarks to the Appendix of the RECORD, I hereby submit his article for the information of the Congress:

U.S. SEAPOWER AND THE AMERICAN DESTINY

(By Anthony Harrigan)

A navy is no better than the national objective which determines its use. This is a truth which bears repetition in an era in which weapons systems often are regarded as answers to grave problems facing the nation. Armed forces, however, are mere aggregations of men, ships, planes, and missiles. Effective employment of weapons systems on land, sea, and in the air is wholly dependent upon the framework of national policy provided for their potentialities. In short, the usefulness of national forces is subject to the development of national purposes.

American seapower, like American land and airpower, can be understood only in terms of what the American Nation considers to be its destiny. History provides perspectives for clear comprehension. At the commencement of our national life, this Republic sought an isolated existence. American seapower, such as it was, had the function of a floating barrier against aggression from Europe. The country had neither the capability nor the desire to project naval strength as a form of intervention in the affairs of distant regions. In his farewell address, President George Washington cautioned against foreign entanglements. His counsel left a lasting impression on the American mind.

EXPANDING ROLE

But a changing America altered its mental outlook. Since the end of the Civil War, there has been steady enlargement in the popular concept of the American destiny. A series of major conflicts has forced the country into a continuously expanding world role. Today, there is a consensus that the United States is permanently involved in the affairs of nations in all parts of the globe. The role of seapower has become progressively more significant throughout this entire period—from the development of the steam-powered ironclad to the nuclear-powered missile-firing submarine. Indeed seapower has moved forward parallel with enlargement of the sense of American destiny. Without a great deal of formal theory, apart from Mahan, it has become established, nevertheless, that seapower is the basic instrumentality of American political destiny beyond our shores.

The ablest American thinkers have been keenly aware of the importance of seapower to a strong and secure United States. As long ago as 1899, Senator Albert J. Beveridge of Indiana declared: "This Republic must have a mighty navy." In an address delivered in that year, Senator Beveridge discussed the American destiny, taking note of the reshaping of national ideas then in process. "The dominant notes in American history," he said, "have thus far been self-government and internal improvements. But these were not ends; they were means. They were modes of preparation. The dominant notes in American life henceforth will be not only self-government and internal development, but also administration and world improvement."

NO RETREAT

This was a visionary statement that has been amply confirmed by the course of modern American history. But the full extent of his vision needs stressing even after the passage of six decades, for his was a vision of national goals. This bold address, entitled "The Republic That Never Retreats," is timely for a new generation confronted by Communist aggression on a global scale. "We followed the flag at Trenton and Valley Forge," he said, "at Buena Vista and Chapultapec, at Gettysburg and Mission Ridge, at Santiago and Manila, and everywhere and always it means larger liberty, nobler opportunity, and greater human happiness; for everywhere it means the blessings of the greater Republic. And so God leads, we follow the flag, and the Republic never retreats."

The speech is in a somewhat more florid style than is popular in the 1960's. Nevertheless, it is a singularly straightforward definition of the American destiny. In modern terms, one might say that it calls for a strategy of advance and a forward goal for this Nation. Since Senator Beveridge delivered this address, many names—symbolic of great national struggles—have become available for his list—the Argonne, Tarawa, Inchon, and many others.

The American destiny has been projected along the same line from 1899 to 1961—the line of a free nation with expanding responsibilities imposed by its high sense of duty and obligation to the Western civilization of which it is a part.

To seek enterprises worthy of American power, to obtain opportunities as proud as the strength of the United States—these are proper aims for Americans. A nation that is not moving forward is a nation that is static and ripe for retreat. But as Senator Beveridge proudly declared: "The Republic never retreats."

David Sarnoff, distinguished U.S. business leader, recently expressed the same conviction when he said: "If the area of freedom is not expanded, then assuredly it will continue to contract." Indeed this is an underlying feature of all life: a growing body expands, and passivity is a sign of withdrawal and decay.

STRATEGY OF ADVANCE

Unfortunately, this truth is not fully recognized in the United States. The need for a strategy of advance in keeping with our national destiny is, in some quarters, unappreciated. To be sure, some Americans have a very different view of the national destiny.

The opposing view was set forth in a recent article entitled "Is the United States a Second-Rate Power?" published in the Western Political Quarterly. The author, Prof. Urban G. Whitaker, Jr., took the position that the United States "will someday be a second-rate power." He asserted that "de facto world government * * * seems about to overcome the fiction of individual national sovereignty." By the 21st century, he wrote, "only 42 years from now—we will probably have less say than some of our global neighbors in world affairs. If the Chinese and Indians are ruling the world—well, they constitute one-third of it. We we are a minority voice—well, we are are minority."

In this possible situation, Professor Whitaker found a positive good. "The power we are losing," he said, "is in many ways, the power to commit mistakes. By being weak enough to have to listen to others we are being saved from ourselves."

Professor Whitaker is by no means the only voice declaring that America must accept a second-rate status in the world. Numerous individuals are insisting that Americans cannot expect to find complete solutions to national problems of foreign policy—that our national strength lies in not trying to force solutions that are immediately advantageous to us in strategic terms.

The root trouble with the thinking of persons who oppose a strategy of advance has been ably analyzed by Prof. Gordon Tullock of the department of international studies at the University of South Carolina. In his analysis, American foreign policy thinking—much of it, that is—has become "other directed." Explaining his use of this term coined by David Riesman, Harvard sociologist, Professor Tullock said: "A desire not to follow our own consciences, but to follow the opinions of others dominates our present foreign policy." This "other directedness of our foreign policy," he added, "is particularly striking when the nature of the 'other' is considered. Democracy today is a minority form of government, and the majority of the nations in the U.N. General Assembly have undemocratic forms of government. * * * Only an extremely 'other directed' nation would let the opinions of such people control its policy."

In the same vein is the spurious sophistication of thought embodied in the theory that the United States must await the gradual working out of trends in history instead of boldly attacking a problem in the hope of achieving a complete victory in a short time. It has been said by exponents of this mistaken theory that a bold thrust belongs to a vanished era of our national life—that a mature nation can afford to tolerate pres-

sures from troublemakers at our national doorstep. What all this amounts to is an argument for a passive role for America, the role of the bland, generous benefactor who won't raise a hand in anger against those who are threatening to beat him and throw him in the gutter. To this argument, the bolder spirits in the United States must reply: "Let us have flexibility, yes; but weakness and passivity, never." Senator Beveridge's positive words should be repeated: "The Republic never retreats."

NATIONAL IMPERATIVES

President Woodrow Wilson also set forth the true national imperatives in an address to the Senate July 10, 1919. "There can be no question of our ceasing to be a world power," he said. "The only question is whether we can refuse the moral leadership that is offered us, whether we shall accept the moral leadership that is offered us, whether we shall reject the confidence of the world." The United States unquestionably will reject that confidence if it abandons a strategy of advance against international communism, if it turns away from national purposes defined again and again over the last century.

This is important to bear in mind as we weigh the usefulness of seapower, for, as Eric Sevareid rightly said in a recent essay, "The United States has entered the most critical period of its history. We can afford to lose everything—except respect for our strength and determination." Demonstrations of our willingness to forget "worrying, hair-shirt arguments" that this or that action will offend "world opinion," Mr. Sevareid added, are essential for this country. Indeed there must be concerted action to rid our national policymaking apparatus of restrictive influences that prevent fulfilment of American destiny.

Max Ascoli, editor of the Reporter, remarked on this very situation, commenting: "In fact we love nothing better than to limit our freedom of choice with as many bonds as possible through the United Nations or the Organization of American States. * * * Yet somehow we have to defend our existence. It is not enough to be always on the side of world order, considering that we are faced by an enemy undeviatingly determined to extend disorder wherever he is likely to gain from it. We cannot be neutral in the struggle for ultimate power."

Prof. Frederick Wilhelmsen, addressing a meeting of the Centre Europeen de Documentation et Information, went one step beyond that, insisting that "one of the marks of the barbarian within our midst in recent years has been the insidious suggestion that we must go to school to somebody else—to some teacher foreign to our roots and distant to our own being. This ridiculous and even indecent inferiority complex might very well be our perdition."

Those who formulate a defense strategy for the United States ought to give the most searching consideration to these questions of national purpose and character that have a bearing on the American destiny. When defense leaders urge a strategy of advance based on a full use of seapower, they necessarily alert their fellow citizens to the demands that fall on them as individuals and as a people. The principles of war are immutable; and so are the principles of human conduct that make for national greatness.

In this connection, a close reading of "The Peloponnesian War" by Thucydides, the Athenian general who wrote of his city's war with Sparta, is productive of much understanding of the challenges of our own epoch. As a defense leader of Athens, the greatest seapower of her time, Thucydides' observations are highly significant. No passage in this great historical account is more deserving or study by students of national character and strategy than the speech of the Corinthians to the Lacedemonians. This passage reads as follows:

"There are important interests at stake to which as far as we can see, you are insensible. You have never considered what manner of men are these Athenians with whom you will have to fight, and how utterly unlike yourselves. They are revolutionary, equally quick in the conception and in the execution of every new plan. * * * They are bold beyond their strength; they run risks which prudence would condemn; and in the midst of misfortune, they are full of hope. Whereas it is your nature, though strong, to act feebly * * * they are impetuous, and you are dilatory; they are always abroad, and you are always at home. For they hope to gain something by leaving their homes; but you are afraid that any new enterprise may imperil what you have already. When conquerors, they pursue their victory to the utmost; when defeated, they fall back the least. When they do not carry out an intention which they have formed, they seem to themselves to have sustained a personal bereavement; when an enterprise succeeds, they have gained a mere installment of what is to come."

This lengthy passage should be "must" reading for officers of the U.S. armed services, for it sets forth the highest of standards. And Americans should ask themselves whether they measure up to the description of the Athenians and, if not, then why not. Obvously, the Athenians, as described by the Corinthians, were total believers in a strategy of advance; they were ruled by a powerful sense of destiny. These ancient Athenians would have understood and admired President Theodore Roosevelt's concept of American destiny embodied in his praise of "the strenuous life" as the "only national life which is really worth living."

NOT FOR THE TIMID

A new generation of Americans is not mindful of Roosevelt's stirring call to national action and his unequivocal statement that "the timid man, the lazy man, the man who distrusts his country, the overcivilized man who has lost the great fighting, masterful virtues, the ignorant man and the man of dull mind, whose soul is incapable of feeling the mighty life that thrills 'stern men with empires in their brains'—all these, of course, shrink from seeing the Nation undertake its new duties; shrink from seeing the Nation build a navy and an army adequate to our needs."

Almost 70 years after Theodore Roosevelt delivered this speech, his call to the strenuous national life represents a challenge that should be heeded. The danger from Hitler and imperial Japan has been met and overcome; but Russia and Communist China loom as an even greater danger to our security as a nation. T.R.'s warning was this, and it is a warning based on truth: "If we shrink from the hard contests where men must win at hazard of their lives and at the risk of all they hold dear, then the bolder and stronger peoples will pass us by and will win for themselves the domination of the world."

Obviously, there would be no need for seapower—no need for any armed forces—if the idea of withdrawal before the enemy should become dominant in this country. A defeated country—one that accepts the notion of surrender, whether all at once or piecemeal, has no need to consider its destiny or the instruments of its destiny. A country content to be a second-class power has a destiny that is determined by stronger powers.

But to imagine that the United States would agree to withdrawal from positions of strength is to believe that the American people have no interest in survival. Fortunately, a very healthy interest is manifested. Indeed the citizenry of our country has a passionate desire for victory over communism.

As long as America believes that "there is no substitute for victory" (to utilize General of the Army Douglas MacArthur's memorable words), there will be a need for seapower. Moreover, the conditions of modern warfare—the balance of nuclear strength between the U.S.S.R. and the United States—suggest that in the period ahead, American supremacy will depend upon supremacy on, under, and above the sea. Seapower is the one decisive advantage enjoyed by the United States; seapower is the big lack faced by the Soviet defense establishment. Americans should never forget, and they will not forget if the Navy reminds the country, that the Soviets cannot control the seas or deny the seas to the fleets and merchant ships of the United States.

The classic advantages of seapower to a maritime confederation, which is an accurate description of the western alliance, are too well known to need repetition. But Mahan's dicta on seapower are in need of updating in a sense. For the chief role of modern seapower in a cold or protracted war is not control of logistics but in projecting the psychomoral forces of the nation. Seapower, in the words of Prof. Gordon B. Turner of Princeton University, can "protect our allies from the physical and psychological battering which neighboring Communist countries can give them."

MORAL RESOLUTION

In order to win the long war with communism, the United States must not only protect the industrial bases of the West but also must guard the centers of moral resolution—the countries that will face all risks in order to remain independent. The United States, through the agency of seapower, must see to it that our allies—all of which are maritime countries—are not psychologically overwhelmed by terror campaigns organized in the Communist camp. This buttressing of the spirits of friendly nations is a task for the U.S. Navy, the visible symbol of American power. As the U.S. Navy has made itself of crucial importance in hot wars, so it must be able to effect victories in a cold war. Seapower's unique advantage is that it is under no necessity to move into a country to make its influence felt. From the Formosa Strait to the Mediterranean, one finds examples that illustrate that seapower is a telling national force without engaging in acts of armed interference. An attack transport loaded with marines, standing off a friendly port, provides a measure of security for a threatened people that is truly astonishing. The Navy's felt presence has real weight in political processes. Seapower is truly the flexible system that can best deal with the Communist world's sophisticated use of indirect aggression. In the words of Prof. William R. Emerson of Yale, seapower is able to "influence, to guide, and to control the intricate and unpredictable situations of world politics before there arise from them threats to the peace so serious as to make general war inevitable."

Communism has made many gains in the recent past and may make additional gains in the near future. But, like Sparta in ancient times, the Sino-Soviets will not have final victory until they control the sea—and this they will never do so long as the U.S. Navy is prepared. No matter what temporary gains the Communist enemy makes in Latin America or Africa (or other regions where land transport to the Soviet heartland is not feasible), consolidation of the Communist empire ultimately will depend upon shipping. Until the Reds have the shipping, and until they control the sea, their empire is held by the threat of infiltration and ideological subversion. And while these forces may suffice to grab a country and keep it under domination for

a short time, permanent control depends upon permanent control of the sea. Cuba, for example, would be able to throw off its Communist thralldom in a matter of months if the United States were to enforce a tight sea blockade. Communist seizure of Haiti, the Dominican Republic and all the Caribbean Islands—so eagerly sought by the Kremlin—could not be on a permanent basis unless the enemy controlled sea communications in the waters of the Western Hemisphere. A Chinese Communist conquest of Australia likewise would be contingent upon sea supremacy in that theater of the globe. The vast continent of Africa will not fall and stay under enduring Communist rule without communism obtaining great strength on the surrounding seas.

Communism cannot stay in power in remote areas without the threat of force; and force cannot be projected to the ends of the earth without warships. Therefore, the U.S. response to the Communist military challenge should be guided by the enemy's inadequacy on the sea. Indeed as long as the United States retains sea supremacy, as long as it rules the empire of blue water, total Communist victory will be out of the question.

On the watery vastness of the globe rests the strength of the American Republic and the opportunity for achieving national goals—victory over communism and enduring security. If the full strength of the American Republic is concentrated on the sea, Americans will be able to say with confidence:

"The Republic never retreats."

A Wheat Surplus?—Buy More

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. HALEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial column by Mr. Ralph de Toledano which appeared in a recent issue of the Sarasota Herald-Tribune. The column, "A Wheat Surplus—Buy More," has been very disturbing to some of my constituents who are alarmed about the unsound economic policies we are following. They ask why it is necessary to import a product which is in surplus in our own country.

I hope each of my colleagues will read this article and give thought to the problems so clearly set forth in it.

AND THE GOLD GOES—A WHEAT SURPLUS? BUY MORE

(By Ralph de Toledano)

WASHINGTON.—The Alice-in-Wonderland world of liberal economics, statistics, and facts have come to mean only that what the Federal Government wants them to mean. Consider these three propositions from the pages of President Kennedy's primer:

1. It is mandatory, according to the administration, to curtail drastically U.S. agricultural production.

2. To keep these surpluses down, Congress must appropriate vast sums of money for limiting farm acreage.

3. To maintain U.S. foreign trade, the President must have extraordinary powers, with very little congressional supervision, to adjust tariffs as he sees fit.

This is what we are told morning, noon, and night—and to many propositions have become articles of faith. Now compare them with the facts of economic life, and the manipulation of foreign trade already taking place. Fairly recently the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for International Affairs, Jack N. Behrman, appeared before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee to testify on the export of strategic material to the Soviet Union and Communist bloc countries. One brief exchange was buried in the lengthy transcript, but it bears repeating:

"Senator THOMAS J. DODD. We are supporting wheat in this country, are we not?

"Mr. BEHRMAN. Yes, sir. But we also have a wheat agreement which provides for quota sales among the participants of that agreement.

"Senator KENNETH B. KEATING. What do we do with that wheat we are getting here (from other countries), just storing it in a Government warehouse?

"Mr. BEHRMAN. * * * I have no answer to that.

"Senator DODD. I think that is very interesting.

"Senator KEATING. How much does that net import (from Canada) amount to?

"Mr. BEHRMAN. The wheat for full duty and subject to quota in the United States totals 820,000 bushels, compared to the same period or comparable period of 7,000 bushels of our export into Canada.

"Counsel J. SOURWINE. We exported 7,000 and we imported 800,000?

"Mr. BEHRMAN. Yes, sir."

The subject was not pursued since it was not strictly germane to the hearing. Nor did the Senators ask the Assistant Secretary how many tons or bushels of other agricultural commodities now in surplus in the United States the Federal Government was importing. The point so strikingly made was, in fact, quickly forgotten, and understandably neither the Commerce Department nor the administration cared to bring it up again.

But the zany fact remains that, in the name of foreign trade and good relations with the world, the United States is subsidizing the import of agricultural products, adding them to warehouses already bursting with American surpluses. The United States, moveover, is spending valuable dollars for these products—at a time when billions in foreign aid are steadily draining American gold stocks from Fort Knox.

Perhaps someday a way will be found to give away the wheat we have produced or are importing. But every day the balance of payments deficit is increasing—and will do so at an even greater pace if Congress passes the President's $5.9 billion foreign aid appropriation. Simultaneously, confidence in the American dollar is slumping throughout the world—a blow not only at this country but at other nations dependent on the stability of the dollar for maintaining a sound economy.

The statistics are even more frightening. The gold reserve of the United States has now been reduced to $16.6 billion, but under the law $11.5 billion must be reserved to stabilize the currency. That leaves $5.1 billion to meet $22.5 billion of short-term dollar claims held by European banks. Should those claims be pressed, the United States would face a major economic crisis. The $8 billion we are spending annually in foreign aid and for our oversea forces is the big continuing problem, since some of it must be paid from our gold reserves.

What it adds up to is this: The day is long past when the United States can go thoughtlessly to the economic well. Yet the administration continues to call for increased foreign aid, for wide latitude in making tariff agreements such as the one which compels us to buy Canadian wheat we don't need, for quadrupling the Peace Corps and thereby exporting more American dollars, and for domestic programs that put a growing strain on the Treasury and force us deeper and deeper into deficit spending.

In short, the administration's economic thinking seems to resemble the dialog at the Mad Hatter's tea party. Perhaps Americans have become accustomed to the double talk against fiscal responsibility. Perhaps they believe that the money well is bottomless. Certainly it is true that they have come to believe that the Government's high finance does not touch on their lives. But it does, in every way.

Needed now, and desperately, is a little economic education among those who pay the taxes and cast the votes. Only this can stop the Alice in Wonderland economists from plunging us all down a rabbit hole.

Ignoring Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I call to the attention of my colleagues this excellent editorial from the U.S. News & World Report, of March 26, 1962.

David Lawrence draws a fine bead on the fallacy of ignoring aggression, oftentimes at the conference table.

The editorial follows:

IGNORING AGGRESSION

(By David Lawrence)

Negotiation with the Soviet Union on disarmament is today an exercise in futility.

We have placed our reliance on a fallacious theory that talk plus talk always equals agreement.

It is we who have broadcast the idea that talk is a necessary alternative to war—as if mere talk prevents war—even as the enemy continues deliberately to harass us in Berlin.

Again and again in international crises the aggressor has had a big advantage. He bullies and threatens, and—if he has a wobbly adversary, as in 1939—the end result can be the war that nobody wants.

What is disconcerting at this time is the American Government's position of seeming helplessness in any negotiations with the Soviets.

But are we without instruments of pressure or leverage? We need a leadership strategy which can checkmate the Communists. It must be based on our willingness to speak the plain truth to the Soviet people—to tell them why they are in grave danger of destruction by their own Government. It must be derived from our economic power, which we must unhesitatingly announce that we will use if necessary.

It is disheartening to learn from congressional hearings about how the State Department "muzzles" our military men and cautions them not to offend the Soviets by making public speeches about the dangers of communism. What a philosophy of despair.

It is even more disheartening to discover that the voice of our country—in everyday messages to the Russian people over the radio—is a mixture of timidity and self-imposed restraint. Too often the language of polite diplomacy is being used rather than the forceful words which should be addressed directly and without fear to the people behind the Iron Curtain. We claim to be firm, but we seem to be afraid to articulate our firmness directly to the Communists.

We are not being realistic. We are not using two powerful weapons—first, appeals in unequivocal terms to the Russian people and, second, an economic quarantine of the Soviet bloc.

But, it is said, all this is risky. Yet we seem to be willing to risk even military war in far-off South Vietnam. We have announced that we will try to keep the Communists in check in that area. Why do we fail then to come to the rescue of the starving millions in Cuba—only 90 miles away—who are being oppressed by the Communist-established regime in Havana?

It doubtless will be argued that in South Vietnam our military forces are present by invitation of the existing Government. But we have justifiable reasons, too, for intervening in Cuba—the Monroe Doctrine and the basic principles of international law.

Although we have military forces in and around Berlin, our rights there are being constantly jeopardized. Have the Soviets been clearly warned that we shall resist, not with more talk but with military force, any violations of our rights in the air corridors between Berlin and West Germany?

Our excessive caution is the result of nuclear blackmail. We have allowed ourselves to be propagandized into an obsession about the alleged dangers of nuclear tests. Under the spell of the nuclear scare, we permitted a wall to be constructed on the ground through the city of Berlin. Shall we now permit an air wall to keep us out of the overhead routes to and from Berlin?

What do the current negotiations really mean? Obviously we do not intend to destroy a stockpile of nuclear weapons, and neither do the Soviets. The talk is constantly about arms reduction or limitation. But we know—and the Soviets know—that no mutual trust exists between us today on which any really effective armament agreement can be based.

We know also that nuclear war is out of the question for either side.

We must, therefore, use conventional leverage. We must advise the Soviets that we cannot tolerate their actual aggressions. Since they are unwilling to permit international inspection and to accept a foolproof system of detection so that surprise attack can really be avoided, there is no alternative for us but to adopt a policy of self-protection. This an economic quarantine alone can give us.

Have we made any plans for an economic blockade of the Communist nations? Have we notified the Soviet Government that we intend to cut off all intercourse with the Soviet bloc if there is any further manifestation of hostility toward us? The United States cannot continue to be entangled in the stratagems of the Communists—the multiplicity of conferences and proposals that are so fruitless in the big debate on "disarmament."

Unless we take steps to use the leverage we possess, we cannot expect the enemy to "listen to reason." Unhappily, we give the impression today that we are without any leverage. Such an impression ought to be immediately removed. We cannot any longer ignore aggression.

Dr. Walter Langsam on Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, the University of Cincinnati gained further national recognition last week when its basketball team for the second straight year won the NCAA national championship.

The University of Cincinnati's basketball team is not its only claim to fame. Academically it is one of the top educational institutions in the country. Its fine record in all fields is due largely to its dynamic, dedicated, and exceptionally capable president, Dr. Walter Langsam.

Dr. Walter Langsam recently addressed the Town Meeting of the Wyoming-Lockland Kiwanis Club. The subject was, "Freedom, Our Individual Responsibility." This was an outstanding, thought-provoking speech. Following his address, President Langsam was asked questions with reference to Federal aid to education. It is my feeling that every Member of Congress before voting on further legislation concerned with Federal aid to education should know of the conclusions of one of America's outstanding educators and university administrators.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Langsam's address and the answers and questions to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

The address and article follows:

FREEDOM, OUR INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY

"He who loves not his country can love nothing," so wrote Lord Byron more than a century ago, and so also do we feel this evening as we gather to consider our place and our duty as citizens in a free country—a free country which is a constant target of a propaganda barrage from totalitarian enemies abroad and at home.

One hundred eighty-four years and eight months ago, to be exact, which will be tomorrow, the 14th, 184 years and 8 months tomorrow, the Congress of the United States adopted the stars and stripes as the flag of our Nation. Ever since that memorable June 14, 1777, the flag of the United States of America has been one of the great symbols of our civilization—as the Christian cross and the star of David and the Mohammedan crescent stand for three great world religions. So do the stars and stripes represent freedom under law for almost 200 million people.

Let us, therefore, spend a few minutes tonight thinking about the meaning of this freedom in our land of the free. Some people tend to use the word freedom rather recklessly. They think that it means the right to do anything they please—anything they feel like doing. When we urge such persons carefully to consider a contemplated action, they generally respond by saying, "That's all right. I can go ahead if I want to. After all, I'm grown up and free." Other people use their so-called freedom as an excuse to get out of doing a job which they know ought to be done but which they are too lazy to do. Sometimes the word is used without any understanding and leads people to disregard the experience of others. They think that freedom means merely the right to make their own mistakes. Sometimes, finally, people think they are exercising freedom when they merely accept ready-made political formulas and blindly take up causes that are idealistic on the surface but quite bad beneath that surface.

Now the question arises, Are these men and women really exercising freedom? Have they thought intelligently about freedom and do they know what it really means? I think not. Rather, these people are slaves, not freemen. They are slaves to their own appetite or slaves to ignorance or laziness, or slaves to material things, or at least to thoughtlessness. They think, if they think about such things at all, that freedom is a one-way affair. They think that to be free just means to have things come their way.

They do not know, obviously do not know, that the really free person also gives of him to the freeman. Freedom means the right to contribute his best talents and efforts for the benefit of his fellow man. The freeman is a very busy man. He works hard and does good, thus showing that he understands and appreciates his freedom.

During the Second World War, there was very much talk about freedom. It was mentioned particularly in the often quoted phrase not merely about freedom but about the four freedoms. These, some of you will remember directly, were first defined in 1941 as: Freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want, and freedom from fear. These obviously are noble goals. As a combination, they made a very inspiring fighting slogan during World War II and the four freedoms is still a very good slogan today—long after the war.

The four freedoms propose that you and I shall be allowed to speak freely what is on our mind, that you and I may worship God as we see fit, or not worship Him at all, that you and I shall have plenty to eat, the proper clothing to wear and a comfortable home, and that you and I shall be able to enjoy all of these blessings without fear that they may be taken away from us by a strong, greedy and power-seeking neighbor. Surely these are attractive ideals which fill us with a warm glow. Yet, I think that even these famous four freedoms do not wholly comprise the true meaning of freedom.

Are not all of these items we have just mentioned still of a one-sided and largely selfish nature? They provide for being able to talk as you please, and pray as we please, and eat as we please and that in all of these pleasures be protected and guarded against arbitrary interference. Not, however, not one word in these four freedoms about giving—not a hint of service, no mention of responsibility, of obligation, of duty or work except in maybe a very general way the idea that we not only ourselves be allowed to enjoy these good things but perhaps we should help others to get similar pleasures out of life.

And so I say again, it is not freedom merely to enjoy the four freedoms, it is not enough to even remember and occasionally, perhaps on Sunday mornings, express thanks for these freedoms, for where freedom exists it was won by faith in God, by hard work and by the willing assumption of responsibility. Only by more faith and more hard work and more assumption of responsibility can freedom be maintained and spread.

Especially dear to most of us as Americans are the challenging words of the Declaration of Independence. I think here particularly of the words "all men are created equal," but I am afraid that many of us habitually have thought of these words as referring only to equal rights and equal privileges. We interpret them to mean that we are to get equally favorable treatment with anyone and everyone else on all matters, that nobody else is to get more of anything good than we get, that all of the same opportunities shall be ours which are our neighbors, and so on and on. But that was not the full interpretation of the words as understood by the men who wrote those words. To prove them, in reality the words "all men are created equal" historically refer just as much to equal responsibilities and equal obligations as they do to equal rights and privileges.

The patriotic Thomas Paine correctly expressed the views of his fellow patriots when he said, "Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom must undergo the fatigues of supporting them." "Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom must

undergo the fatigues of supporting it." In other words, we who want freedam must take part in the practice of freedom as well as in its enjoyment. Truly, freedom is not only everybody's right, it is everybody's job, and only the person to whom freedom means duties as well as privileges is a truly useful citizen of the United States.

I should like to become a little more positive about all of this and describe the person who perhaps has truly grasped the meaning of freedom—created in the image of God, he possesses dignity, intelligence, and a soul. These he generously uses in the service of his fellow man and thus becomes completely free. He opposes injustice and fosters justice, but he does this judiciously and not emotionally. In other words, he accumulates the facts concerning any seeming injustice and he does not go off just half cocked. He does not act on heresay, nor sign petitions without reading them and without studying them. Only after he has investigated each situation and examined all its implications does he work out a plan of action; but then he goes ahead bravely with dignity and with courage, knowing that God is on his side because he is right and that his fight for his neighbor's freedom then must succeed.

The intelligent, free person strives faithfully to exercise the duties that free citizens owe their country. He knows that it is important for a citizen to vote, not merely have the right to vote. He willingly serves on juries when necessary and does not think juries are important only when a case of his own is up for trial. How many of us would rebel—literally rebel—if someone tried to take away our voting power or abolish trial by jury? Yet, how many of us are too lazy or too indifferent to go to the poles on election day—and boast to our friends about how clever we were in getting out of jury duty? There is no surer way to lose these rights of franchise and a jury trial than so to neglect them and even to degrade them.

The free man, furthermore, consciously and conscientiously obeys the laws of the land. He does not try to cut corners or get away with things, but tries to do every assignment to the best of his ability. He wants to perform an honest day's work before he collects an honest day's pay. He wants to be treated fairly. Why, because he treats everyone else fairly. He does not see difficulties in every opportunity. Oh, no. He sees an opportunity in every difficulty.

The free citizen, moreover, is interested in the spread of education, but he wants education to raise the level of the common man—not to bring it down to the common man's level. The whole history of our civilization has been the story of man's progress away from the common and away from the lowly. Recently it has become fashionable in some quarters to praise the common man because he is common, instead of praising him because he is a man—a more misplaced emphasis would be hard to imagine.

We must not praise the common man because he is common. He is praiseworthy because he is a man and therefore can be assisted to rise above the common. This philosophy that I speak of can only lead downward to reaction, never upward to freedom. The free man, true, pays his taxes honestly and in every way tries to make his country a better place in which to live. He opposes, but in an intelligent and thoughtful way, prejudice, greed and discrimination; but he does not go around seeking or even creating issues where there are none, nor is he so busy shouting for his own rights that he overlooks the rights of others.

Freedom means also the possession of intellectual curiosity, of a drive to seek the truth, of an ability to think for one's self—the free man does not express opinions until he has the necessary facts on which to base them. Some of us like to think, and we say that since this is a free country, every man is entitled to his own opinion. I wish we could change our attitude there and say every man is entitled to his own opinion on any subject about which he is informed. What a quiet and restful place this world would be if nobody spoke except on subjects on which he is well informed.

To express an opinion based on ignorance, or on a rumor, or on outright guessing—that is not the exercise of freedom. That is a threat to freedom—to accept and spread gossip and rumors is not to be free but to be a slave to the vanity or to envy or to just plain nasty mindedness.

The freeman, finally, is a self-reliant man who wants to stand on his own feet, who wants to win his proper place in society through ambition and hard work, who uses his God-given abilities freely in the service of his fellow man. He does not follow blindly those who promise him rewards that he did not earn. He wants daily to feel the satisfaction that comes from having done a hard job well. This man is free because he does his duty to God and country and fellow man. Therefore he has the enjoyment of certain precious rights and liberties. This is the true freeman and free woman and, today, then this evening, let us dedicate ourselves anew to upholding the freedom of our country, recognizing that this freedom is our individual responsibility.

QUESTION-AND-ANSWER PERIOD

A question-and-answer period followed with excerpts given below:

Question. In view of today's situation, are there any freemen in the United States?

Dr. LANGSAM. The definition of a freeman—I think under my own definition, thank heavens, there still are freemen. Many of us are not nearly so free as we ourselves would like to think ourselves to be. I do think that with the passing of time our rights are being limited more and more. I am disconcerted by that—I am concerned by it. I dislike seeing our rights further restricted.

On the other hand, there seem to be many people who are not worried over that—who prefer security to freedom. I think this is a big problem today and a problem from anybody's point of view. Somehow, and I think it goes back to the days of the big depression which the younger people will not remember but most of the rest of us will, the great depression from late 1929 through the 1930's had an effect on American psychology which I regret. I can understand it. I am sorry that it had this effect, but I think the great depression had such a traumatic effect on tens of millions—and twenties of millions—of Americans that they have come to think that the most important thing in life is what they call security and they are willing to surrender more and more liberty and freedom in order to get what they think is security.

I myself happen to believe that this is a mirage, that what so many people think of as security isn't security at all. I don't think any of these things called security are that in the true sense of the word. We think they are. Maybe they are this year, but there isn't a human being in the world who can guarantee to you that any security legislation today will give you security 10 years from now. Nobody can say that. A lot of people, however, hope that, and I am quite worried—and that is why I go around doing a lot of speaking myself—worried over our willingness as people to give up to a central authority more and more of our individual rights, freedoms and liberties in exchange for what we think is security.

Question. Do you feel Federal aid to education limits the freedom of education? What effect will it bring about? Would you kindly give your views on Federal aid to education in relation to freedom?

Dr. LANGSAM. Some of these questions imply that the person trying to answer the question is a prophet. I am sorry. I know a little bit about the past. I don't profess to know anything about the future and any effort to answer a question and say what this or what that will do is a rash thing, but I have thought about this to some extent and I will give you my own view for whatever interest it may have.

I am not in favor of Federal aid to education in the very broad sense that it is being discussed today. I know that there has been Federal aid to education for the past 100 years. People always point to that, saying it has done no harm. Well, I think that even that is debatable but let us grant then, there has been no problem—no problem at all with interference on the aid that has been going on since 1863, but always the argument has been—they go only so far, and now we are talking about going much further.

I am most opposed to the idea of Federal scholarships. I think that there is absolutely no need for them—none whatever. I can say to you unequivocably and without worry about challenge by anyone that there is not a boy or girl in the United States who is qualified to go to college who cannot go to college for financial reasons. I repeat that. I do not think that there is a single qualified boy or girl living in the United States who is being kept out of college purely for financial reasons. He may be kept out because he doesn't know that money is available through scholarship or loan funds. That's his fault, or the fault of his counselors or parents or teachers or someone else. Even now, in every State of the Union millions of dollars are going begging because nobody is asking for them. These amounts, somewhat larger amounts involved in loan funds and scholarships, but that doesn't matter. The money is available.

No one has been able to prove, except in talking by broad general terms, that there is anybody who cannot go to college and who cannot get aid. We don't turn down a single person for financial reasons. Unfortunately, I would say in some cases, the parents or the children do not know that funds are available. That ought to be corrected.

In many cases, the child doesn't want to go to college, or the parents don't want him to go to college, and the child doesn't want to admit it or the parents don't want to admit it because it is the thing to do now—to go to college. The easiest explanation is, "Oh, I can't afford it," or, "I can't afford to send my children." This is given now fairly often as an excuse. I have not found a case in which it is a fact.

It is respectable in our society not to go to college because we are poor. It is not respectable not to go because you are not bright enough, or want to get married, or because you want to go one place and your father wants you to go to another. Those are the explanations we do not like to give, so even when people go around with questionnaires and collect information saying that—why we found so many boys and girls who would be going to college if they had the money—they never tell you who they interview. I don't doubt that they get those answers but a little closer interviewing and examination would show in most cases that this is an artificial excuse.

I think that the issuance of a quarter million dollars in Federal scholarships each year is just another way of making more people beholden at an earlier age to a central authority. I think the freeman should be beholden only to God. God created him in His image, created in His image, and you know the reason why we have freedom is be-

cause we were created in the image of God. There is no other basis. This is why democracy is tied in with our belief in God. It is because we are created in the Divine Image that we have inalienable rights—inalienable meaning that no one can take them from us.

Now we can surrender them and I think, unhappily, we have been surrendering them more and more and I hope we get to a point where we stop that and stop surrendering rights for what we think may be a larger social security check some day. We aren't sure that is going to come anyway, because nobody is sure what is going to happen 10 years from now, 15 or 20 years from now. You can plan that way. You plan to play God and that doesn't pay. I do think, to me, the most reprehensible act with respect to Federal aid is that with respect to scholarships.

Now we will get to Federal aid with respect to increasing teachers' salaries and I yield place to no one in my own demand for better pay for those who teach on all levels. I again feel that this is not the answer to it—Federal funds—no matter how they may be administered. There is always interference. The people will tell you, "Look, the Federal Government has put up money to put up buildings and there has been no interference at all." That is not true.

I lived through this at several colleges. Unfortunately when the local people don't give you the funds that you feel are necessary you finally succumb to temptation, and this is the evil of it, and take money where you can. We put up one dormitory, Dabney Hall, with money that we borrowed from the Federal Government because we were able to get it at 2⅞ percent interest. Mind you, the Government is paying 4 percent interest now to pay back the money that it loaned to us at that time. You are doing this, you are now paying 4 percent interest on money loaned us and every other college in the country at 2⅞ percent interest. I don't know who is fooling whom, but this is what happens.

Now, but beyond that, we were told that there would be no interference. There was so much interference that we don't want to borrow any money that way. We had our people on campus decide what we needed in a dormitory. We have some pretty competent people—the dean of men, the dean of women, the counselors, our own school of architecture—the dean of which is chairman of the city planning commission and one of the leading architects in the world. Then we hired architects besides, because that is the way you do it. We worked out precisely what we needed. Then, before we could get approval for the loan, we had to send the thing to some clerk in Chicago because that is the office for the area who was trying to earn his $3,000 a year by trying to find something wrong. I tell you Mr. Bursiek had to make half a dozen trips to Chicago, scores of long distance telephone calls to Chicago, because we knew that the toilet room in the dormitory belonged here and this clerk thought it belonged there and he had the right to say where it belonged. I am not exaggerating. I am telling you the truth of an experience we had just 3 years ago. This is a sample on a building. I am not talking now about grants that would apply to teachers or students.

I admit that in some States education is relatively backward compared to other States. I think the people in those States ought to be shown how to wake up. Somehow it ought to be made clear that education is an important factor. It is the duty of each State to take care of it in the best way and then let them go to it. I can say maybe I am too much for State government. I cannot see the sense, the intelligence, in saying people in this State don't want to give more for education so we will take it from this other State and force it down their throats and that is what is proposed here. Now I do think salaries need to go up. I do think there is room for improvement.

I do not believe we are short as many classrooms as is often said. You get that in other statistics. Most of you know my predecessor, the great Dr. Walters, for 40 years made college enrollment studies—the most reliable résumé made anywhere, far more reliable than those issued at the same time by what is now the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—used to be the Bureau of Education under the Department of the Interior. They always have different figures which invariably ran from a million to 2 million—and lately 3 million—higher than Dr. Walters. Dr. Walters' figures were right and now our registrar, Garland Parker, is carrying on in exactly the same way Dr. Walters did.

Dr. Walters' studies dealt with the full-time students. This does not amount to enough for Washington, so their statistics deal with the part-time students as well as full time and they don't separate them. Just to show you what this would mean to the whole country, let me tell you what it means for us. We have 8,000 in the evening college. Very few of these take more than two courses, a great many take one course. They should not be counted each one as a college student. When we prorate them in terms of full-time equivalents, well we have actually—day and evening—about 9,500 part-time students. We say that they are the full-time equivalent of about 3,000. That is all. So, though we would say that right now we have 18,700 students we would say that on a full-time equivalent basis we have only about 11,000 students, or 12,000. Now you multiply that by the 2,000 institutions in the United States and you see how far off you are.

Now you know that sometimes people will say that there are three kinds of liars in the world—the liars, the big liars, and the statisticians. You can prove that easily enough by fixing your figures to suit you.

All this has become a very long and involved answer. To make it very brief, I see no need for Federal law and I see great danger in it. Even if one doesn't want to accuse anybody involved right now, say this individual or this group has bad thoughts. How do we know what somebody in 10 years is going to do with that power. There is only one way to be sure that power won't be misused and that is to keep it to ourselves.

Hadassah's Golden Jubilee—Famous Jewish Women's Organization Marks 50 Years of Good Deeds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that I join my distinguished colleagues today in a salute to the Hadassah Women's Zionist Organization of America. On the occasion of their golden jubilee it is fitting that we congratulate the 318,000 American women of Hadassah, who have, with their tradition of 50 years of service and good works, set an example for us all.

In 1912, on the Jewish holiday of Purim, a small group of women met in New York to form the Hadassah organization. A year later the first Hadassah nurses were sent to Palestine to combat the shocking health conditions in that country. Today, the Hadassah Medical Organization has become a vast system of healing, teaching and medical research, child rescue work, vocational education, social welfare, and land redemption. It includes the new Hadassah Hebrew University Medical Center in Jerusalem, which has been hailed as one of the finest institutions of its kind in the world; a community health center; a mental hygiene and child guidance center; Israel's only leprosarium; a medical, a nursing, and a dental school, and many other institutions too numerous to mention.

Through the work of Hadassah the backward, disease-ridden country of Palestine has emerged as the dynamic, pioneering State of Israel. It is characteristic of the ladies of Hadassah that they have utilized the American spirit of pioneering and combined it with our love of liberty. These are the selfsame traditions that the United States of America and the State of Israel have in common. Both were forced to fight a war in order to achieve independence, both were developed by immigrants who flocked to their shores from all parts of the world, and both have conquered the desolate land which had stood neglected for centuries.

Israel, like America, also feels that it has a duty to work with less fortunate nations of the world. Within Israel's technical assistance program in the newly developing Afro-Asian countries, Hadassah plays a major role. In Liberia, Tanganyika and Ethiopia hospitals and anti-trachoma programs have been set up with the aid of Hadassah medical teams. These teams do not only supervise the programs, but also teach the doctors and nurses of the host country to take over the programs. In addition, students from at least 10 different African and Asian nations are receiving an excellent medical education in Hadassah's medical school in Israel. Thus, the work of Hadassah not only serves the cause of good health throughout the world, but, in addition, is a vehicle for the American and western tradition of freedom in the under-developed nations of the world, setting an example and proving the power of democracy as the best vehicle for development.

For all these reasons and for the wonderful work Hadassah has done in vocational education and in the resettlement and rehabilitation of thousands of children from all parts of the world, I am proud to hail it today. I only hope that we will soon see the day when disease and poverty have been conquered and Hadassah's mission will be gloriously complete.

The AMA—The Same Old Line: Let's Hold the Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Robert G. Spivack from the New York Herald Tribune of April 1, 1962.

Mr. Spivack lays it on the line for medical assistance to our aged population: The AMA is following the same old line in opposing what is in the best interests of the majority. The King-Anderson bill is not socialized medicine, it does not pretend to be socialized medicine; and I do not thing that any fair-minded person who examines the bill can properly call it such.

The article follows:

BATTLE OVER MEDICARE

(By Robert G. Spivack)

WASHINGTON.—The President of the United States and the leaders of the American Medical Association are on a collision course.

In view of the record up to now, the President needs one solid victory on Capitol Hill, or there will be little reason to urge voters to give him another Democratic Congress. On the other hand, the medical lobby must win this last-ditch fight against "socialized medicine"—or there will be no further need for a medical lobby.

The Democratic National Chairman, John Bailey, has compared the AMA to the John Birch Society in its resistance to social change. The head of the AMA, Dr. Leonard W. Larson, says the administration's program is not health insurance but political medicine.

On the sidelines sit the aged, cheering on the President. Other spectators with less immediate interest in the outcome are waiting to see how the young J.F.K. makes out in his first real combat with veteran AMA lobbyists. The AMA has not only friends on Capitol Hill but even more friends working effectively back home.

This is a fight the President has chosen to take directly to the people, bypassing the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, WILBUR MILLS. Representative MILLS is not a spectacular fighter, nor flashy. But he is stubborn, and he wields tremendous power.

He is also coauthor with Senator ROBERT KERR, of Oklahoma, of the Kerr-Mills bill which was intended as a substitute for the Federal medicare program. So pride of authorship may also be involved.

Like many other exciting conflicts that take place in Washington, the real stars of the show do not always make themselves known. The doctors have allowed themselves to be maneuvered into the position of the villains, or the "heavies."

This has proved convenient for the proponents of the Federal medical care program because the AMA has earned a reputation for not moving forward until it is forced to do so. The initials AMA, like NAM in earlier times, are becoming the equivalent of the word "reactionary."

It is ironic that the medical profession, which has done so much to prolong life and postpone death by research and experimentation, allows itself to be pictured in politics as made up of standpatters. The image of the kindly old family physician, the general practitioner with the engaging bedside manner, is being replaced by something far less heartwarming or reassuring.

Are the doctors being made the fall guys? I think they are, but not by the people they are inclined to blame. It is not their "enemies, the advocates of medicare, but their so-called friends who are creating the problem.

Why is there all this outcry for Federal care, under Social Security, for the ailing aged? The answer is quite simple: the inadequacy of the so-called health insurance programs offered by many large insurance companies. Behind the doctors' lobby there stands the insurance lobby, and many believe it is masterminding the fight against the medical care program.

The insurance companies that oppose medicare want the money to go through their channels, not from a Federal agency, to the doctors. They have made it quite attractive for the cooperative physicians and have persuaded them that Federal aid means Federal control.

Of course, there are some splendid private health insurance plans. But many of them do not offer the full coverage they tout so highly in their advertising and direct mail literature. Often they do not pay the entire hospital bill of an indigent patient.

A study a few years ago showed that less than three-quarters of surgical bills were paid in full under these private plans; for half of all obstetrical patients less than 60 percent of the bill was paid. Old people simply did not qualify for many of these plans. Many, if not most, of the private plans do not pay any medical costs if the patient is not hospitalized.

The insurance companies, with some exceptions, are in the business of selling policies at a profit. There is nothing wrong with the profit motive; but some old people simply cannot meet the costs. The private companies cannot help them, but they can hurt them by the kind of campaign they are waging against medicare.

Unnecessary Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, those who would provide aid for local activities constantly repeat the statement that there will be no Federal control.

I want to quote from the closing paragraph of a copy of a letter from Mr. D. C. McCray, director of county welfare in the largest county in my district, to Kathryn D. Goodwin, Director, Bureau of Public Assistance, Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., in which he says:

I would like to say that I believe that the continuing policy of your Bureau in insisting that your directives supersede State laws, through the vicious matching policies you set forth, will boomerang.

Mr. McCray lives with and works with this program of public assistance and he comes in daily contact with the rules and regulations of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. McCray is entirely correct. When the Federal Government provides assistance on any program the Federal Government writes the rules and regulations—make no mistake about that. As serious as that is, it is equally serious that those who are writing the rules and regulations generally do not have personal knowledge of how those rules and regulations are being applied at the grassroots level.

I want to quote, also, from three other paragraphs of his letter, which are as follows:

We doubt that you, as head of public assistance, know or realize what is going on as the grassroots level since you must rely on those under you for information and they are for the most part dedicated to the philosophy of larger bureaus for the sake of bureaucracy and their personal profit. No one objects to assistance for the needy, but beyond that point it becomes a curse to the recipients and will become an unbearable burden to the taxpayers.

I have been a member of the Democratic Party longer than Mr. Ribicoff and before President Kennedy was born, and I assure you that the present trend away from States Rights is not in keeping with earlier traditions. Neither do we believe that unnecessary welfare is politically smart. The votes of those who prefer to live on welfare and the votes of those who dispense welfare for the sake of personal greed have no political convictions or firm affiliations. They become a willing tool for unscrupulous politicians of both political parties.

I am not a crusader and will not annoy you with further letters. I have proven to myself that there is no means of communication through the maze of bureaucracy between the people at the grassroots, and the administrative heads of the Government.

God and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, Communist influence in the churches of America is discussed in a column by George Todt which appeared in the November 27, 1961, issue of the Los Angeles Herald Express—now the Herald Examiner. I would like to have the column printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and ask unanimous consent that this be done.

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION: GOD—AND COMMUNISM

"Religion, if in heavenly truths attired, need only to be seen to be admired."—Cowper, Expostulation.

Is it true that the churches in America are soft on communism? Or socialism? Or Marxism?

One sometimes hears statements that raise some honest doubts. But I think that, by and large, very few churches have wavered too far in the wrong direction.

Of course, any institution is liable to have some misguided members that it finds difficult to control.

The organization should not be held to account because of intemperate actions of certain of its least responsible members. Let's be fair.

THOSE WHO SAY

Not long ago I was asked to address the Temple City Ward of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints on the subject of American free enterprise and its remarkable benefits to our people. We also discussed the question of Red infiltration here.

At the conclusion of my remarks, my friend Bishop I. Verle Funk produced a document of which he was very justly proud. It outlined the militant position of the Mormons against communism as far back as a quarter of a century ago. I think it might serve as an exemplary model for any other church, too. Even in 1961. Here is what it said:

"First Presidency of Mormon Church Warns Members Against Red Menace—July 3, 1936."

MAN IS SUPREME

"With great regret we learn from credible sources, governmental and others, that a few church members are joining—directly or indirectly—the Communists and are taking part in their activities.

"The church does not interfere, and has no intention of trying to interfere, with the fullest and freest exercise of the political franchise of its members, under and within our Constitution which the Lord declared "I established * * * by the hands of wise men whom I raised up for this very purpose * * *."

"But communism is not a political party nor a political plan under the Constitution; it is a system of government that is the opposite of our constitutional Government, and it would be necessary to destroy our Government before communism could be set up in the United States.

"Since communism, established, would destroy our American constitutional Government—to support communism is treasonable to our free institutions, and no patriotic American citizen may become either a Communist or supporter of communism."

HAVE LOST THE WAY

"To our church members we say: Communism is not the united order, and bears only the most superficial resemblance thereto. Communism is based upon intolerance and force—the united order upon love and freedom of conscience and action. Communsim involves forceful despoliation and confiscation—the united order voluntary consecration and sacrifice.

"Communists cannot establish the united order, nor will communism bring it about. The united order will be established by the Lord in His own good time, and in accordance with the regular prescribed order of the church.

"It even reaches its hands into the sanctity of the family circle itself, disrupting the normal relationship of parent and child, all in a manner unknown and unsanctioned under the Constitutional guarantees under which we in America live."

FELL OFF THE BEAM

"Such interference would be contrary to the fundamental precepts of the Gospel and to the teachings and order of the church.

"Communism being thus hostile to loyal American citizenship and incompatible with true church membership—of necessity, no loyal American citizen and no faithful church member can be communist."

This remarkable document was signed a quarter of a century ago by President Heber J. Grant, J. Reuben Clark, Jr., and David O. McKay, who then constituted the Mormon first presidency.

While the Mormons are proud free enterprisers and fiercely anticommunistic, they are joined in such sentiments by millions of their fellow citizens. Here is a good example. Go, thou, and do likewise.

GOP Asserts New Vigor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, because of the general interest in the subject matter, I should like to include an article by Roscoe Drummond which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on March 14, 1962, entitled "GOP Asserts New Vigor":

GOP ASSERTS NEW VIGOR

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—How many voters are aware, do you think, that the labor-retraining bill, just approved by the House of Representatives, was drafted by the Republican minority, sponsored by Republican leaders, and its passage made possible by Republican votes?

Not many, I suspect. One reason is that the Republican-drafted bill was taken over quickly by the Democratic majority on the House Education and Labor Committee, was introduced on the floor of the House by a Democrat, Representative ELMER J. HOLLAND, of Pennsylvania, and promptly was proclaimed an administration measure for which the President is delighted to take credit.

It is true that the Republican Party in Congress does not take such initiative very frequently. Consequently it creates a negative image for itself and often leaves the impression that it either is opposed to nearly everything the administration proposes or is without a constructive alternative of its own.

The procuring cause of the Republican Party's difficulty in keeping the administration's cascade of legislative proposals under scrutiny and in achieving any sustained initiative itself is not visible on the surface. But the cause is there, and the Republicans in Congress are going to remain enfeebled and pretty much voiceless until something is done about it.

I refer to the inadequate, anemic, and usually poorly paid minority party representation on professional staffs of the policy-making and investigatory committees of the Senate and House.

This may seem like a routine housekeeping matter. It isn't. It goes to the very heart of the functioning of the congressional committees.

Of course the members of the House and Senate committees make the final decisions as to what they will recommend, what they will support, what they will put in legislation.

But the generating power behind the congressional committee is its professional staff—its experts, its legislative technicians, its scholars, researchers, and investigators. With them is the real initiative. They shape the reports which shape the decisions of the committees themselves. When the minority party is not provided with competent committee staffing, it is denied an essential instrument to do its job. It does not have the means to keep the majority party on its toes and to initiate alternative solutions to national problems.

How bad is the situation today? It hardly could be worse:

In the House the balance between the two parties is 3 to 2 Democratic. On the professional staffs of the House committees the balance is 14 to 1 Democratic.

On one of the most active and powerful House committees and professional staff is 24 to 1 Democratic.

An official Republican Policy Committee document discloses that on half the House committees the Republican Party has no professional staff whatsoever. The minority staff is zero on 10 out of 20 committees. These committees are Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, Interior and Insular Affairs, Internal and Foreign Commerce, Post Office and Civil Service, Science and Astronautics, Un-American Activities, and, most ironic of all, the House Administration Committee which is concerned with distribution of professional staff.

On the other committees the minority staff is so puny it cannot possibly do its work; with some committees handling many pieces of legislation, with numerous subcommittee hearings proceeding simultaneously, the minority staff cannot even keep track of what is going on.

The Democratic minority staffs were more equitably manned during the first 2 years of the Eisenhower administration when the Republicans were in control. The present imbalance began in 1955 and has been getting worse ever since.

Until last year the Republicans did not greatly feel this disadvantage because, with a Republican in the White House, it was possible for the minority party to use the experts in the executive departments.

Why have the Republicans allowed themselves to get maneuvered into such a disadvantageous position? It is by their own default plus a strong power play by the Democrats who alertly knew what they were doing even if many Republican Congressmen did not.

The fact is that the Republican leaderships in both the House and Senate have taken this deprivation of their minority staffing rights sitting on their hands.

Without a real willingness on the part of the Republican leadership to stand up and fight, the rank-and-file Republicans in Congress have felt themselves immobilized. And they have not done much to build fires under their own leaders.

But things are beginning to stir. Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, long a nearly lone fighter for better staffing, is beginning to win some recruits behind his crusade. Senator CARL T. CURTIS, of Nebraska, and KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York, made a recent attempt to get the Democrats to let the minority have 1 Republican professional to 10 Democrats. The Democrats would have none of that; they rallied instantly to defeat it on a straight party vote.

But the move to reform this staffing inequity is at last in motion, and it is going to gather strength.

America's First Food Concentrate—Nocake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Margo Cairns, the Corn Tassel Lady, whose untiring efforts in behalf of the corn tassel as our national floral emblem are becoming more appreciated every day, has provided me with another reason why corn has such distinguished historical significance.

I call the Members' attention to her dissertation on "Nocake" in which she presents further evidence that corn has been one of the mainstays of this country's development from the very beginning:

NOCAKE

The nourishing and strengthening qualities of maize or corn have been accepted by thoughtful people ever since the white man became acquainted with this American plant. The early explorers, fur traders, and scouts marveled at the endurance of the red man. Running swiftly over the trails, carrying heavy packs that would daunt a white man, or poling heavy laden canoes, the red man appeared tireless, yet he seemingly had no food supplies with him. It was some time before the white man learned the red man's secret—Nocake.

Undoubtedly the first American food concentrate was Nocake. Simple to prepare, easy to carry, always dependable, it was his dependence in the forests, on the trails, even on the warpath.

History tells us that the Pilgrims were saved from starvation during a period of famine by an allowance of five kernels of parched corn to each individual, their only food for a day, proving the nourishing qualities of corn.

The red man parched his corn in hot ashes, blew the ashes away, then ground and beat the parched corn into a fine powder. This he put into a leather bag which he carried like a knapsack on his back. Three spoonfuls a day was considered enough nourishment for a day.

"It was held to be the most nourishing food known and in the smallest and most condensed form. Both Indian and white men usually carried it in a pouch when they went on long journeys, and mixed it with snow in winter and water in summer—it was sweet, toothsome, and hearty. Roger Williams says a spoonful of this and water made him many a good meal" (Home Life in Colonial Days).

—ALICE MORSE EARLE.

S O S—Save Our Streams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, German brown trout weighing more than 25 pounds used to be taken in Logan Canyon in Utah. Never again. A portion of the Logan River has been ruined, as a great fishing stream, because of highway construction.

The March 1962, issue of American Forests, published by the American Forestry Association, tells what happened in an article by Frank A. Tinker entitled "The Battle for Logan Canyon."

Such irreparable loss of sport fishing resources would be avoided or minimized by passage of my bill, S. 2767, which would require the Secretary of Interior's approval of Federal-aid highway plans involving fish, wildlife, and recreation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert the article referred to in American Forests in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BATTLE FOR LOGAN CANYON

(By Frank A. Linker)

Must we have superhighways at the sacrifice of almost all other considerations? In some of the many areas where our huge road-building program is now well along, it may be that such sacrifice is required by the very geography. A disturbing question then faces everyone concerned.

Logan Canyon, a gorge which cuts through the Wasatch Range between Bear Lake and the central Utah Valley, has long been one of that State's prized scenic areas. A winding, two-lane macadam road allowed travelers, most of them recreation bound, to enjoy the towering canyon walls, the branching canopies overhead, and the shadowed Logan River which runs alongside. Unfortunately, the curving road did restrict speed; it took additional time to make the 40-mile trip through the impressive gorge.

The result was inevitable under today's rules. In 1959 the Utah State Highway Commission presented the region IV headquarters of the Forest Service with a request for approval of plans to reconstruct Highway 89 where it runs through the Cache National Forest in this canyon. The results of the commission's traffic survey of this road were offered as proof of the need for improving the highway to meet both present and future traffic requirements. With reservations and some misgivings, the Forest Service approved the plans for the lower 4.2 miles of this road.

Although it was recognized at the time that improvements to this highway would probably result in changes detrimental to the canyon and the river, the total impact was not fully appreciated until the first section was completed. In 1924 the largest German brown trout ever legally hooked, weighing over 25 pounds, had been taken from the Logan. Never again. Now, the stream's quiet pools had been ruthlessly, albeit unavoidably, eliminated. The channels of swift water which were left would preclude any return of such whoppers, or even minnows. Vegetation which had not only contributed to the scenic beauty of the stream but served as protective insect-producing cover for the fish had been 'dozed out in providing right-of-way.

Where the existing road had followed the meandering of the stream in order to avoid encroaching onto its banks, hugging the cliffs when necessary, the new highway was now as straight as the canyon terrain allowed. True, the rugged canyon walls were more visible, but this and the elimination of a few minutes' traveltime were the only real improvements in the road that members of the National Wildlife Federation, the Utah Fish and Game Department, and an aroused committee from the Utah State University could see. These organizations surveyed the damage and descended upon the Forest Service with their findings. Many of these supported the Service's worst fears.

While the already completed 4.2 miles of the highway had destroyed the few good pools along this lower section of the river, much of the stream here was already being diverted for irrigation and community purposes. The Logan had managed to operate three powerplants and irrigated some 18,000 acres of valley land in addition to providing refuge for record trout. Only the trout and the traveler had lost in the first round, but it was obvious now that the next section along the upper river would have to be protected from such drastic modifications.

Several other alarming illustrations of uncontrolled highway construction nearby were cited—Blacksmith's Forks and Daniels Canyon. The Forks, however, ran through private land for the most part, and Daniels Canyon was on an important east-west highway, so the Forest Service has not been faced there with such a delicate balance in values. The construction so altered the once fine trout streams in these canyons that Blacksmith's Forks declined from one of Utah's most productive waters to one of doubtful fishing value either now or in the future. Daniels Canyon is thought by experts to be completely eliminated as a fishing stream. Both have suffered extensive and obvious loss of scenic value.

As for the Logan, the Forest Service's own fish habitat survey had shown only a few large pools and somewhat more smaller ones along its length. These, formed by boulders, cliff outcroppings, and streambank vegetation, lay directly within the path of the proposed new construction. Any changes in the main stream, removal of brush, or an increased gradient with its high water velocity would cause shifts in the streambed and probably ruin natural channels and eddies.

Dr. C. J. D. Brown, a nationally recognized authority on trout waters, made a detailed study of the Logan in 1935 and reported, "* * * the most undesirable physical condition existing in the main Logan River from the point of view of fisheries is the almost complete absence of good pools. The Logan River has but one or two good pools per mile, while the Blacksmith's Fork stream has 40 to 50." Dr. Brown warned, "Shade and cover in the Logan River are generally good. In many sections, it is very dense and affords an excellent hideout for fish. Those plants along the banks and the brush falls in the water should be carefully guarded." The Forest Service believes this appraisal reflects present conditions as well—where the construction project has not laid its heavy hand.

But the first round of the battle of Logan Canyon was now already over and conservation people thought it had been lost by simple default.

Round two began in March of 1961, when representatives of the Forest Service met with those from Fish and Game, the Utah Highway Department, and the Bureau of Public Roads at the site of the next construction project—another 4.2 miles. Plans for this were discussed and changes were suggested to preserve as much of the natural setting as practicable. This proposed section and that which was to follow are the narrowest and most difficult parts of the canyon, but they also hold the greatest number of trout pools, vegetative cover, recreational areas, and just plain scenery of the whole 40 miles.

This round went to the conservationists when the Forest Service withheld its permit, and back to the drawing boards went the highway engineers. They revised plans to shift a 1,200-foot section of the roadway, to save the trees and brush screening the front of Guinavah Forest Camp, to install two culverts so a trout pool might be protected, add a highwater bypass to handle the excess volume of water the culverts might not carry, and to reduce riparian changes throughout the project by about 4,560 feet. But—and here's the rub—all this would increase the cost of that section by $100,000, to a total of $460,000.

When this same group met again in June, the highway department displayed these revised plans for approval and round three began. A close reading of the fine print on the new plans by the Forest Service and its allies has indicated that while these plans are good as far as they go, they do not provide the complete safeguards discussed in March. The Service believes these should include plans to avoid some 1,210 feet of channel construction which, as presently designed, would duplicate the damage done to the lower river. A single 10-foot setback suggested in one area would save more needed vegetation on the stream and eliminate 385 feet of channel encroachment. So

the battle has proceeded along every yard of the canyon.

Again, the cost of these additional changes insisted upon by the Forest Service was high—$126,925 more than the $460,000 already planned by the highway department. And this still left 8,400 feet of important riparian vegetation subject to loss from channel changes, including two major shifts involving construction of 900 feet of entirely new channel. To protect this area fully would cost an additional $325,000, or a grand total of $785,000 for the project. The Forest Service now realizes the impossibility of saving the whole section, but feels it has compromised as much as possible.

The highway department replies that charging taxpayers $35,000 a mile over its revised figures was expecting too much. Also, as the Service has pointed out, the section to follow will involve similar costly modifications. The inevitable impasse between cost and conservation has thus arrived.

Now, however, the Forest Service has proposed a method of arriving at a lower, more acceptable cost-per-mile figure. By planning the construction of the entire 40 miles of highway and averaging the cost, the more expensive sections would be balanced by those upper stretches where the canyon widens and can easily accommodate the new road.

Will this admitted accounting gimmick provide a way around the roadblock? Pressures are building both to halt and to hasten the construction of this high-speed highway. Economic groups in Logan hope to divert some of the Utah-Idaho traffic through their city with a consequent increase in consumers. Boating enthusiasts, normally on conservation's side, here want merely to travel the road as swiftly as possible to and from Bear Lake. Fishermen point out that they not only fish, but that their dollars are just as important, if not more so, as those of the occasional traveler who wants to trade their many hours of enjoyment for a few questionable minutes saved in travel. Other heretics have pointed out that the Logan Canyon Road does not really go anywhere important—why should it be given such priority over all other considerations?

Public Law 86-517 (the multiple use and sustained yield legislation enacted June 12, 1960) provides that both tangible and intangible values must be considered in the management of national forest lands, and this the Forest Service here has tried to do conscientiously. But the battle lines are neither simple nor clear; there is good faith and good argument on both sides. It is this situation which may arise time and again as our billion-dollar highway program develops.

It appears to some disgruntled citizens that the highway through Logan has been halted because neither agency will yield. However, both are still hopeful. At the present time the highway department is working on plans for the entire project without regard to preserving stream or vegetation, merely to arrive at a basic cost, while the Forest Service is devising ways of preserving as much as possible and still provide a good road. When both these estimates are added together and the cost-per-mile refigured, it is possible—and even mandatory—that some compromise can be reached. Until then, hurrying motorists who have sped through the canyon's lower, improved road have saved about a minute. However, if the wider road is not extended, that which has been finished remains a waste of money.

The fact is that highway engineers have done their job well, and perhaps far too well. Their assignment until now has been to devise roads that are efficient, safe thoroughfares at minimum cost to taxpayers. But somewhere along the line their hard logic may break down, or have to give way to softer, more pervasive argument. For instance, are straighter roads, which encourage higher speeds, safer in all instances? Statistics prove otherwise. Does a road such as this through Logan Canyon have the same purpose as that through a Chicago suburb? Are the minutes saved in transport equal to the enjoyment lost by their construction?

Each individual, obviously, must answer such questions for himself, and probably no two answers will be alike. A recent report by Utah State University which emphasizes the need to plan and finance resource protection as an integral part of highway construction projects indicates that Logan's example will not be overlooked in the future. Such protection for intangibles will undoubtedly add to highway costs, but it may save a different wealth which in most cases can neither be counted in dollars nor replaced when once destroyed. It is this difficult balance between real and unseen values, between present costs and future returns, which must be struck. Logan Canyon has shown how this old and thus far irreconcilable problem has reached into an increasingly important area. Whatever compromise is reached will certainly not be satisfactory to every faction. But just as certainly, it will affect everyone who drives, whether his purpose is to go someplace else or to enjoy the going.

Recreation Development at the Allegheny River Reservoir and the U.S. Forest Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, in commenting on a recent resolution adopted by the Pennsylvania Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs, I released the following statement:

I have watched with much interest the gradual development of plans for the Allegheny Reservoir. As this project takes on more definite form, many collateral influences and benefits become a matter of deep concern to the public. Opportunities for outdoor recreation development are especially promising. It is doubtful if any section of the country has a greater public interest in hunting, fishing, and other forms of outdoor recreation. We have several public agencies that possess high competence in the field of recreation development. Each has its major areas of expertness.

In the case of the upper Allegheny region, the maximum returns from the valuable forest lands, now enhanced by a water impoundment of great significance, will require integration of many uses if the public interest is to be best served. The agency with specific competence in this field is the Forest Service.

I have observed the multiple use management program of the Allegheny National Forest for many years. Under this program, timber resources are supplying raw material for local industry. Thinning and weeding operations carried on in the forest provide pulpwood for nearby mills. Under this pattern of wise use, wildlife production is stimulated to provide the maximum opportunity for thousands of sportsmen who flock to this area each fall for healthful outdoor recreation. The dollar value of this use to the local economy is important. Other forms of outdoor recreation—camping, picnicking, swimming—have been developed on the national forest. Each of these uses is a facet of a planned area development.

The Allegheny National Forest is already set up for business. It has long-range plans for developing the upper Allegheny region. It has a staff of skilled people on the job. It is financed to move ahead promptly, and indeed it has already started to work on lands under its control. While other agencies are equipped to take on certain portions of the recreation development program, none is engaged in the multiple-use operation which characterizes the national forest. Any other approach would require setting up new headquarters and new administrative staffs, involving depulication. I hope the air will be cleared in the near future and the Allegheny National Forest can move ahead with its plans for full development of the shoreline resources associated with the Allegheny Reservoir.

Wages and Foreign Trade—Productivity, Employment, and Industrial Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, a recent announcement from the White House stated that the President has appointed a committee of experts to direct a massive drive in support of the new trade bill, H.R. 9900. Hearings have been going on for several weeks before the Ways and Means Committee. Spokesmen for the proposal have been numerous. News columns and TV and radio channels have featured their testimony.

As I see it, when a controversial issue of this kind comes before the Congress it is most important that both sides of the question be fully developed and publicized. Then the public is better able to understand and decide the issue on its merits.

That is particularly true in this instance because the question of trade has become very complicated. It is enmeshed with our problem of growth, employment, productivity, et cetera, in a very vital way. It has also been injected into our foreign relations. Perhaps because of the latter relationship the trend has been to turn the whole subject over to the President and the State Department. This overlooks completely the stake of the Congress in the regulation of our foreign commerce and the making of the tariff. Under the Constitution both of these functions are vested exclusively in the Congress.

Everyone is or should be in favor of stimulating our foreign trade. This is highly essential. The question is how to accomplish this objective to our best advantage. In our attempt to resolve this complicated issue, we need to draw upon the knowledge of all who have studied the subject.

I have here an analysis of wage and foreign trade that goes below the surface of our cliches and shows a relation-

ship between various factors that need a great deal of study before we pass any new trade legislation. This analysis was made by O. R. Strackbein, a constituent of mine, who has spent years in this field.

In past years, Mr. Strackbein spent 5 years in the field of management engineering and prior to that was for several years an economist for national unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. He therefore is in a position to make a competent analysis of the subject to which he has dedicated himself. He holds the degree of master of business administration from the University of Texas. He is chairman of the Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I offer his analysis for inclusion in the RECORD:

WAGES AND FOREIGN TRADE PRODUCTIVITY, EMPLOYMENT, AND INDUSTRIAL GROWTH

The subject of American wages and their effects on foreign trade has come into sharp focus in the past 2 or 3 years. Principal attention has centered on the negative effects of high wages on our exports. Too often this concern has been quite narrow, as will become apparent when certain neglected aspects of our wages system are considered.

More attention has been given to the relative wage level than to other aspects of the competitive position of this country vis-a-vis the rapid industrial developments in other parts of the world and their meaning to us.

However, important as the level of American wages is, it must be related to other aspects of our economy if we are to gain a better understanding of the American competitive position. The wage level must be related, for example, to rising productivity, expansion, and growth of industry not only elsewhere but also in this country. The relation of rising productivity and growth to employment and unemployment must also be established. This in turn requires an inquiry into the character of consumer demand, that is, its elasticity or inelasticity, its response to new products and its behavior toward staple products and whether or how soon saturation points of consumption are reached.

The high American level of wages did not arise from nowhere and for no reason. Unquestionably it was and is closely related to high productivity. Otherwise it could not endure.

Why high productivity became an American innovation in view of the rise of the industrial revolution elsewhere, particularly in England, is something of a mystery. The vision that underlay the miracle is usually attributed to Henry Ford and his advisers. There may, of course, have been a hidden and unsung hero somewhere else.

The concept was one of opening a mass market so that large-scale production could lead to low cost per unit of output. The question undoubtedly arose which came first, the low cost or the mass production. Only a test could provide the answer. The Ford Co. offered a motor vehicle at a low price, probably at a low-profit margin. If the demand responded, the mass production could follow. That was probably how, in a somewhat unpremeditated way, the golden key was found.

Of course, it must also at some point have occurred to the promoters that consumer demand was one thing but effective, money-backed demand something else. The vision of an indefinitely expanding consumer purchasing power was born; it was recognized, perhaps overzealously, and it led far afield. Ford boldly announced the $5-a-day wage. This action completed the trinity on which the American economy was thenceforward to be based and to grow. That there was much else goes without saying, such as free enterprise, vigor, competition, integrity, good government, and so forth, but even with these, which were already present, little would have happened without the added vision.

The United States became the leading industrial nation of the world. Mass production, based on a machine technology; prices low enough to tap the mass market; wages high enough to assure a purchasing power willing and strong enough to buy the mass output; and taxes equitable enough to draw out incentive: that was the system.

After spilling over our own borders, instead of accepting domestic market saturation where it was encountered and succumbing to it, American mass producers went afield and penetrated waiting foreign markets. In large part this was possible despite our higher wages precisely because of our higher productivity per man-hour, made possible by machinery.

We became the world's great exporters of automobiles, steel, petroleum, electrical equipment, office machinery, industrial equipment, cameras, packinghouse products, sewing machines, and much else that we manufactured in superabundance and at relatively low cost.

The world was almost our exclusive market for mass-produced products until nearly 10 years after World War II. Then, as surely as our system blossomed and prospered before, we were confronted with a new situation that should bring with it the realization that the economic and industrial world has changed competitively in several vital respects that we will ignore at our peril.

Since World War II we exported not only our goods but our technology, together with much modern machinery and equipment to give it body. The other industrial countries, principally Western Europe and Japan, began to accept our physical production system with enthusiasm but only one-half of the vision that built it. The concept of mass production and an enlarged market at home or abroad came to them in clear outlines and they "bought" it.

A number of European countries have taken steps to enlarge their markets severalfold by moving toward custom unions. One is already well launched (the EEC) and gives every evidence of success at the beginning of the second of its three stages. If they do succeed their need to export to the outside world will not for some years be as pressing as it was in the past. There will be greater self-sufficiency in Europe itself.

Japan having a considerable home market has nevertheless a deficiency in food and other products and, therefore, lacking the possibility of combining with contiguous territory for a common market, has concentrated on exportation. In this way her industry can possibly achieve a mass market and the basis for mass production at low wages.

One-half of the American vision has thus succeeded in firing the European and Japanese imaginations. But where is the equivalent of the $5-a-day wage or second half of the vision? Unless this is brought abreast of the remainder of the vision the whole enterprise will eventually collapse, but not before it breaks down the American industrial system, unless preventive steps are taken meantime. The oversea outlet that represented the great hope of further expansion of the market for many of our industries for which the market in this country had become saturated will vanish by falling into the hands of our competitors, for they will have the lower costs generated by mass production without the relatively greater wage rises that would equalize their competitive standing with us.

Even the feverish building of other foreign markets for our goods through the process of developing the underdeveloped nations through foreign aid will hardly accomplish its mission. The other older industrial countries rather than we will likely reap the principal benefits of these new markets if they are developed.

Meantime we are learning something else: There is no indefinite expansibility of demand for certain products. Even foreign markets for some products no less than our home market may become saturated.

We have operated quite blindly under the notion that the success of the Ford Motor Co. could be duplicated in all other products, and this is not true at all.

The time is here when we as a Nation must make a thorough examination of our position. Otherwise we will expend our energies churning about in a fog from which there is no egress.

We must study the spectrum of products that are offered to the consumers by our industries and reach conclusions about the effects of increasing productivity and expansion on consumer demand and on employment. We must determine the relative vulnerability of our products to imports. This will differ from product to product, depending on expansibility of the market. We must learn more about the market characteristics of a vast variety of goods. Otherwise we will misspend our resources and technological efforts. We will wear ourselves out with dry runs and trying to pump life into dead horses.

If the demand for a product is inelastic, that is, will not increase perceptibly if the price declines; or if the demand is quite stationary, as when the market is already saturated, so that it responds only to population increase; or if per capita consumption actually declines as is not uncommon—under all these circumstances, every unit that is imported will represent a subtraction from the market that otherwise would be supplied by domestic manufacturers or producers.

This will mean a proportionate subtraction from employment in this country, because imports create little employment. Distribution of imports is only equivalent in point of employment to distribution of domestically produced goods; and, of course, there is no domestic employment in the manufacturing of finished imported products.

The national experience in agriculture should teach us much, both with respect to the effects of a rapidly rising productivity and its capacity under certain conditions to do three things effectively and simultaneously: (1) create labor displacement on a vast scale, (2) accumulate huge and almost immovable surpluses, and (3) harden our dependence on increasingly impenetrable foreign markets, except at the price of more and more subsidization of our exports, and rising tax burdens.

It is imperative that we become better acquainted with the direction that capital investment should take: should it go, for example, into dentifrices or wheat acreage; into fertilizers, automobiles or clothing; or into schools, housing, appliances, gadgets or what not? The question is not only where the investment will be more productive but more productive of what? Of goods or of unemployment, of surpluses or job-creating activities, etc.?

How make the determination? Here and there we will be confronted with blind alleys. The demand for some products is as inelastic as a conservative Dutchman; and we should learn what items these are. Other items may face a more elastic demand. With respect to some products the market may already be saturated; with others not. We may need new products to open new industries and give rise to new services. Can these be ordered or scheduled? What will they be? How are they found?

Let us take a glance at several items of popular consumption in this country:

Wheat flour consumption per capita has fallen greatly. Fifty years ago it was 214 pounds per capita. By 1940 it was down to 155 pounds and then declined on to 118 pounds in 1960.

Egg consumption per capita declined 16.4 percent from 1950 to 1960.

Potato consumption only fell from 106 pounds per capita in 1950 to 103 pounds in 1960; but in 1910 it was 198 pounds.

Fish consumption was at the same per capita level of 10.6 pounds in 1960 as in 1940, after rising to 11.6 pounds in 1950.

Pork consumption has remained remarkably steady, ranging between 60 and 70 pounds per capita since 1910, except 1940 when it rose to 73.5 pounds. In 1960 it was 64.6 pounds.

Shelled peanuts stood at 5.0 pounds per capita in 1940. In 1960 consumption was down to 4.6 pounds.

Coffee consumption has risen from 15.5 pounds per capita in 1940 to 16.1 pounds in 1960.

Sugar consumption has been remarkably steady, ranging between 95.7 pounds in 1940 to 100.8 pounds in 1950 and back to 98.0 pounds in 1960.—(Source: Statistical Abstract of the United States.)

With respect to other foods, per capita consumption has shifted for obvious reasons. Whereas consumption of fluid milk and cream has remained quite steady, moving from 331 pounds per capita in 1940 to 349 pounds in 1950 and back to 340 pounds in 1960, the consumption of condensed and evaporated milk has fallen sharply; that is, from 19 and 20 pounds (a small quantity in relation to fluid milk) in 1940 and 1950 to 13.6 pounds in 1960.

Butter and margarine consumption shifted sharply, with margarine up and butter down, but the two combined have come down from 19.4 pounds in 1940 to 17.4 pounds in 1960.

Fresh fruits have declined from 142 pounds in 1940 to 99 pounds in 1960, but canned and frozen fruits and juices increased from 33.6 pounds in 1940 to 48.1 pounds in 1960.

Fresh vegetables and melons declined from 143.4 pounds in 1940 to 126.8 pounds in 1960; but the canned and frozen variety rose from 35 pounds to 54.3 pounds, thus doing a little more than offsetting the decline in the fresh variety.

Meat consumption increased appreciably because of the rise in beef consumption. This went from 54.9 pounds in 1940 to 85.8 pounds in 1960, and may be attributed to higher consumer income.

Chicken and turkey consumption has also increased but both are still small compared with beef and pork.

OBSERVATION

Food consumption is limited by biological need; and in a country that is relatively well fed no great increase in per capita consumption need be anticipated. An increase in one direction will usually be at the expense of some other food. A move from a "poor man's diet" may represent principally a shift from one food to another instead of a marked increase in the total. A people that is largely sedentary will not consume as much food per capita as one that engages more extensively in physical labor.

The inelasticity of demand for food products is of great importance both to employment and national production goals because food products represent nearly a third of the family budget.

Seventy-five Minutes—"Significant * * * Reassuring"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. BLAINE PETERSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, a prominent editor had a 75-minute meeting last week which he pronounced "significant * * * reassuring" to a "conservative-minded individual" like myself. The editor was Louis B. Seltzer, of the Cleveland Press and News, a Scripps-Howard newspaper. I regard the report he wrote of that meeting as an unusually interesting and straightforward account and believe it deserves a place in the RECORD both on its intrinsic merit and also to bring it to the attention to our countrymen who for various reasons may not have had the opportunity to read it when it was originally published late in March.

[From the Washington Daily News, Mar. 29, 1962]

AN APPRAISAL OF AN OLDER PRESIDENT—A SHARP, REMARKABLE MAN

(By Louis B. Seltzer)

He should have looked worn and tired. It was the end of a typically grueling day. There had been a continuous procession of visitors, both international and American. There were voluminous reports and documents, and many conferences with congressional leaders over hotly contested legislative measures.

And then the day had been preceded by a long jet trip from California. He had arrived at the White House from a nearby landing field only a short time after daybreak. The California weekend was hectic even for a President—marked by talking before 90,000 people in the Berkeley Stadium.

For a few moments I waited outside the Presidential "living room." A Brazilian delegation was with the President, and its members were flying back immediately to their important South American land. I occupied my time looking at walls lined on either side by a gallery of American Indian paintings, obviously old, and original, and dramatic. I waited only a short time.

GUESTS STEP OUT

The door opened. The Brazilian guests stepped out. The President followed. He saw me, and brought the Brazilian visitors over. It is tacitly understood that you do not specifically quote the President, or for that matter, disclose the substance of any informal conversation with him. In this instance I am sure the President wouldn't mind. He said:

"Do you know, Mr. Seltzer, that half of the population of Brazil is 18 years of age or under. Do you know, also, that the average age expectancy is not much beyond the middle forties?"

This information obviously disturbed the President. It did something else. It carried with it the overtones of what an even larger part of the world confronts—a similarly large teenage population because of an astonishingly brief life expectancy on this earth, including the areas the First Lady recently visited.

Now the Brazilians were gone. Now I preceded the President, at his request, into his living quarters. He took his place in a rocking chair. (He has another in his office downstairs, in which once I rocked for a moment in serene peace.)

BRONZED AND ALERT

Now I looked at him. He was bronzed. His eyes were alert and restless. His hair is flecked with gray. His body is trim and slender. He appears to have no waistline whatever. Not an ounce of surplus weight. Tall, athletic, in apparent perfect health, in spite of an occasional recurrence of back trouble traceable to his war days.

We talked for an hour and 15 minutes. Our conversation ranged over many matters. He was the questioner. He made one small-sized cigar do for that period.

There is no doubt whatever that the heavy responsibilities of his office have aged him. The ultimate destiny—the final decision—the historic weight resting on the man who sits in the White House chair would do that to any man—whatever his age, whatever his temperament, whatever his inner resources.

DETERMINED

And yet the President looks, in spite of nuclear testing, and disarmament, and internal problems, and imminent international emergencies, much as he has always looked—youthful, trim, determined. His sharp, incisive, restive, questioning mind moves from one significant situation or subject to another—constantly searching for fragments of information, for additional breadth and understanding of whatever stretches before him in the future.

He appears now to have hit his stride. He seems sure of himself. He knows where he wants to go—has decided what direction to take. He is a determined man. He is a strategist. He knows the American political scene—and has rapidly informed himself about the international political, military, and economic scene.

It was an interesting, significant, and a reassuring hour and a quarter with a most remarkable young man—a man on whom much destiny rides between now and the end of his first term. And it was even reassuring to a conservative-minded individual like myself.

Revenue Potentials of a National Lottery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the natural gambling spirit of the American people was quite evident last week in New York when the horseracing season opened.

In the first week of parimutuel betting, the normal human urge to gamble drove almost 356,000 persons through the gates of Aqueduct in the daytime and Roosevelt at night to bet over $28½ million.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, this kind of betting was all proper and legal. But the question is where and with whom have these people placed their bets since last November when the tracks closed? I do not believe anyone is so naive as to

believe that they stayed at home waiting for the tracks to reopen. No, these people and millions of others throughout the United States have helped to make gambling a $50 billion industry because of our persistent refusal to recognize and capitalize on this deeply ingrained desire to gamble.

Mr. Speaker, it should be obvious by now that the gambling spirit of our people cannot be dampened nor eradicated. They will bet even if they have to do so illegally. We can't stop them anymore than we were able to prevent people from drinking during the prohibition era.

A national lottery will give all of the American people an opportunity to satisfy this gambling urge legally and, at the same time, pump into the coffers of our Government over $10 billion a year in additional revenue.

How long are we going to be stubborn? How long are we going to be hypocritical about this gambling issue? How long are we going to keep our eyes closed to the tremendous revenue potentials of a national lottery which can help to cut taxes and reduce our national debt.

The Wrong Trade Battle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, and the two letters to which it refers, appeared in the Wall Street Journal of March 29.

While all the protagonists but one are freetraders, they all agree that we must first put our own house in order before trying to compete with the members of the Common Market, who have already done this very thing.

Of course, after seeing the amazing displays of fiscal irresponsibility enacted into law by the present Congress, we cannot be too sanguine as to the future. There is certainly no new frontier in the Keynes theory of economics which is now quite old and very worn out.

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK—THE WRONG TRADE BATTLE

This morning we publish two letters expressing views which have been pretty much drowned out by the barrage laid down for the administration's tariff bill. Both of them ought to be heard.

We do not, of course, share all the views of Mr. Bruce Simpson. Essentially he is making a protectionist argument; it seems clear from his letter that he thinks tariffs can make us more prosperous by keeping out foreign goods, and he prefers them higher rather than lower.

Nonetheless, Mr. Simpson raises some pointed questions about the Common Market, which in Washington's habitual fashion is being overvalued and oversold beyond its merits and promises, both of which are great. What he has to say about the unprecedented Presidential power in this bill is quite appropriate. And he is right in warning against the easy notion that we are really going to solve our balance-of-payments problems by just tinkering with our tariffs.

It is to this point that Dr. Boarman of Bucknell particularly addresses himself in his letter. Dr. Boarman, like ourselves, believes in the virtues of free trade. He knows that a true lowering of trade barriers is a stimulus to growth and prosperity, and therefore to the American advantage.

But Mr. Boarman is reminding us that tariffs are but one among many barriers, and that even all the tangible barriers together—including direct controls—are not the real obstacle. Therefore, merely lowering the tariff barriers might be catastrophic.

A tariff simply raises a price differential between a foreign product and a domestic one. It is therefore a barrier that can be leaped if the cost of the American product is so high as to offset the price differential. This isn't so with direct controls. What, then, is the gain for freer trade when a tariff is eliminated entirely and replaced with a rigid import quota?

Worse: What is the gain for anything, free trade or American prosperity, to remove all of the nominal barriers such as tariffs or quotas if there confronts American producers an even greater barrier to selling competitively against foreign producers? No barrier is so insurmountable for American industry as a cost of production forced high by domestic monetary and labor policies.

This being so, those who complain that a sudden lowering of tariffs will cause an injurious inflow of foreign goods, with painful pressure on our short-term balance of payments, have a point not to be dismissed. They have reason, too, to question whether the vaunted increase in American exports would actually take place even if by some miracle the Common Market lowered all its tariffs by a like amount.

Producers in an economy still under inflationary pressure will not find it easy to compete with producers in countries, such as most of Europe today, where inflation has been halted. A tariff is at most but one factor in the total cost of a product delivered to a customer.

It is not difficult to see what would happen in practice from a deep reduction in general U.S. tariffs if our inflationary domestic policies remain unchanged. Tariffs might be reduced, but the political pressure from the resultant upheaval would give birth to direct controls—temporarily, of course, and as relief measures. If you doubt this, look at what has actually happened in the case of textiles.

If anyone supposes this to be an argument for protectionism, he is quite mistaken. To retain protectionist policies in the hope they will let us safely continue domestic inflationary policies is the worst sort of illusion. To do so would steadily widen the gulf between the United States and the rest of the industrialized Western World. We would daily have more difficulty in resisting the pressures of cheaper foreign products, more difficulty in selling U.S. made products abroad. All our problems, including those of our balance of payments, would be compounded.

This country has got to move toward freer trade, for the simple reason that in its own interests it cannot do otherwise. But the crux of the matter is not tariffs. What is imperative is that we get our own house in order, our labor policies, our fiscal policies, our monetary policies. If we don't do that then the battle will, as Dr. Boarman says, have been fought upon the wrong field.

TARIFFS AND TRADE—TWO READERS TAKE ISSUE WITH THE PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM

THE ISSUE ISN'T TARIFFS

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

For an economist who, with the majority of his colleagues, has year in and year out preached the doctrine of free trade, patiently explained the theory of comparative advantage, and exposed the fallacies of the protectionists, it is a peculiarly ungrateful task to have to say nay to the President's proposals for tariff reform. And yet it is urgently necessary that this be said before, in the general euphoria surrounding this venture, we are led to take a step which could end in national disaster.

Let it be said at the outset that tariff reduction is good, and for all those excellent reasons set forth in innumerable textbooks. But tariff reduction is at present only one of the adjustments the United States needs to make if it is to survive, economically, in changed world surroundings.

Far more important than tariff reform is reform of our internal economy, away from the collectivist-inflationary policies of the Keynesian orthodoxy and back to the principles of a genuinely competitive market economy, to fiscal and monetary discipline in the public and private sectors.

It is one of the ironies of history that the United States, which reached the zenith of its economic power without benefit of Keynesianism, should be clinging doggedly in its hour of distress to economic shibboleths which were the ruination of our neighbors in Europe and which they have long since abandoned. Unless we too abandon these stale and unprofitable doctrines we cannot meet the serious economic challenge which these neighbors—in the Common Market and out of it—are now presenting to us.

There is as yet, unfortunately, little evidence that U.S. policymakers have awakened to the fact that the United States is no longer a free agent in the international economy; that it is no longer able to do what it wants internally, letting the world take the hindmost.

At bottom, the problem facing the Nation is not whether the movement for tariff reform (good in itself) will succeed, but whether domestic inflationary pressures—created by perpetually rising wages and Federal deficits—will be reduced or, optimally, eliminated altogether. If such pressures are not contained, excess demand at home (which is the initial form inflation takes) may be expected to consume exportable resources, thus slowing exports, and to suck in larger quantities of imports. Reduction of tariffs under such circumstances will merely have the effect of accelerating these unfavorable movements in the trade balance.

But let the protectionists, those manipulators of the power of Government for selfish advantage, not take comfort in these observations. Only about 30 percent ($5 billion worth) of U.S. imports are directly competitive with American-produced goods. Consequently, the damage to American industry and to American job opportunities from marked increases in imports may not be as severe overall as is sometimes feared (though it is doubtless true that import-caused dislocations in specific industries and in individual firms could be considerable). There can be little doubt, in any case, of the ultimate value of subjecting domestic industry to the fresh winds of foreign competition. Economic stagnation breeds under the mantle of protectionism.

While it is likely, though not certain, that we shall be able to take the long-run structural consequences of increased imports in stride, this is definitely not the case with respect to the short-run balance of payments effects of increased imports. It is these effects which demand attention as never before.

Now it is argued that against the possible structural dislocations (unemployment) and the worsening of the balance of payments deficit which increased imports would bring about, must be set the presumed rise in exports which the lowering of other countries' tariffs (under a system of mutually

negotiated tariff reductions) would induce. But it is precisely here that we find the rub: Will the mere lowering of other countries' tariffs bring about an increase in U.S. exports? Or are there other factors—domestic inflationary pressures, to name one—which would hold back U.S. export growth?

No responsible economist has ever argued for the abolition of all tariffs overnight since the ensuing short-run dislocations in patterns of consumption, production, and employment could send the economy into a severe tailspin, internally. Moreover, in the present conjuncture, such action could bankrupt us externally as well. But it is the inflationists in our midst and the growth-at-any-cost advocates who make the laudable venture in even gradual tariff reduction so risky.

The issue is not tariff reform or no tariff reform. It is whether we should have tariff reform with, or tariff reform without internal fiscal, monetary, and economic reforms. The American people need to be alerted to the administration's deceitful attempt to befuddle the issues in noble rhetoric; to have it believed that tariffs can be lowered (with impunity) while at the same time the Nation continues its present inflationary course—Federal budget deficits and the coddling of labor bosses—unaltered. The one word which seems not to be present in the vocabulary of the New Frontier is "priorities." Everything is demanded, and promised, at once from a landing on the moon, medicare for the aged, Federal aid for the colleges, foreign aid for India, shorter workweeks with higher pay, more subsidies for everybody.

According to the sophisticated reasoning of some, unless we Americans join the Common Market, we shall perish economically. Join it, by lowering our tariffs, and we shall be saved. This is not true. None of the nations now members of the Common Market were made economically virtuous by reason of their membership in that economic entity. They were virtuous, or returned to virtue (witness the case of France), prior to and as a condition of such membership. Nor can the United States expect to succeed, inside or outside of the Common Market, unless it mends its domestic ways.

The battle for tariff reform is the wrong battle being fought on the wrong battlefield.

PATRICK M. BOARMAN,
Associate Professor of Economics,
Bucknell University.

A BUSINESS VIEWS TARIFFS

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

The lack of constructive argument on the proposed Kennedy tariff bill has anyone with a real acquaintance of our trading conditions abroad aghast at the naivete with which this measure has been accepted.

My claim to speak is based on nearly 30 years of business activity all over the world—particularly in Europe. I have just returned from another month in Europe, where I made a particular effort to inquire into the European Common Market and its effect on us.

First, we are being fed the theory—as a fact—that the European Common Market is a success, and that we better get in now while we can. This is simply not true.

Trade barriers are still up between the members of the European Common Market and will not be eliminated for another 5 years, if then. The elimination is slow, step by slow step; already, many exceptions are being acted on which will result, in my opinion, in never bringing about a pure customs union.

Our own legislation, although supposed to span a period of 5 years, gives President Kennedy's Tariff Commission acceleration power—if they want it. We could very well, under the hazy idea of the importance of immediacy, go out ahead of the Common Market and cause the destruction of our protection. Furthermore, the European Common Market is at present a fairly well balanced unit with Germany, France, and Belgium supplying industrial products, while Luxembourg, Italy, and Holland supply agricultural. No one can forecast what will happen when England with her industrial potential begins to compete industrially, or when Norway and Sweden compete agriculturally. In a word, the European Common Market is at present in a state of flux and will be for some time, yet we are being importuned to take out at least a partial partnership in this unknown quantity.

Second, the political implications of our partial or, some day, full partnership with Europe have never been brought out, presumably because it is felt better tactics to let that happen gradually.

However, it is absolutely clear in Europe that political overtones are already acted upon. Some of these ideas are socialistic in the extreme, and if America were either a part or full partner, and that is the direction, it would ultimately cause a loss of a great part of our sovereignty.

For example, European Common Market officials are now proposing that labor fringe benefits be averaged up to the level of the most advanced member, on the basis that it would give those countries without such benefits an unfair economic advantage. America might, therefore, some day be in a position where, in order to hold a market within this zone, we could be forced to surrender certain rights of choice simply because, unless we did, we could be considered in unfair competition. We might have to give up economic advantages on which we depend.

Third, the effect of tariff cuts in the United States is much too quickly and vaguely put aside.

Considerable credibility is being given to the fact that labor rates in the European Common Market will come up to meet ours. This is simply not true. In our company we employ skilled mechanical engineers and draftsmen at an average rate of $700 a month. They are the best in our industry, and probably in the world, but last month in Europe I checked the rates on these men's opposite numbers in Switzerland, Germany, France, and England, and the rate was never over $200 a month.

Even assuming a 100-percent increase in efficiency for the Americans, that still means we are nearly 100 percent over the European cost in this field. How can we hope to compete in Europe with this disadvantage, particularly with mass-produced products where labor is unskilled?

We have had tariffs for a long time. They are part of our calculations as an economic fact, and even if wrong, cannot be quickly altered without considerable adjustment. We have had the Reciprocal Trade Act since Roosevelt's time and generally it has allowed for an orderly adjustment of these matters.

This act already permits our Government to negotiate with others and to make arrangements with due hearings to interested parties, but it does in addition one thing that Mr. Kennedy's new bill proposes to change. It allows Congress to have some control of the procedure. In the new legislation, under the guise of the requirement for more efficient negotiation with the European Common Market, the new Tariff Commission will report to Congress. This means centralization of control in the Executive over tariffs and a surrender to the Executive of the power of Congress.

Section 8 of the Constitution gives to Congress, and only to Congress, the right to impose duties and to regulate commerce with foreign nations. James Monroe, who was responsible for this clause, named it as the most important in the Constitution, because it gave to Congress, the direct representative of the people, the power to adjust inequities.

I am horrified at the lack of thought given to this subject. It seems to me every American should ask himself what this would mean to him personally.

Why, for example, when our favorable balance of trade of $5 billion is eaten up by foreign aid and spending abroad, do we use this solution for attempting to cure our excessive foreign-aid commitments?

Why should we not wait until the European Common Market becomes successful before we start tearing up our own system? We certainly can negotiate in 3 or 4 years as well as today.

What political implications are involved for us in the future, when we may have to follow our economic commitments which have been made in Europe?

Finally, does anyone really believe that increased imports of textiles from Belgium, electronic equipment from France, electrical components from Holland, machinery from Germany and clothing from Italy at lower prices than American products, are really going to solve our problems?

BRUCE L. SIMPSON,
President,
National Engineering Co.

Viewing the 2d Session of the 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, many partisan commentaries have been published in the past few weeks on the assets and liabilities of the 2d session of the 87th Congress. For an intelligent and accurate viewpoint of the conduct and progress of this session, I submit the following column by William S. White which has appeared in the Washington Evening Star of Wednesday, March 21, 1962.

DOING THE NECESSARY THINGS WELL—HIGH RECORD IS PREDICTED FOR CONGRESS IN QUALITY AND PRUDENCE OF ACTIONS

(By William S. White)

This is going to be a Congress that did a few superlatively big things superlatively well—these things and very little else.

If weighed up for quality, for prudence, and for a sense of world responsibility, its record will come out high. If weighed up for mere quantity production, for breathless innovations at home, for reformist domestic legislation, its record will come out low.

It will be a "do-nothing" Congress only to those who want many dubious things done in a great hurry and hurrah. And, oddly enough, for a congressional election year, it will be one of the least partisan Congresses in memory. On the compelling issues, the minority Republicans will be about as decisive as the Democrats.

All these forecasts can now be made with confidence, even though 5 or 6 months may well lie between now and congressional adjournment.

For the pattern of performance is already pretty well set. The central motive among the moderate-minded politicians who run the show in both parties is simply to do what clearly must be done in this dangerous world. There is no intention to become in-

volved in a great many other things simply because some people, including some of President Kennedy's more academically liberal advisers, think they ought to be done.

In the category of must are the President's foreign military-economic aid and world trade programs. Foreign aid will be approved in sound form. And Mr. Kennedy's request for unexampled power to cut tariffs, to enable this Nation to deal realistically with the vast lower tariff trading rising in Europe among the Common Market nations, is in unexpectedly good shape.

It is now possible to predict that he will get a big chunk of the authority he has asked here. (It is plain, too, that the legitimate problems of those industries which are abnormally vulnerable to foreign competition will get a fair hearing—and also some direct help by way of reasonable subsidies, however described.)

It is also possible to predict that the Pandora's Box of across-the-board Federal aid to lower school education will not really be opened at all. There will be more Federal assistance to higher education. But this will be about the end of it. Too many complications lie in wait for the broader plan of putting Federal aid down into grade school level. The greatest of these is the infinitely complex question of Federal aid to church schools.

Would it be constitutional? Nobody knows for sure. So there is a compelling urge among the politicians to skip the issue, at least for now, in the hope that the Supreme Court will somehow soon give some guidance—and also take on a lot of the responsibility—in a field especially difficult and risky in political and human terms.

Medical care for the old people? Possibly—just possibly—in some form. Generally, however, major social welfare legislation of all sorts is out of the window.

In short, this Congress is being run by highly responsible men, in both parties, to strengthen this country to survive in the world around us. It is not being run to make vast and debatable legislative reforms within this country. Such reforms in ordinary times might or might not be desirable. In a time such as this they are inopportune and irrelevant.

If Congress does nothing more than to approve the twin and indispensable tools of the cold war—foreign aid and foreign trade—it can go home with a job well done. And with these acts alone the President himself, will be no loser. It is, as in baseball, not the number of piddling scratch hits that counts. It is the homers that drive in runs.

Report on Atlantic Salmon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, the enclosed letter from Philip Harriman, president of the Maine Atlantic Salmon Federation, is an extremely interesting and informative report on the Atlantic salmon.

It was my privilege at one time to serve as commissioner of sea and shore fisheries for the State of Maine, and I have always retained a great interest in conservation and development of our fisheries.

I am sure my colleagues will find this well worth reading.

MAINE ATLANTIC
SALMON FEDERATION,
Portland, Maine, March 30, 1962.

Hon. STANLEY R. TUPPER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you with reference to the Atlantic salmon, known as "the king of all game fish." As you know, this fish was once plentiful in all rivers north of the Hudson River on the east coast, and, as you also know, due to the construction of dams and the pollution of our rivers, the Atlantic salmon became extinct in all but a few small streams in eastern Maine.

Approximately 15 years ago, the restoration of this noble fish began when "Mother Nature," in the form of floods, destroyed the remaining dams on these small, pollution-free streams in Washington County in eastern Maine, and today token runs of Atlantic salmon have been reestablished in the Dennys, Machias, Pleasant, and Narraguagus Rivers as well as in the Sheepscot River in southern Maine. However, the once famous Penobscot and Kennebec Rivers, with their dams and pollution, and inadequate fishways, no longer support even token runs of salmon. And no longer does the first fish of the season taken on rod and reel from the famous Bangor Pool on the Penobscot grace the table of the President of the United States, because, the Bangor Pool is a thing of the past and the Penobscot is a "dead" river.

The restoration of the Atlantic salmon in the State of Maine is necessary and it must become a joint State and Federal responsibility. The present restoration effort being made by the Maine Sea-Run Salmon Commission is inadequate, due in part to limited funds. The assistance being provided by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service at its Craig Brook Hatchery is also inadequate due to limited funds.

The Atlantic salmon must be restored because of its tremendous economic potential in the State of Maine. For proof of this economic potential we have only to turn to the neighboring Maritime Provinces of Canada.

In New Brunswick, a study titled "Economic Benefits of the Atlantic Salmon to the Province of New Brunswick," which was prepared by Eugene Grasberg of the department of economics and political science of the University of New Brunswick, indicated that the total New Bruswick income from the Atlantic salmon resource was $1,999,900. This total income represents an average year in the midfifties and includes income from both sport and commercial fishing for salmon, processing and retailing from Federal expenditure on research and protection. Of this $1,999,900 total, the revenue from sport fishing alone was $1,144,125 representing expenditures by anglers for food and lodging, guides, fishing equipment, clothing, china, car repairs, licenses, etc.

In Quebec, a similar study was prepared by George Mahuex, professor of zoology at Laval University. This study, titled "Atlantic Salmon in the Economy of the Province of Quebec," indicated that the total annual economic value of salmon in Quebec expressed as personal income for residents was $2,498,000. Of this total, revenue from sport fishing was $1,900,000.

In order to preserve this valuable resource, the Canadian Provincial and Federal Governments are spending approximately $1 million annually in the Maritime Provinces on fisheries research, hatcheries, stocking and protection.

As an example of the progressive policies of the Canadian Government in preserving and improving its salmon resource (in this particular case the Pacific salmon) let us consider the million-dollar Big Qualicum River project as I have summarized it below from the January 1961 and 1962 issues of the Trade News, a publication of the Department of Fisheries of Canada.

"The largest single salmon development project of its kind ever undertaken is under construction on the Big Qualicum River, Vancouver Island, British Columbia, Canada. Basically, the project will create a 'controlled-flow' river system on the Big Qualicum River; it will cost in excess of $1 million.

"The Big Qualicum River, like Maine's Atlantic salmon streams, is subject to flash flood and drought. During spawning and incubation periods, waterflow has ranged from a trickle of 15 cubic feet per second to freshets of over 7,000 cubic feet per second with resultant reduction in egg-to-fry survival. Fisheries personnel recommend a flow of 200 cubic feet per second during the spawning period.

"The Big Qualicum project, in addition to water control over the entire river's system, will include facilities which permit manipulation of water temperatures throughout the system; in fact, during warm water periods the river temperature can be lowered by as much as 9°. The project will also include artificial spawning areas.

"Canadian Department of Fisheries biologists say that the Big Qualicum project will contribute to increased salmon production. If this increased production is realized, the $1,250,000 being invested in the river development will be returned, in a relatively short time, in the form of increased earnings in the commercial fisheries.

"The department of fisheries regards the Big Qualicum River project as one of the most significant developments in the realm of fish culture ever undertaken. The project is the only one of its kind known to Canadian authorities; it may well be the first time in history that a complete river system has been harnessed in this fashion.

The members of the Maine Atlantic Salmon Federation are of the opinion that the Atlantic salmon can be successfully restored in Maine rivers. We are also of the opinion that the successful restoration of the Atlantic salmon represents an economic potential of more than $1 million annually in terms of revenue to residents of Maine from sport fishing alone. In addition there would be the tremendous recreational value to the residents of other States, particularly in the Northeast, a value which is difficult to express in terms of dollars and cents.

If we are ever to reach this potential, we must follow the example of the Canadians and provide Federal funds for Atlantic salmon restoration programs. We must have fisheries research, more hatcheries, and water-control projects similar to the Big Qualicum project but on a smaller scale.

We should start with closer cooperation between the Maine Sea-Run Salmon Commission and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, expanded facilities at the Craig Brook Federal Hatchery, and a water-control project on the Dennys or Narraguagus River.

Without Federal funds the Atlantic salmon cannot be successfully restored in the State of Maine.

Sincerely,

PHIL HARRIMAN, *President.*

Correction of Speech Is Noted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I am including in these remarks a letter to

the editor which was written by Mr. Murray D. Lincoln, President of the Nationwide Insurance Co. of Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Lincoln spoke at a meeting of the American Association for the United Nations on March 12 and was incorrectly quoted by the Washington Post.

Mr. Lincoln has been noted throughout his life for his outspoken beliefs. We do not agree on various matters and that is as it should be. However, we are in complete agreement on the fact that every effort should be made to achieve accurate reporting and when incorrect accounts are published every effort should be made to set the record straight.

Mr. Lincoln's letter is as follows:

MARCH 14, 1962.

The EDITOR,
The Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The headline and lead paragraphs on your story reporting my speech to the American Association for the United Nations, March 12, gave a very much distorted interpretation of what I said.

The five-column headline declared:

"CARE FOOD PARCELS TO RED CHINA URGED"

"Murray D. Lincoln, board chairman of CARE, said yesterday that consideration should be given to sending CARE packages to Communist China. 'Food should be used wherever there are hungry people', Lincoln declared. 'We must let human sympathy, as well as our own conscience dictate what we should do.' "

The question directed to me was a general question about whether American food surpluses should be sold to Red China and no reference was made to CARE. I pointed out that while this was a highly controversial question that I thought our sympathies and our conscience should be an important consideration in what we do. This was in reference to the sale of surplus wheat to China.

Your reporter probably didn't understand just how CARE operates and how it would have to operate if it were asked to provide food for Red China.

It is my own belief that Red China would not accept CARE packages. Over the last 15 years CARE has operated only in countries where we are invited to come in and help. We serve only where the host government will give CARE a contract which authorizes CARE personnel (U.S. citizens) to supervise directly the distribution of CARE packages. The government must also agree that there shall be no discrimination against the recipients of CARE packages and no political use made of the packages.

CARE is anxious to help hungry people everywhere. But we have a responsibility to our contributors to deliver their contributions effectively and efficiently, and to give them a full and complete report on how their money was used in the countries they designated.

We would not send CARE food packages donated by individuals to Red China unless the donor specified that was the country to which they wished their contribution to be made. Our operation would have to be under the conditions which prevail in all the countries in which CARE operates.

Because there are many, many thousands of contributors to CARE who read the Washington Post, I hope you will devote the space to clarifying this very important matter.

Sincerely,

MURRAY D. LINCOLN, *President.*

My Responsibilities as an American Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, the following essay was written by a high school student in the Eighth Congressional District of Ohio. Anyone who reads it can understand why it was a winner in the essay contest sponsored by the Ohio Department of the American Legion. It gives one the assurance that the coming generation has an abiding of respect for America and a definite feeling of responsibility as citizens. The author is Jeff Grummel, Mohawk High School, Sycamore, Ohio.

MY RESPONSIBILITIES AS AN AMERICAN CITIZEN

A nation's strength lies in the character of its people, in their willingness to sacrifice leisure, comfort, and a share of their talents, for the welfare of the nation of which they are a part.

The Declaration of Independence states our birthright as American citizens. The Constitution, likewise, indicates that the blessings of liberty are the heritage of our nation. It is our responsibility to help preserve these liberties, not take them for granted.

I am a freshman in high school. Today I am learning more about my obligations when I reach the "desired age of twenty-one" and accept these duties as a citizen.

My home is first on the list. I must share in the work, regardless of how much I feel the tasks are "below" my young man's ideas.

My school is another. Here, I want to assume the responsibility of being on time to classes and complete my assignments as required. These alone will help lighten my teachers' burdens. I want to assist with all organizations by being an alert and active member, and enter sports with enthusiasm and a never-die spirit, although I may not be one of the best players. I feel that every day profitably spent in school will help me better understand my place in America. I must realize that America is made up of individuals, each with his part as a citizen. I must learn my part.

Just as important is my duty to my church. My faith will lead me toward being a regular member of Sunday school, church, choir, and youth fellowship.

I must remember that the simple right to vote cost other human beings much. Perhaps they had no thought of me, but were concerned with the making of their America. I have what they made. To take this right to vote for granted is the first step to losing it. With this privilege I must study, very carefully, the candidates for each office from local to county, State, and finally national offices. Privilege and responsibility go hand in hand.

Another is my obligation to my community. I will run for office if I am chosen, and will do my very best if elected. I will pay all taxes that are voted for by the people. This is my community, a small part of great America, and I want everyone to enjoy it. Thus, each day I will try to make it a better place in which to live.

A good citizen is not a selfish citizen. I must remember my duty to others less fortunate than I. I must be considerate of the people in other countries who are fighting communism, hunger, poverty, and disease. These people want to be democratic and enjoy living in a free world, too. To them I owe all the financial and moral support I can give, regardless of race, creed, or color.

To be a good American citizen is the most important job of my future. Now, I must learn the why of America. Why I have been granted life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, privileges no other person in the world can have. Then, and only then, I can look up with pride and dignity and say to the world, "I have helped assume my responsibilities as an American citizen."

JEFF GRUMMEL.

The Real Extremists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, one of the favorite pasttimes of today is to take a word or a combination of words, that in themselves are quite innocuous, and give them an evil interpretation. The prescription is to keep repeating the formula until it sticks in everyone's mind as an insult.

The worst thing to call anyone today is an extremist. No one quite knows why, but everyone thinks it is an insult.

The following editorial by Mr. David Lawrence appeared in the April 2d issue of U.S. News & World Report. It proves that extremists exist on the right and on the left, up and down, and in and out, and that they are objectionable only when they are not our particular brand of extremist:

THE REAL EXTREMISTS

(By David Lawrence)

We hear a good deal nowadays about extremists—those who brand as Communists other persons who are not Communists. Name-calling, however, while deplorable, doesn't do as much harm to the American people as a whole as do the extremists in public office who would disregard the Constitution.

For there is a trend today toward circumvention of the Constitution. Scarcely a month goes by that some new legislative measure or Executive order isn't proposed which seeks to get around the Constitution.

The argument recently espoused in all seriousness as an alibi by some people inside and outside Government is that amending the Constitution is a laborious and slow process. The point is made that "times have changed" and that some of the doctrines of past decades in the field of law have become obsolete.

Oddly enough, that's exactly the excuse Nikita Khrushchev gives for abrogating the allied agreements made in 1945 to insure unrestricted access to Berlin. He says these agreements are outmoded.

Is it right for one party to an agreement to declare arbitrarily that he will no longer abide by its terms because he decides it is obsolete?

The people of the Thirteen Original States, by a compact with each other, gave up certain rights and delegated them to a central government. All powers not enumerated in

the Constitution as having been delegated to the Federal Government were specifically "reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." This is the language of the 10th amendment. Why is this agreement so persistently violated?

If the people at any time wish to change the Constitution, it can be amended by a two-thirds vote of Congress followed by acts of ratification by three-fourths of the States.

But we hear today that this is too cumbersome a method and that it takes too much time. Yet some amendments have gone through from congressional action to State ratification in less than a year.

The truth is that where there is substantial opposition to an amendment, it naturally isn't approved.

Unfortunately, our record as a Nation is not clean. The 14th amendment was not legally inserted in the Constitution. The same Southern States which were considered eligible members of the Union when—after the Civil War was over—they ratified the 13th amendment abolishing slavery were then punished by Congress for refusing to ratify the 14th amendment. Ratification was accomplished by legislative coercion of the States by Congress and at the point of the bayonet by armed forces stationed in the State legislatures. Yet this same 14th amendment is the basis of most of the executive orders on civil rights today. The Supreme Court has never consented to pass upon the validity of the method used to ratify the 14th amendment, though the Court has accepted cases challenging the validity of other amendments.

Recently a new trend toward usurpation of power has arisen. It seeks by executive order, or by the passage of new laws, to thwart or ignore the plainly written provisions of the Constitution.

President Kennedy sent a bill to Congress a few weeks ago proposing a far-reaching change in the handling of tariffs. The Executive would fix the duties and commodity quotas—a power granted by the Constitution only to Congress. The bill, now before the House Ways and Means Committee, provides, moreover, that presidential determinations "shall be final and conclusive and shall not be subject to review by any court."

Why should the people be deprived of judicial review when they are the victims of illegality in the application of trade laws?

Also the Kennedy administration has just signed treaties with 24 countries on trade relations, but does not intend to submit these agreements to the Senate for ratification by a two-thirds vote.

Executive orders have been issued, moreover in civil rights matters, on many of which Congress itself has refused to pass laws. Thus, by Executive order, purchase contracts for goods or services can be withheld by the Government from any business which refuses to accept the Government's dictation as to the number of employees of a particular color that the contractor or subcontractor may hire.

It certainly is a form of extremism to substitute Executive orders for the laws of Congress.

Extremism is bred by extremism. We would have less trouble with the malcontents in our midst if the spirit and letter of the Constitution were observed.

If the method of amending the document is too cumbersome, let the people by the constitutional method change it. But let's face the face that new extremists have arisen who believe that the executive order can circumvent the Constitution if the stated objective merely has popular appeal. This is government by emotion—by extremism. It is not government by a written constitution.

Needed: Increased Funds for Cooperative Extension Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE GRANT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, the tremendous accomplishments of American agriculture are well known today. Widespread use of technological information has played a major part in this truly magnificent success story. And an organization which has carried a heavy responsibility in this area through the past half century has been the Cooperative Extension Service.

As the name implies, the Cooperative Extension Service is a cooperative endeavor between the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges. I have been greatly impressed with the work of the Extension Service in my State of Alabama for the past many years. I have supported the program wholeheartedly. I want to see it adequately financed.

In checking into the present financial support for the Extension Service, I find that the Federal Government has been carrying a smaller and smaller share of the financing. Yet, at the same time the Cooperative Extension Service is being asked by the U.S. Department of Agriculture to carry increased educational responsibilities in connection with Department programs.

At the present, only 37 percent of the funds for the Cooperative Extension Service come from Federal sources. This contrasts with 59 percent of the money originating from Federal sources in 1936. As late as 1947, the Federal Government was providing at least 50 percent of the funds for this Service.

The legislative history of the Smith-Lever Act and the memorandum of understanding between the land-grant colleges and the U.S. Department of Agriculture all stress the cooperative nature of Extension work and are strongly suggestive of equal responsibility for the financing of this work. But the increase in Federal appropriations has been less than one-half that provided by the States and local governments in the period since 1950. Actually $40,047,000 of increased Federal appropriation would be required to equal the appropriations from States and local sources today.

Current salary scales in Extension make it difficult to attract and hold personnel that can best serve the needs of the people. Certainly salaries for Extension workers need to be commensurate with those of individuals employed in other occupations which require a similar level of training. But this does not appear to be the case. Studies have been made which show that the average salaries of Extension workers are now well below those of other Federal employees in the Department of Agriculture where the same level of training and competency is required.

Furthermore, classified civil service employees have received "across-the-board" or automatic salary increases of 51.8 percent since 1950. Federal funds have provided an average increase of 8.1 percent of the salaries of cooperative Extension workers. And if all of the nonearmarked funds appropriated to Extension had been used for salary improvement—which would have left none for increased operating costs—this would have provided an increase of only 12.8 percent in the salaries of Extension workers since 1950.

So it is apparent that this organization—the Cooperative Extension Service—which has served farmers and society so well is at a serious disadvantage because of lack of financing. I know that this inadequate financing shows up in my own State of Alabama where the average county extension worker draws an annual salary of $5,768. These are dedicated well-trained people who frequently find it desirable to move into other areas of agriculture work where the pay is better and the work less demanding. Last year the turnover of county extension workers in my State was more than 13 percent.

The Cooperative Extension Service in Alabama has carried out a program of great economic and social significance to the people of my State. One important facet of the program is 4-H Club work in which more than 125,000 young people received training last year. I want to see the club work along with the other parts of the extension program move ahead even more rapidly in the future. I believe the recent increased emphasis on programs of economic development by the Extension Service in Alabama provides one of the great opportunities for betterment of our people in the years immediately ahead.

This will require additional finances. I wish to strongly support the $12 million increase in Federal funds requested by the Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges for this important work.

Documentation of a Young Man's Service in the Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of publicity recently about the reactions of members of the Armed Forces to their service requirements. One young man from the District I represent was so impressed with his contribution to the Air Force that he documented it for use by his superiors. It not only reveals a refreshing interest in military obligation but also might be the beginning of a practice that could prove helpful to new recruits. I take the liberty of including in my remarks the

following excerpts from a letter which this young man wrote his father:

The thought which continually passes through my mind is this: That unless the people in our armed services are willing to preserve their work and their accomplishments in writing, their successors in office will have gained little from what their predecessors have done. This became evident to me at my last post which, as you know, was at Sandia Base at Albuquerque. I began to realize at the end of my first year that much of the value of what I was doing would be lost unless it was put down in writing for the benefit of my successor. Accordingly, during my last 3 years at Sandia Base, I tried to study my job and my responsibilities in detail and with great care. I had to make a lot of decisions, and gradually I developed a sort of philosophy in regard to the job and its responsibilities. When I left Sandia Base last summer, I placed in the hands of my immediate superior a document of some 60 typewritten pages which reviewed my work, my job and my philosophy in regard to it. My sole objective was to condense my 3 years of military experience into something which would be of value to new and inexperienced men who were sent to Sandia Base and who were expected to carry on the work from where I had left off. I would like to have had such a document handed to me when I arrived at Sandia 5 years ago, for it would have saved me and the Government endless hours of study and work. Now I hope a lot of that can be saved for my successors.

Residual Oil Import Restrictions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, residual oil import restrictions remain one of New England's most pressing problems.

In the face of unanimous entreaties on the part of the New England congressional delegation, the administration continues its policy of limiting the quantity of fuel oil which may be imported from abroad.

In the face of its stated policy of encouraging freer trade, the administration continues to choke off the supply of heating oil available to our industries, our electric utilities, our schools, our hospitals, and our other public buildings.

In the face of rising prices resulting from restricted and controlled supplies, the administration has failed to lift this burden from New England consumers.

In the face of all manner of studies, investigations, reports, and recommendations—including those authored by its own agencies—the administration has ignored conclusions that present federally imposed restrictions on residual oil imports are penalizing New Englanders without assisting the oil industry the restrictions were designed to protect.

In the face of pious protestations to the effect that Federal trade policies would not be instruments of partisan politics, the administration continues to play one section of our economy against another.

Mr. Speaker, the restrictions on residual oil imports further but one interest—that of the coal industry, which hopes to preserve a noncompetitive industrial fuel market. Limited residual oil supplies, it is hoped, will contribute to more customers paying higher prices for an alternative fuel—coal.

Now, we agree that coal producers have serious problems, but we insist that these problems not be attacked in such a way as to present other problems to other consumers. Let us approach the crisis in the coal industry fairly and squarely. Let us not attempt to make New England pay indirectly for the problems faced by Pennsylvania, West Virginia and Virginia.

With these thoughts in mind, Mr. Speaker, I commend the attention of my colleagues to a letter addressed to Secretary Udall on behalf of the New England Council by its executive vice president, Gardner A. Caverly. The House is familiar with the work of New England Council, its reputation and responsible approach to regional economic problems. Once again NEC asks to be heard on the issue of residual oil imports and I respectfully urge my colleagues to consider carefully its plea, which I now make available for the RECORD.

THE NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL,
Boston, Mass.

Hon. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The New England Council is a nonpartisan organization, representing all aspects of the New England economy. It was established in 1925 at the request of the six New England Governors and serves today as secretariat for the New England Governors Conference. In addition, the council provides a number of services to the State governments, working principally in the area of interstate cooperation. It is concerned, of course, with Federal legislation and administrative actions as they may affect the economy of our region. Made up of representatives from industry, labor, educational and farm groups, as well as the State governments, the council is concerned solely with regional development and with the improvement of the New England economy.

You have asked for comments on the proposed changes in the oil import regulations which appeared in the Federal Register of March 1, 1962. The council is reluctant to comment on the proposed changes and announced quotas for the next 12 months because of its strong belief that nothing short of a complete removal of the quota will be of significant benefit to the consumers and the country.

Press reports indicate that the fuel producing industries are either happy or, at worst, diffident about the proposed changes; indeed the coal industry claims a victory of sorts, asserting that the proposed regulations and announced quotas will stabilize their east coast market for at least a year.

Mr. Secretary, if this is so, then this a disastrous defeat for fuel users in the east coast because it guarantees a continuation of a noncompetitive industrial fuel market, a condition which must be offensive to anyone in an administration dedicated to furthering our ability to compete in the world markets.

So long as there are quotas and quota regulations, there will be dislocations in distribution, added cost of distribution, and a price penalty on fuel users in the United States. These added costs make the difference between profit and loss in many segments of the New England economy, already suffering from many well-known geographical disadvantages. Continued regulation of a critical raw material such as oil may deter our ability to enter into a free world alliance which will grow together as opposed to one that grows apart.

The OEP price surveys have consistently pointed out the price differential which exists on the east coast between bonded and nonbonded oil. This differential never existed before the quota program and will not disappear until this program is discontinued.

We appreciate the fact that the Interior Department intends to make every effort to see that domestic shortages do not occur and to see that every user receives an abundant supply at reasonable prices. Under any quota system, however, this laudable objective simply can never be achieved. There have been repeated instances which have been brought to the attention of your Department where residual fuel oil was not available to supply consumers. Your own price statistics reveal a steady increase in price since the quota system was imposed. If there is any doubt as to the harmful effects of the quota program in terms of shortages of supply and price increases, we would be more than happy to supply specific data to you.

In summary, no adjustments in the level of imports and no plan of controlled distribution short of a totally free market can cure the evils of the quota program. The changes which you are recommending are merely palliatives; they do not bring about basic solutions. Accordingly we urge you to recommend complete removal of the quota restrictions which impose a heavy discriminatory penalty on consumers small and large and merely prepetuate the big cartels by destroying a free competitive market.

Very truly yours,

GARDNER A. CAVERLY,
Executive Vice President.

The Court Does It Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include a perceptive editorial which appeared in the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch on March 28, 1962.

The editorial follows:

THE COURT DOES IT AGAIN

Article X: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Under-representation of rapidly growing urban areas in State legislatures has become a national disgrace. Because of this devaluation of votes in cities and suburban areas (which often pay the lion's share of State taxes), the inequity in effect approaches "taxation without representation."

In Tennessee, for example, the 3,454 residents of rural Moore County have one vote in the house, whereas Memphis, with 627,019 residents, elects only 8 members—1 for every 78,000 residents.

This absurd and disgraceful state of affairs resulted from the Tennessee legislators' refusal, for the past 60 years, to reapportion—despite the State constitution's mandatory

requirement calling for reapportionment every 10 years.

Urban voters of Tennessee appealed to the State courts. Failing to find relief there, they took their case to a three-judge Federal district court. The court agreed that the plaintiffs' rights had been violated, but stated that "the remedy in this situation clearly does not lie with the (Federal) courts." The decision was based on the U.S. Supreme Court's repeated refusal over the past 16 years to rule on intrastate political matters. In doing so the High Court had properly refrained from hurdling the roadblock of limitations spelled out in article X of the U.S. Constitution.

On Monday, however, the Supreme Court, by a 6–2 vote, ruled that the apportionment of seats in State legislatures is a proper subject for constitutional scrutiny—by Federal courts.

Justices Frankfurter and Harlan sharply dissented. Frankfurter warned that the majority decision would not only lead Federal judges into "a mathematical quagmire," but that public confidence in the judiciary's authority would be impaired as a result of intervention in State political matters.

He summed up the High Court's constitutional limitations in a paragraph which applies with equal force to the Court's trespass in the school decision in which he concurred 8 years ago:

"There is not under our Constitution a judicial remedy for every political mischief. In a democratic society like ours, relief must come through an aroused popular conscience that sears the conscience of the people's repsentatives."

And he reminded the Court's majority—as he should have done in 1954—that—

"Those who consider that continuing respect for the Court's authority depends, in large measure, upon its wise exercise of self-restraint and discipline in constitutional adjudication will view the decision with deep concern."

It is a great pity that the six-vote majority failed to take this long range view, but instead took a judicial shortcut to effect what, under article X, should have been done by the legislators of individual States, or by the people's approval of a constitutional amendment designed to correct chronic inequities in apportionment.

As in its bombshell decision of 1954, the Court once again has abused its power, acting impetuously on the dangerous assumption that authoritarian means are justified by the ends.

Obsolete Education and Dropouts Aggravate Automation Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times, Sunday, March 18, 1962:

UNEDUCATED YOUTH—OBSOLETE EDUCATION AND DROPOUTS AGGRAVATE AUTOMATION CRISIS

(By Fred M. Hechinger)

Two experts on education and employment last week looked at the future job market and the way in which the schools are preparing youth to enter it. Both saw disaster unless attitudes and procedures are rapidly and radically changed.

Mrs. Mary Conway Kohler, a member of President Kennedy's Committee on Youth Employment, completed a national survey on schooling and jobs, financed by the Taconic Foundation (666 Fifth Avenue, New York 19), and published a special report on "Youth and Work in New York City." Eli E. Cohen, executive secretary of nongovernmental National Committee on Employment of Youth (419 Park Avenue South, New York 16), reported on the problem during the annual meeting of the Child Study Association of America.

The gist of the problem is that the number of jobs which can be filled by unskilled labor or inadequately educated young people is declining steadily. Automatic elevators, for example, have displaced an estimated 40,000 operators. But of every 100 youngsters of high school age, only 88 go to high school and almost half of these drop out before graduation. In other words, 54 percent of all teenagers fail to get a high school diploma or, more important, a complete high school education.

ISSUES

Here are some of the issues of immediate national concern:

(1) Lack of learning: Mr. Cohen points out that even if, by some magic, jobs could be created for the nearly 1 million unemployed youths (age 16 to 25), many would be unable to qualify or, having been hired, perform well enough to be retained.

"Some lack the rudimentary work skills, sense of responsibility, or acceptable work habits and attitudes," Mr. Cohen said. Education requirements are rising everywhere. A generation ago, an elementary school diploma was considered adequate for many jobs. Today high school graduation is a minimum requirement for most. "I venture to predict that within the next 10 years post-high school education for 2 years—at a junior college or technical institute—will replace the high school diploma as a basic requirement," he said.

As a result, youth fits educationally into three categries: first, the collegebound who, as a group, will do well in the job market; second, the high school graduates who, on the whole, will manage but not without some difficulty; third, the dropouts who, Mr. Cohen warns, "will find a most unwelcome reception."

MANY QUALIFIED

Tragically, studies of dropouts show that 70 percent have at least average intelligence and would be capable of completing high school. Between 6 and 13 percent are bright enough to do college work.

Unless the pattern changes, the Nineteen Sixties must be expected to produce 7.5 million school dropouts of whom 2.5 percent will not have gone beyond elementary school. Yet by 1965 there will be only five high-school graduates for every seven jobs requiring specific skills, while three unskilled workers will compete for every two jobs for which they qualify.

(2) Discrimination: In every educational category, nonwhites will experience relatively greater difficulty in finding work. Only one man in ten in the work force is a Negro, but one in five of the unemployed is, says Mrs. Kohler.

Mr. Cohen cites a Pennsylvania community where Negro college graduates earn only 5 cents an hour more than Negroes with an elementary school education, whereas Negro college graduates earn 7 cents an hour less than white Protestants with only an elementary school education.

On the encouraging side, however, proportionately more Negro youngsters are staying in school longer, with the result that the number of Negroes in desirable occupations is steadily increasing.

(3) Obsolete schooling: Mrs. Kohler's indictment begins with a lack of enough, or sufficiently trained, vocational guidance experts. Since much guidance, furthermore, is concentrated in the eleventh and twelfth grades, those who need it most never benefit from it; most drop out by 10th grade.

PROBLEM REMAINS

Mrs. Kohler charges that, although many youngsters are dumped into vocational schools because they were unable to cope with the academic work, the "ancient 50–50 formula of half the time spent on academic subjects, half in the shops" forces too many pupils to cope with the same subjects and the same teaching methods for at least half the time which have already proved unsuccessful with them.

Although the service trades—dry cleaning, shoe repairing, home appliance repair, diner and lunchroom serving—are expanding, too few trade schools teach these skills.

"Perhaps the worst indictment that can be made of vocational schooling is that it exists in a kind of fairyland that has not much relation to the real world of work," Mrs. Kohler writes. Equipment is often obsolete.

Frequently there is no relationship between the skills the trade schools teach and the actual requirements for job entry.

In other instances the more intricate skills (repair of automatic transmission for auto mechanics) are taught first, the less skilled aspects of the job (body paint work) come later. Result: The less able, who drop out early, have inadequate knowledge of the demanding skills, while the more elementary work might make them employable.

The field of vocational training on which the greatest amount of money is spent—ironically is agriculture, the one with the most rapidly declining opportunities.

4. Automation: Predictions are fraught with danger, but Mr. Cohen points out that in processing the last U.S. census, 50 statisticians handled the same job that 10 years earlier took 4,100.

A report on education for automation, just published by the department of public instruction in Pennsylvania, stressed that automation will put a far greater premium on "the ability to read, think, and write in both words and numbers," combined with a passion for accuracy.

What are some of the answers?

The Air Force likes to say, "If it works, it's obsolete," meaning that when something finally is built a better model is on the drawing board. The schools must, in a similar spirit, realine their education and training programs, not every generation but every year. Some employers and unions have done an excellent job of cooperating with the schools, but the majority must learn from the few—and do it without racial discrimination.

FLEXIBLE APPROACH NEEDED

Newcomers must be helped through highly flexible schools, without the traditional grades and prerequisites, as is being done in Milwaukee; underprivileged children must be salvaged, as is being done through the Higher Horizons program in New York City, which offers special guidance and cultural opportunities; "skill centers" must retrain persons of all ages.

Mr. Cohen warns that none of these efforts is sufficient without immediate public work and training programs for youth, as would be provided under the Youth Employment Opportunity Act, a bill introduced in Congress this year.

Finally, schools and colleges must adjust to the uncertainty and ferment of the future by teaching all young people far more effectively the techniques—with the help of books, television, recordings, and teaching machines—to teach, advance, retrain, and retreat themselves throughout their lives and careers.

Burma Patriot Charges U.S. State Department Actually Aids Southeast Asia Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I am including as a part of these remarks a very astute account of our State Department policy in Burma as told by an on-the-spot observer, Mr. Harry R. Horvitz. Mr. Horvitz is publisher of the Mansfield News-Journal and the Lorain Journal, two outstanding Ohio newspapers.

During his recent trip to India and the Far East, Mr. Horvitz analyzed very closely the American foreign aid program and our general foreign policy. His article, which appeared in the Mansfield News-Journal on Sunday, March 18, 1962, is a very sobering presentation and is very timely as we commence hearings once more on the foreign aid bill. The article follows:

BURMA PATRIOT CHARGES U.S. STATE DEPARTMENT ACTUALLY AIDS SOUTHEAST ASIA REDS

(By Harry R. Horvitz)

"The American State Department does not understand what is happening in Asia, and in many cases is actually aiding Communist aggression."

With these shocking words an angry and indiscreet Burmese patriot echoed the views of a large number of Asians who are vitally worried that the United States is losing Asia to communism.

He was a troubled old man who has spent his life in his country's service. His knowledge of recent history and actual political conditions was complete and accurate.

Earlier the American Ambassador to Burma, John Scott Everton, had spoken with great optimism of conditions in the country. The Ambassador, at a press conference for American newspapermen, described the stability of the Burmese Government. Everton praised Prime Minister U Nu as a strong political leader as well as a great moral force in the country. He was enthusiastic about Burma's economic progress. He felt that the Government was very democratic and that all basic freedoms were being maintained. According to Everton, the Communists were getting weaker all the time.

Just 5 weeks after the American Ambassador painted this optimistic picture, a tough anti-Red general, Ne Win, overthrew the Burmese Government because of economic and political crises. General Win's actions appear to have been welcomed by the Burmese people, many of whom deplored the rapid economic deterioration of their country and the strong shift toward communism.

Later news reports have verified that information furnished by the Burmese patriot was accurate; that furnished by the American Ambassador inaccurate.

The actual situation in Burma at the time of the military coup was that the company was suffering from great internal dissention. The states of Shan and Karen had been threatening secession. The Shans had been terrorizing border villages with open rebellion.

WEAK LEADER

The Prime Minister, U Nu, was not a great moral leader, but a religious weakling. He would go off on meditations for months at a time completely isolating himself from political events. In some cases his religious beliefs were deterrent to progress. For example he would not allow the Government to take action against the packs of rabid dogs running wild through the country.

The economic condition of the country was deteriorating. There was widespread unemployment. The Government was systematically confiscating private property, and foreign investors were unwilling to build needed factories because of the lack of adequate guarantees against nationalization.

Further, Communists already controlled high Government posts. The Union Party, the largest in Burma, was under Communist control.

The American acquiescence and even support for the acceptance of Communists into governments is one of the greatest worries of many Asians. Laos is an example.

A glance at a map will show that Laos is the central country of southeast Asia, surrounded by Vietnam, Thailand, Cambodia, and Burma. In most areas the borders are not clearly defined, and that jungle nature makes them almost impossible to defend against infiltration. President Kennedy spoke of Laos as holding the key to much of southeast Asia.

Yet the United States is forcing the pro-Western Lao General Phoumi to take Communists into the Cabinet by withholding all foreign aid. Czechoslovakia was lost to Communists by infiltration in the Cabinet, and then in 1946 Gen. George Marshall went to China and forced Chiang Kai-shek to form a coalition government with the Communists. He did this by cutting off all foreign aid for 9 crucial months. Soon afterward China fell to the Communists.

Other pro-Western Asians can see signs that the Kennedy administration is forsaking Nationalist China by advocating the existence of two Chinas, and pressuring the Chinese Nationalists to abandon Quemoy. Just recently the American Ambassador to Taiwan, Everett F. Drumright, a man sympathetic to Chiang Kai-shek was retired. He will probably be replaced by a diplomat less hostile to Communist China.

VIEWS SHARED

The Burmese patriot felt that the ineptness of American foreign policy in Asia and the unwillingness of the United States to give full support to the anti-Communists will eventually lead to the loss of all southeast Asia to the Reds.

Or, by the time Americans realize how bad things really are, a full-scale war will be necessary to salvage this vital part of the world. His views are shared by many Asians and American observers in the Far East.

Resolution Unanimously Adopted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, 1962, it was my honor and privilege to be the main speaker at a mass meeting held at the Hotel Biltmore in New York City sponsored by the Byelorussian-American Association to commemorate the 44th anniversary of Byelorussian independence.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith the text of a resolution adopted unanimously at that meeting:

Whereas the Byelorussian people, one of many victims of Communist Russian aggression, have been forcibly deprived of their national sovereignty, their religious, political, social, cultural, and economic freedom;

Whereas Soviet Russia poses as a "champion of liberation of the Asian and African nations from colonialism" before the free world and especially in the United Nations but at the same time she practices the worst possible form of colonial oppression and enslavement of Byelorussia and other non-Russian nations using all means at her disposal to suppress every manifestation and aspiration of these nations to freedom and national independence;

Whereas the assertion uttered by Secretary of State Rusk that the Ukraine, Armenia, Georgia and others, i.e. including Byelorussia are "traditional parts of the Soviet Union" has no historical ground, is erroneous, and from political point of view detrimental to the national interests of the United States;

Whereas the unjustified discrimination against the Byelorusisan language by the Voice of America cannot but lead the Byelorussian-American community to the conclusion that this U.S. agency is opposed to application of the principle of self-determination to Byelorussians, when at the same time this principle is upheld by the U.S. Government.

Resolved, That this meeting appeal to the President, Secretary of State and the Members of the U.S. Congress with request:

To reexamine the American foreign policy, in particular its position with respect to the Byelorussian and other nations enslaved by Moscow, doing that in the interests of American security;

To take appropriate steps through the United Nations and other channels to stop the Soviet Russian colonial policy in Byelorussia and force Russia to restore Byelorussia's independence;

To give full support to the resolution of Congressman FLOOD regarding the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations;

To end the discrimination against the Byelorussian language by the Voice of America and establish broadcasting programs in Byelorussian language, arbitrarily ignored by the "Voice of America" for the last 10 years.

Resolved, To support the Government of the United States in its effort to achieve a durable peace with freedom and justice for all men and all nations in the world.

Warren E. Wright

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1962

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the political life of Warren E. Wright, former state treasurer of Illinois, who died Thursday, March 29, 1962, can best be described as that of a political office-seeker, who sometimes stood on the outside of his party, looking in. He was truly an Independent in every respect, as far as party platforms or affiliations were concerned. His bids for nomination to the many offices that he sought in the public service were always opposed by the regular organization. His tremendous activities in both veterans' and church circles won for him many inti-

mate friends. He was a lovable and understanding leader of men and, as a result, those friendships resulted in surrounding him with an independent organization of individuals who personally entered the field of politics to support his candidacies.

The use of the telephone as a communication medium of political appeal on the part of Candidate Wright was his innovation in political campaigns. His policies stimulated his political strength among progressive Republicans and Democrats alike. It was readily admitted by both Republican and Democratic leaders that, had Warren Wright received the support of the regular Republican organization, there is no telling to what heights he would have risen in the public service. His opponents knew him as a strong adversary. There were no stronger, more popular, or more aggressive leaders ever pitted against one another for public preferment for the office of Secretary of State, than in the campaign of 1952, between the invincible Charles F. Carpentier and Warren Wright.

Unlike most leaders of importance, Warren Wright was easy to meet and converse with, and to pass the time of day. He was always a kind and considerate person. Every legislator at the State level was impressed by his down-to-earth solutions to public problems. He was one of the worthwhile personalities whose sincere and honest expression of friendship was real. He had a knack of meeting people, personally, and conversed with them face to face, making each one understand his position. The electorate accepted him as an honest and sincere individual. As a matter of fact, the Democrats felt that the greatest mistake Warren Wright ever made was in affiliating himself with the Republican Party. His career in the Democratic Party would have been far more remunerative to the great political efforts he made in behalf of the party of his selection. And the Democratic Party sought him out.

Warren Wright was a person of high character, both spiritually and morally. He reflected the highest sense of integrity as an elected public official. The people of the State of Illinois have lost one of their noble sons. As a wounded World War I veteran, the Disabled American Veterans and the American Legion have lost one of their most active patriots. The Republican Party has lost a great leader and campaigner.

All of the members of the Illinois congressional delegation, and especially those who served in the State assembly, with whom he was a great favorite, regret his passing and extend their heartfelt condolences to his widow, Mrs. Alma Wright, and his daughter, Mrs. Eliza Morris.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Mar. 30, 1962]

EX-TREASURER WRIGHT DIES OF HEART ATTACK

Warren E. Wright, 69, former State treasuerer, died yesterday apparently of a heart attack, in his home at 128 North Merrill Ave., Park Ridge.

He awakened about 4 a.m., complained to his wife, Alma, that he did not feel well, and collapsed an hour later.

STATE TREASURER 4 YEARS

He was State treasurer 4 years, from 1941 to 1943 and from 1955 to 1957.

Mr. Wright had worked Wednesday night as a harness State racing steward at Maywood Park track. Under Dr. Kerner, he had held this $100-a-day job during racing season, and in the off-season he was an $800-a-month investigator for the State public works department.

Mr. Wright ran for office 10 times as a Republican, but in 1960 he supported Kerner, a Democrat, for Governor.

His active campaigning for Kerner was attributed to the failure of former Governor Stratton and the Republican organization to support Mr. Wright in 1960, when he sought Republican nomination for U.S. Senator and was beaten by Samuel W. Witwer.

FORMER AUTO DEALER

Mr. Wright, a native of Murrayville, Morgan County, operated an auto agency in Murrayville and later in Jacksonville, with time out for oversea service in World War I.

In other political campaigns, he either sought nominations or elections unsuccessfully for State treasurer in 1930, 20th District Congressman in 1934, Congressman at Large in 1936, U.S. Senator in 1942, secretary of state in 1952, Governor in 1956 and State treasurer in 1958.

In 1931 he quit a job as chief investigator for the secretary of state to organize the Central Motor Freight Association, and in 1934 became secretary-treasurer of the Certified Motor Carriers.

MAC ARTHUR SUPPORTER

In 1948 he was national coordinator of the MacArthur for President clubs, supporting Gen. Douglas MacArthur. Three times he was State commander of Disabled American Veterans, and he is a former State commander of Amvets.

Mr. Wright, who moved to Park Ridge after World War II, is survived by his widow and a daughter, Mrs. Eliza Morris.

Services will be held at 9:30 a.m. tomorrow in the chapel at 120 S. Northwest Highway, Park Ridge, with burial at 3:30 p.m. that day in Murrayville.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Mar. 30, 1962]

WARREN E. WRIGHT, 69, DIES; TWICE GOP STATE TREASURER

Warren E. Wright, two-time Republican State treasurer and one of Illinois best known political figures, died Thursday at age of 69.

Death came after Mr. Wright suffered what apparently was a heart attack before dawn in his home at 128 North Merrill, Park Ridge. He was pronounced dead at Resurrection Hospital.

A tireless campaigner, Mr. Wright probably had shaken hands with as many Illinoisans as any other politician of his day.

He was elected to statewide office just twice—as treasurer in 1940 and 1954—but figured prominently in a score of other primary and regular elections either as a candidate or as a behind-the-scenes operator with control over a considerable bloc of votes.

TRIBUTE FROM KERNER

Governor Kerner, in Springfield, said: "In all my dealings with Mr. Wright I found him an honorable man and an outstanding gentleman. He was extremely reliable."

Kerner, a Democrat, last year named Mr. Wright a $100-a-day steward for the Illinois Harness Racing Commission and recently reappointed him to that post for the 1962 season. During the recent winter months Mr. Wright served briefly as an investigator for the State department of public works and buildings.

Often a problem to the regular GOP organization, Mr. Wright openly supported Kerner in his 1960 bid to unseat Republican Gov. William G. Stratton.

In 1958, Mr. Wright showed his strength as an independent Republican by defeating the Stratton-backed candidate, Louis E. Beckman, in the GOP primary for nomination as State treasurer. However, he lost in the fall election to Democrat Joseph D. Lohman.

PERSON-TO-PERSON FORMULA

Mr. Wright, who observed his 69th birthday on Monday, credited his 1958 primary victory to the person-to-person political formula he practiced for more than three decades—"handshakes and phone calls."

Born and educated in Murrayville, Morgan County, he worked with and later succeded his father in the operation of a hardware and implement business.

Later he entered the auto business in Jacksonville and in more recent years had been a banker. He served in both world wars.

As a journeyman politican, Mr. Wright wasn't happy unless he was running for office. In addition to his two successful races for the State treasurer's post, he lost in bids for such offices as Congressman, U.S. Senator, secretary of State, Governor and State treasurer. Most often his defeats came in primary elections.

LOST TO CARPENTIER

One of his nearest misses was in 1952, when he lost to Charles F. Carpentier by a slim 6,445 votes in the GOP primary for nomination as secretary of State.

Surviving Mr. Wright are the widow, Alma, and a daughter, Mrs. Eliza Morris.

Services will be held at 9:30 a.m. Saturday in the Ryan-Parke Funeral Home, 120 South Northwest Highway, Park Ridge. Burial will be in the cemetery at Murrayville.

Should Congress Bar Communist Mail?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, our colleagues who nearly unanimously supported section 12 of the House postal rate bill, that section aimed at free distribution of Communist propaganda, acted for many reasons. One primary reason was the belief that we have no obligation to the Communists to deliver their propaganda when they have unilaterally broken their agreement to deliver our mail without delay or censorship.

It is so well known in this country that the Communists do not live up to their agreement that it comes as a surprise to find that occasionally someone thinks the House action will cause the Communists to retaliate against our mail. In fact, we are retaliating for their actions.

An interesting discussion of this phase of the situation has come to my attention. It is found in the February 1962 issue of "The American Bulletin," published by the Czechoslovak National Council of America. I believe it will be of interest to our colleagues and to other readers of the RECORD and ask that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

SHOULD CONGRESS BAR COMMUNIST MAIL?

The U.S. House of Representatives has now passed the postal rate increase bill. Under an amendment to the rate bill Communist mail would be barred from distributing in this country if the Justice Department deems it propaganda, provided of course the bill passes also in the Senate. During the debate in the House it was argued that the cost of distributing mail from the Communist-controlled part of the world is paid by American taxpayers after the mail reaches the country. Thus, it was argued, the legislation would spare citizens the expense of disseminating Red propaganda. As Congressman WICKERSHAM pointed out (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Jan. 24), many people are disturbed by the fact that Communist propaganda can flow into this country freely and be distributed by the U.S. postal system free of charge; that 99 percent of the people contacted have said that they did not order the mail and did not wish it delivered.

Nevertheless, the issue is controversial, for others believe that "distribution of international mail is a treaty obligation." In an editorial "Hands Off the Mail," the Chicago Sun Times (Jan. 31, 1962) calls to task the Congressmen "who supported this measure for they should bear in mind that restrictions can be imposed both ways."

Both ways. These are the two crucial words, the crux of the whole issue, for the truth of the matter is that it has always been one way: only the United States has observed treaties of obligations while the Red regimes have abused and disregarded them. Communist Czechoslovakia has always banned newspapers, magazines, books. Please bear in mind that this is not unsolicited mail, but mail paid for by American citizens and sent to Czechoslovak friends, yet nothing is delivered, except sometimes a fashion magazine and always, of course, pro-Communist Czech publications printed in the United States. We Americans of Czechoslovak descent resent the ban on American mail in Czechoslovakia and we resent the fact that we have to pay for unsolicited Communist propaganda, sent us against our wish and at our expense while our mail is dumped.

Several news commentators and editors have stated that we send seven times more poundage behind the Iron Curtain than we receive from there. This is a baffling figure. Certainly it cannot mean printed matter, or— if sent it is not being delivered. However, if it is gift packages of food and old clothing that is meant, then Americans of Czechoslovak descent state most emphatically that even this privilege of sending packages is denied us: since August 1, 1961, there is a prohibitive tax of $7 for 2 pounds of old clothing to Czechoslovakia and U.S. citizens are instructed to send dollars only.

What is true for Czechoslovakia is evidently true also for other countries behind the Iron Curtain (perhaps with the exception of Poland). A refugee from a Baltic state has stated the case clearly and as his words are applicable, with minor variations, also to the case of Czechoslovakia, we reprint in part his "Letter to the Editor," in the Chicago Daily News (Feb. 4, 1962).

Sorry, but I cannot agree with your editorial of January 26, in which the proposal to ban propaganda mail from Communist countries is opposed on the ground that they "would most likely retaliate with a ban of their own on U.S. mail."

Why talk about a risk of such a ban when it already exists and has existed ever since the Communists came to power?

I am a refugee from a Communist-occupied country and I myself receive almost weekly Red propaganda mail that I don't want.

I know quite a few people who also have come from Communist-occupied countries and are in the same situation.

We have learned to accept the fact that sometimes a fashion magazine sent to our friends behind the Iron Curtain is delivered, whereas a book of science never reaches its destination—not to mention works on political or religious subjects, which are totally banned. (There have been specific occasions where the Soviets have allowed some German Bible shipments to Siberia, but even that was done for propaganda reasons.)

The situation did not improve after President Kennedy last March 17 lifted all restrictions on Red propaganda mail from abroad.

Quite the contrary:

You state that the poundage of mail sent from this country to the Moscow empire exceeds by seven times that received. But you fail to add that it is gift parcels of food and clothing that make up this difference in weight.

In order to be able to send these gift parcels one has to pay approximately a 100 percent prepaid duty to Moscow, in addition to postage.

Once and for all we should make an end to this.

If we do not stop the Red propaganda flow, a deficit will soon be found not only in Post Office Department finances, but in American patriotism.

TEDIS ZIERINS.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Newsletter of March 31, 1962:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, of Texas)

The Revenue Act of 1962 (see Newsletters of March 17 and 24) will affect every person, and this Nation, adversely for years to come, if enacted. (It now goes to the Senate). The House passed it 219 (218 Democrats, 1 Republican) to 196 (162 Republicans, 34 Democrats) after a bitter, partisan struggle where, too frequently, partianship overshadowed the facts and merits. President Kennedy and the Democrat leadership, liberals all, wanted the bill and brought all the pressure possible to bear on other Democrats. For my part, I can report (no matter my differences with Republicans on some other occasions) that virtue rested almost entirely on the Republican side by any test, of fact, merit, Constitution, and traditional American principle. Overall, Republicans were particularly concerned with the budget-busting cost of the package bill, of $1 billion or more the first fiscal year 1963 with all the dangers of inflation at home and gold outflow through unfavorable balance of payments abroad, and secondly, the "carrot and stick" reward and punishment nature through further Federal control of our lives, business and personal.

Since Republicans and Democrats agreed on many of the noncontroversial provisions the debate centered about the 3 sections in dispute. Section 2 Investment Credit, section 13 Foreign Controlled Corporations, section 19 Withholding TAX on Interests and Dividends. These three comprised the amendments embodied in the substitute rule, requested by Republicans of the Rules Committee, to grant a limited rule, 3 specific amendments replacing the closed rule, not permitting any amendments.

For section 2, the Republicans substituted liberalized depreciation and an inventory allowance for distribution and retail type businesses. For section 13, the Republicans offered a substitute tightening foreign tax rules but not taxing earnings until repatriated to the shareholders. Section 19, to eliminate entirely the withholding. This attempt to improve a bad bill was defeated when the limited rule was refused by a vote of 225 (all Democrat) to 190 (all Republicans plus 27 Democrats).

The three sections of the bill can be summarized as follows: Section 2, Investment credit. A credit of 7 percent for industry (three-sevenths for public utilities), of the amount of investment in new equipment will be subtracted from taxable income. Section 13. A "controlled foreign corporation," 50 percent of which is owned directly or indirectly by American taxpayers, would be taxed on earnings abroad, irrespective of whether the foreign corporation distributes earnings to shareholders. Section 19. A withholding tax on all interests and dividends, except those under 18, unless exemption certificates are filed by the individual with each savings account or corporation.

Some of the arguments against are sufficient to show why Republicans (as conservatives), disapproved these sections. Section 2. Investment credit (as opposed to liberalized depreciation, a faster writeoff). (1) A $2 billion annual subsidy to only certain industries constituted a tax windfall, bonanza, loophole, or gimmick, making a total of 107 percent of equipment cost, since 100 percent depreciation will still be received; (2) favors large business and penalizes small, also omits distribution and retail types of business; (3) subsidizes laggards (and inefficiency) since those who haven't modernized nor stayed abreast wil get more than those current in equipment replacement; (4) faster depreciation is not involved, so our industry is still not placed in competitive position with foreign business (Japan 100 percent depreciation in 5 years, Germany 67 percent, United States less than 50 percent); (5) no one wants this legislation, on the contrary thinks it bad legislation and self-defeating; the C. of C., N.A.M., AFL–CIO, Farm Bureau, Farmers Union—the poles are joined-in opposition.

Section 19. Withholding of interest and dividends, (1) administrative monstrosity and chaos; (2) massive over-withholding will result, taxes taken from those who pay no tax, not recoverable unless claim is filed, no notification to taxpayer of amounts withheld, and no forgiveness unless exemption certificate filed in advance, annually with each savings account and corporation, a procedure difficult and unlikely for people to follow; (3) corporations and savings institutions will necessarily go to great expense and trouble to be tax collector for Government; (4) this is not tax equity to match withholding on salaries and wages. In latter case there is a taxpayer with deductions, exemptions, etc., but in recipient of interest and dividend there is not necessarily a taxpayer; (5) voluntary basis of U.S. tax reporting is now abandoned; (6) taxpayer identification numbers, already placed on each taxpayer, plus automatic data processing (ADP) by computers plus educational campaign will produce desired results voluntarily, without this new withholding; (7) 32 million withholding accounts will be less than 40 cents, costing more to process than collected. Two hundred and 50 million above $10 with processing cost of $5.5 million. Hundreds of millions accounts below $10, costing who knows how much to process? (8) 15 million shareholders of stock, many are not taxpayers, 29 million savings and loan recipients, 7 million of which receive less than $10, again many not taxpayers involved.

In summary, the Treasury will collect and keep large amounts of tax to which Government is not entitled, taken from people who need it most.

Section 13. Foreign controlled corporation. This section is so farreaching in effect, and so interrelated with our treaties and trade policy I would like to present them comparatively for some sober thought on the part of my readers. This comparison is drawn in the remarks I made on the floor of the House during debate.

The speech is reprinted below:

REVENUE ACT OF 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, too little attention in this debate, it seems to me, has been given to the comparative consideration of this tax bill and the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, both measures coming before the Ways and Means Committee. Interestingly enough, both give evidence to the attempt being made by both the administration and Democratic congressional leaders to lessen the competitive position economically of the United States in the world today. Three general and related statements can be made about the provisions of these bills, even before any attempt is made to wonder why this is being done. First, both bills lessen U.S. industry's ability to compete in the world market. Second, both bills increase Government's control over industry and in so doing threaten to destroy private enterprise, replacing our private ingenuity and incentive with Government-controlled industry. The answer to socialism, communism's challenge of Government-controlled industry is not to shackle our own with similar controls. On the contrary, we should free up our industry in both tax and trade to place our Nation in a better position economically to compete for the world's market, as freemen and private enterprise.

Freedom and private enterprise can run circles around men who work for Government in Government-controlled industries.

Let us look at both the tax and trade bills. The minority report, the Republican separate views state the case well, on the tax effect of U.S. foreign-controlled corporations—pages 21–27 of the report. These points are made:

First. Congress cannot constitutionally tax shareholders on the undisturbed income of foreign corporations, except in case of evasion. Until the Court decides this after costly litigation we will not know if this tax is even constitutional.

Second. This tax bill reverses a longstanding U.S. policy of encouraging expansion of U.S. industry abroad. Trade not aid was part of this theme.

Third. Tax deferral abroad was considered so important last year by the Democrats that H.R. 5 was sponsored with this statement in the report of their position:

"The postponement of American tax as long as the funds are used in foreign operations is necessary to place the U.S. corporations operating abroad on a competitive basis with other corporations, either United States or foreign owned, which operate in the same foreign countries."

Today's tax bill completely reverses this policy of last year and many years in the past, placing our U.S. corporations at a disadvantage by now increasing their tax burden.

Fourth. Foreign investment of U.S. industry that accumulates abroad in the long run helps, not hurts, the balance-of-payments problem because a dollar invested abroad increases exports from the United States and produces dividends to the American investor which ultimately exceed the dollar invested. This bill now contradicts this undisputed logic.

Fifth. Any attempt to keep American business at home through the tax laws is isolationism at its worst. The tax laws would then become the equivalent of a discriminatory tariff or duty, applicable only to the American-owned business operating overesas but not to its foreign-owned competitor.

Sixth. Until there is free trade with others, nations lowering tariffs to meet ours, Congress should not penalize the American businessman further for going abroad in order to seek and make a place in that market.

Seventh. American corporations must compete with foreign owned. If the American firm cannot invest equally abroad with this competitors, foreign capital will take its place. Then income flowing back to the United States will be less.

Eighth. The other 14 major industrial nations do not tax undistributed earnings as we are here seeking to do. On the contrary many adopt tax incentives to encourage investment abroad.

Ninth. Liberalized depreciation, not investment credit, as here proposed is the area too where foreign nations can outcompete the United States. In the first 5 years, while U.S. industry can depreciate less than 50 percent of the cost of equipment Japan can write off 100 percent, Germany 67 percent, and others can do likewise.

Tenth. The use of so-called tax havens by an American-owned foreign company actually produces more tax revenue for the United States when funds are repatriated.

Eleventh. The tax bill is likely to cause foreign nations to increase their tax of U.S. industry there to soak up the differential in tax which would otherwise go to the United States. This too will serve to drive American business out of the European market.

Twelfth. The tax on U.S.-controlled foreign corporations violates our tax treaties with other nations. For one, the U.S. membership of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—OECD—permits the United States taxing American shareholders only on those profits which are distributed by the company. This bill violates our agreements with Sweden, the United Kingdom, Germany, France, Netherlands, Denmark, Norway, Switzerland, Austria, Italy, Belgium, Greece, Ireland, and Canada.

Boil these statements down—they say one thing. American firms are in for tougher times in trying to compete in the world market.

Now let us look at the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. The President is given carte blanche authority to cut tariffs 50 percent on broad categories of products and remove all tariffs that are lower than 5 percent. What is and what will be American industry's position in world market? Will it be easier to compete or not?

First of all, U.S. tariffs are now among the lowest in the world. Others in reciprocal trade agreements do not match ours.

On the contrary they impose, in violation of GATT agreements, quotes, licenses, embargoes, cartels, registrations, levies, and subsidies and many other restrictive controls, more restrictive than are tariffs as a control of the free flow of trade. American industries are already hurt not because of ability to compete but because other nations unfairly keep up trade barriers. So what will lowering our tariffs accomplish? Further harm to U.S. industry, less ability to compete. The Trade Act of 1962 asks the Congress to abandon, first, the no-injury policy; second, item-by-item consideration of products in trade; third, the peril point and escape clause protection; fourth, Tariff Commission findings; fifth, any court review; sixth, congressional jurisdiction.

In place of this the shift of power goes to the President or to whomever he delegates to single out industries and products for devastating foreign competition by lowering our tariffs while others keep up their tariffs and other controls. Then the President, or whomever he delegates, can single out or deny any industry harmed for Federal aid in loans, guarantees, and advisory help as well as monetary assistance to that industry's workers who are displaced by foreign imports.

Now put the two bills together. What do we have? We have a tremendous increase of governmental control over industry and the transfer of tremendous power to the President by Congress over U.S. industry, dictatorial in scope, beyond recall or repair in damage. Of course, political friends or foes can be properly rewarded or punished. Beyond dictatorial power we see, second, U.S. industry cannot compete with other nations if our creative genius and private initiative is destroyed by bureacratic governmental control through tax and tariff. Destroyed it will be through regulation by tax and tariff as these bills spell out. Well might we pause to ask ourselves, what is our national purpose? Who is behind this scheme? Why does the President and the Democratic leaders of Congress insist on these two pieces of bad legislation? Our only hope lies in the commonsense and intelligence of our people to see the danger and deny this power and governmental control over our private enterprise and personal freedoms.

Senator Wayne Morse Honored by American International College, Springfield, Mass., With Doctor of Laws Degree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague on the Senate side, the Honorable WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, spoke brilliantly and to the point on President Kennedy's alliance for progress for Latin America during his convocation address at American International College in my home city of Springfield, Mass., on March 10.

The distinguished Senator, who is chairman of the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, was also honored for his service to all Americans when American International College presented him with an honorary doctorate of laws degree. I am very proud myself for I too received an honorary doctorate of laws degree from American International College during commencement last June.

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to include with my remarks at this point the citation to Senator MORSE accompanying the honorary degree, and the news story from the Springfield Sunday Republican of March 11 containing excerpts from his convocation address, given in connection with the Conference of the New England Association of International Relations Clubs at American International College on March 9, 10, and 11:

WAYNE LYMAN MORSE

Son of the great State of Wisconsin, you were a brilliant student in her schools, as you were later when working for your four earned degrees at Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Columbia Universities.

As college professor, law school dean, member of numerous boards and committees,

and statesman, you have won the admiration of your colleagues and friends as well as the respect of your fellow citizens.

In the Senate of the United States you serve the State of Oregon and the Nation with great distinction, as a tireless worker for the principles you have never compromised.

We acknowledge your splendid attainments, and we are proud to count you an honorary alumnus of this college.

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the board of trustees of American International College, I hereby confer upon you the degree of doctor of laws, honoris causa, with all of the rights, honors, and privileges pertaining thereunto.

JOHN F. HINES,
President.

Given at Springfield, Mass., this 10th day of March 1962.

SENATOR BACKS U.S. LATIN AIMS

If American students of this generation can export freedom of thought to other nations, an effective blow will be struck for freedom, Senator WAYNE L. MORSE told the conference of New England Association of International Relations Clubs at American International College Saturday.

About 150 delegates representing 22 colleges and universities, including the University of Montreal, Canada, are attending the 3-day conclave.

GIVEN HONORARY DEGREE

The Oregon Democrat, veteran of 18 years in the Senate, member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and a member of various subcommittees, was presented an honorary doctor of laws degree by AIC President John F. Hines during the program in the new campus center.

The citation read in part: "As college professor, law school dean, member of various boards and committees, and statesmen, you have won the admiration of your colleagues and friends as well as the respect of your fellow citizens, in the Senate of the United States you serve the State of Oregon and the Nation with great distinction, as a tireless worker for the principles you have never compromised. We acknowledge your splendid attainments, and we are proud to count you as an honorary alumnus of this college."

Senator MORSE said he was deeply moved by the honor and accepted the degree with "pride and gratitude."

LATIN AFFAIRS TOPIC

Taking part in the presentation in the center's Alumni Auditorium were John I. Robinson, chairman of the AIC History Department and Dr. Gilman Randall of the college faculty.

"I come here, as elsewhere, not asking for agreement but for thought," Senator MORSE told the assembled students, faculty members and guests.

He spoke on U.S. affairs with Latin America from his experience as chairman of the Senate's Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs and as a participant in the recent conference at Punta del Este, Uruguay.

"The basic policy of the United States toward Latin America today is to foster both security and progress in the shortest period of time, Senator MORSE declared.

EMERGE FROM ISOLATIONISM

He traced the origin of Inter-American affairs from the Monroe Doctrine of 1823, through various interpretations and through the emergence of Latin America to a position of importance in the affairs of the free world.

"* * * It may be said that while the United States has emerged from isolationism to join and lead a worldwide community of wealthy and long-established democratic states, the nations of Latin America have emerged from isolation to join the new countries of Asia and Africa not in a community but in a common revolution. It is a revolution conceived in economic deprivation and political humiliation, nurtured by the force of nationalism and soaring hopes of economic advance and dedicated to the goal of securing for themselves decent, dignified, and rewarding lives as modern nations."

The peoples of Latin America have awakened to the great social forces—communism, democracy and especially nationalism—that have aroused all peoples of the non-European world, he said.

UNRESOLVED DILEMMAS

"Both the United States and the Latin American republics came into their new roles with unresolved dilemmas and anomalies. The ambiguity for the United States was its failure until very recently to adjust the regionalism of the Monroe Doctrine to the new 'globalism' of the problems that confront us. While we spent billions to rebuild Europe, and more billions to help the new nations of Asia and Africa, and we said to Latin America: 'We are not going to help you, and under the Monroe Doctrine, we are not going to let anyone else help you either,'" Senator MORSE continued.

The United States intervened in Latin American affairs in the past chiefly for the protection of U.S. investments and security, he said.

Today's problem of nonintervention is whether the Organization of American States can or cannot intervene in the affairs of one of its member states in order to forestall intervention from beyond the American Continents that threatens the security of the entire hemisphere, the Senator contended.

"It is not difficult to understand that, for deeply rooted historical reasons, the Latin American reaction to Soviet intervention in the hemisphere is conditioned by the experience of American intervention."

CONCERN OVER CASTRO

Many Latin Americans who are persuaded that Fidel Castro's professed Marxist-Leninist political philosophy has the support of the Cuban people do not contest what they regard as Cuba's right to self-determination.

Coupled to the existence of real concern in some democratic Latin American governments that Castro's breed of communism may be exerted beyond the borders of Cuba, is satisfaction and some surprise that the Punta del Este conference went so far as to deprive Cuba of participation in the OAS, the speaker continued.

"The compelling question at this juncture is the degree to which the governments of Latin America are prepared to tolerate the efforts of the Castro regime to subvert the legitimate representative governments that now prevail in most of Latin America. There can be no question that some progress was made at Punta del Este when shipments of arms and other implements of war from Cuba to subversives in other countries of the OAS were embargoed. Another measure to forestall intervention from Cuba was the setting up of a five-man committee of experts on how to combat subversion," Senator MORSE said.

CAN HANDLE CADRES

He noted that most Latin American governments are able to deal at present with the hard core of Moscow-trained Communists within their own frontiers.

"In the past there has been a tendency to regard intervention by the United States as intolerable and Communist intervention with indifference or only mild concern. The alliance for progress and the excesses of the Castro regime are bringing about a slow but discernible change in these attitudes. In due course these trends may be expected to generate new attitudes toward intervention, more favorable in regard to the United States, and more realistic in regard to Cuba and the Soviet Union," he said.

The alliance for progress, representing a new form of intervention in depth designed to cope with ancient social and economic ills and to recast the societies of Latin America, aims to generate the means for creating a decent social and economic life for all Latin Americans under free institution, the Senator declared.

REFORMS NEEDED

He added that great reforms are needed to solve the staggering social and economic problems oppressing Latin America and the United States and the OAS must help bring them about by due process of law.

"We've got to export economic freedom to Latin America and stop trying to export political freedom * * * We've got to remember that when we plant the seedbeds of economic freedom, the flowering plant of political freedom will follow."

He cited needs for land reform, new housing, investment capital, diversification of export products and—"probably the most pressing long-term need—education." Teacher training and adapting curricula to social reformations could be a great field of activity for the Peace Corps, Morse suggested.

"The task of the alliance for progress in the face of these staggering problems is, in the words of President Kennedy, 'to demonstrate to the entire world that man's unsatisfied aspirations for economic justice can be achieved by free men working within a fromework of free institutions.' With an objective of social revolution without violent upheaval, the alliance exceeds in scope and design the postwar Marshall plan for Europe, whose objective was one of restoration.

"The extent to which it succeeds or fails will probably also be the extent of success with our modern version of the Monroe Doctrine," he concluded.

The East-West Conflict: Will Versus Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, since the conduct of foreign affairs is a dominating issue here in Washington especially with the contradictory policies of the State Department administration, I deem it necessary from time to time to insert into the RECORD articles and comments that are intended to clarify our understanding and thinking on the issue. Such an article is one by Marguerite Higgins in the Monday, April 2 issue of the Chicago Sun-Times, which I ask leave to insert into the RECORD at this point:

AS MARGUERITE HIGGINS SEES IT—THE EAST-WEST CONFLICT: WILL VERSUS POWER

(By Marguerite Higgins)

WASHINGTON.—Prime Minister Nikita S. Khrushchev, proving himself flamboyantly undeterred by the New Frontier's determined show of civility, remains without question the modern world's most bellicose statesman. He leaves Red China's Mao Tse-tung, for example, far behind so far as the art of threatening is concerned—at least in public utterances.

Khrushchev's latest in the threat department is, of course, the claim to powerful new global rockets that can come in through America's south polar window, while this country's defenders are intently watching the arctic door.

Khrushchev and his defense ministers also claim to have an antimissile missile in the works, thus presenting the picture of an America that is not only helpless to prevent nuclear devastation but unable to retaliate effectively.

Washington doesn't believe either.

But ever since the new Soviet test series there has been much anguished prophesying in the West about the dreadful future if the Russians were to have the balance of power shifted in their favor.

DE GAULLE HAS A WORD FOR IT

But what would really happen if the nightmare were realized?

Would a shift to the Russians of the balance of power automatically bring on a chain reaction and disaster for the West?

France, the leading lesson for our time of how even a European nation larger than Albania can defy the Russians, does not think so. President Charles de Gaulle has said: "What do I care if the Russians can kill France 10 times over, if I can kill the Russians once" (meaning reach any important part of Russia with nuclear weapons). De Gaulle is assuming that no matter how many antimissile missiles Khrushchev produces, the West can still get through to Russia with something.

De Gaulle contends, in other words, that the balance of terror is insufficient as a concept and indeed that the area of decision is in the balance of wills.

WASHINGTON LAGS IN LEARNING

Learning from one's enemies is, alas, a lamentably lagging enterprise in Washington. Nonetheless there is high potential return in examining the records of how Russia managed to operate at a geographical and political profit in those years when the United States was (1) the sole possessor of the atomic bomb, (2) the strongest world power, and (3) the only major power whose industrial real estate had not been shattered by bombs.

Consider Russia in 1945. There was semistarvation in many areas such as the Ukraine. Four million Soviet citizens had defected under General Slassov to the West. America had the atom bomb and a shift in the world balance of power was a mere gleam in Joseph Stalin's eye.

Nonetheless, Stalin had the will to act as if Russia were the greatest world power and to test the will of America. This correspondent was in Poland during the beginning of one of the first great tests of wills. Cautiously the Russians set about welshing on the Yalta pact, providing for Polish self-determination.

Soviet experts like Charles E. Bohlen argued the Red Army was in Poland, so there was nothing that all America's balance of power could avail those Poles who so desperately wanted to keep their freedom.

However, there was no responsible diplomat on the scene in Poland at that time who agreed with Bohlen.

It was the view of the non-Bohlen school of Soviet experts that if America had taken its pledges of freedom seriously enough to issue some brisk warnings, and recall a few reservists, there is no doubt but that Russia would have had no choice—given the balance of power—but to back down—or rather live up to their solemnly signed agreements.

What is certain is that the United States did nothing effective about Poland. What Stalin deduced thereby of America's will to act is recorded by the historical fact that between 1945 and 1950 the Soviet Union took over much of East Europe.

Is the only correct question therefore this one: If Russia did all that when the United States had the balance of power, what won't she do if this becomes Moscow's possession?

Or is it possible to ask whether even the democracies could not overcome the theoretical and practical odds of a shift in the balance of power and wonder if President de Gaulle may not be showing us the way?

Wages and Foreign Trade—Productivity, Employment, and Industrial Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, as a sequel to a preceding analysis of Wages and Foreign Trade, Productivity, and so forth, I offer for the RECORD under leave to extend my remarks, part II of Mr. O. R. Strackbein's analysis:

II

A study of market demand, including the possibility of its expansion and the degree of its saturation, and the consequent illumination of the field of production by the light of what is already known about farm-product demand, the possible foreign markets, and also what we know of industrial products and minerals and the nature of demand for them, are a necessary prelude to the intelligent guidance of economic expansion and growth. This does not call for governmental planning of production or the control of the flow of investment but rather the gathering and systematic correlation of information both by the government and private sources.

It follows that we should inquire into the effects of rising productivity on employment. This usually revolves around the character of the demand for particular products. Some products have a definite ceiling. The demand for other products may be more elastic and may be expansible far beyond even apparent saturation.

It would only create more problems for us if we should continue blindly to pursue rising productivity without regard to consumer needs. We may end up with great efficiency and a surplus, with worker-displacement as a special dividend. This is what happened with our agricultural production. A most commendable leap in productivity was made and we have fed and clothed our people; but at the same time created a surplus and unemployment problem.

It follows from the biological limit to food consumption, for example, that an increase in agricultural productivity that is sharper than the rise in population will inevitably result in surplus output; and if the productivity has increased very sharply massive displacement of farmworkers will be inevitable. In the face of this problem we are now feverishly trying to export agricultural products on a rising scale but, of course, obstacles appear on all sides.

The rise in the yield per acre of American agriculture has indeed been phenomenal, and greatly exceeded the population growth. In the case of corn the yield went from 37.4 bushels per acre in 1950 to 53 bushels in 1960, representing an increase of 41.7 percent in 10 years, compared with an 18.4-percent increase in population.

In the case of wheat, the yield rose from 16.5 bushels per acre in 1950 to 25.9 bushels in 1960, and this was an increase of 57 percent in 10 years. Cotton rose from 269 pounds per acre to 448 pounds, thus recording an increase of 66.5 percent. Rice yield increased 43 percent; tobacco 35 percent and sorghums for grain gained a little over 100 percent.

Acreage restrictions have not equaled the increase in yield, with the result that in spite of our 18.4-percent increase in population from 1950 to 1960, surpluses continued generally to increase disconcertingly.

This fact, as just noted, has created great pressure for exportation. At the same time we have unaccountably encouraged importation.

Unfortunately the prices on our principal export crops; namely, wheat (including wheat flour) and cotton are some 30 percent above world prices. Therefore in order to export them we have found it necessary to subsidize both items about 30 percent of the world price. In the most recent fiscal year we exported $2 billion of these two crops, with wheat (including wheat flour) slightly in the lead; and it cost the U.S. Treasury, i.e., the taxpayer, between $500 and $600 million to do so.

We have indeed increased our agricultural exports in the past decade, going from $2.98 billion in 1950 to $4.9 billion in fiscal year 1960–61. Yet our surplus persists. If we wish to export more it will be necessary to subsidize even more.

The European countries of the Common Market, particularly Germany, seeing this example, perhaps prefer to continue their smaller farm system and thus avoid the surplus and unemployment problem that has beset us.

Is it not possible that efficiency, much as we are wedded to it, and the rising productivity to which it leads, may create more problems than it solves if it is pushed in the wrong direction? The worship of efficiency should perhaps be more discriminating; for it must be clear that rising productivity may and often does generate stubborn unemployment.

From 1950 to 1960 U.S. farm employment dropped from 9,926,000 to 7,118,000 for a total decline of 2,808,000. Meantime population continued to expand.

Had the efficiency or productivity of our farms increased only 18.4 percent during the decade no new unemployment would have resulted; but nor would already employed workers have been laid off. The quota for agriculture would have been 1,826,000 additional workers to keep in step with population. Instead, employment fell by 2.8 million. Added together we find our farming operations falling 4,634,000 behind in employment absorption in 10 years' time.

Unless these workers found employment elsewhere they would remain without work.

Where then would they look? To industry?

Unfortunately, industry, too, had become more productive through greater efficiency, mechanization and automation. The increased output per man-hour is not in all cases as easily measured as the yield per acre of a crop; but we do have some measures and these indicate a varying rate in productivity increases among different products.

However, there is a difference between some industrial products and farm products with respect to the character of demand. Greater elasticity of demand characterizes some industrial products.

The notion that human wants are indefinitely expansible no doubt arose, not from observing the consumption of wheat or milk or peanuts, but rather from the proliferation of new industrial products, new uses for old products, etc., that was visible on many sides.

Yet, the demand for industrial products is not in all instances notably elastic or expansible. Some industrial products, such as

shoes, may also reach a saturation point in a particular market and then must depend on population growth or exports for further expansion. This might be true of soap, dentifrices, towels, shirts, hair brushes, and many other items.

The question in each instance would be whether all potential customers are already consumers; or only 10, 25, or 50 percent, or the like. If the market were not yet saturated, additional output might still be disposed of through special effort.

Would additional investment then be justified? That might depend upon the possibility of achieving a lower cost of production, for the current price level might act as an obstacle to gaining new customers. Only if the demand for the product were elastic, i.e., price responsive, could a lower price become the lure to greater consumption.

Assuming an elastic demand we are next confronted with the question of purchasing power. Do the potential customers have the means of buying, for example, is their demand only in the head or is it supported by pocketmoney or credit?

If effective demand is present a reduction in the cost (assuming an elastic demand) would ordinarily attract more customers; but whether these would merely be drawn away from other producers or were net additions to the consumer rank would determine whether the technological improvement that led to the lower prices would spell net unemployment or a standstill or rising employment. If sales increased sufficiently, additional workers might be added; otherwise employment would actually shrink. If sales did rise sufficiently a yet greater volume of output would result and new economies might be realized and still lower prices might be offered. This in turn would tap additional new customers; and a larger workforce would then be needed.

This process might continue over a considerable period of time. New producers might be enticed into the field, even as existing ones expanded. Production and consumption might expand quite amazingly and eventually to great proportions, as has been experienced with many products in this country, assuming that the purchasing power also had expanded. This would depend on the wage level and general productivity.

The doctrine of higher productivity together with higher wages was based on this concept; and it worked. Yet it does not work with all products and under all circumstances. The exceptions are very important and becoming more so; and they are not limited to the products for which demand is inelastic, important as this is, such as the demand for sugar, floor, salt, thimbles, black pepper, and other products, some of them already mentioned.

Assume that a domestic manufacturer produces barbed wire and that he had established a distribution system that produced a sales volume sufficient to maintain his plant at a level of about 1,000 employees. Assume further that he had been sufficiently efficient, not only to hold his own with his competitors at home but even to expand his sales in keeping with a slowly growing demand. Finally assume that imports of such wire began to rise and to invade his market. The prices offered might be 10, 20 or 25 percent below those received by the American manufacturer, a differential that is not uncommon.

Unquestionably in order to compete, this manufacturer would find it necessary to reduce his prices. At first this would mean shrinking profits. After seeing his profits receding he would turn to means of reducing costs. How best accomplish this? The heaviest factor would probably be in wages. Therefore he would undertake to install more productive machinery if it were available. In days long gone by he would have reduced wages.

Let us say the then succeeded in reducing his work force to 800 workers.

Would this resort to cost-reduction expand his market? This would be unlikely, even if the demand for his product were elastic, because he would only be meeting the lower cost of the imported wire. He would merely be holding his own in his market. The net result would then be the displacement of 200 workers. Should he then struggle to reduce his cost still more he would find that his foreign competitor could also do so. Perhaps he would in the end find a level at which he could live with the existing competition; but in time he might be confronted with a type of competition that he could not hope to reach even with further cost reductions, such as might come from Japan.

What to do now? Close his plant? Such has, of course, often been the result. He might, on the other hand, look about for new products to manufacture; or, were he a large operator, he might make arrangements for manufacturing abroad. Both courses have been pursued and continue to be pursued to a disturbing degree. New products do, however, on occasion come to the rescue; but foreign manufacturers are intensely interested in new products themselves. Also they now have advanced greatly in technology and mechanization; so that in 2 or 3 years or sooner the domestic manufacturer need not be surprised to find himself confronted anew with the import problem. He would then have to cast about frantically for another new product or do as some have already done, i.e., become an importer himself.

If, to avoid such a merry-go-round, he were to invest abroad instead of expanding in this country, the effect on domestic employment would, of course, be negative and regressive. Import activities cannot create as much employment as the domestic manufacture of the same products would generate.

The quest for new products is, in truth, continuous even where import competition does not supply the spur. Domestic competition produces such search without surcease. The launching of such products usually represents a process of trial and error, and success cannot be scheduled.

The fact is that in the United States great success has been achieved in this direction. Patent protection acts as an incentive; and in any case domestic competition can be absorbed because it is based on wage levels that are more nearly equal, and all competitors face equal tax burdens, etc. Sometimes the marketing of new products for which the demand has already been tested and found rewarding, gives rise to lively "growth" industries. We have depended on a number of industries of this kind to provide the employment opportunities needed to absorb those who have been displaced in the settled industries and agricultural pursuits where the market has become saturated and where improvements in productivity have reduced the need for workers. We have only to think of the automobile industry, motion pictures, refrigeration, television, plastics, air conditioning, etc., in the industrial field and of tung nuts and soybeans in the agricultural field.

Some but not all of these new industries, however, sometimes merely replace existing ones and do not contribute much to employment except as the population increases.

The richer possibility lies with industrial products. We should not sacrifice industrial production in order to export agricultural output. To do so might be the same as trading products that have greater growth and employment potentials for those for which the market is inelastic and the employment possibilities relatively limited.

Unfortunately the appearance of new industries cannot be commanded or foretold. Moreover, the demand for a product, simply because it is new, cannot itself often be forecast. Wonderful prospectuses may be issued but these too frequently have the mortality, in practice, of seed catalogs.

Even the potential demand for a given new product may be limited by the population because each person could consume only so much. The market at the outset might nevertheless still be a huge one in this country because of our population. The trend of consumption and therefore of employment in producing the item would then depend on the extent of market exploitation. Advertising and salesmanship would become the principal means of exhausting the potential.

Until saturation were reached consumption might increase from year to year and, unless higher productivity canceled the need for more workers, as well it might, employment would rise.

The employment potential of products obviously varies greatly. Petroleum production is a low-level employer; as are sugar refining, distilling of alcoholic beverages, cigarette manufacturing and many other important industries. Their contribution to employment lies largely in the distributive and service trades; but, as we shall see, this has not been large enough to overcome the shrinkage elsewhere.

The demand for some products, again, revolves about the law of probabilities, as reflected, say, in mortuary tables and other vital statistics. Only so many coffins or diapers are sold. Also, the need for an item may be only occasional rather than diurnal, such as cornplaster, tophats or household iodine. Other items have a durable quality that endear them to the consumer. A hammer in a home may render service for many years. The ambitious manufacturer then seeks to enlarge his market by generating two-hammer homes; or he might seek feverishly to invent new uses for the hammer. Some of these might be too gruesome for pursuit.

Again, the demand for some items fades out in spite of all efforts to prevent it. Hatlessness has prevented the men's hat industry from growing apace. Men's garters were replaced by elastic-top socks. Tie pins went out with the snows of yesteryear; and what has become of spats and shaving mugs? Death sentences may come from anywhere, even as new demand develops for other products.

When there is no other hope of increasing demand the temptation is high to tamper with the durability of the product or to export it.

Time was when the launcher or manufacturer of a new product enjoyed a long period in which to exploit the market. Today imports may soon be on his heels and foreign markets soon supplied from abroad. In some cases the producer of the new product or one of his brethren may license a foreign manufacturer and thus split the market and quickly terminate the vista of an ever-growing foreign and domestic market, with its rich employment possibilities. This procedure has been exemplified in some degree by the licensing of foreign producers of certain electronics items, new drugs, etc. in recent years.

As a rescue squad for solution of the unemployment problem our new, dynamic and growing industries have unfortunately lagged in recent years. In several important cases import competition turned down the wick on expansion. Even with the help of the "service" industries, trades and professions, we threw people out of work faster from 1950 to 1960 than they could be absorbed; or faster, rather, than they, plus the million new workers who came on the scene each year, could be provided with jobs.

Chicago's Good American Awards Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Good American Awards for "outstanding contributions in the fields of civic improvement and human relations" will be presented tomorrow night, April 3, in Chicago, to 40 outstanding leaders who have been selected for this great honor by the Chicago Committee of 100.

Governor Kerner, the chief executive of the State of Illinois, has proclaimed the week of April 1 through 7 to be "Good Americans Week" in the State of Illinois in conjunction with the awards which are being presented to these outstanding citizens tomorrow night in Chicago.

In his proclamation, Governor Kerner paid tribute to the Chicago Committee of 100 which, since its inception in 1941, has pledged itself as an organization of business and professional men and women to foster civic, social, and economic improvements in the city of Chicago.

The Governor quite appropriately commends the Chicago Committee of 100 for its firm belief that the leadership which our great Nation can offer a troubled world today depends totally upon its ability to continue producing Americans who are passionately and vigorously dedicated to the sacred ideals which have brought our country to unrivaled greatness.

Those being honored with the Good American Award in Chicago have helped create a true image of our Nation by practicing in their daily lives the basic principles of American democracy. These 40 Americans who will be honored during an impressive banquet at McCormick Place in Chicago tomorrow evening are indeed a reflection of the entire population of Chicago, which time and again has demonstrated its abiding dedication to the principles of democracy.

Chicago truly represents the spirit of America. In this great metropolis we find Americans of virtually all ethnic, racial, and religious backgrounds working together to strengthen the fibers of American ideals. On the shores of Lake Michigan, we find people of all economic levels expressing the courage ond confidence which is so manifest in the idealism of a nation built on free enterprise and dedication.

The Good American Award recipients, whose names I shall include at the conclusion of my remarks, reflect a cross section of the people of Chicago. Each in his own way has earned this very distinguished honor because of the contribution that he or she has made to the principles of democracy.

While we in Chicago are proud of every one of the people receiving this year's Good American Award, I am particularly proud of the fact that in this group is included one of my own most distinguished constituents, Dr. Lois L. Higgins, director of the Illinois Crime Prevention Bureau, and one of the Nation's outstanding authorities in the field of prevention of crime among young people. Dr. Higgins is known throughout America, and indeed the world, for the great contribution she has made in recent years toward the development of more effective techniques to deal with the problem of wayward youth. She richly deserves the award she will receive in Chicago tomorrow.

I am sure that my colleagues will want to join me in paying tribute to these outstanding Americans from Chicago who are recipients of the Good American Award. It is my hope that, in time, the Good American Awards will become a national institution, when communities throughout the country will hold similarly inspirational programs to honor the outstanding citizens of their respective communities for their contribution to the American ideals of freedom and democracy.

Mr. Speaker, the leaders named by the Chicago Committee of One Hundred to receive awards in Chicago tomorrow night are:

Senators Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois, and Dirksen, Republican, of Illinois; Mayor Daley; Maj. Gen. B. O. Davis, Jr., Air Force Director of Manpower and Organization; Arthur Rubloff, real estate executive; C. Virgil Martin, president of Carson Pirie Scott & Co.; Joel Goldblatt, president of Goldblatt Bros. department stores; Remick McDowell, chairman of Peoples Gas Light & Coke Co.; Ferd Kramer, president of Draper & Kramer; H. D. Pettibone, former chairman of Chicago Title & Trust Co.; Myron Goldsmith, president, Lag Drug Co.; Dr. Perry E. Julian, president of Julian Laboratories.

Others are Louis E. Martin, deputy chairman of the Democratic National Committee; A. Abbott Rosen, midwest director of the Anti-Defamation League, B'nai B'rith; Judge Hubert L. Will of the Federal district court; Howard C. Mathis, director of West Kentucky Vocational School, Paducah; Norman Ross, radio-television news commentator; Hilton E. Hanna, executive assistant, Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butchers Workmen of North America Union, LeRoy Winbush, president of Winbush Associates; J. C. Staehle, vice president of Alden, Inc.; Maurice F. X. Donohue, director of the University College of the University of Chicago; the Very Reverend Daniel M. Cantwell, chaplain of the Catholic Interracial Council of Chicago.

The list also includes Lois L. Higgins, director of the Illinois Crime Prevention Bureau; Richard P. Larson, president of South Side Bank & Trust Co.; Raymond M. Hilliard, director of Cook County Department of Public Aid; Mrs. Charlemae Rollins, children's librarian of the Hall branch library; Harriet E. White, director of community affairs for the National Conference of Christians and Jews; Dr. E. Jerry Walker, pastor of St. James Methodist Church; Dr. Archibald J. Carey, Jr., pastor of Quinn Chapel; Dr. T. Manuel Smith, physician and surgeon, and Mrs. Stella L. Counselbaum, executive secretary of the Illinois Commission on Human Rights in High Education.

Nine leaders were named previously to receive the award. They are:

Judge James B. Parsons of the Federal district court; Conrad Hilton, hotel executive; Russ Stewart, executive vice president of the Chicago Sun-Times & Daily News; C. E. McKittrick, assistant to the publisher of the Chicago Tribune; Stuart List, publisher of Chicago's American; Andrew T. Hatcher, associate White House press secretary; Irv Kupcinet, Chicago Sun-Times columnist; Joseph L. Block, chairman of Inland Steel Co., and Frank Reynolds, news commentator from the Columbia Broadcasting System.

The Problem of Narcotic Addiction Is Social and Medical

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the problem of narcotics is one which has disturbed the American people. The use of narcotic drugs has increased in the United States despite the sustained effort to punish traffickers of these drugs; whereas, in other countries the number of cases has dwindled. Some of these countries recognize that the users should be treated as medical cases and social problems rather than as criminals. The great State of New York, of which I am proud to be a Representative, recently passed a concurrent resolution memorializing Congress and the President of the United States to provide a Federal narcotics hospital in the New York metropolitan area. Their urgent plea should not be disregarded. A detailed statement by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of New York demonstrates what the use of narcotics has done to the victims and shows a way to cope with the problem.

I introduced in 1961, H.R. 9224, which would authorize the Surgeon General to make grants-in-aid to the States and the political subdivisions to construct narcotic hospital facilities to be used in conjunction with a posthospital program for the care, treatment, and rehabilitation of addicts. This measure was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which should give serious consideration to this legislation.

The great New York newspaper, The Journal-American, has inspired a campaign to inform the public as to the ravages of the use of narcotics drugs and has urged interested citizens to importune their legislators to take legal action to combat this growing scourage. One constituent of mine, the Rev. Norman C. Eddy, has been actively engaged in programs to fight the narcotic problem and to treat narcotic addicts as sick people instead of as criminals. It behooves us,

therefore, to pay heed to the resolution passed by the New York State Legislature. All those who have forward-looking views and who are concerned with the welfare of their unfortunate fellow man who has fallen victim to the use of drugs should read the resolution and absorb its contents.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION 117

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress and the President of the United States to provide a Federal narcotics hospital in the New York metropolitan area

Whereas the human suffering and social and economic loss caused by drug addiction are matters of grave concern to the people of this State; and

Whereas persons who become addicted to narcotic drugs are most often adolescents and young adults who are victimized before they are old enough to appreciate the tragic consequences; and

Whereas the highly infectious scourge of drug addiction continues to take its toll of human lives and the health of thousands of its helpless victims; and

Whereas essentially the entire illegal supply of narcotics in the United States is brought into New York State from foreign countries; and

Whereas Federal authorities have not been able to sustain an effective attack against the smuggling of narcotics into the country; and

Whereas the inability of Federal authorities to cope effectively with the illicit importing of narcotics has directly contributed to the increasing urgency of this most pressing medical and social problem; and

Whereas effective, coordinated State, Federal, and local programs of treatment can be developed to save hundreds and ultimately thousands of young narcotics addicts from enslavement to drugs by offering them medical and psychiatric treatment; and

Whereas the problem of drug addiction can be attacked effectively only if all levels of government, local, State, and Federal, shoulder their full measure of responsibility in research and in prevention, treatment, and aftercare of drug addiction; and

Whereas the State of New York has taken a major step forward to meet its share of these responsibilities by enactment of legislation and other action offering arrested drug addicts humane medical treatment instead of imprisonment, and by strengthening its program of voluntary commitments of noncriminal addicts to State hospitals for treatment; and

Whereas it is the unanimous consensus of expert medical opinion that drug addicts share a common need for programs of planned hospitalization followed by intensive aftercare treatment; and

Whereas New York State, and particularly the city of New York, by reason of its national eminence as a seaport and the availability of illicit narcotic drugs smuggled into the United States from all over the world through the enormous port facilities of New York City, has the most serious addiction problem in the country; and

Whereas hospital and aftercare treatment facilities, to be of maximum benefit to persons in need of such assistance should be located in areas of high concentration of addiction: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That the Congress and the President of the United States are hereby respectfully memorialized to take immediate steps toward providing affirmative support to State, local, and individual initiative in obtaining a Federal narcotics hospital in the New York metropolitan area to provide for (a) extensive research in narcotics addiction, (b) addict treatment services affording adequate inpatient care, and (c) aftercare services for released addicts; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the U.S. Senate, to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of Congress duly elected from the State of New York and that the latter be urged to assert their best efforts to the task of accomplishing the purposes of this resolution.

By order of the senate:

JOHN J. SULLIVAN,
Secretary.

In assembly, March 27, 1962, concurred in without amendment.

By order of assembly:

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

San Leandro Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, March 21, I was privileged to be present at the White House when the San Leandro Chamber of Commerce was awarded the coveted Presidential E Award by the President of the United States.

The award was received on behalf of the San Leandro Chamber of Commerce by its president, John G. Blaisdell. I am personally pleased that a city in my district was among the first recipients of this award. My pride goes further than this because of the meaning represented by the award. San Leandro can truly serve as an example for other cities to follow in setting the pace in America's renewed interest in a sound world trade program and a domestic industrial and commercial expansion.

The President's blue and white E flag—a revival of World War II's "E for excellence," plus especially inscribed certificates were conferred on five manufacturers, a bank, a trade magazine, a steamship line, the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, in addition to the San Leandro Chamber of Commerce.

Chamber President Blaisdell said:

This is one of the greatest honors ever to befall upon the San Leandro Chamber and the industrial community which it constantly supports. The progressiveness of our industrial firms in expansion of their export activities has been substantial proof of their belief in this important item on the chamber's program of work—that of building foreign trade. It is an award which will call for a full-scale local celebration.

In a special meeting held by the chamber's executive committee and 1961 Industrial Expansion Committee Chairman Alan Parry, chamber director who initiated and guided stepped-up trade expansion activities by the chamber last year, chambermen were unanimous in their decision to send Blaisdell to Washington for the award.

The chamber's executives are also declaring Thursday, April 5, as a general membership meeting, at which time the flag will be officially hoisted at the chamber office, 858 East 14th Street. Hoisting ceremonies are scheduled for 12 noon sharp. Immediately following, those in attendance will go to Onstad's, 1812 Washington Avenue, for the celebration luncheon.

Included in activities at the luncheon will be presentation of Special E Award pins which chamber President Blaisdell will make to San Leandro industries and distribution firms with export activities, to 1961 Chamber officers, former Chairman Parry, and 1962 Industrial Expansion Chairman F. A. Louis Meyer.

Mayor Jack Maltester joined in words of praise to San Leandro industrialists for their expansion of oversea business. The mayor declared:

It is my understanding that our San Leandro Chamber was selected from several hundred nominations. All of us can join in congratulations to the Chamber on its contribution to our community in urging local companies to build up their export trade business. Many of them have shown substantial percentage increases during this past year. Some of them have broken into a particularly tough competitive market. They have introduced San Leandro-made products in areas where no American products were being sold and they have demonstrated their ability to solve complex documentation, freight forwarding, sales, and market distribution problems in the country of destination. Again, I urge all San Leandrans to join with me in saluting the chamber and saluting the industries which have given the chamber's program substance.

In addition to San Leandro, companies and organizations receiving awards are: Dan River International Corp., New York City; C. G. Hokanson Co., Inc., Los Angeles; Le Tourneau-Westinghouse Co., Peoria; McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York City; Scripto, Inc., Atlanta; Chicago Association of Commerce & Industry, Chicago; Industrial National Bank of Rhode Island, Providence; Isbrandtsen Co., Inc., New York City; Steel Magazine, Cleveland.

I am pleased to offer some background information on steps leading to the award. The 1962 chairman of the San Leandro chamber's industrial expansion program recently lauded his predecessor, Mr. Alan Parry. In addition he outlined the activities under Parry's chairmanship which led to this award:

First. Announced major goal in January 1961 of aiding and urging San Leandro industries to engage in expanded or newly created export trade. Objective formalized following presentation from Philip R. Creighton, Chief of Foreign Trade Division, U.S. Department of Commerce, San Francisco office, at a chamber general membership meeting.

Second. Sponsored areawide seminar for San Leandro firms, first in the West, calling upon U.S. Department of Commerce, export agency and financial officials, plus local industrialist to detail means whereby goal could be accomplished. At this meeting, John J. Judge, western manager for the U.S. Department of Commerce, San Francisco field office; Charles R. Kelly of Getz Bros. & Co., San Francisco export house; Richard Oddie, director of business extension, Bank of America, and Ray Sulprizio, vice president, United Engine & Machine Co., San Leandro, headed up the panel.

Third. Participated in World Trade Week activities using week to further

export goal. Participation involved series of newspaper ads, speaker from Japanese foreign consulate, speakers bureau to organizations; and arranged for 12 local firms in foreign trade to arrange major displays at strategic foot-traffic points in San Leandro.

Fourth. Conducted work session with Frank Felix, manager at that time of San Francisco World Trade Center, explaining services. This was followed by chamber of commerce official visit to World Trade Center for inspection and study of trade opportunities.

Fifth. Displayed throughout year in chamber lobby poster board of U.S. Department of Commerce foreign trade information, including world trade leads issued by the Bureau of International Business Operations.

Sixth. Consulted periodically with local industrialists regarding specific world trade matters and referred them to necessary specialists. Mailed leads to individual companies as they came to chamber's attention.

Seventh. Issued news stories during year regarding world trade opportunities—stories based on Bureau of International Business Operation leads.

Eighth. Held work session with James Simpson, area manager for REA, and other REA express officials. Issued prepublicity and followup news stories on REA's uniform bill of lading and staff helps the company can give industrialists desiring to work through one agency on world trade documentation matters and the like.

Ninth. Arranged for Merrell Woodruff, acting manager, San Francisco U.S. Department of Commerce field office, to present at Northern and Central California Chamber of Commerce Executive Association need for local chambers of commerce to work on building export trade. Several chambers followed up with seminars similar to those held in San Leandro.

Tenth. Set up mechanics for getting 1962 off to a good start for world trade promotions by arranging with Pan American World Airways to fly from New York, George R. Moore, director of worldwide marketing services, to address industrialists on marketing practices in foreign countries.

Eleventh. At year's end, it was estimated number of San Leandro firms engaging or planning to engage in some phase of world trade grew from 22 to 35.

I truly hope the San Leandro story will serve as an inspiration to other communities which will stir them to greater efforts in this area of expanding economic development.

Mrs. Grace Baxter Fenderson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, the whole Nation, and the city of Newark in particular, has suffered a keen loss in the passing of Mrs. Grace Baxter Fenderson on March 19, 1962. This distinguished American exerted a far-reaching influence for good and made a notable contribution to the great causes of education and of civil rights.

Mrs. Fenderson, a lifelong resident of Newark, was the daughter of the late James M. Baxter, the city's sole Negro principal of a public school. From 1864 until his death in 1909, he was in charge of a school for colored children, and his memory was honored in naming a housing project for him. In recent years his daughter played a leading role in the campaign to secure equality of opportunity for advancement for all teachers in the Newark school system.

Mrs. Fenderson graduated from the old Newark Normal School and was one of the first regular Negro teachers in the Newark public school system. She retired in 1948 after serving 42 years as a teacher in Monmouth Street School. She was a founder and the first president of the Monmouth Street School's Parent-Teacher Association and was made a life member of the PTA after her retirement.

For more than half a century Mrs. Fenderson was a militant foe of racial discrimination and she fought to secure for Negro citizens their right to enjoy our country's limitless horizons of freedom and opportunity. She was a founder in 1914 of the Newark chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People which in later years she served as president and as chairman and member of its executive committee. She was also a national vice president of the organization.

Mrs. Fenderson was active in many civic and educational groups. She was past president of the Lincoln Douglass Memorial Association, and a former board member of the New Jersey Hygiene Association, and the Sojourner Truth branch of the YWCA; member of the Newark Teachers' Association and the Schoolwomen's Club of Newark. She was a member of St. Philip's Episcopal Church.

I join with her fellow citizens in mourning the passing of this distinguished woman, and I extend to her husband and her brother my heartfelt condolences.

The Concern of a Kentucky Mountain Woman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE SILER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1962

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from a very wise, sensible and patriotic woman who is a resident of one of the cities in my district. I only wish we had many other citizens of her courage and caliber who are willing to call our attention to some of the things that are so foolhardy that they are generating much concern in the rank and file of American citizenship. Her letter is as follows:

BARBOURVILLE, KY.,
March 29, 1962.

Hon. EUGENE SILER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SILER: Have just been looking over some of our latest news items such as "Overseas Aid Hoard is Reported," "Our Vanishing Dollars in Haiti," "The Federal Government's Reckless Spending Explosion." Also, stories about the millions being paid to farmers to keep them from growing crops on acres they don't even own. How long must we, the American taxpayers, be robbed of food from our mouths and clothing from our own backs to support such a socialistic trend in government?

When I grew up in these mountains, I was taught that my Government was for me, that it would always protect my rights and interests because we had a Government that was "by the people, and for the people," and I believed it. The waving of "Old Glory" sent a tingling sensation up my spine and into the roots of every hair on my head, because of what that flag represented. There was both faith and pride in the salute I gave her even in elementary school. I'm afraid that neither we nor our children actually feel just this way any more, and I say with all sincerity, "I am afraid."

All this is being done under the guise of defense for our Nation. The strongest defense for any nation is a living vital faith in that nation and morals that honor the Living God.

Restore free enterprise, the privilege of earning and keeping a decent amount of what one earns, let our Nation again be a Government for and by the people and, with God's help, we can lick any power on earth because we would fight as only "free men fight."

Can we do nothing to stop this endless waste and spending that is bleeding the American people white?

Respectfully,

MRS. JOHN H. MEALER.

Wages and Foreign Trade Productivity, Employment, and Industrial Expansion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to have printed at this point in the RECORD part III of Mr. O. R. Strackbein's analysis of employment, productivity, and expansion in relation to import competition:

III

Despite the discouraging aspects of automation, rising productivity and the displacement of workers, the problem must, of course, be met; but we must know what we are about.

Even during the 1950–60 decade while most of our manufacturing industries actually reduced their work force, a few industries moved against the trend. Their employment expanded more rapidly than did the population of the country.

What, if anything, did these industries have in common? They were new indus-

tries as well as established industries. The new ones were aircraft and parts, electrical communication (principally electronics), certain chemical products, such as plastics, synthetics, and drugs. The old established industries that expanded with the population or nearly in step with it, sometimes ahead of it, were machinery, including heavy electrical apparatus, ship and boat building and repairing, engines and turbines, machine tools, industrial machinery, office machines, engineering and laboratory and related instruments; printing and publishing, including newspapers, books and commercial printing, paper and allied products, and certain chemical products, including industrial organic chemicals.

The new industries seem to have nothing in common. Some opened new fields, others simply replaced or supplemented existing industries. Some of the old established industries that expanded were alike in having a great deal to do with the automation and mechanization that caused much of the unemployment mischief.

Five of the industries that led in employing more workers during the decade than the 18.4 percent growth in population, including aircraft, electronics, and chemicals, gained 1,326,000 in total number employed. The net gain over the population rise, however, was only 700,000. Some other industries also gained but not sufficiently to affect the equation.

Thirty industries, on the other hand, including such stalwarts as the iron and steel industry, coal mining, textile mill products, lumber and wood products, dairy products, etc., lost 1,169,000 workers during the same period. Had they expanded employment in proportion to the population rise they would have added 1,153,000. The total lag was therefore 2,322,000. This was hardly offset by the 700,000 net gain above population growth provided by the more dynamic industries.

While the effect of import competition cannot be isolated from other causes it is nevertheless true that our imports increased by more than 50 percent during this period and that the share of manufactured goods doubled in relation to total imports; i.e., more and more of our imports were in the form of competitive finished products.

The principal employment rescue operation fell to the lot of the services, trades and professions, such as wholesale and retail trade, State and local government, teachers, finance, insurance, laundering, real estate, and military service. The aggregate employment in this vast field jumped by 6,602,000 or from 19.8 to 26.4 million between 1950 and 1960. This was growth indeed.

Yet even if this explosive expansion is added to that provided by the growth industries during the decade it was insufficient to overcome the lag caused by worker displacement in agriculture, industry, mining, transportation, etc., which in the aggregate amounted to 7,366,000. The deficiency, in relation to population growth, was 3.7 million workers; and if the rise of a million in the military service is excluded, the U.S. economy failed by 4.7 million workers to employ the unemployed and the addition to the work force between 1950 and 1960.

It can be noted that an absolute employment decline was registered in the manufacture of food and kindred products, where inelasticity of demand would indeed be expected to retard expansion. Textile mill products suffered even a more severe decline. Mill consumption of textile fibers did indeed decline, going from 45.03 pounds in 1950 to 38.18 pounds in 1959. This included not only cotton, wool, silk, and flax, but also manmade fibers, such as rayon, nylon, etc. A considerable part if not all of it was, however, attributable to textile and garment imports. The remainder of the decline in employment not accounted for by reduction in per capita consumption, would be attributable to greater automation.

Food and clothing absorb about 40 percent of the family budget.

Consumption in these important fields will hardly do more than grow with population increase, if that much. That being the case, rising productivity that outstrips population growth in this sector will cause further unemployment. While import competition was the cause of a great part of the decline in per capita textile consumption by domestic mills, any appreciable rise in per capita consumption of textiles, domestic and imported combined, will depend on a general increase in purchasing power. More dresses, suits, shirts, blouses, and apparel of higher quality come with higher real incomes, not merely higher money wages.

The call is therefore for more employment-expansion industries.

What, if anything, characterizes such industries?

If the industry is a new one and if the product has general acceptability it will have a mammoth market from the beginning, even if the demand is inelastic, simply because of the large market. It would be as if some brilliant entrepreneur came out with the idea of putting shoes on our feet if we still had a wholly unshod population. Even though the market might later become saturated he would nevertheless meantime be selling scores of millions of pairs of shoes. The manufacturing of these shoes would require tens of thousands of workers.

A number of manufacturing plants would spring up and that would call for the employment of other thousands of workers to build these plants. It would be necessary to install machinery but the machines in turn must first be produced. For this purpose other factories would be required, whether expanded old ones or new, and machine tools would be needed to shape the shoe machinery. If these machine tools were not already in existence they too must first be built.

Employment would expand in all directions. The manufacturing plants having been built and, with production underway, it would be necessary to hire salesmen and advertising specialists and to open shoe stores or shoe departments in existing ones, engage retail shoe clerks to wait on customers, etc.

Before long it would be found that the original sheen on the footwear is not permanent and someone would become seized with the notion that here was the possibility of a business and he would begin testing materials that might give promise of refurbishing shoes once they had lost their brightness; and in time he or someone else would discover the necessary substance. This would then be manufactured in plants or shops set up for the purpose. The shine-inducing material must, of course, be applied to the shoes. The wearer himself might do this; but before long some other enterpriser would conclude that it might be possible to do this chore for people at a price; and shoe-shining parlors would spring up. These too, would need space, materials and employees.

In time a whole complex of suppliers, from cowhides and kid to shoelaces and rubber heels, would be developed. After some years and much effort a high percentage of the population would be shod. A shoe repair system would then be added.

If further growth were now looked for, the nondurability of shoes would come to the rescue. Each person of the population would need not only one pair of shoes but perhaps several pairs per year; and since man is a creature that craves variety a shoe could be built for different occasions.

Then it would occur to an acute observer that man is also afflicted with vanity. The idea of style and sudden style changes to catch wearers in midseason, so to speak, would take hold, so that wearers would cast off shoes before they were worn out.

All of this would finally come to pass, and finally the market would be saturated. Then why not export? Other countries might still be unblessed with shoe saturation. Why not do it all over again in country after country?

Alas, there would be difficulties. These may be listed briefly:

1. Other countries might also have learned by now to manufacture shoes. In fact shoe manufacturing is an early industrial undertaking in developing countries. Perhaps we supplied them with the machinery.

2. In many cases foreign countries would have undertaken to protect their shoe industry with import duties or quotas.

3. Foreign styles differ from the American.

4. In the countries where the best potential market might appear to exist, because of vast population, such low per capita income might prevail that purchasing power would be very meager.

5. It might be more profitable to manufacture abroad, where labor costs are lower, than to produce here. Rather than export shoes it might be more advantageous to export the capital or to license foreign manufacturers. Both are being done.

6. Other industrial countries that had learned to manufacture shoes and that had achieved a high order of productivity combined with low wages might contest our lead in foreign market by competing with us and possibly little by little driving us back.

Export business faces many hazards such as these but determined enterprise may overcome many of them.

However, competitive inequalities caused by the upsurge of productivity abroad hand in hand with low wages present formidable and in some cases insuperable obstacles.

The demand for some products is indeed quite indefinitely expansible, provided imagination accompanies the design and consideration of possible uses of such item. Yet, there is a budgetary limit; and the potential may not be realized. The proportion of family income that is expended for certain groups of products, be it entertainment, health, clothing, housing, or food, does not vary extensively, even if shifts do occur over a period of time.

In terms of total employment the shifts are not necessarily helpful. If more of the total budget is spent for food, less will be spent for housing or something else, possibly entertainment or health or education.

Increase of the budget is then the important consideration. This may be brought about by the manufacture of new products, by stimulating growth industries, by the development of resources, by distributing wages in keeping with the advancement and encouragement of productivity, and by preventing the erosion of employment in existing industries through import competition.

The function of infant industries was written off too soon. We need them as much as ever. Actually more so.

Control of imports so that they will not disrupt the domestic market and therefore dampen or extinguish the ardor of domestic expansion represents a primary and necessary step if (1) old, established industries, which outnumber the others, are to expand with the population, and (2) if growth industries are to exploit the market potential for their products and (3) if new products are to face a future bright enough to induce their development and the expenditure of effort and money to stimulate a market for them. They must have a chance to breathe.

In the past, American industry had such assurance, and industrial expansion was limited only by the resourcefulness of our inventors and researchers and the acumen and ambition of business enterprisers to exploit new products or to open new industries.

We relied on a competitive system that after the expiration of patents prevented monopolistic practices, a tax system that did not dampen incentive and a wage system that with rising productivity increased the family budget, and we had a protective tariff. Today, because of an 80-percent reduction in the protective effect of our tariff, much of the earlier assurance is gone, both at home and in markets for our products overseas.

COMMENTARY AND CONCLUSION

Foreign trade did not father the vision that created the American productive system. It had nothing to do, for example, with the creation of the automobile industry and perhaps less than nothing with the institution of the $5-a-day wage. Foreign trade had nothing to do with the creation and development of our motion picture industry; with household and retail refrigeration, automatic clothes washers and dryers, automatic dishwashers, with air conditioning, and many other innovations that helped to keep our workers employed. High wages had a great deal to do with it.

It was only after the domestic market approached saturation that foreign markets began to look good. They were there to be had with application of due diligence, courage and caution and they offered an outlet for our overruns.

Today foreign competition is at our windows looking in on us. It has a long reach. It can do what we can do and, thanks to its low-wage philosophy, it can often do it better. It can penetrate our own market at will and outer markets with greater ease than we.

Once the foreign mass markets are fully developed, as one of them (the European Common Market) is by way of doing, our high-wage system will be confronted with its first real, head-on challenge. The distant rumbling of thunder is already heard. There is no accommodating or coexisting with the foreign low-wage philosophy without being drained by it down to its own slowly rising level, unless we take steps to avoid the dissipation of our economic vision.

Unless we do indeed take these steps we will whistle in vain for the growth and the employment surge that we need.

Three tentative proposals that have recently been made by public spokesmen would indeed put this whistle in our mouth: (1) Lowering our tariffs to the European Common Market; (2) tariff reductions by broad categories rather than item by item; and (3) extending Federal help to import-injured industries, lending them a hand in their efforts to go into other fields of manufacture.

These suggestions are made on the grounds that we must export more, even at the expense of outright shrinkage of some domestic industries.

The wisdom of these proposals is highly questionable:

1. When the head of a household favors some of his children at the expense of others he invites a nagging ill will and backbiting that will poison the atmosphere and sour domestic relations.

2. If we expose our stable industries no less than growth industries to the raw and ill winds of low-wage import competition, even more than they are now exposed, we will shrivel in the bud many natural lifegiving and enterprising ambitions that would otherwise bloom and boom into job-creating activities throughout the land; and we cannot afford to lose them.

It would be far better to unleash the self-starting proclivities of private enterprise and let it scent out the new opportunities for new products or new industries than to look to governmental agencies to do so. Far better to give the lead to useful and fruitful industrial initiative that cannot in any case be copied or successfully imitated by the uninitiated and financially uncommitted, than to vest in bureaucrats, no matter how imaginative or venturesome, the authority, first to put our industries in jeopardy by tampering with tariff cuts and then leading the crippled victims by the hand into some vague and still unlocated haven for recuperation from the damage done them.

As for the cross-fertilizing system of mass production and high wages that lifted us to the industrial forefront in the world:

Do we keep it, or do we not?

It is in mortal jeopardy. We are poised to yank one robust leg out from under it. If we do this we will have begun to crumble the edifice that was built on the vision that became incomparably fruitful.

How Would You Rate the Morale of Employees in Your Agency?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein a supplemental tabulation of returns on a questionnaire I recently circulated among registered voters in Virginia's 10th Congressional District.

The overall returns from the questionnaire were printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last Wednesday, March 21. However, the final question among my inquiries was addressed to employees of the Federal Government and asked, "How would you rate the morale of employees in your agency?"

I now have a detailed tabulation of some 7,400 responses to this last question wherein the respondents identified the agency in which they were employed. In the belief that this detailed tabulation might be of interest and perhaps benefit to personnel officers and others concerned with Government morale, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as part of these remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

	Total responses	Good	Percent	Medium	Percent	Poor	Percent
State	143	29	20.3	37	25.9	77	53.8
AID	71	8	11.3	26	36.6	37	52.1
USIA	68	27	39.7	28	41.2	13	19.1
Foreign Service	2	2	100.0				
Security	1					1	100.0
Agriculture	305	182	59.7	99	32.5	24	7.9
Farmers Home Administration	7	4	57.1	3	42.9		
Cotton Division	2	2	100.0				
Forestry Service	37	27	73.0	7	18.9	3	8.1
Agricultural Research Service	16	9	56.3	5	31.3	2	12.5
Farmers Crop Service	4	2	50.0	2	50.0		
Grain Division	1					1	100.0
Soil conservation	30	21	70.0	8	26.7	1	3.3
Office of Information	2			1	50.0	1	50.0
Agriculture Library	1	1	100.0				
Market service	20	14	70.0	3	15.0	3	15.0
Plant quarantine	1	1	100.0				
Stabilization and Conservation Service	4	3	75.0	1	25.0		
Federal Ext. Inc	7	4	57.1	2	28.6	1	14.3
REA	16	6	37.5	6	37.5	4	25.0
Foreign Agricultural Service	7	5	71.4	2	28.6		
Farm Credit Administration	2	1	50.0	1	50.0		
Entomology Research Division	1					1	100.0
Economics Research Division	5	5	100.0				
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation	1			1	100.0		
Veterans' Administration	202	85	42.1	84	41.6	33	16.3
Hospital	2					2	100.0
Finance Division	1	1	100.0				
Benefits Office	2			1	50.0	1	50.0
Navy	418	184	44.0	164	39.2	70	16.7
Bureau of Ships	131	47	35.9	52	39.7	32	24.4
CNO	10	3	30.0	4	40.0	3	30.0
Bureau of Weapons	145	39	26.9	65	44.8	41	28.3
Subsistence	2	1	50.0	1	50.0		
NRL	74	41	55.4	26	35.1	7	9.5
NAVPECO	2	1	50.0			1	50.0
Bureau of Docks	49	3	6.1	28	57.1	18	36.7
Naval weapons plant	18	3	16.7	4	22.2	11	61.1
Bureau of Personnel	38	15	39.5	16	42.1	7	18.4
Bureau of Supplies and Accounts	28	2	7.1	3	10.7	23	82.1
ONR	7	3	42.9	4	57.1		
Naval Medical Center	1			1	100.0		
Photo interp	1	1	100.0				

	Total responses	Good	Percent	Medium	Percent	Poor	Percent
Bureau of Medical Surgery	5	1	20.0	3	60.0	1	20.0
ONI	8	2	25.0	3	37.5	3	37.5
Naval propellent plant	1			1	100.0		
EXOS	3	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3
Hydrographic	12	8	66.7	2	16.7	2	16.7
Audit	2			1	50.0	1	50.0
NSS	1	1	100.0				
Comptroller	3	1	33.3	2	66.6		
NOL	6	1	16.7	5	83.3		
David Taylor Model Basin	10	4	40.0	4	40.0	2	20.0
Photo Center	5	1	20.0	4	80.0		
Communications	1	1	100.0				
Military Sea Transportation Service	4	2	50.0	2	50.0		
Naval material	2	1	50.0	1	50.0		
GAO	133	37	27.8	43	32.3	53	39.8
GSA	221	75	33.9	84	38.0	62	28.1
Library of Congress	33	12	36.4	13	39.4	8	24.2
Small Business Administration	17	8	47.1	3	17.6	6	35.3
GPO	86	26	30.2	39	45.3	21	24.4
Export-Import Bank	5	3	60.0			2	40.0
CAB	15	10	66.7	4	26.7	1	6.7
National Gallery of Art	6	2	33.3	2	33.3	2	33.3
National Academy of Science	1	1	100.0				
Army	519	162	31.2	245	47.2	112	21.6
Ordnance	72	26	36.1	19	26.4	27	37.5
AMS	61	19	31.1	26	42.6	16	26.2
Engineering	182	68	37.4	76	41.8	38	20.9
ERDL	124	44	35.5	40	32.3	40	32.3
ASA	23	10	43.5	7	30.4	6	27.1
AG	32	9	28.1	16	50.0	7	21.9
OM	24	8	33.3	5	20.8	11	45.8
Comptroller	6	3	50.0			3	50.0
Chemical engineer	23	9	39.1	7	30.4	7	30.4
DOFL	23	8	34.8	10	43.5	5	21.7
National Guard	14	3	21.4	4	28.6	7	50.0
Army Research Bureau	1					1	100.0
Transport	29	8	27.6	9	31.0	12	41.4
Tech Inst AG	6	3	50.0	2	33.3	1	16.7
Fort Myer	6	1	16.7	1	16.7	4	66.7
COMP AG	15	4	26.7	8	53.3	3	20.0
Logistics	9	2	22.2	1	11.1	6	66.7
Office of the Secretary of the Army	9	2	100.0				
Finance	17	1	5.9	6	35.3	10	58.8
Photo AG	4	2	50.0	1	25.0	1	25.0
Surgeon General	12	5	41.7	4	33.3	3	25.0
Signal	44	17	38.6	13	29.5	14	31.8
Chief of Staff	6	5	83.3	1	16.7		
Reserve and ROTC	1					1	100.0
Audit	5	1	20.0	1	20.0	3	60.0
IG	2	2	100.0				
Band	1					1	100.0
Treasury	88	43	48.9	31	35.2	14	15.9
IRS	150	68	45.3	64	42.7	18	12.0
Finance Division	2	2	100.0				
FDIC	10	6	60.0	2	20.0	2	20.0
Budget Bureau	17	15	88.2	2	11.8		
Public Department	6	1	16.7	2	33.3	3	50.0
Bureau of Engraving and Printing	38	14	36.8	12	31.6	12	31.6
Coast Guard	24	6	25.0	12	50.0	6	25.0
Customs	12	8	66.7	1	8.3	3	25.0
SEC	20	13	65.0	6	30.0	1	5.0
Council of Economic Administration	1			1	100.0		
Bureau of Accounts	2	1	50.0			1	50.0
Federal Reserve System	6	4	66.7	2	33.3		
Federal S. & L. Inf	2	1	50.0	1	50.0		
Federal Home Loan Bank	2	2	100.0				
Defense	290	114	39.3	126	43.4	50	17.2
CIA	164	105	64.0	37	22.6	22	13.4
NSA	67	15	22.4	33	49.3	19	28.4
Finance and Accounts	1					1	100.0
AEC	25	9	36.0	12	48.0	4	16.0
Office of Secretary of Defense	58	27	46.6	16	27.6	15	25.9
NASA	46	30	65.2	12	26.1	4	8.7
Defense Supply Agency	31	13	41.9	8	25.8	10	32.3
Defense Traffic Management Service	9	5	55.6	2	22.2	2	22.2
Transportation Intelligence Agency	6	6	100.0				
Surplus Materials Division	1	1	100.0				
American States	11	2	18.2	6	54.5	3	27.3
Office of Emergency Planning	12	2	16.7	4	33.3	6	50.0
ICS	4	2	50.0			2	50.0
National War College	2	2	100.0				
Court of Military Appeals	1	1	100.0				
Selective Service	4	2	50.0	1	25.0	1	24.0
R. & D	2					2	100.0
ASTIA	7	5	71.4	1	14.3	1	14.3
Interior	102	54	52.9	35	34.3	13	12.7
Solicitor's Office	3	1	33.3	2	66.7		
FDC	13	4	30.8	5	38.5	4	30.8
Geological Survey	122	50	41.0	43	35.2	29	23.8
Arlington National Cemetery	3	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3
ICC	59	29	49.2	18	30.5	12	20.3
FAA	276	91	33.0	89	32.2	96	34.8
FHA	48	18	37.5	20	41.7	10	20.8
FTC	24	10	41.7	6	25.0	8	33.3
Indian Affairs	8	6	75.0	2	25.0		
HHFA	24	13	54.2	8	33.3	3	12.5
Tariff Commission	10	5	50.0	5	50.0		
Bureau of Labor Statistics	1					1	100.0
Panama Canal	1			1	100.0		
FCC	43	22	51.2	16	37.2	5	11.6
Geo. intell. map	1	1	100.0				
Weather	39	15	38.5	16	41.0	8	20.5
Reclamation	9	4	44.4	2	22.2	3	33.3
National Park Service	25	16	64.0	7	28.0	2	8.0
Smithsonian	23	10	43.5	9	39.1	4	17.4
Airport	4	1	25.0	1	25.0	2	50.0
Archives	8	2	25.0	2	25.0	4	50.0
Bureau of Mines	16	6	37.5	5	31.3	5	31.3
Park Police	5	3	60.0	1	20.0	1	20.0
Bureau of Land Management	3	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3

	Total responses	Good	Percent	Medium	Percent	Poor	Percent
Fish and Wildlife	8	2	25.0	2	25.0	4	50.0
Office of the Secretary of the Interior	1					1	100.0
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	1			1	100.0		
Commerce	101	44	43.6	35	34.7	22	21.8
Public Roads	52	24	46.2	18	34.6	10	19.2
Patent Office	76	16	21.1	34	44.7	26	34.2
Census	16	9	56.3	3	18.8	4	25.0
National Inn Conc	2					2	100.0
Coast and Geodetic Service	28	10	35.7	11	39.3	7	25.0
Maritime Administration	24	18	75.0	4	16.7	2	8.3
Office Tech. Sec	1			1	100.0		
Business and Defense Services Administration	3	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3
International business operations	3					3	100.0
Area Reder. Administration	1	1	100.0				
NBS	17	9	52.9	7	41.2	1	5.9
Air Force	294	117	39.8	110	37.4	67	22.8
Aerospace research	2	2	100.0				
Surgeon General	2			1	50.0	1	50.0
Bolling Air Force Base	4			2	50.0	2	50.0
A.C. & C	7	1	14.3	2	28.6	4	57.1
Information Center	6			2	33.3	4	66.7
Maintenance	1					1	100.0
Administrative services	1	1	100.0				
AFIC	19	3	15.8	6	31.6	10	52.6
OSI	2	1	50.0	1	50.0		
Construction Division	1			1	100.0		
Engineering Division	1					1	100.0
Health, Education, and Welfare	109	54	49.5	39	35.8	16	14.7
St. Elizabeths	8	3	37.5	3	37.5	2	25.0
Public Health	34	19	55.9	10	29.4	5	14.7
Division of Vocational Education	1			1	100.0		
Public Housing	4			2	50.0	2	50.0
Office of Education	21	13	61.9	6	28.6	2	9.5
NIH	17	9	52.9	5	29.4	3	17.6
Food and Drug	13	5	38.5	6	46.2	2	15.4
National Science Foundation	5	5	100.0				
NEA	1	1	100.0				
Vocational rehabilitation	2	2	100.0				
National Cancer Institute	1			1	100.0		
District of Columbia General Hospital	1			1	100.0		
Post Office	256	61	23.8	105	41.0	90	35.2
Mail equipment shop	4	1	25.0	2	50.0	1	25.0
Research and engineering	1					1	100.0
Fairfax	1	1	100.0				
Philat sales	1					1	100.0
Alexandria	5	1	20.0	1	20.0	3	60.0
Arlington	11	1	9.1	5	45.5	5	45.5
Annandale	2	1	50.0	1	50.0		
Springfield	1	1	100.0				
Falls Church	2			1	50.0	1	50.0
Herndon	1			1	100.0		
Rosalyn	2	1	50.0	1	50.0		
Centerville	1	1	100.0				
Postal Transportation Service	1			1	100.0		
Labor	80	33	41.3	28	35.0	19	23.8
Bureau of Employment Security	4	3	75.0			1	25.0
NLRB	13	7	53.8	3	23.1	3	23.1
USES	3	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3
USMC	45	23	51.1	16	35.6	6	13.3
District of Columbia government	43	16	37.2	16	37.2	11	25.6
Public School	10	1	10.0	7	70.0	2	20.0
Department of Highways and Traffic	8	1	12.5	5	62.5	2	25.0
Department of Buildings	5	1	20.0	1	20.0	3	60.0
Correction	26	14	53.8	8	30.8	4	15.4
General Hospital	4	2	50.0	2	50.0		
Recreation	2	2	100.0				
Attorney's Office	1	1	100.0				
Metropolitan Police Department	13	3	23.1	4	30.8	6	46.2
Public health	6	2	33.3	2	33.3	2	33.3
CD	2	1	50.0			1	50.0
Fire	6	2	33.3	3	50.0	1	16.7
Sewage sanitary engineering	3			3	100.0		
Unemployment compensation	5	2	40.0			3	60.0
Bureau of Prisons	2			2	100.0		
Welfare	5	1	20.0	3	60.0	1	20.0
DMU	1	1	100.0				
Parole	1					1	100.0
Capitol Architect	9	5	55.6	4	44.4		
Northern Virginia Regional Planning Commission	1	1	100.0				
Capitol Power Plant	3			3	100.0		
Justice	60	34	56.7	16	26.7	10	16.7
FBI	39	24	61.5	12	30.8	3	7.7
Supreme Court	1					1	100.0
U.S. marshal	1	1	100.0				
Court of Claims	2	1	50.0			1	50.0
Tax Court	6	3	50.0	1	16.7	2	33.3
District court	2	1	50.0	1	50.0		
House of Representatives	9	8	88.9	1	11.1		
Senate	9	7	77.8	1	11.1	1	11.1
White House	7	4	57.1	2	28.6	1	14.3
USCSC	59	17	28.8	28	47.5	14	23.7
Peace Corps	3	3	100.0				
Red Cross	2					2	100.0
Civil War Centennial	1					1	100.0
Bureau of Federal Credit Union	1	1	100.0				

J.F.K.: Is Delay in Communist Party Registration Due to World Opinion?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a great many Americans are evidencing concern as to why the Attorney General has not taken more forceful action in the registration of members of the Communist Party of the United States. Americans are concerned that perhaps again the administration is yielding to the pressure of world opinion in shaping its policies. Too often in the last several months we have seen the administration take a position which it felt was consistent with world opinion but which was not necessarily in the best interest of the United States; that is, principally U.N. votes against our allies and friends of many years.

Mr. Speaker, I pray that this is not the case with respect to the Attorney General and the Department of Justice's obligation to register all members of the Communist Party of the United States of America.

A penetrating article recently appeared in the VFW American Security Report of February 1962, published under the direction of Robert B. Hanson, commander in chief, and Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, director, national security and foreign affairs.

Under unanimous consent, I include this article herewith:

RED FIGHT AGAINST REGISTRATION GAINS STEAM

Voices all over America are speaking up on behalf of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

They come from clergymen, lawyers, businessmen; from people in all walks of life. And they all say almost the same thing. They claim—

1. Peace is the No. 1 issue of 1962.
2. The Communist Party, U.S.A., is a political party, nothing more.
3. That the McCarran Act (under which Communists must register as agents of the Soviet Union) violates the fifth amendment of the U.S. Constitution.
4. The enforcement of the act is an open attack against all the democratic organizations striving for peace and for better living standards.

These voices in the United States are being joined by choruses of other voices abroad. The Worker (Jan. 7) reports that the Communist Parties of Australia and Portugal, and the Tudeh (Communist Party) Party of Iran have "expressed solidarity with the American Communists."

In addition, civic leaders in Australia have picked up the same line and have written to President Kennedy claiming that the McCarran Act is an effort to suppress those striving for peace and progress in the United States.

The Free League of Japanese Lawyers are reported by the Worker to have taken the same action.

Thus, we are hearing from voices all over the world. They don't want the Communists in the United States to have to register as agents of the Soviet Union, as required under the McCarran Act (Internal Security Act of 1950).

The Moscow news service, Tass (Jan. 5) wraps up the Soviet position by reporting that "a movement is growing in the United States for the repeal of the oppressive McCarran law * * * during the forthcoming session of Congress."

Identifying the voices which support this Communist-favored position is not important. They can be defeated by vocal support of individuals and groups on the grassroots level in favor of the vigorous enforcement of the Federal orders that the Communist Party, U.S.A., and members of the Party register with the U.S. Attorney General as directed under authority of the Internal Security Act of 1950.

Maverick Conservatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following letter appeared in the Wall Street Journal of March 9.

The letter is written by Mr. Douglas Caddy, national director, Young Americans for Freedom, Inc.

Mr. Caddy makes his case clearly and without passion. While it may be felt that his letter applies mostly to the Republican Party, this is not entirely true. As he points out, the problem not only applies to the GOP but also to the Nation's political system.

The letter follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 9, 1962]

MAVERICK CONSERVATIVES

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

As an active conservative I read with great interest the Journal's article "GOP 'Regulars' Claim Ultraconservatives Sap Party's Strength" (Feb. 12). The growing tendency on the part of a number of conservatives to splinter off from the Republican Party and to plow money and effort into "independent" causes poses a problem not only to the GOP but also to the Nation's political system.

If there is a major political problem developing in America today it is that the balance of power is swinging so heavily against the Republican Party that the GOP will no longer be a vigorous opposition in Washington or the Nation. The Democratic majority in the Senate is 64 to 36 and in the House, 260 to 174 (3 vacancies). The Democrats have 34 governorships to 16 for the Republicans. President Kennedy's popularity is at an alltime high; the Republican Party apparatus is woefully weak.

As a supporter of Senator GOLDWATER, I cannot reconcile myself to the strategy mapped out by those who wish to fight the political wars of conservatism outside the two-party structure. In the case of the announced plan of the newly organized Conservative Party of New York to oppose Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, conservatives should ask themselves: Will the defeat of Governor Rockefeller, admittedly a liberal Republican, and his replacement in Albany by, say, New York's Mayor Wagner, an ultraliberal Democrat, benefit the conservative cause?

The Republicans are already a minority. Why should conservatives further drain the waning power of the GOP by starting a third party? Indeed, if ever there were a time when conservatives should come to the aid of their party and work solely through the GOP, it is today.

DOUGLAS CADDY,
National Director, Young Americans, for Freedom, Inc.

Taxes and Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, when the proponents of the Revenue Act of 1962 claimed that it would provide jobs for this year's graduates, it sounded to me like a generous amount of poetic license with what the actual facts of the matter will be.

I respectfully call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial that appeared in the Newark, N.J., Evening News on March 31, 1962, which emphasizes the extraordinary coincidence of a morning press conference by the President with the date of the final vote on this important legislation.

It also gives sound advice to the June graduates of 1962 not to count on the passage of the legislation as an opportunity to find jobs.

The editorial follows:

TAXES AND JOBS

Passage of the tax reform bill in the House by the surprisingly large margin of 219–196 goes to prove what a little pressure from the right source applied in the right places can do. Not since the packing of the Rules Committee last year has such weighty influence been felt on Capitol Hill.

The bill's chief provisions are a withholding tax on dividends and interest, and a 7-percent tax credit on purchases of new machinery and equipment by farmers and businessmen. It is doubtful whether either will contribute significantly to the economy or toward a balanced budget.

While the vote added some prestige to the otherwise lusterless Democratic leadership in the House, the victory appeared to be a personal one for President Kennedy. It was coincidence, of course, that his usual press conference was shifted to the day and the hour debate started on the measure.

Without waiting for questions on the controversial bill, Mr. Kennedy used the conference to take the issue to the country. In a dramatic warning, he said if the bill were killed, "we will have lost a most valuable opportunity to find jobs for the college and high school graduates who will be seeking jobs in June."

June grads had better not count on it, for it will be some time before Congress completes action on the bill. It faces an uncertain fate in the Senate where it will have to survive a conservative Finance Committee and then prospective revision on the Senate floor. Thereafter will be the House-Senate conference and following that perhaps an even more difficult test in the House on the conferees' report.

The tax credit, which most businessmen would gladly exchange for liberalization of the Treasury's present rules on depreciation allowances, was designed to encourage economic expansion and thus provide new job opportunities. But assuming the bill even-

tually becomes law, it may take a long time before the expected expansion and jobs materialize. This year's graduates would do well not to wait that long.

Tax and Tariff Bills Call for More Power for the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal points up to what extent the President is asking for increased powers in the tax bill passed by the House last week and in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 now before the Ways and Means Committee.

The editorial follows:

THE APPEAL OF UNPRECEDENTED POWER

In their testimony before Congress these past few days both the critics and the supporters of the proposed new tariff bill have agreed on one thing. It contains an "unprecedented" grant of power to the President.

For all practical purposes the bill would leave the President free to lower tariffs, raise them, abolish them, invoke new ones, or to take off and put on direct trade controls without let or hinderance from anybody. Those who might be injured by a Presidential action would have little recourse.

What is more interesting is how this unprecedented grant of powers is conceded by its advocates and then used as a reason why the bill should be passed. Only by granting the President this power, they argue, can the right things be accomplished.

The argument here is that the normal machinery of government—Congress and all that—is inadequate to cope with the complexities of tariff and trade policy. Therefore Congress should not set even the broad outlines of policy. It should turn the whole problem over to the President and give him the power to do whatever he thinks is necessary.

This is an argument not limited to the tariff bill. Recently there was the proposal to give the President authority to altar taxes at will. For another example, there was the suggestion the administration should have a wide grant of power to change the farm program at its discretion.

Any congressional action, you see, must be a consensus of many views, the resolution of many political pressures. Generally the decision will be a compromise unlikely to satisfy completely the logic of any view. And the process of congressional action will almost always be time consuming.

How much simpler and easier it all is if a single Chief Executive can just say, "Let it be done this way," and it is thereupon done that way.

This is an approach to Government which has long had a strong appeal for those of so-called liberal views. They always perfer the concentration of authority over its diffusion because they think that is the best way to order society. They are always the proponents of a powerful Presidency as the only solution to the complexities of modern government.

But this same idea can infect others whenever they have some particular goal—in this case, lower tariffs—and think that they will get there quicker if a Chief Executive simply has the power to command. The rationalization is always on the grounds of efficiency and order through centralized decision and control.

It is debatable whether this is indeed the way to the best decisions. Even in wartime cumbersome democracies have proved more efficient than single-minded dictatorships. And in economic matters it is only in inefficient market economies that there is ever a problem of superabundance.

But what is perfectly plain is that all these people, unconsciously or not, are expressing a dissatisfaction with the machinery of democratic government. What the arguments all boil down to is that Congress must give up its power to set taxes—or tariffs or whatever—because Congress cannot be trusted to decide them wisely or well.

What is equally plain is that this is an argument for those forms of government to which we ordinarily give opprobrious names. By the same argument Germans were won to national socialism and Italians to fascism. On the same argument centralized authority makes all the decisions on Russia.

Surely this is a curious habit we have fallen into. And many who stood up in a meeting and advocated any of these systems would be shouted out of the hall. Yet men will gravely propose that a President be given almost unlimited powers to fix our tariffs or juggle our taxes and other men will gravely discuss it.

Hardly anyone, any longer, will even notice what they are really saying.

Piecemeal Surrender of Congressional Power To Establish Tariffs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, piecemeal surrender to the President of the power of the Congress to regulate foreign commerce and hence establish tariffs is the subject of an editorial which appeared in the March 26, 1962, issue of the Los Angeles Herald Examiner, a very fine daily newspaper. I believe the editorial will be of interest to my colleagues in the Congress and therefore, under unanimous consent, include it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

LITTLE BY LITTLE

In the long history of the tariff, for the first time the Executive seeks authority to take the tariffmaking power away from Congress and turn it over to the Executive.

This move was inevitable, no matter who was President, in view of the large number of treaties and agreements we have been making, the worst of which goes by the name of GATT, so hogtying the United States that either we give the President the authority he seeks or we chuck all treaties and agreements.

The tariffmaking power belongs to Congress.

Little by little, since the days of Woodrow Wilson, the power of Congress has been invaded by the Executive. Even the power to make war was evaded by Harry Truman when he arranged to have the Korean war called a United Nations police action.

As the power of Congress diminishes, the authority of the people diminishes.

This trend must be halted.

Who Is Extremist?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the President has said much about extremists, yet he is strangely silent on this subject within his own party. I am refering to "The Liberal Papers" whose recommendations, in a nutshell, advocate what Khrushchev has been advocating for a long time. Isn't it time for the President to repudiate these members of the Democratic Party, whose solutions to world problems could hardly be considered anything less than extreme?

Ráymónd Moley, in a recent article in the New York Herald Tribune, very succinctly discusses this "design for surrender."

REPUDIATE THE EXTREMISTS

(By Raymond Moley)

Over the past year liberals generally and liberal Democrats in particular have made a public relations killing by spreading far and wide the implication that the extremists in the John Birch Society and its leader, Robert Welch, represented conservatism generally and the Republican Party specifically. This has been despite the vigorous and early repudation of such extremism by former President Eisenhower and former Vice President Nixon and by leading conservatives more recently. Such extremism is neither conservative nor Republican.

Now that monkey on the back of the right has a mate, considerably larger, squatting on the shoulders of liberalism generally and the Democratic Party specifically.

It would seem to be wise at the moment for sound and reasonable people, both liberal and conservative, Democratic as well as Republican, to repudiate extremism of both kinds. In these perilous days there should be no monkey business in either political party.

There has appeared a paper-bound volume entitled, "The Liberal Papers." We are told in the introduction by Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT that this is the outgrowth of the efforts of "a group of fellow congressional colleagues during the 86th Congress, 1959–60." These statesmen, says ROOSEVELT, were apprehensive of what he calls the treacherous course of foreign policy at that time. This, of course, means that the Eisenhower administration was pursuing a treacherous course.

These Congressmen, apparently unable to supply an alternative out of their own heads, resorted to the familiar device of getting a group of intellectuals to provide some essays for them.

It has now been shown that the group to which ROOSEVELT refers consisted of 12 Democratic Members of the House of Representatives who were very active in the project. It is charged by Republican Senators that there were 23 other Democratic members of the House who were "close" to the project and that among these was Chester Bowles. Of the original 12, 5 were defeated in 1960, and 3 of these are now employed in the Kennedy administration.

The papers for which these Congressmen, including ROOSEVELT, are the sponsors were written by 12 individuals whose names are familiar among the writers and pamphleteers who deal with foreign affairs.

The following is a summary of positions taken by these writers:

1. West Berlin is of no value "except as a moral liability" of the Western Powers. Presumably the "moral liability" can be abandoned. East Germany would be recognized. The Polish Rapacki plan should be used, and both Germanys should be neutralized militarily.

2. NATO should be disestablished, leaving nothing but an Atlantic alliance of Britain, Canada, and the United States. Thus all of continental Europe should be left to the caprice of the Soviet.

3. Presumably this would mean the withdrawal of our forces from all of continental Europe.

4. At home we should abandon "the half-baked arrangement called civil defense."

5. We should unilaterally abandon the idea of nuclear tests.

6. We should let the Soviet "plug in" on our radar warning system. Thus the Soviet would be allowed to warn itself against any attack by the United States.

7. We should "liberalize" our trade policy with Russia.

8. The idea that we can avoid war with the Communist world by preparing for it is "irrational."

9. There should be recognition by the United States and admission to the U.N. of "both Germanys, both Koreas, Communist China, and both Vietnams. Incorporate Quemoy and Matsu into the China mainlands" These are the recommendations of Quincy Wright, professor emeritus of international law of the University of Chicago and the University of Virginia.

The whole thing is a craven design for surrender. And since this bombshell, thus sponsored by Democratic House Members, is dropped just as the Kennedy administration is entering into negotiations for disarmament and other purposes, it would seem that the President should be even more concerned about repudiating his own extremists than he has been in attacking the extremists of the right. For in the Birch case the sponsorship has been by a private individual in Massachusetts named Welch. But this work is by a considerable number of the President's own party.

In this moment of vital national crisis, both political parties shold repudiate both extremes and find common ground in foreign policy in the interest of firmness before the Communist threat, national security, and the maintenance of American good will and moral leadership in the free world.

Resolution by the Colorado Press Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER H. DOMINICK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker, one of the resolutions adopted by the Colorado Press Association during its annual meeting held recently, deserves the most thoughtful consideration of Congress and the postal service. Certainly, it proposes a means for solving the postal deficit in a manner which seems just and fair for all users of the U.S. mail. I include this resolution as a part of my remarks:

RESOLUTION BY THE COLORADO PRESS ASSOCIATION

Whereas the newspaper industry of Colorado wants to pay in postage what it costs the U.S. Post Office to process and deliver our newspapers; however, it should be kept in mind that newspapers today perform many of the functions formerly performed by the post offices, including sorting, sacking, and labeling the sacks for train and truck dispatching: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Colorado Press Association go on record urging Congressmen ROGERS, DOMINICK, CHENOWETH, and ASPINALL, and Senators ALLOTT and CARROLL to recommend that the postage on newspapers be fixed to cover only what it costs the Post Office Department to handle and deliver them, without any profit, and that they be notified of this action. At the same time, we urge our Representatives and Senators to investigate the cost of handling all other classes of mail, and see to it they also be charged the full cost of handling.

Dove of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, last month my native New Orleans pulled all the stops in staging one of the most exciting Mardi Gras celebrations in the history of that wonderful day. From all accounts it epitomized everything Mardi Gras in New Orleans has come to be down through the years.

As any Mardi Gras participant or onlooker can tell you, the success of the day depends in a large degree on the originality and staging of the many parades that roll through the Crescent City on that day. Traditionally the parades of Rex and the Mystik Krewe of Comus climax the celebration.

In the last few years, however, another parade has grown so much in stature that it deserves widespread and immediate recognition. I refer to the exciting and imaginative parades of the Elks Krewe of Orleanians and I think that this year's parade was their best yet. Nor am I alone in this thinking.

For example, one float in particular, entitled "Dove of Peace," was adjudged grand prize winner and needless to say this is not an honor to be treated lightly. The Krewe members who created this particular float are to be commended for the profundity of their theme and the daring and brilliant execution of the design.

It was a float that must be seen to be fully appreciated but it will give some small idea of its appearance to say that it consisted of a giant dove, an elaborate center piece carrying the float's title, and at the end of the float an enormous globe depicting the earth. As the "Dove of Peace" arrived before City Hall a large number of doves were released and I am told it was one of the most stirring moments of the 1962 Mardi Gras when the doves fluttered into the brilliant skies.

Although the Elks Krewe of Orleanians is comparatively young as carnival organizations go, it has probably made as much or more progress as any other carnival group in its 27 years of existence. New Orleanians have watched this parade climb the ladder of Mardi Gras recognition year by year and it is a credit to every member of the Krewe that this is so.

And now the "Dove of Peace" has climaxed their efforts. I know the Members of this House will join with me in extending our heartiest and warmest congratulations.

Resolution on Public Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to place in the RECORD the resolution on Public Welfare adopted by the County Officers Association in the State of New York in their convention held in the city of Rochester.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ON PUBLIC WELFARE

Whereas the Federal law commonly known as the Social Security Act, requires that the public assistance plans of a State meet with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare as a condition for receipt of Federal aid; and

Whereas that requirement permits the Federal bureaucracy to assume full power to dictate, in the greatest detail, every phase of the operations of State and local public assistance administration; and

Whereas Federal dictation of that detail has submerged State and local administrators in a sea of red tape; and

Whereas Federal rules and regulations have removed the power of discretion from the hands of State and local administrators in the performance of their function; and

Whereas the growing Federal domination ignores the basic right and responsibility of the State and its localities to decide how they will conduct their public business; and

Whereas the New York State Board of Social Welfare has recommended amendment of the Social Security Act to restore a proper Federal-State-local relationship; and

Whereas the Legislature of the State of New York, has adopted a resolution memorializing Congress to enact such amendments: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the County Officers Association of the State of New York hereby commends the State board of social welfare for its recommendation to stop and reverse the trend of Federal domination; and be it further

Resolved, That the County Officers Association of the State of New York hereby endorse the action of the legislature of this State in adopting the appraised resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That the County Officers Association of the State of New York hereby call upon every member of Congress from New York State to join in sponsoring the Federal legislation necessary to carry that recommendation into effect and to work for its enactment; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the New York State Board of Social Welfare, the members of the New York State Legislature, and each Member of Congress from the State of New York.

I, C. L. Chamberlain, executive director of the County Officers Association of the State of New York, do hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was duly adopted by the

County Officers Association of the State of New York in convention assembled, in the city of Rochester, N.Y., duly held on the 18th, 19th, and 20th days of March 1962.

C. L. CHAMBERLAIN,
Executive Director, County Officers Association of the State of New York.

American Responsibilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion of Ohio annually sponsors an essay contest, and among the winners this year is Miss Margaret J. Turner, daughter of Dr. and Mrs. E. V. Turner, 21 North Stanwood Road, Columbus, Ohio.

I am most happy to submit for the RECORD the winning essay of Margy Turner, not only because it is an outstanding demonstration of clear thinking and inherent patriotism, but also because I have had the pleasure of knowing this fine young lady and her family for many years.

The winning essay follows:

AMERICAN RESPONSIBILITIES

In a world tormented by tension and the possibility of nuclear war, a world where millions of enslaved people are looking to the free world for help, what are my responsibilities as an American citizen? What should I, as one single individual, do to insure the blessings of liberty, not only to my generation and those to come, but to the world?

My first responsibility is that of appreciation. I should be thankful for the privilege of living in this free country. Too often, the people of the United States forget that our country did not just happen. My ancestors have left their blood on the snow at Valley Forge, the grassy slopes at Gettysburg, and the sands of Normandy and Okinawa. Hundreds of thousands of lives have been sacrificed to build and preserve our freedoms by men and women who believed in their country. I must remember their strivings to establish a lasting democratic government, and I must appreciate my American heritage.

My next responsibility is to become aware of what my country is doing. I must be informed about current affairs and must take an active interest in the happenings of my city, State, and National Government as well as those of the United Nations and of the whole world. Being informed is the individual responsibility of each American citizen.

Once I am aware of what my country is striving for, I then should take my most important responsibility, that of action. Support of the U.S. Government is not a spectator sport. I, as well as each other citizen, must play the game of life actively by taking advantage of my liberties and privileges. Utilizing my freedom to worship, my privilege to get an education, my right to be critical of my Government, and other innumerable rights is my responsibility as an American citizen. It is my duty to give my support to the institutions which strengthen our free society and to work actively to support them.

Another responsibility is standing up for what I think is right. Unless I have the courage of my convictions, my appreciation, awareness, and support of the United States are futile. It is my responsibility to defend and protect my way of life in order to help secure this way of life for future generations of all the world's people.

Finally, I, as an American citizen, am charged to preserve the concept of freedom in the world through respecting the rights of all people. I must always be aware of the worth and dignity of every human being, treating each one as I myself wish to be treated. If I am to be free from oppression or tyranny, I should wish all people to be free and should work for that. If I want to be free of fear of my neighbor, I must act in such a way that he will not be afraid of me. If I am to be free from hunger, it is my responsibility to do what I can to see that no person lacks enough to eat.

If I accept my individual responsibilities of appreciation, awareness, action, conviction, and preservation and if every American citizen accepts similar responsibilities, together we will be able to maintain and safeguard our American way of life and secure a lasting future of freedom for all men everywhere.

Back-Door Federal Control of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOFFMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Federal aid to education in one form or another is, and has been, a subject of much discussion for several years. The overall and far-reaching effect should be the primary concern in the consideration of Federal aid in any field.

Dr. V. R. Edman who came to Wheaton College some 26 years ago and who has served as its President since 1941 ably discerned this in studying the provisions of H.R. 8900, to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities.

Dr. Edman's letter to the editor, the Daily Journal, Wheaton, Ill., and printed in the issue of March 21, 1962, follows:

"SUBSIDIZATION JUST MEANS SECULARIZATION"—EDMAN

(NOTE.—The following letter from Dr. V. R. Edman, president of Wheaton College, tells why he joined other college presidents in opposing the Federal educational subsidy proposal.)

DEAR EDITOR: Inquiry has been made of me why I along with 20 some college presidents of liberal arts colleges sent a protest to the House Rules Committee regarding H.R. 8900 which contemplates subsidization for higher education. I have communicated my persuasion to Senator DIRKSEN and also to our Congressman, ELMER HOFFMAN. Here is the substance of our objection to this proposed legislation:

1. Subsidization means inevitable standardization. Congress is under obligation to set up controls for the expenditure of public funds. Sooner or later, directly or indirectly, there will be Federal control which will destroy the diversity, the individual initiative and self-improvement that have marked American colleges all down the years.

2. Subsidization means secularization. This would mean that Wheaton College could not teach Bible classes, have chapel services, have prayer in each class; nor could St. Procopius or any other church-related college.

3. Subsidization is unsound historically. Federal support of higher education was considered at the Constitutional Convention of 1787 which decided that it was not the province of the Federal Government.

4. Subsidization is an unsound assumption that all that higher education really needs is money. The theory is bigger bureaucracy, better education.

5. Subsidization is unnecessary. Basically the choice is between forcible support by Federal taxation or by the voluntary support which has marked privately endowed higher education for nearly 350 years in our country.

6. Subsidization shifts the responsibility for education of the children from the parents and students, the college and its friends, to the Federal Government. Elaboration of the welfare state will further weaken family cohesion and cooperation, and family life is a national resource we cannot afford further to diminish.

7. Subsidization knows no cessation. Once begun it grows rather than diminishes. The colleges will be compelled to depend increasingly on Federal money. To my way of thinking that is selling our soul for a mess of politics.

The Federal Government has more responsibilities than it can carry effectively and successfully now. It must defend our country from foreign aggression and from domestic suppression of the liberties of us citizens. If Washington will mind its own business and cut expenses, we will provide a college education for every young person who is willing to work for it.

V. R. EDMAN.

The Best of Times, the Worst of Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER A. GARLAND
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Speaker, in view of the present day clamor for more and more Federal assistance in affairs properly of local and State concern, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues and the American people a speech given by Ronald Speers, a member of the Maine Governor's Executive Council, to the American Legion Convention in Rockland, Maine, last June. Mr. Speers, one of Maine's most distinguished citizens, was recently awarded the National Freedom Foundation Award for this thought-provoking address.

THE BEST OF TIMES, THE WORST OF TIMES

"It was the best of times, it was the worst of times." In this simple but eloquent beginning to "A Tale of Two Cities" Dickens managed to sum up the period of the French revolution, but I would ask whether in a broader sense this evaluation could not be applied to any period of history, including our own, since the times are worst or best only in relation to the lives of the people who are a part of them. Each of us, individually, decides in some measure by our actions how our times will be, but we do so only in relation to our heritage—to what we have received from the past.

We are all products of our environment and of our past. We are a democracy today only because of the defeat through the centuries of despots and dictators in their attempts to crush the freedom of the individual. The nobles who forced the Magna Carta upon King John, by their actions made possible the writing of the Declaration of Independence. The men who died at Waterloo to defeat Napoleon contributed to our heritage of freedom in the same way as did those who died to defeat Hitler.

In keeping with this thought then, I would submit to you that we have an even greater responsibility than to just determine how our times shall be. We are the heritage of future generations—what we do in our time, and with our time, shall in some measure, directly or indirectly, affect the way in which they shall live.

Each day, through new discoveries in the fields of medicine, engineering, chemistry, and agriculture, to name but a few, we are providing for a better and more abundant life for generations yet unborn—in medicine alone we have freed them of the threat of many diseases from diphtheria to polio—but what will any of these provisions be worth to them if we lose them freedom? If we leave them a legacy of a totalitarian world?

There has never been any question but that a democracy is the most difficult form of government to maintain. It calls for a high degree of responsibility on the part of its citizens. As the citizens abrogate this responsibility so the Government must assume it, and in so doing it shifts more and more away from democracy towards socialism.

We are living in an age where the trend seems to be for the citizen to disregard his responsibilities—to shift everything to the Government—from the care of his aging parents to the food, clothing, and shelter needs of his dependent children. We are in grave danger of defaulting our freedoms and our liberties and our form of government, and the freedoms and liberties and Government of future generations through our own laziness and neglect and our loss of a sense of values as a people.

We need to examine this lack of a sense of values. For example, right at this moment somewhere in southeast Asia the hospital ship *Hope* is bringing medical care and help to people whose needs are desperate. The doctors on board that ship are all volunteers and all are dedicated men—men who believe in their hippocratic oath and who feel that what talents they have in the healing arts should be used to aid humanity. At the same time in our land there are some surgeons whose skill is great enough to command large fees and who operate once or twice a week—not because the human need is small but simply because they have no need financially to do more, and to do so would steal time from their golf or their boating or their social life. Yet which of these two groups—the volunteer doctors of the *Hope* or the men of self-interest and high fees enjoy the position of prestige and the deference and approval of the public?

Does the hardworking young district attorney or county attorney win the approval of the people for his efforts in their behalf, or do the plaudits generally go to the high-priced lawyer who may have just skimmed the edge of legality in rescuing an obviously guilty client from his just punishment?

In today's warped thinking, wouldn't the good Samaritan be considered just another sucker for helping the unfortunate traveler?

"The best of times and the worst of times." Surely our values and our sense of responsibility need overhauling. We owe so much to the future in order to repay our debt to the past.

We need to teach our youngsters—and we need to remind ourselves—that the carefree tracks we make in the sands of our beaches in the summer were made possible by bloody footprints in the snow at Valley Forge; that each time we go to a voting booth and cast our ballot as Americans, regardless of race, creed, or color, that men died at Gettysburg and Chancellorsville and Shiloh to make it so; that the full and bountiful table we set in our American homes, and accept as our normal due, is ours because men went without and starved and died to gain a little time on Bataan and Corregidor.

These things I say to you my fellow Americans, because we seem to have forgotten many of the basic lessons of history. A nation can be only as strong as its people. A democracy can exist only as long as its people are willing to work and to sacrifice to maintain it.

"The best of times and the worst of times * * *" that is what it has always been in every age and for every generation, depending on what they make of it. Which of the two it shall be for us and for our posterity in the generations to come, depends entirely upon what we do individually and collectively to renew, to maintain, and to strengthen the moral principles and ideals upon which our Nation was founded and upon which it grew to greatness.

The challenge is here and now. The struggle we are engaged in is vital—the stakes so high and so vast as to form a concept almost beyond grasp—the control of men's minds and lives and destinies—of civilization for centuries to come.

The Communists are aware of it and they never lose sight of it. Khrushchev voiced it when he said our grandchildren would live under their system.

It is up to us to prove him wrong and to justify through our efforts the sacrifices of past generations that have made it possible for us to live in freedom.

If we but do those things that need to be done, we cannot fail.

If we do less—we cannot succeed.

Justice Denied

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there is an old expression in the legal profession that "justice delayed is justice denied." There is very much truth in this, as indeed there seems to be in many common expressions if analyzed. The administrative processes of our Federal Government often give a justice that is long delayed.

One of the examples of this administrative delay is in the handling of actions under the Antidumping Act of 1921. The provisions of this act are to come into play when it is found that imported goods are being sold in the United States at prices below those at which they are sold abroad—when foreign products are being dumped on the American market. The remedy under this act to such dumping, and the resultant injury to American domestic industry, is the imposition of a differential duty, a special tariff merely to cover the differential in prices and eliminate the dumping aspect of the sales in this country. This is not protectionism in the classical sense of this word, but rather a shield against unfair competitive practices on an international scale.

The situations calling for the application of this act are fairly clear; the procedures for invoking its protection are, on the surface, relatively easy. Two steps are taken as preliminary factfinding in the administration of this act. First, the Treasury Department must find the existence of price differentials; then, this matter is reported to the Tariff Commission to determine if there is any injury to American industry. If there is an affirmative finding as to both the existence of suspected dumping and of injury, it is returned to the Treasury Department for the assessment of the differential duty.

The Tariff Commission is required to act in its function under the bill in 3 months. No time limits are placed on the Treasury, either in its factfinding role or in the suspension of regular tariffs, awaiting the determination of the possible special dumping duties, or in the assessment of them. As a result of there being no limits set for the time within which the Treasury Department may act, there has been great delay in the determination of these cases, the delay which denies justice. The delay affects both the domestic industry and the exporters, injecting confusion and uncertainty into the international trade field to the detriment of international commerce.

Legislation has been introduced by various members of this body to correct this situation by providing time limitations on the functions of the Treasury Department in such cases. I would certainly commend this proposal to the attention of the Congress.

Destruction From Within

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shelbyville News:

DESTRUCTION FROM WITHIN

"Is it possible for us to destroy ourselves from within?"

That is the question asked by one of the Nation's foremost authorities on Government fiscal matters, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, who is chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, in the course of a statement issued on the financial situation in which the United States now finds itself.

As chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, the Virginia Democrat says, "It was with a good deal of reluctance and, I will say, a good deal of sadness that I was compelled to ask for an increase in the Federal debt limit from $298 to $300 billion. I did so because I was told that unless the debt limit was increased, our Government could not pay its current bills.

"I do not recall in my long service on the Senate Committee on Finance that there

ever before arose such a condition as was presented to us.

"It had to be recognized that the failure of this Government to pay its bills would create chaos at home and abroad in the free world.

"Such a situation could not be permitted to occur.

"Under circumstances which had been allowed to develop we were virtually forced to go more deeply into debt to pay running expenses continually coming due in excess of revenue income."

What is especially frightening in all this is that, as Senator BYRD points out, "Federal financial crises such as this are recurring with increasing frequency. Enactment of the bill raised the limit on the Federal debt $7 billion in 8 months.

"A year ago the debt limit was $293 billion. In June 1961, at the request of the administration the debt limit was raised to $298 billion. Now, at the request of the administration, it has been raised to $300 billion."

He points out that Treasury figures relating to the recent $2 billion debt increase show that "deterioration in the fiscal situation has been precipitous since the June request to raise the debt limit to $298 billion."

Senator BYRD states quite clearly what has been happening to bring the U.S. fiscal situation to this new and latest crisis. "Unnecessary spending," he says, "is increasing. Nonmilitary Federal expenditures in the first 7 months this (fiscal) year, through January 1962 ran 10 percent higher than during the same period last year. Total Federal expenditures in the July–January period was $3.9 billion higher than last year; nonmilitary expenditures increased by $2.4 billion, and military expenditures increased by $1.5 billion.

"We have been the policeman, the banker, and the Santa Claus for the free world more than 15 years. Recent figures showed U.S. foreign aid has totaled more than $100 billion, and it is continuing"

We are already laboring, as he adds, under a terrible tax burden—a burden which is confiscatory in some areas. Deficits are continuing, and the debt is at a peak never reached even for 4 years of global shooting war. And in adidtion to $300 billion in direct debt, we have assumed contingent liabilities at home and abroad amounting to untold billions more.

But let's look into the near future.

"Before July 1962," Senator BYRD states, "the administration is going to ask that the debt limit be raised again by $8 billion, lifting the limit by $5 billion in a year. As the situation stands now, this will be the year of the highest revenue and the highest debt in history."

It is also clear, as Mr. BYRD says, that continually raising the statutory limit on the Federal debt "is only temporizing with dangerous deterioration in the Government's basic fiscal condition.

"As chairman of the Finance Committee," he adds, "I shall oppose to the utmost of my capacity raising the debt limit an additional $8 billion, to $308 billion for the next fiscal year when the administration says there will be a balanced budget."

In the meantime, Senator BYRD says his committee will make a thorough examination of the financial position of the United States. This study will be exhaustive and "concerned with hard facts as distinguished from fiscal fantasy."

Well, in the latter regard, we certainly have had an awful lot of fiscal fantasy over a period of some 30 years. Some of this fantasy at the present time is coming from certain Government leaders who are telling the people that there will be a balanced budget in the next fiscal year starting July 1. They are the same hollowheads who lulled the public into believing the budget would balance in the current fiscal year, while, as a fact, there will be a deficit of between $7 and $10 billion. And Senator BYRD says it is his "frank and considered opinion that there will not be a balanced budget next year. I would be willing to venture, as strongly as I can, the prediction that there will be a very substantial deficit unless something is done to stop unnecessary spending in the fiscal year beginning on the first of July 1962."

Returning to the question of whether it is possible to destroy ourselves from within, Senator BYRD cites the fact that "Neither our form of government nor our system of enterprise can survive insolvency. All of us know that we cannot continue much longer to spend and spend, and tax and tax, and borrow and borrow."

Noting now before Congress or any other branch of Government is more important than protection of the Nation's fiscal structure. Just what are our national leaders doing about that? The answer seems to be obvious.

Vocational Training Programs Need Updating

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, vocational training programs are of the greatest importance to young people entering the labor market and to persons who wish to change positions and need greater skills. The retraining legislation recently voted on by Congress deals with much of this problem. It is therefore important that all of us familiarize ourselves with the vocational training programs in our community and State. Unfortunately in all too many instances people are being trained for skills that are not needed and where there are no jobs available. Herbert Hill, the labor secretary of the NAACP, has pointed out that Negro workers have been especially hurt by this. The Taconic Foundation of New York, headed by Mr. Stephen Currier, has recently financed a study of this problem as it applies to New York City.

The results as reported in the New York Times and Herald Tribune of March 12 are truly shocking. Many Americans are involved in this inadequate and outdated system of so-called vocational training. Improvements are badly needed and the study made for the Taconic Foundation of New York, should be helpful to many communities and local leaders in improving the situation as it exists on the local level. No one group of people can solve this problem, just as no one group has all the responsibility for the unsatisfactory situation we find today in this field of education. I hope my colleagues and other responsible citizens as well as the press will study the findings of the Taconic Foundation report and will take the necessary steps in their own communities to improve this vital job creating function.

The article follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 12, 1962]

PER-PUPIL COST AND DROPOUTS HIGHEST IN CITY

(By Terry Ferrer, education editor)

The most expensive program in the city school system—vocational high schools—is "very deficient" and only "a small fraction" of students attending such schools receive "any realistic and practical preparation for work."

Two out of every three vocational students quit before graduation—against one in three in academic high schools. They drop out into a world without employment or much hope of it.

These were the indictments yesterday of Judge Mary Conway Kohler, who has been conducting an 18-month survey of youth employment for the Taconic Foundation. Her findings on the city, "Youth and Work in New York City," were published yesterday by the foundation from its offices at 666 Fifth Avenue.

Mrs. Kohler, a former judge of the San Francisco Superior Court, Juvenile Division, declared that the vocational high schools frequently "train youngsters for jobs which rarely exist," such as cabinet making, and that schooling in the food trades "approaches the dimensions of a scandal."

This is despite the fact that the per-pupil cost in vocational high schools is the highest in the system—$93.24 a year, according to the latest board of education figures. Other pre-pupil costs are $502.38 for elementary pupils, $515.46 for junior high, and $605.39 for academic high school students. Currently there are some 39,000 students in 29 vocational high schools, and almost 189,000 in 57 academic and technical high schools.

URGES NEW EFFORT

To aid the 50,000 young people who start looking for work each year in the city, Judge Kohler urged a cooperative effort by city officials, employers, unions and the schools under the direction of the mayor's office.

The cooperative program should try to end discrimination against Negroes and Puerto Ricans in job opportunities, remove union obstacles to memberships for youth, and, if necessary, create jobs through a public works program such as the administration's youth employment opportunities bill now pending before Congress.

Judge Kohler, who is chairman of the National Committee on Employment of Youth, also urged the board of education to establish a "skills center" which would be open day and night all year to persons of all ages.

Turning to some of the poorer city vocational programs, Judge Kohler said that the Food Trades High School, 208 West 13th Street, had a plant that is "impossible." She said that she agreed with one description of the school that such obsolete equipment "would not be used in a beanery in the Bowery." In her report, she described the 86-year-old building as "antiquated" and the conditions for food preparation "unsanitary and sometimes dangerous."

She added that only 1 of every 10 boys at the school is graduated. The Food Trades School was cited in June during the school scandal investigation as in serious need of repair.

In the 30-page summary of her report, Judge Kohler blamed conflict among schools, employers and unions for the poor transition between school and job. The school, she said, must shoulder the greatest responsibility for seeing the child through training to a job.

She called for repeal of "rigid" State laws which now require that vocational students spend half their time in academic work and half in shop work. Half of the vocational

pupils who make it through their high schools are now failing their academic courses, she said.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 12, 1962]

SCHOOLS, UNIONS, AND INDUSTRY SCORED ON JOB TRAINING HERE—FOUNDATION SAYS VOCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS OFFER WORK THAT IS OFTEN USELESS

(By Gene Currivan)

Efforts to prepare teenagers here for employment were indicted yesterday in a report by a nonprofit organization specializing in eduactional research and the study of delinquency and discrimination.

The charges, supported by 15 city and State organizations, were directed at the city schools—principally the vocational institutions—city agencies, unions, and industry.

The vocational schools were accused of giving obsolete training that in many cases is not acceptable to unions. The Food Trades High School, for example, was said to offer training "that approaches the dimensions of a scandal."

Both labor and management were said to be guilty of discrimination and the city agencies that operate programs in the area of youth and work were accused of having no coordinated policy.

JOBLESS RATE 20 PERCENT

The report said that with about 50,000 youths, including 27,000 who have dropped out of school, looking for work each year, there was poor correlation between job opportunities and training. The unemployment rate runs to 20 percent.

In some cases, it said, the youngsters have been trained for practically nonexistent jobs such as cabinetmaking, while others have had little, if any, guidance on choosing a vocation.

In the latter category are those who were enrolled in the "general curriculum" in the academic high schools, described as "a catchall of courses in which less able students generally receive a watered-down academic program."

"The school has not the slightest idea what will become of them vocationally," the report said "Their entrance into industry is governed, more than anything else, by chance."

The report said the needs of about 25 percent of the vocational and academic pupils were not met.

The report, "Youth and Work in New York City," is part of an 18-month national survey of youth employment by the Taconic Foundation. The foundation was set up in 1958 and is headed by Stephen R. Currier.

Mr. Currier is president of Currier & Co., a concern that manages a variety of commercial holdings, but he devotes much of his time to the foundation. A spokesman described the foundation as a philanthropic organization concerned mainly with urban affairs, including social welfare and race relations.

The preparation of the report was directed by Mrs. Mary Conway Kohler.

One of the principal recommendations was that the board of education establish a skill center that would operate day and night, all year round, for persons of all ages. It would give free courses to dropouts, unskilled graduates, and adults in such diverse fields as foreign languages, industrial chemistry, and cooking.

The center, the report suggested, could concentrate costly equipment in one place, making obsolescence of training equipment less likely.

AGREEMENT URGED

The report called for "agreement among schools, industry, and unions to standardize training both in apprenticeship and in formal 2-year post-high-school technical courses."

At present, the report noted, with some of the unions refusing to fully credit vocational school training, applicants for jobs must spend an additional 3 to 5 years in apprenticeship.

At this rate "it takes almost as long to be a plumber as to be a doctor," said Mrs. Kohler.

Mrs. Kohler was formerly children's court judge in San Francisco, a member of President Kennedy's Committee on Youth Employment, a Ford Foundation consultant, and a consultant to the Temporary Commission on the Courts of New York State.

Speaking at a press conference on Friday at the Taconic Foundation's headquarters, 666 Fifth Avenue, she said that a youth who spent 3 years in printing school found that he had to start from scratch when he entered the industry.

There has been no orderly transition or adequate attempt at a breakthrough by either the schools or the unions, the report held. Exceptions noted were the High School of Fashion Industries and the Aviation High School, both of which benefit from current employment demands.

EQUIPMENT CALLED PRIMITIVE

The equipment in the main, 86-year-old building of Food Trades High School "can only be described as primitive," the report said.

"This school was one of the victims of the lack of attention paid by the board of education to repair needs in recent years," it noted. "As a result, the conditions under which food is prepared and served are unsanitary and sometimes dangerous."

There are 654 boys in the school, but because of the high dropout rate only 56 were graduated last year. This is in spite of the statements by industry representatives that they can guarantee further training and employment to any graduate. The board is planning a new school but it is not scheduled for completion until 1965.

The study found that two of every three youngsters dropped out of vocational schools and one in every three dropped out of academic high schools. The board of education has estimated it spends $925.96 annually for each vocational pupil and $602.96 for each academic high school pupil.

Among the report's recommendations were the following:

The school must bear the greatest responsibility for setting the child on the right road to educational and eventual occupational success.

All-day neighborhood schools should be expanded and also cover junior high school youngsters.

Students must be provided with a greater number of opportunities to explore various kinds of work before choosing a career.

Schools, city government, unions and employers must cooperate to end discrimination against Negroes and Puerto Ricans and unions must end opposition to youth membership.

Vocational schools should be kept open in the summer.

Students should not be required to spend half their day in academic and half in shop work when a flexible arrangement would be more practicable.

Responsibility for coordination of youth and work problems must be lodged at the top city government level.

There should be one counselor for every 300 high school students.

The board of education should establish a center for research on basic educational problems and evaluation of experimental programs in the schools and community.

The sponsors of the report were the American Association of University Women (New York Branch), the American Jewish Congress (Metropolitan Council), the American Jewish Committee (New York Chapter), the Child Study Association of America, the Citizens Committee for Children of New York, the Metropolitan Council, B'nai Brith, the New York Adult Education Council, the New York City Mission Society, the New York State Congress of Parents and Teachers (Metropolitan District), the New York State Citizens Committee for the Public Schools, the Public Education Association, United Neighborhood Houses of New York, United Parents Associations of New York City, the Urban League of Greater New York and the Vocational Advisory Service.

Can't Have Cake and Eat It, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALTON LENNON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues a keen analysis of the general agricultural situation by Mr. Leslie Gruber, farm editor of the Star-News, Wilmington, N.C.

The article follows:

CAN'T HAVE CAKE AND EAT IT, TOO

(By Leslie Gruber)

After listening to numerous criticisms and reading many others, one comes to the conclusion that many people want to have their cake and eat it too.

No particular defense can be made of administration of farm programs, especially the grain storage program of the past years. This particularly unsavory program was fully revealed in the storage scandals a year or so ago in Kansas and other points where conniving brought huge profits to certain individuals at the expense of the public.

But, on the other hand, no particular defense can be made of the attitude that demands price protection, support, or whatever it is called on one side and refuses the production controls and inspections that would make this program valid, on the other hand.

The many farm people who claim they are not to blame for the surplus mess in feed grains should stop and think a bit. They and thousands of farmers like them have showered Congressmen with letters and comments whenever the support price program came before Congress.

The will of the farm mass has been different than the will of its leadership in many areas and in many years.

This appears from the mass actions of farmers in the Midwest whenever prices of hogs dip sharply.

Many conservative farm leaders declare it would be terrible if the Government would release any large portion of its surplus grain. And, they do decry this release at present. And, only a small portion has been released.

However, they yell loud and clear at the Federal crop programs, real or proposed. Without production controls to keep production in line with demand there is no excuse whatever for charging the public hundreds of millions of dollars a year for storage.

Modern agriculture can produce twice or more the needs of any current workable, practical marketing situation.

With its high capital cost, modern agriculture can successfully break itself up in business if it goes on a strictly competitive basis, due to the inflexibility of its cost structure in relation to its price structure.

None of the apparent or practical alternatives have too much right in them. Most have plenty of wrong in them.

Agriculture must have some basic protection, whether it is right or wrong.

The rights and wrongs of the situation, vary according to each individual's philosophy.

The point now reached by agriculture as a whole is that it can't have its cake and eat it too.

The trmendous weight of the nonfarm public will bring that about. Agriculture must win the good will of this public. Some of agriculture's strongest criticism, however, comes from the small townspeople of the Nation.

Voluntary programs have failed. They will continue to fail, people being as they are and not what they are supposed to be.

The respected and noted farm leader who publicly brags about how his sons and he "have beaten the feed grain program" by planting more plants per acre and fertilizing them more pulls his own house down around him.

For he and others talk about voluntary controls and actions, yet they take the lead in defeating the idea and goal of the controls. The selfish action is natural. Individually, one feels helpless against the mass and goes ahead to make the best of his own particular situation, regardless of what it does when multiplied a million times.

This is why the economic theories in agriculture haven't held. While in livestock, generally, low prices and overproduction have brought cutbacks, it hasn't always been so, and in crops it has never been so.

Thus agriculture has reached a point where if pure economics becomes the goal, most present farmers will be forced off the land and bankrupt. Agriculture in a purely economic situation will gradually develop on a large corporate basis.

However, the human side of the picture requires some different answers. First, generally, it isn't figured healthy for the country to allow agriculture to become centralized in a few large corporations.

Second, it has been an axiom of American life and philosophy that the country was the best place to live and to bring up children.

Third, it has been an axiom that the conservatism (not always true) of the rural mass balanced the radicalism of the urban mass.

Fourth, agriculture has been a way of life for most of its people. It still is for many. And for many, there is no other way of life.

To the individual farmer it matters little whether he can produce all he wants when he receives a price lower than the cost of production.

A tobacco farmer who has a 3-acre allotment and who averaged 50 to 65 cents a pound for his crop last year made more than he would if he produced all he wanted, along with everyone else, and received 30 or 40 cents a pound for it.

Trade Expansion Act of 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Thomas Kennedy, president, United Mine Workers of America, to the House Ways and Means Committee on H.R. 9900, Trade Expansion Act of 1962, on March 22.

STATEMENT OF THOMAS KENNEDY, PRESIDENT, UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA, TO THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, ON H.R. 9900, TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962, IN WASHINGTON, D.C., THURSDAY, MARCH 22, 1962

My name is Thomas Kennedy. I am the president of the United Mine Workers of America.

My purpose here today is not to deliver a lecture on the subject of international economics. Rather, I would like to tell this committee of the very real social and economic chaos that is prevalent in the coal fields of this Nation because of an import policy that is both destructive and shortsighted.

I am speaking, of course, of the importation of residual oil into the east coast region of the United States.

Since 1957 residual imports into what is known as districts I–IV (that is the United States with the exception of the west coast region) have increased from 30 million tons of coal equivalent to 39 million tons. The greatest percentage of this oil has gone into the east coast or PAW district I. During the years 1959, 1960, and 1961 this oil was subject to a quota limitation imposed by the President in the interest of national security.

We have preliminary indications of the 1962 quota. As usual, it will increase further the burdens under which the coal industry must operate. The actual projected figure for the coming year is 44 million tons of coal equivalent of allowable imports.

The United Mine Workers of America has always maintained, and still most forcefully maintains, that these imports are inflicting fatal damage to the coal industry of the Appalachian area and sending America along the road to utter dependence on foreigners for a source of energy.

For the purpose of the committee, we would like to break down the imports of residual oil into actual impact upon the coal miners of this Nation.

The 39 million tons of coal equivalent imported as residual oil means a loss of 3 million man-days of work lost to the coal miner in the areas supplying coal to the east coast. It meant a loss in wages of almost $73 million.

But the damage does not end here. Since the coal miner depends upon a healthy coal industry for his prosperity, the depressing effect upon coal because of the predatory pricing of residual oil added a note of instability to that employment which he did have.

We have witnessed firsthand the results of this import policy. We have seen the crushing effect of residual on coal communities, on coal companies, and on coal miners. It is a most distressing sight, a situation that demands nothing less than total solution.

There is chaos stalking the coal fields today because of residual oil imports. There is uncertainty, unemployment, underemployment, and actual physical need. Everyone looks for help, for a way out, and there is none, because residual oil is allowed to drown the hopes, ambitions, and futures of a great and proud industry and those who work in it.

But there is a broader implication to the question of residual oil imports than the immediate question of the coal industry itself. There is national interest here, an interest so deep and so vital that it must be met if America is to progress. Permit me to tell this committee wherein that interest rests.

The coal industry is basic to the future of the United States. Coal has formed one of the underlying sources of strength upon which the prosperity of the Nation is built. Coal is necessary in peace, as well as in war.

But coal mining is a complex industry. It requires huge investments, managerial skill of an unusually high degree, and a skilled labor force able to cope with the natural hazards of coal mining as well as the complex operational nature of the industry.

Coal has laboriously built up this strength over a period of many years. Coal possesses today the ability to supply this Nation with all of its varied energy needs at a reasonable cost.

Coal is the basis of the economic prosperity for many of the States in the Appalachian area. For example, West Virginia, Kentucky, parts of Virginia, and Pennsylvania are closely tied to coal.

Thus, the influx of residual oil is not a parochial or sectional consideration.

Residual oil is a threat to the continued existence of the coal industry. Residual imports, through a constant pressure on the price of energy, have undermined the basic economic and financial strength of the coal industry. Improvements, needed improvements, have been neglected because there is no money available to finance them. Research, so necessary in our modern economy, cannot be carried on to any extent because the profit margins of the coal industry cannot bear such burdens.

In short, the many ways that coal could serve the economy are circumscribed. The progress of the past, with all of its advantages for the producers of coal, the miners of coal, and most importantly, the consumers of coal, has come to a standstill in the face of the disastrous situation prevailing in the marketplace. Instead of progress in all phases of coal production, transportation, and utilization, progress which would serve the Nation, coal is forced to engage in a gutter, "no holds barred" war to hold its market from a wholesale invasion of its traditional marketing area.

We contend that this is not competition, but only self-destruction.

Residual oil has cut a swath of economic privation and misery through the coal fields of the Appalachian area. Entire States have been plunged into economic depression because the underlying strength of their economies has been systematically destroyed.

But the cruelest blow of all has been to the coal miner and his family and the other segments of the community that depend upon the coal miner for sustenance.

We know of areas in West Virginia where unemployment is 40 percent of the working force. There are children in this Nation who must depend upon the school lunch program for their only hot meal of the day. Men who have known nothing but hard work all of their lives, men who ask nothing but the right to earn a decent living, have been thrown out of jobs without any hope of reemployment because of residual oil imports.

I wonder; indeed, every member of the United Mine Workers of America wonders, if the benefits that accrue from residual imports are worth such social and economic decay.

We cannot as a Nation stand this burden indefinitely. The consequences are too far-reaching, the results too serious to contemplate. America must decide whether or not to plunge an entire section of the country into social and economic oblivion unheard of in our times.

It is a fateful decision to make, a decision which can decide the future of this Republic.

Yet, today coal miners suffer, coal communities languish, and the entire coal industry pauses as those charged with the responsibility of protecting and promoting the welfare of this Nation deliberate and consider their fate, whether that fate be to live and work as American citizens, or to descend the long road to economic destitution.

As we continually increase our imports of residual oil, we still talk of economic growth. Even as a foreign energy source strangles the domestic coal industry, and even our own

oil industry, plans are being laid for the millenium that is to come.

But we must ask: Where will the impetus originate? Certainly not from the coal producing regions of the country. Obviously not from the coal miner who must face the future with a great deal of apprehension. Nor can we look to the coal operators to invest further billions of dollars to make coal as efficient and as modern as it must be to serve the growing energy needs that any economic growth presupposes.

Instead, while we talk of growth we must look to the underlying sickness that pervades the energy industries of our Nation. We must take cognizance of the virtual destruction that faces coal and oil and associated industries.

For we cannot talk of economic growth while allowing entire basic industries to perish before unfair competition. We cannot speak of prosperity while at the same time fostering economic privation. It just cannot be done.

It behooves those who are charged with the economic future of this Nation to become aware of what has been happening to the basic coal industry of this Nation. As we talk of economic progress and as they plan for such progress, they must be prepared to protect that basic industry which is the source of all progress. Any other course would be sheer economic folly.

I spoke earlier of $73 million in wages that was lost to the coal miner in 1961 because of residual oil imports. There was reference made to the 3 million man-days of work that was lost because of these imports.

These figures represent economic stagnation. They are dollars lost to our economy, working time and working skill wasted. They are dollars that have permanently left our shores and dollars that enrich a few oil barons and oil importers.

What could have been done to the depressed areas of the coal mining States with those dollars, with those job opportunities? Isn't it obvious that saving those dollars and using American workers to produce in an efficient manner those goods and services which we need is at the basis of that economic growth which we all so ardently desire?

Thus, our industry lies at the base of our material strength. Besides, our industry has made possible the huge foreign aid program which is an integral part of our national policy. This aid amounts to almost $57 billion in the period 1950-60, a huge figure, a staggering figure, yet one that can be borne by the American taxpayer because of the inherent strength of our Nation.

The burdens that are projected for the future are even more staggering. These proposed programs call for sums of gargantuan nature—$35 billion for space, $50 billion per year for national defense, $20 billion for Latin American aid.

Yet the responsible people, those officials who must go to the American people for these huge figures, attempt, for one reason or another, to destroy the source of strength that makes it all possible—industry and the energy that powers that industry.

Just last week further increases in the residual oil quota were announced by the Secretary of the Interior. These new quotas would increase the deluge of residual oil to some 5 million additional tons of coal for this year. More jobs will be lost. More money will flow from the coal areas and from the Nation. And another step will have been taken toward the eventual destruction of the coal industry in America.

It is time; indeed, it is long past time for the Congress of the United States to call a halt to this condition. For it is a dangerous and disheartening thing to witness the gradual but rapidly accelerating disintegration of the coal industry and the States that depend upon that industry for a livelihood.

The forces that would remove the residual oil quotas are strong. They have succeeded in reducing the program to a shambles and defeating many of its original purposes. Each day they increase the pressure to lift the amount of residual oil that is coming into the Nation. All too often their efforts are crowned with success.

So we would urge the Congress to make permanent a rigid quota on residual oil imports. We do not mean that such a quota will completely eliminate all imports. But we do strongly recommend that the invasion of coal's markets and the destruction of the coal industry of the Appalachian area should be terminated and terminated at once.

Congressional action is necessary for two reasons. First, it would place the oil import program on a permanent basis and remove it from the constant pressure for change that is inherent in the program as it is now constituted. Secondly, it would give the coal industry some reasonable assurance for the future by allowing them to know from year to year what kind of competition they will face, instead of their current and constant state of uncertainty.

Also, congressional action on this question is necessary if Congress is, in fact, to regulate foreign commerce in the way the Constitution intended. It is your responsibility, a national responsibility, one which bears no delay.

While the attention of the coal industry has been fixed primarily on the harmful effects of residual imports, we are not unmindful of the many restrictions placed on our coal in the nations of the world.

It is with some pride that I cite the record of the coal industry with respect to coal prices in the world market. There is no area of the world where our coal is not competitive. American coal can be delivered to Germany, Japan, Italy, England, Belgium, Finland, France, and other European countries and be in a position to compete with coal produced in those nations. It is well to emphasize that our coal is produced with labor paid the highest industrial wage of any workers of the world. Yet, in spite of the wage factor and the great distances which American coal is transported to these countries, we are in the best position of any nation of the world insofar as competition is concerned.

However, we must bear in mind that practically all of the countries affiliated with the Common Market are building up a big cartel, not only affecting coal but other commodities as well. It is well to emphasize that these countries have quotas fixed for coal imports from countries outside the Common Market and limitations have been placed on these imports. For example, in France and Belgium there are import restrictions on coal; and in Belgium some of the mines are subsidized by the Government. In Germany, up to 6 million tons of American coal are permitted to be imported on a duty-free basis. However, once this quota has been reached, a stiff tariff of more than $4 is applicable to each ton of American coal which is imported. In Great Britain, France, Belgium and other countries, a license is needed to import coal. Just recently, American metallurgical coal was kept out of Wales because of the protests of the Welsh coal miners.

These instances are cited to show that while the rest of the world seeks access to our markets, they are not willing to let us compete for thier own, except within the narrow concept of national self-interest. We do not mean to quarrel with this concept. However, we definitely believe that it is pertinent for our discussions on this very trying situation. Certainly, a very careful analysis is in order as ways and means are being advanced by certain interests to open the American market to the floodgates of foreign competition.

There was a time when the United Mine Workers of America held great hopes for the future of exporting coal. We did everything possible to stimulate the expansion of coal in this market.

But over the years we have come to grasp the very real problems of foreign trade and to face the refusal of foreign nations to permit their own industrial life to be destroyed by imports from another nation.

Fortunately, there are two nations which allow American coal free access to their markets. These are Italy and Japan. Both of these nations have little coal of their own, or do not possess it in sufficient quantity and quality to satisfy their needs. So they are forced to come to America for coal, coal to furnish them with the sinews of industrial might.

It is inconceivable for us to comprehend how our Government can justify oil imports while at the same time watching American coal being shut out of logical markets. It would appear that there is a double standard being applied, one for the foreign nations who wish to sell to us. This standard allows them to enter our market without hindrance. This is done in the name of "international good will," or as a defense against communism, or any other pious sounding and patriotic reasons. The other is applied to American exports which are shut out of foreign nations when it suits them to do so. Then we are told to understand that conditions are different, that we must take account of the internal problems of these countries and be patient.

I might say to this committee that the United Mine Workers of America does not understand and it does not intend to be patient. If, in fact, there is poverty abroad, there is poverty at home also. If oilworkers in South America are out of work, so are coal miners in West Virginia. If it is expedient for the German Government to protect its coal industry, it is far more necessary for the American Government to protect and defend its own coal industry.

What we are asking for is a small amount of sanity in the high sounding, but largely meaningless phraseology, that has come to surround every mention of free, or so-called reciprocal trade.

In the interest of brevity, we have confined our remarks to the direct damage that is being done to the coal industry because of the excessive importation of residual oil. However, the interests of the coal miner extend much farther than this. As members of this committee well know, coal is used as a basic energy source. As such, it is used to generate electricity and to power industry and commerce. Because of these factors, the fortunes of coal and those of coal miners are tied to the general economic posture of the Nation.

Therefore, while we have not made special reference to other industries and other groups of workers affected by the trade bill, we are not unmindful of the fact that the welfare of the coal miner is at stake in other areas. We take this position because we are cognizant of the fact that if any industry is forced to curtail production or to shut down entirely, energy and power needs will be reduced and thus affect the coal mining industry.

It is therefore incumbent upon the Members of Congress and all who are interested in the prosperity of coal-consuming industries and potential coal-consuming industries that they should carefully consider the net impact of the proposed import program upon the coal industry in the United States. As pointed out time and time again, coal is the basic industry of this Nation, and every effort should be made by the Congress to weigh the damage that will accrue to the section of the economy which depends upon coal for a source of heat and energy.

In conclusion, let me state quite firmly that the United Mine Workers of America look to their Government for a measure of relief from foreign invasion. This is of paramount importance, whether such an invasion is military or economic. It is our strong belief that the Congress is charged with the responsibility of protecting and promoting the public interest, and we sincerely trust that this committee will discharge that responsibility.

A View of the President's Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in March of this year, the Economic News of the American Institute for Economic Research of Great Barrington, Mass., published its views on both the format and content of the President's Economic Report. This report was the subject of hearings by the Joint Economic Committee and a committee report, issued early last month.

I believe that the American Institute for Economic Research has made a valuable contribution to the understanding of the President's report, both as an economic document and as an organ for the espousal of the Keynesian economic theories which are now predominant in the administration. For this reason, I am placing this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC REPORT

In submitting his Economic Report, President Kennedy has chosen to return to the procedure used by President Truman. The part signed by him is a brief summary requiring only 24 of the 300 pages. The full report submitted to him by his Council of Economic Advisers constitutes the remainder of the document.

When President Eisenhower in 1955 changed that procedure and assumed responsibility for the entire document, we said:

"Although we, and probably other economic analysts as well, should like to have available the report of the Council on which the President's report presumably is based, the current practice seems, on the whole, to be preferable to that followed earlier. The members of the Council are now free to advise the President as economic scientists and need give no consideration to the political implications of their reports to him, a most desirable situation."

We believe that in reverting to the earlier method, President Kennedy has adversely influenced the scientific usefulness of his advisers' work. Obviously, they cannot now even pretend to function as economic scientists but must function as pseudo-scientific special pleaders for the various proposals that the President chooses to advocate. For example, if there is any one thing on which economists are agreed, it is that arbitrary increases (above the free market rate) in the price of one production factor (land, labor, or capital) must lessen the demand for that factor and hinder production. Yet the Council, in its portion of the report, lists the 1961 increase in the minimum wage as part of the program for economic recovery and growth. We believe that few economists would maintain that arbitrary increases in the price of one factor above the free market rate could do otherwise than impede business expansion.

When the increase in the minimum wage was under consideration by Congress last year, Dr. Gottfried Haberler, a distinguished economist at Harvard, wrote a letter to the New York Times (Feb. 12, 1961) in which he deplored the proposed action and asserted that the arguments being used to support it should make "* * * any economist blush." Moreover, we have no doubt that all three of the President's economic advisers taught their college classes the precise opposite of what they now imply. Economists who prostitute their talents to serve political ends cannot continue to be relied upon as scientist advisers.

Although the President has assumed technical responsibility for the recommendations, we assume that he has relied upon the analyses offered by his council. Considered in its entirety, the council's report is a strictly Keynesian document. The principal features of it could have been taken from any of several college textbooks that present the Keynesian notions as if they were scientifically warranted explanations of economic developments.

In the introduction the council asserts, "since inadequate demand has in recent years been a major cause of unemployment and excess capacity, expansion of demand has been and remains a principal task of Government policy." This is a typcial Keynesian assumption. What are the facts?

Ever since the Government began creating inflationary purchasing media on a large scale early in World War II, more and more inflationary purchasing media have been forced into the channels of trade in the United States. In the postwar years, whenever inflating by monetizing private debt has leveled off or decreased for a year or two, further monetizing of Government debts has occurred or inflationary purchasing media previously hoarded or held idle have been dishoarded and used. The evidence, complete and in great detail, proves beyond any doubt that inadeaquate demand, in the sense of insufficiency of funds or unwillingness to buy with available funds, has not been the cause of postwar recessions. One thing from which the economy certainly has not suffered since 1942 is "inadequate demand," a conclusion supported not only by the record of purchasing media in use but also by the prolonged decline in the buying power of the dollar.

These facts in the case are disregarded by the Keynesian doctrinaires. They insist on their pet panecea, more expansion of demand (i.e., more inflating), regardless of the facts. They refuse to admit that any other cause than the one believed to justify their remedy can account for cyclical recessions.

The economic advisers are so confident of their omniscience that they assert, "Government fiscal and monetary policies contributed strongly to the favorable economic developments of the past year * * * the impressive pace of the economic expansion must be attributed in large measure to Government actions." Is this assumption correct?

The cyclical recovery of business began well before any of the steps proposed by President Kennedy could be acted upon. Moreover, economic developments indicating that the recovery was imminent are now known to have occurred before Mr. Kennedy assumed the Presidency. In addition, the recovery since the cyclical trough in February 1961 has in many respects resembled several others among the 26 such recoveries recorded since 1854 and studied in detail by the National Bureau of Economic Research. Finally, the rate of recovery has lessened considerably since last summer, by which time Treasury deficits had become substantial, the first increase in the minimum wage had taken place, and other allegedly helpful actions by the Government could have become effective. In short, we find no evidence that actions of the Federal Government had any marked favorable influence.

In order to "* * * arrest economic decline or support economic recovery," the Council recommends a "* * * quick-starting, fast-moving capital expenditures pregram * * *" by Government. This same panacea was described in 1928 by Governor Brewster of Maine when he referred to President-elect Hoover's interest in it thus:

"It is the considered recommendation of the one who has received the overwhelming mandate of the American people to guide and guard their progress in the next 4 years that a construction reserve may prudently be accumulated in time of plenty against the lean year that is to come.

"Picture the approach of an economic crisis with unemployment threatening on every hand. The release of $3 billion in construction contracts by public and quasi-public authorities would remedy or ameliorate the situation in the twinkling of an eye. Federal indexes are already becoming available that remove the problem from the domain of speculation or opinion and place the need upon a basis of simple facts."

This new-construction panacea was tried in an attempt to halt the 1929–32 recession. However, as the present writer predicted in an article published when the experiment was initiated, the result was complete failure. President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers recommends supplementing the spending on new construction by tax reductions in order to enlarge the Treasury's deficit. But there can be no certainty that such deficits would result in more inflating and thereby stimulate demand. Much would depend on the source of the funds that financed the deficits. If current savings were used to purchase all of the Government securities issued, no net addition to total purchasing media would result. What would be assured is a great increase in the risk that foreign creditors would demand gold and precipitate a money-credit crisis.

In their analyses and recommendations for stimulating economic growth, the President's economic advisers demonstrate how the Keynesian notions restrict the vision of any economist who accepts them. The economic advisers argue that "* * * full employment is easier to maintain under the budget program with the smaller surplus, because less private demand is required." In other words, the Government should incur large deficits and be careful to avoid large surpluses in order to foster economic growth. How do they think the Nation prospered while paying off much of the Civil War debt in the years from 1879 to 1892 (years of most rapid growth and well-maintained prosperity)? How could the Nation have been prosperous from 1919 to 1928, when the World War I debt was being reduced by one-third? How did any nation ever prosper and grow before the Keynesian notions were invented? How has West Germany prospered by following a course contrary to the advice that Dr. Walter Heller (the council chairman) helped to formulate more than a decade ago? Apparently anyone who wears the Keynesian glasses fails to see such facts or sees them in some upside-down perspective that negates their obvious significance.

The council asserts, "The favorable prospects for private demand, together with current economic programs and proposals of the administration, point to a strong and sustained expansion." We deny that such predictions can be anything but guesses

in view of the current status of the scientific advance in economics. The prediction is based primarily on the same economic dogmas that were used in predicting a great depression following World War II, a depression that never occurred. Events may develop as the council forecasts; but, if so, that will prove not that the forecasters' analyses were sound but that they guessed correctly.

The President's councilors overlook a vitally important fact. Their pet panacea, inflating the purchasing media, has been almost continuously applied in the United States during the past 20 years, sometimes inadvertently but generally in strict accordance with the Keynesian prescription. Are the consequences prosperity and sustained economic growth?

On the contrary, application of the Keynesian panacea for two decades has fostered numerous serious economic distortions in the United States, distortions reflected today in unnecessary unemployment, stagnation of major industries, extensive depreciation of the dollar, loss of world markets, and fully justified loss of confidence in the dollar. An economy that could be the wonder of the world now falters, not even in second place but nearly the most backward, judged by rates of growth for the world's industrial economies. Such are the consequences of applying the Keynesian notions over a prolonged period. The Council of Economic Advisers not only fails to see the obvious facts but recommends more of the same erroneous prescription. Far from fostering prosperity and sustained economic growth, this prescription has discouraged them.

Blinded Veterans Association, Through Its Intelligent Programs, Carries Forward Worthwhile Work—The Rambler Is Quoted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Blinded Veterans Association reports that more than 40,000 veterans are visually handicapped as a result of their service in the armed forces of the United States. Five thousand of these veterans are now blind, and it is estimated that 4,000 more will go blind from their war and service injuries. They are presently going blind at the rate of more than 100 a year. Five thousand veterans know what blindness is, and, with the help of the Blinded Veterans Association, hundreds of them have brought to life BVA's motto, "that the blinded veteran may take his rightful place in the community of his fellows."

I am a member of the advisory board of the Blinded Veterans Association. It was organized in March 1945, at Avon, Conn., by a group of newly blinded veterans at the Advanced Army Rehabilitation Center for the Blind and chartered by Congress in 1958. From this small nucleus, an organization has developed that is recognized as one of the most dynamic and outstanding in its field. The association has an excellent record for its program of service, its cooperation with other organizations and Government agencies, and its high standards of fundraising.

For the past 17 years, the BVA has worked continuously for good rehabilitation services for all blind people. It was responsible for the establishment of the blind rehabilitation program at the Veterans Administration Hospital, Hines, Ill., in 1947. The training there has become a pattern for many State and private programs that are administered for the civilian blind.

In 1953, the BVA, with headquarters in Washington, D.C., established its field service program. Since then, over 2,000 blinded veterans have been interviewed and assisted by field representatives. These men have been helped in securing adjustments in their disability compensation or pensions; in obtaining needed medical care, social services, prosthetic equipment and sensory aids; in securing prevocational and vocational training; and in finding gainful employment. The field service program has demonstrated beyond doubt that blind persons who have the will to succeed, with adequate training and intelligently coordinated services, can find and hold gainful employment.

It is hoped that in the foreseeable future, all rehabilitated blind people will be judged on the merits of their abilities and will find employment in keeping with their talents and training. Today, many employers judge a blind person by these criteria, but there are others who think a blind person must do repetitive work or be placed in sheltered types of employment. In case after case, the association has disproved this. There are now blinded veterans who are machinists, electricians, and cabinetmakers. There are others who own their own businesses, teach school and do social work. There are also doctors, lawyers, (and one Indian chief).

One phase—an important one—of employment for the blind veteran and nonveteran, is in the operation of small business units under the Randolph-Sheppard Act—Public Law 74-732—signed into law by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. It was my responsibility to have coauthored this measure when I served in the U.S. House of Representatives.

This legislation authorized the operation of stands in Federal buildings by blind persons and to enlarge economic opportunities for the blind. The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, reports that in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, there were 2,332 blind persons operating vending stands in Federal and non-Federal buildings. The total sales amounted to $42,057, 598 with a net profit to the operators of $8,376,408.

Although a picture of great accomplishment has been presented here, there are many cases that are incomplete. There are blinded veterans who, for one reason or another, have not yet been able to be placed in gainful employment. These men will continue to need a wide variety of services. Many suffer from multiple injuries. In addition to their blindness, some have sustained the loss of hearing or the loss of arms and legs.

And what about the 4,000 still to go blind? They can only await this major handicap with fear and anxiety. But once the shock of blindness has been suffered, they, too, can be helped along the road of total rehabilitation—moving from medical rehabilitation to prevocational training; from vocational training to competitive employment.

The Blinded Veterans Association has a good history and a merited reputation, but much work lies ahead. It is always ready to assist those persons who are going blind, by working with the Veterans' Administration, the State agencies for the blind, and many private organizations to see that each will receive the same services as those blinded during World War II and in Korea.

Interesting and factual information about the Blinded Veterans Association is in the Rambler's column from the Washington (D.C.) Star for November 20, 1961, which I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RAMBLER LUNCHES WITH BLIND VETS

(By George Kennedy)

"Luncheon, at 12:30," said Jim Chambers over the telephone. "We'll be seeing you."

The last was just a figure of speech, because Jim Chambers is blind. He had telephoned about the Blind Veterans of America, wanted the Rambler to meet George Gillespie, the new executive secretary.

"All our staff members are blind," Jim said. "We have only two sighted employees, clerical workers in the Washington office."

Jim turned out to be surprisingly young. He wore a wedding band on left-hand ring finger.

George Gillespie, a heavy-set man of 44, wore dark glasses. His nose and cheeks evidently had been rebuilt after severe head wounds.

Four years ago, when Jim was 19 and serving in the Army, he was blinded by the accidental discharge of a shotgun while hunting rabbits.

George Gillespie was in a truck in the Colmar pocket on the upper Rhine in January 1945 when a mortar shell exploded above it.

BVA employs six other blind vets who are stationed around the country. Blindness is increasing among our 22 million veteran population, sometimes from old war injuries, sometimes from peacetime accidents and often from diabetes.

At the end of the war there were 1,400 blind vets; now there are 3,500.

When a new case of blindness is reported to the Veterans' Administration, a BVA representative goes to the home and assures the family, the wife especially, that life is not over.

He encourages the man to accept retraining at the VA rehabilitation center for the blind at Hines, Ill., near Chicago.

"Blind veterans will never starve," said George Gillsepie. "If blindness is service-connected, they get $309 a month. But they want to live normal lives. Most are married. They have children. They need to earn on their own."

"All through history people have been sorry for the blind. 'Alms for the blind' is a very old expression. It is only recently that efforts have been made to help the blind help themselves.

"It started with workshops where the blind made brooms, stuffed mattresses, or caned chairs. Improved machinery and plastics are denying this work to the blind, and maybe it's a good thing in the long run. We know

now that the blind can be trained to do highly skilled and complicated work."

Jim Chambers said, "We have one member who assembles gear boxes for helicopters; another works on the assembly of missiles."

The BVA has an unusual angel, an organization known as the Bowlers of America. During the war, the bowlers, like other organizations, wanted to do what they could to help. They chose the rehabilitation for the blind as their field of service. They raised money.

After the war, when they realized how much blind veterans, who had been through the mill, were able to do for the newly blind, they gave the newly organized BVA $75,000. Since then they have given it $25,000 a year.

Two-Faced Paper Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, the North Side News, a fine weekly newspaper published in my district, carried an editorial entitled "Two-Faced Paper Money," in its edition of March 22.

Although written tongue in cheek, the editorial was a devastating commentary upon the confusion and disorganization that comes out of employing people—not according to ability and professional talent, but according to race and the dictates of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the Congress for Racial Equality, and other such minority-controlled, radical groups.

The editorial follows:

TWO-FACED PAPER MONEY

The private eye we deal with in Washington to make snoopie on the top bureau drawer secrets for the North Side News readers advised us by registered mail yesterday against undue excitement over the two-faced paper money that's making the front pages of late.

"The old craftsmen have been thinned out in the Bureau of Printing and Engraving," he advised us, "and in their place has been substituted NAACP personnel of the sort you'll find anywhere in our two-toned Government. The printing and the press work isn't what it used to be and nobody seems to care."

A one-dollar, two-dollar, five-dollar bill, or even a hundred- or a thousand-dollar bill has no premium value at all, he tells us, any more than a newspaper loaded with typographical errors would have a special premium value at a PTA paper sale. The U.S. Treasury will be glad to replace it with a bona fide greenback, he says, after exhaustive investigation of how, where, when, what, and why it came into your possession at what hour on what date, and that's all.

"You should see those printing and press rooms," he writes us. "They have whites and blacks on the payrolls here in the prescribed percentage that the White House orders * * * and all the old pride in the profession is gone. No one seems to care much about anything any more except integrated coffee breaks and integrated mealtimes. And out of that atmosphere comes nothing but integrated indifferences * * * from both races."

Counterfeiters have never had it so good.

Can "Decent Americans" Be Anti-Communist?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Can 'Decent Americans' Be Anti-Communist?" with the subtitle "New Liberal Study Says 'It Is Difficult'" which was published in the March 23, 1962, edition of the Indianapolis News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN "DECENT AMERICANS" BE ANTI-COMMUNIST?—NEW LIBERAL STUDY SAYS "IT'S DIFFICULT"

In previous editorials of this series, we have examined the domestic policies of the far-left element in American politics. The "fringe on top"—the radical group which exerts so much influence in the Kennedy administration—has an overwhelming urge to use the police powers of the state to coerce free Americans.

As disturbing as this tendency is, the left mentality in our politics has an even more ominous failing: Its chronic inability to understand the central crisis of our age—the crisis presented by the threat of communism.

Although they claim to abhor communism, the radicals refuse to believe it is a force committed to our destruction. They entertain perpetual hopes that we can achive "understanding" with the Communists, and that the way to achieve it is by giving the Communists what they want.

Last week a book appeared which spells this tendency out in considerable detail. The book, consisting of a dozen essays by liberal professors, is edited by Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California. Entitled "The Liberal Papers," it is the outgrowth of a study launched by a dozen or so Democratic Congressmen during the 1959–60 session of Congress. Among those associated with the study were Chester Bowles, now a high official in the Kennedy administration, former Congressman Charles O. Porter, Democrat, of Oregon, and Congressman ROBERT KASTENMEIR, Democrat, of Wisconsin.

In the opening chapter of the book, there appears the following statement: "* * * as the cold war continues, it becomes increasingly difficult for decent Americans, humane enough to prefer peace to an egocentric national honor, to be outspokenly and genuinely anti-Communist."

This fantastic statement—that "decent Americans" find it difficult to be "genuinely anti-Communist"—is a suitable epigraph for this book. The authors of it, David Riesman and Michael Maccoby, say the essay containing it "reflects the concern of the Congressmen"—who presumably consider themselves "decent Americans"—about the cold war climate in America.

Moreover, the authors say the essay was discussed with the Congressmen and their staff assistants. It would thus appear that, unless they will come forward and disown it, these Democratic Congressmen accept the incredible sentiment quoted above—and the equally incredible programs which are offered as a means of fulfilling it.

This point becomes all the more disturbing in view of the charge, related by Raymond Moley in his column today, that three of these legislators, defeated in the 1960 general election, have been appointed to official positions in the Kennedy administration. Where are these men? Does the Riesman-Maccoby statement "reflect their concern"? If so, they should be removed from Government service. If not, they should disavow it promptly.

One of the most fantastic sections of the book is a chapter entitled "Reciprocal Initiative," by Charles E. Osgood of the University of Illinois. Osgood's thesis is that the Communists are hostile toward us because they believe we are hostile toward them. Therefore, it follows that we should start making one-sided concessions to them, such as unilateral cessation of all nuclear tests, and convince them of our sincerity.

When the concessions begin piling up, the Soviets will feel embarrassed and start making concessions of their own. Everyone will disarm, and the cold war will thaw out. If this seems too silly to believe, read the steps proposed by Professor Osgood as a "hypothetical program" for America to adopt, appearing in the adjoining column.

Extremism? In view of this fantastic symposium on appeasement, we think President Kennedy and his entourage would do well to leave off their attacks on "right-wing extremists" and do some tall explaining about the radical left fringe in the American Government.

Vigilant Foreign Aid Agency Employee Loses His Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the incredible story of how a vigilant employee of the International Development Agency—AID—was fired is told by Clark Mollenhoff, of the Des Moines Register's Washington Bureau, in the Sunday Register of April 1.

"All I did was do my job," says the fired employee, Jerry Jackis, "and I did not think that it was possible for this to happen to anyone unless you did something wrong."

The evidence supports the charge that Jackis has been the victim of a conspiracy within the International Development Agency and I am convinced that he has been done a grave injustice.

I commend the article by Mr. Mollenhoff to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

HOW VIGILANT U.S. EMPLOYEE LOST HIS JOB—BOSSES BIASED, FILE JUGGLED, HE SAYS

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—In Korea, Jerry Jackis searched out and exposed a multimillion-dollar scandal in the use of American foreign aid.

In the jungles of northern Cambodia, he rode an elephant and hiked with a small group of soldiers to determine the effectiveness of the U.S. program for digging wells, to cut down on waterborne disease.

When he noticed that U.S.-financed concrete, asphalt, and reinforcement rods were

going into a Russian-sponsored hospital in Pnom-Penh, Cambodia, he reported it.

In many ways it would seem that 41-year-old Jackis would be just the man that the International Development Agency (AID) would want to help straighten out the foreign aid program.

LOSES JOB

But last week Jackis was out of a job, and was knocking on doors at other Government agencies trying to find another before the $30-a-week unemployment checks stopped.

In January, Jackis was dropped from his $8,700-a-year job in the aid Agency on the basis of a file that showed he was given a "one" (low) efficiency rating in 1958, the month after he insisted on reporting that U.S.-financed material was being used on a Soviet showpiece, the Russian-sponsored hospital.

An investigation by a House Government Operations Subcommittee has established no justification for the low efficiency rating in 1958.

But the big aid Agency just can't find a place for him, and obviously isn't trying very hard. Some high employees of AID say that in some respects it is a favor to Jackis to refuse to rehire him, for he probably wouldn't be very happy working with AID employees after taking his troubles to a congressional committee.

WHY HE FIGHTS

Jackis is enough of a realist to know that he would be resented by some officials, for his testimony has indicated weaknesses in the aid program and laxness and incompetency in administration of it. But he wants to be rehired as a foreign aid investigator to vindicate him in his 3-year fight to get a public hearing.

Vindication is more than just a moral victory, for unless he is rehired by the foreign aid Agency, his discharge will be a permanent hurdle to clear in seeking any other Government post.

Chairman PORTER HARDY, JR., Democrat, of Virginia, and Representative GEORGE MEADER, Republican, of Michigan, key members of the House Investigating Subcommittee, have indicated they feel Jackis has been the victim of a vicious conspiracy within the bureaucracy of the foreign aid program.

WANTS NEW STUDY

Jackis is hopeful that the committee will force AID Administrator Fowler Hamilton to make another examination of the case, and disregard the unflattering opinions and conclusions with which his superiors filled his file in the months after he reported the U.S. aid being used on the Soviet-sponsored hospital.

At this stage no one has attributed any subversive motives to the officials in AID who downgraded Jackis. Chairman HARDY has indicated he believes it is a combination of vindictiveness and bureaucratic bungling.

IN FOREIGN AID JOBS SINCE 1954

Jackis, son of a Greek immigrant barber was born in Savannah, Ga., and was reared in Charleston, S.C. He was a wiry 5-foot-8 and weighed 135 pounds, and played high school football.

In 1942, after 2 years at The Citadel, he volunteered for the Army, and served with Patton's 3d Army in France and Germany.

After his discharge from service in 1946, he went to work as a clerk at the General Accounting Office and started to save money to return to college.

In 1948 he went back to The Citadel, and in 1950 was graduated with a Bachelor's degree in English. He worked as a civilian employee in Marine Corps headquarters, transfered to the National Security Agency, before taking 6 months out for travel and study in Greece.

SENT TO KOREA

In 1954 Jackis was hired by the Foreign Operations Administration (FOA), the agency that handled foreign aid at that time. It later became the International Cooperation Administration, and was changed to AID last year.

Jackis was one of the first end-use investigators sent to Korea. The job was to trace down how foreign aid was used, and determine if the final use was in line with the law, policy, and goals of the United States.

The Jackis career was sensational. The multimillion-dollar scandals he uncovered in Korea came to the attention of the highest officials there and in Washington. He was given a two-grade promotion in July 1956, on the basis of his initiative and performance.

His accomplishments were listed as exposure of one $750,000 fraud, and uncovering of a million-dollar scandal.

NEAR THE TOP

"The result of his initial findings will be the correction of abuses now inherent in the procurement and supply of ICA material," the report stated. His rating was now "four" which is next to perfect "five" rating.

Within a year, Jackis completed his tour of duty in Korea, took his home leave, and in March 1957, was assigned to Cambodia. In his first months in Cambodia, Jackis received ratings of "three" or "four," and in the spring of 1958 he was commended for a comprehensive report on the status of the overall foreign aid program in Cambodia.

U.S. ASPHALT IN SOVIET JOB

On June 10, 1958, Jackis was returning from work when he noted the Russian-sponsored hospital had ICA-purchased cement in the yard to be used on the still uncompleted structure.

He looked closer, and noted that asphalt drums in the yard appeared to have the ICA symbol painted out, and there were steel reinforcement rods of a type purchased by ICA.

When he filed his report, Jackis says, he hoped to follow up with a more complete investigation. Instead, he said, he was "chewed out" by Marlin Haas, the supervisor. He said Haas told him he had no business investigating the material used in the Russian hospital.

Jackis told the Hardy committee he felt he had an obligation to investigate and report any indications of misuse of foreign aid.

PROBE OF WELLS

Within a few days after this incident, Jackis said, Paul Beroud, his immediate supervisor, and Haas assigned him to an investigation of the wells in the remote parts of Cambodia. These dozens of wells were constructed with ICA funds and, supposedly, according to U.S. specification.

Jackis said he went into the jungle on a half-dozen expeditions to examine the wells, accompanied by a French mission employee, and by a small group of soldiers in the more remote sections. There were no trains to many of the places, and they rode bicycles, rode an elephant, or walked.

"We finally found all of the wells," Jackis said. His reports on the wells showed that many were not properly constructed, that a large number were dry, and that in almost all cases the pump was broken, or had been pulled up and discarded.

There were no ICA signs on the few wells that were in place. Jackis made a factual report and suggested that something should be done.

DISAGREED

Back at the Cambodian capital, Jackis said Haas and Beroud questioned his facts.

"They had not been outside of the capital at that time, and yet they argued with the facts in my report which included the precise location of the wells," Jackis said. "They argued that I had not found the right wells, and I insisted that I had and that the reports were correct."

Jackis declared that a later investigation in 1960 by other aid officials confirmed his report.

"But that did me no good at that time," Jackis said. "They continued to fill my file with complaints about my work."

SWEPT FLOORS LIKE A COOLIE

In August, 1958, Jackis filed an appeal from the low rating that Beroud and Haas had submitted. In the meantime, Jackis said he was taken off end-use investigations and was assigned to a warehouse where he had to straighten the warehouse and "like a coolie" do such jobs as moving furniture and sweeping floors.

"I did it, because I was sure that it would be all over when my appeal was read in Washington," Jackis said.

However when Jackis finally got to Washington in the summer of 1959, he found that no action had been taken on his appeal. In fact, those he questioned couldn't find it.

When it was finally found, Jackis was informed that no appeal procedure was set up in what was then the ICA. Everyone seemed at a loss as to what to do about the appeal.

TOLD HE WON

It wasn't until October 10, 1960, that Jackis received any satisfaction from J. T. Walden, acting director of personnel.

Walden notified Jackis that "the derogatory implication of the efficiency rating mention has been overcome by subsequent documentation.

"No further action on the appeal will be taken by the agency," Walden wrote to Jackis. "Future assignments, as for all satisfactory employees, will depend on positions available, and the qualifications of persons eligible to be considered therefor."

In his Washington work, Jackis was receiving "three" and "four" ratings, but that somehow didn't get him another assignment.

FIRED ON BASIS OF STRIPPED FILE

Last November, Jackis received notice that he would be terminated in January. It was a polite notice that he was being fired, and the hurrying newly named AID didn't take time to interview Jackis.

Administrator Fowler Hamilton and his subordinates were eliminating those who had had low efficiency ratings, and presumably saw the bulky file of complaints from Jackis' superiors in Cambodia.

Jackis was unsuccessful in seeking to gain access to that file for months. When he finally examined it in the last 3 weeks, he found it was stripped of most of the pertinent documents on his side of the dispute.

However, there was no lack of documentary evidence against Jackis. "The efficiency rating of one that Mr. Haas had given me, which is well-documented, is in the file," he said.

CLEARANCE MISSING

Also eliminated from the file were the records showing that the 1960 investigation had actually cleared Jackis of the charges in connection with the reports on the wells, and had found the "one" rating to be unsubstantiated.

"I'm no security risk. I don't have any criminal record. All I did was do my job, and I just didn't think that it was possible for this to happen to anyone unless you did something wrong," Jackis said.

Jackis said he felt fortunate that he is not a married man with the financial responsibility for children.

"I'm a bachelor, and I have saved up a little money so I can get along for a time," Jackis said.

Do We Need Another CCC?—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 15, 1962

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD part 1 of an article in the March 1962 issue of American Forests by John Prokop, its assistant editor. In part 1 he discusses the recent legislative history of an attempt to reestablish a CCC-type organization.

The article follows:

DO WE NEED ANOTHER CCC?

(By John Prokop)

Today, 19 years after the first Civilian Conservation Corps closed its annals with a resounding impact on American conservation practice, its accomplishments have fallen into a shabby state through a long period of neglect.

A conservation lag is a matter of demonstrable fact to the millions of Americans who seek to enjoy our overcrowded, badly maintained, and understaffed National and State parks and forests. A vast acreage of timber worth millions of dollars is lost annually because forest management, pest control, and firefighting personnel are still insufficient.

In these past 19 years, our population has shot upward at a tremendous rate. The demand for recreation area has spiraled with it. The projected estimated needs for wood and wood products by our growing population for the year 2000 indicates a record high demand.

For the last several years there has been talk of reviving the CCC or creating a similar organization which would provide a labor force for neglected outdoor projects. The new organization would be the Youth Conservation Corps.

However, conservation is not the only problem with which the YCC would deal. Our most important resource, a human resource, our American youth, or at least certain segments of it, have been left in a state of neglect for more than a decade. In slums, declining rural areas, and in economically depressed industrial areas, there are fairly large pockets of people who, because of low wages and unemployment, are not earning enough to provide the bare necessities of life. Among these people opportunity is lacking and they can never earn enough to create opportunity for themselves or their children. Most can never save enough to leave their area. Those who do manage to go somewhere else find that because of their lack of training or skills, and their lack of money, they are forced to lead the same substandard life or one even worse. These people participate in American life largely in a vicarious way. They wish, they hope that someday they can possess and enjoy the homelife and material comfort which they see pictured in magazines and advertisements.

This problem has been recognized by authorities for the greater portion of the "frantic fifties." In 1959, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, sponsored a bill (S. 812) to establish a YCC to help solve youth unemployment. The bill was passed by the Senate but died in the House of Representatives. Undaunted, Senator HUMPHREY, along with 21 cosponsors, reintroduced the same bill (now titled S. 404). President Kennedy also sent a bill (S. 2036) to the Senate for a YCC, but it proposed only a small "pilot" program.

President Kennedy on the same date, June 7, 1961, sent a letter to Vice President JOHNSON (President of the Senate), expressing the need to solve the youth unemployment problem. In part the letter read as follows:

"I am transmitting * * * a draft bill to provide useful employment and training on a pilot basis for young men and women between the ages of 16 and 22.

"* * * this legislation would provide pilot programs over a 3-year period, designed to develop the most effective methods of assisting our young people in acquiring the skill necessary for productive employment. The draft legislation would establish three different pilot programs through which young people can equip themselves for suitable employment: (1) on-the-job training, (2) local public service and public works programs performed in the areas in which the youths reside, (3) a Youth Conservation Corps (for men only).

"The progress we make as a Nation depends upon the use we make of our resources, including manpower. And it is especially important that our young people—the real key to our national future—be prepared to contribute to our economic growth.

"Forecasts of the difficulty they can expect to meet in the next few years in finding suitable employment make it clear that we must act without delay. The approaches to this problem proposed in the attached draft will provide a solid base upon which an effective program can be built. We believe, too, that they will stimulate action by all elements of our communities, both public and private, in developing employment opportunities and training for our youth."

After both bills had hearings before the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the subcommittee combined the HUMPHREY and Kennedy proposals into one bill under the title S. 404.

As it was, President Kennedy's bill (S. 2036) would have cost $75 million the first year and $100 million the remaining 2 years. In its first year it would have supported projects for over 500,000 young persons under its 3 programs, of which approximately 6,000 would have been men in the YCC program.

The Humphrey bill (S. 404) dealt solely with a YCC program which planned to enroll 50,000 men in the first year, 100,000 the second year and 150,000 the third year. HUMPHREY estimated the entire 3-year program would cost about $400 million maximum.

The combined bill, now on the Senate calendar waiting to be voted on, still retains the title S. 404. Under title I of the bill, a YCC would be established. Under title II, a youth public service program would be established to provide work experience opportunities for youths through the use of pilot programs authorizing local public service employment.

It is with title I, the YCC that we are concerned. The major change from Senator HUMPHREY's proposal has been the reduction of enrollees in the first year from 50,000 to 30,000. The program is now to extend over a 5-year period and calls for a maximum enrollment of 150,000 men during this time. Over a 5-year period, it is estimated that the YCC portion of S. 404 alone will cost $1.7 billion. With over $4 billion worth of conservation backlog waiting to be taken care of, proponents feel the $1.7 billion investment is needed now. As Senator HUMPHREY said, this investment over a 5-year period to conserve our vital natural resources is not one-fifth of the amount we spend on national defense in 1 year.

The Youth Employment Opportunities Act of 1961 (H.R. 8354), the House of Representatives version of the Senate bill (S. 404), differs greatly in its attempt to provide aid to youth. The act has three titles: Title I—On-the-Job and Other Appropriate Training; Title II—Public Service Employment and Training; and Title III—Youth Conservation Corps. The act requests a $184 million appropriation for its 3-year YCC program. This is substantially less than the $1.7 billion the Senate is asking for its proposed 5-year program and even less than the $275 million the President recommended for his 3-year pilot program. The House bill makes no mention of the number of enrollees its YCC program would be expected to handle. It does recommend a base salary of $70 a month and up to $20 a month additional for enrollees with special skills. This differs from the Senate proposal of $60 a month base salary, $10 a month extra for special skills or leadership ability, plus $5 a month extra for each reenrollment. In all cases, an enrollment period would last 6 months and each enrollee would be limited to four enrollments or become automatically ineligible upon reaching age 22.

The House bill is now in the hands of the House Rules Committee which will determine if the bill will or will not come before the House of Representatives for a vote. As we go to press, the Rules Committee has not yet made a decision.

Courage at the Top Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, Marguerite Higgins' article on how far a counrty can go with a display of courage is must reading for every American. It appears in today's New York Herald Tribune and indicates how wrong Charles Bohlen has been in the past. It is so strange that he still gives advice on how we should handle the Soviets.

We have the military power in the United States and if some of our high powered politicians in possession of influence could show some courage instead of constantly talking about it, we would be in much better shape in the cold war.

THE BALANCE OF WILLS

(By Marguerite Higgins)

WASHINGTON.—Premier Khrushchev, proving himself flamboyantly undeterred by the New Frontier's determined show of civility, remains without question the modern world's most bellicose statesman. He leaves Red China's Mao Tse-tung, for example, a second rater so far as the art of threatening is concerned—at least in public utterances.

Mr. Khrushchev's latest in the threat department is, of course, the claim to powerful new global rockets that can, so to speak, come in through America's South Polar window, while this country's defenders are intently watching the Arctic door.

Mr. Khrushchev and his defense ministers have also claimed to have an anti-missile missile in the works, thus presenting the picture of an America that is not only helpless to prevent nuclear devastation but unable to retaliate effectively.

Washington doesn't believe either.

But ever since the new Soviet test series, which brought the Russians stunning new advances, there has been a good deal of anguished, albeit vague, prophesying in the Western World about the dreadful future

if, for the first time in nuclear history, the Russians were to shift the balance of power in their favor.

But what would really happen if the nightmare were realized? Would a shift to the Russians of the balance of power automatically bring on a chain reaction and disaster for the West? France, the leading lesson for our time of how a nation can defy the Russians, does not think so. President de Gaulle has said: "What do I care if the Russians can kill France 10 times over, if I can kill the Russians once?" (Meaning reach any important part of Russia with nuclear weapons.) President de Gaulle is assuming, of course, that no matter how many antimissile missiles Mr. Khrushchev produces, the West can still get through to Russia with something. Therefore all Mr. Khrushchev's hydrogen bombs and all Mr. Khrushchev's threats cannot eliminate the central reality that if he permits nuclear war, Russia will be blown into the kind of bits that will be very hard to put back together again.

President de Gaulle contends, in other words, that the balance of terror is insufficient as a concept and indeed that the area of decision is in the balance of wills.

Learning from one's enemies is, alas, a lamentably lagging enterprise in today's Washington. But nonetheless there is high potential return in examining closely the records of how Russia managed to operate at a geographical and political profit (at our expense) in those years when the United States was the sole possessor of the atomic bomb, was the strongest world power, and additionally was the only major power whose industrial real estate had not been shattered by war.

Consider Russia in 1945. There was semi-starvation (literally) in many areas such as the Ukraine. Four million Soviet citizens had defected under General Vlassov. America had the atom bomb and a shift in the world balance of power was a mere gleam in Stalin's eye.

Nevertheless, Stalin had the will to act as if Russia were the greater world power, and to test the will of America. This correspondent was present in Poland during the beginning of one of the first great tests of wills. Cautiously, ever so cautiously, the Russians set about welshing on the Yalta Pact, providing for Polish self-determination.

Soviet experts like Charles Bohlen argued that the Red Army was in Poland, so there was nothing that all America's balance of power could avail those Poles who so desperately wanted to keep their freedom. However, there is no responsible diplomat on the scene in Poland at that time who agreed with Mr. Bohlen. It was the view of the non-Bohlen school of Soviet experts that if America had taken its pledges of freedom seriously enough to issue some brisk warnings, and recall a few reservists, there is no doubt but that Russia would have had no choice but to back down—or rather live up to its solemnly signed international agreements.

What is certain is that America did absolutely nothing effective about Poland. What Stalin deduced thereby of America's will to act is recorded by the historical fact that between 1945 and 1950 the Soviet Union took over all of East Europe. Indeed, it was during the period between 1945 and 1950—the period when the world balance of power was America's proud, solitary, but unused possession—that the Communist empire expanded at a rate conservatively estimated at between 45 and 50 square miles an hour.

Is the only correct question therefore this one: If Russia did all that when America had the balance of power, what won't she do if this becomes Moscow's possession?

Or is it possible to ask whether even the democracies could not overcome the theoretical and practical odds of a shift in the balance of power and wonder if President de Gaulle may not be showing us the way?

Funding Political Campaigns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the March 30, 1962, Tucson Daily Citizen gives very cogent consideration to the problem of funding political campaigns. For the benefit of my colleagues I am under unanimous consent inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The editorial follows:

WHO SHOULD PAY FOR THE HIGH COST OF POLITICS?

The recent series of fundraising dinners sponsored by both Republicans and Democrats has focused attention on the high cost of politics.

Political campaign costs are borne, traditionally and properly, by citizens who want to support their party and see their candidates win. Now it appears that the Federal Government wants to pick up the check. The President's Commission on Campaign Costs, a nine-man, bipartisan group, is studying methods by which Government can help finance the heavy costs. The Commission's report is due next month.

The total cost of the 1960 national campaign, as reported on the Federal level, amounted to $28.3 million—but expert estimates place the actual cost at approximately $175 million. Both parties went into debt.

Republicans started 1961 with a $1 million deficit. They received $2.3 million during the year and reported expenditures of $3.1 million. However, the GOP financial plight has been alleviated somewhat by $1.5 million collected at recent fundraising dinners.

Democrats inherited a bigger debt, a whopping $3.8 million, from the 1960 presidential campaign. They raised $4.2 million in 1961, almost four times as much as in the last postelection year of 1957. They spent all of the money, much of it going to reduce the deficit. They are also holding fundraising events and hope to be out of debt by mid-1962.

Political campaigns are very costly. But that doesn't mean the Federal Government should pick up the check. President Kennedy again revealed his penchant for big Central Government when he appointed his Campaign Costs Commission last fall.

Acting under the President's mandate, the commission is reportedly giving top consideration to actual Federal subsidies to the major parties and their presidential candidates.

One fault in such a plan is that all taxpayers would be making mandatory contributions to both parties. No matter how strong his political convictions one way or another, a taxpayer would have no choice. Isn't it better to let each citizen support the party of his choice as he sees fit?

If the Government once starts subsidizing presidential campaigns, a dangerous precedent will be set. Potential presidential candidates spend tremendous sums entering primaries and otherwise wooing delegates to nominating conventions. Should the Government pay these costs? And how about congressional elections, and State and local elections? Where would subsidies end?

Political candidates do need money, lots of it, and there is a danger that they can be unduly influenced by major contributors. This problem would be minimized if the vast sums needed were contributed by rank-and-file party members, each making a relatively modest donation. The Government could encourage this by granting an income-tax deduction or credit for small political contributions.

Maj. Gen. Keith R. Barney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, on March 31, 1962, my good friend, Maj. Gen. Keith R. Barney, Deputy Chief of Engineers for Construction, is retiring. General Barney has done an outstanding job and has certainly been a friend, not only to Alabama, but to all of the States in the Union. General Barney's experience is wide and varied.

Before assuming his present duties in October 1960, General Barney was division engineer, Missouri River division, with headquarters in Omaha, Nebr. In this position, which he held from 1958 to 1960, he continued the authorized program of the Army Corps of Engineers for the development and control of the waters of the Missouri River Basin. He served as district engineer, Kansas City District, a part of the Missouri River Basin, from 1953 to 1955.

Between his tours of duty in the Missouri River Basin, General Barney was Director of Installations in the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, Washington, D.C. His other tours of duty in Washington included 3 years, 1950 to 1953, in the Office, Chief of Engineers, Military Construction, and 2 years, 1945 to 1947, as a General Staff Officer, War Department. Between these last two tours, he was Director of Installations, Pacific Air Command.

In World War II, General Barney assumed command of the newly activated 1120th Engineer Combat Group, which he took overseas and commanded throughout the European campaign. His decorations include the Silver Star, Legion of Merit, Army Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant, Legion of Honor (France), and the Croix de Guerre (France).

Prior to World War II, his assignments included a tour of duty as military assistant to the district engineer, St. Paul, Minn.

General Barney was born in Springfield, Vt., on July 17, 1904. He graduated from the local high school and then from the Phillips Exeter Academy. He was commissioned in the Army Corps of Engineers upon his graduation in 1926 from the U.S. Military Academy,

West Point. He holds the professional degree of civil engineer from Cornell University, 1929. He is also a graduate of the Engineer School, Fort Belvoir, and the Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, Kans.

General Barney is a fellow of the American Society of Civil Engineers and a registered professional engineer, District of Columbia. He is a former chairman of the board, Army-Navy Country Club. He has written articles for the Society of American Military Engineers and the American Society of Civil Engineers .

He is married to the former Frances McClymonds, of Pittsburgh, Pa. They have one son, 1st Lt. Keith R. Barney, Jr., TC–Res., presently on active duty at Fort Gordon, Ga.

I know all of you join with me in wishing General Barney well now that he is leaving Government service. Fortunately, General Barney will stay in the Washington area and will join an engineering concern here in Washington. We will all miss his words of encouragement and advice.

The Distrustful Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, last week the tax bill was rammed through a reluctant House. Now it is undergoing hearings within the other body.

Those of us who thought at least three parts of the measure were not in the best interests of the citizens of the United States are hopeful that appropriate changes can be made in the other body. The following editorial in today's New York Herald Tribune very aptly discusses what is wrong with the bill:

THE SENATE'S TURN ON THE TAX BILL

The administration's tax bill, in somewhat altered form, got rammed through a reluctant House. But now it faces a crossfire of criticism in the Senate, and particularly in the Finance Committee.

Its key provision—tax credits for certain kinds of capital investment—is unpopular with liberals and conservatives alike, though for different reasons. Dividend and interest withholding has substantial opposition. There has been speculation that the tightening of tax rules on foreign investment might cause more of a stir in the foreign-affairs-minded Senate than it did in the House, which had little patience with its complexities. Though the Senate has shown a greater loyalty than the House to the New Frontier, opponents of the bill's major provisions have at least a fighting chance to win some modifications.

There is nothing wrong with the basic notion of stimulating economic growth through tax reform; some such action is sorely needed. But this reform ought to be aimed at freeing the natural market forces, not at imposing new discriminations and fashioning new, artificial gimmicks.

The basic point at issue is not the revenue impact of proposed changes, or even whether Mr. Kennedy's investment credit would stimulate purchases of new equipment—which, to some limited extent, it would.

The main question is the appropriateness of these measures for an economy structured as this country's is. And on this, the major Kennedy proposals fall flat.

They betray a distrust of the free market, a feeling that Washington has both a right and a duty to pressure companies into spending their money in the way Federal planners see fit, rewarding those that do at the expense of those that don't.

They also—in dividend and interest withholding—show too great a readiness to saddle both innocent taxpayers and helpless middlemen with the burdens of increasing the yield of a still imperfectible collection system.

There is plenty in the bill for the Senate to deliberate about, with judicious independence.

Good Shepherd Parish Marks 50th Anniversary of Founding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 13, 1962

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the New York Sunday News, Sunday, April 1, 1962, concerning the parish of the Good Shepherd, which is located in the congressional district that I have the honor to represent.

The article follows:

The 50th anniversary of the founding of the parish of the Good Shepherd, which has grown from the original congregation of 150 persons and 2 padres to more than 17,000 parishioners and 50 priests, sisters, brothers, and laymen, will be celebrated with a dinner-dance reunion at 7:30 p.m. May 29 at the Astor Hotel. The Reverend John Donelon is moderator of the jubilee program.

It was a half century ago that Archbishop Farley, of New York, invited the Paulist Fathers to assume the spiritual charge of Inwood Heights, which is now known as Good Shepherd parish.

The first Mass in the parish was celebrated in St. Phillip's Villa, 218th Street and Broadway, a year after it was canonically established, in January of 1912. Baker Field fieldhouse is on the site of the villa.

The Paulist Fathers built the parish's first church at Broadway and Isham Street. In the basement of the partially completed church, the first Mass in the church was offered.

For 25 years the church served the community. Then it was moved to a new location on Cooper Street where it served as an auxiliary church for the last half century.

When the original church was moved to Cooper Street, a new church was built and dedicated around the corner from it at Broadway and 207th Street. The new church's Romanesque styling has made it a landmark in upper Manhattan.

The parish is seeking funds to build 6 new classrooms to add to its 30-room school, which opened in 1925. To make room for the new school annex, the original church is being torn down.

Historically, the church is near the site of Cock Hill Fort, which during the Revolutionary War was one of the redoubts established by General Washington to protect the northern approach to Fort Washington.

BOUGHT ISLAND THERE

Cock Hill Fort, which was defended by only a few men who manned 2 guns, was attacked by more than 1,200 Hessian troops. The fort held out until its guns became too hot to fire. Its defenders retreated to Fort Washington, which surrendered later that day, dealing the American cause a severe blow.

Also, in Good Shepherd Park, there is a plaque, which was originally attached to a tree that was knocked down by lightning. The plaque reads: "According to ancient legend Peter Minuit in 1626 under this tree purchased Manhattan Island for 60 guilders." Now attached to a boulder, the plaque was placed there by Peter Minuit American Legion Post, according to Father Donelon.

To commemorate the anniversary, the jubilee committee has planned other activities throughout the year, including a Solemn Requiem Mass for the Gold Star veterans of the parish June 6 and a 3-week mission beginning October 4. The jubilee year will close with a midnight Mass December 25.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all the constituents of the district, of every race, religious faith, or denomination, I take pride in felicitating Good Shepherd on its 50th anniversary.

Citizens for Decent Literature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, through constant vigilance and hard work, the Citizens for Decent Literature of Greater New Orleans, Inc., continue to render a very fine service for the moral betterment of our community.

For over 2 years since this civic organization was formed in December 1959, its members have exercised great diligence in seeking to remove from the newsstands and other vendors' racks in the New Orleans metropolitan area those obscene publications and other lewd material which flow into our city, and unfortunately, are on sale for minors as well as adults.

The Citizens for Decent Literature is composed of leaders of the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish faiths and of representatives of the public, parochial and private school systems as well as the New Orleans Police Department and the Orleans Parish district attorney's office. This group has been successful in curbing the distribution and sale of such obscene material in our city. Through its efforts, in cooperation with the police department and the district attorney's office, some 50 obscene publications have been removed from the city's newsstands.

Furthermore, through speeches to civic, fraternal and religious organizations, and mailings to these groups, the Citizens for Decent Literature have been successful in educating the public on the extent of imported obscene material sold

in our city, and has provided pointers on combating the obscenity racket.

Almost 500 different organizations and clubs of all kinds in the New Orleans area have supported the Citizens for Decent Literature, which also has obtained the unanimous passage of stiffer city and State obscenity laws in Louisiana.

For the past 2 years I have worked closely with the outgoing president of the Citizens for Decent Literature, Mr. Ivor Trapolin, who has provided first-rate leadership and guidance for this crusade. Together, Mr. Trapolin and the other officers of Citizens for Decent Literature and I have endeavored to obtain greater cooperation from various Federal agencies, particularly the Justice Department, in this work and to secure more stringent application of Federal obscenity statutes.

Although much certainly remains to be accomplished in this field, I feel that some progress has been made toward the more successful application of Federal obscenity laws. In a report which I received from the Department of Justice, it was noted that as of the end of February in the current fiscal year, there have been more than 255 arrests for violating the Federal obscenity statute; this constitutes a 26.7-percent increase over the corresponding period in the preceding fiscal year. Furthermore, in the same 8-month period in the present fiscal year, the Justice Department has obtained 202 convictions in the 205 cases brought to trial; this represents a 27.8-percent increase over the identical period in fiscal year 1961.

Now Mr. Theodore Rahe, business manager of Ochsner Clinic in New Orleans, has been elected president of the Citizens for Decent Literature, and I am confident that he will carry on the splendid work of this group in the same high manner as Mr. Trapolin has. I am happy to pledge my continuing cooperation with the Citizens for Decent Literature and Mr. Rahe in its crusade to rid our area of obscene literature, and thus, strengthen the moral fiber of our community.

I am heartened by the fine cooperation which the New Orleans Police Department has given to this work, and I was quite pleased to read the recent statement of Police Superintendent Joseph I. Giarrusso that New Orleans is one of the cleanest cities in the Nation as far as traffic and sale of obscene literature is concerned. This positive statement assures us that we are on the right track, and I am confident that the efforts of the Citizens for Decent Literature will bring greater success in the future.

Hail to Hadassah

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me on this 50th anniversary to participate in doing honor to Hadassah, the women's Zionist organization of America.

In celebrating this day we recognize the public-spirited work of Hadassah, the largest Jewish women's organization in the world. This organization has participated fully in the democratic way of life and has fortified its activities by providing basic education in Judaism.

Its religion fervor has manifested itself in deeds of charity and in social welfare work not only in America but also in that great democratic state in the Near East, Israel. This organization, guided by tender hands and humane hearts, has ministered medical services to those in need.

The world is indebted to Miss Henrietta Szold who founded Hadassah in 1912. Over 318,000 members, in over 1,300 chapters follow the principles of Henrietta Szold and Hadassah. They are dedicated to raise the standard of health in Palestine and to foster Jewish ideals. We congratulate them on their past accomplishments, we encourage them to continue their fine work, and we wish them well.

Ponaganset Science Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 28, 1962, the Ponaganset Junior-Senior High School of the Foster-Glocester regional school district conducted its second annual science fair. Fifty-five exhibits were on display covering a wide variety of scientific subjects from milk production to cholesterol control.

Science fairs are, as we know, pioneer endeavors to discover at the high school level those who have the potentialities to become the scientists of the future. The results of the Ponaganset science fair clearly indicate that our boys and girls certainly have the deep seated interest in scientific subjects and the innate ability to perform in that area which should bode well for them in their later training.

I should like to compliment them on their accomplishments and I would particularly like to congratulate their teachers on a job well done.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a news item from the Providence Evening Bulletin for March 29, 1961, which covers the science fair and list the many winners.

PONAGANSET SCIENCE FAIR DRAWS 300

Nearly 300 parents and friends last night attended the second annual science fair at Ponaganset Junior-Senior High School of the Foster-Gloucester Regional School District.

Top winner in the State award class was Hilary Owren, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Erling Owren of Mill Road, Foster. A junior and member of the National Honor Society, she hopes to study medicine. Her project was on cholesterol.

Other State awards went to Marilyn Barden, Shirley Huling, Catherine O'Reilly, Michael Corbin, Malcolm Spaulding, and Joseph Roback.

Winners of first awards were Manuel Anas, Charles Beeldey, Chris Brayton, James Landers, Wayne Sacco, Janice Sweet, Virginia Bassett, Pamela Maxwell, Norma Aldrich, Sandra Poole.

Second awards went to Robert Leach, George Tierney, Jr., Emily Westcott, Kevin May, Thomas Mulvey, Niles Robertson, Stephen Mercier, Gerald Westcott, Steven Winsor, Barney Goff, Virginia Rowe, Russell Burlingame, Deedra Cook, Thomas Wright, and Beth Bodes.

Third award winners were Glenn Bolwell, James Chase, Linda Steere, Kathleen Thoman, Evelyn Villanova, James Ansley, Brad Harris, Kevin Rivers, Garry Scharch, Sharon Lalancette, John Lepoaja, George Arsics, and Donald Kingsley.

Judges were Mrs. Berthe Nelson, a Smithfield teacher, and Thomas Harris of Aldrich Junior High School faculty, Warwick. Miss Judith Wronoski, science department chairman, directed the fair, assisted by Robert Plante, Elviro Mastrobuono, and Edward Vallee, science teachers.

The exhibits on display, 35 in the junior division and 20 in the senior division, were the best of about 225 projects at the school. Winners of State awards will exhibit at the Rhode Island Schools' Science Fair sponsored by the Journal-Bulletin April 2, 3, and 4, at Marvel Gymnasium, Brown University.

Among topics covered by the projects were heart disease, milk production, aircraft, petroleum production, steam engines, parabolic microphones, fallout shelters, guided missiles, water wheels, insect life, beekeeping, regeneration, orbiting satellites, a sawmill in miniature, and heat engines.

A Medical Care Bill of Substance Should Be Passed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Detroit News of March 31, 1962, entitled "A Medical Care Bill of Substance Should Be Passed."

The article follows:

A MEDICAL CARE BILL OF SUBSTANCE SHOULD BE PASSED

Many of America's 17 million senior citizens are seriously wondering if Congress will take positive action on the administration's medical care bill.

The King-Anderson bill offers health care through social security. The bill has many benefits, but we are afraid that when it comes up for debate the bill's contents will become blurred by fanatical political patriotism. The administration realizes it has a serious fight ahead to get the bill past a hostile coalition of standpatters in the Senate and House.

Unlike the American Medical Association, the large insurance companies and the chambers of commerce, our aging citizens don't have a strong voice in Congress and they don't have the resources and the politcial contacts to bring pressure upon their representatives. So, the fight for the medical

care bill has to be carried on by an organization called the National Council of Senior Citizens for Health Care Through Social Security.

The Council gives the following reasons why the King-Anderson medical care bill should be passed by Congress:

"America's senior citizens look upon the social security approach as the only sound and sensible way to finance a really meaningful health insurance program. By spreading the cost of such a program over one's working years, the small weekly payroll deductions for social security taxes will purchase a prepaid health insurance plan at time of retirement at age 65.

"This is social insurance with dignity. The worker pays for it. The worker is free to choose his own doctor. The doctor, in turn, renders his services in the hospital of which he is a staff member. The King-Anderson bill specifically insures against Government intervention or controls in the free practice of medicine.

"The cost per worker will amount to one-fourth of 1 percent increase in social security tax or about $12.50 a year. The cost to employers will be the same. The $1 billion revenue collected during the first year will adequately cover the costs for medical and health services available under the King-Anderson bill."

If the bill is passed, some 14 million senior citizens, age 65 and over, covered under the Social Security System and Railroad Retirement Act, will be eligible for medical care benefits.

A medical care bill with substance should be passed by Congress, without allowing the measure to be watered down by partisan politics.

We hope our national lawmakers realize the crucial need for medical assistance for the aged and that this need should be placed above and beyond their own special or political interests and the whims of professional lobbyists.

Agnes E. Meyer, Friend of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I pay tribute to a never-say-die friend of education, Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer. This gracious and patriotic lady, whose life has been devoted to good works, has dedicated time and substance toward improving educational opportunities of our boys and girls. She has been an effective witness before the subcommittee of which I am the chairman, urging the Congress to support efforts of the States and local communities to help themselves.

Many, of fainter heart, long since might have given up the good fight. Mrs. Meyer, although a gentlewoman, is a fighter who does not understand the meaning of the word "quit."

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Meyer has formed a distinguished committee whose purpose is to focus attention on the urgent need to increase the financial support for education at all governmental levels.

I tip my hat to a great lady for her untiring efforts in behalf of our boys and girls.

As a part of my remarks, I include a news item from the Washington Post of April 3, announcing the launching of Mrs. Meyer's committee.

The article follows:

COMMITTEE ON SCHOOLS IS SET UP—EMINENT AMERICANS JOIN DRIVE TO HELP PUBLIC EDUCATION

(By Elsie Carper)

Formation of a bipartisan committee to alert the American people to the need for adequate financing of public schools was announced yesterday.

The new National Committee for Support of the Public Schools has among its members former President Truman, Eleanor Roosevelt, former Republican presidential candidate Alf M. Landon, Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Carl Sandburg, former Harvard President James B. Conant and other leaders in publis service, business, labor, the professions and the arts.

The announcement was made by Agnes E. Meyer, author and lecturer, who will serve as chairman. Other officers are Harold Taylor, former president of Sarah Lawrence College, who is vice chairman, and David Scoll, New York attorney and former Government official, who is secretary-treasurer.

The committee will set up a Washington office with Ralph W. McDonald, president emeritus of Bowling Green State University in Ohio, as executive director.

During a press conference held here at the Statler-Hilton, Mrs. Meyer emphasized that the committee will do no lobbying for legislation nor will it concentrate on the need for Federal aid.

"We shall not propose legislation," Mrs. Meyer said, "but rely on the intelligence of the American people first to make the maximum effort locally, then to demand whatever help may be needed from their State governments and from the Federal Government, to supplement the resources of local school districts."

Among the objectives of the committee will be to inform the public of the need for modern, efficient elementary and secondary schools in a scientific and technological era, to prepare studies and reports on the tax structure that now finances public education, and to propose ways in which the quality of education can be improved.

UNIQUE EFFORT

Mrs. Meyer called the effort unique. While many groups and individuals have worked for better education, she said, "there has been no continuing, concerted nationwide movement focusing on the hard core of the matter—more adequate financial support for public schools from all levels of government."

She said the public school system was built on a financial structure keyed to the local property tax. While this was appropriate for the 1900's, it is no longer adequate and new approaches to financing public education must be found, she said.

"The committee believes," she said, "that the American people will provide the funds needed for public schools once they appreciate more fully the value of education and the critical financial situation faced by many public schools."

McDonald said that one concern is the number of school construction bond issues that are now being defeated in local referendums. This is due to the fact that bonded indebtedness has tripled in the last 10 years and people are concerned about the tax burden, McDonald declared. Sources other than the property tax must be found to finance schools, he said.

ARMED FORCES SPOKESMEN

Two representatives of the Armed Forces, who attended the press conference stressed the importance of raising the quality of public education for national security.

Under Secretary of the Navy Paul B. Fay, Jr., said 60 percent of volunteers do not meet mental or physical standards for the Navy, and that the Marines lose 75 percent.

Benjamin Fridge, a special Air Force assistant, said that a major problem is to find personnel who have the educational background to handle the new technological machines.

With Mrs. Meyer at the press conference were General Bradley; Taylor; Scoll; Mrs. E. Lee Ozbirn, president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, and James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union. Mrs. Ozbirn and Patton are both also members of the committee.

Eisenhower administration officials on the committee include Marion B. Folsom, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; Herman Phleger, San Francisco attorney who served as State Department legal adviser, and Devereux L. Josephs, chairman of President Eisenhower's Commission on Education Beyond the High School.

Democrats include former Senators William Benton, of Connecticut, Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, and Edwin C. Johnson, of Colorado.

Among businessmen are John I. Snyder, Jr., president of United States Industries, Inc.; Stanley Marcus, president of Nieman-Marcus; and Martin D. Schwartz, of Muncie, Ind., president of Schwartz Paper Co.

Writers on the committee in addition to Sandburg include John Hersey, Ralph McGill, of the Atlanta Constitution; Hodding Carter, of the Delta (Miss.) Democrat Times; and Harry Golden.

Labor is represented by Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers' Union.

Others from the fields of business, philanthropy and education are Mrs. Marshall Field, New York; Mrs. Alfred W. Crozier, Pittsburgh; Robert Finkelstein, Woonsocket, R.I.; Eleanor Clark French, New York; Olga Gellhorn, New Jersey; Virginia Gildersleeve, dean emeritus of Barnard College; William Horowitz, New Haven.

Mrs. Charles Hymes, Minneapolis; Mrs. Albert Lasker, of New York; Edith M. Lerrigo, New York; Robert M. MacIver, Palisades, N.Y.; Dr. Karl Menninger, Topeka, Kans.; Charles P. Taft, Cincinnati.

Mrs. Meyer said the committee will be filled out with representatives from every State.

Spend, Spend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, besides being able to show Madison Avenue how it is done, President Kennedy is outstanding, thus far, in his ability to spend someone else's money—in this case, the taxpayer's.

His recent proposal to ask for dictatorial powers in public works spending is still another calculated attempt to solve every problem by spending. The following editorial in the March 29 issue of the Washington Daily News is flush on the point:

TO KILL A SLUMP—SPEND

On second thought, President Kennedy has decided that with a paltry $600 million

he can correct the unhappy economic conditions existing in 958 U.S. localities.

This is an afterides to his original proposal of last month in which he asked Congress to let him spend $2 billion on public works if and when a new slump seemed to be developing on a nationwide basis.

The President was goaded into this latest move by the slow decline in the number of jobless—despite a sharp rise in the number who are employed. About 1.4 million have been idle more than 15 weeks.

While the President speaks of this program as "immediate relief," he concedes only $25 million could be spent between now and June 30, even if Congress approves at once. The remainder would be dealt out over the next year and a half. Not very "immediate," it would seem, and rather slim pickin', spread over some 4.5 million unemployed.

Moreover, the Government already has budgeted at least $15 billion, including loans, for this type of work. In addition it is planning to spend in the next year an equal amount on military equipment. If this $30 billion, which will directly affect unemployment, can't take up the employment slack, is a $600 million veneer over the top of it likely to do the job?

Burgeoning Business at American Printing House for the Blind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BURKE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate and thank sincerely the able and respected gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and the other distinguished members of the Subcommittee on Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies of the Committee on Appropriations for their excellent and seemingly tireless work during the hearings on and consideration of H.R. 10904. We are indeed fortunate to have the services of these gentlemen who were able to bring out a unanimous report on this appropriation bill.

Mr. Speaker, necessary funds for many important programs are provided in H.R. 10904. One such program, I feel, is that carried on by the American Printing House for the Blind at Louisville, Ky. The work of the printing house may not be as well known as some other activities financed under this appropriation bill, but its importance to the Nation and to the children directly affected thereby cannot be overstated.

The American Printing House for the Blind is a nonprofit educational institution founded in 1858. Since 1879 the printing house has received annual Federal appropriations used in providing free braille textbooks and other educational materials needed for the education of the Nation's blind children. For many years only those blind students attending special schools and classes for the blind received the benefit of these materials. More recently the emphasis on educating blind children has changed from special schools to providing instruction in regular schools and classes with sighted children. During the 84th Congress the law was changed to permit Federal funds to be used for these materials in regular public schools and classes.

Mr. Speaker, the number of blind children in both regular public schools and special schools for the blind is increasing each year. In 1959 there were 12,024 blind schoolchildren. During the coming school year there will be 17,175 blind children among whom the 1963 appropriation must be apportioned. In 1961 the per capita annual Federal grant for these children had fallen to $27.77, the lowest figure in 9 years. The appropriation in H.R. 10904 will provide a per capita grant for 1963 of $40 first reached last year after enactment of Public Law 87-294. The total of these grants for 1963 will be $677,000.

In addition a maximum of $41,000 is provided for staff salaries and expenses relating to the advisory committees created pursuant to Public Law 87-294 to make recommendations as to how the education of blind children can be improved. Great progress has been made in developing educational materials for blind children. The Printing House has the facilities and the know-how to develop and manufacture these materials, whether they be braille texts, plastic maps and globes, braille slate and stylus, braille writers, talking books or other basic or supplementary matter. This appropriation, particularly that portion relating to the advisory committees, will make it possible for still greater progress to be made in the near future.

All of us who are interested in providing an opportunity for blind children to obtain an education comparable to that given sighted children are encouraged by this appropriation and are deeply indebted to the subcommittee.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286-3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

PACIFIC LUTHERAN UNIVERSITY,
Tacoma, Wash., March 21, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We urge you to keep the Captive Nations Committee going, to support House Resolution 211. From my own experience, I know that the Soviet Government is persecuting the non-Russian peoples, especially the Ukrainian people. We like to see that our U.S. Government knows about it. Our U.S. Government should be interested in what goes on under the Soviets.

We should not give in to the Russians.

Sincerely yours,

TED LUCION.

UKRAINIAN AMERICAN
YOUTH ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Hartford, Conn., March 24, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: In view of the fact that resolution (H. Res. 211) calling for the establishment of a permanent Committee on the Captive Nations will be taken under consideration shortly, we urge that you, Mr. FLOOD, consider favorably the abovementioned committee.

The existence of a permanent Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would definitely be a true source of authentic information on the state of affairs behind the Iron Curtain, particularly in the Ukraine, which had suffered more and for a longer period of time than any other nation.

The American Government and the American people would have reliable information which is so badly needed since the Soviet Union is such a constant threat to not only America but also the entire world.

We are aware of the fact that Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Rusk, is opposed to the formation of such a committee, but that of course is only because Mr. Rusk does not possess true and solid information and knowledge of the prevailing conditions and situations behind the Iron Curtain.

In behalf of the members of the Ukrainian American Youth Association, Hartford branch, we appeal to you, Mr. Congressman, for favorable consideration regarding House Resolution 211.

Very truly yours,

PETER SZAHAJ,
President.

WASYL GRUNTOWSKY,
Secretary.

MARCH 22, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I again commend you for introducing House Resolution 211.

Please send me a copy of the resolution.

I am quite certain you will have the support of Congressman RALPH HARVEY, of Indiana, and my cousin, Congressman J. EDGAR CHENOWETH, of Colorado.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely,

G. MERLE JOHNSON.

MARCH 22, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Branch No. 240 of the Ukrainian National Association strongly urges and appeals to you to reconsider the resolution (H.R. 211), which calls for the establishment of a permanent Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This committee would have as its main function the job of informing the American people and the world on the state of affairs behind the Iron Curtain. It would also serve as a body for collecting data and information about the various captive nations in the U.S.S.R. This information would be made available to the U.S. Government and its various agencies. Such information can be invaluable in helping the captive nations and in serving the United States to better understand and cope with U.S.S.R. We feel that such a committee is long overdue and could perform priceless service to our country.

Please reconsider this issue favorably in the House Rules Committee.

Thank you for your cooperation, we remain,

Respectfully yours,

JOSEPHINE OLINKEVYCH, *Secretary.*

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE
OF AMERICA,
FLINT, MICH. BRANCH, *March 26, 1962.*

Hon. HOWARD K. SMITH,
Chairman of House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOWARD K. SMITH: The members of our Flint, Mich. Branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America appeal to you urgently for your support for the resolution of Congress Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD (H.R. 211 calling for creating of a permanent Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

In our opinion such a congressional committee will render the Nation immeasurable service by gathering firsthand information about the greatest colonial and slavery empire—the U.S.S.R. and suppling it to U.S. Government.

We strongly oppose the views of our Secretary of State—Mr. Dean Rusk who opposes the Resolution H.R. 211.

The U.S.S.R. is no one nation but prison for oppressed nations. Even the Kremlin's statistics can not conceal that fact and show there are 45 percent non-Russians in the U.S.S.R. The nations and especially Ukraine with 42 million population are allies of the United States and the free world. When State Department is unable to evaluate properly the true situation in the U.S.S.R. to the advantage of free world it is the duty of our Congress to do the job. For this reason we consider creating of the premanent Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives is in the best interest to United States.

We hope that you, Mr. Chairman, will support the Resolution.

Thank you.

Very sincerely yours,

J. A. MONSCHAK, *Chairman.*
STEFAN STEFARIN, *Secretary.*

Jack Brooks Sounds Keynote for Economic Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, each Member of the Congress is aware of many of the economic problems confronting our Nation which affect every businessman and every working man. These problems often seem to feed upon one another and multiply among themselves until all that is apparent on the surface is a picture of confusion and hopelessness for the future.

We have long admired the work of our distinguished colleague from Texas, JACK BROOKS, for his untiring and demanding work as chairman of the Brooks subcommittee in effecting sizable savings for our taxpayers by demanding that we receive a full dollar's worth of good government for every tax dollar our National Government receives. Congressman BROOKS' work toward eliminating waste and inefficiency in some 15 Federal agencies has reflected outstanding credit not only on the Congress but also on the people of the Second Congressional District who support his courageous work.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we have still another reason to admire the perceptiveness of our colleague, JACK BROOKS. In a speech which he delivered to the 11th Annual Management Conference at the Lamar State College of Technology on March 30, 1962, Congressman BROOKS struck straight to the heart of our economic problems and offered the people of his district clear guideposts which can guide the economic development of southeast Texas to new horizons of business and job opportunities.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit this speech to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for today so that each of us may profit from Congressman BROOKS' clear insights and unhindered vision.

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN JACK BROOKS, 11TH ANNUAL MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE, LAMAR STATE COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY, MARCH 30, 1962

Let me say first of all that I am delighted to have this opportunity to be with you here at the 11th Annual Management Conference. The fact that this is the 11th conference has particular significance to many of us here who worked together to create our 4-year Lamar Tech.

The bill creating Lamar Tech was approved 13 years ago this spring. This is the 11th anniversary of the 1st graduating class as well as the 11th anniversary of our 1st management conference.

The creation of Lamar Tech was a significant step forward in providing educational and economic opportunities for the people of southeast Texas. The progress Lamar has made in the past 13 years has more than justified the faith of those of us who worked to make this dream a concrete reality. And I believe it illustrates in an important way the importance of the close, working relationship between Government and business.

The State of Texas is making a vital contribution to the efficient management of our industries and businesses here in southeast Texas by providing a first-class college curriculum covering many of the subjects in which our plants and businesses must find trained graduates. It is now possible for the future executives of our industries and businesses to have been born, reared, educated, employed, and to rise to top management in their field—all right here in southeast Texas.

In a larger way, our National Government and business are very natural partners in our democracy. We are committed as a nation to the defense of freedom. Those of us who treasure democratic freedom have no choice, just as we had no choice in World War II. But if this commitment to the defense of freedom is to be meaningful, our Nation must be strong.

When business does well, and people who want jobs can find jobs, and our economy is growing fast enough to provide for our needs, our Nation is strong and we can equip ourselves to win on all fronts of the cold war against communism—the military front, the educational front, the trade front as well as the production front. When business activity and employment are high, our country does well. When our economy slumps, we all pay the price.

Another reminder of the importance of the relationship between Government and business is the understanding by all our citizens that our democratic form of government is irrevocably tied to our free enterprise economic system. Both are on trial for their lives (indeed, our lives) in the arena of world history. In order to succeed, our business community must prosper and our people must have an opportunity to work.

Thre is no question in any responsible person's mind that we must prove our free enterprise system, as well as our free election system, equal to the challenges which lie before us. Although there may be differences of opinion on how best to bring this country prosperity, responsible citizens know that if our economy prosperts, the Nation lives: if our economy fails, we are dead.

Let's look for a moment at our current economic posture:

Our total national output of goods and services—our gross national product—has increased more than 8 percent in the past year—up to an annual rate surpassing $550 billion.

Consumer spending has risen in the past year $28 billion. This is an increase of 7 percent.

Personal disposable income now stands above the figure of $1 billion per day. This is an increase of 6 percent in the past year.

Corporate profits have increased to a total of about $47 billion per year. This is an increase in corporate profits of about 20 percent.

Expenditures for new plants and equipment have reached the annual rate of $36.5 billion. This is an increase of about 7 percent in the past year.

These advances in our economy are genuinely gratifying because they have been made in a period which reflects stable prices.

However, we have still with us some very serious economic problems which point up very vividly that our economy must grow and expand even faster in order to meet the challenges of our time.

The level of housing starts is not recovering as fast as we would like after the slump of 1960, but we may anticipate that the formation of new families will eventually accelerate the rate of new starts on homes.

Of even more serious nature is the continued high rate of unemployment. There are more than 4.5 million workers unemployed in our country. This is almost 7 percent of our total civilian labor force. Here in Jefferson and Orange Counties, while there are 108,000 persons employed, 7.6 percent of our labor force is unemployed. We have made some progress. A year ago at this time more than 9 percent of our workers here at home did not have jobs.

But at the present rate of growth of our national economy, it's not easy to be optimistic about further reducing unemployment unless we devote particular attention to this critically important problem.

Here are some reasons why:

Although 2 million workers were added to industrial payrolls during the calendar year 1961, there are still 4.5 million workers without jobs.

There are 800,000 teenagers out of school and out of work right now. There will be 26 million new young workers coming into the job market in this decade. Unfortunately, out of this 26 million, about 7.5 million are not going to have high school diplomas. These are the "drop-outs" that our parents, our teachers, and our school boards are deeply concerned about. This 7.5 million teenagers will enter the labor market as unskilled workers.

New production methods are, this year, already displacing 35,000 unskilled workers every week.

As you can see it's easy not to become overly optimistic about the employment situation.

It is fundamental to clear thinking about the economic issues of the cold war, that we must rely on the strength of our free enterprise system in order to survive. We cannot outnumber the populations of the Communist bloc nations, but we can beat them with quality, with know-how and with efficiency.

We cannot turn back the clock to old production methods. Instead we must continually search for new and better and more efficient methods to produce. Automation has been an important answer to more efficient production * * * and no one can long defend any proposal to repeal automation. But at the same time no one can ignore either the human or the economic tragedy of millions of workers unnecessarily out of work * * * and still more millions expected in the labor market.

Our task, then, is to find a way to utilize the God-given talents of these men and women so that they can find a good job and make a worthwhile contribution to our community. We can be absolutely sure that poor folks enjoy living as much as rich folks * * *and bank accounts aren't always an indication of a person's willingness to work his heart out for his family, or to want to do his part as an American.

Most of you already know that the Congress approved and the President signed, on March 15, a pilot program providing for the retraining of about 410,000 displaced workers so they might qualify for jobs in industries which need new workers. The Federal Government, the State governments and businesses themselves can all cooperate under the provisions of this legislation.

I am delighted to report that in approving this legislation, Congress did not create any new bureaus. I believe this program bears watching to see if something along these lines might be a significantly helpful approach to our unemployment problem.

Another perplexing problem facing our economy today is that of a favorable balance of payments * * * having as many gold dollars coming into the United States as are going out.

Our problem is not that we import more goods than we export. As a matter of fact we exported last year $5 billion more in merchandise than we imported. Secretary of Commerce Hodges told me last week that this area exported about $130 million in petrochemicals last year. But this surplus is being more than offset by our military expenditures abroad, the 20 percent of our foreign aid not actually spent in the United States, by American capital investment abroad and by American travel expenditures overseas.

The balance of payments deficit of 1960 of $3.9 billion was reduced by careful management to about $2.5 billion in 1961. But we still have a way to go.

One answer to the problem might be to renege on our military and economic commitments abroad, however, I do not think anyone seriously believes we can survive as a free island in a world left for the Communists to move in and take over.

Instead, the present administration and business leaders are convinced that the answer lies in our exporting more goods to make up the deficit. This emphasis on exports does not seem unreasonable. We export only 4 percent of our total national production. And if we increased our exports by just 10 percent, the balance of payments deficit would no longer be a problem.

In comparison with our exports of 4 percent of our national production, West Germany exports 17 percent, Canada exports 15 percent and Sweden exports 21 percent of their national production.

Now expanding our export market at this time has some unique problems. But if we do expand our export market, we shall also enjoy some unique advantages.

We all are aware that the principal industrial nations of Western Europe are uniting in a trade agreement known as the European Common Market. This means simply that they hope to eliminate tariffs among themselves as quickly as possible so that goods will flow between these European countries duty-free, just as we ship products freely back and forth across the Sabine River. As a matter of fact, they got the idea from us.

The European Common Market is potentially the largest market in the entire free world. Soon about 90 percent of the free world's industrial production may become concentrated in only two markets—the United States and an expanded European Common Market.

If we are to stay in business we must take adequate steps to be able to trade advantageously with the European Common Market—to sell them what we can produce most efficiently and buy from them what they can produce most efficiently. In this way we can win tariff concessions from them.

Here's a somber example of the type of competition the common market is already showing us: In 1960, before the common market tariffs were being lowered, West Germany imported 39 percent of a certain radio category from the United States and imported only 4 percent from Italy. Nine months later, as common market tariffs began to come down, we dropped from 39 percent to 20 percent of the West German market. Italian sales jumped from 4 percent to 25 percent.

Our signal opportunity to increase our exports, do business advantageously with the European Common Market and further solidify the free world's economic position against Communist trade advances is being considered by Congress at this time. Under the proposed Trade Expansion Act, we would have the bargaining power we need to compete and cooperate with the European Common Market and at the same time safeguard our trade agreements with Japan and other free countries not included in the common market.

We all know that tariff agreements are pretty complicated, but every person here is aware of one import problem that hits mighty close to home. This is the problem of oil imports. It's a complex problem but it has a simple result. When we import large quantities of oil to be refined instead of refining our own oil, our domestic oil producers are severely affected. And the men who run the drilling rigs, the pumpers, the pipeliners, the oilfield equipment folks—are looking for jobs most of the time.

You can be sure that I'm working with every Member of Congress I know who is from an oil producing State—Democrats and Republicans—to see if we can get a realistic limit imposed on oil imorts so our people who depend on domestic oil production for a job and a living, will have an opportunity to work.

I believe a reasonable limit can be imposed without jeopardizing in any way whatsoever our bargaining position with the European Common Market.

In reviewing our national and State picture, we canot escape the facts that we here in southeast Texas have a high stake in alleviating the unemployment problem, in finding a way to better utilize our manpower resources and in finding markets abroad for the products that we produce.

Jefferson and Orange Counties in 1960 had a population of about 300,000 persons. The best census bureau projections for 1970 predict that we shall have, in just 8 years, a population of about 400 thousand. If we need 115 thousand jobs now for full employment, this means we will need about 170 thousand jobs for workers in 1970. In the next 8 years our economy in Jefferson and Orange counties must produce from 50 to 55 thousand new businesses and job opportunities. This is a large order.

These young people coming into the labor market must be educated and trained if they are not to flounder in a large pool of unskilled workers. And our economy here in southeast Texas must grow at an accelerated rate if there are to be jobs for skilled workers.

Here—as we began—I believe our government and our business community are national partners.

In southeast Texas we are just beginning to tap the total wealth of our natural resources. Two hundred million dollars in new industrial expansion has been announced in Jefferson County since the first construction money on McGee Bend Dam was approved by Congress. The dam represents a sizable investment by the people of the United States in developing the Neches and Angelina watershed, but the industrial expansion which we can support when the dam is completed—and we have an almost-unlimited supply of fresh water—will dwarf the initial investment.

I expect Congress to consider this summer authorization for the Corps of Engineers to dredge our deep-water shipping channels serving our heavy industries down to 40 feet. This is more efficient and effective utilization of our natural resources for economic growth. Ships which have to leave our ports and industries partly loaded to keep from scraping bottom will now be able to top off their holds and tanks.

Congress will also consider this summer authorization of a hurricane protection plan for the highly industrialized Port Arthur and South Jefferson County area. This program cannot only protect the present investments we, our friends and neighbors have in businesses and homes and jobs, it will encourage new business and new job opportunities for the South County area.

Each of these projects involves participation and contributions by local governmental bodies. And each is a sound investment in the economic future of our area, just as the creation of Lamar Tech has been.

These are graphic examples of the advantages of our Government and our business community working together, and there are others.

As a member of the House Judiciary Antitrust Subcommittee, I have an opportunity to see firsthand the role of our Government in protecting the opportunities for businessmen to compete in the open market.

I have learned that the popular conception of our Government's role in antitrust matters as "antibusiness" is just not true. Roughly two-thirds of the complaints on antitrust violations come from businessmen themselves—businessmen who represent almost every conceivable area of the business community—both giant and small—and who are asking their Government's help in enforcing the well-recognized rules of the game.

As a Member of the House Government Operations Committee, I have seen firsthand the fantastic results of research projects, financed by Congressional appropriations, carried out by private companies and the findings later applied to both business and Government practices which save both investors and taxpayers substantial sums of money.

Our free society has demonstrated time and time again that our Government and our business community are logical partners in developing the maximum strength of our Nation.

Frankly, I believe that those persons who would incite our Government against our business community, and who would incite our business community against our Government, are attempting to hold back our people when we must move ahead.

Here in Southeast Texas we have made genuine progress, but there is much that remains to be done. We have come this far through cooperation and hard work. We are laying a solid foundation for a "go economy" in Southeast Texas. We must now finish this foundation and begin to build a new economic structure.

I am confident we will continue to work together and I am equally confident that all our people can prosper and remain free.

Thank you.

Economic Illiteracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, over the years, our Nation—operating economically upon the principles of free enterprise—has created the greatest economy in the history of the world.

To meet the challenges of the future, however, we need greater efforts to strengthen our free enterprise system.

Among other things, this means creating a greater understanding among the people of the working principles of our economy. In effect, we cannot afford economic illiteracy.

Recently, the Janesville Daily Gazette published a thought-provoking editorial on the prevalence of such illiteracy. Reflecting upon a serious challenge confronting the Nation, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC ILLITERATES

Ask a high school or college graduate how he would distinguish between deficit spending and pay-as-you-go government policies. Ask him whether he thinks making a profit is necessary to business enterprise. Ask him to name one advantage which the American economic system has over socialism or communism.

What is it that gives this country its economic strength which the Soviets envy? Why is an American able to outproduce citizens of any other country?

It seems strange that most Americans cannot answer questions like these, that they remain quite unaware of what makes their country rich and productive. Their notions of profit and loss, investment and capital are frequently confused. They do not understand the relationship between these factors of the American system and their own work and lives.

In a recent poll, George Gallup learned that most of us are ignorant of basic economic facts, regardless of education. Another independent group, the Committee for Economic Development (CED), also has found that Americans, generally, are economically illiterate, but the CED proposes a solution.

It recommends that high schools provide at least a semester course designed to teach the student what free enterprise is and how it affects him. It recognizes that teachers are not skilled in this subject, and suggests that material supplied by the joint council on economic education would be helpful.

The CED emphasizes the need for a wider dispersal of economic knowledge. Americans are involved directly in determining who shall govern and can choose according to the economic philosophies of candidates. They need to know the difference between deficit inflationary spending and pay-as-you-go spending. Whichever philosophy they choose will bear directly both on the taxes they will pay and the economic health of the Nation.

"Is the average American able to make such decisions?" the CED asks. "We cannot but conclude that economic understanding, economic literacy, must reach a majority of our people if we are to flourish. Americans must have this knowledge to manage their own economic lives wisely. They must have it to shoulder their responsibilities as citizens."

Recent events show clearly that the world turns on an economic axis—witness the importance of the Common Market, its effect upon American foreign trade and tariffs, the dependence of American jobs upon import as well as export trade. When citizens become aware of the meaning of the American system to their paychecks and their lives, they will be more ready to protect it from all comers, foreign and domestic.

The Washington Post and the Administration's Medicare Publicity Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have addressed the House before on the subject of one-sided media coverage of the health care debate. The March 28, 1962, edition of the Washington Post provides an interesting illustration of some of the points I have been trying to make. An article entitled "Doctors Pledge at White House To Support Medical Care Plan" occupies a prominent spot on the front page. An article on the Kerr-Mills legislation, "Medical Aid Plan Called Too Limited," appears on page 4. Finally there is a Herblock cartoon on the editorial page, captioned "I Think He Should Have a Choice of Doctors" which depicts the AMA in the guise of a witch doctor and the medical men for Kennedy health care plan as the respectable physician.

I have no complaint with any media that reports and comments editorially on the news. I am deeply concerned, however, when there are indications that the media are presenting uncritically only one side of a national debate. In this case the Washington Post is at the very least serving as a vehicle for the administration's publicity campaign to sell the King-Anderson bill. Who are these outstanding doctors that have come out publicly in favor of the Kennedy health care plan? How representative of the medical profession was the group of 27 physicians that called at the White House?

Mr. Speaker, I think we should look at the facts behind this recent publicity effort for the King-Anderson bill. One was chairman of the Platform Committee on Health at the 1960 Democratic National Convention, seven of them testified before us at the Ways and Means Committee in support of the Kennedy plan, one organized a committee of physicians for Kennedy during the 1960 presidential campaign, three are officials of citizens' groups which have been in the forefront of the lobbying campaign for H.R. 4222, three are employed by international unions which have endorsed the plan, two are New York City employees of Mayor Wagner, who is an outspoken supporter of the Kennedy plan, and one is a director of a hospital supported entirely by Government funds. These, Mr. Speaker, are old faces, many of whom have long been identified with the King-Anderson bill. Contrary to the image created by the Kennedy public relations team and conveyed by the Washington Post, there is no new ground swell of professional support for the President. None of these physicians, to the best of my knowledge, are in private medical practice. Although the White House represented the view of the visiting doctors as being widely held among medical men, the American Medical Association estimates that 95 percent of the 271,000 physicans in the country today are opposed to the President's medicare plan. Secretary Ribicoff himself admitted to the members of the Ways and Means Committee that "a majority of the doctors agree with the position of the AMA."

Mr. Speaker, these are the facts. I am sorry to have to point out that they bear little resemblance to the impression that is being created, wittingly or unwittingly, with the assistance of the news media.

The articles follow:

DOCTORS PLEDGE AT WHITE HOUSE TO SUPPORT MEDICAL CARE PLAN

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

President Kennedy conferred at the White House with doctors from various parts of the country yesterday in what amounted to a frontal attack on the American Medical Association's opposition to his medical care for the aged bill.

The meeting is expected to result in the formation of a nationwide doctors' group to fight for the President's bill and to counter AMA arguments against the controversial legislation.

Mr. Kennedy thanked the group at a ceremony in the White House rose garden and said he hoped their action would stimulate other doctors "to examine and reexamine their own positions."

CALLED BEST WAY

The doctors told the President that they supported medical care for the aged under social security. They said that was the best way to preserve the profession's independence. The AMA has branded the social security approach as socialistic.

As part of a stepped-up campaign to get action on the medical care bill, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare yesterday issued a report on the present Kerr-Mills Act approved during the Eisenhower administration. It showed that the act was providing help to less than 1 percent of the aged.

On May 20, President Kennedy will address a rally in New York City in another effort to win support for his proposal, now blocked in the House Ways and Means Committee.

HEW Secretary Abraham A. Ribicoff, who is leading the fight for the bill, gave a luncheon in the Sheraton Carlton Hotel for the doctors after their White House visit and a call on Vice President JOHNSON.

Ribicoff said the fact that "these outstanding doctors" have come out for the program "will help rally other doctors." The AMA attack is so extreme, he said, that "it is self-defeating."

Ribicoff said the bill has "an excellent chance of passage" despite the opposition in Congress.

After the public ceremony in the rose garden, the President spoke privately to the doctors. Ribicoff said Mr. Kennedy declared that many doctors don't understand what is in the bill and that their opposition is based on "myths and propaganda."

STATEMENT OF SUPPORT

Dr. Caldwell B. Esselstyn, a surgeon and medical director of the Rip Van Winkle Clinic in Hudson, N.Y., was spokesman for the group of 42 doctors who signed a statement of support. Twenty-seven of the signers made the trip to the White House.

Among them were Dr. Robert E. Cooke, professor of pediatrics and director of the department of pediatrics at the Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, Baltimore; Dr. Thomas Hunter, dean, University of Virginia Medical School, Richmond; Dr. R. Frank Jones, medical director of Freedmen's Hospital, Washington; Dr. Lawrence S. Kubie, director of training at Sheppard-Enoch Pratt Hospital, Towson, Md.; Dr. Helen Taussig, professor of pediatrics, Johns Hopkins Medical School, and Dr. Warren Fales Draper, executive medical officer, United Mine Workers Welfare and Retirement Fund, Washington.

Dr. Esselstyn said that 75 percent of those present were AMA members.

"We believe the social security system is the most practical and sound method of financing health benefits for the great majority of the aged," the doctor's statement said.

Mr. Kennedy told the doctors that his plan "maintains the freedom of the medical profession which has so benefited the people of this country and has been responsible for so much progress.

MEDICAL AID PLAN CALLED TOO LIMITED

(By Eve Edstrom)

Less than 1 percent of the Nation's aged are being helped by the Kerr-Mills medical assistance for the aged program, yet it will cost $215 million during this fiscal year.

This, among other things, was disclosed yesterday by Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Abraham A. Ribicoff in a report submitted to the House Ways and Means Committee.

The bulk of that money—92 cents out of every $1—continues to be spent in New York, Massachusetts, and Michigan.

And almost five out of every six medical assistance for the aged beneficiaries live in those three Northern States.

HALF ARE TRANSFERS

Almost one-half of the MAA beneficiaries were transfers from old age assistance rolls, principally in New York and Massachusetts. This is because the States can pick up more Federal matching dollars for old, ill persons under the medical assistance for the aged program than they can under old-age assistance.

Detailing the first year's experience in providing medical care through the Kerr-Mills legislation, the HEW report concluded that "as a result of State limitations, services under medical assistance for the aged have been provided to comparatively few of the Nation's older citizens."

In an accompanying letter to Committee Chairman WILBUR D. MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas, Ribicoff declared that the HEW study "supports the conclusion that to rely on existing public assistance legislation alone as a means of meeting the medical care needs of aged persons would not only fail to cover many aged people in need, but would also be very costly in general revenues."

SEEN AS SUPPLEMENT

"The legislation could, and in my judgment should, be a supplement to the type of protection which would be afforded under the administration's proposals for health insurance for the aged through social security," he said.

To forestall social security financing of health care, the Kerr-Mills legislation was passed by Congress in the fall of 1960. The American Medical Association supports it as the answer to the health care needs of the aged who cannot afford to pay for their hospital and doctors' bills.

Authored by MILLS and Senator ROBERT S. KERR, Democrat, of Oklahoma, the law contains two provisions. One substantially increases Federal participation in medical payments for aged persons on relief rolls.

FEDERAL-LOCAL PLAN

The second provision, known as medical assistance for the aged, authorizes a Federal-local program to help persons whose income does not qualify them for relief but whose resources are not sufficient to meet medical costs.

But participating States, which set eligibility qualifications, have established relatively restricted medical assistance for the aged programs. Therefore, the HEW study notes, "States are not extending the benefits of their programs to a very large segment of the elderly above the level of the old-age assistance program."

The report covers the year ending last October when 15 States and the Virgin Islands were participating in the medical assistance for the aged. Payments to 66,000 recipients totaled $13.6 million in October. Of that amount, $12.4 million was spent on more than 50,000 beneficiaries in Massachusetts, Michigan, and New York.

During the first year, annual expenditures were at the rate of $164 million. By January, 24 States were in the program, thus causing the annual estimate to be raised to $215 million for this year.

While noting that the Kerr-Mills law has made it possible for most States to raise the level of medical services provided to needy individuals, the report points out that "the majority of States does not provide the five major types of services (hospitalization, nursing-home care, physicians' services, dental care, and prescribed drugs) without some limitation on the conditions needing care or on the extent of care."

Whip Reds With Our Virtue?—A Conservative Ridicules It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. William F. Buckley, Jr., the nationally syndicated conservative editor, makes the telling point in a recent column that our leaders "talk as though the answer to (Communist) tanks crushing students in Budapest is more sit-ins in Montgomery, Ala."

Mr. Buckley said that as a result of our unrealistic approach to fighting communism "millions of people * * * look forward to an eternity of slavery."

I concur in Mr. Buckley's statement. The cause of freedom is not being aided by radically sponsored sit-ins, kneel-ins, eat-ins, wade-ins, misnamed "freedom" rides and other "pushy" and idiotic activities that divide our people and give the Kremlin free propaganda to use against us.

Certainly, a principal goal of communism is to provoke internal dissension, break down law and order and first weaken, then destroy the constitutional processes of government.

The organized minorities, aided and encouraged by subservient newspapers and radical politicians, are playing directly into the hands of the Communists.

Mr. Buckley's article is worth reading. It follows in full:

WHIP REDS WITH OUR VIRTUE?—A CONSERVATIVE RIDICULES IT

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

The New York Times has been wildly excited over a booklet on "Communism: Threat to Freedom," by the Reverend John F. Cronin, S.J., of the National Catholic Welfare Conference. What caught the eye of the Times isn't an anti-Communist pamphlet, but an anti-"extreme rightwing" pamphlet. "Catholics Assail Right Extremist," said the delirious headline on page 1.

The pamphlet itself is not too bad on the subject of communism. There are in it traces of a toughness of mind about the Communist problem that would normally horrify the New York Times. For instance, Father Cronin recommends highly J. Edgar Hoover's "Masters of Deceit," which, when published, was treated by the Times reviewer as contemptuously as if it had been written by Robert Welch.

Other books praised by Father Cronin include a half dozen by writers call ultraconservatives by many liberals. He also endorses the House Un-American Activities Committee, the Senate Internal Security Committee, and the McCarran Act of 1950, all anathema to the liberals.

Father Cronin decries "using the reaction against communism to attack groups not favored by the organization involved."

If it is wrong to use the reaction against communism as a springboard to attack any other group, isn't it wrong for Father Cronin in the same pamphlet to use "the reaction against communism" as an argument to oppose white segregationists in the South? "Segregation has provided Communists with millions of rubles in propaganda," writes Father Cronin.

A major complaint of Father Cronin's pamphlet is against those who believe the Communist threat is primarily internal. Strictly speaking, it isn't, of course. The distinction is unreal because the scope of the Communist effort transcends conventional barriers, and therefore the conventional vocabulary is anachronistic.

But the principal error Father Cronin's pamphlet makes is to assume that we can beat the Communists by burnishing our own souls. Be honest, moral, tolerant, encourage national unity and racial integration, be charitable towards those with whom you disagree and—you will go to heaven, to be sure, but your passage there might very well be expedited by a Soviet bullet.

Alas, if every one of us were a survivor of the saints it would not follow that we would win the war against the Communists, for they know how to conquer good people, too. What did our greed and materialism and dope traffic and all the rest of the ignominious blotches on our culture that we all deplore have to do with the loss of Czechoslovakia?

Our failures have been primarily failures of (1) understanding, (2) will, and (3) imaginative statecraft. We do not want national unity, cannot afford national unity, behind the proposition that to check the Communists, we need merely to purify ourselves.

We must do that too, for eternally imperative reasons. But we must do other things as well, if we are to hold back the Communists. We must, among other things, develop a genuine moral concern for the plight of millions of people who look forward to an eternity of slavery because the leaders of the West talk as though the answer to tanks crushing students in Budapest is more sit-ins in Montgomery, Ala.

Recognition Given J. Edgar Hoover for Outstanding Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, on May 10, 1962, J. Edgar Hoover will mark his 38th anniversary as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Many honors have deservedly been received by Mr. Hoover over the years in recognition of his outstanding services. Thus, for the second time in 6 years, he recently received the Freedom Foundation's highest award—the $5,000 George Washington Medal, honoring Mr. Hoover for his anti-Communist writings and speeches.

It is also appropriate to note that 1 day prior to his 38th anniversary, Mr. Hoover will be honored by the Safety First Club of Maryland, at the Sixth Annual Wheelmaster Banquet the organization will hold on Wednesday, May 9, beginning at 7 p.m. at the Lord Baltimore Hotel in Baltimore. A National Wheelmaster Award is to be accorded to Mr. Hoover on that occasion "for distinguished direction of the Federal Bureau of Investigation since 1924 in the field of crime prevention and detection, as well as for special services in the field of traffic accident prevention."

It has been my pleasure to call attention in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the excellent program being conducted by the Safety First Club of Maryland, cofounded February 13, 1956, by J. O. Shugar, president, and Maurice R. Shochatt, executive vice president. The organization has been crusading since its inception for safety on our streets and highways.

The organization believes that traffic supervision and control belong in the sphere of duly-constituted experts and authorities; but, nevertheless, such groups as the Safety Frst Club of Maryland can render services through planned and consistent safety programs, campaigns and activities aimed at helping to reduce our tragic traffic toll.

The Safety Frist Club's major objectives are:

First. Help reduce traffic fatalities and injuries.

Second. Stress the importance of traffic safety among our youth.

Third. Work for the passage and enforcement of statutes aiming to reduce our tragic traffic toll.

Fourth. Give proper recognition to the deserving for attainments in the field of traffic safety.

Among its various activities the Safety First Club of Maryland received a National Safety Council trophy in 1959 for outstanding contributions to traffic safety. This was a national award limited to the Safety First Club and 10 other organizations throughout the entire country. It also received a certificate of appreciation from the National Safety Council and the Advertising Council in grateful appreciation for help given in the 1960 stop accidents campaign—a campaign designed in the public interest to save lives and thereby make America a safer place in which to live.

In addition to Mr. Shuger and Mr. Shochatt, the officers of the Safety First Club include Morris A. Kasoff, senior vice president; Maurice Cardin, Leon Finglass, William J. Ryan, and Barney Waldman, vice presidents; Albert Haar, secretary; Samuel Matz, treasurer; Paul Huddles, chairman of board; and Bernard Potts, vice chairman of board.

It is worth noting that, in conjunction with the Safety First Club's tribute, Gov. J. Millard Tawes, of Maryland, has issued a proclamation designating May 9, 1962, as J. Edgar Hoover Day. The text of the proclamation is as follows:

Whereas J. Edgar Hoover has been serving as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation since May 10, 1924; and

Whereas the FBI has distinguished itself through the years under his leadership in the field of crime prevention and detection, as well as also rendered excellent services in the area of accident prevention; and

Whereas the Safety First Club of Maryland, at its sixth annual banquet that is to take place on May 9, 1962, at the Lord Baltimore Hotel in Baltimore, will present a national wheelmaster award to Mr. Hoover in tribute to his dedicated services to his country and its citizens: Now, therefore, I, J. Millard Tawes, Governor of the State of Maryland, do hereby proclaim May 9, 1962, as J. Edgar Hoover Day.

A J. Edgar Hoover Day proclamation, along similar lines, has also been issued by Mayor J. Harold Grady, of Baltimore, Md.

The Safety First Club of Maryland has been deeply impressed by the article, "I Challenge Your Right To Drive," written by Mr. Hoover. It has been published in various publications, including "The Transmitter," from which it is reprinted.

The text of the article is as follows:

More than four human lives are sacrificed on the roads of America every hour. Traffic fatalities are a major cause of death in the United States. And frankly, the problem threatens to become far worse unless our people readjust their thinking and adopt a more realistic attitude toward the citizens who—though law abiding in all other respects—repeatedly violates traffic regulations.

In terms of the grief and suffering which he causes, the careless, indifferent or irresponsible motorist is as great a threat to this country as the most vidious criminal gunman.

Yet disrespect for traffic regulations has become so commonplace throughout the United States today, that in the minds of many motorists it is fashionable to exceed the speed limit, to drive through stop signs, to pass other cars on hills and blind curves, and to run a traffic light if no police cars are in sight. Reputable citizens—persons who would never think of committing other types of violations—run the gamut of traffic offenses without suffering the slightest pangs of conscience.

Loud protests have been raised against the use of radar to detect speeders and, thereby, to make the roads safer for all. Police officers who stop violators are sneered at and subjected to insults. Many offenders complain about the inconvenience of having to appear in traffic court. Warnings, pleas, and educational programs have made the least impression where the need for them has been the greatest possible.

The time has come for the American people to stop tolerating the arrogant, disrespectful attitude which so many motorists openly display toward the traffic codes. Drivers who prove by their own actions that they constitute a menace to themselves and others must be denied the privilege of operating motor vehicles.

In areas where the existing laws are inadequate to meet the problem, new and more realistic traffic codes should be adopted. Motorists who are guilty of repeated offenses, as well as those who have intentionally placed the lives of other citizens in jeopardy, must be treated as the public menaces they are. Whenever it is in the public interest to do so, maximum fines and long jail sentences should be imposed upon offenders.

Each year, traffic accidents claim thousands of American lives. The senseless slaughter and crippling of human beings on our roads have reached staggering proportions. This problem must be met immediately with forceful, positive action.

The price of failure has become far too great—more than four human lives per hour.

Those sentiments for sane and safe driving are echoed by all of us who are appealed by the slaughter, on the highways, of thousands of men and women and children.

I am still of the same opinion, as in 1957, when I stated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

The Safety First Club of Maryland advocates that safety is everybody's business. How I wish that it might be possible to instill this thought in the consciousness of every man and woman, boy and girl, who lays a hand on the steering wheel of an automobile, truck, or other automotive vehicle, releases

the brake and steps on the gas, that each one of them is part of that group called "everybody and that it is highly essential for them to operate that vehicle with utmost care, that they may not snuff out either their own lives or the lives of innocent victims.

History and Scope of Communism and the Threats of Communist Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, by leave previously obtained, I insert in the RECORD the keynote address on "History and Scope of Communism and the Threats of Communist Aggression," which I delivered on March 30 at the American Strategy Cold War Seminar, sponsored by the Buffalo Junior Chamber of Commerce, and held on the campus of the University of Buffalo, Buffalo, N.Y.:

HISTORY AND SCOPE OF COMMUNISM AND THE THREATS OF COMMUNIST AGGRESSION

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, reverend members of the clergy, and my fellow Americans, the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Buffalo deserves the highest commendation for organizing this 2-day American Strategy Seminar. Your program reflects a keen awareness of the life or death challenge which confronts every citizen of the United States, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, and 52 weeks in every year. It also heralds a determination to penetrate in depth the facts and realities of this challenge, to clearly identify the enemy, to understand the objectives and tactics of that enemy, and to generate a spirit of public dedication in support of the will to win the war which has been forced upon us.

The leaders of business, industry, religion, and education who have given their support to this seminar are deserving of an equal accolade. For they are the responsible leaders in any community—as they go, so goes the community—and as the communities throughout the length and breadth of our Nation go, so goes our Nation in its response to the challenge of the Red barbarians on the march. What your Government in Washington does on this vital issue is, and will continue to be, in direct proportion to what the people of our Nation demand be done. Government in the United States is the servant of the people and it cannot serve well or adequately unless the voice of the people is clear and loud on vital issues. There is nothing wrong with the body politic of the United States that an enlightened and articulate electorate cannot remedy. It has always been the role of responsible local leadership to crystalize issues directly affecting the welfare of the people in their community and to hammer out corrective programs of action directed at removing evil threats to local peace and security while advancing the common good. Organized, aggressive, Russian communism is a present threat to every citizen in every community in the United States. That is the nature of the war which has been forced upon us. I, therefore, congratulate the leaders of the city of Buffalo gathered here today, for meeting their responsibilities to the people of your city, to our Nation, and to the cause of freemen everywhere.

Karl Marx and his associate Frederick Engels took the theories and notions of a wide assortment of dreamers and malcontents out of the coffeeshops, beer halls, and dusty attics of Europe and brought them into the marketplace of human affairs. This they did by their publication of the "Communist Manifesto" of 1848, which was the first general and organized public statement of what a Communist should believe. For some time prior, the so-called Communists had been meeting and acting in a covert manner, loosely organized or I should say disorganized, because they lacked basic definition of purpose and the guidance of stated principles. Marx claimed the time had come for those who believed in communism to openly face the world, though those who so believed or thought they believed were but a handful of men, and to do so through an open statement of principles. That is the why of the manifesto, which was composed by Marx and Engels. It is interesting to note that in the introduction to the manifesto this bold but untrue claim was made; "Europe is haunted by the specter of communism." Europe of 1848 was certainly haunted by terrible injustices in the social order as a consequence of the industrial revolution and there was grave unrest among the working classes but there was no specter of communism because no one had, up to that time, given any definition to the term. Yet Marx and Engels engaged in the art of the grandiose claim before agreement had been reached among a handful of theorists on the meaning of communism and certainly long before the oppressed common man had even heard the term. This is an important point in the history of communism because it has been maintained and perfected as a technique by the Russians since 1918. The grandiose claim is still the most powerful weapon of the Russian Communists and their collaborators.

From 1848 to 1918, the theories of Marx and Engels remained as theories. The believers of Marx split off into countless sects in this long period of debate, recrimination, and accusation which marked the internal workings of the Communist believers for that period of 70 years. But the crackup of the Russian Empire of the czars in 1917–18, provided the first opportunity for those believers to test the theories of communism. Lenin, an exiled Russian living in Switzerland, was the leader of one Communist sect who had done extensive work on the organization aspects of Communist theory. He, with another handful of adherents arrived in Petrograd at a time when the seat of imperial power was broken and a vacuum of government authority existed because the Russian people for centuries had grown accustomed to the despotic rule of the czars and were hence incapable of self-government. Lenin stepped into this vacuum with his totalitarian concepts for applying the theories of communism and the transition of power was completed in a relatively short period of time.

Once in power, Lenin devoted his first efforts to reconstructing the empire of the czars. This required wars of aggression against the many, newly independent nations which had broken out of the empire during the period of 1917 through 1920. It was in these circumstances that Lenin developed the techniques of war communism, that is war against all the non-Russian nations which were once under the colonial rule of the czars. These same techniques of war communism are now directed at every nation on earth—the objective being to make the entire world a colony of the Russians.

But Lenin ran into real trouble when he began to apply the social and economic theories of communism to the captive non-Russian nations of his reconstructed empire. He found they would not work, that they were contrary in a violent sense to the nature of man. We must, however, credit him with an all-out try—costing the lives of millions of people during the period of experiment.

In 1923 Lenin was forced to conclude that the economic theories of Marx must be abandoned and that it was necessary to seek the help of the free world capitalists to save the revolution from total collapse. He then announced a New Economic Policy which we now refer to as NEP, and under which the capitalists of the free world rushed to the rescue of the Russian despots. The so-called revolution was saved, but in all candor it must be admitted that the remedy once applied could not be abandoned by its users. That is why there is no communism in practice in the Soviet Union or elsewhere behind the Iron Curtain. Khrushchev openly admits this fact while at the same time predicting hat a Communist system will be established there during the next 20 years. This was his major boast during the recent 22d Congress of the Communist Party. At least he has dropped the 5-year-plan idea for a 20-year promise—he won't be around then, and hence won't be responsible for admitting another failure. Here again we find the Russians stalling for time. The fact is, and Khrushchev knows it as well as I do, the economic system of the Soviet Union is state capitalism with all the monopolistic features most pleasing to the new Russian barons in the Kremlin. The theories of communism have been made into myths—sort of lullabies to keep the Russian people in a stupor of ignorance and contented with their historic lot of servility.

Reasonable men must ask, "If there is no communism in practice behind the Iron Curtain, as Khrushchev openly admits is the case, what, then, is the enonomic and social structure of the empire? Well, I have already described what the economic system is. Now as to the social system. It can be summed up very quickly. It is no different in essential respects from the system of social injustice which existed for hundreds of years under the tzars. All that has changed are the names and titles of the rulers, the state religion, and the line of succession to the seat of the tzar. Believing this, as I do, I suggest it is time we stopped chasing shadows and stopped attempting to wrestle with myths and theories. It is time we got down to the business of engaging the real, live enemy. That enemy is Russian imperialism, not a new specter haunting Europe, but one which has haunted the civilized peoples of Europe for many centuries. Now it is our business because it haunts the present and the future of our free way of life.

So, for purposes of our discussion, when I mention communism please remember it is the mythical cover word for Russian imperialism. Hence, communism and Russian imperialism have the same meaning and I shall use the terms interchangebly.

Moreover, members of Communist parties anywhere in the world are nothing more than Russian agents, even though some of them may still believe they are chasing the utopian dreams of Marx.

The present epoch of great trial in which we live started with our political recognition of the Soviet Union in 1933. We can trace step after step, defeat after defeat in our dealing with the Communists, because we have refused or failed to understand or recognize the nature of the enemy we face. The Russian Communists have broken international agreements again and again, as Lenin directed years ago, "like piecrusts, made to be broken." Yet even today we continue to negotiate with these same rogues who are basically immoral and dishonest. They believe that the end justifies the means—and the end is imperial Russian rule of the world. These people will not change.

We must accept this as a fact of contemporary life.

Fearful defeatists contend that we should not speak the truth about communism or Communists because we might offend them, or lose some point at a conference table, or provide grist for their propaganda machine. I want to see concrete evidence of anything we ever gained at a conference table with the Russians. They will hold an agreement only as long as it is in their own vital interests and not one minute longer.

If it suits the Communist purpose to negotiate—and they have been much more successful at this deadly game than we have—they will negotiate regardless of what we say or do. If negotiation does not suit their purposes, no sweet words from the West will induce them to negotiate. A lie to the Communists comes just as easily as a distortion for propaganda purposes. We must learn that the Communists react only to raw power, never to sweet and soft words. We must never judge them by our own normal intentions or reactions. They have no ethical or moral code. The only code they live by is the Communist code which says that any act is justifiable which promotes the cause of Russian communism.

Today the Communists control 26 percent of the world's land mass and 36 percent of the world's population. They have dragged 15 countries and 900 million people behind the Iron, or Bamboo, Curtain since World War II. They had destroyed the national independence of no less than 10 other nations before World War II.

Why have we, the strongest nation in the world, allowed this swallowing up of free and independent nations by the forces of Russian tyranny? I feel this has happened because we, as a people, have lost the feel for our own political heritage. We have become soft and secure on the fruits of the Founding Fathers. We have allowed a compromise of the great principles of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness under God. We have lost sight of the great spiritual values which motivated our Founding Fathers. We have not stood firm against any and all efforts to weaken the structure of representative self-government. In brief, we have not been acting like the informed, bold, and dedicated leaders who passed on the torch of freedom to succeeding generations of Americans.

Our national policies have been weak, vacillating, and aimless. Three main ideas have governed our policy. They were from 1947 to 1955, containment; 1955 to 1961, evolution, i.e., the mellowing of the Soviet Union into a peaceful Socialist state; and now 1961, escalation into general nuclear war.

The theory of containment of the Communist menace became national policy in 1947. This stated that communism contained the seeds of its own destruction, therefore if we contained it, it would destroy itself. This gave the Communists a base from which to operate, which was unmolested and unchallenged. They were able to consolidate their illegal base and build up their military and economic power. From this base they moved to new adventures on the international scene.

In 1955 a new tactic in the cold war was adopted by your Government. National policy was then based upon two pillars—foreign and international information programs. These were called positive-action programs. Since the policymakers of the period considered anticommunism as strictly negative, national policy concerning the Sino-Russian bloc could only go in one direction. It went from containment to the policy of encouraging changes within the Sino-Russian bloc by evolutionary processes. This change brought about cultural exchanges, trade with the Russians, aid to Poland and Yugoslavia, and visits to the United States by Mr. Khrushchev, Mikoyan, and other Russian Communist leaders.

The policy planners in the State Department sold our leaders on the idea that we should not attempt to win the cold war. By this, I do not mean that they wanted us to lose. They had the idea that we should not dare to win for fear that we might lose. So, they naively sought an accommodation with a conspiracy which they held would evole into a peaceful Socialist state, but which in reality, can be trusted to do only one thing—to seek to bury us, as Mr. Khrushchev has vowed they will do.

There are many indications the fuzzy thinking of the State Department policy planners has been compounded by pouring in a top layer of accommodation sympathizers in high level positions of your Government. This is not something new. It has been going on without interruption since 1955.

Within the framework of containment and evolution there was a slight opening for some strong actions against the Russian Communists.

There is a possibility that this slight opening for positive political action may soon be closed tight. The present guidance within our State Department holds that we should be careful of any action against the Communists, since it might escalate into general nuclear war. Under this policy guidance, even an individual soldier may not fire back to defend himself, since it might escalate.

During the Korean war we were not allowed to fight for final victory, since it might have led to general war—so held the State Department. Now, it appears that we are not allowed to fight for any victory in the all-out war being waged against us by communism, since it might escalate into general nuclear war.

This newest version of national policy, escalation into general nuclear war, is a graduated extension of the policies of evolution and containment, with a new variation. The prior policies led us into defeat after defeat and the new policy of escalation offers high promise of leading us into the better Red than dead finality.

No victory has been ever achieved by fear. Fear paralyzes our every activity against the threats of communism. Even the deadly poison of Castro only 90 miles from our shore cannot be eliminated, because Khrushchev has exploded 50 atomic bombs and hinted that any efforts to effect change in Cuba might escalate. Too many high officials immediately run for their shelters and ask for more millions for bomb shelters at the slightest threat from Khrushchev. I ask you, if the wildest threats from Khrushchev and company do not escalate us into nuclear war then who is in charge of the escalator?

In spite of all the evidence of our softness and confusion, we can win the cold war and defeat Russian imperialism if we are determined to do so and establish a bold course of action for this purpose. Secretary of State Dean Rusk recently stated that any effort on our part toward victory in the cold war would only lead to a nuclear holocaust. This type of fearful reasoning will lead us into retreat, step by step, as we have been doing, to the point where there would be no choice left except surrender or nuclear war. No sane person wants to be backed into that corner. Let us make sure that shall never happen.

The American people deserve and are waiting for leadership toward another alternative—victory over Russian communism. Only the American people can bring about this change. I said earlier that in our country, government is the servant of the people. It is the people, therefore, who have the right to determine what the policies of their National Government shall be at any given time. This right of the people to determine national policies includes the right of the people to determine foreign policies. The principal means by which the people can exercise this right is through the ballot. But foreceful expression of their desires by the innumerable means available to them is desirable at all times.

The American people can be deprived of their right to determine national policy only if the facts of the existence of alternative courses of action are withheld from them. If by some device or devices all but one course of action open to us is withheld from the public, the people then lose their right to participate in the formulation of policies. I maintain it is the duty of Government to fully inform the people on all courses of action open to us in meeting the Russian problem.

One point of view expounded by many individuals high in Government circles deliberately avoids a public examination of other avenues of action which might better serve our national needs and interests.

It is not so much the elected officials of your Government who engage in the take-it-or-leave-it approach to policy as the nonelected, but appointed or career employees thereof. They tend to know what is best for the people, much like the foreign offices in monarchies, and they too often feel they are above the electorate, and they are more often wrong than right.

When the public is deprived of a clear and understandable explanation of a national problem, a degree of apathy can be fostered which assures continuation of the monopoly on the making of policy by the favored few. This is especially true in the area of foreign policy which the bureaucrats are trying to wrap in mystery and intrigue.

An example of announcing a policy and shielding, from the public, of the full facts is the recent announcement by the Department of State on what they call the fragmentation of the Communist Parties caused by the forces of nationalism. This in effect means that our policy toward the Russians will be based on the premise that the Russians have lost control of the non-Russian Communist Parties of the world and that the forces of nationalism are affecting the internal cohesion of the Russian international conspiracy.

What are the true facts. Is the Russian government really losing control of the Communist Parties of the world? Are the forces of nationalism affecting and weakening the Communist Parties of the world? There can be no doubt that the most powerful political force in the world today is nationalism. That is the driving power behind the national independence movements in all quarters of the globe. But President Kennedy has warned that "the tide of self-determination has not yet struck the Communist empire." I agree with him, but the career people in the State Department do not.

We are not faced with a Nazi- or Fascist-type movement. Those movements could be compared with an octopus spreading its tentacles. Communism is a Banyan tree. From its roots spring trunks of trees often bigger and stronger than the original tree. Its roots travel underground. The mother tree remains Russian Imperialism.

In my opinion, there is no sharp division between the Russian, Chinese Communists, Yugoslavs and Albanians. There is no hard intelligence which justifies claims of a deep rift between these groups. The estimates of a split are based upon the words and strange actions of the Communists, and no more. Since when could a Communist's words be relied upon or his strange actions be considered other than normal for an abnormal person.

The current theory of fragmentation of the Communist parties of the world is accompanied by an abundance of wishful thinking.

In rebuttal to this theory, the present Russian activities in espionage and subversion speak an adequate answer. Those actions are well directed, effective, and well integrated into the Communist worldwide system which is tightly controlled by the organs of the Soviet Union. The control emanates from the foreign section of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The head of the foreign section is M. Suslov, a member of the Presidium of the U.S.S.R.

The Russian espionage and subversive network has made serious inroads into political, military, and industrial targets around the world. They control all the intelligence services of the satellite nations and work in close unison with the Chinese Communist agents. The Chinese Communists have an espionage and subversive office in East Berlin which is directed at Europe and the continent of Africa.

One tentacle of this system, for example, leads from Moscow to Prague to Mexico City. There it is directed south toward Central and South America and north toward the United States and Canada. Another tentacle runs from Moscow to Belgrade to Havana. The Yugoslavs are also exporting the Russian-Cuban type subversion to Central and South America.

The Communist intelligence and subversive system leaves little to chance and is supported by a number of parallel organizations. All the Russian instruments of espionage and subversion are now operating at full capacity.

In view of the above, it is fair to ask where is the fragmentation, how can the forces of nationalism weaken the basic espionage and subversive tasks of Communist parties throughout the world? This intelligence and subversion master plan is well controlled and close knit. Espionage and subversion are not ends in themselves, but only serve to further other more insidious plans. In this case world domination by the Soviet Union.

We cannot afford to sit back and wait for the Communists to evolve into a peaceful Socialist state; we must carry the political fight to the heartland of the Russian empire. We must realize that the Communists have declared total war against us and all the free peoples of the world. We are not in a cold war, but an all-inclusive war—political, economic, diplomatic and military. At this very moment, people in other parts of the wrold, are losing their liberties and even their lives at the hands of Communists who are using subversion, terror, treachery, and deceit to attain their goal.

It is this attitude of sitting back and waiting for the Russian Communists to change, by some magic formula unknown to the general public, this wait-and-see attitude which has dominated our policies toward the Russian empire which in turn have caused a widespread spirit of frustration and disappointment among our people. Frustration and disappointment on such a massive scale is the primary cause, the stimulus for what is now being called "thunder on the right." There are always individuals standing in the marketplace of human events who are quick to seize upon the negatives of contemporary affairs. Their actions soon identify them for what they are—opportunists. But the average citizen, who is concerned about the future of his country, whose intuitive sense tells him all that he believes in stands in mortal danger, who is moved by genuine patriotic intentions, can be made the innocent scapegoat of slogan branders. You and I know the nasty name callers are now busy as bees in the spring branding all those who dissent on the passive negative policies of evolution and escalation as rightists if not Fascists. But this name calling will not get us out of the fix we are in and I hope it will not calm the voices of those who seek and master the facts about the origin, nature, and objectives of imperial Russian communism.

A massive effort is now being made to neutralize the body politic of the United States on the Russian question. That effort is directed by the manipulators of thought in the Kremlin and supported by their agents and organs of propaganda in the United States. They seek to make anyone who learns the truth about them and who dares to speak out against them appear as lunatics in the public image. In my considered judgment anyone who knows the facts on this vital issue would be acting like a lunatic if he does not speak out—to inform and warn his fellow citizens of the clear and present danger which confronts our Nation.

The sense of frustration and disappointment of which I speak will remain with us as long as the Russian imperial problem exists and our Government delays initiation of a political action program to bring about the orderly dismemberment of the modern-day Russian Empire. If our people were offered such a program, such a challenge, they would liquidate their frustrations in the healthy positives such a program would of necessity offer them. When we speak of the rising tide of expectations among the peoples of the world, let us not forget that the people of these United States are riding the crest of that tide. As members of a dynamic, free society they expect more from their Government in terms of positive political action programs on the international front than they have been getting in recent years. They are, I am sure, willing to take the risks involved to escalate the world into peace with freedom and justice for all men and all nations.

The Russian Communists consider a shooting war only an extension of political action—to be turned on and off as it suits their purpose. Many people and even some Americans are dying before Communist guns at this moment. Conflagrations caused by Communist treachery are now blazing in Laos, Vietnam, South Korea, Guatemala, Thailand, and the Congo. These wars are hot to the people facing Communist guns, yet our policymakers prefer to call it a cold war.

The firing squads in Cuba, mass starvation in Communist China, and the slave labor camps in the Soviet Union and the satellites are also part of a hot war where people die daily.

Any negotiation or accommodation with the Communists ends in appeasement or war. They leave their enemy no other alternative. Concessions provide them an opening for infiltration and subversion. What we need is a positive, overall strategy to win the war thrust upon us. If we don't dare win; then we don't deserve the right to be called the leader of the free world and worse, we will end up in chains as is always the lot of the timid when faced by the barbarian. We will win and survive as a free society only if the people of the United States and the majority of their duly elected representatives in the Congress demand victory.

The people of our Nation have the will and the tools with which to lay the foundation for a winning political offensive. We have a constitutional form of government which has given our people more freedom than any people have ever known. We have the finest churches, schools, and the highest per capita income in the world. Our technological capabilities are greater than all the rest of the world put together. We have the best system ever known to man, to sell. We need not apologize to anyone for our way of life nor is there need to prove our mettle. We need not prove our intentions to the world or coddle the neutrals. Our history as a nation speaks for itself. Our way of life is an open book of which we should all be justly proud. Let the peoples of the world see us for what we are, let them compare and learn; and then I would ask them to point to a system which gives more freedom and opportunity to the individual than ours provides.

We must maintain a Military Establishment second to none. We should never be lulled into the dangerous fallacy of unilateral disarmament. Let us not quibble over certain aspects of air power or antimissile capability. We need RB-70 and an antimissile, missile. We cannot afford to be without them.

Our homes and heritage are too precious to be jeopardized by petty polticial squabbles. We must insure a supremacy of power and destructive capability since these are the only things the Communists respect—force and power. We need not fear a nuclear holocaust, if we remain strong and powerful. The Communists will never start a war as long as there is clear evidence that they will lose.

A high official once told me that, "Communism would not be difficult to destroy if we could get through the marshmallow curtain in our own Government." This marshmallow cutrain is the internal threat of subversion and infiltration. The Attorney General today lists 283 Communist-front organizations and I have been informed that there are approximately 200 new fronts not yet listed. 185 of these are now under FBI investigation. These fronts can be more dangerous than the Communist Party. After the experience of the past we would be awfully naive to think that there are no Communist secret agents in our Government. To proceed on the wise premise that agents of Moscow will infiltrate our Government is a prudent policy. We are and must remain an open society. We have vulnerabilities, and precautions must be taken to indentify and prosecute all agents of a foreign power who operate within or outside our Government.

There is no short cut to victory. While we must carefully reckon with the possibility of a nuclear war, we must stop ignoring the piecemeal, salami tactics employed by the Russian Communist. Let us take a brief look at the results of these piecemeal, salami tactics: Cuba is a vassal state of Russia, British Guiana under Japan is moving in that direction, Brazil and Argentina are tottering, Mexico is ripe for plucking, Communist uprising and agitation in Guatemala, Costa Rica, Haiti, Honduras, Ecuador is a reality, and guerrila warfare in Colombia and Venezuela is underway. This is on our doorstep. In Africa, Ghana is for all intents and purposes, tied to Moscow, serious situations are arising in the Brazzeville States, Rhodesia, Angola, and the Congo.

The Arab States of Africa and the Middle East are being manipulated by the agents of Moscow. In southeast Asia we are awed by the so-called specter of the Chinese Communists with the "largest land army in the world of 3 million men." But the true story is that they could not even muster more than 20 combat-ready divisions, amounting to approximately 200,000 men. In spite of this, our policymakers are so frightened of the myth of Red China power that southeast Asia could very well fall to the Communists whenever they make a serious effort to take those countries. Fear can prevent the kind of bold leadership demanded by the bold ventures of aggressive communism on the march.

The fundamental cause of fear is ignorance of the facts relating to a given situation. People who seek the facts are not addicted to fear, nor do they engage in name calling. Knowledge is power and the knowledge

you seek here today is the key to a sane and realistic policy toward the agelong Russian problem which in our generation we have come to call communism. I wish you every success in your mission here and the rewarding public work which I am sure will follow from your experiences during these 2 days of the American Strategy Conference. Thank you.

The U.N. and the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing sacrosanct about the U.N., yet when it is justly criticized, even by leading Democrats, we hear great howls from those who are committed completely to the U.N., whether it hurts the United States or not.

The recent courageous speech by Senator JACKSON, of Washington, was one of these instances, which Arthur Krock writes about in today's New York Times.

IN THE NATION—JUST SETTING THEM UP AND KNOCKING THEM DOWN

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON.—The organized official outcry against the recent expressions of concern by Senator JACKSON, of Washington, over certain trends of the United Nations and the influence these trends and our U.N. delegation have exercised on the Kennedy administration's foreign policy is the strongest kind of testimony that the official record is vulnerable. That is demonstrated by the fact that the administration spokesmen who have led and organized the protest have based it on contentions JACKSON never made.

For example, the U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., Adlai E. Stevenson, in his joint television appearance yesterday with Senator HUMPHREY said it was a "great mistake" to equate U.S. support of the worldwide body as an alternative to support of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. And he said it was "wrong even to hint" that control of our foreign policy had been ceded to the U.N. But the administration's votes in the Assembly, and not JACKSON's remarks, are the source of the view that the subordination of the one organization to the other has become U.S. policy.

In the chancelleries and among the people of Portugal, the Netherlands and Belgium—all vital to an effective military alliance with the United States against world communism—our Assembly votes for certain highly biased resolutions of the Afro-Asian bloc have evoked deep and abiding resentments. In basing one of his questions on the dangerous disruption these votes have risked in NATO Senator JACKSON did not create the problem, as Stevenson's comment implied; he merely called it to the attention of the American people.

The official responses to JACKSON'S attention-calling in the form of pertinent questions could be compared to setting up strawmen and then knocking them down—a familiar tactic of the vulnerable when under effective fire—were it not for a fundamental difference. It is, that the setups are not straw at all; they are solid products of the administration's U.N. policy. And they cannot successfully be debited as JACKSON'S products, though this is being attempted, because he noted their existence.

As Senator MANSFIELD, the majority leader in his branch of Congress, said today: "Concern over the U.N. will not disappear if Senators JACKSON, AIKEN, and HICKENLOOPER are buried under an avalanche of highly unjustified criticism for having the temerity to discuss aspects of the problem." Moreover, the "avalanche," now in full official motion, cannot wipe out the record which shows that Senators JACKSON and RUSSELL, Democrats, and AIKEN and HICKENLOOPER, Republicans, are principally responsible for the basic, constructive changes in the President's request for authority to buy outright one-half share of the U.N.'s projected bond issue of $200 million—changes which procured the bipartisan support indispensable to congressional approval. Nor can the highly unjustified criticism of JACKSON wipe out the record which shows Stevenson voting this Government in favor of Afro-Asian bloc resolutions which he first opposed for their irresponsibility and the anti-European bias of their text.

On November 24, 1961, Stevenson offered amendments to the Assembly's Congo resolution to include other secessionist Congo regimes with Tshombe's in Katanga. Before these amendments were rejected by the bloc, he prophesied that the ignored Soviet-supported secessions would prove a greater danger to world peace than Tshombe's. But then he voted for the resolution.

In 1961 and early 1962, Stevenson deplored "the use of force by the U.N. in colonial questions." But he voted for the unabridged text of the Angola resolution, which censured Portugal but not the terrorists, and included an irresponsible demand for "immediate independence of all African peoples," without regard of the incapacity of many for self-government. And when the Security Council refused to register disapproval of Nehru's seizure by force of Portuguese Goa, even by asking for a cease-fire, our U.N. delegate, after mourning aloud that this was "the first act in a drama which could end with the death" of the organization, made no effort to carry the issue into the Assembly.

This U.N. record of the Kennedy administration, not Senator JACKSON'S questioning of it, is the source of the rising dissatisfaction in the United States and NATO with the U.N. and its manifested influence over our foreign policies.

Remarks by Congressman Emilio Q. Daddario, Democrat, of Connecticut, Before a Symposium on Government Relations to Patents Sponsored by the New England Council in Cooperation With the Boston Patent Law Association, Hotel Statler-Hilton, Boston, Mass., February 9, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, recently I had occasion to discuss growing problems in the legislative and political arenas with regard to patent policies. I traced some of the history, analyzed arguments, and presented reasons why I believe Congress can reach a reasonable solution to this controversy. I offer this speech for the RECORD as a contribution to this discussion:

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, DEMOCRAT, OF CONNECTICUT, BEFORE A SYMPOSIUM ON GOVERNMENT RELATIONS TO PATENTS SPONSORED BY THE NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL IN COOPERATION WITH THE BOSTON PATENT LAW ASSOCIATION, HOTEL STATLER-HILTON, BOSTON, MASS., FEBRUARY 9, 1962

I want to thank the members of the Boston Patent Law Association for asking me to come here today and discuss with you some of the growing problems in the legislative and political arenas in regard to patents. I do not know if the issues involved could yet be described as "burning" ones, but they are certainly not far away from it.

I am not a patent lawyer—and indeed, I do not know of any Member of Congress who is—but I have in the past 3 years been rather deeply immersed in certain aspects of patent law; namely, legislation directed to amending the controversial patent section of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958. In 1959 and 1960 I served as a member of the Subcommittee on Patents and Scientific Inventions of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics. Last year I became chairman of that subcommittee and I serve in that capacity at the present time.

There can be little doubt that nationwide interest is growing in regard to the issues of patent ownership which face us today. Things could scarcely be otherwise, and I think, for two reasons: One is because of the tremendous sums of money which the American taxpayers are putting up to fund the cause of scientific research and development. Any time a Federal endeavor reaches these proportions it is bound to have serious side effects, and the danger to private patent rights which we have seen demonstrated is one of these. The second reason for growing national interest is because we are basically a nation dedicated to the proposition of private enterprise. Our system is based on old Anglo-American concepts of property rights. And certainly there is no property which is dearer to the hearts of our people than their ideas, no greater interest than these ideas when they have been put into practical use.

For these reasons I think that the issues which we face today are natural ones and ones from which we should not shy away. Neither do I feel that we should become bitter about the situation or hurl about reckless charges of either "socialism" or "monopolistic greed." I do not think that either situation is the case. What we are faced with is the natural concomitant of the technological explosion which has been taking place ever since the dawn of the atomic era in 1945, and particularly since the advent of the space age in 1957.

The big issue which appears to be present, at least on the surface, is whether or not title to all patentable inventions resulting from federally financed research should vest in the Federal Government or whether title to all these inventions ought to remain with the contractor, the Federal Government taking no more than a royalty-free irrevocable license.

Let me suggest to you, however, that this issue is more apparent than real. And this statement I make on the basis of the testimony and data which our committee has acquired over a period of 3 years. It seems clear to me, after listening to the arguments presented and exploring the facts of the situation, that we simply cannot arrive at any uniform policy where title to all inventions involving Federal research would go to the Government. Neither does the situation appear to warrant a rigid policy in which the Government never receives more than a license to use the invention for governmental purposes. It is, in fact, obvious that there must be flexibility in what-

ever overall policy is adopted. Even the most extreme partisans on either side of the question agree on this point. For example those who have favored the title approach have freely conceded to our committee that such a system would have to make broad use of waivers should it be instituted. At the same time, those most insistent upon the license approach also concede that instances can occur where the United States is entitled to and actually needs more than the simple royalty-free license. I can say, however, that the preponderance of evidence provided to us suggests that the most practical method of administering an overall policy will involve the license approach with exceptions rather than a title approach with exceptions.

Let us look for just a moment at some of of the major arguments which are made in favor of the title approach and then see what the facts are concerning them as we have uncovered them to date.

First, it is argued strongly that since the Government bears the cost of developing the invention it should own title to any patents which result.

This, to the uninitiated, is an appealing argument and I freely admit a difficult one to overcome because it seems almost conclusive on its face. The appearance, however, is deceptive, for the facts are that in very few instances does the Government bear all the costs of developing inventions, or even the major part of the cost. In the vast majority of cases the Government gives its research contracts on the basis of experience, knowledge and know-how developed by private industry. It is simply taking advantage of a situation which exists and it puts up some of its own money in order to reduce these ideas and this know-how into a state that is useful to the Government. This is what the Government bargains for when it enters into a research contract, and it is entitled to receive and must receive in all cases a license to use the results of the research contract, including any patentable inventions, without any further cost and through the efforts of any private firm which it chooses. In nearly all cases this is all that the Government can make use of for governmental purposes. Except in unusual cases title in the Government is of no further value—that is, unless the Government wishes to go into business in competition with private enterprise and seek to exploit the patents it holds for commercial purposes and for the production of revenue. This has never been the concept which most of us have held as being the proper function of Government.

A second major argument used by the title enthusiasts is that the Government needs title to these patents in order to insure widespread access to the new technological knowledge which has been produced in the course of the research contract.

Nobody has yet suggested a means by which such knowledge would be disseminated more efficiently or more rapidly by virtue of Government ownership. It is true that this whole question of the dissemination of technical information is becoming a very serous problem and one which warrants joint action by all the agencies of Government to speed it up. A great deal of study is going on right now on an interagency basis to see by what means this can be accomplished. However, Government ownership of inventions produced under its research contracts is no guarantee whatever that the information will be disseminated more widely or more quickly. For the most part information relating to patentable inventions is held inviolable until the patent is issued, and this process is not going to be any faster simply because the title may eventually wind up being the property of the United States. On the contrary, the evidence which has been presented to our committee suggests that dissemination of knowledge is likely to be diminished if the Government insists on title. This is due to the apparent fact that disclosures of information to agencies which insist on title to inventions are slow in developing and less complete in their presentation than would be the case if the contractor were seeking to retain the title himself.

Let me point out that in 3 years of operations on the part of the space agency, involving thousands of research contracts, only 159 invention disclosures have been made by commercial contractors and only 23 of these have been authorized for presentation of patent applications. By way of comparison I might mention that our hearings have disclosed that the Navy Patent Organization, for example, in the single year of 1960, operating in regard to far fewer contracts, received 674 invention disclosures from its contractors. It is also interesting that in the case of a single large aircraft manufacturer for the same year, 734 invention disclosures were received from employees, 129 patent applications filed and 109 patents issued. It seems hard to argue in the face of this type of evidence that disclosure of any technological information is going to be speeded up by a title policy.

The third major argument of the proponents of the title approach is that this is essention in order to prevent undue concentration of economic power in a few large business firms.

I am not prepared to argue the proposition that undue concentration of economic power in a few large business firms does not occur. Neither am I prepared to argue that the prevention of monopoly is not the proper function of our National Government. Obviously the reverse is true. But I do have strong doubts that such unlawful or undue monopoly results from the application of the patent laws as they may be affected by the current trend toward widespread Federal financing and research. Our subcommittee has not found any significant evidence of serious or damaging monopoly which exists because of the operation of our patent system in connection with federally financed research.

Let me just say a word here about what would have to happen if we should adopt an overall policy of keeping title in the Government. One of two things would have to happen. Either the portfolio of Government-owned patents would fall into the limbo of public ownership where they now reside with an identical lack of interest, or the National Government would have to make a concerted effort to see that these patents were made available and used. The latter proposal, of course, has been made to the Congress and several bills exist which would establish such a system and set up a new Federal bureau to prosecute our national patent holdings. But let me ask you at this point, what would be the result of all this? Would it be a profitable venture? I very much doubt it. Even if we accepted the philosophy that commercial exploitation is proper for the National Government, which I do not, it is quite another thing to make the commercial exploitation of patents a profitable venture, and here I would call your attention to the experience of the British in this connection. The National Research & Development Corp., established by Parliament in 1949, has attempted to do just this sort of thing. What has happened? In the first 10 years of the corporation's existence the total revenues realized have been a little over £1 million and the total expenditures a little over £3½ million. The Government's Board of Trade has had to make up the difference. I would point out also that our Office of Alien Property has never succeeded in exploiting its patent holdings to any appreciable degree, and the effort of the Canadian Government over a 12-year period to work its patent holdings has resulted in profits that are almost negligible. In short, we have received no evidence that a concentrated effort by the Government to work and operate a large patent portfolio could be made economically feasible.

And certainly we have received no evidence which would tend to support the notion that patents, as they are presently owned by the Government and left to haphazard development, result in any significant commercial utility. Even in the case of the patent holdings of the Atomic Energy Commission—an extremely promising, exciting, and potentially profitable area of endeavor—requests for opportunities to use Government-held patents do not appear to be overwhelming. The AEC has told our committee that of the 2,600 patents which it owns at the present time, requests have been received for licenses on only about 450, and there is no way of knowing how many of these licenses have actually been utilized.

Let us turn now to the other side of the question and look at the arguments for a license approach to the problem.

We have been told that private title to patents resulting from Government research is necessary as an incentive to encourage private industry not only to accept Government R. & D. contracts but to help keep the cost of Government research lower and to insure that the Government gets the benefit of the best efforts of the contractor. The record which we have made indicates that this is certainly true to a large extent, although these things are difficult to gage. We have uncovered a number of instances in which individual companies have either been reluctant or have refused outright to consider any research contract containing a Government title clause.

The number of such instances is not impressively large. But such cases clearly do exist, and I am left with the uncomfortable feeling that nobody knows—not even the Space Administration—how much better off our space program might be if NASA were not obliged to follow its present patent policy. How do you count the number of firms which may decline to submit bids on a particular program? How do you find out whether they put their best people on the Government contract? How do you find out whether they use all their best ideas in connection with a given project? I submit that there is no way to find these things out, but at the same time I am strongly of the opinion—and I think that this is a fairly well informed opinion—that the number of instances in which this occurs in regard to our space program is far larger than the ease of securing contractors would suggest. Of course Government agencies can find somebody to take their contracts. It is quite a different thing to prove that when contractors operate under conditions which are repugnant to them they provide the same interest, energy, and devotion to the work they are undertaking.

The argument that a license policy encourages incentive, I think, is true as a consequence of human nature, and the same applies to the contention that few firms are going to bother with developing an invention commercially unless they can do so on an exclusive basis for a period of time. This is a built-in element of our profit system and to deny it is to be economically unrealistic.

At the beginning of this talk I mentioned the vast increase in the expenditure of Federal funds for scientific research and development. Evidence which I have received suggests that today something like 65 cents out of every research dollar is being supplied by the National Government. From this we can only conclude that Federal rights and interests in inventions produced in whole or in part by this money must increase, and I must find myself in agreement

with the proposition that there are some cases where the Federal Government has and should have a larger interest in inventions than a mere license to use them. This may occur as a protection against payment of royalties when the contractor does not deem it necessary to patent an invention.

It may be necessary in order to avoid an inequitable situation when the contractor reduces an invention to practice by utilization of previous work done by other firms or by the Government. It may occur when an invention sought will clearly provide universal benefits for all our people or have a crucial meaning for the national security. It may also occur in cases where the Federal Government may seek the item for purposes of public convenience or safety and then require its use by law. An example of this is the situation often confronting the Federal Aviation Agency as it endeavors to improve the traffic control of our airways. While I am not convinced that the principle of royalty-sharing, in order to recover Government research costs, is either a good concept or economically feasible. I am disposed to agree with those who have presented evidence to us of the possible need for compulsory licensing under certain circumstances. This latter approach might be employed when inventions arising under Federal research contracts are patented by the contractor, but neither marketed nor licensed for a period of from 3 to 5 years. If they still appear at that time to have commercial potential then the Federal Government—acting as the agent of the public—might properly require the licensing of such inventions at reasonable royalties.

Let us take a moment now to look at the trend of thinking in Congress toward this problem. You are all familiar with the history of the three organic acts which deal with the patent problem. The first of these arose in 1946 with the Atomic Energy Act which generally followed the title approach. The second occurred in 1950 with the National Science Foundation Act. This left the matter entirely to the discretion of the Director, with the admonition that he should consider both the interest of the public and the equities of the contractor in making his decisions. The third occurred with the passage of the National Aeronautics and Space Act in 1958. Its patent clause is somewhat similar to that in the Atomic Energy Act.

The whole situation began to ferment in Congress in 1960. By that time it was evident that the distaste which industry had expressed for the patent provision in the Space Act also existed within NASA itself. The administration requested a change aiming toward the sort of language employed in the National Science Foundation Act. This request resulted in lengthy consideration by our subcommittee, the full Committee on Science and Astronautics, and the House of Representatives. The House passed the amendment by a considerable margin in June 1960, but the Senate failed to take any action—so the law remains today as it was originally written.

At about this same time a rather curious thing started to take place—curious in the sense that the philosophy involved was quite contrary to that evidenced by the House in voting to amend the Space Act. What happened was a concerted effort on the part of various individuals in the Senate to amend all legislation being passed through that body which carried any authority or funds for research and development. These amendments were offered and adopted in committee or on the floor of the Senate. They were not administration-sponsored nor the subject of extensive debate.

In brief, these amendments provided that all information, processes, products, patents and other developments resulting from such research should be freely available to the general public. I am told that a fair number of patent lawyers are not quite sure what this means—nor am I. Nevertheless, it would appear tantamount to a dedication. Language of this sort was incorporated in the Coal Research Act, the Saline Water Act, the Marine Research Act, and the Arms Control Act, all passed by the Senate within the space of 18 months or so. The Coal Research Act and the Saline Water Act have now become law—as has the Arms Control Act. The latter, however, was revised in conference at the insistence of those of us in the House who felt that the amendment was undesirable—at least without considerably more study than was being given to it. The change which we fostered in this case had the effect of limiting such research as was to be freely available to the public to "information" concerning it.

From this brief history I think it is apparent that what has sometimes seemed to be a trend in Congress toward a general Government title policy may now be checked. So far as I can see, this trend never was a grassroots movement but originated with a few ardent protagonists who sincerely feel that the "Government-pays-Government-must-own" idea is prima facie evidence of the desirability of Government ownership. The fact was and is, however, that the concept has never been as carefully examined in Congress as its importance warrants.

Today that situation still exists. The major tenets of the antimonopolists regarding patents have yet to receive the careful consideration of the whole Congress. There is a difference, however, for Congress now is aware that the issue exists and that it must be examined before many further steps are taken. The action of the House in 1960 in attempting to amend NASA's patent clause and the insistence of the House in amending the Arms Control Act last year have awakened our legislators to the fact that this is not a simple one-sided affair.

As you may know, the administration is presently in the process of attempting to put together a National Inventions Act which would be applicable across the board to all agencies of Government handling research contracts. A draft of such an act has been circulated among the various Federal agencies for comments, and it is my understanding that they have received quite a few stringent ones as well as some that are diametrically opposed to each other. The implication is that no one today is finding this matter a simple problem to solve, and I predict that even if the bill receives congressional attention this year, the road before it will be long and thorny.

Our subcommittee, meanwhile, has been going into the Space Act provision again this year, partly because we feel that an overall Federal patent policy may be some time in developing, while the patent problems of the Space Administration should be eliminated at the earliest possible moment. Our space program is founded on the need for high-caliber research and development as is no other program of the Federal Government. It must have as many impediments removed from its path as possible. We simply have too much at stake not to avail ourselves of the best our contractors have to offer.

Another reason for the interest of our subcommittee and of our full committee is the need to familiarize ourselves with all the issues of patent ownership. The House Science Committee is charged with general oversight of all matters of scientific interest, and we feel that it behooves us to acquire sufficient background in order to make valid judgments if and when broad patent legislation reaches the floor of the House.

While our Patent Subcommittee has not at this date concluded its consideration of all the evidence placed before it, I can summarize certain additional findings which the evidence tends to substantiate.

1. We find it difficult to believe that anyone outside a small government group really wants a Government title policy across the board. This might be the easy way to do things, but the risks certainly suggest that it would not be the wisest.

2. There seems nothing to indicate that a general Federal title policy would enhance the Government's own research efforts, inasmuch as the Government has access to all these inventions anyway. Thus the Government-title approach is not really predicated upon assisting the Government itself, but rather on controlling certain side issues of its research program.

3. It is clear that in the past few years industry has been making a concerted effort to ameliorate criticism leveled against it in regard to the way it handles its own research employees. Innumerable industrial firms today have evolved or are in the process of evolving incentive plans which give creative employees a larger investment in the work they do.

4. It is not the large industrial firm which will suffer the most if the Government insists on all commercial rights to inventions produced under its research contracts. The subcontractor, the little fellow, is the one who is going to be caught in the middle. He is the one who depends most upon the commercial rights in his inventions to keep his organization going. The old established firms with secure background patent situations do not have this worry, at least not to the same extent.

In conclusion, let me suggest to you that the coming battle (if it can be called that) in regard to Government versus private patent ownership is an honest one. On one side the antimonopolists are simply exercising a long-established and legitimate interest of our Goverment. Their concern is genuine, and their basic success is vital to the welfare of this country. On the other hand, we must not lose sight of the provisions set down in the U.S. Constitution almost 200 years ago—provisions which authorize the Congress to grant limited monopolies to creative persons in order to foster the arts and sciences. The principles on which these provisions were based are as valid and as important today as they were in 1787. We must not, in our zeal to protect the Nation from the evils of monopoly, obliterate this system which has stood us in good stead for so long a period.

I am convinced that we can reach a reasonable and effective method to follow. And, after a full review by the Congress, I am equally confident that it will be done.

A Friend Is a Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, some friends are never forgotten, especially under the New Frontier and President Kennedy.

To help a friend is laudable except when it is done with taxpayers' money as in the case, according to Robert J. Donovan in his article of March 24 in the New York Herald Tribune, of Mr. K. LeMoyne Billings, who has spent many weekends with the President and who is the recipient of an advertising bonanza.

The article is as follows:

GOP SENATOR SAYS KENNEDY FRIENDS PROFIT

(By Robert J. Donovan)

WASHINGTON.—Senator CARL T. CURTIS, Republican, of Nebraska, charged yesterday that the Government-controlled General Aniline Film & Dye Corp. is being used by the administration to provide patronage for two friends of the Kennedys.

He cited these cases, both of which originated a year ago:

1. General Aniline's advertising account, reportedly worth $1.5 million a year, was awarded to Lennen & Newell, Inc., 380 Madison Avenue, New York, whose vice president is K. Le Moyne Billings, a personal friend of President Kennedy and Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy. In fact, Mr. Billings has been one of the President's best friends since they were schoolmates at Choate, in Wallingford, Conn.

2. General Aniline's accounting business, reportedly worth $65,000 a year, was given to Wright, Long & Co., 2 Park Avenue, New York, which has had an association with Carmine Bellino, a special consultant to the President and the Budget Director. He was chief accountant to the Senate Rackets Committee when Robert Kennedy was its chief counsel.

"We are all familiar with the fact," Senator CURTIS told the Senate, "that private businesses operated by the Federal Government become a warm haven for high-salaried patronage employees.

"When the American President Lines were operated by the Maritime Commission the story was the same. Many illustrious politicians went from party service to top-ranking spots in American President Lines. The same is equally true in the General Aniline situation and was true throughout the administrations of Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, and the current administration."

General Aniline, whose executive offices are at 111 West 50th Street, New York, produces films, cameras, chemicals, and dyestuffs. It is owned by German nationals, but was vested as alien property during World War II. Under the law the Attorney General, whoever he may be, controls 97 percent of the stock and thus can handpick the board that runs the company.

Attorney General Kennedy was out of the city yesterday, but his office recalled that he had previously commented on these same two cases, which have been aired before.

His previous comment on the Billings case was to compliment the General Aniline board for having given the advertising contract to Lennen & Newell. He pointed out that the president of the firm, Adolf J. Toigo, is also listed in "Who's Who" as a political adviser to the Republican Party."

As for the accounting business, the Attorney General believed that it was wise practice to change accounting firms with a change in administrations. Thus, according to his office, he consulted Mr. Bellino and the account was switched to Wright, Long & Co. It had been held by the New York firm of Arthur Andersen & Co., which, incidentally, does the family accounting work of the Kennedys.

At the Justice Department it was said that Mr. Bellino's only relationship with Wright, Long & Co. is an association in some small accounts he had handled as an accountant in Elizabeth, N.J., and had turned over to the firm.

Senator CURTIS told the Senate:

"Mr. Bellino is reported to have said that he is not a partner of Wright, Long & Co., but he has worked with them since 1950 and is their resident agent in Washington. His name is carried on the directory of the building at 247 Park Avenue as an occupant of the space in which Wright, Long & Co. is headquartered."

Senator CURTIS also referred to newspaper accounts that had quoted Mr. Billings to the effect that he did not personally handle General Aniline business and had done nothing more than "introduce some people."

"What more political influence can come," the Senator asked, "from close to the White House?"

Under the Eisenhower administration the advertising account of General Aniline was handled by Benton & Bowles, according to Senator CURTIS.

"Actually," he said: "the gravamen of this whole situation is the fact that the Government continues to operate a competitive industry which boasts of assets of $170 million and which employs 8,000 persons. It is operated by directors picked by the Attorney General, and it is obvious that the attributes of a private business; namely, legal fees, auditing fees and advertising fees, find their way to the faithful."

The Senator noted that "there is no apparent disposition on the part of the Government to divest itself and permit the corporation to operate as a normal business."

"It does appear," he declared, "that in this 17th year following the end of World War II we should be getting to the place where a large and important industrial enterprise can return to normal operation."

A year ago, Attorney General Kennedy said he would be delighted to have the Government sell General Aniline and get out of the business. The Alien Property Act under which it was seized, however, provides that vested property may not be sold while there is any pending litigation involving it. Litigation over the ownership of General Aniline stock has been in the courts for years, and no end is in sight. A bill has been introduced in Congress to permit the sale despite litigation, but it has not got far.

The School Dropout Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, shortly the House will, I hope, have an opportunity to consider the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps. In this connection I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the Reporter magazine article, "Dropouts to Nowhere," which discusses some aspects of this problem.

The article follows.

DROPOUTS TO NOWHERE—TOO MANY KIDS ARE UNSKILLED, UNSCHOOLED, AND UNEMPLOYED

(By Naomi Barko)

The East Harlem Youth Employment Service Office is a long, narrow storefront, as easy to walk into as the grocery stores, the linoleum shops, and the guady-windowed iglesias that make thier shabby way along upper Second Avenue. Just behind the plate-glass window, on wooden folding chairs, sit the jobseekers, some obviously anxious, some effecting a more or less convincing nonchalance.

"Yeah, I'm a dropout," a young man named David told me. "I'm 16, went to Machine & Metal Trades for 2 years. But I kept getting into fights.

"No, I didn't have much trouble with school. Got good marks in math and science." He smiled at my look of surprise. "Yeah, the grade adviser kept telling me I'd be all right if I could keep away from those other kids. I even tried another school." He shrugged. "You can't keep away from it."

He has worked before. "My father was a mason, but I didn't take to that too well. It was boring. I thought there must be jobs that aren't boring.

"I've been looking for 3 or 4 months now," he admitted. "They dont send me out much, because of my age I guess. Maybe I'll get a shipping clerk job or messenger job now—just something to occupy my day."

Over in West Harlem the office of the youth employment service (optimistically abbreviated as YES) is in the basement of a YMCA. It was there not long ago that a boy named Howard, huddled in an overstuffed leather armchair, told me another classic version of the dropout story. Now 17, he has been out of school and in and out of odd jobs for a year.

"I wasn't doing so well," he confessed. "Wasn't making time. I had a year and a half to go, but it just didn't seem worth staying in. Everybody gets sick and tired of school. Everybody quits. I thought it would be easy to get a job, and maybe go to night school. But it isn't. I guess I should not have done it."

"My father? Oh, he doesn't live with us. I don't know what he does. My mother, she cleans up places.

"I'd sure like to work in an office. That seems like nice work. Not a little office, a big one."

These are the out-of-school, out-of-work youngsters whom Dr. James B. Conant calls "social dynamite," whom Secretary Abraham Ribicoff calls "a terrible waste," and who Secretary Arthur Goldberg says pose "potentially the most dangerous social condition in America today." There are now nearly a million of them. Some are dropouts, some are among the still not completely counted number of high school graduates who cannot find work in an increasingly specialized and competitive job market.

Unemployment in the under 24-age group has been at least twice as high, and has been rising at a faster rate, than that of older age groups ever since 1950. The National Committee on Employment of Youth, the major private agency in the field, estimates that in Negro slum neighborhoods, youth unemployment runs as high as 35 to 40 percent, with a 50-percent rate for dropouts. Up until very recently, as Dr. Conant says, the employment of youth has been "literally nobody's affair."

Much is already known about the dropouts. Many, like Howard, are backward students with severe reading and arithmetic problems. Others, like David—the latest Bureau of Labor statistics dropout study shows 70 percent—have normal intelligence or better. But almost all of them, whether they come from subsistence-level farms or big-city slums, have parents with low incomes, little education, and very low vocational aspirations. When dropouts get to an employment agency, they have no skills and very little idea of how to go about getting a job.

"These kids think I have a job machine out in back," I was told by John Koestner, the counselor at the East Harlem YES office.

"They all want to work in offices," exclaimed Frank Broughton in West Harlem. "Some of them even come in with minimum salary requirements."

"Many of these kids have no knowledge of work," Koestner told me. "When you ask them what their fathers do, a lot of them just say, 'He works.'" Less than 50 percent of the families in the neighborhood Koestner serves made as much as $2,000 last year.

"They have no idea of how to present themselves to an employer," according to Broughton. "The girls will come in with crazy hairdos, the boys with loud shirts,

not completely clean. They sit down without being asked. They begin a job interview by telling an employer what they don't want to do."

"So many of these kids," said Koestner, "don't have much contact with the white world. They're scared of going downtown. They may only have been there a few times before, to go to a 42d Street movie. I had a very neat, pretty Puerto Rican girl here once. I wanted to send her to a fashionable florist in the East Fifties. She got the job eventually, but I had to talk to her about an hour before she would go. 'They won't like me down there,' she kept saying."

Skillful counseling can deal with problems like these, and YES, which was designed especially for dropouts, does manage to place a significant number. But agencies like YES, which is maintained by the New York State Employment Service, are still rare. Chicago, Cincinnati, Detroit, and Philadelphia are among the few large cities where this kind of counseling is available.

Even if there were more of them, however, they could not begin to touch an even more widespread and basic problem—that of skills. Lack of preparation for work is not only a problem of dropouts. There is increasing evidence to show that a good many high school graduates are not much better off.

In Newark, the Urban League is completing a study of unemployment among high school graduates in Negro slum areas. "We found one high school," a League official told me, "where all the Negroes in the graduating class of January, 1961, were unemployed 5 months later. There were 33 boys, all with academic diplomas, and 20 girls, all of whom took commercial courses. It wasn't hard," he says, "to find out why they were out of work. The 33 boys subsequently took the Army general classification test. All failed. They didn't even have a fourth-grade reading level. Some of the girls, who were supposed to be typists, couldn't type 30 words a minute."

FRUSTRATION IN THE FACULTY

Even the briefest excursion into the schools reveals what the trouble is. The great tide of youth that threatens to flood the labor market has already overwhelmed the schools.

Many vocational high schools have been unable to keep up with advances in industry. A 1957 National Manpower Council report noted that it was possible to study cabinetmaking in high schools in more than 300 communities, but that courses for typewriter and office-machine repairmen were given in only 12, and for industrial laboratory technicians in only 3. Vocational educators point out that they cannot compete with industry in hiring the skilled workers who could teach such courses. And even if they could, they say, many of their students could not pass them. They complain that their schools have become a dumping ground for youngsters who do poor academic work.

The teachers, however, are almost placid in comparison to the guidance people. In a junior high school in Bedford-Stuyvesant, one of Brooklyn's worst slum areas, a guidance counselor responsible for 600 children told me: "The number of disturbed kids in an area like this is fantastically high, and I only get to see a fraction of those. The normal children I never get to see at all. I'm supposed to be helping them with educational and vocational problems. But I'm not. I'm working as a psychiatrist. And I'm not a psychiatrist."

The ideal ratio of guidance personnel to students, most educators agree, is 1 to 250. The national average ratio is now about 1 to 550, and according to the U.S. Office of Education, a third of all guidance counselors do not meet minimum certification requirements. Fortunately, the guidance gap is decreasing, thanks largely to the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which makes Federal funds available to State guidance programs.

Several school systems, particularly New York's, have also recently undertaken experimental programs to try to develop curricula for under-par students, to catch emotional and learning problems in the early grades, to improve reading, and to increase the motivation of those classified as culturally deprived. But the money needed to develop these programs is still not available.

Meanwhile, in the labor market, employers are raising educational requirements for hiring. Most large firms will not even consider a dropout. Many not only insist on diplomas but take care to check the kind of diploma as well as the applicant's school record. Others now also want applicants, particularly boys, to show signs of advancement potential. Some will not even hire a graduate if he is under 18. Given minimum-wage laws, many simply prefer older workers. Trade union exclusion policies are another barrier. Some of these are based on age, but more on nepotism. Although apprenticeships are considered an excellent method of training and although 45 percent more skilled craftsmen will be needed in the next 15 years, only 225,000 apprentices are now being trained throughout the country. The 1961 report of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission documents another familiar and bitter fact: that the unions' programs are also helping to perpetuate discrimination. In St. Louis, the Commission's report notes, out of 1,767 apprentices only 7 were Negroes. In New York State, 2 percent of apprentices were Negroes, in Detroit less than 2 percent, in New Jersey less than one-half of 1 percent.

All of these barriers must finally be measured against the ultimate one: there are simply not enough jobs to go around. As one union official asked recently, "What do you want to do—take the job away from the father and give it to the son?"

GRAY AREAS AND HIGHER HORIZONS

There are many angry questions—and, as yet, not enough answers. Many approaches are being tried. In answer to widely heard calls for business, labor, and agency people to get together, several cities and States have set up mayors' and Governors' committees on youth unemployment. President Kennedy's new committee, which includes the presidents of the National Association of Manufacturers, of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and of the AFL-CIO, and the executive director of the National Urban League, along with Secretary Goldberg and Dr. Conant, is itself such a response. Probably the most complete service is Detroit's job upgrading program, which offers counseling on appearance and manners and on-the-job training as well as placement. The U.S. Employment Service's 1,800 offices are now putting a new emphasis on youth services. The Service already has counselors for graduates at nearly half of the Nation's high schools, and is now extending its counseling and aptitude testing to dropouts.

Some cities try to catch the prospective dropout and offer him some useful training before he leaves school. Such is the case in Indianapolis, where Wood High School offers courses in skills lower than those taught in the regular vocational schools. The courses, which include such subjects as auto-body repairing, barbering, and drycleaning, are geared to job openings in the community. Advisory committees of businessmen, union representatives, and others help plan courses, get contributions of equipment and funds, and find jobs.

Efforts have also been underway to improve the level of big-city schooling. A notable program is the Ford Foundation-financed great cities gray area project, which has studied problems of slum schooling in 10 cities across the country. Each project is different, but all seek to relate school services to the total problems of the neighborhood, including housing, health, wealfare, recreation, and crime. Still the most dramatic program in this area is New York City's higher horizons, now functioning in 65 elementary and junior high schools. In the two graduating classes that have so far gone through the complete program, there were 40 percent more children finishing high school and 350 percent more going on to college than before. Similar projects are now underway in other cities in New York State, in St. Louis, and in the District of Columbia, and an important part of the administration's request for $5.7 billion in aid to education is intended to stimulate more of them.

The Federal program most directly aimed at youth unemployment is the youth employment opportunities bill, which, though strongly supported by interested people across the country, failed to get through Congress last year. The original bill calls for a $275 million pilot program to set up a Youth Conservation Corps and to provide on-the-job training in private industry as well as in local and State government enterprises.

There is still a chance that the bill, or at least some of its provisions, will be passed during the current session of Congress. But despite all the good work being done, many boys like David must still wait without much hope for "just something to occupy my day."

Program of Attack on Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, every American, whether he supports Richard M. Nixon or not, certainly will agree that he knows quite a bit about Communists and their methods, and especially how they operate in the United States. It is therefore with pleasure that I insert in the RECORD his most recent article as printed in today's Washington Post, on how Americans should fight communism in the United States.

The article follows:

RICHARD NIXON WRITES—ALL THINKING AMERICANS SHOULD JOIN FIGHT ON U.S. REDS; PROGRAM OFFERED

(By Richard M. Nixon)

Because of the irresponsible antics of some self-styled experts on anticommunism, national attention for months has been directed to the subject of how not to fight communism in the United States. It is time now to direct attention to the even more critical problem of how to fight communism at home. Because if there is one thing that is more harmful to the national interest than exaggerating the internal Communist danger, it is ignoring it or downgrading it.

I will suggest here a program of how to mount a responsible attack upon communism and Communist influence within the United States.

First, we must recognize that there is a danger. As Cardinal Cushing, of Boston, pointed out recently, there seems to be "a concerted campaign to establish the conclusion that there is no internal threat from communism in the United States. The idea

that there is no danger from communism contradicts the records of the congressional committees. It rests on the absurd premise that the United States, the prime target, is alone among the nations of the world exempt from concerted Soviet subversion and infiltration."

What is the magnitude of the danger?

J. Edgar Hoover, of the FBI, stated in a recent speech:

"I would like to be able to report that the internal enemies of our society have virtually disappeared—that they have faded into the dim past like the dangers of the wagon trail and the Northwest frontier. But this is not so. From the depths of our criminal and subversive underworlds, strong enemies—deadly enemies—continue to challenge the right of decent Americans to live in freedom and dignity under God. The Communist threat from without must not blind us to the Communist threat from within.

"The latter is reaching into the very heart of America through its espionage agents and a cunning, defiant, and lawless Communist Party, which is fanatically dedicated to the Marxist cause of world enslavement and destruction of the foundations of our Republic."

On the other hand, Attorney General Robert Kennedy, in a Los Angeles press conference on March 24, pointed out that the Communist Party had only 10,000 members and characterized it as a "political organization of no danger in the United States."

And the California Federation of Young Democrats reflected their estimate of the internal Communist threat when they recently passed abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and repeal of the State law requiring State employees to sign loyalty oaths.

Which of these estimates of the threat of communism in the United States is most accurate?

The weight of evidence overwhelmingly supports Mr. Hoover's conclusion.

To say that the Communist Party, because of its small membership, is of no danger in the United States is more than a misinterpretation of numbers; it is a misinterpretation of history.

Have we learned no lesson from the Hiss and Rosenberg cases, from the espionage activities of Klaus Fuchs in Great Britain, from the spy ring in Canada or from Robert Sohlen and Irving Scarbeck most recently in the United States? The Communists do not need great numbers to steal state secrets.

Equally important, if not as dramatic as spying, is the alarming success of U.S. Communists in planting and spreading ideas that have affected U.S. policy. For example, Communist fronts and Communist dupes sold the idea of Mao Tse-tung as an agrarian reformer—a propaganda line which considerably influenced our China policy with disasterous effects.

To ignore 10,000 American Communists, in short, would be as foolhardy as to underestimate the Communist guerillas in South Vietnam because they are only a few thousand. Communists around the world operate as an elite corps, not as an infantry division.

The fight against communism within our borders should be joined by every thinking American, regardless of political party. It should not be left by default to those who overestimate or underestimate the danger.

As a minimum program for dealing with communism in the United States, I would suggest the following:

1. The establishment of a privately financed national foundation, headed by men of great prestige and experience, which would be equipped to extend a seal of approval to responsible groups and organizations fighting communism, after a thorough examination of their personnel, programs and financial records.

The private citizen today is in need of some trustworthy guidance in this area. This foundation should be completely nonpartisan. This is not a matter in which Americans should divide as Republicans or Democrats. Too many groups today are confusing the fight against communism with a variety of extraneous political, economic and social issues.

2. Education at the school-age and adult level on Communist tactics, aims and purposes—including high school courses on the contrasts between communism and the principles of free societies, implemented first by the selection of authoritative textbooks and the training of teachers.

The great problem in America today is not too much patriotism or too little patriotism, but too little knowledge—knowledge about communism and about our own way of life.

3. A similar educational program made available to all Americans traveling or living abroad (privately or in Government service) so that they could better serve as ambassadors of freedom throughout the world.

4. Vigorous and strict enforcement of the Subversive Activities Control Act, which requires all Communists to register with the Attorney General, so that they may be labeled properly for what they are.

5. Public support of J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI in the investigation of Communist activities. Those from the far left who have made Hoover into their personal whipping boy will one day discover how scrupulously his methods have upheld civil liberties while doing a superb investigating job.

6. Public support of investigations by legislative committees in this complex field, including those of the Committee on Un-American Activities, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, and the investigating committees of State legislatures. Legislative investigative committees sometimes make mistakes; and when procedures are improper they should be corrected.

But I would suggest that those who have been calling for the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities may one day examine its procedures and discover them to be as fair or more fair than the procedures of other investigating committees which have had their support. The anti-Communist arms of our Government deserve support and constructive suggestions from the press and public, not just carping criticism.

7. Public support of loyalty and security programs for Federal, State, and local employees whose government employment is a privilege, not a right.

8. Denial of the use of tax-supported schools and institutions for speeches by any individuals who have defied the registration provisions of the Subversive Activities Control Act or who have refused to testify before legally constituted grand juries or legislative investigating committees.

I have limited this article to a discussion aimed primarily at the subject of dealing with the danger of communism at home. In my next and last article in this series I shall discuss what I believe are the actions we should take to deal with communism abroad.

Congress Ponders Seat Belts, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, because of the interest in the legislation sponsored by the Honorable KENNETH ROBERTS, of Alabama, I would like to call attention to the Members, the article which appeared in the March 1962 issue, of the Modern Tire Builder, entitled "Congress Ponders Seat Belts, Too."

The article follows:

CONGRESS PONDERS SEAT BELTS, TOO

Like the ASBC, Congress is concerned about the quality of seat belts, too. Their quality is of special concern to House Representative KENNETH A. ROBERTS, Democrat, of Alabama, who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and Safety of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. He has introduced legislation on seat belt quality that should be of interest to all TBA men. Here is an exclusive interview with Representative ROBERTS as reported by Larston Farrar.

Question. Will you describe your so-called seat belt legislation?

Answer. My bill is H.R. 194. It was introduced first in the 85th Congress in 1957, after my subcommittee brought out our report on automobile seat belts.

My bill simply provides that all seat belts shipped in interstate commerce must be manufactured properly of durable materials and in a manner approved by standards to be promulgated by the National Bureau of Standards.

Question. Why is it that so many people thing your legislation makes it compulsory for seat belts to be installed in every vehicle on the road?

Answer. No doubt there is some confusion on this point. My colleague, Congressman JOHN KYL, Republican, of Iowa, has introduced H.R. 3295, which would make it mandatory for automobile manufacturers to install seat belts as standard equipment on new cars sold in interstate commerce.

Question. As chairman of the subcommittee, are you planning to hold hearings on your legislation and Mr. KYL's legislation this year?

Answer. By all means. I believe that, according to present schedule, my subcommittee will get around to seat belt legislation by mid-March, although there is a chance that other hearings we are scheduling will be extended and we will not get to the seat belt legislation until April.

I expect to take testimony on Mr. KYL's bill, too, for it deserves a hearing, although I, personally, am not in favor of the compulsory approach on installation of seat belts. I think it is impossible to frame a law that would make everyone fasten the belts, even if they were standard equipment. Whether or not a person has a seat belt, or many of them, in his car, should be left up to the choice of the individual. As I noted, even if they were installed, it would be impossible to make sure that everyone fastens his belt. This essentially must be an individual matter, in my judgment.

Question. As an Alabaman, and certainly in favor of States rights, how can you justify sponsoring legislation that seems to give so much power to Uncle Sam? Do you, as some charge, want to set up a new bureaucracy to plague businessmen?

Answer. My goal in all my legislation along this line has been to stimulate the industry most vitally concerned to get busy and make changes by voluntary efforts. I have always given the industries involved ample time to formulate adequate programs.

My aim has not been to get restrictive legislation into law, but to use the legislative process as a warning notice, in effect, to the industry that there are groups seeking change and that the changes seem justified.

If the trade associations will get busy—as they did relative to the blowby device—and formulate programs and standards to be certain that people who buy seat belts get only belts of good quality and that these

are installed properly, I will not press for my legislation.

The truth is that the first publicized instance of a flimsy belt—one that does not really offer any protection to a driver in an accident—may be a real black eye to the growing market for seat belts. I am aware that it is a "hot" TBA item, and I believe it will become an even hotter item. There are 82 million vehicles of all kinds registered in the United States. At only a few dollars a seat belt, installed, this runs into the possibility of sales of hundreds of millions of dollars in the coming years.

But even the industry must understand its stake in seeing to it that every possible seat belt manufactured is made of durable materials, and that every installation is made properly, so as to insure the safety of the user.

Question. What do you think of the chances of passage of your specific bill?

Answer. I feel keenly, based on my knowledge of my subcommittee and of the full committee, that this bill can be reported almost without opposition by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the full House would pass it almost without objection, if it were to get to the floor this session. As I have noted, developments by the industry itself could change this picture, for if the industry makes the proper moves, I will not be constrained to push for passage this year. But I want to see action, not just public relations phases.

Question. Do you have any sales tips for tire dealers who are pushing seat belt installations?

Answer. I certainly do. I feel that they are engaged in doing a badly needed job for the public in helping to alert people to the safety measures of seat belts. Testimony taken years ago by my subcommittee indicated that every traffic authority, every safety expert, and others who had studied the use of the seat belt (with one exception) endorsed the use of such belts as a precautionary safety measure that can cut down the ghastly accident toll in the United States.

It seems to me that tire dealers would do themselves up proud by leading in both setting standards for materials used in seat belts, and proper types of installation of such belts. This is the guts of what I'm trying to do—get the associations to set up standards, and procedures, so that the members of the public interested in getting seat belts will be sure to get the proper type, properly installed.

If I were a dealer, besides making certain that my belts met strict standards, if these have been promulgated and approved, and making certain that my installation was of the best and the safest type, I would advertise it, both in streamers and other ways. I know that the market is growing, and I am a great believer that consumer satisfaction is the best way to get real sales in any retail situation.

The Phony Urban Affairs Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, by the overwhelming vote of the House, the President was told that the country did not want his phony Department of Urban Affairs bill.

To further prove the point, Charles P. Taft—hardly a rightwinger—in a letter to the New York Times shows how by a bit of reorganization by the President the purposes can be accomplished without adding another bureaucratic department to our already overburdened taxpayer.

The letter follows:

URBAN AFFAIRS PROPOSAL QUERIED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

During the discussion of the President's proposal for a Department of Urban Affairs, you published several editorials supporting it. While I agree wholly with the objectives you have set out in your editorials, I must take issue with the idea that the proposed Department would accomplish anything in that direction.

The proposal was nothing more than to make the Housing and Home Finance Agency a Cabinet department. It not only did not bring into that, the new Department, any of the varied agencies with which cities have to deal; it did not even give the new Cabinet officer authority to compel coordination between Federal Housing Administration and Urban Renewal in his own Department. It would still have left the constant lack of planning and operating coordination between Urban Renewal and the Bureau of Public Roads.

Collins, mayor of Seattle and president of the American Municipal Association, in testifying on February 8 for the bill, said that, whether it passed or not, it was essential to have a strong and adequate Urban Affairs staff in the White House if any real coordination was to be secured in the Federal Government on urban affairs.

A new Secretary for urban affairs under the President's bill could not have called the head of Public Roads. He must call Secretary of Commerce Hodges. The White House can call anybody if the President backs him up.

The President can set up such a staff by himself with no legislation. The City Charter Committee of Cincinnati wrote him after the bill's defeat to suggest he do so.

CHARLES P. TAFT.

CINCINNATI, *March 20, 1962.*

Congressman Santangelo: A Fighter for Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 8, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, February 4, 1962, I had the pleasure of presenting to Ed Re, Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, one of President Kennedy's great appointments, the coveted award of the Federation of Italian-American Democratic Clubs of the State of New York. Also receiving a similar award were Michael Capanegro, learned assemblyman from the County of Queens, and Fred Baroni, an outstanding assistant district attorney of Bronx County. A surprise of the evening was the presentation of the Menorah Award to my colleague [ALFRED E. SANTANGELO], by the Israel Consul David Ben-Dov in behalf of his Government, the State of Israel. This award was given to Congressman SANTANGELO for his part in fighting discrimination against the State of Israel and for his activities in the promotion of Inter-Faith relationships. The American Jewish Ledger on October 26, 1961 carried the story of Congressman SANTANGELO's fight against discrimination in behalf of the State of Israel. I commend the article to the readers.

The article follows:

[From the American Jewish Ledger, Oct. 26, 1961]

B. & W. STOPS 5-YEAR CIGARETTE WAR WITH JEWS—BROWN & WILLIAMSON SWITCHES SIGNALS; ECONOMIC POSITION "BECAME UNTENABLE"; JWV AND CONGRESSMAN SANTANGELO FORCE THROUGH FINAL CHANGE IN COMPANY POLICY

(By Simon Bloom)

Last week, every "thinking" Jew was electrified when he heard that the company that was selling (or trying to sell) the "thinking man's" cigarette in this country had finally agreed to sell cigarettes to Israel. The company was the Brown & Williamson Co. of Louisville. It had refused to sell cigarettes to Israel and its sale of cigarettes in this country had continued to drop, drop, drop, going from bad to worse. Protests had been made for 5 years by the Jewish War Veterans, and finally other Jewish organizations became concerned, but still the company was adamant. No cigarettes to Israel.

Then last week it became OK to sell cigarettes to Israel, and the Israel Trade Commission issued an order allowing the B. & W. to export its cigarettes. The order could have been had at any time the last 5 years, but the company didn't want it.

What brought about the switch in signals of the company? That is the $64 question, I was told, by Meyer London, of Teaneck, N.J., of the Jewish War Veterans. I asked that question of other top JWV officials, of the B. & W. Co. official in Louisville to whom I spoke, of Congressman ALFRED E. SANTANGELO.

The answer? I didn't get it. The story may never be forthcoming. It might be like the Balfour Declaration which was issued in 1917 and just last year a man wrote a book, supposedly giving the story of how the Balfour declaration came to be issued. It took 43 years for that story to be revealed. The story of the B. & W. Co. capitulation hasn't been revealed, but I am telling you here what I was able to find out.

The story itself is simple. It involves two cigarette companies, one called the British American Tobacco Co. and the other the Brown & Williamson Co. The British American I was told is one of the 10 big corporations of the world. If it is the 11th, I am quite sure that the company won't sue me for libel. I don't think they will, for neither they nor their offspring the B. & W. Co. of Louisville sued the Jewish War Veterans for libel even though they twice threatened them when the JWV put its educational pamphlets out.

ARAB PRESSURE

The British American Tobacco Co. pressured by the Arabs agreed not to sell their cigarettes to Israel. So they transmitted that order to their B. & W. Co. The B. & W. Co. thereupon refused to sell all its cigarettes to Israel, it would sell just certain ones. JWV protested to the B. & W. Co. and it commenced an educational campaign among its members that they should stop buying the cigarettes made by B. & W.

When I learned that the B. & W. Co. had gotten a certificate to export its cigarettes I picked up the phone and called the company in Louisville. I was connected with Addison Yaeman the general counsel for the company who is also attorney in this country for the British American tobacco firm. He told me to hold the phone and he got John Blalock, the public relations director

to talk to me. "What brought about the switch in signals," I asked Blalock. "Why after 5 years of refusing to sell cigarettes to Israel, has the company changed its mind."

BECOMES UNTENABLE

"When it becomes untenable here, we made a new agreement," said Blalock. "We were trying to do this for years." They were unable to do it, I gathered, because of the agreement entered into by the parent company of London. In 1956 the British American "who own many tobacco companies," said Blalock, had entered into an agreement with Saudi Arabia that they would not sell cigarettes to Israel. If B. & W. will now sell cigarettes to Israel, does that mean that the agreement of 1956 has been broken by your parent company I asked. I didn't get a direct answer. What I got was "the 1956 agreement is not in effect as far as B. & W."

Why was it in effect then, all the preceding 5 years? I didn't ask that question but instead I asked Blalock just what he meant by the company's position being "untenable" here. "Did your company's sale of cigarettes drop so that you had to change your position?"

NOT FOR QUOTE

I didn't get an answer to that, either. What I got was "The word 'untenable' is not for quote, Mr. Bloom." Well, friend Blalock, when I called you, I introduced myself as the editor of this paper and you did not put me under oath of not quoting you.

GOOD ECONOMICS

"Was it because of any pressure groups, you switched your signals?" I asked. Blalock didn't like the words "pressure groups," and he indicated to me that they were sort of impolite words, not fitting for a good American. "Pressure groups are one thing. Good economics is another." O.K., my friend, but if it is good economics in 1961 to sell to Israel, why wasn't it good economics to sell to Israel in 1956? I guess the answer is, it took the B. & W. Co. and its London hierarchy all this time to find it out.

The London office prides itself on economics. I spoke to Abraham Kraditor, who is a past national commander of the Jewish War Veterans. Kraditor, who is a lawyer in New York, is the chairman of the foreign affairs committee and he told me that in the year 1959 he and other Jewish officials were in the Waldorf suite of Philip Klutznik. They were there talking to Yaeman, W. S. Cutchins, president of the B. & W. Co., and Duncan Oppenheim, chairman of the board of directors of the British-American Tobacco Co. The matter being discussed by the group of tobacco officials was the refusal of their companies to sell cigarettes to Israel. Oppenheim (no Jew despite his name) said it was all a matter of dollars, "Gentlemen we have to reason with economics." The Arabs had told them to stop selling to the State of Israel and they were complying. It was as simple as that.

OTHER COMPANIES

When the JWV officials pointed out that other big corporations had been similarly threatened by the Arabs but they had disregarded the threats and kept on doing business with Israel, it meant nothing to the tobacco hucksters. Emerson Radio, Dow Chemical, General Tire and many others had never succumbed to the Arab threats; and two that had, the Shell Oil and American Express altered their trade policies and they had found their business had not been harmed. It all meant nothing to Oppenheim.

GOT NOWHERE

"We got nowhere," Kraditor told me. Kraditor continued traveling throughout the country telling JWV members and families of the fact that an American company was refusing to sell its cigarettes to Israel. The JWV put out one pamphlet of which they printed 200,000 copies in which they told the story of how B. & W. refused to sell to Israel, and then they printed a second edition called "Smokescreen of Cowardice and Deceit," with another enormous print run. I was informed by a high JWV official that still another big print order was in the planning stage.

SALES DROP

The JWV has an enormous membership of 150,000 veterans and the sale of the B. & W. cigarettes continued to drop. "The advertising agency of the B. & W. account made a fortune, made it from tzuros," said Kraditor. Fortunes were appropriated and spent to get the American people to smoke the B. & W. cigarettes. But the quiet educational program got results. I was told by Morton London, who is a member of the national executive of JWV and who once was the national chairman of foreign affairs committee that the situation was getting such that the company couldn't sell a carton of cigarettes in the Weequahic section of Newark. Large sums of money were offered by the sales manager of B. & W. to various food and chainstores to display the company product in the Weequahic area, but it was no go. And the pattern was the same all over the country.

Still, the B. & W. refused to sell its cigarettes to Israel. "All a matter of economics, old boy, doncher know."

PLANTS CONFISCATED

The Arab friends of the British American Tobacco Co., decided to confiscate the plants of the British American in Egypt. "So what," cried Oppenheim in his scotch and soda, "let us wait and maybe they will give us our lovely plants back. Why should we hasten to sell to those blasted Israelis. We still have that 1956 agreement with the Saudi Arabians, you know."

So Oppenheim waited and so did B. & W. Oppenheim could have with profit opened up his Bible and turned to II Kings 19 where it tells what happens when you place your confidence in Egypt, "this bruised reed whereon if a man lean it will go into his hand and pierce it." They got pierced and when they finally realized they couldn't hope to ransom their cigarette manufactories they publicly confessed so in the financial pages of the New York Times.

But cigarettes to Israel? No, not yet.

MORE MEETINGS

And the conference of presidents of Jewish organizations met and had pow-wow and letters and meetings were had with B. & W. And still no cigarettes. And still the sales drop.

THE SANTANGELO CHAPTER

And here is where we enter upon what may have been the decisive element in this whole bizarre drama. Though who can tell, only those who sit in on the makings of the decision of the British American Tobacco Co., know. The curtain rises on an entirely different set of actors and a different mise-en-scene involving the Liggett & Myers Tobacco Co., and their TV production the "Untouchables." In that production there were derogatory reflections upon Italians and one man rose who has been described to me as "fearless" and he said to the giant tobacco corporation, "Put the 'Untouchables' on, the way you have it, you will be sorry. You are undermining the decency of a vast group of American citizens, those of Italian extraction. Don't do it, until you eliminate the derogatory reflections." The "fearless" man who said that was Congressman ALFRED SANTANGELO of New York. He rose like David against Goliath.

The giant corporation mocked him. The distribution of the Liggett & Myers cigarettes then stopped in 5 States within 48 hours. That is what Congressman SANTANGELO told me he accomplished. The TV show was picketed. And the Liggett people decided they didn't want their distribution stopped in 6 States, and then 7 and who knows perhaps the whole 50. So the "Untouchables" became touchable, touched up by SANTANGELO. And lo and behold, the number of cigarettes of the company that continued to be sold did not decrease in volume, even though actors made no derogatory references. Amazing.

Even with that sad story of a competitor having been played before them the B. & W. people were unmoved. Gad, they were as immovable as Gibraltar. Until they themselves met up with SANTANGELO. He told me on the phone he had received help from Jewish people in his fight again the "Untouchables" and he felt the situation involving the refusal of B. & W. to sell cigarettes had repercussions that involved American democracy. So the man who put the kibosh on the Liggett & Myers production, the man who has the real American fire in his blood, told me he communicated on August 14 with the B. & W. people, and he told them he was giving them 1 month to discontinue their boycotting of Israel. He cut through all the fancy language, Kraditor told me. He used simple, blunt words. He used the word "boycott," which everyone in their talks to me had been very careful not to use. But SANTANGELO when I spoke to him, said that he told the B. & W. Co. they must discontinue their boycott.

"YOU TALK ROUGH"

Else, he would commence a contrary boycott in this country of their products. There are 2,500 Italian clubs in New York which look up to this man, and they passed a resolution condemning the practice of B. & W., and a copy of it was sent to B. & W., Yaeman, one of the big guns of B. & W. sat down with SANTANGELO, and Yaeman, according to SANTANGELO admitted the policy of the company was wrong. But it would take time to get it changed. He pleaded he needed time. "You talk rough," he told SANTANGELO, and he wanted to know how SANTANGELO would implement any boycott.

"Reflect on what occurred with Liggett & Myers," was SANTANGELO's answer. "I told him they would be hurt if they didn't deliver the goods. I told them I would secure the cooperation of cigarette distributors, I would get the longshoremen to stop the loading of their cigarettes. I was all geared for action. To my mind, their conduct was completely undemocratic. The State of Israel is a democracy and an unhealthy condition had existed for 5 years. It was absolutely wrong, it was wholly out of the spirit of our way of life, and it was high time it was changed."

The Congressman sent letters to the Attorney General in which he queried whether there was a violation of antitrust law; he communicated with Secretary of State Rusk asking whether the conduct of B. & W. wasn't inimical to our foreign policy; he had material introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD showing how strange the policy of B. & W. was.

He had given, he told me, B. & W. 1 month to change their policy. Before the deadline of September 15 came around, SANTANGELO was contacted by the president of B. & W., S. W. Cutchins, who asked for an extension of 1 month. "Give us until October 15." That was agreeable to SANTANGELO. What a story would be unfolded to the American public if one could but know what went on in the secret meetings of the directors of the mammoth British American Tobacco Co. as they sat down to ponder on the ultimatum of this one sole American.

No one knows as yet the straw that broke the camel's back. We do know that the B. & W. Co. has capitulated and now they say the agreement of the British American Tobacco Co. of 1956 with Saudi Arabia has no bearing on its conduct. The world's busi-

nessmen have gotten another lesson in how to do business, the cigarette business.

In finishing this story I want to offer the tycoons of business a suggestion. But before I do I want Tycoon Cutchins to know that Blalock did a fine public relations job. He wanted his name kept out of the story completely and he wanted all credit to go to you. I am quoting him now when he said: "W. S. Cutchins, president of B. & W. says he is very pleased that a mutually satisfactory agreement has been reached. He is particularly happy because it removes any doubt in this country that the B. & W. will sell all cigarettes it manufactures to Israel, and it hopes that our good Jewish friends will continue to be our friends."

I don't know if your B. & W. has a suggestion box so I am making the suggestion in my paper, Mr. Crutchins. The first suggestion is to elevate Blalock to a vice presidency which I suppose pays around $30,000 in your company. I have talked to many P.R. people in my time, and he would be worth every cent. He did a bangup job with me.

But the real suggestion I want to put in your suggestion box is that as your company and the British American are so concerned with "economics" in the running of your businesses, it ought to hire some Jewish vice presidents, who may have a little better knack of tieing up a package of human dignity along with economics. Give it some thought.

But above all, don't hire Abraham Kraditor or even think of him for the job. For I learned that in his speaking tours throughout the country on a couple of occasions your topmen refused to appear on the same platform with him. His analysis of the economics involved was too keen. He would sell so many cigarettes to the Americans that your production facilities wouldn't be able to manufacture them fast enough. Then the Arabs wouldn't be able to get hold of any at all, and then where would you be? What a muddle you would have then with Saudi Arabia.

Steel Hanky-Panky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, press agentry is the fact of life of the Kennedy administration and it has claimed all the credit for the recent steel settlement. Donald I. Rogers, financial expert of the New York Herald Tribune, reveals hitherto unknown facts concerning the settlement and makes very interesting reading:

STEEL HANKY-PANKY

(By Donald I. Rogers)

Although there is an industrywide effort to keep the facts from seeping to the public, the steel companies involved in the so-called settlement with the United Steelworkers of America on a new labor contract, are seething with indignation over the way Labor Secretary Arthur Goldberg and the White House parlayed a tentative general agreement on terms into a major public relations coup.

At stake, the steel companies feel, is the principle of collective bargaining.

There is some doubt that the agreement, as announced, was the final one that would have been reached. Both the steel companies and the negotiators from the union never feel that they have a firm agreement until contracts have been signed. Yet, before the negotiators of both sides had even reached the handshaking stage, news of the settlement was leaked from Washington in a method that is now becoming a familiar pattern.

While some 30-odd trained labor reporters were waiting around in Pittsburgh, eager for word from behind closed doors where negotiations were taking place, a mysterious announcement in Washington made it possible for the two major news services to break the story of the agreement.

No one knows exactly how it happened. It is reported—merely reported, not confirmed—that Secretary Goldberg called in some of his trusted friends of the press early last Wednesday (day of the announced settlement) and told them of the terms of the agreement. Then later he called another press conference in which he expressed indignation that one of the news outlets had leaked the story.

Almost simultaneously the two wire services moved the story.

The Associated Press used it with a Washington dateline.

United Press International used it with a Pittsburgh date.

The story was in city rooms all over America while the press corps covering the negotiations in Pittsburgh was still waiting for word from behind the closed doors. If some of those reporters have found difficulty in explaining their tardiness in getting the story to their editors, this is the reason:

The story was planted in Washington, even before the agreement had been reached. It was planted by the Department of Labor.

Says the trade magazine, American Metal Market, editorially: "It would not be a surprise to any one to learn that terms of the agreement announced by Secretary Goldberg were the same as those the Kennedy administration has said would be acceptable."

Strangely, on that hectic day of turbulent reportage, none of the press agents in the Labor Department or the White House was available after the stories had been kited by the wire services.

Strangely, too, it had been an open secret in Washington for 2 weeks previous that there would be no pay raise in the settlement in Pittsburgh.

The administration takes the bows on the premise that the settlement is noninflationary because it will not result in price rises in steel. While the steel negotiators agree that there will probably not be a price increase, they do not share the happy view about the settlement being noninflationary.

The new agreements cover a 2-year span, but are reopenable for wage rates, pensions, insurance, and certain contractural items on 90 days' notice after April 30, 1963.

They provide for a wide range of new benefits in the fields of seniority, pensions, vacations, and supplemental unemployment benefits. They also include a novel savings and vacation plan designed to open new job opportunities by giving added vacations to employees and encouraging retirement of longer service employees.

The steel companies estimate that benefits will increase employment costs by about 2½ percent during the first year. This compares with an average annual increase of from 3½ to 3¾ percent under the existing contract, and 8 percent per year in the 20 years 1940–60.

Whether all this is inflationary or not remains to be seen.

Of more immediate concern is the suspicion that the Government, by taking a coercive position in this and by playing the situation into press agentry, has dealt another severe blow to free collective bargaining.

Under pressure from the White House and the Labor Department we may be substituting the power and influence of Government for good labor practices.

Mr. Jelesnik and the "Salt Lake Philharmonic"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID S. KING

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the people of Utah and of the Nation can be justly proud of the life and activities of Eugene Jelesnik.

Mr. Jelesnik, conductor of the Salt Lake Philharmonic Orchestra, violinist and composer, left behind him the bright lights of Broadway just 17 years ago to live in the place he loves best, his now adopted State of Utah. Born in Russia on March 19, 1914, Mr. Jelesnik came to the United States with his mother when he was 11 years old to seek his musical future in the promised land. Shortly after his arrival, he received a musical scholarship through the New York Philharmonic, and pursued his career with one thing in mind—repaying his country for the privilege of being an American.

To Mr. Jelesnik, financial remuneration is only secondary to his art and service to his community. In Salt Lake City where he now resides with his wife, Virginia, Mr. Jelesnik brought to Utah the old musical tradition of the "Pops concerts." His first concert was at the Liberty Park bandstand, overlooking the lake, on September 1, 1947. Ever since that date, these concerts have been repeated, much to the delight of music lovers. These concerts are presented free to the public and are sponsored annually by the city of Salt Lake and the parks department as a public service. For the past 10 years, Mr. Jelesnik directed, and still directs, the musical Pops concerts for the annual "Days of 1947" celebration which commemorates the entry of the Mormon pioneers into the Salt Lake valley in 1847.

Every year during the Christmas holidays, Mr. Jelesnik assembles a group of entertainers for the annual Christmas cheer tour, which takes the performers to every major hospital and the blind center in the area.

Although he made a good living as a musician during World War II, he devoted much of his time in entertaining our GI's in connection with the USO camp shows, both in the United States and overseas. While waiting to go overseas, Mr. Jelesnik performed in every Army and Navy hospital in the United States. In February 1944 he left to go overseas and performed under fire on the "Fox Hole Circuit" in the Mediterranean theater of operations where he played in the frontlines in Italy. For the 145 performances he gave before a total of 56,640 soldiers there, Mr. Jelesnik re-

ceived from the War Department his most treasured possession, the Civilian Service Award Ribbon.

Mr. Jelesnik and his variety artists also traveled over 35,000 miles to entertain our soldiers in Korea, Japan, Philippine Islands, Okinawa, Guam, and Hawaii. Mr. Jelesnik's show "Magic and Melody" was acclaimed as "one of the best, if not the best, entertainment units ever to play in Korea." For his tour of the Far East Command, Mr. Jelesnik received a Silver Medal Citation.

As a composer, Mr. Jelesnik holds an appointment to the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers. It was through his untiring efforts on behalf of the community in which he lives, that public musical tributes were given to two outstanding Utahans and world renowned musical figures, Mr. Otto Harbach and Mr. Harold Orlob. Indeed, Mr. Jelesnik himself is a source of great pride for all Utahans. His great ability, mixed with his desire to serve, has indeed made a substantial contribution to the field of music.

The President's Trade Bill Analyzed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee is presently holding hearings on the President's Trade Expansion Act of 1962. There has been much misinformation in the press concerning the bill and I believe it is important for the Members of Congress to know exactly what the program is and what it will do to American business, to jobs, and to the free enterprise system. Following are two letters written to the Wall Street Journal which offer a lucid explanation of the inherent dangers in the proposal now before Ways and Means. Included also, as a part of these remarks, is an editorial from the Wall Street Journal which supplements the two letters.

The letters and editorial follow:

TARIFFS AND TRADE—TWO READERS TAKE ISSUE WITH THE PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM

THE ISSUE ISN'T TARIFFS

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

For an economist who, with the majority of his colleagues, has year in and year out preached the doctrine of free trade, patiently explained the theory of comparative advantage, and exposed the fallacies of the protectionists, it is a peculiarly ungrateful task to have to say nay to the President's proposals for tariff reform. And yet it is urgently necessary that this be said before, in the general euphoria surrounding this venture, we are led to take a step which could end in national disaster.

Let it be said at the outset that tariff reduction is good, and for all those excellent reasons set forth in innumerable textbooks. But tariff reduction is at present only one of the adjustments the United States needs to make if it is to survive, economically, in changed world surroundings.

Far more important than tariff reform is reform of our internal economy, away from the collectivist-inflationary policies of the Keynesian orthodoxy and back to the principles of a genuinely competitive market economy, to fiscal and monetary discipline in the public and private sectors.

It is one of the ironies of history that the United States, which reached the zenith of its economic power without benefit of Keynesianism, should be clinging doggedly in its hour of distress to economic shibboleths which were the ruination of our neighbors in Europe and which they have long since abandoned. Unless we too abandon these stale and unprofitable doctrines we cannot meet the serious economic challenge which these neighbors—in the Common Market and out of it—are now presenting to us.

There is as yet, unfortunately, little evidence that U.S. policymakers have awakened to the fact that the United States is no longer a free agent in the international economy; that it is no longer able to do what it wants internally, letting the world take the hindmost.

At bottom, the problem facing the Nation is not whether the movement for tariff reform (good in itself) will succeed, but whether domestic inflationary pressures—created by perpetually rising wages and Federal deficits—will be reduced or, optimally, eliminated altogether. If such pressures are not contained, excess demand at home (which is the initial form inflation takes) may be expected to consume exportable resources, thus slowing exports, and to suck in larger quantities of imports. Reduction of tariffs under such circumstances will merely have the effect of accelerating these unfavorable movements in the trade balance.

But let the protectionists, those manipulators of the power of Government for selfish advantage, not take comfort in these observations. Only about 30 percent—$5 billion worth—of U.S. imports are directly competitive with American-produced goods. Consequently, the damage to American industry and to American job opportunities from marked increases in imports may not be as severe overall as is sometimes feared—though it is doubtless true that import-caused dislocations in specific industries and in individual firms could be considerable. There can be little doubt, in any case, of the ultimate value of subjecting domestic industry to the fresh winds of foreign competition. Economic stagnation breeds under the mantle of protectionism.

While it is likely, though not certain, that we shall be able to take the longrun structural consequences of increased imports in stride, this is definitely not the case with respect to the shortrun balance-of-payments effects of increased imports. It is these effects which demand attention as never before.

Now it is argued that against the possible structural dislocations (unemployment) and the worsening of the balance-of-payments deficit which increased imports would bring about, must be set the presumed rise in exports which the lowering of other countries' tariffs (under a system of mutually negotiated tariff reductions) would induce. But it is precisely here that we find the rub: Will the mere lowering of other countries' tariffs bring about an increase in U.S. exports? Or are there other factors—domestic inflationary pressures, to name one—which would hold back U.S. export growth?

No responsible economist has ever argued for the abolition of all tariffs overnight since the ensuing shortrun dislocations in patterns of consumption, production, and employment could send the economy into a severe tailspin, internally. Moreover, in the present conjuncture, such action could bankrupt us externally as well. But it is the inflationists in our midst and the growth-at-any-cost advocates who make the laudable venture in even gradual tariff reduction so risky.

The issue is not tariff reform or no tariff reform. It is whether we should have tariff reform with, or tariff reform without internal fiscal, monetary, and economic reforms. The American people need to be alerted to the administration's deceitful attempt to befuddle the issues in noble rhetoric: To have it believed that tariffs can be lowered (with impunity) while at the same time the Nation continues its present inflatory course—Federal budget deficits and the coddling of labor bosses—unaltered. The one word which seems not to be present in the vocabulary of the New Frontier is "priorities." Everything is demanded, and promised, at once: From a landing on the moon, medicare for the aged, Federal aid for the colleges, foreign aid for India, shorter workweeks with higher pay, more subsidies for everybody.

According to the sophisticated reasoning of some, unless we Americans join the Common Market, we shall perish economically. Join it, by lowering our tariffs, we shall be saved. This is not true. None of the nations now members of the Common Market were made economically virtuous by reason of their membership in that economic entity. They were virtuous, or returned to virtue (witness the case of France) prior to and as a condition of such membership. Nor can the United States expect to succeed, inside or outside of the Common Market, unless it mends its domestic ways.

The battle for tariff reform is the wrong battle being fought on the wrong battlefield.

PATRICK M. BOARMAN,
Associate Professor of Economics,
Bucknell University.

A BUSINESSMAN VIEWS TARIFFS

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

The lack of constructive argument on the proposed Kennedy tariff bill has anyone with a real acquaintance of our trading conditions abroad aghast at the naivete with which this measure has been accepted.

My claim to speak is based on nearly 30 years of business activity all over the world—particularly in Europe. I have just returned from another month in Europe, where I made a particular effort to inquire into the European Common Market and its effect on us.

First, we are being fed the theory—as a fact—that the European Common Market is a success, and that we better get in now while we can. This is simply not true.

Trade barriers are still up between the members of the European Common Market and will not be eliminated for another 5 years, if then. The elimination is slow, step by slow step; already, many exceptions are being acted on which will result, in my opinion, in never bringing about a pure customs union.

Our own legislation, although supposed to span a period of 5 years, gives President Kennedy's Tariff Commission acceleration power—if they want it. We could very well, under the hazy idea of the importance of immediacy, go out ahead of the Common Market and cause the destruction of our protection. Furthermore, the European Common Market is at present a fairly well balanced unit with Germany, France and Belgium supplying industrial products, while Luxembourg, Italy, and Holland supply agricultural. No one can forecast what will happen when England with her industrial potential begins to compete industrially, or when Norway and Sweden compete agriculturally. In a word, the European Common Market is at present in a state of flux and will be for some time, yet we are being importuned to take out at least a partial ownership in this unknown quantity.

Second, the political implications of our partial or, some day, full partnership with Europe have never been brought out, presumably because it is felt better tactics to let that happen gradually.

However, it is absolutely clear in Europe that political overtones are already acted upon. Some of these ideas are socialistic in the extreme, and if America were either a part or full partner, and that is the direction, it would ultimately cause a loss of a great part of our sovereignty.

For example, European Common Market officials are now proposing that labor fringe benefits be averaged up to the level of the most advanced member, on the basis that it would give those countries without such benefits an unfair economic advantage. America might, therefore, some day be in a position where, in order to hold a market within this zone, we could be forced to surrender certain rights of choice simply because, unless we did, we could be considered in unfair competition. We might have to give up economic advantages on which we depend.

Third, the effect of tariff cuts in the United States is much too quickly and vaguely put aside.

Considerable credibility is being given to the fact that labor rates in the European Common Market will come up to meet ours. This is simply not true. In our company we employ skilled mechanical engineers and draftsmen at an average rate of $700 a month. They are the best in our industry, and probably in the world, but last month in Europe I checked the rates on these men's opposite numbers in Switzerland, Germany, France and England, and the rate was never over $200 a month.

Even assuming a 100 percent increase increase in efficiency for the Americans, that still means we are nearly 100 percent over the European cost in this field. How can we hope to compete in Europe with this disadvantage, particularly with mass produced products where labor is unskilled?

We have had tariffs for a long time. They are part of our calculations as an economic fact, and even if wrong, cannot be quickly altered without considerable adjustment. We have had the Reciprocal Trade Act since Roosevelt's time and generally it has allowed for an orderly adjustment of these matters.

This act already permits our Government to negotiate with others and to make arrangements with due hearings to interested parties, but it does in addition one thing that Mr. Kennedy's new bill proposes to change. It allows Congress to have some control of the procedure. In the new legislation, under the guise of the requirement for more efficient negotiation with the European Common Market, the new Tariff Commission will report to Congress. This means centralization of control in the Executive over tariffs and a surrender to the Executive of the power of Congress.

Section 8 of the Constitution gives to Congress, and only to Congress, the right to impose duties and to regulate commerce with foreign nations. James Monroe, who was responsible for this clause, named it as the most important in the Constitution, because it gave to Congress, the direct representatives of the people, the power to adjust inequities.

I am horrified at the lack of thought given to this subject. It seems to me every American should ask himself what this would mean to him personally.

Why, for example, when our favorable balance of trade of $5 billion is eaten up by foreign aid and spending abroad, do we use this solution for attempting to cure our excessive foreign aid commitments?

Why should we not wait until the European Common Market becomes successful before we start tearing up our own system? We certainly can negotiate in 3 or 4 years as well as today.

What political implications are involved for us in the future, when we may have to follow our economic commitments which have been made in Europe?

Finally, does anyone really believe that increased imports of textiles from Belgium, electronic equipment from France, electrical components from Holland, machinery from Germany, and clothing from Italy at lower prices than American products, are really going to solve our problems?

BRUCE L. SIMPSON,
President, National Engineering Co.

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK—THE WRONG TRADE BATTLE

This morning we publish two letters expressing views which have been pretty much drowned out by the barrage laid down for the administration's tariff bill. Both of them ought to be heard.

We do not, of course, share all the views of Mr. Bruce Simpson. Essentially he is making a protectionist argument; it seems clear from his letter that he thinks tariffs can make us more prosperous by keeping out foreign goods, and he prefers them higher rather than lower.

Nonetheless, Mr. Simpson raises some pointed questions about the Common Market, which in Washington's habitual fashion is being overvalued and oversold beyond its merits and promises, both of which are great. What he has to say about the unprecedented Presidential power in this bill is quite appropriate. And he is right in warning against the easy notion that we are "really going to solve" our balance-of-payments problems by just tinkering with our tariffs.

It is to this point that Dr. Boarman of Bucknell particularly addresses himself in his letter. Dr. Boarman, like ourselves, believes in the virtues of free trade. He knows that a true lowering of trade barriers is a stimulus to growth and prosperity, and therefore to the American advantage.

But Dr. Boarman is reminding us that tariffs are but one among many barriers, and that even all the tangible barriers together—including direct controls—are not the real obstacle. Therefore, merely lowering the tariff barriers might be catastrophic.

A tariff simply raises a price differential between a foreign product and a domestic one. It is therefore a barrier that can be leaped if the cost of the American product is so high as to offset the price differential. This isn't so with direct controls. What, then, is the gain for freer trade when a tariff is eliminated entirely and replaced with a rigid import quota?

Worse: What is the gain for anything, free trade or American prosperity, to remove all of the nominal barriers such as tariffs or quotas if there confronts American producers an even greater barrier to selling competitively against foreign producers? No barrier is so insurmountable for American industry as a cost of production forced high by domestic monetary and labor policies.

This being so, those who complain that a sudden lowering of tariffs will cause an injurious inflow of foreign goods, with painful pressure on our short-term balance of payments, have a point not to be dismissed. They have reason, too, to question whether the vaunted increase in American exports would actually take place even if by some miracle the Common Market lowered all its tariffs by a like amount.

Producers in an economy still under inflationary pressure will not find it easy to compete with producers in countries, such as most of Europe today, where inflation has been halted. A tariff is at most but one factor in the total cost of a product delivered to a customer.

It is not difficult to see what would happen in practice from a deep reduction in general U.S. tariffs if our inflationary domestic policies remain unchanged. Tariffs might be reduced, but the political pressure from the resultant upheaval would give birth to direct controls—temporarily, of course, and as relief measures. If you doubt this, look at what has actually happened in the case of textiles.

If anyone supposes this to be an argument for protectionism, he is quite mistaken. To retain protectionist policies in the hope they will let us safely continue domestic inflationary policies is the worst sort of illusion. To do so would steadily widen the gulf between the United States and the rest of the industrialized Western World. We would daily have more difficulty in resisting the pressures of cheaper foreign products, more difficulty in selling U.S.-made products abroad. All our problems, including those of our balance of payments, would be compounded.

This country has got to move toward freer trade, for the simple reason that in its own interests it cannot do otherwise. But the crux of the matter is not tariffs. What is imperative is that we get our own house in order, our labor policies, our fiscal policies, our monetary policies. If we don't do that then the battle will, as Dr. Boarman says, have been fought upon the wrong field.

Do We Need Another CCC?—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD part two of an article in the March 1962 issue of American Forests by John Prokop. In part two he appraises the arguments for and against the reestablishment of a CCC-type organization.

OPPONENTS SAY YCC'ERS NOT INTERESTED IN YOUTH

The opponents of a YCC program have many different and conflicting arguments on why such a program is not needed.

First they contend that the proponents of the bill are more interested in conservation than in the problem of youth unemployment and delinquency. When YCC'ers deny this and point out that the YCC program provides a mutual solution, and, at least, a partial solution, to both problems, then the anti-YCC people shout that there is no national unemployment problem such as there was during the depression of the 1930's to warrant the establishment of the YCC.

But pro-YCC people never said there was nationwide unemployment. Though they did point out that the young people who live in the "poverty pockets" scattered throughout America, as of May 1961, amounted to 555,000 youths between the ages of 16 and 21 who were neither in school nor at work. When school closed for the summer, this number swelled to 1,460,000. Most of these youngsters were looking for work, but couldn't find it. For our youth in the 16 to 21 age group, the unemployment rate is twice as high as in any other group, and because of their lack of skills or training, they represent a high number of the unemployable.

Right, say the anti-YCC'ers. And the YCC won't teach them anything but "pick and shovel" work. When the boys leave the YCC they won't have any skill or training more useful than when they went in. That, however, appears to be an unreasonable distortion of the truth.

There will be pick-and-shovel work and there will be plenty of other work. The old CCC boys completed some fantastic projects which required skill, the ability to absorb plenty of information, and carry out complicated instructions. The statistics of the total amount of work done by the CCC is tremendous. In the 8 years of its existence before World War II forced its conclusion, the CCC built 126,000 miles of trails and minor roads, planted whole forests for a total of 2,356 million trees, laid 89,000 miles of telephone lines, spent 6,459,000 man-days fighting forest fires, built 6,660,000 erosion control check dams, and covered 21 million acres checking trees, plant disease, and pest control. There are 3½ more pages listing line by line the CCC's accomplishments, and only a small portion listed is pick-and-shovel work.

The anti-YCC'ers retort, "It will be cheaper to hire regular employees than to start camps." The estimated cost of maintaining an enrollee for 1 year by the Forest Service was about $3,330, and by the Senate subcommittee, between $3,100 and $3,250. These estimates are exclusive of camp construction. The average salary an enrollee would receive in a year would be $720, and this is included in his maintenance cost. The Army Engineers who have experience building many camps, estimate that it would cost $250,000 to build an adequate YCC camp with all necessary features and facilities; their estimate is below the estimates of the Department of the Interior ($260,000) and Department of Agriculture ($340,000).

The old CCC had during its time 4,500 different camps, with the average number of 1,643 camps operating at any one time. Over 3 million young men, war veterans, Indians, and territorials participated. It got off to a magnificent start under its dynamic first Director, Robert Fechner. James J. McEntee, the Director of the CCC's last years, estimated that it advanced natural resource conservation in such fields as reforestation and erosion control from 25 to 35 years, completing work in these two fields alone of a then estimated value of $1,750 million. The total cost for the 10-year CCC program was $3.1 billion, or approximately $1,200 per youth. The average annual cost was $310 million. The boys received $30 a month base salary, of which $25 was sent home if the boy's family qualified as needy dependents.

The CCC program was effective because of the spirit and cooperation the camp setup elicited from the boys. It was cheaper to have all the boys living together where they could be called upon immediately to perform the needed tasks. Besides lending their youthful enthusiasm to constructing everything from bridges (38,550) to bathhouses (395) and radio stations (116) to reservoirs (9,805), the CCC boys spent 6,459,403 man-days fighting forest fires, constructed 68,882 miles of firebreaks, spent 5,750,311 man-days on fire presuppression work and reduced fire hazards along 80,399 miles of roads and trails and on 2,158,946 acres of land.

In fact the CCC's fire fighting and fire prevention work was one of the greatest contributions to our Nation's conservation program, both resourcewise and dollarwise. When the CCC was terminated in 1943, the State forester of West Virginia reported that "the reduction in camps had resulted in a 20-percent increase in acres burned in areas having camps last spring." Similar reports came from other State foresters. The regional forester from Missoula, Mont., reported at the 1942 House Appropriations Committee hearings that, "In the early days of the CCC, the general feeling throughout the field units here was that it required three enrollees to equal one firefighter. Today," he said, "the reverse is true. Most supervisors feel that they would sooner have one organized 25-enrollee unit than 50 to 75 men recruited on the street. It is actually heart warming to see how efficiently these units operate from the time they leave their base camp until they return. The general public, too, appreciates this fact."

The general public today still appreciates the CCC record. A nationwide Gallup poll released August 28, 1961, showed 80 percent of the public that was polled, was in favor of the CCC-type YCC program.

Although the CCC is no longer in existence, its legacy, the conservation camp, is profitably still with us. Several States, including Pennsylvania and Michigan, have made excellent use of conservation camps staffed by underprivileged and delinquent youths. Also, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman testified before the Senate Committee that, "Establishment and management of camps of all sizes, up to 500 men, is a routine operation for the Forest Service. Several large camps, 25 to 100 men, are presently operated on regular conservation programs."

Secretary Freeman has listed a breakdown of the backlog to be done on national forests. "The types of work involved," he said, "include timber stand improvement, reforestation, recreation area development, fire hazard reduction, trail construction and maintenance, fishing stream and lake improvement, wildlife habitat improvement, range water development, range, boundary and other fence construction and maintenance, and national forests boundary line maintenance.

"This is broken down in terms of numbers of man-years, and total out as a total of 293,700 man-years of inventoried and prepared work projects."

Over a 10-year period, Secretary Freeman said there would be 405,700 man-years of work on the national forests, the equivalent of 41,000 jobs annually on a 10-year basis. Secretary Udall listed 448,760 man-years of work on Department of Interior lands, which is the equivalent of 45,000 jobs annually on a 10-year basis. Together they total over 850,000 man-years of significant conservation work—86,000 jobs annually for 10 years. The State forester of Pennsylvania estimated a total of 16,000 man-years of work backlog on his State's forests alone. If you totaled the conservation work backlog of all the Federal agencies and that of the agencies of the 50 State governments, you would get an astronomical sum of conservation work that must be done.

Some middle-of-the-road Senators and Representatives contend that we should try the President's small pilot YCC program if we have to try any program at all. They say we will experiment and see if a CCC type program will work today before we go ahead and waste money.

Many people, including prominent Senators and Secretary Freeman, feel that the old CCC provided 10 years of experience upon which we can rely. And, as was mentioned, successful conservation camps on a small scale have been operating for several years now. Both Secretary Freeman and the President's brother, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, testified before the Senate committee that the small pilot program was recommended largely because the administration was trying to balance the budget.

Most people fail to realize though, that the Forest Service is one of the few Government agencies that operates in the black year after year and returns money to the Treasury. Its spending can be considered investing. As Secretary Freeman testified, "By rough rule of thumb, $3,000 invested in timber stand improvements, would bring back within 10 years approximately $5,000 to the Federal Government." The appropriation for a YCC would be an investment, not an expenditure. Certainly, most of the returns will not be direct dollar returns as in the case of the Forest Service. But in the long run, we would come out ahead with more recreation facilities, improved and rehabilitated soil and grasslands, better erosion control, improved watersheds, and a corps of useful citizens. If we put these problems off until some indefinite future date, the value of our resources will have depreciated tremendously from lack of care, and the cost to rehabilitate them may then be far beyond our means and we may be too late.

Still, the anti-YCC'ers contend, "The program would cost a lot of money," and as Judge Mary Conway Kohler (15 years experience in San Francisco with the juvenile court and presently a consultant to the Taconic Foundation in New York City) testified, "New York would gobble up the whole appropriation very shortly."

First, as the Senate bill is set up, New York would not receive the entire appropriation, although without a doubt New York City could use all the money it can get. Secondly, if the youth problem is so great in New York, then certainly this calls for even greater measures if we are to find a way to help solve the youth problem on a nationwide scale.

"Well, anyway," says the anti-YCC'ers "many young men who are not able to find useful work enlist in the Armed Forces * * * the fulfillment of one's military service at an early age will enable these young men to accept employment in private industry without the likelihood of a subsequent interruption of their careers.* * * With motorized equipment and the many applications of electronics in every field of military activity, a young man who serves in the Armed Forces has a unique opportunity to acquire skills that will serve him well throughout his later life."

How wonderful that statement would be if it applied to the people the YCC would be trying to help. Our Armed Forces require enlistees to pass an examination before they will even consider boys for the specialized training programs. A recruiter told me, "It is doubtful that a boy who did not graduate from high school could pass the test."

Secondly, even boys who do pass the test do not always get the training they had hoped for. There are more qualifying for training than there are facilities and instructors to train them. Again, the training is geared to a particular branch of the Armed Forces and its needs and is usually a type of training useful only to the Armed Forces.

Thirdly, and most important, about a fourth or more of the boys who would be helped by the YCC program, those 16 years old, are ineligible to join the Armed Forces. Also, 17-year-old boys cannot enlist in the military without their parents consent, and many remain unemployed until they are 18 and can enlist without parent's consent.

Nor should our Armed Forces become a dumping ground for immature, unemployed youth, where, it is hoped, that something miraculous might happen to the boys to make civilian life easier for them when they get out. Our Armed Forces has as one of its primary purposes, the job of fashioning fighting men out of its recruits. It also trains as many personnel as it needs to do its specialized jobs. Its purpose in peacetime is to have trained fighting men and other personnel ready in "cold storage" in event of a war. It is not a catchall for the young,

unemployed people of our country. Nor should it be.

Many young people concur that every able-bodied young man should serve a period in the Armed Forces to be trained and prepared to serve his country in time of need. However, the military training lasts for a period of 8 weeks. After that, according to young men who have been there, if the enlistee or draftee is not employed at a specialized task, most of his duty consists of keeping the barracks and his equipment in shape, policing the campgrounds, kitchen duty, guard duty, and other nondescript chores that have been created to give him something to do. Otherwise, today's peacetime soldier wastes much valuable time waiting his turn to perform one of these tasks.

Many have suggested that after the Armed Forces' trainees have received their military instruction, that the Armed Forces put the boys to work saving our vital natural resources. This work could be performed in conjunction with the Agriculture and Interior Departments. The old CCC camps were under administrative supervision of the Army. The field work they did was under the direction of the agency to which the individual camp was assigned. Some people say this arrangement did not always work out too well. In view of the CCC's accomplishments, if we could make any future youth conservation corps work as well, our achievement would be considerable.

A package deal offering completion of military obligation and the chance to perform useful, meaningful conservation work probably would have a far greater appeal to many of our youth who now join the Armed Forces because it is the only thing that I can do, or because I might as well get it over with. And yet these boys have not lost their patriotism. It is just that the separate segments of our society, education-wise and defense-wise, have not joined together to help our youth work out solutions to the many pressing problems of their uncertain future and present economic plight.

Then there is the argument that, "No matter how influential a YCC is on a boy, he has to go back to the detrimental influences of the environment which he has temporarily escaped." In the YCC a boy would be given a chance to learn useful work, to feel valuable and useful himself, and to learn to work together and live together with others. In his formative years he would be given the opportunity to mature in a decent environment. To pacify the anti-YCC'ers, perhaps we should leave the boys in the slums to grow bitter against society which they feel has rejected them.

We must begin now to provide programs in which youth can learn to help themselves. During the decade of the 1960's, studies by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare show that 7½ million boys and girls will drop out of school before achieving high school graduation. Yet, while the number of youths in the labor force is and will be increasing sharply, the number of jobs available to beginning workers, under the impact of automation is not increasing and indeed may be declining. In the last 13 years material goods output increased 67 percent, and the population rose by 36½ million; but efficiency has risen to the point where a single U.S. worker can produce enough food and goods to supply 7 persons—and the number of workers needed in industry and agriculture has dropped 1.7 million.

The prospect for rural youth is not better. The Secretary of Agriculture testified, "* * * in the next 10 years there will be approximately 250,000 young people (per year) in rural areas reaching maturity, and of them there will be room for approximately 23,000 on farms that will have an income of $1,500 or better."

Because we have failed in our job to teach the value of self discipline and hard work, and because the belief in "opportunity for everyone" has been shattered for the youth in marginal existence, anti-social communities which have been allowed to grow like internal cancer in our slums, rural areas, and economically depressed areas, we have failed to instill the spirit of good citizenship in these young people. We have failed to build faith in our democracy and our Government, and thus we automatically leave these neglected young people prey to the vultures of crime and even communism.

Must we also wait until our resource and recreation problems grow worse? We could attack and lick both problems now—with a YCC as we once did with the CCC.

Still people raise their voice in protest, "The YCC will cost money, plenty of money." Every year the American public invests millions of dollars to educate young people. The purpose of that education is to prepare constructive, taxpaying citizens. When students leave school after we have made such an investment, whether they have completed high school or not, and step not into a world of opportunity, but into a world of unemployment for which they are not prepared, there is not only a danger of losing the investment, but of placing our youth in the ledger as "tax receivers" rather than "taxpayers." This is exactly what has been happening in many parts of our country.

The youth unemployment problem and the conservation problem are presently two of the outstandingly weak links in the chain of domestic strength of our Nation. Criticism notwithstanding a Youth Conservation Corps program could forge two powerful links to keep the chain strong—our youth, strong, hardworking and patriotic, and our resources, well cared for and the show-piece gems of nature.

Meanwhile, the trees planted by our first Civilian Conservation Corps of now aging, useful citizens, stand now as forests and continue to reach for the sun. To us, those trees and the young men who planted them present an inspiring symbol of the resourceful American way of doing things.

Resolutions Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Enact Legislation Granting Certain Pensions to Veterans of World War I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions adopted by the General Court of Massachusetts:

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION GRANTING CERTAIN PENSIONS TO VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I

Whereas it has been the policy of the United States to assist its veterans by granting them a pension, in consideration of their services in the Armed Forces of their country in time of war; and

Whereas there has been no general pension granted to veterans of World War I: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation granting a pension of $100 a month to veterans of World War I; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, to each member thereof from this commonwealth, and to each member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States.

House of representatives, adopted, March 22, 1962.

WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
Clerk.

Senate, adopted in concurrence, March 27, 1962.

THOMAS A. CHADWICK, *Clerk.*
KEVIN H. WHITE,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

H.R. 9900 Can Make the President a Dictator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the House Ways and Means Committee is currently holding hearings on H.R. 9900, which the President calls the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. One of the things this bill will do is expand the power of the President and take some very vital rights away from the American citizen.

I am pleased to enclose a letter sent me by the president of the Association of the Customs Bar together with a memorandum on certain aspects of the bill.

I want to commend the Association of the Customs Bar for studying the bill and taking a stand on it.

MEMORANDUM OF THE ASSOCIATION OF THE CUSTOMS BAR IN OPPOSITION TO PROVISIONS OF H.R. 9900 WHICH WOULD LIMIT, CURTAIL, OR ELIMINATE ADEQUATE PUBLIC NOTICE TO INTERESTED PARTIES, PUBLIC HEARINGS, OR DEPRIVE INTERESTED PARTIES OF OPPORTUNITY FOR COMPLETE JUDICIAL REVIEW

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Provisions of section 221(c), 223, 248(b)(2), and (c) (1) and (2), 306 change existing law by restricting or eliminating public hearings in connection with negotiations of trade agreements, peril point, and escape clause investigations, and section 404 which would deny judicial review of Executive or administrative action which would be taken under title II of H.R. 9900, and would also deny judicial review retroactively of Executive or administrative acts taken under existing law.

The Association of the Customs Bar recommends that the aforesaid sections of H.R. 9900 be amended or deleted as necessary, to grant interested parties the right to participate in public hearings, or obtain full judicial review of Executive acts.

H.R. 9900—TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962

H.R. 9900 proposes legislation by the Congress to the President of broad, sweeping powers to reduce or eliminate duties on imports into the United States. The bill sharply modifies the requirements of present law for public hearings and full opportunity for interested parties to present their views prior to action. Said bill, furthermore, includes an even more drastic change in past and present law by proposing in section 404 to make actions by the President thereunder or by administrative agencies in administering the law, final and conclusive and not subject to judicial review.

Finally, the bill would vest power in the President to modify or change trade agreements entered into under prior laws and includes sweeping provision in section 248(b)(2) and section 248(c) (1) and (2) that compliance with procedures or actions taken under previous laws shall be considered as having been taken under the provisions of H.R. 9900.

The power under the Constitution to lay and collect duties is clearly vested in the Congress under article 1, section 8, clause 3, reading as follows:

"Sec. 8. The Congress shall have Power to Lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises * * * but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;"

Powers purported to be delegated to the President to reduce or remove duties are clearly, therefore, delegations by the Congress. Under well established principles of law, any such delegation must be based on clearly defined "yardsticks" or limitations on the agent or agency named by the Congress. Clearly, also, under the historic separation of powers under our form of Government, there must exist a method to prevent abuse or disregard of delegated powers. Historically, correction of such abuse or disregard has been provided through court review. The association believes that court review is essential, and should be maintained.

Ample precedents exist for delegation of tariff powers by the Congress to the President. In the area of trade agreements with foreign countries, particularly, the Congress, as far back as 1934, delegated such authority to the President, which authority has been extended by successive acts, the latest of which will expire on June 30, 1962. Throughout all of such prior congressional acts, each delegation of power has been accompanied by clear, concise requirements of public notice, public hearing with opportunity of interested parties to appear and be heard, and full judicial review.

The importance of judicial review is illustrated by the many instances in which action by the President and/or Administrative Agencies named to assist him in exercising his delegated powers under trade agreement legislation have been brought before the courts. (See e.g. annotations 19 ESC 13.51 and cases cited in note 1 below.) Examples are found in recent cases, one brought by an American manufacturer contesting the reduction in duty by trade agreement action on certain tuna fish (*Star Kist Foods, Inc.* v. *United States*, 47 CCPA 52, C.A.D. 728; 275 F. 2d 472), and the other an action brought by an importer protesting against a proclaimed increase in duty by trade agreement action on certain bicycles (*United States* v. *Schmidt, Pritchard & Co. et al* (1960) 47 CCPA 152, C.A.D. 750, aff'g. 41 C.C.R. 108, C.D. 2029, Cert. den. (1960) 364 U.S. 919). In the latter case the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, in reviewing a decision by the U.S. Customs Court, unanimously held that the President had exceeded powers delegated to him under trade agreements legislation, and his action in attempting to proclaim an increase in duties was, therefore, illegal, null and void.

NOTE 1. The constitutionality of the Trade Agreements Law was reviewed in the *Star Kist Foods, Inc.* case, *supra*. Earlier decisions dealing with constitutional issues were: *Fletcher* v. *United States* (1937) 25 CCPA 195, 92 F. 2d 713; *Wislar* v. *United States* (1938) 26 CCPA 138, 97 F. 2d 152, Cert. den. 305 U.S. 628.

The President's authority to negotiate a preferential trade agreement with Cuba was reviewed in *Von Damm* v. *United States* (1937) 25 CCPA 97, 90 F. 2d 263, Cert. den. 302 U.S. 722.

By the powers delegated to him in H.R. 9900, the President could apparently transfer a product from one tariff paragraph to another, and such action would not be subject to judicial review, even though existing trade agreements could be involved. Under existing law trade agreement concessions so made are illegal, and were so declared by the courts, see cases cited in note 2, below.

NOTE 2. *United States* v. *Canadian National Railways* (1942) 29 CCPA 272, C.A.D. 202; *Atlanta Trading Corp.* v. *United States* (1954) 42 CCPA 90, C.A.D. 577; *United States* v. *Curley-Bates Co.* (1958) 46 CCPA 14, C.A.D. 688; *E. Dillingham, Inc., et ano* v. *United States* (1961) C.A.D. 762, 48 CCPA—.

The provisions of section 404 of H.R. 9900, would bar future correction of unwarranted action by the President or administrative agencies in exercising delegated powers under trade agreement legislation. The clearly expressed intention of the Congress and the judicial construction by the courts that all interested parties have a right to challenge illegal action and obtain redress therefor, would thus be seriously endangered, if not completely removed.

Retroactive elimination of judicial review of prior Executive acts is contemplated under section 248 which incorporates by reference previous actions of the President and administrative agencies in administering trade agreement laws made under authority of Congress.

The following language of 248(b)(2) and (c)(1) and (2) is clearly intended to deprive importers or domestic manufacturers of the right to maintain their present position under existing law to judicially, or otherwise challenge, the Executive Department's findings or decisions, implementing or proclaiming customs concessions under trade agreements:

"Sec. 248. Repeals.

The following are repealed:

* * * * *

(b) Sections 2 through 4 of the act entitled 'An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930', approved June 12, 1934, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1352, 1353, and 1354). Notwithstanding such appeal—

* * * * *

(2) compliance prior to July 1, 1962, with any of the procedures of section 4 of that act shall be considered compliance with any comparable procedures of section 221 of this Act. Note 3.

NOTE 3.—The United States Code of Customs and Patent Appeals took jurisdiction of a question raised by an importer where the President had not furnished reasonable public notice of an intention to negotiate a trade agreement. *Aris Gloves, Inc.* v. *U.S.* (1958) 46 CCPA. 41 C.A.D. 693.

(c) The Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1360–1367). Notwithstanding such repeal—

(1) action taken by the President prior to July 1, 1962, under section 5 of that Act shall be considered as having been taken by the President under section 231 of this Act;

(2) any proclamation issued by the President under section 7 of that Act in effect on July 30, 1962 shall be considered as having been issued by the President under section 351 of this Act,"

Sec. 248, without complete judicial review, leaves the citizen helpless to protest against existing proclamations or decisions made by the Executive and Administrative Departments.

Not only does H.R. 9900 seek to eliminate judicial review but also attempts to abolish the right of the citizen to be heard in public hearings conducted by administrative or legislative agencies charged with the execution and administration of the law.

Under section 7 of existing law, public hearings are required to be held by the Tariff Commission in the conduct of escape clause investigations. Sections 305 and 306 of H.R. 9900 do not provide for the continuance of such public hearings.

Also the existing right of interested parties to be heard in connection with peril point investigations under existing law is modified in H.R. 9900 so as to make such hearings merely permissive rather than mandatory. The language of section 221(c) of the bill should be amended to require the Tariff Commission to conduct such hearings.

Similar language should also be incorporated into section 223 of the bill to require that public hearings be held prior to entering into trade agreement negotiations.

For the foregoing reasons, the following amendments to the bill, H.R. 9900, are respectfully suggested:

1. Section 221(c), page 7, line 10, change the word "may" to "shall" so that the provision will read as follows:

"(c) In the course of preparing such advice, the Tariff Commission shall hold hearings, giving reasonable public notice thereof, to afford opportunity for interested persons to be present, to produce evidence, and to be heard."

2. Section 223, page 8, line 9—Before the word "after" insert "including public hearings", so that the said section will read as follows:

"Before entering into negotiations for any trade agreement under this title, the President shall afford an opportunity, including public hearings, after reasonable public notice, for any interested person to present his views, including views on the reservation of any article from the negotiations".

3. Section 248(b), page 17—Delete subsection (2), lines 12 to 15, inclusive, reading as follows:

"(2) compliance prior to July 1, 1962, with any of the procedures of section 4 of that Act shall be considered compliance with any comparable procedures of section 221 of this Act."

4. Section 248(c), page 17—Delete the following matter beginning on line 17 to and including page 18, line 9:

"(1) action taken by the President prior to July 1, 1962, under section 5 of that Act shall be considered as having been taken by the President under Section 231 of this Act; and

"(2) any proclamation issued by the President under section 7 of that Act in effect on July 30, 1962, shall be considered as having been issued by the President under section 351 of this Act, except that, in the case of any proclamation issued more than three years prior to the effective date of this Act, the termination date for the purpose of section 351(c) of this Act shall be one year after the effective date of this Act."

5. Section 306, page 23, following line 18—Insert a new subdivision (c) to read as follows:

"(c) In the course of preparing such advice, the Tariff Commission shall hold hearings giving reasonable public notice thereof and afford opportunity for interested parties to be present, to produce evidence, and be heard."

6. Section 404—Delete the following words at page 58 on lines 17 and 18 in subsection (a):

"Determinations required to be made by the President under title II of this Act and"

and on lines 20 and 21:

"or in making determinations with respect to extraordinary relief".

Respectfully submitted.

THE ASSOCIATION OF THE CUSTOMS BAR.

By ——— ———, *President*.

MARCH 22, 1962.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

Supreme Court Decision on Apportionment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Dangerous Decision," published in the Arizona Republic of March 28, 1962. The editorial relates to the decision rendered by the Supreme Court last week, in which the Court sought to intrude itself a little more into the business of the States.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DANGEROUS DECISION

The U.S. Supreme Court has again proved that the U.S. Constitution means what the Court says it means, and it means that only until the Court changes its mind. In the Tennessee legislative election case, decided Monday, the High Court completely reversed the decision it rendered in 1946. The same Constitution applies in 1962 that applied in 1946. But in 1946, the Supreme Court held the Constitution did not give Federal courts the right to review the manner in which seats are apportioned by a State legislature; Monday it held the Constitution does provide that right.

The Tennessee case involves a matter of great importance; namely the gradual disenfranchisement of city voters. Despite the movement of its population from the farms to the cities, Tennessee still uses the same legislative districting plan that it used 60 years ago. Consequently the relative strength of rural voters has grown tremendously and the Tennessee legislature is dominated by representatives from the agricultural areas, who have a penchant for neglecting the needs of the cities.

This is, of course, an obvious violation of the principle of proportional representation. A farmer's vote should be worth no more than a city resident's vote, and vice versa. But instead of using local means of changing the complexion of the legislative, the cities of Tennessee sought relief from the Federal Court. Quite wisely, we believe, the Court refused to interfere in a strictly State matter. But on appeal, the U.S. Supreme Court said the lower court had the right to interfere, and instructed it to do so. The country can only await the outcome of this new litigation.

Had the U.S. Supreme Court been ruling on a congressional election case, the matter might have been different. For Federal agencies do have authority in national affairs. But the election of a State legislature is a matter for the State itself to decide. If the urban citizens of Tennessee were discriminated against, they had the power to rewrite the State constitution and redistribute legislative power. But when the Federal Government moves into what Justice Frankfurter once called "this political thicket," it endangers the entire principle of States rights.

The situation in Arizona is somewhat different from that in Tennessee, although here, too, the legislature is dominated by the small or rural counties. Our State constitution provides for a revision of the membership of the State house of representatives every 4 years. As city population grows, so does the strength of the cities in the house. This principle does not apply to the senate, but if the Arizona voters don't like the apportionment in the senate, they can change it—and there is a fair chance they will do that very thing. But they won't expect the Warren Court to solve their political problems for them.

The danger of such decisions by the Supreme Court is, it seems to us, obvious. Even if you give the Court every allowance for good intentions, you still come down to the fact that the Constitution can't mean one thing today and another tomorrow—at least it can't if we are to have a government of law and not of men. As certainly as the sun rises in the east, the day will come when men whose intentions are not good will sit on the highest Court of the land. Then, buttressed by such decisions as this one, they will be able to turn the Constitution into an instrument for the enslavement of the people who now place their trust in it.

If the liberal establishment, for which the Warren Court so often speaks, wants to change the Constitution, it should do so openly. The people are sovereign, and their votes can settle the issue. But changing the Constitution by judicial interpretation, as the Court is doing, can only destroy the Republic.

Hon. John W. Murphy

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, the passing of the Honorable John W. Murphy, chief Federal judge of the middle Pennsylvania district court, removes a distinguished jurist, not from the State, but from the entire country.

It was my good fortune to know Judge Murphy for many years, and to have served with him in this great body, the House of Representatives, for 3 years.

One of the great marks of this man was his ability to be impartial and fair in all of his dealings, be it in the courtroom as a prosecutor or later as a judge. I have known few men who possessed the courage and wisdom displayed at all times by Judge Murphy.

Truly, Judge Murphy was a self-made man. He started earning money as a breakerboy in anthracite mine in his hometown of Avoca, Luzerne County. After graduation from his hometown high school, he continued his studies at the University of Pennsylvania where he received a bachelor of science degree in 1926 and a law degree 3 years later.

Active in politics in his State, he came to this great body, the House of Representatives in 1943, and served with distinction. Former President Harry Truman recognized John's great abilities and appointed him to the Federal courts to serve in the middle Pennsylvania district.

His knowledge of the law was recognized nationwide, as he served on the board at the university school of law and also participated in a number of seminars at leading universities of the country. Judge Murphy also served on the Committee on Operation of the Jury System in the U.S. Courts for the Judicial Conference of the United States.

All of us join in extending deepest sympathy to his wife, Ella, and their two daughters and two sons.

Government by Extremism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, today there is much name-calling and finger pointing on the question of who is an extremist. And we do have among us extremists of both the right and the left—the former advocating courses which would lead to totalitarianism and the latter preaching steps down the road to socialism.

But Editor David Lawrence, of U.S. News & World Report observes with great truth in his column featured in the April 2 issue of that respected publication that the real extremists—those who are most to be feared—are those in public office who would disregard the Constitution. He further identifies them as those who would ignore the rights of States and the people specifically reserved to them by the Constitution, who would substitute executive orders for the laws of Congress and who would circumvent the clear provisions of the Constitution setting forth the procedures for its amendment. Mr. Lawrence writes:

> This is government by emotion—by extremism. It is not government by a written Constitution.

His observations and conclusions are so pertinent to today's trends and attitudes and so sobering to all who will consider them with open minds that I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the

text of them be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REAL EXTREMISTS

(By David Lawrence)

We hear a good deal nowadays about extremists—those who brand as Communists other persons who are not Communists. Name calling, however, while deplorable, doesn't do as much harm to the American people as a whole as do the extremists in public office who would disregard the Constitution.

For there is a trend today toward circumvention of the Constitution. Scarcely a month goes by that some new legislative measure or Executive order isn't proposed which seeks to get around the Constitution.

The argument recently espoused in all seriousness as an alibi by some people inside and outside Government is that amending the Constitution is a laborious and slow process. The point is made that times have changed and that some of the doctrines of past decades in the field of law have become obsolete.

Oddly enough, that's exactly the excuse Nikita Khrushchev gives for abrogating the Allied agreements made in 1945 to insure unrestricted access to Berlin. He says these agreements are outmoded.

Is it right for one party to an agreement to declare arbitrarily that he will no longer abide by its terms because he decides it is obsolete?

The people of the Thirteen Original States, by a compact with each other, gave up certain rights and delegated them to a Central Government. All powers not enumerated in the Constitution as having been delegated to the Federal Government were specifically "reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." This is the language of the 10th amendment. Why is this agreement so persistently violated?

If the people at any time wish to change the Constitution, it can be amended by a two-thirds vote of Congress followed by acts of ratification by three-fourths of the States.

But we hear today that this is too cumbersome a method and that it takes too much time. Yet some amendments have gone through from congressional action to State ratification in less than a year.

The truth is that where there is substantial opposition to an amendment, it naturally isn't approved.

Unfortunately, our record as a nation is not clean. The 14th amendment was not legally inserted in the Constitution. The same Southern States which were considered eligible members of the Union when—after the Civil War was over—they ratified the 13th amendment abolishing slavery were then punished by Congress for refusing to ratify the 14th amendment. Ratification was accomplished by legislative coercion of the States by Congress and at the point of the bayonet by armed forces stationed in the State legislatures. Yet this same 14th amendment is the basis of most of the Executive orders on civil rights today. The Supreme Court has never consented to pass upon the validity of the method used to ratify the 14th amendment, though the Court has accepted cases challenging the validity of other amendments.

Recently a new trend toward usurpation of power has arisen. It seeks by Executive order, or by the passage of new laws, to thwart or ignore the plainly written provisions of the Constitution.

President Kennedy sent a bill to Congress a few weeks ago proposing a far-reaching change in the handling of tariffs. The Executive would fix the duties and commodity quotas—a power granted by the Constitution only to Congress. The bill, now before the House Ways and Means Committee, provides, moreover, that presidential determinations "shall be final and conclusive and shall not be subject to review by any court."

Why should the people be deprived of judicial review when they are the victims of illegality in the application of trade laws?

Also the Kennedy administration has just signed treaties with 24 countries on trade relations, but does not intend to submit these agreements to the Senate for ratification by a two-thirds vote.

Executive orders have been issued, moreover, in civil rights matters, on many of which Congress itself has refused to pass laws. Thus, by Executive order, purchase contracts for goods or services can be withheld by the Government from any business which refuses to accept the Government's dictation as to the number of employees of a particular color that the contractor or subcontractor may hire.

It certainly is a form of extremism to substitute Executive orders for the laws of Congress.

Extremism is bred by extremism. We would have less trouble with the malcontents in our midst if the spirit and letter of the Constitution were observed.

If the method of amending the document is too cumbersome, let the people by the constitutional method change it. But let's face the fact that new extremists have arisen who believe that the Executive order can circumvent the Constitution if the stated objective merely has popular appeal. This is government by emotion—by extremism. It is not government by a written constitution.

Plight of the Cotton Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. EVERETT JORDAN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address delivered by the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia, Mr. TALMADGE, at the annual convention of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute in Palm Beach, Fla., on Saturday, March 31, 1962. Senator TALMADGE made a penetrating analysis of many of the problems facing the textile industry, and his address was extremely well received by those attending the convention.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF REMARKS OF U.S. SENATOR HERMAN E. TALMADGE, OF GEORGIA, BEFORE THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN COTTON MANUFACTURING INSTITUTE AT PALM BEACH, FLA., SATURDAY, MARCH 31, 1962

My friends, I have a deep appreciation for this great and vital industry whose guidance rests in your hands. It is inescapable, for I'm a Georgian.

It is your industry in which some 95,000 Georgians earn their daily bread.

It is your industry to which more than 85,000 Georgia cotton farmers sell their product.

It is your industry that keys countless other industries and businesses to such an extent that perhaps there isn't a Georgia family whose welfare isn't affected by your activity.

The conclusion is clear. As a Member of the U.S. Senate, any contribution I might make for the benefit of your industry will be also a contribution to the welfare of the State I have the honor to serve.

To go a step further, however, let me say I sincerely believe that any contribution that anyone might make for this essential industry will stand as a contribution to the welfare of our Nation.

And this view, you can be assured, is being taken by my colleagues in the Senate. Believe me, your industry is not without friends in the Congress. This fact has been demonstrated in an unusually unique and effective way in both Houses of the Congress during the past year or so.

There is a growing awareness of the unsound, unfair, and intolerable situation the American textile industry has been plunged into by Government policies.

Here we have an industry that virtually stands alone as a showcase of the American concept of free enterprise, yet one that has been damaged by cumulative Government policies that can be characterized charitably as careless but more accurately as stupid.

Since World War II we have seen the American textile industry retain its basic competitiveness, continue to turn out superior products at minimum prices, place on the market the results of the most modern research, meet consumer demands, and then find itself in trouble. Why?

We have seen textile jobs fall from more than one and a quarter million in 1947 to around 840,000 today. Production of cotton goods has plummeted. Prices have shrunk. Profits have fallen. Textile mill stocks are selling below their book value. Why?

That's the big question, ladies and gentlemen. Why?

The answer, or rather the explanation for this incredible, shocking situation, is to be found where our national policymakers gather.

The American textile industry, moreso than any other industry, has had to live and try to grow trussed in a governmental straitjacket. This happened, not because it had become unruly or ugly or dangerous, but primarily because the attendant—the policymaker—was unwilling to face up to the facts and deal with them intelligently.

You will remember that a few years ago the U.S. Senate established a special subcommittee to investigate everything that has happened to the industry. And the conclusion, in essence, was that most of its problems stemmed from Government policies and, by the same token, solutions would have to come from Government action.

A start in this direction was made just about a year ago. You will recall that my colleague from Rhode Island, the Honorable JOHN O. PASTORE, reactivated his Textile Study Committee to update all pertinent information and renewed its recommendations to the executive branch of the Government.

In turn, President Kennedy took some rather unprecedented steps to move in on some of the basic problems of this industry, particularly as they relate to policies of Government. He appointed a special Cabinet-level committee, headed by the Secretary of Commerce, to explore the situation and make recommendations to him. An interagency textile subcommittee was formed, headed by the Assistant Secretary of Commerce. For a period of months there was intensive activity in the executive branch of Government, given full support and encouragement by those of us in the Congress, and aimed at coming up with a plan of action.

It was, and continues to be, an unusual situation. I do not recall a previous instance

where any American industry has received such concentrated interest and attention at the highest levels of Government—both within the legislative and executive branches. It is a tribute to the national significance of your industry and to the manner in which you and your representatives have gained public understanding and recognition for your situation.

The result, of course, was the so-called President's textile program, and the steps that have been taken under it.

Now, I would like to convey to you an assessment of what has been done and what remains to be done for the President's program to become genuinely meaningful to the industry and to the Nation. And I can assure you that most, if not all, of my views are shared by my colleagues in the U.S. Senate and our friends in the House of Representatives.

First, the Treasury Department's action in having the Internal Revenue Service revise the depreciation schedules for the textile and apparel industries represents a concrete contribution toward strengthening the industry. This, coupled with an investment incentive proposal in the pending tax bill, can be regarded as an important plus, and I am sure is already stimulating new interest in plant improvement and modernization. This is an objective you have sought for years, and its attainment is a major victory.

Then there were the international trade arrangements, dealing only with cotton textiles, with which you are familiar and which certainly appear to become another plus. My colleagues and I, however, are fully cognizant of the fact that the international arrangements will stand or fall upon the character of enforcement given by our Government.

There must be no loopholes. There must be strict adherence to the terms and intent of the arrangements. There must be no departure from the position that, first and foremost, the interests of the American textile industry must be served.

Those of us who have watched closely the development of these arrangements are encouraged by recent actions of the U.S. Government in enforcing its rights under the program. Such positive action, right now in the beginning, is vital as a signal to the rest of the world that the United States means business. In all candor, I must say that this is a new and strange departure for our Government, and I hope it isn't too good to last.

Now, I understand there are some indications that the administration will move shortly in an effort to bring some order to free world trade in fibers other than cotton—woolens, worsted, manmade fibers, and silk. This is essential. There was never the slightest indication in the President's program that it was to apply only to cotton products, important as they are.

The textile industry of the world today is so complex, so interrelated, that a partial solution will create distortions that will plague both you and the Government from now on. The problem is not resolved on the basis of a piecemeal solution, and those of us in the Congress will not rest on the subject until there is action across the board.

Many of us in the Congress share a view widely held in this audience. That is, if the Office of Emergency Planning were to rule favorably on the case now pending before it, the way would be clear for the President to deal quickly and forthrightly with problems on all fibers. In fact, the authority given to him by such an action would make it much easier and simpler for him to do whatever is necessary to complete his textile program.

It should be remembered that one aspect of the international arrangements concerned a change in attitude by the nations in the European Common Market toward Asian textile exports. The Europeans have been keeping their doors closed to the Japanese and Asian output. They let the U.S. market bear the brunt of the low-wage imports from these countries.

It is to the credit of U.S. negotiators that they were able to persuade the Common Market countries to lessen the Asian pressure on the United States by opening up their markets. This facet of the arrangement is of vital importance to Japan and the other countries of the East, and they make themselves look selfish and ridiculous when they threaten not to sign the arrangement if the United States takes certain other actions.

There is no question but that Europe represents an important market for American industrial and agricultural products. But let it not go unnoticed that the Common Market was established in part for the purpose of protecting the economies of the participating nations against all outsiders, not for the purpose of throwing wide open their doors to the rest of the world.

Now let us turn our attention to another item of unfinished business as we chronicle the results of the administration program for dealing with the Nation's textile import problem.

You may recall that last May 2 the President's pronouncement included these words—and I quote:

"I have directed the Department of Agriculture to explore and make recommendations to eliminate or offset the cost to U.S. mills of the adverse differential in raw cotton costs between domestic and foreign textile producers."

Almost 3 months later, by direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, the raw cotton cost differential between U.S. mills and foreign mills increased from $30 to $42.50 a bale.

Those of us in the Congress, and especially those of us on the Agriculture Committee of the U.S. Senate, were fully aware of the fact that a bad situation had worsened.

It strengthened my conviction that a farm bill I had offered to the Senate was on the right track. Its purpose was to free the farmer to sell his product on a market that could seek its own levels under the law of supply and demand. It is my view that the most efficient and economical way under such an arrangement would be to provide compensatory payments on basic commodities to farmers equal to the difference between the market price and 100 percent of parity.

In effect, such a program would have enabled our own textile mills to buy American cotton at the prevailing world price, thereby eliminating entirely the two-price system.

In my opinion, it is very unfortunate that the regional politics of this whole farm policy situation are such that any legislation along this line has not been able to gain momentum, even though there is substantial support among many Members of Congress.

This being true, there obviously is only one way to comply with the President's directive to the Secretary of Agriculture—that is, to offset the disparity between the United States and world prices for cotton by placing on all cotton product imports a fee equal to the difference in price, as reflected by the raw cotton export subsidy.

As you well know, the Secretary of Agriculture made such a recommendation to the President; the President acted on the recommendation by initiating a Tariff Commission investigation of the subject; the required hearings have been held; and we now await the findings and recommendations of that body. In my opinion, an undeniably impressive case has been made for such an offset import fee.

My friends, let me say this, simply and clearly, for one and all, including our friends in Japan, to understand: The cotton cost equalization fee must be established.

And, at the risk of digressing, let me just say another word about our Japanese friends.

Personally, I resented very much the Japanese textile industry's intervention in the section 22 case before the Tariff Commission. To my way of thinking, this is a case of the Japanese interfering with the internal affairs of the United States.

Many of you here, I am sure, recall the efforts we went to in the postwar days to help Japan get back on her feet, back in the textile business and many other businesses. To be sure, Japan's friendship is important to us. But her textile industry went beyond the bounds of good order in raising a worldwide clamor of protest against our Government's efforts to correct an intolerably unfair situation here at home.

Some press articles would lead us to believe that Japan would attempt to frustrate the international textile trade arrangements if our Government establishes a cotton cost offset fee. This is incredible, but should it come to pass, I assure you it will not go unnoticed on the part of the U.S. Congress.

I repeat, it is imperative that the raw cotton cost equalization fee be established as a matter of equity and justice for you manufacturers, for the benefit of our cotton farmers, and in the interest of the general public.

My interest in this particular issue grows out of my official duties. It is my privilege to serve on the Finance and the Agriculture Committees of the U.S. Senate. And these committees have responsibility for helping to shape the Nation's foreign trade and farm program legislation.

Within a matter of weeks my committee is going to have an opportunity to examine and pass upon proposals for the law under which the United States will engage in foreign trade in the years to come.

The measure we will consider will be whatever bill the House of Representatives enacts. The House Ways and Means Committe, as you know, is presently holding hearings on the administration's proposal. And there is little likelihood that the administration bill as originally drafted will emerge from the House without change.

There is no doubt in my mind but that it is in our Nation's best interests for our trade legislation to take note of the development of the European Economic Community. It poses tremendous problems for us, not only from an economic standpoint but also with respect to Soviet Russia's announced purpose to use trade as a weapon in the cold war.

President Kennedy is correct in wishing to have a trade law that will permit the United States to expand its exports and thereby share in the growing prosperity within the Common Market. It is logical for him to seek broader authority to cope with trade problems in a fast-changing world situation.

For my part, however, I am gravely concerned over the failure of provisions in the present trade agreement act to protect individual American industries from debilitating injury as the result of indiscriminate imports.

It was heartening to see the President, only about 10 days ago, approve Tariff Commission recommendations for higher duties on imports of certain carpets and glass. This was an occasion where the executive branch of the Government permitted the intent of Congress to be served. This hasn't happened too often in recent years; this was a refreshing, encouraging change. And I hope sincerely it was the beginning of a trend.

It is inconceivable to me that the Congress, while fully in accord with the need for up-to-date trade machinery, would strip away all safeguards against destruction of American industries.

Our farmers, workers, and investors simply cannot be subjected to downward trends in

employment, production, sales, prices, and profits while inventories, material costs, labor costs, and imports go skyward. Not if we are to maintain a healthy, expanding, and prosperous economy in our land.

I need not tell you that manufactured articles cannot compete under a system of free trade where the cost of labor is a paramount factor. Our products just cannot compete with those from Europe and Asia where their labor costs range from one-fourth to one-tenth of ours.

It is my conviction that the remedy for this does not lie in placing unemployed American workers and distressed American industries on the Government payroll. There must be a more reasonable and workable prescription. And it is my opinion that the success or failure of President Kennedy's proposed trade expansion program hinges upon the safeguards it provides for American jobs. There is no reason why such provisions, thoughtfully and carefully developed, should be inconsistent with the objectives of a new trade policy.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

MARCH 24, 1962.

Congressman FRANK W. BURKE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BURKE: I note with interest the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 15, page A2018. The State Department and the Captive Nations, inserted by Edward J. DERWINSKI, Congressman from Illinois. I believe he and Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD are certainly to be commended for their attempts to pass House Resolution 211. The intent of this measure is certainly in accord with the finest traditions of our great country. Will you please lend any help and assistance to these Congressmen who are trying to get this resolution passed and give it your active support during this session of Congress.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. FISH.

ROCHESTER, N.Y.,
March 19, 1962.

The Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SMITH: On behalf of the Rochester, N.Y. branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee, I respectfully request your favorable consideration of House Resolution 211 (the Flood resolution) which would establish a permanent Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

Our organization is in favor of a permanent House Committee on the Captive Nations.

We fail to understand Secretary of State Dean Rusk's opposition to such a committee. It would appear that Secretary Rusk does not have knowledge of the true situation behind the Iron Curtain, especially in the Ukraine where the Ukrainian people are actively engaged in opposition to and struggle against the alien Communist rule imposed by Moscow.

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM ANDRUSHIN,
President, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Rochester, N.Y. Branch.

RICHMOND ANNEX, CALIF.,
March 20, 1962.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: We are very happy to hear of your efforts to create a Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives, and we wholeheartedly support you.

We are enclosing a copy of our letter to Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH relative to House Resolution 211.

Yours truly,

ALEXANDER LYSKO, *President.*

RICHMOND ANNEX, CALIF.,
March 20, 1962.

The Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: As spokesman for our organization, I respectfully request your favorable consideration of resolution (H. Res. 211) which would create a permanent Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. Our reasoning is as follows:

The Russians make up less than half the population of the Soviet Union. The rest of the population consists of many different nationalities, some small in number, some large, but all having different historical backgrounds, languages, and customs from those of the Russian people. The Ukrainians (40 million) comprise the largest number of non-Russians dwelling in the Soviet Union. All these non-Russian nationalities were once independent, but became victims of Russian imperialism. All these subjugated peoples are treated as second-class citizens of the Soviet Union, and they are waiting for the right moment to cast off Russian dominance and be free once again. Under Russian domination are also many nations we call satellites; they also are looking for the right moment to shake off the Russian yoke. This is the Achilles heel of Russia.

Unfortunately, too many Americans, including political leaders such as Secretary of State Dean Rusk, seem to be uninformed about these elementary facts regarding the Soviet Union. Since the Soviet Union is the greatest threat to our democracy, it is imperative that we know the true facts about the Soviet Union. A permanent Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives will be of tremendous use in supplying to the American people and their political leaders the necessary data about the Soviet Union and the problems of the subjugated peoples in the Soviet Union.

The existence of a permanent Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives will give encouragement to the subjugated peoples and strengthen their resistance to their Russian Communist rulers.

For these reasons the logical and certain consequences of creating such a committee will be a strengthening of the position of the United States and a weakening of the position of the Soviet Union.

I hope you will give due consideration to the above mentioned reasons and give your support to House Resolution 211.

We also wish you to know that we are very sad to hear of Secretary of State Dean Rusk's opposition to such a committee, and we feel that he would not have opposed it if he had been in possession of the true facts about the subjugated peoples of the Soviet Union.

Yours truly,

ALEXANDER LYSKO, *President.*

BRIGHTWATERS, LONG ISLAND, N.Y.
March 25, 1962.

The Honorable DANIEL FLOOD,
Congressman,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I should like a copy of your "Captive Nations Committee" resolution, House Resolution 211.

You are to be commended for introducing this resolution and I sincerely hope that you are successful, with your colleagues, in establishing the committee, which would contribute immensely toward educating the American people as to what has happened in the captive nations since Communist takeover, and what will certainly happen here should we fail to keep our guard up.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

E. LEE NORTH.

MARCH 22, 1962.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I would like to express our organization's positive feelings on House Resolution 211—the resolution sponsored by Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD of Pennsylvania—which deals with the non-Russian captive nations within the U.S.S.R.

We would request that your House Rules Committee give serious thought to the passage of this highly pertinent bill at this time.

Our feeling is that the United States of America should put its best foot forward in helping all ethnic groups (Ukrainians, Georgians, Armenians, Byelo-Ruthenians, and so forth) to rid themselves of the dreaded Russian colonialism-imperialism that plagues Eastern Europe.

Whether under czar or commissar, the non-Russian peoples, who make up over 55 percent (a majority) of the total population in the U.S.S.R., have suffered beyond description under the imperialistic Russian boots, and we Americans should strive to aid these people who are the weak point or "crack" in the Russian armor, and therefore definitely the free world's strong point.

Such anti-Captive Nations Committee opinions as those voiced by Secretary of State Dean Rusk are a great detriment to the ultimate goal of the free world—peace, freedom and prosperity for all peoples and nations in a free and peaceful world. The feelings (I seriously doubt that he may have any)—of the murderer of Ukraine, N. Khrushchev, are the last thing that we should consider in any dealings with the Russian gangsters in the Kremlin.

Again, I reiterate one group's position that your committee should favorably consider House Resolution 211—the Flood resolution.

Thank you and your committee for your thoughtful and kind consideration and cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

ANTHONY SHARAN,
President, Ukrainian Community Center, Jersey City.

William Stern, Republican

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, normally I would not call the attention of my Senate colleagues to the campaign being waged by a man running for reelection as precinct committeeman.

However, this candidate is most unusual and I believe that colleagues on both sides of the aisle who know him will agree that his contribution to his Nation has been a great and continuing one.

I refer to a very good friend of mine, William Stern, of my State of North Dakota, and an article written about his distinguished career by John D. Paulson, editor, Fargo Forum.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILLIAM STERN, REPUBLICAN
(By John D. Paulson)

One of the rather fantastic stories of Cass County politics is the place of prominence that William Stern has held for nigh onto 30 years.

Some people have the idea that the Fargo branch of the Republican Party does not do anything without an OK from Bill Stern. This is not literally true, as of now, but it used to be the fact. It is true that this 75-year-old banker keeps a pretty close touch on all the operations as far as party politics go. He was never one to argue about party principles or platforms in the county meetings. His dedication has been to practical politics. All he has insisted on is having a hand in the selection of candidates for the legislature; the selection of precinct committeemen; and the selection of delegates to the State convention. He has gained his reputation as a party worker largely because of the long service he has given to the financial needs of the party. He has been both a solicitor and a contributor, and has had a major say on expenditures.

A lot of time and effort have played a part in Bill Stern's political power. He started as a Republican precinct committeeman in Fargo more than 50 years ago—in 1911 to be exact. And he's seeking reelection at the precinct level in 1962.

He moved upward to the State convention, and by the time Calvin Coolidge was nominated for his first full-time term as president in 1924, Stern was a delegate to the national convention, having been elected in the presidential primary.

In 1932, in the last presidential primary conducted in this State, he was elected a national committeeman and had a part in the ill-fated campaign for Herbert Hoover that year. He held on to the national committee post for 12 years. He still insists that newcomers to party politics come up the way he did—as precinct committeeman, as party worker, as money raiser—and then to whatever higher honor the person can achieve. In the years since he has retired as a national committeeman—18 years ago—he still has retained the power of veto over the aspirations of a lot of would-be politicians.

His friends and associates in party politics do not become very specific when they try to explain how Stern has retained such prominence within the party. The men he associated with in the earliest years of his service have long since departed the political scene. But Stern was always able to move along from one group of party leaders to the new group of youngsters coming up. His cronies of 30 years ago laid down the reins when they became a little tired of the infighting that goes with politics. But not Stern. He let some of the newcomers take care of some of the other duties that go with politics. They ran the errands, and looked up to Stern as the boss and as their protector, as the man who could help them achieve political prominence.

One of the big factors in his success as a politician is undoubtedly his desk at the front corner of the Dakota National Bank at Broadway and NP Avenue—center of Fargo's downtown. He was always ready to visit with anybody who dropped by—he often tapped on the window to have passersby drop in to chat. He knows the value of personal contact in politics.

I know that it is not quite fair to dig back into the newspaper files to find out what the politician said 30 years ago, but in view of the conversation that still centers around Stern after the 1962 Cass County convention, it shouldn't hurt to dig out a few of the items. Here they are:

November 1932: "To St. Paul to greet his chief went William Stern, Republican national committeeman still confident President Hoover will carry North Dakota."

February 1940: "To the great delight of the Republican National Committee in Washington, William Stern, North Dakota national committeeman proposed his own city of Fargo as the site for the party's 1940 convention.

"Fargo, in competition with Philadelphia and Chicago, got two of the 98 votes."

July 1940: "William Stern, national Republican committeeman declared himself out of the intraparty fight caused by the drafting of William Lemke, GOP congressional nominee, to run against William Langer, the party's senatorial candidate.

"'As Republican national committeeman for North Dakota, I feel that my foremost duty is to do everything possible to carry the State for Wilkie and McNary, Stern said."

This is the background of Bill Stern and it may help explain his long hold on the operations of the Republican Party in this city. Perhaps he is no longer the power he once was, but I do know that the list of delegates to the State convention was submitted to him for his examination—and presumably approval—prior to its adoption by the county convention.

And just about any time some party problems come up when he's out of town, the party chieftains are quite likely to defer action by saying, "Wait till Stern gets back."

Perhaps the best explanation for his success is the fact that he's rarely against anybody, but he might be so definitely for someone that he makes a stanch friend without incurring the enmity of the opposition.

When informed that this article was being prepared, Stern told me he was surprised that he had been 51 years a precinct committeeman. "Someone asked me recently and I guessed about 35 years," he said.

But he had a simple explanation for his continued success: "I've always kept my word. When I said I'd do something, I did it."

A simple rule, but sometimes hard to live up to in the rough world of politics.

Steel Contract May Portend New Era in Labor Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY A. TAYLOR
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the thoughtful analysis of the recent steel labor contract contained in an editorial of the Asheville Times.

The editorial follows:

STEEL CONTRACT MAY PORTEND NEW ERA IN LABOR RELATIONS

The new 2-year contract agreed upon by the basic steel industry and the Steelworkers Union may well portend a new era in labor relations.

The negotiations, coming far ahead of expiration of present contracts and at the Government's suggestion, assure the Nation that there will be no crippling strike such as the 116-day walkout of 1959.

Steel producers feel the cost of the new contract can be absorbed without price increases, and that they will be able to meet the growing competition from foreign manufacturers.

Workers and their union are satisfied that provisions of the contract will give them better job security, something that in these days of automation and widespread unemployment in the steel industry, is more important than higher earnings.

The Government's role in encouraging both labor and management to get together and work out their differences before a strike threat is significant in its practicality, its foresight and the fact that it is plain commonsense.

There is also strong evidence that both the steel companies and the union entered into negotiations aware of the importance of an equitable agreement to the national economy, as well as to their own interests. With this in mind, they met the administration's expressed wish for an early and noninflationary settlement.

The approach, the behavior of both parties, and the ultimate agreement are examples other industries and other unions are obligated to study and profit from.

The Belgian Carpet Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Belgian Carpet Case" which appeared in the Muncie Star edition of April 2, 1962.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BELGIAN CARPET CASE

That America must trade with the rest of the world is so patently true that it needs no explanation. How America trades with the rest of the world is the subject for most thorough argument.

The best example of this situation has to do with Belgian carpets and glass. A few days ago, President Kennedy used his authority to sharply increase the import duties on these two items. Belgium made immediate, emphatic protests, and the last of these complaints has not been heard.

In Brussels, Foreign Trade Minister Maurice Brasseur described this action as "a political blunder which risks compromising past and future trade agreements between the United States and Europe." He pointed out that the Common Market will use all means to fight the decision by the President. Included in those means would be reconsideration of agreements for a broad reduction of tariffs between this country and the market in Europe.

Brasseur said that while Belgium alone could do little to defend itself, other Common Market partners had supported the small country. Britain and Japan also expressed their distaste for such an abrupt change in a pattern of trade which had been accepted as normal.

As few things have, the President's action regarding carpets and glass focuses attention on the danger in the proposal to give unlimited powers in this field to the Chief Executive. How the President uses that authority will determine how America trades with the rest of the world. Frankly, it may be asked whether any one American should wield such undiluted control of our international trade.

It has been suggested that the President took this step to woo votes in Congress for his trade proposal. There are several votes to be gained from representatives of those States where industry produces glass and carpet in competition with the Belgians. This might be shrewd politics.

Yet, with no check on his powers in this field, what is to prevent the President from dropping duties on carpets and glass, once he gets what he wants from Congress? It would make good sense, politically. The President could buy votes in Congress with a duty increase, and then buy votes in Europe afterwards by lowering the import levy. What could be sweeter?

Politically, this kind of crossfire is most attractive. Yet, how does the President expect any businessman to operate under those conditions? Presidential whim and political expediency would replace normal market and economic factors.

In the light of the President's performance on the proposed Department of Urban Affairs, the process we have described is probably the one most likely to be followed.

Perhaps it is well that the Belgian rug matter came up at this time. Again, Brasseur has some pertinent points to make. "Can we trust the United States? That is the question. We could have understood such a measure coming from the Russians. But I can't understand how President Kennedy could take that decision at the risk of compromising trade and political alliance with Europe," he said.

The mere suggestion that American and Communist trade policies can be compared is one to make the stoutest Frontiersman pause. Yet, does not Khrushchev manipulate Red trade for political purposes? Have not we Americans taken smug pride in the fact that our international sales were conducted along economic lines, rather than under Government dictation?

Trade we must, but we must not trade on any terms, including the President's. The case of the Belgian rugs is proof enough.

A Bill To Authorize Life Imprisonment or the Death Penalty for the Sale of Narcotics to the Youth of This Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today which would authorize life imprisonment or the death penalty for the sale of narcotics to the youth of this country.

The objective of this bill is to safeguard our Nation's youth, which is another way of saying, safeguarding this Nation's future. In the words of FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover:

> Of all the corrupters of youth, none is more terrible than the dope peddler who entices children to try narcotics. Such a calculated assault on the standards of our youth should be met by a force of good within each community, united behind stern law enforcement and punishment.

Stern law enforcement and stern punishment are the most effective universally recognized way to curb the flow of illicit drugs. But the penalties that we have put into the law for the sale of narcotics, especially for the sale of drugs to minors, are not commensurate with the vicious crime which is committed. It is important to note in this regard that the narcotic problem is to a great extent a juvenile problem, since most, if not all, addicts acquire the habit during their teens. At present, the pusher who sells drugs to a minor is liable for a minimum jail sentence of only 10 years. This term is only 5 years longer than that which applies to pushers who sell to adults.

My bill would amend section 7237(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that any person who sells drugs to a minor may be subject to life imprisonment or death. While the penalties I propose are severe, nobody will deny that the purveyor of this "living death" should get less, or that such a penalty is not commensurate with the crime.

The U.S. Commissioner of Narcotics has gone on record time and again to the effect that "strong laws, good enforcement, stiff sentences are the necessary foundation upon which any successful program must be predicated." And that makes good sense, as all of us know from the enactment of the Lindbergh Act and the more recent aircraft piracy legislation, both of which authorize the death penalty and both of which have had the desired deterrent effect. The insidiousness of narcotic addiction with its terrible implications to the individual, and indeed to the Nation as a whole, requires similar forceful treatment. Stern penalties must be written into our statute books. Without them the courts do not have the tools to implement the program to wipe this crime from our communities.

Unlike other proposals in this area, my bill does not lump the narcotic traffic and everything and everyone related to it as a criminal activity; it is aimed solely at the pusher, and not the affected person on whom this traffic feeds.

For the sake of our children and our Nation's future, I commend this proposal for your immediate and serious attention.

Future of Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, early in March, Chairman ANDERSON, of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, put in the RECORD an exchange of letters with the Secretary of Agriculture on the continuing need for irrigation. In his letter, Secretary Freeman made it clear that to produce our food requirements in 1980 on fewer acres, we will need better, upgraded acres capable of producing 56 percent more on each acre under cultivation.

The Secretary subsequently made an address at the Farm Policy Conference in Brawley, Calif., in which he elaborated on the irrigation situation.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD copy of a Department of Agriculture release on his address.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN AT A FARM POLICY DINNER AT BARBARA WORTH COUNTRY CLUB, BRAWLEY, CALIF., MARCH 3, 1962

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman said today in Brawley, Calif., in the Imperial Valley, that sound reclamation and irrigation projects and the land adjustment proposals of the food and agriculture program for the 1960's are compatible with each other.

The Secretary based his statement on three foundation facts:

1. To attempt to balance production with market needs by eliminating sound reclamation and irrigation projects would be tantamount to deliberately promoting inefficient use of agricultural resources.

2. Reclamation and irrigation have a highly necessary role to play in the wise present and future use of national land and water resources.

3. Most of the farm products coming from irrigated land are not the ones for which there are serious overproduction problems.

Speaking at the opening of the Imperial County Fair, Secretary Freeman noted that 95 percent of the cropland in Imperial County is irrigated. The average value of the land and buildings comprising the 1,300 farms in the county is more than $200,000—twice the average for California as a whole and several times the average farm value in the United States.

"There is no conflict between sound reclamation and irrigation and the proposed A-B-C-D farm program," the Secretary said. "The crops grown on reclaimed and irrigated land are not primarily crops that are seriously in surplus.

"It is only through reclamation and irrigation that many areas in the West can have agriculture at all. Production from these acres is essential to both local and regional economies. More than 150 crops are grown on irrigated lands in the West, many of them not produced elsewhere in commercial quantities.

"It is unsound to suggest that the current imbalances which exist in some crops could be corrected by squeezing off water resource development in one section of the country.

"The same attitude is expressed by some who feel that the problem of overproduction could be solved by squeezing out farmers who have inadequate resources or by cutting back the investment in research. All such proposals avoid the basic question raised by the technological revolution in agriculture and none of them would solve the problem of production exceeding efficient use.

"Irrigation makes it possible for farmers to diversify to crops which are more profitable and in current market demand.

"As we look to the longtime future there is no question but that reclamation and irrigation must go forward. The concept fits logically into the abundance, balance, conservation, development approach. Certainly there is an urgent need for planning the future use of land to assure agricultural abundance and balance, while at the same time providing for conservation and development. We must plan now for farming, for recreation, for forests, for wildlife, for efficient use of limited water supplies, and for a land reserve before the acres are gobbled up and we have passed the point of no return in terms of future wise land use.

"Finally, there never has been, is not now, and I do not see how there ever can be, a sound argument for planned inefficiency in agriculture. Whatever short-term benefit might conceivably be derived from the standpoint of balancing supply and demand through inefficiency would be far more than offset by the waste of human, natural, and manmade resources. Our entire economy rests in large measure on a foundation of increasing agricultural efficiency, and the future progress of that economy will rest on further increases in farming efficiency.

"The technological revolution in agriculture has brought great rewards to the economy of the Nation. It has provided American consumers with more and better food at lower real cost than the people of any other nation have ever enjoyed. It has brought sustenance to hungry people throughout the world. The one real difficulty is that it has not brought adequate rewards to the farmers who produce this abudance. Problems of surpluses and low farm returns have blinded us to the tremendous productive success of our agriculture that has become the envy of most of the world.

"The problems exist because we have not been able to match the rate of advance in productivity with commensurate advances in social, political, and economic engineering that are necessary if we would make full use of our abundance.

"Research and education—yes, and mechanization and irrigation—have taught and enabled the American farmer to produce abundantly, but we have not yet learned how to manage that abundance in the best interest of all. Agricultural and industrial science has shown us that we can produce more abundantly than we can consume, but social science has not yet shown us how to engineer this efficient productivity to benefit the farmer producers, whose incomes average far below those of the nonfarm producers in the economy."

New Facts on College Classrooms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, despite the drumbeating to work up a head of steam in behalf of Federal aid to higher education, a mounting body of evidence is indicating that this massive Federal program is unnecessary. More evidence each day indicates that a great number of our institutions of higher learning do not want the Federal Government to get a foothold on the campus.

It is a well known fact that the Ford Foundation has never been known for espousing the more conservative or moderate cause. However, a study has just been released by the Educational Facilities Laboratories of the Ford Foundation indicating that our liberal arts colleges are more than keeping up with enrollment problems. The survey covered over 60 midwestern colleges and showed that the typical institution could increase its enrollment by 50 percent without putting up a single new classroom or laboratory, if it used its space more economically.

It also indicated that the average classroom in these institutions was being used only 17.6 hours a week and the average laboratory only 10.8 hours a week.

This intensive study was a follow up of a broader investigation of twice as many colleges which revealed that few of them, only 11 out of 124, had made any study on the adequacy of their plant. This recalls a California-Big Ten university study of several years ago which similarly revealed that classroom space was available for large increases in enrollment.

These new findings suggest the wisdom of further study by congressional committees of the need to finance college classroom construction through Federal loans or grants. A free copy of this study is available from the Educational Facilities Laboratories, The Ford Foundation, 477 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N.Y.

A brief description of this study, published in the New York Times on April 1, 1962, follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 1, 1962]

EXPENSIVE SPACE WASTED?

One of the chronic problems in American education is the difficulty of the small liberal arts colleges to survive. All the predictions, based on rising costs, increasing competition for faculty members, and the greater affluence of research-oriented universities, make their future seem grim.

But yesterday a hopeful note was struck, along with an "exposé" of current waste, in a study published by the Ford Foundation's Educational Facilities Laboratories. The survey covered over 60 midwestern colleges and showed that the typical institution could increase its enrollment by 50 percent without putting up a single new classroom or laboratory—if it used its space more economically.

Inevitably, these figures will be debated.

The new study, "To Build or Not To Build" (available without charge from EFL, 477 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.), anticipates the arguments. "There will always be colleges which place a high value on low pupil-teacher ratios and small classes," the report says. "But these institutions should have a clear understanding of what these luxuries cost, who pays for them, and what they have to do without as a result."

The average classroom in the institutions discussed in the survey was found to be in use only 17.6 hours a week and the average laboratory only 10.8 hours a week.

The booklet, which includes a "Space Utilization Workbook" for college administrators, is intended to help colleges to use their present space more efficiently and to build their future campuses for maximum efficiency.

The study links the need for a dramatic increase in faculty salaries—a doubling or tripling in the next 10 to 15 years instead of the 59-percent raise anticipated by the colleges—directly to the efficiency problem. One-fifth of the classes in the surveyed colleges had fewer than 10 students. The number of students per teacher ranged from 17.6 in colleges with 1,500 to 3,000 students, to 12.1 in the smallest ones with an enrollment below 400.

In a larger but less intensive survey, the EFL found that of 124 colleges only 12 had undertaken "intensive total studies" of their future plans. Twenty-nine had no studies planned at all; for 44 only enrollment projections; 28 only curricular studies, and only 11 had studies of adequacy of their plant.

Women May Be Answer in Space Field Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the dawning of the space age—with its dramatic impact upon our individual and global life—will require a special effort to provide the technological scientific

know-how and capability for space exploration and conquest.

Currently, Uncle Sam, free enterprise, our educational institutions, and others, are engaged in, or contributing to, specialized but limited projects.

As space activities expand, however, there will be a need for a greater reservoir of highly trained personnel.

To fulfill this requirement, we will need to take a new look at our manpower situation. Recently, the Green Bay Gazette published an article reflecting the views of William Howe, chief regional recruiter for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, entitled "Women May Be Answer in Space Field Shortage."

Recognizing that women, in our national life and in history, have successfully and admirably filled roles of significance, particularly in times of crisis, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for the consideration of Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Green Bay Press-Gazette, Mar. 27, 1962]

WOMEN MAY BE ANSWER IN SPACE FIELD SHORTAGE

NEW YORK.—A Government recruiter says that women may provide the ultimate answer to the acute shortage of engineers for aerospace and missile work.

William Howe, chief regional recruiter for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, says, "We're definitely trying to interest high school and college girls in engineering.

"Without interesting women, we just can't see how we're going to meet our long-range personnel objectives," he said in an interview.

Howe made his comments as he and scores of talent hunters from private segments of the areospace and electronics industries joined in an elaborate project for interviewing engineers assembled here for the 1962 convention of the Institute of Radio Engineers (IRE).

Of more than 60,000 expected for the 4-day meeting, it was estimated that 10,000 institute members will actively investigate a possible switch in jobs, and 1,000 will make a change.

NASA has passed the halfway mark in a nationwide drive, launched last fall, to add to its payroll 2,000 professional-level employees by June 30. In the next several years, it wants to hire 13,000 more.

Regarding the engineering shortage, the National Science Foundation recently estimated that 81,000 jobs were waiting for 37,000 graduate engineers turned out by colleges and universities last year.

The disparity promises to be even bigger this year.

As a result defense contractors and electronics firms compete vigorously for available manpower in the field, scouring campuses, visiting scientific conventions and occasionally raiding staffs of rival firms.

While there is a shortage of engineers, surveys have also shown that executives of some businesses which employ large professional staffs are cool toward hiring women.

In addition, women have tended to stay out of the engineering field.

Said Howe:

"Part of the trouble is that engineering has always had a connotation among women as being a dirty job—of men in boots, standing hip deep in mud.

"It will be hard and take time to change that image. And there'll be a marriage problem to fight."

Asked whether any headway had been made through NASA "spacemobile" demonstrations at high schools and colleges, undertaken to stimulate engineering interest in girls as well as boys, Howe replied:

"It's too early to say."

St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, on March 19, 1962, I asked to be allowed to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under my remarks an editorial that appeared in the Jersey Journal, published in Jersey City, N.J.

Omitted from my remarks was the fact that this editorial was a reprint from a column that was written by Hal Boyle some years ago.

I hereby ask that my remarks be repeated with the corrected credit attributed to Mr. Boyle.

Mr. Speaker, St. Patrick, the patron saint and the apostle of Ireland, is one of the most celebrated and revered church fathers in Christendom, and his birthday, St. Patrick's Day, is the Irish national holiday. His exact birthplace in Britain, called Bannanuenta, has not been definitely identified, and even the year of his birth is not certain, but it is said to fall between 385 and 389. He was brought up as a shepherd, and when he was 16 years old, he was set upon by a band of Irish bandits who had been making a raid on King Niall. They took him and his sheep to Connaught and kept him there in captivity for 6 years. Then he made his escape on a ship used for exporting fierce Irish wolfhounds. He landed on the coast of Gaul—France—and eventually made his way to the monastery of Lerins, where for several years he studied the principles of Christianity.

While there he saw in a dream a man named Victorious, bearing many epistles in his hands. On one of these St. Patrick read the words "The Voice of the Irish," and imagined he heard his people say: "We pray thee, holy youth, come and walk among us as before." This vision inspired him to return to Ireland as a missionary. After preparing for his mission he returned to Ireland to teach his people the new religion.

At first the Irish were ready to stone him for attempting an innovation in the religion of their ancestors. He obtained a hearing, however, and to explain his point he picked a shamrock from the roadside, using the three leaves on one stem to illustrate the principle of the Trinity. This simple comparison so greatly impressed his hearers that they allowed themselves to be baptized there and then. That was the glorious beginning of Christianity in Ireland.

During his long ministry he founded many churches, among them the church and monastery of Armagh, where he spent the latter part of his life and where he died at the age of 72. The Irish, being at heart a deeply religious people, always remember St. Patrick and celebrate St. Patrick's Day with particular enthusiasm and joy.

I would also like to include the excellent editorial which appeared in the Jersey Journal, March 17, 1962, paying tribute to St. Patrick's Day.

The editorial follows:

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

(By Hal Boyle)

(On St. Patrick's Day in Hudson County the principal editorial should discuss the occasion. However, no editorial could improve on Hal Boyle's column, first published here 10 years ago today. So here it is again.—THE EDITOR.)

What is it to be Irish?

On 364 days of the year being Irish isn't visibly different from being Scottish, French, Italian, Jewish, Serbian, Dutch, or—yes—even English.

The Irishman pays his bills, complains against his taxes, does his work, listens to his wife like the man of any other race.

But on this one day of the year—holy St. Patrick's Day—the Irishman becomes an Irishman.

And on this day you have to be Irish, to know what it is to be Irish.

The outer signs, of course, can be seen by all. The Irishman overnight grows a foot taller and stalks the earth like a giant. All traffic lights turn green for him, and if they don't he sees red.

But this air of majesty is only token evidence of internal change. The men of other races who envy the Irishman his bearing on St. Patrick's Day would envy him far more if they could look inside the Irishman's soul.

What is it to be Irish?

How can you put the wonder of it into words?

If a psychiatrist stretched himself out on his own warm couch after his last customer had gone home, and he dreamed of the man he himself would most like to be, well, he might be perfect, but he'd still be only half an Irishman on St. Patrick's Day.

What is it to be Irish?

It is to have an angel in your mouth, turning your prose to poetry. It is to have the gift of tongues, to know the language of all living things. Does an Irishman pause and turn an ear to a tree? It is because on this day he wants to hear what one sleepy bud says to another as it opens its pale green hands to the warm sun of spring.

What is it to be Irish?

Oh, on this day it is music. Not just the cornet in the parading high school band, but the deep, deep music of living, the low, sad rhythms of eternity. The Irishman hears the high song of the turning spheres, the dim lullaby of the worm in its cocoon. All the world is in tune, and he is in step with the tune, the tune that only he can hear.

What is it to be Irish?

It is to live the whole history of his race between a dawn and a dawn—the long wrongs, the bird-swift joys, the endless hurt of his ancestors since the morning of time in a forgotten forest, the knock-it-his-heart that is a part of his religion.

What is it to be Irish?

It isn't only the realization that he is descended from kings. It is the realization that he is a king himself, an empire on two feet, striding in power, a strolling continent of awe.

Why on St. Patrick's Day, to be Irish is to know more glory, adventure, magic, victory, exultation, gratitude, and gladness than any other man can experience in a lifetime.

What is it to be Irish?

It is to walk in complete mystic understanding with God for 24 wonderful hours.

Representative Collier, of Illinois, Addresses American University Marketing Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN KYL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, the following is an address delivered by my colleague, the Honorable HAROLD R. COLLIER, of Illinois, at the Third Annual Conference on Business-Government Relations in Marketing, sponsored by the American University, on March 30. Representative COLLIER, who was an advertising and sales promotion executive prior to his election to the House of Representatives, looks at the problem of the business and Government relationship from "both sides of the fence" and provides an objective study of the subject. His remarks offer nutritious food for thought as Congress deliberates on many issues which will have a deep impact upon marketing procedures in the months ahead.

The address follows:

BUSINESS AND GOVERNMENT IN MARKETING

(By Hon. HAROLD R. COLLIER, of Illinois)

The subject of this conference is as vast in its scope as the entire operation of this Nation's economic system. This sounds like an exaggeration, but is it? Speaking of government on one hand, in its broad sense, we have the greatest centralization of power in a single entity existing anywhere in the free world. While marketing, on the other hand, is properly defined as the aggregate of functions involved in transferring title and in moving goods from producer to consumer, including among others, buying, selling, storing, transporting, standardizing, financing, risk bearing, and supplying market information.

Hence the relationship between the two demands the closest cooperation and coordination in serving the public interests. Congress, in its wisdom, created the prime regulatory agencies and vested in them the power to regulate interstate commerce. Congress alone passes the laws which govern in varying degree the many facets of marketing; and it is incumbent upon the regulatory agencies to enforce these laws entirely within the realm of the intent of Congress. Obviously, if this were not the case, a regulatory commission or board would have the power to completely ignore regulations essential to the public interest in one extreme or virtually destroy any process of marketing on the other.

Since the Government must properly act to police the Federal statutes in many fields of commerce, it is entirely understandable that the performance of its enforcement duties generates allegations of hostility. But, of course, enforcement procedures in almost any field are accompanied by feelings of hostility on the part of those who are involved.

However, it seems to me that the Federal Government, its agencies, and the Congress have a certain responsibility, that of contributing to a healthy climate in which legitimate free enterprise can flourish. Laws which provide tools of too stringent control and harassment directly affect public confidence and create a business environment which is reflected in the marketing processes.

On this chord, let us briefly examine some of the legislation which I know is of deep concern to one segment or another of our marketing system.

Yesterday, for example, the House passed the Revenue Act of 1962, an omnibus bill which embraced many areas of tax revision. I suggest that each of you gentlemen in the advertising field acquaint yourself with its contents as your professional responsibility to yourself. For example, it provides for more stringent regulations in establishing your entertainment expenses for tax purposes. And you will have to interpret a variety of expressions such as "reasonable allowances" and "expenses directly related to the active conduct of a trade or business."

Of primary interest, I know, is the pending revision of our trade policies. While the final composition of the legislation to replace the expiring Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1958 is yet unknown, the basic proposal of the administration as outlined in President Kennedy's recent message will naturally require reappraisals and reevaluations of certain marketing procedures in many industries. While Congress for the most part recognizes the problems inherent in dealing with the European Common Market, it likewise recognizes the effect which it is going to have upon certain segments of our economy. To assume that government action can absorb the shocks wherever they occur through subsidies or doles, is wishful thinking. To further assume that it will provide a bonanza of immediate increases of foreign markets for American-manufactured products would be a gross miscalculation, too.

Certain businesses have already shown a sensitivity to the anticipated impact of sweeping changes in our trade and tariff policies. Others directly concerned see it as a boon to our participation in the world market. On a long-range basis we are faced with no easy series of adjustments; but we must move forward, nevertheless, in our broad national interest; and business and industry are sure to find in the final legislation a need to revise certain marketing procedures.

One item of legislation which is pending before our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—one which most certainly strikes at the core of our marketing processes—is House bill 8830. This would amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide for the issuance of temporary cease and desist orders to prevent certain practices, pending completion of the Federal Trade Commission's proceedings. The legislation itself is well meaning and basically designed to protect the consumer as well as foreclose the prolonging of any violation during the time hearings are being conducted by the Federal Trade Commission.

On the other hand, such legislation could cause irreparable damage before the defendant in such proceedings could establish his case.

The bill further states that under certain conditions the court could issue an order directing compliance with any temporary cease and desist order issued by the Commission and that failure to obey such an order of the court may be punishable as a contempt thereof.

You are all aware of the proposal before Congress that would change the drug patent law and would force holders of new drug patents into compulsory licensing for the manufacture of a new product at a fixed royalty after 3 years from the time of issuance of a new patent. As you know, patents are now protected for 17 years. Presently the proposal would be restricted to the drug industry but it most certainly has implications of precedent which can hardly be ignored in retrospect. There is no question that such legislation, if enacted, could, by reason of precedent, be broadened to include many types of patents.

Just yesterday the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce approved a bill which, if enacted, will require by law that television manufacturers include on all television receivers shipped in interstate commerce a unit for receiving both VHF and UHF signals, regardless of whether a particular consumer wants or needs the facility. There is a very good possibility that this bill will be enacted into law during this session; but there is a great deal less probability that Congress will act to eliminate the 10-percent Federal tax on television receivers to compensate for the inevitable increase in the cost of manufacturing only all-channel sets for shipment in interstate commerce.

It is normal for proponents of stringent regulatory legislation to point to malpractices of some individuals or companies in justification of their position. And none of us here are so naive as to believe that there isn't merit to this argument. More often than not, however, it is usually a case of requiring all business operations to suffer for the sins of a few who insist on making false advertising claims or engaging in some unethical practice or another.

In summary, let me say that management has before it the task of self-discipline, an area in which there is always room for improvement. And I hasten to assure you that this is applicable to Congress, the agencies and the Government itself, for that matter. But that is another subject.

The fact remains that it is the responsibility of the legislators and the agencies of Government to protect the consumer, just as it is the duty of business and industry.

Because the American business community is and always has been fiercely competitive, there is a great degree of consumer protection provided. And I have found from my own personal experience in this field that the American consumers are a pretty astute lot. More business firms have failed because the American consumer would not tolerate mistreatment or malpractice than have been forced out of business by legislation or regulation. Granted, there are always consumers who are gullible and who will be victimized by misrepresentation; but I am prepared to believe that these are the exception rather than the rule and I also believe that most successful businesses remain successful because they render a service or a product in which the public has confidence. For it is elementary that when any enterprise operates in a manner that destroys public confidence in it, it is destined to failure.

At the same time, we all recognize that Government has a solemn responsibility to protect the consumer, too. But in this process, we must guard against legislation and practices that force business to operate in a climate of public suspicion and skepticism, or in an atmosphere of constant uncertainty.

The fact that Government today, through legislative channels and executive action, is applying artificial respiration to resuscitate some industries which it has helped to strangle through regulation and legislative controls is in itself significant.

The gigantic and vitally important business of advertising in this most productive Nation is one which requires mutual understanding and cooperation between its participants and Government. For only if this exists can we expect to achieve the goal to

which we are all dedicated, that of expanding our gross national product to preserve and improve a standard of living which has been the highest for the greatest number of people of any nation in history.

Commit 25 Million

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, the belief of Prof. Richard Hofstadter, of Columbia University, that 25 million Americans who oppose radical ultra-liberal thinking and dogma should be placed in insane asylums is the subject of a column by George Todt which appeared in the March 26, 1962, issue of the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner. I am sure that Mr. Todt's column will be of interest to many Members of Congress. Under unanimous consent I ask that his column be placed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

COMMIT 25 MILLION

Should 25 million Americans who oppose radical ultra-liberal thinking and dogma be placed in insane asylums?

A controversial Columbia University professor, Dr. Richard Hofstadter, thinks so. In fact, he said so at Town Hall in Los Angeles last week. Also on KNX Radio's program called "Kaleidoscope." What's up?

Dr. Hofstadter is author of "The Age of Reform" and a visiting Haynes Foundation lecturer at the University of Southern California. He seems to have a penchant for infuriating people. What are his views?

Conservatives are "overprincipled," according to the learned doctor, and really hate America and what she has become by now. Through self-deception, these freaks want to return to "the good old days." Of course, in the process, they seek to intimidate and harm the innocent.

SHADES OF HITLER

Fortunately, Hofstadter assures us, the conservatives only number a small 15 percent of the population—and we must "encapsulate" such lunatics without political concessions or compromise.

I take it that he means concentration camps are just too good for such vermin. Adolf Hitler, where art thou?

Here is an exact quote of this modern Nietzschean superman, reported by a morning newspaper, as he describes conservatives:

"We certainly cannot commit them all to mental hospitals, but we can recognize their agitation as a kind of vocational therapy, without which they might have to be committed."

Apparently the only reason Hofstadter would refrain from committing "them all to mental hospitals" is because his figure of 15 percent conservatives in the U.S. population amounts to a whopping 25 million American citizens.

Only the Soviet Bolshevik Communists ever succeeded in putting that many "political deviates" behind barbed wire at once.

It's too staggering an order over here, you see.

However, we may be sure Hofstadter would like to see as many "encapsulated" as we have facilities for such an operation.

TO MANY, MAYBE

This is the Republic of the United States?

Or is it a bad dream of Hitler's "Mein Kampf"?

This is what that Nazi so-and-so outlined for countless innocent Jews in his Third Reich—and that's one of the reasons why we fought him, exterminated him.

What is the difference between Hitler placing Jews in concentration camps because they were opposed to him politically in Nazi Germany—and what Hofstadter now proposes for conservative Americans who disagree wtih his ultra-liberal thinking?

WORK OF SATAN

I think it is disgraceful and despicable that anyone who pretends to the word "American" could even contemplate the hideous and wicked thought of imprisoning—in insane asylums, yet—those who disagree with our political views. This is cowardly and vile.

It is impossible for any honest, decent Christian or Jew who believes truly in Almighty God, the Father of us all, to take such an evil stand.

The people who claim to fight "extremists" ought to take a rest from Robert Welch and take a closer look at Dr. Hofstadter.

His views on putting Americans in insane asylums came not only from Hitler and Lenin—but Lucifer, himself.

A Tribute to Hadassah

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. SCRANTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to say a few words apropos of Hadassah, the women's Zionist organization of America—a group engaged in work of the utmost importance to the cause of humanity.

Fifty years ago Hadassah entered the struggle for better living conditions in Palestine, which by then was already the prospective site of a Jewish national state. In 1912 plague and death dominated the land and poverty prevented the presence of adequate medical facilities. In answer to all of this, Hadassah was organized in America and went to work raising funds for medical assistance to the people of Palestine.

Since that time, the effort has been continued and expanded to the point where disease in that area has all but been erased, with the aid of $200 million, raised by the women of Hadassah.

By the time the State of Israel was born, in 1948, the infant death rate, which had been 140 per 1,000—in 1918—was down to a Western World normal of 29. Trachoma, the dread eye disease, was down from 34 to 4.3 percent; ringworm from 40 to 1 percent.

To accomplish results of this nature it was necessary to build many hospitals—and Hadassah accomplished the task. In a recent visit to Jerusalem, I had occasion to visit one of these hospitals, which impressed me as being among the most modern in the world.

To the women of Hadassah belongs the pride of knowing that theirs was an errand of mercy, crowned with success.

And as one of those who have viewed their success, in terms of the happy and healthy Israel population, I hail their cause, in the name of humanity.

Hadassah Commended

SPEECH

OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to commend Hadassah, the women's Zionist organization of America, on the occasion of its golden jubilee celebration.

We are all acutely aware of the tremendous accomplishments that Hadassah has made in the past half-century. Hadassah can be proud to look back on a remarkable record of achievement and forward to a future of continuing services in Israel and the United States. Founded in February 1912, the Hadassah program began as a modest attempt to raise the health standards of what was then Palestine. It has become an intricate system of healing, teaching, medical research, child rescue work, vocational education, social welfare, and land redemption which has earned international renown.

Unique in its flexibility, Hadassah has always been able to go forward with its ever-expanding program, even in the face of emergency situations in Israel and the United States. During World War II, Hadassah mustered its membership at home and earned a citation for its war effort while it geared for medical cooperation with the Allies on the Middle Eastern front.

In postwar Israel, after the creation of the state, Hadassah met the new challenge—the sudden flood of new immigrants—by a program of social and economic rehabilitation.

Hadassah's program in the United States stresses our democratic heritage and is pointed toward strengthening the role of democracy as a force for freedom and peace abroad. Objective and nonpartisan, Hadassah encourages interest in major issues by providing factual information to its members. It is its desire to forge closer links between the sister democracies, the United States and Israel.

From my own personal observations on several recent trips to Israel, I could not help but notice the scope and size of the many Hadassah projects mushrooming throughout this young democracy. These effective and useful projects have cemented the already firm bond of friendship between Israel and the United States.

The impact that Hadassah has had on the growth of Israel is incalculable. In fact, during my last visit, in a conference with Premier Ben-Gurion, this observation was made to me by the Premier.

I am thus proud to join in this 50th anniversary celebration, proclaiming Hadassah's golden jubilee year.

A Crucial Book Which Should Be Better Read

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important books in our national life, and one of the most neglected, is the Federal budget.

I include a brilliant comment on this subject by Maurice H. Stans, former Director of the Federal Bureau of the Budget. As author of the book during several years of the Eisenhower administration, he certainly is in a unique position to write as he has.

There have been a number of recent statements on the subject of economic illiteracy. Certainly one way to come to grips with this illiteracy would be to make the Federal budget required reading in the colleges and universities of the Nation for every student.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 2, 1962]

OUR CHANGING ECONOMY—MOST CRUCIAL BOOK IS NO BESTSELLER

(By Maurice H. Stans)

(Maurice H. Stans was Director of the Budget in the Eisenhower administration. He now is president of Western Bancorporation.)

The most important book published in this country in 1961 had a circulation of less than 5,000 copies. Yet, it is a volume that directly affects the life and circumstances of everyone. It spells out policies that will affect the conditions under which we will live, and the taxes we will pay, for years to come.

This grossly neglected book is the budget of the United States.

It is deplorable that the American people know so little about their Nation's budget or its impact on their individual lives. Because they are frightened by its telephone book size and its astronomical figures, they are content to form impressions on Government spending from newspaper headlines, and they assume that the budget itself is so complex that only the Congress and the financial experts can understand it.

Yet the budget of the United States is easy to understand. Actually, except for the size of its figures, it is remarkably like a simple, family budget in its basic characteristics. It estimates (a) how much revenues will be received during the year, (b) how much the President believes ought to be spent by the Government for the security and welfare of its people, and (c) the balance available for savings or for payments on debts (or if the budget is in the red, the amount that will have to be borrowed).

It is a working program for the country spelled out in intricate detail to the last dollar. Since it is practically impossible for the Government to carry out any activities without money, everything that the Government does is reflected in the annual budget.

From this, the parallels with a family budget become more clear. The Federal budget never contains all of the programs or all of the expenditures that people want, and therefore it must be based on a careful evaluation and rating of the things the Government can do. Priorities must be fixed, which is another way of saying that first things come first.

In a family, a new fur coat for the wife, a new car and a trip to Mexico may all be desirable. But it is not likely they can all be afforded in the same year, if at all. There is only so much money left after rent is paid, food and clothing are bought, and other essentials are provided. And even after the choices are made among the desirable things and that trip to Mexico is planned, it may have to give way entirely if junior has an accident and is hospitalized for a month.

The point is that not all desires can ever be met in a budget. If there is enough money to cover everything, it isn't a budget at all but a shopping list. A budget involves choosing: selecting the necessary from the desirable and the more desirable from the less desirable, all within a framework of ability to pay.

In describing this process to an audience, I once coined a statement which has since been attributed to me as Stans' Law: "Effective budgeting is the uniform distribution of dissatisfaction." Certainly this is true in the Federal Government, where there never is enough to go around to satisfy everyone. I once estimated that if all proposals submitted to Washington were to be approved, the budget would double. And that wouldn't be the end, because the next year new ideas would develop to double it again. Spending enlarges in concentric circles.

To disregard a proper relationship between income and outgo can have fatal consequences for a family. It can be no less fatal for Government. Borrowing is sometimes possible to tide things over until a better day comes, but borrowing can only be done on credit—the willingness of others to trust—and this is not unlimited.

This is equally true for a government. Its credit can be weakened by excessive spending, continuing deficits, and overaccumulation of debt, to the point of financial collapse. This has happened in a great many countries in the world in the last several decades.

A better knowledge of the workings of the Federal budget by more people might help restrain unreasonable demands on the Government. It might discredit candidates who are willing to make unlimited promises to get elected. It would certainly result in better and more responsible government.

But this increased knowledge is not likely to happen if the Federal budget's circulation is only 5,000 copies. For years, Budget Directors have sought to improve its distribution. A short, 64-page pamphlet entitled "The Budget in Brief" has been published concurrently with each budget for a number of years. Its price from the Government Printing Office is only 25 cents. In 1962, Budget Director David Bell boiled down the most pertinent parts of the Federal budget into a book of 361 pages. It can be had from the Government Printing Office for $1.

Either way, this is a low price to find out firsthand what your Government is doing. Learning about its programs is a first step in responsible citizenship. And it's the best way to earn the right to complain about high Government spending and excessive taxes.

The National Lottery of Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to bring to the attention of this body the national lottery of Greece. A nation does not have to be large in population or size to realize the tremendous benefits of a national lottery. All that is required is a little commonsense.

Greece is a small nation, and one not overly blessed with natural resources. The Greeks work hard to earn their money, and they know a good revenue device when they see one.

In 1961, Mr. Speaker, the Greek national lottery took in over $15 million—almost $3 million more than the previous year. The profits amounting to almost $3½ million were applied by the Government to the support of welfare, education, science, and archeology.

Mr. Speaker, why can we not be as wise as our foreign friends and capitalize on the normal human urge to gamble? A national lottery in the United States can easily and painlessly pump into our Government coffers over $10 billion a year in additional revenue which can be used to bring tax relief to our wage earners and start reducing our big national debt.

Other Way Around

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, there are many people throughout the Nation who are growing increasingly alarmed with the expansion of the powers and activities of the Federal Government. Most everyone blames this tendency on what they call encroachments upon the States powers. A recent editorial in the Grand Junction Daily Sentinel takes a different view of the situation which confronts us in these trying times. The editorial points out that the Federal Government has taken over local functions, not by usurpation but by default. It is well worth the few moments necessary for each Member to read this interesting viewpoint.

The editorial follows:

OTHER WAY AROUND

A conservative newspaper has said recently that "Because the Federal Government collects and spends more money than other subdivisions of government, some people are losing interest in local government."

We think it is the other way around. Because people, in a materialistically rich State which offers an easy way of life without a challenge to preserve it, began to neglect local government and local problems Federal Government was at first forced and now more than willing to take over.

We do not agree that Government is a boogey sitting in Washington grabbing all it can get. It looks like that, but it only looks like that because the American people have forgotten that they are the Government.

As, over the years, they refuse to face or do not attempt to solve local problems they make it possible for Federal Government to present a case for taking over. As the voters, they send men to Washington whose philosophy of government includes Federal con-

trol of practically everything—even those things local government could do better.

Yes, it's the other way around. Government does not take from people. People surrender their rights to government. They get the government they deserve.

Responsibilities of an American Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion of Ohio annually sponsors an essay contest among the young students of this great State.

This year an exceptional young man, Duane Rogers, of the Sixth Congressional District, was one of the winners. One merely has to read this outstanding essay and he can readily understand why Mr. Rogers was declared a winner. The work of this young man gives one the assurance that our youth of today have an abiding respect for America and a sincere sense of responsibility as citizens. I am exceedingly proud to submit this young American's work in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The essay follows:

MY RESPONSIBILITIES AS AN AMERICAN CITIZEN

In this day of nuclear power, of our missiles, rockets and high-powered bombs, we ask ourselves if we are glad to be living in this space age. Everything is going at a fast pace. People are hurrying and scurrying here and there. It does not seem that they are taking time to live and to enjoy life and to appreciate their opportunities.

We, here in America, are lucky people. There is no other country that has the opportunities unfolding day to day, as we have them here in our country. It is our privilege to take advantage of these opportunities and help build a stronger and better America. But how many of us take time to think of how lucky we are to be American citizens living in a land of luxuries?

As I scribbled these things down on paper, I began to feel drowsy. I must have fallen asleep, because suddenly I was dreaming. There was George Washington. He led the Colonies in their fight for freedom. He also helped make the new Nation and became the first President. There were also many great men gathered around a table making the Constitution. It was one of the greatest papers ever written in our history. There was also Thomas Jefferson who wrote the Declaration of Independence. He was a great President. On down through history I went until I came upon Andrew Jackson. He was our leader in the Battle of New Orleans in 1812. He was called "Old Hickory." On and on, time went on down through history.

Then I awoke with a start. It all seemed so real. As I sat there, I thought of how far our country has come since history began. From the 13 Colonies until our present day we have had to fight all the way for our freedom. We shall have to keep on fighting to keep it, maybe not with weapons, but with determination and loyalty to our country. Liberty is very dear to us, and we must keep it.

As an American citizen, what are my responsibilities to my country? One is to fight communism. How dreadful is the word. It is trying to seep into our beautiful land. We must fight it like a contagious disease. We cannot let it take root in our soil. As I grow older I understand its meaning more.

I want to be able to go to the church of my choice on Sunday and worship God in my own way. That is one of our freedoms. Another responsibility is when I reach voting age to get out and vote for my choice for different offices. That is each American citizen's responsibility. Sometimes I think we become lazy when we become old enough to vote for our choice.

We should sympathize with our President, whoever he may be because he carries a very heavy load. We look to him for the guidance of our country. We also look to him when any kind of national trouble occurs.

It is my responsibility not to hate people of other countries. There would be constant national wars if each nation would get angry at every little thing that happens. Getting angry does not solve anything anyway. We must learn to live and work together. We must learn to live and let live. We cannot afford to fight another war with the weapons we have today.

My greatest responsibility as an American citizen is to pray for peace and for the leaders of our country. May God bless America and keep her free.

Italy's Boys Towns—Msgr. J. Patrick Carroll-Abbing, Irish Founder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I take a great deal of pleasure in inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today an article extolling the great work of a priest whom I know very well indeed. The Right Reverend Monsignor J. Patrick Carroll-Abbing was the Irish founder of Italy's boys towns established as an aftermath of World War II which left tens of thousands of very young boys, orphaned and homeless, wandering over the land.

This article was printed in the National Chronicle and is entitled "Rome and Italy Honor the Founder of Italy's Boys Towns on His Silver Jubilee With National Celebrations."

When in Italy I visited two of these boys towns and since my return to the United States I have assisted in every way possible the continuation of this great work of Monsignor Carroll-Abbing.

The article speaks for itself and I add my own words of congratulations for the tremendous sacrifice and assistance of Monsignor Carroll-Abbing for young boys.

The article follows:

ROME AND ITALY HONOR THE FOUNDER OF ITALY'S BOYS' TOWNS ON HIS SILVER JUBILEE WITH NATIONAL CELEBRATIONS

In the ancient capital, which is today the city hall of Rome, many historic ceremonies have taken place. But on December 21 the great Hall of the Protomoteca was the scene of a festivity unique in the history of the capitol: the celebration of the 25th anniversary of the ordination of a Catholic priest. Twelve members of the Italian Government and the presiding justices of the Supreme Constitutional Court, the Court of Cassation, and the Court of Appeals were members of the committee.

The Right Reverend Monsignor J. Patrick Carroll-Abbing, Irish founder of Italy's Boys' Towns, was to receive a commemorative gold medal specially struck for the occasion by the city of Rome.

At 5 o'clock the frescoed hall was filled; their Eminences Cardinals Tisserant, Pizzardo, and Roberti, archbishops and bishops, ambassadors and a host of friends and well wishers crowded it to overflowing.

His Excellency Giuseppe Spataro, Minister of Transportation, opened the proceedings by recalling some of the salient moments of the priest's life. Immediately after his ordination he had entered the service of the Holy See. From the outbreak of war, and with the blessing of Pope Pius XII, he dedicated the greatest part of his day to the spiritual care of the wounded. Under the Nazi occupation of Rome he assisted the persecuted and aided the suffering populations. His heroic work was recognized on the day of Rome's liberation, when the resistance movement and the military and civil governor of Rome conferred upon him the Silver Medal for Military Valor on the field of battle.

'Contemptuous of the grave personal dangers to which he exposed himself he prodigated himself unceasingly to assist political refugees, patriots, and freedom fighters. Singled out by the Nazi-Fascist mob he continued serene and unafraid to protect all those who struggled for the just cause. A shining example of valor, of contempt of peril, and of Christian virtues." Thus read the citation in part.

The towns in the battle areas where Monsignor Carroll had lived in the caves, organizing medical aid, evacuating the sick and the wounded and caring for the children, conferred honorary citizenship upon him.

In that same period His Eminence Cardinal Canali wrote to him to express the gratitude of the Commission of Cardinals for the Government of the Vatican City, which "had full confidence in entrusting delicate and arduous tasks to you and is happy to testify that this confidence was not placed in vain.

"Nor could it be otherwise, when undertakings of exceptional charity are placed in the hands of an ecclesiastic who grants himself no rest nor allows any obstacles or dangers to hinder him, if he can bring help to the suffering members of the Mystical Body of Christ. To convince oneself that these appraisals are in no way exaggerated it is enough for us to recall the way in which you exposed your life to continual dangers and with unperturbed serenity, in order to succor your fellowmen, who were reduced to extreme need by the terrible upheaval of the war."

After the liberation Monsignor Carroll's work for the poor continued. He opened medical dispensaries, organized an antimalarial campaign, supervised the distribution of medical aid on a national scale. The Italian Government recognized his signal services in this field by conferring upon him the highest medical distinction, the Gold Medal for Public Health.

It is for his help to the child-victims of the war, however, that Monsignor Carroll will be most remembered. He gathered together the vagabond youngsters; he fed and clothed them and gave them a home. Thousands of men who are good citizens today and who are ex-citizens of his Boys' Towns, look to him with filial affection and gratitude.

The Minister concluded: "We salute today the learned scholar, the famed criminologist, but above all, we salute the father of the poor and of the children, the noble priest."

The mayor of Bovalino, a little town in Calabria, followed, expressing the gratitude of the poor populations of southern Italy for the more than 30 children's centers

opened there by Msgr. Carroll. In conclusion the mayor of Rome, Diana, in bestowing upon Msgr. Carroll the Gold Medal, read the citation:

While human solidarity lay in ruins, Msgr. Carroll-Abbing with indomitable fervor reawakened in the peoples crushed by the war and in the hearts of lost children, without consideration for differences of race and creed, the certainty of the Christian message of renewed concord among men.

The city of Rome decorating Msg. J. Patrick Carroll-Abbing with the Gold Medal on the occasion of his 25th priestly anniversary wishes to give testimony to him of its thankfulness and gratitude."

Later the same evening, at an official dinner at the Grand Hotel, and in the presence of His Eminence Cardinal Eugene Tisserant, dean of the Sacred College, and of members of the Italian Government, the Minister of Foreign Affairs presented to Msgr. Carroll the insignia of the Grand Cross of the Order of Merit of the Italian Republic, the highest rank of Italy's highest decoration, conferred upon him by the President of the Republic. The Under Secretary of State Elkan bestowed on him the Gold Medal of the Ministry of Public Instruction for his great educational achievements.

Significant among the other celebrations was the presentation made to Msgr. Carroll by the president of the Italian Jewish community, in gratitude for his help during the Nazi persecution, and the presence at the ceremonies of numerous representatives of the Protestant communities in Italy.

Milk Price Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Freeman's action setting the milk price support at $3.11 a hundredweight from the former $3.40 causes the Minneapolis Star to doubt the wisdom of Mr. Freeman's action a year ago in raising supports, and to comment that the current move is a political game. Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial in the Appendix:

MILK PRICE POLITICS

Agriculture Secretary Freeman has set the new milk support price at $3.11 a hundredweight. That's a sizable reduction from the former $3.40 and will mean a substantial cut in income for many farmers.

Freeman says he has no discretion under the law, that he can set the price higher than 75 percent of parity only if the increase is necessary to assure an adequate supply for consumers.

He and President Kennedy had asked Congress to continue the $3.40 price the rest of the year or until a new dairy program could be enacted. This proposal was turned down in the Agricultural Committees of both the House and Senate.

Some Congressmen said that Freeman had discretionary power and could set the price higher than $3.11. While the Secretary denies this now, he seemed to take the other view a year ago when he raised the support price from $3.22 to $3.40.

When the increase was announced last year, the Star said that "any rise in prices is likely to develop more resistance on the part of buyers. So some slight drop in consumption is possible. Such a drop, coupled with even a small increase in production, could unsettle the balance of recent years."

Consumption consequently did go down and production went up. The increased support price wasn't entirely responsible for either development but it was a factor, particularly in the production rise last year.

As things turned out, Freeman would have been wiser to have left the price unchanged a year ago. Apparently he was trying to play the role of hero in the Department of Agriculture and show the farmers how much better off they would be with Ezra Benson gone.

Now he seems to be using the minimum support price in a political move to win backing for his dairy control plan in the new farm bill. And his opponents are not above playing politics in the matter.

Caught in the middle are the dairy farmers, who probably would be best served by a moderate cut in the support to the old level of $3.22.

Victory for the Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the well-known radio commentator, Joe McCaffrey on March 29, 1962, made some pertinent remarks on his broadcast over Washington's station WMAL, which I wish to call to the attention of the Members of the House:

Good evening. President Kennedy can relax a little tonight. He has won the toughest fight of this congressional session. He has gotten his tax revision bill through the House of Representatives.

And the Democratic leadership of Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK, Majority Leader CARL ALBERT, and Whip HALE BOGGS can take a few bows.

Because this well knit leadership team not only won a victory that a few days ago was thought by some seasoned observers to be impossible. But they won going away—not by 5 votes as was the guessing in the Speaker's lobby at noon today, but by a healthy 225-to-190 vote on the showdown issue when Republicans sought to recommit the bill for two changes.

Speaker MCCORMACK is probably relaxing tonight too.

This was a victory for him—a victory for his leadership.

For the last month, Mr. MCCORMACK's leadership has been under a drumfire of attack. Not only by a nationally syndicated columnist, but in the little select liberal weekly press.

Most of this material has been written by editors—and reporters with little or no knowledge of the House of Representatives, and in many cases with little or no knowledge of something even more basic—the truth.

It is interesting that every one of these commentators and every one of these publications opposed JOHN MCCORMACK for the Speakership last November and December.

Today, the McCormack-Albert-Boggs team showed its capability. It not only had the Democratic Members on hand—it had them lined up and voting right.

There are other tests yet to come—the new Democratic leadership may not win them all. But today, it showed its critics that now that the shakedown cruise is over—it's going to be a tough team to beat.

Hadassah Golden Jubilee Tribute

SPEECH

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, this year, Hadassah, the Women's Organization of America, is celebrating its 50th anniversary as a nationwide movement of women dedicated to service to the United States and Israel. Hadassah, with a membership of 318,000 is the largest group of its kind in the world. I want to take this opportunity to extend my hearty congratulations and sincere best wishes to this fine organization. As Hadassah looks back at a remarkable record of 50 years of high achievement and progress, I wish to express the heartfelt desire that it will continue to grow and prosper.

I have been most impressed with Hadassah's history of medical service to Israel. From its inception in 1912 continuing to the present day, Hadassah has provided an ever-expanding program of medical care to the people of Israel. The goal of medical aid and public health service was foremost in the mind of its founder, Miss Henrietta Szold, a Baltimore schoolteacher, Hebrew scholar, and social worker. Miss Szold was distressed by the prevalence of malaria and trachoma in Palestine, where there was little, if any, medical aid available. This emphasis in medical programing may be seen in Hadassah's motto which is taken from the words of the prophet, Jeremiah: "The healing of the daughter of my people."

In 1913, the second year of Hadassah's existence, the organization sent two American-trained nurses to Palestine to set up a welfare station in Jerusalem for maternity care and the treatment of trachoma. By 1918, the Henrietta Szold School of Nursing, the first nurses' training school in Palestine, was opened in Jerusalem. Today the school of nursing has complete housing and teaching facilities for 150 student nurses.

In 1939, the Rothschild-Hadassah-University Hospital in Mount Scopus was opened. Another first for Hadassah, as this was the first medical center in Palestine. The medical school, at that time, was for postgraduate students and research only. In June of last year, the Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center was dedicated, a majestic 21-building complex devoted to medical healing, teaching, and research activities.

The Hebrew University-Hadassah Medical School is, in my estimation, the outstanding achievement of Hadassah's half century of existence. The school, which is Israel's only medical school, opened in 1949 with an initial student body of 45. Today, the medical school has a student body of over 700, and one of the finest faculties in the world. The Hebrew University Medical School has already given Israel a corps of expertly trained physicians. Graduates of the school constitute 90 percent of the hos-

pital resident physicians in Israel. Since 1946, a comprehensive fellowship program has enabled over 200 Hadassah physicians, nurses, and hospital administrators to receive specialized training in universities and hospitals in the United States and Europe.

The Hadassah program began as a modest attempt to raise the health standards of Palestine. This program has grown into an intricate system of healing, teaching, and medical research. Hadassah has laid the foundation of a significant public health program through its hospitals, mother-and-child clinics, community health programs, diagnostic, clinical and research activities, medical and nursing education.

It is my devout hope that all the countries of the Middle East will put aside petty bickering and jeolousy in order that the benefits that flow from this great school may be utilized by all the people of the Middle East. Such a development would stabilize peace and inure to the benefit of all mankind.

Hadassah: Golden Jubilee

SPEECH

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, 1962 marks the golden jubilee of the women's Zionist organization of America—Hadassah.

Organized in New York in 1912, under the direction of Henrietta Szold, this group can look back on five decades of outstanding achievement.

The beginning years were devoted to initiating, expanding, and consolidating a program which laid the foundation for what was to become a widespread medical system.

The purpose of Hadassah then as now is dual in nature—fostering Zionist ideals in America and establishing public health nursing in Palestine.

The American Zionist Medical Unit, the Henrietta Szold School of Nursing, Hadassah Hospital, and Rothschild-Hadassah University Hospital are but a few of the achievements of those early years.

As the stirrings of World War II were first felt, it was Hadassah that initiated the Youth Aliyal movement that would eventually transfer over 100,000 Jewish children from Europe into Israel.

During the war Hadassah membership was mustered behind the American war effort and in postwar Israel, after the creation of the new state, this organization met a new challenge—the sudden flood of new immigrants—by a program of social and economic rehabilitation.

Perhaps the most magnificent accomplishment of Haddassah is the Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center which rests on a hill above Ein Karem. This veritable city of science opens its healing doors to all, no matter what creed or nationality.

Thus from its initial modest attempts to improve medical standards in Palestine, Hadassah has developed an internationally, renowned medical, educational, and social welfare system.

While its roots are in the beginnings of the Jewish people, in the United States it has found the healthy suroundings and conditions that have enabled it to grow and thrive.

In the United States achievements like Hadassah's are an intrinsic part of our privilege as free citizens in a democracy. Because of this freedom, Hadassah has helped interpret Israel and its people to the American public and thereby has strengthened the bonds between our two countries.

Proposed Permanent Commission on Federal Expenditures—Endorsement by Shipbuilders Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, earlier this session, I introduced a bill, S. 2727, to establish a permanent Hoover-type watchdog commission on Federal expenditures.

Recently, I was privileged to receive a letter from the Shipbuilders Council of America. In the message, Mr. Edwin M. Hood, president of the council, endorsed the objectives of my bill, as well as pointed out other significant factors relating to the need for maintaining a strong, nongovernmental shipbuilding industry.

Believing that these observations deserve the consideration of Congress, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHIPBUILDERS COUNCIL OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., March 28, 1962.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The proposal in the star copy of your bill S. 2727 to establish a permanent Hoover-type watchdog commission on Federal expenditures is applauded by all troubled by the obvious disregard for economy in some Government operations. We particularly share the hope expressed in the legislation that, as one necessary step, the Government will make a renewed effort to eliminate governmental activities that can be better performed by private enterprise.

This proposal in S. 2727 prompted me to again review the recommendation made by the second Hoover Commission in its May 16, 1955, report on "Business Enterprises," concerning competition by the Government-owned and operated naval shipyards with private enterprise.

In a subchapter on that subject the Commission report made the following significant comments and recommendation:

"The Department of Defense owns a total of 48 shipyards of which 38 are maintained in the Navy's departmental industrial reserve. The Navy itself operates 10 shipyards, 32 of those in the industrial reserve are leased to private parties, and 6 of them are inactive. These shipbuilding and ship repair facilities originally cost $1.6 billion. The 10 active shipyards are part of the Navy's basic industrial facilities. Their primary mission is to render services and logistical support to the active fleet. They engage in construction of new vessels and in ship repair and conversions.

"The postwar tendency of the Navy to achieve self-sufficiency in this area is evident from the prewar and postwar employment levels in Government-owned and privately owned shipyards. During the 11 prewar years, 1930 through 1940, the Government employed 36 percent of all shipyard workers in the United States. During the post-World War II shipbuilding decline from 1947 through 1950, the Navy employed 44 percent of all shipyard workers. In October 1954, the Navy employed 105,900 persons or 51 percent of all the shipyard workers in this country.

"One of the reasons for the intensive operation of the Government yards is that section 2 of the Vinson-Trammell Act of 1934, as amended, requires that '* * * the first and each succeeding alternative vessel * * *' of each type of ship specified and their replacements be built by the Government. However, the act authorizes the President to have such '* * * vessel or vessels built in (either) a Government or private yard * * *' if he thinks it would be 'inconsistent with the public interest * * *' to follow the alternate construction requirement.

"While this requirement may have been necessary when it was enacted in 1934, the Subcommitee on Business Enterprises has found that the situation which it was designed to remedy has been reversed. Today private yards lack the construction and repair activity needed to maintain their capacity, skills, and military mobilization utility.

"Due to the distressed conditions of the private shipbuilding industry and the serious competition engendered by Government shipyards, the private industry is weakened as a war reserve. Considering the idle capacity of private shipyards to construct and repair all types of naval vessels, the subcommittee considers that the Navy's operation of all these 10 shipyards represents a destructive intrusion into the private shipbuilding industry of this country.

"RECOMMENDATION NO. 1

"That the Congress provide for the appointment of a commission to study the effect on the private shipbuilding industry of the construction and repair of naval vessels in Government shipyards. The commission should make recommendations for the transfer, where advisable, of such construction and repair to private facilities, and for the best disposition of the Government facilities; that this commission include representatives of the Departments of Defense and Commerce and of the private shipbuilding and repair industry; and that the majority of this commission consist of independent citizens having no connection with either the Department of the Navy or the private shipbuilding and repair industry."

(Source: pp. 9–12, H. Doc. No. 162, 84th Cong.)

The commission further recommended that all public laws which require or permit the armed services to engage in business operations which can be performed by private enterprise be reviewed and amended to permit private business to provide military requirements to a greater extent Also, that, in implementing its recommendations

for termination or curtailment of commercial-type activities, every effort should be made to proceed on a reasonable time schedule.

But look at what has actually happened in the naval shipyards since the commission report was published in 1955.

With capital assets of approximately $3 billion in land, buildings, and equipment—immune from all forms of taxation, 10 naval shipyards and 1 naval repair facility continue to perform the major share of all conversions, alterations, and repairs on naval ships, despite clear evidence that costs to the Government are greater for this type of work at these Navy installations, and despite the economic fact that any reduction of activity in the taxpaying private shipyards results in reduced revenue for the Treasury. Ironically, at the present time there are twice as many production workers employed on naval shipwork in the Government installations as are employed on this kind of work in the private shipyards.

Senate bill 721, introduced by Senators BUTLER, BUSH, and CANNON, complements the objectives of your bill. This measure, which has been referred to the Committee on Armed Services points to a correction of the present inequitable distribution of contracts for repair, alterations, and conversions of naval vessels between Navy and private yards. Better than 75 percent of this work is now allocated to naval shipyards.

Private shipbuilding and ship repair facilities compose a vital part of the Nation's mobilization potential. The present large amount of idle facilities in the private yards is hardly contributing to economic health and security. Private industry built, repaired, converted or altered a great majority of the ships which made victory possible in World War II. During and after that war almost all world leaders paid glowing tribute to the American shipbuilding and production genius which made it possible in the 1941–44 period to balance current losses with new ships and eventually to replace our earlier losses.

I can only repeat that your sponsorship of legislation favoring private competitive enterprise must be applauded. Please let us know if you have need for further information on the private shipbuilding and ship repair industry. We will certainly do our utmost to aid in your effort.

Sincerely,

EDWIN M. HOOD,
President.

The Democratic Charge That the Coal Industry Has No Future in the Economy of Pennsylvania Is Ridiculous Since Curbing the Unrestricted Flood of Foreign Residual Oil by Executive Order Can Restore Coal to Its Rightful Place in the Economy of the Keystone State

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, Friday, March 23, the executive director and secretary-treasurer of the Central Pennsylvania Coal Producers Association revealed that the State of Pennsylvania has, for the first time in the annals of the Nation's coal industry, fallen into third place among the bituminous coal-producing States. Robert T. Laing told a joint State government commission meeting at Huntingdon that bituminous coal output for Pennsylvania in 1961 fell to approximately 62 million tons and thus relinquished second place to Kentucky. It is a sad commentary on how the industry upon which Pennsylvania's industrial might was built has suffered under unrealistic policies on the part of the Federal Government. In retrospect, we realize that it was Pennsylvania's coal which fueled the fires for the entire Nation's industrial progress during the last century and well into the 1900's. Coal still accounts for almost a quarter of the total energy provided by fuels and waterpower, but the figure would be substantially higher if inequities that abound on the competitive fuels market were eliminated.

Coal began to replace wood as a source of heat more than 200 years ago. In 1763, during the seige of Fort Pitt by the Indians, Captain Ecuyer, the commandant, wrote that during a lull in the enemy's offensive, he led a party of 60 soldiers across the Monongahela River to get in a supply of coal. Gradually coal was used more and more in the smithing trade. During the revolution anthracite was shipped to Carlyle for use by armorers.

Anthracite was introduced into blast furnaces for making iron about 1830 and soon began to replace charcoal in the pig iron industry. Meanwhile, bituminous coal's versatility was becoming recognized on the other side of the Alleghenys. During the early 1800's bituminous coal was used for domestic heating, brickmaking, and blacksmithing. In 1808 a gristmill in Pittsburgh installed a steam engine, and 3 years later the first steamboat was built to operate on the Monongahela River. Ironworks arose at various junctures in the coalfields of western Pennsylvania. Glass plants and a variety of factories began to make their appearance. The Pittsburgh Gazette of November 7, 1833, listed 87 kinds of industries—including flour mills, gun factories, papermills, and rolling mills. Most of them used steam engines. Pennsylvania was moving faster than any other State on the way to industrial progress, and coal was the propelling force.

Bituminous coal production in Pennsylvania went over the million ton mark in 1845, and by 1880 had moved beyond 20 million tons annually. Meanwhile, the anthracite industry was developing even more rapidly, reaching an output of a million tons in 1837 and exceeding 20 million tons in 1872.

Mr. Speaker, these statistics may appear irrelevant to some of my colleagues, but they reflect very clearly the part that coal has played in the development of our State and our country.

Shortly after the turn of the century the bituminous coal mines of Pennsylvania began to produce upwards of 100 million tons per year, while anthracite's annual contribution averaged in excess of 60 million tons each year for the first half of this century. Trouble for these two great fuels industries began shortly after the conclusion of World War II. By now a new philosophy had been adopted by the Federal Government. Despite the great contributions of the men and boys from our mining communities to the cause of victory in Europe and Asia, their interests were subordinated to the desires of foreign flags by the time the shooting had stopped. In 1949 both the anthracite and bituminous coal industries in Pennsylvania were confronted with an economic menace which threatened to—and did—drive thousands of the working force of our State into the ranks of the unemployed.

Foreign residual oil had begun to take its deadly toll. Members of Congress who were serving in 1950 will recall hearings on both sides of the Capitol to determine just what impact alien oil would have on the domestic economy. I testified. So did many representatives of coal and railroad management and labor, as well as independent oil people. Here is a quotation from the testimony of Harry See, who represented the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen:

> In the last 3 years, from February 1947 to February 1950, the number of men employed by the railroads of America has declined from 1,368,285 to 1,170,192 a decrease of 198,093. While we do not ascribe all of this enormous increase in railroad unemployment to any single cause, we cannot escape the obvious significance of an increase in oil imports of almost 400,000 barrels a day in the same 1947–50 period.

Frank Earnest, Jr., who was then president of the Anthracite Institute, made this observation:

> It is axiomatic that in a given area a certain amount of energy is required to meet the needs for heat, light, and power. In this particular area (eastern seaboard) energy is supplied chiefly from bituminous coal, anthracite, oil, gas, and water power. If part of this area's energy requirements is to be supplied by oil from foreign sources, it follows that American labor formerly necessary to produce the energy must inevitably be reduced.

Here is a significant figure, Mr. Speaker. It was offered by Mr. Joseph T. Berta, who was president of the Pennsylvania Coal and Coke Corp. and is now president of the Pittston-Clinchfield Coal Sales Corp.:

> My company, in January 1, 1947, employed 1613 men * * * January 1, 1949, 1605 * * * As of May 10, this year, we have a total of 878 men. The other men are off the payroll.

I cite the residual oil record as a glaring instance of Federal policy that prevents the coal industry from obtaining a more equitable share of the national fuels market. Residual oil imports have increased fivefold since the first postwar year. The bituminous and anthracite coal industries have in consequence experience tremendous losses. Output has dropped drastically. From 57 million tons in 1947, anthracite production slipped to less than 18 million tons in 1961. At the same time bituminous coal production was declining from 147 million tons to 62 million tons; thus the alarming situation which finds our State's industry in third place among the Nation's producers. I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that Kentucky has also had a

fine record in its mining industry, yet the fact remains that the coal is available in Pennsylvania for use in the heavily populated and highly industrialized east coast markets. Our State has in the past two centuries produced more than 8¼ billion tons of bituminous coal and about 6 billion tons of anthracite, yet Pennsylvania has another 35 billion tons of mineable anthracite and bituminous coal reserves.

With this rich heritage, Pennsylvania stands ready to provide low cost heat and power for the industrial growth that must come with increasing population and higher standards of living. To permit a foreign fuel to deprive Pennsylvania's citizens of the opportunity to earn a livelihood while preparing for this economic upsurge of the future impinges upon the constitutional rights of those citizens. Last Thursday, March 22, Thomas Kennedy, president of the United Mine Workers of America, testified before the House Ways and Means Committee. After describing the cruel effects of excessive foreign residual oil shipments into this country, he said:

I wonder; indeed, every member of the United Mine Workers of America wonders, if the benefits that accrue from residual imports are worth such social and economic decay.

We cannot as a nation stand this burden indefinitely. The consequences are too far reaching, the results too serious to contemplate. America must decide whether or not to plunge an entire section of the country into social and economic oblivion unheard of in our times.

It is a fateful decision to make, a decision which can decide the future of this Republic.

Yet, today coal miners suffer, coal communities languish, and the entire coal industry pauses as those charged with the responsibility of protecting and promoting the welfare of this Nation deliberate and consider their fate, whether that fate be to live and work as American citizens, or to descend the long road to economic destitution.

As we continually increase our imports of residual oil, we still talk of economic growth. Even as a foreign energy source stranges the domestic coal industry, and even our own oil industry, plans are being laid for the millenium that is to come.

But we must ask: Where will the impetus originate? Certainly not from the coal-producing regions of the country. Obviously not from the coal miner who must face the future with a great deal of apprehension. Nor can we look to the coal operators to invest further billions of dollars to make coal as efficient and as modern as it must be to serve the growing energy needs that any economic growth presupposes.

Instead, while we talk of growth we must look to the underlying sickness that pervades the energy industries of our Nation. We must take cognizance of the virtual destruction that faces coal and oil and associated industries.

For we cannot talk of economic growth while allowing entire basic industries to perish before unfair competition. We cannot speak of prosperity while at the same time fostering economic privation. It just cannot be done.

It behooves those who are charged with the economic future of this Nation to become aware of what has been happening to the basic coal industry of this Nation. As we talk of economic progress and as they plan for such progress, they must be prepared to protect that basic industry which is the source of all progress. Any other course would be sheer economic folly.

Mr. Speaker, the recent increase in residual oil quotas granted to importers by the White House is inimical to the welfare of the residents of Pennsylvania and other coal-producing States. It needs to be rescinded, for there was no basis whatsoever in granting this favor, which amounts to an additional $35 million per year sales order, for the international oil crowd. There was no shortage of fuel. The importing companies have, in fact, been conducting a market campaign to widen their consumer area while contending that the volume of imports has been insufficient to meet demands of regular customers. Despite the fact that some imported oil is now being shipped inland as far west as the Harrisburg area, there has been ample supply on the seaboard itself. Let me insert the following comment from the March 15, 1962, issue of Platt's Oilgram:

Atlantic coast: Net reseller prices for heavy fuels are off in varying amounts at some eastern locations today reflecting discounts in effect and spot availability—see other story this issue.—[Not printed in the RECORD.]

Some heavy-fuel suppliers indicate they are meeting latest drop in prices (see March 14 Oilgram). Action is described as appraisal of product's easing trend, especially at reseller truck and barge levels. These adjustments, they conjecture, brought on relative changes at the cargo level.

At New York, many sources agree that spot lots of heavy fuel are more readily available now than they've ever been since the start of mandatory import restrictions. The day of premium offers for spot delivered cargoes is in the past. In fact, with the end of the current allocation period approaching, some suppliers still haven't used up their "tickets." Furthermore, there are indications that some "tickets" may be unused at the end of the allocation period.

Gasoline markets edged lower in portions of New England, Pennsylvania, and New York today—see other story this issue. [Not printed in the RECORD.] Distillate markets show little change. Resellers continue to satisfy only immediate needs. As a result, spot interest is dull.

No, Mr. Speaker, the recent increase in residual oil import quotas was as unnecessary as it was unfair. I recognize that the administration, at least as represented by its U.S. Senator from Pennsylvania, has written off a large segment of coal industry operations from all future activity. He made this statement on February 9:

Historically, this is an area built on coal and farming. It has a wonderful tradition and a proud history, and no one would be happier than I if the future of coal and farming in central Pennsylvania is as bright today as it was 100 years ago; but I suggest we must look stark facts in the face. That day is dead. It is gone. It's never going to come back and there's nothing we can do to resuscitate this. We can do something to shield the shorn lamb from the harsh cold wind. We can mitigate the plight of the family farmer. We can bolster, to some extent, the soft coal industry; but we are never going to be able to bring those occupations back to the proud state they occupied when this part of Pennsylvania was being built and became great. Rather we must look to new economic sources of wealth, create them if you will, to make this area a future worthy of its marvelous past.

If foreign oil is permitted to come in and wipe out the jobs of coal miners, railroaders, and the many other skilled and unskilled workers whose income is dependent upon the coal industry, then there is no question but that revival of mining in areas that are victimized by these imports may seem an insurmountable task. But I refuse to stand by and see the economy of our State surrendered. I would remind my friends who feel otherwise about the coal industry to study the statement made last week by The Honorable Thomas Kennedy, former Lieutenant Governor of the State of Pennsylvania. He said that residual oil imports are taking 3 million man-days of work from our coal miners each year and that the loss in wages amounts to $73 million. If Pennsylvania were able to regain its share of this volume of business, it would enjoy an automatic economic upturn throughout coal communities, railroad centers, and in every business house where the employees of these and skilled industries do their trading.

I commend the president of the United Mine Workers for his forthright message. I assure him that I for one will continue to do everything possible to give the coal industry of Pennsylvania its rightful opportunity to resume the economic role which it filled so effectively in days gone by.

Lemuel Covington Berry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include therein an article taken from the winter issue of South Carolina City, which pays honorable and deserving tribute to the late Mayor Lemuel Covington Berry, of Lowrys, S.C.

Lowrys is located in the district I have the honor to represent and is located in what we in my hometown of Chester affectionately refer to as our suburbs.

It was my privilege to know Mayor Berry. He was a fine, Christian gentleman, and the article written by Mr. Caldwell illustrates so well the exemplary life and good works of this good man.

The article follows:

LEMUEL COVINGTON BERRY

(By J. N. Caldwell, Jr.)

Lemuel Covington Berry, who served the town of Lowrys, as well as all towns and cities in South Carolina through his work in behalf of the Municipal Association of South Carolina, left this life and passed on to a higher office late in the evening of Saturday, December 16, 1961. His final rites were held in Chester, Monday afternoon, December 18, with burial in the historic Lowrys Cemetery, but all of us who knew and loved Mr. Berry will always feel that he is still with us.

Perhaps the two words that come most readily to one's mind in thinking of Lemuel

Berry are "Mr. Mayor." Lem Berry was first elected mayor of the little Chester County town of Lowrys in 1946, and served in that capacity until his untimely death in the waning days of 1961. From the day he was voted into office until his passing he was one of the most active municipal officials within the membership ranks of the Municipal Association of South Carolina. In the year 1952 he served as president of the municipal association, but at the time of his death almost 10 years later he was just as active in behalf of the work of the municipal association as on the day he became its president.

Mr. Berry was not only well-known throughout South Carolina, but throughout the entire United States as there were very few National American Municipal Association meetings that he missed during his tenure in the office of mayor. He was well-known by all of the legislators both in the present 94th general assembly and all of the preceding general assemblies for he was a diligent worker in behalf of better legislation for the towns and cities in South Carolina.

Two years ago when the municipal association was desperately attempting to see enacted into law a revised annexation statute—which although eventually would be important for the town of Lowrys was not necessarily needed by his town at that time, nevertheless, he worked just as hard in behalf of that legislation had he been the mayor of South Carolina's largest city.

Lemuel Berry was born on September 1, 1896, in Chester, the son of the late Thomas N. Berry and Lena Covington Berry. He also lived in Cheraw, S.C., for a time after being educated at Clemson College here in South Carolina and Guilford College in North Carolina.

Throughout his lifetime he was an active member of the Baptist church. On July 21, 1921, he was married to Miss Alda Pitman, and their daughter, Miss Harriet Berry, is now the chief stewardess instructor for Delta Air Lines in Atlanta, Ga.

In addition to serving the town of Lowrys as its mayor, Mr. Berry was chairman of the Chester County Library Board; a member of the board, Chester Red Cross Chapter; Chester County Development Commission; Chester County Democratic Committee; Executive Committee Southwide Association of Municipalities; the James Hemphill Post No. 27 American Legion, and the Ground Observer Corps for Civil Defense.

In March of 1918, Mr. Berry enlisted in the Regular Army at Fort Screven, Ga., and when sent to France he was wounded by enemy action, which would eventually lead to his death. Having been gassed by enemy action in 1918, Mr. Berry was at one time forced to retire and spend 3 years at the Oteen Respiratory Disease Center in North Carolina. Lem Berry, like the late executive director of the Municipal Association of South Carolina, looked upon this organization as the only voice that spoke for the cause of local government in South Carolina—the branch of government in this country which each of them believed supplied more direct services to the people—yet received very little recognition.

There are many people in South Carolina who will never realize the debt they owe Lemuel Covington Berry, who will never know how his work has touched and made their lives better. He was in the forefront of all legislation in the last 15 years enacted for the benefit of municipal government in South Carolina. His warm humanity, loyalty, love and devotion to friends, his unselfish service in behalf of others, and love for life itself, will never be forgotten by all of us who were privileged to know and work with him.

Boxing Kills Without Reason

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill, H.R. 11074, to prohibit the broadcasting of boxing matches on radio or television.

Since the 1st of January, Mr. Speaker, three persons have died as a result of boxing matches; Benny Paret who died yesterday was the third. According to the following article from today's Washington Post, Benny Paret was the 450th person to be killed in this sport since 1900.

The Washington Post article follows:

PARET AUTOPSY SHOWS NO PRIOR BRAIN INJURY

NEW YORK, April 3.—An autopsy on the body of boxer Benny (Kid) Paret today showed no evidence of an old brain injury.

Dr. Milton Helpern, city chief medical examiner, reported the findings after a 4-hour autopsy on Paret, who died early today of a beating suffered in a Madison Square Garden fight with Emile Griffith 10 days ago.

Dr. Helpern's statement said:

"Death was caused by complications of brain injuries sustained as a result of the boxing bout. The autopsy did not reveal any gross evidence of old brain injury."

The stocky, 25-year-old Cuban, star of one bruising battle after another since he started his U.S. campaign 4 years ago, never regained consciousness after being pounded against the ropes in the 12th round on March 24.

He couldn't punch too hard (9 knockouts in 49 fights) but he could absorb a wallop and wear down most opponents with his stamina and relentless attack.

A two-time welterweight champion, he became the first defender of a title ever to suffer fatal injuries in the ring. He was the third fighter to die of boxing injuries this year and about the 450th since 1900, according to Boxing Historian Nat Fleischer.

There was criticism that he had fought too soon after taking a severe beating in a 10-round knockout loss to National Boxing Association middleweight champion Gene Fullmer at Las Vegas last December 9.

There was worldwide criticism, too, of the Paret-Griffith fight and cries for the abolishment of the sport.

Death came to the kid at 1:55 a.m. at Roosevelt Hospital. His death was foreshadowed when pneumonia developed Monday, complicating the severe brain damage.

Some ringside spectators and viewers of the nationally televised bout counted from 20 to 26 blows Griffith hammered to the head of his rival before Referee Ruby Goldstein halted the action at 2:09 of the 12th round.

Doctors had given Paret only the slimmest chance of ever recovering from the injuries.

Only a few hours after the Saturday night fight, he underwent a delicate 3-hour brain operation to relieve the pressure of two blood clots. Doctors said then that "all that can be done has been done."

Later a tube was put through an incision in his throat to aid his breathing. He was fed by injections. But despite his stubborn, silent battle, doctors never had given much hope to his wife, Lucy, and others who stood the long vigil in and about the specially equipped room.

By State athletic commission rules, Mrs. Paret will receive $10,000 from the promoter's receipts, plus $750 for hospital expenses. She also has Paret's two-thirds' share of his $50,000 purse, with his manager getting one-third. Paret had no other insurance.

Pennsylvania Home Rule Association, in the Face of an Adverse Report by the Department of Commerce, Defends My Bill, H.R. 8612, Providing for the National Home Rule Road Program

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, since the introduction, on August 9, 1961, of H.R. 8612 at the request of my good friend and constituent, Mr. Thomas S. Stephenson, president, Pennsylvania Home Rule Association, Altoona, Pa., there has been widespread interest in the legislation. It has been described as the national home rule road program, because it proposes amendments to the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 which would channel all Federal gasoline and automotive excise taxes into the Highway Trust Fund. These taxes would be used for road improvement purposes and would spur improvements on all classes of public highways.

On March 2, 1962 the U.S. Department of Commerce, through its Under Secretary, Edward Gudeman, advised Chairman WILBUR D. MILLS, of the House Committee on Ways and Means, of its opposition to H.R. 8612.

The position of the Department of Commerce reveals the Kennedy administration's attitude in opposing any further amendments to the Federal Highway Act of 1956. The letter from the Department of Commerce follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in further reply to your request for the views of the Department of Commerce concerning H.R. 8612, a bill "To amend the Highway Revenue Act of 1956, and for other purposes."

The proposed legislation, which would be cited as the "national home rule road program," would provide that the entire amount received from Federal gasoline and automotive excise taxes would be placed in the highway trust fund and used for road improvement purposes. It would be provided that all public highways would be eligible for Federal aid, with 60 percent of the Federal funds available in the highway trust fund to be used for improvement of the Federal-aid systems and 40 percent for improvement of State highways and local roads and streets not designated as a part of any Federal-aid system. With respect to the latter, 50 percent of such funds would be expended by the State on State highways not designated as part of the Federal-aid high-

way system and 50 percent would be allocated by the State to those of its political subdivisions having jurisdiction over local roads and streets. The bill also would remove the present matching requirements of Federal-aid highway legislation so that Federal-aid highway funds apportioned to each State would be expended by the State or political subdivisions thereof without necessity for the States or their political subdivisions contributing funds toward highways constructed or improved under the legislation.

The Department of Commerce would be strongly opposed to the pending bill.

With respect to the provisions of the bill providing that all Federal gasoline and automotive excise taxes be placed in the highway trust fund, your attention is invited to the special message of the President concerning highways, dated February 28, 1961, which opposed transfering certain automotive excise taxes to the highway trust fund and recommended that financing of the highway program should be continued on a pay-as-you-go basis, supported by the user taxes specified in the Highway Revenue Act of 1956. These recommendations of the President were closely followed in the enactment of the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1961 under which additional revenues were provided to finance the completion of the Interstate System and the continuation of the program for improvement of the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems and their urban extensions.

If legislation such as H.R. 8612 were enacted, estimated revenues totaling over $1.6 billion annually, now accruing to the general fund, would be transferred to the highway trust fund.

The remaining provisions of the bill are entirely inconsistent with the fundamental concepts of Federal-aid highway legislation as developed by the Congress over a period of 45 years. Experience during these many years of Federal-aid highway operations has demonstrated the desirability of providing for the improvement of designated Federal-aid systems. It is apparent that funds would be widely dispersed and that an uncoordinated pattern of improvement would result if there were no requirement for system improvement. In fact, the requirement for system improvement was first incorporated in the Federal Highway Act of 1921 and has remained unchanged in principle.

Under the provisions of H.R. 8612, however, 40 percent of the Federal-aid highway funds could be expended without regard to system development or continuity of route improvement. The Department of Commerce considers that the expenditure of public funds in this manner would be highly undesirable and could readily lead to misuse of Federal-aid highway funds. We firmly believe that the public would not be receiving the greatest possible benefit from its highway dollar under such provisions.

In connection with that portion of the bill which would remove the present matching requirements of Federal-aid highway legislation, it is stressed that, as a result, the volume of Federal-aid highway work which could be performed would be reduced substantially. Under the present law, the Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban funds authorized to be appropriated by the Congress must be matched on a 50 percent Federal-50 percent State basis, and interstate funds must be matched on a 90 percent Federal-10 percent State basis. Under Federal-aid authorization levels for the fiscal year 1963, the program reduction resulting from a recision of State matching requirements would amount to nearly $1.2 billion annually.

Beyond this fact, there is to be considered the longstanding principle of Federal-State cooperation in the Federal-aid highway program. This Department believes it is essential that State or local funds contribute to the costs of projects financed from Federal-aid funds, except in certain special cases now authorized by law, as a means of insuring good highway administration. Prudent and efficient supervision of Federal-aid highway projects is much more likely to result at the State or local level if State or local funds are being expended together with the authorized Federal contribution.

The Department of Commerce believes that the provisions of H.R. 8612 are in direct conflict with the fundamental concepts which have been so recently supported by the Congress and the President in the enactment and approval of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1961 and strongly opposes the enactment of the proposed legislation.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there would be no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD GUDEMAN,
Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the following letter which I received, dated March 28, from Mr. Thomas S. Stephenson, of the Pennsylvania Home Rule Association, Altoona, Pa., in which he takes issue with the negative position of the Department of Commerce regarding H.R. 8612.

PENNSYLVANIA HOME RULE ASSOCIATION,
Altoona, Pa., March 28, 1962.

Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
1104 New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VAN ZANDT: Thanks for your letter of March 12 requesting our views on objections raised by the Department of Commerce to your bill, H.R. 8612, to provide a national home rule road program.

In analyzing the objections raised by the Department of Commerce, it is obvious that the author of the Department's objections had distorted the provisions of the bill and ignored its objectives and, in particular, the benefits that would accrue to the people in every State and congressional district in the Nation by enactment of the measure.

The basic provisions of the bill would:

1. End the diversion of motor revenues.
2. Guarantee the motorists a balanced highway improvement program on all classes of public roads—Federal, State, and local.
3. Promote the civic welfare of every community in every congressional district in the Nation.
4. Help to restore national prosperity by providing employment for several hundred thousand men on the roads and streets and in the roadbuilding material, equipment, and allied industries.
5. Enhance real estate values in every community where road improvements are made.
6. Promote the building of new homes, stores, shopping centers, offices, and service stations, as such construction always follows road and street improvements. This would provide additional employment in the building and allied industries.
7. Provide additional employment in the factories and farms that would produce the food, clothing, household, and other necessities that would be bought by those employed in the program.

All the foregoing objectives could be attained by Congress by enacting H.R. 8612, because this bill requires that all Feedral gasoline and excise taxes be placed in the highway trust fund to be used exclusively for road improvement purposes. Sixty percent of the trust fund, the same amount as is now used, would be allocated for improvements on the Federal-aid system. The other 40 percent would be allocated to the States, one-half to be used for State highway improvements and the other half to be allocated by the States to their political subdivisions on a 60-percent mileage and 40-percent population basis for the improvement of local roads which are not on the Federal-aid system.

The Department of Commerce objects to the use of the now diverted funds for the improvement of the State and local road systems that are not on the Federal-aid system. Its spokesman said, "The Department of Commerce considers that the expenditure of public funds in this manner would be highly undesirable and could readily lead to misuse of Federal-aid highway funds. We firmly believe that the public would not be receiving the greatest possible benefit from its highway dollar under such provisions."

This statement obviously is intended to mislead the Members of Congress, since it is not in keeping with the facts or the record.

The Department's charge that State and local road officials would misuse Federal funds comes with poor grace, when its Federal-aid policies are being subjected to an investigation by the Blatnik committee of Congress, which already has exposed corruption, waste, and downright graft in the Federal-aid program. Here is a quote from disclosures as published in a national magazine:

"Minnesota Representative JOHN BLATNIK estimates a large slice of the $41 billion highway bill is stolen by grafters."

Here is another from the same article:

"One investigator estimates a graft between 10 and 20 percent, a minimum of a $100,000 take a mile, or $4.1 billion for the whole network."

The foregoing are only samples of the findings of the investigators. Yet, the Department of Commerce spokesman is telling the Members of Congress that State and local officials might misuse Federal funds and the public would not be receiving the greatest possible benefit from its highway dollar.

The record shows that local officials and State highway officials give the motorists more highways for the dollar than they receive under the Federal-aid program. In fact, it is our opinion that the allocation of the $1,700 million of diverted funds to State and local roads would result in a minimum of more than 60,000 miles of road improvements annually.

The Department spokesman had overlooked one important point in his loose statements: The funds allocated for the improvement of State and local roads and streets would be subject to the same rigid laws regulating the expenditure of State and local funds for highway improvements.

The highway officials of the various States are either elected or appointed. The local officials, in the counties and other political subdivisions that would receive a share of the funds, are elected by the people.

The Department of Commerce spokesman for the Federal-aid bureaucracy, in making such rash accusations against the honesty, integrity, and ability of State and local officials, disclose little regard for the intelligence of elected officials, and it appears that they have the same opinion of Members of Congress or they would not have resorted to so many distortions of the provisions of H.R. 8612.

The Federal highway bureaucracy is not adverse to spending an average of $1 million per mile for the Interstate System, which is estimated by the Bureau of Public Roads to carry only 20 percent of the total highway traffic when it is completed in 1975. Yet, the same officials object to the proposal in H.R. 8612 to provide that the $1,700 million of diverted funds be made available for improvements on the State and local systems, which now carry 34 percent of the total highway traffic, or 15 percent more than the Interstate System will carry when it is completed at a cost of $41 billions.

Motorists throughout the country are becoming aroused over the deplorable condition of the public road system. They are finally becoming alerted to the diversion policy of the Federal Government, which is shortchanging them out of tens of thousands of miles of road improvements annually. They also are becoming aware that the matching provisions likewise are robbing them of improvements on the State highway systems. Many of them long have been aware that they are not getting their money's worth and they are being irked more than ever by dispatches published in their newspapers disclosing that hundreds of millions of dollars that they pay in Federal automotive taxes are being used to build, yes, superhighways in foreign countries, when they cannot get the improvements they need on the State and local roads that are not on the Federal-aid system.

The following is a sample and is a quote from a recent newspaper dispatch: "Washington—The World Bank's first loan to Venezuela, $45 million, will help to finance two express highways and cut transportation costs."

It is not hard to understand the feeling of the motorists when they read such reports and realize there are millions available for express highways in foreign countries, but no money for the roads used by American motorists who are paying the multibillion-dollar tax bill.

The matching provisions of the Federal-aid policy are directly responsible for the deplorable condition of thousands of miles of State highways. The matching provisions penalize the districts that need help the most. They must either put up the matching money or lose the Federal aid their taxpayers help to pay. Rather than lose it, they must put up money that is needed for State highway improvements. This forces neglect of the State roads that are not on the Federal-aid system and will, if the present policy continues, cost the taxpayers additional billions of dollars for reconstruction through the forced neglect by the notorious matching provisions.

On the face of it, the matching provisions constitute a ridiculous policy. Why should the people of any State put up from 10 to 50 percent of the State highway funds to get back only part of the money their motorists pay into the Federal Government in automobile excise taxes?

The Federal Highway Bureau policymakers, of course, do not want the matching provisions eliminated and the allocation of Federal-aid funds made directly to the States. Not because less roads would be built, but because the matching provisions give them greater powers to control, not only the expenditure of Federal-aid moneys, but over $1 billion of State funds, too.

These bureaucratic controls in Washington are ridiculous in that they violate the basic principles of State's rights and home rule. Why should State and local officials be controlled from Washington by the Federal highway bureaucracy? Certainly the local officials know their people's needs better than Federal highway officials who could not know anything about local road problems.

The Commerce Department spokesman places great stress on the charge that the allocation of Federal funds for State and local road improvements "would be widely dispersed and that an uncoordinated pattern of improvements would result if there were no requirement for system improvement."

This is a ridiculous assertion, in view of the fact that it would be impossible for any road officials to build all highways first. They must build, and have been building, the most important roads and adding to them as funds are available.

The Interstate System policy, controlled by the Bureau of Public Roads, has been the subject of public and congressional criticism for the widely scattered improvements on the Interstate System. No public road officials—Federal, State or local—can build a 10-mile stretch of highway, regardless of its importance, if there is only enough money available to build 1 mile. But the Commerce Department, in its statement, is evidently trying to impress Congress by the inference that only State and local roads would be constructed on a scattered pattern.

The Department also places some stress on the argument that H.R. 8612 would change the Federal-aid highway setup. It doesn't change any part of the Federal-aid program, excepting the matching provisions. What it does provide for is that the 1,700 million collected in motor taxes and now diverted be allocated to the States and political subdivisions for the improvement of State and local roads not on the Federal-aid system.

In conclusion, we hope that the Committee on Ways and Means will take prompt action and report H.R. 8612 for a vote in Congress, and that the bill may be enacted at this session of Congress in time for the 1962 construction season, so that several hundred thousand men may be put to work on the greatest State and local road improvement program in the Nation's history.

Cordially yours,

PENNSYLVANIA HOME RULE ASSOCIATION,
THOMAS S. STEPHENSON,
President.

Mr. Speaker, the proposal of the Pennsylvania Home Rule Association for a national home rule road program as embodied in my bill H.R. 8612 would mean as Mr. Stephenson says in his letter the creation of the greatest State and local road improvement program in the Nation's history. Therefore, it is hoped that the House Committee on Ways and Means will schedule hearings on H.R. 8612 so that the measure may be considered on its merits.

Hamstringing the GOP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, many thoughtful editorials have been written recently on the subject of congressional staffing. Some of these have appeared in the RECORD. The Newhouse newspaper chain, which serves my district through the Newark Star Ledger, has printed a number of good editorials on minority staffing.

Today, I should like to include an editorial "Hamstringing the GOP," which appeared in the March 20, 1962, edition of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat. Its publisher, Mr. Richard Amberg, is well known to many of my colleagues as an outstanding citizen, dedicated to a strong Republican Party and to a constructive Republican effort in the Congress. Therefore, his comments on staffing, a subject in which my friend, TOM CURTIS, of Missouri, has had a long, sincere and continuing interest, deserve special notice.

HAMSTRINGING THE GOP

When Democrats on the House Education and Labor Committee decide to saddle up and charge off on a crusade, they have a small army to hold their stirrups. Democrats on this committee have a staff of 48 at their command.

Their staff includes researchers, writers and other experts who help dig up information and put it on paper. Congressmen themselves are too busy to do this pick and shovel work.

By contrast with the Democrats' 48-man staff, the GOP members of the committee have only 2. Thus, on any pending legislation, the Democratic majority has ample help to prepare its case for or against it. The GOP doesn't.

On other committees, the staffs are almost equally lopsided.

Obviously the GOP is hamstrung in its efforts to dig up the facts and tell the other side of the story. Yet, without an effective opposition, our democratic process of government is in trouble.

Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS has waged a long campaign to bring about greater equality in the staffs on congressional committees. Roscoe Drummond, one of the Globe-Democrat's columnists pointed out the other day that Mr. CURTIS' efforts have not had the allout backing they deserve from his party.

The staff is the eyes and ears of the members of a congressional committee. It's high time the GOP demanded an adequate staff for its committee members.

Sewage Treatment Plants—Not Dams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable William O. Douglas addressed the Potomac Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, last January 10, on the subject of a clean Potomac River. Justice Douglas' speech discusses the proposal of the Corps of Engineers for a high dam at River Bend, and an alternative proposal for a clean Potomac. The speech, as it appeared in National Parks magazine, March 1962, follows and should be read by all who are interested in this problem.

SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANTS—NOT DAMS

(By William O. Douglas)

(The Nation's capital belongs, in the larger sense, to all the people of the United States. The welfare of the city and its surroundings—and, in fact, that of the entire river basin in which the city is located—is therefore a matter of concern to all the people. One of the pressing problems faced by the Federal City is that of an adequate supply of pure water, answer to which, most conservationists feel, is a clean Potomac River. In a January 10, 1962, address to the members of the Potomac Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, the Honorable William O. Douglas, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, spoke of the urgent need for a clean rather than a flushed Potomac; flushing is proposed by those ad-

vocating high-dam construction on the river. Justice Douglas' remarks before the Daughters of the American Revolution are presented here in full.—EDITOR.)

Pollution of the Potomac River is the foremost problem confronting all who live in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area. It is also a problem for every citizen who has pride in the Nation's Capital. The Potomac River though having some of the charm that George Washington knew, is now a national disgrace. At places it is an open sewer. At points the sewage sludge is 10 feet deep on its bottom. The Public Health Service standard for drinking water is a 5,000 bacteria count per 100 milliliters. The bacteria count at Great Falls, on the Potomac River, where Washington, D.C., gets most of its drinking water, is about 7,000 per 100 milliliters.

The Corps of Army Engineers proposes a high dam at a locality known as River Bend, near Great Falls. Its primary function will be to supply water to wash the sewage down the river. The dam would back the river up 40 miles, flooding choice grasslands, farms, and homes of Virginia and Maryland that must be condemned at very high prices. The water level would fluctuate as much as 35 feet, for the water flow in the Potomac is irregular. Think how ugly the silted mud banks of that lake would be. Think how awful they would smell. It is said that the water level in the summer months would fluctuate only 5 feet. A vertical fluctuation of only 5 feet means much wider margins of mud on the sloping banks of the river. Think how awful even that exposed area would look and smell. Think how dreadful the sight and smell, as the water level continues to go down in fall and winter when recreational needs are still great.

Eighteen communities in the Potomac Basin have no sewage disposal plants and dump raw sewage into the river above Washington, D.C.

There are 15 communities in the Potomac Basin which have sewage treatment plants but which give only primary treatment and thus discharge sewage effluent into the waterways that contains 60 to 70 percent of the original contamination. These 15 communities are above the Washington Metropolitan area and discharge their sewage effluent into the river above the District's water intake.

TREATMENT NOT WHOLLY EFFECTIVE

Thirty-one communities in the basin have sewage disposal treatment plants that give complete treatment. Of these 31 communities, 22 are above the Washington Metropolitan area. Even when a sewage treatment plant gives so-called complete treatment, it is only 70 to 80 percent effective. To put the matter another way, a sewage disposal plant which serves 1 million people pollutes the river at least to the extent of raw sewage produced by 300,000 people. So the combination of raw sewage plus sewage effluent heavily contaminates the river.

Sewage consumes oxygen in any water. Silt, by covering up bottom plants in waterways, also tends to reduce the oxygen content of rivers. Sewage plus silt creates a serious problem for any river. Some of our rivers have zero oxygen. Then even the hardiest of fresh water fish—the buffalo fish—leave the water. I have seen fish leave the Potomac and thrash until death on the river's bank.

As the Potomac passes historic Mount Vernon, it is unfit for swimming and too polluted for fish. In warm weather the stench that greets the visitor is appalling.

This is a sorry condition for George Washington's river. It is also a needless condition.

Recently proposals were made to dam Trappe Creek in Worcester County, Md. After a study, the Water Pollution Control Commission of Maryland recommended against the dam. The commission reported that the stream is too heavily polluted by sewage and industrial waste.

The same would be true of the River Bend Dam. The pollution of the Potomac at Great Falls is getting worse with each passing year. The area behind the high dam at River Bend would concentrate this pollution; the lake it would create would be so ugly and so ill smelling that no one would ever want his name associated with it.

Why then propose it?

THE RURAL COOPERATIVES

The chief lobby behind it are the rural cooperatives. In 1937 they obtained a preference to power generated by Bonneville Dam on the Columbia. By the act of December 22, 1944, this preference was extended to other public power projects. Under this law they will be entitled to priority over the electric energy generated at the proposed River Bend Dam. They want that power for transmission to the eastern shore of Maryland; and they expect to get it at 7 mills per kilowatt.

River Bend would produce at most only 90,000 kilowatts, which is not enough to supply steady power levels. It would, in other words, supply only peak power. There is no shortage of power in the Potomac Basin. Private power companies have an overload capacity of about 200,000 kilowatts. The Coordinating Committee on the Potomac River Valley, in a pamphlet entitled "Potomac Prospect" that was published in January 1961, says that River Bend Dam with a maximum of 90,000-kilowatt capacity would cost the public about $1,540,000 annually.

If the powerful lobby of the rural co-ops obtains the River Bend Dam, it should inherit the wrath of our people. For this River Bend Dam will inundate some of the loveliest valley and river-bottom lands in the area and substitute for their beauty the stinking banks of a muddy reservoir. All this for the greedy ends of lobbyists who pretend to march under the banner of conservation and recreation.

The rural co-ops have found a stout ally in the Corps of Army Engineers. It will take a united, concerted movement to defeat the disastrous designs they have in mind for the beautiful Potomac. The rural co-ops call the prospective River Bend Dam a great showcase for Washington, D.C. It would be a showcase of stench and of ruin and a permanent monument to the co-ops' greed.

NONDESTRUCTIVE PROGRAM NEEDED

Checci & Co. has submitted a report to the Governor of Maryland dated November 13, 1961, endorsing the River Bend Dam. It bases its recommendations on the "economic significance of tourism and recreation," which it says will come from the River Bend Dam. That report proceeds from one fancy hypothesis to another, claiming that millions of people would be attracted to the lake area above the dam and bring millions upon millions of dollars into Maryland. But that report is only a cheap beating of brass. For it overlooks the basic problem, viz, that people would never be attracted to a reservoir surrounded by mudbanks that have the stench of sewage on them. It also fails to realize that there exist even greater recreational potentials along the estuary once it is cleaned up; it fails to appreciate the fact that access and facilities are the key to recreational development. A pool 8 miles long now exists west of Seneca, Md., that can provide the same benefits for recreation that are proposed for a River Bend dam. All that is needed is access and development of facilities. This can be done with no destruction to farms, grasslands, and homes and at a much lower cost.

Some will say, "Let's build the dam and clean up the river." But if the river is cleaned up—as it must be—there will be no need for the dam.

The real need of the metropolitan area is a stable water supply and a healthy water supply. We can have it now, and in the year 2000 A.D., and in all future years, without any dams—if we will only clean up the Potomac and the Patuxent.

CLEANING UP THE RIVER

A nation that can conquer outer space and put a man on the moon certainly should be able to clean up its waterways. This cannot be done overnight. What we need is a full-fledged overall program so that in the near future we can have a clean river. This requires the following:

1. Prohibition of any raw sewage from any source being discharged into the waters of the Potomac Basin.

2. The adoption of sewage disposal systems for all communities in the Potomac Basin so that the so-called complete treatment would be given all sewage in the near future, and a system of treatment which would remove 100 percent of the contamination should be prepared for the next decade or two. The latter is possible by putting the effluent through distillation or other methods that may be developed. It will give our grandchildren, if not our children, a clean and healthy waterway.

If this is done, and there is no reason why it cannot be done at a cost no greater than the cost of the dams which the Army Engineers propose, there will be an abundance of water for all our metropolitan needs.

The estuary of the river can be divided into two parts: the lower and upper. The lower estuary extends from Chesapeake Bay to about Indian Head, approximately 30 miles below Little Falls, and is brackish or saline. In time—and probably a shorter time than we now appreciate—economic desaltation will be available. It is being used extensively in Israel today. The town of Freeport, Tex., has desalted water in its entire metropolitan water system. So has a small town in California. So has St. Thomas in the Virgin Islands. The scientific know-how is available. The problem is one of getting the cost lower; and the experts says there is a solution for that which is just around the corner. When that happens, all the estimates of the water needs of the entire country, including the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, will change.

But in the meanwhile we have in the Upper Estuary an abundant supply of potable water, if the river is only cleaned up. The Upper Estuary extends from Indian Head to Little Falls, where a new pumping station has been installed in recent years. This 30-mile strip of river contains a minimum of seventy-five billion gallons of fresh water. Once the river is cleaned up and restored to the beauty that George Washington knew, we would have a reserve of seventy-five billion gallons of potable water; and that is enough by any estimate to satisfy any use, normal or emergency. Whenever the natural flow of the river above Little Falls became inadequate, the present pumping system need only be shifted to the Upper Estuary.

FLUSHING NOT A SOLUTION

Flushing a dirty river is not the answer to our problem. We need a clean, wholesome playground for the four or five million people who will inhabit the metropolitan area. We need clean swimming holes, waterways for canoeing and boating, picnic sites for old folks. We need a waterfront toward which people will turn their faces, not their backs. We need the esthetic values of the Potomac. We need to preserve the historic shrines scattered along its whole length. We need them as reminders of the men who fashioned the Nation. We need these wild lands at our back door so that we, too, can find places for relaxation. Dams are sometimes necessary. If dams were necessary so that people could drink and bathe, all of us would subordinate other desires. But there is no such need on the Potomac.

Selfish interests distort the Potomac picture, making people believe that only dams provide salvation. Dams on the polluted Potomac would bring shame and disgrace to their proponents. Dams on a Potomac that was not polluted would be bad enough. When the pollution is ended, the need for dams disappears both at River Bend and on the several wilderness tributaries upstream from Washington, D.C.

If we are short of electric power, let's build steamplants and put West Virginians back to work mining coal. It is reckless and irresponsible for selfish groups, who have a dollar to gain, to make their profits through destroying the Potomac. But the lobby is a powerful one. If that lobby is to be defeated, all who love the Potomac for its history, its beauty, and the wonders of its islands and white waters must present a united front.

Resolution of Massachusetts State Building and Construction Trades Council, AFL–CIO, on Fallout Shelters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

RESOLUTION 4

Whereas Massachusetts Building and Construction Trades Council, AFL–CIO, adopted by resolution the following six points at its 82d semiannual convention in Boston, Mass., to wit:

1. The inclusion of shelter or shielding in all new schools, State and Federal facilities, hospital, private institutions and public and private housing wherever feasible.

2. The amending of building codes and ordinances to permit such construction if they be nonexisting.

3. The encouragement of public information through the construction of free demonstration of family fallout shelters in every large community of the State wherever practical.

4. The assistance of the press, radio, and television as well as any other form of communication to inform the public of the value of the shelter program and the importance of protection against fallout radiation.

5. The further encouragement of all duly constituted officials to obtain tax incentives and proper financing for such construction.

6. And be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be sent to the press, State and National headquarters of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization and our affiliated locals.

Whereas the new accelerated program which provides for marking, cataloging and surveying existing Federal installations and such private buildings that will be surveyed and made available to the public is highly constructive in nature; and

Whereas world tensions have highly increased, jeopardizing the lives of all free people; and

Whereas the Massachusetts building trades realize that nothing short of immediate action is necessary to meet this problem: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That all authorized officials in the State of Massachusetts request their governing bodies to grant their building inspection departments the authority to make provisions for changing their respective building codes to allow construction of all proper types of nuclear fallout shelters; and be it further

Resolved, That the duly authorized local officials obtain authority to grant adequate tax relief to those building fallout shelters; and be it also

Resolved, That the President appoint a Massachusetts Building Trades Civil Defense Committee of skilled official building executives who will act as coordinators in their geographic areas, and that the President and Secretary coordinate and effect a liaison with the proper State and regional officials as appropriate for the proper functioning of the committee; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress be requested to inaugurate a new Federal matching program for the construction of nuclear fallout shelters in all new schools, State and Federal facilities, hospitals, private institutions, and public housing wherever feasible; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of the above be sent to the press, President Neil J. Haggerty, the Governor's office, U.S. Senators and Congressmen, Labor Office, Department of Defense, OCD, and all affiliated locals, and the Office of Emergency Planning.

It's Time To Call a Halt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the true character of H.R. 10010, the Democrats' proposal for American agriculture, is eloquently stated in the following editorial from the Prairie Farmer of March 6, 1962, written by the editor, Paul C. Johnson:

I've been studying the new administration-backed farm bills which have appeared in Congress as COOLEY's H.R. 10010 and ELLENDER's S. 2786. I think it's time to call a halt on this march toward policed farming. Prairie Farmer has tried to be helpful to the administration efforts to deal with farm problems. We have explained the feed-grain law and given encouragement to the principle of crop adjustment embodied in this law. At the same time, we have been frank in saying that this program can't go on indefinitely.

But the proposed laws are not the answer. They have about them the smell of coercion. They propose to apply compulsory quotas to dairy products, feed grains, and other products. These quotas are backed with confiscation of property, fines, and jail sentences. Yes, there's provision to vote, but the vote is limited to certain producers and the choices offered the voter are both bad. There's provision in the law to dump Government surplus if the voters make the wrong choice. There's only a pitful 25 acres of escape at the bottom for farmers with small acreages.

If these proposals become law we may be past the point of no return. They had better be killed now. So unlimber your pencils and tell your Congressmen and Senators what you think.

Farming has its problems, but they are not so desperate that we should prescribe this kind of medicine. It has been said that we must do something to cut the cost. I agree. It is also said that we have tried everything and nothing has worked. I do not agree.

Here are things we haven't done. We haven't inaugurated serious, forward-looking programs to get poor lands out of farming into forest, water conservation and recreational areas, with all levels of government as well as individuals participating.

We haven't really done a job of cropland adjustment. We abandoned the soil bank conservation reserve just as we were learning how to use it by putting retired acres on a bid basis. We never did get around to limiting supports to a base portion of the crop and letting the big farmers go on their own beyond this base.

We haven't exhausted the possibilities of moving food abroad to hungry peoples. Nor have we done anything about concentrating the high-quality foods such as dairy and meat products and putting them away to be used only in event of atomic attack.

We haven't gotten it through our heads that if we expect Government supports at profit levels we are asking for complete Government management. If profitable farming is guaranteed, capital and people will rush in to swamp us. The only workable supports are those kept below average market levels and which function only in cutting the very lowest dips off the price cycle.

I am still confident that if we do some of these things and do them properly we can save money on farm programing and we can keep surpluses in check until the demand from an increasing population will come into reasonable balance with supply.

The Vote Is the Key

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, in the finest traditions of the Bay State's militant vigilance in behalf of individual liberty, the Boston Globe has published the following outstanding editorial:

THE VOTE IS THE KEY

Historically, the ballot has been the lever with which American minorities have gained status. It is probably the key to the civil rights problem in the South, where 60 percent of the whites and only 30 percent of the Negroes are registered to vote.

Of value in obtaining the ballot for the Negro is court action by the Department of Justice. A Federal law suggested by Dean Griswold of the Harvard Law School to qualify as literate every one with 6 years schooling could be useful. So could an antipoll tax amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

But in the long run the vote guaranteed by the 15th amendment must be obtained for the Negro—and by him—in the South. The 2-year drive to get him registered there, now being launched by the Southern Regional Council, an organization of southerners of both races, is therefore immensely important.

Endorsing this effort are the national committee chairmen of both political parties. It deserves universal commendation. In particular it challenges those who have criticized freedom riders on the ground that readjustment of race relations in the South should be gradual and orderly. How can that be better accomplished than by implementing the fundamental constitutional right to vote?

Staff of the Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter sent by me to the Librarian of Congress:

APRIL 4, 1962.

Mr. L. QUINCY MUMFORD,
Librarian of Congress, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MUMFORD: The Library of Congress report inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 28, 1962, at page 4927, leaves an entirely erroneous impression regarding the staff of the Committee on Un-American Activities, of which I am chairman.

Had you given any consideration to your responsibility in preparing such a statement, you would have ascertained that the staffing of this committee is entirely different from the impression your report gives.

This committee, as you should know, consists of five members of the majority party and four of the minority party, in order that it may function as free from political influence and restraint as our system of government can devise. The positions on the staff of this committee are not held by reason of political preference, and no member of the staff is considered as a "majority employee" or a "minority employee." In order to preserve the absolute freedom of staff action, such political classifications are not made with regard to the members of the staff of this committee.

The true situation relative to the staff of this committee will be briefly stated. Of the 14 key positions on the staff, 7 are occupied by Democrats and 7 by Republicans. Six of these individuals, three being Democrats and three being Republicans, have held positions with this committee for more than 13 years.

A more detailed statement of the facts is set forth below:

Richard Arens, Republican, was appointed the first director of the committee during the 84th Congress, and upon his resignation, effective September 1, 1960, Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., Democrat, who has served as counsel for the committee since the 81st Congress, succeeded to the position of director. Gwendolyn Lewis, Republican, was appointed administrative assistant to the director (Arens), in 1957, 85th Congress, and continues to occupy that position. Counsel and cocounsel, both Democrats, were appointed during the 86th Congress. The record clerk, a Republican, was appointed during the 79th Congress. The director of research, a Republican, was appointed during the 85th Congress. The head of the files and reports section, a Democrat, was appointed during the 79th Congress. The head of the editorial staff was appointed during the 84th Congress. Of the investigative staff of six, one, a Republican, was appointed during the 79th Congress; two, one a Democrat and the other a Republican, were appointed during the 80th Congress; a fourth investigator, a Republican, was appointed during the 83d Congress, and of the remaining two, one, a Democrat, was appointed during the 85th Congress, and the other, a Republican, was appointed during the 86th Congress.

I need hardly suggest that you make an appropriate amendment to your report setting forth the facts as given to you in this letter, and that it be given as full publicity as your original report.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman.

Handicapped Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lancaster News, Lancaster, S.C., of April 2, 1962:

HANDICAPPED INDUSTRY

J. P. Stevens & Co. announced last Saturday that the Hampton Mills plant at Easthampton, Mass., engaged in the manufacture of cotton textiles, would be shut down. The company's announcement said the action was being taken with deepest reluctance and regret.

The reasons given for the shutdown add up to a simple and forceful summary of the problems of the textile industry in the United States:

"This action on our part," continues the company announcement, "is but another illustration of the simple fact that unless industry can operate under conditions which enable it to make a profit, it cannot continue to furnish jobs to employees or returns to investors and, therefore, cannot continue to exist.

"Hampton Mills has been running at a loss for some time. This closing is also another example of the fact that the American textile industry has been operating under great difficulties and heavy handicaps."

This is not the case of a fugitive cotton mill desiring to move south. Stevens is already an extensive operator in the South. It is simply the case of closing down a plant which is operating at a loss. Factors contributing to this situation undoubtedly include high labor costs in the union-dominated New England area. They also include foreign competition and a dozen years of trading off the industry to win friends and influence diplomacy by the U.S. State Department.

A change has taken place in the past year in respect to cotton textiles in this country. President Kennedy has moved rather substantially to carry out the seven-point program announced May 2, 1961, to assist the industry.

The recent 19-nation agreement permitting a nation to freeze imports of cotton textiles threatening to disrupt domestic markets and offering other controls will become effective October 1.

President Kennedy has also acted to limit shipments of cotton textiles from Hong Kong and seems disposed to do something about the two-price cotton system.

These moves are viewed with satisfaction by the Special Senate Subcommittee To Study the Textile Industry, headed by Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, of Rhode Island, and including Senators NORRIS COTTON, of New Hampshire, and STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina.

In a second supplementary report issued on March 29, the Pastore subcommittee had this to say:

"Much has been accomplished during the past year. And for the first time this subcommittee can issue a report which is optimistic in tone. We wish to commend the members of the Interagency Textile Administrative Committee for a job well done at Geneva. And the hundreds of individuals who have participated in our investigations over the past 4 years must feel a sense of satisfaction in the progress to date. But the problems of the domestic textile industry as a whole have not been solved."

Saturday Classes in Russian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest barriers between common understanding among peoples of our country and those of foreign lands is that created by our inability to communicate—to express ourselves so that others may understand our strong desire for peace among all peoples. The Woburn Senior High School foreign language program has undertaken an important project with its Saturday morning classes in Russian which is a voluntary endeavor on the part of the Woburn students. The results of these classes will certainly be fruitful in years ahead when the present generation of high school students become the citizens and leaders of tomorrow. The principal, faculty, and student body of Woburn High School are to be congratulated. Under leave to extend my remarks I include the following account of this project appearing in the Boston Traveler of March 30:

SCHOOL OFFERS SATURDAY CLASSES IN RUSSIAN

A distinctive extension of the Woburn Senior High School foreign language program is the Saturday morning classes in Russian.

This is a completely voluntary endeavor on the part of the students.

The classes were initiated in September of 1960 on an experimental basis through the efforts of Mr. Henry Blake, principal of the Woburn Senior High School, and Mr. Ernest Mazzone, chairman of the foreign language department.

Students eligible to participate in the program have already had experience in one ancient and one modern foreign language.

One of the primary objectives of the course is to instigate a desire within the student to pursue the study of Russian, a language which has been placed among the top 10 in the National Defense Education Act's list of the Nation's most critical languages.

The course itself carries no Carnegie units, but if continued over a 2- or 3-year period will enable the serious student to approach his formal study of the language with greater ease and less distress than is usually encountered by those beginning study of Russian in college.

The results of these pilot classes will enable us to determine the feasibility of offering formal courses in Russian in the regular school curriculum.

The Cardinal and His Misgivings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the amazing similarity between the tragic foreign policy errors of the Roosevelt and Truman administrations and the policies now being followed by the Kennedy administration are obvious to all keen observers. Certainly, we are aware that State Department personnel responsible for formulating the erroneous decisions reached by Presidents Roosevelt and Truman are returning to positions of importance in the State Department at this time. The obvious inability to grasp the true meaning and menace of world communism that caused tragedies in the Roosevelt foreign policy is being practiced by the Kennedy administration.

Under unanimous consent, I insert into the RECORD an editorial which deserves thorough thought, especially by those within the administration who might be in a position to change the drift of our foreign policy before even greater errors than those perpetrated by Roosevelt and Truman might occur. The editorial "The Cardinal and His Misgivings" is from today's Chicago Daily Tribune:

THE CARDINAL AND HIS MISGIVINGS

Archbishop Spellman of New York, before his elevation to cardinal, had a long and close association with President Franklin Roosevelt and was appointed by the White House as military vicar of the American Forces in World War II. His memoirs disclose his feelings as an ominous change came over Roosevelt.

Spellman was already troubled by doubts when the Casablanca conference of 1943 produced Roosevelt's unconditional surrender formula. The archbishop saw that it would stiffen enemy resistance and lead to innumerable casualties, and he could not reconcile it with the pope's belief that there should be "peace with justice."

The Quebec conference of 1944, at which Roosevelt scrawled his "OK—F.D.R." to the Morgenthau plan for wrecking a defeated Germany's mines and factories and forcing the German people to subsist in a soup kitchen economy, fed the archbishop's doubts. Roosevelt, after his return from Quebec, confessed he was "frankly staggered" when this plan was reviewed with him, and he said he had subscribed to the idea "without much thought."

Still, his blunders did not suffice to discourage him from his continuing intention, first revealed in 1943 before Tehran, of appeasing Stalin and communism. He would tell Spellman, "with a disarming smile," that "the pope is too worried about communism." In rich tones he would expound to the archbishop how "Russia has need of protection. She has been invaded twice, you know."

So he persisted in the plan to deed a large swatch of Catholic Poland to the Kremlin atheists, ignoring Spellman's argument that this would be immoral and that Poles could never be transformed into Russians.

Spellman had been shocked profoundly that Roosevelt would go halfway around the world to meet Stalin in his own backyard at Teheran. He "felt humiliation" in 1945 when Roosevelt then went to Russia itself to join Stalin at Yalta. Roosevelt would tell him, "Don't worry. I know how to talk to Stalin. He is just another practical man who wants peace and prosperity."

The archbishop remonstrated, "He is not just another anything. He is different. You can't trust him. He'll never cooperate."

By the accounts of many associates, Roosevelt's health was precarious by the time he left for the Crimea. He could not formulate his thoughts and had even greater difficulty expressing them. His former ambassador to Russia, William C. Bullitt, observed, "But he still held to his determination to appease Stalin."

Although the distressed archbishop, in his New York office, knew rather more than most Americans of what was going on at the Black Sea resort, his peace of mind was not further unsettled by knowledge of a significant note slipped to Roosevelt at Yalta by his confidant, Harry Hopkins. As Roosevelt was busily handing over vast territories to communism, Hopkins scrawled the incredible counsel during a crucial discussion, "The Russians have given in so much at this conference that I don't think we should let them down."

Knowledge of the extent of Roosevelt's surrender at Yalta, especially the transfer of Japan's Kurile Islands to the Soviet Union, transformed Spellman's "old doubts and fears * * * into genuine disillusionment." For not too long before Roosevelt had pointed to these islands on a map and told Spellman, "Those islands are a dagger aimed at the heart of America. They must never fall into the hands of an enemy." And now the President himself had placed that dagger in the enemy's hand.

In view of Mr. Kennedy's accumulating hints of going to see another Soviet dictator at a summit conference, Cardinal Spellman's memoirs are recommended reading. He might save himself from some of the worst errors of his dotty party predecessor.

Private Initiative Developed the New Frontiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, America was built upon the strength, the initiative, the hustle and sweat of its people striving to create for themselves and their posterity a better, fuller, richer life. It was not done by the Government, wealth was not created through subsidy, the great West was not opened up through public works, but by the vision and the toil of our grandparents who dreamed the American dream and had the courage, as individuals, to make it come true. The following copy from an advertisement by Warner & Swasey Co. in the U.S. News & World Report gives us a basic reminder which it would be well for all of us to remember as our country stands at the crossroads of history where we may soon choose between freedom and slavery.

New England was a depressed area, too, but people took all they had—an axe, a plow, two hands, courage and self-respect—moved out of their depressed area, and founded the great West.

When it is let alone—when the Government keeps its wasteful hands off—the profit motive leads men to outdo themselves, create their own frontier, and grow and prosper.

But when Government decides it is its function to take care of people, it kills ambition, progress, self-respect. And that kills the country.

Post Office Gives Its Side of a Controversy Over the Mails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the magazine and third-class mail interests are continuing their campaign against a reasonable adjustment of postal rates to meet the mounting postal deficit. One of their recent weapons is an article in the current issue of Reader's Digest. The Honorable J. Edward Day, Postmaster General of the United States, has answered this Reader's Digest article in the April 9 issue of U.S. News & World Report. Mr. Day's presentation is so factual and forceful that I have asked leave to insert it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

The article follows:

POST OFFICE GIVES ITS SIDE OF A CONTROVERSY OVER THE MAILS

(By J. Edward Day, Postmaster General of the United States)

Myths, as everyone knows, die hard. Somehow cold facts never seem to be as attractive as legend. Some people simply prefer comfortable and familiar distortion to prosaic but demonstrable fact.

Sometimes legends serve a useful purpose. The familiar story of George Washington and the cherry tree has taught generations of American children a memorable lesson in truthfulness.

Sometimes legends serve a less laudable purpose. So it is with the hoary myths surrounding the Post Office Department. The Reader's Digest editorial, reprinted recently in U.S. News & World Report (in the issue of Mar. 26, 1962) dredges up once again the fanciful notions—almost all of them wrong—which do a great disservice to 582,000 proud, resourceful members of a vast but highly efficient communications system.

But more important is the disservice done the 54 million American households who use this system and, as mail users, can and do bear their share of the cost of its operation.

I speak so forcefully of myth versus fact in the postal service from a unique position—that of a Postmaster General who came to the management of this Department directly from a top executive position in one of America's largest corporations.

My management experience—first in business, now in Government—convinces me that any sound American business would do well to employ the kind of men and women who make up our postal service.

Our employees take pride in their increasing efficiency. They might be amused, for instance, at the Reader's Digest mention of the advanced technology of the Netherlands post office. There, the average Dutch postal worker handles the equivalent of 95,000 letters per year, while his much-maligned American counterpart, measured on the same basis, handles a volume of 121,000.

Since 1950 the volume of mail has increased 44.1 percent, but total man-years of employment have increased only 19.5 percent. Clerk employment alone has increased only 13.9 percent.

But I am heartened to find so many areas of agreement between the publishing industry and the Post Office Department.

We both agree that postal rates must be increased and postal costs must be carefully controlled.

We both agree that magazine-newspaper publishing is more than a business. The public interest is certainly served by the widest possible dissemination of news and information.

We both agree that publications should have a concessionary rate.

We both agree that magazine publishing these days is a precarious business at best.

We both agree that modernization and mechanization of the postal service are vital.

We both agree that the bulk of the cost of the proposed first-class increase would be borne by industry and commerce—as would the cost of the second- and third-class increases.

Our areas of agreement don't end here.

The Reader's Digest noted: "If a businessman were presented with the problem of putting the Post Office on a sound basis, he would take one obvious step at once: He would eliminate from postal expenses all costs for the many functions which are in every sense a public service."

I am the businessman who was presented with this problem. I did eliminate public service costs from postal expenses.

To review a bit, the Postal Policy Act of 1958, enthusiastically endorsed by the publishing industry, identified the areas of public service. But, up until 1961, the Department was quite content to ignore the intent of the Congress, clearly expressed in the 1958 legislation.

We, on the other hand, concluded early in our administration that the intent of the Congress should be implemented. For the first time, we successfully advocated proper recognition of these public service costs which should not be properly charged to the regular users of the mail.

If the previous pattern of cost determination were followed, ignoring the clear intent of the law, allowances for public services in 1963 would be about $74 million.

We have determined these allowances—to be deducted from costs charged to mail users big and small—properly total $247.8 million. Not surprisingly, we find the publishing industry agreeing with us on this more liberal and realistic approach.

But here, unfortunately, the area of agreement ends.

The Reader's Digest and other magazines need be concerned only with their own self-interest in regard to the adjustment of postal rates.

I cannot.

Let's make it clear what we mean when we discuss an increase in second-class postage. We propose to charge 1 cent more for each copy of a magazine or newspaper, such increases to become effective in two steps, 1 year apart.

At present, publications mailed at the regular rate pay 25 percent of what it costs us to handle them.

The Reader's Digest pays 2½ cents per copy mailed.

In other words, at the same time we ask the letterwriter to pay 5 cents instead of 4 cents, we ask the Reader's Digest to pay only 3½ cents instead of 2½ cents.

The Reader's Digest would shift the burden of increase in postal rates—which all agree are needed—to users of first-class mail to lighten the burden on second class, which is used for distributing their product. We cannot agree. I have the responsibility of being sure that the needed increases are fairly distributed among all the users of the mail.

Let us look at the economics of publishing. Magazines today are faced with new competition for the time and attention of their traditional audience. It is true that a number of magazines and newspapers have gone out of business or merged with others.

It is also true that a substantial number of new publications have gone into business and seem to be thriving. For example, such publications as TV Guide—third-largest magazine in the mails—American Heritage and Sports Illustrated are among some 30 magazines that have begun publication in the last 10 years.

The impressive list of successful new publications suggests strongly that factors other than postal rates determine the success or failure of a magazine.

A study by J. K. Lasser published by the Magazine Publishers Association indicates that second-class postage consumes just over 3 percent of total magazine revenues. Profits account for 1.7 percent of revenues.

Other costs run something over 95 percent. Most businessmen would be inclined to look at the vast area of 95 percent of an industry's cost for symptoms of its difficulty. Few managers, I think, would concentrate their efforts just in the 3-percent segment.

In an effort to solve immediate financial problems, magazines are placing greatest reliance on advertising revenues. In order to improve their revenue from advertising, they find it necessary and desirable to seek the largest possible circulation. With large circulation they can charge higher rates per page to their advertisers.

As a consequence, magazines are bending every effort to secure more and more subscribers. This is expensive.

For example, the Reader's Digest, which spends $3.2 million for postage to deliver the magazine to the subscriber, spends $4.4 million to solicit still more subscribers through the use of circular advertising mail.

The reader of a magazine who buys a year's subscription pays a lower per-copy price than the casual newsstand purchaser. Recently, in the race for expanded circulation, publishers have made special promotional subscription offers at substantial discounts below the regular subscription price. For instance, today the special offers have become the rule rather than the exception, with about half of all subscriptions being sold at the special rate. Some magazines have as much as 80 percent of their total circulation sold at special rates.

For example, the Reader's Digest has a special-rate offer, introduced in its current issue. The single-copy price at the newsstand is 35 cents. The cost of each copy bought at the regular subscription price is 33½ cents. But the current special offer brings the cost down to 17 cents per copy. This is 18 cents less than the newsstand price and 16 cents less than the regular subscription price.

The Reader's Digest only has to reduce the amount it is now giving away in discounts from 18 cents to 17 cents or from 16 cents to 15 cents in order to cover the added postage costs on a very large segment of its circulation.

According to the most recent publication of the Association of National Advertisers, the Reader's Digest, for example, sells 98.5 percent of all its subscriptions on terms under their basic subscription price.

The real question seems to be: Are lower rates for mailing magazines being used to serve the public interest or are they being used to increase the revenue from advertising by means of higher advertising rates based on artificially swollen circulation?

Merchandisers quite frequently sell products at discounted prices to build volume. On the other hand, if the discounted prices, in spite of the volume they create, reach the point where they wipe out profit, the merchandiser cannot logically turn to his Government for subsidy.

Yet the current position of the magazine-publishing industry, if we are to accept its plea that magazines be excused from paying their share of increased postal rates, is exactly that.

Such an approach to merchandising is not, in my opinion, sound business or good government.

The editors of the Reader's Digest quote John Fisher, editor of Harper's, as follows: "I just can't believe that the Government actually intends to destroy magazines such as Harper's, the Atlantic Monthly, the Reporter, Commentary, Commonweal, and Saturday Review."

The Post Office does not intend to destroy any magazines. That certainly is not our purpose. In proposing rate increases we cannot properly choose any user or any type of magazine as deserving particular or special consideration. The courts, including the Supreme Court, have ruled that, so long as its content does not violate the law, the Post Office cannot pass judgments as to the value or quality of the publication.

Value judgments are made by the reader when he chooses which of the 12,000 diverse magazines being published he will buy and read. This is as it should be.

There are one or two other observations I would like to make about specific points raised in the Reader's Digest.

A paragraph states that "several national accounting experts have recommended that the Post Office cost system should be overhauled to end the issuance of inaccurate, thoroughly misleading figures about profits and losses on the various classes of mail." This, too, is one of those myths that persist in the face of fact. The cost-accounting system is a convenient target for attack, when the actual target is not the system but the inescapable conclusion from its findings. The several national accounting experts apparently are not familiar with the discussion, debate, and legislative history on which the Post Office accounting system is based. These experts are apparently not familiar with the conclusion reached by such highly qualified people as Price Waterhouse & Co., which has testified to the soundness and accuracy of the cost-ascertainment system.

FOR A BALANCED POSTAL BUDGET

The Reader's Digest suggests that, even after the postal rates are increased, a deficit will remain because "red ink is waiting in the wings" in the form of increased pay for postal workers. Actually, President Kennedy's overall budget recommended an increase in postal rates sufficient to cover a deserved increase for postal employees. For the first time in history, an administration has simultaneously taken the initiative in both of these areas. The result of enactment by the Congress of both rate and pay legislation as proposed by the administration would be not barrels of red ink, but rather the first deficit-free peacetime postal budget since 1916.

Fiction and fact again appeared in an untidy intermixture when the Reader's Digest chose to say: "It is obvious that by ending the horse-and-buggy methods * * * by installing mail-handling machinery of all kinds, the Post Office could save tremendous sums of money."

I suspect that even the Reader's Digest would concede the way the mail was handled 100 years ago would not give them today the distribution system that makes possible the virtually simultaneous delivery of their magazine each month in millions of homes—at 2½ cents per copy.

As far back as 1922, mechanized sorting equipment was being tried out by the U.S. Post Office. Many of our offices today have modern machines to speed the flow of mail

and eliminate the menial drudgery of our employees. As fast as they are developed—and proven practical—new mechanical aids are added to our postal system.

We have a high degree of mechanization in 27 of our major post offices which handle about 34 percent of our total mail. Extensive mechanization is practicable only in our larger offices with their heavy, concentrated mail volume.

Meanwhile, foreign postal systems look to us—not the other way around—for the latest in postal mechanization. For example:

"The United States has made the most advances in research and development * * * as compared with all other members of the Consultative Committee on Postal Studies," according to L. T. Hoolboom, Superior Director of Posts, the Netherlands.

"The most advanced mechanization seen in any postal system," said Stanley Scott, Assistant Director of Mechanization and Building, London, England.

"We got numerous suggestions from your postal laboratory and your mechanized post offices for future development of mechanization and automation in our postal service." Franz Vierling, Post Director, Bundesministerium, Bonn, West Germany, wrote recently.

Like any business, we buy and use only proven machinery in those applications where volume and utilization make such usage practical. Like any business, we are devoting talent and money to research. Through our new challenge to industry program, we are enlisting private industry in the challenges of postal mechanization.

The Reader's Digest vaguely implies, perhaps in frustration, that some presently unused machine, installed simultaneously in each of our 35,000 offices, would magically create a new mechanized era of mail handling.

The concentrated engineering talent of the free world has yet to develop such machines. When—and if—such mechanical marvels do appear, the U.S. postal system will be the first to utilize them.

But, in the meantime, we have a gigantic day-to-day responsibility. So long as letters, addressed in everything from a child's scrawl to computer type, must be read several times to move them on their way, men—not machines—will be the heart of the postal system.

So long as Americans continue to be the world's most literate people and most voracious readers, magazines and newspapers that satisfy their subscribers' wants will sell by the million. And the Post Office will continue to deliver them at concessionary rates reflecting their public interest value.

So long as the U.S. Post Office continues to fill its unique dual role as a contractor to mail users and a service to the public, our rates will have to reflect those twin responsibilities.

The postal-rate bill, passed by the House and now pending before the Senate, does just that.

In providing for $691 million in new revenues, it will give all users of the mail a fair and equitable share of the cost of the service they enjoy without violating the historic and justified concessions granted publishers and others.

In earmarking $248 million for public service, the legislation will realistically acknowledge the postal and nonpostal costs of running this Department in the public interest which should not be borne by mail users.

Since the days of Ben Franklin there have been those who raised strident voices claiming that the postal revenue deficiency would somehow be resolved if only the Post Office were "modernized," or "energized," or "streamlined," or "automated."

The Reader's Digest seems to envision a robot clanking up to your house and mine, delivering our mail and our Digest mechanically, getting our signature on insured packages, opening a slot in his enameled chest for collecting postage due, petting the dog with a cold metallic hand and chatting about the weather, perhaps via prerecorded tape.

WHY MAIL COSTS ARE RISING

The dreamers of such dreams choose to ignore a number of the very wideawake facts which I have outlined briefly here. The costs of running a modern and efficient postal service for the benefit of all mail users are rising because of the greater and greater use of our service by more and more people.

Our choice is not between the letter carrier who brings the mail every day and a robot who might replace him—but between a mail service paid for by those who use it or paid for by all of the taxpayers.

Raytheon Gets Crucial Planning Job for Rusk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the Fifth District of Massachusetts, which I have the honor to represent, is contributing hugely to our Nation's defense. The Raytheon Corp. plays a major role in this contribution. Now, the Fifth District also is being charged with a share of our efforts toward the time when, hopefully, a sound, bilateral disarmament agreement has been achieved. The following article from the Boston Globe of March 29 tells the story:

RAYTHEON GETS CRUCIAL PLANNING JOB FOR RUSK

WASHINGTON, March 28.—Secretary of State Dean Rusk reported to President Kennedy and the National Security Council today on the Geneva Conference.

The Conferences came as the Government moved forward with Rusk's proposal for a zonal inspection system in any disarmament agreement growing out of the Geneva sessions. A $125,000 contract was awarded a private firm to work out details of the plan.

Action on Rusk's proposed plan was taken by the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. It awarded the contract to the Raytheon Co.'s missile and space division, Bedford, Mass.

In his closing speech at Geneva, Rusk suggested that inspection of any disarmament agreement could be limited at first to certain zones in Russia, the United States and other countries.

He said this might meet Russian objections to international inspection, while retaining safeguards demanded by the United States.

The Raytheon study, to last 6 months, will deal with ways for drawing the zones, the number of zones needed, manpower requirements, the extent to which inspection stations would be needed at fixed military installations and methods for preventing secret movement of arms.

Rusk, who returned from Geneva Tuesday night, conferred first today with the President, and both then attended a meeting of the Security Council. While subjects under discussion were not announced, the talks were believed to have dealt in part with resumption of Berlin discussions.

Rusk and Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko agreed at Geneva to resume contacts on Berlin "in an appropriate way" after reporting to their governments and consulting with the allies.

In Geneva today, the Soviet Union offered to join the West in prohibiting the spread of nuclear weapons to nations that do not now have them.

But Soviet delegate Semyon Tsarapkin warned British and American negotiators at the conference that Russia will renew nuclear testing if the United States resumes atmospheric tests next month.

President Kennedy has announced that the United States will resume the tests unless agreement on a workable ban is reached before then.

Today's session of the three-power nuclear test ban talks, held in the framework of the general conference, made no progress toward a testing agreement.

Coming Events Cast Their Shadows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, someday American boys may die on the shores of Cuba, and many of our citizens may even give up their lives when Cuba directed bombs make a frontline of the streets, residential areas, and children's playgrounds in Florida as well the Cubans could and might. There are those, unfortunately too many in key positions in the State Department, who decry every suggestion that we put an end to the Communist-fortified menace 90 miles from our coasts and so, without an adequate policy to defeat communism in the western hemisphere, we sit here idly while Cuba arms and points her guns and bombs at the United States. The following news item, based on information supplied by this same State Department which claims Cuba is not a menace, is taken from the U.S. News and World Report. Must Americans die before the President recognizes the danger a Soviet controlled Cuba poses to our Nation?

THE MILITARY MACHINE REDS HAVE BUILT IN CUBA

WASHINGTON.—An up-to-date list of military aid given to Cuba by Soviet Russia and the Communist bloc:

Fifty to seventy-five Russian Mig fighter planes, plus Communist helicopters, trainers and transports; 150 to 250 tanks; 50 to 100 assault guns; 500 to 1,000 field-artillery pieces; 500 to 1,000 antiaircraft-artillery guns; 500 mortars; 200,000 small arms; a number of Soviet patrol vessels and motor torpedo boats.

Altogether, in the last 18 months, Fidel Castro has received 100 million dollars' worth of military equipment and technical services from the Reds, the State Department said in a March 27 report. It estimated that Castro now has ground forces of 300,000 men, all equipped with small arms, and many equipped with heavier weapons as well.

No missiles or bombers are believed to have been supplied to Cuba as yet, but "Communist military aid has turned the Cuban military establishment into one of the most formidable in Latin America," the State Department said.

Taxes and the Government Debt: A Plan for the 1960's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, the March 1962 number of the Tax Foundation's Tax Review presents an article by Mr. George Champion, chairman of the board of directors of the Chase-Manhattan Bank in New York City. The article is based on an address Mr. Champion delivered before the American Bankers Association last year in San Francisco. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Champion's article is timely, thoughtful, and constructive. I am glad to be able to place it before the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

TAXES AND THE GOVERNMENT DEBT: A PLAN FOR THE 1960'S

Our Government in Washington has come to a major crossroads, and too few people throughout the country are fully aware of it. Today we are confronted with the prospect of Government expenditures suddenly leaping to a new high level. A good portion of this rise, of course, is due to increased needs for defense. Nobody will begrudge any needed expenditures for such a purpose. Protection of our homeland and our way of life is one of the basic functions of Government. Everyone will be glad to pay all that is required for defense.

But piled on top of this, in the most ill-timed way imaginable, are a number of costly proposals which would cast the Federal Government into a whole new set of functions and activities—many of which tend to revise the historical relationship of Government to the individual, business, city, and State.

Moreover, the apparent thinking in Washington is that all these added expenditures must be carried out without any new sacrifice. Rather, it is argued we should be able to afford guns, butter, and a great deal of coddling all at the same time. What is not mentioned is what we shall have to give up; namely, perhaps the last chance we shall have to reduce an unconscionably heavy burden of taxes, and along with it to give to the individual a new sense of initiative, self-reliance, and responsibility.

Outside of Washington it is not widely appreciated that we now have a tax system which in itself constitutes a wide-open invitation for increased Government spending. For one thing, the flow of revenue to Government automatically increases as the national income grows. But even more, the greater the growth in national income, the larger is the proportional share which is diverted to Government. This tendency, which certainly is a happy one for those who feel that they in Government should plan and think for everybody, is the inevitable result of the highly progressive character of our personal income tax.

How many realize, for example, that since 1955 the yield from the personal income tax has grown from $30 billion to about $43 billion, and with no change in rates. During that period personal incomes in dollar terms rose by a third, and the tax collector had handed to him on a platter an increase in revenue of some $13 billion. Or take a still longer period and make the comparison with 1950: the yield since then has grown by no less than $25 billion. A decade ago individuals turned over about 7½ percent of their total personal income for the Federal income tax; today the proportion has risen to 10½ percent.

Other taxes also throw off larger revenues as the economy grows, although not to the same extent. For example, half of any increase in corporate profits automatically flows back to the Government. And the more people buy, the larger is the amount they pay in excise taxes. At any rate, estimates now being made by the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1963—that's the year which begins next July—point to a total revenue which may be up as much as $15 billion over that for fiscal 1961, simply because of the growth in our national income.

These facts add up to a very significant conclusion: "namely, that one of the most effective controls over the activities of government—lack of sufficient income—is noticeable for its absence from the American scene." Parkinson's famous law is: "Expenditures rise to meet income." The history of our own Government in Washington is an outstanding example of that all-too-accurate observation.

Indeed, one has only to look for a moment at what this increased revenue in recent years has been spent for. Has the bulk of it gone for defense or, as some have alleged, for foreign aid? Not on your life. True, outlays for defense have been edging higher; the total in fiscal 1961 was $3 billion higher than in fiscal 1954, the year after the Korean war had been ended.

Meanwhile, spending on foreign aid has actually decreased. Unfortunately, the same thing cannot be said for veterans, for housing, for agriculture, and for a long list of other subsidies. Add up all nondefense expenditures, and exclude foreign aid, and you have an increase since the midfifties of $13 billion, as much as the bigger tax yield from personal incomes.

Take the farm program as an all-too-typical example. In fiscal 1961 this program cost taxpayers approximately $6 billion—almost double the amount for 1954. The total spent by the Government on programs involving the farmer was about equal to 45 percent of all net farm incomes. Have we moved any closer to a solution of the farm problem as a result? The answer, as we all know, is in the negative.

SEES NEW PHILOSOPHY

Unhappily, the Government shows no signs of cutting back on its subsidies and handouts. Indeed, it gives promise of moving off on just the opposite tack—of actually broadening the field for subsidy, at the very moment the Nation is called upon to make a vast new effort at defense. Moreover, in the process it appears to be embarking on a radical new philosophy, a philosophy which calls for the Federal Government to take over responsibilities which heretofore have been State and local.

Consider, as one example, the new housing law, with its grants to local communities to finance part of the cost for certain recreational facilities. Or take the urban renewal program, a part of which involves what used to be called normal civic improvements—local sewers, waterlines, firehouses, and the like.

Add to this the aid given for local highway projects, the proposed aid to education, huge Federal outlays for local welfare purposes, expanded public power, first low-income housing, now housing for the middle-income group (to name only a few programs) and it becomes crystal clear that the Federal Government is taking on a vast new dimension, one which has crept up like a tide on the American people and which they would not sanction if they were fully aware of the administrative costs as well as the power of the vast sums in the hands of bureaucrats.

One result, of course, is that the taxpayer in Pittsburgh, St. Louis, or even New York is called upon to pay for benefits that fall to other citizens thousands of miles away. We find invoked a new principle: taxation without benefit, and benefit without responsibility to the detriment of a true democracy.

Indeed, one of the great challenges of a democracy is the responsibility it throws on the individual. Personal freedom is only possible where there is a high measure of personal self-discipline. Yet such discipline is bound to be seriously weakened when benefits have no relation at all to responsibility.

That is a major reason why all Americans should oppose extending Federal aid to education. From the outset of our country, education has been a prime responsibility of local and State government—of those who benefit most directly from it. It is up to the local community, and above all the parents in it, to see that the community has good schools.

And it is the representatives from these same local communities, acting as a group, who need to stand watch over the State universities, maintaining adequate facilities and assuring their high quality. For those who can afford it, there is still a further responsibility—help, badly needed, for the independent colleges which have contributed so much to this country over the years.

Let me ask this question: Is it better for the home and the family that they bear ultimate responsibility for education of their young; or should they wash their hands of the whole matter and cast it off on some far-off Central Government? Is the farmer a better man if he plans his own life and relies on his own ability and initiative rather than being dependent on handouts from big brother in Washington? Is it better for the local community to see to its own physical welfare—its parks, its utilities, all those things that make for a better environment?

The answer is clear cut. If Americans are to have a sense of pride, of strength, of well-being that comes with accomplishment, the individual, the family, the local community must bear ultimate responsibility for their own welfare even though personal sacrifices are required. Only in this way can we have a strong, self-reliant and a more vigorous America.

Down the opposite path lies softness and eventual moral decay. And moral decay is a far more serious malady than physical hardship. An attitude of "Let Uncle Sam do it" can only lead to evasion of responsibility and a final paralysis of the national will. That is the road to a weak and a declining America.

One of the paradoxical aspects of our present position is that more than ever the individual citizen has the means and the ability to stand on his own two feet. Average incomes in real terms today are two-thirds higher than those of a generation ago and they still are rising. How much better it would be to add to these incomes further by reducing the tax burden, thereby strengthening the ability of the family to carry on those responsibilities that belong to it.

Instead we are confronted with a threat to siphon off an even larger share of income for handouts throughout the country. Very few families, if any, realize that urban renewal, Government power projects, or costly assistance to the farmer represent in reality tax on themselves. If they did, they might have second thoughts on the matter.

The time has come to take a realistic forward look at the fiscal position of Government and to do so some wise and intelligent forward planning. Most Americans quite naturally have been reluctant to advocate any tax cut at a time when the

Government is running a deficit. Now that the Nation faces a huge rise in defense spending, our caution and reluctance become stronger than ever. But the fact of the matter is that Government revenues under the existing tax structure will expand over the next 5 years.

That is an open invitation for increased spending—an invitation which those in Washington are taking advantage of today. Now is the time to reject any program which adds to welfare spending—indeed, the present program should be materially curtailed. We should let our Congressmen know that after needs of defense are fulfilled we want the highest priority to go to a cut in taxes and to debt reduction.

URGES TAX-DEBT CUTS

Indeed, I would set as a goal for the sixties a cut of no less than 10 percent in taxes and a reduction of $30 billion in the Federal debt.

Under present tax schedules, revenues by 1965 for the Federal Government could rise by $25 billion, and by 1970 the increase could be $50 billion if nothing were done to cut rates back. There is room to finance a larger defense, to cut taxes, and to reduce debt—all three—in the years ahead, provided we have the foresight and the will to do it. The reduction in both taxes and debt should be far greater in these next 10 years, but we at least should set this as our minimal goal.

On the tax front top priority should go to relief on the income tax, both at the personal and corporate level. An eventual reduction of 10 percent in the corporate tax would merely eliminate the emergency levy put on at the time of Korea. Such measures, along with debt reduction, would yield incalculable benefits over a period of time, including a powerful stimulus both to economic growth and employment.

It is significant that almost every student of taxation today agrees that the personal income tax is too high. It is too high all along the line. One should aim for cuts in every bracket.

Extreme tax rates were first introduced during World War II as an emergency measure designed to place on everyone a maximum sacrifice. It was never intended at that time that they should become a permanent feature of our tax system. Even today, rates in excess of 60 percent could be eliminated with a loss of no more than $500 to $600 million of income. The gains to society would clearly outweigh this modest sum many fold.

Most people would gladly line up in favor of a tax cut. But they are inclined to pay much less attention to the growth and size of the Government debt—certainly less attention than this tremendously important matter deserves. Today we have a Federal debt which is fast approaching $300 billion, or fully 60 percent of our gross national product. But this in itself is by no means the full story.

PRESSURE ON STATES GROWS

The Federal debt is too large in itself. But it becomes doubly so when one takes a look at what is happening at the State and local level. These are the units of Government whose facilities can't help but be expanded in the sixties—to take care of our growing population, if nothing else. During the fifties, debt of State and local governments increased nearly threefold, from $21 to $60 billion on a net basis. An even larger advance appears to be inescapable in the sixties.

There is no doubt in my mind but that the Federal Government could be of greater help to State and local units by reducing its own debt, and by cutting taxes, than through any other course of action. In both instances badly needed funds would be freed for use at the local level. It is at this level that the funds ought to be raised and spent. At the same time such action could be a powerful stimulus to economic growth.

Not enough attention has been paid to this aspect of the matter in Washington. Few would deny that economic growth depends in large measure on increased investment—on more tools and on new and better equipment needed to increase productivity. By running a surplus and paying off debt, the Government can channel to private business funds for just that purpose. One gets no economic growth by spending on welfare projects. Nor does defense necessarily bring economic growth in its wake.

We shall never achieve debt reduction, let alone a tax cut, unless we plan ahead for it. For years now the Government has paid lip-service to a balanced budget over the life of the business cycle—to a surplus in good times which will offset deficits in less prosperous years. But somehow the surplus never manages to match the deficits, and the fault in the past hasn't lain in defense or foreign aid.

Rather, the basic, major difficulty has stemmed from skyrocketing subsidies and welfare costs. This remains the grave danger for the future. Indeed, it is a bit paradoxical that the President has called on all of us for sacrifice and then proposes increased subsidies and new programs designed primarily to make life easier. We cannot have it both ways and remain the world leader for freedom.

What is required is a long-range plan for fiscal reform and the will to see it through. But if this is really to be accomplished, it will require an informed and aroused public opinion to back it up. There is an old saying, that when a politician changes his point of view, it may not mean he's seen the light but rather he's felt the heat. That is where responsible citizens enter the picture. Our people need to be informed of the facts and urged to act upon them. Community leaders must acquaint our fellow citizens with the outlook and the problem—convince them of the necessity for fiscal reform and that now is the time for needed action.

More is at stake, of course, than either the budget or tax reform, important as these are. Involved is our own future way of life: Whether we are to become increasingly soft and dependent on Government, or stand as families and individuals on our own two feet. We ought never to forget that in spite of all the gadgets around us we live in a rugged world. Anything that is done to weaken the individual, or to destroy his self-reliance, weakens America. The power of the Nation is only a multiple of the strength, skills and character of the individuals that make it up.

What is needed more than anything else is a rebirth of the spirit—a moral regeneration combined with a renewed toughness of character. Indeed, we must live according to the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount, for in doing so man becomes strong and the need for manmade laws is greatly lessened.

Today Mr. Khrushchev and the Communists are convinced that they have great military and economic power and it would be a bad mistake to underrate them. Yet no good American can doubt for a moment the final outcome. Our people have an underlying strength and a solid core of good commonsense. Their skills provide a potential for great growth and progress—a potential which the Communists can never match.

And we possess the most precious heritage of all—freedom—a blessing the average Russian dare not even dream of. It is up to all Americans to oppose with all vigor any encroachment by Government on any of the three basic freedoms—speech, religion and economics—in order to make the most of our tremendous advantages. The future of the world may well depend upon it.

President's Trade Program Will Encourage Further Concessions by the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Patrick McMahon, in the April edition of the newspaper World, reviews the position American industry finds itself in competitively in the world market because of political concessions made by this country on trades and tariffs. The Trade Expansion Act of 1962, now before the Ways and Means Committee, will lay the groundwork for further concessions on our part and greater injury to our industry and our economy.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article:

UNITED STATES LOST BARGAINING POWER IT HAD ON TRADE

(By Patrick McMahon)

One factor that is firing the tempers of both proponents and opponents of the Kennedy tariff-cutting program, is that at the end of World War II the United States possessed ample bargaining power to assure American products complete protection against discriminatory practices in the European markets.

But, our negotiators ceded it away in the first of the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and asked no concessions at all in return.

The threat posed to U.S. industry and agriculture by the Common Market, a threat which will be redoubled if Britain and the Scandinavian countries join, stems not so much from present or proposed tariff levels of the member countries. It results chiefly from the discriminations that will be employed.

For instance, U.S. automobiles will be subject to a flat duty of 27 percent in all of the Common Market countries; those produced in the member countries will be imported into other member countries duty free. Italy will import wheat from France duty free, but will level a tariff of 25 percent on U.S. wheat. Virtually every U.S. industrial and agricultural product that is now being sold to Europe will be subject to similar differentials, which will give the European producers a marked price advantage over the U.S. competitors.

TRADING NATIONS FIRMLY COMMITTED

But at the end of World War II, every major trading nation in Western Europe, plus all of the major components of the British Commonwealth were firmly committed in covenants signed with the United States to "take agreed action * * * directed to the elimination of all forms of discriminatory treatment in world commerce."

Clauses to that effect were written into every one of the lend-lease agreements, under which we delivered more than $40 billion worth of goods to our Western allies. Similar provisions were written into the charters of the International Bank and the Monetary Fund. They were repeated, in effect, in the Marshall plan agreements.

The original purpose of the clauses in the lend-lease agreements was to provide a basis for eliminating the British Empire preferences at the war's end, and to protect Amer-

ican commerce from any new preferential trading blocs that might be formed.

A strong nondiscrimination clause was written into the first GATT agreement, negotiated at Geneva in 1947. However, the GATT agreement contains a modifying clause which was accepted by U.S. negotiators, which completely nullifies the nondiscriminatory pledge, and which, in all practical effects, supersedes the clear-cut pledges that were written into the lend-lease and other international agreements.

CLAUSE EXEMPTS MANY PREFERENCES

The modifying clause specifically exempts British Commonwealth preferences; similar Dutch, French, and Belgian preferences with their colonial possessions; and any Common Market or free-trading areas that might be set up among contiguous nations.

As a result U.S. industry and agriculture in their efforts to maintain and expand overseas markets, are hemmed in by a growing multiplicity of discriminatory trading blocs, set up with the consent and even encouragement of their own Government. A small but potentially effective common market is commencing to function in Central America. Brazil, Argentina, and Chile are working out a similar mechanism, and under the alianza para progreso these may be combined and expanded to include all of Latin America. Free trade areas are being discussed already by African nations, and some of the countries of southeast Asia.

And the immediate effect is that in order to obtain a modicum of protection for U.S. exporters, and obtain some reduction of the discriminatory margins, the Kennedy administration feels it must grant new concessions to countries whose tariff and other protectionist devices already far exceed ours.

Civil Rights "Mood"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following editorial from the Boston Herald of Saturday, March 31, 1962:

CIVIL RIGHTS "MOOD"

African diplomats, rebuffered and humiliated in attempts to rent Washington apartments, can't possibly agree with the general conclusion in a report by the Southern Regional Council that the first year of the Kennedy administration brought "a genuine turning point in American racial relations."

More in line with the opinion of Negro victims of outrageous housing discrimination in the Nation's Capital must be those sections of the report that are critical.

For all its glowing praise of the administration for "establishing a national mood and direction" favorable to civil rights, the council put its finger on several shortcomings in the executive branch.

"Activity and energy can become a substitute for results," it said. And it added: "A department or agency which is sponsoring controversial legislation may be irresistibly tempted to court marginal congressional votes by leaving civil rights alone."

In truth, the council—comprised of Negro and white leaders—is more realistic, convincing and constructive in its criticism than in its praise.

Proof that a generous official mood and good intentions are far from adequate comes in complaints from the State Department's protocol officer, Pedro Sanjuan, who is charged with aiding Negro diplomats to find living quarters in Washington.

After 8 months of a voluntary program, Mr. Sanjuan reports that African statesmen are still being turned away from buildings that display "apartment available" signs.

And nearly 20 months after the President campaigned on a pledge to end discrimination in Federal housing "with the stroke of a pen," the Nation is still waiting for him to sign the promised Executive order.

Political expediency—"leaving civil rights alone"—in a campaign to push other controversial legislation has its limits. And those limits have long since been reached in assuring equal opportunity for Negroes in federally financed housing and in finding decent shelter for Africans on official missions to the United States.

Is Mr. Kennedy Right in His Prediction?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Greensburg Daily News:

IS MR. KENNEDY RIGHT IN HIS PREDICTION?

All Americans hope that President Kennedy is right in his prognosis about the Nation's economy.

According to the President, the Nation is in better economic shape than appears on the surface.

That constitutes an encouraging statement.

But is Mr. Kennedy correct in his analysis?

Has he listened too much to so-called experts with an ultraliberal point of view?

There is a sharp disagreement among economists of the Nation as to the financial policies of the present administration.

Early in World War II, economists indicated that the national debt could approximate $75 billion without any adverse effect on the Nation's economy. But before the war was terminated, the national indebtedness was considerably over four times this figure.

At the end of the Eisenhower administration the Nation owed $287 billion plus some factors such as social security, not included in the budget.

Now, the Federal debt stands at $295 billion, and the debt limit has been increased to $300 billion. Added to this is the commitment for social security. It is predicted that before the end of the present fiscal year, the Nation's indebtedness will total over $305 billion.

The Nation's debt limit is being pushed upward by socialistic experimentation. Nothing is being done in the field of ultimate reduction of the Federal indebtedness.

Is this a sound business procedure? Certainly, it would not work for private businesses.

There has been no reduction in the outflow of gold from the United States. This can be interpreted only in the light that foreign economists feel that the United States is spending at a higher rate than national income permits.

New Frontier philosophy contemplated that Federal spending would increase employment and that this, in turn, would prove a stimulus to the Nation's economy.

The present rate of unemployment remains at a far higher figure than was envisioned at the start of the Kennedy administration. In part, this can be attributed to administration-sponsored legislation.

The farm picture may be slightly better than it was a year ago. At the same time, agriculture is not receiving its proportionate share of national income. While fixed costs of industrial operations are rising, agriculture must pay for needed equipment at the prevailing market prices. The proposed farm bill means, in simple terms, compliance or forfeiture of any benefits from farm legislation.

Some Federal tax relief has been hinted for 1963. This would be of definite benefit to the Nation's economy. On the other hand, it is impossible to reduce taxes and continue peak spending at the same time. This could lead to even higher Federal debt, which at some time must be paid.

Scant success has been achieved in halting inflation of a creeping character. Lipservice to the principle of austerity has been accompanied by proposals which would result in peak spending on the part of the Federal Government.

Let us hope that the President is correct in his view on the status of the Nation's economy—that it has underlying elements of strength.

However, continuance of unsound economic practices could lead to an ultimate day of reckoning. Fiscal solvency is closely allied to national strength.

There Is Nothing New Under the Sun: Not Even the Radical Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Gerald W. Johnson which appeared in the New Republic of February 19, 1962.

Mr. Johnson writes good sense about extremists; we should ponder his words and be glad that these "Tories" are but a small minority of our people.

The article follows:

TAKE HEART—THE RADICAL RIGHT IS NOTHING NEW, AND WE CANNOT DENY TO ANY MAN HIS INALIENABLE RIGHT TO MAKE A MONKEY OF HIMSELF ACCORDING TO THE DICTATES OF HIS OWN FOLLY

(By Gerald W. Johnson)

All that we learn from history is that nations learn nothing from history. As regards nations, the Hegelian dictum is supported by impressive evidence; but as regards individuals, surely acquisition of historical perspective is not quite that barren. For instance, a cursory examination of the annals of this country is enough to convince a rational man that no idiocy of modern times, however fantastic, is really new. The extraneous and incidental features may have a certain novelty, but the essential absurdity supports the preacher's observation that "there is no new thing under the sun."

Consider, now, the theory currently and stridently proclaimed by the radical right, that a longstanding reputation for propriety and respectability is prima facie evidence of treasonable proclivities, leading to the inference that Eisenhower, Warren, Truman

and Acheson are to be bracketed with Quisling and Laval. The theory was not invented by the late Joe McCarthy. It had been propounded a century and a half earlier by Theodore Dwight and James Callender, who found in the esteem enjoyed by Thomas Jefferson and John Adams proof of their appalling hypocrisy. Nor has it been monopolized by guttersnipes. Tom Paine reviled Washington, and Andrew Jackson was called a murderer, Abraham Lincoln a baboon, Roosevelt I a drunk, and Roosevelt II every epithet known to Billingsgate, all by reputable members of society.

Naturally, efforts to organize, control and manipulate this emotional steam pressure have been continuous. Theodore Roosevelt, not averse to being regarded as high priest of "the star-eyed goddess of reform," conceded that every reform movement is attended by a lunatic fringe; he might have included every deforming movement if there is any clear distinction between the two. But Roosevelt's observation, accurate enough, leaves unexplained the structural form of this lunacy, which has been curiously persistent throughout American history.

It must be admitted that there is no obvious similarity in the announced purposes of the anti-Masons, the Locofocos, the Know-Nothings, the Greenbackers, the Dixiecrats and the John Birchites. I exclude from consideration such massive organizations as the Populists and the Bull Moosers, for they attained the dimensions of real political parties and the objects of this examination are political aberrations; and these have at least one common characteristic: no matter how various the programs they promulgate, they are all woebegone. Most of them have been angry, too, but they were unanimously dismal.

The Single Taxers are not an exception. It is true that Single Taxers are (there are numbers of them still around) curiously blithe fellows, but they never have been a compact, drilled, and disciplined movement comparable to the Know-Nothings and the John Birchites. Perhaps this is because they regard their pet scheme as desirable but by no means essential to salvation. Their prophet, Henry George, while he was a greater man than the faculties of history and economics have ever admitted, never mistook himself for a fourth person of the Trinity; he thought that ere they accept his idea men must become wiser, but not necessarily holier. Hence his followers, confessing that they are sinful men, are permitted to smile.

Not so the bulk of the fantasts. The American Protective Association founded at Clinton, Iowa, in 1887 by Henry F. Bowers, for example, offered certain economic and sociological arguments to support its attack on aliens and Catholics, but the vital spark of the movement was no political view; it was moral earnestness. And that earnestness attracted a million members to the APA by 1896. The emotional attitude that in almost every primitive language made the words "stranger" and "enemy" synonyms persists to an extent that we are not willing to admit; and in no phase of life is it more persistent than in religion.

The original settlement of three States, Massachusetts, Maryland and Pennsylvania, was made by victims of religious intolerance, and Rhode Island was established by victims of the intolerance of the refugees. It took us nearly 200 years to accept in principle the fact that what is different is not necessarily evil, and then the acceptance was in principle only. My own great-great-great-grandfather was that anomaly, a Scottish Baptist, who came to this country as a missionary, not to the Indians, but to his fellow countrymen who had preceded him to the New World; but who remained Presbyterians, i.e., practically heathen. Within my own lifetime I have heard of a pious Methodist mother who sat by the fire all night long, weeping like Rachel. She would not be comforted, for her only son was lost—he was about to marry a Baptist.

Thus, to assume that the American protective idea was hypocrisy is as grave an error as to assume that the segregationists—southern, mostly, but it was in Idaho that the customers, not the proprietor, heaved out a Negro who went into a public house patronized by hard rock miners—are not sincerely alarmed by the state of affairs. The early movements were the more excusable in that native Americans in the 1830's had had little contact with Catholics and non-English-speaking immigrants, and therefore were facing the unknown, which is always terrifying.

Economic heresy, and even some measure of social nonconformity can be viewed with a certain equanimity. They may indeed have comic aspects that add to the gaiety of their opponents. But moral degeneration is no laughing matter. Hence a single taxer, for all his conviction that we are losing money by not accepting his ideas may still remain a relatively gay and jocund fellow; but a man persuaded that his is the only road to salvation must assume that in refusing to follow it we are in danger of losing not only money, but our immortal souls as well. He can no more be of good cheer than could the Methodist mother.

This is most conspicuous as it affects religious dogma, but it is not confined to that field. The impending collapse of the Republic is no occasion for amusement. Without doubt, a great many John Birchites really believe that the United States is rapidly losing its character. They have to admit that one of the objects of government specified in the preamble to the Constitution is "to promote the general welfare," but they insist that to promote it in any new way is to undermine the Constitution.

Then there is the pervasive, although never acknowledged, disbelief in the permanence of American institutions. This is not fundamentally irrational. Democracy, after all, is a relatively new experiment as a form of government and we cannot be certain of how it is going to turn out. We have long been indoctrinated with the theory of "invisible government," and we know by bitter experience that it is not altogether a fantasy. Hence the word "conspiracy" has an extraordinary political potency in America. We have made it all but an article of faith that, while honest individuals may avow their true aims, organizations never do so.

The Communist Party, for example, has avowed that its ultimate aim is the destruction of our existing system of government, yet our leadership, from the President down, is committed to the theory that the party is a conspiracy. But destruction is final. What other, more terrible but unconfessed aim communism may have is hard to imagine.

THE PRECEDENT OF CINCINNATUS

The first manifestation of this tendency to detect conspiracies in the doings of our fellow citizens—and incidentally, a brilliant illustration of its danger—was the furious revolt against the organization of the Society of the Cincinnati, in spite of the fact that George Washington was a founding member. Certainly no more highly respected American was living at the time, but Washington's character was accepted simply as proof of how devious and deeply hidden was the plot to erect an order of nobility in America and gradually ease us back into monarchy.

As a matter of historical fact the Society of the Cincinnati never wielded half the political influence of later veterans organizations, the Grand Army of the Republic and the American Legion. The original society long ago faded out and the modern, purely social group, is a successor. But it had a lasting effect, all right. The "conspiracy" of the Cincinnati led directly to the organization of the Tammany Society, progenitor of Tammany Hall; and Tammany did survive.

We are accustomed to think of proletarian suspicion of the bourgeoisie as typically Russian. But we were contending with the same thing long before Lenin was born. For a textbook case, consider the Anti-Masonic Party. To begin with, one must scratch William Wirt, the party's nominee for President in 1832. Wirt was no more a real anti-Mason than Theodore Roosevelt was a real non-Partisan Leaguer in 1912. But somehow Wirt got the idea that the Whigs could not, or would not, nominate their best man, Henry Clay, for President, and in that case a third-party candidate might draw together all the elements opposed to Andrew Jackson. It was a pipe-dream, of course, for Jackson's enemies, as the event proved, produced much more noise than votes. But it explains Wirt's candidacy, as it explains the activity of later and more astute politicians in other protest movements.

In the ranks of the anti-Masonic party, however, there were many perfectly genuine anti-Masons. Today one reads this with incredulity. How could sane men have engendered such hatred of a harmless fraternal order dedicated in the main to charity and sociability? Ostensibly, the cause was the disappearance of one William Morgan, who had written, or threatened to write, a book exposing the secrets of the order; and word went around that the Masons had murdered him. Possibly some Mason did knock off Morgan, but certainly not on a Grand Mason's orders.

Morgan was only a pretext. The revolt was a revolt against stuffed-shirtism, which had become stifling, and the Masonic order caught the force of the blast because it had become a cachet of social status to an extent that is now incomprehensible. Every individual on the make, as soon as he attained the level of a prominent citizen, joined the Masons and bought a stovepipe hat as a matter of course. Both were symbols of dignity. So the time came when practically every congressman, governor, judge, mayor and other public official down to deputy sheriff was a Mason; and when that came home to the woolhat boys; panic swept them. It was fomented, of course, by demagogs, but not invented by them. It was a genuine panic of the excluded.

This has been true, mutatis mutandis, of the other outbreaks of extremists. It is characteristic of them all that they pay relatively little attention to the extremists on the other flank; they can go for the center, they assail respectability. The John Birch Society rarely expends ammunition on William Z. Foster and Earl Browder; its preferred targets are Eisenhower, Truman or the late Dag Hammarskjold. The higher the dignity, the taller the stovepipe hat, the better the target. An ex-President is good, but the ultimate expression of this frenzy is a Birchite demand for impeachment of the Chief Justice of the United States.

Action and reaction being equal and opposite, such outbreaks have often tested the commonsense of the majority to and beyond the breaking point. Reasonable men frequently denounce unreasonably the participants in such affairs as fakers and frauds, through and through. It may be true enough of the leaders, for any movement that seems to promise some notoriety is sure to be embraced by a limber-jenkins with no interest in anything beyond self-advertisement; but it is not true of the mass of his followers. Their chills and fevers, however fantastic, are not feigned—a fact that the healthy minded should never forget.

The anti-Masons—not Wirt, but the rank and file—really were in fear of their lives. The know-nothings did feel that they were being pushed out of their rightful place by Catholics and aliens. The locofocos did think—as the prohibitionists and various

other splinter groups think to this day—that the moral stamina of the country was collapsing and the Devil was taking over the land. Their fear and resentment are those of the displaced person, and nothing is more real.

The basic error, of course, is nothing concocted by Joe McCarthy, or Senator Goldwater, or General Walker. It is the inability of perhaps a third of our people to accept emotionally as well as rationally Lincoln's assertion that this Nation is "dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." For Lincoln flatly contradicts the dictum of old William Stoughton that "God sifted a whole nation that he might send choice grain over into this wilderness." Choice grain. Chosen People. Herrenvolk. There are three expressions of the idea that ever since Stoughton preached, 200 years before Lincoln spoke, has denied the faith that all men are created equal. If we Americans are indeed choice grain, then obviously all men are not created equal, for Stoughton spoke of seedcorn, not the matured plant. If men are not created equal, then some must be inferior, and it is logical to hate and fear those leaders who hold that Lincoln—and Jefferson before him, and all the notables who signed Jefferson's document—spoke truth, and therefore would extend to the inferior all the legal rights and privileges enjoyed by the choice grain.

THE MILITANT ONE IN THREE

John Adams estimated that at the time of the Revolution only one-third of the American people actively favored independence. Another third were dragged along without caring much one way or the other. The last third were Tories, adhering to the monarchy. In the midst of the current uproars, one is tempted to suspect that the proportion has not changed appreciably. Are there, even today, more than a third who believe, viscerally as well as cerebrally, that an honest Jew swareth to his own hurt and changeth not, that an honest Catholic will defend the Constitution, that an honest Negro is as human as any passenger on the Mayflower? It is a question.

But if Adams' statistics still hold good, it is not a question what should be done about it. In 1776 and the 7 years thereafter one-third proved to be enough, and the reasonable presumption is that they are enough today. If the inoculation with Americanism has failed to "take" in a considerable number of cases, those who have received it into their blood know that the way to deal with the failures is not to beat them up or shut them up. We cannot deny to any American his inalienable right to make a monkey of himself according to the dictates of his own folly.

It is not easy. Indeed, it is the acid test of one's Americanism. But the strain is lessened somewhat when one reflects that idiocy is not an invention of the modern age but is as old as the race; yet mankind has persevered thus far. Although the too serious minded can never realize it, there is a great survival value in the character of Sabatini's hero who "was born with the gift of laughter and a sense that the world is mad."

Administration Continues Its Mixedup Approach To Solving National Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the President continues to pursue a policy of confusion and failure by demanding $600 million for a public works program to fight unemployment at the same time we are considering a $2 billion request for standby authority to fight future recessions and all the time he is assuring the country our economy is expanding by leaps and bounds under his leadership. Perhaps the President feels he can afford the luxury of indulging in the administration of national policy through a good press and highly inspired public relations, but we in Congress must bear a graver responsibility to the people of trying to keep the economy strong and our country solvent in spite of the fuzzy-minded proposals coming from the planners at the White House. Pump priming via public works is wrong medicine for wrong sickness.

The following editorial from the Wall Street Journal makes a point in this regard:

PUBLIC WORKS CONFUSION

The administration, it seems to us, is creating considerable confusion with its proposed public works legislation.

Just as a House committee begins hearings on a request for "standby" authority to spend $2 billion to counter future recessions, President Kennedy tosses in a request to start spending an extra $600 million immediately in areas of high unemployment.

So a question arises as to what is the purpose of all this contemplated activity. If public works are to be used to provide makework jobs right now, that is one thing. Such subsidies, to be sure, do not constitute a solution to unemployment, but are at best a stopgap which had little effect when tried extensively in the thirties.

But that, in any case, is a different proposition from using public works in an attempt to counter a recession at some later date. Here the administration's reasoning is that the flow of funds would give the economy a fillip and so curtain the slump. One of the many troubles with this theory is that the recession would probably be over before the spending could register any economic effect. This theory, too, has been tried before.

Indeed, the dispiriting thing about the whole mixed-up approach is its backwardness. Instead of seriously analyzing the complex problems of unemployment and economic growth, the advocates of such legislation merely propose the first thing that occurs to the political mind. That confuses the real issues and delays the day when they can be sensibly tackled.

Tools for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the Associated Industries of Massachusetts has taken a giant step toward cementing friendship and assisting economic growth in underdeveloped countries. The organization is headed by my good friend, Don S. Greer.

The following Associated Press story tells what AIM is doing:

AIM PLANS TOOLS FOR FREEDOM

BOSTON.—Associated Industries of Massachusetts, a businessmen's organization, is undertaking a tools for freedom program to assist technical schools in the free world.

Don S. Greer, president of the organization, said its 2,000 members will donate outmoded but usable machinery to schools in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. He said 167 such schools need more than 600 pieces of machinery for training equipment.

"Two of every three qualified applicants to technical schools are being turned away, primarily due to lack of training equipment," Greer said last night.

Hillsdale College Rejects Washington Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, may I call the attntioin of my colleagues to an interesting editorial which appeared in the Pontiac Press of March 22.

They say that man bites dog is news. But a college turning down a Federal handout deserves first-class play on the editorial page, which this item received.

It is refreshing to note that at least one educational institution would rather meet its expenses in its own way rather than depend upon Washington to keep it in funds. The teaching of responsibility should be one of the main aims of an educational institution, and Hillsdale College practices what it teaches.

The editorial is as follows:

HILLSDALE COLLEGE REJECTS WASHINGTON SUBSIDIES

In these days of "help, help help," it's refreshing to observe the courageous stand of Hillsdale College in the matter of Federal subsidies.

Hillsdale says "No." She refuses Washington handouts. Hillsdale recognizes Washington money is simply local funds carted to the District of Columbia where they are administered and then returned after the extraction of fat fees and minus the amount that goes to other districts.

We reproduce an editorial from the Hillsdale Daily News, whose publisher, E. C. Hayhow, is a former Pontiac newspaperman:

"Hillsdale College will not be subsidized by the Federal Government.

"At a time when the pressure for public funds has reached critical proportions Hillsdale's board of trustees makes its position clear in a forthright and brave declaration of independence."

It points out that the Federal aid concept is contrary to the institution's educational philosophy and would compel a compromise with tradition.

The declaration follows:

"Whereas Hillsdale College was conceived as an independent educational institution and dedicated to an educational philosophy embracing America's basic ideals; and

"Whereas since 1844 it has remained steadfastly faithful to these concepts; and

"Whereas the thousands of young men and young women who have studied here have been taught some fundamental truths; among these is that the freedom guaranteed them as citizens of this great country is the freedom to dream and aspire without limit and the freedom to fulfill their dreams and aspirations without interference; that our country's greatness is the result not of Government benevolence but rather of individual initiative and enterprise; that responsi-

bility is the counterpart of independence; and

"Whereas we hold these views to be as valid today as they were in 1844 despite the appearance and growth of a contrary philosophy based on Government paternalism; and

"Whereas it is our conviction that this contrary philosophy is negatory to the traditional beliefs and teachings of Hillsdale College and is to be deplored as harmful to the continued development of our country both morally and economically: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That it be the decision of the board of trustees of Hillsdale College to reaffirm its historic independence and to resist subsidization of its affairs by the Federal Government. Acknowledging that the possibility of failure is a concomitant of independence, the trustees place their trust in God and and in the dedication and generosity of students, alumni and friends who share their views. With this help, and through their own continuing efforts, they are confident that the principles to which the college is dedicated will continue to be available to young men and young women seeking Christian higher education."

It is a temptation for colleges such as Hillsdale to succumb to the lure of Federal subsidy. Finances are a nagging and perplexing worry for the schools' administrations.

This is especially true at Hillsdale where income from a small endowment and from student fees do not begin to meet operating costs. Each year the school must raise thousands of dollars among alumni and friends to close the gap and finish in the black. This year the needed total is in excess of $300,000.

But Hillsdale has chosen to face its fiscal responsibilities the hard way. It's a stiff price to pay for independence. But in the opinion of the board it's a bargain.

This clear-cut stand is a refreshing one to those who weary of mounting tax burdens and to those who believe that Government subsidy inevitably leads to Government control.

International Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Gaffney Ledger, Gaffney, S.C., of March 20, 1962:

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Twenty-eight years ago, when the first Reciprocal Trade Act was passed, American exports were less than $2 billion a year. Now they are more than $20 billion. So, clearly, we have a stake in the economic affairs of the world. And it is up to the businessman and farmer of the Midwest to understand this no less than those who reside in great seaports and watch arrivals and departures of ships and planes from far lands.

The President's recent message to Congress, urging passage of the Trade Extension Act of 1962, cited some figures that reveal how deeply this country has become involved in international trade, especially in the critical Common Market countries.

We sell to Western Europe more machinery, transportation equipment, chemicals and coal than our total imports of those commodities from all regions of the world combined.

Thirty percent of our exports, totaling over $4 billion a year in industrial goods and nearly $2 billion in farm products, go to present and prospective members of the European Common Market. Our agricultural trade with Western Europe is 4 to 1 in our favor.

As to exports in general, one of every seven farmworkers produces for export; one of every three workers engaged in manufacturing is employed in establishments that export.

Thus, on the surface, the export picture looks good. But there are catches. Plenty of them. Until recently, economic questions involving this country, Western Europe and the Common Market meant little to the average person, or so he thought. Today, this is changed. In an economic sense, a United States of Europe—call it the Common Market or whatever you wish—is rapidly becoming a reality. France, Italy, Germany, Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg have in fact become a community of nations for purposes of trade. As a result, for the first time in its history, the United States is up against a kind of competition in the marketplace that is forcing the experts, the economists and the politicians to make "agonizing reappraisals." If American business is going to compete in this new world of the Common Market, drastic changes on the domestic scene will have to take place.

Some Facts To Consider Before We Vote To Spend More of the Taxpayers' Dollars on Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the facts brought out in the following editorial from the Dallas Morning News should be of real concern to all Members of Congress as we are faced with continued demands for more and more money by the administration to increase foreign spending programs and domestic welfare programs:

WHERE OUR MONEY GOES

Over the weekend, three interesting stories developed which have a direct bearing on the spending of U.S. dollars abroad—through our foreign aid program as well as our contributions to the United Nations.

On Saturday, the House Foreign Affairs Committee released a report by its staff investigators which revealed extravagant waste and poor administration of foreign aid programs in several countries. Among the examples cited by the committee were: (1) A $5.3 million military-aid project in Turkey which has produced nothing in 5 years, (2) a $10 million project in Korea which was supposed to get underway 4 years ago, but has not yet been started, (3) waste of $300,000 in South Vietnam on trucks that could have been bought much cheaper if officials had compared notes, (4) an $11 million highway project in Vietnam approved 2 years ago which isn't even on the drawing boards yet.

Last fall President Kennedy promised that he was reorganizing the entire foreign aid program and that such waste and poor administration would promptly be halted. But the committee's report on Saturday charged that there was little evidence that this was being done. It stated that "moneysaving does not appear to be an important objective in the administration of U.S. aid."

At almost the same time the committee released its report, one of its members, Representative JOHN L. PILCHER, Democrat, of Georgia, criticized the practice of holding closed hearings on the foreign aid requests submitted by the President to Congress. PILCHER accused the committee of concealing information about the aid program in order to keep from offending neutralist nations which are receiving part of the dole.

He said that security questions "have nothing whatever to do with the exclusion of the public from these hearings." Citing one example which has led to closed hearings, the Congressman said: "The public is not allowed to know how much military aid goes to Pakistan because the State Department thinks that India might take offense."

On Sunday, John Mashek, of the News' Washington Bureau, reported how the United States has been helping its enemies pay off their debts to the U.N. Mashek pointed out that the United States has paid $114 million to finance the U.N. action in the Congo since 1960. Out of that total, more than $30 million went to pay the assessments of numerous other countries—friend and foe alike.

The United States, for example, paid $338,918 of Cuba's debt. We also paid more than $1.5 million for Albania, Bulgaria and Poland—all Communist nations. We paid more than $5 million to help out nine other neutral countries which consistently vote against us in the U.N. and side with the Soviet bloc. These nations are Yugoslavia, Mali, Indonesia, Guinea, Ghana, India, U.A.R., Nigeria and Iraq.

We even paid these countries' bills for the Congo operation, Mashek points out, before we paid our own. He also noted that we have paid 90 percent of the cost of reducing the payments of other countries—friend and foe alike—for the U.N. operation in the Gaza strip. This has cost us about $4.5 million.

These disclosures are timely because Congress is now considering President Kennedy's request for $4.9 billion in foreign aid for fiscal year 1963. Members of Congress are also considering the President's request that we buy half of the U.N.'s $200 million bond issue.

The collection of facts brought to light over the weekend concerning extravagant waste and mismanagement in foreign aid and the use of American dollars to pay the U.N. bills of our enemies goes a long way toward debunking the President's claim that every dollar he has requested for foreign aid is vital and the U.N. bond proposal cannot be turned down.

We are certain that Members of Congress are aware of these facts. Let us hope that they act accordingly.

The War We Are Waging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday evening I had the honor of addressing an American Strategy Seminar in Buffalo, N.Y., sponsored by

the Buffalo Junior Chamber of Commerce under the chairmanship of Mr. John R. Owen, Jr.

I believe that public information and educational activities typified by this 2-day seminar are an important contribution to the understanding and resolute will essential for victory over the forces of international communism. I commend the Buffalo Junior Chamber of Commerce for its activities on this score.

Under unanimous consent, I include the text of my address, "The War We Are Waging":

THE WAR WE ARE WAGING

My fellow Americans, we are at war.

Those responsible for planning and conducting this American Strategy Seminar are aware of that fact. This 2-day seminar testifies to that awareness.

I am honored to be a guest in this Buffalo area, ably represented in the Congress of the United States by my colleagues and good friends, Hon. WILLIAM E. MILLER, Hon. JOHN R. PILLION, and Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI. I am also honored to share a place on your program with Congressman PILLION and Hon. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, of Ohio, keynoter of the seminar, as well as with the other distinguished speakers.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, we are at war, and I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge and pay tribute to the joint resolution introduced in the House of Representatives on June 12 last year by Congressman PILLION, "expressing a declaration of war against the 98 Communist Parties constituting the international Communist conspiracy" and pledging the United States and all of its resources "to the defeat and destruction of the Communist parties of the world." I support and commend the realism of that joint resolution and its declaration of intent.

The most heartening aspect of this American seminar is its completely nonpartisan—or perhaps more accurately bipartisan—character. It is not going to matter one whit whether we are Democrats or Republicans if we do not win the war in which we are engaged.

Before I proceed further in my discussion, I offer two brief observations.

The first is that Americans can do one thing that Khrushchev, without their aid, can never do.

They can defeat the United States.

They can do it in many ways or combinations of ways—through ignorance, apathy, superficial thinking, intemperate suspicion, overtrustfulness, shortsighted selfishness and greed, undisciplined generosity, timidity and cowardice, or through simple default.

Your presence here tonight is a token of your awareness of this harsh fact and an earnest of your determination that this shall not happen.

One further comment:

A decade ago, in testimony before a joint Senate committee hearing, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur voiced his faith in America with respect to the global conflict with international communism.

He summed it up in a single sentence of five eloquent words:

"I have confidence in us."

I share that faith. And so, I am sure, despite some rude setbacks, do you.

It is in that spirit that I address you tonight.

The subject I am assigned tonight is vast and complex. The best I can hope to do is to develop my comments around a number of simple propositions—each one of which I can discuss only very briefly.

International communism confronts us with a totally new kind of enemy, engaged in a new kind of war, seeking a new kind of total victory.

The several propositions which I will offer are for the purpose of elaborating and illustrating this basic premise.

Proposition No. 1: Communism is not something to be dealt with as if it were merely an idea.

It is not to be dealt with as if it were merely an idea because it is not merely an idea.

To be sure, Communist dogma and strategy and goals involve ideas and ideologies.

As Eugene Lyons has so aptly said:

"Communism has become an engine of power, an apparatus of destruction, which has our destruction as its primary goal."

Unless we face up to this fact, we can expect that any counterstrategy we devise will miss its target and prove self-defeating.

Interntaional communism—whatever else it may be and it is too many things to recite them in detail here tonight—is all-powerful government in its ultimate and most ruthless form, operating by internal subversion and external aggression, bent on complete world domination, and employing all of the apparatus and techniques of brute force, blackmail, infiltration, propaganda, treachery, deception, brainwashing, liquidation and all of the other methods of protracted warfare.

Let me add two observations to underscore the point that communism is not something to be dealt with as if it were merely an idea. Early in this seminar you viewed the Pentagon film, "Challenge of Ideas."

Whatever your personal evaluation of this film, I submit that any merit it possesses is pretty well sabotaged by the title itself, "Challenge of Ideas." At best this is a fragmentary and therefore gravely misleading definition of the challenge we face.

The true symbol of the challenge we face is not the debating society but the firing squad.

Communism is not merely an idea but a very simple challenge and ultimatum to be enforced by brute force or by the threat of brute force: either acquiescence and total capitulation to the victory of international communism or liquidation.

I stress this point for a further reason.

Quite understandably the inclination of young Americans particularly is to regard all movements as being primarily subject matter for discussion and debate. In many cases young people (and many adults) view the Communist movement in this light. Unfortunately for the true Communist, the movement is not a matter of discussion but of dedication. Of course the Communists would accept adherence won by persuasion but they make unmistakably clear that those who are not persuaded are to be compelled by naked power with liquidation as the sole alternative. We are confronted, therefore, not with theory but with tyranny and brute force.

Do you doubt that? Then ask the Hungarians, the East Germans, the people of China, and the Cubans.

Proposition No. 2: The claim that the Communist Party, U.S.A., is "just another political party" is a dangerous falsehood.

And that claim is also an attractive bait for the gullible.

Let's give it a cold, hard look.

In 1959 the Communist Party, U.S.A., marked its 40th anniversary. In that connection a prominent spokesman of American communism, Mr. Herbert Aptheker, editor of the Marxist magazine, Political Affairs, wrote an article for a Moscow Communist publication issued in October 1959 reviewing the history of the party in the United States.

In this article Mr. Aptheker praised the Communist Party, U.S.A., because even in its difficult first years "it came out in support of Soviet Russia." He pointed out that "after the Hitlerite attack on the Soviet Union, the Communist Party [in the United States] aimed all its efforts at increasing the contribution of the United States to insuring victory over the enemy." He didn't mention that prior to that attack the party had denounced American war efforts as "imperialistic activity."

Finally, while criticizing certain "opportunists" in the Communist Party, U.S.A., who fell away after Soviet Russia's ruthless suppression of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters in 1956, Mr. Aptheker boasted that "the rank-and-file members of the party * * * did not adopt the road of treason."

Note that language and its clear meaning. For him, as for all American Communists, treason does not relate to the United States but to a violation of loyalty to Soviet Russia.

Just another political party?

Moreover, Mr. Aptheker in this same article singled out for special praise as a loyal Communist leader, the late Comrade William Z. Foster, chairman emeritus of the Communist Party, U.S.A. Now let me quote a statement from a book written by this American Communist leader, William Z. Foster, in 1949:

"When a Communist heads the Government of the United States—and that day will come as surely as the sun rises—the Government will not be a capitalistic government but a Soviet government, and behind this government will stand the Red Army to enforce the dictatorship of the proletariat."

Just another political party?

Another commentary on this false and dangerous claim.

Back in 1934 a member of the Young Communist League was on trial—and was convicted—for activities in connection with a riot in Minneapolis. Here are some questions and answers from the record of that trial:

"Question. But you would prefer the Russian—you would prefer to be in Russia?

"Answer. I prefer America with a Soviet government.

"Question. Are you willing to fight and overthrow this Government?

"Answer. Absolutely.

"Question. And you are willing to take up arms and overthrow the constituted authorities?

"Answer. When the time comes, 'Yes.' "

So what, you may ask. That was in 1934. Here is "So what."

That Young Communist League member was Gus Hall. In December 1959, this same Gus Hall was elected general secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

He still holds that post.

At long last, in June of last year, the U.S. Supreme Court officially affirmed what the Congress many years before had spelled out; namely, that the Communist Party, U.S.A., is not "just another political party" but is a part of a foreign based and controlled international program of conquest.

Proposition No. 3: International communism is a unique combination of "enemies, foreign and domestic" and for this reason current debate as to whether the threat is external or internal is totally unrealistic.

The threat of the international Communist conspiracy cannot be described or accurately appraised on an either-or basis but only on a both-and basis. Of course, it is an external threat.

But the techniques of subversion, espionage, sabotage, and propaganda are likewise internal threats—real, unremitting, persistently active, and potentially deadly.

On this point I quote the ablest American authority on the subject, Hon. J. Edgar Hoover:

"Some 200 known or suspected Communist-front and Communist-infiltrated organizations are now under investigation by the FBI. Many of these fronts are national in scope with chapters in various cities throughout the United States.

"They have infiltrated every conceivable sphere of activity: youth groups, radio, television, and motion picture industries; church, school, educational and cultural groups; the press, nationality minority groups and civil and political units."

Also, in a speech delivered only 4 months ago in Washington, Mr. Hoover said:

"The Communist threat from without must not blind us to the Communist threat from within. The latter is reaching into the very heart of America through its espionage agents and a cunning, defiant, and lawless Communist Party, which is fanatically dedicated to the Marxist cause of world enslavement and destruction of the foundations of our Republic."

One final word on this matter. In an address last April, President Kennedy pointed out that armies and nuclear armaments served primarily as the shield "behind which subversion, infiltration, and a host of other tactics can steadily advance." Mr. Kennedy was speaking specifically of Communist methods in Latin America and the Far East.

Can anyone be so unrealistic to suppose for a moment that the United States—prime target of Communist designs of conquest—is immune from these tactics and these efforts of the international Communist conspiracy.

Proposition No. 4: An attempt to evaluate the Communist threat solely or primarily in terms of the number of avowed or identified adherents is equally fallacious and dangerous.

In other words, it is foolish and potentially fatal to hold that there is nothing to fear about communism in this country because there are so few Communists—only a few thousand party members. This glib premise flies in the face of the history of the international Communist conspiracy.

Communists today constitute only 3 percent of the population of Soviet Russia. Moreover, 33 million Communists in a worldwide network control 40 percent of the population of this globe—900 million people—and honeycomb the vital control centers of the societies of the remaining 60 percent of the world population.

As the great American and great Democrat who heads the House Committee on Un-American Activities, Chairman FRANCIS E. WALTER, of Pennsylvania, has said, communism is not to be compared to two or three drops of red ink added to a large jug of water and immediately diluted to the point that it fails even slightly to discolor the water.

Addressing a patriotic rally in the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, Congressman WALTER added:

"A true analogy [is] the vast and complicated electrical wiring system in this hotel. This wiring system can be shortcircuited by a single disruption at a control point."

It didn't require very many dedicated Communists to deliver our nuclear secrets to Soviet Russia.

Bear in mind also the further ominous fact that the Communists themselves boasted, as Mr. Hoover has pointed out, that for every one formal party member in the United States there are 10 fellow travelers, sympathetic nonmembers, and dupes who serve the Communist cause.

The peril is not to be measured merely by arithmetic.

Proposition No. 5: "This is neither the time for inaction nor vigilante action; the job of curtailing and containing communism is one for legally constituted authorities with the steadfast cooperation of every loyal citizen."

This fifth proposition is a quotation from a public statement last year by J. Edgar Hoover.

I wish to draw two or three specific conclusions from the premise stated by Mr. Hoover.

1. The starting point for "the steadfast cooperation of every loyal citizen" is an understanding of the international Communist conspiracy, its objectives and its methods, both domestic and foreign.

That is precisely the value and the urgency of such seminars as this.

2. There are numerous "legally constituted authorities" which share in the job of curtailing and containing communism.

These include the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Central Intelligence Agency, the National Defense Agency, the intelligence services of the three military departments, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, and the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

With respect to the last two named agencies—the investigating committees of the Congress—I should like to make one point. Despite the propaganda to the contrary—much of it Communist-inspired—these two committees are a safeguard against vigilantism and not its creator. They serve the dual purpose of recommending legislation against Communist propaganda and subversion and of informing the Congress and the American people as to the facts about communism.

3. In that connection, I should like to call attention to the statement of the Supreme Court in the 1959 Barrenblatt case—a statement by the way never quoted by those dedicated to the abolition of these two legislative committees:

"That Congress has wide power to legislate in the field of Communist activity in this country, and to conduct appropriate investigations in aid thereof, is hardly debatable * * * In the last analysis this power rests on the right of self-preservation * * * Justification for its exercise in turn rests on the long and widely accepted view that the tenets of the Communist Party include the ultimate overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence."

To suggest that these two essential functions can be performed by the FBI and the other agencies of the executive branch is, of course, completely mistaken. Their role in combating communism is entirely different. They operate under restrictions of secrecy which would make them virtually useless to the legislative branch.

No one suggests, of course, that, because we have the FBI and the Department of Justice, and other investigative and law enforcement agencies dealing with interstate crime, labor racketeering, antitrust violations, or other criminal or antisocial activities, there should be no legislative committee investigations in these fields. This fallacious argument is not heard except with relation to legislative investigations of communism and subversion. The argument falls on its own weight.

4. Mr. Hoover's warning against vigilantism is a timely reminder that we must always differentiate between treason and dissent; between conspiracy and heresy; between loyalty and incompetence or wrongheadedness. This means, in simplest terms, that we must avoid reckless and indiscriminate charges of communism, and on this point Mr. Hoover has some further very sound advice:

"There exists today in our land a vital rift which the Communists are exploiting. Unfortunately, this involves certain people across the country who engage in reckless charges against one another. The label of 'Communist' is too often indiscriminately attached to those whose views differ from the majority * * *."

This warning goes not merely to the matter of accuracy and fairness and to the need of avoiding the cry of "Wolf! Wolf!" but to even more fundamental considerations.

Weakness, incompetence, wrongheadedness, mistaken policies, are not necessarily treason, but they can be as fatal and as deadly as treason.

But the point is that the method for dealing with weakness, incompetence, wrongheadedness, and mistaken policies are entirely different from those for dealing with treason, disloyalty, subversion, and so on. The former falls in the field of political action. The latter falls in the field of legislation, law enforcement, surveillance, and exposure.

We illy serve the cause of anticommunism if we mistakenly confuse either the offense or the corrective measures.

Proposition No. 6: Whatever serves the cause of communism serves that cause regardless of motives.

I interject this proposition because of the very harsh fact and real peril of parallelism.

I interject this proposition as a stern reminder to those of the so-called extreme left and those who are unconscious dupes of the Communist cause.

This is not primarily an area subject to correction by law or even by the exposures of legislative committees.

It is rather a matter of citizen responsibility and conscience.

But certainly not everyone who advocates a viewpoint which coincides with the international Communist line is therefore a Communist or a traitor.

But the point is that advocates of policies which do parallel the Communists can unwittingly and unintentionally serve the Communist cause. I think it is only a matter of fairness and reciprocity that those who assert their undoubted right, for example, to advocate recognition of Red China or unilateral suspension of nuclear testing, be willing to accept in good grace the equally undoubted right of other citizens to point out the parallelism and to continue to conclude that such advocacy does in fact serve the Communist cause.

It is one of the crimes of international communism that this is the inevitable consequence.

Proposition No. 7: It is imperative that we have straight thinking regarding the matter of suspicion in this conspiratorial age.

We are frequently told these days, and particularly by the enemies of the House Committee on Un-American Activities that anti-Communist organizations and activities and even the exposure of Communists by legislative committees tends to create an unhealthy divisive and dangerous climate of suspicion and that the effect is to make Americans distrustful of their neighbors.

Frequently this aura of suspicion is linked in these denunciations with that Communist-invented term "McCarthyism."

The accusations go even to the length of suggesting that this epidemic or contagion of suspicion is virtually psychopathic.

Now I should like to address myself to just two aspects of this matter of suspicion.

Insofar as there is suspicion, it would seem reasonable to raise the question as to the genesis of that suspicion. Let me use a homely illustration:

Suppose that I happen to attend a gathering in one of the large reception rooms in a Washington hotel to which room admission is gained only through one door and only by ticket. As I enter the room I take my

pocketbook from my pocket, remove the ticket and present it and thereupon replace my pocketbook in my pocket.

A short time later I find the pocketbook is missing and after a quiet search fail to locate it anywhere, I reluctantly advise my host that there apparently is a pickpocket among his guests. In consequence of my complaint, my host turns indignantly upon me, accuses me of creating suspicion, and sees to it that I am promptly ejected.

Now it would seem to me that there is some basis for alleged confusion and illogic in the mind of my host in charging me with being the cause and source of the suspicion. I am naive enough to believe that the real offender—so far as suspicion has been created—is the pickpocket. Furthermore, added to the insult of being ejected is the injury which I continue to suffer in not regaining my pocketbook.

Without torturing the analogy, I cannot conceive of anyone who would be more interested in condemning me for creating suspicion and in diverting condemnation to me, than the pickpocket himself.

Again, it is one of the crimes of international communism that by its conspiratorial and subversive activities it creates the somewhat logical suspicion that there are Communists and that they do indulge in conspiratorial activities and subversion.

Let us carry the examination of this matter of suspicion one step further.

Are we not in danger of ignoring and minimizing the survival value and imperative of suspicion?

Is it an exaggeration to say that the parents who teach their children not to accept rides from strangers, or the safety experts who warn against picking up hitchhikers are in truth creating, or at least laying the basis for suspicion and distrust?

And isn't this a healthy, necessary, and vitally protective type of suspicion? I think the answer is obvious.

Now, of course, if a guest in every gathering, however selective, views his associates as actual or potential pickpockets or if there is a disposition to impute Communist affiliations or leanings to everyone who expresses a political, economic, or social view contrary to our own, we may well have a case of psychopathic suspicion.

Here again, I venture the suggestion that the constituted authorities dealing with the facts and machinations of the international Communist conspiracy—including legislative investigative committees, instead of creating vigilantism and generating indiscriminate suspicion, actually serve, if we will but take the time to read and ponder their findings, to discipline suspicion and keep it from getting out of hand.

Proposition No. 8: It is imperative also that we have straight thinking regarding the matter of human greed, particularly as it relates to the class war propaganda of the international Communist conspiracy.

Incidentally, this matter goes to an idea aspect of international communism and its class war propaganda.

Let me explain what I mean.

In his farewell television address to the American people at the close of his first visit to the United States—when we generously made available to our declared enemy our vast communication facilities and no one bothered to claim equal time to refute his vicious propaganda—Mr. Khrushchev said something on this score:

"Human greed is a terrible thing. Did you ever know a millionaire who didn't want to become a multimillionaire?"

This was indeed a touching homily on the sinfulness of human selfishness, avarice, and covetousness delivered of a quiet Sunday evening by a grandfatherly appearing old scoundrel who himself—and in the system he represents—epitomized another and vastly more terrible form of human greed which has never scrupled at mass murder to accomplish its unholy purposes.

Of this other and infinitely more dreadful type of human greed—the grasping greed of the totalitarian state and the ruthless dictator—Mr. Khrushchev of course said not a word. Which was to be expected.

But then, as I have indicated, neither did any top-ranking spokesman for America. Which to me is unexpected and inexplicable.

Surely someone ought to have said at once—in paraphrase of Mr. Khrushchev's words—"Human greed is indeed a terrible thing. Did you ever know of a dictator who didn't want to tighten his totalitarian grip or extend and expand the scope and sway of his domination?"

It was against this very form of greed that our Founding Fathers sought in this constitutional Republic to provide lasting safeguards.

I am not unfamiliar with the manifestations of greed for wealth. But I'll take the millionaire eager to become a multimillionaire—under a system of freedom and self-government which can curb his avarice—in preference any day to the dictator and the centralized totalitarian government which leaves freemen and freedom defenseless.

Let Mr. Khrushchev preach his sanctimonious class warfare on other soil hereafter.

Proposition No. 9: It is imperative that we have straight thinking regarding the popular cliche that "it is better to be talking than shooting."

Winston Churchill's picturesque version is, "jaw, jaw, jaw, is better than war, war, war."

Now there is just enough truth to this proposition to make it plausible and appealing. It is one of those half-truths potentially more misleading and dangerous than an outright untruth.

And of course it is a risky business for anyone to challenge the statement—as I indeed do challenge it; risky because it subjects the challenger to the charge that he prefers war—nuclear war, no less—to talk, conferences, and negotiation. And this opens the way to the epithet "warmonger."

This glib cliche that "It's better to be talking than shooting" is a dangerous half-truth precisely because—standing alone and without qualification—it ignores the crucially important fact that talk can be just as perilous, just as fatal to the cause of justice, to national security, to the survival of our freedoms as war itself. It is possible that freedom, justice and even life itself may better survive war than talk—if, in that talk, we say or believe or trust the wrong things.

You can suffer diplomatic defeat as disastrous as military defeat. You can surrender as completely and abjectly at the conference table as on the battlefield or under an atomic holocaust.

Talk can be as catastrophic as war itself—for one reason because Soviet Russia has amply demonstrated the accuracy of the warning given by Democratic Secretary of State Bainbridge Colby in 1920 that the leaders of the Soviet regime "have frequently and openly boasted that they are willing to sign agreements and undertakings with foreign powers while not having the slightest intention of observing such undertakings." Incidentally, 50 or 52 major agreements to which the United States has been a party have been broken by Soviet Russia since we extended diplomatic recognition in 1933.

Talk can be as catastrophic as war itself in this age of scientific propaganda for another even more crucial reason. As a prominent English authority on communism has so aptly pointed out, the Communists have deliberately "decided to harness the fear of war instead of war itself to the Communist cause."

This analysis of Communist strategy, one that I believe to be appallingly accurate, adds up to a strategy of blackmail—nuclear blackmail.

And this underscores the catastrophic potential of talk.

We talked at Yalta.

And the direful consequences of that talk can be magnified at future Yaltas if we become enamoured with the efficacy of talk alone.

There is one form of talk which I regard as particularly dangerous and fatal. It is the kind of talk by supposedly responsible public officials, of either the executive or legislative branch, and for that matter on the part of nongovernmental communication media, which announces to our enemies the steps we do not intend to take in behalf of our defense and national security. I am sure that I do not have to document for this audience the fact that we have had, from time to time, that kind of talking and from the highest sources in our Nation.

Proposition No. 10: Finally, we must be alert to, and vigilant against, the insidious doctrine of fatalistic inevitability and helplessness which can only serve to sap our courage, paralyze our wills, and neutralize our power.

We must be equally alert to and vigilant against this insidious doctrine whether it has its origins in the international Communist conspiracy or whether it has its origins in inept and foolish counsels of weakness in our own midst.

The only kind of disarmament that Khrushchev or international communism are really interested in is the moral and spiritual disarmament of their enemies and principally of the United States. Time permits only the briefest documentation of this warning and this peril.

As one example, I quote from a New York Times editorial of Wednesday, April 16, 1961:

"One reason for the hesitant mood is the tragic dilemma facing a democratic society which, with all its imperfections, espouses certain moral principles as pursuing its own advantage under the law of the jungle. While the Soviets seek to stir up revolution and war against us wherever they can—even to the perfidy of the Hitler-Stalin pact—we must seek to discourage anti-Communist revolts in order to avert bloodshed and war. We must, under our own principles, live with evil even if by doing so we help to stabilize tottering Communist regimes, as in East Germany, and perhaps even expose citadels of freedom, like West Berlin, to slow death by strangulation."

Here is another example:.

This is a statement by Dr. Kenneth A. Foreman which appeared in the October 1961 issue of the Presbyterian Outlook:

"Freedom * * * or fight * * * is not the alternative any more. * * * The alternative now is 'peace' with slavery, or total destruction."

It is not my wish in the slightest degree to violate the bipartisan or nonpartisan character of these remarks or of this seminar. Yet I must offer my respectful disagreement with the statement of the Honorable J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, made on the floor of the Senate July 24, 1961, when he said:

"Apparently we have not yet fully accepted the fact that there are no absolute solutions, that we can hope to do little more than mitigate our problems as best we can and learn to live with them."

I have only two comments to offer regarding this statement.

I do not profess to know what Senator FULBRIGHT means by "absolute solutions." I do believe that his statement, however intended, can contribute to the philosophy of fatalistic futility which can, in turn, sap our courage, paralyze our wills, and neutralize our power.

I am sure that if Senator FULBRIGHT were lost in a forest with a working compass in his pocket, he would accept the relative solution offered by that compass instead of re-

signing himself to helplessness because he had no absolute solution.

I suggest also that it is fortunate that medical science has not been paralyzed into immobility because it has no absolute solutions. Doctors, to be sure, have found no absolute solution to the fact of death, but they have defeated, and do defeat, death countless times. They have eliminated scourages. They have increased life expectancy. They have not only mitigated problems—they have solved them. They have not merely enabled men to live with physical handicaps and problems (sometimes, in truth, that is all that is possible) but they have eliminated these ills and removed the handicaps. Are we to ask or expect any less of statesmanship?

I am deeply disturbed by the frequent rebukes of those who, it is alleged, glibly offer "simple solutions." It is very easy, I suspect, to equate this rebuke with a resignation to the fact that there are no solutions.

I quote, for example, Chalmers M. Roberts in his December 23, 1961, article on "Thunder on the Right." Mr. Roberts offers the premise that "In today's vastly complex world, major international problems admit of no neat solutions soothing to the international ego." Mr. Roberts adds:

"In the simpler world of the past, American power could be, and was, brought to bear and was, in itself, or with the unwritten British alliance, sufficient to accomplish all our purposes in international affairs. But gunboat diplomacy is dead; in the newer age risk of direct action by a great power entails the risk of suicide.

"In such a complex world those with the easy explanation and the simple solution appeal to the many who are frustrated with insolubility."

Mr. Roberts cites as a typical attitude of these "frustrated Americans" those who "want to know why if we can't smack the big devil in Moscow, why can't we swat the little devil in Havana."

While I admit that Cuba is a graphic and appalling dangerous "exhibit A" as to the consequences of both incredible blunders, of "too little and too late" in terms of action which could have been effective at minimum cost had it been taken timely, and as to the example of cumulative effect of misinformation, miscalculation, lack of courage, paralysis of will and neutralization of power. I happen also to think that, late as it is, it is not too late for decisive action, but I cannot pursue that matter further here except to say that since October 1959, I have been detailing specific suggestions for a progressive course of firm and decisive action with respect to this bastion of international communism so near our shores.

I share with Clare Booth Luce the view that "the chain of destiny is forged link by link, and so is the chain of captivity." I share also the appraisal recently given by Roscoe Drummond, the distinguished columnist:

"Fear of war has almost continuously paralyzed Western policy [since the end of World War II] but fear of war has not paralyzed Communist policy.

"If we continue to be afraid of nuclear war while the Soviets are not afraid of nuclear war, we are going to end up losing diplomatically what we fear to lose in a nuclear war. If we keep stepping back from the Moscow-created brink every time Mr. Khrushchev says: 'Give us a little something more or you will get yourselves destroyed by war'—we will keep on losing the cold war and getting nearer to actual war."

Nuclear blackmail can be frustrated by the simple expedient of refusing to be blackmailed.

Progressive steps, including declaration of contraband, total embargo, and military intervention can be taken if necessary to liberate Cuba.

Nuclear testing can and should be resumed.

Unilateral concessions can be rejected.

Futile—or even worse, peace at any price—negotiations can be foregone.

Domestic Communist machinations can be (and are being) kept under surveillance, and exposed and countered by effective measures.

Captive nations can be encouraged and aided in their quest for the recovery of their freedom.

Capitalism—including American capitalism—given reasonable safeguards and encouragement, can wage effective war against the inroads of the slave system of communism.

The American people can be rallied to the support of policies of "firmness in the right as God gives to see the right."

To General MacArthur's declaration of faith, which I quoted at the outset, "I have confidence in us" I add his words of warning and challenge delivered on the battleship *Missouri* at the surrender at Tokyo Bay: "It must be of the spirit if we are to save the flesh."

Robert Frost Speaks of New Hampshire With Greatness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein the attached editorial from the Somersworth Free Press, published in Somersworth, N.H., on March 29, 1962, entitled "He speaks of New Hampshire—and With Greatness":

HE SPEAKS OF NEW HAMPSHIRE AND WITH GREATNESS

This week America's greatest living poet, Robert Frost, observes his 88th birthday.

Frost, of all contemporary writers, has the most likely prospect of having his works stand out in history as being truly great—truly classic—in the fullest and broadest sense of those words.

Frost, although born in San Francisco, in comparative exile from New England, nonetheless is a poet of New England. Early in this century he lived on an isolated farm in Derry where he farmed for a livelihood and got to know beauties of the New Hampshire outdoors by doing the things that farmers know and do. Those 11 years he spent in New Hampshire, Poet Frost has described as being "best for my writing." And so they must have been. There's hardly a volume of Frost's poems that doesn't reflect the insight and awareness that this man has of his fellow man, of the natural beauties that have made New Hampshire and New England a sanctuary and an inspiration for those who wish to live apart from the maddening crowd.

To coincide with Frost's birthday Tuesday, the new collection of his poems—the first in 14 years—was published. "In the Clearing" contains pieces such as "The Gift Outright" which have already become a part of the Frost tradition.

In this volume, Frost explores, to the relief of many of his admirers, some of his views of Christian theology.

The final verse in this new volume is typical not only of Frost's awareness of nature but it also signals his awareness that this volume may well be his final one.

"IN WINTER IN THE WOODS ALONE

"In winter in the woods alone
Against the tree I go.
I mark a maple for my own
And lay the maple low.

"At four o'clock I shoulder ax
And in the afterglow
I link a line of shadowy tracks
Across the tinted snow.

"I see for Nature no defeat
In one tree's overthrow
Or for myself in my retreat
For yet another blow."

Failure To Ease Federal Debt May Finally Crush the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the real victim of irresponsible fiscal policies by the Federal Government and ever increasing demands for heavier spending by the Kennedy administration may result finally in completely crushing the American people. The fallacies of the President's spending demands and the inevitable result are clearly pointed out in the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune:

THE COIN CLIPPERS: I—WE OWE IT TO OURSELVES

You can recognize the silver-tongued squandering debthatcher (usual habitat, the Potomac) by its pleading cry, "But we owe it to ourselves."

This parasitic species has been common since the New Deal descended on Washington and the mellow voice of Franklin Roosevelt assured us that we had nothing to fear from the Government. "Let us never forget," he said, "that Government is ourselves." If you hear a muffled groan, it is coming from the grave of an earlier Democrat, Thomas Jefferson, who believed that aside from restraining men from injuring one another, a good government should "leave them free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement."

Today is April Fool's Day, and when the Government emits its fluted note, perhaps you can guess who it takes to be the fool, all year 'round, year in and year out. It is you—the patsy who pays the bill for its interference in his affairs.

We've been borrowing "from ourselves" now for 30 years. Since 1931 we've run the national debt up from $17 to $300 billion, and the increase can't all be blamed on the Second World War, which itself was no contribution to American interest or survival.

During the 10 peacetime years before the war, the debt went up by $26 billion, more than the cost of World War I, and since 1946 it has gone up by $29 billion.

What has all this accomplished?

The original purpose of the New Deal spending was to provide jobs for the 11 million who were unemployed during the campaign of 1932. Seven years and more than 20 billion deficit dollars later, unemployment had dropped only to 10½ million. When the problem was finally licked, it wasn't by doles and make-work projects; it was by the demand for production resulting from World War II.

Today the excuse for Government spending is that we must "get America moving again." Don't ask why, if $29 billion of deficit spending since the war hasn't got us moving, any more will do it now. Don't have the temerity to bring up the failure of this therapy in the 1930's or to point out that our greatest periods of peacetime growth have been accompanied by balanced budgets and, in general, reduction of the debt. You would merely get the familiar assurance that it doesn't matter too much, because we're only borrowing from ourselves.

It doesn't matter, apparently, that this supposedly harmless borrowing threatens to put "the richest Nation in the world" into the international poorhouse and to make foreigners shy away from our money. It has perverted two of the basic purposes of the Federal Reserve System: to maintain a stable currency and to "afford a means of rediscounting commercial paper." The latter meant that banks which loaned money to business would be able to borrow from the Federal Reserve on the strength of these notes, and thus have more money to lend to business.

Business loans have always been a fair measure of economic growth. In 1920 more than 90 percent of the assets of the Federal Reserve System, other than gold, consisted of notes representing commercial loans. In the 3 years preceding the end of 1934, this percentage dropped from 57 to less than one-half of 1 percent.

Senator Carter Glass, of Virginia, a Democrat, protested at that time that "the Federal Reserve banks are doing nothing in the world but financing the Government of the United States. They are not financing business."

His colleague, Senator HARRY BYRD, told Congress in 1935 that "after 2 years of trying to spend ourselves back to prosperity on borrowed money, we are now asked to appropriate $5 billion for public works * * * and we are told that if we do that, prosperity will return."

Today Treasury securities make up 99.9 percent of the nongold assets of the Federal Reserve banks. The debt is still growing. The dollar is down to four-tenths of its pre-New Deal value. Senator BYRD is still valiantly protesting. The Government is still promising, and the people are still paying.

There are signs, especially in the foreign exchange markets, that the ice beneath us soon may crack. But why worry? Nobody will drown but the people from whom we have "borrowed"—namely, ourselves.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Second Supplemental Appropriation Bill, 1962

SPEECH

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11038) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, what I am discussing here today has to do with the basic integrity of the subcommittees dealing with appropriations. Mr. Chairman, I resent the beginning of a $9 million program—this is not just $2.5 million—it is the beginning of a $9 million program extending over the next 3 years, yet it is included in what is supposed to be an emergency or deficiency bill.

All of the Members here know that when they come before our Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture, we give them courteous treatment; we listen to their requests. We do the best we can. I do not think there is a better chairman on any subcommittee on appropriations than the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. We are always courteous.

I am surprised that my good friend from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] becomes a party, unknowingly I am sure, to the start of a $9 million program concerning which Dr. Popham and his associates had not even appeared to testify before our subcommittee.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I will be glad to listen to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, just wherein has this humble subcommittee committed any error? This item was sent over to the subcommittee from the Bureau of the Budget. This committee has been duly organized and set up to handle these items. We again humbly apologize to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Will the gentleman agree to my amendment? That would be the best apology that I know of.

Mr. THOMAS. We have a duty and a responsibility here, as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has explained. I am not a farmer. He lives in one of the great farming communities of the world, as does the gentleman from Minnesota. This screw-worm is fixing to hatch out in the spring. If you are going to have any relief, now is the time to have it; do not wait until June or July or August of this year. If you want to help the farmers, go on and help these people. After all, these are matching funds.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Has the gentleman finished, on my time?

Mr. THOMAS. I should be glad to yield the gentleman whatever time he wants, if I have that right.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I would have to get it by unanimous consent.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed an additional 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I yield. I want to show the gentleman where he is wrong in this particular instance.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman does not want to hurt part of Louisiana, all of Texas, all of Oklahoma, all of Arkansas, and all of New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. That is correct.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman talks about $9 million. I do not know where he gets that figure. These are matching funds. There is only $2½ million in here and if it were to go for 2 years, I do not see where it would come to over $5 million.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Will the gentleman permit me to continue?

Mr. THOMAS. It is the gentleman's time. He yielded to me.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I just want to say how necessary it is to approach a situation of this kind through the subcommittee which really knows what this problem is all about.

Mr. THOMAS. Of course, you know your subject matter.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Let me answer the gentleman. If the gentleman will turn to page 3 of the hearings, he will see there that the Department of Agriculture has $800,000 a year, right today, to do all this work of scattering sterile screw-worm flies throughout that area. Look at page 3 of the hearings. The gentleman did not know that. The gentleman admits that he did not know that.

Mr. THOMAS. I did not admit anything. Do not put words in my mouth.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] does not even know that the Department of Agriculture wrote a letter to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and myself and asked permission to take $800,000 of its present existing funds and proceed with the scattering of these sterile flies. Look at the bottom of page 3. No harm is done by doing that. The work is progressing. On page 9 the gentleman from Texas himself asked this question of Dr. Popham:

> What is your best guess will be required over the 3-year period in which you think you can get the job done to do it like you have done it in the Southeast?
>
> Dr. POPHAM. We think it would take approximately the same amount in the fiscal years 1964 and 1965.

Here it is only 2 months before July 1. They have $800,000 available, and here you are coming in with a $9 million program over the next 3 years. I realize you people did not have an opportunity to study the problem, but I am not objecting to that. I think it is irresponsible procedure to take away from the proper subcommittee its due authority. We have done everything we could to promote this great eradication work. We did it for the Southeast. If it comes to the feasibility of establishing an artificial barrier between Mexico and the United States, let us at least have the privilege in our subcommittee of having these folks come before us and tell us something about what they want done. But no, here we are being committed to an appropriation of $2.5 million. I think the gentleman will agree with me it is a little bit unfair to our subcommittee, and I plead for the commonsense of the House to leave it to the jurisdiction of the proper subcommittee to take care of this very important work.

Mr. THOMAS. We certainly do not want to usurp any jurisdiction that the gentleman may have. We went to the full committee and presented this item. My very able and distinguished friend was there, and he did not mention it.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I was not there; I am sorry.

Mr. THOMAS. It is a little bit embarrassing to the gentleman——

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. No; it is not embarrassing at all.

Mr. THOMAS. For a member of the committee to get up and raise that point after the action has been taken. We would have been glad to turn it over to you. As a matter of fact, we have more work to do now than we wanted.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. The gentleman from Texas is a very able gentleman. He is a lovable gentleman, as he has often said to others. The gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from Mississippi were unable to be at that particular meeting that morning. Neither of us was advised in advance that that particular item would be in the bill. Right now I am attempting on behalf of the gentleman from Mississippi and my subcommittee to defend the integrity of my subcommittee.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. It is not only unfortunate that the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota was not at the full committee meeting to raise the question, but insofar as his viewpoint is concerned, it is also unfortunate that he offered an amendment instead of making a point of order here in the Committee of the Whole today. I suspect a point of order might have been successful but it is now too late.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. May I say to the gentleman from New York that the gentleman from Minnesota will always make his own decisions as to his procedure. I ask you, ladies and gentlemen, in the name of fairplay to remember that the Department has $800,000 it is using now for this purpose. Remember, there are only about 2 months between now and July 1. Remember that my subcommittee on appropriations has not yet completed hearings. So in the name of fairplay, I hope this item will be stricken.

Naval Hospital at Long Beach, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the Defense Department, the U.S. Navy, and the executive branch of the Federal Government have all recommended there be authorized a new naval hospital in the Long Beach-Los Angeles area in southern California.

There are 205,000 active and retired military personnel in that area today. The hospital facilities available to them are meager.

I very much hope that this year the Senate Committee on Armed Services will approve proposed legislation to authorize the construction of this urgently needed medical and hospital facility to serve men in uniform, their dependents, and retired military personnel in the entire Greater Los Angeles-Long Beach area.

The Los Angeles Herald Examiner published an excellent editorial on this subject April 2, 1962, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW NAVY HOSPITAL

While U.S. Navy circles, other branches of the armed services and southern Californians generally are thankful that the House Armed Services Committee in Washington has given its approval to the proposed $9 million naval hospital in Long Beach, there's still a hurdle to be surmounted.

The naval hospital project so desperately needed in southern California still must receive approval from the important Senate Armed Services Committee. Action there is possible sometime within the coming week.

It is not as if there already were at least partly adequate military hospital facilities in the Southland. But as the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, the Navy League and numerous military and civilian officials have pointed out repeatedly, conditions are not only deplorable but bordering on the dangerous.

Dr. Frank G. Nolan, president of the Beverly Hills Council of the Navy League of the United States, points out that there are approximately 114 naval vessels which make their home port the Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor. This makes the local port the third largest naval base in the United States.

However, present hospital facilities for an estimated 205,200 active and retired military personnel with their dependents in the Greater Los Angeles-Long Beach area are limited to the following meager facilities:

1. A 50-bed Army hospital at Fort MacArthur, San Pedro.

2. A 40-bed dispensary at a considerable distance at the El Toro Marine Corps Air Station near Santa Ana.

3. A 350-bed hospital ship, the old *Haven*, at the Los Angeles-Long Beach Naval Base. Unfortunately, this ship with its limited facilities is overage and is being condemned to be put out of service.

So the need for the new Navy hospital in the Long Beach area becomes even more imperative. Its construction as soon as possible for the use of Navy personnel and those from other branches of the Armed Forces should no longer be delayed.

The $9,260,000 needed for the hospital's construction already has been allocated by the Department of Defense. All that is needed is a final go-ahead from Congress. Our California Senators and others should strongly urge that approval.

The 50th Anniversary of Hadassah

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, today is the 50th anniversary of Hadassah, the women's Zionist organization of America, and I rise in tribute to its achievements.

Hadassah has grown from a handful of dedicated individuals devoted to the ideals of their religion and the problems of public health nursing to the largest Jewish women's organization in the world with active interests in public health, medical research, child rescue work, vocational education, social welfare, and land reclamation.

Clearly, this is no organization withdrawn from society or prone to righteous pleading: it is an actual organization. There is no gap between its beliefs and its practical undertakings. The expansion of the activities of the association came in response to the calamities of disease, ignorance, poverty, and war. Its devotion to these universal and unending tasks has not eroded its patience nor its energies in coping with them.

Its health activities have fulfilled pioneering roles not only in Israel but also in the newly developing Afro-Asian countries. Hospitals and medical teams have conducted work in Monrovia and Tanganyika, and medical education is supplied to students from many countries of Africa and Asia.

Hadassah is an example of the close affinity of spiritual values and practical service to mankind. Its outlook is not narrowly sectarian but broadly humanitarian. In pursuit of its aims it has cooperated with other service organizations, such as the National Citizens Committee of the WHO and the National Civil Liberties Clearing House.

I congratulate Hadassah in its golden jubilee year as an outstanding group dedicated to the highest ideals of democracy and good will.

Ceremonies Honoring Wisconsin Decendant of Civil War Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on April 18, 1962, historic ceremonies will mark the centennial of the birth of the Congressional Medal of Honor.

For the occasion, a daughter of Wisconsin—and of a Federal Civil War soldier—will, if all goes as planned, be present for the ceremonies.

On April 18, 1865, Pvt. Richard H. Cosgriff, of my hometown of Chippewa Falls, Wis., was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor for outstanding bravery during the Civil War.

For the April ceremonies, here in Washington, D.C., his daughter, Mrs. J. C. Shellings, will be one of the few living daughters or sons of men who received one of the first congressional medals.

Currently, Mrs. Shellings is residing in New Smyrna Beach, Fla.

Recently, the DeLand Sun News, published an article, by Helen Coble, about this daughter of the Civil War hero entitled "New Smyrna Woman Will Be Feted at U.S. Medal of Honor Ceremonies."

With Wisconsin sharing the reflected honor to Mrs. Shellings with the great State of Florida—where Mrs. Shellings now resides—I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW SMYRNA WOMAN WILL BE FETED AT U.S. MEDAL OF HONOR CEREMONIES

(By Helen Coble)

Volusia County has an 80-year-old young woman that the States of Iowa and Wisconsin would love to get their hands upon. But they can't have her, although we will generously permit them to pay homage to her.

Her name is Mrs. J. C. Shellings and she lives at 301 Lincoln Avenue, New Smyrna Beach. She's a beautiful woman with deep blue eyes and white hair. She bubbles over with a zest for living.

Her mind is as bright as a spanking new silver dollar and her trigger-sharp memory is something exceptional.

She's proud, happy, and excited as each day brings her closer to a memorable highlight of her life.

CEREMONIES SET

April 18, 1962. That's the red-letter day she's looking forward to. The place? Washington, D.C. The reason? Historic ceremonies will mark the centennial of the birth of the Congressional Medal of Honor and she is one of the living daughters of a Federal Civil War soldier whose heroic deeds earned him one of the coveted medals.

There'll be many high brass of the military at the commemorative event. Maybe even President Kennedy himself will be there. There'll be Congressmen and Senators, generals, and admirals; but there won't be very many living daughters and sons of the men who received the first congressional medals from their Government.

If everything goes as planned, she'll be there—eyes shining brightly with pride. And in her hand she'll reverently hold the medal her father received.

RIBBON FADING

The blue ribbon is fading, but the stars are still clear. The medal itself is still as bright as the honor of the man to whom it was given. The word "calor" stands out sharply and the fine inscription on the back reads: "The Congress to Pvt. Richard H. Cosgriff, Co. L, 4th Iowa Cav. Vols., Columbus, April 16, 1865."

Mrs. Schelling knows well the story of how her father earned this tribute. As a child she heard it from his lips. Later, she read about it in a book entitled "Deeds of Valor," stories and pictures of men awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor for their outstanding bravery during the Civil War.

CAPTURES BRIDGE

Pvt. Richard Cosgriff's heroism remains on the printed pages for future generations to read about. "Bold Capture of a Bridge" is the title of that section telling of her father's heroic action.

It was during the famed raid of Gen. James H. Wilson on the Chattahochee River at Columbus, Ga., that Private Sosgriff joined the ranks of Federal heroes.

Two bridges had been destroyed and the one remaining was heavily guarded by Confederate units. Two pieces of artillery supported the Confederate men who were stationed at the bridge to prevent its capture or loss.

Cosgriff led the 200 volunteers, who were ordered to ride over the earthworks in front of the brigade "at full speed and not fire a shot but dash on and capture the guard on the bridge." That's what the story tells.

MISSION ACCOMPLISHED

The mission was accomplished. Wilson's raiders went on to their next objective and for his bravery, Cosgriff was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor.

When War Between the States broke out in 1860, Cosgriff was too young to join a home unit in Wisconsin. Everyone knew he was under age. But the youth was determined to serve and as he later told his family, he ran away to the Mississippi River and floated south by raft until he came to Iowa and he joined the 4th Iowa Cavalry Volunteers. He stayed with them until the war was over and then he went back home to Wisconsin, where he lived until his death in 1910.

Three States can share in the reflected honor which Mrs. Schelling will receive—Wisconsin, his home State; Iowa, where he joined the cavalry; and Florida, the home of his daughter.

When the Nation pauses next April and pays tribute to its Civil War Congressional Medal of Honor heroes, a very proud daughter will be there in the front ranks just as her father was a century ago.

Remarks of Hon. Robert W. Hemphill Before the Southeastern Milk Marketing Clinic, Chattanooga, Tenn., March 30, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an address before the Southeastern Dairy Marketing Clinic at Chattanooga, Tenn., made by Hon. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL, Member of Congress from the Fifth District of South Carolina, on March 30. Mr. HEMPHILL is a vigorous, articulate, determined, and persuasive advocate of the views and desires of his constituents. I am sure his views will be of interest to many in this body.

The address follows:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN ROBERT W. HEMPHILL, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE FIFTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA, BEFORE THE SOUTHEASTERN MILK MARKETING CLINIC IN CHATTANOOGA, TENN., MARCH 30, 1962, AT 9:30 A.M.

Mr. President, my good friend VERNON THOMSON of Wisconsin, members of the Chattanooga Area Milk Producers Association, ladies and gentlemen, I am happy to be with you today and feel privileged to be on your program. I could not come to the romantic city of Chattanooga, with all the nostalgia the very name inspires to all of us of privileged southern origin, without paying homage, engaging in admiring salute, to a great American, the Congressman from this district, the Honorable JIM FRAZIER. Since I have been in the Congress, I have come to know him as an able and dedicated legislator, and his service inspires, even demands, my respect. I am proud to know him and serve with him.

Since I come from an area in which the production of milk is increasing and the quality is second to none in the Nation, I have every sympathy with your problems; every admiration for your contribution to the food and welfare of this Nation; and to the agricultural economy of your State and region. From a personal standpoint, I am not in the milk production business, but I was taught to milk a cow at a very early age and I reckon with and appreciate the hard work and demanding care incidental to the milk production—a hard way to make a living—and 7 days a week at that.

In this session of Congress, we are again faced with some demand for legislation to impose upon the milk production industry, and especially the smaller producers, the burdens, the regimentations, of Federal control of milk inspection. If the legislation were to pass, Federal control of milk inspection would affect all fluid milk for the simple reason that all milk is either in or affected by interstate commerce.

The proponents of the legislation, and it is significant that they come from one particular area of the country, seek to impress us with the arguments that they wish the high health standards now contained in the U.S. Milk Ordinance and Code. The facts are that this so-called high health standard is accepted in most of the States, especially in our section of the country, and is accepted not as the highest, but the lowest or minimum standards permissible for milk whether in local or interstate shipment.

Under the previous administration we held hearings on H.R. 3840 which sought to legislate and provide that any milk which met the requirements of a Federal milk sanitation code, as promulgated by the Surgeon General under the auspices of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, could not be excluded from any State or fluid market in the United States. It was significant that the proponents of this legislation, who, for the most part, with exceptions of those who have been replaced by their constituency, or the proponents of this session of Congress, ignored the years of study and application made by local, county, and State health departments, ignored the high standards which have resulted, and sought to use the interstate commerce approach as a vehicle for a new and unneeded, useless Federal bureaucracy.

When a Member of Congress introduces a bill on any subject, it is referred to the appropriate committee. The clerk of that committee, for the chairman of the committee, writes to each executive agency or department interested and asks for a report on the legislation. I was interested in the reports on this legislation, made under the Republican administration, since that was my first acquaintance with the inequities of this proposed legislation. In 1960, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, a bureaucracy anxious to enlarge its powers over milk producers as well as in other fields, favored the legislation because of what it termed "trade barriers allegedly formed by health regulations." The Department of Commerce had the gall to state that it favored the legislation as a "new approach to protect the public from unsanitary barriers." I can only criticize this last as bureaucratic bungling as there was a complete lack of testimony given and expected of any "unsanitary barriers." The Justice Department criticized the legislation because of the inclusion of the term "interstate shippers" which the Justice Department criticized as being too vague and which could include individual farmers, haulers, and some other persons.

The Justice Department ably ferreted the scope of this legislation. If a Federal bureaucracy is put in charge of milk sanitation in this country, every producer will be affected and regimented, and the gradual elimination of the small producer will amount to a question of time.

The Agriculture Department, on April 28, 1960, gave a rather significant report, and I quote from it:

"There is no indication in the findings that public health is endangered under the present system of State and local sanitary inspection. * * *

"We, therefore, question the desirability of using a Federal public health measure and program as an instrument to eliminate or minimize undesirable trade barriers to the interstate movement of milk. * * *

"We seriously question the need for invasion of State and local governments desires, rights and responsibilities. * * *

"Substantial volumes * * * are now moving freely in interstate commerce.

"We are also concerned as to the Federal cost inherent in * * * program * * * we visualize Federal appropriations of a substantial amount."

These observations I have just quoted are significant in our approach today, pinpoint major concerns.

We are fortunate that we are aware of the Russians' failure in agriculture, else we would be plagued with the cry that the Russians are getting ahead of us in milk productions and we need this bureaucracy to stay ahead of the Russians. This vehicle of propaganda is a common source of transportation for

weak programs which certain eggheads in Washington seek to create and strengthen by legislation in the Nation's Capitol today.

In 1961, reports under a new administration are somewhat different. The report from the Department of Justice quotes the title of the bill, relating that the act is supposed to protect the public from unsanitary milk and milk products shipped in interstate commerce. The Justice Department does not, however, point out any unsanitary aspects of the various local administrations in the country, but says, "the legislation would eliminate certain barriers to free interstate shipment milk."

It is, therefore, obvious that the title is wrong and that the legislation is under a false front, a false front of sanitation.

The report from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare pursues the hypocrisy. I quote two paragraphs which gives the hypocrisy away.

"This Department has consistently held that health regulations should not be used as domestic trade barriers to the interstate shipment of milk and milk products of high sanitary quality. At the same time, we recognize the public health gains that have been achieved through State and local sanitary control of milk supplies and the continuing need for such control. In accordance with these views, the Public Health Service has long advocated the adoption of uniform milk sanitation regulations which, if correctly applied, would result in safe supplies of milk, and to this end has developed a model milk ordinance and code for voluntary adoption by interested State and local governments. This model ordinance presently serves as the basis of milk sanitation regulations in 36 States and has been adopted by more than 1,900 local jurisdictions.

"Moreover, H.R. 50 has important public health implications. It would assure milk and milk products of high sanitary quality to jurisdictions receiving milk and milk products under its provisions. In many cases, it would lead to improvement in the sanitary quality of the local supply as well. Despite the vast improvement in the sanitary quality of milk that has accrued from State and local milk sanitation programs, there still remain areas where sanitary quality of milk and milk sanitation practices do not meet our presently recommended standards. In such areas, we believe it inevitable that the immunities conferred by the bill, together with the prestige attached to compliance with the Federal standard, would inspire both industry and official milk sanitation agencies to seek the necessary improvements in their own control programs. Consequently, we are certain that the bill would result in added health protection for a substantial segment of the Nation's population."

As legislators, we are concerned that the executive branch of the Government should participate in this endeavor when there is no call from the public. Washington, of course, would direct. Washington could enjoin. Washington would regiment, and Washington would manipulate and the small producers of this country would find themselves unable to compete. That is the objective and that is the purpose and no amount of frills can disguise it.

Has there been any evidence that the local agencies have not done a good job in the area of milk sanitation?

The record speaks for itself: Dr. John Andrews, allegedly representing the Conference of State Sanitary Engineers, had to admit at the 1961 hearings that his State of North Carolina had done an excellent job and that private enterprise in North Carolina was against the legislation.

This idea has some popularity with State public health officers who have been brainwashed by the U.S. Public Health Service. Too many of these State public health officers want to get under the Federal umbrella of high pay, low production, low effort, abundant holidays and substantial retirement. The proponents speak of high inspection fees, yet they would substitute high paid bureaucrats for the present system.

The consumers of milk have made no demand, and I am sure they want no Federal control or interference. It is the consumer who will pay the bill and the consumer who will suffer if the health standards are lowered, local incentive will be destroyed and a general discouragement of State and local attempts will evolve.

Secretary Freeman could not, or did not, name any consumer groups for this legislation when he testified before our committee in August of 1961.

Let us turn briefly to the testimony of Dr. John D. Faulkner, Chief, Milk and Food Branch of Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, when asked by Chairman HARRIS about the purpose of this bill.

"The CHAIRMAN. And that is the only purpose of this legislation, then, is it not?

"Mr. FAULKNER. I would say that there were two purposes in the legislation, sir, as I see them. And one would be to prevent the use of health regulations in a way to prevent the movement or obstruct the movement of milk on health grounds when such health grounds were not justified. That would be what I would say would be the primary objective of the bill."

I was amazed to hear, and I quote from page 152 of the hearings, Mr. Ivan A. Nestingen, Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, make the statement: "There is one point that should be made. When you say that this bill takes away the sovereignty the State has in this effect, the State need not participate under this bill if it does not want to." Such a statement is either deliberately misleading, or smacks of the lack of care as to what might be said to get the legislation, so long as its enactment was procured.

Before you buy the propaganda line, examine carefully the fallacy that the local boards will continue to function as they do now. Examine carefully the rationale that Secretary Freeman, who would shackle the milk industry with marketing orders, was pushing the legislation.

Examine carefully the fact that a majority of the States of the Nation are opposed to this legislation.

Determine whether you would surrender local protection for the purpose of gaining Federal control, if this could be said to be a gain.

I do not believe you want this monstrosity. Leaving aside the question of Federal control, where do we find evidence that the country as a whole will benefit, that you as producers will benefit, or that the consumers will benefit? The facts of the case are against the enactment of this legislation. The jury I am sitting on has so far turned down the proposal. I hope you are against this iniquitous idea and the legislation I have discussed.

News Release From Office of Senator Young of North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the contents of one of my recent news releases.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Feeding starving pheasants and other wildlife with Government surplus grains should meet with the approval of just about everyone. Game biologists believe, however, that unless such feeding is undertaken only in long periods of deep snow and very cold weather, it could do more harm than good. I sponsored and secured passage of this legislation last year in cooperation with wildlife interests in North Dakota.

Unfortunately, as is the case with many other worthy programs, it will appear as an expenditure in next year's Department of Agriculture budget although it will only slightly increase this budget estimated at $5.8 billion. It would be more easily understood if the feed costs were charged to the Fish and Wildlife Service. Congress and the Bureau of the Budget insist on the more simple procedure of having the Commodity Credit Corporation pay for all such programs and then be reimbursed by Congress the following year. Many critics of agriculture who list all its expenditures as subsidies to farmers are either unaware of these fiscal policies or do not want to understand them. As a result, millions of people have come to believe that farmers are actually receiving subsidy checks for the entire amount of the USDA budget. The following are a few of the items contained in this budget which are often erroneously charged as subsidies to farmers:

1. Food for peace. (This is for CCC stocks of food sold to hungry nations of the world. We accept their currencies and reloan most of it for development programs in recipient countries	$1,389,000,000
2. Gifts of food for famine relief throughout the world	300,000,000
3. Surplus food bartered for strategic water materiels	250,000,000
4. Loans to REA and RTA (repayment record nearly 100 percent)	370,000,000
5. FHA loans to farmers who are unable to secure credit elsewhere (repayment record of more than 90 percent)	198,000,000
6. School lunch and milk distribution program	271,000,000
7. Surplus food to school lunch and for charitable purposes	235,000,000
8. Sugar program (self-financing from duties and excise taxes)	87,000,000
9. Wool support program (self-financing from duty on imported wool)	70,000,000

While all these huge sums are charged as subsidies to farmers, they are either repaid, self-financing, or of greater benefit to urban people than they are to farmers. The Extension Service with its home economics program and girls' and boys' 4-H work is as popular with urban people as farmers. Soil conservation to assure abundant future supplies of food and fiber is everybody's business.

Agriculture research has been of untold benefit to everyone. It has been directly responsible for reducing the incidence of tuberculosis and brucellosis in humans due to nationwide campaigns to eradicate the disease in cattle, and for developing large-scale inexpensive methods of producing penicillin. From 1947 to 1957, the cost of penicillin was

reduced from about $1,400 to $100 a pound. Other results are the development of starch sponge for hospital use which absorbs blood and facilitates clotting and the development of dextran, a vital blood plasma extender, used successfully in Korea as a substitute for human blood plasma to reduce serious incidence of infectious hepatitis. Much of this has now been made a part of our civil defense program.

Agriculture research can claim many accomplishments in the field of producing more healthful and nutritious foods. There is an equally impressive list of accomplishments in the field of utilization research such as the recent development of fast-drying linseed oil emulsion paints of high quality and the many plastics from farm surpluses. There are improved insecticides and weedicides. Through plant breeding research, better and higher yielding varieties of almost every crop have been made possible. This, coupled with the ingenuity, efficiency, and hard work of farmers, has made possible the most abundant supplies of food and fiber at the lowest prices ever attained by any nation in the world.

Centennial of Philadelphia—Jewish Chaplain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the centennial of the Jewish military chaplaincy was observed in Philadelphia during the 70th annual meeting of the American Jewish Historical Society on April 1 and 2. The first chaplain of Jewish faith in the recorded history of warfare is believed to have been from Philadelphia. An excellent news item on the history of rabbis in uniform is contained in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of April 2 by George Riley of the Bulletin staff.

I attach the item for the Members to read:

CENTENNIAL OF PHILADELPHIA—JEWISH CHAPLAIN

(By George Riley)

The first Jewish military chaplain in the recorded history of warfare is believed to have been from Philadelphia.

He started serving early in the Civil War. Europe's first such chaplain served later, in the Franco-Prussian War.

This contennial of the Jewish chaplaincy was noted during a 70th annual meeting of the American Jewish Historical Society yesterday and today. The American Philosophical Society here was host to the sessions.

The April Jewish Digest is devoted to articles on the development of the chaplaincy and of heroic and unusual experiences of rabbis in uniform.

311 IN WORLD WAR II

World War II is said to have had 311 chaplains of Jewish faith, 2 of whom were killed by enemy action.

Rabbi Bertram W. Korn, of Elkins Park, a past president of the National Jewish Historical Society and author of a definitive book, "American Jewry and the Civil War," contributed an article. It tells how, amid some agitation, a Jew first came to minister to Union Army volunteers.

When Congress set up regulations in July 1861 for the rapidly mobilizing groups, it provided that the regimental commander could, with approval of his officers, select a chaplain from among regularly ordained ministers of Christian denominations.

SOUGHT NEW YORK RABBI

Philadelphia's 65th Regiment of the 5th Pennsylvania Cavalry, which had a Jewish commander, Col. Max Einstein, and some Jewish officers and enlisted men, sought to name as chaplain a New York rabbi, Arnold Fishel.

Fishel was not commissioned but the public agitation and his intercession with President Lincoln led Congress to change regulations in July 1862.

Cantor Jacob Frankel, of Rodeph Shalom, Philadelphia, became the first military chaplain. He did not go into the field but remained here to serve the war wounded who were rapidly filling hospitals.

FIRST IN COMBAT

Rabbi Ferdinand Sarner, a German immigrant in 1859, became the first Jewish chaplain in combat, even though he was mistakenly recorded as a Lutheran minister, quite probably due to his polished German education and his sparse knowledge of English.

His horse was killed and he was wounded at Gettysburg. He subsequently took a congregation in Memphis, Tenn., and died there in 1878.

An artist's sketch of Rabbi Sarner is the subject of a poster that has been distributed for this week's observance of American Jewish History Week.

American Fiscal Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very thought provoking article written by Mr. Constantine Brown, a newsman from Washington who has been traveling in Europe rather extensively for the past several months.

Mr. Brown, writing out of Zurich, Switzerland, warns the United States about its fiscal irresponsibility, and backs up his warning with arguments from Swiss bankers.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SWISS BANKERS WARN AMERICA AGAINST SUICIDAL FISCAL POLICIES

(By Constantine Brown)

ZURICH.—There are no politicians in Switzerland and no VIPs who claim special privileges. It is refreshing to find Swiss officials from the top man in the canton to the traffic policeman or Federal customs inspector considering themselves servants of the people, not miniature autocrats.

Here family life remains the foundation and backbone of the social structure, with the father as supreme authority. Here the children rise when papa enters the room and saying of grace at meals is the rule, not the exception. This is a country of slightly more than 5 million inhabitants who are deeply nationalistic and united.

This is a rich, prosperous, and intensely capitalistic nation. It lacks almost every kind of raw material. But hard work compensates for this. The yearly per capita income of $1,294 is the highest in Europe. Yet despite the many prosperous industries there are no rich families.

The top salary of the president of the biggest bank is about $20,000 a year. The heads of big industries may sometimes earn as much as $50,000 a year and anybody with such an earned income is considered a millionaire. Taxes on earned income are small for the high brackets and practically nonexistent for medium or small incomes.

By necessity, the heads of the big industrial and banking corporations are the best informed in the world. Their existence depends on making few mistakes. It is for this reason that I like to sound out my Swiss friends about the shape of things to come.

I have yet to find a single Swiss banker or businessman who does not have a warm feeling for the United States. But at the same time they more realistically appraise our future than most of our own economists or partisan politicians. And their estimates present a gloomy outlook for the future. A "direktor" of one of the greatest banking institutions in this country set forth his misgivings:

"You are still the richest country in the world," he said, "not only in raw materials but in inventive genius, know-how and daring. But at the rate of your expenditures for domestic progress, defense and particularly your indiscriminate desire to help the rest of the world—regardless of its deserts—you will not be able to continue to discharge this self-imposed obligation without serious consequences. The gold outflow should be a real warning.

"Your rate of taxation has not yet reached the saturation point but you are not far from it. Since it is obvious that all your political men are pledged to the continuation of this role of the world's Good Samaritan, I cannot see the end of these expenditures.

"Even in the highly problematic circumstances that there may be a lessening of the arms race, you will be compelled by drastic economic necessities to divert the billions you are spending on defense to social works. This means the burdens of taxation will continue.

"The outflow of gold is continuing at a more alarming pace than the average American citizen and, even, your lawmakers realize. In order to provide the huge amounts neded for social engineering and increased help to the underdeveloped countries, which would follow the highly unlikely slowing down of the arms race, you will have to increase the taxation of every American, from factory worker to the man living on modest retirement and the coupon clipper.

"Don't forget history. There have been many instances when the tax collector has become more of an oppressor of the people than the secret police in a dictatorship. In your case, income tax collectors will become more arbitrary and increasingly consider the taxpayer as a lemon which must be squeezed to the last drop. And in the long run, this will cause you serious trouble."

Second Supplemental Appropriation Bill, 1962

SPEECH

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11038) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal

year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I shall not dwell on this subject for more than a minute or two.

As everyone knows, this $17 million is an appropriation for the New York World's Fair. My amendment would reduce this amount to $10 million, or just $30,000 more than the $9,970,000 allotted by the Congress to the Federal Government for support of the fair at Seattle, Wash. It is that simple. I see no reason why we should vote more money for New York City in the State of New York for a fair than we voted for Seattle, Wash.

American Slovaks Mourn Death of Bishop Jozef Cársky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. SCRANTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker, the American press published a brief account of the death of the Most Reverend Bishop Jozef Cársky, administrator of Kosice diocese in Slovakia about 2 weeks after his burial. The sad news reached America via the Vatican. Bishop Cársky died on March 12.

Bishop Cársky visited the United States 36 years ago, during which time he was inspired by our way of life. He had witnessed many upheavals and changes of government in his lifetime, yet he stood his ground as a loyal shepherd of his flock. He also used every opportunity to keep in touch with America and his countrymen. And in return, American Slovaks responded generously to his pleas for aid and relief, especially after World War II, when eastern Slovakia was mutilated and over 170 villages were razed.

During these crucial years, Bishop Cársky made the best out of the worst situations and kept the faith and hope alive in the hearts of his flock. Thousands of Slovak visitors from America, especially before World War II, made special trips to his historic cathedral in Kosice, metropolis of eastern Slovakia, just to receive his blessing. And many dared and found ways to visit him even during the Communist regime of that country.

Since Bishop Cársky visited my district 36 years ago and gained many friends and admirers, who still cherish the pleasant memories of his brief stay in America, I feel that the American people should learn more of this great leader. Although living in a country of communistic ideologies, he still hoped and prayed that our way of life might eventually be victorious in his native land, known for its rich Christian traditions and culture.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by John C. Sciranka, American Slovak journalist of Passaic, N.J., who knew Bishop Cársky and who gives us a most interesting picture of his dramatic life:

BISHOP CARSKY HAD CLOSE TIES WITH AMERICAN SLOVAKS

(By John C. Sciranka)

The Vatican confirmed a report that the Most Rev. Jozef Carsky, titular Bishop of Tagora and apostolic administrator for the diocese of Kosice, Slovakia, died on March 12 at the age of 75.

Bishop Carsky visited the United States in 1926 during the Eucharistic Congress in Chicago. He came at that time with three other bishops of Slovakia, namely, Marian Blaha, Ján Vojtassak and Paul Jantausch. Bishops Blaha and Jantausch preceded him to eternity. Bishop Vojtassak is prisoner of the Red regime.

Bishop Carsky was born on May 8, 1886, in the town of Gbely, known as the Tulsa of Slovakia on account of its rich oil fields. This town gave American Slovaks Mrs. Anna Hurban, founder of the First Catholic Slovak Ladies Union, largest Slovak ladies organization in the world, and Sgt. Matej Kocak, U.S. Marine, who was killed in action on October 4, 1918, in France and was awarded posthumously two Congressional Medals of Honor for bravery, one by the U.S. Army and the other by the U.S. Navy.

Bishop Carsky was ordained to the priesthood in 1909 and consecrated as bishop on June 14, 1925. A year later he came to the United States for a visit and was a guest of Cardinals Hayes in New York and Mundelein in Chicago, as well as many American bishops.

On July 5, 1926, Bishop Carsky addressed 30,000 Slovaks at the first American Day of Slovaks of New York and New Jersey on the campus of Fordham University, New York, N.Y., where Bishop Jantausch was celebrant of a Pontificial Field Mass. The writer was general chairman and organizer of this day and recalls vividly the young energetic bishop's address to the vast audience. He endeared himself to his listeners.

Most of Bishop Carsky's countrymen from Slovakia live in Binghamton, Johnson City, Endicott, Johnstown, and Schenectady, N.Y., whom he visited. He also visited most of the larger Slovak colonies in the United States and then welcomed visitors from the United States of America in Slovakia, some as recently as several months ago, although he was in very poor health.

In Pittsburgh, Pa., where Bishop Carsky appeared with the three above named Slovak bishops and the late Bishop Hugh C. Boyle, 80,000 Slovaks welcomed them at Kennywood Park.

Bishop Carsky participated with other Slovak bishops and Msgr. Andrew Hlinka in the first graduation exercises of the Slovak Girls Academy, Danville, Pa., founded and supervised by the Sisters of SS. Cyril and Methodius, which was held in June 1926.

This was an outstanding historical event inasmuch as in honor of this graduation the educational department of the State of Pennsylvania officially recognized Slovak as the modern language. This recognition was obtained through the efforts of the Reverend Michael C. Bernat, pastor of Sacred Heart Slovak Church, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., who had the cooperation of Dr. John D. Prince, Prof. Clarence Manning, Dr. Arthur P. Coleman, all of Columbia University and the writer, then editor of the Daily Slovak American, oldest Slovak newspaper in America, published in New York City.

Bishop Carsky and his bishop colleagues also visited Washington, D.C., in company of the Reverend Francis C. Vlossak, then of Bethlehem, Pa., and the Reverend Paul C. Lisicky of Lansford, Pa.

All the bishops were later the guests of the Most Reverend Michael J. Hoban, Bishop of Scranton, Pa., at a reception given by Mr. Michael Bosak, well-known American Slovak philanthropist.

While in Passaic, N.J., Bishop Carsky and other Slovak bishops received honorary membership of the Slovak Catholic Sokol organization. And in 1929 when the Sokol gymnasts from America visited Slovakia, Bishop Carsky was their host. He had close ties with Americans and great admiration for them. Five years ago, when he was visited by Rev. George Varga, S.T.L., then in Brookville, Pa., and now pastor of St. Stanislaus Church, Tyler, Pa., which is in Erie diocese, Bishop Carsky gave this American priest, who was the first to visit his native Slovakia behind the Iron Curtain, and who is a native of his Kosice diocese, his views on the current situation.

It seems that Bishop Carsky's entire priestly career was dedicated to the people of eastern Slovakia, where he was very popular. While he suffered with his people during two world wars, nothing was more humiliating to him than the desecration of the historical cathedral of St. Elizabeth, when the late Admiral Horthy, regent of Hungary, marched into this house of God on a white steed, almost to the main altar, and the authorities forced Bishop Carsky to welcome him against his will. Kosice was then annexed to Hungary by Hitler. This brought tears to the ailing Bishop Carsky, when he described the incident to his American priest-visitor, who related it to the Vatican.

Bishop Carsky considered himself a prisoner of the Reds and reviewing the religious life in the Communist country, he concurred with other Catholic leaders sorrowfully, that under circumstances even the Pope could not do more for the salvation of souls, than he tried in his way, often being humbled and degraded by the enemies of Christianity.

Bishop Carsky loved America and Americans. He received penicilin and other medicine which he needed, yet he placed it at the disposal of his medical assistance committee.

Kosice, known in Hungarian as Kassa, is a historical city, known for its rich vineyards and a beautiful cathedral of St. Elizabeth, built in 1342 by Queen Elizabeth, the wife of Charles I. The city was also known for its army garrisons and many an old American Slovak pioneer recalls serving the Emperor there as a soldier, or escaping the compulsory military service by coming to America.

Bishop Carsky added to the glory of this imperial city as its bishop for 31 years, outside of 6 years during Hitler's regime, when he was forced to reside in the city of Presov, also a well known metropolis of Eastern Slovakia.

Although humiliated by Admiral Horthy in 1939, Bishop Carsky returned to Kosice after the Allied victory. He welcomed there the exiled government of President Eduard Benes, which returned from London not knowing of its many secret ties with Moscow. The new government had its capitol for a short duration in Kosice, where the Kosice Pact was formulated. This was to substitute the Pittsburgh Pact of 1918 and the independent State of Slovakia in the new Czechoslovak Republic, which was of the short duration. Being approved by Stalin and Moscow, with the Communists in key positions, it was evident that this democratic setup would not last long and in February 1948 the Communists took over. Again Bishop Carsky was on the crossroads of the destiny of his beloved Slovak nation, which he adored and hoped to see free and independent on the American pattern. He went from village to village and administered sacraments. His heart was bleeding when the seminary in his diocese and other dioceses were closed and the number of Catholic Slovak priests began to diminish.

In spite of illness, he stuck to his post, like a true soldier of Christ. At last, death ended his suffering. Slovakia, which will observe the 11th centennial of the arrival of apostles SS. Cyril and Methodius in 1963 and 2 million American Slovaks mourn his death.

How Far Can We Go?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, the current hearings of the Ways and Means Committee on legislation intended to authorize more liberal trade agreements have brought forth many compelling arguments and illuminating statements on the importance of free trade upon the economy of the United States. A point that we cannot overlook, and one that has also been emphasized in the hearings, is the danger of going too far and too fast at the risk of jeopardizing the economy of some industrial areas which already have suffered considerably through the competition of imports from nations which have the wage factor decidedly in their favor.

One of the most enlightening statements in this latter category has been made before the Ways and Means Committee by our colleague, the Honorable JOHN S. MONAGAN, who represents the Fifth Congressional District of Connecticut. He has made the point, and I think it is an important one, that it appears the full brunt of a liberalized trade program is borne by districts like the one he represents, which is in the highly industrialized Naugatuck Valley where rubber footwear, plumbers' brass goods, clocks, common pins, and bicycles have been produced in large quantities over the years by skilled workers who have come to recognize from experience the employment and economic problems created by reduced tariffs and increased imports.

With permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include at this point the statement made by Congressman MONAGAN on April 2, 1962, before the Ways and Means Committee.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN, DEMOCRAT, OF CONNECTICUT, BEFORE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE CONCERNING H.R. 9900, APRIL 2, 1962

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for this opportunity to appear in connection with H.R. 9900.

I applaud the objective of the administration in seeking through this legislation to increase our trade with other nations of the world. Certainly, we want to stimulate that trade and to keep our allied nations economically sound and proof against Communist infiltration.

At the same time, however, we should not liquidate our own industries in order to stimulate imports of foreign products.

It is clear, therefore, that free trade cannot be considered in the abstract, but must be considered in relation to the peculiar conditions of cost and production in the industries affected and the social effects of trade regulation.

I represent a district whose industries have felt the impact of low-cost foreign imports increasingly for many years. When we speak of the effect of broader trade, we speak from experience because this broadening process has been going on for over 10 years.

The industries in our district have been badly hit by imports. The domestic production of watches has practically ceased and the clock industry has been substantially reduced. Imports of rubber footwear have risen from 2 to 52 percent of the domestic market in less than 10 years. The share of our district in the domestic bicycle business has been practically eliminated. One of our local factories has discontinued its manufacture of plumbers' brass goods. Our pin manufacturers have had such difficulty that the Tariff Commission recently recommended the increase of tariffs from 20 to 35 percent. The imports of foreign pins have increased 50 percent since 1957 and presently constitute one-third of the domestic market.

Sometimes it appears that the full brunt of the liberalized trade program is borne in districts like mine. While other sections of the country may benefit, the question must be raised as to the justification for eliminating industries and jobs and creating the very sort of depressed areas for which we legislated in the last session without some idea as to the subsequent balance of business and employment in the country.

The natural effect of reduced tariffs and increased imports has been to close factories and to create substantial unemployment in our section of Connecticut. One of our major cities is an area of persistent and substantial unemployment and another has an unemployment rate sufficient to qualify as such. The largest city in the district, and another of the smaller ones, are presently characterized as areas of substantial labor surplus.

The hundreds of millions of dollars which are spent on production for defense provide a temporary strong economic cushion in other sections of our State, but the prospect of the conditions which would exist if these defense contracts were terminated and the deterioration of our industries through imports allowed to continue, is not a pleasant one to contemplate.

For our typical industries, it is no answer to say that we must increase our imports since the disparity in production costs makes it impossible for our industries to compete on even terms with producers in the Common Market, for example.

Nor is it any satisfaction for us to be told that we will have the benefit of retraining provisions, Government loans, and subsidies. These are cumbersome and, at best, long-range attempts to solve this problem, and they could affect only a small segment of our population.

We prefer to retain the industries and jobs that we have at the present time and we feel that our section has already contributed sufficiently in the liberalization of international trade. The objective of reviving foreign industry after the war has been attained.

The people in my district do not object to the idea of broader trade, but they do object to the uneven character of its impact and to the speed of implementation of this policy.

It is the lack of control over the process of liberalization that is included in H.R. 9900 that gives us most concern. Already, under the provisions of existing law, we have had a steady decrease in business and employment and we have been faced with a consistently increasing wave of low-cost imports from countries whose wage rates are a fraction of ours. We know from experience that even the present escape clause and peril point procedures do not guarantee remedial action and may be disregarded by a President. In fact, these provisions have been disregarded by Presidents of both parties in the vast majority of cases which have come to them for consideration.

I introduced in this session H.R. 8850 which sought to tighten up the peril point and escape clause procedures with the objective of making the findings of the Tariff Commission binding upon the President and with the purpose of broadening the test of injury to domestic industry under which protective action might be taken.

It is my belief that the sections of H.R. 9900 which markedly extend the authorization to enter into trade agreements are much too broad and I believe it essential to the reasonable protection of our industry and employment that these sections be tightened up. Under them, there is no requirement that the President follow the recommendations of the Tariff Commission, and control of trade is further removed from Congress.

I urge the committee to revise H.R. 9900 to place reasonable restrictions upon the authority to enter into trade agreements and I hope that the committee will consider standards of the type set forth in sections 3, 4, and 7 of my bill, H.R. 8850.

I hope that the committee will also consider legislative regulations which will provide for a standard of exclusion of low-wage foreign products which will relate the restrictions on such imports to foreign wage conditions as compared with those in the United States. This method attacks the point where the real conflict exists.

I have introduced a bill, H.R. 1028, which gives the authority to make such a determination to the Secretary of Labor upon consultation with the Tariff Commission. However, it is not the method which is important, but the recognition of the fact that it is in the difference between our productive cost, wage rates, and working conditions and those of exporting countries where the real problem lies, and it is to this difference that attention should be directed.

In summary, therefore, it is clear that H.R. 9900 would have a widespread and damaging effect upon business and employment in my district and in the State of Connecticut. I do not want to be parochial about this matter, and I do recognize the need to maintain reasonably free trade, but I do feel that the broad provisions of the proposed bill should be cut down for the adequate protection of the industries which have furnished the economic foundation for our communities for generations. I sincerely hope that the committee will find a formula, perhaps in line with that which I have suggested, which will enable us to move toward the objectives of the President without sacrificing the economic base of many sections of our country.

Second Supplemental Appropriation Bill, 1962

SPEECH

OF

HON. WALTER L. McVEY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11038) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Chairman, several months ago I requested available space

transportation aboard a Military Air Transport Service plane to Greece in order to plead for the life of a young Kansan, Roger Ranney, 27 years of age, of Chanute, who is awaiting execution before a Greek firing squad. Ranney was convicted of allegedly murdering two Greek sailors whose bodies have never been found. As his Congressman, I had hoped to see the King and plead for his life.

I was refused transportation by Military Air Transport Service on one of their regularly scheduled flights because I am not a member of the military Reserves; however, I have recently read that the First Lady's gift horse, Sardar, is being flown from Pakistan to the United States aboard a Military Air Transport Service plane.

Mr. Chairman, I merely want to inquire whether or not Sarda is a military reservist, or in the Reserve.

Symbol or Retreat?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, George Todt, a columnist who writes regularly for the Los Angeles Herald Examiner, expressed some very worthwhile thoughts concerning the B-70 manned bomber in one of his recent columns. I refer to the column which appeared in the March 25, 1962, issue of the Herald Examiner. Under unanimous consent, I include the column in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION—SYMBOL OR RETREAT?

The decision of the President and his Secretary of Defense to restudy the controversial matter of the B-70 bomber was wise, when viewed in any light, and reflects credit upon the administration.

Both J.F.K. and Robert McNamara have shown, by this action, that they do not consider themselves infallible and are subject to reason. This sort of down-to-earth humility goes a long way when practiced by those in high position and will win many new friends.

But the battle for America's new aerial superdreadnaught is far from won and those who have been in the foremost of the fight for its subsequent development and future incorporation into the Strategic Air Command will be well advised to keep up their fire.

Many times over in past years I have noticed that whenever a hot issue—like this one—gets too hot to handle by the powers-that-be, a routine course of action seems to set in. The item in question is withdrawn for a proper cooling-off period. Then it pops up at a later date when public interest has died down a bit.

Since this matter has been indicated by Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Air Force Chief of Staff and SAC's first Chief, as being vital for future American aerial supremacy—I brushed up on it.

The gist of McNamara's presentation to the Congress—which may be read in entirety on pages 3992-3993 of the March 16 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—revolves about the point that the B-70 is such an advanced aerodynamic concept that he does not believe we could produce adequate subsystems to go along with it by 1970, much less 1967.

Such subsystems would "include reconnaissance sensors, processing systems, display systems, communication systems, all requiring human interpretation and decision within very short times, and air-to-surface missiles. Many of these new subsystems, it should be recognized, have yet to be developed. Indeed, our technical review of this proposal, to date, indicates that some of the key elements may well lie beyond what can be done on the basis of present scientific knowledge."

Remember we are talking about a manned missile now, one which will travel 2,000 miles per hour—or three times the speed of sound!

Mr. MCNAMARA is on very solid ground in taking the stand he has taken in the past. His reasoning leaves few holes in it.

However, I believe that we ought to consider the very same difficulties he has pointed out to us so capably as representing one of our greatest challenges to man and his vaunted science in the aerospace-nuclear age.

Actually, the B-70 is the greatest airplane yet put on the drawing boards, the aerodynamic masterpiece of the 20th century. It is the closest thing to real space ships of the future that man has yet designed. As my friend Maj. Speed Chandler once pointed out, the ships that eventually go into space will likely greatly resemble the B-70.

If this may be true, then how dare we assume in advance that mere technical problems cannot be solved, that we must hold up our progress for fear of defeat? On the contrary, man's knowledge is advancing at a faster-than-ever clip. Let's make the B-70 our symbol of achievement.

What's Sacred About U.N.?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the New York Daily News of Wednesday, April 4, which supports my position completely to the effect that the American public is becoming deeply concerned over the present structure of the United Nations.

The editorial follows:

WHAT'S SACRED ABOUT U.N.?

President Kennedy appears to feel that he has a sacred duty to preserve and protect the United Nations.

Many lawmakers are expressing deep misgivings about the U.N., notably Senators HENRY M. JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, and MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana.

Yet leaders of both parties in the Senate have now agreed to a compromise bill to let the President use $100 million of the taxpayers' money as he sees fit in bailing the U.N. out of its latest money troubles.

That would be a congressional surrender to the White House, and could lead to more of the same.

Why doesn't it occur to some of our lawmakers to point out that the United States is increasingly uncomfortable and unsafe in the U.N., what with new and irresponsible nations streaming into it—each with one vote—and that we would be better off outside the U.N. as now constituted?

That's the long and the short of the matter at this time, and we think some early and extended discussion of it on Capitol Hill is urgently needed.

Small Business Set-Asides in Government Action

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1962

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, we are all very much concerned with the legitimate interests of small businessmen in obtaining their fair share of Government business in all categories. We are especially anxious that whatever programs we adopt in the Small Business Administration be in the genuine best interest of legitimate small businessmen.

A bill which I have introduced would repeal the so-called small business set-aside in Government construction, maintenance and repair contracts. I have not taken this step lightly and I assure you that I have given this problem my most careful consideration. I have come to the conclusion that the construction set-aside as presently operated is harmful to the Government, harmful to small business, and harmful to the building construction industry.

I believe that the small business set-aside is harmful to the Government because it denies the Government the advantage of competitive bidding in building construction. By its very nature, building construction is wide open for price fixing, political favoritism and monopoly unless contracts are awarded on the basis of competitive bidding. There is not now nor has there ever been any other way of safeguarding the public interest in construction contracts.

No matter how zealous we may be in our efforts to help a small businessman, when we give this assistance in such a way as to remove the protection of competitive bidding we are taking a very dangerous step. With the tremendous taxloads we are asking the people of the United States to assume in the cold war, we must exhaust every means of making certain that their dollars are spent wisely. The small business set-aside in Government construction by definition encourages work to be done at prices which may be substantially higher than if this work was performed under open bidding.

I have also introduced this bill because I believe that the construction set-aside is harmful to the legitimate self-interest of the small businessman. My concept of the small businessman that the Small Business Act strives to protect is a man with an established business, a number

of employees, overhead responsibilities, and operating experience. The small businesses are part of communities, assume taxloads, participate in civic affairs, and in general their community depends upon them. When one of these small businessmen in my city of Toledo who may be in the manufacturing business wants to manufacture an item for the Defense Department, I believe that it is perfectly sound and in the Nation's best interest that we set aside a portion of our defense production for small businessmen like this. But as we all know, when we set aside this defense production for this small operator, he is required to meet the price stipulations, the quality requirements, and the technical standards of the production agency with whom he contracts.

In construction, however, we do not have this situation. A contractor without a job to perform is not even in business. He doesn't have to hire anybody except perhaps an estimator until he is actually awarded a contract. That contract may very well be at a location far removed from his hometown. This man doesn't have to own any equipment. He doesn't have to have any fixed overhead charges. He can do all of these things after he gets his contract.

My objective in introducing this bill is to draw the distinction between the established small businessman in our Nation's economy and the so-called small business contractor in construction. I believe that there is a great difference in these two types. Furthermore, I believe that if the set-aside in Government construction is permitted to continue to the detriment of the Government as well as the construction industry, that our overall effort to help the small businessman may be drastically affected.

Finally, I have introduced my bill because I believe that the present construction set-aside is having very harmful effects on stabilized labor relations in the building construction industry. The stability of labor-management relations which we so earnestly seek, and about which this Congress has legislated for many years, depends upon good faith collective bargaining. The nature of the building construction industry is such that collective bargaining is conducted on an area basis by associations of contractors and associations of unions. The small business set-aside program is affecting good labor relations which have been existing in this industry for many years. The policies of the Small Business Administration in setting up small business contractors by loaning them money to get into business and then reserving large chunks of Government construction for them, is giving to these fledgling contractors a vast and unfair advantage over established businessmen. The set-aside contractors are able to perform work at costs substantially below that incurred by established firms. It is very significant that although these new entrants in the field are enabled to perform work with lower paid employees, more often than not their bids are substantially higher than that of established construction firms.

In addition to medical benefits, health and welfare insurance, and supplemented social security benefits, the construction industry in cooperation with their unions performs a genuine service to the Nation in their apprenticeship programs. Here again the small business set-aside does not require, nor can it require that these newly set up contractors make their contribution in terms of manpower training. I believe this is contrary to the national interest and is another reason that my bill should be enacted.

An added reason that I believe that this program will be harmful to small business is the shocking loss rates which the Small Business Administration is now incurring on loans to small business contractors. I am informed that on all construction loans now in force at the Small Business Administration the loss and arrears rate is running at 17 percent. This is very dangerous and shocking when one realizes that in all other categories of SBA loans, the loss rate is under 2 percent. Therefore, from the point of view of good business, SBA's loans to so-called small business contractors are very unsound.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to emphasize again in closing that I am not against the Small Business Administration, nor am I against its legitimate objectives. I am simply persuaded that the construction industry by its very nature already meets the requirements of our interest in small business by its historic subcontracting system. I believe that the great majority of work in this industry has been and will continue to be performed by legitimate small businessmen. On the other hand, I believe that all elements in this industry—prime contractors, subcontractors, and labor unions—must conduct themselves in such a way as to guarantee that our Government will have the advantage of the finest construction techniques at the lowest possible dollar cost. I hope that the Committee on Banking and Currency of which I am a member will have hearings soon on this measure in order that the House may express its will.

Tribute to Hadassah

SPEECH

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a privilege and a pleasure to join with my colleagues in extending warm congratulations and good wishes to the women's Zionist organization of America—Hadassah—on the occasion of their 50th anniversary.

This outstanding group of public-spirited, patriotic American Jewish women has a remarkable record of achievement. These achievements include development in the State of Israel of hospitals, health centers, research, training, and medical care services. They include the rescue and rehabilitation of over 100,000 Jewish children from various countries, uprooted by World War II and its aftermath.

In addition, I would like to point out that Hadassah promotes good Americanism. It does this through an information program where members receive study materials on vital domestic and international issues so that they may participate actively and intelligently in community, State, and national affairs.

Hadassah is to be congratulated on its half century of constructive, humane work. May its efforts be crowned with success in the future as they have in the past.

Revenue Act of 1962

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10650) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit for investment in certain depreciable property, to eliminate certain defects and inequities, and for other purposes.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, it is with regret that I must offer opposition to this bill, H.R. 10650, although it contains several good provisions as to closing tax loopholes, but the people of my district have expressed opposition to this bill, especially the withholding tax on savings interest and dividends. I do not believe that the withholding on interest and dividends is a fair method of collecting tax because the tax reduces the amount of earned interest the taxpayer would have received because of the deductions every 3 months—this takes from him money on which he would otherwise be receiving interest.

It is my belief that the American taxpayer does not seek, in the majority, to defraud the Government and is agreeable to paying his fair share. Under the new system of identification numbers instituted by the Internal Revenue Service, any tax fraud or failure to report can easily be determined.

The tax bill benefits many large concerns which, I believe, if they wish to expand their operations could do so under present high profits.

There is nothing in this tax reform measure which would touch on our greatest source of additional revenue and which needs great revision, and that is the tax credits allowed for oil and mineral depletion. This remains at its high level of 27½ percent. I have introduced legislation relative to a more equitable tax plan for said depletion allowances.

If we are to benefit the economy of this Nation, we must start with the small taxpayer so that on this foundation can be built proper safeguards and tax revision.

In Common With Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID S. KING

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, in recent years we have been deluged with reading material concerning Premier Khrushchev. These readings have revealed him to be the personification of all that our own Nation is fighting against.

I therefore commend to the Nation an excellent editorial published in the church section of the Deseret News, March 31, 1962:

IN COMMON WITH KHRUSHCHEV

Khrushchev is probably the most universally hated man on earth. Certainly he is so in the free nations.

His disregard for others, his deliberate attempt to frighten us into submission by covering the earth with deadly fallout, his treatment of the Iron Curtain countries, his wall through the midst of Berlin, his ranting against the leaders of our country, all have added to the worldwide resentment against him.

But there is a peculiar paradox in it all. Millions hate him and yet they do many of the things he does, and seemingly refuse to change.

Can we be consistent as good Americans if we do many of the things he does?

As lovers of freedom it would seem that we would do all in our power to avoid doing anything which would be in common with this destroyer of human rights. Who wants to be like Khrushchev? Who wants to do what he does? Who wants to be in the same category with him—in anything?

Americans almost to a man would give the same answer, and it would be, "No one."

And yet, millions go right down the line with Khrushchev and do many of the wrong things which he does.

Khrushchev profanes the name of the Almighty God. Do any Americans follow his example?

Khrushchev never keeps his word. His pledge and promise are without value. He has broken nearly every promise he has ever made to the United States.

Are there any among us who break sacred promises? Is our word of any value?

Khrushchev teaches a Communist philosophy which says that any means is justified to gain a desired end.

Are there any Americans who have the same idea? Do Americans take advantage of their fellow citizens—even their close friends at times—to make a dollar or to gain some selfish end?

Khrushchev is ruthless in politics. He flouts his friends, undermines his opponents, does anything to gain political power.

Are there any Americans who do the same? Are politics clean in this country? Is there any effort in the United States to use votes for personal gain?

Khrushchev oppresses the poor. Are there any in America who do the same? Or in this country do all men love their neighbors as themselves?

Khrushchev says there is no God. Are there any in America who join him in this? Or is God a living, vital force in the lives of all Americans inasmuch as "in God is our trust?"

Khrushchev never goes to church. Half our total population in the United States never go to church either. Do they ever stop to consider that they resemble Mr. Khrushchev in this respect?

Khrushchev has no regard for the Sabbath day. How many of the Americans who crowd beaches, ball parks, golf courses, tennis clubs, swimming pools, race tracks, ski resorts, hunting lodges, fishing streams, national parks, grocery stores, and other business places which remain open on Sunday ever stop to think that in this respect they go along with Mr. Khrushchev?

Khrushchev doesn't pay his bills to Uncle Sam. He still owes us money for war loans made in the Second World War. How many Americans try to get out of paying their just bills to our Government? How many dodge income tax, property tax, gasoline tax, and inheritance tax?

Khrushchev sees no necessity for a general election. Are there any Americans who show the same attitude since they never go to the polls to safeguard the democratic way of life?

There is little stability of character in Khrushchev, little that we know as fundamental common ordinary honesty. How much is there of honesty in the average American? Do we all pay our bills? Are we honorable in all of our transactions? Do we lie, deceive, or cover up the truth?

The fact is that Khrushchev represents everything that is evil. He seems to be an emissary of Lucifer himself. When we see in him the personification of all these sins, why should we do so many of the same things he does?

Why are we not more willing to follow the personification of truth, justice, love, honor, devotion, and goodness? Why do we hesitate to follow Christ?

Compensation for Service-Connected Disabled Veterans

SPEECH

OF

HON. RAY ROBERTS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. ROBERTS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to urge this House to give its unanimous consent to the passage of H.R. 10743. This bill will give across-the-board increases in benefits to our service-disabled veterans.

The increases in this bill are based on a sound appraisal of the ever-expanding cost of living.

A great number of the men in this body are veterans of this country's wars. Yet in the press and urgency of Congress and as day-to-day problems arise, some of us tend to forget the real meaning of the word "disabled." Let me call to mind a scene that—in one form or another—is branded into the memory of every man who shared the horrors of war. Remember the man next to you that fared less well than yourself. Maybe internal injuries or mangled limbs that could never be restored were his lot. Perhaps you saw, as I did, promising, healthy young men reduced by the cruelties of war to damaged hulks, never to be able to make their marks on the world. These men made the ultimate sacrifice. It is perhaps an unkind memory to force on you. But we must remind ourselves from time to time just what the words "service-connected disability" mean and what we owe these men.

Every man or woman, who in time of war or peace serves his country, acquires our debt. Those who suffer the vagaries of fate and are damaged in mind or body, either seriously or less so, are the ones to whom we owe the most. Though time may cloud our memory, there must never be a time when we forget those who did not die, yet lost a part of their lives in defense of our country.

Though we may hesitate at some measures that spend the Nation's money, we must not fall short of doing what can be done to recompense the losses of our disabled veterans.

This bill strives toward decency, assuring an adequate living allotment for the totally disabled, and a just compensation for the lesser disabled. I again urge this body to give its unanimous consent. Thank you.

Mr. Mansfield on the U.N

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of Wednesday, April 4, which supports my position completely to the effect that the American public is becoming deeply concerned over the present structure of the United Nations.

The editorial follows:

MR. MANSFIELD ON THE U.N.

As a good friend of the United Nations, Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD now has spoken out in significant and somber terms against certain weaknesses of the world organization. What he has in mind most of all is not its financial difficulties, which surely are serious enough, but its internal structural and political distortions, which are potentially very grave.

Similar concern has been voiced in recent weeks by such other stanch friends of the U.N. as Senators HICKENLOOPER of Iowa, AIKEN of Vermont and JACKSON of Washington. Like Mr. MANSFIELD, and with good reason, they have asked stern questions about the wisdom and sanity of letting critical decisions be taken on the basis of "one-state-one-vote procedure in a General Assembly of 104 nations, ranging in population from 175,000 in the smallest to 407 million in one of the largest." Many of these member states are new, relatively primitive, politically unsophisticated, and otherwise woefully inexperienced or backward. Yet, in terms of voting, they have as much weight in the Assembly as our own country or the U.S.S.R.

Further, these international newcomers like to throw that weight around—often in an insufferably self-righteous manner, and quite recklessly and absurdly in relation to ancient, highly civilized lands. This amounts to a major U.N. weakness that has lead Mr. JACKSON, for example, to speak out as he has against the highly dubious wisdom, if not

fatuousness, of our own Government's policy— a policy aimed at currying the favor of world opinion—of voting with the mass of the fledgling, immature nations against NATO allies like Portugal and Belgium on issues such as Angola and the Congo. Certainly, in Mr. MANSFIELD's words, this is one of the distortions that threaten to make the United Nations innocuous at best or lead to its extinction at worst. To quote him further:

"That outcome is not what successive Presidents and Secretaries of State—of both parties—have said is in the best interests of this Nation. They have all stressed the importance of a strong and vital United Nations. * * * Yet the prospect for such an outcome is there, and it is looming larger. It will not go away if we delude ourselves with the belief that it does not exist. It will not disappear if the Senator from Washington, the Senator from Iowa, and the Senator from Vermont are buried under an avalanche of highly unjustified criticism for having the temerity to discuss aspects of the problem. * * *

"* * * The possibility is ever present, under the one-state-one-vote formula, that we shall, at some time, find some involvement [in the U.N.] totally unacceptable. So we ask ourselves * * * what then? Do the lights then go out in the General Assembly, as they have already gone out in the Security Council? Do we then take the lead in putting them out? * * *

"This * * * is the deeper crisis in the United Nations. It is the crisis of a moribund Security Council where, under the charter, decisions could be coupled realistically with the real and proportionate responsibilities of the various nations. * * * It is the crisis of a General Assembly which has been subtracting from its enormous potential of moral force as it has presumed to add to itself the functions of the Security Council * * * under procedures which invite disrespect."

Coming from the majority leader of the U.S. Senate, these are words of more than passing import. He continues to be a strong supporter of the U.N., but he obviously is full of misgivings about its drift, and this reflects a widespread feeling in America. Other member nations, particularly the new ones, would be well advised not to pooh-pooh the significance of that fact. It could turn out to be much bigger than they may imagine at the moment.

The National Lottery of Ghana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House, the Ghana national lottery which was first established in 1958.

The gross receipts in 1961 amounted to $1,200,000 which, considering the size and population of this new nation, was very significant. The net income to this country came to $400,000 which went into the general revenue account.

Ghana is a poor country and a national lottery offers needed revenues which are a help for this small nation.

Mr. Speaker, the United States is a big, rich country which has developed gambling into a $50-billion-a-year industry. Only through a national lottery can we legally cut into this illicit revenue. A national lottery in the United States can pump into our Federal Treasury over $10 billion a year in new revenue which can be well used to cut our high taxes and start reducing our national debt.

The No Longer Almighty Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include an editorial from the current issue of Life magazine, entitled "The No Longer Almighty Dollar." I feel that this is written in understandable terms, points up the salient problems which, as legislators for the people of the United States, we face, and arrive at a sound solution.

The article follows.

The monetary unit of the State of New Hampshire was the English shilling, by provision of the State constitution, until the year 1948. That's right, 1948, the year of Harry Truman's election. In that year the citizens of New Hampshire voted (about 2 to 1) to rescind the old provision of 1784 and officially replace the shilling with the dollar, which they had all been using anyway for over a hundred years.

This tiny footnote to history is recited only to illustrate a basic fact about money: it is not always what the law says it is. Just as the people of New Hampshire had allowed their official shillings to go out of use, so the people of any country will accept a more valuable or convenient currency when conditions warrant. Money values are finally set by people, not governments. Cigarettes were money in Germany in 1945–48. Beaver skins, tobacco, and wampum were American money in colonial times. The dollar sign is an abbreviation not for U.S. currency but for pesos, which were legal tender here until 1857. The dollar did not become almighty overnight.

Nor is it almighty now. There was a period—roughly from the 1930's to the 1950's—when it was beyond question the world's most desired currency. But since then enough questions have been asked about the dollar, especially in Europe, to cast a deep shadow over its supremacy.

What Europeans think of our money is not just another problem of U.S. prestige or "image" to be handled by the Voice of America. The dollar's valuation abroad must ultimately reflect—and be reflected in—its real value at home; there is a real if roundabout connection between a London gold auction and an Indiana payday. To explore that connection will help suggest policies for the dollar that can answer Europe's questions and serve American interests as well.

American monetary experience has been a little different from Europe's. As Dr. Arthur Nussbaum points out in his "A History of the Dollar," Americans have been more ingenious and more experimental with their money, and less in awe of the millennial mystique of gold. Americans were the first Western people to experiment successfully with paper money, not the least reason being that Benjamin Franklin was in the printing business, wanted the contract to make Pennsylvania's paper money and wrote a well-considered guide for its use. What Americans always wanted was a useful and plentiful money, not money for its own sake. There has always been a utilitarian candor about American money and the public attitude toward it. The first of the paper "continentals" (which became a synonym for worthlessness) bore the engaging motto, "The Issue Is in Doubt." Nor would "In God We Trust," now stamped by law—since 1955—on all our coins, seem the ideal monetary slogan.

The European experience has been longer and sadder. The hold of gold on Europeans—notably French peasants—bespeaks their inherited knowledge that no government can long be trusted with money, neither a coin-clipping king nor an inflating parliament. Whether the cynical European or the euphoric American view of money is truer to the facts of politics, especially future politics, is a nice question. At any rate, these separate experiences have now merged in a common set of problems which will require a common monetary doctrine—if not a common money.

The dollar first became an important international currency after the Civil War, when our thriving exports and our need for foreign capital made it possible and desirable for us to tie the dollar to the old "gold standard." This archtype of world monetary order was maintained and managed by London bankers for the health and growth of world trade. World War I and the depression of 1929–39 brought this orderly system to an end. The pound itself cut loose from gold in 1931. The dollar did not entirely cut loose; instead F.D.R. nationalized all the gold in the United States. From that day to now, gold is used for almost nothing but settling debts between national governments. American citizens—unlike Frenchmen and many others—can't own it at all, except to adorn their fingers, ear lobes or teeth. And most of them don't care.

It was World War II that made the dollar virtually almighty among currencies. There were two reasons. First, the postwar United States enjoyed a virtual monopoly of undamaged productive facilities so that dollars could buy things other currencies could not. Second, the U.S. policy of buying and selling gold at $35 an ounce had proved a stable factor amid prewar and wartime monetary chaos, and had brought about half of all the gold in the world to the United States. This omnipotence lasted until the early 1950's, when both monopolies were undermined.

Our monopoly of productive facilities was undermined—thanks in part to Marshall aid but also to some strict European money management—when Europe recovered and began competing successfully with U.S. exports. Our control of gold was undermined—thanks in part to lax U.S. money management—when the United States began running a series of deficits in its balance of payments. Again, most Americans didn't care very much. In 1958, these balance-of-payments deficits began showing up in the form of massive losses of U.S. gold. This drain of gold has not stopped.

The U.S. balance of payments is what we owe (unfavorable) or are owed (favorable) after all that we have spent, lent, and invested abroad is set against all that foreign countries have spent, lent, and invested here. If this balance is unfavorable year after year (as ours has been, except for 1957, every year since 1950), and is not reversed, it leads to the nearest equivalent of bankruptcy that can overtake a sovereign nation; namely, exchange controls. That would mean U.S. Government rationing of all dollars going in and out of our country and thus control of all our foreign

trade, travel, and investment, with many unpleasant internal consequences.

This form of bankruptcy can be forestalled so long as a country has enough gold (or convertible currencies) to sell against its unfavorable balance of payments. That is what we've been doing since 1958. But nobody has enough gold to do that forever. It is a strange experience for Americans, after years of monopoly, to be reminded that foreign accounts must balance somehow. One high New Frontier official, when he got the idea, is said to have remarked, "I see; we have to pay our debts to foreigners, even if not those we owe to ourselves."

Alas, the distinction is not that easy. It is worth recalling what led to our enormous gold losses of recent years, and the flight of short-term capital that accompanied them. The year 1958 brought a sudden U.S. recession, and a consequent deficit in the U.S. Government's domestic budget (not to be confused with our balance of payments abroad) of a whopping $12.4 billion. This shocked many important Europeans.

What shocked them still more was to observe that despite this recession, U.S. prices and wage costs did not go down at all. It looked as though nothing, neither a business-minded Government nor a $12.4 billion recession, could stop the steadily growing inflationary influence in the U.S. economy. If so, the U.S. economy had become incapable of the structural corrections essential for competitive power in trade. Although the power and usefulness of dollars in world trade still overshadows gold's, the universal confidence the dollar once enjoyed moved closer to the stark fact of its gold convertibility. And that will last only as long as our supply of gold.

The United States could, of course, restore its balance-of-payments position at once. It could call home all its oversea forces, stop foreign aid and investment and otherwise cut back its world political commitments to those of a second-class power. Even if the dollar should then rise technically in foreign exchange markets, that would be small recompense for the loss of political confidence that such a retreat would cause throughout the Wetsern World.

The alternative solution is wiser and safer: to increase the difference between our exports (about $20 billion last year) and our imports (about $15 billion)—chiefly by increasing our exports. To make this possible, the United States must demonstrate control of its domestic price level, and its ability to grow without the illusory aid of "creeping inflation." This demonstration will require two steps.

The first is a balanced Government budget for 1962–63. It is no accident that a decade of balance-of-payments deficits climaxed a longer period of domestic budgetary deficits (25 in the last 32 years). The Kennedy budget for fiscal 1963 promised a slight surplus but the promise grows more doubtful as 1962 wears on. Much as the statement would surprise such hard-money stalwarts as Andrew Jackson and Grover Cleveland, one wing of Kennedy's advisers says that "the Democrats never won an election on a balanced budget." But if the Government cannot control its own expenditures, the fear or fact of inflation remains real and industry is less able to earn the pounds, francs, and marks—or gold—that foreigners must be paid in. The first party to install exchange controls is not likely to win many elections either.

The second essential step is up to American business and labor, who are directly responsible for industrial costs. It is now high time that prices, and perhaps also profits for the sake of investment, began to share more of the gains—hitherto chiefly commanded by wages—from our general increases in industrial productivity. The current steel negotiations are a test of this sharing. As Arthur Goldberg has said, the U.S. balance of payments wasn't even an issue in the last (1959) steel wage contract; but this time it is—or should be—the central "national interest" issue. Only if industrial prices (of which steel is the leader) are low at home can they be genuinely competitive abroad.

Unemployment, and the sluggishness of the current recovery, are the two chief excuses for higher Federal budgets and industrial wage costs. Neither is a good enough excuse. Some kinds of unemployment, including much of ours, are better cured by lower wages than by higher.

Only if we can control our Federal budget and our industrial costs can we reasonably expect the needed increase in U.S. exports over the next few years. The export promotion campaign launched by Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges will of course be helpful in this aim; but competitive values are the sine qua non. We need only a 10-percent or 15-percent increase in our exports to achieve equilibrium in our balance of payments, an objective which the administration hopes to achieve by the end of 1963. The hope is plausible but by no means sure. The need is beyond question.

Meanwhile our "money managers," the Treasury and the Federal Reserve, have shown a strong grasp of the problem and have taken all the subsidiary steps toward balance within their power. They have moved in on interest rates in such a way as to curb the flight of short-term capital abroad without making long-term capital too expensive for internal borrowing and expansion. They have "tied" almost all our foreign aid to the purchases of U.S. exports. They have arranged a system of close collaboration with European money managers. They have persuaded other NATO members, especially Germany, to buy more arms in the United States and to prepay some of their dollar debts. They have even gone into the foreign exchange markets and a London gold pool in order to conduct counterraids against speculators against the dollar. But the more they do these subsidiary things, the better they realize that a reliable balance of U.S. payments cannot be reached unless the U.S. economy keeps control of its costs and improves its competitive power in world markets.

Such are the stern realities of the world position of the dollar. It is still the key currency, "the sun around which other currencies revolve" (as West Germany's Economics Minister Erhard calls it). But unless it stays so, and keeps the revived rivalry of gold in its place, the Western system of expanding trade and free payments could go into another decline or even collapse.

Even when we get our own payments back in balance, the fight for an orderly international money system will not be entirely won. We may face what Sir Oliver Franks and others have warned against, a "liquidity crisis," meaning that one or more nations will always be in balance-of-payments trouble under the present monetary system. For example, if we should tip the balance-of-payments scales sharply in our favor, then Europe could again grow short of gold and dollar reserves, enough to bring the mark, pound, and franc under pressure. Is there not enough reserve money in the world to enable Europe and America to thrive at the same time? Can one feel flush only at the other's expense?

This problem, although as yet more theoretical than real, has already elicited some ingenious solutions. Some would change the basic nature of the International Monetary Fund; others would return to the full gold standard at a higher gold price. Our money managers think they have anticipated it by their recent negotiations of a $6 billion increase in national drawing rights in the International Monetary Fund. They count on their increasingly close collaboration with European central bankers to assure monetary order through skillful management of the leading currencies. Their management so far incites confidence because they are committed to the maintenance of the system of expanding competitive trade and free payments so painfully built since World War II. They know that this system depends on a strong dollar, and none of them, Americans or Europeans, will sleep well until they see U.S. exports rise and conquer the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit.

This competitive test of our money is the only one that promises greater real prosperity for the West and the whole world. It is the first step toward any new international monetary order. Once taken, it will have earned us time to rethink the problem of better international payment machinery and the role of gold therein.

Can human money managers, however cooperative, ever replace gold's ancient magic and certainty? Some of them think so; yet few want to expunge it entirely from the world monetary scene. Gold's hold on man may be irrational—"a barbarous relic" in the words of that "proud destroyer" of the old gold standard, John Maynard Keynes. It nevertheless provides a hard recourse from official currencies for people who have reason not to trust their governments, and is therefore a check on what any government can get away with. When the ideal currency arrangement is worked out between the United States and Europe, gold should have a place in it. It will be the sign that the Atlantic governments do not fear their own people, and are strong enough to make room for distrust as well as hope.

Revenue Act of 1962

SPEECH

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10650) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit for investment in certain depreciable property, to eliminate certain defects and inequities, and for other purposes.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Chairman, in accordance with a motion made by Mr. MILLS in relation to the Revenue Act of 1962, granting general leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to submit the following statement:

When the Revenue Act of 1962, H.R. 10650, was debated on the floor last week, I was unavoidably absent. On a motion to recommit, I had a general pair with Congressman ANDREWS, of Alabama, and on final passage I was not paired.

I wish to state at this time that if I had been present, I would have voted "yes" on the motion to recommit and would have voted "no" on final passage.

I believe that there are too many inequities in this bill in its present form and I am unequivocably opposed to this legislation.

Tribute to a Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, there have been many excellent tributes written in regard to the historic orbital flight and personal achievement of Col. John Glenn. America, today, can point to this tremendous achievement and be proud, proud not only of the scientific victory but proud also of Americans like Colonel Glenn who stood recently before a joint session of Congress and humbly said, "I still get a hard-to-define feeling inside when the American flag goes by."

One of the finest tributes I have read concerning Colonel Glenn was written by my friend and colleague, the Honorable FRANK BECKER, of the Third Congressional District of New York. His article appeared in the April issue of the American Legion magazine, Oceanside, N.Y., and I am happy to call it to the attention of my colleagues in the House.

The article follows:

TRIBUTE TO A HERO

(By P.C.C. FRANK BECKER)

America has a new hero. And what a hero.

I have been somewhat annoyed over the years with our young people when they seemed to hero-worship loose-living movie stars, swivel-hipped singers, and a variety of other "heroes" with questionable credentials, but now the Nation has a new hero who has captured the imagination and admiration of young and old alike. In fact, we have seven heroes.

As Astronaut John Glenn sat in his capsule atop the Atlas missile, each of us vicariously shared his apprehension. Figuratively, each of us shared the cabin with him as he orbited the earth, and what a wonderful feeling of exhilaration we experienced when we learned that he was safely aboard the recovery ship.

It was a great day for America.

Besides the immense pride I have in our Nation's scientific achievement, I have a warm feeling of pride about the kind of man Colonel Glenn is. As a dedicated husband and father, as a man of religious conviction, as a dedicated patriot, as a hardworking member of our Armed Forces, as a man of modesty and humility who shared the spotlight with other members of the space team, Colonel Glenn personifies the best in American manhood.

I have become increasingly concerned over the years that patriotism and honor of the American flag have been on the wane. The feeling seems to be that this kind of sentimentality is "old fashioned" and has no place in our sophisticated society today. I am most happy to report that Colonel Glenn is an "old fashioned" American. In appearing before Congress, this steel-nerved marine said he was glad to see that pride in our country and its accomplishments are not a thing of the past. He said, "I still get a hard-to-define feeling inside when the flag goes by and I know you do too. Today, as I rode up Pennsylvania Avenue from the White House and saw the tremendous outpouring of feeling on the part of so many thousands of people, I got that same feeling. Let us hope that none of us ever loses that feeling."

I jumped to my feet with my fellow Members of Congress and cheered. I, too, hope that Americans will never lose that feeling.

Later, our space hero matter-of-factly told a congressional committee in response to a question, that he had made his peace with God years before he was launched into space.

"I feel we should live all our lives every day as though that were going to be the last day. Now, I fall so far short of this every day that it is pitiful, but we come back and keep trying the next day anyway.

"But * * * my religion is not a fire engine, and not something that I call on in an emergency, and then put God back in the woodwork in His place at the end of a particularly stressful period.

"We try to live every day as best we can, and I think that is the way. I would say the same thing happened on the [space] mission. My peace had been made with my Maker for a number of years, and so I have no particular worries along that line."

Here, indeed in John Glenn, America has a real hero. One we hope all our young people will try to emulate.

Friendship 7's triple orbit the earth was the high point of a monumental effort which has been going on for many years. Successful performance of the Atlas missile in 1957 was an important milestone. Effort has been intensified since 1959 when the astronauts were selected and began their training.

Now that we have accomplished this important objective, Khrushchev has said that the Soviet Union and the United States should cooperate in our space efforts. Isn't it strange that similar offers made previously by Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy fell on deaf ears in the Kremlin? If the Soviets have, in fact, orbited a man around the earth, why didn't Khrushchev make his generous offer to share space data then? Now that he feels we might have some valuable information from which the Soviets would benefit, Khrushchev puts away his club and dangles his "carrot" before the West.

I hope our country will not be gullible enough to be duped into giving the Soviets any of our hard-won space information.

To Amend the Peace Corps Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10700) to amend the Peace Corps Act.

Mrs. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I regret that due to circumstances beyond my control, I was unable to be present on April 3, during the debate, to register my strong support for the continuation and expansion of the Peace Corps.

The overwhelming vote by the Members of this body for the Peace Corps is testimony to the growing body of its friends in the House. We are pleased to join the continuing chorus of approval from abroad by the people of those countries who have received these voluntary ambassadors of good will. The record of this program in its first year has been excellent. Its aims, its operations, its administration, its personnel, all reaffirm the wisdom of its establishment. It reminds us that new approaches to international understanding and cooperation can be fruitful and serve jointly the best interests of the United States and peoples abroad.

Farm Bill Lobbyists on Federal Payroll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, further proof that the administration is converting the Department of Agriculture into a giant lobbying organization is provided by these news stories from the Chicago Tribune.

The first one appeared in the April 5 issue. It quotes the President in words which amount to an invitation for ASC committeemen to wink at the law:

SHUMAN RAPS LOBBYING AT U.S. EXPENSE—HEAD OF FARM BUREAU PROTESTS TO KENNEDY

(By Russell Freeburg)

WASHINGTON, April 4.—Charles Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, today protested to President Kennedy the use of taxpayers' money to propagandize the administration's farm bill on Capitol Hill through part-time Department of Agriculture employees.

Shuman estimated the cost of the operation at $75,000. He charged it was an improper use of Government funds.

The part-time employees, paid $40 to $50 a day plus expenses when on the job, are State chairmen and committeemen of the Agricultural Stabilization Committee. They were brought to town by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman. Most of them arrived by air Monday night for a 2-day stay.

KENNEDY ADDRESSES GROUP

Kennedy talked to the group this morning on the White House lawn. While acknowledging in his speech that the group is prohibited by law from lobbying, he at the same time urged them to visit Members of Congress.

"While you are prohibited by custom and law, quite rightly, from involving yourselves in any particular agricultural program, or recommending it, or lobbying it, nevertheless we do value very highly the communication which goes from here to you because you are our most direct link with the farmers themselves," Kennedy said.

We hope you also will see the Members of Congress and acquaint them and the Senators. We don't want them to be, as the Secretary said, lonesome.

SECRET LEAKS OUT

The President was a bit behind the Agriculture officials. Many of them yesterday trooped to Capital Hill to see Congressmen about backing the administraiton farm bill. The day also included a briefing by Freeman and a cocktail party thrown by the National Farmers Union.

The Agriculture Department made no announcement of the 2-day session, which did not become known outside of official circles until last night. Shuman charged Freeman with attempting to hold the meeting in secret.

In his telegram to Kennedy, Shuman said: "We protest as improper the use of public funds for paying travel and per diem expenses of State ASC committeemen at a secret meeting, called in Washington by the Secretary of Agriculture. One apparent purpose

of the meeting was to develop a propaganda campaign and to lobby Members of Congress in support of the administration farm bill. Even if they had paid their own expenses, organized lobbying by Government employees is a dangerous and deplorable practice."

FIRST SINCE 1930'S

Shuman called the operation, "The latest exercise of the administration's rather frightening technique of using Federal funds and Federal employees to promote Federal programs and even proposed legislation for Federal programs."

The ASC meeting was the first held in Washington since the 1930's. Agriculture officials told reporters they were brought here to have them get acquainted with the Department's problems. Men leaving the briefing by Freeman said, however, that the Secretary told them in effect to get out and sell the administration's farm program.

This news story is from the April 4 issue:

NICK TAXPAYERS FOR FARM LOBBY

(By Russell Freeburg)

WASHINGTON, April 3.—A band of part-time Government employees paid $40 to $50 a day and treated to cocktails by the National Farmers Union have been brought to town by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman to crusade for the administration's farm bill on Capitol Hill.

The shock troop are the 175 State chairmen and committeemen of the Agricultural Stabilization Committee, most of whom arrived here by air Monday night for a 2-day stay.

TAXPAYER GETS IT IN NECK

After a hard day of briefings and tramping through the Halls of Congress today most of the group attended a 2-hour cocktail party thrown by the Farmers Union at the Continental Hotel in the shadow of the Capitol's dome. More of the same is scheduled for tomorrow.

The Farmer's Union, a strong backer of the farm policies of President Kennedy, picked up the liquor tab, but taxpayers will foot the rest of the bill. The operation could cost taxpayers $50,000, or more, when the Treasury finishes paying travel, hotel, meal allowances, and printing expenses in addition to the per diem compensation.

With most of the operation an airlift, total travel costs would be around $16,000, at $150 a man. Round trip air fares (tax free) from California are $330; Hawaii, $708; Dallas, Tex., $175, and Chicago, $87. Per diem compensation for 2 days here and 2 days of travel time would total around $30,000. Hotel rooms in Washington run from $8 to $20 a day.

IT'S SELL PROGRAM OR ELSE

The meeting was the first to be held in Washington for the ASC since the New Deal days of the 1930's.

R. E. Leonard, press assistant to Freeman, described a morning briefing to the group as a get-acquainted affair, but ASC men leaving the meeting said Freeman told them in effect to get out and sell the administration farm program or they might not have any program to administer.

Shortly after the meeting, the chairmen and committeemen began turning up in congressional offices to plug for the administration farm bill. Other Congressmen reported appointments for tomorrow * * *.

Freeman timed the propaganda operation correctly, lawmakers said, since the full Senate Agriculture Committee started do-or-die executive sessions on the bill Monday. The House committee started them today.

The State ASC officials, who Leonard said are paid $40 to $50 a day when on the job, run the stabilization operation on the local levels. They are political appointees. Under them are 130,000 to 140,000 county and township committeemen.

The State officials displayed Government printed propaganda material today that has been handed out around the country. Included was a handy packet of 16 cards that contained notes for a lecture on the Kennedy administration farm bill. On the cards were such phrases as "Government costs must be cut, "farm income is unfairly low," "use of abundance has limits," and "CCC (Commodity Credit Corporation) stocks will be cut if quotas rejected." Arguments against an opposition program advocated by the American Farm Bureau were outlined in other material.

Discrimination by Private Clubs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am including herewith a survey report made by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith to determine the extent of religious discrimination by social clubs in the United States.

The report is quite revealing, and points up a practice which should certainly not exist in these United States.

The report follows:

DISCRIMINATION BY PRIVATE CLUBS

In November 1956, ADL's national commission considered the problem of discrimination by private clubs and adopted the following policy statement:

"Discriminatory practices by social, fraternal, and ritualistic organizations are the concern of the Anti-Defamation League. However, no action shall be taken at the present time with respect to such practices except where such organizations are important centers of community influence and power."

Thereafter, acting within the framework of this policy, ADL rarely involved itself in complaints about or problems concerning private club discrimination, acting only in exceptional instances where a particular club translated its prejudice into economic or housing discrimination.

No program was developed by ADL with respect to the vast numbers of private clubs which it is believed bar Jews, which have no reasonable basis for so discriminating and which are not "important centers of community influence and power."

Because of increasing expressions of opinion (particularly after the West Side Tennis Club incident of 1959) that our "concern" with discriminatory clubs should be expressed more directly and energetically, the question of ADL policy came before the national commission once again in December 1959.

Prior to this national commission meeting, 16 ADL regional advisory boards and committees had considered the problem and made recommendations running the gamut from reaffirmation of the policy restricting ADL action to "important centers of community influence and power" to the recommendation that ADL ought to act against discrimination by all private clubs. Three ADL groups believed that the restrictive policy was adequate while the other 13 urged varying degrees of change.

Following joint deliberation by the national civil rights, program and community service committees, the national commission adopted the following statement as policy of the Anti-Defamation League (December 1959):

"Discriminatory practices by social, fraternal and ritualistic organizations are the concern of the Anti-Defamation League. However, the degree of concern and action, if any, varies in relation to the nature of the private club.

"A. As to membership selectivity based on religion by religious organizations, the Anti-Defamation League has no concern.

"B. As to those organizations which are important centers of community influence, and

"C. As to service organizations, the concern of the Anti-Defamation League shall manifest itself in the creation of a program designed, in a general sense, to educate against and eliminate such discrimination.

"D. In the case of all other private clubs, the ADL staff may conduct factfinding and research in order to determine the existence and nature of discriminatory practices and to recommend a program for the consideration of and approval by the ADL."

In January 1961, the discriminations subcommittee of the national civil rights committee approved a plan by the staff (in accordance with section D of the above policy) to study the extent of discrimination by clubs in the United States.

The study has been completed and a copy of the report is attached. Although only quantitative in nature, the report reveals that religious discrimination by clubs in the United States is extensive. We found that 67 percent of all the clubs which were examined practiced religious discrimination; this suggests a serious failure on the part of the American community, at the social level, to accept individuals on the basis of individual worth and merit.

Certainly, the results of the ADL study make it evident that the extent of discrimination against Jews by clubs is far greater than the levels of discrimination against Jews that we have found in education, employment, housing, and public accommodations—the traditional areas of civil rights concern.

Furthermore, if the thesis is accepted that many prestige clubs are power structures that influence greatly the political and economic life of the community, then the fact that 60 percent of the prestige clubs in ADL's study discriminate against Jews may have serious implications for the Jewish group.

Finally, the study indicates that one consequence of the development of the institution of the "Christian club" has been the emergence of the "Jewish club." The fact that almost 8 percent of the clubs examined in our study were "Jewish clubs" which discriminated against Christians is eloquent testimony to the further institutionalization of religious prejudice. When, as, and if the Jewish community relations agencies conclude that the problem of the "Christian club" merits their attention, they will inevitably have to cope with the other side of the coin; namely, the "Jewish club."

This report, then, complies with the commission request to the staff to complete a study and suggests the need of "* * * a program for the consideration of and approval by the ADL." At the present time, because of policy, there is little emphasis in ADL materials on the problem of private club discrimination. Indeed, the most effective educational job that has been done on the question of discrimination against Jews by private clubs is a recent film, "The Chosen People," which was produced by the National Council of Catholic Men.

The completion of the ADL study poses two queries:

1. Shall the ADL create an educational program designed generally to educate against and eliminate discrimination by clubs?

2. If the answer to query No. 1 is in the affirmative, then shall the ADL include in such an educational program the so-called "Jewish clubs" which discriminate against Christians? (With respect to this question, it may be observed that when ADL formulated its policy with respect to college fraternities, it did so in a statement that placed the ADL in opposition to all discriminatory fraternities, including the Jewish group.)

A STUDY OF RELIGIOUS DISCRIMINATION BY SOCIAL CLUBS

Discriminatory practices by social clubs, long recognized as a pervasive pattern among proverbially gregarious Americans, was dramatically and publicly challenged last summer by the U.S. Attorney General and several other important public figures who resigned from the Metropolitan Club, probably the most distinguished club in Washington, D.C.

In the spring of 1959 Dr. Ralph Bunche publicly challenged the action of the West Side Tennis Club in Forest Hills, N.Y., for refusing membership to his son. The club is the scene of the most important national and international tennis matches held in the United States.

In 1956, the Anti-Defamation League publicly challenged the tax exemption of the Merchants Club, which, as a social club, barred Jews, and for tax advantages called itself a business club.

In 1955, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, invited to speak at a community Brotherhood Week function in Lancaster, Pa., canceled her appearance at the last moment. She found that the club at which the meeting was to be held barred Jews from membership and as guests at all other times.

Why these public challenges? Clubs which discriminate on religious and racial grounds have traditionally taken, and won acceptance for, the position that the social club is an extension of one's own parlor. Since a man has a right to choose whom he will invite into his home, he thus also has the right to choose whom he will admit to his club.

Are these actions then a challenge to the right of privacy or a questioning of the nature of the social or private club? Attorney General Kennedy said it was the latter, explaining that the Metropolitan Club's restrictive policy, because it kept members from inviting certain foreign diplomats into the club, created international political ramifications.

Dr. Bunche took a similar position. He contended that the West Side Tennis Club, because of its central place in the tennis world, was not merely a private sports club, but had a quasi-public character.

In the case of the Merchants Club, the ADL came to the same conclusion. It showed the club's social character was merely a facade for a business club that was a power in the textile industry. In this respect it is a representative specimen.

Business Week magazine in an article on private clubs pointed out that such clubs have become the "businessman's castle." Though the businessman may be "socially frisked" before he can gain membership, it is not the social life but the fact that the club is an informal center of power that is important to him.

As for Mrs. Roosevelt, she questioned the morality of holding a Brotherhood Week observance in a club that at all other times excluded people whom it was willing to acknowledge as brothers on this one day only.

Are the positions cited here then a challenge to the right of privacy or are they indeed a challenge to those who, by their insistence upon social exclusiveness, seek to obtain or hold economic, political, and other power advantages to which they may otherwise not be entitled?

Those who issue the challenge say that they are concerned only when the right of privacy is invoked to the detriment of the common good and when it runs counter to public policy. They are primarily concerned with discriminatory clugs that become important factors in a community's or industry's power structure. They are secondarily concerned with clubs which, because of their special character, take on quasi-public functions; and finally those which, because of their positions of prestige, tend to foster undemocratic social patterns in the general community.

The Anti-Defamation League generally associates itself with the position stated in the foregoing paragraph. It arrived at that position from its own observations of the phenomenon of the discriminatory social club and from the sociological researches into various aspects of the problem that are only now beginning to inform public opinion. While there have been depth studies of specific communities, notably by Dr. Lloyd Warner, Dr. John P. Dean, Floyd Hunter and others, there has been no recent effort to determine how widespread religious discrimination by private clubs is on a national scale. This report is intended to fill that gap. It is frankly statistical and limited to the religious factor. We have long known more about the why and how of exclusionary practices by clubs than we have known about the extent of such practices. Before reaching into the new statistics, however, it would be well to restate our understanding of the situation.

Not too many years ago an important industrialist explained to the Anti-Defamation League why he could not readily employ Jewish executives in his organization.

"It is important for our business," he said, "that our plant managers maintain a certain status in their communities. They must join the country club and the leading city club. Today that's where the big deals are discussed and made. They must be socially acceptable to the banking and business leaders of the town. They must be able to maintain a free and easy association with the people who count. If we promote Jewish personnel into key, sensitive positions, we run the risk of social nonacceptability. We avoid this by picking someone else."

Without judging the moralities, this industrialist dealt with the reality that certain important social clubs were part of the power structure in any given community, that the "social" institution was often in fact an economic stronghold, exclusion from which must necessarily impede the rise of those excluded.

Looked at from this vantage point, social discrimination (i.e., discrimination by clubs) assumes new dimensions. If the seat of power in any community discriminates against Jews, it may sound a note that will be taken up by others in the community. The industrialist will be confirmed in his negative view about Jewish plant managers; the plant managers in turn will find it more expedient not to employ Jewish subordinates. Lower echelon civic groups, ears closely attuned to the not from on high, will find sanction for similar exclusions. The university, upon whose board of trustees sit members of the discriminatory club, will not protest a quota system, the fraternities will mimic their elders in exclusionary practices. Thus may a new generation, while still in its formative years, be schooled in the ways and benefits of social discriminations.

Clearly, the problems raised by such exclusionary practices are not only social, but more frequently economic, political and sociological. The ultimate victim is not the man reaching toward the seat of power or toward the prestige of upper level social acceptance. Rather it is the youth who finds he is barred from job or school (and when he is older, from a home) simply and solely because he is Jewish.

Comparatively few of the exclusionary clubs are strategic elements in the power structure of a community; many more merely foster undesirable and undemocratic social practices. These latter groups may be only minor sources of irritation, singly, but they represent in their totality a formidable expression of anti-Semitic attitudes. They are the result of social and economic forces which have been operating on the American scene for many decades. They represent the attitudes of individual Americans and, in that sense signify that education for democracy and human relations work still have far to go. Only by improving the attitudes of individuals can the behavior of the group be altered. If a club has a baseless barrier against Jews, we must infer a failure in education or at least a need for more. Thus it devolves upon human relations agencies, perhaps especially Jewish groups, to spearhead the kind of positive educational program that aims to create positive attitudes.

Obviously, the Anti-Defamation League must be concerned with the irrational exclusion of Jews from clubs which by reasonable test are secular in purpose and program. For such exclusions represent a philosophy of racism. It not only gratuitously wounds the "outs," but it nurtures and reinforces in the minds of the "ins" the notion that Jews should be shunned. In short, if the primary goal of the ADL is the building of sane intergroup relations and healthy attitudes, discrimination by such clubs, however small they may be, must be a matter of concern. ADL can no more disregard the development of anti-Semitic prejudice in the club room than in any other facet of our society.

At the same time, ADL is aware that the practices of clubs which bar Jews has had its concomitant in the establishment by Jews of separate club facilities. Some of these, as the statistics on the following pages will show, also adopted exclusionary patterns.

It must be stated as a truism that those groups which are organized for clearly religious purposes have an unchallengeable right to impose religious requirements for membership. There can be no question of the right of a Newman Club to limit membership to Catholics, the men's club of a temple to Jews, the Westminister Fellowship to Presbyterians. By extension, no matter how large and potent such organizations may become, they cannot be charged with discrimination as long as they continue genuine sectarian programs. Thus, too, B'nai B'rith, the Knights of Columbus, the Epworth League, all frankly religious in purpose and orientation, are beyond reproach for their sectarian membership requirements.

THE SAMPLE

To determine the extent of religious discrimination by social clubs in the United States, the Anti-Defamation League surveyed a representative list of such clubs which could be reasonably termed a national cross section. The criterion for selection was whether the clubs employed professional managers. A list of clubs maintained by a group of professionals in the private club field was used for the sample. The total number of such clubs was 1,332. For purposes of the study 44 Armed Forces clubs on the list were excluded, leaving a balance of 1,288 clubs with essentially civilian memberships.

The 1,288 clubs were situated in 46 States and the District of Columbia. Only 4 States—Alaska, Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont—were not represented in the survey group which was based on the list. The number of clubs in the other States ranged from one each in North Dakota and Wyoming to 159 in New York State.

The clubs on which information was sought were broadly of two types. First, city clubs which were defined as clubs physically situated within cities or towns. There were 369 such city clubs. In terms of distribution among the States, the number of city clubs ranged from 1 each in 7 States to 59 in New York State.

The second major group on which information was sought was country clubs. There were 919 such clubs on the initiation of this survey. Country clubs were defined as those located in suburban and rural areas which had the accoutrements normally associated with country clubs—golf course, tennis courts, swimming pools, and other sport facilities.

The distribution of the country clubs among the States ranged from 1 in each of 4 States to 116 in the State of New York.

AIMS OF THE STUDY

The survey was conducted by the staff of the Anti-Defamation League and the tables which appear herein are based upon the geographic distribution of ADL regional offices which worked on the study.

The first step was to obtain an evaluation of the status of each club. Three categories were established: (1) high prestige or power structure clubs; (2) those which enjoyed average acceptance in their community; (3) and those which were considered of little or no importance. This information was obtained by interviewing knowledgeable people and polling a cross section of community opinion. At the same time, an estimate of each club's membership was sought.

Thereafter, a determination was made for each club as to whether it discriminated on the basis of religion.

An identification of "nondiscrimination" was made if the club accepted Christians and Jews without regard to religion in its membership policy and practice. For any clubs so identified, no further information was sought.

However, if the club was considered discriminatory on grounds of religion, it was studied further. Such clubs would be identified as "Christian" clubs if they either barred Jews or had a quota for Jewish membership. The reporters were asked to distinguish between those clubs that barred Jews absolutely and those that admitted Jews on a limited basis.

In the same way, identification was made of "Jewish" clubs which either barred Christians or had quotas for Christian members.

Finally, wherever a club was identified as a "Christian club" or a "Jewish club," the reporter sought to establish whether the restrictions were official (i.e., in the club's constitution or bylaws) or unofficial (i.e., informal, gentlemen's agreements, and so forth.)

THE FINAL STUDY GROUP

Of the 1,288 clubs on which information was sought data was received on 1,152, or almost 90 percent. The remaining 136 included clubs that had gone out of existence, or about which, for a variety of reasons, information was not available.

The 1,152 clubs about which information was obtained were located in 46 States and the District of Columbia. Again, only four States—Alaska, Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont—were not represented. The 1,152 clubs were distributed from a low of 1 each in Nevada, North Dakota, and Wyoming to a high of 149 in New York State.

Of the 1,152 clubs, 349 were city clubs. These city clubs were distributed from a low of 1 each in Idaho, Mississippi, Montana, New Mexico, North Dakota, Rhode Island, and West Virginia to a high of 43 in the State of New York.

Information was obtained on 803 country clubs which were distributed from a low of 1 each in Idaho, Nevada, South Dakota, and Wyoming to a high of 106 in New York State.

Table I shows, State-by-State (including the District of Columbia), the total number of clubs on which information was sought; the number of clubs on which information was obtained; and a breakdown of the last statistic into country clubs and city clubs.

NATIONAL FINDINGS—CITY AND COUNTRY CLUBS COMBINED

Table II consolidates on a State-by-State basis data with respect to the 1,152 clubs on which information was received. In this table, column 1 reports the total number of clubs in each State upon which information was obtained. In column 2, this figure is broken down, under the heading "Status," into A clubs (prestige or power structure); B clubs (average community acceptance); and C clubs (little or no community significance). Column 3 gives the total estimated membership of the clubs in each State. Column 4 indicates how many of the clubs are nondiscriminatory as between Jews and Christians. Column 5 enumerates "Christian clubs." This column is divided into two parts: (a) clubs that have no Jewish members, and (b) clubs that have a limitation on Jewish membership. Column 6 treats "Jewish clubs." This column, too, is divided into two parts: (a) clubs with no Christian members, and (b) clubs with a Christian quota.

Finally, column 7 concerns itself with all the clubs listed in columns 5 and 6—that is to say, the clubs which had absolute or qualified restrictions against Christians or Jews. Such clubs were classified in terms of whether the restrictions were official (in the constitution or bylaws) or unofficial (gentlemen's agreements, and so forth).

1. Of the 1,152 clubs on which sufficient information was received for evaluation, 693 (or 60 percent) were deemed to enjoy top status in their communities; 372 clubs in the national group (or almost 33 percent of the total) have average acceptance in their communities. The remaining clubs, numbering 87 (or almost 8 percent of the national survey group) were evaluated as clubs which enjoyed little or no standing in their communities.

2. The total estimated membership of the 1,152 clubs in the survey group was almost 700,000.

3. Of the 1,152 clubs, 371 (or almost 33 percent) were nondiscriminatory, erecting no religious barriers to membership.

4. Seven hundred and eighty-one clubs (or 67 percent) practiced religious discrimination.

5. Of the 781 clubs which practiced religious discrimination, 691 were "Christian clubs" which either barred Jews completely or imposed a limitation upon the number of Jews that could join. These 691 "Christian clubs" represented 88 percent of all the discriminatory clubs and 60 percent of all clubs examined.

6. Of the 781 discriminatory clubs, 90 were "Jewish clubs" which either barred Christian membership or imposed limitations upon Christians. Thus, the "Jewish clubs" represented almost 12 percent of all the discriminatory clubs, and almost 8 percent of all clubs studied.

7. Of the 691 "Christian clubs," 555 (or about 80 percent) barred Jews completely. The remainder, 136 (or about 20 percent), limited Jewish membership to small numbers.

8. Of the 90 "Jewish clubs," 85 (or about 95 percent of the group) barred Christian members completely; the other 5 admitted Christians in small numbers.

9. Of the 781 discriminatory clubs, 696 (or 90 percent) maintained their restrictions "unofficially"—without religious proscriptions in their constitutions or bylaws. The restrictive practices of these clubs was carried out informally through gentlemen's agreements, et cetera. The remaining 85 restrictive clubs were said to maintain their restrictions "officially"—by constitution or bylaws.

CITY CLUBS

Table III reports by State the information obtained on 349 city clubs. The same format is used in this table as was employed in table II for the combined city and country clubs. The findings with respect to city clubs follow:

1. Of the 349 city clubs that were evaluated, 210 (60 percent) enjoyed top status in their cities and towns. One hundred and six (more than 30 percent of the city clubs) had average acceptance in their communities while the remaining city clubs, numbering 33 (almost 10 percent of all the city clubs) were evaluated as groups that enjoyed little or no standing in their communities. It may be noted at this point that the status distribution of the city clubs is almost identical with the status distribution of all city and country clubs combined (see finding 1 under city and country clubs combined—table II).

2. The total estimated membership of the 349 city clubs was almost 300,000 or slightly less than half of the total estimated membership of city and country clubs combined.

3. Of the 349 city clubs surveyed, it was found that 147 (over 40 percent) were nondiscriminatory, erecting no religious barriers to membership.

4. Two hundred and two city clubs (almost 60 percent) practiced religious discrimination.

5. Of the 202 city clubs that practiced religious discrimination, 186 (or more than 90 percent of all discriminatory city clubs) were "Christian clubs" which either barred Jews completely or imposed limitations on the number of Jews that could join. It may be noted here that discriminatory "Christian clubs" comprised more than 50 percent of all the city clubs examined.

6. Of the 202 discriminatory city clubs, 16 were "Jewish clubs"; 14 of these barred Christians completely while 2 acccepted Christians in small numbers. Thus, "Jewish clubs" represented about 8 percent of all the discriminatory city clubs and about 5 percent of all the city clubs studied.

7. Of the 186 "Christian city clubs," 139 (or about 80 percent) barred Jews completely. The other 47 "Christian city clubs" limited Jewish membership to small numbers.

8. Of the 202 discriminatory city clubs, 183 (or 90 percent) maintained "unofficial" restrictions by means of gentlemen's agreements, and so forth. The remaining 19 discriminatory city clubs were said to maintain their restrictions "officially."

9. The 202 discriminatory city clubs were analyzed to determine how they were distributed in terms of status. We found (see table IV) that of the 202 discriminatory city clubs, 115 (or 55 percent) were reported as "A" groups—that is to say, they enjoyed top prestige in the cities and towns where they were located. Sixty-three of the discriminatory city clubs (32 percent) were identified as "B" clubs, with average acceptance in their communities. The remaining discriminatory city clubs, 24 in number (or about 13 percent of the discriminatory group) were identified as "C" clubs—that is, of little or no consequence in their communities. It should be noted that the total estimated membership of the discriminatory city clubs was over 200,000 representing almost a third of the total estimated membership of all the clubs we surveyed.

COUNTRY CLUBS

Table V reports the information obtained on 803 country clubs. Again, the format used in this table is the same as was used in tables II and III. With respect to country clubs, we found:

1. Of the 803 country clubs evaluated, 483 (60 percent) were top status clubs. Two hundred and sixty-six (33 percent of the country clubs) had average acceptance while the remaining country clubs, 54 (or 7 percent), were evaluated as not having significant standing. Again, it is noteworthy that the status distribution of the country clubs in percentages is virtually identical with the status distribution of all city and country clubs combined and with city clubs.

2. The total estimated membership of the 803 country clubs was over 400,000, or more than half of the total estimated membership of all the clubs surveyed.

3. Of the 803 country clubs surveyed, 224 (28 percent) were nondiscriminatory, erecting no religious barriers to membership.

4. Five hundred and seventy-nine country clubs (72 percent) practiced religious discrimination. It should be noted that this percentage figure is appreciably higher than the proportion of city clubs (60 percent) that used religious criteria.

5. Of the 579 country clubs that discriminate along religious lines, 505 (or 87 percent of all the discriminatory country clubs) were "Christian clubs." It is worthy of note that the "Christian clubs" comprised almost 63 percent of all the country clubs in our study group.

6. Of the 579 discriminatory country clubs, 74 were "Jewish clubs"; 71 barred Christians completely, while three accepted Christians in small numbers. The "Jewish country clubs" represented about 12 percent of all discriminatory country clubs and about 9 percent of all the country clubs studied.

7. Of the 505 "Christian country clubs," 416 (or about 80 percent) barred Jews completely. The other 89 "Christian country clubs" (or about 20 percent) limited the membership of Jews.

8. Of the 579 discriminatory country clubs, 513 (about 90 percent) maintained their restrictions "unofficially." The other 66 country clubs were reported to have restrictions in their constitutions or bylaws.

9. The 579 discriminatory country clubs were analyzed for status distribution. We found (see table VI) that of the 579 country clubs, 352 (60 percent) were "A" groups. 182 (32 percent) were described as "B" clubs with average acceptance in their communities while the remaining discriminatory country clubs, 45 in number (or 8 percent of the discriminatory group), were identified as "C" clubs. The total estimated membership of the discriminatory country clubs was about 260,000, or somewhat over a third of the total estimated membership of all the clubs surveyed.

REGIONAL ANALYSIS

As we pointed out in our "National Findings—City and Country Clubs Combined (table II) our study of 1,152 clubs revealed that 871 (or 67 percent of the national total) practiced religious discrimination. 691 were "Christian clubs" that discriminated against Jews, while 90 were "Jewish clubs" which discriminated against persons of the Christian faith.

In order to determine whether there were any significant regional differences with respect to club discrimination, we analyzed our data in terms of five geographical areas, as follows:

1. South and Southwest: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia.

2. Far West: California, Colorado, Hawaii, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wyoming.

3. Mid West: Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin.

4. North Atlantic: Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania.

5. New England: Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island.

Tables VII–XI inclusive present the statistical findings regionally in terms of the foregoing geographical consolidations.

1. The regional percentages of discriminatory clubs are: South and Southwest, 60 percent; Far West, 58 percent; Mid West, 73 percent; North Atlantic, 74 percent; New England, 68 percent. From these data, it appears that discrimination by clubs is significantly higher in the Mid West and North Atlantic States than in the other three regions.

2. Of the discriminatory clubs in the South and Southwest, 91 percent are "Christian clubs." In the Far West the percentage is 95. In the Midwest, the "Christian clubs" comprise 89 percent of all discriminatory clubs. In the North Atlantic States and New England, the proportions were 81 percent and 93 percent respectively.

3. The proportion of "Jewish clubs" among the discriminatory clubs varies little in four regions. In the South and Southwest it is 9 percent; in the Far West, 5 percent; in the Midwest, 11 percent; and in New England, 7 percent. But in the North Atlantic States, 19 percent of all the discriminatory clubs were "Jewish clubs."

THE ATHLETIC CLUBS

It has long been believed that many major city clubs calling themselves "athletic clubs" (usually preceded by the names of their home cities) show a complete disregard for the maxim of fair play. The study provided an opportunity to evaluate the long-held suspicion that "athletic clubs" in large American cities frequently set up religious criteria for membership.

The survey group included 20 "athletic clubs" situated in 19 great cities. The total membership of these 20 clubs is over 50,000. Fourteen of them are regarded as prestige groups while six are said to have average acceptance in their communities.

Of the 20 "athletic clubs," only 5 are nondiscriminatory as between Jews and Christians. However, of the remaining 15 clubs, 8 bar Jews completely while 7 impose a quota upon Jewish membership.

In short, 75 percent of the city "athletic clubs" examined have discriminatory barriers against Jewish members. And, contrary to the courage so commonly associated with athletic activities, these discriminatory clubs universally enforce their restrictions "unofficially"—that is, by gentlemen's agreements and the blackball.

THE PRESTIGE CLUBS

In order to understand better the potential impact upon Jews of club discrimination, the data was analyzed with particular attention to clubs that were evaluated as enjoying maximum prestige in their communities.

Of the 1,152 city and country clubs examined, 693 (60 percent) were accorded such distinction. Of these 693 top American clubs, 455 (66 percent) practice religious discrimination.

Of the 455 discriminatory clubs, 417 (more than 90 percent) discriminate against Jews.

To recapitulate in terms of the total prestige group of 693 clubs included in our study, 60 percent of the prestige group discriminated against Jews; 5 percent discriminated against Christians; and 35 percent were nondiscriminatory in terms of religion.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Religious discrimination by clubs in the United States is extensive and pervasive. The fact that 67 percent of all the clubs studied practiced religious discrimination indicates a serious failure on the part of the American community, at the social level, to accept the individual on the basis of individual worth and merit.

2. If the thesis is accepted that many prestige clubs are factors in the power structures which influence greatly the political and economic life of the community, then the fact that 60 percent of the prestige clubs of the United States discriminate against Jews has serious implications for the Jewish group.

3. It would appear that the extent of discrimination against Jews by clubs is far greater than the levels of discrimination against Jews in other areas such as education, employment, housing and public accommodations.

4. A consequence of the development of the institution of the "Christian club" has been the emergence of the "Jewish club." The fact that almost 8 percent of all the clubs studied were "Jewish clubs" that discriminated against Christians is eloquent testimony to the further institutionalization of religious prejudice. When, as, and if Jewish community relations agencies conclude that the problem of the "Christian club" merits their attention, they will inevitably have to cope with the other side of the coin—the "Jewish club."

Testimony of Dale Pontius Before Federal Communications Commission on Chicago TV Programing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Chairman Newton M. Minow, in an attempt to upgrade the quality of television programs, has held hearings in several cities including Chicago. Among those who testified was one of my constitutents, Dale Pontius. Another constituent from the University of Chicago asked me to secure for him a copy of those hearings. When a member of my staff attempted to secure this copy he was informed: First, they are not available except through Ward & Paul at a cost of $700; and second, the transcripts would be available at a public reference room.

Since I am sure that my colleagues as well as many of their constitutents are interested in this testimony, I am making the part contributed by Professor Pontius available through the privilege of extension of remarks:

TESTIMONY OF DALE PONTIUS, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF POLITICAL SCIENCE, ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY, ON BEHALF OF ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY TEACHERS UNION, AFT LOCAL 1188, BEFORE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION HEARING ON CHICAGO TV PROGRAMING

The Roosevelt University Teachers Union, AFT Local 1188, originated a resolution on the status of television and radio which was adopted by the annual convention of the American Federation of Teachers in Philadelphia, Pa., August 14–19, 1961. This resolution called attention to the fact that "television and radio both fail to provide a diversity of live music, significant drama, imaginative children's programs, and provocative discussion and interpretation of political and cultural issues," and resolved to:

1. Support Federal Communications Commission Chairman Minow in his efforts to improve television and radio programing;

2. Urge its locals to prepare to oppose renewal of licenses of stations which fail to present a balanced program in the public interest;

3. Ask Congress to instruct the FCC to reexamine Federal laws regulating the industry, and to appropriate funds to support national and regional networks of educational stations;

4. Urge State and local governments to subsidize educational stations;

5. Request commercial stations to encourage responsible and intelligent diversification in the commenting on national and international news.

The failure of the Federal Communications Commission to open hearings before granting renewal of licenses to two Chicago stations has prevented the Chicago community from presenting testimony which might have some effect in deciding whether these existing stations are worthy of renewal of their licenses. When stations receive renewals without a public hearing, they receive a new lease of life to continue as before. Hearings with respect to these stations become about as useful as downtown coaching after the ball game is over.

Terry Turner, TV and radio critic of the Chicago Daily News, summarized the feelings of many Chicagoans a few months ago when he wrote, "Everybody I know is tired of TV. * * * The industry has not only driven away its more thoughtful viewers; it has corrupted those who remain."

The programing of the Chicago commercial television stations is so inadequate that we are unable to consider a remedy merely in terms of further time for local programs, whether live or filmed or taped. If the same influences were to prevail over additional local live programs as now dominate the network programs, there is not much of an issue so far as we are concerned. If local live programs merely added to the prevailing westerns, situation comedies, and crime, crime, and more crime, coming in from the networks, then the issue becomes for us a question of tweedle-dum tweedle-dee. The public interest gets lost in the shuffling, and the same vacuum of regulation on the part of the FCC from the standpoint of programing continues.

If, on the other hand, local live programs were produced to give an outlet to entertainment having the merit of high dramatic quality, music which was not limited to popular music or desiccated segments of classical music; if some alternatives to the "Three Stooges" and silly animated cartoon children's programs, were to be presented, then we definitely would favor an increase for such programing during prime time. It is not the elimination of escapist and broadly popular programs that we seek, it is an alteration of "the ratio between rubbish and treasure that is really the heart of the issue" to quote Jack Gould of the New York Times (New York Times magazine, Jan. 14, 1962, p. 15). For us it is impossible to consider the problem of local programing except in terms of a complex balance, a balance between many local interests, and a balance with regard to what we are getting on network programs.

Furthermore, the timing of programs is just as important as a balance in the quality of programs. It is the present usurpation of prime time from 6:30 to 10:30 where the failure of the FCC to exert some control has led to the preponderance of rubbish.

I wish to consider some deficiencies of Chicago local programing in the area of political discussion. There is some excellent coverage by Chicago stations of State and local politics, both by individual commentators and by panel-type discussions. In the area of national and international affairs, however, the commercial stations offer limited spot commentary connected with regular news broadcasts, occasionally special programs, and two after-midnight panels. The after-midnight programs often are lively, provocative, and challenging. Nothing like them goes on during prime listening time. Only a limited portion of Chicago citizens are night owls. Whatever the outside world may think, we are also people who live normal lives, most with something else to do than to lie in bed early Saturday or Sunday mornings.

Furthermore, with respect to the presentation of diversified views on programs shown during prime listening time, we are not getting this. I can illustrate by an experience during the last year. Concerned about the possible risks of world war because of the Berlin situation last summer, I spoke to representatives of several Chicago stations urging that they sponsor responsible discussion. The representative of one station rejected the contention that it had any obligation to put on the views held by any minority, unless that minority was somewhere within the range of 40 percent or more of the population. Another representative did put on a series on Berlin, excellent in many ways, but it represented largely one view of American diplomacy.

The presentation of divergent views presents some risks, I know. That superb Chicago columnist for the lovelorn and distressed, Ann Landers, had a letterwriter a few days ago whose husband got up and smashed the television after hearing one politician picked apart by an interviewer. These are the risks democracy must accept. The gains to democracy are great in challenging all citizens to a greater awareness of the complexities of national and international politics.

In the area of political discussion of national and international issues, regional differences are important. Television and radio both offer a great resource for the encouragement of local participants, for the flourishing of grassroots democracy. With the commercial stations offering very little except programs coming from Washington and New York, the presentation of regional and local points of view gets lost.

May I point out that the educational channel 11 also has limitations from the standpoint of a free forum. One station executive commented in a discussion of their problems that the station operates at such a close margin of existence that it cannot risk offending a $5 contributor. I am certain this was exaggeration. However, even there is a homogenizing effect which is the result of control by public relations officers of contributing universities who often do not like to risk having controversial speakers from their faculties.

Some witnesses at these hearings have suggested that perhaps a local advisory committee might help attain some rectification of the imbalance between "rubbish and treasure" which we are presently getting. I am less confident than they that this would be effective. I am afraid they would get the same runaround collectively that individuals now get between station managers and their network supervisors in New York. What we need is an FCC which is willing to do its job. I was dumfounded, Mr. Commissioner, to hear you remark during the "city desk" broadcast on Sunday afternoon, that so far as you were aware, there are no problems in programing at present, and that the situation is satisfactory. I hope these hearings have the merit at least of getting the Commission out of its ivory tower (if an academician may say so).

There is one brief word I wish to say about one thing we do get from local televisioning, and that is with respect to the alleged wrestling matches which are shown. In view of the public scandals over quiz programs, I am unable to understand why nothing is done to test the honesty and integrity of wrestling bouts.

In the area of children's programing, one local program that was produced with considerable skill and competence was "Zoo Parade." That this program should be dropped after several seasons of successful presentation illustrates the declining interest the commercial television stations have taken in imaginative children's programing.

In conclusion, I wish to thank the Commission for the opportunity to testify. Frankly, I am skeptical of any good resulting from these hearings, as I think it is possible for the commercial stations to throw in some programs for a few weeks to appease the concerns expressed here. They will then revert to the same indifference, the same runaround that you have had abundantly exhibited during the testimony of these hearings. Frankly, I look forward to the day when the Commission awakes to its responsibilities—and if that is impossible—for its replacement by members who will meet the responsibilities which an aroused public expects. We have the right to expect firmer exercise of responsibility by the Commission. We have the right to expect the use of the sanction of denial of renewal if network stations fail to take some action to improve the present imbalance in programing. We expect the Commission not to be taken in by the smokescreen of freedom of the air. Former Chairman of the FCC, James Lawrence Fly, has recently commented on this legal furor:

"Some network leaders and their propagandists have set up a verbal barrage about the freedom of the air, i.e., anyone has the right to use the air, just as anyone has the right to establish a newspaper, and neither the public nor the FCC can abridge that right." ("The Network Bluff," the Nation, Mar. 10, 1962, pp. 210–211.)

As Mr. Fly says, "The argument is both fallacious and a grave public disservice. The network leadership takes millions from the public airspace. This is only an added reason why any indolence and arrogance on their part toward the public's vital interest are not to be tolerated. Liberty and responsibility are essential counterparts."

We hope these hearings produce a change, and that the Commission will monitor the Chicago stations to see that a change sticks. We are selling our tremendous birthright for a great deal of pottage under present management.

Peter Hackes—Emphasis on the Military

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, last session a group of us in the House called upon the administration to implement the Hoover Commission's recommendation that a unified supply system be established in the Department of Defense. Savings for the taxpayers would be tremendous. Secretary of Defense McNamara has done a splendid service to his Nation by making the recommendation an accomplished fact, and I was pleased to hear Peter Hackes pay tribute to the achievement in a recent NBC radio broadcast.

The transcript follows:

PETER HACKES—EMPHASIS ON THE MILITARY

From tiny screws one-sixth of an inch long to a mighty 60-ton crane, from a 6-cent

electronic resistor to giant 4-foot-high radar tubes that cost $35,000 apiece, the military services buy supplies totaling $3 billion every year.

Until the first of this year, these items—clothing, medical supplies, petroleum, construction supplies, food, tools, and the rest, everything but weapons—were bought and handed out by each of the services. The Air Force, for example, bought its handkerchiefs at one place, the Army another, and Marine Corps nosewipes came from still another. The same was true in thousands of different categories, many of them duplicating or just slightly different from items already in the inventory of another service.

To stem the tide, to try to bring order out of what had become multibillion-dollar chaos, Defense Secretary McNamara has set up a single organization to work out a unified procurement, management, distribution system. It's called the Defense Supply Agency, DSA.

Already its Chief, Lt. Gen. Andrew McNamara (no relation), says he sees an immediate saving to the taxpayers of $250 million a year and it could go higher than that. To do it, here are just a few of the actions taken by DSA:

It will shortly close up the Marine Corps and Navy clothing factories, all service uniforms to be made at a single installation—saving $1½ million a year.

DSA saves the taxpayers a half million dollars in 3 months merely by buying standardized bath towels, combat boots, fatigue uniforms, and laboratory smocks for all the services, rather than a different kind for each. No longer do the services provide seven styles of men's shoes, now it's only three—a saving of $800,000 a year. There used to be 103 kinds of uniform buttons, now that's been cut to 37.

DSA took a close look at the kinds and shades of paint being supplied to the services—promptly cut out 24 percent of them, including a shade called apple blossom pink.

The food center in Chicago now saves $63,000 every 3 months merely by buying tea in cartons instead of cans; by buying its frozen eggs once a year instead of whenever a service needs them.

The furniture-buying center at Richmond has now dropped 72 percent of the items it used to carry—it once listed 18 kinds of desks—now carries just 4.

At the moment DSA headquarters is pondering a request from the medical center in Brooklyn. We can save $3 million a year say the medics if you will let us substitute miles and miles of surplus 3-inch gauze we have for the regulation 4-inch, a large stock of 6¼-inch-long forceps for the now used 5½-inch, and the warehouse full of reddish brown and ivory colored beds instead of the now standard green beds. The taxpayers as well as the sick servicemen will no doubt rest more easily.

H.R. 4222—What It Will Not Do at Three Times the Cost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, people over 65 years of age are being propagandized into thinking that H.R. 4222, the King bill, is a bargain. This is pure hoax. What the King bill will not do is very succinctly stated in the following article from the Nation's Business April issue:

HEALTH TAX WOULD BUY DISAPPOINTMENT—MILLIONS IGNORED IN SOCIAL SECURITY PROPOSAL

Anyone who is depending on the Government plan to meet health costs for himself or his aged relatives through new social security taxes faces disappointment.

The plan would pay at most about 19 percent of the costs of health care for the aged, according to estimates by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The reasons are plain when some vital questions about the measure are answered:

Who would be omitted?

About 3.5 million of those now 65 and older.

The program will cover only those under social security or railroad retirement who are at least 65, whether retired and receiving cash benefits or working full time.

What services are omitted?

The plan would not pay for a physician's calls at home, in his office, or in the hospital. It would not pay for surgery, dental care, or medicine and drugs outside the hospital or nursing home.

What services are provided?

In any 1 year, the plan would pay for 90 days' hospital care, but only after the patient had paid $10 a day for the first 9 days of his stay. Statistics show that hospital stays of 3.8 percent of those 65 and older average 1 day; 37.4 percent average 2 to 7 days; 29.7 percent stay 8 to 14 days; 18.7 percent stay 15 to 30 days; 9.8 percent stay 31 days or longer. The plan would also pay for 180 days in a nursing home or 240 visits by a visiting nurse.

What would the plan cost?

The first full year of operation would cost about $1.1 billion, according to HEW estimates based on a limited sample. Using actual claim experience, the Health Insurance Association of America estimates costs at double that figure. The association believes costs might eventually reach $6 to $7.7 billion a year.

Most of the costs would be met by increasing both the taxable wage base and the tax rate on all workers and employers under the programs. The base would be upped from $4,800 to $5,200 a year. The rate would be increased one-fourth of 1 percent on both the employer and the employee.

Social security taxes will increase 54 percent by 1968 under present law, even without the new levy, just to pay cash benefits already promised.

How would the plan work?

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would make contracts with providers of health services. These contracts would call for reasonable charges. "Reasonable" is not defined.

Is private insurance available?

The proportion of the aged population with health insurance has increased from 26 to 50 percent in the past 8 years.

Private initiative and private voluntary effort are rapidly devising new methods of mass enrollment of the aged in health insurance plans.

Under these new techniques each aged citizen can now buy the kind of guaranteed renewable protection best suited to meet his own personal and family needs—without physical examination.

In 1970, approximately 21 million persons will be 65 or older; 13 million of these, however, were aged 55 to 64 in 1960. These newcomers to the aged population will retire after 15 to 20 years of high-paid employment. The vast majority will carry health insurance with them into retirement.

Space Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. PAUL KITCHIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, it has been necessary that I spend a great deal of time in my congressional district however, I return to Washington to cast my votes, and this week I returned to vote on some important measures—among them being additional authorization for our Peace Corps program—and a supplemental appropriation bill.

Included in H.R. 11038, the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1962, which passed the House yesterday, and which I supported, is an appropriation of $80 million for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development. This includes $50 million to increase development effort on the Saturn program, $9 million for additional vehicle development costs on the Centaur, and $26 million to begin program development of a 1-million-pound-thrust engine primarily for the Nova second stage. While these funds will not complete the program on these items, it will enable a balanced program to be pursued.

Mr. Speaker, recently it has come to my attention that there has been distortion from several sources, not alone in North Carolina, regarding a vote taken in 1959 on an authorization for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and since this is apparently an underhanded method of creating unfavorable publicity by distorting the record of those who have supported the space program, I welcome this opportunity to set the record straight since I have been included in this campaign of distortion, stating that I did not support the space program in 1959.

The statement has appeared in the press that "If Congress had followed Mr. KITCHIN in 1959 Colonel Glenn would not have orbited the earth yet" also stating that I "voted against appropriations for the space program."

I did not in 1959, or at any other time, vote against an appropriation bill for the space agency. I have voted for each appropriation bill brought to the House of Representatives for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. I shall continue to give this program my unqualified support.

I have voted for the authorization bills for NASA, with the exception of one, and this was not a vote against the space program, but a vote against the parliamentary procedure by which this measure was brought to the floor. Many Members opposed the bill at this time, and I feel sure for the same reason I did, the parliamentary way in which it was brought up for passage, not under normal procedure, but under a procedure known as "suspension-of-the-rules" which limits debate to only 40 mnutes, 20 minutes to each side, and under this pro-

cedure, no amendments are allowed to the bill. Under this procedure, Members have little knowledge of what is in a bill, or what they are called upon to vote, except the relative few who helped to draft the legislation. It has always been my policy on all legislation, whatever the subject, to study the measure carefully, listen to full debate on the floor, and then cast my vote accordingly.

There are many who oppose this procedure of bringing bills to the floor, rather than the legislation itself, when the full facts are not available. In fact, a check of the votes on this particular authorization bill indicates that the gentleman from Missouri, Representative CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the Appropriations Committee in the House; the gentleman from Ohio, MIKE KIRWAN, chairman of the House Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee; and the gentleman from Louisiana, Representative HALE BOGGS, the No. 3 man in the Democratic leadership, as well as the Democratic whip; and other Members of the North Carolina delegation, also voted against the procedural aspect apparently for the same reason I cast my vote.

I have supported our authorization and appropriation legislation for military and civilian space programs since I have been in Congress, and I shall continue to do so. But I shall continue to vote against suspending the rules and passing any bill that comes before the House when full and sufficient debate is not allowed.

"What Freedom Means to Me"—Essays by Students of Junction School, Kansas City, Kans.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I recently received a very fine group of essays on "What Freedom Means to Me." These essays were written by eighth-grade civics students of Junction School, District 16, Kansas City, Kans.

The simple and frank response of these boys and girls impressed me with the outstanding job that our public school teachers are doing of instilling principles of democracy in the minds of our children.

Mr. Albert Hinshaw, the teacher of 108 civics students at Junction School, is an outstanding example of the hundreds of dedicated educators whom we owe our gratitude and support in Kansas and the Nation.

I have asked my staff to choose three of the essays from Mr. Hinshaw's class to be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

(By Patricia Smith)

To me freedom means that I can do what I please within certain rights. It means that I can write an article about the Government in which I live and have it printed without being punished. Even if it criticizes the Government.

It also means I can have a voice in Congress through my Senator or Representative that will act for me and the district in which I live.

Freedom means that if I am in my home and a policeman comes to the door and wants to search my house, I can refuse him until he has a search warrant. This is one of the reasons I am glad I don't live in East Berlin or in a Communist country, for they search and destroy many homes.

Another thing that freedom means to me is the trial by jury. If I am accused of a crime, I have the right to a speedy trial by jury.

Also, I enjoy the freedom as stated in the Constitution establishing the three parts of the Government. Each one has its own job and none of them can operate without the other. This way I am safe from being ruled by a dictator.

Freedom means that I can have the right to choose my own way of life. To be free in America is not as it is in Russia, where, from the day you are born you belong to and worship the state.

I can go to the church of my choice. I am very glad we do not have the religious persecution as did the Jewish people in Germany when Hitler was dictator.

To me, freedom to vote for our President is a wonderful thing. It is only too bad that all people do not get out and use this freedom.

Another thing that makes me think freedom is wonderful is being able to know the truth about what our Government is doing and what other governments are doing through the radio, television, and newspapers and through groups who get together and use their freedom of assembly.

I would like to close by spelling out the word "Freedom":

F—Is for the freedom I enjoy.
R—Is for the many races who live in America.
E—Is for the equality of all people.
E—Is for free education.
D—Is for the democratic government of our country.
O—Is for the right to object without punishment.
M—Is for the militia or National Guard which protects us.

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

(By Andy Ussery)

Freedom, many of us take for granted. This should not be. We might not realize it, but we are using our freedom in most everything we do. Every day when we talk, we don't have to ask or be afraid of what we say. We have the right to listen to what we please. The freedom of religion is what our country was founded on. It is our freedom we hold most dear. We all have the right to choose our own church. The freedom of press means that we don't have to print or write just what a ruler or dictator says for us to write. We print and write just what we believe to be true.

What does freedom mean to me? It means going to the movie or to a drugstore for a coke without fear of being punished for our actions. It is having the chance for an equal education. Just to be free should be enough to make any of us proud. We have fought many times to preserve our freedom and now it is threatened again, but I am still proud. This is what freedom means to me.

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

(By Rita Bower)

What does freedom mean to us? To answer this we must know what freedom is. The dictionary defines freedom as personal and political liberty. When we say personal liberty, does that mean we may do anything we want to do? Yes, as long as we do not harm other people. Freedom insures us of being able to live without the fear of being dragged from our homes and put into prison camps.

Freedom insures us peace throughout our lives. To me freedom is part of my life. What it means is not something I can express in so many words, but something that is felt within my heart. Without freedom to do what we know is right, our lives would not be worth living.

Today as our freedom is threatened by communism, we must realize what our freedom means to us. We must fight to protect our freedom.

There's no Doubt the President Is Positive in Spending the Peoples' Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is a favorite trick of the radicals to say it is a negative approach to call for fiscal responsibility, to ask for a balanced budget, to protect the peoples' money. I like to believe that the best positive policy is one that supports constitutional, limited government, that puts the peoples' interest first, that protects our economy in order to offer more jobs and greater opportunity for all the people, that insures the soundness of our dollar and preserves the solvency of our currency. To do these things is negative according to the do-gooders, the social planners, the proponents of the welfare state who believe the only positive course is to make all the people kept subjects of the Government. The President is proving that he is positive only when it comes to spending the peoples' money. Even a casual glance at the record of the growth of Federal Government in just a little over a year with President Kennedy shows the astronomical ascent of Federal payrolls, Federal spending, Federal controls. The subject is covered in the following article from the U.S. News & World Report shows the boom in Kennedy spending all of which must be paid for through the toil and sweat of the people, not the Kennedy family who are doing handsomely on the Federal payroll.

BUSINESS LAGS, KENNEDY ACTS—THE OUTLOOK

(A steel settlement without a strike can be just the tonic that business needs. As high Government officials size up the outlook now: If a big union in a big industry can restrain its wage demands, a new era in labor peace may begin. With a real break in the wage-price spiral, industry will be encouraged to expand, create jobs, give the economy a lift. President Kennedy, in any

case, is taking other steps to bolster the business revival. But the big hope is that peace in steel, without costly raises, will prove contagious.)

Business sentiment and business trends are expected to be helped by a new labor contract in the basic steel industry. This contract is being made, barring some unforeseen blow-up, without a strike and without an increase in hourly rates of cash pay.

Here is a pattern cheering to American businessmen in many fields. It confirms the break in the wage-price spiral that first occurred in 1959.

Planning now can be done with more assurance of stability in both wages and prices. Strikes, for many years, have been accepted almost as a matter of course in most basic industries whenever labor contracts expired.

Hope: a new era. An example of restraint now has been set by a union. The hope of high Government officials is that this agreement in steel is to open a new era in labor relations.

The break in the steel industry came at a time of growing uncertainty in business.

Business activity in the first quarter of 1962 did not rise to the extent that officials had expected.

Luther H. Hodges, Secretary of Commerce, said on March 27 that he looked for the second quarter of the year also to be somewhat below the earlier estimates of his Department.

President Kennedy, recognizing this prospect, asked Congress on March 26 to approve $600 million for spending on public works in communities with substantial unemployment.

The official feeling had been one of disappointment over the degree of improvement in business.

Much of the failure to move ahead on the officially charted schedule was due to a lag in the rate of spending by business.

A steel settlement—free of an increase in cash wages—is expected to have big effect on business sentiment. The point is made that a major union in a basic industry, for the first time since World War II, has recognized broad public interest in negotiating a new contract.

The official hope now is that this attitude will become contagious. In that case, more confidence would be expected to enter into business planning and business investment.

Business activity itself is expected to lag a bit once all doubt has been removed about terms of a settlement in steel. This will be because some users did build larger-than-normal stockpiles as a hedge against the threat of a strike. Ordering might be a little less than normal while this steel is used up.

In general, however, officials are strengthened in their view that the second half of 1962 will be somewhat better than had been expected, just as the first half is turning out less good than expected.

The outlook for profits will be improved by assurance that there will be no problem of supply in steel and no general rise in prices of steel or of steel products. Profits stand to gain, too, from the outlook that a halt has been called in the wage-cost spiral.

Meanwhile, the current trend of rising incomes for people is expected to continue as more jobs open up and as the workweek lengthens.

That trend, in turn, will be reflected in increased spending by people for goods and services.

Business also will be stimulated by rising outlays of Federal, State, and local governments.

The hope of Government officials is that these pressures for business expansion will prompt businessmen themselves to increase their plan for investment and plant expansion.

Signs now are that, in the second half of the year, total output will run considerably higher than the present pace.

GOVERNMENT GROWS AND GROWS

One boom that seems never to slacken is the boom in Government. Federal offices are expanding, adding workers, raising payrolls. Big growth fields: defense, space, welfare—maybe a "new WPA." Latest spending plans show what to expect.

Spending by Government is to continue in a steadily rising trend. The level of spending between the last year of the Eisenhower administration and the first full budget year of the Kennedy administration is to rise by $7.5 billion.

A rise of an additional $3.5 billion is officially scheduled for the year to start next July 1. By that time, budgeted spending will be up to $92.5 billion a year. Not included are the billions of old-age-insurance programs and other spending out of Federal trust accounts.

President Kennedy now is asking Congress to approve a new program of public works. This added spending would go into projects that could be started quickly in areas where unemployment remains a major problem. The first request is for $600 million.

Critics are saying that this suggested program bears some of the earmarks of the Works Progress Administration—WPA—of the days of Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal. They say that the program, once started, would be open to rapid expansion.

Spending increases during the Kennedy administration are found to center in three major fields:

1. Space exploration: This field is undergoing rapid expansion that involves billions in new spending. Added space costs will total $15.4 billion in 5 years and and may exceed that sum.

2. Defense: Spending on defense is expected to rise by $3.7 billion in the year that ends next June 30. It will rise $1.5 billion more in the year ending June 30, 1963. The rise will go on.

3. Welfare: Programs of social welfare represent the third field of broad expansion. Related to these programs are others designed specially to stimulate a lag in the business upturn. Social-welfare programs advanced by the President in some cases are involved in controversy and may not be approved.

The principle accepted by the present administration is that spending by Government can be used to stimulate general business and help to relieve the problem of unemployment.

Thus the Federal Government is a vast and growing institution.

How vast and how rapidly the Government is growing is shown in part by charts on these pages. Shown, too, are some of the programs, proposed or started during the first 14 months of the present administration, that will expand the field of spending, and the total, in the years ahead.

President Kennedy has proposed plans that, by the year ending June 30, 1965, will total more than $9 billion. However, he also has made proposals to reduce the cost of Government in some areas. One proposal would reduce farm subsidies. Another would increase postal rates and thus lower the postal deficit. Together, these would shave about $1.7 billion from Federal spending.

On balance, these proposals would add almost $7.3 billion a year by the 1965 fiscal year. It is in November of that year that the next President is to be elected. Additional plans may be offered in the 2½ years before the next presidential election.

To give you an idea of the size of the Federal establishment, look at the number of civilian employees in Government agencies:

In his first year in office, President Kennedy added 76,900 workers to the Federal payroll, bringing the total number of civilian employees to more than 2.4 million. By mid-1963, a payroll of more than 2.5 million persons is indicated. That would mean a total of 200,000 more workers.

GROWING PAYROLL

The Federal payroll for the year ending June 30, 1961, when Mr. Kennedy had been in office for 6 months, came to $13.6 billion. In the year ending next June 30 the payroll will reach $14.3 billion, $700 million more than when the new administration took office. By mid-1963 an additional $400 million is expected to be added to the payroll, bringing the total increase to $1.1 billion.

The President also is asking for pay increases in years ahead for Federal workers. That probably would put an additional $1 billion on the payroll.

Or consider the office space now required for the staff of Federal employees. The Federal Government now owns buildings containing 286 million square feet of office space. These buildings are the equivalent of 133 Empire State Buildings, based on the Empire State's 2,158,000 square feet of office space, exclusive of maintenance areas, elevators, etc., which is available to tenants.

These Government buildings include not only office space in the big Federal buildings in Washington, D.C., but buildings in all parts of the country. The cost of these structures is $2.5 billion.

RENT PAYER

But that's not all. The Federal Government also is a big renter. All told, the Government rents 73 million square feet of office space—the equal to 34 Empire State Buildings. The annual rental comes to about $110 million.

This establishment of workers and space for them to occupy leaves out of account the military forces that the Government also maintains. Defense, however, occupies a lot of office space for administrative work.

The added spending listed in the table contains only those programs on which a price tag can be estimated. Other proposals of the President promise to add still further to Federal expenses. These proposals also would give the Federal Government a hand in nearly all activities of the country, affecting almost every man, woman, and child.

Take, for example, the President's farm program. He has outlined a plan to reduce the outlay for price support subsidies, but he also has suggested increased outlays in other farm areas. He wants to expand the food stamp program for aiding the needy. He wants to increase food-for-peace shipments. And he has suggested a rural renewal plan, including the training of farm-workers for nonfarm jobs.

All of these proposals would add to Federal costs.

Another example can be found in the administration's trade bill. The program is offered as a means of promoting the country's foreign trade, thereby adding to production and employment. But dislocations are foreseen, and to treat them will cost money.

WHERE COSTS MOUNT UP

Thus the administration calls for a program to retrain workers displaced by competition from imports. Workers also would be given allowances to relocate where they can find jobs. And businessmen and farmers would be given loans, tax benefits and technical help in solving problems created by rising imports.

In years immediately ahead, the administration also would add to welfare costs by larger grants to States. The idea is to improve State welfare services so that people eventually could be taken off relief rolls. Meanwhile, Federal payments to State welfare services would rise from 50 to 75 percent. Small Federal grants are proposed to enable States to set up day-care centers for working mothers.

When it comes to conservation, the administration, has a broad program, the cost of which cannot now be estimated. It calls for land purchases for nine new national parks,

a wilderness preservation system, and a Federal-State shoreline preservation system. Federal aid for State recreational programs is included in the list.

FEES TO PAY OFF

Much of the conservation expense is to be met by admission fees and other fees for the use of recreation areas, but a $500 million fund is proposed as a starter, eventually to be repaid.

One of the President's most expensive welfare plans is medical care for the aged, to be financed by higher taxes under the social security system. This would cost more than $1 billion in the 1965 fiscal year.

But the health program goes further than this. Included is a plan to provide free immunization for all children under 5 against polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus.

Also included are 10-year grants to plan and build medical and dental schools, scholarships for training physicians and dentists, more money for health research.

On Federal aid to education, the administration program, if accepted, would start at a modest $160 million for the year ending June 30, 1963, but would rise to nearly $1.2 billion in the 1965 fiscal year.

What Kennedy's program would cost if approved by Congress in full

[In millions of dollars]

	In year ending June 30—	
	1963	1965
Increases in spending for—		
Space programs	900	4,000
Aid to education—public schools, colleges	160	1,168
Medical care for aged [1]		1,060
Pay raise for Federal workers	208	929
Higher military allowances and retired pay	171	367
Civil defense shelters	105	500
Public welfare, relief	191	237
Aid to distressed areas	122	200
Job retraining for unemployed	60	165
Peace Corps	52	100
Youth program	60	83
Aid for disabled veterans	64	63
Other programs	445	204
Total increases	2,538	9,076
To be offset in part by—		
Higher postal rates	595	621
Saving on farm programs	434	1,114
Cut in school aid to federally impacted areas	36	
Net increase in annual spending	1,473	7,341

[1] As part of Social Security, financed by proposed increase in payroll tax.

NOTE.—Spending figures above are those for which costs can be measured in advance with some accuracy. Many other programs, though expected to rise in cost, are omitted, as no estimates for future years are available at this time. These include foreign aid, defense, additional public works in time of recession, etc.

Source: Mostly official estimates; some figures are estimates by U.S.N. & W.R. Economic Unit based on official data.

How the Federal payroll is rising in workers

Federal civilian employees as of:

Jan. 1, 1961	2,368,700
Jan. 1, 1962	2,445,600
July 1, 1962 (estimated)	2,522,300
July 1, 1963 (estimated)	2,568,400

Thus in Kennedy's first year, Federal employment rose by 76,900. By mid-1963, officials figure the administration will have added 200,000 workers to the payroll.

Yearly Federal payroll cost in dollars

Year ending:	*Billions*
June 30, 1961	$13.6
June 30, 1962 (estimated)	14.3
June 30, 1963 (estimated)	14.7

Thus in Kennedy's first year and a half in office the cost of the Federal payroll increased by $700 million a year, and by mid-1963 it will be $1.1 billion a year higher than when he entered office. And—the President has asked Congress for Federal pay raises that would add another billion to present payroll costs by the year 1965.

This calls for Federal aid to build elementary schools plus Federal assistance in raising teachers' salaries. College scholarships are another part of this program.

MORE STAFF

Even in his consumer message the President proposed small increases in Federal outlays. He called for increased staff and more funds for all the major regulatory agencies of Government.

Mr. Kennedy also asked for a 25-percent increase in the staff of the Food and Drug Administration, more funds for meat and poultry inspection, more money to regulate pesticides.

Other programs that appear certain to keep adding to Federal costs are foreign aid, power-transmission lines, soil conservation, rural-electrification loans, air-traffic controls and air-navigational aids, and urban renewal.

The urban-renewal program could develop into heavy spending if cities decide to launch projects on a large scale with Federal help.

At present no estimate is available for costs of urban renewal. But aid to distressed areas is just getting started, will cost a modest $122 million in fiscal 1963, rise to $200 million in fiscal 1965. Federal commitments to distressed areas could well exceed this amount.

The President, in fact, proposes to channel his requested $600 million for public works into these areas, as well as areas where high unemployment has been persistent. Altogether, there are 40 major employment areas and 66 smaller areas that would be eligible for this emergency aid. In addition, there are 852 localities that have been officially designated as distressed areas.

This request for $600 million for emergency outlays indicates how heavily the administration is depending on Federal spending as a prop to business. By most measures, American business now is in an expanding phase, and output is running at record levels. But employment still is a problem and Government officials are dissatisfied with the rate of expansion.

So it is proposed to spend $25 million on public works before the end of next June, $350 million in the year that ends June 30, 1963, and $225 million in the year ending June 30, 1964. Projects under this program would be limited to those that can be started quickly and completed in 12 months.

IF RECESSION COMES

The Government's budget, believed balanced last January, already is out of balance. If a genuine recession occurs again, as it has four times since World War II, the administration probably would not hesitate to send Government spending, already soaring, to skyrocketing heights.

One Nation Under God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the Lowell Sun, one of New England's finest newspapers, reminds us editorially that display of our national colors is a custom Americans should revive.

The editorial is as follows:

ONE NATION UNDER GOD

The next national holiday on which the U.S. flag should fly on every home is V-E Day, May 8. To avoid such long waits between flag-flying days, many God-fearing people advocate flying the U.S. flag on every home, on every Sunday until the whole world, under God, is free. It seems such a small thing for an American citizen to fly a flag on his home as a gesture of patriotism until the importance of the privilege makes its impact. If for only one reason, our thankfulness for freedom of worship, the symbolism of the flag then becomes a Sunday must.

The U.S. flag is a national trademark for every house of worship in the land. It would be understandable if those who agree would take steps to recommend that their own congregation display the flag every Sunday. Few symbols of freedom are so potent and so meaningful.

Scuttled by Redtape

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following very interesting article which appeared in the New Englander for April 1962, published by the New England Council for Economic Development in Boston:

THE REGION'S GROUNDFISH INDUSTRY—SCUTTLED BY REDTAPE—IT'S CALLED THE TARIFF ACT, BUT AS FAR AS GROUNDFISHERMEN ARE CONCERNED, IT'S THE ANCHOR THAT COULD DRAG A VITAL SEGMENT OF OUR FISHING INDUSTRY RIGHT TO THE BOTTOM

(By E. Robert Kinney)

I intend to confine this article to the most important product of the New England fishing fleet—groundfish. I hasten to point out that groundfish are not ground-up fish flesh as hamburger is ground-up meat, but are those fish that live near or on the ocean floor. By limiting myself to groundfish, I am not detracting from the importance of other large New England fisheries, such as the growing scallop industry out of New Bedford, the Maine sardine fishery and the lobster, clam, and oyster catches along our shores.

Groundfish are defined by the Tariff Act of the United States. This fact, as you will see, has contributed to the sad status in which the groundfish industry, once the granddaddy of all New England industry, now finds itself. The act defines groundfish as only cod, haddock, ocean perch, hake, pollock and cusk, although other countries include such fish as whiting and flatfish, also found near the ocean floor.

Now, why is the groundfish industry in real danger of becoming the forgotten industry? There are five major contributing factors: (1) the Tariff Act; (2) the antiquity of our fishing fleet; (3) the declining number of young fishermen; (4) the so-called subsidy for the fishing fleet; and (5) foreign competition. The close interrelationship among these five points will become clear as I go along.

The Tariff Act restricts the size of ships that can be built by Americans in foreign yards, while the Subsidy Act limits the nature of the catch that they can land at U.S. docks. The Tariff Act prohibits any fishing

boat of more than 5 gross tons built in a foreign shipyard from landing fish at any U.S. port. You do not need me to tell you that a boat under 5 tons is a mighty small one. It takes a trawler of at least 100 gross tons to groundfish on Georges or the Grand Banks. The Subsidy Act forbids an American-owned groundfish trawler from landing at a U.S. fish pier a catch not made up by more than half of the species listed in the act as groundfish.

This prohibition is, in effect, penalizing the groundfisherman for vagaries of nature. If groundfish have moved to other banks, if the number of groundfish has been reduced for biological reasons, if climatic conditions or depredators scatter the schools of groundfish, the American trawler, under the terms of the Subsidy Act, must return to port with half a cargo or less or must stay at sea for uneconomically long periods. It is as if the Government should say to a farmer that he can't plant cabbage if his potato crop fails.

If it were possible to transport you to the Gloucester and Boston fish piers where the principal groundfish fleets are based, you would quickly see for yourselves the unhappy condition of the boats that fish the offshore banks. It is with regret that I report that no trawler over 100 feet in length has been added to the Boston fleet in more than a dozen years. In 1950, there were 39 large trawlers fishing out of Boston; today, there are 25.

A similar condition exists in Gloucester. It has been 7 years since a 100-foot boat was built there. Since 1950, 15 draggers have been added to the Gloucester fleet, but—and here's the rub—during the same peirod 28 boats were lost by sinking or by demolition as unseaworthy—a net loss of 13 vessels in 11 years.

Because the number of boats has declined, the landings at New England ports have declined, too. The groundfish catch and the business of processing this catch will continue to decline unless the catch of fish can be increased. The average age of Boston trawlers runs from 21 to 40 years, according to size; Maine trawlers average 20 years in age.

As the fleets have become more aged, so have the men who work the ships. In 1959, nearly 70 percent of the Boston fishermen were over 51 years of age and less than 10 percent were less than 41 years old. In Gloucester, only 9 percent were less than 41 years old and, to make matters worse, employment on Massachusetts trawlers dropped nearly 60 percent since 1949.

A few more statistics will underline the magnitude of the problem. Ever since 1949, groundfish landings have declined. In 1948, a half-billion pounds of groundfish were landed in New England; today, the total is less than 300 million pounds. While the catch has gone down, fish prices have remained stationary, the fleets have grown more antiquated, the cost of maintaining these old boats has gone up, and so have the costs of fishing gear and vessel insurance.

In more recent years, the cost of a boat built in this country increased dramatically over the cost in foreign shipyards. This situation grew so acute that our Government could no longer ignore it. A subsidy to assist in rebuilding our fishing fleet was enacted in Washington—but, that so-called subsidy looked better in the statute than it did in practice.

The act gives a subsidy of one-third of the cost of a boat that must be built in a U.S. yard. A loan of 75 percent on the remainder of the construction cost is guaranteed. Just how does this work out?

Current estimates for a 124-foot steel trawler to fish out of Boston are about $450,000. A one-third subsidy would reduce the cost to $300,000. Within the last year, the same vessel could have been built in a shipyard in Holland or Scandinavia for from $200,000 to $250,000. In other words, the U.S. fishing industry is asked to pay a minimum premium of $50,000 to get a subsidy from its own Government. These are real, hard facts that raise the question "How much of a penalty should the industry be asked to pay to remain in business?"

However, not even a subsidy is needed if fishing vessels can be imported without the penalities imposed by the Tariff Act. That act was supposed to protect the domestic shipbuilding industry, but American shipyards are not being protected as far as fishing trawlers of 100 feet or more are concerned because none are being built. Looking a little into the future, the domestic yards will not even enjoy repair work because there will be no fishing vessels to repair.

One of the realities our fishing fleet has had to face is the increasing competition on the fishing grounds from foreign sources. On the Grand Banks, our fishermen find modern vessels from England, Germany, Russia, Spain, and Canada, to name but a few countries, exploiting the catch possibilities with the best possible equipment. It is not necessary to go so far from home. Recently, the Boston haddock fleet began seeing Russians with well-equipped trawlers catching haddock on Georges Bank.

Just how the Russians pay for their boats to come fishing over here I do not know, but I do know they have plenty of them—and more to come. Just this spring, Mr. Diestel, executive vice president of the Baader Machine Works in Germany, visited me in Gloucester. His company manufactures equipment for shore-processing plants and for factory ships. We purchase for use in our Gloucester plants equipment identical to the type used on Russian factory ships. A factory ship is just what its name implies. It catches, prepares, and freezes fish for processing at shore plants. Mr. Diestel showed his plant's production schedule for this equipment from 1960 through 1965. His output was allotted primarily to installations on 60 factory ships being built for Russia in Polish shipyards.

New England's chief competitor in the groundfish fillet market is Canada. It will be worth our while to examine for a moment what assistance both the National and Provincial Governments give the Canadian vessel owners. Until this year, the National subsidy was aimed at small boats under 70 feet in length. Recognizing the need to keep their fleets up to date and competitive with European vessels, the Canadians saw that they must give aid to keep trawlers 100 feet and more renewed in their fleet.

The subsidy from Ottawa for new vessels is 40 percent of the cost of the trawler if built in Canada, but, in the September 11, 1961, "Canadian Ship Construction Assistance Regulations," the subsidy is increased to 50 percent if the new vessel replaces a used wooden or steel trawler.

If you are fortunate enough to operate processing plants in the Province of Quebec, as our company, Groton's, does, you can secure more than the 40-percent subsidy. For example, if we have a fisherman who wants to acquire a boat that costs $150,000 to build, the Canadian Maritime Commission will pay, by subsidy, 40 percent of the cost, making the owner's investment $90,000. If the boat is built in the Province of Quebec, the Provincial Government will lend the fisherman $81,000 on the remaining cost. Thus, the fisherman needs only $9,000 as an initial payment on a $150,000 boat.

The next question that must come to your mind is "How can the owner, who usually is the operator of the boat, pay off the big debt and the interest on it"? The answer is that the loan from the Quebec Department of Fisheries is interest free. Payments on the principal and the expensive hull insurance are made only from 14 percent of the proceeds of the catch while a boat is fishing.

In England, the Government's material assistance for the fishing fleet takes the form of encouraging the industry to build new ships that, over the years, can contribute to the industry's financial independence. One method of assistance is to provide a subsidy based on a percentage of the gross proceeds of a trip of fish. There are also grants for the construction of new fishing ships with additional grants when a newer type vessel is built. In other words, the excess cost of a newer type boat over a conventional trawler is paid in part by government aid. This form of assistance also goes to additional equipment, such as freezers.

Let's look at what the English fleet is doing with its newer equipment on the fishing banks off Newfoundland. After all, this is some of the competition we have to face if we are going to have a New England fleet compete.

Since World War II, 170 ships over 140 feet in length have been built. The vessels are well maintained and attract and hold their crews. Fishing gear is modern, fish holds are hygienic, crew's quarters excellent. Three large factory ships are in operation. The newest development in fishing trawlers is the *Lord Nelson* type which costs about $1 million to build. This ship will freeze a major portion of its catch at sea for filleting when landed at the home port. New techniques have been devised to dielectrically thaw fish frozen in the round. Taste panels in England have been unable to determine the difference between fresh fish and fish that have been frozen and dielectrically thawed and then processed. Dielectric thawing is the defrosting of fish very rapidly without permitting the temperature to rise above 38 degrees.

It is apparent that we are lagging far behind our competition on the fishing banks. If the industry is to survive at all, there must either be a change in the Tariff Act to encourage rather than to deter our domestic fishing industry or the subsidy must be made realistic.

Given the opportunity and the proper encouragement, we believe that the New England fisheries can meet foreign competition.

Private Investment and the Alliance for Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in New York City, on March 21, 1962, Mr. Peter R. Nehemkis, Jr., Washington counsel for Whirlpool Corp., gave an address entitled "Private Investment and the Alliance for Progress before the Inter-American Forum on "The Hemisphere's 11th Hour" which was sponsored by the Overseas Press Club of America.

In this address, Mr. Nehemkis described the necessity for American firms to invest private capital in Latin America and he indicated how this investment can best be implemented so as to afford optimum benefit to the Latin American economy. He discussed the recent establishment of Latin America's first technical school, founded as a cooperative venture by Whirlpool Corp., of Benton Harbor, Mich., and the Corporacion Educativa de la Industria of

Medellin, Colombia, for the purpose of training high school graduates in the industrial techniques of middle management.

Mr. President, I believe that the work of the Whirlpool Corp., in this area serves as an important example of what can be done by American private industry to supplement the objectives of the alliance for progress and I believe that their efforts should be commended. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Nehemkis' excellent address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRIVATE INVESTMENT AND THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

(An address by Peter R. Nehemkis, Jr., Washington counsel, Whirlpool Corp.)

Much is being said regarding the importance of private investment in the implementation of the alliance for progress. The official rhetoric, however, strikes me as consisting merely of a ritualistic and ceremonial genuflection to the virtues of private enterprise. Meaningful direction for, or clarification of, the role which the private economy should play has been conspicuously absent from the discussion.

At the outset it may serve as a useful frame of reference to indicate the stake which U.S. business already has in Latin America. In 1961, it amounted to about $9 billion. You begin to realize how much U.S. private investment contributes to Latin America's growth when recognition is given to these facts: over one-third of Latin America's industrial and mining production is accounted for by U.S. companies; one-third of all Latin America's exports originate with U.S. companies; about one-fifth of all Latin America's taxes are paid by U.S. companies. If you total the wage and salary costs, the expenditures on local materials and services, along with the tax bill, U.S. companies contribute annually to Latin America's economy about $6.1 billion. To put this figure in perspective keep in mind that, under the alliance for progress, the U.S. Government is committed to invest in Latin America some $10 billion over the next decade. U.S. companies from their existing investments are contributing to Latin America over $6 billion annually.

Now if all that Washington has in mind for the furtherance of the objectives of the alliance for progress on the part of the private economy is just to keep up the flow of investments, Washington can save its wind. For under our system, private capital is deployed by its own logic and its own compulsions. Investment decisions are made by corporate boards of directors acting as trustees for stockholders' money. These decisions are predicated, among other things, on market considerations, profit potentials, and the prevailing political climate.

The political factor more than any other element in the Latin American investment equation is the influential deterrent. This circumstance is clearly reflected in the figures on the flow of U.S. capital in the post-Castro years. From a high in 1957 of over $1 billion, the flow dropped to a little over $200 million in 1961.

By all odds Brazil should occupy a strategic position in the calculations of U.S. private investment. Yet last year U.S. direct investments had virtually dried up—the flow of new money was somewhere around $25 or $35 million. This was considerably less than many U.S. companies allocate for their domestic advertising budgets. Admittedly this is a critical setback for a country just about at the takeoff stage when heavy infusions of foreign capital can provide the extra momentum. But Brazil is also the classic example where private capital is inhibited because of the risks attendant upon the unsettled political weather.

So I would repeat: Pious declarations to the effect that there is a role for private capital to play in the alliance for progress will not open the floodgates. Yet this role is of overriding importance. For there just isn't enough governmental money on this planet to supply Latin America's needs. Only by marshaling private capital—United States and Latin American, West European and Japanese—will the alliance for progress succeed in furnishing Latin America's enormous capital requirements.

So, what's to be done? How can we resolve this dilemma? If my answer is in shorthand I ask your indulgence because time restrains our dialog. The answer, I believe, lies in the mobilization by the business community of its own unique technical, financial and managerial resources for a massive assault upon a few, critically important areas where the impact will be striking.

As one example of what might be undertaken by our American business leadership I suggest activating the embryonic Central American Common Market. This could be accomplished by organizing a series of joint or mixed private and Government ventures to supply the capital and consumer goods for a potentially viable and integrated regional economy. The limited geographical area involved as well as the limited number of plants initially required makes the operation readily manageable.

The Central American Common Market offers an unparalleled opportunity for U.S. business leadership to make a spectacular contribution to modernization and to realize profitable successes fairly early.

But let us be candid with each other: whether justifiable or not (and, in my opinion, it is largely unjustifiable), it is, nevertheless, a fact of life that the North American corporate image mirrored throughout much of Latin America, and especially in middle America, is not what it ought to be. It would be unwise, therefore, for an undertaking of this magnitude to be exclusively North American. Not only would the venture be suspect, but the very idea would become a target for attack by the extremist left. To insure a favorable reception, as well as for its own intrinsic reasons, the undertaking should be international in scope. West European, Canadian, United States, Japanese, and Central American capital (both private and governmental), should be mobilized. Neighboring Puerto Rico and Mexico could supply technicians and managers and some capital.

Perhaps the most significant and far-reaching contribution—for both the immediate Common Market undertaking and for the future of U.S. investments throughout Latin America—would be for the coventurers to propose to and negotiate with the Central American Common Market Authority a charter of the rights, duties, and obligations of the investors and of the respective governments. It could be made abundantly clear that this international consortium did not intend to preserve its investment over the indefinite future; that its stake could be bought out either by local private capital or governmental bodies; that it was the intention of the sponsors to dilute its financial ownership through the widest possible distribution of stock to nationals of the region. In a word, it could be made crystal clear that the whole sweep of the idea was to light the fuse and to help detonate an explosion of economic growth—and then get out. Such a declaration of intentions would automatically remove the lingering fear in the minds of many of Latin America's intellectuals and businessmen that foreign capital never lets go once it takes hold.

The charter could spell out that, although the sovereign power of expropriation is inviolable, its exercise would carry with it the duty of fair compensation enforceable, when and if necessary, by the International Court of Justice. The charter could delineate those areas of the economy reserved for State investment and operation and those areas reserved for development by the private sector. The charter could specify the bargaining rights of labor. It could declare the obligation of the consortium to facilitate through training programs the early and rapid assumption of managerial and supervisory responsibilities by nationals of the region.

Plainly, the voluntary initiation of such a charter for investment by U.S. business leadership would have an electrifying effect: It takes account of Latin America's nationalist sensitivity and pride. It does not attempt to impose a capitalism which is unique to the United States. It is a genuine offer of partnership. It operates strictly within the disciplines of the profit system. It is, nevertheless, an unsentimental offer of help.

Last night, Gov. Carlos Lacerda in a brilliant address called for a Federation of the Americas—a rebirth of Bolivar's dream of the unification of the hemisphere. But as a working politician Governor Lacerda warned against the wishful thinking that, like Minerva, this vision can spring into existence full blown. It must start—Governor Lacerda cautioned—in small beginnings. But if the goal of political unification is given a practical economic underpinning—as is proposed in the Central American Common Market—political integration in time can become a living reality, precisely as is taking place in the European Common Market.

Although businessmen are not supposed to concern themselves with such esoteric matters as the political unification of the Americas, it is not without ironic interest that the father of the European Common Market is a businessman. The businessmen of West Europe ultimately will be responsible for the realization of one of Europe's oldest dreams—a unified political and economic continent.

Why shouldn't the business leaders of middle America and North America unite to breathe life into one of the oldest aspirations of the New World of the Americas?

In advancing these proposals I do not underestimate the inherent complexities and difficulties involved in putting together such an undertaking. Nor do I underestimate the consummate business diplomacy and organizing skills which must be employed. Nor am I unmindful that at this moment you of this audience are probably saying to yourselves, "This is a pipe dream; the corporate managers of American big business will never respond to any such challenge." If, indeed, you are skeptical, I don't blame you. But I venture to suggest your judgment may be premature.

Take my own company as an illustration. In seeking for a course of constructive action whereby we might genuinely identify ourselves with the needs and aspirations of Latin America, it seemed to us that technical education was an area where we might make a modest contribution. For it is axiomatic that the export of capital, public or private, to a developing country lacking technical skills goes through a sieve.

At Medellin, Colombia, we found our industrial colleagues eager to join with us in establishing a technical institute to train high school graduates in the skills, the knowledge and the disciplines of middle management. Last month, the Institute Tecnologico de Medellin opened its doors for its first class of 60 young high school graduates. Eventually, 600 students will be en-

rolled. The first class is now embarked on a 3-year course of technical studies which will enable them to man Colombia's burgeoning industries with the technical management without which sustained economic growth is impossible. I am happy to say that the Organization of American States is now considering using the institute at Medellin as a training center for teachers from other Latin American countries and to provide scholarships for young men from the other American Republics.

Visualize, if you will, what 100 similar technical institutes sponsored by 100 other U.S. companies would do to satisfy Latin America's critical need for trained administrators? Here, again, is another example of what I believe Governor Lacerda had in mind when he spoke last night of the pooling of technical institutes and schools as the first step in effectuating the federation of the Americas. Technology knows no geographical or political boundaries. Technology is the sharp cutting edge which can destroy Latin America's balkanization.

Do I still find you skeptical and do I hear you say that one swallow doesn't make a spring? You may be right. But I would observe that I don't believe my company is unique in its response to Latin America's revolutionary challenge. There are others in the business community who also believe that in a revolutionary epoch where the entire world is undergoing a transformation neither business as usual (nor government as usual) will be able to survive the dynamic, ruthless, and effective competition of an adversary who makes no bones of his intention to bury us.

Latin America is our battleground. To win, the Communists have only to continue to point their finger at the pervasive social injustice, at the meager benefits of industrialization for the masses. To win, the democratically oriented governments must produce fast results or they will disappear from the scene.

The moral dilemma which business leadership throughout this hemisphere must resolve—and soon—was posed neatly and eloquently by President Kennedy when he said: "If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich."

Will history record that we, too, perished for want of vision; that we were strangled by our own indifference to the misery of the people of the poor lands?

A Treatise on Bookies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1962

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, it is refreshing to note that crusading journalism still is a potent part of the American scene. At times we are thrilled to observe journalistic works which fill us all with pride. When we do, we are usually filled with a combination of joy and anger—joyful because we admire the courage and fortitude which is inherent in this type of journalism and angry because we become aroused with indignation that there should be the need for such exposure.

On this occasion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my admiration of the works of John W. Creighton, editor and publisher of the Long Island Post, who has been an effective battler against the underworld elements which thrive in our communities. Organized crime needs no reminder of the adversary it has in Mr. Creighton, and his work in this field is well known to the people in Queens and Long Island. I believe it is the type of crusading journalism which we would all like to see more of throughout the Nation in the country's vital struggle to combat organized crime.

It is for this reason that I offer for the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Treatise on Bookies" written by this fine newspaperman, despite threats to his physical being, which appeared in the Long Island Post recently. I do this because I feel it will be valuable reading for all my distinguished colleagues in both Houses of Congress who represent other communities of America which may be similarly threatened by this evil scourge.

The editorial follows:

A TREATISE ON BOOKIES

(By John W. Creighton)

The January 1 issue of U.S. News & World Report carries a splendid interview with FBI Chief J. Edgar Hoover on the fantastic rise in crime in the Nation today. He cites statistics showing that serious crimes have risen 98 percent when the population has risen only 18 percent in the past decade in the Nation.

The major point Mr. Hoover makes is that organized crime has to be defeated on the grassroots level. He points out that the crime overlords have moved out of gang hideouts and bought into legitimate businesses or set up their own with investment money from local gambling, prostitution, the sale of narcotics, and obscene material.

The FBI chief says: "As long as the private citizen 'trades' with the gambler, the prostitute, the drug pusher, or any other agent of the racketeer, there will be more vice and more and more murderers, rapists, robbers, and thieves. But, if citizens will stop dealing with criminals and start reporting what they know about illegal activities, we can clean out the top hoodlums and racketeers and their underlings."

On the local level, the bookie is the main wellspring feeding the crime lords. He is often the czar of all the other vices that morally degrade a community. He owes his daily sustenance to those who often don't realize, or care to realize, the serious damage they are causing a society already undermined by a cynicism rooted to the materialism from the plush postwar years. Indeed, it has been this monetary outpouring that had made the bookie more prosperous, more powerful, more arrogant.

There is little the bookie touches that eventually doesn't lead to corruption. Indeed, the disease has even gotten to weak-minded college athletes found culpable of ditching old alma mater to shave points or throw games for a few dirty bucks. Amateurs, no less. One begins to wonder how far the malignancy has eaten into the professional sports in which the players make a living out of their athletic antics.

What kind of a man is a bookie? Perhaps the erstwhile king of them all, Harry Gross, can supply the answer. The reader may recall that about 11 years ago, Gross unpleasantly had to undergo the penalty of answering for his sins. Seems that as a result of an internal rumble, it was learned that Gross was paying off "ice" to some wayward cops to stay in business.

During the police departmental trial investigating the charges, Gross was the paragon of stately arrogance as he cockily answered the questions put forth. He was a big deal in hoodlum showmanship at its best. He glorified and clucked in the revelation that he was housed in a plush suite in a Brooklyn hotel, and that he got about town in a chauffeured limousine. The punk-runt apparently felt he could afford these excesses in demeanor in the mistaken knowledge of an 11th-hour reprieve from his embarrassing difficulties.

Instead, he was sentenced to 12 years in prison. What did the multimillionaire bookie do during the sentencing? He cried—and like a baby. And during his time in stir, reports had it that he cried most every day before earning parole. And no sooner was he out, he was back in again. It happened that he fleeced a widow out of $13,000.

It's obvious that Gross is mentally and morally weak. The others, like him, suffer no qualms of conscience. They lack the compassions and sympathies and constructiveness that go to building communities, cities—a nation. Worse, they obstruct the efforts of those who do possess them.

When the "heat" is on, they whistle a tune to the words, "Live and let live." When their toes are stepped on, they don't even have the courage or guts to face up to their own battles. Instead, they hire hoods to do their head busting. And with all this, it's been said that some even have the gall to attend church on Sundays—a sadistic self-indulgence simply to hear how lousy they are.

What of the gamblers who keep the bookie in business? Most are family men who are generally law-abiding churchgoers. Yet, in seeking individual redemption, they suffer no pangs of remorse in illegal betting that is undermining the society around them. Only penny-ante betting, they call it. However, add it up across the Nation and it annually totals into the billions of dollars feeding into the higher echelons of crime for reinvestment into legitimate businesses. Crime prevention officials say that at the rate the illegal flow is rising, it won't be long before the racketeers will be investing more into the economy than legitimate businessmen.

It has to stop, and as Mr. Hoover says, at the grassroots level. Clergymen, service, community and veterans' organizations are asked to join in a concerted campaign to wipe out the sickly menace by continually and persistently urging their members not to gamble with the bookies.

Citizens can help on an individual basis by reporting to their local precincts any signs of vice they may encounter in their communities.

To those who have to gamble—settle for a good neighborly poker or pinochle game. To those who can't keep away from the horses, go to the race track when in season. At least the state will get a cut out of your losses and put it to better use in betting at the mutual windows.

Bet on a better and more decent community—and nation—by not betting with the bookie.

Labor's Monopoly Power Is Weakening Our Country and Aiding the Enemy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, a column from the Washington Evening Star and

written by David Lawrence points out the result on our defense effort of the unwarranted jurisdictional strikes at our missile bases. Work stoppages have been one of the main reasons why the Communists have been able to cut down our lead in the development of space and missile vehicles. Continued unchecked, such disregard of the security of the United States could result in our defeat by the Soviet Union. Whether or not it is intended, such strikes play into the hands of the enemy and the net result, as Mr. Lawrence points out, is the same as though these people were being paid by the Communists to sabotage our defenses.

Drastic action is needed to end this threat to our security. It may be necessary to outlaw strikes at defense and missile bases, but this in itself will not put an end to the serious threat to our Nation posed by labor's unrestricted power and the monopoly it enjoys. We can end labor's abuse of power just as we did when industry abused its responsibility, by putting labor organizations under antitrust law as proposed in my bill, H.R. 8407. By curtailing labor's power to act against the public interest, we can control strikes and work stoppages at missile bases, and we can end the power labor has to price American industry out of the world market.

The power of labor to affect our trade abroad has been clearly brought out in the hearings presently being held by the Ways and Means Committee on the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. Here it has been clearly shown that labor alone can restrict the trade of American concerns by its unrestricted power to increase wages artificially without regard to productivity or ability to compete in the world market.

No Member of this body, Mr. Speaker, will be more concerned with labor's legitimate rights to protect collective bargaining, but I am equally concerned with labor's responsibility as an important segment of a free society.

Certainly one of its responsibilities, and one which no present prominent labor leader has deemed important, is to put an end to the destructive work stoppages in our defense areas as outlined in Mr. Lawrence's column.

The column follows:

OUTLAWING MISSILE BASE STRIKES—SERIOUSNESS OF WORK STOPPAGES FEARED LIKELY TO REQUIRE DRASTIC ACTION

(By David Lawrence)

Work stoppages at bases in this country where missiles and space vehicles are being built by the U.S. Government are so serious that the only remedy may be the passage of a law by Congress outlawing strikes in this field.

There is a big mystery over what's been happening. There is no evidence of Communist infiltration, but the net result of the work stoppages has nevertheless been to delay the American missile program. Senator MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, who has been in charge of hearings by a Senate subcommittee on the subject of delays in the construction of missiles told the Senate recently:

"Had these work stoppages during the years 1956 through 1961 not occurred, it is reasonably certain that we would have been able to have a manned orbital flight much earlier than we did. * * *

"No man can say with certainty what the time losses have cost us or may yet cost us."

The Arkansas Senator noted a rise during the months of January and February of this year "not only in man-days lost but in the types of disputes including jurisdictional disputes."

A national commission had been appointed by the Federal Government, labor leaders had publicly taken a nonstrike pledge, but the work stoppages at the bases persisted. Only this week they had become so serious that a special meeting was called at the Pentagon, at which were assembled labor leaders, contractors and public representatives. Secretary of Defense McNamara, and Secretary of Labor Goldberg spoke to the group, and Vice President Johnson, chairman of the Space Council, also attended.

But meetings and pleas have been tried before to no avail. There has been much talk of the "public interest," but it falls on deaf ears. It could be that the labor leaders themselves are not quite sure what causes all the friction in the ranks. Jurisdictional disputes sometimes furnish a convenient way of hiding the real malcontents. Trouble is easily stirred up that way.

More than a year ago the Senate subcommittee began its investigation. On April 25, 1961, the Secretary of Labor established a missile site public contracts advisory committee to recommend "fair and impartial standards" to the Department of Labor. On August 25, 1961, such work standards were submitted to Secretary Goldberg, and the report was released to the public on October 14, 1961. The Senate subcommittee inquired and was told on December 15, 1961, that the standards recommended "are still under study, and as yet no action has been taken by the Secretary of Labor."

The findings and conclusions of the McClellan committee were made available to the public within the last 3 weeks. They say in part:

"Approximately one-half of the man-days lost occurred at the test center at Cape Canaveral, Fla., where intercontinental ballistic missiles and space rockets were tested and proven before becoming operational.

"The space and missile programs, upon which our survival depends in the mortal struggle with communism, were intolerably delayed by wildcat strikes, work stoppages, slowdowns, and a deliberate policy of low productivity, callously indulged in during the 4½-year period by local union officials and local union members, who placed profit and greed ahead of their devotion to the safety of our country.

"These hearings have disclosed that many of these workers, through strikes and other pressure tactics, have collected millions of dollars in exorbitant, unnecessary overtime pay in a brazen gouge of the U.S. taxpayer.

"Testimony shows that many of the strikes and slowdowns had a common purpose—to stretch out the jobs and to put pressure on the contractor and the Government to pay overtime in order to meet the construction deadlines. Instances of overtime pay reached the outrageous levels of journeymen electricians collecting $748 a week; truck drivers, $324 a week; and ditchdiggers $287 a week.

"Slowdowns and low rates of productivity, estimated by witnesses to be as low as 40 percent of normal capacity, have prevailed at missile construction sites."

So there was no lack of money—and the management side got high profits, too. What more effective way, therefore, to delay, if not frustrate, America's progress in space than by slowdowns, strikes, and jurisdictional disputes?

Maybe congressional committees will some day uncover the real answer. It is still a mystery not merely to public officials but also to those loyal labor leaders who have been trying to prevent work stoppages, only to be plagued with unauthorized interruptions called "wildcat strikes."

Former Maryland Governor Advocates Federal Aid to the Aged for Medical Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to know that not everyone puts partisan politics above human needs, and opposes a measure because he happens to be of one party and the proposal is made by the member of another party. Human needs know no party line, but only that prompt action must be taken to alleviate them.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the Appendix an address made by the former Republican Governor of Maryland, Theodore R. McKeldin, at an all university religious service in the Andrew Rankin Memorial Chapel at Howard University last Sunday:

I am informed that here at Howard University you have just completed a rather intensive study of our social and political policy, so perhaps some of you would rather have me speak on art, or literature, or music, or anything else, rather than go back to the subject of the recent conferences.

On the other hand, now that your attention has been directed to this subject by some very able speakers, it may be a good moment to bring up another aspect of it, especially as this aspect is hot news in Washington today by reason of the fight in Congress over it.

I refer, of course, to the policy of Federal assistance to the aged in meeting their medical bills.

President Kennedy is not of my political party, and I hold no brief for him; but I go along with such Republicans as Governor Rockefeller and Senator JAVITS in holding that in this particular instance he is right, or more nearly right than his opponents. After all, it is not a partisan issue. In fact, it is not a question of policy at all, for we are already committed to the policy of assisting the aged. The dispute is over how the assistance shall be handled, and I can't see how a question of that sort affects the basic tenets of either of the major parties. We are not deciding what to do, but merely how to do it; and on a matter of bookkeeping I am willing to admit that a smart accountant may be right, even though a Democrat.

Years ago, we found that there were two facts that we have to face. One is that under the American standard of living, people live longer than they used to live. This means that the total number of people over 65 has been increasing rapidly. The other fact is that even under the American standard, old people cannot do as much work, and are subject to more aches and pains than people in the prime of life. That

means that as a man's income goes down, his doctors' bills go up.

When your expenses go up as your income goes down, you are headed for trouble, I don't care who you are. Millions of our older people are in trouble, serious trouble, already, and more are getting into trouble every day. Nor is the trouble confined to the old. Any decent man whose parents are too old and feeble to do a full day's work feels obliged to help them out. If it were simply a matter of keeping them fed and clothed it would not be such a serious problem, for in modern America one strong, skilled worker can support a pretty large family.

But it is a different proposition when illness strikes. Hospitals and surgeons and medicines and nurses and appliances—wheelchairs, and crutches, and all the other things needed for treatment—are not cheap, and there is no way of making them cheap. When all that falls on a man who is trying to help out the old folks, it is often too much for him. He is in trouble, for he has to do one of two things, neither of which a decent man likes to do—he must let the old people suffer, which makes him feel like a dog—or he must see his wife and children suffer, which also makes him feel like a dog.

Now, I am eternally opposed to pushing any honest American into a situation in which he will feel guilty, not matter what he does. I am in sympathy with the old people; but I am even more in sympathy with their children when they are being broken down by the burden of paying the old people's medical bills. If there is any way in which our Government can relieve them, they ought to be relieved.

We admit that, and we have taken steps for their relief, but we have taken them in such a way that it is hard for self-respecting people to obtain relief. Under the Kerr-Mills law, it is possible for old people to obtain medical aid from the Government. They must pass what is called the means test which is a form of pauper oath. You must swear that you have nothing, can earn very little, and have no relatives capable of taking care of you.

In the old days, before we had given much real thought to the problem, it was still possible for old people to escape starvation. They could go to the poorhouse. But the poorhouse was eventually abolished largely because there were so many who would rather die and literally did die before they would endure the shame of going there. Today there are many who feel that the means test is a reflection on them and, if they have children, on their children; and they will suffer for years rather than take it.

What would you think of a man who is willing to give a dollar to a crippled beggar, but not unless the beggar will first go down on his knees and kiss the man's boots? Do you call that charity? Of course you don't. You call it taking advantage of misery in a hateful way. Do you think the recording angel in Heaven gives that man credit for his dollar? I don't—well, maybe so; but if the angel credits him with the dollar, at the same time he charges him with 10 for humiliating the beggar.

I feel that the means test takes all merit out of the help we give our old people, and I favor the administration bill because it abolishes the means test. It goes further than that. It abolishes the giveaway element in the whole scheme except as it may apply to those who are already old and in need. They will not live very much longer and after that it will not be a giveaway, it will be a form of insurance.

What the Government proposes is to add one-quarter of 1 percent to the social security tax a worker already pays, and the same amount to the tax the employer pays, making one-half of 1 percent, the money to be used for medical assistance to the aged, to an old millionaire as well as to an old pauper. When the present generation, now in the prime of life, comes to be old, they can draw on that fund, not as charity, but by right, just as a man who has carried accident insurance for years draws his money by right if he gets hurt. If he never gets hurt, he never collects; but he has had the protection all the time, and that is worth the price.

Opponents the the bill say, "Oh, yes, but a man buys insurance because he wants to, and he pays taxes because he has too." It is all wrong to compel people to pay taxes for anything except strictly public expense. I don't deny that it would be better, in theory, if every man, while he is strong and healthy and making good money would lay by enough to keep him when he is old. But you know, and I know, that it isn't going to happen. Even among those who try it, "a thousand things can defeat their efforts. Often they make bad investments. Sometimes they are robbed, and frequently they are swindled. It is surprising and alarming to learn how many men, regarded as well off at 40, have nothing left at 65.

We can't run this country on beautiful theories. We have to face the brutal fact, and the fact is that a great many people have to be made to do the thing that is in their own best interest. We already have 16 million old people on our hands, and the number will be 20 millions quite soon. They are here now, and we have to deal with them now. I favor putting the thing on a sound basis just as soon as possible; for at best, a great many will die in misery before we can get it set up and working.

The American Medical Association is fighting the bill bitterly, but not all doctors. Its argument is that no doctor wants a Government official coming around and telling him how to treat his patient. Of course he doesn't; but the bill doesn't say one word about how a doctor shall treat his patient, nor about which doctor a man must call in. The AMA admits this, but says, "Just wait a few years and you will see bureaucrats dictating to doctors."

There are many doctors, however, some themselves members of the AMA, who cannot support a policy of denying aid to people who need it now out of fear of something that may happen 20 years hence. I believe they are right. The bill as it stands does not give the Government authority to interfere with the private practice of medicine. If it is ever to gain that authority, it must have new laws. If the people who will be runing this country 20 years hence can't prevent such laws, that's their lookout. We cannot neglect our duty because we are afraid the next generation will neglect theirs.

Theodore Roosevelt once drove half the country to the dictionary by calling Woodrow Wilson "a Byzantine logothete." Very few people knew what a logothete was, and I am not sure Roosevelt himself did, because the term did not apply very well to Wilson. The logothetes were originally Government bookkeepers and later the word was used to indicate almost any Government officer, much the same as our word "bureaucrat" does now. But historians of the West developed the idea that in Byzantium the logothetes were fellows who relied entirely on words and not on deeds. Since Byzantium stood for 1100 years after Rome fell, that seems unlikely, but it was the prevailing idea.

I sometimes wonder if Theodore Roosevelt could rise from the grave and examine the country over which he presided 60 years ago, whether he would not denounce all of us with that resounding phrase. I am sure that we are much too inclined to take the word for the deed, as the logothetes were accused of doing.

Socialism and communism, for instance, are in my opinion pernicious political doctrines. But it is the things that are dangerous, not the words. If any suggested policy is just and sensible, you can't make it wrong and foolish by calling it socialistic or communistic. For my part, I believe that the policy of providing medical care for the aged through old-age and survivors insurance is just and sensible; and I am not to be frightened out of that belief by allegations that it opens the door to socialism. It isn't socialism in itself; it is a form of insurance; and I don't believe that insurance is a bad thing, or can be made bad by calling it something else.

So I urge you, especially you students who are preparing yourselves for active life in the world, to make up your minds—in this as in other matters, by examining things, and not their names, never letting theory take priority over fact. For we have the highest authority for it that it is the truth, and only the truth, that shall make you free.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ASIAN PEOPLES' ANTI-COMMUNIST LEAGUE,
REPUBLIC OF CHINA,
Taipei, Taiwan, China, March 20, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: We are very pleased to learn from Prof. Lev. E. Dobriansky that

you have thoughtfully introduced to your Congress a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations. I should like to take opportunity of this letter to pay, on behalf of 597 constituent member-units of this organization, our high respect for your enthusiastic effort to give support toward the Communist-enslaved people in their struggle for freedom.

Considering that there have been numerous cases in which uprisings against communism took place successively behind the Iron Curtain and thousands upon thousands of people risked their life to flee for freedom, we can fully understand that millions of people now under Communist enslavement and persecution are desperately waging a life and death struggle against the Communists. Your House Resolution 211 for a Special Committee on Captive Nations not only will give a new hope to the captive people behind the Iron Curtain, but also will serve as a great encouragement to those people who are under the threat of Communist aggression at this moment and who are exerting their utmost to safeguard the cause of freedom.

I sincerely hope that the resolution which will be of benefit to the entire world, will be successfully passed at the U.S. Congress with your continuous effort.

With every good wish,

Sincerely,

KU CHENG-KANG,
President, APACLROC.

ORGANIZATION FOR DEFENSE
OF FOUR FREEDOMS
OF UKRAINE, INC.,
Detroit, Mich., March 23, 1962.

Re resolution for a permanent subcommittee of the House for the captive nations.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Despite the fact that this resolution was not passed by the last Congress, we strongly feel that it is in the best interest of this Nation that we show these captive peoples that we as a nation are ready to again assume the moral leadership of the world. We feel that this action is the best and real answer to the Soviet propaganda concerning colonialism. The benefit of creating such a subcommittee would be to begin the trend and have the effect of maintaining the support of these captive peoples and would be a decisive factor in the struggle of the free world against Communism.

We most strongly urge you to support the resolution for the creation of such subcommittee in the opening session of Congress.

Respectfully yours,

PHILIP SOTNYK,
Secretary.

MARCH 22, 1962.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I would like to inform you that our Ukrainian Youth League of New Jersey is unanimously in favor of House Resolution 211 (Flood resolution), which deals with the establishment of a permanent governmental Captive Nations Committee which would include all the many non-Russian nations within the U.S.S.R.

We submit that the ideas such as favored by Secretary of State Dean Rusk in his letters to your committee last summer are totally incongruous and unrealistic on the true situation behind the Iron Curtain today.

A more realistic approach to this ticklish problem would be the establishment of this much-needed Committee on Captive Nations to show Mr. Khrushchev, the "Hangman of Ukraine," and his ilk in the Kremlin that we, the liberty-loving American people are strongly in favor of ridding this world of colonialism and imperialism, which definately means Russia, the most despotic nation in all history.

Thus we urge you and your House Rules Committee to consider House Resolution 211 (Flood resolution) on the captive nations.

Thank you.

Yours truly,

ANDREW SEMEN,
President, Ukrainian Youth League of New Jersey.

UNITED UKRAINIAN
AMERICAN RELIEF COMMITTEE,
Philadelphia, Pa., March 25, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
The New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: In behalf of the Executive Committee of the United Ukrainian American Relief Committee I strongly support the House Resolution 211 calling for the establishment of a permanent Committee on the Captive Nations in

For more than 15 years UUARC has been studying the problems of refugees from behind the Iron Curtain. The nationalities policy in the Soviet Union is of a great importance. Enslaved by the Soviet regime nations are willing to escape tyranny and despotism. In their struggle for freedom they should be assisted by the free world.

Our executive committee has expressed also its criticism of the view of our Secretary of State Mr. Dean Rusk who is against such committee.

I appeal to you, dear Congressman FLOOD, to consider favorably this resolution.

Thank you.

WALTER GALLAN,
President
(For the Executive Committee).

FORGOTTEN FOREST,
Eatonville, Wash., March 21, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: In perusing a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the date March 7, I found the material which you presented introducing H.R. 211 and would like to ask you further about it.

I would first like to explain my particular interest in this. I am a student in the field of propaganda and psychological warfare, and at this particular time I am trying to coordinate a certain "psywar" offensive, utilizing various patriotic groups here in the Pacific Northwest, and using this small area of the United States as a test ground or laboratory for our effort.

We feel that for too long the American scene has been the battleground for Soviet "psywar" pressures, to which our public has simply reacted in the Pavlonian manner (and most of the time, I might add, without even realizing that they were under assault of this nature). We would like to experiment with a counterpressure of our own, and we feel that the point around which it should be built is the one which is generally considered by the experts to be the most vulnerable and sensitive spot on the Soviet side—that is, the free elections and self-determination of the slave states and of the Russian people themselves.

In discovering your material concerning H.R. 211, therefore, I was very pleased to see that legislation being introduced at this time can be tied into our campaign, or perhaps I should say that our campaign can be timed to coincide with this. I would appreciate all the literature your office could send me, and also any references to other material in former CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS which might concern this matter of the Soviet colonial empire.

Another thing which I would like to ask you about is the matter of the Captive Nations Week. What dates are selected for this? We would like to coordinate some of our publicity and efforts around these dates.

I would like to know if the Committee on the Captive Nations is suggested as a permanent committee or if it is just to be a temporary thing with some particular job to do. I shall urge my Washington district Congressman, Mr. THOR TOLLEFSON, to support this measure, and I hope you will keep me posted on any important developments.

I might add, sir, that your State, Pennsylvania, will always be a dear memory for me. I went to college in Bucks County and just loved the country around there.

Most sincerely,

Mrs. BETTY ANN DOBIASH.

Army Reorganization, Its Effect on Chemical, Biological, and Radiological Research, Procurement, and Posture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest rewards of congressional service is the close friendship and appreciation for colleagues with whom we associate in our work. The gentleman from Florida, BOB SIKES, is one whom we all love and respect for his leadership for the welfare of our country. He has particularly served his country well in his knowledge and understanding of defense problems and their solution. Our country is safer today because of the wisdom and leadership that BOB SIKES has given us in the field of defense. It is therefore with pleasure that I insert in the RECORD the following address by Congressman SIKES, which he made at the Armed Forces Chemical Association dinner, March 6, 1962, and which is found in volume XVI of the Armed Forces Chemical Journal:

SIKES SEES CHALLENGE IN ARMY REORGANIZATION

(Address of Congressman ROBERT L. F. SIKES, at Armed Forces Chemical Association dinner, New York City)

The subject originally given to me tonight is the Army reorganization; its effect upon our chemical, biological and radiological research, procurement, and posture. Now, that is quite a lulu of a subject. It should effectively scare away all but the most dedicated. However, it appears that this is a subject which should be discussed because this group has a very keen interest in the Army reorganization. This is particularly true because reorganization is to be an actuality. The date for rejection by the Congress already has passed. Therefore, good or bad, the reorganization is upon us.

I took the position that there is considerable question about the advisability of such a reorganization. It involves a transfer of 3,500 Army staff officers from their present status to a new status within an 18 months period. The cost is estimated at $11 million with no certainty of savings at some time in the future. With continuing crisis in Berlin and in southeast Asia and heavens knows where else in that 18 months period, this seems to me a poor time to engender

additional confusion by reorganization. I suspect this is not even the Army's baby, since it was developed by budget officers within the Department of Defense rather than in the Department of the Army. However, the Army, when questioned on this, has been quick to place the blessings of legitimacy upon this offspring by insisting it is indeed an Army product. Now let me talk more specifically about the Chemical Corps and reorganization.

At the present time, the chief chemical officer provides for the decisionmaking level of the Department of the Army the only focal point for direction of the Department of Defense effort toward achieving capabilities in the fields of chemical, biological, and radiological (CBR) warfare. The chief chemical officer holds a statutory position established in the National Defense Act of 1920 in recognition by Congress of the requirement for a specific element of the Department of the Army responsible for research and development, manufacture, procurement, and supply to the armed services of chemical warfare material, the organization, equipment, training and operation of chemical troops and such other duties as the President might from time to time prescribe.

Thus, despite the organizational layers above the chief chemical officer in the current organizational structure of the Department of the Army, there does exist now a focal point at the national level for stressing the need for adequate considerations of these weapons systems and defense against them. In addition, he exercises command supervision, centralized direction, and control of a completely integrated CBR organizational structure in the field.

The reorganization as proposed would have eliminated the chief chemical officer and, to me, fractionate the mission and programs of the Chemical Corps. The research, development, and production functions are relegated to the Munitions Command; the field testing and evaluation function is placed within a separate test and evaluation agency; supply and maintenance of these highly specialized munitions and equipment are absorbed in the Supply and Maintenance Command; the responsibility for developing new doctrine, preparing and revising field manuals and tables of organization and equipment prescribing requirements for new material and conducting war games, is transferred to the Combat Developments Command; the training functions, which include specialized Chemical Corps schools, are made a responsibility of the Continental Army Command; and the career development and management of technical specialists, both officer and enlisted, pass to a consolidated officer of personnel operations. Under this plan, there would have been no provision for monitoring from an overall point of view the CBR mission, functions, and responsibilities.

I fully believe that to follow such a plan for the reorganization of the Chemical Corps could result in its destruction as an effective branch of the service just at the time when its importance is becoming much more widely and fully recognized.

The U.S. Army today is the only military organization of the free world which has a retaliatory CBR capability, limited as it is. The CBR posture of the Department of the Navy and the Air Force is completely inadequate. This situation exists both in our own forces and that of allied nations, and is the direct result of their lack of organizational emphasis on CBR weapons systems and defenses. This is not true behind the iron curtain. There the need for adequate organizational emphasis on CBR matters has been recognized by the Soviet Union, and they do have a significant CBR capability. It is not better than ours, but it is bigger and the Russians have been taught more about defense in CBR.

The Chemical Corps is an organization which requires specialization as much as any other service. To bury this agency under many layers of officialdom could in my opinion spell its death knell. This would be a most serious thing to contemplate if in the future there should be a chemical or biological attack on this country or upon our allies.

Now, quite obviously, those of us who recognize the importance of the Chemical Corps have not been idle. Realizing quite early that such key people as Senator RUSSELL and Congressman VINSON, who head the Armed Services Committees in the Senate and in the House respectively, were not disposed to fight the reorganization as a whole, we saw the necessity for developing alternative proposals insofar as the Chemical Corps is concerned. Almost as soon as the proposed reorganization became known to the public, I personally drafted communications to the Secretary of Defense, Secretary of the Army and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, and the Chief of Staff of the Army—among others. Possible alternatives were suggested in which the Chemical Corps would be better served and so would the nations. These suggestions were not original with me, and certainly mine were not the only representations made.

I think you will be interested in quotations from the responses which I have received. On February 7, the Secretary of Defense wrote me as follows:

"The matter of the CBR capability of the Department of Defense has been of particular concern to me over the past year. As you know, we have taken steps recently to strengthen this capability. In the fiscal year 1963 budget we have raised research and development to $146 million, from its fiscal year 1962 level of $78 million. We have also added a new Deputy Director (Chemistry and Engineering) of Defense Research and Engineering who will have major responsibilities in this area.

"In our increased emphasis on CBR, we are, of course, building on the well-recognized past achievements of the Chemical Corps. (By this term I mean not only the Chemical Corps as a branch of the Army which the new organization will retain, but the technical service establishment of the Chief Chemical Officer, which will have its functions redistributed.)

"However, I must say that, while in my judgment the Chemical Corps has itself accomplished a great deal in the past, the offensive and defensive CBR capabilities of our Army forces as a whole, as reflected in their actual organization, doctrine, and materiel, seem to be to leave much to be desired. I feel that the CBR know-how and interest which have been maintained in the Chemical Corps have not been adequately infused into the Army itself.

"I attribute this condition primarily to the fact that in the existing Army organization the combat arms of the Army are structurally separated from the technical services, particularly in the critical fields of combat developments, research and development, and training. The object of the new organization is to couple CBR expertise much more closely into the actual process of organizing, training, and equipping Army forces.

"For example, I consider it an organizational improvement that the new Combat Developments Command will take over the present combat development functions of the Chemical Corps. This will assist in providing a more effective CBR input into Army doctrine and organization. Similarly, the fact that the Continental Army Command will take over the present Chemical Corps training function should materially assist in increasing the effectiveness of the CBR training of all our officers, enlisted men, and units—not simply those of the Chemical Corps.

"We are particularly eager to integrate more closely CBR with other Army materiel development. Placing present Chemical Corps and Ordnance Corps materiel functions in one command will certainly facilitate the development and production of those advanced weapons which call for the closest integration of chemical and ordnance technologies.

"Like you, we recognize that the CBR capability of the Army is a national, indeed a free world, asset. We have been concerned from the outset of the studies on Army organization that the CBR asset which has been painstakingly built up within the Army not be adversely affected by this reorganization. However, I think the Army has taken steps to insure that the integrity of this asset will be preserved. The Chemical Corps remains as a branch of the Army, with its officer personnel management separately identified within the Office of Personnel Operations, and its special schooling and training preserved. The Chemical Corps materiel establishment will remain intact as the CBR Agency of the Munitions Command, within the Materiel Development and Logistic Command. As you recommend, there will be established a general officer position, Director of CBR, within the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Military Operations. The Army believes that this General Staff position will be more effective than the present position of the Chief Chemical Officer, in assisting the Army in taking fully into account CBR capabilities in all areas of activity.

"In summary, let me say that we agree with you that the invaluable CBR asset which the Army now possesses must be preserved; we believe we not only will maintain but will improve the Army's CBR capability; and we believe also that the capability will be more a part of the Army and the Department of Defense, in reality, than it is today."

The Secretary of the Army responded in a similar vein. In part he said:

"The advisability of the reorganization was carefully considered by the study group that made the initial recommendation and subsequently reviewed by the Chief of Staff, other key staff personnel and myself. I fully recognize the vital nature of the chemical, biological, and radiological (CBR) missions of the Army in support of the Department of Defense and the free world. This recognition is borne out by the decision to establish a focal point within the General Staff for CBR planning and related activities. A separate identifiable element is to be established under the Deputy Chief of Staff for Military Operations to insure continued emphasis in these matters. The upgrading of this function from Special Staff status to the General Staff level clearly demonstrates the Army's recognition of the importance of CBR.

"Under the new Army organization, the horizons of officers assigned to the Chemical Corps will be considerably broadened by their utilization in the U.S. Army Materiel Development and Logistic Command, the U.S. Continental Army Command, the U.S. Army Combat Development Command, the Army General Staff, and the Office of Personnel Operations in the Army Special Staff.

"But, most importantly, we intend to see to it that the Army's key role in the CBR field is both protected and expanded. The Assistant Secretary of the Army for Research and Development will take a continuing and intense interest in this field as will the Office, Chief of Research and Development. The Chief of Staff and I will follow it closely. He and I have had a number of conversations on this subject recently, and we are

considering additional possibilities for insuring that the CBR field is exploited to a much greater degree and that the fine talent in the Chemical Corps is utilized to the optimum."

Then, more recently there is word that the Defense Department is considering a plan to establish an Armed Forces Special Weapons Agency to direct CBR warfare. It would parallel the Defense Support Agency and the Defense Intelligence Agency. It is the brain child of General Stubbs who sees it as a single integrated organizational element responsible for all aspects for CBR preparedness for the entire Department of Defense. This plan failed to receive the blessings of the Department of the Army, but it has been picked up by Dr. Harold Brown, Director of Research and Engineering in the Department of Defense, and under his aegis the plan is receiving careful scrutiny at top levels.

NEW LEVEL

So the Chemical Corps is not to be put out of business under the reorganization. Its new level of operations may not be as satisfactory or as successful as the present one. But, a door is opened, an opportunity is presented and if the challenge is accepted, the mission of the Chemical Corps may well have greater importance in the overall scheme of things.

Now, what is the reason for an Army reorganization? To give the Devil his due, there must, of course, be justification. This is not just an idle shift of men and billets. It is patterned somewhat after the Air Force and Navy reorganization of some years back and somewhat after the German General Staff plan. In the words of Secretary Stahr in response to a question from me in congressional hearing:

"The principal purpose is to give us better management, to eliminate or minimize duplications of effort, fragmentations of authority, responsibility and operations, to give us an organization that is more responsive to the needs of the combat troops, to give us a clearer fix of responsibility in a number of major tasks which are now somewhat fragmented.

"One of the basic elements of the concept is to reduce to the minimum the number of operating tasks that have somehow grown up in the General Staff so that they can give more attention to basic planning, programing, policymaking and supervision of the overall Army effort. This means some of the actual operating things which have been done in the Headquarters Department of the Army will be moved to these field commands, which to my mind is a sound organizational concept."

One of the principal reasons given to me for the reorganization is that this will help to put an end to the inexcusable system whereby we require 8 to 10 years to perfect weapons or equipment through design to manufacture and delivery to troops while the Soviets do it in 4 or 5; that it will do this through direct line of responsibility from concept to actuality.

In a word, we have reorganization of the Army and of the Chemical Corps. But we also have assurance from top to bottom that the Chemical Corps is not to be downgraded, buried and forgotten. Even so, this could happen if Chemical Corps personnel allow it to happen. It is up to those of us who recognize the importance of the Chemical Corps to carry our message to Garcia. We are being pushed—not very willingly—out of the shell of our own particular little world. Then let us accept this new opportunity to enrich the broader world of the military services with the leavening of the Chemical Corps.

The story of the Chemical Corps and of CBR is not a familiar one to most people. From World War I until very recent years it has been almost a subject forgotten except in the minds and in the hands of a few dedicated people. In some quarters it became a bad word and there is reason to believe a considerable part of this is due to the skilled work of Communist propagandists who want this Nation weak in defense against chemical and biological warfare. Now the pendulum is swinging the other way. We can keep it swinging. This is the time to fight for the mission of the Chemical Corps.

PROPER DEFENSE

The people of the United States are mentally conditioned to accept 37,000 deaths and many more thousands of injuries from automobile accidents in a single year. The public accepts the fact that millions could be killed in the first exchange of nuclear weapons with accompanying untold destruction. Yet many under the skillful tutelage of dedicated leftwing publications shudder in horror at the thought of the use of chemical and biological weapons—do not even want to consider the necessity of attaining a proper defense against them. Those who saw the devastation and the death wrought in Germany and Japan by conventional weapons even before the day of atomic weapons should shudder instead at the possibility of the repetition of this kind of warfare. I recall, also, that it was largely the American taxpayer who rebuilt the world after the destruction of World War II and who rehabilitated the survivors of that war. The total cost in billions is staggering.

By contrast, chemical and biological warfare can leave a nation with all its resources intact and undamaged. It can leave a nation with its people comparatively unharmed and alive but temporarily incapacitated for fighting. Talk about your humanitarian aspects, what greater contrast can we offer. A bare handful of planes can seed this city with biological agents sufficient to infect the total populace, and so can a half-dozen enemy submarines off our coast or a few dozen enemy agents quietly driving around the city with disease micro-organisms being fed into the atmosphere through the exhaust fumes of their vehicles.

PROGRAMS

CBR has its lethal aspects as well. War is not a humane business. But, by way of emphasizing the human characteristics that I have mentioned, let me tell briefly of two or three particularly significant programs of many which now are under study. Let's talk first about incapacitating agents. These are compounds which have physical or mental incapacitating effects which are of short duration. These agents are not new. Riot-control agents, such as tear gas, also incapacitate. We've used these for years. Chemical compounds which produce incapacitation may be subdivided into two broad classes, those which produce temporary mental incapacitation, in effect, controlling a person's will to resist; and those which produce physical incapacitation such as severe discomfort, amnesia, paralysis, or immobilization for a significant period of time. We have an odorless, colorless compound which can be injected into the atmosphere and breathed, or taken into a person's body through food and water, to so impair a man's ability that for hours or days he could not land a jet, or fire a weapon, or operate a communications system, or give intelligent commands. Men so affected do not win battles.

Work also of great significance is being done by the Chemical Corps Biological Laboratories in the field of molecular genetics. In a brilliant contribution we are told that hereditary information is written into highly polymerized molecules of nucleic acid which are contained in the nucleus of a cell; we know the complete alphabet of letters of the hereditary language; we know how the cell "reads" and obeys, to the letter, the set of hereditary instructions; and we know that the same language is used for all kinds of living things. Insofar as human destiny is concerned, the importance of these scientific findings is without parallel.

This means that scientists now foresee a means to control micro-organisms causing diseases by breeding into the micro-organisms exactly the characteristics that are desired. A strain of a normally virulent disease can be developed which is so mild that it can be used as a virus against the disease. Or a new strain of a disease can be developed which will be immune to known vaccines. Possibly over the long pull some diseases can be bred out of existence. Bacteria can be made more or less resistant to antibiotics. All of this has tremendous significance to the medical profession. Of course, you have long known that the work of the Chemical Corps is not altogether related to the field of warfare. Great contributions have been made through the years to medicine and to public health by the Chemical Corps.

We know how to destroy the food supply of the Communist world—and they know how to destroy ours—but their food supply is highly susceptible because of limitations in supply and variety which we do not have.

Now when you hear a mounting crescendo of horror at this thought—remind your audience that a hungry man can help to overthrow his oppressors, gain food, and a new future of freedom. But a man burned to death with napalm or blown to bits with nuclear weapons has no future.

We live in an exciting age. The spectacular achievements of Colonel Glenn and his associates have given America new pride and new buoyancy. People are looking ahead. We have learned to expect the spectacular, but we have to remember to keep one foot on the ground. Today's great accomplishments are possible because of the values that were established in the long ago. The solid values which make America thrive and endure were founded in the Constitution and engrained in the thinking of our people during the formative years of the Republic. The faith of our fathers and the courage of our fathers gave us this land. But now it is our land and what we do with this land will determine its tomorrow, or whether there will be a tomorrow for America. So, I want to talk for a little while about our country and about the responsibilities that each of us has to it.

RESPONSIBILITIES

In this there is no greater responsibility than that of maintaining the institution of representative government in a nation where citizenship is a high privilege and a serious responsibility. In all the big complex structure which makes up the U.S. Government, the Congress is the only part which is close to the people and is in fact the voice of the people. But whatever the branch of Government—and for effective operation of a democracy the three great branches of government must be separate and coequal—government in a democracy is no stronger or no weaker than the public which it represents. Americans can have whatever government they want if they are willing to work for it and only if they are willing to work for it.

Now, what is it we must be willing to work for? I have indicated that I want this Nation to be strong militarily and that means a strong defense regardless of most. There are no second-place winners in war. We must have a balanced defense with strength in all categories. We have been too long like a man with one hand tied behind him. Now, with a buildup in conventional war capabilities, we are better prepared to fight with both fists. Mr. Khrushchev knows these things as well as we. For this reason primarily, he has been easier to talk to in recent months.

STRONG DEFENSE

Granted that we will have a strong defense, I am not disturbed by any threat which may arise from abroad if also we make certain that we are strong as a people and strong as a government. There must be recognition by the majority of people of an essential requirement for soundness in government, for a government which sees beyond minority or selfish demands, for a government that can say no when the good of the Nation requires it. There must be certainty that those who produce goods or capital are encouraged to continue to do so; that the worker is a man who prides himself on his skill, a man who is willing to do a day's work for a day's pay, not a man who is a faceless number in a racket-controlled union; that the taxload which must be borne be borne fairly by all for without this we cannot protect this Nation's credit and insure its necessary operations and its defenses. In no other way than these can we retain the self-determination and free enterprise which gives people a choice of government and a good government.

Is there nothing else? Are these all the things that are required? No. The stool has yet another leg. Sometimes, I think it has been the weakest one. This is a requirement for diplomacy which can wield the strength of America for the definite purpose of thwarting and circumventing communism; a diplomacy which can be as effective as we know America's military forces can be effective. This we have not had in recent years. We are still in the process of growing up to the fearsome responsibility of being the leader of the free world's diplomatic forces. We haven't quite learned that when you deal with communism, you are in a fight to the death; that we can't afford to be good to people who really intend our destruction. We simply haven't had a strong enough foreign policy. We fought over Korea—settled for a stalemate and half the country. We watched our allies give away half of Vietnam. The Reds overran half of Laos and now negotiate for the remainder. Cuba went down the drain even though the Communists had to leapfrog 5,000 miles of Western strength—even though we have a strong military base on the island itself. With a record like this, why shouldn't Khrushchev have expected concessions on Berlin?

There had to be a change. In the past year there has been change. It has not been a major change, but change is perceptible.

We have not yielded on Berlin. We are gradually uniting the hemisphere against Castro in Cuba. The Communists have not got the Congo. The Communists have not got Laos. The situation there is dangerous, but better than it was a year ago. There is split between China and Soviet Russia. It may grow and China is in trouble, bad trouble. And, we are growing in strength and in prosperity.

WHY WEAKER?

All of this is but a beginning. There must be new spirit, new determination all along the line in our diplomatic forces. There has been too much business as usual, too much of trying to get along with everybody, hurt no feelings, wound no sensibilities. That is not leadership. Leadership also means kicking the lethargy out of the lethargic; insistence upon quid pro quo from those who are recipients of American aid. If we need to resume nuclear testing in the atmosphere in order not to be surpassed in nuclear weapons capability, then whose business is it but ours? Certainly, we know the Russians have no intentions of talking seriously about disarmament. We have tried time and again to get an agreement. So, why weaken ourselves by waiting and hoping. Leadership means insistence upon a more effective role for the U.N.; a more realistic attitude toward those friends who really stand by us: less generosity with American dollars for the neutrals who work both sides of the street.

This is what America wants. We are not frightened people. We are the descendants of brave men and women who founded a nation and forged its beliefs in blood and steel. American character has not changed. The spirit and the courage and the heritage are here, and with belief in the Eternal God, our people will weather the tests of the future just as we did those of the past. I saw Admiral Burke stand with tears in his eyes as the President pinned one of our highest decorations on him and heard him say: "It is a wonderful thing to live in a country which will give to a simple farm boy the opportunity I have had." This country gives that opportunity to all of its sons and daughters. That is the difference which makes this country worth fighting for. The struggle for freedom is a never-ending struggle. Each generation must earn its own right to freedom. We are an essential part of our generation's fight for freedom.

GOALS

Yes, there is work to be done; work to be done by each of us. And, if the outlook sometimes is confused and the goals on the far horizons hard to define, I like to think of words given to us by Allen Drury who wrote "Advise and Consent."

"In terms of a standard now desperately embattled in the world, one kind of greatness in a nation can be assessed by the answer to the simple question: Are its people free? Freedom, of course, is not an easy thing; it is the most difficult of all forms of government.

"In that testing, the great Republic of the West still stands supreme, battered though she is by the vicious and incessant onslaughts of her enemies and the occasional confusions and wearyings of will of her own citizens. Her freedom is not perfect—but it is a long sight better than that of most of her contemporaries. Her liberties are not everywhere as thorough and complete as they should be—but compared to the grimly laughable mockeries of liberties that go on in Russia and elsewhere, they shine like a tenfold beacon in the night. Her errors are those of the goodhearted; her ineptitudes those of a contender who cannot yet quite conceive of the utter corruptions of the utter evil arrayed against her. She is awkward at times, blundering at times, shortsighted at times, at times hesitant and uncertain and almost willfully stupid. She is, now and again, an object of ridicule to a carping world, and, upon occasion, an object of scorn.

"But she is free.

"Few other nations in this sick and shabby century can make that claim."

I think all that we have said about chemical and biological warfare can be summed up in a statement by Dr. Thomas M. Rivers: "It is a contemplation fraught with terror and with hope—the fear of vast and tragic consequencies if such knowledge is misused, the hope of a better, healthier world within our reach. It is not for the scientists to shrink from the truth for fear of what other men may do with it. Nothing worthwhile in this life has ever been produced through fear alone or by turning our eyes away from that in nature which has been revealed to us. If there is danger in truth, I believe our only safeguard lies in the further pursuit of more of it."

President's Efforts To Control News Media Threatens a Free Press and Is Dangerous to the Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, time was in America when the greatness of a President was measured in his deeds, in his performance as the Chief Executive of the Nation carrying out the proud traditions of a free people. Under President Kennedy the formula has been changed. With an eye on controlling future elections and in creating a public image guaranteed to win the popularity contest of public-opinion polls this administration is not going to wait for the verdict of history, nor even take the time to do those things in the interest of the people which will build a favorable record. Rather a new technique has been evolved—control the Nation's news media so that only the favorable stories concerning the President and his family are given to the public. Crush all press criticism by denying to those reporters courageous enough to point out inadequacies in the President's performance or question the wisdom of some of his actions, such as his failure in Cuba, Laos and at Geneva, the right to any new sources. This administration has been unashamed in putting pressure on publishers and working newsmen.

This technique will get results because any person threatened with losing the right to make a living in his chosen profession, and this is what would happen to a reporter cut off from his news sources, will think twice before encouraging the displeasure of the President and his publicity man. The story of the Kennedy image and how it is built is detailed in the following article from U.S. News & World Report:

THE KENNEDY IMAGE—HOW IT'S BUILT

(This Nation, under President Kennedy, is seeing something new in White House politics. News reporters who write things that irritate the President are likely to wind up on his carpet. Publishers are sometimes converted to the Kennedy viewpoint after an invitation to the White House. Kennedy agents constantly keep busy wooing Congressmen and State officials. What all this adds up to is a carefully calculated program of public relations that could give a few pointers to Madison Avenue. Object is to create the desired image of the President.)

If public-opinion polls are correct, John F. Kennedy at the end of 14-months is just as popular now as Dwight D. Eisenhower ever got to be as President.

President Kennedy won his election with barely 50 percent of the popular vote. The latest Gallup poll indicates that 79 percent of the people now feel that the new President is doing a good job. At this point in his first administration, Mr. Eisenhower held the approval of 68 percent of the people. His peak of popularity for his two terms in

office was 79 percent, reached in 1955 and again in 1957.

There are other polls that suggest the Kennedy popularity is rubbing off on Democrats in Congress. A Gallup poll published on March 20 indicated that 61 percent of the people favor a Democratic Congress.

At a similar point in Mr. Eisenhower's administration, there was no carryover of his popularity to Republicans in Congress. Only 48 percent of the people favored a Republican Congress. Control of Congress slipped away from Mr. Eisenhower in the autumn voting of 1954.

The Kennedy image, however, is pictured as having a strong appeal to the American people, and, on the same basis, to be giving a lift to Democrats in Congress in an election year.

Out of this situation, questions are rising about how the Kennedy image has been built and maintained.

How was Mr. Kennedy developed this popular image? He has ended no war. There is no boom in business. There still is much unemployment. A Democratic Congress seems not to be impressed by many Kennedy requests for passage of new laws.

The answer seems to lie in one phrase: public relations. Mr. Kennedy and all of those around him work intensively to create the image that the White House wants to build. Madison Avenue advertising experts could take a lesson from the White House.

TECHNIQUES IN ACTION

In practical terms, the techniques used by the Kennedy administration to get across its story in the desired form are found to include the following:

For working newsmen

The "carrot and stick" approach is used for reporters. The "carrot" is an invitation for a private talk with the President, the gift of an exclusive story, of favors of various kinds. The "carrot" is held out for those who write or broadcast in the way the White House staff likes. The "stick" is criticism, sometimes a caustic goingover by the President himself. And some members of the White House staff are frankly disinclined to cooperate with those who write critical stories.

For publishers

Many who edit and manage publications are invited to lunch with the President. For these, there are question-and-answer sessions with Mr. Kennedy. Some get dinner invitations. In this area, no distinction is made between those who have been critical of the President and those who have supported him. Up to now, 186 editors and publishers have been invited to special luncheons. More such sessions are planned. Out of these have come some interesting conversions to the President's point of view.

For state officials

Press secretaries to Governors of States have been given special attention. These officials are important sources of news in their States. They have been called to Washington and educated in Kennedy ideas and programs, with some attention being given to the practical effects these programs may have within the individual States.

For Members of Congress

The White House is generous with invitations to U.S. Senators and Representatives and their wives. No party lines are drawn. Both Republicans and Democrats are invited. There is reported to be a better understanding about the handling of patronage matters than in previous administrations. The President is much more accessible to members of Congress, by telephone and otherwise, than was President Eisenhower.

For congressional staffs

Meetings are being held to indoctrinate key personnel in the offices of Senators and Representatives in the operations of the Kennedy program. These are staff workers who are highly important in the workings of Congress. Briefings are given by Cabinet officers and other high officials. Democrats and Republicans both are invited.

ELSEWHERE

Few chances are overlooked to get across the story of the Kennedy administration. And television is an especial favorite. This is a medium through which the President can reach directly into the homes over the Nation, and he uses it deftly and carefully at every opportunity.

GOAL: 100-PERCENT SUPPORT?

A glimpse of how the system works is given by the experience of an important publication that supported President Kennedy in the 1960 election campaign and supports most of his actions and ideas as President.

A prominent member of the publication's staff said: "We support the President 90 percent of the time. Yet few weeks go by without a call from the White House to call attention to some point to which objection is made. Nothing less than 100-percent support seems to be appreciated."

A note of irritation is expressed by those who write for that publication.

CONVERTING PUBLISHERS

White House reporters have noted luncheon or dinner meetings the President has had with important writers. Then they watch the writings of those entertained. At times, the changes have been described as striking.

Any individual is honored and flattered to be invited to the White House—particularly to a private meeting with the President. This appeal extends even to group meetings.

How it works is illustrated by one of a group of 23 publishers who recently were invited to have lunch with the President. One publisher put it this way:

"I came to Washington quite critical of foreign aid. I had the feeling that the money was not getting to the people who need it and that we were not doing enough to insist that other well-to-do countries bear their share. I spoke to the President about this. He gave me some good answers. I must say that he convinced me we are doing right. I told him that I just wished that all 180 million Americans could have heard his answer."

This man was a Republican. So was another who said:

"Everything is handled in such an informal manner that you feel at ease. The President asked us for our opinions on a number of matters. He told us that he liked to have as much background as possible before making a decision. The President speaks so frankly about things that you get a feeling he trusts you and that he is taking you into his confidence."

Commented another: "I had a feeling before going to the White House that the President was pretty young. When you talk to him, though, you get a feeling that this is a mature man who knows what he is talking about."

Still another publisher said: "I was amazed. He did not dodge a single question."

This luncheon meeting, followed by questions and answers, lasted 2½ hours.

The President considers these press luncheons so successful that he plans to invite editors and publishers from all 50 States. He has entertained big-city editors and top officials in radio and television, but his main target is the large group of editors and publishers of smalltown dailies and weeklies.

A READER AND TALKER

Mr. Kennedy, in dealing with newsmen at the working level, can be smiling and friendly, cool, or very angry. The President talks much more freely with those who report his activities than did Mr. Eisenhower. But the President and his staff are intent upon getting across a "favorable image."

Reporters cannot remember when a President was so concerned with what was written or said about him. Mr. Kennedy digests a number of newspapers. He watches magazines closely. He follows television shows that stress news.

One White House reporter said: "I just wish he would not read so much."

Those newsmen who cover the White House also sometimes wish President Kennedy and his staff would not be so intense about what is written. One said: "You write what you think is a good story. It is as factual as you can make it and the impression on the whole is favorable to the President. But they will kick just the same."

There are times when reporters have been cut off from all news sources at the White House because of an item that did not win approval. Presidential aids have refused to see or talk with these reporters. This punishment sometimes goes on for weeks. Some reporters say the President does not know how far his aids go in trying to shape the stories that are written about him and his programs.

This comment was heard: "It seems that, if you want to be an insider, the best thing to do is to let Ted Sorensen write your stories for you." Theodore C. Sorensen writes many of the President's speeches and messages.

NEWSMEN OFTEN GUESTS

Newsmen and television men—especially top reporters, columnists, and commentators for important publications and big networks—are high on the guest list at the White House. These lists reveal that an average of one guest out of every five at luncheons and dinners has been a writer or reporter.

The total of news people exceeds by 5 percent that of Members of Congress who have been invited by the President to luncheon or dinner. Businessmen, labor leaders, and representatives of the arts are invited less often. Only foreign officials and members of the Kennedy administration exceed the number of newsmen who have been invited to the White House.

These invitations to newsmen, reporters say, go more freely to those who cooperate most fully with the White House in their preparation of news.

LOTS OF HELPERS

No President has ever had so large an army of press-relations people in his entourage. The President has his own staff busy. His brother, Robert F. Kennedy, the Attorney General, has a staff at the Justice Department. And Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy has her own press-relations people. All of these are busy.

Almost every official on the White House staff does his bit at one time or another in trying to get friendly stories published or spread across the television and radio networks.

Pierre Salinger, press secretary to the President, heads the publicity staff. Last year, Mr. Salinger traveled from coast to coast touching up the President "image." He made 29 speeches, a thing unheard of in the days when Stephen T. Early was in charge of press relations for Franklin D. Roosevelt. More speeches are planned by Mr. Salinger.

Working with Mr. Salinger are two assistants and numerous secretarial helpers. One man devotes his time to relations with foreign correspondents, for whom an information center has been opened in New York at a cost of about $100,000.

PENALTY FOR CRITICISM

It is among the White House aids that penalties for failure to cooperate are most evident.

Newsmen whose papers are critical of the President sometimes get the silent treat-

ment. Presidential aids refuse to answer questions or give information to them.

For others, an aid now and then will suggest the exact language the President would like to see in a story. If the language does not appear as dictated, there are likely to be telephone calls. It is not unusual for a White House aid to ask to see a story before it is printed.

Sometimes, the President telephones a reporter to criticize a story. Quite a few correspondents have been called into his office for a lecture from Mr. Kennedy himself.

One reporter says: "They are awfully touchy about foreign-policy stories or anything that suggests Mr. Kennedy is not doing well in Congress." Another remarked: "You can hardly crack a joke around here nowadays."

Another reporter asked the White House aids for information. He got this response: "Maybe if you had cooperated with us more on your previous stories we would help you now. But you haven't, so all I can say is: 'Sorry.' "

POLICYMAKERS ALERT

An illustration of what happens was given recently in a story that was distributed by United Press International, written by its veteran White House correspondent, Merriman Smith.

Mr. Smith wrote that policy-level members of the President's staff, at the level of Theodore C. Sorensen, seem to suffer unduly when something is written or broadcast that is not to their liking.

Ardent associates of the President, Mr. Smith wrote, "tend to regard news stories and news personnel in terms of being for or against the Chief Executive." He added:

"Their intensity in this respect seems frequently to surpass that of Kennedy himself. This sort of loyalty may be quite admirable from a political viewpoint, but it can cause problems for the President without his being aware of it.

"It has been known to work this way: A reporter of no particular political convictions writes what he considers an in-depth treatment of some aspect of the administration. The President may not find it entirely pleasing, and expresses himself quite freely within the inner circle.

"Then one of the torchbearers hunts up the reporter and complains vehemently; not at Kennedy's bidding, but entirely on his own. And the once-objective newsman is pushed almost perforce into an anti position."

ENDLESS CONTACTS

At the Capitol, the President's "image" is kept well polished. He does much of the work himself. An army of specialists from the White House and Government departments does the rest. Lawrence F. O'Brien, a Special Assistant to the President, directs this work.

Mr. Kennedy's personal contacts with Senators and House Members are endless. He talks with them on the telephone, breakfasts each week with Democratic leaders, sees Members of both parties at afternoon coffee hours, at White House parties, and in small private groups.

A Republican says: "The Kennedys wine and dine Representatives and Senators from both parties. Kennedy calls them down for social functions for foreign dignitaries."

One man who has watched other Presidents work with Congress has this to say:

"Roosevelt was personally persuasive, but he could not get along with his enemies in Congress; he would not even talk to them. Truman got in trouble with Congress because a lot of people who knew him in the Senate did not think he knew how to run the country. Ike was aloof; he didn't like politics and didn't understand Congress. But Kennedy understands and likes politics and he stays on good terms with everyone."

MRS. KENNEDY'S ROLE

For Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, there are two press-relations people. But her entourage spread out when she started her trip to India and Pakistan.

The U.S. Information Agency moved in and made Mrs. Kennedy the star of a documentary film. A director and two cameramen were hired to go along and produce the film, to see that the story of the trip was recorded properly, in order to keep the family image fresh and attractive.

There were immediate complaints from some Republicans in Congress that the cost—estmiated at $72,807—was too high.

As the trip moved on around the world—to India and Pakistan and England and back to the United States—reporters traveling with the First Lady found their stories drifting away from the front pages. But for weeks to come the pictures of the First Lady's travels made by TV networks are to be regular fare for television viewers at home. Those made for USIA will be shown abroad.

DOMINATING THE NEWS

In one way or another, members of the Kennedy family manage to dominate the news.

On one day recently the newspapers were filled with pictures and stories of the President's traveling to California, receiving a degree, watching a missile shot, visiting former President Eisenhower. On the same day, Mrs. Kennedy was shown riding an elephant in India and a camel in Pakistan. And, in their own ways, Robert and Edward Kennedy were making news in Washington and Massachusetts. The stories and pictures filled big space in newspapers, magazines, and television channels.

Popularity polls indicate that people like the Kennedy "image." But some friends are asking: Is there not danger of overexposure?

Restricted Stock Options Should Be Prohibited Completely, Especially in the Banking Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on May 17, 1961, I introduced H.R. 7141, to provide that income received as a result of restricted stock options be treated for tax purposes as ordinary income. This measure is frankly advocated for the purpose of discouraging this form of compensation. I have long opposed these options as being unfair and discriminatory. J. A. Livingston has written in the Washington Post—on March 31, 1962—that Comptroller of the Currency James J. Saxon offered this advice to small banks who wish to use this method to "obtain or hold good management":

We have under consideration proposed regulations under which national banks would be permitted to provide reasonable stock options for their officers and stock purchase plans for their employees. Such incentives are necessary to enable banks to attract and retain management of the caliber needed in this vital industry.

After thusly quoting the comptroller, Mr. Livingston goes on to say:

Saxon apparently is not deterred by two technical considerations which impelled earlier comptrollers to bar stock options:

Options would give officers preemptive rights to bank shares not available to all stockholders.

National banks have not been permitted to have authorized but unissued stock, which stock-option plans require.

According to the American Banker, 22 States now permit State banks to have stock option plans. The Mercantile Trust Co., of St. Louis, has a plant in effect and so do two of the smaller banks in California.

The American Bankers Association and the Association of Reserve City Bankers have officially stamped approval on stock options for banks. Both argue that bankers can't compete for executive talent with industrial companies. And, of course, national banks are at an additional disadvantage in competing for personnel with State banks that do offer stock options.

According to a survey by Clinton B. Axford, editor emeritus of the American Banker, those bankers who oppose options employ a fiduciary argument:

Banks deal with money, not things. Bankers have a trust. If an officer has options, his judgment may be warped by speculative ambitions. Therefore, options are not compatible with sound banking.

The same argument, it seems to me, could be used against options in general, or against any form of stock ownership. All businessmen have a fiduciary responsibility to stockholders and most manage to resist the speculative pull of stock options or ownership.

Basically, options have the same allure for the banker as for the industrial executive. They offer a free ride in the stock market with tax protection. The optionee doesn't have to take up his stock—that is, put up any money—until after the stock has advanced above the option price. And, when he sells the stock, his profit is subject to the 25 percent capital gains tax as a maximum, rather than the regular income tax which can run to 50, 60 percent, and even higher, depending on income.

Stock options are a fast-spreading form of economic privilege. College professors, doctors, dentists, partners in law or accounting firms, and most salaried workers and wage earners don't get free rides in Wall Street with special tax benefits attached.

Stock options have become the Gresham's law in compensation. Tax-sheltered compensation drives out "real" money. And if the Comptroller extends the option privilege to national banks, then competing State banks in nonpermissive States will want ditto. The privilege would become even more deeply imbedded in the U.S. tax structure.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, all familiar with the banking industry know that shares in small banks are usually closely held and not readily marketable. It appears to me that granting the banks the right to offer these restricted stock options to their executives is merely broadening a practice that is already much too widely spread.

There is no question but that, as Mr. Livingston says:

An option plan will be most beneficial to bankers in larger cities. They will be able to take advantage of active trading for stock-market profit.

If a stock-option line can be drawn somewhere, maybe Congress will have the courage to draw it everywhere—by changing the tax law—so as to abolish a privilege of an already well-compensated class, the business executive.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is exactly why I think H.R. 7141 should be enacted into law as soon as possible.

Merited Praise for a Job Well Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, all of my colleagues are aware of the overwhelming support we gave during the last session of Congress to House Resolution 403, introduced by my friend and distinguished colleague, the able Representative from North Carolina, A. PAUL KITCHIN. This resolution, adopted on September 7, 1961, established a select committee for the purpose of making a thorough study of the administration of the Export Control Act of 1949 and related acts, and, in particular, the problems involved in the control of trade between the United States and foreign countries and the Sino-Soviet bloc.

Mr. KITCHIN was named chairman of the select committee created for this purpose.

I have been very much impressed with the detailed pertinent information developed during the hearings promptly conducted by this select committee.

The published testimony is replete with pertinent facts establishing beyond doubt that the enforcement machinery in operation at the present time is entirely inadequate to cope with the many problems involved in control of strategic exports to the Communist countries. Other weaknesses have been detected by the committee and I am sure all of these matters will be fully covered for you when the select committee submits its report to this body.

Of particular interest to me is the forthright action taken by the chairman of the select committee and our esteemed Speaker when they learned of the efforts by a west coast firm to obtain this Government's approval to export wheat valued at $400 million to North Korea and Communist China. All freedom-loving people, I am sure, were happy to learn of the rejection of the application.

Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott recently succinctly recorded the pertinent facts relative to this proposed transaction in their syndicated column, which I include in the RECORD:

GRAIN FOR CHINA: TWO SOLONS BLOCKED IT

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—The vigorous opposition of two influential Members of Congress played a major role in stopping the sale of $400 million worth of grain to Communist China and North Korea.

The huge grain shipment was barred by President Kennedy after he learned that Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, and Representative A. PAUL KITCHIN, Democrat, of North Carolina, chairman of a special House investigating subcommittee were opposed to the sale and were ready to light a congressional bonfire if it was approved.

EXPLOSIVE

Word of this explosive legislative opposition was given the President by Commerce Secretary Luther Hodges during a White House meeting called to determine whether a private export license for shipment of the grain should be granted.

International Trade Corp., a Seattle, Wash., firm, had applied for the license to ship six million tons of wheat and barley to Red China and 4.5 million tons to North Korea over a 3-year period.

The refusal of the license was announced by the Commerce Department in a two-sentence statement issued last Friday. It made no mention of the following dramatic White House meeting during which the legislators' intervention tipped the scales against the sale.

TWO FAVORED

Under Secretary of State George Ball and Dr. Walt Rostow, Chairman of the State Department's Planning Commission, had just finished a vigorous argument supporting the grain sale when the President, turning to Secretary Hodges, asked for his views, stating:

"Luther, since it is your responsibility to grant or deny this license, let's hear from you."

"Before giving you my own position," Hodges replied, "I would like to present the views of Speaker MCCORMACK and Representative KITCHIN who is chairman of a House subcommittee investigating the sale of strategic materials to the Communist bloc."

"Have they expressed themselves?" inquired the President.

"Quite vigorously," said Secretary Hodges. "They called me personally and expressed very strong objections to the sale. They requested that I make their views known to you."

"On what grounds are they opposed?" asked the President.

"Speaker MCCORMACK took the position that the sales would serve to bolster a sinking Communist government at a time when we should be taking steps to hasten its downfall," reported Hodges. "He warned that approval of the shipment of grain to Peiping would touch off a major foreign policy debate in Congress that could easily endanger passage of your trade program."

KITCHIN BLUNT

"What did Representative KITCHIN say?" questioned the President.

"KITCHIN was very blunt," replied Hodges. "He threatened a full-scale investigation."

"What is your recommendation?" the President asked.

"As you know," said Hodges, "I have been opposed to granting the license from the outset unless you should rule it in the national interest to permit such sales. This legislative opposition reinforces my position."

"There are good arguments on both sides," said the President in summing up. "However, my decision is that we do nothing to jeopardize the trade bill. We can't afford to have that important legislation mixed up in a China policy debate."

TERSE REFUSAL

Later, the President called Hodges and directed him to reject the license and issue a terse statement, reading:

"There was no evidence that the order held by International Trade Corp. was based upon a request from the government concerned. It is rejected."

This statement was drafted by Secretary Ball and Dr. Rostow. They prepared it to keep the door open for future sales to Communist China. Their argument is that surplus grain can be used to temper the Chinese Communist hostilities toward the United States.

POLICY REVIEW

The United States does not recognize either Communist China or North Korea, and has a tight embargo against trade with both countries.

At the President's request, Dr. Walt Rostow has begun an overall review of our policy toward Communist China. This review is based on a State Department policy paper stating that Sino-Soviet relations are deteriorating so fast that the United States should adopt a flexible China policy to take advantage of the alleged split.

This view of a Russia-China split is challenged by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Central Intelligence Director John McCone. They hold that the rift is not nearly as deep as claimed in the official State Department paper.

Address by the Honorable Matt S. Szymczak Before the Annual Stockholders Meeting of the Federal Home Loan Bank, March 20, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following remarks of the Hon. Matt S. Szymczak, a consultant to the C. J. Devine Co., of New York, a professional lecturer in economics at Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., and a former member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. I heartily recommend Mr. Szymczak's speech "Changes That Affect Us" to the attention of my colleagues.

CHANGES THAT AFFECT US

(By Matt S. Szcmczak)

You and I know that our body—our human body—is undergoing constant change. Yet so gradual and continuous is this process that we are never really aware of it. So it is also with the constant changes in the life of the nation—in the body politic: Not until they directly affect our daily lives and our business—our means of livelihood—do we sit up and take notice.

When I was a director of a building and loan association not too many years ago in Chicago we used to meet in a small room and our job was strictly local—in the small neighborhood of a small portion of the northwest side. A secretary did the day-to-day work, but he was not too busy to do other things to provide him an income. Now, look at you—the savings and loan associations—and look at this annual stockholders' meeting of the Home Loan Bank of Cincinnati. What a change, and over what a short span of years.

But of course these are changes that you are all very much aware of, and I did not come here to carry coal to Newcastle. What I came here to talk about are other changes—changes in the national and world economy, changes that have also been going on for a long time but are only now beginning to come home to you and me. We may shrug them off as of no concern to us—they seem so far removed and we are so busy with the many details in our daily business that seem of so much more immediate concern. But when these changes in the larger political and economic picture are likely to affect our own position, our mode of operation and our earnings we can no longer ignore them. And this is especially true of anyone who is in a position of trust, handling not only his own but

other people's money, engaged in finance in any form.

Let's take a look at the events and forces that have begun to shape our new economic world all around us, and let us consider the effects of these changes on our own business of finance; for this is a time for men in finance to look sharply, to study closely, and to give a lead.

POSTWAR CHANGES

What is the essence of the vast transformation which we are witnessing? To put it in stark and simple terms, the postwar era has come to an end, and we have entered a radically new era.

Three facts dominated the postwar era: the cold war, inflation at home, and America's unchallenged economic and political supremacy throughout the free world. Even at that time, of course, international conditions had a bearing on the domestic economy. Rearmament after the outbreak of the Korean conflict and American efforts to help rebuild and strengthen the economies of our free-world allies diverted resources from the domestic consumer market and contributed at least somewhat to inflationary pressure. But things have changed now. No longer do we look upon rearmament as a great once-for-all effort; in this age of the nuclear stalemate we have had to settle down to the long haul of an armed rivalry with Soviet Russia for the duration, and have learned to live with a defense budget of over $50 billion as a regular part of a near-peacetime economy. (In fact, cutting out individual items, such as the B-70 bombers, seems to present problems of its own.) Our ever more productive economy is now capable of providing, without strain, for these military expenditures, for the satisfaction of consumer wants, and for many public programs as well as for aid to underdeveloped countries. Thus the sheer physical pressure on our limited resources has greatly abated, and inflationary tendencies have greatly lessened—since 1959 the general price level has been rising only very slowly, and in the past 12 months not at all.

But perhaps more spectacular than anything else has been the transformation in Western Europe and Japan. Out of the ashes of war destruction and postwar chaos have risen the vigorous, most rapidly advancing economic powers of today. Foreign economic policy can seldom have been as successful as under our occupation policy and then the Marshall plan which, in a decade, helped turn weak clients into strong partners.

It is the very success of our policies in Europe that has brought about the biggest economic shift in the world today. After 10 years of spectacular economic progress and ever-increasing economic cooperation, there has begun to rise a new economic giant. Recipients of aid have become highly competitive suppliers of goods and a market of almost unlimited potential. Encouraged, indeed prodded by us, six West European countries (France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg) have formed the European Economic Community (better known as the Common Market), and many of the other countries of Western Europe are considering or already negotiating association with the Community. There is thus coming into existence a vast new market, comparable to the United States in purchasing power and productive capacity, and comprising 170 million and, when the outsiders join, perhaps more than 250 million people. Within this Common Market there will soon be no more internal tariff barriers; people can move freely within the area, and so can capital; custom duties on imports from outside will be uniform; and economic and social legislation will be harmonized as much as possible.

HOW WILL THAT AFFECT THE UNITED STATES?

How will all that affect the United States? We can look forward to more and more sharing the responsibility and the burden of economic leadership in the free world. And we must radically reappraise our trade relationship with the rest of the world. Do we want to work with the Common Market for a mutual lowering of barriers to trade, leading ultimately to largely free trade in the free world, with all the benefits of an international division of labor; or do we want to try and insulate ourselves from those developments abroad through increasing protectionism? There is no middle way. The President, in submitting to the Congress the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, has chosen the first way.

The proposed new trade bill would authorize the President to negotiate tariff reductions across the board for whole categories of products. This is made necessary by the vast number of individual items that enter into international trade; it is also the only way in which the Common Market is able to negotiate tariff reductions.

I said earlier that we have left the postwar world behind and have entered an entirely new era. From this standpoint the new trade bill is by far the most important legislation requested; important precisely because it boldly faces the radical transformation in the world economy and equips the country to face the new challenge. Until now the emphasis in our trade policy has been on adjusting the flow of trade item-by-item to the interests—real or presumed—of individual American industries; the new approach, on the other hand, puts the emphasis on adjusting America's industrial pattern to the flow of international trade, to the market forces of a free economy embracing the whole free world. It recognizes that such an opening of doors to competition will cause considerable dislocation in many segments of an economy that has grown up partially behind protective barriers, but instead of perpetuating this artificial protection it proposes to help affected industries either to become more competitive or, where the United States is at a comparative disadvantage, to diversify and shift into lines where this country is relatively more efficient. This is to be achieved by providing technical information, advice, and consultation; through tax benefits to encourage modernization and diversification; and through guarantees as well as through loans otherwise not commercially available. Similar provision is to be made for workers in affected industries: they are eligible for assistance in retraining to acquire new skills, and in financial assistance where necessary.

Hearings on this free trade bill proposed for 1962 will bring out a great many matters of importance to our economy and industry. They began before the House Ways and Means Committee on Monday, March 12, as this is being written, and we shall hear and read much about this from now on.

RECENTLY ANNOUNCED TARIFF CHANGES

How important it is that the President have broad authority in order to be able to bargain effectively with other countries was demonstrated quite recently: On March 7 the President announced the results of long negotiations with the Common Market. According to the figures presented by him, the United States gained concessions worth about one-third more than the tariff concessions this country made to the Europeans; but this result was possible only with the help of some cuts of import duties below the peril-point level. Equally significant is it that the Europeans have made clear that they will not grant tariff concessions to us in exchange for American concessions which we reserve the right to withdraw later on; in other words we cannot expect trade agreements in the future unless we drop the insistence on escape clauses. But with the new approach favored by the President we should be able to gain fair access to the Common Market, the most rapidly expanding market in the world today. Given this opportunity, we need feel no pessimism concerning the ability of many American industries to compete successfully in the international markets. Even now we have a considerable trade surplus not only with the countries of the Common Market, but with the world at large: for several years now the value of our exports has exceeded the value of our imports by roughly $5 billion annually. But we need to expand this trade surplus further if we are to meet those other international commitments which we consider essential for our national interest and that of the free world: military assistance to our allies, foreign aid to underdeveloped countries, and private investment abroad.

DEFICIT IN OUR BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

In the past, and especially in the last 4 years, these financial commitments abroad, together with the movement abroad of short-term capital, have been considerably larger than the net earnings from our trade surplus. This is the reason why over the last 4 years our balance-of-payments deficit has added up to more than $13 billion, and our gold reserves have fallen by approximately $6 billion. And this is the reason why we have a vital interest in improving our international balance of payments—by expanding the opportunities for exporting, through the new trade approach, by preventing inflation and thus keeping our exports competitive, by improved facilities for financing export credits, by attracting ever more foreign tourists, in short by those many measures, large and small, which have already been set in motion but which require and deserve the whole-hearted and continuous cooperation of the entire public. Also vital is our continuing policy to have dollars loaned to underdeveloped countries spent here and our continued efforts to have our allies assume their shares of this assistance to underdeveloped countries as well as their share of defense expenditures.

Among the various measures to improve our balance of payments, two are of special interest because they illustrate the impact of developments in the world economy on domestic economic policies: One is the need to avoid inflation in order to keep our exports competitive. Throughout the postwar years we attempted, with varying success, to stem the tide of rising prices, but for strictly dimestic reasons we wanted to avoid, or at least keep to a minimum, the disruptive effects of inflation on the domestic economy. Price stability at home is as desirable as ever, but now a new, powerful argument has been added: We must keep our prices down in order to survive in the world economy. The alternatives are practically unthinkable: we would either have to devalue the dollar, or retreat from the world economy into economic isolation with bilateral trade agreements after the manner of Nazi Germany in the 1930's. But that would be the end of America as the leading world power; one only has to face these alternatives to reject them out of hand.

But for us in the financial field our interdependence with the rest of the world was brought home even more strikingly by another series of measures. I am speaking of the recent open-market and interest rate policy of the Federal Reserve. For several years prior to 1961 the Federal Reserve had adhered to a bills-only or bills-mostly policy, that is to say, in all open-market operations the System confined itself strictly

to dealings in short-term securities. About a year ago, this policy was dropped; and one of the chief reasons was the need for maximum flexibility in the face of conflicting national and international requirements—domestically we were in the midst of a recession, which called for a continued supply of reserves to the banking system to enable the banks to expand the extension of credit. The result of such excess reserves are lower interest rates. But internationally we were experiencing a steady outflow of short-term capital attracted at least in part by higher interest rates in foreign money markets—an outflow which seriously added to the drain on our dollars. To cope with this situation, the Federal Reserve embarked on "Operation Nudge"—a deliberate attempt not to lower the short-term rates in order to stem the outflow of funds. And of course the discount rate was allowed to remain at 3 percent; not reduced to 2½ or 2 percent. And the recent decision to allow commercial banks to raise interest rates on time and savings deposits fits into the same pattern: it was at least in part motivated by the desire to make it more attractive, for Americans as well as foreigners, to keep their money in American banks and thus relieve the pressure on our balance of payments.

CHANGES IN THE USE OF MONETARY POLICY INSTRUMENTS

This is not the only example of international considerations entering in the formulation and execution of monetary policy and operations. Only recently, the Federal Reserve System announced that it would in the future operate in the foreign exchange market in order to give support to the dollar. Another instance are the new arrangements between the leading financial nations of the world to increase the lending powers of the International Monetary Fund.

What we are forced to recognize is that we are no longer an island unto ourselves, economically and financially any more than politically and militarily. Not only our trade policy but our monetary policy as well must be meshed with the policies of the other leading nations of the free world. To this end we need a public well informed about events abroad, close, almost day-to-day following of foreign developments, and frequent consultation with financial and economic leaders in the most important countries of the West. That is why, when I testified before the Joint Economic Committee of Congress last August 14, I recommended that the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System should not be charged with additional bank supervisory responsibilities (as suggested by the Committee on Money and Credit). In fact, I pointed out, the Board already has too many such duties that are taking up too much of its time and energy. Board members should be allowed to travel abroad more and more, and when in Washington should have more time and energy available for the formulation of monetary policy. For the same reason, the Board membership should not (as also recommended by the Committee on Money and Credit) be reduced from seven to five. All seven have full-time jobs in the monetary field. They need not all be present simultaneously in Washington; but perhaps one of them or someone else at policy level on an alternating basis, should spend a longer period—say, a year—at the Bank for International Settlements in Basle, Switzerland, to confer with other Central Bank Governors there and in the capitals of Western European countries.

REVIEW

At the beginning of my speech I pointed out that the postwar era was dominated by the cold war, by inflation at home, and by America's economic preeminence in the world. Let me now try to characterize our new economic environment in similar shorthand fashion: In my opinion, four items—call them facts, or problems—will dominate the new era of the sixties: our enormously increased interdependence with the rest of the Western World; the continuing race with the Communists; and the need to find jobs for our fast-increasing labor force at a time of rapidly advancing automation; and a need for increasing our economic growth.

Our economic interdependence with other free nations I have already commented at length. That the contest with the Soviet world has become a long-term proposition, in fact an endurance test, involving not only heavy military outlays of a traditional sort but also continuing efforts in aiding developing nations, in scientific research, in space exploration, and so forth—all that is by now well understood. As to the third problem, to find enough jobs, allow me to quote from a recent speech by Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon: "We must grow fast enough to create an additional 1.5 million new jobs a year during the present decade to provide for the expected increase in our labor force. In addition, more than a million jobs are needed merely to reduce unemployment from its present unacceptable level of more than 5½ percent, to a more tolerable level of 4 percent. Finally, employment opportunities must be kept open for the millions of workers who will be affected in the years ahead by advancing technology." To provide all these we must have an expanding economy at stable prices.

Seen in this light, the task before our economic and monetary managers, and indeed all of us, is almost staggering. We must devise, shape and execute policies which will simultaneously maintain price stability and encourage industrial modernization and readjustment (to preserve international competitiveness), stimulate new investment and, generally, rapid growth throughout the economy (to create new jobs for technologically displaced workers as well as millions of young entrants to the labor market), and also provide vast new resources for the ever-increasing demands of national defense, foreign assistance, research and space programs.

We are at present well on the way to recovery from the last recession. While January and February figures show something of a slowdown, I believe that to be only temporary and seasonal. To emerge completely from the recession will, however, only be the beginning of the job. Merely to reach the previous peak will not nearly be good enough. From there our economy must continue to expand at a fast clip in order to absorb the millions of new jobseekers and provide the means for the huge new tasks.

ROLE OF MONETARY POLICY

From this it is not too difficult to foresee the outline of the monetary policies required for the sixties: for one thing, monetary policy can no longer be made to fight inflation (through credit restriction) almost singlehandedly; it must be supported more strongly by fiscal and debt management policy, by self-restraint on the part of labor and management, and on crucial occasions, such as the current steel negotiations, perhaps even by Presidential intervention to lay down guidelines dictated by the public interest. Secondly, long-term interest rates will move upward only slowly and not abruptly or in sizable percentages, for to encourage a continuing high rate of investment, both for modernization and expansion, will be one of the overriding objectives. (However it is important to note that rate changes are dependent on demand for credit; as the demand increases, rates increase.) And third, short-term rates can never be allowed to fall quite as low as in some past periods, at least not unless and until we have completely reversed our international balance of payments.

CONCLUSION

I began my talk with an analogy between the human body and our national economic organism, and by pointing out that the slow but far-reaching changes in the economic climate will eventually affect all of us in our daily life, our business, and our pocketbook. I have given you my reasons for expecting a profound change in our economic environment. Let me now end by suggesting how all this may affect the savings and loan industry.

I believe that the demand for mortgage funds will slowly increase in the next few months, and that mortgage (and other long-term) rates will also rise, but not by much. Treasury and Federal Reserve have made it clear that they will not permit any steep increase in rates (which might choke off recovery and growth); and that will apply not only to loan rates but also to rates paid to depositors and stockholders of banks and savings institutions. The recent warning by Joseph P. McMurray, Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, that he might seek from Congress legal authority to set a limit on dividend rates paid by savings and loan associations, is a case in point. It seems clear to me that unlimited rate competition for savings will not be permitted. The new higher rates offered by some commercial banks on time and savings deposits, as I pointed out earlier, was at least partly motivated by international financial conditions to which, in the new circumstances, we must pay more attention than ever before. Thus the new framework within which savings institutions must now operate is fairly strictly delimited. Like other industries which will soon face stronger winds of competition, we must not weaken, we must grow stronger in spirit and in determination and thus also in fact. Because this new era will not only mean stiffer competition all round, it will also bring new challenges and new opportunities. An expanding economy will mean greater affluence, ever-rising living standards, ever-greater sources of savings, and constantly increasing investment outlets. It will mean the exploration not only of outer space but also of ever-new economic territory at home and throughout the free world. It will be an era of fabulous innovations and new vistas, perhaps another age of unlimited opportunities for all of us, if we will only grasp them.

Airport for Sale?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the following editorial from my hometown paper, the Lowell Sun, which pinpoints the "Pandora's box" opened up by the Supreme Court in its recent airport decision:

AIRPORT FOR SALE?

It is estimated that perhaps 100,000 property owners all over the Nation may try to sue airports, in the light of the Supreme Court's decision that airport authorities must compensate those whose property suffers from the noise and vibration of aircraft.

If this forecast is reasonable, massive entanglements may confront many communities with major airfields.

There is much more in this particular Pandora's box. When new houses spring up

close to airfields now far from urban centers, will their owners be justified in claiming damage? And what hampering, uneconomic limits may be put on U.S. air traffic to avoid such costly claims?

With population spilling everywhere, with a supersonic plane and its glass-shattering sonic booms coming by 1970, the High Court has posed a serious puzzle for all those concerned with this country's commercial air transport. Progress could be very costly.

Area Airports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an address by the Honorable Robert T. Murphy, Vice Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, before the 1962 spring conference of the Airport Operators Council, the Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D.C., April 3, 1962.

In his usual cogent and capable manner, Vice Chairman Murphy has set forth an excellent analysis of the concept of area airports. His remarks on the subject deserve special notice by all of us.

The address follows:

I am delighted, indeed, to have this opportunity to meet with members of the Airport Operators Council and to discuss some matters of mutual interest at this annual spring conference. I am particularly grateful for the opportunity to renew some old friendships which go back to my service as counsel for the Senate Aviation Subcommittee during the trying days when Senator MIKE MONRONEY and his colleagues were battling for retention of an adequate Federal Airport Aid Act. I came to know and appreciate some of the problems of the local airport operators at that time and, consequently, I do not feel at all strange in your company.

The relationship between adequate airports and effective air service is so obvious that I need not tell you that the Civil Aeronautics Board has an abiding interest in the objectives of your organization. Our immediate concern is that service be provided at airports reasonably accessible from the population centers required to be served and that those airports be adequately equipped and operated so that reliable, safe and efficient common carrier service can be offered to the public.

The tempo of the times is such that I have been asked to speak today on the subject of the so-called regional or area concept. As you all are well aware, the Board has recently instituted an area airport investigation in New England and has indicated that this will be the first phase of a general review that will eventually encompass all other regions of the United States. Against this background, I will endeavor to give you my personal thoughts as an individual Board member of what the area airport concept means to me.

First, I would like to say that I prefer the term "area" airport rather than "regional" airport because, in my opinion, it better connotes the intendment of our Board program. In this connection, it is interesting to observe that the May 1961, joint statement by Chairman Alan S. Boyd of the Board and Administrator Najeeb E. Halaby of the Federal Aviation Agency, with which you are all familiar, does not use the term "regional airport." Rather, it refers to the desirability of a single airport to serve reasonably adjacent points. The statement noted that, "from the point of view of the Civil Aeronautics Board, scheduled airline service into two separate airports that are reasonably adjacent often results in a deterioration of the quality of airline schedules to the area. In many cases, without substantial inconvenience to the air passengers, they could be served through a single airport, resulting in improved scheduling, better quality of service through the use of larger equipment and an overall improvement in air service to the area."

I know you are all interested in what these words mean in terms of actual cases. A good illustration is found in the Board's recent Greensboro-High Point-Winston-Salem decision. There, after notice and hearing, the Board found that these important communities would receive improved trunkline service with cost savings to the air carriers, if truck carrier services were provided at one rather than two airports—airports that are only 16 air miles apart. Specifically, the Board found that the area would lose one flight but would gain in terms of a desired early morning flight to New York, improved prospects for low-cost coach service and the assurance of jet service. These overall service improvements, plus significant cost savings for the carriers whose services at both airports had been unprofitable, were weighed against the added inconvience to some travelers who previously found service through the second airport more suitable to their needs. In that case, the Board concluded that this inconvience was outweighed by the improved service benefits to the area at large and the financial benefit to the air carriers. This, to my mind, is what the area airport concept is all about and this is the kind of analysis required before the Board will act to implement it.

What I have just described is not a new development in transportation. We are all familiar with the fact that Seattle-Tacoma, Minneapolis-St. Paul, the tri-cities—Bristol-Johnson City-Kingsport—are all served by a single airport. Nor is this concept peculiar to air transportation. It is a policy applied in all forms of transportation. Not every port city on our coastlines receives service by oceangoing ships. Our trains did not serve every community that was nearby their lines; the buses and streetcars do not stop to pick up and discharge passengers at every corner.

I think the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals cut through the labels in its decision sustaining the Board's Greensboro order when it said: "A comparison of this statement (the joint CAB–FAA policy statement) with the statutory criteria laid down by the Congress for the operation of the Board makes it obvious that the policy enunciated in the press release is hardly more than a statement that the Board intends to discharge its statutory obligations by serving the public interests first."

This is precisely what we shall endeavor to do. It is in the national public interest that our citizens receive the best possible public service from carriers financially able to provide convenient service with the most modern and most suitable aircraft, and we must be ever striving for upgrading and improving that service.

We know this national interest in a sound air transport system may impinge on local airport interests from time to time, but I assure you that we are not approaching the matter with a father-knows-best attitude. We intend to look into each case on the basis of an evidentiary record with full opportunity for all interested persons to be heard.

In this connection, I wish to commend the long-range planning and foresight that has gone into the New England Council's regional airport plan. That the local aeronautical authorities have voluntarily come forward with a plan which they believe will best serve the overall interests of their States is typical of the local initiative and local action which we have grown accustomed to expect from New England. This report and the work that went into it has been of great value to us and permits the Board to move forward with a New England case in an orderly manner on the basis of a considered plan initiated by the local authorities. This reflects the operation of our republican form of government at its best with State and Federal entities working in harmonious cooperation.

Extensive investments in airline operations, the subsidies required by local service carriers, and the cost of facilities required at an airline airport all add up to tremendous sums. The area airport concept is just part of the overall job of attempting to channel those expenditures so that the traveling public will get the best possible product for the least possible cost.

We intend to institute a series of regional investigations looking toward the amendment of air carrier certificates in terms of the redesignation of separately designated points as a single certificated point (perhaps designating service through a specific airport as was done in the Greensboro case) or the deletion of some certificated points. With continuing improvements in the highway system, existing airports become more accessible to a larger geographic area. The lessening of ground traveltime to airports can certainly justify the consolidation of air services in particular cases. Also, this highway improvement may now make it much easier for those passengers at points with low-traffic generation, which can support only very limited carrier schedules, to get to nearby airports where a greater frequency of schedules with more modern aircraft is available.

In judging each case the Board will look primarily at the convenience to the largest number of travelers. Among other things we will consider the time required to get to the airport, the number of passengers involved, and the improvements in service, if any, that could result from a consolidation of carrier services at one, rather than two or more airports. Another important factor is the potential savings in subsidy which can result from consolidation of service by the subsidized local service carriers. When I speak of improvements in service, I am thinking in terms of availability of coach service, greater frequency of schedules throughout the day, better timing of daily departures and arrivals and such other similar things as will redound to the benefit of the man with the suitcase.

A part of the area airport program which is of particular interest to you gentlemen is exemplified by the basic premise of the New England council report. That report recognizes the availability of a limited amount of funds—from both Federal and local sources—for airport expenditures and the basic purpose of the report was to decide where that money could be best spent. This is a vexing problem in all regions of the country. With the continuing urbanization of our country, we must think in terms of airports serving population masses which no longer fit precisely into the old city boundaries. The day when an airport can be rightfully claimed as the pride and joy of city A, and city A only, is on the wane.

With the emphasis on larger and faster jet aircraft which seems to be the mold and fashion of the aviation industry today and with the public attention being distracted by the success of orbital flight and lunar possibilities, it is well for all of us to remember that our chief responsibility

is to foster the transport of persons and goods in their conventional and natural channels. Speaking for myself, I can assure you that I will be ever mindful of this comparatively prosaic responsibility. This leads me to say that it is my earnest hope that our resourceful aeronautical manufacturers and designers will heed the eloquent description of Senator MIKE MONRONEY, in his Wright Memorial Dinner address, of the crying need of this country for a true successor to the DC-3 aircraft which can be purchased at DC-3 prices. Perhaps the area airport concept would be greatly influenced if such an aircraft were now available or if we had a reasonable hope that one would be available within a reasonable length of time. Many areas of this country could be best served by such an aircraft without incurring tremendous costs for improving existing ground facilities. We shouldn't have to consider the air service needs of the more sparsely settled areas of our country in terms of DC-8 economics. It is a truism that no industry can be more efficient than its unit of production. We all recognize that many of our mutual problems could be tempered if such a small aircraft were available. Let us do all in our power to bring it about, not only because of the important domestic uses to which such an aircraft would be put, but also because of the tremendous need for such a plane to assist in the economic and political advancement of underdeveloped countries throughout the world.

I hope these few remarks give you some idea of the thought in my own mind in approaching the area airport review. It is a program which the Board intends to approach in the spirit of a real national and local partnership for the promotion of the common good of all of our citizens.

It cannot be executed overnight and will be decided upon in each individual case only after a development of a full record which will reflect the thinking of all parties who will be affected. We need the help and cooperation of your membership as well as that of responsible citizens of those areas served through your respective airports. Let it be clearly understood that our only objective is the improvement of our national air transportation system with its consequent benefits to individuals in all parts of our country. Having worked with you in the past, I am confident that you will give us your effective cooperation.

Gen. Clyde D. Eddleman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 12, 1962

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, March 30, I had the privilege and honor of attending retirement ceremonies at Fort Myer, Va., for Gen. Clyde D. Eddleman, Vice Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army.

I am proud to have known General Eddleman as a close personal friend for years and I am sure that not only the Army, but the Nation as a whole, will feel the loss of the services of this fine officer.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the statements made by the Secretary of the Army, Elvis Stahr, and by Gen. George H. Decker, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, on this occasion:

REMARKS BY HON. ELVIS STAHR, SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

It is for me a personal honor and an official privilege to say a few words at this ceremony marking Gen. Clyde Davis Eddleman's retirement from active military service.

With his retirement, the Army is today losing one of its outstandingly versatile and dependable senior officers. General Eddleman has filled almost every type of assignment in the book. The testimony of all those most closely associated with him bears witness to the fact that he has performed throughout his career with the same masterful capability he has displayed—as I can testify from my own personal knowledge—during the 14 months since I became Secretary of the Army.

The Chief of Staff has related for us the most prominent and significant events in General Eddleman's long and remarkable career. No words of mine could add further luster to this brilliant record. It speaks for itself loudly and clearly. I would sum it up in this way: Clyde Eddleman is one of the most prominent of that devoted band of professional Army officers who not only stood by the Army through long, lean days of neglectful peace, and led it through the most terrible and farflung battles that men have ever fought, but have helped it make the transition into a fit and capable instrument of national policy in an age when our Army's primary mission is not only to be ready to fight a war but to prevent war and yet protect freedom, in circumstances where great forces are ready to the hand of a world conspiracy that aspires to bury us.

No Army has ever made a greater transition, and it could not have been done without the leadership of dedicated men such as General Eddleman so perfectly typifies.

In the full knowledge that his heart and interest will remain with us—that his services will constantly be on call should they be needed—we congratulate him on the enviable record he has made; we thank him for the distinguished service he has rendered, and we wish him and his family a bountiful measure of health and well-earned happiness for many years to come.

REMARKS BY GEN. GEORGE H. DECKER, CHIEF OF STAFF, U.S. ARMY

General Eddleman, Secretary Stahr, distinguished guests, fellow soldiers, this ceremony today honors an officer who has served his country with distinction for almost four decades. While the medal that was presented today and the review of troops are small reward for a lifetime of dedicated service, they are symbolic of the way that the Army says well done and farewell.

General Eddleman's many assignments have included those in the highest levels of both command and staff. As a tactician strategist, he was the operations officer of a field army in the hot war. He was responsible for the planning of all of the operations of the 6th Army in the Southwest Pacific extending over a period of 3 years and covering the territory between Australia and Japan. That Army participated in more than 20 major amphibious operations—all of them successful—and in several extensive land campaigns. He has had an important role in guilding the Army in its present cold war mission.

As a military educator, he helped to establish the Armed Forces Staff College, and he served a tour as the commandant of the Army War College.

As a civil administrator, he was Director General of Civil Affairs in Trieste. In his final command assignment as commander in chief, U.S. Army, Europe, he was responsible for the greatest Army that the United States has ever assembled in peacetime. In addition, he was responsible for the relationship of our forces with the governments and citizens of Allied countries where the majority of our oversea forces are stationed.

The Army will sorely miss this officer who has served it so faithfully and so well. His departure will leave a gap in our ranks that will be hard to fill. I shall miss him personally, as well as officially, since our military careers have ben singularly parallel. Thirty years ago we were lieutenants together in the same battalion. We served together on the same Army staff during all of the World War II campaigns in the Southwest Pacific area. We served together several times on the War Department general staff; later, we served together in Europe, and finally, as you know, his last tour of duty was as my Vice Chief of Staff.

I can say from my own personal knowledge, that the entire period of General Eddleman's service has been characterized by outstanding skill, integrity, moral courage, and loyalty to both his superiors and to his subordinates.

There is no greater sense of satisfaction for those who dedicate their lives in the service of our country than the esteem and approbation of their comrades. I am sure that General Eddleman carries with him into retirement the heartfelt good wishes of all ranks of the Army that he has served so well. I know I speak for all of the Army in wishing him Godspeed and good luck; and our best wishes we all extend also to his charming wife, Mrs. Eddleman.

Thank you very much.

Rebuilding a Mountain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Second District of Oregon, which I have the honor to represent, has many outstanding scenic attractions. One of these, the Steens Mountain area, in Harney County, was the subject of an article appearing in the current issue of the Izaak Walton magazine. I call the attention of my colleagues to this article which describes some of the potentials which the Steens Mountain area possesses and indicates the program of development which the Bureau of Land Management has initiated in the interest of full multiple use:

REBUILDING A MOUNTAIN

(By Howard R. DeLano)

In southeastern Oregon, nearly 10,000 feet above sea level, looms a volcanic uplift known as Steens Mountain. From a distance during the summer this mountain is an unimpressive gray with occasional spots of snow. Then suddenly, after an overnight autumn storm, it becomes strikingly white.

It extends over 70 miles north and south and is bisected by many deep glacial gorges. The latest of these are the Kiger and McCoy, which carry water to the fertile Diamond Valley, and the Blitzen, the Big Indian and Wildhorse, which carry water to the valleys below them. The east face of the mountain is generally abrupt and precipitous. By following the road from Burns south to the west side of the Steens one passes through

the interesting 160,000-acre Malheur National Wildlife Refuge. On the refuge is a variety of wildlife including waterfowl, upland birds, fur bearing animals, deer and antelope.

From the small village of Frenchglen the traveler may follow up the gentle west slope of the mountain on a road built originally by the Civilian Conservation Corps and improved by the Bureau of Land Management so that now it extends to the summit. Asserted to be the highest road in the State of Oregon, it follows the high ridges overlooking the wild and spectacular scenery below. There are many vantage points along this road to view the deep U-shaped glacial valleys and the rugged east face of the mountain. Also visible on a clear day are the Silver City Mountain Range of Idaho, the Ruby Range in Nevada, and the Sierra Nevada Range in California.

The white man's first interest in the mountain was in his search for grass and browse to graze his sheep, cattle, and horses. Before him, however, this mountain was a favorite summer hunting and fishing grounds for the Piute Indians, apparent from the many arrowheads and other Indian artifacts found throughout the area. For the Indian hunter there were deer in the brush areas, antelope in the grassy plains, and California bighorn sheep relaxing in the craggy rims of the glacial amphitheaters.

The ranges of the Steen, along with the surrounding desertlike areas, could be used as a year-round grazing operation by the early stockmen. Even in hard winters the rich virgin stands of grass standing high above the snow were in reach of these early herds of livestock.

When the spring breakup came and the new green grass appeared, the sheep and cattle moved up onto the lower slopes of the mountain. By July snow remains only in banks and the mountaintop becomes a bed of colored flowers. The scattered meadows become lush with dark green grass.

Shortly after the turn of the 19th century, sheep moved into the area from Idaho and Nevada. Early reports from the Department of Agriculture indicated 200,000 sheep grazing at one time. Sheepherders' tents dotted the hills. The grass was free for the taking; first come, first grazed. The sheep being herded from place to place each day could be moved from the more accessible areas to the more steep and rocky areas where forage was still available. There was no incentive to protect the vital watersheds and maintain the grass for future production. Much of the original stands of perennial grass was killed out. Stock trails and other heavily used areas became dust beds. Deer numbers were low and the wild bighorn sheep became extinct.

During World War I, in southeastern Oregon as in other western range States, the range situation became extremely critical. Then in 1934, the Taylor Grazing Act was passed by Congress, giving protection on the use of the public domain to stockmen who were local landowners. The preamble of the act stated its purpose as stopping injury to the public grazing lands by prevention of overgrazing and soil deterioration and by providing for their orderly use, improvement, and development to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range and for other purposes. The Grazing Service was created in the Department of the Interior to administer the rangelands under the act. In 1946 it was consolidated with the General Land Office to form what is now the Bureau of Land Management.

Changing about 500,000 acres of public lands from an unregulated to a regulated use was no small task. Regulation of grazing use has been only one of the many management considerations on this mountain. Here was an area that needed watershed protection; in places as much as 8 inches of soil had been lost on the summer range areas. Measures were needed for prevention of further soil deterioration and stream pollution. Habitats for the large population of deer, antelope, sage grouse, Hungarian partridges, quail, fish, and other animal life had to be protected and scenic beauty preserved. All public land uses had to be recognized.

It is the Bureau's objective to administer the resources on these lands under the principles of multiple use. The Bureau is building a 60-mile loop road through some of the most scenic country in the United States. Plans are being made to construct campground facilities on the mountain loop route and at several places along the main road around the mountain.

Steens Mountain has long been known as one of the best deer hunting areas in the State of Oregon. State game management spokesmen have said that the deer harvest can be considerably increased under the formal resource management program now possible. This area is an attractive habitat for sage grouse and quail. Following the transplanting of chukar partridges along the foothill areas by the State game commission, these birds have increased rapidly.

During the 2 years past, the State game commission has transplanted a total of 11 California bighorn sheep to the east face of the Steens Mountain from the Hart Mountain Refuge in Oregon. The last known bighorn sheep of the earlier Steens Mountain herd disappeared after 1912.

To repair past damage, allotments of range are made in accordance with the ranchers' proportionate share of the total grazing privileges. The grazing use currently permitted must be in balance with available forage. Plants that hold the soil and provide good feed for livestock and wildlife must be protected from overuse. Areas where such plants have been killed out in the past must be seeded again and these seedings protected until firmly established on the soil.

Summer ranges taken over by brush can be sprayed with chemicals, returning a proper balance between brush and grass and increasing the forage production.

On the Steens Mountain several thousand areas have been seeded by the Bureau of Land Management to crested wheatgrass, a perennial grass that gives maximum soil protection and is high in feed value. Where not in conflict with the needs of big game for browse, more thousands of acres have been chemically treated to control sagebrush and poisonous larkspur. Still, many more thousands of acres need seeding, brush control treatment, fencing, and development of water. Carrying out such practices along with the proper control of the livestock use should rehabilitate the mountain ranges almost to what they were before the thousands of cattle and sheep converged on the mountain. The supply of mountain water for maintaining the wildlife refuge and furnishing irrigation to the adjacent hay ranches must be protected.

However, providing forage and habitat for livestock and wildlife are only part of the objectives in managing the resources of the mountain. It must be protected against fire; the soil must be held in place and improved; recreational facilities must be developed and the scenic beauty must be preserved; consideration must also be given to the use of the mountain by people pursuing all forms of outdoor recreation including interest in bird, insect, animal and plant life, geology, and mining.

In keeping with this principle of multiple use of the resources on the national land reserve, on December 13, 1961, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall announced that the State advisory boards in 10 Western States, and the National Advisory Board Council will include representation of other interests as well as of livestock and wildlife interests.

We are now on the threshold of our most productive years in the balanced use and conservation of the public lands of America and must continue to go forward under these principles.

(The author is range conservationist, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior.)

Federal Aid to Education Must Reach All Our Young People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my statement to the Committee on Education and Labor on the important subject of Federal aid to education, showing that continued Federal support of educational institutions which do not comply with constitutional principles is unconscionable and should be stopped without further delay:

STATEMENT OF HON. JACOB H. GILBERT, OF NEW YORK

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on Education and Labor, your committee has under consideration my bill, H.R. 668, which would provide that Federal aid be withheld from schools which discriminate between students by reason of their race, color, religion, ancestry, or national origin.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak in favor of this vitally needed legislation and to urge your support and favorable action.

In his message to the Congress concerning aid to education, President Kennedy stated: "Our progress as a nation can be no swifter than our progress in education. Our requirements for world leadership, our hopes for economic growth, and the demands of citizenship itself in an era such as this all require the maximum development of every young American's capacity." Please note the words "every American." They include Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and members of all minority groups in the United States now denied educational opportunities.

Your committee approved a $3.3 billion bill to help build public school classrooms and pay their teachers. There is another bill pending, providing for Federal aid to higher education which would cost many additional millions. Last year the National Defense Education Act was extended and broadened, and this authorized Federal expenditure of more than a billion dollars. In 1961, the Federal Government was obligated to expend $487,704,470 under our various education grants-in-aid programs. We should now take necessary action to insure that all the young people of this Nation share equally in the benefits such funds are meant to provide.

The Supreme Court has decreed that racial segregation in the public schools is inherently unequal, and has observed that the opportunity for education where the State has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms.

Under the segregated school system which has prevailed in many States, Negro children are denied the educational opportunities to which they are entitled. Lack of educational opportunity is one of the crucial

factors handicapping the Negro in his struggle for equality. Records show that many are prevented from attending school at all; their schools are, in the main, small and substandard; their teachers do not have the training and teaching background demanded by schools of the white children. Negro children in numerous localities are required to travel many miles in order to attend the nearest Negro school. Obstacles of all kinds have been placed in the way of the Negro to prevent him from gaining the necessary learning which would enable him to reach his full potential as an educated person.

The practice of denying Negroes admission to institutions of higher learning is equally shocking. The report of the Civil Rights Commission dealing with denial of the equal protection of the laws in public higher education in 1960 is indeed an indictment of the whole American community. The Commission reported great progress in the past 20 years in eliminating denials of equal protection, but discrimination continues to be the pattern in the Deep South, and Negroes are the principal victims of such discrimination. The Commission reported that in Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, Florida, and Louisiana, education for the Negro is indeed separate and unequal, not only at the college level but also in preparation for college. The Commission stated that "this inferior preparation of the Negro high school student in the segregated high school of the South helps perpetuate the problem of segregation and discrimination at the college level" and that "educational deprivation of Negroes is similarly transmitted from the educationally, economically, and culturally deprived parent to the child." It is reported that the United States has permitted southern legislatures to create separate land-grant colleges for Negroes and to channel almost all Federal funds for specific programs in such institutions to the separate white colleges. In the allocation of Federal money for research, for college housing and for educational institutes, white colleges and white students have been altogether disproportionate beneficiaries.

The Commission report concludes that "the total impact of Federal aid to public higher education in these States has been to increase the discrepancy between the amounts spent by the States themselves for white institutions as compared with Negro institutions."

The Commission made a clear recommendation that the Federal Government end financial aid to publicly controlled institutions for higher education which continue to discriminate on grounds of race, religion, or national origin.

Congress should provide that all Federal grant-in-aid programs involving education are to benefit all our youth, not just one segment of our population. The discrimination now prevailing in our institutions of learning based on color, race, religion, or national origin, must be eliminated.

I maintain that continued Federal support of educational institutions which do not comply with constitutional principles is unconscionable, and such support should be stopped without further delay.

Naughty Book

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a column entitled "Naughty Book," by James A. Wechsler which appeared in the New York Post on April 3, 1962. Mr. Wechsler discusses the Republican attack on the new Doubleday book "hTe Liberal Papers" edited by Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT. It is Mr. Wechsler's keen observation that it is the "Republican hope to smother the story of the John Birchers by picturing the Roosevelt group as a comparable extreme. This is to equate frenzied paranoia with responsible dissent, it is to assume that the country has lost all desire for thoughtful debate, and all capacity for serious judgment."

The article follows:

NAUGHTY BOOK

The Sunday News dedicated its editorial page to an attack on a book. On the same day Roscoe Drummond opened fire on the same volume in the Herald Tribune. The current issue of the Brooklyn Tablet, right-wing organ of the Brooklyn diocese, condemns the work. "EV" and "CHARLIE" have both pronounced it a sinister document (on television).

Probably not since "Lolita" has any book threatened to stir so wide a storm. But let the reader not be too quickly titillated; the tome in question is a collection of essays on foreign policy called "The Liberal Papers," recently published in paperback by Doubleday. It is described as "edited by JAMES ROOSEVELT," and with an introduction by him.

Some people at Doubleday must be wondering whether they were born lucky. Under ordinary circumstances such a book, whatever its merits or demerits, would have been bought by a small number of serious citizens and widely ignored in most places. But the Republican National Committee and its varied mouthpieces have transformed this rather private endeavor into a celebrated affair.

The book was really born back in 1959 when a group of liberal Congressmen, including Mr. ROOSEVELT, began holding a series of discussions on the stalemates and frustrations of our time.

It was the decision of the group to invite a number of scholars to prepare papers on varied aspects of world trouble—from the Far East to Berlin to Latin America. Some time later, ROOSEVELT said yesterday, a Doubleday representative heard of the project and proposed that the papers be published. Out of that modest beginning has emerged the present furor. For the book is now being described by such literary critics as "EV" and "CHARLIE" as proof that the Democratic Party is engaged in a conspiracy to "soften up" the Nation, and Mr. Kennedy is being challenged by Mr. Drummond, and others to repudiate the work.

What the tumult proves is not that Mr. ROOSEVELT and his colleagues are dangerous men, or that the contributors—including James Warburg, Walter Millis, Frank Tanenbaum, David Reisman and Quincy Wright—are covert Communists. What it reveals is how hard it has become to conduct responsible public debate on such sacred cows of U.S. foreign policy as Chiang Kai-shek and Dr. Adenauer, and to urge reexaminations of policies that have led to so many explosive dead ends.

Many of the propositions stated in the volume are surely subject to argument; the book will have served its purpose if it provokes such debate. For example, Mr. Warburg writes that "if the United States declared one of its aims to be the achievement of universal disarmament under adequate enforced world law, it must be prepared to agree that every nation in the world must be a party to the agreement and participate in the creation and maintenance of the enforcement agency."

This, of course, would involve a change in U.S. policy with respect to Red China "and the presently divided nations of Germany, Korea and Vietnam."

Is that idea too hot for public discussion?

In a paper on Latin America, written many months before President Kennedy took office, Frank Tanenbaum anticipates the alliance for progress and decries the double standard that so long characterized our Latin American policy:

If we want the goodwill and support of the next generation of Latin Americans, then we must make it clear by word and deed that we will have no further truck with dictators even if they play the anti-Communist game, in public, so that we can be gulled into believing them.

Is that an undiscussible heresy?

In the same volume, Arthur Waskow explores the risks and complexities of the "deterrence" policy; H. Stuart Hughes urges consideration for some form of the Rapacki plan "which has gone through various modifications but which has usually had as its central feature the nuclear demilitarization of East and West Germany, Poland and Czechoslovakia."

Are these thoughts unworthy of public debate?

There are many passages in the book with which I quarrel, and one might disagree with the selection of some of the contributors. In his introduction Mr. ROOSEVELT anticipated such dissent when he wrote, "It goes without saying that I do not subscribe to or agree with everything that the contributors have said in this volume * * *" Then he added:

The primary function of these essays is to reopen the political forum and reinstate the dialogue of politics in our attempt to lead to new directions in public policy.

Nothing has more painfully revealed the bankruptcy and sterility of the Republican congressional chieftans—and their right-wing cheerleaders—than their effort to ban such dialogue.

Mr. ROOSEVELT seems undismayed by the rightist clamor. He says, "I don't back down one word from what I said in the introduction—that these are proposals to be considered." He remarks sharply that he wonders whether the Republicans want to occupy the position of "refusing to discuss ideas." He says his own mail is running three-to-one in his favor, without any sign of large commotion, and that many people are telling him they plan to read the book. It is his impression that the White House shares his calm.

Obviously, it is the Republican hope to smother the story of the John Birchers by picturing the Roosevelt group as a comparable extreme. This is to equate frenzied paranoia with responsible dissent, it is assume that the country has lost all desire for thoughtful debate, and all capacity for serious judgment.

Hon. Robert C. Byrd, of West Virginia, Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 26, the District of Columbia Welfare Association honored my good friend, our former colleague in the House, the distinguished junior Senator

from West Virginia, the honorable ROBERT C. BYRD.

It was my privilege to participate in the ceremonies. I include as a part of my remarks the brief words I spoke on that occasion:

People of Washington are very fortunate in having a man of BOB BYRD's caliber, of BOB BYRD's honesty and integrity, as the guardian of their fiscal affairs. I know BOB BYRD's work on appropriations for the District Department of Welfare has been badly misrepresented in some quarters in Washington. What BOB BYRD has been trying to do is what everybody in the past has failed to do—he has tried to find out what happens to the welfare dollar, how it is being spent, whether it is being wisely spent, whether it is going to people who are not deserving as opposed to people who are in real need.

I know that there is always a hue and cry from conscientious people who fear any hard look at welfare, who feel that any probing would "upset the applecart." But if one never picks up the rug to clean out the dust and dirt that might accumulate under it, then one cannot say that one's home is clean. By the same token any fear of lifting the lid on the Welfare Department to see what dust and dirt might have accumulated under it is condoning uncleanliness and unwholesomeness that might be prevalent in the Department. It takes a man of great courage to force down critics who are quick to see evil in any probe of welfare.

BOB BYRD has never been a coward. He has never shirked his duty where he saw his duty to be, and I can tell you that the Department of Welfare will be a better Department, a more efficient Department, a Department better oriented to meet the needs of people who are worthy of relief, as a result of BOB BYRD's action.

The commendation that you are affording BOB BYRD today is one that he richly deserves. His job as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia Government Appropriations is in truth a thankless job. I know that he has devoted countless hours to this task; in fact, I know that he has worked far into the night for countless nights, and on countless weekends as well, in order to give the people of Washington the very best kind of fiscal responsibility.

I want to add my voice to those of you here today in commending Senator ROBERT C. BYRD for his conscientious work in behalf of the District of Columbia government.

Tribute to Hon. G. Oberdan Rizzo—Writer, Lecturer, Poet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, amongst our trials and tribulations over domestic and foreign problems, we seldom find time to reflect on the basic American and what has made this country forge ahead. Some of the greatest contributions came from people who were rarely if ever heard from, for their efforts were not accepted or realized until years later when the full value of their contribution was realized.

I therefore bring to the attention of the House today one who merits such plaudits, who is still among the living, a real American who realizes only too well and with much more vehemence the virtues of our country than many who in these days take for granted their heritage.

The man in question is Dr. Gaetano Oberdan Rizzo, who in the 1920's fled from Italy to escape Mussolini's Fascist soldiers and came to this country where he became an American citizen. He has established himself in this country and around the world.

Dr. Rizzo's fame as a writer, lecturer, and poet is renowned throughout the world. For over 40 years he has been a freelance journalist. He is a contributing editor to approximately 50 newspapers and magazines and is the editor and publisher of the monthly magazine Il Mondo Libero, "the free world," a cultural magazine.

Prominent writers such as Robert Mandel have written articles lauding Dr. Rizzo for his significant contribution to the world of literature.

In 1960, the authorities of the University of Puerto Rico requested Dr. Rizzo to translate the five books of the poet laureate of Puerto Rico, Obdulio Bauza, from Spanish into Italian. The publication, Calabria Letteraria, considered the translation more beautiful than the original works.

Many academies, newspapers, magazines and universities have honored Dr. Rizzo with doctorate degrees for excellence in poetry.

The Gold Legion of Rome under UNESCO proclaimed him honorary counsel, presented him with an academic gold medal; the academy Tiberine proclaimed him poet laureate.

Dr. Rizzo has directed his writing talents to informing the peoples of the world of the cultural, social, and economic way of American life. As a direct result of this, he has received hundreds of invitations to lecture on America and also to receive personally special recognition in Italy this year.

He has been invited to lecture at the Rome Exposition, an equivalent of our World's Fair, between May 26 and June 10, 1962.

Casa Materna, similar to our Boys Town, in Portici, Italy, has invited Dr. Rizzo to speak. The International Academy of Nicastro, Calabria, wishes to personally honor Dr. Rizzo for his achievements in poetry as well as bestowing upon him the Grand Collare of a grand knight.

The Chamber of Deputies of the Congress of Italy wish to present a gold medal to him personally.

Those of us who know Dr. Rizzo's contributions in promoting democracy, brotherhood, and humanity, and the cultural and spiritual aspects of life realize how truly deserving he is of such recognition.

Approximately 400 poets, writers, and critics from all over the world have recognized his works by highly praising his significant contribution to the abovementioned causes. During World War II our Government called upon Dr. Rizzo to inform the Italian people about the values of democracy and freedom. He accomplished this through organizing groups, lecturing, and writing editorials.

Through his untiring efforts an orphanage was established in Italy approximately 5 years ago. Italy has honored him on many occasions as a humanitarian poet. He has been awarded the international first prize by the writers academy in Argentina for his poetry because of the humanitarian sentiments.

In October 1961, during the poetry festival in Paris, France, 1 day was dedicated to the reading of Dr. Rizzo's works and General de Gaulle telegraphed his congratulations.

Dr. Rizzo is a modest man in spite of his world recognition as a humanitarian poet, patriot, and civic-minded citizen.

Italians can be rightly proud of his accomplishments and the United States appreciative of his efforts to spread good will and understanding throughout the world through his writings.

Poverty Oath Medicine?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I believe that it would be of great value for our colleagues to have the opportunity to read the following editorial from the Red Wing, Minn., Daily Republican Eagle of April 2, 1962. This editorial shows the foolishness of the charge that receiving medical care under the Kerr-Mills bill forces anyone to take a poverty oath.

POVERTY OATH MEDICINE

Today appears Abe Ribicoff's third article urging public support for President Kennedy's plan to provide health care for old people. The Daily Republican Eagle questions the wisdom of this plan, but we believe citizens ought to hear the arguments for it.

Secretary Ribicoff devotes most of this article to running down the Kerr-Mills or medical assistance to the aged program which the Eisenhower administration pushed through Congress shortly before leaving office. Ribicoff scorns this program as "public relief." He attacks it because "the elderly must prove they are paupers." Other pro-administration literature brands the Kerr-Mills ideas as "poverty oath medicine" because it requires old people to take a "pauper's oath."

Now leaving these emotional epithets aside for a moment, let's take a look at what's required right now in Goodhue County for an old person to get help with a medical bill. The county welfare office will pay provided: (a) That the person doesn't have more than $10,000 in unencumbered real estate (that is, he can own a $10,000 home free and clear or a $15,000 home with a mortgage of $5,000 or more); (b) that his cash on hand or in the bank not be over $300 (or $450 for a married couple); (c) that his cash value in paid-up life insurance or prepaid burial not be over $500 ($1,000 for a married couple); and (d) that his income not be greater than what the welfare office, according to careful budget standards, determines to be his needs. In addition, the welfare office will take a lien on this person's property so that, in effect, his heirs will repay the taxpayers before they inherit a $10,000 home or other

property. Minnesota law sets no limit on the amount a welfare office may pay out for an old person's medical care.

Let's suppose next that Minnesota goes into the Kerr-Mills program—as it surely ought to do with the 1963 legislative session. Under the terms that have been proposed, an old person could then get county welfare help with his medical bills if: (a) his debt-free home doesn't exceed $15,000 in market value (or a $22,000 home with not less than a $7,000 mortgage); (b) his ready cash and paid-up insurance isn't more than $1,500; and (c) his income isn't over $1,600 per year for a single man or $2,400 for a married couple. And to make it easier there'd be no lien placed against his property and no length-of-residence requirement in Goodhue County.

What we'd like to know, Mr. Ribicoff, is whether you consider an elderly couple who own a $15,000 home free of debt, have $1,500 in the bank, and receive an income of $200 per month mere paupers. Is an old person who testifies to these facts taking a poverty oath? Such a person would need help with big doctor and medical bills, surely, but otherwise he ought to be able to get along. And that's exactly the theory behind the Kerr-Mills law which Ribicoff derides. Kerr-Mills assistance, incidentally, extends to doctor bills and drugs, while the social security plan is limited to hospital, nursing home, and home nursing care.

Minnesota, of course, hasn't yet adopted this Kerr-Mills program. And Ribicoff makes capital out of the fact that only a minority of States have to date. But remember that Congress put Kerr-Mills into effect only 18 months ago, and State legislative mills often grind slowly. Is it not preferable to let each State determine the levels of its own medical assistance to old people? Or should the rest of us pick up the check because some States just won't tax themselves to take care of their own old people?

This question of a means test really goes to the heart of the difference in outlook between America's two major political parties. Republicans would encourage everybody to save during his working life so that, with the aid of his regular social security check after age 62 or 65, he'll be able to take care of himself. But if some people fail to save or their savings don't prove to be enough, Republicans would have taxpayers cover their old-age health costs so that nobody will ever suffer for lack of proper medical care. Democrats, on the other hand, would impose permanently heavier taxes on all working people and all business firms in order to finance free hospital and nursing home care in old age for everybody, whether the individual is of limited means or a millionaire. And the Republicans, while offering Federal assistance, would let each State determine its own level of care through its own political process. And then have local county welfare boards and welfare offices run the program, making sure that human needs are met and taxpayers get their money's worth. But Democrats would take State and local governments out of it completely, making the program a Federal one lock, stock, and barrel.

The Savings Industry—A New Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address by the Honorable Joseph P. McMurray, Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, given at a meeting of the stockholders of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Boston, Mass., at Boston, on March 10, 1962:

THE SAVINGS INDUSTRY—A NEW PERSPECTIVE

(By Joseph M. McMurray)

First, I bring greetings to you from my good friends and very able colleagues, Joe Williams and Ira Dixon, who have been such a great help to me during these first 10 months. I am always happy for the opportunity to come to New England. It was through the port of Boston that my ancestors on my mother's side arrived over a hundred years ago from that beautiful isle across the sea and about which you will hear so much on next Saturday. My mother was born and raised in Rhode Island, while my father was born and raised just a few miles from the Connecticut border in Dutchess County, N.Y. My roots are in New England as, indeed, are the roots of our democracy and, yes, the thrift industry.

Your record in thrift-type banking during the period 1929 to 1933 was remarkable in terms of the soundness of the institutions and the degree to which you weathered the storm. The cooperative banks and savings banks of New England are a sentinel bearing testimony to the fact that financial institutions can be guided with prudence, safety, and, yet, serve the community in a very excellent fashion.

Your savings and loan associations and your home loan bank also have set a standard of performance which is commendable and should be copied by others. In talking with you today I hope to explore some of the things which bear so critically on our work and your performance within the regulatory framework that we adopt.

I should like to ask you to join me in looking at two broad areas of responsibility—yours and the Board's, including the Federal home loan banks. In doing so, I will adopt a maxim that many of you have repeated to me in one form or another since I took office. Almost without fail, some one of you has expressed the hope that my tenure in office would bring to the savings industry the status it deserves.

We are attempting to build an organization and to inculcate a set of procedures which will assure more than a reaction to conditions as they arise. Our principal concern has been the substance rather than just the form of our actions. While we have acted promptly and decisively on issues affecting the flexibility of the industry and its safety and soundness, a great deal of work remains in developing economically justifiable practices and a policy framework fitting the structure of our society as we find it today and as it is likely to develop in the years ahead.

Among the problems that now attract our attention is the liquidity of the bank system. Procedures adopted since 1955 have served us well, but there are those who argue we are not liquid enough. Preliminary indications are almost directly the opposite. Currently, the banks have almost $1.3 billion in cash and governments. Liquid reserves against deposits and for unanticipated loan demand are quite large. Only during the most extreme seasonal pressure for loan demand does the operating liquidity come under any meaningful pressure and that occurs before the reserve for unusual loan demand is even touched. The period of stringency lasts a very short time—a week or two—and disappears, and no member is even aware of the problem. Furthermore, the stringency is taken care of without issuing new obligations. In fact, after a record high in loan demand last December, we were able to pay off in full an issue maturing in February without pressing on operating liquidity. Let me point out also that the consolidated obligations enjoy a very favorable market, selling at only a small fraction of a point above Treasury obligations of the same maturity, and it appears the market would absorb consolidated obligations in amounts much larger than are now outstanding. The spread between U.S. Government obligations and home loan bank obligations of comparable maturity amounts to between fifteen and twenty-five hundredths of 1 percent.

Nevertheless, there are those who believe that the system should carry more liquidity. It is recommended that we issue long-term obligations and invest the funds in short-term obligations, assessing the difference in cost against the members. Another proposal is to require that the members maintain a certain percentage in cash with their Home Loan Bank. That percentage could then be invested in short-term securities and the special deposits would the earn a rate of return based on the earnings of the short-term securities.

One of our consultants has remarked that this is a little bit like the corporate treasurer who does not understand the financial report for his corporation and says to his accountant "Let's go down and have a look in the till." This member of the task force group takes the position that liquidity which is available in the market place is a good substitute for liquidity on hand. It costs money to have liquidity where you can touch it and count it and you have to get something for this money.

He argues that perhaps there is nothing to be gained by stockpiling liquidity and paying an extra price for it unless there is some clear present need. He would recommend, therefore, that neither of the foregoing proposals be adopted. Even though we may agree that potential liquidity is an adequate substitute for liquidity on hand, and even though we may not wish to pay out any more money for liquidity which we may not use for some indefinite period, we do believe that this is an important problem. We are therefore taking a second look to see if our procedures are sufficiently flexible and if they provide for the most efficient use of the funds entrusted to the care of the banks.

There has been considerable discussion in the savings and loan industry, in the financial community generally, the CED Commission on Money and Credit, and to some extent, in the academic fraternity of the lending practices of the bank system. Some of the comment has questioned some of the programs including their legislative history but I believe the doubts represent an inadequate appraisal of the role of the bank system. Many observers fail to recognize that in the past 12 years advances of the Federal home loan banks have risen about $1.6 billion while Fannie Mae's portfolio has increased more than $5.5 billion. Even though in recent years the volume of loans made by member institution banks has outstripped other types of lending in the mortgage area, in the 12 years ending in 1960 VA and FHA loans have increased by the same amount as conventional loans made by the savings industry.

If we compare the increase in FNMA financing to the increase in VA and FHA loans we find that FNMA has supplied about 12 percent of the funds going into those mortgages. Member institutions, however, have borrowed only about 4 percent of the funds they have employed in expanding their loan portfolio. I would not want to rest the case on the fact that the bank system's performance has been more moderate than some other institutions; the comparison is offered merely to provide some perspective. I think the real point is that member institutions have not made the maximum use of the privilege which the Home Loan Bank System offers. If we look at the size of the contribution of borrowing from home loan banks by members, the figures seem to suggest that the increase has been used to bridge tempo-

rary gaps in the supply of funds and to maintain a reasonably steady level of lending. It does not appear to have been used as a major prop to the expansion of portfolios.

There are numerous other practices with which we are concerned. The role of holding companies, affiliated companies, loans to one borrower, construction lending, fees, variable dividends, and other operating procedures merit our study and perhaps action. We do not intend to act precipitously or to be restrictive for the sake of restriction alone. We intend instead to create a body of procedures which can withstand scrutiny and about which we are confident.

We would like to broaden and improve the techniques used in our participation program. Despite the very favorable performance of that program, we are not entirely pleased with the flow of funds and some of the terms that exist in the participation market. We are even considering permitting insured institutions to lend throughout the country. This would be subject to a restriction of 5 percent of assets or some other limitation of a similar type, at least until we gained some experience with it. It would have the virtue of making people more cognizant of conditions in the participation market; it would offer an alternative to the participation market; and, finally, would help to increase the flow of funds from regions with surpluses to regions with deficits. It might dampen the tendency in capital-short areas for institutions to continually hike dividend rates as a means of attracting capital, causing serious problems in capital surplus areas. It will also afford capital surplus areas an opportunity to share in good quality, higher yield mortgages.

There is one issue which is very much on your mind and on the Board's. That is the issue of the constant increase in dividend rates, particularly in some parts of the country where mortgage funds are scarce and member associations have been able to raise rates and attract money from other parts of the country. As I indicated earlier, we would like to see a good movement of funds throughout the country. But we are beginning to become convinced that there is a problem here that the raising of rates alone does not solve. While the areas with higher rates may attract some funds from other parts of the country they do so when demand is strong by increasing interest rates or fees or both on mortgages.

This tends to raise the cost of home financing and tends to block us in the pursuit of one of our goals, economical home finance.

More recently, it appears that some of the associations who are raising rates may have to do so at the expense of their addition to reserves or by reaching out for marginal loans of dubious quality. You may recall that in the 1920's one of the problems that the commercial banks got into was a competitive race for savings deposits. As a matter of fact, during the 1920's the proportion of savings deposits to total deposits in the commercial banks was much higher than it is today. This was in part a reflection of the fact that the commercial banks were very aggressive in competing for those deposits. Virtuous as this may seem under some conditions, the competition reached such a point that many banks sought loans that were of poor quality and which, during the period from 1929 to 1933, caused a great deal of grief. It was for this reason that Senator Carter Glass introduced into section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act a paragraph giving the Board of Governors the powers to set limits on the rates paid on savings deposits by commercial banks.

As you know, the Home Loan Bank Board conducted a vigorous campaign late last year to prevent a rise in rates throughout the country. Our success was more than limited. There were, of course, areas in which rates had to rise because the new rates paid by the commercial banks required the savings and loan associations to keep step.

We were most concerned about those areas in which, despite the increase in rates paid by the commercial banks, there was still a good margin in favor of the savings and loan associations. While we had some success at that time, in recent weeks there has been a deterioration. A number of associations in California have recently raised the rate to 4¾ percent. A justification for this procedure is most obscure.

Now the Board can talk to these people, and we can cajole, but we have no positive tool for action. It has been suggested, and we are considering and studying, the possibility of going to Congress and obtaining legislation which would give us the authority to set a limit on dividend rates. We know that this is regarded as an objectionable procedure in the industry. In fact, there are many economists who deplore the need for this type of tool. They argue that, in effect, the regulator is made to do the work that the banks and the savings institutions ought to do for themselves. That argument notwithstanding, however, there are those who point out that in this phase of the cycle you tend to get the type of competition on a rate basis which leads to the reaching out for loans of undesirable quality. While there is no substantial evidence at the present time that this has already occurred, I wonder about the wisdom of waiting until it does occur.

My concentration on the role of the Board and the banks has been intentional. If our procedures are clear, well planned, and of high quality, it is inevitable that the associations will be stimulated to follow the lead. My comments about your role will, therefore, be brief.

I hope that each member of this bank and the 10 others will lend its efforts to recognize that we live in a changing world requiring continuous adaptation. On the operating side, you should seek to adopt the best and most up-to-date recordkeeping and personnel techniques available. In your role as a financial institution, you should be keenly aware and fully informed on changes in the economy, the housing market, and the money and capital markets. As a general rule, you should avoid practices which cast doubt on your basic intentions. On occasion, I find my attention directed to so-called self-dealing and other practices which really debase your coin—public confidence. Of course, these situations can be dealt with by regulation. Let me recommend, however, that you would serve your own best interest by eradicating any questionable practices before someone else tells you to do so. If you want recognition and prestige, you can inspire it most readily by the good you do voluntarily.

Perhaps the most difficult task you face is adapting appropriate lending policies. Some financial institutions choose the extreme of ultraconservatism. They have sparkling balance sheets and few, if any, losses, but many competent observers wonder if they are truly performing their role in society. Then we can always find those who are so anxious for growth and income that almost any risk is considered a good bet if it pushes the institution toward bigger statement totals. Obviously, there is a more sensible middle ground. It isn't easy to define or even to find. I know of no optimum which can be specified precisely, but that is why you are entrusted with the role of management. You must make the judgments, but they need to be sound justifiable decisions. If the thrift industry is to continue to prosper, enjoy public confidence, and evolve into an ever more important mechanism in our society, you will need to pursue these goals with care.

I can best illustrate my point with a story. A very famous architect became known for his dislike of church architecture. He believed it was either too stodgy or sacrificed religious feeling. He yearned for the day when he could create a church that would demonstrate his principles. The day came, and he built an edifice with true religious feeling, reflecting elegance, beauty, and imagination. One day a friend was admiring the project and complimented him, but asked, "By the way, what denomination is going to have this church?" "I don't know," replied the architect, "I'm building it as a speculation."

Perhaps I have wandered a bit from my theme—a new perspective. Indeed, the perspective I have offered you in reality may be time-honored rather than new; namely, that status is the result of achievement rather than of decoration or symbols. It helps sometimes to look at the progress of others. Those of us who can look back 30 years will recall that lawyers were called ambulance chasers and other less complimentary names; doctors were referred to as medicine men; securities brokers were demeaned with the label bucket-shop operators; members of the academic fraternity, until just recently, were labelled longhairs and eggheads and these were terms of aspersion and not approval. There have been some remarkable changes in the standing of these professions. Some of the changes are the result of time or circumstances to an important extent, but in almost every case, self-discipline, integrity, and clearly commendable achievement have also contributed to the new-found respect for men and women in these fields. Here in New England where the cooperative banks are well-known institutions of longstanding, where the savings associations follow practices that are generally regarded as of high quality, and the savings bank originated, there may be little concern about what people think or say about the savings institutions. In other parts of the country, however where the savings institutions are newer and where, perhaps, they seem to have followed rather aggressive policies, even though there have been very few cases where this has resulted in any difficulty, the savings associations are like the new boy on the block—they are going to take a lot of kidding. Time will erase some of this, of course, but, in the main, the savings associations, particularly in other parts of the country, are going to have to earn their status. It will depend in large measure on what they do and how they do it.

Even though some of the comments I am about to make do not apply to you, I hope you will take them seriously and that you will try to convince your colleagues in the industry that they are of some merit. Each of us needs to move to new high ground and gain a perspective which, if not new, is broader than that we have had before.

We must view the thrift institution, not just as another industry, but, rather, as an important element in our economy, linking the saver, the builder, and the home-buyer, and assisting the Nation to pursue its goal of stability and growth. We must recognize our influence on the money and capital markets and their influence on thrift institutions. We must resolve to pursue practices and procedures which lend vitality to our functions and respect to our name. At the risk of repeating what I have said elsewhere, let me add that my good friends and very able colleagues Joe Williams, Ira Dixon, I and our staff are devoted to these goals. We intend to move along in an unswerving path toward them and we hope that our progress will be hastened by your support and assistance.

Seattle World's Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to call attention to an article about the Seattle World's Fair by Lincoln Kirstein in the April 7 issue of the Nation.

Mr. Kirstein does a masterful job of capturing the spirit of this great exposition and the community which brought it into being.

I also wish to renew my often-repeated invitation to my colleagues to set aside a few days this summer or fall to visit the Seattle World's Fair, which will open April 21 and run until October 21. Mr. Kirstein's article follows:

LINCOLN KIRSTEIN

In the coming months, Century 21 Exposition, the Seattle World's Fair which opens on April 21, will get its just and lavish due in the press. But before the massive weight of an indicated and seemingly inevitable success swamps any hint of the trials of its inception and organization, it may be useful to indicate some of the realities behind this exemplary project. The pressures which urged its birth are not unique to our Pacific Northwest, although the physical plant which these pressures have finally determined is unique in this Nation at the present. The normal human obstructions of conservatism, apathy, and the frictions of greed and envy, which made much of the early going difficult, are universal, but the success with which they have been overcome, and fairly rapidly, are unusual anywhere. We now have many projects for "culture centers" all over the country, from Lincoln Center in New York, which is already partly built, to those projected for Los Angeles, Pittsburgh, and Washington, D.C. But next October, at the end of its World's Fair, Seattle will be in possession of a vast civic improvement which will offer a complex of facilities on a scale of practical generosity not even anticipated by any other community. This center will contain an opera house-concert hall, a small theater, a science pavilion, a sports arena, an outdoor stadium, an exhibit hall, and a coliseum.

In the light of Seattle's achievement it is easy to denigrate the present considerable accomplishment of Lincoln Center. But whereas New York City, or rather the Borough of Manhattan, must accommodate a heavily crowded and overbuilt plan on some 14 acres, Seattle could provide an open yet closely integrated design of 74 acres. Lincoln Center will finally cost the Federal, State, and city governments, various foundations and individuals in the neighborhood of $200 million, while Seattle has completed its plan with about $85 million. Again, however, Manhattan is an island, and its costs in land and labor are the Nation's peaks. Social, economic, and geographic insularity predicate extremely conservative possibilities. For one thing, it might have been possible in any European autocratic or Socialist state to condemn the expensive block of real estate leading from Central Park West to Broadway. This would have provided an axis for Lincoln Center, a planted parade approach which is the normal setting for its key building, the Metropolitan Opera House. But the razing of property involved would be unthinkable here and now. Manhattan has not been a frontier town for 2 centuries; in many ways, Seattle still is. And Seattle is more homogeneous and focused than Los Angeles, less rich and complacent than San Francisco.

The more one studies the organization of the Seattle plan, the more one doubts it could have been effected on such a scale in any other part of the country. There may be more money in Texas, but Texas suffers from a self-perpetuating parochialism which prefers to spend its energy in the inbred competition of three towns, and tends to exclude the rest of the world, except as it applies to Texas. New York may be the cultural capital of the country and port to the globe entire, but its costs and pressures in nerves and property preclude much breadth or daring. Washington, as a National Capital, has a symbolic prestige of some urgency and a captive audience of tourists and Government workers, but it is at root inchoate and faceless.

There is a very strong face to the Seattle Fair which is most immediately apparent in the impulse and ability to control its overall visual aspects. From the outset, there has been a determined effort to maintain a unit which contains an elastic interior vitality and variety, presenting a unified, light, elegant stylistic whole. Unlike many previous fairs, one's first impression is not of any startling eccentricity in a few arrogant and insistent profiles, but rather of a more or less delicate fantasy within a compact plan. It sacrifices no gaiety or playfulness, but it is designed as an integrated precinct, rather than as a loose collection of temporary structures.

And unlike other world fairs, past and future, there was a root necessity for the Seattle exposition, beyond the compulsive exuberance of an energetic park commissioner, or the usual enthusiasm of a chamber of commerce. This necessity was the many sided and long acknowledged demand for a center for industrial shows, cultural activities, sports events and entertainment, serving not alone a large city but a whole region that embraced Seattle, Tacoma, Spokane, and up to Vancouver.

It is difficult to understand the economic logic of self-styled hardheaded businessmen, bankers, actuaries, and real estate operators who backed the "Century of Progress" in 1933, the New York Fair of 1939 (as of 1964), and the Brussels Fair of 1958, wherein the greater part of their investment in planning and construction was wiped out at the conclusion of each show. In New York, which is typical, the fair site is too far removed from the urban center to have much continuous value except as a summer park. A concept of permanence and continuous use was paramount from inception in Seattle, and hence its integration, the ordering of its facilities, its accessibility to the heart of the city as well as the adjacent growing outskirts were always considered.

In 1956, the city of Seattle authorized a modest bond issue of $7.5 million, to initiate a civic center whose rather vague conditions then included a 6,000-seat opera house as a multipurpose auditorium. The scope of the present center was hardly indicated, and the interest of national or international factors not even suspected. To be sure, there was the useful reminder that in 1909, Seattle had held the Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition for 137 days. In spite of the lack of mass transport at the time, 4 million people visited Seattle.

In 1957, Gov. Albert D. Rosellini invited some 70 business, labor and community leaders to form a trusteeship for Century 21 Exposition, Inc. However, any major underwriting was a considerable struggle until as late as 1960. Then, with substantial aid from Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, help was promised in Washington for a very ambitious science pavilion, for which the Federal Government granted $9 million, the largest sum for such a purpose that has ever been made. (The New York 1964 fair will probably receive $25 million from the same source.) Having grown from its first notions of a State fair to a regional exposition, Century 21 then sent Joseph Gandy, the energetic president of the fair and a local Ford dealer, to Paris, where he obtained from the Bureau of International Expositions an authorization as a legitimate World's Fair. This recognition automatically allied 30 member nations with the project. Such authorization has been ignored by the New York World's Fair of 1964.

In order to encourage those who follow in the footsteps of Seattle's planners, it should be said that the early going was the reverse of simple or easy. Not only doubt, but possibly well-intentioned opposition was a powerful deterrent. Whenever public lands or facilities are in hazard, either to rehabilitate or replace, whenever there is a question of condemnation, reconversion or improvement, one must expect every legal hindrance due process can muster. Seattle had its full share. For example, an individual who owned some $1,000 worth of the original $7.5 million city bond issue brought suit. He stated that the proposed new multipurpose concert hall was merely a conversion and not the new facility which had been voted by the people; in June 1959, the court ruled in his favor. A general referendum was scheduled for September so that the entire local electorate could be heard. And the Seattle voters sustained the convention program. Had they denied the plan, the cost would have been almost double.

To build an opera house-concert hall from scratch would have entailed many millions more than the original $4 million proposed for that building; no additional facilities could have been afforded. What finally resulted was the completion of an excellent opera house within the walls of an older structure (the former vast civic auditorium) at a cost of $2.5 million; the remaining funds were allocated to the small theater and further permanent exhibition space. In addition, $1.5 million was authorized from the city's general funds to assure completion of the whole culture center in more than a minimal fashion. This included the realistic decision to purchase first-rate equipment and furnishings which will mean long-range economies of maintenance.

At the start, apart from suspicion and envy, there was considerable doubt that sufficient energy and funds could be found to justify an appreciable local displacement of habitual investment and passive planning. Besides, there was not even a skeleton staff to direct strategy for such an exercise. But beginning 5 years ago, a small key group of the busiest men in the Northwest met on fair business weekly, later twice a week, from 7 o'clock in the morning until their own offices opened. It took 3 years of tactical maneuvering to clear the way for actual construction. But the fact remains that for the last 3 years, the fair has enjoyed the strongest volunteer program both in quality of leadership and dollars of underwriting, for any public purpose in the history of the Seattle region. One cannot pretend that it was a mass movement; a very few men did a very great deal of work. That so large a program was undertaken in peacetime, rather than under the whips of war, is also heartening.

Paul Thiry, a local architect of taste and capacity and a member of the city planning commission, was retained as governing architect for the whole exposition, and for the residual permanent civic center. He has insured a unity of style in a manner which has been more editorial than censorious. In order to accommodate diversity within a unified whole, a repetitive module was established for much of the shelter skirting the fair walls.

Tall, delicate, square, black-steel columns at regular intervals support a more or less continuous colonnade, facing the interior of

the fairgrounds; these hold up large square precast concrete vaults which form a solid roofing. The spaces between the columns may be plugged in any way the exhibitors desire, to avoid monotony, although all plans have been under the close observation of Mr. Thiry and his staff. The use of very thin precast concrete slab walls on the perimeters of the grounds is most impressive The construction workers took considerable pride in the great project; it was a mark of some prestige to be chosen to work at the fair. As a result, the broad walls have a surface, their edges a crispness, hardness and apparent solidity, unusual to an often graceless and impermanent material.

B. Marcus Priteca and James Chiarelli, local architects, have inserted a very handsome and capacious opera house seating 3,100 persons, with a huge and well-equipped stage and a luxurious lobby in rose marble, within the shell of the old civic auditorium. Apart from serving the Seattle Symphony annually, it can accommodate the San Francisco and Metropolitan Operas, on tour, in facilities as good as, or even better than, their own homes. The fair has taken similar advantage of other existing and adjacent structures. The sports arena, seating 5,500, has been handsomely refaced in brick; the large State stadium, seating 12,000, has been beautifuly replanted.

A courageous and dramatic move was made during the fair's earliest planning in the retention of Minoru Yamasaki of Detroit as a member of the fair's design standard advisory board. This Nisei architect had lived in Seattle and graduated from the University of Washington, but had left because of the anti-Japanese feeling engendered by the Second World War. His parents had been interned as enemy aliens, and his return to Seattle was not undertaken without emotion. The Federal Science Pavilion, the single most ambitious complex at the fair, is entirely of his design. Although Yamasaki was actually no longer advising the fair when he, with the local Seattle architects Naramore, Bain, Brady, and Johansen, was selected by the U.S. Government to design this building, his interest stemmed from a very close involvement in the original embryonic ideas.

Yamasaki has placed three large rectilinear structures around a watercourt; very tall precast concrete columns in the center form an airy skeletal pavilion, capped with a lacy articulation of tracery and concrete spiderwebbing which is almost late Gothic in feeling, and also recalls the construction of crystals. It is a masterpiece. When the fair closes, it may revert to the University of Washington.

The theme building of London's 1851 International Exhibition was Paxton's Crystal Palace. The fourth international French fair was adorned by Eiffel's Tower which, until the present has surpassed all other theme structures, including the Trylon and Perisphere of New York in 1939, and the atomic globes of Brussels in 1958. John Graham, a Seattle architect-engineer, had recently placed a revolving restaurant on a large office building in Hawaii. He was asked by a group of private financiers to design what has now become the fair's theme building, and promptly produced the Space Tower. It is far handsomer in reality than early models or the renderings issued by the management. In certain lights, it seems entirely improbable, for its central service shaft disappears, and one sees only the slim profiles of the bundle of steel-and-concrete rods, which support its diadem, 600 feet in the air. The rods are pinched together at a height of 375 feet, and then gently flare out to 550 feet, to hold a restaurant seating 600 people, which turns imperceptibly once an hour, to give an incomparable view of bay and mountain ranges. It is proof against earthquake and eevn suicide; it is so perfectly balanced that a 1-horsepower motor is all that is required to swing the restaurant.

"The World of Tomorrow," the theme show of the fair, is housed in perhaps the most radical engineering among many very advanced designs. Paul Thiry has designed a coliseum which can house large conventions and sports events after the fair closes. Four massively sculptured concrete tripods act as abutments for the four steel compression trusses of the roof envelope, and are connected by a hollow prestressed concrete edge beam. Steel cables laced between the trusses form a hyperbolic paraboloid network on which aluminum panels are secured to form the completed roof. This encloses three acres of uninterrupted space and can seat 18,000 persons when cleared of exhibits and converted to civic center use.

In what will be the civic center's main complex, connecting the small theatre designed by Paul Kirk with the opera house, stands the exhibit hall. It is a very high and well-lit concrete shell, enclosing some 40,000 square feet of space. During the fair, this will contain at various times, an ambitious exhibition of masterpieces of painting from international collections, chosen by Dr. William Milliken, director emeritus of the Cleveland Museum; a large show of American and international art since 1950, selected by Dr. Sam Hunter of Brandeis University and Dr. William Sandberg, of the Stedjlijk Museum, Amsterdam; and the arts and crafts of the Pacific Northwest. By no means least, there will be shown the best of the brilliant collection of the Seattle Museum itself, which, under the able direction of Dr. Richard Fuller, has made itself famous among American galleries of middle size since the last war, particularly in its Chinese and Japanese departments. There will also be a one-man show of pictures by Mark Tobey, perhaps the most widely appreciated of Northwestern modern painters. The opera house, the small theater, the sports arena and the large stadium, owned by the Seattle school system, will be continuously occupied by performing arts events, under the direction of Harold Shaw, an associate of S. Hurok.

In an operation of such magnitude, many people have been responsible, and a wealth of medals and bouquets have already begun to be handed around. But, as is often the case, a very few have been in key positions, and of these some have seldom been mentioned at all. In the central operations office of the fair corporation, there is mounted a terrifying robot, the countdown machine. This proclaims visually the weeks, days, indeed the hours to high noon, April 21, 1962, when President Kennedy will declare the fair open. No one watches this relentless reminder with more fascination, alarm, and hope than Ewen C. Dingwall, since 1957 the vice president and general manager of Century 21 Exposition, Inc. Mr. Dingwall, an affably anonymous dynamo, is one of our unsung culture heroes. He served an invaluable apprenticeship as the former executive director of the Washington State Research Council; he has been executive assistant to a mayor of Seattle and is no innocent in Washington, D.C., nor in Athens, or Tokyo. He has been chief administrative officer of the entire fair, charged with carrying out the plans and construction of the whole scheme.

Under 50, Dingwall is a concentrated man who seems first of all to have conquered any apparent restlessness or apprehensiveness of his own, to have found a formula which saves time, money and nerves, with at the same time a just insight into the personal interests of diverse people. Mr. Dingwall has something more than administrative gifts and long experience. By supporting the choice of individuals whose best judgments were sometimes quite at variance with the atmosphere of commercial success, he has imposed a high degree of elegance on this exposition. With the small key group of strong-willed leaders in close agreement, Dingwall recognized from the start the importance of a philosophical or esthetic basis to so popular, so loose, and in the best sense, so democratic a proposition. The fair has not so much good taste, nor any one man's taste; it is the creation and presence of an ambience in which logic, gaiety, a homogeneous lightness and variety interlock with compactness and practicality, with no watering of a central aristocratic integrity, and nothing vulgar.

Is there nothing wrong, at all? Are there no errors? Had it to be done again, could anything be done better? These questions are scarcely relevant at this juncture, particularly since there is so much of excellence and the fair is not yet finished or open. It might be carping to find some fault with the brutal and graceless precast concrete supports of the first monorail train in the United States: it will transport visitors from downtown Seattle to the fairgrounds, more than a mile in 96 seconds. But they point to the fact that the Seattle fair designers had nothing to do with the visual aspects of the monorail; it was planned and executed (and financed) by a West German concern.

When one compares it with the delicate concave and convex domes sheltering many of the national and industrial exhibits, one sees the wisdom of controlling design with a firm yet delicate central hand and eye. One might, as a professional theater man, question the size of the small theater. To provide for only 800 people in so beautiful, so luxurious a house is luxury indeed; the economics of present-day theater being what they are, future managers may moan for another 400 seats for which there can never be room.

And naturally one wonders what use will be found for the opera house, the small theater, the sports arena and coliseum, and all the other fine facilities after the end of next October, when the fair is closed. It would be a tremendous pity if their reversion to the city of Seattle resulted in a perfunctory city-hall operation. To fill such premises, to maintain them in a city the size of Seattle, 52 weeks in a year, year in and year out, will take money for loss and for development. But is it too much to expect that the men and minds which called these structures into being in response to a real need (even though you can't have a World's Fair every year) will be unable to determine their future uses? There is already much discussion of a public-service corporation which will manage or lease the spaces from the city on a basis of planned quality.

It would be good to think that what Seattle has been able to do about getting a culture center as the residual endowment from a World's Fair, could be done in half a dozen other American communities in the next 30 years. Boston, Atlanta, Chicago, and Los Angeles naturally spring to mind. All have large and growing urban and suburban areas, and are regional centers as well. The manner in which Seattle has responded to its necessity, its combination of salvage and courage, is certainly a model and an incitement.

Let's Beat Uncle to the Punch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it has been my practice to periodically place into the RECORD editorial commen-

tary made in community newspapers in my district, representing as they do, typical grassroots opinion.

Under leave granted, I therefore insert into the Appendix of the RECORD a clear, precise, firm commentary on the role of Government in problems which face local communities across the country. The editorial entitled "Let's Beat Uncle to the Punch" appeared in the La Grange Citizen of March 29, 1962:

LET'S BEAT UNCLE TO THE PUNCH

Opportunity to strike a tremendous blow for what has become mostly a conversation piece, freedom, is present in the population explosion and upheaval predicted for Chicago and its suburbs in the next three decades.

The physical magnitude of the population increase (double today's census in the next 30 years) is monstrous in itself, but it represents only half the total problem. The other half takes into account who those people will be, where they will be coming from, and where they will be moving to, as well as the staggering consequent problems, such as education and housing, which demand solution.

These problems, everyone must realize without delay, belong to all of us. This realization is imperative if we are to seize the opportunity mentioned earlier.

Being forewarned, we must now forearm ourselves. Acting on our own initiative, we must begin to lay plans for individual action through our schools, churches, service organizations, and businesses.

Only by assuming and discharging the personal responsibilities implicit in the freedoms we enjoy as inheritors of our American Republic can we head off unwanted and dangerous participation and control by Government.

It requires no special genius to see that Government is always more than willing to assume problems for us. The old and correct sentiment that Government ought to do for the people only that which they cannot do for themselves has a new twist: Government will now do for the people anything which will curry their favor and win their votes.

As Joseph Meek told local businessmen last week: if they don't move first to save themselves, the Government, itching to set up a Cabinet-rank Urban Affairs Department, will assume control, to the ultimate detriment and perhaps destruction of its supposed beneficiaries.

President Kennedy and Senator PAUL DOUGLAS have been making clucking sounds as mother hens. They have said, in effect, that they doubt our ability as consumers and money borrowers to look after ourselves.

Governor Kerner announced last week that six Illinois communities have already eaten of the fatal fruit: they have applied for urban planning grants. Eight other communities preceded them in their request. The budget for this, composed of State and Federal funds, is already $74,110. That's only the beginning.

Thus if we wait for George to do it, we can be certain that Uncle Sam will not only get into the act, but steal the show, along with the admission price of freedom. It is axiomatic and inescapable: with Government help comes Government control.

So this is where constructive conservatism comes in, in fact, must come in. While the radicals frankly urge Socialist solutions, while the reactionaries respond to the challenge by refusing to recognize it, and while the liberals insist on legislation and more taxes to study and later implement policies through new bureaucracies, the conservative has the best course open to him: to do it for himself.

Now this is not so difficult as it might seem. There are already in existence a multitude of private institutions and organizations with whose aims planning and action to solve metropolitan problems is compatible.

Many of the churches in this community have already undertaken or are thinking about activities in this direction. The secondary schools have set up a citizens' committee to probe possibilities for an area junior college, a big piece in the growing puzzle. The YMCA is already involved. The chamber of commerce has felt the first faint stirrings. Some businesses have begun to interest themselves; more should quickly follow suit.

In these communities we are blessed with men and women of superior resources, both in talent and finance. In these citizens we can find far better leadership and more diligent effort than we can in taxpaid bureaucrats. There is no need for a supergovernment, for we can do it for ourselves and do it better, if we only will.

The problems are no longer vague and distant; they stare us in the face.

Take it upon yourself in the next week to ask your minister or priest, your PTA president, the head of your civic or service clubs, others in your business, how you and your group can mobilize to tackle those aspects of the problems which are within your scope or field of interest.

If you don't, you know who will, and the price is higher than any of us should be willing to pay.

How Can We Best Retain Our Freedom in a World Threatened by War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the most important question facing our people and our country today is how to preserve freedom without war and nuclear catastrophe.

To equip young people with the knowledge and understanding to meet this challenge Gregg Post No. 12, American Legion, of Reading, Pa., sponsored an essay contest for high school students. The recent contest was conducted under the supervision of J. Russell Snell, past commander and chairman of the Legion's community services committee.

The winning award went to Thomas Getz, a Reading High School senior. It was a very fine and interesting presentation, Mr. Speaker, and I include it herewith:

HOW CAN WE BEST RETAIN OUR FREEDOM IN A WORLD THREATENED BY WAR?

(By Thomas Getz)

Listen, America. Why are we blessed? Are we smarter or harder working than the other people of the world? Have we a right to eat too much, dress too well, waste surpluses when millions go to bed hungry? When many have no beds? How do we enjoy the blessings of freedom knowing that in most of the underdeveloped world there is no freedom? What shall we do about the rising tensions between the "haves" and the "have nots"? Our answers to these questions and our actions concerning them will change the world.

Listen, America. A world half slave and half free can not exist. Where there are "haves" and "have nots," there will be serious conflict. We Americans have grown a little self-satisfied, a little proud, and much too complacent about the millions of "have nots." The day is past when we can be concerned only with our own Nation, State, city, or self. If American democracy is to remain on the face of this earth, we must enlarge our vision and extend our opportunity to share the priceless gifts with which we have been bestowed.

What do we have to share? First, there are the obvious things—money, food, and farm equipment. Secondly, we must share our knowledge. We must share the new ideas and inventions vital for the forward progress of any nation or any people. In the broadest sense, we must increase our educational activity overseas. We must educate the men and women of tomorrow, not only here in our own country, but everywhere, so that man may shape the common destiny of man. We must help people everywhere to help themselves. The demand for educational opportunity is a great factor in the forces influencing non-Western peoples. In one way or another they will be educated. Whether they will be exposed to the unremitting propaganda of international communism or enlightened by the opportunities of American democracy depends on us.

Listen, America. The question has been asked, "What else can be done?" Many have changed the tense of that question and now ask, "What can we do?" This was the idea behind the origination of the Peace Corps. We are often thought of in other countries as being a nation of "proud, arrogant, capitalists." However, the attitude is very different in places where there has been real human contact at the individual level. The purpose of the Peace Corps is to provide more personal, individual contact so that the real American can be known and understood. The men and women in this program must walk delicately among those who are proud of their own culture patterns, their past history, and their religion. Our young people will work on projects which by Peace Corps standards "will make a difference." This work will be only at the invitation of the host countries. Because of the Peace Corps, young people of various nations will live and work together, breaking down barriers of distrust and paving the way for future cooperation.

Listen, America. There are many of us who are talking about trying to help other countries only for our own self-interest and a desire to contain Communist expansion. If this is the case, our sharing is no more than charity, with no deep feeling of personal and moral responsibility.

Wendell L. Willkie sensed this when he wrote:

"There are no distant points in the world any more. Our thinking in the future must be worldwide.

"The world is awakening at last to the knowledge that the rule of the people by other people is not freedom.

"Freedom is an indivisible word. We must be prepared to extend it to everyone, whether they are rich or poor, whether they agree with us not not, no matter what their race or color. We must have faith that the welfare of one is the welfare of all." [1]

Listen, America. You ask, "How can we best retain our freedoms in a world threatened by war?"

We answer: By sharing with all people the ideals that make America great.

By extending the American vision to include all men.

By making freedom through education possible.

A program of this type is formidable. It is the work of generations, but the time is late; yesterday is gone. Today is here, and we must meet it.

---

[1] NEA Journal, May 1961, p. 18.

My Responsibilities as an American Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, among the many splended essays in the contest sponsored by the American Legion of Ohio, one of the finest was the work of Mr. Dan Duty, a sophomore at Waite High School in Toledo. Dan was winner in the Legion's district 13.

Under leave to extend, I include his essay with my remarks:

MY RESPONSIBILITIES AS AN AMERICAN CITIZEN

(By Dan Duty)

My responsibilities as an American citizen are many and varied. It would be impossible to name all of them, for there is a different responsibility for each different situation.

One of the most important responsibilities is to myself. I am always responsible for my own doings whether good or bad.

I also have a responsibility to my country. I must at all times be ready to serve in any way to better or strengthen my country's democracy. I should be able to think of new ideas for the betterment of my country and to allow other people to use these ideas.

I should be able to do the almost impossible and that is to show no prejudice toward man no matter what race, creed, or religion.

I should be able to accept failures as well as successes.

I also have a responsibility to my parents as well as to my teachers. My responsibilities to my teachers is to do what is expected of me and to do it the best way I know how. My responsibility to my parents is to do what they say and do it the right way.

I must improve myself and my own community at all times, for nothing is perfect and our country must have improvement and new ideas continually to stay alive.

I, as an American citizen, have the right to freedom of speech, press, and religion. Therefore, I have to make sure that everyone has these opportunities.

I have no right to oppress anyone from doing these, no matter if he doesn't dress the same or have the same color of skin or speaks in a different tongue. He is still an American citizen.

I have the right to know and hear the truth so that I can always speak the truth.

The responsibilities are great, but so is being a citizen of America. This country is mine and will always be my responsibility. It is not an easy job to live up to all expectations but it is always worth trying. If I should fail in my responsibility, then I should try again because anything worth having is hard to get.

I must always do what I think is my best and I will be sure to make America proud of me.

My responsibility as an American citizen is first to myself. I must see that I am worthy of being called an American. Next, I must be ready at any time to serve my country as a soldier when I am old enough. I should be kind to all people no matter of what race or religion. I should respect my parents and my teachers, besides living up to my best ability in my home and school. I should do what I can to better my community. I am grateful to be able to express my views, to read about the true facts of world happenings in our daily papers and monthly magazines, and to go to the church of my choice. I will do everything I can, to be a good citizen of this great America.

Anniversary of Greek Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, March 25 marked the 141st anniversary of the Greek Revolution. This Sunday the annual Greek Independence Day Parade takes place in New York City in my congressional district. It is with great pleasure that I bring to the attention of my colleagues a most moving and inspiring address by Dr. Basil Vitsaxis, the Consul General of Greece in New York, to the Eastern Orthodox Fellowship Club of Columbia University, in celebration of this historic and important day:

ADDRESS BY HON. DR. BASIL VITSAXIS, CONSUL GENERAL OF GREECE TO THE EASTERN ORTHODOX FELLOWSHIP CLUB OF COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY AT HARKNESS THEATER BUTLER HALL, MARCH 24, 1962

Great indeed are the historical moments which cannot be specifically marked on a certain date. They are those which embrace, with their deep meaning, the entire history of a nation—which spread out in time, illuminating the yesterdays with the luster of glory and the tomorrows with the clear light of hope.

Such moments illuminate the entire course of a nation throughout the centuries. They light up its future because historically they justify the past, and they light up the past because they constitute a moral guarantee for the future.

March 25 symbolizes such a moment in the history of the Hellenic nation. I say "symbolizes," not only because on this date all the traditional respect and ethnic emotion welled up for the sublime bursting of the Hellenic soul, but because the symbolism is complete inasmuch as nothing exceptional occurred in Greece on March 25, 1821.

John Filemon, author of "Bishop Germanos' Memoranda on the Greek Revolution," writes in his prolog:

"In various military and political documents, we have seen the day of the Annunciation designated as the day of the Revolution, an error also made by historians and journalists. It is true that the revolution had its start on March 21st, for on that day the flags were raised, the nation's emblems were designated, the Turks barricaded themselves in the fortress, and official documents to the Consul Generals announced the official day of the Revolution as March 21, 1821.

"On March 24, the courageous Hierarch entered Patras and set up in the square of St. George the cross upon which the people pledged their oath to the revolution: 'freedom or death'."

But what is the importance of the historical truth compared to the beauty and glory of the legend, and how false it appears to us compared to the perfect symbolism which echoes deep within the heart of the nation.

Ypsilanti designated March 25 as the date of the beginning of the struggle and the newly formed Hellenic State in passing the decree of 1838 by which March 25 was chosen as the anniversary of the national revolution, did nothing more than give expression to the holy and invincible bond which for centuries ties within the Hellenic soul the glorious Greek heritage to the Christian faith.

"For the holy faith in Christ, for the freedom of the country," as the poet says, the Greeks fought, died and perhaps "lived." They did so since the time that Christian redemption gave new wings to the Hellenic spirit and fused with it, to offer to the world the great ideas and the unequaled ethical wealth of Hellenic Christian culture.

The day of the Annunciation, when the angel's holy promise first bridged the human soul with the heavens, the day that man felt deep in his heart the holy leap of truth, is for us Hellenes, a day of double celebration. A day to celebrate the eternal truth which we found again, as human beings, and a day to celebrate the true road which we found again, as a nation. Days such as these bring to our mind the many pioneers of today's freedom and more deeply we feel the meaning of our nation's unity.

Within our hearts echo the joyous tidings of our beloved land and the sweet ringing song of the bell which calls us to the celebration. On days such as these we hear within our heart the unsilenced song of Hellas and we feel proud that fate placed all Hellenes on the front line of the battle against time, to fight and to win.

And I say "all Hellenes" because the Greek Revolution was the work of everyone, both of those who tasted the bitter grapes of slavery and of those who lived in other lands, always alert, carrying the Hellenic torch, with but a single dream—to raise it one day, free again, on the national shrine.

During 400 years of slavery, while the Hellenes of the mainland, through their untamed courage and steel hearts, maintained their precious ethnic heritage proud and unadulterated, while they kept their faith pure, the Hellenes on foreign shores stood at the head, guiding their enslaved brethren.

We can never forget that the well-known organization, the "Filiki Eteria" with its great dreamers, blossomed as the lily of the national annunciation, in distant foreign lands.

The great teachers of the Nation, the wealthy merchants, the dignitaries abroad prepared, both morally and materially, the great national uprising.

The schools which the sons of Greece founded on foreign soil, the libraries and churches, became the fountain-head of freedom which quenched the thirst of the inflamed slave.

And when the national paeans of joy rang out through the woods and passes of Roumeli, when the fires flared in Peloponnese and on the islands, when from one end of Greece to the other, the swords flashed and the rifles hummed, the whole Nation was present to answer the call.

The wind of free thought which blew from the large Greek communities abroad, fanned the flame within the hearts of the sons of Greece and brought the sweet message of brotherhood and unity.

From all corners of the earth came the estranged sons of Greece, flesh of her flesh and blood of her blood, to sacrifice themselves to the holy loft of the Hellenic idea—to give their wealth, their comforts, their positions, to lead the nation, like Ypsilanti, and to sacrifice for her undying ideals, even their very lives.

Their proud Hellenic soul stood as, in all the great moments, like an infallible compass, opening before them bright roads that led to the realization of the country's great destinies.

And when the rifles were stilled, when the blood stained earth was covered with laurels, Greece, like the Phoenix that was reborn

in smoke and flames, became, for her children, the tender mother who holds the balsam for every pain of the soul—a magnificent vision, a magnet that drew their hearts to her.

At her every tear, their eyes filled, at her every leap of joy, their hearts fluttered. And other lives were given, many more lives, so that she might stand proud and unbending before the new storms—those which the eternal fates of the unconquerable idea called Greece, scattered in her path to test her in the eyes of men and to bring to each generation, to every epoch, further evidence of the unbroken continuity of the Hellenic nation.

On days such as these, days of Hellenic joy and pride, all the Hellenic people, from all parts of the world, celebrate their very own joy, their very own victory and wear their very own laurels.

Nations are judged by their acts, and history is their stern judge.

The Hellenes can stand before any one with their heads held high and proud. They have never hesitated when confronted with the great responsibilities which history erected on the road they have followed for centuries. Their victories express the indomitable moral strength of the Hellenic nation, whose continuity is in itself proof of the nation's unity.

The 25th of March is, in this respect, perhaps the brightest symbol of the eternal Hellenic Idea because it embodies the unceasing Hellenic quest for human redemption from the ties of mind and soul. For the Greek revolution was not only a series of heroics and sacrifices before which the entire human race stood awed. It was not only a phenomenon of collective courage before which history bowed with respect. Nor was it merely a revolt against the tyrants. It was, above all, a large ethical movement which had at its base the most beautiful, the most noble, the most worthwhile that nests within the human heart.

"Freedom or death"—this was the oath of the enslaved who tossed his head proudly, opened his soul to the message sent from the depths of time by his ancestors, and carved, with the flame of his sword, the bright road of tomorrow.

Freedom and death, in their broadest meaning, were the worlds that confronted each other in Greece in 1821.

Freedom or death. Is not the life of a slave, death? Is not the unredeemed soul of man, dead? Is not the darkness spread by the ignorance of the mind, a living grave?

The free thinking which illuminated the generations of Hellenes and led them to the bright, peaceful victories of the mind, flared and illuminated again the course of Greece and led it from the ethnic annunciation, through Calvary, towards the resurrection of the nation.

This very light dazzled our national poet as he envisions embattled Greece:

"A torch in the hand,
A flame at the feet,
And all around is light."

The unknown fighter of 1821, who stained the soil of Greece with his blood, had felt with the faultless sensitivity of his Hellenic soul the infinite grandeur of his struggle. The whole Hellenic World became gigantic within him and the unwordly voices of myriad heroes echoed in his breast.

How clearly Kazantzakis pictured this, when he wrote:

"I hear within my being, deep
Those thrice-great, mighty
Fathers of Hellas,
They speak alone—those dreadful moments
The immortals."

But what was the political climate of Europe when the uprising broke out? What were the frames within which the Hellenic movement was born and had swelled up? And, generally, what was its deeper meaning in history?

The wars which had ripped Europe in the beginning of the century, wars inspired by ideals of human freedom, had resulted, with tragic irony, in the establishing of a dark alliance, the so-called Holy Alliance, which from 1815 controlled the political life of Europe and drowned every liberal movement.

The year 1820 marked several revolutionary movements in the Italian and Spanish peninsulas. Their roots were mainly political, their purposes stemmed from the French ideas which had shaken Europe toward the end of the 18th century. The dark alliance which cast its heavy shadow in Europe set immediately in movement its diplomatic machinery. Metternich spoke of this with the most bitter words: "It is a deathly poison," he said, "which endangers the body of society in its most sensitive areas; it is dangerous for the peace of Europe and a scandal in the eyes of the whole world." Richelieu wrote: "The Greeks could not have found a worse moment to revolt."

And indeed, they could not have chosen a worse time. In vain Kapodistrias, the political advisor of the Czar, tried to convince him that the Greek movement was not like those which aimed to shake thrones, like those which stem from political calculations, and which hide at times, impure intentions. We must confess that the confusion which Metternich intended to cause was an easy matter, for indeed a movement such as the Greek one had never broken out in Europe before.

The proclamation signed by the czar, together with the Emperor of Austria and the King of Prussia, at the end of the conference of May 1821, was characteristic of the prevailing mentality.

"We shall ignore," stated the three monarchs, "every change that is made by force of arms in the interior state of any nation, and we shall take the necessary measures which these situations demand to confront the criminal events which have occurred in Eastern Europe."

In the eyes of powerful Europe, the movement of the Hellenic nation, from its very beginning, the form of conspiracy and its aim was considered to be the shaking, by force of arms, of the interior security of the Sultan's empire.

Eighteen months after the first outburst, when the Greek soil was drenched in blood, the Conference at Epidaurus had stated with that admirable concise declaration of January 15, 1822, the true character of the struggle:

"The Hellenic nation," stated the declaration, "attests to heaven and earth that it exists."

And yet, the powerful ones of Europe who had assembled in Verona, closed their ears stubbornly to the cry of Greece who was struggling in vain to convince them that her fight was different and that its ideological basis was a completely distinct one.

It is worth mentioning here, the contents of the mandate signed by Athanasios Kanakaris, then vice president of the legislative body—a message to the assembled monarchs of Europe in Verona. This message was brought by Andreas Metaxas, the Bishop Germanos of Paleon Patron, and the son of Petrobay Georgakis Mavromihalis. The message stated:

"Twice, from the beginning of the war, Greece raised her voice, requesting aid and understanding from the Christian Kingdoms of Europe, or demanding, justifiably, at least their neutrality in her present holy struggle.

"Rivers of blood have flowed to date, yet the flag of the lifegiving cross, waves unfurled over the fortresses on all the mainland, in all parts of Epirus, Thessaly, in Crete, and in the islands of the Aegean Sea. The temporary Greek Government hastens to announce by this declaration, that it shall never accept any treaty, no matter how beneficial it appears, unless proper audience is given to her lawfully dispatched ambassadors."

But those "lawfully dispatched ambassadors" as the declaration called them, never reached Verona. The mighty ones who conferred there—and they were not few—2 emperors, 3 kings, a cardinal, 3 foreign ministers, 20 ambassadors, and 10 secretaries of state—blocked the road to those bringing the paper drenched in blood, which contained the great and glorious message from Greece.

Pope Pius the VII, to avoid displeasing the conference and fearing even for his own safety which he believed was threatened by the Hellenic movement and the ideas that it represented, stopped the Greeks at Ancoma and forced them to turn back, unsuccessful, to Greece.

Back, also, turned the message which emanated from the inner depths of the pure Hellenic soul—a soul which naively believed that the European monarchs should see more clearly the justice which was as great as her 3,000-year history.

Three times the message spoke of the Hellenic nation, 3 times it asked for justice, liberty, equality, and independence, not for individuals, but for the nation. Three times it formulated a new idea which was destined in a short while to shake all of Europe and to constitute an ideological lever to reshape the political map of the Continent.

"The Hellenic nation attests by heaven and earth that it exists."

Vibrant nations may not, alone, create, the historical moment. In fact, they may appear at times to contradict the course of history. And yet, whether it is obvious or not, in reality they express the tendencies of their time.

The Greek uprising of 1821 was from this point of view, a preamble to history. It was the morning song of the idea of nationalities which resonated in the eastern basin of the Mediterranean and the Balkan area. It was the early expression of that, which, from historical necessity, was destined to become, shortly, common conviction, truth and law. For 3,000 years the sacred task of Greece was such: to precede, not to follow the search, never resting, never being satiated, never quenching its thirst from the fountainhead of life. Within her unceasingly blow the winds of freedom and of creation, and her heart is flamed from the quest of a new idea.

In spite of her being enslaved and insignificant, she was the first to feel through the unerring sensitorium of her aliveness, the deepest significance of the historical moment which was ripening in the 18th century.

The seed which flowered the spring of 1821 on Hellenic soil, was a strange seed because it was sowed without being born from the same flower, because it was new—of the first origin—like the creation itself.

We said that vibrant nations perhaps do not mold the historical moments, but they express them. This was the deeper meaning of 1821.

The Hellenic revolution was not only a movement of a proud nation, a movement for human freedoms, it was something more. It was the expression of a new idea which had not yet become a conviction, and which was soon to light fires on all European soil.

It was the sweet dawn of a new concept—the nation. This concept originated from the realization of the value of the common historical ties; it brought recognition of ethnic identity; it made possible the renewal of the political architecture resulting in reshaping the balance of powers before the new historical quests.

We said that it stemmed from the realization of the value of the common historical ties. Thus history was becoming the recollection of a nation and was transformed

from a staid teaching to a live thread which tied the generations together—which tied the present with the past and which made possible a new outlook on the future.

It also brought forth recognition of the concept of ethnic identity for that period which was seeking new political shapes and new philosophic and social foundations in view of the unraveling of the 18th century world. The idea of ethnic "identity" in broader meanings, became a valuable asset, which helped greatly, as we know, in the building of the new Europe and of the world to come.

In 1453, Byzantium, a state, was conquered and its people enslaved. In 1821, a nation rose in its place united as one body. A nation that leaped automatically, that became conscious of itself as from historical premonition and which sealed prophetically, with its blood, not only the boundaries of its own country, but the new map of Europe.

We can be proud of the Greek Revolution not only as Hellenes but in general as human beings. For with her flame she melted the bonds which held prisoner the anonymous units within the morally or historically unjustified state boundaries and paved the way toward the validation of the moral unit which is the nation. And this was, for that era, progress and gain for the entire human race.

I said that we can be proud of the Greek Revolution as human beings, because I believe that this is the measure by which we must judge the true value of historical events, since no conquests and no victories have any meaning or substance over the human being and beyond it.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Needed: Youth Development and Anti-delinquency Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the youth—of Wisconsin and America—represent one of the greatest, most precious assets of our national life.

The future of our Nation—of freedom itself—of the ideals in which we believe: All of these values depend upon our youth of today—our leaders of tomorrow.

We, as adult citizens, however, must ask ourselves: Are we creating a national climate for best utilization and development of the great reservoir of energy, imagination and talent—as well as morality—of youth; or, is present-day environment allowing dissipation and waste of this priceless human resource?

Recently, I was privileged to discuss the outlook in these fields in a broadcast over Wisconsin radio stations. I ask unanimous consent to have the text of my remarks printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today there are more than 66 million boys and girls under 18 years of age—the hope of America of tomorrow.

As a nation, however, we have a special concern for, and interest in, the more than 12 million youth between 12 and 17 years—the teenagers. Why? At this age, these boys and girls are emerging from the shelter of homelife into the outside world.

However, let me make this clear: Graduation into society should not, and must not, provide an excuse for either: (1) Abdication of the responsibility of parents; or (2) for society to developing spoon-feeding pampering programs.

The challenge, rather, is to create the kind of programs to progressively absorb the developing capabilities of youth into useful activities, both in homelife and in the community.

The time has passed when our youth can be expected, in a taken-for-granted kind of way, to easily or automatically integrate into our society. Rather, this can be accomplished successfully only by careful, creative, farsighted planning.

Among other things, we need to (1) encourage adult interest in, and leadership for, this gigantic challenge; (2) provide greater opportunity for participation in civic, church, recreational, and other activities; and (3) opening new job opportunities. Despite the fact that the Nation still has 4 million adult unemployed—for whom we must find jobs—we must also plan for jobs for the 26 million young folks entering the labor force in the next 10 years.

As well, this involves earlier beginnings of vocational training—to equip youth for useful employment.

The Nation—if it fails to create such positive programs, however, can expect that delinquency—instead of being reduced—will grow.

Following a recent study, the allegation was made that we waste a million kids a year. Such a vast army of jobless, useless—and sometimes placeless—youth, could be real social dynamite—a wellspring of delinquency and crime.

Unfortunately, the high rate of delinquency among youth often is preceded—or accompanied by—adult, and yes even community delinquency.

Naturally, this does not absolve our young folks, themselves, from utilizing their God-instilled sense of morality and responsibility. Nevertheless—it does demonstrate that the pointing finger of accusation youth, sometimes can correctly be turned around—requiring a soul searching in adult behavior, mores and moral conduct—and, yes, laws.

For these reasons, then, we also need realistic efforts to discourage delinquencies, including the following:

1. Reemphasize that any delinquency efforts—first and foremost—are the responsibilities of the home—the parents of America.
2. Expand positive efforts by the churches, schools, teachers' association, fraternal, service, and other groups to carry on youth development programs.
3. Modernize our courts and penal correctional institutions to meet the unique problems in this field.
4. As necessary, strengthen Federal laws to prohibit traffic of weapons, narcotics, obscene literature, and other such materials falling into the hands of young folks.
5. Encourage higher standards of presentations through television, radio, magazines, books, and other media.

In attempting to create more effective youth development programs, our society also must not fail to stress—in its news reporting and community recognition programs—that more than 95 percent of our youth are conducting themselves dutifully, constructively, and usefully as keystones in home and community life.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

SOUTH MIAMI, FLA., *March 23, 1962.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I would appreciate you sending me 150 copies of House Resolution 211 pertaining to captive nations. I realize this is quite a few so any number you can send will be appreciated.

Your approach is a definite step in the direction of winning the cold war.

Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

HENRY E. BEZOLD.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC.,
Bismarck, N. Dak., March 20, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Enclosed is a copy of a telegram which our organization forwarded to Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH, chairman, House Rules Committee, favoring House Resolution 211 introduced by you.

Our organization and people appreciate very much your stand and find action on captive nations.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

DR. ANTHONY ZUKOWSKY,
President, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., State Branch of North Dakota.

MARCH 20, 1962.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Our organization, which represents over 25,000 Americans of Ukrainian descent living in North Dakota, is in favor and wholeheartedly supports House Resolution 211 calling for the establishment of a permanent Committee on Captive Nations introduced by Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania.

Favoring this resolution, we earnestly urge you to take a positive action to establish such

permanent committee of the captive nations as soon as possible.

Respectfully yours,

DR. ANTHONY ZUKOWSKY,
President, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., State Branch of North Dakota, Steele, N. Dak.

CLEVELAND, OHIO,
March 21, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Please find enclosed copy of my letter which was sent to the chairman of House Rules Committee, the Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH.

As you see, I am strongly in favor of such a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. It is to the benefit of State Department and American interests to have some kind of body, that would be entrusted with examining and evaluation of information on people that are regarded sometimes by our highest officials as part of Russia and in many instances underestimated as potential allies against communism.

I also take this opportunity to thank you for your splendid work in that direction and for sponsoring the famous Flood resolution, which became a thorn for Russian and Communist press.

I remain,

Yours truly,

WALTER STOROZYNSKY.

CLEVELAND, OHIO,
March 19, 1162.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I ask you for favorable consideration of House Resolution 211 (the Flood resolution), which would establish a permanent Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

It is my strong conviction that such a committee is long overdue and is most urgent.

Every year scores of U.S. Senators and Congressmen pay special tributes on the anniversary of Ukraine's independence. All of these legislators express their admiration for century long Ukraine's struggle for freedom and their faith in ultimate liberation of Ukrainian people, and all recognize that Ukraine is the most important captive nation in the U.S.S.R.

However, somehow, this escapes the attention of our foreign policymakers in the State Department. They persistently show poor state of knowledge in regard to the freedom aspiration of numerous captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union.

For instance, it is difficult to understand the reasoning of Mr. Rusk in advocating "not to set up a Special Captive Nations Committee at this time."

When the Soviet Communist press opposes this issue it is a different matter. They have many reasons to fear the work of this committee. For once, it will expose the Moscow directed Communist imperialism. But, why should we object so long to it, is a complete mystery to me.

The potentialities of enslaved people within the Soviet Union are unexplored and almost totally neglected.

Therefore, the first step to combat the Communist propaganda concerning Western imperialism more effectively is to create the House Committee on Captive Nations.

I sincerely hope that you will use your good office to promote this important legislation.

I am, dear sir,

Yours respectfully,

WALTER STOROZYNSKY.

MARCH 21, 1962.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I would like to take this opportunity to inform your committee that our Ukrainian Youth League of New York organization strongly favors its consideration of House Resolution 211—the Flood resolution sponsored by Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, a most enlightened bit of legislation.

We likewise strongly feel that negative opinions to the contrary regarding the Flood resolution (H.R. 211)—such as those advanced by Secretary of State Dean Rusk in his letters to your committee last year—certainly do not reflect the true situation in Ukraine and other non-Russian nations within the U.S.S.R.

The United States of America was the country that first instituted the peoples fight against colonialism back in 1776, and we should continue this all-important battle of anticolonialism by setting up this permanent Committee on Captive Nations, which would aid those countries as Ukraine, Byelo-Ruthenia, Armenia, Georgia, Azerbaidzan, Turkestan, etc., the non-Russian countries who have suffered longest and the most under that "Jailer of Nations," "Holy Mother Russia."

For we Americans to act in a negative or namby-pamby fashion with the biggest colonial power in the world today—imperialistic Russia—is against the very positive principles of freedom and justice for all.

Consequently we urge the positive and favorable consideration of House Resolution 211 (Flood resolution). Thank you and your fine committee.

Sincerely yours,

METRO J. BARAN,
President, Ukrainian Youth League, New York.

SOCIETY OF MICHAEL HRUSHEWSKY,
BRANCH 219, UKRAINIAN
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION,
Newark, N.J., March 19, 1962.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: Our organization, the Society of Michael Hrushewsky, in Newark, N.J., appeals to you to vote for the resolution (H.R. 211) which calls for the setting up of a permanent committee, in the House of Representatives, on the captive nations. We strongly disagree with the opinion of the Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Rusk, on such a committee. His arguments would seem to indicate he is not familiar with the true situation behind the Iron Curtain and, especially so, in Ukraine.

Russia today is one of the greatest problems facing us. Russia is a prison of many enslaved peoples and nations. These enslaved peoples are anxious and impatient to escape this slavery and depotism. Let's help them. We beg you, Mr. SMITH, to favorably consider House Resolution 211 in your House Rules Committee.

This committee in the House of Representatives would be in a position to furnish information to our Government, to the American people, and also to the rest of the world as to what the state of affairs is behind the Iron Curtain, and in that way help our Government in making up policies for the captive nations enslaved in the Russian empire.

We again implore you, honorable sir, to vote for House Resolution 211 in your House Rules Committee.

Many thanks.

Very truly yours,

M. T. YUROW, *Secretary.*

NEWARK, N.J.

International Wage Policy Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am certain the Members of Congress will be interested reading and having available the statement of the International Wage Policy Committee of the United Steelworkers of America which was issued on March 31, 1962, in Pittsburgh.

In this they discuss the provisions of the new steel contract which is now being discussed between the various companies concerned and the district directors of the United Steelworkers of America.

I feel, as does Mr. David J. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers of America, that time will prove this contract to be one of the most important and significant ever negotiated for the workers in the steel industry.

There is no attempt made to stop the normal growth of progress in the industry, however, the recognition of the workers' needs and the realization that they are human beings—not just classification numbers—has been assured; a fact worth noting in this day of rapid technological advancements. The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL WAGE POLICY COMMITTEE OF THE UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA, PITTSBURGH, PA.

On February 7, 1962, this committee adopted the 1962 wage policy of the United Steelworkers of America. In that policy, we stated that in view of the vast changes going on in the steel industry the fundamental need of steelworkers was a program designed to achieve additional measures of employment and income security. We also stated that steelworkers should share, through improved employment benefits, in the growing prosperity of the steel industry and the economy, that existing inequities should be eliminated, and that improvements were needed in our grievance and arbitration procedures and other provisions of our agreements.

On February 14, upon the urging of the President of the United States, the union and the 11 major steel companies represented by the steel companies coordinating committee began negotiations for new collective-bargaining agreements, to replace those expiring on June 30 of this year.

Today, the international officers have reported to this committee that, after nearly 6 weeks of almost continuous bargaining, they have obtained agreement in principle from the companies on a broad program which represents substantial progress toward achievement of the goals of our union's wage policy. That program consists of the following:

1. A precedentmaking new savings and vacation plan financed by a 3-cent-per-hour contribution by the companies, which will make available valuable new vacation and retirement benefits to those eligible and new employment opportunities for employees who replace those who receive these benefits. The plan provides for a new retirement benefit of 1 week's vacation pay (at 1960 vacation pay rates) for every 5 years continuous service prior to December 31, 1960, and, to the extent of the fund remaining

each quarter, 1 week's special vacation for every 2 years' continuous service after December 31, 1960, to be made available to employees in order of seniority until each employee has received his special vacation, at which point the cycle will begin again.

The vacation benefits under this plan are in addition to the regular vacation (which is also being improved), and can, at the option of the employee, be deferred at interest until retirement or termination, or until it is needed to meet a special hardship situation. After January 1, 1963, to encourage retirement, employees who are age 65 and are eligible for pension will have their new additional benefit based on past service under the plan reduced by 10 percent for every quarter year in which they do not retire.

2. An improved supplemental unemployment benefit plan to be financed by an additional contribution of 4.5 cents per hour by the companies in addition to the present contributions. This additional contribution and a new liberalized reduction table will make the supplemental unemployment benefit funds financially sound, and will minimize the risk that employee benefits will have to be reduced in periods of high unemployment. In addition, whenever the supplemental unemployment benefit fund reaches maximum financing, the remainder of the 4.5 percent additional contribution will spill over into the fund for the new vacation and retirement benefit plan described above.

The supplemental unemployment benefits have also been greatly improved. The gross benefit has been raised to 24 times average hourly earnings plus $1.50 for each dependent up to 4, instead of 65 percent of take-home pay. The maximum benefit has been raised from $25 plus $2 per dependent to $37.50 plus $1.50 per dependent for employees who are receiving unemployment compensation and from $47.50 plus $2 per dependent to $60 plus $1.50 per dependent for employees who have exhausted their unemployment compensation.

A new provision has been agreed to which permits employees who become disabled while on layoff to continue receiving supplemental unemployment benefits if their sickness and accident coverage has ceased.

A short workweek benefit has been negotiated, which provides that an employee who was paid for less than 32 hours in any week will receive his standard hourly wage rate for the difference between the number of hours for which he was paid and 32.

A moving allowance will be provided under the supplemental unemployment benefit plan for laid-off employees who accept jobs under the interregional preferential hiring program which is provided for under the new seniority program, described below.

Extensive administrative improvements have been made in the supplemental unemployment benefit plan, including an improved grievance procedure, a procedure for employees to report to the nearest supplemental unemployment benefit office of the company or by mail when it is unreasonable to require them to report to their own plant, and a procedure other than the presentation of the actual unemployment compensation check for proof of receipt of unemployment compensation benefits. The separate supplemental unemployment benefit requirements establishing availability for work and State employment office reporting have been eliminated where the employee is receiving State unemployment compensation.

3. Significant improvements have been made in the pension eligibility rules and pension benefits for employees who are victims of a permanent shutdown or a layoff or disability with little likelihood of recall. At present, such employees, in order to receive a pension, must have at least 20 years of service and must be 55 years of age. The new agreement would provide a pension for any employee otherwise eligible under these provisions whose age and service add up to 80, or, in the case of employees age 55 or over, whose age and service add up to 75. It would also clarify the right of an employee who elects to be placed on layoff as a result of a permanent shutdown (and who is otherwise eligible) to receive an immediate pension, rather than requiring him to wait 2 years.

Another significant pension improvement is the removal of the $80 deduction in calculating the pension, under the 1-percent formula, for employees who retire under these new provisions and are not eligible for full social security. This gives employees who retire under these provisions a pension which more nearly approximates the retirement income of employees who retire at age 65 and receive both their company pension and social security.

These new benefits and liberalized eligibility rules will apply also to an employee who is not laid off or disabled but who wishes to retire and has the company's consent. This privilege was formerly available only at age 60.

4. Improvements in the regular vacation benefit have been agreed to, extending both the amount of vacation pay and the amount of time off to which employees are entitled. Employees with 3 to 5 years' service will receive 2 weeks off with pay, instead of 1 week off with 1½ weeks' pay. Employees with 10 to 15 years' service will receive 3 weeks off with pay, rather than 2 weeks off with 2½ weeks' pay. Employees with 25 years or more of service will receive 4 weeks off with pay, instead of 3 weeks off with 3½ weeks' pay. Management will have the right to schedule the third week for 10- to 15-year employees and the fourth week for 25-year employees any time during the year, but if management schedules such a week outside the normal vacation period, the employee will have the right to combine it with another of his vacation weeks. He will also have the right to take pay in lieu of the additional week.

In addition, it has been agreed that an employee must take his vacation time off unless a written agreement is made between management, the employee, and his grievanceman, providing for pay in lieu of vacation, and such agreements must be filed with the local union.

5. A vastly improved seniority plan, designed to maximize the employment security and job opportunity of long-service employees, has been negotiated as a guide to the negotiating committees. This guide sets forth minimum standards which are to be implemented—and which may be improved upon—in the local seniority agreements. These standards call for the establishment of "seniority pools" in each plant. Each such pool shall, as a minimum, include all jobs in classes 1, 2, and3, and two-thirds of the jobs in job class 4, and extend over a major operating unit (such as blast furnace, coke plant, open hearth, etc.). An employee with 2 years or more of service who is laid off from his seniority unit will have the right within 60 days of layoff to a job in his seniority pool if a job in that pool is held by an employee with less plant service. He will also be given preference over new hires to any vacancy in any pool which is not filled from within the seniority unit, if he has the necessary qualifications in the promotional sequence involved.

If such an employee is the victim of a permanent shutdown or a layoff which is likely to last 2 years or more (or which in fact does last 2 years or more), he will have a right to a job in any seniority pool in the plant which is held by an employee with less plant continuous service. Provision is also made for the filling of vacancies, which are not filled from within the seniority unit, by employees from any of the seniority units included in the area covered by the same seniority pool in order of plant service.

There is also provided an extensive program for interplant job opportunities, giving employees who have exhausted their employment rights at their own plants hiring rights at other plants of the company, in preference to new hires, in order of continuous service. Under this program, an employee with 2 years or more of service who is not eligible for pension and social security will be afforded such rights in any plant within his own specific geographical area in which suitable vacancies exist. An employee with 10 or more years of service who is under 60 years of age and who is the victim of a permanent shutdown or a layoff which is likely to last for 2 years or more will have a similar preferential right to available jobs in other areas, if no jobs are available to him in his own plant or his own area, and will, if he accepts such a job, receive a moving allowance under the new supplemental unemployment benefit plan.

Another important feature of the new seniority plan is a provision that when a new operation is installed in a plant, the jobs on that operation will be made available, in order of seniority, first to employees from any facility which is being displaced by the new operation, then to employees who are being displaced as the result of the new operation, and then to employees from similar facilities in the plant. Employees entitled to a job on a new facility who are needed on their old job will nevertheless be established on the new job, subject to the right of management to assign them temporarily to their old job at earnings which shall not be below those which would be received on the new job.

6. A joint committee will be established to study the various CWS job classification manuals and establish a single updated manual properly documented as to master classifications, instructive language, conventions, and so forth, which will be applicable on a uniform basis to the 10 companies which use the CWS system. The target date for the completion of this project will be January 1, 1963, and the revised manual will be put into effect immediately upon its adoption. All jobs established or changed after January 1, 1963 or the date of the agreement, whichever is earlier, will be classified in accordance with the new manual, and the committee will have power to recommend the application of the new manual to other jobs as well.

7. A number of the items which have been described above could never have been negotiated without the advance work which was done by the human relations committee established under the 1959 agreement. As a result of the efforts of that committee, the basis for the new seniority program, the new job classification program and a number of other important matters were worked out prior to the opening of contract negotiations, without the pressure of immediate deadlines and in an atmosphere of mutual cooperation. It has therefore been agreed that the human relations committee will be continued, and will be given a number of important responsibilities.

The committee will study a number of matters affecting employment security in an effort to arrive at agreement on contractual provisions dealing with them. These matters include: contracting out, scheduling of overtime while employees are laid off or working short weeks, the problem of foremen performing bargaining unit work, the assignment to nonbargainig unit employees of work which could be performed in the bargaining unit, the scheduling and extension of vacations. Recommendations as to solutions of these problems are to be made by the end of the first year, and are to take effect immediately upon their adoption by the parties. In the event no solutions are recom-

mended or agreed to, these matters may be opened for bargaining on or after May 1, 1963, with the right to strike 90 days after such reopening.

The human relations committee will also study the problem of providing training for employees in order to enable them to progress from lower rated to higher jobs, to equip them to perform jobs on new and improved facilities, and to improve their capacity for reemployment when they are laid off.

Studies will also be conducted to determine what satistical information would aid the parties in the solution of their mutual problems.

6. It has been agreed that the new agreement shall be for a term of 2 years, with the right of either party to reopen wage rates, insurance, pensions, and the matters discussed in the preceding paragraph, on 90 days notice given any time after May 1, 1963.

In addition to the above understandings with the 11 companies, a number of other matters have been discussed in the individual company committees. Substantial progress has been made on some of these matters, including grievance procedure and arbitration, while work on others is still to be completed.

In short, excellent progress has been made on many fronts. The new special vacation benefits and improved regular vacation will create additional job opportunities for thousands of employees, and will permit others to enjoy some well-earned rest and recreation. The new special retirement benefit will improve the living standards of retiring employees, and at the same time provide an inducement to eligible employees to go on pension and make room for others who are in need of work. The new seniority program will provide greater security for all employees, assuring them that the longer they work, the more secure their employment will become. The interplant employment rights will give employees who have lost all hope of employment in their plant a chance to continue at work in another plant, and employees who have lost all hope of employment in their community a chance to transfer to another community. The improved supplemental unemployment benefit plan will make it easier for employees to balance their budgets during periods of layoff, and will prevent the injustice of workweeks of less than 32 hours.

The liberalized pension rights for victims of shutdowns or long periods of layoff or disability will substantially lessen the hardships caused by these occurrences: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved—

1. The understandings which have so far been reached are enthusiastically endorsed as a basis for a settlement.

2. The international officers and the negotiating committees in the 11 companies are authorized and directed promptly to proceed to negotiate appropriate agreements for the basic steel production and maintenance units in order to implement these understandings, and to resolve all issues which are still outstanding by April 6, 1962.

3. The district directors of the union shall immediately contact all other companies in their respective districts whose contracts have been opened or are subject to reopening and seek to apply the terms and conditions of the settlement, as finally reached, to those companies.

4. The international wage policy committee expresses its deep appreciation to President David J. McDonald, Secretary-Treasurer I. W. Abel, Vice President Howard R. Hague, the entire international executive board, the staff personnel, and the members of the negotiating committees for the great work which they have done for the members of the United Steelworkers of America.

Beach Erosion Projects Saved Millions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the storm of March 6 and 7 which ravaged the Atlantic coastal areas caused tremendous damage. This damage would have been infinitely greater except for the extensive work of the Corps of Engineers in constructing, in cooperation with the States, vital beach erosion projects which have been authorized over the years by the House Committee on Public Works.

One hears from time to time the arguments that rivers and harbors and flood control legislation is mere "pork barrel." The savings not only in millions of dollars of property damage from these projects, plus the even greater probable savings in human lives and the resulting misery from this storm damage as a result of the existence of these engineering works, is certainly proof to the contrary. In this connection I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point an article from the highly respected Engineering News-Record dated April 5, 1962, which clearly points out these facts:

EAST COAST ESCAPED EVEN GREATER DESTRUCTION BECAUSE BEACH EROSION PROJECTS SAVED MILLIONS

A $12.5 million investment in beach erosion projects during recent years prevented more than $16 million worth of damage to public and private property by the Atlantic storm of March 6 and 7.

These figures turned up as a byproduct of a rapid seaboard survey by the Corps of Engineers for the Government's disaster agency, the Office of Emergency Planning (Engineering News-Record, Mar. 22, p. 59).

OEP ordered the survey for a graver purpose: to lay the groundwork for quick emergency rebuilding of the storm-torn ocean front to put it in shape to weather the waves of the next hurricane season, slated to start in mid-August.

Savings were noted at 34 projects that had been completed to Corps of Engineers Beach Erosion Board standards in recent years. This string of projects extends from Virginia Beach, Va., to Hampton Beach, N.H. Local interests, required by law to furnish right-of-way for the projects and to maintain them after completion, contributed five-sixths of the $12.5 million total capital cost. The Federal share amounted to $2.1 million.

Fund allocations by OEP can be used only for emergency restoration and temporary repair of public facilities, including publicly owned beachfronts. To complete the emergency beach protection projects for OEP by August 15, the Army Engineers called for right-of-way assignment by April 1.

Where the March storms pushed the shoreline back into private properties of numerous beachfront owners, right-of-way presented tangled problems that State and local agencies struggled hard to straighten out before the deadline.

Emergency rebuilding of the damaged beaches this summer probably will fit them to withstand a storm of the kind that may occur on an average of once in 10 years. Further, this reconstruction will furnish a base for later expansion of the beach projects to resist storms of greater intensity. Before the Corps of Engineers can undertake beach protection of more permanent character, legislation in the form of specific authorizations and appropriations will be required.

Protection afforded by existing beach erosion projects against the March 6–7 storms gives Congress a valid basis for estimating the value of such works. Last month's storms imposed an exceptionally severe test on the beach erosion projects.

Virginia Beach, Va., gave a striking example of the value of a beach erosion project that had been built by the corps and maintained by local authorities to beach erosion board standards. A $900,000 project financed jointly by the city of Virginia Beach and the Federal Government prevented an estimated $8 million in damages.

A beach 100 feet wide sloping to a top elevation 7 feet above mean low water provided this protection. By contrast, just nine blocks away, another section of beach that had been permitted to deteriorate below project specifications allowed the waves and high tides to erode the sand under the concrete boardwalk and undermine the foundations of buildings bordering on the beach.

In other areas of the Atlantic oceanfront, completed beach erosion projects are credited with having prevented these estimated damages:

Indian River Inlet to Rehoboth Beach, Del., $100,000; Atlantic City, N.J., $5 million; Barnegat to Cape May, N.J., $600,000; Jones Inlet to Fire Island Inlet, Long Island, N.Y., $2 million; Connecticut, $400,000; Rhode Island, $150,000; Massachusetts, $200,000; and New Hampshire, $50,000.

The survey also showed that other projects authorized or recommended to protect against hurricane waves and flooding, but which have not yet been built, would have prevented about three-fourths of the storm damage in those project areas had they been in service.

In the current emergency, the Corps of Engineers is undertaking work authorized by OEP to establish a degree of shoreline protection comparable, insofar as possible, with the natural protection the dunes and beaches furnished before the storm damaged them. The degree of protection which can be provided between now and mid-August will be adequate for all storms except violent, sustained northeasters and hurricanes.

First Annual Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner at Huntington, W. Va., Is Addressed by Senator Randolph

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, more than 400 persons attended the first Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner which the sponsoring Democratic Women's Club of Cabell County held on Saturday, April 7, 1962. This dinner will be an annual event in Huntington.

Russell Dunbar, a prominent Huntington attorney and active participant in Democratic Party affairs, was toastmaster, and the official party organization was represented by the Democratic State chairman, Robert P. McDonough, of Parkersburg; by the associate Demo-

cratic State chairman, Mrs. Thelma Hall, of Madison; and by the Cabell County Democratic chairman, Hanley Morgan. And my good friend and colleague Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH was the principal speaker.

Also present and appropriately recognized were Representative Ken Hechler, of Huntington, who ably represents his district; Hon. Milton Ferguson, mayor of Wayne and a former State tax commissioner; and Mrs. Hilda Long, publisher of the Huntington Advertiser, a daily afternoon newspaper, the editorial policies of which are vigorous in their espousal of the principles of the Democratic Party and the programs of the administration; and C. H. Koontz, of Charleston, legislative auditor for the West Virginia Legislature.

Although official business prevented Mayor John Durkin, of Huntington, from remaining for the program of the evening, he was present to extend official greetings to the visiting guests and to extend congratulations to the sponsoring Democratic Women's Club of Cabell County, the officers of which are the following:

Mrs. Andrew Kitchen, president; Mrs. Kemp Cottle and Mrs. Joe Gessner, vice presidents; Mrs. John Edwin Greene, treasurer; Mrs. Charles Adkins, secretary; and Mrs. Homer Chapman, corresponding secretary.

State Chairman McDonough, in introducing Senator RANDOLPH, referred to the latter as "Mr. Ready Democrat" and noted that the Senator has pledged active participation in the party's campaign effort in this year's elections.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the speech by my colleague at this significant event.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, OF WEST VIRGINIA, JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER, HOTEL FREDERICK, HUNTINGTON, W. VA., SATURDAY, APRIL 7, 1962

Mr. Toastmaster, Chairman McDonough, ladies of the host Women's Democratic Club of Cabell County, and fellow Democrats, it is with gratitude that I acknowledge the privilege afforded me to address this significant gathering.

The officers of the sponsoring Women's Democratic Club of Cabell County inform me that this is the first of what they pledge will be an annual Jefferson-Jackson Day observance in Huntington. Congratulations not only for this splendid beginning, but also for the determination to carry forward into the future.

Real progress has been made and is being made by our country under the aggressive leadership of President John Kennedy and Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON.

But in assessing the measure and the quality of this progress we should give adequate consideration to the fact that the Kennedy administration has been in office approximately 2 weeks less than a year and a quarter.

In that relatively short span our administration truly has our Nation on the move again. This is so because the Democratic President and Vice President, working with the Democratic Congress, accepted willingly the challenging struggle of the unfinished business of America.

And, my fellow Democrats, ours is an administration imbued with the spirit of the Democratic Party which, although the oldest political party in existence, is still the youngest in this country measured by vitality.

Ours is the party of youth and the administration exemplifies this characteristic under the leadership of a President who sees our country and the world in terms of the tomorrows while not relying entirely on the yesterdays.

* * * * *

It is because the Democratic Party surveys the present in terms of the future that, with only mild interruptions in the past 30 years, we have merited the confidence of the majority of the American people. There is justice in this condition, for our party itself has confidence in the citizen and in the American future.

These qualities—youth, optimism, confidence in the frontiers of the future—lie at the heart of the American spirit and of the Democratic Party. It was this spirit which again resulted in the mandate of the electorate having been given to our party in 1958 and in 1960.

It is this purpose which continues to animate the Democratic Party and provides it with new vigor and new ideas.

DEMOCRATIC VICTORIES AHEAD

And this purpose, translated into performance, will bring the deserved victories which will be ours in the elections this year—and again in 1964.

The party of the administration in office and in control of the Congress is expected to lose seats in the legislative bodies in an off-year election. But this is not going to occur in 1962. I predict that when the results are tabulated in all States and in all congressional districts there will emerge larger Democratic majorities both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate.

And in the elections 2 years hence, President Kennedy and Vice President JOHNSON will be reelected—not by a narrow margin, but by a very substantial plurality.

I do not make these prognostications frivolously, and I do not fashion them from the fabric of pure partisanship.

Bear in mind the remarkable fact that an administration elected by less than 51 percent of the voters enjoys, just slightly more than a year later, a poll rating of approximately 80 percent. This rating has been earned by reason of a record of dedication to duty and real performance.

But, my fellow Democrats, I am not in any degree inviting or suggesting a resting on the oars. We dare not contemplate such a luxury.

PROGRESS EXCELLENT, BUT MORE WORK AHEAD

The record of progress under the alert and aggressive Kennedy administration is excellent. However, there are goals yet to be accomplished. There must be significant additions to the audit of performance in the months and years immediately ahead—and these additions, in some instances, will not be easy to achieve. They will come to fruition only as a consequence of further diligent effort by all of us who believe in the principles of the Democratic Party and who labor to construct meaningful programs for the common good on the foundation of these precepts of our party.

And, of course, it is a time-honored requirement that even the wisely conceived and the best constructed program must have public acceptance and appreciation. We must all work harmoniously and vigorously in efforts to encourage the broadest possible public consensus for the programs of our party. At the bedrock, however, must be efficient and effective party organization and stimulation of voter participation in maximum degree.

So, there is work to be done by each and every one of us. We must all join in meeting these requirements or the victories on the bright horizon will fade into the shadows of the gloom of frustration.

* * * * *

What are some of the major challenges faced and the significant achievements realized by our country during the first year of the new President?

We have an administration which has boldly moved ahead in the field of our relations with other nations.

And notwithstanding turnovers and uneasiness in the domestic political affairs of a number of Western Hemisphere countries, we are justified in asserting that there has been a strengthening of our friends in this hemisphere through the launching of the alliance-for-progress program.

We have stood firm at Berlin in the face of threats and bluffs.

We have buttressed NATO by increasing our own strength and by persuading other nations to do likewise.

OUR ROLE IN THE UNITED NATIONS

We have frustrated the Communist efforts to obstruct and neutralize the United Nations. If we are to avert the unparalleled disaster of nuclear war, maintain the vision of what the United Nations must become—an effective agency for bringing the rule of law into international affairs.

In addressing a meeting of a unit of the American Association for the United Nations at Charleston, W. Va., on December 8, 1961, I made a statement appropriate to reemphasize. It is this:

As armaments continue to spiral upward we live in ever increasing danger of war by accident or miscalculation. In this atmosphere of uncertainty and increasing tension the ultimate testing time of freedom is just now beginning.

The unity which we must create among the free Nations will not remain viable if predicated solely upon a shared antagonism to communism. It must be built on the firmer foundation of a community of aims and aspirations among our allies. And this will require a greater degree of intellectual honesty and hard self-scrutiny than we have heretofore given to the task.

In saying this, I declared last December that I specifically refer to the practice in recent years of the United States depending too heavily on the United Nations as an arena in which to conduct our foreign policy. Too often our willingness to take problems to the U.N. has been a cloak for our own lack of policy. In so doing, we have not strengthened the United Nations, and we have not served the cause of freedom by posing problems which could not be solved in that forum.

I am not suggesting that we "go it alone." I am recommending, however, that we be scrupulously honest in our appraisal of our own ideals and in the capacity of the United Nations to serve them. We do no disservice to the U.N. when we acknowledge that, as presently constituted, there are some problems it cannot solve. Indeed, we may help preserve the United Nations and allow it to grow strong if we do not prematurely overburden it.

I believe there is a cognizance by the present administration of the need for such a reappraisal of our country's role in relationship to that of the United Nations.

PEACE CORPS ACCLAIMED

Perhaps one of the most significant of all achievements the cause of world peace and to identify our country's peaceful efforts and objectives more closely with other countries—especially with the struggling new Nations—was the establishment of the Peace Corps and the beginning of projects during

the first year of this infant but fast-maturing agency.

I was a firm believer in the concept of the Peace Corps from the beginning of efforts to bring about its creation. That my name is asociated with those of other cosponsors on the legislation which brought the Peace Corps into being is one of the most gratifying developments of my career in the Congress.

It is evident that the Corps has helped to restore, in many underdeveloped sections of the world, the vision of America as a nation committed to the improvement of the life and enhancement of opportunity for all people. And it is heartening to know that in the House of Representatives, where the original Peace Corps measure faced much hostility, there is a popular readiness to grant this vital new agency an increase of more than 100 percent in appropriations and a threefold increase in personnel to enable it to expand its most purposeful endeavors.

In its first year, the administration, with the cooperation of the Congress, doubled the acquisition rate of Polaris submarines, doubled the production capacity of the Minuteman missile, increased by 50 percent the aircraft on ground alert, and doubled the strategic military manpower reserve. These have been significant gains in our country's efforts to bolster our deterrent capability and thus enhance the cause of peace.

Vice President JOHNSON has aptly said, "We have stopped strolling in the space moonlight and have started running toward the moon." It has been a year of big decisions and one of magnificent progress in the field of space and astronautics, including not only Col. John Glenn's successful triple orbiting of the earth, but marked also by the fact that we launched in 1961 eight times as many earth satellites as did the Russians. Furthermore, in communications, weather, and navigation, we have made very important scientific strides.

DOMESTIC ECONOMY PROGRAMS BOLD

While achieving the numerous accomplishments so important to our country in its external affairs and in the areas of security and science, the administration and the Congress have taken bold and adventurous steps to improve our domestic economy.

The West Virginia delegation in the Congress has made noteworthy contributions to the support accorded administration proposals, and I give assurance that we have had a real measure of cooperation from the White House and most agencies and departments of the executive establishment.

I am privileged to pay tribute to the high degree of devotion to duty and to the faithfulness of my Democratic colleagues—Senators ROBERT C. BYRD and Representatives KEN HECHLER, CLEVE BAILEY, HARLEY O. STAGGERS, ELIZABETH KEE, and JOHN M. SLACK, JR.—to the principles of our party and the best interests of both the State and the Nation as expressed through their actions in the Congress.

The pace of progress in the vital areas of congressional and administration efforts to improve the economic status of our country and its citizens perhaps has not been as rapid as some of us had hoped.

But again we must take cognizance of the fact that our domestic economic problems have been long in the making and the present administration has been on the scene less than 15 months.

Even though we may manifest impatience in expressing our hopes and expectations concerning domestic economic progress, we should not overlook the fact that at the end of the first year of this administration there were a million more people working than at the same time the prior year. And income from wages and salaries advanced 7 percent while, at the same time, net farm income increased by more than a billion dollars, or approximately 6 percent.

Last month, the President, in speaking of a February drop in unemployment, remarked: "I think this economy has more vitality in it than some of its premature mourners." He was able to point to the fact that the number of unemployed in the Nation declined by 120,000 to 4,543,000. This represented a 19-month low of 5.6 percent of the work force—still too high, of course, but an improvement.

It is essential that we look realistically at some economic facts.

The American economy has shown a capacity to grow at an average annual rate between 4 and 5 percent, without inflationary strain, during periods other than depression or war. This growth rate is measured by changes in total national production; States in uniform dollars.

OUR INADEQUATE GROWTH RATE

But during the period 1953–61, the average annual growth rate was only 2.5 percent, or hardly better than half the rate required—in view of the ever-accelerating technology—to absorb increases in the labor force and in productivity per man-hour.

This unsatisfactory record has been compounded of a fairly rhythmic succession of booms, periods of stagnation, recessions, and inadequate recoveries.

The deficient growth rate has led to a chronically rising level of unemployed manpower. Indeed, the peak of each boom thus far reached since 1953 has found us with more unemployment than the peak of the immediately preceding boom, and the trough of each recession has found us with more unemployment than the trough of the immediately previous recession.

It is my privilege to be a member of the Senate Labor Committee's Sucommittee on Employment and Manpower. I assure you that the facts reaching us demonstrate very clearly that unemployment, far from being concentrated in a few sectors of the economy, has become generally distributed throughout most of the important areas of the economy. And we find, too, that a very large and consistent increase in the chronic level of idle plant capacity have accompanied the chronic increases in idle manpower.

What is the outlook for improvement in the economic picture based on business spending on factories and equipment? Fortune magazine estimates spending in this area of economic activity will be at a rate of $40 billion. If this rate develops as forecasted, the previous peak record established in 1957 will be exceeded and the increase will measure 15 percent over 1961.

Fortune's experts emphasized—and economists in Government agree—that conditions are right for the businessman to add zest to the economic recovery for these reasons:

First, the need for investing in modernization of plants and in cost-saving production equipment is imperative.

Second, the cash to finance the construction is available.

Third, the Government is taking vital steps to encourage the spending.

Fourth, the usual tendency of businessmen is to expand their spending budgets over initial plans during a period of business advancement.

The real answers, of course, are months away—but the prospects seem to be reasonably favorable.

* * * * *

INDUSTRY MUST MODERNIZE

Standpatism, lethargy, and obsolescence are the enemies of progress in this age of advancing technology and rapid change. Investments in facilities and equipment—in other words, modernization and expansion—by American industry will be the key to the continuing success of democracy and the free enterprise system in the competition with communism.

We must have not only the men to match our times but, also, the forceful leadership within our business community which will forge a future filled with a challenge to achieve and the faith to accomplish our country's goals and better serve the national interest and the cause of peace.

We have an administration which is aggressive and progressive. And I have faith that the end product of the labors of the 87th Congress will be conducive to a bolstering of the businessman's outlook and planning.

But the American who holds the key to whether our country's current economic upswing stays strong through 1962 and well into 1963 is in considerable degree, the U.S. businessman.

If the businessman comes through with a sharp stepup in his spending for new plants and modern equipment in the months ahead our economy will be stronger. The upturn, which began precisely a year ago, will have the power to continue for a long time.

If the businessman, however, invests only subnormal totals in factories and equipment, we are in for trouble. Once more the upturn will falter, and we will be facing the threat of the fifth recession of the post-World War II period uncomfortably soon.

The American consumers have done and are doing their part in sustaining the advance by increasing their spending. Likewise, government at every level—Federal, State, and local—also has been performing and is performing its part in aiding the economic recovery by broadening expenditures.

But the expansion induced by Government and the consumers is a year old.

Consumers are not going to continue boosting their spending if the economy shows signs of sliding again.

So the conclusion to be reached is that the next stimulant must come from higher business spending.

WEST VIRGINIA ECONOMIC PICTURE

With reference to our West Virginia situation, there are both elements of encouragement and discouragement in the latest State department of employment security report.

The favorable factors are these: At mid-February, 527,400 persons were employed throughout the State, representing a gain of 100 from mid-January and 600 over the previous year. Total unemployed numbered 76,100, a drop of 8,100 during the month and 29,300 lower than a year ago.

Unfavorable, however, is the fact that the civilian labor force dropped to an estimated 603,500, which is 28,700 lower than mid-February 1961. This indicates extensive outmigration of our workers.

Meanwhile, however, there is a measure of encouragement to be read in the March issue of the Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Co.'s "Business in West Virginia" summary, which reports:

"Business activity in West Virginia advanced on a broad front in February. The second consecutive strong monthly increase further confirmed the opinion that December's pause was a temporary one." It was noted, too, that more than a year has passed since the bottom of West Virginia's recession in December 1960, and there was reassurance in the declaration that "the index of gross State product has already risen 10 points during the recovery and now exceeds the level achieved in 1957—a strong year for the economies of West Virginia and the Nation. The seasonally adjusted unemployment rate, which reached 17.4 percent during the recession, has dropped to 9.9 percent of the labor force."

In line with the unfavorable element of the employment security department report, the telephone company summary also includes the realistic observation that "job openings in the State, however, have been insufficient to absorb most jobless workers

who, it is generally believed, have migrated to other States. Thus, employment has barely exceeded the low point of the past recession."

This bears out the national experience; namely, that the peak of each boom thus far reached since 1953 has found us with more unemployment than the peak of the immediately preceding boom, and the trough of each recession has found us with more unemployment than the trough of the immediately previous recession.

OUR PROGRAM NEEDS

It is clearly indicated, therefore, that there must be acceleration of economic growth at both the State and national levels. It indicates, too, that there is need for the Area Redevelopment Act program signed into law by the Democratic President after prior vetoes by his predecessor of the other party. It attests to the requirement that the loan activities of the very helpful Small Business Administration be accelerated at the more realistic pace being maintained by SBA under this administration. It means that the manpower retraining features of the Area Redevelopment Act and the sweeping new Manpower Utilization and Training Act passed by Congress and signed by the President last month provide important tools to be brought into action with dispatch and vigor. It means that there is validity in the President's recommended long-range antirecession public works program with its provision for partial implementation at the earliest possible date. It means—especially for West Virginia and other coal-producing States, that the Government's coal research programs must be accelerated, as the present administration gives evidence of being determined to do.

These are purposeful programs intended to aid industrial, economic, and manpower development. No one of these programs alone will perform a miracle, but in combination they will be helpful. They have to do with business and industrial expansion and manpower utilization. Thus, they are meaningful in the sense that they are keyed to both the improvement of economic growth and the affording of new job opportunities. The element of "dole" is not present in these programs.

In West Virginia our foremost needs are industrial expansion and diversification. This is not a statement of new need. These have been our obvious requirements for a number of years, and especially since the mid-1950's when rapid mechanization of coal mining brought an acceleration of manpower displacement in that basic industry.

It is indicated and it is appropriate that a tribute be paid to the efforts of many dedicated citizens of our State and helpful citizens of other States who have been devotedly and vigorously assisting in the aggressive campaign to bring about the industrial expansion and diversification so vitally needed.

STATE ADMINISTRATION, LEGISLATURE AND PARTY LEADERSHIP MERIT PRAISE

And here, too, I am privileged to express a special sense of gratification concerning the outstanding accomplishments of our Democratic State administration under the persuasive leadership of Gov. Wally Barron, and with the vigorous cooperation of the Democratic legislature. Together, they have faced trying conditions with courage, boldness, and imagination. They have fashioned and implemented programs and instrumentalities which give promise of providing lasting solutions for grave problems.

I commend especially the establishment of the West Virginia State Department of Commerce and the creation of a Washington Liaison Office staffed by a special assistant to the Governor. Those of us representing our State in the Congress have reason to know and to be grateful for the work of these new offices and the capable services being performed by Commerce Commissioner Hulett Smith and the Governor's Special Assistant, Paul Crabtree.

The fact is that Hulett and Paul are symbols of the seldom before duplicated quality and degree of cooperative spirit which prevails between the Federal Government and the State government—and between the State's Democratic Party headed by Bob McDonough and the National Democratic Party and the Kennedy administration.

The esprit de corps engendered by these relationships are of inestimable value to our people and will doubtless augur well for the future of the Democratic Party in West Virginia.

Knowing of the real affection President Kennedy has for West Virginia and being aware of his expression of sympathetic interest in our problems, we have doubtless been too prone to expect quick, miracle-type solutions through Federal Government intercession and actions.

Make no mistake about it, my fellow West Virginians, we have been accorded recognition and a substantial measure of assistance from our national Government. But we must bear in mind that the laws and regulations which apply to the other 49 States also apply to West Virginia in matters such as the negotiation and awarding of Government contracts, the making of loans, and the awarding of grants.

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS HELP EMPLOYMENT

With a helpful degree of sympathetic understanding and a more cooperative spirit prevailing in Washington, our businessmen and industrialists are coming more and more to bid competitively and to negotiate with a reasonable degree of success for Government contracts. Consequently, we are no longer the almost totally overlooked and nonparticipating State in this area of activity which has real potential for improving our economic status and job opportunities for our workers. This is attested to especially by the substantial defense and non-defense prime contracts won competitively during the past year by Marietta Manufacturing Co. of Point Pleasant, by the FMC Corporation Ordnance Division of South Charleston, by the Carroll Division of Watson Electronics at Martinsburg, and by the Hercules Powder Co. at Rocket Center near Keyser. New employment afforded under these contracts will exceed 3,000 jobs.

We have reason to be optimistic that other prime contracts will be awarded to firms producing or planning to produce in West Virginia in the near future to provide even more jobs.

Another favorable development during the past year has been the location within our State of branch production units of well established prime defense contractors, notably, facilities of the aircraft and missile industries for the first time—Lockheed at Clarksburg and North American Aviation at Princeton; the highly diversified Melpar, a division of Westinghouse Air Brake, at Fairmont; and Harrington and Richardson's West Virginia Ordnance Co. subsidiary at Wheeling to produce under that Massachusetts company's defense contracts.

We are gratified to have Kaiser Aluminum expanding extensively near Ravenswood, to have Corning Glass increasing operations in our State, to have Virginia Electric & Power Co. installing a huge new operation in Grant County, and to have the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway substantially augmenting the staff and payroll here in Huntington by concentrating talent and activities in the former Government-surplus plant it acquired within the past year. There are many other plants I could list.

We have considered where we have been during the first year and a quarter of the present Democratic administrations in Washington and Charleston. Now where are we going?

We must induce and enable our businessmen to expand, to outthink, to outmanage, and outproduce our adversaries. We must rally our workers to make the best of everything with efficiency and at the lowest cost.

TRADE, TAX, AGED CARE MEASURES

This means we must have a more modern trade program—but one which will be equitable and just to domestic industries and American workers, whether producing for export or for domestic markets in competition with imports from abroad.

It means, too, that the tax program to be passed by the Congress must likewise be a modern one which will enhance our national growth and be equitable.

Medical care for the aged should be strengthened. I stand with the administration for expanding the social security system to provide insured coverage for all senior citizens eligible or to become eligible to participate in that system. The national chairman of the other party admitted a few days ago that existing programs for care of the aged are inadequate. He does not yet join us in favoring the social security approach—but he and his party seem to be withdrawing reluctantly from their former no retreat policy.

Antirecession legislation should be provided, and a cornerstone seems to me to be the public works program proposed by the President, and now including a plan for immediate implementation of an employment acceleration measure similar to one I joined Senator CLARK, of Pennsylvania, and Senator PELL, of Rhode Island, in cosponsoring in the 1st session of this 87th Congress.

I associate myself with a recent remark by our Vice President in which he declared that we have a long way to go—a hard way to go—but we are moving. We have begun, as President Kennedy admonished us to do in his world-acclaimed inaugural address. And if we will close ranks our party will be remembered and our country will be preserved.

The National Lottery of Finland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House an example of cultural advancement through gambling revenues. I refer specifically to the national lottery of Finland where the proceeds are divided between the National Opera, the National Theatre and the Ministry of Education.

Finland is a small nation of a little over 4 million persons, but size notwithstanding, it is noted for cultural and artistic attainment. The Finns are not a rich people, and they find it difficult to provide for the sustenance and promotion of their cultural heritage. They are quite dependent upon the national lottery as a means to this end. There is no evidence that they find this money somewhat tainted, for unlike many Americans they are not plagued by pious hypocrisy in these matters.

The national lottery of Finland brings in over $4,330,000 a year based on the

1961 figures. About one-third of this money goes to the treasury in the form of revenue. The lottery in this country is a small operation but produces big results.

Mr. Speaker, if we were not blind to human and financial reality, we could learn quite a bit from the Finns. A national lottery in the United States could bring a tremendous lift to our taxpayers. We could, painlessly and voluntarily, raise over $10 billion a year in additional revenue and apply it toward tax cuts and reduction of our national debt.

Augean Stables—Secretary Freeman Is a Poor Substitute for Hercules

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the April 2 issue of Barron's carries a pretty objective appraisal of the administration's success—or lack of same—with the farm program. This front-page article also assesses Secretary Freeman's role in shepherding his supply-management approach. The author of the article cuts through the smokescreen of publicists, in and out of the Department, to paint the picture in nothing by rosy hues. I found this article to be most appropriate at a time when Congress is wrestling with legislation on the farm issue, and, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert this Barron's report in the Appendix of the RECORD:

AUGEAN STABLES—SECRETARY FREEMAN IS A POOR SUBSTITUTE FOR HERCULES

For Columnist Joseph Alsop, who long has been on very friendly terms with the President, the change in administration has turned out to be by no means an unmixed blessing. Back in the bad old Eisenhower days, with bumbling Charlie Wilson and the ominous bomber and missile gaps, a crusading journalist of his persuasion never lacked for copy. In this new era of good feeling, however, Mr. Alsop evidently has found worthy targets few and far between. Perhaps as a consequence, he recently wandered onto less familiar ground, the area of farm policy. In a column headlined "The Administration's Sleeper," the noted Washington correspondent had some extravagantly kind things to say about Orville Freeman, who "in his own legislative bailiwick, has made as good an impression as any member of the present Cabinet, and a better impression than any Secretary of Agriculture since the dim depths of the remotest past." He also heaped praise on the Secretary's proposed new laws, which would extend to several commodities, notably feed grains and milk, "a strict but democratically based system of production controls." Unless the Freeman program is blocked by "envenomed opposition," the author concluded, it promises at long last to clean up the mess on the farm.

From a quarter which customarily dispenses gloom and doom, the word of good cheer comes as a welcome change. Unhappily, however, like other thunderbolts of revelation from the same Olympian source, this one has fallen palpably wide of the mark. To begin with, despite the historic impact which Secretary Freeman reputedly has made on Congress, he somehow failed to move the Senate Agriculture Committee, which last week, by a lopsided majority, rebuffed his plea to keep dairy price supports at their recent lofty heights.

The rest of his legislative program has aroused the ire of influential rural groups, notably the American Farm Bureau Federation, which, unlike some city slickers, happens to know that production controls are about as democratic, and as desirable, as a Nazi plebiscite. Finally, to judge by his record over the past year or so, the Secretary of Agriculture, far from contributing toward relief of the Nation's difficulties in the field, has made things perceptibly worse. Regardless of their political leanings, most observers would agree that U.S. farm policy bears an uncomfortable likeness to the mythological Augean stables. However, oracular columnists to the contrary notwithstanding, the signs and portents also suggest that Orville Freeman is no Hercules.

His official performance to date, indeed, is more likely to call to mind the famous Charles Atlas 97-pound weakling. After grappling for more than a year with the persistent oversupply of food and fiber, the Secretary of Agriculture has failed to nudge the burdensome problem one inch closer to solution. On the contrary, financially speaking, at any rate, he has lost ground. The feed grains are a case in point. In particular, the Department of Agriculture last year made a mighty effort to reduce the output of corn. Toward this end it persuaded a reluctant Congress to grant it temporary authority to pay farmers to refrain from planting. Moreover, in order to divert acreage into other crops, notably soybeans, USDA also decreed a sharp increase in the latter's support price. The two-pronged effort, officials were confident, would do the trick.

What followed was simply not according to plan. To be sure, the Department succeeded bountifully in spurring the cultivation of soybeans. The lie-fallow scheme, however, was less effective in discouraging the growing of corn. For while growers and others flocked to participate—nearly 5 million phantom acres (including a golf course), which hadn't been sown to the grain at all the previous year, thereby were taken out of production—they proceeded to work harder on the land that remained. In the end, an investment of nearly $1 billion of the taxpayer's money yielded the USDA only a 7-percent cutback in the corn crop.

However mismanaged, the soil bank in corn at least aimed at whittling surpluses. In dairy products, however, the Department incredibly has done its best to produce a glut. In a gesture of good will toward the Nation's dairymen, the Secretary of Agriculture, who hails from a dairy State himself, last year raised CCC supports on milk and butterfat by roughly 10 percent. The rest, as the saying goes, is history. Higher prices stimulated producers and discouraged consumers. A flood of surplus milk products descended on the startled bureaucrats, to whom this inevitable sequence of events evidently came as a stunning surprise. In the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961, the Government spent some $275 million supporting the milk price. In the current fiscal period the outlay will double, and, if an uneasy Congress had failed to turn off the spigot last week, the cost next year would surely have topped the $700 million mark.

For their good sense in lowering dairy price supports, effective April 1, the lawmakers have earned scant kudos from the administration. President Kennedy, who sought to wipe out the surplus by drinking a glass of milk on television, told a press conference last week that he "regretted" the move by Congress. His feelings undoubtedly are shared by Secretary Freeman, whose solution is equally unlikely. What the Secretary proposes is a sweeping extension of production controls to milk and a number of other farm products. "Producers of surplus commodities," he said in a speech the other day, "should have an opportunity to impose effective methods of supply management upon themselves through the time-honored democratic instrument of the ballot."

As in the case of the Holy Roman Empire, the Secretary's description is a classic example of mislabeling. For production controls are anything but democratic or time honored. On the first count, the pending legislation would authorize the Department of Agriculture, in the event of an adverse vote on a given commodity, to dump its holdings onto the market, thereby depressing prices and punishing the farmers for their independence. Besides employing coercion, USDA also would be empowered to rig the results through adroit use of exemptions and exclusions, which effectively bar small producers from the ballot box (in wheat, for example, the majority of growers does not vote). As to the second, wherever controls have been employed, notably in wheat, cotton, and rice, they have failed to prevent the accumulation of vast, unmanageable Government hoards. The Farm Bureau Federation, which has enrolled over 1 million farm families, has properly taken the measure of the Freeman plan. "The results would be inefficiency, higher production costs, frustration, and reduced opportunity for farmers."

The federation also knows what it wants. "The future of agriculture lies in producing for the market—in producing the things for which consumers indicate a preference by the way they spend their money. This means that the price system must be allowed to guide changes in production and consumption." To Orville Freeman and his friends, such sentiment may constitute envenomed opposition, or rank heresy. To Barron's it has the ring of sanity and truth.

From One Who Ought To Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am happy to include an article which appeared in the Monday issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald.

This syndicated article is by the Honorable Maurice H. Stans, who did such an able service while Budget Director in the Eisenhower years.

It is a thoughtful analysis and worthy of reading.

BALANCED BUDGET PROSPECTS GLOOMY

(By Maurice H. Stans)

Now that several months have elapsed since President Kennedy sent to the Congress his recordbreaking peacetime budget of $93 billion, it is a good time, while the Congress is still debating appropriations, to analyze its prospects. With the benefit of several months of hindsight, some new appraisals can be made.

It is now highly improbable that Kennedy's narrowly balanced budget for 1963 will survive the year in the black. Its rev-

enue assumptions are not likely to be realized, and its expenditure estimates will undoubtedly be exceeded. The projected surplus of half a billion dollars will more probably turn out to be a deficit of somewhere between $3 and $6 billion. Only a sharp turnabout by the White House before July 1 can change this prospect.

Here are some of the forces working against a balanced budget for 1963:

The estimated tax revenues are based on a hoped-for gross national product of $570 billion in calendar 1962. Most economists presently place their expectations in the range of $555 to $560 billion. Less prosperity means less personal tax collections.

Corporate tax collections in the budget assume that 1962 profits will be 22 percent higher than in the best year in history. While earnings of corporations should be better in 1962 than in any previous year, it is not likely that they will average out this well.

Despite last minute changes by the Ways and Means Committee, the tax bill passed by the House apparently will cost more in taxes in the first year than it will raise. The Senate, of course, may modify this.

Promised liberalization of depreciation allowances by Treasury Secretary C. Douglas Dillon will reduce taxable business income. If this relief is to be meaningful in amount, corporation tax payments will be lessened.

With all this, it is a fair assumption that, as matters now stand, revenues will fail to reach the President's $93 billion level by a considerable amount—as much as $3 billion or even more.

EXPENDITURE SIDE

On the expenditure side, there is little room for optimism either. The cuts the Appropriations Committees will make will not help 1963 significantly, because usually the biggest reductions are in authorizations with long leadtime, like construction or foreign aid. The Congress will probably again take a good whack at foreign aid, but a billion-dollar slash in this appropriation would normally reduce actual current year expenditures by only $100 or $200 million. In the meantime:

Interest costs on the national debt will probably run a bit higher than the $9.4 billion budgeted, a result of refunding operations that produce higher interest rates.

Kennedy's request for higher postal rates probably will not be enacted in time to take effect July 1, as the budget intended. And in the same bill the Congress is almost certain to raise the pay of Government employees more than the $210 million included in the budget for increases for the 2.7 million Government employees; the last Government-wide pay increase cost $700 million a year.

The budget reduction of $434 million in the cost of farm price supports is speculative. It is too late for the Congress to vote a farm bill in time to save any money on the crop-support program during fiscal 1963. In the meantime, the upward trend in farm productivity will continue to frustrate efforts to keep production in line with consumption, and only increased farm exports could alleviate this situation.

Part of the budgeted saving in farm programs is proposed to come by holding dairy price-support costs to $300 million. This may be politically unpalatable for the Congress.

Kennedy has just recommended continuance of the Federal program of extended unemployment benefits, retroactive to the expiration date of April 1. This unbudgeted expenditure alone could destroy the small surplus.

He also has proposed, subsequent to the budget, that the Congress vote a new $600 million public works program. If this is enacted, the expenditures in fiscal 1963 will be increased by $300 million; the balance will fall in future years.

Other pressures to accelerate the outflow of spending will prevail all through the year. The unspent authorizations of prior years carried over into fiscal 1963 will amount to about $82 billion. Unless the White House deliberately restrains the rate of these expenditures, the amount of actual outgo for military and other Government programs could exceed the scheduled flow by as much as $1 or $2 billion. Back-door spending authorizations in existing law, and carryover appropriations from previous years, can be held up only by deliberate presidental action.

The military budget may be exceeded for another reason. The budget message points out that the amount planned assumes that "the special measures associated with (the Berlin) crisis will terminate at the beginning of (the) fiscal year." If they do not, defense costs could go up substantially.

WORLD CONFIDENCE

In short, there are no presently visible items that will work in Kennedy's favor, in comparison with the original budget estimates.

The President's goal of a balanced budget deserves approval within and outside the country. But with this array of uncertainties, it is not realistic to expect that a budget as tinged with optimism as the one he submitted for 1963 can be achieved. Past commitments, going programs, and spending habits have too much momentum.

A deficit for 1963 in the range of $3 to $6 billion could be another blow to world confidence. It could threaten a further drain on our gold supply. Last fall, when Kennedy found out that the 1962 deficit was heading for $9 billion, he ordered drastic cuts in spending already authorized by the Congress (medical research, housing, veterans' loans, airplane procurement, and other items), and he may have to do it again this year.

Blocking Free Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER H. DOMINICK

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker, the tax bill which recently passed the House had a number of provisions to which many of us objected but, because of the closed rule, no amendments to change the bill could be offered unless the committee itself proposed them. One of these objectionable features involves the right of American citizens to take to the public messages advertising their position on important legislative matters or positions concerning fundamental political principles. Under the recent bill as passed such advertising may no longer be deducted as a business expense. One of the best explanations of the effect of this discriminatory provision appeared in an editorial of March 16, 1962, in the Daily Sentinel, which serves the western slope of Colorado. It reads as follows:

BLOCKING FREE PRESS

Advertising expenditures for promotion or defeat of legislation—regardless of whether a firm's business life is at stake—would not be tax deductible as a business expense under provisions of a tax reform proposal completed by the House Ways and Means Committee recently.

Dues or other expenses paid by a taxpayer to an organization and used "with respect to legislation of direct interest to the taxpayer and to such organization" would be tax deductible. This would include cost of travel and preparation of testimony as well as expense incurred in appearance at legislative hearings or communicating with legislators. (One assumes from this that entertaining legislators to influence their votes might also be deducted?)

Under present Internal Revenue Service regulations lobbying expenses are not tax-deductible. The net effect of the new proposal is to sanction lobbying costs and expenses of direct contacts with legislators and disallow expenses of taking the same message directly to the people through advertising.

The unfairness of such legislation is obvious. It interferes with the right of the individual or organization to go to the public. Lobbying efforts which can be and usually are personal are hidden from the public. These are sanctioned. The right to use the press, TV or radio to make a point for or against legislation is not. Lawmaking and the lobbying which influences it will thus become more and more isolated from the people who are vitally concerned.

This is obviously an effort of Government to find one more way to collect taxes from the people. But it is far more than that, it is a deliberate attempt of Government to shut itself off, protect itself if you will, from the results of the use of a free press to express views with which the Government may not agree.

As such it involves far more than the free press. It involves the rights of all free people and should be protested just as loudly by them as by the press itself.

United States Aids Darien Gap Survey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that as a part of the alliance-for-progress program there has been authorized the sum of $2 million to make possible an engineering survey of the Darien Gap which lies between Colombia and Panama. This is the first step needed to bring about the construction of the final 450 miles of the Pan American Highway which will establish a road running from Alaska to South America when completed.

The Committee on Public Works authorized this extensive highway program. As a result of committee action the present Inter-American Highway and the Rama Road, which is part of this vast highway network, is near completion.

As chairman of this committee, I am deeply interested in seeing that the remainder of this program linking the great continents of North and South America will become a reality.

In this connection I would like to include an article from the Engineering News-Record of April 5, 1962, on the present status of the Darien Gap Roadway:

U.S. AIDS DARIEN GAP SURVEY

The United States, through the alliance-for-progress program, will put up $2 million to make possible an engineering survey that should lead to construction of the last 450 miles of the Pan American Highway.

This 450-mile section, known as the Darien Gap, stretches across mountainous jungle regions of Panama and Colombia. It is the final link in a highway system that will extend from Alaska to Chile.

Under a new agreement with the Organization of American States, the United States provides up to $2 million for the survey, and Colombia, which already has paid $166,666 into a special survey fund, will complete its $333,333 contribution April 15. Panama already has contributed $333,333.

Other contributions have been received from El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Peru, Chile, Ecuador, Mexico, and Venezuela, bringing the special fund total to $2,581,647 at the present time. If all the contributing nations fulfill their assigned quotas, the fund will total $2,892,504.

Though rumors long persisted that hostile Indians lived in the area and that it was virtually impassible, a Pan American Highway Congress expedition, using an American Jeep and a Britah Land Rover, managed to make it from Chepa, 35 miles south of Panama City, to the Colombia border, where heavy rains forced them to take to rafts.

Plans and contracts for the survey will be completed within 60 days, according to the Agency for International Development (AID).

Because of excessive rainfall and jungle conditions, the survey will cost some $6,000 per mile, compared with $4,000 in rugged terrain in other areas.

Ground surveys in Panama and Colombia will require more than a year to complete, according to AID; subsequent reports and engineering calculations will require another 12 months.

Survey funds will be administered by the Pan American Union under the direct supervision of the Darien Subcommittee of the Pan American Highway Congress.

Hadassah Golden Jubilee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, this year we celebrate the golden jubilee of a most unique service organization, Hadassah, the women's Zionist organization.

Organized in 1912 by that remarkable humanitarian, Miss Henrietta Szold, the Hadassah program was originally intended to raise the health standards of Palestine. In 1913 Hadassah sent two American trained nurses to Jerusalem to establish a welfare station for maternity care and the treatment of trachoma. By 1918 the Henrietta Szold School of Nursing, the first such school in Palestine, was opened in Jerusalem. Today the school of nursing has facilities for the housing and teaching of 150 student nurses.

In the five decades of its existence Hadassah has assiduously pursued its original purposes of fostering Zionist ideals in America and establishing public health nursing in Palestine.

During the cruel years of World War II Hadassah put its substantial efforts in the movement of the transfer of 100,000 Jewish children from Europe into Israel. When the new State was founded the ladies of the Hadassah successfully met the challenge of the flood of new immigrants with a social and economic rehabilitation program.

Today in Israel the new Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center in Jerusalem—a 21-building complex devoted to medical healing, teaching, and research—stands as an imposing monument to the greatness of this organization. Not only is Israel benefited but the center, through its medical education programs, has been the means of serving the cause of health and taking the western tradition of freedom into many Asian and African nations.

I am proud on this occasion to salute the work of the more than 318,000 members in over 1,300 chapters throughout the country who carry forward the principles of Miss Henrietta Szold.

Proposed Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing in the House of Representatives three bills dealing with civil rights.

President Kennedy in his state-of-the-Union message this year stressed the importance of human rights, and emphasized the fact that there is still much to be done in the field of civil rights.

My first bill provides for the abolition of the literacy test and other performance examinations as a qualification for voting. Such arbitrary and unreasonable discrimination has no place in our democracy, although unfortunately it has been used as a means of depriving many of our citizens from exercising their right to vote. As I pointed out in a statement recently before Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Judiciary Committee, 19 States have literacy requirements, including my own State of New York. The law in New York is restrictive in that it requires voters to be able to read and write English. It is most unfortunate that this requirement thus works to prevent so many of our Puerto Rican citizens who are literate in Spanish but not in English from participating in elections. This was estimated as affecting some 200,000 Puerto Ricans in 1961. When Puerto Ricans were granted U.S. citizenship 45 years ago they were permitted to choose between English and Spanish as the official language; and to penalize them now for making a free choice is certainly most unfair and undemocratic.

In its 1961 report the Civil Rights Commission indicated that in some instances voting discrimination on racial grounds was practiced by requiring voters not only to be able to read and write, but to give a "satisfactory interpretation" of the Constitution, and to calculate their age to the very day.

My bill will protect the right of all citizens, including the Puerto Ricans, to participate in Federal elections if they have at least a sixth-grade education, regardless of race, creed, or color. It will prevent the misuse of so-called literacy tests in some of our Southern States in keeping qualified Negroes from voting, but would also protect the right of the individual State to make literacy a qualification for voting.

My second bill provides for the prompt desegregation of public schools. It is most appropriate that the Congress of the United States enunciate the law of the land in spelling out the decision of the Supreme Court in 1954, which held that there should be no segregation in public schools. President Kennedy has pointed out that a strong America requires the assurance of full and equal rights to all its citizens, of any race or of any color, among them the right to free public education.

This bill would provide that assignment of all students to public schools would be made irrespective of race or color, and would require every school board to adopt a desegregation plan within 6 months from the date of enactment of the bill. It permits the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, if called upon to do so, to render technical assistance to school boards in the preparation, adoption, and implementation of such desegregation plans, and to grant financial assistance where necessary to carry out such plans.

One of the main provisions of the bill would authorize the Attorney General of the United States to institute a civil action against any school board which fails to put into effect a plan of school desegregation within the time specified.

Our public school system must be preserved and strengthened, and no child should be denied his right to a free public education because of his race, color, creed, or national origin.

The third bill calls for the establishment of the Civil Rights Commission as a permanent agency within the executive branch of the Government, and requires the submission of a yearly report to the President and the Congress on its activities of the preceding year and on any recommendations for further action. The Commission has done a remarkable job in the past in bringing to light some of the problems of discrimination in this country, and in bringing about a realization of the national objective of equal rights and equal opportunities for all our citizens. It can certainly continue its work in the field of human rights, thus guaranteeing that there will be no denial of constitutional rights to any of our fellow Americans.

As the leader in the effort to establish man's dignity as an individual, entitled to certain basic rights and freedoms, we must prove to the entire world, particularly to those countries behind the Iron Curtain and to those on the brink, that the United States is a land where such

freedoms and the rights of each and every individual are respected and protected by the highest standards of justice. If we are to continue to preach democracy, freedom, and equality to the rest of the world, the Congress must fulfill its responsibilities and enact strong laws which will absolutely guarantee these rights regardless of race, ancestry, color, religion, or national origin.

I therefore urge that the House of Representatives give prompt and favorable consideration to these measures.

The Great Economic Issue Today: Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. Speaker, in our struggle with the Communists, the United States has often been lectured "to get off the defensive and seize the initiative." However, as President Kennedy noted:

> While this is not an unreasonable urge, its concrete application is more difficult. In the military area, the initiative rests with the aggressor—a role that we shun by nature and tradition and our alliances are largely, therefore, defensive. In the paramilitary arenas of subversion, intimidation, and insurrection, an open and peaceful society is again at a disadvantage. But there is one area in particular where the initiative can and has been ours—an area of strategic importance in which we have the capacity for a still greater effort—the area of economic policy.

The Marshall plan, point 4, and the alliance for progress are examples of our initiative in this area. These programs were devised not only to thwart communism but to strike a blow for freedom.

THE GREAT ECONOMIC ISSUE TODAY: TRADE

The great international issue today—one with far greater consequences than any foreign aid program—is the U.S. trade policy. Our trade policy affects our national security for our military and economic commitments abroad must be paid for by a favorable balance of trade. Our trade policy affects every sector of our economy.

The crops grown on 1 out of every 6 acres by the American farmer is sold on the foreign market. Sixty percent of our rice, 49 percent of our cotton, 45 percent of our wheat, and 42 percent of our soybean production are exported.

We export twice as many manufactured products as we import. Since 1945, machinery, vehicles, wood, paper, and chemical exports from the United States have doubled. One out of every three workers in manufacturing is employed in a firm that exports. Thousands more owe their jobs directly or indirectly to exports.

Our export industries are our strongest, most efficient, and highest paying growth industries, and not our lowest paying industries. A good example is U.S. coal—almost $55 million was sold to the Japanese in 1960 and 1961. The U.S. coal miner is paid 8 times more per hour than a Japanese coal miner, but he produces 14 times as much coal so that the real cost per ton of U.S. coal is far smaller.

Today, about 60 to 65 percent of our imports do not compete with the goods we produce. Forty percent of our imports are raw materials. More than 90 percent of our manganese or chrome ore for our steel mills is imported, as is 84 percent of the bauxite for our aluminum.

To state it more graphically, if the United States stopped trading abroad, the shortage and price rise would make these items virtually nonexistent: coffee, cocoa, spices, anything in tin cans, aluminum kitchenware, new radios, television sets, telephones, washing machines, and cars.

While exports represent about 3.9 percent of the gross national product in 1960, or about $1 out of every $25, American exports account for more than one-sixth of the world commerce.

TRADE IN PERSPECTIVE

What do all these statistics mean? It means that the United States is consuming more raw materials than our land is capable of producing; that we are not self-sufficient in a wide variety of minerals; that exports are crucial to the prosperity of many of our farmers and some segments of industry. Furthermore, the U.S. needs for raw materials will increase, for the rate of population increase in the United States is among the highest of the world's major countries.

We are the world's largest trading nation and many free world countries depend on our imports and exports. We, in turn, must look to exports to pay not only for our raw materials but to help us pay for our other oversea expenses such as maintaining troops in Berlin; to pay for our aid to less developed countries; to pay for the deficits caused by the outflow of American capital to tax-haven nations.

In 1959, the United States ran a deficit in its balance of payments of $3.7 billion; in 1960 it was $3.9 billion. In 1961 this deficit is estimated at over $1.5 billion. This deficit will grow unless it is offset by foreign investments in the United States and a favorable balance of trade.

But more important, trade will determine the size and shape of the free world. Japan, Canada, Philippines, Chile, Venezuela, Peru, India, Uruguay, Liberia, Pakistan, and other free world countries must have access to new markets for their raw materials and new manufactured goods if their economies are to expand to meet the demands and needs of their people, and if their new industries are to be successful. If the free nations do not offer growing trade opportunities with the West—opportunities which will allow them to pay eventually for their needs with exports—these countries will be forced to turn to the Communist bloc for their market.

THE EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET

In the sixties, some 90 percent of the free world's industrial production may soon be concentrated in two great markets: The United States and the European Economic Community, popularly known as the European Common Market. The United States has a population of 185 million and a gross national product of $500 billion. The European Common Market, including the United Kingdom which has applied to become a member, has a population of 250 million and a gross national product of $245 billion. The U.S. exports to Western Europe account for one-fourth of our total exports.

Ever since the end of World War II, the U.S. policy has been to support greater European unity. Our aim was twofold: to curb the kind of European nationalism which led to two World Wars by encouraging the establishment of a common economic system, and to help create a strong Western Europe which would help guard the security and prosperity of free nations. The pooling of French and German coal and steel production under a common authority was one step toward that direction.

The Marshall plan brought the statesmen of these nations together. The United States asked them to determine not just the needs of their respective countries, but the needs of Western Europe.

In 1958, six European nations—France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg—signed a treaty to bring about a European economic community. The treaty members pledged to: First, remove tariffs and other trade barriers among themselves; second, create a uniform system to regulate trade between themselves and the rest of the world; third, abolish restrictions on the movement of labor, capital, business enterprises and services within the new community; fourth, coordinate monetary and fiscal policies in order to promote high employment and stable prices in each country; and, fifth, establish a common agricultural policy.

The Common Market nations set a timetable of 12 to 15 years to accomplish the reduction of tariffs. Trade barriers among the original six members have been reduced by 50 percent at the beginning of 1962, nearly 2 years ahead of schedule. Other countries, notably former colonies of members of the Common Market, were accepted as associated states and have free access to the Common Market.

For alliance for progress countries, the special concessions made to former European colonies, particularly the African states, accentuate Latin America's trade problems, for both continents produce cotton, coffee, bananas, and other fruit.

The Common Market with its common external tariff wall against the rest of the world, presents a serious threat of discrimination against American exports and against the goods of free nations such as Canada, Japan, and countries in Latin America.

How much of a handicap this tariff will be, depends on the imported product and Europe's demand for it. The Common Market has indicated its willingness to bargain down its external tariff in exchange for trading concessions with outsiders, particularly the United States.

Hence, whether or not these two enormous markets in the free world will grow apart and engage in a trade war or whether they will expand the flow of trade and thereby stimulate and strengthen the respective economies will be determined by the trade policy of the United States.

HAWAII AND FOREIGN TRADE

Foreign trade has a direct impact on the life and livelihood of the American people in every state. Any change in tariffs could bring about serious dislocations in a State's economy causing the closing of some plants and unemployment with all its social problems.

It is difficult to gage the exact effect of world trade on Hawaii. Recently, the tariff on Hawaiian pineapple was raised in the Common Market. This move was not unexpected, for pineapples from French territories have had a distinct advantage over Hawaii in sales to Common Market countries. However, this increase in tariff could mean a further loss of the West German market which, heretofore, was the leading oversea buyer of Hawaiian pineapple products.

The extent to which Hawaii is involved with international trade should be emphasized. In 1960 Hawaii exported $44 million of agricultural products, or roughly 15 percent of the islands' total agricultural produce. Included were $41.5 million for field crops, $1.1 million for livestock and livestock products, $984,000 for fruits and nuts, and $377,000 for vegetables.

In 1960 exports of manufactured goods from Hawaii were estimated at $15.5 million. This is less than 1 percent of the gross State product. But over 23,000 workers or over 9 percent of the labor force are employed by manufacturing establishments reporting exports of $25,000 a year or more. These firms range from Dole Corp., Libby McNeill & Libby, California Packing Corp., to California Ink Co., Pacific Chemical & Fertilizer, Honolulu Iron Works, to smaller apparel and furniture companies.

TRADE EXPANSION ACT

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act expires in June. If our exports are to retain and expand their position in the world market, and if the aim of our foreign policy is to bring about this greatest advance in increased living standards, especially in newly developed areas, our trade policy must be revised, not extended.

The United States needs a trade policy that grants new authority first, to negotiate broad trade agreements rather than one that negotiated item by item—a bargaining technique obsolete in many cases; second, to exchange tariff concessions; and, third, to increase trade to strengthen our balance of payments.

Of utmost importance is the retention of the most-favored-nation principle which would assure our other trading partners that any tariff concessions would be extended to them.

The new Trade Act should also contain some kind of trade adjustment program to give prompt and effective help to those firms and workers who face genuine hardships as a result of competition from increased imports. The aim of such a program would be to help firms modernize their equipment and plants, to help firms and workers move into lines of work in which they can compete more effectively.

I feel that the United States should equip itself to meet the challenge and the advantages that the European Common Market offers by adopting a liberal trade policy. The alternative is to retreat from some oversea commitments which are vital to the security of the free world. This is unacceptable.

If the Government Ran Our Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, my attention was attracted recently to an editorial in the Washington, Iowa, Evening Journal under the title "If the Government Ran Our Schools."

There will be those who say, "It can't happen here," but just to make sure that it does not, it might be well to dwell on some of the hypothetical situations which might arise under any system of centralized control of education. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

IF THE GOVERNMENT RAN OUR SCHOOLS

Some aid-to-education enthusiasts hold that local schools, as they are managed now, would have everything to gain and nothing to lose by direct Government supervision. Let's see, however, what Robert E. Wilson, professor of education administration at Temple University in Philadelphia, thinks about it. He suggests the following as a general pattern which might well evolve:

Parent: "I want my child's teacher changed."

Superintendent: "I only work here; see your Senator."

Citizen: "My school taxes are too high."

Superintendent: "See your Congressman; finance bills originate in the lower House."

Teacher: "Our arithmetic books are worn out; can we order new ones?"

Superintendent: "This is election year; no additional expenses this year."

Citizen: "Kids are cutting across my lawn on the way home from school and have damaged my petunias."

Superintendent: "Don't bother me. File your list of damages with the U.S. regional court of claims."

Parent new to district: "What school will my child attend?"

Superintendent: "The U.S. Office of Education does not not distribute its building and pupil allocation until August."

Janitor: "I want a raise."

Superintendent: "See your Congressman; finance bills originate in the lower House."

High school student: "But why can't we have a pep rally?"

Superintendent: "This is an election year; White House directive dated January 4 forbids rallies that might detract from nominating convention rallies."

Parent: "How many days do we get for Christmas this year?"

Superintendent: "Maybe I don't have to answer that question; did you vote in the last national election?"

Parent: "That teacher kept my child after school just for throwing a paper wad."

Superintendent: "Detention for paper-wad throwing upheld by U.S. Supreme Court, *Althouse v. Union School District, Ga.* (11 T. 381, 1976.)"

Principal: "Why can't I receive my annual supply of writing paper for the third grade?"

Superintendent: "Congressional Budget Committee increased military appropriation this year; education budget reduced."

Parent: "How do I get the bus to stop in front of my house?"

Superintendent: "See Senate Subcommittee on Intrastate Communications and Transportation."

Parent: "My child can't eat that lousy food served in the cafeteria."

Superintendent: "Why tell me? Write the Secretary of Agriculture."

Parent: "My little Everett is so smart for his age; why can't you make an exception for him to start first grade even if he won't be 6 until December?"

Superintendent: "Is he Republican or Democrat?"

From the Washington Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include an editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald. It is not every day that the Post is critical of the present administration. Their complaint at the secret meetings held here last week by the Department and agricultural stabilization and conservation committeemen from all over the Nation is, I think, constructive and timely. The editorial entitled "Farm Choices" follows:

FARM CHOICES

President Kennedy very succinctly stated the agricultural policy dilemma to the agricultural stabilization and conservation committeemen who gathered on the White House lawn on Wednesday. He rightly pointed out that continued overproduction may produce a burden of surpluses so great that the storage and disposition of them will tax the Treasury to the point where public opinion may compel abandonment of the farm program with consequent economic disaster.

The trouble is that this once-removed disaster has less impact upon farmers than their immediate predicament. As long as individual incomes are at all satisfactory—as the result of massive governmental intervention in the markets—the disagreeable controls that would make that intervention less urgent are likely to be unpopular. It is this circumstance that makes unwise the high price supports on dairy products fixed by Secretary Freeman a year ago and now reduced. And it is this circumstance that is the essence of the administration's new program in which farmers must consciously opt for unlimited production with low prices or controlled production with higher prices. It is certain that the effort to have it both ways will discredit the farm program.

There is every social and economic reason for a broad Federal farm program at considerable cost to Government. Farmers, whose productivity has increased more rapidly than that of any bther group, and whose per capita investment is greater than that of industry, have a right to a fair return on investment and a decent reward for labor. By and large, they are getting neither. They have a right to say that they ought to be given the economic equivalent of the tariffs and subsidies Government has conferred on industry and the political counterparts of collective bargaining and immigration restrictions which benefit organized labor.

Citizens and consumers have a right to ask that the governemntal intervention be practical as well as just. It is toward a balanced abundance that the proposed farm programs point. It is difficult to quarrel with this goal, whatever the difference in detail. It is possible to say, at the same time, that on some basic commodities, there ought to be a willingness to try alternative devices. In some cases it might be simpler than the program now in effect or proposed to have less interference with price levels and put dependence on direct payments plus controls. Cotton seems a notable example of a commodity that would move more swiftly in foreign trade (without the reproach of subsidizing foreign textile manufacturers) if farmers were given supplementary payments linked to acreage and production limits.

The Government's policies would be better understood and more widely debated if they were arrived at more democratically. The Farm Bureau has justly complained of the secrecy of the proceedings of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee meetings here this week. It is a curious thing indeed that there is a public text of the proceedings of the agricultural conference of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union Central Committee, while the makers of the American farm policy deliberate in secret. The selection of the committees at the State level is not as democratic as it might be either. These cozy practices lend a furtive air to agricultural planning that is calculated to make the consuming public both suspicious and uninformed. More open and more democratic processes might make farmers more familiar with consumer reactions and make consumers more aware of farm difficulties.

Farmers have nothing to hide. They have no need to make a secret of a production record better than that of any economic group in the national life, or of a program for dealing with that production that is fully consistent with broad national interest.

REA Adopts Information Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the Rural Electrification Administration has reversed a policy of secrecy which had surrounded the agency's action on loan applications for rural power projects for the past 26 years.

In an order which states that information about loan applications will be made public in the future, the REA also has set up a positive information policy for the first time since the agency was established in 1936. The order was issued by REA Administrator Norman Clapp following a series of discussions with the Special Subcommittee on Government Information.

The new REA information policy statement declares that the agency will make information about all of its activities available to the public to the maximum extent possible. The policy statement lists the reports, financial data, and other information which the agency will publish on an annual, quarterly, or monthly basis. The new procedure on loan applications will be to make available to the public the name and address of a loan applicant, the date of the application, the amount of the loan applied for, and the general purpose of the loan.

The new order also spells out the criteria to protect business and financial information which is restricted by law or by regulations of the Agriculture Department under which REA operates. The order states that any applicant who objects to disclosure of the basic information about the filing of an application must appeal to REA Administrator Clapp stating reasons for any restriction on information.

The new REA information policy statement also urges rural cooperatives and other REA borrowers to make public information about their local activities.

Following is the text of the REA information order:

REA BULLETIN 20-12, ELECTRIC—REA BULLETIN 320-16, TELEPHONE

SUBJECT: PUBLIC AVAILABILITY AND RELEASE OF INFORMATION

I. Purpose: To state existing policy and new procedure relating to the release of information and the availability of records.

II. Policy: Under direction of the Secretary of Agriculture and pursuant to applicable Department regulations, it is the practice of the Rural Electrification Administration to make information on its program activities available to representatives of media of public communications, to organizations, individuals, and Members of Congress and to make its official records available to the public, to the maximum extent possible. This policy recognizes and encourages public interest in the REA programs.

III. Implementation: The Rural Electrification Administration will implement this policy in a number of ways:

A. REA will publish annually:

1. Report of the Administrator summarizing the activities of the agency during the fiscal year.

2. Statistical report of its electric borrowers stating detailed information about their operations and their financial status.

3. Statistical report of its telephone borrowers stating detailed information about their operations and their financial status.

4. Report of energy purchased setting forth the amount of power purchased by each electric borrower, the price paid for power and from whom purchased.

5. List of generating units financed by REA by type, location, and capacity.

B. REA will publish quarterly:

1. Statistical bulletin summarizing National and State information on electric borrowers, including miles of lines in operation, consumers served, kilowatt-hours generated, purchased, and sold, and revenues from such sales.

2. Statistical bulletin sumarizing National and State information on telephone borrowers, including telephones in service, total subscribers served, subscribers receiving initial service through REA financing, number of central offices, and revenues received from operations.

C. REA will publish monthly:

1. Statistical bulletin summarizing National and State information on the electric program, including amount of loans to borrowers by purpose, loan estimates of miles of line to be constructed and consumers to be served, loan funds advanced to borrowers and interest and principal payments received from them.

2. Statistical bulletin summarizing National and State information on the telephone program, including amount of loans to borrowers by purpose, loan estimates of miles of line to be constructed and subscribers to be served, loan funds advanced to borrowers and interest and principal payments received from them.

3. Rural Lines, a magazine designed to inform borrowers and interested persons of agency policy and the experience and problems and progress of its borrowers.

D. REA will publish official bulletins on policy, procedures, and practices.

E. REA will issue a press release on each loan approval, stating the name of the borrower, the exact amount of the loan, its specific purpose or purposes, the area to benefit, and the approximate number of consumers or subscribers to receive service.

F. REA, upon request, will furnish additional information about its loans and programs to public communications media, to organizations, individuals, and Members of Congress, including up-to-date reports prepared on a National, regional, State, and local basis.

IV. Availability of records: REA policy and practices concerning the availability of records are governed by departmental policy as set forth in title I, chapter 9, section 7 of "Administrative Regulations."

V. Procedures and criteria relating to loan applications:

A. REA recognizes its responsibility under Department regulations for treating as administratively confidential information furnished it in expressed or implied confidence in connection with a contract, loan, or other benefit or service when release of the information would impair the legitimate interests of the person supplying the information. In recent years the basic information listed in paragraph B below generally has been made available by the applicants themselves. On the basis of this experience, REA finds that such information about an application for an REA loan usually does not come to the agency in implied confidence and can be disclosed by REA without injury to the legitimate interests of the applicant.

B. Therefore, in response to inquiries from the public or at such other times as REA deems appropriate, REA will, subject to provisions of paragraph C below, make available the following information concerning pending loan applications:

1. Name and address of applicant.

2. Date of the application.

3. Amount of the application.

4. General purpose for which loan funds are requested:

(a) In the case of electric loan applications, this will include estimates of the number of miles of line to be constructed and the number of consumers to be served by the facilities; the approximate voltage of transmission lines, and the estimated size and approximate location of generating facilities.

(b) In the case of telephone loan applications, this will include the number of new miles of line to be constructed and the approximate number of subscribers to receive service.

C. A loan applicant who desires that the Administrator should not disclose any of the basic information listed in paragraph B should at the time the loan application is filed specify the particular information he wishes withheld, together with a statement

of reasons. If the Administrator determines that such request must be denied, he will inform the applicant of such decision. If the applicant's request is approved, but subsequently the Administrator determines that in the public interest such information must be disclosed prior to the making of any loan, notice thereof will be given to the applicant if time and circumstances permit.

D. Under the provisions of 1 AR 536b(13) of the Department regulations, information received from an applicant for a loan is to be treated as administratively confidential if its release "would impair legitimate interests of the person supplying the information." On the basis of experience, REA finds that release of the following information, while the application is pending, "would impair legitimate interests of the person supplying the information." Therefore, REA will treat such information as administratively confidential unless the applicant consents to its release, or the Administrator specifically determines that in the public interest such information must be disclosed:

1. Status of contracts and contract negotiations involving the applicant's business.

2. Information relating to the current financial status and structure of the applicant.

3. Details of the economic and engineering feasibility and plans of the proposed project.

4. Data submitted on new loans and services.

E. For purpose of this bulletin, a loan application is considered to be:

1. In the electric program, a board resolution requesting a loan from REA.

2. In the telephone program, REA form 490, "Application for Rural Telephone Loan" for initial loans, or similar information for supplemental loans.

VI. Recommendation: Consistent with this policy, REA recommends that borrowers and prospective borrowers, as organizations devoted to community service, recognize the legitimate interest of the public in their operations.

A. It is recommended that borrowers and prospective borrowers make available to the public, to the maximum extent possible, information about their activities.

B. It is further recommended that borrowers and prospective borrowers develop policies with regard to the release of information to the public and that they develop continuing information programs to disseminate this information to all appropriate public communications media.

What Is a Well-Educated Man?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Nation—to meet the needs of a fast-expanding population and the challenge of communism to freedom in the world—is taking a new look at its educational system.

Living in a scientific-technological age, we will depend to a large degree upon an adequate reservoir of educated, creative-minded individuals—not sterotyped, mass-produced robots—to design the tools, policies, and programs needed to meet the challenges of the times.

Usually we evaluate our educational needs in terms of classrooms, teachers, transportation, tuition, and other factors.

However, I believe, we need also to take a new, analytical look at first, the concept of education itself; second, the special needs of the times; and, third, the end product of the U.S. system—that is, are individuals being well equipped to meet present-day individual and national challenges, or are we turning out old-fashioned, obsolete models—inadequately trained for the complex age in which we live?

Recently, the editors of the National Education Association Journal asked a group of distinguished American statesmen, educators, scientists, religious and cultural leaders, and others for their definition of a well-educated person in today's world.

The article, I believe, provides perceptive and analytical insight on fundamental criteria for a well-rounded educated individual in today's world. Believing that the Congress—considering legislation in the field of education, as well as the American people—needs to take a new look at our concept of—and success in meeting—the needs of education. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS A WELL-EDUCATED MAN?

Journal editors recently asked a group of distinguished American statesmen, educators, scientists, religious and cultural leaders, and others for their definition of a well-educated person in today's world. Statements of those who responded appear below.

Teachers may wish to ask their students to study these definiations and to express their own thoughts on what it means to be well educated. Students' comments may be published in a later Journal.

Sterling M. McMurrin, U.S. Commissioner of Education:

"An educated man is at home with ideas. He is as comfortable with concepts as he is with objects. He readily infers the general from the particular, for his capacities for rational abstraction equal his powers of concrete perception.

"An educated man is one whose reason disciplines his attitudes and action, but in whom the emotions are alive and sensitive and in whom there is genuine moral awareness, artistic perceptiveness, and spiritual commitment.

"An educated man has some understanding of himself. He is aware of his own prejudices, is critical of his own assumptions, and knows his own limitations.

"An educated man is aware of the events that have brought the world to where he finds it. He knows the wellsprings of his own society and culture and understands the essential unity of past, present, and future.

"An educated man has a fine sense of the relation of the ideal to the real, of the possible to the actual. He is not satisfied with the world as it is, but he knows that it will never be what he would like it to be. He has hope for the future, but refuses to deny the tragedies of the present.

"An educated man has a cultivated curiosity that leads him beyond the bounds of his own place and circumstances. Provincialism and parochialism have no place in his world, for they stifle thought and inhibit creativity.

"Finally, an educated man is one who loves knowledge and will accept no substitutes and whose life is made meaningful through the never-ending process of the cultivation of his total intellectual resources."

Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission:

"An educated man is a man whose mind is open and whose spirit is free. He is always searching for knowledge, always seeking the truth. He is aware of his own nature and of the nature of his physical and social environment, and he can, because of this awareness, adjust to his environment and contribute to its betterment.

"He is well grounded in the fundamentals of science as well as in other traditional fields of knowledge; he understands the origins and the development of social, religious, and political institutions and their influence on the past, the present, and the future. He is able to communicate intelligently. He is alert to his responsibilities to all segments of society, and he is active—never passive—in their performance.

"He is learned, but also conscious of the stream of life. He is a proud part of the mass of humanity, and yet aspires to understand it better and to leave it some legacy of material, mind, or spirit."

Ewald Turner, NEA president; on leave from his duties as a classroom teacher in Pendleton, Oreg.:

"The educated man is one who has learned where to go to find the answers to the problems which confront all men. Not all the answers he will need will be supplied to him in the classroom or between the covers of books. Formal study will have played a part in his educational development; and it should have taught him how to think. Having learned to do that, he must then search relentlessly, within himself, for the truths by which to set his course.

"The educated man will have the vision to know where he is going and where he has been. He will find, within himself, understandings that are the heritage of his past, and he will have the creative energy, acting upon these stored resources in the light of new experiences, to transmit and, in at least some small way, enhance them before handing down the heritage to those who come after him.

"Compassion will lead him to share generously with his fellows, for he will have learned that there is no easy road to wisdom. He will have constructed a system of values which will prompt him to employ his learning for worthy objectives, consistent with his dignity as an individual. He will remain steadfast to his principles even at a loss of personal prestige.

In a troubled world he will discover the faith and courage to play his role cheerfully, confident that, this side of Paradise, he lives in the best of all possible worlds."

Paul C. Reinert, S.J., president, St. Louis University:

"Subjectively viewed, the well-educated man must be one in whom basic human potentialities have been harmoniously developed, in whom the powers of mind and body, of imagination and intellect, of emotion and will, have been strengthened and trained to maturity within an integrated personality.

"He will have a basic grasp on the facts, the disciplines, and the creative activities which constitute our culture. He will understand the society and the world in which he lives so that he can fulfill his social duties to family, nation, and all men.

"He will have elected an area of deeper and more thorough training in which he will exercise his vocational role as an expert finding his livelihood and his career in a special contribution to society.

"His personality will be integrated and his development and activities harmonized by the real personal acceptance of (and commitment to) what has often been called wisdom; that is, an intelligently grounded and intellectually grasped set of values integrated with the supreme end of human life. Of its very nature this wisdom must be religious in character and, for those who have come to know that God has spoken through Christ. His Son, it must be not only humanly good but specifically Christian and illumined and uplifted by divine love."

MARGARET CHASE SMITH, U.S. Senator:

"In today's world, a well-educated man has a college education. However, it does not end there; he continues to study after college, for in our world today there is always an opportunity to further one's education.

"Keeping informed of the world situation as well as of the current events of our own country is vital to the well-educated man. To him, integrity is essential—for integrity is that personal ingredient which makes men and women speak up when they know that in doing so they are going to make themselves unpopular. It is outspoken recognition that the right way is not always the popular and easy way.

"The ability to lead is another very important characteristic, in addition to having initiative and the quality of being able to handle any responsibility one may be expected to assume. Being well dressed and well groomed is a necessary asset.

"In this rapidly changing world of ours, knowledge has clearly replaced physical force as the dominant power and the factor which determines the relative strength of nations of the world."

Label A. Katz, president, B'nai B'rith:

"It seems to me that the well-educated man fears he isn't. This because he is a sophisticate; humbly aware of the dynamism of human experience. The Talmud—that remarkable compilation of Jewish laws and parables—reminds him that humility is a prerequisite to knowledge. Thus, his pursuit of education is not a goal but a way of life, never a fulfillment but only a lifelong process toward it.

"The well-educated man is a reader. Books are his provocative companions. He revers initiative and ideas as the catalysts of human progress. He has a catholic curiosity. He seeks to understand others not merely from his own vantage or by his own values, but as others see themselves in their environment.

"He is endowed with a sense of social obligation, responsive to the events that shape his world and to the people in it. He does not exist by himself; he is not the passive scholar. Yet, he does not fear the splendid isolation of the nonconformist. He encourages dissent as a stimulating prod to creativity.

"He honors tradition by refusing to embalm it; he wants to apply the wisdom of the past to an understanding of the future. He wants to learn from history so that, as Santayana warned, he won't doom himself to repeating it.

"He wants to leave something of himself to the succeeding generation. He believes with the sage Maimonides that the advancement of learning is the highest commandment."

Marya Mannes, author:

"The first mark of the well-educated man is that he speak well, I would put knowledge of his own language as a prime element, for until a man can communicate what he knows, he does not know it. This ability is as essential as the reading of prose and poetry from the earliest written expression until the present. It is my belief, moreover, that the study of Latin is an invaluable aid not only in the precision of thought but in familiarity with word roots.

"I believe, too, that a man cannot be considered truly educated without fluent knowledge of at least one modern foreign language. This is more than a convenience abroad or a tool for a career. It provides an experience vital to this contracting world: The ability to think and feel in an alien idiom.

"I do not consider a man or woman well educated who has not learned enough about the history and techniques of art, music, architecture, and dance to give him that extra dimension of awareness which only trained senses can provide.

"For this same reason, and for many others, today's man must know something about the nature of matter, the laws of the universe, and the basic principles of the technology by which we now live.

"Finally, the educated man's mind is an open mind; he is willing to hear thoughts in opposition to his own even though he may continue to reject them. In the well-educated man or woman, the capacity to learn remains infinite."

Pauline Tompkins, general director, American Association of University Women:

"In any era, the well-educated man is one whose mind, throughout his life, is questingly exposed to at least some of the most significant thories, facts, and dreams which have shaped his past and present and are influencing his future.

"The quality of his education is demonstrated in the first instance by his general and specific knowledge reflected in his responses to the problems posed by his time. Infinitely more important is the temper of his mind, revealed in the logic and integrity of his thought. The well-educated man is the intellectually honest and humble man. The appetite for knowledge is the hunger for truth. The more of it one grasps, the more his knowledge approaches wisdom, and the more profound his awe.

"The well-educated man is, by the same token, the liberated man. His commitment to the search for truth pervades all his thinking. He, more than others, dares to rise above the parochialism of his day, to cast it in the bold relief of history, and to voice the perplexing questions which accompany this appraisal. His freedom and his education are equally marked by the disciplined versatility of his mind, the absence of mental taboos, the ordered breadth of his imagination, the humaneness of his understanding."

MAURINE B. NEUBERGER, U.S. Senator:

"The well-educated man is one to whom the myriad doors of the 20th century have been opened. He has learned to live with himself, to be a constructive member of his society, and to utilize the technological advances to create a better world."

David D. Henry, president, University of Illinois:

"The educated man may be marked by the nature of his participation in the discussion of public affairs: Does he show urbanity or narrow partisanship? Does he contribute to reconciliation or divisiveness? Does he seek to clarify or merely to argue? * * * Is he interested in public purpose?

Controversy has a part in the crystallization of public decisions. The search for truth is characterized by the free play of minds working upon one another, and in the process, strong men sharply differ. But, in differing, educated men behave as serious men going about important business, with deliberation, thoroughness, and mutual respect. * * *

"The educated man will apply the standards of reason and scholarship to public questions and let his opinion be guided by the results. He believes in independent judgment, but he also respects the point of view of others, even when it differs widely from his own.

"The educated citizen, with an understanding of the contending forces for the control of the minds of men, is the hope for fulfillment in action of the democratic ideal; he is devoted to problem solving, not panaceas; and he is willing to have patience for progress as he seeks to apply intelligence to the civic tasks of every day."

Helen C. White, chairman, Department of English, University of Wisconsin:

"A well-educated man knows what he cares about and what he can do; but he knows, too, that he must go beyond himself if he is to do his part. He knows that he can only begin to understand even the natural world. As for the forces at work among his fellow men, he realizes that he needs all the experience, past or present, that he can draw upon even to ask the questions that will open up the meaning of what he sees before him.

"Beyond the limits of his own competence, he knows how to find the experts he wants and how to use them critically and constructively. Because he cannot know everything, he does not refuse to act on what he does know. And always he is alert for the fresh insight that is the reward of the man who never wearies in the pursuit of understanding."

Allen P. Britton, president, Music Educators National Conference, NEA:

"The phrase 'well educated' has two connotations one of which is occasionally overlooked. Both connotations are equally important, however, and deserve equal emphasis.

"The connotation which seems to be universally understood is that the well-educated man should be a broadly educated man, educated in all of the most signicant aspects of the Western cultural heritage. I believe that an education of adequate breadth must include an education in the great arts of our culture, including music, of course, but also the dance, the theater, painting, sculpture, and architecture.

"The second connotation and the one which does not always receive proper emphasis is that the well-educated man is one whose education has been of the highest quality.

"Once upon a time an ancient monarch inquired as to whether or not there was some comparatively easy and quick method by which he could acquire the basic principles of geometry. He was told, 'Sire, there is no royal road to geometry.' Neither is there such a road to music or any art or any body of scientific or literary knowledge. The great disciplines are not come by without discipline. Thus, the well-educated man must not only be broadly educated in the intellectual and artistic glories of our civilization but also thoroughly educated in them."

Dorothy B. Ferebee, M.D., medical director, Howard University health service:

"In today's world, a well-educated man reveals himself by his attitudes, his behavior, his speech, and by the depth of his concerns.

"One of the most significant and important characteristics of an educated man is his manner, his projection of himself through ways of thinking and through his attitudes toward life and lives. The wholeness of his thinking and attitudes emerges into an ability to relate daily activities to worthwhile and purposeful ends; a kind of relatedness that enables him to seek truth through honesty and dignity. His whole being is illuminated by the way he chooses, or makes judgments, or effects a balance between his emotions and his intellect. An educated man is one who has used his opportunity to grow in understanding of himself and of the environment in which he lives.

"In the truly educated man, there is always apparent a command and a control of responses and reactions reflected in regard and respect for the rights and dignity of other humans, irrespective of differences. He reveals himself in a quiet, well-modu-

lated voice, employing good word usage and lucid expression born of an ability to think straight and to deploy ideas effectively.

"Finally, an educated man shows a sensitivity to the changing needs of people in the society around him and throughout a dynamic world. His world-mindedness envisions the reality of the problems and aspirations of unseen millions. He responds to our shrinking world and its demands with informed concern. In short, he has a humanness which he is not afraid to express."

Rt. Rev. Msgr. O'Neil C. D'Amour, associate secretary, National Catholic Educational Association:

"In any age, a man is well educated insofar as he has developed his potentialities—physical, emotional, moral, and intellectual—so as to enable him to meet the problems and challenges of his environment and finally to obtain that union with God that is the destiny of every man.

"Since in our age the expanse of human knowledge has broadened dramatically, the well-educated man is one who has used his inborn abilities to the utmost in the bringing of a sense of order to that knowledge and in the using of it for bettering his life and that of others.

"Since our society places its stress not on authority but on freedom, he must have strengthened his will in the right use of freedom. Since our culture is one depending on the social responsibility of the individual, he must have made himself vitally aware of his duties to society. Since the minds of men have probed the secrets of nature as never before, he must have become mindful of how little he and all mankind truly know and must recognize his humility before his Maker.

"Only the man who, under the grace of God, has so lived his life can be considered truly well educated."

Lillian M. Gilbreth, consulting engineer; president, Gilbreth, Inc.:

"A well-educated person is one who does credit to his education. The dictionary says that education develops natural powers, and mentions the knowledge and skill that result from education and training. Training is described as the result of systematic instruction and practice. Education should prepare us to live fully and richly; training fits us to live usefully. The educated person has need of both.

"Learning, of course, involves work, and work can be best approached by asking: Why do I do it? Exactly what should be done—when, where, by whom, how? Answers to these questions help us to clarify our thinking and planning, and properly evaluate the results.

"We can learn in every area of our lives—as individuals, as members of a family group, as citizens, as volunteer workers, as paid workers. Learning is a life-long process, and our long-term planning must utilize every facility.

"We must recognize and grasp our own opportunities for education and training, and contribute to the opportunities of others. It is a service that 'blesseth him that gives and him that takes.'

"We have a responsibility to see that everyone everywhere can enjoy an educated head, educated hands, and an educated heart."

Ralph W. Sockman, minister emeritus, Christ Church, New York:

"An educated person is one so eager to learn that he continues his life-long study. He knows where to find the needed facts and how to weigh them so that his factfinding becomes truth seeking. He studies deeply enough in some field to pursue effectively a line of work and broadly enough to see how his specialty fits into the social pattern.

"He has a philosophy of life sufficiently sound to give meaning to his daily work and clear goals to his long pursuits. He has a sense of history which enables him to see the passing scene in the perspective of things invisible and eternal. His imagination is trained and sensitized to see how life looks to people of other cultures and creeds and colors. His sympathy is cultivated to the point where he does not sacrifice persons on the altar of principles or compromise principles by easy conformity. His aim is not to master men for the making of things, but to master things for the making of men.

"In short, the educated man is one whose knowledge matures into wisdom."

Hint at Higher Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, Jack Williams, the Kansas City Star's Washington correspondent, has written a perceptive and revealing news story about what appears to be the beginning of a campaign to raise Federal taxes next year. I include the story—from the Kansas City Times of April 3, 1962—and will refer back to it next year when the request for higher Federal taxes comes down from the executive branch of the Government:

HINT AT HIGHER TAXES—WITH DEFICITS AND INCREASED SPENDING APPARENTLY AHEAD, ADMINISTRATION EXPECTED TO SEEK INCREASE NEXT YEAR—SEE BIG DEFICIT—PREDICTED FINANCIAL SURPLUS MAY CHANGE INTO HUGE ADDITION TO DEBT—LIMIT UP TO $308 BILLION—REQUEST EXPECTED SOON TO INCREASE CEILING TO A RECORD FIGURE

(By Jack Williams)

WASHINGTON, APRIL 2.—Deficits and increased spending today were viewed here by many as indicating the administration will have to ask Congress for a Federal tax increase next year.

Such forecasts by veteran financial observers in and out of Government are given credence by statements of some administration leaders. Their statements are seen by many as paving the way for such action.

TAXES HIGHER IN EUROPE

Treasury Secretary Dillion, testifying before the Senate Finance Committee today, said the overall taxes—Federal, State, and local—paid by business are lower than in European countries whose prosperity has outdone the United States.

An increase in business taxes would be reflected in higher prices to consumers. An increase in personal income taxes would lower consumer buying power.

Some time ago Commerce Secretary Hodges said the pickup in the economy forecast by the Kennedy administration had not come up to expectations this year. In a television program last night Mortimer Caplin, Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service, said the Federal tax rate is not near the point where there would be resistance to it from taxpayers.

On the other side of the picture, some administration supporters in Congress are calling for even greater spending.

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, said the unemployment in the country is nearer 8 million than the 4.5 million reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. On that basis he and other liberal Members are pushing for huge outlays of billions for public works programs.

FORECAST HUGE DEFICIT

From Capitol Hill staff reports today came word that instead of the $463 million surplus President Kennedy predicted in the fiscal year starting July 1, it may become a deficit of around $5 billion instead.

The administration already this session has obtained a temporary increase in the debt limit to equal the alltime record, made during World War II, of $300 billion. Another request is expected shortly to increase it again to the new record figure of $308 billion.

Dillon urged the Senate committee to abolish the $50 exclusion and the 4-percent credit now allowed on dividends. He said that would increase taxes $475 million a year. The House refused to take such action in the bill it sent to the Senate on which hearings now are starting.

RETAINS TAX CREDIT

On the other hand Dillon urged the Senate to retain in the bill a provision to allow a 7-percent tax credit for business and industry in the purchase of new equipment and machinery. It does not apply to buildings. Dillon argued the credit, branded a "tax bonanza for business" by opponents in the House, would increase jobs and speed up the economy.

Business does not want it left in the bill and there is strong indication there are enough votes in the Finance Committee to knock it out.

DOUGLAS emphasized his opposition to the investment credit in questioning Dillon. He brought out such a tax credit would be available for the purchase of a new cocktail mixer in a tavern or a new popcorn machine in the Yankee ball park. He drew a grin from Dillon when he asked if such a tax allowance would contribute to the growth of America and enable it to compete abroad.

Dillon said he would be pleased if the committee could work out some formula to make the application of the credit more restrictive but that the administration had failed to find one.

"Will this tax credit be available to farmers to buy new machinery to produce more commodities now in surplus?" DOUGLAS asked.

Dillon said it would.

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, asked why, in its search for more revenue, the administration had not suggested a revision of the 27½-percent depletion allowance on oil and gas.

Dillon said that matter was being studied along with other measures. He promised it would be brought up with the next tax bill to be submitted or there would be a good reason why it would not.

DOUGLAS commented that the effort to close tax loopholes appears to be opening the way for bigger loopholes."

QUESTIONED ON DIVIDENDS

Dillon was questioned about the withholding tax on dividends and interest, particularly as to how that would affect holders of Government and coupon bonds. It is another section of the bill which will come under study in the weeks ahead when witnesses will be heard by the committee.

It took the House Ways and Means Committee 10 months to write the bill. At the outset of the hearing today, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, chairman, said his Senate group wanted to take a thorough look at the bill.

The second round of hearings will extend at least until well up into May, it is expected. Twice before the Senate has amended the committee bill to abolish the tax credit on dividends, and it is expected to do so again this year. That Senate action each time was reversed when the differing Senate and House bills went to conference for a compromise bill.

Golden Anniversary of Hadassah

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in offering congratulations and commendations to Hadassah on the occasion of the observance of its golden anniversary.

In its 50 years of life, Hadassah has grown from the zeal and determination of one dedicated American woman, Miss Henrietta Szold, into an organization of more than 300,000 women, whose devotion to principle is more than praiseworthy and whose accomplishments are virtually unequalled.

Hadassah was established to promote Jewish institutions and enterprises in Israel and to foster the ideals of Judaism. But Hadassah's value is not limited to its work for Israel. By keeping its members fully informed on all issues facing America and the rest of the free world, Hadassah assures the perpetuation of an enlightened citizenry and the enhancement of America's spiritual and moral values.

Hadassah's activities in Israel date back to 1913, when the organization sent two nurses to that area to offer assistance to the medically backward populace. The extent of the organization's work can be measured by the better than $200 million which since has been raised to contribute to medical centers in Israel and finance other Hadassah projects. Hadassah's most magnificent accomplishment is the recently opened 21-unit complex, the Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center consisting of a 500-bed hospital, medical school and a nurses training school, clinical and preclinical laboratories, research laboratories, and a mother-and-child pavilion. In addition, the organization runs a series of community services, 12 community health centers in Jerusalem, school hygiene and dental hygiene services, and antitrachoma facilities. There are facilities for treatment of lepers and psychological disturbances.

Hadassah is also responsible for enabling teams of medical specialists to be sent to Liberia, Tanganyika, and other emerging nations in Africa.

The Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center stands as a living memorial to the dedication of these women, to their humanitarianism and devotion to the principle that there is joy and meaning in giving.

I am sure that Americans of all religions join with us in paying tribute to Hadassah. I would like to add a special word of congratulations to many friends who are hard-working, dedicated members of Hadassah. They are a tribute to their religion, their community, and their country.

We are all proud of the motives of Hadassah; we are thrilled by its accomplishments.

Meaning of Our Free Enterprise System and What We Must Do To Save It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the March 1962 issue of the Home Builders Journal an article by Mr. Charles M. Crawford entitled "True Values of America's Private Enterprise System," which I would like to bring to the attention of Members of Congress. In this article Mr. Crawford discusses the collectivist threat to our free enterprise system, the best of all economic systems. Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I place the article in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TRUE VALUES OF AMERICA'S PRIVATE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

(By Charles M. Crawford)

I am going to talk about a subject which I believe to be of great importance to every one of us and possibly one of the most important before the American public today because of its many ramifications and the many points at which it is under attack by those who would change our American way of life. I think nothing I say will be new to you, but some good frequently results from stating a problem over and over.

The thing about which I am speaking pays most of our taxes; provides most of our jobs; has given us our factories and shops; develops inventors and business builders; originated the principles of efficiency; has done most to lower costs and prices; has done most to raise our standard of living; and its preservation is the hope of the American people. Yet—Karl Marx said it must be destroyed.

What is it?

It is the private enterprise economic system.

OPPOSITION IS ACTIVE

Strangely enough it has become apparent that not only have Karl Marx and his followers said that the private enterprise system and its collateral of individual freedom must be destroyed, but there is current in the centralized governments of our Nation and state a definite campaign devoted to its destruction, geared to the theory that it is good politics to be antibusiness and that Government can do the job better. Of course, this is sheer nonsense. Government never has done the job better if for no other reason than that of monumental inefficiency. In addition, the real business of Government is not to compete with private enterprise but is to guarantee the individual's constitutional freedoms, not his economic security.

Today, this interference has gone far beyond the theory point and is being actively processed in our legislative bodies. Some of these troubles are of the businessmen's own making because of their apathy and their lack of concerted action and I wish to make it quire clear that this applies not only to so-called big business but to you and to me in the conduct of our everyday affairs.

In the time allotted to me we cannot go into much detail, but let us examine some of the forms that this attack on the private enterprise system takes.

1. The fallacy that the welfare of the public and the activities of business are incompatible.

This theory first reared its head years ago when big business was all powerful, and the public, rightly in some cases, learned to fear that the power would be used for evil purposes, the evil being in the sense that the so-called big business was opposed to the best interests of the masses of the people.

PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING NEEDED

To a great extent this trend to power was halted by the antitrust laws the various regulatory commissions which came into being in the late 1890's, but, as is usually the case, the pendulum swung too far and although the cure worked, the theory that business is evil carried on because it had political appeal but also because while developing great advertising programs and physical efforts to make its products and services pleasing to the public, business has not taken proper steps to secure public understanding of its position and support for the private enterprise system on which it is based and which has served the public so well.

Other groups have been less neglectful: i.e., the unions, the farmers, the professional educators, the veterans. They are all continuously active in telling what they want and threatening defeat of the politicians by grouping of votes if their demands are not met.

I have seen company publications devote page after page to shop and office doings with never a suggestion as to the important questions of the day. On the contrary, most union-sponsored publications bombard their members with the labor slant on social security, unemployment insurance benefits, the evils of the Taft-Hartley Act and indeed, in many cases, even for whom to vote.

EDUCATIONAL WORK NEEDED

Unless we businessmen promptly change our course and do enough educational work with the public and the politicians to deserve and achieve a new effectiveness as to our aims and motives, we will have little or no ability to prevent a further damaging of the already weakened structure, and our country will end as a complete socialistic State—which will be the eventual disaster.

2. The use of business as a whipping boy by the politician who has no real case but must have a point of attack to get elected.

This procedure is very simple. Take your own case as an example. You, the owner of a business have only one, or with your wife, two votes. If you hire 10 workers, this makes, with their wives, 20 votes, and if the politician can persuade those 10 or 20 votes that your sole purpose is to exploit them and that he, the politician, will change it all if he is elected, the vote score will be 10 to 1 against you.

These gentlemen will promise anything, will spend huge sums legally or illegally to get elected and, when elected, will join forces with others of the same persuasion to attempt to destroy the American system. Too often they consider the very fact of their election as a mandate for proposing and defending giveaway programs at home and abroad with promises of present free service and future carefree, secure old age for everyone without working.

3. The fallacy that business must not get into politics.

Too many public officials are committed to this "antibusiness" program from the day they are elected because the votes that elected them while they always are pro this or pro that, usually are "antibusiness." Not only have businessmen been too busy on their own woodpile to take part in politics, but they shy away from political activity because they fear the Federal Corrupt Practices Act and the reprisals of too zealous tax investigators.

ACTIVITY FOR BUSINESS

Actually there is a broad area of nonpartisan political activity open to business which is not only permitted but protected by law. The legal phases of this are too involved to go into here but you hire good attorneys to

solve other business problems, and they are just as competent to advise on this most important matter. Believe me, there are some very promising recent activities on the part of businessmen which are entirely legal, and if anyone is interested, he can refer to the many avenues of information, such as the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the Missouri State Chamber of Commerce, the Manufacturing Association of Syracuse, the General Electric Co., the Gulf Oil Co., and many more.

PROGRAM IS NONPARTISAN

If business is to improve its effectiveness in the legislative processes, businessmen as a group, and individually, must become more active in politics.

Of course, this will take time, devoted and capable leadership, and group effort, but I am convinced that the results will be well worth it. The very fact that people in general are apathetic presents an open door, for it means that a small group of dedicated, active individuals can exert great influence.

Gentlemen, please let me stress the fact that this is a strictly nonpartisan matter. There are good Republicans and good Democrats, and by the same token there are bad Republicans and bad Democrats, but if he walks like a duck, acts like a duck, and associates with ducks, believe me, he is no lark, but a duck, and I personally deeply resent the politician who wraps himself in the cloak of either party to get elected and then votes consistently for those measures which are direct highways to socialism and the welfare state.

4. The invasion of the business field by Government.

In recent years governmental agencies have more and more penetrated the field of competition with private industry, often illegally so. More than 700 Federal corporate enterprises have been established. They absorb approximately one-half of our tax dollars; they have already taken over 40 percent of the land area and 20 percent of the industrial capacity of the Nation operating as interest-free, tax-free, often rent-free activities competing with every American, be he producer, retailer, or consumer. Public housing, publicly owned and operated powerplants, publicly owned and operated business ventures of all classes are too numerous to catalog here.

However, it has been reliably reported, with the figures to support it, that in the year 1954, if the Government had refrained from business activities in which it had no right to be involved and which were carried on at a loss, without any sacrifice of funds for public defense or other necessary functions, no collection of income taxes would have been necessary, and there would have been a substantial surplus to apply on the national debt.

AN EXPENSIVE LUXURY

And do not let anyone tell you that Government operations in the field of business activities are not an expensive luxury as to cost. All that I have examined are most inefficient, besides which, they pay no income taxes, no property taxes and use Government credit to secure money at low cost. This use of taxpayers' money and Government credit to engage in business in competition with private industry must be stopped if we are to remain a solvent country. Right here I would like to comment on the tendency of local governments and yes, let's face it, local businessmen, to run to Washington for financial aid for every local need.

Not long ago we witnessed a convention of city mayors, the rallying cry of which, according to newspaper reports was—"On to Washington for more and bigger handouts." May I be pardoned if I suggest that many of those who seek Federal funds for local projects have in mind that, as collection of these funds does not directly hit the pocketbook of the local citizens, they, the spenders, do not have to account to these citizens for the manner of spending of this "Free manna from Heaven."

To show the line of thinking of these free spenders, recently in Philadelphia, when asked in a hearing as to why actual costs of federally financed projects always went far beyond the originally proposed amount, the man responsible for spending the funds asked to be allowed to answer the question in private. When this privilege was denied, on the the stand he admitted, and I quote: "There are a limited number of Federal dollars, and we like to get as many as possible. If we put our original applications for funds in at a low figure, we can get more projects authorized and then can get them amended for higher costs a lot easier than if the actual cost was originally proposed." This, gentlemen, is not an isolated case, but the method is practiced continuously.

THE TAXPAYER PAYS

This procedure often is defended on the theory that if we locally don't get those funds someone else will. I hope you will repeat to yourselves again and again the revealing banner line carred by the Newport Harbor Press which I quote as follows: "The Government Has No Money Except What It Takes From the People."

And please remember two things about this money: First, the funds, after being collected from us all, must pass through ever-expanding governmental bureaus where a large share is used in high operating costs; and second, when the remaining portion finally gets back to the point of serving local need, in spite of vigorous denials by the bureaucratic agencies, it is only with faroff governmental controls attached. Whenever Government enters any field of activity, that field then becomes a political battleground.

5. The censorship of business through taxation and other controls.

If I were to ask you, "What is the Federal Internal Revenue Service?" you would be correct if you answer, "It is the agency whose duty is to collect taxes, as provided in the revenue laws, passed by Congress." Well, let me assure you that the Service is going far afield from that purpose. With very little reference to the laws as passed by Congress, it is daily making regulations as to what business may or may not do, and enforcing its edicts by its punitive power. Without doubt, today's tangled web of corporate income tax is a most serious retardant to business growth.

Recently the Internal Revenue Service has ruled that an electric company cannot deduct as an expense the cost of an institutional, educational advertising campaign which presents the picture of public versus private power. In contrast to this ruling, the TVA, which itself is tax free, with your money, has been running full-page advertisements urging favorable action on legislation affecting it at that very moment before Congress.

MANY MYSTERIOUS RULES

Internal Revenue Service also has ruled that the cost of literature opposing socialism issued by one of the country's most respected professional organizations, the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, is not an allowable deduction for tax purposes.

Internal Revenue Service also has disallowed as an expense deduction the cost of a public relations advertising program placed over a 4-year period by the Timken Roller Bearing Co. This advertising discussed the Bill of Rights, capitalism versus socialism, principles of taxation, and other matters on which the public so desperately needs to be informed. These examples are only a few of the many. I can refer you to the last paragraph in an editorial in a recent Wall Street Journal headed "Some Thoughts on Deception."

Previously, I mentioned the effect on business activity of the antitrust acts and regulatory commissions. For example, we have the devastating and destructive action against the Du Pont Co. and General Motors, against the companies experimenting with the new drugs, the proposed action against Ford Motor Co., all apparently being processed on the theory that to be big and to be efficient is not in the public interest. Without this efficiency, this overall know-how and this buying power for raw materials, the price of a General Motors or Ford car would be out of reach of many who now enjoy them.

These suits are only another indication of the antibusiness climate of our Government and the cost of defending them in managerial and legal time and money is a serious drain on the shareholders of the company under attack. Some of these suits run for years with a most upsetting effect on all involved, and, gentlemen, in spite of some thinking in Washington and in labor unions, profits are not dishonorable, and there is nothing disgraceful about earning money to pay debts or dividends to owners.

Of course, no one defends a deliberate law breaking combination in restraint of trade or an agreed price fixing scheme, but in the case of the electric companies such action was promptly and rightly punished by fines and jail sentences—not so the unions or the Government itself. I believe no one knows better than this group the multiplicity of Government controls often contradictory to each other and the cost of paperwork we are forced to do—much of which is filed away in expensive storage places but never used. Much of this redtape is deliberately designed to keep some bureaucrats on your payroll.

Another glaring example of Government interference with business is its handling of the farm problem. I would like to quote from a recent publication of the American Institute for Economic Research:

"Well might the American farmer exclaim—'God save me from my friends. I can take care of my enemies.' The farmer's enemies—bugs, weeds, and weather—have but a limited power to harm, but the farmer's so-called political friends have created a farm problem beyond the ability of any one farmer or all of them put together to solve. The farmer is no longer a free agent, but both he and the consumer are forced to support this intervention—which is but a phase of statism in its worst form, and the cost of it to the taxpayer is astronomical."

One of the serious results from the excessively lengthy term in office of one President and one party was the appointment of so many Federal judges indoctrinated with the so-called liberal philosophy. It would take more time than is allotted to me today to go into the matter of the trend of recent decisions of these judges and of the Supreme Court of the United States which, in usurping powers never granted to them, have changed the Constitution by decree rather than by amendment, and have often changed prior decisions made by the same Court. These are dangerous tendencies and businessmen must be alarmed about them—if for no other reason than for the fact that they can never be sure as to when a procedure and method of doing business, previously established and approved, will be declared illegal.

LEARN THE FACTS

It is easy to criticize and find fault with things as they are, but I personally am not of a mind to let it go at that. I believe the basic requirement of the American citizen today is a willingness to learn the facts and to face them. If they do not like what they see, the one way to change it is to know the economic philosophy of the various candidates for office, and after the elections follow up campaign pledges and promises to see that they are kept.

It has been said a person cannot be called crazy for talking to himself but only when

he begins to talk back. Well, I must be crazy, for I not only ask myself what I as an individual can do about the prevailing conditions, but proceed to answer myself with a creed as follows:

1. I will have constantly in mind that we are in a war between two systems: The one devoted to individual freedom and free enterprise, the other devoted to making captive individuals in a slave state.

2. I will make it my duty and my obligation to educate myself as to what is going on and why. I will try to resist the tendency of the age which is to cultivate a sense of personal remoteness from the problems of politics and economics.

3. I will vote for no individual, regardless of party affiliation for any office, from the highest to the lowest (not forgetting the important boards of education) until he has by definite and unequivocable statement made his position clear as to:

(a) Where he stands with regard to restoring our constitutional government and individual freedom and protecting the free enterprise system; and

(b) Where he stands in the effort to get Government out of illegal competition with private industry.

4. I will keep in close touch with my elected representatives and continually encourage them to resist surrender to the enemy. (By the way, how many of you take time to congratulate the men in Government when they have fostered a sound program, sometimes to their detriment votewise?)

5. I will never apologize for our free enterprise system but at every opportunity will preach the gospel of its preservation as I am attempting to do here today.

6. I will serve where and when needed, in organizations and committees, to start educational campaigns which may well develop into cleansing fires.

Too often we hear people say: "I am only one small fish and my efforts are of no value."

The Christopher Society has the following motto: "If everyone would light one candle, what a bright world this would be." I am sure many of you have seen this in operation in the Los Angeles Coliseum, when with the lights out, everyone present was asked to light a match at a given signal. One match is of no significance, but the whole group provides light to dim a hundred Olympic torches.

To conclude, may I plead with you not to consider your individual efforts to no avail and remind you of the words of the English poet, John Donne, used by Ernest Hemingway as a theme for his great novel, which I quote: "No man is an island unto itself entire, therefore, never send to know for whom the bell tolls—it tolls for thee."

BIOGRAPHY OF CHARLES M. CRAWFORD

Charles M. Crawford was born of parents of Irish descent in Pittsburgh, Pa. In the early 1900's his parents joined the great "go West" movement, and with them he went to Greeley, Colo., where he attended grade and high school, graduating in 1907 from the Colorado State Normal High School in Greeley.

After high school, he worked for 2 years in the accounting department of the Great Western Sugar Co., but feeling the need of more education, entered Carnegie Institute of Technology's Engineering School in Pittsburgh. He was graduated with honors and a degree of bachelor of science in mechanical engineering.

Always active in college affairs, he was president of both his freshman and senior classes and captain of the track team in his senior year. He is a member of the Beta Theta Pi social fraternity and the Tau Beta Pi engineering honor fraternity.

Coming to California in 1913 for what he thought was a short visit, he adopted it as a desirable place to live and in 1915 became associated with property management department of Torrance Marshall & Co., an active stock and bond house, and its affiliated companies and successors—all of which had extensive land and property holdings in Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties. Although never engaged in housebuilding activities as such, he has been most active in the preparation of some 25,000 acres of land for subdivisions in home, commercial, and industrial use.

Always interested in outdoor athletic activities, in the early 1920's he engaged in the raising and training of polo ponies and was an active playing member of the famous Uplifters polo teams for some years. During this same period he was the owner of the also famous Flying V Ranch near Tucson.

In 1949, Mr. Crawford became general manager of Dominguez Estate Co. The present owners of the company have the unique distinction of being direct descendants of Juan Jose Dominguez, who was the original grantee of a 1784 Spanish land grant of some 76,000 acres in the southwest portion of Los Angeles County, this being the first of such grants. The company is now actively engaged in development of its remaining lands.

Mr. Crawford is an Episcopalian by faith, a conservative Republican by politics, and is devoted to preservation of an economic free enterprise system.

Equal Employment Opportunity Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1962

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, a recent newsletter of the Commission on Law and Social Action of the American Jewish Congress discussed H.R. 10144, the Federal equal employment opportunity bill. The report is objective and fair, and I believe will be of interest to my colleagues:

THE ROOSEVELT FEPC BILL

At long last there seems to be a reasonable prospect that Congress may enact a Federal fair employment practices act. The House Committee on Education and Labor reported such a bill sponsored by Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT of Los Angeles and there are indications that the Rules Committee will permit the measure to come to a vote in the House. For reasons which will be explained below, it seems to me that the measure may pass the House and has a reasonable likelihood of also passing the Senate.

Obviously, in order to have any such prospect of enactment, Federal legislation must be different in some fundamental respect from the traditional type of fair employment practices act which has been proposed for many years past. There is such a fundamental difference in the present bill which now carries the title "Federal Equal Employment Opportunity Act." This difference lies in the fact that the five-man commission to set up to administer the law is given no power to make any determination that its provisions against discrimination and segregation have been violated. On the contrary, the commission is limited to investigation and conciliation and, if these fail, to bringing suit in the U.S. district courts to secure an injunction against the continuance of the alleged illegal practices. In the alternative, the commission may permit the individual aggrieved to bring such suit in the Federal court directly on his own behalf.

To persons unfamiliar with the history of the development of Federal administrative law, this departure from the traditional procedures may seem to be of no great significance. However, one of the fundamental struggles between liberal and conservative forces in the entire area of governmental regulation has been over the issue of whether independent administrative bodies shall have the responsibility for determining the facts and shaping of the remedy, with subsequent court review limited to whether there was any evidence to support the administrative finding and whether the remedy is arbitrary. Many conservatives may, therefore, vote in favor of the Roosevelt bill in the hope that it will serve as a precedent for stripping other administrative bodies of their present powers and relegating them to suit in the Federal courts.

The main opposition to any Federal employment practices act has, of course, been the opposition of southern Congressmen. It may be that their opposition will be lessened by the provision for judicial enforcement rather than administrative enforcement since they are quite aware of the extreme conservatism of most U.S. district judges in the Southern States to the ending of discrimination and segregation by Federal action. The "all deliberate speed"—or rather the lack of speed—typical of most U.S. district courts in the South in implementing the Supreme Court's decision in the school desegregation cases may encourage southerners to believe and/or hope that the same reception will be given to a statutory mandate against segregation and discrimination.

It seems to me doubtful that the Republican Party is likely to take anything like a unified position in opposition to a measure of this character. Particularly this is so since it would, in my judgment, end for a generation any hope for attracting any considerable number of Negroes to the support of Republican candidates. Employment is a "bread and butter" issue and it is principally on that ground that in my opinion, during the past three decades an overwhelming shift has occurred in the pattern of Negro voting which, until then, was predominantly Republican.

Since the bill covers not only employers and employment agencies, but also labor unions, it will be interesting to observe what position the labor unions take on the measure. It would certainly be a strange spectacle if labor unions were to find themselves as bedfellows of southern Democrats. This is not out of the question since the bill specifically seeks to strike at several notoriously discriminatory practices of a number of major international unions. Among these are the maintenance of segregated locals, separate seniority lists (with extremely limited promotional possibilities in the categories for Negro employees) and apprenticeship and other training programs which virtually exclude Negroes. Such exclusion is increasingly serious in these days of increasing automation and tends to doom Negroes to unemployment and underemployment.

Despite the limitations of the bill on enforcement, it would, in my opinion, represent a giant step forward in dealing with one of the two major evils of American society, the other being the denial of the franchise to the Negro. It may be overly optimistic on my part to believe that Federal judges in the South will not have the same reluctance to end employment discrimination as they have shown toward ending school segregation. For one thing, schools involve children and employment involves adults. Even if this optimism is disproved by experience, the bill would, it seems to me, represent a major breakthrough in its validation of the principle of the propriety of intervention by the Federal Government. If the system of judicial enforcement proves inadequate, the

inevitable next step will be the creation of a commission with the conventional powers of other administrative bodies.

The fear that enactment of the bill would open the door to repressive legislation in other fields of Federal regulation seems to me to be doctrinaire and unrealistic. There are strong forces which will exert pressure against such developments. Besides, the stakes involved in those struggles are, in my judgment, minor as compared with the issue of emancipation of 20 million people, half of whom still reside in the Southern and border States where only Federal legislation can give them any hope of equal employment opportunities.

In its present form, the bill authorizes action by the commission on the vote of as few as two of the five members. Only an absolute majority may prevent the commission from proceeding to the courts if conciliation efforts fail. Moreover, any single member of the commission can, in any event, authorize an aggrieved individual to bring suit on his own behalf even though the commission itself declines to do so.

The bill covers all private employment where as many as 25 employees are involved, except during the first year when the coverage is limited to employers with 100 employees, and the second year when it applies only to persons employing 50 employees. These exemptions, in my opinion, are of no real economic significance.

Employment agencies are also broadly included, except that agencies of the United States or of any State or municipality are excluded. On the other hand, specifically covered are the U.S. Employment Service and the systems of State and local services receiving Federal assistance. These federally assisted services are, of course, the most significant and, in many States, the most consistent violators of the principle of nondiscrimination.

The Commission established by the bill would have the right to refrain from acting in those States where effective State laws exist and in such instances no individual would be entitled to bring suit under the Federal statute. This provision is manifestly reasonable and eminently desirable since it will entitle the Federal Commission to concentrate on those areas which have no fair employment practices law.

The Commission would have no express jurisdiction over discrimination within the Federal establishment. On the other hand, the bill authorizes and directs the President to take such action in that area as is necessary to insure equal employment opportunities for Federal employees. This provision would certainly entitle the President to utilize the Commission for the purpose of conducting investigations and holding hearings with respect to discrimination within the Federal establishment. On the basis of any report by the Commission in such a case, the President could, by executive action, put an end to any discrimination found and there is, obviously, no reason why provision need be made for invoking the aid of the courts in such cases.

Thus far it could be assumed from what has been written above that the bill deals only with segregation and discrimination on account of race, religion, color, national origin or ancestry. In fact, however, the bill goes further and prohibits discrimination on account of age unless the reasonable demands of the position require such age distinction.

If enacted without substantial change from its present form, the bill introduced by Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT will constitute a landmark in American history. It is eminently appropriate that so fundamental a piece of legislation should bear the name Roosevelt.

Operation Baptism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the April 1962 issue of the Ladies Home Journal contains a stirring and dramatic account of the humane effort on the part of the present ruler of the Catholic Church, then known as Msgr. Angelo Roncalli, to save some of the Jewish men, women and children facing Nazi extermination in Hungary during World War II.

The article is written by my dear friend, Ira Hirschmann, who was at the time stationed in Turkey as the representative of the U.S. War Refugee Board with the rank of Ambassador. His role in saving many Jews from Europe via Turkey and later bringing them to Palestine is well known and is one of the most humane and dramatic chapters of the war years.

In the article referred to above, Ambassador Hirschmann relates a most interesting incident how he approached Monsignor Roncalli in 1944, who was then the Apostolic Delegate of the Vatican in the Middle East stationed in Turkey, for help in saving as many of these Jews as can be brought out from Hungary. The problem was how to do it. Monsignor Roncalli suggested that since the Nazis have been honoring baptismal certificates and allowing those possessing such certificates to leave Hungary, perhaps this could be a way out for many Jews. Mr. Hirschmann relates that Monsignor Roncalli offered to provide such certificates on a large scale and that later it would be up to these people themselves to decide whether they would wish to remain in the church or go their way.

Thus came about "Operation Baptism" under the auspices of the Catholic Church whereby thousands of Hungarian Jews succeeded in escaping from certain death. All of this was made possible through the merciful intervention of a man, then almost unknown, but today loved and revered by hundreds of millions of people all over the world. Monsignor Roncalli is today Pope John XXIII. His noble deed, as detailed by Mr. Hirschmann, is unquestionably an unparalleled example of compassion in a period when the world had practically lost its appreciation and value of human lives.

Mr. Hirschmann's heart-warming story demonstrates how one great man utilized his religious privileges and influence to rescue thousands of persecuted human beings, notwithstanding the fact that they were of another faith. At this time of the year, as we approach the holy Easter-Passover season which has so much meaning to both Christians and Jews, it is worth recalling this incident as cogent proof that compassion and brotherhood can provide answers to human suffering when humanity cries out aloud. The cry from the depths was heard by a man of destiny. Today he sits on the throne of St. Peter.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert the article by Ira Hirschmann into the RECORD and I urge all my colleagues to read it:

ONE MAN'S HUMANITY

(By Ira Hirschmann)

The woman on my right was engrossed in sprightly table talk with the man on her right.

We had been introduced as we sat down to dinner, but her name had escaped me in the wave of chatter and the shuffling of chairs. I did quickly notice, however, the evident modishness of her dress and the smartness of her grooming. "Chic" was the word, and to a middle-aged romantic she was immediately designated as a continental.

I had no desire to eavesdrop, but snatches of her conversation reached me, disconnected words and phrases which despite their vagueness suddenly interested me. There was something in the way she flattened certain vowels and thickened her consonants which hinted at an accent that seemed to have meaning to me.

When, finally, she turned toward me, I reintroduced myself and put the question: "Are you from Europe?"

She laughed at the naivete of my question and answered, "Couldn't you tell by my accent? I'm from Hungary, from Budapest."

"Were you there during the war?" I asked.

"Oh, yes, for most of it."

I remarked that I knew something of the hardships suffered by the people there at that critical time, adding, "Especially the Jews."

By this time our conversation was no longer the typical chatter one exchanges with dinner partners. Her face clouded over with an expression close to pain as she quietly told me, "I should know. I was one of them."

"But you did get out before the end?"

"Yes," she said after a moment's hesitation. "Yes, I got out, at the last moment. But if I hadn't been baptized that night, in a bomb shelter, I might not be here today, talking to you."

The words were simply said, but the impact struck me with more force than she could have expected. In that moment I was transported as if in a filmed flashback to another period, years earlier and thousands of miles away.

I was aboard a tiny excursion boat on the Sea of Marmora which separates the Aegean and Black Seas and is practically landlocked by the two halves of Turkey. It was late in the summer of 1944; my companion was Gilbert Simond, the International Red Cross representative in Turkey and we were on our way to the tiny island of Biuyacada to see Msgr. Angelo Roncalli, the Apostolic Delegate of the Vatican in the Middle East.

At that time I was serving as a special envoy for the War Refugee Board, which had been established by President Roosevelt with the express purpose of saving lives wherever and whenever possible. My personal mission was to extricate refugees from the Balkans.

In the months that I had been in Turkey, we had been able to force the closing of the concentration camp at Transnistria in Rumania. Ships of all sizes and descriptions were leaving the Black Sea port of Costanza, loaded with people fleeing to escape the fate suffered by so many others—being driven, in turn, into ghettos, concentration camps, and finally the extermination centers. And the flow of these refugees across Turkey and Syria to safety in Palestine had grown to sizable proportions.

But all of us concerned with saving the remnants of European Jewry were horrified

and frustrated by the news that was leaking out of Hungary. The reports that came to us from underground sources would have been unbelievable if we had not by that time learned at first hand of the actual existence of the gas chambers, the crematoria and the other implements of Hitler's savage and unrelenting war against the Jews.

We learned that the Nazis, under the personal direction of the infamous Adolph Eichmann, goaded by the knowledge that the tides of the war were racing against them, were determined to complete their grisly task of extermination, their "final solution to the Jewish problem." They sought to accomplish in weeks in Hungary what had taken years in Germany, Austria, Poland, and the rest.

The statistics of the charnel house tell their own tragic story. From April 10, 1944, to June 28 of the same year, 516,075 Jews of all ages had been transported from Hungary to Auschwitz and systematically slaughtered. In slightly more than two months all Hungary outside of Budapest had been rendered "Judenrein"—free of Jews—the most devastating mass annihilation in the history of mankind.

We didn't know all the grim statistics then, but we did know that the time for rescue had shrunk to a few precious weeks. Something drastic had to be done immediately to save the Jewish population of a Budapest, approximately a quarter of a million terrified and helpless men, women, and children.

In desperation I turned to Gilbert Simond, a man of great good will who had been instrumental in the savings of thousands of lives. Simon was an influential Catholic layman, and I begged him to prevail upon his friends in the church to help us in the name of humanity. He suggested that we see Monsignor Roncalli and arranged a meeting.

The home of the Pope's highest emissary in the Middle East was a spacious old house sitting high atop a hill. Hidden from below by lush foliage, it nevertheless afforded a stunning view of the sea in all directions. Immediately on our arrival on the island, we had been ushered into a well-appointed room where we waited for Monsignor Roncalli.

After a brief wait, he entered, a short rotund man whose good humor was immediately evident in his eyes, twinkling under his black skullcap. Warmly and graciously, he welcomed us in Italian, bidding us be seated. As we did so, I offered a silent prayer of thanks for the Italian I had learned some years back: it established an easy contact between us.

Once Simond and I were comfortably settled, our host turned to a small cupboard from which he took a bottle of red wine. After admiring its color, he poured out three glasses and insisted upon drinking to our health. Anxious about my mission, I discreetly tried to introduce the reason for my visit. But Monsignor Roncalli brushed me aside, saying, "That will come later. First we must enjoy the view, the conversation, and the wine."

His personality was so radiant and his conviviality so genuine that I was warmed by his spirit and for the moment let the purpose of my presence escape me. In fact, it wasn't until the dregs of a second bottle had been downed that he would permit any thought of practical discussion. Then, suddenly, he announced, "Dunque, cominciamo * * * now, let us begin."

Monsignor Roncalli listened intently as I outlined the perilous plight of the Jews in Hungary. I cited the meager statistics available to me and repeated several of the eyewitness accounts I had received from underground operatives. Then he pulled his chair closer and quietly asked, "Do you have any contact with people in Hungary who will cooperate?"

After my affirmative reply, he hesitated a few moments before asking, "Do you think the Jews there would be willing to undergo baptism ceremonies?"

Not prepared for this suggestion, I equivocated a bit and said that I could only guess or assume that if it meant saving their lives, they would be ready to do so gratefully. I added, "I know what I would do."

He went on to say that he had reason to believe that some baptismal certificates had already been issued by nuns to Hungarian Jews. The Nazis had recognized these as credentials and had permitted their holders to leave the country.

We agreed that he would communicate with his representatives in Hungary and that I would get in touch with our underground connections to arrange for either large-scale baptism of Jews or, at least, certificates to be issued to women and children. It would be up to those who were baptized to decide later whether they would wish to remain in the church or go their way.

The proposal and agreement had been accomplished in what seemed like a few minutes. It was clear to me that Monsignor Roncalli had considered this plan before my arrival and that he had created an atmosphere in which to test my credentials, my discretion, and my ability to put the operation into effect practically. I had no doubt that the wheel would soon be set in motion in Hungary for "Operation Baptism" under the auspices and with the mercy of the Catholic Church.

Simond and I were silent as we sailed back to Istanbul in the little ferryboat. Somehow we were awed by the scope and direction of the events of the afternoon, arrived at so simply and without inhibition, but so heavy with possibilities. In our silence, each of us was taking stock of the implications of our compact. We were approaching twilight, and as our little steamer skimmed over the water the lengthening shadows stretched ahead like moving phantoms. Could this be a portent of the lifting of a curtain to reveal a new freedom for those whose lives depended on our help?

Try as I may, I have not been able to ascertain exactly how many Hungarian Jews were saved or had their lives made easier with those baptismal certificates. They must number in the thousands. And all this thanks to the compassionate intervention of the benevolent Apostolic Delegate to the Middle East.

No other personality I met during those troubled times in Turkey had more sharply etched himself into my memory. How often I have recalled our meeting and remembered his warmth, dynamism, and sympathy. It was not within the purview of his pastoral duties to be involved in the rescue of Jews. His action was proof of his humane concern for the welfare of all people.

Is it any wonder that I was moved to tears when in 1958 I read the headlines which announced to the world that Angelo Roncalli had been elected the ruler of the Catholic Church and was from that date to be known as Pope John XXIII?

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District of Texas, April 7, 1962)

The second supplemental appropriation passed with House membership refusing to go on record (not enough Members arose to support the demand for a record vote). Earlier, on a motion to recommit, the bill failed 235 to 153. I voted to recommit to limit the U.S. portion of the United Nations payment. It seems wrong to me for us to pay $25 million toward the Katanga-Congo dispute, when other nations are failing to do their part. For that matter, the time is long overdue when each nation should bear the same share as every other or those, like the United States, contributing more should have a larger vote percentage to match their contribution. As in the U.S. income tax, so in the United Nations—the Communist doctrine is followed from each according to ability to pay, to each according to his needs. So we continue to belittle success and achievement and agrandize inability, a sure way to stultify the accomplishment of a world of self-respecting and respectful neighbors. Freeloaders, do-gooders, something-for-nothingers, are part of this pattern, hardly a sound basis for a realistic world of hard knocks. The appropriation bill, totaling $431.8 million, highlighted again our worsening fiscal position. As the Kennedy spending demands grow the deficit increases, and now we learn the gross national product and tax income will be less than anticipated. The deficit widens even more.

The Peace Corps amendment, asking Congress to up the next year's expense from the earlier request of $40 to $64 million, passed 316 to 70 although many Members felt the program too new for accurate evaluation and increase. It appears that Government is moving into private missionary efforts, including YMCA, YWCA, and others. At the outset few realize the ultimate domination of Government when participating in joint projects. In this instance, private and religious missionary work will be replaced. Few, if any, know where the Peace Corps is going. Many Members, even proponents, agree the foreign aid program is long overdue a general review, and overhauling. The buildup for its continuation and expansion is beginning.

President Goulart, of Brazil, proved again the adage "the best defense is a good offense." Instead of apologizing or defending the expropriation of American industry he proclaimed that other property will be taken and paid for, if, as, and when he sees fit. For this, the United States wined and dined him and gave him the key to the Treasury. Apparently, he will get $100 million or more as a gift. Castro's success has undermined U.S. prestige and property throughout this hemisphere, until every Latin American nation is further prey now to Communists and anti-U.S. sentiment. We now further aid and abet our demise by lauding the expropriators and rewarding them by grants of money. It's almost too fantastic to be believable and some say Mr. Kennedy's popularity is greater than ever. Meanwhile, Cuba is arming militarily with Russian planes, tanks, and artillery. The United States complacently rests easy 90 miles away. Ninety miles is no missile gap. And the Monroe Doctrine is dead.

A public works pump priming $600 million to help unemployment has been asked by the President even as Congress is asked to consider a $2 billion standby fund to combat future recessions. The pump priming failures of the past have taught this administration little, it seems. Public works projects fail since the unemployed are not in these areas, by trade or geographically and worse yet, recessions are encouraged by the tax take of the Federal Government from the taxpayer to pay for these projects. Where's the money coming from? is still the appropriate question.

Floor debate on the administration's propaganda to support legislation asked of Congress brought to light shocking power plays by the President and his lieutenants. Not only is the taxpayers' money spent incorrectly for this purpose, but the propaganda is false and misleading. The administration admits (p. 5462 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 4) distributing material widely to explain and support the legislative requests. In debate I pointed out the State Department's pamphlet widely distributed called, Together We Grow Strong, which says that U.S. auto industry could not exist without oil from Kuwait. Other equally fallacious representations about world trade are being distributed to accompany our present consideration of the Trade Expansion Act. It is becoming quite apparent that administration claims of a freer trade bill are absolutely misleading and erroneous.

Muzzling of the press is a danger today, greater than ever before. The portrayal of this situation in the U.S. News & World Report, April 9 issue, is a real eye opener. The title "The Kennedy Image, How It's Built," could be reentitled, "A Dictator's Demands of the News Media." Here again, the naive idealistic average citizen who thinks "it can't happen here" is unaware of the real danger, it seems to me. When a news reporter is threatened or punished by being denied news material because he failed earlier to depict the President as he wished to be depicted, news control is complete. The problem today is now one of both sides of the issues getting through to the people. When you realize that the liberal or radical side, such as Keynesian economics, Fabian socialism, communism, the ADA views, and labor leader's legislative observations, do get complete coverage you can estimate the brainwash of our people. Unfortunately, there are too few conservative media, writers and commentators.

The imbalance of the professional staffs of the House committees which are loaded with Democratic appointees poses a serious threat to good government and proper representation of all the people. This week I introduced a resolution, House Resolution 588, to insure that the minority party is given adequate staff help on all House committees. House committees figures have been collected to show that staff members responsible to the Democrats total 462 while only 39 staff members on House committees are responsible to the Republicans.

Positive Proof Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, one of the leading Anglo-Jewish newspapers in Philadelphia, the Philadelphia Jewish Times, published an interesting head editorial in its March 30, 1962 issue, urging the selection of Philadelphia as the permanent national headquarters for the American Jewish Historical Society.

Since delegates from nearly every State in the country came to Philadelphia to attend the annual meeting last weekend, they may have occasion to report to their Congressmen on the remarkable changes and progress made in our great city. Therefore I include herewith the Times editorial, which develops further the idea that the Philadelphia site would be advantageous for the library-museum for historic American Judaica:

POSITIVE PROOF NEEDED

Delegates from nearly every State in the country will be coming to Philadelphia this weekend to attend the annual meeting of the American Jewish Historical Society. It is fitting that the convention should be held in this city, for it was here that the society, which is dedicated to fostering interest in and the study of the historical contributions of Jewry to American life, was founded in Philadelphia in 1892.

While Sunday night's dinner will be a formal affair and with a special invited guest list, Philadelphia Jewry should still make an effort to stop into the American Philosophical Society Headquarters at Fifth and Chestnut Streets to listen to the foremost Jewish historians of our country during the conference sessions Sunday morning and afternoon and Monday. A variety of subjects will be discussed centered on historiography, Philadelphia history, biography and genealogy.

Interest on the part of visitors could very well be the indication that Philadelphia should be the site of the American Jewish Historical Society's permanent national headquarters. At present the society is considering a request that it locate its library-museum for historic American Judaica in Philadelphia. It is also considering possible sites in New York City and Cincinnati. Let us prove that Philadelphia is the proper and justifiable location.

Freedom To Pray

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I present to your attention and the attention of all the other Members of this great legislative body, and any others who read the text thereof, a feature editorial appearing in the Washington Evening Star on Thursday, April 5, 1962.

As the editorial closes, its last sentence: "Legalisms to one side, we don't understand them because we can't see how petitioning a divine providence violates the first amendment," is manifestly one in which every thinking American citizen must be interested and concerned. The editorial follows:

FREEDOM TO PRAY

"Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers and our country."

This simple little prayer, which has been recommended by the New York Board of Regents for use in public schools throughout the State, is now the subject of a great debate, so to speak, in the Supreme Court of the United States.

This is so because a handful of persons—five parents with children in one of the schools of New Hyde Park, Long Island—are suing to have the prayer declared unconstitutional. They themselves want no part of it, and even though virtually all their fellow New Yorkers may be quite happy, and even anxious, to have their own offspring recite it each morning in class, the suers are determined to impose their will, and our highest tribunal is letting them have their say—which is as it should be.

Yet it all seems to us to be a rather bleak business in terms of the free mind, the human spirit and the majority's right to pray, if it wishes to do so, despite a tiny minority's objection. As in the McCollum case, for example, why should our Supreme Court have ruled—as it did, in effect, in 1948—that a single atheist is entitled not merely to practice atheism, but also to prevent believers from holding certain types of released-time religious instruction in our public schools? And why should this happen in a land whose founders thought it rather important to have faith in God?

The Mayflower Compact of 1620 begins, for example, with these words: "In the name of God, Amen." And the Philadelphia Congress historic declaration of 1775 is studded with such phrases as "the Divine Author of our existence," "a reverence for our great Creator," "before God," and "the supreme and impartial Judge and Ruler of the universe." And our Declaration of Independence, of course, speaks of "Nature's God," and of people being "endowed by their Creator," and of placing "a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence." And here are some pertinent words from George Washington's Farewell Address:

"Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, Religion and Morality are indispensable supports.—In vain would that man claim the tribute of Patriotism, who should labour to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of Men and Citizens.—The mere Politician, equally with the pious man ought to respect and to cherish them.—A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths, which are the instruments of investigation in Courts of Justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition. that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure; reason, and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle."

Clearly, regardless of how the Supreme Court may decide on New York's prayers, our country has a strong religious basis in history and tradition. Until recent years the concept of God and the validity of prayer have not been seriously challenged in America, but now we have all sorts of militant people who think otherwise. Legalisms to one side, we don't understand them because we can't see how petitioning a divine providence violates the first amendment.

Address of Vice Admiral Edward C. Holden, Jr., U.S. Navy, Retired

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention and to the attention of our colleagues the arresting remarks of Vice Adm. Edward C. Holden,

Jr., U.S. Navy, retired, which he delivered recently at the 28th Annual Regional Safety and Fire Conference in Philadelphia, Pa. In my mind, his observations and conclusions are well worthy of our serious consideration:

THE ART, SCIENCE, AND HUMANITIES OF ACCIDENT PREVENTION

(Address by Vice Adm. Edward C. Holden, Jr., U.S. Navy, retired)

This safety conference is indicative of the fact that creative minds are anxious to reach a more constructive and effective approach to the safety problems confronting industry.

This leads us to the question: "What is industry?" According to Webster's dictionary, industry is denoted as: steady application to business or labor; productive labor; an industrial art; a particular branch of work or trade.

Industrialism is defined as: a state of society marked by the predominance of industrial pursuits; the system or mode of living founded upon industrial occupations; the social organization depending upon industry for its well-being.

Why is it necessary to ask this question? The answer is simple. Many people do not realize that industry is not management alone; it is composed of both management and labor. This concept is of the essence in the safety program of the Maritime Safety Foundation—a joint management-labor relationship for safety. It is productive management and labor combined to promote the industrial art for accident prevention. It represents a system or mode of living founded upon industrial occupations; the social organization depending upon industry for its well-being. The word social is too often confused with socialism. Nothing is further from the truth as I shall point out in giving the history of the social contract in the evolution of human society. It will be seen that avoidance of this contract has led to State and Federal regulations and to the further extension from time to time of Government controls over management. For example, the recent "Safety and Health Regulations for the Stevedoring and Ship Repairing Industries."

The unremitting increase in the frequency and severity of maritime industrial accidents on a nationwide basis since 1947 bears dramatic evidence to the fact that the maritime industries are paying approximately $150 million per annum for insurance protection. This colossal cost is pure economic waste. Human suffering and property damage are thereby weighed in the balance. It is encouraging to note that this safety conference is striving to solve these problems in a voluntary manner exemplifying the spirit of free enterprise at work for the common good.

In view of the astronomical cost of accidents in the maritime industries, it is crystal clear that improvements are in order. The unilateral approach by industry to the safety problem has not curbed the upward cost surge to the stratosphere where it is in orbit.

The lack of balance and equilibrium in safety matters is largely due to a lack of knowledge and understanding of the true fundamental of safety and social organization in a rapidly changing world. The social evolution necessitates an immediate reevaluation of company policies particularly as to the importance of man in the industrial machinery. There should be no conflict of interest in the field of maritime safety.

Based on industry's unsatisfactory safety record since 1947 and its retarded development for progress, the Maritime Safety Foundation was constituted to assist the maritime industries to meet the safety challenge head on in a completely realistic manner. Therefore, it rejects the old "unilateral" approach by industry to the safety problem as being ineffective and obsolete for all practical purposes. A true, modern, effective and productive "bilateral"—a horizontal approach is substituted for the vertical. In this respect, it encompasses a joint management-labor system for the practical realization of a total safety concept. It also aims to promote better public and industrial relations, all of which is in the public interest.

The Maritime Safety Foundation recognizes and cooperates with all established safety organizations. It encourages the voluntary development of ingenuity and creativity of mind and action throughout each and every level of management and labor for the attainment of the safety idea. Constructive, unified thought and action supplants inertia and the status quo. It releases inhibited thinking and shows how to get the safety idea through to the workers. The cooperation of labor for safety is a milestone in safety progress. Labor is vitally interested because its workers are the ones who are getting killed or injured. Participation in this joint safety endeavor promotes respect, confidence, and teamwork for the common good.

All of which leads us to the $64,000 question: "Do you have a modern safety scale for measuring the weight, balance, and equilibrium of your management policies and of your safety program by means of a joint management-labor system?

If you do not, then a scientific analysis and reevaluation of your management processes will enable you, among other things, to organize for receptiveness to new ideas for development; how to become informed as to key factors that signal time to change; how to create a new spirit for safety and productive efficiency in operations; how to cope with human factors; how to get the facts you need for decisionmaking; how to measure results against goals; how to spotlight danger areas; how to prevent management breakdowns for safety; how to teach management skills for safety; how to correct dangerous thinking errors; how to eliminate the resistance factor in key spots; how to promote a more healthy business and work attitude; and how to understand and use these valuable tools in your business decisions.

In these matters the Maritime Safety Foundation can be of great service. Many organizational difficulties are avoidable. A charting of the reefs, shoals, currents, and eddies in an organization will enable the analyst to plot an intelligent course, steering around known hazards, and preparing well in advance for those which lurk in the dark recesses of human minds at each level in an organization. If you really desire improvements, you will reduce expenses and save money by looking at what you are not doing.

Then, too, you may find that organizational deficiencies or obsolescence may be due to a failure along the line to understand the meaning of the social contract and the moral obligations imposed on management for the benefit and safety of the members of the evolutionary human society in which we live and work. Perhaps you are unaware of the principles of the social contract. Its practical application will create a new image of management and labor for unity in accident prevention.

In this connection, it is suggested that we should instinctively view life as a dichotomy—a pulling and hauling, two forces in balance, an equilibrium that produces results. Indecision in this matter invariably creates conflicts and tensions. Things get out of balance. Joint management-labor systems for safety give balance and equilibrium throughout the industrial complex. The optimum of safety can be attained by all forces—management and labor—joining hands in a new spirit of understanding and good will for the common good and well-being of all concerned. Good faith is the key to every human endeavor. Strong leadership will keep company safety policies and programs on a true course. All efforts must be sincere and enthusiastic. There is no substitute for honesty in the direction of management and labor in human affairs.

We hear much of moral values—human values—economic values—et cetera. All of these values will be sustained if something is told about their background in the development of human society. In the hope of creating a new climate for receptiveness of these values for both management and labor, I shall give a brief history thereof.

LITTLE KNOWN FACTS RELATIVE TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF HUMAN SOCIETY AND THE EVOLUTION OF THE SOCIAL CONTRACT AS A BASIS FOR EFFECTIVE ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF ACCIDENT PREVENTION

In the conflict which seems to exist in certain areas between negative and positive minds for the effective organization and administration of modern accident prevention techniques, it is thought that the path we pursue for safety will be the more valiantly and the more wisely traversed if we hold in true social perspective the purposes of our efforts based on moral, human, and economic values.

In 1762, Jean Jacques Rousseau wrote what he called "The Social Contract," a study of human relations in a human society. In substance, it related the transition from primative human relations to the recognition of human values in a changing world.

Prof. Julius Stone, who, in referring to Cairn's work, "The Theory of Legal Science" says of the social contract:

"Social control in its widest sense, includes every way through which human society exercises a modifying influence upon itself or part of itself through law, religion, folkways, and custom."

By definition, the social contract is that contract into which we may be deemed to have entered upon leaving our caveman shelters and joining together in social groups for the common good. From this contract are derived all the codes required in man's endeavors to secure a fuller, a more noble, a more dignified and a more safe life in the conduct of human affairs.

The execution of the social contract requires the formation of codes regulating behavior and conduct based on human and industrial needs within society, and the variation of such codes and regulations as changing circumstances may require. In fact, social, legal codes, and regulations have existed from the early days of the Assyrians and the Babylonians. Isaiah, a great prophet, stressed the need for social changes to meet the needs of an evolutionary society. Legal codes were developed for the protection of society against itself; the lack of balance in human forces. Human society has used legal codes through the ages for governing itself. History has a habit of repeating itself.

In a study of the ancient laws of the sea, we find articles, rules, and regulations for the safety and protection of ships, cargo, passengers, and crew members. They delineated the duties, responsibilities, and financial obligations of management in the operation of vessels. Historically, these laws and their codifications are set forth as follows:

The Rhodian laws, Justinian's digest of Roman laws, the laws of Oleron, the laws of Wisbuy, the Hanseatic laws, the admiralty jurisdiction of England, marine laws and ordinances of France, admiralty and maritime laws of the United States, rules and regulations imposed by Government, regulatory agencies, international treaties and conventions.

It is, therefore, respectfully submitted that the maritime industries have been bound by

social, moral, and legal codes since time immemorial. Furthermore, that they have been legislative in nature rather than voluntary.

SAFETY LEGISLATION VERSUS VOLUNTARY SAFETY

In the last century, we saw the rise of industry, the early factory safety legislation. Today, to the same purpose we see the rise of industrial safety movements on a voluntary basis through the medium of joint management-labor safety systems. Therefore, there should be no resistance or "whipsawing" as to human and safety progress.

However, we should not be unmindful of the fact that the safety millennium in the maritime industries lurks in the unknown future because of the absence, to a very considerable degree, of intelligent and constructive leadership in some areas to develop joint management-labor safety systems. Such failures are tragic and costly in an astronomical degree when viewed in terms of human suffering, property damage, and monetary losses.

Great concern relative to the lack of comprehensive safety programs, leadership, and progress in the maritime industries has been expressed in the Congress of the United States from time to time with resultant safety legislation and scrutiny of limitation of liability, as you all know.

In a nutshell, a study of safety legislation in all industries reveals the startling fact that in each and every case certain segments of industry failed to provide minimum safety standards or safety codes, whereby the Congress of the United States found it necessary in the public interest to do a job for the protection of workers which industry should have done but did not do. Each piece of safety legislation has teeth for enforcement and penalties for noncompliance with safety standards established by law. Industry then falls into line. Furthermore, it is a known fact that the very liberalized court awards in negligence and unseaworthy cases are based on management's failure to comply with certain basic social, moral, and legal responsibilities for the prevention of accidents. So-called excessive awards are often no more than penalties to awaken management to its responsibilities. Violation of the social contract becomes an increasingly serious matter.

Postal Workers Urge Salary Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution recently adopted by the Southern Tier District Association of New York of the National Association of Letter Carriers:

RESOLUTION BY THE SOUTHERN TIER DISTRICT ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK

Whereas postal pay increases, since World War II, have never been sufficient to bring them up to pay rates, outside Government service; and

Whereas living costs show no immediate signs of decreasing; and

Whereas these conditions work financial and economic hardship upon postal employees; and

Whereas the proposed salary adjustment by the administration does not fill the need, as well as H.R. 9531: Therefore be it

Resolved, That our Representative from the 37th New York District, as well as the State's two Senators, be urged to lend their support and vote for the passage of H.R. 9531, and/or an equivalent Senate bill, so that the over 200 postal employees assembled at Owego, N.Y., on this 18th day of March 1962, along with their fellow postal workers, may be able to catch up with other American workers in the matter of salaries; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Representative and Senators mentioned above, as well as all New York State members of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, to particularly urge their best efforts to secure a hearing on H.R. 9531 in the committee, and to vote it out onto the floor of Congress.

"California: Big, Bigger"—An Editorial Appearing in the Christian Science Monitor on Saturday, March 24, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I present to the attention of your own distinguished self, and all the other Members of this great legislative body, a timely and pertinent editorial appearing in the Christian Science Monitor on Saturday, March 24, 1962:

CALIFORNIA: BIG, BIGGER

(By Kimmis Hendrick, chief of the western bureau of the Christian Science Monitor)

LOS ANGELES.—Demographers reckon that just before Christmas, 1962, California may move past New York as the most populous State in the union. They estimate it will have 17,345,000 people.

Every minute it is adding one new resident.

Every month it adds the equivalent of a medium-sized city.

Every year it has been adding enough citizens to fill a city the size of Oakland or San Diego.

Exciting as this seems for California, it looms as a future fraught with challenge:

"Biggest" means opportunity—more wage-earners, more tax revenue, more voters, more creative citizenship.

It also means problems—more public services, more highways, more crowding.

In the Nation's politics, California seems bound to have increasing influence. Already, the man who wins California's governorship is almost automatically a vice-presidential or presidential prospect.

The "biggest" prediction is, understandably, somewhat tentative. State demographer Walter P. Hollmann says in Sacramento that on the basis of New York's and California's growth rates for the past decade, it can be figured that the Golden State will pass the Empire State by a dozen people around December 21.

THE BIG CHALLENGE AHEAD OF US

But the growth rate of either State could be changing. Demographers—specialists in vital statistics—say that California has been growing three times as fast as New York for the past 10 years. Mr. Hollmann sounds optimistic about California's getting ahead this year, but he speaks cautiously.

Eugene C. Lee, acting director of the Bureau of Public Administration of the University of California at Berkeley, a major source of authoritative information on California civic problems, accepts 30 million as the State's likely population by 1980.

"The big challenge ahead of us," he says, "is whether we can control the environment of new cities."

A principal key to this is land use. It seems strange to hear the adjective "crowded" applied to a spacious State such as California. But anybody familiar with the problems of space—schools, housing, traffic, and so on—can understand why there are advocates of some new approach.

"This new approach should start in southern California," says James Gillies, assistant dean of the Graduate School of Business Administration, University of California at Los Angeles.

NEW ZONING CONCEPTS STRESSED

Dean Gillies is a nationally recognized authority on land use and an adviser to industry on plant location.

"We have worked for years," Dean Gillies points out, "to get a 40-hour week, yet we add 2 hours a day just for getting to work and home again. We take youngsters to school on buses."

Applying this comment to California's famous distances and the resulting transportation problem, Dean Gillies says: "The only way to solve the transportation problem is to eliminate the trip."

New zoning concepts, he submits, can do it. California cities typically zone property in terms of performance—homes here, shopping centers there, factories somewhere else.

Dean Gillies says the beginning of a land-use answer will come with zoning in terms of use—how many people, how many autos, how much noise, what quantity of utilities, and so on, can be concentrated in a given area.

AN ALMOST CLASSLESS SOCIETY

Who are California's millions? Researchers are really just beginning to find out. Indications are that they form an almost classless society.

Politically, they are what former Vice President Richard M. Nixon, a Republican candidate for Governor of California this year, calls "centerists."

Economically, they are prosperous. Racially, they are of many backgrounds.

No native Californian ever has been elected President, although Herbert Hoover was a long-established resident when he was nominated. Only three Presidents—Mr. Hoover, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and Harry S. Truman—have been natives of States west of the Mississippi.

Mr. Nixon was the only native—or resident—Californian to become Vice President. There have been only five others from west of the Mississippi. But interestingly, all but one of the last seven Vice Presidents have been from west of the Mississippi.

LIBERAL IMPACT FORECAST

The voice of California will be increasingly heard in Congress. In the reapportionment of seats after the 1960 census, California gained 8 to give it a total of 38. New York lost 2 to give it 41.

At present, California Democrats hold 16 of 30 seats. It is estimated that under the 38-seat arrangement—apportioned by the Democratic-controlled legislature—6 of the 8 new seats will go to the Democrats in the 1962 elections.

California's politicians who rise to national prominence have been mostly liberals—regardless of party—in recent years. Thus, it would appear that the impact of California on national politics in the future will be liberal, although it has often seemed as if some of the most conservative political groups have had their most warm and fervent support in California.

Southern California has its first agency doing research on population makeup in the recently established population research

laboratory of the University of Southern California. One of its major projects, under the direction of Profs. Georges Sabagh and Maurice D. Van Arsdol, Jr., is studying the psychological and sociological factors underlying this region's immense mobility.

WHAT MOTIVATES PEOPLE TO MOVE

"We have found that simple reasons do not explain mobility," Professor Van Arsdol adds, pointing out how advancing income, family plans, and other considerations always seem to be yielding new mixed motivations for people to move, get better housing, improve themselves, change location. This area has schools with classrooms where the pupil turnover runs as high as 300 percent annually.

Returning to Mr. Lee of the University of California's bureau of public administration, one is remined that the size of California now and for the years ahead can be appraised in terms of how it comes to grips with city living.

He asks some questions. Are State and local government equipped to meet growing school costs? What happens as the proportion of youths and senior citizens gets bigger than the earning group in the middle?

What is the responsibility of government to racial minorities? What about protecting agricultural land from urban encroachment? What about land for recreation?

Mr. Lee has another question: "Will the California of 1970 and 1980 be golden?" He declares, "The answer will be yes if, and only if, her citizens and their political leaders have the vision to see the path and the courage to follow it."

An American in the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of an article published in the New York Times of February 12, 1962, concerning my good friend Jose A. Benitez, who is the Deputy High Commissioner of the U.S. Pacific Island Trust Territory.

Commissioner Benitez is a native of Puerto Rico and, I am informed, is doing a great job in our Pacific Trust Territories. Since the highlights of his brilliant career are mentioned in the article, I refrain from repeating these facts. I do want to add, however, that for a number of years he served as Democratic committeeman from Puerto Rico.

The article reads as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 12, 1962]

ENTHUSIASTIC TRUSTEE

(By Jose Antonio Benitez)

YAP, CAROLINE ISLANDS, February 6.—"My opinion of this school," announced the Deputy High Commissioner of the U.S. Pacific Islands Trust Territory, "is this." The opinion then delivered was a swift, hard kick against the tin walls of the school. The school quivered and so did a district official standing nearby. "A tin shack," shouted the Deputy High Commissioner. "This is not a school. This is not America."

A half hour later, the Deputy High Commissioner was beaming. He was riding on the cab roof of a huge earthmover clearing the way for a new airstrip.

"This, this is America," he cried happily. "Progress, bulldozers, America."

The islands of Micronesia have seen many things in their encounter with foreign civilization—galleons from Spain, merchants from Germany, geisha girls from Japan, farm specialists from Ohio. But they have never seen anything quite like Jose Antonio Benitez, who, next to light rum, has become Puerto Rico's best-known export in the Pacific.

COVERS HIS TERRITORY

Mr. Benitez and his rubber-ball personality have been bouncing from island to island in the trust territory for 8 months. By this time, there are not many bare brown shoulders in the islands that have not been clapped, not many island chiefs who have not been embraced and lifted off the ground and heard "Amigo, you are my brother, I love you," shouted into their ear.

Sometimes American officials in the islands stand by with a tight look on their faces while the clapping and embracing are going on. They are professionals and Mr. Benitez is a politician, exultantly and delightedly and vociferously a politician, and it takes them some time to get used to it.

"I tell you, though," said one American island official, "the man clicks with the islanders, like a firecracker."

Clicking and exploding, shouting, pleading, hugging, kissing, dancing, spurring, Mr. Benitez tours the islands, carrying with him a change of shirts, a limitless supply of enthusiasm, a conviction that Puerto Rico and the Micronesian islands go together like rice and beans, and a message.

Mr. Benitez is a man who loves gaiety and a dance and a song, but in Micronesia, when he delivers the message, the time for fun ends.

The message is that the islands are to be "no more a museum," no more to be left "sitting under the coconut trees," but a place where the United States will give of its best to help the islanders meet the pressures of a civilization thrust upon them without a by-your-leave.

WOULD PRESERVE CULTURE

"I am not saying destroy their culture," he said the other night at a meeting of Americans and Micronesians in the club on Yap.

"No, not at all. The Yapese, they can have their stone money and their shell money and their dances, and whatever they want, whatever they want to keep.

"But I tell you that clean water does not destroy culture. Schools and hospitals do not destroy culture. If a man can sleep on a mattress instead of the bare ground that does not destroy his culture. A latrine does not destroy his culture."

Sometimes, tired American officials look quizzically at each other when the Benitez message is delivered, and sometimes they ask him, "But how about the money?"

"Papa, no more 'how about the money,'" he cries. "That is the way it used to be, not the way it will be now. Money, that is not your job, it is our job. You tell us what you need and let us go and fight for the money for the schools and the hospitals and the roads.

"If we fail, then we will have fought for a good thing and not just sat back and said, 'Where's the money, where's the money?' These are our brothers—brothers—brothers."

Mr. Benitez, who is 37 years old, looks like a man of 37—and is alert, handsome, and possessed of large brown eyes and a well-groomed mustache.

POLITICS HIS LIFE

He is a native of the Puerto Rican island of Vieques. But he has spent most of his life in San Juan—and a great deal of his adulthood in politics.

After majoring in political science at the University of Puerto Rico, he served in the Army from August 1943 to February 1946. Later he held various administrative posts in Puerto Rico's legislative and executive offices.

In 1956 he founded an import company on his own and joined a brother in establishing an insurance agency. But in recent years he has left most of his business operations to associates.

He and his wife, the former Miss Reina Colon, of San Juan, have a son, 11, and a 16-month-old daughter.

Mr. Benitez was chosen by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall to serve under M. Wilfred Goding, of Alaska, the High Commissioner, and the two of them blend well, like rum and Coca Cola. Mr. Goding is a career man and Mr. Benitez a political appointee. But they have in common one strong bond—the belief that the time has come for more progress, faster progress, in the trust territory.

To Mr. Benitez, politics is the pepper and salt of life and he began sprinkling his plate with it when he was in his twenties. In those days, he was a protegé of Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marin.

PARTED WITH GOVERNOR

But Mr. Benitez says that, in 1960, he decided that he stood for things that the Governor did not—statehood, affiliation by the Puerto Rican Democrats with the National Democratic Party, commitment to then Senator John F. Kennedy for the Presidency. He rolls his eyes now in delighted memory of the fuss all this stirred up, of how he fought with the Muñoz group for control of the delegation to the party's national convention, of the wonderful excitement of it all.

Mr. Benitez' group, the "Benicrats," won the chairmanship of the delegation during the convention but afterward the National Democratic Party decided it was time for things to cool off politically in Puerto Rico, and the job in the islands was offered to Mr. Benitez.

He will be back in politics one day; everybody knows that. In the meantime, the appointment to the islands fills him with delight.

"How can I not understand these people," he says. "I am from an island, a minority, a struggling place. I know. I know.

"Give me 10 Puerto Ricans and, papa, I will show you something from these islands," he says.

Speech by Hon. Vernon W. Thomson, of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, on the 30th of March of this year, the able and distinguished Congressman from the Third District of Wisconsin, the Honorable VERNON W. THOMSON, former Governor of the great State of Wisconsin, and I were on a program at the Southeastern Dairy Marketing Clinic, held at Chattanooga, Tenn. He and I discussed there the pros and cons of the proposed Federal milk sanitation legislation, and his people who favor that legislation, can

rest assured that he was, as he always is, a determined advocate of their cause. He made a magnificent presentation and I am happy here to include it into the RECORD, as presented by him:

PRESENTATION BY CONGRESSMAN VERNON W. THOMSON AT THE SOUTHEASTERN DAIRY MARKETING CLINIC, CHATTANOOGA, TENN.

I am a Representative in Congress from America's Dairyland, the State where men are men and the dairy cow is queen. Let me put this into perspective for you. The U.S. Department of Agriculture tells us, for instance, that our friends in South Carolina produced 540 million pounds of milk in 1961; in Georgia, 1,032 million pounds were produced; in Tennessee, 2,347 million; while in Wisconsin we produced last year 17,997 million pounds of milk. In terms of cash farm income from milk, in South Carolina it represents 6.9 percent; in Georgia it represents 6.4 percent; in Tennessee, it represents 15.4 percent; while in Wisconsin it represents 53.7 percent of cash farm income.

In my capacity both as Governor of Wisconsin and as a Member of the House of Representatives, I have been deeply and directly concerned with the promotion of a sound and prosperous dairy economy for my State and our Nation.

I would like to present to you the viewpoint of the Wisconsin dairy producer on this vital issue of milk sanitation legislation. First, let me say that I have absolutely no desire, nor do the dairy farmers of Wisconsin, to hurt the farmers of Tennessee, New York, Texas, or any other State. It is just a fact of life in this world in which we live that some groups are always anxious to preserve the status quo. This situation not only exists between different groups on different commodities, but it has been apparent many times right within the dairy industry itself. It has happened not only on the national level, but, I think we can all fairly say, it has also happened within our own States. The dairy industry as a whole is one of the most important ones in America today, and I think we can all agree that it is faced wtih some very serious problems. Of course there are a variety of causes for this, but I submit that one of the most important causes of our trouble is and has been the erection of artificial trade barriers that are not based on common sense or sanitary standards.

We in Wisconsin do not seek to gain any unfair advantages over local dairy farmers in other areas of America. Dairy farmers located next to large metropolitan markets have a number of advantages based simply on geography. Now, if all our Wisconsin dairy farmers could resettle around the city of New York or around the cities covered by the now existing 81 Federal milk marketing orders, they would have no cause to complain. Unfortunately, however, they are not, so they must ship milk from long distances, pay expensive transportation costs and then face an uphill fight for markets which in many instances are dominated by unduly restrictive local economic barriers acclaimed as sanitation standards: Such as requiring a certain model of drinking cup in a barn by Chicago, requiring a certain exterior finish on bulk tanks in Pennsylvania, longer legs on bulk tanks than the 3-A standards in Louisiana, 400 cubic feet of air space per stanchion in Maryland, while Washington, D.C., requires 600, Ohio requires gutters 16 inches wide and 8 inches deep, while Nevada prescribes 14 inches wide and 4 inches in depth—Washington, D.C. requires individual cloth towels which are laundered and sanitized after each usage or a single service paper towel to wipe the udder of each cow—Nevada requires the milk house to be windward from the barn, while California requires a 2-room milk house—many municipalities refuse to accept milk produced or handled under the supervision of other jurisdictions having substantially equivalent dairy standards, such as Kansas City, Mo., and Kansas City, Kans. The innumerable variety of inspections per year required by different jurisdictions and the impossible and costly duplication of inspections (Wisconsin, 23), are but a sampling of the conflicts of regulation and the multiplication of costs and uncertainties faced by a farmer attempting to qualify to serve an out-of-State market.

Let's take a look at this basic issue in the perspective of time, the past, the present, and the future. Restrictive trade devices, as you know, are nothing new. They have been devised and erected since the beginning of man's first venture into commerce and trade. They still exist in many shapes and forms today in all parts of the world. They existed in 1776 when the American Colonies threw off the yoke of English oppression and formed our great Nation.

The early efforts of the Founding Fathers, as you know, resulted in the Articles of Confederation, which in effect represented a customs union. Later, when the device proved to be ineffective, the Constitution was adopted, making the United States truly a political union. Even in the days of the Confederation, tariffs, trade restrictions, and taxes were recognized as unhealthy for a prosperous economy. The Constitution specifically protected free trade among the States and a large body of constitutional law has been built on the proposition that no one State can discriminate in commerce against her sister States. This principle of encouraging the free flow of goods and commodities in interstate commerce has allowed our Nation to grow and prosper.

It lets Detroit make our cars, and it lets Iowa raise our hogs. It lets Milwaukee brew our beer, and it lets California and Florida produce our oranges, and Tennessee produce Jack Daniels. The Constitution doesn't prevent other States from making cars, raising hogs, brewing beer, or growing oranges, of course, but it allows the most efficient and economical producers in Michigan, Wisconsin, Iowa, California, Florida, and Tennessee to do so by prohibiting the other States from erecting restrictive and burdensome barriers to the free flow of the goods and commodities.

The Wisconsin dairyfarmer then simply asks, "Why not let me have the opportunity to produce dairy products more efficiently?"

So much for the past. Let's look at the present in regard to dairying. In the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, the law under which Federal milk marketing orders are established, has a provision in section 2(C)(5)(G) which states:

"(G) No marketing agreement or order applicable to milk and its products in any marketing area shall prohibit or in any manner limit, in the case of the products of milk, the marketing in that area of any milk or product thereof produced in any production area in the United States."

This provision was inserted into the law many years ago by the late Representative August Andresen, of Minnesota, who for over 30 years served on the House Committee on Agriculture.

This amendment was accepted by Congress for the very reason that it was the clear congressional intent that trade barriers should not be built up in this country between various sections of the Nation in the marketing of milk. It is still on the lawbooks today but, unfortunately, it is not being realistically enforced. If the administration farm bill now pending before Congress were passed in its present form, even this provision would, in fact, be nullified.

What, then, the Wisconsin dairyfarmer asks, is the difference between a policy of prohibiting or limiting the marketing of milk in any one area of the country and prohibiting or limiting the marketing of oranges in any one area of the country. Is it any more justifiable for a local segment of the dairy industry in Hawaii, for example, to prohibit Wisconsin milk than it would be for orangegrowers in an Alaskan hothouse to prohibit the sale of California oranges in Alaska?

The marketing problems of our Wisconsin dairyfarmers is only one aspect of the problem, of course. Its twin is local sanitary standards. The proposals in Congress to establish a uniform standard to prevent discrimination in this regard are both fair and reasonable.

The standards proposed in those bills are high standards. The Public Heath Service model ordinance and code, which is the standard in these bills, was developed with the aid of a national advisory committee of experts in public health, dairy, and veterinary science.

Since the code was first established in 1924, it has been revised 12 times to keep abreast of modern techniques and new scientific knowledge. These standards are currently in effect in over 1,900 communities and 35 States. It is a standard which provides consumers with a high degree of protection which is of vital importance, particularly in view of the importance of milk to growing boys and girls.

It is a standard of longstanding in the State of Wisconsin. It is a standard that guarantees the basic purity and quality of the product produced, and let me add parenthetically that you must not delude yourselves with the fiction that the purity or quality of the product produced in any one of your States is superior to that produced in the greatest dairy State in this Union. It was and is essential to the maintenance of our preeminent position that we establish and maintain and improve every phase of agriculture required to meet the most rigorous standards established anywhere, that policy is vital to competitive agriculture. We have no intention in Wisconsin of being a residual supplier only, and we willingly accept the challenge to meet any standard of purity or quality and compete against anyone for the most efficient production.

I, too, believe in States rights and local responsibility, but I would not stultify the importance of those terms by using them as a shield to protect the uneconomic entrepreneur.

So much for the past and the present. Let us move to the future for dairying in America. In many ways it is a bright future, even though beset with problems. New science and technology is coming into play each day. Our universities and experiment stations are finding better ways to produce, market and use nature's most perfect food. The development of whole milk powder and canned sterile whole milk is just in its infancy. Perhaps in this new technology lies the answer to some of our problems if—and I stress this is a big "if"—new and more ingenious restrictive devices aren't adopted to affect the new technology.

These restrictive devices aren't the wave of the future—they are the wave of the past. As illustrated by the present economic developments in Europe, the wave of the future is for expanded trade. The nations in the Inner Six of the European Economic Community are now forming a customs union to break down ancient trade barriers between their nations. Like the Articles of Confederation in our Nation's early history, the Common Market is seeking to allow the free interchange of goods and commodities between its members, thus allowing the most efficient producers in that area to produce free of restrictions. The development of the European Common Market is of vital significance to our Nation. We have a huge stake in the prosperity and strength of Europe. If we are to be in a competitive position with

the Common Market, we, too, must reject the same type of restrictive devices that protect Italian Fiats from German Volkswagens and Texas milk from Wisconsin milk.

In conclusion, let me say this: Realistic sanitation legislation is an absolute must for the economic survival of the most efficient dairy farmer. It need not be Federal legislation if all or most States adopt fair and reasonable provisions and do not exercise their local police power to unduly burden and obstruct milk marketing under the guise of acting to promote public health standards. We in Wisconsin would like the opportunity to provide the metropolitan consumer with a high standard product. We are blessed with the weather, the topography and the skills of generations of efficient dairy families. We merely wish to compete fairly and economically with other areas blessed with geographic proximity to urban markets.

Quality Stabilization Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I am hereby submitting a statement made by me before the Special Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee at the beginning of their hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 159, known as the quality stabilization bill. This is a companion bill to H.R. 10335 filed by me and identical bills filed by five other Members of the House of Representatives.

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN RAY J. MADDEN, FIRST DISTRICT OF INDIANA, BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE RELATIVE TO SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 159

Mr. Chairman and members of the special subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee, I am grateful to the chairman and members of this committee for your decision to hold hearings this week on the quality stabilization bill, Senate Joint Resolution 159. Your cooperation demonstrates that you are much concerned over the devastating methods of merchandising in recent years that is causing a great damage to the manufacturers, retailers, and consumers throughout the country.

Basically, the quality stabilization bill offers a major step in curbing dishonest practices that are misleading the consumer in merchandise values. It spells out bait advertising, deceptive pricing, and published misrepresentations of the product, as reasons why a manufacturer may protect the property rights in his brand name or trademark.

The public will be helped by the enactment of the quality stabilization law since the established price and quality symbolized by the brand name will be a standard from which it may judge the competitive values of products. The consumer will be guarded against the loss-leader operator who uses the honored brand name or trademark to build store traffic at the expense of his more honest competitors, while recouping his loss at the same time on overpriced, inferior, and blind merchandise.

OPERATION

If the owner of the trademark elects to come under quality stabilization, the retailers and distributors must cooperate with the owner or manufacturer in maintaining the stablized price of that trademarked product. This enables the manufacturer to continue to build quality into his stabilized brand-name product. If the retailer violates the provisions of the quality stabilization law, the brand-name owner can revoke the retailer's right to use the brand name. If the distributor violates the revocation order, the brand-name owner (the manufacturer) can then institute a Federal civil suit for damages.

This legislation will call for no Government bureaucracy or department to supervise or enforce the quality stabilization law. The law is 100 percent optional and the manufacturer, retailer, wholesaler, or consumer can choose to come under or stay out of quality stabilization. It provides a wholly meritorious and worthwhile opportunity for quality products to be distributed through quality-conserving resellers.

NOT FAIR TRADE

Since its introduction last January 1961, the merits of this proposed legislation have come to the attention of thousands upon thousands of manufacturers, distributors, retailers, and consumers. This bill is not fair trade legislation and is not a price-fixing measure.

The quality stabilization bill has now become one of the most widely publicized and acclaimed measures that await action in this session of Congress. In our long and critical struggle against communism, the American system of free enterprise must be our major weapon. Business failures in recent years and the growing lack of protection for consumer purchases must be given consideration by this Congress. The marketplace is rapidly becoming infested with the so-called fast buck merchandisers.

OPTIONAL

In giving the manufacturer the optional right to control his trademark, safeguards are also established for the distributor, the retailer and, most important of all, the consumer. It is imperative in considering the bill, that you fully realize that its use by the manufacturer, retailer, and consumer is optional. No product can be stabilized under the proposed quality stabilization law unless competitive products are available to the consumer. And sale or purchase of a product stabilized under the proposed law is also completely voluntary on the part of the distributor, the retailer, and the consumer. It is of fundamental importance that this bill be recognized as one not aimed at harming any legitimate business, but as a measure of economic benefit to all.

BUSINESS FAILURES

The Senate Small Business Committee has reported that small business failures (bankruptcies—businessmen giving up the struggle for survival) climbed in 1960 to the highest point since 1933 and the great depression. The House Small Business Committee, in its December 16, 1960, report entitled "Status of Small Business (1948–1958)," 86th Congress, 2d session, made this frightening statement:

"Most small retailers discontinue businesses without going through bankruptcy. This explains why, of the 139,000 who discontinued business in 1959, only 6,873 showed up among the business failures."

There are about 2 million retailers in America: 88 percent of them operate in only one location from one store; 70 percent individually own their own businesses. These are not huge outfits—over 75 percent have annual sales under $100,000.

There are 165,000 merchant wholesalers in the United States: 91 percent of them are active owners of unincorporated businesses; 71 percent operate from only one building.

It is the well-known brand names—brands with a reputation for reliability—that are taking it on the chin. If these brands did not have such an excellent reputation, do you suppose they would be of interest even for 1 million to the discounter who needs a traffic builder for his kind of selling?

We cannot permit the further degeneration of the brand name system of distribution. We must arrest the growing rate of failure of small business in this country. We must give the incentive to the manufacturer in this country to build toward excellence, and we must protect the consumer from junk merchandise.

Quality stabilization covers specific areas in which a manufacturer can control—that is, prevent—the unfair use of his own property—his trademark—by the reseller. These areas are:

1. Intentional misrepresentation as to make, model, size, age, etc.
2. Bait and switch merchandising tactics.
3. Price.

To repeat, it is not compulsory that the brand name owner use the law.

MECHANICS OF USING THE LAW

The manufacturer who does elect to use the quality stabilization law will publish a specific retail price at which his trademarked product must be sold. He has this right so that he may protect the quality of the product, the good will of his brand name, the ethical reseller and the consumer. This is not to say that the manufacturer cannot change his specific price. Not at all. Competition is promoted—not restricted—by the quality stabilization bill, and the interaction of competitive forces will insure that the manufacturer's price represents fair value or else that manufacturer will be forced out of his business. Any price established under this law will be at the manufacturer's peril. This is the way the free enterprise system should function.

If a retailer knowingly violates the published policy of the manufacturer by engaging in any one or all of the three specific practices named in the bill—price deviation, bait and switch tactics, misrepresentation, then the manufacturer may revoke the right of that offending retailer to make any further use of the manufacturer's name, brand or trademark.

The quality stabilization bill is not a one-way street. It imposes an obligation on the manufacturer as well. The bill states that lack of due diligence in revoking the rights of competing resellers known to the trademark owner to be committing similar acts of unfair competition, will constitute a valid defense against any action brought under this law.

With the enactment of the quality stabilization bill, the reseller and the public will know where each manufacturer stands as to policy and quality consistency. The manufacturer no longer will have the convenient excuse that he cannot protect good resellers against unfair competition.

FOUNDATION ESTABLISHED BY SUPREME COURT

The quality stabilization bill contains none of the usual fair trade language. There is no provision for contracts; as the bill is wholly predicated on the owner's property rights in his good name; there is no dependence on a nonsigner clause as is the case with fair trade.

The essential difference is that fair trade enforcement is to compel a dealer to raise his prices for a product, while under the quality stabilization bill, the action is one akin to trespass—to stop a reseller from abusing a manufacturer's property right in his trademark.

The quality stabilization bill simply provides that when a trademark is abused, the trademark owner may deny that unfair reseller further use of the brand name or trademark. Essentially, it is a confirmation by Congress of the unanimous decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in *Old Dearborn Distributing Co. v. Seagram-Distiller's Corp.*

(299 U.S. 183 (1936)), that the manufacturer possesses property rights in the good will symbolized by his trademark. The bill describes how the manufacturer may protect his trademark as it moves along the channels of distribution.

CONSTRUCTIVE COMPETITION INSURED

The quality stabilization bill leaves the Sherman Act intact. Any group of manufacturers or wholesalers or retailers who abuse the quality stabilization bill to effect illegal collusive price fixing between themselves would be courting the same prosecution as the heavy electrical firms and their executives experienced not long ago in Philadelphia.

The underscore that the quality stabilization bill will promote competition, it must be emphasized repeatedly that the manufacturer alone must make the basic marketing decision—whether to stabilize his price, as a means of restoring and improving quality, or to rely primarily on price alone to attract customers. It is after all, his brand and his reputation which is at stake. Only he can make the decision.

Wholesalers and retailers will be free, too, to determine whether they wish to handle products of stabilized quality or a competitive unstabilized one. They may elect to handle top brand lines which are stabilized and others on which they can vary the price. It is their decision. If they elect to handle the quality stabilized brand, they must respect the law and the manufacturer's established policy. This means that the reseller may not abuse the brand name by misrepresentation as to make, model, size, age or other details of the quality-stabilized brand, by "bait and switch" merchandising techniques or by selling that brand name product at other than the manufacturer's specific price.

THE CONSUMER'S INTEREST

This legislation safeguards the consumer. This committee is not unmindful of the situation that results when an unprincipled retailer can take advantage of a product by running a loss-leader ad. For every dollar spent by the misguided customer who is brought in on account of this ad, sacrificing a brand name or a trademark of some producer, that customer spends an estimated $9 for inferior products at the regular or higher price. Now, what happens? It does not take long until that honored product loses customers. Soon the loss-leader advertiser drops the brand name product and picks up another quality product to temporarily pack his store with unsuspecting customers. It is operations of this kind that the quality stabilization bill will control by protecting the customer, the producer, and the small retail man.

We need protection for the small retailer, the consumer, labor, and for the man who invents a product or spends his adult life and great sums of money to establish a brand name or trademark.

Enactment of the quality stabilization bill will result in availability of products in which the public can have confidence—confidence in their stabilized price and in their quality. Customers can buy that which they seek: Quality and price, or, price alone. The retailer, by offering both quality stabilized and unstabilized brands, can give the consumer an excellent mix of durable, high quality products and products of lesser quality whose prices fit his pocketbook or his limited needs.

I feel confident that there will be many brands, made by reputable manufacturers, which will not be stabilized even though some of their brands are stabilized. The quality stabilization bill will affect discount merchants only as to the products the manufacturers place under quality stabilization and then, only as to the brand name thereof. On those products the manufacturer will have the legal and equitable right to protect his property. But the discounter is optionally free to handle quality stabilized products along with merchandise that he does not elect to comé under quality stabilization.

It is not the purpose of the quality stabilization bill to put anyone out of business. Indeed, it is my conviction that it will reduce the number of small businesses whose owners find it necessary to liquidate. I predict that enactment of the quality stabilization bill will result in a drastic drop in the number of small business failures.

Obviously, the buying public will benefit from this bill. For the first time in a number of years, the consumer will have a standard against which to measure quality. The quality stabilization law will also give protection to the consumer against entrapment and unwise purchase of the loss-leader merchant specializing in bait-and-switch tactics.

HELP RESTORE EMPLOYMENT

In urging speedy consideration of this bill by this committee, I direct your attention to the fact that unrestrained price slashing is rapidly disabling labor, industry, resellers, and the public. Our entire economy will continue to deteriorate at a time when leading economists and statesmen agree we need instead, economic growth to strengthen our Nation for survival.

I represent the great industrial Calumet region of Indiana. In recent years purchasers and small retailers have been asking me what can be done to reestablish confidence in retail marketing. Unemployment in my area is critical.

Enactment of this quality stabilization legislation will contribute more toward restoring employment than any other legislation that can be enacted by Congress. When a manufacturer is forced to make 15 men do the work of 20, and is forced to employ cheaper and less-skilled labor as well as inferior materials, both American labor and the American consumer are injured where it hurts most. Smaller manufacturers of trademarked products have been forced to close their factories or downgrade the quality of their products to suit the high pressure, falsely advertising retailers, as a means of staying in business. This type of retailer may be few in number but they are powerful and heavily financed, and growing in size and number every day.

Enactment of the quality stabilization bill will give manufacturers the confidence to build better products instead of cheaper products with poor quality.

This bill will give the bargain seeker an opportunity of knowing what is a bargain by placing a standard of value as a gage.

NONPARTISAN

This is strictly nonpartisan legislation. Ten U.S. Senators of both parties have cosponsored quality stabilization, and seven Members—from both parties—have introduced the bills in the House of Representatives.

I am hereby submitting with my statement the list of more than 50 national trade and professional organizations that have endorsed this quality stabilization bill:

Quality Brands Associates of America, Inc.
National Retail Hardware Association.
National Retail Furniture Association.
National Association of Retail Clothiers and Furnishers.
National Appliance & Radio-TV Dealers Association.
National Sporting Goods Association.
National Office Machine Dealers Association.
Retail Jewelers of America.
Master Photo Dealers & Finishers Association.
Independent Garage Owners of America.
Toy Wholesalers' Association of America.
Wholesale Stationers' Association.
National Stationery & Office Equipment Association.
National Wholesale Jewelers Association.
American Fishing Tackle Manufacturers Association.
Archery Manufacturers & Dealers Association.
National Association of House to House Installment Companies, Inc.
Marine Manufacturers Safety Equipment Association.
Gift & Decorative Accessories Association of America.
Sporting Goods Jobbers Association.
Billiard & Bowling Institute of America.
American Watch Association, Inc.
Automotive Service Industry Association.
Fountain Pen & Mechanical Pencil Manufacturers' Association, Inc.
National Wholesale Hardware Association.
Watch Material Distributors of America.
National Association of Bedding Manufacturers.
The National Association of Shirt, Pajama & Sportswear Manufacturers.
National Industrial Distributors Association.
Christian Booksellers Association.
National Small Business Men's Association.
National Congress of Petroleum Retailers.
National Shoe Manufacturers Association.
Wallcovering Wholesalers Association.
American Research Merchandising Institute.
American Retailers Association.
National Art Materials Trade Association.
Motor and Equipment Manufacturers Association.
National Shoe Retailers Association.
Northamerican Heating & Airconditioning Wholesalers, Inc.
American Watch Manufacturers Association.
National Association of Women's & Children's Apparel Salesmen, Inc.
National Audio-Visual Association, Inc.
National Bicycle Dealers Association, Inc.
National Office Furniture Association, Inc.
National Outerwear & Sportswear Association.
The Automotive Warehouse Distributors Association, Inc.
National Frozen Food Association, Inc.
American Association of Small Business.
National Association of Glove Manufacturers.
National Association of Retail Druggists.
Paint & Wallpaper Association of America, Inc.
National Marine Products Association.
Retail Tobacco Dealers of America.
National Association of Tobacco Distributors.
National Retail Farm Equipment Association.
Conference of State Pharmaceutical Association Secretaries.
American Pharmaceutical Association.

I thank you.

Inspiration for the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I am enclosing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by unanimous consent, a newspaper article containing a poem from the March 29 issue of the Weekly News of southwest Pittsburgh, a fine weekly newspaper of

the Pittsburgh district. I am also enclosing the well written poem covering Astronaut Lt. Col. John Glenn, Jr.'s, flight on February 20, 1962.

These two poems have been written by Mrs. Millie J. Pektas, a popular citizen of the southern part of the city of Pittsburgh, Pa., and the wife of Officer John B. Pektas, a police officer at the Pittsburgh Police Station No. 2 at Center and Devilliers Streets.

Millie Pektas was deeply interested in the successful flight of Lieutenant Colonel Glenn on February 20, and has writen the poem concerning Colonel Glenn's flight shortly before the flight took place. Millie Pektas was greatly concerned about this flight, although she realized that she might not live to see it take place. When Millie Petkas died on March 19, 1962, we lost a fine citizen who brought happiness and inspiration to her friends and all who knew her.

We in Pittsburgh want to share the fine spirit of these poems with the Members of Congress and the American people, and I am, therefore, submitting the poems for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

MILLIE J. PEKTAS

Elliot's most popular citizen passed away March 19, after a brief illness. Millie J. Pektas was known by thousands in the 20th ward. She had been a contributor to this paper and had an unusual talent for poetry. It is with deep grief that we publish her last poem written at St. Joseph's Hospital just before she passed away:

"Happiness is what we make it; each and every day,
If we spread a little sunshine, love will lead the way.
Happiness is what we do to others along life's path.
Be the other fellow's neighbor. Never stand aghast.
Just be sure to be of some use in this little world of ours
Happiness comes wrapped in smiles for each and every soul
Just remember, folks, it's you who must set the goal.
And happiness will last."

APRIL 2, 1962.

Hon. JAMES G. FULTON,
U.S. Congressman, New Federal Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

DEAR SIR: In reference to our conversation of Sunday, March 25, 1962, in the hill district celebrating St. Joseph's Day at the House of Hospitality, I am forwarding this poem my wife Millie Pektas composed at St. Joseph's Hospital around the middle of February in regard to Astronaut Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr.'s, flight of February 20, 1962:

"Astronaut Glenn will soon make a flight,
In some early morning he will alight,
Into the rocket capsule he will go,
Up, up, and on with the show.

"Around the world and back again,
We wish him success!
As do all men!
He'll make it for sure, we'll all pray,
For him and the good old U.S.A."

My wife died at this hospital March 19, 1962, at 11 p.m.

Sincerely yours,
Officer JOHN B. PEKTAS.

(Assigned to No. 2 police station, Pittsburgh, Pa. Home address: 1217 Chartiers Avenue, Pittsburgh 20, Pa.)

Chemical Progress Week, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House that April 9–13, 1962, is being observed nationally as Chemical Progress Week.

It is the ninth annual observance. This year's theme, "New Worlds Through Chemistry," is more than just a slogan to the men and women of the chemical industry. It implies the industry's vital role in America's race to the stars, and it applies to exciting advancements in other chemical products—from synthetic fibers to miracle drugs.

PROGRESS THROUGH RESEARCH

Chemical Progress Week spotlights the continual advancements made by the chemical industry to contribute to healthier, more comfortable, safer lives for every American.

Each year more than 500 new industrial chemicals are developed in the laboratories and research departments of more than 12,000 producers in the industry. Chemical companies on an industrywide basis spend more of their own money on research—outside Government grants and private endowments—than any other U.S. industry. In 1961, the chemical industry allotted approximately $800 million for basic and product research.

For every 10,000 persons employed in production facilities in the chemical industry, there are 623 working in research—the highest proportion of any U.S. manufacturing industry.

PROGRESS THROUGH GROWTH AND DIVERSIFICATION

Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., the national trade association of the industry, reports that the chemical industry is fourth in size in terms of assets—$26 billion—among U.S. industries; fifth, in terms of sales—nearly $30 billion last year.

But, despite the size of the industry, the combined sales of the three largest companies account for only 17 percent of total industry sales. And nearly 65 percent of the industry's plants employ less than 20 people each. In all, some 830,000 men and women are employed in America's chemical industry.

Nor is the industry content to stand still. Last year, according to U.S. Government figures, the chemical industry spent more than $1½ billion on new plants and equipment.

In my State of West Virginia, there are 41 establishments employing 40,577 people; with an annual payroll of $256,738,000. West Virginia ranks 12th in the chemical manufacturing industry.

Self-Defense in Outer Space and the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1962

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the February 1962 issue of Air Force Space Digest:

SELF-DEFENSE IN OUTER SPACE AND THE UNITED NATIONS

"Consider the possibility of a satellite in flight around the earth in an orbit which brings it repeatedly over a great number of states. If it is equipped with a nuclear device which can be released and propelled downward by radio command, the satellite is an imminent threat to every state in its path. But it is not an armed attack on any single state until the warhead is released minutes before striking the eventual victim. Can it be argued that no state has a right to intercept the satellite even though such state is aware of its possible danger?"

(By John Cobb Cooper)

(Biography: Professor Cooper is a noted authority on air and space law and professor emeritus of international air law at McGill University in Montreal. Long a resident of Princeton, N.J., Professor Cooper is a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, a trustee of the Aerospace Education Foundation, president of the International Institute of Space Law, a member of the International Academy of Astronautics and the American Rocket Society, and a fellow of the British Interplanetary Society.)

The United States, as a member of the United Nations, subscribes to its purposes, including the commitment "to maintain international peace and security." As a party to the North Atlantic Treaty, the United States reaffirmed its faith "in the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, and their desire to live in peace with all peoples and all governments."[1] But as a sovereign state, the United States did not surrender its individual right to defend its territorial integrity and political independence. As Secretary of State Kellogg properly said during the course of the negotiations for the 1928 Briand-Kellogg Pact renouncing war: "That right [of self-defense] is inherent in every sovereign state and is implicit in every treaty."[2]

The Briand-Kellogg Pact, the U.N. Charter, and the organization of NATO all antedate the present space age. Now new problems face the United States and other members of the U.N. and of NATO:

What are the rights of self-defense in outer space?

If spacecraft threaten national survival of a member of the United Nations, must that nation stand by and await an actual physical attack, or may it take necessary preventive measures before receiving a crippling blow?

Concretely, when and where may a nation in self-defense attack a suspected spacecraft?

The limits of this paper will not permit detailed discussion, but some broad outlines of the questions now involved may be suggested.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Such questions have not been answered by the recent and already historic resolution adopted by the United Nations. On December 11, 1961, the First (Political) Committee of the U.N. General Assembly unanimously accepted a draft resolution on international cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space. This resolution was sponsored by the United States, the U.S.S.R., Great Britain, France, and the other states which had been members of the dormant Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. The resolution extended the life of the Committee, added one Asiatic and three African States to membership, and requested the Committee to meet not later than March 31, 1962, to go forward with the program of study which had been adopted 2 years earlier. Part A of the resolution is of major significance. It said:

"The General Assembly,

"Recognizing the common interest of mankind in furthering the peaceful uses of outer space and the urgent need to strengthen international cooperation in this important field,

"Believing that the exploration and use of outer space should be only for the betterment of mankind and to the benefit of states irrespective of the stage of their economic or scientific development,

"1. Commends to states for their guidance in the exploration and use of outer space the following principles:

"(a) International law, including the United Nations Charter, applies to outer space and celestial bodies;

"(b) Outer space and celestial bodies are free for exploration and use by all states in conformity with international law, and are not subject to national appropriation;

"2. Invites the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space to study and report on the legal problems which may arise from the exploration and use of outer space." [3]

It must be noted that the resolution does not define the term "outer space" or the term "peaceful uses." However, the resolution clearly commits the U.N. to the basic principles that international law and the charter are there applicable, also that this area and celestial bodies are free for exploration and use by all states "in conformity with international law," and "are not subject to national appropriation." This can only mean that neither outer space nor celestial bodies are now subject to territorial claims of any single state nor can they be hereafter. The U.N. has thus determined that outer space has an international status analogous to that of the high seas where, as Mr. Justice Storey, of the U.S. Supreme Court said in the case of the *Mariana Flora* in 1826: "It is the common highway of all, appropriated to the use of all, and no one can vindicate to himself a superior prerogative there."

Also it has been ably argued that peaceful uses of outer space include defense uses. As Dr. Edward C. Welsh, Executive Secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, speaking at the recent Air Force Association Symposium on "Space and National Security," said, in part:

"The National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 states that it is the policy of the United States that 'activities in space should be devoted to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind.'

"That is a sound policy for any vigorous, peaceloving nation. Even though it is sound, however, I know also that it is sometimes misinterpreted. It does not mean that space has no military or defense uses. * * * Nothing is more essential for peace than the capability to discourage or deter attack.

"In my view, we do not have a division between peaceful and nonpeaceful objectives for space. Rather, we have space missions to help keep the peace, and space missions to help increase our ability to live well in peace." [4]

Footnotes at end of speech.

With this view the present writer fully concurs. Nor is there anything in the resolution adopted by the United Nations which of itself precludes the bona fide use of outer space for self-defense against an aggressor, particularly in view of the fact that the resolution asserts in effect that outer space is not part of the territory of any state.

The major question, however, is whether or not any principle of international law or any provision of the U.N. Charter, now agreed to be applicable in outer space, prevents or limits acts of self-defense. For example, is it permissible for a state to intercept in outer space a foreign spacecraft known to be armed with a nuclear warhead and thereby constituting a source of potential attack on any state flown over?

States have traditionally claimed the right to act in self-defense and self-protection outside national territory. As Elihu Root said in a 1914 address as president of the American Society of International Law:

"The right is a necessary corollary of independent sovereignty. It is well understood that the exercise of the right of self-protection may and frequently does extend in its effect beyond the limits of the territorial jurisdiction of the State exercising it." In the same address, discussing the background of the Monroe Doctrine, Mr. Root insisted upon "the right of every sovereign state to protect itself by preventing a condition of affairs in which it will be too late to protect itself." [5]

The circumstances in which a state may use force in self-defense outside national territory were carefully stated by Daniel Webster, when he was Secretary of State, in an exchange of notes with the British Government following the destruction of the American vessel *Caroline* and the loss of two American lives. Webster's dictum has become part of traditional international law.

The *Caroline* was a small American vessel used in 1837 to transport men and supplies from the American side of the Niagara River to two Canadian islands occupied by Canadian insurgents. On the night of December 29, 1837, a British force crossed from Canada and seized and burned the *Caroline*, which was moored on the American side of the river. The United States protested the violation of its territory. The British Government claimed justifiable self-defense, even though two Americans had been killed escaping from the vessel. In 1841, a British citizen named McLeod was arrested in New York and indicted for murder on the ground that he had participated in the attack on the *Caroline*. The British Government protested the arrest, again claiming that the attack was justified as military preventive self-defense. Daniel Webster, who had become Secretray of State, insisted in words now famous, that the British and Canadian authorities, to justify the attack in American territory, must show "a necessity of self-defense, instant, overwhelming, leaving no choice of means and no moment of deliberation."

He added that even supposing necessity authorized entry into American territory, it must also be shown that nothing unreasonable or excessive was done, "since the act, justified by the necessity of self-defense, must be limited by that necessity and kept clearly within it." These phrases have been repeatedly acknowledged as valid statements of customary international law.[6]

The *Caroline* case dealt directly with violation of foreign territory while acting in self-defense. The same rule applies on the high seas. For example, a vessel sailing to a port of the capturing state for the purpose of invasion or bringing help to insurgents presents a case of necessity in that the danger is imminent and can be frustrated only by the capture of the vessel.[7]

Judge Jessup, writing in 1927 and referring to the *Caroline* case, said: "It must be remembered that the great principle of the inviolability of national territory is qualified by the right of self-defense. Why should it be denied that the freedom of the seas may also be subject to qualifications?" [8] Later he said that circumstances applicable when the act of self-defense involves the invasion of the territory of a neighboring state apply "a fortiori * * * upon the ocean." [9]

There is no reason why the rule in the *Caroline* case is not now also applicable in nonterritorial outer space.

The substance of Webster's now famous dictum as to justifiable acts of self-defense beyond national territory was directly approved in 1946 by the judgment of the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg. It accepted the contention that preventive self-defense was justified to meet an imminent attack but held that the facts showed that the German invasions of Denmark and Norway could not be thus excused, saying:

"It must be remembered that preventive action in foreign territory is justified only in case of an instant and overwhelming necessity for self-defense, leaving no choice of means, and no moment of deliberation. (The *Caroline* case, Moore's International Law Digest, vol. II, p. 412.)" Then after discussing the facts, the tribunal held: "In the light of all the available evidence it is impossible to accept the contention that the invasions of Denmark and Norway were defensive, and in the opinion of the tribunal they were acts of aggressive war." [10]

In 1947 the International Military Tribunal for the Far East, sitting at Tokyo, sustained the Netherlands declaration of war against Japan as justifiable preventive self-defense, the proof showing that the Netherlands had become aware of an imminent Japanese attack.[11]

It therefore appears that the rule in the Caroline case states present international law as to the circumstances when a state may exercise its rights of self-defense in any area outside its national territory, unless some change in the law has become effective since World War II. It has, in fact, been contended that such change did take place and that the U.N. Charter now denies the use of force in self-defense except under much more limited circumstances. In particular, some writers have urged that the imminence of attack is not sufficient, and that force may be used in self-defense only after an actual attack.

Article 2(4) and article 51 of the United Nations Charter require consideration.

Article 2(4): "All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

Article 51: "Nothing in the present charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken by members in the exercise of this right of self-defense shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present charter to take, at any time, such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security."

The views of certain well-known authorities on international law construing these articles must be noted. One said in 1947 that article 51 limits the right of individual and collective self-defense to the one case of armed attack against a member of the United Nations—that the term "armed attack" means something that has taken place—that article 51 prohibits preventive war—that the threat of aggression does not justify self-defense under article 51 and that imminent armed attack does not suffice.[12]

Another legal expert wrote in 1950 that it is "of importance to note that article 51 does not use the term 'aggression' but the much

narrower concept of armed attack which means that a merely imminent attack or any act of aggression which has not the character of an attack involving the use of armed force does not justify resort to force as an exercise of the right established by article 51." [13] The same commentator had stated earlier that article 51 applies only in the case of an armed attack, and that "the delinquent State which is in actual possession of the illegal advantage is protected by the charter against any enforcement action other than that taken by the Security Council"—that "the charter forbids any use of force on the part of the individual members except for the exercise of the right of self-defense against armed attack." [14]

Another commentator wrote in 1958 that article 51 suggests a limitation on the right of self-defense, namely "it may be exercised only if an armed attack occurs"—that the restriction in article 51 "very definitely narrows the freedom of action which states had under traditional law"—that a "case could be made out for self-defense under the traditional law where the injury was threatened but no attack had yet taken place," but that "under the charter, alarming military preparations by a neighboring state would justify a resort to the Security Council, but would not justify a resort to anticipatory force by the state which believed itself threatened." [15]

At the 1958 meeting of the International Law Association, Judge Krylov, a distinguished jurist from the U.S.S.R., is reported to have said: "We have before us the text of the charter and we must interpret this text exclusively. Article 51 speaks of self-defense, but the text of the charter does not mention preventive self-defense. Self-defense is permissible only if an armed attack occurs. So, once more, I repeat that the interpretation of the article must be a restrictive one. * * * It is surprising to listen to the citation of the Caroline case which took place about 150 years ago. This citation and this opinion cannot be defended against the clear and unquestionable text of the charter." [16]

It is impossible for this writer to accept the result of these interpretations. Neither article 2 nor article 51 nor the charter as a whole has, in my considered judgment, limited, or destroyed the fundamental right of a state to defend itself by force against imminent attack or danger threatening its existence. I have long held this view. If the restrictive interpretation were correct, and if the charter had been in force during World War II, the judgment of the Tokyo tribunal would not have been valid when it found that the Netherlands was justified in declaring war on learning that a Japanese attack was imminent. Certainly the charter was not intended as an instrument to reverse world feeling against aggression.

The problem is to some extent based on the manner in which the charter should be construed. Prof. Arthur L. Goodhart, now master of University College at Oxford, states the correct rule, namely that "all powers which have not been expressly or by necessary implication transferred to the United Nations remain in the individual states. They hold these powers not by grant but by sovereign right." [17] Commenting on the contention that article 51 establishes the right of self-defense and that this right has no other content than the one determined by article 51, Professor Goodhart continues: "It is obvious that this interpretation of the charter must narrow the rights of the individual states, because their rights can then be found only within the terms of the charter itself. On the other hand, if the charter is regarded as leaving all residual rights in the hands of the states, then the question will always be: To what extent has any particular provision of the charter limited the existing liberty of the individual states? * * * As the charter does not limit the right of self-defense in any way, it follows that a state or a group of states may defend themselves in any manner consonant with that end." Discussing article 2 (4) Professor Goodhart points out that this article does not establish a "universal obligation not to use force," but prohibits it only in three instances, namely, the following:

"(a) Use of force against the territorial integrity of any state. It is clear that defense against aggression cannot be regarded as an attack against the territorial integrity of the aggressor.

"(b) Use of force against the political independence of any state. Here again it is clear that the use of force against an aggressor is not an attack on its political independence.

"(c) Use of force in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations. It cannot be regarded as inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations that states should defend themselves against a wanton attack. It follows that the right of self-defense is not 'an essential restriction of the obligation established by article 2, paragraph 4,' but is an independent inherent right which is not within the purview of that article and is in no way restricted by it." [18]

An authoritative statement as to the continued effect of the *Caroline* case doctrine was made by the Lord Chancellor of Great Britain (Lord Kilmuir) in the British Parliament on November 1, 1956: "Article 51 must be read in the light that it is part of chapter VII of the charter and concerned with the defense against grave breaches of the peace. It would be an entire misreading of the whole intention of article 51 to interpret it as forbidding forcible self-defense in resistance to an illegal use of force not constituting an armed attack. In my view, it is equally clear that article 51 does not cut down the customary right by restricting forcible self-defense in cases where the attack provoking it has actually been launched. I think that every one of your Lordships will appreciate that if that were done, it would be a travesty of the purpose of the charter to compel a defending state to allow its opponent to deliver the first fatal blow. * * * The doctrine that I have put forward is an old and well established doctrine. It was established at least 100 years ago in the case of the *Caroline*, which was a matter discussed between the United States and ourselves. The foundation of the doctrine was accepted as 'imminent threat to your nationals.' The doctrine arises, and that form of self-defense becomes legal, when the imminent threat is made." [19]

Professor McDougal, of Yale, recently published an able, extensive, and persuasive analysis of these difficult questions. Limits of space here prevent my referring to more than a few passages of his excellent discussion. He points out in connection with the formulation at San Francisco of article 2(4) of the U.N. Charter, that in a committee report approved at the plenary conference it was made clear that the traditional position of self-defense was not intended to be abridged, but on the contrary, was intended to be reserved and maintained.[20] In forceful language dealing with article 51, Professor McDougal states that "it is scarcely conceivable * * * that the major security purposes of the parties to the charter could in contemporary conditions be adequately, if at all, served by an interpretation which would reduce self-defense to assumption of the posture of the sitting duck." [21] Later he quoted Professor Waldock, of Oxford, to the effect that "to cut down the customary right of self-defense beyond even the *Caroline* doctrine does not make sense." [22]

The views expressed by these recent authorities appear to me to present the soundest position on a difficult and most important question. I join them in the belief that the traditional right of preventive self-dense has not been limited by membership in the United Nations. Under present conditions this would be a fatal assumption. Consider the possibility of a satellite in flight around the earth in an orbit which brings it repeatedly over a great number of states. If it is equipped with a nuclear device which can be released and propelled downward by radio command, the satellite is an imminent threat to every state in its path. But it is not an armed attack on any single state until the warhead is released minutes before striking the eventual victim. Can it be argued that no state has a right to intercept the satellite even though such state is aware of its possible danger?

In my judgment, the Webster dictum in the Caroline case is still sound international law and is applicable to self-defense in outer space. It is part of the international law referred to in the resolution of the General Assembly. As stated by the Nuremberg tribunal, preventive action "is justified only in case of an instant and overwhelming necessity for self-defense, leaving no choice of means, and no moment of deliberation." If these conditions are deemed to be present, action is not denied by the Charter of the U.N. nor precluded by the recent U.N. resolution.

The real problem is therefore not legal. The question is rather one of scientific progress, military strategy, and national policy. If a state determines that the conditions are present justifying action, and if effective means are available, action can be taken in self-defense on land, at sea, in the air—or in outer space.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] Preamble to North Atlantic Treaty, Apr. 4, 1949: U.S. Treaties and Other Int. Acts-Series 1949.

[2] Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States (1928) I, 36; Briggs, "The Law of Nations," 2d ed., p. 977.

[3] Report of U.N. First Committee, Doc. A/5026 approved by General Assembly Dec. 20, 1961.

[4] Air Force and Space Digest (November 1961), pp. 73-74.

[5] 8 Am. Jour. Int. Law, p. 6.

[6] Moore, "International Law Digest," vol. II, sec. 217, pp. 409–414; R. Y. Jennings, "The Caroline and McLeod Cases," 32 Am. Jour. Int. Law (1938) p. 82.

[7] Oppenheim, "International Law," 8th ed. (Lauterpacht) (1955), vol. I, p. 301, n. 1; D. W. Bowett, "Self Defense in International Law (1958)," p. 72.

[8] Philip C. Jessup, "The International Law of Territorial Waters and Maritime Jurisdiction (1927)," p. 76.

[9] Ibid., p. 97.

[10] Judgment International Military Tribunal (Nuremberg) Oct. 1, 1946, 41 Am. Jour. Int. Law (1947), p. 172, 205.

[11] Bowett, op. cit., p. 144.

[12] Joseph L. Kunz, "Individual and Collective Self-Defense in Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations," 41 Am. Jour. Int. Law (1947), p. 871.

[13] Hans Kelsen, "The Law of the United Nations (1950)," pp. 797–799.

[14] Ibid., p. 269.

[15] Philip C. Jessup, "A Modern Law of Nations (1958)," pp. 163–166.

[16] Int. Law Association, report of the 47th conference (New York, 1958), p. 512.

[17] A. L. Goodhart, "The North Atlantic Treaty," 79 Recueil des Cours, Acadamie de Droit International (1951–II) p. 188, 193; see also remarks of L. C. Green (United Kingdom) Int. Law Association, report op. cit., p. 517: "The right of self-defense was inherent before the Charter was written; it has remained inherent, and as such it covers preventive self-defense as well as self-defense resorted to after you have already been exterminated."

[18] Goodhart, op. cit., p. 231.

[19] Int. and Comp. Law Quar., vol. 6 (1957) p. 330, quoting "House of Lords Debates," vol.

200, cols. 847 and 849, Dec. 11, 1956; see also Bowett, op. cit., p. 186.

[20] Myres S. McDougal and Florentino P. Feliciano, "Legal Regulation of Resort to International Coercion: Aggression and Self-Defense in Policy Perspective," Yale Law Journal, vol. 68, No. 6 (May 1959), pp. 1057, 1146.

[21] Ibid., p. 1147, n. 260.

[22] Ibid., p. 1148.

A Letter-Petition to the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1962

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, with the Senate having now passed its so-called compromise bill authorizing the purchase of $100 million worth of U.N. bonds, as requested by the administration, presumably the House will act on similar legislation in the very near future.

In this connection, 501 constituents of mine, residing in Seattle, Wash., recently addressed a letter to the President of the United States, which they titled "A Re-Declaration of Independence." These constituents characterize themselves, and properly so, as sovereign citizens of these United States of America and as such, they have exercised their constitutional right of petition in so addressing the President.

The entire text of this letter-petition was reprinted in the Ballard News, one of the leading weekly publications in Seattle, under date of Wednesday, March 28, 1962. As such, the text of this petition is now public property.

Inasmuch as the subject matter of this letter has a direct bearing on the administration's request for authority to purchase $100 million worth of U.N. bonds, I think the Members of the House will be interested in the views of these sovereign citizens before considering legislation involving the purchase of these U.N. bonds. Therefore, I include the full text of this petition as it appeared in my local paper without further comment, believing that the views expressed speak for themselves:

A REDEDICATION OF INDEPENDENCE—AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

SEATTLE, WASH.,
March 12, 1962.

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Mr. PRESIDENT: We, the undersigned 501 sovereign citizens of these United States of America, both petition and demand that your high office exert the maximum influence to the end that H.R. 9567 be enacted into law in order that the rescission and revocation of this once glorious Republic's membership in the Red-controlled United Nations Organization be accomplished as expeditiously as the mechanism of emergency legislative procedure will permit. No vacuous promises or international pledges can reassure us or conceivably justify further futile attempts to merge Christian Americanism with atheistic communism. Coexistence is surrender. Our intent and purpose is this Nation's complete, unqualified, and absolute withdrawal from this international death-trap of our national sovereignty and to forever remove the headquarters of this spy's nest from our American homeland. At this late hour it should be glaringly apparent, even to the most gullible, that most, if not all of this Nation's major ills stem from this leprous aorta that supplies our present spiritual, social, economic, and political bloodstreams. All other remedies are of no avail, should we forever lose our national sovereignty and constitutional government.

Mr. President, we are fully cognizant of the awesome responsibility of your office, and the tremendous press of the multitudinous issues with which you are continuously confronted. It is obvious that you must place the greatest reliance on your advisory staffs. Your position is most unenviable because yours is the greatest burden of any Chief Executive since our Founding Fathers fought and died to win our national independence. In the extant world crisis our cherished American heritage is not only in immediate jeopardy, but the enslavement of the entire world's peoples necessarily depends directly upon America's triumph or defeat. If the light of freedom is extinguished in this last major Christian bulwark against godless international socialism, the darkness of atheistic tyranny will reign universally throughout humanity's temporal era.

Your burden has been increased by reason of our Congress having neglected its constitutional function for many years. In the main, our legislative branch of Government has long since assumed the role of a "seconding" or "endorsing" body in vital domestic legislation and in critical foreign relations issues. It is our determination to forcibly remind our Congress of their constitutional responsibility to bear their proportionate share of your burden in this hour of national peril. Exhaustive research and officially documented findings disclose that our recent Chief Executives have been influenced, and even directed by individuals and groups not dedicated to this Nation's best interests. It is our verifiable indictment that the Business Advisory Council and Council of Foreign Relations for many years have most materially undermined the loyal functioning of our State Department. To quote your words of wisdom in your Los Angeles speech: "It was not civil war that removed China from the free world; it was treason in high places." We might well ponder the fact that the traitor, Alger Hiss, was one of the principal architects of the United Nations Charter.

We are of the firm conviction that if this Nation maintains adequate defensive armament, the enemy poses no threat of armed might. In the absence of direct or indirect aid from other nations, the enemy has not yet acquired 1 square mile of territory by armed conquest. Since they require a standing army of approximately 6 million to enforce enslavement upon their satellite nations, it should be obvious that armed hostilities is the very last resort they could hazard. Infiltration and subversion have ever been the devouring jaws of the Reds. How well these tools have served their purpose in America is reflected by the sizable number of UNESCO proponents (Oct. 18, 1951, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Extension of Remarks by Hon. John T. Wood, in the House of Representatives), and National Council of Churches (June 6, 1961, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix, Extension of Remarks of Hon. DALE ALFORD, in the House of Representatives).

In viewing our tragic record of continuous blundering in foreign relations we reflect in righteous indignation that such consistency in error cannot logically be attributed to coincidence. An unbroken thread of design becomes most manifest. The American people cannot reasonably expect that you, alone, could possibly eradicate the accrued disloyal elements from Government officialdom during your short tenure of office. However, we pledge that awakened, genuinely patriotic Americans throughout this land are rapidly uniting and are directing the Congress to exert untiring effort to the end result that all Red trojan horses be stampeded forever from our American fortress or meted out the full measure of justice so rightly accorded to traitors. This element now brazenly sponsors the "Program for General and Complete Disarmament of the Peaceful World" (Department of State publication 7277, obtainable from U.S. Government Printing Office, 15 cents per copy. By some coincidence their supply of this publication was depleted as of Jan. 19, 1962). We will not even consider repealing our own Declaration of Independence, nor betraying our American tradition by exchanging these sacred heritages for the unenforcible guarantees of the United Nations Organization. Our rivers would be crimson-hued before we would acquiesce in the type of lasting peace imposed upon Hungary, China, Tibet, and many European Red satellite states—and the United Nations Organization, in the absence of enforcement powers, is unable to warrant more. The groundwork for our national coup de grace was most treasonably prepared years ago in the conspiratorial framing of the United Nations Charter—article 51 thereof magnanimously grants the right of "self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security." How naive are the American people presumed to be?

The top commander of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations Organization has always been a Communist (Sobelov, Chernychev, Dobyrin, Zinchenko, Dragoslav, and Arkadev). Sobelov and Zinchenko masterminded our overall military strategy during the Korean war debacle, in which the flower of this Nation's manhood sustained 136,000 casualties, with 33,000 dead, and this is but a mild foretaste of what is in store for us if we surrender our defensive nuclear armament and submit America's destiny to the "benevolent" protection of the United Nations Organization. Before the Jenner Committee in 1954, the testimony of Generals Clark, Van Fleet, and Stratemeyer, and that of Admiral Joy, was summed up in the words of General Stratemeyer, quote: "We were required to lose the Korean war."

We are impelled to remind our State Department and other governmental branches responsible for our treaties and foreign relations of the all too elemental truism that nations are comprised of human beings who shape national policies and that, until there is an essential change in human nature for the better, no group of individuals or nations can enforce agreements or impose sanctions solely upon the honor system. We could not maintain domestic law and order without our police force and our courts. In view of this incontrovertible logic, the peace guarantees of the United Nations Organization become most vacuous and mythological. The design, of course, is to mindwash the American people into the necessity of an armed international police force and a world court that would supersede and nullify our Constitution and Bill of Rights. This will not come to pass, despite Mr. Warburg's prediction that "We shall have world government, whether we like it or not." Neither would a devious repeal of the Connally reservation diminish the militant resistance of loyal Americans in our sacred vow to preserve our national sovereignty and American autonomy. A recent Gallup poll mirrors the accelerated resurgence of genuine American patriotism in disclosing that 81 percent of the American people prefer a nuclear war to the enduring hell-on-earth under interna-

tional socialism that would be imposed by a United Nations Organization World Police Force. It logically and necessarily follows that we will preserve our American way of life by adequate defensive armament and by whatever means necessary.

To further ensure our national survival and to decelerate the trend toward national bankruptcy, we unreservedly refuse to further finance a United Nations organization global Frankenstein that would ultimately transform the U.S.A. into the U.S.S.A. It is common knowledge that the red bloc of nations have consistently declined to contribute their proportionate financial assessment to the maintenance of this universal peace-ensuring paralytic, and that the American taxpayers, on the overall, have been required to contribute approximately 80 percent. Are we fulfilling Lenin's prophesy that we will be induced to finance our own destruction? Should American taxpayers be compelled to support a world organization over which the enemy is gaining increasing control, but to which that same enemy refuses to contribute financially? Furthermore, no ceaseless deluge of internationalistic propaganda diffused by our news and entertainment media could ever convince us that this Nation cannot stand alone—when all the world knows that we have not only stood alone, but have borne the Western free world on our back for many years, besides which we have given financial assistance to several enemy satellite states. By some weird intellectual legerdemain we are told that we are so strong and wealthy that we can defend and subsidize half the world, yet we are so weak that we cannot defend ourselves without the aid of those whom we have subsidized.

As mounting public indignation forces facts from a muzzled press, we shudder at the harm already wrought upon the minds of young Americans in our tax-supported educational institutions in the glorification of one-worldism, the disparagement of nationalism, and the ridicule of patriotism in prolonged and expertly coordinated "conditioning" curricula, designed to substitute international interdependence for national independence. Ever increasing numbers of Americans are horrified in perceiving the end design of UNESCO, the poisoned artery of the United Nations organization that would induce us to surrender complete control of our educational system to UNESCO's international supervision. The UNESCO "Convention Against Discrimination in Education" is a treaty. If ratified by two-thirds of our U.S. Senate (and it is on the Senate docket) it will become the law of the land and supersede our Constitution. Its ratification would automatically remove education from under "domestic" law and control, poison the minds of our teachers or replace them, revise our textbooks and teach disloyalty to our children. This international socialist agency could close every parochial and private school in America (UNESCO Treaty, S. 1021, H.R. 7300, H.R. 7904, S. 1726). This treaty would invalidate the Connally reservation, guaranteeing noninterference in our domestic affairs by a World Court. UNESCO popularizes international socialism to the destruction of American nationalism. Can you conceive of the enemy tolerating experimentation in educational ideologies under their ironclad indoctrination program? To further debilitate our national strength countless alphabetical international "human betterment" agencies have been spawned and unwittingly espoused by many governmental agencies. Pointed reference is made to NDEA, UNRRA, WHO, GATT, ILO, ECOSCO, IMF, FAO, UPU, ICAO, WMO, ITU, and others, all fostered and nurtured by the parent United Nations Organization. Neither should we overlook mental health, fluoridation, metro, urban renewal, and other internationally inspired programs. The design and pattern are all too familiar.

An American President who fights to preserve this Nation's sovereignty will not stand alone. Ever-increasing numbers of awakened Americans are uniting and denouncing international socialism, intentionally misnamed "communism," as the all-inclusive evil incarnate. It must be that the crush of routine assignment has blinded our Congress to the imminent national crisis now apparent even to Mr. and Mrs. Average American, who finally recognize the United Nations Organization in its ghastly essential character and purpose. Its dismal and unbroken record of utter failure in maintaining world peace is a highlighted and repetitious tragedy of errors. Since its evil inception an additional 600 million human beings have been doomed to unending tyranny. If this hypocritical global shell had possessed requisite efficacy why were the creation of NATO and SEATO necessary, unless to mutually protect the signatories from the United Nations Organization that was purportedly founded to safeguard the peace and autonomy of all nations? Even the betrayal of this Nation's fighting forces in Korea by this international monstrosity was not factually reported to the American people by our internationally slanted news media. The loss of Cuba to the free world at long last has alerted even the most uninformed and apathetic American. Our growing ranks are dedicated to the sole purpose that you, our Chief Executive, will be provided with whatever congressional support is necessary to enable the fulfillment of your sacred oath of office—"to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States to the best of your ability."

We are unqualified instructing all members of our United States Senate that you must be relieved immediately of the oppressive responsibility of any and all executive agreements. This body must reassume its constitutional function in maintaining our representative form of Government.

To further bolster your position, we are mutually pledged to collectively and adequately resist any compromise or surrender of our religious, economic, military or political national independence or autonomy to any group of foreign nations. Countless thousands of Americans of greater stature than we have offered the supreme sacrifice upon freedom's altar to safeguard our American liberty and independence. We should be most unworthy of our priceless American heritage were we unwilling to sacrifice the same full measure to guarantee constitutional government to posterity. We would not rather be red than dead, and with God's help we shall remain free. Neither will our children nor successive American generations salute any flag other than the Stars and Stripes. It is not our intent that the anguished curses of unborn American generations shall justifiably revile our craven memory.

We are resolved, determined, and dedicated to getting these United States out of the United Nations Organization, and getting the United Nations Organization out of these United States, and we will not settle for less than the complete achievement of this objective.

As with great American Chief Executives of the past, may Almighty God enlighten and strengthen you in directing our course of action in the restoration of our national dignity, honor and self-respect.

Respectfully yours,

FORGOTTEN AMERICANS.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

All-Electric Furnace at Chattanooga, Tenn., First of Kind in United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. FRAZIER, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Speaker, on April 11, the Chattanooga Glass Co. will officially open the new all-electric furnace at Chattanooga, Tenn., and I am proud to call attention to a pace-setting industrial development in my district in Tennessee.

While there are several all-electric glass furnaces in foreign countries, this is the first and only one of its type used in the production of glass containers in the United States. Mr. Reginald Armour, president of the Dorsey Corp., of which Chattanooga Glass is a division, described the furnace as marking another milestone in the industry's technological progress.

The new all-electric furnace is in addition to the company's three presently operating gas-fired furnaces. Chattanooga Glass president, J. Frank Harrison, pointed out that the company's location in the heart of the Tennessee Valley Authority area enables Chattanooga to be the forerunner of a general power transition which will take place over the next several decades. The furnace will use 48,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity every 24 hours and will be in continuous operation. Mr. Harrison explained that the electric furnace has not only a longer life, shorter repair time, small space requirements, and better quality production than other types, but its TVA location makes the superior power of electricity economically practical.

Mr. Armour and Mr. Harrison are to be commended for their foresight in bringing to the United States this superior technological development and for their contribution to the econom·· of Tennessee.

The article follows:

ALL-ELECTRIC GLASS FURNACE HERE TO BE FIRST OF KIND IN THE UNITED STATES

The Chattanooga Glass Co. expects to have its all-electric glass furnace—the first of its type ever used in a bottle-making plant in the United States—in operation in April, President J. Frank Harrison announces.

The furnace is a part of a $1 million expansion program being carried out in the company's Alton Park plant. The unit and related equipment being added will increase—the plant's capacity by 20 percent and employment by about 100 to a peak of 650, Harrison said.

The installation is the first step in an expansion program which is the result of the purchase of Chattanooga Glass by the Dorsey Corp., an investment company of New York City. The purchase plan was announced several months ago.

IN NEW BUILDING

Erection of a two-story building containing 36,000 square feet of floor space to house the new furnace, two new feeders, two Hartford forming machines and six sections having twice the output of machines presently in use and two annealing ovens is in the advanced stage.

O. B. Davis Construction Co. is the general contractor for the building. The site is adjacent to the present Alton Park plant and the new equipment is to be received and ready for installation as soon as the building is completed.

The new furnace will melt 60 tons of raw material into glass every 24 hours and will use 48,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, Harrison explained. Raw materials will be fed into the furnace continuously and molten glass will pour into two feeder lines.

The furnace will be the fifth in the Alton Park plant, the other four being gas-fired. The company also has a one-furnace plant at Corsicana, Tex.

In operation the electric furnace differs completely from those now in use.

In gas furnaces the gas burns above the raw materials. In the electric furnace electrodes extend into the raw material from the sides of the furnace. The material is melted from below the surface of the glass ingredients. While the heat in the material is at 2,760 degrees, it will be possible to place a hand on the top of the material since the upper layer remains cool.

Additional material is fed in from the top as the glass pours out of the bottom of the furnace into feeder lines at about 2,180 degrees.

The new furnace was designed by Larry Pemberthy of Seattle, a glass industry engineer. It will be assembled and installed by local craftsmen under direction of glass company engineers.

Harrison said that the all-electric furnace offers a number of advantages over those using other fuels. These include longer life, shorter repair time, economy in fuel cost, smaller space for installation, and a better quality of glass. Inside dimensions of this 60-ton furnace will be only about 17 by 17 feet by 25 feet high.

Chattanooga Glass is one of Chattanooga's pioneer industries and was founded in 1901. It produces more Coca Cola bottles than any other glass company in the world.

The company also produces a large volume of glass bottles for other soft drinks and glass containers for miscellaneous use.

There are several all-electric furnaces in glass container plants in foreign countries but the one here will be the first in the United States, Harrison said.

Federal Pilot Program in Manpower Retraining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, last Tuesday the U.S. Government inaugurated its pilot program in manpower retraining. One of the two sites chosen for the experiment was Newark, N.J. A primary reason is that out of the 190,000-odd unemployed in our State, 33,000 of them are young men and women between 16 and 22. Newark has a high proportion of this number. But New Jersey is not unique in having to deal with this question. It is a widespread and infectious problem. There is hardly a State in the Union that does not have similar difficulties. It was with these thoughts that I had in mind that I voted for, and Congress passed, President Kennedy's manpower retraining bill for unemployed workers.

In order to effectively carry out the retraining program, test cities were needed. It is gratifying to me that my State's largest city was chosen.

The greatest waste among the unemployed is the youth. Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg called this a "tragic waste of our young people." The Newark pilot project is designed to answer the questions "Why?" and "What can be done?" The youth of America are our future and we must help them. Franklin D. Roosevelt, one of our finest Presidents, once said: "Youth comes to us wanting to know what we may propose to do about a society that hurts so many of them." The unemployed youth present a critical problem.

Mr. President, I vigorously applaud the pilot program and am proud that Newark, N.J., has been chosen as one of the sites. I am sure that the city will cooperate in every way possible. With these thoughts in mind, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a series of editorials and articles from the Newark Evening News that are relevant to this topic.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, Mar. 24, 1962]

TEST CITY

Newark has been chosen, along with St. Louis, for testing job-finding and placement

programs for unemployed young men and women. This is another phase of the Federal Government's attempt to deal with chronic unemployment in the Nation. Last week's enactment of the manpower retraining program was aimed at getting at the hard core of joblessness resulting from automation and other "structural" changes in the economy.

The Government's pilot program is a special effort to stop what Labor Secretary Goldberg calls "this tragic waste of our young people." The two cities, representative of relatively large metropolitan centers where youth problems require critical examination, were chosen because as centers of diversified industry they may offer more job possibilities.

Locally, steps already have been taken in this direction. The Newark office of the State employment service has been making its own surveys on unemployed out-of-school youth. Mayor Carlin is to name a citizens' task force to study the problem previously explored by representatives of industry, education, social agencies and civic organizations.

If the Federal effort in Newark and St. Louis is successful, it holds the promise not only of reinforcing municipal programs, but of effective application elsewhere in the Nation.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Sunday News, Mar. 25, 1962]

CITY LEADERS WELCOME PILOT PROJECT FOR SCHOOL DROPOUTS

(By Robert F. Palmer)

The cancerous growth of the number of idle youth in Newark, uneducated for work and unprepared for modern life, is about to be placed in the national spotlight.

Even though it means wide attention will be focused on an uglier side of the face of the city, community leaders welcome the announcement last week that Newark will be the site of a Federal Government pilot project on unemployed, out-of-school youth.

City and school authorities, business and labor leaders, and community groups have long recognized the existence of an immense educational and social problem. Although many conferences have been held and some steps taken, nothing has been done locally on a large scale, the community leaders say, because of the very enormity and complexity of the problem. Federal attention, they say, is just what they have been advocating.

The Federal project, which will be launched Tuesday at a dinner in the Essex House, will seek to find the extent of the problem. Careful statistics never have been compiled. Noses haven't been counted.

HEADS TASK FORCE

The Federal project comes just as the city is taking steps to develop a task force to look into the problem. Acting on the recommendation of a special conference held last November by Mayor Leo P. Carlin and the Council of Social Agencies, the mayor last night announced the appointment of Francis S. Quillan, vice president in charge of personnel for the Prudential Insurance Co., as chairman of the task force.

The conference was attended by 130 representatives of business, industry, schools, labor, and social and civic groups. Besides asking the mayor to name a citizens' task force, the conference recommended that guidance facilities in the schools be expanded, that neighborhood centers for school dropouts be established, that methods by which industry and government can create new jobs be studied, and that efforts be made to obtain Federal and State funds.

At the conference, Quillan, who is president of the Glen Ridge Board of Education, discussed the problems resulting from the continuing disappearance of unskilled jobs or jobs requiring little skills.

AUTOMATION'S EFFECT

"Traditionally," he said, "ditchdigging has been the typical unskilled job. If you couldn't do anything else, you could dig ditches. Today, even ditchdigging is mechanized. Our problem is how to prepare these young people to live in a world where education and skill are increasingly necessary."

Quillan cited this example of diminishing jobs from his own Prudential Co.: "We have millions of insurance policies in force. Every year we mail out many millions of notices of premiums due. These are, in effect, bills. We used to have hundreds of girls typing these bills on typewriters. Today these jobs are gone. The bills are prepared automatically on large electric computers. This is automation."

Newark is one of two cities in the Nation—the other is St. Louis—picked for Federal pilot projects because they represent metropolitan areas where the problem of unemployed youth is critical. The projects are the reflection of a growing national concern over the problem and the desire of Federal officials to end what Secretary of Labor Goldberg calls "a tragic waste of our young people."

FIVE THOUSAND IDLE HERE

In Newark, there are 5,000 young people between 16 and 21 out of school and unemployed. They are among 33,000 in New Jersey and approximately 1 million in the Nation in that category. Job opportunities, in Newark, as in other cities, are decreasing, especially for the unskilled, as a result of automation and other technological developments.

Immigrant families are pouring into Newark in steadily increasing numbers and finding it difficult to obtain work. The influx is particularly heavy among Negroes and Puerto Ricans, now estimated at more than 40 percent of the city's population. It is estimated that 90 percent of the Puerto Ricans and 35 percent of the Negroes in the city have arrived in the last 10 years.

There is a serious school dropout problem with more than a third of the pupils leaving before high school graduation.

CRUX OF PROBLEM

The crux of the problem is that somewhere between school and work many young persons get lost and, in the central city areas, become what Dr. James B. Conant calls social dynamite. This, he said, can be blamed on unemployment, unrealistic school programs, and discrimination by employers and labor unions.

Publication by Conant in October 1961 of "Slums and Suburbs," gave added impetus to the efforts of community leaders to tackle the problem of jobless youth. Action in the Newark area included a survey by the Essex County section of the National Council of Jewish Women, and discussions by other agencies and education groups, in addition to the November conference.

All the Newark community leaders concerned with the problem of jobless youth emphasize the growing job-finding difficulties encountered by those who leave high school before graduation. This is the way Dr. Carrie R. Losi, director of guidance in the Newark school system, describes the dropout and his chances:

"Where a student has a pattern in school of no special skill, no serious-minded interest, poor achievement, weak personality traits, poor attendance, undesirable attitudes and work habits, then jobs and employers are hard to find. Even when we do succeed in getting job opportunities for this group, they just do not measure up. They can't meet the competition, discipline, and demands of industry because they are either unable or unwilling. They do not suddenly change patterns of behavior and become mature, self-reliant, ambitious individuals just because they turned 16 and are out in the labor market."

DROPOUT RATE

Dr. Losi insists that Newark's dropout rate of 35 percent compares well with that in other industrial cities where the range is from 40 to 50 percent. She says the Newark rate would be higher if it weren't for the intensive guidance program now in operation. Pupils are interviewed by counselors every term to keep them in the school program best suited to their needs, desires, and ability.

Any pupil showing a determination to leave is given a special "exit" interview at which efforts are made to get him to reconsider and remain in school, which some do. If he is still set on leaving, efforts are made to get him a job. In a followup program, letters are sent to those who left asking if they have a job and if they need help.

The dropouts are urged to continue their education at Central Evening High School while working during the day, and some of them do.

STUDIES EXPANDED

The dropout problem has been receiving increasing attention from the State department of education. Studies made for many years were expanded last year into the first full-scale dropout study in the Nation. Under the program, which will be made permanent, every principal in the State submits data on every pupil who leaves school, giving the reason he left.

Why do pupils leave school? The first compilation of data in the State study shows the reasons. During the halfyear between January and June 1961, a total of 7,831 youngsters dropped out. The greatest number, 3,336, left to enter or seek employment; 899 left because they were dissatisfied with school; 469 entered correctional institutions; 466 entered military service; 402 left for marriage; 266 had physical disabilities; 165 left because they changed their residence and didn't go back to school; 153 had emotional disabilities; 149 had social disabilities; 96 died; 81 left for financial reasons; 64 had mental disabilities. The reason for leaving couldn't be determined in 156 cases and 1,129 left for a combination of other reasons.

The total leaving school in Essex County was 1,418, or 18 percent of the State figure.

Although State law requires school attendance until age 16, the statistics show that 722 boys under 16 and 579 girls under 16 dropped out. Of those 16 and over, 4,040 boys and 2,490 girls left school.

The rate of dropout was highest in grade 10, closely followed by grade 11 and grade 9.

The dropout situation will be one of the areas that will be studied intensively in the Federal pilot project. The study will be undertaken by the New Jersey Division of Employment Security, with funds to be made available by the Federal Bureau of Employment Security. While concentrating on Newark, the project also will cover the area served by the Newark industrial and service office of the State employment service, which comprises all of Essex, Harrison, Kearny, and East Newark in Hudson, and North Arlington in Bergen.

The project is aimed at factfinding and jobfinding and developing test programs which might be applied in other cities and towns throughout the Nation.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, Mar. 29, 1962]

JOBS FOR YOUTH

Encouraging stimulus on the State and local level has been given the Federal Government's pilot project that puts Newark in the vanguard of an attack on persistent unemployment among youths who drop out of school.

Heading the Newark study, one of two like it in the Nation, will be Simeon F. Moss, a special assistant to Labor Commissioner Male. By training and experience, Mr. Moss should be qualified for the task of exploring new methods of apprenticeship and job placement aimed at arresting deplorable waste of young manpower.

Additional assistance will be provided by a task force named by Mayor Carlin under the chairmanship of Francis S. Quillan, vice president of the Prudential Insurance Co. As Prudential's director of employment and president of Glen Ridge's Board of Education, Mr. Quillan is well acquainted with the problems, and opportunities, facing young jobseekers.

What these prospects may be is evident in Labor Department statistics. They show that unskilled workers represent 5 percent of the Nation's labor force, but 13½ percent of the long-term unemployed. Semiskilled form 18 percent of the working force, but 32 percent of the chronically unemployed. Skilled workers are 11 percent of the labor force, but only 2.8 percent remain out of work for long periods.

A million youngsters annually contribute to the chronically unemployed by leaving school before they complete their studies.

Thirty-five percent of Newark's high school students have been dropping out before graduation, one of the reasons it was chosen for a national project. The problem here also is aggravated by the fact that many are Negroes and Puerto Ricans, the children of recent migrants who themselves have trouble finding steady work.

It is necessary, therefore, that the Newark youth demonstration project proceed on several fronts. Improved counseling in the schools to reduce the number of dropouts is part of it. Testing, training, and job placement also must be developed.

Progress will depend in large measure on the cooperation of employers and union officials. Old barriers of prejudice must be removed as much by the cooperative attitude of potential workers as by those who will be encouraged to hire them. But progress the project must, for hard-core unemployment remains a persistent blot on the free enterprise system.

Unless erased among the young, it will grow worse as they advance in age. The burden on the Nation will therefore magnify, expanding relief rolls and depriving victims of the opportunity all deserve.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, Mar. 22, 1962]

YOUNG AND IDLE—33,000 IN NEW JERSEY JOBLESS, SAYS MALE

TRENTON.—Some 33,000 New Jersey young men and women are among the State's 190,000-odd unemployed, State Labor Commissioner Raymond F. Male reported today.

Most of the 33,000 young jobless—from 16 to 22 years old—in the State are in urban areas, and a majority of them are males, he said.

The Federal Government's pilot drive to get to the bottom of the reasons why there are 5,000 jobless young people in Newark does not mean that the problem is not prevalent throughout the State, and outside it, Male declared.

The Federal program will begin Tuesday at a meeting at the Essex House, Newark, at which U.S. Labor Secretary Goldberg, Governor Hughes, and Male will speak.

MANY REASONS

The 33,000 young jobless are both out of school and out of work, many of them having dropped out of school before finishing, the commissioner declared. "They represent a big slice of our statewide unemployment total," Male declared.

He said many reasons are suspected.

"Many young people who didn't finish school don't have enough background to fill jobs which are more than menial," Male said. Automation and new technology, which are putting older, often more needy people out of work, doesn't help either.

Also, he said, discrimination appears to be a big factor. Last year, 6 percent of the Nation's white work force was jobless, compared to 12.5 percent for Negroes.

New Jersey's cities, like Newark, have thousands of Negroes and Puerto Ricans who are faced with job bias. Nationally, 15.1 percent of 18- and 19-year-old white boys and 23.9 percent of Negro boys are out of work, he said.

Newark's high proportion of minority youngsters and its in-between size as a city were major factors in its selection for the Labor Department study, Male said.

Another factor in unemployment of the young is deemphasis of neighborhood jobs with disappearance of such erstwhile institutions as the corner market, said Male. Reluctance to hire Army- or Navy-bound youngsters is less of a factor, he declared.

On the average, it takes a youngster two to three times longer than an adult to find a job. While the jobhunting period used to be about 4 months, it is now 6 to 7, he said. Another problem for authorities is the idle time this affords for youths to get into trouble with the police, Male said.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, Mar. 31, 1962]

SESSION TUESDAY ON IDLE YOUTHS—UNITED STATES SETTING UP SPECIAL OFFICE FOR PILOT STUDY HERE

The Federal Government's pilot program to learn all about the problems of 5,000 unemployed young men and women in Newark will begin Tuesday at a meeting at the Robert Treat Hotel.

Secretary of Labor Goldberg, Governor Hughes and Raymond F. Male, State commissioner of labor and industry, will speak at the session, which will be attended by local and school authorities, community groups, and representatives of business and labor.

In Washington, a U.S. Labor Department spokesman today said a separate office, staffed by about 35 persons, will be set up in Newark to direct the pilot project. The office will remain in existence until at least June 1963, he said. The staff members will be hired by the New Jersey State Employment Service, he said.

ALSO IN ST. LOUIS

Newark and St. Louis were announced yesterday as the sites for the pilot project to test improved job-finding and placement programs for unemployed young people.

Almost every large city in the country was considered during a 4-month period when the program was under study, Labor Department officials said. It was decided that a study in the bigger cities would require more staff resources than the Department wanted to use.

Eventually Newark and St. Louis were selected as metropolitan areas large enough to provide the kind of information the Department is seeking.

Newark, according to one official has had considerable immigration and also is faced with a serious school dropout problem. There is no immediate plan for any job retraining program to be included in the demonstration, according to one expert in the Bureau of Employment Security in Washington.

DETAILS AWAITED

Goldberg said yesterday there are a million out-of-school youngsters who are unemployed. Many of them are dropouts, children who do not complete their high school education.

Herbert A. Bergen, manager of the Newark industrial and service office of the State Employment Service, said he is eagerly awaiting details of the plans for the study. He said the Newark office has been doing its own surveys on jobless, out-of-school youth for some time. "Now, it seems, we'll study these problems on a much bigger scale."

Mayor Leo P. Carlin is expected to name in the near future a citizens' task force to examine the problem of unemployed, out-of-school youth and coordinate activities of groups concerned with the problem.

The task force was recommended following a conference on jobless youth in November attended by 130 representatives from business, industry, school, social agencies, and civic organizations.

LACKED RESOURCES

Carlin said today:

"We've recognized for some time that the problem exists here and that a study was called for. But we didn't have the resources to undertake the size and type of project we felt was needed. Actually, something like this is long overdue."

The mayor said he felt the task force he will appoint could act as an advisory committee to those conducting the pilot program.

Goldberg described the national problem as a critical one. The pilot programs will attempt to learn in what capacities the unemployed are apt to find jobs, which employers will hire such young people and the extent of unemployment in various age groups and characteristics of the unemployed.

Information also will be sought on whether additional training is needed and problems related to migration of rural youths to cities.

Freedom To Pray

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, in troubled days such as we are living in now, when the threat of all-out nuclear warfare hovers over the world, and when the very existence of our civilization and our own American way of life is continually in danger, we find a ridiculous and explosive case being argued before our Supreme Court. Due to a simple little prayer being recited in the public schools in the State of New York—and I know this is true also of schools in many other States—a group of five families has made this attempt to impose their will and their belief—or should I say, lack of belief—on the entire United States of America.

Freedom and liberty in this country was meant for everyone—and while I do not feel our public schools should undertake to teach or advocate any certain type or kind of religion—neither do I feel they should be a forum for advocating atheism.

The Supreme Court has many many urgent and important matters to decide. I feel a case such as this is merely a mischievous one, but the kind of mischief which is not in fun.

The Washington Evening Star headed its editorial page on Thursday, April 5,

1962, with a fine commentary on this case before the Supreme Court, entitled "Freedom To Pray." I would like to ask unanimous consent that this article be included with my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

FREEDOM TO PRAY

"Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers and our country."

This simple little prayer, which has been recommended by the New York Board of Regents for use in public schools throughout the State, is now the subject of a great debate, so to speak, in the Supreme Court of the United States.

This is so because a handful of persons, five parents with children in one of the schools of New Hyde Park, Long Island, are suing to have the prayer declared unconstitutional. They themselves want no part of it, and even though virtually all their fellow New Yorkers may be quite happy, and even anxious, to have their own offspring recite it each morning in class, the suers are determined to impose their will, and our highest tribunal is letting them have their say—which is as it should be.

Yet it all seems to us to be a rather bleak business in terms of the free mind, the human spirit, and the majority's right to pray, if it wishes to do so, despite a tiny minority's objection. As in the McCollum case, for example, why should our Supreme Court have ruled—as it did, in effect, in 1948—that a single atheist is entitled not merely to practice atheism, but also to prevent believers from holding certain types of released-time religious instruction in our public schools? And why should this happen in a land whose founders thought it rather important to have faith in God?

The Mayflower Compact of 1620 begins, for example, with these words: "In the name of God, amen." And the Philadelphia Congress' historic declaration of 1775 is studded with such phrases as "the Divine Author of our existence" * * * "a reverence for our great Creator" * * * "before God" * * * and "the supreme and impartial Judge and Ruler of the Universe." And our Declaration of Independence, of course, speaks of "Nature's God," and of people being "endowed by their Creator," and of placing "a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence." And here are some pertinent words from George Washington's Farewell Address:

"Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labour to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths, which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition, that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure; reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle."

Clearly, regardless of how the Supreme Court may decide on New York's prayers, our country has a strong religious basis in history and tradition. Until recent years the concept of God and the validity of prayer have not been seriously challenged in America, but now we have all sorts of militant people who think otherwise. Legalisms to one side, we don't understand them because we can't see how petitioning a Divine Providence violates the first amendment.

The No-Longer Almighty Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the current issue of Life magazine contains an interesting editorial entitled "The No-Longer Almighty Dollar." It is an interesting, constructive analysis of the situation affecting the U.S. dollar.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NO-LONGER ALMIGHTY DOLLAR

The monetary unit of the state of New Hampshire was the English shilling, by provision of the State constitution, until the year 1948. That's right, 1948, the year of Harry Truman's election. In that year the citizens of New Hampshire voted (about 2 to 1) to rescind the old provision of 1784 and officially replace the shilling with the dollar, which they had all been using anyway for over a hundred years.

This tiny footnote to history is recited only to illustrate a basic fact about money: it is not always what the law says it is. Just as the people of New Hampshire had allowed their official shillings to go out of use, so the people of any country will accept a more valuable or convenient currency when conditions warrant. Money values are finally set by people, not governments. Cigarets were money in Germany in 1945–48. Beaver skins, tobacco and wampum were American money in colonial times. The $ sign is an abbreviation not for U.S. currency but for pesos, which were legal tender here until 1857. The dollar did not become almighty overnight.

Nor is it almighty now. There was a period—roughly from the 1930's to the 1950's—when it was beyond question the world's most desired currency. But since then enough questions have been asked about the dollar, especially in Europe, to cast a deep shadow over its supremacy.

What Europeans think of our money is not just another problem of U.S. prestige or "image" to be handled by the Voice of America. The dollar's valuation abroad must ultimately reflect—and be reflected in—its real value at home; there is a real if roundabout connection between a London gold auction and an Indiana payday. To explore that connection will help suggest policies for the dollar that can answer Europe's questions and serve American interests as well.

American monetary experience has been a little different from Europe's. As Dr. Arthur Nussbaum points out in his "A History of the Dollar," Americans have been more ingenious and more experimental with their money, and less in awe of the millennial mystique of gold. Americans were the first Western people to experiment successfully with paper money, not the least reason being that Benjamin Franklin was in the printing business, wanted the contract to make Pennsylvania's paper money and wrote a well-considered guide for its use. What Americans always wanted was a useful and plentiful money, not money for its own sake. There has always been a utilitarian candor about American money and the public attitude toward it. The first of the paper "continentals" (which became a synonym for worthlessness) bore the engaging motto, "The Issue Is in Doubt." Nor would "In God We Trust," now stamped by law—since 1955—on all our coins, seem the ideal monetary slogan.

The European experience has been longer and sadder. The hold of gold on Europeans, notably French peasants, bespeaks their inherited knowledge that no government can long be trusted with money, neither a coin-clipping king nor an inflating parliament. Whether the cynical European or the euphoric American view of money is truer to the facts of politics, especially future politics, is a nice question. At any rate, these separate experiences have now merged in a common set of problems which will require a common monetary doctrine—if not a common money.

The dollar first became an important international currency after the Civil War, when our thriving exports and our need for foreign capital made it possible and desirable for us to tie the dollar to the old "gold standard." This arch-type of world monetary order was maintained and managed by London bankers for the health and growth of world trade. World War I and the depression of 1929–39 brought this orderly system to an end. The pound itself cut loose from gold in 1931. The dollar did not entirely cut loose; instead F.D.R. nationalized all the gold in the United States. From that day to now, gold is used for almost nothing but settling debts between national governments. American citizens (unlike Frenchmen and many others) can't own it at all, except to adorn their fingers, ear lobes, or teeth. And most of them don't care.

It was World War II that made the dollar virtually almighty among currencies. There were two reasons: First, the postwar United States enjoyed a virtual monopoly of undamaged productive facilities so that dollars could buy things other currencies could not. Second, the U.S. policy of buying and selling gold at $35 an ounce had proved a stable factor amid prewar and wartime monetary chaos, and had brought about half of all the gold in the world to the United States. This omnipotence lasted until the early fifties, when both monopolies were undermined.

Our monopoly of productive facilities was undermined—thanks in part to Marshall aid but also to some strict European money management—when Europe recovered and began competing successfully with U.S. exports. Our control of gold was undermined—thanks in part to lax U.S. money management—when the United States began running a series of deficits in its balance of payments. Again, most Americans didn't care very much. In 1958, these balance-of-payments deficits began showing up in the form of massive losses of U.S. gold. This drain of gold has not stopped.

The U.S. balance of payments is what we owe (unfavorable) or are owed (favorable) after all that we have spent, lent and invested abroad is set against all that foreign countries have spent, lent and invested here. If this balance is unfavorable year after year (as ours has been, except for 1957, every year since 1950), and is not reversed, it leads to the nearest equivalent of bankruptcy that can overtake a sovereign nation, namely exchange controls. That would mean U.S. Government rationing of all dollars going in and out of our country and thus control of all our foreign trade, travel, and investment, with many unpleasant internal consequences.

This form of bankruptcy can be forestalled so long as a country has enough gold (or convertible currencies) to sell against its unfavorable balance of payments. That is what we've been doing since 1958. But nobody has enough gold to do that forever. It is a strange experience for Americans, after years of monopoly, to be reminded that foreign accounts must balance somehow. One high New Frontier official, when he got the idea, is said to have remarked, "I see. We have to pay our debts to foreigners, even if not those we owe to ourselves."

Alas, the distinction is not that easy. It is worth recalling what led to our enormous gold losses of recent years, and the flight of short-term capital that accompanied them. The year 1958 brought a sudden U.S. recession, and a consequent deficit in the U.S. Government's domestic budget (not to be confused with our balance of payments abroad) of a whopping $12.4 billion. This shocked many important Europeans.

What shocked them still more was to observe that, despite this recession, U.S. prices and wage costs did not go down at all. It looked as though nothing, neither a business-minded government nor a $12.4 billion recession, could stop the steadily growing inflationary influence in the U.S. economy. If so, the U.S. economy had become incapable of the structural corrections essential for competitive power in trade. Although the power and usefulness of dollars in world trades still overshadows gold's, the universal confidence the dollar once enjoyed moved closer to the stark fact of its gold convertibility, and that will last only as long as our supply of gold.

The United States could, of course, restore its balance-of-payments position at once. It could call home all its oversea forces, stop foreign aid and investment, and otherwise cut back its world political commitments to those of a second-class power. Even if the dollar should then rise technically in foreign exchange markets, that would be small recompense for the loss of political confidence that such a retreat would cause throughout the Western World.

The alternative solution is wiser and safer: to increase the difference between our exports (about $20 billion last year) and our imports (about $15 billion)—chiefly by increasing our exports. To make this possible, the United States must demonstrate control of its domestic price level and its ability to grow without the illusory aid of creeping inflation. This demonstration will require two steps.

The first is a balanced Government budget for 1962–63. It is no accident that a decade of balance-of-payments deficits climaxed a longer period of domestic budgetary deficits (25 in the last 32 years). The Kennedy budget for fiscal 1963 promised a slight surplus, but the promise grows more doubtful as 1962 wears on. Much as the statement would surprise such hard-money stalwarts as Andrew Jackson and Grover Cleveland, one wing of Kennedy's advisers says that "the Democrats never won an election on a balanced budget." But if the Government cannot control its own expenditures, the fear or fact of inflation remains real and industry is less able to earn the pounds, francs, and marks—or gold—that foreigners must be paid in. The first party to install exchange controls is not likely to win many elections, either.

The second essential step is up to American business and labor, who are directly responsible for industrial costs. It is now high time that prices, and perhaps also profits for the sake of investment, began to share more of the gains—hitherto chiefly commanded by wages—from our general increases in industrial productivity. The current steel negotiations are a test of this sharing. As Arthur Goldberg has said, the U.S. balance of payments wasn't even an issue in the last (1959) steel wage contract; but this time it is—or should be—the central "national interest" issue. Only if industrial prices (of which steel is the leader) are low at home can they be genuinely competitive abroad.

Unemployment, and the sluggishness of the current recovery, are the two chief excuses for higher Federal budgets and industrial wage costs. Neither is a good enough excuse. Some kinds of unemployment, including much of ours, are better cured by lower wages than by higher.

Only if we can control our Federal budget and our industrial costs can we reasonably expect the needed increase in U.S. exports over the next few years. The export promotion campaign launched by Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges will of course be helpful in this aim; but competitive values are the sine qua non. We need only a 10 percent or 15 percent increase in our exports to achieve equilibrium in our balance of payments, an objective which the administration hopes to achieve by the end of 1963. The hope is plausible but by no means sure. The need is beyond question.

Meanwhile our "money managers," the Treasury and the Federal Reserve, have shown a strong grasp of the problem and have taken all the subsidiary steps toward balance within their power. They have moved in on interest rates in such a way as to curb the flight of short-term capital abroad without making long-term capital too expensive for internal borrowing and expansion. They have "tied" almost all our foreign aid to the purchases of U.S. exports. They have arranged a system of close collaboration with European money managers. They have persuaded other NATO members, especially Germany, to buy more arms in the U.S. and to prepay some of their dollar debts. They have even gone into the foreign exchange markets and a London gold pool in order to conduct counterraids against speculators against the dollar. But the more they do these subsidiary things, the better they realize that a reliable balance of U.S. payments cannot be reached unless the U.S. economy keeps control of its costs and improves its competitive power in world markets.

Such are the stern realities of the world position of the dollar. It is still the key currency, "the sun around which other currencies revolve" (as West Germany's Economics Minister Erhard calls it). But unless it stays so, and keep the revived rivalry of gold in its place, the Western system of expanding trade and free payments could go into another decline or even collapse.

Even when we get our own payments back in balance, the fight for an orderly international money system will not be entirely won. We may face what Sir Oliver Franks and others have warned against, a "liquidity crisis," meaning that one or more nations will always be in balance-of-payments trouble under the present monetary system. For example, if we should tip the balance-of-payments scales sharply in our favor, then Europe could again grow short of gold and dollar reserves, enough to bring the mark, pound and franc under pressure. Is there not enough reserve money in the world to enable Europe and America to thrive at the same time? Can one feel flush only at the other's expense?

This problem, although as yet more theoretical than real, has already elicited some ingenious solutions. Some would change the basic nature of the International Monetary Fund; others would return to the full gold standard at a higher gold price. Our money managers think they have anticipated it by their recent negotiation of a $6 billion increase in national drawing rights in the International Monetary Fund. They count on their increasingly close collaboration with European central bankers to assure monetary order through skillful management of the leading currencies. Their management so far incites confidence because they are committed to the maintenance of the system of expanding competitive trade and free payments so painfully built since World War II. They know that this system depends on a strong dollar and none of them, Americans or Europeans, will sleep well until they see U.S. exports rise and conquer the U.S. balance of payments deficit.

This competitive test of our money is the only one that promises greater real prosperity for the West and the whole world. It is the first step toward any new international monetary order. Once taken, it will have earned us time to rethink the problem of better international payment machinery and the role of gold therein.

Can human money managers, however cooperative, ever replace gold's ancient magic and certainty? Some of them think so; yet few want to expunge it entirely from the world monetary scene. Gold's hold on man may be irrational—a barbarous relic, in the words of that proud destroyer of the old gold standard, John Maynard Keynes. It nevertheless provides a hard recourse from official currencies for people who have reason not to trust their governments, and is therefore a check on what any government can get away with. When the ideal currency arrangement is worked out between the United States and Europe, gold should have a place in it. It will be the sign that the Atlantic governments do not fear their own people, and are strong enough to make room for distrust as well as hope.

A Tribute to the Late Secretary General of the United Nations, Dag Hammarskjold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I appeared as a guest speaker at a meeting of the Conference of Jewish Women's Organizations in Los Angeles, Calif., recently.

As part of the program for the meeting, Mrs. Maurice Turner, of Los Angeles, presented a tribute to the late Secretary General of the United Nations, Dag Hammarskjold. I was so impressed by the tribute Mrs. Turner gave I requested a copy for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that this beautiful tribute by the past president of the B'nai B'rith Women, Mrs. Maurice Turner, be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

IN MEMORIAM

It is altogether fitting that this annual meeting of the Conference of Jewish Women's Organizations dedicated to the United Nations should be opened with a tribute to its late Secretary General.

Dag Hammarskjold summed up the goal of the United Nations in these words: "There is a basic morality that motivates most people. The great moment is the moment of realization in people that their desire for decency exists not only in their own groups but in others. Someday, I know it, people will

realize that the United Nations is a reflection of that desire, and if they tear it down, they will have to build it up again."

Dag Hammarskjold breathed life into that reflection and became for many people the personal embodiment of the United Nations and all it stood for. This was his philosophy; for this he strove; for this he died.

He brought to the art of diplomacy the clean, clear vision of the mountain climber that he was, accustomed to aspiring to great heights, and to great heights did he aspire in and for the United Nations. His moral courage was surpassed only by his efforts to keep the world at peace. This caused him to meet head on any challenge anywhere even at great personal danger when the principles of the United Nations were at stake.

His was an indomitable spirit motivated by an abiding passion to make the United Nations work, to translate into concrete terms man's hunger for human dignity, freedom and security. No spectator was he but a man of action always seeking new horizons to serve the cause of peace through the United Nations. He fought its enemies every inch of the way. His stature can perhaps best be measured by the tremendous impact of his death and by the fact that the 7-week great powers' struggle in U.N. to replace him is not yet over.

Few have failed to grasp the significance of his passing, the result of which jeopardizes the future of the United Nations as a vital factor in world affairs. Dag Hammerskjold carried a heavy responsibility, never swerving from it, never deserting his principles or this post even under the heaviest barrage of Soviet abuse.

It is the knowledge that our years are limited that makes them precious. Dag Hammerskjold made his days count. He exemplified by his life that the highest destiny of an individual is to serve rather than to rule. Since life is not measured by the number of years we live but rather by what we achieve in the days of our life, who shall then say that Dag Hammerskjold did not have a full, a rich life, too short though it was?

We know that when the sun goes down below the horizon, it is not set. The heavens glow for a long time after its departure. And when the sun goes down on a man who has led a meaningful life, the sky of his world remains luminous for a long time after he is out of sight. Such a man cannot die out of this world because when he goes he leaves so much of himself behind. He continues to live in many ways as Dag Hammerskjold lives today, not only in the halls of the United Nations, where his presence will be felt for a long, long time to come, but he will live in the hearts of thinking men and women everywhere who must carry on the fight for which he gave his life on the battlefield of peace.

It is in this spirit that the Conference of Jewish Women's Organizations pays its tribute to the memory of Dag Hammerskjold.

MRS. MAURICE TURNER,
United Nations Chairman.

Voluntary Milk Quota Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Congress presently is attempting to find a solution for the imbalance of production and utilization of farm commodities.

In dairying, particularly, we face a serious problem.

Unfortunately, the administration has come up with no realistic solution.

Neither has the Congress devised a workable formula maintaining production and utilization in regulated good balance.

We recognize, of course, that—while legislative action can help to resolve much economic problems—there is a need also for realistic action by the dairy industry itself.

Recently, Dr. Arvid Knudtson, director of the dairy section of the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperatives urged dairymen to adopt a voluntary milk quota plan as a solution to the production-consumption imbalance.

The "Farmers Friend," of Green Bay, Wis., published an article entitled "Voluntary Milk Quota Plan Best Solution." Reflecting upon this, and other aspects of the farm situation, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOLUNTARY MILK QUOTA PLAN BEST SOLUTION, BBC TOLD—LIKENED TO FEED GRAIN PLAN; BILL 10010 DEAD ISSUE

SHAWANO.—A voluntary cutback in milk production by individual producers is the best method to bring supply in line with demand and maintain farm income, the director of the dairy section of the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperatives said here last week.

Dr. Arvid Knudtson spoke to 500 members and delegates of Bodger Breeders Cooperative at the 21st annual meeting. He said the administration's dairy quota proposal was a "dead horse."

Knudtson said the voluntary program, based along the lines of the feed grain program was "more politically feasible" than any other plan offered thus far. He said it would generate less opposition from Southern and Eastern dairymen than any other proposal.

The program favored by Knudtson was termed an "up and down the road" plan that would leave it up to the individual farmer whether or not to participate. He said the agriculture department "did not give its blessing to the plan."

Under the plan, dairy price supports would be set at $3.11 per hundred for manufactured milk. (This is 75 percent of parity for milk with 3.8 percent butterfat content. With Wisconsin's 3.5 butterfat, the price would be about $3.06 per hundred.) Farmers who voluntarily decided to cut back production a minimum of 7½ percent would receive $3.40 per hundred. Knudtson said the 29 cents difference could be considered a direct payment.

Knudtson said proposals similar to the administration's were "going to crop up and will bear watching."

One, termed the Ellender plan after Senate agriculture committee chairman, ALLEN ELLENDER (Democrat of Louisiana) would give farmers an annual quota based on 1961 production. Quotas would be negotiable. A penalty of either $2.50 or $2.75 per hundred pounds would be levied on farmers who marketed more than their allotment. The penalties would be used to buy, store, and export surpluses. Two-thirds of the producers voting in a referendum this fall would have to approve the plan. If the proposal was okayed, direct payments would be made to producers who cut production 7½ percent.

Knudtson said more effective regulation of supply is necessary if farm incomes are to be maintained, but he warned that "obtaining a license to operate a control program will not be extracted from Congress with ease."

He said there is no "policy utopia that will cut Government cost, maintain farm income, impose no further restrictions and maintain prices to consumers all at the same time." A simple solution was impossible because of the diversification in agriculture itself and because Government assistance to farmers involved the entire economy, not just agriculture, Knudtson said.

He said past and current solutions did not do the job though some had their good points. He said the solutions offered were:

Price supports and storage must be limited because of the growing concern of taxpayers over the $9 billion food stockpile.

Direct payments, while some facets are good, it fails because it costs too much.

Expansion of demand. Domestically, if every person in the country were put on a "nutritionally adequate diet," food consumption would decline. "We simply eat too much." Overseas, some merit under the food-for-peace program but competition from Canada, Australia, and other nations is too intense to expect too much.

Supply adjustment production resources control failed because labor and capital were still free to boost output on remaining land. Except for the whole farm aspect of the soil bank, the plan too often retired poor land and found intensified farming on the remainder.

Labor control migration from farm to city has been going on for decades, but production still continues upward as smaller farms become units in more efficient operations.

Supply control to date, only flow of milk into classes has been curbed, total supply has not.

Kenneth Wallin, cooperative general manager, said despite the threat of the price-support cut, "Nobody seems to be carrying the ball, the dairy industry goes thrashing around and the Secretary of Agriculture becomes expendable."

Wallin said, "We need public understanding of our agriculture problem more than any one other thing."

He said farmers, in order to operate successfully, have employed "much greater trained brainpower and the end is not yet in sight." He said land-grant colleges such as the University of Wisconsin were largely responsible for training agricultural leaders.

Figures released for 1961 showed the cooperative had 27,882 members, more than 392,000 first services and an average of nearly 3,000 services per technician. The 1961 first service conception rate was 69 compared with 55 percent in the cooperative's first full year, 1941. The co-op operates in 29 Wisconsin counties and Menominee County, Mich.

Wallin said BBC was staying on top of research into solids not fat and protent content in milk. He said 14,000 to 15,000 dairy cows were now being tested to determine these characteristics. "There is and probably will be more emphasis on protein content in milk," Wallin said, because the consumer is dodging fats.

A resolution presented by the Calumet County BBC unit asked that no production controls be imposed without restrictions on dairy imports, that quotas be across the board and not exempt deficit areas and that free flow of milk between States be OK'd. The resolution was adopted unanimously.

Five members received true-type models of perfect cows in recognition of more than 100 first services in 1961. They were John H. Schmidt, Brown County, 102; Baumgartner Bros., Brown County, 108; Wilfred Jeanquardt, Door County, 109; John Ziegler, Manitowoc County, 114; and John Pincher, Shawano County, 117.

Trade Policy in an Interdependent World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the text of an address by Howard C. Petersen, special assistant to the President for trade policy, before the United Nations Association of Maryland in Baltimore on March 28. Included in this talk is a cogent analysis of some of the critical international problems that we face and the way in which the administration's trade bill, H.R. 9900, is related to them.

The address follows:

TRADE POLICY IN AN INTERDEPENDENT WORLD

(Address by Howard C. Petersen, special assistant to the President for trade policy before the United Nations Association of Maryland, Wednesday, March 28, 1962)

It is a genuine pleasure to be here tonight. You have given me the opportunity to retreat for a few minutes from the many intricate and special problems which go into the making of trade legislation and to view the matter instead through a wide-angle lens. I intend to take that opportunity, for in our very necessary and important concern over the benefits and threats of foreign trade to the various industries and trades in the American economy, a concern that spans the scale from the steel industry to the growers of creeping red fescue seed, it is often easy to miss that elusive thing called the national interest.

Trade policy these days involves a lot more than export advantages and import competition for American industry and agriculture. President Kennedy has called his Trade Expansion Act of 1962 "the expression of a nation" and that is just what it will be no matter how Congress disposes of the act. If the act emerges from the Congress with its authorities intact and clear, and its safeguards moderate and well-defined, the United States will have told the world in a most concrete way that it is ready, willing and able to face a future of much closer economic cooperation within the free world. If the act emerges crippled with restrictions, it will be interpreted widely as a vote of no confidence in the future.

To say that trade policy this year will provide a unique expression of this Nation's view of the future is not to say that it will solve any of the problems which immediately face us. Trade policy will not bring peace and stability in Vietnam or banish Castro from Cuba and his shadow from Latin America. It will not make an harmonious chorus out of the United Nations General Assembly, nor will it bring down the wall in East Berlin.

Trade policy is concerned with the long-distance races in foreign policy, not with the dashes. It is a test of the stamina of a nation, not its ability to turn on a burst of speed. But the problems of this day and age require stamina more than anything else. In a world in which peace of a kind is maintained only through what Churchill called the balance of terror, all policies which have a dimension in foreign affairs must be concerned with preserving the balance of hope. That is the real test of trade policy.

Today the free world alliance is undergoing a fundamental transformation. Across the Atlantic a new economic and political power is being formed in the guise of the Common Market. Across the Pacific the galloping growth of Japan, freedom's anchor in the Far East, is being translated into an insistent bid for genuine partnership with other trading nations. From both sides we hear the question: "What does America want? What will she do?"

In the resurrection of Western Europe and Japan we see the fruits of our own handiwork. If after World War II, when the United States possessed unchallenged power in the world, we missed many opportunities, we did use our power effectively and successfully to build up the economic muscle of free Europe and Japan. We did this out of a conviction that our security and well-being would be better served, not through encouraging a band of dependent followers, but through encouraging a partnership of equals with which to share the burdens and rewards of free world leadership.

To be sure, the alternative might have been Communist control in many of these countries. But throughout the Marshall plan much more than anticommunism was at work. The idea was alive then that the way to maintain the balance of hope in a world frozen in the balance of terror was to pool the resources and resourcefulness of the West's industrial might and use them to bring about economic advance in all free nations.

Today we are faced with the consequences of our success in the postwar years. As with all developments in the affairs of nations, these consequences are ambiguous. We have paid a price for our past successes in the form of a new predicament. President Kennedy put the matter simply when he said of our relations with our allies, "We either grow together or we grow apart."

In Japan and in Western Europe today there are complex economic forces at work which tend to force us apart from our major allies. The growth of Japan can only be sustained through steadily increasing trade, either with us or with somebody else. The growth of the Common Market, on the other hand, could result in restricting trade with the outside world in favor of a relatively self-contained and protected European market with almost unlimited demand for at least the next decade. The combination of these forces, Japan with its insistent need for foreign trade, Europe with its new and unformed personality—add up to a crucial turning point in the development of the free world alliance.

I have no doubt that there are many analysts in the Kremlin who are rubbing their hands in anticipation over the prospects for troublemaking which are inherent in this situation. The picture of Western Europe and the United States bickering over trade matters as the Common Market's new external tariff begins to have its effect on American exports—the picture of Japan denied full membership in the free world's trading system—these can make quite an exhibition in the gallery of Communist political theory. It's enough to give a new lease on life to that hoary old thesis of Lenin's which holds that capitalist countries will inevitably weaken themselves in disputes over foreign markets and foreign trade.

And there's always the prospect, too, of the United States—its exports to Europe stagnating or declining—forced through a balance-of-payments crisis to reduce its military commitments overseas, to cut back foreign aid and to withdraw from advanced positions in favor of positions further from the battleline. Finally, the Communists can play on the fears of the underdeveloped countries that what is in train is a rich man's trading club which will severely restrict the trading opportunities of the poorer nations in the name of protecting high wages and high living standards in the West.

There is no doubt that in the present rearrangement of the economic affairs of the free nations the Communists have many new opportunities for troublemaking. And perhaps it is well to consider these lurid possibilities if only to give added meaning to President Kennedy's warning that "We either grow together, or we grow apart."

However, I came here not to freighten you but to convince you. What is going on in the free world today doesn't follow the pattern of Communist theory; it is the result very largely of our own influence and of the influence of economic growth in a free society. We have come face to face with the consequences of our own successful diplomacy in the past. To become alarmed now and to try to float policy on a sea of alarmist rhetoric is only to denigrate our own achievements in the past.

For instance, it is true that in the formation of the Common Market outsiders are placed at a handicap. As internal tariffs are swept away and replaced by a common external tariff, our exports are placed at a disadvantage in comparison with our competitors in Europe. But this is not a cause for alarm; it simply means it's time for action, action to make sure that the new Europe turns outward, not inward.

If a German manufacturer came here and complained that he was being discriminated against because his competitor in Pennsylvania could sell in Maryland free of duty while he, the German, had to pay the U.S. tariff we'd all laugh and say, "But we're all Americans." We shouldn't cavil if the French or Italians or Germans or Dutch say to us "But we're all Europeans now." We haven't been tricked; this is something we've been urging ever since World War II.

The thing to do is to bargain down that Common Market tariff and, of course, this is a prime objective of President Kennedy's trade policy. To do this the President is going to have to have a great deal of bargaining authority. What he wants to do is to negotiate a historic trade agreement with the Common Market, designed to gradually widen over the next 5 years or so the area of completely free trade across the Atlantic, widen it to include the most modern industries on both sides. The stage is set for such an agreement, if the President gets the authority which he has requested.

The objective of this agreement would not be to create an exclusive trading partnership but an open trading partnership. There has been some misunderstanding on this score and let me correct it right now. It is precisely through lowering tariffs all around, not just between the United States and Europe, that the President's policy aims to ease the impact of the Common Market on the trade of other countries. Japan is very much a part of this agreement; so is Latin America and the members of the Commonwealth, whose special relations with Britain will be upset by Britain's membership in the Common Market. The objective is not to replace Indian textiles in Britain with Italian textiles; nor to replace the Latin American coffee bean with the African coffee bean. The objective is to open up the markets on both sides of the Atlantic to nondiscriminatory trade with all free nations.

There is another dimension to the President's trade policy which has a direct bearing on these matters. The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 aims at substituting a new kind of safeguard for the direct subsidy of tariff protection. It is called trade adjustment assistance and includes a bundle of measures designed to give selective help to individual firms and groups of workers who can show the prospect of genuine hardship as a result of accelerated import competition. Trade adjustment assistance is an investment, not a subsidy; it is designed not to protect firms and workers from com-

petition, but to assist then to get back into the competitive stream.

From the point of view of foreign policy trade adjustment assistance removes one of the most serious obstacles to successful tariff negotiations. In the past, our trade legislation has sometimes looked like one of those insurance policies which promises great benefits in big, bold type and then waters them all down in the small print. Our trading partners are more than a little afraid that this year's bill will turn out that way, broad authority for the President, which is then eroded away with exceptions and escape clauses. Through trade adjustment assistance the President is explicitly stating that from now on tariff relief will only be accorded in extraordinary circumstances, in emergencies or in cases where national security is threatened. Such a policy is only fitting both for those who may be seriously dislocated here and for those abroad who want assurance that we mean what we say when we talk freer trade.

I might point out here how important it is that Congress make crystal clear the authorities which it delegates to the President in trade matters. The debate over tariffs often concentrates on the degree of authority delegated to the President from the Congress, but the real issue is the clarity of that authority. Congress has the constitutional duty to regulate foreign commerce; for the past 28 years this duty has been discharged by delegating to the President the authority to negotiate reciprocal trade agreements within clearly defined limits. So far as I can see no group in Congress wants seriously to go back to the old system whereby Congress in effect negotiated these treaties itself by establishing individual tariff rates. The problem ever since 1934 has been to set objective guidelines within which the President must conduct his negotiations.

I'm sorry to hear now voices raised in criticism of this proven system. We hear the suggestion that the Congress be given a veto over any agreements which the President might negotiate. Certainly this is very bad diplomacy. To negotiate trade agreements with the threat of a veto hanging over your head is a little like playing poker without any clear idea what the chips are worth. In business, contracts must be clear and binding if they are to be effective. The same is true of trade agreements—which, after all, are very like business contracts. Other nations are certain to trim their offers to us if they feel that our offers are subject to withdrawal by the Congress at a later date simply by a vote of the Congress. A veto over agreements entered into by our country under a clear delegation from Congress and negotiated within clear guidelines laid down by Congress is not a good idea.

The President needs, it is true, more authority than he has had in the past if he is to conclude the kind of agreement which we must conclude if the Common Market is to turn outward and not inward. But the limits of this authority are made very clear in the act; there is no departure from the principles which have prevailed for the past 28 years. Alarmist talk about sacrificing industries and undermining the role of Congress has no place in this debate, except among those protectionists who would clothe themselves in some other issue. The serious issue is not one of Congress authority; that's in the Constitution. The serious issue is America's answer to the new state of affairs in the free world alliance.

Taken together, the major points of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962—authority to negotiate a historic trade agreement with the Common Market, opening up both Atlantic markets to the trade of other free nations, and trade adjustment assistance, add up to what I would call a declaration of interdependence. This declaration maintains the promise that out of the current rearrangement in the economic affairs of our alliance will come the genuine partnership we envisioned at the time of the Marshall plan. Much more than trade is involved here; as the two giant markets astride the Atlantic each impart strength and vigor to the other, so there will be more resources and more skills available for our many common enterprises around the world, for sharing the military burden and for sharing foreign aid. But trade policy must be set on a course toward expansion and away from discrimination first.

Trade is the cement of our alliance without which it can never grow in unity and strength. Our defense arrangements through NATO and other regional organizations may provide us with a framework of steel. The many forums of the United Nations may provide us with meeting places in which to try to reconcile our differences, or at least to let off steam without causing an explosion. We have our financial institutions in the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank and a growing number of regional economic organizations. We are experimenting with new diplomatic arrangements all the time, the alliance for progress and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, to name two.

If at times the number of instruments in the diplomatic orchestra seems bewildering, this is no more bewildering than the diplomatic problems which remain to be solved. What trade policy does in support of all this network of diplomacy is to provide an atmosphere in which we can conduct more business with one another and keep alive the hope that the community of free nations will, in time, quite literally grow together. In this way trade policy is an indispensable means of maintaining the balance of hope.

Alexander Hamilton, writing in the Federalist Papers, observed "that it seems to have been reserved for the people of this country, by their conduct and example, to decide * * * whether societies of men are really capable or not of establishing good government from reflection and choice, or whether they are forever destined to depend on accident and force." Trade policy this year provides us with precisely such a challenge. With a little reflection on our predicament today, I am confident the right choice will be made.

U.S. Gold Dwindling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "U.S. Gold Dwindling," which appeared in the April 3, 1962, edition of the Madison (Ind.) Courier.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. GOLD DWINDLING

In 1951 the United States had $23 billion in gold. But in 1962, we only had $17 billion. That means we have lost in the last 9 years $6 billion, while other countries in 1961 had $24 billion worth of gold—that is in their own country. In 1952 they had $13 billion worth of gold, and other countries in 9 years have increased their gold holdings by more than $10 billion, whereas the United States has lost gold.

This means that if these countries ask us for their $23 billion in gold tomorrow, we only have about $16 billion worth, and would be about $5½ billion short of enough to pay them. In addition, we must maintain or hold at all times $11 billion worth of gold as a reserve against our currency. That's the bad situation we find ourselves in today in gold.

When asked how this came about, Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, of Indiana, said: "It came about because in the last 9 or 10 years we've had an imbalance of payments in our foreign transactions; meaning that we have given away and loaned, and in other ways, including military purchases in foreign countries, more money than we took in.

Further, CAPEHART says the United States has a public debt of $296 billion, while the other free nations of the world—that's all of them—have only $196 billion. We owe $100 billion more than all free nations in the world and we owe $24 billion more than all nations combined in the world. Yet we continue to run deficit after deficit and spend and spend and spend. For example, the estimate of the deficit that we will run this year is about $9 billion.

It would seem that all this deficit spending and debt would come as good news to Khrushchev, who would like to see us reach a point where we are no longer a world power financially, but actually so far in debt that our dollar value, which has shrunk to about 50 cents, drops to a point where other nations will point to the dollar value with ridicule.

It is nice to be Santa Claus if we can afford it, but it is nearing the time when we can't go on giving and loaning money to countries—buying their friendship and support—only to have many of them classify themselves as neutrals, and vote as they please.

Often, it has been observed, these nations which have been helped financially and economically by the United States, vote independently when it comes to a showdown on world affairs. They ask for, and accept, all the help they can get, but vote as they please when major issues come up.

Russia must sit back and laugh at us when that nation observes what is going on in the world.

Arguments and Fear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, presently our Committee on Foreign Affairs is in the midst of hearings on the foreign-aid program. I have read volumes on this controversial issue. However, an editorial which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y., on March 27, 1962, presents by far the most panoramic view of this program in three short paragraphs.

The editorial follows:

ARGUMENTS AND FEAR

When reasoned arguments in favor of American foreign aid are ignored or brushed aside by its opponents President Kennedy gets a little testy. So did his two predecessors, Messrs. Truman and Eisenhower, so it isn't surprising.

After patiently pointing out many of the reasons for using some of our resources to help other nations "maintain their inde-

pendence," he remarked the other day that "those who want to put the ax to foreign aid hardest are the ones who make the most vigorous speeches against communism and call for a policy of victory."

Whenever the enlightened patriotism of supporting foreign aid is sought in Washington, those who are dead set against spending a dime beyond our own shores rush onto platforms and into print with accusations of being "soft on communism." It is they who are being softheaded about it. Efficiently and properly operated, the U.S. "mutual security" program (foreign aid), together with national strength, are contributions to our best hopes of peace—and security from encroachments of communism.

Research and Development Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Daily Home News of New Brunswick, N.J., has made the observation that New Jersey meets the conditions set down by Gen. J. B. Medaris at the New Jersey Council for Research and Development which would characterize thriving research and development areas.

I am happy to concur with the opinion of this paper, and I wish to point out to my colleagues that New Jersey has indeed been out in the forefront of new research. From 1776 until today New Jersey has always striven for excellence in this field. Our most recent example is the $20 million research center which will be built in South Brunswick.

I ask for unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial of the Daily Home News from March 13, 1962.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEETING NEEDS OF RESEARCH

When Gen. J. B. Medaris addressed the first annual dinner meeting of the New Jersey Council for Research and Development a few weeks ago, he listed three conditions which characterize thriving research and development areas, and stated categorically that all three are essential.

These are the conditions:

The existence of a sound, adequately financed educational complex including graduate school resources which permit the scientist or engineer to continue his academic work or to teach on a part-time basis and where an interplay between industry and technical institutions can develop. Significantly, the educational complex must include good grammar and secondary school systems to which the scientist can send his children.

A cultural atmosphere in which the scientist is highly regarded, an atmosphere in which he can gain professional recognition as his most cherished reward.

An attitude of business and Government conducive to a progressive economy. Certainly no industry can be expected to invest a great deal of money in buildings, equipment and personnel in areas where local taxation is prohibitive, or its basis unfavorable.

It is curious how well our central New Jersey situation meets these conditions set down by Medaris. We have in large measure the sound, adequately financed educational complex. Princeton and Rutgers offer an incomparable opportunity to the scientist or engineer. Both are adding greatly to their scientific resources, Princeton with its almost $60 million in new funds from friends and alumni, Rutgers with its own funds and solid State financial suport. Our lower schools in most communities are of good repute, and in many communities new high schools, with the most modern of equipment, have arisen in the past few years.

The scientist has long been highly regarded here. Central New Jersey goes back to the great Thomas Edison, and its industries, chemical, pharmaceutical and the like, have so long pioneered in science that the scientist has long been an eminently respected and admired figure in every community.

The attitude of business and Government here, too, is conducive to a progressive economy. This is due in large measure, we think, to long established participation of the leaders in industry here, and the leaders in the universities, in local government. Most of our communities have a high respect for research and industry, make sincere efforts to accommodate them. A good example of this is the cooperative efforts made by South Brunswick officials to meet the desire of the developers of the $20 million research center which is coming there.

We think and believe New Jersey meets the conditions set down by General Medaris almost completely if not completely.

National Lottery of Guatemala

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the Members of this House about the national lottery of Guatemala. This country, although a small nation, has the financial wisdom to recognize and accept the worth of a national lottery.

In 1961, the gross receipts of the Guatemalan national lottery came to $2,883,580. The total net income to the Government in that year came to over half a million dollars which was used for the construction of a national theater and for the development of the art of music.

Mr. Speaker, there is really nothing special about the national lottery of Guatemala, for Guatemala is another of those countries where it is simply assumed that the Government will have the intelligence to supervise and control gambling rather than disregard it. Unfortunately, this wisdom has not yet dawned upon the Government of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, if we would only open our eyes and see beyond our noses, we would see that a national lottery in the United States could offer a great deal to our people. A national lottery in this country can easily and voluntarily pump into our Government coffers over $10 billion a year in needed additional revenue which can help provide a tax cut and reduce our national debt.

Statement of B. C. Deuschle, President, Shears, Scissors & Manicure Implement Manufacturers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD the statement of Mr. B. C. Deuschle, president of the Shears, Scissors & Manicure Implement Manufacturers Association before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives on March 23, 1962.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF B. C. DEUSCHLE, PRESIDENT, SHEARS, SCISSORS & MANICURE IMPLEMENT MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 23, 1962

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee on Ways and Means, my name is B. C. Deuschle. I am vice president of the Acme Shear Co., located in Bridgeport, Conn. I appear before this committee as president of the Shears, Scissors and Manicure Implement Manufacturers Association, the only national trade association of domestic manufacturers of scissors and shears. The scissor and shear industry is a distinct industry and should not be confused with the larger cutlery and flatware industries.

The association respectfully wishes to record with this committee its strong opposition to H.R. 9900 in its present form. This bill could destroy industries such as ours and add to the unemployment problem.

During the past 15 years representatives of our association have appeared before this committee and other congressional committees, the Committee for Reciprocity Information and the Tariff Commission, to present our views on the impact of imported scissors and shears on our domestic industry. We have never requested or suggested that a complete embargo be placed on the import of scissors and shears. All that we have asked for and desire is a fair competitive opportunity, not an advantage. To date we have not obtained relief in any form.

We believe that H.R. 9900 would make matters worse. H.R. 9900 provides for new Presidential authority to reduce or eliminate duties. We realize that title III of H.R. 9900 provides for adjustment assistance, but the criteria are general and too much is left to the discretion of the President in granting assistance. Terms such as "significant," "prolonged," and "reasonable" used in title III to determine if a firm or an industry should receive assistance are subject to many interpretations.

Injury or threat of injury as it is written into our present escape clause cannot be properly defined. When 42 manufacturers out of 50 cease manufacturing and go out of business within 12 years as a direct or indirect result of excessive imports, and the Tariff Commission as well as the President decide that there is no injury or threat of injury, something should be done. Imports of shears and scissors valued over $1.75 per dozen import value have reached the proportion that they represent 95 percent of domestic production of scissors and shears in this category. This category represents

75 percent of total sales of all scissors and shears in the domestic market. Would you honestly say, under these circumstances, that there is no injury or threat of injury to our industry?

H.R. 9900 provides for the repeal of section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 as amended, the so-called escape clause. The escape clause must not be repealed. It must be retained and strengthened by amendments to establish definite criteria to guide the Tariff Commission in the determination of injury or threat thereof. And, the Tariff Commission findings of fact in escape clause cases have got to be binding upon the President. If not, we are finished.

The following table shows better than any words I could use the import problem faced by the domestic scissor and shear industry.

U.S. imports, scissors and shears, valued at more than 50 cents per dozen

Year	Quantity, number	Value, U.S. dollars
Average, 1931-40	162,078	61,569
1947	20,776	16,162
1948	75,269	59,610
1949	150,372	117,608
1950	769,068	375,538
1951	1,852,926	879,590
1952	2,671,753	1,161,922
1953	3,785,709	1,484,819
1954	3,982,327	1,583,285
1955	5,357,026	1,975,859
1956	5,714,717	2,257,205
1957	6,088,896	2,304,819
1958	6,775,491	2,727,104
1959	8,204,568	3,059,673
1960	8,777,126	3,193,996
1961	9,056,730	3,265,843

Source: Bureau of the Census.

The sharp increase in imports during 1950 and 1951 were due to a 50-percent reduction in the rate of duty during those years.

Industries such as ours are supposed to be able to obtain relief from injury or threatened injury under the provisions of the so-called escape clause. The domestic scissor and shear industry has had two escape clause investigations, one in 1953 and again in 1958. Neither of these investigations resulted in any relief for our industry.

Members of the association concluded after the 1958 investigation that it would be futile to request a third investigation until Congress amended the escape clause to restrict the Tariff Commission's interpretative powers and the President's unlimited discretion over the Commission's recommendations. Now we find ourselves faced with H.R. 9900, which provides for the repeal of the escape clause, the only hope for relief that import ravaged industries had available.

The Secretary of Commerce in his presentation to this committee passed over industries such as ours by stating that they accounted for only a minute part of our gross national product. We realize that the domestic scissor and shear industry with its 1,000-plus employees accounts for only a fraction of 1 percent of the gross national product, but we see this as no justification for letting the industry be completely destroyed by imports produced with low cost labor. The workers in the domestic scissor and shear industry do not want to become wards of the State; they want to use their skills, which have taken years to develop. These workers are not interested in retraining; over many years they have developed a skill they are proud of and want to continue the work they are happy doing.

If the scissors and shears imported during 1961 had been manufactured in the United States, it would have provided over 2 million man-hours of factory work, or full-time employment for over 1,000 American employees.

Domestic manufacturers of scissors and shears have modernized and automated their operations in an effort to meet foreign competition. But foreign manufacturers also have modern equipment and with their lower wage rates are underselling domestic firms in the United States market at today's rate of duty.

H.R. 9900 would give the President unrestricted authority to reduce duties and thereby further reduce the cost of imported scissors and shears in our market. Under the provisions of this bill, scissors and shears would be buried in a category with many other items and the duty cut 50 percent. This would mean a reduction of at least 20 cents per pair at the retail level for scissors and shears now being retailed at $1 to $1.29 per pair.

If this is permitted, we do not need a crystal ball to see the results. There are only 8 domestic firms now remaining of the 50 operating in the United States prior to the 50-percent reduction in import duty during 1950–51. These few remaining manufacturers would be forced to close their doors and discharge their employees. The United States would then become wholly dependent on imported scissors and shears.

We cannot understand how it could be in the national interest to permit such a loss. We would lose the skills of the employees and management of the industry as well as the capital investment in production equipment. In the event of a national emergency and imports were cut off, the United States would be without a source of scissors and shears, basic tools for many industries and trades essential to our defense.

The scissor and shear industry is one of the oldest in the world. The skill was brought to the United States from Germany at a time when the United States needed new industry and a scissor and shear industry in particular.

Scissors and shears of all sizes and types are used in every school, retail establishment, office, factory, hospital and home in the United States. Scissors cannot be classified as a luxury, gimmick, or novelty.

Scissors are used to separate us from our mothers at birth; to cut our toe nails; to trim the leather in our shoes; to cut and trim the materials used in every piece of clothing that we wear. They are used to cut our finger nails, to trim our mustaches, the hair in our ears and nose, and to cut hair on our heads, even down to the end of the road when our best suit or dress is cut down the back so that the undertaker can dress us for the last ride. Scissors are truly used from birth to death. They are essential to our health, education and general welfare. I ask you, gentlemen, is this an industry that should be permitted to become extinct in this country?

We request that the committee not grant the President the authority he has requested in H.R. 9900, but that the bill be amended.

We urge that Congress retain its power over duties as is provided in section 8 of the Constitution.

We request that the escape clause be retained, strengthened and clearly defined as to what will constitute injury or threat of injury, and we also request that this bill be sent to Congress under open rule procedure.

List of 42 companies manufacturing scissors and shears in 1950 that have since ceased production:

Ace Cutlery Co., Newark, N.J.; Atomic Cutlery Co., Irvington, N.J.; H. Balke, Newark, N.J.; H. Boker & Co., Inc., New York, N.Y.; C. J. Bates & Son, Chester, Conn.; Belmar Instrument Co., Belmar, N.J.; Berridge Shear Co., Sturgis, Mich.; Birmingham Cutlery Co., Birmingham, Ala.; Cameron Manufacturing Co., Emporium, N.Y.; Case-Smiley Co., Fremont, Ohio; Clayton Manufacturing Co., New York, N.Y.; Crown Cutlery Co., Newark, N.J.; Cueto & Stanek Cutlery Co., Newark, N.J.; Cutlery Corp. of America, Bridgeport, Conn.; Arthur Dorp, Newark, N.J.; Essex Cutlery Co., Newark, N.J.; Harjan, Inc., East Orange, N.J.; A. Henkel Manufacturing Corp., Keene, N.H.; Carl W. Heuser, Irvington, N.J.; International Edge Tool Co., Newark, N.J.; Kafelt Manufacturing Corp., Keene, N.H.; La Cross Manicure Accessories, New York, N.Y.; William Longbein & Bros., Brooklyn, N.Y.; Ernst Melchoir's Cutlery, Irvington, N.J.; Midwest Tool & Cutlery Co., Sturgis, Mich.; Monarch Cutlery Manufacturing Co., North Bergen, N.J.; Carl Monkhaus, Ellicotville, N.Y.; Progress Cutlery Co., Forth Smith, Ark.; Revlon Implement Corp., Irvington, N.J.; Rex Cutlery Corp., Irvington, N.J.; Schneffel Bros., Newark, N.J.; T. E. Schneider Corp., South Norwalk, Conn.; Smileys, Inc., Fremont, Ohio; Springfield Cutlery, Springfield, N.J.; Tri-Ess Products, Inc., Jersey City, N.J.; U.S. Shear Co., Bronx, N.Y.; W. L. W. Manufacturing Co., Chicago, Ill.; Wallace Manufacturing Co., West Springfield, Mass.; Wigder Manufacturing Co., Newark, N.J.; Witte & Schmitz Cutlery Co., Bridgeport, Conn.; W. V. Hershey & Sons Co., Fremont, Ohio; Metroloy Corp., Canton, Ohio.

List of eight companies now manufacturing scissors and shears:

Acme Shear Co., Bridgeport, Conn.; John Ahlbin & Sons, Bridgeport, Conn.; Case Shear Corp., Nashville, Ark.; Clauss Cutlery Co., Fremont, Ohio; The W. H. Compton Shear Co., Newark, N.J.; The A. Lincoln Co., Bridgeport, Conn.; Wahl Clipper Corp., Sterling, Ill.; J. Wiss & Sons Co., Newark, N.J.

Grain Storage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of western South Dakota are being forced to lose $1,351,171 in cash revenues as a result of the decision of the Secretary of Agriculture to call in the 1958 farm-stored wheat. They are losing thousands of additional dollars because of the decision of the Secretary to call in the 1959 farm-stored barley and the 1960 farm-stored rye. This, Mr. Speaker, is revenue the farmers could in good conscience have expected rather than having this grain called at this time and placed in commercial warehouses.

In a letter from the Washington office to all State ASC offices in the Nation under date of March 19, 1962, the Secretary said, "Also, it is well to note that the storage situation has improved because of more construction and accelerated disposal programs." It is understandable, Mr. Speaker, that the Department has probably agreed with commercial warehouses and large storage companies that if they would increase their storage capacity, the Department would see to it that these additional storage capacities were kept full. The result is, Mr. Speaker, as was stated by the Secretary in his report, they probably have provided more construction and this is the reason that farm-stored grain is being called at this time.

If the Department has made these agreements with the big storage outfits, then there is little the small farmer can do except to give this source of revenue to the large commercial outfits.

Insofar as wheat is concerned, the situation is a little strange because today there is in storage 1,023,162,812 bushels as compared with commercial storage at this same time last year of 1,000,593,449 bushels. By the same token, farm stored wheat today totals 53,428,590 bushels as compared with 114,445,551 bushels at this time last year. In other words, Mr. Speaker, some 23 million bushels has already been called in and has already gone into central warehouses for storing, pulling it off the farm, taking that revenue away from the farmer, when the cost to the Government for farm storage is exactly the same as the cost to the Government for commercial storage.

Some of the farmers in my country are beginning to wonder if this great bureaucracy here in Washington is actually a Department of Agriculture or a department of commercial storage. They are beginning to wonder just whose chestnuts are being pulled out of the fire, they know it is not theirs.

In their letter of March 19, they indicated that the farm storage program was intended only to meet a shortage of commercial warehouse space. This, Mr. Speaker, was not the intent of Congress in passing these on-the-farm storage programs. Congress intended that the grain should be kept on the farm where it belongs. Congress intended that it should be kept there in the event of some natural emergency and as a safe storage place for the Nation's food supply in the event of war. Apparently this administration feels the danger of war is over, or at least there is less concern about having the food supply equally distributed across the Nation. One wonders how long it would take an enemy with nuclear warheads to blast every large grain terminal filled with wheat into oblivion.

Another thing, Mr. Speaker, if it had been the intention of the Department of Agriculture to call in this farm-stored wheat and feed grain, would it not have been the fair thing to have notified the farmers last fall that the Department intended to call in this grain? If this had been done, the farmers could have sold this grain on the open market last winter at a somewhat higher price than the initial loan. This would have given the farmer a little more money for his grain, and it would have alleviated the Government of all the additional cost of handling and the continued storage in commercial warehouses. In most of the Great Plains area, the farmers feel it is to their benefit to keep this grain on the farm as a protection for the coming year should the next year be a short productive season.

Another thing, Mr. Speaker, insofar as barley, oats, and rye are concerned, this grain which is in storage is simply imported grain or the offset from imported barley, oats, and rye. Each year the Department of Agriculture publishes a complete compilation of the domestic production, the total disappearance, and the imports of all grains. If anyone is sufficiently interested to take the time to total these figures on an adding machine, they will find that during the past 10 years we produced in this country 3,774 billion bushels of barley and that our disappearance during those 10 years was 3,774.5 billion bushels. They will also be surprised to learn that we imported 206 billion bushels. In other words, if there are 206 billion bushels of barley in storage today, all of it has been imported because our disappearance was greater than our production.

If they are interested in running up the figures on oats, they would find that our production during the past 10 years was 12,359.8 billion bushels, and that our disappearance was 12,586.8 billion bushels, or 227 million bushels greater than our production, and that we imported 221.6 billion bushels besides. The domestic production of rye was 252,114 billion bushels, the disappearance was 287,802 billion bushels, or some 35 billion bushels more than we produced, and our imports were 44,250 billion bushels.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, all of the feed grains—barley, oats, and rye—in storage today have either been imported or are the offset from imported grains. In spite of this fact, Mr. Speaker, in the Secretary's letter of March 19, he said, "The failure of the programs (since 1952) to keep production in line lead to a large buildup of stocks creating an imbalance with available storage capacity." The imbalance, Mr. Speaker, was created not by overproduction, not by any failure of the farm program, but purely and simply from imported feed grains, and yet even the Secretary of Agriculture is beating the farmers of America over the head trying to make them believe that it is their overproduction which is causing him his headaches.

Mr. Speaker, following is a complete tabulation of domestic production, total disappearance, and imports of barley, oats, and rye for the past 10 years with the exception that the 1961–62 figures are estimates. These figures are compiled and printed annually by the Department of Agriculture and are available to anyone who would care to take the time to study them. They are very conclusive proof that any barley, oats, or rye in storage has been imported during the past 10 years. The tabulation is as follows:

Production, disappearance, and imports, 1952–62

[Millions of bushels]

	Domestic production	Total disappearance	Imports
		Barley	
1952–53	228.2	290.3	24.9
1953–54	246.7	275.2	38.3
1954–55	379.2	265.1	24.1
1955–56	401.2	344.0	28.3
1956–57	376.8	443.0	26.5
1957–58	437.2	393.1	24.4
1958–59	475.2	420.6	14.3
1959–60	422.4	468.0	17.9
1960–61	427.1	458.2	5.3
1961–62	380.0	417.0	2.0
Total	3,774.0	3,774.5	206.0

Production, disappearance, and imports, 1952–62—Continued

[Millions of bushels]

	Domestic production	Total disappearance	Imports
		Oats	
1952–53	1,217.4	1,314.2	68.6
1953–54	1,153.2	1,255.3	79.8
1954–55	1,409.6	1,353.6	20.0
1955–56	1,503.1	1,461.9	3.1
1956–57	1,163.2	1,286.5	16.8
1957–58	1,301.0	1,241.1	24.5
1958–59	1,415.5	1,376.2	3.5
1959–60	1,052.0	1,154.3	2.0
1960–61	1,150.8	1,095.7	1.3
1961–62	994.0	1,048.0	2.0
Total	12,359.8	12,586.8	221.6
		Rye	
1952–53	16.146	19.377	5.56
1953–54	18.894	23.644	13.47
1954–55	25.935	27.954	3.45
1955–56	29.055	32.200	3.39
1956–57	21.155	34.641	3.42
1957–58	27.243	27.325	3.26
1958–59	32.186	32.561	3.30
1959–60	23.100	29.500	4.20
1960–61	32.500	31.600	2.70
1961–62	25.900	29.000	1.50
Total	252.114	287.802	44.25

Urban Affairs in New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, many newspaper editorials in my State have spoken about urban affairs. One of the most insightful statements of opinion was that of station WBUD of Trenton, N.J. They contend that "President Kennedy is right when he says that a Federal Department to deal with city affairs is necessary and inevitable, and that such a Department will have to be established sooner or later." They also comment on the work that Gov. Richard Hughes is doing to help the problems of city life and emphasize that something must be done in a constructive manner on all levels of government.

I ask for unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, WBUD's editorial on urban affairs.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WBUD SPEAKS OUT

Since 89 percent of New Jersey's population is directly concerned with the problems of city life, it is apparent that the time has come for creation of governmental machinery designed to deal with the urban situation in a constructive manner. And the move should be made without further delay at either the Federal or the State level—or both.

According to the latest report from the U.S. Census Bureau, New Jersey leads all 50 States in point of urban development. Only California, Rhode Island, New York,

Massachusetts, and Illinois have population densities approaching that of this area.

President Kennedy is right when he says that a Federal Department to deal with city affairs is necessary and inevitable, and that such a Department will have to be established sooner or later. Recent defeat of the President's plan by an adverse vote in the House of Representatives, in other words, is merely a temporary setback for a proposal of genuine merit that cannot be long postponed.

Fortunately, Governor Hughes has indicated a determination to proceed on a State basis no matter what has happened or may happen at Washington. In light of New Jersey's distinctly urban character, this slant is one of farsighted statesmanship.

WBUD has consistently maintained that regional progress in an urban area can be achieved only through intelligent and authoritative consolidation of State, county, and municipal efforts. Let us hope that New Jersey soon takes the lead in advancing the all-round welfare of our vast and steadily growing throngs of city dwellers.

Let's Have a Tough Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an excellent editorial that appeared in Monday's edition of the Allentown (Pa.) Morning Call, entitled "Let's Have a Tough Law." I think it adequately points up the feelings of our colleague, Representative FRANCIS WALTER, and points up his reasoning for inserting his most recent bill, one that calls for abolishing the supplemental airlines.

The editorial follows:

LET'S HAVE A TOUGH LAW

Under normal circumstances we couldn't agree with Representative FRANCIS WALTER's bill calling on Congress to end the operations of all nonscheduled airlines, like the one that carried 29 Lehigh Valley Army recruits to death near Richmond last November. It would be too much like ruling all trucks off the highways because some consistently violate the rules of the road.

The circumstances, however, aren't quite normal. The measure has been introduced in an effort to make certain the shoddy operators among these supplemental airlines do not continue doing business in the same old hazardous way.

Both the House and Senate have passed separate bills tightening regulations for these operations. Both have set considerably higher safety standards, but the House measure also would limit these lines to carrying cargo. Before it can be enacted into law, both Houses must agree on all the provisions.

There is a strong possibility this measure may die in the hands of the Senate-House conference committee charged with reconciling the differences. Four of the eight Senators on the committee are said to insist on the right of the lines to carry passengers under certain conditions.

If these holdouts kill effective regulatory legislation, Representative WALTER wants to be ready to put a strong measure on the statute books. He is not willing to risk the lives of any more passengers on these flights or take any more chances they'll be stranded at foreign airports because the companies to which they paid their fares don't have the money to buy fuel to bring them back. He is not willing to wait for a case now pending before the courts to drag on for 3 or 4 more years.

Under these circumstances we agree with Representative WALTER. It would be difficult to do otherwise, particularly in view of an admission by the Civil Aeronautics Board that it cannot adequately enforce the safety regulations for these nonscheduled operations.

A Challenge to American Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, a clear challenge to American youth was stated March 30, 1962, in the Aquin, the official newspaper of the College of St. Thomas in St. Paul, Minn. This allegory was written by the Right Reverend Monsignor James P. Shannon, president of the college.

It deserves the attention of the Senate and the youth of America. It is a challenge to our young college graduates to choose the difficult way, the life of service to mankind, and to the highest ideals.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN SHINING ARMOR, KNIGHT EYES ROAD FORK

Once upon a time there was a daring young knight who vowed to spend his life fighting battles for the weak and the downtrodden. He was to be the friend and advocate of the weak, the neglected, the oppressed. Wherever there was injustice he would seek it out and expose it. Where there was deceit he would uncover it. Where there was malice he would challenge it.

His name soon was known throughout the land and he was admired extravagantly, even by people who had never seen him or benefited by his zealous chivalry. But he was admired especially by the younger knights who aspired to his high standards of selfless devotion and purity of purpose. They longed to ride as his companion in his continuing crusade against the powers of darkness. He always had more offers of help from these willing and youthful warriors than he needed.

He preferred not to ride with the older knights. They could not match his pace. They slowed him down. He moved quickly from one critical situation to another, never sparing himself, always eager to find new work for his flashing sword and his cold courage.

His adversaries were usually wicked kings who exploited their subjects, abused their power, and defied the law. His method of attack was not complex. On hearing of the evils rampant in a distance shire he would ride at once, often alone, sometimes with a younger knight, frequently traveling day and night. At his destination he would either challenge the wicked king to personal combat or he would provoke the evil ruler to a duel. His youthful vigor and practiced hand always won over his soft, undisciplined, and aging opponents.

He relied for his information and for new challenges on the tips he received regularly from his many friends among the poor, the neglected, the oppressed. Hence he was surprised one day to receive an invitation from a powerful ruler in a distant land, asking him to visit the ruler's castle. No other king had ever invited him. All others had feared his coming. Some had even fled at his approach.

Intrigued by the strange request, he sent a courier to tell the king that he accepted gladly and that he would come within a few days. On his arrival he was surprised to find that this king was loved by all his people, that peace prevailed in his kingdom, and that justice and order were everywhere apparent. He had never seen such an orderly kingdom.

On his first night there he learned from the king that the royal family had no male heir and that the aging king was seeking a just and strong man whom he could choose to succeed him as ruler. The king explained the economy, the laws, the traditions, the education, and the religion of his people.

It was apparent that the old ruler was proud of his kingdom and of its venerable traditions of honor and justice. His people were prosperous. His country was respected by its neighbors.

Hoping that this good repute might be preserved after his death, the old king had sent for the young knight whose fame as a crusader recommended him for the role of a ruler.

The young man asked for time to consider this generous and unexpected offer. The king agreed. Whereupon the young man went out to walk in the night and to ponder the new proposal. In spite of the obvious prestige and honor of the new position, he was vaguely uneasy as he walked slowly back and forth on the bank of the river which ran close by the castle.

Suddenly his thoughts were interrupted by a voice from the shadows. He stopped. A bedraggled figure came forth and identified himself as a woodgatherer on the estate of an infamous and wicked king. The poor man said he had walked for 3 days to find the famous knight and to enlist his help on behalf of the subjects of the unjust king. As the woodgatherer described the indignities and tortures regularly suffered by his family and friends, the knight became visibly excited by the sad and moving tale.

The next morning the good king was surprised to find at his door a note written in haste and at night by the young knight. It read: "You are very kind. I have weighed your generous offer carefully. But I have been visited in the night by a poor and needy man who begs my services for his suffering kinsmen. I must go to serve them with my sword."

Foreign Publication of Technology Textbooks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following very interesting letter, together with enclosure of statement by Technology Textbook Agents,

that warrants the immediate attention of every Member of the Congress:

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,
Cambridge, Mass., April 8, 1962.

Mr. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It has come to my attention from advertisements placed in my dormitory by an organization which calls itself the Technology Textbook Agency, that a foreign publisher is printing American textbooks and selling them at highly reduced prices. They claim that by utilizing cheaper labor and materials and avoiding the payment of a royalty they are able to sell texts at approximately 45 percent of the list price in spite of a high tariff. The fact that orders are being taken in advance and payment is made when the books arrive in September has led me to believe that these operations are made on a mail-order basis.

The texts they publish are standard works used by almost every engineering and technical school in the country.

In the face of ever-rising tuition costs the factor which texts play in college expenses is decreasing. Yet, if foreign publishers are able to compete with American, their volume of business cannot be too small.

Such operations are a crime against both the author and the publisher and, if not illegal, is highly dishonest and should be stopped either by making such transactions illegal or by raising tariff restrictions to such a degree that such business is unprofitable.

Thank you.

Respectfully,

MALCOLM SHUSTER.

TECHNOLOGY TEXTBOOK AGENTS

To All Members of the MIT Community:

We who study at the Institute well know the high cost of textbooks. Twice yearly, we go to the Co-op or TCA and spend $20 to $40 purchasing them. There is now a third source of textbooks—Technology Textbook Agents.

What TTA is—Technology Textbook Agents is an organization of students for negotiating the purchase of textbooks at reduced cost. In order to make a profit, we must offer you a commodity that you want at a highly competitive price. If you will look at the attached order blank, we think that you will be pleasantly surprised with our concept of highly competitive. We of Technology Textbook Agents can bring you a very considerable monetary savings.

How TTA does it—How can anyone sell Rossi's "Optics" for $5.35 (Co-op price $10.75) or the 2-volume Morse & Feshbach for $14.95 (Co-op price $32.00)? First, let us dispel some of your doubts. These books are brand new. They are hardbacks. They are printed by the same process as your present textbooks—lithography. They are the current edition, unlike some of the obsolescent volumes at TCA.

From ——— ———.

To Technology Textbook Agents, Box 358, East Campus.

We can offer you these prices—in all cases at lower cost than either the Co-op or TCA—by dealing in large volume with foreign publishers. We of Technology Textbook Agents have gone to a great deal of effort and expense to bring you high quality textbooks at the lowest possible price. Even after paying U.S. customs, the low cost of foreign labor, slightly smaller pages (typically 22 by 14 centimeters), slightly thinner paper, and no need of paying royalties, all combine in an extremely significant savings for you.

No risk with TTA—Technology Textbook Agents has been cleared by the Institute; we are not a fly-by-night business. To purchase books from Technology Textbook Agents, fill out the attached order blank, and drop it in the Institute mail. We will foward your order to the publishers. Next September when you return to MIT, the books will be waiting for you. Then, and only then, do you pay us; no money leaves your hands until you have received the texts that you have ordered. TTA makes all credit arrangements, keeps all records, and handles all shipping. You just fill out the order blank, and the books are on their way.

Technology Textbook Agents sincerely hopes that we can be of service to you. If you have any questions, or would like to examine any copies of the textbooks, visit Munroe 507, East Campus, 8 to 9 p.m., April 13, or call any time.

Cordially yours,

BILL SCHMID,
Business Manager.

No.	Title	Co-op	TTA
6.02 6.14	Zimmermann & Mason: Electronic Circuit Theory	$9.00	$5.50
6.03	Fano, Chu, and Adler: Electromagnetic Fields, Energy and Forces	10.00	6.00
6.05	Mason and Zimmermann: Electronic Circuits, Signals and Systems	10.50	6.25
6.07	Adler, Chu, and Fano: Electromagnetic Energy Transmission and Radiation	12.00	6.75
6.14	Skilling: Electrical Engineering Circuits	8.95	4.45
8.031	Frank: Introduction to Electricity and Optics	7.00	4.60
8.041	Rossi: Optics	10.75	5.35
8.05	Richtmeyer, Kennard, and Laureitsen: Introduction to Modern Physics	10.75	5.35
8.05	Born: Atomic Physics	6.50	3.50
8.051	Eisberg: Fundamentals of Modern Physics	10.50	6.75
8.06	Dicke and Witke: Introduction to Quantum Mechanics	8.75	4.90
8.711	Slater and Frank: Mechanics	6.00	3.50
8.711	McCuskey: Introduction to Advanced Dynamics	8.75	4.30
8.791	Morse and Feshbach: Methods of Theoretical Physics	32.00	14.95
18.04	Martin and Reissner: Elementary Differential Equations	7.50	3.85
18.15	Hildebrand: Methods of Applied Mathematics	10.75	5.35
18.20	Hoffman and Kunze: Linear Algebra	7.50	3.50
18.21	Rudin: Principals of Mathematical Analysis	6.25	3.30
2.02	Housner and Hudson: Applied Mechanics—Dynamics	5.25	2.80
5.61	Moore: Physical Chemistry	8.50	4.65
5.64	Pauling: Nature of the Chemical Bond	8.85	4.65

If you are interested in any book not listed, please drop a line to TTA, Box 358, East Campus.

Prices are subject to change without notice.

History of Journalism in Dunklin County, Mo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD V. LONG
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, with its "Spirit of '75 edition" of Monday, April 2, 1962, the Daily Dunklin Democrat, published at Kennett, Mo., began its 75th year of service to the people of the southeast Missouri-northeast Arkansas area.

Among the congratulatory messages received by the Daily Democrat's publisher, Jack Stapleton, Jr., was one from a former newsman, who has more recently received national recognition in another profession. That message was as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C.

JACK STAPLETON, Jr.,
Publisher, the Daily Dunklin Democrat,
Kennett, Mo.:

I was pleased to learn that your newspaper is observing its 75th anniversary. This is certainly a significant event. I know you will continue in the years to come to exercise your skill and judgment in permitting your readers to receive full and fair coverage of the news.

With all best wishes.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

This same edition of the Daily Dunklin Democrat also carried an excellent account of the history of journalism in Dunklin County, Mo., which traces the development of bringing the printed news to the people west of the Mississippi, in the early days. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD, so that all my colleagues will have an opportunity to read and enjoy it as I have.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DDD HAS LONG HISTORY OF SERVICE TO MO-ARK AREA

Journalism in the form of the printed word was introduced west of the Mississippi River and to Missouri in 1808 with the printing of the first edition of the Missouri Gazette in old St. Louis by Joseph Charless. This pioneer publication heralded in several ways the birth of Missouri journalism with its humble beginning, Democratic philosophy, endurance and influence.

Some 11 years later in 1819, the first newspaper in southeast Missouri—actually, the second one published in the State outside St. Louis—was begun in Jackson. The Missouri Herald brought the printed medium to a section of the State which was still largely undeveloped, but whose need for news was just as great as today.

Dunklin County was not established as a political unit occupying the western half of southeast Missouri's "bootheel" until 1845, and a year later the present city of Kennett was laid out in the center of the county near a village of Delaware Indians. This community was first known as Chilletacaux, the name of a prominent Indian chief.

The early history of journalism in Dunklin County is rather vague, but the best sources seem to indicate that the first newspaper published in the county was the Dunklin County Herald printed at Clarkton in 1870. Clarkton was then the largest and most prosperous town in the county.

All authorities seem to agree that by 1872 this paper had moved to Kennett, but was published there only a short time.

Clarkton proved to be the spawning place for several more papers, the next being the Advertiser founded there in 1872 after the Herald had moved. Albert and Baldwin established this publication which shortly afterwards became the property of Charles Stokes who changed its name to the Enterprice. Apparently as his journalism predecessors had done, Stokes saw Kennett as a "greener pasture," and in 1876 the Enterprise moved to the county seat. Also like previous ventures, it was discontinued after a short time.

The early Dunklin County paper whose existence is most substantiated is the Dunklin County Advocate which was established at Clarkton in October of 1877 by W. R. McDaniel. Two different accounts of its

existence are given, but both seem to have a common conclusion.

Goodspeed in his "History of Southeast Missouri," published in 1888, relates that the Advocate was taken to Kennett soon after its establishment and published there for several months.

Quoting Douglass' "History of Southeast Missouri": "It [the Advocate] shortly after its beginning in Clarkton came under the control of John W. Baldwin and was moved to Kennett.

"In 1879, the paper was purchased by Charles Stokes and moved to Molden. Here its name was changed to the Malden Clipper. It was then taken to Kennett in 1886 and its publication discontinued in 1887.

"The printing of the Kennett Clipper was begun in March 1888, by R. H. Jones."

In either case, it would seem there is a direct line of descent from the founding of the Dunklin County Advocate in 1887 at Clarkton to the beginning of the Kennett Clipper at the county seat in 1888.

Because of the numerous previous failures to make a newspaper a success in Kennett, little optimism was expressed by local residents when R. H. Jones, Will Mitchim, and Will A. Jones arrived on April 9, 1888, with the intention of printing the Kennett Clipper.

Mitchim soon left the firm, and Will A. Jones became the printer, with R. H. Jones the owner, proprietor, and editor.

In the early part of 1893, the entire operation was sold to a group of Kennett businessmen who formed the Dunklin County Publishing Co. This group, all stanch Democrats and prominent in the community, was anxious that Dunklin County have a successful Democratic newspaper which would be active for the party.

A search for a permanent editor was carried on for several weeks, and finally E. P. Caruthers was chosen. The journalist of several years experience assumed charge of the newspaper on June 22, 1893, with an editorial announcing the change of the paper's name to the Dunklin Democrat.

Other milestones in the history of the Daily Democrat include:

1903: First permanent home for the paper is built and a new press and paper folder is installed. (This building is the present home of the Daily Democrat);

October, 1913: Caruthers dies, Will A. Jones returns to continue the paper;

1921: A Goss Comet webb press is installed;

January, 1925: The first edition of the Twice-A-Week Dunklin Democrat makes its appearance;

January, 1953: Will A. Jones & Sons announce the sale of the Dunklin Democrat to Stapleton Publications Co. of Albany, Mo. The former company was composed of U.S. Representative Paul C. Jones and Edgar Jones, who served as editors and publishers of the newspaper with distinction. Additional interests of the partnership brought about the sale to the Stapleton Publications Co., which is headed by Jack Stapleton, Sr., of Albany, Mo.

February 1, 1953: Stapleton Publications Co. assumes ownership and management of the Dunklin Democrat.

July 1, 1953: Jack Stapleton, Jr., of Stanberry, Mo., appointed publisher of the newspaper.

April 2, 1956: The first edition of the Daily Dunklin Democrat is published, signifying the changeover from semiweekly to daily publication.

March 15, 1960: Installation of the newspaper's 32-page Goss Straightline rotary press, with full color facilities, is completed.

November 1, 1960: The daily circulation of the newspaper exceeds 5,000 copies.

April 2, 1962: The Daily Democrat begins observance of 75 years of service of southeast Missouri and northeast Arkansas.

Supreme Court Decision in Tennessee Reapportionment Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, South Carolina newspapers have carried considerable comment regarding the Supreme Court's recent decision in the Tennessee reapportionment case. As in its 1954 desegregation decision, the Supreme Court has again reversed all previous precedents and by a modern interpretation of the 14th amendment opened the door for Federal court regulation of representation in State legislatures.

The Court decision in the reapportionment case is one of the most dangerous decisions ever handed down affecting the rights of the States. It ranks on a par with the 1954 desegregation decision. That decision was likewise picked out of the air for the purpose of remedying what the Court considered an "evil" which the States and the Congress had refused to cure. Court decisions of long standing have repeatedly held that the question of representation in the State legislatures is a "nonjusticiable" issue, that is, one which is political in nature and therefore to be handled by the people in constitutional reforms or by legislative action within the States.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have the following articles and editorials printed in the Appendix to the RECORD: "Reapportionment Case Decision Political" from the March 31, 1962, issue of the State; "Court's Apportionment Decision Reflects a Two-Sided Problem" from the March 30 issue of the Florence Morning News; "The Court Steps Into Vacuum" from the March 28 issue of the Greenville News; and "Court Rewrites Constitution," from the March 31 issue of the Greenville News.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greenville (S.C.) State, Mar. 31, 1962]

REAPPORTIONMENT CASE DECISION POLITICAL—INVADES BASIC POWERS OF STATES

(By Raymond Moley)

Back at the turn of the century, this observation was made by Finley Peter Dunne:

" 'What's that?' asked Mr. Hennessey.

" 'That is,' said Mr. Dooley, 'no matter whether th' Constitution follows th' flag or not, th' Supreme Court follows th' iliction returns.' "

It is a pity that Dunne could not be here now to provide the commonsense necessary to understand the meaning of what the 1962 Supreme Court has said in its decision opening the Federal courts to those who seek what they call a more "democratic" representation in State legislatures.

REAL POINT

For the Court now not only is following the election returns. It has taken a step which will permit it to determine what those returns will be.

In Mr. Justice Frankfurter's dissent there is clearly outlined what the consequences may be under this stretching of the "equal protection of the laws" clause in the Constitution.

He points out, in an opinion which should rank with the great defenses of constitutional liberty, that the majority opinion is purely political:

"The Court's authority * * * ultimately rests on sustained public confidence in its moral sanction. Such feeling must be nourished by the Court's complete detachment, in fact and in appearance, from political entanglements."

DISTRESSING EFFECT

Frankfurter's opinion also points out the distressing practical questions of fact, not law, of such intervention in reapportioning the State legislatures.

To review and pass judgment upon the "democratic" problems of reapportionment would lead the courts into "a mathematical quagmire." Also, he made clear that the Federal courts cannot in reason be required to correct every wrong, however small. "There is not under our Constitution a judicial remedy for every political mischief."

Whatever grounds there may be for further opening the breach in the Constitution in the name of "equal protection," the spirit of the Constitution itself is violated in this decision.

EPOCHAL COMPROMISE

For the epochal compromise which was necessary, if there was to be any Constitution at all, set a pattern of representation which violated the meaning with which liberals now have invested the term "democracy."

The States were given equal representation—while the House of Representatives was to have representation on the basis of population.

The Senate was created in that pattern because then—and, I believe, quite properly now—the States were invested with a certain sovereignty.

SPECIFIC INTERESTS

It was recognized then and it is clear now that each State, however small in population, has specific interests which deserve a voice in the Federal Legislature. To recast the Senate would overwhelm a score of small States. They would be subjected to the vast popular majorities of the heavily populated industrial States.

It will be answered that to upset the present makeup of the Senate, a constitutional amendment would be needed. To accomplish that, Congress would initiate the amendment and send it to the States for ratification.

Small States would object. But suppose that the necessary three-quarters of the States would stand to gain Senate representation under such an amendment.

They could in consequence overwhelm the one-quarter of the small States which would stand to be swallowed up in the result.

VENGEANCE

But there is a factor which will probably forever bar such an amendment from being proposed by Congress, especially by a Congress which is as heavily dominated by those who favor more Federal power as the present one.

With the proliferation of the vast Federal bureaucracy, the administration in Washington now has a horde of Federal bureaucrats in many of the smaller States. The vote of those bureaucrats can and in some cases does dominate elections.

Hence, the Senators from those States generally vote for more and more Federal power and more handouts for their sparsely populated areas. Indeed, in some of those States the Federal Government is already the largest property owner in terms of land, resources, and Government installations. Those States are also more dependent upon Federal grants-in-aid.

This decision of the Supreme Court is in line with what liberals call "democracy at work." It certainly is working with a vengeance foreign to our constitutional traditions.

[From the Florence (S.C.) Morning News, Mar. 30, 1962]

COURT'S APPORTIONMENT DECISION REFLECTS A TWO-SIDED PROBLEM

In dealing with the apportionment of State legislatures, the Supreme Court has invaded a new field of States rights. The Court has ruled that where the States themselves refuse to reapportion representation to keep abreast of shifting population, the Court can rule on the constitutionality of such refusal.

There are two sides to this issue with considerable right on both sides.

On the Court's side, there is the failure of some State legislatures to take into account population changes resulting in a concentration in metropolitan centers and a decline of residents in rural areas. Politically, the effect is to dominate State legislatures by thinly settled rural counties at the expense of cities. Cities with their mounting revenue problems are finding it more and more difficult to obtain a fair shake in the distribution of State taxes from rural-dominated legislatures.

The effect of the Court's decision is to say to State legislatures that unless they take into account the fact of these population changes and reapportion their representation accordingly, then that failure becomes an issue for constitutional consideration by the Federal Court.

On the other hand, there is the right of the State to determine the proportion of representation by counties. It is based on our dual concept of government in which States have rights reserved to them by the Constitution. Erosion of these rights by Federal court decisions seriously endangers the constitutional basis upon which this Republic was founded.

It is proper, of course, to point out that States rights carry responsibilities and were never intended as a screen for evading these responsibilities. But the High Court shows an impatience with the practical problems faced by the States in conditioning public opinion to accept changes. In appropriating the authority of the States, the Court poses a greater danger to the Republic than the problem it seeks to solve.

We are in sympathy with the principle upon which the Court acted. We are ready to acknowledge that States magnify rights to the neglect of responsibilities. But we are also aware of the alarming threat posed by this gradual erosion of the rights reserved to the State by the Constitution.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, Mar. 28, 1962]

THE COURT STEPS INTO VACUUM

The U.S. Supreme Court decision declaring unconstitutional the failure of State legislatures to reapportion State legislative districts may properly be described as tragic, but it was inevitable.

And the great tragedy is that it was avoidable at the option of the States themselves.

The Court has now entered that "political thicket" it had carefully stepped around in earlier, parallel cases. By ruling against the States, it has made itself the judge of proper legislative apportionment, giving itself a task that will prove to be difficult if not impossible to fulfill.

The drawing of legislative boundaries is always a difficult job, replete with temptations to make political profit in the process. "Gerrymander" is one of the most time-honored political slang expressions in the American lexicon.

But time and precedent have done nothing to erase the basic unfairness of the process. Nor have they done anything to relieve the feeling of resentment of voters whose ballots have been diluted to a fraction of their proper value.

The cries of anguish have risen as the tide of population has shifted, leaving legislative boundaries unmoved. Representation in districts established 20, 40, or even 100 years ago has in many cases remained unchanged even where the number of people represented has been drained away.

The rigid refusal to readjust to population changes has been in direct conflict with State constitutions. Almost without exception they, or State laws, require redrawing of legislative districts to conform with the U.S. census taken every 10 years.

Acting on the theory that this was a matter primarily for State concern, however, the Supreme Court had held aloof from this problem.

But it demanded relief and the Court's reversal of position came as little surprise.

Not for some 30 years has the Supreme Court showed signs of excessive caution and sensitivity in matters of State affairs. The once-carefully drawn line between Federal and State problems has been obscured in decision after decision since Franklin D. Roosevelt threatened to "pack" the Court.

This latest decision, then, is the logical outgrowth of a trend long discernible in the Court's philosophy.

But it is more than that. It could have been avoided in an instant if the defaulting States had faced up to the duties imposed upon them by their own constitutions.

They chose, for a variety of unwholesome reasons, not to do so. They cannot escape partial blame for the Federal interference which will now inevitably flow from their refusal to act.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, Mar. 31, 1962]

COURT REWRITES CONSTITUTION

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—Men who have long tried to hold the Supreme Court in special veneration cannot now deny that it is rewriting the Constitution and meddling in politics to suit the wishes of some—but only some—of nine unelected men.

This is the central, the true and tragic, meaning of the new and divided court decision claiming for the Federal judiciary the unexampled power to make its own determination as to whether seats in State legislatures are rationally apportioned as between urban and rural areas.

This extraordinary ruling to their enduring credit was able and memorably opposed by the two best legal minds on the bench, Justices Felix Frankfurter and John Marshall Harlan. On its face it is a good thing. For it is undeniable that rural voters in many States have been given disproportionate voices in their legislatures by districting formulas which penalize city voters.

Thus no doubt there will be dancing in the streets of the metropolitan centers—indeed, in the metropolitan centers in which this column now appears. But those who are celebrating this presumed fall of rural dominance would do well to take a second thought and a second look below the surface.

For something else is falling, too—the Constitution of the United States as we have known it. It is being altered not by Congress and people—the only constitutional way for its alteration—but rather by a momentary majority of a Court which seems fatally determined to change the whole social and political fabric of this country, on its own writ and mandate.

It may well be that such changes should be made. But they cannot rightfully be made merely and solely by a handful of men—six men in this case—whose thirst for reform has caused them to falter in a high mission. This is the high mission of a cool, detached, impersonal justice which is the only true distinction of the loftiest Court in all the world.

Losing this, the Court in the end will lose itself. And this is the greatest tragedy of all.

"Well," it will be said, "if the rural people have in fact gained undue power and the legislatures themselves won't do anything about it, why shouldn't the Supreme Court step in?"

The ultimate answer is that the Court should not "step in" simply because it has no right under the Constitution to do so, a fact which, until now, it has repeatedly recognized over the long course of nearly two centuries.

And the practical answer is that the people themselves must work out their own difficulties here, however long and hard the task, if we are to maintain the Constitution of the United States. A bleak prospect? Yes. But listen to Justice Frankfurter, a great judge who a generation ago was the very symbol of "racialism" to certain excited conservatives but who has now proved himself a towering guardian of that best-of-all conservatism which is constitutionalism:

"There is not under our Constitution a judicial remedy for every political mischief. In a democratic society like ours, relief must come through an aroused public conscience that sears the conscience of the people's representatives."

Not a thousand rotten boroughs in the legislatures can justify what is now happening. For the Supreme Court is being made the agent of a determined political drive by urban interests to reverse the balance of political power and so make urban voter hereafter master over rural voter.

There is nothing evil in this drive; there is no criticism in this column of the motives or actions of those who thrust this case before the Court. The business of advocates is to advocate. But the business of the Supreme Court is to judge and decide, not what is "good" for country and people, but what the Constitution and laws are—not what they should be.

Not the Image

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, there are many who feel that the image of America, and the image of American women as a whole, was not properly depicted by the recent visit of the First Lady in India and Pakistan.

Following is a letter from one South Dakota lady which expressed something the feeling that many have reported to me:

I wish to protest the taxpayers picking up the bill for the distorted image of America abroad made by Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy's trip to India, the movie cameraman and director expenses totaling $72,000, and the large entourage she took with her. It turned out

to be nothing but a pleasure trip and fashion show; how can it be justified as Government expense? She saw nothing of the use of our foreign aid money; learned nothing of the tens of thousands of hungry, and sick, and homeless people on the streets of India's cities; expressed no sympathy for their profound need and want; paid no visit to hospitals, schools or churches—presented only a fashion show of colorful clothes to the public and did only the things she especially wished to do. Surely the image of the women of America she left in the minds of India is false, distorted, unfriendly, and untrue. I doubt if the impression of America in Asia or the world was improved by the lavish display of luxurious gifts purchased to bring home, the five-times-a-day change of costume, the display of horsewomenship, and the emphasis on American wealth and luxuries. Even the Queen of England does not put on such a show when she travels abroad.

The image of America the Kennedy administrtaion is giving to other countries today is marked by distortions. Newspapers around the world broadcast present-day America as having only one privileged wealthy class. Why wouldn't every country flock to the United States for aid? I think it is time to stop all this free will offering, and keep the Kennedy family at home where they belong. Let our State Department do the traveling.

We women are urged to write out Representatives how we feel back home, so now I have expressed myself and many other of my friends feel the same.

Balanced Budget Prospects Gloomy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, at this time many of us are interested in what is likely to be the possibility of a balanced Federal budget. We are scrutinizing each new request for funds with apprehension. It now seems likely that tax revenues will run far short of the President's January estimate. The proposed tax measure, rather than raising revenues, seems very likely to run us further "in the red."

The people of Idaho are gravely concerned and pessimistic about the present spending trends. An excellent article on our economy by Maurice H. Stans, formerly Director of the Bureau of the Budget, was published in the Washington Post under date of April 9, 1962, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BALANCED BUDGET PROSPECTS GLOOMY

(By Maurice H. Stans)

Now that several months have elapsed since President Kennedy sent to the Congress his recordbreaking peacetime budget of $93 billion, it is a good time, while the Congress is still debating appropriations, to analyze its prospects. With the benefit of several months of hindsight, some new appraisals can be made.

It is now highly improbable that Kennedy's narrowly balanced budget for 1963 will survive the year in the black. Its revenue assumptions are not likely to be realized, and its expenditure estimates will undoubtedly be exceeded. The projected surplus of half a billion dollars will more probably turn out to be a deficit of somewhere between $3 and $6 billion. Only a sharp turnabout by the White House before July 1 can change this prospect.

Here are some of the forces working against a balanced budget for 1963:

The estimated tax revenues are based on a hoped-for gross national product of $570 billion in calendar 1962. Most economists presently place their expectations in the range of $555 billion to $560 billion. Less prosperity means less personal tax collections.

Corporate tax collections in the budget assume that 1962 profits will be 22 percent higher than in the best year in history. While earnings of corporations should be better in 1962 than in any previous year, it is not likely that they will average out this well.

Despite last-minute changes by the Ways and Means Committee, the tax bill passed by the House apparently will cost more in taxes in the first year than it will raise. The Senate, of course, may modify this.

Promised liberalization of depreciation allowances by Treasury Secretary C. Douglas Dillon will reduce taxable business income. If this relief is to be meaningful in amount, corporation tax payments will be lessened.

With all this, it is a fair assumption that as matters now stand, revenues will fail to reach the President's $93 billion level by a considerable amount—as much as $3 billion or even more.

EXPENDITURE SIDE

On the expenditure side, there is little room for optimism either. The cuts the Appropriations Committees will make will not help 1963 significantly, because usually the biggest reductions are in authorizations with long lead time, like construction or foreign aid. The Congress will probably again take a good whack at foreign aid, but a billion dollar slash in this appropriation would normally reduce actual current year expenditures by only $100 or $200 million. In the meantime:

Interest costs on the national debt will probably run a bit higher than the $9.4 billion budgeted, a result of refunding operations that produce higher interest rates.

Kennedy's request for higher postal rates probably will not be enacted in time to take effect July 1, as the budget intended. And in the same bill, the Congress is almost certain to raise the pay of Government employees more than the $210 million included in the budget for increases for the 2.7 million government employees; the last Government-wide pay increase cost $700 million a year.

The budget reduction of $434 million in the cost of farm price supports is speculative. It is too late for the Congress to vote a farm bill in time to save any money on the crop support program during fiscal 1963. In the meantime, the upward trend in farm productivity will continue to frustrate efforts to keep production in line with consumption, and only increased farm exports could alleviate this situation.

Part of the budgeted saving in farm programs is proposed to come by holding dairy price support costs to $300 million. This may be politically unpalatable for the Congress.

Kennedy has just recommended continuance of the Federal program of extended unemployment benefits, retroactive to the expiration date of April 1. This unbudgeted expenditure alone could destroy the small surplus.

He also has proposed, subsequently to the budget, that the Congress vote a new $600 million public works program. If this is enacted, the expenditures in fiscal 1963 will be increased by $300 million; the balance will fall in future years.

Other pressures to accelerate the outflow of spending will prevail all through the year. The unspent authorizations of prior years carried over into fiscal 1963 will amount to about $82 billion. Unless the White House deliberately restrains the rate of these expenditures, the amount of actual outgo for military and other Government programs could exceed the scheduled flow by as much as $1 or $2 billion. Backdoor spending authorizations in existing law, and carryover appropriations from previous years, can be held up only by deliberate presidential action.

The military budget may be exceeded for another reason. The budget message points out that the amount planned assumes that "the special measures associated with (the Berlin) crisis will terminate at the beginning of (the) fiscal year." If they do not, defense costs could go up substantially.

WORLD CONFIDENCE

In short, there are no presently visible items that will work in Kennedy's favor, in comparison with the original budget estimates.

The President's goal of a balanced budget deserves approval within and outside the country. But with this array of uncertainties, it is not realistic to expect that a budget as tinged with optimism as the one he submitted for 1963 can be achieved. Past commitments, going programs and spending habits have too much momentum.

A deficit for 1963 in the range of $3 to $6 million could be another blow to world confidence. It could threaten a further drain on our gold supply. Last fall, when Kennedy found out that the 1962 deficit was heading for $9 billion, he ordered drastic cuts in spending already authorized by the Congress (medical research, housing, veterans' loans, airplane procurement, and other items), and he may have to do it again this year.

Studying and Teaching Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, there is no more challenging area for educational activity than in the teaching of the real meaning and the practice of brotherhood.

It was with a sense of pleasure and enlightenment that I recently read in March 18, 1962, issue of the Sunday Exponent-Telegram, of Clarksburg, W. Va., excerpts from an article on the subject by Mrs. Harriette Rhawn Behringer of Park Forest, Ill.

Mrs. Behringer is a graduate of Northwestern University and a postgraduate student in education there and at Chicago University. She is presently teaching world history at the Rich Central High School at Olympia Fields, near Chicago. She is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. H. G. Rhawn of Clarksburg.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from Mrs. Behringer's interesting and informative article as published in the Clarksburg Sunday Exponent-Telegram.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEACHING BROTHERHOOD IS TOPIC OF ARTICLE WRITTEN BY FORMER LOCAL GIRL

CHICAGO, ILL., March 17.—The National Conference of Christians and Jews has just reprinted from Illinois Education, a magazine devoted to discussion of educational problems, a special article describing a course in brotherhood. The reprint is given nationwide circulation.

Author of the article is Mrs. Harriette Rhawn Behringer, the former Miss Harriette Rhawn, of Clarksburg, W. Va., the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. H. G. Rhawn of that city.

Excerpts from the article follow:

"I took a course in brotherhood, and I am going to remember it for a long, long time. It gave me a deep sense of the real meaning of good human relations.

"I was a student in intergroup education, a graduate-level course designed for teachers, supervisors, and school administrators on all levels and in all academic fields. The course is an education service of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, and is sometimes offered in cooperation with a sponsoring college or university, often as an inservice course for school districts.

"As an elementary teacher, I was dubious that the course could deal with human relations and prejudices as subject matter. But I took the plunge and gathered informally once a week with 15 other teachers around a large conference table in the faculty room of Bloom Township High School, Chicago Heights.

"Our leader and moderator was Dr. Edward G. Olsen, director of education, NCCJ, Chicago region. We approached human relations philosophy, materials, and methods from a dozen different directions. We did some stimulating reading on our contemporary society and its values, and went into history for some of our answers.

"We tried to search out the dusty corner of our own minds while we looked at our community and our world. What kinds of schools have we? How closely do they reflect the culture values of the community? (Very closely, we learned; if the community has a high prejudice quotient, chances are that the school has one equally as high.)

"We also took a place at the world about us through films. We looked, listened, read, discussed, and even did some role playing. We drank coffee, ate cake, and argued.

"But all the time we were self-probers. Discussion questions included: How rapidly can human beings adapt to social change? Can we fit into new patterns of integration overnight, or is this necessarily a long, slow process? Is there any real evidence of improved intergroup relations in the past decade? What are some racial and religious myths and misconceptions? What do Negro Americans really want? How do their aspirations compare with what white Americans think they want? What are various points of view on religion in the public schools?

"There were no pat answers to these questions, but we did a great deal of positive thinking. Although we did not always agree with one another, one feeling seemed generally accepted by all of us—that the public school has done a great deal to nurture quality in human relations; more, in fact, than any other single institution sonce colonial times.

"Another extremely helpful area covered in the seminar was of the materials-and-methods procedure. Although I had always tried to be fair in the classroom, considering each child as an individual, I never had considered a positive program of objectives, curriculam approaches, and resource materials.

"As a result of the course, I am now well equipped to make concrete suggestions and to provide various materials. I have a file describing good books dealing with brotherhood; specific films, film strips, and scripts that I can order; and guided tours of nearby Chicago that my class can take. I know now that I can write for free or inexpensive classroom materials to the National Council of Christians and Jews, 203 North Wabash, Chicago 1.

"Another section of the course was devoted to individual and group research. My own research project dealt with religion in the public schools and took the form of correspondence and interviews with priests, rabbis, ministers, and public school administrators in my own community of Park Forest. All were queried for viewpoints on the teaching of religion in the public school with specific reference to such practices as holiday celebrations, recitation of prayers to open class sessions, and readings from the Bible.

"There are many things to think about and to talk about in relation to brotherhood—children, for one; tomorrow, for another.

"About children: it is true, as the song from 'South Pacific' tells us, that you've got to be taught to hate and fear. Too often children are taught to hate. They absorb, easily and early, the prejudices and fears of those about them. Teachers themselves often deny the notion of racial and religious prejudices in children, pretending these attitudes do not exist.

"We are educating children for a wise adulthood in a world of tension, and we must be aware of intergroup relationships, taking every available path to understanding others. Discriminate, of course. But on the basis of individual excellence, not of race or religion.

"Today is tomorrow, for children. Today, in the classroom, we are shaping their futures. What kind of tomorrows will there be?

"The free world looks more and more to our country to see democratic ideals in practice. Teachers can do more than any other group to make the world of tomorrow, today. But we need professional training of the kind most of us never received in our teacher-education programs. This kind of course is of genuine help in meeting that need."

Peace Corps Man From Lowell Lauds Achievements in Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Boston Sunday Globe illustrates the type of enthusiastic good will which has made our Peace Corps a strong operative throughout the world:

[From the Boston Sunday Globe, Apr. 1, 1962]

PEACE CORPS MAN FROM LOWELL LAUDS ACHIEVEMENTS IN AFRICA

A young Peace Corps representative from Lowell, now serving in Africa, reported recently that he is "definitely optimistic" about the future of the Corps.

In a letter to Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Newell Flather, 52 Mansur Street, said: "The amount of good that can be accomplished by a small group of well-organized, well-educated Americans is constantly evident."

Flather, a 1961 graduate of Harvard, is now teaching in secondary school in Winneba, Ghana. He wrote in reply to a request from SALTONSTALL for his views and experiences with the Corps thus far. His letter was read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

While pointing out that "every Peace Corpsman would admit to times of disappointment and frustration and to brief flashes of loneliness," Flather praised the Corps leaders and said SALTONSTALL's "interest and support in the program are justified."

One of the biggest problems Flather is trying to combat is the absence of background in the students' training, which he said "seems sometimes insurmountable."

SLOW WITH FUNDS

"For some reason, the Peace Corps has been slow in coming through with the promised $1,000 of teaching aids, which I would spend on a film projector for the school," he added.

Flather's former teachers in the Lowell elementary school have recognized the obstacles he has faced and have shown a deep interest in the work he is doing. They have sent books needed for his teaching and have organized correspondence between students in this country and those in Winneba.

While not denying that the Nigerian Peace Corps postcard incident of last fall was controversial, Flather said the Ghanaian were usually indifferent or amused. The headmaster of the school and Flather heartily agreed that "anyone in a foreign country for the first time was subject to cultural shock."

"The headmaster had just received a letter from his nephew in Britain who was unfavorably impressed with the food, the climate, and the people," Flather added.

He said that real privations have been at a minimum. His house, a 2-mile walk from the school, is without electricity, refrigeration, and transportation.

"But it is compensatingly located on the beautiful, grassy, warm, windswept plains and faces the distant and lovely Mount Mankoadze.

"Never before have I seen so much sky, eaten such good fish, or breathed so much good air."

LATE, LATE SHOW

Flather's house is within hearing distance of Winneba's ceremonial grounds, and he is able "to catch a late show and a late late show of magnificent dancing, drumming, and chanting three or four times a week."

"One of the most delightful customs of the town," he wrote, "is the ritual equivalent to our Thanksgiving, which features a deer-hunt and a barehanded kill."

Winneba, or Winneba-by-the-Sea as he has renamed it, is described as "undoubtedly not unlike what Rockport, Mass., was a century ago."

"On the one hand, it is considered a health resort and an excellent swimming-picnic area by Europeans; on the other hand, it is an area of intense progovernment, proparty political activity," he reported.

Flather teaches 28 hours a week of English language and literature, French, and British history. Extra activities include being a form (grade) master and master for entertainment and debating. He plans to coach wrestling, tennis, and basketball.

He says the Ghanaians are friendly toward the Corps representatives. "It is a fact that Ghanaians distinguish Americans from other Europeans by their casual, open friendliness."

"The Volta loan seems to have gone deep into their hearts, no matter what their previous beliefs or inclinations might have been," he added.

One suggestion Flather has made to Peace Corps officials, and about which he has had no reply, is that the representatives be given the opportunity to choose, or

recommend likely students for American schools and colleges.

He recommends that a Government-supported Peace Corps scholarship fund be established.

Appraisal of the Administration's Legislative Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very succinct and accurate appraisal of the administration's legislative program thus far. The editorial appeared in the April 9 editions of the New York Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS

With his transportation message last week President Kennedy has put before Congress the full design of the legislation he considers necessary this year for national prosperity, security, and the discharge of our world obligations. The range of his proposals has been impressive; the accomplishments to date meager.

The focus has been much more heavily on domestic affairs then it was in the President's first year, when his most imaginative undertaking and his greatest successes were in matching military readiness with improved instruments for international cooperation. The proposal for a 5-year Trade Expansion Act to meet the challenge and opportunity of the European Common Market is 1962's only counterpart of such ventures as the Alliance for Progress, the long-range charter for foreign aid and the Peace Corps.

On the domestic front the President can point to only one major bill passed in 3 months. This is the $435 million job-retraining program, rescued from probable death in the House by Republican help. Congress is reacting frigidly to a Kennedy plea for standby authority to ward off future recessions through tax cuts and large-scale public works. A quiet burial has been given the administration's call for a much-needed overhaul of unemployment insurance. Now the White House and the jobless will have to be content with an extension of last year's patchwork plan to prolong payment to those idle so long as their benefit rights have run out.

The persistence of high unemployment in many areas has prompted the President to move beyond his bid for standby authority and urge an immediate Federal appropriation of $300 million for public works. Slackness in the economy in the first quarter has cast uncertainty on the hairline balance in Mr. Kennedy's budget for fiscal 1963, but he remains hopeful that a new upswing will keep business, jobs and Government revenue moving forward. His success in promoting a noninflationary steel settlement should help. On the plus side, too, is House approval, under keen Presidential pressure, of a tax bill designed to spur plant investment and close loopholes.

The proposal for a Cabinet level Department of Urban Affairs has been killed. Extinction also appears in store for Federal aid to public schools, despite the brave words with which the President sent his education message to Congress again this year. Unless Mr. Kennedy gives more energetic support to the rest of his program than he has to his all-but-orphaned school bill, the great bulk will wind up as campaign issues, not laws.

On the list, uniformly labeled "urgent" or "vital," are such desirable measures as medical care for the aged, a comprehensive conservation program, moves to abolish the poll tax and racial discrimination in literacy tests, the encyclopedic transportation plan, a changed accent in public assistance to foster rehabilitation, liberalization of foreign aid, the exciting foreign trade program and House authorization for the purchase of United Nations bonds. Also awaiting action are a consumer protection plan that sounds more like a campaign display case than a serious bid for legislation and a highly controversial program for bringing sense into the calculated lunacy of the farm subsidy program.

In his New York Coliseum speech in the closing hours of the 1960 campaign, Mr. Kennedy pledged that he would be "a President who will not back down under pressure or let down his spokesmen in the Congress—a President who does not speak from the rear of the battle but who places himself in the thick of the fight." Now, with so much of his program in peril, it is time for that type of leadership.

We Cannot Meet President Kennedy's Spending Demands and Balance the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, through the help of friendly propagandists the President has been able to make the people believe that he can spend the people's money on any and all Federal schemes and welfare projects and at the same time maintain fiscal responsibility by balancing the budget. It can't be done. Next year we will have to raise an additional $14 billion just to break even because of increased spending demanded by the President. There is only one way to maintain fiscal responsibility and protect the people's money, and that way is to cut Federal spending, balance the budget, pay down the debt and reduce taxes. Any other course is merely doubletalk and I do not believe even this President can fool the American people too much longer. A look at our economy is outlined in the following article by Maurice H. Stans in the Washington Post:

BALANCED BUDGET PROSPECTS GLOOMY

(By Maurice H. Stans)

Now that several months have elapsed since President Kennedy sent to the Congress his recordbreaking peacetime budget of $93 billion, it is a good time, while the Congress is still debating appropriations, to analyze its prospects. With the benefit of several months of hindsight, some new appraisals can be made.

It is now highly improbable that Kennedy's narrowly balanced budget for 1963 will survive the year in the black. Its revenue assumptions are not likely to be realized. and its expenditure estimates will undoubtedly be exceeded. The project surplus of half a billion dollars will more probably turn out to be a deficit of somewhere between $3 and $6 billion. Only a sharp turnabout by the White House before July 1 can change this prospect.

Here are some of the forces working against a balanced budget for 1963:

The estimated tax revenues are based on a hoped-for gross national product of $570 billion in calendar 1962. Most economists presently place their expectations in the range of $555 billion to $560 billion. Less prosperity means less personal tax collections.

Corporate tax collections in the budget assume that 1962 profits will be 22 percent higher than in the best year in history. While earnings of corporations should be better in 1962 than in any previous year, it is not likely that they will average out this well.

Despite last minute changes by the Ways and Means Committee, the tax bill passed by the House apparently wil cost more in taxes in the first year than it will raise. The Senate, of course, may modify this.

Promised liberalization of depreciation allowances by Treasury Secretary C. Douglas Dillon will reduce taxable business income. If this relief is to be meaningful in amount, corporation tax payments will be lessened.

With all this, it is a fair assumption that as matters now stand, revenues will fail to reach the President's $93 billion level by a considerable amount—as much as $3 billion or even more.

EXPENDITURE SIDE

On the expenditure side, there is little room for optimism either. The cuts the Appropriations Committees will make will not help 1963 significantly, because usually the biggest reductions are in authorizations with long leadtime, like construction or foreign aid. The Congress will probably again take a good whack at foreign aid, but a billion-dollar slash in this appropriation would normally reduce actual current year expenditures by only $100 or $200 million. In the meantime:

Interest costs on the national debt will probably run a bit higher than the $9.4 billion budgeted, a result of refunding operations that produce higher interest rates.

Kennedy's request for higher postal rates probably will not be enacted in time to take effect July 1, as the budget intended. And in the same bill, the Congress is almost certain to raise the pay of Government employes more than the $210 million included in the budget for increases for the 2.7 million Government employees; the last Government-wide pay increase cost $700 million a year.

The budget reduction of $434 million in the cost of farm price supports is speculative. It is too late for the Congress to vote a farm bill in time to save any money on the crop support program during fiscal 1963. In the meantime, the upward trend in farm productivity will continue to frustrate efforts to keep production in line with consumption, and only increased farm exports could alleviate this situation.

Part of the budgeted saving in farm programs is proposed to come by holding dairy price support costs to $300 million. This may be politically unpalatable for the Congress.

Kennedy has just recommended continuance of the Federal program of extended unemployment benefits, retroactive to the expiration date of April 1. This unbudgeted expenditure alone could destroy the small surplus.

He also has proposed, subsequent to the budget, that the Congress vote a new $600 million public works program. If this is enacted, the expenditures in fiscal 1963 will be increased by $300 million; the balance will fall in future years.

Other pressures to accelerate the outflow of spending will prevail all through the year. The unspent authorizations of prior years carried over into fiscal 1963 will amount to about $82 billion. Unless the White House deliberately restrains the rate of these expenditures, the amount of actual outgo for military and other Government programs could exceed the scheduled flow by as much as $1 or $2 billion. Backdoor spending authorizations in existing law, and carryover appropriations from previous years, can be held up only by deliberate Presidential action.

The miltiary budget may be exceeded for another reason. The budget message points out that the amount planned assumes that "the special measures associated with (the Berlin) crisis will terminate at the beginning of (the) fiscal year." If they do not, defense costs could go up substantially.

WORLD CONFIDENCE

In short, there are no presently visible items that will work in Kennedy's favor, in comparison with the original budget estimates.

The President's goal of a balanced budget deserves approval within and outside the country. But with this array of uncertainties, it is not realistic to expect that a budget as tinged with optimism as the one he submitted for 1963 can be achieved. Past commitments, going programs and spending habits have too much momentum.

A deficit for 1963 in the range of $3 to $6 million could be another blow to world confidence. It could threaten a further drain on our gold supply. Last fall, when Kennedy found out that the 1962 deficit was heading for $9 billion, he ordered drastic cuts in spending already authorized by the Congress (medical research, housing, veterans' loans, airplane procurement and other items), and he may have to do it again this year.

Tribute to Mrs. May Craig

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, in one respect, I am luckier than most of my colleagues in the Senate. All of them are aware of the distinguished Washington reporter for Maine's Gannett newspapers, Mrs. May Craig. But only two of us are subject to her daily inquiries.

From long experience, I know that I am not free, early or late, from the questions posed by the inquisitive and persistent Mrs. Craig. This is not a burden, however, but a stimulant. She helps to keep me on my toes.

In the April 24 issue of Look magazine, there is an excellent profile of Mrs. Craig which I commend to my colleagues. Because she has been for so long and remains one of Washington's most colorful and important figures, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "May Craig: TV's Most Unusual Star" be printed in the RECORD at this point. I offer it as a tribute to a grand lady and a good friend.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY CRAIG: TV'S MOST UNUSUAL STAR

(By Eleanor Harris)

Millions who have seen her on "Meet the Press" think of her as a sharp-tongued spinster who likes to wear funny hats. Here are the surprising facts about the shrewd, southern-born grandmother who has become nationally famous while representing three nationally obscure Maine newspapers in Washington.

The scene was a Wednesday morning press conference at the White House. President Franklin D. Roosevelt was obviously relishing the smooth give-and-take of the questions and answers. Suddenly, a wrenlike little woman in a blue suit and fluffy pink hat got his attention and asked him a touchy question. The President hesitated, answered reluctantly and then snapped at her, "You must have stayed awake all night thinking that up."

"I did," she told him crisply. The President and the correspondents dissolved in laughter, and her unexpected sally at the Chief of State has become a legend among Washington newspapermen.

The wrenlike little woman was May Craig, a correspondent for three nationally obscure Maine newspapers, and needling Presidents is now an old game with her. Six Chiefs of State and untold scores of celebrities have been her prey in the 38 years she has been part of the Washington press corps. Today, she is a TV personality in her own right and one of the most unlikely stars ever produced by that medium.

This grim little old lady now appears frequently on "Meet the Press," a news-interview TV program originating in the Capital. In the 13 years that she has been on the show, interviewing more than 150 of the world's top political personalities, she has titillated cartoonists and comedians by her manner and personality. Her tidy little person, no-nonsense air, and granite face have reduced even salty TV critics to marshmallow sentiment. She looks and talks like a caricature of a New England spinster. In fact, May Craig is a southerner, a widow, and a grandmother. Furthermore, she has dancing blue eyes, an almost flirtatious smile, and a gurgling chuckle, all of them in nonstop action when she is off camera. Her age is a secret she guards fiercely—"I'm going to be 50 until I die"—but her oldest child is known to be 51.

A hard worker at perpetuating the fiction of New England austerity, she even dresses the part. Her winter costume never varies: She always wears a navy blue suit and pink blouse topped by a fake pink pearl necklace. She has 45 necklaces, most of them pink, and 32 hats—all pink. Her tidy brown-gray hair is held strictly in place with bone hairpins and combs; below her unfashionably long hemlines are neat, straight-seamed stockings and sturdy walking shoes. "All my clothes," says Mrs. Craig in her flat New England-style voice, "in every single detail, are planned out, as I plan everything I do."

"She's one of the tidiest and most methodical women I've ever met," says Isabel Griffin of the Griffin News Bureau. Mrs. Griffin once noticed that Mrs. Craig wore the same white cotton dress for 4 consecutive days, and although the weather was steamily hot, the dress remained crisply immaculate. "Finally, I asked her how she did it. She said that she had been wearing four different dresses, one each day. If she likes a dress, she buys the same style over and over."

Her hats have become a hallmark. In the 38 years that she has been reporting in the Capital, May Craig has never appeared by daylight without a gaily colored hat. She tells friends: "A bright hat is my trademark—hats of black and brown can't be picked out in a crowd." During both the Democratic and Republican conventions of 1960, she wore the same distinctive rose-flowered hat day after day after day. "I did it deliberately, so that I could be easily recognized in the mobs of people," she admits. Then she adds pugnaciously, "But don't forget there are brains under the hat."

It was directly due to both hat and brains that May Craig became the offbeat heroine of "Meet the Press." Ever since President Roosevelt made Presidential press conferences more informal by not requiring written questions, her planned queries, asked from a planned spot in the front row (in the second row at President Kennedy's conferences), have brought her attention. Even her enemies agree that she shines as a questioner. She researches thoroughly, asks penetrating questions and has the tenacity of a terrier.

Lawrence Spivak, producer of "Meet the Press" and himself a longtime observer of the Washington scene, says, "I first noticed her at Presidential press conference. She has a very distinctive personality and voice. I found her fair, challenging, informed, and responsible." Furthermore, Mrs. Craig usually asks the questions "that the audience would like asked."

May Craig first appeared on "Meet the Press" while it was still solely a radio show, in 1946. On January 30, 1949, she made her debut on the televised program, one of four reporters questioning a political guest. From the beginning ("No, I wasn't a bit nervous; I never am," she says), she seemed to interest viewers more than any of the hundreds of reporters Spivak has used on the show.

This television personality, like everything else about her, was planned. "I watched women on television a great deal before I ever went on," she admits, "and I decided a number of things not to do. I think women's voices are too high, and I think they smile too much trying to be pleasing, and I hated their laughter even on radio. I made up my mind I'd rather be grim than giggly." Then she adds, "Most women have a tendency to argue, too; I always remember that the thing is to get information out of the guest." She also decided to wear a little makeup and a lot of hat.

Usually notified a week or two in advance that she will be on a certain show with a specified guest, she immediately collects material about him, often from the guest's own office.

"But I don't do anything about this material until the morning of the show," she says. "Then I spread it all out and go over it. I make notes of key words and dates on folded yellow paper. I write down exact statements he has made. Then I think up questions, generally ones I imagine the audience would like to have asked—but these I never write down in advance. By that night, I'm ready." So ready is she that at least one target, Lawyer Ray Jenkins, of the McCarthy-Army hearings, sent her orchids in advance of appearing on the show. "Did him no good," Spivak reports now.

Only once on the show did she shock her male fellow reporters by appearing to act as catty as a back-fence gossip. The guest was former First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt, and it was during the time that JAMES ROOSEVELT was making headlines because of his admitted wide acquaintance among ladies who were not his wife.

Ken Crawford, of Newsweek, tells of that particular show: "Just before the program started, all the men reporters agreed we wouldn't embarrass Mrs. Roosevelt by asking her about her son JIMMY; May just listened to us. Then, when her turn come to ask questions on the show, she suddenly piped up, 'Mrs. Roosevelt, what is your attitude toward your son's current troubles?' To our astonishment, Mrs. Roosevelt didn't seem a bit disturbed and gave a calm reply.

Later, we found that they were old friends who had spent the evening together. Why, Mrs. Roosevelt was even wearing one of May's pink hats on the show. Apparently, they'd agreed on the question ahead of time in perfect harmony."

It is ironic that, although everyone in Washington knows May Craig, most people have never read a word she has written. However, in Maine, she is read every morning on the editorial pages of 3 newspapers with a total circulation of 86,496. On Sundays, when Portland's Press-Herald, Augusta's Kennebec Journal, and Waterville's Sentinel are all represented by a single newspaper, the combined circulation is 97,705.

Surprisingly, her 750-word column turns out to be as cosily rambling as her personality appears to be terse and aloof. Of it, she says, "The column is really me—it represents me and my thinking more than anything else." Then she adds suddenly, "I don't have time to polish it, and I know that it's ungrammatical at times. But I think it's awfully good, myself."

It is a mishmash of political reporting, sudden thoughts and personal opinion, as if she were talking teacup to teacup with an old friend after spending an exciting day wandering in and out of the places of the privileged in Washington—which indeed she does daily. She writes the column between 6:30 a.m., when she awakens, and 8:30 a.m., when she breakfasts. "After two cups of coffee from a vacuum bottle beside my bed, I get up, dress and go into the workroom next to my bedroom to type the column." Then, going downstairs, she gets the Washington Post at the front door and settles down in front of her television set, in her living room, to watch the "Today" show. Beside her is one of her nine radios. (She keeps a radio in each room of her house, and she always carries one in her handbag so that she can listen hourly to the news, no matter where she is.) By 9 o'clock, and often much earlier, she has started her all-day round of news collecting. Comments Ned Brooks, moderator of "Meet the Press," "May Craig covers more territory each day than most able-bodied men."

There is little doubt that she has become conscious of her fame since her television triumphs. At a recent party for the cast of the Washington-based motion picture "Advise and Consent," she was introduced to Actor Charles Laughton. Said Laughton cordially, "So this is the famous Mrs. Craig." Twinkling up at him, May said with equal cordiality, "But Mr. Laughton, you're famous too."

"In recent years, May's become an actress, and she's always in character," says one old friend. To another, "May has an image of herself she wants the public to have." Hope Ridings Miller, editor of the Diplomat, adds, "She made herself over as perfectly as if she had cut herself out with a cookie cutter. She's all of a piece now, but I understand that wasn't always the case."

The May Craig who first went to work in Washington had a thick Southern accent, which soon went by the board. "I made an effort to speak with clear diction as soon as I got into the newspaper business, and particularly since I've been on radio and TV," she says. Her full name, Elizabeth May Craig, by which she was known professionally, disappeared in the 1930's "when I began going on the air—it seemed too long."

She started life in Coosaw, S.C., one of nine children born to Alexander and Elizabeth Adams. Her Scottish-born father was an overseer in a phosphate mine. May was 4 years old when her mother died, and she was raised by friends. "I came to Washington with them when I was 12," she says, "and I've lived here ever since." By the time she was graduated from Washington's Central High School, she was dreaming of writing and of being a nurse.

Instead, she married Donald Alexander Craig, a respected newspaperman who headed the Washington bureau of the then New York Herald. They had two children, but May still managed to be a militant feminist, marching and shouting in suffragette parades as early as 1913; she organized Bryan Elementary School's first PTA and became its first president; she also began writing feverishly. "None of my fiction sold, so I began doing some little newspaper feature stories about Washington."

In 1923, Craig was injured in an automobile accident while covering President Warren G. Harding's trip to Alaska; although his injuries bothered him for the remainder of his life, he continued working until his death in 1934. Four months after his injury, Elizabeth May Craig wrote her first "Inside in Washington" column for the Guy Gannett newspaper chain. She has been writing the column, 7 days a week, for 38 years.

Because of her long residence in Washington, she has never been qualified to vote in an election. "I think this is a good thing—I don't think reporters should ever show partisanship by voting," she comments. However, voting is her only abstinence from personal political activity; she has always been one of the Capital's most vigorous organizers. Joining the Newspaper Guild as soon as it was started, during the early 1930's, she became a fierce fighter in the struggle to break its domination by left-wingers. In 1943–44, she was president of the Women's National Press Club. In her speeches, in her weekly telephoned radio broadcasts to the Gannett-owned station in Maine, in her columns, and in her questioning of high officials, she has continually plumped for women's rights.

From 1944 through 1960, Mrs. Craig made a series of trips that took her all over the world as a roving columnist. She seems proudest of her adventures in Europe as World War II ended. Hanging in her home workroom are several framed photographs of herself wearing GI pants and a GI cap, and she talks with animation of running into her fellow correspondents in Paris the day after it was liberated, and of visiting Dachau concentration camp on V-E Day.

May Craig is obviously carrying on two absorbing love affairs—one with political news as it happens ("It's so exciting to be in on the world's events right here in Washington—I never get used to it, you know"), and the other with the red brick house she has owned and lived in for the past 21 years.

In this house, her passion for planning has reached full bloom; here, everything is planned—and every piece of furniture is kept in its proper place. She has a "travel drawer," enabling her to prepare instantly for a trip. It contains, already packed, such necessities as hand lotion, a travel clock, toothpaste, envelopes of instant coffee, and even peppermint candy. She also has a "gift drawer" and a "card shelf" (birthday and sick cards). In the cabinet of her one bathroom, a shelf has a portion labeled "Visitor's Corner," and here are collected all the things a guest might need, from toothbrush to washcloth. For visiting children, she has a carton filled with toys, a shelf of children's books and, in the kitchen, a "country store"—a shelf supplied with candy bars.

Except for a pink bedroom and pink upstairs and downstairs halls, the inside of the entire house is in pale blue; even two outside brick walls are blue. Within the hazy blue atmosphere are a number of practical ideas: One wall of her workroom, for example, consists of bookshelves sturdy enough to serve as a ladder. Above the doorways in her upper hall are bookshelves, piled to the high ceiling with paperbacks. Her living room contains two small fireplaces, one of which is fitted with shelves and made into a magazine rack. At both front and back doors are old coffee cans, filled with stones. "They're for throwing at cats who dig up my nice garden," she explains.

In her immaculate house, Mrs. Craig entertains rarely and carefully at dinner parties. She always serves exactly the same menu, with a main course of chicken. For hot weather, she has one dessert: fruit soaked in cordial. For cold weather, another: vanilla ice cream dressed with hot marmalade. In the 1955 edition of the Women's National Press Club Cookbook, she explained her reasons for serving the same meal. Under the heading "Ingredient: Personality," she wrote: "Put your personality into your dinner. Have a specialty of the house. Serve it all the time, so people remember it, look forward to it, never forget you. I have a basic dinner, developed over the years, so that I never worry about what I am going to have."

Some of Washington's most prominent people have dined off her stock dishes, often in all-female company. She favors parties consisting of 1 male politician and 11 women reporters.

She has never been an avid partygoer in Washington. "You can waste your soul substance going to crowded cocktail parties and listening to half sentences," she says, "and besides, I'm a loner. I'm happiest when I'm aloof—with my family, my books and my house." Often she invites her children to dinner. Her son Don works as special consultant to the Quartermaster General of the Army. He is a widower with two teenage daughters. Her daughter Betty is married to Albert Clagett, who is in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. They have two sons.

As part of her routine, Mrs. Craig is usually in bed by 9 o'clock—in pink pajamas. Nearly every night, she reads until the 11 o'clock news. "I reread Victor Hugo almost every year," she says, "and I love H. Rider Haggard, murder mysteries and the latest political books, like the new one about Woodrow Wilson's wife."

At home or on the air, May Craig is always true to her philosophy. She defines it thus: "Do the very best you can, and plan. Then you don't have to worry about a thing."

Kennedy Aid Protests Barring of Red Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, when the Senate Judiciary Committee is considering the qualifications of Mr. Byron R. White to serve as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, they might do well to inquire into the statements made by him in a letter to Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, of South Carolina, under date of March 5, 1962.

As reported by the Associated Press, Mr. White as Deputy Attorney General objected to the House amendment prohibiting the distribution of Communist propaganda through the mails, setting out five principal reasons.

One of the reasons is, "Even assuming an adequate definition, the legal and administrative problems involved in enforcement would be so substantial as to raise serious doubts as to its legality and efficiency."

Mr. Speaker, at a time when the United States is spending some $62 billion to defend itself from communism by force, can it be said that a few million dollars would not be well spent in hiring staffs to sort, sift and dispose of propaganda intended to destroy this Nation from within?

Even 1 percent of the $62 billion spent on defense from without could well be spent on defense from within. This would cost only $620 million and would go a long way toward relieving unemployment.

Another reason given by Mr. White is, "It is inconsistent with the tradition of an open society which has characterized the history of this country and which the first amendment to the Constitution reflects."

Mr. Speaker, the Senate Committee on the Judiciary must determine what Mr. White means by this statement. Is this his own personal feeling, or is he just mouthing the opinion of the Attorney General, Robert Kennedy?

Is the Senate of the United States going to approve the appointment of an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court who would permit a "Trojan horse" to be wheeled into every library and home in the Nation?

Does this man believe that in order to have an "open society" we must permit lies and misinformation to be fed into the minds of our students and citizens, at the expense of the American taxpayers? Just what kind of thinking is this, Mr. Speaker? What kind of decisions might we expect from men going onto the highest court in the land who hold these beliefs?

Another point he made is, "It is apt to do substantial injury to the international objectives of the United States." I do not care to comment upon this statement. Suffice it to say that I sincerely urge the Senate committee to check carefully into the theory of an appointee for this high post who believes that to stop the pouring of tons of Communist propaganda into this country would be apt to do substantial injury to the international objectives of the United States.

The Associated Press report on this matter is as follows:

KENNEDY AID PROTESTS BARRING OF RED MAIL

The Kennedy administration feels that legislation aimed at keeping Communist propaganda out of the mails is "objectionable in its present form."

It was learned that this administration view was expressed in a letter written March 5 by Deputy Attorney General Byron R. White to Senator JOHNSTON, Democrat, of South Carolina. Senator JOHNSTON is chairman of the Senate Post Office Committee, which is considering the legislation.

Mr. White referred to a House-approved bill which would increase postal rates by about $690 million a year.

In passing the measure, the House wrote in an amendment by Representative CUNNINGHAM, Republican, of Nebraska, to prohibit the Post Office from handling any mail that the Attorney General determines to be Communist political propaganda.

WHITE LISTS REASONS

"Even though we are sympathetic with the motivation for (the amendment)," Mr. White wrote Senator JOHNSTON, "the administration opposes its enactment in its present form for a number of reasons."

Mr. White listed these reasons for opposition to the amendment:

"1. It would deprive even those in our country who have a legitimate reason to receive foreign Communist political propaganda, however defined, of the opportunity to do so.

"2. It does not provide an adequate definition of Communist political propaganda.

"3. Even assuming an adequate definition, the legal and administrative problems involved in enforcement would be so substantial as to raise serious doubts as to its legality and efficacy.

"4. It is inconsistent with the tradition of an open society which has characterized the history of this country and which the first amendment to the Constitution reflects.

"5. It is apt to do substantial injury to the international objectives of the United States."

ADVANTAGE NOTED

In his 17-page letter, Mr. White said those with legitimate reason for receiving Communist political propaganda include teachers, students, specialists in Communist affairs, newspapers and newspapermen, libraries, and scientists.

Mr. White told Senator JOHNSTON the Cunningham amendment also would give Iron Curtain countries an excuse to curtail or ban mail from this country. He noted that President Kennedy said in a news conference last January 24 that this country sends seven times as much mail behind the Iron Curtain as it receives from there.

Trade Associations and the Federal Income Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, during the 1st session of the 87th Congress, I introduced S. 467, a bill which would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that lawful expenditures for legislative purposes shall be allowed as deductions from gross income.

In the March 26, 1962 edition of "The Construction News," the official publication of the construction industry for Indiana, Mr. Marshall D. Abrams, managing director of the four largest trade associations for the construction industry of Indiana, editorially endorsed the objectives of my bill and pointed out the need for this vital legislation.

Mr. Abrams has had a successful career not only as head of the construction trade associations, but also as an outstanding attorney in the field of labor relations. He is a former prosecuting attorney, a former circuit court judge, and a former member of the staff of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. I am indeed privileged that a man of Mr. Abrams' stature has expressed his support of S. 467 and I believe that his remarks on the subject deserve consideration by Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Abrams' editorial entitled "Second Thoughts" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECOND THOUGHTS

(By Marshall D. Abrams)

Under the present Internal Revenue Act the so-called trade association, of which there are thousands in the United States, are exempt from the payment of Federal income tax. This is on the theory that the trade associations have dedicated themselves to the job of generally elevating the standards of service which the industry represented renders to the public, and to increasing the quality of the products which the industry furnishes to the public. However, it has been ruled that if a substantial portion of the services rendered by the association innure to the sole benefit of the members of the association it then becomes a self-serving agency and its income becomes taxable income to the extent that it is removed from its tax-exempt status.

This is probably a fair interpretation and a fair-minded person could hardly take exception to it. Certainly, if a group of persons combine themselves into an association for the sole purpose of bettering their economic condition to the exclusion of others who are not members of the group, this amounts to a profitmaking venture and should be required to pay its share of taxes on its profits.

However, the Internal Revenue Department has gone a long step further in ruling that membership fees paid to a trade association are not a valid business deduction where any portion of the efforts of the association are used for the purpose of "influencing legislation." As a matter of fact, recently this measuring stick has been the principal one applied by the Department in determining the tax status of these funds and if any portion of the trade association funds are used for the purpose of lobbying, or otherwise contacting Congressmen or Senators in the interest of, or in opposition to, proposed legislation, you are in trouble taxwise.

Time was when business rarely felt the hand of Government, but the opposite is the case today. The Government has its fingers in every phase of business, either from the standpoint of taxation or regulation. Since it is business, and only business, which provides employment in this country, the very welfare of Government itself is made to depend upon the welfare of business. This being the situation, it is all the more important that our representatives should seek, and depend upon, the opinions of business concerning taxation and regulation. Most Senators and Congressmen will say that they must depend upon business, as represented by the trade associations, for most of their information. To tax a businessman for taking an interest in Government is obviously unjust. Such a tax actually discourages citizens from taking an interest in Government. This certainly is not the way to make our form of Government operate.

In recognition of this fallacy, Indiana's Senator VANCE HARTKE has introduced S. 467 which would allow tax deductions for funds paid to trade associations to influence legislation. Senator HARTKE says that the present system "threatens freedom of expression, freedom to organize to petition Congress and State and local governments." He has called for support of his bill in order to see to it that legitimate expenses of carrying a message to Congress and other legislative bodies are considered legitimate and deductible business expenses. The Senator is to be commended for his recognition of this fundamental weakness in the taxing system and his efforts to remedy the situation. S. 467 should be supported actively by all individuals who care to perpetuate the free enterprise system in America.

Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, there is no question that our most pressing domestic problem is unemployment. All of us who are concerned with the plight of the unemployed are doing everything we can to put them back to full, productive work. Our Public Works Committee has just concluded hearings on the President's proposed public works legislation and before long I hope we will report out a bill which will give both an immediate stimulus to employment, as well as provide us with a powerful standby weapon to prevent future recessions.

Mr. Speaker, I think that more and more thoughtful people are coming around to the position to which I have always subscribed, that forthright action on the part of the Federal Government can come to grips with the unemployment problem. Indeed, the cold facts of the situation seem to be converting many people who previously had doubts about the effectiveness of governmental fiscal policy in combating recessions. I was partcularly struck by a recent article in the New Republic entitled, "What About Those Unemployed?" by Mr. Edwin L. Dale, Jr., who is now in Europe writing on economic affairs for the New York Times. Mr. Dale, who has long been a respected financial analyst for the New York Times, in previous years had in general, I believe, espoused the conservative philosophy that Government spending and investment programs were not a solution to our economic dilemma and indeed might be harmful in sowing the seeds of future inflationary problems. The conservative cast of his economic thinking was apparent in a popularly received book published in 1960 entitled, "Conservatives in Power—A Study in Frustration."

Apparently the overpowering facts and logic of our economic situation have caused a basic shift in his thinking and his most recent article, "What About Those Unemployed?" which I am putting in the RECORD today, is a hardhitting call for Government action to solve the problem of rising unemployment. He puts the blame squarely where it belongs, on the lack of effective demand in our economy, a situation we owe to the 8 years of the Republican administration which relentlessly pursued both a restrictive monetary policy and an ill-advised fiscal policy which inevitably contributed to the frequency and severity of the recessions which have plagued our economy in recent years. I share wholeheartedly in his assessment of where the blame for our economic problems lies and his view that proper governmental budgetary and fiscal policy, by creating more consumer demand, can be a major factor in doing away with the unemployment problem which affects our economy and which should also afflict the consciences of those "do-nothings" who worship the fetish of balanced budgets, but turn their backs on the sufferings of the unemployed.

The article follows:

WHAT ABOUT THOSE UNEMPLOYED?

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

Is the American economic problem—unemployment, slow growth, low rate of investment, high costs—really as easy to solve as it seems from Western Europe? I think so. It can be solved by more demand. And in the first instance the Government alone, mainly through its budget policy, i.e., high and rising spending, with deficits as necessary, can create more demand.

The present administration is acting vaguely, cautiously, almost reluctantly as if it were aware of this. It may get away with the trick it is trying: to be fairly modern while seeming to be orthodox and conservative. It is gently, rather shamefacedly, pushing up the budget while professing its faith in orthodoxy. But, again looking from Western Europe, one has two fears.

First, the mentality of the Congress, and almost certainly the American electorate, is so old fashioned that verbal tricks are necessary to put over even the minimum necessary to keep the American economy firmly on the road to expansion. Senator Harry Byrd, Ev and Charlie, Judge Howard Smith have 3 million unemployed on their conscience, but they do not know it. Every day in every way they will fight to prevent the aggressive expansionary policy (a sharply rising budget in present circumstances) that would put the unemployed back to work.

They believe, sincerely, that high budgets and deficits are bad for us when in fact high budgets, preferably with deficits for a while, are the one thing that can easily save us. As long as they believe this, the administration may not get away with its good sense.

Second, there is a widespread unawareness in the United States, even among liberals, of the staggering importance of high demand in getting done what has to be done in the economy—above all, putting people to work. If it were not so tragic, it would be amusing to read of liberals in the administration and Congress and the press talking about automation and the growth of the labor force as a cause of unemployment. Europe is automating faster than the United States and some countries (West Germany, for example) have had a far faster growth in the labor force; but the trouble in Europe is lack of labor. There is no unemployment. The simple and single reason is high demand.

We have had insufficient demand in the United States because our Government willed it so. It is time Americans of all political persuasions awakened to the appalling consequences of the wrong economic policies of the last years of the Eisenhower administration.

These policies were not made by evil men. As one who at the time thought they made sense, I can claim they were not self-evidently wrong. But how terribly wrong they were.

For reasons that will be noted in a moment, George Humphrey, William McChesney Martin, Robert Anderson, Maurice Stans, Raymond Saulnier, and others stayed awake nights during much of the last decade figuring out how to restrict demand. They curbed the Federal budget whenever and wherever they could, and they imposed tight money whenever the economy was expanding. They succeeded in restricting demand.

The result? A still-secret, unanimous report by a working party composed of all 20 members of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) gives the answer. The working party had the task of examining the economic growth records of the countries of Western Europe and North America in the past decade and finding out why Europe grows so much faster than America. Its conclusion about the United States is unequivocal: U.S. growth was slow in the last half of the decade because of "insufficient pressure of demand." It clearly implies that this was the Government's fault.

Another unanimous OECD report, public but not widely reported, charges in polite words that restrictive Government budget and monetary policy was the reason for the 1960–61 American recession and the subsequent high unemployment.

The connection is direct. Slow growth equals high unemployment, above all in the case of the United States. Overcurbing expansion produces recession. Government can turn demand on and it can turn demand off; the American Government turned it off, mainly by trying to create a surplus in the conventional budget through the device of checking spending. It usually didn't get the surplus because the economy was so sluggish.

The famous ratcheting upward of unemployment since the Korean war—with each business cycle peak showing a higher level of unemployment than the one before—is no mystery. It is not something structural. It is the consequence of decisions by Messrs. Humphrey, Martin, Anderson, Stans, and Saulnier, heartily backed by Messrs. Byrd, Dirksen, Halleck, and Smith. In short, the men who ran the country. Needless to say, President Eisenhower was fully in accord with them.

To their credit, these men had a reason for curbing demand. They were worried about inflation, not only the mild inflation that existed but the growth of inflationary psychology. At a terrible price, they managed to kill inflation. American wholesale prices have not risen for nearly 4 years; the infinitesimal rise in consumer prices is almost entirely attributable to the special case of services.

To their discredit they, or rather some of them, were plainly ignorant about the modern economy. George Humphrey thought a rising budget would bring a "depression that will curl your hair" when the exact opposite was true: a failure to allow the budget to rise sufficiently, or to cut taxes instead, brought gradually increasing unemployment and occasional recession.

Robert Anderson and Maurice Stans produced the massively restrictive fiscal wrench that was the 1960 budget—a wrench that even conservative economists like William Butler of the Chase Manhattan Bank now recognize as excessive—on the ground it was needed to restore confidence in the dollar abroad. In fact, by bringing on a premature recession, it produced the most serious flight from the dollar and loss of gold in modern history.

Ironically, all the talk at the time was about how dangerously the budget was rising, or would rise, unless drastic action were taken to curb it. We were fighting the wrong war at the wrong time, against the wrong enemy. Many of us still are.

In some apparently wasted words, the reports in January of President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers and of the OECD have recognized what happened. Our error was partially understandable. Our budget was becoming increasingly restrictive even as it appeared to rise, and regardless of whether the conventional accounts at the end of the year showed a deficit or a surplus.

By using the brilliant device of describing budgets in terms of their "full employment surplus," and measuring them by the national economic accounts instead of by our hopelessly misleading conventional account-

ing, the Council of Economic Advisers has shown what took place. The last two Eisenhower budgets, partly innocently, were the most restrictive since before the great depression. The results are plain to see.

One reason for this is the dynamite hidden in our tax system. In brief, it is so sensitive to the business cycle that our spending receipts equation automatically becomes restrictive, i.e., a true budget surplus, within a matter of months of the beginning of the upward phase of the business cycle, and recovery is snubbed, unless something is done. The something, of course, must be higher spending or a tax cut. The British Conservative Government, with all its troubles, has been careful to keep full employment by cutting taxes every time the budget moved automatically toward a dangerous surplus. The Eisenhower administration, despite its abhorrence of taxes, would not even do this.

In any event, restrictive budgets in the United States—innocent in part but mainly purposeful—produced precisely the effect that modern economics and Western European experience could have predicted: slow growth, unemployment, and a low rate of investment in plant and equipment. The low rate of growth and of investment, in turn, contributed their part in raising our costs and thus making more difficult the solution of our balance-of-payments problem.

The present administration, or part of it, realizes all this. But because of the amazingly old-fashioned climate of American opinion, it has to play with fire by aiming at a balanced budget, when any self-respecting European government, in present American conditions and given American budget accounting, would aim for a sizable deficit. Thus we may be stuck with unemployment for a while longer.

Of course, Americans can go on having unemployment if they want to enjoy their quaint ideas about deficits, the national debt and the dangers of Government spending. Seems a pity, though, for the unemployed.

The Appeal for Unprecedented Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Appeal for Unprecedented Power," which appeared in a recent edition of the Wall Street Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE APPEAL FOR UNPRECEDENTED POWER

In their testimony before Congress these past few days both the critics and the supporters of the proposed new tariff bill have agreed on one thing. It contains an "unprecedented" grant of power to the President.

For all practical purposes the bill would leave the President free to lower tariffs, raise them, abolish them, invoke new ones, or to take off and put on direct trade controls without let or hindrance from anybody. Those who might be injured by a Presidential action would have little recourse.

What is more interesting is how this unprecedented grant of powers is conceded by its advocates and then used as a reason why the bill should be passed. Only by granting the President this power, they argue, can the right things be accomplished.

The argument here is that the normal machinery of Government—Congress and all that—is inadequate to cope with the complexities of tariff and trade policy. Therefore Congress should not set even the broad outlines of policy. It should turn the whole problem over to the President and give him the power to do whatever he thinks is necessary.

This is an argument not limited to the tariff bill. Recently there was the proposal to give the President authority to alter taxes at will. For another example, there was the suggestion the administration should have a wide grant of power to change the farm program at its discretion.

Any congressional action, you see, must be a consensus of many views, the resolution of many political pressures. Generally the decision will be a compromise unlikely to satisfy completely the logic of any view. And the process of congressional action will almost always be time consuming.

How much simpler and easier it all is if a single Chief Executive can just say, "Let it be done this way," and it is thereupon done that way.

This is an approach to Government which has long had a strong appeal for those of so-called liberal views. They always prefer the concentration of authority over its diffusion because they think that is the best way to order society. They are always the proponents of a powerful Presidency as the only solution to the complexities of modern government.

But this same idea can infect others whenever they have some particular goal—in this case, lower tariffs—and think that they will get there quicker if a Chief Executive simply has the power to command. The rationalization is always on the grounds of efficiency and order through centralized decision and control.

It is debatable whether this is indeed the way to the best decisions. Even in wartime cumbersome democracies have proved more efficient than single-minded dictatorships. And in economic matters is it only in "inefficient" market economies that there is ever a "problem" of superabundance.

But what is perfectly plain is that all of these people, unconsciously or not, are expressing a dissatisfaction with the machinery of democratic government. What the arguments all boil down to is that Congress must give up its powers to set taxes—or tariffs or whatever—because Congress cannot be trusted to decide them wisely or well.

What is equally plain is that this is an argument for those forms of government to which we ordinarily give opprobrious names. By the same argument Germans were won to national socialism and Italians to fascism. On the same argument centralized authority makes all the decisions in Russia.

Surely this is a curious habit we have fallen into. And many who stood up in a meeting and advocated any of these systems would be shouted out of the hall. Yet men will gravely propose that a President be given almost unlimited powers to fix our tariffs or juggle our taxes and other men will gravely discuss it.

Hardly anyone, any longer, will even notice what they are really saying.

A Unified Transportation Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, the President's message on transportation is a forthright response to the deep and complex problems of the transportation industry. It will provide the Congress with a sound basis for enacting urgently needed reform. In this connection, I offer the following three articles for the RECORD. The first two are from the New York Times. The third is an editorial from the Wall Street Journal. It is my great hope that Congress will act in this session on the most urgent aspects of the message.

The editorials follow:

[From the New York Times]

A UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION POLICY

Underlying the transportation message President Kennedy sent to Congress yesterday is a recognition that railroads, airlines, buses, trucks, and water carriers can no longer be viewed as unrelated entities. Our chaotic system of laws and regulatory agencies needs revision to provide a coordinated approach to what ought to be a closely linked network of carriers to meet the Nation's needs efficiently and economically.

The President's prime prescription for transportation health is encouragement of freer competition through a drastic cut in Federal regulation and subsidies. He finds managerial initiative shackled by cumbersome Government rules and by the unfairness that too often marks present tax and benefit policy. Cutting of passenger and freight rates would be allowed so long as its purpose was not to put competitors out of business in violation of the antitrust laws. To foster parity in competition, new taxes would be imposed on airlines and users of inland waterways to offset a small part of the advantage they derive from the huge Federal investments in both airports and waterways.

The message proposes vast expansion of Federal financial assistance to improve urban mass transport. The President rightly notes the crushing impact this country's population growth is bound to have on already overburdened transit arteries serving metropolitan centers.

The whole transportation program is of such magnitude and the pressure groups in the field are so entrenched that there is no realistic prospect that Congress will act on the plans this year despite the precarious financial condition of many carriers. The accumulation of problems over a century, coupled with dramatic recent changes in the technology of transportation and distribution, justifies careful scrutiny of Mr. Kennedy's proposals, but does not justify stalling on them. The President has made a thoughtful contribution to the solution of an urgent national problem. Congress must do the rest.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 6, 1962]

IN THE NATION—A PROGRAM PARTLY IMPEDED BY LATE TIMING

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, April 5.—President Kennedy's message to Congress today, proposing

the formation of a realistic national transportation policy, is comprehensive and perceptive. His recommendations go to the heart of a problem whose prolonged neglect by Government has brought the American people to the verge of an appalling choice of alternatives. These are: allow their great imperial asset, the railroad network, to crumble away entirely; or disastrously and finally impair its potential of efficiency by nationalization.

The late timing of the message in this last session of the 87th Congress would appear to narrow any prospect which might have existed of the prompt legislative action on the President's recommendations the grave situation demands. Instead of being the first major item in his program, as once had been indicated and the protracted and mounting railroads emergency requires, this transportation message is his last. And in the remaining period of this session not only does it seem impossible for Congress to make a legislative beginning on Mr. Kennedy's recommendations. But also the timing will give competing transport interests an excellent opportunity to obstruct even this beginning if seriously attempted.

Then the 87th Congress will go home to run for reelection. And anyone who has observed the influence which the carriers that compete with the railroads can exert will have a pretty good idea of the local pressures against the President's recommendations for rail transport relief that will be applied to congressional candidates.

The scope of the message, and the intensive study of the transportation problem suggested by its contents, may have made its late timing inevitable. Also, the product of this study merits favorable acknowledgment of the comment by Myer Feldman, the Presidential assistant in charge, that it is the first comprehensive, detailed draft of a national transportation policy any President has submitted. Furthermore, the proposals are bold, constructive, and an impartial assertion of the public interest in commendable disregard of the political influence of some special groups affected. Nevertheless, their submission at this date in a session already packed with major Presidential requests, and in an election year, aids the blocking operation in which these special interest groups are certain to engage.

PROSPECT IN THE COMMITTEES

The railroads' troubles are the special concern of some members of the congressional committees with primary jurisdiction over the President's recommendations. Other members are more responsive to the claims of the competing carriers. This is fair play in the politics and economy of a free enterprise society. But in the present circumstances it is a certain source of inaction or delay. For nothing in Mr. Kennedy's message is more solidly sustained by the facts than the following statements of causes, and of the need to uproot them with more than deliberate speed:

"A chaotic patchwork of inconsistent and often obsolete legislation and regulation has evolved from a history of specific actions addressed to specific problems of specific interests at specific times. This patchwork does not fully reflect either the dramatic changes in technology of the past half-century or the parallel changes in the structure of competition. * * *

"The difficulty and complexity of these basic troubles will not correct themselves with the mere passage of time. On the contrary, we cannot afford to delay further. Facing up to the realities of the situation, we must begin to make the painful decisions necessary to providing the transportation system required by the United States of today and tomorrow."

A good new parlor game would be to compare speculative answers to these questions: Which of the congressional committees to which the President's message is referred will make the first painful decision? When will it be made? If and when made, will it be based on the finding of the President and the facts that the transportation system in most need of quick relief is the railroads, at least two of which are confronted with early bankruptcy? Or will it be framed to try to "take care" of carriers with more politically effective lobbies?

Senator MAGNUSON's Commerce Committee offers a perfect playing field for this game.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 9, 1962]

THE TRANSPORTATION CAGE

In his generally sound approach to the Nation's transportation mess, President Kennedy provides a bitter commentary on the consequences of Government intervention in economic life.

The President himself pulls few punches about the Government contribution to the mess. "A chaotic patchwork of inconsistent and often obsolete legislation and regulation has evolved from a history of specific actions addressed to specific problems of specific industries at specific times. * * *

"The regulatory commissions are required to make thousands of detailed decisions based on out-of-date standards. The management of the various modes of transportation is subjected to excessive, cumbersome, and time-consuming regulatory supervision that shackles and distorts managerial initiative."

The words are worth pondering in an era when Federal intrusions into all sorts of private activities are on the increase. Such intrusions usually begin simply enough. Thus railroads once enjoyed a transportation monopoly; therefore they were regulated by Government. That is reasonable. But what happens?

Nearly a century later, the roads are still regulated as though they were a monopoly, despite the development of powerful and variegated competition, and now they are in a crisis. Over the long years Government regulators become encrusted in their regulations; Congress is slow to react to change; competitors acquire a vested interest in the status quo no matter how urgent the national need for sensible modifications. Politics reigns over the economic good, and we finally end up with the transportation spectacle we see today.

That history, harshly sketched by the President, should signal caution on his own proposal for massive Federal aid to revitalize public transportation in urban areas. The past, by his own account, offers scant support for hope that this specific new intrusion will solve the problem to which it is specifically addressed.

But apart from that, Mr. Kennedy sees the remedy implied in his diagnosis of the country's transportation ills. If too much government is a main source of the trouble, then a prime requisite for health is, in his words, "less Federal regulation and subsidization."

From this inescapable premise he proceeds to list a number of sensible steps. They include: Putting water carriers on a more equitable regulatory footing with rails and other forms of transportation. Making it possible for intercity carriers to lower their rates and so compete more effectively. Repealing the 10-percent passenger transportation tax, a protracted hangover of our past two wars, and making other tax adjustments. Ending subsidies to feeder airlines and making the major air carriers ineligible for future subsidies. In sum, restoring competition.

Taken as a whole, then, the President's program would go far toward bringing sanity out of the transportation chaos. The question, of course, is whether it will in fact be taken by Congress, or enough of it to mean any significant improvement. There have been transportation reports before, but the resulting legislation changes have been minor in relation to the scope of the problem.

For the very history of control which Mr. Kennedy so scathingly attacks is now a cage for all concerned. The Government itself has built the cage, rod by rod, over the years, and that makes it all the more difficult for Government officials to break out of it; no more than other human beings, do they relish relinquishing authority long enjoyed or political advantages assumed to exist.

But if the Congressmen and the regulators still refuse to listen to reason, it will not be President Kennedy's fault. He, at least, has raised the voice of reason for all to hear—or disregard at the Nation's expense.

Beware of Simple Answers in the Great Farm Debates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to a remarkable editorial which appeared in the Worthington Daily Globe of Worthington, Minn., written by Mr. Jim Vance, editor of that newspaper.

Mr. Vance has given the Congress a wise and proper admonition when he alerts us to "Beware of Simple Answers in the Great Farm Debates".

The editor has asked some very penetrating questions about the administration's farm program. This editor comes from a rural area where the farm programs mean a great deal to family farm operators and to the businessman on Main Steet. We would be well advised to give thoughtful consideration to the suggestions of Editor Vance and to remember as he has so well pointed out, that agricultural problems are not simple. There is no shortcut easy answer to our problems of production and distribution. Editor Vance concludes his editorial with a warning to farm producers, asking that they accept reasonable restraints on their output in order to obtain the more important goal of an improving farm economy.

I ask unanimous consent that this fine editorial appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEWARE OF SIMPLE ANSWERS IN THE GREAT FARM DEBATES

Our Nation's farmers—and its town and city people, too—will need to beware of "simple answers" when they join in making the big farm decision of 1962.

Simple solutions won't work. Our American farm economy is much too complex for simple remedies.

Take the idea that "the Government should get out of farming." This suggestion is a ridiculous oversimplification.

Imagine what this proposal would really involve if put into practice.

It would mean closing up every agricultural extension office in the country.

It would be the end of Federal support for vocational agricultural programs in every high school in the land (and help for school lunch programs, too).

Hundreds of thousands of CCC grain bins would be for sale.

Huge surpluses of farm products, federally owned, would have to be dumped somewhere.

The farm marketplace would turn to a kind of "law of the jungle" in which the tiger beast of prey would be American agriculture's tremendous capacity to overproduce and glut markets with surpluses of superdepression proportions.

There would be no State and Federal livestock reporting service to aid farmers in adjusting their output to market demand.

There would be no restraints on per-farm production through allotment limits.

There would be no price supports.

The simple idea of "getting the Government out of agriculture" seems to have appeal to a certain type of farmer. Slogans are dangerous, however, and this particular, one-shot remedy wouldn't be helpful at all. It would bring farm catastrophe, farm depression, and farm calamity of such proportions that the entire Nation would suffer.

Other slogan words that can be tricky include "regimentation" and "freedom." These expressions will probably be used thousands of times by political orators and others in debating this year's important farm decision. Remember, they can be misleading, and they can only have valid meaning when evaluated in connection with the particular farm proposal to which they are linked.

For example, what is regimentation? Is an individual being regimented when he is arrested for endangering the public safety by driving above the speed limit? Or is it regimentation when a person is penalized for endangering the same public welfare by overplanting his crop allotment and creating a surplus problem which can hurt prices received by every other farmer in the Nation?

What is freedom? Is it the right to take advantage of an improved market which was made possible by the cooperative efforts of other farmers? Does true freedom amount to true-life extension of the law of the jungle to economic affairs, where the principle of survival of the fittest will determine who will succeed and who will fail under circumstances where only a very few can survive?

Yes, what is freedom? Is society more or less free when it maintains a police force to employ restraints? Isn't it true that certain limits on group and individual practice are sometimes necessary to provide a greater freedom for all? Governmental power can be oppressive when misapplied—and there are ample illustrations of this in the world today. But power itself, when in governmental or private hands, is a neutral entity. It is the use of power which is either good or bad. Government can assist as well as oppress. In the great farm debate of 1962, it is important that Federal programs be carefully scrutinized so that their ultimate effects will be helpful for agriculture and society, not oppressive.

Are the new administration-backed farm bills a "march toward policed farming"? The answer to this question depends upon your point of view—and also whether you are more concerned about the general welfare of our farm economy or the degree of operational freedom which an individual producer ought to have.

The provisions for referendums on marketing quotas, of course, are only a small part of the overall plan the administration has offered, and in terms of long-term requirements, they may be of lesser import.

One of the biggest points in the new farm program is the proposal to launch a massive national effort to get poor lands out of cultivation and into recreational, forest and water conservation areas. This proposal of President Kennedy is of interest not only to farmers. The principal beneficiaries, promise to be our giant urban populations, who would be provided with new opportunities to enjoy the great American out of doors, plus the added and important benefits that water and sound resource management can have for them.

Then, too, there is the important work which the new food-for-peace program is doing to help hungry peoples abroad, a program which is working more successfully today than ever before and which should be expanded.

No one simple solution obviously, can bring about a better day for agriculture. And there will always be a need to give new ideas a trial. Several important concepts which still need to be incorporated into farm legislation are cross-compliance on crop allotments and support limits on a base portion of the crop, letting the large producers go on their own beyond this base.

Finally, there are the important benefits for the general population which can be obtained by cutting farm program costs. These costs cannot be reduced by giving our tremendously resourceful agriculture a green light to produce without restrictions and then having Uncle Sam underwriting the costs of maintaining farm income. The time has come when U.S. farm producers will have to accept reasonable restraints on their output in order to obtain the more important goal of an improving farm economy.

The Confused Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, in the last few months the general public has been treated to an astounding degree to a confused and confusing set of charges and countercharges by so-called liberals and so-called conservatives.

Many people who truly believe in a conservative approach, which Webster's dictionary describes as "designating, pertaining to, or characteristic of, a political party which favors the conservation of existing institutions and forms of government," find themselves all at once being called extreme rightists or rabid rightists, and such titles. Many of the epithets applied to the conservative person are not as polite as these mentioned. Indeed, the two terms "conservative" and "liberal" can actually be interchangeable, depending upon the issue being argued or the approach being made to solve a political problem. I find Webster also calls the "liberal" one who has a tendency toward democratic or republican, as distinguished from monarchical or aristocratic forms.

Perhaps I am wrong, but I feel those American citizens who wish to promulgate a sense of freedom in this country are at one and the same time conservatives and liberals— because first, we want to conserve existing institutions and our present constitutional form of government from inroads of Communists and Socialists, who would most definitely take away our freedoms, to a greater or lesser degree, depending upon the methods used. They can take it away with a "hard sell" or "soft sell" approach, or by means of a revolution. But the end result would be the same. We would be under a form of dictatorship, which would not be too dissimilar from the old monarchical form of government from which our forefathers fled. Whether a dictator wears a brown or black shirt, or an ermine robe, there is no great difference in what he does to the mass of people suffering under his rule.

People often make the remark that you can do anything with figures or statistics. I feel the same thing can be done with words or phrases. A lie is a lie whether it is by means of statistics repeated often enough to sound valid, or by means of a label or catch phrase repeated often enough to become convincing.

So let us have done with extremism in this country, whether it comes from a so-called rabid rightist or so-called liberal leftist. Let us examine carefully what we might, through carelessness or lack of vigilance, lose—our freedoms as American citizens—guaranteed to us under the Constitution. It would behoove us all to read and re-read the Constitution and Bill of Rights. And after we do, it would be good were we to gracefully grant to ourselves and our neighbors the rights which those famed documents promised to us. A resurgence of good old-fashioned patriotism and love of our country might be just the tonic needed to help us to walk upright and proudly once more, and might prove to be far more attractive to those foreign countries we have been trying to assist than all the gold we can pour into them can ever succeed in doing. After all, if we want to impress upon someone else the value of anything we might possess, we have to be glad to possess it first and foremost, not apologetic and half-hearted about it.

Mr. Speaker, today I read, in the National Observer, under date of April 8, 1962, an editorial which impressed me greatly. It is entitled, "The Confused Debate." I commend it to the attention of my colleagues, and would like to ask unanimous consent that the editorial be included with my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The editorial follows:

[From the National Observer, Apr. 8, 1962]

THE CONFUSED DEBATE

Hardly a day passes without fresh attacks on this country's "extreme right." For one example from the week's news, the Presbytery of New York, comprising 62 Presbyterian churches, had this to say about the extreme-rightists:

"They waste ammunition on the wrong targets. Victims of an amateurish do-it-yourself intelligence system, the rabid right fire their gatling gunlike charges into startled crowds and then with alarming naivete announce that they are bringing down Communists."

Now that's pretty extreme language on its own, with all those epithets packed into two sentences, but it is not untypical of the comment from many American individuals and groups. It suggests right off that extremism breeds extremism. It makes you wonder also, if the importance of the target is not being exaggerated. The ordinary

citizen, anyway, must find it had to agree with the Presbytery that the extreme rightists are "creating an anxiety neurosis in the Nation."

Not that there is any question about the extremism. People who profess to believe, among many other curious things, that President Eisenhower was some kind of dupe of the Communists scarcely commend themselves to reasonable men or rational discussion. But merely to say they are extremists doesn't explain anything. It is well to ask how they got that way and what is the real damage, if any, they are doing to the country.

Whatever else they may be, the rightists represent a reaction to another extremism, the extreme left, which has made considerable inroads into our national life. Like anyone else, the rightists can look back on the past few decades and see many disturbing events.

An American foreign policy that failed to prevent the absorption of nearly a billion of the world's people into the Communist orbit. Proved cases of Communist infiltration in our own Government. A Federal establishment that has grown incredibly large and continues to grow like crabgrass, that burdens the people's resources and impinges on their liberties, that has already brought about a semisocialized state.

In these circumstances, it would be surprising indeed if there had not arisen these groups to vehemently denounce communism and socialism, and to demand political changes. Their mistake, of course, is in going too far. Their charges are too encompassing and embrace too many people, a tendency vividly demonstrated in the charges former General Walker has been making in just the past few days. From such excessiveness, it seems to us, flow at least two undesirable consequences for the basic political debate in the United States.

One is that the extreme rightists, by calling so much attention to themselves and drawing such exaggerated attention from so-called liberals, help to obscure the real dangers of the extreme left. They have accomplished the self-defeating feat of making themselves appear, in many eyes, a serious threat to the Nation, whereas the actual threat is the collectivist conspiracy which the United States is supposedly battling all over the world.

The other unfortunate result is that they have created confusion about the political viewpoint which is currently called conservatism. They call themselves conservatives; hence the impression is left that all conservatives share their extremism.

Nothing could be further from the truth. There are many American conservatives today who have, and want, nothing whatever to do with the extremists. Theirs is a perfectly respectable political position with a long and honorable history, whatever its label may have been at any given time. In the last century they would have been called liberals, a term all but expropriated by the contemporary collectivists in the United States.

These liberal-conservatives adhere to the political concepts which animated the Constitution, the most perfect framework yet devised for personal liberty within the requirements of national order. They understand very well the infrequency of freedom in man's long past; that it is a frail reed which must be constantly and consciously nurtured lest it be stamped out.

They do not want to uproot the Government and plunge the Nation into either anarchy or totalitarianism. But they do perceive the threat to liberty in the unceasing drift toward collectivism. More than that, they see that the Nation and its political institutions and economy would be stronger if there were less statism and greater scope for individuals.

This is the appropriate political debate in America, between the friends and foes of freedom, just as it is the heart of the struggle in the world. Whatever one's politics, it is a pity to have that debate confused in a barrage of extremist and counterextremist charges.

Tribute to the Army Corps of Engineers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the Anderson, S.C., Independent in its lead editorial of April 4 paid a richly deserved tribute to the Army Corps of Engineers and the outstanding job it is doing in developing the waterways of America. The editorial was a devastating reply to those whose have criticized the corps for its recommendation for the construction of a high-level dam at Trotters Shoals on the Savannah River to complete the development of the Savannah River Basin. The Independent rightly concluded that the corps' record "needs no defense. It speaks for itself." I ask unanimous consent that the text of this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CORPS OF ENGINEERS: LONG HISTORY OF COMBAT AND CIVIL ACHIEVEMENTS

With near-completion of the Hartwell Dam and Reservoir—a magnificent job—the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers status in relation to public works of this kind again is being misrepresented by the opponents of the Trotters Shoals project.

The propaganda peddlers' stock-in-trade is summed up in the deprecatory remark, "Aw, the Engineers are just trying to promote themselves another project."

Opponents said it when Clark Hill was projected. They used the same line against the $100 million Hartwell project. And now it has cropped up again in regard to Trotters Shoals.

The Corps of Engineers doesn't run around "looking for projects" or promoting them.

It so happens that the Corps history dates from the Revolutionary War when Gen. George Washington realized the need. Brig. Gen. Louis LeBegue du Portail, of the French Army's Royal Corps of Engineers, was first commandant. France was an ally, and General Washington recognized the lack of trained men among the Colonials and picked the French expert.

The corps that served during the Revolution was mustered out at end of the conflict. But it was apparent that the struggling young Nation, isolated in an almost completely hostile royalist world, needed to maintain a corps of engineering experts, principally to fortify key ports along the long Atlantic coastline.

So it was that by an act of Congress of March 16, 1802, the Corps of Engineers was formally established and ever since has been the principal engineer component of the Regular U.S. Army.

West Point, the U.S. Military Academy, was started by the corps at the direction of the act of 1802 which specified that corps should be stationed at West Point in New York State. It was to constitute a military academy, the Congress said, and its officers would be available for use elsewhere at the discretion of the President.

From the very first, the Corps of Engineers carried out the orders of Congress, and not vice versa as some would have you believe today.

And from the first, also, their services were utilized on public works. They established internal routes of communication still in use, pioneering westward and mapping the wild country.

From time to time Congress turned to the Corps of Engineers to apply its special skill and training to a manifold number of undertakings. Nonmilitary duties included:

Improvement of rivers and harbors to spur commerce and industry.

Planning and construction of early lighthouses and other fixed points for navigation.

Planning and construction of numerous public buildings, utilities and monuments in Washington, D.C.—including the Capitol, the Library of Congress, Washington Monument, and Lincoln Memorial, among others.

President Teddy Roosevelt, and Congress called upon the U.S. Corps of Engineers to construct the Panama Canal.

They improved the Great Lakes for navigation, and were assigned to open the first roads and trails into newly purchased Alaska.

They were authorized to enforce laws having to do with water power and navigation on rivers of interstate importance, such as the Savannah River. (This stream is navigable and does not belong, as some seem to believe, exclusively to South Carolina.)

Soundness of the policy of employing Army engineers in civil peacetime projects has been repeatedly demonstrated during the entire history of the United States.

It affords opportunities for developing engineering skill, in undertaking large operations involving staff work, the procurement of supplies, and the application of new techniques to meet the changing face of warfare's forms.

Tours of duty of Corps of Engineers officers are mapped to assure both combat and civil experience. Rotation is the policy. In the past few years, for example, officers named to direct the Savannah district have just completed a tour in regions of potential military combat; or else, when reassigned, are sent to such regions.

The Corps of Engineers, predating even the Constitution, has a long history of combat and civil works achievements. The Corps' record needs no defense. It speaks for itself.

Anderson area and other Americans need remember from time to time—especially when second-rate peanut politicians and hired propagandists try to smear the Corps—the fact that the Corps of Engineers does the bidding of the President and the Congress and does not promote projects on its own.

Trotter Shoals, for instance, is another phase under the act of Congress of 1944 authorizing the full and comprehensive development of the resources of the upper Savannah River on behalf of its owners—the people of the United States.

In fact, the entire development program of the Savannah River was authorized by Congress in 1944. The Corps of Engineers is carrying out its orders, which are written into the law of the land.

Our Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, this marks the 25th year that our Vice Presi-

dent has been in Washington, a quarter century of devoted public service.

We owe much to this man. In his steady stride toward the top, he has acquired a profound knowledge of the intricacies of Government which has been of enormous benefit to all America. His native understanding of human character has contributed largely to his achievements, and much of the fine legislation passed by Congress can be attributed to his tireless efforts.

We here in Congress can perhaps appreciate the depth and breadth of his ability more than can those who have been not quite so closely associated with him, and for this reason I wish to include in the RECORD my own thanks to our distinguished Vice President, and to insert a well-deserved eulogy by Drew Pearson which appeared today in the Washington Post.

The article follows:

LYNDON HERE FOR QUARTER CENTURY

Today LYNDON JOHNSON celebrates his 25th year of Government service. It was on April 10, 1937, that a tall, gangling country boy from Texas got off the train at Union Station to become a Member of Congress. It was a fateful day both for Washington and for LYNDON.

Indeed, some have sworn that the dome of the Capitol has sometimes resembled his Texas sombrero. This impression gained force during the 8 years he rode herd on the Senate and kept the political strays in the corral better than any Senate leader in history.

He was such a persuasive and powerful leader, in fact, that the political wiseacres predicted he would never be at peace sitting behind John F. Kennedy. JOHNSON had worn the pants in the Democratic family too long, they said, to work under one of his freshmen.

They warned that he would try to run the Kennedy administration from the back seat, that there would be a struggle between head and tail to rule the dog.

But the dire predictions haven't come true. Far from competing for power, JOHNSON has channeled his restless energy and enormous influence in the Kennedy cause.

There was a period, after their bruising battle for the Democratic presidential nomination, that the two men regarded one another with cold suspicion. Brother Bobby was especially chilly. But the chill thawed under the Florida sun during their preinaugural Palm Beach conferences.

The hostility changed to mutual respect, then frank admiration.

"If you have any legislative problems," the President told his first Cabinet meeting, "ask the Vice President. He knows better than anyone else how to handle Congress."

Today, a genuine warmth exists between the two men. They frequently confer, lunch, and swim together. JOHNSON is the only person, other than Attorney General Robert Kennedy, who is allowed to walk in on the President without an appointment.

The tireless and talkative JOHNSON has become the most active Vice President in history. He works out of half a dozen offices between the White House and Capitol Hill. In fact, he has a mania for many offices. But his favorite is an imperial, aquamarine suite off the Senate floor from which plush sanctum he oversees the space program, Peace Corps, and fair-employment drive. He has made impressive accomplishments in all three.

But probably JOHNSON's most effective work for the Kennedy administration has been on Capitol Hill, where his persuasive arm, wrapped around a recalcitrant Senator, has changed many a vote.

In all these functions, the Vice President has kept out of the spotlight, deferring to the President to take the bows.

WHAT IS L.B.J.?

But what of LYNDON JOHNSON the man? He isn't the sort of politician who can be described in a word. He is a study in contradictions, a curiously complex person; a homespun Texas politician yet a sophisticated world leader.

He can be harsh, brusque, and demanding; yet he is warm, generous, and kind. He has a massive ego which is easily bruised. Yet he is a political pragmatist who accepted his defeat in the presidential sweepstakes philosophically.

He moved cooly and efficiently into the second spot. No one who knows him doubts that he is aiming for the top. But it is typical of his political acumen that he is preparing for the day by becoming the best possible Vice President.

"I am trying to be the kind of Vice President I would want," he says simply.

INSIDE L.B.J.

But underneath the drive, underneath the vanity, LYNDON JOHNSON is a warm, outgoing human being who can be tender and affectionate toward his friends.

Also sentimental, he is easily touched by a word of praise. After a depressing day recently, he was cheered by a quotation he was shown from a Pakistani taxi driver who told an American newswoman:

"We taxi drivers get to know people very well. I, myself, have driven a king and some of your Senators in my cab. But Mr. JOHNSON was the first big man who came here and looked down at a common man and made him happy."

Sighed the Vice President: "No matter how tough things are in this job, it is all worth while when a taxi driver in Karachi will say that."

JOHNSON was also warmed by a comment from a Negro voter who had been listening to him campaign for Congressman HENRY GONZALEZ last year from the rear of a pickup truck.

"I've lived here all of a long life," the old Negro told JOHNSON. "Never in the wildest night did I dream that I'd live long enough to have a white Texas Vice President of the United States come to this corner, be introduced by a Negro, and get up and appeal to the people to vote for a man named GONZALEZ."

Those who were standing beside the Vice President, as he bent over to shake hands, noticed that his eyes were moist.

What Is Happening to the Small Farms?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the decrease in the number of small family farms that has come about in America during the past 25 years, is startlingly evident to anyone traveling in the great "bread basket" area of our country. Nowhere is this change more pronounced than in Missouri.

The Missouri Farmers Association, in cooperation with the Missouri State government, has shown real leadership in fostering our rural area development program. The aim of the program is to reduce the farm-to-city migration by helping the small farmer increase his productivity to meet the needs of our growing national population.

In a recent speech to the Hannibal Chamber of Commerce, Fred V. Heinkel, president of the Missouri Farmers Association, warned of the inherent danger of going too far in concentrating our agricultural production in the large corporate farm, which he vividly described as "factories in the field, with transient labor." In its March 29 editorial entitled "What Is Happening to the Small Farms?" the Farmington Press, of Farmington, Mo., discusses Mr. Heinkel's thought-provoking speech. Because there is wide national interest in this subject, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD, and recommend it to the reading of all our colleagues.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS HAPPENING TO THE SMALL FARMS?

One fact that is evident to anyone who travels the back roads of St. Francois County is that there are not as many small farms as there used to be. The same thing is probably true in most other counties of Missouri and other States. That does not mean that farm productivity is less, for farm crops and livestock are being made ready for market at a rate that is probably at an all time high. As farms have grown in average size, for the most part they have become more productive.

Last week Fred V. Heinkel, president of the Missouri Farmers Association, told the Hannibal Chamber of Commerce, which met on March 22, "Each day there are more than 8,000 new citizens to be fed, yet there is no worry about feeding our rapidly expanding population."

He explained that this was the equivalent of adding 140 cities the size of Hannibal to the Nation's population each year. "Surely this emphasizes the importance of agriculture," he said. However, he sounded a note of warning against carrying the farm-to-city exodus too far.

"Many nations of the earth struggle with poverty, chaos and revolution because they have treated agriculture as an outcast and of course they are short of food," he continued.

"Stable government is nearly always accompanied by a stable and prosperous agriculture." He pointed out that the rural areas have, throughout the world, constituted the hard core of opposition to communism.

Heinkel warned, "If we convert these family farms into factories in the field, with hired transient labor, we may soon find this situation changed."

Pointing to the technological strides being made by agriculture and the proven efficiency of the family farmer, the MFA leader warned of possible human and social consequence. Farm homes are among the "most substantial customers" of American industry, labor and retail business. Farm families provide some of the greatest markets for petroleum products, steel, fertilizer, agricultural chemicals and a multitude of other products. "They maintain the rural towns and cities of America," Heinkel decalred. "Loss of income and buying power on the farm is reflected in loss of business in the towns and cities."

You don't help our towns and cities and their industries by reducing the number of country customers, he explained.

"If we allow these family farmers to be driven from their land into the city, we have not solved the problem of financing their existence. If the migration to the cities increases, is it not inevitable that the newcomers will either displace existing workers or go on direct relief? In either event, have the

taxpayers gained anything by uprooting these rural families?" the MFA leader asked.

The rural area development program now getting underway "holds much promise" Heinkel said, for slowing down this migration.

The Honorable Harry E. Watkins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to pay public tribute to a man whom I have known over the years, one of whom West Virginia is very proud, a great jurist, the Honorable Harry E. Watkins, U.S. district judge for the northern and southern districts of West Virginia.

On April 6, almost to the day, Judge Watkins celebrated his silver anniversary as a member of the Federal judiciary. The Marion County Bar Association at Fairmont honored him with a testimonial dinner. I personally deeply regret that due to prior commitments, it was impossible for me to be present on this most auspicious occasion. I believe it most appropriate that I include a news story regarding this affair, which appeared in the Fairmont, W. Va., Times, under date of April 7, 1962:

TRIBUTE PAID WATKINS HERE BY COUNTY BAR—ADVICE GIVEN 25 YEARS AGO WAS GOOD, JUDGE TELLS COLLEAGUES

Soon after Judge Harry E. Watkins has assumed office in the U.S. Court for the Northern and Southern Districts of West Virginia, the Marion County Bar Association honored him at a dinner. On that occasion, he was showered with admonitions concerning his conduct on the bench.

Last night almost exactly 25 years later, Judge Watkins told his colleagues in the legal profession at a silver anniversary dinner that the advice he had been given then was the best that any judge could ever have received.

"The Marion County Bar Association has been most generous and kind to me over the years," said Judge Watkins in responding to the tributes tendered him at the dinner in the Fairmont Hotel. "Tweney-five years ago almost to the day, the bar had a party for me when I was appointed. I found out that it was to give me advice.

"Older members of the bar had much justified doubt how the great power of the judiciary would affect me, and I was glad to get the words of wisdom they expressed to me that night, for I realized my lack of experience and the need for counsel.

"Tusca Morris, now the dean of our bar, pointed his finger at me and said, 'Promise me you'll not act too much like a Federal judge.' The late Judge Harry Shaw gave us a 'final admonition: Be a gentleman and if it turns out you know a little law, too, that won't hurt.'"

Judge Watkins said that the task of being a Federal judge "is not so tough" when there are lawyers to prepare briefs and law clerks to look up the weight of authority. As for procedure, he said he could always ask Clerk Russell M. Barrett, who began with the Federal courts as a page boy under Judge Jackson, West Virginia's first Federal judge, appointed by President Abraham Lincoln who served until his death in 1905.

He said one of the pleasures of his job was the opportunity to travel to other districts and observe the lawyers who appeared before him. West Virginia attorneys, so far as ability and ethics are concerned, rank at the very top in his opinion, one shared by the late Judge John J. Parker of the Fourth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals.

The Federal jurist said he was indebted to the Marion County bar for being helpful in seeking the truth and seeing that the ends of justice are served. He said this had made his work a delight and declared he was "deeply touched by the expressions of friendship from my own bar."

Judge Frank C. Haymond of the State Supreme Court asserted he was deeply appreciative of the opportunity to return to his own bar association to pay tribute to its "most distinguished member." He said Judge Watkins in his 14 years of practice before going on the bench had shown all the qualities of leadership which had made him an outstanding jurist.

A judge, he said, "must have the ability to listen courteously, to consider wisely, and to decide impartially. The record has established, Judge Watkins, that you are endowed with these qualities in generous measure."

Hugh E. Jones, lifelong friend of Judge Watkins, spoke of his activities off the bench and his determination to be a winner in any endeavor. He referred to him as the father of one of the most widespread men's bridge movements in the country.

Attorney Tusca Morris, as dean of the bar, spoke briefly. Messages were read by Attorney George W. May, chairman of the dinner committee, from Circuit Judge Herbert S. Boreman, District Judges John A. Field, Jr., of Charleston and Charles F. Paul, of Wheeling, A. Hale Watkins of Charleston, Clerk Virgil F. Frizzell of Charleston, U.S. Attorney Robert E. Maxwell and Charles H. Goren, noted bridge expert.

A resolution memorializing Judge Watkins on his 25th anniversary was unanimously adopted after its presentation by Attorney Herschel Rose. It pointed out that the composition of the U.S. Supreme Court and the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals had completely changed in the quarter century Judge Watkins has occupied the bench, and that under him had served two clerks, five marshals and seven U.S. attorneys.

"During his years on the United States bench," the resolution continued, "Judge Watkins has made an enviable record. It is rare indeed that a court is favored with the incumbency of a judge who has behind him 25 years of rich experience with yet the prospect of unlimited years of future service.

"Judge Watkins is recognized and esteemed not only within the northern and southern districts of West Virginia, but his talents and capabilities have been such that he has been repeatedly called upon to serve as judge in other district courts outside of West Virginia, on the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and on other courts of appeal. This requires it to be said, therefore, that Judge Watkins is indeed a judge's judge. It is not without reason that he is now chief judge of the northern district of West Virginia."

The resolution cited other activities in which Judge Watkins has engaged, referring to the report of a committee he headed on the jury system as a "landmark in judicial administration." His assistance to the West Virginia State Bar in the revision of its rules of practice also was recognized.

The bar extended its congratulations to Judge Watkins, "that he do hereby know the high esteem in which he is held by members of this association and of their pride in his records and accomplishments as a judge, and that this association recognizes the favorable public image of the administration of justice which his faithful and competent discharge of duty has created."

Russell L. Furbee, bar president, presided at the dinner. Special guests included members of Judge Watkins' long-established bridge club. Upward of 60 attended.

Tourism in Wisconsin: A Year-Round Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, over the years, I have welcomed the opportunity to invite fellow Senators and their constituents to visit Wisconsin and enjoy a truly great vacation in a land of great natural beauty, unlimited opportunity for indoor and outdoor recreation, and a friendly, wonderful people.

Today, about 85 percent of working Americans enjoy paid vacations, spending about $20 billion a year.

Recently the Green Bay Press-Gazette published an article by John Torinus on the advantages of northeastern Wisconsin as a tourist "mecca".

Reflecting upon the advantages of this area as a tourist land as well as the efforts of citizens to make it more inviting, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Green Bay (Wis.) Press-Gazette, Apr. 1, 1962]

TOURISM IN AREA CAN BE A YEAR-ROUND BUSINESS

(By John Torinus)

In our thinking about the desirability of attracting new industry to northeastern Wisconsin many of us are consistently underestimating what can be accomplished to increase our tourist and recreation business in this area. And we frequently fail to realize the modern economic importance of this industry.

There are a number of stirrings in this direction which are significant. This past year an increasing number of resorts and tourist facilities in Door County have gone into full-year operation. The success of the Nor-Ski Ridge ski area was a factor in this.

Gordon Lodge, as example, now has a heated swimming pool and has converted to year-round operation. Leatham Smith Lodge is doing the same.

The tourist business in Door County has traditionally been a 2-month operation. Many of the natives active in this business there were content with trying to make enough money in July and August so that they could take it easy the other 10 months of the year.

AUTUMN BEST TIME OF YEAR

Yet the autumn season is the best time of the year in Door County for my money. And the area has many charms in the winter.

In New England many resorts are as busy in the fall as in summer through promoting the advantages of fall vacations for seeing the display of autumn color and hunting. And, of course, New England has been the

leader in developing the winter sports business.

I'll predict that new operators are going to come into the field in Door County who will plan to operate on a 9-month season.

Another example of the terrific potential in this field is the Dome at Marinette.

Papa Hasenfus years ago operated an amusement park at this location on the bay shore southeast of Marinette. After it burned down he built a large dancehall. Later a bowling alley was added.

Now, with his two sons also active in the business, the Dome is being developed into a complete resort complex, something like the Wagon Wheel at Rockton, Ill. There is a complete motel-hotel with indoor swimming pool and adjoining bar. The dancehall has been remodeled into a bar with two adjoining dining rooms. And now an intimate cocktail lounge and dining room is being added to the motel.

YEAR-ROUND PROGRAM HELD

The Dome promotes business with year-round activities, swimming and golf in the summer, hunting in the fall, skiing, skating and tobogganing in winter, bowling year around. It has an occupancy average in the high 90-percent bracket in the summer and operates at over 70 percent the rest of the year.

"This isn't resort country," Don Hasenfus says many critics told him. But whether it is or not Don says he doesn't care. What he has is a location the right distance from population centers in the Fox River Valley, Milwaukee and Chicago. It's far enough so people have the feeling they are getting away from it all, and yet is readily accessible.

Incidentally, the people who operate the Wagon Wheel have purchased King's Gateway at Land o' Lakes, installed an indoor pool there last year and added to the hotel facilities. Given the same promotional treatment which built the Wagon Wheel, Gateway should experience a real rebirth of activity.

When we were first trying to promote the Railroad Museum here John Borgenson pointed out that 80 percent of the tourist business in Wisconsin goes through the Madison area and up into the western and north-central parts of the State. Eastern Wisconsin gets only 20 percent of the business.

One factor was people's unwillingness to drive through or around Milwaukee on inadequate highways. The expressway construction there will help to change that.

But for northeastern Wisconsin to get its proper cut of the business private and public entrepreneurs will have to construct facilities which meet the traveling public's modern day wants. And operate and promote them on a year-round basis.

Czechoslovak National Council Supports Communist Mail Amendment Passed by House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to share with our colleagues a letter from the executive vice president of the Czechoslovak National Council of America, Mr. Vlasta Vraz, of Chicago. After expressing full support for the House action in ending the free and subsidized delivery of Communist propaganda, Mr. Vraz states:

The council has been protesting in vain and for years against conditions existing in the United States. Americans of Czechoslovak descent have been receiving vast amounts of unsolicited Communist mail, while our magazines and newspapers are barred from Czechoslovakia. In fact, Americans are no longer allowed to send even gift packages of foodstuffs and old clothing to their relatives because of a prohibitive tax; the Red regime permits only dollars from the States. This is no way of winning the cold war.

For the information of the House, the Czechoslovak National Council of America is a nonprofit organization founded in 1918. Its aim is the promotion of cooperation of all peoples for the preservation of democratic freedom and of course it serves as a common bond for many Americans of Czech descent.

Federal Payments to Nonintegrated School Districts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, many have been shocked by the recent announcement by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Abraham Ribicoff, that payments to nonintegrated school districts to meet education costs for children of Federal employees who live on Federal property and therefore pay no local taxes are to be withheld beginning in September of 1963 until they do integrate. He also indicated similar action against funds for children of Federal employees who do not live on Federal property will be attempted soon.

The executive action against what has been called Federal aid to federally impacted school districts, but which more properly should be termed payments in lieu of taxes, constitutes the rankest type of economic blackmail. The Congress has never authorized the imposition of integration as a condition for Federal payment to the States. In fact such proposals have been rejected on several occasions.

This order also contradicts previous assurances by Secretary Ribicoff and other Federal officials that controls, especially integration controls, would not follow the dollar, particularly in Federal aid to education. These assurances had been given to win passage of a general Federal aid to education bill. Now, however, the control cat is out of the bag, and the administration will be able to lure few, if any, Southern votes to get its aid bill through Congress. Some of us have warned for years that Federal control follows Federal aid and that Federal aid for education would be used to force integration of the races.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that an editorial from the April 4, 1962, issue of the Spartanburg Herald entitled "A Message as Clear as a Federal Edict" and an article from the Greenville News of April 8, 1962, entitled "Blackmail Versus Constitution" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Spartanburg (S.C.) Herald, Apr. 4, 1962]

A MESSAGE AS CLEAR AS A FEDERAL EDICT

The lesson seems so obvious it is hardly necessary to say it.

But some people may have missed it.

Federal participation in school financing means Federal control of education.

The message is as clear as Abraham Ribicoff's announcement could make it.

Any schools receiving Federal funds because they are receiving children from Federal facilities will have to integrate or lose the money.

Apparently, the edict will not hit too hard in South Carolina, though it will in a few places. What's frightening is that this is a mild preview of what's coming if Washington obtains control of the public schools.

The Kennedy administration is getting the cart turned around a bit on this thing. South Carolina schools have been educating these Federal offspring as a courtesy to their parents. Our schools can continue to operate without them.

Of course, the national taxpayer—including us—will have to pay a good bit more for the integrated schools Mr. Ribicoff demands, which undoubtedly will be especially built for these children.

Some of our people have turned their eyes toward Washington as the solution for public education ills. They have discounted the warnings that Federal control follows Federal aid.

Need there be further debate on the point?

This whole movement toward Federal Government domination of almost every facet of American life is becoming more pressing every day.

Those who disclaimed the promises of the Democratic platform during the presidential campaign should remember well, too.

A lot of things are falling pretty much in line with it.

Some recent rulings of the National Labor Relations Board have been particularly painful to South Carolina, like the loss of an industry or so. Remember the local denials about big labor domination?

Just in the past few days, we have seen a sortie into the rights of States to control election procedures. First was the poll tax smokescreen—though it did take the form of a proper procedure for the amendment of the Constitution, instead of the new popular method of simply outdating the Constitution. The Supreme Court then decreed the privilege of Federal ocurts to demand realinement of voting districts.

Quite a number of States have been grossly abusive toward sizable segments of their urban citizens to their lasting discredit. Georgia is a notable example.

This is the justification that leads the way toward Federal preeminence. The conduct of elections in some other sections of the Nation, in the big cities, where ballots are blatantly falsified and elections gleefully stolen, have not induced the ire of the big government advocates. Maybe that's because so much of the successful stealing has gone in their direction.

There is no reason whatsoever to conclude that Federal control of elections will be con-

ducive to good government. A lot of people think quite to the contrary.

Don't forget, either, the proposal now espoused that a sixth grade education should be literacy enough for the high privilege of voting. That comes right out of the democratic platform of 1960—which some people around here told us didn't mean a thing.

Bosh! What this nation needs is a more rigid standard of literacy and intelligence for voting. It's ridiculous to say that every idiot who can stumble to the polls deserves the right to a ballot. Voting is no right.

It's a privilege. And it's a privilege that is too blatantly misused by the ignorant, and by the heedless.

The pertinent point is that here, once more, the Federal Government is moving in to take an initiative which is specifically denied to it in the Constitution.

So, the Ribicoff edict on schools is not an action that stands by its lonely. Not at all. It is a skein in the whole fabric of an encroaching federalism that is reaching deeper into the heart of every community with almost every passing day.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, Apr. 8, 1962]

BLACKMAIL VERSUS CONSTITUTION

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—A passion to win the votes of minority groups seems to have taken precedence in the policies of President Kennedy over the plain requirements of the Constitution. It also seems to have affected Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who is about to enter the race for U.S. Senator in Connecticut.

Congress has passed a law giving financial aid to schools in what are known as "federally impacted areas," where children of military and other Government personnel are educated. The statute doesn't say a word about the desegregation question. Yet the President now has ordered the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to withhold Federal funds from the schools in those areas unless they are desegregated.

Members of Congress are calling it "blackmail of the highest order." Newspapers in some of the districts affected are calling it a violation of the Constitution.

Secretary Ribicoff is reported by the Southern School News, an information service on education, as having said 2 months ago that funds would not be withheld because Congress had not made desegregation a condition for receipt of the money and that, until Congress did so, he would continue to disburse the funds to "segregated as well as desegregated schools alike." About a year ago, Mr. Ribicoff said:

"I think it is a tragedy to put on the back of education the problems of everything, including the problem of civil rights."

But a ruling was nevertheless issued by Secretary Ribicoff to withhold funds from areas where the schools are not desegregated within the next year.

The Sarasota, Fla., Herald Tribune, calling attention to these inconsistencies of Mr. Ribicoff and to the effect of the new ruling on certain schools in Florida, says in an editorial:

"Is this upholding the spirit and the letter of the Constitution—a document that establishes a system of checks and balances giving Congress the power to enact laws and ordering the President to 'take care that all laws be faithfully executed'?

"Each time the executive branch of the U.S. Government makes an end run around Congress, our system of checks and balances is further eroded and our Constitution weakened, no matter how 'worthy' and 'moral' the cause. This is the implication of Mr. Ribicoff's action."

It is being asserted here that, since legislation on the subject of desegregation can't get through Congress, only the President, acting on his own, can accomplish the change—in other words, that "the end justifies the means." This is the cry that used to be heard when an impassioned and unreasoning group of citizens lynched an aleged murderer without waiting for a trial. The argument always was: "Why wait for a court order when he's guilty anyhow?"

Scarcely a month goes by that this argument, in one form or another, isn't being used here with respect to circumventing the Constitution.

The school of thought which is gaining headway here these days is the one that believes an executive ruling can get around the Constitution. President Kennedy has apparently become a believer in this philosophy. He recently issued an Executive order declaring that anyone who sells goods or services to the Government—and more than $50 billion of contracts are involved—must agree in advance to conform, in effect, to the Government's edict concerning the employment of persons of a certain color.

Does the Constitution really give the power to the Chief Executive to tell an employer whom he shall hire just because he sells goods or services to the Federal Government? Nowhere in the Constitution is anything said on the subject. The Supreme Court of the United States unfortunately has in certain cases closed the door to judicial appeal by aggrieved citizens. This completes the picture of what may be truly called dictatorial power by the Chief Executive.

Congress, however, not only can pass a law assuring judicial appeal but also can limit the power of the Chief Executive to use Federal funds as a form of economic blackmail.

Court orders are understandable in the desegregation controversy, but to use the Executive order as a means of withholding Federal funds unless the wishes of the Executive are followed is an attempt to secure conformity by coercion.

Hope, the Only Universal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, a very good friend of mine by the name of V. R. Washburn, of Rapid City, S. Dak., has forwarded to me a statement of principles and philosophy that I believe should be passed on for the benefit of those many who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

His statement of philosophy is as follows:

HOPE, THE ONLY UNIVERSAL

Will each person own the fruits of his labor or will these fruits be owned or confiscated by some more powerful person or group of people? Such has been man's endless problem since his appearance on this earth where the natural resources necessary to sustain mortal life are furnished free by the Creator except for man's labor needed to convert these resources to man's use.

Man is a creature of hope and every person's greatest hope is to realize his hopes. His only hope of doing so depends on his use of the fruits of his labor. This is freedom. If the state owns all property and collects all of the fruits of men's labor, man is automatically a slave and unable to realize his hopes. This is collectivism.

Goods or wealth can be created only by man's labor on natural resources. A government cannot create wealth because it is an artificial creature devised by man and it possesses no innate powers to hope, think, and labor. Hence, any government can only collect or confiscate the fruits of men's labor and thereby diminishes man's hopes.

If these things be true, men without freedom are also without hope, except the hope of regaining their freedom.

Homer Thornberry Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, April 2, the San Marcos Baptist Academy presented our distinguished colleague, HOMER THORNBERRY, with the San Marcos Baptist Academy Award. This award is given only to outstanding patrons of the school, and the respect it betokens is indicated by the fact that this is only the fourth such award to be made in the 55-year history of the institution. Because of the deserved recognition it thus accords to our respected colleague, I am including under the unanimous-consent agreement the thoughtful and thought-provoking remarks made on that occasion by Dr. William H. Crook, president of the academy, for printing in the RECORD:

A TRIBUTE AND A PLEA

(Address by Dr. William H. Crook, president of San Marcos Baptist Academy)

We have chosen today to honor a man who has distinguished himself as an elected Representative to Congress and in civic and humanitarian efforts. The Honorable HOMER THORNBERRY has written with his life the kind of success story that is told repeatedly on the pages of America's history books. Those who may be tempted to surrender to the difficulties that present themselves in the path of every human being, should be encouraged by his example. Having been born to parents who could neither speak a word nor hear a sound, Mr. THORNBERRY had an acceptable and readymade excuse for failure. The public would have understood and sympathized if the silence of his home had led him to resentment and embarrassment. But love, which is independent of words, was the vehicle that his parents used to carry across the silences a set of values. Instead of withdrawing from life with its problems, he developed a strong human sympathy and a sense of Christian responsibility. His entire adult life has been devoted to causes greater than himself.

I have seen him at work in the Nation's Capitol and I have learned that this modest, approachable man is a respected and able legislator. But it is not because of what he has done that we honor him today but because of what he is and what he stands for. At a time when the art of debunking is at an all-time high and the motives of man are cynically questioned, both by word and pen, it is good to be reassured by observing the life and conduct of a humble and dedicated public servant.

The national pastime of criticizing all that pertains to government at every level has developed harmful proportions. Responsible public criticism is a necessary preservative for freedom. It is the lubricant for

the working parts of a democratic system, keeping the processes of government functioning. But there is a form of criticism which is subversive. It springs from insecurity and contempt. It is more an expression of neurosis than it is of healthy egotism. The form of criticism that is in vogue today performs no constructive good. It is cynicism wearing the uniform and decorations of the patriot, but it knows neither the patriot's courage nor the patriot's deed. It is gutless. It is this hollowness that makes it dangerous.

America is tolerant of her critics—she hears them out. And in time the people decide. For generations their perception has been sharpened by Old West medicine shows and the Madison Avenue sales pitch. The people expose the fraud, the fool, and the psychopath—one by one. But today, as never before, the fraud, the fool, and the psychopath have united. They have pooled their talents and are playing ceaselessly the same refrain on the same string in the best brainwashing style. The theme is the same with slight variation of verses—"the Federal Government is an evil and greedy octopus," "all public officials are corrupt," "all statesmen are stupid," "intrigue and espionage are conceived in the White House, form in the Congress, live in the Pentagon, and work at the State Department."

This shrill and morale-shaking voice of dissention has never been so loud, so articulate, or so discordant. The experienced adult has learned to tune it out but what of the youth? Can he resist the constant drip, drip, drip, of charges, insinuations, and hysterical alarms without losing respect for and confidence in the government of his country? We may teach him to say:

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States and to the Republic for which it stands," but if he has been fed the bread of contempt and taught to suspect those principles, processes, and personalities that form the Republic, his pledge may not be forever valid nor his allegiance forever binding.

It is doubtful if any institution, including the apparently invulnerable Government of the United States, can survive indefinitely in an atmosphere of public cynicism and disrespect.

The right to protest and to question is inherent in our liberty and it is stressed by the faculty of San Marcos Academy. But along with the right to protest, we intend to stress the necessity for positive appreciation for and sincere confidence in that form of Government which in the long evolution of the thought of man remains imperfect but unsurpassed.

For this reason, as we come to honor a Member of Congress, we wish also to honor the Congress of which he is a Member—and to express renewed confidence in the destiny of our Nation under God, and in the integrity of those public servants of both parties whose motivations are unselfish and sincere.

New Uses for the Farm Products, Not New Uses for Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, there is much discussion on the farm bill and the farm problem. I recommend to my colleagues, the following editorial from the Livestock Reporter of April 6, 1962, which discusses research in agricultural commodities. If we can find new uses for farm products, through research, we will not have to "find a new use for the farmer."

[From the Livestock Reporter, Apr. 6, 1962]

WHERE THE EMPHASIS SHOULD BE

Congress ought to spend more effort on finding new uses for the farmer's product and less on trying to find a new use for the farmer.

That's the interesting idea advanced by Senator KARL E. MUNDT, an ardent exponent of the theory that what ails agriculture is not so much due to overproduction as it is underutilization of the products of agriculture. We agree wholeheartedly with his assertion that, "it's time we devoted our attention in a big way toward doing something other than stuffing away in a storage bin what the farmer produces."

The South Dakota lawmaker points out, in the way of substantiating evidence, that in its two decades of operation, the U.S. Department of Agriculture utilization research has added over $2.5 billion of value to farm commodities at a cost of less than $200 million invested—an excellent benefit ratio of 15 to 1. During the past 5 years, utilization research enhanced agricultural commodity values $1.75 billion, which is 70 percent of the total gain made in the two decades of this program, the Senator reminds us.

Are we lagging in utilization research for agriculture? Dr. Byron T. Shaw, Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service, thinks so. He notes that no increase has been provided in funds earmarked for utilization research, and that of the $56 million allocated for research, only $18.7 million was provided for utilization research, new uses, and new products. An additional $2.6 million is provided for human nutrition and consumer uses research, making a total of $21 million, which, Shaw believes, "is but a drop in the bucket considering the fact that we are searching for the solution to a problem which requires an annual outlay of more than $6 billion."

Helping agriculture through more research aimed at finding new uses for what the farmer produces is not a fantasy, Senator MUNDT declared. He observed that in the past fiscal year, 124 research projects were terminated. Of these, exactly one-half—a marvelous percentage of success in scientific research—attained the desired objectives. Twenty-nine more achieved partial attainment, only three were found unpromising. While these 124 projects were terminated, another 125 were started, 62 researching possible industrial uses of farm products, 49 devoted to potential food uses, and the remaining 14 to possible feed uses.

What has been accomplished in this line? In the last fiscal year alone, the achievements included development of a new food from whole grain wheat; a new process in tanning of sole leather using dialdehyde starch, which is a new chemical derivative of cereal grain, discovery of new flour from wheat and new starch products from cereal which can be incorporated as an integral part of paper and other pulp products, adoption by three manufacturers of an ARS process for commercial use of a water-soluble gum produced by bacterial fermentation of corn sugar; a rapid chemical process development which greatly simplifies wool feltmaking; and development of potentially new crops, such as ironweed seed, which has potential use in plastics.

"Congress is now considering a farm program which, in my mind, cannot achieve success for the farmer because instead of being directed toward finding new uses for the farmer's product, it is aimed at finding a new use for the farmer," MUNDT said. "Instead of directing efforts to the costly task of relocating farmers, a greater service is to unleash the great productive capacity of our minds and move extensively and swiftly into the field of utilization research. It can be the key to a prosperous agriculture offering a future on the farm, as well as off the farm, for America."

Farmers who agree with the Senator may want to tell their own Representatives and Senators of their support for this approach to the farm problem.

Kennedy Evaluates Hadassah's Vital Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share an editorial with the many of my colleagues who have offered such rich, merited tribute to Hadassah, the women's Zionist service organization, as it celebrates its 50th anniversary. I read this editorial in the Detroit Jewish News with a great sense of privilege, which I am sure you will share. Mrs. Siegfried Kramarsky's and Mrs. Rose R. L. Halpern's statements concerning this organization's historic mission are deeply stirring and give eloquent testimony to the limitless impact of Hadassah's concern and participation in the vital problems and affairs of mankind—not of Jews alone.

One must remember with reverent thrill the prodigious and successful work of Hadassah in World War II in transferring, under unspeakable dangers, thousands of Jewish children from the oppression of Nazi tyranny in Europe to the dynamism of what would be the new nation of Israel. But this was a problem and a burden of responsibility and guilt which belonged to the world, and in their inspired, dramatic and successful response to it, Hadassah performed a mission for all mankind which is beyond calculation.

Today, as President Kennedy said in his message citing the impact of Hadassah, "Men everywhere are immigrants to freedom and opportunity" and they behold Israel and their hope and aspirations are refired.

Today in Israel, the medical and research services of the Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center, described as one of the most imposing and finest anywhere, flow into African and Asian nations, and the impact of this benefit is to all mankind.

When Hadassah calls upon peoples everywhere to fight anti-Semitism and discrimination wherever they may arise, it is involved in the fight of oppressed mankind wherever he exists—not alone of Jewish people.

I was interested to read in an article just across the page from this editorial a comment by Dr. Harry Joshua Stern, of Temple Emanu-El, Montreal, in an address he had made. He said:

Let Christians be the best kind of Christians and let Jews be the best kind of Jews and therein is hope for a decent society.

This, I think, is what Hadassah says. We do not perfect ourselves, spiritually, morally, intellectually without becoming involved and totally sharing in the perfecting of mankind and his welfare everywhere.

I share this editorial and salute Hadassah:

KENNEDY EVALUATES HADASSAH'S VITAL ROLE

A significant evaluation of Hadassah's vital role in human affairs has been made by President Kennedy, who, in a message to the women's Zionist organization, on its 50th anniversary, had this to say:

"Hadassah has demonstrated for more than a generation that our society receives in giving. Our significance as a nation is often more visible in the hopes and aspirations that others entertain for us than in our own estimates of ourselves. For many years, immigrants to these shores constantly rekindled the vision of opportunity and freedom that inspired our first settlers. Now the tide runs in new channels. For all men everywhere are immigrants to freedom and opportunity; as our Nation bends its strength and lends its hand to help them achieve this horizon in the spirit, in that act free men discover their own worth.

"Hadassah has realized this great truth for many years. It has brought not only help to others, but awareness to our own Nation. For that, you are to be thanked and commended. As the world struggles from the dark ways of the past, and seeks the destiny of peace in freedom, organizations like Hadassah will continue to find a vital place in human affairs."

The President thus has indicated the appreciation that is extant of the efforts of the women's movement in behalf of good health in the Middle East and its contributions toward the erasing of the low standards that existed in pre-Israel Palestine among Arabs as much as among impoverished Jews who flocked to the Holy Land. The President's message also expresses recognition of Hadassah continued activities which bring awareness of help that is being given by Americans to less fortunate people overseas.

Observed on the occasion of Purim, Hadassah's half century of service was noted in a statement by Hadassah's president, Mrs. Siegfried Kramarsky, who, while calling upon peoples everywhere to fight anti-Semitism and discrimination wherever they may arise declared:

"Whenever the venom of anti-Semitism seeps into a society, whether it be instigated by a Haman in Persia, by a Hitler in Germany, by Communists or Nazis—the echo of Mordecai's injunction to Esther is a call to action. And the Jewish people throughout the ages have responded even as Esther did."

It is as a creative force that Hadassah began a new era of activities. Mrs. Rose R. L. Halpern, cochairman of the Jewish agency and a former national Hadassah president, described the movement's historic position properly by stating:

"We believe that the Jewish people is an eternal people; that it is one people and that to insure its survival and its unity must be the task of every successive generation. We believe that Israel reborn and the people of Israel settled on its own soil can create its own image, develop its own character, strive for its own perfection in a way that is impossible for any community in the Diaspora and that to aid Israel in this task is the responsibility of all of us.

"We believe that the Diaspora can be creative, that Jewish life can become more deeply rooted; that we can put the brakes on against the trend to ignorance. To this task we must dedicate ourselves for it would be a historic tragedy if the State of Israel were to be reborn and the Jewish people lost. We believe that Jewish communities everywhere and the Jewish community of Israel must be partners in the great task of survival."

Hadassah's efforts have been felt wherever Jews reside in this country today. In all communities, large and small, including Detroit, the movement has left its mark upon humanitarian efforts. The organization's work continues unhampered, earning for it the heartiest greetings of all of us on the present anniversary celebration.

White House Sings Praise of "Old Pro" McCormack—Kennedy Hopeful Since Tax Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1962

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the White House aides in offering my congratulations to our distinguished Speaker, JOHN W. MCCORMACK, for his remarkable display of leadership which, in a great measure, was responsible for the House victory of the President's tax bill last week.

A newspaper feature from the Boston Sunday Globe, of April 8, 1962, written by Wilfrid C. Rodgers, one of the most able correspondents in the Nation's Capital, expresses the esteem and appreciation which White House aides have for our very competent Speaker, JOHN W. MCCORMACK. I commend this article to the attention of my fellow colleagues:

WHITE HOUSE SINGS PRAISE OF "OLD PRO" MCCORMACK—KENNEDY HOPEFUL SINCE TAX VICTORY

(By Wilfrid C. Rodgers)

WASHINGTON, April 7.—Because an old pro came through in the pinch, the White House is taking a more optimistic view of the chances of its legislative program.

The old pro is Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Dorchester, who is being given credit by the White House for turning defeat into victory on the controversial tax bill of the administration.

As late as the night before the vote, White House aids were convinced they didn't have the House votes. But they were overlooking MCCORMACK.

"It was the Speaker who won that fight for the administration," an aid points out, "and don't forget it.

"He put together a solid 225 votes, more Democrats than you can usually round up to support adjournment."

As a result of the victory, MCCORMACK has grown in stature not only on Capitol Hill but also at the White House.

Prior to the tax vote, there were rumbles concerning MCCORMACK's leadership. There was pessimism concerning the fate of the administration's key legislative bills, foreign trade, the U.N. bond issue, and medical care for the aged.

The tax bill still isn't out of the woods since the Senate will have a whack at it.

Yet, White House aids admit that Speaker MCCORMACK's victory in the House has given them a chance to get a second wind.

Perhaps more important, a renewed push is being rallied behind the tariff bill.

Opposition groups to the tariff proposal were counting on a split in the Democratic ranks in the House to bring about drastic changes or outright death for this controversial proposal. Now the opposition isn't so sure.

As for medical care for the aged—White House aids declare the tax victory in the House has strengthened the chances of getting that measure out of Ways and Means Committee and on the floor of the House.

The Speaker—who predicted at the beginning of the session, that the bulk of the administration's legislation would get through the House—shrugs off praise for the accomplishment.

Although he is a few pounds lighter than when the session started, he still twirls the ever-present cigar between his fingers.

And a relaxed smile comes quicker to his lips—particularly since passage of the tax bill.

MCCORMACK has removed any threat of losing the ball to the opposition. He and the New Frontier are back on the offensive and they don't care who knows it.

An Academy for Public Service on Ellis Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to establish a National Academy for Public Service to be located on Ellis Island in New York Harbor.

Ellis Island, which served for many decades as the path of entry for millions of immigrants coming to this country, is today unused. There is only the memory of its glorious past when it teemed with eager newcomers to our friendly shores who had obtained their first contact and glimpse of America through a few days sojourn on this island until their admission had been cleared. Ellis Island was a symbol of hope and the realization of that hope for several generations of new Americans.

I propose that we give this island a new lease on life and a new hope for present and future generations of Americans by establishing a National Academy for Public Service there. At this Academy young American men and women will be trained in the service of the Federal, State, and municipal governments as dedicated public servants. There they will have the opportunity to specialize in the various fields of government to enable them to assume positions of responsibility with national or local government agencies.

In other words, this institution of higher learning will emphasize education for public service. This is not intended as another liberal arts college to compete with other municipal and private educational institutions in New York, as has been suggested for Ellis Island, but rather as a school for quali-

fied students who want to make a career of government service. We have some 2½ million people employed by the Federal Government and many hundreds of thousands by State and municipal governments, and yet we do not have a single higher educational institution that specializes in training and preparing public servants for these positions.

I believe that an Academy for Public Service at Ellis Island, set up on a similar basis as the academies of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Coast Guard, and merchant marine, could render a most useful purpose to the various branches of government just as the other academies serve our military and maritime needs. In addition, the Public Service Academy could provide refresher training for those now in public service.

My bill provides that the U.S. Government make available the use of Ellis Island for the establishment of the proposed Public Service Academy where it is estimated that about 1,000 to 1,200 students could be accommodated. After the academy begins its operations, students between the ages of 17 and 25 may be admitted on the basis of nationwide competitive examinations prescribed by the director of the academy. Each of these "public service trainees" will be requested to sign an agreement that he will serve in the U.S. public service for a period of at least 3 years after graduation.

Each State will be entitled to appoint annually as many candidates to the academy equal to its representation in both Houses of Congress, plus one additional appointment. Thus, the Governor of each State, each U.S. Senator, and each Member of the House of Representatives will be able to recommend someone for an appointment. In addition, the President will be entitled to make up to 10 appointments annually.

Tuition, room and board, books, and other necessities shall be provided free to all trainees in a similar manner as these emoluments are provided at the military academies. The curricula shall be established by the director of the academy, with emphasis on those studies which are best suited in his judgment for careers in public service. Upon graduation, the trainees will receive an undergraduate degree.

The academy will also provide graduate training on a limited basis to not more than 100 persons chosen each year for specialized training in this field. They shall be persons who are career public servants, recommended by the head of their department or agency, or chosen by a special selection panel. The selection panel is to be appointed by the President and is to consist of 10 members, who are distinguished in the fields of Government, education, and other public service. They are to serve without compensation. The selection of persons for advanced training in public service may be made from among those employed in the Federal, State, and local governments, and is to include also those serving in the national and State legislatures, as well as members of the judiciary branch of Government.

Mr. Speaker, public service has long been described as a public trust. In the highly skilled times in which we live it has become a necessity to stress skill and specialization in every endeavor. Public service is no different. We must have the people who possess not only an education, but a special type of education and training, as well as the zeal to make public service their lifetime career. There is no doubt in my mind that such an educational institution would render a most useful service to our Nation.

And I can think of no better location than Ellis Island, only minutes away from the heart of our great metropolis of New York, with its many libraries, museums and other institutions of higher learning. In this manner Ellis Island can once again perform a great service to the country, in other ways and in other generations, but still in the best interests of the American people.

Nondeductible Wives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Art Buchwald, which needs no comment. Read it and weep:

NONDEDUCTIBLE WIVES

(By Art Buchwald)

NEW YORK.—Congress is wrestling with a new tax law which is supposed to tighten up on existing entertainment tax writeoffs for business purposes. In the future you may have trouble writing off a yacht as a business tax deduction, a hunting lodge, or even a trip to a foreign land, if it's proved you got any fun out of it yourself.

While most people are sympathetic with abolishing the larger tax excesses, there is one rider to the new law that might very well wreck the American home. And that is that a wife can no longer be considered tax deductible.

If, as an example, you take a client and his wife to dinner and the theater you can deduct them as legitimate business writeoffs. You can also deduct yourself, but if the new law is passed you can't deduct your wife.

So obviously no man in his right fiscal mind is going to want to take his wife out to dinner anymore.

What makes the new law even more aggravating from a wife's point of view is that her husband can take out another woman on his expense account, providing the other woman has something to do with his business. This makes it much more attractive for a man to take out a beautiful blond stranger, who works in a similar business and is considered deductible, than his own wife, who is really nothing more than a financial drain on his income tax return.

One shudders to think what will happen to the American home if the law is passed.

The husband is shaving and whistling in the bathroom, getting ready to go out for the evening. His wife, still in her apron, is sitting wistfully on the bed watching him.

"Where are you going tonight?" she asks him.

"We'll probably go to 'Camelot' and then to the Persian Room afterward."

"Who are you going with?"

"The woman buyer of lingerie from Sears, Roebuck."

The wife starts sniffing.

"Now don't start that again," the husband says. "You know very well why you can't go. Do you want my accountant to explain it to you again?"

"I haven't been out in 3 months."

"You're exaggerating. You went out 7 weeks ago with me when that man from the Aetna Curtain Co. took us to a hockey game at Madison Square Garden."

"Something's happened to us," the wife says. "We used to have so much fun doing things together."

"Blame it on Uncle Sam," the husband says. "When I married you, you were the most beautiful legitimate writeoff a man could want. I'll never forget that first night when I took you to the Copacabana. The bill came to $45 and we both laughed as I signed the check. Do you know how much I'd have to earn now to pay that check? One hundred and fifty dollars."

"Then you married me just because I was tax deductible?" the wife says.

"Now you're being unreasonable," the husband says angrily. "I married you because I loved you. I took you out because you were deductible. Don't you see the difference? Look, if it was up to me I'd take you out every night in the week. But if I did we wouldn't be able to live on the salary I'm making."

"Well, why are you always going out if I can't go out with you?" the wife sobs.

"Because I can deduct myself. It doesn't cost me anything if I go out. Darling, you're got to grow up and face facts as they are. I'll tell you what you do. Write another letter to your Congressman. Maybe by the time I get back from Florida they'll change the law."

"Florida?"

"Oh, I forgot to tell you."

West Liberty State College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story on my alma mater, "West Liberty College on Its Way," which appeared in the Wheeling, W. Va., News Register, under date of March 30, 1962. May I add, Mr. Speaker, that West Liberty College has indeed gone a long way since my days as a student there, and I am most proud of the progress that has been made over the years.

I extend my congratulations to President Paul N. Elbin and to the distinguished members of his faculty.

The story follows:

WEST LIBERTY COLLEGE ON ITS WAY

Like the University of Pittsburgh, which dates its origin from the founding of Pittsburgh Academy in 1787, West Liberty State College began its 125 years March 30, 1837, as West Liberty Academy.

But no one should disparage our humble origin, for West Liberty Academy challenged its students with a curriculum that many a college student of today would find overwhelming.

Chartered in 1837 and opened the following year, West Liberty Academy under its

original and later names has never missed a term through civil and world wars and has developed steadily to meet the needs of each succeeding generation. West Liberty Academy (1837–70), West Liberty State Normal School (1870–1931), and West Liberty State Teachers College (1931–43) served their times nobly, and we are gratefuly for the memory of able leaders and teachers as well as faithful students of those days.

GROWTH IN RECENT YEARS

The growth of West Liberty State College (1943) in the past 15 years is nothing less than sensational. That we offer our community something of recognized value is attested in many ways.

West Liberty's enrollment has risen from a little over 500, 10 years ago, to more than 1,300. From one of the smallest higher educational institutions in the area and State, West Liberty now enrolls more students from the northern panhandle of West Virginia than all other West Virginia colleges and universities combined.

Our annual legislative appropriation has risen from $147,000 in 1949 to $750,000 in 1962, while the total annual operating budget has increased from $650,000 to $1,300,000. Though the building program is not yet half completed, $3½ million have been spent on capital improvements in recent years. Curricular offerings have expanded from teacher education alone to a balanced offering of liberal arts and preprofessional courses along with nationally recognized programs in business administration and dental hygiene.

ON OUR WAY

As we look back over the past 125 years or even over the past 15 years, we could be pardoned for saying that West Liberty State College has arrived. It is more accurate to say that we are on our way.

The public has obviously come to hold higher education in high esteem. And a college, like a business, grows when it offers something the people want.

If the families of Greater Wheeling, northwestern West Virginia and adjacent areas continue to utilize the advantages of West Liberty State College during the next 8 years at the same annual rate of increase as during the past 8 years, our enrollment will pass the 3,000 mark by the end of this decade.

STUDENT DEVELOPMENT OUR OBJECTIVE

The objectives of West Liberty State College, however, are not measured in terms of enrollment or budget. They are measured in terms of student development. With students as our main concern, we are selecting students with greater care than ever before, and we are retaining only those who prove their ability to do genuine college work.

The more West Liberty progresses in the direction of quality the greater appears to be the desire of worthy young people to attend the college. This realization offers a happy guide for the next 125 years of West Liberty State College.

Hatlessness and Joblessness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, the whims of fashion have consequences that go far beyond changes in styles. As Representative of the Nation's hatmaking center, I am well aware of the economic impact that fashions can have. The hat industry is troubled by the current trend of fashion. A fine analysis of these troubles appeared recently in a Christian Science Monitor article, which I now offer for the RECORD. It is my earnest hope that the present style trend will revert to what I like to think of as merely good grooming:

HATLESSNESS AND JOBLESSNESS—PEOPLE AT WORK

(By Ed Townsend)

NEW YORK, March 31.—A few days ago an officer of the United Hatters, Cap and Millinery Workers International Union looked regretfully—and with some irritation—at a newspaper picture of hatless John F. Kennedy, smiling and windblown, and hatless Mrs. Kennedy, her charm defying the end-of-winter wind.

"Every picture like that costs us jobs," the union official said.

The Hatters, Cap, and Millinery Workers can tick off many problems—high among them the unemployment among the union's 40,000 members. It blames this in part on foreign competition; too many hat bodies are being imported, it complains. However, it is much more concerned over a steady loss of jobs because of today's more casual dress.

Men and women are going hatless too much of the time; it's commonplace.

The union doesn't blame the Nation's first family for this trend, but it does wish that the President or Mrs. Kennedy would appear more often in hats—and perhaps set styles for the too-hatless men and women to follow.

"You know what pictures of the President's rocking chair did for the furniture-makers' rocking chair sales," the Hatters spokesman said. He added, "We know what the First Lady's pillbox hats did for women's hat styles in our industry.

"We could use another tickler like that," he said.

The union's concern is particularly about hatless men. Too many men are completely out of the hat market now; they do not own a single hat. Others buy hats only at irregular and long intervals—perhaps one hat every year or two. Very few buy a hat for every suit and every season.

WOMEN'S MARKET

It's somewhat different with the women. Few of them are really out of the market. They can be enticed into hatshops and into buying. But, according to industry figures, they aren't buying new hats often enough. They're not wearing the old ones enough to get tired of them.

"You want to see that, look around," the Hatters spokesman said. It was true. Shortly after noon on a Friday, in a midtown New York department store, the first floor and escalators were crowded with shoppers, but hats—on men or women—were the exception and not the rule. "People need to be persuaded that they ought to wear hats, for good grooming, for health reasons, for——"

"For jobs?"

"Of course, we're interested in that," the union man agreed.

The Hatters, Cap & Millinery Workers and the hat industry are cooperating to do the job of persuasion that they feel is necessary to make men and women more hat conscious—and better customers. Several years ago the union and employers established a joint Hat Council, Inc., as a means of promoting the wearing of men's hats. More informally, the hatters and women's hat manufacturers are cooperating to stimulate more interest in women's hats.

The Hat Council, Inc., last year asked the noted designer, Raymond Loewy, of Raymond Loewy/William Snaith, Inc., to come up with a new look in men's hats—a turn away from past conservatism, a change that would get men into the hatstores.

The new hat styles were introduced last fall, after 4 months of work. Loewy commented at the time that his organization had found that breaking with traditional hat styles meant dealing with "objects so precious, so sacrosanct, that we might better have undertaken the redesign of the egg—or the U.S. flag."

Many men were incensed at the new design with a sculptured swirl on the crown and a high-rolled brim at the sides, and at the introduction of colors and decorations. But the change apparently did woo some of the hatless back; hat sales rose, particularly among younger men.

HOW TO STIMULATE SALES

The question now is whether men's hat sales will hold up or whether, with the warmer weather of spring and summer, they will drop off again.

Efforts will be made to stimulate sales through ads and arguments that a man can keep cooler in a hat. But the problem is fitting a hat into today's casual living and casual dress. The man who spends much of his time in slacks and sport shirt is likely to do without a hat.

The hatters' union isn't the only one concerned about today's casual dress. It has been a matter of considerable concern in the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, too, and in the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union to a lesser extent. It has caused problems for unions in hosiery, glove, and other accessory industries as well.

For the ACWA, in the men's garment industry, the casual life of today has meant sharp reductions in needs for suits; sports jackets and slacks are acceptable substitutes even in many fields of business. For the suitmakers, the great problem is that men's trousers wear out before their suit coats; with the trousers going or gone, the suit must be discarded. Now, the sports jacket continues to be worn with a succession of slacks.

If that wasn't problem enough, in casual living a coat or jacket may be dispensed with entirely, at times; separate topcoats and overcoats are becoming a thing of the past, replaced by a single coat with a zip-in liner; and even trousers or slacks may be given longer life by acceptance on a growing scale of shorts for home and even casual outdoor wear.

Women's wear has been affected, too, but not as much. The fashion industry's sweeping changes each season have succeeded in outmoding the clothing in women's closets—and sending them shopping. But casual living—less need to be dressily dressed—has cut into total sales and, particularly, has hurt the accessory lines.

Not long ago a women's-wear manufacturer said that Mrs. John F. Kennedy "probably has done more to make women dress-conscious than any other First Lady in recent history." Nobody in the hat or clothing industry really is hoping for miracles, but they hope that someone—or something—will stimulate more interest in dress generally, from shoes to hats.

"No-Win" or Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following

editorial from the Muncie (Ind.) Star of April 10, 1962:

"NO-WIN" OR VICTORY?

At a press conference President Kennedy was asked this direct question. "Mr. President, a number of rightwing critics say that your foreign policy is based on a no-win policy in the cold war. Would you address yourself to this charge?"

The President replied indirectly. He said: "Well, of course, every American, whoever they may be, wants the United States to be secure and in peace and they want the cause of freedom around the world to prevail. Quite obviously, that is our national objective. What we are anxious to do, of course, is to protect our national security, protect the freedom of the countries, permit what Thomas Jefferson called the disease of liberty to be caught in areas which are now held by Communists, and in some areas where people are imprisoned. We want to do that, of course, without having a nuclear war. Now if someone thinks we should have a nuclear war in order to win, I can inform them that there will not be winners of the next nuclear war, if there is one, and this country and other countries would suffer very heavy blows. So we have to proceed with responsibility and with care in an age where the human race can obliterate itself. The objective of this administration, and I think the objective of the country, is to protect our security, keep the peace, protect our vital interests, make it possible for what we believe to be a system of government which is in accordance with the basic aspirations of people everywhere to ultimately prevail, and that is our objective and that is the one we shall follow." This is the entire statement as reported by the Associated Press.

What does it mean? It means that the rightwing critics are correct. What the President is saying is that he does not intend to lose the cold war, but he has no intention of risking a nuclear war to win it. The entire tone of his answer is defensive. He seeks peace and security and protection of our liberties. And he will permit liberty to try its wings in other parts of the globe, but will not necessarily help that process—at the risk of nuclear war.

Nowhere did he say bluntly what Khrushchev has told the American people. "We intend to see your children live under freedom and be ashamed that their parents and grandparents were Communists." He did not say he intended to seek victory in the cold war. He did not say he would take the offensive against communism—not militarily—but diplomatically, economically, politically. Nor did he state his aim to be the eventual liberation of the captive nations, and of the Russian people themselves.

We agree with the President that peace and security and freedom for our people are worthy objectives of the U.S. foreign policy. But we do not believe that these aims can be secured by a defensive, no-win policy. Khrushchev has told us we have only two choices, coexistence or nuclear war. But he has accepted neither of these choices for communism. He seeks to bury us. He aims at total victory for communism everywhere in the world. He and Stalin have won nearly half of the world not by war, but by revolution, diplomacy, bluff and bluster, and negotiation by coexistence. He intends to win the cold war for communism without nuclear war or any kind of total war. He has told us so. He has acted on that intention in Laos, Vietnam, and Cuba, as well as China and Eastern Europe.

Lincoln once said that the Union could not long endure half slave and half free. But Mr. Kennedy does not believe that freedom cannot long endure in a world half free and half Communist. Where Khrushchev seeks total victory, Mr. Kennedy has no such aim. Proof lies in the blocking by his administration of the victory resolution authored by Congressman DONALD BRUCE. This resolution calls upon the President to establish policies aiming toward victory in the cold war. Note, we said, "The cold war."

A liberal Washington columnist recently wrote: "The rightwing in the United States of America believes in preventive war." This is a lie. No responsible leader of the conservative movement, not Senator GOLDWATER, not Senator TOWER, not the Muncie Star, has ever advocated preventive war in any military sense.

What we advocate are measures in the fields of diplomacy, economics, and politics aiming at victory in the cold war. We support those who would seek victory for freedom in Cuba. We know that activities of this kind can be carried out behind the overwhelmingly powerful shield of our atomic air and missile power. That is why, as the President's Deputy Secretary of Defense has said, "This Nation has a nuclear retaliatory force of such lethal power . . . [that] we are confident that the Soviets will not provoke a major war."

Surely the President knows the published facts about American superiority in military power. He knows, or should know, we have a 3-to-1 superiority in nuclear missiles and a 4,100-to-150 superiority in intercontinental nuclear bombers, who take that awful risk.

Why then does the President fail to seek victory diplomatically, economically and politically as the Soviets do? Why does he follow the futile policy of containment which has given communism victory after victory in the cold war?

We can only conclude, from the President's own statement and actions, that U.S. policy is, in fact, based on a no-win policy. It is a policy well described by Senator GOLDWATER'S sarcastic revision of the old Marine Corps slogan "Retreat hell. We have just begun to negotiate." Or "Millions for defense and not one cent for victory."

It is our belief that this no-win policy will fail—as it has failed—as the maginot line failed to stop the German offensive in France. We believe, in cold wars as in hot wars, that the best defense is a good offense. We already have an immensely superior military defense over the Soviet Union. But we have no cold war offensive to match and defeat their implacable one. Because of this we have been losing from Laos to Cuba. We will continue to lose until the no-win policy is changed to a win policy.

U.S. Schools Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the April 4 Boston Herald tells of a situation which has generally been overlooked and which should be corrected:

U.S. SCHOOLS ABROAD

The Defense Department should investigate complaints by the National Education Association that many among the 178,000 children of U.S. servicemen overseas are getting inferior schooling.

The advantages of foreign travel and living abroad do not offset inadequate training in reading, writing and arithmetic.

NEA charges that some of the schools operated by the Pentagon in 26 foreign countries are set up in converted warehouses and that generally they are staffed by unskilled teachers.

The Defense Department budget for operating these schools is approximately $45,-million a year, or about $253 per pupil. Only nine States in the United States, all in the notoriously parsimonious South, spend so little.

Surely, an administration dedicated to raising educational standards should not let those over which it has direct control slip to the lowest level in the continental United States.

Troyers Find Indian Farmers Friendly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, two residents of my district participated in an agricultural exchange program and spent two months visiting in India. I know Mr. and Mrs. Alva Troyer well and I am sure their services as ambassadors of good will for our country were quite successful. I was interested to read an interview published in the April 7, 1962, issue of the Wabash, Ind., Plain Dealer in which they explain briefly their impressions and reaction to India and the Indian agricultural program. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

TROYERS FIND INDIAN FARMERS FRIENDLY

(By Joe Buchanan)

Alva Troyer, La Fontaine, Rural Route 1, is still very much a man-on-the-go after his return from a 2-month visit to India with a farm group as part of Government's cultural exchange program.

Troyer returned to the Hoosier State as president of the Indiana Farmers Union and has been on the run handling his new responsibilities with that group, reporting to a congressional committee of the State of Indian agriculture and just being a farmer.

Mr. and Mrs. Troyer were in a group of 15 American farmers which held 66 meetings with Indian farmers and visited 8 agricultural colleges and 23 experimental farms on the great subcontinent.

ATTITUDE PLEASING

Troyer says he's agreeably surprised with the progress India is making in housing and feeding its enormous population and the attitude of Indians he met toward Americans in general and their appreciation of U.S. aid to the nation.

He believes the farm and student exchange programs are paying big dividends in shaping a favorable image of the United States among India's people. Troyer says it was quite evident to him the Indians who have studied in American schools and visited with American farm families are among the most enthusiastic supporters of U.S. interests in India.

Mrs. Troyer said the Indians were quite frank in expressing their appreciation for U.S. shipments of dry milk and Troyer says wheat shipments to that country during the drastic food shortage of a few years ago struck a real blow in behalf of creating a good attitude toward America.

However, it would be a mistake to assume that all Indians have a highly favorable impression of Americans, according to the Troyers. Mrs. Troyer related one incident in

which an Indian host was quite surprised to discover that hardly a member of the U.S. farm delegation either smoked or drank. She says the Indian was under the impression that virtually all Americans were smokers and drinkers. The host said that the impression was largely created by U.S. films.

IMPLEMENTS CRUDE

Troyer said he was surprised at the productivity of the average Indian farm considering the primitive nature of the implements used by the farmers. He said that on the average farm (about 2½ acres) about 90 percent of the farmers use a wooden plow with a wooden beam and steel spike.

The farmers there have to battle one of nature's most rugged challenges every year—the monsoon season. During this season 90 percent of the total 25-inch rainfall drenches the land. The monsoons last 3 months and for the remaining 9 months of the year the earth is very dry and the farmers have to depend on irrigation wells, according to Troyer.

Despite this handicap, the hardy and resourceful Indian farmer manages to produce as many as three crops a year. Nearly all of the wells are operated by oxen and camels and are hand-operated in some instances, he says. Troyer noted that the Indian farmer shoulders the responsibility for feeding a population of 438 million from a farm area half the size of the U.S. farming area. And, in Troyer's estimation, the Indian farmer is giving a good account of himself in the struggle.

WOMEN WORK HARD

An Indian farm area is quite different in appearance from the usual Hoosier farm community, says the La Fontaine area farmer. Most of the farm homes are grouped together in small communities and one seldom sees a home in the middle of the farm.

Mrs. Troyer is frank to admit that the Indian woman works much harder than an American woman. She is in most cases a day laborer.

"I wouldn't be happy with her lot," Mrs. Troyer said.

Many Indian youngsters start to kindergarten at 2½ years of age so that mom can get back to work as soon as possible.

With all this, both the men and women seem quite happy and have a quick and ready smile. The youngsters seem to be chips off the old block in this respect, according to Mrs. Troyer.

"Even the little half-clothed children will give you the biggest smile you ever saw," she says.

STRESS RELIGION

Religion plays a big part in Indian family life in all economic brackets, she says. Each house the couple visited had a worship center which is frequently referred to as the worship room. In the richer homes the worship room can be quite elaborate and the wealthy families often hire caretakers for the place of worship.

"By our standards just about all run-of-the-mill Indian families seem poor," said Troyer. "The average laborer receives 1 rupee a day (about 21 cents). Laborers on dams and other projects usually get twice as much."

Although there are some extremely rich people in India, Troyer gained the impression that perhaps there were not as many ultra-rich people there as here in America.

"To us most of the common people seem poor—but happy," he said.

Troyer was quite surprised by the amount of construction activity and modern design of the buildings. He was especially impressed with the eye-pleasing architecture of housing projects and new public buildings.

"We would be proud to have many of the buildings right here in the United States," said Troyer.

LOOK TO FUTURE

He detected great hope among young Indians for a bigger and brighter future for their country. He said the younger generation appears to be pushing for great changes not only in the economic status, but also in the social structure of their country.

Many of the young people are attempting to dispell the taboos and customs ingrained in centuries of Indian culture. They're attempting to modify the "sacred cow" aspect in Indian philosophy, he says. Mrs. Troyer cited an incident that illustrates this trend.

It seems the monkeys were creating quite a problem on one estate by eating bananas and coconuts. The monkeys are never satisfied with eating a complete coconut, but often strip a large number of them as they skip about from tree to tree, leaving many half eaten and unmarketable.

One Indian youth told of reaching the breaking point and firing into a group of monkeys engaged in such monkey business. He did this from time to time, but never told his mother, said Mrs. Troyer. His mother, like a majority of Indians, regarded the monkeys as sacred.

COWS SACRED

Of all sacred animals, the cow is perhaps the most sacred, according to Troyer. He said that Indian motorists will often swerve their cars in the direction of a group of people rather than risk hitting a cow standing in the roadway.

Another example of the sacred status of the cow is the fact that one seldom, if ever, sees homes for aged people, but does find homes for aged cows. The lack of homes for the aged is explained by the fact that Indians assume a definite responsibility for caring for their parents, he said.

When the son of a family marries, he returns with his bride to live in the family home. Some farm families have as many as 25 or 30 members, according to Troyer. Marriages are almost always arranged and usually involve a union of a son and daughter from neighboring villages.

MILK RICH

Troyer says that Indian dairy production and techniques are quite impressive. In New Delhi the pasteurizing equipment is of stainless steel and the milk is transported in stainless steel milk trucks. The milk is unusually rich, says Troyer, with usually 6 to 7 percent butterfat and as high as 10 to 12 percent in the larger cities.

Milk is sold in half-pint bottles from milk stations usually about 8 feet square scattered all over New Delhi. It is usually heated before selling, and the container is a pressed fiber type of bottle.

FEW TREES

He was quite conscious of the lack of trees in a number of the areas he visited.

"You see very few trees—no wooded areas like you see in this country. Most of the trees you see are along the roadside," said Troyer. He said it was unlawful to cut the trees while they were still alive and most of the wood used for fuel was from dead trees. Cow dung is extensively used for heating purposes, he says.

Orange and banana and a few apple trees were the ones that seemed most prominent in the areas visited by Troyer. He said he saw few trees familiar to the Hoosier countryside.

SAVE PAPER

New Delhi's streets are swept once a day by workers with armpower. They stay pretty clean and one seldom if ever spots any scraps of paper on them. Troyer says this is perhaps due to the premium placed on paper in India. Indians carefully collect and reprocess paper for repeated use.

It is in India's cities that one notices the population explosion, according to Troyer. Most of the large cities are crammed with people and it's not unusual to see them sleeping on the sidewalks at night.

New Delhi is an interesting example of the old and new India meeting headlong. Troyer says Old Delhi is surrounded by an ancient wall and within the walls live some half million people. New Delhi in turn surrounds the old city and the rest of the city's 1¼ million population is located there. The old city stays pretty much the same, but New Delhi radiates the looks and attitude of the new India.

The Troyers returned to Indiana with around 700 slides picturing their visit to India. He says he expects to keep busy for quite a while showing them to friends in the area. In addition, the slides serve as a pleasant reminder of a rewarding venture into the fascinating subcontinent.

Financial Problems of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. BLAINE PETERSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, the proposal of a bond issue to enable the United Nations to cope with its grave current financial problems has generated much healthy and democratic discussion among the voters of Utah's First Congressional District which I represent.

As a result of these discussions I have received a number of letters from constituents asking for a variety of information bearing directly or indirectly on the general subject. To make sure that I would have the latest data available for replying to these letters, I compiled a series of broadly representative inquiries and addressed them to the chief U.S. representative to the United Nations requesting the pertinent facts on the points involved.

I do not doubt that my colleagues in this House have been or will be in receipt of somewhat similar letters from their constituents, hence I believe it will be helpful to them and other regular readers of the RECORD if I ask permission to insert therein the response my request elicited from the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson. My thought is that thereby I may spare colleagues the need of correspondence covering much the same factual ground and also obviate the requirement for much duplicative paper work on the part of our delegation's U.N. staff:

1. What will happen to the United Nations if we do not purchase these bonds to meet the special assessment?

Answer: "It would probably be necessary to call a special meeting of the General Assembly to consider alternative possibilities of raising the money."

2. If we refuse is there any alternative means of meeting the present financial obligations of the United Nations? If so what are these alternatives.

Answer: "Many alternatives were considered before the bond issue was decided upon. They included out and out loans, having the Security Council members foot the bill, etc. These were rejected as being less feasible and less desirable than the bond plan."

3. What is the amount of the total annual budget of the United Nations?

Answer: "The 1961 expenditures of the United Nations under the regular budget were estimated at $72.7 million. Total estimated expenditures for 1961 for the United Nations Specialized Agencies and special programs amounted to $450.6 million. About $100 million of this was for the Congo operation and about $19 million for the Emergency Force in the Middle East. Contributions of the United States were $22.3 million to the regular budget and $194 million for the special programs."

4. Under the present prorated assessment arrangement why is the United States with only one vote in the General Assembly forced to pay 32 percent of the UN's regular budget while Russia with three votes in the Assembly pays less than 15 perecnt?

Answer: "The total Soviet assessment (U.S.S.R., 14.97; Ukraine, 1.98; Byelorussia, 0.52) is 17.47 percent. The Charter of the United Nations provides for one vote for each member. Assessments are based on ability to pay under the charter. The United States share is less than it would be if a strict ability to pay formula were used. It has been estimated that on an ability to pay formula our share would be closer to 40 percent. In 1957 the United Nations General Assembly approved an eventual decrease in our assessment to 30 percent which will become the maximum contribution of any one member to the ordinary expenses of the United Nations (Resolution 1137, 12th session). These contributions are determined by a body of professional statisticians who make up the Committee on Contributions of the United Nations. An interesting sidelight is that the U.S.S.R. recently demanded a recomputation of its assessment, claiming that it is being assessed too much in the light of its ability to pay. The U.S.S.R. was thus forced to admit that its grandiose claims of economic might and rapid growth were false."

5. What is the record of the Communist bloc of nations in making payments for their share of the regular annual U.N. budget? Have they at any time been in arrears? If so, how often and what length of time?

Answer: "No country, including the Soviet bloc, has refused to pay its assessments for the regular budget and Soviet bloc countries have been paying these assessments within the required 2-year period. On February 28, 1962, Communist bloc countries owed the following amounts on their contributions for the 1961 regular budget:

U.S.S.R.	$1,568,843
Ukraine	247,436
Byelorussia	54,008
Albania	3,535
Bulgaria	----------
Czechoslovakia	----------
Hungary:	
1960	116,442
1961	259,841
	376,283
Poland	218,569
Rumania	50,347
Total	2,519,021

"Since February 28, the U.S.S.R., Byelorussia, and Rumania have paid the above amounts. As will be seen from the above figures only Hungry owes an amount from 1960. As a generalization, all bloc countrise pay their budget assessments completely by the middle of the year following the year in which the assessment was made."

6. Are they now in arrears and how much?

Answer: "The answer contained in '5' above."

7. How much does the Communist bloc owe the United Nations for special assessments for emergency operations in the Middle East and the Congo operation?

Answer: "The countries of the Communist bloc named in answer to question 5 above owe the amount of $44,432,220 for their portion of the assessments for operations in the Middle East and the Congo."

8. Out of the total membership of the U.N. how many nations have refused to pay their share of these special assessments?

Answer: "To our knowledge, only 13 countrise have refused to pay their Congo assessments: the 10 Soviet bloc countries, Cuba, France, and Belgium. However, an additional 49 countries have not yet paid for a variety of reasons. Refusals to pay for UNEF total 15: the Soviet bloc plus 5 Arab States. An additional 15 have not yet paid for other seasons. Of these nine are recently admitted African states all of which have unusual financial problems."

9. Will a penalty be imposed upon nations refusing to pay the special assessment?

Answer: "Yes, if the International Court of Justice holds that these assessments are expenses of the Organization as defined by article 17 of the United Nations Charter. Article 19 of the Charter provides for the loss of the vote in the General Assembly when a member's arrears 'equal or exceeds the amount of the contributions due from it for the preceding two full years.' Some countries, including the Soviet bloc, have refused to pay their special assessments for peace and security operations in the Middle East and the Congo because they contend these are not expenses of the Organization as defined in article 17."

10. If yes, upon what rule or law of the United Nations will such a penalty be based.

Answer: "Upon the basis of Article 19 and the Court decision discussed above."

11. Has an advisory opinion been requested from the World Court?

Answer: "Yes, the International Court of Justice has been asked to render an advisory opinion on the mandatory character of the special assessments of the United Nations operations in the Middle East and the Congo."

12. If so, when is it expected that an opinion will be rendered?

Answer: "This summer."

13. Is it true that a nation may lose its vote in the General Assembly by being more than 2 years in arrears on its regular dues? If yes, for what period of time and with what result as to voting rights?

Answer: "In the opinion of the United States and the majority of members article 19 applies to the total of all 'expenses of the organization' and should therefore not be applied only to the regular budget, but should include the Middle East and Congo assessments."

14. If the World Court finds that member nations must pay special assessments or lose their vote, would it still be necessary for the United States to purchase $100 million of the bonds?

Answer: "Yes. The proceeds from the bond issue and from the collection of arrearages are both needed if the United Nations is to meet its unpaid bills as well as the costs of continuing its Middle East and Congo operations. These costs are estimated at $210 million from July 1, 1962 to December 31, 1963 and the full $200 million from the bond issue is really needed for these costs alone. However, it will undoubtedly be necessary to use some of these funds to pay back debts at least until the arrears can be collected."

Mr. Speaker, by way of a footnote to Ambassador Stevenson's letter, I think that the role or burden of the United States in supporting the U.N. appears in better perspective when it is remembered that while this country accounts for only some 6.2 percent of the world's population, we own almost 50 percent of its wealth, according to estimates for the last calendar year. In other words, the pooled financial resources of all the rest of U.N.'s 103 members are less than what we command, for there are physically significant segments of the world which do not figure in this financial comparison since for various reasons they are not U.N. members.

Freedom in American Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to place in the RECORD an address of the Reverend Virgil C. Blum, S.J., acting chairman and professor of the Department of Political Science at Marquette University, delivered before the annual teachers congress held at St. John's University in Brooklyn.

Freedom in American education has been one of the basic principles observed in our national history. I believe that Father Blum's studied remarks warrant our careful consideration, and I would like to commend them to the attention of the membership of this body:

FREEDOM IN AMERICAN EDUCATION

(Speech delivered by the Reverend Virgil C. Blum, S.J., Department of Political Science, Marquette University, at the annual teachers congress, November 7, 1961, St. John's University, New York)

I am extremely delighted to have the opportunity to address this annual teachers congress precisely because it is a congress of teachers. You are engaged in the most important profession in America. Together with the parents of the Nation's children, you are the architects of the future. The America of tomorrow—you are fashioning it in the classrooms of today.

For this reason I did not hesitate for a moment to accept the invitation extended to me by Father John Flynn, former president of St. John's University, to speak to you on such a challenging topic as "Freedom in American Education." Freedom in education is of the essence of a free society. It is rooted in the first amendment provision which guarantees freedom of mind and freedom of religion in the quest of truth. Freedom in education or academic freedom in the pursuit of truth is the most fundamental liberty possessed by a child or student in organized political society. The degree to which they enjoy this freedom is the best measure of a nation's dedication to liberty. When a nation restricts this freedom by either direct or indirect means, it is engaging in thought control. You will agree, I am sure, with Justice Robert Jackson that "thought control is a copyright of totalitarianism, and we have no claim to it," and with Justice Hugo Black that "government should leave the mind and spirit of man absolutely free." This idea was put affirmatively by Justice Stanley Reed. "Without freedom of thought," he said, "there can be no free society." This simply means that in a free society, "government," in the words of Justice Jackson, "must let man's mind alone."

It is my contention, however, that government in America is not letting man's mind alone. It is my contention that Government, both State and Federal, is engag-

ing in thought control. Hence, I am compelled to conclude that in American democracy, unlike nearly every other Western democracy, there is serious violation of freedom of mind and freedom of religion in the pursuit of truth. There is serious violation of academic freedom in the pursuit of knowledge; there is compulsory conformity to a state-established orthodoxy.

Let me support these contentions by an appeal to the civil rights of parents in the education of their children.

In the famed Oregon case of 1925 the Supreme Court declared unanimously that under the liberty due process clause of the 14th amendment parents have the right to send their chidiren to independent schools. This provision, said the Court, guarantees freedom of choice in education. Hence, the Court held that the Oregon law which compelled attendance at public schools exclusively was unconstitutional. By judicial interpretation, this freedom of choice in education is an exercise of both freedom of mind and freedom of religion, protected by the 1st amendment guarantee to the free exercise of religion. Hence, when parents choose to send their children to church-related or other independent schools they are, under the first amendment, exercising their religion.

Let me proceed a step further. The 5th and 14th amendments require that the Federal and State Governments treat every citizen alike. No person may be discriminated against because of his race, color, or religious belief. All the needy aged, to use an obvious example, must be treated alike regardless of their religious beliefs.

It is fundamental in constitutional law that the right to share in welfare benefits is vested in the individual person. It is not vested in institutions, educational or otherwise. Under the Constitution the right to equality of treatment is a personal right. For example, the individual needy aged has a personal right to share in the benefits provided by the Old-Age Assistance Act. So also, the individual school child has a personal right to share equally in all welfare benefits provided by Government to school children. The individual child, therefore, has a claim under the Constitution to an equal share in all Federal educational benefits.

Therefore, to speak of Federal education aid to public or independent schools is as much a distortion of constitutional principles as to speak of Federal old age assistance to the Milwaukee Home for Aged Lutherans. Neither public schools nor independent schools have any right to share in Federal educational benefits; only the individual American child has that right under constitutional law. Schools, whether public or independent, are merely instrumental to achieving the education of the Nation's children.

I have thus far been speaking of the two constitutional principles that are the basis of freedom in American education. I should like now to raise a question. May Congress compel parents to surrender their religious freedom in the education of their children as a condition of their children's receiving an equal share of Federal educational benefits? Or, may our Congressmen say to parents, if you refuse to surrender your right to control your children's education, they will be denied all Federal educational benefits and degraded to the level of second-class citizens? In other words, may our Congressmen penalize parents for the exercise of a constitutional right? Clearly, if Congress can condition participation in welfare benefits on the surrender of a constitutional right, it can quite obviously erode the whole Bill of Rights.

About such erosive action by a State the U.S. Supreme Court declared, "if the State may compel the surrender of one constitutional right as a condition of its favor, it may, in like manner, compel the surrender of all." Thus, by indirect action the State or Federal Government could suppress all the constitutional rights of American citizens. Such action is unconstitutional. "It is inconceivable," asserted the Court, "that guarantees embedded in the Constitution of the United States may thus be manipulated out of existence."

Acting in its role as protector of the liberties of the people, the Court declared that a State "may not impose conditions (for sharing in benefits) which require the relinquishment of constitutional rights." Yet this is precisely what the administration's education bill demanded. It demanded that the parents of the Nation's 7 million independent school children surrender their constitutional right to send their children to independent schools as a condition for sharing in a massive Federal-aid-to-education program. In other words, the bill demanded the surrender of freedom of mind and freedom of religion in education—the two freedoms that are most fundamental to a free society.

Under such an administration program, independent school children can share in a Federal education program only if (through their parents) they surrender their civil right to learn about God in school. If they insist on learning about God, they are degraded to the level of second-class citizens. While their neighborhood friends receive a full education loaf from the Federal Government, they are to be starved—starved because they want to study the truth of God as well as the truth of secular subjects. This is a penalty imposed on religious belief; it is a civil disability. And, as Justice Black once remarked, "freedom to think is inevitably abridged when beliefs are penalized by impositions of civil disabilities." It is because of there disabilities that the eminent Eposcopalian clergyman and educator, the late Dr. Bernard Iddings Bell, declared, "as the American school system is now conducted, more and more conducted, there is no such thing as religious liberty in American education. There is liberty only to be unreligious.

The administration's bill was unconstitutional on yet other grounds. By conditioning educational benefits on attendance at public schools, the bill called for the use of economic pressure to compel children to conform to the religious and philosophical orientation of State schools. Every school has a religious and philosophical orientation. The question of God cannot be avoided; and neutrality on the fundamental question of God is impossible.

"On the fundamental religious issue," says Sir Walter Moberly, educator and formerly chairman of the University Grants Committee of England, "the modern university intends to be, and supposes it is, neutral, but it is not. Certainly it neither inculcates nor expressly repudiates belief in God. But it does what is far more deadly than open rejection; it ignores Him. * * * It is in this sense that the university today is atheistic. * * * It is a fallacy to suppose that by omitting a subject you teach nothing about it. On the contrary, you teach that it is to be omitted, and that it is therefore a matter of secondary importance. And you teach this not openly and explicitly, which would invite criticism; you simply take it for granted and thereby insinuate it silently, insidiously, and all but irresistibly."

This conclusion from pedagogical psychology was underscored by Dr. Luther A. Weigle, formerly dean of the Yale Divinity School. "The ignoring of religion by the schools," he declared, "inevitably conveys to the children a negative suggestion. * * * It is natural for them to conclude that religion is negligible, or unimportant, or irrelevant to the main business of life."

This exclusion of God from the child's formal educational endeavors is secularism. It eliminates God as a significant factor from virtually all of the child's most important day-to-day activities. Dr. Will Herberg, a profound student of American religious sociology and professor of Judaic studies, observed in in 1952 that "today the spirit of public school education is, by and large, secularist, even militantly so." In fact, the exclusion of God from the classroom constitutes the establishment of secularism as the religion of the public schools.

"It is in the secular universities and schools," writes Dr. John Conway, of Harvard, in the current issue of Daedalus, "that the civic religion is being shaped and taught." And it is because the civic religion or secularism is being "shaped and taught" in the public schools, maintains Dr. Conway, "that the President's enormous subventions for education are to be directed exclusively to them." That is to say, the public schools are the denominational schools of the secularist establishment, and as such are alone entitled to Federal aid. This fact, Conway writes, "should reassure anyone who doubts the existence of a higher doctrine, well-established and safe from the encroachments of the traditional faiths" of Protestantism, Catholicism, and Judaism.

One of the paradoxes of our times is that the high priests of this secularist establishment are incessantly and loudly crying for complete and absolute separation of church and state. These high priests of the secularist religion are arrogantly intolerant of the equal rights of Protestants, Catholics, and Jews. Not only are they intolerant; they are determined to force their doctrine upon every American school child.

It is, moreover, highly ironical that the secularists should be successful in this drive to deprive citizens of religious freedom under the guise of constitutional law. To this perversion of the Constitution, Christopher Dawson refers when he says that "the great paradox of American history" is that "the separation of church and state which was intended to protect religious freedom has become the constitutional basis of the secularization of American culture." In fact, says Dawson, "the first amendment has become the bulwark of secularist dogma."

When the Federal Government says to the parents of independent school children, your children may share in a multibillion dollar Federal aid to education program on condition that they conform to this "higher doctrine" of secularism, it is guilty of a serious violation of their religious freedom. To force a defenseless child to accept a religious orientation of knowledge that clashes with his religious beliefs is not only a violation of his constitutional rights. It is also a violation of his personal integrity. It is the forcible exposure of the child to ideas and beliefs in conflict with, if not in contradiction to, his most cherished beliefs. It is for this reason that the Baptist educator, Dr. Ken Hutcheson says that "consecrated Baptist parents are alarmed because the faith of their children is being undermined in the public schools." In the language of Thomas Jefferson, it would appear to be "sinful and tyrannical" to compel a child to conform to a religious orientation of knowledge that contradicts, if it does not directly undermine, his most cherished beliefs.

This compulsion to conformity in the things of the mind and spirit is in direct violation of Justice Jackson's injunction that "government must let man's mind alone." It is the intrusion of the government's authoritarian arm into the mind and spirit of the child, demanding the right to shape and form his thoughts and beliefs as the condition for sharing in educational benefits. This thought control violates personal rights and personal integrity. It violates the principles of a free and open society.

"The priceless heritage of our society," said Justice Jackson, "is the unrestricted constitutional right of each member to think as he will."

Moreover, this violation of religious freedom, this enforced conformity results in what Dawson calls "this deadening blanket of secularist conformity which is stifling the spiritual and intellectual life of modern culture."

The power of the secularists and their allies in national politics, it should be noted, is clearly demonstrated by their ability to kill all Federal aid to education legislation that does not discriminate against all children who attend Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish schools. As the price of their support of Federal aid, they demand the academic scalps of 7 million American children. They demand the suppression of freedom of mind and freedom of religion in education; they demand the denial of equal rights before the law to children who are learning about God as well as about secular subjects.

President Kennedy said several weeks ago that we live in the most dangerous period of the history of man. Our very existence as a nation is endangered by the Soviet Union, a nation that is developing the brainpower of its children to its highest potential. Already the Soviet Union has outstripped us in certain areas of scientific and technological development. If we are to survive, we must keep pace with if not surpass the Soviet Union in science and engineering. To accomplish this, we must give every single one of our children the best educational opportunities possible for intellectual development. Not one child can be excluded; the one excluded may have the intellectual potential of another Teller.

Yet, every education bill introduced in Congress calls for massive discrimination against 7 million American children — all potential scientists—solely because of their religious beliefs. While the nation faces annihilation by a power made superior by superior scientific and technological progress, such discrimination can on no grounds be justified. Such discrimination is, in fact, gambling with national self-destruction for the sole purpose of gratifying the prejudices and biases of secularists and their allies.

There is no constitutional justification for such discriminations. There are scores of constitutional precedents for giving direct grants to parents to enable them to pay tuition in the independent schools of their choice. Fully aware of this, the proponents of discrimination in both the Congress and Kennedy administration have wrenched, twisted, and distorted constitutional law in a vain effort to make it fit the political demands of the powerful pressure groups that oppose freedom in education.

They have argued, for example, that the Government may subsidize the education of students who attend denominational colleges because their attendance at college is optional, while it may not subsidize the education of children who attend denominational schools because their attendance is compulsory. This is a complete perversion of constitutional law. The Supreme Court made it abundantly clear in the Barnette case that exactly the opposite is true. Children who attend school under compulsion, said the Court, must have greater freedom than college students whose attendance is optional. Therefore, a denial of freedom in education to independent school children is a more serious violation of constitutional liberties than a denial of freedom in education to college students.

I have said that we have many precedents for giving direct grants to parents to enable them to pay tuition in the schools of their choice. The best-known precedent is of course the GI bill of rights. Under its terms about 1 million veterans used Federal funds to pay tuition in the Nation's 474 Protestant, 265 Catholic, and 5 Jewish institutions of higher education. As a matter of fact some 30,000 veterans used Federal funds to study for the Protestant ministry.

Some opponents of freedom in education argue that in passing the GI bill, Congress meant to reward veterans for services rendered to their country, and that for this reason only is a veteran's use of Federal funds to pay tuition at a denominational school constitutional. The motive of Congress in passing the GI bill is of course totally irrelevant to the question of its constitutionality. Lofty congressional motivation does not suspend the Constitution.

Moreover, today, tens of thousands of war orphans are paying tuition in the Nation's denominational colleges with Federal education grants. These students enjoy freedom in education; they are not compelled to attend State colleges. Academic freedom in the pursuit of truth is also enjoyed by students who are pages in Congress and the Supreme Court, by students who are members of the Army Reserve Officers Training Corps and of the Navy Reserve Officers Training Corps, by students who are fellows under the terms of the National Defense Education Act, by students who receive grants from the National Science Foundation, and by teachers who attend institutes conducted under the National Defense Education Act.

We have precedents, incidentally, not only for giving tuition grants to students or their parents. We have precedents also for giving cost-of-education grants to schools. In the academic year 1960–61, for example, there were approximately 299 graduate fellows attending denominational universities under the National Defense Education Act.

Each of these students receives from $2,000 to $2,400 a year, plus $400 for each dependent, in direct grants from the Federal Government, and the university he attends receives up to $2,500 a year as a cost-of-education grant.

Of the 299 fellows attending denominational institutions, 160 are pursuing graduate studies in Methodist universities. Let us assume that these 160 students are now in the second year of their graduate studies and that they average one-half a dependent. If so, these Methodist university students are now receiving approximately $384,000 a year in direct grants from the Federal Government.

It means, moreover, that the Methodist universities they attend are receiving roughly $400,000 a year in cost-of-education grants from the Federal Government.

The Honorable Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, drawing up his extensive knowledge of constitutional law, maintains that there is nothing unconstitutional in such Government grants. He argued on the Senate floor last summer that Federal grants to students are constitutional because they are given directly to students, and that cost-of-education grants to denominational schools are constitutional because in legal effect such grants follow the student.

We find precedents for direct Government grants to parents for tuition payments at independent schools on the State level also. States with extensive scholarship programs, such as New York, New Jersey, Maryland, Rhode Island, Illinois, and California, give their award winners freedom of choice in education. Students may use the scholarship grants to pay tuition at denominational college. But undoubtedly the biggest step taken in the direction of freedom in education is Gov. Nelson Rockefeller's scholar incentive program. Under this program, as you know, all resident college students who pay tuition in excess of $200 are given a tuition grant by the State of New York of $100, $200, or $300 a year, depending on taxable family income. This Rockefeller program is a breakthrough for freedom in education. The Governor and people of New York are to be commended for the adoption of this program which assures a measure of freedom of mind and freedom of religion in education for the college youth of your State.

These programs on the college level are, of course, precedents for a Federal program of direct tuition grants to parents of independent school children. If Federal funds may be used to pay tuition in denominational colleges for the study of calculus, nuclear physics, Chaucer and geopolitics, such funds may also be used to pay tuition in denominational elementary and secondary schools for the study of arithmetic, general science, Robin Hood, and geography. Quite obviously, it cannot be maintained that secular subjects cease to be secular simply because they are taught in a school that also teaches about God. There is no such thing as a Protestant, or Catholic, or Jewish multiplication table.

Freedom in education can be achieved in a variety of ways. I propose that America adopt a Federal Junior Bill of Rights for independent school children. A Federal aid to education program, incorporating the principle of freedom of mind and freedom of religion, would, on the one hand, channel its educational benefits for public school children directly to State public school agencies, and, on the other, channel its educational benefits for independent school children directly to their parents in the form of vouchers for tuition payments.

Without elaboration, let me call your attention to the fact that Federal welfare legislation in more than a dozen welfare areas provides direct grants to citizens. The direct grant method of providing welfare benefits is well tested. There is no reason why it cannot be adopted in the most important of all welfare areas—Government aid for the intellectual development of our children.

While traveling in Europe this summer I discovered that children in almost every European democracy enjoy a large, if not full, measure of freedom in education. In the Netherlands, Scotland, and Ireland children, regardless of religious beliefs, enjoy complete freedom of mind and freedom of religion in the pursuit of truth. In England, Belgium, Denmark, and a number of West German states, the measure of freedom enjoyed by children varies as the state subsidy for denominational education varies. These subsidies range from 50 to 100 percent of the cost of education. Even in France where secularists were able to suppress freedom in education absolutely for more than half a century, children are now beginning to enjoy a measure of freedom of mind and freedom of religion in the pursuit of truth.

In speaking with Protestant, Catholic, and civic educational leaders in many of these countries, two things particularly impressed me. I was impressed by their strong commitment to freedom in education, a commitment which many of them equate with their commitment to the principles of liberty and democracy.

I was most impressed, however, by the close cooperation among the different religious groups in support of freedom in education. With few exceptions, this cooperation is complete. In Holland, for example, Calvinists and Catholics worked together to secure freedom in education. Moreover, leaders of both these religious groups told me that their country has never enjoyed greater unity and religious harmony than it does today.

The great anomaly of the education controversy in America, as Dr. Will Herberg has pointed out, is that the leaders of many Protestant and Jewish groups are cooperating with secularists to oppose freedom in education. There is increasing evidence, however, that many Protestant and Jewish leaders are

having second thoughts about their collaboration with secularists, a collaboration that will, they are beginning to realize, inevitably bring about the complete secularization of our culture.

There are many Americans of all religious faiths, however, who are dedicated to freedom. Their dedication is genuine; it is indivisible. And because their dedication to freedom is genuine and indivisible they subscribe to freedom in education, to academic freedom in the pursuit of truth. There are other Americans who, though they pretend to be liberals, are opposed to freedom of mind and freedom of religion in education. They demand freedom for themselves, but deny it to their fellow citizens. Their defense of freedom is selective; their dedication to freedom is not indivisible, and hence it is not genuine. They are liberal absolutists.

At a time when the survival of our nation is threatened by the growing scientific and technological potential of the Soviet Union, an educational policy that obstructs the brainpower development of millions of children is little short of national suicide. In the development of scientific devices for destructive purposes the U.S.S.R. has already outstripped us, yet, strangely, we cripple the Nation's capacity to meet the Soviet challenge by denying equal educational benefits to 7 million children because of their religious beliefs. A cynical observer might well remark that we seem ready to endanger the freedom of the whole free world rather than grant freedom of mind and freedom of religion to American children who attend independent schools.

We cannot fight tryanny with a denial of freedom—and win. If, while we harness our Nation in defense of freedom, we nevertheless suppress more and more of the freedoms of our people by coercing conformity to an expanding number of state-established orthodoxies, we are ebracing the very tyranny we profess to abhor. Freedom cannot survive in a context of enforced conformity.

It seems to me that neither Protestant, Catholic, nor Jew can idly stand by while Government demands that parents surrender their constitutional right to send their children to an independent school, and demands, moreover, that their children conform to the religio-philosophic orientation of state schools, as a condition for sharing in Federal educational benefits. If freedom is to be preserved in America, it is incumbent upon each and every citizen to take the positive action necessary to preserve it. Freedom was not self-generating; it is not self-preserving. It must be defended, or our children and grandchildren shall not enjoy it. In your efforts to preserve freedom, remember, you have nothing to fear from freedom.

British Taxpayers Pay for Wigs Under Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I would like to include the following item from the District 50 News, published by District 50, United Mine Workers of America:

FREE WIGS COST BRITAIN ONE-QUARTER MILLION

Britain's National Health Service is spending between £100,000 and £200,000 ($280,000 to $560,000) a year on free toupees and wigs for men and women, Parliament has been told.

General practitioners can recommend wigs for patients, but a hospital specialist must rule whether they are necessary on medical or social grounds before the Health Service will supply them.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286–3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

DULUTH, MINN., *March 21, 1962.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I wish to take this opportunity to join the countless Americans who have in the past indicated their unqualified support of your proposal, House Resolution 211, designed to create a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

Tragically, since the outset of this deadly protracted conflict, we have been floundering between two sterile and repugnant courses of acquiescence and inaction. We can ill afford a continuation of our naivete. The hour is late—we must commit ourselves to battle.

The Congress has before it numerous ways through which the United States could at last serve notice upon the entire world that we intend to win this struggle and, as you point out, House Resolution 211 is a modest proposal which could rekindle our dedication to human freedom.

It is regrettable that the leadership chooses to ignore this potentially fruitful measure, but I trust you will continue the fight for ultimate adoption.

Enclosed you will find a copy of a letter I have addressed to my Congressman, JOHN A. BLATNIK, urging his support of your efforts.

With best wishes, I am,

Yours sincerely,

ARCHIE D. CHELSETH.

MARCH 21, 1962.

Hon. JOHN A. BLATNIK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BLATNIK: As you are undoubtedly aware, Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, is sponsoring a proposal, House Resolution 211, which would establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. To epitomize the envisioned functions of the suggested committee, one need only say that it would spotlight Communist imperialism and colonialism in hopes of educating the world as to who are really the colonialists.

Since he first introduced this resolution, the Congressman has received widespread and enthusiastic support. Needless to say, House Resolution 211 is not a political question.

We need desperately a strategy for victory and House Resolution 211 appears to me to be a constructive approach to our vexing problems. I trust that you will lend your support to this proposal and work for House consideration before the adjournment of this Congress.

Kindly inform me of your position on this matter. With best wishes, I remain,

Yours sincerely,

ARCHIE D. CHELSETH.

ASSOCIATION FOR THE LIBERATION OF UKRAINE, INC.,
Cleveland, Ohio, March 20, 1962.

The Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: Our organization—Association for the Liberation of Ukraine—in the United States appeals to you to take a favorable stand toward the resolution (H. Res. 211) calling for establishment of a permanent Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. It is our sincere belief that such a committee should have been established a long time ago.

It is a fact that the Soviet empire is a multinational prison where many nations and peoples are enslaved; some of them became victims after the Second World War, and others were absorbed centuries ago by Russian expansionism. These enslaved nations are ever eager to regain their lost freedom and in the struggle against the Soviet regime they are our best allies. The national problem in the Soviet Russia has never been solved and it is in fact the basic weakness of this empire. The Soviet system is not a passive system; it aims at territorial, ideological, and military expansion. These expansionist endeavors represent the threat to the existing democracies. It is evident that the Soviet threat is of permanent nature and intensity of threat does not subside, hence it would seem imperative that the problem of captive nations should be of our primary concern.

We believe that a Committee on Captive Nations established in the House of Repre-

sentatives would serve this purpose. The committee would collect and disseminate among the people of the United States and for the free world all the factual data relative to the affairs behind the Iron Curtain. The facts collected by the committee would also have informative value for various Government agencies that are engaged in the formulation of foreign policies. We believe that creation of such a committee cannot be postponed indefinitely, and the position of the United States as the leader of the free world requires such an undertaking. We urge you, Mr. Congressman, to consider favorably House Resolution 211 in your House Rules Committee. Thank you.

Very truly yours,

A. Y. YEMETZ,
President.
S. TERENTIUK,
Secretary.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *March 20, 1962.*

The Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We American students of LaSalle College of Philadelphia, support earnestly our Ukrainian-born students in their endeavor to establish the resolution, House Resolution 211, on creation of Special House Committee on Captive Nations.

Respectivelly yours,

Wolodyrugs C. Powzainski, William C. Temashunas, William Cassidy, R. Gsett, V. Joseph Tomlinson, John R. Milewski, Edward V. Steble, Ken White, Paul A. Torelli, James J. Fillibin, Carl P. McCarty, Michael Mile, David M. Fuerle.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *March 20, 1962.*

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Enclosed you will find a copy of a letter that was sent to chairman, House Rules Committee, HOWARD W. SMITH.

Respectfully yours,

WOLODYRUGS C. POWZAINSKI.

UKRAINIAN EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE
OF NORTH AMERICA,
Detroit, Mich., March 21, 1962.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: The Ukrainian Evangelical Alliance of North America appeals to you to consider favorably the resolution (H. Res. 211) calling for the establishment of permanent Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. We are sure that such a committee is long overdue. One of the greatest problems confronting our Nation today is the Soviet Union, a prison house of many captive and enslaved nations and peoples. These nations, e er eager and wanting to escape Soviet Russia slavery and despotism, constitute perennial weaknesses of the Soviet Union. Therefore, it is to our advantage to know these weaknesses, and work to multiply them.

We strongly oppose the views of Mr. Dean Rusk, our Secretary of State, who expressed the opposition of the Department of State to such a committee. His arguments, in effect, display a lack of solid information and knowledge of the true situation behind the Iron Curtain, especially in Ukraine.

A Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would serve as a reservoir of information and data on the various captive nations in the U.S.S.R., which information could be made available to the U.S. Government and its various agencies. Its main function, however, would be to inform the American people and the world at large on the state of affairs behind the Iron Curtain and assist the U.S. Government in formulating its policies with respect to the captive nations enslaved in the Soviet Russian Communist empire.

We strongly urge you, Mr. Congressman, to consider favorably House Resolution 211 in your House Rules Committee.

Sincerely yours,

Rev. W. BOROWSKY,
Executive Secretary.

HARTFORD, CONN., *March 20, 1962.*

Re Permanent Committee on the Captive Nations (H. Res. 211).

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Parent Teachers' Association of St. Michael School in Hartford, Conn., oppose the views of Mr. Dean Rusk, our Secretary of State, regarding the establishment of a permanent Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

We regret to state the fact that Mr. Dean Rusk displayed a lack of elementary knowledge of the real and factual situations in the Ukraine.

We do not believe that the existence of such a committee will ever put the United States in an embarrassing position. We feel, however, that such a committee will inform the American public and the rest of the free world about the true state of affairs behind the Iron Curtain. Furthermore, such a committee will assist U.S. Government in formulation and realization of its foreign policy principles based on morality and reality.

We strongly urge you, Mr. Congressman, to consider positively House Resolution 211 in your House Rules Committee.

Sincerely yours,

BOHDAN STELMACH,
President.
SOPHIE RADIO,
Secretary.

(CC: Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.)

ORGANIZATION FOR THE DEFENSE OF
FOUR FREEDOMS FOR UKRAINE,
INC., BRANCH 25,
Rochester, N.Y., March 26, 1962.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Enclosed is a copy of the resolution which was sent to Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH.

We also want to take this opportunity to thank you for your strong support in establishing a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER BOJKO,
President.

ORGANIZATION FOR THE DEFENSE OF
FOUR FREEDOMS FOR UKRAINE,
INC., BRANCH 25,
Rochester, N.Y., March 20, 1962.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: We strongly urge you, Mr. Congressman, to consider favorably House Resolution 211 in your House Rules Committee.

Below is the resolution that was agreed on by the Americans of the Ukrainian descent. The resolution reads as follows:

"Americans of the Ukrainian descent gathered in a demonstration that took place at Rochester, N.Y., on February 4, 1962, express their astonishment and reservation about the content of the letter addressed by Secretary of State Dean Rusk to Congressman SMITH in connection with the resolution calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

"1. They state that the assertion uttered by Secretary of State Rusk has no historical ground, is par excellence erroneous and from political point of view detrimental to the national interests of the United States.

"Such assertion helps Russian propagandaa and makes stronger the position of Moscow in her struggle against enslaved nations.

"2. Soviets interpret this assertion for disadvantage of the United States. They try to convince the enslaved peoples of their empire that the United States regarded by them as a champion of freedom and guarantee of their liberation, refuse the right of self-determination and national independence to the Ukraine, Armenia, and Georgia, recognizing them as 'traditional parts of the Soviet Union,' while the constitution of the U.S.S.R. is recognizing them as separate republics and some of them like Ukraine and White Russia are members of the United Nations.

"3. Such views of Secretary of State and his political advisers give the basis to conclude that they are not sufficiently acquainted with the historical problems of Eastern Europe; these views arouse the suspicion that they are disposed to give their support to the preservation of Soviet Russian empire, while a considerable number of excolonial peoples of Asia and Africa, often without any historical and national traditions, have been recognized as independent nations.

"Therefore the participants of the demonstration:

"1. Appeal to the Secretary of State Dean Rusk to reexamine and to refute his view that inflicted moral and political damage on Ukrainians and nations concerned;

"2. Appeal to the Secretary Dean Rusk to give his full-hearted support of the resolution of Congressman FLOOD regarding the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations;

"3. Appeal to the Congress of the United States of America to reexamine the American foreign policy, in particular its position vis-a-vis the nations enslaved by Moscow, doing that in interests of American security and success in the cold war that with changing tension but unceasingly and according to plan is waged against this country."

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER BOJKO,
President.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA., *March 22, 1962.*

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We kindly ask you for favorable consideration of House Resolution 211 (the Flood resolution), which would establish a permanent Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives.

We believe that the existence of this committee in the legislative branch of the Government would raise a high world opinion of the United States, and that the position of the U.S. Government will be strengthened, but not "weakened by any action which confuses the rights of formerly independent peoples or nations which the status of areas, such as the Ukraine, Armenia, or Georgia, which are traditional parts of the Soviet Union." (From a letter of Mr. Rusk to you of August 22, 1961.) Two of these areas, White Russia and Ukraine, are charter members of U.N.

Yours very truly,

M. P. PETRENKO.
M. A. PETRENKO.

The Long View of Our World and Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 23 I had the great privilege, along with Senator CLAIR ENGLE and Congressman GEORGE P. MILLER, of being in Alameda County and the Seventh District of California, the district I am honored to represent, and on the campus of my alma mater, the University of California, with the President of the United States.

In his memorable address to more than 90,000 persons in the university's Memorial Stadium, an address which was the high spot of this great university's 94th charter day ceremonies, the President made an eloquent and characteristically thoughtful appraisal of developments in our world and of the basic principles of our foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I submit the President's speech for the RECORD.

The speech follows:

TEXT OF PRESIDENT'S SPEECH AT UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

This is a great anniversary of a great university. It is in fact a double anniversary. One hundred years ago this July Abraham Lincoln signed the Morrill act, establishing a nationwide system of land-grant colleges and universities. Six years later the University of California received its charter; and, from the moment of its foundation, its remarkable contributions to State and Nation have proven the wisdom of the land-grant college program.

The first graduating class at Berkeley produced, I am informed, a Governor of California, two regents of the university, a college professor, a clergyman, a State assemblyman, and assorted lawyers, engineers and civic leaders—all out of 12 graduates.

Today, you are doing nearly as well. When I observe the men who surround me in Washington—when I reflect that the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Ambassador to India are all graduates or former students of this university—I am forced to confront an uncomfortable truth, and so are you: that the New Frontier may well owe more to Berkeley than to Harvard.

This has been a week of momentous events around the world. The long, painful struggle in Algeria drew nearer to solution. Both nuclear powers and neutrals labored at Geneva to renew the quest for disarmament. The Foreign Ministers of the Soviet Union and the United States met once again on the subject of Berlin. The Congress opened hearings on a trade bill of far-reaching importance to the growth and strength of this Nation and the Atlantic Community. And my wife had her first and last ride on an elephant.

But history may well remember this week for an act of lesser immediate impact—the decision by the United States and the Soviet Union to seek concrete agreements on the joint exploration of space.

Experience has taught us that an agreement to negotiate does not always lead to negotiated agreements. But should such a joint effort be realized, its significance could well be tremendous.

In terms of space science, our combined knowledge and efforts can benefit the peoples of all nations; joint weather satellite systems to provide more ample warning against the destructive powers of storm—joint communications systems to draw the world closer together—and cooperation in space medicine research and space tracking operations to speed the day when man will explore the moon and even beyond.

But the scientific gains a joint effort would offer might be small compared to the gains for world peace. For a cooperative Soviet-American effort to space science and exploration would emphasize the interests that unite us instead of the conflicts that divide us.

It offers us an area in which the stale, sterile dogmas of the cold war can be left literally a quarter of a million miles behind. And it would remind us on both sides that knowledge, not hate, is the passkey to the future—that knowledge transcends national antagonisms—that it speaks a universal language—that it is the possession, not of a single class, a single nation or a single ideology, but of all mankind.

I hardly need to emphasize the pursuit of knowledge here. Your faculty includes more Nobel laureates than any other faculty in the world—more in this one community than our principal adversary has received since the awards began in 1901.

I am happy to pay honor to those winners who are here on the platform today—and to the community which has sought and sustained them. And I know that the University of California will continue to grow as an intellectual center because your presidents, your chancellors, and your professors have rigorously defended that unhampered freedom of discussion and inquiry which is the heart of the intellectual enterprise and the soul of the free university.

We may be proud as a Nation of our record in scientific achievement, but at the same time we must be humbled by an understanding of the interdependence of all knowledge. I am certain that every scholar and scientist present today would agree that his own work has benefited immeasurably from the work of men and women in other countries.

The prospect of a partnership with Soviet scientists in the exploration of space opens up exciting prospects of collaboration in other areas of learning. And cooperation in the pursuit of knowledge can hopefully lead to cooperation in the pursuit of peace.

Yet the pursuit of knowledge itself implies a world where men are free to follow out the logic of their own ideas. It implies a world where nations are free to solve their own problems and to realize their own ideals. It implies, in short, a world where collaboration emerges from the voluntary decisions of nations strong in their own independence and their own self-respect.

It implies, I believe, the kind of world which is emerging before our eyes—the world produced by the revolution of national independence which is today sweeping everywhere across the earth.

I sometimes think that we are impressed too much by the clamor of daily urgencies. The newspaper headlines and the television screen give us the short view. They so flood us with stop-press detail that we lose sight of the grand movements of history. Yet it is the profound tendencies, and not the passing excitements, that will shape the future.

The short view gives us the impression as a nation of being shoved and harried, everywhere on the defense. But this impression is surely an optical illusion. From the perspective of Moscow, the world today may seem even more troublesome, intractable, and frustrating than it does to us.

The leaders of the Communist world are not only confronted by acute internal problems in each Communist country—the failure of agriculture, the rising discontent of the youth and the intellectuals, the demands of technical and managerial groups for status and security. They are confronted in addition by profound divisions within the Communist world itself—divisions which have already shattered the image of communism as a universal system guaranteed to abolish all social and international conflicts, the most valuable asset which the Communists had for many years.

Wisdom requires the long view. And the long view shows us that the revolution of national independence is a fundamental fact of our era. This revolution cannot be stopped.

As new nations emerge from the oblivion of centuries, their first aspiration is to affirm their national identity. Their deepest hope is for a world where, within a framework of international cooperation, every country can solve its own problems according to its own traditions and ideals.

It is in the interests of the pursuit of knowledge—and it is in our own national interest—that this revolution of national independence succeed. For the Communists rest everything on the idea of a monolithic world—a world where all knowledge has a single pattern, all societies move toward a single model, all problems have a single solution, and all roads lead to a single destination.

The pursuit of knowledge, on the other hand, rests everything on the opposite idea—on the idea of a world based on diversity, self-determination and freedom. And that is the kind of world to which we Americans, as a Nation, are committed by the principles on which this republic was formed.

As men conduct the pursuit of knowledge, they create a world which freely unites national diversity and international partnership. This emerging world is incompatible with the Communist conception of world order.

It will irresistibly burst the bonds of Communist organization and Communist ideology. And diversity and independence, far from being opposed to the American conception of world order, represent the very essence of our vision of the future.

There used to be much talk a few years ago about the inevitable triumph of communism. We hear such talk much less now. No one who examines the modern world can doubt that the great currents of history are carrying the world away from the monolithic idea toward the pluralist idea—away from communism and toward national independence and freedom.

No one can doubt that the wave of the future is not the conquest of the world by a single dogmatic creed, but the liberation of the diverse energies of free nations and freemen. No one can doubt that cooperation in the pursuit of knowledge must lead to freedom of the mind and of the soul.

Beyond the drumfire of daily crisis there is arising the outlines of a robust and vital world community, founded on nations secure in their own independence, dedicated to freedom of choice, and united by allegiance to world peace and justice.

It would be foolish to say that this world will be won tomorrow, or the day after. The processes of history are fitful, halting, and aggravating. There will be frustrations and setbacks. There will be times of anxiety and gloom.

The specter of thermonuclear war will hang over mankind; and we must heed the advice of Oliver Wendell Holmes of "freedom leaning on her spear" until all nations are wise enough to disarm safely and effectively.

Yet we can have a new confidence today in the direction in which history is moving.

Nothing is more stirring than the recognition of public purpose. Every great age is marked by innovation and daring—by the ability to meet unprecedented problems with intelligent solutions.

In a time of turbulence and change, it is more true than ever that knowledge is power; for only by true understanding and steadfast judgment are we able to master the challenge of history.

If this is so, we must strive to acquire knowledge—and to apply it with wisdom. We must reject oversimplified theories of international life—the theory that American mission is to remake the world in the American image.

We must seize the vision of a free and diverse world—and shape our policies to speed progress toward a flexible world order.

This is the unifying spirit of our policies in the world. The purpose of our aid programs must be to help developing countries to move forward as rapidly as possible on the road to genuine national independence.

Our military policies must assist nations to protect the processes of democratic reform and development against disruption and intervention.

Our diplomatic policies must strengthen our relations with the whole world, with our several alliances and with the United Nations.

As we press forward on every front to realize the flexible world order, the role of the university becomes ever more important both as a reservoir of ideas and as a repository of the long view.

"Knowledge is the great sun of the firmament," said Daniel Webster. "Life and power are scattered with all its beams."

In its light, we must think and act not only for the moment, but for the century. I am reminded of the story of Marshal Lyautey, who once asked his gardener to plant a tree. The gardener objected that the tree was slowgrowing and would not reach maturity for a hundred years. The marshal replied, "In that case, there is no time to lose, plant it this afternoon."

Today a world of knowledge—a world of cooperation—a just and lasting peace—may well be years away. But we have no time to lose. Let us plant our trees this very afternoon.

The 125th Anniversary of Congregation Shaare Zedek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, 1962 is the 125th anniversary of the founding of Congregation Shaare Zedek, the third oldest Jewish congregation in New York City, which is located in the congressional district I am proud to represent. Founded in 1837, Congregation Shaare Zedek from generation to generation has served faithfully the community. On Sunday, April 8, the congregation held its 125th anniversary ceremonies. It was an inspiring occasion.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to express my best wishes and congratulations to the members of the congregation: Dr. Arthur T. Buch, the rabbi; Rev. Moshe Taube, cantor; Dr. Samuel R. Levine, president of Congregation Shaare Zedek; Judge J. Daniel Fink, who presided at the proceedings; and the many others who contributed so much to this celebration.

Mr. Speaker, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, made a principal address which traced the history and accomplishments of Congregation Shaare Zedek. In his usual lucid style Chairman CELLER captured the spirit of the occasion, and his talk was received enthusiastically.

As Chairman CELLER said:

The activities of the congregation have proven time and again that no man is an island unto himself.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the text of this excellent speech:

CONGREGATION SHAARE ZEDEK

(By Representative EMANUEL CELLER)

To one we love we say, "May he live to one hundred and twenty"—Biz ein hundret tzvunzig yuhr. But mere man is rarely thus blessed. One hundred and twenty-five years in the life of an institution is not a long time, as history measures time, but 125 years of existence of a synagogue in a nation only itself 186 years old, as a nation, is a memorable reminder of the life of the Jew in America and of his contributions as a Jew and an American to this country which fought its way through to religious acceptance for races and creeds.

If I have my facts straight, I believe that one of the most interesting characters in the United States was active in forming the Congregation Shaare Zedek in 1837. Solomon Henry Jackson was born in England and came to the United States about 1787, settled in Pike County, Pa., and married Helen Miller, daughter of a Presbyterian minister. He edited a magazine called the Jew and after the death of his wife, Jackson came to New York City as the first Jewish printer in the city. He raised his five children as Jews; four of whom married Jews, and the fifth daughter, Eliza, married Dr. Peter Donovan who embraced Judaism.

In addition to editing the Jew, Jackson translated and published an English and Hebrew prayer book in 1826 and issued the first American edition of the Passover "Hagada" in English and Hebrew.

I don't know if a biography has been written of Jackson. If it hasn't, it ought to be because in his story lies the drama, the dedication, the scholarship of the Jew in America.

As we all know, the synagogue for the Jew was in those days the center of his life. His status in his society was determined not only by the seat he held in the synagogue but by the office he occupied therein. All his social and spiritual forces were nourished from the stream of his faith. Be he peddler, merchant, or physician, his scholarship established his prestige. His birth, his marriage, his death were matters of deep personal concern to the synagogue. From the synagogue flowed the acts of charity; a system of social welfare so that the congregant was never without refuge or solace in times of need.

This unity reminds me of the anecdote told about the soldier in Napoleon's army who cried out, "shema yisorel" every time he fired his gun into the opposing troops, so that if his shot killed another Jew, that Jew at least would die with this profession of Jewish faith—if not on his lips, at least in the air about him.

Thus the establishment of a synagogue was no small moment in the lives of the Jews in New York in the first half of the 19th century. Congregation Shaare Zedek bears, of course, the proud heritage of being the third oldest Jewish congregation in the city of New York. Again, if I recall my history correctly, the establishment of a third synagogue symbolized a movement of the Jews in America from the South into the eastern port of New York, for it was in the South that the Jew in America had established himself most solidly in the earliest days of Jewish migration to the United States.

For many years now, as many of you must know, I associated myself first with the establishment of a homeland for the Jews in Palestine and later with the establishment of the independent State of Israel. But long before the problem gripped me, the Congregation Shaare Zedek understood and pursued the cause of the homeland. The activities of the congregation have proven time and again that no man is an island unto himself.

In fact, your congregation was among the first to contribute to the Jewish National Fund back in 1921, to support the united Palestine appeal and to extend to various individuals throughout the country, and in other lands, money for personal sustenance. It contributed to such institutions as the Shaare Zedek Hospital in Jerusalem, to passover funds for Jewish prisoners, the Jewish Students' House and other groups, certainly, more familiar to the congregant than to me. I make mention of this only because of my consciousness of the long and fruitful history of the congregation, of its growth with and within the march of time. The congregation fed the Jews of the 19th century as it now feeds the Jews of the 20th century. It began in the year of a great financial panic in the United States and withstood the storms and received the blessings of the Nation, of which it was a part, and together with the Nation, as givers and receivers, enriched the soil of this, our native land.

Think of the history of Shaare Zedek has seen: The Civil War, the Reconstruction era, the tremendous industrial growth of the United States, the mass immigration beginning with 1890, the First World War, the first postwar period, the rise and fall of Hitler, the cold war, from the uses of coal to the uses of atomic energy, from the horse and buggy to the jet-propelled plane, the rise and multiplication of city life, the massive shifts of populations. How inextricably is the congregation tied with the development of these United States. Much has it seen both in glory and in disaster and because of this, this congregation has a meaning that strikes the deepest notes in our hearts. These are the notes of tradition, of belief, of belonging. Thus, I am proud to have been honored to address you on the occasion of your 125th anniversary. Tradition and change have combined to produce your unique quality of endurance as a people together, passing on the accumulated wisdom to the new generations.

I speak to you with the respect you have earned and with the reverence of a faith sustained.

Is REA Really Reversing Policy of Secrecy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, it was announced in the afternoon papers yesterday that the Rural Electrification Administration was "reversing" a 26-year-old policy of secrecy surrounding pending loan applications. Many of my fellow members on the House Government Operations Committee, including my good

colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], whose presence here is sorely missed by all of us, and many of my other colleagues in the House have worked for years to break the wall of secrecy which has surrounded REA's consideration of loan applications. One might think, therefore, that this announcement of a policy reversal would be met with universal applause and a feeling of accomplishment. This has not happened, however.

A careful reading of the REA bulletin announcing the information policy will reveal that, in substance, there is little more there than a possibility of reversal in some areas. The real nub of REA's announcement is that certain information heretofore made available only by loan applicants will now be made available by the REA upon request unless, and this could be a pretty big "unless," the applicant objects to disclosure of the information and is upheld by the Administrator. It appears from the announcement that the criteria for judging the applicant's objection will be left to the broad discretion of the Administrator.

As my able colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], has indicated, this could represent a small modicum of progress in the right direction; but, by that same token, it could represent little more than window dressing for an effort to maintain essentially the status quo. Only time will tell what the result will be. In any event, it does not provide for full discosure of essential information concerning loan applications.

So, I would merely point out to my colleagues that, although a small chink might have developed in the wall of secrecy down at REA, this is no time to relax. There is still a long way to go before the wall comes down.

My colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], has followed this matter very carefully for years and issued a statement to the press this past weekend evaluating REA's announcement. I am including my colleague's statement at this point and I commend his analysis to those who might be prone to accept REA's announced reversal at face value:

"The Rural Electrification Administration is planning to issue a policy bulletin soon which allegedly penetrates the iron curtain of secrecy which surrounds that agency's tremendous lending activities," according to Representative ROBERT H. MICHEL, Republican, of Illinois, in a statement issued from his office today.

Mr. MICHEL, a member of the Agriculture Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, which has jurisdiction over REA's appropriations, has been striving for several years to get that agency to eliminate its secrecy policy which he believes is contrary to the best interests of the farmers and other persons in rural America.

Mr. MICHEL also noted that rather than penetrating the iron curtain of secrecy, this proposed bulletin—with relatively minor exceptions—seems merely to put into writing the existing practices of the agency which have been coming under increasing criticism from many directions recently. "Apparently," he said, "the REA in putting out a bulletin like this must believe that Members of Congress follow the old axiom of P. T. Barnum that 'there's a sucker born every minute.'"

Mr. MICHEL indicated that he has read the bulletin carefully in an effort to determine whether or not something new was actually being added to REA's existing practices, but that he must conclude:

"1. REA lists five different statistical reports which will be published annually. But, every bit of information suggested is already being published annually and, therefore, nothing new has been added.

"2. REA will publish two different quarterly statistical bulletins summarizing national and State information of a very general nature, which again they already do today. Still, nothing new has been added.

"3. REA will publish monthly statistical bulletins summarizing national and State information in a very general way. Again, this is being done today, so nothing new is being added.

"4. REA will publish a magazine entitled "Rural Lines," which they have been doing for years, so nothing new has been added.

"5. REA will publish official bulletins on policies, procedures and practices. They have been doing this for years, so nothing new has been added.

"6. REA will issue a press release on every loan approval, stating the name of the borrower, the exact amount of the loan, its purpose or purposes, the area to benefit, and the approximate number of customers or subscribers to receive service. This information is being published today after the loan has been approved, so nothing new has been added."

Mr. MICHEL went on to say:

"When I got down to the section entitled 'Procedures and Criteria Relating to Loan Applications,' I thought that perhaps finally something new was being added. However, after a platitude about REA's recognizing its responsibility for treating as administratively confidential certain loan information, the bulletin says REA will make available certain other information—with one major proviso. This one proviso—that the information would be made available unless the loan applicant asks the Administrator not to disclose it—has the effect of virtually nullifying the effectiveness of the preceding expression of willingness to release certain basic information.

"Actually, this is almost the same procedure presently being followed by REA, so again for all intents and purposes relatively little of a substantial nature has been added."

Today Mr. MICHEL tested this new policy by calling the REA in an effort to obtain certain information on pending generation and transmission loans which he has been trying to get for Congress for several years. He was informed that a list of pending loans will be prepared for him except those still held to be confidential at the request of the borrower. Mr. MICHEL indicated that he considers this to be at least a small modicum of progress in the right direction, but it still falls far short of the complete disclosure of detailed information upon which Congress and the American people can evaluate the propriety of the REA loan program.

Mr. MICHEL then concluded:

"In the last analysis the REA Administrator, apparently feeling the pressure of public criticism of his iron curtain of secrecy, is now attempting to make the Congress and the American people believe the policy is being substantially changed. While admitting that progress is being made, I, for one, cannot accept this proposed new policy bulletin as being a conscientious effort to remove completely this restrictive practice of REA. I will continue to do everything in my power to get the Administrator to eliminate the secrecy restrictions entirely, because I believe that full disclosure of the information relative to governmental activities is imperative in our American system of government."

Home Loan Bank Membership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the very capable members of this administration is the Honorable Joseph P. McMurray, Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. At the 15th annual midyear meeting of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, in New York City on December 12, 1961, Chairman McMurray spoke very persuasively about the reasons for savings bank membership in the Federal Home Loan Bank System. I commend his address to the attention of our colleagues:

WHY SAVINGS BANK MEMBERSHIP IN THE FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK SYSTEM?

(By Joseph P. McMurray)

It's nice being back home. Especially is it nice when you come back to talk with so many of you whom I know and whom I admire.

My first contact with banking was with a savings bank on Fordham Road in the Bronx where I opened an account with my first week's earnings on my newspaper route. Later on in college I studied economics and banking under one of your most ardent advocates and expert advisers, Dr. William H. Steiner, who is now my long-time friend and a man to whom I owe much of my success. The speaker and renowned economist who preceded me, Eli Shapiro, was one of my closest friends and classmates in Brooklyn College, also a student of Dr. Steiner and later to be his collaborator and coauthor of that famous text "Money and Banking." Grover Ensley I have known since his first days in Government when he was in the Budget Bureau and later when we worked together on Capitol Hill. Bill McKenna, your counsel, worked with me for many years on the staff of the Banking and Currency Committee when I was staff director. Sam Justice, your public relations director, "picked my brain" almost daily when he worked for Business Week covering the Capitol. Sol Klaman, of course, I know from working with him when he was with the Federal Reserve Board. Harry Held of Bowery, served with me on President-elect Kennedy's Task Force on Housing and Urban Affairs. Two of you served on my Federal Home Loan Bank Board Task Force, Rusty Crawford of Bowery and John deLaittre of the Farmers & Mechanics in Minneapolis. Grover Ensley also participates as representative of your association. While I was housing commissioner in New York I had the opportunity of working and becoming better acquainted with many of your group. I could go on naming names and associations, but suffice it to say that I am what I am in large part because of and from whom I learned, and because I have learned in whom I can entrust my confidence.

Having grown up in this city where the savings banks have made such a contribution to better living for the ordinary folk and from my associations and personal experience, you can understand why I have so much respect and admiration for the mutual savings bank system and why I like working for you and with you. My somewhat sentimental feelings about you and your industry have, with greater knowledge and maturity, ripened into respect for what you have done to promote thrift and economical homeownership and better living among and for those in your communities.

My appearance before you on the eve of the opening of the first savings bank in the State of Alaska presents an opportunity to salute your newest endeavor. Your leaders displayed great foresight when they recognized in the State of Alaska an opportunity for extension of the benefits of savings banking. You will help this still new frontier to meet both the thrift needs of individuals and the capital and housing needs of the State. Savings banks, through the Central Industry Fund, have shown not only public responsibility but enlightened self-interest in providing assistance so that the bank is now ready to operate. In my travels these past weeks, I had occasion to be in Anchorage. I met Ron Rettig there, saw the new bank building going up, and was much impressed with the dedicated spirit and enthusiasm among all those concerned with the new venture. My congratulations to you and my hope that the Alaska savings bank will be able to make a maximum contribution to the economic well-being and growth of that new frontier.

What the new bank can do for the citizens of Alaska, your banks have been achieving for most of the years of our Nation's history. Your record of safety to depositors is unmatched. Your ability and willingness to shift a major part of your assets after the war into mortgage loans helped the Nation meet its housing objectives.

A basic concern of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board is the promotion of a high level of residential construction and economical homeownership. This is a concern you share. Mortgage credit at reasonable cost has helped increase homeownership and has made an ever-increasing proportion of our citizens property owners with a real rather than a theoretical stake in our society.

There are many factors that contribute to economical home finance. The ability of savings banks and other financial institutions to mobilize savings efficiently is without a doubt quite critical. Yet, you and I know that if these funds, no matter how efficiently assembled, were not channeled into mortgage credit, the cost of home financing would not only be greater, but the housing industry would atrophy and homeownership would be impeded. This is also why the Federal Home Loan Bank Board expressed grave concern before the House Ways and Means Committee over the impact of taxation of mutual thrift institutions. What we felt needed consideration was the effect of any tax proposal on the flow of savings into the mortgage market. We were concerned that some proposals might throttle the flow of savings into housing at a time when our economy still needed whatever stimulus homebuilding could give the economy.

Recently, after I had stated this position, the American Banker carried statements to the effect that the Board's position was contrary to that of the administration and the HHFA and VA. Some other allegations were also made, but I do not care to engage in a demeaning argument.

I would like to take this opportunity merely to set the record straight. As of the present time the administration has not taken an official position. The Treasury's memorandum submitted to the House Ways and Means Committee is a staff report requested by that committee and contains a number of alternatives and significantly enough points to possible effects such taxation might have on home financing. The administration has not indicated that it endorses any specific alternative in that memorandum. The Board's alleged contradiction of the HHFA and VA position on the availability of mortgage funds was based on reports submitted by them on problems not relating to taxes, and, incidentally, the Board estimate that mortgage funds would be adequately available in 1961 proved correct. The HHFA and VA record on the tax matter is clear. The August hearings contain letters, cleared by the Bureau of the Budget, from both agencies expressing their grave concern about the impact of a tax program.

There seems to be a deliberate tendency to polarize the positions on the tax issue. This practice, in my opinion, represents an attempt to obscure the real issues and to hide behind the shield of a mythical model of tax equality. I should like to call your attention to the fact that tax equality does not exist among financial institutions nor among nonfinancial enterprises. Congress throughout our history has allowed special deductions to various industries or has given them the privilege of accepting alternative definitions of current income. By this method various industries have been treated differently with reference to their effective marginal tax rate, despite a uniform general tax rate. Special tax treatment for given industries represents an attempt to recognize economic realities as they affect the public interest in certain situations.

When I was appointed by President Kennedy he asked me to see what I could do for housing, to promote it, to help it stimulate the economy. I would be derelict in my duty if I did not investigate the potential impact of alternative tax programs on housing, and I would be timid indeed if I did not express myself, once having made an independent determination. This does not mean that expressing my views in an open forum in which alternative views are invited by Congress and when no position has been stated by the administration constitutes taking a stand against administration policy, or is it "a thinly hidden assault upon the President of the United States" or "an insult to the Secretary of the Treasury and his subordinates." I love and respect the President too much and I have the highest admiration and friendship for Secretary Dillon and his staff to do anything that could be so characterized. I am sure that if this able and distinguished gentleman who said this knew me, he would agree.

We at the Board look at the tax question in a broad perspective, recognizing the Nation's needs for tax revenue as well as housing's need for savings capital. What we are trying to avoid is an immediate, massive impact of some tax schemes on the flow of funds into the mortgage markets—schemes which seem to increase tax revenue but, because of their impact on housing, result ultimately in a net loss to the economy and to overall Government revenues. This seems to me a clear statement of our position. I hope that further discussions of the tax question will be objective and realistic and will rely on careful analysis of the several variables involved in this problem. The Board's report to the House Ways and Means Committee, those of you who read it, I believe, will agree, approached the problem exactly in that manner.

The tax question is not the only problem in which you and savings associations can find common cause. We have urged savings associations to act in a restrained manner in determining their dividend rates so as to avoid creating an upward thrust on mortgage rates. We hope commercial banks will also act with reasonable restraint.

But my principal purpose today is to discuss with you the ways in which the Federal Home Loan Bank System can be of value to mutual savings banks.

I am sure it is unnecessary to spell out in detail your fine record in the fields of saving and home finance. In the course of your endeavors, you have adhered firmly to some very commendable principles. Each institution has usually been regarded as self-sufficient and autonomous. You have provided within your own individual units both primary and secondary liquidity. You stand ready to meet whatever drains may confront you. These principles are very commendable, and, in broad outline, I think they should be followed in the future.

There is one aspect of the liquidity question, however, which requires reconsideration. Should financial institutions be prepared to meet any or all drains upon them? Or should they rely on a lender of last resort for meeting unforeseeable drains and those quite temporary requirements which, though anticipated, can induce a disruption of the orderly flow of funds? In commercial banking, the policy is quite clear. Individual institutions are expected to maintain sufficient liquidity to meet the variations in flows which any demand deposit institution may face. But unforeseeable drains, no matter how short in duration, may be met by borrowing. Furthermore, though an individual bank may hold readily marketable assets, it may borrow to meet unusual loan demand or deposit withdrawal or conditions which result from exceptional circumstances. If banks had to rely only on buying and selling securities to adjust their position, we would have a very jerky money and capital market, and minor disturbances affecting banks would be amplified throughout the economy.

Savings institutions face a less severe problem than demand deposit organizations. But even a savings bank or savings association can run up against unusual seasonal requirements, steeper than expected cyclical swings in loan or deposit patterns, or some purely temporary, accidental swing in its flow of funds. Requiring these institutions to meet these types of drains only with their own resources, we can affect their functions and the securities market in an unsatisfactory way. Relying on its own resources only, an institution might have a more variable lending pattern than is necessary, and concerted frequent buying or selling of securities by a large number of mutual savings banks or savings associations threatens the orderly course of our major securities markets. Yet, there are some mutual savings banks with liquidity ratios only slightly smaller than the average for commercial banks.

I think that the principles which have guided your industry are solidly based. In this changing world of ours, I suggest, however, that you reconsider your flexibility and resiliency and the impact of your response to unusual circumstances on your lending or security portfolio practices. We all face the problem of flexibility along a number of fronts. You have shown excellent performance in developing a variety of savings plans and in modernizing your operating procedures.

As part of a continuing effort to make the Federal Home Loan Bank System equally flexible and capable of fulfilling its role in the Nation's thrift and housing programs, I formed a task force. As I have already mentioned, I invited two savings bank leaders as members and another as an observer to serve with this group. Morris D. Crawford, Jr., John deLaittre, and Grover Ensley have participated in the series of meetings of the task force. They have worked with leaders from the savings and loan industry, and in the process we have all come to realize that both industries have many more similarities than differences. It is to the mutual interest of the two major thrift and home financing institutions to do all they can to strengthen their common ties. By making it possible for the two industries to discuss both differences and common objectives, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board is meeting its basic responsibility, which is clearly to promote an increased flow of savings into housing and home financing.

While the task force was meeting to sort out and offer solutions to the problems facing the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, another group was also looking into the structure and operations of the Federal Home Loan Bank System. This group, as you know from the previous speaker, Dr. Shapiro, was the Commission on Money and Credit. Greater flexibility in the management of all money and credit facilities runs through all the Commission's recommendations. They also stress programs for strengthening these facilities so as to match their greater flexibility.

Specifically, the Commission recognizes that adequate provision should be made for additional liquidity to help mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations meet temporary or seasonal needs. The Commission therefore recommends, and I quote, "that membership in the Federal Home Loan Bank System be made more attractive for all eligible thrift institutions."

Recent legislation has translated that term "attractive" in two ways: First, and most important, effective January 2, the cost of membership will be cut in half; and, two, by putting the election of directors of the 11 Federal home loan banks on a new basis, greater representation of the interests of all members is achieved. Both provisions, it seems to me, are particularly advantageous to mutual savings banks. Reduction of the capital outlay for membership by half permits mutual savings banks to obtain membership by subscribing to the stock of their regional bank only one percent of the aggregate of the unpaid principal of its home mortgage loans. This saving benefits only those institutions which are members of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, in this instance, mutual savings banks. Those who are members of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, specifically, savings and loan associations, must repay future premiums to the Insurance Corporation in an amount equal to what they would otherwise have been required to invest in Federal home loan bank stock.

Having achieved, on our part, a more attractive basis for savings bank membership, the question remains as to whether savings banks will take up the offer. Obviously, only you can decide—as individual banks with individual problems and methods of operations, and as a system of banks dedicated to thrift promotion. A number of savings banks have already made commitments to accept membership in the System.

The research department of your national association has completed and distributed to you a study of the Federal Home Loan Bank System that analyzes the basic question relating to savings bank membership in the System. Knowing of your desire to consider any proposal that has growth potentials for your industry or individual bank, I am certain that you will want to study this laudable effort of your research department.

You have also received the latest edition of the booklet describing the System. Any questions you may have concerning membership in the System are welcome. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board in Washington, and the presidents of the regional home loan banks stand ready to provide you with every assistance in reaching a decision as to membership.

In suggesting that you give serious consideration to membership in the Federal Home Loan Bank System, I am not forgetting your truly remarkable record for meeting both seasonal and emergency liquidity needs. Nor am I unmindful of that tough-minded self-sufficiency which is the hallmark of savings banking. You have, traditionally, relied on your own management ability and flexibility of investments to meet these needs, whether temporary, local, seasonal, or as they relate to major economic disasters. Savings and loans, on the other hand, with less diversity and less flexibility in their investment powers, have typically relied on borrowing—both to meet temporary or seasonal liquidity needs and also to expand, when advantageous, their mortgage lending.

Over the years savings banks have greatly improved their analysis of cash flows to meet daily liquidity needs and have maintained secondary sources of liquidity to such a degree that, according to FDIC data, mutual savings banks at the end of 1960 had outstanding borrowing totaling but $3.6 million—this was less than one ten-thousandth of their deposit liability.

Praiseworthy as all this is, is it worth it in terms of your basic function to promote savings? In other words, is it worth it to burden your investment portfolio with items that are there solely to meet emergency cash needs? Would it not be more advantageous to your depositors to reduce some of this burden by transferring some of your secondary reserves into longer term, higher yielding securities—yields that could eventually be translated into higher interest rates to your depositors?

Naturally, the cost of membership in a Federal home loan bank must be balanced against yields now earned on the assets you would have to sell to provide for membership costs. In computing your cost, may I suggest that you keep in mind the 2¾ percent now paid on home loan bank stock before you arrive at your final cost. Also, if you use your membership to meet only emergencies that may occur very infrequently, then your membership costs are proportionately higher than if you were to avail yourself of borrowing privileges more frequently to provide a basis for great flexibility in your investments.

The Board and task force are also giving very serious study to ways and means of better utilizing the credit mechanism of the Federal Home Loan Bank System to provide added secondary support to the liquidity of its members and to shape long-term advances to legitimate expansion needs, so that less reliance for such needs be placed on savings growth alone. To the extent the System can serve a secondary mortgage market need, it will help promote a greater stability in the mortgage market and the cost of mortgage credit will decrease. Exactly what we can do, as I said, is under study, but with you being a part of our System the possibility of a successful secondary mortgage mechanism within our System will be greatly increased. And with increased competition for long-term investment funds and savings, such a mechanism will be increasingly needed and helpful to the savings and loan industry and the savings bank system.

There are some other points I trust you will consider as you weigh the advantages of membership for your individual bank. First, you retain your freedom of choice; you can terminate membership whenever it appears to have lost its value. Second, your reporting and examination requirements remain about the same as now. Third, your present liquidity is above the normal requirement of the Home Loan Bank System. Fourth, initial subscription may be paid for on an installment basis over a 1-year period. Fifth, once a member, a mutual savings bank can obtain credit to meet liquidity needs within 24 hours. Finally, we consider the System completely adequate to meet the liquidity needs of the members. These resources include the capital stock, the retained earnings, members' deposits, consolidated obligations, and the authorization to the treasury to purchase up to $1 billion of consolidated obligations in times of extreme need.

Two years ago, a trustee of a mutual savings bank and an outstanding economist discussed at this midyear meeting an effective investment policy for savings banks. He said, and I refer to Prof. Roger Murray, that savings banks should "cultivate the willingess to borrow" and suggested that borrowing is a better way than the traditional bond investments to provide a secondary reserve for contingencies that cannot be offset or foreseen.

The term "magic five" is so painful to savings bankers that I hesitate to mention it; but I must do so in order to indicate what could have been avoided if savings banks had had access to a reliable source of credit to meet a most difficult, but temporary, withdrawal experience.

Dr. Murray was advocating borrowing as one way of building the best possible earning power for your banks over a period of years. I endorse his advocacy. As you are well aware, net deposit gains in mutual savings banks move downward as business activity and yields on alternative investments move upward. Savers seek not only safety and availability; they are sensitive to interest rates, and some of them shift their savings frequently in response to changing yields.

Thus, during periods of rising market interest rates, savings banks—one of the principal sources of mortgage loans—face a diminished cash flow. Access to a reliable source of credit would permit mutual savings banks to take advantage of the more favorable rates. I should add, in fairness, that this privilege is subject to limitations of national fiscal and monetary policy. Conformance by the system to monetary and fiscal policy does not mean a complete curtailment of the credit facility; it merely means that the facility must adjust to changing economic tides. Credit would be more costly in periods of tight money and less costly in periods of easy money and collateral terms associated with credits may also vary over the cycle.

Another reason for membership is reflected in your own efforts in drafting a bill to grant Federal charters for mutual savings banks. The bill names the Federal Home Loan Bank Board as the chartering and supervising agency. We can look at the recent history of your industry and find considerable justification for this program. Despite the fine record amassed by mutual savings banks in serving the public and the economy, your growth in recent years has been substantially less than that of many other financial institutions. A number of reasons can be advanced for the slower growth of mutual savings banks, but most of them can be concisely summarized in the statement that you are an isolated group.

As I mentioned before, each mutual savings bank is regarded as an autonomous, self-sufficient organization. To a large extent you are concentrated in a narrow band along the eastern seaboard, but without sufficient concentration in any one State to generate the type of interest in your problems which other financial institutions enjoy. The record clearly shows that in many cases your branching powers have been much more limited than those of competing types of financial organizations. Furthermore, outside this area of concentration, many States do not provide statutory authority for mutual savings banks. The market, therefore, has moved away from the locations traditionally occupied by mutual savings banks.

As a consequence of this pattern of development, your growth has been arbitrarily restrained, and you cannot expand into many areas where the services of a mutual savings bank, with its broad investment powers, could aid in the development of the economy.

I should like to quote a recommendation from the Commission on Money and Credit:

"At present commercial banks and savings and loan associations may obtain Federal charters. Since only 17 States now provide for the establishment of savings banks, it is

not possible to establish savings banks in two-thirds of our States. Federal charters for savings banks would permit operation in any State, and this would stimulate competition and enterprise among financial institutions, improve the banking facilities in some communities, and perhaps encourage greater conventional mortgage lending activity in all areas."

I think the intent of the Commission on Money and Credit is clearly evident from their own statement. The Commission also recommended broader branching authority for thrift institutions. We at the Board endorse the principles enunciated in their position, but you should not overlook the fact that if mutual savings banks were to increase in number and were to receive the type of treatment accorded other federally chartered institutions, a yardstick would be developed which those of you who are State chartered could employ in obtaining reasonable recognition of the tools which you need in a changing competitive world.

One way for you to advance the Federal charter program is to join the Federal Home Loan Bank System. By so doing, you clearly indicate the fact that you wish to support an agency which is designed and dedicated to maintaining flexibility and soundness in the savings mechanism of this country. I think the Federal charter bill would receive more sympathetic consideration from Congress if your willingness to participate with others in a common pool of liquidity and in a common set of principles were clearly evident. Without giving up your present status as State-chartered institutions, I think you could enjoy many important indirect benefits from the Federal chartering program.

The problems I have discussed with you about the membership of mutual savings banks in the Federal Home Loan Bank System are only one aspect of the many issues confronting the Board today. I know my colleagues would join me in saying that we at the Board are concerned with improving our credit mechanism, our supervision techniques, and the economic analysis necessary for developing policy as conditions in the economy, the housing market, and the capital markets change over time. In this process, we are not seeking to aggrandize our agency or to intrude upon time-honored arrangements in our society. There is a dual system in banking and savings associations. We can see no objection to a dual system for mutual savings banks. My aim in urging your membership reflects our general concern with the strengthening of our financial mechanism generally and giving it the flexibility that the Commission on Money and Credit and others have urged so cogently.

Let me assure you, however, whether you join the bank system or not, we shall maintain a vital interest in your progress and development. We want you, in turn, increasingly to become interested in our problems and our operation and we solicit your constructive help and friendship.

As I said when I started, "It's nice to be home again." I only want to reciprocate your welcome. "Just come home."

Labor Irresponsibility Hurts the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Dallas Morning News reminds us of the serious damage to the Nation from labor's irresponsible actions as exemplified by the strikes and walkouts at our military establishments and missile bases and the current stoppage of west coast shipping which is actually causing the people of our 50th State to face shortages of food and other necessities. How long, Mr. Speaker, will the Congress and the people of the United States tolerate this ruthless dictation by power-hungry labor bosses? How can we, as a Nation, maintain a position of world leadership when we cannot face a few despots who run some of the labor unions? The answer is simple, we cannot. There is only one answer to this problem and that is to make labor subject to the same rules of the game followed by all the rest of us in this free society. In the national interest labor unions should be subject to antitrust law to curb the abuse of power. My bill, H.R. 8407, would accomplish this purpose and I hope this Congress will take the initiative and bring this legislation to the floor for discussion and vote.

The editorial follows:

LABOR IRRESPONSIBILITY

Testimony by Air Force Maj. Gen. W. T. Thurmond to the House Appropriations Committee substantiates the charge that labor unions seriously and irresponsibly are delaying vital U.S. missile and space programs, and proves again the need for strong legislation to prevent such delay.

In his testimony, General Thurmond revealed that the rate of man-days lost as a result of labor quarrels in mid-March was 430 percent higher than during the last 8 months of 1961.

General Thurmond's testimony sharply contradicted Labor Secretary Goldberg's rosy statement last week to the effect that the labor situation was much better at missile sites this year than it was a year ago. Secretary Goldberg, however, gave no figures to back up his claim.

The data cited by General Thurmond showed that, during the first 2½ months of 1962, there were 7,500 man-days lost in 45 strikes. In the last 8 months of 1961, there had been 5,580 man-days lost.

Last week, Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, made charges similar to those leveled by the Air Force. A report of MCCLELLAN'S Senate Investigations Subcommittee said that U.S. missile and space programs have been "intolerably delayed" by union members and local officers who put profit and greed ahead of national safety.

The subcommittee's report said that in the past 4½ years, there have been 325 work stoppages at 19 sites with a loss of 162,872 man-days of work. It cited several "outrageous" cases of overtime pay—one in which ditchdiggers received as much as $287 a week—and explained that many workers used strikes, slowdowns, featherbedding and loafing tactics to collect millions of dollars in such overtime pay. This, the subcommittee report said, was "a brazen gouge of the U.S. taxpayer."

If the United States is indeed behind the Soviets in some aspects of missile and space development, much of the blame must be placed at the feet of labor.

Our survival in the struggle with communism could well depend upon the speed with which these programs are developed. To permit irresponsible labor practices to halt or delay progress is suicide.

Senator MCCLELLAN has proposed legislation to deal with the problem by prohibiting strikes at defense establishments and missile bases vital for the Nation's security. His proposals are not only reasonable, but their adoption by Congress is essential. Without them, the President's pledges to keep the United States ahead of the Soviets in missile and space development—as well as Secretary Goldberg's false reassurances—are self-defeating.

Perspective on the Moon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, as each week brings forth more news concerning preparations for the U.S. lunar venture, I feel that it is in order to remind ourselves of the real aims of our space programs. The Moon, of course, is important, but its importance is primarily that of one goal out of many, not an ultimate. For example, concurrent projects in all fields of research and development may prove to be equally vital, and they must be given great encouragement. Then, too, we must begin to prepare for post-lunar developments: expeditions elsewhere, of course; the altered legal problems; requirements for prolonged space environment and even space colonization; intricate analyses of new materials, metals, perhaps even of new forms of intelligence, to mention but a few.

Mr. J. D. Williams, of the Rand Corp., puts the subject of the Moon program in its proper perspective, and I wish to insert in the RECORD his remarks delivered recently at a Princeton conference. Amusing and highly perceptive, his approach will be of great interest to this body.

The address is as follows:

ANYONE FOR THE MOON?

(J. D. Williams, the Rand Corp., Santa Monica, Calif.)

The United States will outfit an expedition to the Moon, the President announces. Hopefully, man's first. The few who act as though they hear the man seem astonished that one with power, brains, and devotion to human well-being can have such a notion, for they could compile a yard-long list of problems without raising their eyes to the heavens. Even our intellectual are nonplussed, for once, and given to wistful glances at the money.

I shall sketch the thesis that an expedition to the Moon is a fairly good idea, in a day when good ideas are elusive. Of course, as a goal, a three-man party to the Moon is short-term and on-the-cheap compared to, say, a 1,000-man expedition to Mars, or better, a reconnaissance in force to Proxima Centauri. Therefore the reader should be aware that I regard the lunar expedition as a Kitty Hawk-class affair, but a harbinger of profound events.

About the cost—estimates of the cost of a voyage to the Moon range from $10 billion to $40 billion. Since I would advocate the mission at either price, I may as well accept the apparent burden of the $40 billion. Parts of the argument would improve if the price tag were $400 billion.

Most of us have simple notions about large expenditures for such projects—not to disparage, for none are more simple than mine. For instance, to some this project is like a scheme to put $40 billion in orbit; and so

much bullion would require a 36,000-ton spaceship. Moreover, they do not expect the ship to come back, though this is an essential feature of the plan. But one may argue that the ship is more likely to contain 36 tons of aluminum than 36,000 tons of gold so if we can get it at wholesale, the irreplaceable treasure aboard will be worth about $10,000—which we expect to recover. At the risk of heart failure among economists, my friends, I ask, Which of these simple views is nearer reality?

I need a long aside here on taxation and its role, but there is not time for it. However, I note that most of us know just enough to wince when taxes rise, and to smile when they do not. This is the economic equivalent of Pavlov's dog. The economists have not instructed us how to think about it more usefully, I suppose because they know too much. Being free of that burden, I would enjoy developing the theme that it is reasonable to smile more often than we do when taxes rise, and to frown more often than we do when they do not.

Let us suppose the lunar project runs 10 years at an annual rate of $4 billion. Since the national income is $400 billion, it could be funded by a penny tax on each income dollar. Net receipts of the Federal Government exceed $90 billion, so $4 billion is not a drastic change.

If the fund were disbursed in bills soaked in molasses, licking the fingers would quickly become a national trait. A lot of people would handle these bills, because the principal use of money is to pay people, and we do not pay individuals very much. Money would flash out from the Treasury to a few prime contractors, then to hundreds of subcontractors, then to thousands of vendors. An organization touched by the flash would have perhaps 100, or perhaps 100,000, workers, the income producers for a three-times larger crowd, the families. The families would immediately disburse most of the income to their creditors—the grocers, the mortgage holders, the automobile dealers, and the doctors; who would say, "Thanks," or "Thank heavens" and send it to their creditors.

This is a tremendous activity if money changes hands very often. For instance, if the Treasury disburses only to six creditors on the 1st payday, each of them to six new faces on the 2d payday, and so on, there will be 60 million payees on the 10th payday—every family in America could be represented, though that is not likely. Money does in fact change hands often, so the diffusion of these marked bills through the country is very fast. We can get a clue to the speed by comparing bank clearings for a year with demand deposits—our checking accounts: the ratio is about 20 to 1. The number of times money really changes hands may be less than this, because bank clearings include some obscure financial rites, but the notion that money changes hands often should not offend the intuition of those paid twice a month, one clean jump ahead of the bailiff.

So the Government collects money for the Moon and shoots it out through the economy in marked bills. A few months later they are in the hands of millions. Including mine, I hope, and I will give it to Sears, say. What has happened? If nothing, it would have been neater to give it to Sears in the first place.

If we are looking for dramatic events, we see that nothing has happened. There is no solid gold spaceship about to blow up, nor any other way that our wealth is streaming off into the void. It is not a feasible way for the Nation to go broke. The important effects are subtle and indirect, small and numerous. Some are transitory, other cumulative; some are desirable, others not. I cannot discuss them all, for lack of time and because I do not perceive and understand them all, but, generally, those I see appear compatible with the kind of world—not the Moon—I think I would like to live in; which is why I favor the project.

An expedition to the Moon is not a stunt, such as going over Niagara Falls in a barrel. To do it in style implies the prior occurrence of a great intellectual achievement: gaps in knowledge in a thousand fields—practically all you can name from algebra to zymology—have been filled, and enough of the whole has been focused on the expedition to get it off the ground. The knowledge and focusing are quite imperfect, and so is the expedition, but it is quite a thing for the least precocious of animals to have done. It implies a powerful, effective, and broad social organization.

This was the meaning of sputnik. The peoples who have more modest societies would have been impressed if that ship had borne an American flag, but they were shocked that it was Russian; for here was clear proof that there really is behind the Iron Curtain a social organization capable of great feats; and not just grubby ones. The shock was less for us, because we have had such an organization for some time; moreover, our intellectual basket cases thought it a cheap stunt. Other peoples may reason: The Russians do remarkable things after 40 years, so doubtless we can too; but perhaps we must use the Russian system. Thus one benefit of superior performance is prestige. This is a civilized way to influence men's minds. It is a real, directional force, although, like gravity, you cannot touch it.

The money could be spent on more obviously practical projects: to build B-52 bombers, or nuclear submarines, or highways, or dams, or schools, or hospitals, or to support commodity prices. These projects differ, among themselves and from the lunar project, in more ways than one. One distinction is that we know how to do them. They may be necessary, or useful, or desirable, but they no longer pose serious intellectual challenges. The lunar project excels in this, for it has a strong element of research. Because it so excels, its ultimate consequences are likely to exceed the others in practical utility.

It we want a great flood of specified things such as safety pins and refrigerators and bridges, we invest in steel plants. Similarly, if we want a great flood of new things, we invest in research. It is easier to absorb this fact whole than in detail, for research, like a steel plant, does not satisfy our immediate needs. As a rolling mill may frustrate one who wants a safety pin, a research activity may baffle one who wants anything. He will be revolted by seemingly pointless endeavor for which he has no more affinity than for eating beetles. He will be appalled by the failure rate, for the breakage of ideas in research is high—and necessary, because ideas, good and bad, are look-alikes at birth, and the bad outnumber the good. Because the good idea that survives is valuable, knowledge is a superlative high-risk, high-gain investment. While it is difficult to assess explicity the economic gains of knowledge, scattered efforts to do so indicate they range, roughly, from half to twice the original investment, annually.

Funds for a difficult project funnel though research facilities to an unusual degree before they spread to the economy generally. Research facilities are thus stressed, and respond with changes in pace, emphasis, and growth. The market mechanism begins to work: The facilities bid for the talented, strays are collected, and, because of interest, excitement, and increased salaries, the sources of talent are affected. However, the incubation period is long: typically, 7 years of college and graduate work for those whom the schools have given the fundamentals with which to begin—respect for intellectual effort and some competence in reading, writing, and arithmetic. Therefore the stress must be long. We should seek and welcome stresses that induce intellectual development.

It is easy to miss this entire point, if bemused by the thought that it is silly for organizations operating with public funds to bid up the price for the talented and so increase the cost of the services the Government already enjoys. But this is the heart mechanism of the free enterprise system, here operating to increase the highly trained, which is not so silly. We can afford the cost increases, but we cannot afford to be confused about the benefit.

I claim that the lunar project is a deep stimulus to knowledge, which is the best compound interest investment we know for economic growth. That is a sufficient reason to support the project. And as the Senator once said to a too-helpful friend of mine, "Young man, one good reason is enough." However, like my friend but lacking the Senator's guidance, I have an itch to go deeper, for I think there is something more profound than economic growth hidden here. It remains to be seen whether I can probe it without butchering it.

Our times are notable for raging tides of humanity, of expectations, and of technology. These forces may not tear apart civilization, given enough miracles. The pragmatic approach to miracles is knowledge.

I touched on the topic of prestige. The counterpart of prestige abroad is pride at home. Pride in the project can be shared by the most diverse: the Republican, the Catholic, the patriot, the cabdriver, the mathematician, the conscientious objector, the schoolboy, and the guest at Alcatraz. It offends the principles and mores of almost no one. It might do more.

Man's unique quest for meaning and purpose of life has led him to a desolate region. The supernatural pillars of classical religions are crumbling, which seems to jeopardize the superstructures of ethics; so as man loses his old visions, his guides to behavior fade. The secular faith of the patriot, God-fearing or not, shrinks as the world shrinks. As the absolutes of church and State are thus compromised, man feels malaise. I wonder whether he can, in these circumstances, make do with some faith in himself. His knowledge and power would be envied by most of the gods he has bowed to. If he assumed forthright responsibility for his life and world, commensurate with his growing knowledge and power, he might construct a salubrious environment, with an amiable philosophic base. He might cope with famine, pestilence, and war; with fear of God, devil, or man; with poverty of goods or thoughts; with slavery of body or mind. He might explore and contemplate the universe, and discover some profound meanings not now in sight. He might improve his mind—literally—to do all this better. Of course he might fail in some or all, for while he has the conventional attributes of the gods he certainly lacks experience in the role.

The deliberate pursuit of intellectual excellence, of knowledge, understanding, and wisdom, emphasizes the characteristic of man that I think would stand out to a visitor from abroad—Proxima Centauri, say—i.e., his ability to learn. He learned as an individual. Then he learned to share knowledge with his physical group; then to draw on the intellectual capital of past generations; then to share with his contemporary group. And all future generations may draw on him. While his personal prowess as a thinker is outstanding, this cumulative power of thought of the species is a fantastic

event. To find another of this rank, we may have to go to the appearance of life on the planet.

This development provides a practical realization of the quest for immortality. The modern student who learns the meaning of language; of zero, one, and the other integers; of Archimedes' principle and Newton's laws; and so on, ad infinitum, gives testimony that the men who created these things still live. As the intellectual heirs of the past, it seems fitting that we regard it as high moral purpose to contribute some thoughts to the future. Surely a thought is more spiritual than a gene.

It can be argued with force that the lunar project is not likely to produce the benefits I seek. It could fail for subtle reasons, but its conspicuous weakness is that it is not really ambitious. While it will doubtless turn out to be distressingly difficult, the prognosis is that the mission will in fact be accomplished, perhaps in nearer to 5 than to 10 years, and perhaps by the Russians before the Americans—someone has remarked that we may have to fight our way to the Moon. Now, goals must be in front, not in back; and this one will soon be in back. There it cannot provide the long stress needed to develop our intellectual resources. If it is put in back by the Russians, we will be frustrated as well as goalless. On the other hand, if the goal were more ambitious, say to explore the solar system, or beyond, our activities in the next decade would be little affected, but our attitudes would be greatly affected. We would not run out of goals. And we would not be shattered if the Russians beat us on the first short leg. Moreover, we would be less likely to be beaten on the next leg.

Thus the lunar project looks anemic. But it is at least compatible with grander views. It is stimulating, benign, and large enough to be noticed amongst the competition—the world series seems to be the event of broadest interest now. Whatever else we do for our mutual benefit and for posterity, I believe the lunar project should surely be included.

Fifty Years of Child Health Services in Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct pleasure for me to join in saluting the Children's Bureau of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on its 50th anniversary. I am happy to commend the staff and employees of this bureau for the fine services which they have rendered for the care of the Nation's children over the past half century.

At this time, I should also like to extend my heartiest congratulations to the board of health of my own State, Louisiana, for its first 50 years of providing a statewide health program for our children. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that Louisiana was the Nation's pioneer in this field; it was in January, 1912—some 3 months prior to the formation of the U.S. Children's Bureau—that the first statewide health program for children was begun by my State. This bureau of child hygiene was organized under the Louisiana State Board of Health, which, incidentally, is the oldest State board of health in our country, having been in continuous operation since 1855.

For the information of my colleagues, I should like to cite some of the pertinent facts about the successful statewide health program for children in Louisiana. Dr. William J. Rein, Louisiana's splendid State health officer, has provided pertinent information on the organization and progress of the State's child health program which I am pleased to pass on to you.

The information follows:

FIFTY YEARS OF CHILD HEALTH SERVICES IN LOUISIANA

Fifty years ago Louisiana set up the Nation's first statewide health program for children. In 1911, Miss Agnes Morris, versatile Louisiana schoolteacher, was employed by Dr. Oscar Dowling, State health officer of Louisiana, to head its proposed Bureau of Child Hygiene. The bureau began its work in January 1912, predating the establishment of the U.S. Children's Bureau by a few months.

Working through the early parish health organizations, Miss Morris and her staff were concerned with maternal and infant hygiene, dental hygiene, school hygiene, instruction of midwives, registration of births, and general health education.

As early as 1915, schoolchildren were receiving physical examinations from Louisiana's "visiting nurses."

State programs for children received their first outside financial assistance from funds allocated to the Children's Bureau, then in the Department of Labor, under the Maternity and Infancy Act of 1921.

During the depression years, child health programs in Louisiana and many other States were severely curtailed.

Today the health departments of Louisiana and other States and territories are engaged in far-reaching child health programs. Aided by funds authorized under the Social Security Act of 1935, the Louisiana State Board of Health's maternal and child health programs gained momentum and activities in school and dental health and crippled children services were begun.

Today maternal and child health workers are entrusted with the developing and improving of community services for children. Prenatal medical and nursing care, health supervision of infants and preschool children, medical examinations as well as immunization are among the health services offered by the State board of health through the parish health units located in all 64 parishes.

"Pierre the Pelican," author of a series of mental health pamphlets, is well known to thousands of Louisianians. His messages are distributed by the board to parents before and after the arrival of their new babies.

Another activity of the Louisiana State Board of Health in its provision of services to children is the crippled children program. This program was legally initiated by Act 54 of the 1936 Louisiana Legislature. That act designated the State board of health as the agency to develop and plan for the operation of services for crippled children in accordance with title V of the national Social Security Act of 1935.

The board put such a plan into operation during 1939, providing for casefinding, treatment and necessary followup for children crippled or suffering from conditions which might lead to crippling. The program has continued with an ever-upward trend in amount and quality of services. The services provide that any child under 21 years of age, suspected of having a condition treatable in this program, may be referred for an initial medical evaluation and recommendations, but treatment may be provided only for specified conditions and for those individuals who are indigent or medically indigent. Initially the conditions eligible for treatment were restricted to orthopedic handicaps, such as tuberculosis of the bone, poliomyelitis, rickets, muscular dystrophy, cerebral palsy, congenital malformations, arthritis, and so forth. These have been expanded to include rheumatic fever, rheumatic and congenital heart disease, cleft-lip and cleft-palate with related orthodonture, prosthodonture, and operative dentistry, other conditions requiring plastic surgery, and hearing impairments.

During the last year the program has continued operating eight district offices, located throughout the State as follows: Alexandria, Amite, Baton Rouge, Lafayette, Lake Charles, Monroe, New Orleans, and Shreveport. Each of these operated outpatient clinics serving the children referred from the several parishes comprising the district. Local private physicians, orthopedists, pediatricians, plastic surgeons, cardiologists, and pediatric cardiologists provide the required professional services. These individuals receive only a small honorarium as recompense for their great contributions of time and effort to the care of the handicapped children.

During 1961, 8,413 children visited these clinics for a total of 22,187 visits. Of this number, approximately 1,000 were hospitalized for medical or surgical treatment for a total of 25,284 hospital days. This number of children represents a relatively small percent of the total number of handicapped children in the State because of the limited number of conditions which are eligible for treatment in this program. In addition, others who are handicapped are cared for privately by charity hospitals, other State agencies, and to some extent by voluntary organizations. In any event, no crippled child in Louisiana, that is, one with a condition which is treatable in the State board of health crippled children program, need go without treatment because the program stands ready to provide the very finest diagnostic services for any child and treatment for those who need financial assistance.

Staffing Committees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to insert the following excellent editorial from the Boston Herald of April 4:

STAFFING COMMITTEES

It has been said that a congressional committee is as good or as bad as its professional staff.

Back in 1946 the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress tried to take committee staffs out of politics.

"They should be appointed," it said, "without regard to political affiliation and only persons whose qualifications are approved by the director of congressional personnel should be eligible for appointment by the committee. The staff members should be

considered permanent employees of the Congress and should not be dismissed for political reasons."

But in the 16 years since the committee's report Congress has made little progress toward that ideal. A few committees, like the House Foreign Affairs and the Senate Foreign Relations Committees, have genuinely nonpartisan staffs. But the great majority do not. Most staff people are appointed by and are answerable to the committee majority. They last as long as the majority holds power.

Lately a number of Republican Congressmen have become so incensed at this situation that they have sought to remedy it by claiming staff appointments for the minority.

Pointing out that the imbalance in committee staffs in the House now averages 14 for Democrats to 1 for Republicans, Representative SCHWENGEL has introduced a resolution (H. Res. 570) which would give to the minority members of any committee the right, upon demand, to name 40 percent of the professional and clerical staff members. Similar bills have been introduced by other Republican Congressmen.

Representative SCHWENGEL and his friends have a point. If committee personnel is going to be appointed on a partisan basis, then the minority should have a proportionate share of the appointments. In a two-party system it is just as important to have the minority well informed as the majority.

But is this really the best solution? Would not both parties be better served if the committees went back to the 1946 plan of naming all or most staff members on a purely nonpartisan basis. A 60–40 split is admittedly better than a 90–10 split. But why split at all? Why not move in the direction of complete professionalization of the professional staffs?

If the minority members would put up a strong fight for that, they would have the whole country behind them.

Annual Governor's Prayer Breakfast Speech by John A. Volpe, Governor of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I have just read a very fine speech by Gov. John A. Volpe, of Massachusetts. It was delivered on the occasion of the second annual Governor's prayer breakfast, an event which Governor Volpe inaugurated when he became the chief executive of Massachusetts.

One of the very real and extremely serious tasks facing the people of Massachusetts is the cleanup of past corruption in State government which Governor Volpe has undertaken. In this speech, the Governor outlines the responsibility of the people in the maintenance of high moral standards in public office. His ideas are so universally applicable that I feel everyone can benefit from their value.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Governor Volpe's remarks. The speech follows:

SECOND ANNUAL GOVERNOR'S PRAYER BREAKFAST, PARKER HOUSE, BOSTON, MASS., MARCH 22, 1962

My friends, this is the second annual Governors prayer breakfast, which we were privileged to inaugurate last year. This year, at the request of a group of U.S. Senators, Governors of the various States were asked to send prayers from occasions such as this to President John F. Kennedy to indicate that all over our broad land the Governors and the peoples of the various States are praying for God's direction in the affairs of this Nation and for the leaders of our country.

A few days ago I forwarded my prayer as Governor of Massachusetts to our President.

It would be, I think, fitting to quote today from that prayer. It was as follows:

"Dear God, we know that without Your help in our human affairs we will stumble and fall. In the days of our youth we dedicated our Nation and ourselves to Your way; we committed ourselves to truth and justice for all men. But Your way has been spurned by evil forces of the world, endangering all mankind.

"We beg Your protection of our Nation and our President in these times of peril. Give him wisdom and strengthen him so that he may guide this land safely on its course. Safeguard our peace and our democracy and deepen our faith so that we may never be blinded to the spiritual principles from which we sprang.

"Help us to remember we are a nation founded under Your divine providence. Keep us safely in your hands. Amen."

In sending that prayer to the President, I had in mind, of course, the peace of the world, but I also had in mind divine guidance of our Government right here in this country and that is something that we all can do something about at every level here in America. We can do something about our local government, our county government, our State government, and the big challenge presented by government today is not only the challenge of doing a good job, it is a moral challenge.

We must be committed to truth and justice for all men, to integrity that spurns evil forces, to the principle that we must never be blinded to the spiritual sources from which we sprang.

In these troubled times we need brilliant minds, we need experts in many fields, but even more, we need men of unquestioned integrity.

In our early days such men answered the call of service—Washington, Jefferson, Franklin, Adams, and many others and it was that way through the days of our great emancipator, Abraham Lincoln.

But of late years there has seemed to be a growing disinclination on the part of many fine Americans to go into public service.

Sometimes this grew out of economic reasons, going into government frequently means a loss of some portion of one's normal earning power, and yet such a loss, such a seeming disadvantage is often far outweighed by the many advantages that an individual will receive by an honest dedication to public service.

There are true rewards usually based on inner satisfaction in taking part in the work of government, although there are no rewards of money, and frequently not of fame.

But helping to shape the character and the progress of government, from the lowliest civil servant on up to the President of the United States, is a rewarding endeavor in public trust.

A Christian holding public office or a government position must devote himself to strengthening the belief of the all in the efficiency and honesty of free democratic government. The public welfare must be put above personal gain. We should not go into government to do well for ourselves but to do good for others.

In these troubled times we hear much of corruption in high places. If that exists there will be cynicism among our people.

For in our country one is virtually as bad as the other. If there is corruption and people are cynical, people will begin to look upon all government as corrupt, will begin to think of democracy as a farce, will lose faith in democratic leadership.

We do not want either the corruption or the cynicism. When there is corruption the cynicism can only be avoided by vigorous action to stamp out the corruption. And that my friends, is the duty of all of us who love our country and value our democratic way of life.

And remember, no individual in the United States can hold himself aloof from our Government. We are all deeply involved in it and affected by its processes whether we realize it or not. If you are an employer or an employee, get a ticket for parking or speeding, fill out an income tax blank, you are involved with government. Every time you see policemen or firemen in operation, or see a school, you are watching government in action.

In fact, I cannot think of any human activity in our modern society where the impact of government is not felt.

So government is a part of every living human being and governments are instituted in these modern days to secure to us all the rights given us by our good Lord.

As a result in a nation such as ours which is founded on the recognition of man's Godgiven rights and his eternal relationship to his Creator, apathy and indifference to government on the part of an individual is inexcusable.

Far too many people are afflicted with indifference or are merely critical of government. Actually they should make every effort to support it, to participate in it even if the participation is only to the extent of voting at every opportunity. Of course, the voting should be done with knowledge of the issues and personalities involved, and it is the good citizen's duty to familiarize himself with both, then he votes intelligently and with the desire to help his government and his country by his active participation in public affairs.

This old world of ours, this great country of ours, will never be any more than we are individually. If it is in bad shape it is because too many of us are not doing our duty.

Unfortunately, there are many people who do not know what they are for, they do know more or less vaguely what they are against. It is not enough to just be against, for instance, communism, and for, for instance, good government. We have all got to be more positive than that; we have got to be against all things that are insidious to our Government and our Christian way of life. We have got to be for those things and forces that stand for betterment and improvement and the best that can be achieved in the moral and the religious concepts on which our Nation was founded.

A steady trend away from morality in our personal lives and in government will ultimately bring about the collapse of our Nation from within. More than from any force from without.

Lax social and personal morality, a tendency to self-indulgence and softness, dishonesty in official places as well as in our private lives, human delinquency, a lack of knowledge and acknowledgment of God, and of the responsibilities of Christians to Him and to each other, are devastating enemies.

Now Americans have always interpreted most liberally the rights of minorities to believe and to express their beliefs in every political or economic doctrine, with few exceptions.

But no American citizen in his right mind could seriously argue that forces that would wreck our democracy should be allowed in government, that ranges all the way from a supporter of Communist ideologies to the dishonest individual.

We insist that every employee or official of our Government live up to both the letter and the spirit of the oath he or she takes to uphold the Constitution, and if we ferret out the subversives, we have taken a long step forward in making our Government the kind that we wanted it to be, the kind that was mapped by our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution.

The inspiration of these documents, inspiration of our Founding Fathers, was God. And in the words of William Penn: "Those people who are not governed by God will be ruled by tyrants."

As we work for peace in this world today we need men and women who will serve without the patriotic stimulus of war, without public recognition, perhaps more often than not, even without public appreciation, and we must recognize that this service, particularly in Government, is often as important to the survival of our Nation as is service in the Armed Forces in time of war.

A great philosopher has said that a free society is not a perfect society, but it is a society in which individuals are free to define perfection and struggle toward it.

And we must forever strengthen our knowledge that the foundation of our Nation rests on belief in God, and "under God" as our Founding Fathers expressed it, we must live these beliefs if we are to maintain our Nation.

We are here today as are the peoples of our other States asking divine aid and guidance for our country, our people, and our President.

U.S. Foreign Policy Encourages Seizure of American Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, we should not be surprised when the property of American citizens is stolen by foreign nations and even the citizens themselves become the victims of bandit governments. Disrespect for the United States and its citizens is the natural result of a weak and confused foreign policy by which we quail before every government and helplessly wring our hands when our people are assaulted and their property seized. This question of expropriation of American property by foreign governments is discussed in the following column by George E. Sokolsky which appeared in the Washington Post:

EXPROPRIATION

(By George E. Sokolsky)

It is becoming customary for officials of new revolutionary governments to seize American property, as has recently been done in Cuba and in Brazil and as had earlier been done in Red China and Soviet Russia. As a matter of practice, the United States in recent years has done nothing about such expropriations. During earlier administrations, particularly in the Theodore Roosevelt and Taft administrations, the United States pursued what came to be known as dollar diplomacy, by which was meant that the United States not only protected American life but also American property.

Since the Franklin Roosevelt administration, American policy on this subject had to change because when Roosevelt recognized Soviet Russia he ignored the fact that Russia had expropriated American property in Russia without compensation of any kind. It used to be true, particularly in countries where the United States exercised extraterritorial jurisdiction, that any company could register at a consulate as an American company. In 1924, Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes held that:

"The question, however, as to the extent to which this Government should afford such a corporation assistance in a foreign country is one which may properly be governed in large measure by the nature and extent of the American interests involved."

Since the Franklin Roosevelt administration it has become policy to protect neither American life nor American property anywhere, even in countries with a low-level civilization, with the result that expropriations have become increasingly usual. The assumption is that American corporations are owned by rich tycoons and to hell with them. The fact is that American corporations are usually owned by thousands of small stockholders, often widows, orphans, trust funds left for children's education, educational institutions and the like.

When an expropriation takes place, these stockholders have been robbed as though their pockets had been picked. When the Brazilian Government, for instance, expropriates American property in Brazil, the property of a duly franchised American company, it actually steals the possessions of the shareowners of that property. It is after such an event that our Government entertains President Joao Goulart of Brazil.

Are we to finance the Brazilian Government in its depredations as we gave Stalin $11 billion to become our principal enemy?

The real difficulty is that whereas we speak of ours as a capitalist country, we do not quite mean what we say. Capitalism is the investment of our surplus above the necessities of life in the economy of a country at the risk of the investor, who hopes to profit by it, but may lose.

When, however, the Government encourages companies to take a share of their investments abroad, it assumes a specific responsibility, at any rate, to protect that investment from expropriation.

In the old days, when we were a proud nation and were putting money into Latin American enterprises, we did something about it. We sent the marines and maintained the Monroe Doctrine. But it was impractical to do that when the Russian Bolsheviks seized American property. We were not ready to go to war with Soviet Russia. We did send an army to Siberia to prevent Japan from seizing the Trans-Siberian Railroad from Lake Baikal east, an act which prevented the partitioning of Russia among the Allies early enough to contain the Bolsheviks in a small and perhaps unconquerable area.

While there is a flight of capital from the United States and an export of jobs to Western Europe and Japan, Americans show wisdom in keeping their money out of those countries which have a history of expropriation.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).